

Some comments and open questions on black hole entropy from LQG

Norbert Bodendorfer

Institute of Theoretical Physics
University of Warsaw

largely based on works in collaboration with
Yasha Neiman, Thomas Thiemann, Andreas Thurn

Second EFI winter conference on Quantum Gravity

February 13, 2014

Unterstützt von / Supported by



Alexander von Humboldt
Stiftung/Foundation

Plan of the talk

- 1 Entropy calculation: Basic ingredients (in 3+1 dimensions)
- 2 Review of some recent results
- 3 Open(?) questions
- 4 Wrap-up

Outline

- 1 Entropy calculation: Basic ingredients (in 3+1 dimensions)
- 2 Review of some recent results
- 3 Open(?) questions
- 4 Wrap-up

Entropy calculation: Basic ingredients

[Smolin '95; Krasnov '96; Rovelli '96; Ashtekar, Baez, Corichi, Krasnov '97-; ... Domagala, Lewandowski '04; ... Engle, Noui, Perez '09-; ...]

Isolated horizon boundary of spacetime

Connection variables \rightarrow boundary degrees of freedom ("Edge states" in cond. matter)

Entropy calculation: Basic ingredients

[Smolin '95; Krasnov '96; Rovelli '96; Ashtekar, Baez, Corichi, Krasnov '97-; ... Domagala, Lewandowski '04; ... Engle, Noui, Perez '09-; ...]

Isolated horizon boundary of spacetime

Connection variables \rightarrow boundary degrees of freedom ("Edge states" in cond. matter)

Idea: Count boundary degrees of freedom in agreement with total area

Entropy calculation: Basic ingredients

[Smolin '95; Krasnov '96; Rovelli '96; Ashtekar, Baez, Corichi, Krasnov '97-; ... Domagala, Lewandowski '04; ... Engle, Noui, Perez '09-; ...]

Isolated horizon boundary of spacetime

Connection variables \rightarrow boundary degrees of freedom ("Edge states" in cond. matter)

Idea: Count boundary degrees of freedom in agreement with total area

Important observation for BH entropy from LQG:

$$S_{\text{BH}} \propto \frac{1}{\gamma} A_H$$

γ = Barbero-Immirzi parameter, A_H = horizon area

Entropy calculation: Basic ingredients

[Smolin '95; Krasnov '96; Rovelli '96; Ashtekar, Baez, Corichi, Krasnov '97-; ... Domagala, Lewandowski '04; ... Engle, Noui, Perez '09-; ...]

Isolated horizon boundary of spacetime

Connection variables \rightarrow boundary degrees of freedom ("Edge states" in cond. matter)

Idea: Count boundary degrees of freedom in agreement with total area

Important observation for BH entropy from LQG:

$$S_{\text{BH}} \propto \frac{1}{\gamma} A_H$$

γ = Barbero-Immirzi parameter, A_H = horizon area

Ingredients on horizon slice H

- Boundary symplectic structure $\int_H \delta_1 A^i \wedge \delta_2 A_i$
- Boundary condition $F^i(A) = \Sigma^i(E)$
- Area spectrum $8\pi G\gamma\sqrt{j(j+1)}$

Outline

- 1 Entropy calculation: Basic ingredients (in 3+1 dimensions)
- 2 Review of some recent results
- 3 Open(?) questions
- 4 Wrap-up

Higher dimensions (also $2+1$ / $3+0$ / $3+1$ / $4+0$ / $\Lambda \in \mathbb{R}$)

Known:

- Isolated horizon (IH) framework extendable to higher dimensions
[Lewandowski, Pawłowski [gr-qc/0410146](#); Korzynski, Lewandowski, Pawłowski [gr-qc/0412108](#)]
[Ashtekar, Pawłowski, v. d. Broeck [gr-qc/0611049](#); Liko, Booth [0705.1371](#)]
- LQG extendable to higher dimensions, gauge group $SO(D + 1)$
[NB, Thiemann, Thurn [1106.1103](#)]

Higher dimensions (also $2+1$ / $3+0$ / $3+1$ / $4+0$ / $\Lambda \in \mathbb{R}$)

Known:

- Isolated horizon (IH) framework extendable to higher dimensions
[Lewandowski, Pawłowski gr-qc/0410146; Korzynski, Lewandowski, Pawłowski gr-qc/0412108]
[Ashtekar, Pawłowski, v. d. Broeck gr-qc/0611049; Liko, Booth 0705.1371]
- LQG extendable to higher dimensions, gauge group $SO(D + 1)$
[NB, Thiemann, Thurn 1106.1103]

Recent result: [NB, Thiemann, Thurn, 1304.2679] , [ILQGS 2013 of NB]

- Boundary symplectic structure on IH can be derived:
Higher-dimensional Chern-Simons (even dimensions) or flux-like variables
- Boundary condition can be derived:
Similar to Chern-Simons theory coupled to particles
- Variational principle well defined in the presence of an isolated horizon boundary
- Higher-dim. CS-theory has local degrees of freedom
- Horizon connection not unique (also observed by [Engle, Noui, Perez, Pranzetti 1006.0634])
- Except for variational principle, computations independent of boundary type

Generalized theories and Wald entropy

Known:

Entropy from classical first law [\[Wald gr-qc/9307038\]](#)

$$S_{\text{Wald}} = \frac{1}{4G} \int_H \sqrt{h} \frac{-\delta \mathcal{L}}{\delta R_{\mu\nu\rho\sigma}} \epsilon_{\mu\nu} \epsilon_{\rho\sigma} \neq \frac{A_H}{4G}$$

\mathcal{L} = Lagrangian, \sqrt{h} = area density on H
 $\epsilon_{\mu\nu} = 2n_{[\mu} s_{\nu]}$ = horizon slice bi-normal

For non-minimally coupled scalar field in LQG, see [\[Ashtekar, Corichi gr-qc/0305082\]](#)

Generalized theories and Wald entropy

Known:

Entropy from classical first law [\[Wald gr-qc/9307038\]](#)

$$S_{\text{Wald}} = \frac{1}{4G} \int_H \sqrt{h} \frac{-\delta \mathcal{L}}{\delta R_{\mu\nu\rho\sigma}} \epsilon_{\mu\nu} \epsilon_{\rho\sigma} \neq \frac{A_H}{4G}$$

\mathcal{L} = Lagrangian, \sqrt{h} = area density on H
 $\epsilon_{\mu\nu} = 2n_{[\mu} s_{\nu]}$ = horizon slice bi-normal

For non-minimally coupled scalar field in LQG, see [\[Ashtekar, Corichi gr-qc/0305082\]](#)

Recent result: [\[NB, Neiman, 1304.3025\]](#) , [\[ILQGS 2013 of NB\]](#)

- Computation of Wald entropy from Lovelock gravity reduces to GR case
- Area operator gets substituted by “Wald entropy operator”
- Choice of connection is very important for this computation!
- Analog of the spacetime connection is preferred
(More precisely, the flux has to measure Wald entropy)
- Use of other connections conceivable, but semiclassical limit would be complicated
see [\[NB, Stottmeister, Thurn 1203.6525\]](#) for explicit example

Quantization and state counting in higher dimensions

Known:

- Remark in [\[Engle, Noui, Perez, Pranzetti 1006.0634\]](#) that horizon theory can be formulated alternatively in terms of flux-like variables

Quantization and state counting in higher dimensions

Known:

- Remark in [Engle, Noui, Perez, Pranzetti 1006.0634] that horizon theory can be formulated alternatively in terms of flux-like variables

Recent result: [NB 1307.5029] , [ILQGS 2013 of NB]

Densitized bi-normals on the horizon slice as boundary variables

$$L^{IJ} := 2/\beta n^I \tilde{s}^J \quad \left\{ L^{IJ}(x), L^{KL}(y) \right\} = 4 \delta^{(D-1)}(x-y) \delta^{L[J} L^{I]K}(x)$$

n^I = internal (time) normal, $s^I = \hat{s}_a E^{aI}$ = horizon slice normal, $\tilde{s}^I = \sqrt{h} s^I$, \sqrt{h} = area density on horizon slice
 β = free parameter analogous but different from Barbero-Immirzi parameter

- $L^{IJ} = \hat{s}_a \pi^{aIJ}$ restriction of the flux variable $\pi^{aIJ} \approx 2/\beta n^I E^{aJ}$ to the horizon slice
- Quantization straight forward (representation spaces of $\mathfrak{so}(D+1)$)
- State counting problem can be reduced almost to the $3+1$ dim. one
- Dimension independent log. correction in accordance with Carlip

Comparison with semiclassical effective action

(Recently became) Known:

- Large spin flat 4-simplex asymptotics exhibit contributions from boundary “bending” through null directions [Barrett, Dowdall, Fairbairn, Hellmann, Pereira 0907.2440] .
- On-shell (Lovelock-type) gravity actions have an imaginary part, resulting from the boundary “bending” through null directions. [Neiman 1301.7041]
- Analytic continuation to imaginary Barbero-Immrizi parameter $\gamma = \pm i$ yields $S = A/4$. [Frodden, Geiller, Noui, Perez 1212.4060; Han 1402.2084]

Comparison with semiclassical effective action

(Recently became) Known:

- Large spin flat 4-simplex asymptotics exhibit contributions from boundary “bending” through null directions [Barrett, Dowdall, Fairbairn, Hellmann, Pereira 0907.2440] .
- On-shell (Lovelock-type) gravity actions have an imaginary part, resulting from the boundary “bending” through null directions. [Neiman 1301.7041]
- Analytic continuation to imaginary Barbero-Immrizi parameter $\gamma = \pm i$ yields $S = A/4$. [Frodden, Geiller, Noui, Perez 1212.4060; Han 1402.2084]

Recent result: [NB, Neiman 1303.4752] , [ILQGS 2013 of Neiman]

- The imaginary part of the 3 + 1-dim GR action in a bounded region corresponding to the flat 4-simplex can be reproduced from the result of [Barrett, Dowdall, Fairbairn, Hellmann, Pereira 0907.2440] iff one sets $\gamma = \pm i$ after the calculation.
- Conceptually sound: Semiclassical regime $\Rightarrow S = A/4G$
- Semiclassical in the sense of path integral stationary on (Regge) GR action
- Interpretation of this regime open (argued to exhibit “transplanckian” character in [NB, Neiman 1303.4752])

Independence of the type of boundary

Known:

- Entropy computations within LQG well understood in the presence of an isolated horizon boundary. (Variational principle, classical phase space, ...) [[Ashtekar et al.](#)]
- Concept of (weak) holography has been conjectured / observed for general boundaries [[many authors, see e.g. Smolin hep-th/0003056](#)]
- Counting boundary states corresponds to computing entanglement entropy [[Balachandran, Momen, Chandar hep-th/9512047; Donnelly 0802.0880](#)]

Independence of the type of boundary

Known:

- Entropy computations within LQG well understood in the presence of an isolated horizon boundary. (Variational principle, classical phase space, ...) [[Ashtekar et al.](#)]
- Concept of (weak) holography has been conjectured / observed for general boundaries [[many authors, see e.g. Smolin hep-th/0003056](#)]
- Counting boundary states corresponds to computing entanglement entropy [[Balachandran, Momen, Chandar hep-th/9512047](#); [Donnelly 0802.0880](#)]

Recent result: [[NB, Thiemann, Thurn 1304.2679](#); [NB, 1402.1038](#)]

- All computations can be generalised to general boundaries with fixed induced metric and York-Gibbons-Hawking boundary term
- Connection on horizon is in general not the pullback of a space(time) connection
- Reasoning of comparison with semiclassical 4-simplex effective action especially sound for general boundaries and entanglement entropy [[Neiman 1310.1839](#)]
- Hints at weak holography in the terminology of [[Smolin hep-th/0003056](#)] :

Accessible information at the boundary of a region is given by $\exp(A/4G)$ in the large spin, $\gamma = \pm i$ semiclassical regime in $3 + 1$ dimensions.

Outline

- 1 Entropy calculation: Basic ingredients (in 3+1 dimensions)
- 2 Review of some recent results
- 3 Open(?) questions**
- 4 Wrap-up

How do we want to compute (black hole) entropy?

Recall observations: there are multiple proposals within LQG

- State counting in isolated horizon framework [many authors '95-]
 $S \propto A$, no comparison to effective action
- Entanglement entropy from coherent states [Dasgupta '05]
 $S \propto A$, no direct comparison to effective action
- Thermodynamic, involving temperature and energy [Ghosh, Perez '11; Bianchi '12; ...]
 $S = A/4G$, no comparison to effective action
- State counting, large spins, $\gamma = \pm i$ [Frodden, Geiller, Noui, Perez '12]
 $S = A/4G$, comparison to large spin effective action needs $\gamma = \pm i$ [NB, Neiman '13]

How do we want to compute (black hole) entropy?

Recall observations: there are multiple proposals within LQG

- State counting in isolated horizon framework [many authors '95-]
 $S \propto A$, no comparison to effective action
- Entanglement entropy from coherent states [Dasgupta '05]
 $S \propto A$, no direct comparison to effective action
- Thermodynamic, involving temperature and energy [Ghosh, Perez '11; Bianchi '12; ...]
 $S = A/4G$, no comparison to effective action
- State counting, large spins, $\gamma = \pm i$ [Frodden, Geiller, Noui, Perez '12]
 $S = A/4G$, comparison to large spin effective action needs $\gamma = \pm i$ [NB, Neiman '13]

What is the fundamental derivation we are aiming for?

- Is having a temperature / thermodynamics fundamental?
- Is the “string theory” type derivation [Strominger, Vafa '96] of counting states and comparing to effective action more fundamental? (IMHO Yes)

Relation to Bekenstein-Hawking entropy

Recall observations:

- Bekenstein-Hawking entropy is about thermal states
- Computing entanglement entropy (=tracing over half of space) leads to the same density matrix as the thermal state observed by the Unruh observer [[Kabat, Strassler '94](#)].
- Isolated horizon entropy computation computes entanglement entropy [[Husain '98](#); [Donnelly '08](#); [NB '14](#)]

Relation to Bekenstein-Hawking entropy

Recall observations:

- Bekenstein-Hawking entropy is about thermal states
- Computing entanglement entropy (=tracing over half of space) leads to the same density matrix as the thermal state observed by the Unruh observer [Kabat, Strassler '94] .
- Isolated horizon entropy computation computes entanglement entropy [Husain '98; Donnelly '08; NB '14]

Is this satisfactory? In which sense?

- More precise analysis would be desirable!?
- What to compute to make analogy more explicit?
- Should temperature be an explicit part of the entropy computations?

Entropy of general boundaries

Recall observations:

- All computations generalise to general boundaries
- Only difference being choice of connection on the boundary

Entropy of general boundaries

Recall observations:

- All computations generalise to general boundaries
- Only difference being choice of connection on the boundary

What is the general feeling towards this result?

- Are causal horizons special? (*Physical* boundaries)
- Is there a “special” (pulled back) connection on the boundary?
- Does it make sense to talk about the entropy for general regions? (e.g. as the information accessible on the boundary)

Why does the analytic continuation to $\gamma = \pm i$ work?

Recall observations: (several miracles conspiring)

- Entropy becomes $A/4G$
- 4-simplex large spin effective action has also correct imaginary part
- “Supposed to be” KMS states are really KMS [[Pranzetti 1305.6714](#)]
- $\gamma = \pm i$ corresponds to spacetime connections (no miracle, just a fact)

Why does the analytic continuation to $\gamma = \pm i$ work?

Recall observations: (several miracles conspiring)

- Entropy becomes $A/4G$
- 4-simplex large spin effective action has also correct imaginary part
- “Supposed to be” KMS states are really KMS [Pranzetti 1305.6714]
- $\gamma = \pm i$ corresponds to spacetime connections (no miracle, just a fact)

In my current opinion, the explanation is somehow hidden in the connection corresponding to a spacetime connection for $\gamma = \pm i$

- Bug in the quantisation for real gamma?
- Signature of spacetime not appreciated?
- If yes, we are rather lucky that the “analytic continuation” seems to work
- Other *hard* arguments for using spacetime connections?

Outline

- 1 Entropy calculation: Basic ingredients (in 3+1 dimensions)
- 2 Review of some recent results
- 3 Open(?) questions
- 4 **Wrap-up**

Wrap-up: New results

- Dimension-independent derivation
 - ▶ Higher-dimensional Chern-Simons theory or bi-normals
 - ▶ Counting reduces to 3 + 1-dimensional case
- Wald entropy for generalised gravity theories
 - ▶ Area \rightarrow Waldentropy as fundamental operator
- Comparison with large spin semiclassical effective action, $\gamma = \pm i$
 - ▶ $S = A/4G$ and imaginary part of GR action correct in asymptotics
- Independence of the type of boundary
 - ▶ Boundary condition and symplectic structure as for isolated horizons

Wrap-up: Questions

- Relation to Bekenstein-Hawking entropy
 - ▶ Tracing \rightarrow thermality / relation satisfactory?
- How do we want to compute (black hole) entropy?
 - ▶ Temperature / state counting / classical input / effective action
- General boundaries: What is the opinion towards this result?
 - ▶ *Physical* boundaries? “Special” (pulled back) connection on boundary?
- Why does the analytic continuation to $\gamma = \pm i$ work?
 - ▶ Bug in the quantisation for real gamma? / Signature of spacetime?

Wrap-up: Questions

- Relation to Bekenstein-Hawking entropy
 - ▶ Tracing \rightarrow thermality / relation satisfactory?
- How do we want to compute (black hole) entropy?
 - ▶ Temperature / state counting / classical input / effective action
- General boundaries: What is the opinion towards this result?
 - ▶ *Physical* boundaries? “Special” (pulled back) connection on boundary?
- Why does the analytic continuation to $\gamma = \pm i$ work?
 - ▶ Bug in the quantisation for real gamma? / Signature of spacetime?

Thank you for your attention!