

On Information Theory, Spectral Geometry and Quantum Gravity

Achim Kempf, Robert Martin
Departments of Applied Mathematics and Physics
University of Waterloo
Waterloo, Ontario N2L 3G1, Canada

We show that there exists a deep link between the two disciplines of information theory and spectral geometry. This allows us to obtain new results on a well known quantum gravity motivated natural ultraviolet cutoff which describes an upper bound on the spatial density of information. Concretely, we show that, together with an infrared cutoff, this natural ultraviolet cutoff beautifully reduces the path integral of quantum field theory on curved space to a finite number of ordinary integrations. We then show, in particular, that the subsequent removal of the infrared cutoff is safe.

PACS numbers: 04.60.-m, 04.62.+v, 03.67.-a, 04.60.Pp

Well-known quantum gravity arguments indicate the existence of a natural ultraviolet (UV) cutoff in nature. In this context, there is much debate as to whether spacetime is fundamentally discrete or continuous. Spacetime discreteness would naturally regularize quantum field theoretic UV divergencies but general relativity naturally lives on a differentiable spacetime manifold. As was first pointed out in [1], the presence of an information theoretic natural UV cutoff would allow spacetime to be in a certain sense both discrete and continuous: spacetime would be described as differentiable manifold while physical fields possess a merely finite density of degrees of freedom. In this scenario, when a field is known on an arbitrary discrete lattice of points whose spacing is at least as tight as some finite value, e.g., at the Planck scale, then the field is reconstructible at all points of the manifold. In this way, actions, fields and their equations of motion can be written as living on a smooth spacetime manifold, displaying, for example, symmetries such as Killing vector fields, while, completely equivalently, the same theory can also be written on any sufficiently dense lattice, thereby displaying its UV finiteness. Continuous external symmetries such as Killing vector fields are not broken in this scenario because there is no preference among the lattices of sufficient proper density. This type of natural UV cutoff could be a fundamental property of spacetime or it could be an effective description of an underlying structure within a quantum gravity theory such as string theory or loop quantum gravity. Indeed, this type of natural UV cutoff has been shown to arise, see [1], from generalized uncertainty relations of string theory and general studies of quantum gravity [2].

The mathematics of continuous functions which can be reconstructed from their sample values $\{f(t_n)\}$ on any discrete set of points $\{t_n\}$ of sufficiently tight spacing is a well-developed field, called sampling theory, and it plays a central role in information theory. Shannon introduced sampling theory in his seminal work [3] as the link between discrete and continuous representations of information. For example, the basic Shannon sampling theorem applies to functions, f , which possess only fre-

quencies below some finite bandwidth Ω , i.e., which are bandlimited. The theorem states that it suffices to know the discrete values $\{f(t_n)\}$ at a set of equidistant points t_n whose spacing $t_{n+1} - t_n$ is smaller than $1/2\Omega$ to be able to *perfectly* reconstruct $f(t)$ for all t :

$$f(t) = \sum_{n \in \mathbb{Z}} f(t_n) \frac{\sin(\Omega(t - t_n))}{\Omega(t - t_n)} \quad (1)$$

Sampling theory for functions of one variable is a mature field, [4], with countless applications from communication engineering to pure mathematics. Sampling theory is much less developed for the case of bandlimited functions in R^n , though Landau [5] established the average spacing which sample points $\{t_n\}$ must have if the sample values $\{f(t_n)\}$ are to allow the stable reconstruction of bandlimited functions $f(t)$ for all $t \in R^n$. Of interest for our purposes is of course the generalization of sampling theory for functions on generic non-compact curved spaces, a field that is so far only at its beginning, [6, 7].

In this Letter, we find a powerful new tool for developing sampling theory on generic non-compact curved spaces, namely a deep relationship between sampling theory and spectral geometry. In particular, we use the new tool to derive results on quantum field theory (QFT) on generic non-compact curved spaces with the sampling theoretic UV cutoff. Our aim is to model the behavior of QFT, on a curved background spacetime, as the Planck scale is approached from lower energies.

We begin by considering the path integral formulation of euclidean signature QFT. The spectrum of the Laplacian is an invariant of the manifold and therefore cutting off the spectrum of the Laplacian, say close to the Planck scale, is to covariantly project the Hilbert space of square integrable functions down to a Hilbert space of bandlimited functions. This UV cutoff could arise in various ways depending on the underlying theory of quantum gravity. For example, the full effective action could contain a power series in the Laplacian with a finite radius of convergence, see [7]. The subspace of covariantly Ω -bandlimited functions on a curved manifold M

is then defined as $B(M, \Omega) := P_{[0, \Omega^2]}(-\Delta)L^2(M)$. Here, $P_{[0, \Omega^2]}(-\Delta)$ is the projector onto the subspace spanned by the eigenfunctions to $-\Delta$ whose eigenvalues lie in the interval $[0, \Omega^2]$. To be precise, using the functional calculus for self-adjoint operators, $P_{[0, \Omega^2]}(-\Delta)$ is the characteristic function of the interval $[0, \Omega^2]$ with the Laplacian as its argument.

While, therefore, it is straightforward to define bandlimitation covariantly, the fundamental problem is to show that these bandlimited functions can be reconstructed from their discrete samples if those samples are taken at a suitable average spacing that is finite. Our strategy for developing sampling theory on noncompact curved spaces is to reconsider the very simplest instances of sampling theory and to build up the case of sampling on generic noncompact curved spaces from there. To this end, consider the simple case of an N -dimensional function space, F , spanned by some generic basis functions $\{b_i(x)\}_{i=1\dots N}$, i.e., all f obey $f(x) = \sum_{i=1}^N \lambda_i b_i(x)$ for some $\{\lambda_i\}$. There automatically holds a sampling theorem for this function space: assume we know of a function $f \in F$ only its amplitudes $a_n = f(x_n)$, for $n = 1\dots N$ at some N generically chosen points x_n , i.e.,

$$f(x_n) = a_n = \sum_{i=1}^N \lambda_i b_i(x_n) \quad (2)$$

Then, Eq.2 generally allows us to determine the coefficients λ_i and therefore $f(x)$ for all x . This is because for generic basis functions b_i and sample points x_n the $N \times N$ matrix $B = (b_i(x_n))_{i,n=1\dots N}$ has a nonvanishing determinant and is therefore invertible, so that we obtain: $\lambda_i = \sum_{j=1}^N B_{ij}^{-1} a_j$ and therefore

$$f(x) = \sum_{n=1}^N f(x_n)G(x_n, x) \quad \text{for all } x$$

where the reconstruction kernel G reads: $G(x_n, x) = \sum_{i=1}^N B_{ni}^{-1} b_i(x)$. In practice, we are interested in sampling theory for infinite-dimensional function spaces. As we therefore let $N \rightarrow \infty$ the number of basis functions and correspondingly also the necessary number of sample points diverges. It depends crucially on the particulars of the set of basis functions whether or not for $N \rightarrow \infty$ these infinitely many sample points can still be chosen at a finite spacing, i.e., whether or not there is a sampling theorem for $N \rightarrow \infty$. Our aim now is to pursue this analysis on generic noncompact Riemannian manifolds.

Our starting point is the fact that the space of bandlimited functions on any Riemannian manifold K is as simple as described above, namely finite dimensional, if the manifold is compact: it is known, see [8], that, e.g., for Dirichlet and v. Neumann boundary conditions, the Laplacian Δ_K on K has only purely discrete eigenvalues, of finite multiplicity $0 \leq \lambda_1 < \lambda_2 < \dots \rightarrow \infty$ and without finite accumulation points. Thus, imposing a bandlimit

by cutting off the spectrum of the Laplacian on K implies that the space of bandlimited functions on K is in fact finite dimensional. Thus, the euclidean path integral on K consists of finitely many ordinary integrations.

For later reference we note a subtle point: the space of Ω -bandlimited functions on K , defined as $B(K, \Omega) := P_{[0, \Omega^2]}(-\Delta_K)L^2(K)$, is a subspace in $L^2(M)$ through $B(K, \Omega) = P_K P_{[0, \Omega^2]}(-\Delta_K)P_K L^2(M)$. Here, P_K is uniquely the projector of $L^2(M)$ onto $L^2(K)$ but $P_{[0, \Omega^2]}(-\Delta_K)$ depends on the choice of self-adjoint extension of Δ_K , i.e., on the choice of boundary conditions on K , a dependence which we will have to control.

Now our strategy for developing sampling theory on a non-compact Riemannian manifold M is to choose a sequence of nested compact sub-manifolds K_i , with the same dimension as M , such that their union is all of M . Physically speaking, we are imposing and removing an infrared (IR) cutoff. We know that the space of bandlimited functions on M is infinite dimensional, i.e., as we consider larger and larger portions K_i of M , the dimension N of the space of functions over K_i with the same bandlimit (say at the Plank scale) should grow and eventually diverge. (Thereby, the path integral will again become an infinite number of integrations.) The key question is how quickly the dimension N diverges as a function of the size of K_i . The speed of this growth determines if the sample density can be kept finite as the size of the portions K_i of M diverges. Here, we observe a deep connection to spectral geometry:

Spectral geometry studies the relationship between the size and shape of a Riemannian manifold and the spectra of differential operators, such as the Laplacian on that manifold. See, e.g., [8] or the well-known article ‘‘Can one hear the shape of a drum?’’ by Kac [9]. Spectral geometry therefore naturally encompasses the mathematics of general relativity, i.e., differential geometry, as well as that of quantum theory, i.e., functional analysis. Spectral geometry has found various applications from number theory to noncommutative geometry [10]. Of interest for us here is a fundamental result of spectral geometry called Weyl’s asymptotic formula for compact Riemannian manifolds: it states that the number, $N(\Omega, K)$, of the Laplacian’s eigenvalues below some value Ω^2 approaches

$$N(\Omega, K) \rightarrow \frac{\Omega^d V(B_d) V(K)}{(2\pi)^d} \quad (3)$$

for large Ω , where $V(K)$ is the volume of K and $V(B_d)$ is the volume of the d -dimensional unit ball in \mathbb{R}^d . For intuition, consider the special case of the Hamiltonian, $H = -\partial^2$, of the free particle on an interval of length L : the spectrum of H is proportional to $(n/L)^2$ and therefore the number $N(\Omega)$ of eigenvalues of H that are below some cutoff value Ω^2 is proportional to the size L of the interval: $N(\Omega, L) \propto \Omega L$. The same argument applies in \mathbb{R}^d . Weyl’s asymptotic formula shows that the spacing of eigenvalues behaves for large Ω the same way also on

curved manifolds. This is plausible since modes of large enough eigenvalues possess wavelengths that are short compared to the smallest length scale of the curvature.

Equation (3) provides exactly the information that we need, at least in the physically relevant case where the curvature and the UV cutoff are such that we are in the asymptotic regime where Weyl's formula holds. Intuitively, this is the case where the UV cutoff length scale is small compared to the smallest curvature length scale of the manifold. We will consider the alternate case at the end. Now Weyl's asymptotic formula shows that the dimension, N , of the space of bandlimited functions on K_i is proportional to the volume $V(K_i)$ of the compact submanifolds K_i . Thus, for larger and larger K_i , the spatial density $N(K_i)/V(K_i)$ of sample points does in fact remain finite, at $(\Omega/2\pi)^d$. Note that for flat space this agrees with Landau's value, as it should. The use of Weyl's formula on successively larger submanifolds of a generic non-compact curved manifold, i.e., while imposing and removing an IR cutoff, therefore provides us with a powerful new tool both for sampling theory and for QFT. On one hand, Weyl's formula should be very useful for further developing sampling theory on curved space, e.g., to investigate when a particular set of sample points is dense enough to allow the reconstruction of functions from those sample values. On known results, see [6]. On the other hand, the controlled imposing and removing of the IR cutoff in curved space, with the UV cutoff, can render the path integral finite and well-defined. In particular, because of the sampling property, the fields can be viewed as living on a differentiable manifold and also as living on any one of a set of sufficiently dense lattices, as discussed above. It is straightforward, for example, to calculate the representation of the derivatives on the lattice representations, as will be shown explicitly in a follow-up paper. While this approach so far only applies to the euclidean signature, it does cover the case of Wick-rotated spacetimes and the case of space-like hypersurfaces (in particular, if the d'Alembertian possesses an elliptic spatial part). It could therefore provide a covariant quantitative framework for holography.

At this point we need to consider, however, that, in the presence of a UV cutoff, it is in fact non-trivial to keep the imposition and subsequent removal of an IR cutoff under control. In the path integral of quantum field theory an IR cutoff on a curved manifold M is the restriction of the space of fields $L^2(M)$ to $L^2(K)$ where $K \subset M$ is a submanifold with compact closure. Removing the IR cutoff corresponds to considering a nested sequence of ever larger submanifolds K_i (whose closures are compact), and whose union is all of M . One possibility would be to impose the UV cutoff first, i.e., to restrict the space of fields that is being integrated over in the path integral to $B(M, \Omega)$, then to impose an IR cutoff, perform calculations, and finally remove the IR cutoff. Technically, we would work with the image of $L^2(M)$ under the op-

erators $P_n P_\Omega$ and then take the limit as $n \rightarrow \infty$, where P_Ω projects onto $B(M, \Omega)$ and P_n projects onto $L^2(K_n)$. This procedure, however, is not practical.

First we notice that the operator $P_n P_\Omega$ is not a projector because P_n and P_Ω do not commute. In fact, the range of $P_n P_\Omega$ is not closed and is therefore not the image of $L^2(M)$ under any projector. In the path integral it would not be straightforward to restrict the fields to this subspace so that the UV cutoff on the full manifold is regained as the IR cutoff is removed. In fact, the subspace resulting from imposing first the UV and then the IR cutoff does not obey an UV cutoff on K_n , i.e., performing the path integral will be no simpler than with no UV cutoff on the full manifold. The reason can be traced to the existence of superoscillations [11, 12]: even for the simple case where M is the real line, it is known that the space of Ω -bandlimited functions contains functions that oscillate arbitrarily fast on any given finite interval. This means that the projection of $B(\mathbb{R}, \Omega)$ onto the space of functions with support on a finite interval I does not yield a space $B(I, \Omega)$ of bandlimited functions on that finite interval. Instead, it yields a subspace which is dense in $L^2(I)$ [11], implying that imposing first an UV and then an IR cutoff yields an infinite dimensional subspace of functions even on the compact submanifolds K_n .

Instead, as we will now show, it is practical to first restrict the fields to $L^2(K_n)$ and then to cut off the spectrum of the Laplacian on K_n , namely, to project $L^2(M)$ with the projector $P_{K_n, \Omega} P_n = P_n P_{K_n, \Omega} P_n$ where $P_{K_n, \Omega} = P_n P_{[0, \Omega^2]}(\Delta_n) P_n$ projects onto $B(K_n, \Omega)$. This is what we did above and we know that the resulting space of fields, $B(K_n, \Omega)$ is a closed, finite-dimensional subspace, so that the path integral in the presence of both the UV and IR cutoffs is then simple, well defined and has the sampling property. We have to show, however, that the removal of the IR cutoff is under control, i.e., that one recovers the full theory as $n \rightarrow \infty$.

To this end, we need to consider the functionals on fields ϕ , such as the action functional $S[\phi]$ in the path integral formulation or such as the state functionals $\Psi[\phi]$ in the Schrödinger formulation of QFT. We have to show that the evaluation of such functionals in the full (i.e. only UV cutoff) theory agrees with the limit of evaluating these functionals on successively larger submanifolds. Concretely, if Ψ is such a functional then in order that the removal of the IR cutoff be safe we need that

$$\Psi[P_{K_n, \Omega} \phi] \rightarrow \Psi[P_\Omega \phi] \quad (4)$$

as $n \rightarrow \infty$ for any $\phi \in L^2(M)$. For any continuous Ψ , equation (4) will hold provided that $P_{K_n, \Omega} \phi \rightarrow P_\Omega \phi$ for all $\phi \in L^2(M)$, i.e., provided that we can show that $P_{K_n, \Omega}$ converges strongly to P_Ω . We claim that, in spite of the above-discussed superoscillations and in spite of the non-uniqueness of the boundary conditions (as well as self-adjoint extensions, eigenvectors and spectra) of the IR-cutoff Laplacians the following holds:

Proposition 1. *The projector P_Ω is the strong limit of the sequence of projectors $\{P_{K_n, \Omega}\}_n$, i.e., $P_{K_n, \Omega} \xrightarrow{s} P_\Omega$.*

Here, “ \xrightarrow{s} ” denotes convergence in the strong operator topology, [16]. The detailed proof is somewhat technical and lengthy and we therefore postpone its full presentation to the follow-up paper. Let us here however outline the method that we use for the proof. First, let M be any C^∞ complete Riemannian manifold and let $\{K_n\}$ be a sequence of open submanifolds $K_n \subset M$ which have compact closures and which are nested $K_n \subset K_{n+1}$ and which cover all of M , $\bigcup_n K_n = M$. Then, let Δ_n be any self-adjoint extension of the Laplacian on K_n . The Laplacians are unbounded operators and our first aim is to show, therefore, that for any bounded continuous function $g : \mathbb{R} \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ we have that $g(\Delta_n) \xrightarrow{s} g(\Delta)$. To this end, we prove a stronger proposition:

Proposition 2. *The Laplacian of M is the strong graph limit (and, equivalently, the strong resolvent limit) of any sequence of self-adjoint Laplacians Δ_n on the compact submanifolds K_n , i.e., $\Delta_n \xrightarrow{sg} \Delta$.*

In the literature, special cases for one dimension and for flat space are known, see [13, 14, 15]. Useful for our purpose here is the known result that if $A_n \xrightarrow{sg} A$ and if $a, b \in \mathbb{R}$, $a < b$ and a, b are not eigenvalues of A then $P_{(a,b)}(A_n)$ converges strongly to $P_{[a,b]}(A)$, [16]. Therefore, to prove proposition 1, namely that $P_{[0, \Omega^2]}(\Delta_n)$ converges strongly to P_Ω , we show that $\Delta_n \xrightarrow{sg} \Delta$. (We can assume that $0, \Omega^2$ are not eigenvalues of Δ , if need be by a suitable arbitrarily small change of the spectral interval that we project on.) With this result it is then straightforward to show that $P_{K_n, \Omega} = P_n P_{[0, \Omega^2]}(\Delta_n) P_n$ also converges strongly to P_Ω . In fact, the exact same proof also goes through for pseudo-Riemannian manifolds M for which the Dirac operator D , or the d’Alembertian, \square , is essentially self-adjoint on $C_0^\infty(M)$. That is, if K_n is a sequence of nested compact submanifolds of M as before then $P_n P_{(a,b)}(\square_n) P_n$ converges strongly to $P_{[a,b]}(\square)$ provided again that a, b are not eigenvalues of \square . The present work therefore lays the groundwork also for generalizing sampling theory to Lorentzian manifolds.

Let us now recall that so far we restricted attention to QFT on fixed background spacetimes which are curved only on length scales that are significantly larger than the UV cutoff scale. The alternate case where spacetime is curved on scales that are significantly smaller than the UV cutoff scale for particle fields is physically likely excluded by a natural UV cutoff on curvature, at about the same scale. The remaining case of a manifold with bounded curvature, say a bounded geometry, which possesses curvature at length scales down to close to the UV cutoff scale is clearly of interest and points toward the need to develop sampling theory for manifolds themselves, with a suitable UV cutoff for curvature then playing the role of the bandwidth. The problem of imposing

a curvature cutoff is nontrivial, especially on Lorentzian manifolds [17]. Sampling theory of geometry should then very interestingly intertwine, roughly speaking, the location and the amplitude of samples of the metric field.

The present sampling theoretic methods could be of interest in any theory of quantum gravity. For example, in the context of spin foam models, [18], the lattice representations of sampling theory could provide discretizations of the manifold which automatically preserve the dimension and topology of the manifold. The sampling theoretic UV cutoff has already been implemented in inflationary cosmology, [19], and it is therefore linked to a potential experimental window to Planck scale physics.

REFERENCES

-
- [1] A. Kempf, Phys. Rev. Lett. **85** 2873 (2000)
 - [2] D.J. Gross, P.F. Mende, Nucl. Phys. **B303**, 407 (1988), D. Amati, M. Ciafaloni, G. Veneziano, Phys. Lett. **B216** 41, (1989), A. Kempf, J. Math. Phys. **35** (9), 4483 (1994), D.V. Ahluwalia, Phys. Lett. **B339**, 301 (1994), M.-J. Jaeckel, S. Reynaud, Phys. Lett. **A185**, 143 (1994), E. Witten, Phys. Today **49** (4), 24 (1996), G. Amelino-Camelia, J. Ellis, N.E. Mavromatos, D.V. Nanopoulos, Mod. Phys. Lett. **A12** 2029 (1997)
 - [3] C.E. Shannon, *The mathematical theory of communication*, The University of Illinois Press (1949)
 - [4] J.J. Benedetto, P.J.S.G. Ferreira, *Modern Sampling Theory*, Birkäuser (2001)
 - [5] H.J. Landau, Acta Mathematica, **117**, 37 (1967)
 - [6] I. Pesenson, Trans. Am. Math. Soc. **352**, 4257 (2000)
 - [7] A. Kempf, Phys. Rev. Lett., **92**, 221301 (2004)
 - [8] B. Davies, and Y. Safarov (eds.), *Spectral Theory and Geometry*, London Mathematical Society Lecture Note Series, **273**, Cambridge University Press, 1999.
 - [9] M. Kac, American Mathematical Monthly, **73**, 1 (1966)
 - [10] A. Connes, *Noncommutative Geometry*, AP (1994)
 - [11] D. Slepian, H.O. Pollak, Bell Sys. Tech. J. **40**, 43 (1960)
 - [12] P.J.S.G. Ferreira and A. Kempf, IEEE Trans. Signal Processing, **54** (2006)
 - [13] J. Weidmann, Math. Scand. , **54**, 51 (1984)
 - [14] P. Stollmann, Math. Z. **219**, 275 (1995)
 - [15] R.T. Martin, Sampling Theory in Signal and Image Processing, in press, (2007)
 - [16] M. Reed, B. Simon, *Methods of Modern Mathematical Physics v.1*, Academic Press (1972)
 - [17] F.P. Schuller, M.N.R. Wohlfarth, Nucl.Phys. B698, 319 (2004)
 - [18] F. Markopoulou, Class. Q. Grav. **20**, 777 (2003); D. Oriti and H. Pfeiffer, Phys. Rev. D 66, 124010 (2002); L. Smolin, hep-th/0209079.
 - [19] A. Kempf, Phys. Rev. **D63** 083514, (2001) A. Kempf, J. C. Niemeyer, Phys. Rev. **D64** 103501 (2001), R. Easther, B. R. Greene, W. H. Kinney, G. Shiu, Phys. Rev. **D64** 103502 (2001)