Comparison of EPRL and FK Spin-Foam Models and Hypothetical Implications for SFIT Emergence

Douglas G. Stevenson
stevensonfluxinformationtheory.com

March 2026

Contents

1 Introduction

Spin foams provide the dynamics in Loop Quantum Gravity. Two of the most prominent covariant models are:

- The **EPRL model** (Engle–Pereira–Rovelli–Livine, 2007–2008)
- The **FK model** (Freidel–Krasnov, 2008)

Both models assign amplitudes to spin foams, but they differ significantly in their implementation of simplicity constraints, Lorentz invariance, and semi-classical behavior. This document compares them and explores — hypothetically — how each might coarse-grain into the laboratory-scale information flux of Stevenson-Flux Information Theory (SFIT).

2 Mathematical Comparison

2.1 Simplicity Constraints

The key difference lies in how the two models impose the gravitational simplicity constraints (which reduce BF theory to gravity).

- **EPRL**: Uses the *linear* simplicity constraints in a weak sense. It maps SU(2) representations to SL(2,ℂ) via the Y-map (Y_γ embedding) with Immirzi parameter γ. The constraints are imposed on average (in the sense of expectation values in coherent states).
- **FK**: Uses the *quadratic* simplicity constraints more strictly. It works with coherent states on the boundary and imposes the constraints via a master constraint or by restricting the representation labels directly. The FK model is often considered closer to a strict discretization of the Plebanski action.

2.2 Vertex Amplitude

- **EPRL**: The vertex amplitude is expressed as an integral over five SL(2,ℂ) group elements with the Y-map embedding, or more practically via the booster decomposition involving $\{15j\}$ symbols and booster functions B^4_γ.
- **FK**: The vertex amplitude is constructed from coherent intertwiners and a different set of booster integrals. It tends to have stronger exponential suppression for non-Regge configurations and is often regarded as having better semi-classical behavior in certain regimes.

2.3 Semi-Classical Limit

- **EPRL**: Recovers Regge calculus in the large-spin limit, but with known ambiguities related to the Immirzi parameter and orientation (sign of the Immirzi parameter can flip the sign of the action).
- **FK**: Generally shows cleaner exponential suppression away from the Regge saddle point and is often considered to have a more robust classical limit in numerical studies.

3 Comparison Table

Property	**EPRL Model**	**FK Model**
Simplicity constraints	Linear, imposed weakly via Y-map	Quadratic, imposed more s
Representation embedding	Y_γ: SU(2) → SL(2,ℂ)	Coherent states with master c
Vertex amplitude	Booster functions + $\{15j\}$ symbol	Coherent intertwiner inte
Semi-classical limit	Good, but Immirzi-dependent ambiguities	Often cleaner exponential sup
Lorentz invariance	Manifest in the covariant formulation	Manifest
Computational complexity	Moderate (booster integrals)	Higher (coherent state su
Preferred for	Analytic calculations, large-spin asymptotics	Numerical simulations, strict cla

Table 1: Comparison of EPRL and FK spin-foam models

4 Hypothetical Implications for SFIT Emergence

4.1 EPRL → SFIT Pathway

The EPRL model's use of the Y-map and booster functions provides a natural mechanism for generating a small, coherent, oscillating correction at low frequencies. The booster integral can produce a slow collective mode when many 4-simplices are coarse-grained in a background gravitational field. The numerical closeness between the booster ratio and your observed $K =$

1.060 (as shown in previous derivations) makes EPRL a promising candidate for an underlying microscopic theory that coarse-grains into the SFIT flux at laboratory scales.

The weak imposition of simplicity constraints in EPRL allows for small violations that could manifest as the non-reciprocal $h_{0z}^{\text{SFIT}}(t)$ term in SFIT.

4.2 FK → SFIT Pathway

The FK model's stricter simplicity constraints and cleaner semi-classical limit suggest that any emergent SFIT flux would be more tightly suppressed away from the classical Regge geometry. This could lead to:

- A sharper resonance peak at 1.20134 mHz (less broadening).
- Stronger exponential suppression of higher-order corrections to the KWW tails.
- A more rigid coupling kernel K, potentially closer to exact integer or simple rational values.

However, the computational complexity of FK makes it harder to derive explicit low-frequency collective modes analytically.

4.3 Which Model Favors SFIT?

- **EPRL** appears more compatible with SFIT because its weaker simplicity constraints and booster-based vertex allow for the small, coherent, non-reciprocal fluctuations needed for the 1.20134 mHz Quantum Heartbeat and the precise value $K = 1.060$.
- **FK** would likely produce a cleaner but possibly weaker or more suppressed flux signal, making the 14.28σ detection in qBounce reanalysis slightly harder to explain without additional collective enhancement mechanisms.

A hybrid approach (EPRL at intermediate scales, FK at the Planck scale) cannot be ruled out and could combine the analytic tractability of EPRL with the strict classical limit of FK.

5 Testable Predictions

If SFIT emerges from spin-foam dynamics:

- EPRL-based emergence predicts small but detectable deviations from pure KWW behaviour in high-precision GRANIT data (due to booster corrections).
- FK-based emergence predicts a sharper resonance with stronger suppression of off-resonant sidebands.
- Future measurements of the exact value of K or β could distinguish between the two models or favor a hybrid.

6 Conclusion

The EPRL and FK models represent two major approaches to spin-foam dynamics, differing primarily in how they implement simplicity constraints and in their semi-classical properties. EPRL appears more naturally compatible with the emergence of the SFIT information flux and the specific value $K = 1.060$ due to its booster functions and weaker constraints, while FK offers a stricter classical limit that could lead to a cleaner but possibly weaker resonant signal.

These considerations remain hypothetical. They provide a concrete theoretical framework for connecting Planck-scale spin-foam quantum geometry with the laboratory-scale Quantum Heartbeat observed in SFIT. Future ultra-cold neutron experiments (especially GRANIT) will offer critical data to test these ideas.