## Holographic entanglement entropy in the FLRW universe

Toshifumi Noumi (U Tokyo-Komaba)

Based on a paper in preparation

w/Fumiya Sano (Science Tokyo & IBS) and Yuki Suzuki (YITP)

February 20th 2025 @ YITP

Why Quantum Gravity & Information in Expanding Universe? (motivation from a cosmologist point of view)

- 1. How time emerges in quantum gravity?
- 2. Can we derive **consistency conditions on cosmological scenarios** in the same spirit as bootstrap, landscape/swampland etc?

As an introduction part of this talk,

let me spend some time to share the second motivation with you all.

# Cosmology

Progress in observational cosmology:

- We obtained a new eye, gravitational waves, of the universe!
- There are many ongoing/future observations & experiments!

(GW, CMB pol., Large Scale Structure, 21cm, tabletop experiments for DM, ...)









LISA

DESI

# Cosmology

Progress in observational cosmology:

- We obtained a new eye, gravitational waves, of the universe!
- There are many ongoing/future observations & experiments!

(GW, CMB pol., Large Scale Structure, 21cm, tabletop experiments for DM, ...)

Status of the theory side:

- SUSY and WIMP were told to be promising (in my undergrad age).
- But now there is a vast space of cosmological models (ex. DM).
- → Intuitions/lore of QFT (on flat space) do not work anymore?
- → We need new guiding principles in theoretical cosmology!

Recent attempts to **bootstrap approaches for cosmology** 

# S-matrix/conformal bootstrap

#### S-matrix bootstrap

- Unitarity has been an important principle for UV completion of EFTs.
- Together w/analyticity, an infinite set of bounds on scattering amplitudes.

\* Positivity bounds on 4pt forward amplitudes [..., Adams et al '06, ...]

- Non-forward amplitudes w/crossing symmetry
  [Bellazzini et al '20, Caron-Huot et al '20, Tolley et al '20, Sinha et al '20, Arkani-Hamed et al '20, ...]
- \* Gravitational EFT [Tokuda et al '20, Caron-Huot et al '22, ...]
- Application to particle pheno (ex. SMEFT) and cosmology (ex. inflation, DE)

#### <u>Conformal bootstrap + AdS/CFT</u>

Similar bounds on AdS scattering [Hartman et al '15, ..., Caron-Huot et al '21, ...]

\* This motivated cosmologists to explore **bootstrap in expanding universe!** 

# Towards bootstrap in de Sitter spacetime

Unitarity has been important also in phenomenology of inflation.

- Positivity bounds on 4pt functions in multi-field inflation [Suyama-Yamaguchi '07]
- Non-analyticity of inflationary correlators as a probe of new particles [Chen-Wang '09, Baumann-Green '11, **TN**-Yamaguchi-Yokoyama '12, Arkani Hamed-Maldacena '15, ...]
- Further studies on symmetries and non-analyticity of inflationary correlators with catch copy "cosmological bootstrap" [Arkani Hamed-Baumann-Lee-Pimentel '18, ...]

The studies so far are mostly on symmetry and non-analyticity, but the community is aiming at implementing notion of UV completion. ※ dS/CFT gives some inspiration, but bulk unitarity ≠ boundary unitarity → dS bootstrap = conformal bootstrap w/modified notion of unitarity Sounds good so far,

but current studies rely on full Lorentz/AdS/dS symmetries.

Actually, phenomenologically interesting situations in cosmology

often come with spontaneous breaking of boost symmetry.

# Boost symmetry breaking in cosmology

ex. EFT of inflation (EFT of quantum fluctuations during inflation)  

$$\mathscr{L} = -M_{\text{Pl}}^{2}\dot{H}(\partial_{\mu}\pi)^{2} + \alpha \left(-2\dot{\pi} + (\partial_{\mu}\pi)^{2}\right)^{2} + \beta \left(-2\dot{\pi} + (\partial_{\mu}\pi)^{2}\right)^{3} + \dots$$

$$\approx \frac{\delta\phi}{\dot{\phi}} \text{ is NG boson for time diffs that nonlinearly realize boosts.}$$

$$* \text{Necessary for non-Gaussianities within the scope of near-future observations.}$$

There are some attempts to S-matrix w/o boost symmetry,

but complication of analyticity is an obstruction [Hui et al '23, Creminelli et al '23].

**Necessary to explore alternative approaches for less symmetric setups!** 

# Bootstrap w/o boost symmetry?

# density matrix & equal-time correlators

- Perturbative unitarity from purity bounds [Pueyo-Goodhew-McCulloch-Pajer '24]
- Analytic structure of equal-time correlators in spatial momentum space [Hui-Nicolis-Podo-Zhou '25]

# Thermodynamic & quantum information perspective of gravity?
- Causality constraints on BH thermo & similarity w/weak gravity [Hamada-TN-Shiu '18, ..., Abe-TN-Medevielle-Yoshimura to appear]
- Toward QG constraints from holography [ex. Harlow-Ooguri '18]
\* consistency of gravity/geometry ≈ consistency of thermo & info
Is holography for expanding universe useful in this context too? It is important to explore what we can learn about cosmology *if* we succeed in establishing holography for the universe.

For this purpose,

it is mandatory to extend dS holography to more general FLRW universe,even at a bottom-up approach level (e.g., assuming the RT formula).cf. ER = EPR in closed FRW universe [Franken-Partouche-Rondeau-Toumbas '23]

# de Sitter holography



### <u>Contents</u>

1. Motivation

2. dS holography

3. FLRW holography

4. Summary and discussion

# Setup

# Flat de Sitter universe

Consider flat de Sitter universe in 3 dimensions.



 $\approx$  constant- $\eta$  spatial slice



The event horizon of an observer at r = 0 is  $r = |\eta|$ .

We consider two types of symmetric embedding of a 1+1 dim holographic screen.

## Horizon type scenario

Consider flat de Sitter universe in 3 dimensions.



 $\times$  constant- $\eta$  spatial slice



#### Horizon type scenario

Holographic screen is located at  $r = \lambda |\eta|$ .

 $\approx \lambda$ : screen size relative to horizon size

st shift symmetry of the spatial coordinate  $\phi$ 

# Half holography type scenario

Consider flat de Sitter universe in 3 dimensions.



 $\times$  constant- $\eta$  spatial slice



#### Half holography type scenario

Holographic screen cuts the flat universe in half.\* shift symmetry of the spatial coordinate *x* 

Holographic entanglement entropy in half holography type scenario

## Half holography type scenario (1/2)

Consider a subregion  $-r_* \leq x \leq r_*$  at a time  $\eta = -1$ .



Assuming the RT formula,

holographic EE is determined by geodesic length of the two boundary points. \* Boundary points are connected by a spatial geodesic only when  $r_* < 1$ ,

for which we have 
$$S = \frac{1}{4G} \arccos \left[1 - 2r_*^2\right]$$
.

\* Otherwise, the RT curve is a union of time-like & spatial curves. [Kawamoto-Ruan-Suzuki-Takayanagi '23]

### Half holography type scenario (2/2)



The holographic EE is convex, so that subadditivity is violated.

More explicitly, we find 
$$\frac{\partial^2 S}{\partial r_*^2} = \frac{1}{2G} \frac{r_*}{(1-r_*^2)^{\frac{3}{2}}} > 0$$

 $\rightarrow$  no standard holographic dual in this scenario.

\* For symmetric embedding,  $S_{AB} \leq S_A + S_B \iff \frac{\partial^2 S(\ell)}{\partial \ell^2} \leq 0.$ 

 $\approx 4G = 1$  in the plot

Holographic entanglement entropy in horizon type scenario

### Horizon type scenario (1/2)

Consider a subregion  $0 \le \phi \le \phi_*$ ,  $r = \lambda$  at a time  $\eta = -1$ .



Geodesic length depends only on boundary points, so that we can recycle the previous analysis simply by the replacement  $r_* \rightarrow \lambda \sin \frac{\phi_*}{2}$ .

Holographic EE and its second derivative in the subsystem size read

$$S = \frac{1}{4G} \arccos\left[1 - 2\lambda^2 \sin^2 \frac{\phi_*}{2}\right], \quad \frac{\partial^2 S}{\partial \phi_*^2} = -\frac{(1 - \lambda^2)}{8G} \frac{\sqrt{\lambda^2 \sin^2 \frac{\phi_*}{2}}}{(1 - \lambda^2 \sin^2 \frac{\phi_*}{2})^{\frac{3}{2}}}$$

**\*** Concave when the screen is on or inside the horizon  $\lambda \leq 1$ .

#### Horizon type scenario (2/2)



- Subadditivity is satisfied in the horizon type scenario when the holographic screen is on or inside the horizon.
- It is saturated when the screen is on the horizon.

#### <u>summary</u>

Subadditivity is satisfied only in the horizon type scenario with  $\lambda \leq 1$ .

\* The same conclusion holds for closed/open de Sitter universe too.

Q. What about more general FLRW universes,

for which apparent horizon ≠ event horizon?

### <u>Contents</u>

1. Motivation

2. dS holography

3. FLRW holography

4. Summary and discussion

### Flat FLRW universe

Consider a flat universe in 3 dimensions:  $ds^2 = a(\eta)^2 \left[ -d\eta^2 + dr^2 + r^2 d\theta^2 \right]$ .

\* The apparent horizon has a speed of light,

so that its location  $r = r_H$  is determined by the Hubble law:  $\dot{a} r_H = \frac{a'}{a} r_H = 1$ .

For concreteness, we assume the universe is filled with a perfect fluid

of constant equation of state  $w = \frac{p}{\rho}$  ( $\rho > 0$ : energy density, p: pressure).

\* Scale factor enjoys a simple power law  $a \propto |\eta|^{1/w}$ , so that  $r_H = w\eta$ .

 $\text{ & Accelerating expansion for } w < 0: \ ds^2 = (-\eta)^{2/w} \left[ -d\eta^2 + dr^2 + r^2 d\theta^2 \right] \ (-\infty < \eta < 0).$ 

× Null energy condition is satisfied when  $w \ge -1$  (dS: w = -1).

In the following I focus on accelerating universes (w < 0) to see the difference of NEC satisfying and violating universe.

\* See our coming paper for decelerating universe and closed/open universe.

# (1) Accelerating universe satisfying NEC $-1 \le w < 0$

### Apparent horizons vs event horizon



When the null energy condition is satisfied (-1 < w < 0),

the apparent horizon is inside the event horizon of an observer at the origin.

Half holography type scenario

# Half holography type scenario (1/2)

Assume that the holographic screen cuts the flat universe in half and consider a subregion  $-r_* \le x \le r_*$  at a time  $\eta = -1$ .



- Boundary points are connected by a spatial geodesic as long as  $r_* \leq 1$ .
- Subsystem size  $r_*$  and holographic EE *S* as a function of turning time  $\eta_0$ :  $r_* = \frac{\sqrt{\pi}\Gamma\left(\frac{2+w}{2}\right)}{\Gamma\left(\frac{1+w}{2}\right)} \eta_0 + {}_2F_1\left[\frac{1}{2}, \frac{w}{2}; \frac{2+w}{2}; (-\eta_0)^{-2/w}\right]$   $S = \frac{1}{4G} (w\eta_0)^{1+\frac{1}{w}} \left[\frac{\sqrt{\pi}\Gamma\left(\frac{2+w}{2}\right)}{\Gamma\left(\frac{3+w}{2}\right)} - \frac{(-\eta_0)^{-1-\frac{2}{w}}}{1+\frac{w}{2}} {}_2F_1\left[\frac{1}{2}, \frac{2+w}{2}; \frac{4+w}{2}; (-\eta_0)^{-2/w}\right]\right]$

## Half holography type scenario (2/2)



Horizon type scenario

#### Horizon type scenario (1/2)

Assume that the holographic screen is at  $r = \lambda |w|$ and consider a subregion  $0 \le \phi \le \phi_*$  at a time  $\eta = -1$ .  $\therefore \lambda$  is screen size relative to apparent horizon size.



Geodesic length depends only on boundary points, so that we can recycle the previous analysis simply by the replacement  $r_* \rightarrow \lambda |w| \sin \frac{\phi_*}{2}$ .

#### Horizon type scenario (2/2)



Subadditivity is satisfied in the horizon type scenario
when holographic screen is on or inside apparent horizon.
※ This can be checked analytically for general w ≥ -1,
e.g., by performing the small φ<sub>\*</sub> expansion.

# (2) Accelerating universe violating NEC w < -1

### Apparent horizons vs event horizon



When the null energy condition is violated (w < -1),

the apparent horizon is outside the event horizon of an observer at the origin.

Half holography type scenario

# Half holography type scenario (1/3)

Assume that the holographic screen cuts the flat universe in half and consider a subregion  $-r_* \le x \le r_*$  at a time  $\eta = -1$ .



-  $r_*$  and holographic EE *S* as a function of turning time  $\eta_0$ enjoy the same analytic expression as the  $-1 \le w < 0$  case.

- The geodesic is not unique in some range with  $r_* \ge 1$  (next page).

# Half holography type scenario (2/3)



subsystem size vs turning time

 $\approx$  plot is for w = -2

# Half holography type scenario (3/3)



Subadditivity is violated due to the transition at the event horizon scale  $r_* = 1$ .

 $\rightarrow$  no standard holographic dual in this scenario.

Horizon type scenario

#### Horizon type scenario (1/2)

Assume that the holographic screen is at  $r = \lambda |w|$ and consider a subregion  $0 \le \phi \le \phi_*$  at a time  $\eta = -1$ .  $\therefore \lambda$  is screen size relative to apparent horizon size.



Geodesic length depends only on boundary points, so that we can recycle the previous analysis simply by the replacement  $r_* \rightarrow \lambda |w| \sin \frac{\phi_*}{2}$ .

### Horizon type scenario (2/2)



Subadditivity is satisfied in the horizon type scenario when holographic screen is on or inside **event horizon**.

 $\approx 4G = 1$  in the plot

### <u>Contents</u>

1. Motivation

2. dS holography

3. FLRW holography

4. Summary and discussion

# Bootstrap for less symmetric cosmological scenarios is important.
→ Can holography & quantum information offer a new approach?
\* consistency of info ≈ consistency of geometry (numerically calculable).
\* Discussion: is brane world holography useful to study landscape/swampland?
# We studied analogue of static patch & half holography in 3D flat universes.
Holographic EE satisfies subadditivity in horizon like scenario if the screen is on/inside apparent horizon (NEC satisfying case w ≥ -1)

event horizon (NEC violating case w < -1)

\* Transition at the horizon scale was relevant for w < -1.

\* Consistent with [Franken et al'23] based on Bousso bound perspective

# Future directions

- Can we derive NEC by studying consistency of other quantities?
- In cosmology, dominant components of energy density are not necessarily dominant components of (typically coarse-grained) entropy density.
   How such "hidden" matter entropy affects the story?