


Progress in Horizon Thermodynamics

Aron Wall
DAMTP,
Cambridge


Penrose Diagrams with Horizons (or, how relativists visualize spacetimes)

A Penrose diagram is a spacetime drawn such that:


1. All but 2 dimensions are suppressed (e.g. each point is a sphere of some radius)
2. The diagram is squished to finite size (using a conformal transformation)
3. Light travels at 45° (if propagating radially)
4. Boundaries represent: infinity (solid lines), singularities (jagged lines) or a coordinate origin (long dashed lines)




asymp. flat black hole



de Sitter



anti-de Sitter




asymp. flat

Green lines show “observers” going to null infinity who see a horizon
“Black hole thermodynamics” isn't just about black holes!

Static Black Hole thermodynamics

(this part of the talk mostly reviews older material,
but there will be some recent results at the end)

Penrose Diagram of an Eternal Static Black Hole



asymptotically AdS boundary
 But most of what I say generalizes
 to other Killing horizons:
 including de Sitter, Rindler

area A constant along
 future and past horizons $H(+/-)$
 because black hole is stationary

This spacetime has multiple
 Killing vectors (symmetries) satisfying

$$\nabla_a \chi_b + \nabla_b \chi_a = 0$$

But the most important one is the “horizon generating” χ which is null along H (this vector looks like a time translation @ ∞ but like a Lorentz boost near B). If we pick χ to be normalized w.r.t. some boundary clock time, then the surface gravity $\kappa = |\nabla_a \chi_b|$ is constant along H (the *Zeroth Law*).

Black Hole Thermodynamics

$$E = \text{ADM mass} \quad (\text{already clear in GR})$$

$$T = \frac{\hbar}{2\pi} \kappa \quad (\text{Hawking radiation})$$


$$S = \frac{A[H]}{4G\hbar} + \text{quantum \& string corrections} \quad (\text{entropy increases with time})$$

combination of these quantities satisfy *First Law* (i.e. Clausius relation):

$$dE = TdS$$


[some extra terms are needed if black hole is rotating or charged]

Hartle-Hawking Path Integral




There is a special “Hartle-Hawking” state of QFT on the BH background obtained by Wick rotating to Euclidean path integral:

$$\Psi_{\text{HH}}[\Phi(t_0)] = \int_{\Phi(t_0)} D\Phi e^{-I[\Phi]/\hbar}$$




Because the double sided Euclidean path has rotational symmetry,
it follows that if Ψ_{HH} is restricted to one side of B, it is thermal:

$$\rho \propto e^{-2\pi K/\hbar}$$



this wedge
is thermal
wrt Killing
energy K


Thermofield Double State



The thermality of HH is related to the fact that in AdS/CFT, the dual boundary CFT path integral gives the thermofield double state:

$$|\Psi\rangle = e^{-E/2T} |E_L\rangle |E_R\rangle$$


$$\text{with } S_{\text{CFT}} = S_{\text{BH}}$$



this might make you think that the left and right wedges are dual to the left and right CFTs


—this turns out to be not only correct, but part of a bigger statement called “entanglement wedge reconstruction” that I will mention later.

back to statements which are true independently of holography...



On the other hand, if we look at all of $H+$ (including behind $H-$), then Ψ_{HH} is a pure state and is in fact the *ground state* w.r.t. null translations on the horizon (not a Killing symmetry of the whole spacetime)

Israel, Kay-Wald, Sewell...



Actually a stronger statement is true. Ψ_{HH} is a ground state with respect to the null energy integrated along ANY lightray L on the horizon H .


If v is an (affine) null coordinate, the (renormalized) QFT stress-tensor exactly satisfies

$$\int_L T_{vv} dv |\Psi_{HH}\rangle = 0$$


which saturates the lowest bound for all states:

$$\int_L \langle T_{vv} \rangle dv \geq 0 \quad (\text{ANEC})$$

furthermore, because the ANE generates null translations, HH is thermal not just in the wedge outside the bif. surface B...





$$K = \int_{v>0} \underbrace{T_{vv} v}_{\text{Killing flux}} dv d^{d-2}y$$



...but also above *any* slice of the horizon.

$$K[V(y)] = \int_{v-V(y)>0} T_{vv}(v - V(y)) dv d^{d-2}y$$

(in asymptotic flat case, this is true up to a constant related to matter that escapes to infinity)




(Needed to prove quantum Second Law, Wall '11)

What's new in the last few years?


Mainly, we now know that these statements should continue to hold for general *interacting* QFTs (with a UV fixed point).

Proofs of the ANEC



Faulkner, Leigh, Parrikar, Wang '16

relative entropy $\langle \Delta K \rangle_\rho - \Delta S(\rho)$
decreasing from A to B, and B' to A
(K calculated perturbatively using CFT)



Hartman, Kundu, Tajdini '16

causality constraint applied
to OPE of operators as they
approach null separation
(twist gap, chaos bound, sum rules...)

Modular Hamiltonian on Null Slices

Casini Testé Torroba '17 derived K on null slices, in followup paper proved a-theorem

For QFT in curved spacetime ANEC has exceptions

(but not on Killing horizons)


The ANEC only required along “achronal” complete null geodesics meaning that no 2 points are related by timelike curves

In a gravitational field, most lightrays are not “fastest possible”.

Graham & Olum '07

imposing achronal ANEC

generically implies that that NO achronal null geodesics exist, but this very fact implies most of the GR proofs that require the ANEC!




lightrays slowed down by passing through gravity wells are *chronal*; a timelike observer can catch up to them by going around

Dynamics (Classical)

Expansion

It is helpful to define the “expansion” of a codim-2 surface as the rate of area increase of lightrays shot outwards from it

$$\theta_v = \frac{1}{\delta A} \frac{d\delta A}{dv}$$



In the case where the outgoing lightrays satisfy $\theta_v = 0$
(while the ingoing lightrays satisfy $\theta_u \leq 0$)
we call the surface μ marginally trapped.

(These surfaces play an important role in the Penrose singularity Thm.)

When we add infalling matter (not shown), black hole is not stationary... different notions of “horizon” separate from one another.


1. Extremal (HRT) Surface (both θ 's = 0)

2. Trapping Horizon (one $\theta = 0$)


(a.k.a. dynamical horizon, holographic screen...)

3. The Event Horizon


4. General Null Surface



long wormhole



collapse



Classically, if we assume
the Null Energy Condition


$$T_{vv} \geq 0$$

then the following statements
are generically true,
as are their time-reversals.

(Nongenerically, can saturate ineq's.)

1. X and T+ always lie inside of H+.

Trapped Surfaces always lie inside of event horizons
(cf. Hawking-Ellis, Wald books)



Classically, if we assume
the Null Energy Condition


$$T_{vv} \geq 0$$

then the following statements
are generically true,
as are their time-reversals.

(Nongenerically, can saturate ineq's.)

1. X and T+ always lie inside of H+.
2. H+ has increasing area (**Hawking '71**)
3. T+ has increasing area timelike-pastward and spacelike-outward (**Hayward**)
and even for mixed signature, area is monotonic (**Bousso-Engelhardt '15**)

Two versions of the “Second Law”—entropy increases



Classically, if we assume
the Null Energy Condition

$$T_{vv} \geq 0$$


then the following statements
are generically true,
as are their time-reversals.

(Nongenerically, can saturate ineq's.)

1. X and T+ always lie inside of H+.
2. H+ has increasing area (**Hawking '71**)
3. T+ has increasing area timelike-pastward and spacelike-outward (**Hayward**)
and even for mixed signature, area is monotonic (**Bousso-Engelhardt '15**)
4. X has less area than $H+ \cap H-$ (**Hubeny-Rangamani '12, Wall '12**)
5. Area[X] gives the (leading order in $1/N$) entropy of each dual CFT (**HRT, LM**).

If X gives the “fine grained” S, then H or T must involve a “coarse-grained” S!

How the Ordinary Second Law works



$S_{\text{fine}} = -\text{tr}(\rho \ln \rho)$ is conserved under unitary time evolution

Hence no (nontrivial) second law that allows $\frac{dS}{dt} > 0$

Solution is “coarse graining”—must find a way to “forget” detailed correlation of molecules, i.e. find “coarse-grained” procedure for calculating entropy such that


$$S_{\text{coarse}} > S_{\text{fine}}$$

(multiple approaches to this)

So far there is only a story along these lines for T^+ , not H^+

Outer Entropy:

maximize the area of the stationary surface X ,
given knowledge of all classical field data outside surface




pick ANY interior compatible with the field data outside

Engelhardt-Wall '17, '18: for a wide class of marg. trapped μ 's,
 $\text{OuterS}[\mu] = \text{Area}[\mu]$, hence can interpret as coarse-grained entropy.
(This does *not* work for H^+)

Quantum Corrections

Entanglement Entropy



Given any Cauchy surface Σ , and a surface E which divides it into two regions $\text{Int}(E)$ and $\text{Ext}(E)$, can define entanglement entropy:

$$S_{\text{ent}} = -\text{tr}(\rho \ln \rho)$$

where ρ is the density matrix restricted to one side or the other. for a pure total state, doesn't matter which side (ρ_{out} or ρ_{in}), since $S_{\text{in}} = S_{\text{out}}$.

but for a mixed state, it does matter ($S_{\text{out}} \neq S_{\text{in}}$)

S_{ent} is UV divergent, but divergences are local.


The Generalized Entropy

If the theory is GRAVITATIONAL, then we can also define a finite “generalized entropy” of E :

$$S_{\text{gen}} = \frac{\langle A \rangle}{4G\hbar} + S_{\text{out}} + \text{counterterms}$$

(or we can use S_{in} , which equals S_{out} for a pure state.)


counterterms are *local* geometrical quantities used to absorb EE divergences, (e.g. leading order area law divergence corrects $1/G$)



True Meaning of Generalized Entropy?

For a static horizon $S_{\text{gen}}[H]$, plausibly counts the total entropy of all degrees of freedom including Planck/string d.o.f. (**Sorkin, Jacobson, Susskind & Uglum**), assuming QG cuts off contributions below the Planck scale.

Using known relations between action & entropy, this scenario is equivalent to the “induced gravity” hypothesis of Sakharov that the gravitational action R/G comes entirely from quantum loop corrections i.e. the “bare” $1/G = 0$



Susskind & Uglum argued that the Bekenstein-Hawking entropy comes mainly from strings that cross the horizon, but their calculation of $A/4$ requires off-shell string theory

There is a large literature on other approaches to counting microstates of black holes in string theory (and in other approaches) but no time to review

Suggests way to extend classical GR proofs to “semiclassical” situations involving quantum fields...

just replace the area with the generalized entropy!

$$A \rightarrow 4G\hbar S_{\text{gen}}$$

Quantum Expansion



classical: area increase (per unit area) of :

$$\theta = \lim_{A \rightarrow 0} \frac{1}{A} \frac{dA}{d\lambda}$$

quantum: generalized entropy increase (still per unit area!)

$$\Theta = \lim_{A \rightarrow 0} \frac{4G\hbar}{A} \frac{dS_{\text{gen}}}{d\lambda} = \frac{4G\hbar}{a} \frac{\delta S_{\text{gen}}}{\delta \lambda(y)} \quad \leftarrow \text{functional derivative of nonlocal quantity}$$

finite area element



Quantum Focussing

asserts that a *second* functional derivative is negative:

QFC

$$\frac{\delta}{\delta\lambda(y)}\Theta(y')|_{\sigma} \leq 0$$

for *any* null surface,
not just event horizons



$G \rightarrow 0$ limit


quantum perturbation to class. stat. null surf.
just look at $y \rightarrow y'$ contact term

QNEC

$$\langle T_{vv} \rangle \geq \frac{\hbar}{2\pi} S''$$

this is now an assertion
about QFT on a fixed
background

- * QNEC now proven for general QFT's (**Ceyhan & Faulkner '18**,
(see citations therein for many partial proofs))
- * Surprisingly, QNEC saturated for interacting $d > 2$ CFTs!
(**Leichenauer, Levine, Shahbazi-Moghaddam '18**,
Balakrishnan, Chandrasekaran, Faulkner, Levine, Shahbazi-Moghaddam '19)



In semiclassical regime, ought to redefine X and T_{\pm} using quantum expansion Θ :

1. q Extremal (both Θ 's = 0)
2. q Trapping Horizon (one $\Theta = 0$)

Then the “quantum” version of the previous statements hold:

1. qX and qT_{+} always lie inside of H_{+} (**Engelhardt-Wall '15**, from #2 below)

Generalized Second Laws:

2. H_{+} has increasing S_{gen} (**Wall '11**, from monotonicity of relative entropy)
3. qT_{+} has increasing S_{gen} (**Bousso-Engelhardt '15**, from QFC)
4. qX has less S_{gen} than $H_{+} \cap H_{-}$ [not sure if anyone has shown this one yet]
5. S_{gen} gives the entropy of the dual CFT to all orders in $1/N \sim \hbar$

(**FLM '13, Engelhardt-Wall '15, Lewkowycz-Dong '17**)

At the *first* subleading (quantum) order in \hbar ,
for states expanded around a single spacetime background,
the following remarkable relations hold:

$$\mathbf{FLM:} \quad S_{\text{CFT}} = S_{\text{gen}}[X] \quad (\text{derived from path integral})$$

linearize around any ρ

$$\mathbf{JLMS:} \quad K_{\text{CFT}}^\rho = K_{\text{gen}}^\rho[X]$$


where the modular Hamiltonian is $K^\rho \equiv -\ln \rho$ (viewed as an operator)

This gives an enormous amount of additional information about AdS/CFT
and is useful for reconstructing information behind $H(+/-)$

Also implies relative entropies $\langle \Delta K^\sigma \rangle_\rho - \Delta S(\rho)$ agree:

$$S_{\text{rel}}(\rho | \sigma)_{\text{CFT}} = S_{\text{rel}}(\rho | \sigma)_{\text{bulk}}[X]$$

which in turn implies
Entanglement Wedge Reconstruction




Jafferis, Lewkowycz, Maldacena, Suh '15
Dong, Harlow, Wall '16

Traversable Wormholes

AdS/CFT implementation:


entangled thermal CFTs \leftrightarrow Einstein-Rosen bridge



ANEC forbids traversable wormholes

$$|\Psi\rangle = e^{-E/2T} |E_L\rangle |E_R\rangle$$


Loophole: couple the CFT's to each other,
negative energy flux for one sign of coupling, due to NORMAL matter



null geodesic
is “morally”
chronal due
to interaction

$$H_{\text{int}} = \int dt h(t) \mathcal{O}_L \mathcal{O}_R$$


Wormhole becomes traversable when backreaction taken into account. Effect is in eikonal regime, so approximations seem to be under good control



wormhole wide open from perspective of infalling traveller @ early times

Quantum Teleportation

From a holographic (CFT) perspective, can regard the Einstein-Rosen bridge as 2 entangled but uncoupled systems, dual to single-sided black holes



Maldacena, Stanford, Yang '17 slightly varied our protocol to send qubits through wormhole using only classical communication.

Further Extensions

1) alternative protocols allow for eternally traversable wormholes

Maldacena & Qi '18;

Fu, Grado-White & Marolf '19

2) can embed the 2 ends into 1 asymptotically flat region, and make them traversable using Standard Model fields (using chiral fermions + magnetic flux through throat)

Maldacena, Milekhin & Popov '18


3) seems possible in principle to pair-create the 2 ends of the wormhole by a nonperturbative quantum instanton process

Horowitz, Marolf, Santos, Wang '19


+ many other follow-up papers...

Q & A

Explicit solution maximizes X behind μ
(they are connected by a stationary null surface N)



Statistical Explanation for Area Law when T^+ spacelike




Maximizing entropy subject to fewer constraints \rightarrow increases

Statistical explanation for Hayward area law

What coarse-grained entropy corresponds to event horizon???

Also possible to generalize coarse-graining setup to quantum extremal surfaces...



(Bousso, Chandrasekaran, Shahbazi-Moghaddam '19)

Stringy /
Higher-Curvature
Corrections

Higher Curvature Gravity

$$S_{\text{gen}} = \frac{\langle A \rangle}{4G\hbar} + S_{\text{out}} + \text{counterterms}$$

starting with a local correction to the GR action, e.g:

$$I = \int d^D x \sqrt{g} f(R_{abcd})$$

can derive entropy functional  (in null coordinates v, u)

$$S = -\frac{2\pi}{\hbar} \int d^{D-2} x \sqrt{g} \left[\underbrace{4 \frac{\partial L_g}{\partial R_{uvuv}}}_{\text{Wald}} + 16 \underbrace{\frac{\partial^2 L_g}{\partial R_{uiuj} \partial R_{vkvl}} K_{ij(u)} K_{kl(v)}}_{\text{Solodukhin, FPS, Dong, Miao...}} \right] + \mathcal{O}(K^4)$$

$$= \frac{A}{4G\hbar} \text{ for GR}$$

Wald

Solodukhin, FPS, Dong, Miao...
(extrinsic curvature corrections only matter for nonstationary null surfaces)

Higher Curvature Focussing

Wall '15


In any metric-scalar theory of gravitation w/ arbitrarily complex action

$$I = \int d^D x \sqrt{g} L(g^{ab}, R_{abcd}, \nabla R \dots \phi, \nabla \phi \dots) + I_{\text{matter}}$$

for a linearized perturbation of g_{ab}, ϕ about a Killing horizon, one can always construct an entropy density s that focusses:

$$T_{vv} = H_{vv} = -\frac{2\pi}{\hbar} \frac{d^2 s}{dv^2}$$

obtain s by repeatedly differentiating by parts, at least 2 ∂_v 's end up outside:

$$\delta H_{vv}^{(2)} = \sum_{n \geq 0} X^{(-n)} \cdot \delta Y^{(2+n)} \quad (i) = \text{Killing weight}$$


the integral of this s agrees with “Dong entropy” for f(Riemann) actions!

Beyond
Semiclassical
Quantum
Gravity?