

Entropy-Area Law from Interior Semi-classical Degrees of Freedom

Yuki Yokokura *

iTHEMS Program, RIKEN, Wako, Saitama 351-0198, Japan

Abstract

We consider a spherical static gravitational bound state consisting of many semi-classical degrees of freedom that exist uniformly inside and have maximum gravity, and study the entropy including the self-gravity in the semi-classical Einstein equation. We construct the self-consistent interior metric such that the entropy follows the Bekenstein-Hawking formula exactly for any degree of freedom. The interior is a dense configuration without horizon or singularity and behaves like a local thermal state. Here, the self-gravity plays an essential role in changing the entropy from the volume law to the area law.

1 Introduction.

Information has energy and curves spacetime. When a sufficient amount of information is gathered, a black hole is formed, which should be characterized more properly by the fact that the amount of information is measured by the surface area [1, 2], than by the existence of horizons. This is because the concept of information is quantum mechanical while in quantum theory the geometrical notion of horizons should emerge approximately only under a certain limit.

Such a view appears naturally among various approaches pursuing the idea that a black hole is a bound state of degrees of freedom responsible for the area entropy: string [3–5], discrete geometry [6–8], graviton condensation [9, 10], semi-classical dynamical modes [11–13], and so on (although their formation process is not well studied). Then, where do such degrees of freedom live? Around the surface or somewhere inside? While the former may be a naive and natural idea, there also exists a nontrivial fact that the self-gravity of interior degrees of freedom changes the volume-law of entropy [14–16]. In this paper, we consider interior semi-classical degrees of freedom with extremely strong self-gravity, and find an interior metric satisfying the semi-classical Einstein equation

$$G_{\mu\nu} = 8\pi G \langle \psi | T_{\mu\nu} | \psi \rangle \quad (1.1)$$

such that the entropy follows the area law exactly.

As a simple trial, we consider a spherical static gravitational bound state with mass $M = \frac{a}{2G}$, consisting of many semi-classical degrees of freedom uniformly distributed with respect to the proper radius, except for a small region around $r = 0$ where the semi-classical approximation may break down ($a \gg l_p \equiv \sqrt{\hbar G}$). That is, they are uniformly distributed in $l_p \ll r \leq R$, where the size of the bound state R is close to a . Here, we don't specify the details of the formation process and the degrees of freedom, except that their energy-momentum $\langle \psi | T_{\mu\nu} | \psi \rangle$ satisfies (1.1).

To express the strength of gravity, we can use, from the equivalence principle, the proper acceleration $\alpha_n(r)$ required to stay at r inside. We here note two observations. First, in the

*yuki.yokokura@riken.jp

Schwarzschild metric with $M = \frac{a}{2G}$, the acceleration increases as $r \rightarrow a$ and becomes $\mathcal{O}\left(\frac{1}{l_p}\right)$ at $r \sim a + \frac{l_p^2}{a}$ [17], where $\Delta r \sim \frac{l_p^2}{a}$ corresponds to the typical fluctuation of the mass, $\Delta M \sim T_H = \frac{\hbar}{4\pi a}$. Second, in quantum gravity, the limit of spacetime resolution is considered to be the Planck length l_p [18–21], which is related to the existence of the maximum acceleration $\sim \frac{1}{l_p}$ [22–26]. Therefore, the characteristic scale at r , given by $\alpha_n(r)^{-1}$, must be sufficiently longer than l_p for the semi-classical description to hold. Motivated by these, we thus characterize the uniformly distributed bound state with the semi-classically maximum gravity by $\alpha_n(r) \approx \text{const.} = \mathcal{O}\left(\frac{1}{Cl_p}\right)$ for $l_p \ll r \leq R$, where \mathcal{C} is a large number of $\mathcal{O}(1)$.¹

Using these two conditions, we construct the interior metric of the bound state. The key step is to evaluate the energy density for the distribution of the information and apply it to (1.1). The metric is a warped product of AdS_2 of radius $\sim Cl_p$ and S^2 of radius r , and means that the bound state for sufficiently many degrees of freedom is a dense object without singularity or horizon due to the full 4D dynamics of (1.1). The state $|\psi\rangle$ behaves like a local thermal state at a near-Planckian temperature T_{loc} , leading to the equilibrium with a heat bath at $T_H = \frac{\hbar}{4\pi a}$. Evaluating the entropy density through thermodynamic relations and summing it up over the interior volume, the area law is derived with the factor 1/4 for any degree of freedom, where the strong self-gravity changes the entropy from the volume law to the area law. Note that this configuration is an example of having no horizon and saturating the Bekenstein bound [27].

This is shown in a self-consistent manner. First, we find a candidate metric such that the entropy is proportional to the area law (Sec.2). Next, we apply the Unruh effect locally to the metric and get T_{loc} (Sec.3), to derive the area law exactly (Sec.4). We determine the position R of the surface from the thermodynamic equilibrium conditions in a heat bath (Sec.5). We then evaluate $\langle\psi|T_{\mu\nu}|\psi\rangle$ and show that the metric satisfies indeed (1.1) (Sec.6). Finally, we consider the time evolution of quantum fields in the formation and evaporation process of the bound state and derive that particles are dynamically created inside at T_{loc} (Sec.7). Thus, we obtain the self-consistent interior configuration satisfying the area law and (1.1).

2 Interior metric from information

Setting the interior metric for $l_p \ll r \leq R$ by

$$ds^2 = -e^{A(r)} dt^2 + B(r) dr^2 + r^2 d\Omega^2, \quad (2.1)$$

we first determine $B(r)$. Suppose that there are N quanta with local energy ϵ_{loc} and 1 bit of information in a width $\Delta\hat{r}$ around r . Here, N is a number to be determined, and (\hat{t}, \hat{r}) is the local coordinate with $\Delta\hat{t} = \sqrt{-g_{\hat{t}\hat{t}}(r)}\Delta t$ and $\Delta\hat{r} = \sqrt{g_{\hat{r}\hat{r}}(r)}\Delta r$. Then, the total local energy, $N\epsilon_{loc} = 4\pi r^2 \Delta\hat{r} \langle T^{\hat{t}\hat{t}} \rangle$, leads to

$$-\langle T^{\hat{t}\hat{t}}(r) \rangle = \frac{N\epsilon_{loc}}{4\pi r^2 \Delta\hat{r}}, \quad (2.2)$$

where we used $g^{\hat{t}\hat{t}} = -1$ and $T^{\hat{t}\hat{t}} = T^{\hat{t}}_{\hat{t}} = -T^{\hat{t}\hat{t}}$.

Here, the contribution to the ADM energy of the part within r in a spherically symmetric system is given through (1.1) by

$$M(r) = 4\pi \int_0^r dr' r'^2 \langle -T^{\hat{t}\hat{t}}(r') \rangle, \quad (2.3)$$

where $\lim_{r \rightarrow \infty} M(r) = M$, and $(r^2 \langle T^{\hat{t}\hat{t}}(r) \rangle)|_{r \rightarrow 0}$ is finite [17, 28]. (2.2) and (2.3) lead to the formula for the ADM energy ΔM_{1bit} of a 1-bit quantum located at r :

$$\Delta M_{1bit} = 4\pi r^2 \Delta\hat{r} \frac{\langle -T^{\hat{t}\hat{t}}(r) \rangle}{N} = \frac{\epsilon_{loc}}{\sqrt{g_{\hat{r}\hat{r}}(r)}}. \quad (2.4)$$

¹ $\mathcal{O}(1)$ means $\mathcal{O}(r^0)$ or $\mathcal{O}(a^0)$ for $r, a \gg l_p$.

On the other hand, by using the uniform distribution condition and Bekenstein's argument, we can obtain

$$\Delta M_{1bit} \sim \frac{\hbar}{r}. \quad (2.5)$$

The reason is as follows. First, the total size R is to be determined later as $R = a + \mathcal{O}(l_p^2/a)$ (see (5.4)), which is of the same order as the radius at which Bekenstein's thought experiment is performed [1]. Second, the physical property at any radius r is equivalent due to the uniform distribution, and the interior of a given r is not affected by its exterior due to the spherical symmetry. Therefore, the size of the bound state with mass $M(r)$ is $r = a(r) + \mathcal{O}(l_p^2/a(r))$, where $a(r) \equiv 2GM(r)$. Then, applying Bekenstein's idea to massless fields, a quantum with $\Delta M \sim \frac{\hbar}{r}$ has wavelength $\sim r$ and carries 1 bit of information about whether it would enter or not when forming the bound state of mass $M(r)$ and size $\approx r$ since the wavelength and the bound state size are comparable. Hence, from the continuity of the uniform distribution, a 1-bit quantum at r has energy (2.5).

Thus, by equating (2.4) and (2.5), we can evaluate the proper wavelength as $\lambda_{loc} \sim \frac{\hbar}{\epsilon_{loc}} \sim \frac{r}{\sqrt{g_{rr}(r)}}$. Now, since there are N quanta with 1 bit of information and this wavelength in the width $\Delta \hat{r} \sim \lambda_{loc}$, the entropy per unit proper length can be estimated as

$$s(r) \sim \frac{N}{\Delta \hat{r}} \sim \frac{N \sqrt{g_{rr}(r)}}{r}. \quad (2.6)$$

Because the uniform spherical distribution means that $s(r)$ is constant, (2.6) requires us to set $g_{rr}(r) = \frac{r^2}{2\sigma}$, where σ is a constant. Then, the total entropy can be estimated as $S = \int_{\sim l_p}^R dr \sqrt{g_{rr}(r)} s(r) \sim \int_0^a dr \frac{N g_{rr}(r)}{r} \sim \frac{Na^2}{\sigma}$. For this to be consistent with $S \sim \frac{a^2}{l_p^2}$, we must have²

$$g_{rr}(r) = B(r) = \frac{r^2}{2\sigma}, \quad \sigma \sim N l_p^2. \quad (2.7)$$

As a result, the entropy density (2.6) becomes $s(r) \sim \frac{\sqrt{\sigma}}{l_p^2} \sim \frac{\sqrt{N}}{l_p}$. Thus, σ determines the entropy density, and $\mathcal{O}(\sqrt{N})$ bits are packed per the proper Planck length. Note that the wavelength and local energy for 1 bit of information are given through (2.7) by

$$\lambda_{loc} \sim \sqrt{N} l_p, \quad \epsilon_{loc} \sim \frac{m_p}{\sqrt{N}}, \quad (2.8)$$

respectively, where $m_p \equiv \sqrt{\frac{\hbar}{G}}$.

To fix $A(r)$, we consider the other condition, $\alpha_n(r) = \mathcal{O}\left(\frac{1}{c l_p}\right)$, where $\alpha_n(r) \equiv |g_{\mu\nu} \alpha_n^\mu \alpha_n^\nu|^{\frac{1}{2}}$, $\alpha_n^\mu \equiv n^\nu \nabla_\nu n^\mu$ and $n^\mu \partial_\mu = (-g_{tt}(r))^{-\frac{1}{2}} \partial_t$. This can be expressed as

$$\alpha_n(r) = \frac{\partial_r \log \sqrt{-g_{tt}(r)}}{\sqrt{g_{rr}(r)}} = \frac{1}{\sqrt{2\sigma\eta^2}}, \quad (2.9)$$

by introducing another constant η satisfying $N\eta^2 = \mathcal{O}(1) \gg 1$. Integrating this through (2.7) provides

$$A(r) = \frac{r^2}{2\sigma\eta} + A_0, \quad (2.10)$$

where A_0 is an integration constant to be fixed later. Thus, we reach

$$ds^2 = -e^{\frac{r^2}{2\sigma\eta} + A_0} dt^2 + \frac{r^2}{2\sigma} dr^2 + r^2 d\Omega^2. \quad (2.11)$$

²Note that this requirement is just the first step in the self-consistent argument, and at this stage we don't claim that the area law is derived.

Note that the above procedure provides a generic method of constructing a metric from information such as a total entropy S and a distribution $s(r)$.

Let us now study the properties of the interior metric (2.11). Using (1.1),³ we have

$$-\langle T^t_t(r) \rangle = \frac{1}{8\pi G r^2}, \quad (2.12)$$

$$\langle T^r_r(r) \rangle = \frac{2-\eta}{\eta} (-\langle T^t_t(r) \rangle), \quad (2.13)$$

$$\langle T^\theta_\theta(r) \rangle = \frac{1}{16\pi G \sigma \eta^2}, \quad (2.14)$$

as the leading ones for $r \gg l_p$. First, the energy density (2.12) reproduces through (2.3) mass $M = \frac{R}{2G} \approx \frac{a}{2G}$ if the region outside $R \approx a$ is almost vacuum. Second, in a static gravitational field, physical excitation of the semi-classical degrees of freedom should be locally consistent with thermodynamics and have positive pressures [29], which leads through (2.13) to

$$0 < \eta < 2. \quad (2.15)$$

To hold $N\eta^2 = \mathcal{O}(1) \gg 1$, therefore N must be a constant of $\mathcal{O}(1)$ much larger than 1. Third, the tangential pressure (2.14) is almost Planckian stabilizing the bound state against the gravity, and the interior is not fluid because of $\langle T^\theta_\theta \rangle \gg \langle T^r_r \rangle$.

The leading values of the curvatures for $r \gg l_p$ are semi-classically maximum:⁴

$$R = -\frac{2}{L^2}, \quad R_{\mu\nu}R^{\mu\nu} = \frac{2}{L^4}, \quad R_{\mu\nu\alpha\beta}R^{\mu\nu\alpha\beta} = \frac{4}{L^4}, \quad (2.16)$$

$$L \equiv \sqrt{2\sigma\eta^2} \sim \sqrt{N}l_p \gg l_p. \quad (2.17)$$

Two points should be noted here. One is that the bound state should have no singularity. Indeed, if we apply (2.3) and (2.12) to $r \sim \sqrt{N}l_p$, such a small semi-classical region has the energy $M(r \sim \sqrt{N}l_p) \sim \sqrt{N}m_p$. Therefore, we can expect that the center region $0 \leq r \lesssim l_p$ has a small energy $\sim m_p$ and is described as a quantum-gravity regular state. The other one, from the Ricci scalar in (2.16),⁵ is that the interior is a warped product of AdS_2 of radius L (2.17) and S^2 of radius r [30].

Note that the interior metric (2.11) is robust in that it is essentially the same as one obtained by various approaches [13, 30–35] because the both have the same leading terms for $r \gg l_p$ of the accelerations and curvatures. In particular, the metric can be obtained by adiabatic formation in a heat bath [32, 35], which should be thermodynamically typical. See Appendix A for a simple dynamical model that explicitly demonstrates this.

3 Local thermal behavior

The interior metric (2.11) originates from the self-gravity of the quanta responsible for the entropy and other modes that may be induced self-consistently. Let us study the behavior of the former ones in this background metric.

First, they are in uniformly accelerated motion with acceleration (2.9) against the gravity such that they are uniformly and steadily distributed on a t -constant hypersurface. Let us now consider the Unruh effect [36, 37]. In general, in a local spacetime region of size smaller than the radius of the curvature \mathcal{R} , a quantum moving with an acceleration $\alpha \gtrsim \mathcal{R}^{1/2}$ feels the temperature $T_U = \frac{\hbar\alpha}{2\pi}$, although the effect may be negligible compared to the effects of the

³Note again that the metric (2.11) is the ansatz at this stage, and is later shown to satisfy (1.1).

⁴The curvature radius L (2.17) is almost the same length as the wavelength $\lambda_{loc} \sim \sqrt{N}l_p$ (from (2.8)), and the above arguments based on the local frame (\hat{t}, \hat{r}) are valid, albeit barely.

⁵More precisely, the Ricci scalar is $R = -\frac{2}{L^2} + \mathcal{O}(r^{-2})$.

curvature and excitation energy [38, 39]. In our case, the acceleration (2.9) is barely on the same scale as the curvature (2.16), and the quanta in the local region with the coordinate system (\hat{t}, \hat{r}) feel the temperature $T_U = \frac{\hbar \alpha_p}{2\pi} = \frac{\hbar}{2\pi L} \sim \frac{m_p}{\sqrt{N}}$. Notably, since this temperature is on the semi-classically maximum energy scale, the quanta in any initial state $|\psi\rangle$ will become like a thermal state after transitioning to this configuration. Therefore, the quanta at each r behave like the local thermal state in the radial direction at the local temperature

$$T_{loc} = \frac{\hbar}{2\pi L}, \quad (3.1)$$

which is consistent with the energy scale for 1 bit, $\epsilon_{loc} \sim \frac{m_p}{\sqrt{N}}$ (2.8). In Sec. 7, this is proved at a dynamical level. Note that this holds universally for any types of degrees of freedom.

We here discuss Tolman's law [29, 40]. First, the fact that each small part of the interior has the local temperature (3.1), which is constant, might at first glance appear to violate Tolman's law. In general, the law holds only if thermal radiation can propagate between objects at rest with respect to each other in a stationary spacetime within a time considered [40]. For the interior, due to an exponentially large redshift (see (5.5)), the small parts separated by a distance $\Delta r = \mathcal{O}(a)$ cannot exchange radiation until time $\Delta t = \mathcal{O}(e^{a^2/l_p^2})$ has passed.⁶ Therefore, only during $\Delta t \ll \mathcal{O}(e^{a^2/l_p^2})$, can the bound state exist in local (not global) equilibrium, consistent with Tolman's law.⁷

4 Universality of the area law

We are now ready to derive the area law. In this local equilibrium, the 1D Gibbs relation

$$T_{loc} s = \rho_{1d} + p_{1d} \quad (4.1)$$

holds for $\rho_{1d} = 4\pi r^2 \langle -T^{\hat{t}}_{\hat{t}} \rangle$ and $p_{1d} = 4\pi r^2 \langle T^{\hat{r}}_{\hat{r}} \rangle$ because the interior is uniform in the proper radial length \hat{r} [41].⁸ Also, from (2.13),

$$p_{1d} = \frac{2 - \eta}{\eta} \rho_{1d} \quad (4.2)$$

plays a role of the equation of state, since $\langle T^{\theta}_{\theta} \rangle (\gg \langle T^r_r \rangle)$ has a qualitatively different origin (see Sec. 6). From (2.12), (2.17), (3.1), (4.1) and (4.2), we obtain

$$s(r) = \frac{1}{T_{loc}} \frac{2}{\eta} \rho_{1d} = \frac{2\pi\sqrt{2\sigma}}{l_p^2}. \quad (4.3)$$

This provides the area law for any degrees of freedom:

$$S = \int_0^R dr \sqrt{g_{rr}(r)} s(r) = \int_0^R dr \sqrt{\frac{r^2}{2\sigma} \frac{2\pi\sqrt{2\sigma}}{l_p^2}} = \frac{\mathcal{A}}{4l_p^2}, \quad (4.4)$$

where we used (2.7) and $\mathcal{A} \equiv 4\pi a^2 \approx 4\pi R^2$.

Let us consider the reason for (4.4) by reviewing our discussion. First, we have considered the self-gravity of the interior degrees of freedom and constructed the interior metric (2.11) so that their entropy scales as the area law. Next, considering the metric as the background, we have shown that any degrees of freedom behave like the local thermal state at T_{loc} . Finally, using the Einstein equation (1.1), to be shown to hold indeed in Sec. 6, we have evaluated their

⁶See [35] or Appendix B for the details of the time scale $\Delta t = \mathcal{O}(e^{a^2/l_p^2})$ and the time freezing effect.

⁷This local equilibrium makes the interior different from that of [15].

⁸Here, the chemical potential is zero because of the particle creation (see Sec. 7) [29].

entropy to derive the area law (4.4). The key is that the details of the degrees of freedom are introduced into the metric as σ through (1.1) when obtaining (2.7),⁹ and the entropy density (4.3) is determined (through T_{loc} and thermodynamic relations) such that σ cancels out in (4.4), leading to the factor 1/4 universally for any interior degrees of freedom¹⁰ without causing a problem like the “species problem” [42, 43]. In this sense, the dynamics of gravity, (1.1), plays the essential role in the area law.

5 Surface in equilibrium

Let us fix the size R and the constant A_0 from thermodynamics. Suppose that the bound state is in equilibrium with a heat bath of temperature T (during $\Delta t \ll \mathcal{O}(e^{a^2/l_p^2})$). Here, for simplicity, we neglect a small backreaction from thermal radiation and vacuum fluctuation around the bound state [36] and set the exterior metric for $r \geq R$ as

$$ds^2 = -\left(1 - \frac{a}{r}\right) dt^2 + \left(1 - \frac{a}{r}\right)^{-1} dr^2 + r^2 d\Omega^2. \quad (5.1)$$

From the thermodynamic relation $TdS = dM$ and (4.4), then the equilibrium temperature is determined as

$$T = \frac{\hbar}{4\pi a}, \quad (5.2)$$

which agrees with the Hawking temperature [44]. Furthermore, thermodynamics and Tolman’s law require that the local temperature be continuous at $r = R$ [29]:

$$T_{loc} = \frac{T}{\sqrt{1 - \frac{a}{R}}}. \quad (5.3)$$

Setting $R = a + \Delta$ ($\Delta \ll a$) and using (3.1) and (5.2), this becomes $\frac{\hbar}{2\pi L} = \frac{\hbar}{4\pi a} \frac{1}{\sqrt{\frac{\Delta}{R}}} \approx \frac{\hbar}{4\pi\sqrt{a\Delta}}$, leading through (2.17) to $\Delta = \frac{\sigma\eta^2}{2a}$. Thus, the position of the surface in equilibrium is given by

$$R = a + \frac{\sigma\eta^2}{2a}. \quad (5.4)$$

To fix A_0 , we can use the continuity of the induced metric at $r = R$ [17, 45]. This yields $-g_{tt}(R) = e^{\frac{R^2}{2\eta\sigma} + A_0} = 1 - \frac{a}{R} \approx \frac{\sigma\eta^2}{2R^2}$, where (2.11), (5.1), and (5.4) were used. Thus, the interior metric (2.11) is fixed completely as

$$ds^2 = -\frac{\sigma\eta^2}{2R^2} e^{-\frac{R^2-r^2}{2\sigma\eta}} dt^2 + \frac{r^2}{2\sigma} dr^2 + r^2 d\Omega^2. \quad (5.5)$$

(5.4) indicates that the bound state has, instead of a horizon, the surface at $r = R > a$ as the boundary between (5.1) and (5.5) [13, 31].¹¹

6 Self-consistent values of (σ, η)

The results so far are based on the assumption that there exist (σ, η) satisfying (1.1). To obtain them, we need to evaluate the renormalized energy-momentum tensor $\langle\psi|T_{\mu\nu}|\psi\rangle$ in the

⁹See (6.3) for an example of σ .

¹⁰This result is non-trivial because while (2.7) is, at that point, just a candidate metric obtained by a *rough mechanical estimation* (2.6) and the proportionality to the area law, that metric eventually satisfies (1.1) self-consistently (see Sec.6), leading (with (3.1)) to the *exact thermodynamical derivation* (4.4).

¹¹The proper length of the second term in (5.4), $\Delta\hat{r} = \sqrt{g_{rr}(R)}\frac{\sigma\eta^2}{2a} = \mathcal{O}(\sqrt{N}l_p)$, is large compared to l_p for $N \gg 1$ and physically meaningful in the semi-classical description [13].

background metric (5.5) and an excited state $|\psi\rangle$ at T_{loc} , compare the both sides of (1.1), and then find the self-consistent values of (σ, η) . We here discuss this briefly.

As a simple case, when the degrees of freedom are conformal,¹² we can use 4D Weyl anomaly:

$$\langle\psi|T^\mu{}_\mu|\psi\rangle = \hbar(c_W\mathcal{F} - a_W\mathcal{G} + b_W\Box R), \quad (6.1)$$

which is independent of $|\psi\rangle$ [36]. Here, $\mathcal{F} \equiv C_{\alpha\beta\gamma\delta}C^{\alpha\beta\gamma\delta} = R_{\alpha\beta\gamma\delta}R^{\alpha\beta\gamma\delta} - 2R_{\alpha\beta}R^{\alpha\beta} + \frac{1}{3}R^2$ and $\mathcal{G} \equiv R_{\alpha\beta\gamma\delta}R^{\alpha\beta\gamma\delta} - 4R_{\alpha\beta}R^{\alpha\beta} + R^2$. c_W and a_W are positive constants determined by the matter content of the theory (for small coupling constants), while b_W also depends on the finite renormalization of R^2 and $R_{\alpha\beta}R^{\alpha\beta}$ in the gravity action.

Then, using (2.16) and $\Box R = \mathcal{O}(r^{-4})$ for (5.5), the trace of (1.1) provides

$$\frac{2}{L^2} = 8\pi l_p^2 c_W \frac{4}{3L^4} \Rightarrow L^2 = \frac{16\pi l_p^2 c_W}{3}, \quad (6.2)$$

at the leading order for $r \gg l_p$. This leads through (2.17) to [32]

$$\sigma = \frac{8\pi l_p^2 c_W}{3\eta^2}, \quad (6.3)$$

where c_W plays a role of N in (2.7). Therefore, for $c_W \gg 1$, the number of fields must be sufficiently large.

For η , we can use the dimensional regularization and a perturbative technique and evaluate directly another component (say, $\langle\psi|T^t{}_t|\psi\rangle$) to find the self-consistent value of η [30].

Thus, the vacuum fluctuation of all modes with arbitrary angular momentum (which leads to 4D Weyl anomaly [36]) guarantees the existence of L (6.2) and induces the acceleration (2.9), pressure (2.14), and curvatures (2.16) self-consistently [30, 35]. The full 4D dynamics is essential for the bound state.

7 Dynamical derivation of T_{loc}

We here restart with the results in Sec.2 and rederive (5.2) and (5.4) from mechanical methods instead of thermodynamics, to reobtain (3.1) dynamically. The argument consists of three steps.

Step1. We study the time evolution of quantum matter fields in a background geometry for the formation and evaporation of the bound state, to show self-consistently that particles are created inside at temperature (5.2).

We first set up the background geometry. Suppose that the bound state with the interior metric (2.11) is formed from, say, a collapse of matter. The metric can be expressed as

$$ds^2 = -K^2 e^{-\frac{R^2-r^2}{2\sigma\eta}} dt^2 + \frac{r^2}{2\sigma} dr^2 + r^2 d\Omega^2. \quad (7.1)$$

At this stage, the radius of the surface is not yet determined except that $R = a + \Delta$ ($\Delta \ll a$). According to the continuity of the induced metric at $r = R$, a constant K is determined by the exterior metric and the value of Δ , such that t connects to the static time in the asymptotically flat region. K can then be a power of a : $K = K(a)$. As shown later, the details of Δ and K are not important for the particle creation. For convenience, we now introduce $K e^{-\frac{R^2}{4\sigma\eta}} du = K e^{-\frac{R^2}{4\sigma\eta}} dt - \frac{r}{\sqrt{2\sigma}} e^{-\frac{r^2}{4\sigma\eta}} dr$ to rewrite (7.1) as

$$ds^2 = -K^2 e^{-\frac{R^2-r^2}{2\sigma\eta}} du^2 - 2K \frac{r}{\sqrt{2\sigma}} e^{-\frac{R^2-r^2}{4\sigma\eta}} du dr + r^2 d\Omega^2. \quad (7.2)$$

¹²Even for non-conformal fields, σ can be determined [30].

u is chosen to be connected to the outgoing null time in the asymptotically flat region.

Imagine then that the bound state evaporates in the vacuum according to the Stefan-Boltzmann law of Hawking temperature (5.2):

$$\frac{dM(u)}{du} = -\frac{C}{2Ga(u)^2}. \quad (7.3)$$

Here, $M(u) = \frac{a(u)}{2G}$ is the Bondi mass, and C plays a role of the Stefan-Boltzmann constant of $\mathcal{O}(Nl_p^2)$ ¹³ including the gray-body factor [29]. Then, the interior is almost frozen by the large redshift and is still described approximately by (7.2) with $R(u) = a(u) + \Delta'(u)$ ($\Delta' \ll a$):¹⁴

$$ds^2 = -K'^2 e^{-\frac{R(u)^2 - r^2}{2\sigma\eta}} du^2 - 2K' \frac{r}{\sqrt{2\sigma}} e^{-\frac{R(u)^2 - r^2}{4\sigma\eta}} dudr + r^2 d\Omega^2, \quad (7.4)$$

where K' can be a power of $a(u)$: $K' = K'(a(u))$. On the other hand, the exterior is given by a u -dependent metric describing (7.3), say, a Vaidya metric [17].

Thus, the whole geometry for the formation and evaporation consists of the initial flat space, the intermediate curved space described by the above interior and exterior metrics, and the final flat space. The Penrose diagram is topologically the same as the Minkowski space [30, 35].

Next, we suppose that in this background spacetime, quantum fields start from the initial flat space in the Minkowski vacuum state $|0\rangle_M$, pass the center $r = 0$, propagate the dense region with (7.4), and come out to an asymptotically flat region. Then, the fields feel the time-dependent gravitational potential to create particles [2, 36]. To demonstrate this simply, we consider s-waves of N_s massless scalar fields in the eikonal approximation, where the fields propagate along a u -constant line after passing $r = 0$. Then, we can evaluate the energy flux of the created particles, $J \equiv 4\pi r^2_M \langle 0|T_{uu}|0\rangle_M|_{r \gg a}$, as

$$J \approx \frac{\hbar N_s}{48\pi} \left(\left(\frac{d\xi}{du} \right)^2 - 2 \frac{d^2\xi}{du^2} \right), \quad (7.5)$$

where $\xi \equiv \log \frac{du'}{du}$ and u' is an arbitrary local time coordinate at a point $r = r'$ ($l_p \ll r' \ll R(u)$) on the u -constant line [31, 35] (see Appendix C for a review).

To evaluate (7.5), we can use, say, the proper time at $r = r'$ defined by $du' \equiv K' e^{-\frac{R(u)^2 - r'^2}{4\sigma\eta}} du$ (from (7.4)). Then, we have $\xi \approx -\frac{R(u)^2 - r'^2}{4\sigma\eta}$ and calculate $\frac{d\xi}{du} \approx -\frac{a(u)}{2\sigma\eta} \frac{da(u)}{du} = \frac{C}{2\sigma\eta a(u)}$ from $R(u) \approx a(u)$ and the ansatz (7.3), to reach

$$J = \frac{\hbar N_s}{192\pi a(u)^2} \left(\frac{C}{\sigma\eta} \right)^2. \quad (7.6)$$

Comparing this to $J = \frac{C}{2Ga^2}$ (from (7.3)), we obtain

$$C = \frac{96\pi}{N_s l_p^2} \sigma^2 \eta^2, \quad (7.7)$$

which is $\mathcal{O}(Nl_p^2)$ indeed.¹⁵ Therefore, the existence of C proves self-consistently that particles are created inside as thermal-like radiation at Hawking temperature (5.2). Note that we can

¹³According to the setup in Sec.2, N corresponds to the number of the degrees of freedom contributing to the entropy and should appear in the Stefan-Boltzmann constant.

¹⁴Since the evaporating bound state is not in equilibrium, its surface may not coincide with the surface of the stationary one in the heat bath; the difference may be $\Delta - \Delta' = \mathcal{O}(Nl_p^2/a)$ due to the energy fluctuation $\sim \frac{N\hbar}{a}$.

¹⁵For example, applying (6.3) to N_s scalar fields and using $c_W = \frac{N_s}{1920\pi^2}$ [36], (7.7) becomes $C = \frac{N_s l_p^2}{5400\pi\eta^2}$. Here, if $1 \leq \eta < 2$, a larger η reduces the intensity C , which can be considered as an effect of interactions inside [13].

use a simple model to show this explicitly [31, 35] (see Appendix A), and that we can also derive the particle creation inside at a 4D dynamics level [34].

Step2. Next, we put this evaporating bound state into a heat bath of temperature (5.2). Then, the outgoing energy flow from the bound state and the ingoing one from the bath are balanced, and the system reaches equilibrium. The exterior is given by the Schwarzschild metric, (5.1), while the interior is described by (2.11) (or (7.1)).

To determine R mechanically, we consider the surface energy-momentum tensor $S_{\mu\nu}$ on the timelike hypersurface at $r = R$, which represents a gap of energy-momentum density between the inside and outside [17, 45]. For mechanical equilibrium, it should be natural to assume that the surface is determined so that the gap is as small as possible in a consistent way with the uniform interior distribution. Note here that N quanta with $\epsilon_{loc} \sim \frac{m_p}{\sqrt{N}}$ (2.8) exist around each radius r inside. Therefore, the condition

$$4\pi R^2 S^\mu{}_\nu \sim N \epsilon_{loc} \sim \sqrt{N} m_p \quad (7.8)$$

should hold. Indeed, this determines R as (5.4) and leads to $S_{\mu\nu}$ satisfying a dynamical stability condition of the surface [46] (see Appendix D).

Now that we have (5.2) and (5.4), we can determine from (5.3) the local temperature at the surface as (3.1). Thus, the mechanical condition (7.8) is consistent with the thermodynamical one (5.3).

Step3. Finally, suppose that we grow up such a small bound state to a large one adiabatically by changing the temperature and size of the bath appropriately [32, 35] (see Appendix A for a model). For each stage of the formation, the results of Step1 and Step2 can be applied due to the uniformness. That is, at each stage with energy $\frac{a'}{2G}$, the bound state creating particles at temperature $T = \frac{\hbar}{4\pi a'}$ is in equilibrium with the bath of $T = \frac{\hbar}{4\pi a'}$, the surface is located at $r = a' + \frac{\sigma \eta^2}{2a'}$, and the local temperature there is (3.1). This local temperature is then kept in the subsequent stages due to the large redshift (during $\Delta t \ll \mathcal{O}(e^{a^2/l_p^2})$).

Thus, we have shown that, as a result of the particle creation inside, the quanta in each small region behave like the local thermal state at the local temperature (3.1).

8 Conclusion and discussion

We have constructed self-consistently a semi-classical configuration consisting of many interior degrees of freedom with the strong self-gravity, such that the interior metric satisfies the semi-classical Einstein equation and the entropy follows the Bekenstein-Hawking formula and saturates the Bekenstein bound. Here, the area law is obtained by integrating the entropy density over the interior volume, which holds universally for any degrees of freedom and originates from the 4D self-consistent gravity.

This might mean that the holographic property of black hole entropy emerges from interior degrees of freedom due to the strong self-gravity. Indeed, the dense configuration could be considered as a candidate of quantum black holes in that it reproduces the area law, creates particles at the Hawking temperature, and has the surface close to the Schwarzschild radius (although it has no horizon or singularity).

One way to advance this is to apply the new method of constructing a metric from a distribution of information to various problems. For example, it is important to construct interior metrics for other configurations and examine which one is more plausible for, say, dynamical stability. It is also interesting to study the modification of (5.5) from the corrections to the area law [47, 48]. Through these studies, we should be able to find the essence of the entropy-area law, beyond the uniformity assumption used in this paper.

Another one is to investigate a mechanism for information recovery based on the obtained picture that the information itself is carried by the interior degrees of freedom although the

amount of information is measured by the surface area. Since particles are created in the region where the interior degrees of freedom exist, we can expect that interactions between them will transfer the information to the emitted particles, leading to information recovery at a semi-classical level [13].

Y.Y. thanks K.Goto, P.Höhn, S.Nagataki, R.Norte, and N.Oshita for valuable comments and encouragement. Y.Y. is partially supported by Japan Society of Promotion of Science (Grants No.21K13929 and No.18K13550) and by RIKEN iTHEMS Program.

A Multi-shell model

For a self-contained argument, we provide a short review of a simple model that describes adiabatic formation of a uniform configuration in a heat bath [30, 31]. Specifically, we analyze time evolution of a null matter by considering the backreaction of particles created during the collapse, to show explicitly that the matter approaches a uniform configuration and eventually evaporates, and that the emitted particles behave like a thermal state at the Hawking temperature. Note that this model is just an example of the configuration in the main text.

Suppose that, during adiabatic formation in a heat bath, many radiations with typical energy $\sim \frac{\hbar}{a}$ come together in order with spherical symmetry. We model these radiations as $n(\gg 1)$ concentric thin null shells. Then, the metric changes in time, and generically particle creation can occur around each shell [36]. To introduce its backreaction, we postulate, as an ansatz, that each shell evaporates according to the Stefan-Boltzmann law of Hawking temperature, (7.3), and that the metric just outside each shell is given by the Vaidya metric [17]:

$$ds_i^2 = - \left(1 - \frac{a_i(u_i)}{r} \right) du_i^2 - 2du_i dr + r^2 d\Omega^2, \quad (\text{A.1})$$

with

$$\frac{da_i(u_i)}{du_i} = -\frac{C}{a_i^2} \quad (\text{A.2})$$

for $i = 0, 1, 2 \dots n$. Here, $\frac{\Delta a_i}{2G} \equiv \frac{a_i - a_{i-1}}{2G}$ is the energy of the i -th shell, and u_i is the local time just above it. The total size a_n is a , the outer most time u_n is u , and the center is flat: $u_n = u$, $a_n = a$; $u_0 = U$, $a_0 = 0$. To connect these coordinates, we employ the fact that each shell, whose locus is denoted by $r = r_i(u_i)$, moves at the speed of light in both its exterior and interior metrics:

$$\frac{r_i - a_i}{r_i} du_i = -2dr_i = \frac{r_i - a_{i-1}}{r_i} du_{i-1}. \quad (\text{A.3})$$

This means

$$\frac{dr_i(u_i)}{du_i} = -\frac{r_i(u_i) - a_i(u_i)}{2r_i(u_i)}, \quad (\text{A.4})$$

$$\frac{du_i}{du_{i-1}} = \frac{r_i - a_{i-1}}{r_i - a_i} = 1 + \frac{a_i - a_{i-1}}{r_i - a_i}. \quad (\text{A.5})$$

We here examine where $r_i(u_i)$ will approach in the background (A.1). When $r_i \sim a_i$, we can replace r_i in the denominator of (A.4) by a_i and set $\Delta r_i(u_i) \equiv r_i(u_i) - a_i(u_i)$ to obtain

$$\frac{d\Delta r_i(u_i)}{du_i} \approx -\frac{\Delta r_i(u_i)}{2a_i(u_i)} - \frac{da_i(u_i)}{du_i}. \quad (\text{A.6})$$

The first term is negative, expressing the effect of the collapse, and the second one is positive due to the evaporation (A.2). When $\Delta r_i(u_i) \sim \frac{Nl_p^2}{a_i(u_i)}$, both terms are balanced and the right-hand side vanishes. This indicates that each shell will behave asymptotically as [13]

$$r_i(u_i) \rightarrow a_i(u_i) - 2a_i(u_i) \frac{da_i(u_i)}{da_i} = a_i(u_i) + \frac{2C}{a_i(u_i)}. \quad (\text{A.7})$$

Now, let us take a continuum limit $\Delta a_i \rightarrow 0$ and assume that each shell reaches the asymptotic position (A.7). Then, the shells pile up continuously and become a spherical dense configuration with the total mass $\frac{a}{2C}$. We can get the redshift factor $\xi_i \equiv \log \frac{dU}{du_i}$, as follows.

$$\begin{aligned}
\xi_i - \xi_{i-1} &= \log \frac{\frac{dU}{du_i}}{\frac{dU}{du_{i-1}}} = -\log \frac{du_i}{du_{i-1}} \\
&= -\log \left(1 + \frac{a_i - a_{i-1}}{r_i - a_i} \right) \\
&\approx -\frac{a_i - a_{i-1}}{r_i - a_i} = -\frac{a_i - a_{i-1}}{\frac{2C}{a_i}} \\
&\approx -\frac{1}{4C}(a_i^2 - a_{i-1}^2).
\end{aligned} \tag{A.8}$$

Here, at the second line we used (A.5); at the third line we considered $\frac{a_i - a_{i-1}}{\frac{2C}{a_i}} \sim \frac{l_p^2/a_i}{Nl_p^2/a_i} = \frac{1}{N} \ll 1$ for a large N (or $\Delta a_i \rightarrow 0$); at the final line we approximated $2a_i \approx a_i + a_{i-1}$. Using $u_0 = U$ and $a_0 = 0$, we obtain

$$\xi_i = -\frac{1}{4C}a_i^2. \tag{A.9}$$

Then, we can construct the continuum interior metric in the (U, r) coordinate. By considering the shell that passes a spacetime point (U, r) inside, we have at $r = r_i$

$$\frac{r_i - a_i}{r_i} = \frac{\frac{2C}{a_i}}{r_i} \approx \frac{2C}{r^2}, \quad \frac{du_i}{dU} = e^{-\xi_i} = e^{\frac{a_i^2}{4C}} \approx e^{\frac{r^2}{4C}},$$

where we employed (A.7) and (A.9). Thus, the metric at that point is given by

$$\begin{aligned}
ds^2 &= -\left(1 - \frac{a_i}{r_i}\right) du_i^2 - 2du_i dr + r_i^2 d\Omega^2, \\
&= -\left(1 - \frac{a_i}{r_i}\right) \left(\frac{du_i}{dU}\right)^2 dU^2 - 2\left(\frac{du_i}{dU}\right) dU dr + r_i^2 d\Omega^2 \\
&\approx -\frac{2C}{r^2} e^{\frac{r^2}{2C}} dU^2 - 2e^{\frac{r^2}{4C}} dU dr + r^2 d\Omega^2.
\end{aligned} \tag{A.10}$$

By introducing $e^k dt = dU + \frac{r^2}{2C} e^{-\frac{r^2}{4C}} dr$ (k : a constant or a function of t), (A.10) can be rewritten as

$$ds^2 = -\frac{2C}{r^2} e^{\frac{r^2}{2C} + 2k} dt^2 + \frac{r^2}{2C} dr^2 + r^2 d\Omega^2. \tag{A.11}$$

Comparing this with (5.5), the power parts of r in $g_{tt}(r)$ are different but don't contribute to the leading values (for $r \gg l_p$) of the curvatures and accelerations. Therefore, the both are the same (at the leading level) when we identify

$$\sigma = C, \quad \eta = 1 \tag{A.12}$$

and choose k properly. Note that the position of the surface of the evaporating configuration in this model is given from (A.7) by $R(u) = a(u) + \frac{2C}{a(u)}$, which may be different from that of the stationary configuration in the heat bath (see footnote 14).

Finally, we consider s-waves of N_s massless scalar fields in the eikonal approximation and apply the formula of the energy flux (7.6) to (A.12), to obtain

$$J = \frac{\hbar N_s}{192\pi a(u)^2}. \tag{A.13}$$

Using this, (A.12) and $J = \frac{C}{2Ga(u)^2}$ (from (A.2)), we can find the self-consistent value of σ in this model:

$$\sigma_{model} = \frac{N_s l_p^2}{96\pi}. \quad (\text{A.14})$$

Here, $\eta = 1$ leads to $\langle T^r_r \rangle = -\langle T^t_t \rangle$ (from (2.13)), which means that the radial motion of the quanta is null without scattering [32]. Considering this point and the spherical symmetry of the system, we can identify (A.13) with the energy flux of 1D thermal radiation $J_{1d} = \frac{N_s}{12\hbar} T^2$ [29], to get the Hawking temperature:

$$T = \frac{\hbar}{4\pi a(u)}. \quad (\text{A.15})$$

Note that the above analysis can be applied to each a_i .

Thus, we have seen explicitly that (i) as a result of the self-consistent time evolution of the adiabatic formation, the uniform dense configuration appears (see [30] for a more direct analysis of the semi-classical time evolution), and (ii) particles are created at temperature $T = \frac{\hbar}{4\pi a_i}$ in each region inside (see [31] for a Planck-like spectrum).

B Time freezing effect

We review the time freezing effect [35]. To check how the local time \hat{t} at $r = R - \Delta r$ elapses, we compare the local time scale $\Delta \hat{t} = \sqrt{-g_{tt}}|_{r=R-\Delta r} \Delta t \approx \frac{\sqrt{2\sigma}}{a} e^{-\frac{a\Delta r}{2\sigma\eta}} \Delta t$ for a given outside time scale Δt with the characteristic time scale at that point, $\tau_r \equiv \alpha_n(r)^{-1}|_{r=R-\Delta r} = L$ (from (2.9) and (2.17)). If $\Delta \hat{t} < \tau_r$, that is,

$$\Delta r > \frac{L^2}{\eta a} \log \frac{\Delta t}{a\eta}, \quad (\text{B.1})$$

then the local time flows slowly. Therefore, for the time scale of the evaporation $\Delta t = \mathcal{O}(\frac{a^3}{Nl_p^2})$, time flows only in the surface region with width $\Delta r < \frac{Nl_p^2}{a} \log \frac{a}{l_p}$, while the deeper region is frozen. On the other hand, if one waits $\Delta t > \mathcal{O}(ae^{a^2/l_p^2})$ in the heat bath, the time will start to flow in the deep region for $\Delta r = \mathcal{O}(a)$. In other words, such a deep region is frozen during $\Delta t \ll \mathcal{O}(ae^{a^2/l_p^2})$.

C Derivation of energy flux formula J

We give a short review of the derivation of (7.5) [35]. First, we can use the eikonal solution of the scalar fields and the point-splitting regularization to express the energy flux of the created particles as

$$J \equiv 4\pi r^2_M \langle 0|T_{uu}|0 \rangle_M|_{r \gg a} = \frac{\hbar N_s}{16\pi} \{u, U\}, \quad (\text{C.1})$$

where $\{x, y\} \equiv \frac{\dot{y}^2}{y^2} - \frac{2}{3} \frac{\dot{y}}{y}$ is the Schwarzian derivative for $y = y(x)$, and U is the outgoing null time in the flat space before the formation [31].

Next, using a formula $\{z, x\} = \{z, y\} + \left(\frac{dy}{dx}\right)^2 \{y, x\}$, this can be expressed as

$$J = \frac{N_s \hbar}{16\pi} \left(\{u, u'\} + \left(\frac{du'}{du}\right)^2 \{u', U\} \right), \quad (\text{C.2})$$

where u' is an arbitrary local time coordinate at $r = r' < R(u)$ on the u -constant line. Here, (C.2) means that the first term represents the energy flux of the particles created in the region $r' \lesssim r \lesssim R(u)$, and the second one expresses the redshifted energy flux of those below $r = r'$.

Therefore, if we take, say, the proper time at $r = r'$ defined by $du' \equiv K' e^{-\frac{R(u)^2 - r'^2}{4\sigma\eta}} du$ (from (7.4)) and consider $r' \ll R(u) - \frac{\sigma}{a(u)}$, the second term is negligible (unless $\{u', U\}$ is exponentially large), and only the first one remains. Then, using another expression $\{u, u'\} = \frac{1}{3} \left(\frac{d\xi}{du} \right)^2 - \frac{2}{3} \frac{d^2\xi}{du^2}$ for $\xi \equiv \log \frac{du'}{du}$, we reach $J \approx \frac{\hbar N_s}{48\pi} \left(\left(\frac{d\xi}{du} \right)^2 - 2 \frac{d^2\xi}{du^2} \right)$, which is (7.5).

D Fixing the surface from mechanical equilibrium

We show that the mechanical equilibrium condition (7.8) fixes R as (5.4). First, the surface energy-momentum tensor on the timelike hypersurface Σ at $r = R$ is given by [17, 45]

$$S_{\mu\nu} = -\frac{1}{8\pi G} ([K_{\mu\nu}] - h_{\mu\nu}[K]). \quad (\text{D.1})$$

Here, we write the exterior and interior metrics collectively as the form of (2.1), and we define the induced metric $h_{\mu\nu} dx^\mu dx^\nu \equiv -e^{A(R)} dt^2 + R^2 d\Omega^2$, the extrinsic curvature $K_{\mu\nu} \equiv h_\mu^\alpha h_\nu^\beta \nabla_\alpha r_\beta$ and its trace $K \equiv K^\mu{}_\mu$, and the ‘‘jump’’ of a quantity X across Σ $[X] \equiv X_+ - X_-$, where $r_\mu dx^\mu = \sqrt{B} dr$ is the unit normal vector to Σ and $X_\pm \equiv \lim_{r \rightarrow R \pm 0} X$ are X on Σ in the interior/exterior region.

From these, we can calculate $K^t{}_t = \alpha_n$ and $K^\theta{}_\theta = K^\phi{}_\phi = \frac{2}{r\sqrt{B}}$, where $\alpha_n = \frac{\partial_r A}{2\sqrt{B}}$. Using the interior metric (2.11) and the exterior one (5.1), we can check

$$\begin{aligned} [\alpha_n] &= \frac{\frac{a}{R^2}}{2\sqrt{1 - \frac{a}{R}}} - \frac{1}{\sqrt{2\sigma\eta^2}} \\ &\approx \frac{1}{2\sqrt{a\Delta}} - \frac{1}{\sqrt{2\sigma\eta^2}} = \mathcal{O}\left(\frac{1}{\sqrt{N}l_p}\right), \end{aligned} \quad (\text{D.2})$$

$$\begin{aligned} \left[\frac{1}{r\sqrt{B}} \right] &= \frac{1}{R} \sqrt{1 - \frac{a}{R}} - \frac{\sqrt{2\sigma}}{R^2} \\ &\approx \frac{1}{a^2} (\sqrt{a\Delta} - \sqrt{2\sigma}) = \mathcal{O}\left(\frac{\sqrt{N}l_p}{a^2}\right), \end{aligned} \quad (\text{D.3})$$

where $R = a + \Delta$ and $\Delta \ll a$. Therefore, (7.8) together with (D.1) requires $[\alpha_n] = 0$. This leads to $\Delta = \frac{\sigma\eta^2}{2a}$, which means (5.4).

As a result, the surface energy density and pressure are given respectively by

$$-S^t{}_t = \frac{1}{4\pi R^2} \frac{2 - \eta}{G} \sqrt{\frac{\sigma}{2}}, \quad S^\theta{}_\theta = -\frac{1}{4\pi R^2} \frac{2 - \eta}{2G} \sqrt{\frac{\sigma}{2}}. \quad (\text{D.4})$$

For (2.15), the former is positive and the latter is negative, which satisfies a dynamical stability condition of the surface [46].

References

- [1] J. D. Bekenstein, Phys. Rev. D **7**, 2333 (1973); Phys. Rev. D **9**, 3292 (1974).
- [2] S. W. Hawking, Commun. Math. Phys. **43**, 199 (1975) [Erratum-ibid. **46**, 206 (1976)].
- [3] A. Strominger and C. Vafa, Phys. Lett. B **379**, 99-104 (1996).
- [4] G. T. Horowitz and J. Polchinski, Phys. Rev. D **55**, 6189-6197 (1997).

- [5] S. D. Mathur, Fortsch. Phys. **53**, 793-827 (2005).
- [6] A. Ashtekar, J. Baez, A. Corichi and K. Krasnov, Phys. Rev. Lett. **80**, 904-907 (1998).
- [7] J. Diaz-Polo and D. Pranzetti, SIGMA **8**, 048 (2012).
- [8] A. Perez, Rept. Prog. Phys. **80** (2017) no.12, 126901.
- [9] G. Dvali and C. Gomez, Fortsch. Phys. **61**, 742-767 (2013).
- [10] R. Casadio, A. Giugno and A. Orlandi, Phys. Rev. D **91**, no.12, 124069 (2015).
- [11] G. 't Hooft, Nucl. Phys. B **256**, 727 (1985).
- [12] A. O. Barvinsky, V. P. Frolov and A. I. Zelnikov, Phys. Rev. D **51**, 1741-1763 (1995).
- [13] H. Kawai and Y. Yokokura, Phys. Rev. D **93**, no. 4, 044011 (2016).
- [14] R. D. Sorkin, R. M. Wald and Z. J. Zhang, Gen. Rel. Grav. **13**, 1127-1146 (1981).
- [15] J. Oppenheim, Phys. Rev. D **65**, 024020 (2002); Phys. Rev. E **68**, 016108 (2003).
- [16] T. Banks, W. Fischler, A. Kashani-Poor, R. McNees and S. Paban, Class. Quant. Grav. **19**, 4717-4728 (2002).
- [17] E. Poisson, *A Relativistic Toolkit* (Cambridge University Press, Cambridge, 2004).
- [18] T. Padmanabhan, Class. Quant. Grav. **4**, L107-L113 (1987)
- [19] T. Yoneya, Prog. Theor. Phys. **103**, 1081-1125 (2000).
- [20] J. Polchinski, *String Theory* (Cambridge University Press, Cambridge, 2005).
- [21] C. Rovelli and F. Vidotto, *Covariant Loop Quantum Gravity* (Cambridge University Press, Cambridge, 2014).
- [22] E. R. Caianiello, Lett. Nuovo Cim. **32**, 65 (1981)
- [23] H. E. Brandt, Found. Phys. Lett. **2** (1989), 39.
- [24] R. Parentani and R. Potting, Phys. Rev. Lett. **63**, 945 (1989)
- [25] S. Capozziello, G. Lambiase and G. Scarpetta, Int. J. Theor. Phys. **39** (2000), 15-22.
- [26] C. Rovelli and F. Vidotto, Phys. Rev. Lett. **111**, 091303 (2013).
- [27] J. D. Bekenstein, Phys. Rev. D **23**, 287 (1981).
- [28] L. D. Landau and E. M. Lifshitz, *The Classical Theory of Fields* (Butterworth-Heinemann, Oxford, 1980).
- [29] L. D. Landau and E. M. Lifshitz, *Statistical Physics* (Butterworth-Heinemann, Oxford, 1984).
- [30] H. Kawai and Y. Yokokura, Universe **6**, no.6, 77 (2020).
- [31] H. Kawai, Y. Matsuo, and Y. Yokokura, Int. J. Mod. Phys. A **28**, 1350050 (2013).
- [32] H. Kawai and Y. Yokokura, Int. J. Mod. Phys. A **30**, 1550091 (2015).
- [33] P. M. Ho, Class. Quant. Grav. **34**, no.8, 085006 (2017).

- [34] H. Kawai and Y. Yokokura, *Universe* **3**, no.2, 51 (2017).
- [35] H. Kawai and Y. Yokokura, *Phys. Rev. D* **105**, no.4, 045017 (2022).
- [36] N. D. Birrell and P. C. W. Davies, *Quantum Fields in Curved space* (Cambridge University Press, Cambridge, 1982).
- [37] W. G. Unruh, *Phys. Rev. D* **14**, 870 (1976)
- [38] T. Jacobson, *Phys. Rev. Lett.* **75**, 1260-1263 (1995).
- [39] T. Padmanabhan, *Rept. Prog. Phys.* **73**, 046901 (2010).
- [40] R. Tolman and P. Ehrenfest, *Phys. Rev.* **36**, no.12, 1791-1798 (1930).
- [41] S. R. de Groot and P. Mazur, *Non-Equilibrium Thermodynamics* (North-Holland, Amsterdam, 1962).
- [42] T. Jacobson, [arXiv:gr-qc/9404039 [gr-qc]].
- [43] J. D. Bekenstein, [arXiv:gr-qc/9409015 [gr-qc]].
- [44] G. W. Gibbons and S. W. Hawking, *Phys. Rev. D* **15**, 2752 (1977).
- [45] W. Israel, *Nuovo Cim. B* **44S10**, 1 (1966) [erratum: *Nuovo Cim. B* **48**, 463 (1967)].
- [46] H. Yang, B. Bonga and Z. Pan, *Phys. Rev. Lett.* **130**, no.1, 011402 (2023).
- [47] V. Iyer and R. M. Wald, *Phys. Rev. D* **50**, 846-864 (1994).
- [48] S. Carlip, *Class. Quant. Grav.* **17**, 4175-4186 (2000).