

# $N$ -cutoff regularization for fields on hyperbolic space

RUDRAJIT BANERJEE<sup>1</sup>, MAXIMILIAN BECKER<sup>2</sup>, AND RENATA FERRERO<sup>3</sup>

<sup>1</sup>*Okinawa Institute of Science and Technology Graduate University,  
1919-1, Tancha, Onna, Kunigami District, Okinawa 904-0495, Japan*

<sup>2</sup>*Institute for Mathematics, Astrophysics and Particle Physics (IMAPP),  
Radboud University, Heyendaalseweg 135, 6525 AJ Nijmegen, The Netherlands*

<sup>3</sup>*Institute of Physics (THEP), University of Mainz,  
Staudingerweg 7, D-55128 Mainz, Germany*

## Abstract

We apply a novel background-independent and scale-free quantization and regularization scheme, the  $N$ -cutoffs, to scalar fields and metric fluctuations on a maximally symmetric but non-compact spacetime, namely hyperbolic space. The  $N$ -cutoffs are a regularization on the spectrum of the fields' fluctuation modes, and are implemented on a continuous quantum number here. For both the scalar field and metric fluctuations, we find that the inclusion of increasingly many field modes tends to reduce the negative curvature of the hyperbolic space, leading to vanishing values in the limit of removing the cutoff. This phenomenon is analogous to the results found for those fields on a self-consistent spherical background.

---

<sup>1</sup>email: [rudrajit.banerjee@oist.jp](mailto:rudrajit.banerjee@oist.jp)

<sup>2</sup>email: [M.Becker@hef.ru.nl](mailto:M.Becker@hef.ru.nl)

<sup>3</sup>email: [rferrero@uni-mainz.de](mailto:rferrero@uni-mainz.de)

# Contents

<b>1</b>	<b>Introduction</b>	<b>1</b>
<b>2</b>	<b>The gravitational one-loop effective action induced from “matter” fields</b>	<b>6</b>
2.1	Matter fields on Riemannian background spacetimes . . . . .	6
2.2	The free scalar field . . . . .	7
2.3	Metric fluctuations/the free graviton field . . . . .	8
2.4	Semi-classical equations of motion and the SET . . . . .	9
<b>3</b>	<b><math>N</math>-type cutoffs for <math>\mathbb{H}^d(L)</math></b>	<b>12</b>
3.1	Spectral properties of the Laplacian on $\mathbb{H}^d(L)$ . . . . .	12
3.2	$N$ -type cutoffs . . . . .	17
<b>4</b>	<b>Maximally symmetric <math>N</math>-geometries</b>	<b>20</b>
4.1	The scalar field . . . . .	20
4.2	Metric fluctuations . . . . .	23
4.3	Summary . . . . .	25
<b>5</b>	<b>Conclusions and outlook</b>	<b>26</b>
<b>A</b>	<b>Decomposition of <math>V</math> and <math>ST</math></b>	<b>28</b>
<b>B</b>	<b>Addition theorems on hyperbolic space</b>	<b>30</b>
<b>C</b>	<b>Calculation of the gravitational effective action induced from a free scalar field on <math>\mathbb{H}^d(L)</math></b>	<b>37</b>

# 1 Introduction

Of the known fundamental interactions, gravity carries the unique distinction of furnishing the very stage on which the laws of Nature manifest – the spacetime manifold itself. This special role of the gravitational interaction strongly suggests that an essential virtue of any approach to the dynamics of gravity ought to be the preservation of *background independence*. Background independence is a concept that, at present, comprises a collection of desiderata for a physical theory, which are yet to fully crystalize into rigorous mathematics [1]; nonetheless certain aspects are clear. Consider first the case in which the gravitational field is treated classically, with matter degrees of freedom quantized on a classical, gravitationally non-trivial (i.e., curved) background. While for specific analyses it might be of interest to keep this background non-dynamical, when the quantum fluctuations are no longer “small” (as measured by the expectation value of the stress-energy tensor (SET)), the spirit of general relativity (GR) demands that the backreaction of these quantum modes on the classical spacetime be taken into account. Through the resulting “semi-classical” Einstein equation, the classical spacetime is thus dynamically determined. On the other hand, there is full-fledged quantum gravity (QG). Here, spacetime itself is quantized and the resulting quantum spacetime consequently becomes a prediction of the theory. Thus, if a theory of QG resorts to background structures, e.g., by splitting the spacetime metric into a background and fluctuation part, then – at least at the level of observables – the theory must be shown to be independent of the employed background structures. This may be achieved by initially keeping the background metric fully generic throughout the quantization procedure, and then subsequently determining it by dynamical principles [2], i.e., by solving equations akin to the Einstein equation. These settings illustrate the precise aspect of *background independence* on which we focus, namely that any background metric appearing in the formulation of the theory must be self-consistently determined by the backreaction of the quantum degrees of freedom. Thus, the desideratum of background independence may be re-expressed in terms of the criterion of *self-consistency*.

In this paper we further develop the novel approach to background-independent field-quantization introduced in [3,4], wherein the requirement of *background independence through self-consistency* is extended into the realm of the regularized theories from which the quantum field theory (QFT) is defined. This is achieved by employing *gravity-coupled approximants*, each of which is a regularized, quasi-physical quantum system together with a self-consistent background metric. One may heuristically regard the approximants as consisting of quantum degrees of freedom living on the very spacetime that they would natively “wish” to inhabit. “Quasi-physical” is the requirement that the regularized quantum system itself has the potential of being physically realizable. Although somewhat nebulous in scope, this requirement imposes important restrictions on acceptable regularization schemes: common frameworks such as dimensional regularization or zeta-function regularization must be excluded, as e.g. in the former case a regularized theory at some generic dimension  $d = 4 - \varepsilon$  cannot be experimentally realized. Furthermore, the regularization procedure must not rely on any dimensionful scales intrinsic to the background metric that is to be self-consistently determined. This final requirement rules out the usual momentum cutoff, and indeed it

has been demonstrated [3] that a self-consistent momentum cutoff does not act as a proper ultraviolet (UV) cutoff anymore. This has motivated the development of an alternative *scale-free* regularization technology: the *N-type cutoffs* [3,4].

The *N-type cutoffs*, or *N-cutoffs* for brevity, are scale-free UV cutoffs that are formally constructed as follows. Consider an Euclidean path integral of the form  $\int \mathcal{D}_g \Phi \exp(-S[\Phi; g])$ . Here,  $\Phi$  represents some quantum field(s) on a classical Riemannian (background) manifold with metric  $g_{\mu\nu}$ ; the field  $\Phi$  is classically governed by the action  $S[\Phi; g]$ . We note further that the path integral measure  $\mathcal{D}_g \Phi$  is  $g$ -dependent, in order to achieve a diffeomorphism/Becchi-Rouet-Stora-Tyutin (BRST) invariant path integral [5–8]. Next, one may expand  $\Phi$  in the basis  $\{\phi_j\}$  of eigenfunctions of the background Laplacian. Then the path integral is simply regularized by integrating only over that function space, which is spanned by those modes with  $j \leq N$ . For compact background spacetimes, one has  $N \in \mathbb{N}_0$ , while for non-compact background spacetimes one has  $N \in \mathbb{R}_+ = [0, \infty)$ . It is to be stressed that this regularization prescription according to the scale-free  $N$  is fully background independent in the sense that no particular background metric is required to assess whether a field mode is integrated out or not. From the path integral regularized in this way, the induced gravitational effective action  $\Gamma_N[g]$  may be computed (e.g. via the standard loop expansion), with the background metric  $g_{\mu\nu}$  still kept fully generic. Then the quantum equations of motion  $\delta\Gamma_N[g]/\delta g = 0$  may be analyzed for solutions that are the self-consistent background metrics  $g_{\mu\nu}(N)$ , which for  $N \rightarrow \infty$  give the metric of the self-consistent spacetime that the concomitant QFT lives on.

In summary, the  $N$ -cutoff regularization scheme follows from three requirements connected in a logical sequence: background independence, gravity-coupled approximants, and  $N$ -type cutoffs. The motivation for the introduction of this framework is twofold: Firstly, if the regularized system itself is quasi-physical, some properties of the theory might be already analyzed at the level of the regularized system, and not only in the QFT-limit. This concerns for example unitarity, which is difficult to assess in QG theories. Secondly, it may reasonably be expected that “better” QFT limits arise as  $N \rightarrow \infty$ , particularly given the “physical flavor” of the regularized system. Finally we note that in order to construct  $N$ -cutoffs, one must have access to the spectral properties of a suitable operator, say, the background Laplacian, acting on some Hilbert space built upon the spacetime manifold. Unfortunately, since such spectral properties are unknown in the general case,  $N$ -cutoffs are challenging to construct on generic backgrounds.

In the case of maximally symmetric spacetimes, however, the situation is different. Here, the metric tensor may be expressed as  $g_{\mu\nu} = L^2 \gamma_{\mu\nu}$ , with  $L$  a dynamical “Hubble radius” that relates to the scalar curvature, the only scale on a maximally symmetric manifold, with  $R \propto 1/L^2$ . Further,  $\gamma_{\mu\nu}$  is a rigid, undynamical metric corresponding to the case  $L = 1$ . For instance,  $L$  could be the radius of an  $d$ -sphere,  $\mathbb{S}^d(L)$ , with  $R = d(d-1)/L^2$  and  $\gamma_{\mu\nu}$  the metric of the unit  $d$ -sphere. As a result, when e.g. matter fields are quantized on a maximally symmetric background in presence of an  $N$ -cutoff, the backreaction of the

corresponding quantum modes through the contracted semi-classical Einstein equation

$$-\frac{1}{2}(d-2)R + d\Lambda_b = 8\pi G\langle T_\mu^\mu \rangle_N, \quad (1.1)$$

gives rise to the self-consistent ‘‘Hubble radii’’  $L^{\text{sc}}(N)$ , or, equivalently, the self-consistent scalar curvatures  $R^{\text{sc}}(N)$  (when the equations of motion do have solutions).

As a first application of the  $N$ -type cutoffs on compact manifolds, the self-consistent spherical background geometries have been calculated for a free scalar field [3], as well as for full QG treated as quantized metric fluctuations on spherical backgrounds to one-loop order<sup>1</sup> [4]. Here the compactness of  $\mathbb{S}^d(L)$  implies that the background Laplacian  $-\square = -g^{\mu\nu}D_\mu D_\nu$  has a discrete spectrum, indexed by  $N \in \mathbb{N}_0$ . Invoking an  $N$ -cutoff, it is convenient to express the right-hand side (RHS) of the (regularized) traced Einstein equation, c.f. (4.19), as

$$\langle T_\mu^\mu \rangle_N(L) = \frac{1}{L^d \Omega_d} \Theta_N^{\text{scal}}(L), \quad (1.2)$$

where  $\Omega_d$  is the volume of the unit  $d$ -sphere, and  $\Theta_N^{\text{scal}}(L)$  is the integrated and traced SET. We remark that this entails no loss of information, as the (regularized) traced SET is *constant* on the sphere, which is a consequence of the addition theorem for spherical harmonics (Theorem B.1) together with the expression for  $\langle T_\mu^\mu \rangle_N(L)$  in terms of the eigenfunctions of  $-\square$  (c.f. Eq. (3.34)).

For a free scalar field with mass  $M$  and non-minimal coupling  $\xi$  to gravity, one has

$$\Theta_N^{\text{scal}}(L) = \sum_{n=1}^N D_n \left[ 1 - \frac{M^2}{\mathcal{E}_n(L) + \xi R(L) + M^2} \right]. \quad (1.3)$$

Here,  $\mathcal{E}_n$  are the eigenvalues of  $-\square$  acting on  $\mathbb{S}^d(L)$  and  $D_n$  their degeneracies. For  $M = 0$ , Eq. (1.3) becomes independent of  $L$  and reduces to

$$\Theta_N^{\text{scal}} = \sum_{n=1}^N D_n \equiv \mathbf{f}_{\text{scal}}(N), \quad (1.4)$$

where  $\mathbf{f}_{\text{scal}}(N)$  are the degrees of freedom of the regularized quantum system with  $\mathbf{f}_{\text{scal}}(N) \approx \frac{1}{12}N^4$  at leading order for large  $N$ . One finds from Eq. (4.19) the solutions for  $\Lambda_b > 0$ ,

$$L^{\text{sc}}(N)^2 = \frac{3}{2\Lambda_b} \left[ 1 + \sqrt{1 + \frac{G\Lambda_b}{3\pi} \mathbf{f}_{\text{scal}}(N)} \right] \xrightarrow{N \rightarrow \infty} \infty. \quad (1.5)$$

Since  $\mathbb{S}^d(L)$  is compact,  $\{L^{\text{sc}}(N)\}_{N \in \mathbb{N}_0}$  is a sequence of self-consistent background geometries, represented by the self-consistent radii  $L^{\text{sc}}(N)$ . Clearly, this sequence entails  $R^{\text{sc}}(N) \rightarrow 0$  as  $N \rightarrow \infty$ . We note that this behavior remains stable for massive scalar fields,

---

<sup>1</sup>These may be interpreted as the free graviton field.

and remark that in the case of diverging mass,  $M \rightarrow \infty$ , the RHS of Eq. (1.3) vanishes, which yields  $\lim_{N \rightarrow \infty} R^{\text{sc}}(N) = 2d \Lambda_{\text{b}} / (d - 2)$ .

The analogous result holds for full quantum gravity on spherical geometries, in terms of quantized metric fluctuations at one-loop order. Here, the RHS of Eq. (4.19) reads

$$\langle T_{\mu}^{\mu} \rangle_N(L) = \frac{1}{L^d \Omega_d} \Theta_N^{\text{grav}}(L), \quad (1.6)$$

with

$$\Theta_N^{\text{grav}}(L) = \mathbf{f}_{\text{G}}(N) - \mathbf{f}_{\text{gh}}(N) + \Delta \Theta_N^{\text{grav}}(L; \Lambda_{\text{b}}). \quad (1.7)$$

Here,  $\mathbf{f}_{\text{G}}(N)$  and  $\mathbf{f}_{\text{gh}}(N)$  are the degrees of freedom of the regularized system corresponding to the free graviton field (G) and (Fadeev-Popov) ghost fields (gh). At leading order one has  $\mathbf{f}_{\text{G}}(N) - \mathbf{f}_{\text{gh}}(N) = [10 - 8] \mathbf{f}_{\text{scal}}(N)$ , reflecting the  $10 - 8 = 2$  physical polarization states of the graviton. The term  $\Delta \Theta_N^{\text{grav}}(L; \Lambda_{\text{b}})$  contains the quadratic and logarithmic divergences and thus is subleading. Consequently, for  $\Lambda_{\text{b}} > 0$  we find in the leading- $N$  approximation the very same self-consistent Hubble radii as for the free scalar field, only with the respective degrees of freedom exchanged,

$$L^{\text{sc}}(N)^2 = \frac{3}{2\Lambda_{\text{b}}} \left[ 1 + \sqrt{1 + \frac{G\Lambda_{\text{b}}}{3\pi} [\mathbf{f}_{\text{G}}(N) - \mathbf{f}_{\text{gh}}(N)]} \right] \xrightarrow{N \rightarrow \infty} \infty. \quad (1.8)$$

Thus, also for full quantum gravity, the divergences of the associated SET drives the self-consistent scalar curvature of  $d$ -spheres to zero,  $R^{\text{sc}}(N) \rightarrow 0$ .

The reader may remark that the above results appear to rely on two rather restrictive assumptions: maximal symmetry on the one hand, and compactness on the other. For the former one may argue the above results to remain valid for generic compact backgrounds by referring to *Weyl's law* (and its extensions), which supplies the asymptotics of the number  $N \equiv N(\mathcal{E})$  of eigenvalues of  $-\square$  smaller than a given  $\mathcal{E} > 0$ :  $N(\mathcal{E}) \sim \mathcal{E}^{d/2} V[g]$ , with  $V[g]$  the spacetime volume. In contrast, it is not a priori clear whether the  $N$ -type cutoffs can be employed in the same way also on non-compact spacetimes. Indeed, one may anticipate that  $\Theta_N^{\text{scal}}(L)$  or  $\Theta_N^{\text{grav}}(L)$  above are ill-defined when the spacetime volume is infinite. Further, if the  $N$ -type cutoffs can be defined, do the resulting self-consistent background geometries possess the analogous features to the compact case? In this work we introduce  $N$ -type cutoffs for the maximally symmetric but non-compact hyperbolic space<sup>2</sup>, and show that this is indeed the case.

The structure of this paper is as follows. In Section 2 we briefly review the (formal) path integral quantization of scalar and metric fluctuations on a Riemannian manifold, obtaining the induced gravitational one-loop effective action and associated SET in each case. Next, in Section 3 we construct the  $N$ -cutoffs on the  $d$ -dimensional hyperboloid  $\mathbb{H}^d(L)$ , and apply

---

<sup>2</sup>The technical subtleties encountered when transitioning from the discrete spectrum of  $-\square$  on  $\mathbb{S}^d(L)$  to the continuous spectrum characteristic of the Laplacian on the non-compact hyperbolic space are discussed in Appendix B.

these to the results of the preceding section to obtain the regularized one-loop effective action  $\Gamma_{1L}[g]_N$  and SET  $T_{\mu\nu}[g]_N$ . In Section 4, the resulting “self-consistent  $N$ -geometries” are obtained as solutions of the equations of motion corresponding to these gravity coupled approximants. Section 4 closes with a simple argument that contextualizes the results of  $N$ -cutoffs on the sphere and hyperboloid as instances of any quasi-physical scale free cutoff. Finally, we present our conclusions and outlook in Section 5.

## 2 The gravitational one-loop effective action induced from “matter” fields

Throughout this paper  $(\mathcal{M}, g_{\mu\nu}) \equiv (\mathcal{M}, g)$  denotes a  $d$ -dimensional Riemannian spacetime manifold, i.e., we employ Euclidean signature for the metric  $g_{\mu\nu}$ . Moreover,  $D_\mu$  denotes the covariant derivative on  $(\mathcal{M}, g_{\mu\nu})$  derived from the Levi-Civita connection and  $-\square := -D^2 \equiv D_\mu D^\mu = -g^{\mu\nu} D_\mu D_\nu$  is the corresponding Laplacian. Furthermore, we abbreviate as usual  $\sqrt{g} = \sqrt{\det(g_{\mu\nu})}$ . We also note that when  $(\mathcal{M}, g_{\mu\nu})$  is maximally symmetric, the Riemann, Ricci and Weyl tensors may be expressed in terms of the constant scalar curvature  $R$  according to the usual conventions

$$R_{\mu\nu} = \frac{1}{d} g_{\mu\nu} R, \quad R_{\mu\nu\rho\sigma} = \frac{1}{d(d-1)} (g_{\mu\rho} g_{\nu\sigma} - g_{\mu\sigma} g_{\nu\rho}) R, \quad C_{\mu\nu\rho\sigma} \equiv 0. \quad (2.1)$$

In this section, we consider matter fields in contact with dynamical gravity. For the dynamical background metric, we consider the Einstein-Hilbert action,

$$S_{\text{EH}}[g] = \frac{1}{16\pi G} \int d^d x \sqrt{g(x)} (-R(x) + 2\Lambda_b), \quad (2.2)$$

with  $G$  Newton’s constant and  $\Lambda_b$  the (bare) cosmological constant.

### 2.1 Matter fields on Riemannian background spacetimes

Scalar (S), vector (V) and symmetric rank-2 tensor fields (ST) will appear in this paper, and will often be collectively denoted by the label I. We note that in general tensor fields are covariant fields by default (i.e., only lower indices in local coordinate/abstract index notation). The corresponding Hilbert spaces of square-integrable fields<sup>3</sup>,  $L^2_I(\mathcal{M}, g)$  with  $I = \text{S, V, ST}$ , may be regarded as the completion of the space of smooth, compactly supported sections of the associated vector bundles with respect to the canonical inner products

$$\begin{aligned} \langle \tilde{\sigma}, \sigma \rangle_{\text{S}} &:= \int d^d x \sqrt{g(x)} \tilde{\sigma}(x)^* \sigma(x), \\ \langle \tilde{\xi}, \xi \rangle_{\text{V}} &:= \int d^d x \sqrt{g(x)} g^{\mu\nu}(x) \tilde{\xi}_\mu(x)^* \xi_\nu(x), \\ \langle \tilde{\tau}, \tau \rangle_{\text{ST}} &:= \int d^d x \sqrt{g(x)} I[g]^{\mu\nu\rho\sigma}(x) \tilde{\tau}_{\mu\nu}(x)^* \tau_{\rho\sigma}(x), \quad I[g]^{\mu\nu\rho\sigma} = \frac{1}{2} (g^{\mu\rho} g^{\nu\sigma} + g^{\mu\sigma} g^{\nu\rho}). \end{aligned} \quad (2.3)$$

Unlike scalar fields, vector and tensor fields may be decomposed further. Vector fields may be decomposed into transverse ( $I = \text{T}$ ) and longitudinal ( $I = \text{L}$ ) pieces, while symmetric rank-2 tensor fields may be split into the four parts of the York decomposition<sup>4</sup> ( $I = \text{TT}, I =$

<sup>3</sup>The local trivialization of the V and  $\text{ST}^2$  vector bundles have fibres  $V_x = \{x\} \times \mathbb{C}^d$  and  $\text{ST}_x = \{x\} \times \mathbb{C}^{d(d+1)/2}$ . The associated Hilbert spaces can thus be locally represented in terms of the scalar Hilbert space as  $L^2_{\text{S}}(\mathcal{M}, g) = L^2((\mathcal{M}, g); \mathbb{C})$ ,  $L^2_{\text{V}}(\mathcal{M}, g) = L^2_{\text{S}}(\mathcal{M}, g) \times \mathbb{C}^d$ , and  $L^2_{\text{ST}}(\mathcal{M}, g) = L^2_{\text{S}}(\mathcal{M}, g) \times \mathbb{C}^{d(d+1)/2}$ .

<sup>4</sup>The vector field and York decomposition apply only to tensors which are defined on Einstein manifolds.



LTT, I = LLT, I = tr) [9]. Furthermore, it is not hard to see that these decompositions yield mutually orthogonal subspaces under the inner products given in Eq. (2.3). A detailed description of these decompositions may be found in Appendix A.

Finally, in the path integral formulation of QFT – and also in the present work – it is sometimes necessary to consider densitized fields, i.e., the fields above adjusted with factors of  $\sqrt{g}$  for the appropriate density weight, which appear as integration variables of diffeomorphism/BRST-invariant path integrals [5, 10, 11]. The densitized fields for I = S, V, ST are defined as<sup>5</sup>

$$\text{S : } \quad \sigma_{\text{den}}(x) \quad := \quad g^{1/4}(x)\sigma(x), \quad \forall \sigma \in L^2_{\text{S}}(\mathcal{M}, g), \quad (2.4a)$$

$$\text{V : } \quad \xi_{\text{den},\mu}(x) \quad := \quad g^{(d-2)/(4d)}(x)\xi_{\mu}(x), \quad \forall \xi_{\mu} \in L^2_{\text{V}}(\mathcal{M}, g), \quad (2.4b)$$

$$\text{ST : } \quad \tau_{\text{den},\mu\nu}(x) \quad := \quad g^{(d-4)/(4d)}(x)\tau_{\mu\nu}(x), \quad \forall \tau_{\mu\nu} \in L^2_{\text{ST}}(\mathcal{M}, g). \quad (2.4c)$$

## 2.2 The free scalar field

We begin by considering a free scalar field  $A$  with action

$$S_{\text{M}}[A; g] = \frac{1}{2} \int d^d x \sqrt{g(x)} A(x) \mathcal{K}_x A(x), \quad (2.5)$$

where  $\mathcal{K}_x = -\square_g^x + M^2 + \xi R(x)$ . Here,  $M$  is the scalar field's mass and  $\xi$  its non-minimal coupling to gravity. The induced gravitational one-loop effective action, which is exact for a free scalar, is given by

$$\Gamma[g] := \Gamma[A; g] \Big|_{A=0} = S_{\text{EH}}[g] + \Gamma_{\text{1L}}[g], \quad (2.6)$$

where the one-loop term  $\Gamma_{\text{1L}}[g]$  is obtained from the path integral

$$e^{-\Gamma_{\text{1L}}[g]} = \int \mathcal{D} \left[ g^{1/4} \widehat{A} \right] e^{-S_{\text{M}}[\widehat{A}; g]} = \int \mathcal{D} \widehat{B} e^{-S_{\text{M}}[g^{-1/4} \widehat{B}; g]}. \quad (2.7)$$

Here,  $\mathcal{D}[g^{1/4} \widehat{A}] = \mathcal{D} \widehat{B} := \prod_x d\widehat{B}(x)$  is the diffeomorphism-invariant path integral measure and  $B = g^{1/4} A$  the scalar field density whose action is

$$S_{\text{M}}[g^{-1/4} B; g] = \frac{1}{2} \int d^d x B(x) \tilde{\mathcal{K}}_x B(x), \quad (2.8)$$

with  $\tilde{\mathcal{K}}_x = g^{1/4}(x) \mathcal{K}_x g^{-1/4}(x) = \mathcal{K}_x$  since  $-\square_g^x$  arises from the Levi-Civita connection. The Gaussian path integral in (2.7) may be (formally) evaluated to yield

$$\begin{aligned} \Gamma_{\text{1L}}[g] &= \frac{1}{2} \text{Tr}_{\text{S}} \log \mathcal{K} \\ &= \frac{1}{2} \text{Tr}_{\text{S}} \log (-\square + M^2 + \xi R), \end{aligned} \quad (2.9)$$

---

<sup>5</sup>For contravariant vector fields (one forms) the corresponding weight is given by  $\xi_{\text{den}}^{\mu}(x) = g^{(d+2)/(4d)}(x)\xi^{\mu}(x)$ .

where the trace  $\text{Tr}_S$  over the space  $S$  is purely formal, requiring regularization to render it well defined. Prior to introducing a specific regularization scheme in Section 3.1, we will denote by  $\Gamma_{\text{IL}}[g]_{\text{reg}}$  some regularized version of  $\Gamma_{\text{IL}}[g]$ .

## 2.3 Metric fluctuations/the free graviton field

Proceeding to QG, we split the full metric  $g_{\mu\nu}$  into a background metric  $\bar{g}_{\mu\nu}$  and a fluctuation part  $h_{\mu\nu}$  according to the linear split,

$$g_{\mu\nu} = \bar{g}_{\mu\nu} + g_{\mu\nu}. \quad (2.10)$$

The classical metrics  $g_{\mu\nu}$  and  $h_{\mu\nu}$  are to be understood as the expectation values (with respect to the path integral introduced below) of their quantum versions,  $g_{\mu\nu} = \langle \widehat{g}_{\mu\nu} \rangle$  and  $h_{\mu\nu} = \langle \widehat{h}_{\mu\nu} \rangle$ , respectively. Further, the background metric  $\bar{g}_{\mu\nu}$  stays purely classical, yet dynamical. Next, the two Faddeev-Popov ghost fields  $\bar{C}_\mu = \langle \widehat{\bar{C}}_\mu \rangle$  and  $C^\mu = \langle \widehat{C}^\mu \rangle$  in the standard way to give the full bare action

$$S[h, \bar{C}, C; \bar{g}] = S_{\text{EH}}[\bar{g} + h] + S_{\text{gf}}[h; \bar{g}] + S_{\text{gh}}[h, \bar{C}, C; \bar{g}]. \quad (2.11)$$

Here,  $S_{\text{EH}}$  is the Einstein-Hilbert action (2.2), while  $S_{\text{gf}}$  and  $S_{\text{gh}}$  are the gauge-fixing and ghost action respectively<sup>6</sup>.

Next, the bare action (2.11) is expanded in  $(h, \bar{C}, C)$  around the equations of motion to yield the ‘‘matter’’ action,

$$\begin{aligned} S_{\text{M}}[h, \bar{C}, C; \bar{g}] &= S[h, \bar{C}, C; \bar{g}] - S_{\text{EH}}[\bar{g}] \\ &= S_{\text{FG}}[h; \bar{g}] + S_{\text{Fgh}}[\bar{C}, C; \bar{g}] + (\text{linear}) + O((h, \bar{C}, C)^3). \end{aligned} \quad (2.12)$$

The terms linear in  $(h, \bar{C}, C)$  solve the equations of motion by construction, and we neglect the terms that are cubic order or higher in  $(h, \bar{C}, C)$ . What remains are two terms, one quadratic in  $h_{\mu\nu}$ , and one quadratic in  $(\bar{C}, C)$ , which we will interpret as the actions for the free graviton (FG) and free ghost (Fgh) fields, respectively

$$S_{\text{FG}}[h; \bar{g}] = \frac{1}{2} \int d^d x \sqrt{\bar{g}} h^{\mu\nu} \mathcal{K}[\bar{g}]_{\mu\nu}{}^{\rho\sigma} h_{\rho\sigma}, \quad (2.13)$$

$$S_{\text{Fgh}}[\bar{C}, C; \bar{g}] = -\sqrt{2} \int d^d x \sqrt{\bar{g}} \bar{C}_\mu \mathcal{M}[\bar{g}, \bar{g}]^\mu{}_\nu C^\nu. \quad (2.14)$$

For a maximally symmetric spacetime<sup>7</sup>  $(\mathcal{M}, g)$ , which are the focus of this paper, the operators  $\mathcal{K}[\bar{g}]$  and  $\mathcal{M}[\bar{g}, \bar{g}]$  are given by<sup>8</sup>

$$\begin{aligned} \mathcal{K}[\bar{g}] &= \frac{1}{32\pi G} (\mathbb{1}_{\text{ST}^2} - \text{P}_{\text{tr}}) (-\bar{D}^2 + 2\Lambda_{\text{b}} + c_{\text{I}}\bar{R}) \\ &\quad - \frac{1}{32\pi G} \frac{d-2}{2} \text{P}_{\text{tr}} (-\bar{D}^2 + 2\Lambda_{\text{b}} + c_{\text{tr}}\bar{R}), \end{aligned} \quad (2.15)$$

<sup>6</sup>Since the full forms of  $S_{\text{gf}}[h; \bar{g}]$  and  $S_{\text{gh}}[h, \bar{C}, C; \bar{g}]$  are not explicitly required in this paper, we refer the interested reader to their precise forms given in [4] (cf. Eqs. (4.2) and (18.2) in [12]).

<sup>7</sup>The results for the general case may be found in [4].

<sup>8</sup>We have applied the harmonic gauge conditions,  $\alpha = 1$  and  $\beta = 1/2$ .

with  $c_I = \frac{d(d-3)+4}{d(d-1)}$  and  $c_{\text{tr}} = (d-4)/4$ , as well as

$$\mathcal{M}[\bar{g}, \bar{g}] = \mathbb{1}_V \left( \bar{D}^2 + \frac{1}{d} \bar{R} \right). \quad (2.16)$$

The one-loop effective action for vanishing ghost arguments is given by

$$\Gamma[h, 0, 0; \bar{g}] = S_{\text{EH}}[\bar{g} + h] + \Gamma_{\text{1L}}[\bar{g} + h] + O(2 \text{ loops}), \quad (2.17)$$

with

$$\Gamma_{\text{1L}}[g] = \Gamma_{\text{FG}}[g] + \Gamma_{\text{Fgh}}[g]. \quad (2.18)$$

These one-loop actions for the free graviton and free ghost fields are obtained from the path integrals,

$$e^{-\Gamma_{\text{FG}}[\bar{g}]} = \int \mathcal{D}\hat{f}.. \exp \left( -S_{\text{FG}} \left[ \bar{g}^{-(d-4)/4d} \hat{f}..; \bar{g}.. \right] \right), \quad (2.19)$$

and

$$e^{-\Gamma_{\text{Fgh}}[\bar{g}]} = \int \mathcal{D}\hat{B}.. \mathcal{D}\hat{\bar{B}}.. \exp \left( -S_{\text{FG}} \left[ \bar{g}^{-(d-2)/4d} \hat{B}.., \bar{g}^{-(d+2)/4d} \hat{\bar{B}}..; \bar{g}.. \right] \right), \quad (2.20)$$

where we have introduced the densitized fields  $f_{\mu\nu} = \bar{g}^{(d-4)/4d} h_{\mu\nu}$ ,  $\bar{B}_\mu = \bar{g}^{(d-2)/4d} \bar{C}_\mu$ , and  $B^\mu = \bar{g}^{(d+2)/4d} C^\mu$ . Moreover, as for the scalar field, the path integral measures are defined as  $\mathcal{D}(\dots) = \prod_x (\dots)(x)$ , and are adjusted with factors of  $\sqrt{\bar{g}}$  in order to make (2.19) and (2.20) BRST-invariant. The path integrals (2.19) and (2.20) are merely Gaussian integrals, which (formally) evaluate to

$$\Gamma_{\text{FG}}[\bar{g}] = \frac{1}{2} \text{Tr}_{\text{ST}} \log \mathcal{K}[\bar{g}], \quad (2.21)$$

and

$$\Gamma_{\text{Fgh}}[\bar{g}] = -\text{Tr}_V \log \mathcal{M}[\bar{g}, \bar{g}]. \quad (2.22)$$

Again, as in case for the scalar field, Eqs. (2.21) and (2.22) are divergent quantities and for the moment we will denote by  $\Gamma_{\text{FG}}[\bar{g}]_{\text{reg}}$  and  $\Gamma_{\text{Fgh}}[\bar{g}]_{\text{reg}}$  some regularized versions thereof.

## 2.4 Semi-classical equations of motion and the SET

As discussed in the Introduction, we invoke the principle of background independence [13–16] by calculating the backreaction<sup>9</sup> of the quantized matter degrees of freedom on the (dynamical) background metric  $g_{\mu\nu} \equiv \bar{g}_{\mu\nu}$ , and thereby obtain the self-consistent solution  $g_{\mu\nu}^{\text{sc}}$  from the resulting equations of motion. In case of the quantized free scalar field, the corresponding equations of motion read

$$\left. \frac{\delta}{\delta g_{\mu\nu}} \Gamma[g]_{\text{reg}} \right|_{g_{\mu\nu} = g_{\mu\nu}^{\text{sc}}} = 0, \quad (2.23)$$

<sup>9</sup>For a further analysis of the issues of gravitational backreaction, we refer to [17].

where  $\Gamma[g]_{\text{reg}}$  is some regularized version of the one-loop effective action (2.6). For quantized metric fluctuations, the corresponding equations of motion [1, 18] are

$$\left. \frac{\delta}{\delta h_{\mu\nu}} \Gamma[h, 0, 0; \bar{g}] \right|_{h_{\mu\nu}=0, \bar{g}_{\mu\nu}=\bar{g}_{\mu\nu}^{\text{sc}}} = 0, \quad (2.24)$$

where  $\Gamma[h, 0, 0; \bar{g}]_{\text{reg}}$  is some regularized version of the one-loop effective action for vanishing ghost arguments, c.f. Eq. (2.17). Note that both equations of motion (2.23) and (2.24) may be expressed in the form

$$\left. \frac{\delta}{\delta g_{\mu\nu}} S_{\text{EH}}[g] \right|_{g_{\mu\nu}=g_{\mu\nu}^{\text{sc}}} + \left. \frac{\delta}{\delta g_{\mu\nu}} \Gamma_{\text{1L}}[g]_{\text{reg}} \right|_{g_{\mu\nu}=g_{\mu\nu}^{\text{sc}}} = 0, \quad (2.25)$$

where the regularized one-loop corrections are given by Eq. (2.9) in case of a quantized free scalar field, and Eq. (2.18) (together with Eqs. (2.21) and (2.22)) in case of quantized metric fluctuations. We stress that the regularization scheme that enters the equations of motion (2.25) must be strictly background independent, in the same sense that the regularization scheme is only allowed to make use of the (unspecified and arbitrary) background metric  $g_{\mu\nu}$ , that thus remains fully dynamical. Crucially, no (geometric) background structure is allowed to be fixed “by hand”.

Defining the effective (regularized) SET following Euclidean conventions as

$$T^{\mu\nu}[g]_{\text{reg}} := -\frac{2}{\sqrt{g}} \frac{\delta}{\delta g_{\mu\nu}} \Gamma_{\text{1L}}[g]_{\text{reg}}, \quad (2.26)$$

the equations of motion (2.25) take the familiar form of the Einstein equation,

$$R_{\mu\nu} - \frac{1}{2} g_{\mu\nu} R + \Lambda_{\text{b}} g_{\mu\nu} = 8\pi G T_{\mu\nu}[g]_{\text{reg}}. \quad (2.27)$$

On maximally symmetric spacetimes, the left-hand side (LHS) of Eq. (2.27) is

$$\left[ \frac{1}{d} \left( -\frac{d}{2} + 1 \right) R + \Lambda_{\text{b}} \right] g_{\mu\nu}, \quad (2.28)$$

with  $R \equiv \text{constant}$ . This entails that in order for the Einstein equation (2.27) to be consistent, the regularization scheme must be such that the SET is of the form  $T_{\mu\nu}[g]_{\text{reg}} = \text{constant} \times g_{\mu\nu}$ . In this case, it is sufficient to consider the traced version of (2.27),

$$\left( -\frac{d}{2} + 1 \right) R + d\Lambda_{\text{b}} = 8\pi G T_{\mu}^{\mu}[g]_{\text{reg}}, \quad (2.29)$$

with  $T_{\mu}^{\mu}[g]_{\text{reg}}$  a constant (on  $\mathcal{M}$ ).

To proceed we note the simple identity<sup>10</sup>

$$\int d^d x \sqrt{g} g^{\mu\nu} T_{\mu\nu}[g]_{\text{reg}} = \left. \frac{d}{d\alpha} \Gamma_{\text{1L}}[e^{-2\alpha} g] \right|_{\alpha=0}, \quad (2.30)$$

---

<sup>10</sup>It is readily checked that this is valid beyond in the non-maximally symmetric case as well.

which follows from the definitions of the SET and functional derivative. The variation of the operator trace(s) [3, 4] (cf. Eq. (17.9) in [12]) appearing in  $\Gamma_{1L}[g]_{\text{reg}}$  for scalars (2.9) yields

$$T_{\mu}^{\mu}[g]_{\text{reg}}^{\text{scal}} = \underline{\text{Tr}}_{\text{S}} \left[ \frac{-\square + \xi R}{-\square + M^2 + \xi R} \right]_{\text{reg}}, \quad (2.31)$$

while the result for metric fluctuations follows from Eqs. (2.18), (2.21) and (2.22),

$$T_{\mu}^{\mu}[g]_{\text{reg}}^{\text{grav}} = \underline{\text{Tr}}_{\text{ST}} \left[ \mathcal{K}[g]^{-1} \left( \mathcal{K}[g] \Big|_{\Lambda_{\text{b}}=0} \right) \right]_{\text{reg}} - 2 \underline{\text{Tr}}_{\text{V}} [\mathbf{1}_{\text{V}}]_{\text{reg}}, \quad (2.32)$$

and  $\underline{\text{Tr}}_{\text{I}}[\mathcal{O}]_{\text{reg}} := \text{Tr}_{\text{I}}[\mathcal{O}]_{\text{reg}}/\text{vol}[\mathcal{M}]$  denotes the (regularized) trace-per-volume of the operator  $\mathcal{O}$  in the above formulae.

Lastly, we point out that the effective SET (2.26) can also be related to the expectation value of an operatorial version of the classical SET. For example, for the scalar field, one has

$$T^{\mu\nu}[g] = -\frac{1}{\sqrt{g}} \frac{\delta}{\delta g_{\mu\nu}} \left\langle S_{\text{M}} \left[ g^{-1/4} \widehat{B}; g \right] \right\rangle, \quad (2.33)$$

where  $S_{\text{M}}$  is given by Eq. (2.8) and the expectation value is taken with respect to Eq. (2.7). It is important to emphasize that the RHS of Eq. (2.33) does not correspond to a quantized version of the typically employed SET, which classically is given by  $-\frac{2}{\sqrt{g}} \frac{\delta}{\delta g_{\mu\nu}} S_{\text{M}}[A; g]$ , which is due to the extra  $g$ -dependence in the first argument of  $S_{\text{M}}$  in Eq. (2.33). Classically, both quantities agree on-shell (though not off-shell), while their quantum versions differ by a divergent term. It has been argued that (2.33) constitutes the more natural choice for a quantum SET [12]. Finally, we remark that the discussion for the case of metric fluctuations follows analogously.

### 3 $N$ -type cutoffs for $\mathbb{H}^d(L)$

#### 3.1 Spectral properties of the Laplacian on $\mathbb{H}^d(L)$

The objective of this paper is to investigate the self-consistent hyperbolic background geometries arising from Eq. (2.29), with the regularization implemented in the form of the  $N$ -cutoff. We now present a brief review of the salient aspects of the hyperboloid, referring the reader to Appendix B for additional details.

We define the hyperboloid of dimension  $d$  and radius  $L$  as the non-compact submanifold of  $\mathbb{R}^{1,d}$ ,  $(d+1)$ -dimensional Minkowski space, defined by

$$\mathbb{H}^d(L) = \{x \in \mathbb{R}^{1,d} \mid (x^0)^2 - (x^1)^2 - \dots - (x^d)^2 = L^2, x^0 > 0\}. \quad (3.1)$$

The hyperboloid  $\mathbb{H}^d(L)$ , together with the metric it inherits as a submanifold, is a maximally symmetric Riemannian manifold. Its metric is given by the line element (in standard coordinates)

$$ds^2 = L^2 dy^2 + L^2 \sinh^2(y) d\Omega_{d-1}^2 = d\tau^2 + L^2 \sinh^2(\tau/L) d\Omega_{d-1}^2, \quad (3.2)$$

with  $d\Omega_{d-1}^2$  the line element of the unit  $(d-1)$ -sphere  $\mathbb{S}^{d-1}(1)$ , and  $\tau = Ly$  is the geodesic distance from the point  $(L, 0, \dots, 0) \in \mathbb{H}^d(L)$ . Being maximally symmetric, the metric of  $\mathbb{H}^d(L)$  may be written  $g_{\mu\nu}(x) = L^2 \gamma_{\mu\nu}(x)$ , with  $\gamma_{\mu\nu}$  the metric of the unit hyperboloid  $\mathbb{H}^d(1)$ .

The Laplacian  $-\square$  acting on S, V and ST has a fully continuous spectrum (i.e., there is no discrete part). We may write the eigenvalue problem in general as

$$-\square_g u_{\lambda l}^I(x) = \mathcal{E}_{\lambda}^I u_{\lambda l}^I(x) \quad (3.3)$$

where  $I = S; T, L; TT, LTT, LLT$ ,  $tr$  is an index labeling the type of field under consideration,  $\mathcal{E}_{\lambda}^I$  is the eigenvalue depending on the continuous label  $\lambda \in [0, \infty) =: \mathbb{R}_{\geq 0}$ , and  $u_{\lambda l}^I$  is an eigenfunction<sup>11</sup> associated to the eigenvalue  $\mathcal{E}_{\lambda}^I$ . Furthermore,  $l$  is a multi-index labeling the degeneracy of the eigenvalue  $\mathcal{E}_{\lambda}^I$ , and we note that the set of degeneracy labels has cardinality  $|l| = |\mathbb{N}_0|$ , which also counts the dimension of each eigenspace. We write the dimension of each  $\mathcal{E}_{\lambda}^I$ -eigenspace formally as

$$|l| = \sum_{l \in \mathcal{I}(I)} 1, \quad (3.4)$$

where  $\mathcal{I}(I)$  is the discrete index set depending on  $I$ , that  $l$  runs over, and keeping in mind that this sum is implicitly  $\lambda$ -dependent.

---

<sup>11</sup>With the spectrum being purely continuous, these eigenfunctions do not live in the corresponding space of square-integrable fields on  $\mathbb{H}^d(L)$ . Rather, these ‘‘generalized eigenvectors’’ live in an associated Rigged Hilbert space (Gel’fand triple).

The spectral values  $\mathcal{E}_\lambda^I$  and associated eigenfunctions  $u_{\lambda,l}^I$  (with  $\lambda \in \mathbb{R}_{\geq 0}$ ) on  $\mathbb{H}^d(L)$  may be obtained from those of the sphere through analytic continuation [19–21]. In more detail, on the  $d$ -sphere  $\mathbb{S}^d(L)$  the eigenvalue problem for field species I reads

$$-\square u_{nl}^I(x) = \mathcal{E}_n^I u_{nl}^I(x), \quad n \in \mathbb{N}_0. \quad (3.5)$$

Using standard polar coordinates in which the line element on  $\mathbb{S}^d(L)$  is  $ds^2 = L^2 d\chi^2 + L^2 \sin^2(\chi) d\Omega_{d-1}^2$ , the eigenfunctions and associated eigenvalues on  $\mathbb{H}^d(L)$  may with hindsight be obtained through the analytic continuation,

$$\chi = iy, \quad n = -\rho + i\lambda, \quad \rho = \frac{d-1}{2}, \quad (3.6)$$

resulting in the practical formula

$$\left( \mathcal{E}_\lambda^I \right)_{\mathbb{H}^d(L)} = - \left( \mathcal{E}_n^I \right)_{\mathbb{S}^d(L)} \Big|_{n=-\rho+i\lambda}, \quad \lambda \in \mathbb{R}_{\geq 0}. \quad (3.7)$$

The set of eigenfunctions  $\{u_{\lambda,l}^I\}$  obtained in this way thus forms an orthonormal and complete basis for the Hilbert space of square integral fields of species I on  $\mathbb{H}^d(L)$ . Explicitly, for the species under consideration we have the following.

*Orthonormality:*

$$\begin{aligned} \int d^d x \sqrt{g(x)} u_{\lambda l}^S(x)^* u_{\lambda' l'}^S(x) &= \delta(\lambda - \lambda') \delta_{ll'}, \\ \int d^d x \sqrt{g(x)} g^{\mu\nu}(x) (u_{\lambda l}^I)_\mu(x)^* (u_{\lambda' l'}^J)_\nu(x) &= \delta_{IJ} \delta(\lambda - \lambda') \delta_{ll'}, \quad \text{for } I, J \in \{T, L\}, \\ \int d^d x \sqrt{g(x)} I[g]^{\mu\nu\rho\sigma}(x) (u_{\lambda l}^I)_{\mu\nu}(x)^* (u_{\lambda' l'}^J)_{\rho\sigma}(x) &= \delta_{IJ} \delta(\lambda - \lambda') \delta_{ll'}, \\ &\text{for } I, J \in \{TT, LTT, LLT, \text{tr}\}. \end{aligned} \quad (3.8)$$

*Completeness:*

$$\begin{aligned} \int d\lambda \sum_{l \in \mathcal{I}(S)} u_{\lambda l}^S(x')^* u_{\lambda l}^S(x) &= \delta(x, x'), \\ \sum_{I=T, L} \int d\lambda \sum_{l \in \mathcal{I}(I)} g^{\mu\alpha}(x') (u_{\lambda l}^I)_\alpha(x')^* (u_{\lambda l}^I)_\nu(x) &= \delta_\nu^\mu \delta(x, x'), \\ \sum_{I=TT, LTT, LLT, \text{tr}} \int d\lambda \sum_{l \in \mathcal{I}(I)} g^{\mu\alpha}(x') g^{\nu\beta}(x') (u_{\lambda l}^I)_{\alpha\beta}(x')^* (u_{\lambda l}^I)_{\rho\sigma}(x) &= I_{\rho\sigma}^{\mu\nu} \delta(x, x'). \end{aligned} \quad (3.9)$$

The eigenfunctions for  $I = S, T, TT$  are well known [19, 22, 23], and for each  $\lambda \in \mathbb{R}_{\geq 0}$  the set  $\{u_{\lambda l}^I\}_{l \in \mathcal{I}(I)}$  may be regarded as furnishing a basis for an unitary irreducible representation

of the action of  $SO(1, d)$  on  $\mathbb{H}^d(L)$ . The remaining eigenfunctions can be constructed from these via the isomorphisms (A.3), (A.10), (A.12), and (A.13),

$$\begin{aligned}
(u_{\lambda l}^L)_\mu(x) &= (P^{L,S})_\mu u_{\lambda l}^S(x), \\
(u_{\lambda l}^{LTT})_{\mu\nu}(x) &= (P^{LTT,T})_\nu (u_{\lambda l}^T)_\mu(x), \\
(u_{\lambda l}^{LLT})_{\mu\nu}(x) &= (P^{LLT,S})_{\mu\nu} u_{\lambda l}^S(x), \\
(u_{\lambda l}^{\text{tr}})_{\mu\nu}(x) &= (P^{\text{tr},S})_{\mu\nu} u_{\lambda l}^S(x).
\end{aligned} \tag{3.10}$$

Further, the densitized versions of these eigenfunctions are denoted as  $v_{\lambda l}^I$ , and are defined by (2.4a)-(2.4c) for the corresponding field species. The resulting orthonormality and completeness relations for the bases  $\{v_{\lambda l}^I\}$  are the same as Eqs. (3.8) and (3.9), but with  $g_{\mu\nu}$  replaced by its unimodular variant,

$$q_{\mu\nu}(x) = g(x)^{-1/d} g_{\mu\nu}(x) \quad \Leftrightarrow \quad q^{\mu\nu}(x) = g(x)^{1/d} g^{\mu\nu}(x), \tag{3.11}$$

i.e.  $\det(q.) = 1$ , and with the factor  $1/\sqrt{g}$  on the RHS of Eq. (3.9) removed.

Next, an essential ingredient for the  $N$ -cutoff regularized operator traces is the the spectral function for species I (also known as the Plancherel measure) [19],

$$\mu^I(\lambda) := \frac{\pi \Omega_{d-1} L^d}{2^{d-2} \dim(\text{I})} \sum_{l \in \mathcal{I}(I)} u_{\lambda l}^I(x_0)^* \cdot u_{\lambda l}^I(x_0), \tag{3.12}$$

which encodes information about the multiplicity of the eigenvalues  $\mathcal{E}_\lambda^I$  of  $-\square$ . Here,  $x_0$  is arbitrarily chosen point on  $\mathbb{H}^d(L)$  (which may be thought of as the ‘‘origin’’), the dot ‘‘ $\cdot$ ’’ denotes the contraction of the eigenfunctions’ tensor structure, and

$$\dim(\text{I}) = \begin{cases} 1 & \text{for I = S, L, LLT, tr} \\ (d-1) & \text{for I = T, LTT} \\ (d+1)(d-2)/2 & \text{for I = TT.} \end{cases} \tag{3.13}$$

The RHS of definition (3.12) does not depend on the choice of  $x_0$ . Indeed, one can show that the quantities

$$d_\lambda^S \equiv \sum_{l \in \mathcal{I}(S)} (u_{\lambda l}^S)^*(x) (u_{\lambda l}^S)(x), \tag{3.14a}$$

$$d_\lambda^T \equiv \sum_{l \in \mathcal{I}(T)} g^{\mu\nu}(x) (u_{\lambda l}^T)_\mu^*(x) (u_{\lambda l}^T)_\nu(x), \tag{3.14b}$$

$$d_\lambda^{\text{TT}} \equiv \sum_{l \in \mathcal{I}(\text{TT})} g^{\mu\alpha}(x) g^{\nu\beta}(x) (u_{\lambda l}^{\text{TT}})_{\alpha\beta}^*(x) (u_{\lambda l}^{\text{TT}})_{\mu\nu}(x), \tag{3.14c}$$

are constant in  $x$  on  $\mathbb{H}^d(L)$ . The relations (3.14a)-(3.14c) are analogues on  $\mathbb{H}^d(L)$  of the well-known addition theorems for spherical harmonics on  $\mathbb{S}^d(L)$ ; however in contrast to the



sphere, the addition theorems on the hyperboloid are more subtle as the non-compactness of  $\mathbb{H}^d(L)$  entails that the summations are over infinitely many terms. A detailed discussion of these subtleties is presented in the proof of Theorem B.2 of Appendix B, wherein the scalar case (3.14a) is treated.<sup>12</sup>

From the definition of the eigenfunctions for the species  $\mathbf{I} = \text{L, LTT, LLT, tr}$ , Eqs. (3.10), together with the relations (3.14a)-(3.14c), it follows that

$$\mu^{\text{S}}(\lambda) \equiv \mu^{\text{L}}(\lambda) \equiv \mu^{\text{LTT}}(\lambda) \equiv \mu^{\text{tr}}(\lambda) \quad \text{and} \quad \mu^{\text{T}}(\lambda) \equiv \mu^{\text{LTT}}(\lambda). \quad (3.15)$$

Therewith, we have gathered all relevant information on the spectrum of  $-\square$  on  $\mathbb{H}^d(L)$ , which we present in Table 1 below.

Field	Eigenfunction	Eigenvalue	Spectral function
$\underline{\mathbf{I}} = \underline{\mathbf{S}}$	$u_{\lambda l}^{\text{S}}(x)$	$\mathcal{E}_{\lambda}^{\text{S}} = \frac{\lambda^2 + \rho^2}{L^2}$	$\mu^{\text{S}}(\lambda)$
$\underline{\mathbf{I}} = \underline{\mathbf{V}}$	$(u_{\lambda l}^{\text{T}})_{\mu}(x)$	$\mathcal{E}_{\lambda}^{\text{T}} = \frac{\lambda^2 + \rho^2 + 1}{L^2}$	$\mu^{\text{T}}(\lambda)$
	$(u_{\lambda l}^{\text{L}})_{\mu}(x)$	$\mathcal{E}_{\lambda}^{\text{L}} = \frac{\lambda^2 + \rho(\rho + 2)}{L^2}$	$\mu^{\text{L}}(\lambda) = \mu^{\text{S}}(\lambda)$
$\underline{\mathbf{I}} = \underline{\mathbf{ST}}$	$(u_{\lambda l}^{\text{TT}})_{\mu\nu}(x)$	$\mathcal{E}_{\lambda}^{\text{TT}} = \frac{\lambda^2 + \rho^2 + 2}{L^2}$	$\mu^{\text{TT}}(\lambda)$
	$(u_{\lambda l}^{\text{LTT}})_{\mu\nu}(x)$	$\mathcal{E}_{\lambda}^{\text{LTT}} = \frac{\lambda^2 + \rho(\rho + 2) + 3}{L^2}$	$\mu^{\text{LTT}}(\lambda) = \mu^{\text{T}}(\lambda)$
	$(u_{\lambda l}^{\text{LLT}})_{\mu\nu}(x)$	$\mathcal{E}_{\lambda}^{\text{LLT}} = \frac{\lambda^2 + \rho(\rho + 4) + 2}{L^2}$	$\mu^{\text{LLT}}(\lambda) = \mu^{\text{S}}(\lambda)$
	$(u_{\lambda l}^{\text{tr}})_{\mu\nu}(x)$	$\mathcal{E}_{\lambda}^{\text{tr}} = \frac{\lambda^2 + \rho^2}{L^2}$	$\mu^{\text{tr}}(\lambda) = \mu^{\text{S}}(\lambda)$

Table 1: Decomposed eigenfunctions, associated eigenvalues and spectral functions, with  $\lambda \in \mathbb{R}_{\geq 0}$  and  $\rho = (d - 1)/2$ .

Lastly, we note that for  $d = 4$  explicit expressions have been given to the spectral functions [19, 24]. These read

$$\begin{aligned} \mu^{\text{S}}(\lambda) &= \frac{\pi}{16} \left( \lambda^2 + \frac{1}{4} \right) \lambda \tanh(\pi\lambda), \\ \mu^{\text{T}}(\lambda) &= \frac{\pi}{16} \left( \lambda^2 + \frac{9}{4} \right) \lambda \tanh(\pi\lambda), \\ \mu^{\text{TT}}(\lambda) &= \frac{\pi}{16} \left( \lambda^2 + \frac{25}{4} \right) \lambda \tanh(\pi\lambda). \end{aligned} \quad (3.16)$$

Having collected these results on the spectrum of  $-\square_{\mathbb{H}^d(L)}$ , let us consider the operator trace-per-volume in  $d$ -dimensions of a function  $f(-\square + c)$ , where  $c$  is an endomorphism of

<sup>12</sup>We expect that the techniques of proof for the scalar case generalize to higher spin fields, with potentially some additional technical input due to the tensor structure.

the field species I,

$$\underline{\text{Tr}}_I[f(-\square + c)] = \frac{2^{d-2} \dim(I)}{\pi \Omega_{d-1} L^d} \int_0^\infty d\lambda \mu^I(\lambda) f(\mathcal{E}_\lambda^S + c). \quad (3.17)$$

This formula may be justified by the following (formal though intuitive) computation, presented for the case of scalar fields for simplicity. The Laplacian  $-\square$  is essentially self-adjoint on  $C_c^\infty(\mathcal{M}, g)$ , and hence has a unique self-adjoint extension. It follows from the spectral theorem that

$$\begin{aligned} \text{Tr}_S[f(-\square + c)] &= \int_0^\infty d\lambda \sum_{l \in \mathcal{I}(S)} \int d^d x \sqrt{g} u_{\lambda l}(x)^* f(-\square + c) u_{\lambda l}(x) \\ &= \int_0^\infty d\lambda \sum_{l \in \mathcal{I}(S)} \int d^d x \sqrt{g} u_{\lambda l}(x)^* f(\mathcal{E}_\lambda^S + c) u_{\lambda l}(x) \\ &= \int_0^\infty d\lambda f(\mathcal{E}_\lambda^S + c) \int d^d x \sqrt{g} \sum_{l \in \mathcal{I}(S)} u_{\lambda l}(x)^* u_{\lambda l}(x) \\ &= \frac{2^{d-2}}{\pi \Omega_{d-1}} \frac{\text{vol}[\mathbb{H}^d(L)]}{L^d} \int_0^\infty d\lambda \mu^S(\lambda) f(\mathcal{E}_\lambda^S + c), \end{aligned} \quad (3.18)$$

where the final equality follows as the constancy (c.f. (3.14a)) of  $d_\lambda^S = \sum_{l \in \mathcal{I}(S)} u_{\lambda l}(x)^* u_{\lambda l}(x)$ , together with the definition of the spectral function (3.12). It then follows that the trace-per-volume is given by dividing out the volume of  $\mathbb{H}^d(L)$ , yielding (3.17) for  $I = S$ . We remark that this argument can be formulated rigorously by considering the operator trace on the compact manifold obtained by quotienting  $\mathbb{H}^d(L)$  by a lattice of  $SO(1, d)$ , and subsequently analyzing the infinite volume limit (analogous to how a torus provides a volume regularization in flat spacetime).

Finally, we present explicit expressions for the relevant traces:

I = S:

$$\underline{\text{Tr}}_S[f(-\square + c)] = \frac{2^{d-2}}{\pi \Omega_{d-1} L^d} \int d\lambda \mu^S(\lambda) f(\mathcal{E}_\lambda^S + c), \quad (3.19)$$

I = V:

$$\underline{\text{Tr}}_V[f(-\square + c)] = \frac{2^{d-2}}{\pi \Omega_{d-1} L^d} \int d\lambda \left\{ (d-1) f(\mathcal{E}_\lambda^T + c) \mu^T(\lambda) + f(\mathcal{E}_\lambda^L + c) \mu^S(\lambda) \right\}, \quad (3.20)$$

I = ST:

$$\begin{aligned} \underline{\text{Tr}}_{ST}[f(-\square + c)] &= \frac{2^{d-2}}{\pi \Omega_{d-1} L^d} \int d\lambda \left\{ \frac{(d+1)(d-2)}{2} f(\mathcal{E}_\lambda^{TT} + c) \mu^{TT}(\lambda) \right. \\ &\quad \left. + (d-1) f(\mathcal{E}_\lambda^T + c) \mu^T(\lambda) + [f(\mathcal{E}_\lambda^{LLT} + c) + f(\mathcal{E}_\lambda^{\text{tr}} + c)] \mu^S(\lambda) \right\}. \end{aligned} \quad (3.21)$$

### 3.2 $N$ -type cutoffs

**Formal definition.** Consider a formal functional integral of the form

$$Z = \int_{\mathcal{F}} \mathcal{D}\phi e^{-S[\phi]}, \quad (3.22)$$

where  $\mathcal{F}$  is some function space of fields living on  $\mathcal{M}$ , and  $\phi$  being such a field. Suppose that  $\mathcal{B}$  is any basis for  $\mathcal{F}$ , and suppose that such a basis exists. From  $\mathcal{B}$  we construct a family of subbases,  $\{\mathcal{B}_N\}_{N \in [0, \infty)}$ , with

$$\mathcal{B}_0 = \emptyset, \quad \mathcal{B}_\infty = \mathcal{B}, \quad \text{and} \quad N_2 > N_1 \Rightarrow \mathcal{B}_{N_2} \supset \mathcal{B}_{N_1}. \quad (3.23)$$

Then the family of subspaces of  $\mathcal{F}$ ,

$$\{\mathcal{F}_N := \text{span } \mathcal{B}_N\}_{N \in [0, \infty)} \quad (3.24)$$

is called an  $N$ -type cutoff for the formal path integral (3.22). For more details, we refer to [3, 4].

**$N$ -type cutoffs for  $\mathbb{H}^d(L)$ .** In this work, we consider the one-loop path integral given by Eqs. (2.7) as well as (2.19) and (2.20). The Hilbert spaces for S, V and ST defined in Section 2.1 appear as the integration domains for those path integrals. For  $\mathcal{M} = \mathbb{H}^d(L)$ , they are spanned by the bases of eigenfunctions of Eq. (3.3), i.e.,

$$\begin{aligned} L_S^2(\mathbb{H}^d(L), L^2\gamma_{\mu\nu}) &= \text{span} \{u_{\lambda l}^S \mid \lambda \in [0, \infty), l \in \mathcal{I}(S)\}, \\ L_V^2(\mathbb{H}^d(L), L^2\gamma_{\mu\nu}) &= \bigoplus_{I=T,L} \text{span} \{u_{\lambda l}^I \mid \lambda \in [0, \infty), l \in \mathcal{I}(I)\}, \\ L_{ST}^2(\mathbb{H}^d(L), L^2\gamma_{\mu\nu}) &= \bigoplus_{I=TT, LTT, LLT, \text{tr}} \text{span} \{u_{\lambda l}^I \mid \lambda \in [0, \infty), l \in \mathcal{I}(I)\}. \end{aligned} \quad (3.25)$$

Therewith, it is straightforward to construct an  $N$ -type cutoff for path integrals over S, V, and ST on  $\mathcal{M} = \mathbb{H}^d(L)$ : We simply introduce the “regularized” function spaces  $S_N$ ,  $V_N$ , and  $ST_N$  that arise as the span of the eigenfunctions in Eq. (3.3), for the maximal value of the eigenvalue  $\lambda$  truncated at the dimensionless UV-cutoff parameter  $N \in [0, \infty)$ . Their Hilbert spaces are thus<sup>13</sup>

$$\begin{aligned} L_{S_N}^2(\mathbb{H}^d(L), L^2\gamma_{\mu\nu}) &= \text{span} \{u_{\lambda l}^S \mid \lambda \in [0, N], l \in \mathcal{I}(S)\}, \\ L_{V_N}^2(\mathbb{H}^d(L), L^2\gamma_{\mu\nu}) &= \bigoplus_{I=T,L} \text{span} \{u_{\lambda l}^I \mid \lambda \in [0, N], l \in \mathcal{I}(I)\}, \\ L_{ST_N}^2(\mathbb{H}^d(L), L^2\gamma_{\mu\nu}) &= \bigoplus_{I=TT, LTT, LLT, \text{tr}} \text{span} \{u_{\lambda l}^I \mid \lambda \in [0, N], l \in \mathcal{I}(I)\}. \end{aligned} \quad (3.26)$$

---

<sup>13</sup>Technically, the decomposed sectors of V and ST, respectively, each could be assigned a different dimensionless cutoff parameter. However, here we take liberty at setting all of them to the same cutoff value  $N$ .

By employing an  $N$ -type cutoff on  $\mathbb{H}^d(L)$ , the operator traces (3.19), (3.20) and (3.21) become regularized in the following way

$I = S_N$ :

$$\underline{\text{Tr}}_{S_N} [f(-\square + c)] = \frac{2^{d-2}}{\pi\Omega_{d-1}L^d} \int_0^N d\lambda \mu^S(\lambda) f(\mathcal{E}_\lambda^S + c) , \quad (3.27)$$

$I = V_N$ :

$$\underline{\text{Tr}}_{V_N} [f(-\square + c)] = \frac{2^{d-2}}{\pi\Omega_{d-1}L^d} \int_0^N d\lambda \{ (d-1)f(\mathcal{E}_\lambda^T + c) \mu^T(\lambda) + f(\mathcal{E}_\lambda^L + c) \mu^S(\lambda) \} , \quad (3.28)$$

$I = \text{ST}_N$ :

$$\begin{aligned} \underline{\text{Tr}}_{\text{ST}_N} [f(-\square + c)] = & \frac{2^{d-2}}{\pi\Omega_{d-1}L^d} \int_0^N d\lambda \left\{ \frac{(d+1)(d-2)}{2} f(\mathcal{E}_\lambda^{\text{TT}} + c) \mu^{\text{TT}}(\lambda) \right. \\ & \left. + (d-1)f(\mathcal{E}_\lambda^T + c) \mu^T(\lambda) + [f(\mathcal{E}_\lambda^{\text{LLT}} + c) + f(\mathcal{E}_\lambda^{\text{tr}} + c)] \mu^S(\lambda) \right\} . \end{aligned} \quad (3.29)$$

Further, we introduce the degrees of freedom of the regularized system for corresponding sectors  $I = S, V, \text{ST}$  as

$$\mathbf{f}_I(N) := \text{Tr}_{I_N}[\mathbf{1}_I] . \quad (3.30)$$

Eq. (3.30) still diverges due to the presence of the volume in the trace. Therefore, it is convenient to introduce the degree-of-freedom density per unit volume,

$$\mathfrak{f}_I(N) := \mathbf{f}_I(N) / (\text{vol}[\mathbb{H}^d(L)]/L^d) = L^d \underline{\text{Tr}}_{I_N}[\mathbf{1}_I] , \quad (3.31)$$

which is a finite,  $L$ -independent quantity, that only diverges with  $N$  as  $\mathfrak{f}_I(N) \sim \int_0^N d\lambda \mu^I(\lambda)$  in the limit  $N \rightarrow \infty$ .

As an example, let us emphasize that for instance the one-loop gravitational effective action (2.9) induced from a scalar field, when regularized with an  $N$ -cutoff reads, with  $g_{\mu\nu} = L^2\gamma_{\mu\nu}$ ,

$$\begin{aligned} \Gamma_{\text{1L}}[g]_N &= \frac{1}{2} \text{Tr}_{S_N} \log(\mathcal{H}) \\ &= \frac{1}{2} \frac{2^{d-2}}{\pi\Omega_{d-1}} \frac{\text{vol}[\mathbb{H}^d(L)]}{L^d} \int_0^N d\lambda \mu^S(\lambda) \log(\mathcal{E}_\lambda^S(L) + M^2 + \xi R(L)) . \end{aligned} \quad (3.32)$$

Of course, (3.32) can also be derived by applying an  $N$ -cutoff to the integration domain of the path integral (2.7). This involves a number of non-trivial steps, and is outlined in

Appendix C. Next, the associated traced SET may be obtained from (3.32) using (2.30), yielding

$$T_\mu^\mu[g]_N = \frac{2^{d-2}}{\pi\Omega_{d-1}} \frac{1}{L^d} \int_0^N d\lambda \mu^S(\lambda) \left[ 1 - \frac{M^2}{\mathcal{E}_\lambda^S(\lambda) + M^2 + \xi R} \right]. \quad (3.33)$$

Finally, it is instructive to note that this same expression also arises directly from the expectation value of the classical SET, viz. Eq. (2.33). In terms of the densitized scalar eigenmodes  $v_{\lambda l}$  we have

$$\begin{aligned} T_\mu^\mu[g]_N = & \frac{1}{\sqrt{g}} \int_0^N d\lambda \sum_l \frac{1}{\mathcal{F}_\lambda^S} \left\{ \left( 1 - \frac{d}{2} \right) D^\mu v_{\lambda l} D_\mu v_{\lambda l}^* - v_{\lambda l}^* D^2 v_{\lambda l} \right. \\ & \left. + \xi R |v_{\lambda l}|^2 - 2\xi(1+d)v_{\lambda l}^* D^2 v_{\lambda l} - 2d\xi D^\mu v_{\lambda l} D_\mu v_{\lambda l}^* \right\}, \end{aligned} \quad (3.34)$$

with  $\mathcal{F}_\lambda = \mathcal{E}_\lambda + M^2 + \xi R$ . The (in-principle) non-trivial  $l$ -sum may then be performed using the results of Theorem B.2, yielding (3.33).

## 4 Maximally symmetric $N$ -geometries

So far, we have developed the  $N$ -cutoff regularization scheme for hyperbolic space,  $\mathbb{H}^d(L)$ , culminating in the regularized operator traces given by Eqs. (3.27)-(3.29). In this Section, we will apply this scheme to the RHS of the contracted Einstein equation (2.29), i.e.,

$$\left(-\frac{d}{2} + 1\right) R(L) + d\Lambda_b = 8\pi G T_\mu^\mu(L)_N, \quad (4.1)$$

with  $T_\mu^\mu(L)_N \equiv T_\mu^\mu[g = L^2\gamma]_N$ . However, since the corresponding results for the case  $\mathcal{M} = \mathbb{S}^d(L)$  have already been obtained [3, 4], here it is instructive to consider Eq. (4.1) for both, the spherical, as well as the hyperbolic case, and thus, w.l.o.g., for the general case of  $\mathcal{M}$  being maximally symmetric. Then, on the LHS of Eq. (4.1) one has  $R(L) = \pm d(d-1)/L^2$ , where “+” corresponds to the case  $\mathcal{M} = \mathbb{S}^d(L)$ , and “-” to  $\mathcal{M} = \mathbb{H}^d(L)$ . On the RHS of Eq. (4.1),  $T_\mu^\mu(L)_N$  is regularized in terms of the traces (3.27)-(3.29) in case of  $\mathcal{M} = \mathbb{H}^d(L)$ . For the case of  $\mathcal{M} = \mathbb{S}^d(L)$ , one has  $T_\mu^\mu(L)_N = \Theta_N(L)/(L^d\Omega_d)$  and  $\Theta_N(L)$  is to be regularized by the corresponding  $N$ -trace formulae for the spherical case, see [3, 4, 12].

Solutions to Eq. (4.1) are the self-consistent background geometries. In the presence of the cutoff  $N$ , we will refer to these as “ $N$ -geometries”.

### 4.1 The scalar field

First, let us consider the case of a free scalar field. The traced SET is given by Eq. (2.31), regularized by an  $N$ -type cutoff according to Eq. (3.27) yields for both  $\mathcal{M} = \mathbb{H}^d(L)$  and  $\mathbb{S}^d(L)$

$$T_\mu^\mu(L)_N^{\text{scal}} = \underline{\text{Tr}}_{\mathbb{S}^N} \left[ \frac{-\square + \xi R(L)}{-\square + M^2 + \xi R(L)} \right]. \quad (4.2)$$

We can rewrite Eq. (4.2) in terms of the degrees-of-freedom (3.30),

$$T_\mu^\mu(L)_N^{\text{scal}} = \frac{1}{L^d} \mathfrak{f}_S(N) + \Delta T_\mu^\mu(L; M)_N^{\text{scal}}, \quad (4.3)$$

with

$$\Delta T_\mu^\mu(L; M)_N^{\text{scal}} = -\underline{\text{Tr}}_{\mathbb{S}^N} \left[ \frac{M^2}{-\square + M^2 + \xi R(L)} \right]. \quad (4.4)$$

Note that in case of a massless scalar field one has  $\Delta T_\mu^\mu(L; M)_N^{\text{scal}} = 0$ . Plugging Eq. (4.3) into the equations of motion (4.1) yields

$$\left(-\frac{d}{2} + 1\right) R(L) + d\Lambda_b = 8\pi G \left\{ \frac{1}{L^d} \mathfrak{f}_S(N) + \Delta T_\mu^\mu(L; M)_N^{\text{scal}} \right\}, \quad (4.5)$$

where  $\mathfrak{f}_S(N)$  is the degree-of-freedom density given by Eq. (3.31) in the case  $\mathcal{M} = \mathbb{H}^d(L)$ ,

$$\mathfrak{f}_S(N) = \frac{2^{d-2}}{\pi\Omega_{d-1}} \int_0^N d\lambda \mu^S(\lambda), \quad (4.6)$$

and by [3]

$$f_S(N) = \frac{1}{\Omega_d} \sum_{n=1}^N D_n, \quad (4.7)$$

with  $D_n = (2n + d - 1)(n + d - 2)! / (n!(d - 1)!)$ , in the case  $\mathcal{M} = \mathbb{S}^d(L)$ . Note that in  $d = 4$  dimensions one has, with  $\Omega_3 = 2\pi^2$  and  $\Omega_4 = 8\pi^2/3$ , in leading order in  $N$  for both, the spherical as well as the hyperbolic case,

$$f_S(N) = \frac{1}{32\pi^2} N^4 (1 + O(1/N)) \quad (d = 4). \quad (4.8)$$

Subsequently, we only consider the case  $d = 4$ . It is intriguing to point out that  $f_S(N)$  diverges only quartically in this case. The infamous logarithmic divergences are only sub-leading in the case  $\mathcal{M} = \mathbb{H}^d(L)$  and not present at all in the case  $\mathcal{M} = \mathbb{S}^d(L)$  [3].

**A massless scalar field in  $d = 4$  dimensions.** For a massless scalar field in  $d = 4$  spacetime dimensions, the equations of motion (4.5) boil down to

$$-R(L) + 4\Lambda_b = 8\pi G \frac{1}{L^4} f_S(N). \quad (4.9)$$

Using  $R(L) = \pm 12/L^2$ , we can rewrite the RHS in terms of  $R(L)^2 = 144/L^4$ ,

$$-R + 4\Lambda_b = \frac{8\pi G}{144} f_S(N) R^2. \quad (4.10)$$

Eq. (4.10) is a simple quadratic equation for  $R$  whose solutions are the self-consistent spherical ( $R > 0$ ) and hyperbolic ( $R < 0$ ) background geometries ( $N$ -geometries).

Firstly, note that  $f_S(N = 0) = 0$ , such that for the classical case  $N = 0$ , we always have  $R = 4\Lambda_b$ , resulting in the familiar classical spherical/hyperbolic solutions of the Einstein equation in vacuum,  $L^2 = \pm 3/\Lambda_b$ . Secondly, for  $N \geq 0$ , the general solution of Eq. (4.10) reads

$$R^{\text{sc}}(N) = \frac{9}{\pi G f_S(N)} \left\{ -1 \pm \sqrt{1 + \frac{8\pi G \Lambda_b}{9} f_S(N)} \right\}. \quad (4.11)$$

Choosing, the “+”-branch, this solution converges for  $N \rightarrow 0$  to the classical solution  $R^{\text{sc}}(N) \xrightarrow{N \rightarrow 0} 4\Lambda_b$ . In the “-”-branch, the limit  $N \rightarrow 0$  must not be taken, and thus these solutions are purely quantum. This follows from the very basic fact that a quadratic equation  $ax^2 + bx + c = 0$  has two branches of solutions, only one of which converges to  $x = -c/b$  in the limit  $a \rightarrow 0$ . For  $N > 0$ , the solutions of Eq. (4.11) depend on the sign of  $\Lambda_b$ .

For  $\Lambda_b = 0$ , the solutions are simple: One is  $R^{\text{sc}} \equiv 0$ , which applies to the spherical as well as the hyperbolic case for  $L \rightarrow \infty$ . The other is  $R^{\text{sc}}(N) = -\frac{144}{8\pi G f_S(N)}$ , which can only be realized in the hyperbolic case. This solution has the property  $R^{\text{sc}}(N) \rightarrow 0$  as  $N \rightarrow \infty$ , thus recovering a flat spacetime in the QFT-limit.

For  $\Lambda_b > 0$ , the “+”-branch of Eq. (4.11) corresponds to a strictly positive self-consistent scalar curvature  $R^{\text{sc}}(N) > 0$ , thus resulting in the spherical  $N$ -geometry already obtained in [3] (cf. Eq. (1.5)), while the “-”-branch corresponds to  $R^{\text{sc}}(N) < 0$ , a new hyperbolic  $N$ -geometry. For  $N \rightarrow 0$ , the spherical “+”-branch connects to  $R^{\text{sc}}(0) = 4\Lambda_b$ , while the “-”-branch diverges,  $R^{\text{sc}} \rightarrow \infty$ , reflecting that this limit may not be taken in the “-”-branch. For  $N \rightarrow \infty$ , on the other hand, one has  $R^{\text{sc}}(N) \sim 1/\sqrt{f_S(N)}$ , and thus  $R^{\text{sc}}(N) \rightarrow 0$  as  $N \rightarrow \infty$ , for both branches of solutions. Thus, for  $\Lambda_b > 0$ , there are spherical as well as hyperbolic  $N$ -geometries, whose curvature shrinks as modes are added, i.e., as  $N$  increases, cf. Figure 1. In the case of a negative bare cosmological constant,  $\Lambda_b = -|\Lambda_b| < 0$ , the




Figure 1: The maximally symmetric  $N$ -geometries arising from Eq. (4.11) for  $\Lambda_b > 0$ .

square root on the RHS of Eq. (4.11) can only be taken for  $\frac{8\pi G|\Lambda_b|}{9}f_S(N) \leq 1$ . Thus, in this case, there exist  $N$ -geometries only up to a maximal critical value of  $N = N_{\text{crit}}$ , which in the leading- $N$  approximation is given by  $N_{\text{crit}} \approx \sqrt[4]{36\pi/(G|\Lambda_b|)}$ . For  $N \in (0, N_{\text{crit}}]$ , one has  $R^{\text{sc}}(N) < 0$ , and thus for  $\Lambda_b < 0$  there are only hyperbolic  $N$ -geometries. Again, choosing the “+”-branch, one recovers  $R^{\text{sc}}(0) = -4|\Lambda_b|$  in the limit  $N \rightarrow 0$ , while in the “-”-branch, one has  $R^{\text{sc}} \rightarrow \infty$  as  $N \rightarrow 0$ . These solutions are illustrated in Figure 2.

**A massive scalar field in  $d = 4$  dimensions.** In the case of a non-vanishing mass  $M$  of the scalar field, we also must account for the  $\Delta_N^{\text{scal}}$ -term on the RHS of Eq. (4.5), given by






Figure 2: The maximally symmetric  $N$ -geometries arising from Eq. (4.11) for  $\Lambda_b < 0$ .

Eq. (4.4). For  $\mathcal{M} = \mathbb{S}^d(L)$ , one has

$$\Delta T_\mu^\mu(L; M)_N^{\text{scal}} = -\frac{4}{\pi\Omega_3 L^4} \int_0^N d\lambda \mu^S(\lambda) \frac{M^2}{\mathcal{E}_\lambda^S(L) + M^2 + \xi R(L)}. \quad (4.12)$$

Since  $\mathcal{E}_\lambda^S \sim \lambda^2$  and  $\mu^S(\lambda) \sim \lambda^3$  for  $\lambda$  large,  $\Delta T_\mu^\mu(L; M)_N^{\text{scal}}$  will only diverge quadratically in  $N$  and is thus subleading compared to the quartic divergence of  $f_S(N)$ . Thus, in the leading- $N$  approximation, the results previously obtained for the case  $M = 0$  also remain valid for the case  $M \neq 0$ .

## 4.2 Metric fluctuations

Next, let us analyze the maximally symmetric  $N$ -geometries arising from metric fluctuations (i.e., from their induced one loop (1L) effective gravitational action). Then, the integrated and traced SET on the RHS of Eq. (4.1) is given by Eq. (2.32), where the traces are regularized

via the  $N$ -traces (3.27)-(3.29):<sup>14</sup>

$$\begin{aligned} T_\mu^\mu(L)_N^{\text{grav}} &= \underline{\text{Tr}}_{\text{ST}_N} \left[ \frac{\mathcal{K}(L)|_{\Lambda_b=0}}{\mathcal{K}(L)} \right] - 2\underline{\text{Tr}}_{\text{V}_N} [\mathbb{1}_V] \\ &= \underline{\text{Tr}}_{\text{ST}_N} \left[ (\mathbb{1}_{\text{ST}^2} - \mathbb{P}_{\text{tr}}) \frac{-\square + c_I R(L)}{-\square + 2\Lambda_b + c_I R(L)} + \mathbb{P}_{\text{tr}} \frac{-\square + c_{\text{tr}} R(L)}{-\square + 2\Lambda_b + c_{\text{tr}} R(L)} \right] \\ &\quad - 2\underline{\text{Tr}}_{\text{V}_N} [\mathbb{1}_V] , \end{aligned} \quad (4.13)$$

where in the last step we have used Eq. (2.15). Similar to Eq. (4.3) in the scalar case, we may rewrite Eq. (4.13) as

$$T_\mu^\mu(L)_N^{\text{grav}} = \frac{1}{L^d} \{ \mathfrak{f}_g(N) - \mathfrak{f}_{\text{gh}}(N) \} + \Delta T_\mu^\mu(L; \Lambda_b)_N^{\text{grav}} . \quad (4.14)$$

Here, we have introduced the degrees of freedom of the free graviton (G) and free ghost fields (gh), which are given by, respectively,

$$\begin{aligned} \mathfrak{f}_G(N) &= \mathfrak{f}_{\text{ST}}(N) = L^d \underline{\text{Tr}}_{\text{ST}_N} [\mathbb{1}_{\text{ST}}] \\ \mathfrak{f}_{\text{gh}}(N) &= 2\mathfrak{f}_V(N) = 2L^d \underline{\text{Tr}}_{\text{V}_N} [\mathbb{1}_V] . \end{aligned} \quad (4.15)$$

Again, we denote the corresponding degree-of-freedom densities by  $\mathfrak{f}_{(\dots)} = \mathbf{f}_{(\dots)} / (\text{vol}[\mathbb{H}^d(L)]/L^d)$ . It is intriguing to observe that evaluating Eqs. (4.15) with the hyperbolic  $N$ -traces (3.27)-(3.29), one finds at leading order in  $N$ ,

$$\mathfrak{f}_G(N) - \mathfrak{f}_{\text{gh}}(N) = \left[ \frac{1}{2}(d+1)(d-2) - (d-1) \right] \mathfrak{f}_S(N) + O(N^{d-1}) , \quad (4.16)$$

i.e., precisely the  $d(d-3)/2$  polarization states of the graviton field. The very same result had already been found in the spherical case [4]. Moreover, the last term on the RHS of Eq. (4.14) is given by

$$\Delta T_\mu^\mu(L; \Lambda_b)_N^{\text{grav}} = -\underline{\text{Tr}}_{\text{ST}_N} \left[ (\mathbb{1}_{\text{ST}^2} - \mathbb{P}_{\text{tr}}) \frac{2\Lambda_b}{-\square + 2\Lambda_b + c_I R(L)} + \mathbb{P}_{\text{tr}} \frac{2\Lambda_b}{-\square + 2\Lambda_b + c_{\text{tr}} R(L)} \right] . \quad (4.17)$$

For the very same reasons as outlined in the scalar case, namely that  $\mathcal{E}_\lambda^I \sim \lambda^2$  and  $\mu^I(\lambda) \sim \lambda^{d-1}$  for large  $\lambda$ , it is evident from the  $N$ -trace formulae (3.27)-(3.29), that  $\Delta T_\mu^\mu(L; \Lambda_b)_N^{\text{grav}}$  will only give subleading contributions in  $N$ . Here, we will only analyze the leading- $N$  case, in which the integrated and traced SET thus is given by

$$T_\mu^\mu(L)_N^{\text{grav}} = \frac{d(d-3)}{2} \mathfrak{f}_S(N) + O(N^{d-1}) , \quad (4.18)$$

which is independent of  $L$ . Eq. (4.16) has the immediate consequence, that the maximally symmetric  $N$ -geometries for a scalar field with vanishing mass and for the graviton field at leading order in  $N$  are qualitatively the very same. In particular, to obtain the corresponding results for the graviton field from the results previously outlined for a massless scalar field in  $d=4$  dimensions, one simply has to make the substitution  $\mathfrak{f}_S(N) \rightarrow 2\mathfrak{f}_S(N)$  in Eqs. (4.9)-(4.11) and the subsequent text.

<sup>14</sup>Technically, each sector I of the decomposition of ST and V could be assigned its own cutoff value  $N_I$ . Therewith, different minimal lengths  $L/N_I$  could be resolved in each sector. However, here we choose the case  $N_I \equiv N$ .

### 4.3 Summary

In this section, we have analyzed the maximally symmetric self-consistent spherical and hyperbolic background geometries (“ $N$ -geometries”) arising from quantized scalar field fluctuations as well as quantized metric fluctuations. In general, the result outlined in the introduction has been confirmed: by defining the quantum theory via a background independent regularization, and keeping the background metric dynamical, we find flat geometries in the QFT-limit for both compact (spherical) and non-compact (hyperbolic) cases. This is in contrast to the curvature singularity arising in the background dependent case of the “cosmological constant problem” [25–27]. It is particularly intriguing that for  $\Lambda_b > 0$  there are self-consistent solutions for the hyperboloid such that  $R^{\text{sc}}(N) \rightarrow 0$  in the QFT limit (i.e.  $N \rightarrow \infty$ ), but there is no solution when  $N = 0$  (as depicted in Figure 1); this trajectory may be regarded as “pure quantum”, lacking a classical limit when there are no quantum modes inhabiting the spacetime.

We conclude with some remarks on why the above results are expected to be generic for *any* scale-free quasi-physical regulation scheme on a maximally symmetric spacetime. Consider the regularized (traced) Einstein equation in  $d = 4$  dimensions,

$$-R + 4\Lambda_b = 8\pi G T_\mu^\mu[g]_{\text{reg}}, \quad (4.19)$$

and assume that the regularization is consistent, i.e. that  $T_\mu^\mu[g]_{\text{reg}}$  is a constant. In the case of conformal coupling of massless fields,  $R$  is the only scale in the theory, and hence one may conclude on purely dimensional grounds that  $T_\mu^\mu[g]_{\text{reg}} \propto R^2$ , with a proportionality constant that diverges as the regularization is removed. Thus Eq. (4.19) is a quadratic equation in  $R$ , and it is clear that for  $\Lambda_b > 0$  the divergence of  $T_\mu^\mu[g]$  implies that the solution will be driven to zero,  $R^{\text{sc}} \rightarrow 0$ .

## 5 Conclusions and outlook

In this paper, we have constructed  $N$ -cutoffs for quantized fields, including full quantum gravity, living on the self-consistently adjusted  $d$ -dimensional hyperboloid  $\mathbb{H}^d(L)$ . This self-consistent adjustment of the background manifold is at the heart of the  $N$ -cutoff regularization scheme, and is realized through the backreaction of the quantized field modes onto the background spacetime at a given value of the dimensionless cutoff  $N \in \mathbb{R}_+$ . On a practical level, the  $N$ -cutoffs are constructed using spectral properties of the Laplace operator on hyperbolic space, whose spectrum being purely continuous entails a number of mathematical subtleties discussed in Appendix B. Our results have already been summarized in Section 4.3 and need not be repeated here. Instead, we comment on some extensions and future directions.

A natural extension of the  $N$ -cutoff formalism would be the maximally symmetric (*Lorentzian* signature) de Sitter and anti-de Sitter spacetimes. Along the same lines, another interesting setting would be to analyze self-consistent product spacetimes, such as  $\mathbb{S}^1(L_1) \times \mathbb{S}^3(L_2)$ , since a Wick rotations from here to a Lorentzian spacetime has already been performed [28]. As a second step, it would be instructive to look into interacting fields, e.g., a scalar field with a potential.

Another important direction to pursue is to relate the  $N$ -cutoff regularization to a renormalization scheme, possibly by implementing a renormalization group (RG) flow equation. Although the  $N$ -cutoff is by construction scale-free, this approach does generate a self-consistent scale, namely the hyperboloid's radius  $L^{\text{sc}}(N)$ , which in turn defines a self-consistent momentum scale  $\mathcal{P}^{\text{sc}}(N) = (N^2 + \rho^2)^{1/2}/L^{\text{sc}}(N)$  for e.g. scalars. For each  $N$  this places an upper bound on the accessible momenta, and it is interesting to note that  $\lim_{N \rightarrow \infty} \mathcal{P}^{\text{sc}}(N) < \infty$ , namely even in the QFT limit there remains an upper limit on the momenta of the fields. Unfortunately, it is unclear how this relates to a genuine adjustable renormalization scale. Relatedly, analogous results have been observed in attempts to connect the RG scale employed in the functional renormalization group (FRG) framework to the spectral flow of the quantized field modes [29, 30]. Further, since flow equations such as the Polchinski equation [31] are constructed from the requirement of scale invariance of the path integral in presence of a dimensionful UV cutoff, it is in principle unclear if the RG à la Wilson can be implemented solely from the  $N$ -cutoff point of view. Finally, we note that if an  $N$ -cutoff renormalization scheme is successfully constructed, we can look ahead to analyze further physical implications of the  $N$ -cutoffs, e.g. by making contact with traditional results from QFT in curved spacetime, such as the SET's trace anomaly [32–36].

## Acknowledgments

We thank Martin Reuter, Max Niedermaier, Frank Saueressig, Roberto Percacci, Dario Benedetti, Roberto Camporesi, and Rainer Verch for interesting discussions. The authors are also grateful to Martin Reuter, Max Niedermaier, Frank Saueressig, and Roberto Percacci for helpful comments on the manuscript. The authors thank the Institut Henri

Poincaré in Paris for the hospitality at the workshop “Quantum gravity, random geometry and holography”, during which part of this work was completed. MB gratefully acknowledges financial support by DFG Grant BE 7780/1-1.

## A Decomposition of $V$ and $ST$

The following decompositions are valid for vector fields and symmetric rank-2 tensor fields on any Einstein manifold.

**Decomposition of  $V$ .** The Hilbert space  $L_V^2(\mathcal{M}, g)$  can be decomposed as

$$L_V^2(\mathcal{M}, g) = L_T^2(\mathcal{M}, g) \oplus L_L^2(\mathcal{M}, g), \quad \xi_\mu = \xi_\mu^T + \xi_\mu^L, \quad (\text{A.1})$$

with the transverse part  $\xi_\mu^T$  of the vector field  $\xi_\mu$  defined by  $D^\mu \xi_\mu^T = 0$ . The associated scalar products  $\langle \cdot, \cdot \rangle_T$  and  $\langle \cdot, \cdot \rangle_L$  arise from the corresponding restriction of  $\langle \cdot, \cdot \rangle_V$  to  $T$  and  $L$ . Locally, we may identify

$$L_T^2(\mathcal{M}, g) \cong L_S^2(\mathcal{M}, g) \times \mathbb{C}^{d-1} \quad \text{and} \quad L_L^2(\mathcal{M}, g) \cong L_S^2(\mathcal{M}, g), \quad (\text{A.2})$$

where the latter isomorphism is given by the mapping

$$P^{L,S} : L_S^2(\mathcal{M}, g) \rightarrow L_L^2(\mathcal{M}, g), \quad \sigma \mapsto (P^{L,S})_\mu \sigma := D_\mu \frac{1}{\sqrt{-D^2}} \sigma = \xi_\mu^L. \quad (\text{A.3})$$

It is easy to verify that the mapping (A.3) defines an *isometry* of the spaces  $L_S^2(\mathcal{M}, g)$  and  $L_L^2(\mathcal{M}, g)$ , with  $\langle \sigma_1, \sigma_2 \rangle_S = \langle \xi_1^L, \xi_2^L \rangle_L$  for  $\xi_i^L = D_\mu \frac{1}{\sqrt{-D^2}} \sigma_i$ ,  $i = 1, 2$ .<sup>15</sup> This property is employed in this paper to construct an orthonormal basis for  $L$  from a given one for  $S$  in the case of  $\mathcal{M}$  maximally symmetric.

Finally, we denote the projectors onto  $T$  and  $L$  by  $\mathbb{P}_T$  and  $\mathbb{P}_L$ , which have matrix elements

$$\langle x, \mu | \mathbb{P}_I | y, \nu \rangle = (P_{I\mu}{}^\nu)^{\text{diff}, x} \delta(x - y) / \sqrt{g(y)}, \quad I = T, L. \quad (\text{A.4})$$

The explicit form of the projectors  $P_{I\mu}{}^\nu$  as differential operators is not relevant here and can be found e.g. in [38, 39].

**Decomposition of  $ST$ .** First, we decompose the Hilbert space  $L_{ST}^2(\mathcal{M}, g)$  as

$$L_{ST}^2(\mathcal{M}, g) = L_{TT}^2(\mathcal{M}, g) \oplus L_{LT}^2(\mathcal{M}, g) \oplus L_{\text{tr}}^2(\mathcal{M}, g), \quad \tau_{\mu\nu} = \tau_{\mu\nu}^{\text{TT}} + \tau_{\mu\nu}^{\text{LT}} + \tau_{\mu\nu}^{\text{tr}}. \quad (\text{A.5})$$

Here,  $TT$  is the space of transverse-traceless tensor fields, i.e.,  $D^\mu \tau_{\mu\nu}^{\text{TT}} = 0$  and  $g^{\mu\nu} \tau_{\mu\nu}^{\text{TT}} = 0$ . Locally, we identify

$$L_{TT}^2(\mathcal{M}, g) \cong L_S^2(\mathcal{M}, g) \times \mathbb{C}^{(d+1)(d-2)/2}. \quad (\text{A.6})$$

Next,  $LT$  is the space of longitudinal-traceless tensor fields. Since locally we have,

$$L_{LT}^2(\mathcal{M}, g) \cong L_S^2(\mathcal{M}, g) \times \mathbb{C}^d = L_V^2(\mathcal{M}, g), \quad (\text{A.7})$$

---

<sup>15</sup>We remark that often the isomorphism  $L_S^2(\mathcal{M}, g) \simeq L_L^2(\mathcal{M}, g)$  is defined via the local mapping  $\xi_\mu^L = D_\mu \sigma$ , in contrast to the non-local definition employed here. It is important to note that while the mapping (A.3) has the advantage of turning the relationship between  $S$  and  $L$  into an isometry, this transformation is not legitimate for physical degrees of freedom. However,  $\sigma$  itself is a gauge degree of freedom [37].

we can further decompose  $L_{\text{LT}}^2(\mathcal{M}, g)$  by means of the vector field decomposition (A.1),

$$L_{\text{LT}}^2(\mathcal{M}, g) = L_{\text{LTT}}^2(\mathcal{M}, g) \oplus L_{\text{LLT}}^2(\mathcal{M}, g), \quad \tau_{\mu\nu}^{\text{LT}} = \tau_{\mu\nu}^{\text{LTT}} + \tau_{\mu\nu}^{\text{LLT}}. \quad (\text{A.8})$$

LTT is the space of longitudinal-transverse traceless tensor fields, locally isomorphic to

$$L_{\text{LTT}}^2(\mathcal{M}, g) \cong L_{\text{S}}^2(\mathcal{M}, g) \times \mathbb{C}^{d-1} \cong L_{\text{T}}^2(\mathcal{M}, g). \quad (\text{A.9})$$

Thus we can identify LTT and T via the mapping

$$(P^{\text{LTT}, \text{T}})_{\nu} : L_{\text{T}}^2(\mathcal{M}, g) \rightarrow L_{\text{LTT}}^2(\mathcal{M}, g), \quad (\text{A.10})$$

$$\xi_{\mu}^{\text{T}} \mapsto (P^{\text{LTT}, \text{T}})_{\nu} \xi_{\mu}^{\text{T}} = \frac{1}{\sqrt{2}} \left[ D_{\mu} \frac{1}{\sqrt{-D^2 - R/d}} \xi_{\nu}^{\text{T}} + D_{\nu} \frac{1}{\sqrt{-D^2 - R/d}} \xi_{\mu}^{\text{T}} \right] = \tau_{\mu\nu}^{\text{LTT}}.$$

Again, it is straightforward to see that definition with (A.10), the spaces T and LTT become isometric.

Lastly, we can locally identify

$$L_{\text{LLT}}^2(\mathcal{M}, g) \cong L_{\text{S}}^2(\mathcal{M}, g) \quad \text{and} \quad L_{\text{tr}}^2(\mathcal{M}, g) \cong L_{\text{S}}^2(\mathcal{M}, g), \quad (\text{A.11})$$

and the mappings that make the Hilbert spaces of LLT and tr isometric to that of S, respectively, are given by<sup>16</sup>

$$(P^{\text{LLT}, \text{S}})_{\mu\nu} : L_{\text{S}}^2(\mathcal{M}, g) \rightarrow L_{\text{LLT}}^2(\mathcal{M}, g), \quad (\text{A.12})$$

$$\sigma \mapsto (P^{\text{LLT}, \text{S}})_{\mu\nu} \sigma = \sqrt{\frac{d}{d-1}} \left( D_{\mu} D_{\nu} - \frac{1}{d} g_{\mu\nu} D^2 \right) \frac{1}{\sqrt{-D^2}} \frac{1}{\sqrt{-D^2 - R/(d-1)}} \sigma = \tau_{\mu\nu}^{\text{LLT}},$$

and

$$(P^{\text{tr}, \text{S}})_{\mu\nu} : L_{\text{S}}^2(\mathcal{M}, g) \rightarrow L_{\text{tr}}^2(\mathcal{M}, g), \quad \sigma \mapsto (P^{\text{tr}, \text{S}})_{\mu\nu} \sigma = \frac{1}{\sqrt{d}} g_{\mu\nu} = \tau_{\mu\nu}^{\text{tr}}. \quad (\text{A.13})$$

We denote the projectors on the subspaces of the York decomposition by  $\mathbb{P}_{\text{I}}$ ,  $\text{I} = \text{TT}, \text{LTT}, \text{LLT}, \text{tr}$ , with the matrix elements

$$\langle x, \mu, \nu | \mathbb{P}_{\text{I}} | y, \rho, \sigma \rangle = (\mathbb{P}_{\text{I}\mu\nu}{}^{\rho\sigma})^{\text{diff}, x} \delta(x-y) / \sqrt{g(y)}. \quad (\text{A.14})$$

For the specific form of the differential operators  $\mathbb{P}_{\text{I}\mu\nu}{}^{\rho\sigma}$  see e.g. [38, 39].

---

<sup>16</sup>As in case for the decomposition of V, here all nonlocal field redefinitions are legitimate since only gauge degrees of freedom are concerned.

## B Addition theorems on hyperbolic space

As discussed in the Introduction, the addition theorem for spherical harmonics (Theorem B.1 below) plays an essential technical role in ensuring that the (regularized) traced SET  $\langle T_\mu^\mu \rangle_N$  is a constant on the sphere, and hence *no information is lost* by the technically convenient integration over the sphere to obtain the integrated traced SET  $\Theta_N$  (c.f. Eq. (1.2)). In this paper we consider hyperbolic space, where the validity of this integration procedure is dubious due to the infinite volume of  $\mathbb{H}^d(L)$ . However, in order for the contracted Einstein equation (4.1) encoding the self-consistent backreaction of the quantized fields on hyperbolic space to be consistent, the constancy of the  $N$ -cutoff regularized traced SET  $T_\mu^\mu(L)_N$  is *essential*. This follows from Theorem B.2 (which may be regarded as the addition theorem for (scalar) hyperbolic harmonics), together with its Corollary B.3.

In this Appendix we shall prove the addition theorem for both the (scalar) hyperbolic and (scalar) spherical harmonics, respectively Theorems B.1 and B.2, as well as Corollary B.3. We also take the opportunity, following the proof of Theorem B.1, to add remarks that highlight the subtleties that arise when dealing with the continuous spectrum of  $-\square$  on the non-compact hyperbolic space. Since we focus only on the scalar case, for notational brevity the field species label  $I = S$  will be omitted below, i.e. we will write  $u_{\lambda l} \equiv u_{\lambda l}^S$ ,  $\mathcal{E}_\lambda \equiv \mathcal{E}_\lambda^S$ ,  $d_\lambda \equiv d_\lambda^S$ , and  $\mu_\lambda \equiv \mu_\lambda^S$ .

**Theorem B.1** (Addition theorem for spherical harmonics).

Consider the  $D$ -dimensional unit sphere  $\mathbb{S}^D$ , and the associated (scalar) spherical harmonics  $Y_{\ell m}$  satisfying  $-\square_{\mathbb{S}^D} Y_{\ell m} = \ell(\ell + D - 1)Y_{\ell m}$ , where  $\ell \in \mathbb{N}_0$  and  $m$  is a multi-index labeling the finitely many orthogonal eigenfunctions in the  $\ell^{\text{th}}$  eigenspace. Then for all  $\Omega \in \mathbb{S}^D$

$$\sum_m |Y_{\ell m}(\Omega)|^2 = \frac{G_\ell}{\text{vol}(\mathbb{S}^D)}, \quad \text{vol}(\mathbb{S}^D) = \frac{2\pi^{(D+1)/2}}{\Gamma((D+1)/2)}, \quad (\text{B.1})$$

and

$$G_\ell := \frac{(2\ell + D - 1)(\ell + D - 2)!}{\ell!(D - 1)!} \quad (\text{B.2})$$

is the dimension of the  $\ell^{\text{th}}$  eigenspace.

**Theorem B.2** (Addition theorem for hyperbolic harmonics).

Consider the hyperboloid  $\mathbb{H}^d(L)$  and associated (scalar) eigenfunctions  $u_{\lambda l}$  satisfying  $-\square_{\mathbb{H}^d(L)} u_{\lambda l} = \mathcal{E}_\lambda u_{\lambda l}$ , with  $\lambda \in \mathbb{R}_{\geq 0}$  and  $l$  a discrete multi-index taking values in a countable set of infinite cardinality. Given  $\lambda \geq 0$ , consider the function  $d_\lambda : \mathbb{H}^d(L) \rightarrow [0, \infty]$  defined by

$$d_\lambda(x) := \sum_l u_{\lambda l}(x) u_{\lambda l}(x)^*, \quad \forall x \in \mathbb{H}^d(L). \quad (\text{B.3})$$



Then  $d_\lambda$  is a finite constant function,

$$d_\lambda(x) \equiv \frac{2^{d-2}}{\pi \Omega_{d-1} L^d} \mu(\lambda), \quad \forall x \in \mathbb{H}^d(L), \quad (\text{B.4})$$

with  $\mu(\lambda)$  the spectral function for scalars. We will write (by slight abuse of notation)  $d_\lambda(x) \equiv d_\lambda$ .

### Corollary B.3.

For arbitrary  $x \in \mathbb{H}^d(L)$  and  $\lambda \geq 0$  we have  $\sum_l D_\mu u_{\lambda l}(x) D^\mu u_{\lambda l}(x)^* = -\mathcal{E}_\lambda d_\lambda$ .

*Proof of the addition Theorem for (scalar) spherical harmonics (Theorem B.1):* The Laplacian  $-\square_{\mathbb{S}^D}$  is essentially self-adjoint on  $C_c^\infty(\mathbb{S}^D)$ , and hence has a unique self-adjoint extension in  $L^2(\mathbb{S}^D)$ . Its inverse is a compact operator, thereby having a fully discrete spectrum. The spectral theorem then entails that the set of spherical harmonics  $\{Y_{\ell m}\}$  forms a complete orthonormal basis of  $L^2(\mathbb{S}^D)$ . Given two arbitrary points  $\Omega, \Omega' \in \mathbb{S}^D$ , the transitive action of  $SO(D)$  implies that there is a group element  $\sigma$  such that  $\Omega' = \sigma \triangleright \Omega$ . Then, clearly  $Y_{\ell m}(\sigma \triangleright \Omega) = Y_{\ell m} \circ \sigma(\Omega)$ . Since  $\sigma$  is an isometry of the sphere, the set  $\{Y_{\ell m} \circ \sigma\}$  is also a complete orthonormal basis of  $L^2(\mathbb{S}^D)$ , and hence the two bases may be expressed in terms of one another,

$$Y_{\ell m} \circ \sigma = \sum_{\ell' m'} \alpha_{\ell m, \ell' m'}(\sigma) Y_{\ell' m'}, \quad \sum_{\ell'' m''} \alpha_{\ell'' m'', \ell m}(\sigma) \alpha_{\ell'' m'', \ell' m'}(\sigma)^* = \delta_{\ell \ell'} \delta_{m m'}, \quad (\text{B.5})$$

with the second relation following from the unitarity of the basis change map  $L^2(\mathbb{S}^D) \rightarrow L^2(\mathbb{S}^D)$ . Next, to conclude that only  $\ell' = \ell$  terms appear in the above expansion, we note that the action of  $-\square_{\mathbb{S}^D}$  commutes with  $\sigma \in SO(D)$ , which implies that  $\alpha_{\ell m, \ell' m'}(\sigma) = \delta_{\ell \ell'} C_{\ell m m'}(\sigma)$ . Inserted into the expansion (B.18), this eliminates the sum over  $\ell' \in \mathbb{N}_0$ , leaving only the sum over  $m$  that consists of finitely many terms,

$$Y_{\ell m} \circ \sigma = \sum_{m'} C_{\ell m m'}(\sigma) Y_{\ell m'}. \quad (\text{B.6})$$

Further, the unitarity relation for the coefficients  $\alpha_{\ell m, \ell' m'}(\sigma)$  in (B.18) implies that the coefficients  $C_{\ell m m'}(\sigma)$  satisfy  $\sum_{m''} C_{\ell m'' m}(\sigma) C_{\ell m'' m'}(\sigma)^* = \delta_{m m'}$  for all  $\ell \in \mathbb{N}_0$ . Hence we have

$$\begin{aligned} \sum_m |Y_{\ell m}(\sigma \triangleright \Omega)|^2 &= \sum_m |Y_{\ell m} \circ \sigma(\Omega)|^2 = \sum_m \sum_{m', m''} Y_{\ell m'}(\Omega) Y_{\ell m''}(\Omega)^* C_{\ell m m'}(\sigma) C_{\ell m m''}(\sigma)^* \\ &= \sum_{m', m''} Y_{\ell m'}(\Omega) Y_{\ell m''}(\Omega)^* \sum_m C_{\ell m m'}(\sigma) C_{\ell m m''}(\sigma)^* = \sum_m |Y_{\ell m}(\sigma)|^2, \end{aligned} \quad (\text{B.7})$$

where the order of finite sums may readily be exchanged. Therefore we conclude that  $\sum_m |Y_{\ell m}(\sigma)|^2$  is a constant on the sphere. The final result (B.1) is obtained by integrating this constant over the sphere and using the orthonormality of the spherical harmonics.  $\square$

**Remark:** In order to transition from the sphere to hyperbolic space, it is helpful to observe that this argument consists of two key components: (i) The transitivity of the group action entails that for any two points on the manifold, there is a group element mapping between them. (ii) For any group element  $\sigma$ ,  $Y_{\ell m} \circ \sigma$  is itself an element of  $L^2(\mathbb{S}^D)$ , and hence by the spectral theorem may be expanded in the  $Y_{\ell m}$  with coefficients satisfying a unitarity relation (B.18). Further, the sums appearing in the calculation (B.7) are finite sums, therefore requiring no further statements on convergence. It is clear that (i) generalizes readily to hyperbolic space, where indeed the action of  $SO(1, d)$  can link any two points  $x, x' \in \mathbb{H}^d(L)$ . Unfortunately, the argument of (ii) does not generalize so readily. The culprit of course is that the Laplacian has a purely continuous spectrum on  $\mathbb{H}^d(L)$ . The eigenfunctions  $u_{\lambda l}$  do not belong to  $L^2(\mathbb{H}^d(L))$ , and hence the spectral theorem cannot be directly applied to conclude that  $u_{\lambda l} \circ \sigma$  (for  $\sigma \in SO(1, d)$ ) may be expressed in terms of the  $u_{\lambda l}$  themselves<sup>17</sup>. Moreover, the precise sense of the convergence of such an expression is unclear (e.g. it cannot be relative to the  $L^2$ -norm, since neither are square integrable). While such questions can be addressed through the Nuclear Spectral Theory of Gel'fand-Maurin, we find it instructive to present the following more elementary analysis.

However, before proceeding to the proof, some preparations are needed. We begin with a brief review of the eigenfunctions  $u_{\lambda l}$  on  $\mathbb{H}^d(L)$  following [19]. Recall that  $-D_\mu D^\mu u_{\lambda l} = \mathcal{E}_\lambda(L) u_{\lambda l}$  with

$$\mathcal{E}_\lambda(L) = (\lambda^2 + \rho^2)/L^2, \quad \rho := (d-1)/2. \quad (\text{B.8})$$

Using standard coordinates  $(y, \Omega)$  on  $\mathbb{H}^d(L)$ , with  $y \geq 0$  and  $\Omega \in \mathbb{S}^{d-1}$ , we have

$$u_{\lambda \ell m}(y, \Omega) = N_{\lambda \ell}(L) q_{\lambda \ell}(y) Y_{\ell m}(\Omega), \quad \lambda \in \mathbb{R}_{\geq 0}, \quad \ell \in \mathbb{N}_0, \quad (\text{B.9})$$

and  $m$  distinguishes different eigenfunctions with eigenvalues labeled by  $\lambda$  and  $\ell$ .<sup>18</sup> Here  $Y_{\ell m}$  are the complete orthonormal scalar spherical harmonics on  $\mathbb{S}^{d-1}$ ,

$$-\square_{\mathbb{S}^{d-1}} Y_{\ell m} = \ell(\ell + d - 2) Y_{\ell m}. \quad (\text{B.10})$$

Next,  $q_{\lambda \ell}$  is conveniently expressed in terms of a hypergeometric function,

$$q_{\lambda \ell}(y) := (i \sinh y)^\ell F\left(i\lambda + \rho + \ell, -i\lambda + \rho + \ell; \ell + \frac{d}{2}; -\sinh^2(y/2)\right), \quad (\text{B.11})$$

---

<sup>17</sup>The reader may be concerned by the apparent tension between the fact that eigenfunctions  $u_{\lambda l} \notin L^2(\mathbb{H}^d(L))$ , and the statement that they constitute a complete orthonormal basis for  $L^2(\mathbb{H}^d(L))$ , c.f. Eqs. (3.8), (3.9), (3.25). However, *completeness* and *orthonormality* are to be understood in terms of the spectral theory of  $-\square_{\mathbb{H}^d(L)}$  whereby  $L^2(\mathbb{H}^d(L))$  is unitarily equivalent to a Hilbert space in which the Laplacian acts by multiplication. This unitary mapping is determined by the  $u_{\lambda l}$  via

$$f(x) \mapsto f^\wedge(\lambda, l) := \int_{\mathbb{H}^d(L)} d^d x \sqrt{g(x)} u_{\lambda l}(x)^* f(x), \quad f \in C_c^\infty(\mathbb{H}^d(L)) \subseteq L^2(\mathbb{H}^d(L)).$$

<sup>18</sup>We have decomposed the degeneracy multi-index  $l$  into  $(\ell, m)$ . As is the case for the sphere, for each  $\ell$ ,  $m$  takes values in a finite set.

and the normalization factor is

$$N_{\lambda\ell}(L) = \frac{1}{L^{d/2}} \left| \frac{2^{\ell-(d-2)/2} \Gamma(\ell + d/2) \Gamma(i\lambda)}{\Gamma(i\lambda + \rho + \ell)} \right|^{-1}. \quad (\text{B.12})$$

**Lemma B.4.** *For every  $x \in \mathbb{H}^d(L)$ , and every  $\lambda \geq 0 : d_\lambda(x) = \sum_l |u_{\lambda l}(x)|^2 < \infty$ .*

**Remark:** This is weaker than the statement of Theorem B.2 in that it only asserts that  $d_\lambda$  is a finite function on  $\mathbb{H}^d(L)$ , with its constancy remaining unproven.

*Proof of Lemma B.4:* Fixing arbitrary  $x = (y, \Omega) \in \mathbb{H}^d(L)$  and  $\lambda \geq 0$ , we have from the decomposition (B.9)

$$\begin{aligned} \sum_{\ell, m} |u_{\lambda\ell m}(y, \Omega)|^2 &= \sum_{\ell} N_{\lambda\ell}(L)^2 |q_{\lambda\ell}(y)|^2 \sum_m |Y_{\ell m}(\Omega)|^2 \\ &= \frac{1}{\text{vol}(\mathbb{S}^{d-1})} \sum_{\ell} G_{\ell} N_{\lambda\ell}(L)^2 |q_{\lambda\ell}(y)|^2, \end{aligned} \quad (\text{B.13})$$

where the second line follows from Theorem B.1 with  $G_{\ell} = \frac{(2\ell+d-2)(\ell+d-3)!}{\ell!(d-2)!}$ . From Stirling's formula we obtain the asymptotic large  $\ell$  behavior

$$G_{\ell} N_{\lambda\ell}(L)^2 \sim 2^{-2\ell} \ell^{d-3}, \quad (\text{B.14})$$

where the “ $\sim$ ” means that  $G_{\ell} N_{\lambda\ell}(L)^{-2} / (2^{-2\ell} \ell^{d-3})$  is bounded by a ( $\ell$ -independent) constant as  $\ell \rightarrow \infty$ . Next, a large  $\ell$  bound on  $|q_{\lambda\ell}(y)|^2$  is obtained through the following integral representation of the hypergeometric function in (B.11),

$$F(\ell + a, \ell + b; \ell + c; -\sinh^2(y/2)) = \frac{\Gamma(\ell + c)}{\Gamma(\ell + b)\Gamma(c - b)} \int_0^{\infty} \frac{t^{\ell+b-1} (t+1)^{a-c}}{[\cosh^2(y/2)t + 1]^{\ell+a}} dt, \quad (\text{B.15})$$

where we have defined for brevity  $a := \rho + i\lambda$ ,  $b := \rho - i\lambda$ ,  $c := d/2$ . Since for every  $y \geq 0$  we have the upper bound  $t^{\ell}/[\cosh^2(y/2)t + 1]^{\ell} \leq 1/(\cosh(y/2))^{2\ell}$ , it follows that

$$\begin{aligned} &|F(\ell + a, \ell + b; \ell + c; -\sinh^2(y/2))| \\ &\leq \frac{|\Gamma(\ell + c)|}{|\Gamma(\ell + b)| |\Gamma(c - b)|} \frac{1}{(\cosh(y/2))^{2\ell}} \int_0^{\infty} \frac{t^{\rho-1} (t+1)^{-1/2}}{[\cosh^2(y/2)t + 1]^{\rho}} dt \\ &\leq \frac{1}{(\cosh(y/2))^{2\ell}} \ell^{1/2} K_{\lambda} \left| F\left(\rho, \rho; d/2; -\sinh^2(y/2)\right) \right|, \end{aligned} \quad (\text{B.16})$$

for all  $\ell \in \mathbb{N}_0$  and  $y \geq 0$ , with  $K_{\lambda}$  an  $\ell$ -independent function of  $\lambda$ . Together with Eq. (B.14) this gives the following large  $\ell$ -bound of the summands in (B.13)

$$G_{\ell} N_{\lambda\ell}(L)^2 |q_{\lambda\ell}(y)|^2 \leq \ell^{d-2} \exp\{2\ell \ln[\tanh(y/2)]\} K_{\lambda} \left| F\left(\rho, \rho; d/2; -\sinh^2(y/2)\right) \right|. \quad (\text{B.17})$$

It is clear from (B.17) that the  $\ell$ -sum defining  $d_\lambda(x)$  converges uniformly over compact subsets of the form  $[y_0, y_1] \times \mathbb{S}^{d-1} \subseteq \mathbb{H}^d(L)$ , completing the proof of Lemma B.4.  $\square$

**Lemma B.5.** Given  $\sigma \in SO(1, d)$  and an eigenfunction  $u_\lambda$ , consider the composition  $u_\lambda \circ \sigma$ . Then there is a pointwise expansion

$$(u_\lambda \circ \sigma)(x) = \sum_j C_{\lambda j}(\sigma) u_{\lambda j}(x), \quad (\text{B.18})$$

which further converges uniformly for the compact sets  $[y_0, y_1] \times \mathbb{S}^d \subseteq \mathbb{H}^d(L)$  with  $y_0 > 0$ . Moreover, the coefficients  $C_{\lambda j}(\sigma)$  are unitary matrices (in the  $j, l$  indices), satisfying

$$\sum_k C_{\lambda k j}(\sigma) C_{\lambda k l}(\sigma)^* = \delta_{j l}. \quad (\text{B.19})$$

*Proof of Lemma B.5:* Fixing  $\sigma \in SO(1, d)$  arbitrarily, we define for brevity  $f_\lambda(x) := u_\lambda \circ \sigma(x)$ ,  $x \in \mathbb{H}^d(L)$ . Writing  $x = (y, \Omega)$  for some arbitrary  $y > 0$  consider the  $(d-1)$ -sphere  $\mathcal{S}$  at this coordinate. It is in particular clear that

$$f_\lambda|_{\mathcal{S}} \in L^2(\mathbb{S}^{d-1}). \quad (\text{B.20})$$

Therefore, for each  $y > 0$  we may expand  $f_\lambda$  in spherical harmonics

$$f_\lambda = \sum_{j,m} \alpha_{\lambda j m}(y) Y_{j m}, \quad \alpha_{\lambda j m}(y) = \int_{\mathbb{S}^{d-1}} d\Omega Y_{j m}^* f_\lambda|_{\mathcal{S}}, \quad (\text{B.21})$$

where the convergence is in the  $L^2(\mathbb{S}^{d-1})$ <sup>19</sup>.

Unfortunately, convergence in  $L^2$ -norm is not sufficiently strong for our purposes. Indeed, we claim that the sum in Eq. (B.21) converges *uniformly pointwise* on the (compact) set  $[y_0, y_1] \times \mathbb{S}^{d-1} \subseteq \mathbb{H}^d(L)$ , where  $0 < y_0 < y_1$ . To show this note that for  $k \in \mathbb{N}$

$$\begin{aligned} (j(j+d-2))^k \alpha_{\lambda j m}(y) &= \int_{\mathbb{S}^{d-1}} d\Omega (-\square_{\mathbb{S}^{d-1}})^k Y_{j m}(\Omega)^* f_\lambda(y, \Omega) \\ &= \int_{\mathbb{S}^{d-1}} d\Omega Y_{j m}(\Omega)^* (-\square_{\mathbb{S}^{d-1}})^k f_\lambda(y, \Omega), \end{aligned} \quad (\text{B.22})$$

by repeated integration by parts on  $\mathbb{S}^{d-1}$ . In particular,  $(-\square_{\mathbb{S}^{d-1}})^k f_\lambda(y, \Omega)$  is a smooth function for all  $y > 0$ , and its modulus is hence bounded on  $[y_0, y_1] \times \mathbb{S}^{d-1}$  with  $y > 0$ . Calling this bound  $B_k$  we have

$$(j(j+d-2))^k |\alpha_{\lambda j m}(y)| \leq B_k \int_{\mathbb{S}^{d-1}} d\Omega |Y_{j m}(\Omega)| \leq B_k \text{vol}(\mathbb{S}^{d-1}), \quad (\text{B.23})$$

<sup>19</sup>By slight abuse of notation we have displayed the  $y$ -dependence of the coefficient functions  $\alpha_{\lambda j \ell m}$ .

and hence

$$\sup_{y \in [y_0, y_1]} |\alpha_{\lambda l j m}(y)| \leq \frac{B_k \text{vol}(\mathbb{S}^{d-1})}{(j(j+d-2))^k}. \quad (\text{B.24})$$

For sufficiently large  $k \in \mathbb{N}$  this implies the uniform pointwise convergence of

$$f_{\lambda l}(y, \Omega) = \sum_{j, m} \alpha_{\lambda l j m}(y) Y_{j m}(\Omega) \quad (\text{B.25})$$

over the compact subset  $[y_0, y_1] \times \mathbb{S}^{d-1} \subseteq \mathbb{H}^d(L)$ , proving the claim. Furthermore, this argument generalizes straightforwardly to show that

$$-\square_{\mathbb{H}^d(L)} f_{\lambda l}(y, \Omega) = \sum_{j, m} -\square_{\mathbb{H}^d(L)} (\alpha_{\lambda l j m}(y) Y_{j m}(\Omega)), \quad (\text{B.26})$$

with the sum converging uniformly pointwise on  $[y_0, y_1] \times \mathbb{S}^{d-1} \subseteq \mathbb{H}^d(L)$ . Since  $\sigma \in SO(1, d)$  is an isometry, its action commutes with that of the  $-\square_{\mathbb{H}^d(L)}$ , so  $-\square_{\mathbb{H}^d(L)} f_{\lambda l} = \mathcal{E}_\lambda f_{\lambda l}$ . It follows therefore that  $-\square_{\mathbb{H}^d(L)} (\alpha_{\lambda l j m}(y) Y_{j m}(\Omega)) = \mathcal{E}_\lambda \alpha_{\lambda l j m}(y) Y_{j m}(\Omega)$ , and by separation of variables one concludes that  $\alpha_{\lambda l j m}(y) \propto q_{\lambda j}(y)$ , where we recall  $u_{\lambda j m}(y, \Omega) = N_{\lambda j} q_{\lambda j}(y) Y_{j m}(\Omega)$ . In summary, we may reexpress the expansion (B.25) in terms of the  $u_{\lambda j}$ ,

$$u_{\lambda l} \circ \sigma(y, \Omega) = \sum_j C_{\lambda l j}(\sigma) u_{\lambda j}(y, \Omega), \quad (\text{B.27})$$

where the summation is over the multi-index  $j = (j, m)$ . We note that this expression holds for all  $y > 0$ , and the convergence is uniform over the compact sets  $[y_0, y_1] \times \mathbb{S}^{d-1}$  with  $y_0 > 0$ .

To proceed, we note that  $\sigma$  is an isometry of  $\mathbb{H}^d(L)$ , and hence the functions  $u_{\lambda l} \circ \sigma$  also constitute an orthonormal complete basis for  $L^2(\mathbb{H}^d(L))$  in the sense of Eqs. (3.8), (3.9). The orthonormality and completeness of both sets  $\{u_{\lambda l} \circ \sigma\}$ ,  $\{u_{\lambda l}\}$  then clearly entails that the coefficients  $C_{\lambda j l}(\sigma)$  appearing in the expansion (B.27) must satisfy

$$\sum_k C_{\lambda k j}(\sigma) C_{\lambda k l}(\sigma)^* = \delta_{j l}, \quad \forall \lambda \geq 0. \quad (\text{B.28})$$

Finally, the large  $l$  estimates on  $u_{\lambda l}$  developed in the proof of Lemma B.4, together with the continuity of the functions  $u_{\lambda l}$  and  $u_{\lambda l} \circ \sigma$ , implies that the result (B.27) can be continued to  $x_0 \in \mathbb{H}^d(L)$  defined by  $y = 0$ . Thus  $u_{\lambda l} \circ \sigma(x_0) = \sum_j C_{\lambda l j}(\sigma) u_{\lambda j}(x_0)$ , with  $u_{\lambda j}(x_0) \neq 0$  for only finitely many  $j$  as may be explicitly observed from Eqs. (B.9), (B.11).

In conclusion, we have shown for any  $\sigma \in SO(1, d)$  that pointwisely for all  $x \in \mathbb{H}^d(L)$

$$(u_{\lambda j} \circ \sigma)(x) = \sum_l C_{\lambda j l}(\sigma) u_{\lambda l}(x), \quad \sum_k C_{\lambda j k}(\sigma) C_{\lambda l k}(\sigma)^* = \delta_{j l}. \quad (\text{B.29})$$

Furthermore, the convergence is uniform over all compact sets  $[y_0, y_1] \times \mathbb{S}^{d-1}$  with  $y_0 > 0$ .  $\square$

*Proof of the addition theorem for (scalar) hyperbolic harmonics (Theorem B.2):* Fix an arbitrary  $x \in \mathbb{H}^d(L)$ , and define  $x_0 \in \mathbb{H}^d(L)$  as the point on the hyperboloid at with coordinate  $y = 0$ . Then there is  $\sigma \in SO(1, d)$  such that  $x = \sigma \triangleright x_0$ . Thus by Lemma B.5

$$\begin{aligned}
d_\lambda(x) &= \sum_l |u_{\lambda l} \circ \sigma(x_0)|^2 = \sum_l \sum_{j, j'} C_{\lambda l j}(\sigma) C_{\lambda l j'}(\sigma)^* u_{\lambda j}(x_0) u_{\lambda j'}(x_0)^* \\
&= \sum_{j, j'} u_{\lambda j}(x_0) u_{\lambda j'}(x_0)^* \sum_l C_{\lambda l j}(\sigma) C_{\lambda l j'}(\sigma)^* \\
&= \sum_{j, j'} u_{\lambda j}(x_0) u_{\lambda j'}(x_0)^* \delta_{jj'} , \tag{B.30}
\end{aligned}$$

i.e.,  $d_\lambda(x) = d_\lambda(x_0)$ . Note that since  $u_{\lambda j}(x_0) \neq 0$  for only finitely many  $j$ , there is no difficulty in exchanging the orders of summation in arriving at the penultimate equality. Hence  $d_\lambda$  is a constant function on the hyperboloid, with its relation to the spectral function following by comparing to the defining relation (3.12). □

*Proof of Corollary B.3:* Fixing  $x \in \mathbb{H}^d(L)$  arbitrary, with  $x_0$  the point with coordinate  $y = 0$ , by a calculation analogous to (B.30) we arrive at

$$\begin{aligned}
\sum_l D_\mu u_{\lambda l}(x) D^\mu u_{\lambda l}(x)^* &= \sum_l D_\mu u_{\lambda l}(x_0) D^\mu u_{\lambda l}(x_0)^* \\
&= \frac{1}{2} \sum_l D_\mu D^\mu |u_{\lambda l}(x_0)|^2 - \sum_l u_{\lambda l}(x_0)^* D^\mu D_\mu u_{\lambda l}(x_0). \tag{B.31}
\end{aligned}$$

Since  $D_\mu D^\mu |u_{\lambda l}(x_0)|^2 \neq 0$  for only finitely many  $l$ , the derivative may be taken outside the summation, yielding  $D_\mu D^\mu d_\lambda = 0$ . This leaves  $\sum_l D_\mu u_{\lambda l}(x) D^\mu u_{\lambda l}(x)^* = -\mathcal{E}_\lambda d_\lambda$ , completing the proof. □

## C Calculation of the gravitational effective action induced from a free scalar field on $\mathbb{H}^d(L)$

Consider a free scalar field  $A(x)$  on  $\mathbb{H}^d(L)$  with action (2.5), where  $g_{\mu\nu}$  is the metric on  $\mathbb{H}^d(L)$  and  $\mathcal{K}_x = -\square_g^x + M^2 + \xi R(x)$ . This matter action induced the one-loop gravitational action  $\Gamma_{1L}[g]$  via the path integral (2.7),

$$e^{-\Gamma_{\text{scal}}[g]} = \int \mathcal{D} \left[ g^{\frac{1}{4}} A \right] e^{-S_M[A;g]} \equiv \int \mathcal{D} [B] e^{-S_M[B;g]} .$$

Now we expand the scalar field density  $B(x)$  in terms of the densitized eigenfunctions  $\{v_{\lambda l}^S(x)\}$ , respectively a corresponding real-valued densitized basis derived therefrom which we denote by the same symbol,

$$B(x) = \int d\lambda \sum_l b_{\lambda l} v_{\lambda l}(x) . \quad (\text{C.1})$$

Then, the path-integral measure  $\mathcal{D}B$  transforms as  $\mathcal{D}B = \prod_{\lambda, l} db_{\lambda l}$ .<sup>20</sup> However, since the quantum number  $\lambda$  is still continuous, we must further discretize it:

$$\lambda \equiv \lambda_n := n\varepsilon, \quad n \in \mathbb{N}_0, \quad \varepsilon \text{ small} . \quad (\text{C.2})$$

Then, integral transform as

$$\int d\lambda f(\lambda) = \varepsilon \sum_n f(\lambda_n) =: \varepsilon \sum_n f_n , \quad (\text{C.3})$$

and thus,

$$\mathcal{D}B = \prod_{\lambda, l} db_{\lambda l} = \prod_{\lambda_n l} db_{\lambda_n l} =: \prod_{n, l} \varepsilon db_{nl} . \quad (\text{C.4})$$

Hence, with the eigenvalue equation,

$$\mathcal{K}_x v_{\lambda l}^S(x) = \mathcal{F}_\lambda^S v_{\lambda l}^S(x), \quad \text{where} \quad \mathcal{F}_\lambda^S = \mathcal{E}_\lambda^S + M^2 + \xi R \quad (\text{C.5})$$

with  $\mathcal{E}_\lambda^S$  given in Table (1), the path integral becomes

$$\begin{aligned} e^{-\Gamma_{\text{scal}}[g]} &= \int \prod_{n, l} \varepsilon db_{nl} \exp \left\{ -\frac{1}{2} \varepsilon^2 \sum_{n, n'} \sum_{l, l'} \mathcal{F}_n^S b_{nl} b_{n'l'} \int d^d x v_{nl}(x) v_{n'l'}(x) \right\} \\ &= \int \prod_{n, l} d(\varepsilon b_{nl}) \exp \left\{ -\frac{1}{2} \sum_{n, l} \mathcal{F}_n^S (\varepsilon b_{nl})^2 \right\} = \left( \prod_{n, l} \mathcal{F}_n^S \right)^{-\frac{1}{2}} . \end{aligned} \quad (\text{C.6})$$

<sup>20</sup>The Jacobian  $\frac{\delta B(x)}{\delta b_{\lambda l}} = v_{\lambda l}(x) =: J_{x, \lambda, l}$  is one, since, by using the completeness and orthogonality relations,  $(JJ^\dagger)_{x, x'} = \int d\lambda \sum_l v_{\lambda l}(x)^* v_{\lambda l}(x') = \delta(x - x')$  as well as  $(JJ^\dagger)_{\lambda, \lambda'} = \int d^d x v_{\lambda l}(x)^* v_{\lambda' l'}(x) = \delta(\lambda - \lambda') \delta_{ll'}$ , we have  $\det J = \sqrt{\det(JJ^\dagger)} = 1$ .

And hence we have further,<sup>21</sup>

$$\begin{aligned}
\Gamma_{\text{scal}}[g] &= \frac{1}{2} \log \left( \prod_{n,l} \mathcal{F}_n^{\text{S}} \right) = \frac{1}{2} \sum_n \sum_l \log \mathcal{F}_n^{\text{S}} \\
&= \frac{1}{2} \frac{1}{\varepsilon} \sum_n \sum_l \log \mathcal{F}_n^{\text{S}} = \frac{1}{2} \frac{1}{\varepsilon} \int d\lambda \sum_l \log \mathcal{F}_\lambda^{\text{S}} \\
&= \frac{1}{2} \int d\lambda \delta(0) \left( \sum_{l \in \mathcal{J}(\text{S})} 1 \right) \log \mathcal{F}_\lambda^{\text{S}}. \tag{C.7}
\end{aligned}$$

At this stage, it is helpful to make use of the relations (3.14a)-(3.14c) and the orthonormality relations (3.8) to reexpress this (formal) result in terms of spectral functions. For instance, for the scalar sector we have the formal computation

$$\begin{aligned}
\mu^{\text{S}}(\lambda) &:= \frac{\pi \Omega_{d-1} L^d}{2^{d-2}} \sum_{l \in \mathcal{J}(\text{S})} (u_{\lambda l}^{\text{S}})^*(0) (u_{\lambda l}^{\text{S}})(0) \\
&= \frac{\pi \Omega_{d-1} L^d}{2^{d-2}} \sum_{l \in \mathcal{J}(\text{S})} (u_{\lambda l}^{\text{S}})^*(x) (u_{\lambda l}^{\text{S}})(x) \\
&= \frac{\pi \Omega_{d-1} L^d \text{vol} [\mathbb{H}^d(L)]}{2^{d-2} \text{vol} [\mathbb{H}^d(L)]} \sum_{l \in \mathcal{J}(\text{S})} (u_{\lambda l}^{\text{S}})^*(x) (u_{\lambda l}^{\text{S}})(x) \tag{C.8} \\
&= \frac{\pi \Omega_{d-1} L^d}{2^{d-2}} \frac{1}{\text{vol} [\mathbb{H}^d(L)]} \sum_{l \in \mathcal{J}(\text{S})} \int d^d x \sqrt{g(x)} (u_{\lambda l}^{\text{S}})^*(x) (u_{\lambda l}^{\text{S}})(x) \\
&= \frac{\pi \Omega_{d-1} L^d}{2^{d-2}} \frac{1}{\text{vol} [\mathbb{H}^d(L)]} \delta(0) \sum_{l \in \mathcal{J}(\text{S})} 1.
\end{aligned}$$

For the second equality we have used Theorem B.2 for the constancy of the sum over  $l \in \mathcal{J}(\text{S})$ . Using this result in Eq. (C.7) yields, with  $g_{\mu\nu} = L^2 \gamma_{\mu\nu}$ ,

$$\begin{aligned}
\Gamma_{\text{scal}}[g] &\equiv \Gamma_{\text{scal}}(L) = \frac{1}{2} \text{Tr}_{\text{S}} \log(\mathcal{K}) \\
&= \frac{1}{2} \frac{2^{d-2}}{\pi \Omega_{d-1}} \frac{\text{vol} [\mathbb{H}^d(L)]}{L^d} \int d\lambda \mu^{\text{S}}(\lambda) \log(\mathcal{F}_\lambda^{\text{S}}(L)). \tag{C.9}
\end{aligned}$$

Finally, we note that an  $N$ -cutoff may be applied to the  $\lambda$ -integration straightforwardly.

---

<sup>21</sup>Here we use  $\delta(x) = \lim_{\varepsilon \rightarrow 0} \frac{1}{|\varepsilon| \sqrt{\pi}} e^{-(x/\varepsilon)^2} \Rightarrow \delta(0) \sim \lim_{\varepsilon \rightarrow 0} 1/|\varepsilon|$ .



## References

- [1] Domenico Giulini. Some remarks on the notions of general covariance and background independence. *Lect. Notes Phys.*, 721:105–120, 2007. [arXiv:gr-qc/0603087](#), [doi:10.1007/978-3-540-71117-9\\_6](#).
- [2] Martin Reuter and Frank Saueressig. *Quantum Gravity and the Functional Renormalization Group*. Cambridge University Press, 2019.
- [3] Maximilian Becker and Martin Reuter. Background Independent Field Quantization with Sequences of Gravity-Coupled Approximants. *Phys. Rev. D*, 102(12):125001, 2020. [arXiv:2008.09430](#), [doi:10.1103/PhysRevD.102.125001](#).
- [4] Maximilian Becker and Martin Reuter. Background independent field quantization with sequences of gravity-coupled approximants. II. Metric fluctuations. *Phys. Rev. D*, 104(12):125008, 2021. [arXiv:2109.09496](#), [doi:10.1103/PhysRevD.104.125008](#).
- [5] Kazuo Fujikawa and Hiroshi Suzuki. *Path integrals and quantum anomalies*. 2004. [doi:10.1093/acprof:oso/9780198529132.001.0001](#).
- [6] David J. Toms. Functional measure for quantum field theory in curved spacetime. *Phys. Rev. D*, 35:3796–3803, 1987. [doi:10.1103/PhysRevD.35.3796](#).
- [7] Ron K. Unz. Path Integration and the Functional Measure. *Nuovo Cim.*, A92:397–426, 1986. [doi:10.1007/BF02730500](#).
- [8] Emil Mottola. Functional integration over geometries. *J. Math. Phys.*, 36:2470–2511, 1995. [arXiv:hep-th/9502109](#), [doi:10.1063/1.531359](#).
- [9] James W. York, Jr. Covariant decompositions of symmetric tensors in the theory of gravitation. *Ann. Inst. H. Poincaré Phys. Theor.*, 21:319–332, 1974.
- [10] Kazuo Fujikawa. Comment on Chiral and Conformal Anomalies. *Phys. Rev. Lett.*, 44:1733, 1980. [doi:10.1103/PhysRevLett.44.1733](#).
- [11] Kazuo Fujikawa. Energy-momentum tensor in quantum field theory. *Phys. Rev. D*, 23:2262–2275, May 1981. [doi:10.1103/PhysRevD.23.2262](#).
- [12] Maximilian Becker. *The Renormalization of Geometric Operators and Background Independent Field Quantization in Quantum Gravity*. PhD thesis, Mainz, 2021. [doi:http://doi.org/10.25358/openscience-6392](#).
- [13] Abhay Ashtekar, Martin Reuter, and Carlo Rovelli. From General Relativity to Quantum Gravity. 8 2014. [arXiv:1408.4336](#).

- [14] Renate Loll. Quantum Gravity from Causal Dynamical Triangulations: A Review. *Class. Quant. Grav.*, 37(1):013002, 2020. [arXiv:1905.08669](#), [doi:10.1088/1361-6382/ab57c7](#).
- [15] Claus Kiefer. *Why Quantum Gravity?* Approaches to Fundamental Physics. edited by E. Seiler and I.-O. Stamatescu, 2007.
- [16] Roberto Casadio, Alexander Kamenshchik, and Iberê Kuntz. Background independence and field redefinitions in quantum gravity. 10 2022. [arXiv:2210.04368](#).
- [17] Thanu Padmanabhan. Semiclassical Approximation for Gravity and the Issue of Back Reaction. *Class. Quant. Grav.*, 6:533, 1989. [doi:10.1088/0264-9381/6/4/012](#).
- [18] Christopher J. Isham. Prima facie questions in quantum gravity. *Lect. Notes Phys.*, 434:1–21, 1994. [arXiv:gr-qc/9310031](#), [doi:10.1007/3-540-58339-4\\_13](#).
- [19] Roberto Camporesi and Atsushi Higuchi. Spectral functions and zeta functions in hyperbolic spaces. *Journal of Mathematical Physics*, 35(8):4217–4246, August 1994. [doi:10.1063/1.530850](#).
- [20] Dario Benedetti. Critical behavior in spherical and hyperbolic spaces. *J. Stat. Mech.*, 1501:P01002, 2015. [arXiv:1403.6712](#), [doi:10.1088/1742-5468/2015/01/P01002](#).
- [21] Maximilian Demmel, Frank Saueressig, and Omar Zanusso. RG flows of Quantum Einstein Gravity on maximally symmetric spaces. *JHEP*, 06:026, 2014. [arXiv:1401.5495](#), [doi:10.1007/JHEP06\(2014\)026](#).
- [22] Roberto Camporesi. Harmonic analysis and propagators on homogeneous spaces. *Phys. Rept.*, 196:1–134, 1990. [doi:10.1016/0370-1573\(90\)90120-Q](#).
- [23] Roberto Camporesi and Atsushi Higuchi. On the Eigen functions of the Dirac operator on spheres and real hyperbolic spaces. *J. Geom. Phys.*, 20:1–18, 1996. [arXiv:gr-qc/9505009](#), [doi:10.1016/0393-0440\(95\)00042-9](#).
- [24] Roberto Camporesi and Atsushi Higuchi. The Plancherel measure for p-forms in real hyperbolic spaces. *Journal of Geometry and Physics*, 15(1):57–94, December 1994. [doi:10.1016/0393-0440\(94\)90047-7](#).
- [25] Steven Weinberg. The Cosmological Constant Problem. *Rev. Mod. Phys.*, 61:1–23, 1989. [doi:10.1103/RevModPhys.61.1](#).
- [26] Sean M. Carroll. The Cosmological constant. *Living Rev. Rel.*, 4:1, 2001. [arXiv:astro-ph/0004075](#), [doi:10.12942/lrr-2001-1](#).

- [27] Norbert Straumann. The History of the cosmological constant problem. In *18th IAP Colloquium on the Nature of Dark Energy: Observational and Theoretical Results on the Accelerating Universe*, 8 2002. [arXiv:gr-qc/0208027](#).
- [28] Harald Grosse, Gandalf Lechner, Thomas Ludwig, and Rainer Verch. Wick Rotation for Quantum Field Theories on Degenerate Moyal Space(-Time). *J. Math. Phys.*, 54:022307, 2013. [arXiv:1111.6856](#), [doi:10.1063/1.4790886](#).
- [29] Carlo Pagani and Martin Reuter. Background Independent Quantum Field Theory and Gravitating Vacuum Fluctuations. *Annals Phys.*, 411:167972, 2019. [arXiv:1906.02507](#), [doi:10.1016/j.aop.2019.167972](#).
- [30] Renata Ferrero and Martin Reuter. The spectral geometry of de Sitter space in asymptotic safety. *JHEP*, 08:040, 2022. [arXiv:2203.08003](#), [doi:10.1007/JHEP08\(2022\)040](#).
- [31] Joseph Polchinski. Renormalization and Effective Lagrangians. *Nucl. Phys. B*, 231:269–295, 1984. [doi:10.1016/0550-3213\(84\)90287-6](#).
- [32] Leonard Parker. Aspects of Quantum Field Theory in Curved Space-Time: Effective Action and Energy Momentum Tensor. *NATO Sci. Ser. B*, 44:219–273, 1979.
- [33] Stephen A. Fulling. *Aspects of Quantum Field Theory in Curved Space-time*, volume 17. 1989.
- [34] Nicholas D. Birrell and Paul C. W. Davies. *Quantum Fields in Curved Space*. Cambridge Monographs on Mathematical Physics. Cambridge Univ. Press, Cambridge, UK, 1984. [doi:10.1017/CB09780511622632](#).
- [35] Lowell S. Brown. Stress Tensor Trace Anomaly in a Gravitational Metric: Scalar Fields. *Phys. Rev. D*, 15:1469, 1977. [doi:10.1103/PhysRevD.15.1469](#).
- [36] Tim R. Morris and Roberto Percacci. Trace anomaly and infrared cutoffs. *Phys. Rev. D*, 99(10):105007, 2019. [arXiv:1810.09824](#), [doi:10.1103/PhysRevD.99.105007](#).
- [37] Roberto Percacci. *An Introduction to Covariant Quantum Gravity and Asymptotic Safety*, volume 3 of *100 Years of General Relativity*. World Scientific, 2017. [doi:10.1142/10369](#).
- [38] Dario Benedetti, Kai Groh, Pedro F. Machado, and Frank Saueressig. The Universal RG Machine. *JHEP*, 06:079, 2011. [arXiv:1012.3081](#), [doi:10.1007/JHEP06\(2011\)079](#).
- [39] Kai Groh, Frank Saueressig, and Omar Zanusso. Off-diagonal heat-kernel expansion and its application to fields with differential constraints. 12 2011. [arXiv:1112.4856](#).