## arXiv:0807.0300v2 [gr-qc] 24 Jun 2009 [arXiv:0807.0300v2 \[gr-qc\] 24 Jun 2009](http://arxiv.org/abs/0807.0300v2)

## A note on the connection between the universal relaxation bound and the covariant entropy bound

Alessandro Pesci [∗](#page-0-0)

INFN, Sezione di Bologna, Via Irnerio 46, I-40126 Bologna, Italy

A recently formulated universal lower-bound to the characteristic relaxation times of perturbed thermodynamic systems, derived from quantum information theory and (classical) thermodynamics and known to be saturated for (certain) black holes, is investigated in the light of the gravity/thermodynamics connection. A statistical-mechanical property, unrelated to gravity, essential for the validity of the generalized covariant entropy bound, namely the existence of a lower-limiting value  $l^*$  for the size of thermodynamic systems, is found to provide a way to understand this universal relaxation bound, thus regardless of the kind of foundations (i.e. whether conventional or information-based) of the statistical-mechanical description. As a by-product an example of a conventional system (i.e. not a black hole) seemingly saturating the universal relaxation bound is provided.

PACS numbers: 04.20.Cv, 04.70.Dy, 04.62.+v, 05.20.-y, 05.30.-d, 05.70.-a

Recently, a precise formulation of a universal lower-bound to the relaxation times of perturbed thermody-namic systems has been proposed [\[1](#page-2-0)]. For a given thermodynamic system, if  $\tau$  is the time characterising the rate of change of a quantity which starts from some non-equilibrium value, the expression of the bound, named TTT (Time times Temperature) by its discoverer, is

<span id="page-0-1"></span>
$$
\tau \ge \frac{\hbar}{\pi kT} \equiv \tau_{min},\tag{1}
$$

being T the temperature of the system (and k and  $\hbar$  the Boltzmann and (reduced) Planck constants). Its derivation hinges on quantum information theory and (classical) thermodynamic considerations [\[1\]](#page-2-0). This same bound however, at least for certain systems, appears to be reachable through a different path, not directly related to quantum information theory, and the aim of this note is to briefly describe this alternative approach. The derivation of bound [\(1\)](#page-0-1) does not involve gravity (see [\[1](#page-2-0)] and [\[2](#page-2-1), [3\]](#page-2-2)). At the same time however the only known systems able to attain the bound are (certain) black holes [\[1,](#page-2-0) [4](#page-2-3), [5\]](#page-2-4). A by-product of the approach followed here will be to show that also some conventional thermodynamic systems are seemingly able to saturate the bound.

Once again black holes signal a connection between gravity and thermodynamics, the main evidence for it coming from the laws of black hole mechanics [\[6](#page-2-5)], the assignement of an entropy to black holes [\[7](#page-2-6), [8\]](#page-2-7) and the formulation of a generalized second law [\[8,](#page-2-7) [9](#page-2-8)]; one may wonder if among these thermodinamic/gravitational laws a clue can be hidden able to bring to bound [\(1\)](#page-0-1). Since in bound [\(1\)](#page-0-1) gravity has no role, this clue should have a peculiar nature: to be required for the thermodynamical laws of gravity to hold and to possess an intrinsic meaning not depending on gravity.

The generalized second law has been shown to be a consequence of the generalized Bousso bound –a generalization of the Bousso covariant entropy bound [\[11\]](#page-2-9)– provided the ordinary second law is assumed to hold [\[10\]](#page-2-10). This generalized bound asserts that the entropy S on a lightsheet (a null hypersurface, generated by non-expanding light rays emanating orthogonally from an assigned spacelike 2-surface) associated with a given 2-suface with area A and truncated on another spacelike 2-surface with area  $A'(\leq A)$  satisfies (in Planck units, the units we will use from now on unless explicitly stated otherwise)

<span id="page-0-2"></span>
$$
S \le \frac{1}{4}(A - A'). \tag{2}
$$

In addition of having the generalized second law included in it, this entropy bound subsumes also the various proposed entropy bounds, such as the universal entropy bound of Bekenstein [\[12\]](#page-2-11) or the holographic bound [\[13,](#page-2-12) [14\]](#page-2-13) (closely related to the so-called holographic principle [\[13,](#page-2-12) [14](#page-2-13)], roughly the idea that the physics inside a region of spacetime can be fully described by degrees of freedom living on the boudary), while avoiding their limitations. It seems thus to stay at the hearth of the connection between gravity and thermodynamics/statistical physics, somehow summarizing its content (besides the thermodynamic imprint directly grasped in Einstein's

<span id="page-0-0"></span><sup>∗</sup>Electronic address: [pesci@bo.infn.it](mailto:pesci@bo.infn.it)

field equations [\[15](#page-2-14)] and in the action [\[16](#page-2-15)]). If a clue bringing to [\(1\)](#page-0-1) somewhere in thermo-gravitational laws does exist at all, it should not lie outside this entropy bound.

In [\[17\]](#page-2-16) a novel proof of the bound [\(2\)](#page-0-2) has been given (other proofs are in [\[10\]](#page-2-10) and [\[18,](#page-2-17) [19\]](#page-2-18)) in which, reconducting the validity of the bound as applied to a generic thermodynamic system to its validity on each thin slice which the system can be thought to be made of, at least for ultra-relativistic ideal fluids with vanishing chemical potential  $\mu$  a condition is set, in terms of local variables and the thickness of the slice, sufficient and necessary for the validity of the bound. This condition, generalized in [\[20\]](#page-2-19) to address the case of generic ideal fluids, reads

<span id="page-1-0"></span>
$$
s \le \pi l(\rho + p),\tag{3}
$$

where s,  $\rho$  and p are local entropy density, energy density and pressure respectively and l is the thickness of the slice. This formula looks similar to some of the conditions found to be sufficient to prove the bound [\(2\)](#page-0-2) in other derivations of it [\[10](#page-2-10), [18\]](#page-2-17). At the end all these conditions correspond to some reformulation of the Bekenstein bound.

The result [\(3\)](#page-1-0) can be reinterpreted [\[17,](#page-2-16) [20\]](#page-2-19) as showing that the generalized bound [\(2\)](#page-0-2) is universally satisfied iff a minimal length scale  $l^*$  exists for the size l of the systems for which a meaningful notion of statistical entropy can be given, so that always

<span id="page-1-1"></span>
$$
l \ge l^* \equiv \frac{1}{\pi} \frac{s}{\rho + p} = \frac{1}{\pi T} \left( 1 - \frac{\mu n}{\rho + p} \right),\tag{4}
$$

where n is local number density and in  $\mu$  the (possible) rest-energy of constituent particles is included. The expression for  $l^*$  turns out to be very similar to the expression [\(1\)](#page-0-1) above for  $\tau_{min}$ , in particular when  $\mu = 0$ . In this case we have

$$
l^* = \frac{1}{\pi T} = \frac{\hbar c}{\pi kT},\tag{5}
$$

where in the last equality all the constants have been inserted  $(c$  is the speed of light), so that the expressions for  $l^*$  and  $\tau_{min}$  are absolutely similar (actually coincident, in Planck units). Analogously to Hod's TTT bound, the bound [\(4\)](#page-1-1), as well as the condition [\(3\)](#page-1-0), has no reference to gravity (yet  $\ell^*$  will be in general much larger than the Planck length [\[20](#page-2-19)]). As discussed in [\[20\]](#page-2-19) the origin of  $l^*$  appears to be entirely statistical-mechanical (and this is exactly what happens also for the Bekenstein bound [\[12](#page-2-11)]); the emerging scenario is that quantum mechanics, requiring the existence of a minimal size  $l_{min} \geq l^*$  for thermodynamic systems (usually by far satisfied), ultimately determined by the spatial quantum uncertainty of the constituent particles (or the maximum between this and their size in case of composite objects), protects the generalized Bousso bound [\(2\)](#page-0-2). Conversely, if the bound [\(2\)](#page-0-2) is axiomatically assumed, quantum mechanics is required to emerge, in order to fix the minimal length scale accompanying necessarily the bound. <sup>2</sup>

The existence of lower-limiting sizes for the statistical-mechanical systems is just what provides a connection between the entropy bound [\(2\)](#page-0-2) and the relaxation bound [\(1\)](#page-0-1), thus the clue bringing to [\(1\)](#page-0-1). Assuming in fact that the time  $\tau$  characterising the rate of change of an assigned quantity (when starting from some non-equilibrium value) is given by the time it takes a perturbation to propagate through the system (see for instance [\[22](#page-2-20)]), for slices of thickness  $l_{min}$  we should expect  $\tau = l_{min}/c_s$ , where  $c_s$  is sound velocity, and this becomes

<span id="page-1-2"></span>
$$
\tau = l_{min} \tag{6}
$$

when perturbations propagate at the speed of light. Two elements cause  $\tau$  to be not lower than  $l^*$  for the assigned thermodynamic conditions, namely the fact that, accepting the scenario above,  $l_{min} \ge l^*$   $(l_{min} \gg l^*$ usually) and also that  $c_s \leq 1$ . This suggests that even if in general  $l^*$  can be smaller than  $1/\pi T$  (when  $\mu > 0$ actually), Hod's TTT bound can be protected by the pertinent  $l_{min}$  and  $c_s$  values.

What we find quite interesting and worth stressing here is what happens for a photon gas or, more generally, for a gas of ultra-relativistic particles with  $\mu = 0$ . If in fact, as discussed in [\[20](#page-2-19)], photon-gas slices can be chosen

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>1</sup> The noticing of this point is due to S. Hod (see also  $[20]$ ).

<sup>2</sup> Reasoning on single-particle systems, in [\[21](#page-2-21)] the role of quantum mechanics as protecting the Bekenstein bound or being predicted by it, has been stressed.

with limiting thickness  $l = l_{min} = l^* = \frac{1}{\pi T}$ , they will saturate the generalized Bousso bound [\[20](#page-2-19)], but from [\(6\)](#page-1-2) they do saturate also Hod's TTT bound, adding to the known example of black holes [\[1](#page-2-0), [4,](#page-2-3) [5\]](#page-2-4).

The discussion in [\[20](#page-2-19)] on photon gases shows moreover that it is not possible to choose slices with thickness smaller than  $l^*$  without destroying the thermodynamical conditions in the slice. This could then be considered as an argument bringing to Hod's TTT bound (actually for photon gases or for ultra-relativistic systems with  $\mu = 0$ ) totally internal to statistical mechanics, without the need of explicit reference to quantum information theory. At the end the fact that a thermodynamic result can be understood alternatively from quantum information theory or from conventional statistical mechanics should not be surprising in the light of the strong evidence of equivalence between conventional and quantum-informational based statistical mechanics (see for example [\[23\]](#page-2-22)).

The generic existence of some universal lower limit for the characteristic time  $\tau$  with inverse dependence on temperature is known to be required within conventional statistical mechanics [\[22\]](#page-2-20) (as stressed in [\[24\]](#page-2-23)). The argument just given turns out simply to permit one to focus on a precise expression for this limit,  $\frac{3}{5}$  the TTT bound, linking it to the generalized Bousso bound, exactly. The key element for this is the existence of a lower-limiting scale  $l^*$  for the size of statistical systems, required for the thermo-gravitational laws to hold. This limiting scale appears to be understandable within statistical mechanics alone (regardless moreover of its foundations, i.e. whether quantum-informational or conventional) so that its meaning, existence and value have no relation at all to gravity.

I would like to thank Shahar Hod for the stimulating correspondence.

- <span id="page-2-0"></span>[1] S. Hod, Phys. Rev. D **75** (2007) 064013, [gr-qc/0611004.](http://arxiv.org/abs/gr-qc/0611004)
- <span id="page-2-1"></span>[2] J.D. Bekenstein, Phys. Rev. Lett. 46 (1981) 623.
- <span id="page-2-2"></span>[3] H.J. Bremermann, in Proc. of Fifth Berkeley Symposium on Mathematical Statistics and Probability, edited by L. M. LeCam and J. Neyman (Univ. of California Press, Berkeley, 1967).
- <span id="page-2-3"></span>[4] A. Gruzinov, [arXiv:0705.1725.](http://arxiv.org/abs/0705.1725)
- <span id="page-2-4"></span>[5] S. Hod, Class. Quantum Grav. 24 (2007) 4235, [arXiv:0705.2306.](http://arxiv.org/abs/0705.2306)
- <span id="page-2-5"></span>[6] J.M. Bardeen, B. Carter and S.W. Hawking, Commun. Math. Phys. 31 (1973) 161.
- <span id="page-2-6"></span>[7] J.D. Bekenstein, Nuovo Cim. Lett. 4 (1972) 737; Phys. Rev. D 7 (1973) 2333.
- <span id="page-2-7"></span>[8] S.W. Hawking, Nature 248 (1974) 30; Commun. Math. Phys. 43 (1975) 199.
- <span id="page-2-8"></span>[9] J.D. Bekenstein, Phys. Rev. D 9 (1974) 3292.
- <span id="page-2-10"></span>[10] E.E. Flanagan, D. Marolf and R.M. Wald, Phys. Rev. D  $62$  (2000) 084035, [hep-th/9908070.](http://arxiv.org/abs/hep-th/9908070)
- <span id="page-2-9"></span>[11] R. Bousso, JHEP07(1999) 004, [hep-th/9905177;](http://arxiv.org/abs/hep-th/9905177) JHEP06(1999) 028, [hep-th/9906022;](http://arxiv.org/abs/hep-th/9906022) Class. Quant. Grav. 17 (2000) 997, [hep-th/9911002.](http://arxiv.org/abs/hep-th/9911002)
- <span id="page-2-11"></span>[12] J.D. Bekenstein, Phys. Rev. D **23** (1981) 287.
- <span id="page-2-12"></span>[13] G. 't Hooft, in Salamfest (1993) 0284, [gr-qc/9310026.](http://arxiv.org/abs/gr-qc/9310026)
- <span id="page-2-13"></span>[14] L. Susskind, J. Math. Phys. 36 (1995) 6377, [hep-th/9409089.](http://arxiv.org/abs/hep-th/9409089)
- <span id="page-2-14"></span>[15] T. Jacobson, Phys. Rev. Lett. **75** (1995) 1260, [gr-qc/9504004.](http://arxiv.org/abs/gr-qc/9504004)
- <span id="page-2-15"></span>[16] T. Padmanabhan, Phys. Rept. 406 (2005) 49, [gr-qc/0311036;](http://arxiv.org/abs/gr-qc/0311036) Int. J. Mod. Phys. D 15 (2006) 1659, [gr-qc/0606061;](http://arxiv.org/abs/gr-qc/0606061) AIP Conf. Proc. 939 (2007) 114, [arXiv:0706.1654.](http://arxiv.org/abs/0706.1654)
- <span id="page-2-16"></span>[17] A. Pesci, Class. Quantum Grav. 24 (2007) 6219, [arXiv:0708.3729.](http://arxiv.org/abs/0708.3729)
- <span id="page-2-17"></span>[18] R. Bousso, E.E. Flanagan and D. Marolf, Phys. Rev. D  $68$  (2003) 064001, [hep-th/0305149.](http://arxiv.org/abs/hep-th/0305149)
- <span id="page-2-18"></span>[19] A. Strominger and D.M. Thompson, Phys. Rev. D 70 (2004) 044007, [hep-th/0303067.](http://arxiv.org/abs/hep-th/0303067)
- <span id="page-2-19"></span>[20] A. Pesci, Class. Quantum Grav. 25 (2008) 125005, [arXiv:0803.2642.](http://arxiv.org/abs/0803.2642)
- <span id="page-2-21"></span>[21] R. Bousso, JHEP05(2004) 050, [hep-th/0402058.](http://arxiv.org/abs/hep-th/0402058)
- <span id="page-2-20"></span>[22] L.D. Landau, E.M. Lifshitz and L.P. Pitaevskij, Statistical Physics (Pergamon Press, Oxford, 1980).
- <span id="page-2-22"></span>[23] A. Ben-Naim, A farewell to entropy: statistical thermodynamics based on information (World Scientific, Singapore, 2008).
- <span id="page-2-23"></span>[24] K. Ropotenko, [arXiv:0705.3625;](http://arxiv.org/abs/0705.3625) [arXiv:0803.4489.](http://arxiv.org/abs/0803.4489)
- <span id="page-2-24"></span>[25] S. Sachdev, Quantum phase transitions (Cambridge University Press, New York, 1999).

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>3</sup> In [\[25](#page-2-24)] the relaxation bound in the form  $\tau \geq C\frac{1}{T}$ , with C a number of order unity, was first discussed and models have been considered (describing quantum critical points), for some of which  $\tau$  approaches a few  $1/T$ .