

Entanglement entropy of black holes and AdS/CFT correspondence

Sergey N. Solodukhin

School of Engineering and Science, International University Bremen, P.O. Box 750561, Bremen 28759, Germany

A recent proposal by Ryu and Takayanagi for a holographic interpretation of entanglement entropy in conformal field theories dual to supergravity on anti-de Sitter (adS) is generalized to include entanglement entropy of black holes living on the boundary of adS. The generalized proposal is verified in boundary dimensions $d = 2$ and $d = 4$ for both the UV divergent and UV finite terms. In dimension $d = 4$ an expansion of entanglement entropy in terms of size L of the subsystem outside the black hole is considered. A new term in the entropy of dual strongly coupled CFT, which universally grows as $L^2 \ln L$ and is proportional to the value of the obstruction tensor at the black hole horizon, is predicted.

PACS: 04.70Dy, 04.60.Kz, 11.25.Hf

I. INTRODUCTION.

For more than a decade entanglement entropy has remained in the focus of theoretical studies. Its geometrical nature and the fact that it grows as area rather than as volume makes entanglement entropy an attractive candidate for the statistical-mechanical origin of the Bekenstein-Hawking entropy [1]-[17]. Much of the past interest was related to understanding the UV divergences of the entropy that resulted in the demonstration [9] that these divergences are the same as those of the quantum action and are renormalized by the standard renormalization of the gravitational couplings in the action. This result guarantees that if the couplings (Newton's constant and those in front of the quadratic in curvature terms) are entirely due to quantum effects (bare gravitational couplings vanish), as in [15], then entanglement entropy is precisely the Bekenstein-Hawking entropy. Another related approach with similar behavior of the entropy is the "brick wall" model of 't Hooft [18], [19]. Entanglement entropy in string theory was discussed in [16].

Recently, there has been renewed interest in the study of entanglement entropy. This interest is two-fold. On one side, entropy is considered to be a reasonable measure of entanglement in quantum systems that is needed for the realization of the idea of quantum computers. This motivates the studies of entanglement entropy in condensed matter models [20]-[25]. On the other side, entanglement entropy was recently studied in the context of the holographic AdS/CFT correspondence (for a review of the correspondence see [26]). This study [27], [28] suggests a new geometric (and completely classical) picture for entanglement entropy of quantum systems. This offers new possibilities for understanding the black hole entropy as entanglement entropy [29]. The proposal of [27], [28] relates the entanglement entropy of a quantum system living in the boundary of anti-de Sitter (adS) with the area of the minimal surface in the adS whose boundary is the surface that divides the subsystems in the boundary theory. This proposal works exactly in the $d=2$ case, but can only be checked approximately for

higher dimensions because the CFT entanglement entropy is only known in the free field limit, far from the strongly coupled limit that is expected to agree with the classical gravity result. The success of this proposal for systems in flat space-time suggests that this may be generalized for space-times containing a black hole. In that case the black hole would lie in the boundary of the anti-de Sitter space. One proposal for this generalization is available [29] (see also [30]) and consists in considering a minimal surface that bounds the black hole horizon. It is, however, not clear how this proposal works in two dimensions when the horizon is just a point. On the other hand, it does not give the expected behavior of entanglement entropy on the size of the total system. In this note we suggest another way to generalize the construction of [27], [28] for black holes which resolves these issues.

II. ENTANGLEMENT ENTROPY OF BLACK HOLES.

Entanglement entropy is defined for a system divided into two subsystems A and B for a given state determined in general by a density matrix $\rho(A, B)$. Typically, the total system is considered to be in a pure state (for instance, in a ground state) described by wave function $|\Psi\rangle$ then $\rho(A, B) = |\Psi\rangle\langle\Psi|$. It can also be in a mixed, for instance, thermal state, described by a density matrix. If one neglects information about a subsystem, say B , then this situation is described by the reduced density matrix $\rho_A = \text{Tr}_B \rho(A, B)$, where a partial trace over only subsystem B is taken. Thus, provided we have access only to a part of the system then entanglement entropy defined as $S_A = -\text{Tr}_A \rho_A \log \rho_A$ gives us a measure for the lack of information about the state of the total system. On the other hand, this entropy is non-vanishing because there are correlations between the subsystems. Entanglement entropy, thus, can be also viewed as some measure for these correlations. In local theories the correlations are short-distance and, hence, the entropy is expected to be determined by

the geometry of the boundary dividing the two subsystems. On the other hand, the entropy should depend on the geometry (size and shape) of the total system $A \cup B$. In the limit, when the size of any of the subsystems is large, the reduced density matrix becomes thermal, so that the entropy grows as volume, if the total system was in a thermal state.

The notion of entanglement entropy is ideally suited for black holes since the black hole horizon naturally divides space-time on two subsystems so that an observer outside a black hole does not have access to excitations propagating inside the horizon. Entanglement entropy for black holes, especially the UV divergent part of the entropy, was well studied in the past (see [4]-[14] and references therein). In two dimensions, for a conformal field theory with central charge c , entanglement entropy can be obtained explicitly including the UV finite terms. As in the case of a CFT on interval [5], [20], [22] the conformal symmetry plays an important role in providing us with a closed form expression. For a black hole metric written in the conformally flat form $g_{\mu\nu} = e^{2\sigma}\delta_{\mu\nu}$, entanglement entropy [12], [10] is given by value of the conformal factor at horizon, $S = \frac{c}{6}\sigma(x_+) + \frac{c}{6}\ln(\Lambda/\epsilon)$, where ϵ is a UV regulator and Λ is a dimensionful parameter. Let the black hole geometry be described by a 2d metric

$$ds_{bh}^2 = f(x)d\tau^2 + \frac{1}{f(x)}dx^2, \quad (1)$$

where the metric function $f(x)$ has simple zero in $x = x_+$; $x_+ \leq x \leq L$, $0 \leq \tau \leq \beta_H$, $\beta_H = \frac{4\pi}{f'(x_+)}$. It is easy to see that (1) is conformal to the flat disk of radius z_0 ($\ln z = \frac{2\pi}{\beta_H} \int_L^x \frac{dx}{f(x)}$):

$$ds_{bh}^2 = e^{2\sigma}z_0^2(dz^2 + z^2d\tilde{\tau}^2), \quad (2)$$

$$\sigma = \frac{1}{2}\ln f(x) - \frac{2\pi}{\beta_H} \int_L^x \frac{dx}{f(x)} + \ln \frac{\beta_H}{2\pi z_0},$$

where $\tilde{\tau} = \frac{2\pi\tau}{\beta_H}$ ($0 \leq \tilde{\tau} \leq 2\pi$), $0 \leq z \leq 1$. So that entanglement entropy of the 2d black hole takes the form [14], [13]

$$S = \frac{c}{12} \int_{x_+}^L \frac{dx}{f(x)} \left(\frac{4\pi}{\beta_H} - f' \right) + \frac{c}{6} \ln \left(\frac{\beta_H f^{1/2}(L)}{\epsilon} \right), \quad (3)$$

where we omit the irrelevant term that is a function of (Λ, z_0) but not of the parameters of the black hole and have retained dependence on UV regulator ϵ . Notice that the UV-divergent term here is proportional to $c/6$ rather than $c/3$ as in the case of the field system on interval [5], [20]. This is because the interval has two ‘‘boundaries’’ where subsystems come into contact with each other, while in the case of a black hole there is only one such a boundary (horizon). As was shown in [14], entanglement entropy (3) is identical to the entropy of the thermal atmosphere of quantum excitations outside the horizon in the ‘tHooft’s [18] ‘‘brick wall’’ approach.

The black hole resides inside a finite size box and L is the coordinate of the boundary of the box. The coordinate invariant size of the subsystem complementary to the black hole is $L_{\text{inv}} = \int_{x_+}^L dx/\sqrt{f(x)}$. Two limiting cases are of interest. In the first, the size of the system L_{inv} is taken to infinity. Then, assuming that the black hole space-time is asymptotically flat, we obtain that entanglement entropy (3) approaches the entropy of the thermal gas, $S_{\text{th}} = \frac{c\pi}{3} L_{\text{inv}} T_H$. Another interesting case is when L_{inv} is small. In this case we find the universal behavior

$$S = \frac{c}{6} \left(\ln \frac{L_{\text{inv}}}{\epsilon} - \frac{R(x_+)}{36} L_{\text{inv}}^2 + O(L_{\text{inv}}^3) \right). \quad (4)$$

The universality of this formula is in the fact that it does not depend on any characteristics of a black hole (mass, temperature) other than the value of the curvature $R(x_+)$ at the horizon.

In higher dimensions, much is known about the UV-divergent part of the entropy. The leading UV divergence is proportional to the area of the horizon while the subleading logarithmically divergent term is determined by the way the horizon surface Σ is embedded in space-time. In four dimensions one has [7], [8], [9]

$$S_{\text{div}} = \frac{c_0}{4\epsilon^2} A_\Sigma - 8\pi \int_\Sigma (c_1 R + \frac{c_2}{2} R_{aa} + c_3 R_{abab}) \ln \epsilon, \quad (5)$$

where values of c_k , $k = 0..3$ depend on the type of field, $R_{aa} = R_{\mu\nu} n_a^\mu n_a^\nu$, $R_{abab} = R_{\mu\nu\alpha\beta} n_a^\mu n_a^\alpha n_b^\nu n_b^\beta$ and n^a , $a = 1, 2$ is a pair of orthonormal vectors orthogonal to Σ . These divergences of the entropy are related to the UV divergences of the quantum action [9], [10]

$$W_{\text{div}} = - \int [\frac{c_0}{16\pi\epsilon^2} R - (c_1 R^2 + c_2 R_{\mu\nu}^2 + c_3 R_{\mu\nu\alpha\beta}^2) \ln \epsilon].$$

III. THE PROPOSAL.

Our proposal for the holographic interpretation of entanglement entropy of a black hole is the following: Let d -dimensional spherically symmetric static black hole with horizon Σ lie on the regularized boundary (with regularization parameter ϵ) of asymptotically anti-de Sitter space-time adS_{d+1} inside a spherical cavity Σ_L of radius L . Consider a minimal d -surface Γ whose boundary is the union of Σ and Σ_L . Γ has saddle points where the radial adS coordinate has extremum. By spherical symmetry the saddle points form $(d-2)$ -surface \mathcal{C} with geometry of a sphere. Consider the subset Γ_h of Γ whose boundary is the union of Σ and \mathcal{C} . According to our proposal, the quantity

$$S = \frac{\text{Area}(\Gamma_h)}{4G_N^{d+1}} \quad (6)$$

is equal to entanglement entropy of the black hole in the boundary of AdS. In particular, it gives the expected dependence of the entropy on the UV regulator ϵ and on the size of the system. Below we verify this proposal for $d = 2$ and $d = 4$.

IV. ENTANGLEMENT ENTROPY OF 2D BLACK HOLES FROM THE ADS/CFT CORRESPONDENCE.

In order to check our proposal we need a solution to the bulk Einstein equations that describes a black hole in the boundary of adS. In three dimensions a solution of this type is known explicitly [31],

$$ds^2 = \frac{d\rho^2}{4\rho^2} + \frac{1}{\rho} \left[f \left(1 + \frac{1}{16} \frac{f'^2 - b^2}{f} \rho \right)^2 d\tau^2 + \frac{1}{f} \left(1 + \frac{1}{4} f'' \rho - \frac{1}{16} \frac{f'^2 - b^2}{f} \rho \right)^2 dx^2 \right], \quad (7)$$

where we set the adS radius to unity. At asymptotic infinity ($\rho = 0$) of metric (7) one has the 2d black hole metric (1). Note, that (7) is a vacuum solution of the Einstein equations for any function $f(x)$ in (1). The regularity requires that constant b should be related to the Hawking temperature of the two-dimensional horizon, $b = f'(x_+)$. The geodesic Γ lies in the hypersurface of constant time τ . The induced metric on the hypersurface (ρ, x) has a constant curvature equal -2 for any function $f(x)$ and is, thus, related by coordinate transformation to metric

$$ds_\tau^2 = \frac{dr^2}{4r^2} + \frac{1}{r} dw^2. \quad (8)$$

The exact relation between the two coordinate systems is

$$w = \frac{1}{8b} e^{z(x)} \left(\frac{16f(x) - (b^2 - f_x^2)\rho}{16f(x) + (b - f_x)^2\rho} \right) \\ r = f(x) e^{2z(x)} \frac{\rho}{(16f(x) + (b - f_x)^2\rho)^2}, \quad (9)$$

where $z(x) = \frac{b}{2} \int_L^x \frac{dx}{f(x)}$. The equation for the geodesic in metric (8) is $r = \frac{1}{C^2} - (w - w_0)^2$. The geodesic length between two points with radial coordinates r_1 and r_2 is $\gamma(1, 2) = \frac{1}{2} \ln \left[\frac{1 - \sqrt{1 - C^2 r}}{1 + \sqrt{1 - C^2 r}} \right]_{r_1}^{r_2}$. The saddle point of the geodesic is at $r_m = 1/C^2$. The length of the geodesic Γ_h joining point r_+ corresponding to $(x = x_+, \rho = \epsilon)$ and the saddle point is $\gamma(\Gamma_h) = -\frac{1}{2} \ln \frac{C^2 r_+}{4}$. The constant C is determined from the condition that geodesic Γ joins points $(x = x_+, \rho = \epsilon^2)$ and $(x = L, \rho = \epsilon^2)$ lying on the regularized (with regularization parameter ϵ) boundary. One finds that $\frac{C^2 r_+}{4} = \epsilon^2 \frac{b^2}{f(x_+)} \exp(-b \int_{x_+}^L \frac{dx}{f(x)})$ in the limit of small

ϵ . Notice, that this is a finite quantity even though $1/f(x_+)$ itself is divergent. Now, taking into account that $\frac{1}{G_N} = \frac{2c}{3}$, where c is the central charge of boundary CFT, we find

$$S = \frac{1}{4G_N} \gamma(\Gamma_h) \quad (10) \\ = \frac{c}{6} \ln \frac{1}{\epsilon} + \frac{c}{12} \left[\int_{x_+}^L \frac{dx}{f(x)} (b - f') + \ln f(L) - \ln b^2 \right]$$

that coincides with the expression (3) for entanglement entropy of the 2d black hole in conformal field theory. This confirms our proposal in two dimensions.

V. ENTANGLEMENT ENTROPY OF HIGHER DIMENSIONAL BLACK HOLES: UV DIVERGENCES AND FINITE TERMS.

In higher dimensions there is no exact solution similar to (7). However, a solution in the form of an asymptotic in ρ expansion is available. In the rest of the note we focus on the case of boundary dimension 4. Then one finds [32], [33]

$$ds^2 = \frac{d\rho^2}{4\rho^2} + \frac{1}{\rho} g_{ij}(x, \rho) dx^i dx^j \quad (11)$$

$$g(x, \rho) = g_{(0)}(x) + g_{(2)}\rho + g_{(4)}\rho^2 + h_{(4)}\rho^2 \ln \rho + \dots,$$

where $g_{(0)ij}(x)$ is the boundary metric, coefficient $g_{(2)ij} = -\frac{1}{2}(R_{ij} - \frac{1}{6}Rg_{(0)ij})$ is the local covariant function of boundary metric [33]. Coefficient $g_{(4)}$ is not expressed as a local function of the boundary metric and is related to the stress-energy tensor of the boundary CFT [34], which has an essentially nonlocal nature. $h_{(4)}$ is a local covariant function of the boundary metric and is obtained as a variation of the integrated conformal anomaly with respect to the boundary metric [34]. Explicit form was computed in [34] and reads (in curvature conventions with a different sign than those used in [34])

$$h_{(4)ij} = \frac{1}{8} R_{ikjl} R^{kl} - \frac{1}{48} \nabla_i \nabla_j R + \frac{1}{16} \nabla^2 R_{ij} \quad (12) \\ - \frac{1}{24} R R_{ij} + \left(\frac{1}{96} R^2 - \frac{1}{32} R_{kl}^2 - \frac{1}{96} \nabla^2 R \right) g_{(0)ij}.$$

It is a conformal tensor and in mathematics literature is known as the ‘‘obstruction’’ tensor [35]. We choose the boundary metric describing a static spherically symmetric black hole to take the form

$$ds^2 = f(r) d\tau^2 + f^{-1}(r) dr^2 + r^2 (d\theta^2 + \sin^2 \theta d\phi^2) \quad (13)$$

The minimal surface Γ lies in the hypersurface of the constant τ of 5-dimensional space-time (11). The induced metric on the hypersurface takes the form

$$ds_\tau^2 = \frac{d\rho^2}{4\rho^2} + \frac{1}{\rho} \left[F \frac{dr^2}{f(r)} + R^2 (d\theta^2 + \sin^2 \theta d\phi^2) \right], \quad (14)$$

where functions $F(r, \rho) = g_{(0)}^{rr} g_{rr}$ and $R^2(r, \rho) = g_{\theta\theta}$ have ρ -expansion due to (11). The minimal surface Γ can be parameterized by (ρ, θ, ϕ) . Instead of radial coordinate r it is convenient to introduce coordinate $y = \int dr/\sqrt{f}$ so that near the horizon one has $r = r_+ + by^2/4 + O(y^4)$. y measures the invariant distance along the radial direction. By spherical symmetry, the area to be minimized is

$$\text{Area}(\Gamma) = 4\pi \int \frac{d\rho}{\rho} R^2 \sqrt{\frac{1}{4\rho^2} + \frac{F}{\rho} \left(\frac{dy}{d\rho}\right)^2}, \quad (15)$$

where ρ_m is coordinate of the saddle point. In the small vicinity of the horizon ($y \ll 1$), we can neglect dependence of functions $F(y, \rho)$ and $R^2(y, \rho)$ on coordinate y . The minimization of the area of the surface gives the equation

$$\frac{FR^2 \frac{dy}{d\rho}}{\rho^2 \sqrt{\frac{1}{4\rho^2} + \frac{F}{\rho} \left(\frac{dy}{d\rho}\right)^2}} = C = \text{const.} \quad (16)$$

The area of the minimal surface Γ_h is then given by the integral

$$\text{Area}(\Gamma_h) = 2\pi \int_{\epsilon^2}^{\rho_m} d\rho \mathcal{A}(\rho), \quad \mathcal{A} = \frac{R^2}{\rho^2 \sqrt{1 - \frac{C^2 \rho^3}{FR^4}}} \quad (17)$$

Using (11) we find that $\mathcal{A}(\rho) = [\frac{r_+^2}{\rho^2} + \frac{g_{(2)\theta\theta}(r_+)}{\rho} + \dots]$. Substituting this expansion into (17) we find that the first two terms produce divergences (when ϵ goes to zero) which, according to our proposal, are to be interpreted as UV divergences of entanglement entropy. At the black hole horizon, one has a relation $2R_{\theta\theta}|_{r_+} = r_+^2(R - R_{aa})$. According to the AdS/CFT dictionary, one has $\frac{1}{G_N} = \frac{2N^2}{\pi}$, where N is number of colors in the boundary CFT. Putting everything together and applying our proposal (6), we find for the divergent part (compare with general formula (5))

$$S_{\text{div}} = \frac{A(\Sigma)}{4\pi\epsilon^2} N^2 - \frac{N^2}{2\pi} \int_{\Sigma} \left(\frac{1}{4}R_{aa} - \frac{1}{6}R\right) \ln \epsilon, \quad (18)$$

where $A(\Sigma) = 4\pi r_+^2$ is the horizon area.

Let's briefly discuss this result. The leading divergence in (18) has the form of the area law and resembles the Bekenstein-Hawking entropy. This is more than just a resemblance. Replace the regularized boundary with a brane in a Z_2 configuration (expression (18) should be multiplied by factor of 2 then) as in [15]. The induced Newton's constant on the brane is $\frac{1}{G_4} = \frac{2N^2}{\pi\epsilon^2}$. The first term in (18) then (with factor 2 included) is exactly the Bekenstein-Hawking entropy $S_{BH} = \frac{A(\Sigma)}{4G_4}$ of a black hole on the brane. Thus, our proposal supports the suggestion, originally made in [15] for de Sitter space-time, that the entropy of a black hole on the brane is entirely entanglement entropy.

The logarithmic term in (18) is conformally invariant. It is related to log divergence [33] $W_{\text{log}} = \frac{N^2}{4\pi^2} \int [\frac{1}{8}R_{\mu\nu}^2 - \frac{1}{24}R^2] \ln \epsilon$ in the quantum effective action of boundary CFT. This relation is a particular manifestation of general formula (5). In the case at hand one has $c_1 = -c_2/3 = -\frac{N^2}{96\pi^2}$, $c_3 = 0$. In the free field limit this set of values of the coefficients c_k corresponds to $\mathcal{N} = 4$ $SU(N)$ super Yang-Mills multiplet.

The UV-finite terms in the entropy can be calculated in the limit when the radial size $L_{\text{inv}} = y(L) - y(0)$ of the subsystem complimentary to the black hole is small. Then one can neglect the dependence of the metric on entire surface Γ on the coordinate y . The area of the minimal surface is given by (17) with $\mathcal{A}(\rho) = \frac{R^2(r_+, \rho)}{\rho^2 \sqrt{1 - (\frac{\rho}{\rho_m})^3}}$, where in $R^2(r_+, \rho) = (g_{(0)} + g_{(2)}\rho + g_{(4)}\rho^2 + h_{(4)}\rho^2 \ln \rho)_{\theta\theta}$ we drop terms of order ρ^3 and higher. The location of saddle point $\rho_m = (r_+^4/C^2)^{1/3}$ is determined from the condition that Γ interpolates between spheres at $r = r_+$ and $r = L$, $L_{\text{inv}} = \frac{1}{2\rho_m^{3/2}} \int_0^{\rho_m} \frac{d\rho\rho}{\sqrt{1 - \rho^3/\rho_m^3}}$. Evaluation of the integral gives the relation $\rho_m = \frac{1}{\delta_1^2} L_{\text{inv}}^2$, $\delta_1 = \frac{1}{6}B(\frac{1}{2}, \frac{2}{3})$.

The ρ -integration in (17) can be performed explicitly and the result is the sum of UV-divergent terms (18) and finite terms. For the finite part we get an expansion in L_{inv} (that generalizes (4) to a higher dimension),

$$S_{\text{fin}} = \frac{N^2}{4\pi} (a_0 L_{\text{inv}}^{-2} + a_1 \ln L_{\text{inv}} + a_2 L_{\text{inv}}^2 \ln L_{\text{inv}}) \quad (19)$$

$$a_0 = -\delta_1 A(\Sigma), \quad a_1 = \int_{\Sigma} \left(\frac{1}{2}R_{aa} - \frac{1}{3}R\right),$$

$$a_2 = \frac{\delta_2}{48} \int_{\Sigma} [2(R - R_{aa})^2 - \nabla^2 R - \frac{3}{2}\text{Ric}^2 + R_{aa}^2],$$

where $\delta_2 = \frac{1}{3\delta_1^2} B(\frac{1}{2}, \frac{1}{3})$. The next term in expansion (19) is L_{inv}^2 with coefficient determined by the value of $g_{(4)\theta\theta}$ on the horizon. It is not expressed in terms of local functions of metric and requires knowledge of the stress-energy tensor of boundary CFT. The first two terms in (19) are local and repeat the structure of the UV divergences (18) so that, for a certain value $L_{\text{inv}} \sim \epsilon$, the total entropy vanishes. The last term in (19) is of special interest. This is the first term in the expansion (19) which vanishes when L_{inv} goes to zero. The unusual presence of the logarithm in this term should be noticed. Up to a numerical factor, the coefficient a_2 is the value of the $(\theta\theta)$ component of the "obstruction tensor" (12) at the horizon. (We have used relations $(\nabla_r R_{\theta\theta})_{r_+} = r_+(2R_{aa} - R)_{r_+}$ and $2(1 - f'(r_+)r_+) = r_+^2(R - R_{aa})_{r_+}$ valid at the black hole horizon when derived a_2 in the form (19).) As is well known, the obstruction tensor (despite its ultimate relation to conformal anomaly) does not contribute to the quantum action since it is trace-

less. Interestingly, it makes its direct appearance in entanglement entropy. This property takes place in any even boundary dimension d (this is the dimension in which the term $h_{(d)}\rho^{\frac{d}{2}}\ln\rho$ in expansion (11) is non-vanishing). The corresponding term in the entropy takes the form (up to numerical factor) $S \sim r_+^{d-2}h_{(d)\theta\theta}(r_+)L_{\text{inv}}^2\ln L_{\text{inv}}$. The direct calculation of such terms in entanglement entropy on the CFT side is not yet available. The dual conformal

field theory in question is strongly coupled. For $d = 4$ it is $\mathcal{N} = 4$ super Yang-Mills theory and for $d = 6$ it is a $(2, 0)$ theory. Our result (19) and its generalization for $d = 6$ is, thus, a prediction for the entropy in these theories.

I would like to thank V. Korepin for interesting discussions. This work is supported in part by DFG grant Schu 1250/3-1.

-
- [1] L. Bombelli, R. K. Koul, J. H. Lee and R. D. Sorkin, Phys. Rev. D **34**, 373 (1986).
 [2] M. Srednicki, Phys. Rev. Lett. **71**, 666 (1993).
 [3] V. P. Frolov and I. Novikov, Phys. Rev. D **48**, 4545 (1993).
 [4] C. G. Callan and F. Wilczek, Phys. Lett. B **333**, 55 (1994).
 [5] C. Holzhey, F. Larsen and F. Wilczek, Nucl. Phys. B **424**, 443 (1994).
 [6] D. Kabat and M. J. Strassler, Phys. Lett. B **329**, 46 (1994).
 [7] S. N. Solodukhin, Phys. Rev. D **51**, 609 (1995).
 [8] S. N. Solodukhin, Phys. Rev. D **51**, 618 (1995); Phys. Rev. D **52**, 7046 (1995).
 [9] D. V. Fursaev and S. N. Solodukhin, Phys. Lett. B **365**, 51 (1996).
 [10] D. V. Fursaev and S. N. Solodukhin, Phys. Rev. D **52**, 2133 (1995).
 [11] D. Kabat, Nucl. Phys. B **453**, 281 (1995).
 [12] R. C. Myers, Phys. Rev. **D50**, 6412 (1994).
 [13] V. P. Frolov, W. Israel and S. N. Solodukhin, Phys. Rev. D **54**, 2732 (1996).
 [14] S. N. Solodukhin, Phys. Rev. D **54**, 3900 (1996).
 [15] S. Hawking, J. M. Maldacena and A. Strominger, JHEP **0105**, 001 (2001).
 [16] R. Brustein, M. B. Einhorn and A. Yarom, JHEP **0601**, 098 (2006).
 [17] D. V. Fursaev, arXiv:hep-th/0602134.
 [18] G. 't Hooft, Nucl. Phys. B **256**, 727 (1985).
 [19] J. G. Demers, R. Lafrance and R. C. Myers, Phys. Rev. D **52**, 2245 (1995).
 [20] V. Korepin, Phys. Rev. Lett. **92**, 096402 (2004).
 [21] H. Fan, V. Korepin, V. Roychowdhury, Phys. Rev. Lett. **93**, 227203 (2004).
 [22] P. Calabrese and J. Cardy, J. Stat. Mech. **0406**, P002 (2004).
 [23] P. Calabrese and J. Cardy, arXiv:quant-ph/0505193.
 [24] G. Vidal, J. I. Latorre, E. Rico and A. Kitaev, Phys. Rev. Lett. **90**, 227902 (2003).
 [25] A. Riera and J. I. Latorre, arXiv:quant-ph/0605112.
 [26] O. Aharony, S. S. Gubser, J. M. Maldacena, H. Ooguri and Y. Oz, Phys. Rept. **323**, 183 (2000).
 [27] S. Ryu and T. Takayanagi, Phys. Rev. Lett. **96**, 181602 (2006).
 [28] S. Ryu and T. Takayanagi, arXiv:hep-th/0605073.
 [29] R. Emparan, arXiv:hep-th/0603081.
 [30] Y. Iwashita, T. Kobayashi, T. Shiromizu and H. Yoshino, arXiv:hep-th/0606027.
 [31] K. Skenderis and S. N. Solodukhin, Phys. Lett. B **472**, 316 (2000).
 [32] C. Fefferman and C. R. Graham: Conformal Invariants. In: Elie Cartan et les Mathematiques d'aujourd'hui, (Asterisque, 1985), 95.
 [33] M. Henningson and K. Skenderis, JHEP **9807**, 023 (1998).
 [34] S. de Haro, S. N. Solodukhin and K. Skenderis, Commun. Math. Phys. **217**, 595 (2001).
 [35] C.R. Graham and K. Hirachi, math.DG/0405068.