

# Central Charge and Entangled Gauge Fields

Kuo-Wei Huang

*C. N. Yang Institute for Theoretical Physics, Department of Physics and Astronomy,  
Stony Brook University, Stony Brook, NY 11794, USA*

Entanglement entropy of gauge fields is calculated using the partition function in curved spacetime with boundary. Deriving a Gibbons-Hawking like term from a BRST action produces a Wald entropy like codimension-2 surface term. It is further suggested that boundary degrees of freedom localized on the entanglement surface generated from the gauge redundancy could be used to resolve a subtle mismatch in a universal conformal anomaly-entanglement entropy relation.

**Introduction:** In spite of being perhaps the weirdest consequence from quantum mechanics [1], the concept of entanglement plays an important role in many areas of physics: A key ingredient in quantum information, an order parameter in the phase transition in many-body systems [2], a measure of renormalization group flow in quantum field theories [3]. The entanglement is also suggested as the origin of the black hole entropy [4],[5]. Partition Hilbert space into pieces  $A$  and the complement  $B$ ,  $\mathcal{H} = \mathcal{H}_A \otimes \mathcal{H}_B$ , the entanglement (von Neumann) entropy is defined by  $S_{EE} \equiv -\text{tr} \rho_A \log \rho_A$ . The reduced density matrix,  $\rho_A \equiv \text{tr}_B \rho$ , is a partial trace of the full density matrix  $\rho$  over the degrees of freedom in  $B$ . For gauge theories where the observables are Wilson loops, such a partition might become an issue since a partition would cut some loops. Hilbert space of gauge fields is defined modulo the gauge transformation, the direct factorization as a product of two Hilbert spaces of the subsystems could be troublesome. See [6], [7], [8], [9] for attempts to address this issue in lattice gauge theory.

It is often difficult to compute entanglement entropy (EE) directly, in particular for spacetime dimensions higher than two. There are several alternative ways to compute EE. One is the replica method where a conical singularity is introduced [10], [11]. Another method (that we adopt in this letter) was introduced recently [12] (see also [29]) by conformally mapping a vacuum state of a conformal field theory (CFT) onto a thermal state on the hyperbolic spacetime,  $S^1 \times H^{d-1}$ . The radius  $R$  of the circle defines the temperature,  $T = \frac{1}{\beta} = \frac{1}{2\pi R}$ . The main observation is that the full casual development connected to the spherical region can be conformally mapped to the open Einstein space (or the static patch of de Sitter space). The computation of EE is then mapped to calculating thermal entropy via

$$S_{EE} = (1 - \beta \partial_\beta) \log Z(\beta)|_{\beta=2\pi R}. \quad (1)$$

AdS/CFT correspondence also provides a way to calculate EE [13]. Here we focus on field theory calculation; holography provides a consistent check.

A minor nuisance of EE is its UV cut-off dependence. However, despite that the coefficients of power law divergences depend on regularization schemes, the log divergent term is scheme-independent hence becoming a universal result. We focus on EE from a spherical entanglement surface in 4D flat spacetime. The log term of

EE is shown to be determined by the central charge [12]

$$S_{EE,\log} = (-1)^{\frac{d}{2}-1} 4A \log\left(\frac{R}{\delta}\right), \quad (2)$$

where  $\delta$  is the divergence cut-off. The type-A center charge ‘‘A’’ is defined by the conformal anomaly in even spacetime dimensions ( $d = 2n$  with  $n = 1, 2, 3, \dots$ ),  $\langle T_\mu^\mu \rangle = \sum_n B_n I_n - 2(-)^{\frac{d}{2}} A E_d$ , where  $E_d$  is the Euler density;  $I_n$  are the Weyl invariants that defines the type-B anomalies, which will not contribute to EE in our discussion. (Also notice that we consider a scheme without introducing the so-called  $D$ -type anomaly. This is the minimal scheme used recently in [31] to obtain the general stress tensors from conformal anomalies. See [32] for more discussion.) For 4D gauge fields (spin  $s = 1$ ), the result predicted via the formula (2) is

$$S_{EE,\log}^{(s=1)} = -\frac{31}{45} \log\left(\frac{R}{\delta}\right). \quad (3)$$

This result can be confirmed via holography [14], [15]. However, to our knowledge, a direct field theory calculation giving this result is absent (besides directly adopting the anomaly coefficients). In [16], a direct modification of the stress tensor is suggested to obtain this result. In this letter, we would like to see more closely what new ingredients are needed to give (3). A better understanding of boundary effects should be important. Therefore, we will first revisit the formulation of a gauge theory in curved spacetime with boundary. Our main motivation is that finding a way to improve an alternative method of calculating EE might shed light on defining EE directly for general gauge theories. (*Note added:* Upon the author finishing this work, a new interesting paper [33] appeared where they used a different approach to discuss the entanglement entropy of a gauge field. They related the mismatch result that we will also discuss with the entangling boundary  $S^2$  independently.)

**EE of gauge field on  $S^1 \times H^3$  and discrepancy:** We here show how a standard calculation leads to a mismatch. (See appendix in [17] for related calculation for the conformally coupled scalar field and Dirac fermion. [18] observed the same mismatch for gauge fields on the static de Sitter space.) We are interested in EE on  $\mathcal{R}^{1,3}$  with the entangle surface  $S^2$  with radius  $R$ , at a time slice  $t = 0$ . The original flat spacetime metric written in polar coordinates is  $ds^2 = -dt^2 + dr^2 + r^2 d^2\Omega_2$ , where  $d^2\Omega_2$  is

the metric of the sphere with unit radius. The transformations that map the geometry into the open Einstein space are

$$t = R \frac{\sinh(\frac{\tau}{R})}{\cosh u + \cosh(\frac{\tau}{R})} ; \quad r = R \frac{\sinh(u)}{\cosh u + \cosh(\frac{\tau}{R})} \quad (4)$$

The metric becomes

$$ds^2 = \Omega^2 \left( -d\tau^2 + R^2(du^2 + \sinh^2 u d^2\Omega_2) \right). \quad (5)$$

The prefactor  $\Omega = (\cosh u + \cosh \frac{\tau}{R})^{-1}$  can be eliminated via the conformal transformation and the resulting metric is  $R \times H^3$ . The limits  $\tau = \infty \rightarrow (t = \pm R, r = 0); u = \infty \rightarrow (t = 0, r = R)$ , confirm that the full causal development are covered after the mapping [12].

We also use the heat kernel method. Let the kernel  $K(x, y, s)$  on a fixed spacetime background  $\mathcal{M}$  satisfying the heat equation  $(\partial_s + D)K(x, y, s) = 0$  where  $D$  denotes a second order differential kinetic operator. A boundary condition is imposed,  $K(x, y, 0) = \delta(x, y)$ . The trace of the heat kernel is given by  $\mathcal{K}(s) = \int_{\mathcal{M}} K(x, x; s) = \sum_i e^{-s\lambda_i}$  with summation over all eigenvalues  $\lambda_i$  of the operator  $D$  including possible degeneracy. The parameter  $s$  must have dimensions of length squared if the argument of the exponential is to be dimensionless. The partition function can be obtained by

$$\log Z = -\frac{1}{2} \sum_i \log \lambda_i = \frac{1}{2} \int_0^\infty \frac{ds}{s} \mathcal{K}(s). \quad (6)$$

Our starting point is the standard action of the U(1) gauge field  $A_\mu$  on  $S^1 \times H^3$ :  $S = \frac{1}{4} \int F_{\mu\nu} F^{\mu\nu}$  with  $F_{\mu\nu} = [\nabla_\mu, \nabla_\nu]$ . Due to the gauge symmetry of the action,  $\delta A_\mu = \nabla_\mu \lambda$ , we will add the Lorenz gauge-fixing term  $S_{gf} = \frac{1}{2} \int (\nabla_\mu A^\mu)^2$ . The gauge fixing procedure introduces the standard Fadeev-Popov ghosts  $\bar{b}$  and  $b$  that are anti-commuting scalars with the action  $S_{gh} = -\int \bar{b} \square b$ . Adding the gauge fixing term, if we integrate by parts and simply drop surface terms and use  $[\nabla_\mu, \nabla_\nu] A^\nu = -R_{\mu\nu} A^\nu$ , the gauge field action becomes  $S = -\frac{1}{2} \int A^\mu D_{\mu\nu} A^\nu$  where  $D_{\mu\nu} \equiv \square \delta_{\mu\nu} - R_{\mu\nu}$ . The partition function is

$$Z = \text{Det}(-\square_s) \int \mathcal{D}A_\mu \exp \left[ \frac{1}{2} \int_{S^1 \times H^3} A^\mu D_{\mu\nu} A^\nu \right] \quad (7)$$

where the factor  $\text{Det}(-\square_s)$  stands for the Faddeev-Popov determinant. Factoring out the temporal index and performing a Gaussian integral over  $A_\tau$  yields

$$Z = \text{Det}(-\square_s)^{1/2} \int \mathcal{D}A_i \exp \left[ \frac{1}{2} \int_{S^1 \times H^3} (A^i D_{ij} A^j) \right] \quad (8)$$

We write

$$\log Z(\beta) = \frac{1}{2} \text{Det}(-\square_s) - \frac{1}{2} \text{Det}(D_{ij}) \equiv \frac{1}{2} \int_0^\infty \frac{ds}{s} \mathcal{K}(s),$$

by decomposing the total heat kernel via

$$\mathcal{K}(s) = K_{ij}(S^1) K^{ij}(H^3) - K_s(S^1) K_s(H^3), \quad (9)$$

with  $K_{ij}(S^1)$  being a short hand for  $\text{tr} \int_{S^1} K_{ij}(s, \tau, \tau)$  and  $K_{ij}(H^3)$  for  $\text{tr} \int_{H^3} K_{ij}(s, x, x)$ . The same notation applies on  $K_s$  (scalar) parts.

The heat kernel on  $S^1$  can be evaluated using the method of images preserving the periodic boundary conditions. The result is given by an infinite sum on an infinite line shifted by  $2\pi Rn (\equiv n\beta)$

$$K_{ij}(S^1) = \frac{2\beta}{(4\pi s)^{1/2}} \sum_{n=1}^{\infty} e^{-\frac{n^2 \beta^2}{4s}} = K_s(S^1). \quad (10)$$

The  $n = 0$  part is ignored because it will not contribute to EE. The heat kernels  $K^{ij}(H^3)$  and  $K_s(H^3)$  can be found in the literature [19], [20] and are given by

$$K_{ij}(H^3) = \frac{e^{-\frac{s}{R^2}} + 2 + 4\frac{s}{R^2}}{(4\pi s)^{3/2}} ; \quad K_s(H^3) = \frac{e^{-\frac{s}{R^2}}}{(4\pi s)^{3/2}} \quad (11)$$

Plugging these results into (9) gives

$$\log Z(\beta) = \frac{2\pi^2 R^2 + 15\beta^2}{90R^2\beta^3} \text{Vol}(H^3). \quad (12)$$

We next introduce an IR cut-off for the divergent  $\text{Vol}(H^3)$  via  $\cosh(u_{max}) = \frac{R}{\delta}$  [12]. The scale of the hyperbolic curvature is arbitrary but we set it to be  $R$  for convenience. In 4D, one obtains a log term from  $\text{Vol}(H^3) = -2\pi R^3 \log(\frac{R}{\delta}) + \dots$  Finally, using (1), we find a mismatch

$$S_{EE, \log} = -\frac{16}{45} \log\left(\frac{R}{\delta}\right). \quad (13)$$

**Gauge fields in curved spacetime with boundary revisited:** If a manifold has a boundary, we should be careful regarding a well-defined variation principle. In this section, we shall first consider general manifolds where the spacetime background is not yet fixed as  $S^1 \times H^3$ . The U(1) action (in Lorenz gauge) in curved spacetime with ghost fields reads

$$S = \int_{\mathcal{M}} \frac{1}{4} F_{\mu\nu} F^{\mu\nu} + \int_{\mathcal{M}} \left( \frac{1}{2} (\nabla_\mu A^\mu)^2 + \nabla^\mu \bar{b} \nabla_\mu b \right) \quad (14)$$

The action has the BRST symmetry defined by an infinitesimal anticommuting constant parameter  $\epsilon$ :

$$\delta A_\mu = (\nabla_\mu b)\epsilon ; \quad \delta b = 0 ; \quad \delta \bar{b} = (\nabla^\mu A_\mu)\epsilon, \quad (15)$$

provided that a boundary condition is imposed: Either  $\nabla_n b|_{\partial M} = 0$  or  $\nabla_\mu A^\mu|_{\partial M} = 0$ . In fact, when one writes the bulk ghost action as  $-\int_{\mathcal{M}} \bar{b} \square b$ , integration by parts is used and we should also impose a boundary condition: Either  $\nabla_n b|_{\partial M} = 0$  or  $\bar{b}|_{\partial M} = 0$  (whose BRST symmetry requires  $\nabla_\mu A^\mu|_{\partial M} = 0$ ). We will simply adopt  $\nabla_n b|_{\partial M} = 0$  in the following.

We next emphasize that, different from the non-minimally coupled scalar fields, the original gauge field action (14) does not have second derivatives of the metric so that one does not really need to add a Gibbons-Hawking like term in the action. However, as we saw above, in the heat kernel method it is most natural to

use an action which involves a second order differential operator  $D_{\mu\nu}$ . Integrating the standard action by parts to produce the operator  $D_{\mu\nu}$  naturally needs a Gibbons-Hawking like term. But one should not add a new term during an immediate calculation. Our resolution is that the Gibbons-Hawking like term should be *derived* in the gauge field case. More precisely, we consider ( $\nabla_n \equiv n^\mu \nabla_\mu$ )

$$\begin{aligned} \int_{\mathcal{M}} \left( \frac{1}{4} F_{\mu\nu} F^{\mu\nu} + \frac{1}{2} (\nabla_\mu A^\mu)^2 \right) &= - \int_{\mathcal{M}} \left( \frac{1}{2} A^\mu D_{\mu\nu} A^\nu \right) \\ &\quad - \frac{1}{2} \int_{\partial\mathcal{M}} n_\mu [A_\nu \nabla^\nu A^\mu - A^\mu \nabla^\nu A_\nu - A_\nu \nabla^\mu A^\nu] \\ &= - \int_{\mathcal{M}} \left( \frac{1}{2} A^\mu D_{\mu\nu} A^\nu \right) + \frac{1}{2} \int_{\partial\mathcal{M}} K_{\mu\nu} A^\mu A^\nu \\ &\quad + \int_{\partial\mathcal{M}} [A^n (\nabla^\nu A_\nu) + \frac{1}{4} \nabla^n A^2] - \frac{1}{2} \int_{\partial\mathcal{M}^{d-1}} g_{\mu\nu}^\perp A^\mu A^\nu. \end{aligned} \quad (16)$$

In the last line we integrate by parts one more time in order to obtain the Gibbons-Hawking like term that provides the cancellation involving  $\nabla_n(\delta g_{\mu\nu})$ .  $K_{ab}$  is the extrinsic curvature and  $n_\mu$  is the (spacelike) outward unit vector normal to  $\partial\mathcal{M}$ .  $g_{\mu\nu}^\perp \equiv n_\mu n_\nu$  denotes a projection onto the directions perpendicular to the entangling surface. To our knowledge, no literature has mentioned this kind of treatment regarding a gauge field action in curved spacetime with boundary. (See, for example, [21], [22] for different approaches.)

**Conical contact entropy:** Let us relate the action (16) to the contact term obtained from the conical method [23] (see also [24]). If all surface terms are ignored, the  $U(1)$  action is simply given by  $S_{\mathcal{M}} = -\frac{1}{2} \int_{\mathcal{M}} (A^\mu D_{\mu\nu} A^\nu) - \int_{\mathcal{M}} \bar{b} \square b$ . On a manifold  $\mathcal{M}$  with a conical singularity, we are interested in the heat kernel for first-order change of the conical angle  $\beta$  away from  $2\pi$ . The conical deficit introduces a singular curvature at the tip of a cone. The curvature can be expanded as [28]

$$R_{\mu\nu} = \bar{R}_{\mu\nu} + (2\pi - \beta) g_{\mu\nu}^\perp \delta_\Sigma + \mathcal{O}(2\pi - \beta)^2, \quad (17)$$

where  $\bar{R}_{\mu\nu}$  vanishes in flat spacetime. The higher order terms in (17) do not affect EE. The entropy formula in the conical method reads  $S_{\text{cone}} = (1 - \beta \partial_\beta) \log Z(\beta)|_{\beta=2\pi}$ . The ghosts do not contribute to the contact entropy. The partition function of gauge fields can be written, using (17), as ( $\bar{D}_{\mu\nu} \equiv \square \delta_{\mu\nu} - \bar{R}_{\mu\nu}$ )

$$\begin{aligned} \int \mathcal{D}A \exp \left[ \frac{1}{2} \int_{\mathcal{M}} \{ A^\mu (\bar{D}_{\mu\nu} - (2\pi - \beta) g_{\mu\nu}^\perp \delta_\Sigma) A^\nu \} \right] \\ = \bar{Z}_A - \left( \pi - \frac{\beta}{2} \right) \int_{\Sigma} \langle g_{\mu\nu}^\perp A^\mu A^\nu \rangle, \end{aligned} \quad (18)$$

where the first term  $\bar{Z}$  denotes the "regular" contribution. The second term leads to the contact entropy.

Now the claim is that the codimension-2 surface term in the action (16) precisely cancels this tip contribution when we identify the codimension-2 surface as the entangling surface. That is, put the action (16) on a manifold having a conical singularity and express

the curvature via (17). The tip interaction is then cancelled. It would be interesting to explore how the action (16) can be quantized in different kinds of spacetime manifolds. (Notice that the cancellation requires using the conical expansion before considering the boundary condition.) Let us finally remark that the codimension-2 surface term is intimately related to the expectation value of Wald entropy [25]:  $\langle S_{\text{Wald}} \rangle = -2\pi \langle \int_{\Sigma} \frac{\partial \mathcal{L}}{\partial R_{\mu\nu\lambda\rho}} \epsilon_{\mu\nu} \epsilon_{\lambda\rho} \rangle = -\pi \int_{\Sigma} \langle g_{\mu\nu}^\perp A^\mu A^\nu \rangle$ .

**Boundary conditions:** Let us now go back to the hyperbolic approach to EE where the spacetime background is  $S^1 \times H^3$ . We consider the following boundary conditions to have a well-defined field equation of  $A_\mu$

$$A_n|_{\partial\mathcal{M}} = 0, \nabla_n \lambda|_{\partial\mathcal{M}} = 0, (\nabla_n A_i + K_{ij} A^j)|_{\partial\mathcal{M}} = 0 \quad (19)$$

where  $n$  is the normal component while  $i$  and  $j$  represent the tangential components. This is referred to as the absolute boundary condition in [26] although there the surface action is different from ours. This set of boundary conditions is sufficient for us to have a well-defined field equation of  $A_\mu$ . The BRST invariance of the absolute boundary condition (19) and its consistency with the gauge choice are already mentioned in [26]. (One might want to consider the so-called relative boundary condition [26]:  $A_i|_{\partial\mathcal{M}} = 0, \lambda|_{\partial\mathcal{M}} = 0, (\nabla_n A_n + K A_n)|_{\partial\mathcal{M}} = 0$ . However, in our case, because of the presence of the codimension-2 surface term, using this condition we need to further impose  $\nabla_n A_n|_{\partial\mathcal{M}} = 0$  and we see it causes inconsistency.)

**Edge entropy from entangling surface:** Here we suggest a way to resolve the mismatch in (13). Recall that the gauge symmetry results in the gauge fixing condition  $\nabla^\mu A_\mu = 0$ . The gauge redundancy is determined by  $\square \lambda = 0$ . In the bulk, this residual gauge can be fixed by imposing a boundary condition on the boundary. However, the freedom of choosing different boundary data then might be interpreted as having edge degrees of freedom satisfying the constraint  $\square \lambda|_{S^2} = 0$ . (The boundary here we mean the explicit physical boundary  $\Sigma = S^2$  with a radius  $r$  used to define the entanglement entropy. Note  $r = R$  before the mapping while  $r = R \sinh u_{\text{max}}$  viewed from hyperbolic space.) We suggest these boundary modes give additional contributions.

The bulk 4D action does not see any boundary modes since all surface terms are set to zero using the boundary conditions. We interpret the boundary mode's partition function by treating the constraint  $\square \lambda|_{S^2} = 0$  as a field equation on  $S^2$  and define the partition function again by (6). The question then can be reduced to finding the corresponding eigenvalues using the heat kernel method.

The heat kernel on  $S^2$  is essentially given by solving the standard eigenvalue problem of the Laplacian on  $S^2$  where the eigenvalues are  $l(l+1)$  with the orbital quantum number  $l$  and the degeneracy  $2l+1$ . The eigenfunction is the familiar spherical harmonic. (See [27] for heat kernels in different spacetime manifolds.) The heat

kernel (density) that we need is given by

$$K(S^2) = \frac{1}{4\pi r^2} \sum_{l=0}^{\infty} (2l+1) e^{-s \frac{l(l+1)}{r^2}}. \quad (20)$$

We will be interested in the small  $s$  expansion. We use the Euler-MacLaurin formula

$$\sum_{l=0}^{\infty} f(l) = \int_{l=0}^{\infty} dl f(l) + \frac{1}{2} f(0) - \frac{1}{12} f'(0) + \dots \quad (21)$$

with a function  $f(l)$  satisfying  $f^{(n)}(\infty) = 0$  for arbitrary  $n$ . We focus on the (scheme independent) log divergence term and the higher order terms in (21) are irrelevant. From (20) and (21) we have

$$K(S^2) = \frac{12r^4 + 4r^2s + s^2}{48\pi r^4 s} + \dots \quad (22)$$

Define the partition function on  $S^2$  as  $\log Z(S^2) = \frac{1}{2} Vol(S^2) \int_{\epsilon^2}^{\infty} \frac{ds}{s} K(S^2)$ , where  $Vol(S^2) = 4\pi r^2$  which is simply the area of the entangle surface. The  $s$ -independent term in (22) gives the log divergence. Notice the gauge parameter  $\lambda$  is understood as the ghost  $b$  so it contributes as a negative massless scalar field on  $S^2$ . We obtain the log term from the edge modes:  $\log Z(S^2) \rightarrow -\frac{1}{6} \log(\frac{R^2}{\delta^2})$ . A dimensional scale  $R$  is inserted to have a dimensionless argument. Note the log term is independent of the radius of the entangle surface. We next identify the UV cut-off  $\epsilon$  with the cut-off  $\delta$  in regularizing  $Vol(H^3)$ ,  $\epsilon = \delta$ . The edge correction to the log term reads

$$\Delta S_{EE, \log}^{(s=1)} = -\frac{1}{3} \log\left(\frac{R}{\delta}\right), \quad (23)$$

which resolves the mismatch.

**Renyi entropy:** It is now straightforward to generalize our discussion to Renyi entropy defined by  $S_q = \frac{\log \text{tr} \rho_A^q}{1-q}$ . It has a simple relation to EE via  $S_{EE} = \lim_{q \rightarrow 1} S_q$ . Having the partition function, we can calculate Renyi entropy by [29]:  $S_q = \frac{\log Z(q\beta) - q \log Z(\beta)}{(1-q)} \Big|_{\beta \rightarrow 2\pi R}$ . Using (12), we obtain

$$S_{q, \log} = \frac{(q+1)(31q^2+1)}{360\pi q^3 R^3} Vol(H^3). \quad (24)$$

Let us also include the boundary modes. Note we should view the boundary contribution as an universal contribution (the log term) in the sense that it is independent of  $\beta$  and radius of the entangle surface. It then should be also independent of the parameter  $q$  inserted in temperature  $T = \frac{1}{2\pi R q}$ . By adding the edge contribution (23), the full log divergent term of Renyi entropy is given by

$$S_{q, \log}^{(s=1)} = -\frac{1+q+31q^2+91q^3}{180q^3} \log\left(\frac{R}{\delta}\right). \quad (25)$$

This result is consistent with holographic prediction [14], [15] for gauge fields.

If we use the standard heat kernels ([19], [20]) to consider the conformally coupled scalar field, the log term in Renyi entropy can be obtained directly. We find

$$S_{q, \log}^{(s=0)} = -\frac{1+q+q^2+q^3}{360q^3} \log\left(\frac{R}{\delta}\right). \quad (26)$$

Take  $q = 1$ , it gives  $-\frac{1}{90} \log(\frac{R}{\delta})$ , which matches exactly with the expected type-A anomaly prediction. On the other hand, there is no mismatch problem for fermions. The heat kernel and related algebra can be found in literature (for example, appendix in [17]). For useful reference, we list the corresponding result of the 4D Dirac fermion:

$$S_{q, \log}^{(s=\frac{1}{2})} = -\frac{7+7q+37q^2+37q^3}{720q^3} \log\left(\frac{R}{\delta}\right). \quad (27)$$

Take  $q = 1$ , it gives the expected  $-\frac{11}{90} \log(\frac{R}{\delta})$ . In short, the field theory calculation of the log terms of the conformally coupled scalar field and massless fermion on  $S^1 \times H^3$  match directly with the anomaly prediction, without boundary modes needed. This might be consistent with the fact that the boundary modes contribute in the gauge field case due to the existence of the gauge symmetry.

**Discussion:** It would be interesting to better understand the boundary modes and explore its potential applications. It has been suggested in literature [6] [7] (See also [8] [9]) that one might modify the decomposition as  $\mathcal{H} = \mathcal{H}_A \otimes \mathcal{H}_B \otimes \mathcal{H}_{\partial A}$ , where  $\mathcal{H}_{\partial A}$  denotes the boundary Hilbert space, to have a special treatment of boundary in calculating EE of gauge fields. Let us make an initial attempt to see if this idea can be related to the approach here. If one wants to derive the edge contribution (23) from a classical action, an immediate issue is that a surface action will cause trouble regarding the variation principle when getting the bulk field equation. If we consider a boundary Hilbert space  $\mathcal{H}_{S^2}$  separately, we might consider a surface action subjected to the path integral quantization in this separated Hilbert space. Then, to incorporate the contribution from the boundary, we define

$$Z(S^2) = \sqrt{Z(\bar{b}, b)}; \quad Z(\bar{b}, b) = \int D\bar{b} D b e^{-\int_{S^2} (\bar{b} \square b)}. \quad (28)$$

(Since the edge part here does not have any gauge field, we simply define  $\delta b_{S^2} = \delta \bar{b}_{S^2} = 0$  so that the surface action is BRST invariant.) Notice that because of the intrinsic asymmetric treatment on ghost fields  $b$  and  $\bar{b}$  in the BRST transformation,  $\delta A = \nabla b$  in (15), the gauge redundancy in the theory (and the resulting boundary entropy) is solely determined by  $b$  in this framework, so we adopt  $\sqrt{Z(\bar{b}, b)}$  as the correct counting.

**Acknowledgments:** I would like to thank Christopher Herzog for useful discussion. This work was supported in part by the National Science Foundation under Grant No. PHY-0844827.

- 
- [1] A. Einstein, B. Podolsky, and N. Rosen, “Can quantum-mechanical description of physical reality be considered complete?” *Phys. Rev.* **47** 777 (1935)
- [2] G. Vidal, J. Latorre, E. Rico and A. Kitaev, “Entanglement in quantum critical phenomena,” *Phys. Rev. Lett.* **90**, 227902 (2003)
- [3] H. Casini and M. Huerta, “On the RG running of the entanglement entropy of a circle,” *Phys. Rev. D* **85**, 125016 (2012)
- [4] L. Bombelli, R. Koul, J. Lee and R. Sorkin, “Quantum source of entropy for black holes,” *Phys. Rev. D* **34**, 373 (1986)
- [5] M. Srednicki, “Entropy and area,” *Phys. Rev. Lett.* **71**, 666 (1993)
- [6] P. Buividovich and M. Polikarpov, “Entanglement entropy in gauge theories and the holographic principle for electric strings,” *Phys. Lett. B* **670**, 141 (2008)
- [7] W. Donnelly, “Entanglement entropy in loop quantum gravity,” *Phys. Rev. D* **77**, 104006 (2008)
- [8] H. Casini, M. Huerta and J. Rosabal, “Remarks on entanglement entropy for gauge fields,” *Phys. Rev. D* **89**, 085012 (2014)
- [9] H. Casini and M. Huerta, “Entanglement entropy for a Maxwell field: Numerical calculation on a two dimensional lattice,” arXiv:1406.2991 [hep-th].
- [10] C. Callan, Jr. and F. Wilczek, “On geometric entropy,” *Phys. Lett. B* **333**, 55 (1994)
- [11] P. Calabrese and J. Cardy, “Entanglement entropy and quantum field theory,” *J. Stat. Mech.* **0406**, P06002 (2004)
- [12] H. Casini, M. Huerta and R. C. Myers, “Towards a derivation of holographic entanglement entropy,” *JHEP* **1105**, 036 (2011)
- [13] S. Ryu and T. Takayanagi, “Holographic derivation of entanglement entropy from AdS/CFT,” *Phys. Rev. Lett.* **96**, 181602 (2006)
- [14] D. V. Fursaev, “Entanglement Renyi Entropies in Conformal Field Theories and Holography,” *JHEP* **1205**, 080 (2012)
- [15] S. N. Solodukhin, “Entanglement entropy, conformal invariance and extrinsic geometry,” *Phys. Lett. B* **665**, 305 (2008)
- [16] C. Eling, Y. Oz and S. Theisen, “Entanglement and Thermal Entropy of Gauge Fields,” *JHEP* **1311**, 019 (2013)
- [17] L. Y. Hung, R. Myers and M. Smolkin, “Twist operators in higher dimensions,” arXiv:1407.6429 [hep-th].
- [18] J. S. Dowker, “Entanglement entropy for even spheres,” arXiv:1009.3854 [hep-th].
- [19] S. Giombi, A. Maloney and X. Yin, “One-loop Partition Functions of 3D Gravity,” *JHEP* **0808**, 007 (2008)
- [20] R. Camporesi and A. Higuchi, “Spectral functions and zeta functions in hyperbolic spaces,” *J. Math. Phys.* **35**, 4217 (1994). A. Grigor’yan and M. Noguchi, *Bull. London Math. Soc.* **30**, 643 (1998);
- [21] A. D. Barvinsky and S. N. Solodukhin, “Nonminimal coupling, boundary terms and renormalization of the Einstein-Hilbert action and black hole entropy,” *Nucl. Phys. B* **479**, 305 (1996)
- [22] T. Jacobson and A. Satz, “On the renormalization of the Gibbons-Hawking boundary term,” *Phys. Rev. D* **89**, 064034 (2014)
- [23] D. N. Kabat, “Black hole entropy and entropy of entanglement,” *Nucl. Phys. B* **453**, 281 (1995)
- [24] W. Donnelly and A. C. Wall, “Do gauge fields really contribute negatively to black hole entropy?,” *Phys. Rev. D* **86**, 064042 (2012)
- [25] R. M. Wald, “Black hole entropy is the Noether charge,” *Phys. Rev. D* **48**, 3427 (1993)
- [26] D. V. Vassilevich, “Heat kernel expansion: User’s manual,” *Phys. Rept.* **388**, 279 (2003)
- [27] Camporesi, Roberto “Harmonic analysis and propagators on homogeneous spaces,” *Physics Reports*, Volume 196, Issue 1-2, p. 1-134.
- [28] D. V. Fursaev and S. N. Solodukhin, “On the description of the Riemannian geometry in the presence of conical defects,” *Phys. Rev. D* **52**, 2133 (1995)
- [29] H. Casini and M. Huerta, “Entanglement entropy for the n-sphere,” *Phys. Lett. B* **694**, 167 (2010)
- [30] L. S. Brown and J. P. Cassidy, “Stress Tensors and their Trace Anomalies in Conformally Flat Space-Times,” *Phys. Rev. D* **16**, 1712 (1977).
- [31] C. P. Herzog and K. W. Huang, “Stress Tensors from Trace Anomalies in Conformal Field Theories,” *Phys. Rev. D* **87**, 081901 (2013)
- [32] K. W. Huang, “Weyl Anomaly Induced Stress Tensors in General Manifolds,” *Nucl. Phys. B* **879**, 370 (2014)
- [33] W. Donnelly and A. C. Wall, “Entanglement entropy of electromagnetic edge modes,” arXiv:1412.1895 [hep-th].