

# CHARACTERIZATION OF THE NULL ENERGY CONDITION VIA DISPLACEMENT CONVEXITY OF ENTROPY

CHRISTIAN KETTERER

ABSTRACT. We characterize the null energy condition for an  $(n + 1)$ -dimensional, time-oriented Lorentzian manifold in terms of convexity of the relative  $(n - 1)$ -Renyi entropy along displacement interpolations on null hypersurfaces. More generally, we also consider Lorentzian manifolds with a smooth weight function and introduce the Bakry-Emery  $N$ -null energy condition that we characterize in terms of null displacement convexity of the relative  $N$ -Renyi entropy. As application we then revisit Hawking's area monotonicity theorem for a black hole horizon and the Penrose singularity theorem from the viewpoint of this characterization and in the context of weighted Lorentzian manifolds.

## CONTENTS

1. Introduction	1
2. Preliminaries	4
3. Proof of the main results	6
4. Applications	16
References	20

## 1. INTRODUCTION

Many classical theorems in general relativity rest on local geometric constraints for the underlying Lorentzian space-time. These local constraints often have the form of lower bounds for curvature quantities like the Ricci tensor and via the Einstein equation they are interpreted as energy conditions. One such condition is the null energy condition that requires non-negativity of the Ricci tensor in direction of null vectors. The null energy condition plays a crucial role in the Penrose singularity theorem about incompleteness of null geodesics [Pen65] which foreshadowed the existence of black holes and in Hawking's area monotonicity theorem [Haw72] which asserts that the area of cross-sections of a black hole horizon is non-decreasing towards the future provided the horizon is future null complete.

In this article we present a characterization of the null energy condition for a time-oriented Lorentzian manifold in terms of entropy convexity along the future-directed geodesic null flow on null hypersurfaces.

---

*2010 Mathematics Subject Classification.* Primary 83C75, 83C57, 49Q22. Keywords: null energy condition, null hypersurface, entropy convexity, singularity theorems.

A null hypersurface  $\mathcal{H}$  in a Lorentzian manifold  $(M^{n+1}, g)$  is a submanifold of dimension  $n$  such that the metric  $g$  restricted to  $\mathcal{H}$  degenerates. The entropy is the relative  $(n-1)$ -Renyi entropy

$$S_{n-1}(\mu | \text{vol}_{\mathcal{H}}) = - \int \rho^{1-\frac{1}{n-1}} d \text{vol}_{\mathcal{H}}$$

where  $\mu$  is a probability measure on  $M$ ,  $\text{vol}_{\mathcal{H}}$  is the degenerated volume of the Lorentzian metric  $g$  on  $\mathcal{H}$  and  $\rho$  is the density of  $\mu$  in the Lebesgue decomposition w.r.t.  $\text{vol}_{\mathcal{H}}$ . A null flow on  $\mathcal{H}$  consists of null geodesics that foliate the hypersurface  $\mathcal{H}$ . We say that a probability measure  $\pi$  on  $M \times M$  is a null coupling if there exists a null hypersurface  $\mathcal{H} \subset M$  such that  $\pi$  is concentrated on

$$R_{\mathcal{H}} = \{(x, y) \in \mathcal{H}^2 : \exists \text{ flow curve } \gamma_{x,y} \text{ s.t. } \gamma(s) = x, \gamma(t) = y \ \& \ x \leq y\}.$$

For  $x, y \in R_{\mathcal{H}}$  let  $t \in [0, 1] \mapsto \tilde{\gamma}_{x,y}(t)$  be the affine reparametrization of  $\gamma_{x,y}$ . Two probability measures  $\mu_0, \mu_1 \in \mathcal{P}(\mathcal{H}, \text{vol}_{\mathcal{H}})$  are called acausal if they are supported on acausal submanifolds  $S_0$  and  $S_1$ . Here  $\mathcal{P}(\mathcal{H}, \text{vol}_{\mathcal{H}})$  is the set of  $\text{vol}_{\mathcal{H}}$ -absolutely continuous probability measures concentrated on  $\mathcal{H}$ . We say that two acausal probability measures  $\mu_0$  and  $\mu_1$  are null connected if there exists a null coupling  $\pi$  such that the marginal measures of  $\pi$  are  $\mu_0$  and  $\mu_1$ . If  $\mu_0$  and  $\mu_1$  are null connected, we define  $\mu_t = (e_t)_{\#} \pi$  for  $t \in [0, 1]$  where  $e_t : (x, y) \mapsto \tilde{\gamma}_{x,y}(t)$  is the evaluation map. We will call  $(\mu_t)_{t \in [0,1]}$  null displacement interpolation.

**1.1. Statement of main result.** Our main result is the following theorem.

**Theorem 1.1.** *Let  $(M^{n+1}, g)$  be a Lorentzian manifold. The null energy condition holds if and only if for all  $\mu_0, \mu_1 \in \mathcal{P}(M, \text{vol}_{\mathcal{H}})$  that are acausal and null connected, it holds*

$$(1) \quad S_{n-1}(\mu_t | \text{vol}_{\mathcal{H}}) \leq (1-t)S_{n-1}(\mu_0 | \text{vol}_{\mathcal{H}}) + tS_{n-1}(\mu_1 | \text{vol}_{\mathcal{H}}).$$

We also introduce a Bakry-Emery  $N$ -null energy condition for weighted Lorentzian manifolds. We say  $(M, g, e^{-V})$  satisfies the Bakry-Emery  $N$ -null condition for  $N \geq n-1$  if

$$(N' - n + 1) (\text{ric}(v, v) + \nabla^2 V(v, v)) \geq \langle \nabla V, v \rangle^2$$

for any null vector  $v \in TM$  and any  $N' > N$ . We obtain the following.

**Theorem 1.2.** *Let  $(M^{n+1}, g, e^{-V})$  be a weighted Lorentzian manifold for  $V \in C^\infty(M)$ . The Bakry-Emery  $N$ -null energy condition holds if and only if for all  $\mu_0, \mu_1 \in \mathcal{P}(M, \mathfrak{m}_{\mathcal{H}})$  that are acausal and null connected, it holds*

$$S_{N'}(\mu_t | \mathfrak{m}_{\mathcal{H}}) \leq (1-t)S_{N'}(\mu_0 | \mathfrak{m}_{\mathcal{H}}) + tS_{N'}(\mu_1 | \mathfrak{m}_{\mathcal{H}}) \quad \forall N' \geq N.$$

where  $\mathfrak{m}_{\mathcal{H}} = e^{-V} \text{vol}_{\mathcal{H}}$ .

Theorem 1.1 and Theorem 1.2 are in the spirit of similar results for the strong energy condition by R. McCann [McC20] and for the Einstein equation by A. Mondino and S. Suhr [MS22b] for which these authors proved characterizations via entropy convexity on the space of probability measures equipped with a Wasserstein distance derived from the time separation function. Such results are motivated by the desire to formulate local energy conditions in a low regularity framework where the classical notion of Ricci

curvature breaks down. In particular, this was the starting point for the development of a *synthetic definition of the strong energy condition* via entropy convexity [CM20] in the framework of Lorentzian length spaces [KS18] (see also [Bra22, MS22a] for further developments). The characterization of lower Ricci curvature bounds via entropy convexity on the Wasserstein space of probability measures was first established for Riemannian manifolds [CEMS01, vRS05, OV00]. Optimal transport of probability measures that are supported on submanifolds inside of a Riemannian manifold in relation to curvature bounds has been studied in [KM18].

At the moment it is not clear to us if, starting from our main results, it is possible to define a synthetic null energy condition in the setting of Lorentzian length spaces. Our characterization requires a good notion of null hypersurface and null geodesic congruence to make sense in a more general situation of possible lower regularity.

As application of our main results we revisit Hawking's area monotonicity theorem and the Penrose singularity theorem in the setting of weighted, time-oriented Lorentzian manifolds that satisfy the Bakry-Emery  $N$ -null energy condition. First we prove the following version of the monotonicity theorem.

**Theorem 1.3** (Hawking Monotonicity). *Let  $(M^{n+1}, g, e^{-V})$  be a weighted space-time that satisfies the Bakry-Emery  $N$ -null energy condition for  $N \geq n - 1$  and let  $\mathcal{H} \subset M$  be a null hypersurface. Assume  $\mathcal{H}$  is future null complete. Let  $\Sigma_0, \Sigma_1 \subset M$  two acausal spacelike hypersurfaces. Define  $\Sigma_i \cap \mathcal{H} = S_i$ ,  $i = 0, 1$ , and assume  $S_0 \subset J^-(S_1)$ . Then*

$$m_{\mathcal{H}}(S_0) \leq m_{\mathcal{H}}(S_1).$$

Then we introduce the notion of Bakry-Emery future converging for a codimension 2 submanifold  $S$  in a weighted Lorentzian manifold  $(M, g, e^{-V})$  (Definition 4.7) and we prove the following version of the Penrose Singularity Theorem for a weighted space-time.

**Theorem 1.4.** *Let  $(M, g, e^{-V})$  be a weighted, time-oriented Lorentzian manifold that is globally hyperbolic. Assume there exists a non-compact Cauchy hypersurface  $\Sigma \subset M$ ,  $M$  contains a Bakry-Emery future converging, compact, oriented codimension two submanifold  $S$  and the Bakry-Emery  $N$ -null energy condition for  $N \geq n - 1$  holds. Then  $M$  is future null incomplete.*

The rest of this article is structured as follows.

In Section 2 we will briefly recall important notions about smooth, time-oriented Lorentzian manifolds and null hypersurfaces. We will define the Ricci and the Bakry-Emery Ricci tensor and the corresponding null energy conditions. We also introduce the degenerated volume and the corresponding relative Renyi entropy.

In Section 3 we define the notion of null coupling, null connectedness and null displacement interpolation. We prove that null displacement interpolations are induced by maps. Then, we prove that the null energy condition is necessary and sufficient for null displacement convexity for the Renyi entropy along null hypersurfaces.

In Section 4 we present consequences that we can derive directly from the null displacement convexity. This includes the Hawking area monotonicity and a corollary that leads to the Penrose singularity theorem.

*Acknowledgments.* The main part of this work was done when the author stayed at the Fields Institute in Toronto as Longterm Visitor during the Thematic Program on *Nonsmooth Riemannian and Lorentzian Geometry*. CK wants to thank the Fields Institute for providing an excellent research environment. In particular many thanks go to Robert McCann, Clemens Saemann and Mathias Braun for stimulating discussions about topics in general relativity. This work was completed during a research visit of the author at UNAM Oaxaca, Mexico.

## 2. PRELIMINARIES

**2.1. Lorentzian manifolds.** A space-time is a smooth, connected, time-oriented Lorentzian manifold  $(M, g)$  with  $\dim_M = n + 1$ . The signature of  $M$  is  $(-, +, \dots, +)$ . We also write  $g = \langle \cdot, \cdot \rangle$ . A vector  $v \in T_x M$  is timelike, spacelike, causal or null if  $\langle v, v \rangle$  is negative, positive, non-positive or 0, respectively. A  $C^1$  curve  $\gamma : I \rightarrow M$  is then timelike, spacelike, causal or null if  $\gamma'(t)$  is so for every  $t \in I$ . For  $x, y \in M$  we write  $x \leq y$  if there exists a future directed causal curve from  $x$  to  $y$  and  $x \ll y$  if there exists a future directed timelike curve from  $x$  to  $y$ . For  $A \subset M$  let  $J^+(A) := \{y \in M : \exists x \in A \text{ s.t. } x \leq y\}$  be the causal future of  $A$  and similarly, let  $J^-(A) := \{y \in M : \exists x \in A \text{ s.t. } y \leq x\}$  be the causal past.  $A$  is called achronal (acausal) if no timelike (causal) curve intersects  $A$  twice. An achronal hypersurface  $\Sigma$  is a Cauchy hypersurface if every inextendible timelike curve intersects  $\Sigma$  exactly once. A space-time  $(M, g)$  which possesses a Cauchy hypersurface, is called globally hyperbolic.

## 2.2. Bakry-Emery Ricci curvature.

**Definition 2.1.** The Ricci tensor of  $(M, g)$  is  $(0, 2)$ -tensor defined as

$$\text{ric}(v, w) = \text{trace}[z \mapsto R(v, z)w] = \sum_{i=0}^n \langle R(v, e_i)w, e_i \rangle$$

where  $v, w \in T_x M$  for  $x \in M$  and  $e_0, e_1, \dots, e_n$  an orthonormal basis of  $T_x M$  w.r.t.  $g_x$ . If  $|\langle v, v \rangle| = 1$ , one can pick an orthonormal basis  $e_0, \dots, e_n$  such that  $v = e_j$  for some  $j \in \{0, \dots, n\}$  and hence

$$\text{ric}(v, v) = \sum_{j \neq i=0}^n \langle R(v, e_i)v, e_i \rangle.$$

If  $v$  is null, there exist orthonormal vectors  $e'_2, \dots, e'_n \in v^\perp$  such that

$$\text{ric}(v, v) = \sum_{i=2}^n \langle R(v, e'_i)v, e'_i \rangle$$

[O'N83, Proof of Lemma 8.9].

Given  $V \in C^\infty(M)$  the Bakry-Emery Ricci tensor is

$$\text{ric} + \nabla^2 V =: \text{ric}^V.$$

Given  $N \in [N + 1, \infty)$  and  $K \in \mathbb{R}$  the weighted space-time  $(M, g, e^{-V})$  satisfies the timelike Bakry-Emery  $N$ -Ricci curvature condition if

$$(N' - n + 1)(\text{ric}^V(v, v) - K\langle v, v \rangle) \geq \langle \nabla V, v \rangle^2$$

for any timelike vector  $v \in TM$  and  $\forall N' > N$ . In particular, if  $N = n + 1$ , it follows that  $V$  is constant along any timelike curve. A characterization of the timelike Bakry-Emery  $N$ -Ricci curvature condition in term of entropy displacement convexity was given in [McC20, MS22b].

**Definition 2.2.** Let  $N \in [n - 1, \infty)$ . We say  $(M, g, e^{-V})$  satisfies the Bakry-Emery  $N$ -null condition if

$$(N' - n + 1) \text{ric}^V(v, v) \geq \langle \nabla V, v \rangle^2$$

for any null vector  $v \in TM$  and any  $N' > N$ .

If  $N = n - 1$ , it follows that  $V$  is constant along any lightlike curve. Hence  $\langle \nabla V, v \rangle = \nabla V^2(v, v) = 0$  for every null vector  $v$  and the condition reduces to the null energy condition

$$\text{ric}(v, v) \geq 0 \quad \text{for any null vector } v \in TM.$$

**2.3. Null hypersurfaces.** A null hypersurface  $\mathcal{H}$  in  $M$  is an embedded  $C^2$  submanifold of codimension one such that the pull-back metric of  $g$  on  $\mathcal{H}$  is degenerated. There exists a non-vanishing  $C^1$  future-directed, null vector field  $K \in \Gamma(T\mathcal{H})$  such that  $K_x^\perp = T_x\mathcal{H}$  for all  $x \in \mathcal{H}$ . The flow curves of  $K$  are null geodesics and one says that  $\mathcal{H}$  is null geodesically generated (ruled). A flow curve admits an affine reparametrization. More precisely, let  $\gamma_x : (\alpha, \beta) \rightarrow \mathcal{H}$  be the flow curve of  $K$  with  $\gamma_x(0) = x$ . There exists a reparametrization  $\varphi : (a, b) \rightarrow (\alpha, \beta)$  of  $\gamma_x$  such that  $\gamma_x \circ \varphi(t) = \exp_x(tK(x))$ . The vectorfield  $K$  is unique up to a positive factor. For further details about the geometry on null hypersurface we refer to [CDGH01, Appendix A].

*Example 2.3.* Let  $S$  be a codimension 2 smooth hypersurface that is spacelike. Assume also that  $S$  is an oriented manifold. At any point  $x \in S$  we can pick two future-directed orthogonal null vectors  $L_x$  and  $\underline{L}_x$ . Assume  $L_x$  projects to the exterior of  $S$ . We will call  $L_x$  an outer null normal to  $S$  at  $x$  and  $\underline{L}_x$  an inner null normal to  $S$  at  $x$ . We choose a the map  $x \in S \mapsto L_x$  to be smooth. For every  $x \in S$  there exists a null geodesic  $\gamma_x(t) = \exp_x(tL_x)$  with  $\gamma_x(0)$  and  $\gamma'_x(0) = L_x$  and we consider the set  $\mathcal{C} = \bigcup_{x \in S} \text{Im} \gamma_x$  formed by these geodesics.  $\mathcal{C}$  is also called a null geodesic congruence. By replacing  $L$  with  $\underline{L}$  we also define  $\underline{\mathcal{C}}$ . A neighborhood  $\mathcal{H}$  of  $S$  in  $\mathcal{C}$  is a smooth submanifold of codimension two and the vector field  $L$  extends to a smooth vector field  $K$  on  $\mathcal{C}$  via  $K(\gamma_x(t)) = \gamma'_x(t)$ . Then  $\mathcal{H}$  is a null hypersurface. Similarly there exists a corresponding null hypersurface  $\underline{\mathcal{H}}$  for  $\underline{\mathcal{C}}$ .

**2.3.1. Volume.** Let  $\mathcal{H} \subset M$  be a null hypersurface. The Lorentzian metric  $g$  induces a  $(n - 1)$ -form  $\text{vol}_{\mathcal{H}}$  on  $\mathcal{H}$ . If  $S \subset \mathcal{H}$  is spacelike, codimension 2  $C^2$  submanifold, then  $\text{vol}_{\mathcal{H}}(A) = \int_A d \text{vol}_{\mathcal{H}}$  whenever  $A \subset S$  is measurable. If  $V \in C^\infty(M)$ , we set  $\text{m}_{\mathcal{H}} = e^{-V} \text{vol}_{\mathcal{H}}$ .

A probability measure  $\mu \in \mathcal{P}(M)$  is called  $\text{m}_{\mathcal{H}}$ -absolutely continuous if  $\mu = \rho d \text{m}_{\mathcal{H}}$  for a measurable function  $\rho : M \rightarrow [0, \infty)$ . The set of  $\text{m}_{\mathcal{H}}$ -absolutely continuous measures is  $\mathcal{P}(M, \text{m}_{\mathcal{H}})$ .

2.3.2. *Relative entropy.* The relative  $N$ -Renyi entropy w.r.t.  $m_{\mathcal{H}}$  of a probability  $\mu \in \mathcal{P}(M)$  is defined as

$$\mu = \rho d m_{\mathcal{H}} + \mu^s \mapsto S_N(\mu | m_{\mathcal{H}}) = - \int \rho^{1 - \frac{1}{N}} d m_{\mathcal{H}}$$

where  $\rho d m_{\mathcal{H}} + \mu^s$  is the Lebesgue decomposition of  $\mu$ . Basic properties of  $S_N$  are  $S_N(\mu | m_{\mathcal{H}}) \leq 0$  with " $=$ " if  $\mu \perp m_{\mathcal{H}}$  and  $S_N(\mu | \mu_S) \geq -m_{\mathcal{H}}(\text{supp } \mu)^{\frac{1}{N}}$ .

### 3. PROOF OF THE MAIN RESULTS

#### 3.1. Null couplings.

**Definition 3.1.** Let  $(M, g)$  be a space-time and  $\mathcal{H} \subset M$  a null hypersurface with tangent vector field  $K$  that generates a geodesic null flow. We define a transport relation  $R_{\mathcal{H}}$  on  $\mathcal{H}$  by

$$R_{\mathcal{H}} = \{(x, y) \in \mathcal{H}^2 : \exists \text{ flow curve } \gamma \text{ of } K \text{ s.t. } \gamma(s) = x, \gamma(t) = y \text{ \& } x \leq y\}$$

Let  $x, y \in R_{\mathcal{H}}$ ,  $\gamma|_{[s, t]} =: \gamma_{x, y}$  the flow curve that connects  $x$  and  $y$ , and let  $\tilde{\gamma}_{x, y} : [0, 1] \rightarrow \mathcal{H}$  its affine reparametrization. Let  $\mathcal{G}(\mathcal{H})$  be the collection of all affine parametrized flow curves  $\tilde{\gamma} : [0, 1] \rightarrow \mathcal{H}$ , and for  $\tilde{\gamma}^0 \neq \tilde{\gamma}^1 \in \mathcal{G}$  we define

$$d_{\infty}(\tilde{\gamma}^0, \tilde{\gamma}^1) = \sup_{t \in [0, 1]} d_g(\tilde{\gamma}^0(t), \tilde{\gamma}^1(t)).$$

This induces a topology on  $\mathcal{G}(\mathcal{H})$ .

A probability measure  $\pi \in \mathcal{P}(M^2)$  is called a *null coupling* if there exists a null hypersurface  $\mathcal{H}$  such that  $\text{supp } \pi \subset R_{\mathcal{H}}$ . By measurable selection we can define a measurable map  $\Upsilon : (x, y) \mapsto \mathcal{G}(\mathcal{H})$   $\pi$ -almost everywhere such that  $\Upsilon(x, y) = \tilde{\gamma}$  if and only if  $\tilde{\gamma}(0) = x$  and  $\tilde{\gamma}(1) = y$ . We call the pushforward  $\Upsilon_{\#} \pi = \Pi$  dynamical (null) coupling. If  $e_t : \mathcal{G}(\mathcal{H}) \rightarrow \mathcal{H}$ , then we call  $\mu_t = (e_t)_{\#} \Pi$ ,  $t \in [0, 1]$ , *null displacement interpolation*.

Let  $(\mu_t)_{t \in [0, 1]}$  be a null displacement interpolation. For  $\mu_t$ -almost every  $x \in \mathcal{H}$  there exists a unique  $\tilde{\gamma}_x^t \in \mathcal{G}(\mathcal{H})$  such that  $\tilde{\gamma}_x^t(t) = x$ . Then we also have the  $\mu_t$ -almost everywhere defined map  $\Lambda_t : x \mapsto \tilde{\gamma}_x^t$ . One can check that  $(\Lambda_t)_{\#} \mu_t = \Pi$ .

We call a probability measures  $\mu$  *acausal* if there is a space-like acausal  $C^2$  submanifold  $\Sigma$  such that  $\mu$  is concentrated in  $\Sigma$ .

We call two acausal probability measures  $\mu_0$  and  $\mu_1$  *null connected* if there exists a coupling  $\pi$  between  $\mu_0$  and  $\mu_1$  that is null. In particular, it holds  $\text{supp } \mu_i \subset \mathcal{H} \cap \Sigma_i$ ,  $i = 0, 1$ , for a null hypersurface  $\mathcal{H}$  and two spacelike, acausal submanifolds  $\Sigma_0$  and  $\Sigma_1$ .

**Lemma 3.2.** *A null coupling  $\pi$  between acausal probability measures  $\mu_0$  and  $\mu_1$  as above is induced by a  $C^1$  map  $T : U \rightarrow \mathcal{H}$  where  $U \subset S_0$  open such that  $\text{supp } \mu_0 \subset U$ . More precisely, there exists  $r \in C^1(U)$  such that  $T(x) = \exp_x(r(x)K(x))$  and  $(\text{id}_{\text{supp}(\mu_0)}, T)_{\#} \mu_0$ . We call  $T$  transport map.*

*Proof. 1.* Since  $\Sigma_1$  is acausal, for every  $x \in \Sigma_0$  there exists a most one  $y \in \Sigma_1$  such that  $(x, y) \in R_{\mathcal{H}}$ . Moreover, by existence of a null coupling  $\pi$  for  $\mu_0$ -almost every  $x$  there exists at least one such  $y \in \Sigma_1$ . Hence  $y$  is the unique intersection of  $\gamma_x$  with  $\Sigma_1$ . So we set  $\mu_0$ -almost everywhere  $x \mapsto y =: \tilde{T}(x)$ , and for  $\pi$ -almost every  $(x, y)$  it holds  $\tilde{T}(x) = y$ .

**2.** Let  $\Phi : S_0 \times (0, \omega) \rightarrow \mathcal{H}$  be the map given by  $\Phi(x, t) = \exp_x(tK(x))$ . We note that for every  $(x, t) \in S_0 \times (0, \infty)$  there is exactly one inextendible flow curve  $\gamma_y$  of  $K$  in  $\mathcal{H}$  up to reparametrization passing through  $\Phi(x, t)$  since  $K$ . Hence  $\Phi(x, t) = \gamma_y \circ \varphi(t)$  for a regular reparametrization  $\varphi$ . Hence, Lemma 4.15 in [CDGH01] says that there are no focal points along  $t \in (0, \omega) \mapsto \Phi(x, t)$ . Consequently  $D\Phi_{(x,t)} : T_{x,t}(S_0 \times (0, \infty)) \rightarrow T_{\Phi(x,t)}M$  is injective.

**3.** If  $y \in S_1$  with  $\Phi(x, t) = y$  for  $x \in S_0$ , we can find an open set  $O \times (t - \delta, t + \delta) \ni (x, t)$  in  $S_0 \times (0, \infty)$  such that  $\Phi|_{O \times (t - \delta, t + \delta)}$  is a diffeomorphism. Since for every  $x \in O$  the curve  $\Phi(x, t)$  meets  $S_1$  at most once and since  $\Phi(O \times (t - \delta, t + \delta)) \cap S_1$  is open in  $S_1$ , we can choose  $O$  small enough such that for every  $y \in O$  there exists a unique  $s \in (t - \delta, t + \delta)$  such that  $\Phi(y, s) \in S_1$ . Then the implicit function theorem implies existence of a  $C^1$  function  $g : O \rightarrow (t - \delta, t + \delta)$  such that

$$\exp_x(g(x)K(x)) = \Phi(x, g(x)) \in S_1 \quad \forall x \in O \subset S_0.$$

Since  $\tilde{T}(x)$  is already the unique intersection point of the flow curve  $\gamma_x$  with  $S_1$ , we have  $\tilde{T}(x) = \exp(g(x)K(x))$  for all  $x \in \text{supp } \mu_0 \cap O$ . Hence, the map  $\tilde{T}$  is the restriction of the  $C^1$  map  $T : x \in U \mapsto \exp_x(r(x)K(x))$  with  $r : U \rightarrow (0, \infty)$  for  $U \subset S_0$  open.  $\square$

*Example 3.3.* Consider a space-time  $(M, g)$  and let  $\Sigma_0, \Sigma_1 \subset M$  be spacelike, acausal submanifolds and let  $S_i = \mathcal{H} \cap \Sigma_i$  such that  $S_0 \subset J^-(S_1)$ . Since  $\Sigma_1$  is acausal, for every  $x \in S_0$  there exists at most one  $y \in S_1$  such that  $J^-(y) \ni x$ . Then, exactly as in the proof of the previous lemma we can construct a  $C^1$  map  $T : S_0 \rightarrow S_1$  of the form  $T(x) = \exp_x(\tilde{K}(x))$ . In particular, if  $\text{vol}_{\mathcal{H}}(S_0) < \infty$  (for the definition of  $\text{vol}_{\mathcal{H}}$  see Section 2.3.1 below), we can define  $\mu_0 = \frac{1}{\text{vol}_{\mathcal{H}}(S_0)} \text{vol}_{\mathcal{H}}|_{S_0}$  and  $\mu_1 = (T)_{\#}\mu_0$ . Then  $\mu_0$  and  $\mu_1$  are null connected.

*Remark 3.4.* The proposition implies that  $\exp_x(t\tilde{K}(x)) = \tilde{\gamma}_{x,T(x)}(t) =: \tilde{\gamma}_x(t)$  where  $\tilde{K}(x) = r(x)K(x)$  and  $\tilde{\gamma}_{x,T(x)} = \Upsilon(x, T(x))$ . We set  $T_t : U \rightarrow \mathcal{H}$  via  $T_t(x) := \exp_x(t\tilde{K}(x)) = \tilde{\gamma}_x(t)$ . In particular, we have for the induced null displacement interpolation that  $\mu_t = (T_t)_{\#}\mu_0$ . Let  $\omega_x > 0$  such that  $\tilde{\gamma}_x([0, \omega_x]) \subset \mathcal{H}$  and let  $b \in [0, \omega_x]$ . For  $x \in U$  and  $v \in T_x U$  the vectorfield  $t \in [0, b] \mapsto (DT_t)_x v$  satisfies the Jacobi equation with  $DT_0 v = v$  and  $\frac{d}{dt} DT_{t,x} v = \nabla_v \tilde{K}(x)$ . Since, by Lemma 4.15 in [CDGH01], there are no focal points along  $\tilde{\gamma}_x(t)$  unless there is an endpoint of  $\gamma_x$  in  $\mathcal{H}$ ,  $DT_{t,x} v$  is not lightlike for any  $v \in T_x S_0$ . (Since  $\mathcal{H}^2$  is  $C^2$  submanifold and  $K$  a non-vanishing  $C^1$  vectorfield on  $\mathcal{H}$ , there are no endpoints in  $\mathcal{H}$ .) Hence  $T_t$  is a  $C^1$  diffeomorphism with  $T_t(S_0) = S_t$  spacelike and acausal. In particular  $g|_{S_t}$  is non-degenerated.

*Remark 3.5.* This setup is also meaningful in a more general context. A general null hypersurface  $\mathcal{H}$  is a topological codimension 1 submanifold that is the union of null geodesics. The concept of transport relation and null coupling are defined analogously. A measure  $\mu$  is acausal if it is supported on a  $n-1$ -rectifiable subset that is acausal. The definition of  $r$  and the map  $T$  is the same and by [CDGH01]  $T$  and  $r$  are Lipschitz continuous.

### 3.2. The null energy condition implies null displacement convexity.

Let  $\mu_0, \mu_1 \in \mathcal{P}(M, \mathfrak{m}_{\mathcal{H}})$  be acausal and null connected and let  $(\mu_t)_{t \in [0,1]}$  be the induced null displacement interpolation. Each  $\mu_t$  is supported on the set  $T_t(U) \subset S_t$  where  $S_t$  is the image of  $S_0$  under  $T_t : U \rightarrow \mathcal{H}$ .

**Lemma 3.6.**  $\mu_t \in \mathcal{P}(M, \mathfrak{m}_{\mathcal{H}}) \forall t \in (0, 1)$ .

*Proof.* Let  $N \subset S_t$  with  $\mathfrak{m}_{S_t}(N) = 0$ .  $T_t$  is a  $C^1$  diffeomorphism and hence  $T_t^{-1}$  is a  $C^1$ . It follows  $(T_t)^{-1}(N)$  has 0 measure w.r.t.  $\text{vol}_{\mathcal{H}}$ . Let  $\Pi$  be the dynamical null coupling and  $\pi = (e_0, e_t)_{\#}\Pi$ . Then

$$\mu_t(N) = \pi(S_0, N) = \pi((T_t)^{-1}(N), N) \leq \pi((T_t)^{-1}(N), S_t) = \mu_0((T_t)^{-1}(N)).$$

Hence  $\mu_t(N) = 0$  and  $\mu_t$  is  $\mathfrak{m}_{\mathcal{H}}$  absolutely continuous.  $\square$

**Lemma 3.7.** *Let  $\mu_t = \rho_t \mathfrak{m}_{\mathcal{H}}$ . Then*

$$e^{-V \circ T_t} \rho_t(T_t(x)) \det DT_t(x) = \rho_0(x) e^{-V(x)}.$$

*Proof.* Let  $W \subset S_0$  be an measurable and arbitrary.  $S_0$  and  $S_t$  are equipped with the restricted metric  $g$ . Then

$$\begin{aligned} \mu_0(W) &= \mu_t(T_t(W)) = \int_{T_t(W)} d\mu_t \\ &= \int_{T_t(W)} e^{-V} \rho_t d \text{vol}_{\mathcal{H}} = \int_W e^{-V \circ T_t} \rho_t \circ T_t \det DT_t d \text{vol}_{\mathcal{H}} \end{aligned}$$

where we used the area formula for the map  $T_t : S_0 \rightarrow S_t$ . Since  $W$  was arbitrary, the claim follows.  $\square$

We denote the densities of  $\mu_t$  w.r.t.  $\mathfrak{m}_{\mathcal{H}}$  with  $\rho_t$ .

**Theorem 3.8.** *Let  $(M, g)$  be a smooth, time-oriented,  $(n+1)$ -dimensional Lorentzian manifold. Let  $\mu_0, \mu_1 \in \mathcal{P}(M)$  be acausal and null connected. Let  $(\mu_t)_{t \in [0,1]}$  be corresponding null displacement interpolation.*

- (1) *If the null energy condition holds and  $\mu_0, \mu_1 \in \mathcal{P}(M, \text{vol}_{\mathcal{H}})$ , then it follows that  $t \in [0, 1] \mapsto S_{n-1}(\mu_t | \text{vol}_{\mathcal{H}})$  is convex.*
- (2) *If the weighted Lorentzian manifold  $(M, g, e^{-V})$  satisfies the Bakry-Emery  $N$ -null energy condition for  $N \geq n-1$  and  $\mu_0, \mu_1 \in \mathcal{P}(M, \mathfrak{m}_{\mathcal{H}})$ , then it holds that  $t \in [0, 1] \mapsto S_{N'}(\mu_t | \mathfrak{m}_{\mathcal{H}}) \forall N' \geq N$ . is convex.*

*Proof.* Let  $\tilde{K}(x) = r(x)K(x)$ ,  $x \in U \subset S_0$ , the vector field given by Lemma 3.2 and let  $T_t(x) = \exp_x(t\tilde{K}(x)) = \tilde{\gamma}_x(t)$ . The family of maps

$$t \in [0, 1] \mapsto A_x(t) := DT_t(x)$$

from  $T_x S_0$  to  $T_{\tilde{\gamma}_x(t)} S_t$  satisfies the Jacobi equation

$$(2) \quad A_x'' + R(A_x, \tilde{\gamma}_x') \tilde{\gamma}_x' = 0$$

with  $A_x(0)v = v$  and  $A_x'(0)v = \nabla_v \tilde{K}$  where  $R$  is the curvature tensor.

We define

$$t \in [0, 1] \mapsto U_x(t) = A_x'(t) A_x^{-1} : T_{\tilde{\gamma}_x(t)} S_t \rightarrow T_{\gamma_x(t)} \mathcal{H}$$

and check that it satisfies the Riccati equation

$$U_x'(t) = A_x''(t) A_x^{-1}(t) - A_x'(t) A_x^{-1}(t) A_x'(t) A_x^{-1}(t) = -R(\cdot, \gamma_x') \gamma_x' - U_x^2(t).$$



This equation is also known as the *Optical Equation* [CDGH01].

Let  $E_1(t), \dots, E_{n-1}(t) \in T_{\tilde{\gamma}_x(t)}S_t$  be the solutions of the linear equation

$$P_t \nabla_{\tilde{\gamma}'_x(t)} E_i = 0, \quad E_i(0) = e_i$$

for an orthonormal Basis  $e_1, \dots, e_{n-1}$  of  $T_x S_0$ . The map  $P_t : T_{\tilde{\gamma}_x(t)}\mathcal{H} \rightarrow T_{\tilde{\gamma}_x(t)}S_t$  is the linear projection.

*Claim.*  $E_1(t), \dots, E_{n-1}(t)$  is an orthonormal basis of  $T_{\tilde{\gamma}_x(t)}S_t$ .

*Proof of the claim.* We observe

$$\frac{d}{dt} \langle E_i(t), E_j(t) \rangle = \langle E'_i(t), E_j(t) \rangle + \langle E_i(t), E'_j(t) \rangle = 0.$$

Hence  $\langle E_i(t), E_j(t) \rangle$  is constant along  $\tilde{\gamma}_x$ .  $\blacktriangle$

The trace of  $U_x(t)$  restricted to  $T_{\tilde{\gamma}_x(t)}S_t$  is then

$$\text{tr} U_x(t) = \sum_{i=1}^{n-1} \langle E_i(t), U_x(t) E_i(t) \rangle = \sum_{i=1}^{n-1} \langle E_i, P_t U_x(t) E_i(t) \rangle.$$

*Claim.* The derivative  $P'_t$  is a linear map from  $T_{\tilde{\gamma}_x(t)}\mathcal{H} \rightarrow T_{\tilde{\gamma}_x(t)}S_t^\perp$ .

*Proof of the claim.*  $P'_t : T_{\tilde{\gamma}_x(t)}\mathcal{H} \rightarrow T_{\tilde{\gamma}_x(t)}\mathcal{H}$  is a linear map. Note that

$$E_1(t), \dots, E_{n-1}(t), \tilde{\gamma}'_x(t) = E_n(t)$$

is an orthogonal basis of  $T_{\tilde{\gamma}_x(t)}\mathcal{H}$  and  $\langle P_t E_i(t), E_j(t) \rangle = \langle E_i(t), E_j(t) \rangle$  for  $i, j = 1, \dots, n$ . Therefore

$$0 = \frac{d}{dt} \langle P_t E_i(t), E_j(t) \rangle = \left\langle \left( \frac{d}{dt} P_t \right) E_i(t), E_j(t) \right\rangle \quad \forall i, j \in \{0, \dots, n\}.$$

This proves the claim.  $\blacktriangle$

*Claim.*  $\text{tr}(U_x)' = \text{tr}(U'_x)$ .

*Proof of the claim.* We compute

$$\begin{aligned} \langle E_i, U_x E_i \rangle' &= \langle E_i, P U_x E_i \rangle' \\ &= \langle E'_i, P U_x E_i \rangle + \langle E_i, P' U_x E_i \rangle + \langle E_i, P U'_x E_i \rangle + \langle E_i, P U_x P E'_i \rangle \\ &= \langle E_i, P U'_x E_i \rangle. \end{aligned}$$

Summing w.r.t.  $i = 1, \dots, n-1$  yields the claim.  $\blacktriangle$

Hence taking the trace of the optical equation we obtain

$$\text{tr}(U_x)' + \text{tr}(U_x^2) + \text{tr}R(\cdot, \tilde{\gamma}'_x) \tilde{\gamma}'_x = 0$$

where  $\text{tr}R(\cdot, \tilde{\gamma}'_x) \tilde{\gamma}'_x = \sum_{i=1}^{n-1} \langle R(\tilde{E}_i, \tilde{\gamma}'_x) \tilde{\gamma}'_x, \tilde{E}_i \rangle = \text{ric}(\tilde{\gamma}'_x, \tilde{\gamma}'_x) \geq 0$  and the last inequality follows from the null energy condition.

*Claim.* Fix  $t_0$ .  $U_x(t_0)$  is a self-adjoint operator on  $T_{\tilde{\gamma}_x(t_0)}S_{t_0}$ .

*Proof of Claim.* Note that  $U_x(t) = A'_x(t) A_x^{-1}(t)$  and  $A_x(t_0 + s)z = J(s)$  satisfies the Jacobi equation with  $J(0) = v \in T_{\tilde{\gamma}_x}S_{t_0}$  where  $v A_x^{-1}(t_0) = z$  and  $J'(0) = w \in T_{\tilde{\gamma}_x(t_0)}\mathcal{H}$ . By standard Riemannian calculus we can write

$$J(s) = \frac{\partial}{\partial \epsilon} \Big|_{\epsilon=0} \exp_{\alpha(\epsilon)}(s \hat{K} \circ \alpha(\epsilon))$$

where  $\alpha : (-\epsilon, \epsilon) \rightarrow \mathcal{H}$  is  $C^2$  and satisfies  $\alpha(0) = \tilde{\gamma}_x(t_0) =: y$ ,  $\alpha'(0) = v$  and  $\hat{K}$  is a  $C^1$  vectorfield on  $\mathcal{H}$  in a neighborhood of  $y$  such that  $\hat{K}(0) = \tilde{\gamma}'_x(t_0)$  and  $\nabla_v \hat{K}(y) = w$ . Hence,  $U_x(t_0)v = A'_x(t_0)z = J'(0) = w = \nabla_v \hat{K}(y)$ .

Since  $\tilde{K}$  is also a normal vectorfield, this is the null Weingarten map of  $\mathcal{H}$  in  $y = \tilde{\gamma}_x(t_0)$ . Hence  $U_x(t_0)$  is self-adjoint.  $\blacktriangle$

By an application of the Cauchy-Schwarz inequality it follows

$$\mathrm{tr}(U_x^2) \geq \frac{1}{n-1} \mathrm{tr}(U_x)^2.$$

Hence  $\mathrm{tr}(U_x)' + \frac{1}{n-1} \mathrm{tr}(U_x)^2 \leq 0$ .

We set  $\det(A_x) = y_x$ . It follows that  $(\log y_x)' = \mathrm{tr}(A_x' A_x^{-1}) = \mathrm{tr}(U_x)$  and therefore

$$(3) \quad (\log y_x)'' + \frac{1}{n-1} ((\log y_x)')^2 \leq 0$$

as well  $\frac{d^2}{dt^2} y_x^{\frac{1}{n-1}} \leq 0$ , or equivalently

$$y_x^{\frac{1}{n-1}}(t) \geq (1-t) \underbrace{y_x^{\frac{1}{n-1}}(0)}_{=1} + t \underbrace{y_x^{\frac{1}{n-1}}(1)}_{=(\det DT(x))^{\frac{1}{n-1}}}.$$

Equation (3) also follows from the *Raychaudhuri equation*. However for this paper we gave a derivation of (3) that is closer to ideas in optimal transport.

We have  $\mu_t = (T_t)_\# \mu_0$  with  $T_t$ . Then, together with Lemma 3.7,

$$\begin{aligned} S_{n-1}(\mu_t | \mathrm{vol}_{\mathcal{H}}) &= - \int \rho_t^{1-\frac{1}{n-1}} d \mathrm{vol}_{\mathcal{H}} \\ &= - \int \rho_t^{-\frac{1}{n-1}} \circ T_t d\mu_0 \\ &= - \int_{S_0} \rho_0^{-\frac{1}{n-1}} (\det DT_t)^{\frac{1}{n-1}} d\mu_0 \\ &\leq -(1-t) \int \rho_0^{-\frac{1}{n-1}} d\mu_0 - t \int \rho_0^{-\frac{1}{n-1}} (\det DT)^{\frac{1}{n-1}} d\mu_0 \\ &= (1-t) S_{n-1}(\mu_0 | \mathrm{m}_{\mathcal{H}}) + t S_{n-1}(\mu_1 | \mathrm{m}_{\mathcal{H}}). \end{aligned}$$

This finishes the proof of (1).

Similarly, we can consider  $z_x(t) = e^{-V \circ \tilde{\gamma}_x(t)} y_x(t)$ . It follows that

$$\begin{aligned} (\log z)_x''(t) &= - \langle \nabla^2 V |_{\tilde{\gamma}_x(t)} \tilde{\gamma}_x'(t), \tilde{\gamma}_x'(t) \rangle + (\log y_x)''(t) \\ &\leq - \mathrm{ric}^V(\tilde{\gamma}_x(t), \tilde{\gamma}_x(t)) - \frac{1}{n-1} ((\log y_x)')^2 - \frac{1}{N' - n + 1} \langle V \circ \tilde{\gamma}_x(t), \tilde{\gamma}_x'(t) \rangle^2 \\ &\leq - \frac{1}{N'} ((\log z_x)')^2 \end{aligned}$$

where we used  $\frac{1}{n-1} a^2 + \frac{1}{N' - (n-1)} b^2 \geq \frac{1}{N'} (a+b)^2$  and the Bakry-Emery  $N$ -null energy condition.

Then we also have  $\frac{d^2}{dt^2} z_x^{\frac{1}{N'}} \leq 0$ . Again using Lemma 3.7, it follows

$$\begin{aligned} S_{N'}(\mu_t | \mathfrak{m}_{\mathcal{H}}) &= - \int \rho_t^{1 - \frac{1}{N'}} d\mathfrak{m}_{\mathcal{H}} = - \int \rho_t^{-\frac{1}{N'}} \circ T_t d\mu_0 \\ &= - \int_{S_0} \rho_0^{-\frac{1}{N'}} e^{-\frac{1}{N'}(V \circ T_t - V)} \det DT_t^{\frac{1}{N'}} d\mu_0 \\ &\leq -(1-t) \int \rho_0^{-\frac{1}{N'}} d\mu_0 - t \int \rho_0^{-\frac{1}{N'}} e^{-\frac{1}{N'}(V \circ T_1 - V)} \det DT_t^{\frac{1}{N'}} d\mu_0 \\ &= (1-t) S_{N'}(\mu_0 | \mathfrak{m}_{\mathcal{H}}) + t S_{N'}(\mu_1 | \mathfrak{m}_{\mathcal{H}}). \end{aligned}$$

This finishes the proof of (2).  $\square$

### 3.3. Null displacement convexity implies the null energy condition.

#### Theorem 3.9.

- (1) Let  $(M, g)$  be a  $(n+1)$ -dimensional, time-oriented Lorentzian manifold. Assume for every null hypersurface  $\mathcal{H}$  and for every  $\mu_0, \mu_1 \in \mathcal{P}(M, \text{vol}_{\mathcal{H}})$  that are null connected via a null coupling  $\pi$ , it holds

$$S_{n-1}(\mu_t | \text{vol}_{\mathcal{H}}) \leq (1-t) S_{n-1}(\mu_0 | \text{vol}_{\mathcal{H}}) + t S_{n-1}(\mu_1 | \text{vol}_{\mathcal{H}})$$

where  $\mu_t$  is the induced null displacement interpolation.

Then  $(M, g)$  satisfies the null energy condition.

- (2) Let  $(M, g, e^{-V})$  be a weighted,  $(n+1)$ -dimensional, time-oriented Lorentzian manifold and assume for every null hypersurface  $\mathcal{H}$  and for every  $\mu_0, \mu_1 \in \mathcal{P}(M, \mathfrak{m}_{\mathcal{H}})$  that are null connected via a null coupling  $\pi$ , it holds  $\forall N' > N \geq n-1$  that

$$S_{N'}(\mu_t | \mathfrak{m}_{\mathcal{H}}) \leq (1-t) S_{N'}(\mu_0 | \mathfrak{m}_{\mathcal{H}}) + t S_{N'}(\mu_1 | \mathfrak{m}_{\mathcal{H}}),$$

Then  $(M, g, e^{-V})$  satisfies the Bakry-Emery  $N$ -null energy condition.

*Proof.* We argue by contradiction in both cases.

For (1) assume there exists a null vector  $v \in TM$  and  $\varepsilon > 0$  such that

$$\text{ric}(v, v) \leq -6\varepsilon < 0.$$

For (2) we set  $N' = N$ . Assume there is a null vector  $v \in T_p M$  with

$$(N - n + 1) \text{ric}^V(v, v) - \langle \nabla V, v \rangle^2 < 0$$

and let  $\varepsilon > 0$  such that

$$\text{ric}^V(v, v) - \frac{1}{N - n + 1} \langle \nabla V, v \rangle^2 \leq -6\varepsilon < 0.$$

**1.** Consider the exponential map  $\exp_p : \mathcal{U} \subset T_p M \rightarrow M$  in  $p$  where  $\mathcal{U}$  is an open subset of  $T_p M$  such that  $\exp_p$  is a diffeomorphism. Let  $\mathcal{I} : \mathbb{R}_1^{n+1} \rightarrow (T_p M, g_p)$  an isometry between the Minkowski space  $\mathbb{R}_1^{n+1}$  and the tangent space at  $p$ . Hence  $\phi := \exp_p \circ \mathcal{I} : \mathcal{I}^{-1}(\mathcal{U}) =: \mathcal{V} \rightarrow \phi(\mathcal{V})$  is a normal coordinate map.

We choose an orthonormal basis  $e_0, e_1, \dots, e_n$  in  $\mathbb{R}_1^{n+1}$  with  $e_0$  timelike and  $e_1, \dots, e_n$  spacelike such that  $e_0 + e_1 = \sigma v$  for some  $\sigma > 0$ . The vectors  $e_1, \dots, e_n$  span a spacelike linear subspace  $\Lambda' = \langle e_1, e_2, \dots, e_n \rangle$  in  $\mathbb{R}_1^{n+1}$  that is isometric to  $\mathbb{R}^n$ .

In  $\Lambda' \simeq \mathbb{R}^n$  we choose a codimension 1 submanifold  $\mathcal{S}$  such that  $0 \in \mathcal{S}$  and such that the second fundamental form in 0 satisfies  $\Pi_p = \lambda \langle \cdot, \cdot \rangle_{\mathbb{R}^{n-1}}$  for  $\lambda \in \mathbb{R}$  that we choose later.

We define  $\Sigma = \phi(\Lambda' \cap B_\delta(0))$  and  $S = \phi(\mathcal{S} \cap B_\delta(0))$  where  $B_\delta(0)$  is the ball w.r.t. the standard Euclidean metric for some  $\delta > 0$  such that  $B_\delta(0) \subset \mathcal{I}^{-1}(\mathcal{U})$ .  $\Sigma$  and  $S$  are spacelike submanifolds in  $M$  such that  $S \subset \Sigma$ .

Let  $N_0 : S \rightarrow T\Sigma$  be the smooth normal unit vectorfield of  $S$  as submanifold in  $\Sigma$ , and let  $N_1 : \Sigma \rightarrow TM$  be the future pointing normal unit vector field on  $\Sigma$  in  $M$  such that we have  $D\phi_0(e_1) = N_0(p)$  and  $D\phi_0(e_0) = N_1(0)$ . Hence  $\sigma v = N_0(p) + N_1(p)$ . We define  $N : S \rightarrow TM$  as  $N_0 + N_1|_S$ . It follows that  $N$  is a null vector field along  $S$  and

$$\nabla_v N = \nabla_v N_0 \quad \forall v \in T_p S$$

since the covariant derivative of  $N_1$  at  $p$  in direction of vectors in  $T_p \Sigma$  vanishes. Here we use the properties of normal coordinates at the base point. Hence, we also have

$$\langle \nabla_v N(p), v \rangle = \Pi_S^\Sigma(v, v)$$

where  $\Pi_S^\Sigma$  is the second fundamental form of  $S$  in the ambient space  $\Sigma$ .

We can extend  $N : S \rightarrow TS$  to a smooth null vector field on  $\Sigma$  that we denote as  $\hat{N}$ . We define the map  $\Phi : \Sigma \times (-\epsilon, \epsilon) \rightarrow M$  via  $\Phi(x, t) = \exp_x(t\hat{N}(x))$  and the restriction  $\Phi|_{S \times (-\epsilon, \epsilon)} = \Psi$ . We can compute the differential of  $\Psi$  in  $(p, 0)$  and see it is injective. Hence, we can choose a neighborhood  $O' \cap \Sigma$  of  $p$  in  $\Sigma$  and  $\delta$  such that  $\Psi|_{O \times (-\delta, \delta)}$  is a diffeomorphism to its image where  $O = S \cap O'$ . By the definition of the map  $\Psi$  the image  $\Psi(O \times (-\delta, \delta)) =: \mathcal{H}$  is a null hypersurface in  $M$  that contains  $O$ .

Because  $N(q)$  is a null vector in  $T\mathcal{H}$  we also have that  $N(q) \in T_q \mathcal{H}^\perp$  for  $q \in S$ . Now, we extend  $N$  to a smooth, non-vanishing null vector field  $N$  on a neighborhood of  $p \in \mathcal{H}$  in  $\mathcal{H}$ . Therefore the second fundamental form of  $\mathcal{H}$  in  $p$  can be computed as  $\langle \nabla_v N(p), v \rangle = \Pi_{\mathcal{H}}^M(v, v)$  and so

$$\langle \nabla_v N(p), v \rangle = \Pi_{\mathcal{H}}^M(v, v) = \Pi_S^\Sigma(v, v) = \lambda \langle v, v \rangle \quad \forall v \in S.$$

*Remark 3.10.* Let us make a few comments at this point. If  $K$  is a non-vanishing, smooth null vector field along  $\mathcal{H}$ , the null Weingarten map is defined as  $\nabla_X K \bmod K = b(\bar{X})$  where  $\bar{X}$  is the equivalence class of spacelike vector  $X$  modulo  $K$ . If  $\tilde{K} = fK$  is another such null vector field for a smooth function  $f$ , then  $\nabla v \tilde{K} = f \nabla_v K \bmod K$ . Hence the Weingarten map  $b$  is a tensor field and depends at a given point  $p \in \mathcal{H}$  only on the value of  $K$  at  $p$ . The null second fundamental form of  $\mathcal{H}$  is then defined as  $\bar{\Pi}_{\mathcal{H}}^M(\bar{X}, \bar{Y}) = \langle \nabla_X K, Y \rangle = \Pi_{\mathcal{H}}^M(X, Y)$  for  $X, Y$  spacelike. This is consistent with the above.

We set  $\Sigma_r = \Phi(\Sigma \times \{r\})$  as well as  $S_r = \Psi(S \times \{r\})$  for  $r > 0$  small.  $\Sigma_r$  and  $S_r$  are space-like. A transport relation is given by  $R_{\mathcal{H}} = \{(x, y) \in \mathcal{H}^2 : x \in S, y \in \Psi(x, r) = \exp_x(rN(x))\}$ . Now we choose  $\mu_0$  supported in  $S$  and consider  $\mu_1 = (\Psi(\cdot, r))_\#$ . The coupling  $\pi = (\text{id}_S, \Psi(\cdot, r))_\# \mu_0$  is a null coupling between  $\mu_0$  and  $\mu_1$ . Let  $\mu_t$  be the induced null displacement interpolation. We also set  $\gamma_q(t) = \Psi(q, t)$ . Then  $\gamma'_q(0) = v$ . A transport map  $T$  like in Lemma is given by  $\Psi(\cdot, r)|_U$  for any open subset  $U \subset S$  that contains the support of  $\mu_0$ . Moreover  $\tilde{K} = rN$ . We assume  $\mu_r$  is supported

in  $B_\eta(p) \subset U$  where  $B_\eta(p)$  is a geodesic ball w.r.t. the induced intrinsic distance of  $g$  on  $S$ .

Repeating the calculation as in Theorem 3.8 we obtain

$$\operatorname{tr}(U_x)' + \operatorname{tr}(U_x^2) + \operatorname{ric}_x(\gamma'_x, \gamma'_x) = 0 \quad \forall x \in U$$

where  $U_x = A'_x A_x^{-1}$  and  $A_x(t) = (DT_t)|_x$ ,  $t \in [0, 1]$ , with  $A'_x(0)w = \nabla_w \tilde{K} = r \nabla_w N$ . Hence  $\langle A'_p(0)w, w \rangle = \langle U_p(0)w, w \rangle = r \lambda \langle w, w \rangle$ . Here  $w \in T_p S$ .

**2.** First we prove (1). For this we choose  $\lambda = 0$ . Recall  $\gamma'_p(0) = v$ .

By continuity of  $\operatorname{ric}$  and  $(x, t) \mapsto \gamma'_x(t)$  we can choose  $r$  and  $\eta$  such that

$$\operatorname{ric}(\gamma'_x(t), \gamma'_x(t)) \leq -5\varepsilon < 0 \quad \forall x \in B_\eta(p) \forall t \in [0, 1].$$

By continuity of  $(x, t) \mapsto U_x(t)$  we can choose  $\eta$  and  $r$  small enough to obtain

$$\varepsilon \geq \operatorname{tr} U_x^2(t) \quad \& \quad \frac{1}{n-1} (\operatorname{tr} U_x(t))^2 \geq -\varepsilon.$$

Then we compute

$$\operatorname{tr}(U_x)' = -\operatorname{tr}(U_x^2) - \operatorname{ric}_x(\gamma'_x, \gamma'_x) \geq -\varepsilon + 5\varepsilon \geq 4\varepsilon \geq -\frac{1}{n-1} (\operatorname{tr} U_x(t))^2 + 3\varepsilon.$$

Hence, setting  $y_x(t) = \det A_x(t)$  we get

$$(\log y_x)''(t) + \frac{1}{n-1} ((\log y_x)'(t))^2 > 0 \quad \forall x \in B_\eta(p)$$

and therefore

$$\left( (y_x)^{\frac{1}{n-1}} \right)'' > 0 \quad \forall x \in B_\eta(p).$$

It follows

$$(y_x)^{\frac{1}{n-1}}(t) < (1-t)(y_x)^{\frac{1}{n-1}}(0) + t(y_x)^{\frac{1}{n-1}}(1) \quad \forall x \in B_\eta(p).$$

Here we used that strict positivity of the second derivative is sufficient for strict convexity.

We can proceed as in the end of the proof of Theorem 3.8 and obtain

$$S_{n-1}(\mu_t | \mathfrak{m}_{\mathcal{H}}) > (1-t)S_{n-1}(\mu_0 | \mathfrak{m}_{\mathcal{H}}) + tS_{n-1}(\mu_1 | \mathfrak{m}_{\mathcal{H}}).$$

This contradicts null displacement convexity.

**3.** Finally we treat (2).

For this we choose  $\lambda = -\frac{1}{N-n+1} \langle \nabla V(p), v \rangle = -\frac{1}{N-n+1} \langle \nabla V(p), N(p) \rangle$ . In particular  $r\lambda = -\frac{1}{N-n+1} \langle \nabla V(p), \tilde{K}(p) \rangle$  since  $rN(p) = \tilde{K}(p)$ .

Provided  $\eta > 0$  and  $r > 0$  are small enough, by continuity of  $\operatorname{ric}^V$  and  $(x, t) \mapsto \gamma_x(t)$  we have

$$(1) \quad \operatorname{ric}^V(\gamma'_x(t), \gamma'_x(t)) - \frac{1}{N-n+1} \langle \nabla V, \gamma'_x(t) \rangle^2 \leq -5\varepsilon \quad \forall x \in B_\eta(p) \quad \forall t \in [0, 1]$$

and by continuity of  $(x, t) \mapsto A_x(t)$  and  $(x, t) \mapsto \langle \nabla V(x), \gamma'_x(t) \rangle$  we have

$$(2) \quad |\operatorname{tr} U_x(t) - \langle \nabla \circ \gamma_x(t), \gamma'_q(t) \rangle| \leq C \quad \forall x \in B_\eta(p) \quad \forall t \in [0, 1]$$

for some constant  $C > 0$ .

Now we choose  $\varepsilon' \leq \min\{\frac{N}{2C}\varepsilon, \frac{N(N-n)}{n}, N\}$  and since  $(x, t) \mapsto U_x(t)$  and  $(x, t) \mapsto \langle \nabla V(x), \gamma'_x(t) \rangle$  are continuous, we can choose  $\eta$  and  $r$  even smaller such that

$$(3) \quad \text{tr}U_x^2(t) \leq \text{tr}U_x^2(0) + \varepsilon',$$

$$(4) \quad |\text{tr}U_x(0) - \text{tr}U_x(t)| \leq \varepsilon'$$

$$(5) \quad |\langle \nabla V(p), v \rangle - \langle \nabla V(x), \gamma'_x(t) \rangle| \leq \varepsilon'.$$

$\forall x \in B_\eta(p) \quad \forall t \in [0, 1]$  where, again,

$$(n-1)r^2\lambda^2 = \text{tr}U_x^2(0) = (\text{tr}U_x(0))^2 \quad \text{and} \quad (N-n+1)r\lambda = -\langle \nabla V(p), \tilde{K}(p) \rangle.$$

With this we compute first, using (1) and (3),

$$\begin{aligned} \text{tr}(U_x)' - (V \circ \gamma_x)'' &= -\text{tr}(U_x^2) - \text{ric}_x^V(\gamma'_x, \gamma'_x) \\ &\geq -\frac{1}{n-1} ((n-1)^2 r^2 \lambda^2) - \frac{1}{N-n+1} (\langle \nabla V \circ \gamma(t), \gamma_x(t) \rangle)^2 + 4\varepsilon = (\star) \end{aligned}$$

Next we use

$$(6) \quad \frac{1}{N}(a+b)^2 + \frac{n}{N(N-n)} \left( b - a \frac{N-n}{n} \right)^2 = \frac{1}{n}a^2 + \frac{1}{N-n}b^2.$$

and obtain

$$\begin{aligned} (\star) &\stackrel{(6)}{=} -\frac{1}{N} ((n-1)r\lambda - \langle \nabla V \circ \gamma_q(t), \gamma_q(t) \rangle)^2 \\ &\quad - \frac{n}{N(N-n)} (\langle \nabla V \circ \gamma_q(t), \gamma_q(t) \rangle + (N-n+1)r\lambda)^2 + 4\varepsilon \\ &\stackrel{(4)+(5)}{\geq} -\frac{1}{N} (\text{tr}U_q(t) - \langle \nabla \circ \gamma_q(t), \gamma'_q(t) \rangle \pm \varepsilon')^2 - \underbrace{\frac{n}{N(N-n)}(\varepsilon')^2}_{\leq \varepsilon} + 4\varepsilon \\ &= -\frac{1}{N} (\text{tr}U_q(t) - \langle \nabla \circ \gamma_q(t), \gamma'_q(t) \rangle)^2 \\ &\quad - \underbrace{\frac{2}{N} (\text{tr}U_q(t) - \langle \nabla \circ \gamma_q(t), \gamma'_q(t) \rangle) \varepsilon'}_{\leq \frac{2}{N} C \varepsilon' \leq \varepsilon} - \underbrace{\frac{1}{N}(\varepsilon')^2}_{\leq \varepsilon} + 3\varepsilon \\ &= -\frac{1}{N} (\text{tr}U_q(t) - (V \circ \gamma_x)'(t))^2 + \varepsilon \end{aligned}$$

Consequently

$$\text{tr}(U_x)' - (V \circ \gamma_x)'' + \frac{1}{N} (\text{tr}U_x(t) - (V \circ \gamma_x)'(t))^2 > 0.$$

and if we set  $\text{tr}U_x - V \circ \gamma_x = z_x$ , it follows

$$\left( (z_x)^{\frac{1}{N}} \right)'' > 0.$$

Exactly as before it follows

$$S_N(\mu_t | \mathfrak{m}_{\mathcal{H}}) > (1-t)S_N(\mu_0 | \mathfrak{m}_{\mathcal{H}}) + tS_N(\mu_1 | \mathfrak{m}_{\mathcal{H}})$$

that is a contradiction.  $\square$

**Definition 3.11.** A weighted space-time  $(M^{n+1}, g, e^{-V})$  satisfies the synthetic  $N$ -null energy condition for some  $N \geq n-1$  if for every null hypersurface  $\mathcal{H}$  and for every  $\mu_0, \mu_1 \in \mathcal{P}(M, \mathfrak{m}_{\mathcal{H}})$  that are null connected via a null coupling  $\pi$ , it holds

$$S_{N'}(\mu_t | \mathfrak{m}_{\mathcal{H}}) \leq (1-t)S_{N'}(\mu_0 | \mathfrak{m}_{\mathcal{H}}) + tS_{N'}(\mu_1 | \mathfrak{m}_{\mathcal{H}}) \quad \forall N' > N$$

where  $\mu_t$  is the corresponding null displacement interpolation.

### 3.4. Localisation.

**Proposition 3.12.** *Consider a weighted, time-oriented Lorentzian manifold  $(M^{n+1}, g, e^{-V})$ . Then the synthetic  $N$ -null energy condition for  $N \geq n - 1$  holds if and only if for every null hypersurface  $\mathcal{H}$  and for every  $\mu_0, \mu_1 \in \mathcal{P}(M, \mathfrak{m}_{\mathcal{H}})$  that are acausal and null connected one has  $\forall t \in [0, 1]$  that*

$$(4) \quad \rho_t^{-\frac{1}{N}}(\gamma_t) \geq (1-t)\rho_0^{-\frac{1}{N}}(\gamma_0) + t\rho_1^{-\frac{1}{N}}(\gamma_1) \text{ for } \Pi\text{-almost every } \gamma \in \mathcal{G}(\mathcal{H})$$

where  $\rho_t$  is the density of the  $\mathfrak{m}_{\mathcal{H}}$ -absolutely continuous part of the measures  $\mu_t$  of the corresponding null displacement interpolation.

*Proof.* By Hölder's inequality it is possible to replace  $N$  in (4) with  $N' > N$ . Integrating (4) w.r.t. the dynamical null coupling  $\Pi$  that comes from  $\pi$  yields

$$S_{N'}(\mu_t | \mathfrak{m}_{\mathcal{H}}) \leq (1-t)S_{N'}(\mu_0 | \mathfrak{m}_{\mathcal{H}}) + tS_{N'}(\mu_1 | \mathfrak{m}_{\mathcal{H}}) \quad \forall N' > N.$$

Let us now assume the synthetic  $N$ -null energy condition. Let  $(\mu_t)_{t \in [0,1]}$  be a null displacement interpolation between two acausal measures  $\mu_0, \mu_1 \in \mathcal{P}(\mathcal{H}, \mathfrak{m}_{\mathcal{H}})$  supported on  $S_0$  and  $S_1$ .  $\mu_t$  is induced by a  $C^1$  diffeomorphism  $T_t : S_0 \rightarrow \mathcal{H}$  and  $T_t(S_0) = S_1$  is a spacelike  $C^1$  submanifold. We fix  $\tau \in [0, 1]$  and  $x \in S_\tau$ , and we define

$$\Gamma = \{\tilde{\gamma} \in \mathcal{G}(\mathcal{H}) : \tilde{\gamma}(t) \in B_\delta(x) \subset S_\tau\}$$

where  $B_\delta(x)$  is the ball of radius  $\delta > 0$  in  $S_t$ . Assume  $\Pi(\Gamma) > 0$  and set  $\Pi' = \frac{1}{\Pi(\Gamma)}\Pi|_\Gamma$ . In particular  $\mu_\tau(B_\delta(x)) = \Pi(\Gamma) \cdot (e_t)_\# \Pi' = \mu'_t$  is still a null displacement interpolation that is induced by the same family of maps  $T_t$ . Moreover, for  $B \subset S_t$

$$\mu'_t(B) = \Pi'(e_t^{-1}(B)) = \frac{1}{\Pi(\Gamma)}\Pi|_\Gamma(e_t^{-1}(B)) \leq \frac{1}{\Pi(\Gamma)}\Pi(e_t^{-1}(B)) = \frac{1}{\Pi(\Gamma)}\mu_t(B).$$

Hence  $\rho'_t \leq \frac{1}{\Pi(\Gamma)}\rho_t$  and  $\rho'_\tau = \frac{1}{\Pi(\Gamma)}\rho_t|_{B_\delta(x)}$ . The synthetic  $N$ -null energy condition yields

$$\begin{aligned} \mathfrak{m}_{\mathcal{H}}(B_\delta(x))^{\frac{1}{N'}} &\geq \int (\rho'_\tau)^{-\frac{1}{N'}} d\mu'_\tau \\ &\geq \int \left[ (1-t)(\rho'_0)^{-\frac{1}{N'}}(e_0 \circ \Lambda_\tau(x)) + t(\rho'_1)^{-\frac{1}{N'}}(e_1 \circ \Lambda_\tau(x)) \right] d\mu'_\tau(x) \\ &\geq \Pi(\Gamma)^{\frac{1}{N'}-1} \int_{B_\delta(x)} \left[ (1-t)\rho_0^{-\frac{1}{N'}}(e_0 \circ \Lambda_\tau(x)) + t\rho_1^{-\frac{1}{N'}}(e_1 \circ \Lambda_\tau(x)) \right] d\mu_\tau(x) \end{aligned}$$

where the first inequality follows from Jensen's inequality. Now let  $x$  be a density point of the measure  $\mu_t$  w.r.t.  $\mathfrak{m}_{\mathcal{H}}$  and also a density point of  $(1-t)\rho_0^{-\frac{1}{N'}}(e_0 \circ \Lambda_\tau(x)) + t\rho_1^{-\frac{1}{N'}}(e_1 \circ \Lambda_\tau(x)) =: F(x)$  w.r.t.  $\mu_\tau$ . Here we use that  $F(x)$  is in  $L^1(\mu_\tau)$ . We divide the previous inequality by  $\mu_\tau(B_\delta(x))^{\frac{1}{N'}}$ . Then we take  $\delta \downarrow 0$ . It follows

$$\rho_\tau^{-\frac{1}{N'}}(x) \geq (1-t)\rho_0^{-\frac{1}{N'}}(e_0 \circ \Lambda_\tau(x)) + t\rho_1^{-\frac{1}{N'}}(e_1 \circ \Lambda_\tau(x))$$

for  $\mu_\tau$ -almost every  $x \in S_\tau$ . Since  $\Pi = (\Lambda_\tau)_\# \mu_\tau$ , our claim follows.  $\square$

## 4. APPLICATIONS

## 4.1. Hawking area monotonicity.

**Definition 4.1.** Let  $\mathcal{H}$  be a null hypersurface and let  $K : \mathcal{H} \rightarrow T\mathcal{H}$  be the normal  $C^1$  null vector field as in Subsection 2.3. We call  $\mathcal{H}$  future null complete, if  $\exp_x(tK(x)) \in \mathcal{H}$  for all  $t \in [0, \infty)$  and for all  $x \in \mathcal{H}$ .

The Lorentzian manifold  $(M, g)$  is called future null complete if  $\exp(tv)$  is defined for all  $t \in [0, \infty)$  for every future-directed null vector.

*Remark 4.2.* Let  $\mathcal{H}$  be future null complete and  $S \subset \mathcal{H}$  an acausal spacelike submanifold. Let  $\tilde{K}$  be a  $C^1$  null vectorfield along  $S$ . Then  $T_t : S \rightarrow \mathcal{H}$  with  $T_t(x) = \exp_x(t\tilde{K}(x))$  is a  $C^1$  diffeomorphism for all  $t \in [0, \infty)$  and for a probability measure  $\mu$  on  $S$ ,  $(T_t)_\# \mu = \mu_t$  is a probability measure on  $S_t$  for all  $t \in [0, \infty)$ .

**Theorem 4.3** (Hawking Monotonicity). *Let  $(M^{n+1}, g, e^{-V})$  be a weighted space-time that satisfies the Bakry-Emery  $N$ -null energy condition for  $N \geq n - 1$  and let  $\mathcal{H} \subset M$  be a null hypersurface. Assume  $\mathcal{H}$  is future null complete. Let  $\Sigma_0, \Sigma_1 \subset M$  two acausal spacelike hypersurfaces. Define  $\Sigma_i \cap \mathcal{H} = S_i$ ,  $i = 0, 1$ , and assume  $S_0 \subset J^-(S_1)$ . Then*

$$m_{\mathcal{H}}(S_0) \leq m_{\mathcal{H}}(S_1).$$

*Proof.* Assume there exist  $S_0$  and  $S_1$  such that

$$m_{\mathcal{H}}(S_0) > m_{\mathcal{H}}(S_1).$$

By Example 3.3 there exists a map  $T : S_0 \rightarrow S_1$  given by  $T(x) = \exp_x(\tilde{K}(x))$  for a  $C^1$  null vector field along  $S_0$ . Since  $\mathcal{H}$  is future complete, the family of maps  $T_t(x) = \exp_x(t\tilde{K}(x))$  are  $C^1$  diffeomorphisms for all  $t \in (0, \infty)$  [CDGH01, Lemma 4.15] and  $T_t(S_0) = S_t$  are spacelike and acausal hypersurfaces in  $\mathcal{H}$  of codimension 2 in  $M$ .

Let  $N' > N$ . We define  $\mu_0 = \frac{1}{m_{\mathcal{H}}(S_0)} m_{\mathcal{H}}|_{S_0}$  and  $(T_t)_\# \mu_0 =: \mu_t$ . It follows that

$$-S_{N'}(\mu_0 | m_{\mathcal{H}}) = m_{\mathcal{H}}(S_0)^{\frac{1}{N'}}$$

and by Jensen inequality also

$$-S_{N'}(\mu_1 | m_{\mathcal{H}}) \leq m_{\mathcal{H}}(\text{supp } \mu_1)^{\frac{1}{N'}} \leq m_{\mathcal{H}}(S_1)^{\frac{1}{N'}}.$$

Hence

$$-S_{N'}(\mu_0 | m_{\mathcal{H}}) > -S_{N'}(\mu_1 | m_{\mathcal{H}}).$$

Now, pick  $t_0 \gg 1$  and let  $\hat{T}_\tau(x) = \exp_x(\tau t_0 \tilde{K}(x))$  and define  $\nu_\tau := (\hat{T}_\tau)_\#(\mu_0)$  for  $\tau \in [0, 1]$ . For  $\tau_1 = \frac{1}{t_0}$  we have  $\nu_{\tau_1} = \mu_1$ .

It follows

$$\begin{aligned} -S_{N'}(\mu_0 | m_{\mathcal{H}}) &> -S_{N'}(\nu_{\tau_1} | m_{\mathcal{H}}) \\ &\geq -(1 - \tau_1)S_{N'}(\nu_0 | m_{\mathcal{H}}) - \tau_1 S_{N'}(\nu_1 | m_{\mathcal{H}}). \end{aligned}$$

For  $t_0 \gg 1$  large enough we have a contradiction.  $\square$



#### 4.2. Penrose singularity theorem.

**Definition 4.4.** Let  $(M^{n+1}, g, e^{-V})$  be a weighted space-time and let  $\mathcal{H} \subset M$  be a null hypersurface. Let  $\Sigma \subset M$  be a acausal spacelike hypersurface and we set  $\Sigma \cap \mathcal{H} = S$ . For every  $p \in S$  there exists a geodesic ball  $B_\eta(p) \subset S$  w.r.t.  $g|_S$  and a null vectorfield  $\tilde{K} : S_0 \rightarrow T\mathcal{H}$  such that  $x \in S_0 \mapsto T_t(x) = \exp_x(\tilde{K}(x))$  is a  $C^1$  diffeomorphism for  $t \in (0, t_p)$  for some  $t_p > 0$ .

We say  $S$  is *future converging in  $\mathcal{H}$*  if for every  $p \in S$  and  $T_t$  defined as before there exists  $\eta > 0$  and  $\epsilon(p) \in (0, 1)$  s.t.

$$\frac{d^-}{dt} \log m_{\mathcal{H}}(T_t(B_\delta(p)))|_{t=0} \leq -\epsilon(p) < 0$$

for any  $\delta \in (0, \eta)$ .

**Lemma 4.5.** Let  $(M^{n+1}, g, e^{-V})$  be a weighted space-time and let  $\mathcal{H} \subset M$  be a null hypersurface. Let  $\Sigma \subset M$  be a acausal spacelike hypersurface.  $\Sigma \cap \mathcal{H} = S$  is future converging in  $\mathcal{H}$  if and only if

$$H_{V, \tilde{K}} = H + \langle \nabla V, \tilde{K} \rangle > 0.$$

We call  $H_{V, \tilde{K}}$  the weighted mean curvature in direction of  $\tilde{K}$ .

*Proof.* By the area formula we have

$$m_{\mathcal{H}}(T_t(B_\delta(p))) = \int_{B_\delta(p)} e^{-V \circ T_t(x)} \det DT_t(x) d \text{vol}_{\mathcal{H}}(x).$$

Differentiating this formula at  $t = 0$  yields

$$\begin{aligned} \frac{d}{dt} \Big|_{t=0} m_{\mathcal{H}}(T_t(B_\delta(p))) &= \int_{B_\delta(p)} \frac{d}{dt} \Big|_{t=0} e^{-V \circ T_t(x)} \det DT_t(x) d \text{vol}_{\mathcal{H}}(x) \\ &= \int_{B_\delta(p)} \left( \text{tr} \frac{d}{dt} \Big|_{t=0} DT_t(x) - \langle \nabla V(x), \tilde{K}(x) \rangle \right) d m_{\mathcal{H}}(x). \end{aligned}$$

Moreover

$$\text{tr} \frac{d}{dt} \Big|_{t=0} DT_t(x) = \text{tr} D\tilde{K}(x) = \sum_{i=1}^{n-1} \langle \nabla e_i \tilde{K}(x), e_i \rangle = -H(x)$$

for alle  $x \in B_\delta(p)$  where  $e_1, \dots, e_{n-1}$  is an orthonormal bases in  $T_x S$  and  $H(x)$  is the mean curvature of  $S$  in direction of  $\tilde{K}$  at  $x$ .

Hence

$$\begin{aligned} 0 > -\epsilon(p) &\geq \frac{d^-}{dt} \log m_{\mathcal{H}}(T_t(B_\delta(p)))|_{t=0} \\ &= \frac{1}{m_{\mathcal{H}}(B_\delta(p))} \frac{d}{dt} m_{\mathcal{H}}(T_t(B_\delta(p)))|_{t=0} \\ &= \frac{1}{m_{\mathcal{H}}(B_\delta(p))} \int_{B_\delta(p)} \left( -H(x) - \langle \nabla V(x), \tilde{K}(x) \rangle \right) d m_{\mathcal{H}}(x). \end{aligned}$$

If  $\delta \downarrow 0$ , it follows

$$(5) \quad H(p) + \langle \nabla V(p), \tilde{K}(p) \rangle > 0.$$

If we assume (5), then for every  $p \in S$  we find  $\eta > 0$  and  $\epsilon(p) > 0$ , such that

$$H(x) + \langle \nabla V(x), \tilde{K}(x) \rangle \geq \epsilon(p) \quad \text{for } x \in B_\delta(p) \text{ and for all } \delta \in (0, \eta).$$

With the previous computations we see that  $S$  is future convergin in  $\mathcal{H}$ .  $\square$

*Remark 4.6.* The definition of *future converging* for a codimension two submanifold  $S$  in a Lorentzian manifold  $(M, g)$  is that  $\langle \mathbf{H}, v \rangle > 0$  for every future directed null vector  $v$  normal to  $S$  [O’N83, Chapter 14]. Here  $\mathbf{H}$  is the mean curvature vector of  $S$ . Hence,  $\langle \mathbf{H}(p), \tilde{K}(p) \rangle = H(p)$ ,  $p \in S$ , and future converging implies future converging in  $\mathcal{H}$ .

For a weighted space-time we make the following definition.

**Definition 4.7.** Let  $(M, g, e^{-V} \text{vol}_g)$  be a weighted Lorentzian manifold. We call a codimension two submanifold  $S \subset M$  Bakry-Emery future converging (or Bakry-Emery trapped) if

$$\langle \mathbf{H}, v \rangle + \langle \nabla V, v \rangle > 0$$

for every future-directed normal null vector at  $S$ .

Our definition of *future converging in  $\mathcal{H}$*  is motivated by related definitions of lower mean curvature bounds for the boundary of subsets in metric measure spaces that satisfy a synthetic Ricci curvature bound or for measured Lorentzian length spaces (see [Ket20, Ket21, BKMW20, CM22, CM20]).

**Corollary 4.8.** *Consider a weighted space-time  $(M, g, e^{-V})$  that satisfies the synthetic  $N$ -null energy condition and let  $\mathcal{H}$  be a null hypersurface. Let  $\Sigma \subset M$  be an acausal spacelike hypersurfaces and define  $\Sigma \cap \mathcal{H} = S$ . Assume  $S$  is future converging in  $\mathcal{H}$ . Then  $\mathcal{H}$  is not future null complete.*

*Proof.* For  $p \in S$  we choose  $\eta > 0$  and  $\tilde{K}$  as in Definition 4.4. We argue by contradiction. Assume  $\mathcal{H}$  is future complete. It follows that  $T_t(x) = \exp_x(t\tilde{K}(x))$ ,  $x \in B_\eta(p)$ , is a  $C^1$  diffeomorphism for all  $t \in (0, \infty)$ . We define  $\mu_0 = \frac{1}{\text{m}_{\mathcal{H}}} \text{m}_{\mathcal{H}}|_{B_\delta(p)}$  and  $\mu_t = (T_t)_\# \mu_0$ . Since  $\mathcal{H}$  is future complete, it follows, similarly as in the Hawking Monotonicity Theorem, that

$$S_{N'}(\mu_0 | \text{m}_{\mathcal{H}}) \geq S_{N'}(\mu_1 | \text{m}_{\mathcal{H}}).$$

for all  $N' > N$ . Then it follows with the synthetic null energy condition

$$\begin{aligned} 0 &> -(N' - 1) \text{m}_{\mathcal{H}}(B_\delta(p))^{\frac{1}{N'}} \epsilon(p) \\ &\geq \liminf_{\tau \downarrow 0} \frac{1}{\tau} \left( \text{m}_{\mathcal{H}}(\hat{T}_\tau B_\delta(p))^{\frac{1}{N'}} - \text{m}_{\mathcal{H}}(B_\delta(p))^{\frac{1}{N'}} \right) \\ &\geq -S_{N'}(\nu_1 | \text{m}_{\mathcal{H}}) + S_{N'}(\nu_0 | \text{m}_{\mathcal{H}}) \geq 0. \end{aligned}$$

This is a contradiction. We can refine our analysis as follows.

Let  $p \in S$  and  $\eta > 0$  and  $\tilde{K}$  as above such that  $T_t(x) = \exp_x(t\tilde{K}(x))$ ,  $x \in B_\eta(p)$ , is a  $C^1$  diffeomorphism for all  $t \in (0, t_p)$  and for some  $t_p > 0$ . We define  $\mu_0 = \frac{1}{\text{m}_{\mathcal{H}}} \text{m}_{\mathcal{H}}|_{B_\delta(p)}$  for  $\delta \in (0, \eta)$  and  $\mu_t = (T_t)_\# \mu_0$ .

Recall that area formula implies

$$\text{m}_{\mathcal{H}}(T_t(B_\delta(p))) = \int_{B_\delta(p)} \det DT_t e^{-V \circ T_t} d \text{vol}_{\mathcal{H}} = \int_{B_\delta(p)} \frac{\rho_0}{\rho_t \circ T_t} d \text{m}_{\mathcal{H}}.$$

Hence future converging in  $\mathcal{H}$  yields

$$\begin{aligned} -\epsilon(p) &\geq m_{\mathcal{H}}(B_{\delta}(p))^{-1} \frac{d}{dt} \Big|_{t=0} m_{\mathcal{H}}(T_t(B_{\delta}(p))) \\ &\geq m_{\mathcal{H}}(B_{\delta}(p))^{-1} \int_{B_{\delta}(p)} \frac{d}{dt} \Big|_{t=0} \frac{\rho_0}{\rho_t \circ T_t} d m_{\mathcal{H}}. \end{aligned}$$

and with  $\delta \downarrow 0$  one gets

$$0 > -\epsilon(p) \geq \frac{d}{dt} \Big|_{t=0} \frac{\rho_0(p)}{\rho_t \circ T_t(p)} = \frac{d}{dt} \Big|_{t=0} \log(\rho_t \circ T_t(p))^{-1}.$$

Since  $t \mapsto (\rho_t \circ T_t(p))^{-\frac{1}{N}}$  is concave, we have  $t_p < \frac{1}{\epsilon(x)}$  by Riccati comparison.  $\square$

Now, we will prove a Penrose Singularity theorem for the Bakry-Emery null energy condition.

**Theorem 4.9.** *Let  $(M, g, e^{-V})$  be a weighted, time-oriented Lorentzian manifold that is globally hyperbolic. Assume there exists a non-compact Cauchy hypersurface  $\Sigma \subset M$ ,  $M$  contains a Bakry-Emery future converging, compact, oriented codimension two submanifold  $S$  and the Bakry-Emery  $N$ -null energy condition for  $N \geq n-1$  holds. Then  $M$  is future null incomplete.*

*Proof.* Let  $\mathcal{C}$ ,  $\underline{\mathcal{C}}$ ,  $\mathcal{H}$ ,  $\underline{\mathcal{H}}$ ,  $L$  and  $\underline{L}$  as in Example 2.3. By the Bakry-Emery future converging condition for  $S$  and since  $S$  is compact, we have that

$$H_{V,L} \geq \epsilon > 0, \quad H_{V,\underline{L}} \geq \epsilon > 0.$$

We define the map  $T_t(x) = \exp_x(tL(x))$  on  $S$ . Assume now that  $(M, g)$  is future null complete. Then it follows that for a fixed  $x \in S$   $\exp_x(tL(x)) = \gamma_x(t)$  is defined on  $[0, \infty)$ .

Let  $p \in S$  and define  $\mu_0 = \frac{1}{m_{\mathcal{H}}(B_{\delta}(p))} m_{\mathcal{H}}|_{B_{\delta}(p)}$ . Let  $t_p > 0$  such that  $T_t$  is a diffeomorphism on  $B_{\delta}(p)$  for all  $t \in (0, t_p)$  and  $\mu_t := (T_t)_{\#} \mu_0$ .

Let  $\rho_t$  be the density of  $\mu_t$  w.r.t.  $m_{\mathcal{H}}$ . By the previous proof we have that  $t_p \in (0, \frac{1}{\epsilon})$ . Hence, there is a focal point  $\tau$  before  $\frac{1}{\epsilon}$ . For  $t > \frac{1}{\epsilon} \geq \tau$  there exists a time-like geodesic from  $S$  to  $\gamma_x(t)$  and therefore  $\gamma_x(t) \notin \partial J^+(S)$ .

It follows that  $\partial J^+(S)$  is a closed and bounded, hence compact, subset of  $\mathcal{C} \cup \underline{\mathcal{C}}$ .

From here we can follow the proof of the classical Penrose Singularity Theorem. Let us outline the argument.

In view of the time-orientability of  $(M, g)$ , there is a global timelike vector field  $T$  whose integral curves are timelike, foliate  $M$  and intersect the Cauchy hypersurface  $\Sigma$  exactly once. Since  $J^+(S)$  is a future set, the topological boundary  $\partial J^+(S)$  is an achronal  $(n-1)$ -dimensional Lipschitz submanifold without boundary. Hence, every integral curve of  $T$  intersects  $\partial J^+(S)$  at most once. The projection  $P$  of  $\partial J^+(S)$  to the Cauchy Hypersurface  $\Sigma$  along the flow lines of  $T$  is continuous and bijective. Since  $\partial J^+(S)$  is compact,  $P$  is a homeomorphism. This is contradiction, since  $\Sigma$  was assumed to be non-compact.  $\square$

## REFERENCES

- [BKMW20] Annegret Burtscher, Christian Ketterer, Robert J. McCann, and Eric Woolgar, *Inscribed radius bounds for lower Ricci bounded metric measure spaces with mean convex boundary*, SIGMA, Symmetry Integrability Geom. Methods Appl. **16** (2020), paper 131, 29 (English).
- [Bra22] Mathias Braun, *Rényi’s entropy on lorentzian spaces. timelike curvature-dimension conditions*.
- [CDGH01] P. T. Chruściel, E. Delay, G. J. Galloway, and R. Howard, *Regularity of horizons and the area theorem*, Ann. Henri Poincaré **2** (2001), no. 1, 109–178 (English).
- [CEMS01] Dario Cordero-Erausquin, Robert J. McCann, and Michael Schmuckenschläger, *A Riemannian interpolation inequality à la Borell, Brascamp and Lieb*, Invent. Math. **146** (2001), no. 2, 219–257. MR 1865396 (2002k:58038)
- [CM20] Fabio Cavalletti and Andrea Mondino, *Optimal transport in Lorentzian synthetic spaces, synthetic timelike Ricci curvature lower bounds and applications*, arXiv e-prints (2020), arXiv:2004.08934.
- [CM22] Fabio Cavalletti and Andrea Mondino, *A review of Lorentzian synthetic theory of timelike Ricci curvature bounds*, Gen. Relativ. Gravitation **54** (2022), no. 11, 39 (English), Id/No 137.
- [Haw72] S. W. Hawking, *Black holes in general relativity*, Comm. Math. Phys. **25** (1972), 152–166. MR 293962
- [Ket20] Christian Ketterer, *The Heintze-Karcher inequality for metric measure spaces*, Proc. Am. Math. Soc. **148** (2020), no. 9, 4041–4056 (English).
- [Ket21] Christian Ketterer, *Rigidity of mean convex subsets in non-negatively curved RCD spaces and stability of mean curvature bounds*, arXiv e-prints (2021), arXiv:2111.12020.
- [KM18] Christian Ketterer and Andrea Mondino, *Sectional and intermediate Ricci curvature lower bounds via optimal transport*, Adv. Math. **329** (2018), 781–818. MR 3783428
- [KS18] Michael Kunzinger and Clemens Sämann, *Lorentzian length spaces*, Ann. Global Anal. Geom. **54** (2018), no. 3, 399–447 (English).
- [McC20] Robert J. McCann, *Displacement convexity of Boltzmann’s entropy characterizes the strong energy condition from general relativity*, Camb. J. Math. **8** (2020), no. 3, 609–681 (English).
- [MS22a] Robert J. McCann and Clemens Sämann, *A Lorentzian analog for Hausdorff dimension and measure*, Pure Appl. Anal. **4** (2022), no. 2, 367–400 (English).
- [MS22b] Andrea Mondino and Stefan Suhr, *An optimal transport formulation of the einstein equations of general relativity*, Journal of the European Mathematical Society (2022).
- [O’N83] Barrett O’Neill, *Semi-Riemannian geometry. With applications to relativity*, Pure and Applied Mathematics, 103. New York-London etc.: Academic Press. xiii, 468 p. (1983)., 1983.
- [OV00] F. Otto and C. Villani, *Generalization of an inequality by Talagrand and links with the logarithmic Sobolev inequality*, J. Funct. Anal. **173** (2000), no. 2, 361–400. MR 1760620 (2001k:58076)
- [Pen65] Roger Penrose, *Gravitational collapse and space-time singularities*, Phys. Rev. Lett. **14** (1965), 57–59. MR 172678
- [vRS05] Max-K. von Renesse and Karl-Theodor Sturm, *Transport inequalities, gradient estimates, entropy, and Ricci curvature*, Comm. Pure Appl. Math. **58** (2005), no. 7, 923–940. MR 2142879 (2006j:53048)

UNIVERSITY OF FREIBURG

*Email address:* christian.ketterer@math.uni-freiburg.de