Comments on Papadodimas-Raju

Santa Barbara Gravity Workshop II Joe Polchinski

Attractive features of PR:

- Incorporates the expectation that typical states do not have firewalls
- Provides a framework for spacetime from entanglement, ER=EPR
- Passes some nontrivial tests

Main point here: make more precise the nature of the *state-dependence*.

Ordinary QM: The system is in a state $|\Psi>$. We have a basis |i>. The probability of finding the system in a given basis state is

 $|\langle i|\Psi\rangle|^2 = \langle \Psi|P_i|\Psi\rangle$

The probability of finding a given excitation is

 $\sum_{i \in S} |\langle i | \Psi \rangle|^2 = \langle \Psi | P_S | \Psi \rangle$

where *S* is the set of all states with the given excitation and background. The `background-dependence', i.e. the black hole or whatever is being excited, is all built into *i* and *S*. P_S is a linear operator, which does not depend on $|\Psi>$.

This is the Born rule, and PR modify it.

$$\mathsf{PR:} \quad \widetilde{A}_p = g^{mn} A_m e^{\frac{-\beta H}{2}} A_p^{\dagger} e^{\frac{\beta H}{2}} |\Psi_E\rangle \langle \Psi_E | A_n^{\dagger}$$

Here, $g_{mn} = \overline{A_m A_n^{\dagger}}$, $|\Psi_E\rangle = U|\Psi\rangle$, $U = \exp(i\theta^m A_m)$, and the θ^m are determined by

$$\langle \Psi | U^{-1}A_p U | \Psi \rangle = \overline{A_p}$$

This last step may be well defined (*N* equations for *N* unknowns, if we only act with untilded *A*'s) but it introduces a complicated $|\Psi\rangle$ dependence into operators, e.g. P_S : it modifies the Born rule.

One symptom (Marolf): it is possible to find states

10>, lexc>

such that, according to PR, the first is definitely unexcited and the second is definitely excited yet

 $<0|exc> = 1 - \varepsilon$,

not zero. In ordinary QM, this is not possible. E.g., what is the excitation probability for

 $\alpha |0\rangle + \beta |exc\rangle?$

(Note $\alpha^2 + \beta^2 \neq 1$, rather $\alpha + \beta \approx 1$.) The PR formula gives an answer, but it's not simple: plug this into equation determining *U* (previous slide), the answer is a complicated function of α , β , and lexc>.

Is this a bug or a feature?

Isn't a sharp change in the rules of quantum mechanics at the horizon as bad as a firewall?

Perhaps not – maybe it is a property of the transition functions relating different observers.

Is PR well defined (cf. Harlow)?

- Systems entangled with other systems. Unlike ordinary QM, this requires new rules.
- Excitations of tilded operators.
- Systems far from equilibrium, like Hawking radiation (due to gray body factors).

Is PR well defined (cf. Harlow)?

- Systems entangled with other systems. Unlike ordinary QM, this requires new rules.
- Excitations of tilded operators.
- Systems far from equilibrium, like Hawking radiation (due to gray body factors).

What fundamental framework might give rise to this scenario?

Is PR well defined (cf. Harlow)?

- Systems entangled with other systems. Unlike ordinary QM, this requires new rules.
- Excitations of tilded operators.
- Systems far from equilibrium, like Hawking radiation (due to gray body factors).

What fundamental framework might give rise to this scenario? Demote state-dependence to field-dependence: third quantization!