

# A New Proof of the QNEC

STEFAN HOLLANDS

Institut für Theoretische Physik, Universität Leipzig  
Brüderstrasse 16, 04103 Leipzig, Germany  
Max Planck Institute for Mathematics in Sciences (MiS)  
Inselstraße 22, 04103 Leipzig, Germany

ROBERTO LONGO

Dipartimento di Matematica, Tor Vergata Università di Roma  
Via della Ricerca Scientifica, 1, I-00133 Roma, Italy

## Abstract

We give a simplified proof of the quantum null energy condition (QNEC). Our proof is based on an explicit formula for the shape derivative of the relative entropy, with respect to an entangling cut. It allows bypassing the analytic continuation arguments of a previous proof by Ceyhan and Faulkner and can be used e.g., for defining entropy current fluctuations.

## 1 Introduction

The quantum null energy condition (QNEC) states that<sup>1</sup>

$$2\pi \langle T_{ab} \rangle k^a k^b \geq S''_{EE}, \quad (1)$$

where the double prime indicates the second shape variation, of an entangling cut, in the direction  $k^a$  within an outgoing, non-expanding, affinely parameterized null-surface tangent and normal to  $k^a$ .  $S_{EE}$  is the entanglement entropy associated with the cut and some state of the quantum field theory (QFT), and  $\langle T_{ab} \rangle$  is the expected stress energy tensor<sup>2</sup> of the QFT in that state.

The QNEC can be seen as a semi-classical limit of the quantum focusing conjecture [10], potentially a fundamental feature of quantum gravity. Among other things, it is the basis of the generalized second law for dynamical *apparent* black hole horizons [16, Sec. VII].

In [9], a heuristic argument in favor of the QNEC was given. But it is not straightforward to obtain a mathematically rigorous proof—nor even statement—of the QNEC, because both the precise formulation of second shape variation as well as the notion of entanglement entropy are subtle in QFT.

<sup>1</sup>We use units such that  $k_B = \hbar = c = 1$ .

<sup>2</sup>In a curved spacetime, the operator  $T_{ab}$  has well-known ambiguities, and it is somewhat unclear how these are understood in (1). However, such ambiguities are not present in  $T_{ab}k^ak^b$  if the null surface is a (future) bifurcate Killing horizon, where  $C_{ab}k^ak^b = 0$  for any curvature tensor  $C_{ab}$  [16].

Ceyhan and Faulkner proposed [11] that “half-sided modular inclusions” [6, 7, 22, 5, 13] are a natural framework for the QNEC. By this one means an inclusion  $\mathcal{N} \subset \mathcal{M}$  of von Neumann algebras together with a pure state  $\Omega$  such that the dynamics associated with the reduction of that state to  $\mathcal{M}$ , called the “modular flow”, cannot leave  $\mathcal{N}$  for positive flow times, see sections 2, 3 for precise definitions.

A manifestation of this structure is given by the set-up illustrated in figure 1:  $\mathcal{M}$  is the algebra of QFT observables associated with the entire exterior region of Schwarzschild spacetime,  $\mathcal{N}$  the subalgebra associated with an entangling cut  $C_a$  of the future horizon, and  $\Omega$  is the Hartle-Hawking state. The modular flow corresponds to the time-translation symmetry of the Schwarzschild spacetime.




Figure 1:  $\mathcal{N}$  corresponds to the dark gray region,  $\mathcal{M}$  to the light- and dark gray regions combined. The arrows indicate the orbits of the positively directed modular flow of the Hartle-Hawking state with respect to  $\mathcal{M}$ .

The structural theorem [22, 5, 13] about half-sided modular inclusions states that there always exists a positive self-adjoint generator  $P$  of “translations” whose unitary Heisenberg evolution  $U(a) = e^{iaP}$  obeys the relations of an affine group  $A(1)$  with the modular flow of  $\Omega$ . In the above example of Schwarzschild spacetime,  $U(a)$  indeed implements affine translations of the dark gray wedge, sliding it along  $H^+$ . It is noteworthy that such translations are *not* isometries of Schwarzschild spacetime, so the existence of  $P$  is non-trivial. Heuristically,  $P$  is an integral over the null-components of the stress tensor<sup>3</sup>, though one should stress that the notion of half-sided modular inclusion does not require this object a priori.

A half-sided modular inclusion defines a whole one-parameter family of nested algebras by  $\mathcal{M}(a) = U(a)\mathcal{M}U(a)^*$ . For each  $a$  and each state  $\Phi$  in the Hilbert space, one may then define Araki’s relative entropy [2, 3]

$$S(a) := S(\Phi|\Omega)_{\mathcal{M}(a)} \quad (2)$$

with respect to  $\mathcal{M}(a)$ . Ceyhan and Faulkner argued [11] that a mathematically rigorous reformulation of the QNEC (1) should be

$$\partial^2 S(a) \geq 0. \quad (3)$$

Their formulation nicely avoids the technical problems with (1) in two ways: arbitrary shape variations are included because the inequality holds for a half-sided modular inclusion

<sup>3</sup>Informally,  $P = \int_{H^+ \cup \bar{H}^- \cup I^+ \cup \bar{I}^-} T_{ab} k^b dS^a$ , see figure 1.

associated with an *arbitrary* entangling cut. Furthermore, the relative entropy is better defined mathematically than the entanglement entropy, and formally yields both terms in (1) at the same time.

More concretely, the connection between (3) and (1) can be seen from the heuristic formulas

$$\omega_a = e^{-2\pi K_a}, \quad K_a = \int_{V>a} (V-a) T_{bc} k^c dS^b + \dots, \quad (4)$$

for the reduced density matrix,  $\omega_a$ , of  $\Omega$  to the dark gray region in figure 1 that is defined by the cut  $C_a$ . Here,  $V$  is an affine parameter on  $H^+$  such that  $k^b \nabla_b V = 1$ ,  $V = a$  on  $C_a$  and such that  $V = 0$  on the bifurcation surface. The dots indicate additional contributions, for example, from  $I^+$  and  $i^+$ , as well as a formally infinite constant, all of which arguably do not depend on  $a$ . These disappear when the two derivatives are applied in (3) using the heuristic formula  $S(a) = \text{Tr}(\varphi_a \log \varphi_a - \varphi_a \log \omega_a)$  for the relative entropy in terms of the reduced density matrix  $\varphi_a$  of  $\Phi$ . A short calculation thereby gives a formula equivalent to (1) for an appropriate notion of second shape variation.

A proof of the QNEC, in their formulation, was also given by [11], based on the “ant-formula” suggested by [21]. The ant-formula is

$$-\partial S(a) = 2\pi \inf_{u'}(u' \Phi, P u' \Phi) \quad (5)$$

in the formulation by [11], where  $u'$  runs over unitary operators from the commutant  $\mathcal{M}(a)'$  of  $\mathcal{M}(a)$ . The variational nature of this formula immediately gives<sup>4</sup>  $\partial S(b) \geq \partial S(a)$  when  $b \geq a$ , because  $\mathcal{M}(a)' \subset \mathcal{M}(b)'$ . We thereby obtain the QNEC even in cases when only the first, but not second, derivative of  $S(a)$  exists.

While [11] could show without too much difficulty that the right side of (5) cannot be smaller than  $-\partial S(a)$ , the construction of a sequence of unitaries  $u'_s$  saturating (5) turned out to be the central technical problem in their proof, requiring complicated techniques of analytic continuation in two variables and advanced methods from complex analysis.

In the present paper, we will give a substantially simplified argument in this crucial step, avoiding any such analytic continuations. Like the construction by [11], we shall choose the minimizing sequence  $u'_s$  to be the Connes-cocycle [12] between  $\Omega, \Phi$  sending the parameter  $s \rightarrow \infty$ . However, our arguments why this saturates the ant-formula are different from [11] and rely on an explicit formula for the derivative of the relative entropy which we derive in section 4:

$$\partial S(a) = i(\Phi, [P, \log \Delta'_a] \Phi), \quad (6)$$

where  $\Delta'_a$  is a relative modular operator [2, 3] between  $\Phi, \Omega$  with respect to  $\mathcal{M}(a)'$ . From (6) to the proof of the QNEC is a relatively short step, described in section 5.

Equation (6) might be of independent interest because it displays the relative entropy flux as an expectation value of a suitably defined entropy-current operator. In particular, one may consider the variance (fluctuations) of the relative entropy flux, see section 6 for further discussion.

---

<sup>4</sup>Note that monotonicity of the relative entropy only gives  $S(b) \leq S(a)$  when  $b \geq a$ .

## 2 Relative modular operators and entropy

Let  $\mathcal{M}$  be a von Neumann algebra on a Hilbert space  $\mathcal{H}$ , and  $\Omega, \Phi \in \mathcal{H}$  cyclic and separating vectors for  $\mathcal{M}$ . The *relative Tomita's operators* [2, 3] on  $\mathcal{H}$  are given by the closures of

$$\begin{aligned} S_{\Omega, \Phi} &\equiv S_{\Omega, \Phi; \mathcal{M}} : x\Phi \mapsto x^*\Omega, \quad x \in \mathcal{M}, \\ S'_{\Omega, \Phi} &\equiv S_{\Omega, \Phi; \mathcal{M}'} : x'\Phi \mapsto x'^*\Omega, \quad x' \in \mathcal{M}'. \end{aligned} \quad (7)$$

By considering the polar decompositions, we get the *relative modular operators and conjugations*:

$$S_{\Omega, \Phi} = J_{\Omega, \Phi} \Delta_{\Omega, \Phi}^{1/2}, \quad S'_{\Omega, \Phi} = J'_{\Omega, \Phi} \Delta_{\Omega, \Phi}^{1/2}.$$

Recall the formulas

$$J'_{\Omega, \Phi} = J_{\Phi, \Omega} = J_{\Omega, \Phi}^*, \quad \Delta'_{\Omega, \Phi} = \Delta_{\Phi, \Omega}^{-1} = J_{\Omega, \Phi} \Delta_{\Omega, \Phi} J_{\Omega, \Phi}^*. \quad (8)$$

From the last equality in (8) we have

$$J_{\Omega, \Phi} f(\Delta_{\Omega, \Phi}) J_{\Omega, \Phi}^* = \bar{f}(\Delta_{\Phi, \Omega}^{-1})$$

for every complex Borel function  $f$  on  $(0, \infty)$ , with  $\bar{f}$  the complex conjugate of  $f$ . The modular operators have the covariance properties:

$$\Delta_{v\Omega, u\Phi} = v\Delta_{\Omega, \Phi}v^*, \quad \Delta_{v'\Omega, u'\Phi} = u'\Delta_{\Omega, \Phi}u'^*, \quad (9)$$

for any unitaries  $u, v \in \mathcal{M}, u', v' \in \mathcal{M}'$ . We also use the modular flow, which are the 1-parameter groups of automorphisms of  $\mathcal{M}$  respectively  $\mathcal{M}'$  given by

$$\sigma_t^\Phi(m) = \Delta_{\Phi}^{it} m \Delta_{\Phi}^{-it}, \quad \sigma_t^{\Phi}(m') = \Delta_{\Phi}^{-it} m' \Delta_{\Phi}^{it} \quad (10)$$

respectively. Here, and in the rest of the paper, we define  $\Delta_\Phi := \Delta_{\Phi, \Phi}$ . The modular flows may also be expressed with the help of the relative modular operators:

$$\Delta_{\Phi, \Omega}^{it} m \Delta_{\Phi, \Omega}^{-it} = \Delta_{\Phi}^{it} m \Delta_{\Phi}^{-it}, \quad \Delta_{\Phi, \Omega}^{it} m' \Delta_{\Phi, \Omega}^{-it} = \Delta_{\Omega}^{it} m' \Delta_{\Omega}^{-it}. \quad (11)$$

With  $\varphi = (\Phi, \cdot\Phi)$ ,  $\omega = (\Omega, \cdot\Omega)$  the states on  $\mathcal{M}$  associated with  $\Phi, \Omega$ , the following formulas for the *Connes-cocycles* [12] hold:

$$u_s = (D\omega : D\varphi)_s = \Delta_{\Omega, \Phi}^{is} \Delta_{\Phi}^{-is} = \Delta_{\Omega}^{is} \Delta_{\Phi, \Omega}^{-is}; \quad (12)$$

$u_s$  respectively  $u'_s$  are unitary operators from  $\mathcal{M}$  respectively  $\mathcal{M}'$  for all  $s \in \mathbb{R}$ . Since  $(D\omega : D\varphi)_s = (D\varphi : D\omega)_s^*$ , we have by (8)

$$u_s = \Delta_{\Omega, \Phi}^{is} \Delta_{\Phi}^{-is} = (\Delta_{\Phi, \Omega} \Delta_{\Omega}^{-is})^* = \Delta_{\Omega}^{is} \Delta_{\Phi, \Omega}^{-is} = \Delta_{\Omega}^{is} \Delta_{\Omega, \Phi}^{is}. \quad (13)$$

Set  $u'_s = (D\omega' : D\varphi')_s$ , with  $\varphi' = (\Phi, \cdot\Phi)$ ,  $\omega' = (\Omega, \cdot\Omega)$  on  $\mathcal{M}'$ . Then

$$u_{-s} u'_s = \Delta_{\Omega}^{-is} \Delta_{\Phi}^{is}. \quad (14)$$

One may also define unitary cocycles associated with the modular conjugations [4, App. C], [11, App. A]:

$$v_{\Omega, \Phi} = J'_{\Omega, \Phi} J'_{\Phi} = J'_{\Omega} J'_{\Omega, \Phi} \in \mathcal{M}, \quad (15)$$

and similarly for  $\mathcal{M}'$ .

If  $\Phi$  is not cyclic or not separating, then appropriate modifications of the above formulas involving the so-called support projections  $s(\Phi) \in \mathcal{M}$ ,  $s'(\Phi) \in \mathcal{M}'$  apply, where for instance  $s(\Phi)$  is the orthogonal projection onto the closure of the subspace  $\mathcal{M}'\Phi$ . For details on such relations see [3], [4, App. C], [11, App. A].

For a cyclic and separating vector  $\Omega$ , Araki's *relative entropy* is defined by [2, 3]

$$S(\Phi\|\Omega)_{\mathcal{M}} = -(\Phi, \log \Delta_{\Omega, \Phi} \Phi). \quad (16)$$

The first covariance property (9) implies that

$$S(u'\Phi\|v'\Omega)_{\mathcal{M}} = S(\Phi\|\Omega)_{\mathcal{M}}, \quad S(u\Phi\|v\Omega)_{\mathcal{M}'} = S(\Phi\|\Omega)_{\mathcal{M}'}, \quad (17)$$

for any isometries  $u, v \in \mathcal{M}$ ,  $u', v' \in \mathcal{M}'$ . This implies that  $S(\Phi\|\Omega)_{\mathcal{M}} \equiv S(\varphi\|\omega)_{\mathcal{M}}$  i.e., the relative entropy only depends on the functionals  $\varphi = (\Phi, \cdot\Phi)$ ,  $\omega = (\Omega, \cdot\Omega)$ , the states on  $\mathcal{M}$  associated with  $\Phi, \Omega$ , and similarly for the commutant (second formula).

**Lemma 2.1.** *Let  $\mathcal{M}$  be a von Neumann algebra on the Hilbert space  $\mathcal{H}$  and  $\Phi, \Omega \in \mathcal{H}$  cyclic and separating vectors. Then there exists  $m_\lambda \in \mathcal{M}$  such that*

$$(\Delta_{\Phi, \Omega} + \lambda)^{-1} \Phi = m_\lambda \Omega \quad (18)$$

for any  $\lambda > 0$ . In addition, the map  $\lambda \mapsto m_\lambda$  is strongly continuous and we have

$$\int_0^\infty m_\lambda m_\lambda^* d\lambda = 1 \quad (19)$$

(integral in the weak topology).

**Proof.** We have

$$(\Delta_{\Phi, \Omega} + \lambda)^{-1} = (\Delta_{\Phi, \Omega}^{1/2} + \lambda \Delta_{\Phi, \Omega}^{-1/2})^{-1} \Delta_{\Phi, \Omega}^{-1/2} = (\Delta_{\Phi, \Omega}^{1/2} + \lambda \Delta_{\Phi, \Omega}^{-1/2})^{-1} \Delta_{\Omega, \Phi}^{1/2}.$$

From the formula

$$\frac{1}{e^{p/2} + e^{-p/2}} = \int_{-\infty}^{\infty} \frac{e^{itp}}{e^{\pi t} + e^{-\pi t}} dt$$

we then get

$$(\Delta_{\Phi, \Omega} + \lambda)^{-1} \Phi = \frac{1}{2\sqrt{\lambda}} \int_{\mathbb{R}} \frac{\lambda^{-it}}{\cosh(\pi t)} \Delta_{\Phi, \Omega}^{it} dt \Delta_{\Phi, \Omega}^{1/2} \Phi = \frac{1}{2\sqrt{\lambda}} \int_{\mathbb{R}} \frac{\lambda^{-it}}{\cosh(\pi t)} \Delta_{\Phi, \Omega}^{it} dt J_{\Omega, \Phi} \Omega. \quad (20)$$

Using the properties of the relative modular flow and the definition of the Connes-cocycle, we have

$$\Delta_{\Phi, \Omega}^{it} J_{\Omega, \Phi} \Omega = \Delta_{\Phi, \Omega}^{it} J_{\Phi, \Omega} J_{\Omega} \Omega = \Delta_{\Phi, \Omega}^{it} w \Omega = \Delta_{\Phi, \Omega}^{it} w \Delta_{\Phi, \Omega}^{-it} \Delta_{\Phi, \Omega}^{it} \Delta_{\Omega}^{-it} \Omega = \sigma_t^\varphi(w)(D\varphi : D\omega)_t \Omega,$$

where  $w = J_{\Phi, \Omega} J_{\Omega} \in \mathcal{M}$  is a unitary and  $\omega, \varphi$  are the states on  $\mathcal{M}$  associated with  $\Omega, \Phi$ .

Therefore formula (18) holds with

$$m_\lambda = \frac{1}{2\sqrt{\lambda}} \int_{\mathbb{R}} \frac{\lambda^{-it}}{\cosh(\pi t)} v_t dt \quad (21)$$

where  $v_t = \sigma_t^\varphi(w)(D\varphi : D\omega)_t$ .

The strong continuity of  $\lambda \mapsto m_\lambda$  follows from (21) and the Lebesgue dominated convergence theorem.

We now prove the relation (19). The map  $t \mapsto v_t^* \xi / \cosh(\pi t)$  is an  $\mathcal{H}$ -valued  $L^2$ -function on  $\mathbb{R}$  for all  $\xi \in \mathcal{H}$ . Therefore, since the Fourier transform is an isometry of  $L^2(\mathbb{R}, \mathcal{H})$ , also  $u \mapsto e^{u/2} m_{e^u}^* \xi$  is an  $\mathcal{H}$ -valued  $L^2$ -function on  $\mathbb{R}$ . Using that the Fourier transform is an isometry of  $L^2(\mathbb{R}, \mathcal{H})$  and making a change of integration variable from  $\lambda$  to  $u = \log \lambda$ , we therefore have by (20), for any pair  $\xi, \eta \in \mathcal{H}$ :

$$\int_{(0, \infty)} (\xi, m_\lambda m_\lambda^* \eta) d\lambda = \frac{\pi}{2} \int_{\mathbb{R}} \frac{(\xi, v_t v_t^* \eta)}{\cosh^2(\pi t)} dt = \frac{\pi}{2} \int_{\mathbb{R}} \frac{(\xi, \eta)}{\cosh^2(\pi t)} dt = (\xi, \eta) \quad (22)$$

because  $v_t$  is unitary.  $\square$

*Remark 2.2.* By the same argument, Lemma 2.1 shows that  $(\Delta_{\Phi, \Omega} + \lambda)^{-1} \mathcal{M}' \Phi \subset \mathcal{M} \Omega$ . The case  $\Phi = \Omega$  is Tomita's lemma, used in most proofs of the Tomita-Takesaki main theorem.

Let now  $T_n, T$  be (anti)-linear, densely defined, closed operators on the Hilbert space  $\mathcal{H}$ . Denote by  $P_T$  the orthogonal projection on  $\mathcal{H} \oplus \mathcal{H}$  onto the graph of  $T$ . We write  $T_n \rightarrow_g T$  if  $P_{T_n} \rightarrow P_T$  strongly.

As is known [19], we have

$$P_T = \begin{pmatrix} (1 + T^*T)^{-1} & T^*(1 + TT^*)^{-1} \\ T(1 + T^*T)^{-1} & (1 + TT^*)^{-1} \end{pmatrix}$$

therefore  $T_n \rightarrow_g T$  implies that  $(1 + T_n^* T_n)^{-1} \rightarrow (1 + T^* T)^{-1}$  strongly.

**Proposition 2.3.** *Let  $\mathcal{M}$  be a von Neumann algebra on the Hilbert space  $H$  and  $\Phi_n, \Omega_n, \Phi, \Omega \in \mathcal{H}$  cyclic and separating vectors with  $\Phi_n \rightarrow \Phi$  and  $\Omega_n \rightarrow \Omega$  in norm. Then  $(\Delta_{\Phi_n, \Omega_n} + \lambda)^{-1} \rightarrow (\Delta_{\Phi, \Omega} + \lambda)^{-1}$  and  $J_{\Phi_n, \Omega_n} \rightarrow J_{\Phi, \Omega}$  strongly for all  $\lambda > 0$ .*

**Proof.** It is easily seen that  $S_{\Phi_n, \Omega_n} \rightarrow_g S_{\Phi, \Omega}$  thus the proposition follows by the above considerations by arguments similar to the ones in [14, Sect. 6] for the case  $\Phi_n = \Omega_n$ .  $\square$

### 3 Half-sided modular inclusions

Let  $\mathcal{N} \subset \mathcal{M}$  be an inclusion of von Neumann algebras on a Hilbert space  $\mathcal{H}$  such that the following conditions are satisfied:

1. There exists a unit vector  $\Omega \in \mathcal{H}$  which is cyclic and separating for both  $\mathcal{M}$  and  $\mathcal{N}$ .
2. Denote by  $\Delta_\Omega$  the modular operator for  $\mathcal{M}$ . Then  $\Delta_\Omega^{-it} \mathcal{N} \Delta_\Omega^{it} \subset \mathcal{N}$  for all  $t \geq 0$ .

Then  $(\mathcal{N} \subset \mathcal{M}, \Omega)$  is called a *half-sided modular inclusion* with respect to  $\Omega$ . Given a half-sided modular inclusion, one can define the family of unitary operators

$$U(1 - e^{-2\pi t}) = \Delta_{\Omega; \mathcal{N}}^{it} \Delta_{\Omega; \mathcal{M}}^{-it}. \quad (23)$$

Wiesbrock's theorem [22, 5, 13] is the statement that:

**Theorem 3.1.** *Given a half-sided modular inclusion  $(\mathcal{N} \subset \mathcal{M}, \Omega)$  there is a family of unitary operators  $U(a), a \in \mathbb{R}$ , given by (23) for  $a \leq 1$ , realizing the situation described by Borchers' theorem [6, 7], namely one has:*

1.  $\{U(a) \mid a \in \mathbb{R}\}$  is a strongly continuous 1-parameter group of unitaries with self-adjoint generator  $P$ ,  $U(a) = e^{iaP}$ .  $P$  is positive, meaning  $\text{spec} P \subset [0, \infty)$ .
2.  $U(a)\Omega = \Omega$  for all  $a \in \mathbb{R}$ .
3.  $\mathcal{M}(a) := U(a)\mathcal{M}U(a)^* \subset \mathcal{M}$  for  $a \geq 0$  and  $\mathcal{M}(a) \subset \mathcal{M}$  is a half-sided modular inclusion relative to  $\Omega$ . In particular,  $\mathcal{M}(b) \subset \mathcal{M}(a)$  for  $b \geq a$ .
4.  $\mathcal{M}(1) = \mathcal{N}$ .
5.  $\Omega$  is cyclic and separating for each  $\mathcal{M}(a)$  and therefore for each  $\mathcal{M}(a)'$ .
6.  $\Delta_\Omega^{-it} P \Delta_\Omega^{it} = e^{2\pi t} P$  for all  $t \in \mathbb{R}$ , on the domain  $\mathcal{D}(P)$  of  $P$  given by Stone's theorem (in particular,  $\mathcal{D}(P)$  is invariant under  $\Delta_\Omega^{-it}$ ), or equivalently  $\Delta_\Omega^{-it} U(a) \Delta_\Omega^{it} = U(e^{2\pi t} a)$  for all  $t, a \in \mathbb{R}$ .
7.  $U(-a)\mathcal{M}'U(-a)^* \subset \mathcal{M}'$  for  $a \geq 0$  and  $J_\Omega U(a) J_\Omega = U(-a)$  for all  $a \in \mathbb{R}$ .

By item 3) and the monotonicity of the relative entropy [20], the function  $a \mapsto S(\Phi \parallel \Omega)_{\mathcal{M}(a)}$  from  $\mathbb{R} \rightarrow [0, \infty]$  is monotonically decreasing. It is also clear from (34) that

$$S(a) := S(\Phi \parallel \Omega)_{\mathcal{M}(a)} = S(U(a)^* \Phi \parallel U(a)^* \Omega)_{\mathcal{M}} = S(\Phi_a \parallel \Omega)_{\mathcal{M}}, \quad \Phi_a := U(a)^* \Phi. \quad (24)$$

Since  $a \mapsto \Phi_a$  is strongly continuous, it follows that  $a \mapsto (\Phi_a, \cdot \Phi_a)$  is weak-\* continuous. By the lower semi-continuity of the relative entropy [3, Thm. 3.7], therefore

$$\liminf_{a \rightarrow b} S(a) \geq S(b). \quad (25)$$

Therefore by monotonicity,

$$\lim_{a \rightarrow b^+} S(a) = S(b). \quad (26)$$

By analogy, since  $\mathcal{M}(a)' \subset \mathcal{M}'$  is a half-sided modular inclusion for  $a \leq 0$ , we also get, writing  $\bar{S}(a) := S(\Phi \parallel \Omega)_{\mathcal{M}(a)'}$ ,

$$\lim_{a \rightarrow b^-} \bar{S}(a) = \bar{S}(b). \quad (27)$$

These statements can be combined to deduce the continuity of  $a \mapsto S(a)$  under certain conditions. In fact, suppose  $a, b \in \mathbb{R}$  with  $S(a) < \infty$ ,  $\bar{S}(b) < \infty$ . Then by [11, Lem. 1] or [15, Prop. 3.2], we have the sum rule

$$S(a) - S(b) = \bar{S}(a) - \bar{S}(b) + 2\pi(b - a)(\Phi, P\Phi), \quad (28)$$

for every vector state  $\Phi \in \mathcal{D}(P)$ . Therefore, if  $(a, b)$  is an open interval in which both  $S, \bar{S}$  are finite, and if  $\Phi \in \mathcal{D}(P)$ , it follows from (28) and (26), (27) that  $S, \bar{S}$  are continuous on  $(a, b)$ . Since  $S, \bar{S}$  are monotone, their derivatives  $\partial S, \partial \bar{S}$  exist almost everywhere on  $(a, b)$ .

## 4 Formula for $\partial S(a)$

For a positive self-adjoint operator  $A$  with  $\ker A = \{0\}$ , we have the integral formula

$$\log A = \int_{(0,\infty)} [(1 + \lambda)^{-1} - (A + \lambda)^{-1}] d\lambda, \quad (29)$$

meaning that

$$(\Phi, \log A \Phi) = \int_{(0,\infty)} [(1 + \lambda)^{-1} \|\Phi\|^2 - (\Phi, (A + \lambda)^{-1} \Phi)] d\lambda \quad (30)$$

for all  $\Phi \in \mathcal{H}$  such that  $(\Phi, \log A \Phi)$  is well-defined.

This formula will allow us to reduce the considerations about the logarithm of the modular operator to its resolvent  $(A + \lambda)^{-1}$ . In particular, from (16), (8), we have

$$S(\Phi \|\Omega)_{\mathcal{M}} = \int_{(0,\infty)} (\Phi, [(1 + \lambda)^{-1} - (\Delta'_{\Phi, \Omega} + \lambda)^{-1}] \Phi) d\lambda. \quad (31)$$

Thereby, with our previous notation (24) for  $S(a)$ , we also have

$$S(a) - S(b) = \int_{(0,\infty)} (\Phi, [(\Delta'_b + \lambda)^{-1} - (\Delta'_a + \lambda)^{-1}] \Phi) d\lambda, \quad (32)$$

where from now on, we will use shorthands such as

$$\Delta_a := \Delta_{\Phi, \Omega; \mathcal{M}(a)}, \quad \Delta'_a := \Delta_{\Phi, \Omega; \mathcal{M}(a)'}. \quad (33)$$

Note that we have

$$\Delta_a := \Delta_{\Phi, \Omega; \mathcal{M}(a)} = U(a) \Delta_{U(a)^* \Phi, \Omega; \mathcal{M}} U(a)^* = U(a) \Delta_{\Phi_a, \Omega; \mathcal{M}} U(a)^*, \quad (34)$$

where  $\mathcal{M} = \mathcal{M}(a)$  and  $\Phi_a = U(a)^* \Phi$ ; and similarly

$$\Delta'_a := \Delta_{\Phi, \Omega; \mathcal{M}(a)'} = U(a) \Delta'_{\Phi_a, \Omega; \mathcal{M}} U(a)^*. \quad (35)$$

**Lemma 4.1.** *Let  $\Phi \in \mathcal{H}$ ,  $\Phi_a := U(a)^* \Phi$ ,  $\lambda > 0$ ,  $a \in \mathbb{R}$ . Then*

$$(\Phi, (\Delta'_a + \lambda)^{-1} \Phi) = (\Phi_a, (\Delta'_{\Phi_a, \Omega} + \lambda)^{-1} \Phi_a). \quad (36)$$

**Proof.** From (35), we have  $(\Delta'_a + \lambda)^{-1} = U(a) (\Delta'_{\Phi_a, \Omega; \mathcal{M}} + \lambda)^{-1} U(a)^*$ , and this immediately gives the lemma.  $\square$

**Lemma 4.2.** *The map  $a \mapsto (\Delta'_{\Phi_a, \Omega} + \lambda)^{-1}$  is strongly continuous for any  $\lambda > 0$ .*

**Proof.** It follows by the continuity  $\Psi \mapsto \Delta_{\Psi, \Omega}$  in the strong resolvent sense given by proposition 2.3.  $\square$

For  $\lambda > 0$ , we now investigate the limit

$$\begin{aligned} & \liminf_{b \rightarrow a} (b-a)^{-1} (\Phi, [(\Delta'_b + \lambda)^{-1} - (\Delta'_a + \lambda)^{-1}] \Phi) \\ &= \liminf_{b \rightarrow a} (b-a)^{-1} [(\Phi_b, (\Delta'_{\Phi_b, \Omega} + \lambda)^{-1} \Phi_b) - (\Phi_a, (\Delta'_{\Phi_a, \Omega} + \lambda)^{-1} \Phi_a)], \end{aligned} \quad (37)$$

where lemma 4.1 is used to prove the equality. We assume throughout that  $\Phi \in \mathcal{D}(P)$ . By Stone's theorem  $\mathcal{D}(P) = \{\Psi \in \mathcal{H} \mid s - \lim_{a \rightarrow 0} [U(a)\Psi - \Psi]/a \text{ exists}\}$ , and for  $\Psi \in \mathcal{D}(P)$ , we have in fact  $iP\Psi = s - \lim_{a \rightarrow 0} [U(a)\Psi - \Psi]/a$  or equivalently,  $-iP\Psi_a = s - \lim_{b \rightarrow a} (\Psi_b - \Psi_a)/(b-a)$  in our notation  $\Psi_a = U(a)^*\Psi$ . Therefore, since  $a \mapsto (\Delta'_{\Phi_a, \Omega} + \lambda)^{-1}$  is strongly continuous and uniformly bounded by lemma 4.2, it is easily seen from the second line in (37) that

$$\begin{aligned} & \liminf_{b \rightarrow a} (b-a)^{-1} (\Phi, [(\Delta'_b + \lambda)^{-1} - (\Delta'_a + \lambda)^{-1}] \Phi) \\ &= i(P\Phi_a, R_a(\lambda)\Phi_a) - i(R_a(\lambda)\Phi_a, P\Phi_a) + \liminf_{b \rightarrow a} (b-a)^{-1} (\Phi_a, [R_b(\lambda) - R_a(\lambda)] \Phi_a), \end{aligned} \quad (38)$$

where we use

$$R_a(\lambda) := (\Delta'_{\Phi_a, \Omega} + \lambda)^{-1} \quad (39)$$

for the resolvent. Relation (38) allows us to prove the following lemma.

**Lemma 4.3.** *Let  $\Phi \in \mathcal{D}(P) \cap \mathcal{D}(\log \Delta'_a)$ . Then*

$$\liminf_{b \rightarrow a+} \frac{S(a) - S(b)}{b-a} \geq -i(\Phi, [P, \log \Delta'_a] \Phi). \quad (40)$$

*Remark 4.4.* By the same proof, if  $\Phi \in \mathcal{D}(P) \cap \mathcal{D}(\log \Delta_a)$ , then an analogous formula holds also for  $\partial \bar{S}(a)$ :

$$\liminf_{b \rightarrow a-} \frac{\bar{S}(b) - \bar{S}(a)}{b-a} \geq i(\Phi, [P, \log \Delta_a] \Phi). \quad (41)$$

**Proof.** By lemma 4.1, (38), (31), and  $\Phi \in \mathcal{D}(\log \Delta'_a)$ , we have

$$\liminf_{b \rightarrow a+} \frac{S(a) - S(b)}{b-a} \geq -i(\Phi, [P, \log \Delta'_a] \Phi) + \int_{(0, \infty)} \liminf_{b \rightarrow a+} \frac{(\Phi_a, [R_b(\lambda) - R_a(\lambda)] \Phi_a)}{b-a} d\lambda. \quad (42)$$

We should therefore show that the integral in (42) is non-negative. Using the following elementary algebraic property of the resolvent,

$$R_b(\lambda) - R_a(\lambda) = R_b(\lambda) [\Delta'_{\Phi_a, \Omega} - \Delta'_{\Phi_b, \Omega}] R_a(\lambda) = R_a(\lambda) [\Delta'_{\Phi_a, \Omega} - \Delta'_{\Phi_b, \Omega}] R_b(\lambda), \quad (43)$$

twice, we have for  $\lambda > 0$ ,

$$\begin{aligned} & (\Phi_a, [R_b(\lambda) - R_a(\lambda)] \Phi_a) \\ &= (\Phi_a, R_a(\lambda) [\Delta'_{\Phi_a, \Omega} - \Delta'_{\Phi_b, \Omega}] R_a(\lambda) \Phi_a) + \\ & \quad (\Phi_a, R_a(\lambda) [\Delta'_{\Phi_a, \Omega} - \Delta'_{\Phi_b, \Omega}] R_b(\lambda) [\Delta'_{\Phi_a, \Omega} - \Delta'_{\Phi_b, \Omega}] R_a(\lambda) \Phi_a) \\ &\geq (\Phi_a, R_a(\lambda) [\Delta'_{\Phi_a, \Omega} - \Delta'_{\Phi_b, \Omega}] R_a(\lambda) \Phi_a). \end{aligned} \quad (44)$$

We therefore have

$$\begin{aligned} \liminf_{b \rightarrow a+} \frac{S(a) - S(b)}{b - a} &\geq -i(\Phi, [P, \log \Delta'_a] \Phi) + \\ &\int_{(0, \infty)} \liminf_{b \rightarrow a+} \frac{(\Phi_a, R_a(\lambda) [\Delta'_{\Phi_a, \Omega} - \Delta'_{\Phi_b, \Omega}] R_a(\lambda) \Phi_a)}{b - a} d\lambda. \end{aligned} \quad (45)$$

Let  $m'_\lambda \in \mathcal{M}'$  be given by Lemma 2.1 so that

$$m'_\lambda \Omega = R_a(\lambda) \Phi_a, \quad \lambda > 0.$$

We have

$$\begin{aligned} &\int_{(0, \infty)} \liminf_{b \rightarrow a+} \frac{(\Phi_a, R_a(\lambda) [\Delta'_{\Phi_a, \Omega} - \Delta'_{\Phi_b, \Omega}] R_a(\lambda) \Phi_a)}{b - a} d\lambda \\ &= \int_{(0, \infty)} \liminf_{b \rightarrow a+} \frac{(m'_\lambda \Omega, [\Delta'_{\Phi_a, \Omega} - \Delta'_{\Phi_b, \Omega}] m'_\lambda \Omega)}{b - a} d\lambda \\ &= \int_{(0, \infty)} \liminf_{b \rightarrow a+} \frac{\|m'_\lambda m'^* \Phi_a\|^2 - \|m'_\lambda m'^* \Phi_b\|^2}{b - a} d\lambda \\ &= \int_{(0, \infty)} \left[ -i(P\Phi_a, m'_\lambda m'^* \Phi_a) + i(m'_\lambda m'^* \Phi_a, P\Phi_a) \right] d\lambda. \end{aligned} \quad (46)$$

In the last step, we used  $\Phi_a \in \mathcal{D}(P)$  and Stone's theorem. The last integral is zero because of (22) and because  $P$  is Hermitian, so the proof of the lemma is completed.  $\square$

We can upgrade lemma 4.3 using the sum rule (28), to get a formula for  $\partial S(a)$ , if we know that this derivative exists. More precisely, we have:

**Proposition 4.5.** *Suppose that the derivative  $\partial S(a)$  exists and that  $\Phi \in \mathcal{D}(P) \cap \mathcal{D}(\log \Delta'_a) \cap \mathcal{D}(\log \Delta_a)$ , so, in particular,  $S(a), \bar{S}(a), (\Phi, P\Phi) < \infty$ . Then*

$$\partial S(a) = i(\Phi, [P, \log \Delta'_a] \Phi), \quad (47)$$

and the analogous formula also holds for  $\partial \bar{S}(a)$ ,

$$\partial \bar{S}(a) = i(\Phi, [P, \log \Delta_a] \Phi). \quad (48)$$

**Proof.** The sum rule (28), lemma 4.3 and its analogous version for  $\bar{S}$  in remark 4.4 imply

$$2\pi(\Phi, P\Phi) = -\partial S(a) + \partial \bar{S}(a) \geq -i(\Phi, [P, \log \Delta'_a] \Phi) + i(\Phi, [P, \log \Delta_a] \Phi). \quad (49)$$

We apply (14) to  $\Phi$  and differentiate with respect to  $s$  at  $s = 0$ , using Stone's theorem and the fact that  $\Phi \in \mathcal{D}(\log \Delta'_a) \cap \mathcal{D}(\log \Delta_a)$ . It follows on the one hand that  $\partial_s(u_{-s} u'_s \Phi)|_{s=0} = -i(\log \Delta_a) \Phi + i(\log \Delta'_a) \Phi$ , and on the other hand that  $\partial_s(u_{-s} u'_s \Phi)|_{s=0} = -i(\log \Delta_{\Omega; a}) \Phi$ . Therefore,  $\Phi \in \mathcal{D}(\log \Delta_{\Omega; a})$ , and we have

$$-\log \Delta'_a \Phi + \log \Delta_a \Phi = \log \Delta_{\Omega; a} \Phi. \quad (50)$$

Since  $\Phi \in \mathcal{D}(P)$ , therefore,

$$-i(\Phi, [P, \log \Delta'_a]\Phi) + i(\Phi, [P, \log \Delta_a]\Phi) = i(\Phi, [P, \log \Delta_{\Omega; a}]\Phi). \quad (51)$$

The expression on the right may be evaluated noting that by item 6) of Wiesbrock's theorem 3.1 applied to the half-sided modular inclusion  $\mathcal{M}(a) \subset \mathcal{M}(a+1)$ , we have  $(\Phi, \Delta_{\Omega; a}^{-it} P \Delta_{\Omega; a}^{it} \Phi) = e^{2\pi t} (\Phi, P\Phi)$ , and noting that  $\Phi \in \mathcal{D}(\log \Delta_{\Omega; a})$ . Therefore, Stone's theorem may be used when taking a derivative with respect to  $t$  at 0, which gives  $2\pi(\Phi, P\Phi)$ . Relation (49) thereby becomes

$$2\pi(\Phi, P\Phi) = -\partial S(a) + \partial \bar{S}(a) \geq -i(\Phi, [P, \log \Delta'_a]\Phi) + i(\Phi, [P, \log \Delta_a]\Phi) = 2\pi(\Phi, P\Phi). \quad (52)$$

The inequality in (52) that stems from the application of the inequalities of lemma 4.3 and the following remark 4.4 (where  $\liminf$  may be replaced by  $\lim$  by our assumption) to  $-\partial S(a)$  and  $\partial \bar{S}(a)$  must therefore be an equality. The same must therefore be true for the inequalities of lemma 4.3 and the following remark 4.4. This proves the proposition.  $\square$

## 5 Proof of the QNEC

We now show that, barring a further technical assumption, either one of the formulas (47) or (48) of the proposition 4.5 implies the QNEC fairly straightforwardly. In fact, we shall prove the ‘‘ant-formula’’ [21, 11] expressed by the following theorem. As we have already discussed in the introduction, the QNEC is an immediate corollary of the ant-formula.

**Theorem 5.1.** *Suppose that for some  $a \in \mathbb{R}$ ,  $\partial S(a)$  or  $\partial \bar{S}(a)$  exists,  $\Phi \in \mathcal{D}(\log \Delta_a) \cap \mathcal{D}(\log \Delta'_a)$ , and that either  $u_s \Phi \in \mathcal{D}(P)$  or  $u'_s \Phi \in \mathcal{D}(P)$  for  $s \in (-\infty, s_0)$  and some  $s_0$ , where  $u_s = (D\omega : D\varphi)_s$  are the Connes-cocycles associated with  $\mathcal{M}(a)$  and  $\Phi, \Omega$ , and likewise  $u'_s = (D\omega' : D\varphi')_s$  for  $\mathcal{M}(a)'$ . Then we have*

$$\partial \bar{S}(a) = 2\pi \inf_{u \in \mathcal{M}(a)} (u\Phi, Pu\Phi), \quad (53)$$

*in the first case, while*

$$-\partial S(a) = 2\pi \inf_{u' \in \mathcal{M}(a)'} (u'\Phi, Pu'\Phi) \quad (54)$$

*in the second case. The infima are over isometries  $u, u'$  in the respective commutant algebras, and as before, we use the definitions  $S(a) = S(\Phi \| \Omega)_{\mathcal{M}(a)}$  and  $\bar{S}(a) = S(\Phi \| \Omega)_{\mathcal{M}(a)'}$ .*

*Remark 5.2.* The assumptions of our theorem,  $\Phi \in \mathcal{D}(\log \Delta_a) \cap \mathcal{D}(\log \Delta'_a)$ ,  $u_s \Phi \in \mathcal{D}(P)$  or  $u'_s \Phi \in \mathcal{D}(P)$ , are stronger than those by [11], who only ask that  $(\Phi, P\Phi), S(a), \bar{S}(a) < \infty$ . It is unclear to us whether the explicit formulas of proposition 4.5 would apply under their assumptions. Our view is that the precise regularity assumptions are more a question of taste, since for example, for physical reasons, one would at any rate like to have, e.g., a finite variance of  $P$  in the state  $\Phi$ , i.e.,  $\Phi \in \mathcal{D}(P)$ , etc. A wide class of ‘‘smooth’’ states satisfying our assumptions is described in proposition A.2.

**Proof.** We assume for definiteness that  $u_s\Phi \in \mathcal{D}(P)$  for  $s \in (-\infty, s_0)$  and prove (53). The other case is treated in a completely analogous manner, suitably exchanging  $\mathcal{M}(a)$  with  $\mathcal{M}(a)'$  and  $S$  with  $\bar{S}$ . First, the sum rule (28) and the monotonicity of the relative entropy imply

$$2\pi(\Phi, P\Phi) = \partial\bar{S}(a) - \partial S(a) \geq \partial\bar{S}(a). \quad (55)$$

But then, the invariance (17) of the relative entropy also implies

$$2\pi \inf_{u \in \mathcal{M}(a)} (u\Phi, Pu\Phi) \geq \partial\bar{S}(a). \quad (56)$$

(To be precise, we first know that this is the case for the right derivative  $\partial^+$ ; but since we assume that  $\partial S(a)$  exists, this makes no difference.) Thus, we must display a sequence  $u_n \in \mathcal{M}(a)'$  of isometries such that equality is attained in this bound as  $n \rightarrow \infty$ . Following [11], we shall show that  $u_n := u_{s_n}$  for a sequence  $s_n \rightarrow -\infty$  does the job. We will see that this follows straightforwardly from (48) in proposition 4.5.

For ease of notation, we shall put  $a = 0$  from now on. This is no loss of generality since  $(\mathcal{M}(a) \subset \mathcal{M}(a+1), \Omega)$  is a half-sided modular inclusion with the same  $P$ . Proposition 4.5 may be applied to  $u_s\Phi$ , because  $u_s\Phi \in \mathcal{D}(P)$  by assumption and because of the following lemma:

**Lemma 5.3.** *We have  $u_s\Phi \in \mathcal{D}(\log \Delta_{u_s\Phi, \Omega}) \cap \mathcal{D}(\log \Delta'_{u_s\Phi, \Omega})$  under the assumptions of the theorem (5.1).*

**Proof.** a) By covariance (9) of the relative modular operator,

$$\frac{1}{t}(\Delta_{u_s\Phi, \Omega}^{it} - 1)u_s\Phi = u_s \frac{1}{t}(\Delta_{\Phi, \Omega}^{it} - 1)\Phi, \quad (57)$$

so the limit  $t \rightarrow 0$  exists in the strong sense since we assume that  $\Phi \in \mathcal{D}(\log \Delta_{\Phi, \Omega})$ . Consequently,  $u_s\Phi \in \mathcal{D}(\log \Delta_{u_s\Phi, \Omega})$  by Stone's theorem.

b) Again by the covariance of the modular operator, the formula  $\Delta'_{\Phi, \Omega} = \Delta_{\Omega, \Phi}^{-1}$  and the first form of  $u_s$  in (63),

$$\frac{1}{t}(\Delta_{u_s\Phi, \Omega}^{it} - 1)u_s\Phi = \frac{1}{t}(\Delta_{\Phi, \Omega}^{it} - 1)\Delta_{\Omega, \Phi}^{is}\Phi = \Delta_{\Phi, \Omega}^{-is} \frac{1}{t}(\Delta_{\Phi, \Omega}^{it} - 1)\Phi, \quad (58)$$

so the limit  $t \rightarrow 0$  exists in the strong sense since we are assuming that  $\Phi \in \mathcal{D}(\log \Delta'_{\Phi, \Omega})$ . Consequently,  $u_s\Phi \in \mathcal{D}(\log \Delta'_{u_s\Phi, \Omega})$  by Stone's theorem.  $\square$

Now, applying (48) in proposition 4.5 and (56) to  $u_s\Phi$ , we have

$$0 \leq 2\pi(u_s\Phi, Pu_s\Phi) - \partial\bar{S}(\Phi\|\Omega) = (u_s\Phi, \{2\pi P - i[P, \log \Delta_{u_s\Phi, \Omega}]\}u_s\Phi). \quad (59)$$

**Lemma 5.4.** *Under the assumptions of the theorem (5.1), we have*

$$(u_s\Phi, \{2\pi P - i[P, \log \Delta_{u_s\Phi, \Omega}]\}u_s\Phi) = e^{2\pi s} (\Phi, \{2\pi P - i[P, \log \Delta_{\Phi, \Omega}]\}\Phi) \geq 0. \quad (60)$$

**End of proof of theorem 5.1.** Taking  $s \rightarrow -\infty$  in (59) and using (60) gives

$$0 = \lim_{s \rightarrow -\infty} 2\pi(u_s\Phi, Pu_s\Phi) - \partial\bar{S}(\Phi\|\Omega). \quad (61)$$

This equation shows that the infimum in (56) is achieved by the sequence  $u_n = u_{s_n}$  provided that  $s_n \rightarrow -\infty$ , and that it precisely saturates (56).  $\square$

We remark that combining 48 and lemma 5.4, we obtain one of the key technical results by [11, Lem. 2].

**Proof of Lemma 5.4.** At first, for simplicity, we assume that  $\Phi$  is cyclic and separating for  $\mathcal{M}$ . We study the family of bounded operators depending on  $t, a \in \mathbb{R}$ , defined by

$$g(t, a) = U(a)\Delta_{\Phi, \Omega}^{-it}U(-ae^{-2\pi t})\Delta_{\Phi, \Omega}^{it}, \quad (62)$$

and considered also by [11] and by [13] for  $\Phi = \Omega$ . Each  $g(t, a)$  is a unitary which, as we shall now show, commutes with any  $m' \in \mathcal{M}'$  as long as  $a \geq 0$ , hence  $g(t, a) \in \mathcal{M}$  by the double commutant theorem. To see this, we note that  $\Delta_{\Phi, \Omega}^{it}m'\Delta_{\Phi, \Omega}^{-it} = \Delta_{\Omega}^{it}m'\Delta_{\Omega}^{-it}$  by (10), (11). Furthermore, for any  $b \geq 0$ , we have  $U(-b)\mathcal{M}'U(b) \subset \mathcal{M}'$  by the properties of half-sided modular inclusions. The statement  $[m', g(t, a)] = 0$  for  $a \geq 0$  then follows from the commutation relations between  $U(b), \Delta_{\Omega}^{it}$  for half-sided modular inclusions.

Now, let  $g_s(t, a)$  be defined as  $g(t, a)$ , but replacing  $\Phi$  by  $u_s\Phi$ , so  $g_s(t, a)$  is still a unitary of  $\mathcal{M}$  for  $a \geq 0$ . Using the first of the equivalent forms

$$u_s = \Delta_{\Omega, \Phi}^{is}\Delta_{\Phi}^{-is} = \Delta_{\Omega}^{is}\Delta_{\Phi, \Omega}^{-is}, \quad (63)$$

together with  $\Delta_{\Phi}^{-is}\Phi = \Phi$ , and

$$\Delta_{\Omega, \Phi}^{-is}g_s(t, a)\Delta_{\Omega, \Phi}^{is} = \Delta_{\Omega}^{-is}g_s(t, a)\Delta_{\Omega}^{is} \quad (64)$$

since  $g_s(t, a) \in \mathcal{M}$ , we arrive at

$$(u_s\Phi, g_s(t, a)u_s\Phi) = (\Phi, \Delta_{\Omega}^{-is}g_s(t, a)\Delta_{\Omega}^{is}\Phi). \quad (65)$$

We next use  $\Delta_{u_s\Phi, \Omega}^{it} = u_s\Delta_{\Phi, \Omega}^{it}u_s^*$  from covariance and then, using the second form in (63),

$$\Delta_{u_s\Phi, \Omega}^{it} = \Delta_{\Omega}^{is}\Delta_{\Phi, \Omega}^{it}\Delta_{\Omega}^{-is}. \quad (66)$$

Applying this relation to  $g_s(t, a)$  and using the commutation relations for half-sided modular inclusions gives

$$\begin{aligned} \Delta_{\Omega}^{-is}g_s(t, a)\Delta_{\Omega}^{is} &= \Delta_{\Omega}^{-is}U(a)\Delta_{\Omega}^{is}\Delta_{\Phi, \Omega}^{-it}\Delta_{\Omega}^{-is}U(-ae^{-2\pi t})\Delta_{\Omega}^{is}\Delta_{\Phi, \Omega}^{it} \\ &= U(ae^{2\pi s})\Delta_{\Phi, \Omega}^{-it}U(-ae^{-2\pi(t-s)})\Delta_{\Phi, \Omega}^{it}. \end{aligned} \quad (67)$$

Inserting this relation into (65) gives

$$(u_s\Phi, U(a)\Delta_{u_s\Phi, \Omega}^{-it}U(-ae^{-2\pi t})\Delta_{u_s\Phi, \Omega}^{it}u_s\Phi) = (\Phi, U(ae^{2\pi s})\Delta_{\Phi, \Omega}^{-it}U(-ae^{-2\pi(t-s)})\Delta_{\Phi, \Omega}^{it}\Phi). \quad (68)$$

Now, the relation

$$Pu_s\Delta_{\Phi, \Omega}^{it}\Phi = e^{2\pi t}\Delta_{\Omega}^{it}Pu_{s-t}\Phi, \quad (69)$$

which is obtained using the second form in (63) and the commutation relations for half-sided modular inclusions, shows that  $\Delta_{u_s\Phi, \Omega}^{it}u_s\Phi = u_s\Delta_{\Phi, \Omega}^{it}\Phi$  is in the domain of  $P$  for all real  $s \in (-\infty, s_0)$  and sufficiently small  $|t|$  as  $u_s\Phi$  is for all  $s \in (-\infty, s_0)$ . Consequently, by Stone's theorem, we may take the right derivative of both sides of (68) with respect to  $a$  at  $a = 0$ , to obtain

$$(u_s\Phi, \{iP - ie^{-2\pi t}\Delta_{u_s\Phi, \Omega}^{-it}P\Delta_{u_s\Phi, \Omega}^{it}\}u_s\Phi) = e^{2\pi s}(\Phi, \{iP - ie^{-2\pi t}\Delta_{\Phi, \Omega}^{-it}P\Delta_{\Phi, \Omega}^{it}\}\Phi). \quad (70)$$

Finally, as  $u_s\Phi$  is in the domain of  $\log \Delta_{u_s\Phi, \Omega}$  for all  $s \in (-\infty, s_0)$ , we may take the derivative with respect to  $t$  at  $t = 0$  of both sides of the equation by Stone's theorem. This gives the statement of the lemma.

If  $\Phi$  is not cyclic or not separating, then straightforward modifications of the above formulas involving the so-called support projections  $s(\Phi) \in \mathcal{M}, s'(\Phi) \in \mathcal{M}'$  must be made when dealing with relative modular operators, conjugations, and flows. For details on such relations see e.g., [11, App. A]. These modifications do not change the argument significantly and are therefore not laid out in detail here.  $\square$

Our proof of theorem 5.1 yields the following corollary:

**Corollary 5.5.** *Under the assumptions of theorem 5.1, the infimum in (53) is attained by the sequence of Connes-cycles  $u_{s_n}$  and that in (54) by the sequence of Connes-cycles  $u'_{-s_n}$ , where  $s_n \rightarrow -\infty$ .*

*Remark 5.6.* The flowed states  $u_s\Phi$  respectively  $u'_{-s}\Phi$  have an interesting holographic interpretation [8].

## 6 Outlook

Our proof of the QNEC was mainly based on the expressions for  $\partial S(a)$  and  $\partial \bar{S}(a)$ , the relative-entropy-currents between  $\Phi$  and  $\Omega$  with respect to  $\mathcal{M}(a)$  respectively  $\mathcal{M}(a)'$ , given in proposition 4.5.

We may write these expressions as expectation values, e.g.,  $\partial S(a) = (\Phi, \Sigma_\Phi(a)\Phi)$ , where

$$\Sigma_\Phi(a) = i[P, \log \Delta'_a - \log \Delta'_{\Phi, a}]. \quad (71)$$

This operator is defined as a quadratic form on the domain  $\mathcal{D}$  in proposition 4.5. As such, it has a vanishing commutator with any sufficiently smooth element  $m' \in \mathcal{M}(a)'$ , e.g., elements of the form (74), which leave  $\mathcal{D}$  invariant. So in this sense,  $\Sigma_\Phi(a)$  is affiliated with  $\mathcal{M}(a)$ , although due to its unbounded nature, it is not an element of  $\mathcal{M}(a)$  in general.

In view of  $\partial S(a) = (\Phi, \Sigma_\Phi(a)\Phi)$ , we may perhaps think of  $\Sigma_\Phi$  as a relative-entropy-current operator. Adopting this interpretation, one may think of

$$\text{Var}[\partial S] = (\Phi, \Sigma_\Phi^2 \Phi) - (\Phi, \Sigma_\Phi \Phi)^2 \quad (72)$$

as the variance of the relative-entropy-current, or simply the variance of the QNEC. Of course, since  $\Sigma_\Phi(a)$  is only a quadratic form, this quantity may be infinite even if  $\Phi \in \mathcal{D}$ , although it is probably finite for the smooth vectors defined in proposition A.2.

Leaving this technical issue aside, our interpretation is supported by the fact that, for sufficiently smooth isometries  $u' \in \mathcal{M}(a)'$ , one has  $\Sigma_{u'\Phi}(a) = u'\Sigma_\Phi(a)u'^*$ , so this variance only depends on  $\varphi = (\Phi, \cdot \Phi)$  viewed as a state on  $\mathcal{M}(a)$ , and not on the particular vector representative. We think that it would be worth further investigating this variance in the context of quantum gravity.

In view of frequent applications in the context of the replica method, it would also be worth investigating the validity of the QNEC for the Rényi entropies of index  $n \in \mathbb{N}$ , see [17] for a heuristic proof in the case of free QFTs.

**Acknowledgements.** R.L. acknowledges the MIUR Excellence Department Project awarded to the Department of Mathematics, University of Rome Tor Vergata, CUP E83C23000330006. S.H. warmly thanks Edward Witten for exchanges regarding the QNEC.

**Data availability.** Data sharing not applicable to this article as no data sets were generated or analysed during the current study.

## Declarations

**Conflict of interest.** The authors have no relevant financial or non-financial interests to disclose.

## A Smooth vectors

**Proposition A.1.** *The vectors*

$$\Phi = \int_{\mathbb{R}^2} e^{-t^2/\lambda} f(a) \Delta_{\Omega}^{1/4+it} U(a) m'_0 \Omega \, dadt \quad (73)$$

where  $m'_0 \in \mathcal{M}(-1)'$ ,  $f \in C_0^\infty((-1,1))$ ,  $\lambda > 0$ , have the following properties:

1. They generate a dense subspace of  $\mathcal{H}$ .
2. There are  $m \in \mathcal{M}, m' \in \mathcal{M}'$  such that  $\Phi = m\Omega = m'\Omega$ .
3.  $\Phi \in \mathcal{D}(\Delta_{\Phi,\Omega}^{1/2}) \cap \mathcal{D}(\Delta_{\Phi,\Omega}^{1/2}) \cap \mathcal{D}(P^r)$  for any  $r \geq 0$ .
4.  $\Phi \in \mathcal{D}(|\log \Delta_{\Phi,\Omega}|^r) \cap \mathcal{D}(|\log \Delta'_{\Phi,\Omega}|^r)$  for any  $r \geq 0$ .

**Proof.** 1) Density follows from the fact that  $\mathcal{M}(-1)'\Omega$  is dense together with standard arguments considering a sequence  $e^{-t^2/\lambda_n} f_n(a)$  that converges suitably to the delta distribution  $\delta(t)\delta(a)$ .

2) Shifting the integration contour,  $\Phi$  has the alternative representations  $\Phi = m\Omega = m'\Omega$  where

$$m = \int_{\mathbb{R}^2} e^{-(t-i/4)^2/\lambda} f(a) \Delta_{\Omega}^{it} U(-a) m_0 U(a) \Delta_{\Omega}^{-it} \, dadt, \quad (74)$$

$$m' = \int_{\mathbb{R}^2} e^{-(t+i/4)^2/\lambda} f(a) \Delta_{\Omega}^{it} U(a) m'_0 U(-a) \Delta_{\Omega}^{-it} \, dadt, \quad (75)$$

where  $m_0 = J_{\Omega} m'_0 J_{\Omega} \in \mathcal{M}(1)$ .

3) By 2), in particular  $\Phi \in \mathcal{D}(\Delta_{\Phi,\Omega}^{1/2}) \cap \mathcal{D}(\Delta_{\Phi,\Omega}^{1/2})$ . Furthermore, using the representation (74), the relations for half-sided modular inclusions, and performing an integration by parts, we find that

$$[-iP, \cdot]^r(m) = \int_{\mathbb{R}^2} e^{-2\pi tr - (t-i/4)^2/\lambda} \partial^r f(a) \Delta_{\Omega}^{it} U(-a) m_0 U(a) \Delta_{\Omega}^{-it} \, dadt \in \mathcal{M} \quad (76)$$

( $r \geq 0$  integer), hence by  $P\Omega = 0$ , we get  $\Phi = m\Omega \in \mathcal{D}(P^r)$  for any  $r \geq 0$ .

4) Since obviously we have  $\Phi \in \mathcal{D}(\Delta_{\Phi,\Omega}^{-1/2}) \cap \mathcal{D}(\Delta_{\Phi,\Omega}^{-1/2})$  in view of (8), the spectral calculus and 3) give the claim.  $\square$

Let  $h_0 = h_0^* \in \mathcal{M}(1)$  and consider  $h$  defined as in (74), so obviously  $h = h^*$ . Consider now the vector  $\Psi := \Omega^h$  defined by the strongly convergent Araki perturbation series [1],

$$\Omega^h = \sum_{n=0}^{\infty} \int_0^{1/2} ds_1 \int_0^{s_1} ds_2 \cdots \int_0^{s_{n-1}} ds_n \Delta_{\Omega}^{s_n} h \Delta_{\Omega}^{s_{n-1}-s_n} h \cdots \Delta_{\Omega}^{s_1-s_2} h \Omega. \quad (77)$$

Then  $\Psi \in \mathcal{P}_{\Omega}^{\sharp}$ , the natural cone [18, Lem. 12.4]. Let  $\omega = (\Omega, \cdot \Omega), \psi = (\Psi, \cdot \Psi)$  be the corresponding functionals on  $\mathcal{M}$ , and  $u_s = (D\omega : D\psi)_t$  the Connes-cocycle. Then we have

$$u_t = \text{T exp} \left[ i \int_0^t h(s) ds \right], \quad (78)$$

where ‘‘T exp’’ denotes the ‘‘time-ordered exponential’’ obtained by ordering the integration parameters as in (77), and  $h(s) := \sigma_{\Omega}^s(h) = \Delta_{\Omega}^{is} h \Delta_{\Omega}^{-is}$ .

**Proposition A.2.** *Let  $h = h^* \in \mathcal{M}$  be defined as in (74) with  $m \rightarrow h, m_0 \rightarrow h_0$ , for some  $h_0 = h_0^* \in \mathcal{M}(1)$ , and define  $\Psi := \Omega^h \in \mathcal{H}$  [see (77)]. Then:*

1.  $u_s, s \in \mathbb{R}$  has an analytic continuation to an entire function  $\mathbb{C} \ni z \mapsto u_z \in \mathcal{M}$ .
2.  $u_s \Psi \in \mathcal{D}(P^r)$  for any  $r \geq 0, s \in \mathbb{R}$ .
3.  $\Psi \in \mathcal{D}(\Delta_{\Psi, \Omega}^{1/2}) \cap \mathcal{D}(\Delta_{\Psi, \Omega}^{1/2})$ .
4.  $\Psi \in \mathcal{D}(\log^r \Delta_{\Psi, \Omega}) \cap \mathcal{D}(\log^r \Delta'_{\Psi, \Omega})$  for any  $r \geq 0$ .
5. There exist  $m, n \in \mathcal{M}, m', n' \in \mathcal{M}'$  such that  $\Psi = m\Omega = m'\Omega, \Omega = n\Psi = n'\Psi$ .
6. Let  $\psi^{(t)} = (\Psi, \cdot \Psi), \omega^{(t)} = (\Omega, \cdot \Omega)$  as functionals on  $\mathcal{M}$ , respectively  $\mathcal{M}'$ . Then there exists  $c > 0$  such that  $c\psi^{(t)} \leq \omega^{(t)} \leq c^{-1}\psi^{(t)}$ .

**Proof.** 1) First we define an analytic continuation  $h(z)$  of  $h(s) = \Delta_{\Omega}^{is} h \Delta_{\Omega}^{-is}$  by

$$h(z) := \int_{\mathbb{R}^2} e^{-(t-z-i/4)^2/\lambda} f(a) \Delta_{\Omega}^{it} U(-a) h_0 U(a) \Delta_{\Omega}^{-it} da dt \quad (79)$$

which is obviously still in  $\mathcal{M}$  for all  $z \in \mathbb{C}$ , and by (74) reduces to  $h(s)$  for  $s \in \mathbb{R}$ . Pulling the operator norm inside the integral, we can estimate

$$\|h(z)\| \leq \sqrt{\pi\lambda} \|h_0\| \|f\|_{\infty} e^{\Im z(\Im z - 1/2)/\lambda}. \quad (80)$$

By (78), the desired analytic continuation of  $u_s$  is given by

$$u_z = \text{T exp} \left[ i \int_0^z h(w) dw \right], \quad (81)$$

where the integration contour is e.g., a straight path from 0 to  $\Re z$  followed by a straight path from  $\Re z$  to  $z$ . In fact, the series (81) defining  $u_z$  converges absolutely in operator norm. A concrete bound is given by

$$\begin{aligned} \|u_z\| &= \left\| \text{T exp} \left( i \int_{\Re z}^z h(w) dw \right) u_{\Re z} \right\| \\ &\leq \sum_{n=0}^{\infty} \frac{|\Im z|^n}{n!} \left( \sqrt{\pi\lambda} \|h_0\| \|f\|_{\infty} e^{\Im z(\Im z - 1/2)/\lambda} \right)^n \\ &= \exp \left( |\Im z| \sqrt{\pi\lambda} \|h_0\| \|f\|_{\infty} e^{\Im z(\Im z - 1/2)/\lambda} \right) < \infty. \end{aligned} \quad (82)$$

We have  $u_z \in \mathcal{M}$  because  $[u_z, m'] = 0$  for  $\Im z = 0$ , and this remains zero for arbitrary  $z$ , since  $u_z$  is an analytic function taking values in  $B(\mathcal{H})$ . Thus,  $u_z \in \mathcal{M}$  by the double commutant theorem.

2) Since  $\Psi$  is in the natural cone, we have [4, App. C]  $J'_{\Omega, \Psi} = J_{\Omega} = J_{\Psi}$ , and the formula  $u_s^{-1} = \Delta_{\Psi}^{is} \Delta_{\Psi, \Omega}^{is}$  gives

$$\Psi = u_{-i/2}^{-1} \Omega = \bar{\text{T}} \exp \left[ \int_0^{1/2} h(-is) ds \right] \Omega, \quad (83)$$

where  $\bar{\text{T}}$  is the anti-time ordered product corresponding to the reverse ordering of the integration parameters compared to  $\text{T}$ . By Duhamel's formula,

$$[-iP, u_{-i/2}^{-1}] = \int_0^{1/2} \bar{\text{T}} \exp \left[ \int_0^s h(-is_1) ds_1 \right] [-iP, h(-is)] \bar{\text{T}} \exp \left[ \int_s^{1/2} h(-is_2) ds_2 \right] ds. \quad (84)$$

The commutator in the middle expression may be expressed in a similar way as (76) via (79), leading to

$$[-iP, h(-is)] = \int_{\mathbb{R}^2} e^{2\pi(t+is)-(t+is-i/4)^2/\lambda} \partial f(a) \Delta_{\Omega}^{it} U(-a) m_0 U(a) \Delta_{\Omega}^{-it} dadt \quad (85)$$

giving the bound

$$\| [P, h(-is)] \| \leq \sqrt{\pi\lambda} \|h_0\| \|\partial f\|_{\infty} e^{s(s+1/2)/\lambda} \quad (86)$$

for  $s \geq 0$ . Applying this bound in an estimation similar to (82) yields

$$\| [P, u_{-i/2}^{-1}] \| \leq c_1 \sqrt{\lambda} \|h_0\| \|\partial f\|_{\infty} e^{c_2/\lambda} \exp \left( c_1 \sqrt{\lambda} \|h_0\| \|f\|_{\infty} e^{c_2/\lambda} \right) < \infty, \quad (87)$$

for some constants  $c_1, c_2 > 0$ . In view of  $\Psi = u_{-i/2}^{-1} \Omega$  and  $P\Omega = 0$ , we get  $\Psi \in \mathcal{D}(P)$ . A completely analogous estimation yields the same bound for  $\| [P, u_s] \|$  for  $s \in \mathbb{R}$ , and thereby also  $u_s \Psi = u_s u_{-i/2}^{-1} \Omega \in \mathcal{D}(P)$ . By analyzing in the same way repeated commutators of  $u_s$  and  $u_{-i/2}^{-1}$  with  $P$  one obtains  $u_s \Psi = u_s u_{-i/2}^{-1} \Omega \in \mathcal{D}(P^r)$ , where the bound on the norm  $\|P^r u_s \Psi\|$  now depends on  $\|\partial^j f\|_{\infty}$  for  $0 \leq j \leq r$ .

3) We have, since  $\Psi$  is in the natural cone and  $u_{i/2}, u_{-i/2}^{-1}$  are in  $\mathcal{M}$ ,

$$\Delta_{\Psi, \Omega}^{1/2} \Psi = \Delta_{\Psi, \Omega}^{1/2} u_{-i/2}^{-1} \Omega = J_{\Omega} u_{-i/2}^{-1*} \Psi, \quad \Delta_{\Psi, \Omega}^{1/2} \Psi = \Delta_{\Omega, \Psi}^{-1/2} \Delta_{\Psi}^{1/2} \Psi = u_{-i/2} \Psi, \quad (88)$$

which gives the statement.

4) Same as 4) of proposition A.1.

5) We have  $\Psi = m\Omega$  with  $u_{-i/2}^{-1} \in \mathcal{M}$ . Since  $J_{\Omega} \Phi = \Phi$ ,  $J_{\Omega} \Omega = \Omega$ , we also have  $\Psi = m'\Omega$  where  $m' = J_{\Omega} m J_{\Omega} \in \mathcal{M}'$ . Likewise,  $\Omega = n\Psi$ , where  $n = \text{T} \exp \left[ - \int_0^{1/2} h(-is) ds \right] \in \mathcal{M}$ , and  $\Omega = n'\Psi$ , where  $n' = J_{\Omega} n J_{\Omega} \in \mathcal{M}'$ .

6) Follows from 5) by standard results on von Neumann algebras.  $\square$

## References

- [1] H. ARAKI, *Expansionals in Banach algebras*, Ann. Sci. Ecole Norm. Sup. 6 , 67 (1973)
- [2] H. ARAKI, *Relative entropy of states of von Neumann algebras*, Publ. RIMS Kyoto Univ. 11, 809–833 (1976)
- [3] H. ARAKI, *Relative entropy of states of von Neumann algebras. II*, Publ. RIMS Kyoto Univ. 13, 173–192 (1977)
- [4] H. ARAKI AND T. MASUDA, *Positive Cones and  $L_p$ -Spaces for von Neumann Algebras*, Publ. RIMS Kyoto Univ. 18, 339–411 (1982)
- [5] H. ARAKI AND L. ZSIDO, *Extension of the structure theorem of Borchers and its application to half-sided modular inclusions*, Rev. Math. Phys. 17, 491–543 (2005)
- [6] H. J. BORCHERS, *The CPT-theorem in two-dimensional theories of local observables*, Comm. Math. Phys. 143, 315–332 (1992)
- [7] H. J. BORCHERS, *Half-sided modular inclusions and the construction of the Poincaré group*, Comm. Math. Phys. 179 , 703–723 (1996)
- [8] R. BOUSSO, V. CHANDRASEKARAN, P. RATH AND A. SHAHBAZI-MOGHADDAM, *Gravity dual of Connes cocycle flow*, Phys. Rev. D 102, 066008 (2020)
- [9] R. BOUSSO, Z. FISHER, J. KOELLER, S. LEICHENAUER AND A. C. WALL, *Proof of the Quantum Null Energy Condition*, Phys. Rev. D 93, 024017 (2016)
- [10] R. BOUSSO, Z. FISHER, S. LEICHENAUER AND A. C. WALL, *Quantum focusing conjecture*, Phys. Rev. D 93, 064044 (2016)
- [11] F. CEYHAN AND T. FAULKNER, *Recovering the QNEC from the ANEC*, Commun. Math. Phys. 377, no.2, 999–1045 (2020)
- [12] A. CONNES, *Une classification des facteurs de type III*, Ann. Sci. de l'École Normale Supérieure, 6. No. 2. (1973)
- [13] M. FLORIG, *On Borchers' Theorem*, Lett. Math. Phys. 46, 289–293 (1998)
- [14] U. HAAGERUP AND C. WINSLOW, *The Effros-Marechal topology in the space of von Neumann algebras*, American J. of Math. 120, N. 3, 567–617, (1998).
- [15] S. HOLLANDS AND R. LONGO, *Bekenstein Bound for Approximately Local Charged States*, arXiv:2501.03849
- [16] S. HOLLANDS, R. M. WALD AND V. G. ZHANG, *Entropy of dynamical black holes*, Phys. Rev. D 110, no.2, 024070 (2024)
- [17] M. MOOSA, P. RATH AND V. P. SU, *A Rényi quantum null energy condition: proof for free field theories*, JHEP 01, 064 (2021)
- [18] M. OHYA AND D. PETZ, *Quantum entropy and its use*, Springer (1993)

- [19] M. H. STONE, *On unbounded operators in Hilbert space*, J. Indian Math. Soc. 15, 155–192 (1951)
- [20] A. UHLMANN, *Relative entropy and the Wigner-Yanase-Dyson-Lieb concavity in an interpolation theory*, Commun. Math. Phys. 54, 21-32 (1977)
- [21] A. C. WALL, *Lower Bound on the Energy Density in Classical and Quantum Field Theories*, Phys. Rev. Lett. 118, 151601 (2017)
- [22] H.-W. WIESBROCK, *Half-sided modular inclusions of von Neumann algebras*, Comm. Math. Phys. 157, 83–92 (1993) [erratum: Comm. Math. Phys. 184, 683–685 (1997)]