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Second Report of the Second Referee -- BH11160/Gu

I have reviewed the new version of the paper and the reports by the two referees (as well as the authors’ response to them). It is my opinion that the theory described in this work most likely has nothing to do with gravity. The response of the authors to the comments of your two referees show that they are wrong at a very basic level. Contrary to what the authors state General Relativity is a gauge theory as it is based on the notion of general covariance which is a local symmetry. Any hamiltonian description (whatever this may mean in this case) must necessarily involve local constraints whose solution is highly non trivial. From this point of view, one of the differences between GR and standard gauge theory is that in the latter the gauge group is compact while in GR the gauge group is non-compact.

I also find disingenuous the argument that they do not need to compare with earlier (and quite extensive) lattice approaches. This is not the case. They should make a clear comparison to determine if their theory can even qualify as a theory of quantum gravity. They have never made the case for even that.

In summary this is a very misleading paper which almost surely has nothing to do with gravity (quantum or otherwise). It should not be published in PRB. At any rate, Physical Review B is most certainly not the correct venue for this work. If ever publishable, it should be
a more appropriate journal, such as Nuclear Physics B, or JHEP. Using a lattice is not a condition for publication in PRB.