Spacetime's Gauge Reality: Testing Loop Quantum Gravity with the AB Effect

Shan Gao
Research Center for Philosophy of Science and Technology,
Shanxi University, Taiyuan 030006, P. R. China
E-mail: gaoshan2017@sxu.edu.cn.

April 29, 2025

Abstract

The gravitational Aharonov-Bohm (AB) effect, where quantum particles acquire phase shifts in curvature-free regions due to a gauge-fixed metric perturbation $h_{\mu\nu}$, highlights the intriguing gauge dependence of spacetime. This study explores whether Loop Quantum Gravity (LQG), which views spacetime as emerging from SU(2)- and diffeomorphism-invariant spin networks, can accommodate this effect. The AB effect suggests that LQG should incorporate gauge dependence at the quantum level, which appears challenging within its relational, gauge-invariant framework. Potential modifications to LQG, such as introducing gauge-fixing constraints or effective fields, may require assumptions aligned with substantivalism, potentially diverging from its emergent paradigm. These results invite a thoughtful reconsideration of spacetime's ontological status, encouraging a dialogue between relational and substantivalist perspectives in quantum gravity.

1 Introduction

The quest to understand the nature of spacetime—whether it emerges from fundamental relations or exists as an independent entity—is a central theme in modern theoretical physics. This question becomes particularly compelling in efforts to unify quantum theory and general relativity, where different approaches offer diverse perspectives. Loop Quantum Gravity (LQG), a prominent framework for quantum gravity, suggests that spacetime emerges from discrete, SU(2)- and diffeomorphism-invariant spin networks, with quantized geometric observables like area and volume [4]. In contrast, substantivalist views propose that spacetime possesses an intrinsic, independent reality. The gravitational Aharonov-Bohm (AB) effect offers a valuable empirical perspective to explore this debate, as it shows that quantum particles experience measurable phase shifts in regions without spacetime curvature, influenced solely by a gauge-fixed metric perturbation $h_{\mu\nu}$ [3]. This phenomenon invites us to consider whether spacetime's gauge-dependent metric is a physically significant property, rather than a mathematical construct.

In the weak-field regime of general relativity, the metric is approximated as $g_{\mu\nu} = \eta_{\mu\nu} + h_{\mu\nu}$, where $h_{\mu\nu}$ represents gravitational perturbations. The AB effect reveals that, even in the absence of curvature ($R^{\rho}_{\sigma\mu\nu} = 0$), a carefully chosen $h_{\mu\nu}$ induces measurable quantum phase shifts, similar to the electromagnetic AB effect, where the gauge-dependent vector potential A_μ affects phases in field-free regions. In LQG, the classical metric $g_{\mu\nu}$ emerges statistically in the semiclassical limit, without inherent gauge dependence. However, the AB effect suggests that the gauge-fixed $h_{\mu\nu}$—and thus spacetime's physical state—must be reflected at the quantum level. This poses an intriguing challenge for LQG, as its invariant framework may struggle to incorporate such gauge-dependent quantum states without modifications that could affect its relational ontology.

This paper examines whether LQG can account for the gravitational AB effect, suggesting that substantivalism—the view that spacetime is a fundamental entity with a gauge-fixed metric—may align more naturally with this phenomenon. We explore the following points:

- The AB effect's phase shift relies on a gauge-fixed $h_{\mu\nu}$ as the physical state (Section 2), which may be difficult to reconcile with LQG's emergent, invariant framework (Section 4).
- Potential modifications to LQG to accommodate this requirement (Section 5) may introduce substantivalist assumptions, such as background metrics or effective fields, which could diverge from its relational foundations.
- The empirical reality of the AB effect encourages a substantivalist perspective, prompting further reflection on relational ontologies (Section 6).

By exploring this interplay, we aim to contribute to a broader conversation about quantum gravity, inviting a reconsideration of spacetime's ontological foundations and suggesting avenues for future theoretical and experimental exploration (Section 7).

2 Physical Reality of Gauge-Fixed Metrics

The AB effect offers a fascinating perspective on gauge-invariant ontologies by highlighting the physical significance of gauge-dependent potentials. In the electromagnetic AB effect, a compelling analysis shows that the phase shift, expressed as $\phi_{AB} = \frac{1}{T}\int_0^T e\Phi(t)\,dt$ in the generalized case with time-varying flux, cannot be fully explained by gauge-invariant quantities like magnetic flux Φ [1]. Such explanations, which predict an instantaneous phase at interference, face challenges due to issues of nonlocality and discontinuity, unable to account for the local, path-dependent influence of the vector potential A_μ, fixed in the Lorenz gauge ($\partial_\mu A^\mu = 0$). This insight finds a parallel in general relativity (GR): the gravitational AB effect induces a phase shift via the metric perturbation $h_{\mu\nu}$ in regions without curvature ($R^\rho_{\sigma\mu\nu} = 0$), suggesting that a gauge-fixed $h_{\mu\nu}$ may play a physically significant role, akin to A_μ's role in quantum mechanics. By drawing this connection between electromagnetism and GR, we explore how $h_{\mu\nu}$'s determinacy might reshape our understanding of GR's ontology.

In the weak-field limit of GR, the metric is approximated as:

$$g_{\mu\nu} = \eta_{\mu\nu} + h_{\mu\nu}, \quad |h_{\mu\nu}| \ll 1, \tag{1}$$

where $\eta_{\mu\nu} = \mathrm{diag}(-1, 1, 1, 1)$ is the Minkowski metric, and $h_{\mu\nu}$ represents small perturbations. For a static gravitational source, the Newtonian potential is:

$$V = -\frac{GM}{r}. \tag{2}$$

This corresponds to the metric component:

$$h_{00} \approx \frac{2V}{c^2}, \tag{3}$$

reflecting time dilation in the weak field. The gravitational AB effect manifests as a phase shift for a particle (mass m) traversing two interferometer paths L_1 and L_2 over time T:

$$\phi_g = \frac{m}{\hbar}\int_0^T [V_1 - V_2]\,dt, \tag{4}$$

where $\hbar$ is the reduced Planck constant, and V_1 and V_2 are the gravitational potentials along the two paths. This phase, measurable through neutron or atom interferometry, arises despite vanishing curvature along the paths, mirroring the electromagnetic AB effect's field-free dynamics [3].

For general, time-varying fields in curvature-free regions ($R^\rho_{\sigma\mu\nu} = 0$), a more comprehensive phase is proposed [1]:

$$\phi_g = \frac{m}{2\hbar} \left[\int_{x_1(t)} h_{\mu\nu}(x,t) u^\mu dx^\nu - \int_{x_2(t)} h_{\mu\nu}(x,t) u^\mu dx^\nu \right], \tag{5}$$

where $u^\mu = dx^\mu/d\tau$ is the four-velocity, and the integrals are taken over the paths $x_1(t)$ and $x_2(t)$ from $t = 0$ to T. In the static, weak-field limit with $h_{00} \approx \frac{2V}{c^2}$ and other components negligible, and assuming non-relativistic motion ($u^0 \approx 1$, $u^i \approx dx^i/dt$), this reduces to:

$$\phi_g \approx \frac{m}{2\hbar} \int_0^T [h_{00}(x_1(t)) - h_{00}(x_2(t))] \, dt \approx \frac{m}{\hbar} \int_0^T [V_1 - V_2] \, dt, \tag{6}$$

matching Equation (4). Equation (5) captures contributions from all metric components in dynamic scenarios.

The phase's dependence on $h_{\mu\nu}$ requires gauge fixing to ensure a consistent, observable effect. Without a fixed gauge, diffeomorphic $h_{\mu\nu}$ configurations could lead to varying phases, complicating empirical predictions. The harmonic gauge:

$$\partial_\mu(\sqrt{-g} g^{\mu\nu}) = 0, \tag{7}$$

or a Proca-like condition inspired by massive gravity [1]:

$$\partial^\mu h_{\mu\nu} = \partial_\nu h, \tag{8}$$

provides the necessary determinacy. The Proca-like gauge, reducing degrees of freedom to five in massive gravity, aligns with boundary conditions (e.g., asymptotic flatness, $h_{\mu\nu} \to 0$) to yield a unique $h_{\mu\nu}$, similar to the Lorenz gauge's role in fixing A_μ. This determinacy is essential: just as A_μ's continuous influence in the electromagnetic AB effect requires a specific gauge to avoid ambiguity, the gravitational AB effect's phase relies on a uniquely fixed $h_{\mu\nu}$ to reflect spacetime's physical state.

This parallel encourages a deeper reflection on spacetime's ontology. The electromagnetic AB effect's analysis suggests that gauge-invariant quantities alone cannot fully explain the phase's local, temporal accrual, favoring the physical significance of A_μ. Similarly, the gravitational AB effect challenges the idea that curvature invariants (e.g., $R^\rho_{\sigma\mu\nu}$) fully capture spacetime's essence, as they vanish along the paths yet the phase persists. A gauge-fixed $h_{\mu\nu}$, whether in harmonic or Proca-like gauge, appears to mediate the effect, suggesting a substantivalist perspective where spacetime's geometry has intrinsic reality, beyond relational constructs. This view invites a reconsideration of emergent theories that prioritize gauge-invariant quantities, aligning GR with the potential-centric ontology established in electromagnetism [1].

The gravitational AB effect thus extends the insights from electromagnetism, offering a unified perspective on gauge theories. Future experiments, leveraging advanced tools like LIGO or atom interferometry with dynamic sources, could further explore time-varying $h_{\mu\nu}$'s phase contributions, testing this ontology. Identifying the optimal gauge-fixing condition may help universalize $h_{\mu\nu}$'s determinacy, reinforcing its role as spacetime's physical state, much like A_μ in the Lorenz gauge anchors the electromagnetic AB effect.

3 Gauge-Fixed Metrics in Quantum Gravity

The gravitational AB effect, as discussed in Section 2, relies on a gauge-fixed metric perturbation $h_{\mu\nu}$ to produce a consistent phase shift in quantum interferometry. This empirical requirement suggests that gauge dependence should be reflected in the quantum theory, posing an intriguing challenge for quantum gravity frameworks like LQG, which emphasizes an emergent, gauge-invariant structure.

In the electromagnetic AB effect, the phase is given by:

$$\phi_{\text{EM}} = \frac{q}{\hbar} \oint_C A_\mu dx^\mu, \tag{9}$$

depending on the gauge-fixed vector potential A_μ, even in regions where $F_{\mu\nu} = 0$. This gauge dependence is captured in Quantum Electrodynamics (QED) through:

- **Direct Gauge Fixing**: Quantizing A_μ in a specific gauge (e.g., Lorenz gauge, $\partial^\mu A_\mu = 0$), where operator constraints ensure $\langle A_\mu \rangle$ reflects the chosen gauge.
- **Post-Quantization Fixing**: Quantizing all components of A_μ and imposing constraints (e.g., Gupta-Bleuler condition, $\partial^\mu A_\mu^{(+)} |\psi\rangle = 0$), selecting states where $\langle A_\mu \rangle$ aligns with the gauge.

These approaches succeed because A_μ is a fundamental quantum field, allowing its expectation values to encode gauge dependence, ensuring a consistent phase for both static and dynamic cases [1]. Similarly, the gravitational AB effect's quantum nature suggests that the gauge-fixed $h_{\mu\nu}$, responsible for the phase in Equations (3) or (4), should be represented by quantum expectation values $\langle h_{\mu\nu} \rangle$. This invites a quantum gravity theory to produce states or operators that yield a specific $h_{\mu\nu}$ in a chosen gauge (e.g., harmonic gauge), reflecting spacetime's gauge dependence at the quantum level.

For LQG to accommodate the AB effect, its quantum states should ideally encode the gauge-specific structure of $h_{\mu\nu}$ without relying solely on classical post-processing. This requirement encourages a careful examination of LQG's emergent paradigm, where $g_{\mu\nu}$ arises statistically, to assess its compatibility with the quantum-level gauge dependence suggested by the AB effect.

4 LQG's Challenges with Gauge-Fixed Spacetime

LQG faces difficulties in meeting the gravitational AB effect's requirement for a gauge-fixed $h_{\mu\nu}$ at the quantum level, given its SU(2) and diffeomorphism-invariant framework, which prioritizes relational, emergent geometry. This challenge invites a deeper exploration of how LQG's principles align with the empirical demands of the AB effect.

In LQG, spacetime geometry emerges from spin networks, quantum states defined on abstract graphs labeled by SU(2) representations [4]. These networks encode relational geometry through holonomies of the Ashtekar connection A_a^i and fluxes of the conjugate triad E_i^a, satisfying:

- **SU(2) Invariance**: The Gauss constraint, $D_a E_i^a = 0$, ensures invariance under local SU(2) gauge transformations.
- **Diffeomorphism Invariance**: Physical states are invariant under spatial coordinate transformations, upholding background independence.

Geometric observables, such as areas quantized as:

$$A = 8\pi\gamma\ell_P^2 \sqrt{j(j+1)}, \tag{10}$$

where γ is the Immirzi parameter and ℓ_P is the Planck length, are relational and gauge-invariant, capturing interactions without coordinate dependence [4]. The classical metric $g_{\mu\nu}$ emerges statistically in the semiclassical limit ($\hbar \to 0$) through coarse-graining, approximating the smooth geometry of general relativity.

To account for the AB effect, LQG would need to produce quantum states whose expectation values yield a gauge-fixed $h_{\mu\nu}$, such as $h_{00} \approx -2V/c^2$, to drive the phase in Equations (3) or (4). However, LQG's framework presents several considerations:

- **Emergent Metric**: Unlike QED, where A_μ is a fundamental quantum field, $g_{\mu\nu}$ or $h_{\mu\nu}$ in LQG is an emergent, statistical construct, not a quantum operator. Expectation values $\langle g_{\mu\nu} \rangle$ arise only semiclassically, potentially lacking the quantum-level gauge dependence needed for $\langle h_{\mu\nu} \rangle$.

- **Diffeomorphism Invariance**: Gauge fixing $h_{\mu\nu}$ (e.g., harmonic gauge) requires a coordinate system, which may conflict with LQG's background-independent approach. In QED, U(1) gauge fixing is internal, preserving spacetime symmetries, but gravitational gauge fixing introduces coordinate dependence, challenging LQG's relational paradigm.

- **Relational Observables**: LQG's observables, such as areas and volumes, are SU(2) and diffeomorphism-invariant, lacking the tensorial, gauge-dependent structure of $h_{\mu\nu}$. The AB phase requires specific components (e.g., h_{00}), which may not be derivable from LQG's invariant quantities.

- **Invariant Quantum States**: LQG's spin networks are constrained to be SU(2) and diffeomorphism-invariant, limiting their ability to encode gauge-specific expectation values like $\langle h_{\mu\nu} \rangle$. Unlike QED, where states can reflect gauge choices (e.g., via Gupta-Bleuler), LQG's invariance may restrict such flexibility without introducing a background metric.

This tension arises from the nature of LQG's physical states. In classical general relativity, the metric $g_{\mu\nu}$ includes non-physical gauge degrees of freedom under diffeomorphisms, $g_{\mu\nu} \to g_{\mu\nu} + \mathcal{L}_\xi g_{\mu\nu}$, which are resolved by gauge fixing to produce a specific $h_{\mu\nu}$ for the AB effect. In contrast, LQG's physical spin network states, being solutions to the diffeomorphism constraint, inherently exclude these non-physical freedoms, generating only gauge-invariant quantities in the semiclassical limit. As a result, LQG may struggle to produce the full $g_{\mu\nu}$ with its gauge-dependent components, as required by the AB effect. To address this, LQG would need to incorporate a gauge-fixed $g_{\mu\nu}$ in its quantum states or produce a gauge-fixed $\langle h_{\mu\nu} \rangle$ at the quantum level, a task that appears to challenge its invariant framework, as explored in Section 5.

While semiclassical coarse-graining might yield a statistical $\langle g_{\mu\nu} \rangle$, which could be gauge-fixed classically to compute the AB phase, this approach may not fully capture the quantum-level gauge dependence required by the AB effect's quantum nature. Reformulating the phase using LQG's invariant quantities, such as holonomies, also faces challenges, as these lack the gauge-dependent tensor structure of $h_{\mu\nu}$ needed to couple to the potential in curvature-free regions.

In summary, LQG's core principles present challenges in accommodating the AB effect's requirement for a gauge-fixed metric, encouraging a thoughtful exploration of whether spacetime's gauge-dependent structure aligns more closely with a substantivalist perspective.

5 Modifying LQG: A Substantivalist Turn?

Section 4 highlighted the challenges LQG faces in producing a gauge-fixed $\langle h_{\mu\nu} \rangle$ at the quantum level due to its SU(2) and diffeomorphism-invariant framework. Here, we consider whether LQG can be adapted to meet the gravitational AB effect's requirements, exploring the implications for its relational paradigm.

To align with the AB effect's need for a gauge-fixed $h_{\mu\nu}$, such as $h_{00} \approx -2V/c^2$ in Equations (3) or (4), LQG would need to incorporate gauge dependence into its quantum states. Possible approaches include:

- **Introducing Gauge-Fixing Constraints**: New constraints could be developed to select spin network states that yield expectation values $\langle h_{\mu\nu} \rangle$ in a specific gauge, similar to QED's Gupta-Bleuler condition. This would require defining a quantum operator for $h_{\mu\nu}$, which is emergent in LQG, not fundamental. Such an operator might necessitate a background metric to define coordinate-dependent components, potentially conflicting with LQG's background-independent approach.

- **Incorporating Effective Fields**: Introducing effective fields that mimic a gauge-fixed $h_{\mu\nu}$ could enable LQG to couple to the AB phase. These fields would act as fundamental entities, akin to QED's A_μ, but their inclusion might suggest a metric-like structure at the quantum level, aligning more closely with substantivalism than LQG's relational geometry.
- **Modifying Coarse-Graining**: Adjusting the coarse-graining process to produce a gauge-fixed $\langle g_{\mu\nu} \rangle$ directly at the semiclassical limit could be considered. However, this approach may not encode gauge dependence in the quantum states, as required by the AB effect's quantum nature, which demands quantum-level gauge fixing for a determinate phase.

Each approach presents significant considerations. Adding gauge-fixing constraints or effective fields would likely require a fundamental metric-like entity, which could diverge from LQG's emergent paradigm, where geometry arises from SU(2)-invariant holonomies and fluxes. Such changes might align LQG more closely with substantivalism, suggesting that spacetime possesses intrinsic, gauge-dependent properties, contrary to LQG's relational ontology [4]. Reformulating the AB phase using invariant quantities, such as path-ordered holonomies, may also be insufficient, as these lack the tensorial structure of $h_{\mu\nu}$ needed to couple to the gravitational potential in curvature-free regions.

Moreover, such modifications could impact LQG's predictive framework. For example, introducing a background metric to define gauge-fixed states might affect the quantization of geometric observables, such as areas:

$$A = 8\pi\gamma\ell_P^2\sqrt{j(j+1)}, \tag{11}$$

potentially altering LQG's predictions of granularity and superpositions [4]. Thus, adapting LQG to accommodate the AB effect may require reconsidering its core principles, suggesting that the gauge-fixed $h_{\mu\nu}$'s significance may favor a substantivalist view of spacetime.

6 Implications for Spacetime Ontology

The gravitational AB effect's reliance on a gauge-fixed $h_{\mu\nu}$, as established in earlier sections, and the challenges LQG faces in accommodating this requirement (Section 5), invite a thoughtful reconsideration of spacetime's ontology. These results encourage a substantivalist perspective, which views spacetime as a fundamental entity with intrinsic properties, over relationalism, which sees spacetime as emerging from relations among physical entities.

Substantivalism posits that spacetime, characterized by the metric $g_{\mu\nu}$, exists independently with gauge-dependent properties encoded in $h_{\mu\nu}$. The AB effect's dependence on a specific gauge-fixed $h_{\mu\nu}$ to produce a determinate phase (Section 2) suggests that spacetime may carry intrinsic, gauge-dependent information, beyond relational roles [3]. This contrasts with LQG's relational ontology, where spacetime emerges from SU(2)- and diffeomorphism-invariant spin networks, and physical observables lack the tensorial structure of $h_{\mu\nu}$ [4].

The hole argument in general relativity, which supports relationalism by equating diffeomorphic metrics [2], is brought into question by the AB effect. If diffeomorphic $h_{\mu\nu}$ configurations were physically equivalent, the phase's reliance on a unique gauge might be merely conventional. Instead, the empirical necessity of a specific $h_{\mu\nu}$ suggests that gauge dependence is intrinsic, encouraging a substantivalist perspective over relationalism's view that spacetime properties are fully captured by diffeomorphism-invariant relations. Section 5 supports this by showing that LQG's attempts to incorporate gauge dependence may require a fundamental metric-like entity, aligning with substantivalism and challenging relationalism's premise of emergent spacetime.

This tension extends to other relational quantum gravity approaches, such as causal set theory, which also emphasize invariant structures [4]. The AB effect suggests that theories denying spacetime's fundamental nature must address gauge-dependent phenomena at the quantum level, a challenge that relational frameworks may find difficult without adopting substantivalist assumptions. For instance, introducing effective fields or background metrics, as explored in Section 5, implicitly assumes a substantival spacetime, highlighting the complexities of maintaining a purely relational ontology.

The substantivalist perspective also invites broader philosophical reflection:

- **Ontological Priority**: The AB effect suggests that the metric's gauge-dependent structure may be a primary ontological feature, indicating that spacetime's reality includes intrinsic properties tied to specific gauge choices.

- **Empirical Constraints**: The effect provides an empirical basis for considering substantivalism, as it requires a physical state ($h_{\mu\nu}$) that relational theories like LQG may struggle to produce without significant revisions.

- **Theoretical Implications**: Theories treating spacetime as a fundamental entity may better accommodate the AB effect's gauge dependence, encouraging further exploration of their philosophical and theoretical merits [4].

Thus, the AB effect's implications encourage a substantivalist view, inviting a deeper exploration of relationalism's ability to describe spacetime's physical reality and fostering a dialogue about quantum gravity's ontological foundations.

7 Conclusions and Future Directions

The gravitational Aharonov-Bohm (AB) effect, which relies on a gauge-fixed metric perturbation $h_{\mu\nu}$ to produce a phase shift in curvature-free regions (Section 2), presents an intriguing challenge for Loop Quantum Gravity (LQG). As explored in Sections 3 and 4, LQG's SU(2)- and diffeomorphism-invariant framework faces difficulties in encoding the gauge dependence of $h_{\mu\nu}$ at the quantum level due to its emphasis on emergent, relational geometry. Potential modifications to LQG (Section 5) may require fundamental changes, such as background metrics or effective fields, which align more closely with substantivalism, diverging from LQG's relational paradigm. This interplay, coupled with the AB effect's support for spacetime's intrinsic gauge-dependent properties (Section 6), encourages a substantivalist perspective over relational ontologies in quantum gravity.

The AB effect suggests that spacetime, characterized by a gauge-fixed $h_{\mu\nu}$, may be a fundamental entity rather than an emergent construct. By questioning the equivalence of diffeomorphic metrics posited by the hole argument, the effect supports a substantivalist view where spacetime's gauge dependence is intrinsic. LQG's challenges in addressing this requirement invite a thoughtful reconsideration of quantum gravity's ontological foundations.

Future directions to explore these insights include:

- **Refining LQG's Framework**: Investigate modifications to LQG that incorporate gauge-dependent structures at the quantum level, such as novel constraints or effective fields, while assessing their impact on predictions like quantized geometry (Equation (5)). Such efforts could clarify whether LQG can adapt without fully adopting substantivalist assumptions [4].

- **Empirical Validation**: Design experiments to test LQG's relational predictions, such as granularity or superpositions in quantum geometry, against gauge-dependent phenomena like the AB effect. Precision measurements of phase shifts in varied gravitational fields could further inform relational theories [3].

- **Alternative Quantum Gravity Theories**: Explore other frameworks, such as string theory or causal set theory, to assess their ability to accommodate gauge-dependent effects. Comparative analyses could shed light on the ontological commitments required for quantum gravity [4].

- **Philosophical Reassessment**: Deepen the exploration of substantivalism versus relationalism by examining other gauge-dependent phenomena in quantum gravity contexts. Revisiting the hole argument in light of empirical constraints from the AB effect could refine spacetime ontology [2].

The gravitational AB effect highlights the interplay between emergent and fundamental views of spacetime, encouraging a collaborative reevaluation of quantum gravity's theoretical and philosophical foundations. By emphasizing the significance of spacetime's gauge dependence, it offers a valuable perspective for developing a consistent theory of quantum gravity.

References

[1] Gao, S. (2025). The Aharonov-Bohm Effect Explained: Reality of Gauge Potentials and Its Implications. `https://philsci-archive.pitt.edu/24913/`.

[2] Norton, J. D., Pooley, O., and Read, J. (2023). The Hole Argument. In *The Stanford Encyclopedia of Philosophy*, edited by E. N. Zalta and U. Nodelman, `https://plato.stanford.edu/archives/sum2023/entries/spacetime-holearg/`.

[3] Overstreet, C., Asenbaum, P., Curti, J., Kim, M., & Kasevich, M. A. (2022). Observation of a gravitational Aharonov-Bohm effect. *Science*, 375(6577), 226–229. `https://doi.org/10.1126/science.abl7152`.

[4] Rovelli, C., & Vidotto, F. (2023). Philosophical Foundations of Loop Quantum Gravity. In *Handbook of Quantum Gravity*, edited by C. Bambi, L. Modesto, and I. Shapiro, Springer, `https://arxiv.org/abs/2211.06718`.