

Analyzing quantum gravity spillover in the semiclassical regime

Harkirat Singh Sahota* and Kinjalk Lochan†

*Department of Physical Sciences, Indian Institute of Science Education & Research (IISER) Mohali,
Sector 81 SAS Nagar, Manauli PO 140306 Punjab India.*

One of the standard approaches of incorporating the quantum gravity (QG) effects into the semiclassical analysis is to adopt a dressed metric from the QG model. This procedure assumes that the expectation value of the metric effectively captures all the QG subtleties in the semiclassical regime. However, the geometrical factors that typically appear in the semiclassical equations of motion, e.g., the Hubble parameter and its derivatives, the Ricci scalar etc., are usually made out of conjugate variables of the gravitational degrees of freedom, that do not commute in a fully quantized gravity and therefore will not be known entirely from the expectation value of only one variable in the phase space. In addition, many of these operators suffer from the operator ordering ambiguity, and different ordering schemes might leave their imprints in the semiclassical analysis. We investigate the viability of the dressed metric approach in the context of a de-parameterizable model, namely for the case of a dust dominated and a dark energy dominated universe. The model under consideration is a flat-FLRW model with perfect fluid as matter. We write the Hermitian operators corresponding to these observables (following Kuchař's proposal of perennials and observables), interpreted as relational observables, with the fluid degree of freedom as the clock. A general class of operator ordering of these observables is considered, and their expectation values are calculated for a unitarily evolving wave packet. It is shown that the operator ordering ambiguity is relevant only near the singularity. In the case of dust dominated universe, the expectation value of the Hubble parameter matches the “dressed” expression, i.e., the expression computed from the scale factor expectation value. In the case of curvature invariants, the relative difference between the dressed expression and quantum expectation is maximum at the location of singularity and decays for late time. The case of cosmological constant driven universe is at contrast: there is a disagreement between the dressed expressions and quantum expectations, even at the late time. Thus, the dressed metric approach captures the essence of the full quantum treatment for the dust dominated case, whereas it is bound to receive significant correction for the dark energy dominated or inflationary universes.

* ph17078@iisermohali.ac.in

† kinjalk@iisermohali.ac.in

I. INTRODUCTION

The notion of observables in canonical quantum gravity has been at the forefront of the issues that plague the theory; (for recent reviews see, e.g., [1, 2] and references therein). Classically, at the level of canonical description of the singular systems, i.e., the systems with gauge degrees of freedom, the whole phase space is no longer the physical space [3–6]. The gauge redundancy is encoded in a set of functions of phase space variables which are constrained to vanish on-shell. These functions are called the constraints of the theory and they define the physical space, called constraint surface, in the phase space. The constraints generate the gauge transformations on the phase space, and not all functions of phase space variables correspond to the physical (Dirac) observables. The phase space functions that are invariant under the gauge transformations are considered the Dirac observables. This implies that these functions need to have weakly vanishing Poisson bracket with the generators of these gauge transformations [3–6].

General Relativity is a famous example of the singular systems, which has diffeomorphism and time reparametrization constraints appearing at the canonical level [7–9], that generate the gauge transformations in the phase space, i.e., diffeomorphism and time reparametrization transformations [10–12]. The observables in general relativity, therefore must be invariant under diffeomorphisms and time reparametrizations. However, the discussion surrounding the systems with time reparametrization symmetry is tricky as the Hamiltonian of such systems is itself a constraint. This means that the Hamiltonian generates the gauge transformations, implying the dynamics in a generally covariant system is just the unfolding of the gauge transformation. It seems that the physical observables in such a system are frozen in time or, in other words, are constants of motion; this is commonly referred to as the problem of time in QG [13, 14].

A possible resolution to this conundrum comes from the understanding that the canonical Hamiltonian generates the evolution in the coordinate time, which due to general covariance, is indeed redundant. What we observe is the evolution of the dynamical fields with respect to the other fields. This idea is best implemented in the context of relational quantum dynamics, see e.g., [1, 15]. The approach, in a nutshell, is an amalgamation of the different manifestations of relational notions available, called the ‘*trinity of relational quantum dynamics*’ [16]. The system can be described equally well by a clock neutral picture of Dirac quantization (first quantize then constrain), the relational Schrödinger picture of the Page-Wootters formalism [17, 18], and the relational Heisenberg picture resulting from quantum symmetry reduction [19, 20]. A detailed exposition of these approaches and their correlation can be found in [16]. In this work, we will investigate the relational picture obtained upon deparametrization of a clock neutral theory i.e., reduced phase space quantization.

The motivation to have the discussion about observables is twofold - how the QG effects are incorporated in the observations e.g., in dressed metric approach [21–24] and how singularity resolution is addressed in the canonical approach to quantum gravity [25–27]. The dressed metric approach is extensively investigated in the context of loop quantum cosmology (LQC) models [28–33], where the quantum perturbations are propagating on the quantized background described via a dressed metric that is represented by the generalized expectation value of the metric in the quantum model. The line element of a QG corrected spacetime in this approach is assumed to be [21]

$$\widetilde{ds}^2 = - \widetilde{N}^2 dT^2 + \widetilde{a}^2 h_{ij} dx^i dx^j, \quad (1.1)$$

$$\widetilde{N} = \langle \hat{H}_o^{-\frac{1}{2}} \hat{a}^4(T) \hat{H}_o^{-\frac{1}{2}} \rangle^{\frac{3}{4}} \langle \hat{H}_o^{-1} \rangle^{\frac{1}{4}}, \quad \text{and} \quad \widetilde{a}^4 = \frac{\langle \hat{H}_o^{-\frac{1}{2}} \hat{a}^4(T) \hat{H}_o^{-\frac{1}{2}} \rangle}{\langle \hat{H}_o^{-1} \rangle}. \quad (1.2)$$

Here \hat{H}_o is the effective quantum Hamiltonian operator in LQC, and T is the matter clock. Essentially, the evolution of the scale factor is dictated by the LQC dynamics, and the equations of motion of the metric perturbations are solved with this dressed expression of the scale factor. For example, the equations of motion for scalar and tensor perturbation in dressed metric approach are [28]

$$\mathcal{Q}_k'' + 2 \frac{\widetilde{a}'}{\widetilde{a}} \mathcal{Q}_k' + (k^2 + \widetilde{U}) \mathcal{Q}_k = 0, \quad (1.3)$$

$$h_k'' + 2 \frac{\widetilde{a}'}{\widetilde{a}} h_k' + k^2 h_k = 0, \quad (1.4)$$

where \mathcal{Q}_k and h_k are the Fourier modes of scalar and tensor perturbation and \widetilde{U} is the effective potential. In the case where one is working with non-minimal coupling [34], the Ricci scalar will also appear in the equation of motion and one has to compute the Ricci scalar associated with the dressed metric in Eq. (1.1). A pertinent question to ask here is whether it is justified to use the dressed expressions for the Hubble parameter and Ricci scalar (in non-minimal setting for example) instead of the expectation value of these observables coming from the QG model. In this work, we will write phase space expressions for these observables. Since these observables are made up of the scale factor and its conjugate momentum, knowing the expectation value of the scale factor alone may not be sufficient. A comparative

analysis of the dressed metric approach together with related approaches of incorporating quantum gravity effects can be found in [35–38]. A recent criticism of these approaches can be found in [39, 40].

Further, DeWitt’s criteria is widely used as a marker for the non-existence of singularity in a quantum gravity model. It states that “*A singularity is said to be avoided if $\Psi \rightarrow 0$ in the vicinity of the classical singularity*” [25]. DeWitt’s criteria has been applied for various systems to check for singularity resolution, e.g., [27, 41–54]. There also exists criteria of singularity avoidance based on the vanishing of Klein-Gordon like current associated with Wheeler-DeWitt equation in the vicinity of the singularity and the spreading of the wave packet near singularity [44, 55]. Studying the spectrum or the expectation value of configuration variables of the model e.g., scale factor or volume operator, is another way to infer the singularity structure in a quantum model [56–63]. In general relativity, however, a singular configuration is characterized by the divergence of the curvature invariants and metric variable may indicate the presence of coordinate singularity only. One would therefore expect that the prediction of singularity resolution in these models is robust if the Hermitian operators associated with the curvature invariants have finite expectation values at the singular configurations. Since such operators contain both canonically conjugate operators, the expectation value of only one operator is not guaranteed to capture all the quantum gravity effects. An extensive account of the various singularity resolution criteria used in the context of quantum cosmology can be found in [64].

In the context of the analysis presented in this work, we will follow Kuchař’s proposal of perennials and observables [65–67]. The main idea is to distinguish between conventional gauge systems and parameterized systems. In the case of general relativity, Kuchař proposed that the functions which commute with both diffeomorphism and Hamiltonian constraints are termed as perennials and those that commute only with diffeomorphism constraint as observables. The mainstream point of view is that one can observe only perennials, which is contested in Kuchař’s proposal. In the context of a reduced phase space system, we will relax the weakly vanishing of the Poisson bracket of observables with the Hamiltonian constraint.

The problem of time in this work is dealt by working with Brown-Kuchař dust [68] and Schutz fluid [69] as matter, and the fluid degree of freedom provides the notion of clock in the system. These models are phenomenologically constructed, such that the momentum conjugate to the fluid variable appears linearly in the Hamiltonian constraint. Classically, the fluid variable is linearly related to the comoving time in the appropriate gauge. The Wheeler-DeWitt equation takes the form of Schrödinger equation with dust variable as the Schrödinger time [70]. In the quantum picture, unitarity is demanded with respect to the fluid clock. Dynamics in the quantum model tell us about the behavior of gravitational degrees of freedom with respect to the matter degree of freedom, thereby implementing the relational notion of observables.

After quantization, one would ideally like to obtain the self-adjoint extension of all the relevant observables appearing in theory and study their spectral properties. In the context of infinite dimensional Hilbert space, the self-adjoint operator is a Hermitian operator with the added condition that the domain of the adjoint of the operator is equal to the domain of the operator [71–73]. The blueprint that we will follow in this work is to write the self-adjoint extension for the Hamiltonian operator to ensure unitary evolution in the model and construct wave packets from the eigenfunctions of the Hamiltonian operator. We will primarily concern ourselves with the Hermitian extension of the other operators, whose behavior we are interested in. The Hermiticity condition suffices in this case because it ensures that the expectation values are real.

In this work, we aim to address three questions: (I) Writing the phase space functions corresponding to the observables that depict singularity in the classical model, and studying their behavior in the quantum model, thereby checking the robustness of DeWitt’s criteria. (II) The status of operator ordering ambiguity in this quantum model. (III) The domain of validity of the dressed metric approach, where the QG signatures are investigated by replacing the scale factor expectation in the classical expressions. These questions are addressed in the context of a minisuperspace model of gravity in which the system has finite number of degrees of freedom. Although there are conceptual issues regarding such symmetry reduction before quantization [74], yet this toy model is a perfect playground that is relatively easier to handle analytically and also captures the essence of the subtleties associated with the quantization of gravity.

We will address these issues for the case of the flat-FLRW (Friedmann-Lemaître-Robertson-Walker) model with Brown-Kuchař dust [68] and Schutz fluid [69] as matter. Following Kuchař’s prescription of observables in the QG models, we will write the quantum observables that correspond to the Hubble parameter, Ricci scalar, and other curvature invariants. We will start with the discussion on observables in generally covariant systems in Sec. II. The classical and quantum description of the FLRW model with Brown-Kuchař dust is given in Sec. III and we will discuss singularity resolution in this model. In Sec. IV, we will write Hermitian extensions of the observables of importance and address the viability of the dressed metric approach. We will extend this analysis for a perfect fluid model in Sec. V and VI and investigate whether the generic features observed in the earlier case can be seen in this case as well. Finally, we will summarize the results in Sec. VII with some remarks.

II. OBSERVABLES AND GAUGE INVARIANCE IN GENERALLY COVARIANT SYSTEMS

Physical observables in a gauge theory are supposed to be invariant under the gauge transformations [3, 4]. The canonical analysis of the general relativity establishes that the redundancy associated with the choice of coordinates does in fact have a direct correspondence with the gauge transformations in the geometrodynamical phase space [10–12]. The total Hamiltonian of the general relativity is a constraint that generates the time reparameterization and diffeomorphisms. Thus the direct implementation of Dirac’s ideas about gauge systems leads to the counterintuitive notion of frozen dynamics [13, 14].

The notion of time and observables in generally covariant systems is discussed in the context of relational dynamics. Due to time reparameterization invariance, the dynamics with respect to the coordinate time is indeed redundant and a physically meaningful change is observed relationally. Instead of observing change with respect to an absolute external time, the dynamics in a generally covariant system is observed through an internal clock. In a gauge theory, all degrees of freedom are not dynamical, and one can in principle choose any internal degree of freedom as a clock. Since one can choose the clock variable at their whim, there exist multiple choices of clocks in the model [13, 14]. The inequivalence of clock choice at quantum level as conjectured by Gotay and Demaret [42] has been investigated in recent works [61, 62], where it is shown that the quantum model with different clock choices leads to different quantum dynamics. Choosing fluid clock, a slow clock (which encounters singularity in finite time) according to the Gotay-Demaret terminology, leads to the singularity resolution. Whereas, the model with scale factor clock which is a fast clock (which reaches the singular point asymptotically) does not resolve singularity [63].

The mainstream implementation of relational dynamics is achieved through Rovelli’s proposal of partial and complete observables [75, 76]. A partial observable is a ‘physical quantity to which we can associate a measuring procedure leading to a number’, with the assumption that one can associate a measuring procedure to an arbitrary phase space function. A partial observable is a phase space function and it does not have to commute (weakly) with the constraints of the theory. A complete observable is a ‘quantity whose value can be predicted by the theory’. Therefore, a complete observable has to commute with the constraints and is in-fact the Dirac observable. Relational ideas are incorporated by considering two partial observables, an internal clock T and a phase space function f , calculating the value of f at a *time* at which T takes the value τ . The value of f at the “clock time” τ is a constant of motion for the flows generated by the Hamiltonian constraint and therefore gives a one-parameter family of complete (Dirac) observables.

This vague statement is cast succinctly in mathematical language in [77, 78]. The flow $\alpha_C^t(x)$ of a phase space point x generated by constraint C with a Hamiltonian vector field $\chi_C(f) = \{C, f\}$ satisfies

$$\frac{d}{dt}\alpha_C^t(x) = \chi_C(\alpha_C^t(x)), \quad \text{and} \quad \alpha_C^t(f)(x) = f(\alpha_C^t(x)). \quad (2.1)$$

With these definitions, for two partial observables f and T one can associate a family of complete observables $F_{[fT]}(\tau, x)$ labeled by a parameter τ defined as

$$F_{[fT]}(\tau, x) = \alpha_C^t(f)(x) \Big|_{\alpha_C^t(T)(x)=\tau}. \quad (2.2)$$

Let f, T be two phase space functions and $x \in \mathcal{M}$ be a phase space point, fulfilling the condition $\alpha_C^t(f)(x) = \alpha_C^s(f)(x) \forall s, t \in \mathbb{R}$ for which $\alpha_C^t(T)(x) = \alpha_C^s(T)(x)$, then $F_{[fT]}(\tau, x)$ is invariant under the flow generated by C .

A rather straightforward implementation of this idea can be done in the context of reduced phase space quantization, where classically the gauge is fixed and then the quantization is carried out [79, 80]. For the case analysis in this work, the matter degrees of freedom are used as clock in the model. The Hamiltonian constraint generates the redundant dynamics with respect to the comoving time. With the appropriate gauge choice, the fluid variable is linearly related to the coordinate time and one can write the relations between gravitational variables and dust variables, which are gauge invariant.

In the case of fluid models under consideration, the momentum conjugate to the dust variable T is equal to the negative of the gravitational part of the Hamiltonian constraint $P_T = -H_g$ and that generate the dynamics with respect to the dust variable. The self-adjointness of the operator corresponding to the gravitational Hamiltonian will ensure the unitary evolution in the Schrödinger time i.e., the fluid clock. The expectation values of the various gravitational observables are related to the fluid clock, thereby implementing the relational notion in the quantum model. Still, one has to address the question - which phase space functions are to be considered as observables? Here, we advocate Kuchař’s proposal of perennials and observables [65].

The key idea that the Kuchař’s proposal hinges upon is the distinction between conventional gauge systems and the parameterized systems. The main argument can be summarized as the physically observable quantities should commute with the diffeomorphism constraint and not necessarily with the Hamiltonian constraint. The phase space functions that commute with all constraints are termed perennials. Thus, the complete observables are termed perennials and partial observables as observables. We will use Kuchař’s proposal and consider these phase space

functions observables while keeping in mind that anyway, the relational picture is implemented by construction in the quantum model.

III. FLRW MODEL WITH BROWN KUČAŘ DUST

In this section, we will discuss the FLRW model coupled to the Brown-Kučař dust. We will start with the canonical description of the model and write the observables as a function of phase space variables in the subsection III A. The classical model has two disjoint solutions which represent a universe expanding from the Big Bang singularity and a universe collapsing to the Big Crunch singularity. The matter source is the pressureless dust, parameterized via Brown-Kučař formalism [68, 81]. In the subsection III B, we will quantize this model following [53] and discuss the singularity resolution in this quantum model.

A. Classical Model

Line element and Ricci scalar for a homogeneous and isotropic FLRW spacetime with constant spatial curvature k are given as

$$ds^2 = -\mathcal{N}^2(\tau)d\tau^2 + a^2(\tau) \left[\frac{dr^2}{1-kr^2} + r^2 d\Omega^2 \right], \quad (3.1)$$

$$\mathcal{R} = \frac{6}{\mathcal{N}^2} \left[-\frac{\dot{\mathcal{N}}\dot{a}}{\mathcal{N}a} + \frac{\ddot{a}}{a} + \left(\frac{\dot{a}}{a} \right)^2 \right] + \frac{6k}{a^2}, \quad (3.2)$$

where $a(\tau)$ is the scale factor and \mathcal{N} is the lapse function. We start with the Einstein-Hilbert action with the Gibbons-Hawking-York (GHY) term,

$$\mathcal{S} = \frac{1}{2\kappa} \int d^4x \sqrt{-g} \mathcal{R} - \frac{1}{2\kappa} \int_{\partial\mathcal{M}} d^3x \sqrt{h} \mathcal{K}. \quad (3.3)$$

where h is the determinant of the induced metric and \mathcal{K} is the extrinsic curvature. The GHY term is included to make the variational problem well defined, canceling the boundary terms that are coming from the terms involving double derivative in the EH action. The action for the FLRW model takes the form

$$\mathcal{S} = \frac{3V_0}{\kappa} \int d\tau \left[-\frac{a\dot{a}^2}{\mathcal{N}} + k\mathcal{N}a \right]. \quad (3.4)$$

Here we have integrated over the fiducial cell of volume V_0 for convenience, even though the integral is over the whole spacetime. After performing Legendre's transformation, we get the Hamiltonian of the system.

$$\mathcal{H} = \mathcal{N} \left[-\frac{\kappa}{6V_0} \frac{p_a^2}{2a} - ka \right]. \quad (3.5)$$

The Hamiltonian Constraint is in square bracket which generates the time reparametrization invariance transformation. We will use the Brown-Kučař dust as the matter source [68, 81], which is parameterized by a set of non-canonical scalar fields ρ , T , W_a and S^a with $a = 1, 2$ and 3 via the action

$$S_D = -\frac{1}{2} \int_{\mathcal{M}} d^4x \sqrt{-g} \rho (g^{\mu\nu} U_\mu U_\nu + 1). \quad (3.6)$$

Here $U_\mu = -\partial_\mu T + W_a \partial_\mu S^a$ is the 4-vector parameterized via the aforementioned scalar fields. The equation of motion of field ρ ensures the timelike nature of the 4-vector U_μ and the stress energy tensor corresponding to this matter action is $T_{\mu\nu} = \rho U_\mu U_\nu$. Thus, the 4-vector U_μ is interpreted as the 4-velocity of the fluid and ρ is the energy density of the fluid. The ADM decomposition of the matter action yields

$$S_D = \int d\tau d^3x (P_T \partial_0 T + P_a \partial_0 S^a - NH^D - N^i H_i^D), \quad (3.7)$$

where P_T and P_a are momentum conjugate to the fields T and S^a , while H^D and H_i^D are the Hamiltonian and diffeomorphism constraints for the Brown-Kuchař dust, given by

$$H^D = \sqrt{P_T^2 + h^{\dot{j}} H_i^D H_j^D}, \quad (3.8)$$

$$H_i^D = P_T \nabla_i T + P_a \nabla_i S^a. \quad (3.9)$$

The fields ρ and W_a are non-dynamical and are related to the phase space variables via

$$W_a = -P_T^{-1} P_a, \quad (3.10)$$

$$\rho = \frac{P_T^2}{\sqrt{h(h^{\dot{j}} H_i^D H_j^D + P_T^2)}}. \quad (3.11)$$

For the case of symmetry reduced model like FLRW model, we have $S^a \equiv 0$, $T = T(\tau)$ which implies $W_a = 0$, $\rho = \rho(\tau) = P_T/\sqrt{h}$, $H_i^D = 0$ and $H^D = P_T$. In this case, the Hamiltonian constraint for the flat-FLRW model with Brown-Kuchař dust is given by,

$$\mathcal{H} = \mathcal{N} \left(-\frac{\kappa}{6V_0} \frac{p_a^2}{2a} + V_0 P_T \right) = \mathcal{N} \mathcal{H}. \quad (3.12)$$

In the further analysis, we will choose $\kappa/6V_0 = 1$ and rescale dust variable as $V_0 P_T \rightarrow P_T$. The momentum conjugate to the dust proper time appears linearly in the Hamiltonian constraint and the quantization of this model will yield a Schrödinger-like equation with dust variable appearing as Schrödinger time. In this case, the momentum conjugate to dust variable is a perennial (complete observable) and is identified with the energy of the dust, $V_0 \rho a^3$, which is indeed a constant of motion. On the other hand, scale factor and the momentum conjugate to scale factor are not perennials. The equations of motion for this model are

$$\begin{aligned} \dot{T} &= \{T, \mathcal{H}\} = \mathcal{N}, \\ \dot{P}_T &= \{P_T, \mathcal{H}\} = 0, \\ \dot{a} &= \{a, \mathcal{H}\} = -\frac{\mathcal{N} p_a}{a}, \\ \dot{p}_a &= \{p_a, \mathcal{H}\} = -\frac{\mathcal{N} p_a^2}{2a^2}. \end{aligned} \quad (3.13)$$

In the comoving gauge with $\mathcal{N} = 1$, the dust degree of freedom is linearly related to the comoving time, $T(\tau) = \tau + C$, with C being a constant of integration. The momentum conjugate to the dust degree of freedom P_T is the constant of the motion. The first two equations give rise to, $\dot{a}^2 + 2a\ddot{a} = 0 \implies a(\tau) \propto \tau^{2/3}$, which is the standard solution of the Friedmann's equations with pressureless dust. Since the coordinate time is equal to the dust variable, the gauge invariant relation between scale factor and dust variable is $a(T) \propto T^{2/3}$. Now that we have the phase space structure for this model, we can analyze various geometric quantities of relevance by expressing them as phase space functions and study their behavior in the quantum domain.

1. Hubble Parameter

The Hubble parameter for this model in terms of the phase space variables is given by

$$\mathbb{H} = \frac{\dot{a}}{\mathcal{N}a} = -a^{-2} p_a. \quad (3.14)$$

Classically, the Hubble parameter goes as $\mathbb{H}(t) = 2/3\tau$, diverging at the singularity $\tau = 0$.

2. Ricci Scalar

The canonical expression for \dot{a} and \ddot{a} is computed by using the defining equation for the momentum conjugate to the scale factor,

$$\dot{a} = -\frac{p_a \mathcal{N}}{a}, \quad (3.15)$$

$$\begin{aligned} \ddot{a} &= -\left(\frac{\dot{p}_a \mathcal{N}}{a} + \frac{p_a \dot{\mathcal{N}}}{a} - \frac{p_a \mathcal{N}}{a^2} \dot{a} \right) \\ &= -\left(\frac{\{p_a, \mathcal{H}\} \mathcal{N}}{a} + \frac{p_a \dot{\mathcal{N}}}{a} + \frac{p_a^2 \mathcal{N}^2}{a^3} \right). \end{aligned} \quad (3.16)$$

The canonical expression of the Ricci scalar in Eq. (3.2) in this case turn out to be

$$\mathcal{R} = \frac{6}{\mathcal{N}^2} \left[-\frac{\dot{\mathcal{N}}}{\mathcal{N}a} \left(-\frac{p_a \mathcal{N}}{a} \right) - \frac{1}{a} \left(\frac{\{p_a, \mathcal{H}\} \mathcal{N}}{a} + \frac{p_a \dot{\mathcal{N}}}{a} + \frac{p_a^2 \mathcal{N}^2}{a^3} \right) + \frac{1}{a^2} \left(-\frac{p_a \mathcal{N}}{a} \right)^2 \right] = -\frac{6\{p_a, \mathcal{H}\}}{\mathcal{N}a^2}. \quad (3.17)$$

In the comoving gauge, we have $\mathcal{N} = 1$ and any other gauge choice is related to this gauge choice via

$$\mathcal{R} = -\frac{6\{p_a, \mathcal{H}\}}{a^2} + 6 \frac{\partial \mathcal{N}}{\partial a} \frac{\mathcal{H}}{a^2} \approx -\frac{6\{p_a, \mathcal{H}\}}{a^2}. \quad (3.18)$$

Thus the canonical expressions corresponding to different gauge choices are equal on the constraint surface. The on-shell expression (obtained by computing the Poisson bracket) for the Ricci scalar, therefore, is

$$\mathcal{R} = \frac{3p_a^2}{a^4}. \quad (3.19)$$

For the dust dominated universe, the Ricci scalar behaves as $\mathcal{R} = 4/3\tau^2$. Therefore, the flat-FLRW model with dust as matter has curvature singularity at $\tau = 0$, when $a \propto \tau^{2/3} \rightarrow 0$ and $\mathcal{R} \rightarrow \infty$.

3. Higher curvature invariants

Non-vanishing components of Riemann and Ricci tensor are

$$R_{0101} = R_{0202} = R_{0303} = \frac{a}{\mathcal{N}} (\dot{a}\dot{\mathcal{N}} - \mathcal{N}\ddot{a}), \quad (3.20)$$

$$R_{1212} = R_{1313} = R_{2323} = \frac{a^2 \dot{a}^2}{\mathcal{N}^2}, \quad (3.21)$$

$$R_{00} = 3 \frac{\dot{a}\dot{\mathcal{N}} - \mathcal{N}\ddot{a}}{a\mathcal{N}}, \quad R_i = \frac{aN\ddot{a} - a\dot{a}\dot{\mathcal{N}} + 2\mathcal{N}\dot{a}^2}{\mathcal{N}^3}. \quad (3.22)$$

We will term the scalar constructed out of the contraction of the Ricci tensor with itself as the Riemann scalar,

$$\text{Ri} = R_{\mu\nu} R^{\mu\nu} = 9 \frac{(\dot{a}\dot{\mathcal{N}} - \mathcal{N}\ddot{a})^2}{a^2 \mathcal{N}^6} + 3 \frac{(aN\ddot{a} - a\dot{a}\dot{\mathcal{N}} + 2\mathcal{N}\dot{a}^2)^2}{a^4 \mathcal{N}^6}. \quad (3.23)$$

Using (3.15) and (3.16) and gauge $\mathcal{N} = 1$, we arrive at

$$\text{Ri} = \frac{12}{a^4} \left(\{p_a, \mathcal{H}\}^2 + \frac{p_a^4}{a^4} + \frac{p_a^2}{a^2} \{p_a, \mathcal{H}\} \right). \quad (3.24)$$

Similarly, the canonical expression for the Kretschmann Scalar for this model is given by

$$\begin{aligned} K &= R_{\mu\nu\alpha\beta} R^{\mu\nu\alpha\beta} = 12 (R_{0101} R^{0101} + R_{1212} R_{1212}) \\ &= 12 \left(\frac{(\dot{a}\dot{\mathcal{N}} - \mathcal{N}\ddot{a})^2}{\mathcal{N}^6 a^2} + \frac{\dot{a}^4}{a^4 \mathcal{N}^4} \right) \\ &= \frac{12}{a^4} \left(\{p_a, \mathcal{H}\}^2 + \frac{2p_a^4}{a^4} + \frac{2p_a^2}{a^2} \{p_a, \mathcal{H}\} \right). \end{aligned} \quad (3.25)$$

Classically for dust as matter, Riemann and Kretschmann scalars are given by $Ri = 16/9\tau^4$, and $K = 80/27\tau^4$, again diverging at $\tau = 0$. All the phase space functions that we have considered here, do not commute with the Hamiltonian constraint and in conventional terminology are not Dirac observables. Following Kuchař's prescription, we will consider these phase space functions as observables. Moreover, these observables are a product of scale factor and its conjugate momentum and hence their quantum avatars suffer from the operator ordering ambiguity. Therefore, supplementing only the expectation value of scale factor is not guaranteed to capture the full quantum behavior of these observables, as we shall see below.

B. Quantum Model

In the quantum realization of this model, the Brown-Kuchař dust provides the notion of time and degree of freedom associated with dust is the clock variable, whose rate of change is proportional to the flow of comoving time classically. In the quantum analysis, we will use the dust clock variable and comoving time interchangeably. The Wheeler-DeWitt equation for this model then takes the form,

$$i \frac{\partial \Psi(a, \tau)}{\partial \tau} = \hat{H} \Psi(a, \tau), \quad (3.26)$$

$$\hat{H} = \frac{1}{2} a^{-1+p+q} \frac{d}{da} a^{-p} \frac{d}{da} a^{-q}. \quad (3.27)$$

This model exhibits the operator ordering ambiguity, and parameters p and q represents our freedom to choose operator ordering. This Eq. (3.26) has the form of Schrödinger equation and the stationary states for this models are

$$\phi_E^1(a) = a^{\frac{1}{2}(1+p+2q)} J_{\frac{1}{3}|1+p|} \left(\frac{2}{3} \sqrt{2E} a^{\frac{3}{2}} \right) \quad (3.28)$$

$$\phi_{-E}^1(a) = a^{\frac{1}{2}(1+p+2q)} I_{\frac{1}{3}|1+p|} \left(\frac{2}{3} \sqrt{2E} a^{\frac{3}{2}} \right)$$

$$\phi_E^2(a) = a^{\frac{1}{2}(1+p+2q)} Y_{\frac{1}{3}|1+p|} \left(\frac{2}{3} \sqrt{2E} a^{\frac{3}{2}} \right) \quad (3.29)$$

$$\phi_{-E}^2(a) = a^{\frac{1}{2}(1+p+2q)} K_{\frac{1}{3}|1+p|} \left(\frac{2}{3} \sqrt{2E} a^{\frac{3}{2}} \right)$$

$$\phi_0^1(a) = a^q \quad , \quad \phi_0^2(a) = a^{1+p+q}. \quad (3.30)$$

Here J_n , Y_n , K_n and I_n are the Bessel functions of the first and second kind. The eigenvalue of Hamiltonian can be interpreted as Misner-Sharp mass which is related on-shell to the energy density of dust¹. We choose Hilbert space $L^2(\mathbb{R}^+, a^{1-p-2q})$ that will make this Hamiltonian Hermitian,

$$\langle \psi | \chi \rangle = \int_0^\infty da a^{1-p-2q} \psi^*(a) \chi(a). \quad (3.31)$$

The self-adjoint extensions and the spectrum of the Hamiltonian operator (3.27) are discussed in [53]. Since, J_ν functions have closure relation,

$$\int_0^\infty dx x J_\nu(ax) J_\nu(bx) = \frac{\delta(a-b)}{a}, \quad \text{for } \nu > -\frac{1}{2}. \quad (3.32)$$

The positive energy stationary states ϕ_E^1 form an orthogonal set under the scalar product we have chosen, thus making them suitable for the construction of wave packet.

$$\langle \tilde{\phi}_E^1 | \tilde{\phi}_{E'}^1 \rangle = \delta(\sqrt{E} - \sqrt{E'}), \quad \text{where } \tilde{\phi}_E^1 = \frac{2}{\sqrt{3}} E^{\frac{1}{4}} \phi_E^1. \quad (3.33)$$

¹ Misner-Sharp mass for a spherically symmetric system $ds^2 = g_{ab}(z) dz^a dz^b + R^2(z) d\Omega^2$ is $M_{MS} = R(z) (1 - g^{ab} \partial_a R(z) \partial_b R(z)) / 2G$. For the case of FLRW mode, Misner-Sharp mass $M_{MS} = a \dot{a}^2 r^3 / 2G = (4\pi r^3 / 3) \rho a^3 = V_0 a^3 \rho$, is related to the mass of dust in the fiducial cell of volume V_0 , which is a constant of motion. The gravitational Hamiltonian is given by $H = -(3V_0 / 8\pi G) \dot{a} \dot{a}^2 = -V_0 \rho a^3 = -M_{MS}$, therefore Hamiltonian represents the energy associated with dust.

For the case of these positive energy modes, the behavior of probability amplitude near singularity $a = 0$ is

$$a^{(1-p-2q)}|\tilde{\phi}_E^1|^2 \sim a^{2+|1+a|} \rightarrow 0. \quad (3.34)$$

Following DeWitt's criteria, the singularity is considered to be avoided for the positive energy states and the wave packets constructed from it. The discussion on the singularity resolution for other stationary states can be found in [53]. From the positive energy modes, a unitarily evolving wave packet is constructed by choosing a normalized Poisson-like distribution

$$\psi(a, \tau) = \int_0^\infty d\sqrt{E} \tilde{\phi}_E(a) e^{\mathbf{E}\tau} A(\sqrt{E}), \quad (3.35)$$

$$A(\sqrt{E}) = \frac{\sqrt{2}\lambda^{\frac{1}{2}(\kappa+1)}}{\sqrt{\Gamma(\kappa+1)}} \sqrt{E}^{\kappa+\frac{1}{2}} e^{-\frac{\lambda}{2}E}, \quad (3.36)$$

where $\kappa \geq 0$ and $\lambda > 0$ are real parameters with κ being dimensionless and λ has dimensions of length or inverse of energy. For the choice of distribution, expectation value of Hamiltonian is inversely proportional to λ .

$$\bar{E} = \int_0^\infty d\sqrt{E} A(\sqrt{E})^2 E = \frac{\kappa+1}{\lambda}, \quad (3.37)$$

$$\Delta E = \sqrt{\int_0^\infty d\sqrt{E} A(\sqrt{E})^2 E^2 - \left(\int_0^\infty d\sqrt{E} A(\sqrt{E})^2 E\right)^2} = \frac{\sqrt{\kappa+1}}{\lambda}. \quad (3.38)$$

With this choice of the distribution, the wave packet takes the form,

$$\begin{aligned} \psi(R, \tau) = \sqrt{3} \left(\frac{\sqrt{2}}{3}\right)^{\frac{1}{3}|1+p|+1} & \frac{\Gamma\left(\frac{1}{6}|1+p| + \frac{\kappa}{2} + 1\right)}{\sqrt{\Gamma(\kappa+1)}\Gamma\left(\frac{1}{3}|1+p| + 1\right)} \frac{\lambda^{\frac{1}{2}(\kappa+1)}}{\left(\frac{\lambda}{2} - i\tau\right)^{\frac{1}{6}|1+p| + \frac{\kappa}{2} + 1}} a^{\frac{1}{2}(1+p+|1+p|+2q)} \\ & {}_1F_1\left(\frac{1}{6}|1+p| + \frac{\kappa}{2} + 1; \frac{1}{3}|1+p| + 1; -\frac{2a^3}{9\left(\frac{\lambda}{2} - i\tau\right)}\right). \end{aligned} \quad (3.39)$$

To simplify the expression, one can take $\kappa = |1+p|/3$ [53] with which the expression for the wave packet reduces to the form,

$$\psi(a, \tau) = \sqrt{3} \frac{a^{\frac{1}{2}(1+p+|1+p|+2q)}}{\sqrt{\Gamma\left(\frac{1}{3}|1+p| + 1\right)}} \left(\frac{\sqrt{2}\lambda}{3}\right)^{\frac{1}{3}|1+p|+1} e^{-\frac{2a^3}{9\left(\frac{\lambda}{2} - i\tau\right)}}. \quad (3.40)$$

This simplification comes at a cost, the energy distribution in this case depends on the operator ordering parameter, which may become a point of reflection in the analysis later. This model avoids singularity according to DeWitt's criteria following [53] and represents a bouncing universe that tunnels from the collapsing branch to the expanding branch.

IV. OBSERVABLES IN THE MODEL WITH BROWN-KUCHAŘ DUST

As discussed in Section II, we will not demand the observables to commute with the Hamiltonian constraint and will incorporate Brown-Kuchař model for dust as matter, where the dust proper time appears naturally in the quantum picture, thereby sidestepping the issue of frozen dynamics in QG models.

In the quantum domain, we will be using the Hermitian extension of the observables as it ensure the reality of expectation values appearing in the model. Since, this work does not involve studying spectral properties of the operators corresponding to various phase space observables, we will adopt the viewpoint that the Hermiticity is a sufficient requirement for an operator to be a quantum observable. In this section, we will write Hermitian extension of the phase space functions that are of particular importance in classical theory, and compute the expectation values of these operators in the wave packet constructed in the previous section.

The focus of this analysis is around the operator ordering ambiguity in the various observables and in the last subsection IV D we will address the case when the constraint on ordering parameter $\kappa = |1+p|/3$ is relaxed. There are several physical prescriptions on choosing the ordering of Hamiltonian like covariance of superspace leading to

Laplace-Beltrami ordering [25] or ordering used by Vilenkin [82]. For the case of observables, no such determination can be made a priori. The best one can hope is to do a comparative analysis of different ordering schemes and check where the ambiguity plays the role and look out for any unphysical inconsistencies.

It is shown in [83] that the parameter q appears as a free parameter in the theory and we can work with the Hilbert space $L^2(\mathbb{R}^+, a^2 da)$ following the quantization on half-line, which leads to the constraint on ordering parameters $p + 2q + 1 = 0$. The momentum operator Hermitian with this choice is $\hat{p}_a = -ia^{-1}\partial_a a$ and more discussion on the Hermiticity and self-adjointness of momentum operator on half-line can be found in [83] and references therein. With this choice, the Hamiltonian operator and the wave packet (3.40) takes the form

$$\hat{H} = -\frac{1}{2}\hat{a}^{-q-1}\hat{p}_a\hat{a}^{2q+1}\hat{p}_a\hat{a}^{-q-1}, \quad (4.1)$$

$$\psi(a, \tau) = \sqrt{3} \frac{a^{|q|}}{\sqrt{\Gamma(\frac{2|q|}{3} + 1)}} \left(\frac{\sqrt{2\lambda}}{3} \right)^{\frac{2|q|}{3} + 1} e^{-\frac{2a^3}{9(\frac{\lambda}{2} - i\tau)}}. \quad (4.2)$$

Now, the idea is to write the Hermitian extension of the phase space functions corresponding to the geometric quantities that characterize a classical FLRW universe, such as the Hubble parameter, the Ricci scalar and higher curvature invariants derived in subsection III A and analyze their quantum behavior for the semiclassical² wave packet in the Eq. (4.2). For instance, the expectation value of the scale factor for the wave packet in (4.2) is,

$$\bar{a}(\tau) = \int_0^\infty da a^2 \psi^* a \psi = \left(\frac{9(\lambda^2 + 4\tau^2)}{8\lambda} \right)^{\frac{1}{3}} \frac{\Gamma\left(\frac{2|q|}{3} + \frac{4}{3}\right)}{\Gamma\left(\frac{2|q|}{3} + 1\right)} \quad (4.3)$$

From Eq. (4.3) we see that for large $|\tau|$, i.e. $\tau^2 \gg \lambda^2$, the scale factor follows the classical trajectory $a(\tau) \propto \tau^{2/3}$ for the dust dominated universe, but for small $|\tau|$ the behavior differs. This model represents a bouncing universe where the scale factor has a global minimum at the classical singularity $\tau = 0$. In this work, we will compute the expectation value of the various observables and compare them with the “semi-classical” (dressed) expression computed directly from the expectation value of the scale factor. This will be relevant for the dressed-metric approach [21–24], where the quantum corrections to observationally relevant objects like e.g. power spectrum are computed by substituting the quantum expectations of scale factor in the evolution equations of perturbations e.g., Mukhanov-Sasaki equation [84, 85].

The interesting thing to note here is that the q -dependence of the expectation value of the scale factor is of the form $\bar{a}(\tau, \lambda, q) = f(\tau, \lambda)g(q)$. Since all the observables in dust dominated case depend on scale factor via the terms of the form \dot{a}/a or \ddot{a}/a , therefore the semi-classical expressions corresponding to these observables will be independent of the parameter q . On a side note, as the energy distribution itself depends on the ordering parameter, the q dependence of any observable in this choice is a combined effect of its dependence on the shape of energy distribution and the ordering of the Hamiltonian.

A. Hubble Parameter

The semi-classical expression of the Hubble parameter in Eq. (3.14), computed from the expectation value of scale factor (4.3) is given by,

$$\mathbb{H}(\bar{a}) = \frac{\dot{\bar{a}}}{\bar{a}} = \frac{8\tau}{3(\lambda^2 + 4\tau^2)}. \quad (4.4)$$

In order to compare the quantum expectation w.r.t. the semi-classical expression, we will write symmetric operator orderings for the Hubble parameter. As the phase space expression of Hubble parameter is a product of scale factor and its conjugate momentum, its quantum counterpart exhibits the operator ordering ambiguity. Here we will introduce two ordering schemes that we will follow throughout this work, first the trivial symmetric ordering as ordering 1 and a Weyl-like symmetric ordering as ordering 2.

$$F.O.1 \rightarrow \hat{\mathbb{H}}_1 = -a^{-1}\hat{p}_a a^{-1}, \quad (4.5)$$

$$F.O.2 \rightarrow \hat{\mathbb{H}}_2 = -\frac{1}{2} (a^{n-2}\hat{p}_a a^{-n} + a^{-n}\hat{p}_a a^{n-2}). \quad (4.6)$$

² The wave packet is being referred to a semiclassical state as it is peaked along the classical trajectory.

It is a well known result that for functions linear in either position or momentum i.e. of the form xp^n or $x^n p$, the different ordering prescriptions give rise to the same differential operator [86, 87]. This can be shown explicitly in this case,

$$\hat{\mathbb{H}}_1 \psi = \hat{\mathbb{H}}_2 \psi = i a^{-2} \frac{\partial \psi}{\partial a} = \hat{\mathbb{H}} \psi. \quad (4.7)$$

These operators are Hermitian, provided the boundary term $\psi^* \chi|_0^\infty$ vanishes, which is the case for the set of wave packets (4.2), provided $q \neq 0$. The expectation value of Hubble parameter for the wave packet (4.2) is,

$$\overline{\mathbb{H}}(\tau) = \langle \psi | \hat{\mathbb{H}} | \psi \rangle = i \int_0^\infty \psi^*(a, \tau) \frac{\partial \psi(a, \tau)}{\partial a} da = \frac{8\tau}{3(\lambda^2 + 4\tau^2)}. \quad (4.8)$$

Interestingly, the expectation value of the Hubble parameter matches the semi-classical expression in (4.4). Therefore in this case, the dressed approach is well-justified as dressed expression completely capture the quantum gravity effects. Another thing to notice is that the expectation value is independent of the parameter q , which is the ordering parameter of the Hamiltonian and parameter that describe the shape of the energy distribution. In the large $|\tau|$ limit, i.e. $\tau^2 \gg \lambda^2$, we recover the classical expression of the Hubble parameter

$$\overline{\mathbb{H}}(\tau)|_{\tau^2 \gg \lambda^2} = \frac{2}{3\tau}. \quad (4.9)$$

The expectation value of Hubble parameter is plotted in Fig. 1.




FIG. 1: Expectation value of the Hubble Parameter for different λ values. The blue curve represents the expectation value of Hubble parameter and orange curve is classical Hubble parameter, whereas the shaded region represents the regime where the quantum effects dominates.

The Hubble parameter $\overline{\mathbb{H}}(\tau)$ has a global maximum at $\tau = \lambda/2$ and a global minimum at $\tau = -\lambda/2$. At the point of classical singularity, Hubble parameter vanishes and the quantum effects regularize the divergent classical Hubble parameter, thereby representing the bouncing universe. Early on in the collapsing branch, the Hubble parameter is decreasing and follows the classical behavior. As the system approaches $\tau = -\lambda/2$, the quantum effects kick in and it deviates from the classical trajectory with the Hubble parameter acquiring a minimum at $\tau = -\lambda/2$. Thereon, the Hubble parameter starts increasing, vanishes at $\tau = 0$ and just before $\tau = \lambda/2$ it again turns around and acquire a maximum at $\tau = \lambda/2$ then starts decreasing and follow the classical behavior for late time in the expanding branch. The differential operators corresponding to the square of the Hubble parameter operator is again same for both ordering choices in (4.6).

$$\hat{\mathbb{H}}_1^2 \psi = a^{-1} \hat{p}_a a^{-2} \hat{p}_a a^{-1} \psi = -a^{-2} \partial_a (a^{-2} \partial_a \psi), \quad (4.10)$$

$$\begin{aligned} \hat{\mathbb{H}}_2^2 \psi &= \frac{1}{4} (a^{n-2} \hat{p}_a a^{-2} \hat{p}_a a^{-n} + a^{-n} \hat{p}_a a^{-2} \hat{p}_a a^{n-2} + a^{n-2} \hat{p}_a a^{-2n} \hat{p}_a a^{n-2} + a^{-n} \hat{p}_a a^{2n-4} \hat{p}_a a^{-n}) \psi \\ &= -a^{-2} \partial_a (a^{-2} \partial_a \psi). \end{aligned} \quad (4.11)$$

However, this analysis can be generalized by writing the symmetric orderings corresponding to the phase space function that represent the square of Hubble parameter $p_a^2 a^{-4}$,

$$\widehat{\mathbb{H}}_1^2 = a^{-j} \hat{p}_a a^{2j-4} \hat{p}_a a^{-j} = -a^{-j-1} \frac{\partial}{\partial a} a^{2j-4} \frac{\partial}{\partial a} a^{-j+1}, \quad (4.12)$$

$$\begin{aligned} \widehat{\mathbb{H}}_2^2 &= \frac{1}{2} (a^{-j} \hat{p}_a a^{-k} \hat{p}_a a^{j+k-4} + a^{j+k-4} \hat{p}_a a^{-k} \hat{p}_a a^{-j}) \\ &= -\frac{1}{2} \left(a^{-j-1} \frac{\partial}{\partial a} a^{-k} \frac{\partial}{\partial a} a^{j+k-3} + a^{j+k-5} \frac{\partial}{\partial a} a^{-k} \frac{\partial}{\partial a} a^{-j+1} \right). \end{aligned} \quad (4.13)$$

Here parameters j and k encapsulate the operator ordering ambiguity in the square of Hubble parameter. The choice $j = 1$ in the case of the first ordering gives the square of Hubble parameter operator in (4.6). Here the Hermiticity of these operators require the boundary term to vanish

$$\left[a^{-2} \left(\psi^* \frac{\partial \chi}{\partial a} - \frac{\partial \psi^*}{\partial a} \chi \right) \right]_0^\infty \rightarrow 0, \quad (4.14)$$

which holds in the case when $|q| > 3/2$ for wave packet under consideration in (4.2). The expectation value of the square of Hubble parameter for such states is

$$\overline{\mathbb{H}}_1^2 = \langle \psi | \widehat{\mathbb{H}}_1^2 | \psi \rangle = \overline{\mathbb{H}}^2 \left(1 + \frac{3|q| + 2(j-4)(j-1) \lambda^2}{36|q|(2|q|-3)} \frac{\lambda^2}{\tau^2} \right), \quad (4.15)$$

$$\overline{\mathbb{H}}_2^2 = \langle \psi | \widehat{\mathbb{H}}_2^2 | \psi \rangle = \overline{\mathbb{H}}^2 \left(1 + \frac{3|q| - 2j(j+k-4) + 5k - 12 \lambda^2}{36|q|(2|q|-3)} \frac{\lambda^2}{\tau^2} \right). \quad (4.16)$$

For the second ordering, we see the square of Hubble parameter acquires negative values³ for small $|q|$ which we will later see is the theme for this class of orderings.




FIG. 2: Expectation value of the square of Hubble parameter for the case of $j = 1$ is plotted along with the square of expectation value of Hubble parameter.

In the large q limit, the expectation value of the square of the Hubble parameter follows closely the square of the expectation value of Hubble parameter (which is the semi-classical expression for the square of Hubble parameter), as is seen in Fig. 2. For small q , the function has a global maximum at the classical singularity whereas for large q , the function has local minimum at classical singularity and global maximum at $\tau \approx \pm \lambda/2$. The key finding of this subsection is that the expectation value of the Hubble parameter matches with its semi-classical expression. The analysis of the square of the Hubble parameter hints that in the large q regime, the ordering of the square of Hubble parameter is irrelevant and the expectation value of the square of Hubble parameter correlates well with its dressed/semi-classical counterpart.

³ On the face of it, this result is troubling, the expectation value of the square of a Hermitian operator \hat{O} is always positive as $\langle \psi | \hat{O}^2 | \psi \rangle = \sum_n \langle \psi | \hat{O} | n \rangle \langle n | \hat{O} | \psi \rangle = \sum_n |\langle \psi | \hat{O} | n \rangle|^2 > 0$. But notably, this is the case of Weyl-like ordered operator which is not the square of a Hermitian operator, and therefore the negative expectation value do not raise any logical fallacy in the quantum model.

B. Ricci Scalar

In the study of Friedmann universes, Ricci scalar is one of the most prominent geometric quantity that appears in the dynamical equation for the non-minimal coupling case [34]. First, we compute Ricci scalar from the expectation value of scale factor given in (4.3), i.e., the semi-classical expression of Ricci scalar

$$\mathcal{R}(\bar{a}) = 6 \left[\frac{\ddot{\bar{a}}}{\bar{a}} + \left(\frac{\dot{\bar{a}}}{\bar{a}} \right)^2 \right] = \frac{16(3\lambda^2 + 4\tau^2)}{3(\lambda^2 + 4\tau^2)^2}. \quad (4.17)$$

This semi-classical expression for Ricci scalar represents the regularized function with a maximum at origin and follows the classical behavior $\mathcal{R}(\tau) \rightarrow 4/3\tau^2$ in the large τ regime. Near bounce, the quantum effects in this approach are accounted for via the parameter λ which is inversely proportional to the mean energy (3.37).

We are interested in writing the Hermitian extension of Ricci scalar in the Hilbert space under consideration. Since Ricci scalar is product of the phase space variables and exhibits operator ordering ambiguity, we will write general operator orderings that will make the operator that corresponds to the phase space function given in Eq. (3.17) Hermitian with the given measure following the symmetrization schemes as in Eqs. (4.5) and (4.6)

$$\widehat{\mathcal{R}}_1 = 6i \hat{a}^{-1} [\hat{p}_a, \hat{H}] \hat{a}^{-1}, \quad (4.18)$$

$$\widehat{\mathcal{R}}_2 = 3i \left(\hat{a}^{-n-2} [\hat{p}_a, \hat{H}] \hat{a}^n + \hat{a}^n [\hat{p}_a, \hat{H}] \hat{a}^{-n-2} \right). \quad (4.19)$$

Here the parameter n encapsulate the freedom we have to choose the operator ordering. The commutator between momentum operator and Hamiltonian operator (4.1) takes the form,

$$\begin{aligned} [\hat{p}_a, \hat{H}] &= -\frac{1}{2} [\hat{p}_a, \hat{a}^{-q-1} \hat{p}_a \hat{a}^{2q+1} \hat{p}_a \hat{a}^{-q-1}] \\ &= \frac{i}{2} \left(-(q+1) \hat{a}^{-q-2} \hat{p}_a \hat{a}^{2q+1} \hat{p}_a \hat{a}^{-q-1} + \hat{a}^{-q-1} \hat{p}_a \hat{a}^{2q+1} \hat{p}_a \hat{a}^{-q-2} \right) + (2q+1) \hat{a}^{-q-1} \hat{p}_a \hat{a}^{2q} \hat{p}_a \hat{a}^{-q-1}. \end{aligned} \quad (4.20)$$

The differential operators corresponding to the Ricci scalar operator for the two orderings come out to be,

$$\widehat{\mathcal{R}}_1 = 3a^{-6} (3(q^2 - 1) + 2a\partial_a - a^2\partial_a^2), \quad (4.21)$$

$$\widehat{\mathcal{R}}_2 = 3a^{-6} ((3q^2 - n(n+2) - 4) + 2a\partial_a - a^2\partial_a^2). \quad (4.22)$$

These operators are Hermitian provided the states satisfy the boundary condition

$$-3 \left[a^{-2} \left(\psi^* \frac{\partial \chi}{\partial a} - \frac{\partial \psi^*}{\partial a} \chi \right) \right]_0^\infty \rightarrow 0, \quad (4.23)$$

which is the case for the wave packet in consideration, provided $|q| > 3/2$. Thus, the expectation value of Ricci scalar operator with first ordering in the wave packet (4.2) is

$$\overline{\mathcal{R}}_1(\tau) = \frac{16(3\lambda^2(|q|(1+2|q|) - 2) + 4|q|(2|q| - 3)\tau^2)}{3|q|(2|q| - 3)(\lambda^2 + 4\tau^2)^2}. \quad (4.24)$$

For the second ordering choice of Ricci scalar, the expectation value is

$$\overline{\mathcal{R}}_2(\tau) = \frac{16(\lambda^2(-2n(n+2) + 3|q|(2|q| + 1) - 8) + 4(2|q| - 3)|q|\tau^2)}{3|q|(2|q| - 3)(\lambda^2 + 4\tau^2)^2}. \quad (4.25)$$

We see, the expectation value for both cases is a well behaved regular function in the domain of parameters that ensures the Hermiticity. The Hermiticity of the operator and regularity of the expectation value do not have any direct correlation and the Hermiticity constraint appears as *deus ex machina* that save the model from possible divergences. In appendix A and B, we have derived the conditions for Hermiticity of Ricci scalar operator and regularity of its expectation values among others and shown that the domain of applicability matches.

In this case as well, early in collapsing regime or late in the expanding regime i.e. $\tau^2 \gg \lambda^2$, we recover the classical expression for Ricci scalar irrespective of operator ordering choosen,

$$\overline{\mathcal{R}}_{1,2}(\tau) \Big|_{\tau^2 \gg \lambda^2} = \frac{4}{3\tau^2}. \quad (4.26)$$

Therefore, this quantum gravity analysis predicts a regularized Ricci scalar, which follows the classical behavior far away from the region of classical singularity, where the quantum gravity effects are expected to be prominent. The expressions for various ordering merge to that of semiclassical one for $q \rightarrow \infty$.

$$\overline{\mathcal{R}}_{1,2}(\tau) \Big|_{q \rightarrow \infty} = \frac{16(3\lambda^2 + 4\tau^2)}{3(\lambda^2 + 4\tau^2)^2} = \mathcal{R}(\bar{a}). \quad (4.27)$$

Thus, we see that semi-classical expression is a limiting case and the quantum expectation in general is different for finite q . At the location of classical singularity, the expectation value is always positive for the first ordering in the allowed q -range. The operator with Weyl-like ordering can have negative expectation value (which is classically forbidden) that depends on the value of the parameters n and q . Moreover, the expectation value always have a maximum at classical singularity for first ordering while for Weyl-like ordering, the expectation value can have minimum as well as maximum depending again on the parameters n and q .




FIG. 3: Expectation value of Ricci scalar for both orderings (4.18) and (4.19). The first snap in the first row has expectation value of Ricci scalar with first ordering choice for different values of parameter q . The next two snaps contains the expectation value of Ricci scalar for second choice of ordering for fixed value of q and different values of n . The second row contains the expectation value of Ricci scalar ordered according to the second scheme for different value of q .

We have plotted the expectation value of Ricci scalar for the two orderings in Fig. 3. In the case of the operator ordered with first scheme, the expectation value has a global maximum at the classical singularity for allowed parameter values and it matches the semi-classical expression for large q . However, the case of operator with second ordering choice is more interesting, the function can have a maximum or a minimum at the classical singularity and can also attain negative values as well. The trend observed is, for fixed q and $|n| \gg |q|$ the Ricci scalar has a minimum with negative amplitude at the singularity and it increases as $|\tau|$ increases. At finite time, the Ricci scalar becomes positive, attains a maximum and then starts decreasing and matches the classical behavior. There exists a window where $O(n) \approx O(q)$, where the crossover happens, from the profile of Ricci scalar with a global minimum at origin to the profile with a global maximum at origin. This is illustrated in the last two plots in the first row of Fig. 3. For the case when $|q| \gg |n|$, expectation value for all the operator orderings merge to the same profile, i.e., the semi-classical expression. The standard deviation of the Ricci scalar $\delta\mathcal{R}^2 = \overline{\mathcal{R}^2} - \overline{\mathcal{R}}^2$ for the two operator orderings is given by

$$\delta\mathcal{R}_1^2 = \frac{1024\lambda^2 (4(|q| - 3)|q|^2(2|q| - 9)(2|q| - 3)\tau^2 + 3\lambda^2(|q|(|q|(|q|(4|q|(3|q| - 8) - 27) + 60) + 12) - 27))}{3(2|q| - 3)^2(|q| - 3)|q|^2(2|q| - 9)(\lambda^2 + 4\tau^2)^4}, \quad (4.28)$$

$$\delta\mathcal{R}_2^2 = \frac{1024\lambda^2}{3(3 - 2|q|)^2(|q| - 3)|q|^2(2|q| - 9)(\lambda^2 + 4\tau^2)^4} \left(\lambda^2 \left(-3(8n(n+2) + 35)|q|^3 + 60(n(n+2) + 4)|q|^2 + 4(n(n+2) + 4)^2|q| - 9(n(n+2) + 4)^2 + 36|q|^5 - 96|q|^4 \right) + 4(|q| - 3)|q|^2(2|q| - 9)(2|q| - 3)\tau^2 \right). \quad (4.29)$$




FIG. 4: In the first row, we have fractional change in the expectation value of different operator orderings of Ricci scalar as compared to the semi-classical expression for the Ricci scalar. In the second row, we have plotted the relative standard deviation in the Ricci scalar.

In the first row of Fig. 4, we have plotted the fractional change in the expectation value of Ricci scalar as compared to the Ricci scalar computed from the expectation value of scale factor for both ordering choices. As we keep on increasing the parameter q , the fractional change keeps on decreasing, as expected. In the second row of Fig. 4, we have plotted the relative standard deviation in the Ricci scalar as a function of time for both orderings. Here as well, we notice that the quantum fluctuations are small for large q parameter. Moreover, the relative standard deviation in Ricci scalar overshoots the fractional change in expectation value of Ricci scalar at all times, for both orderings. This means that for large q , we can trust the semi-classical expressions even near the classical singularity where the quantum effects dominate. We see even for small q , the fractional change in the expectation in Ricci scalar as compared to its semi-classical counterpart does not exceed 35% and it decreases as q increases. Therefore, the dressed metric approach does not receive significant corrections for the case of non-minimally coupled scalar field.

C. Riemann and Kretschmann Scalar

In the same spirit, we can study the behavior of the other curvature invariants in the quantum model. The expression for Riemann and Kretschmann scalar computed from the expectation value of scale factor (4.3) is

$$\text{Ri}(\bar{a}) = 9\frac{\ddot{\bar{a}}^2}{\bar{a}^2} + 3\frac{(\bar{a}\ddot{\bar{a}} + 2\dot{\bar{a}}^2)^2}{\bar{a}^4} = \frac{256(3\lambda^4 + 16\tau^4)}{9(\lambda^2 + 4\tau^2)^4}, \quad (4.30)$$

$$\text{K}(\bar{a}) = 12\left(\frac{\ddot{\bar{a}}^2}{\bar{a}^2} + \frac{\dot{\bar{a}}^4}{\bar{a}^4}\right) = \frac{256(9\lambda^4 - 24\lambda^2\tau^2 + 80\tau^4)}{27(\lambda^2 + 4\tau^2)^4}. \quad (4.31)$$

The semi-classical expressions for both curvature invariants are regularized functions with a maximum at singularity and follow the classical behavior $\text{Ri} \rightarrow 16/9\tau^4$ and $\text{K} \rightarrow 80/27\tau^4$ in the large $|\tau|$ regime. The phase space expressions for the Riemann and Kretschmann Scalar are given in equations (3.24) and (3.25). There are three distinct terms appearing in both expressions, involving the powers of scale factor, momentum and the Poisson bracket of momentum and Hamiltonian. In principle, there exist infinitely many options for symmetric ordering of these terms, but in this analysis we will do comparative analysis and write two set of symmetrized orderings, following the first ordering prescription.

Classical expression	Ordering 1	Ordering 2
$\{p_a, \text{H}\}^2 a^{-4}$	$-\hat{a}^{-2}[\hat{p}_a, \hat{\text{H}}][\hat{p}_a, \hat{\text{H}}]\hat{a}^{-2}$	$-\hat{p}_a, \hat{\text{H}}\hat{a}^{-4}[\hat{p}_a, \hat{\text{H}}]$
$a^{-8} p_a^4$	$\hat{a}^{-4} \hat{p}_a^4 \hat{a}^{-4}$	$\hat{p}_a^2 \hat{a}^{-8} \hat{p}_a^2$
$a^{-6} p_a^2 \{p_a, \text{H}\}$	$-i\hat{a}^{-3} \hat{p}_a [\hat{p}_a, \hat{\text{H}}] \hat{p}_a a^{-3}$	$-i\hat{p}_a \hat{a}^{-3} [\hat{p}_a, \hat{\text{H}}] a^{-3} \hat{p}_a$

TABLE I: Three terms that the Riemann and Kretschmann scalar are comprised of and the symmetric orderings corresponding to each term.

In one set, the powers of scale factor operator will be the leftmost and rightmost while other operators are sandwiched in-between. Whereas in the other set, the powers of momentum operator is placed on the leftmost and rightmost with other operators sandwiched and in one term that is devoid of the bare momentum operator, the commutator operators is placed on the leftmost and rightmost, as shown in the Table I. With these choice of orderings, the operators corresponding to the Riemann and Kretschmann scalar are

$$\begin{aligned} \hat{\text{Ri}}_1 &= 12 \left(-\hat{a}^{-2}[\hat{p}_a, \hat{\text{H}}][\hat{p}_a, \hat{\text{H}}]\hat{a}^{-2} + \hat{a}^{-4}\hat{p}_a^4\hat{a}^{-4} - i\hat{a}^{-3}\hat{p}_a[\hat{p}_a, \hat{\text{H}}]\hat{p}_a a^{-3} \right), \\ \hat{\text{K}}_1 &= 12 \left(-\hat{a}^{-2}[\hat{p}_a, \hat{\text{H}}][\hat{p}_a, \hat{\text{H}}]\hat{a}^{-2} + 2\hat{a}^{-4}\hat{p}_a^4\hat{a}^{-4} - 2i\hat{a}^{-3}\hat{p}_a[\hat{p}_a, \hat{\text{H}}]\hat{p}_a a^{-3} \right), \\ \hat{\text{Ri}}_2 &= 12 \left(-[\hat{p}_a, \hat{\text{H}}]\hat{a}^{-4}[\hat{p}_a, \hat{\text{H}}] + \hat{p}_a^2\hat{a}^{-8}\hat{p}_a^2 - i\hat{p}_a\hat{a}^{-3}[\hat{p}_a, \hat{\text{H}}]a^{-3}\hat{p}_a \right), \\ \hat{\text{K}}_2 &= 12 \left(-[\hat{p}_a, \hat{\text{H}}]\hat{a}^{-4}[\hat{p}_a, \hat{\text{H}}] + 2\hat{p}_a^2\hat{a}^{-8}\hat{p}_a^2 - 2i\hat{p}_a\hat{a}^{-3}[\hat{p}_a, \hat{\text{H}}]a^{-3}\hat{p}_a \right). \end{aligned} \quad (4.32)$$

Using the expression of the commutator of momentum operator and Hamiltonian operator in Eq. (4.20), the differential operators corresponding to these orderings take the form

$$\begin{aligned} \hat{\text{Ri}}_1 &= 3a^{-12} \left((9|q|^4 - 66|q|^2 + 1153) - 736a\partial_a + 218a^2\partial_a^2 - 36a^3\partial_a^3 + 3a^4\partial_a^4 \right), \\ \hat{\text{Ri}}_2 &= 3a^{-12} \left((9|q|^4 - 282|q|^2 + 493) + 608a\partial_a + 50a^2\partial_a^2 - 36a^3\partial_a^3 + 3a^4\partial_a^4 \right), \\ \hat{\text{K}}_1 &= 3a^{-12} \left((9|q|^4 + 18|q|^2 + 2005) - 16(3|q|^2 + 79)a\partial_a + (6|q|^2 + 368)a^2\partial_a^2 - 60a^3\partial_a^3 + 5a^4\partial_a^4 \right), \\ \hat{\text{K}}_2 &= 3a^{-12} \left((9|q|^4 - 342|q|^2 + 913) - 16(3|q|^2 - 77)a\partial_a + (6|q|^2 + 56)a^2\partial_a^2 - 60a^3\partial_a^3 + 5a^4\partial_a^4 \right). \end{aligned} \quad (4.33)$$

For different orderings, the third and fourth order terms in derivative match while the other terms are distinct. The boundary terms arising from the requirement of Hermiticity of Riemann scalar and Kretschmann scalar operator are

$$\left[3a^{-6} \left(\psi^* \frac{\partial^3 \chi}{\partial a^3} - \frac{\partial \psi^*}{\partial a} \frac{\partial^2 \chi}{\partial a^2} + \frac{\partial^2 \psi^*}{\partial a^2} \frac{\partial \chi}{\partial a} - \frac{\partial^3 \psi^*}{\partial a^3} \chi \right) + 18a^{-7} \left(\frac{\partial^2 \psi^*}{\partial a^2} \chi - \psi^* \frac{\partial^2 \chi}{\partial a^2} \right) + Aa^{-9} \left(\psi^* \frac{\partial \chi}{\partial a} - \frac{\partial \psi^*}{\partial a} \chi \right) \right]_0^\infty$$

$$\left[5a^{-6} \left(\psi^* \frac{\partial^3 \chi}{\partial a^3} - \frac{\partial \psi^*}{\partial a} \frac{\partial^2 \chi}{\partial a^2} + \frac{\partial^2 \psi^*}{\partial a^2} \frac{\partial \chi}{\partial a} - \frac{\partial^3 \psi^*}{\partial a^3} \chi \right) + 30a^{-7} \left(\frac{\partial^2 \psi^*}{\partial a^2} \chi - \psi^* \frac{\partial^2 \chi}{\partial a^2} \right) + Ba^{-9} \left(\psi^* \frac{\partial \chi}{\partial a} - \frac{\partial \psi^*}{\partial a} \chi \right) \right]_0^\infty \quad (4.34)$$

respectively. The operators are Hermitian provided these boundary terms vanish. In the Hermiticity condition for different orderings, only the coefficients in the third term are different. The coefficient A is 92 for $\bar{R}i_1$ and 76 for $\bar{R}i_2$ whereas B is $2(3|q|^2 + 79)$ for \bar{K}_1 and $2(3|q|^2 - 77)$ for \bar{K}_2 . Anyway, the coefficients do not matter for the vanishing of these boundary terms and for the set of wave packets the boundary terms vanish if $|q| > 9/2$. We notice that the Hermiticity condition is indifferent to the operator orderings ambiguity. The expectation values of these operators for the wave packet in (4.2) are




FIG. 5: Expectation value of Kretschmann scalar and Riemann scalar operator for various operator orderings.

$$\bar{R}i_1(\tau) = \frac{256 (\lambda^2 + 4\tau^2)^{-4}}{27(|q| - 3)|q|(2|q| - 9)(2|q| - 3)} \left(\lambda^4 (3|q| (12|q|^3 - 61|q| - 205) + 1264) + 48(|q| - 3)|q|(2|q| - 9)(2|q| - 3)\tau^4 + 8\lambda^2 (|q| - 3)(2|q| - 9)(27|q| - 62)\tau^2 \right), \quad (4.35)$$

$$\bar{R}i_2(\tau) = \frac{256 (\lambda^2 + 4\tau^2)^{-4}}{27(|q| - 3)|q|(2|q| - 9)(2|q| - 3)} \left(\lambda^4 (3|q| (12|q|^3 - 349|q| + 131) + 7696) + 48(|q| - 3)|q|(2|q| - 9)(2|q| - 3)\tau^4 + 8\lambda^2 (|q| - 3)(2|q| - 9)(27|q| + 106)\tau^2 \right), \quad (4.36)$$

$$\bar{K}_1(\tau) = \frac{256 (\lambda^2 + 4\tau^2)^{-4}}{27(|q| - 3)|q|(2|q| - 9)(2|q| - 3)} \left(-24\lambda^2 (|q| - 3)(2|q| - 9)(|q|(2|q| - 15) + 36)\tau^2 + \lambda^4 (9|q|(|q|(4|q| - 1)|q| - 13) - 117) + 2188) + 80(|q| - 3)|q|(2|q| - 9)(2|q| - 3)\tau^4 \right), \quad (4.37)$$

$$\bar{K}_2(\tau) = \frac{256 (\lambda^2 + 4\tau^2)^{-4}}{27(|q-3)|q|(2|q-9)(2|q-3)|q|} \left(-24\lambda^2(|q-3)(2|q-9)(|q|(2|q-15) - 68)\tau^2 + (9|q|(|q|(4(|q-1)|q| - 173) + 91) + 14668)\lambda^4 + 80(|q-3)|q|(2|q-9)(2|q-3)\tau^4 \right). \quad (4.38)$$

All the expressions are regular functions for the case when $|q| > 9/2$ and have a maximum at the classical singularity, except for $\bar{K}_2(\tau)$. Here as well, the regularity of expectation value and the Hermiticity condition put the same constraint on parameter q . In the large q regime, different orderings give rise to same expectation value thereby reaffirming that there is no signature of operator ordering ambiguity in this regime. Far away from singularity $\tau^2 \gg \lambda^2$, we recover the classical expressions for both Riemann and Kretschmann scalar.

We have plotted the expectation value of the both curvature invariants in Fig. 5. Here as well, the expectation value of different orderings of the curvature invariants are in stark contrast for small q values. On the other hand, different orderings merge on to the semi-classical expressions as we keep on increasing the q parameter, following the trend observed in the case of Ricci scalar expectation value. The expectation value of the Kretschmann scalar in the second case acquires negative value near singularity for small q , with the profile similar to the one observed for Weyl-like ordering of Ricci scalar.

The analysis for higher curvature invariants yields the same trend as observed in the preceding subsections. Thus for the ordering class of the Hamiltonian in Eq. (4.1) and wave packet in Eq. (4.2), the main results can be summarized as: the Hubble parameter matches with the semi-classical expression and for other observables we can trust the semi-classical expressions only in the large q parameter regime. All this was discussed with a fixed ordering scheme of the Hamiltonian. We can now relax the condition used to simplify the expression in Eq. (3.39) and consider the case when the model has same energy distribution parameters but different ordering parameters of Hamiltonian operator.

D. Operator Ordering Ambiguity in the Hamiltonian constraint

For the case of quantum FLRW model with Brown-Kuchař dust, the simplification of the functional form of wave packet (3.40) comes at the cost of making the distribution parameter ' κ ' a function of operator ordering parameter. This would mean that the operator ordering ambiguity in the Hamiltonian constraint is harder to address in full generality. We will circumvent this issue following the approach in [83], where we simplify the expression for the wave packet by fixing the distribution parameters and have different ordering parameters leading to the wave packets

$$\kappa = 4, \lambda = 1, p = 5, \text{ and } q = -3 \implies \psi_I(a, \tau) = \frac{16a^3(27 - 4a^3 - 54i\tau)}{243(1 - 2i\tau)^5} e^{-\frac{2a^3}{9(\frac{1}{2}-i\tau)}}, \quad (4.39)$$

$$\kappa = 4, \lambda = 1, p = 11, \text{ and } q = -6 \implies \psi_{II}(a, \tau) = \frac{64a^6}{243(1 - 2i\tau)^5} e^{-\frac{2a^3}{9(\frac{1}{2}-i\tau)}}. \quad (4.40)$$

The operator ordering ambiguity in the Hamiltonian can be addressed in a restricted sense by comparing the expectation value of the observables in these wave packets. The expectation value of the scale factor is given by

$$\bar{a}_I(\tau) = \frac{(260\tau^2 + 47) \Gamma(\frac{13}{3})}{240 \sqrt[3]{3} (4\tau^2 + 1)^{2/3}}, \quad (4.41)$$

$$\bar{a}_{II}(\tau) = \frac{\sqrt[3]{4\tau^2 + 1} \Gamma(\frac{16}{3})}{16 \sqrt[3]{3}}. \quad (4.42)$$

Hubble parameter and Ricci scalar computed from the scale factor expectation value are

$$\mathbb{H}(\bar{a}_I) = \frac{8\tau(260\tau^2 + 101)}{(12\tau^2 + 3)(260\tau^2 + 47)}, \quad (4.43)$$

$$\mathbb{H}(\bar{a}_{II}) = \frac{8\tau}{3(1 + 4\tau^2)}, \quad (4.44)$$

$$\mathcal{R}(\bar{a}_I) = \frac{16(5200(52\tau^2 + 47)\tau^4 + 137452\tau^2 + 14241)}{3(1040\tau^4 + 448\tau^2 + 47)^2}, \quad (4.45)$$

$$\mathcal{R}(\bar{a}_{II}) = \frac{16(4\tau^2 + 3)}{3(4\tau^2 + 1)^2}. \quad (4.46)$$

The boundary term $\psi^* \chi|_0^\infty$ vanish for the wave packets in Eq. (4.39) and (4.40) and Hubble parameter is Hermitian. The expectation value of the Hubble parameter is given by

$$\overline{\mathbb{H}}_{\text{I}}(\tau) = \frac{16(\tau + 2\tau^3)}{3(1 + 4\tau^2)^2}, \quad (4.47)$$

$$\overline{\mathbb{H}}_{\text{II}}(\tau) = \frac{8\tau}{3(1 + 4\tau^2)}. \quad (4.48)$$

The locations of extrema of both expressions do not match, for the first expression the extrema are located at $\tau \approx \pm 0.375$ whereas for the second case the extrema are at $\tau = \pm 1/2$. Furthermore the profile for the second case is completely enveloped by the profile for the first case. The extrema in the first case are closer to the singularity and are greater in magnitude as compared to the second case.




FIG. 6: We have plotted the expectation value of Hubble parameter for both wave packets, for first wave packet the expectation value along with the semi-classical expression and the difference between the expectation value of the Hubble parameter and the semi-classical expression respectively.

For the wave packet in Eq. (4.40), the expectation value of Hubble parameter matches the semi-classical expression whereas it is not the case for the wave packet in (4.39). This is an indication that the expectation value of Hubble parameter depends on the operator ordering chosen for the Hamiltonian and the exact matching with the semi-classical expression may not always be the case, as is seen in the Fig. 6. However, the difference is small and it has global minimum and maximum close to singularity at the $\tau \approx \pm 0.16$ which are sandwiched between local minimum and maximum at $\tau \approx \mp 0.68$ and it vanishes away from singularity.

We can also compare the expectation value of the Ricci scalar operator in this case, as the Hermiticity condition is satisfied for both wave packets in Eq. (4.39) and (4.40). In the case of the first ordering scheme of the Ricci scalar in Eq. (4.18), the expectation value takes the form

$$\overline{\mathcal{R}}_{\text{I}}^1(\tau) = \frac{64(36\tau^4 + 65\tau^2 + 119)}{27(4\tau^2 + 1)^3}, \quad (4.49)$$

$$\overline{\mathcal{R}}_{\text{II}}^1(\tau) = \frac{16(36\tau^2 + 11)}{27(4\tau^2 + 1)^2}. \quad (4.50)$$

Whereas for the case of second ordering in Eq. (4.19), the expectation value is

$$\overline{\mathcal{R}}_{\text{I}}^2(\tau) = \frac{16(-4n(n+2)\tau^2 - 13n(n+2) + 432\tau^4 + 776\tau^2 + 1415)}{81(4\tau^2 + 1)^3}, \quad (4.51)$$

$$\overline{\mathcal{R}}_{\text{II}}^2(\tau) = \frac{16(4(27\tau^2 + 8) - n(n+2))}{81(4\tau^2 + 1)^2}. \quad (4.52)$$




FIG. 7: The expectation values of the different orderings of Ricci scalar with the two wave packets under consideration are plotted in the first two sub-figures. In the third sub-figure, we have plotted the ratio of Ricci scalar computed from scale factor expectation and expectation value of Ricci scalar for both cases.

For Weyl-like ordered Ricci scalar operator, the expectation value can take the negative values and we have plotted for the case when Ricci scalar is strictly positive ($n = 4$ and $n = 2$ respectively) in the Fig. 7. For the wave packet in (4.39), the expectation value overshoots the classical value and joins the tail from the above whereas it is other way around for the wave packet in (4.40). The striking difference is how these expectation values relate to the semi-classical expression. For the first case, the expectation value overshoots the semi-classical expression and it is other way around for the second case. Thus as is seen for the case of Hubble parameter, the expectation value of Ricci scalar follows pretty much the same trend but its relation to semi-classical expression changes drastically, when we change the ordering of Hamiltonian operator. Therefore in conclusion, one has to be careful while using the dressed metric approach as different ordering schemes of Hamiltonian may lead to the inconsistency in the semi-classical analysis.

For the case of FLRW model with Brown-Kuchař dust clock, the main findings can be summarized as follows. The model shows robust singularity resolution where the expectation of the observables, that mark the singularity in a classical model, have regular expressions with appropriate behavior away from the singularity. The operator ordering ambiguity is relevant only near the classical singularity and has no signature away from the singularity, reaffirming the behavior reported in an earlier work [83]. The applicability of the dressed metric approach is addressed in this model. It is found that in a certain class of orderings of Hamiltonian, the use of semi-classical expression is well justified as it matches the expectation of the Hubble parameter, although a different choice of ordering leads to the case when these expressions do not match. For observables other than the Hubble parameter, these expressions do not match in general, but it is observed that the semi-classical expression is the limiting case of the expectation of these observables when we take the limit $q \rightarrow \infty$. Therefore, the semi-classical expressions in this case can be trusted for the large q limit. On the other hand for small q , there are appreciable departures from the dressed metric approach, particularly for small τ . Though at large τ , there are no significant departures from the semiclassical expression, yet it was shown in [83] that in LTB collapse model, the post bounce outgoing modes do contain signatures of the ordering parameter in the infrared regime, even at late time. A similar analysis in this context is worthy of inspection.

V. FLRW MODEL WITH SCHUTZ FLUID

In this section, we will investigate the same questions in the most trivial generalization of the previous case. Here the perfect fluid is used as the clock, which is modeled via Schutz parameterization [69, 88]. The aim is to check the robustness and model independence of the earlier analysis and see if the results hold true in this setting. We will repeat the same exercise except for the fact that in the quantum model under consideration we will work with the ordering of the Hamiltonian used in [57, 89]. In this section, we will present classical and quantum analysis of this model for general equation of state parameter. However, since most of the semiclassical signatures are seeded in the inflationary phase, we will restrict our focus on the cosmological constant driven universe. A general fluid analysis will be done elsewhere.

A. Classical Model

The action for the perfect fluid following Schutz's formalism is given by [69, 88],

$$S_M = \int d^4x \sqrt{-g} p, \quad (5.1)$$

where p is the pressure of the perfect fluid with 4-velocity that is parameterized as

$$U_\nu = \frac{1}{\mu} [\epsilon_{,\nu} + \xi \beta_{,\nu} + \theta S_{,\nu}]. \quad (5.2)$$

Here μ is the enthalpy, S is specific entropy, ξ , β are rotational potentials and ϵ , θ have no physical interpretation [69]. The action for the fluid in flat-FLRW universe is,

$$S_M = \int dt \frac{\omega \mathcal{N}^{-\frac{1}{\omega}} a^3}{(1+\omega)^{1+\frac{1}{\omega}}} (\dot{\epsilon} + \theta \dot{S})^{1+\frac{1}{\omega}} e^{-\frac{\epsilon}{\mu}}. \quad (5.3)$$

Here ω is the equation of state parameter for the fluid with $\omega < 1$. After a couple of canonical transformations, the Hamiltonian for the flat-FLRW model with Schutz's fluid in Eq. (3.5) becomes [88],

$$\mathcal{H} = \mathcal{N} \left[-\frac{p_a^2}{2a} + \frac{P_T}{a^{3\omega}} \right], \quad (5.4)$$

where T is the fluid parameter obtained after the canonical transformations. With the gauge choice $\mathcal{N} = a^{3\omega}$, we have $\dot{T} = 1$ i.e., fluid variable is linearly related to the coordinate time. The equations of motion with this gauge choice are

$$\dot{T} = 1 \quad \& \quad \dot{P}_T = 0 \quad \& \quad 2\frac{\ddot{a}}{a} + (1-3\omega) \left(\frac{\dot{a}}{a} \right)^2 = 0, \quad \& \quad a^{1-3\omega} \dot{a}^2 = 2P_T. \quad (5.5)$$

Here in this case as well, the constant of motion P_T is related to the energy density via $P_T \propto \rho a^{3(1+\omega)}$. Classically the scale factor in this gauge behave as

$$a(\tau) = \left(\frac{9P_T(1-\omega)^2}{2} \right)^{\frac{1}{3(1-\omega)}} \tau^{\frac{2}{3(1-\omega)}}. \quad (5.6)$$

With Hubble parameter and Ricci scalar in Eq. (3.2) given by

$$\mathbb{H} = \frac{\dot{a}}{a\mathcal{N}} = a^{-3\omega-1} \dot{a} = \left(\frac{9P_T(1-\omega)^2}{2} \right)^{-\frac{\omega}{1-\omega}} \frac{2}{3(1-\omega)\tau^{\frac{1+\omega}{1-\omega}}}, \quad (5.7)$$

$$\begin{aligned} \mathcal{R} &= 6a^{-6\omega} \left(\frac{\ddot{a}}{a} + (1-3\omega) \left(\frac{\dot{a}}{a} \right)^2 \right) \\ &= \frac{4(1-3\omega)}{3(1-\omega)^2} \left(\frac{9}{2} P_T (1-\omega)^2 \right)^{-\frac{2\omega}{1-\omega}} \tau^{-2\frac{1+\omega}{1-\omega}}. \end{aligned} \quad (5.8)$$

The classical model exhibits curvature singularity at $\tau = 0$, where the Ricci scalar and the Hubble parameter diverge except for the special cases of dark energy and radiation as fluid. For dark energy dominated universe, both Hubble parameter and the Ricci scalar are constants, that depend on the momentum conjugate to the fluid variable. The expressions for Hubble parameter and Ricci scalar in this case are $\sqrt{2P_T}$ and $24P_T$ respectively, satisfying the relation $\mathcal{R} = 12\mathbb{H}^2$. For the case of radiation dominated universe, the Hubble parameter diverges at the singularity while the Ricci scalar vanishes throughout. The phase space expression for the Hubble parameter in this model is

$$\mathbb{H} = \frac{\dot{a}}{\mathcal{N}a} = -a^{-2} p_a. \quad (5.9)$$

The canonical expression for Ricci scalar derived in the section II is model independent. In this case, using Eq. (3.17) and with gauge $\mathcal{N} = a^{3\omega}$, we have

$$\mathcal{R} = -\frac{6\{p_a, \mathcal{H}\}}{a^{3\omega+2}}. \quad (5.10)$$

Other gauge choices are equal on the constraint surface, as seen in Eq. (3.18). These observables are a product of the scale factor and its conjugate momentum and their quantum counterparts will be non-trivial.

As discussed earlier, the case of cosmological constant driven universe is of particular interest. The curvature invariants are constant throughout and the vanishing of the scale factor is in fact a coordinate singularity. This coordinate singularity will disappear for an appropriate choice of coordinates, e.g., the standard cosmic time gauge⁴ where the lapse function is $\mathcal{N} = 1$ and the scale factor vanishes at the infinity of the cosmic time.

B. Quantum Model

In this case, we will not consider the most general operator ordering for the Hamiltonian and will work with the representation used in [57]. The Wheeler-DeWitt equation for flat-FLRW model with the perfect fluid is ,

$$\frac{a^{3\omega-1}}{2} \frac{\partial^2 \Psi}{\partial a^2} = i \frac{\partial \Psi}{\partial \tau}. \quad (5.11)$$

For the Hamiltonian operator to be Hermitian, the inner product is chosen as

$$\langle \Phi | \Psi \rangle = \int_0^\infty a^{1-3\omega} \Phi^* \Psi da \quad (5.12)$$

With this choice of the Hilbert space $L^2(\mathbb{R}^+, a^{1-3\omega} da)$, the Hermitian representation of the momentum operator is given by

$$\hat{p}_a = -ia^{-\frac{(1-3\omega)}{2}} \frac{\partial}{\partial a} a^{\frac{(1-3\omega)}{2}}. \quad (5.13)$$

The ordering for the Hamiltonian operator corresponding to this representation of momentum operator is

$$\hat{H} = -\frac{1}{2} a^{\frac{3\omega-1}{2}} \hat{p}_a^2 a^{\frac{3\omega-1}{2}}. \quad (5.14)$$

The solution of WDW equation is obtained via separation ansatz and the eigenfunctions with positive energy are,

$$\begin{aligned} \Psi_E^1(a, \tau) &= \sqrt{a} J_{\frac{1}{3(1-\omega)}} \left(\frac{\sqrt{8E}}{3(1-\omega)} a^{\frac{3(1-\omega)}{2}} \right), \\ \Psi_E^2(a, \tau) &= \sqrt{a} Y_{\frac{1}{3(1-\omega)}} \left(\frac{\sqrt{8E}}{3(1-\omega)} a^{\frac{3(1-\omega)}{2}} \right). \end{aligned} \quad (5.15)$$

The model is singularity free according to DeWitt's criteria as the probability amplitude associated with the ψ_E^1 states vanishes $a^{1-3\omega} |\psi_E^1|^2 \rightarrow a^{3(1-\omega)} \rightarrow 0$ as $\omega < 1$. The Poisson-like energy distribution is chosen following [57] to construct the wave packet

$$A(r) = Cr^{\nu+1} e^{-\lambda r^2}, \text{ where } r = \frac{\sqrt{8E}}{3(1-\omega)}, \text{ and } \nu = \frac{1}{3(1-\omega)}, \quad (5.16)$$

the parameter ν is made equal to the index of the Bessel function, a choice similar to the one made in last case to simplify the wave packet in (3.40) and C is an appropriate normalization factor. The parameter λ is inversely proportional to the mean of the energy in this distribution,

$$\bar{E} = \frac{3(1-\omega)(4-3\omega)}{16\lambda}. \quad (5.17)$$

⁴ The comoving gauge here will be defined according to the observer comoving with the fluid and the $\mathcal{N} = 1$ choice is identified with the cosmic time gauge. For the case of dust as fluid, the comoving time and cosmic time match.

The normalized wave packet constructed from ψ_E^1 states with Poisson-like energy distribution takes the form [57]

$$\begin{aligned}\Psi(a, \tau) &= \int_0^\infty A \left(\frac{\sqrt{8E}}{3(1-\omega)} \right) e^{E\tau} \Psi_E^1(a, \tau) dE, \\ &= \frac{\sqrt{3(1-\omega)}(2\lambda)^{\frac{4-3\omega}{6(1-\omega)}}}{\sqrt{\Gamma\left(\frac{4-3\omega}{3(1-\omega)}\right)}(-2\lambda + \frac{9i}{4}(1-\omega)^2\tau)^{\frac{4-3\omega}{3(1-\omega)}}} a \exp\left(-\frac{a^{3(1-\omega)}}{4(\lambda - \frac{9i}{8}(1-\omega)^2\tau)}\right).\end{aligned}\quad (5.18)$$

Now the stage is set to investigate the status of observables in this quantum model as we did for the model with Brown-Kuchař dust.

VI. OBSERVABLES IN THE MODEL WITH SCHUTZ FLUID

Here, we are interested in looking at the quantum dynamics of the cosmological constant driven flat-FLRW universe. The classical dynamics of this model implies that the curvature invariants are finite even though the scale factor vanishes at finite coordinate time, indicating that it is just a ‘‘coordinate’’ singularity. Therefore, it will be interesting to study the quantization of this ‘‘singularity-free’’ classical model and see how do the boundary conditions, that are required for the unitarity, modify the dynamics in this quantum model [61–63]. The discussion on a general ordering scheme of the Hamiltonian and for the arbitrary equation of state parameter will be presented elsewhere.

For the cosmological constant driven case ($\omega = -1$) the Hilbert space is $L^2(\mathbb{R}^+, a^4 da)$ and the wave packet takes the form

$$\Psi(a, \tau) = \frac{\sqrt{6}(2\lambda)^{\frac{7}{12}}}{\sqrt{\Gamma\left(\frac{7}{6}\right)}(-2\lambda + 9i\tau)^{\frac{7}{6}}} a \exp\left(-\frac{a^6}{4\lambda - 18i\tau}\right).\quad (6.1)$$

The expectation value of the scale factor with wave packet in Eq. (6.1) is

$$\bar{a}(\tau) = \frac{\Gamma\left(\frac{4}{3}\right)}{2^{\frac{1}{6}}\Gamma\left(\frac{7}{6}\right)} \left(\frac{4\lambda^2 + 81\tau^2}{\lambda}\right)^{\frac{1}{6}}.\quad (6.2)$$

Instead of vanishing, the scale factor acquire a finite minimum at the point classical singularity thereby representing a bouncing cosmological model. Again as before, the late time in expanding (early time in collapsing) regime, i.e. when $\tau^2 \gg \lambda^2$, the scale factor behaves as

$$\bar{a}(\tau)|_{\tau^2 \gg \lambda^2} \rightarrow \frac{\Gamma\left(\frac{4}{3}\right)}{2^{\frac{1}{6}}\Gamma\left(\frac{7}{6}\right)} \left(\frac{81\tau^2}{\lambda}\right)^{\frac{1}{6}}\quad (6.3)$$

following the classical trajectory. Classically, the Hubble parameter has a step function-like discontinuity and is negative for $\tau < 0$ and positive for $\tau > 0$, whereas Ricci scalar is constant throughout. The classically anticipated values of these observables for the universe represented by the wave packet in Eq. (6.2) are discussed in the Appendix C. Again, we will compare the semi-classical expressions of Hubble parameter and Ricci scalar computed from this expectation value of the scale factor with the expectation value of these observables.

A. Hubble Parameter

The Hubble parameter in Eq. (5.7) computed from the expectation value of the scale factor (6.2) turn out to be

$$\mathbb{H}(\bar{a}) = \dot{\bar{a}}\bar{a}^2 = \frac{27\sqrt{2}\Gamma\left(\frac{2}{3}\right)^3\tau}{\pi^{3/2}\lambda} \sqrt{\frac{\lambda}{4\lambda^2 + 81\tau^2}}.\quad (6.4)$$

The semi-classical expression approaches the negative value early in the collapsing branch $\tau < -\lambda$ and to a positive value late in the expanding branch $\tau > \lambda$, with a smooth transition from collapsing branch to the expanding branch representing a bounce. The leading order behavior of the semi-classical expression of the Hubble parameter is

$$\mathbb{H}(\bar{a})|_{\tau^2 \gg \lambda^2} = \frac{3\sqrt{2}\Gamma\left(\frac{2}{3}\right)^3}{\sqrt{\pi^3\lambda}} \frac{|\tau|}{\tau}.\quad (6.5)$$

The symmetric operator orderings of Hubble parameter in Eq. (5.9), following the prescription of ordering used earlier, are

$$\hat{\mathbb{H}}_1 = -a^{-1}\hat{p}_a a^{-1}, \quad (6.6)$$

$$\hat{\mathbb{H}}_2 = -\frac{1}{2} (a^{-2+n}\hat{p}_a a^{-n} + a^{-n}\hat{p}_a a^{-2+n}). \quad (6.7)$$

Again, both orderings for the Hubble parameter operator lead to the same differential operator,

$$\hat{\mathbb{H}}_1\psi = \hat{\mathbb{H}}_2\psi = \frac{i}{a^2} \left(\frac{\partial\psi}{\partial a} + \frac{1}{a}\psi \right) = \hat{\mathbb{H}}\psi. \quad (6.8)$$

The Hermiticity of this operator requires the vanishing of the boundary term,

$$[a^2\psi^*\chi]_0^\infty \rightarrow 0, \quad (6.9)$$

which is satisfied for the case of wave packet in Eq. (6.1). The expectation value of the Hubble parameter for the wave packet in Eq. (6.1) is,

$$\bar{\mathbb{H}}(\tau) = \frac{81\sqrt{2}\Gamma(\frac{5}{3})\tau}{\Gamma(\frac{1}{6})\lambda} \sqrt{\frac{\lambda}{4\lambda^2 + 81\tau^2}}. \quad (6.10)$$

At the leading order, i.e., when $\tau^2 \gg \lambda^2$, the expectation value of the Hubble parameter asymptotes to a constant value given by

$$\bar{\mathbb{H}}(\tau)|_{\tau^2 \gg \lambda^2} = \frac{9\Gamma(\frac{5}{3})}{\Gamma(\frac{1}{6})} \sqrt{\frac{2|\tau|}{\lambda}}. \quad (6.11)$$

We see the expectation value of the Hubble parameter does not agree with its semi-classical expression in the classical regime ($\tau^2 \gg \lambda^2$). The possible origin of this disagreement is discussed in the Appendix C.




FIG. 8: Expectation value of the Hubble parameter for the case of cosmological constant driven universe.

The expectation value of the Hubble parameter is plotted in Fig. 8 along with the semi-classical expression. Classically, the Hubble parameter has a behavior as that of a step function with a constant negative value in the contracting branch and constant positive value in the expanding branch, with the transition from collapsing to expanding branch as forbidden. Both, the dressed expression and quantum expectation follow the same generic trend, the Hubble parameter in this case is a continuous generalization of the step function and have a smooth transition from constant negative value for $\tau \ll -\lambda$ to the constant positive value for $\tau \gg \lambda$ with Hubble parameter passing through the origin at $\tau = 0$. This represents a quantum tunneling of the universe from a collapsing branch to expanding branch, i.e., a bouncing universe.

B. Ricci Scalar

The semi-classical expression for the Ricci scalar is obtained as

$$\mathcal{R}(\bar{a}) = \frac{648\Gamma\left(\frac{2}{3}\right)^6 (2\lambda^2 + 27\tau^2)}{\pi^3 (4\lambda^3 + 81\lambda\tau^2)}. \quad (6.12)$$

At the leading order, the semi-classical expression of Ricci scalar settles at the value

$$\mathcal{R}(\bar{a})\big|_{\tau^2 \gg \lambda^2} = \frac{216\Gamma\left(\frac{2}{3}\right)^6}{\pi^3 \lambda}, \quad (6.13)$$

in the classical regime. Moreover, the semi-classical expression do follows the classical relation between the Ricci scalar and Hubble parameter at the leading order in τ^{-1}

$$\mathcal{R}(\bar{a}) = 12\mathbb{H}(\bar{a})^2 + \frac{1296\Gamma\left(\frac{2}{3}\right)^6 \lambda^2}{\pi^3 (4\lambda^3 + 81\lambda\tau^2)}. \quad (6.14)$$

The quantum imprint on the Ricci scalar are pronounced near the coordinate singularity, where the universe tunnels from a collapsing branch to an expanding branch.

In order to analyze the quantum behavior of the Ricci scalar operator, we will again write the symmetric operator orderings corresponding to the phase space function in Eq. (5.10) that is Hermitian with the given measure, following the ordering scheme introduced in Eqs. (4.5) and (4.6),

$$\hat{\mathcal{R}}_1 = 6i\hat{a}^{\frac{1}{2}}[\hat{p}_a, \hat{\mathcal{H}}]\hat{a}^{\frac{1}{2}}, \quad (6.15)$$

$$\hat{\mathcal{R}}_2 = 3i\left(\hat{a}^{1-n}[\hat{p}_a, \hat{\mathcal{H}}]\hat{a}^n + \hat{a}^n[\hat{p}_a, \hat{\mathcal{H}}]\hat{a}^{1-n}\right). \quad (6.16)$$

The differential operators corresponding to the these orderings turn out to be

$$\hat{\mathcal{R}}_1 = 12a^{-6}\left(-\frac{1}{4} - a^2\partial_a^2\right), \quad (6.17)$$

$$\hat{\mathcal{R}}_2 = 12a^{-6}\left(-2n(n+2) - 6(n+3) + 19\right) - a^2\partial_a^2. \quad (6.18)$$

The Hermiticity analysis of Ricci scalar operator for both orderings yields the boundary term, $[\psi^*\partial_a\chi - \chi\partial_a\psi^*]_0^\infty$, which goes to zero for the wave packets under consideration (6.1).⁵ In this case, the expectation values of Ricci scalar for both ordering schemes with the wave packet in Eq. (6.1) are

$$\overline{\mathcal{R}}_1(\tau) = \frac{63}{\lambda} - \frac{36\lambda}{4\lambda^2 + 81\tau^2}, \quad (6.19)$$

$$\overline{\mathcal{R}}_2(\tau) = \frac{63}{\lambda} - \frac{72\lambda(2(n-1)n+1)}{4\lambda^2 + 81\tau^2}. \quad (6.20)$$

Now, a pertinent question to ask here is, whether the quantum expectations respects the classical relation between Ricci scalar and Hubble parameter, namely, $\mathcal{R} = 12\mathbb{H}^2$. Here we will investigate two cases, square of the expectation value of the Hubble parameter and the expectation value of the square of Hubble parameter. The expression for expectation value of Hubble parameter is given in Eq. (6.10) and this relation is not satisfied even in the ‘‘classical’’ regime, whereas, the expectation value of the square of the Hubble parameter⁶ is given by

$$\overline{\mathbb{H}^2}(\tau) = \frac{21}{4\lambda} + \frac{24\lambda}{4\lambda^2 + 81\tau^2}. \quad (6.21)$$

⁵ In the case of Schutz fluid with arbitrary equation of state parameter, ω appears in the measure of the inner product $L^2(\mathbb{R}^+, a^{1-3\omega} da)$ and in the operator representation of various observables. As anticipated from the case study of Brown-Kuchař dust (parameter p and q appear there in the same spirit as ω), the Hermiticity of various observables will put a constraint on the equation of state parameter that will depend on the ordering of the Hamiltonian. As it happens, for the trivial ordering of the Hamiltonian used in the literature [89] and $\omega = -1$, the observables of interest turn out to be Hermitian with the set of wave packets at our disposal. However this might not be the case in general. These aspects will be discussed in full detail in a companion study.

⁶ Square of the Hubble parameter operator for both orderings in Eqs. (6.6) and (6.7) leads to the same operator given by the expression $\widehat{\mathbb{H}^2} = -a^{-4}(\partial_a^2 - 2a^{-2})$.

We see, in this case the quantum expectation values satisfy the classical relation at the leading order, i.e., for $\tau^2 \gg \lambda^2$, irrespective of the ordering of Ricci scalar operator. The behavior of these objects near $\tau = 0$ is opposite of each other, maximum for the expectation value of the square of the Hubble parameter and minimum for the case of the expectation value of the Ricci scalar.

The semiclassical expression for the Ricci scalar can be cast in the form,

$$\mathcal{R}(\bar{a}) = \frac{216\Gamma\left(\frac{2}{3}\right)^6}{\pi^3\lambda} + \frac{432\lambda\Gamma\left(\frac{2}{3}\right)^6}{\pi^3(4\lambda^2 + 81\tau^2)} \sim \frac{43}{\lambda} + \frac{86\lambda}{4\lambda^2 + 81\tau^2}. \quad (6.22)$$

Similar to the case for the Hubble parameter, the quantum expectation and the semi-classical expressions do not agree, even in the classical regime, although both expressions become constant for large $|\tau|$ as anticipated from the classical behavior. Thus, the quantum gravity effects are expected to survive for long time in this analysis and not just near the bounce.




FIG. 9: Expectation value of Ricci scalar and the square of Hubble parameter in the first sub-figure. Expectation value of Ricci scalar for different ordering in the second sub-figure, for the case of $\omega = -1$.

In the Fig. 9, we have plotted the Ricci scalar expectation value along with its semi-classical expression and the square of the Hubble parameter in the first sub-figure, whereas in the second sub-figure, we have plotted the Ricci scalar expectation value for different ordering choices. As alluded to before, the interesting observation is that the quantum expectation and semi-classical expression do not agree even in the “classical” regime. Moreover, the nature of extrema is also different, minimum for quantum expectation and maximum for the semi-classical expression.

As is seen in first sub-figure of Fig. 9, the relations $\mathcal{R}_a(\tau) = 12\mathbb{H}_a^2(\tau)$ and $\bar{\mathcal{R}} = 12\bar{\mathbb{H}}^2(\tau)$ holds in the classical regime when $\tau^2 \gg \lambda^2$. Whereas, the object $\bar{\mathbb{H}}^2(\tau)$ does not correlate with $\bar{\mathbb{H}}^2(\tau)$ even in the classical regime, suggesting a non decaying variance. In the second sub-figure of Fig. 9, it is shown that the expectation value for different orderings of the Ricci scalar merge to same behavior for $\tau^2 > \lambda^2$ and therefore the quantum relation $\bar{\mathcal{R}}_{1/2} = 12\bar{\mathbb{H}}^2(\tau)$ is valid for all orderings in the classical regime.

Therefore, we conclude that for the case of cosmological constant driven universe, the dressed metric approach is bound to receive significant contribution even at late times, as the dressed expressions do not correlate at all with the quantum expectations, both for the Hubble parameter and the Ricci scalar.

VII. CONCLUSIONS

We have investigated the three questions discussed in the introduction, in the context of dust dominated and the cosmological constant dominated flat-FLRW universes: (i) to check the robustness of DeWitt’s criteria of singularity resolution, (ii) the status of operator ordering ambiguity in this quantum model, (iii) the domain of validity of the dressed metric approach. For the canonical system corresponding to the aforementioned models, we have written the phase space expressions for the observables relevant to the analysis, namely Hubble parameter, Ricci scalar and other curvature invariants. Apart from the fact that these observables mark the existence of the singularity in the

classical picture, they are also at the heart of the dressed metric analysis. Therefore, studying these observables in the quantum picture allows us to address all three questions at hand.

We have addressed the robustness of the singularity resolution in these quantum models by showing that the expectation value of the operators associated with curvature invariants are regular functions and follow the classical behavior away from the singularity. In the case of the Hubble parameter, the general trend is that the expectation value has a minimum in the collapsing branch and a maximum in the expanding branch, while it vanishes at the singularity. The location and the width of these extrema depend upon the energy density of the fluid and the extrema are sharp and closely spaced for highly energetic fluid. For the case of Ricci scalar in the dust dominated universe, the expectation value has a maximum at the singularity for a certain class of orderings and a minimum of negative magnitude sandwiched between maxima. Away from the singularity, the expectation value asymptotes to the classical trajectory for all orderings. The expectation values of the Riemann and Kretschmann scalars are computed for dust dominated universe and these invariants have maxima at the singularity in all cases barring one choice of ordering of the Kretschmann scalar. Away from the singularity, these observables asymptote to the classical trajectory. Therefore, we have demonstrated the robustness of singularity resolution in the FLRW model with dust clock.

Another question of interest in this model is the operator ordering ambiguity. The phase space expressions of all observables under consideration are the product of the scale factor and its conjugate momentum. It is apparent that there will be operator ordering ambiguity since multiple ordering choices are available for the same observable. In this work, we write two classes of ordering to symmetrize the operator: trivial symmetric ordering and Weyl-like ordering. For the case of Hubble parameter, it is observed that both ordering prescriptions give rise to the same differential operator, following a generic result that various ordering prescriptions lead to the same operator for functions linear in either position or momentum. Therefore, there is no operator ordering ambiguity at the level of Hubble parameter operator. For the case of observables that are quadratic or have a higher power in momentum, the key finding of this analysis is that the operator ordering ambiguity plays a role only near the classical singularity, the regime where quantum effects dominate. There is no signature of ordering ambiguity away from the singularity and various orderings converge to the classical behavior. The regulated expectation value of various observables is highly sensitive to the ordering scheme as observed e.g., for the square of Hubble parameter, Ricci scalar and other curvature invariants. For the case of dust dominated universe, there exists a parameter q related to the ordering of the Hamiltonian which appears as a control parameter and different orderings of the observables merge to the same expectation in the limit $q \rightarrow \infty$.

Lastly we have investigated the applicability of the dressed metric approach in this setting. The dressed/semi-classical expressions for the observables are computed from the expectation value of the scale factor. We compared these semi-classical expressions against the expectation value of these observables. In all cases under consideration, the general trend observed is that the dressed expression and quantum expectation match in the classical domain, i.e., $\tau^2 \gg \lambda^2$, and the difference is pronounced only near the classical singularity. The Hubble parameter is one of the most important objects in this regard as it appears in almost all of the dynamical equations for perturbations and leaves a direct imprint on the physical observations [84]. The dressed expression matches the expectation value of the Hubble parameter for a certain choice of ordering of the Hamiltonian. However, for a different choice of ordering of Hamiltonian and distribution parameter, these expressions do not match although the difference between them remains substantially small. The Ricci scalar also plays a crucial role in the dynamics of non-minimally coupled scalar field. In the case of dust dominated universe, the dressed expression for Ricci scalar does not match the expectation value in general. In the limit of the control parameter $q \rightarrow \infty$, different orderings of observables merge to the same profile, which in fact is the semi-classical expression for the Ricci scalar. The same behavior is true for other curvature invariants as well. Furthermore, the fractional change in the expectation of the Ricci scalar as compared to the semi-classical expression does not exceed 35% with the limiting case being for small q and at the singularity. Therefore the semi-classical expression for Ricci scalar can be trusted for the case when q is large.

The case of quantum dynamics of the cosmological constant driven universe is somewhat different. The classical model has two disjoint branches, a collapsing branch labeled by constant negative Hubble parameter and an expanding branch labeled by constant positive Hubble parameter. The quantum model predicts a quantum tunneling from a collapsing branch to the expanding branch. Classically, the Ricci scalar is constant throughout and the model has no curvature singularity. The Hubble parameter has a step function like discontinuity at the coordinate singularity and its quantum expectation is a smooth approximation of the step function behavior representing a bouncing cosmological model. Even though there is no divergence or discontinuity in the classical Ricci scalar, still the quantum expectation of Ricci scalar gets modified from the classical value due to the quantum tunneling from collapsing branch to expanding branch. Different orderings of the Ricci scalar asymptote to the same expectation value for the large τ regime and ambiguity is relevant only near the coordinate singularity. The dressed expressions and quantum expectation values satisfy the relation $\mathcal{R}^2 = 12\mathbb{H}^2$ in the classical regime. However, the major deviation from the dust dominated case comes from the comparison of the dressed expressions and quantum expectation for Hubble parameter and Ricci scalar. Even in the classical domain, the dressed expression and quantum expectation value asymptotes to different

constant values, thereby raising the questions on the validity of the dressed metric approach for the case of cosmological constant driven universe.

It is interesting to note that in the case of dust dominated universe, the matching of the dressed expressions with quantum expectations is ordering dependent, and hence, one has to be careful while using the dressed metric in the semiclassical analysis (as the quantum fluctuations survive at late time leading to large backreaction [90]). For the cosmological constant driven universe, the dressed expressions have no correlation with the quantum expectation values at all and therefore the applicability of this approach is questionable in this case. As a result, a full quantum treatment is expected to introduce significant corrections in the semiclassical analysis. There have been recent studies which also indicate significant quantum effects at late times in matter and dark energy dominated universes, e.g., possible quantum effects at the transition from cosmological deceleration to acceleration in [91] and enhanced quantum correlations for nearly matter dominated universe in [90].

VIII. ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

HSS would like to acknowledge the financial support from University Grants Commission, Government of India, in the form of Junior Research Fellowship (UGC-CSIR JRF/Dec- 2016/503905). Research of KL is partially supported by the Department of Science and Technology (DST) of the Government of India through a research grant under INSPIRE Faculty Award (DST/INSPIRE/04/2016/000571). HSS would like to thank Prof. S. Shankaranarayanan and Dr. Sumanta Chakraborty for helpful comments.

Appendix A: Hermiticity of operators

The self-adjointness of the Hamiltonian operator (3.27) is discussed in [53] whereas the self-adjointness of the Hamiltonian in Eq. (5.11) is discussed in [57]. In this section, we will discuss the Hermiticity of other operators that appears in the main text.

1. Hubble parameter: Brown-Kuchař dust Case

For the case of Brown-Kuchař dust, the Hermiticity of Hubble parameter operator in Eq. (4.7) implies

$$\begin{aligned} \langle \psi | \hat{\mathbb{H}} | \chi \rangle &= \int_0^\infty da a^2 \psi^* \hat{\mathbb{H}} \chi = i \int_0^\infty da \psi^* \frac{\partial \chi}{\partial a} \\ &= i \left(\psi^* \chi \Big|_0^\infty - \int_0^\infty da \frac{\partial \psi^*}{\partial a} \chi \right) \\ &= i \left[\psi^* \chi \right]_0^\infty + \langle \hat{\mathbb{H}} \psi | \chi \rangle. \end{aligned} \quad (\text{A1})$$

Hermiticity of the operator requires the vanishing of the boundary term in the square bracket. This term vanishes for the case when the wavefunctions vanishes at $a \rightarrow 0$ and $a \rightarrow \infty$. For the wave packets under consideration in Eq. (4.2), the boundary condition is satisfied, provided $q \neq 0$.

2. Hubble parameter: Schutz fluid Case

Similarly for the case of Schutz fluid, the Hermiticity of Hubble parameter operator in Eq. (6.8) implies

$$\begin{aligned} \langle \psi | \hat{\mathbb{H}} | \chi \rangle &= \int_0^\infty da a^4 \psi^* \hat{\mathbb{H}} \chi = i \int_0^\infty da a^2 \psi^* \left(\frac{\partial \chi}{\partial a} + \frac{\chi}{a} \right) \\ &= i \left[a^2 \psi^* \chi \right]_0^\infty - i \int_0^\infty da a^2 \left(\frac{\partial \psi^*}{\partial a} + \frac{\psi^*}{a} \right) \chi \\ &= i \left[a^2 \psi^* \chi \right]_0^\infty + \langle \hat{\mathbb{H}} \psi | \chi \rangle. \end{aligned} \quad (\text{A2})$$

The Hubble parameter operator is Hermitian, provided the boundary term in the square bracket vanishes. For the case of the wave packets in Eq. (6.1), at the lower limit $a \rightarrow 0$, the boundary term goes as a^4 and therefore vanishes.

Whereas at the upper limit $a \rightarrow \infty$, the exponential term will kill off the boundary term. Therefore, the Hubble parameter is Hermitian for the set of the wave packets constructed.

3. Square of Hubble parameter and Ricci scalar: Brown-Kuchař dust Case

The differential operators corresponding to the square of Hubble parameter operator in Eqs. (4.12), (4.13) is

$$\widehat{\mathcal{H}}_1^2 = a^{-6} ((j-1)(j-4) + 2a\partial_a - a^2\partial_a^2), \quad (\text{A3})$$

$$\widehat{\mathcal{H}}_2^2 = a^{-6} (2j(j+k-4) - 5k + 12 + 2a\partial_a - a^2\partial_a^2). \quad (\text{A4})$$

We see that the difference comes from the term with no derivative, and the terms with derivative match with the terms for Ricci scalar operator in Eqs. (4.21) and (4.22). The reason for this happenstance is that the two observables in question have similar phase space expression on-shell $\propto p_a^2 a^{-4}$. We can write a general operator that represents all four case via

$$\widehat{\mathcal{O}} = \alpha a^{-6} (\beta(q) + 2a\partial_a - a^2\partial_a^2). \quad (\text{A5})$$

The Hermiticity of this operator implies

$$\langle \psi | \widehat{\mathcal{O}} | \chi \rangle = \int_0^\infty da a^2 \psi^* \widehat{\mathcal{O}} \chi \quad (\text{A6})$$

$$= \alpha \int_0^\infty da a^{-4} \psi^* (\beta(q)\chi + 2a\partial_a \chi - a^2\partial_a^2 \chi), \quad (\text{A7})$$

$$= \alpha \left[a^{-2} \left(\psi^* \frac{\partial \chi}{\partial a} - \frac{\partial \psi^*}{\partial a} \chi \right) \right]_0^\infty + \int_0^\infty da a^{-4} (\beta(q)\psi + 2a\partial_a \psi - a^2\partial_a^2 \psi)^* \chi, \quad (\text{A8})$$

$$= \alpha \left[a^{-2} \left(\psi^* \frac{\partial \chi}{\partial a} - \frac{\partial \psi^*}{\partial a} \chi \right) \right]_0^\infty + \langle \widehat{\mathcal{O}} \psi | \chi \rangle. \quad (\text{A9})$$

The boundary conditions required for the Hermiticity of these operators are same. For operators to be Hermitian, this boundary terms has to vanish. For a function with asymptotic behavior $\psi(a) \rightarrow a^k$ as for $a \rightarrow 0$ and $\psi(a) \rightarrow a^{k'}$ as for $a \rightarrow \infty$, the boundary term behaves as

$$\lim_{a \rightarrow 0} \left[a^{-2} \left(\psi^* \frac{\partial \chi}{\partial a} - \frac{\partial \psi^*}{\partial a} \chi \right) \right] = \lim_{a \rightarrow 0} a^{2k-3} = 0, \quad \text{if } k > \frac{3}{2}, \quad (\text{A10})$$

$$\lim_{a \rightarrow \infty} \left[a^{-2} \left(\psi^* \frac{\partial \chi}{\partial a} - \frac{\partial \psi^*}{\partial a} \chi \right) \right] = \lim_{a \rightarrow \infty} a^{2k'-3} = 0, \quad \text{if } k' < \frac{3}{2}. \quad (\text{A11})$$

For the set of wave packets, the boundary term vanishes at the upper limit for all parameter values while at the lower limit the boundary term vanishes when $|q| > 3/2$. The Hermiticity and boundary conditions for the Riemann and Kretschmann scalar in Eq. (4.33) can be computed in the similar fashion, leading to the boundary terms in Eq. (4.34).

4. Ricci scalar: Schutz fluid case

The differential operators corresponding to different ordering in Eqs. (6.17) and (6.18) differ only at the level of term without derivative. The general operator can be cast in the form

$$\widehat{\mathcal{O}} = 12a^{-6} (-\beta - a^2\partial_a^2) \quad (\text{A12})$$

The Hermiticity of this operator implies

$$\langle \psi | \hat{\mathcal{O}} | \chi \rangle = \int_0^\infty da a^4 \psi^* \hat{\mathcal{O}} \chi \quad (\text{A13})$$

$$= \int_0^\infty da a^{-2} \psi^* (\beta \chi - a^2 \partial_a^2 \chi) \quad (\text{A14})$$

$$= \left[\psi^* \frac{\partial \chi}{\partial a} - \frac{\partial \psi^*}{\partial a} \chi \right]_0^\infty + \int_0^\infty da a^{-2} (\beta \psi - a^2 \partial_a^2 \psi)^* \chi \quad (\text{A15})$$

$$= \left[\psi^* \frac{\partial \chi}{\partial a} - \frac{\partial \psi^*}{\partial a} \chi \right]_0^\infty + \langle \hat{\mathcal{O}} \psi | \chi \rangle, \quad (\text{A16})$$

the boundary term in the square bracket should vanish. For the set of wave packets considered in Eq. (6.1), the upper limit vanishes due to the exponential factor and for the lower limit, the boundary term goes as a and vanishes, as $a \rightarrow 0$

Appendix B: Regularity of the expectation values of operators

In the subsection IV B, we encountered the divergences in the expectation value of the Ricci scalar in Eq. (4.24) and (4.25) that are for the parameter values outside of the domain of Hermiticity of Ricci scalar. The similar trend is observed for the case of Riemann and Kretschmann scalar. In the last section, we have derived the Hermiticity condition for various operator and here we will derive the condition for the regularity of the expectation value of the various operators. As the states considered in this analysis are vanishing exponentially as $a \rightarrow \infty$, the cause for divergences is the lower limit. For the discussion in this section, we will assume the states with asymptotic behavior $\psi(a) \rightarrow a^\alpha$ as $a \rightarrow 0$ and exponentially decaying as $a \rightarrow \infty$.

First, we will discuss the case of the Hubble parameter for which the expectation value in state ψ is

$$\bar{\mathbb{H}} = \int_0^\infty da \psi^* \frac{\partial \psi}{\partial a}. \quad (\text{B1})$$

Here, since the lower limit is of concern, we need to check the behavior of integrand near $a = 0$. Using the asymptotic expression for wave function, the integrand behaves as $a^{2\alpha-1}$ as $a \rightarrow 0$. Using the p -test⁷ for the convergence, we get the condition $\alpha > 0$. For the wave packet in Eq. (4.2), this condition translates to $q \neq 0$.

In the case of Ricci scalar operator for both orderings in Eq. (4.21) and (4.22), the expectation value in the state ψ takes the form

$$\bar{\mathcal{R}} = 3 \int_0^\infty da a^{-4} \psi^* (\beta(q)\psi + 2a\partial_a\psi - a^2\partial_a^2\psi). \quad (\text{B2})$$

The behavior of the integrand for the given state is $a^{2\alpha-4}$ as $a \rightarrow 0$ (as the terms are of form $a\partial_a$ and $a^2\partial_a^2$). Again using the p -test, the integral is converge for the case when $\alpha > 3/2$ that translates to $|q| > 3/2$ for the states under consideration in Eq. (4.2).

Similarly, for the higher curvature invariants operators in Eqs. (4.33), the integrand behaves as $a^{2\alpha-10}$ as $a \rightarrow 0$ (here as well the terms involved are $a\partial_a$, $a^2\partial_a^2$, $a^3\partial_a^3$ and $a^4\partial_a^4$). In this case, the p -test leads to the condition $\alpha > 9/2$ that translates to $|q| > 9/2$ for case in point.

Here, we have derived the conditions for Hermiticity of operators and the conditions for the regularity of the expectation value of these operators. Although the origin of these conditions is different, the domain of Hermiticity overlaps with the domain of the regularity, thereby saving the quantum model from the problematic divergences in a natural manner.

⁷ the integral of form $\int_0^a dx x^p$ is convergent, if $p > -1$.

Appendix C: Classically anticipated expressions

In the case of dust dominated universe, the classical expression for scale factor is

$$a(\tau) = \left(\frac{9P_T}{2}\right)^{\frac{1}{3}} \tau^{\frac{2}{3}}, \quad (\text{C1})$$

and the Hubble parameter and curvature invariants are independent of the constant of motion P_T . The system is placed in a state described by the wave packet given in Eq. (4.2), which is constructed using the energy distribution in Eq. (3.36). For this state, the classically anticipated expression for scale factor is given by,

$$a(\tau) = \left(\frac{9}{2}\right)^{\frac{1}{3}} \tau^{\frac{2}{3}} \langle P_T^{\frac{1}{3}} \rangle = \left(\frac{9(\lambda^2 + 4\tau^2)}{8\lambda}\right)^{\frac{1}{3}} \frac{\Gamma\left(\frac{2|q|}{3} + \frac{4}{3}\right)}{\Gamma\left(\frac{2|q|}{3} + 1\right)}, \quad (\text{C2})$$

where $\langle P_T^{1/3} \rangle$ is the ensemble average⁸ in the distribution (3.36). The expectation value of the scale factor in Eq. (4.3) matches with the classically anticipated scale factor at the leading order, i.e., when $\tau^2 \gg \lambda^2$.

In the case of dark energy dominated universe at the classical level, the scale factor, Hubble parameter, and Ricci scalar are related to the energy density via $a \propto \rho^{1/6}$, $\mathbb{H} = \sqrt{2\rho}$ and $\mathcal{R} = 24\rho$, with energy density being equal to the momentum conjugate to the fluid variable $\rho = P_T$. First, we will address what should be the classically expected behavior of various objects for the universe that the wave packet in Eq. (6.1) represents. The wave packet is constructed using the Poisson-like energy distribution, and the ensemble averages with the distribution in Eq. (5.16) for various objects are

$$a_{\text{cl}}(\tau) = (2)^{1/6} 3^{2/3} \langle P_T^{1/6} \rangle \tau^{1/3} = \frac{2^{1/6} 3^{2/3} \tau^{1/3} \Gamma\left(\frac{2}{3}\right)}{\sqrt{\pi} \lambda^{1/6}}, \quad (\text{C3})$$

$$\mathbb{H}_{\text{cl}}(\tau) = \sqrt{2} \langle \sqrt{P_T} \rangle = \frac{9\sqrt{2} \Gamma\left(\frac{5}{3}\right)}{\sqrt{\lambda} \Gamma\left(\frac{1}{6}\right)}, \quad (\text{C4})$$

$$\mathcal{R}_{\text{cl}}(\tau) = 24 \langle P_T \rangle = \frac{63}{\lambda}. \quad (\text{C5})$$

These expressions correlate exactly with the expectation values of these observables in Eqs. (6.3), (6.11), (6.19) and (6.20) in the classical regime $\tau^2 \gg \lambda^2$ but the dressed expressions do not correlate with the classically expected expressions. Interestingly, this exact quantum to classical correspondence is possible only in the context of the semiclassical state (e.g., coherent state or squeezed state), and it seems that the wave packets constructed in this analysis mimic the behavior as that of a semiclassical state [92].

The difference between the semi-classical expressions and the quantum expectations of these observables comes from the fact that, for the distribution in Eq. (5.16), the ensemble average follows $\langle P_T^n \rangle \neq \langle P_T \rangle^n$. The semi-classical expressions capture the distribution properties via the expectation value of scale factor through $\langle P_T \rangle^{1/6}$ and the semi-classical expressions are the powers of this factor.

[1] J. Tambornino, *SIGMA* **8**, 017 (2012), [arXiv:1109.0740 \[gr-qc\]](https://arxiv.org/abs/1109.0740).

[2] E. Anderson, *Annalen der Physik* **524**, 757 (2012), <https://onlinelibrary.wiley.com/doi/pdf/10.1002/andp.201200147>.

[3] M. Henneaux and C. Bunster, *Quantization of gauge systems*, Physics (Princeton University Press, Princeton, New Jersey, 1992).

[4] D. M. Gitman and I. V. Tyutin, *Quantization of Fields with Constraints*, Springer Series in Nuclear and Particle Physics (Springer, Berlin, Germany, 1990).

[5] G. Date, in *Refresher Course for College Teachers* (2010) [arXiv:1010.2062 \[gr-qc\]](https://arxiv.org/abs/1010.2062).

[6] L. V. Prokhorov and S. V. Shabanov, *Hamiltonian Mechanics of Gauge Systems* (Cambridge University Press, Cambridge, 2011).

⁸ Since $P_T = E$, the ensemble average $\langle P_T^n \rangle = \langle E^n \rangle = \langle \psi | \hat{H}^n | \psi \rangle = \int_0^\infty d\sqrt{E} E^n A(\sqrt{E})^2$ is the $2n$ -th moment of the distribution $A(\sqrt{E})$.

- [7] P. A. M. Dirac, *Proc. Roy. Soc. Lond. A* **246**, 333 (1958).
- [8] R. Arnowitt, S. Deser, and C. W. Misner, *Physical Review* **116**, 1322 (1959).
- [9] P. A. M. Dirac, *Phys. Rev.* **114**, 924 (1959).
- [10] P. G. Bergmann and A. Komar, *Int. J. Theor. Phys.* **5**, 15 (1972).
- [11] J. Lee and R. M. Wald, *J. Math. Phys.* **31**, 725 (1990).
- [12] J. M. Pons, D. C. Salisbury, and L. C. Shepley, *Phys. Rev. D* **55**, 658 (1997), arXiv:gr-qc/9612037.
- [13] K. V. Kuchař, *International Journal of Modern Physics D* **20**, 3 (2011), <https://doi.org/10.1142/S0218271811019347>.
- [14] C. J. Isham, NATO Sci. Ser. C **409**, 157 (1993), arXiv:gr-qc/9210011.
- [15] L. Chataignier, *Timeless Quantum Mechanics and the Early Universe*, Springer Theses (Springer, Berlin, Germany, 2022).
- [16] P. A. Hoehn, A. R. H. Smith, and M. P. E. Lock, *Phys. Rev. D* **104**, 066001 (2021), arXiv:1912.00033 [quant-ph].
- [17] D. N. Page and W. K. Wootters, *Phys. Rev. D* **27**, 2885 (1983).
- [18] W. K. Wootters, *International Journal of Theoretical Physics* **23**, 701 (1984).
- [19] P. A. Höhn, *Universe* **5** (2019), 10.3390/universe5050116.
- [20] P. A. Höhn and A. Vanrietvelde, *New J. Phys.* **22**, 123048 (2020), arXiv:1810.04153 [gr-qc].
- [21] A. Ashtekar, W. Kaminski, and J. Lewandowski, *Phys. Rev. D* **79**, 064030 (2009), arXiv:0901.0933 [gr-qc].
- [22] I. Agullo, A. Ashtekar, and W. Nelson, *Phys. Rev. Lett.* **109**, 251301 (2012), arXiv:1209.1609 [gr-qc].
- [23] I. Agullo, A. Ashtekar, and W. Nelson, *Phys. Rev. D* **87**, 043507 (2013), arXiv:1211.1354 [gr-qc].
- [24] I. Agullo, A. Ashtekar, and W. Nelson, *Class. Quant. Grav.* **30**, 085014 (2013), arXiv:1302.0254 [gr-qc].
- [25] B. S. DeWitt, *Physical Review* **160**, 1113 (1967).
- [26] C. Kiefer, *Quantum gravity*, third edition ed., International series of monographs on physics No. 155 (Oxford University Press, Oxford, 2012).
- [27] C. Kiefer, N. Kwidzinski, and D. Piontek, *The European Physical Journal C* **79**, 686 (2019).
- [28] A. Barrau and J. Grain, “Loop quantum gravity and observations,” in *Loop Quantum Gravity: The First 30 Years*, edited by A. Ashtekar and J. Pullin (2017) pp. 281–306, arXiv:1410.1714 [gr-qc].
- [29] B. Bonga and B. Gupt, *Gen. Rel. Grav.* **48**, 71 (2016), arXiv:1510.00680 [gr-qc].
- [30] I. Agullo and N. A. Morris, *Phys. Rev. D* **92**, 124040 (2015).
- [31] B. Bonga and B. Gupt, *Phys. Rev. D* **93**, 063513 (2016).
- [32] B.-F. Li, P. Singh, and A. Wang, *Phys. Rev. D* **101**, 086004 (2020).
- [33] B.-F. Li, S. Saini, and P. Singh, *Phys. Rev. D* **103**, 066020 (2021), arXiv:2012.10462 [gr-qc].
- [34] N. D. Birrell and P. C. W. Davies, *Quantum Fields in Curved Space*, Cambridge Monographs on Mathematical Physics (Cambridge Univ. Press, Cambridge, UK, 1984).
- [35] B. Bolliet, J. Grain, C. Stahl, L. Linsefors, and A. Barrau, *Phys. Rev. D* **91**, 084035 (2015), arXiv:1502.02431 [gr-qc].
- [36] B.-F. Li, P. Singh, and A. Wang, *Front. Astron. Space Sci.* **8**, 701417 (2021), arXiv:2105.14067 [gr-qc].
- [37] S. Iteanu and G. A. Mena Marugán, *Universe* **8**, 463 (2022), arXiv:2208.01987 [gr-qc].
- [38] B.-F. Li and P. Singh, *Phys. Rev. D* **106**, 086015 (2022), arXiv:2206.12434 [gr-qc].
- [39] W. Kamiński, M. Kolanowski, and J. Lewandowski, *Class. Quant. Grav.* **37**, 095001 (2020), arXiv:1912.02556 [gr-qc].
- [40] M. Bojowald, *Phys. Rev. D* **102**, 023532 (2020).
- [41] W. F. Blyth and C. J. Isham, *Phys. Rev. D* **11**, 768 (1975).
- [42] M. J. Gotay and J. Demaret, *Phys. Rev. D* **28**, 2402 (1983).
- [43] P. Hájíček and C. Kiefer, *International Journal of Modern Physics D* **10**, 775 (2001).
- [44] M. P. Dabrowski, C. Kiefer, and B. Sandhöfer, *Phys. Rev. D* **74**, 044022 (2006), arXiv:hep-th/0605229.
- [45] H. Bergeron, E. Czuchry, J.-P. Gazeau, P. Małkiewicz, and W. Piechocki, *Physical Review D* **92**, 124018 (2015).
- [46] Y. Liu, D. Malafarina, L. Modesto, and C. Bambi, *Physical Review D* **90**, 044040 (2014).
- [47] A. Y. Kamenshchik, *Classical and Quantum Gravity* **30**, 173001 (2013).
- [48] M. Sami, P. Singh, and S. Tsujikawa, *Physical Review D* **74**, 043514 (2006).
- [49] C. Kiefer, arXiv:1512.08346 [gr-qc] (2015), arXiv: 1512.08346.
- [50] A. Kamenshchik, C. Kiefer, and N. Kwidzinski, *Phys. Rev. D* **93**, 083519 (2016), arXiv:1602.01319 [gr-qc].
- [51] A. Alonso-Serrano, M. Bouhmadi-López, and P. Martín-Moruno, *Phys. Rev. D* **98**, 104004 (2018), arXiv:1802.03290 [gr-qc].
- [52] M. Bouhmadi-López, C. Kiefer, and P. Martín-Moruno, *Gen. Rel. Grav.* **51**, 135 (2019), arXiv:1904.01836 [gr-qc].
- [53] C. Kiefer and T. Schmitz, *Physical Review D* **99**, 126010 (2019).
- [54] S. Jalalzadeh, *Phys. Lett. B* **833**, 137285 (2022), arXiv:2207.00727 [gr-qc].
- [55] C. Kiefer, N. Kwidzinski, and D. Piontek, *Eur. Phys. J. C* **79**, 686 (2019), arXiv:1903.04391 [gr-qc].
- [56] M. Bojowald, *Phys. Rev. Lett.* **86**, 5227 (2001), arXiv:gr-qc/0102069.
- [57] F. G. Alvarenga, J. C. Fabris, N. A. Lemos, and G. A. Monerat, *Gen. Rel. Grav.* **34**, 651 (2002), arXiv:gr-qc/0106051.
- [58] M. Bojowald, *Phys. Rev. D* **64**, 084018 (2001), arXiv:gr-qc/0105067.
- [59] M. Bojowald, *Class. Quant. Grav.* **19**, 2717 (2002), arXiv:gr-qc/0202077.
- [60] S. Gryb and K. P. Y. Thébault, *Class. Quant. Grav.* **36**, 035009 (2019), arXiv:1801.05789 [gr-qc].
- [61] S. Gielen and L. Menéndez-Pidal, *Class. Quant. Grav.* **37**, 205018 (2020), arXiv:2005.05357 [gr-qc].
- [62] S. Gielen and L. Menéndez-Pidal, *Class. Quant. Grav.* **39**, 075011 (2022), arXiv:2109.02660 [gr-qc].
- [63] S. Gielen and L. Menéndez-Pidal, (2022), arXiv:2205.15387 [gr-qc].
- [64] K. P. Y. Thebault, (2022), arXiv:2209.05905 [gr-qc].
- [65] K. Kuchař, “Canonical quantum gravity,” (1993).
- [66] J. Barbour and B. Z. Foster, “Constraints and gauge transformations: Dirac’s theorem is not always valid,” (2008),

arXiv:0808.1223 [gr-qc].

- [67] M. Bojowald, P. A. Höhn, and A. Tsobanjan, *Physical Review D* **83** (2011), 10.1103/physrevd.83.125023.
- [68] J. D. Brown and K. V. Kuchar, *Physical Review D* **51**, 5600 (1995).
- [69] B. F. Schutz, *Phys. Rev. D* **2**, 2762 (1970).
- [70] F. Amemiya and T. Koike, *Physical Review D* **80** (2009), 10.1103/physrevd.80.103507.
- [71] F. Gieres, *Reports on Progress in Physics* **63**, 1893–1931 (2000).
- [72] G. Bonneau, J. Faraut, and G. Valent, *American Journal of Physics* **69**, 322–331 (2001).
- [73] D. M. Gitman, I. V. Tyutin, and B. L. Voronov, “Free one-dimensional particle on an interval,” in *Self-adjoint Extensions in Quantum Mechanics: General Theory and Applications to Schrödinger and Dirac Equations with Singular Potentials* (Birkhäuser Boston, Boston, 2012) pp. 207–236.
- [74] K. V. Kuchař and M. P. Ryan, *Phys. Rev. D* **40**, 3982 (1989).
- [75] C. Rovelli, *Phys. Rev. D* **42**, 2638 (1990).
- [76] C. Rovelli, *Phys. Rev. D* **43**, 442 (1991).
- [77] B. Dittrich, *Gen. Rel. Grav.* **39**, 1891 (2007), arXiv:gr-qc/0411013.
- [78] B. Dittrich, *Class. Quant. Grav.* **23**, 6155 (2006), arXiv:gr-qc/0507106.
- [79] A. Barvinsky, *Physics Reports* **230**, 237 (1993).
- [80] A. O. Barvinsky and A. Y. Kamenshchik, *Phys. Rev. D* **89**, 043526 (2014), arXiv:1312.3147 [gr-qc].
- [81] H. Maeda, *Classical and Quantum Gravity* **32**, 235023 (2015).
- [82] A. Vilenkin, *Phys. Rev. D* **37**, 888 (1988).
- [83] H. S. Sahota and K. Lochan, *Phys. Rev. D* **104**, 126027 (2021).
- [84] V. F. Mukhanov, H. A. Feldman, and R. H. Brandenberger, *Phys. Rept.* **215**, 203 (1992).
- [85] H. Kodama and M. Sasaki, *Progress of Theoretical Physics Supplement* **78**, 1 (1984), <https://academic.oup.com/ptps/article-pdf/doi/10.1143/PTPS.78.1/5321391/78-1.pdf>.
- [86] E. H. Kerner and W. G. Sutcliffe, *Journal of Mathematical Physics* **11**, 391 (1970), <https://doi.org/10.1063/1.1665150>.
- [87] M. A. De Gosson, *Entropy* **20** (2018), 10.3390/e20110869.
- [88] B. F. Schutz, *Phys. Rev. D* **4**, 3559 (1971).
- [89] F. G. Alvarenga and N. A. Lemos, *Gen. Rel. Grav.* **30**, 681 (1998), arXiv:gr-qc/9802029.
- [90] A. Dhanuka and K. Lochan, *Phys. Rev. D* **102**, 085009 (2020), arXiv:2003.07380 [gr-qc].
- [91] B. Alexandre and J. Magueijo, *Phys. Rev. D* **106**, 063520 (2022), arXiv:2207.03854 [gr-qc].
- [92] A. Ashtekar, L. Bombelli, and A. Corichi, *Phys. Rev. D* **72**, 025008 (2005), arXiv:gr-qc/0504052.