

# Singularities From Entropy

Raphael Bousso

Berkeley Center for Theoretical Physics and Department of Physics,  
University of California, Berkeley, CA 94720, USA

Arvin Shahbazi-Moghaddam

Stanford Institute for Theoretical Physics,  
Stanford University, Stanford, CA 94305, USA

Assuming the Bousso bound, we prove a singularity theorem: if the light rays entering a hyperentropic region contract, then at least one light ray must be incomplete. “Hyperentropic” means that the entropy of the region exceeds the Bekenstein-Hawking entropy of its spatial boundary. Our theorem provides a direct link between singularities and quantum information. The hyperentropic condition replaces the noncompactness assumption in Penrose’s theorem, so our theorem is applicable even in a closed universe. In an asymptotically de Sitter spacetime, for example, a big bang singularity can be diagnosed from the presence of dilute radiation at arbitrarily late times. In asymptotically flat space, Penrose’s theorem can be recovered by adding soft radiation.

## INTRODUCTION

Penrose’s singularity theorem [1] is of fundamental importance to general relativity and quantum gravity. It implies that singularities are generic and not just an artifact of highly symmetric solutions.

A singularity—defined as the incompleteness of a null or timelike geodesic—signifies a breakdown of classical spacetime. One expects a quantum gravity theory to provide a consistent mathematical description, though it may not be geometric.

The half-century since Penrose’s work has seen breakthrough advances in quantum gravity [2–4]. Yet, the nature of singularities remains largely a mystery. This is particularly vexing since the Universe contains black holes and may also have a singularity in the past.

It would be helpful, therefore, to gain a new perspective on singularities. In this work, we prove that a singularity must form when the entropy in a spatial region exceeds the maximum entropy allowed on a lightsheet emanating into the same region. Our result suggests that singularities are the response of the spacetime geometry to the presence of too much quantum information.

The Bousso bound [5] states that the renormalized entropy of the quantum fields on a lightsheet  $L$  emanating from a surface of area  $A$  is bounded by  $A/4G$ , where  $G$  is Newton’s constant. (See, *e.g.*, Refs. [5–12] for evidence and generalizations. We set  $k_B = c = \hbar = 1$ .) A lightsheet is an everywhere nonexpanding null hypersurface.

By contrast, the entropy in a spatial region  $B$  (a partial Cauchy surface) is generally unconstrained by the area of its boundary  $\partial B$ . The simplest example is a spatially closed universe with nonzero entropy. Or consider a star in an advanced stage of gravitational collapse: its surface area becomes small, but its entropy cannot decrease. We shall call regions with  $S(B) > A(\partial B)/4G$  *hyperentropic*.

But if  $B$  and  $L$  have the same domain of dependence, *i.e.* if  $D(B) = D(L)$  (see Def. 3 below), then the quantum

states on  $B$  and  $L$  are unitarily equivalent and have the same entropy [5]. In this case, the Bousso bound on  $L$  implies that  $B$  cannot be hyperentropic; see Fig. 1a.

The condition  $D(B) = D(L)$  can be broken up as follows: first, the nonexpansion condition must hold on  $\partial B$ , so that a lightsheet  $L$  directed towards the interior of  $B$  exists; and secondly,  $L$  has to “close off,” so that the same matter passes through  $B$  and through  $L$ .

Our central observation is that a contrapositive of this result depends only on initial data on  $B$ . Suppose that  $B$  is hyperentropic, and suppose moreover that a lightsheet  $L$  towards the interior of  $B$  exists. Then  $L$  must fail to close off, or else the Bousso bound would be violated. For example,  $L$  might fail to close off if it expands out and runs off to infinity. But since  $L$  is an initially contracting null hypersurface, this possibility is excluded [6] by the null energy condition<sup>1</sup> (see Def. 13). Therefore,  $L$  must run into a singularity, as shown in Fig. 1b.




FIG. 1. In these Penrose diagrams, the thin vertical line represents  $r = 0$ ;  $L$  is a contracting light cone (generally, a lightsheet); and  $B$  is a spatial region. (a) If  $L$  “closes off,” then all matter in  $B$  (arrows) must pass through  $L$ , so its entropy is bounded by the area of  $\partial B$ . (b) If  $B$  is hyperentropic [ $S(B) > A(\partial B)/4G$ ], then  $L$  cannot close off, or else the Bousso bound would be violated. We prove that this implies a singularity.

<sup>1</sup> This assumption can be eliminated [13] by taking a quantum extension of the Bousso bound [14] as the starting point.

We will now make this heuristic argument rigorous and derive a singularity theorem. We will then discuss the relation between Penrose's theorem and ours; and we will illustrate our theorem in several examples where Penrose's theorem does not apply.

### SINGULARITY THEOREM

*Convention 1.* Let  $(M, g_{ab})$  be a time-orientable globally hyperbolic spacetime. ( $M$  may be extendible.) We use  $\partial$  to denote a boundary as a subset of a Cauchy slice  $\Sigma$  and an overdot to represent a boundary as a subset of  $M$ .

*Convention 2.* Everywhere below,  $B$  will denote a closed subset of a Cauchy slice  $\Sigma$  of  $M$ , such that  $\partial B$  is a compact codimension 2 submanifold of  $M$  and  $B - \partial B \neq \emptyset$ .  $C$  denotes the complement of  $B$  on  $\Sigma$ . Thus,  $C$  is an open subset of  $\Sigma$  and  $\partial C = \partial B$ .

*Definition 3.* For any closed achronal set  $K \subset M$ , the *future domain of dependence*,  $D^+(K)$ , is the set of points  $p$  such that every past-inextendible causal curve through  $p$  must intersect  $K$ . The *past domain of dependence*,  $D^-(K)$ , is defined analogously. The *domain of dependence* is  $D(K) \equiv D^+(K) \cup D^-(K)$ .

*Definition 4.* The chronological and causal future and past,  $I^\pm(K)$  and  $J^\pm(K)$ , of any set  $K \subset M$  are defined as in Wald [15]. For  $K = \{p\}$ , it is conventional to drop the set brackets. For convenience we list key consequences of these definitions that will be important below:  $p \notin I^+(p)$  but  $p \in J^+(p)$ ;  $I^+(K)$  is open; and since we assume global hyperbolicity, for compact  $K$ ,  $J^+(K)$  is closed.

*Definition 5.* For any set  $K \subset M$ , we define its *domain of influence* as the union of  $K$  and all points that can be reached by a timelike curve from  $K$ :  $I(K) \equiv I^+(K) \cup I^-(K) \cup K$ .

**Lemma 6.** *With  $B$  as in Convention 2,  $D^\pm(B)$  and  $D(B)$  are closed.*

*Proof.* Let  $p \in \overline{D^+(B)}$ , and let  $\gamma$  be a past-inextendible causal curve through  $p$ . Suppose for contradiction that  $\gamma \cap B = \emptyset$ . Then  $\gamma' = \gamma \cap C \neq \emptyset$  and  $\gamma \cap \partial C = \emptyset$ . Therefore  $\gamma'$  contains its future endpoint  $r$ . Using the submanifold structure of  $C$  one can find a point  $r' \in \gamma$  in a neighborhood of  $r$  such that  $I^-(r') \cap C \neq \emptyset$ . By Wald Lemma 8.1.4 [15], there exists a timelike curve  $\gamma''$  connecting  $p$  to  $C$ . By achronality of  $\Sigma$ ,  $\gamma''$  fails to intersect  $B$ , which contradicts Wald Proposition 8.3.2. Hence  $\gamma \cap B \neq \emptyset$ , so  $p \in D^+(B)$ . The time-reverse of this argument shows that  $D^-(B)$  is closed, and hence  $D(B) = D^+(B) \cup D^-(B)$  is closed.  $\square$

**Lemma 7.** *With  $B$  and  $C$  as in Convention 2,  $D^+(B) = D^+(\Sigma) - I^+(C) - C$  and  $D(B) = M - I(C)$ .*

*Proof.*  $p \in D^+(\Sigma) - I^+(C) - C \iff$  every past-inextendible timelike curve through  $p$  intersects  $\Sigma$ , but none intersects  $C \iff$  every past-inextendible timelike curve through  $p$  intersects  $B \iff p \in D^+(B)$ . The final equivalence follows from Wald Proposition 8.3.2 and Lemma 6. Combining this result with its time-reverse yields  $D(B) = M - I(C)$ .  $\square$

**Lemma 8.** *With  $C$  as in Convention 2,  $\dot{I}^+(C) - C = \dot{I}^+(\partial C) - I^+(C) - C$ .*

*Proof.*  $\dot{I}^+(\partial C) - I^+(C) - C \subseteq \dot{I}^+(C) - C$ : let  $q \in \dot{I}^+(\partial C) - I^+(C) - C$ . If  $q \in \partial C$ , we are done, so we may assume from here that  $q \notin \partial C$ . Then since  $q \in \dot{I}^+(\partial C)$ ,  $q$  lies on a null geodesic  $\gamma \subset \dot{I}^+(\partial C)$  which is either past-inextendible or has a past endpoint  $p \in \partial C$  [15]. Only the latter option is consistent with  $\Sigma \supset \partial C$  being a Cauchy surface. Now suppose that  $q \notin \dot{I}^+(C)$  for contradiction. Then since  $q \notin I^+(C)$ , there is an open neighborhood  $O(q)$  that satisfies  $O(q) \cap I^+(C) = \emptyset$ . Hence  $\gamma$  can be deformed into a timelike curve from  $p$  to  $r \in O(q)$ ; and since every open neighborhood of  $p$  enters  $C$ , it can be further deformed to a timelike curve from  $s \in C$  to  $r$ . This contradicts  $r \notin I^+(C)$ .

$\dot{I}^+(C) - C \subseteq \dot{I}^+(\partial C) - I^+(C) - C$ : let  $q \in \dot{I}^+(C) - C$ . Again we may assume that  $q \notin \partial C$  since otherwise we are done. Since  $I^+(C)$  is open,  $q \notin I^+(C)$ . It remains to be shown that  $q \in \dot{I}^+(\partial C)$ . Note that  $I^+(\partial C) \subset I^+(C)$  since every timelike curve from  $\partial C$  to a point  $r$  in  $I^+(\partial C)$  can be deformed to a timelike curve from  $C$  to  $r$ . Hence  $q \notin I^+(\partial C)$ . Now suppose that  $q \notin \dot{I}^+(\partial C)$  for contradiction. Then there exists an open neighborhood  $O(q)$  such that  $I^-[O(q)] \cap \partial C = \emptyset$ . Based on a similar argument to the one in the first paragraph,  $q \in \dot{I}^+(C)$  implies that there exists a null geodesic  $\gamma$  connecting  $q$  to  $C$ . Let  $p$  be the point of intersection with the smallest past-directed affine parameter, i.e.  $\gamma$  leaves  $C$  immediately to the future of  $p$ . Then, either  $p \in \partial C$  contradicting  $I^-[O(q)] \cap \partial C = \emptyset$  as in the previous paragraph. Or  $p \in C$  in which case there exists a point  $s$  in  $\gamma$  in a neighborhood of  $p$  such that  $I^-(s)$  intersects  $C$ . This contradicts  $q \in \dot{I}^+(C)$ .  $\square$

**Corollary 9.** *With  $C$  as in Convention 2, let  $\partial C$  be smooth. Then  $\dot{I}^+(C) - C$  is the union of the future-outward directed null geodesics orthogonal to  $\partial C$ , terminated at either caustics or self-intersections.*

*Proof.* By the main theorem in Ref. [16],  $\dot{I}^+(\partial C)$  is the union of the future directed null geodesics orthogonal to  $\partial C$ , terminated at either caustics or self-intersections. By definition, the outward-directed null geodesics are those that do not enter  $I^+(C)$  immediately. The result then follows from Lemma 8.  $\square$

**Proposition 10.** *With  $B$  as in Convention 2, let  $B'$  be a compact achronal codimension 1 submanifold such that*

$\partial B = \partial B'$  and  $B' \subset D^+(B)$ .<sup>2</sup> Then  $B$  is compact and  $D(B) = D(B')$ .

*Proof.* By Wald Lemma 8.1.1, there exists a smooth timelike vector field  $t^a$ . Since  $B' \subset D^+(B)$ , the integral curves of  $t^a$  that intersect  $B'$  must also intersect  $B$ ; and no curve intersects either set more than once. This provides a homeomorphism  $\psi : B' \rightarrow B$  (with the image given the topology induced by  $B$ ). Since  $\partial B = \partial B'$  and  $\psi(B') \subset B$ ,  $\partial\psi(B') = \partial B$  and so  $\psi(B') = B$ . This implies that  $B$  is compact.

Let  $\gamma$  be an inextendible timelike curve, and let  $p = \gamma \cap \Sigma$ , so either  $p \in B$  or  $p \in C$ . If  $p \in B = \psi(B') \subset J^-(B')$ , then  $J^+(p) \cap J^-(B') \neq \emptyset$  and furthermore (by an obvious generalization of Wald Theorem 8.3.10) is compact, so  $\gamma$  intersects  $J^-(B')$  by Wald Lemma 8.2.1.  $J^-(B' - \partial B)$  is closed and so contains the closure of any of its subsets. Moreover, the closure of  $B' - \partial B$  in  $M$  is also its closure in  $\Sigma$ . Hence  $B' \subset J^-(B' - \partial B)$ , and  $J^-(B') = J^-(B' - \partial B) = \dot{I}^-(B' - \partial B)$ . Suppose that  $\gamma$  did not intersect  $B' - \partial B$ . Then taking  $C \rightarrow B' - \partial B$  in Lemma 8, it follows that  $\gamma$  intersects  $I^-(\partial B)$ . This violates the Cauchy property of  $\Sigma$  unless  $\gamma$  intersects  $\partial B$ . Hence  $\gamma$  must intersect  $B'$ , and by achronality of  $B'$  it does so exactly once. If  $p \in C$ , it follows from  $B' \subset D^+(B)$  that  $\gamma \cap B' = \emptyset$ . It follows that  $B' \cup C$  is a Cauchy slice. By Corollary 7,  $D(B) = D(B')$ .  $\square$

*Definition 11.* Let  $\mu$  be a smooth compact codimension 2 submanifold of  $M$ . A *lightsheet*  $L(\mu)$  is a null hypersurface such that  $\partial L \supset \mu$ , with everywhere non-positive expansion away from  $\mu$ .

*Conjecture 12* (Classical Bousso Bound). The renormalized entropy on a lightsheet satisfies

$$S[L(\mu)] \leq \frac{\text{Area}(\mu)}{4G}. \quad (1)$$

*Definition 13.* A spacetime  $M$  satisfies the *null curvature condition* if  $R_{ab}k^ak^b \geq 0$  everywhere, where  $R_{ab}$  is the Ricci tensor and  $k^a$  is any null vector. (This will be the case if  $M$  satisfies the Einstein equation with the null energy condition holding for the stress tensor,  $T_{ab}k^ak^b \geq 0$ .)

**Theorem 14** (Singularity Theorem for Hyperentropic Regions). *Let  $B$  be a closed subset of the Cauchy slice  $\Sigma$  of  $M$ , with smooth compact boundary  $\partial B$  as in Convention 2. Let the null curvature condition and the Bousso bound hold on  $M$ . If the future-directed inward null geodesic congruence orthogonal to  $\partial B$  has negative expansion, and moreover if  $S(B) > \text{Area}(\partial B)/4G$ , then at least one of the above null geodesics is incomplete.*

<sup>2</sup> The latter condition can be relaxed to  $B' \subset D(B)$ , but this lengthens the proof and is not needed below.




FIG. 2. Spatially flat expanding universe with pressureless dust. Both the noncompact region  $B_1$  and the compact region  $B_2$  are hyperentropic, and the past-directed lightsheets entering them run into the big bang singularity.

*Proof.* Let  $L = \dot{I}^+(C) - C$ . By Wald Theorem 8.1.3,  $\dot{I}^+(C)$  is a codimension 1 embedded  $C^0$  achronal submanifold of  $M$ . Hence  $L$  is a submanifold with boundary  $\partial L = \partial B$ , and by corollary 9,  $L$  is a null hypersurface. By assumption, the expansion  $\theta$  of  $L$  is negative on  $\partial B$ , and by the null curvature condition it will remain negative everywhere on  $L$ , so  $L$  is a lightsheet.

By compactness of  $\partial B$ ,  $\theta$  is bounded away from 0; hence by rescaling the affine parameter at different points, we can arrange that  $\theta = -1$  everywhere on  $\partial B$ . By the focussing theorem of general relativity, all generators of  $L$  must leave  $L$  at or before affine distance 2 from  $\partial B$ . Assuming for contradiction that every generator is complete, then  $L$  is a subset of the union  $\mathcal{L}$  of the null geodesics orthogonal to  $\partial B$  in the closed interval  $[0, 2]$ . Since  $\partial B$  is compact, then so is  $\mathcal{L}$ ; and since  $L$  is closed,  $L$  must be compact.

By Lemma 8, no point in  $L$  can be connected by a past-inextendible timelike curve to  $C$ . Therefore, by the Cauchy property of  $\Sigma$ , all past-inextendible timelike curves passing through  $L$  must intersect  $B$ . Hence  $L \subset D^+(B)$ , and by Lemma 6,  $L \subset D^+(B)$ . Since  $\partial L = \partial B$ , Proposition 10 implies that  $B$  is compact and that  $D(L) = D(B)$ . Thus, by unitarity,  $S(L) = S(B)$ . This contradicts the Bousso bound, so at least one null generator of  $L$  must be incomplete.  $\square$

## DISCUSSION

Our theorem, like Penrose's, provides sufficient conditions for a singularity, but not an equivalence. For example, neither theorem predicts a singularity from the data on an early Cauchy surface of a collapsing dust cloud that eventually forms a black hole.

Our theorem does not require the fine-grained entropy

to be large. One can coarse-grain the matter entropy in  $B$  while holding fixed the stress tensor and thus the spacetime geometry. If the coarse-grained state is hyperentropic, then there will be a singularity even if the fine-grained entropy in  $B$  is small.

Both Penrose's theorem and ours are proven by demonstrating that  $B$  cannot evolve to a compact null hypersurface  $L$ . In Penrose's case, the obstruction is topological, since  $B$  is noncompact. In our theorem, the obstruction is unitarity: if all the entropy on  $B$  passed through  $L$ , then the Bousso bound would be violated.

Yet, in a broad class of examples, our theorem implies Penrose's. Suppose for example that  $B$  is asymptotically flat and satisfies the conditions of Penrose's theorem. If  $B$  is not hyperentropic, then it would appear that our theorem does not apply. But in the asymptotic region of  $B$ , one can add soft radiation carrying an arbitrary amount of entropy with arbitrarily small backreaction. Now our theorem does imply a singularity, and since the metric is unchanged, the singularity must have been present in the original spacetime. (However, this argument is not rigorous: not all noncompact  $B$  can be made hyperentropic with small backreaction in  $D(B)$ .)

Penrose's theorem gives no information about the character of the singularity it predicts, and our theorem shares this limitation. Geodesic incompleteness need not be accompanied by the divergence of a curvature invariant. For example, it could be caused by a violation of strong cosmic censorship: for a complete initial data slice  $\Sigma$ ,  $M = D(\Sigma)$  is a proper subset of a maximally extended spacetime  $\mathbf{M}$ . In that case, let  $H^+(\Sigma)$  denote the future Cauchy horizon of  $\Sigma$  in  $\mathbf{M}$ . Since  $\Sigma$  is complete, it has no edge, so by Wald Theorem 8.3.5, every point  $p \in H^+(\Sigma)$  lies on a past-inextendible null geodesic contained entirely in  $H^+(\Sigma)$ . Hence  $H^+(\Sigma)$  either contains an incomplete null geodesic or a past asymptotic region. If  $p$  lies also in the closure of  $D^+(B)$  in  $\mathbf{M}$ , then the past-inextendible geodesic is contained entirely in this closure.

## EXAMPLES

Consider an expanding Friedmann-Robertson-Walker universe whose energy density is dominated by pressureless dust (Fig. 2). At any fixed time, sufficiently large spheres are anti-trapped [5]; let  $B_1$  be the exterior of such a sphere. The entropy  $S(B)$  is infinite, so both conditions of our theorem are satisfied (with past and future exchanged). The Penrose theorem, too, would have predicted the big bang singularity from data on  $B_1$ , since  $B_1$  is noncompact.

However, Theorem 14 can diagnose the big bang from compact regions as well. In the above example, the past-inward directed null geodesics orthogonal to any sphere have negative expansion. At any fixed time, the entropy in a ball  $B_2$  of proper radius  $r$  scales as  $r^3$ , whereas the




FIG. 3. Closed radiation-dominated universe. The compact hyperentropic region  $B_3$  is similar to  $B_2$  in Figure 2.




FIG. 4. The full square without the wiggly line represents de Sitter space, which is nonsingular. A late hemisphere  $B_4$  can be made hyperentropic by adding soft radiation with negligible local backreaction. Under backward evolution this results in a big bang, as predicted by our theorem.

area scales as  $r^2$ . Hence, for large enough radius,  $B_2$  will be hyperentropic.

The Penrose theorem never applies in a closed universe, since all spatial regions are compact, but our Theorem 14 does. A simple example is the region  $B_3$  in Fig. 3, obtained by introducing positive spatial curvature on a scale much greater than the hyperentropic region  $B_2$ .

To showcase the power of Theorem 14, let us study a closed universe with cosmological constant  $\Lambda > 0$  (Fig. 4). Our construction begins with the vacuum de Sitter solution, which is not singular. Each time slice is a three-sphere of radius  $a(t) \propto t_\Lambda \cosh(t/t_\Lambda)$ , where  $t_\Lambda = (3/\Lambda)^{1/2}$ . Let  $\Sigma$  be the sphere at a very late time  $t \gg t_\Lambda$ , and modify the data on  $\Sigma$  by adding thermal radiation with negligible density  $\rho \ll \Lambda/G$ . This will not change the metric much near  $\Sigma$ , but it can make the left hemisphere  $B_4$  hyperentropic. The radiation entropy in the left hemisphere  $B_4$  is  $S_{B_4} \sim \rho^{3/4} a^3$ . The equator has area  $A(\partial B_4) \sim a^2$ , and its past-directed orthogonal light rays have negative expansion. Thus, the conditions of Theorem 14 can be satisfied by choosing  $a$  large at fixed




FIG. 5. Gravitational collapse of a dust ball (shaded). The light-sheet of the hyperentropic region  $B_5$  runs into the future black hole singularity.

$\rho$ . Note that the universe can be made to look arbitrarily close to empty de Sitter space for as much time as we like before  $\Sigma$ , by choosing  $a$  large and  $\rho$  small. Yet, explicit calculation shows that if the late hemisphere is hyperentropic, the radiation density will eventually come to dominate over the vacuum energy under backward time evolution, replacing the bounce with a big bang. Thus, the Theorem diagnoses a big bang in the arbitrarily distant past.

Finally, consider the gravitational collapse of a ball of pressureless dust (a “star”) of mass  $M$  shown in Fig. 5. This can be constructed by cutting out the hyperentropic region  $B_2$  in Fig. 2 and reversing time [17]. The exterior is a vacuum solution, shown here as noncompact, but our theorem applies even if the global topology is compact.

*Acknowledgements* We would like to thank D. Harlow, G. Horowitz and R. Mahajan for discussions. We are grateful to A. Chatwin-Davies, C. Murdia, A. Rolph, and E. Shaghoulian for comments on Ref. [18] that indirectly [13] motivated this paper. This work was supported in part by the Berkeley Center for Theoretical Physics; by the Department of Energy, Office of Science, Office of High Energy Physics under QuantISED Award DE-SC0019380 and under contract DE-AC02-05CH11231; and by the National Science Foundation under Award Numbers 2112880 (RB) and 2014215 (ASM).

- [1] R. Penrose, “Gravitational collapse and space-time singularities,” *Phys. Rev. Lett.* **14** (1965) 57–59.
- [2] J. D. Bekenstein, “Black holes and the second law,” *Lett. Nuovo Cim.* **4** (1972) 737–740.
- [3] S. W. Hawking, “Particle Creation by Black Holes,” *Commun. Math. Phys.* **43** (1975) 199–220. [Erratum: *Commun. Math. Phys.* **46**, 206 (1976)].
- [4] J. M. Maldacena, “The Large N limit of superconformal field theories and supergravity,” *Int. J. Theor. Phys.* **38** (1999) 1113–1133, [arXiv:hep-th/9711200](#).
- [5] R. Bousso, “A Covariant Entropy Conjecture,” *JHEP* **07** (1999) 004, [arXiv:hep-th/9905177](#).
- [6] R. Bousso, “Holography in general space-times,” *JHEP* **06** (1999) 028, [arXiv:hep-th/9906022](#).
- [7] E. E. Flanagan, D. Marolf, and R. M. Wald, “Proof of classical versions of the Bousso entropy bound and of the generalized second law,” *Phys. Rev. D* **62** (2000) 084035, [arXiv:hep-th/9908070](#).
- [8] R. Bousso, “The Holographic principle,” *Rev. Mod. Phys.* **74** (2002) 825–874, [arXiv:hep-th/0203101](#).
- [9] A. Strominger and D. M. Thompson, “A Quantum Bousso bound,” *Phys. Rev. D* **70** (2004) 044007, [arXiv:hep-th/0303067](#).
- [10] R. Bousso, E. E. Flanagan, and D. Marolf, “Simple sufficient conditions for the generalized covariant entropy bound,” *Phys. Rev. D* **68** (2003) 064001, [arXiv:hep-th/0305149](#).
- [11] R. Bousso, H. Casini, Z. Fisher, and J. Maldacena, “Proof of a Quantum Bousso Bound,” *Phys. Rev. D* **90** no. 4, (2014) 044002, [arXiv:1404.5635 \[hep-th\]](#).
- [12] R. Bousso, H. Casini, Z. Fisher, and J. Maldacena, “Entropy on a null surface for interacting quantum field theories and the Bousso bound,” *Phys. Rev. D* **91** no. 8, (2015) 084030, [arXiv:1406.4545 \[hep-th\]](#).
- [13] R. Bousso and A. Shahbazi-Moghaddam (to appear).
- [14] R. Bousso, Z. Fisher, S. Leichenauer, and A. C. Wall, “Quantum focusing conjecture,” *Phys. Rev. D* **93** no. 6, (2016) 064044, [arXiv:1506.02669 \[hep-th\]](#).
- [15] R. M. Wald, *General Relativity*. University of Chicago press, 2010.
- [16] C. Akers, R. Bousso, I. F. Halpern, and G. N. Remmen, “Boundary of the future of a surface,” *Phys. Rev. D* **97** no. 2, (2018) 024018, [arXiv:1711.06689 \[hep-th\]](#).
- [17] J. R. Oppenheimer and H. Snyder, “On Continued gravitational contraction,” *Phys. Rev.* **56** (1939) 455–459.
- [18] R. Bousso and A. Shahbazi-Moghaddam, “Island Finder and Entropy Bound,” *Phys. Rev. D* **103** no. 10, (2021) 106005, [arXiv:2101.11648 \[hep-th\]](#).