

# Geometrisation of Ohm's reciprocity relation in a holographic plasma

---

**Giorgio Frangi**

*Higgs Centre for Theoretical Physics, The University of Edinburgh,  
Peter Guthrie Tait Road, Edinburgh EH9 3FD, Scotland*

*E-mail:* [giorgio.frangi@ed.ac.uk](mailto:giorgio.frangi@ed.ac.uk)

ABSTRACT: It has been pointed out in [1] that the familiar reciprocity relation between the conductivity  $\sigma$  and resistivity  $\rho$  should not be expected to hold in all possible settings, but, as argued in [2], is rather a property that may (or may not) emerge as a consequence of specific features, or in certain limits of interest, of a given theory. In this work, I prove the conventional statement:  $\rho = \sigma^{-1}$ , which I refer to as *Ohm's reciprocity relation*, for a large class of holographic models with  $d = 3 + 1$  boundary dimensions. The proof involves a generalisation of the electric-magnetic duality in the  $D = 4 + 1$  bulk, the validity of which is discussed in detail. I then confirm these findings by considering one specific model and run numerical simulations in different settings.

---

## Contents

<b>1</b>	<b>Introduction</b>	<b>1</b>
<b>2</b>	<b>Dualisation map and background</b>	<b>3</b>
<b>3</b>	<b>Renormalisation and Kubo formulae</b>	<b>7</b>
<b>4</b>	<b>An analytic proof of reciprocity</b>	<b>10</b>
<b>5</b>	<b>Numerical transport coefficients</b>	<b>12</b>
<b>6</b>	<b>Discussion</b>	<b>15</b>

---

## 1 Introduction

Electric conduction in a vast and very diverse array of materials is described by Ohm's law, which prescribes that, under very few assumptions, applying a voltage  $V$  to any two points of a piece of a conducting material results in a linearly proportional electric current  $I$  flowing between them:  $V = R \cdot I$  [3]. The coefficient  $R$  is the *resistance* of the conductor, which depends on both its shape and the intrinsic and thermodynamic properties of the material. To isolate the latter, it is possible to rewrite Ohm's law in terms of locally defined transport coefficients, named the *conductivity*  $\sigma$  and the *resistivity*  $\rho$ , which express a linear relation between the current density  $\mathbf{j}$  and the electric field  $\mathbf{E}$  measured at a given point in space. In simple phenomenological models – for example in the Drude model –, the two of them are effectively interchangeable, as they are taken to be reciprocal:  $\rho = \sigma^{-1}$ . I will refer to this identity as *Ohm's reciprocity relation*.

At a more fundamental level, transport coefficients such as  $\sigma$  and  $\rho$  can be related to retarded correlators of an underlying quantum field theory (QFT) via the machinery of linear response theory. In this context, they are defined by appropriate Kubo formulae [4]:

$$\sigma(\omega) = \lim_{\mathbf{k} \rightarrow 0} \frac{G_{\text{ret}}^{jj}(\omega, \mathbf{k})}{i\omega}, \quad \rho(\omega) = \lim_{\mathbf{k} \rightarrow 0} \frac{G_{\text{ret}}^{EE}(\omega, \mathbf{k})}{i\omega}, \quad (1.1)$$

where  $G_{\text{ret}}^{XX}$  denotes the real-time retarded two-point function of the operator  $\hat{X}$ . While the former is a well known result that has been present in the literature for a long time – see for example [5–7] –, the expression for  $\rho$  is much more recent, and was originally reported in [1] in an equivalent form involving the retarded 2-point function of a conserved magnetic 2-form symmetry  $\mathcal{J}^{\mu\nu}$ :<sup>1</sup>

$$\rho(\omega) = \lim_{\mathbf{k} \rightarrow 0} \frac{G_{\text{ret}}^{\mathcal{J}\mathcal{J}}(\omega, \mathbf{k})}{i\omega}. \quad (1.2)$$

---

<sup>1</sup>The equivalence of the two expressions for  $\rho$  has been discussed in [8].

In this framework, there is no obvious relation between  $\sigma$  and  $\rho$ , and the reciprocity relation becomes, in effect, a law of nature to be proven. Given the definitions (1.1) and (1.2), it can be checked by inspection in a number of methods and settings. [2] has been a first study in this sense, concluding that, at least in neutral states,  $\rho = \sigma^{-1}$  is an emergent property of  $T \neq 0$  states in the DC limit ( $\omega \rightarrow 0$ ), or in very special theories in which higher order diagrammatic corrections are suppressed. The primary goal of this work is to investigate the destiny of these claims in more general settings.

One roadblock in this programme is that, from a technical standpoint, the calculation of DC transport coefficients from finite temperature perturbative QFT is a formidable task, as the onset of pinching-pole singularities breaks the usual loop expansion, and diagrams of all loop orders need to be resummed to find the correct result – see for example [9, 10]. Even in theories in which it is possible to perform a large  $N$  expansion the DC transport coefficient cannot be calculated by simply computing a few Feynman diagrams, but knowledge of the solutions to a quantum Boltzmann equation is required, as outlined in [11, 12].

The situation is different for theories that possess a classical gravitational dual [13]. Within the framework of the AdS/CFT correspondence, the calculation of transport coefficients is relatively straightforward, thanks to a simple prescription to calculate thermal retarded propagators from the bulk physics [14]. In this picture, perturbations of a thermal state are encoded in the dynamics of quasinormal modes on top of a black hole geometry. The accessibility of this kind of calculations made it possible to use holography to construct toy models for strongly interacting materials with no quasiparticle excitations. Many studies have then established a dictionary to study thermodynamic and transport properties of phases of matter with realistic features, such as finite charge density, background electromagnetic fields, momentum dissipation and strain deformations [15–20].

While the effect of these additional features on the conductivity  $\sigma$  (as defined in (1.1)) has been investigated thoroughly, only a handful of examples of holographic resistivities are available in the literature [21, 22]. These works rely on a dualisation map, also studied in [23], that generalises the electric-magnetic duality of free Maxwell theory in  $D = 3 + 1$  bulk dimensions – which corresponds to a particle-vortex duality in the  $d = 2 + 1$  boundary [24] – to one dimension more. Its effect is to exchange a gravitational theory with an ordinary  $U(1)$  1-form gauge field for one containing a 2-form, which one takes to be dual to a magnetic 2-form symmetry on the boundary – thus introducing dynamical electromagnetism on the boundary, as shown in [25], and allowing the calculation of the resistivity  $\rho$  through (1.2).

Comparing values of  $\sigma$  and  $\rho$  requires then to prove that this map preserves the gravitational backgrounds, which in turn ensures that the thermodynamic properties of the boundary state upon which the ensemble average is performed are not affected. I work this out explicitly in Section 2 for the simple case of finite charge density and momentum dissipation, and then spell out a criterion to identify which models with an electromagnetic sector are expected to have a 2-form dual.

Four further sections follow. In Section 3 I consider the problem of holographic renormalisation in a more general setting, and elaborate on the scale-dependence of the holographic Kubo formulae for  $\sigma$  and  $\rho$  in  $d = 3 + 1$  boundary dimensions. These results are

key in proving Ohm’s reciprocity relation in the subsequent Section 4, where I show that this identity is encoded in special properties of the background bulk metric. To further substantiate my claim, in Section 5 I reprise the backgrounds studied in Section 2 and proceed with a numerical calculation of the transport coefficients, showing the reciprocity relation to hold even at finite frequency. I will then conclude in Section 6 by outlining the boundaries of validity of the result and discuss a few possible phenomenological application of the result, and possible future developments.

## 2 Dualisation map and background

According to the holographic dictionary, the thermodynamic properties of the boundary state on which averages are calculated are encoded in the bulk background geometry. In this section, I review how to select states with a finite charge density and momentum dissipation to calculate holographic conductivities, and then show how to construct a suitable background for the resistivity. The dualisation procedure is straightforwardly applicable to a large class of backgrounds; exceptions will be addressed in a paragraph at the end of the section. From now on, I specialise to homogeneous, isotropic states in  $d = 3 + 1$  boundary dimensions – unless otherwise stated. At the end of the section, I will comment on lower dimensional systems, too.

**Conductivity** A simple model to calculate the conductivity of a charged plasma dissipating momentum has been given by Andrade and Withers [17]. They consider the gravitational action:

$$S_\sigma = \int d^5x \sqrt{-g} \left( R - 2\Lambda - \frac{1}{4e^2} F_{ab} F^{ab} - \frac{1}{2} \sum_I \partial_a \psi^I \partial^a \psi^I \right) + S_\sigma^{\text{bdy}}, \quad (2.1)$$

where  $\Lambda = -6/L_{\text{AdS}}^2$  is the (negative) cosmological constant,  $F = dA$  is the tensor strength associated to an abelian one-form gauge connection and  $\psi^I$  is a multiplet of scalar fields (axions) with the index  $I$  running on the spatial coordinates of the boundary QFT:  $x, y$  and  $z$ . The radial coordinate  $r$  is picked so that the AdS boundary sits at  $r \rightarrow \infty$ .  $S_{\text{bdy}}$  is a local action defined on the AdS boundary including the Gibbons-Hawking-York term and possibly counterterms – which I discuss later. For simplicity, from now on I set both the gauge coupling  $e$  and  $L_{\text{AdS}}$  to unity.

The equations of motion following from (2.1) are:

$$\begin{aligned} \square \psi^I &= 0, \\ \nabla_a F^{ab} &= 0, \\ R_{ab} + 4g_{ab} - \frac{1}{4} \left( 2F_{ac} F_b^c - \frac{1}{3} g_{ab} F^2 \right) - \frac{1}{2} \partial_a \psi^I \partial_b \psi^I &= 0. \end{aligned} \quad (2.2)$$

As previously stated, I will separate each field into background and fluctuation. Formally:

$$\psi^I \rightarrow \psi^I + \delta\psi^I, \quad A_a \rightarrow A_a + \delta A_a, \quad g_{ab} \rightarrow g_{ab} + \delta g_{ab}. \quad (2.3)$$

In the immediate following I deal with the background part only; fluctuations will be important when considering transport in later sections. In order to restrict to homogeneous, isotropic, static states with no background flow, one picks the ansatz:

$$\begin{aligned} \psi^I &= \alpha x^I, \quad A = A_t(r) dt, \\ ds^2 &= -f(r)dt^2 + \frac{dr^2}{f(r)} + r^2 dx^I dx^I. \end{aligned} \quad (2.4)$$

The metric coefficient  $f$  is taken to have a simple zero at a finite radius  $r_h$ :  $f(r_h) = 0$ . This inserts a black brane event horizon in the bulk, which places the boundary theory in a thermal bath. Additionally,  $A_t(r_h) = 0$  to ensure the gauge field to be regular on the horizon. The linear profile of the axions spoils neither homogeneity nor isotropy as only their derivatives appear in the action (2.1).

The expressions (2.4) can be plugged into the covariant equations (2.2) to give two ODEs for  $A_t$  and  $f$ . These can in turn be solved with the aforementioned boundary conditions on the horizon  $r_h$  and the additional requirement that the time component of the gauge field asymptotes to a constant value  $\mu$ , which can be interpreted as a chemical potential in the boundary theory. This leads to the background functions:

$$A_t(r) = \mu \left( 1 - \frac{r_h^2}{r^2} \right), \quad (2.5)$$

$$f(r) = \left( 1 - \frac{r_h^2}{r^2} \right) \left( r^2 + r_h^2 - \frac{\alpha^2}{4} - \frac{\mu^2 r_h^2}{3r^2} \right). \quad (2.6)$$

The chemical potential  $\mu$  can be expressed in terms of the charge density  $n$  by noticing that the  $r \gg 1$  expansion of  $A_t$  is, according to the holographic dictionary:

$$A_t(r) \simeq \mu + \frac{n}{2r^2}, \quad (2.7)$$

so that:  $n = -2r_h^2 \mu$ . The two variables can then be used interchangeably.


Each bulk background configuration of the kind (2.1) is uniquely identified by 3 dimensionful parameters:  $\alpha$ ,  $n$  (or  $\mu$ ) and the temperature  $T$ , which is equal to:

$$T = \frac{1}{\pi r_h} \left( r_h^2 - \frac{\alpha^2}{8} - \frac{n^2}{24r_h^4} \right). \quad (2.8)$$

As the boundary theory is scale invariant, its states will be labeled by two dimensionless ratios. For the rest of this work, I will take them to be:  $\alpha/T$  and  $n/T^3$ .

**Resistivity** In order to calculate a holographic resistivity from the Kubo formula (1.2) one needs to introduce a bulk gauge field dual to a 2-form conserved current, as outlined in [21, 22]. With the addition of axions, a minimal action of this kind is:

$$S_\rho = \int d^5x \sqrt{-g} \left( R - 2\Lambda - \frac{1}{12\tilde{e}^2} H_{abc} H^{abc} - \frac{1}{2} \sum_I \partial_a \psi^I \partial^a \psi^I \right) + S_r^{\text{bdy}}. \quad (2.9)$$



**Figure 1. Left:** effect of the 5d Hodge dualisation on the 4d forms induced on a radially constant slice. **Right:** schematic effect on the corresponding conserved currents. By definition:  $\mathcal{J} = *F$ . Dashed arrows denote induction operations, whereas solid ones Hodge dualisations.

Here,  $H = dB$  with  $B$  a 2-form gauge field. Its gauge freedom is  $B \rightarrow B + d\Lambda$ , with  $\Lambda$  a generic 1-form. For simplicity, I will take  $\tilde{\epsilon} = 1$ . It is then straightforward to derive the covariant equations of motion:

$$\begin{aligned} \square\psi^I &= 0, \\ \partial_a(\sqrt{-g}H^{abc}) &= 0, \\ R_{ab} + 4g_{ab} - \frac{1}{4}\left(H_{acd}H_b{}^{cd} - \frac{2}{9}g_{ab}H^2\right) - \frac{1}{2}\partial_a\psi^I\partial_b\psi^I &= 0. \end{aligned} \tag{2.10}$$

Again, fields can be separated into background and fluctuations:

$$\psi^I \rightarrow \psi^I + \delta\psi^I, \quad B_{ab} \rightarrow B_{ab} + \delta B_{ab}, \quad g_{ab} \rightarrow g_{ab} + \delta g_{ab}. \tag{2.11}$$

To make a meaningful comparison between quantities calculated from (2.1) and (2.9) one needs to make sure to consider the same boundary state. This can be achieved by introducing a map between the two backgrounds. It has been shown in [23] that fluctuations of  $A_a$  and  $B_{ab}$  on top of a neutral background can be mapped into each other via a Hodge dualisation:


$$H = *_5 F, \tag{2.12}$$

where  $*_5$  is the Hodge star in the bulk. I argue that this map naturally extends to backgrounds, as it can be used to write one action in terms of the other:

$$F \wedge *_5 F = - *_5 H \wedge H = H \wedge *_5 H. \tag{2.13}$$

There is an elegant interpretation of this: given a 2-form (such as  $F_{ab}$ ) in 5d and a 4d brane at constant  $r$ , the former induces a 1- ( $F_{r\mu}$ ) and a 2-form ( $F_{\mu\nu}$ ) on the latter. Likewise, a 3-form (such as  $H_{abc}$ ) induces a 2- ( $H_{r\mu\nu}$ ) and a 3-form ( $H_{\mu\nu\sigma}$ ). If the higher-dimensional forms are related by Hodge dualisation in the bulk ( $*_5$ ), the induced fields will likewise be related by Hodge dualisation restricted to the brane ( $*_4$ ), up to multiplicative  $r$ -dependent factors. This is depicted in the diagram in the left panel of Figure 1. Now, this diagram can be understood in terms of conserved quantities of the boundary theory. According to the membrane paradigm [26], these can be extended into the bulk by considering the conjugate momenta of the dual fields with respect to a radial foliation of the bulk spacetime:

$$j_{\text{mb}}^\mu = \frac{\delta S_\sigma}{\delta A_{\mu,r}} = -\sqrt{-g}F^{r\mu}, \quad j_{\text{mb}}^{\mu\nu} = \frac{\delta S_r}{\delta B_{\mu\nu,r}} = -\sqrt{-g}H^{r\mu\nu}, \tag{2.14}$$



**Figure 2.** The selected backgrounds for  $S_\sigma$  (magenta, left) and  $S_\rho$  (violet, right) give rise to the same boundary state (yellow, bottom) when related by the duality (2.12).

with  $j_{\text{mb}}^\mu$  and  $j_{\text{mb}}^{\mu\nu}$  asymptoting to the expectation value of the corresponding boundary currents at  $r \rightarrow \infty$ . In other terms,  $F_{r\mu}$  and  $H_{r\mu\nu}$  naturally encode information on the corresponding conserved current. Hence, the diagram can be reinterpreted as in the right panel of Figure 1. It is worth pointing out that these considerations precede the choice of boundary conditions, and thus imply the relations between different sides of the duality (2.12) discussed in [23].

As a first check of this picture, the background configuration for  $H_{abc}$  obtained from (2.5) via the dualisation (2.12) is:

$$H = n dx \wedge dy \wedge dz, \quad (2.15)$$

which clearly asymptotes to  $*_4 j$  on the boundary, as anticipated. To further confirm the consistency of this construction, solving the equations of motion leads to the same metric function  $f$  in (2.6) and to the same temperature  $T$  (2.8). Hence, the backgrounds on the two sides of the duality (2.12) have the same thermodynamic properties and describe the same state. This is summarised in the diagram in Figure 2.

**Limitations to the dualisation procedure** In the example presented above, the duality (2.12) has been proven to be a boundary state-preserving map by showing that it expresses one bulk action in terms of the other, and that solving the equations of motion on the two sides generates the same background. Such a procedure is not always possible, and it is desirable to have a criterion to establish which gravitational actions that include an electromagnetic sector do have a dual in terms of a 2-form field.

A simple answer comes from considering the action of the dualisation on the equations of motion and Bianchi identity in our specific example:

$$\begin{array}{ccc} d *_5 F = 0 & \xleftrightarrow{*_5 F = H} & d *_5 H = 0 \\ dF = 0 & \xleftrightarrow{\quad} & dH = 0 \end{array} \quad (2.16)$$

It is apparent that the action of (2.12) is to swap the two. Importantly, while Bianchi identity is always of the form  $dX = 0$  (where  $X$  is a tensor strength), the equation of motion is not. Focusing on the 1-form side of the transformation, the presence of matter fields charged under the ordinary  $U(1)$  can modify its right hand side. This would lead to a contradiction:

$$d *_5 F = *_j \xrightarrow{*_5 F=H} dH = d^2 B = *_j \neq 0. \quad (2.17)$$

Models such as the celebrated holographic superconductor presented in [27, 28] violate this requirement, and thus may not have a dual description in terms of 2-forms. An analogous conclusion is reached if the 1-form action includes a Chern-Simons term:  $A \wedge F \wedge F$ , as it would if it were obtained through the dimensional reduction of  $\text{AdS}_5 \times S^5$  [29, 30]. This naturally lead to the conclusion, to be verified in further studies, that any modification of the Maxwell (or the 2-form) equation of motion results in the impossibility to dualise the theory, and get the same boundary state.

**Lower dimensional systems** It is important to stress that this construction is meaningful only in 5 bulk dimensions. From the boundary viewpoint, in this case only does the map (2.12) relate a theory with an ordinary conserved current to another with a 2-form current. This is a consequence of  $*_5 F$  being a 3-form.

Another interesting case is the analogue construction in 4 bulk dimensions, which was thoroughly studied in [24]. Here, the bulk dualisation becomes nothing but the electromagnetic duality, which can be understood, in terms of the boundary theories, as a duality of particle-vortex type. From this picture, a relation similar to the reciprocity law naturally emerges; however, a substantial difference from the case at hand is that the lower dimensionality makes the kinetic term of the photon irrelevant, so that it is removed by flowing to the IR, as argued in the original reference – see also [31].

### 3 Renormalisation and Kubo formulae

In this section, I derive holographic Kubo formulae for the conductivity  $\sigma$  and the resistivity  $\rho$ . Because of divergences in the boundary action(s), these are sensitive to the renormalisation procedure in a precise sense which is reminiscent of the scale dependence in theories of electromagnetism in  $4d$ .

The explicit form of the holographic Kubo formula is expressed as customary in Fefferman-Graham (FG) coordinates, which I write in the form adopted in [32]:

$$ds^2 = \frac{du^2}{u^2} + \frac{1}{u^2} \gamma_{\mu\nu}(u, x) dx^\mu dx^\nu, \quad (3.1)$$

so that the AdS boundary is located at  $u \rightarrow 0$ , and  $\gamma_{\mu\nu}$  has the asymptotic expansion:

$$\gamma_{\mu\nu}(u, x) \simeq \eta_{\mu\nu} + \gamma_{\mu\nu}^{(2)}(x)u^2 + \gamma_{\mu\nu}^{(4)}(x)u^4 + \tilde{\gamma}_{\mu\nu}(x)u^4 \log u + O(u^5 \log u). \quad (3.2)$$

The leading coefficient in the expansion is the  $4d$  Minkowski metric  $\eta_{\mu\nu}$  in accordance with the spacetime being asymptotically AdS. For reference:

$$u(r) = \exp \left[ - \int \frac{dr}{\sqrt{f(r)}} \right] \simeq \frac{1}{r} + \frac{\alpha^2}{16r^3} + O(r^{-5}). \quad (3.3)$$

This can be used to map any asymptotic expansion for  $r \rightarrow \infty$  into the corresponding one for  $u \rightarrow 0$  (and vice versa). In the latter case, using the given metric expansion into the covariant equations of motions for each of the two gauge fields ((2.2) and (2.10)) leads to their FG expansions:

$$A_\mu(u, x) \simeq A_\mu^{(0)}(x) + A_\mu^{(2)}(x)u^2 + a_\mu(x)u^2 \log u + O(u^3 \log u), \quad (3.4)$$

$$B_{\mu\nu}(u, x) \simeq B_{\mu\nu}^{(0)}(x) + B_{\mu\nu}^{(1)}(x) \log u + O(u \log u), \quad (3.5)$$

where  $a^\mu = -\partial_\alpha F_{(0)}^{\alpha\mu}/2$ , following the procedure outlined in [33]; higher order coefficients, if needed (for example in numerical methods, see later), can be determined recursively. Plugging the expansions respectively into the (2.1) and (2.9), one obtains the (divergent) boundary actions:

$$S_{\sigma, \text{on-shell}} \supset \int_{u=\epsilon} d^4x A_\mu^{(0)} \left[ A_{(2)}^\mu - \frac{1}{2} \left( \log u + \frac{1}{2} \right) \partial_\alpha F_{(0)}^{\alpha\mu} \right] + O(u \log u), \quad (3.6)$$

$$S_{\rho, \text{on-shell}} \supset \frac{1}{4} \int_{u=\epsilon} d^4x \left( B_{\mu\nu}^{(0)} + B_{\mu\nu}^{(1)} \log u \right) B_{(1)}^{\mu\nu} + O(u \log u). \quad (3.7)$$

These should be understood as defined on a cutoff brane (at  $u = \epsilon$ ) close to the AdS boundary, to be regulated via the addition of suitable local counterterms that make the limit  $\epsilon \rightarrow 0$  finite. The gravitational part is the same in both the actions considered and is known to be logarithmically divergent as well [34], but this is not relevant to the present discussion. Axions, on the other hand, do not introduce any new divergences.

The minimal prescription for holographic renormalisation is to simply remove the divergences [33], and this is the scheme that, for simplicity, I will adopt. In case such divergences are logarithmic this is nevertheless not a unique choice, as I will argue later.

**Minimal renormalisation scheme** To remove the divergences from the electromagnetic sectors of the boundary actions (3.6) and (3.7), one adds the counterterms – see [21, 32] – :

$$S_{\sigma, \text{ct}} = -\frac{1}{4} \log \epsilon \int_{u=\epsilon} d^4x F_{\mu\nu}^{(0)} F_{(0)}^{\mu\nu}, \quad S_{\rho, \text{ct}} = -\frac{1}{4} \log \epsilon \int_{u=\epsilon} d^4x \mathcal{H}_{\mu\nu} \mathcal{H}^{\mu\nu}, \quad (3.8)$$

where  $\mathcal{H}_{bc} = \bar{n}^a H_{abc}$  with  $\bar{n}$  an (ingoing) normal to the  $u = \epsilon$  brane. One can check that the two counterterms are mapped one into the other by the duality (2.12) by expressing it in components. The regularised actions are then:

$$S_{\sigma, \text{reg}} \supset \int d^4x A_\mu^{(0)} \left( A_{(2)}^\mu - \frac{1}{4} \partial_\alpha F_{(0)}^{\alpha\mu} \right), \quad S_{\rho, \text{reg}} \supset \frac{1}{4} \int d^4x B_{\mu\nu}^{(0)} B_{(1)}^{\mu\nu}. \quad (3.9)$$

Then, the currents can be identified by taking the  $r \rightarrow \infty$  ( $u \rightarrow 0$ ) limit of (2.14), adapted to the presence of counterterms:

$$\langle j^\mu \rangle_\sigma = 2A_{(2)}^\mu - \frac{1}{2} \partial_\alpha F_{(0)}^{\alpha\mu}, \quad \langle \mathcal{J}^{\mu\nu} \rangle_\rho = B_{(1)}^{\mu\nu}. \quad (3.10)$$

where I used subscripts in the expectation values to denote through which gravitational theory each of them is calculated. Comparing (3.10) with (3.9) one can identify the corresponding external sources, and retrieve the holographic Kubo formulae. If the background

state is assumed to be isotropic,  $\sigma$  and  $\rho$  are scalars that can be evaluated by considering charge dynamics – i.e. bulk perturbations – in a single spatial direction. Assuming that to be  $x$ , one finds:

$$\sigma(\omega) = \frac{2\delta A^{(2)}}{i\omega\delta A^{(0)}} + \frac{i\omega}{2}, \quad \rho(\omega) = \frac{\delta B^{(1)}}{i\omega\delta B^{(0)}}, \quad (3.11)$$

where the FG coefficients appear in the asymptotic expansions of  $\delta A_x$  and  $\delta B_{yz}$ .

It may appear odd that the conductivity  $\sigma$  is made of two terms. This is a consequence of the FG expansion (3.4) having a logarithmic term, which is why the second term is absent in  $d = 3$  (or in any odd number of dimensions). However, while such a term is clearly irrelevant as far as DC ( $\omega \rightarrow 0$ ) transport is concerned, it has a dramatic impact at finite frequency (AC), and a clear phenomenological interpretation. Assuming the external source  $A_{(0)}$  to obey Maxwell's equation in vacuum, the expectation value of the current in (3.10) reads:

$$\langle j^\mu \rangle_\sigma = 2A_{(2)}^\mu + \frac{1}{2}j_{\text{ext}}^\mu, \quad (3.12)$$

where  $j_{\text{ext}}$  is the electric current needed to support the chosen  $A_{(0)}$  profile. This suggests that neglecting the extra term results in considering just part of the total current – the one made of dynamical degrees of freedom. This difference is, of course, very relevant to the topic of reciprocity, as I will show later. As for the extra factor of 2 appearing in front of  $j_{\text{ext}}$ , a possible explanation is that the field lines it sources live in the half space  $u > 0$ , thus making Coulomb interactions stronger by a factor of 2. This phenomenon has been noted – albeit in one dimension less – in QED<sub>3,4</sub>, as noted in [35]. A deeper analysis, which I leave to future work, would be needed to pinpoint the nature of this numerical prefactor precisely.

**Alternative renormalisation schemes** In the previous paragraph I anticipated that the minimal renormalisation procedure is not unique. Following [21], divergences could be in principle tamed by introducing the alternative counterterms:

$$S_{\sigma,\text{alt-ct}} = -\frac{1}{4} \log \frac{\epsilon}{\mathcal{C}} \int_{u=\epsilon} d^4x F_{\mu\nu}^{(0)} F^{\mu\nu}, \quad S_{\rho,\text{alt-ct}} = -\frac{1}{4} \log \frac{\epsilon}{\mathcal{C}} \int_{u=\epsilon} d^4x \mathcal{H}_{\mu\nu} \mathcal{H}^{\mu\nu}, \quad (3.13)$$

where  $\mathcal{C}$  is some arbitrary dimensionless number. Actions regularised in this way read:

$$\begin{aligned} S_{\sigma,\text{alt-reg}} &\supset \int d^4x A_\mu^{(0)} \left[ A_{(2)}^\mu - \frac{1}{2} \left( \log \mathcal{C} + \frac{1}{2} \right) \partial_\alpha F_{(0)}^{\alpha\mu} \right], \\ S_{\rho,\text{alt-reg}} &\supset \frac{1}{4} \int d^4x \left( B_{\mu\nu}^{(0)} + B_{\mu\nu}^{(1)} \log \mathcal{C} \right) B_{(1)}^{\mu\nu}, \end{aligned} \quad (3.14)$$

and lead to alternative Kubo formulae:

$$\sigma(\omega) = \frac{2\delta A^{(2)}}{i\omega\delta A^{(0)}} + i\omega \left( \log \mathcal{C} + \frac{1}{2} \right), \quad \rho(\omega) = \frac{\delta B^{(1)}}{i\omega (\delta B^{(0)} + \delta B^{(1)} \log \mathcal{C})}. \quad (3.15)$$

I will refer to  $\log \mathcal{C}$  as the *renormalisation parameter*. Its introduction generalises the formulae (3.11), to which (3.15) reduce upon choosing  $\mathcal{C} = 1$ . The freedom to pick any other value can be interpreted as the necessity to specify the energy scale under consideration, as

proposed in [21]. This is consistent with the fact that for any  $\mathcal{C} \neq 1$ , the regularised actions (3.14) contain a double-trace operator, which breaks conformal invariance on the boundary. For a discussion of these kind of operators in holography, I refer to the discussion in [36].

**Anisotropy** Both (3.11) and (3.15) have been derived under the simplifying restriction to isotropic background states, which factorises charge dynamics into distinct directions. As I shall show later, however, the reciprocity proof applies to a larger class of states. From the viewpoint of linear response theory, anisotropy allows sources to generate non-zero responses in orthogonal directions as well. In the gravitational dual picture, this corresponds to a decrease in the number of independent channels in the perturbative equations. This makes the tensor structures of  $\sigma$  and  $\rho$  more complicated, as the holographic Kubo formulae become:

$$\sigma(\omega)_{ij} = \frac{2\delta A_i^{(2)}}{i\omega\delta A_j^{(0)}} + i\omega \left( \log \mathcal{C} + \frac{1}{2} \right) \delta_{ij}, \quad \rho(\omega)_{ij} = \frac{\varepsilon_{ikl}\delta B_{kl}^{(1)}}{i\omega\varepsilon_{jmn} \left( \delta B_{mn}^{(0)} + \delta B_{mn}^{(1)} \log \mathcal{C} \right)}, \quad (3.16)$$

with  $\varepsilon_{xyz} = 1$  being the totally antisymmetric symbol in  $3d$  space. The number of independent coefficients in the formulae is determined by residual symmetry. The introduction of a magnetic field in a neutral background, for instance, yields to two independent resistivities, as was shown explicitly in [21].

## 4 An analytic proof of reciprocity

In this section I provide an analytic proof of the reciprocity relation, and discuss its validity. As spatial momentum is equal to 0 in all Kubo formulae considered so far, I will limit my discussion to the case of homogeneous, alternating perturbations on the boundary. I work in FG coordinates, so that the metric tensor is given by (3.1).

The most general bulk perturbations (on both sides of (2.12)) are:

$$\delta A = (\delta A_x(u)dx + \delta A_y(u)dy + \delta A_z(u)dz) e^{-i\omega t}, \quad (4.1)$$

$$\delta B = (\delta B_{xy}(u)dx \wedge dy + \delta B_{yz}(u)dy \wedge dz + \delta B_{zx}(u)dz \wedge dx) e^{-i\omega t}, \quad (4.2)$$

which in terms of tensor strengths are:

$$\delta F = (\delta A'_x(u)du \wedge dx - i\omega\delta A_x(u)dt \wedge dx) e^{-i\omega t} + (x \rightarrow y) + (x \rightarrow z), \quad (4.3)$$

$$\delta H = (\delta B'_{xy}(u)du \wedge dx \wedge dy - i\omega\delta B_{xy}(u)dt \wedge dx \wedge dy) e^{-i\omega t} + (xy \rightarrow yz) + (xy \rightarrow zx). \quad (4.4)$$

The dualisation (2.12) acts on the 2-forms in (4.3) as:

$$\begin{aligned} *_5(du \wedge dx) &= \frac{\sqrt{-g}}{3!} g^{uu} g^{x\mu} \varepsilon_{u\mu\nu\sigma\rho} dx^\nu \wedge dx^\sigma \wedge dx^\rho \simeq \frac{1}{u} dt \wedge dy \wedge dz + O(u), \\ *_5(dt \wedge dx) &= \frac{\sqrt{-g}}{3!} g^{ta} g^{xb} \varepsilon_{abcde} dx^a \wedge dx^b \wedge dx^c \simeq \frac{1}{u} du \wedge dy \wedge dz + O(u), \end{aligned} \quad (4.5)$$

where  $\varepsilon_{txyzu} = -1$  is the antisymmetric symbol in  $5d$ , and the second (approximate) equality holds as long as the leading coefficient in the Fefferman-Graham expansion for  $\gamma_{\mu\nu}$  is  $\eta_{\mu\nu}$  – i.e., if the spacetime under consideration is asymptotically AdS. Analogous expressions can be found for  $du \wedge dy$ ,  $dt \wedge dy$ ,  $du \wedge dz$  and  $dt \wedge dz$ . Through these and (4.3), one finds an alternative expression for  $\delta H$ , which reads, close to the AdS boundary:

$$\begin{aligned} \delta H = & \left( \frac{1}{u} \delta A'_x(u) dt \wedge dy \wedge dz - \frac{i\omega}{u} \delta A_x(u) du \wedge dy \wedge dz + \right. \\ & \left. + (xyz \rightarrow yzx) + (xyz \rightarrow zxy) \right) e^{-i\omega t} + O(u). \end{aligned} \quad (4.6)$$

Equating the result with (4.4) leads then to:

$$-i\omega \delta B_{yz}(u) = \frac{1}{u} \delta A'_x(u) + O(u), \quad \delta B'_{yz}(u) = -\frac{i\omega}{u} \delta A_x(u) + O(u), \quad (4.7)$$

and four additional relations obtained by considering cyclic permutations of  $x, y$  and  $z$ . Plugging the FG expansions (3.4) and (3.5) into (4.7) leads to:

$$\begin{aligned} -i\omega \left( \delta B_{yz}^{(0)} + \delta B_{yz}^{(1)} \log u \right) &= 2\delta A_x^{(2)} - \omega^2 \left( \log u + \frac{1}{2} \right) \delta A_x^{(0)} + O(u \log u), \\ \delta B_{yz}^{(1)} &= -i\omega \delta A_x^{(0)} + O(u \log u), \end{aligned} \quad (4.8)$$

and analogous expressions for cyclic permutations of  $x, y$  and  $z$ . This in turn leads to the identifications (at  $u = 0$ ):

$$\begin{aligned} \delta B_{yz}^{(0)} &= \frac{2i}{\omega} \delta A_x^{(2)} - \frac{i\omega}{2} \delta A_x^{(0)}, & \delta B_{yz}^{(1)} &= -i\omega \delta A_x^{(0)}, \\ \delta B_{zx}^{(0)} &= \frac{2i}{\omega} \delta A_y^{(2)} - \frac{i\omega}{2} \delta A_y^{(0)}, & \delta B_{zx}^{(1)} &= -i\omega \delta A_y^{(0)}, \\ \delta B_{xy}^{(0)} &= \frac{2i}{\omega} \delta A_z^{(2)} - \frac{i\omega}{2} \delta A_z^{(0)}, & \delta B_{xy}^{(1)} &= -i\omega \delta A_z^{(0)}. \end{aligned} \quad (4.9)$$

These relations do not follow from a specific form of the action or background: they are just a manifestation of the bulk duality (2.12). The only requirement is that the metric (3.1) asymptotes to AdS. Substitution into (3.15) easily leads to the reciprocity relation for arbitrary values of the renormalisation parameter  $\log \mathcal{C}$  in the scalar case; the anisotropic case requires some more work – as the functional derivatives need to be re-expressed as suitable ratios of FG coefficients – but leads to the same result. The conclusion is that:

$$\sigma_{ij}(\omega) \rho_{jk}(\omega) = \delta_{ik}. \quad (4.10)$$

I will postpone a discussion on the regime of validity of this formula to Section 6. Before doing so, however, I confirm its validity with a numerical study of the backgrounds described in Section 2.

## 5 Numerical transport coefficients

This section is dedicated to the numerical calculation of the AC transport coefficients for the backgrounds described in Section 2. As these are isotropic, one can consider charge dynamics along a single direction (which I will pick to be the  $x$  axis); the appropriate definitions for  $\sigma$  and  $\rho$  are given in (3.15).

As for the conductivity  $\sigma$ , one starts by considering the following perturbations:

$$\delta\psi^x = \delta\psi(r)e^{-i\omega t}, \quad \delta A = \delta a(r)e^{-i\omega t}dx, \quad \delta(ds^2) = 2r^2\delta h(r)e^{-i\omega t}dtdx. \quad (5.1)$$

Plugging these expressions into (2.2) gives a set of radial ODEs that have been extensively studied the past: in [17], they have been used to derive an analytic formula for the DC ( $\omega \rightarrow 0$ ) conductivity  $\sigma_{\text{DC}}$ , whereas the numerical result for the frequency-dependent AC conductivity can be found in [37]. I will not discuss these equations, and quote the result when discussing the resistivity. More detail on the physics than can be extracted from those simple equations can be found in [20].

Similarly, in order to calculate the holographic resistivity  $\rho$ , it is convenient to consider charge dynamics along the  $x$  direction. The relevant perturbations are, in the radial gauge:

$$\delta\psi^x = \delta\psi(r)e^{-i\omega t}, \quad \delta B = \delta b(r)e^{-i\omega t}dy \wedge dz, \quad \delta(ds^2) = 2r^2\delta h(r)e^{-i\omega t}dtdx. \quad (5.2)$$

Plugging these into (2.10) one finds:

$$\delta\psi'' + \left(\frac{f'}{f} + \frac{3}{r}\right)\delta\psi' + \frac{\omega^2}{f^2}\delta\psi - \frac{i\alpha\omega}{f^2}\delta h = 0, \quad (5.3)$$

$$\delta b'' + \left(\frac{f'}{f} - \frac{1}{r}\right)\delta b' + \frac{\omega^2}{f^2}\delta b - \frac{in\omega}{f^2}\delta h = 0, \quad (5.4)$$

$$\alpha\delta\psi' + \frac{n}{r^4}\delta b' - \frac{ir^2\omega}{f}\delta h' = 0, \quad (5.5)$$

where primes denote a radial derivative, plus a fourth equation containing  $\delta h''$ , which is implied by the ones above. As expected, setting the charge density  $n$  to 0 decouples the electromagnetic perturbation  $\delta b$  from the rest. Equations (5.3)-(5.5) are superficially similar to the ones reported in [17], but their structure – which encodes a different asymptotic expansion – is different enough to make it impossible to repeat their argument for an analytic DC formula.

The task of numerically integrating (5.3)-(5.5) is made simpler by picking a radial coordinate with a compact support. An obvious candidate is  $z = r_h/r$ .<sup>2</sup> The AdS boundary is at  $z = 0$  and the horizon at  $z = 1$ . Notice that  $z \neq u$ , the latter being the FG radial coordinate, as it can be seen by substituting  $r$  for  $z$  in (3.3). In this new coordinate system

---

<sup>2</sup>This is not to be confused with the spatial boundary coordinate  $z$ . Context allows to distinguish the two of them without ambiguities.

the equations of motion become:

$$\delta\psi'' + \left(\frac{f'}{f} - \frac{1}{z}\right) \delta\psi' + \frac{r_h^2 \omega^2}{z^4 f^2} \delta\psi - \frac{ir_h^2 \alpha \omega}{z^4 f^2} \delta h = 0, \quad (5.6)$$

$$\delta b'' + \left(\frac{f'}{f} + \frac{3}{z}\right) \delta b' + \frac{r_h^2 \omega^2}{z^4 f^2} \delta b - \frac{ir_h^2 n \omega}{z^4 f^2} \delta h = 0, \quad (5.7)$$

$$\alpha \delta\psi' + \frac{z^4 n}{r_h^4} \delta b' - \frac{ir_h^2 \omega}{z^2 f} \delta h' = 0, \quad (5.8)$$

with primes now denoting  $z$  derivatives. Boundary conditions can be imposed by studying the IR and UV asymptotics of the equations. In the former case, solutions are required to be radially infalling near the horizon:

$$\begin{aligned} \delta\psi &\sim (1-z)^{-\frac{i\omega}{4\pi T}} \sum_n \delta\psi_{\text{IR}}^{(n)} (1-z)^n, & \delta b &\sim (1-z)^{-\frac{i\omega}{4\pi T}} \sum_n \delta b_{\text{IR}}^{(n)} (1-z)^n, \\ \delta h &\sim (1-z)^{-\frac{i\omega}{4\pi T}+1} \sum_n \delta h_{\text{IR}}^{(n)} (1-z)^n. \end{aligned} \quad (5.9)$$

Close to the UV boundary, the asymptotic expansion must take into account of possible logarithmic terms. A simple ansatz is then:

$$\begin{aligned} \delta\psi &\sim \sum_n z^n \left( \delta\psi_{\text{UV}}^{(n)} + \delta\tilde{\psi}_{\text{UV}}^{(n)} \log z \right), & \delta b &\sim \sum_n z^n \left( \delta b_{\text{UV}}^{(n)} + \delta\tilde{b}_{\text{UV}}^{(n)} \log z \right), \\ \delta h &\sim \sum_n z^n \left( \delta h_{\text{UV}}^{(n)} + \delta\tilde{h}_{\text{UV}}^{(n)} \log z \right). \end{aligned} \quad (5.10)$$

By inserting the expansions (5.9) and (5.10) into the equations of motion (5.6)-(5.8), one finds that all coefficients are either 0 or recursively determined from:


$$\delta\psi_{\text{IR}}^{(0)}, \delta b_{\text{IR}}^{(0)}, \delta\psi_{\text{UV}}^{(0)}, \delta b_{\text{UV}}^{(0)}, \delta h_{\text{UV}}^{(0)}, \delta\psi_{\text{UV}}^{(4)}, \delta\tilde{b}_{\text{UV}}^{(0)}. \quad (5.11)$$

There are thus 2 coefficients more than expected, as (5.6)-(5.8) form a system of 2 second order and 1 first order ODEs, the solutions of which are uniquely determined by 5 boundary conditions. The redundancy can be fixed by noticing that the equations of motion are invariant under the two translational symmetries:

$$\delta\psi \rightarrow \delta\psi + c_1, \quad \delta b \rightarrow \delta b + c_2, \quad \delta h \rightarrow \delta h - i\omega \left( \frac{c_1}{\alpha} + \frac{c_2}{n} \right), \quad (5.12)$$

where  $c_1$  and  $c_2$  are arbitrary constants. These symmetries can be understood in terms of a residual gauge invariance that survives the radial gauge choice in (5.2); to see this, it is sufficient to notice that it is the action of the diffeomorphism generated by:  $\xi^a = \delta_r^a \xi(r) e^{-i\omega t}$  that allows to set  $\delta g_{rx} = 0$  in the first place. (5.12) are the transformations generated by  $\xi(r) = \text{const}$ . An analogous phenomenon, which does not involve all three fields, has been extensively reported in calculations of the conductivity, starting from [38].

Because the equations of motion (5.6)-(5.8) are linear in the perturbations, rescaling the fields by the same constant factor leaves them invariant. All these considerations, then, inform a strategy for the numerical calculation of the resistivity  $\rho$ :



**Figure 3.** AC resistivity in absence of momentum dissipation for different values of  $n/T^3$ : 0 (violet), 1 (magenta), 2 (orange) and 4 (yellow). In the insets – which depict the small frequency behavior – the additional value 8 (grey, dashed) has been plotted.


- select a background state identified by  $(\alpha/T, n/T^3)$ ;
- start integrating (5.6)–(5.8) numerically from  $z = 1$  towards  $z = 0$ , fixing one of the two free IR coefficients to 1 and leaving the other free;
- fix the latter by requiring the combination  $\omega\delta\psi_{UV}^{(0)} - i\alpha\delta h_{UV}^{(0)}$  to vanish, and set  $\delta h_{UV}^{(0)} = 0$  via (5.12). This ensures that only the electromagnetic source is turned on;
- read the resistivity off at the boundary  $z = 0$  using (3.15).

The outcome of numerical calculations is summarised in Figures 3, 4 and 5; unless otherwise stated, the calculations have been performed with  $\log \mathcal{C} = 0$ . In all of the cases under consideration, inverse conductivities and resistivities are indistinguishable to the precision of the integration algorithms used. This constitutes direct evidence in support of the analytic argument presented above.


On top of that, a number of other features comply with predictions valid for the holographic conductivity. Figure 3 shows that in absence of momentum dissipation ( $\alpha = 0$ )  $\rho_{DC} = 0$  whenever  $n \neq 0$ . This is consistent with the fact that in such states the imaginary part of the holographic conductivity  $\sigma$  diverges for small frequencies, as argued in [16]. Unlike it, in addition, the real part of  $\rho$  does go smoothly to its expected DC value, which has to be 0 on the grounds of translational symmetry.

Such symmetry can be broken by setting a finite value to  $\alpha/T$ ; for those states, the DC conductivity takes the analytic value calculated in [17]. The numerical AC resistivities approach smoothly, in the DC limit, its inverse. This is depicted in Figure 4, which suggests that the stronger the momentum dissipation, the more resistive the phase under consideration. This is intuitive and reminiscent of the Joule effect. Another notable effect is the disappearance of the one of the two minima of the imaginary part as momentum dissipation increases.

Lastly, I consider the effect of a non-zero renormalisation parameter  $\log \mathcal{C}$  on the transport coefficients. AC resistivities at different energy scales are reported in Figure 5. An



**Figure 4.** AC resistivity at  $n/T^3 = 4$  for different values of  $\alpha/T$ : 0 (yellow), 0.25 (orange), 0.5 (magenta), 1 (violet) and 1.5 (grey, dashed). The circles are the inverses of the appropriate analytic DC prediction of [17]. Insets depict the small frequency behavior of the curves.



**Figure 5.** AC resistivity at  $n/T^3 = 4, \alpha/T = 0.25$  for different value of the renormalisation parameter  $\log \mathcal{C}$ : 0.5 (yellow), 0.25 (orange), 0 (magenta), -0.25 (violet), -0.5 (grey, dashed). The last value corresponds to calculate  $\sigma$  without external contribution – see (3.11) and the discussion that follows.

interesting feature is the fact that, while positive values of  $\log \mathcal{C}$  make the imaginary part of  $\rho$  more negative – and the system less resistive –, there appears to be a critical negative value in the interval  $(-0.5, -0.25)$  below which  $\text{Im}(\rho) > 0$  for some finite range of frequencies. It is also worth noticing that the different behavior of the magenta and dashed, grey curves in Figure 5 is direct evidence of the fact that the inverse conductivity (3.11) without the second term does not invert to the correspondent resistivity.

## 6 Discussion

The main result of this work is the formula (4.10), which I derived analytically and confirmed numerically in a number of simple settings. Another important milestone is the dualisation criterion enunciated towards the end of Section 2. These inform two possible future developments: the search for deviations from (4.10) in holography, and the existence of loopholes to the contradiction in (2.17).

Regarding the former, the result does not seem to heavily depend on the specific form of the actions (2.1) and (2.9), but on the dualisation relation relating them. This is clarified by the calculation I presented, in which the equations and boundary conditions that lead to the specific profile of either  $\delta A$  or  $\delta B$  play no role; the actions enter the discussion only through the Kubo formulae, which are fixed by the quadratic nature of the electromagnetic part of the action. The expectation is then that any two actions, quadratic in  $F$ ,  $H$  and related by (2.12) – i.e., avoiding the contradiction (2.17) – should produce the same result. There are nonetheless a few extra conditions that need to be met in order to obtain the result:

- the metric must be asymptotically AdS close to the UV boundary;
- the boundary currents must follow from (2.14);
- the bulk must be entirely described by classical fields.

The last observation suggests that stringy corrections may, at least in principle, produce a deviation from (4.10). From the boundary viewpoint, this would amount to considering finite- $N$  corrections, which have been shown in [2] to be very relevant to the validity of the statement. Concretely, this could be achieved by considering curvature-square corrections to Einstein gravity, for instance by adding to the action a Gauss-Bonnet-type term, as in [39, 40].

The conditions listed above are nevertheless met by a large class of holographic models. One such example are the the magnetic brane solutions studied in [18, 41], which describe boundary states with uniform background magnetic fields. These are of particular interest as they offer a simple tool to study properties of matter in strong magnetic fields. This is a notoriously hard task if undertaken with conventional methods – see [42] for a new approach with novel EFT techniques –, but of the utmost importance to shed some light into the phenomenology of nuclear matter in neutron stars, and possibly – by considering different horizon topologies – to give insights into Tokamak physics. Specifically, one could investigate whether gravitational instabilities in the bulk translate into plasma instabilities on the boundary [43, 44].

On the other hand, exceptions to the contradiction (2.17) at the heart of the proposed criterion for dualisation could come from a modification of the map (2.12), and allowing violations of the Bianchi identities  $dX = 0$ . In  $D = 3 + 1$  bulk dimensions, this can be understood in terms of the introduction of magnetic monopoles in the dual theory; in  $D = 4 + 1$ , no such clear interpretation is readily available. Regardless, advances on this front could eventually lead to a procedure to dualise holographic models with  $U(1)$ -charged matter.

## Acknowledgments

I would like to thank my doctoral supervisor Sašo Grozdanov and my fellow student Mile Vrbica for interesting conversations we had while I was working on this project, and comments on an early version of this manuscript. I am also grateful to Matteo Baggioli who

stoked my interest in the topic. My doctoral studies are supported by an Edinburgh Doctoral College Scholarship (ECDS) from the University of Edinburgh.

## References

- [1] S. Grozdanov, D.M. Hofman and N. Iqbal, *Generalized global symmetries and dissipative magnetohydrodynamics*, *Phys. Rev. D* **95** (2017) 096003 [[1610.07392](#)].
- [2] G. Frangi and S. Grozdanov, *To Appear*, .
- [3] C. Kittel, *Introduction to Solid State Physics*, Wiley (2004).
- [4] R. Kubo, *Statistical mechanical theory of irreversible processes. 1. General theory and simple applications in magnetic and conduction problems*, *J. Phys. Soc. Jap.* **12** (1957) 570.
- [5] P. Arnold, G.D. Moore and L.G. Yaffe, *Transport coefficients in high temperature gauge theories (i): leading-log results*, *Journal of High Energy Physics* **2000** (2000) 001.
- [6] P. Kovtun, *Lectures on hydrodynamic fluctuations in relativistic theories*, *J. Phys. A* **45** (2012) 473001 [[1205.5040](#)].
- [7] J.I. Kapusta and C. Gale, *Finite-temperature field theory: Principles and applications*, Cambridge Monographs on Mathematical Physics, Cambridge University Press (2011), [10.1017/CBO9780511535130](#).
- [8] J. Hernandez and P. Kovtun, *Relativistic magnetohydrodynamics*, *Journal of High Energy Physics* **2017** (2017) .
- [9] S. Jeon, *Hydrodynamic transport coefficients in relativistic scalar field theory*, *Phys. Rev. D* **52** (1995) 3591 [[hep-ph/9409250](#)].
- [10] S. Jeon and L.G. Yaffe, *From quantum field theory to hydrodynamics: Transport coefficients and effective kinetic theory*, *Phys. Rev. D* **53** (1996) 5799 [[hep-ph/9512263](#)].
- [11] K. Damle and S. Sachdev, *Nonzero-temperature transport near quantum critical points*, *Physical Review B* **56** (1997) 8714–8733.
- [12] S. Sachdev, *Nonzero-temperature transport near fractional quantum hall critical points*, *Physical Review B* **57** (1998) 7157–7173.
- [13] J.M. Maldacena, *The Large N limit of superconformal field theories and supergravity*, *Adv. Theor. Math. Phys.* **2** (1998) 231 [[hep-th/9711200](#)].
- [14] D.T. Son and A.O. Starinets, *Minkowski-space correlators in AdS/CFT correspondence: recipe and applications*, *Journal of High Energy Physics* **2002** (2002) 042–042.
- [15] S.A. Hartnoll and P.K. Kovtun, *Hall conductivity from dyonic black holes*, *Physical Review D* **76** (2007) .
- [16] S.A. Hartnoll, *Lectures on holographic methods for condensed matter physics*, *Class. Quant. Grav.* **26** (2009) 224002 [[0903.3246](#)].
- [17] T. Andrade and B. Withers, *A simple holographic model of momentum relaxation*, *Journal of High Energy Physics* **2014** (2014) .
- [18] E. D’Hoker and P. Kraus, *Magnetic brane solutions in AdS*, *Journal of High Energy Physics* **2009** (2009) 088–088.
- [19] S.A. Hartnoll, A. Lucas and S. Sachdev, *Holographic quantum matter*, MIT Press (2018), [[1612.07324](#)].

- [20] M. Baggioli, K.-Y. Kim, L. Li and W.-J. Li, *Holographic axion model: A simple gravitational tool for quantum matter*, *Sci. China Phys. Mech. Astr.* **64** (2021) .
- [21] S. Grozdanov and N. Poovuttikul, *Generalised global symmetries in holography: magnetohydrodynamic waves in a strongly interacting plasma*, *JHEP* **04** (2019) 141 [[1707.04182](#)].
- [22] D.M. Hofman and N. Iqbal, *Generalized global symmetries and holography*, *SciPost Phys.* **4** (2018) 005 [[1707.08577](#)].
- [23] O. DeWolfe and K. Higginbotham, *Generalized symmetries and 2-groups via electromagnetic duality in AdS/CFT*, *Phys. Rev. D* **103** (2021) 026011 [[2010.06594](#)].
- [24] C.P. Herzog, P. Kovtun, S. Sachdev and D.T. Son, *Quantum critical transport, duality, and M-theory*, *Phys. Rev. D* **75** (2007) 085020 [[hep-th/0701036](#)].
- [25] S. Grozdanov, A. Lucas and N. Poovuttikul, *Holography and hydrodynamics with weakly broken symmetries*, *Physical Review D* **99** (2019) .
- [26] N. Iqbal and H. Liu, *Universality of the hydrodynamic limit in AdS/CFT and the membrane paradigm*, *Phys. Rev. D* **79** (2009) 025023 [[0809.3808](#)].
- [27] S.A. Hartnoll, C.P. Herzog and G.T. Horowitz, *Building a Holographic Superconductor*, *Phys. Rev. Lett.* **101** (2008) 031601 [[0803.3295](#)].
- [28] S.A. Hartnoll, C.P. Herzog and G.T. Horowitz, *Holographic Superconductors*, *JHEP* **12** (2008) 015 [[0810.1563](#)].
- [29] E. Witten, *Anti-de Sitter space and holography*, *Adv. Theor. Math. Phys.* **2** (1998) 253 [[hep-th/9802150](#)].
- [30] A. Chamblin, R. Emparan, C.V. Johnson and R.C. Myers, *Charged AdS black holes and catastrophic holography*, *Physical Review D* **60** (1999) .
- [31] S. Giombi, G. Tarnopolsky and I.R. Klebanov, *On  $C_J$  and  $C_T$  in Conformal QED*, *JHEP* **08** (2016) 156 [[1602.01076](#)].
- [32] M. Taylor, *More on counterterms in the gravitational action and anomalies*, [hep-th/0002125](#).
- [33] K. Skenderis, *Lecture notes on holographic renormalization*, *Class. Quant. Grav.* **19** (2002) 5849 [[hep-th/0209067](#)].
- [34] M. Henningson and K. Skenderis, *The holographic Weyl anomaly*, *Journal of High Energy Physics* **1998** (1998) 023–023.
- [35] W.-H. Hsiao and D.T. Son, *Duality and universal transport in mixed-dimension electrodynamics*, *Physical Review B* **96** (2017) .
- [36] E. Witten, *Multitrace operators, boundary conditions, and AdS / CFT correspondence*, [hep-th/0112258](#).
- [37] K.-Y. Kim, K.K. Kim, Y. Seo and S.-J. Sin, *Coherent/incoherent metal transition in a holographic model*, *Journal of High Energy Physics* **2014** (2014) .
- [38] A. Donos and J.P. Gauntlett, *Holographic q-lattices*, *Journal of High Energy Physics* **2014** (2014) .
- [39] S. Grozdanov and A.O. Starinets, *Second-order transport, quasinormal modes and*

zero-viscosity limit in the Gauss-Bonnet holographic fluid, *Journal of High Energy Physics* **2017** (2017) .

- [40] A. Folkestad, S. Grozdanov, K. Rajagopal and W. van der Schee, *Coupling constant corrections in a holographic model of heavy ion collisions with nonzero baryon number density*, *Journal of High Energy Physics* **2019** (2019) .
- [41] E. D'Hoker and P. Kraus, *Charged magnetic brane solutions in AdS5 and the fate of the third law of thermodynamics*, *Journal of High Energy Physics* **2010** (2010) .
- [42] S. Vardhan, S. Grozdanov, S. Leutheusser and H. Liu, *A new formulation of strong-field magnetohydrodynamics for neutron stars*, [2207.01636](#).
- [43] F.F. Cap, *Handbook on Plasma Instabilities*, Elsevier Science & Technology, United States (1982).
- [44] A.B. Mikhailovskii, *Instabilities in a confined plasma*, CRC Press (2017).