

Scalar curvature operator for models of loop quantum gravity on a cubical graph

Jerzy Lewandowski and Ilkka Mäkinen

Faculty of Physics, University of Warsaw
Pasteura 5, 02-093 Warsaw, Poland

jerzy.lewandowski@fuw.edu.pl, ilkka.makinen@fuw.edu.pl

In this article we introduce a new operator representing the three-dimensional scalar curvature in loop quantum gravity. Our construction does not apply to the entire kinematical Hilbert space of loop quantum gravity; instead, the operator is defined on the Hilbert space of a fixed cubical graph. The starting point of our work is to write the spatial Ricci scalar classically as a function of the densitized triad. We pass from the classical expression to a quantum operator through a regularization procedure, in which spatial derivatives of the triad are discretized as finite differences on the cubical lattice provided by the graph. While more work is needed in order to extend our construction to encompass states based on all possible graphs, the operator presented here can be applied in models such as quantum-reduced loop gravity and effective dynamics, which are derived from the kinematical framework of full loop quantum gravity, and are formulated in terms of states defined on cubical graphs.

1 Introduction

Loop quantum gravity [1–4] is one of the main candidates for a quantum theory of gravitation. The quantum states of the gravitational field in loop quantum gravity – the well-known spin network states – have a natural physical interpretation as states describing discrete, quantized spatial geometries [5]. Thus, loop quantum gravity provides a concrete realization of a quantum theory of gravity as a theory of quantum geometry.

Geometrical observables are represented in loop quantum gravity as self-adjoint operators acting on the kinematical Hilbert space of the theory. Operators corresponding to areas of surfaces and volumes of spatial regions [5–7] are of essential importance in loop quantum gravity, the fundamentally discrete nature of geometry being encoded in the discrete spectra of these basic geometric operators. Another key example of a geometrical observable is the Ricci scalar of the spatial manifold (in the context of a 3+1 formulation of general relativity). In addition to being an important geometrical quantity characterizing the geometry of the spatial manifold, the Ricci scalar appears in the Hamiltonian constraint of general relativity, and hence has a direct connection with the dynamics of both classical general relativity and loop quantum gravity.

An operator representing the scalar curvature of the spatial manifold has been constructed for loop quantum gravity in [8]. The construction is based on the observation that the integral of the Ricci scalar over the spatial manifold,

$$\int d^3x \sqrt{q} {}^{(3)}R, \quad (1.1)$$

is also the Einstein–Hilbert action for Euclidean general relativity in three dimensions. Thus, using the ideas of Regge calculus [9], the integral can be expressed in terms of the hinge lengths and deficit angles associated to a cellular decomposition of the

spatial manifold. This fact, together with the knowledge that operators representing lengths and angles [10, 11] are readily available in loop quantum gravity, enables one to promote the integral (1.1) into a well-defined operator of loop quantum gravity in a rather straightforward fashion.

Nevertheless, due to the indirect nature of the strategy of turning to Regge calculus in order to quantize the integrated Ricci scalar, it is not obvious whether the properties of the resulting operator are fully satisfactory from the physical point of view. For instance, the curvature operator can be used as a part of the Hamiltonian constraint operator, to replace the Lorentzian part of the constraint commonly used in loop quantum gravity. Then it seems unclear whether the operator of [8] can be consistent with any operator proposed so far as a quantization of the Euclidean part of the constraint. A conflict could conceivably arise due to the fact that the classical foundations underlying all available quantizations of the Euclidean part refer to the smooth, continuous physical geometry of the spatial manifold, whereas Regge's formula for the integral (1.1) instead makes use of an auxiliary manifold whose geometry is singular, with curvature being concentrated entirely on one-dimensional submanifolds.

In this article we propose a new operator representing the integrated scalar curvature (1.1). The starting point of our construction is to express the spatial Ricci scalar as a function of the densitized triad, after which a curvature operator can be defined through a regularization whereby the integral (1.1) is expressed in terms of quantities corresponding to well-defined operators in loop quantum gravity. On the technical level, the main challenge which is encountered in such an approach is to find an appropriate regularization of spatial derivatives of the densitized triad. For now, we deal with this challenge by suitably weakening the problem to be solved: We will not attempt to define a curvature operator in the entire Hilbert space of loop quantum gravity, instead limiting our considerations only to states defined on a fixed cubical graph¹. Under this restriction, it becomes relatively straightforward to regularize spatial derivatives by discretizing them as finite differences on the rectangular lattice provided by the graph.

The restriction to a cubical graph implies that our construction does not apply to the vast majority of states which span the Hilbert space of loop quantum gravity. Thus, the result of the construction will not be a well-defined operator in full loop quantum gravity. Instead, the operator which we obtain is defined on the Hilbert space of a fixed cubical graph, and so it has to be interpreted in the context of some suitable framework or a model which is based on the formalism of full loop quantum gravity, but where the restriction to a cubical graph is taken as an assumption. Such models include quantum-reduced loop gravity [12–14] – a simplified model of loop quantum gravity, which is derived from the full theory through a procedure representing a gauge fixing to a diagonal densitized triad – and the effective dynamics approach [15–17], where the expectation value of the Hamiltonian with respect to a family of semiclassical states is considered as an effective Hamiltonian generating evolution on a classical phase space. From a more theoretical standpoint, algebraic quantum gravity [18, 19] constitutes a framework in which the use of a single fixed graph (which one can take to be e.g. a cubical one) is given a justification based on the formalism of full loop quantum gravity.

From the point of view of full loop quantum gravity, the construction presented in this article is best seen as a preliminary investigation, whose ideas and techniques may – with more work – eventually be extended to yield a well-defined curvature operator

¹By a cubical graph we mean a graph whose nodes are six-valent, and whose edges are aligned with the coordinate directions defined by a fiducial Cartesian background coordinate system.

on the entire Hilbert space of the theory. On the other hand, our work in its present form is directly relevant to several physically motivated models of loop quantum gravity, which are often formulated exclusively in terms of states based on cubical graphs. For such models, our construction provides a well-defined curvature operator which is ready to be used in physical applications.

Indeed, the motivation for our work comes primarily from the desire to find a satisfactory curvature operator for quantum-reduced loop gravity. The states of the quantum-reduced model are defined on cubical graphs, and belong to the kinematical Hilbert space of full loop quantum gravity; hence the curvature operator of [8] can be applied to these states. However, if one does this, one finds that as measured by this operator, all states in the quantum-reduced Hilbert space carry zero curvature. Thus, it seems that no physically adequate curvature operator for the quantum-reduced model is available in the current literature of loop quantum gravity. In addition to quantum-reduced loop gravity, we expect that the operator defined in this article will be useful for models belonging to the program of effective dynamics, in which semiclassical states based on a cubical graph are typically used to derive the effective Hamiltonian.

Our work on the curvature operator is divided into two articles. In the present article, we carry out the construction of a curvature operator for states which belong to the kinematical Hilbert space of full loop quantum gravity and are defined on a cubical graph. Apart from the restriction concerning the graph, the construction is completely general, and is not tied to any particular model of loop quantum gravity which makes use of states based on cubical graphs. In the companion article [20] we will consider the problem of taking the operator introduced in this article and using it to derive a curvature operator for quantum-reduced loop gravity. The derivation is performed in line with the results established in [14], where it was shown that operators of quantum-reduced loop gravity can be extracted from the corresponding operators of full loop quantum gravity simply by applying the operator of the full theory on states in the Hilbert space of the quantum-reduced model, and discarding certain small terms generated by the action of the operator.

The material in this article is organized as follows. The present introductory section is followed by section 2, where we introduce the expression which gives the three-dimensional Ricci scalar as a function of the densitized triad, and which forms the classical starting point of our work. This section also serves to fix our notation and conventions regarding the basic notions of the Riemannian geometry of the spatial manifold. In section 3 we give a brief review of the key elements of loop quantum gravity, focusing particularly on those aspects which will play a role in our construction of the curvature operator. The construction itself is then carried out in section 4. Since the construction is somewhat lengthy and technical, we begin by providing an outline of the procedure, before going on to present the full details of the construction. After having completed the definition of the curvature operator, we briefly describe some of its basic properties. In section 5, we summarize and assess our results, and discuss the prospects of extending our construction to obtain a well-defined operator in the framework of full loop quantum gravity. In the Appendix we provide a detailed derivation of the classical identity expressing the Ricci scalar in terms of the densitized triad.

2 The classical Ricci scalar

The classical setting for our work is the 3+1 formulation of general relativity [21, 22], expressed in terms of the Ashtekar variables [23–25]. The elementary variables of the formalism are the Ashtekar–Barbero connection A_a^i and its conjugate, the densitized triad E_i^a . The densitized triad is related to the inverse metric of the spatial manifold Σ according to

$$q^{ab} = \frac{E_i^a E_i^b}{|\det E|}, \quad (2.1)$$

where $\det E \equiv \det E_i^a$ is the determinant of the densitized triad. The metric itself can be written as

$$q_{ab} = |\det E| E_a^i E_b^i, \quad (2.2)$$

where

$$E_a^i \equiv \frac{1}{2 \det E} \epsilon_{abc} \epsilon^{ijk} E_j^b E_k^c. \quad (2.3)$$

is the inverse of the densitized triad, both with respect to the internal index and the spatial index:

$$E_i^a E_b^i = \delta_b^a, \quad E_i^a E_a^j = \delta_i^j. \quad (2.4)$$

Note that E_i^a is a density of weight 1, whereas E_a^i is a density of weight -1 . Accordingly, E_a^i is not obtained from E_i^a simply by using the metric q_{ab} to lower the spatial index; rather, the relation between the densitized triad and its inverse reads $E_a^i = q_{ab} E_i^b / |\det E|$.

We define the Riemann tensor on Σ according to the convention

$$[D_a, D_b]v^c = {}^{(3)}R^c{}_{dab}v^d, \quad (2.5)$$

where D_a is the covariant derivative compatible with the metric q_{ab} . Under this definition, the Riemann tensor is given by the expression

$${}^{(3)}R^a{}_{bcd} = \partial_c \Gamma_{bd}^a - \partial_d \Gamma_{bc}^a + \Gamma_{ce}^a \Gamma_{bd}^e - \Gamma_{de}^a \Gamma_{bc}^e, \quad (2.6)$$

where Γ_{bc}^a are the Christoffel symbols corresponding to the spatial metric. We then have the Ricci tensor

$${}^{(3)}R_{ab} = {}^{(3)}R^c{}_{acb} \quad (2.7)$$

and the Ricci scalar

$${}^{(3)}R = q^{ab} {}^{(3)}R_{ab} = q^{ab} (\partial_c \Gamma_{ab}^c - \partial_b \Gamma_{ac}^c + \Gamma_{ab}^c \Gamma_{cd}^d - \Gamma_{ad}^c \Gamma_{bc}^d). \quad (2.8)$$

Eq. (2.8) expresses the Ricci scalar in terms of the spatial metric q_{ab} . Deriving an expression for the Ricci scalar as a function of the densitized triad is in principle straightforward; it suffices to insert Eqs. (2.1) and (2.2) into Eq. (2.8). However, the resulting calculations are somewhat lengthy, and for this reason a full presentation of these calculations has been relegated to the Appendix. In the end, we obtain the result

$$\begin{aligned}
|\det E|^{(3)}R &= -2E_i^a \partial_a \partial_b E_i^b + 2Q^{ab} E_c^i \partial_a \partial_b E_i^c \\
&\quad - (\partial_a E_i^a)(\partial_b E_i^b) - \frac{1}{2}(\partial_a E_i^b)(\partial_b E_i^a) \\
&\quad + \frac{5}{2}Q^{ab}(\partial_a E_i^c)(\partial_b E_c^i) - \frac{1}{2}Q^{ab}Q_{cd}(\partial_a E_i^c)(\partial_b E_i^d) \\
&\quad + 2A^{ab}{}_a B_{cb}{}^c + 2A^{ab}{}_b B_{ca}{}^c + A^{ab}{}_c B_{ba}{}^c \\
&\quad + \frac{1}{2}Q_{ab}A^{ca}{}_d A^{db}{}_c - Q^{ab}B_{ca}{}^c B_{db}{}^d \\
&\quad + 2(Q^{ab}B_{ca}{}^c - A^{ab}{}_a - A^{ba}{}_a)C_b + \frac{3}{2}Q^{ab}C_a C_b - 2Q^{ab}C_{ab} \tag{2.9}
\end{aligned}$$

where we have introduced the following abbreviations:

$$Q^{ab} = E_i^a E_i^b \tag{2.10}$$

$$Q_{ab} = E_a^i E_b^i \tag{2.11}$$

$$A^{ab}{}_c = E_i^a \partial_c E_i^b \tag{2.12}$$

$$B_{ab}{}^c = E_a^i \partial_b E_i^c \tag{2.13}$$

$$C_a = \frac{\partial_a |\det E|}{|\det E|} \tag{2.14}$$

$$C_{ab} = \frac{\partial_a \partial_b |\det E|}{|\det E|} \tag{2.15}$$

Eq. (2.9) forms the classical starting point for our construction of an operator representing the integrated Ricci scalar

$$\int d^3x \sqrt{q}^{(3)}R. \tag{2.16}$$

Besides being an essential geometrical observable in its own right, the Ricci scalar also plays a role in the formulation of the dynamics of loop quantum gravity (see section 3.4). For the latter purpose, one needs an operator representing the Ricci scalar integrated against an arbitrary smearing function $N(x)$,

$$\int d^3x N \sqrt{q}^{(3)}R. \tag{2.17}$$

The construction presented in this article also provides a well-defined operator corresponding to the smeared Ricci scalar (2.17).

3 Loop quantum gravity

In this section we will briefly review the basic elements of the kinematical structure of loop quantum gravity, focusing on those aspects of the framework which are relevant to the work presented in this article. We will recall the kinematical Hilbert space of loop quantum gravity and the basic operators of the theory. In particular, we will introduce and establish the basic properties of the so-called parallel transported flux operator, which is a key ingredient in our construction of the curvature operator. For a more detailed presentation of the foundations of loop quantum gravity, we refer the reader e.g. to [1–4, 26–28].

3.1 The kinematical Hilbert space

The kinematical Hilbert space of loop quantum gravity is formed by the so-called cylindrical functions. A cylindrical function is labeled by a graph Γ , with edges e_1, \dots, e_N (which are assumed to be oriented, and embedded in the spatial manifold Σ). A function cylindrical with respect to a graph Γ is essentially a complex-valued function of the form

$$\Psi_\Gamma(h_{e_1}, \dots, h_{e_N}), \quad (3.1)$$

where the arguments of the function are $SU(2)$ group elements, one for each edge of the graph. The group elements h_e are usually referred to as holonomies, due to their classical origin as holonomies of the Ashtekar–Barbero connection.

The holonomies are assumed to satisfy certain algebraic properties, reflecting their role as parallel transport operators in the classical theory. We have

$$h_{e^{-1}} = h_e^{-1} \quad (3.2)$$

where e^{-1} denotes e taken with the opposite orientation;

$$h_{e_2} h_{e_1} = h_{e_2 \circ e_1} \quad (3.3)$$

where the endpoint of e_1 coincides with the beginning point of e_2 , and $e_2 \circ e_1$ denotes the edge obtained by joining e_1 and e_2 ; and

$$h_p = \mathbb{1} \quad (3.4)$$

if p is a curve consisting of a single point.

A scalar product on the space of cylindrical functions can be defined in a natural way using the Haar measure of $SU(2)$. For two cylindrical functions based on the same graph Γ , one defines

$$\langle \Psi_\Gamma | \Phi_\Gamma \rangle = \int dg_1 \cdots dg_N \overline{\Psi_\Gamma(g_1, \dots, g_N)} \Phi_\Gamma(g_1, \dots, g_N), \quad (3.5)$$

where dg is the normalized Haar measure of $SU(2)$. The definition is extended to cylindrical functions based on two different graphs Γ_1 and Γ_2 by taking any larger graph Γ_{12} that contains Γ_1 and Γ_2 as subgraphs, and viewing the functions as cylindrical functions on Γ_{12} in the standard way (by introducing a trivial dependence on the group elements associated with the additional edges, see e.g. [2]) and then applying Eq. (3.5).

A basis of the space of cylindrical functions can be constructed using the $SU(2)$ representation matrices $D_{mn}^{(j)}(g)$. By the Peter–Weyl theorem, the space of functions cylindrical with respect to a graph Γ is spanned by the functions

$$\prod_{e \in \Gamma} D_{m_e n_e}^{(j_e)}(h_e), \quad (3.6)$$

as the quantum numbers j_e , m_e and n_e range over their possible values. The basis states (3.6) are orthogonal but not normalized under the scalar product (3.5). In order to obtain a normalized basis, each representation matrix in Eq. (3.6) should be multiplied with the factor $\sqrt{d_{j_e}}$, where $d_j \equiv 2j + 1$ denotes the dimension of the spin- j representation of $SU(2)$.

At the classical level, the Ashtekar formulation of general relativity enjoys a local $SU(2)$ gauge symmetry, which corresponds to rotations of the densitized triad with respect to the internal index (the spatial metric being invariant under such rotations). These gauge transformations are generated in the classical theory by the Gauss constraint

$$G_i = \partial_a E_i^a + \epsilon_{ij}^k A_a^j E_k^a. \quad (3.7)$$

Within the kinematical Hilbert space of loop quantum gravity, one can identify the subspace consisting of states which are invariant under the analogous gauge transformations in the quantum theory.

Under a local gauge transformation described by a gauge function $g(x) \in SU(2)$, the holonomy associated to an edge e transforms as

$$h_e \rightarrow g(t_e) h_e g^{-1}(s_e), \quad (3.8)$$

where s_e and t_e denote the beginning point and endpoint ("source" and "target") of e . From this one deduces that the space of functions cylindrical with respect to a graph Γ , and invariant under $SU(2)$ gauge transformations, is spanned by functions of the form

$$\left(\prod_{v \in \Gamma} \iota_v \right) \cdot \left(\prod_{e \in \Gamma} D^{(j_e)}(h_e) \right). \quad (3.9)$$

Here an invariant tensor ι_v – usually referred to as an intertwiner – is assigned to each node v of the graph, and the dot symbolizes a complete contraction of magnetic indices in the way indicated by the pattern of the graph. The condition for ι_v to be invariant has to be understood in the appropriate sense, taking into account the orientation of the graph. If the node v contains M incoming edges (carrying spins j_1, \dots, j_M) and $N - M$ outgoing edges (carrying spins j_{M+1}, \dots, j_N), this condition reads

$$D^{(j_1)}(g) \dots D^{(j_M)}(g) D^{(j_{M+1})}(g^{-1}) \dots D^{(j_N)}(g^{-1}) \iota_v = \iota_v \quad (3.10)$$

with ι_v being viewed as a tensor having M upper indices and N lower indices, and the representation matrices acting on ι_v by contraction of magnetic indices.

3.2 Kinematical operators

The elementary operators of loop quantum gravity are the holonomy and flux operators. The holonomy operator $D_{mn}^{(j)}(h_e)$ acts on cylindrical functions by multiplication. The form of the resulting state,

$$D_{mn}^{(j)}(h_e) \Psi_\Gamma(h_{e_1}, \dots, h_{e_N}), \quad (3.11)$$

depends on whether the edge e is contained among the edges e_1, \dots, e_N . If e is not an edge of Γ , the state (3.11) defines a cylindrical function on the graph $\Gamma \cup e$. If e coincides with an edge of Γ , the function (3.11) is still a cylindrical function on the graph Γ . In the latter case, if the state $\Psi_\Gamma(h_{e_1}, \dots, h_{e_N})$ is given in the basis (3.6) or (3.9), the result of the multiplication (3.11) can be expressed in the same basis by coupling the holonomies on the edge e by means of the Clebsch–Gordan series

$$D_{m_1 n_1}^{(j_1)}(h_e) D_{m_2 n_2}^{(j_2)}(h_e) = \sum_j C_{m_1 m_2 m_1 + m_2}^{(j_1 j_2 j)} C_{n_1 n_2 n_1 + n_2}^{(j_1 j_2 j)} D_{m_1 + m_2 n_1 + n_2}^{(j)}(h_e), \quad (3.12)$$

where $C_{m_1 m_2 m}^{(j_1 j_2 j)}$ are the Clebsch–Gordan coefficients of $SU(2)$.

The flux operator is a quantization of the classical variable

$$E_i(S) = \int d^2\sigma n_a(\sigma) E_i^a(x(\sigma)) \quad (3.13)$$

representing the flux of the densitized triad through the surface S . If we consider just one edge, which has a single intersection with the surface S at a point v , the action of the flux operator reads

$$E_i(S) D^{(j)}(h_e) = i\nu(S, e) \times \begin{cases} \frac{1}{2} D^{(j)}(h_e) \tau_i^{(j)} & \text{if } e \text{ begins from } v \\ \frac{1}{2} \tau_i^{(j)} D^{(j)}(h_e) & \text{if } e \text{ ends at } v \\ D^{(j)}(h_{e_1}) \tau_i^{(j)} D^{(j)}(h_{e_2}) & \text{if } v \text{ is an interior point of } e \end{cases} \quad (3.14)$$

Here $\tau_i^{(j)}$ are the anti-Hermitian generators of $SU(2)$ in the spin- j representation, and $\nu(S, e)$ denotes the relative orientation of S and e , i.e. $\nu(S, e) = +1$ or $\nu(S, e) = -1$ according to whether the orientation of e at the intersection point agrees with or is opposite to the orientation of S , and $\nu(S, e) = 0$ if the edge intersects the surface tangentially. When the flux operator is applied on a cylindrical function, its action obeys the Leibniz rule, in the sense that each intersection between the surface and an edge contributes a term of the form (3.14).

Operators representing other classical quantities can be constructed by expressing the classical function in terms of the elementary variables, i.e. holonomies and fluxes, and then promoting the resulting expression into an operator. A basic example of an operator of this kind is the volume operator [7], which is the quantization of the classical observable

$$\int d^3x \sqrt{|\det E|}. \quad (3.15)$$

The action of the volume operator on a state based on a graph Γ takes the form²

$$V|\Psi_\Gamma\rangle = \sum_{v \in \Gamma} \sqrt{|q_v|} |\Psi_\Gamma\rangle, \quad (3.16)$$

where the operator q_v can be expressed in terms of the left- and right-invariant vector fields of $SU(2)$ (an explicit definition of q_v can be found e.g. in [7]), and the sum receives contributions only from nodes of valence three or higher³.

²Strictly speaking, the definition of the operator q_v involves an undetermined multiplicative factor κ_0 , which arises when one performs an averaging over the background structures used in the construction in order to ensure that the volume operator transforms covariantly under diffeomorphisms [7]. In this work we use the value $\kappa_0 = 1/48$ for this factor. This choice is justified by a calculation presented in the companion paper [20] – essentially, it is the unique value of κ_0 for which the operator representing the regularized inverse triad (4.4) behaves as the inverse of the flux operator (3.14) in the Hilbert space of quantum-reduced loop gravity.

³In the gauge-invariant subspace formed by the states (3.9), the action of the volume operator on a three-valent node vanishes identically. However, if applied to a generic, non-gauge invariant state, the volume operator generally has a non-zero action also on three-valent nodes.

3.3 Parallel transported flux operator

The parallel transported flux operator is a useful modification of the standard flux operator defined by Eq. (3.14). The operator is a quantization of the classical function

$$\tilde{E}_i(S, x_0) = -2 \text{Tr} \left(\tau_i \tilde{E}(S, x_0) \right) \quad (3.17)$$

where $\tilde{E}(S, x_0)$ is the matrix-valued variable

$$\tilde{E}(S, x_0) = \int_S d^2\sigma n_a(\sigma) h_{x_0, x(\sigma)} E^a(x(\sigma)) h_{x_0, x(\sigma)}^{-1}. \quad (3.18)$$

Here $E^a \equiv E_i^a \tau^i$, and $h_{x_0, x(\sigma)} \equiv h_{p_{x_0, x(\sigma)}}$ are holonomies which connect each point $x(\sigma)$ on S to a fixed point x_0 along a family of paths $p_{x_0, x(\sigma)}$. The point x_0 may lie on the surface S or outside of it. In principle, the paths $p_{x_0, x(\sigma)}$ can be chosen freely, with different choices giving rise to different, inequivalent implementations of the parallel transported flux operator⁴.

The key feature of the parallel transported flux variable is its simple behaviour under $SU(2)$ gauge transformations. Under a gauge transformation defined by a gauge function $g(x) \in SU(2)$, the variable (3.18) transforms as

$$\tilde{E}(S, x_0) \rightarrow g(x_0) \tilde{E}(S, x_0) g^{-1}(x_0). \quad (3.19)$$

In order to derive the action of the parallel transported flux operator on a cylindrical function, it is useful to note the relation

$$g \tau_i g^{-1} = D_{ki}^{(1)}(g) \tau_k \quad (3.20)$$

(which states that the generators τ_i transform under $SU(2)$ as the components of a vector). With the help of Eq. (3.20), we can rewrite the classical variable (3.17) as

$$\tilde{E}_i(S, x_0) = \int_S d^2\sigma n_a(\sigma) D_{ki}^{(1)}(h_{x_0, x(\sigma)}^{-1}) E_k^a(x(\sigma)). \quad (3.21)$$

When this expression is viewed as an operator and applied to a cylindrical function, the triad operator E_k^a combined with the integral over the surface acts essentially as the standard flux operator, and compared to Eq. (3.14) we simply pick up the rotation matrix $D_{ki}^{(1)}(h_{x_0, x(\sigma)}^{-1})$ evaluated at the point where the surface intersects an edge. If we consider the action of the operator on a single holonomy, and assume that there is a single point of intersection v between the edge and the surface, we obtain

$$\tilde{E}_i(S, x_0) D^{(j)}(h_e) = D_{ki}^{(1)}(h_{x_0, v}^{-1}) E_k(S) D^{(j)}(h_e), \quad (3.22)$$

where $E_k(S)$ is the regular flux operator acting on the holonomy. The result can be expressed in an alternative form by evaluating the action of the flux operator and then using Eq. (3.20) in reverse to eliminate the rotation matrix. For example, assuming for concreteness that v is an interior point of the edge e , this calculation yields

$$\tilde{E}_i(S, x_0) D^{(j)}(h_e) = i\nu(S, e) D^{(j)}(h_{e_2}) D^{(j)}(h_{x_0, x_e}^{-1}) \tau_i^{(j)} D^{(j)}(h_{x_0, x_e}) D^{(j)}(h_{e_1}). \quad (3.23)$$

In practice, depending on the situation at hand, either one of Eqs. (3.22) and (3.23) may be the more convenient way of expressing the action of the parallel transported flux operator.

⁴Therefore, if one wished to use a fully explicit notation, the chosen family of paths should be included among the labels specifying the variable $\tilde{E}_i(S, x_0)$.

3.4 The Hamiltonian constraint

In the canonical formulation of loop quantum gravity, the dynamics of the theory is governed by the Hamiltonian constraint operator. Classically, the Hamiltonian constraint is given by the expression

$$C = \frac{\epsilon^{ij} E_i^a E_j^b F_{ab}^k}{\sqrt{|\det E|}} - (1 + \beta^2) \frac{E_i^a E_j^b}{\sqrt{|\det E|}} (K_a^i K_b^j - K_a^j K_b^i) \quad (3.24)$$

where F_{ab}^i is the curvature of the Ashtekar–Barbero connection, K_a^i is the extrinsic curvature of the spatial manifold, and β is the Barbero–Immirzi parameter. In the case of vacuum gravity, the operator arising from Eq. (3.24) is interpreted as a constraint operator, whose kernel defines the physical Hilbert space of the theory. Alternatively, one can consider a deparametrized formulation of gravity coupled with a scalar field, in which the scalar field is used as a relational time variable for the dynamics of the gravitational field [29–32]. In this case, the operator corresponding to (3.24) (or a certain closely related operator) is interpreted as a physical Hamiltonian, which generates evolution with respect to the time variable provided by the scalar field.

The connection between the Hamiltonian constraint and the work presented in this article arises through the second term in Eq. (3.24), usually referred to as the Lorentzian part of the constraint. In loop quantum gravity, the traditional procedure of quantizing the Lorentzian term is due to Thiemann [33], and is based on a series of ingenious classical manipulations, as a result of which the second term of Eq. (3.24) is expressed in terms of functions which correspond to well-defined operators in loop quantum gravity. More recently, there has emerged an alternative approach, which relies on the fact that (up to a term proportional to the Gauss constraint) the constraint (3.24) can be rewritten in the form⁵

$$C = \frac{1}{\beta^2} \frac{\epsilon^{ij} E_i^a E_j^b F_{ab}^k}{\sqrt{|\det E|}} + (1 + \beta^2) \sqrt{|\det E|} {}^{(3)}R \quad (3.25)$$

where ${}^{(3)}R$ denotes the Ricci scalar of the spatial manifold.

An operator representing the curvature part of the constraint (3.25) has been previously introduced in [8]. The construction of [8] makes use of the basic ideas of Regge calculus, and is based on the observation that the second term of Eq. (3.25), integrated over the spatial manifold, happens to be the action integral of Euclidean gravity in three dimensions. Hence, this term can be expressed in terms of the hinge lengths and deficit angles associated to a cellular decomposition of a Regge-like, piecewise flat manifold approximating the smooth, physical spatial manifold Σ . Moreover, operators representing lengths and angles are readily available in loop quantum gravity, making it a relatively simple task to promote the Regge expression of the scalar curvature into a well-defined loop quantum gravity operator.

The operator which will be constructed in this article represents a new quantization of the curvature term in Eq. (3.25), and therefore provides a novel approach towards defining the Hamiltonian constraint operator in loop quantum gravity. Since our quantization is based on writing the Ricci scalar directly as a function of the densitized triad,

⁵Note the different numerical factor multiplying the Euclidean term in Eq. (3.25) relative to Eq. (3.24). The relevant classical identity states that the Lorentzian term of Eq. (3.24) equals the curvature term of Eq. (3.25), plus a multiple of the Euclidean term (plus a term proportional to the Gauss constraint).

the starting point of our construction is quite straightforward in comparison with the indirect approach of invoking Regge calculus to express the Ricci scalar in terms of quantizable objects. On the other hand, as already emphasized in the introduction, our construction does not encompass all states in the Hilbert space of loop quantum gravity, but is limited to states defined on a fixed graph forming a cubical lattice.

4 The curvature operator

We now move on to the main topic of this work, namely the construction of an operator representing the integrated Ricci scalar (2.16)–(2.17). In order to obtain such an operator, we must begin by introducing a suitable regularization, as a result of which the integral is expressed in terms of objects – e.g. holonomies, fluxes, volumes – which correspond to well-defined operators in loop quantum gravity.

The main technical challenge which must be dealt with in our construction is to find an appropriate regularization of the spatial derivatives appearing in Eq. (2.9). At the moment we do not have a satisfactory proposal on how to accomplish this task for all states in the Hilbert space of loop quantum gravity, since these states may generally be based on graphs having a very complicated and irregular structure. In this work we will therefore restrict ourselves to considering the problem of defining the curvature operator on the Hilbert space of states based on a fixed cubical graph. (By a cubical graph we mean a graph whose nodes are six-valent, and whose edges are aligned with the coordinate directions defined by a fixed Cartesian background coordinate system.) On the regular lattice provided by the cubical graph, it becomes comparatively straightforward to regularize derivatives by approximating them as finite differences between variables associated to neighboring nodes of the graph.

From the perspective of full loop quantum gravity, the assumption of a cubical graph appears to be a very significant limitation, since it implies that our construction applies only to a very small and specific sector of the entire Hilbert space of the theory. On the other hand, as far as physical applications of loop quantum gravity are concerned, the restriction to a cubical graph does have sufficient generality to encompass a number of approaches attempting to probe the physical content of the theory. We have already mentioned quantum-reduced loop gravity and the effective dynamics program as two prominent examples of physical models which are formulated within the kinematical setting of full loop quantum gravity, and which make extensive use of states defined on cubical graphs. Hence our construction, as it stands, has a direct relevance to such models, and provides a well-defined curvature operator which is ready to be used in physical calculations in the context of these models.

In the next section we will give an outline of the construction which we will use to regularize the integrated Ricci scalar, before proceeding to spell out the full details of the regularization in sections 4.2 and 4.3.

4.1 Overview of the regularization strategy

We consider the quantization of the expression (2.17), i.e. the Ricci scalar integrated against an arbitrary smearing function. (The Ricci scalar (2.16) itself can of course be recovered by setting $N = 1$ in the end.)

The structures involved in regularizing the integrated Ricci scalar are summarized in Fig. 1. In order to express the classical function defined by Eqs. (2.17) and (2.9) in




Figure 1: The structures involved in regularizing the integrated Ricci scalar. The integral $\int d^3x N \sqrt{q} {}^{(3)}R$ is approximated as a discrete sum using the rectangular cells $\square(v)$, each of which contains one node of the cubical spin network graph. Inside each cell $\square(v)$ there are introduced three surfaces $S^a(v)$ ($a = x, y$ and z) which are dual to the corresponding background coordinate directions, and which are used to express the densitized triad and its derivatives in terms of flux variables.

terms of variables which can be promoted into operators in loop quantum gravity, we introduce a partition of the spatial manifold into rectangular cells. Each cell contains a single node of the cubical spin network graph, and the faces of the cells are dual to the coordinate directions defined by the fixed background coordinate system. For simplicity of notation, we assume that each cell has edge length ϵ and volume ϵ^3 .

We let $\square(v)$ denote the cell containing a particular node v of the cubical graph. Within each cell $\square(v)$ we set up three surfaces – denoted by $S^x(v)$, $S^y(v)$ and $S^z(v)$ – which are dual to the corresponding background coordinate directions, i.e. the coordinate $x^a = \text{const.}$ on the surface $S^a(v)$. Moreover, we require that the node v is contained in each of the surfaces; in other words, the common point of intersection between all three surfaces coincides with the node: $S^x(v) \cap S^y(v) \cap S^z(v) = v$.

Now the starting point for regularizing the integrated Ricci scalar is to approximate the integral (2.16) as a Riemann sum corresponding to the partition defined by the cells $\square(v)$:

$$\int d^3x N \sqrt{q} {}^{(3)}R \simeq \sum_{\square(v)} \epsilon^3 N(v) \sqrt{q(v)} {}^{(3)}R(v). \quad (4.1)$$

Here $N(v)$, $q(v)$ and ${}^{(3)}R(v)$ are the values of the smearing function, the metric determinant and the Ricci scalar at the point v (though the approximation would of course remain valid if any other point inside $\square(v)$ were chosen). Furthermore, the factors of densitized triad and its derivatives in Eq. (2.9) will be approximated with flux variables associated to the surfaces $S^a(v)$, while factors of determinant of the triad will be expressed in terms of the volume of the cells $\square(v)$.

Triad and inverse triad

The value of the densitized triad at v is approximated by the flux of the triad through the surfaces $S^a(v)$,

$$E_i(S^a(v)) \simeq \epsilon^2 E_i^a(v). \quad (4.2)$$

To deal with the factors of inverse triad, we define a regularized version of the variable

$$E_a^i = \frac{1}{2 \det E} \epsilon_{abc} \epsilon^{ijk} E_j^b E_k^c \quad (4.3)$$

as

$$\mathcal{E}_a^i(S(v)) \equiv \frac{1}{2W(v)} \epsilon_{abc} \epsilon^{ijk} E_j(S^b(v)) E_k(S^c(v)) \quad (4.4)$$

(where $S(v)$ is understood as a common label for the two surfaces $S^b(v)$ ($b \neq a$) entering the expression on the right-hand side). Here

$$W(v) \equiv s_E V(v)^2 \quad (4.5)$$

with

$$V(v) = \int_{\square(v)} d^3x \sqrt{q} \quad (4.6)$$

being the physical volume of the cell $\square(v)$, and $s_E = \pm 1$ the signature of the densitized triad (i.e. $s_E = \det E / |\det E|$). We have

$$W(v) \simeq \epsilon^6 \det E(v) \quad (4.7)$$

so the regularized variable (4.4) indeed approximates the inverse triad:⁶

$$\mathcal{E}_a^i(S(v)) \simeq \frac{1}{\epsilon^2} E_a^i(v). \quad (4.8)$$

Derivatives

The derivatives appearing in Eq. (2.9) are regularized by discretizing them on the rectangular lattice provided by the cubical spin network graph. For instance, a first derivative could be discretized according to the schematic expression

$$f'(x) \simeq \frac{f(x + \epsilon) - f(x)}{\epsilon}, \quad (4.9)$$

where the points x and $x + \epsilon$ are interpreted as two neighboring nodes of the graph. However, Eq. (4.9) singles out the positive direction of the coordinate axis as the one which is used to perform the discretization. This is not a very desirable feature for our purposes, since if we are simply given a spin network state on a cubical graph, and consider a particular node x and two of its neighboring nodes, there is no intrinsic way to determine which of them should be taken as the " $x + \epsilon$ " that enters Eq. (4.9). In order to avoid introducing such an ambiguity, we prefer to discretize the derivatives in a way where the two possible coordinate directions are treated symmetrically. Thus, instead of Eq. (4.9), first derivatives will be discretized as

$$f'(x) \simeq \frac{f(x + \epsilon) - f(x - \epsilon)}{2\epsilon}, \quad (4.10)$$

where $x + \epsilon$ and $x - \epsilon$ are understood as two neighboring nodes of the node x . (This is the simplest possible discretization of a first derivative that does not invoke a preferred

⁶The dependence on opposite powers of the regularization parameter in Eqs. (4.2) and (4.8) is a reflection of the fact that the densitized triad is geometrically a density of weight $+1$, whereas the inverse triad is a density of weight -1 .

direction of the coordinate axis – in other words, is invariant under the substitution $\epsilon \rightarrow -\epsilon$.)

Another issue which must be taken into account in the discretization of derivatives has to do with the $SU(2)$ gauge transformations defined by Eq. (3.8). The regularization of the Ricci scalar (2.9) should be carried out in such a way that a gauge invariant curvature operator is obtained as the result of the construction. In order to meet this requirement, some care has to be taken to regularize the derivatives of the densitized triad in an appropriate way.

To illustrate the problem, let us examine the task of regularizing a first derivative of the triad: $\partial_a E_i^b$. Consider first a naive regularization of the derivative in terms of a simple difference of flux variables residing at two different nodes of the cubical graph. Keeping in mind Eq. (4.10) as the template for discretizing a first derivative, and letting v_a^- and v_a^+ denote the nodes which come before and after v in the direction of the background coordinate x^a (see Fig. 2), one might propose

$$\frac{E_i(S^b(v_a^+)) - E_i(S^b(v_a^-))}{2} \quad (4.11)$$

as a regularized expression approximating the derivative $\partial_a E_i^b(v)$. For small ϵ , the expression (4.11) approaches $\epsilon^3 \partial_a E_i^b(v)$, so in this sense it is a valid approximation of the derivative. This expression is nevertheless not suitable for the purpose of constructing a gauge invariant curvature operator. The problem is that the operators corresponding to the two terms in the expression (4.11) transform in different ways under a gauge transformation, and hence the expression as a whole does not transform in any coherent manner. For this reason, using the expression (4.11) as a discretization of the derivative $\partial_a E_i^b$ would not lead to a gauge invariant curvature operator upon quantization.

In order to remedy this problem, we turn to the parallel transported flux variable given by Eqs. (3.17) and (3.18). We modify Eq. (4.11) by replacing the simple flux variables with their parallel transported counterparts, the parallel transport being taken to the node v in both instances of the variable. Thus, we introduce the object

$$\Delta_a E_i(S^b(v)) \equiv \frac{\tilde{E}_i(S^b(v_a^+), v) - \tilde{E}_i(S^b(v_a^-), v)}{2} \quad (4.12)$$

which represents an improved discretization of the derivative $\partial_a E_i^b(v)$. The parallel transports from v_a^+ and v_a^- to v are taken naturally along the edge connecting the two nodes. At leading order in the regularization parameter, the holonomies performing the parallel transport reduce to identity operators, so the expression (4.12) is still a valid approximation for the derivative of the densitized triad at v :

$$\Delta_a E_i(S^b(v)) \simeq \epsilon^3 \partial_a E_i^b(v). \quad (4.13)$$

Moreover, as seen from Eq. (3.19), both of the terms on the right-hand side of Eq. (4.12) now behave in the same way under a gauge transformation. This suffices to ensure that we will obtain a gauge invariant curvature operator as the outcome of our construction.

Eq. (4.12) expresses the basic idea behind our regularization of derivatives of the densitized triad. The details of regularizing all the derivatives appearing in Eq. (2.9), including second derivatives of the triad, as well as derivatives of the inverse triad and the determinant of the triad, are presented in section 4.2. The use of the parallel transported flux variable to discretize the derivatives in a way which guarantees the gauge invariance of the resulting operator is a key technical feature characterizing our construction of the curvature operator.

Determinant of the triad

The factors of $|\det E|$ appearing in Eq. (2.9) can be regularized in terms of the volume of the cell $\square(v)$ given by (4.6):

$$V(v) \simeq \epsilon^3 \sqrt{|\det E(v)|}. \quad (4.14)$$

Since the volume is a gauge invariant observable (under the internal $SU(2)$ gauge transformations), derivatives of $|\det E|$ can be discretized as differences between volumes associated to neighboring nodes of the graph, without having to introduce any parallel transports to ensure gauge invariance. For example, we can simply take

$$\frac{V(v_a^+)^2 - V(v_a^-)^2}{2} \quad (4.15)$$

as the (symmetric) regularized expression approximating the derivative $\partial_a |\det E(v)|$.

4.2 Regularization of derivatives

The general ideas behind regularizing derivatives of the densitized triad has been outlined in the previous section. The regularization consists of discretizing the derivatives on the lattice formed by the cubical spin network graph. The parallel transported flux variable is used to perform the discretization in such a way that the quantization of the regularized Ricci scalar will lead to a gauge invariant curvature operator. Moreover, the discretized expressions approximating the derivatives are always chosen to be symmetric between the positive and negative coordinate directions defined by the fiducial background coordinate system. In this section we will specify in detail how the various kinds of derivatives appearing in Eq. (2.9) are regularized.

Derivatives of the triad

The regularization of first derivatives of the densitized triad is given by Eq. (4.13). We take

$$\Delta_a E_i(S^b(v)) = \frac{\tilde{E}_i(S^b(v_a^+), v) - \tilde{E}_i(S^b(v_a^-), v)}{2} \quad (4.16)$$

as the discretized, symmetric expression approximating the derivative $\partial_a E_i^b$ at v . The flux variables entering the above expression are parallel transported from their respective nodes v_a^+ and v_a^- to v along the edge connecting the two nodes. The construction is illustrated by Fig. 2, where the left and right panels depict respectively the regularization of the derivatives $\partial_z E_i^z(v)$ and $\partial_x E_i^z(v)$. Note that only the surfaces $S^b(v_a^+)$ and $S^b(v_a^-)$ are involved in the regularization of the first derivative $\partial_a E_i^b$ at v . The surface $S^b(v)$, which is also shown in Fig. 2, will be used in the regularization of second derivatives of the triad, to which we now turn our attention.

We must consider separately the regularization of the pure second derivatives $\partial_a^2 E_i^b$ and the mixed second derivatives $\partial_a \partial_b E_i^c$ (with $a \neq b$). Starting with the case of the pure second derivatives, we observe that the most straightforward discretization of a second derivative,

$$f''(x) \simeq \frac{f(x + \epsilon) - 2f(x) + f(x - \epsilon)}{\epsilon^2}, \quad (4.17)$$

is already symmetric between the positive and negative directions of the coordinate axis, so it can be taken as the template according to which we regularize the pure second derivatives of the densitized triad. Hence we define

$$\Delta_{aa}E_i(S^b(v)) = \tilde{E}_i(S^b(v_a^+), v) - 2\tilde{E}_i(S^b(v), v) + \tilde{E}_i(S^b(v_a^-), v) \quad (4.18)$$

as the object representing the discretization of the second derivative $\partial_a^2 E_i^b$ at v . As before, the parallel transports are taken along the edges connecting v_b^+ and v_b^- to v . When ϵ is small, we have

$$\Delta_{aa}E_i(S^b(v)) \simeq \epsilon^4 \partial_a^2 E_i^b(v), \quad (4.19)$$

so the expression (4.18) is indeed a valid approximation of the pure second derivative. An illustration is again provided by Fig. 2, with the left and right diagrams representing respectively the regularization of the derivatives $\partial_z^2 E_i^z(v)$ and $\partial_x^2 E_i^z(v)$.

We then move on to consider the mixed second derivatives of the triad. The simplest possible discretization of a mixed second derivative, which does not single out a preferred direction of any coordinate axis, is given by

$$\frac{\partial^2 f(x, y)}{\partial x \partial y} \simeq \frac{f(x + \epsilon, y + \epsilon) - f(x + \epsilon, y - \epsilon) - f(x - \epsilon, y + \epsilon) + f(x - \epsilon, y - \epsilon)}{4\epsilon^2}. \quad (4.20)$$

The corresponding discretization of the derivative $\partial_a \partial_b E_i^c$ at v will involve the four nodes diagonally adjacent to v in the plane which contains v and is spanned by the x^a - and x^b -coordinate directions of the background coordinate system. We denote these nodes by v_{ab}^{++} , v_{ab}^{+-} , v_{ab}^{-+} and v_{ab}^{--} , with the superscript of each node indicating the quadrant of the ab -coordinate plane in which the node lies (see Fig. 3).

The flux variables employed in the regularization should again be parallel transported to v from their respective nodes. However, here we encounter the issue that there are two equally viable paths which can be used to perform each of the parallel transports. We choose to resolve this issue simply by averaging over the two possibilities⁷. To this end, let us introduce the notation

$$E_i^{(s)}(S^c(v_{ab}^{++}), v) \equiv \frac{1}{2} \left(\tilde{E}_i(S^c(v_{ab}^{++}), v)_{v_{ab}^{++} \rightarrow v_a^+ \rightarrow v} + \tilde{E}_i(S^c(v_{ab}^{++}), v)_{v_{ab}^{++} \rightarrow v_b^+ \rightarrow v} \right) \quad (4.21)$$

where the subscripts on the right-hand side specify the route along which the parallel transport from v_{ab}^{++} to v is taken. A similar notation applies in an evident manner to the other three nodes entering the construction. We then define

$$\Delta_{ab}E_i(S^c(v)) = \frac{1}{4} \left(\tilde{E}_i^{(s)}(S^c(v_{ab}^{++}), v) - \tilde{E}_i^{(s)}(S^c(v_{ab}^{+-}), v) - \tilde{E}_i^{(s)}(S^c(v_{ab}^{-+}), v) + \tilde{E}_i^{(s)}(S^c(v_{ab}^{--}), v) \right) \quad (4.22)$$

as our discrete approximation of the derivative $\partial_a \partial_b E_i^c$ at v . (To confirm that the approximation is a valid one, we verify that $\Delta_{ab}E_i(S^c(v)) \simeq \epsilon^4 \partial_a \partial_b E_i^c(v)$ for small values of ϵ .)

This completes the regularization of derivatives of the densitized triad. The regularized expressions representing first derivatives, pure second derivatives and mixed second derivatives of the triad are given respectively by Eqs. (4.16), (4.18) and (4.22).

⁷This choice is distinguished from the other possible choices by the property of guaranteeing that the second derivative $\partial_a \partial_b E_i^c$ retains its symmetry in a and b under discretization.




Figure 2: Regularization of spatial derivatives of the densitized triad. Derivatives of the triad at the node v are regularized in terms of parallel transported flux variables associated to the surfaces shown in the figure. The parallel transport from a given node v_a^\pm is taken to v along the edge connecting the two nodes. The left diagram illustrates the regularization of the first derivative $\partial_z E_i^z(v)$ and the second derivative $\partial_z^2 E_i^z(v)$, while the right diagram applies to the first derivative $\partial_x E_i^z(v)$ and the second derivative $\partial_x^2 E_i^z(v)$.




Figure 3: Regularization of the mixed second derivative $\partial_x \partial_y E_i^z$ at v . The four nodes diagonally adjacent to v in the xy -coordinate plane are used to construct a symmetric regularization of the derivative.

Derivatives of the inverse triad

In order to regularize the derivative of the inverse triad E_a^i , we start by introducing a parallel transported version of the regularized variable (4.4) as

$$\tilde{\mathcal{E}}_a^i(S(v), v') = \frac{1}{2W(v)} \epsilon_{abc} \epsilon^{ijk} \tilde{E}_j(S^b(v), v') \tilde{E}_k(S^c(v), v'). \quad (4.23)$$

Here v' denotes one of the neighboring nodes of v , and the parallel transport from v' to v is again taken along the edge connecting the two nodes. We then define

$$\Delta_b \mathcal{E}_a^i(S(v)) = \frac{\tilde{\mathcal{E}}_a^i(S(v_b^+), v) - \tilde{\mathcal{E}}_a^i(S(v_b^-), v)}{2} \quad (4.24)$$

as a discretized, symmetric variable approximating the first derivative $\partial_b E_a^i$ at v . Note that Eq. (2.9) does not contain any second derivatives of the inverse triad, so it is not necessary to consider the regularization of such derivatives.

Derivatives of $|\det E|$

The determinant $|\det E(v)|$ is regularized in terms of the volume of the cell $\square(v)$, as shown by Eq. (4.14). Since the volume is a gauge invariant observable, derivatives of the determinant can be discretized simply in terms of the volumes of neighboring cells; there is no need to invoke any parallel transport operations in order to guarantee that the resulting expressions will be gauge invariant. Hence, the first derivative $\partial_a |\det E|$ at v is discretized as

$$\Delta_a V(v)^2 = \frac{V(v_a^+)^2 - V(v_a^-)^2}{2}, \quad (4.25)$$

the pure second derivative $\partial_a^2 |\det E|$ as

$$\Delta_{aa} V(v)^2 = V(v_a^+)^2 - 2V(v)^2 + V(v_a^-)^2, \quad (4.26)$$

and the mixed second derivative $\partial_a \partial_b |\det E|$ as

$$\Delta_{ab} V(v)^2 = \frac{V(v_{ab}^{++})^2 - V(v_{ab}^{+-})^2 - V(v_{ab}^{-+})^2 + V(v_{ab}^{--})^2}{4}. \quad (4.27)$$

4.3 The regularized expression and its quantization

The regularization of the integral (2.17) can now be carried out using the elements introduced in the previous two sections. In the regularized expression (4.1), each factor of a densitized triad coming from Eq. (2.9) is replaced with a flux through the corresponding surface $S^a(v)$. Similarly, each inverse triad is replaced with the regularized variable (4.4) and each factor of $\sqrt{|\det E|}$ is replaced with the volume $V(v)$, while all derivatives are replaced with the discretized derivatives defined in the previous section. After this procedure is carried out, no explicit dependence on the regularization parameter ϵ will remain, due to the integrand in Eq. (2.17) having the appropriate density weight of one.⁸

For the sake of consistency, we will use parallel transported flux variables to regularize all appearances of the densitized triad in Eq. (2.9), even those which are not acted on

⁸Specifically, when Eq. (2.9) is inserted for ${}^{(3)}R(v)$ in Eq. (4.1), the factor ϵ^3 can be distributed as follows: ϵ^2 for each factor of densitized triad, ϵ^{-2} for each inverse triad, ϵ^3 for each factor of $\sqrt{|\det E|}$, and ϵ for each derivative, with no factors of ϵ left over in the end.

by derivatives. This is essentially a cosmetic modification, since it makes no difference to the form of the resulting quantum operator, but it does ensure that the regularized expression is invariant under $SU(2)$ gauge transformations already at the classical level. Accordingly, we define the regularized counterparts of the variables (2.10)–(2.13) as

$$\mathcal{Q}^{ab}(v) = \tilde{E}_i(S^a(v), v) \tilde{E}_i(S^b(v), v) \quad (4.28)$$

$$\mathcal{Q}_{ab}(v) = \tilde{\mathcal{E}}_a^i(S(v), v) \tilde{\mathcal{E}}_b^i(S(v), v) \quad (4.29)$$

$$\mathcal{A}^{ab}{}_c(v) = \tilde{E}_i(S^a(v), v) \Delta_c E_i(S^b(v), v) \quad (4.30)$$

$$\mathcal{B}_{ab}{}^c(v) = \tilde{\mathcal{E}}_a^i(S(v), v) \Delta_b E_i(S^c(v), v). \quad (4.31)$$

We have then managed to regularize the integrated Ricci scalar as

$$\int d^3x N \sqrt{q} {}^{(3)}R \simeq \sum_{\square(v)} \frac{N(v)}{V(v)} \mathcal{R}(v) \quad (4.32)$$

where

$$\begin{aligned} \mathcal{R}(v) = & -2\tilde{E}_i(S^a(v), v) \Delta_{ab} E_i(S^b(v)) + 2\mathcal{Q}^{ab}(v) \tilde{\mathcal{E}}_c^i(S(v), v) \Delta_{ab} E_i(S^c(v)) \\ & - \Delta_a E_i(S^a(v)) \Delta_b E_i(S^b(v)) - \frac{1}{2} \Delta_a E_i(S^b(v)) \Delta_b E_i(S^a(v)) \\ & + \frac{5}{2} \mathcal{Q}^{ab}(v) \Delta_a E_i(S^c(v)) \Delta_b \mathcal{E}_c^i(S(v)) - \frac{1}{2} \mathcal{Q}^{ab}(v) \mathcal{Q}_{cd}(v) \Delta_a E_i(S^c(v)) \Delta_b E_i(S^d(v)) \\ & + 2\mathcal{A}^{ab}{}_a(v) \mathcal{B}_{cb}{}^c(v) + 2\mathcal{A}^{ab}{}_b(v) \mathcal{B}_{ca}{}^c(v) + \mathcal{A}^{ab}{}_c(v) \mathcal{B}_{ba}{}^c(v) \\ & + \frac{1}{2} \mathcal{Q}_{ab}(v) \mathcal{A}^{ca}{}_d(v) \mathcal{A}^{db}{}_c(v) - \mathcal{Q}^{ab}(v) \mathcal{B}_{ca}{}^c(v) \mathcal{B}_{db}{}^d(v) \\ & + 2(\mathcal{Q}^{ab}(v) \mathcal{B}_{ca}{}^c(v) - \mathcal{A}^{ab}{}_a(v) - \mathcal{A}^{ba}{}_a(v)) \frac{\Delta_b V(v)^2}{V(v)^2} \\ & + \frac{3}{2} \mathcal{Q}^{ab}(v) \frac{\Delta_a V(v)^2}{V(v)^2} \frac{\Delta_b V(v)^2}{V(v)^2} - 2\mathcal{Q}^{ab}(v) \frac{\Delta_{ab} V(v)^2}{V(v)^2}. \end{aligned} \quad (4.33)$$

For small values of the regularization parameter ϵ , the regularized expression on the right-hand side of Eq. (4.32) converges to the continuum expression on the left-hand side.

Each factor involved in the expression (4.33) can now be readily promoted into a well-defined operator of loop quantum gravity. For the six-valent nodes of the cubical graph, the operator q_v entering the definition of the volume operator in Eq. (3.16) can be expressed in terms of the flux operators $\tilde{E}_i(S^a(v), v)$ as

$$q_v = \epsilon^{ijk} \tilde{E}_i(S^x(v), v) \tilde{E}_j(S^y(v), v) \tilde{E}_k(S^z(v), v). \quad (4.34)$$

The negative powers of the volume $V(v)$ are quantized in terms of the regularized inverse volume operator \mathcal{V}_v^{-1} , which is defined by specifying its spectral decomposition as follows.⁹ Let $|\lambda\rangle$ be an eigenstate of V_v , the standard volume operator restricted to the

⁹The operator \mathcal{V}_v^{-1} was first used in loop quantum gravity by Bianchi in his construction of the length operator [10]. It has since been used e.g. in the quantization of the scalar curvature based on Regge's formula [8], and in the construction of a Hamiltonian constraint operator playing the role of the physical Hamiltonian in a model of loop quantum gravity deparametrized with respect to non-rotational dust [32, 34].

More generally, one could consider the operator $\mathcal{V}_v^{-1}(\delta) \equiv V_v / (V_v^2 + \delta^2)$ – the so-called Tikhonov regularization of the inverse operator – where the parameter δ has a small but finite value. The operator defined by Eq. (4.35) can be obtained by taking the limit $\delta \rightarrow 0$ of the operator $\mathcal{V}_v^{-1}(\delta)$.

node v , with eigenvalue λ . Then the action of \mathcal{V}_v^{-1} on the state $|\lambda\rangle$ is defined to be

$$\mathcal{V}_v^{-1}|\lambda\rangle = \begin{cases} \lambda^{-1}|\lambda\rangle & \text{if } \lambda \neq 0 \\ 0 & \text{if } \lambda = 0 \end{cases} \quad (4.35)$$

The factor of $1/W(v)$, which appears in the regularized inverse triad (4.4), can be dealt with in the same way. The squared, oriented volume $W(v)$ corresponds to the operator q_v . Hence, if $|\mu\rangle$ is an eigenstate of q_v with eigenvalue μ , we define the regularized inverse operator corresponding to $1/W(v)$ as

$$\mathcal{W}_v^{-1}|\mu\rangle = \begin{cases} \mu^{-1}|\mu\rangle & \text{if } \mu \neq 0 \\ 0 & \text{if } \mu = 0 \end{cases} \quad (4.36)$$

In this way we have obtained an operator representing the Ricci scalar integrated against a smearing function. The action of the operator on a cylindrical function based on the cubical graph Γ_0 takes the form

$$\left(\int d^3x \widehat{N\sqrt{q}}^{(3)} R \right) |\Psi_{\Gamma_0}\rangle = \sum_{v \in \Gamma_0} N(v) \mathcal{V}_v^{-1} \mathcal{R}_v |\Psi_{\Gamma_0}\rangle \quad (4.37)$$

where \mathcal{R}_v is the operator corresponding to the expression (4.33). (An operator representing the actual scalar curvature of the spatial manifold, i.e. $\int d^3x \sqrt{q}^{(3)} R$, can of course be recovered simply by setting $N = 1$ in the above expression.)

4.4 Properties of the curvature operator

The operator (4.37) is invariant under the internal $SU(2)$ gauge transformations generated by the Gauss constraint. This is guaranteed by the specific methods which we adopted to regularize spatial derivatives, where a derivative of the densitized triad is discretized in terms of parallel transported flux variables which are all transported to the same point. In the framework of full loop quantum gravity, an operator representing a geometrical observable, such as the integrated Ricci scalar (2.16), should additionally be invariant under spatial diffeomorphisms, while the Ricci scalar integrated against an arbitrary smearing function should be represented by an operator transforming covariantly under diffeomorphisms. However, since we consider the operator (4.37) to be defined on the Hilbert space of a fixed graph, the question of its transformation properties under diffeomorphisms essentially does not arise. The operator is of course trivially invariant under diffeomorphisms which preserve the cubical graph on which the operator is defined, but beyond this, it is not possible to establish a more general statement concerning the behaviour of the operator under diffeomorphisms.

In general, the operators corresponding to the various factors in Eq. (4.33) do not commute with each other, so there exist many possible, inequivalent factor orderings of the operator (4.37). The discretization schemes, such as Eq. (4.9) and (4.17), which are used to regularize spatial derivatives, are in principle also not unique, and represent another source of quantization ambiguities. However, if the symmetry between positive and negative directions of the background coordinate axes is imposed as a requirement, then the discretization schemes which we have selected are uniquely distinguished as being the simplest possible ones, in the sense that any other possible discretization would

involve a larger number of nodes, or nodes which are more distant from the "central" node at which the derivative is being regularized.

At a first sight, it might seem that the spin carried by the holonomies entering the parallel transported flux operator is also subject to an ambiguity. After all, a similar situation arises in the construction of the Hamiltonian constraint operator, where the holonomies involved in the operator can be regularized using any irreducible representation of $SU(2)$. However, here it is straightforward to verify that all representations are equivalent for the purpose of defining the parallel transported flux operator. That is, if one takes the equations (3.17) and (3.18) in the spin- j representation instead of the fundamental representation, one finds that the classical variable $\tilde{E}_i(S, x_0)$ can still be written in the form given by Eq. (3.21).¹⁰ Hence – as shown by Eq. (3.22) – the parallel transported flux operators involved in the curvature operator will act by coupling holonomies of spin 1 with the holonomies present in the state on which we apply the operator, regardless of which spin was originally used to define the parallel transported flux operator.

The operator \mathcal{R}_v , being defined on the Hilbert space of a fixed graph, possesses a densely defined adjoint operator \mathcal{R}_v^\dagger on this space. Using the operators \mathcal{R}_v and \mathcal{R}_v^\dagger , we may then introduce a symmetric factor ordering of the operator (4.37), for instance as

$$\sum_{v \in \Gamma_0} N(v) \mathcal{V}_v^{-1/2} \frac{\mathcal{R}_v + \mathcal{R}_v^\dagger}{2} \mathcal{V}_v^{-1/2}. \quad (4.38)$$

The possibility of defining a symmetric factor ordering is a necessary requirement from the perspective that any classically real-valued geometrical observable, such as the scalar curvature, should be represented by a self-adjoint quantum operator. In addition, the symmetric form of the curvature operator can be used as a part of the physical Hamiltonian in models of loop quantum gravity deparametrized with respect to a scalar field, where the Hamiltonian is interpreted as the generator of physical time evolution, and therefore has to be a self-adjoint operator.

We may note that if we tried to extend our construction, in its present form, to define a curvature operator on the entire Hilbert space of loop quantum gravity (which includes states based on all possible graphs), we would encounter a known problem which would prevent the adjoint operator from being densely defined. The issue arises from the fact that the holonomies contained in the parallel transported flux operators act by changing the spin quantum numbers of the state on which the curvature operator acts, and in some cases the action of the operator produces a state where the spin of an edge has become equal to zero – in other words, the edge has been "erased" from the graph. On the full Hilbert space the action of the adjoint operator on such a state will be ill-defined, essentially because there are infinitely many inequivalent ways in which the adjoint operator can reintroduce the missing edge (even if we are working at the level of diffeomorphism invariant states).¹¹ For this reason, it is necessary to perform our construction of the curvature operator on the Hilbert space of a fixed graph, if we wish to obtain a symmetric operator as the result.

¹⁰This is because the relation (3.20) is valid not only in the fundamental representation, but in any irreducible representation of $SU(2)$.

¹¹For a more detailed discussion of this point, see e.g. section 13.5 of [28], where the phenomenon of the "disappearing edge" is examined in the context of Thiemann's regularization of the Hamiltonian constraint.

5 Conclusions

In this article we have introduced a new geometric operator representing the scalar curvature of the three-dimensional spatial manifold. While our operator is constructed using the basic kinematical structures of loop quantum gravity, it is not defined on the entire kinematical Hilbert space of the theory, but only on the Hilbert space of a fixed cubical graph (the graph being defined with respect to a fiducial Cartesian background coordinate system). Thus, the operator can be used in the context of any framework or model which originates from the formalism of full loop quantum gravity, and which incorporates the restriction to a cubical graph among its underlying assumptions. Well-known examples include algebraic quantum gravity, quantum-reduced loop gravity and models of effective dynamics.

The starting point of our construction is to express the classical Ricci scalar directly as a function of the densitized triad. The resulting expression must then be regularized by writing it in terms of objects which correspond to well-defined operators in loop quantum gravity. From the technical point of view, the main challenge at this step consists of constructing a suitable regularization of spatial derivatives of the densitized triad. Having restricted ourselves to working on a cubical graph, it becomes a relatively simple task to regularize the derivatives by discretizing them on the lattice provided by the graph. As a geometrical observable, the operator representing the Ricci scalar should be invariant under $SU(2)$ gauge transformations generated by the Gauss constraint. In order to accomplish this, derivatives of the triad are regularized in terms of parallel transported flux variables, which behave in a controlled way under gauge transformations, and using which we can ensure that our construction yields a gauge invariant curvature operator.

A mathematically well-defined operator representing the scalar curvature in loop quantum gravity, based on Regge's formula expressing the Ricci scalar in terms of deficit angles and hinge lengths, has been previously introduced in [8]. However, if one studies the action of this operator on states of quantum-reduced loop gravity, one finds that all of them carry zero curvature as measured by this operator. Hence the operator of [8] appears to be unsuitable to be used in the quantum-reduced framework.

The principal motivation for the work presented here has been to find a satisfactory curvature operator for quantum-reduced loop gravity. Following the viewpoint established in [14], such an operator can be derived from the operator constructed in this article by computing the action of the latter operator on states in the Hilbert space of the quantum-reduced model, and extracting the terms which dominate in the limit of large spins. These calculations will be presented in the companion article [20]. Our expectation is that the operator introduced in this article will not only provide a physically appropriate curvature operator for quantum-reduced loop gravity, but can also be used in models of effective dynamics as an alternative to the usual Lorentzian part of the Hamiltonian constraint.

From the perspective of full loop quantum gravity, the restriction to a cubical graph certainly represents a rather serious limitation, since it implies that our curvature operator is defined only in a small subspace of the entire kinematical Hilbert space of the theory. However, in addition to facilitating the regularization of spatial derivatives, the assumption of a cubical graph fulfills another important role, having to do with the requirement that any geometrical observable – such as the scalar curvature – should be represented in the quantum theory by a self-adjoint operator. Namely, as discussed in section 4.4, the assumption that our operator is defined on the Hilbert space of a fixed

graph ensures that its adjoint is available as a densely defined operator, and hence a symmetric factor ordering of the operator can be prescribed.

Note that the above statement applies to any operator involving holonomies associated to edges which overlap, even partially, with the edges of the graph on which the operator is acting. In general, the adjoint of such an operator cannot be densely defined on the entire kinematical Hilbert space of loop quantum gravity. Thus it seems certain that the regularization of derivatives in terms of parallel transported flux variables would have to be modified in some suitable way, if one would eventually like to refine the construction performed in this article into an operator which is well-defined in the proper framework of full loop quantum gravity, as opposed to being restricted to the Hilbert space of a single fixed graph.

To sketch a concrete idea of how such a modification could be achieved, we recall the work presented in [31], where a new regularization of the Euclidean part of the Hamiltonian is proposed. Unlike Thiemann's original regularization of the Hamiltonian [33], the adjoint of the operator introduced in [31] is densely defined on the full kinematical Hilbert space of loop quantum gravity. The key idea behind the construction is that the loops created by the operator do not overlap with any edges of the graph on which the operator acts; instead, each loop is tangent to the pair of edges to which it is associated. Adapting this concept to the regularization of the curvature, we would be lead to consider parallel transported fluxes where the parallel transport from one node to another is not taken along the edge already present in the graph, but instead along a new edge connecting the two nodes (and being tangent to the previously existing edges at appropriate orders of tangentiality). We leave the detailed investigation of an operator of this type as a possible topic for future work.

Finally, we note that as a side result of our work, we have obtained a seemingly independent argument to fix the undetermined multiplicative factor κ_0 which is present in the volume operator (see [35–37] for previous work on this question). Our argument arises from the fact that the volume enters the operator representing the regularized inverse flux (4.4) through the operator \mathcal{W}_v^{-1} defined by Eq. (4.36). When the inverse flux operator is applied on states in the Hilbert space of quantum-reduced loop gravity, it seems natural to require that the operator should behave approximately as the inverse of the flux operator itself. A short calculation in the companion paper [20] shows that $\kappa_0 = 1/48$ is the unique value of the factor which satisfies this requirement. This agrees with the value originally found by Thiemann and Giesel in [35, 36] through a different kind of consistency requirement.

Acknowledgments

I. M. thanks Mehdi Assanioussi for helpful discussions. This work was supported by grant no. 2018/30/Q/ST2/00811 of the Polish National Science Center.

A Ricci scalar as a function of the densitized triad

In this Appendix we provide a detailed derivation of Eq. (2.9), which expresses the Ricci scalar of the spatial manifold as a function of the densitized triad. The Ricci scalar is given by

$${}^{(3)}R = q^{ab}(\partial_c \Gamma_{ab}^c - \partial_b \Gamma_{ac}^c + \Gamma_{ab}^c \Gamma_{cd}^d - \Gamma_{ad}^c \Gamma_{bc}^d) \quad (\text{A.1})$$

where the Christoffel symbols are

$$\Gamma_{bc}^a = \frac{1}{2}q^{ad}(\partial_b q_{dc} + \partial_c q_{bd} - \partial_d q_{bc}). \quad (\text{A.2})$$

The spatial metric and its inverse are related to the densitized triad as

$$q_{ab} = |\det E| E_a^i E_b^i, \quad q^{ab} = \frac{E_i^a E_i^b}{|\det E|} \quad (\text{A.3})$$

where $\det E \equiv \det E_i^a$, and

$$E_a^i = \frac{1}{2 \det E} \epsilon_{abc} \epsilon^{ijk} E_j^b E_k^c \quad (\text{A.4})$$

is the inverse of the densitized triad, i.e. it satisfies

$$E_i^a E_b^i = \delta_b^a, \quad E_i^a E_a^j = \delta_i^j. \quad (\text{A.5})$$

Now the required calculation consists simply of inserting Eqs. (A.2) and (A.3) into Eq. (A.1). In order to make the resulting expressions somewhat more compact, we make use of the following abbreviations for various combinations of the triad and its derivatives:

$$Q^{ab} = E_i^a E_i^b \quad (\text{A.6})$$

$$Q_{ab} = E_a^i E_b^i \quad (\text{A.7})$$

$$D_{abc} = E_a^i \partial_b E_c^i \quad (\text{A.8})$$

$$D_{ab}{}^c = E_a^i \partial_b E_i^c \quad (\text{A.9})$$

$$D^a{}_{bc} = E_i^a \partial_b E_c^i \quad (\text{A.10})$$

$$D^{ab}{}_c = E_i^a \partial_c E_i^b \quad (\text{A.11})$$

$$T_{abcd} = (\partial_a E_b^i)(\partial_c E_d^i) \quad (\text{A.12})$$

$$T^a{}_{bcd} = (\partial_b E_i^a)(\partial_c E_d^i) \quad (\text{A.13})$$

$$S_{abcd} = E_a^i \partial_b \partial_c E_d^i \quad (\text{A.14})$$

$$S^a{}_{bcd} = E_i^a \partial_b \partial_c E_d^i \quad (\text{A.15})$$

$$L_a = \partial_a \ln |\det E| \quad (\text{A.16})$$

$$L_{ab} = \partial_a \partial_b \ln |\det E| \quad (\text{A.17})$$

Note that most of the objects defined above are not tensors, which should be kept in mind when manipulating them.

A.1 Christoffel symbols and their derivatives

We start by using Eq. (A.3) in Eq. (A.2) to write the Christoffel symbols in terms of the densitized triad. A simple calculation yields

$$\Gamma_{bc}^a = \frac{1}{2} \left(D^a{}_{bc} + D^a{}_{cb} + Q^{ad}(D_{bcd} + D_{cbd} - D_{bdc} - D_{cdb}) + \delta_b^a L_c + \delta_c^a L_b - Q^{ad} Q_{bc} L_d \right). \quad (\text{A.18})$$

To evaluate the derivative of the Christoffel symbol, it is useful to first establish the identities

$$\partial_d D^a{}_{bc} = T^a{}_{dbc} + S^a{}_{dbc}, \quad (\text{A.19})$$

$$\partial_d D_{abc} = T_{dabc} + S_{dabc}. \quad (\text{A.20})$$

Using these in Eq. (A.18), we immediately find

$$\begin{aligned}\partial_d \Gamma_{bc}^a &= \frac{1}{2} \left(T_{dbc}^a + T_{dcb}^a + S_{dbc}^a + S_{dcb}^a + \partial_d Q^{ae} (D_{bce} + D_{cbe} - D_{bec} - D_{ceb}) \right. \\ &\quad + Q^{ae} (T_{dbce} + T_{dcbe} - T_{dbec} - T_{dceb} + S_{bcde} + S_{cbde} - S_{bdec} - S_{cdeb}) \\ &\quad \left. + \delta_b^a L_{cd} + \delta_c^a L_{bd} - Q^{ae} (\partial_d Q_{bc}) L_e - Q_{bc} (\partial_d Q^{ae}) L_e - Q^{ae} Q_{bc} L_{de} \right). \quad (\text{A.21})\end{aligned}$$

A.2 Ricci scalar. Terms with derivatives of Christoffel symbols

Now we are ready to apply Eqs. (A.18) and (A.20) to Eq. (A.1) in order to express the Ricci scalar as a function of the densitized triad. We will consider the four terms in Eq. (A.1) one by one. The first term amounts to calculating

$$\begin{aligned}E_i^b E_i^c \partial_a \Gamma_{bc}^a &= Q^{bc} \left(T_{abc}^a + S_{abc}^a + \partial_a Q^{ae} (D_{bce} - D_{bec}) + Q^{ae} (T_{abce} - T_{abec} + S_{bcae} - S_{baec}) \right. \\ &\quad \left. + \delta_b^a L_{ca} - \frac{1}{2} Q^{ae} (\partial_a Q_{bc}) L_e - \frac{1}{2} Q_{bc} (\partial_a Q^{ae}) L_e - \frac{1}{2} Q^{ae} Q_{bc} L_{ae} \right), \quad (\text{A.22})\end{aligned}$$

where we have used the symmetry of Q^{bc} to interchange the indices b and c in several of the terms coming from Eq. (A.20). On the first line, we note that $Q^{bc} D_{bce} = (E_i^b E_i^c) E_b^j \partial_c E_e^j = D_{ce}^c$. After this, a short calculation, which relies on the identities

$$E_i^a \partial_b E_a^j = -E_a^j \partial_b E_i^a \quad \text{and} \quad E_i^a \partial_b E_c^i = -E_c^i \partial_b E_i^a, \quad (\text{A.23})$$

shows that

$$(\partial_a Q^{ab}) D_{cb}^c = Q^{ab} T_{cab}^c - (\partial_a E_i^a) (\partial_b E_i^b). \quad (\text{A.24})$$

Noting also that $Q^{bc} S_{bcae} = S_{cae}^c$ and using $Q_{ab} Q^{bc} = \delta_a^c$, we arrive at the result

$$\begin{aligned}E_i^a E_i^b \partial_c \Gamma_{ab}^c &= 2Q^{ab} T_{cab}^c + Q^{ab} Q^{cd} (T_{acdb} - T_{acbd}) \\ &\quad + 2Q^{ab} S_{cab}^c - Q^{ab} S_{abc}^c - (\partial_a Q^{ab}) D_{bc}^c - (\partial_a E_i^a) (\partial_b E_i^b) \\ &\quad - Q^{ab} D_{ac}^c L_b - \frac{3}{2} (\partial_a Q^{ab}) L_b - \frac{1}{2} Q^{ab} L_{ab}. \quad (\text{A.25})\end{aligned}$$

For the second term in Eq. (A.1), we need to evaluate

$$\begin{aligned}E_i^a E_i^b \partial_b \Gamma_{ac}^c &= \frac{1}{2} Q^{ab} \left(T_{bac}^c + T_{bca}^c + S_{bac}^c + S_{bca}^c + \partial_b Q^{ce} (D_{ace} + D_{cae} - D_{aec} - D_{cea}) \right. \\ &\quad + Q^{ce} (T_{bace} + T_{bcae} - T_{baec} - T_{bcea} + S_{acbe} + S_{cabe} - S_{abec} - S_{cbea}) \\ &\quad \left. - Q^{ce} (\partial_b Q_{ac}) L_e - Q_{ac} (\partial_b Q^{ce}) L_e + 3L_{ab} \right). \quad (\text{A.26})\end{aligned}$$

Here we see that several terms cancel due to the symmetry of Q^{ce} . In the remaining terms, we calculate

$$\partial_b Q^{ce} (D_{cae} - D_{cea}) = T_{bac}^c - T_{bca}^c + Q^{ce} (T_{aebc} - T_{eabc}) \quad (\text{A.27})$$

and

$$Q^{ab} Q^{ce} \partial_b Q_{ac} = -Q^{ab} (\partial_b Q^{ce}) Q_{ac} = -\partial_b Q^{be}, \quad (\text{A.28})$$

obtaining in the end

$$E_i^a E_i^b \partial_b \Gamma_{ac}^c = Q^{ab} T_{abc}^c + Q^{ab} S_{abc}^c + \frac{3}{2} Q^{ab} L_{ab}. \quad (\text{A.29})$$

A.3 Ricci scalar. Terms with two Christoffel symbols

We then move on to the third term in Eq. (A.1). Let us first compute the piece $E_i^a E_i^b \Gamma_{ab}^c$. Using Eq. (A.18), and noting the symmetry of Q^{ab} , we have

$$E_i^a E_i^b \Gamma_{ab}^c = Q^{ab} \left(D_{ab}^c + Q^{cd} (D_{abd} - D_{adb}) + \delta_a^c L_b - \frac{1}{2} Q^{cd} Q_{ab} L_d \right). \quad (\text{A.30})$$

Now we may calculate

$$Q^{ab} D_{ab}^c = -E_i^a \partial_a E_i^c \quad (\text{A.31})$$

and

$$Q^{ab} Q^{cd} D_{abd} = -E_i^c \partial_a E_i^a, \quad (\text{A.32})$$

leading to

$$E_i^a E_i^b \Gamma_{ab}^c = -Q^{ac} D_{ab}^b - \partial_a Q^{ac} - \frac{1}{2} Q^{ac} L_a. \quad (\text{A.33})$$

Then contracting this with

$$\Gamma_{cd}^d = D_{cd}^d + \frac{3}{2} L_c, \quad (\text{A.34})$$

we find

$$E_i^a E_i^b \Gamma_{ab}^c \Gamma_{cd}^d = -Q^{ab} D_{ac}^c D_{bd}^d - (\partial_a Q^{ab}) D_{bc}^c - 2Q^{ab} D_{ac}^c L_b - \frac{3}{2} (\partial_a Q^{ab}) L_b - \frac{3}{4} Q^{ab} L_a L_b. \quad (\text{A.35})$$

Now it remains to deal with the last term in Eq. (A.1). Let us again start by considering the contraction of $E_i^a E_i^b$ with one of the Christoffel symbols. Using again the symmetry of Q^{ab} , we obtain

$$Q^{ab} \Gamma_{ad}^c = \frac{1}{2} \left(Q^{ab} D_{da}^c + Q^{ac} D_{da}^b + Q^{ab} D_{ad}^c - Q^{ac} D_{ad}^b + (Q^{ab} Q^{ce} - Q^{ac} Q^{be}) D_{dae} + Q^{bc} L_d + \delta_d^c Q^{ab} L_a - \delta_d^b Q^{ac} L_a \right). \quad (\text{A.36})$$

Since this is to be contracted with the symmetric Γ_{bc}^d , we may keep only the part of the above expression which is symmetric in b and c :

$$Q^{a(b} \Gamma_{ad}^{c)} = Q^{a(b} D_{da}^{c)} + \frac{1}{2} Q^{bc} L_d. \quad (\text{A.37})$$

Now contracting this with

$$\Gamma_{bc}^d = \frac{1}{2} \left(D_{bc}^d + D_{cb}^d + Q^{de} (D_{bce} + D_{cbe} - D_{bec} - D_{ceb}) + \delta_b^d L_c + \delta_c^d L_b - Q^{de} Q_{bc} L_e \right) \quad (\text{A.38})$$

and multiplying out all the terms, we get

$$E_i^a E_i^b \Gamma_{ad}^c \Gamma_{bc}^d = \frac{1}{2} \left(Q^{ab} D_{da}^c D_{bc}^d + Q^{ac} D_{da}^b D_{bc}^d + Q^{ab} Q^{de} D_{da}^c (D_{bce} - D_{bec}) + Q^{ac} Q^{de} D_{da}^b (D_{bce} - D_{bec}) + Q^{ab} D_{ba}^c L_c + Q^{ac} D_{ba}^b L_c + Q^{bc} D_{bc}^d L_d - D_{da}^a Q^{de} L_e + Q^{bc} Q^{de} (D_{bce} - D_{bec}) L_d + Q^{bc} L_b L_c - \frac{3}{2} Q^{de} L_d L_e \right). \quad (\text{A.39})$$

Here most of the terms in this expression can be reduced into a simpler form. For instance, in the first term we have

$$Q^{ab}D^c{}_{da} = -Q^{ab}(\partial_d E_j^c)E_a^j = -E_i^b \partial_d E_i^c = -D^{bc}{}_d, \quad (\text{A.40})$$

and in the first term on the second line,

$$Q^{ab}D^c{}_{da}D_{bce} = E_i^c(\partial_d E_a^i)E_j^a(\partial_c E_e^j) = -(\partial_d E_i^c)E_a^i E_j^a(\partial_c E_e^j) = -T^c{}_{dce}. \quad (\text{A.41})$$

Proceeding like this through the entire expression, we eventually end up with the result

$$\begin{aligned} E_i^a E_i^b \Gamma_{ad}^c \Gamma_{bc}^d &= \frac{1}{2}Q^{ab}(T^c{}_{abc} - T^c{}_{acb}) + \frac{1}{2}Q^{ab}Q^{cd}(T_{acdb} - T_{acbd}) \\ &\quad - \frac{1}{2}D^{ab}{}_c D^c{}_{ab} + \frac{1}{2}(\partial_a E_i^b)(\partial_b E_i^a) \\ &\quad - (\partial_a Q^{ab})L_b - Q^{ab}D^c{}_{ac}L_b - \frac{1}{4}Q^{ab}L_a L_b. \end{aligned} \quad (\text{A.42})$$

A.4 Summary

By combining Eqs. (A.25), (A.29), (A.35) and (A.42), we obtain the following expression for the Ricci scalar as a function of the densitized triad:

$$\begin{aligned} |\det E|^{(3)}R &= 2Q^{ab}(S^c{}_{cab} - S^c{}_{abc}) \\ &\quad + 2Q^{ab}T^c{}_{cab} + \frac{1}{2}Q^{ab}T^c{}_{acb} - \frac{3}{2}Q^{ab}T^c{}_{abc} + \frac{1}{2}Q^{ab}Q^{cd}(T_{acdb} - T_{acbd}) \\ &\quad + \frac{1}{2}D^{ab}{}_c D^c{}_{ab} - Q^{ab}D^c{}_{ac}D^d{}_{bd} - 2(\partial_a Q^{ab})D^c{}_{bc} - (\partial_a E_i^a)(\partial_b E_i^b) - \frac{1}{2}(\partial_a E_i^b)(\partial_b E_i^a) \\ &\quad - 2Q^{ab}D^c{}_{ac}L_b - 2(\partial_a Q^{ab})L_b - \frac{1}{2}Q^{ab}L_a L_b - 2Q^{ab}L_{ab}. \end{aligned} \quad (\text{A.43})$$

At this point we perform one more series of manipulations, which consists of using the identities (A.23) to transform derivatives of the inverse triad into derivatives of the triad itself whenever this is possible. (This has the advantage of slightly reducing the number of different terms which appear in the final expression for the Ricci scalar.) For example, the first term of Eq. (A.43) can be rewritten as follows:

$$\begin{aligned} Q^{ab}S^c{}_{cab} &= E_i^a E_i^b E_j^c \partial_c \partial_a E_b^j \\ &= -E_i^a E_i^b \left(E_b^j \partial_c \partial_a E_j^c + (\partial_a E_b^j)(\partial_c E_j^c) + (\partial_a E_j^c)(\partial_c E_b^j) \right) \\ &= -E_i^a \partial_a \partial_b E_i^b + E_i^a (\partial_a E_i^b) E_b^j (\partial_c E_j^c) + E_i^a (\partial_c E_i^b) E_b^j (\partial_a E_j^c) \\ &= -E_i^a \partial_a \partial_b E_i^b + D^{ab}{}_a D_{bc}{}^c + D^{ab}{}_c D_{ba}{}^c \end{aligned} \quad (\text{A.44})$$

As another example, the first term on the second line gives

$$Q^{ab}T^c{}_{cab} = E_i^a E_i^b (\partial_c E_j^c)(\partial_a E_b^j) = -E_i^a (\partial_a E_i^b) E_b^j (\partial_c E_j^c) = D^{ab}{}_a D_{bc}{}^c. \quad (\text{A.45})$$

After the entire expression has been treated in this way, and the derivatives of Q^{ab} are written as $\partial_c Q^{ab} = D_c^{ab} + D_c^{ba}$, we are left with the result

$$\begin{aligned}
|\det E|^{(3)}R &= -2E_i^a \partial_a \partial_b E_i^b + 2Q^{ab} E_c^i \partial_a \partial_b E_i^c \\
&\quad - (\partial_a E_i^a)(\partial_b E_i^b) - \frac{1}{2}(\partial_a E_i^b)(\partial_b E_i^a) \\
&\quad + \frac{5}{2}Q^{ab}(\partial_a E_i^c)(\partial_b E_i^c) - \frac{1}{2}Q^{ab}Q_{cd}(\partial_a E_i^c)(\partial_b E_i^d) \\
&\quad + 2D^{ab}{}_a D_{cb}{}^c + 2D^{ab}{}_b D_{ca}{}^c + D^{ab}{}_c D_{ba}{}^c \\
&\quad + \frac{1}{2}Q_{ab}D^{ca}{}_d D^{db}{}_c - Q^{ab}D_{ca}{}^c D_{db}{}^d \\
&\quad + 2(Q^{ab}D_{ca}{}^c - D^{ab}{}_a - D^{ba}{}_a)L_b - \frac{1}{2}Q^{ab}L_a L_b - 2Q^{ab}L_{ab}, \tag{A.46}
\end{aligned}$$

which is identical with Eq. (2.9), after we pass to the notation defined by Eqs. (2.12)–(2.15).

References

- [1] A. Ashtekar and J. Pullin (ed.), *Loop quantum gravity: The first 30 years*, World Scientific Publishing (2017).
- [2] A. Ashtekar and J. Lewandowski, *Background independent quantum gravity: A status report*, *Class. Quant. Grav.* 21, R53 (2004). arXiv:gr-qc/0404018.
- [3] C. Rovelli, *Quantum gravity*, Cambridge University Press (2004).
- [4] T. Thiemann, *Modern canonical quantum general relativity*, Cambridge University Press (2007).
- [5] C. Rovelli and L. Smolin, *Discreteness of area and volume in quantum gravity*, *Nucl. Phys. B* 442, 593 (1995); Erratum: *ibid.* B 456, 753 (1995). arXiv:gr-qc/9411005.
- [6] A. Ashtekar and J. Lewandowski, *Quantum theory of gravity I: Area operators*, *Class. Quant. Grav.* 14, A55 (1997). arXiv:gr-qc/9602046.
- [7] A. Ashtekar and J. Lewandowski, *Quantum theory of gravity II: Volume operators*, *Adv. Theor. Math. Phys.* 1, 388 (1998). arXiv:gr-qc/9711031.
- [8] E. Alesci, M. Assanioussi and J. Lewandowski, *A curvature operator for LQG*, *Phys. Rev. D* 89, 124017 (2014). arXiv:1403.3190 [gr-qc].
- [9] T. Regge, *General relativity without coordinates*, *Nuovo Cim.* 19, 558 (1961).
- [10] E. Bianchi, *The length operator in loop quantum gravity*, *Nucl. Phys. B* 807, 591-624 (2009). arXiv:0806.4710 [gr-qc].
- [11] S. A. Major, *Operators for quantized directions*, *Class. Quant. Grav.* 16, 3859 (1999). arXiv:gr-qc/9905019.
- [12] E. Alesci and F. Cianfrani, *Quantum-reduced loop gravity: Cosmology*, *Phys. Rev. D* 87, 083521 (2013). arXiv:1301.2245 [gr-qc].

- [13] E. Alesci and F. Cianfrani, *Quantum reduced loop gravity and the foundation of loop quantum cosmology*, Int. J. Mod. Phys. D 25, 1642005 (2016). arXiv:1602.05475 [gr-qc].
- [14] I. Mäkinen, *Operators of quantum-reduced loop gravity from the perspective of full loop quantum gravity*, Phys. Rev. D 102, 106010 (2020). arXiv:2004.00309 [gr-qc].
- [15] A. Dapor and K. Liegener, *Cosmological effective Hamiltonian from full loop quantum gravity dynamics*, Phys. Lett. B 785 (2018). arXiv:1706.09833 [gr-qc].
- [16] M. Han and H. Liu, *Effective dynamics from coherent state path integral of full loop quantum gravity*, Phys. Rev. D 101, 046003 (2020). arXiv:1910.03763 [gr-qc].
- [17] C. Zhang, S. Song and M. Han, *First-order quantum correction in coherent state expectation value of loop-quantum-gravity Hamiltonian: I. Overview and results*, arXiv:2012.14242 [gr-qc] (2020).
- [18] K. Giesel and T. Thiemann, *Algebraic quantum gravity (AQG) I. Conceptual setup*, Class. Quant. Grav. 24, 2465 (2007). arXiv:gr-qc/0607099.
- [19] K. Giesel and T. Thiemann, *Algebraic quantum gravity (AQG) IV. Reduced phase space quantisation of loop quantum gravity*, Class. Quant. Grav. 27, 175009 (2010). arXiv:0711.0119 [gr-qc].
- [20] J. Lewandowski and I. Mäkinen, *Scalar curvature operator for quantum-reduced loop gravity*, in preparation.
- [21] R. Arnowitt, S. Deser and C. W. Misner, *Dynamical structure and definition of energy in general relativity*, Phys. Rev. 116, 1322 (1959).
- [22] R. Arnowitt, S. Deser and C. W. Misner, *The dynamics of general relativity*, Gravitation: an introduction to current research (L. Witten ed.), Chapter 7, Wiley (1962). arXiv:gr-qc/0405109.
- [23] A. Ashtekar, *New variables for classical and quantum gravity*, Phys. Rev. Lett. 57, 2244 (1986).
- [24] A. Ashtekar, *New Hamiltonian formulation of general relativity*, Phys. Rev. D 36, 1587 (1987).
- [25] F. Barbero, *Real Ashtekar variables for Lorentzian signature space-times*, Phys. Rev. D 51, 5507 (1995). arXiv:gr-qc/9410014.
- [26] M. Han, W. Huang and Y. Ma, *Fundamental structure of loop quantum gravity*, Int. J. Mod. Phys. D16, 1397 (2007). arXiv:gr-qc/0509064.
- [27] N. Bodendorfer, *An elementary introduction to loop quantum gravity*, arXiv:1607.05129 [gr-qc] (2016).
- [28] I. Mäkinen, *Dynamics in canonical models of loop quantum gravity*, PhD thesis, Faculty of Physics, University of Warsaw (2019). arXiv:1910.00469 [gr-qc].
- [29] M. Domagała, K. Giesel, W. Kamiński and J. Lewandowski, *Gravity quantized*, Phys. Rev. D 82, 104038 (2010). arXiv:1009.2445 [gr-qc].

- [30] V. Husain and T. Pawłowski, *Time and a physical Hamiltonian for quantum gravity*, Phys. Rev. Lett. 108, 141301 (2012). arXiv:1108.1145 [gr-qc].
- [31] E. Alesci, M. Assanioussi, J. Lewandowski and I. Mäkinen, *Hamiltonian operator for loop quantum gravity coupled to a scalar field*, Phys. Rev. D 91, 124067 (2015). arXiv:1504.02068 [gr-qc].
- [32] M. Assanioussi, J. Lewandowski and I. Mäkinen, *Time evolution in deparametrized models of loop quantum gravity*, Phys. Rev. D 96, 024043 (2017). arXiv:1702.01688 [gr-qc].
- [33] T. Thiemann, *Quantum spin dynamics (QSD)*, Class. Quant. Grav. 15, 839 (1998). arXiv:gr-qc/9606089.
- [34] M. Assanioussi, J. Lewandowski and I. Mäkinen, *New scalar constraint operator for loop quantum gravity*, Phys. Rev. D 92, 044042 (2015). arXiv:1506.00299 [gr-qc].
- [35] K. Giesel and T. Thiemann, *Consistency check on volume and triad operator quantisation in loop quantum gravity I*, Class. Quant. Grav. 23, 5667 (2006). arXiv:gr-qc/0507036.
- [36] K. Giesel and T. Thiemann, *Consistency check on volume and triad operator quantisation in loop quantum gravity II*, Class. Quant. Grav. 23, 5693 (2006). arXiv:gr-qc/0507037.
- [37] J. Yang and Y. Ma, *Consistency check on the fundamental and alternative flux operators in loop quantum gravity*, Chin. Phys. C 43, 103106 (2019). arXiv:1908.10600 [gr-qc].