The Scale Problem In Moreva Experiment Confirming the Page-Wootters Mechanism

1. Introduction: The Problem of Time and the Emergence Hypothesis

1.1 The Conceptual Conflict: Time in Quantum Mechanics and General Relativity

The conceptualization of time stands as one of the most profound points of divergence between the two foundational pillars of modern physics: quantum mechanics (QM) and general relativity (GR). This discrepancy forms a central obstacle in the quest for a unified theory of quantum gravity (QG).[1]

In the standard formulation of QM, particularly within the Copenhagen interpretation, time assumes a unique and privileged role. It functions as a classical, external background parameter, denoted 't', against which the evolution of quantum systems is described by the Schrödinger equation.[1] Physical observables are measured *at* specific instants in this background time, and probabilities are assigned to these measurement outcomes.[1] The very structure of the Hilbert space formalism in QM relies on the notion of complete sets of commuting observables defined at a fixed time.[1]

Conversely, GR revolutionizes the understanding of time by weaving it inextricably with space into a dynamic four-dimensional continuum known as spacetime. Time is demoted from an absolute background to a coordinate component within this fabric.[1] The geometry of spacetime is not fixed but interacts dynamically with matter and energy distributions; it dictates how objects move (manifesting as gravity) and is, in turn, shaped by their presence.[1] Consequently, the passage of time becomes relative, demonstrably affected by gravitational fields and the motion of observers.[5] GR's field equations describe the evolution of spacetime geometry itself and are inherently covariant, not parameterized by any preferred, universal time coordinate.[1]

This fundamental incompatibility—time as a rigid, external stage versus time as a pliable, dynamic participant—represents more than just a formal mismatch. It reflects deeply different ontological commitments regarding the temporal structure of reality. This clash is not merely a technical inconvenience but a profound conceptual chasm that must be bridged by any successful theory aiming to unify gravity with quantum principles.[1] The difficulty in reconciling these disparate roles of time constitutes a major facet of the "problem of time" in fundamental physics.

1.2 The Wheeler-DeWitt Equation and 'Frozen Formalism'

The conflict regarding time is sharply crystallized when attempting to apply the principles of canonical quantization—a standard procedure for transitioning from classical to quantum descriptions—to the framework of GR. This procedure leads to the Wheeler-DeWitt (WDW) equation, a central equation in canonical quantum gravity, often represented schematically as $H |\Psi\rangle = 0$.[1] In this equation, H represents the total Hamiltonian constraint operator of the universe, encompassing both gravitational and matter degrees of freedom, and $|\Psi\rangle$ denotes the wave function of the entire universe.

The most startling implication of the WDW equation is its apparent lack of any explicit time parameter. The wave function of the universe, $|\Psi\rangle$, seems to describe a static, unchanging state; it does not evolve with respect to any external time variable.[1] This is famously known as the "frozen formalism problem" or, more broadly, the "problem of time" in canonical quantum gravity.[1] It presents a stark contradiction to our direct experience of a dynamic, evolving universe filled with change, motion, and the seemingly undeniable passage of time. The central question arising from the WDW equation is: how can the manifest dynamics observed *within* the universe emerge from a quantum description that suggests the universe *as a whole* is static? This paradox underscores the inadequacy of directly importing the standard QM notion of time evolution into a quantum theory of gravity derived from GR.

1.3 Emergence as a Potential Resolution

Faced with the frozen formalism implied by the WDW equation, one potential avenue for resolution lies in the concept of *emergence*. Perhaps time, as perceived and measured by observers within the universe, is not a fundamental constituent of reality but rather an *emergent* phenomenon. It might arise from the intricate quantum correlations and relationships present within the globally static state $|\Psi\rangle$ described by the WDW equation.[4]

The notion that spacetime itself might be emergent rather than fundamental is not unique to this specific context; it appears as a recurring theme across various approaches to quantum gravity. Both String Theory and Loop Quantum Gravity, despite their different starting points and methodologies, contain elements suggesting that the familiar continuum spacetime of classical physics breaks down at the Planck scale and is replaced by, or emerges from, a more fundamental, possibly discrete or non-geometric, structure.[16] This convergence hints that the classical picture of spacetime might indeed be an effective, large-scale approximation.

This report focuses on a specific and influential hypothesis within this broader theme:

the idea that time emerges directly from *quantum correlations*, particularly *quantum entanglement*, as formalized by the Page-Wootters (PaW) mechanism.[4] The PaW mechanism situates itself explicitly as a proposed solution to the problem of time arising from the canonical quantization of gravity. It attempts to demonstrate how the timeless state predicted by the WDW equation can be reconciled with the observed dynamical world by leveraging the quantum correlations inherent within that state.[1] Its significance lies precisely in its direct confrontation with this fundamental challenge at the intersection of QM and GR.

2. The Page-Wootters Mechanism: Time from Quantum Correlations

2.1 Core Concept: Relational Time in a Static Universe

Proposed by Don Page and William Wootters in 1983 [5], the PaW mechanism offers a framework for understanding how temporal evolution can be perceived within a quantum universe whose overall state is static. The central idea is that time is not an external, absolute parameter but rather emerges *relationally* through the correlations between different subsystems of the universe.[5] Even if the total quantum state $|\Psi\rangle$ satisfies the WDW equation $H|\Psi\rangle = 0$, implying stationarity from a hypothetical global perspective, observers *internal* to the system can experience dynamics.[8]

This relational perspective directly addresses the frozen formalism problem. Instead of seeking evolution *of* the universe against an external time, PaW seeks evolution *within* the universe, where one part acts as a reference (a clock) for another. The mechanism aims to show how the standard Schrödinger evolution observed in laboratories can be recovered from the correlations encoded within the timeless universal state $|\Psi\rangle$.

2.2 The Mechanism Explained

The PaW mechanism unfolds through the following conceptual steps:

1. **Partitioning the Universe:** The total system, representing the universe, is notionally divided into at least two subsystems. One subsystem is designated as the "clock" (C), and the remainder is termed the "system" or the "rest of the universe" (R or S).[8] The Hilbert space of the universe is assumed to have a tensor product structure: $H_U = H_C \otimes H_R$. In the simplest version of the mechanism, the total Hamiltonian H is assumed to be separable, meaning there are no interaction terms between the clock and the system: $H = H_C \otimes 1_R + 1_C \otimes H_R$, where H_C and H_R are the Hamiltonians governing the internal dynamics of the clock and the rest of the system, respectively.[8]

2. **The Static Global State:** The physical state of the universe, $|\Psi\rangle$, is postulated to be an eigenstate of the total Hamiltonian H with eigenvalue zero, thus satisfying the Hamiltonian constraint $H|\Psi\rangle = 0$.[7] This constraint embodies the timeless nature suggested by the WDW equation. For a hypothetical "external" or "super-observer" capable of measuring global properties of $|\Psi\rangle$ without reference to any internal subsystem or clock, this state would appear completely static or "frozen".[8]
3. **Emergent Dynamics for Internal Observers:** An observer *internal* to this universe interacts with, or performs measurements on, the clock subsystem C. The core idea is that the state of the system R is considered *conditional* upon the state of the clock C. If the clock C is found to be in a particular state $|t\rangle_C$ (which effectively represents the clock "reading" time t), then the corresponding state of the system R is given by projecting the global state $|\Psi\rangle$ onto this clock state: $|\psi(t)\rangle_R \propto \langle t|_C |\Psi\rangle$.[8] The crucial result demonstrated by Page and Wootters is that this conditional state $|\psi(t)\rangle_R$ *evolves* as the clock state $|t\rangle_C$ changes. Specifically, $|\psi(t)\rangle_R$ satisfies the standard time-dependent Schrödinger equation governed by the system Hamiltonian H_R: $i\hbar \, d/dt \, |\psi(t)\rangle_R = H_R \, |\psi(t)\rangle_R$.[8] Thus, the perception of time's passage and dynamics arises from observing the correlations between the clock and the rest of the system; time emerges as a relational property internal to the globally static universe.[8]

2.3 Role of Entanglement and Correlations

In the original PaW formulation and its prominent experimental illustrations like the Moreva et al. experiment [8], quantum *entanglement* between the clock C and the system R is highlighted as the essential resource enabling the emergence of dynamics.[5] If the global state $|\Psi\rangle$ were merely a product state (i.e., separable, $|\Psi\rangle = |\phi\rangle_C \otimes |\chi\rangle_R$), then conditioning on any clock state $|t\rangle_C$ would simply yield $|\psi(t)\rangle_R \propto |\chi\rangle_R$. The system state would be independent of the clock state, and no evolution would be perceived. Entanglement provides the necessary correlations such that different clock states $|t\rangle_C$ correspond to different system states $|\psi(t)\rangle_R$.

However, subsequent theoretical investigations have revealed a more nuanced picture regarding the precise nature of the required correlations. A study by Pegg [21] demonstrated that if the universe is described by a *mixed* state (a statistical ensemble of quantum states) rather than a pure state, entanglement between C and R is *not* strictly necessary for the system R to exhibit evolution relative to the clock C in the Schrödinger picture.[21] Other forms of quantum correlations, potentially weaker than entanglement (like quantum discord), might suffice to encode the temporal information in such scenarios. Nevertheless, the same study showed that introducing interactions between the system and the clock can restore the necessity of entanglement for unitary evolution, even for mixed states.[21]

Further research has sought to quantify the essential resource for the PaW mechanism from an information-theoretic perspective. Some work identifies "internal coherence" within the global state as the crucial ingredient.[25] Another line of inquiry connects the resourcefulness to "shared asymmetry" relative to time translations, which can be quantified using the relative entropy of entanglement calculated within specific sectors (charge sectors) of the Hilbert space.[26]

This ongoing refinement suggests that while entanglement provides a robust way to establish the necessary correlations for the PaW mechanism, the fundamental requirement might be a more general correlation structure that allows the clock state to effectively index the evolution of the system state in a way consistent with the conservation of the total (zero) energy. The precise role and type of correlation needed can depend subtly on whether the global state is pure or mixed, whether interactions are present, and even the chosen mathematical picture (Schrödinger vs. Heisenberg) used for the description.[21]

2.4 Refinements: The GPPT Mechanism and Beyond

The original 1983 PaW proposal faced significant criticisms, most notably articulated by Karel Kuchař.[7] Kuchař pointed out inconsistencies related to calculating transition probabilities for sequences of measurements at different times. Standard projective measurements, when applied to subsystems, could potentially take the combined state out of the physical Hilbert space defined by the constraint $H|\Psi\rangle = 0$. Furthermore, reproducing the correct quantum mechanical propagators within the timeless framework proved problematic.

To address these criticisms, Rodolfo Gambini, Rafael Porto, Jorge Pullin, and Sebastián Torterolo (GPPT) proposed refinements to the PaW mechanism.[8] Their approach involved utilizing the concept of "evolving constants of the motion," also known as parameterized Dirac observables.[8] These are operators that commute with the Hamiltonian constraint but whose dependence on an unphysical parameter time 't' matches the Heisenberg evolution of standard observables. By constructing conditional probabilities using these evolving constants and averaging over the inaccessible parameter time 't', GPPT aimed to provide a consistent framework for calculating probabilities for multiple time measurements within the timeless setting.[8]

Further theoretical developments have led to distinct formal approaches for handling measurements and probabilities within the PaW framework, such as the "Twirled

Observable" (TO) approach and the "Purified Measurement" (PM) approach.[7] These formalisms offer mathematically consistent ways to define relational measurements and extract dynamical information from the constrained state, although they differ in their interpretation and implications, particularly when considering realistic, non-ideal clocks. These differences will be explored further in the context of theoretical challenges (Section 7.2).

3. Experimental Illustration: The Moreva et al. (2013/2014) Experiment

3.1 Objective

In 2013, Ekaterina Moreva and collaborators published (arXiv:1310.4691 [8], later in Phys. Rev. A 89, 052122, 2014 [12]) an experiment designed not to definitively prove the PaW mechanism, but to provide a concrete *experimental illustration* or *demonstration* of its core concepts and the subsequent GPPT refinements.[8] The explicit aim was to "demystify" the somewhat abstract and counter-intuitive idea that perceived time evolution could emerge from correlations within a fundamentally static, entangled quantum system.[19] It sought to show how the mechanism could be naturally embedded and studied within small, manageable quantum subsystems.[19]

3.2 Experimental Setup

The experiment utilized quantum optical techniques to create a controllable "toy universe" consisting of two photons [11]:

- **System Components:** A pair of photons was generated, with their polarization degrees of freedom serving as the quantum systems. One photon (labeled C) was designated as the "clock," while the other photon (labeled R) represented the "rest of the universe".[8]
- **Entangled State Preparation:** The two photons were prepared in the maximally entangled Bell state $|\Psi\rangle = \sqrt{1/2}\,(|H\rangle_C|V\rangle_R - |V\rangle_C|H\rangle_R)$, where $|H\rangle$ and $|V\rangle$ represent horizontal and vertical polarization states, respectively.[8] This specific entangled state possesses the crucial property of being globally static under the simulated evolution implemented in the experiment.
- **Simulated Evolution and Abstract Time:** To simulate the dynamics governed by local Hamiltonians H_C and H_R within the PaW framework, identical birefringent quartz plates were inserted into the paths of both photons.[8] Passage through these plates induces a controlled rotation of the photon's polarization state. This rotation is mathematically equivalent to time evolution generated by effective Hamiltonians proportional to the Pauli σ_y operator acting on the polarization

qubit.[8] The physical thickness of these plates served as an analogue for the unobservable "abstract coordinate time" or parameter time 't' that appears in the theoretical PaW framework but is absent in the WDW equation.[8] Because the chosen entangled state $|\Psi\rangle$ is an eigenstate of the total effective Hamiltonian $H = H_C + H_R$ (specifically, an eigenstate with eigenvalue zero in this representation), the global state of the two-photon system remains unchanged regardless of the thickness of the plates, thus realizing the "static universe" condition.[8]

3.3 Observer vs. Super-observer Modes

The experiment was cleverly designed to operate in two distinct modes, corresponding to the different perspectives discussed in the PaW theory:

- **Observer Mode (Internal Perspective):** In this mode, the experimenter simulates an "internal" observer who becomes correlated with the clock. This was achieved by first measuring the polarization of the clock photon C. The outcome of this measurement—detecting either $|H\rangle$ or $|V\rangle$ polarization—determined the "time" (t1 or t2, respectively, for this simple two-state clock).[8] Subsequently, the polarization of the system photon R was measured. The crucial *result* in this mode was that the probability of finding photon R in a specific polarization state (e.g., $|H\rangle$ or $|V\rangle$) was observed to *depend* on the outcome of the measurement on the clock photon C (i.e., on the "time" t1 or t2).[8] This demonstrated the emergence of apparent evolution for system R, as perceived by an observer whose time reference is tied to clock C. This observed evolution was found to be independent of the actual thickness of the birefringent plates (the abstract coordinate time).[8] This mode mimics the situation where an observer, being part of the universe, becomes entangled with a clock subsystem and perceives the rest as evolving.[32]
- **Super-observer Mode (External Perspective):** In this mode, the experimenter simulates a hypothetical "external" observer who can probe the global properties of the entire two-photon system without becoming entangled with the clock subsystem.[8] This was implemented by avoiding individual polarization measurements on C and R. Instead, techniques like quantum interference on a beam splitter followed by polarization measurements were used to perform a Bell-state measurement, effectively probing the overall entangled state of the pair.[8] The *result* here, confirmed using quantum state tomography, was that the global two-photon state remained the initial entangled state $|\Psi\rangle$ with high fidelity, even when the thickness of the birefringent plates (abstract time) was varied.[8] This experimentally confirmed the static nature of the global system from an external perspective, contrasting sharply with the dynamics perceived internally.

This experimental design, mapping abstract PaW concepts onto controllable photonic degrees of freedom (polarization states as clock/system states, birefringent plates as Hamiltonians), provided a powerful way to make the counter-intuitive core idea of PaW—the coexistence of global stasis and internal evolution—more tangible and accessible.[8] However, it's crucial to recognize this as an *analogue simulation* performed within the well-understood framework of standard quantum mechanics, not a direct probe of the quantum gravity regime or the WDW constraint where the PaW mechanism is ultimately intended to apply.

3.4 GPPT Test for Two-Time Measurements

The experiment also included a configuration specifically designed to test the GPPT refinements for handling multiple time measurements.[8] This setup involved:

- Using polarizing beam splitters (PBSs) to implement effective sequential measurements on the system photon R, conditioned on the state of the clock photon C. The first PBS interaction represented an initial time measurement, and a second interaction represented a final time measurement.[8]
- Introducing a controllable phase delay (corresponding to a time interval τ) in the path of the clock photon C *between* the two effective measurement stages. This was achieved by inserting an additional quartz plate of variable effective thickness δ ($\tau = \delta/\omega$, where ω is the polarization rotation rate).[8]
- Measuring the probability of obtaining a specific outcome in the second measurement on R, as a function of the clock state C and the introduced delay τ.

The *results* of this test showed that the probability for the final state of system R exhibited a sinusoidal dependence on the time delay τ introduced in the clock's path.[8] This oscillatory behavior was found to be in good agreement with the theoretical predictions derived from the GPPT framework for two-time conditional probabilities in the PaW context.[8] Notably, the visibility (amplitude) of these sinusoidal oscillations was observed to be reduced compared to the ideal theoretical expectation.[8] The authors attributed this reduction to the decoherence-like effects arising from the use of a very simple, low-resolution clock (the photon polarization qubit having only two basis states, $|H\rangle$ and $|V\rangle$). This effect of reduced visibility or coherence degradation due to imperfect or finite-resolution clocks is a known feature in theoretical studies of the PaW mechanism and related quantum clock models.[8] This experimental observation thus provided an early, concrete hint of the significant theoretical complexities and potential issues that arise when transitioning from idealized mathematical clocks to more realistic physical systems with finite resources, issues that are central to later theoretical critiques and refinements of the PaW formalism (see Section 7.2).

3.5 Significance and Limitations

The Moreva et al. experiment holds considerable significance as the first concrete experimental realization demonstrating the core principle of the PaW mechanism and its GPPT extension.[8] It successfully showed how an internal observer, using one quantum system (photon C) as a clock, can perceive another quantum system (photon R) as evolving dynamically, even when the overall state of the combined system (C+R) remains globally static from an external perspective.[8] Furthermore, it provided an implementation of a "relational" measurement of time, where temporal evolution is gauged purely through internal correlations between subsystems, without relying on any external time standard or reference frame.[8]

However, the authors themselves clearly stated the limitations of their work.[8] The experiment serves as an *illustration* or *analogue*, not as definitive proof of the PaW mechanism as the correct description of time in our universe.[8] It operates entirely within the framework of standard quantum mechanics, employing effective Hamiltonians simulated by optical components, rather than probing the actual constraints of quantum gravity. Consequently, the experiment cannot discriminate between the PaW/GPPT framework and other proposed solutions to the fundamental problem of time in physics.[8] It remains a demonstration within a highly simplified "toy universe".[11]

4. Research Landscape and Supporting Work

4.1 Direct Follow-up and Citations

The publication of the Moreva et al. experiment [8] generated significant interest within the communities focused on quantum foundations, quantum information, and quantum gravity. The paper has been cited in numerous subsequent works discussing emergent time, the PaW mechanism, experimental tests of quantum foundations, and the development of quantum reference frames.[12] Its results were also presented at international conferences, further disseminating the concept of experimentally illustrating emergent time from entanglement.[20] While a comprehensive bibliometric analysis is beyond the scope of this report, the available evidence indicates the experiment is recognized as a key demonstration in the field.

4.2 Broader Connections: Entanglement and Spacetime Geometry

The idea that time might emerge from entanglement, as explored in the PaW mechanism, resonates with a broader and highly active area of theoretical physics research exploring deep connections between quantum information concepts, particularly entanglement, and the fundamental structure of spacetime geometry and gravity. This connection manifests in several distinct, yet potentially related, theoretical frameworks:

- **AdS/CFT Correspondence and Holography:** The Anti-de Sitter/Conformal Field Theory (AdS/CFT) correspondence posits a duality between a theory of quantum gravity in a d+1 dimensional AdS spacetime and a quantum field theory (specifically, a CFT) living on its d-dimensional boundary. A key element of this duality is the Ryu-Takayanagi formula (and its covariant generalizations), which relates the entanglement entropy of a region in the boundary CFT to the area of a minimal (or extremal) surface in the bulk AdS spacetime that subtends that region.[34] This suggests that the geometry of the bulk spacetime is somehow encoded in, or even "built from," the entanglement structure of the boundary theory. This "It from Qubit" paradigm, where spacetime emerges from quantum information, is a central theme in holographic approaches to quantum gravity.[18]
- **ER=EPR Conjecture:** Proposed by Juan Maldacena and Leonard Susskind, the ER=EPR conjecture suggests a profound equivalence between quantum entanglement (EPR, after Einstein-Podolsky-Rosen) and spacetime geometry in the form of wormholes or Einstein-Rosen bridges (ER). It posits that two maximally entangled quantum systems (like black holes) are geometrically connected by a non-traversable wormhole.[39] This conjecture further strengthens the idea that entanglement is intimately linked to the connectivity and topology of spacetime.
- **Matrix Theory:** In the context of M-theory (a candidate fundamental theory unifying different string theories), the Banks-Fischler-Shenker-Susskind (BFSS) Matrix theory proposes that the dynamics of fundamental degrees of freedom can be described by large matrices. In this framework, spacetime itself is expected to emerge from the collective behavior of these matrix degrees of freedom. Studies within Matrix theory have shown how entanglement between different parts of the matrix system can correspond to notions of spatial separation and geometry in the emergent spacetime.[34] For instance, entanglement entropy between matrix modes describing a membrane (like a black hole) and distant probes can be calculated and potentially related to the local geometry.[34]
- **General Emergent Spacetime Models:** Beyond specific frameworks like AdS/CFT or Matrix theory, various theoretical models explicitly attempt to derive spacetime metrics directly from underlying quantum entanglement structures. A common theme in these models is the idea that the amount of entanglement between fundamental quantum subsystems dictates their "closeness" in the emergent geometry; higher entanglement corresponds to shorter distances.[39]

The recurrence of entanglement as a fundamental ingredient for constructing or correlating spacetime properties—whether it's temporal evolution in PaW [8], spatial geometry in AdS/CFT [34], topology in ER=EPR, or distance metrics in other emergent models [39]—is striking. It suggests that the connection between quantum information and gravity might be a deep physical principle. While the specific mechanisms proposed differ significantly (e.g., PaW's relational dynamics within a constrained state vs. AdS/CFT's holographic mapping), they collectively point towards entanglement as a potentially crucial element in understanding the quantum nature of spacetime. The PaW mechanism can thus be viewed as one specific instantiation of this broader research direction, focusing particularly on the emergence of the temporal aspect.

4.3 Quantum Reference Frames (QRFs)

The PaW mechanism is intrinsically linked to, and can be considered a foundational example of, the research program focused on Quantum Reference Frames (QRFs) or Internal Quantum Reference Frames (IQRFs).[23]

The core idea of the QRF program is to formulate physics relationally, describing the properties and dynamics of subsystems relative to other physical systems within the universe, rather than relying on abstract, external, classical reference frames.[23] This aligns philosophically with the principle of background independence central to GR, which suggests that physical laws should not depend on a pre-existing, fixed spacetime structure.[3]

In the PaW mechanism, the "clock" subsystem C serves precisely as an *internal quantum reference frame* for time. The evolution of the "system" R is defined and measured relative to the state of this internal quantum clock.[8] The Moreva et al. experiment explicitly demonstrated such a relational measurement of time.[8]

The broader IQRF research program extends this relational perspective beyond time to include spatial coordinates, orientation, and boosts. It investigates how to describe physics from the "perspective" of a quantum system, which itself might be in a superposition of states (e.g., superposition of positions or momenta) relative to another frame. This leads to intriguing concepts like the "superposition of perspectives" and the "quantum equivalence principle," which attempts to generalize Einstein's equivalence principle to the quantum domain.[24] The PaW formalism provides a key example and motivation for this line of research, exploring the consequences of treating reference systems themselves as quantum objects governed by the laws of quantum mechanics.

5. Theoretical Implications and Consequences

5.1 Impact on Fundamental Concepts

If the hypothesis that time emerges from quantum entanglement via the PaW mechanism proves correct, it would necessitate a radical revision of our understanding of several fundamental physical concepts:

- **Nature of Time:** The most direct consequence would be the demotion of time from a fundamental dimension or parameter of the universe to an emergent, relational property.[4] Time would not be part of the basic fabric of reality but would arise from the correlations, specifically entanglement in many formulations, between quantum subsystems within an otherwise static universal quantum state.[4] Our intuitive perception of a flowing time would be a consequence of our perspective as internal observers coupled to quantum clocks.
- **Causality and Temporal Order:** The emergence of time naturally raises questions about the structure of causality. If time itself is emergent and relational, is the ordering of events also emergent or potentially observer-dependent? Intriguingly, investigations within the PaW framework, particularly using the Purified Measurement (PM) approach with non-ideal clocks, suggest that the very notion of a definite temporal order between events might break down.[7] The inability of finite-resource quantum clocks to perfectly resolve time instances could lead to situations where the order of measurement events becomes fundamentally indefinite.[7] This points towards a possible fundamental limitation on defining temporal sequences, imposed by the quantum nature of the reference frames used to mark time.
- **Arrow of Time:** The PaW mechanism primarily addresses *how* a perception of evolution (a changing state indexed by a clock parameter 't') can arise from a static global state. It does not, in its basic formulation, inherently explain the *directionality* of time—why processes overwhelmingly occur in one direction (from past to future), often associated with the increase of entropy. While PaW provides the stage for evolution, explaining the observed thermodynamic arrow of time likely requires incorporating additional physical principles or assumptions, such as specific initial conditions of the universe or arguments based on statistical mechanics and entropy gradients.[9] The emergence of dynamics and the explanation for its directionality may be distinct problems.
- **Quantum Reference Frames:** The success of the PaW mechanism would strongly bolster the perspective advanced by the QRF research program.[23] It would provide a compelling case that physical laws should ultimately be

formulated in a purely relational manner, describing systems relative to other internal, potentially quantum, reference systems, without recourse to absolute, external background structures like a fixed spacetime manifold.[23] This aligns conceptually with the relational spirit of GR and its principle of background independence.[3]

5.2 Relation to Quantum Gravity Theories

The PaW mechanism, being a direct response to the problem of time in canonical quantum gravity [1], holds significant relevance for various approaches seeking to unify QM and GR [23]:

- **General Relevance:** By offering a potential pathway to reconcile the timelessness of the WDW equation with observed dynamics using standard quantum principles (correlations, conditioning), PaW provides a valuable conceptual tool for foundational discussions in QG.
- **Loop Quantum Gravity (LQG):** LQG is a prominent background-independent approach to QG.[3] It quantizes GR's geometric degrees of freedom directly, leading to a picture of quantum geometry characterized by discrete structures like spin networks and spin foams.[3] In LQG, spacetime, including time, is generally considered to be emergent and likely discrete at the Planck scale.[9] Dynamics is often described relationally, in terms of transitions between quantum states of geometry. While both PaW and LQG feature emergent time and emphasize relationalism and background independence, their underlying mechanisms differ significantly. LQG focuses on the quantization of geometry itself, whereas PaW focuses on deriving time from correlations relative to a designated clock subsystem within a pre-existing (though constrained) state space framework. Establishing precise connections or potential compatibility between the PaW notion of emergent time and the dynamics within LQG remains an area of active research.[43]
- **String Theory/M-Theory:** String theory, historically formulated on fixed background spacetimes, has increasingly revealed emergent spacetime features through non-perturbative dualities, most notably the AdS/CFT correspondence.[18] In this holographic framework, the geometry and dynamics (including time) of the higher-dimensional bulk spacetime emerge from the quantum dynamics of a lower-dimensional boundary field theory.[18] Entanglement in the boundary theory plays a crucial role in reconstructing the bulk geometry.[34] While this shares the theme of spacetime emerging from quantum phenomena involving entanglement, the holographic mechanism is conceptually distinct from PaW's relational clock-system dynamics within a constrained universal state. Some critics argue

that even emergent scenarios in string theory often retain remnants of background dependence compared to approaches like LQG or PaW.[18]

- **Other Approaches:** The conceptual tools developed within the PaW framework, such as relational observables and evolving constants, have found application in related contexts. For example, Gambini and Pullin have argued that formulating quantum mechanics using real clocks within a relational framework provides a natural solution to the long-standing "time of arrival" problem in standard QM.[28] PaW's emergence hypothesis stands in contrast to theories that posit time as fundamental (like Lee Smolin's proposals involving evolving laws [14]) or derive spacetime from fundamentally different structures like discrete causal orders (Causal Set Theory [37]).

The diversity of these approaches underscores that PaW represents just one specific pathway towards understanding quantum time. Its mechanism, rooted in the Hamiltonian constraint of canonical gravity and subsystem correlations, offers a distinct alternative to LQG's quantized geometry, String Theory's holographic emergence, or other proposals based on different fundamental principles. Evaluating its viability requires comparing its explanatory power and consistency against these competing frameworks.

5.3 Philosophical Implications

The hypothesis of emergent time carries profound philosophical implications, challenging deeply ingrained intuitions:

- It questions the status of time as a fundamental aspect of reality, suggesting our experience of temporal flow might be a perspective-dependent illusion or construction.[14]
- It foregrounds the role of the observer (or more generally, the partitioning into subsystems) in the very definition of dynamics, potentially blurring the lines between objective reality and subjective perception.[14] Is the evolution perceived by an internal observer "real" in the same sense as the static global state?
- It connects directly to long-standing philosophical debates about the nature of space and time, particularly the relationalism versus substantivalism debate. PaW aligns strongly with a relational view, where time derives its meaning from the relationships and correlations between physical systems, rather than existing as an independent background container.[10]

6. Future Research Directions

Despite the conceptual appeal and experimental illustration of the PaW mechanism, significant research is required to fully evaluate its validity and implications. Future efforts should focus on both experimental probes and theoretical development.

6.1 Experimental Tests

- **Moving Beyond Illustration:** A crucial next step is to design experiments capable of providing more than just an illustration or analogue of the PaW mechanism. The challenge lies in identifying potential experimental signatures that could uniquely distinguish predictions derived from the PaW framework (especially in a QG context) from those of standard QM or alternative theories.[4] This might involve exploring more complex analogue systems exhibiting similar Hamiltonian constraint structures or searching for subtle effects related to the quantum nature of clocks and reference frames in high-precision measurements. However, finding experimentally accessible regimes where PaW effects deviate significantly from standard QM remains a major hurdle.
- **Probing Quantum Gravity Effects:** While extremely challenging, researchers continue to explore potential avenues for detecting quantum gravitational effects, which might indirectly bear on the nature of time. These could include searching for minute variations in fundamental constants, specific signatures in the cosmic microwave background, anomalies in gravitational wave signals, or effects related to entanglement over cosmological distances.[35] Any empirical evidence for quantum gravity phenomena would provide crucial data against which theories like PaW could be tested.
- **Testing Related Foundational Concepts:** Continued experimental verification and exploration of quantum entanglement in diverse systems and scales—from particle colliders like the LHC [48] to macroscopic objects and long-distance quantum communication [49]—provide essential foundational support. While not directly testing PaW's core claim about time emergence, these experiments refine our understanding and control of entanglement, the purported resource. Analogue gravity experiments, which simulate aspects of GR in laboratory systems (e.g., Bose-Einstein condensates), might also offer platforms to test related concepts in controlled settings.

6.2 Theoretical Development

- **Addressing Criticisms and Refinements:** Significant theoretical work remains to be done to address the outstanding criticisms and ambiguities within the PaW formalism. This includes further investigation into the interpretational challenges surrounding probabilities, observers, and the meaning of the quantum state.[23] A deeper understanding of the implications of using non-ideal, finite-resource clocks is critical, particularly resolving the discrepancies and potential pathologies (non-unitarity, indefinite temporal order) arising in different measurement approaches like TO and PM.[7] Refining the mathematical formalism to handle interactions and realistic measurement scenarios consistently is paramount.

- **Developing Relativistic Frameworks:** The original PaW mechanism is formulated within a non-relativistic quantum mechanical setting. Extending the framework to be fully compatible with special and general relativity, incorporating Lorentz covariance and the dynamics of spacetime itself, is a crucial step towards making it a viable component of a full QG theory.[51]
- **Integration with Quantum Gravity Candidates:** Exploring the relationship between the PaW mechanism and leading QG candidates like LQG and String Theory is essential. Can PaW emerge as an effective description within certain limits or sectors of these more comprehensive theories? Can its insights inform the development of dynamics or the interpretation of time in those frameworks?[43] Bridging these different approaches could lead to a more unified understanding.
- **Exploring Alternatives:** Continued vigorous research into alternative solutions to the problem of time is vital for context and comparison. This includes developing theories based on fundamental time [14], causal sets [37], thermodynamic principles [9], alternative relational approaches [28], and refining the understanding of time within LQG and String Theory.[17] Progress in these areas provides benchmarks against which the PaW hypothesis can be evaluated.

7. Contradictory Evidence and Alternative Models

A critical assessment of the hypothesis that time emerges from quantum entanglement requires examining both the experimental evidence (or lack thereof) and the theoretical challenges and alternatives.

7.1 Experimental Challenges and Counter-Evidence

- **Lack of Discriminating Evidence:** The most significant empirical challenge facing the PaW mechanism is the absence of direct, unambiguous experimental evidence that supports it *uniquely* over standard quantum mechanics or alternative theoretical frameworks.[4] The Moreva et al. experiment [8], while elegant, functions as an analogue simulation whose results are fully consistent with standard quantum optics predictions. It demonstrates the conceptual possibility but does not provide evidence that time *actually* emerges via this mechanism in nature. No experiment has yet been performed that could falsify the PaW hypothesis or distinguish its predictions from conventional physics in an accessible regime.

- **No Direct Contradictions Found:** It is important to note that while lacking unique support, the PaW mechanism (within its domain as a conceptual framework) and the results of the Moreva et al. illustration have not been experimentally *contradicted*. The difficulty lies in the practical challenge of devising and performing experiments that could probe the specific QG context where PaW is intended to apply or find subtle deviations from standard QM attributable solely to this mechanism. The current experimental status is therefore one of non-verification and practical unfalsifiability, rather than empirical refutation.

7.2 Theoretical Criticisms and Challenges

The PaW formalism, despite its conceptual elegance, faces several significant theoretical criticisms and internal challenges:

- **Kuchař's Criticisms Revisited:** The historical objections raised by Kuchař regarding the original PaW formulation remain relevant points of discussion.[7] These include concerns about the consistency of conditional probabilities for multi-time measurements, the issue of standard measurement projections potentially violating the Hamiltonian constraint (taking the state out of the physical Hilbert space), and difficulties in correctly reproducing quantum mechanical propagators within the timeless framework. While modern refinements like the GPPT approach (using evolving constants) [8] and the TO/PM formalisms [7] have been developed specifically to address these issues, debates may persist regarding their complete success, physical interpretation, and whether they fully resolve the original concerns without introducing new problems.
- **Non-Ideal Clocks and Measurement Models:** The treatment of realistic, non-ideal clocks (which inevitably have finite energy resources and resolution) exposes significant tensions within the PaW framework, particularly highlighting the divergence between the Twirled Observable (TO) and Purified Measurement (PM) approaches developed to handle measurements consistently.[7]
  - The **TO approach** defines measurements using time-translation invariant operators (often constructed via a "twirling" procedure) that commute with the Hamiltonian constraint.[7] It successfully reproduces standard quantum mechanical probabilities and maintains unitary evolution even with non-ideal clocks.[7] However, it can be interpreted as describing measurements from an external perspective, where an experimenter chooses the measurement times, potentially undermining the goal of a purely internal, emergent time.[7]
  - The **PM approach** attempts to model measurements more dynamically as

interactions triggered internally when the clock reaches a certain state.[7] While aligning well with the internal observer perspective and yielding equivalent results to TO for ideal clocks, its generalization to non-ideal clocks leads to problematic features.[7] The resulting evolution equation for the system becomes non-local in the clock's time, potentially leading to non-unitary evolution and, most strikingly, to situations where the temporal order of measurement events becomes fundamentally indefinite.[7] These issues raise serious questions: Do they indicate a flaw in the PM approach? Do they reflect a fundamental quantum limit on the precision of timekeeping and temporal ordering? Or could they even hint at a fundamentally discrete nature of time, which, as shown in [7], can restore unitarity and definite order in the PM framework?

- **Interpretational Ambiguity:** The PaW formalism is susceptible to multiple interpretations, making it difficult to draw definitive conclusions about the nature of time without adopting additional interpretational postulates.[23] Key questions remain open: What is the precise physical meaning of the probabilities calculated within the formalism? What constitutes an "observer," and must they be conscious or macroscopic? Is the emergence of time ontological (a feature of reality) or epistemic (a feature of our knowledge or description)? The "final-measurement interpretation" proposed by Sudarsky and colleagues offers one consistent single-world realist perspective but is not universally accepted.[24] Furthermore, the operational meaning of QRFs, especially when quantum systems like particles are used as reference frames and exist in superpositions, remains a subject of debate.[24] This interpretational flexibility, common in quantum foundations, means that the PaW formalism itself, as a mathematical structure, does not provide a complete answer to the question of time's fundamental nature without being embedded within a specific interpretational framework.
- **Circularity Concerns:** A conceptual criticism sometimes leveled against PaW is the potential for circularity.[15] The mechanism relies on partitioning the universe into a "clock" and a "system." For the clock to function effectively, it typically needs to possess properties associated with regular temporal behavior (e.g., periodic motion like an oscillator, or monotonic evolution of some property). The criticism argues that by selecting a subsystem with clock-like properties, the formalism might be implicitly presupposing aspects of time it aims to derive, rather than truly generating time from a purely static, undifferentiated state.[15] This challenges whether PaW genuinely eliminates reliance on temporal concepts or merely internalizes them within the definition of the clock subsystem.
- **Specificity of Entanglement:** As discussed earlier (Section 2.3), the precise role of entanglement versus other forms of quantum correlation is debated.[21] If

entanglement is not strictly necessary (e.g., for mixed states without interaction), it potentially weakens the specific claim that time emerges *primarily* or *solely* from entanglement, suggesting a more general correlational structure might be the key requirement.

To clarify the different approaches developed to address the challenges within the PaW formalism, Table 1 provides a comparison:

Table 1: Comparison of Page-Wootters Interpretational and Formal Approaches

Feature	**Standard PaW (1983)**	**GPPT Refinement**	**Twirled Observable (TO)**	**Purified Measurement (PM)**
Core Idea	Conditional state evolution relative to clock subsystem.	Use evolving constants (Dirac observables) for probabilities.	Define measurements via time-invariant ("twirled") operators.	Model measurements dynamically via interaction Hamiltonians.
Measurement	Implicit/problematic (Kuchař's critique).	Based on conditional probabilities of evolving constants.	Relational Dirac operators acting on constrained state.	Interaction triggered by clock state, involving ancilla.
Kuchař's Criticisms	Vulnerable (probabilities, state projection).	Aims to resolve multi-time probability issues.	Aims to provide consistent measurement framework within constraint.	Aims to provide consistent dynamical measurement description.
Non-Ideal Clocks	Not explicitly addressed.	Not the primary focus.	Maintains unitarity, definite temporal order.	Leads to time non-locality, potential non-unitarity, indefinite order.
Interpretation	Internal observer	Focus on consistent	Can be seen as external	Can be seen as internal

	perceives evolution in static universe.	probability calculation.	perspective choosing measurement times.	perspective triggering measurements dynamically.

7.3 Alternative Theoretical Models

The PaW mechanism is just one proposed solution to the problem of time within the broader landscape of quantum gravity research. Several alternative frameworks exist, offering fundamentally different perspectives on the nature of time:

- **Time as Fundamental:** Some theorists, notably Lee Smolin in certain works, argue against the notion of time as an illusion or emergent property. They propose that time is real and fundamental, possibly even suggesting that the laws of physics themselves might evolve over time.[14] This perspective directly contradicts the emergence hypothesis underlying PaW.
- **Time as Emergent (Different Mechanisms):**
  - **Loop Quantum Gravity (LQG):** As previously mentioned, LQG quantizes spacetime geometry, leading to discrete structures (spin networks/foams).[3] Time is generally considered emergent, arising from the relational evolution of these quantum geometric degrees of freedom, possibly in discrete steps.[9] The mechanism is tied to the dynamics of quantum geometry itself, not necessarily to correlations with a specific clock subsystem as in PaW. Background independence is a central tenet.[3]
  - **String Theory/Holography (AdS/CFT):** In holographic approaches, spacetime (including time) in a higher-dimensional "bulk" emerges from the dynamics of a lower-dimensional quantum field theory on its "boundary".[18] Entanglement entropy in the boundary theory is geometrically encoded in the bulk (Ryu-Takayanagi formula).[34] Time in the bulk emerges concurrently with space, linked to the dynamics and entanglement structure of the boundary theory via the holographic principle—a mechanism distinct from PaW.[18]
  - **Causal Set Theory:** This approach postulates that the fundamental structure of spacetime is a discrete set of "spacetime atoms" endowed only with causal relationships (a partial order defining which events can influence others).[37] The familiar continuum spacetime, including notions of duration and distance, is hypothesized to emerge statistically from the large-scale structure of this causal set. Time, in this view, is fundamentally tied to the causal ordering of events.[37]
  - **Thermodynamic/Statistical Time:** This perspective links the perceived directionality of time (the arrow of time) to the second law of thermodynamics—the tendency for entropy (disorder) in closed systems to

increase.[9] While potentially explaining *why* time seems to flow in one direction, it may not fully address the emergence of evolution itself from a fundamentally static state. Related ideas like entropic gravity propose that gravity itself is an emergent thermodynamic phenomenon related to information and entropy.[52]

- **Other Relational and Canonical Approaches:** Research continues on refining relational descriptions of dynamics using concepts like real clocks and evolving constants, sometimes combining elements of PaW with other ideas.[28] Other canonical quantization approaches propose alternative fundamental spacetime structures or modifications to GR before quantization.[53]

The existence of these diverse and conceptually distinct frameworks highlights the profound lack of consensus regarding the fundamental nature of time and the correct path towards quantum gravity. PaW offers one specific, theoretically motivated hypothesis, but it must be evaluated critically against these alternatives, each possessing its own set of strengths, weaknesses, predictive power, and foundational assumptions.

Table 2 provides a comparative overview of these different perspectives on time in fundamental physics.

Table 2: Alternative Approaches to the Problem of Time in Quantum Gravity

Approach	Status of Time	Proposed Mechanism	Role of Entanglement	Key Concepts	Major Challenges
PaW / Entanglement Emergence	Emergent, Relational [5]	Conditioning on clock subsystem within static global state ($H\Psi=0$) [8]	Primary resource (debated if solely) [8]	Hamiltonian constraint, Quantum correlations, QRFs [8]	Non-ideal clocks, Interpretation, Testability, Circularity? [7]
Loop Quantum Gravity (LQG)	Emergent, Likely Discrete [9]	Relational evolution of quantum geometry (spin networks/foa	Encodes geometric correlations, not primary driver of time	Background independence, Quantized geometry, Holonomies [3]	Dynamics definition, Classical limit, Matter coupling [3]

		ms) [3]			
String Theory / Holography	Emergent (often with space) [44]	Holographic duality (e.g., AdS/CFT); Bulk emerges from boundary QFT [38]	Encodes bulk geometry (Ryu-Takayanagi) [34]	Strings, Branes, Dualities, Supersymmetry (often) [54]	Background dependence (sometimes), Landscape problem, Non-perturbative definition [18]
Causal Set Theory	Emergent from causal order, Discrete [37]	Statistical limit of fundamental causal relations between discrete events [37]	Not central	Discrete spacetime atoms, Causality (partial order), Lorentz invariance [37]	Recovering continuum manifold, Defining dynamics (sprinkling) [37]
Thermodynamic Time	Arrow of time emergent; Evolution assumed? [12]	Linked to entropy increase (2nd Law Thermodynamics) [9]	Not central	Entropy, Statistical mechanics, Coarse-graining [9]	Explaining emergence of dynamics itself, Low entropy start of universe? [9]
Fundamental Time (e.g., Smolin)	Fundamental, Real [14]	Time is a basic element of reality; Laws might evolve in time [46]	Not central	Realism about time, Evolving laws? [14]	Reconciling with GR's relativity of time, Developing predictive framework [46]

8. Synthesis and Outlook

8.1 Comparing Evidence and Theories

The Page-Wootters mechanism presents a conceptually appealing approach to resolving the problem of time inherent in canonical quantum gravity. Its primary strength lies in its ability to potentially reconcile the static universal wave function predicted by the Wheeler-DeWitt equation with the observed dynamics of the universe, using familiar quantum mechanical concepts like subsystem correlations and conditional probabilities.[8] The elegant experimental illustration by Moreva et al. further enhances its appeal by providing a tangible demonstration of the core idea.[8]

However, the mechanism faces significant hurdles. Theoretically, challenges related to the consistent treatment of measurements, the interpretation of probabilities, the problematic behavior associated with realistic non-ideal clocks (particularly in the Purified Measurement formulation), and potential conceptual circularity remain subjects of active research and debate.[7] The specific role and necessity of entanglement versus other quantum correlations also require further clarification.[21] Empirically, the most critical weakness is the lack of unique, testable predictions that could distinguish PaW-driven emergent time from standard physics in accessible experiments.[4]

When compared to alternative approaches, PaW offers a distinct perspective rooted in the Hamiltonian constraint formalism. Loop Quantum Gravity provides a robust framework for background-independent quantization of geometry but struggles with defining dynamics and recovering the classical limit.[3] String Theory offers potential unification and compelling holographic insights into emergent spacetime but often relies on specific background assumptions (like supersymmetry or AdS asymptotics) and faces the challenge of the vast landscape of possible solutions.[44] Other approaches like Causal Set Theory or those positing fundamental time offer different conceptual starting points, each with its own set of advantages and unresolved issues.[37]

8.2 Current Scientific Status

At present, there is no established, experimentally verified theory of quantum gravity, and consequently, no scientific consensus on the fundamental nature of time. The problem of time remains one of the most profound open questions in theoretical physics.

Within this context, the Page-Wootters mechanism stands as a viable, theoretically motivated, and actively researched hypothesis, particularly relevant to quantum gravity approaches based on canonical quantization and constrained systems. It offers a potential paradigm for understanding time not as fundamental but as an emergent property derived from the quantum structure of the universe.

Furthermore, the broader idea underpinning PaW—that quantum correlations, especially entanglement, play a fundamental role in shaping spacetime—finds resonance and support in other areas of theoretical physics, most notably in the context of holography and the AdS/CFT correspondence.[34] This convergence suggests that exploring the interplay between quantum information and gravitational physics is a fruitful direction, even if the specific implementation proposed by PaW remains debated.

8.3 Concluding Remarks

The quest to understand the nature of time at the intersection of quantum mechanics and general relativity represents a formidable challenge to fundamental physics. The hypothesis that time emerges from quantum entanglement, as formalized by the Page-Wootters mechanism, offers a compelling and elegant potential resolution to the paradox of a dynamic universe seemingly described by a static quantum state. The experimental illustration by Moreva et al. provides valuable conceptual insight into how such emergence might occur.

However, the PaW mechanism currently remains a theoretical possibility rather than an established fact. It faces significant theoretical challenges related to its internal consistency, interpretation, and applicability under realistic conditions, particularly concerning measurements and non-ideal clocks. Crucially, it lacks definitive experimental verification or unique, testable predictions that could elevate it beyond a plausible hypothesis.

The ultimate viability of the PaW mechanism, and the broader idea of time emerging from entanglement, will depend on future progress in theoretical refinement, the ability to forge concrete links with more comprehensive theories of quantum gravity, and, most importantly, the potential development of novel experimental probes capable of testing its unique consequences. Until such progress is made, the deep mystery surrounding the quantum nature of time will continue to be a powerful driving force at the frontiers of theoretical physics.

Works cited

1. Problem of time - Wikipedia, accessed April 13, 2025, https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Problem_of_time
2. A list of inconveniences between quantum mechanics and (general) relativity?, accessed April 13, 2025, https://physics.stackexchange.com/questions/387/a-list-of-inconveniences-between-quantum-mechanics-and-general-relativity
3. Loop Quantum Gravity - PMC - PubMed Central, accessed April 13, 2025, https://pmc.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/articles/PMC5567241/
4. Time might be a mirage created by quantum physics, study suggests - Live Science, accessed April 13, 2025,

https://www.livescience.com/physics-mathematics/quantum-physics/time-might-be-a-mirage-created-by-quantum-physics-study-suggests
5. Time, space and Quantum Entanglement - Around SciFi, accessed April 13, 2025, https://aroundscifi.us/en/time-space-and-quantum-entanglement/
6. The Problem of Time - The University of Chicago, accessed April 13, 2025, https://homes.psd.uchicago.edu/~sethi/Teaching/P243-W2020/final-papers/gueron.pdf
7. arxiv.org, accessed April 13, 2025, https://arxiv.org/pdf/2308.10967
8. [1310.4691] Time from quantum entanglement: an experimental illustration - arXiv, accessed April 13, 2025, https://arxiv.org/abs/1310.4691
9. Could Time Be an Emergent Property Rather Than a Fundamental One? - Reddit, accessed April 13, 2025, https://www.reddit.com/r/AskPhysics/comments/1j7b5ko/could_time_be_an_emergent_property_rather_than_a/
10. emergent spacetime in quantum theories of gravity - Christian Wüthrich, accessed April 13, 2025, https://wuthrich.net/talks/2010eUCSDOsherSpacetime2.pdf
11. Is time emergent from quantum entanglement? - Reddit, accessed April 13, 2025, https://www.reddit.com/r/quantum/comments/98aql8/is_time_emergent_from_quantum_entanglement/
12. Is time emergent from quantum entanglement? - Physics Stack Exchange, accessed April 13, 2025, https://physics.stackexchange.com/questions/423835/is-time-emergent-from-quantum-entanglement
13. Time is an illusion resulting from quantum entanglement - The Brighter Side of News, accessed April 13, 2025, https://www.thebrighterside.news/post/time-is-an-illusion-resulting-from-quantum-entanglement/
14. Emergence upgraded - Dr. Andrej Drapal time, accessed April 13, 2025, https://andrejdrapal.com/2025/03/13/emergence-upgraded/
15. New theory suggests time is an illusion created by quantum entanglement - Hacker News, accessed April 13, 2025, https://news.ycombinator.com/item?id=40567676
16. Is emergent spacetime a common opinion among physicists? : r/AskPhysics - Reddit, accessed April 13, 2025, https://www.reddit.com/r/AskPhysics/comments/16nxy24/is_emergent_spacetime_a_common_opinion_among/
17. Emergence of time in Loop Quantum Gravity - PhilSci-Archive, accessed April 13, 2025, https://philsci-archive.pitt.edu/13158/1/Phil%20of%20QG%20Essay%202016.pdf
18. Does String theory say that spacetime is not fundamental but should be considered an emergent phenomenon?, accessed April 13, 2025, https://physics.stackexchange.com/questions/33428/does-string-theory-say-that-spacetime-is-not-fundamental-but-should-be-considere
19. [1310.4691] Time from quantum entanglement: an experimental illustration - ar5iv

- arXiv, accessed April 13, 2025, https://ar5iv.labs.arxiv.org/html/1310.4691
20. Entanglement discloses Time as an emergent phenomenon - Optica Publishing Group, accessed April 13, 2025, https://opg.optica.org/aop/fulltext.cfm?uri=CLEO_QELS-2014-FW1A.8
21. Robustness of the Page-Wootters construction across different ..., accessed April 13, 2025, https://link.aps.org/doi/10.1103/PhysRevD.108.063507
22. vixra.org, accessed April 13, 2025, https://vixra.org/pdf/1905.0154v1.pdf
23. Watching the Clocks: Interpreting the Page-Wootters Formalism and the Internal Quantum Reference Frame Programme, accessed April 13, 2025, https://digitalcommons.chapman.edu/cgi/viewcontent.cgi?article=1968&context=scs_articles
24. arxiv.org, accessed April 13, 2025, https://arxiv.org/pdf/2203.06755
25. Page-Wootters mechanism: the role of coherence and finite sized clocks - Inspire HEP, accessed April 13, 2025, https://inspirehep.net/literature/2114031
26. Quantifying resources for the Page-Wootters mechanism: Shared asymmetry as relative entropy of entanglement | Phys. Rev. A - Physical Review Link Manager, accessed April 13, 2025, https://link.aps.org/doi/10.1103/PhysRevA.103.052420
27. The Page-Wootters formalism: Where are we now? - PIRSA, accessed April 13, 2025, https://pirsa.org/22010079
28. The solution to the problem of time in quantum gravity also solves the time of arrival problem in quantum mechanics, accessed April 13, 2025, https://par.nsf.gov/servlets/purl/10404782
29. [2204.08371] The solution to the problem of time in quantum gravity also solves the time of arrival problem in quantum mechanics - arXiv, accessed April 13, 2025, https://arxiv.org/abs/2204.08371
30. Time from quantum entanglement: An experimental illustration - ResearchGate, accessed April 13, 2025, https://www.researchgate.net/publication/257882756_Time_from_quantum_entanglement_An_experimental_illustration
31. (PDF) Entanglement discloses Time as an emergent phenomenon - ResearchGate, accessed April 13, 2025, https://www.researchgate.net/publication/283657109_Entanglement_discloses_Time_as_an_emergent_phenomenon
32. Time is an emergent phenomenon that is a side effect of quantum entanglement, say physicists. And they have the first experimental results to prove it : r/science - Reddit, accessed April 13, 2025, https://www.reddit.com/r/science/comments/21cplp/time_is_an_emergent_phenomenon_that_is_a_side/
33. Here is a Hypothesis: Time is Not Fundamental, just an emergent effect of quantum processes : r/HypotheticalPhysics - Reddit, accessed April 13, 2025, https://www.reddit.com/r/HypotheticalPhysics/comments/1j4xkc2/here_is_a_hypothesis_time_is_not_fundamental_just/
34. [1705.01128] Emergent spacetime & Quantum Entanglement in Matrix theory - arXiv, accessed April 13, 2025, https://arxiv.org/abs/1705.01128
35. The quest to test quantum entanglement - Symmetry Magazine, accessed April

13, 2025,
https://www.symmetrymagazine.org/article/the-quest-to-test-quantum-entanglement?language_content_entity=und
36. Knitting space–time out of quantum entanglement - Physics World, accessed April 13, 2025,
https://physicsworld.com/a/knitting-space-time-out-of-quantum-entanglement/
37. What do some Scientists mean when they say “space time isn't fundamental” - Reddit, accessed April 13, 2025,
https://www.reddit.com/r/AskPhysics/comments/1cpxayg/what_do_some_scientists_mean_when_they_say_space/
38. Chapter 9: The 'emergence' of spacetime in string theory - PhilSci-Archive, accessed April 13, 2025,
https://philsci-archive.pitt.edu/17204/1/HuggettOON9.pdf
39. On the Relative Distance of Entangled Systems in Emergent Spacetime Scenarios - arXiv, accessed April 13, 2025, https://arxiv.org/pdf/2210.14875
40. Spacetime and gravity's emergence from eternally entangled particles - arXiv, accessed April 13, 2025, https://arxiv.org/html/physics/0107050v13
41. Loop quantum gravity - Wikipedia, accessed April 13, 2025,
https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Loop_quantum_gravity
42. The main idea of a Page-Wootters formulation of a quantum circuit. One... - ResearchGate, accessed April 13, 2025,
https://www.researchgate.net/figure/The-main-idea-of-a-Page-Wootters-formulation-of-a-quantum-circuit-One-considers-a_fig1_359034094
43. [2411.17545] Lessons for loop quantum gravity from emergent modified gravity - arXiv, accessed April 13, 2025, https://arxiv.org/abs/2411.17545
44. The Emergence of Spacetime in String Theory - Notre Dame Philosophical Reviews, accessed April 13, 2025,
https://ndpr.nd.edu/reviews/the-emergence-of-spacetime-in-string-theory/
45. String Theory Defines Space and Time - Dummies.com, accessed April 13, 2025,
https://www.dummies.com/article/academics-the-arts/science/physics/string-theory-defines-space-and-time-178665/
46. A Possible Solution For The Problem Of Time In Quantum Cosmology - Edge.org, accessed April 13, 2025,
https://www.edge.org/conversation/lee_smolin-stuart_a_kauffman-a-possible-solution-for-the-problem-of-time-in-quantum
47. New study suggests time is an illusion arising from quantum entanglement, accessed April 13, 2025,
https://www.thebrighterside.news/post/new-study-suggests-time-is-an-illusion-arising-from-quantum-entanglement/
48. LHC Experiments at CERN Observe Quantum Entanglement at the Highest Energy Yet, accessed April 13, 2025,
https://www.bnl.gov/newsroom/news.php?a=122088
49. Quantum entanglement - Wikipedia, accessed April 13, 2025,
https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Quantum_entanglement
50. Proving that Quantum Entanglement is Real - Caltech, accessed April 13, 2025,

https://www.caltech.edu/about/news/proving-that-quantum-entanglement-is-real
51. Relativity and Page-Wooters (PW) Mechanism - Physics Stack Exchange, accessed April 13, 2025, https://physics.stackexchange.com/questions/833186/relativity-and-page-wooters-pw-mechanism
52. How does the philosophy of 'Emergent Gravity' differ from that of 'Quantum Gravity'?, accessed April 13, 2025, https://physics.stackexchange.com/questions/553104/how-does-the-philosophy-of-emergent-gravity-differ-from-that-of-quantum-gravi
53. Canonical quantisation: A solution to quantum gravity? - Research Outreach, accessed April 13, 2025, https://researchoutreach.org/articles/physical-sciences/canonical-quantisation-solution-quantum-gravity/
54. String theory - Wikipedia, accessed April 13, 2025, https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/String_theory