

# Spin network coherent states for planar gravitational waves

Donald E. Neville \*  
Department of Physics  
Temple University  
Philadelphia 19122, Pa.

April 29, 2013

## Abstract

This paper constructs coherent states for spin networks with planar symmetry. After gauge-fixing, the full  $SU(2)$  symmetry is broken to  $U(1)$ ; but one cannot simply use the  $U(1)$  limit of  $SU(2)$  coherent states, because the planar states exhibit an unexpected  $O(3)$  symmetry arising from the closed loop character of the transverse directions. The coherent states constructed in this paper obey this symmetry. They are superpositions of holonomies which obey the  $U(1)$  gauge symmetry only on average: some holonomies in the superposition violate  $U(1)$  symmetry, although the  $U(1)$  quantum numbers of the state are peaked at values which obey the symmetry. Operators acting on coherent states give back a c-number times the original state, plus small correction states, which make the coherent state an approximate rather than exact eigenstate of the operator. In a follow-on paper these small correction states are used to calculate small corrections to eigenvalues of the volume operator.

PACS categories: 04.60, 04.30

---

\*Electronic address: dneville@temple.edu

## I Introduction

This paper is based on the canonical, spin network formulation of quantum gravity. This approach formulates gravity using densitized triads and a connection, rather than a metric [1, 2]. The connection is real [3], and exponentiated to form a holonomy.

To construct the full theory, one must choose a Euclidean Hamiltonian and consider commutators between holonomy, volume, and Euclidean Hamiltonian [4]. Since commutators with the Hamiltonian are also essentially [volume, holonomy] commutators, the essential commutator is between the holonomy and the triads making up the volume operator. Not only the Hamiltonian, but also the states are constructed from holonomies; therefore it is desirable to make the action of triads on holonomies as simple as possible; this is one goal of the present paper.

The holonomy has its support, not on a continuous manifold, but rather on a one-dimensional network of edges meeting at vertices (spin network) [5, 6]. At present there is no empirical confirmation for the existence of a microscopic spin network structure, although in the future it may be possible to detect Planck-scale modifications to elementary particle decay rates, or modifications to light propagation over cosmological distances [7, 8, 9, 10]. For now, the approach must be checked by undertaking calculations which confirm the internal consistency of the formulation, or confirm consistency with established principles. For example, area and volume operators for the theory possess a discrete spectrum [12], in qualitative agreement with the conclusions from thought experiments that lengths smaller than a Planck length are not measurable [13]. Cosmological calculations, extended back to the big bang, yield a finite result [14]. Black hole calculations predict area  $\propto$  entropy and yield a formula for the entropy [15, 16].

One topic which requires further investigation is the classical limit of the spin network approach. The systems studied so far (black holes, homogeneous cosmologies) have reasonable classical limits, but they are so highly symmetric that they cannot propagate gravitational waves.

In order for the system to propagate waves, the spin network Hamiltonian must be nonlocal: a single term in the Hamiltonian must be able to change the spin network at two or more neighbor-

ing vertices [17]. Once the Hamiltonian is made nonlocal, it is no longer obvious that the constraints have the correct commutation relations, in the limit of fields varying slowly over many spin network vertices [18]. I. e., it is not obvious that the theory possesses general coordinate invariance in the classical limit.

Several approaches use the path integral, or "spin foam" approach to study the classical limit, rather than the canonical, spin network approach. Aleschi and Rovelli calculate the gravitational Green's function, then check for a correct long-range behavior [19]. This approach puts limits on allowable spin foam vertices. Ambjorn, Jurkiewicz, and Loll put the system in a heat bath and solve numerically for the ground state, to see if the geometry is reasonable [20]. This work puts limits on the topology of admissible paths, and favors spin networks which are causal. Markopoulou, and also Oeckl, have studied the application of the renormalization group to gravity theory [21, 22].

Thiemann and Winkler develop another approach to the classical limit: within the canonical approach, construct coherent states which can be used to study the theory approximately in the classical limit [23, 24, 25]. This is the approach followed in the present paper, which constructs coherent states for a space possessing two commuting spacelike Killing vectors which may be written  $\partial/\partial x$  and  $\partial/\partial y$ . This planar symmetry is the simplest which allows propagation of gravitational waves, and therefore requires a nonlocal Hamiltonian.

For this case one cannot use the coherent states constructed by Thiemann and Winkler. In one sense these states are too general. They possess the full  $SU(2)$  local gauge invariance, whereas planar symmetry allows the gauge to be fixed, until only  $U(1)$  gauge rotations around the  $Z$  axis survive [31]. (Lower case coordinates  $x,y,z,t$  refer to coordinates on the global manifold; upper case coordinates  $X,Y,Z,T$  refer to coordinates in local Lorentz frames.) In another sense, the Thiemann Winkler states are not quite general enough, because the planar states must possess an  $O(3)$  symmetry which is not a limit of the  $SU(2)$  gauge symmetry [32, 33].

Section II describes a suitable Hilbert space for plane waves, and discusses the need for the  $O(3)$  symmetry. This section is a summary of an earlier paper by the author [32], and is included to make the present paper reasonably self-contained.

Section III constructs the coherent states. The approach used in

that section is rather intuitive. However, in later sections I show explicitly that the states have the properties expected of coherent states. They are approximate eigenvectors

$$O | \text{coherent state} \rangle = \langle O \rangle | \text{coherent state} \rangle + \text{SC},$$

where the operator  $O$  is either a densitized triad  $\tilde{E}_i^I$  or a spin one-half holonomy. The leading contribution to the matrix element is a c-number function  $\langle O \rangle$ ; and SC is a small correction term. Section V derives  $\langle O \rangle$  for the densitized triad; section VI derives it for the holonomy. Quantitative estimates of the SC terms are worked out in the appendices to this paper. The volume operator is a key operator in the spin network approach. Section VII considers the commutator [ holonomy, volume ].

The present paper is primarily an explication of the properties of coherent states, independent of any choice of Hamiltonian; however, I have emphasized certain properties of coherent states, because these are the properties I expect will be relevant later, when calculating the Hamiltonian. In particular, I have assumed that any future Hamiltonian will be constructed from spin 1/2 holonomies, those in the fundamental representation of  $SU(2)$ . Although spin 1/2 is the simplest choice, Gaul and Rovelli have investigated Hamiltonians involving higher spin [11]. They find there is no problem in principle with using the higher holonomies. Also, there is no problem extending the present formalism to higher holonomies, if they are needed.

The coherent states constructed in this paper are not exact eigenstates of the residual  $U(1)$ . Exact eigenstates could be obtained by angle-averaging the coherent states which will be constructed in section III. But these coherent states are already quite complicated, even before an angle average. It seems simplest to test for general covariance and gravitational wave propagation, using states which obey  $U(1)$  only on average, initially; the calculation can be refined at a later point. For studies of angle-averaged states which obey  $SU(2)$  exactly, see reference [26].

## II The planar Hilbert space

In reference [32] I proposed a spin network for the planar case, and constructed a kinematic basis. For completeness I review the high-

lights of that construction here.

Call the direction of propagation the  $z$  direction. The spin network in the  $z$  direction has the expected topology, a series of vertices connected by edges in the  $z$  direction. Holonomies on the  $z$  axis look like holonomies in the full theory. Each holonomy is integrated from one vertex to the next.

Each vertex also has an infinite number of vertices stretching in the  $x$  and  $y$  directions, but because of the symmetry, the holonomy stretching from vertex  $n$  to vertex  $n+1$  is identical to the holonomy stretching from  $n-1$  to  $n$ . Rather than an infinite number of vertices, one can bend the  $n$  to  $n+1$  holonomy around in a circle and associate both ends of this holonomy with the same vertex  $n$ . I.e. the  $x$  and  $y$  edges may be given the topology of a circle.

I will work in a connection representation for the wave function. The wave function at each vertex is a product of four holonomies: the two  $x$  and  $y$  holonomies on the circular edges, plus one incoming  $z$  holonomy and one outgoing  $z$  holonomy.

These holonomies may be simplified by gauge-fixing the  $\tilde{E}$  and connection fields [31]. The off-diagonal elements  $\tilde{E}_Z^a$  and  $\tilde{E}_A^z$ , with  $a = x, y$  and  $A = X, Y$ , can be gauged to zero; similarly,  $A_a^Z$  and  $A_z^A$  may be set to zero.

This means that the holonomies along the longitudinal  $z$  direction are quite simple, involving only the  $A_z^Z$  and the rotation generator  $S_Z$  for  $U(1)$  rotations around  $Z$ . Coherent states for the case of  $U(1)$  symmetry are well understood; see for example Thiemann and Winkler [25]. The basis holonomies along  $z$  are

$$h_z = \exp \left[ i \int M_z A_z^Z dz \right], \quad (1)$$

where  $M_z$ , an eigenvalue of the diagonal generator  $S_z$ , is integer or half-integer.

Now consider the  $x$  and  $y$  holonomies. Since  $A_a^Z$  and  $A_z^A$  have been set to zero, these involve generators  $S_X, S_Y$  and are rotations in the  $X, Y$  plane. Each transverse holonomy,

$$h^{(1/2)} = \exp \left[ i \hat{m} \cdot \tilde{\sigma} \theta / 2 \right],$$

therefore has an axis of rotation of the general form

$$\hat{m} = (\cos \phi, \sin \phi, 0), \quad (2)$$

for some angle  $\phi$ . (More precisely, there is one holonomy for each transverse direction  $x,y$ ; and one  $\phi$  for each transverse direction,  $\phi_x$  and  $\phi_y$ . Since the two directions are treated equally, I will discuss only the  $x$  holonomies, and will suppress the subscript  $x$  for now.)

The spin 1/2 holonomy  $h^{(1/2)}$  has matrix elements

$$h^{(1/2)} = \begin{bmatrix} \cos(\theta/2) & i \exp(-i\phi) \sin(\theta/2) \\ i \exp(+i\phi) \sin(\theta/2) & \cos(\theta/2) \end{bmatrix}. \quad (3)$$

The usual Euler angle decomposition is

$$\begin{aligned} h^{(1/2)} &= \exp[-i\sigma_Z(\phi - \pi/2)/2] \exp[i\sigma_Y\theta/2] \\ &\cdot \exp[+i\sigma_Z(\phi - \pi/2)/2] \\ &= h^{(1/2)}(-\phi + \pi/2, \theta, \phi - \pi/2). \end{aligned} \quad (4)$$

The natural basis for the transverse Hilbert space might seem to be the generalization of  $h^{(1/2)}$  from 1/2 to general  $j$ , the set of rotation matrices

$$h^{(j)}(-\phi + \pi/2, \theta, \phi - \pi/2),$$

where  $j$  is the highest weight obtained by multiplying together  $2j$   $h^{(1/2)}$  matrices. However, this basis is not convenient because it has complicated behavior under the action of the  $\tilde{E}$  and the volume operator. For example, for  $j = 1/2$ ,  $\tilde{E}$  (acts as a functional derivative with respect to  $A$  and) produces an anticommutator.

$$\begin{aligned} \tilde{E}_A^x h^{(1/2)} &= \tilde{E}_A^x \exp[i \int A_x^B S_B dx] \\ &= (1/2) \gamma \kappa [\sigma_A/2, h^{(1/2)}]_+, \end{aligned} \quad (5)$$

This anticommutator shuffles the matrix elements of  $h^{(1/2)}$  in a complicated way. The anticommutator arises because the transverse holonomy is supported by an edge with the topology of a loop: the holonomy both begins and ends at the same vertex. Therefore  $\tilde{E}$  "grasps" the holonomy on both sides.

In equation (5)  $\kappa = 8\pi G$ ;  $\gamma = \text{Immirsi parameter}$ ; and the 1/2 comes about because the  $\tilde{E}$  grasps the  $\int A \cdot S$  argument of the holonomy at endpoints, resulting in half a delta function. The delta functions are always canceled by the area and line integrals associated

with  $\tilde{E}_A^x$  and  $A_x^B$ . I have suppressed the area integration associated with each  $\tilde{E}$ .

Fortunately, the  $\tilde{E}$  reshuffle the elements of  $h$  in a relatively simple way. Introduce the operators  $\tilde{E}_\pm^x$ , where as usual

$$f_\pm := (f_x \pm if_y)/\sqrt{2}. \quad (6)$$

The operators  $\tilde{E}_\pm^x$  reshuffle the components of  $h$  in the same way that the familiar angular momentum operators  $L_\pm$  reshuffle the  $L=1$  Legendre polynomials  $Y_1^M$ . For example, write out the action of the anticommutator in equation (5), for index  $A = +$ .

$$[\sigma_+/2, h^{(1/2)}]_+ = \sqrt{1/2} \begin{bmatrix} i \exp(-i\phi) \sin(\theta/2) & 2 \cos(\theta/2) \\ 0 & i \exp(+i\phi) \sin(\theta/2) \end{bmatrix} \quad (7)$$

Compare this matrix to the original matrix, equation (3):  $\tilde{E}_+^x$  has reshuffled the matrix elements as follows

$$\begin{aligned} (i/\sqrt{2}) \exp(-i\phi) \sin \theta/2 &\rightarrow \cos \theta/2 \\ \cos \theta/2 &\rightarrow (i\sqrt{2}) \exp(+i\phi) \sin \theta/2 \\ (i/\sqrt{2}) \exp(+i\phi) \sin \theta/2 &\rightarrow 0. \end{aligned} \quad (8)$$

This is isomorphic to the action of the operator  $L_+$  on the  $L = 1$  Legendre polynomials. The isomorphism is

$$\begin{aligned} L_\pm &\leftrightarrow 2 \tilde{E}_\pm^x / \gamma \kappa; \\ L_0 &\leftrightarrow 2 \tilde{E}_0^x / \gamma \kappa; \\ Y_1^\pm(\theta, \phi) &\leftrightarrow Y_1^\pm(\theta/2, \phi - \pi/2) \\ &= \mp N \sin(\theta/2) \exp[\pm(i\phi - i\pi/2)] / \sqrt{2}; \\ Y_1^0(\theta, \phi) &\leftrightarrow Y_1^0(\theta/2, \phi - \pi/2) \\ &= N \cos(\theta/2). \end{aligned} \quad (9)$$

Because of the half angles, the new  $Y$ 's are orthonormalized using

$$\int_0^{2\pi} \int_0^{2\pi} Y^* Y \sin(\theta/2) d(\theta/2) d\phi.$$

After a change of variable  $\rho = \theta/2$ , this dot product is the usual one.  $N$  is the usual normalization  $\sqrt{4\pi/3}$ .

Because the  $Y_1^M(\theta/2, \phi - \pi/2)$  transform more simply than matrix elements of  $\mathfrak{h}$  under the action of  $\tilde{E}$ , one obtains a more convenient basis by using  $O(3)$  Clebsch-Gordan coefficients to join the  $Y$ 's, rather than  $SU(2)$  coefficients to join elements of  $\mathfrak{h}$ . The resultant basis is just the set of spherical harmonics  $Y_L^M(\theta/2, \phi - \pi/2)$  for  $O(3)$ .

The operator  $\tilde{E}_0^x$  is not the triad  $\tilde{E}_2^x$ , which has been gauged to zero.  $\tilde{E}_0^x$  is constructed to complete the trio of generators and act on states in a manner isomorphic to  $L_0$ .

$$\tilde{E}_0^x = [\mathfrak{h}, \sigma_3/2]_- \quad (10)$$

Because the three independent elements of  $\mathfrak{h}^{1/2}$  can be expressed in terms of the  $Y_1^M(\theta/2, \phi - \pi/2)$ , the  $Y$ 's are as complete a set as the elements of  $\mathfrak{h}^{1/2}$ . The relation between  $\mathfrak{h}$  and the  $Y_1^M$  is

$$N\mathfrak{h}^{(1/2)} = \mathbf{1}Y_1^0 + iY_1^+\mathbf{S}_- + iY_1^-\mathbf{S}_+, \quad (11)$$

where boldface denotes a  $2 \times 2$  matrix. This expansion of  $\mathfrak{h}^{(1/2)}$  contains only three matrices and no  $\sigma_3$ , which explains why  $\mathfrak{h}$  contains only three independent elements, corresponding to the three components  $Y_1^M$ .

One can take into account the  $y$  edges as well as the  $x$  edges, by constructing two bases,  $Y_{Lx}^{Mx}$  and  $Y_{Ly}^{My}$  for holonomies along the  $x$  and  $y$  directions respectively. These harmonics transform simply under the action of the  $\tilde{E}$ :

$$(\gamma\kappa/2)^{-1}\tilde{E}_\pm^x Y_L^M = \sum_N Y_{LN} \langle L, N | S_\pm | L, M \rangle, \quad (12)$$

where  $Y_{LM} = Y_{LM}(\theta/2, \phi - \pi/2)$ . The unconventional half-angle reminds us of the origin of these objects in a holonomy  $\mathfrak{h}^{1/2}$  depending on half-angles.

The  $Y$ 's are known to be proportional to matrix elements of rotations,

$$\sqrt{4\pi/(2L+1)} Y_L^M = D_{0M}^{(L)}(-\phi + \pi/2, \theta/2, \phi - \pi/2). \quad (13)$$

Therefore equation (12) is also correct if  $D$ 's are substituted for  $Y$ 's. I prefer  $D$ 's to  $Y$ 's in what follows, because use of  $D$ 's (will require awkward factors of  $\sqrt{4\pi/(2L+1)}$  in initial formulas, but) ultimately will result in fewer factors  $\sqrt{4\pi/(2L+1)}$ .

The planar calculation involves three groups: SU(2), because the holonomies in the Hamiltonian are rotation matrices in SU(2); O(3), because the action of the grasps generates an O(3) group; and U(1), because the usual SU(2) gauge invariance is broken to U(1) by the gauge fixing. It is worth taking a minute to contemplate when to use which group.

Presumably the Hamiltonian will be constructed using holonomies  $h^{(1/2)}$  in the fundamental representation of SU(2). The Euler decomposition of  $h^{(1/2)}$ , equation (3), shows  $h^{(1/2)}$  as depending on the full angle  $\theta$ , but of course the actual matrix elements of  $h^{(1/2)}$  contain half-angles  $\sin(\theta/2)$ ,  $\cos(\theta/2)$ . When these matrix elements are rearranged to form a representation  $D^{(1)}(h)$  of O(3), the matrix elements of  $D^{(1)}(h)$  (and  $D^{(L)}(h)$ , equation (13)) inherit this dependence on half-angles: the Euler expression for the D's involves a half angle. I will use the notations  $h$  for the SU(2) matrix (as,  $h^{(1/2)}$ ) and  $D(h)$  for the O(3) matrices.

Now consider the relation between O(3) and the residual gauge invariance U(1). Most of the O(3) rotations have nothing to do with SU(2) gauge invariance. The exceptions are rotations around the axis of propagation Z. These rotations are just the U(1) gauge rotations. Proof: because of the gauge fixing, the axis of rotation  $\hat{m}$  for the matrix  $h^{(1/2)}$ , equation (2) lies in the XY plane, and must remain in that plane. The SU(2) gauge rotations of the holonomies are reduced to U(1) rotations around the Z axis. The result of a Z rotation of the connections follows from the surviving Z component of Gauss.

$$\begin{aligned} A_x^{X'} &= A_x^X \cos \delta - A_x^Y \sin \delta; \\ A_x^{Y'} &= A_x^Y \cos \delta + A_x^X \sin \delta; \\ A_z^{Z'} &= A_z^Z - \partial_z \delta. \end{aligned}$$

This induces a rotation of the holonomies,

$$\begin{aligned} h' &= \exp[-i\sigma_z \delta/2] h \exp[+i\sigma_z \delta/2]; \\ h'_z &= \exp\left[i \int_1^2 A'_z dz M_z\right] \\ &= \exp[-iM_z \delta(2)] h_z \exp[+iM_z \delta(1)]. \end{aligned}$$

The first line, above, implies that the argument  $\phi$  of  $h$  changes to  $\phi + \delta$ .

$$h'_{mn}(1/2) = h_{mn}(1/2) \exp[i(n - m)\delta].$$

This in turn changes the components of the  $Y_L^M$ .

$$D'_{0M}(L) = D_{0M}(L) \exp[iM\delta].$$

This is identical to the result of an  $O(3)$  rotation around the  $Z$  axis.  
□

It is straightforward to work out the consequences of  $U(1)$  gauge invariance for the simplest basis, where the  $x$  and  $y$  holonomies have definite  $M$ ,  $D_{0Ma}^{(La)}$ ,  $a = x, y$ , and the incoming and outgoing  $z$  holonomies, equation (1), have definite  $M_{zf}$  and  $M_{zi}$ . The total change in phase at each vertex is

$$\exp[i\delta(M_x + M_y + M_{zf} - M_{zi})].$$

$U(1)$  invariance therefore demands that the quantity

$$M_x + M_y + M_{zf} - M_{zi}$$

vanish, for each vertex.

The transverse coherent states constructed here will not have unique values for  $M_x$  and  $M_y$ . These states will be superpositions of  $D_{0Ma}^{(La)}$  matrices; and the superpositions will contain a range of values  $M_a$ . (Similarly, coherent states in the longitudinal direction will not have definite  $M_z$ .) The superpositions are sharply peaked at central values of the  $M$ 's, however, so that  $M$ -values which violate  $U(1)$  are suppressed.

### III Coherent states

From the previous section, a basis for the Hilbert space can be constructed from  $O(3)$  spherical harmonics

$$D_{0M}^{(1)}(-\phi + \pi/2, \theta/2, \phi - \pi/2) := D^{(1)}(h)_{0M},$$

A set of coherent states should therefore be a sum over spherical harmonics,

$$|u, \tilde{p}\rangle = \sum_{L, M} D_{0M}^{(L)}(\mathbf{h}) c(L, M; u, \tilde{p}), \quad (14)$$

for some coefficients  $c$ . The parameters  $(u, \tilde{p})$  label the coherent states.  $u$  is a  $2 \times 2$  matrix specifying the peak value of  $\mathbf{h}$ , and  $\tilde{p}$  determines the peak value of  $\tilde{E}_\Lambda^x$ .

There are two kinds of  $SU(2)$  coherent states available in the literature. The first type has no sum over  $L$  in equation (14), only a sum over  $M$  [27, 28]. These coherent states are too simple for present purposes. If  $L$  is fixed, the  $\tilde{E}$  operators can be made classical, but not the holonomies. Since  $L$  is conjugate to angle, one must superimpose many  $L$ 's to get sharply peaked angular values for  $(\theta, \phi)$ .

The second kind of coherent state was suggested by Hall [29] and elaborated for quantum loop gravity by Thiemann and Winkler [23, 24, 25]. Their results were derived for the general case, full local  $SU(2)$  symmetry. For the planar case, with its  $O(3)$  symmetry, simply taking a  $U(1)$  limit of the general case does not work. One must start from a superposition of representations of the  $O(3)$  symmetry, as in equation (14)

The Thiemann Winkler coherent states may be understood intuitively as generalizations of the minimal uncertainty states for the free particle. One applies a certain recipe to construct the free particle states, and the same recipe works in the general  $SU(2)$  case. Once this intuitive approach is understood, it is straightforward to use the same approach to generate a set of candidate coherent states for the planar  $O(3)$  case.

I review the recipe for constructing a coherent state for the free particle. Start from a wave function which is a delta function.

$$\delta(x - x_0) = \int \exp[ik(x - x_0)] dk / 2\pi.$$

This wave function is certainly strongly peaked, but it is not normalizable. Also, it is peaked in position, but it should be peaked in both momentum and position. To make the packet normalizable, insert a Gaussian operator  $\exp[-p^2/(2\sigma^2)]$ . (Choosing the Gaussian form is a "cheat", because we know the answer; but for future reference note that all the eigenvalues  $k^2$  of the operator  $p^2$  must be positive, so that the Gaussian damps for all  $k$ .) To produce a

peak in momentum, complexify the peak position:  $x_0 \rightarrow x_0 + ip_0/\sigma^2$ .  
 With these changes, the packet becomes

$$\begin{aligned}
 & N \int \exp[-p^2/(2\sigma^2)] \exp[ik(x - x_0) + kp_0/\sigma^2] dk/2\pi \\
 &= N \int \exp[-k^2/(2\sigma^2) + ik(x - x_0) + kp_0/\sigma^2] dk/2\pi \\
 &= (N \exp[p_0^2/(2\sigma^2)]/\sqrt{2\pi}) \\
 &\quad \cdot \exp[ip_0(x - x_0) - (x - x_0)^2\sigma^2/2]. \quad (15)
 \end{aligned}$$

The last line follows after completing the square on the exponential, and exhibits the characteristic coherent state form.

There is not just one state, but a family of coherent states, characterized by the parameter  $\sigma$ . The shape of the wave function is highly sensitive to  $\sigma$ ; but the peak values  $x_0, p_0$  are independent of  $\sigma$ , as is the minimal uncertainty relation  $\Delta x \Delta p = \hbar/2$ . The coherent states constructed below contain a parameter  $t$  which is analogous to  $\sigma$ .

Now apply the above recipe to the planar case. The conjugate variables  $x$  and  $p$  are replaced by a pair of conjugate variables: angles  $(\theta, \phi)$  and angular momenta  $(L, M)$ . The complete set of momentum eigenfunctions is replaced by a complete set of spherical harmonics.

To construct a delta function in angles,

$$\delta(\theta/2 - \alpha/2)\delta(\phi - \beta)/\sin(\alpha/2)$$

I introduce spherical harmonics  $D^{(L)}(\mathbf{u})$  depending on angles  $(\alpha, \beta)$  in the same way that the  $D^{(L)}(\mathbf{h})$  depend on  $(\theta, \phi)$ .

$$\begin{aligned}
 D^{(L)}(\mathbf{u})_{0M} &= D^{(L)}(-\beta + \pi/2, \alpha/2, \beta - \pi/2)_{0M} \\
 &= \sqrt{4\pi/(2L+1)} Y_{LM}(\alpha/2, \beta - \pi/2). \quad (16)
 \end{aligned}$$

Compare equation (16) to equation (13). I can now write the delta function in angle as a sum over spherical harmonics.

$$\begin{aligned}
 & \delta(\theta/2 - \alpha/2)\delta(\phi - \beta)/\sin(\alpha/2) \\
 &= \sum_{L,M} ((2L+1)/4\pi) D^{(L)}(\mathbf{h})_{0M} D^{(L)}(\mathbf{u})_{0M}^*. \quad (17)
 \end{aligned}$$

As discussed in the last section, it is more convenient to use  $D$  matrices rather than  $Y_{LM}$ 's, but the reader who wishes to exhibit the latter can use equations (13) and (16) to replace  $D$ 's by  $Y$ 's in equation (17). The sum then takes on a form which may be more familiar, just  $\sum YY^*$ . The momentum eigenvalue  $k$  in the free particle example corresponds to angular momentum eigenvalue  $L$  in the planar case.

Continue with the recipe: dampen the sum using a Gaussian  $\exp[-tL(L+1)/2]$ . Complexify by extending the angles in  $u$  to complex values, replacing  $u$  by a matrix  $g$  in the complex extension of  $O(3)$ . (For the free particle,  $x$  becomes complex; here, the angles become complex.) The coherent state has the general form

$$\begin{aligned} |u, \tilde{p}\rangle &= N \sum_{L,M} ((2L+1)/4\pi) \exp[-tL(L+1)/2] \\ &\quad \cdot D^{(L)}(h)_{0M} D^{(L)}(g)_{0M}^* \\ &= N \sum_{L,M} \dots D^{(L)}(h)_{0M} D^{(L)}(g^\dagger)_{M0}. \end{aligned} \quad (18)$$

A vector  $\tilde{p}$  is needed to characterize the matrix  $g$ , as follows. Every matrix in  $SL(2,C)$ , the complex extension of  $SU(2)$ , can be decomposed into a product of a Hermitean matrix  $H$  times a unitary matrix  $u$  ("polar decomposition"; see for example [30]). E. g. for the fundamental representation,

$$g = Hu = \exp[\tilde{\sigma} \cdot \tilde{p}/2] u.$$

It follows that every matrix in  $O(3)$  also has a polar decomposition, obtained by restricting the representations of  $SU(2)$  to representations with integer spin.

$$\begin{aligned} g^{(L)} &= \exp[\tilde{S} \cdot \tilde{p}] u^{(L)} \\ &:= H^{(L)} u^{(L)} \end{aligned} \quad (19)$$

At this point I must choose six input parameters: the three Euler angles which determine the unitary matrix  $u$  and the three components of  $\tilde{p}$ , which define the complex extension. By analogy with the free particle case, if  $u$  determines the peak angles, then the complex

extension  $\tilde{\mathbf{p}}$  determines peak values of the canonically conjugate variable, the angular momentum.

In this paper I use the following choices for these parameters. Restrict  $\tilde{\mathbf{p}}$  to be an arbitrary vector in the XY plane.

$$p_3 = 0. \quad (20)$$

Restrict the unitary matrix  $u$  to be an arbitrary rotation with axis of rotation in the XY plane. The Euler decomposition of  $u^{(L)}$  is

$$\begin{aligned} u^{(L)} &= u(-\beta + \pi/2, \alpha, \beta - \pi/2) \\ &:= \exp[i \hat{\mathbf{n}} \cdot \tilde{\mathbf{S}} \alpha/2]; \\ \hat{\mathbf{n}} &= (\cos \beta, \sin \beta, 0). \end{aligned} \quad (21)$$

(Compare this definition of  $u$  to the corresponding definition of the matrix  $h$ , given at equations (2) and (3). Both  $u$  and  $h$  have their axis of rotation in the XY plane.)

These choices are certainly plausible. In the limit of no complexity (in the limit  $\tilde{\mathbf{p}} \rightarrow 0$ ) the coherent state will reduce to the original delta function and  $u$  will become the peak value of  $h$ . Since  $h$  has its axis of rotation in the XY plane, the peak value should also be a matrix with axis in the XY plane.

Also, the generator  $\tilde{\mathbf{S}} \cdot \tilde{\mathbf{p}}$  for  $H$  is the complexification of the generator  $\tilde{\mathbf{S}} \cdot \hat{\mathbf{n}}$  for  $u$ . Since  $\hat{\mathbf{n}}$  lies in the XY plane, the same should be true for  $\tilde{\mathbf{p}}$ . In short, since  $h$  is a very special matrix (its axis lies in the XY plane) the peak matrix  $u$  and its complexification  $H$  should also be special.

I have considered more general choices for  $u$  and  $\tilde{\mathbf{p}}$ ,

$$(u, \mathbf{p}) \rightarrow (\tilde{u}, \tilde{\mathbf{p}}),$$

where  $\tilde{\mathbf{p}}$  and the axis of  $\tilde{u}$  need not be in the XY plane. However, in later sections of this paper I calculate the expectation values  $\langle \tilde{E}_A^x \rangle$  and  $\langle D^{(1)}(h)_{0A} \rangle$ , for  $p_3 = 0$ , and axis of  $u$  in the XY plane, equations (20) and (21), and find that these simpler choices already give coherent states with the required peaked behavior. Use of the more general values seems to add nothing but complexity.

Since  $\tilde{\mathbf{p}}$  now lies in the XY plane,  $\tilde{\mathbf{p}}$  may be parameterized using a magnitude,  $p$ , plus an angle  $\mu$ . It is convenient for later calculations to take  $\mu$  to be the angle between  $\tilde{\mathbf{p}}$  and  $\hat{\mathbf{n}}$ , the axis of  $u$ .

$$\tilde{\mathbf{p}} = p [\cos(\beta + \mu), \sin(\beta + \mu), 0]. \quad (22)$$

From equation (21),  $\beta$  is the angle between  $\hat{\mathbf{n}}$  and the X axis.

## IV Overview

The next two sections verify the properties given in equation (14). The general structure of the calculations is relatively simple, but there are many details which can obscure matters. It may be useful to summarize that structure here, to avoid losing the forest for the trees.

The peak values of both triad and holonomy,

$$\langle \tilde{\mathbf{E}}_A^x \rangle \text{ and } \langle D^{(1)}(\mathbf{h})_{0A} \rangle,$$

are both vectors in SU(2) index space ( $A = X, Y, Z$ ). It is desirable to construct an orthonormal triad of unit vectors with physical significance; then express the two peak values in terms of these unit vectors.

An obvious choice for one unit vector is the peak value of  $D^{(1)}(\mathbf{h})_{0A}$ . From the way the delta function in angle was constructed at equation (17), the peak value of holonomy  $D^{(1)}(\mathbf{h})_{0A}$  will turn out to be  $D^{(1)}(\mathbf{u})_{0A}$ :

$$\langle D^{(1)}(\mathbf{h})_{0A} \rangle = D^{(1)}(\mathbf{u})_{0A}.$$

Every row of an orthogonal matrix is a unit vector, and in particular the three matrix elements  $D^{(1)}(\mathbf{u})_{0A}$  form a unit vector. I introduce a notation which emphasizes the unit character of  $D^{(1)}(\mathbf{u})_{0A}$ :

$$D^{(1)}(\mathbf{u})_{0A} := \hat{\mathbf{D}}_A. \quad (23)$$

The vector  $\hat{\mathbf{n}}$ , the axis of rotation for  $D^{(1)}(\mathbf{u})$ , is another choice for a unit vector. It is orthogonal to  $\hat{\mathbf{D}}$ . To derive the orthogonality, write  $\hat{\mathbf{D}}$  as the rotation of a unit vector initially along the Z axis.

$$\hat{\mathbf{D}}_A = (0, 0, 1)_B D^{(1)}(\mathbf{u})_{BA}. \quad (24)$$

The initial unit vector  $(0, 0, 1) = \hat{\mathbf{Z}}$  is orthogonal to the axis of rotation  $\hat{\mathbf{n}}$ , since the latter lies in the XY plane. It follows that the

rotated unit vector,  $\hat{D}$ , remains orthogonal to  $\hat{n}$ , since orthogonal rotations preserve angles.  $\square$  Given the two orthogonal basis vectors,  $(\hat{n}, \hat{D})$ , one can construct a third from  $\hat{n} \times \hat{D}$ .

Action of the operators on the coherent state does not lead to the three unit vectors immediately, but does give rise to a factor  $D^1(u)_{BA}$ . The row  $B = 0$  yields  $\hat{D}$ . The  $B = \pm 1$  rows are orthogonal to the  $B = 0$  row, and appendix B expresses them in terms of  $\hat{n}$  and  $\hat{n} \times \hat{D}$ .

The  $D^1(u)_{BA}$  are multiplied by factors of  $D^{(L)}(H)_{M0} \exp[-tL(L+1)/2]$ . From appendix C this factor has a Gaussian form for large  $e^p \gg 1$ .

$$\begin{aligned} & \exp(-tL(L+1)/2) D(H)_{MN}^{(L)} \\ & \cong \exp[-t((L+1/2) - p/t)^2/2] \\ & \cdot \exp[-M^2/2(L+1/2) - N^2/2(L+1/2)] [1/\sqrt{\pi(L+1/2)}] \\ & \cdot \exp[p^2/(2t) - p/2] (\exp[-i(\beta + \mu)])^{M-N}. \end{aligned}$$

This result suggests power-series expanding the complex expressions around the mean values supplied by the Gaussian,  $L + 1/2 = p/t$  and  $M = 0$ . The lowest powers supply the peak values; higher powers can be used to estimate the size of the small correction (SC) terms.

Since  $\tilde{E}_A^x$  brings down a factor of spin (equation (12)),  $\langle E_A^x \rangle$  is essentially the peak value of angular momentum. The following quantum mechanical analogy helps in understanding the exact connection between  $\langle \tilde{E}_A^x \rangle$  and  $\hat{D}$ . Consider an electron moving in a central potential and described by polar and azimuthal coordinates  $(\theta/2, \phi - \pi/2)$ . (The definitions of polar and azimuthal angles are unorthodox but acceptable.) The angular wavefunction for the electron, as well as the coherent state equation (18), are both superpositions of spherical functions  $Y_{LM}$ , or equivalently rotation matrices  $D(h)_{0M}$ . Therefore equation (18) can serve as a coherent state describing the angular motion of an electron, when the position of the electron is peaked at  $\hat{D}$ .

Since the angular momentum vector of the electron is perpendicular to the orbit, we have

$$0 = \sum_M \hat{D}_M(u_x) \langle \tilde{E}_M^x \rangle. \quad (25)$$

The constraint equation (25) follows from the symmetry, not the

dynamics; therefore the spin network coherent state must obey the same constraint. The expectation value  $\langle \tilde{E}_A^x \rangle$  must be a linear combination of  $\hat{n}$  and  $\hat{n} \times \hat{D}$ .

This section has sketched the general strategy. The next two sections apply it to specific cases.

## V Action of the $\tilde{E}$

This section computes the action of an  $\tilde{E}$  operator on the coherent state. The main results of this section are the following: the coherent states are approximate eigenvectors of the  $\tilde{E}$ . For  $A = \pm 1$ ,

$$\begin{aligned} (\gamma\kappa/2)^{-1} \tilde{E}_A^x |u, \tilde{p}\rangle &= \langle L + 1/2 \rangle (\hat{n}_A \cos \mu - (\hat{n} \times \hat{D})_A \sin \mu) |u, \tilde{p}\rangle \\ &\quad + \text{SC} \\ &= \langle L + 1/2 \rangle \hat{p}_B D^{(1)}(u)_{BA} |u, \tilde{p}\rangle + \text{SC}. \end{aligned} \quad (26)$$

$L + 1/2$  is an approximation and abbreviation for  $\sqrt{L(L+1)}$ . The peak value of the angular momentum is

$$\langle L + 1/2 \rangle = p/t.$$

From the last line of equation (26), the direction of  $L$  is given by the *rotated* value of  $\hat{p}$ . Consistent with the electron analogy given in the last section, rotated  $\hat{p}$  is a linear combination of the two basis vectors perpendicular to  $\hat{D}$ . The small correction terms SC are investigated in appendix D and shown to be down by factors of order  $1/\sqrt{L}$ .

$\hat{n}$  and  $\hat{p}$  are the axes of rotation for  $u$  and  $H$ , defined at equations (21) and (19).  $\mu$  is the angle between  $\hat{n}$  and  $\hat{p}$ , equation (22).  $\hat{D}$  is an abbreviation for the unit vector  $D^{(1)}(u)_{0A}$ .

The  $A = 0$  component of equation (26) is the  $\tilde{E}_0^x$  introduced at equation (10), where it was defined by its action on the basic holonomy  $h^{(1/2)}$ . In the present context, if  $\tilde{E}_\pm^x$  yields a spin matrix factor  $S_\pm$  multiplying each  $D(h)$  the coherent state, then  $\tilde{E}_0^x$  may be defined as the operator which produces a factor of  $S_0$ , i.e. it multiplies  $D(h)_{0M}$  by  $M$ .

$$\langle (\gamma\kappa/2)^{-1} \tilde{E}_0^x \rangle = \langle M_x \rangle .$$

$M_x$  is the  $U(1)$  quantum number needed to check  $U(1)$  invariance. From equation (26) with  $A = 0$ ,

$$\langle M_x \rangle = \langle L_x \rangle \hat{p}_B D^{(1)}(u)_{B0}. \quad (27)$$

I now derive equation (26). By construction, the  $D(h)$  matrices in the coherent state transform simply under the action of an  $\tilde{E}$  :

$$\begin{aligned} (\gamma\kappa/2)^{-1} \tilde{E}_A^x |u, \tilde{p}\rangle &= N \sum_{L,M} ((2L+1)/4\pi) \exp[-tL(L+1)/2] \\ &\cdot D^{(L)}(h)_{0N} \langle L, N | S_A | L, M \rangle D^{(L)}(g^\dagger)_{M0} \\ &= N \sum_{L,M,R} ((2L+1)/4\pi) \exp[-tL(L+1)/2] \\ &\cdot D^{(L)}(h)_{0N} \langle L, N | S_A | L, M \rangle D^{(L)}(u^\dagger)_{MR} D^{(L)}(H)_{R0} \\ &= N \sum_L ((2L+1)/4\pi) \exp[-tL(L+1)/2] \\ &\cdot [D^{(L)}(h) S_A D^{(L)}(u^\dagger) D^{(L)}(H)]_{00} \end{aligned} \quad (28)$$

On the second line I use the  $g = Hu$  decomposition, equation (19), plus  $D(g^\dagger) = D(u^\dagger)D(H)$ . On the last line I have used a matrix notation to hide some indices.

I now implement the general procedure outlined in the previous section. First I must produce a factor of  $D^{(1)}(u)$ . The spin generator  $S$  in equation (28) is essentially a Clebsch-Gordan coefficient, and from the rotation properties of these coefficients, appendix A, equation (64),

$$S_A D^{(L)}(u^\dagger) = D^{(L)}(u^\dagger) S_B D^{(1)}(u)_{BA}.$$

Equation (28) becomes

$$\begin{aligned} (\gamma\kappa/2)^{-1} \tilde{E}_A^x |u, \tilde{p}\rangle &= N \sum_{L,M} ((2L+1)/4\pi) \exp[-tL(L+1)/2] \\ &\cdot [D^{(L)}(hu^\dagger) S_B D^{(L)}(H)]_{00} D^{(1)}(u)_{BA} \\ &= N \sum_{L,M} ((2L+1)/4\pi) \exp[-tL(L+1)/2] D^{(L)}(hu^\dagger)_{0M} D^{(L)}(H)_{M0} \\ &\cdot [\langle L, M | S_B | L, M - B \rangle D^{(L)}(H)_{M-B,0} / D^{(L)}(H)_{M0}] \\ &\cdot D^{(1)}(u)_{BA}. \end{aligned} \quad (29)$$

The final three lines exhibit the desired factor of  $D^{(1)}(\mathbf{u})$ , as well as factors of  $D^{(L)}(\mathbf{hu}\dagger)_{0M} D^{(L)}(\mathbf{H})_{M0}$  which make the sum in equation (29) look as much as possible like the original coherent state.

The sum is not exactly the original state because of the square bracket, second line from the end of equation (29). The Gaussian behavior of the  $D(\mathbf{H})$  matrices could be used to simplify this bracket; but is slightly more accurate to use a recurrence relation which follows from equation (75) of appendix C in the  $e^P \gg 1$  limit.

$$D^{(L)}(\mathbf{H})_{M\mp 1,0} \cong D^{(L)}(\mathbf{H})_{M,0} (\hat{p}_1 - i\hat{p}_2)^{\mp 1} \cdot 1/\sqrt{(L \pm M)/(L \mp M + 1)}. \quad (30)$$

I have specialized to  $p_3 = 0$ . For  $\tilde{\mathbf{p}}$  parameterized as at equation (22),  $\hat{p}_1 - i\hat{p}_2 = \exp[-i(\beta + \mu)]$ . Also, the matrix element of  $S_0$  is just  $M$ , while  $S_B$  for  $B = \pm 1$  is given by

$$\langle L, M | S_{\pm 1} | L, M \mp 1 \rangle = \mp \sqrt{(L \mp M + 1)(L \pm M)/2} \quad (31)$$

Equation (29) becomes

$$(\gamma\kappa/2)^{-1} \tilde{E}_A^x | \mathbf{u}, \tilde{\mathbf{p}} \rangle = N \sum_{L,M,B} ((2L+1)/4\pi) \exp[-tL(L+1)/2] \cdot D^{(L)}(\mathbf{hu}\dagger)_{0M} C[M, B] D^{(L)}(\mathbf{H})_{M0} \exp[iB(\beta + \mu)] D^{(1)}(\mathbf{u})_{BA};$$

$$\begin{aligned} C[M, B = 0] &= M; \\ C[M, B = +1] &= -(L+M)/\sqrt{2}; \\ C[M, B = -1] &= (L-M)/\sqrt{2}. \end{aligned} \quad (32)$$

Using appendix B, I replace the  $D^{(1)}(\mathbf{u})_{BA}$  by the geometrically more transparent quantities  $\hat{n}$ ,  $\hat{D}$ , and  $\hat{n} \times \hat{D}$ . The row  $D^{(1)}(\mathbf{u})_{0A}$  is just the vector  $\hat{D}$  introduced at equation (23). The rows  $D^{(1)}(\mathbf{u})_{\pm 1,A}$  may be replaced by linear combinations of the unit vectors  $\hat{n}$  and  $\hat{n} \times \hat{D}$ , using equations (68) and (69) in appendix B. Equation (32) becomes

$$\begin{aligned}
(\gamma\kappa/2)^{-1}\tilde{E}_A^x | u, \tilde{p}\rangle &= N \sum_{L,M} ((2L+1)/4\pi) \exp[-tL(L+1)/2] \\
&\cdot D^{(L)}(hu^\dagger)_{0M} D^{(L)}(H)_{M0} \\
&\cdot \{(L \cos \mu + iM \sin \mu)\hat{n}_A + (-L \sin \mu + iM \cos \mu)(\hat{n} \times \hat{D})_A \\
&\quad + M \hat{D}_A\}. \quad (33)
\end{aligned}$$

The third and final step of the general procedure invokes the Gaussian nature of the factor  $D(H)$ . From appendix C

$$\begin{aligned}
D^{(L)}(H)_{M0} \exp[-tL(L+1)/2] &\cong \\
&\sqrt{t/\pi} \exp[-t(L+1/2 - p/t)^2/2] \\
&\cdot \sqrt{1/[(L+1/2)\pi]} \exp\{-M^2/[2(L+1/2)]\} f(p, t).
\end{aligned}$$

This suggests expanding the factors of  $L+1/2$  and  $M$  in the curly bracket around their means,  $\langle L+1/2 \rangle = p/t$  and  $\langle M \rangle = 0$ . Equivalently, in equation (33) set

$$\begin{aligned}
L+1/2 &= p/t + (L+1/2 - p/t) \\
&:= \langle L+1/2 \rangle + \Delta L; \\
M &= \Delta M, \quad (34)
\end{aligned}$$

and keep out to first order in  $\Delta L$  and  $\Delta M$ . The leading terms in the expansion come from the terms proportional to  $L+1/2$  in the curly bracket, equation equation (33). When  $L$  is expanded as  $L+1/2 = \langle L+1/2 \rangle + \Delta L$  one finds a leading term proportional to

$$\langle L+1/2 \rangle (\hat{n} \cos \mu - \hat{n} \times \hat{D})_A \sin \mu.$$

This expression is a constant and may be taken out of the sum, leaving behind just the original coherent state. We get the desired result equation (26) for the leading term.

The remaining terms in the expansion around peak  $M$  and  $L$  all involve  $\Delta X$ ,  $X = L$  or  $M$ . These small correction (SC) terms are studied in appendix D. The sums over  $L$  and  $M$  are approximated by integrals, and the SC terms are then found to be down by factors of order  $\sigma_X / \langle L \rangle$ , where  $\sigma_X$  is the standard deviation for the Gaussian distribution of  $X$ .

Since  $\sigma_L = 1/\sqrt{t}$  depends on  $t$ , from equation (84), evidently the "arbitrary" width  $t$  is not so arbitrary after all. I show in the appendix that the most reasonable value, the one which minimizes all SC terms to the same extent, is  $t = \text{order } 1/ \langle L \rangle$ .

## VI Matrix elements of the holonomy

This section computes the action of the holonomy  $h^{(1/2)}$  on the coherent state. Presumably the Hamiltonian will be a function of this matrix; but for calculations it is more convenient to use the linear combinations  $D^{(1)}(h)$ , equations (11) and (13), rather than the  $h^{(1/2)}$ . The coherent state is an expansion in spherical harmonics  $D^{(L)}(h)$ , and using the matrix  $D^{(1)}(h)$  allows one to invoke identities for simplifying the product of two  $D$ 's. Of course once it is shown that the peak value of  $D^{(1)}(h)$  is  $D^{(1)}(u)$ , it follows that the peak value of  $h^{(1/2)}$  is just  $u^{(1/2)}$ .

Some preliminary qualitative remarks may help the reader once again avoid burial under detail.  $D^{(1)}(h)$  multiplies the  $D^{(L)}(h)$  contained in the coherent state; this quadratic combination of  $D$ 's may be rewritten as a linear combination of  $D^{(L\pm 1)}$  and  $D^{(L)}$ , using Clebsch-Gordan coefficients and the angular momentum addition rules. (Actually, the CG coefficients forbid any  $D^{(L)}$ . Absence of  $D^{(L)}$  also follows from parity conservation.) The coherent state is clearly not an exact eigenfunction of  $D^{(1)}(h)$ , but the Gaussian nature of  $D(H)$  comes to the rescue. The states involving  $D^{(L\pm 1)}$  are shown to be coherent states peaked at  $L \pm 1$ , with sufficiently large standard deviation that these coherent states are indistinguishable from the original coherent state with peak at  $L$ .

After these qualitative remarks, we are ready for the calculation.

$$\begin{aligned}
D^{(1)}(h)_{0A} | u, \tilde{p} \rangle &= N \sum_{L,M} ((2L+1)/4\pi) \exp[-tL(L+1)/2] \\
&\cdot \sum_{L\pm 1} D^{(L\pm 1)}(h)_{0M} \langle L \pm 1, 0 | L, 0; 1, 0 \rangle \\
&\cdot \langle L \pm 1, M | L, M - A; 1, A \rangle \\
&\cdot D^{(L)}(u^\dagger)_{M-A,N} D^{(L)}(H)_{N0} \quad (35)
\end{aligned}$$

On the right I have rewritten  $D(g^\dagger) = D(u^\dagger)D(H)$ , from equation (19); and I have used the formula for combining two  $D(h)$  matrices:

$$D^{(L)}(h)_{0,M-A} D^{(1)}(h)_{0A} = \sum_{L\pm 1} D^{(L\pm 1)}(h)_{0M} \cdot \langle L \pm 1, 0 \mid L, 0; 1, 0 \rangle \langle L \pm 1, M \mid L, M - A; 1, A \rangle.$$

This formula is a special case of the general relation for coupling two  $D$ 's, equation (63), appendix A. As mentioned earlier, the value  $L$  is excluded from the sum on the right; and the sum over  $L$  involves  $D$ 's with  $L \rightarrow L \pm 1$ . For the moment, I postpone an investigation of the  $D^{(L\pm 1)}$  and continue with the general procedure outlined in section IV.

I introduce the basis vectors  $D^{(1)}(u)$  by again invoking equation (63).

$$\langle L \pm 1, M \mid L, M - A; 1, A \rangle D^{(L)}(u^\dagger)_{M-A,N} = D^{(L\pm 1)}(u^\dagger)_{M,N+B} \langle L \pm 1, N + B \mid L, N; 1, B \rangle D^{(1)}(u)_{BA}.$$

I insert this into equation (35), and relabel  $N \rightarrow N - B$ .

$$\begin{aligned} D^{(1)}(h)_{0A} \mid u, \tilde{p} \rangle &= N \sum_{L,N} ((2L + 1)/4\pi) \exp[-tL(L + 1)/2] \\ &\quad \cdot \sum_{L\pm 1} D^{(L\pm 1)}(hu^\dagger)_{0N} D(H)_{N0} \\ &\quad \cdot [\langle L \pm 1, 0 \mid L, 0; 1, 0 \rangle \langle L \pm 1, N \mid L, N - B; 1, B \rangle \\ &\quad \quad \cdot D^{(L)}(H)_{N-B,0} / D(H)_{N,0}] D^{(1)}(u)_{BA}. \end{aligned} \quad (36)$$

I have multiplied and divided by  $D(H)_{N0}$ , so that the second and third lines resemble the original coherent state, except for the change  $L \rightarrow L \pm 1$ .

I must now evaluate the square bracket on the last two lines. As for  $\tilde{E}_A^x$ , I use a recurrence relation which follows from equation (75), appendix C, to evaluate the ratio

$$D(H)_{N-B,0} / D(H)_{N0}.$$

I relabel  $N \rightarrow M$ , and use the results of appendix B to replace  $D^{(1)}(\mathbf{u})$  by  $\hat{\mathbf{n}}$ ,  $\hat{\mathbf{D}}$ , and  $\hat{\mathbf{n}} \times \hat{\mathbf{D}}$ .

$$\begin{aligned}
D^{(1)}(\mathbf{h})_{0,A} | \mathbf{u}, \tilde{\mathbf{p}} \rangle &= N \sum_{L,M} (2L+1)/(4\pi) \exp[-tL(L+1)/2] \\
&\cdot \sum_{L\pm 1} D^{(L\pm 1)}(\mathbf{h}\mathbf{u}\dagger)_{0M} D^{(L)}(\mathbf{H})_{M0} \\
&\cdot (c(L\pm 1, \mathbf{D})\hat{\mathbf{D}}_A + c(L\pm 1, \mathbf{n})\hat{\mathbf{n}}_A \\
&\quad + c(L\pm 1, \hat{\mathbf{n}} \times \hat{\mathbf{D}})(\hat{\mathbf{n}} \times \hat{\mathbf{D}})_A). \quad (37)
\end{aligned}$$

The coefficients  $c$  are

$$\begin{aligned}
c(L+1, \hat{\mathbf{D}}) &= \langle L+1, 0 | L, 0; 1, 0 \rangle \langle L+1, M | L, M; 1, 0 \rangle; \\
c(L+1, \hat{\mathbf{n}}) &= \langle L+1, 0 | L, 0; 1, 0 \rangle \\
&\cdot \sum_{\pm} ((\mp 1/\sqrt{2}) \langle L+1, M | L, M \mp 1; 1, \pm 1 \rangle \\
&\cdot \exp(\pm i\mu) \sqrt{(L \pm M)/(L \mp M + 1)}); \\
c(L+1, \hat{\mathbf{n}} \times \hat{\mathbf{D}}) &= i \langle L+1, 0 | L, 0; 1, 0 \rangle \\
&\cdot \sum_{\pm} ((-1/\sqrt{2}) \langle L+1, M | L, M \mp 1; 1, \pm 1 \rangle \\
&\cdot \exp(\pm i\mu) \sqrt{(L \pm M)/(L \mp M + 1)}). \quad (38)
\end{aligned}$$

For the case  $L+1 \rightarrow L-1$ , replace  $\langle L+1, M |$  and  $\langle L+1, 0 |$  by  $\langle L-1, M |$  and  $\langle L-1, 0 |$ . After some work with a table of 3J symbols, one finds

$$\begin{aligned}
c(L+1, D) &= \sqrt{(L+1)^2 - M^2}/(2L+1); \\
c(L-1, D) &= \sqrt{L^2 - M^2}/(2L+1); \\
c(L+1, n) &= -[\sqrt{(L+1+M)/(L+1-M)}(M)/(2L+1)] \cos \mu \\
&\quad - i[\sqrt{(L+1+M)/(L+1-M)}(L)/(2L+1)] \sin \mu; \\
c(L-1, n) &= i[\sqrt{L^2 - M^2}/(2L+1)] \sin \mu; \\
c(L+1, \hat{n} \times \hat{D}) &= -i[\sqrt{(L+1+M)/(L+1-M)}(L)/(2L+1)] \cos \mu \\
&\quad + [\sqrt{(L+1+M)/(L+1-M)}(M)/(2L+1)] \sin \mu; \\
c(L-1, \hat{n} \times \hat{D}) &= i[\sqrt{L^2 - M^2}/(2L+1)] \cos \mu. \tag{39}
\end{aligned}$$

Continuing with the general procedure, I expand the L and M dependence of the c's. I replace

$$L \rightarrow \langle L \rangle + \Delta L; \quad M \rightarrow \Delta M.$$

and keep terms in equation (39) out to linear in  $\Delta X$ ,  $X = L$  or  $M$ . I have dropped the  $1/2$  in  $\langle L + 1/2 \rangle$  to simplify formulas.

$$\begin{aligned}
c(L+1, D) &\cong \langle (L+1)/(2L+1) \rangle; \\
c(L-1, D) &\cong \langle L/(2L+1) \rangle; \\
c(L+1, n) &\cong -(M/\langle L \rangle) \cos \mu - i \sin \mu \langle L/(2L+1) \rangle; \\
c(L-1, n) &= i \sin \mu \langle L/(2L+1) \rangle; \\
c(L+1, \hat{n} \times \hat{D}) &\cong -i \langle L/(2L+1) \rangle \cos \mu + (M/\langle L \rangle) \sin \mu; \\
c(L-1, \hat{n} \times \hat{D}) &\cong +i \langle L/(2L+1) \rangle \cos \mu. \tag{40}
\end{aligned}$$

Factors of L inside brackets  $\langle \rangle$  should be interpreted as  $\langle L \rangle$ ; terms of order  $\Delta X/\langle L \rangle$  have been kept, but not terms of order  $\Delta X/\langle L \rangle^2$  or  $(\Delta X/\langle L \rangle)^2$ . After inserting this expansion into equation (37), that equation becomes

$$\begin{aligned}
D^{(1)}(h)_{0A} | u, \tilde{p} \rangle &\cong N \sum_{L,M} ((2L+1)/4\pi) \exp[-tL(L+1)/2] \\
&\cdot \{ (1/2) [D^{(L+1)}(hu\dagger) + D^{(L-1)}(hu\dagger)]_{0M} \hat{D}_A \\
&+ D^{(L+1)}(hu\dagger)_{0M} (M / \langle L \rangle) \\
&\cdot [-\cos \mu \hat{n}_A + \sin \mu (\hat{n} \times \hat{D})_A] \\
&+ \text{small terms;} \\
\text{small terms} &= -i(1/2) [D^{(L+1)}(hu\dagger) - D^{(L-1)}(hu\dagger)]_{0M} \\
&\cdot [\sin \mu \hat{n}_A + \cos \mu (\hat{n} \times \hat{D})_A] \\
&+ \text{order}((M/L)^2, 1/L) \} D^{(L)}(H)_{M0}. \quad (41)
\end{aligned}$$

From equation (84),  $\sigma_M = \sqrt{L}$ . I anticipate that

$$M / \langle L \rangle = \text{order } \sigma_M / \langle L \rangle = \text{order } 1/\sqrt{\langle L \rangle}.$$

Therefore I am keeping order  $1/\sqrt{\langle L \rangle}$  but neglecting order  $(M/L)^2 = \text{order } 1/L$ . Because of this, when going from equation (40) to equation (41), it is legitimate to replace  $\langle L/(2L+1) \rangle$  by  $1/2$ , etc..

The sums involving  $D^{(L\pm 1)}$  have not gone away. I must now investigate these sums.

### A The kets $| L \pm 1 \rangle$

Equation equation (41) involves the two new kets,

$$\begin{aligned}
| L \pm 1 \rangle &= N(L \pm 1) \sum_{L,M} ((2L+1)/4\pi) \exp[-tL(L+1)/2] \\
&\cdot D^{(L\pm 1)}(hu\dagger)_{0M} D^{(L)}(H)_{M0}. \quad (42)
\end{aligned}$$

This subsection shows that these kets are Gaussian distributed in  $L$ , but with peak values of  $L$  shifted by one unit, from  $\langle L + 1/2 \rangle$  to  $\langle L + 1/2 \rangle \pm 1$ . This result has a corollary. In equation (41) the linear combination with the upper sign,  $D^{(L+1)}(hu\dagger) + D^{(L-1)}(hu\dagger)$ , is a sum of two Gaussians in  $L$  with slightly different means, but large standard deviations  $\sigma_L = \sqrt{1/t}$ ,  $1/t = \text{order } \langle L \rangle$ . Therefore the two Gaussians strongly overlap with each other, and the sum

strongly resembles the Gaussian of the original coherent state  $|u, \tilde{p}\rangle$ . The remaining combination  $D^{(L+1)}(hu\dagger) - D^{(L-1)}(hu\dagger)$  is the difference between two closely similar Gaussians, therefore is very small. Proof that the difference is small requires a detailed calculation of its normalization constant, and I do this calculation in appendix D.

The states defined at equation (42) have peak angular momentum shifted by one unit. Proof: in equation (42), the  $D(H)$  factor is easier to approximate, while  $D(hu\dagger)$  is harder. Therefore relabel  $L\pm 1 = \tilde{L}$ , then drop tildes, in order to make the  $D(hu\dagger)$  factor equal to the corresponding factor in the original coherent state  $|u, \tilde{p}\rangle$ : under the relabeling,  $D^{(L\pm 1)}(hu\dagger) \rightarrow D^{(\tilde{L})}(hu\dagger) \rightarrow D^{(L)}(hu\dagger)$ . The relabeling changes the exponential  $\exp[-tL(L+1)/2]$  significantly; and it produces negligible changes in  $(2L+1)/4\pi \cong (2\tilde{L}+1)/4\pi + \text{order}(1/L)$

The new  $D(H)$  factor is  $D^{(L)}(H) \rightarrow D^{(\tilde{L}\mp 1)}(H) \rightarrow D^{(L\mp 1)}(H)$ . This matrix differs from the corresponding matrix in  $|u, \tilde{p}\rangle$ , but is easy to relate to that matrix. I group together the two factors in equation (42) that change significantly, and use equation (84).

$$\begin{aligned}
& \exp[-t(L \mp 1)(L \mp 1 + 1)/2] D^{(L\mp 1)}(H)_{M0} \\
& \cong \exp\{-t[L \mp 1 + 1/2]^2/2 + t/8\} \exp[-iM\beta] (\exp(p/2)/2)^{2L\mp 2} \\
& \quad \cdot \frac{(2L \mp 2)!}{\sqrt{(L \mp 1)!^2 (L \mp 1 + M)! (L \mp 1 - M)!}} \\
& \cong \exp\{-t[L \mp 1 + 1/2 - p/t]^2/2 + p^2/2t - p/2\} \\
& \quad \cdot \exp\{-M^2/[2(L \mp 1 + 1/2)]\} / \sqrt{\pi(L \mp 1 + 1/2)} \\
& \cong \exp\{-t[L \mp 1 + 1/2 - p/t]^2/2 + p^2/2t - p/2\} \\
& \quad \exp\{-M^2/[2(L + 1/2)]\} / \sqrt{\pi(L + 1/2)}. \quad (43)
\end{aligned}$$

The factorials were replaced by a Gaussian using equation (80). Now compare the Gaussian in equation (43) to the Gaussian in the original coherent state, equation (84). The two Gaussians in  $L$  are the same except for a shift in peak value.

$$\text{new } \langle L + 1/2 \rangle = p/t \pm 1 = \text{original } \langle L + 1/2 \rangle \pm 1. \quad (44)$$

□

Now separate equation (41) into a leading term plus small corrections. Equation (41) involves the linear combinations

$$(1/2) [D^{(L+1)}(\text{hu}\dagger) \pm D^{(L-1)}(\text{hu}\dagger)],$$

therefore linear combinations

$$(1/2) (|L+1\rangle \pm |L-1\rangle)$$

of the kets just investigated. Therefore, inside a sum over  $L$ ,

$$\begin{aligned} (1/2) [D^{(L+1)}(\text{hu}\dagger) + D^{(L-1)}(\text{hu}\dagger)] D^{(L)}(H) \\ \cong D^{(L)}(\text{hu}\dagger) D^{(L)}(H); \\ (1/2) (|L+1\rangle + |L-1\rangle) \cong |u, \tilde{p}\rangle. \end{aligned} \quad (45)$$

The linear combination with the upper sign will yield a dominant term.

The  $\hat{n}$  terms in equation (41) involve a factor of  $M/\langle L \rangle$ , and the discussion of appendix D shows these terms are down by  $1/\sqrt{L}$ , as expected because  $D^{(L)}(H)$  is Gaussian in  $M$ . Therefore only one term is dominant, the one proportional to  $\hat{D}_A$ . From equation (23)  $\hat{D}_A$  is also  $D^{(1)}(u)_{0A}$ ; and we get

$$D^{(1)}(h)_{0A} |u, \tilde{p}\rangle = D^{(1)}(u)_{0A} (|L+1\rangle + |L-1\rangle)/2 + \text{SC}. \quad (46)$$

I have not replaced the linear combination

$$(1/2) (|L+1\rangle + |L-1\rangle)$$

by  $|u, \tilde{p}\rangle$ , even though the three states overlap strongly. The linear combination  $(1/2) (|L+1\rangle + |L-1\rangle)$  has the same  $\tilde{E}$  eigenvalues as  $|u, \tilde{p}\rangle$ . However,  $(1/2) (|L+1\rangle + |L-1\rangle)$  does not behave like  $|u, \tilde{p}\rangle$  under the action of a holonomy:

$$\begin{aligned} D^{(1)}(h)_{0,A} (1/2) (|L+1\rangle + |L-1\rangle) \\ \cong (1/4) (|L+2\rangle + 2|L\rangle + |L-2\rangle), \end{aligned}$$

where  $|L+n\rangle$  has peak  $L$  shifted by  $n$ . I am not yet sure whether these changes in peak  $L$  have any significance, and for now, I prefer to keep the shifts in  $L$  explicit. Note if the Hamiltonian contains a product of  $n$  holonomies, then the original coherent state will be changed into a linear combination of coherent states with peak  $L$  shifted by up to  $\pm n$  units.

## VII The commutator $[\mathbf{h}, \mathcal{V}]$

At this point it might seem we are finished. The basic building blocks for the Hamiltonian are the holonomy and  $\tilde{\mathbf{E}}$ ; formulas of the previous sections should be adequate to evaluate most matrix elements.

There is one exception, however. The formalism makes extensive use of the volume operator  ${}^{(3)}\mathcal{V}$ . For the planar case this operator factors:

$$\begin{aligned} ({}^{(3)}\mathcal{V})^2 &= \text{sgn } \tilde{E}_Z^z \epsilon_{ZAB} \tilde{E}_A^x \tilde{E}_B^y \\ &:= \text{sgn } \tilde{E}_Z^z ({}^{(2)}\tilde{\mathbf{E}}). \end{aligned} \quad (47)$$

sgn is the sign of the determinant of the  $\tilde{\mathbf{E}}$ . One constructs extrinsic curvatures by commuting this operator with the Hamiltonian. Therefore the formalism contains matrix elements such as

$$\begin{aligned} \langle \mathbf{u}, \tilde{\mathbf{p}} | [h^{(1/2)}, {}^{(3)}\mathcal{V}] | \mathbf{u}, \tilde{\mathbf{p}} \rangle &= \langle \mathbf{u}, \tilde{\mathbf{p}} | h^{(1/2)} | \mathbf{n} \rangle \langle \mathbf{n} | {}^{(3)}\mathcal{V} | \mathbf{u}, \tilde{\mathbf{p}} \rangle \\ &\quad - \langle \mathbf{u}, \tilde{\mathbf{p}} | {}^{(3)}\mathcal{V} | \mathbf{n} \rangle \langle \mathbf{n} | h^{(1/2)} | \mathbf{u}, \tilde{\mathbf{p}} \rangle, \end{aligned}$$

where  $h^{(1/2)}$  is an  $SU(2)$  holonomy coming from the Hamiltonian. This commutator is a small difference between two large terms. The contribution from the leading term,  $|\mathbf{n}\rangle = |\mathbf{u}, \tilde{\mathbf{p}}\rangle$ , cancels out of the difference, and it is very hard to evaluate this commutator using only the results of previous sections.

Thiemann and Winkler have shown that, in the classical limit, the quantum mechanical commutator equals the classical Poisson bracket [25].

$$\langle \mathbf{u}, \tilde{\mathbf{p}} | [O_1, O_2] | \mathbf{u}, \tilde{\mathbf{p}} \rangle / i\hbar = \{O_1, O_2\}(\mathbf{u}, \tilde{\mathbf{p}}) \quad (48)$$

On the right, one computes the Poisson bracket, treating the operators as classical fields, then evaluates the result at the peak values for the coherent state. Since the Poisson bracket is no longer a small difference between two large terms in general, it can be evaluated using the formulas of previous sections.

While this is not the place to construct a full Hamiltonian, some discussion of its likely properties is appropriate, in order to decide which  $[\mathcal{V}, \mathbf{h}]$  commutators are relevant.  ${}^{(3)}\mathcal{V}$  must be commuted with the Euclidean Hamiltonian, which contains the following terms (in a field theoretic formulation, before discretization on a spin network)

$$\begin{aligned}
& F_{xy}^Z \tilde{E}^{(2)} / {}^{(3)}\mathcal{V}; \\
& F_{zx}^A \tilde{E}_Z^z \tilde{E}_B^x \epsilon_{ZBA} / {}^{(3)}\mathcal{V}; \\
& F_{zy}^A \tilde{E}_Z^z \tilde{E}_B^y \epsilon_{ZBA} / {}^{(3)}\mathcal{V}.
\end{aligned} \tag{49}$$

A,B = X,Y only. In spin network theory for the planar case, these terms become commutators with spin 1/2 holonomies along the x, y, and z edges.

$$\begin{aligned}
& 2 F_{xy}^Z \text{Tr}\{\sigma_Z h_z[h_z^{-1}, {}^{(3)}\mathcal{V}]\}; \\
& 2 F_{zx}^A \text{Tr}\{\sigma_A h_y[h_y^{-1}, {}^{(3)}\mathcal{V}]\}; \\
& 2 F_{zy}^A \text{Tr}\{\sigma_A h_x[h_x^{-1}, {}^{(3)}\mathcal{V}]\}.
\end{aligned} \tag{50}$$

Equation (50) is not yet in its final spin network form. Each  $F_{ij}$  must be replaced by a product of four holonomies encircling the four sides of the area  $ij$ . In general a product of four spin 1/2 holonomies will contain all the Pauli matrices. For instance, the holonomies replacing  $F_{xy}^Z \sigma_Z$  could contain  $\sigma_A$  matrices,  $A \neq Z$ , or even the 2x2 unit matrix. Fortunately, there exist several possible holonomy products which reduce to the same  $F_{ij}$  in a field theory limit. (For example, proceed counterclockwise *vs.* clockwise around the area.) One can choose a linear combination of the possibilities which is pure  $\sigma_Z$  or pure  $\sigma_A$ , as needed to reproduce the classical results. In what follows I will assume this has been done, so that *the only traces required are those shown in equation (50)*, the  $\sigma_Z$  trace for  $h_z$  and the  $\sigma_A$  traces, A transverse, for  $h_x$  and  $h_y$ .

## A Holonomies along z

In the planar case it is possible to evaluate the  $[h_z^{-1}, {}^{(3)}\mathcal{V}]$  commutator exactly, if the z dependence of the coherent state is chosen to be an eigenfunction of  $\tilde{E}_Z^z$ . It is helpful to derive this exact result, in order to clarify some issues regarding equation (48).

Consider the  $[h_z, {}^{(3)}\mathcal{V}]$  commutator, with the z dependence at the nth vertex chosen to be eigenfunctions of  $\tilde{E}_Z^z$ . This vertex is the terminus for two holonomies directed along z, one incoming and one outgoing. Therefore the wavefunction at vertex n contains the

product

$$\begin{aligned}
h(z, n) &:= \exp\left[i \int_{n-1}^n A_z^Z S_Z dz\right] \exp\left[i \int_n^{n+1} A_z^Z S_Z dz\right] \\
&= \exp\left[i \int_{n-1}^n A_z^Z M_i dz\right] \exp\left[i \int_n^{n+1} A_z^Z M_f dz\right]. \quad (51)
\end{aligned}$$

The total wavefunction is  $h(z, n) |u_x, \tilde{p}_x\rangle |u_y, \tilde{p}_y\rangle$ . When  $h_z [h_z^{-1}, {}^{(3)}V]$  acts on this wavefunction, the  $\sqrt{|{}^{(2)}\tilde{E}|}$  factor in  ${}^{(3)}V = \sqrt{|{}^{(2)}\tilde{E}|} |{}^{(2)}\tilde{E}|$  commutes through to the  $|u_x, \tilde{p}_x\rangle |u_y, \tilde{p}_y\rangle$  factor, while the  $\sqrt{|{}^{(2)}\tilde{E}|}$  factor acts on the product of the  $h_z^{-1}$  factor in the commutator and the  $h(z, n)$  factor in the state.

To compute the action of  $\sqrt{|{}^{(2)}\tilde{E}|}$ , we must first compute the action of  $\tilde{E}_Z^z$  (without the square root) then take the square root of this operator (which is easy, since the operator is diagonal). The action of  $\tilde{E}_Z^z$  will be a sum of two amplitudes, since  $h(z, n)$  contains two factors, one ingoing and one outgoing.

$$\begin{aligned}
[h_z^{-1}, \tilde{E}_Z^z] h(z, n) &= [\exp\{-i \int_n^{n+1} A_z^Z (\pm 1/2) dz\}, \tilde{E}_Z^z] h(z, n) \\
&= (\gamma\kappa/2) h_z^{-1} h(z, n) [(M_f + M_i) - (M_f + M_i \mp 1/2)]. \quad (52)
\end{aligned}$$

The amplitude for the outgoing (f for "final") factor in  $h(z, n)$  gives rise to the  $M_f$  terms in the square bracket, while the  $M_i$  terms come from the incoming (i for "initial") factor. The  $\pm$  refers to the  $[\pm, \pm]$  diagonal element of the matrix  $h_z^{-1}$ .

Earlier in this section I stated that it was easy to take the square root of the  $\tilde{E}_Z^z$  operator, because this operator is diagonal. On the contrary: the literature contains at least two recipes for extracting the square root of this operator. At present it does not seem possible to distinguish between the two approaches, using general principles; and I need to state which approach I am using here.

When more than three edges terminate at a given vertex, the (volume)<sup>2</sup> operator grasps each triplet of edges in turn, generating a series of amplitudes, one for each triplet. Similarly, when two z

holonomies terminate at a vertex, the  $\tilde{E}_Z^z$  operator generates two amplitudes. To parallel a terminology from classical optics: should one add first, then take the square root? Or take the square root first, then add? I.e. should one add the amplitudes from each triplet (or z holonomy), then take the square root of the magnitude of the result; or should one take the square root of the magnitude of each amplitude first, then add? The literature contains advocates for both "add first" [34, 35] and "take the square root first" [36, 37] choices. For a discussion of the distinct regularization schemes leading to each choice see reference [35]. Presumably no final choice between the schemes can be made until the two choices have been checked in applications.

In this paper I adopt the "add first" choice, for the following (non-rigorous) reason. Consider a four-valent vertex such that two of the edges meeting at the vertex are tangent, one ingoing and one outgoing. Rotate the gauge at the vertex so that the holonomies along these edges are pure  $S_Z$ , with  $S_Z$  eigenvalues  $M_f$  and  $M_i$  for outgoing and ingoing vertices, respectively. (This is of course exactly what we have already, in the planar case, due to the gauge-fixing.) The vertex has two holonomies,

$$\exp[i \int_n^{n+1} M_f A_i^Z dx^i]; \quad \exp[i \int_{n-1}^n M_i A_i^Z dx^i].$$

In the "add first" prescription, the contributions to  $(\text{volume})^2$  from these two holonomies are added, giving a factor of  $(M_f + M_i)/2$ . The factor of 1/2 comes from the integrations over half a delta function. The volume is proportional to the square root

$$\sqrt{|M_f + M_i|/2}.$$

In the "square root first" prescription, the corresponding factor would be

$$\sqrt{|M_i|/2} + \sqrt{|M_f|/2}.$$

In the special case  $M_f = M_i$ , it is possible to view these two holonomies as a single holonomy passing through the vertex. When this is grasped by the  $(\text{volume})^2$  the contribution is proportional to  $M_i$  with no 1/2, and the volume is proportional to  $\sqrt{|M_i|}$ . This result for one holonomy equals the  $M_f = M_i$  limit of the result for two different holonomies, only if the "add first" prescription is used.

That prescription gives the following result for the commutator.

$$[\mathbf{h}_z^{-1}, \sqrt{\eta \tilde{\mathbf{E}}_Z^z}] \mathbf{h}(z, \mathbf{n}) = \sqrt{(\gamma\kappa/2)} \mathbf{h}_z^{-1} \mathbf{h}(z, \mathbf{n}) [\sqrt{|M_f + M_i|} - \sqrt{|M_f + M_i| \mp \eta/2}], \quad (53)$$

where  $|\tilde{\mathbf{E}}_Z^z| = \eta \tilde{\mathbf{E}}_Z^z$  and  $\eta = \pm 1$  is the phase of the eigenvalue  $M_f + M_i$ . That is, I "add first" the  $M_f$  and  $M_i$  contributions, then take the square root. Note the  $M_f + M_i$  and  $M_f + M_i \mp 1/2$  parentheses in equation (52) have not been combined or averaged; they come from two separate applications of the volume operator.

From equation (50) the result equation (53) should be inserted into the trace

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbf{T}(Z, z) \mathbf{h}(z, \mathbf{n}) &:= \text{Tr}\{ \sigma_Z \mathbf{h}_z [\mathbf{h}_z^{-1}, \sqrt{\eta \tilde{\mathbf{E}}_Z^z}] \} \mathbf{h}(z, \mathbf{n}) \\ &= \Sigma_{\pm} \{ (\pm 1) \sqrt{(\gamma\kappa/2)} [\sqrt{|M_f + M_i|} - \sqrt{|M_f + M_i| \mp \eta/2}] \} \mathbf{h}(z, \mathbf{n}) \\ &= \sqrt{(\gamma\kappa/2)} [-\sqrt{|M_f + M_i| - \eta/2} + \sqrt{|M_f + M_i| + \eta/2}] \mathbf{h}(z, \mathbf{n}). \end{aligned} \quad (54)$$

Equation (54) is an exact result. In the limit of large quantum numbers  $|M_f + M_i| \gg 1/2$ , the radicals can be expanded, yielding

$$\mathbf{T}(Z, z) \rightarrow \sqrt{(\gamma\kappa/2)} [\eta / (2\sqrt{|M_f + M_i|})]. \quad (55)$$

This approximate result should be compared to the result from classical field theory (or from the theorem, equation (48))

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbf{T}(Z, z) \mathbf{h}(z, \mathbf{n}) &\rightarrow \text{Tr}\{ \sigma_Z(1) [1 - iA_Z^Z S_Z dz, \sqrt{\eta \tilde{\mathbf{E}}_Z^z}] \} \mathbf{h}(z, \mathbf{n}) \\ &= \text{Tr}\{ \sigma_Z(1) [S_Z dz (\delta/\delta \tilde{\mathbf{E}}_Z^z) \sqrt{\eta \tilde{\mathbf{E}}_Z^z}] \} \mathbf{h}(z, \mathbf{n}) \\ &= (\eta/2) (\gamma\kappa/2) [1/\sqrt{\eta \tilde{\mathbf{E}}_Z^z}] \mathbf{h}(z, \mathbf{n}) \\ &= (\eta/2) \sqrt{(\gamma\kappa/(2|M_f + M_i|))} \mathbf{h}(z, \mathbf{n}). \end{aligned} \quad (56)$$

This result agrees with the large quantum number limit, equation (55).

This agreement helps in understanding a rather puzzling feature of the theorem, equation (48). The  $\sqrt{\eta \tilde{\mathbf{E}}_Z^z}$  operator is not distributive. When acting on a product of two functions of holonomies,

$$\sqrt{\eta \tilde{\mathbf{E}}_Z^z} [f_1(\mathbf{h}) f_2(\mathbf{h})] \neq f_2(\mathbf{h}) \sqrt{\eta \tilde{\mathbf{E}}_Z^z} [f_1(\mathbf{h})] + f_1(\mathbf{h}) \sqrt{\eta \tilde{\mathbf{E}}_Z^z} [f_2(\mathbf{h})].$$

This can be checked readily by choosing the  $f_i$  to be eigenvectors of  $\tilde{E}_Z^z$ . In equation (48) suppose one takes  $O_1 = \sqrt{\eta \tilde{E}_Z^z}$ ,  $O_2 = f_1$ . The theorem seems to state that the action of  $O_1$  on  $f_1$  is independent of the state on which the commutator acts (is independent of  $f_2$ ). One might be tempted to question this result, given the non-distributive character of  $\sqrt{\eta \tilde{E}_Z^z}$ . However, the theorem does predict the correct classical limit, equation (56), in a case where we are working from the exact quantum result.

If the z holonomies at the vertex are coherent states, rather than eigenfunctions of  $\tilde{E}_Z^z$ , the formulas of this section still work, with  $M_f$  and  $M_i$  replaced by their peak values  $\langle M_f \rangle$  and  $\langle M_i \rangle$ .

When the eigenvalues  $|M_i|$  of  $|\tilde{E}_Z^z|$  are large, naively one might expect  $[h_z^{-1}, \sqrt{|\tilde{E}_Z^z|}]$  to be order the eigenvalue of  $\sqrt{|\tilde{E}_Z^z|}$ ,  $\sqrt{|M_i + M_f|}$ ; but instead it is of order  $1/(2\sqrt{|M_f + M_i|})$ , which is the derivative of  $\sqrt{|M_i + M_f|}$ . In the next subsection we will find that this commutator = derivative structure holds also for the commutators of transverse holonomies with the volume.

## B Holonomies along x,y

Now consider commutators involving  $h_a$ ,  $a = x,y$ . As before,  ${}^{(3)}\mathcal{V}$  factors into  ${}^{(2)}\mathcal{V}$  times  $\sqrt{|\tilde{E}_Z^z|}$ ; but now the  $\sqrt{|\tilde{E}_Z^z|}$  factors out of the commutator. We are left with the following trace, which acts on the coherent ket.

$$T(A, a) = \text{Trace}(\sigma_A h_a [h_a^{-1}, {}^{(2)}\mathcal{V}]). \quad (57)$$

Since the case  $a = y$  may be obtained from results for  $a = x$  by a relabeling, it suffices to compute this trace for  $a = x$ .

The theorem, equation (48), gives the commutator in  $T(A,a)$ .

$$\begin{aligned} [h_x^{-1}, {}^{(2)}\mathcal{V}] &= i[\delta(h_x^{-1})/\delta A_x^B][\delta({}^{(2)}\mathcal{V})/\delta \tilde{E}_B^x](\gamma\kappa) \\ &= (\gamma\kappa/2)[S_B, h_x^{-1}]_+[\zeta \tilde{E}_C^y \epsilon^{BC}/2({}^{(2)}\mathcal{V})], \end{aligned} \quad (58)$$

where  ${}^{(2)}\mathcal{V}$  is  $\sqrt{\zeta \tilde{E}_B^x \tilde{E}_C^y \epsilon^{BC}}$  and  $\zeta = \pm 1$  is the sign of the eigenvalue of  $({}^{(2)}\mathcal{V})^2$ . The anticommutator arises on the second line because the holonomy is a loop, beginning and ending at the vertex where

the  $\tilde{E}$  acts. Therefore the grasp occurs on the far left and right of the holonomy.

The  $(^2)\mathcal{V}$  in the denominator of the formula equation (58) has eigenvectors with vanishing eigenvalues, and some of these eigenvectors are even contained in the superposition which forms the coherent state. Replacing commutator by classical Poisson bracket will not do for zero eigenvalue states; strictly speaking one should split off these states, and calculate their contribution using the original commutator.

However, in the classical limit, eigenvectors of  $(^2)\mathcal{V}$  with large values will dominate the coherent state superposition; contributions from zero eigenvectors will be small. Therefore one can split off these eigenvectors—and ignore their contribution.  $(^2)\mathcal{V}$  is given by its peak value.

The  $(^2)\mathcal{V}$  factor also does not give rise to a factor ordering ambiguity, even though it does not commute with the  $h_x^{-1}$ . The difference between two orderings equals a commutator, which is small.

$$\begin{aligned} h_x (1/(^2)\mathcal{V}) &= (1/(^2)\mathcal{V}) h_x + [h_x, 1/(^2)\mathcal{V}]; \\ [h_x, 1/(^2)\mathcal{V}] &= (-1/(^2)\mathcal{V}^2) [h_x, (^2)\mathcal{V}] h_x \\ &= \text{order}(h_x/(^2)\mathcal{V}) ([h_x, (^2)\mathcal{V}]/(^2)\mathcal{V}). \end{aligned} \quad (59)$$

(On the second line, I assume  $h_x$  is outgoing, so that the  $(^2)\mathcal{V}$  operator overlaps with  $h_x$  on the left side of  $h_x$ . An ingoing holonomy would give the same final order of magnitude.) This commutator resembles a derivative with respect to  $L$ , in that the commutator lowers the power of  $L$  by one. To see this, note  $(^2)\mathcal{V}$  is order  $\sqrt{L_x L_y}$ , from the two  $\tilde{E}$  operators in  $(^2)\mathcal{V}$ . From equation (58),  $[h_x, (^2)\mathcal{V}]$  is order  $L_y/\sqrt{L_x L_y}$ , down by a derivative with respect to  $L_x$ . (The  $S_B$  is just a Pauli matrix divided by 2; it is not order  $L$ .) Therefore the two orderings in equation (59) differ by a factor which is suppressed by  $[h_x, (^2)\mathcal{V}]/(^2)\mathcal{V} = \text{order } 1/L_x$ . In the classical limit, factor ordering is not a problem.

I now substitute equation (58) into the expression for the trace, equation (57).

$$\begin{aligned}
T(A, x) &= \text{Tr} [\sigma_A(\sigma_B + h_x \sigma_B h_x^{-1})] (1/2) (\gamma \kappa / 2) \zeta \epsilon_{BC} \tilde{E}_C^y / {}^{(2)}\mathcal{V} \\
&= \text{Tr} [\sigma_A(\sigma_B + \sigma_D D^{(1)}(h_x)_{DB})] (1/2) (\gamma \kappa / 2) \zeta \epsilon_{BC} \tilde{E}_C^y / {}^{(2)}\mathcal{V} \\
&= [\delta_{AB} + D^{(1)}(h_x)_{AB}] (\gamma \kappa / 2) \zeta \epsilon_{BC} \tilde{E}_C^y / {}^{(2)}\mathcal{V} ; \\
D^{(1)}(h) &= D^{(1)}(-\phi + \pi/2, \theta, \phi - \pi/2). \tag{60}
\end{aligned}$$

The second line uses the rotation property of the  $\text{su}(2)$  generators, equation (64). The matrix on the last line is a full-angle rotation, not a half-angle rotation; it is constructed from  $h_x = h_x^{1/2}$ , which is in  $\text{SU}(2)$ , not  $\text{O}(3)$ .

Equation (60) is correct for  $T(A, x)$ . For  $T(A, y)$  replace  $h_x \rightarrow h_y$  and  $\epsilon_{BC} \tilde{E}_C^y \rightarrow \epsilon_{CB} \tilde{E}_C^x$ .

A note on commutator = derivative: for the  $\tilde{E}_Z^z$  operator, the classical limit of the commutator is identically the derivative (with respect to  $M$  rather than  $L$ , but a derivative nonetheless). Compare the commutator, equation (54), to the classical limit equation (55). However, for transverse holonomies, the commutator does not preserve directions. Compare matrix elements of  ${}^{(2)}\mathcal{V}$  to those of  $[h_x^{-1}, {}^{(2)}\mathcal{V}]$ , equation (58). I replace the  $\text{SU}(2)$  objects  $h^{(1/2)}$  by  $\text{O}(3)$  objects  $D(1)_{0A}$  to facilitate order of magnitude comparisons:

$$\begin{aligned}
\langle {}^{(2)}\mathcal{V} \rangle &\sim \sqrt{\langle \tilde{E}_M^x \rangle \langle \tilde{E}_N^y \rangle} \epsilon_{MN}; \\
\langle [D(1)_{0A}, {}^{(2)}\mathcal{V}] \rangle &\sim \langle D(1)_{0B} \rangle \langle \tilde{E}_N^y \rangle \epsilon_{MN} / \langle {}^{(2)}\mathcal{V} \rangle.
\end{aligned}$$

The net effect is to replace  $\langle \tilde{E}_M^x \rangle$  by  $\langle D(1)_{0B} \rangle$ . From equation (26),  $\langle \tilde{E}_M^x \rangle$  is order  $\langle L_x \rangle$

$$\langle \tilde{E}_M^x \rangle = \langle L_x + 1/2 \rangle (\hat{n}_M \cos \mu - \hat{n} \times \hat{V})_M \sin \mu,$$

while its replacement is order unity. Evidently the commutator deletes one factor of  $\langle L_x \rangle$ , in the same manner as a derivative with respect to  $\langle L_x \rangle$ . However,  $\langle \tilde{E}_M^x \rangle$  also contains a unit vector, and information about this vector has been lost. Presumably the commutator = derivative relation was exact for commutators such as  $\sqrt{\tilde{E}_Z^z}$ , because only one direction is involved. For other operators, the relation is useful when one is counting powers of  $L$ .

## VIII Conclusion

The approach used in this paper produces a clean separation between leading terms and the small correction terms. Study of the SC terms, appendix D, reveals that they emphasize small fluctuations, values of the basic variables  $M$  and  $L$  which are near, but not at the mean values  $\langle M \rangle$  and  $\langle L \rangle$ . The standard deviation parameter  $t$  must be near  $1/\langle L \rangle$ , or these SC terms will become large.

The techniques used in the present, planar calculation may be taken over to other groups. The calculation uses only angular momentum theory, therefore applies to any symmetry which has recoupling coefficients analogous to  $3J$  symbols.

In a follow-on paper the small correction states are shown to be a complete subset of the overcomplete set of coherent states [40]. The SC states are used to construct a perturbation series and compute non-leading contributions to the volume operator.

The next step involves constructing a classical plane solution, quantizing it, then studying the semiclassical limit using coherent states. Since solutions to exact LQG are hard to construct, it may be necessary to meet the classical solution halfway: take the semiclassical limit of LQG first; then quantize the classical theory using the semiclassical form.

## A Identities Involving D and S

For the convenience of the reader, this appendix includes brief derivations of two well-known identities involving the rotation matrices  $D$  and generators  $S$ . Throughout, I do not use the relation  $D^{-1} = D^\dagger$ , so that the formulas in this appendix remain valid for matrices in  $SL(2, \mathbb{C})$ . My conventions for Clebsch-Gordan coefficients and rotation matrices are those of Edmonds [39]

The first identity relates matrix elements of  $S$  to a Clebsch-Gordan coefficient.

$$\langle L, M' | S_A \eta_A | L, M \rangle = \sqrt{L(L+1)} \langle L, M' | L, M; 1, A \rangle, \quad (61)$$

where the Clebsch-Gordan coefficients for  $L_1 \otimes L_2 = L_3$  are written

in a bracket notation as  $\langle L3, M3 \mid L1, M1; L2, M2 \rangle$ .  $\eta_A$  is a phase.

$$\begin{aligned} n_A &= -1 \text{ for } A = +1; \\ n_A &= +1 \text{ for } A = -1, 0. \end{aligned} \quad (62)$$

This is the "other" Condon-Shortley phase convention. The operators  $S_A$  are required to have positive matrix elements (the "usual" convention). However, for rotation purposes the  $S_A$  form a vector with spherical components  $n_A S_A$ . The indices on Clebsch-Gordan coefficients have simple rotation properties; therefore the coefficient in equation (61) is a matrix element of  $n_A S_A$ . The next section shows that the factor of  $\eta_A$  can be ignored safely.

The  $M$  dependence of the right hand side of equation (61) is required by the Wigner-Eckart theorem applied to a spin one operator. To check the scalar coefficient  $\sqrt{L(L+1)}$ , square both sides and sum over  $M$  and  $A$ .

$$\langle L, M' \mid \tilde{S}^2 \mid L, M' \rangle = L(L+1) \langle L, M' \mid L, M' \rangle.$$

The phase of the scalar coefficient can be verified by checking a simple example.

The following identity reduces a product of two rotation matrices to a single matrix. (I suppress the labels  $L_i$ , which are obvious from context.)

$$\begin{aligned} D_{N1M1} D_{N2M2} &= \sum_{L3} \langle N3 \mid N1 N2 \rangle D_{N3M3} \langle M3 \mid M1 M2 \rangle; \\ \langle N3 \mid N1 N2 \rangle D_{N1M1} &= D_{N3M3} \langle M3 \mid M1 M2 \rangle D_{M2N2}^{-1}. \end{aligned} \quad (63)$$

The second line is a rewritten version of the first.

As an illustration of these rules, I obtain the usual rotation property for the  $S_A$  vector operator. Insert equation (61) for  $S$  into the second line of equation (63), and restore the  $L$ 's.

$$\begin{aligned} \langle L, N3 \mid S_A \eta_A \mid L, N1 \rangle D_{N1M1}^{(L)} &= D_{N3M3}^{(L)} \langle L, M3 \mid S_B \eta_B \mid L, M1 \rangle D_{BA}^{(1)-1} \\ &\Leftrightarrow \\ \mathbf{S}_A \mathbf{D}^{(L)} &= \mathbf{D}^{(L)} \mathbf{S}_B \eta_B D_{BA}^{(1)-1} \eta_A. \end{aligned} \quad (64)$$

The last line uses a matrix notation to hide some indices. This formula is also valid for matrices  $D$  in  $SL(2, C)$ .

For components of vectors, this paper uses both Cartesian indices (X,Y,Z; or 1,2,3) and spherical indices (+1,-1,0). Strictly speaking, the two should be treated slightly differently when forming dot products.

$$\begin{aligned}\tilde{A} \cdot \tilde{B} &= A_X B_X + A_Y B_Y + A_Z B_Z \\ &= (A_-)^* B_- + (A_+)^* B_+ + A_3 B_3.\end{aligned}\quad (65)$$

Since spherical components are complex, the second dot product resembles the dot product in SU(3) rather than O(3). For the most part I have omitted the complex conjugation stars, trusting to the reader to know when to put them in. Note in most (but not all) cases, no star is needed because one of the indices refers to a final state, which can be considered starred. For example, there should be a star on one of the factors in equation (25); but no star is needed in the sums over magnetic quantum numbers in equation (28).

## B The matrix $D^{(1)}(\mathbf{u})$

This appendix calculates the rows of  $D^{(1)}(\mathbf{u})$ , which form a natural basis for the vector operators  $\tilde{E}$  and  $\mathbf{h}$ . More precisely, from equation (32), the relevant basis vectors are

$$\exp[i\beta B] D^{(1)}(\mathbf{u})_{BA}; \quad A, B = +1, 0, -1.$$

The subscripts (B,A) give the components A of unit vector B.

One may evaluate the components of each vector, starting from

$$D^{(1)}(\mathbf{u})_{BA} = \exp[i(\beta - \pi/2)(A - B)] d^{(1)}(\alpha/2)_{BA},$$

with

$$d^{(1)}(\alpha/2) = \begin{bmatrix} (1 + \cos)/2 & + \sin/\sqrt{2} & (1 - \cos)/2 \\ - \sin/\sqrt{2} & \cos & + \sin/\sqrt{2} \\ (1 - \cos)/2 & - \sin/\sqrt{2} & (1 + \cos)/2 \end{bmatrix}; \quad (66)$$

$\cos = \cos(\alpha/2)$ ,  $\sin = \sin(\alpha/2)$ ; rows and columns are labeled with spherical components in the order (+1, 0, -1).

From equation (24), the basis vector  $B = 0$  is just the unit vector  $\hat{D}$ . This vector has spherical and Cartesian components

$$\begin{aligned}
\hat{D}_A &= D^{(1)}(\mathbf{u})_{0A} \\
&= (\mp \sin(\alpha/2) \exp[\pm i(\beta - \pi/2)]/\sqrt{2}, \cos(\alpha/2)) \\
&= (\sin(\alpha/2) \sin(\beta), -\sin(\alpha/2) \cos(\beta), \cos(\alpha/2)). \quad (67)
\end{aligned}$$

Spherical components are listed in the order  $(\pm, 0)$ ; Cartesian components in the order  $(X, Y, Z)$ .

One linear combination of the rows  $B = \pm 1$  turns out to be  $\hat{n}$ , the axis of rotation for  $\mathbf{u}$ , while the orthogonal linear combination turns out to be  $\hat{n} \times \hat{D}$ , the third axis of an orthogonal coordinate system  $(\hat{n}, \hat{D}, \hat{n} \times \hat{D})$ .

$$\begin{aligned}
\sqrt{2}\hat{n}_A &= -\exp[+i\beta] D^{(1)}(\mathbf{u})_{+1,A} + \exp[-i\beta] D^{(1)}(\mathbf{u})_{-1,A} \\
&= -i(d_{+1,A}^{(1)} + d_{-1,A}^{(1)}) \exp[iA(\beta - \pi/2)] \\
&= (\mp \exp[\pm i\beta], 0) \\
&= \sqrt{2}(\cos(\beta), \sin(\beta), 0); \quad (68)
\end{aligned}$$

$$\begin{aligned}
i\sqrt{2}(\hat{n} \times \hat{D})_A &= -\exp[+i\beta] D^{(1)}(\mathbf{u})_{+1,A} - \exp[-i\beta] D^{(1)}(\mathbf{u})_{-1,A} \\
&= -i(d_{+1,A}^{(1)} - d_{-1,A}^{(1)}) \exp[iA(\beta - \pi/2)] \\
&= i(\mp \cos(\alpha/2) \exp[\pm i(\beta - \pi/2)], -\sqrt{2} \sin(\alpha/2)) \\
&= i\sqrt{2}(\cos(\alpha/2) \cos(\beta - \pi/2), \cos(\alpha/2) \sin(\beta - \pi/2), -\sin(\alpha/2)). \quad (69)
\end{aligned}$$

For convenience I also record the inverses of equations (68) and (69).

$$\begin{aligned}
D^{(1)}(\mathbf{u})_{0A} &= \hat{D}(\mathbf{u})_A; \\
\exp[+i\beta] D^{(1)}(\mathbf{u})_{+1,A} &= (-\hat{n}_A - i(\hat{n} \times \hat{D})_A)/\sqrt{2}; \\
\exp[-i\beta] D^{(1)}(\mathbf{u})_{-1,A} &= (\hat{n}_A - i(\hat{n} \times \hat{D})_A)/\sqrt{2}. \quad (70)
\end{aligned}$$

When  $D^{(1)}(\mathbf{u})_{BA}$  is multiplied by the phases  $\eta_B \eta_A$ , equation (64), all factors of  $\mp 1$  in this section change to  $+1$ . (Factors of  $\exp(\pm i\beta)$  do not change.) Therefore *either* include all factors of  $\eta$  and drop the  $\mp 1$  factors; *or* ignore factors of  $\eta$  and retain the factors of  $\mp 1$ . I have chosen the latter course in the body of the paper.

I could have used the notation  $\hat{r}$  for the unit vector which I labeled  $\hat{D}$ . The present coherent states may be used to describe an electron moving in a central force. In that interpretation, the peak value of electron radius is given by the vector  $\hat{D}$ .

## C The matrix $D^{(L)}(\mathbf{H})$

This appendix derives the properties of the Hermitean factors  $D(\mathbf{H})$  occurring in the coherent state. The initial formulas will be valid for general  $\hat{p}$  and  $p$ ; later results will use the assumptions  $e^p \gg 1$  and  $p_3 = 0$ .

$$\hat{p} = (\cos(\beta + \mu), \sin(\beta + \mu), 0).$$

Most of the mathematical techniques used in this appendix are a direct steal from Thiemann-Winkler paper II [24], with one significant exception: I make no use of traces. Because Thiemann and Winkler deal with the general  $SU(2)$  expansion (matrices  $D_{MN}$ , both  $M$  and  $N$  summed over) they are able to recast their results for  $D(\mathbf{H})$  as theorems about class invariants, the traces  $D_{MM}$ . In my case the expansion matrices are  $D_{0M}$ , sum over  $M$  only; I have not been able to recast my results as theorems about traces. Instead, in order to obtain manageable forms for  $D(\mathbf{H})$ , I use the assumption  $e^p \gg 1$ . This assumption is not a serious limitation unless one wishes to extend the calculation to very low values of  $L$  of order 10. For further discussion of this point, see the estimates given for the size of  $t$ , in appendix D. These estimates in effect also limit the size of  $p$ .

The usual rotation matrices  $D^{(L)}$  are finite power series involving sines and cosines of real angles. Since these trigonometric functions are analytic everywhere except at infinity, the real angles can be continued to complex values, in order to obtain a power series for  $D(\mathbf{H})$ . I start from  $D(\mathbf{H})^{(1/2)}$ , which has the form

$$\begin{aligned} D(\mathbf{H})^{(1/2)} &= \exp[\tilde{p} \cdot \tilde{S}] \\ &= \begin{bmatrix} \cosh(p/2) + \hat{p}_3 \sinh(p/2) & \sinh(p/2)(\hat{p}_1 - i\hat{p}_2) \\ \sinh(p/2)(\hat{p}_1 + i\hat{p}_2) & \cosh(p/2) - \hat{p}_3 \sinh(p/2) \end{bmatrix} \\ &:= \begin{bmatrix} a & b \\ c & d \end{bmatrix} \end{aligned} \tag{71}$$

In terms of the abcd, the  $D(H)^{(L)}$  for arbitrary  $L$  are given by the finite series

$$D^{(L)}(H)_{MN} = (\text{ad})^L (\text{a/b})^N (\text{b/d})^M \sqrt{(L+M)!(L-M)!(L+N)!(L-N)!} \cdot \sum_k \frac{(\text{bc/ad})^k}{(L-M-k)!(L+N-k)!(M-N+k)!k!}. \quad (72)$$

### A Large $p$ limit of $D(H)$

I now assume  $e^p$  large. I am interested in  $\hat{p}_3 = 0$ , primarily. However, in what follows  $\hat{p}_3$  can be anything, provided it is not so close to  $\pm 1$  that it kills the  $e^p$  in the expansions of  $a$ ,  $b$ ,  $c$ , and  $d$ : ( $1 - |\hat{p}_3| \gg 2e^{-p}$ .) Then

$$\begin{aligned} \cosh(p/2) &\cong \sinh(p/2) \\ &\cong e^{p/2}/2; \\ \text{ad} &\cong \text{bc}; \\ D^{(L)}(H)_{MN} &\cong (\text{ad})^L (\text{a/b})^N (\text{b/d})^M \sqrt{(L+M)!(L-M)!(L+N)!(L-N)!} \\ &\quad \cdot \sum_k [(L-M-k)!(L+N-k)!(M-N+k)!k!]^{-1}. \end{aligned} \quad (73)$$

The series in  $k$  can be summed using the addition theorem for binomial coefficients:

$$\sum_k \binom{\mu}{k} \binom{\nu}{\lambda-k} = \binom{\mu+\nu}{\lambda} \quad (74)$$

The equations (73) and (74) give

$$\begin{aligned} D^{(L)}(H)_{MN} &\cong (\text{ad})^L (\text{a/b})^N (\text{b/d})^M \frac{(2L)!}{\sqrt{(L+M)!(L-M)!(L+N)!(L-N)!}} \\ &= (\hat{p}_1 - i\hat{p}_2)^{M-N} (\exp(p/2)/2)^{2L} [1 + \hat{p}_3]^{L+N} [1 - \hat{p}_3]^{L-M} \\ &\quad \frac{(2L)!}{\sqrt{(L+M)!(L-M)!(L+N)!(L-N)!}}. \end{aligned} \quad (75)$$

At this point one can prove: let  $\bar{M}$  and  $\bar{N}$  denote the peak values of  $M$  and  $N$ , i.e. the values which maximize  $|D(H)|$ . Then

$$\bar{M}/L \cong \bar{N}/L \cong \hat{p}_3. \quad (76)$$

Proof: to find the peak value of (say)  $N$ , compute the first difference of the square magnitude of the  $N$  dependence of  $D(H)$ , and set this first difference equal to zero.

$$\begin{aligned} \delta^{(1)}f(N) &:= f(N+1) - f(N); \\ f(N) &= |a/b|^{2N} / [(L+N)!(L-N)!]; \\ 0 &= \delta^{(1)}f(\bar{N}) \\ &\propto |a/b|^2 \frac{L - \bar{N}}{L + \bar{N} + 1} - 1; \\ \bar{N}/L &\cong \frac{|a|^2 - |b|^2}{|a|^2 + |b|^2}; \\ \bar{N}/L &\cong \hat{p}_3. \end{aligned} \quad (77)$$

On the last line I have used the values of  $abcd$  from equation (71). The proof for  $\bar{M}$  is identical except for the replacements  $(a,b) \rightarrow (b,d)$ .  $\square$

## B Small $p_3$ limit of $D(H)$

In the main body of the text I focus on the case  $p_3 = 0$ . From equation (76) of the last subsection, in this limit the important values of  $M$  and  $N$  satisfy  $L \gg M, N$ . Therefore one can use Stirling's approximation for the factorials in equation (75), for example

$$\frac{(2L)!}{(L+M)!(L-M)!} \cong \frac{(2L)^{2L}}{\sqrt{\pi}(L-M)^{L-M+1/2}(L+M)^{L+M+1/2}}. \quad (78)$$

Now use

$$\begin{aligned} (1+x/n)^n &= \exp[n \ln(1+x/n)] \\ &\cong \exp[x - x^2/2n + \dots]. \end{aligned} \quad (79)$$

Take  $n = L + 1/2$ ,  $x = \pm M$ . Also, write  $L^{2L}$  as  $(L + 1/2 - 1/2)^{2L}$  and apply equation (79) to this factor.

$$\frac{(2L)!}{(L+M)!(L-M)!} \cong \frac{(2^{2L} \exp[-M^2/(L+1/2)])}{\sqrt{\pi}(L+1/2)} \quad (80)$$

To obtain a result valid near  $p_3 = 0$ , as well as at  $p_3 = 0$ , assume  $\hat{p}_3 \leq \text{order } 1/\sqrt{L+1/2}$ . Then apply equation (79) to the  $[1 \pm \hat{p}_3]$  factors, with now  $n = L+1/2$ ,  $x = \pm \hat{p}_3 (L+1/2)$ . For example,

$$\begin{aligned} [1 + \hat{p}_3]^{L+N} &= [1 + \hat{p}_3(L+1/2)/(L+1/2)]^{(L+1/2)[1+(N-1/2)/(L+1/2)]} \\ &\cong \exp[\hat{p}_3(L+1/2) + \hat{p}_3(N-1/2) \\ &\quad - (\hat{p}_3)^2(L+1/2)/2], \end{aligned} \quad (81)$$

and similarly for the  $[1 - \hat{p}_3]$  factor. Inserting equations (80) and (81) into equation (75) yields

$$\begin{aligned} D(H)_{MN}^{(L)} &\cong (\hat{p}_1 - i\hat{p}_2)^{M-N} \frac{\exp(pL)}{\sqrt{\pi(L+1/2)}} \\ &\quad \cdot \exp\{-[M - \hat{p}_3(L+1/2)]^2/2(L+1/2)\} \\ &\quad \cdot \exp\{-[N - \hat{p}_3(L+1/2)]^2/2(L+1/2)\} \end{aligned} \quad (82)$$

The  $M$  (and  $N$ ) dependence of  $D(H)$  is peaked at  $M = \hat{p}_3(L+1/2)$ , with the squared width of the Gaussian equal to  $\sqrt{L(L+1)} \cong (L+1/2)$ . This is already a bit more than we need for the main body of the paper.

Equation (82) demonstrates Gaussian behavior in  $N$  and  $M$ . To obtain Gaussian behavior in  $L$ , multiply  $D(H)$  by the other exponential factor in the coherent state.

$$\begin{aligned} \exp(-tL(L+1)/2) D(H)_{NM}^{(L)} &\cong \exp(-tL(L+1)/2) e^{Lp} \dots \\ &= \exp[-t((L+1/2) - p/t)^2/2 + p^2/(2t) + t/8 - p/2] \dots \end{aligned} \quad (83)$$

The  $\dots$  indicates irrelevant factors which are bounded for large  $L$ . On the last line one can neglect  $\exp(t/8) \cong 1$ . Equation (83) is a Gaussian in  $L$  with mean  $\langle L+1/2 \rangle = p/t$  and standard deviation  $1/\sqrt{t}$ .

Since  $t$  is small, the standard deviation is very large. However, what counts is (standard deviation)/(mean value of variable),

$$\sigma_L / \langle L+1/2 \rangle = \sqrt{t}/p,$$

which is small as required.

When  $p_3 = 0$ , it is parameterized by the angle  $\mu$  introduced at equation (22).  $\mu$  is the angle between  $\hat{n}$  and  $\hat{p}$ .

$$\hat{p} = (\cos(\beta + \mu), \sin(\beta + \mu), 0)$$

For this value of  $\hat{p}$ ,  $D(H)$  becomes

$$\begin{aligned} \exp(-tL(L + 1)/2) D(H)_{MN}^{(L)} &\cong \exp[-t((L + 1/2) - p/t)^2/2] \\ \cdot \exp[-M^2/2(L + 1/2)] \exp[-N^2/2(L + 1/2)] &[1/\sqrt{\pi(L + 1/2)}] \\ \cdot \exp[p^2/(2t) - p/2] (\exp[-i(\beta + \mu)])^{M-N}. \end{aligned} \quad (84)$$

## D Small correction (SC) terms

This appendix discusses the nature of the small corrections SC.

$$\text{operator} | \text{coh state} \rangle = \langle \text{operator} \rangle | \text{coh state} \rangle + \text{SC}.$$

The coefficients multiplying these states are shown to be suppressed by factors involving the small parameters  $1/\sqrt{\langle L \rangle}$  and  $\sqrt{t}$ .

Appendix E argues that the parameter  $t$  should be taken to be order  $1/\langle L \rangle$ , in order to minimize the size of the SC terms. If  $t$  is replaced by a number of order  $1/\langle L \rangle$ , everywhere in the factors multiplying the SC terms, then all the SC terms turn out to be suppressed by factors of the same order,  $1/\sqrt{\langle L \rangle}$ .

The SC terms emphasize values of the parameters  $L$  and  $M$  which are near, but not at the average value. I. e. the dynamical variables of the theory connect the original coherent state not only to itself, but also to coherent states with peak values near those of the original coherent state.

### A SC states for the $\tilde{E}$ operator

At equation (33) I replaced

$$L \rightarrow \langle L + 1/2 \rangle + \Delta L; \quad M \rightarrow \Delta M,$$

then asserted that the terms proportional to  $\langle L + 1/2 \rangle$  represented the dominant contribution. I must now examine the terms involving  $\Delta X$ ,  $X = L$  or  $M$ , and show that they are small.

From the previous appendix, equation (84), the original coherent state is proportional to Gaussian factors coming from the  $D(H)$  factor. Therefore the SC terms are proportional to the first moments of Gaussians.

$$\begin{aligned}
|u, \tilde{p}\rangle &\propto \sum_{L,M} D^{(L)}(hu^\dagger)_{0M} \\
&\cdot \exp[-t((L+1/2) - p/t)^2/2] \exp[-M^2/2(L+1/2)]; \\
\text{SC terms} &\propto \sum_{L,M} D^{(L)}(hu^\dagger)_{0M} [\Delta L \text{ or } M] \\
&\cdot \exp[-t((L+1/2) - p/t)^2/2] \exp[-M^2/2(L+1/2)]. \quad (85)
\end{aligned}$$

The original coherent state has the standard Gaussian form, with single peaks at  $\Delta L = 0$  and  $M = 0$ . The SC states have a zero where the original state has a peak; and a peak plus valley at two points located a standard deviation away from the original peak.

The SC states resemble the difference between two Gaussians, each peaked at a value near, but not at the original peak. As mentioned earlier, the operators connect the coherent state to itself, but also to nearby coherent states.

It is difficult to carry out the sums over  $L$  and  $M$  in equation (85) because the  $D^{(L)}(hu^\dagger)_{0M}$  factor is difficult to approximate. There is a simpler way to estimate the order of magnitude of the SC terms, without knowing in detail the  $M$  and  $L$  dependence of  $D^{(L)}(hu^\dagger)_{0M}$ . For the SC terms involving  $M$  and  $\Delta L$ , define the states

$$\begin{aligned}
|1M\rangle &:= N(1(M)) \sum_{L,M} [(2L+1)/4\pi] \exp[-tL(L+1)/2] \\
&\cdot [D^{(L)}(hu^\dagger)_{0M} M D^{(L)}(H)]_{M0}; \quad (86)
\end{aligned}$$

$$\begin{aligned}
|1L\rangle &:= N(1(L)) \sum_{L,M} [(2L+1)/4\pi] \exp[-tL(L+1)/2] \\
&\cdot [D^{(L)}(hu^\dagger)_{0M} \Delta L D^{(L)}(H)]_{M0}. \quad (87)
\end{aligned}$$

The notation  $pX$  denotes the  $p$ th moment of the variable  $X$ . The above states are identical to the original coherent state  $|u, \tilde{p}\rangle$  except for a different normalization factor,

$$N \rightarrow N(1X),$$

and one power of  $\Delta X$  in the summand. In terms of these states, equation (33) becomes

$$\begin{aligned}
(\gamma\kappa/2)^{-1}\tilde{E}_A^x | u, \tilde{p}\rangle &= \langle L + 1/2 \rangle (\hat{n}_A \cos \mu - \hat{n} \times \hat{D})_A \sin \mu | u, \tilde{p}\rangle \\
&+ (N/N(1L)) | 1(L)\rangle \\
&+ (N/N(1M)) [\hat{D}_A + i \sin \mu \hat{n}_A \\
&+ i \cos \mu (\hat{n} \times \hat{D})_A] | 1M\rangle. \tag{88}
\end{aligned}$$

Evidently this replaces the problem of evaluating the sums over L,M by the problem of determining the normalization ratios  $N/N(1X)$ . This may seem like replacing Tweedledum by Tweedledee, except the dangerous factors of  $D^{(L)}(hu^\dagger)_{0M}$  drop out when calculating norms.

I now prove the following:

$$\begin{aligned}
1 &\cong N^2 \exp[p^2/t - p] \sqrt{\langle L + 1/2 \rangle} / 2\pi\sqrt{t}; \\
N/N(1M) &\cong \sqrt{\langle L + 1/2 \rangle} / 2 : \\
N/N(1L) &\cong \sqrt{1/(2t)}. \tag{89}
\end{aligned}$$

I begin with the first line of equation (89). Orthogonality for the  $D(h)$  is

$$\int_{\Omega(h)} D_{0M}^{(L)}(h) D_{0M'}^{(L')}(h)^* = \delta_{L,L'} \delta_{M,M'} (2L + 1)/4\pi.$$

From this and equations (18) and (19),

$$\begin{aligned}
1 &= \langle u, \tilde{p} | u, \tilde{p}\rangle \\
&= N^2 \sum_{L,M} \exp[-tL(L + 1)] [(2L + 1)/4\pi] D_{M0}^{(L)}(g^\dagger)^* D_{M0}^{(L)}(g^\dagger) \\
&= N^2 \sum_{L,M,N,N'} \exp[-tL(L + 1)] [(2L + 1)/4\pi] \\
&\quad \cdot D_{0N}^{(L)}(H) D_{NM}^{(L)}(u) D_{MN'}^{(L)}(u^\dagger) D_{N'0}^{(L)}(H) \\
&= N^2 \sum_{L,M} [(2L + 1)/4\pi] \exp[-tL(L + 1)] \\
&\quad \cdot D_{0M}^{(L)}(H) D_{M0}^{(L)}(H). \tag{90}
\end{aligned}$$

As advertised earlier, the difficult  $u$  and  $h$  dependence has disappeared.

The next step is to carry out the sum over  $M$ . Compare equations (3) and (19): when going from  $h^{1/2}$  to  $H^{(L)}$  we make the replacements

$$i \hat{m} \cdot \tilde{S} \theta \rightarrow \tilde{S} \cdot \tilde{p}.$$

I.e. replace magnitude and direction as follows.

$$i \theta \rightarrow p; \quad \phi \rightarrow \beta + \mu \quad (\Leftrightarrow i \tilde{m} \rightarrow \tilde{p}).$$

The angles are defined at equations (2) and (22). Therefore the Euler decomposition of  $D(H)$  follows from the Euler decomposition of  $D(h)$ , equation (3).

$$\begin{aligned} D(h) (-\phi + \pi/2, \theta, \phi - \pi/2) \\ \rightarrow D(H) (-\beta - \mu + \pi/2, -ip, \beta + \mu - \pi/2). \end{aligned}$$

Therefore the  $D$ 's on the last line of equation (90) equal

$$D^{(L)}(-\beta - \mu + \pi/2, -2ip, \beta + \mu - \pi/2)_{00}.$$

Approximate this factor using equation (84) with  $p \rightarrow 2p, t \rightarrow 2t$ .

$$1 \cong N^2 \sum_L [(2L + 1)/4\pi] \frac{\exp[-t((L + 1/2) - p/t)^2 + p^2/(t) - p]}{\sqrt{\pi(L + 1/2)}}. \quad (91)$$

Replace the sum over  $L$  by an integral:

$$\begin{aligned} \sum_L (\Delta L = 1) &= (1/\sqrt{t}) \sum_L \Delta(\sqrt{t}(L + 1/2) - p/\sqrt{t} := w) \\ &\cong (1/\sqrt{t}) \int dw. \end{aligned} \quad (92)$$

Elsewhere in the integral, replace  $L + 1/2$  by its peak value

$$\langle L + 1/2 \rangle = p/t.$$

Equation (91) then gives the first line of equation (89).

The remaining two lines of equation (89) may be proved using similar approximations, with one exception. The calculation

of  $N(1M)$  resembles the calculation of  $N$ , equation (91), except for an additional factor of  $M^2$  in the summand, so that the sum over  $M$  cannot be carried out immediately. Instead, the sum over  $M$  may be replaced by an integral over a variable  $q$ , using

$$\begin{aligned}\Sigma_M(\Delta M = 1) &= \sqrt{L + 1/2} \Sigma(\Delta M / \sqrt{L + 1/2} := \Delta q) \\ &\cong \sqrt{L + 1/2} \int dq.\end{aligned}\tag{93}$$

□

Equation (89) implies that the SC terms are suppressed: from equation (88), the leading term is order  $\langle L \rangle$ ; therefore the SC terms are down by factors of order

$$\begin{aligned}N/[N(1M) \langle L \rangle] &= 1/\sqrt{2 \langle L \rangle}; \\ N/[N(1L) \langle L \rangle] &= 1/(\sqrt{2t} \langle L \rangle).\end{aligned}$$

At first glance the formula for  $N/N(1L)$  looks dangerous, because of the small factor of  $\sqrt{t}$  in the denominator. However,  $t = p / \langle L + 1/2 \rangle$ , from equation (84). Therefore

$$N/N(1L) / \langle L \rangle \cong 1/\sqrt{2p \langle L \rangle}.$$

Since I am taking  $e^p \gg 1$ , both SC terms are down by at least  $1/\sqrt{\langle L \rangle}$ .

## B SC states for the holonomy

As with the  $\tilde{E}$  operators, I estimate the order of magnitude of the SC terms by calculating appropriate norms. For the  $\tilde{E}$  operators, the SC terms were proportional to new states  $|1X\rangle$  which resemble the original coherent state, except for an additional factor of  $\Delta X$ . Since the holonomy produces states containing  $D^{(L')}(h)$  with  $L' = L \pm 1$ , the states  $|1X\rangle$  are not enough, and I will need the following additional states:

$$\begin{aligned}
|L_{\pm}\rangle &:= N(L_{\pm}) \sum_{L,M} ((2L+1)/4\pi) \exp[-tL(L+1)/2] \\
&\quad \cdot (1/2) [D^{(L+1)}(\text{hu}\dagger) \pm D^{(L-1)}(\text{hu}\dagger)]_{0M} D^{(L)}(H)_{M0}; \\
|L+1, 1M\rangle &:= N(L+1, 1M) \sum_{L,M} ((2L+1)/4\pi) \exp[-tL(L+1)/2] \\
&\quad \cdot D^{(L+1)}(\text{hu}\dagger)_{0M} M D^{(L)}(H)_{M0}. \tag{94}
\end{aligned}$$

In terms of these states, equation (41) becomes

$$\begin{aligned}
D^{(1)}(h)_{0,A} |u, \tilde{p}\rangle &\cong N/N(L_+) |L_+\rangle \hat{D}_A \\
&\quad + N/N(L+1, 1M) |L+1, 1M\rangle \\
&\quad \cdot [-\cos \mu \hat{n}_A + \sin \mu (\hat{n} \times \hat{D})_A] / \langle 2L+1 \rangle \\
&\quad - iN/N(L_-) |L_-\rangle [\sin \mu \hat{n}_A + \cos \mu (\hat{n} \times \hat{D})_A] \\
&\quad + \text{order}(M/L)^2, 1/L. \tag{95}
\end{aligned}$$

The ratios which determine the order of magnitude of the SC terms are

$$\begin{aligned}
N/N(L_+) &\cong 1; \\
N/N(L_-) &\cong \sqrt{t/2}; \\
N/N(L+1, 1M) &\cong \sqrt{\langle L+1/2 \rangle / 2}. \tag{96}
\end{aligned}$$

Proof: the last line of equation (96) is easiest to establish. Because  $|L+1, 1M\rangle$  differs from  $|1M\rangle$  only in the replacement of  $D^{(L+1)}(\text{hu}\dagger)$  by  $D^{(L)}(\text{hu}\dagger)$ , and the  $D(\text{hu}\dagger)$  factors drop out anyway when computing norms,  $N/N(L+1, m1M)$  is the same as  $N/N(m1M)$ , equation (89).

To determine the  $N(L_{\pm})$ , rewrite the  $L_{\pm}$  states as follows.

$$\begin{aligned}
|L_{\pm}\rangle &= N(L_{\pm}) \sum_{L,M} ((2L+1)/4\pi) \exp[-tL(L+1)/2] \\
&\quad \cdot (1/2) [D^{(L+1)}(\text{hu}\dagger) \pm D^{(L-1)}(\text{hu}\dagger)]_{0M} D^{(L)}(H)_{M0} \\
&\cong N(L_{\pm}) \sum_{L,M} ((2L+1)/4\pi) D^{(L)}(\text{hu}\dagger)_{0M} \\
&\quad \cdot (1/2) \sum_{\pm} [(\pm 1) \exp\{-t[L \mp 1 + 1/2 - p/t]^2/2\}] \\
&\quad \cdot \exp\{p^2/2t - p/2 - iM(\beta + \mu)\} \frac{\exp\{-M^2/[2(L+1/2)]\}}{\sqrt{\pi(L+1/2)}} \\
&\cong N(L_{\pm}) \sum_{L,M} ((2L+1)/4\pi) D^{(L)}(\text{hu}\dagger)_{0M} \\
&\quad \cdot \exp\{-t[L+1/2 - p/t]^2/2\} \left[ \begin{array}{c} \cosh[t(L+1/2 - p/t)] \\ \sinh[t(L+1/2 - p/t)] \end{array} \right] \\
&\quad \cdot \exp\{p^2/2t - p/2 - iM(\beta + \mu)\} \frac{\exp\{-M^2/[2(L+1/2)]\}}{\sqrt{\pi(L+1/2)}} \\
&\cong N(L_{\pm}) \sum_{L,M} ((2L+1)/4\pi) D^{(L)}(\text{hu}\dagger)_{0M} \\
&\quad \cdot \exp[-tL(L+1)/2] D^{(L)}(H)_{M0} \\
&\quad \cdot \left[ \begin{array}{c} \cosh[t(L+1/2 - p/t)] \\ \sinh[t(L+1/2 - p/t)] \end{array} \right]. \tag{97}
\end{aligned}$$

The cosh (sinh) goes with the upper (lower) sign. On the third line I have relabeled  $L \pm 1 = \tilde{L}$ , used equation (84) to replace the  $D(H)$  by Gaussians, and then dropped the tildes. From the last line, the  $|L_{\pm}\rangle$  states are just the original states times an additional factor of cosh or sinh. When the state is squared to determine a norm, this factor becomes  $\cosh^2[\sqrt{t}w]$  or  $\sinh^2[\sqrt{t}w]$ , as at equation (92). The variable  $L$  is replaced by a variable  $w$ , and the sum over  $L$  is replaced by an integral over  $w$ . The  $w$  dependence of the Gaussian gives  $w \leq 1$ , and  $t$  is order  $1/\langle L \rangle$ . For the  $L_+$  state,  $\cosh^2[\sqrt{t}w] \cong 1$ . The normalization integral for  $N(L_+)$  reduces to the normalization integral for  $N$ , and we get the first line of equation (96). For the  $L_-$  state,  $\sinh^2[\sqrt{t}w] \cong tw^2$ . This normalization integral should be compared to the normalization integral for  $|1L\rangle$ . That integral contains a  $(\Delta L)^2 = w^2/t$  factor. Therefore in  $(N/N(1L))^2 = 1/(2t)$ ,

equation (89), move the  $t$  from denominator to numerator to get  $(N/N(L_-))^2 = t/2$ .  $\square$

## E Estimates of the parameter $t$

The parameter  $t$ , introduced at equation (18), is analogous to the standard deviation parameter  $\sigma$  present in the coherent state for the free particle, equation (15). That parameter drops out of the Heisenberg relation  $\Delta p \Delta x \geq \hbar$ , but does determine the individual uncertainties  $\Delta x \cong \sigma$ ,  $\Delta p \cong \hbar/\sigma$ . One can choose extreme values of  $\sigma$  leading to "squeezed" states.

It is difficult to put significant limits on the parameter  $t$ , if one looks only at leading terms. The coefficients of the leading terms are the peak values, and the only peak value (of holonomy,  $\tilde{E}$ ,  $L$ , or angles) which depends on  $t$  is  $\langle L \rangle$ . From equation (84) even this peak value depends on  $t$  only via  $p/t$ , rather than  $p$  alone.

$$\langle L + 1/2 \rangle = p/t. \quad (98)$$

To put limits on  $t$ , one must consider the SC terms. I list various states contributing to the SC terms. First, the  $\tilde{E}$  SC terms, from equations (88) and (89):

$$\sqrt{1/(2 \langle L \rangle)} |1M\rangle; \sqrt{1/(2t \langle L \rangle^2)} |1L\rangle.$$

Each state is smaller than the leading term by the factor multiplying the state. Next, the holonomy SC terms, from equations (95) and (96):

$$\sqrt{1/4 \langle L \rangle} |L + 1, 1M\rangle; \sqrt{t/2} |L_-\rangle$$

One of these terms has  $t$  in the numerator, and one has  $t$  in the denominator. we can determine a best value of  $p$  and  $t$  by summing these two factors

$$\sqrt{1/(2t \langle L \rangle^2)} + \sqrt{t/2},$$

then minimizing the sum with respect to  $t$ . The resulting best value is

$$t = 1/ \langle L \rangle. \quad (99)$$

I cannot set  $t = 1/\langle L \rangle$  exactly, however, because then from equation (98) I must take  $p = 1$ . Appendix C requires an expansion in  $\exp(-p) \ll 1$  to neglect non-leading terms in  $D(H)$ . As a

compromise, I take  $p$  large, but not too large; say  $p = 5$ . Then the expansion of  $D(H)$  remains valid, since  $\exp(-5)$  is small; also the SC terms will be small, provided  $\langle L + 1/2 \rangle$  is large enough. The  $t$  dependent factors suppressing the SC terms become

$$\sqrt{1/(2t \langle L \rangle^2)} = \sqrt{1/p \langle L \rangle}; \quad \sqrt{t/2} = \sqrt{p/2 \langle L \rangle}.$$

For  $\langle L \rangle$  greater than 100 or so, and  $p = 5$ , these factors are sufficiently small.

When the SC terms are taken into account,  $t$  is not arbitrarily adjustable. Values of  $p$  and  $t$  much different from  $p = 1$  and  $t = 1/\langle L \rangle$  result in larger-than-optimal SC terms.

## References

- [1] A. Ashtekar, New Hamiltonian formulation of general relativity, Phys. Rev. D **36** (1987) 1587
- [2] A. Sen, Gravity as a spin system, Phys. Lett. **119B** (1982) 89
- [3] Barbero, F. and Fernando, J., Real Ashtekar variables for Lorentzian signature spacetimes, Phys. Rev. D **51** (1995) 5507; Phys. Rev. D **51** (1995) 5498.
- [4] T. Thiemann, Quantum spin dynamics (QSD), Class. Quantum gravity, **15** (1998) 1839 [gr-qc/9606089]
- [5] T. Jacobson and L. Smolin, Nonperturbative quantum geometries, Nucl. Phys. **B299** (1988) 295
- [6] C. Rovelli and L. Smolin, Knot theory and quantum gravity, Phys. Rev. Lett. **61** (1988) 1155; Loop space representation for quantum general relativity, Nucl. Phys. **B331** (1990) 80
- [7] R. Gambini and J. Pullin, Nonstandard optics from quantum space-time, Phys. Rev. **D59** (1999) 124021
- [8] J. Alfaro, H.A. Morales-Tecotl, and L.F. Urrutia, Loop quantum gravity and light propagation, Phys. Rev. **D65** (2002) 103509
- [9] S. Liberati, T. Jackson, and D. Mattingly, Lorentz violation at high energy, Annals of Physics **321** (2006) 150-96

- [10] R. Bluhm, Overview of the standard model extension: implications and phenomenology of Lorentz violation, in *Special Relativity. Will it survive the next 101 years?* edited by J. Ehlers and C. Lammerzahl( Springer, Berlin 2006)
- [11] M. Gaul and C. Rovelli, A generalized Hamiltonian constraint operator in loop quantum gravity and its simplest Euclidean matrix elements, *Class. Quantum Grav.* **18** (2001) 1593-1624 [gr-qc/0011106]
- [12] C. Rovelli and L. Smolin, Discreteness of area and volume in quantum gravity, *Nucl. Phys. B***442** (1995) 593; erratum, *Nucl. Phys. B***456** (1995) 734
- [13] L.G. Garay, Quantum gravity and minimum length, *Int. J. Mod. Phys. A***10** (1995) 145-66 [gr-qc/ 9403008]
- [14] M. Bojowald, Isotropic loop quantum cosmology, *Class. Quantum Grav.* **19** (2002) 2717 [gr-qc/0202077]; Homogeneous loop quantum cosmology, *Class. Quantum Grav.* **20** (2003) 2595 [gr-qc/0303073].
- [15] C. Rovelli, Black hole entropy from loop quantum gravity, *Phys. Rev. Lett.* **77** (1996) 3288
- [16] K. Krasnov, Geometrical entropy from loop quantum gravity, *Phys. Rev. D***55** (1997) 3505
- [17] L. Smolin, The classical limit and the form of the hamiltonian constraint in non-perturbative quantum general relativity [gr-qc/9609034].
- [18] D. E. Neville, Long range correlations in quantum gravity, *Phys. Rev. D* **59** (1999) 044032
- [19] E. Alesci and C. Rovelli, The complete loop quantum gravity propagator: I. Difficulties with the Barrett- Crane Vertex, arXiv [gr-qc/ 0708.0883v1]
- [20] J. Ambjorn, J. Jurkiewicz, and R. Loll, *Phys. Rev. Lett.* **93** (2004) 131301
- [21] F. Markopoulou, Coarse graining in spin foam models, *Class. Quantum Grav.* **20** (2003) 777 [gr-qc/ 0203036]

- [22] R. Oeckl, Renormalization of discrete models without background, Nucl. Phys. **B657** (2003) 107 [gr-qc/ 0212047]
- [23] T. Thiemann, Gauge field coherent states (GCS):I. General properties, Class. Quantum Grav. **18** (2001) 2025-64 [hep-th/0005233]
- [24] T. Thiemann and O. Winkler, Gauge field coherent states II (GCS): Peakedness properties, Class. Quantum Grav., **18** (2001) 2561 [hep-th/0005237]
- [25] T. Thiemann and O. Winkler, Gauge field coherent states III (GCS): Ehrenfest theorems, Class. Quantum Grav., **18** (2001) 4629 [hep-th/0005234]
- [26] B. Bahr and T. Thiemann, Gauge Invariant Coherent States for Loop Quantum Gravity I: Abelian groups ArXiv [gr-qc]0709.4619; Gauge Invariant Coherent States for Loop Quantum Gravity II: ArXiv [gr-qc/0709.4636]
- [27] J.M. Radcliffe, Some properties of coherent spin states, J. Phys. A:Gen. Phys. **4** (1971) 313-23
- [28] A. Perelomov, *Generalized Coherent States and Their Applications* (Springer-Verlag, Berlin 1986)
- [29] B.T. Hall, Phase space bounds for quantum mechanics on a compact Lie group, Commun. Math. Phys. **184** (1997) 233-50
- [30] B.G. Hall, *Lie Groups, Lie Algebras, and Representations: an Elementary Introduction* (Springer-Verlag, New York 2003)
- [31] V. Husain and L. Smolin, Exactly Solvable Quantum Cosmologies from Two Killing Field Reductions of General Relativity, Nucl. Phys. B **327** (1989) 205
- [32] D. E. Neville, Volume operator for spin networks with planar or cylindrical symmetry, Phys. Rev. **D73** (2006) 124004 [gr-qc/0511005]; typos corrected: Phys. Rev. **D77**, (2008) 129901
- [33] D.E.Neville Volume operator for singly polarized gravity waves with planar or cylindrical symmetry, Phys. Rev. **D73** (2006) 124005 [gr-qc/0511006]

- [34] A. Ashtekar and J. Lewandowski, *J.Geo.and Phys.* **17** (1995) 191
- [35] A. Ashtekar and J. Lewandowski, *Quantum Theory of Geometry II: Volume Operators*, (1997) [gr-qc/9711031]
- [36] C. Rovelli and L. Smolin, *Nucl. Phys* **B442** (1995) 593
- [37] Roberto DePietri and C. Rovelli, *Geometry Eigenvalues and Scalar Product from Recoupling Theory in Loop Quantum Gravity*, *Phys. Rev. D* **54** (1996) 2664 [gr-qc/9602023]
- [38] R. Borissov, R. De Pietri, and C. Rovelli, *Matrix Elements of Thiemann's Hamiltonian Constraint in Loop Quantum Gravity*, *Class. Quant. Grav.* **14** (1997) 2793 [gr-qc/9703090]
- [39] A. R. Edmonds, *Angular Momentum in Quantum Mechanics*, Princeton University Press, Princeton, New Jersey, 1960
- [40] D. E. Neville, *Planar spin network coherent states II. Small corrections* [arXiv:0807.1026]