

# Quantum Information Theory of The Gravitational Anomaly

Masataka Watanabe

Kavli Institute for the Physics and Mathematics of the Universe  
Tokyo University Institutes for Advanced Study

based on work in progress with:  
Simeon Hellerman (IPMU)  
Domenico Orlando (Bern U.)

Asian Winter School of Strings  
OIST  
Okinawa, Japan  
9 Jan., 2016

# Entanglement Entropy

# Entanglement Entropy

- ▶ Everybody likes **entanglement entropy**.

# Entanglement Entropy

- ▶ Everybody likes **entanglement entropy**.
- ▶ It's interesting.

# Entanglement Entropy

- ▶ Everybody likes **entanglement entropy**.
- ▶ It's interesting.
- ▶ It's *just* linear algebra.

# Entanglement Entropy

- ▶ Everybody likes **entanglement entropy**.
- ▶ It's interesting.
- ▶ It's *just* linear algebra.
- ▶ ○ ○ ○ ○ ○ ○

# Entanglement Entropy

- ▶ Everybody likes **entanglement entropy**.
- ▶ It's interesting.
- ▶ It's *just* linear algebra.
- ▶ ○ ○ ○ ○ ○ ○
- ▶ Today I want to explain something interesting about **entanglement**.

# Entanglement Entropy

- ▶ Everybody likes **entanglement entropy**.
- ▶ It's interesting.
- ▶ It's *just* linear algebra.
- ▶ ○ ○ ○ ○ ○ ○
- ▶ Today I want to explain something interesting about **entanglement**.
- ▶ Something that is **counter-intuitive**... something that will **horrify** you.



# Entanglement Entropy

- ▶ Everybody likes **entanglement entropy**.
- ▶ It's interesting.
- ▶ It's *just* linear algebra.
- ▶ ○ ○ ○ ○ ○ ○
- ▶ Today I want to explain something interesting about **entanglement**.
- ▶ Something that is **counter-intuitive**... something that will **horrify** you.

# Entanglement Entropy

- ▶ How about this:

# Entanglement Entropy

- ▶ How about this: Entanglement does not exist.

# Entanglement Entropy

- ▶ How about this: **Entanglement does not exist.**
- ▶ It is not a consistent concept.

# Entanglement Entropy

- ▶ How about this: Entanglement does not exist.
- ▶ It is not a consistent concept.
- ▶ ○ ○ ○ ○ ○ ○

# Entanglement Entropy

- ▶ How about this: **Entanglement does not exist.**
- ▶ It is not a consistent concept.
- ▶ ○ ○ ○ ○ ○ ○
- ▶ Okay, I admit. *Not always* are they inconsistent.

# Entanglement Entropy

- ▶ How about this: **Entanglement does not exist.**
- ▶ It is not a consistent concept.
- ▶ ○ ○ ○ ○ ○ ○
- ▶ Okay, I admit. *Not always* are they inconsistent.
- ▶ **But** generally in **even** dimensions there is an **obstruction** that makes entanglement between regions **ill-defined**.

# Entanglement Entropy

- ▶ How about this: **Entanglement does not exist.**
- ▶ It is not a consistent concept.
- ▶ ○ ○ ○ ○ ○ ○
- ▶ Okay, I admit. *Not always* are they inconsistent.
- ▶ **But** generally in **even** dimensions there is an **obstruction** that makes entanglement between regions **ill-defined**.
- ▶ That obstruction is given by the **gravitational anomaly**.



# Entanglement Entropy

- ▶ How about this: **Entanglement does not exist.**
- ▶ It is not a consistent concept.
- ▶ ○ ○ ○ ○ ○ ○
- ▶ Okay, I admit. *Not always* are they inconsistent.
- ▶ **But** generally in **even** dimensions there is an **obstruction** that makes entanglement between regions **ill-defined**.
- ▶ That obstruction is given by the **gravitational anomaly**.

# Tensor Factorization

- ▶ Imagine we have two regions,  $A$  and  $B$ ,  $A \cup B = \Sigma$

# Tensor Factorization

- ▶ Imagine we have two regions,  $A$  and  $B$ ,  $A \cup B = \Sigma$
- ▶ In order to define entanglement, we have to have a **tensor factorization**,  $\mathcal{H}_A \otimes \mathcal{H}_B = \mathcal{H}_\Sigma$ .

# Tensor Factorization

- ▶ Imagine we have two regions,  $A$  and  $B$ ,  $A \cup B = \Sigma$
- ▶ In order to define entanglement, we have to have a **tensor factorization**,  $\mathcal{H}_A \otimes \mathcal{H}_B = \mathcal{H}_\Sigma$ .
- ▶ We want to prove this is not always the case..., so let's suppose that this holds in every theory.

# Tensor Factorization

- ▶ Imagine we have two regions,  $A$  and  $B$ ,  $A \cup B = \Sigma$
- ▶ In order to define entanglement, we have to have a **tensor factorization**,  $\mathcal{H}_A \otimes \mathcal{H}_B = \mathcal{H}_\Sigma$ .
- ▶ We want to prove this is not always the case..., so let's suppose that this holds in every theory.

# Tensor Factorization

- ▶ For simplicity consider that the Hamiltonian on  $\Sigma$  is already conformal.

# Tensor Factorization

- ▶ For simplicity consider that the Hamiltonian on  $\Sigma$  is already conformal.
- ▶ By taking a *suitably regularized partial trace* on  $B$ , you get a Hamiltonian on region  $A$ .

# Tensor Factorization

- ▶ For simplicity consider that the Hamiltonian on  $\Sigma$  is already conformal.
- ▶ By taking a *suitably regularized partial trace* on  $B$ , you get a Hamiltonian on region  $A$ .
- ▶ (Used a heat-kernel regularization,  $\text{Tr}(e^{-\epsilon H_{\Sigma}} \mathcal{O})$ )



# Tensor Factorization

- ▶ For simplicity consider that the Hamiltonian on  $\Sigma$  is already conformal.
- ▶ By taking a *suitably regularized partial trace* on  $B$ , you get a Hamiltonian on region  $A$ .
- ▶ (Used a heat-kernel regularization,  $\text{Tr}(e^{-\epsilon H_{\Sigma}} \mathcal{O})$ )
- ▶ Boundary you get flows to a conformal boundary due to *Friedan and Konechny's hypothesis* on  $g$ -function.

# Tensor Factorization

- ▶ For simplicity consider that the Hamiltonian on  $\Sigma$  is already conformal.
- ▶ By taking a *suitably regularized partial trace* on  $B$ , you get a Hamiltonian on region  $A$ .
- ▶ (Used a heat-kernel regularization,  $\text{Tr}(e^{-\epsilon H_{\Sigma}} \mathcal{O})$ )
- ▶ Boundary you get flows to a conformal boundary due to *Friedan and Konechny's hypothesis* on *g-function*.
- ▶ This defines a **BCFT** on  $A$ .

# Tensor Factorization

- ▶ For simplicity consider that the Hamiltonian on  $\Sigma$  is already conformal.
- ▶ By taking a *suitably regularized partial trace* on  $B$ , you get a Hamiltonian on region  $A$ .
- ▶ (Used a heat-kernel regularization,  $\text{Tr}(e^{-\epsilon H_{\Sigma}} \mathcal{O})$ )
- ▶ Boundary you get flows to a conformal boundary due to *Friedan and Konechny's hypothesis* on *g-function*.
- ▶ This defines a **BCFT** on  $A$ .
- ▶ **Factorization**  $\Rightarrow$  **Boundary**

# Tensor Factorization

- ▶ For simplicity consider that the Hamiltonian on  $\Sigma$  is already conformal.
- ▶ By taking a *suitably regularized partial trace* on  $B$ , you get a Hamiltonian on region  $A$ .
- ▶ (Used a heat-kernel regularization,  $\text{Tr}(e^{-\epsilon H_{\Sigma}} \mathcal{O})$ )
- ▶ Boundary you get flows to a conformal boundary due to *Friedan and Konechny's hypothesis* on *g-function*.
- ▶ This defines a **BCFT** on  $A$ .
- ▶ **Factorization**  $\Rightarrow$  **Boundary**

- ▶ In the presence of a **boundary** you have

$$T = \tilde{T} \text{ at the boundary.}$$

The two chiral stress tensors are equal at the boundary.

- ▶ In the presence of a **boundary** you have

$$T = \tilde{T} \text{ at the boundary.}$$

The two chiral stress tensors are equal at the boundary.

- ▶ In radial quantization language, this is

$$(L_n - \tilde{L}_{-n})|B\rangle = 0$$

where  $|B\rangle$  is the **boundary state**.

- ▶ In the presence of a **boundary** you have

$$T = \tilde{T} \text{ at the boundary.}$$

The two chiral stress tensors are equal at the boundary.

- ▶ In radial quantization language, this is

$$(L_n - \tilde{L}_{-n})|B\rangle = 0$$

where  $|B\rangle$  is the **boundary state**.

# No gravitational anomaly

- ▶ At this point this is straightforward to prove

$$(c_L - c_R) |B\rangle = 0,$$

meaning there is **no gravitational anomaly**.



# No gravitational anomaly

- ▶ At this point this is straightforward to prove

$$(c_L - c_R) |B\rangle = 0,$$

meaning there is **no gravitational anomaly**.

- ▶ There is no such thing as **boundary condition**, and thus **factorization/entanglement**, for a CFT with **unequal central charges**.

# No gravitational anomaly

- ▶ At this point this is straightforward to prove

$$(c_L - c_R) |B\rangle = 0,$$

meaning there is **no gravitational anomaly**.

- ▶ There is no such thing as **boundary condition**, and thus **factorization/entanglement**, for a CFT with **unequal central charges**.
- ▶ The logic flow is as follows:

Factorization  $\Rightarrow$  Boundary  $\Rightarrow$  No gravitational anomaly

# No gravitational anomaly

- ▶ At this point this is straightforward to prove

$$(c_L - c_R) |B\rangle = 0,$$

meaning there is **no gravitational anomaly**.

- ▶ There is no such thing as **boundary condition**, and thus **factorization/entanglement**, for a CFT with **unequal central charges**.
- ▶ The logic flow is as follows:

Factorization  $\Rightarrow$  Boundary  $\Rightarrow$  No gravitational anomaly

# Generalised Nielsen-Ninomiya theorem

- ▶ I will give one of the important applications of the above theorem.

# Generalised Nielsen-Ninomiya theorem

- ▶ I will give one of the important applications of the above theorem.
- ▶ If the 2D CFT has a lattice Hamiltonian regulator, the Hilbert space *trivially tensor factorizes*.

# Generalised Nielsen-Ninomiya theorem

- ▶ I will give one of the important applications of the above theorem.
- ▶ If the 2D CFT has a lattice Hamiltonian regulator, the Hilbert space *trivially tensor factorizes*.
- ▶ So we have

Lattice  $\Rightarrow$  Factorization

# Generalised Nielsen-Ninomiya theorem

- ▶ I will give one of the important applications of the above theorem.
- ▶ If the 2D CFT has a lattice Hamiltonian regulator, the Hilbert space *trivially tensor factorizes*.
- ▶ So we have

Lattice  $\Rightarrow$  Factorization  $\Rightarrow$  Boundary  $\Rightarrow$  No gravitational anomaly

# Generalised Nielsen-Ninomiya theorem

- ▶ I will give one of the important applications of the above theorem.
- ▶ If the 2D CFT has a lattice Hamiltonian regulator, the Hilbert space *trivially tensor factorizes*.
- ▶ So we have

Lattice  $\Rightarrow$  Factorization  $\Rightarrow$  Boundary  $\Rightarrow$  No gravitational anomaly



# Generalised Nielsen-Ninomiya theorem

- ▶ Hence, **gravitational anomalous theory** does not allow **lattice regulators**.

# Generalised Nielsen-Ninomiya theorem

- ▶ Hence, **gravitational anomalous theory** does not allow **lattice regulators**.
- ▶ In the system with chiral fermions only, this means that we must have an **equal number** of left- and right-moving chiral fermions.

# Generalised Nielsen-Ninomiya theorem

- ▶ Hence, **gravitational anomalous theory** does not allow **lattice regulators**.
- ▶ In the system with chiral fermions only, this means that we must have an **equal number** of left- and right-moving chiral fermions.
- ▶ This is the famous **Nielsen-Ninomiya theorem**!

# Generalised Nielsen-Ninomiya theorem

- ▶ Hence, **gravitational anomalous theory** does not allow **lattice regulators**.
- ▶ In the system with chiral fermions only, this means that we must have an **equal number** of left- and right-moving chiral fermions.
- ▶ This is the famous **Nielsen-Ninomiya theorem**!

# Conclusions

- ▶ The gravitational anomaly obstructs the notion of entanglement.

# Conclusions

- ▶ The gravitational anomaly obstructs the notion of entanglement.
- ▶ You can also extend the result to nonconformal QFT using left- and right-moving  $c$ -functions.

# Conclusions

- ▶ The gravitational anomaly obstructs the notion of entanglement.
- ▶ You can also extend the result to nonconformal QFT using left- and right-moving  $c$ -functions.
- ▶ You can most probably reduce gravitational anomaly polynomial in 6D/4D/etc. to 2D to have a similar theorem in those dimensions.

# Conclusions

- ▶ The gravitational anomaly obstructs the notion of entanglement.
- ▶ You can also extend the result to nonconformal QFT using left- and right-moving  $c$ -functions.
- ▶ You can most probably reduce gravitational anomaly polynomial in 6D/4D/etc. to 2D to have a similar theorem in those dimensions.