Cosmic Holography¹

Dongsu Bak¹ and Soo-Jong Rey²

Physics Department, University of Seoul, Seoul 130-743 Korea¹

Physics Department & Center for High-Energy Physics

Seoul National University, Seoul 151-742 Korea²

dsbak@mach.uos.ac.kr, sjrey@gravity.snu.ac.kr

abstract

A version of holographic principle for the cosmology is proposed, which dictates that the particle entropy within the cosmological apparent horizon should not exceed the gravitational entropy associated with the apparent horizon. It is shown that, in the Friedmann-Robertson-Walker (FRW) cosmology, the open Universe as well as a restricted class of flat cases are compatible with the principle, whereas closed Universe is not. It is also found that inflationary universe after the big-bang is incompatible with the cosmic holography.

 $^{^{\}rm 1}$ Work supported in part by BK-21 Initiative Program and KRF International Collaboration Grant 1998-010-192.

The holographic principle in quantum gravity is first suggested by 't Hooft[1] and, later, extended to string theory by Susskind[2]. The most radical part of the principle is that the degrees of freedom of a spatial region reside not in the bulk but in the boundary. Further, the number of boundary degrees of freedom per Planck area should not exceed unity. Recently, the holographic principle is applied to the standard cosmological context by Fischler and Susskind[3]. This Fischler-Susskind version of cosmological holographic principle demands that the particle entrophy contained in a volume of particle horizon should not exceed the area of the horizon in Planck units. The string cosmology is also tested by the Fischler-Susskind holographic principle[4]. In both cases, the matter contents as well as the spacetime geometry of the universe are restricted by the holographic principle alone and the results appear to be consistent with the recent measurement of the redshift-to-distance relation and the theory of the large scale structure formation[5].

In applying the holography in the cosmological context, several outstanding questions still remain unanswered. One of them is concerning a natural choice of the holographic boundary. Fischler and Susskind have chosen it to be the particle horizon, but it is not clear if the choice is consistent with other physical principles. In this note, we will propose a simple choice of the boundary surface based on the concept of cosmological apparent horizon that is a boundary hypersurface of an anti-trapped region and has a topology of S^2 . It turns out that there is natural gravitational entropy associated with the apparent horizon and the associated holographic principle demands that the particle entrophy inside the apparent horizon should not exceed the apparent-horizon gravitational entropy. Moreover, the holography based on the apparent horizon obeys the first law of thermodynamics, in sharp contrast to that based on the particle horizon.

We shall apply the proposed principle to the FRW cosmology and show that, in both the standard cosmology and the string cosmology, the open universe as well as restricted class of flat universe are compatible, while the closed universe is not. We shall further show that the inflationary senario for the standard cosmology is not compatible with the cosmic holography.

Cosmological Apparent Horizon and Gravitational Entropy: We shall consider the spatially homogeneous and isotropic universe described by the FRW metric,

$$ds^{2} = -dt^{2} + a^{2}(t)\frac{dr^{2}}{1 - kr^{2}} + a^{2}(t)r^{2}d\Omega_{d-1}^{2},$$
(1)

where k = 0, -1, +1 correspond to a flat, open or closed Universe respectively. Using the spherical symmetry, the metric can be rewritten as

$$ds^2 = h_{ab}dx^a dx^b + \tilde{r}^2(\mathbf{x})d\Omega_{d-1}^2, \qquad (2)$$

where $x^0 = t$, $x^1 = r$ and the two metric $h_{ab} = \operatorname{diag}\left[-1, \frac{a^2}{1-kr^2}\right]$ is introduced. A dynamical apparent horizon is defined by $h^{ab}\partial_a\tilde{r}\partial_b\tilde{r} = 0$, which implies that the vector $\nabla \tilde{r}$ is null (or

degenerate) on the apparent horizon surface. The explicit evaluation of the condition reads

$$\tilde{r}_{\rm AH} = \frac{1}{\sqrt{H^2 + \frac{k}{a^2}}},\tag{3}$$

where $H = \dot{a}/a$ is the Hubble parameter. The expansion $\theta_{\rm IN}$ ($\theta_{\rm OUT}$) of the ingoing (outgoing) null geodesic congruence are given by

$$\theta_{\rm IN} = H - \frac{1}{\tilde{r}} \sqrt{1 - \frac{k\tilde{r}^2}{a^2}}$$

$$\theta_{\rm OUT} = H + \frac{1}{\tilde{r}} \sqrt{1 - \frac{k\tilde{r}^2}{a^2}}.$$
(4)

The region of spherically symmetric spacetime is referred to as trapped (antitrapped) if the expansions of both in- and out-going null geodesics, normal to the spatial d-1 sphere with a radius \tilde{r} centered at the origin, are negative (positive). The region will be called normal if ingoing rays have negative expansion but the outgoing rays have positive expansion. The region of $\tilde{r} > \left(H^2 + \frac{k}{a^2}\right)^{-\frac{1}{2}}$ is, then, antitrapped, whereas the region of $\tilde{r} < \left(H^2 + \frac{k}{a^2}\right)^{-\frac{1}{2}}$ is normal (assuming H > 0). The boundary hypersurface of the antitrapped spacetime region is nothing but the apparent horizon surface. The ingoing rays outside the horizon actually propagate in the direction of the growing \tilde{r} , whereas the ingoing rays inside the horizon are moving toward the origin.

In general, the radius of the apparant horizon, \tilde{r}_{AH} , changes in time. But, for example, in the de Sitter universe where $a(t) = a_0 e^{Ht}$ with a constant H and k = 0, the apparent horizon, $\tilde{r}_{AH} = \frac{1}{H}$, is constant in time and agrees with the cosmological event horizon of the de Sitter space. The antitrapped region outside of the apparent horizon in the de Sitter space can never be seen in the comoving observer located at the origin. However, in generic situation, the apparent horizon evolves in time and visiblity of the outside antitrapped region depends on the time development of the apparent horizon. In case the \tilde{r}_{AH} becomes smaller in time, the spatial region outside the horizon can never be seen. On the other hand, if it grows, the spatial region outside of the horizon at a given time may be observed at later time. The situation here is reminiscent of what is happening with the black-hole apparent horizon. Namely, the trapped region can never be seen by an outside observer if the horizon of the black grows by an infalling matter, while once-trapped region may become normal if the apparent horizon shrinks by an evaporation of the black hole in presence of the Hawking radiation.

For the total energy inside a sphere of radius \tilde{r} , we introduce an energy defined by

$$E \equiv \frac{d(d-1)\mathcal{V}_d}{16\pi G} \,\tilde{r}^{d-2} (1 - h^{ab} \partial_a \tilde{r} \partial_b \tilde{r}) \,, \tag{5}$$

where $V_d = \frac{\pi^{\frac{d}{2}}}{\Gamma(\frac{d}{2}+1)}$ denotes the volume of the *d*-dimensional unit ball. This is actually the direct (d+1) dimensional generalization of the (3+1) dimensional one given by Misner and

Sharp[7]. It is interesting to note that the energy surrounded by the apparent horizon is given by $E \equiv \frac{d(d-1)\mathcal{V}_d}{16\pi G}\,\tilde{r}_{\rm AH}^{d-2}$, which agrees with the expression for the mass in the d+1 dimensional Schwarzschield black hole once the apparent horizon is replaced by the event horizon of the black hole.

In terms of the energy-momentum tensor of matter T^{ab} that is the projection of the d+1 energy-momentum tensor $T^{\alpha\beta}$ to the normal direction of the d-1 sphere, one may define the work density by

$$w \equiv -\frac{1}{2}T^{ab}h_{ab}, \qquad (6)$$

and the energy-supply vector by

$$\psi_a \equiv T_a{}^b \partial_b \tilde{r} + w \partial_a \tilde{r} \,. \tag{7}$$

As noted in Ref. [8], the work density at the apparent horizon may be viewed as the work done by the change of the apprent horizon and the energy-supply at the horizon is total energy flow through the apparent horizon.

The Einstein equation relates these quantities by

$$\nabla E = A\psi + w\nabla V. \tag{8}$$

where $A = d\mathcal{V}_d \tilde{r}^{d-1}$ and $V = \mathcal{V}_d \tilde{r}^d$. This equation may be interpreted as unified first law. The entropy is associated with the energy-supply term, which in fact can be rewritten, with again help of the Einstein equations, as

$$A\psi = \frac{\kappa}{8\pi} \nabla A + \tilde{r}^{d-2} \nabla \left(\frac{E}{\tilde{r}^{d-2}}\right),\tag{9}$$

with the surface gravity κ defined by

$$\kappa \equiv \frac{1}{2\sqrt{-h}} \partial_a \sqrt{-h} h^{ab} \partial_b \tilde{r} \,. \tag{10}$$

At the apparent horizon, the last term in (9) drops out and, then, the dynamic entropy of the gravity is identified with $S = \frac{A}{4}$ that is a quarter of the area of the apparent horizon measured in the Planck unit. This is direct (d+1) dimensional generalization of the definition of dynamic entropy introduced by Hayward for the (3+1) case[8]. More precisely, the dynamic entropy associated with the apparent horizon is

$$S_{\rm AH} = \frac{\mathcal{V}_d}{4d} \tilde{r}_{\rm AP}^{d-1} \,. \tag{11}$$

We now apply the definition to the FRW universe dictated by

$$H^{2} + \frac{k}{a^{2}} = \frac{16\pi}{d(d-1)} \rho,$$

$$\frac{\ddot{a}}{a} = -\frac{8\pi}{d(d-1)} [(d-2)\rho + dp],$$
(12)

with the energy-momentum conservation

$$\frac{d}{dt}(\rho a^d) + p\frac{d}{dt}a^d = 0. (13)$$

The projected (1+1)-dimensional energy-momentum tensor for the FRW cosmology reads

$$T_{ab} = \operatorname{diag}\left[\rho, \ \frac{p}{1 - kr^2}\right]. \tag{14}$$

From (12), the Misner-Sharp energy can be evaluated, in terms of the matter density, as

$$E = \frac{d(d-1)\mathcal{V}_d}{16\pi} \left(H^2 + \frac{k}{a^2} \right) = \mathcal{V}_d \tilde{r}^d \rho , \qquad (15)$$

which is the matter density multiplied by the flat-volume in d spatial dimensions. One should note that the flat-volume is different from the spatial volume (i.e. $V_p = d\mathcal{V}_d a^d \int_0^r \frac{dr}{\sqrt{1-kr^2}}$) of radius \tilde{r} in case of the open or closed universe. This discrepancy appears due to the gravity contribution to the energy in addition to the matter contribution.

Having clarified the issue of the cosmological entropy, we now state a version of the cosmic holographic principle based on the cosmological apparent horizon: the particle entropy inside the apparent horizon can never exceed the apparent-horizon gravitational entropy.

The main difference from the Fischler-Susskind version of the cosmological holography lies in the choice of the horizon; namely in the Fischler-susskind proposal, the particle horizon and a quarter of the associated area for the gravitational entropy is chosen for the holography. In the cosmological context, there apeared two different kinds of horizon based on the light paths[6]. The particle horizon that specifies the visible region for a comoving observer at time t, is expressed as

$$\tilde{r}_{\rm PH} = a(t)G^{-1}\left(\int_{t_I}^t \frac{dt'}{a(t')}\right),\tag{16}$$

where $G(x) \equiv \int_0^x \frac{dy}{\sqrt{1-ky^2}}$ and t_I represents the initial moment of the Universe. (In case the universe has no beginning, $t_I = -\infty$.) On the other hand, the cosmological event horizon that specifies the boundary of the spatial region to be seen in the future by the comoving observer reads

$$\tilde{r}_{\rm EH} = a(t)G^{-1}\left(\int_t^{t_F} \frac{dt'}{a(t')}\right),\tag{17}$$

where t_F is the final moment of the universe. This is contrasted to the fact that the apparent horizon in (3) does not refer to the initial or final moment where our ability of physical description often breaks down.

Cosmic Holography Tested Against FRW Universe: The holographic principle may restrict the matter contents of our universe because it involves the particle entropy of universe. Since matter contents are molding the geometry and evolution of the Universe, the Universe itself conformed with the holography principle may well belong to a restricted class. The cosmic holography condition leads to an inequality

$$\sigma \text{Vol}_{AH}(t) \le \frac{A_{AH}(t)}{4}.$$
 (18)

where $\operatorname{Vol}_{AH}(t) = d\operatorname{V}_d \int_0^{r_{AH}(t)} dr \frac{r^{d-1}}{\sqrt{1-kr^2}}$ is the coordinate volume inside the apparent horizon. The left side of (18) is the total particle entropy inside the apparent horizon, where the coordinate entropy density is constant in time. In testing the condition to the FRW cosmology, we shall restrict ourselves to the cases of matters with simple equation of state $p = \gamma \rho$.

In the flat Universe (k = 0), the condition is explicitly

$$\frac{4\sigma}{da^{d-1}(t)\dot{a}(t)} \le 1. \tag{19}$$

Since $a(t) = a_0 t^{\frac{2}{d(1+\gamma)}}$ for $\gamma \neq -1$ and $a(t) = a_0 e^{H_0 t}$ for $\gamma = -1$, one concludes that the holography condition is satisfied all the time followed by the Planck time for $|\gamma| \leq 1$ once it is satisfied at the Planck time, $t \sim t_P$. The matters with $|\gamma| > 1$ that are also inconsistent with special relativity, is not compatible with the cosmic holography condition.

Let us now turn to the case of open universe. For the discussion of open and closed universes, it is convenient to introduce the conformal time η ,

$$\eta = \int^t \frac{dt'}{a(t')} \,. \tag{20}$$

The holography condition now reads

$$\frac{4\sigma \int_0^{\chi(\eta)} d\xi \sinh^{d-1} \xi}{a^{d-1}(\eta) \sinh^{d-1}(\chi(\eta))} \le 1.$$
 (21)

where we define $\chi(\eta)$ by $\sinh \chi(\eta) = r_{AH}(\eta)$. The solutions of the equation of motion (12) are given by

$$a(\eta) = a_0 \left(\sinh |(K-1)\eta| \right)^{\frac{1}{K-1}}.$$
 (22)

where $K = \frac{d(1+\gamma)}{2}$, $\eta \in (0, \infty)$ for K-1>0 and $\eta \in (-\infty, 0)$ for K-1<0. Here the initial moment corresponds to $\eta=0$ for K-1>0 and $-\infty$ for K-1<0. Using the definition of apparent horizon in (3), one finds $\chi(\eta)=|(K-1)\eta|$. Using the explicit solution, one may easily show that, for $\gamma \leq 1$, the holography condition is satisfied once satisfied at the initial moment around the Planck epoch. For $\gamma > 1$, the maximum of the left hand side of (21) occurs at some finite time after initial moment and the holography is respected if this this maximum satisfies the bound. But if one assumes that the holography bound is saturated at the Planck epoch, the case of $\gamma > 1$ is rejected by the holography condition. So far the restrictions on the matter contents due to our holography condition are not quite different from those of Fischler-Susskind holography. But we will see that there is some difference in the case of the closed Universe.

The holography condition for the closed Universe (k = 1) is

$$\frac{4\sigma \int_0^{\chi(\eta)} d\xi \sin^{d-1} \xi}{a^{d-1}(\eta) \sin^{d-1}(\chi(\eta))} \le 1.$$
 (23)

where we define $\chi(\eta)$ by $\sin \chi(\eta) = r_{AH}(\eta)$. The solutions of the equation of motion (12) are given by

 $a(\eta) = a_0 \left(\sin |(K-1)\eta| \right)^{\frac{1}{K-1}}.$ (24)

where $\eta \in \left(0, \frac{1}{|K-1|}\right)$. For the Universe with K-1 < 0 (i.e. $\gamma < \frac{2}{d}-1$) begins with infinite scale factor $a(\eta)$, and we shall not discuss these cases since it is clear that our Universe begins with small scale factor from the observational ground. Noting $r_{\rm AH}(\eta) = \sin(|(K-1)|\eta)$, one obtains that $\chi(\eta) = |K-1|\eta$.

Then one finds that the universe with $\gamma > \frac{2}{d} - 1$ are not compatible with the cosmic holography condition. Namely, even if one may satisfy the bound at an initial moment, it is badly violated before reaching the big crunch. This is because the term $\int_0^{\chi(\eta)} d\xi \sin^{d-1} \xi$ monotonically grow with time. The situation is worsened if one assumes that the bound saturates at the Planck time scale.

In the Fischler-Susskind case, a careful analysis shows that the disfavored region by the holography condition is only for $\gamma \leq \frac{4}{d} - 1$. With d = 3, the universe with the matter of $\frac{4}{d} - 1 = \frac{1}{3}$ corresponds to radiation-dominated Universe, which is their marginal bound. On the contrary, the cosmic holography condition seems to disfavor any closed Universe, cleary an over-restrictive condition.

We now consider inflationary model of our d=3 Universe. As illustrated in Ref. [3], the particle entropy-area ratio $\alpha(t) \equiv \frac{4\sigma \text{Vol}_{AH}(t)}{A_{AH}(t)}$ at the time of decoupling is²

$$\alpha(t_D) \sim 10^{-28},$$
 (25)

where the decoupling time is $t_D \sim 10^{56}$ in Planck units. Since $\alpha(t)$ is proportional to $t^{-\frac{1}{2}}$ during the radiation dominant era, the expression of the ratio in the era reads

$$\alpha(t) = 10^{-28} \left[\frac{t_D}{t} \right]^{\frac{1}{2}}.$$
(26)

This show that $\alpha(t) \leq 1$ for all the time later Planck time in case Universe starts off as a radiation-dominant Universe after the Planck time. However, if one assume the inflationary periods after the Planck epoch and an exit to the radiation-dominant Universe, the above conclusion drastically changed. To illustrate this, let us note that in the de Sitter phase, the $\alpha(t)$ scales like $e^{-(d+1)Ht} = e^{-4Ht}$ with constant H. For example, the inflationary factor

²The estimation used in the Ref. [3] relies upon the particle-horizon based holography, but, in case of standard cosmology, the particle horizon differs from apparent horizon by a constant factor of order one. Thus the estimation is still valid for our version of the holography.

 $P \equiv e^{Ht_E}/e^{Ht_B} \sim 10^{100000}$ for the chaotic inflationary senario, where t_E and t_B denote respectively the exit time and the beginning of the inflation, is obtained from the theory of galaxy formation[9]. This implies that the $\alpha(t_B)$ is bigger than $\alpha(t_E)$ by a factor 10^{400000} . The cosmic holography condition is clearly incompatible with this result. Furthermore, any models where $\alpha(t)$ scales t^C with $C < -\frac{1}{2}$ after Planck epoch, violates the holographic principle, so any typical post-big-bang inflationary models that solve the flatness problem by an amplification of the scale factor appear to be incompatible with the holography. Does only the pre-big-bang super-inflationary senario[10] survive out of the restrictive holography condition or, otherwise, should one resort to the regularity of the Planck epoch to solve the flatness and the horizon problem?

One is thus led to conclude that the holography based on apparent horizon, despite its aesthetically simple and appealing features such as compatibility with the first-law of thermodynamics, are not totally satisfactory when applied to cosmology. Nevertheless, we trust that our proposal based on apparent horizon bears an important core of truth provided further specification is supplied on the holographic surfaces and bounded regions therein. After the present work has appeared, Bousso has made an interesting proposal [11] concerning a covariant entropy bound valid for all surfaces in all physical spacetimes. In particular, Bousso has established that Bekenstein bound holds if the surface permits a complete, future-directed, ingoing null geodesic congruences. This singles out the apparent horizon as the largest admissible holographic surface, thus confirming our proposal. Bousso's proposal has also remedied nicely difficulties we have posed in the present paper. Most relevantly, it was shown that the holography bound is satisfied only if the surface obeys the completeness condition and, when dealing with closed universe, the entropy ought to be interpreted as that on null geodesic congruences directed toward the smaller part of the universe.

Before closing, we would like to make a brief comments on the string cosmology. If one applies the new cosmic holographic principle to the string cosmology model considered in Ref. [4], it is straightforward to show that it selects out open Universe together with flat universes with $|\gamma| \leq \frac{1}{\sqrt{d}}$, while the closed universes are ruled out. Here one must note that the apparent horizon should be defined with the Einstein frame metric instead of the string-frame metric because the gravitational entropy is associated with the Einstein frame metric although the relevant physics should be independent of the choice of description. In view of Bousso's proposal [11], the above results should be interpreted as the condition on completeness of the apparent horizon. The above results are true both the pre-big-bang branch and the post-big-bang branch, so that the time reversal symmetry is respected by the cosmic holography. In the analysis[4] using the Fischler-Susskind version, any flat Universes with matters are ruled out by the holography condition. This difference stems from the fact that the particle horizon in the pre-big-bang cosmology is infinite whereas the apparent horizon is finite in the pre-big-bang branch.

References

- [1] G. 't Hooft, Dimensional Reduction in Quantum Gravity, in 'Salamfest' pp. 284-296 (World Scientific Co, Singapore, 1993).
- [2] L. Susskind, J. Math. Phys. **36** (1995) 6377.
- [3] W. Fischler and L. Susskind, Holography and Cosmology, hep-th/9806039.
- [4] D. Bak and S. Rey, Class. Quantum. Grav. 17 (2000) L1 L7.
- [5] S. Perlmutter et al., Nature 391 (1998) 51; A.G. Riess et al., Astron. J. 116 (1998) 1009;
 See also, J. Glanz, Science 278 (1997) 799 and references therein.
- [6] W. Rindler, Mon.Not.Roy.Ast.Soc., **116** (1956) 663.
- [7] C.W. Misner and D.H. Sharp, Phys. Rev. **136**, (1964) B571.
- [8] S.A. Hayward and S. Mukohyama, Phys. Lett. **A256** (1999) 347.
- [9] See for example A. Linde, particle Physics and Inflationary Cosmology, (Harwood, London, 1990) p. 53.
- [10] G. Veneziano, Phys. Lett. **B265** (1991) 287.
- [11] R. Bousso, J. High-Energy Phys. 9907 (1999) 004; ibid, J. High-Energy Phys. 9906 (1999) 028.