

# Comments on Entropy Calculations in Gravitational Systems

S. P. de Alwis<sup>†</sup>

Physics Department, University of Colorado,  
Boulder, CO 80309 USA

## Abstract

We discuss the logic of, and some puzzles in, the various approaches to thermodynamics of gravitational systems. In particular the blackhole, deSitter (dS), black hole in dS (SdS) and in Anti-deSitter SAdS backgrounds are considered. After reviewing the original calculations of Hawking and Gibbons we discuss an alternative Hamiltonian method. This justifies the lowest order Euclidean calculation but is free of the problems associated with the latter when going to higher orders. To conclude we address the sign issue in dS thermodynamics.

<sup>†</sup> dealwiss@colorado.edu

# 1 Summary

We begin by summarizing the classic calculations of Gibbons and Hawking [1] (GH1) and [2] (GH2).

- The original (Euclidean path integral) calculation in GH1 for the black hole action, got (with  $\hbar = c = G = 1$ ),  $I = \beta F = \beta r_h/4 = \beta M - \frac{\beta}{\beta_h} A_h/4$  leading to the identification  $S = A_h/4 = 4\pi M^2$  if we identify the average energy in a canonical ensemble as  $\langle E \rangle = M$ . Here the subscript h denotes horizon and  $\beta_h = \frac{2\pi}{\kappa_h} = 4\pi r_h$  with  $\kappa_h$  being the surface gravity at the horizon (as measured at infinity!), and  $r_h = 2M$  is the horizon radius. For general beta the Euclidean metric has a conical singularity which is removed precisely at  $\beta = \beta_h$  i.e. the Hawking temperature. The original derivation of the temperature was however based on using the behavior of quantum fields in a black hole (of dS) space-time [3][2] and did not depend on Euclidean path integral methods.
- However this result for the entropy forces us to conclude that the canonical ensemble makes no sense - it is divergent since the density of states rises as  $\exp(8\pi E^2)$ , assuming the entropy of a black hole of energy (mass)  $E$  is given by the usual formula above, overwhelming the Boltzmann factor  $\exp(-\beta E)$ . One can as advocated by York[4, 5] insert a wall at a finite distance from the horizon, that is coupled to a heat bath at a fixed temperature to define equilibrium thermodynamics - but that still does not get rid of the problem with the density of states. However as pointed out in [6] the microcanonical ensemble is well-defined. Furthermore in Schwarzschild Anti-deSitter (SAdS) space the entropy grows only as  $E^{2/3}$  so that the canonical ensemble makes sense [7].
- In GH1 the BH entropy comes entirely from the GHY boundary term (at infinity) since the bulk term vanishes for a (Euclidean) vacuum solution. In the dS case (in the static patch) on the other hand the entire classical action comes from the bulk term since there is no boundary at  $r = 0$ .
- For the extended (Kruskal-Szekeres) diagram for the black hole as well as for dS space in global coordinates the entropy (at least to leading order) is zero. This is consistent with identifying these space times with quantum mechanical pure states [8].
- It is unclear how to define the thermodynamics of SdS space since the two horizons are at different temperatures  $\kappa_b/2\pi \neq \kappa_c/2\pi$ . Gibbons and Hawking [2] advocate putting a perfectly reflecting wall in-between the two horizons. But this is artificial and surely not the same as the original system. The system itself is thermodynamically unstable [9, 10].

## 2 Review of original calculations and comments thereof

We will first quote some basic formulae<sup>1</sup> for the gravitational action in both Lagrangian and Hamiltonian form. Note that we work in units  $\hbar = c = G = 1$  and the mostly plus metric convention, with  $R_{\mu\nu}{}^\lambda{}_\sigma V^\sigma \equiv [\nabla_\mu, \nabla_\nu] V^\lambda$  and  $R_{\nu\sigma} = R^\mu{}_\nu\mu\sigma$ . The Einstein-Hilbert action for gravity (without a cosmological constant) is

$$I_H [g_{\alpha\beta}] = \frac{1}{16\pi} \int_{\mathcal{V}} R \sqrt{-g} d^4x. \quad (1)$$

Here  $\mathcal{V}$  is a space-time volume with a boundary which will be denoted by  $\partial\mathcal{V}$ . Under a metric variation we have

$$16\pi\delta I_H = \int_{\mathcal{V}} \left( R_{\alpha\beta} - \frac{1}{2}g_{\alpha\beta}R \right) \delta g^{\alpha\beta} \sqrt{-g} d^4x - \int_{\partial\mathcal{V}} \epsilon h^{\alpha\beta} \delta g_{\alpha\beta, \mu} n^\mu |h|^{1/2} d^3y. \quad (2)$$

The first term contains the Einstein tensor which is the LHS of the Einstein field equation. In the boundary term the  $y$  are coordinates adapted to  $\partial\mathcal{V}$ ,  $n^\mu$  is the unit normal to it with  $n^2 = \epsilon$ , where  $\epsilon = \pm 1$  depending on whether the boundary component is time-like or space-like, and  $h$  is the metric on  $\partial\mathcal{V}$  with  $h^{\alpha\beta} = g^{\alpha\beta} - \epsilon n^\alpha n^\beta$ . If we impose Neumann (N) boundary conditions on  $\partial\mathcal{V}$  the second term vanishes and the variational principle will lead to the field equations.

However if we wish to impose Dirichlet (D) boundary conditions on  $\partial\mathcal{V}$ , we need to add a boundary term whose variation (after fixing the metric on the boundary i.e.  $\delta g_{\alpha\beta}|_{\partial\mathcal{V}} = 0$ ) will cancel the boundary term in (2), thus giving the desired equation of motion. This term [1] is

$$I_B [g_{\alpha\beta}] = \frac{1}{8\pi} \int_{\partial\mathcal{V}} \epsilon K |h|^{1/2} d^3y. \quad (3)$$

Here  $K = \nabla_\mu n^\mu$  is the trace of the so-called second fundamental form (i.e. the extrinsic curvature of  $\partial\mathcal{V}$ ,  $K_{\mu\nu} = \nabla_\mu n_\nu$  as embedded in  $\mathcal{V}$  where  $n_\mu$  is the unit normal to  $\partial\mathcal{V}$ ). Thus the appropriate action that should be used in the path integral is

$$I = I_H + I_B - I_{B_0}, \quad (4)$$

where the last term is given by (3) with  $K \rightarrow K_0$  i.e. the extrinsic curvature evaluated in flat space. This is required in order to have zero action for flat space. Clearly it will not contribute to the equation of motion. It is important to note that this implies (according to the entropy calculation of Gibbons and Hawking) empty Minkowski space (the vacuum) will be assigned zero entropy consistent with standard thermodynamics in flat space where the ground state is assigned zero entropy.

---

<sup>1</sup>See for example the excellent account given by Eric Poisson [11].

One might ask why one would need to impose D boundary conditions rather than N. The reason is that (as explained for instance in [12]) if one wishes to compute the quantum amplitude for transitions from one metric  $h_1$  on a surface (1) to another  $h_3$  on another surface (3), then in order that the sum over states with intermediate metrics  $h_2$  on a surface (2) gives the correct relation in the classical limit, we need  $I(g_1 + g_2) = I(g_1) + I(g_2)$ , where  $g_1$  is the metric between the surfaces 1 and 2 and  $g_2$  being the metric between 2 and 3. This relation can only be satisfied with D boundary conditions.

Given this action for gravity, namely eqn. (4), the thermodynamic interpretation given in [1, 2] follows.

The discussion in [1] (GH1) actually begins by evaluating the Lorentzian action (4). GH1 first evaluate it for the Schwarzschild black hole with the metric

$$ds^2 = - \left(1 - \frac{r_s}{r}\right) dt^2 + \left(1 - \frac{r_s}{r}\right)^{-1} + r^2 d\Omega_2^2, \quad (5)$$

where the last term is the metric on a two sphere with radius  $r$  and the Schwarzschild (horizon) radius  $r_s$  may be identified as  $2M$  where  $M$  is the mass of the black hole.

This has a curvature singularity at  $r = 0$  as well as a coordinate singularity at  $r = r_s$ . In view of these the question is how does one evaluate the bulk action  $S_H$ ? GH1 prescription is to evaluate the action in the so-called Euclidean section where  $t \rightarrow -i\tau$  with  $\tau$  taken to be real. The metric is then everywhere smooth provided that  $\tau$  is taken to be an angular coordinate with  $\tau$  and  $\tau + 4\pi r_s$  identified. In this case the bulk term  $S_H$  is zero since  $R = 0$  everywhere, and the classical action comes entirely from the boundary term which now has the topology  $S^1 \times S^2$  and is compact.

To evaluate this we need the unit normal to the boundary  $r = \text{constant}$  which is  $n_\mu = \delta_\mu^r / \sqrt{1 - \frac{r_s}{r}}$ ,  $n^\mu = g^{\mu\nu} n_\nu = \sqrt{1 - \frac{r_s}{r}} \delta_r^\mu$ , so we get  $K = \nabla \cdot n = \frac{1}{\sqrt{g}} \partial_\mu (\sqrt{g} n^\mu) = \frac{1}{r^2} \partial_r (r^2 \sqrt{1 - \frac{r_s}{r}})$  and  $K_0 = \frac{1}{r^2} \partial_r (r^2) = \frac{2}{r}$ . Also we have  $|h|^{1/2} = \sqrt{1 - \frac{r_s}{r}} r^2 \sin \theta$ . Hence (defining the boundary at  $r = r_b \rightarrow \infty$ )

$$\begin{aligned} I_{\text{bh}} &= \frac{1}{8\pi} \int_0^{-i\beta} dt \int_{S_2} d^2x |h|^{1/2} (K - K_0) |_{r=r_b} = -i \frac{\beta}{2} \left( 2r_b - \frac{3}{2}r_s - 2r_b \sqrt{1 - \frac{r_s}{r_b}} \right) \\ &= i \frac{\beta}{2} \left( \frac{r_s}{2} + O\left(\frac{r_s^2}{r_b}\right) \right) \stackrel{\beta=4\pi r_s, r_b \rightarrow \infty}{=} i\pi r_s^2 \end{aligned} \quad (6)$$

Note that the the final result is  $i$  times a quarter the area of the horizon.

GH1 also calculate the classical action for deSitter space. In this case (1) needs to be replaced by

$$I_H [g_{\alpha\beta}] = \frac{1}{16\pi} \int_V \left( R - \frac{6}{r_{\text{ds}}^2} \right) \sqrt{-g} d^4x, \quad (7)$$

where  $r_{\text{ds}}^2 = 3/\Lambda$  and  $\Lambda$  is the (positive) cosmological constant. Also the space-time has no boundary so there is no boundary term and no singularity. From the Einstein equation we have

$R = 12/r_{\text{ds}}^2$ . However if we substitute this into the action we get infinity from the infinite space time volume.

GH1 argues that one has to again consider the Euclidean section. First let us consider the so-called static patch representation of (part of) dS space given by a presentation like that of the black hole in (5):

$$ds^2 = - \left(1 - \frac{r^2}{r_{\text{ds}}^2}\right) dt^2 + \left(1 - \frac{r^2}{r_{\text{ds}}^2}\right)^{-1} dr^2 + r^2 d\Omega_2^2. \quad (8)$$

As with the black hole metric presentation in (5), the above is also singular at the horizon  $r = r_{\text{ds}}$  (where the time-like Killing vector  $\partial/\partial t$  becomes null). Again following the prescription used in the BH case GH1 propose evaluating the action in the Euclidean section with  $t \rightarrow -i\tau$  (with  $\tau$  real). Also as in the previous case the relation between these coordinates and the global coordinates implies that the Euclidean variable  $\tau$  is periodic with period  $2\pi r_{\text{ds}}$ . This also avoids the conical singularity at  $r = r_{\text{ds}}$  in the Euclideanized version of (8). The topology of the Euclidean section is now an  $S_4$  with radius  $r_{\text{ds}}$ , so the action becomes,

$$\begin{aligned} iI_{\text{ds}} \rightarrow -I_{\text{ds}}^{\text{Euclidean}} &= -\frac{1}{16\pi} \int \sqrt{|g|} d^4 x_{\text{Euclidean}} \left( \frac{6}{r_{\text{ds}}^2} - R \right) = \\ &= \frac{1}{16\pi} \int \sqrt{|g|} d^4 x_{\text{Euclidean}} \frac{6}{r_{\text{ds}}^2} = \frac{1}{16\pi} \frac{8\pi^2 r_{\text{ds}}^4}{3} \frac{6}{r_{\text{ds}}^2} = \pi r_{\text{ds}}^2. \end{aligned} \quad (9)$$

What do these calculations have to do with thermodynamics? This follows according to GH1 from the representation of the partition function for the canonical ensemble by a path integral, i.e.

$$Z(\beta) = \text{Tr} e^{-\beta H} = \int_{\phi(t)=\phi(t+i\beta)} [d\phi] e^{iI[\phi]} \quad (10)$$

Here  $\phi$  stands for all fields in the system including the metric field. One then evaluates the RHS in the saddle point approximation by writing  $\phi = \phi_0 + \bar{\phi}$  in which case we have,

$$-\beta F \equiv \ln Z \simeq iI[\phi_0] + \ln \int_{\bar{\phi}(t)=\bar{\phi}(t+i\beta)} [d\bar{\phi}] e^{iI[\phi_0, \bar{\phi}]} + \dots \quad (11)$$

Here the second term is the one loop correction and the ellipses represent higher loop terms.

Let us evaluate this for the two systems discussed above, i.e. the Schwarzschild black hole and deSitter space. In both cases  $\phi$  is just the metric field. For the black hole (implicitly assuming that  $\phi_0$  just represents a unique black hole of mass  $M$ ) and ignoring the one-loop correction we have,

$$\beta F_0 = -iI_{\text{bh}}[g_0] = \pi r_s^2 = \beta \langle E \rangle - S \quad (12)$$

In the second equality we used (6) and the last one is the usual thermodynamic relation between free energy  $F$  the average energy of the ensemble  $\langle E \rangle$  and the entropy  $S$ . GH1 then proceeds

to identify  $\langle E \rangle$  with the mass  $M$ , and with  $\beta = 4\pi r_s$ ,  $M = r_s/2$  this gives the famous formula  $S = \pi r_s^2 = \frac{1}{4}A_h$ . A similar argument for dS space gives using(9)

$$\beta F_0 = I_{\text{ds}}^{\text{Euclidean}} = -\pi r_{\text{ds}}^2 = \beta \langle E \rangle - S \quad (13)$$

In this case GH1 identify  $\langle E \rangle$  with zero since space is closed (so there is no boundary energy) giving again  $S = \frac{1}{4}A_h$ .

At this point it is worthwhile noting that the two calculations apparently give contradictory results for the entropy of empty Minkowski space. The  $M \rightarrow 0$  limit of black hole space time gives Minkowski space. Given that the calculation of GH1 gave  $S_{\text{bh}} = \pi r_s^2 = \pi (2M)^2 \rightarrow 0$  in the limit, this implies that the entropy of Minkowski space is zero. This is clearly consistent with the expectation that quantum mechanically this geometry must represent a vacuum state. On the other hand one might also argue that Minkowski space is obtained from deSitter space by taking the limit  $r_{\text{ds}} \rightarrow \infty$  so that, since GH1 gave  $S_{\text{ds}} = \pi r_{\text{ds}}^2$ , one has infinite entropy in the limit. In other words one is apparently led to assign infinite entropy to (empty) Minkowski space, which seems rather strange! However It has been argued by many authors (perhaps the earliest were [13] and [14]), that the horizon entropy of dS space is the maximum entropy that this space can hold. With this interpretation then, in the limit of the horizon radius going infinity, the ensuing infinite entropy of Minkowski space, should also be interpreted as the maximum entropy that this space can contain, which of course is reasonable. It is not therefore the entropy of the Minkowski vacuum, which should indeed be zero.

If we look at the calculations in GH1 we see that the two entropies arise from quite different terms in the (Euclidean) action. In the black hole case the space-time volume integral (the Einstein-Hilbert term) gives zero contribution since the space is Ricci flat. The entropy comes from the boundary term. As discussed above, GH1 subtracts from the boundary term a term integrated over the same surface but with  $\nabla \cdot n$  evaluated in flat space. It is the cancellation between these two for Minkowski space which results in zero entropy for this space. On the other hand in the corresponding calculation for dS space it is the volume integral which gives the entropy and there is no GHY boundary term since there is no boundary. Now the integrand in this term (see eqn. (9)) goes to zero like  $\frac{1}{r_{\text{ds}}^2}$  in the Minkowski limit but the volume integral gives a factor of  $r_{\text{ds}}^4$  so the action and hence the entropy is proportional to  $r_{\text{ds}}^2$  ! However the infinite radius limit of dS space should not be identified with Minkowski space. The topologies are different and hence the need for a (spatial) boundary term in the latter case which is absent in the former. Indeed if one worked in the strict Minkowski limit (even though the volume is still infinite) the curvature is strictly zero, so that the E-H term is exactly zero.

## 2.1 Canonical and Microcanonical Ensemble for Black Holes

The canonical ensemble refers to a collection of systems in thermal equilibrium at some externally fixed temperature  $T = \beta^{-1}$ . Instead of a single energy one has a (Boltzmann) distribution of energies. However as is well known the canonical partition function for Schwarzschild black holes is ill-defined even with Brown-York boundary conditions [6], (which impose a physical boundary at a finite distance held at a fixed temperature).

The point is simply that the density of states  $D(E)$  (the exponential of the entropy) increases as  $\exp(4\pi E^2)$  (if indeed the entropy is given by the Bekenstein-Hawking formula). In the Brown-York set up each black hole is enclosed in a spherical wall at some radius  $R > r_H = 2GM$  held at a fixed temperature  $T = \beta^{-1}$ . Nevertheless clearly the density of states overwhelms the Boltzmann factor and hence the partition function is divergent.

It is more appropriate to consider the micro-canonical ensemble (as advocated in [6]). Typically this is an ensemble with a small (or vanishingly small) energy range  $E - dE, E + dE$ . Entropy is then defined to be  $S(E) = \ln D(E)$  where  $D(E)$  is the density of states at energy  $E$ . Instead of (11) one should start with the functional integral representation of  $D(E)$ . This is

$$D(E) = \text{Tr} \delta(E - \hat{H}) = \frac{1}{2\pi} \text{Tr} \int dt e^{i(E - \hat{H})t} = \frac{1}{2\pi} \int_{-\infty}^{+\infty} dt e^{iEt} \mathcal{N} \int_{\phi(0)=\phi(t)} [d\phi] \int [d\pi] e^{i \int_0^t dt' [\int_{\Sigma} \pi \dot{\phi} - H]} \quad (14)$$

Here we've used the path integral representation for the (trace of the) unitary evolution operator,

$$\text{Tr} e^{i\hat{H}t} = \mathcal{N} \int_{\phi(0)=\phi(t)} [d\phi] \int [d\pi] e^{i \int_0^t dt' \int_{\Sigma} \pi \dot{\phi} - H}.$$

The normalization constant  $\mathcal{N}$  is defined so that the trace of the unit operator i.e.  $\text{Tr} \hat{I} = \mathcal{N} \int_{\phi(0)=\phi(t=0)} [d\phi] \int [d\pi]$  is unity, which implies that we have regularized and renormalized our definition of the trace such that, as we'll see below, the extended black hole or deSitter space time (or in general any stationary asymptotically flat or deSitter space time), has zero entropy corresponding to a pure state. The entropy associated with a black hole, or that of de Sitter in static coordinates must then be identified as entanglement entropy. Actually it makes more sense to use the original Hamiltonian representation for the path integral. In this case, we replace  $\phi$  by the set  $N, N_a, h_{ab}, \psi$ , where we've used a 3 + 1 split of space time and defined fields on the space-like surface  $\Sigma_t$  as discussed earlier. Then the expression for the density of states becomes

$$D(E) = \frac{1}{2\pi} \int dt e^{iEt} \mathcal{N} \int_{\phi(0)=\phi(t)} [dN] [dN_a] [dh_{ab}] [d\pi^{ab}] [d\psi] [d\pi_{\psi}] e^{i \int_0^t dt' [\int_{\Sigma} \pi^{ab} \dot{h}_{ab} + \pi_{\psi} \dot{\psi} - H]}. \quad (15)$$

Here  $N, N_a$  become Lagrange parameters imposing the secondary constraints (the primary are  $\pi_N = \pi_{N_a} = 0$ ). The Hamiltonian is given by<sup>2</sup> with matter Hamiltonian  $\mathcal{H}_m$  and momentum

---

<sup>2</sup>See for example Poisson [11] eqn. 4.61.  $k$  is defined in eqn.(23) below.

density  $\nabla_b \mathcal{P}_m^{ab}$ )

$$H = \frac{1}{16\pi} \int_{\Sigma_t} [N ((K^{ab} K_{ab} - K^2 - {}^3R) + \mathcal{H}_m) - 2N_a \nabla_b (K^{ab} - Kh^{ab} + \mathcal{P}_m^{ab})] \sqrt{h} d^3y + H_\partial, \quad (16)$$

$$\equiv \int_{\Sigma_t} [N\mathcal{H} + N_a \mathcal{H}^a] + H_\partial, \quad (17)$$

$$H_\partial = \frac{1}{8\pi} \oint_{S_t} [N(k - k_0) - N_a (K^{ab} - Kh^{ab}) r_b] \sqrt{\sigma} d^2\theta. \quad (18)$$

Here  $S_t$  is the  $S_2$  boundary of  $\Sigma_t$ . Doing the functional integrals over the  $N$ 's gives

$$D(E) = \frac{1}{2\pi} \int dt e^{iEt} \mathcal{N} \int_{\phi(0)=\phi(t)} [dh_{ab}] [d\pi^{ab}] [d\psi] [d\pi_\psi] \delta[\mathcal{H}] \delta[\mathcal{H}^a] e^{i \int_0^t dt' [\int_{\Sigma_{t'}} (\pi^{ab} \dot{h}_{ab} + \pi_\psi \dot{\psi}) - H_\partial]} \quad (19)$$

If we assume that the path integral is saturated by a single stationary configuration with boundary Hamiltonian  $H_\partial$  (as assumed in[1]) then the  $t$  integral also yields a delta function and we have

$$D(E) = \delta(E - H_\partial) \mathcal{N} \int [dh_{ab}] [d\pi^{ab}] [d\psi] [d\pi_\psi] \delta[\mathcal{H}] \delta[\mathcal{H}^a] |_{\text{classical}} = \delta(E - H_\partial) e^{S(E)}. \quad (20)$$

so that  $\int_{H_\partial - \Delta E}^{H_\partial + \Delta E} D(E) dE = e^{S(H_\partial)}$ .

Thus the log of the coefficient of the delta function gives the entropy of this configuration. i.e. the general expression for the exponential of the entropy for a stationary configuration is

$$e^{S(H_\partial)} = \mathcal{N} \int [dh_{ab}] [d\pi^{ab}] [d\psi] [d\pi_\psi] \delta[\mathcal{H}] \delta[\mathcal{H}^a] |_{H_\partial}. \quad (21)$$

Note that this formula is exact for stationary fluctuations around the original stationary background. In general of course we need to keep the time derivative terms in the exponent of (19). In the above we've assumed that there is no inner boundary so that the calculation is appropriate for the extended (two sided) black hole. If one ignored the delta functions in the measure (they are effectively a quantum correction), then we have in this approximation  $S(M) = 0$  which is consistent with the picture of a two sided black hole being a pure state as observed in [8]<sup>3</sup>. Note that the fields in the functional integral here are defined as functions of global coordinates so that  $\Sigma_t$  in the integrand of (19) is taken over both causal wedges (eg. region I and III of the Kruskal diagram in the black hole case). The same would be true of both dS and SAdS spaces. In other words the extended field space for all these configurations should have entropy zero. It is unclear how this generalizes to spaces with more than one horizon such as SdS Kerr black holes etc..

---

<sup>3</sup>In this reference the normalization factor is effectively set equal to one. However it is clear from the above that it has been implicitly defined such that the trace of the unit operator is one.

### 2.1.1 Schwarzschild black hole

If on the other hand we wish to compute the entropy of one sided black hole (here identified as say region  $I$  of the diagram for an eternal black hole) we need to compute in Schwarzschild coordinates in which case (since they diverge at the horizon) we need to insert a boundary there. Let us recall briefly<sup>4</sup> how the first term of (18) arose.

The boundary  $\partial\mathcal{V}$  of the region of integration in (1) can be split up into two space-like boundaries  $\Sigma_{t_1}, \Sigma_{t_2}$  and a time-like boundary  $\mathcal{B}$ . In the 1+3 split (ADM) formulation the action for pure gravity becomes (with  $I_m = \int \sqrt{|g|} \mathcal{L}_m$  being the matter action - including the cosmological constant),<sup>5</sup>

$$16\pi I [g_{\alpha\beta}] = \int_{\mathcal{V}} R\sqrt{-g}d^4x + 2 \int_{\partial\mathcal{V}} \epsilon K |h|^{1/2} d^3y + I_m = \int_{t_1}^{t_2} dt \int_{\Sigma_t} ({}^3R + K^{ab}K_{ab} - K^2 + \mathcal{L}_m) N\sqrt{h}d^3y + 2 \int_{t_1}^{t_2} dt \oint_{S_t} (\mathcal{K} + \nabla_{\beta} r_{\alpha} n^{\alpha} n^{\beta}) N\sqrt{\sigma}. \quad (22)$$

Note that the first term in the second line comes from the time-like part of the GH boundary term (2). Using the completeness relation for the metric (see footnote (5)) we then have

$$\mathcal{K} + \nabla_{\beta} r_{\alpha} n^{\alpha} n^{\beta} = \sigma^{AB} k_{AB} = k. \quad (23)$$

This boundary term in the action then gives us the first term of the boundary Hamiltonian in (18).

On the inner boundary (at the black hole horizon) however there is no GH boundary term thus the corresponding contribution to the boundary integral there is  $\frac{1}{8\pi} \oint_{\mathcal{H}_t} [\nabla_{\beta} r_{\alpha} n^{\alpha} n^{\beta}] N\sqrt{\sigma} d^2\theta$  (there is a minus sign from the fact that the outward normal to  $\mathcal{H}_t$  is  $-r_{\alpha}$  and another one from going from the action to the Hamiltonian). This is evaluated by first moving slightly away from the horizon (to the stretched horizon) where the relevant vectors ( $\hat{n}, \hat{r}$  are respectively still time-like and space-like). We have  $n^{\mu} = N^{-1} \frac{dx^{\mu}}{dt}$  (normalized to  $n^2 = -1$ ) and  $r^{\mu} = N \frac{dx^{\mu}}{dr}$  (normalized to  $r^2 = 1$ ) and  $r \cdot n = 0$ . Then <sup>6</sup>

$$Nn^{\mu}n^{\nu}\nabla_{\mu}r_{\nu} = -Nn^{\mu}r^{\nu}\nabla_{\mu}n_{\nu} = -Nn^{\mu}r^{\nu}\nabla_{\mu}(-N\nabla_{\nu}t) = N^2n^{\mu}r^{\nu}\nabla_{\mu}\nabla_{\nu}t = N^2n^{\mu}r^{\nu}\nabla_{\nu}(-N^{-1}n_{\mu}) = -N^2n^{\mu}r^{\nu}\nabla_{\nu}(N^{-1})n_{\mu} = -N^2n^{\mu}r^{\nu}(-N^{-2}\nabla_{\nu}N)n_{\mu} = -r^{\nu}\nabla_{\nu}N \rightarrow -N\nabla_r N|_{r \rightarrow r_{\mathcal{H}_t}} = -\kappa,$$

<sup>4</sup>For details see for example [11] section 4.2.

<sup>5</sup> $n$  is the time-like normal to  $\Sigma_t$  and  $r$  is the space-like normal to  $\mathcal{B}$ ,  $y, z$  are respectively coordinates on  $\Sigma_t, \mathcal{B}$  with metrics  $h_{ab}, \gamma_{ij}$ . Also  $\mathcal{K} = \gamma^{ij}\mathcal{K}_{ij} = \gamma^{ij} \left( e_i^{\alpha} e_j^{\beta} \nabla_{\beta} r_{\alpha} \right)$ . One also has the completeness relation for the metric  $g^{\alpha\beta} = r^{\alpha}r^{\beta} + \gamma^{\alpha\beta} = r^{\alpha}r^{\beta} - n^{\alpha}n^{\beta} + \sigma^{AB}e_A^{\alpha}e_B^{\beta}$ . Also note that  $\mathcal{B}$  is foliated by  $S_t$ .

<sup>6</sup>All but the last two steps below are the same as in footnote 13 of [15] except that it's in Euclidean form.

where we used  $r^\nu \nabla_\nu t = 0$ ,  $n^2 = -1$ ,  $n^\mu \nabla_\nu n_\mu = 0$ , and  $\kappa$  is the surface gravity at the relevant horizon<sup>7</sup>.

$$\Delta H_\partial = \frac{1}{8\pi} \oint_{\mathcal{H}_t} [\nabla_\beta r_\alpha n^\alpha n^\beta] N \sqrt{\sigma} d^2\theta = -\frac{1}{8\pi} \kappa \mathcal{A}_{\mathcal{H}_t}. \quad (24)$$

Thus what one actually gets from the Lorentzian calculation is (in the classical approximation as above with the path integral saturated by a single black hole of mass  $M = \frac{1}{8\pi} \oint_{S_t^\infty} (k - k_0) N \sqrt{\sigma}$ )

$$D(E) = \delta \left( E - \left( M - \frac{1}{8\pi} \kappa \mathcal{A} \right) \right).$$

How are we to interpret this result? The formula tells us that only states satisfying the relation  $M = E + \frac{1}{8\pi} \kappa \mathcal{A}$  contribute. Alternatively if one computed the partition function in this approximation<sup>8</sup> we have

$$Z = e^{-\beta F} = \int dE D(E) e^{-\beta E} = e^{-\beta \left( M - \frac{\kappa}{2\pi} \frac{1}{4} \mathcal{A} \right)}. \quad (25)$$

If we identify  $\kappa/2\pi$  as the temperature and  $M$  as the internal energy  $U$  then comparing this with the thermodynamic relation  $F = U - TS$  we would obtain the relation  $S = \mathcal{A}/4$ . However this classical approximation to the Lorentzian path integral cannot give an independent derivation of the Hawking temperature. This should not be surprising since if we restored Planck's constant Hawking's expression for the temperature is  $\kappa \hbar / 2\pi$ . In other words the temperature is a quantum effect and was derived by Hawking by computing the Green's functions of quantum fields in a black hole background. One should not expect to derive it in the classical approximation.

Of course once we have the temperature and the identification of the internal energy  $U = \langle E \rangle$  as the black hole mass  $M$  one could have integrated the first law  $dU = TdS$  to get the entropy up to an arbitrary constant i.e.  $S = \frac{1}{4} \mathcal{A} / \hbar + \text{constant}$ . The above argument fixes the constant to be zero.

### 2.1.2 AdS black hole (SAdS)

This has the metric

$$ds^2 = - \left( 1 - \frac{2M}{r} + \frac{r^2}{b^2} \right) dt^2 + \left( 1 - \frac{2M}{r} + \frac{r^2}{b^2} \right)^{-1} dr^2 + r^2 d\Omega_2^2 \quad (26)$$

---

<sup>7</sup>The surface gravity  $\kappa$  is defined by the acceleration at the horizon,  $\xi^\beta \nabla_\beta \xi^\alpha = \kappa \xi^\alpha$  and can be shown to be constant at the horizon. For static space times it can be shown that  $\kappa = N \frac{dN}{dr}$  where  $r$  is the radial coordinate and  $N = N(r)$ .

<sup>8</sup>Note that here we just have one fixed energy - since we are focused on just one black hole. So the issue of the divergence of the partition function does not arise. In other words we are simply identifying what the free energy is corresponding to the one black hole configuration.

Here  $b \equiv \sqrt{3/|\Lambda|}$  is the AdS radius. For  $M = 0$  we have (global) AdS while for  $b \rightarrow \infty$  we have the Schwarzschild black hole. There is only one horizon in this space time which can be identified with the horizon of the black hole, i.e. the solution of  $\left(1 - \frac{2M}{r} + \frac{r^2}{b^2}\right) = 0$ . Calling this  $r_+$  we have the relation

$$2M = r_+ \left(1 + \frac{r_+^2}{b^2}\right). \quad (27)$$

The thermodynamics of this space time using Euclidean methods was worked out in [7]. The Hawking temperature calculation gives<sup>9</sup>

$$\beta = \frac{4\pi r_+ b^2}{b^2 + 3r_+^2}. \quad (28)$$

Note that  $\beta < \beta_0 \equiv \frac{2\pi b}{\sqrt{3}}$  (i.e.  $T > T_0 \frac{\sqrt{3}}{2\pi b}$ ). Also  $T \rightarrow \infty$  for  $r_+ = 0$  and  $r_+ \rightarrow \infty$  and the temperature is minimum at  $r_+ = r_0 \equiv \frac{b}{\sqrt{3}}$ . Unlike in flat space in AdS a black hole can be in thermodynamic equilibrium with radiation without artificial reflecting walls. Note however that for a given temperature there are two possible solutions for the horizon radius  $r_+$ . The larger value corresponds to a black hole with positive specific heat (unlike its flat space analog) and hence is stable, while the smaller value has negative specific heat and is unstable to decay into a bath of radiation. This is easily seen from the graph of temperature vs. radius. So for  $r_+ > r_0$  we have a stable black hole whilst for  $r_+ < r_0$  the black hole is unstable and will decay into radiation. This is the so-called Hawking-Page phase transition.

As for the entropy calculation, in our Hamiltonian framework it proceeds as in the flat space case except that for  $k_0$  in (18) one now has  $k$  evaluated in the background AdS space rather than in flat space and the horizon radius and inverse temperatures are given by (27) and (28). Thus the formula for the free energy is again given by (25) so that the entropy (after identifying  $\beta = \frac{2\pi}{\kappa}$ ) is again

$$S = \frac{1}{4}\mathcal{A} = \pi r_+^2, \quad (29)$$

with the horizon radius given in terms of the black hole mass by (27). The latter formula also tells us that for large  $r_+, M$ , the entropy goes as  $M^{2/3}$ . So unlike in the flat space case, the density of states does not swamp the Boltzmann term  $-\beta M$  and the canonical ensemble is well-defined.

---

<sup>9</sup>As is well-known the quick and easy way of getting the temperature is to Euclideanize the metric and then require the absence of a conical singularity at  $r = r_+$  giving  $\beta = \frac{4\pi}{(dN^2/dr)_{r=r_+}}$ . However this is equivalent to the original Lorentzian calculation of Hawking in terms of QFT in a curved background so is independent of Euclidean methods.

### 2.1.3 deSitter space (dS)

Now consider dS. Again as in the black hole case if we identify the spatial slice  $\Sigma_t$  as extending over the whole spatial region of global dS we would get zero entropy (at least classically as in the black hole case). On the other hand if we take  $\Sigma_t$  as extending only over the static patch (i.e. from the dS horizon to  $r = 0$ ), we get (since the only boundary is at the dS horizon ( $r = 0$  is the origin of coordinates!)),

$$D(E) = \delta \left( E + \frac{1}{8\pi} \kappa_c \mathcal{A}_c \right).$$

Again to interpret this we need to go back to the partition function so,

$$Z = e^{-\beta F} = \int dE D(E) e^{-\beta E} = e^{-\beta \left( -\frac{\kappa_c}{2\pi} \frac{1}{4} \mathcal{A}_c \right)}. \quad (30)$$

As before identifying  $\kappa_c/2\pi$  as the temperature of the horizon [2] and comparing with the formula  $F = U - TS$  but now with the internal energy<sup>10</sup>  $U = 0$  we get the Gibbons-Hawking result  $S = \frac{1}{4} \mathcal{A}_c$ . In this case there is no direct way of comparing with the thermodynamic identity  $dU = TdS$  since the energy is fixed at zero (actually it is not defined). The Gibbons-Hawking argument proceeds by adding external energy to the system and identifying it as that which goes into the thermodynamic identity  $dU$ . We will discuss the implications of this below after rederiving the geometric version of the thermodynamic identity.

In computing the surface gravity at the dS horizon from the formula  $\kappa = \frac{1}{2} \nabla_r N^2$ , it should be noted that this gives the right sign for a black hole where  $N^2 = 1 - r_s/r$ ,  $\kappa = 1/2r_s$ , whereas for dS space, where  $N^2 = 1 - r^2/r_{\text{dS}}^2$ , since the direction of increasing  $r$  is the opposite of the black hole case,  $\kappa = -\frac{1}{2} \nabla_r N^2$ , giving  $\kappa = 1/r_{\text{dS}}$ .

### 2.1.4 deSitter black hole (SdS)

Now let us consider Schwarzschild deSitter (SdS) space. The metric is

$$ds^2 = - \left( 1 - \frac{2M}{r} - \frac{\Lambda}{3} r^2 \right) dt^2 + \left( 1 - \frac{2M}{r} - \frac{\Lambda}{3} r^2 \right)^{-1} dr^2 + r^2 d\Omega_2^2. \quad (31)$$

Now there is a black hole horizon at  $r = r_b$  as well as a cosmological horizon at  $r = r_c$  (when  $\Lambda > 0$ ,  $9\Lambda M^2 < 1$ )<sup>11</sup>, whose positions are given by the two positive roots of  $r - 2M - \frac{\Lambda}{3} r^3 = 0$ . The three roots are such that  $r_- < 0 < 2M < r_b < 3M < r_c$  and  $N^2 = -\frac{1}{r} \frac{\Lambda}{3} (r - r_-) (r - r_b) (r - r_c)$ . The maximum value of the black hole mass is  $M = \Lambda^{-1/2}/3$  where the two horizons coincide - this is the so-called Narai space. From the above formula we then have, with the upper(lower) sign for

<sup>10</sup>There is no boundary energy associated with dS, so Gibbons and Hawking take it to be zero [1]

<sup>11</sup>If the last inequality is not satisfied the two real positive roots become complex and there are no horizons.

blackhole(cosmological) horizons, because of the different directions in which the horizon normals point with respect to the direction of increasing  $r$ .

$$T_{b,c} = \frac{1}{2\pi} \kappa_{b,c} = \pm \frac{1}{2\pi} \frac{1}{2} \left( \frac{2M}{r_{b,c}^2} - \frac{\Lambda}{3} 2r_{b,c} \right). \quad (32)$$

There are now two temperatures one associated with the black hole horizon and the other with the cosmological horizon. The thermodynamics of such a situation is unclear. In fact the system is not in thermal equilibrium and is unstable [9][10].

## 2.2 Alternative Lorentzian arguments

### 2.2.1 Lorentzian conical singularity argument

Marolf [16] has given a Lorentzian argument for the (Schwarzschild) black hole entropy formula. Let us first note that in the Hamiltonian framework, after imposing the constraints it is clear that there is no singularity in the integrand for the action, since (for a static or stationary metric) the Hamiltonian version of the action consists of the boundary terms identified in the previous subsection.

Alternatively let us take the Lagrangian in 3+1 split form given in eqn. (22). On a classical solution one must have  $\mathcal{H}K^{ab}K_{ab} - K^2 - {}^3R = 0$ . Thus we have

$$\begin{aligned} 16\pi I_{cl} &= 2 \int_{t_1}^{t_2} dt \int_{\Sigma_t} (K^{ab}K_{ab} - K^2) N \sqrt{h} d^3y \\ &\quad - 2 \int_{t_1}^{t_2} dt \oint_{S_t} (\mathcal{K} + \nabla_{\beta} r_{\alpha} n^{\alpha} n^{\beta}) N \sqrt{\sigma}. \end{aligned}$$

Again it is clear that the Lorentzian action is well defined on a solution.

Nevertheless it has been argued in [16] that the functional integral is better approximated by slices that are not solutions but contain conical singularities. By contour deformation into the complex plane one can still pick up a saddle point and it turns out to be the Euclidean black hole solution. It would be interesting to see whether this procedure can be applied to dS, SdS and SAdS spaces as well.

### 2.2.2 Algebraic QFT argument

In a recent work Chandrasekaran Pennington and Witten[17] have discussed black hole thermodynamics from an Algebraic QFT perspective. Also these authors and Longo [18], have discussed the thermodynamics of dS spaces from the same point of view. Apparently the Von Neumann algebras

in the two cases are different, which seems rather curious. The arguments are rather abstract and it is not clear to us how it relates to our Hamiltonian argument or to the original Euclidean calculations. Nevertheless it is important to understand the connection. We leave further discussion of this to future work.

## 2.3 Euclidean calculation

At this point it behoves us to revisit the Euclidean argument. Here one argues that the partition function can be represented as a functional integral of a Euclidean action. So we write

$$\begin{aligned} Z &= \text{Tr} e^{-\beta H} = \mathcal{N} \int_{\phi(\tau=0)=\phi(\tau=\beta)} [d\phi] \int [d\pi] e^{\int_0^\beta d\tau' [\int_\Sigma \pi \dot{\phi} - H]} \\ &= \mathcal{N} \int_{\phi(\tau=0)=\phi(\tau=\beta)} [d\phi] \int [d\pi] e^{\int_0^\beta d\tau' [\int_\Sigma (\pi \dot{\phi} - N\mathcal{H} - N^a \mathcal{P}_a) - H_\partial]} \end{aligned}$$

Assuming again that the path integral is well-approximated by a single stationary classical solution (which must necessarily satisfy  $\mathcal{H} = \mathcal{P}_a = 0$ ), we have

$$Z = \text{Tr} e^{-\beta H} \simeq \mathcal{N} \int_{\phi(\tau=0)=\phi(\tau=\beta)} [d\phi] \int [d\pi] e^{\int_0^\beta d\tau' [-H_\partial]} \quad (33)$$

The Euclidean metric only describes region I of the black hole or just the static patch of deSitter space. The horizon, as is well-known, has a conical singularity which needs to be resolved. In addition to the boundary Hamiltonian coming from infinity, we have also the term corresponding to (24). This then gives for the exponent in (33)  $-\frac{1}{8\pi} \int_0^\beta \kappa \mathcal{A}_\mathcal{H} d\tau$ . Putting  $\kappa d\tau = d\theta$  the integral becomes  $-\frac{1}{8\pi} \int_0^{\kappa\beta} \mathcal{A}_\mathcal{H} d\theta$  and resolving the conical singularity amounts to making the range of  $\theta$  cover the full circle of polar coordinates so that  $\kappa\beta = 2\pi$  implying that<sup>12</sup>  $T = \kappa/2\pi$  and the integral becomes  $-\frac{1}{4} \mathcal{A}_\mathcal{H}$  which from (33) may be identified with the entropy associated with the corresponding horizon.

All this is well-known of course - all we've done in the previous subsection, is to reformulate the calculation in Hamiltonian framework. However let us now consider the SdS case. There are two horizons with two different temperatures<sup>13</sup>  $T_b = \kappa_b/2\pi$  and  $T_c = \kappa_c/2\pi$ . In this case there is no way to resolve both conical singularities. This means that this Euclidean configuration will not satisfy the Euclidean equation of motion, breaking down at one or other conical singularity

<sup>12</sup>As mentioned before the temperature calculation necessarily involves quantum mechanics. This is seen here from the fact that  $\tau$  has dimensions of a length (with  $c = 1$  but  $\hbar \neq 1$ ), whereas  $\beta$  which is defined as an inverse temperature in the definition of  $Z$  has dimensions of inverse energy and  $\kappa$  has inverse length dimensions. So restoring the factor of  $\hbar^{-1}$  and  $G$  in the functional integral we have  $\hbar\beta\kappa = 2\pi$  giving  $T = \kappa\hbar/2\pi$  and  $S = \mathcal{A}/4G\hbar$ .

<sup>13</sup>except in the degenerate Narai case where  $r_b = r_c = \Lambda^{-1/2}$  and  $T_b = T_c = 0$

depending on which one was resolved[10]. Indeed it is hard to envisage such a system as being in thermal equilibrium unless as advocated by Gibbons and Hawking [2] one inserts a perfectly reflecting wall between the two horizons.

The above calculation is completely equivalent to that using the Gauss-Bonnet (GB) theorem<sup>14</sup> presented in [19]. That argument although specifically aimed at black holes can clearly be used in the dS case as well. However it cannot be applied to an SdS space. As we've discussed above once one has introduced the range of the Euclidean time variable to be  $\beta$  then the corresponding angular range is  $\beta\kappa$ . In the application of the GB theorem one is using it for the complete disc. But in the SdS case one can complete the disc by taking  $\beta\kappa = 2\pi$  at one horizon or the other but clearly not both, since there is only parameter  $\beta$  defining the ensemble<sup>15</sup>.

### 2.3.1 The problem with Euclidean arguments

While the Euclidean calculations in GH1 seem to give physically meaningful results as long as we just compute the leading (classical) contribution), going beyond this with the functional integral in the Euclidean section is problematic. This is due to the well known conformal factor problem. Computing quantum corrections to the leading order expressions for the entropy will inevitably involve confronting the wrong sign of the kinetic terms for the conformal fluctuations. This is of course well-known and indeed was pointed out in the original papers by Hawking and collaborators (see for instance Hawking's essay in [12]). Nevertheless at the leading order the Euclidean argument gives the correct result - in so far as it agrees with the thermodynamic identity  $dE = TdS$  when the calculation of the temperature in Hawking's original paper which is the Lorentzian calculation is substituted for  $T$ . Of course this determines  $S$  only up to a constant.

In our discussion (subsection (2.1)) and in particular eqn. (15) we gave a Lorentzian formula which in the leading order justifies the Euclidean calculation - including the constant. Furthermore in principle this formula is well-defined (at least perturbatively and subject to the treatment quantum gravity as an effective theory below the cutoff (at Planck or string scale or whatever theory UV completes Einstein's theory). In other words the formula avoids the problems of the Euclidean path integral precisely because of the delta functions in the measure which impose the constraints in the quantum theory.

---

<sup>14</sup>The Gauss Bonnet theorem is valid for compact two dimensional manifolds. The argument of the above reference relies on the fact that in the near horizon region the space time factorizes into a two dimensional cone times an  $S_2$ .

<sup>15</sup>Here we disagree with [20]. This paper claims to derive the (admittedly compelling) formula  $S_{\text{SdS}} = \frac{1}{4}(\mathcal{A}_b + \mathcal{A}_c)$  by using (in effect) the GB theorem. However as argued above one cannot use it simultaneously at both horizon. In [21] the entropy formula for SdS in 3 dimensions is derived. But this space has only one horizon and hence only one temperature, so the above problem does not arise.

### 3 Smarr relations and the first law of Gravitational Thermodynamics - identifying cosmological entropy

In this section we first review both the Smarr relation and the related first law of gravitational thermodynamics [22] with the aim of clarifying a sign issue in its application to dS spacetime.

The Smarr relation for (Kerr) black holes is,

$$M - 2\Omega_H J_H - \frac{1}{4\pi}\kappa_H \mathcal{A}_H = \frac{1}{4\pi} \int_{\Sigma} R^\mu{}_\nu t^\nu d\Sigma_\mu \quad (34)$$

Here  $M$  is the total mass defined as an integral over the bounding surface at infinity of the black hole space-time (taken to be asymptotically flat) and  $\Sigma$  extends from the event horizon to the sphere at infinity.  $\Omega_H, \kappa_H$  are the angular velocity and the surface gravity of the black hole horizon  $H$ . The corresponding first law of black thermodynamics is

$$\begin{aligned} \delta M - \Omega_H \delta J_H - \frac{\kappa_H}{2\pi} \delta \left( \frac{1}{4} \mathcal{A}_H \right) &= \frac{1}{8\pi} \delta \int G^u{}_\nu t^\nu d\Sigma_\mu - \frac{1}{16\pi} \int G^{\mu\nu} \delta g_{\mu\nu} t^\lambda d\Sigma_\lambda \\ &= \delta \int T^u{}_\nu t^\nu d\Sigma_\mu - \frac{1}{2} \int T^{\mu\nu} \delta g_{\mu\nu} t^\lambda d\Sigma_\lambda. \end{aligned} \quad (35)$$

Here  $t^\mu$  is the time like Killing vector of the space-time and the integrals are over the space-like surface between the black hole horizon and the bounding surface at infinity, with  $d\Sigma_\mu = n_\mu d\Sigma$  being the oriented surface element.  $T_{\mu\nu}$  is the energy momentum tensor (including a cosmological constant term<sup>16</sup> or a possibly non-zero minimum of a scalar potential, of an external (to the black hole horizon) matter distribution. Consider now SdS space. Here the surface  $\Sigma$  may be taken to be stretched between the black hole horizon and the cosmological horizon. Denoting the quantities evaluated at the latter by the subscript  $c$  the above two relations take the form<sup>17</sup>

$$-\frac{1}{4\pi}\kappa_c \mathcal{A}_c - 2\Omega_H J_H - \frac{1}{4\pi}\kappa_H \mathcal{A}_H = \frac{1}{4\pi} \int R^\mu{}_\nu t^\nu d\Sigma_\mu \quad (36)$$

and

$$\begin{aligned} -\frac{\kappa_c}{2\pi} \delta \left( \frac{1}{4} \mathcal{A}_c \right) - \Omega_H \delta J_H - \frac{\kappa_H}{2\pi} \delta \left( \frac{1}{4} \mathcal{A}_H \right) &= \frac{1}{8\pi} \delta \int G^u{}_\nu t^\nu d\Sigma_\mu - \frac{1}{16\pi} \int G^{\mu\nu} \delta g_{\mu\nu} t^\lambda d\Sigma_\lambda \\ &= \delta \int T^u{}_\nu t^\nu d\Sigma_\mu - \frac{1}{2} \int T^{\mu\nu} \delta g_{\mu\nu} t^\lambda d\Sigma_\lambda. \end{aligned} \quad (37)$$

<sup>16</sup>So for a pure cosmological constant term without dynamical matter  $T_{\mu\nu} = -\frac{1}{8\pi}\Lambda g_{\mu\nu}$ .

<sup>17</sup>In the original derivation [22] the second term in eqn. (37) was not given but was included in a subsequent essay by B. Carter in [12].

Here  $G_{\mu\nu} = R_{\mu\nu} - \frac{1}{2}R$  and we've used the Einstein equation in the last line. The terms involving the angular velocity correspond to chemical potential terms (such as  $\mu dN$ ) in the thermodynamic identity. Let us ignore these (or consider non-rotating black holes). As discussed above, Hawking's QFT calculation established that a black hole appears to an external observer at infinity as a black body at a temperature  $T_H = \kappa_H \hbar/2\pi$ . A similar argument by Gibbons and Hawking established that to a observer at (say) the origin of static patch coordinates in dS would associate a temperature  $\kappa_c \hbar/2\pi$  to the cosmological horizon. From (35) after identifying  $M$  as the total energy of the system and setting for the moment the external matter-energy to zero, we would have in the black hole case  $\delta M = T_H \delta \left( \frac{1}{4\hbar} \mathcal{A}_H \right)$ , giving the well-known identification of the entropy of a black hole to be  $S = \frac{1}{4\hbar} \mathcal{A}_H$ , after fixing the integration constant to be zero.

On the other hand the corresponding formula for the dS or SdS case is (37). Taking pure dS with some external matter the formula becomes

$$-\frac{\kappa_c}{2\pi} \delta \left( \frac{1}{4} \mathcal{A}_c \right) = \delta \int T^u{}_\nu t^\nu d\Sigma_\mu - \frac{1}{2} \int T^{\mu\nu} \delta g_{\mu\nu} t^\lambda d\Sigma_\lambda. \quad (38)$$

Let us take  $T^{\mu\nu} = -\Lambda g^{\mu\nu}$ , so that initially we have empty dS space. The second term is then  $\Lambda \int g^{\mu\nu} \delta g_{\mu\nu} t^\lambda d\Sigma_\lambda = -\Lambda \int \frac{\delta(N\sqrt{h}}{N} d^3y$  which even for  $\Lambda > 0$ , as is the case here, may be positive or negative. However if the result of adding matter is the creation of a small black hole then this additional term is zero. To see this consider the SdS metric Taking  $\delta g_{\mu\nu}$  to be the result of changing  $M \rightarrow M + \delta M$  (and then setting  $M = 0$ ) we get

$$g^{\mu\nu} \delta g_{\mu\nu} = 0$$

(true even for  $M \neq 0$ ) since  $\sqrt{g}$  is independent of  $M$ . In this case from (38) we have, after identifying  $\frac{\kappa_c}{2\pi} = T_c$  as the temperature of the dS horizon, and  $\delta \int T^u{}_\nu t^\nu d\Sigma_\mu = \delta E$  as the variation of Killing energy, and then comparing with the thermodynamic identity  $\delta E = T \delta S$ , the variation of the entropy associated with the horizon to be  $\delta S_c = -\delta \left( \frac{1}{4} \mathcal{A}_c \right)$ !

This is a long standing puzzle and various resolutions have been proposed. A summary of these proposals has been given in [23]. The original paper [2] had one explanation for it. This was clarified further in [21]<sup>18</sup>. The argument is based on the fact that in the space-like slice of the global dS space is closed so that the total energy (which is a boundary term because of the constraints) is zero. Suppose that the observer is at the south pole of the  $S_3$ . Any added energy there must be balanced by negative energy in the causal patch of the north pole. The

---

<sup>18</sup>In [21] the entropy and the thermodynamic relation for  $dS_3$  was investigated. Following arguments of Gibbons and Hawking the authors considered  $SdS_3$  which only has a horizon at  $r_b = \sqrt{1 - 8GM}$ , and so correspondingly only one temperature  $T = \frac{1}{2\pi} \sqrt{1 - 8GM}$ . They then integrate  $dM = T dS$  and fixing the integration constant so that the maximal mass black hole (with  $M = 1/8G$ ) has zero entropy, which gives them  $S = -\mathcal{A}_b/4G$ ! However as in the above discussion they argue that the correct interpretation of the thermodynamic identity is  $d(-M) = T dS$  which then gives positive entropy. See the discussion around figure 8 of that paper.

thermodynamic relation must reflect what from the observer's point of view is happening beyond the horizon of the observer, i.e. in the north pole patch. Thus the observer would conclude that in that patch the added energy is negative and hence the relation(38) (after dropping the last term) should be read as

$$\frac{\kappa_c}{2\pi} \delta \left( \frac{1}{4} \mathcal{A}_c \right) = T dS = -\delta \int T^u{}_\nu t^\nu d\Sigma_\mu = \delta E \quad (39)$$

where  $\delta E$  now refers to the observer's interpretation of what goes on behind the horizon.

This argument has been criticized in [23] on the grounds that the time-like Killing vector in the north pole patch is pointing downwards - meaning that in that patch the Killing energy (which is the negative of the Killing energy in the south pole patch) is actually positive. However this is not relevant to the thermodynamics of the cosmological horizon of the south pole observer who must interpret what is going on behind the horizon. In other words from the south pole it appears as if the observed system, i.e. the one beyond the south pole observer's horizon, has acquired negative energy and the relevant relation is (39). Obviously observers on the North pole will infer a similar relation for the thermodynamics of what is beyond their horizon. There is of course an inevitable subjectivity in these interpretations since the horizon itself is observer dependent. The paper [23] also argues that if, as is expected, the state of global dS is a pure state (as also argued in the comments after eqn. (19) in this note), then the entropy inside the horizon must equal the entropy outside so both must decrease. However this is in contradiction with the argument in [21] since the energy inside is obviously increasing. But here again the issue is what does the entropy inside mean? What [23] refers to as entropy inside is actually the horizon entropy as seen by the observer at the north pole. As argued above this also decreases since there is complete symmetry between the two observers. In other words once one interprets entropy as representing a measure of the information inaccessible to each observer, then there is no conflict<sup>19</sup>.

Now if we use (39) to solve for the entropy we get

$$S = \frac{1}{4} \mathcal{A}_c + \text{constant}.$$

How are we to fix this constant? In the black hole case the constant was fixed by arguing that when the horizon area goes to zero (i.e. the black hole mass is zero) we should get flat space, which should have zero entropy, thus fixing the constant to be zero. In the dS case however the horizon going to zero is the infinite cosmological constant<sup>20</sup> case! This seems bizarre to say the least. On the other hand if we had set the constant to be zero, as is usually done then as discussed earlier, we would get the entropy of empty flat space (i.e. when  $r_{\text{ds}} \rightarrow \infty$ ) to be infinite in sharp contradiction to the argument in the black hole case where the entropy of flat space was set to

---

<sup>19</sup>The work of [23] advocates an alternate interpretation. It is based on a somewhat different interpretation of horizon entropy than what is advocated in [21] and the present work.

<sup>20</sup> $\mathcal{A}_c = 4\pi r_{\text{ds}}^2$ , where  $r_s = \sqrt{3/\Lambda}$  so flat space is obtained in the limit  $r_s \rightarrow \infty$ .

zero! But as we saw above this entropy is the maximum possible in dS space so its Minkowski limit is the maximum entropy that that space can hold which is plausibly infinite. However the point is that there is no plausible argument for fixing this constant unlike in the black hole case. Our Hamiltonian perspective however did fix both constants.

## 4 Conclusion

In these notes we've reviewed the entropy calculations for static space-times with horizons, based on Euclidean arguments, and presented alternative Lorentzian arguments. At leading order these serve to justify the leading order Euclidean calculations. However unlike the Euclidean calculations which suffer from the well-known problem of the wrong sign kinetic term for conformal fluctuations, the Lorentzian method is well-defined modulo the usual problems of perturbative quantum field theories with gravity. In particular the formulae for the entropy (19) to (21) are free of the conformal factor issue since the constraints eliminate integration over these unphysical modes. Approximating the relevant path integrals with a single black hole etc. leads to the familiar expressions derived by Euclidean methods.

It should be pointed out that we do not have an independent derivation of the Hawking temperature - for that we need to appeal to Hawking's original Lorentzian calculations. Of course once one has the Hawking temperature formulae one may use the thermodynamic identity to evaluate changes in the entropy. Our calculation shows how the constant may be fixed. This is particularly relevant in the dS case since (unlike in the black hole case) the constant cannot be fixed by taking the flat space limit. We also discussed the AdS black hole case and noted some puzzles associated with SdS space.

Finally we revisited the geometric version of the first law and argued in favor of the analysis of [21] (a modified version of that in [2]) for interpreting the sign of this relation in the dS case.

## 5 Acknowledgements

I wish to thank Sebastian Céspedes, Francesco Muia, and Fernando Quevedo for discussions. I also wish to thank Don Marolf for clarifying the arguments of [16] and to Ted Jacobson for email correspondence on [23].

## References

- [1] G. W. Gibbons and S. W. Hawking, *Phys. Rev. D* **15**, 2752 (1977).
- [2] G. W. Gibbons and S. W. Hawking, *Phys. Rev. D* **15**, 2738 (1977).

- [3] S. W. Hawking, Commun. Math. Phys. **43**, 199 (1975), [Erratum: Commun.Math.Phys. 46, 206 (1976)].
- [4] J. W. York, Jr., Phys. Rev. Lett. **28**, 1082 (1972).
- [5] J. D. Brown and J. W. York, Jr., in *The Black Hole 25 Years After* (1994), pp. 1–24, [gr-qc/9405024](#).
- [6] J. D. Brown and J. W. York, Jr., Phys. Rev. D **47**, 1420 (1993), [gr-qc/9209014](#).
- [7] S. W. Hawking and D. N. Page, Commun. Math. Phys. **87**, 577 (1983).
- [8] E. A. Martinez, Phys. Rev. D **51**, 5732 (1995), [gr-qc/9412051](#).
- [9] R. Bousso and S. W. Hawking, Phys. Rev. D **54**, 6312 (1996), [gr-qc/9606052](#).
- [10] C. Teitelboim, in *Meeting on Strings and Gravity: Tying the Forces Together* (2001), pp. 291–299, [hep-th/0203258](#).
- [11] E. Poisson, *A Relativist’s Toolkit: The Mathematics of Black-Hole Mechanics* (Cambridge University Press, 2009).
- [12] S. W. Hawking and W. Israel, *General Relativity: An Einstein Centenary Survey* (Univ. Pr., Cambridge, UK, 1979), ISBN 978-0-521-29928-2.
- [13] T. Banks, Int. J. Mod. Phys. A **16**, 910 (2001), [hep-th/0007146](#).
- [14] W. Fischler, Talk given at role of scaling laws in physics and biology (Celebrating the 60th birthday of Geoffrey West), Santa Fe **19** (2000).
- [15] B. Banihashemi and T. Jacobson, JHEP **07**, 042 (2022), [2204.05324](#).
- [16] D. Marolf, JHEP **07**, 108 (2022), [2203.07421](#).
- [17] V. Chandrasekaran, G. Penington, and E. Witten (2022), [2209.10454](#).
- [18] V. Chandrasekaran, R. Longo, G. Penington, and E. Witten, JHEP **02**, 082 (2023), [2206.10780](#).
- [19] M. Banados, C. Teitelboim, and J. Zanelli, Phys. Rev. Lett. **72**, 957 (1994), [gr-qc/9309026](#).
- [20] R. Gregory, I. G. Moss, and B. Withers, JHEP **03**, 081 (2014), [1401.0017](#).

- [21] M. Spradlin, A. Strominger, and A. Volovich, in *Les Houches Summer School: Session 76: Euro Summer School on Unity of Fundamental Physics: Gravity, Gauge Theory and Strings* (2001), pp. 423–453, [hep-th/0110007](#).
- [22] J. M. Bardeen, B. Carter, and S. W. Hawking, *Commun. Math. Phys.* **31**, 161 (1973).
- [23] B. Banhashemi, T. Jacobson, A. Svesko, and M. Visser (2022), [2208.11706](#).
- [24] S. K. Blau, E. I. Guendelman, and A. H. Guth, *Phys. Rev. D* **35**, 1747 (1987).
- [25] J. D. Brown and J. W. York, Jr., *Phys. Rev. D* **47**, 1407 (1993), [gr-qc/9209012](#).
- [26] J. D. Brown and J. W. York, Jr., *Math. Phys. Stud.* **15**, 23 (1994), [gr-qc/9303012](#).
- [27] A. D. Linde, *Lett. Nuovo Cim.* **39**, 401 (1984).
- [28] A. Vilenkin, *Phys. Rev. D* **30**, 509 (1984).
- [29] A. Vilenkin, *Phys. Lett. B* **117**, 25 (1982).
- [30] J. B. Hartle and S. W. Hawking, *Phys. Rev. D* **28**, 2960 (1983).
- [31] A. R. Brown and A. Dahlen, *Phys. Rev. D* **85**, 104026 (2012), [1111.0301](#).
- [32] E. Witten, *Nucl. Phys. B* **195**, 481 (1982).
- [33] J. Maldacena (2010), [1012.0274](#).
- [34] C. G. Callan, Jr. and S. R. Coleman, *Phys. Rev. D* **16**, 1762 (1977).
- [35] S. Cespedes, S. P. de Alwis, F. Muia, and F. Quevedo, *Phys. Rev. D* **104**, 026013 (2021), [2011.13936](#).
- [36] T. C. Bachlechner, *JHEP* **12**, 155 (2016), [1608.07576](#).
- [37] L. Susskind (2021), [2107.11688](#).
- [38] S. P. De Alwis, F. Muia, V. Pasquarella, and F. Quevedo, *Fortsch. Phys.* **68**, 2000069 (2020), [1909.01975](#).
- [39] E. Farhi, A. H. Guth, and J. Guven, *Nucl. Phys. B* **339**, 417 (1990).
- [40] S. R. Coleman and F. De Luccia, *Phys. Rev. D* **21**, 3305 (1980).
- [41] W. Fischler, D. Morgan, and J. Polchinski, *Phys. Rev. D* **42**, 4042 (1990).