

Comparison of area spectra in loop quantum gravity

G. Gour and V. Suneeta
*Theoretical Physics Institute,
Department of Physics, University of Alberta,
Edmonton, Canada T6G 2J1*

We compare two area spectra proposed in loop quantum gravity in different approaches to compute the entropy of the Schwarzschild black hole. We describe the black hole in general microcanonical and canonical area ensembles for these spectra. We show that in the canonical ensemble, the results for all statistical quantities for any spectrum can be reproduced by a heuristic picture of Bekenstein up to second order. For one of these spectra - the equally-spaced spectrum - in light of a proposed connection of the black hole area spectrum to the quasinormal mode spectrum and following hep-th/0304135, we present explicit calculations to argue that this spectrum is completely consistent with this connection. This follows without requiring a change in the gauge group of the spin degrees of freedom in this formalism from $SU(2)$ to $SO(3)$. We also show that independent of the area spectrum, the degeneracy of the area observable is bounded by $CA \exp(A/4)$, where A is measured in Planck units and C is a constant of order unity.

PACS numbers: PACS numbers:

I. INTRODUCTION

In recent years, the question of microscopic origin of black hole entropy has been addressed in the framework of canonical quantum gravity [1, 2]. A crucial feature of this framework is the fact that operators corresponding to lengths, areas and volume have discrete spectra [3]. A basis for the Hilbert space of canonical quantum gravity is given in terms of graphs whose edges carry representations of the group $SU(2)$. These are known as spin networks as the representations are labeled by positive half-integers j . Each such edge of a spin network contributes an area $A(j)$ to a surface it intersects, where

$$A(j) = 8\pi l_P^2 \gamma \sqrt{j(j+1)}. \quad (1)$$

The area of a surface A_S is a sum over contributions from all the spin network edges intersecting it. Thus, if there are N intersections of the surface where each intersecting edge carries spin j_N ,

$$A_S = 8\pi l_P^2 \gamma \sum \sqrt{j_N(j_N+1)}. \quad (2)$$

This spectrum (2), which we shall refer to subsequently as the LQG (Loop Quantum Gravity) spectrum, has been used in [1] to obtain the entropy of a large Schwarzschild black hole. However, the idea of a discrete area spectrum describing the entropy of a black hole is not new. The description of black hole entropy using an *equally spaced* area spectrum has been extensively discussed in the past beginning with heuristic arguments [4, 5, 6]. More recently (and more rigorously), this spectrum has received support from an algebraic approach to black hole quantization [7, 8, 9], the reduced phase space approach initiated in [10, 11, 12], and from a WKB treatment [13]. [34] More recently, a semiclassical description of the Schwarzschild black hole as a coherent state in LQG has

been proposed by Dasgupta [14]; in this description, the area spectrum relevant for black hole entropy is

$$A_S = 8\pi l_P^2 \gamma \sum (j_N + 1/2). \quad (3)$$

We refer to this area spectrum (3) as the ES (Equally Spaced) area spectrum (this term is used sometimes in literature for a spectrum without the $1/2$ in the equation (3)). There seem to be objections to this spectrum in a set of papers by Corichi and others [15, 16]. These objections refer to a situation in which the above spectrum is obtained as the eigenspectrum of an area operator in LQG. One of the main objections then has to do with the fact that this spectrum predicts a non-zero value for the area quanta for spin $j = 0$. However, in LQG, adding a spin $j = 0$ should not change physics. We wish to emphasize here that in [14] the ES spectrum is the spectrum of the area of the *black hole horizon* as measured on a coherent or semiclassical state that describes the black hole in LQG. Thus, here spin $j = 0$ only describes a peaking around the classical area value. Since this spectrum does not arise out of eigenvalues of an operator acting on an *exact eigenstate*, it is not contradictory to the arguments in [15, 16] which pertain to a proposal in [17]. In [17], Eq. (3) is claimed as the correct area spectrum in canonical quantum gravity including quantum corrections.

One can consider a general area spectrum (which we refer to later as the GA spectrum) of the form [35]

$$A_S = 8\pi l_P^2 \gamma \sum a(j_N), \quad (4)$$

where $a(j_N)$ is some general function of the spins j_N .

In this paper, we analyze the consequences of using various area spectra to describe black hole entropy. In particular, working in the microcanonical ensemble, we show that for the ES area spectrum, the leading order contribution to the entropy comes from a configuration

where nearly all the spins have the value $j = 1$. This has been stated before in a canonical ensemble language in [17, 19].

This is very interesting in light of a proposed connection between the asymptotic quasinormal mode spectrum and area spectra in canonical gravity by Dreyer [20]. We show that applying the argument in [20] carefully to the ES spectrum (3) leads to the correct value of semi-classical entropy *without* the need to change the gauge group from $SU(2)$ to $SO(3)$. This provides an alternative way of making a connection between quasinormal mode and area spectra. This argument for the ES spectrum was outlined by Polychronakos [19]. Here we provide further motivations and explicit calculations for this argument. There are other ideas that in the context of the LQG spectrum do not require a change of gauge group from $SU(2)$ to $SO(3)$ for making contact with the QNM spectra [21, 22]. However, as opposed to the explicit computations here, they are interesting, but heuristic and not by themselves conclusive.

We study the canonical ensembles for these area spectra. The canonical ensemble in the statistical sense cannot be defined here because there is no natural notion of a heat bath. However, what we mean by the term is allowing for fluctuations in the black hole area such that the average of the area is fixed - then the canonical ensemble maximizes the entropy. From this ensemble, we infer that the degeneracy of the area observable, $g(A)$, is bounded by $CA \exp(A/4)$ for *any* area spectrum. The most probable configuration of spins describing a non-Planckian black hole in the ensemble picture is made up of nearly all equal spins with value $j = 1/2$ for the LQG spectrum and $j = 1$ for the ES spectrum. Further, we show that in any process leading to a change in area such that one is still in the non-Planckian regime, mostly the number of spins with $j = 1/2$ for the LQG spectrum and $j = 1$ for the ES spectrum changes - at leading order in area. Thus a process leading to a net change in horizon area can be thought of as occurring due to emission or absorption of spins of mostly *one* value.

We show that the canonical ensemble in LQG can be compared with the algebraic approach initiated by Bekenstein [7, 8, 9] up to second order (in entropy) because the spins other than the most probable one contribute only at higher orders. This is also the reason why both in LQG [32] and using the algebraic approach [9], one obtains the same quantum logarithmic correction $-3/2 \ln A$. One can simulate all the statistical results in LQG within the algebraic approach. i.e. the algebraic approach is a very good approximation (up to second order) for statistical calculations in LQG. The importance of this argument is manifested for example when one considers a Schwarzschild BH in a box or equivalently in an AdS spacetime. The statistical calculations such as the entropy, area fluctuations etc have been calculated in [33], where the area spectrum and degeneracy of the algebraic approach are used. Within the spin network approach, when the black hole is in a box (or an AdS

spacetime), such calculations are extremely complicated and have not been done to the best of our knowledge. However, our argument shows that all the calculations performed in [33] for the Schwarzschild black holes are the same (up to second order in entropy) as the ones in the spin network approach of LQG.

II. BLACK HOLE ENTROPY IN THE MICROCANONICAL ENSEMBLE

In computations of black hole entropy in canonical gravity, it is natural to count microscopic states corresponding to a classical horizon area. Thus, this is like a microcanonical ensemble where the *horizon area* is fixed. The microscopic states are the spin network states that intersect the horizon surface. Each spin j that intersects the surface has an internal degeneracy that for large area black holes is $(2j + 1)$. However, arbitrary spins are not allowed - given a general area spectrum, the spins must satisfy (4). This is the constraint of fixed area and one counts over all spin network states corresponding to a given classical horizon area. Thus, the degeneracy of states corresponding to a given area A , denoted by $g(A)$ is a sum over contributions $g(\{j_N\})$

$$g(\{j_N\}) \approx \prod_{\{j_N\}} (2j_N + 1) \quad (5)$$

and each set $\{j_N\}$ satisfies the area constraint (4). The exact expression for the degeneracy corresponding to a set of spins is given by the dimension of the space of conformal blocks of an $SU(2)_k$ WZW conformal field theory, see for e.g [32]. In this theory, for large area, this is approximately equal to (5) above. For a general area spectrum, the degeneracy $g(A) = \sum_{\{j_N\}} g(\{j_N\})$.

This ensemble must be carefully defined for the LQG spectrum (2). In general, when we try to define a microcanonical area ensemble - i.e counting the quantum states corresponding to a given classical area - we need to define an appropriate spread around the area since the area spectrum is discrete. The constraint (2) would be satisfied in general only for some choices of spin network configurations. This may cause the entropy to change sharply as one goes from one classical area to another. For example, choosing a (large) value of A such that it is saturated by N spins of $j = 1/2$, we see that $N \sim A/l_p^2$ and $S = \ln g(A) \sim A$. On the other hand, one could choose a large A with a value such that it cannot be saturated by spins with $j = 1/2$. In this case, the entropy could be different - either proportional to area with a different proportionality constant, or not even proportional to the area. However, for this area spectrum to describe black hole entropy, one must get an entropy proportional to area with a fixed proportionality constant. The solution is to choose a spread large enough so that it contains a value of the area that is saturated by spins of $j = 1/2$. At first sight, this appears contrived. But due to the special properties of this spectrum [31], there is a very large

number of states lying even in a Planckian size spread in area, as long as the area is large. In fact, for a large horizon area A_H , the number of area eigenvalues in the range $A_H \pm l_P^2$ is of the order of $\exp(\sqrt{A_H}/l_P)$ (The number of area eigenvalues is not to be confused with the number of configurations corresponding to a fixed classical area, which gives the main contribution to the entropy).

Therefore, in [1] where the Schwarzschild black hole entropy is computed using the LQG spectrum, it is argued that one must ‘trace over’ states lying in an area range $A \pm l_P^2$. The counting of states corresponding to this spread is done there - the final result is that the contribution from spins with $j = 1/2$ gives an entropy proportional to area, and the rest of the spins give a lesser contribution each - however the sum is not evaluated explicitly. We work later in a canonical ensemble allowing not for Planckian, but arbitrary fluctuations keeping the average of area fixed, and obtain a *bound* on this sum. The sum of the contributions from other spins to the entropy is bounded by the logarithm of the area. This ‘logarithmic’ correction to the entropy which comes from the other spins and area fluctuations is distinct from the quantum corrections discussed in [32].

We now study the ES spectrum in this picture. From the form of the area constraint (3), we see that for a given classical area, we must choose an appropriate spread around the area such that we have an area value A in the spread for which $A/(8\pi\gamma l_P^2)$ is a half-integer Q . Nothing more is required, and there are now many possible sets of spins $\{j_N\}$ - corresponding to the number of partitions of $2Q$. We first consider the case when all spins corresponding to a particular realization of area are equal. In this case, the area constraint is

$$A = 8\pi\gamma l_P^2 N_j (j + 1/2) \quad (6)$$

where N_j is the number of spins of value j required to satisfy the area constraint. Then the degeneracy corresponding to each such set can be written as $g(\{j_N\}) = g(j, N_j)$ and

$$g(j, N_j) = (2j + 1)^{N_j} \quad (7)$$

For large areas, N_j is large (of $O(Q)$) when j is small. Thus the degeneracy is more for small spin values. We however see something surprising. Let us look at the degeneracies for the cases when all the spins have $j = 1/2$, $j = 1$ and $j = 3/2$. We have

$$\begin{aligned} g(1/2, N_{1/2}) &= 2^Q ; \quad g(1, N_1) = (3^{2/3})^Q \\ g(3/2, N_{3/2}) &= 2^Q \end{aligned} \quad (8)$$

Thus it is easy to see that the degeneracy is maximum when we saturate the area with $j = 1$, and furthermore, $j = 1/2$ and $j = 3/2$ have the same degeneracies. Higher spins will have smaller degeneracies. We have only considered the case of equal spins so far. However, it will be shown in the following that any combination of unequal spins yields a lesser contribution than the case with all spins $j = 1$ for large areas.

In the general case we have N_1 spins with $j = 1$ and N_{j_i} spins equal to j_i for each $i = 2, 3, \dots, s$. The area constraint can be written simply as

$$Q = \frac{3}{2}N_1 + \left(j_2 + \frac{1}{2}\right)N_{j_2} + \dots + \left(j_s + \frac{1}{2}\right)N_{j_s}, \quad (9)$$

and the degeneracy is

$$\begin{aligned} g &= 3^{N_1} (2j_2 + 1)^{N_{j_2}} \dots (2j_s + 1)^{N_{j_s}} \\ &= \left(3^{2/3}\right)^Q \left(\frac{2j_2 + 1}{3^{(2j_2+1)/3}}\right)^{N_{j_2}} \dots \left(\frac{2j_s + 1}{3^{(2j_s+1)/3}}\right)^{N_{j_s}} \end{aligned} \quad (10)$$

Now, for $j_i \neq 1$ it is easy to check that $(2j_i + 1)/3^{(2j_i+1)/3} < 1$, and therefore $g < (3^{2/3})^Q$. Since the degeneracy corresponding to all spins having $j = 1$ is $g(1, N_1) = (3^{2/3})^Q$, we see that any such combination of spins as above always yields a lesser degeneracy. Hence, for large area A , we can write the degeneracy as

$$g(A) \approx (3^{2/3})^Q, \quad (11)$$

and the entropy is

$$S = \ln g(A) = \frac{\ln 3}{12\pi\gamma l_P^2} A + \dots \quad (12)$$

Clearly, for large areas, the leading configuration contributing to the entropy will always be equal spins with $j = 1$. The above result for the entropy (the appearance of a factor of $\ln 3$) is also very striking in that the choice of an ES spectrum has naturally led to a dominance of configurations with spin $j = 1$. Recently, there has been much excitement over a possible connection between the asymptotic quasinormal mode spectrum of the black hole and the area spectrum. In [20] this connection is used to fix the value of the Immirzi parameter γ and it is shown that for the LQG spectrum it gives the correct semi-classical entropy. However, in [20], it is claimed that using the same argument, the ES spectrum would not yield the correct semi-classical entropy. We now proceed to show that this is not the case; applying the argument carefully, one indeed obtains the correct semiclassical entropy. There is the added advantage that with the ES spectrum, the factor of $\ln 3$ needed to make contact with quasinormal mode spectra appears naturally in the entropy - *without* the need to argue for a change of gauge group from $SU(2)$ to $SO(3)$ as required for the LQG spectrum. Both the observation that spins $j = 1$ dominate for the ES spectrum and that making a connection to the quasinormal mode spectrum yields the correct semi-classical entropy has been made before in a canonical ensemble picture in [17, 19]. We present explicit calculations that are necessary to motivate this argument. We apply the argument in [20] to a general area spectrum and then specialize to the case of the ES spectrum. First we revisit the argument which is motivated by the following result :

The reaction of a black hole to a perturbation is given for certain intermediate times by a set of damped oscillations which are characteristic of the black hole. These are the quasinormal modes (See [23, 24] for a review). It is an interesting result that for large imaginary part of the quasinormal frequency (higher order modes), the asymptotic quasinormal mode spectrum for a Schwarzschild black hole can be computed analytically [25, 26] for scalar or gravitational perturbations. It is

$$M\omega = \frac{1}{8\pi} \ln 3 + \frac{i}{4} \left(n - \frac{1}{2} \right) \quad (13)$$

This behavior was found approximately from numerical calculations first in [27] (for Kerr black holes, the highly damped QNMs are computed numerically in [28]) and it was recognized by Hod [29] that the numerical equation in [27] resembled (13). Hod then suggested (based on an argument of Bekenstein [30]) that in the spirit of Bohr's correspondence principle, an oscillatory frequency describing the black hole's (classical) response to a perturbation (i.e real part of the quasinormal frequency) was related to a transition frequency in an area spectrum describing a change in horizon area ΔA .

The exact relation was the following: The real part of the quasinormal mode spectrum (13) is given by

$$\omega_{QNM} = \frac{\ln 3}{8\pi M} \quad (14)$$

Then the change in mass of the black hole ΔM due to a transition is equal to $\hbar\omega_{QNM}$. Since for a Schwarzschild black hole, horizon area $A = 16\pi M^2$, this implies that

$$\Delta A = 4l_P^2 \ln 3 \quad (15)$$

In [20], the change in area ΔA is computed for the LQG spectrum and equated to (15); this fixes the value of the Immirzi parameter. This value gives the correct semi-classical entropy if one considers $SO(3)$ spins instead of $SU(2)$ spins. This conclusion is correct for the LQG spectrum. However, there is an important point to note when one considers a different area spectrum. In the framework of spin network degrees of freedom intersecting a surface, a change of area of the surface is caused by an emission or absorption of a puncture with spin. When this surface is the black hole horizon, we have already seen that the configuration (of set of punctures with spins) that dominates the entropy depends on the choice of spectrum. When the spectrum is such that this configuration is made up of equal spins j_{MP} (MP stands for Most Probable configuration), it is clear that the *minimum* change in horizon area ΔA would arise from the absorption or emission of a spin in the most probable configuration (We provide a proof of this statement in the canonical ensemble picture in the next section). Thus given a general area spectrum of the form (4),

$$\Delta A = 8\pi\gamma l_P^2 a_{j_{MP}} \quad (16)$$

For the LQG spectrum it is indeed correct that $j_{MP} = j_{min}$ where j_{min} is the minimum value of spin for the gauge group chosen, either $SU(2)$ or $SO(3)$. Then, as argued in [20], on fixing the value of the Immirzi parameter using the quasinormal mode spectrum, the correct semi-classical entropy is obtained by choosing a gauge group $SO(3)$. For the ES spectrum with a choice of gauge group $SU(2)$, as we saw, $j_{MP} = 1$ and $j_{min} = 1/2$.

Let us now fix the value of the Immirzi parameter for a general area spectrum of the form (4). We thus equate the r.h.s of (15) and (16). Then we get

$$\gamma_{GA} = \frac{\ln 3}{2\pi a_{j_{MP}}} \quad (17)$$

For the ES spectrum, $j_{MP} = 1$ and $a_{j_{MP}} = 3/2$. Thus for this spectrum,

$$\gamma_{ES} = \frac{\ln 3}{3\pi}. \quad (18)$$

Substituting this value of the Immirzi parameter into the expression for entropy with the ES spectrum (12), we see that we recover the correct expression for semi-classical entropy. In fact, for a general area spectrum with the Immirzi parameter (17), as long as its maximum entropic configuration is given in terms of equal spins j_{MP} - we have the correct semi-classical entropy if $j_{MP} = 1$. Dreyer's argument for replacing $SU(2)$ by $SO(3)$ as the gauge group is a particular case of this general statement.

III. BLACK HOLE ENTROPY IN THE CANONICAL ENSEMBLE

There are, in fact, *two* distinct (but not always separable) sources for black hole entropy. Firstly, there should be a contribution to the entropy due to the number of microstates that are necessary to describe a black hole of a fixed horizon area. Secondly, since in dynamical processes, a black hole absorbs or emits radiation/matter across the horizon, the horizon area will fluctuate. This leads to an additional contribution to the entropy.

It therefore is of interest to study the black hole in an area ensemble that allows for fluctuations in area such that the average of the area is a fixed 'classical' value - the term used to denote the situation when area fluctuations are caused by 'quantum processes' (i.e absorption or emission of spins). This is the canonical area ensemble - however unlike the usual canonical ensemble in statistical mechanics, there is no natural analogue of a heat bath here (There is such an analogue for black holes in *AdS* spacetimes, as discussed in [33]).

In a quantum description, black holes can be described by a density matrix, ρ_{bh} . In particular, in canonical gravity, the density matrix relevant for black hole entropy is obtained by tracing over the 'volume' states (the total Hilbert space carries information about both the bulk

and the surface degrees of freedom). The entropy of the black hole is given by

$$S = -\text{Tr} \rho_{bh} \ln \rho_{bh} \quad (19)$$

where ρ_{bh} is the density matrix describing a black hole with an average area

$$A_H = \text{Tr} \mathbf{A} \rho_{bh}, \quad (20)$$

where \mathbf{A} is the area operator whose eigenvalues give the area spectrum.

Our strategy is to find a density matrix that maximizes the entropy given in (19) and satisfies the condition (20). From a physical point of view, this is *not* the only requirement on the density matrix. In order to achieve thermal equilibrium one has to place the black hole in a ‘box’ (or, for example, in an AdS spacetime). This will induce more conditions, and in a first order approximation one expects a Gaussian distribution around the mean value A_H . That is, the introduction of the box imposes some particular value, Δ on the fluctuations of the area (which depends also on the parameters of the box):

$$\Delta^2 = \langle \mathbf{A}^2 \rangle - \langle \mathbf{A} \rangle^2 = \text{Tr} \mathbf{A}^2 \rho_{bh} - A_H^2 \quad (21)$$

Therefore, the density matrix, ρ_{bh} , that maximizes the entropy given in (19) and satisfies both conditions (20) and (21) is given by:

$$\rho_{bh} = \frac{1}{Z} \exp(\eta \mathbf{A} - \mu \mathbf{A}^2) \quad (22)$$

where η and μ are Lagrange multipliers and the partition function Z is determined by the requirement $\text{Tr} \rho_{bh} = 1$. However, as we stated earlier, there is no natural analogue of a physical heat bath here, and no mechanism by which fluctuations would be restricted as in (21).

In the computation of black hole entropy using the LQG spectrum [1], classically there is no radiation across the horizon. However, quantum fluctuations of the classical area $A \pm l_p^2$ are considered. In fact, they are necessary to get a result $S \sim A$. The physical picture is probably one where arbitrary area fluctuations are not allowed, but quantum fluctuations of the order of Planckian area, caused by spin emissions across the horizon are. This can be stated in the canonical ensemble picture as a condition of the form (21) where the fluctuation $\Delta \sim O(l_p)$. Thus, one must use the density matrix (22) where $\Delta \sim O(l_p)$ would correspond to a particular regime for the Lagrange multipliers η and μ . This unfortunately is a very complicated exercise for the LQG spectrum. We are forced to ignore (21) and allow arbitrary fluctuations keeping the area average fixed. Since we now place lesser constraints on the system, the entropy will be *more* - and will provide an *upper bound* on the actual entropy using the LQG spectrum with Planck area quantum fluctuations.

For arbitrary fluctuations keeping the area average fixed, the relevant density matrix ρ_m (for a general area

spectrum) is given according to standard statistical mechanics by

$$\rho_m = \frac{1}{Z} \exp(-\lambda \mathbf{A}), \quad (23)$$

where the Lagrange multiplier, λ will be calculated below, and

$$Z = \text{Tr} \exp(-\lambda \mathbf{A}). \quad (24)$$

Substituting ρ_m in (19) we find

$$S_m \equiv -\text{Tr} \rho_m \log \rho_m = \ln Z + \lambda A_H \quad (25)$$

(note that $A_H \equiv \langle \mathbf{A} \rangle = \text{Tr} \mathbf{A} \rho_m$).

Following [17, 19], we shall now compute the partition function in this spin network picture for a general area spectrum of the form (4). Then we shall specialize to the cases of the LQG and ES spectra. The partition function $Z(\lambda)$ is given by:

$$Z(\lambda) = \sum_{\{j_N\}} \prod_{j_i \in \{j_N\}} (2j_i + 1) \exp[-\lambda A(\{j_N\})], \quad (26)$$

where $A(\{j_N\})$ for the general case is given in (4) and the product term is approximately the degeneracy for the given set $\{j_N\}$ for large horizon area black holes (The exact expression for the degeneracy can be found in [32]). Let us now denote by m_i ($i = 1, 2, \dots$) the number of times the value $i/2$ appears in the set $\{j_N\}$. In this notation the area can be written as:

$$A(\{j_N\}) = 8\pi l_p^2 \gamma \sum_{i=1}^{\infty} m_i a_i, \quad (27)$$

where $a_i \equiv a(j = i/2)$. Thus, in this notation, the partition function has the form

$$Z(\lambda) = \sum_{\{m_i\}} \prod_{i=1}^{\infty} (i+1)^{m_i} \exp(-8\pi l_p^2 \gamma \lambda m_i a_i), \quad (28)$$

where the sum over all the sets $\{j_N\}$ has been replaced by the sum over all the sequences $\{m_i\}$ of integers.

The partition function above converges if and only if for all $i = 1, 2, \dots$ we have $(i+1) \exp(-8\pi l_p^2 \gamma \lambda a_i) < 1$. This condition imposes a lower bound on λ ; i.e. the partition function $Z(\lambda)$ converges if and only if $\lambda > \lambda_c$, where

$$\lambda_c \equiv \lambda_{i_c} \equiv \max\{\lambda_i\}, \quad (29)$$

and λ_i is defined by the requirement $(i+1) \exp(-8\pi l_p^2 \gamma \lambda_i a_i) = 1$, i.e.

$$\lambda_i = \frac{\ln(i+1)}{8\pi l_p^2 \gamma a_i} \quad (30)$$

Thus, for $\lambda > \lambda_c$

$$Z(\lambda) = \prod_{i=1}^{\infty} \frac{1}{1 - (i+1) \exp(-8\pi l_p^2 \gamma \lambda a_i)}. \quad (31)$$

For the LQG spectrum, $a_i = \sqrt{\frac{i}{2}(\frac{i}{2} + 1)}$, and $\lambda_c = \lambda_1$, i.e corresponding to a spin $j = 1/2$. In comparison, for the ES spectrum, $a_i = \frac{i+1}{2}$, and in this case $\lambda_c = \lambda_2$, corresponding to a spin $j = 1$.

The average of the area is given by

$$\begin{aligned} A_H &\equiv \text{Tr} \rho_m \mathbf{A} = -\frac{d}{d\lambda} \ln Z \\ &= 8\pi l_p^2 \gamma \sum_{i=1}^{\infty} \frac{(i+1) a_i \exp(-8\pi l_p^2 \gamma \lambda a_i)}{1 - (i+1) \exp(-8\pi l_p^2 \gamma \lambda a_i)}. \end{aligned} \quad (32)$$

Now, since we are interested in large black holes (compared to the Planck scale), $A_H/l_p^2 \gg 1$. However, in the above equation, the term in the numerator $(i+1) a_i \exp(-8\pi l_p^2 \gamma \lambda a_i)$ approaches zero very fast as i increases when $\lambda > \lambda_c$. Thus, the only way to get large A_H is by the requirement that one of the terms in the denominator in (32) be close to zero. Fortunately, this is possible when $\lambda \rightarrow \lambda_c = \lambda_{i_c}$. This picks up as the *leading* term in (32), the one corresponding to spins with value $i_c/2$. Therefore, the partition function for $A_H/l_p^2 \gg 1$ (or equivalently $\lambda \approx \lambda_c$) is given by:

$$Z(\lambda) \approx \frac{1}{1 - (i_c + 1) \exp(-8\pi l_p^2 \gamma \lambda a_{i_c})}. \quad (33)$$

In order to obtain the relation between A_H and λ , we substitute $\lambda = \lambda_c + \delta$ in Eq. (32) and expand it up to the second order in δ . We find that

$$A_H = \frac{1}{\delta} [1 + (c - 4\pi l_p^2 \gamma a_{i_c}) \delta + O(\delta^2)], \quad (34)$$

where the constant c is of the order of Planck area and is given by

$$c = \sum_{i \neq i_c} \frac{a_i (i+1) \exp(-8\pi l_p^2 \gamma \lambda_c a_i)}{1 - (i+1) \exp(-8\pi l_p^2 \gamma \lambda_c a_i)}. \quad (35)$$

Hence, the relation between A_H and λ is given by:

$$\lambda = \lambda_c + \frac{1}{A_H} + O(l_p^2/A_H^2). \quad (36)$$

Substituting this in (25) gives

$$S_m = \lambda_c A_H + \ln A_H + O(1) \quad (37)$$

This is an *upper* bound on the entropy of the black hole defined in (19) for a general area spectrum (4) in the spin network picture. In particular, this is also an upper bound for the entropy of a density matrix that satisfies the average area constraint (20) and has zero area fluctuations, i.e. the micro-canonical ensemble. Therefore, the degeneracy

$$g(A) \leq \exp(S_m) = C \frac{A_H}{l_p^2} \exp\left(\frac{A_H}{4l_p^2}\right), \quad (38)$$

where C is a constant of order unity. Before seeing the consequences for the LQG and ES spectra in particular, we note something very interesting that is revealed by working in the canonical ensemble. We saw that for any general area spectrum (4), the large area limit for the black hole is dominated by the configuration of equal spins with values $i_c/2$. In the large area regime, λ is given by (36). Now, if in a process, the horizon area changes, as long as it is in the large area regime, it would always be dominated (at *leading* order) by a similar configuration of equal spins with values $i_c/2$ - except that the *number* of these spins would be different. The terms corresponding to other spin values in (32) do not change at leading order! Summarizing the results, in the spin network picture, convergence of the partition function in the canonical ensemble implies that :

- A large area black hole is described by a most probable configuration involving nearly all equal spins of *one* value, $j = i_c/2$.
- In any process leading to a change in horizon area (for e.g, exchange of spins across the horizon) such that one is always in the large black hole regime, on the average, the number of the spins $j = i_c/2$ changes at leading order - the numbers of all other spins remaining nearly the same. We will compute the average number of spins of a given value in a configuration in this ensemble below to demonstrate this point.

These results are independent of the particular choice of area spectrum. Even if the area spectrum we started out with was not equally spaced (i.e LQG spectrum), area increments are most probably due to exchange of a certain number of spins $j = i_c/2$. Therefore they are in multiples of a fixed number - so long as we are in the large area regime. The peculiarity of the spectrum shows up only for Planckian black holes.

Let us now illustrate this by calculating the average number of spins with $j = j_c = i_c/2$ and the average number of spins with $j \neq j_c$. For this purpose, we define an operator \mathbf{N}_j that counts the number of spins with the value $j = i/2$ for a given configuration of spins. Thus, the average number of spins with a value $j = i/2$ is

$$\langle \mathbf{N}_j \rangle = \text{Tr} \mathbf{N}_j \rho_m = \sum_{m_i} m_i (i+1)^{m_i} \exp(-8\pi l_p^2 \gamma \lambda m_i a_i), \quad (39)$$

where we have used the same notation as in (28). Evaluating the sum above, we find

$$\langle \mathbf{N}_j \rangle = \frac{(i+1) \exp(-8\pi l_p^2 \gamma \lambda a_i)}{1 - (i+1) \exp(-8\pi l_p^2 \gamma \lambda a_i)}. \quad (40)$$

Hence, by substituting the value of λ from (36) we find that the average number of spins that are not equal to

the critical value is given by

$$\begin{aligned}
N_{j \neq j_c} &= \sum_{j \neq j_c} \langle \mathbf{N}_j \rangle \\
&= \sum_{i \neq j_c} \frac{(i+1) \exp(-8\pi l_p^2 \gamma \lambda_c a_i)}{1 - (i+1) \exp(-8\pi l_p^2 \gamma \lambda_c a_i)} + O(1/A) \\
&\equiv c + O(1/A), \tag{41}
\end{aligned}$$

where c is a constant number (i.e. not depending on A_H) of the order of unity. On the other hand, $N_{j=j_c} \sim A_H/l_p^2$. The fact that for large area $N_{j \neq j_c}$ is a constant of order unity and is independent (at first order) of the value of A_H shows that it is the critical spin that play the major role in any dynamical process.

Consider a black hole with an initial area average $A_{initial}$ (we consider macroscopic black holes with area much higher than the Planck scale). Then, after some dynamical process has occurred - for example some particles (or in this picture, spins) have been absorbed or emitted by the black hole - the black hole area average changes to A_{final} . Since the average of spins with $j \neq j_c$ has not changed in the process, we can safely conclude that the change in the area occurred mostly due to exchange in the number of spins with $j = j_c$. Therefore, we conclude that in any dynamical process the probability to exchange a spin with $j \neq j_c$ is much lower than the probability to exchange a spin with $j = j_c$. This explains why it is the $j_{MP} \equiv j_c$ that should be taken in the comparison with the quasinormal mode spectrum (and not j_{min}).

In the above discussion we ignored the fact that in our ensemble the fluctuations in the area are very large. They are given by

$$\Delta^2 \equiv \langle \mathbf{A}^2 \rangle - \langle \mathbf{A} \rangle^2 = \frac{d^2}{d\lambda^2} \ln Z \sim A_H^2. \tag{42}$$

Thus, $\Delta \sim A_H$ as it was expected since the black hole is not in a box and, therefore, cannot be in an equilibrium. However, putting the black hole in a box will not change the results substantially. The argument is that in the limit of a very large box the black hole can be described by ρ_m . Now, taking a smaller box will only reduce the fluctuations and therefore will not increase (actually, probably decrease) the probability to emit/absorb spins. That is, the probability to emit/absorb a spin with $j = j_c$ will remain much higher than the probability to exchange a spin with $j \neq j_c$.

In the algebraic approach the area spectrum is equally spaced, with eigenvalues $A_n = a_0 n$, where n is an integer and a_0 is a fundamental unit of area of the order of Planck scale. The degeneracy of the area levels is approximately k^n (there are corrections due to zero hyperspin [9]), where k is an integer number greater than 1. The integer k is usually taken to be equal to 2 or 3. This picture is identical to the spin network approach if one ignores all other spins but the most probable one. For $k = 2$, $j_{MP} = 1/2$ and for $k = 3$, $j_{MP} = 1$. Following the same steps

that led to (37), the algebraic approach gives the same results for the entropy up to the second order (i.e. with exactly the same logarithmic correction). Our argument above shows why - the spins other than the most probable one in LQG contribute only at higher orders, even for different types of density matrices (such as, for example, the density matrix given in (22)).

In [33] it has been shown (within the algebraic approach) that for an AdS-Schwarzschild black hole (which is in a sense equivalent to putting the Schwarzschild black hole in a box due to the nature of the AdS potential) the correction to the entropy is $1/2 \ln A$ and the fluctuations in the area are $\Delta \sim A^{1/2}$. Our argument implies that we will get exactly the same results in the spin network approach (although the calculations in the spin network approach suffer from mathematical complications that make them difficult to compute). Note that the presence of the box only reduces the area fluctuations and the logarithmic corrections to the black hole entropy.

Let us now compute the entropy for the ES and LQG spectra in the area canonical ensemble. For the ES spectrum, the entropy given by (37) is :

$$S = A_H (\ln 3) / (12\pi l_p^2 \gamma_{ES}) + \ln A_H + O(1) \tag{43}$$

Choosing a value for the Immirzi parameter γ_{ES} in (18) obtained by making contact with the quasinormal mode spectrum, we get the correct semi-classical entropy. The next order correction arises from area fluctuations in the area canonical ensemble.

For the LQG spectrum, the entropy from (37) is now

$$S = A_H (\ln 2) / (4\pi \sqrt{3} l_p^2 \gamma_{LQG}) + \ln A_H + O(1) \tag{44}$$

One can choose an appropriate value for γ_{LQG} such that the correct semi-classical entropy is recovered - as done in [1]. As shown in [20], this is not compatible with the Immirzi parameter obtained from the quasinormal mode spectrum. To make them compatible requires a change of gauge group to $SO(3)$. The expression (44) is the entropy for the LQG spectrum with large area fluctuations keeping the average of area fixed. However, in the picture of the quantum black hole in [1], no exchange of radiation is allowed across the horizon except an exchange of spins corresponding to Planckian fluctuations in area, i.e $A_H \pm l_p^2$. The entropy with fluctuations restricted to be Planckian is less than or equal to the entropy given by (44) above. In particular, it allows us to add a statement to the result of [1] - that the leading order contribution to the entropy comes from the spins with least value, and the sum of contributions from all other spins is bounded by $\ln A$.

Acknowledgments

We are indebted to Don Page and Valeri Frolov for very valuable discussions, and to Jacob Bekenstein for

his suggestions. We would also like to thank Arundhati Dasgupta, Fotini Markopoulou, Lee Smolin, Thomas Thiemann and Andrei Zelnikov for useful comments and Bob Teshima for help with computational programs. We would like to thank Alexios Polychronakos for drawing our attention to a section in [19] where the dominance

of spins $j = 1$ in the ES spectrum was discussed first. We are grateful to J. Engle for pointing out a missing numerical factor in one of the equations. GG is grateful to the Killam Trust for its financial support. VS is supported by a fellowship from the Pacific Institute for the Mathematical Sciences and the NSERC of Canada.

-
- [1] A. Ashtekar, J. Baez, A. Corichi and K. Krasnov, Phys. Rev. Lett. **80** 904 (1998).
- [2] A. Ashtekar, J. Baez and K. Krasnov, Adv. Theor. Math. Phys. **4**, 1 (2000) [arXiv:gr-qc/0005126].
- [3] C. Rovelli and L. Smolin, Nucl. Phys. **B42**, 593 (1995).
- [4] J.D. Bekenstein, Lett. Nuovo Cimento, **11**, 467 (1974).
- [5] V.F. Mukhanov, JETP Letters **44**, 63 (1986).
- [6] J.D. Bekenstein and V.F. Mukhanov, Phys. Lett. **B360**, 7 (1995) [gr-qc/9505012].
- [7] J.D. Bekenstein, The case of discrete energy levels of a black hole 2001: A Spacetime Odyssey ed M J Duff and J T Liu (Singapore: World Scientific) p 21 [hep-th/0107045].
- [8] J.D. Bekenstein and G. Gour, Phys. Rev. **D66**, 024005 (2002) [gr-qc/0202034].
- [9] G. Gour, Phys. Rev. **D66**, 104022 (2002) [gr-qc/0210024].
- [10] A. Barvinsky and G. Kunstatter, “Mass Spectrum for Black Holes in Generic 2-D Dilaton Gravity”, gr-qc/9607030 (1996).
- [11] A. Barvinsky, S. Das and G. Kunstatter, Class. Quant. Grav. **18** 4845 (2001) [gr-qc/0012066].
- [12] G. Gour and A.J.M. Medved, Class. Quant. Grav. **20** 2261 (2003) [gr-qc/0211089]; Class. Quant. Grav. **20** 1661 (2003) [gr-qc/0212021].
- [13] J. Louko and J. Makela, Phys. Rev. **D54**, 4982 (1996) [gr-qc/9605058]; J. Makela and P. Repo, Phys. Rev. **D57**, 4899 (1998) [gr-qc/9708029]; J. Makela, P. Repo, M. Luomajoki and J. Piilonen, Phys. Rev. **D64**, 024018 (2001) [gr-qc/0012005].
- [14] A. Dasgupta, JCAP 0308 004 (2003); arXiv : hep-th/0310069.
- [15] A. Corichi, gr-qc/0402064.
- [16] J. A. Zapata, gr-qc/0401109.
- [17] A. Alekseev, A. P. Polychronakos and M. Smedback, Phys. Lett. **B574** 296 (2003).
- [18] S. Alexandrov, D. Vassilevich, Phys. Rev. **D64**, 044023 (2001) [gr-qc/0103105].
- [19] A. P. Polychronakos, arXiv : hep-th/0304135.
- [20] O. Dreyer, Phys. Rev. Lett. **90** 081301 (2003).
- [21] Alejandro Corichi, Phys. Rev. **D67**, 087502 (2003); Yi Ling and Hongbao Zhang, Phys. Rev. **D68**, 101501 (2003).
- [22] J. Swain, Int. J. Mod. Phys. **D12**, 729 (2003).
- [23] H-P. Nollert, Class. Quant. Grav. **16**, R159 (1999).
- [24] K. D. Kokkotas and B. G. Schmidt, Living Reviews in Relativity (1999) [gr-qc/9909058].
- [25] L. Motl, Adv. Theor. Math. Phys. **6**, 1135 (2003).
- [26] L. Motl and A. Neitzke, Adv. Theor. Math. Phys. **7**, 307 (2003).
- [27] H-P. Nollert, Phys. Rev. **D47**, 5253 (1993).
- [28] Emanuele Berti, Vitor Cardoso and Shijun Yoshida, gr-qc/0401052; Emanuele Berti, Vitor Cardoso, Kostas D. Kokkotas and Hisashi Onozawa, Phys. Rev. **D68**, 124018 (2003).
- [29] S. Hod, Phys. Rev. Lett. **81**, 4293 (1998).
- [30] J. Bekenstein, in Cosmology and Gravitation, M. Novello, ed. (Atlantisciences, France 2000), pp. 1-85 [gr-qc/9808028].
- [31] Steve Fairhurst, private communication.
- [32] R.K. Kaul and P. Majumdar, Phys. Rev. Lett. **84**, 5255 (2000); Phys. Lett. **B439**, 267 (1998).
- [33] G. Gour and A.J.M. Medved, Class. Quant. Grav. **20** 3307 (2003); Phys. Rev. D **68** 067501 (2003).
- [34] More references can be found in [8].
- [35] In a Lorentz covariant loop gravity a completely different area spectrum has been predicted [18]