

Second law of black hole thermodynamics

Koji Azuma^{1,2,*} and Go Kato^{3,2}

¹*NTT Basic Research Laboratories, NTT Corporation,
3-1 Morinosato Wakamiya, Atsugi, Kanagawa 243-0198, Japan*

²*NTT Research Center for Theoretical Quantum Physics, NTT Corporation,
3-1 Morinosato-Wakamiya, Atsugi, Kanagawa 243-0198, Japan*

³*NTT Communication Science Laboratories, NTT Corporation,
3-1 Morinosato Wakamiya, Atsugi, Kanagawa 243-0198, Japan*

(Dated: January 10, 2020)

If simple entropy in the Bekenstein-Hawking area law for a black hole is replaced with ‘negative’ quantum conditional entropy—which quantifies quantum entanglement—of positive-energy particles of the black hole relative to its outside, a paradox with the original pair-creation picture of Hawking radiation, the first law for black hole mechanics and quantum mechanics is resolved. However, there was no way to judge experimentally which area law is indeed adopted by black holes. Here, with the no-hair conjecture, we derive the perfect picture of a second law of black hole thermodynamics from the modified area law, rather than Bekenstein’s generalized one from the original area law. The second law is testable with an event horizon telescope, in contrast to Bekenstein’s. If this is confirmed, the modified area law is exalted to the first example of fundamental equations in physics which cannot be described without the concept of quantum information.

A black hole is one of most beautiful but mysterious objects in our universe. Although its carrier started merely as a purely theoretical object in solutions of the Einstein equation in general relativity, nowadays, it is a target of observational astrophysics [1–7]. Apparently, its typical picture that black holes absorb only and nothing can escape from them looked highly irreversible, compared with normal stars. However, this is merely a view for black holes in the regime of classical general relativity and not the case for the quantum world. In particular, remarkably, Hawking has developed a semi-classical picture [8, 9] where thermal radiation occurs from a Schwarzschild black hole—although it is regarded as ‘useless’ classically because we cannot distil work from it, in contrast to Kerr or charged black holes [10, 11]. As a result, Hawking famously described it as ‘a “black holes” is not completely black’ [12]. However, this Hawking radiation gave us more serious puzzles about the consistency between such black hole mechanics and quantum mechanics.

A puzzle appears [13, 14] when we combine the Hawking radiation with the first law of black hole mechanics [15], the Bekenstein-Hawking equation [8, 9, 12, 16, 17] and quantum mechanics. The first law of black hole mechanics is associated with the energy conservation law: for a stationary black hole B , in Planck unit, we have

$$dM_B = \frac{\kappa_B}{8\pi} dA_B + \Omega_B dJ_B + \phi_B dQ_B, \quad (1)$$

where M_B is the mass, A_B is the area of the event horizon, κ_B is the surface gravity, J_B is the angular momentum, Ω_B is the angular velocity, Q_B is the charge and ϕ_B is the electrostatic potential of the black hole. Here $\Omega_B dJ_B + \phi_B dQ_B$ in the first law corresponds to the change of black hole energy as work, and thus, in

general,

$$\delta Q_B := dM_B - \Omega_B dJ_B - \phi_B dQ_B \quad (2)$$

could be deemed to be the change of heat. On the other hand, the Bekenstein-Hawking equation is an area law for the black hole:

$$\frac{dA_B}{4} = dS(B), \quad (3)$$

where $S(B)$ is the entropy of the black hole B . However, these two laws are inconsistent with the pair-creation picture of Hawking radiation, in a quantum mechanical point of view. More precisely, Hawking’s finding is that an observer at the future infinity receives thermal radiation H^+ with Hawking temperature $\beta_H^{-1} := \kappa_B/(2\pi)$ from a Schwarzschild black hole (with $\Omega = 0$ and $\phi_B = 0$), whose purification partner H^- is regarded as having negative energy and falling into the black hole B . The fact that the observer receives the positive energy of the radiation H^+ means $dM_B < 0$ from the energy-conservation law, implying $dA_B < 0$ according the first law (2) with $\Omega = 0$ and $\phi_B = 0$. On the other hand, according to quantum mechanics, the purification partner H^- has the same positive entropy as the thermal radiation ($S(H^-) = S(H^+) > 0$ because H^+H^- is in a pure state). Thus, the fact that the black hole receives this purification partner H^- means $dS(B) > 0$, implying $dA_B > 0$ according to the Bekenstein-Hawking equation (3). Hence, Hawking’s original picture for Hawking radiation leads to a paradox about the direction of the change of the area A_B .

Recently, it has been argued [14] that this paradox is resolved if we assume that a black hole stores quantum entanglement, rather than simple entropy, i.e., if the

Bekenstein-Hawking equation (3) is modified as

$$\frac{A_B}{4} = I(\bar{B}|B^+) = -S(\bar{B}|B^+) = S(B^+) - S(B^-), \quad (4)$$

where $I(X|Y)$ is called the coherent information [18–20] from X to Y and $S(X|Y)$ is the conditional entropy defined by $S(X|Y) := S(XY) - S(Y)$ with the von Neumann entropy S . This coherent information is positive only in the quantum world, and is indeed associated with the one-way distillable entanglement in quantum information theory. In the modified area law (4), it is assumed that (i) the black hole B is composed not only of normal positive-energy particles B^+ , but also of negative-energy particles B^- generated by the Hawking process (like the Hawking particles H^- above), i.e. $B = B^+B^-$, and (ii) the whole system $B\bar{B} = B^+B^-\bar{B}$, by including a system \bar{B} in the outside of the black hole B , can always be in a pure state. Notice that Eq. (4) is equivalent to the Bekenstein-Hawking equation (3) for any process with $dS(B^-) = 0$, which reproduces [14] all known results shown with the original equation (3). But, Eq. (4) not only solves the paradox above in contrast to Eq. (3), but also is free from [14] other paradoxes, such as the information loss paradox [21] and the firewall paradox [22].

Here, with the modified area law (4) and the no-hair conjecture, we revisited thermodynamics of black holes, from the view of quantum information. In particular, by using Patovi's model for a thermal bath [23, 24], we derive a second law of arbitrary thermodynamic process α' which converts a stationary state B_1 into a stationary state B_2 of a black hole B by interacting with the thermal bath R :

$$-\int_{B_1}^{\alpha' \rightarrow B_2} \beta_R \delta Q_R \leq \frac{A_{B_2}}{4} - \frac{A_{B_1}}{4}, \quad (5)$$

where β_R^{-1} and δQ_R represent the temperature and the received heat of the thermal bath R , which is related with the received heat Q_B of the black hole as $\delta Q_R = -\delta Q_B$. This second law indicates that the area of the black hole behaves like entropy of a normal thermodynamic system. Since all the quantities in the second law are all observables, the law is testable, for instance, by using an event horizon telescope [1–6, 25], in contrast to Bekenstein's generalized second law [17] associated with Eq. (3):

$$\frac{dA_B}{4} + dS(\bar{B}) \geq 0, \quad (6)$$

where the entropy $S(\bar{B})$ of the outside \bar{B} —which is not a direct macroscopic observable along a process beyond a quasi-static one—is included.

Quasi-static process.—To derive our second law (5) from the modified area law (4), let us start by introducing a process to keep a black hole stationary, even if it emits Hawking radiation continuously. This process was

originally considered in Ref. [14], where it is shown that the modified area law (4) allows us to describe a stationary Schwarzschild black hole even under the existence of the Hawking radiation. Here, by generalizing this to be applicable to *any* stationary black hole, we introduce the concept of a quasi-static process for the black hole, in contrast to the Bekenstein-Hawking equation (3). This contrast is the underlying reason why the area law (4) only leads to the second law (5), in contrast to Eq. (3) which just leads to a generalized second law (6).

Let us consider a stationary black hole B , which emits a Hawking pair H^+H^- in state

$$\begin{aligned} |\chi\rangle_{H^+H^-} &:= \exp[r_{\omega'}(\hat{a}_k^\dagger \hat{b}_{-k}^\dagger - \hat{a}_k \hat{b}_{-k})] |\text{vac}\rangle \\ &= \frac{1}{\cosh r_{\omega'}} \sum_{n=0}^{\infty} \tanh^n r_{\omega'} |n\rangle_{H^+} |n\rangle_{H^-}, \end{aligned} \quad (7)$$

where \hat{a}_k and \hat{b}_{-k} are annihilation operators associated with the positive-energy particles H^+ and the negative-energy particles H^- respectively, the parameter $r_{\omega'}$ is related [12] to a mode with frequency ω , angular momentum m about the axis of rotation of the black hole, and charge e via $\omega' := \omega - m\Omega_B - e\phi_B$ and $\exp(-\pi\omega'/\kappa_B) = \tanh r_{\omega'}$, and the effective mode frequency ω' will follow some dispersion relation $\omega' = \omega'(\pm k)$. In the pair creation picture, the negative-energy particles H^- appear in a mode falling into the black hole (i.e. on a world-line crossing the event horizon), while the positive-energy particles H^+ appear in a mode propagating from the vicinity of the event horizon to a distant observer outside the black hole. The reduced state of the positive-energy particles H^+ is the Gibbs state with Hawking temperature $\beta_H^{-1} := \kappa_B/(2\pi)$,

$$\begin{aligned} \hat{\chi}_{H^+} &:= \text{Tr}_{H^-} [|\chi\rangle\langle\chi|_{H^+H^-}] \\ &= \frac{1}{\cosh^2 r_{\omega'}} \sum_{n=0}^{\infty} \tanh^{2n} r_{\omega'} |n\rangle\langle n|_{H^+} \\ &= \frac{e^{-\beta_H \omega' \hat{n}_{H^+}}}{Z_{\beta_H}}. \end{aligned} \quad (8)$$

Since this satisfies $-\ln \hat{\chi}_{H^+} = \beta_H \omega' \hat{n}_{H^+} + \ln Z_{\beta_H}$ for the number operator $\hat{n}_{H^+} := \hat{a}_k^\dagger \hat{a}_k$ and the partition function $Z_{\beta_H} := (1 - e^{-\frac{2\pi\omega'}{\kappa_B}})^{-1} = (1 - e^{-\beta_H \omega'})^{-1}$, we have

$$S(H^+) = \beta_H \omega' n_{H^+} + \ln Z_{\beta_H}, \quad (9)$$

where

$$n_{H^+} = \text{Tr}[\hat{n}_{H^+} \hat{\chi}_{H^+}] = \frac{1}{e^{\beta_H \omega'} - 1}. \quad (10)$$

Hence, the positive-energy particles satisfy that, for given

ω' ,

$$\frac{1}{\omega'} \frac{dS(H^+)}{dn_{H^+}} = \frac{1}{\omega'} \left(\beta_H \omega' + \omega' n_{H^+} \frac{d\beta_H}{dn_{H^+}} + \frac{1}{Z_{\beta_H}} \frac{\partial Z_{\beta_H}}{\partial \beta_H} \frac{d\beta_H}{dn_{H^+}} \right) = \beta_H. \quad (11)$$

Therefore, the emission of positive-energy particles from the event horizon is pure thermal radiation at the Hawking temperature β_H^{-1} .

Now, we consider a process where the black hole emits the Hawking radiation H^+ , while it absorbs a bosonic system C with the same effective mode frequency ω' , energy E_C and entropy $S(C)$ from its outside. Here the system C is assumed to be decoupled with the black hole B before this absorption. In this process, the black hole B loses energy E_{H^+} of positive-energy particles H^+ but receives entropy $S(H^-)$ of negative-energy particles H^- through the Hawking radiation, while it receives energy E_C and entropy $S(C)$ by absorbing such a normal (positive-energy) particle C . Therefore, in this process, the energy change ΔE_B of the black hole B and the change $\Delta I(\bar{B})B^+$ of coherent information are given by

$$\Delta E_B = E_C - E_{H^+}, \quad (12)$$

$$\Delta I(\bar{B})B^+ = S(C) - S(H^-) = S(C) - S(H^+), \quad (13)$$

where we have used $S(H^-) = S(H^+)$ for the pure state $|\chi\rangle_{H^+H^-}$.

Suppose that the system C is in a thermal state $\hat{\chi}_C$ as in Eq. (8), with the Hawking temperature β_H^{-1} . Then, we have

$$\omega' n_C = \omega' n_{H^+}, \quad (14)$$

meaning $E_C = E_{H^+}$ from Eq. (10) and $S(H^+) = S(C)$ from Eq. (9). Hence, in this case, the above process provides $\Delta E_B = \delta Q_B = 0$ and $\Delta I(\bar{B})B^+ = 0$ from Eqs. (12) and (13), which conclude $dA_B = 0$, either from the first law (1) for stationary black holes or from the modified area law (4). Therefore, as long as this equilibrium process is repeated, say if a black hole is surrounded by thermal systems with the Hawking temperature β_H^{-1} , the black hole can be exactly in a stationary state. This is in contrast to the case for the Bekenstein-Hawking equation (3) (see Ref. [14]).

Let us move on to a case where the above equilibrium process is repeated, but at some point, it deviates slightly from its equilibrium version, accompanied by small changes, as heat, on the system C and the Hawking radiation H^+ such that $E_C : \omega' n_C \rightarrow \omega' n_C + \omega' \Delta n_C$ and $E_{H^+} : \omega' n_{H^+} \rightarrow \omega' n_{H^+} + \omega' \Delta n_{H^+}$. This perturbation could occur, for instance, owing to the temperature change of the thermal systems C surrounding the black hole B , from the Hawking temperature β_H^{-1} . For this perturbation, from Eq. (14), Eq. (12) becomes

$$\begin{aligned} \Delta E_B &= \omega' n_C + \omega' \Delta n_C - (\omega' n_{H^+} + \omega' \Delta n_{H^+}) \\ &= \omega' \Delta n_C - \omega' \Delta n_{H^+}, \end{aligned} \quad (15)$$

while Eq. (13) becomes

$$\begin{aligned} \Delta I(\bar{B})B^+ &= \beta_H \omega' n_C + \ln Z_{\beta_H} + \Delta S(C) \\ &\quad - (\beta_H \omega' n_{H^+} + \ln Z_{\beta_H} + \Delta S(H^+)) \\ &= \Delta S(C) - \Delta S(H^+), \end{aligned} \quad (16)$$

using Eq. (9). However, as long as the perturbation is small enough to be regarded as a quasi-static process for system C and Hawking radiation H^+ , the difference ΔX on a quantity X can be regarded as its derivative dX and Eq. (11) should hold. Hence, we have

$$\begin{aligned} dI(\bar{B})B^+ &= dS(C) - dS(H^+) \\ &= \beta_H (\omega' dn_C - \omega' dn_{H^+}) = \beta_H dE_B. \end{aligned} \quad (17)$$

from Eqs. (15) and (16). From $dE_B = \delta Q_B$, this and the first law (1) for stationary black holes conclude

$$\frac{dA_B}{4} = dI(\bar{B})B^+. \quad (18)$$

If the above perturbation is used as a quasi-static process to change the black hole with keeping it in stationary states, we can integrate Eq. (18), leading to Eq. (4) under the assumption of $I(\bar{B})B^+ = 0$ for $A_B = 0$. Since A_B is a quantity of the state of a black hole according to the no-hair conjecture, we can conclude that $I(\bar{B})B^+$ is also a quantity of the state. This will be used later.

Arbitrary thermodynamic process.—We introduce a thermodynamic process, perhaps beyond a quasi-static process, where a black hole B interacts with a thermal bath R . In particular, borrowing the idea in Ref. [14], we consider the following two processes to be elementary thermodynamic processes for the black hole: (a) unitary interaction between positive-energy particles B^+ of the black hole B and the thermal bath R , and (b) Hawking radiation, which is a unitary interaction between the negative-energy particles B^- of the black hole B and a system with an extremely low temperature (like the vacuum) in the bath R .

First, we introduce Partovi's model [23, 24] for a thermal bath R . He considers that the thermal bath R is composed of a huge number of particles r_i in a Gibbs state $\hat{\sigma}_{r_i}$ with temperature $\beta_{r_i}^{-1}$, that is, $R = \bigotimes_i r_i$, where

$$\hat{\sigma}_X = \frac{1}{Z_{\beta_X}} e^{-\beta_X \hat{H}_X} \quad (19)$$

is a Gibbs state for a system X with Hamiltonian \hat{H}_X , temperature β_X^{-1} and the partition function $Z_{\beta_X} = \text{Tr}[e^{-\beta_X \hat{H}_X}]$. For any conversion of a system X from a Gibbs state $\hat{\sigma}_X$ to an arbitrary state $\hat{\rho}_{X'}$, we have

$$\begin{aligned} -\Delta S(X) + \beta_X \Delta E_X &= \text{Tr}[\hat{\rho}_{X'} \ln \hat{\rho}_{X'} + \beta_X \hat{\rho}_{X'} \hat{H}_X] + \ln Z_{\beta_X} \\ &= \text{Tr}[\hat{\rho}_{X'} (\ln \hat{\rho}_{X'} + \beta_X \hat{H}_X + \ln Z_{\beta_X})] \\ &= \text{Tr}[\hat{\rho}_{X'} (\ln \hat{\rho}_{X'} - \ln \hat{\sigma}_X)] \\ &= D(\hat{\rho}_{X'} \| \hat{\sigma}_X) \geq 0, \end{aligned} \quad (20)$$

where $\Delta S(X) := S(X') - S(X)$, $\Delta E_X := E_{X'} - E_X = \text{Tr}[\hat{H}_X \hat{\rho}_{X'}] - \text{Tr}[\hat{H}_X \hat{\sigma}_X]$, and $D(\hat{\rho}_{X'} || \hat{\sigma}_X)$ is the relative entropy and is non-negative. Notice that the Hamiltonian for system X is assumed to be unchanged, implying that ΔE_X is associated [24] with the heat δQ_X received by system X .

Let us consider the elementary process (a). In this process, the positive-energy particles B^+ interact with a system r_i , which is described by a unitary interaction $\hat{U}_{B+r_i \rightarrow B'+r'_i}$. Thus we have

$$\begin{aligned} \Delta_i S(B^+) + \Delta_i S(r_i) &= I(B'^+ : r'_i) - I(B^+ : r_i) \\ &= I(B'^+ : r'_i) \geq 0, \end{aligned} \quad (21)$$

where we assumed that the particle r_i is initially decoupled with B^+ , that is, $I(B^+ : r_i) = 0$, and $\Delta_i = \Delta$ but Δ_i has index i to describe that this change is brought by interaction with particle r_i . Then, since r_i is initially in a Gibbs state which follows Eq. (20), from Eqs. (20) and (21), we have

$$\Delta_i S(B^+) + \beta_{r_i} \Delta_i E_{r_i} \geq 0. \quad (22)$$

Since $\Delta_i S(B^-) = 0$ during this process, we can conclude

$$\Delta_i I(\bar{B})B^+ \geq -\beta_{r_i} \Delta_i E_{r_i}. \quad (23)$$

Next, let us consider the Hawking radiation (b). This process originally occurs between the black hole B and a system r_j in the vacuum state at the outside, by giving them a Hawking pair in a pure entangled state with $S(H^+) = S(H^-)$. Thus, even if we consider Hawking radiation in a more practical scenario where the system r_j in the thermal bath R has an extremely low but nonzero temperature $\beta_{r_j}^{-1}$,

$$\Delta_j S(B^-) = \Delta_j S(r_j) \quad (24)$$

would be a good approximation. Then, from Eqs. (20) and (24), we have

$$-\Delta_j S(B^-) + \beta_{r_j} \Delta_j E_{r_j} \geq 0. \quad (25)$$

Indeed, a model for the practical Hawking radiation shows that this inequality itself holds when $\beta_{r_j}^{-1}$ is low enough with $\beta_H^{-1} \geq \beta_{r_j}^{-1}$, although $\Delta_j S(B^-) \geq \Delta_j S(r_j)$ holds (see Appendix). Also notice that the inequality (25) implies that the heat capacity of the negative-energy particles B^- is negative, if we assume the energy conservation law, $\Delta_j E_{B^-} + \Delta_j E_{r_j} = 0$. In particular, the inequality means that $\Delta_j S(B^-) \geq 0$ implies $\Delta_j E_{B^-} \leq 0$. This is consistent to the assumption that B^- has a negative energy spectrum. Since $\Delta_j S(B^+) = 0$ during this process, we can conclude

$$\Delta_j I(\bar{B})B^+ \geq -\beta_{r_j} \Delta_j E_{r_j}. \quad (26)$$

From Eqs. (23) and (26), for either elementary thermodynamic process (a) or (b), we can conclude

$$\Delta_i I(\bar{B})B^+ \geq -\beta_{r_i} \Delta_i E_{r_i} \quad (27)$$

for any interaction with a thermal system r_i . If we assume that each system r_i is so small that each Δ_i is regarded as derivative, since $\Delta_i E_{r_i}$ corresponds to the received heat δQ_{r_i} of the system r_i in the thermal bath R , we can rephrase this inequality as

$$dI(\bar{B})B^+ \geq -\beta_R \delta Q_R. \quad (28)$$

Cycle.—Let us consider a cyclic process where the black hole B starts from a stationary state B_1 and comes back to the initial state. Then, we have

$$\oint dI(\bar{B})B^+ = 0, \quad (29)$$

because the coherent information $I(\bar{B})B^+$ is a quantity of the state, stemming from the no-hair conjecture. Let us divide this cycle into two path. The first path is any thermodynamic process α' , perhaps beyond a quasi-static process, where the black hole starts from the initial stationary black hole B_1 to another stationary black hole B_2 . The second path is a quasi-static process α which starts from the stationary black hole B_2 and comes back to the initial stationary black hole B_1 . In this path, the black hole satisfies Eq. (18). Combined with Eqs. (28) and (29), this concludes the second law (5) through

$$\begin{aligned} -\int_{B_1 \xrightarrow{\alpha'} B_2} \beta_R \delta Q_R &\leq \int_{B_1 \xrightarrow{\alpha'} B_2} dI(\bar{B})B^+ \\ &= \oint dI(\bar{B})B^+ - \int_{B_2 \xrightarrow{\alpha} B_1} dI(\bar{B})B^+ \\ &= \int_{B_1 \xrightarrow{\alpha} B_2} dI(\bar{B})B^+ \\ &= \frac{1}{4} \int_{B_1 \xrightarrow{\alpha} B_2} dA_B. \end{aligned} \quad (30)$$

Discussion.—Like the second law of normal thermodynamics, our law has many implications. For instance, if $\delta Q_R = 0$ holds, the second law (5) is reduced to Hawking's area theorem $dA_B \geq 0$ —which is derived in the regime of general relativity [26]. Another important implication appears if we consider a stationary black hole B which receives infinitesimally small heat $-\delta Q_R$, with keeping its stationarity, i.e., $\delta Q_B = 4^{-1} \beta_H^{-1} dA_B$ from the first law (2). Then, the second law (5) and $\delta Q_B = -\delta Q_R$ imply $dA_B \geq -4\beta_R \delta Q_R = 4\beta_R \delta Q_B = \bar{\beta}_R \beta_H^{-1} dA_B$, where $\bar{\beta}_R$ is the time-averaged inverse temperature of the thermal bath R . Therefore, the black hole B becomes bigger ($dA_B \geq 0$) when the temperature β_H^{-1} of the black hole is less than $\bar{\beta}_R^{-1}$ ($\beta_H^{-1} \leq \bar{\beta}_R^{-1}$), and it becomes smaller ($dA_B \leq 0$) when its temperature β_H^{-1} is higher than $\bar{\beta}_R^{-1}$ ($\beta_H^{-1} \geq \bar{\beta}_R^{-1}$). Many other implications

would appear; however, the most important point of this paper is that the second law (5) is derived from the equation (4) but cannot from the original one (3), and its validity is testable with current technology of observational astrophysics [1–7]. This test is needed to answer fundamental questions whether a black hole stores quantum entanglement, as suggested by Eq (4), and nevertheless, as implied by Eq. (5), whether the black hole is still analogous to a normal thermodynamic system, as Bekenstein and Hawking have originally imagined [8, 9, 12, 16, 17].

Acknowledgements.—We are especially thankful to S. Subramanian for insightful discussion that has continued since the first paper [14] on this project. We also thank T. Honjo, K. Inaba and W. J. Munro for helpful discussion. K.A. acknowledges H. Obayashi for his excellent presentation at the Gunma Astronomical Observatory about the first result of the M87 Event Horizon Telescope. K.A. and G.K. thank support, in part, from PREST, JST JP-MJPR1861 and from the JSPS Kakenhi (C) No. 17K05591, respectively.

Appendix

In this Appendix, we consider practical Hawking radiation where a system r_j in the thermal bath R has an extremely low but nonzero temperature $\beta_{r_j}^{-1}$. In particular, here we show that even in this framework of practical Hawking radiation, Eq. (25) can hold when $\beta_H^{-1} \geq \beta_{r_j}^{-1}$.

We first define a two-mode squeezing operator for bosonic annihilation operators \hat{a}_{out} on mode a and \hat{b}_{out} on mode b as

$$\hat{S}(r) := \exp[r(\hat{a}_{\text{out}}^\dagger \hat{b}_{\text{out}}^\dagger - \hat{a}_{\text{out}} \hat{b}_{\text{out}})]. \quad (31)$$

This squeezing corresponds to a unitary inducing Hawking radiation, by taking

$$\tanh r = \exp[-\beta_H \omega' / 2] \quad (32)$$

and by regarding a_{out} and b_{out} as annihilation operators on modes for positive-energy particles H^+ and for negative-energy particles H^- , respectively. Then, we have

$$\hat{a}_{\text{in}} := \hat{S}(r) \hat{a}_{\text{out}} \hat{S}^\dagger(r) = \hat{a}_{\text{out}} \cosh r - \hat{b}_{\text{out}}^\dagger \sinh r, \quad (33)$$

$$\hat{b}_{\text{in}} := \hat{S}(r) \hat{b}_{\text{out}} \hat{S}^\dagger(r) = \hat{b}_{\text{out}} \cosh r - \hat{a}_{\text{out}}^\dagger \sinh r. \quad (34)$$

Here \hat{a}_{in} and \hat{b}_{in} are bosonic annihilation operators on mode a and mode b , respectively. If we define quadratures as

$$\hat{q}_c := \hat{c} + \hat{c}^\dagger, \quad (35)$$

$$\hat{p}_c := i(\hat{c}^\dagger - \hat{c}), \quad (36)$$

for $c = a_{\text{out}}, b_{\text{out}}, a_{\text{in}}, b_{\text{in}}$, we have

$$\begin{pmatrix} \hat{q}_{a_{\text{in}}} \\ \hat{p}_{a_{\text{in}}} \\ \hat{q}_{b_{\text{in}}} \\ \hat{p}_{b_{\text{in}}} \end{pmatrix} = \begin{pmatrix} \cosh r & 0 & -\sinh r & 0 \\ 0 & \cosh r & 0 & \sinh r \\ -\sinh r & 0 & \cosh r & 0 \\ 0 & \sinh r & 0 & \cosh r \end{pmatrix} \begin{pmatrix} \hat{q}_{a_{\text{out}}} \\ \hat{p}_{a_{\text{out}}} \\ \hat{q}_{b_{\text{out}}} \\ \hat{p}_{b_{\text{out}}} \end{pmatrix}, \quad (37)$$

This can be rewritten as

$$\begin{pmatrix} \hat{q}_{a_{\text{out}}} \\ \hat{p}_{a_{\text{out}}} \\ \hat{q}_{b_{\text{out}}} \\ \hat{p}_{b_{\text{out}}} \end{pmatrix} = \begin{pmatrix} \cosh r & 0 & \sinh r & 0 \\ 0 & \cosh r & 0 & -\sinh r \\ \sinh r & 0 & \cosh r & 0 \\ 0 & -\sinh r & 0 & \cosh r \end{pmatrix} \begin{pmatrix} \hat{q}_{a_{\text{in}}} \\ \hat{p}_{a_{\text{in}}} \\ \hat{q}_{b_{\text{in}}} \\ \hat{p}_{b_{\text{in}}} \end{pmatrix} \\ =: S(r) \mathbf{x}, \quad (38)$$

where $\mathbf{x} := (\hat{q}_{a_{\text{in}}}, \hat{p}_{a_{\text{in}}}, \hat{q}_{b_{\text{in}}}, \hat{p}_{b_{\text{in}}})^T$.

Now, let us assume that the mode a corresponds to a system r_j in the thermal bath R and the initial state of mode a is a Gibbs state $\hat{\chi}_a$ with temperature

$$\beta_a^{-1} = \beta_{r_j}^{-1}, \quad (39)$$

while the initial state of mode b is the vacuum state $|\text{vac}\rangle$. In general, a Gibbs state

$$\hat{\chi}_a := \sum_{m=0}^{\infty} \frac{n_a^m}{(n_a + 1)^{m+1}} |m\rangle \langle m|_a \quad (40)$$

on mode a , where $n_a := \langle \hat{a}^\dagger \hat{a} \rangle = \text{Tr}[\hat{a}^\dagger \hat{a} \hat{\chi}_a]$, is completely characterized by the covariance matrix $(2n_a + 1)I_{2 \times 2}$ on mode a [27], where $I_{2 \times 2} := \text{diag}(1, 1)$. Therefore, the initial state of the modes a and b is completely characterized by the covariance matrix [27]:

$$\begin{aligned} V_{\text{in}} &= \begin{pmatrix} 2n_{a_{\text{in}}} + 1 & 0 & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & 2n_{a_{\text{in}}} + 1 & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & 1 & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & 0 & 1 \end{pmatrix} \\ &= \begin{pmatrix} \cosh(2s) & 0 & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & \cosh(2s) & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & 1 & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & 0 & 1 \end{pmatrix}, \quad (41) \end{aligned}$$

where $n_{a_{\text{in}}} := [\exp(\beta_a \omega') - 1]^{-1}$ and

$$\tanh s = \exp(-\beta_a \omega' / 2) \quad (42)$$

with a mode frequency ω' . If the two-mode squeezing operation $\hat{S}(r)$ corresponding to Hawking radiation is applied the modes a and b , the final state is still a Gaussian state, which is completely characterized [27] by the covariance matrix

$$V_{\text{out}} = S(r)V_{\text{in}}S^T(r) = \begin{pmatrix} [\cosh(2s) \cosh^2 r + \sinh^2 r]I_{2 \times 2} & \cosh^2 s \sinh(2r)Z_{2 \times 2} \\ \cosh^2 s \sinh(2r)Z_{2 \times 2} & [\cosh^2 r + \cosh(2s) \sinh^2 r]I_{2 \times 2} \end{pmatrix}, \quad (43)$$

where $Z_{2 \times 2} = \text{diag}(1, -1)$. From this covariance matrix, we can conclude that the final states of modes a and b are Gibbs states with

$$2n_{a_{\text{out}}} + 1 = \cosh(2s) \cosh^2 r + \sinh^2 r, \quad (44)$$

$$2n_{b_{\text{out}}} + 1 = \cosh^2 r + \cosh(2s) \sinh^2 r, \quad (45)$$

respectively.

Finally, let us derive the analytic expression for $-\Delta S(b) + \beta_a \Delta E_a$, associated with Eq. (25). From Eqs. (44) and (45), we have

$$\begin{aligned} \Delta S(b) &:= S(b_{\text{out}}) - S(b_{\text{in}}) = S(b_{\text{out}}) \\ &= -n_{b_{\text{out}}} \ln n_{b_{\text{out}}} + (n_{b_{\text{out}}} + 1) \ln(n_{b_{\text{out}}} + 1) \\ &= \frac{1}{2} [\sinh^2 r \cosh(2s) + \cosh^2 r + 1] \\ &\quad \times \ln \left[\frac{1}{2} (\sinh^2 r \cosh(2s) + \cosh^2 r + 1) \right] \\ &\quad - \sinh^2 r \cosh^2 s \ln [\sinh^2 r \cosh^2 s], \end{aligned} \quad (46)$$

$$\beta_a \Delta E_a := \beta_a \omega' (n_{a_{\text{out}}} - n_{a_{\text{in}}}) = \sinh^2 r \cosh^2 s \ln [\coth^2 s]. \quad (47)$$

With these expressions, $-\Delta S(b) + \beta_a \Delta E_a$ is shown in Fig. 1, where we use $-\Delta S(b) + \beta_a \Delta E_a = -\Delta_j S(B^-) + \beta_{r_j} \Delta_j E_{r_j}$ by regarding mode a as a system r_j in the thermal bath R and mode b as a system in the negative-energy part B^- of the black hole B . From the figure, if




FIG. 1: $-\Delta_j S(B^-) + \beta_{r_j} \Delta_j E_{r_j} (= -\Delta S(b) + \beta_a \Delta E_a)$. From the figure, if the temperature $\beta_{r_j}^{-1}$ of a system r_j is much lower than the Hawking temperature β_H^{-1} like the original situation Hawking has considered [2,3], $-\Delta_j S(B^-) + \beta_{r_j} \Delta_j E_{r_j}$ can be positive, implying Eq. (25).

the temperature $\beta_{r_j}^{-1}$ of a system r_j is much lower than the Hawking temperature β_H^{-1} like the original situation Hawking has considered [2,3], $-\Delta_j S(B^-) + \beta_{r_j} \Delta_j E_{r_j}$ can be positive, that is, Eq. (25) can hold.

On the other hand, $\Delta S(a)$ is

$$\begin{aligned} \Delta S(a) &:= S(a_{\text{out}}) - S(a_{\text{in}}) \\ &= -n_{a_{\text{out}}} \ln n_{b_{\text{out}}} + (n_{a_{\text{out}}} + 1) \ln[n_{a_{\text{out}}} + 1] \\ &\quad + n_{a_{\text{in}}} \ln n_{b_{\text{in}}} - (n_{a_{\text{in}}} + 1) \ln[n_{a_{\text{in}}} + 1] \\ &= \cosh^2 s (\cosh^2 r \ln [\cosh^2 r \cosh^2 s] - \ln [\cosh^2 s]) \\ &\quad - \frac{1}{2} [\cosh^2 r \cosh(2s) + \sinh^2 r - 1] \\ &\quad \times \ln \left[\frac{1}{2} (\cosh^2 r \cosh(2s) + \sinh^2 r - 1) \right] \\ &\quad + \sinh^2 s \ln [\sinh^2 s]. \end{aligned} \quad (48)$$

Therefore, $\Delta S(b) - \Delta S(a)$ is described by

$$\begin{aligned} \Delta S(b) - \Delta S(a) &= -\cosh^2 r \cosh^2 s \ln [\cosh^2 r \cosh^2 s] \\ &\quad - \sinh^2 r \cosh^2 s \ln [\sinh^2 r \cosh^2 s] \\ &\quad + \frac{1}{2} [\cosh^2 r \cosh(2s) + \sinh^2 r - 1] \\ &\quad \times \ln \left[\frac{1}{2} (\cosh^2 r \cosh(2s) + \sinh^2 r - 1) \right] \\ &\quad + \frac{1}{2} [\sinh^2 r \cosh(2s) + \cosh^2 r + 1] \\ &\quad \times \ln \left[\frac{1}{2} (\sinh^2 r \cosh(2s) + \cosh^2 r + 1) \right] \\ &\quad - \sinh^2 s \ln [\sinh^2 s] + \cosh^2 s \ln [\cosh^2 s], \end{aligned} \quad (49)$$

from which we can show $\Delta S(b) - \Delta S(a) \geq 0$ analytically.

If one wants to associate the model here with 't Hooft's model [28] for Hawking radiation, one should regard

$$\hat{a}_{\text{in}} \rightarrow \hat{a}_2(\vec{k}, \omega), \quad (50)$$

$$\hat{b}_{\text{in}} \rightarrow \hat{a}_2(-\vec{k}, -\omega), \quad (51)$$

$$\hat{a}_{\text{out}} \rightarrow \hat{a}_I(\vec{k}, \omega), \quad (52)$$

$$\hat{a}_{\text{out}} \rightarrow \hat{a}_{\text{II}}(-\vec{k}, \omega), \quad (53)$$

for annihilation operators $\hat{a}_2(\vec{k}, \omega)$, $\hat{a}_2(-\vec{k}, -\omega)$, $\hat{a}_I(\vec{k}, \omega)$ and $\hat{a}_{\text{II}}(-\vec{k}, \omega)$ in Ref. [28]. In Ref. [28], \hat{a}_2 is an annihilation operator for a freely falling observer, while \hat{a}_I and \hat{a}_{II} are ones on modes in regions with $\rho > 0$ and with $\rho < 0$ for a Rindler space coordinate $\{\tau, \rho, \vec{x}\}$, respectively.

-
- * Electronic address: koji.azuma.ez@hco.ntt.co.jp
- [1] Event Horizon Telescope Collaboration *et al.*, *Astrophys. J.* **875**, L1 (2019).
 - [2] Event Horizon Telescope Collaboration *et al.*, *Astrophys. J.* **875**, L2 (2019).
 - [3] Event Horizon Telescope Collaboration *et al.*, *Astrophys. J.* **875**, L3 (2019).
 - [4] Event Horizon Telescope Collaboration *et al.*, *Astrophys. J.* **875**, L4 (2019).
 - [5] Event Horizon Telescope Collaboration *et al.*, *Astrophys. J.* **875**, L5 (2019).
 - [6] Event Horizon Telescope Collaboration *et al.*, *Astrophys. J.* **875**, L6 (2019).
 - [7] B. P. Abbott *et al.*, *Phys. Rev. Lett.* **116**, 061102 (2016).
 - [8] S. W. Hawking, *Nature* **238**, 30-31 (1974).
 - [9] S. W. Hawking, *Commun. Math. Phys.* **43**, 199-220 (1975).
 - [10] R. Penrose, *Rivista del Nuovo Cimento, Serie 1*, **1**, 252-276 (1969).
 - [11] C. W. Misner, K. S. Thorne, and J. A. Wheeler, *Gravitation* (Freeman and Company, 1973).
 - [12] S. W. Hawking, *Phys. Rev. D* **13**, 191-197 (1976).
 - [13] S. L. Braunstein, S. Pirandola, and K. Życzkowski, *Phys. Rev. Lett.* **110**, 101301 (2013).
 - [14] K. Azuma and S. Subramanian, Preprint at <https://arxiv.org/abs/1807.06753> (2018).
 - [15] J. M. Bardeen, B. Carter and S. W. Hawking, *Commun. Math. Phys.* **31**, 161-170 (1973).
 - [16] J. D. Bekenstein, *Phys. Rev. D* **7**, 2333-2346 (1973).
 - [17] J. D. Bekenstein, *Phys. Rev. D* **9**, 3292-3330 (1974).
 - [18] B. Schumacher and M. A. Nielsen, *Phys. Rev. A* **54**, 2629-2635 (1996).
 - [19] M. Horodecki, J. Oppenheim, and A. Winter, *Nature* **436**, 673-676 (2005).
 - [20] M. Horodecki, J. Oppenheim, and A. Winter, *Commun. Math. Phys.* **269**, 107-136 (2007).
 - [21] J. Preskill, Preprint at <https://arxiv.org/abs/hep-th/9209058> (1992).
 - [22] A. Almheiri, D. Marolf, J. Polchinski, and J. Sully, *JHEP* **02**, 062 (2013).
 - [23] M. H. Partovi, *Phys. Lett.* **137**, 440-444 (1989).
 - [24] A. Peres, *Quantum theory: concepts and methods* (Kluwer, 1993).
 - [25] D. Gottesman, T. Jennewein, and S. Croke, *Phys. Rev. Lett.* **109**, 070503 (2012).
 - [26] S. W. Hawking, *Commun. Math. Phys.* **25**, 152-166 (1972).
 - [27] C. Weedbrook *et al.*, *Rev. Mod. Phys.* **84**, 621 (2012).
 - [28] G. 't Hooft, *Int. J. Mod. Phys. A* **11**, 4623-4688 (1996).