

Kaluza-Klein discreteness of the entropy: Symmetrical bath and CFT subsystem

HARVENDRA SINGH

*Theory Division, Saha Institute of Nuclear Physics
1/AF Bidhannagar, Kolkata 700064, India*

*Homi Bhabha National Institute (HBNI)
Anushaktinagar, Mumbai 400094, India*

Abstract

We explore the entanglement entropy of CFT systems in contact with large bath system, such that the complete system lives on the boundary of AdS_{d+1} spacetime. We are interested in finding the HEE of a bath (system-B) in contact with a central subsystem-A. We assume that the net size of systems A and B together remains fixed while allowing variation in individual sizes. This assumption is simply guided by the conservation laws. It is found that for large bath size the island entropy term are important. However other subleading (icebergs) terms do also contribute to bath entropy. The contributions are generally not separable from each other and all such contributions add together to give rise a fixed quantity. Further when accounted properly all such contributions will form part of higher entropy branch for the bath. Nevertheless the HEE of bath system should be subjected to minimality principle. The quantum minimality principle $S_{quantum}[B] = \{S[A], S_{total} + S[A]\}_{min}$, is local in nature and gives rise to the Page curve. It is shown that the changes in bath entropy do capture Kaluza-Klein discreteness. The minimality principle would be applicable in finite temperature systems as well.

1 Introduction

The AdS/CFT holographic duality [1] has provided a big insight to our understanding of entanglement in strongly coupled quantum theories. Our focus here is on simple cases of the entanglement between two similar type of quantum systems with common interfaces. Generally one believes that sharing of quantum information between systems is guided by unitarity and the locality. Under this principle the understanding of the formation of gravitational black holes like states evolving from a loosely bound pure quantum matter state and the subsequent evaporation process (via Hawking radiation) still remains an unsolved puzzle. Though it is believed that the whole evolution process would be unitary and all information inside the black hole interior (behind the horizon) will be recovered once the black hole fully evaporated. Related to this aspect there is a proposal that the entanglement entropy curve for the bath radiation should bend when the half Page-time is crossed [7]. This certainly is often true when a pure quantum system is divided into two smaller subsystems. But for mixed states of the hawking radiation, or for finite temperature CFTs dual of the AdS-black holes, it is not that straight forward to obtain the Page curve. However, important progress has been made recently in certain models by coupling holographic CFT to an external radiation system (bath), and in some other examples by involving nonperturbative techniques such as wormholes, replicas and islands [4, 6]. Some answers to the difficult questions have been attempted. ¹ Especially for Karch-Randall braneworld set up of gravity with a bath system one can find massive island formulation in the works [20]. Other interesting developments on entanglement islands are included in [21]

Particularly the AMM proposal for generalized entanglement entropy [4] involves the hypothesis of islandic (I) contribution, and by including gravitational entropy of respective island boundary (∂I). According to this proposal the ‘quantum’ entropy of a 2-dimensional radiation bath subsystem (B) can be expressed as

$$S_{quantum}[B] = [ext\{\frac{Area(\partial I)}{4G_N} + S[B \cup I]\}]_{min} \quad (1)$$

This model uses a hybrid type ‘gravity plus gauge theory’ holographic model. (The model is primarily based on QES proposal of [5]). It includes contribution of (gravitational) island entropy to the bath entanglement entropy. The islands are usually disconnected surfaces inside bulk JT gravity. The JT (conformally or nearly AdS) gravity is a dual theory of ‘dot’ like quantum system on the boundary. The same dot lives on the boundary of an infinite CFT_2 bath system. In the low energy description the JT gravity is treated as a system which is in contact with a 2-dim radiation bath over a flat Minkowski coordinate

¹Also see a review on information paradox along different paradigms [8] and for list of related references therein; see also [[9]-[12]].

patch. So there are both field theoretic ($S[B \cup I]$) as well as gravitational contributions ($\frac{Area(\partial I)}{4G_N}$) present in the formula (1). Secondly there is a need to pick the lowest contribution out of a set of many such possible extremas, which may include entropy contributions of islands and the radiation.² Although complicated looking, the expression in (1) seemingly reproduces a Page-curve for the bath radiation entropy [4]. However AMM proposal ignores contributions of several subleading terms which we shall altogether pronounce as ‘icebergs’ terms. Here it should be clear that the icebergs also are contributions of various disconnected elements to the bath entropy, similar to the islands entropy.

The important feature of AMM-proposal is that it highlights the appearance of island inside bulk gravity. The islands are normally situated outside the black hole horizon. These arise by means of a dynamical principle, and usually the islands are associated with the presence of a bath system when in contact with the quantum-dot. We highlight in present work that other subleading (disconnected) contributions of ‘icebergs’ entropies would have to be properly accounted for in the bath entropy.³ Here we will be extending our 2-dimensional proposal [19] to the case of higher dimensional CFTs. We provide the picture that no doubt there would exist island contributions but we must not ignore (subleading) icebergs contributions to the bath entropy. If these are ignored we only end up with incomplete interpretation of the Page curve for quantum entropy.

We clearly show that when island, icebergs and leading (pure) bath entropy once added together as a series, that gives rise to a system dependent constant contribution to the entropy of bath system. These contributions are naturally inseparable from each other as they compensate each other perfectly well no matter how large or small their individual contributions could be. We have explicitly shown this phenomenon for limiting case of a quantum dot like system located at the interface of symmetrical CFT bath system [19]. Correspondingly we find that there are gravitational contributions to the bath entropy arising from island and the subleading icebergs, for system-A attached to large bath (subsystem-B). We must note that the entanglement entropy of two such systems together ($A \cup B$) can be expanded as


$$S_{total}[A \cup B] = S_{pure\ bath} + S_{island} + S_{icebergs} \equiv S_l$$

This expansion can always be done whenever system-B is sufficiently large compared to system-A, e.g. see drawing in lower figure in (2).

Note $S_l \gg 0$ is the entropy contained in the total system ($A \cup B$). It is a constant quantity once the total system size is fixed, and if the system being conserved.

²In other extensions of the hybrid models one also includes wormhole contributions, see [6].

³To explain our terminology, the iceberg entropy is pretty new one. The term was first coined by the author in [19]. Essentially it is supposed to include all subleading corrections to the bath system entropy beyond the ‘island’ entropy. The overall iceberg entropy contribution was found to be negative, but it remains a subleading contribution.



System-A in the middle & symmetrically arranged bath-B

Figure 1: A symmetrical arrangement of CFT system-A in the center (along x_1 -axis) and CFT bath subsystem-B (of size b) situated on either side. The transverse spatial directions other than x_1 (if any) are all suppressed. The complimentary system $B^c = (A \cup B)^c$ is also drawn.

Furthermore, it is proposed that the quantum entropy of entanglement of a large bath subsystem-B should be obtained from local minimality principle

$$S[B]_{quantum} = \{S[A], S_l + S[A]\}_{min} = S[A]$$

where $S[A]$ is the entropy of system-A. To make it further clear the above minimality principle works because both $S[A]$ and $S[B]$, as systems being in contact, involve identical *local* entropies, corresponding to common RT surfaces they do share. ⁴ Note two systems in contact will have common interfaces fig.(1). The complementary system $B^c = (A \cup$

⁴This proposal obviously excludes all fixed constant values, such as S_l , in the entropy of large baths! Particularly S_l is just a constant and remains unaffected under small changes at the common interface between system-A and bath system-B. We assumed nothing happens at the interface between system B and B^c .

Secondly, the proposal is valid only when $b \gg a$, i.e. after phase transition to the Page curve has taken place. There would be further new corrections to above result, but these will be suppressed in the powers of ratio ($s \equiv \frac{a}{b}$) $\ll 1$. We shall report about these corrections in separate communication.

Regarding the violation of subadditivity: We conclude that the subadditivity should not apply for quantum entropy $S[B]^{quantum}$ and $S[A]^{quantum}$, especially in the regime when the bath is very large. In

$B)^c$ which is semi-infinite on both sides does not play direct role here. For non-contact type systems one should study them separately. In conclusion, the above two equations reproduce the Page curve for the entropy of a large bath system, including for finite temperature systems. The formula is definitely valid at least in static (equilibrium) cases. For time dependent processes involving black hole evaporation, or if there is a continuous change in the total system size (e.g. due to change in mass, energy, or horizon size), the scenario is expected to be similar at any point in time, hence it might be applicable for slow enough processes.

The rest of the article is organized as follows. In section-2 we explain the island and icebergs contributions and define the generalized entropy formulation for pure AdS case. On the boundary we take a finite size system in contact with a symmetrical bath. In section-3 we also discuss a limiting case when system-A becomes very small and appears as point like (where we would use Kaluza-Klein scenario) and is in contact with large size CFT bath. Under Kaluza-Klein perspective the situation emerges similar to that of $2n$ parallel quantum (strip) systems attached to some large bath. The results for the AdS black holes cases are covered in section-4. The section-5 contains a summary.

2 Islands and Icebergs and bath subsystem entropy

Let us consider a system (A) in contact with a bath subsystem (B) in fully symmetrical set up, and both having finite sizes, and living on the boundary of the AdS_{d+1} spacetime. Thus it is assumed that both systems A and B are made of identical field species, i.e. described by same field contents, for simplicity of the problem. The pure AdS_{d+1} spacetime geometry is described by following line element

$$ds^2 = \frac{L^2}{z^2}(-dt^2 + dx_1^2 + \cdots + dx_{d-1}^2 + dz^2) \quad (2)$$

where constant L represents a large radius of curvature (in string length units) of space-time. The coordinate ranges lie $-\infty \leq (t, x_i) \leq \infty$ and $0 \leq z \leq \infty$, where coordinate z represents the holographic range of boundary theory.⁵


other words, when the bath is sufficiently large compared to system-A

$$S[B]^{quantum} + S[A]^{quantum} = 2S[A] < S_I = S[A \cup B]$$


would hold. This is independent of how large the bath may be, so long as $b \gg a$.

⁵The Kaluza-Klein compactification over a circle (say $x_{d-1} \simeq x_{d-1} + 2\pi R$) produces a *conformally* anti-de Sitter solution in lower dimensional gravity. Particularly, for $d = 2$ case one obtains Jackiw-Teitelboim type 2-dim dilatonic background [13, 14],

$$\begin{aligned} ds_{JT}^2 &= \frac{L^2}{z^2}(-dt^2 + dz^2) \\ e^{-2(\phi-\phi_0)} &= \sqrt{g_{xx}} = \frac{L}{z} \end{aligned} \quad (3)$$



RT surfaces for $b \ll a$



RT surfaces when $b \gg a$

Figure 2: *Two different extremal situations are drawn schematically. The extremal RT surfaces when bath-B size is small compared to the system-A ($b \ll a$), we have all disconnected minimal area surfaces. The lower graph for $b \gg a$ instead has connected surfaces. We keep l same in the both the graphs.*

The CFT_d theory lives on d -dimensional (t, \vec{x}) flat Minkowski spacetime describing boundary dynamics of AdS_{d+1} bulk geometry. Consider a set up in which a finite size bath subsystem-B lives on the coordinate patches $[-(b+a), -a]$ & $[a, (b+a)]$ along x_{d-1} direction, whereas system-A, sandwiched in between the bath, lives over the patch $[-a, a]$. The sketches are provided in figures (1), (2) for clarity. The entire systems set-up is arranged in a symmetrical way for the convenience. The states of the system-A and the bath subsystem-B are obviously entangled. The complementary system B^c lives over the coordinate patches $[b+a, \infty]$ and $[-(b+a), -\infty]$. The B^c is semi-infinite on either sides.

where ϕ is a 2-dimensional dilaton field of the effective bulk gravity theory, all written in the standard convention (effective string coupling vanishing near the boundary). The two Newton's constants get related as $\frac{2\pi R}{G_{d+1}} \equiv \frac{1}{G_d}$, with G_2 being dimensionless for AdS_2 .

From Ryu-Takayanagi holographic prescription the entanglement entropy of a d -dimensional CFT strip-shape subsystem of width l ($l = 2a + 2b$) is given by

$$S_{total}[A \cup B] = \frac{L^{d-1}V^{(d-2)}}{(2d-4)G_{d+1}} \left(\frac{1}{\epsilon^{d-2}} - \frac{b_0^{d-1}}{(a+b)^{d-2}} \right) \equiv S_l \quad (4)$$

where $\epsilon \simeq 0$ is the UV cut-off of the CFT_d (we shall only consider examples where $d > 2$). $V^{(d-2)}$ is the regulated volume of the box of $(d-2)$ spatial directions perpendicular to the strip width direction x_1 .⁶ We take l sufficiently large but fixed, so that S_l has a constant value. Our aim is to determine entanglement entropy where size b is varied from $b \simeq 0$ to $b \simeq l/2$, by hand. We simply assume local conservation laws, so that the net gain (loss) of system-A is compensated by equal loss (gain) in the size of bath subsystem-B and vice-versa. Note that such a process will keep l fixed. *Especially for explicit time dependent cases one may have some definite rate of change, while $\dot{a} = -\dot{b}$ is true due to conservation of energy. The exact rate of loss or gain and the mechanism by which it may happen is not important here and the actual details of the physical process is also not required here.* All we are considering is that local conservation laws are at work for complete system within total box size, l .⁷ Obviously we are assuming here that the system and the bath are made up of identical (CFT) field content. Let us consider two extreme cases below.

Case-1: Independent entropies

When $b \ll a$, for the bath subsystem-B being very small in size, the entanglement entropy of the larger system-A can be found by its extremal surface area as [15, 16]

$$S[A] = \frac{L^{d-1}V^{(d-2)}}{(2d-4)G_{d+1}} \left(\frac{1}{\epsilon^{d-2}} - \frac{b_0^{d-1}}{a^{d-2}} \right) \quad (5)$$

While the extremal surfaces of bath subsystem on both sides become disconnected. The entropy of small subsystem-B become independently,

$$S[B] = \frac{L^{d-1}V^{(d-2)}}{(d-2)G_{d+1}} \left(\frac{1}{\epsilon^{d-2}} - \frac{2^{d-2}b_0^{d-1}}{b^{d-2}} \right) \quad (6)$$

Eq.(6) involves area contributions from two disconnected but identical extremal surfaces, which contribute to the bath entropy, see the upper graph as in fig.(2). Note that $S[A]$ and $S[B]$ have the local parts which depend on individual strip parameters a and b , respectively, Thus both systems entropies are completely independent even though systems are in contact with each other. The entropy of the small bath system-B would be defined

⁶Note $b_0 = \frac{1}{2(d-1)}B(\frac{d}{2d-2}, \frac{1}{2})$ is specific dimension dependent coefficients involving explicit Beta-functions, see more in appendix of [18].

⁷Any explicit time dependent processes are not studied here.

by equation (6) until the crossover point is reached. After the crossover new extremal (connected) surfaces will emerge as drawn in lower graph of fig.(2). We will discuss it next.

Case-2: Entropies with identical local components

When $b \gg a$, in this regime of large bath system the entanglement entropy of system-B is given by the equation

$$S[B] = \frac{L^{d-1}V^{(d-2)}}{(2d-4)G_{d+1}} \left(\frac{1}{\epsilon^{d-2}} - \frac{2^{d-2}b_0^{d-1}}{(l-2b)^{d-2}} \right) + S_l \quad (7)$$

where S_l is total entropy of the systems together, which is a fixed quantity. S_l gets the contribution from the outer RT surface connecting two farther ends of the symmetrical bath on either side, follow the lower graph in fig(2). Note S_l is independent of individual sizes b or a , and it is a fixed quantity for given l . We might still vary individual system sizes such that we keep l fixed. Now for smaller system-A of strip width $2a$ the entropy is given by

$$S[A] = \frac{L^{d-1}V^{(d-2)}}{(2d-4)G_{d+1}} \left(\frac{1}{\epsilon^{d-2}} - \frac{2^{d-2}b_0^{d-1}}{(l-2b)^{d-2}} \right) \quad (8)$$

where we have simply used $2a = l - 2b$.

From eqs. (7) and (8), we observe that the $S[A]$ and $S[B]$ differ only by an overall constant, S_l , otherwise they have the same type of *local* dependence on b . It also implies that under small change in the system sizes

$$\begin{aligned} \frac{\partial S[A]}{\partial b} &= \frac{\partial S[B]}{\partial b} \\ \frac{\partial S[A]}{\partial a} &= \frac{\partial S[B]}{\partial a} \end{aligned} \quad (9)$$

Put in other words, $S[A]$ and $S[B]$ represent two independent extrema of the same observable and only differ up to a constant. Classically the areas of these extremal surfaces is such that $S[B] > S[A]$, but quantum entropy of large bath instead would be governed by the minimization

$$S_{b \gg a}^{quantum}[B] = \{S[A], S[A] + S_l\}_{min} = S[A] . \quad (10)$$

This states that the quantum entropy of a large bath is the same as the entropy of smaller system-A. Furthermore we note that the quantum entropy of bath decreases as b gets larger and larger but at the same rate as that of system-A. So the Page-curve for entropy of large bath system ($b \gg a$) follows from the principle of minimum entropy,

if there exist multiple extrema separated by constants, like S_l here. The system-A and the bath subsystem-B entropy otherwise have identical local dependences. This is the net conclusion of the proposal given in eq.(10). Although we might still wonder that the bath entropy ought to have been taken simply as $S[B]$ given in (7), which is net classical area of bulk extremal surface. Instead, as per quantum minimality proposal (10), the bath entropy has to be given by smaller quantity $S[A]$, mainly because both have the same local dependence. The latter is in agreement with the Page curve expectation and unitarity for quantum systems that follows from conservation laws. The quantum entropy proposal should be taken as complete result for extremal CFTs (at zero temperature) being in contact with symmetrical bath.




Figure 3: Entropy plots for the values $l = 10$, $\epsilon = .1$, for CFT_3 system. The lower falling curve (in yellow) is preferable for quantum entropy of large size bath. The rising (green) curve is good for entropy in the small bath region only. The topmost graph is classical entropy of large bath and is not the physical one. We have set $\frac{L^2 l_2}{2G_4} = 1$ for the graphs.

Island and Icebergs: full system entropy

We did not explicitly encounter any island like isolated (disconnected) surface area contributions to the entropy so far.⁸ So where are these contributions hidden in the above analysis? We have got the Page curve using quantum minimality principle for large bath system without knowing about the island (fragments) entropy contributions. To understand it we need to dissect the total entropy of system-A and system-B. It is vital to understand first what $S[A \cup B]$ teaches us, even though it is only some system parameter and a fixed quantity. We explore this systematically for $d = 3, 4$ and 5 dimensions. (For $d = 2$ CFT case, this analysis has been presented in [19].)

i) For $d = 3$ CFT: The total system entropy S_l is given by ($l = 2a + 2b$)

$$S_l = S[A \cup B] = \frac{L^2 l_2}{2G_4} \left(\frac{1}{\epsilon} - \frac{b_0^2}{a + b} \right) \quad (11)$$

⁸In higher dimensional bulk theories the 'islands' are multidimensional (co-dim-2) surfaces. These are no longer point objects as in JT gravity and radiation bath models.

where l_2 is the length of the strip. Making an expansion on the r.h.s. in small ratio $s \ll 1$ ($s = \frac{a}{b}$), one can find

$$\begin{aligned} S_l &= \frac{L^2 l_2}{2G_4} \left(\frac{1}{\epsilon} - \frac{b_0^2}{b} \right) + \frac{L^2 l_2 b_0^2}{2G_4 b} (s - s^2 + s^3 - \dots) \\ &\equiv S^{(0)} + S_{\text{Island}} + S_{\text{Icebergs}} \end{aligned} \quad (12)$$

where expressions in the last line have been identified as: 1) entropy of CFT system of size $2b$ (when there is no system-A):

$$S^{(0)} = \frac{L^2 l_2}{2G_4} \left(\frac{1}{\epsilon} - \frac{b_0^2}{b} \right), \quad (13)$$

2) subleading gravitational entropy of *island-ic* boundary:

$$S_{\text{island}} = \frac{L^2 l_2 a b_0^2}{2G_4 b^2}, \quad (14)$$

3) rest all sub-subleading (*icebergs*) entropies together as:

$$S_{\text{icebergs}} = -\frac{L^2 l_2 b_0^2}{2G_4} \left(\frac{a^2}{b^3} - \frac{a^3}{b^4} + \dots \right). \quad (15)$$

Note $S^{(0)}$ in eq.(13) represents the HEE of CFT_3 strip system having width $2b$ (net size of the bath subsystem). Note it is entropy of pure CFT system without the presence of system-A. Whereas S_{island} , which genuinely represents the interactions between bath-B and system-A, is the ‘gravitational’ entropy of island-like boundary situated at $z = b$ (e.g. corresponding to an island-like region lying in between $z = \infty$ and $z = b$ inside the AdS_4). The codim-2 island boundary located at $z = b$ has a geometrical area:

$$\mathcal{A}_{\text{island}} = \frac{2L^2 l_2 a}{b^2}$$

It is proportional to actual size $2l_2 a$ of boundary CFT system-A. Thus geometric entropy of island eq.(14) may be expressed as

$$S_{\text{island}} = \frac{\mathcal{A}_{\text{island}}}{4\tilde{G}_4} \equiv \frac{L l_2 \Phi_0}{2G_3 b^2}$$

Here $\tilde{G}_4 \equiv G_4/b_0^2$ and $G_3 = \tilde{G}_4/(2\pi R)$ has been treated as effective 3-dimensional Newton’s constant (refer to Appendix).⁹ Other sub-subleading terms, which are altogether

⁹It can be seen if we first dualize the CFT strip system-A into AdS_4 , and subsequently do S^1 compactification (along x_1 direction and take radius of compactification as $\simeq a$) to obtain 3-dimensional ‘near- AdS_3 ’. That would create an equivalent hybrid ‘near AdS_3 ’ plus CFT3 system (as bath) on either sides. This hybrid gauge-gravity set-up has been clarified in the Appendix. While CFT-near AdS -CFT is only an effective set-up but it provides a good physical interpretation of the second term (island) in the expansion of the S_l .

named as icebergs' entropies, include contributions from remaining terms in small s expansion.¹⁰ Thus by doing a series expansion it gets revealed that the various terms in the series (12) although may have got distinct interpretations, but they are actually inseparable from each other. No matter what these individual values might be, all the terms are important because these add up nicely to constitute S_l , i.e. the total entropy. The total entropy, including island and icebergs, thus has a constant value, for given l . (The S_l depends only on the parameter l , which is measure of total systems size. In this sense S_l is actually a global quantity.) One could still vary a and b individually but keeping $l(= 2a + 2b)$ fixed. That means the bath size could grow at the cost of size of system-A and vice versa, under mutual local exchanges or those processes which may lead to shift in the mutual interface of systems A and B. (This appears akin to what might happen in black hole evaporation processes also, e.g. through Hawking radiation, where the Hawking radiation is treated as bath.) Perhaps simple CFT models may teach us something about the black hole evaporation process! The relevant entropy graphs are plotted in the figure (3) with a discussion in the caption for small and large bath cases.

Unitarity and the locality of entropy

The question still arises what would happen if we ignored the subleading (icebergs) contributions in eq.(12), due to their smallness, as being subleading $O(s^2)$ and even smaller. Although one is free to do so but we immediately find that the r.h.s. of S_l will now start depending on a and b in independent ways! This will lead to varied conclusions regarding the Page curve, unitarity and about the information content of the systems. Alternatively we may decide that $S_{icebergs}$ terms should not be dropped from leading terms in any situation. In other words precise knowledge of isolated contributions is vital for the unitarity! Furthermore, the island and the icebergs would remain invisible, as these contribute to eq. (7), which is an higher entropy extrema and hence unphysical as per 'quantum entropy' proposal of bath-B. The latter reason solely arises from the quantum entropy principle that for large size bath entropy should be taken with smaller value amongst $(S_l + S[A])$ and $S[A]$, where $S_l \gg 0$ is total entropy.

ii) $d = 4$ case: For CFT_4 the total system entropy $S[A \cup B]$ can be written as

$$S_l = \frac{L^3 l_3 l_2}{4G_5} \left(\frac{1}{\epsilon^2} - \frac{b_0^3}{(a+b)^2} \right) \tag{16}$$

where l_2 & l_3 are the sizes of two transverse spatial coordinates of the CFT_4 on the boundary of AdS_5 geometry. The systems are separated along x_1 direction. By making an

¹⁰These are called as icebergs (one may even call Archipelagos) because their total contribution is overall negative definite, even if it remains sub-leading [19]. The physical interpretation may be difficult to get for all these terms.

expansion on the r.h.s. in (16), for small s we get

$$\begin{aligned}
S_l &= \frac{L^3 l_3 l_2}{4G_5} \left(\frac{1}{\epsilon^2} - \frac{b_0^3}{b^2} + \frac{b_0^3}{b^2} s(1+s)^{-2} \right) \\
&= \frac{L^3 l_3 l_2}{4G_5} \left(\frac{1}{\epsilon^2} - \frac{b_0^3}{b^2} + \frac{b_0^3}{b^2} (s - 2s^2 + O(s^3)) \right) \\
&\equiv S^{(0)} + S_{Island} + S_{Icebergs}
\end{aligned} \tag{17}$$

where break up of various expressions in the last line is as: the leading pure CFT system entropy of size $2b$,

$$S^{(0)} = \frac{L^3 l_3 l_2}{4G_5} \left(\frac{1}{\epsilon^2} - \frac{b_0^3}{b^2} \right), \tag{18}$$

the island-ic (gravitational) entropy,

$$S_{island} = \frac{L^3 l_3 l_2 b_0^3 a}{4G_5 b^3} \equiv \frac{\mathcal{A}_{island}}{4\tilde{G}_5}, \tag{19}$$

and other subleading icebergs entropies:


$$S_{icebergs} = -\frac{L^3 b_0^3 l_3 l_2}{2G_5} \left[\frac{a^2}{b^4} - \frac{a^3}{3b^5} + \dots \right]. \tag{20}$$

Note again S_{island} is proportional to $\frac{2L^3 l_3 l_2 a}{b^3}$ which is the geometrical area of extended 3-dim island boundary located at $z = b$ inside AdS_5 spacetime, with a redefined 5-dim Newton's constant as $\tilde{G}_5 = G_5/b_0^3$. The related entropies are plotted in the figure (5). They exhibit similar properties as $d = 3$ case for small and large bath cases.

iii) For $d = 5$ case: Above results clearly tell us that for CFT_5 the subsystem entanglement properties would also be similar to $d = 3, 4$ cases. We may convince ourselves that it will be a common occurring phenomenon whenever there are two systems (system and the bath) in contact, i.e. separated by interfaces. The islands and icebergs typically arise as a result of interactions and information sharing between the dofs of the systems.

3 Lower dimensional Kaluza-Klein perspective: Multiple thin strips

It is important to discuss special case of the systems described by eq.(7). Consider very small size for system-A, such that $a \simeq R$, where R is Kaluza-Klein scale of the theory (analogous to JT-gravity and near CFT_1 case). (We expect that for such small size system, with a narrow width, system-A could be effectively treated as being compactified on S^1 , with a compactification radius R , but $R \gg \epsilon$.) In that case we can safely take



System-A (having $2n$ strips in the middle) and symmetrically arranged CFT bath-B

Figure 4: An arrangement of system-A (in the middle on x_1 -axis) and CFT bath subsystem-B of size b each lie on either side. All transverse spatial directions (if any) except x_1 direction are suppressed. The complimentary system (B^c) is also drawn.

$a \simeq \pi n R$, with n being a positive integer.¹¹ For simplicity we shall consider only small n values, also $\epsilon \ll \pi R \ll b$ (If there is any difficulty one can simply take $n = 1$). The system-A can essentially be treated as assembly of $2n$ narrow (parallel) strips sandwiched between symmetrical bath system-B (on either sides of total size $2b$). We have a situation as depicted in the figure (4), where transverse directions x_2 and x_3 are suppressed. An expansion on the r.h.s of (7), for small $n \ll \frac{b}{\pi R}$, gives bath entanglement entropy (for $d = 3$)

$$\begin{aligned}
 S[B] &= S_l + \frac{L^2 l_2}{2G_4} \left(\frac{1}{\epsilon} - \frac{b_0^2}{n\pi R} \right) \\
 &\equiv (S^{(0)} + S_{island} + S_{icebergs}) + S_{2n-strips}[A]
 \end{aligned} \tag{21}$$

¹¹Note that it is only an assumption that there is intermediate Kaluza-Klein compactification on S^1 when at shorter scales the size a becomes approximately $\simeq R$. Then it becomes plausible to study a lower dimensional dual (gravitational) description for system-A (viewed as multiple strips of narrow width πR wrapped along circle (KK direction) but fully extended along other transverse directions).

where leading term $S^{(0)}$ is same as described earlier, and other expressions are

$$\begin{aligned} S_{island} &= \frac{L^2 l_2}{4G_3} \frac{n}{b^2}, \\ S_{icebergs} &= -\frac{L^2 l_2}{4G_3} \left(\frac{n^2 \pi R b_0^2}{b^3} \right) + O(n^3) \end{aligned} \quad (22)$$

The $G_3 = G_4/(2\pi R)$ is 3-dimensional Newton's constant. The islandic contribution, especially for $n = 1$, is similar to the gravitational entropy of the island boundary situated at $z = b$ inside bulk. The $S_{icebergs}$ includes rest all subleading contributions. The eq.(21) involves an infinite series which is perturbative. Actually it will not be wise to separate icebergs from first two leading terms in (21) at all! They all remain important as the total sum of these terms (within the parenthesis) sum up to l -dependent entropy S_l . It is quite clear from the starting line of the perturbative expansion in (21).

While the entanglement entropy of the $2n$ parallel strips, assembled side by side, and in contact with bath, is simply (for $d = 3$)

$$S_{2n-strips}[A] = \frac{L^2 l_2}{2G_4} \left(\frac{1}{\epsilon} - \frac{b_0^2}{n\pi R} \right) \quad (23)$$

and the bath system entropy is

$$S[B] = S_l + S_{2n-strips}[A] \quad (24)$$

The local R -dependent terms in eqs. (23) and (24) are identical, and since the two expressions differ only by an overall constant S_l , the actual 'quantum entropy' of bath would be given by the local entropy contained in system-A (multiple narrow strips) only. So under minimality selection rule quantum entropy of bath should simply be stated as

$$S^{quantum}[B] = \{S_{2n-strips}, S_l + S_{2n-strips}\}_{min} = S_{2n-strips} \quad (25)$$

where entropy of all $2n$ parallel strips arranged together is given above. Note l_2 is length of these strips, and the individual strip width is taken as πR . This is the net entanglement entropy of a large bath system, when $b \gg R$, i.e. towards the end of the Page curve. It entirely gets its contribution from single RT surface homologous to central $2n$ strips system. Note the narrow strips have width πR ($\ll b$). It is important to note that the bath entropy is discretized since KK-level n takes integral values ($n \in \mathbb{Z}$). Obviously we would trust these results for small n values only. For large n it would be good to use noncompact continuum description in one higher dimensions.

It can be concluded that the entropy for a large bath will necessarily show *discrete* jumps as and when KK level changes. This is an example of strongly coupled system of $2n$ parallel sheets (system-A) placed in the middle of large symmetrical CFT baths

on either side. The conclusions shall remain unchanged even under infinite size limit ($b \rightarrow \infty$, $l \rightarrow \infty$) and thus should be treated universal. We conclude that we would not be able to see island and icebergs physically, as their net contribution to entropy always results in a fixed constant only.

3.1 Entropy spectrum of strip systems

We are interested in exchanging small number of strips between bath (B) and the multi-strip system (A). This will lead to changes in the systems entanglement entropy. Note a small number of strip exchanges between B and A will not change the total entropy S_l . Thus net change in entropy of system-A with KK-strips number n_2 and with KK-strips number n_1 can be found to be ($n_1 < n_2$)

$$\begin{aligned} \Delta S_{1 \rightarrow 2} &= S_{strips}[n_2] - S_{strips}[n_1] \\ &= \frac{L^2 l_2}{2G_4} \left(\frac{1}{n_1} - \frac{1}{n_2} \right) \frac{b_0^2}{\pi R} \\ &\equiv \frac{1}{T_E} \Delta E_{1 \rightarrow 2} \end{aligned} \tag{26}$$

In the last line the entanglement temperature of bath can be taken as $T_E \simeq \frac{1}{l}$ [17]. Empirically we may determine that typical change in energy density of systems (energy per unit strip-length)

$$\Delta \mathcal{E}_{1 \rightarrow 2} = \frac{\Delta E_{1 \rightarrow 2}}{l_2} = \frac{L^2 b_0^2}{2\pi G_4 l R} \left(\frac{1}{n_1} - \frac{1}{n_2} \right) = \frac{L^2 b_0^2}{4\pi^2 G_3 l R^2} \left(\frac{1}{n_1} - \frac{1}{n_2} \right) \tag{27}$$

This energy spectrum is obviously discrete in nature! A fixed quantum of energy exchanges is required to take place between bath-B and multi-strip system-A during an exchange of the strips. Note we are discussing the CFT ground state (zero temperature) only. The spectrum appears analogous to the atomic spectrum, but system-A here is made up of discrete number of strips whereas a finite number of strips (quantum matter and not the photons) are exchanged between various KK levels. This exchange process entails KK-level ‘jumps’. Here $n_1 = 1$ may be treated as the lowest level (for smallest size single strip system) while $n_2 > 1$ will correspond to higher levels (more than one strip cases). Note a level jump in the strip number is necessarily associated with discrete (quantum) CFT matter exchanges between system and its surrounding bath. The relevant physical scale is compactification radius R .

A plausible interpretation of above energy spectrum may be given as follows. The discrete KK modes have momentum $\sim \frac{1}{R}$. (The strip length l_2 is some large quantity (fixed), $L \gg 1$ is AdS radius of curvature, $G_3 \equiv G_4/(2\pi R)$ is 3-dim Newton’s constant.) Thus

$$\Delta E_{1 \rightarrow 2} \propto \frac{1}{R^2}$$

appears primarily due to the KK momentum modes in this case. (The KK-momentum is quantized as $p \sim \frac{n}{R}$, where $n \in \mathbb{Z}$ is discrete. So $\Delta E \sim p^2$.) The energy-matter exchanges between central strip system-A and the bath are precise and discrete! We emphasize that with more careful analysis of subleading terms in the entropy, we might be able to see winding modes contributions! We hope to report about it in subsequent communications.

A similar analysis for 4-dimensional CFT_4 would provide energy density in exchanges

$$\frac{\Delta E_{1 \rightarrow 2}}{l_3 l_2} = \frac{L^3 b_0^3}{8\pi^3 G_4 l R^3} \left(\frac{1}{n_1^2} - \frac{1}{n_2^2} \right) \quad (28)$$

where $(l_3 l_2)$ is the transverse size of the $3d$ strips, where the individual width of strips is $\sim \pi R$.

We will show that change in entanglement entropy under strip exchange (or KK level jumps) can be determined for finite temperature cases as well. There the $|\Delta E|$ will involve thermal corrections. Perturbatively we shall estimate and find that the leading thermal correction grows proportional to R , the width of the strips. We guess these corrections involve string winding modes.

4 Finite temperature systems

The previous exercise can be extended to the case of CFT at finite temperature as well. The whole process goes in parallel for any CFT system which is in a mixed state. The limitation is that for $d > 2$ case the HEE at finite temperature can only be estimated by using perturbative methods. Alternative options would be resort to the numerical approach. Consider the asymptotically AdS_{d+1} geometry that has Schwarzschild black hole at the center

$$ds^2 = \frac{L^2}{z^2} (-f(z) dt^2 + \frac{dz^2}{f(z)} + dx_1^2 + \cdots + dx_{d-1}^2) \quad (29)$$

where $f(z) = (1 - \frac{z^d}{z_0^d})$ with $z = z_0$ being the location of black hole horizon. There is a finite temperature in the field theory on AdS boundary. Assume now that the strip shaped system-A with strip width $2a$ is taken in thermal equilibrium with symmetrical bath system-B on either sides, so that system-A is located in the middle of bath (net width of bath system being $2b$). Other transverse directions of the systems are infinitely extended. Here both systems A and B have same temperatures. We only discuss the case when $a \ll b$, because $a \gg b$ case is rather straight forward. The entanglement entropy of the strip like bath system-B on the boundary of (29) can be written as

$$S[B] = S_l(l, z_0) + S(2a, z_0) = S_l(l, z_0) + S(l - 2b, z_0) \quad (30)$$

In our notation a functional $S(x, z_0)$ represents the HEE for strip system having width x obtained from area of extremal surfaces in a black-brane AdS geometry [18]. The z_0 dependences indicate there is finite temperature effect (horizon dependence). Note the first term on the r.h.s. of (30) involves those constants which treat system-A and bath-B together as single entity. It measures a global information involving A and B . Only second term has the local entropy information regarding central system-A like the size and location of interface boundaries between system-A and bath-B.

Usually for small width x one can estimate $S(x, z_0)$ using perturbative tools as discussed in [18]. It is the best method so long as we have $x \ll z_0$. Also this is what one would be requiring most when approaching the end of the Page curve involving two systems A & B. Typically the perturbative series looks like [18]

$$S(x, z_0) = S_0(x) + S_1(x, z_0) + S_2(x, z_0) + \dots \quad (31)$$

where leading term $S_0(x)$ is the entropy of AdS ground state, see eqs.(5) and (6), while the first order term is given by

$$S_1(x, z_0) = \frac{L^{d-1}V^{(d-2)}}{16G_{d+1}} \frac{(d-1)a_1x^2}{(d+1)b_0^2z_0^d} \quad (32)$$

note it has explicit horizon (z_0) dependence, and same is true for second order term and so on. (Here a_1 and b_0 are specific dimension dependent coefficients involving explicit Beta-functions, see appendix of [18]).

At the same time the entanglement entropy of central system-A, having width $2a$, is given by

$$S[A] = S(2a, z_0) = S(l - 2b, z_0) \quad (33)$$

In second equality we used $l = 2a + 2b$, as the bath has size $2b$. Again one can compare that the expressions in equations (30) and (33) differ only by an over all constant (global) quantity $S_l(l, z_0)$, that depends only on full size (system plus symmetrical bath) l . From the perspective of system-A S_l is some global fixed quantity. Therefore we conclude that these two equations represent two different extrema of the same entropy observable, primarily because both entropies contain *identical* local terms. The local terms arise from extremal RT surface that connects common interfaces of systems A and B. These local terms contain mutual entanglement information which two systems share between them. Further eqs. (30) and (33) are telling us that they contain identical entanglement entropy (through local exchanges along common interfaces) for system A and system B . Classically they differ only up to overall constant. We conclude that ‘quantum’ entanglement entropy measure at finite temperature for large bath subsystem-B (i.e. $b \gg$

a) ought to be taken as the smaller value between (30) and (33). Therefore the quantum entropy of any large thermal bath system (in contact with smaller system-A) would be

$$S_{\text{quantum}}[B] = \{S[A], S_l + S[A], \dots\}_{\text{min}} = S[A] . \quad (34)$$

The above result in (34) is consistent with the expectations of the quantum entropy Page curve when bath is very large. Note this conclusion is independent of how large l might be, so long as $b \gg a$ is obeyed! In infinite bath limit $b \rightarrow \infty$ ($l \rightarrow \infty$, $a = \text{fixed}$), the constant S_l has a limit:

$$S_l(l, z_0) \rightarrow S_{BH}(z_0)$$

where S_{BH} is black hole entropy. So we will get

$$\lim_{b \rightarrow \infty} S_{\text{quantum}}[B] = \{S[A], S_{BH} + S[A], \dots\}_{\text{min}} \equiv S[A] = S(2a, z_0) . \quad (35)$$

The right hand side of the eqs. (34) and (35) are identical. Hence for mixed states irrespective of the overall system size, the entropy of a large bath system is determined by the entropy of smaller system-A, under quantum minimality principle. $S[A]$ again accounts for the smallest entanglement entropy between two contact systems A & B, even in thermal case!




Figure 5: Entropy plots for the values $l = 10$, $\epsilon = .3$, for the CFT_4 system. The lower falling curve (yellow) is only preferred for quantum entropy at large b . The rising (green) curve is good only for bath entropy in small b region only. The topmost graph is classical entropy for large bath but it is unphysical. We have set $\frac{L^3 l_3 l_2}{4G_5} = 1$.

Perhaps an interesting stage (during blackhole evaporation) can arise when system-A size becomes very small such that it becomes comparable to intermediate Kaluza-Klein scale of the theory, i.e. $a \simeq n\pi R$, and $b \simeq \frac{l}{2} - \pi nR$, where R is radius of Kaluza-Klein circle. Then bath entropy may be expressed as

$$S_{\text{quantum}}[B] = S(2\pi nR, z_0) \quad (36)$$

which is the entropy of $2n$ independent strips (or sheets) put together. It is the smallest quantum entropy for a large bath, and is quantized by the virtue of the presence of KK scale in the (bulk) theory. However we should trust this result for small $n \in \mathbb{Z}$ values only. It is clear that any change in large bath entropy tends to be discrete in nature, if there exists KK scale. Similarly, one can deduce that during quantum evolution of a black hole state after long times, i.e. towards the end of evaporation, when system-A will shrink to zero size, the bath entropy

$$S_{quantum}[B] \rightarrow 0 .$$

That means all the information which was kept within system-A has been transferred to system-B (a very large bath). No loss of information can be expected in this process even for thermal systems!

4.1 Spectrum of narrow KK strips

When the size of the system-A becomes very small such that it is closer to a Kaluza-Klein radius, R , we can set system size as $2a \simeq 2n\pi R$, for some integer KK-level $n \geq 1$. ($n = 0$ means there is no system-A.) We are now interested in exchange of a small number of KK strips between bath (B) and the strip system (A). We may call this process as ‘sheets of CFT matter’ exchange between bath and system-A at their mutual interfaces. This will result in change of level n for the system-A. The resulting change in entanglement entropy from level n_2 to n_1 can be calculated ($n_1 < n_2$) as

$$\begin{aligned} \Delta S_{1 \rightarrow 2} &= S_{strips}[n_2] - S_{strips}[n_1] \\ &= \frac{L^2 l_2}{2G_4} \left(\frac{1}{n_1} - \frac{1}{n_2} \right) \frac{1}{\pi R} + \Delta S_{thermal} \\ &\equiv \frac{1}{T_E} \Delta E_{1 \rightarrow 2} \end{aligned} \tag{37}$$

Assuming entanglement temperature can be set as $T_E = \frac{1}{l}$. So empirically it can be determined that change in energy of strips is discrete,

$$\Delta E_{1 \rightarrow 2} = \frac{L^2 l_2}{G_3 l (2\pi R)^2} \left(\frac{1}{n_1} - \frac{1}{n_2} \right) + \Delta E_{1 \rightarrow 2}^{thermal} \tag{38}$$

A conclusion is drawn from here that a discrete quantum of energy would have to be exchanged between outer bath system-B and central (strip-like) system-A for finite temperature CFT. The length of strips l_2 is some large value (fixed), $L \gg 1$ is AdS radius of curvature, and G_3 is the Newton’s constant.

The thermal part of entropy is difficult to estimate exactly. However in the regime of our interest, when $a \ll z_0$, we can evaluate it perturbatively. From (32) up to first order

(say, for the CFT_3)

$$\Delta E_{1 \rightarrow 2}^{thermal} = \frac{L^2 l_2}{32 G_3 l} \frac{a_1 \pi (n_2^2 - n_1^2) R}{2 b_0^2 z_0^3} \quad (39)$$

Thus schematically we get

$$|\Delta E_{1 \rightarrow 2}| \propto \frac{1}{n_1 n_2 R^2} + \# \frac{(n_2 + n_1) R}{z_0^3}$$

Indeed the first term appears primarily due to the KK momentum modes. While the second term (due to thermal correction) grows linearly with R , which we guess presumably is consequence of string winding (wrapping) modes. We conclude that these energy and matter exchanges are all discrete! The same analysis can also be done for other CFT_d .

5 Summary

We have proposed that quantum entropy of entanglement for a large bath system-B (CFT) when in contact with small subsystem-A follows quantum minimality principle

$$S_{quantum}[B] = \{S[A], S[A] + S_l, \dots\}_{min} = S[A].$$

where S_l is full system ($A \cup B$) entropy. Any small fluctuation in the size of system-A (due to the matter exchange with bath) would not alter this conclusion provided systems follow conservation laws. Thus the equation realizes the Page curve for the entropy of quantum matter in contact with sufficiently large bath system. This conclusion is based upon the observation that for small subsystem-A and relatively large bath-B the respective entanglement entropies differ only by an overall constant. The constant does depend on the total systems size (l), which is fixed. For this reason S_l is conserved and quantum information it contains is essentially global.

We have explicitly shown that islands and subleading entropies (icebergs) contribute to the unphysical extremum of bath entropy. Actually all these contributions form various parts of S_l only. The (physical) quantum entropy of bath however does not get contribution from these fictitious parts! In this light the entropy expression (1) is very close to our proposal, but it is only approximate and may not cover full account of quantum entanglement between systems, mainly it ignores vital subleading contributions beyond the islands. On the contrary, we have shown that there will be an infinitum of such subleading contributions. It is shown to be true for all CFT_d systems in equilibrium. Furthermore we have analysed our results when subsystem-A size becomes ‘point-like’, similar in size as Kaluza-Klein scale of the theory, if there exist such a scale. As the small system size approaches KK-scale, we find necessary discreteness in the entropy and the

energy spectrum due to existence of low lying KK towers. Should there be no spontaneous compactification scale in the theory, the entropy of a large bath would vanish smoothly as and when the subsystem-A disappears. In summary it is indicated that the change in bath entropy does capture Kaluza-Klein discreteness.

Acknowledgments: It is pleasure to thank Stefan Theisen for several insightful discussions on this subject. I am thankful to MPI Golm for the kind hospitality where part of this work was carried out. The financial support from the Alexander-von-Humboldt foundation is also highly acknowledged.


A An effective construction of the hybrid gravity and CFT systems

For small size central CFT subsystem-A, such that its size $2a \approx 2\pi R$, i.e. when the system size can approximately fit within the Kaluza-Klein radius, the system-A may be treated as being point like. The symmetrical bath subsystem-B on either side is being comparatively very large so it can continue to be described by respective (noncompact) CFT. However, for all practical purposes, with out any loss of physical picture, the system-A can also be replaced by dual ‘near AdS’ geometry in one lower spacetime dimensions. The Newton’s constant for near-AdS bulk geometry would become $G_d = G_{d+1}/(2\pi R)$. We have tried to draw these situations in the figure (6) for systems A , B and the compliment CFT system B^c . The mixed gravity and CFT systems set up has been a favourable arrangement for an island proposal [4].


The entropy of gravitational island located at $z = b$ (symmetrically) can be found

$$S_{island} = \frac{Ll_2}{2G_3} \frac{\Phi_0}{b^2} \quad (40)$$

for $d=3$ case. The Φ_0 is suitable parameter and is related to the boundary value of the running dilaton field, $e^{-2\phi} = \frac{\Phi_0}{z}$, of the near- AdS_3 spacetime $ds_{(3)}^2 = \frac{L^2}{z^2}(-dt^2 + dx_2^2 + dz^2)$. The islands can be found to be located at $z = b$ & $-b$, and situated symmetrically on either side in figure (6). Further, without hassle we set $\Phi_0 = \frac{Lb_0^2 a}{2\pi R}$, thus eq.(40) would match the eq.(14). Thus hybrid configuration does provide a physical understanding of the island term eq.(14).



1. CFT system-A in the middle & symmetrical CFT bath subsystem-B (spacetime graph)



2. If system-A is very small it may be replaced by an effective 'near AdS2' geometry with symmetrical CFT bath

Figure 6: *An hybrid arrangement of a near AdS_2 and CFT_2 systems. The gravitational constant G_2 maybe suitably set. The set up would remain similar for all d cases.*

References

- [1] J. Maldacena, Adv. Theor. Math. Phys. 2, 231 (1998) [arXiv:9711200\[hep-th\]](#); S. Gubser, I. Klebanov and A.M. Polyakov, Phys. Lett. B 428, 105 (1998) [arXiv:9802109\[hep-th\]](#); E. Witten, Adv. Theor. Math. Phys. 2, 253 (1998) [arXiv:9802150\[hep-th\]](#).
- [2] A.K. Pati and S.L. Braunstein, NATURE **404**, 164 (2000); S.L. Braunstein and A.K. Pati, Phys. Rev. Lett. 98, 080502 (2007).
- [3] J. R. Samal, A. K. Pati, and Anil Kumar, Phys. Rev. Lett. 106, 080401 (2011).
- [4] A. Almheiri, R. Mahajan and J. Maldacena, "Islands outside the horizon", [arXiv:1910.11077\[hep-th\]](#).
- [5] N. Engelhardt and A. C. Wall, Quantum Extremal Surfaces: Holographic Entanglement Entropy beyond the Classical Regime [arXiv:1408.3203](#), JHEP01 (2015) 073.

- A. Almheiri, N. Engelhardt, D. Marolf and H. Maxfield, The entropy of bulk quantum fields and the entanglement wedge of an evaporating black hole, JHEP12 (2019) 063, arXiv:1905.08762.
- [6] G. Penington, S. H. Shenker, D. Stanford and Z. Yang, “Replica wormholes and the black hole interior”, arXiv:1911.11977 [hep-th]; A. Almheiri, T. Hartman, J. Maldacena, E. Shaghoulian and A. Tajdini, “Replica Wormholes and the Entropy of Hawking Radiation”, JHEP05 (2020) 013, arXiv:1911.12333.
- [7] D. N. Page, “Average entropy of a subsystem”, Phys. Rev. Lett. 71 (1993) 1291–1294, [gr-qc/9305007].
- [8] S. Raju, “Lessons from the Information Paradox”, arXiv:2012.05770.
- [9] L. Susskind, arXiv:1810.11563 [hep-th]; Fortschr. Phys. 64 (2016) 24; D. Stanford and L. Susskind, Phys. Rev. D90 (2014) 126007.
- [10] A.R. Brown , D.A. Robert, L. Susskind, B. Swingle, and Y. Zhao, Phys. Rev. Lett 116 (2016) 191301; A.R. Brown , D.A. Robert, L. Susskind, B. Swingle, and Y. Zhao, Phys. Rev. Lett 93 (2016) 086006;
- [11] A. Bernamonti et.al, Phys. Rev. Lett. 123 (2019) 081601.
- [12] K. Hashimoto, N. Iizuka, and S. Sugishita, Phys. Rev D96 (2017) 126001; K. Hashimoto, N. Iizuka, and S. Sugishita, arXiv:1805.04226 [hep-th]
- [13] R. Jackiw, ”Lower Dimensional Gravity”, Nucl. Phys. B252, 343 (1985).
- [14] C. Teitelboim, ” Gravitational and Hamiltonian Structure in Two Space-Time Dimensions”, Phys. Lett. 126B, 41 (1983).
- [15] S. Ryu and T. Takayanagi, Phys. Rev. Lett. **86** (2006) 181602, arXiv:0603001 [hep-th]; S. Ryu and T. Takayanagi, ”Aspects of Holographic Entanglement Entropy”, JHEP 0608 (2006) 045, arXiv:0605073 [hep-th].
- [16] V. Hubeny, M. Rangamani and T. Takayanagi, JHEP 0707 (2007) 062, arXiv:0705.0016 [hep-th].
- [17] Jyotirmoy Bhattacharya, Masahiro Nozaki, Tadashi Takayanagi, and Tomonori Ugajin Phys. Rev. Lett. 110, 091602.
- [18] R. Mishra and H. Singh, JHEP 10 (2015) 129, e-Print:1507.03836 [hep-th]; S. Maulik and H. Singh, JHEP 04 (2021) 065, e-Print: 2012.09530 [hep-th]

- [19] H. Singh, "Islands and Icebergs may contribute nothing to the Page curve", e-Print: 2210.13970 [hep-th]
- [20] H. Geng and A. Karch, JHEP 09 (2020) 121, e-Print:2006.02438 [hep-th]; Hao Geng, Replica Wormholes and Entanglement Islands in the Karch-Randall Braneworld, arXiv:2405.14872.
- [21] Geoffrey Penington, Entanglement Wedge Reconstruction and the Information Paradox, arXiv:1905.08255.
V. Chandrasekaran, G. Penington and E. Witten, Large N algebras and generalized entropy arXiv:2209.10454,