

# The Interior of a Unitarily Evaporating Black Hole

Yasunori Nomura

*Berkeley Center for Theoretical Physics, Department of Physics,  
University of California, Berkeley, CA 94720, USA*

*Theoretical Physics Group, Lawrence Berkeley National Laboratory, Berkeley, CA 94720, USA*

*Kavli Institute for the Physics and Mathematics of the Universe (WPI),  
UTIAS, The University of Tokyo, Kashiwa, Chiba 277-8583, Japan*

## Abstract

We study microscopic operators describing the experience of an observer falling into the horizon of a unitarily evaporating black hole. For a young black hole, these operators can be taken to depend only on the state in the black hole region, acting only on the soft (or stretched horizon) modes as well as the semiclassical modes in the zone region. On the other hand, for an old black hole, they must involve radiation emitted earlier; the difference between the two cases comes from statistics associated with the coarse-graining performed to obtain the effective theory of the interior. For an old black hole, the structure of interior operators is qualitatively different between the case of a large AdS black hole and that of a black hole in asymptotically flat space (or a small AdS black hole). In the former case, the operators can be taken to act only on early radiation (in addition to the exterior semiclassical modes), while in the latter, both soft modes and early radiation must be involved. We also discuss the origin of the coarse-graining employed in erecting the effective interior theory, which may shed light on the issue of why the dual description of certain bulk physics requires an ensemble of boundary theories.

# 1 Introduction

The purpose of this paper is to study how operators describing the interior of a unitarily evaporating black hole can be constructed at the microscopic level. For a black hole in asymptotically flat spacetime (or a small black hole in AdS spacetime), we work in the framework of Refs. [1,2]. This framework describes a black hole as a state in which the hard modes—the modes relevant for describing small objects around the black hole—are entangled in a generic manner with the soft modes—the degrees of freedom comprising the majority of the black hole. This entanglement is generated by a strong, chaotic dynamics near the horizon. We will also discuss an extension of the framework to a large AdS black hole, which requires some adjustment.

A black hole forms when the system-specific properties, e.g. the details of the surface of a collapsing star, are strongly redshifted due to gravity, so that the system appears to be in a vacuum state at the semiclassical level. This redshift makes the majority of the degrees of freedom unobservable for a long time. These “hidden” degrees of freedom, associated with the black hole, have an exponentially large density of states [3] and are distributed mostly near the horizon. While they are very soft when measured in the asymptotic region, their intrinsic dynamical scale is larger near the horizon due to gravitational blueshift, reaching the string scale at the stretched horizon [4]. The dynamics in this region is chaotic [5,6] across all low energy species, giving generic entanglement between the hidden degrees of freedom (soft modes) and the others (hard modes) that can be used to describe small excitations around the black hole. In fact, this entanglement is the origin [1] of the well-known thermality of the black hole [7].

While the strong dynamics near the stretched horizon cannot be described by a low energy quantum field theory, we expect that it is unitary, as strongly suggested by the AdS/CFT correspondence [8]. The fact that this dynamics lies outside the validity of the low energy theory allows for avoiding the conclusion of information loss [9] reached by semiclassical calculation. The picture of the black hole interior can emerge through the coarse-graining of the degrees of freedom that cannot be physically resolved by an infalling observer, whose consistency with black hole’s unitary evolution is ensured by a specific entanglement structure between the hard modes, soft modes, and early radiation [2].

In this paper, we analyze how the operators in the coarse-grained, effective theory can be realized in the original microscopic theory. We show that the construction of these operators is not unique. In particular, we find that the operators can be written without involving an element outside the black hole region for a young black hole, a black hole that is not yet maximally entangled with the early radiation. On the other hand, for an old black hole, radiation degrees of freedom must be involved, despite the fact that the degrees of freedom describing a falling object may not be directly entangled with the early radiation. A specific way in which this happens depends on whether the black hole is in asymptotically flat spacetime or a large black hole in AdS spacetime.

This analysis elucidates which features of the analyses using a large AdS black hole may or may not apply to a black hole in asymptotically flat spacetime.

In Section 2, we describe the framework of Refs. [1, 2], highlighting features relevant for our discussion. In Section 3, we present our analysis of interior operators for a black hole in asymptotically flat spacetime (or a small black hole in AdS spacetime). We find that for a young black hole, interior operators can be chosen to act only on the hard and soft modes, while for an old black hole, they need to involve early radiation as well as these modes. In Section 4, which was added after the first version of this paper was posted, in response to an intriguing paper by Penington, Shenker, Stanford, and Yang [10], we perform a similar analysis for a large AdS black hole. In this case, we obtain a result in agreement with that in Ref. [10], which, however, does not persist for a flat space or small AdS black hole because of different energetics. In Section 5, we conclude with discussion on the origin of the coarse-graining employed in erecting an effective theory of the interior, which might provide an understanding of why the dual description of certain bulk physics seems to require an ensemble of boundary theories.

Throughout the paper, we focus on black holes in 4-dimensional spacetime that are not significantly rotating or charged, although the restriction on specific spacetime dimensions or on non-rotating, non-charged black holes is not essential. We adopt natural units  $c = \hbar = 1$ , and  $l_{\text{P}}$  denotes the Planck length.

## 2 Flat Space Black Hole in a Distant Description

In this section and the next, we discuss a flat space (or a small AdS) black hole using the framework of Refs. [1, 2]. A key feature of the framework is that the thermal nature of a black hole in a distant description can be viewed as arising from entanglement between hard and soft modes of low energy quantum fields.<sup>1</sup> A mode of a low energy quantum field in the zone region (also called the thermal atmosphere)

$$r_s \leq r \leq r_z \tag{1}$$

is classified as a hard or soft mode, depending on whether its frequency  $\omega$ , as measured in the asymptotic region, is larger or smaller than

$$\Delta \approx O\left(\frac{1}{Ml_{\text{P}}^2}\right). \tag{2}$$

Here,  $r_z \approx 3Ml_{\text{P}}^2$ , and  $r_s$  is the location of the stretched horizon, given by

$$r_s - 2Ml_{\text{P}}^2 \sim \frac{l_s^2}{Ml_{\text{P}}^2}. \tag{3}$$

---

<sup>1</sup>Here and below, low energy fields mean quantum fields existing below the string scale,  $1/l_s$ .

In a distant description, the classical spacetime picture is applicable only outside the stretched horizon, and its location is determined by the condition that the proper distance from the mathematical horizon,  $r = 2Ml_{\text{p}}^2$ , is of order the string length,  $l_s$ .

While the frequencies of the soft modes are small as measured in the asymptotic region, their intrinsic dynamical scale is larger at a location deeper in the zone, due to large gravitational blueshift. In particular, it is of order the string scale near the stretched horizon, where a majority of the modes reside. (The distribution of the soft modes is given by the entropy density that goes as the cubic power of the blueshift factor  $1/\sqrt{1 - 2Ml_{\text{p}}^2/r}$ .) The dynamics of the soft modes there, therefore, cannot be described by the low energy theory.<sup>2</sup> It is this dynamics that is responsible for unitarity of the Hawking emission process.

The quantity  $\Delta$  in Eq. (2) is naturally taken to be somewhat, e.g. by a factor of  $O(10)$ , larger than the Hawking temperature

$$T_{\text{H}} = \frac{1}{8\pi Ml_{\text{p}}^2}. \quad (4)$$

Since  $\Delta$  is the inverse timescale for single Hawking emission, the uncertainty principle prevents us from specifying the energy of the black hole better than that. Below, we will assume that the energy (mass) of a black hole is determined with this maximal precision. A superposition of black holes of masses differing more than  $\Delta$  can be treated in a straightforward manner.

At a given time  $t$ , the state of the entire system—with the black hole being put in the semiclassical vacuum state—is given by

$$|\Psi(M)\rangle = \sum_n e^{S_{\text{bh}}(M-E_n)} e^{S_{\text{rad}}} \sum_{i_n=1} \sum_{a=1} c_{ni_n a} |\{n_\alpha\}\rangle |\psi_{i_n}^{(n)}\rangle |\phi_a\rangle. \quad (5)$$

Excitations on a black hole background will be discussed later. In this expression,  $|\{n_\alpha\}\rangle$  are orthonormal states of the hard modes, with  $n \equiv \{n_\alpha\}$  representing the set of all occupation numbers  $n_\alpha$  ( $\geq 0$ ). The index  $\alpha$  collectively denotes the species, frequency, and angular-momentum quantum numbers of a mode, and  $E_n$  is the energy of the state  $|\{n_\alpha\}\rangle$  as measured in the asymptotic region (with precision  $\Delta$ ).

$|\psi_{i_n}^{(n)}\rangle$  are orthonormal states of the soft modes entangling with  $|\{n_\alpha\}\rangle$  (and hence having energy  $M - E_n$  with precision  $\Delta$ ). The density of states for the soft modes is given by the Bekenstein-Hawking formula

$$S_{\text{bh}}(M) = 4\pi M^2 l_{\text{p}}^2. \quad (6)$$

Here, we have assumed that the degeneracy of hard mode states is negligible compared with that of the soft modes. This implies that  $i_n$  runs over

$$i_n = 1, \dots, e^{S_{\text{bh}}(M-E_n)}. \quad (7)$$

---

<sup>2</sup>Given the fact that the dynamics is not dictated by the low energy theory, we may call these modes the stretched horizon degrees of freedom rather than soft modes of low energy fields near the stretched horizon. In fact, the internal dynamics of these modes are expected to be nonlocal in the transverse spatial directions [5, 6].

Note that with this assumption, the total entropy of the black hole is

$$\ln \left[ \sum_n e^{S_{\text{bh}}(M-E_n)} \right] \approx \frac{\mathcal{A}(M)}{4l_{\text{p}}^2}, \quad (8)$$

where  $\mathcal{A}(M) = 16\pi M^2 l_{\text{p}}^4$  is the area of the black hole, reproducing the standard interpretation of the Bekenstein-Hawking entropy. The last factor  $|\phi_a\rangle$  in Eq. (5) represents the set of orthonormal states representing the system in the far region  $r > r_z$ .

By the black hole vacuum, we mean that there is no physical excitation identifiable at the semiclassical level. This implies that any attribute a hard mode state may have is compensated by that of the corresponding soft mode states (within the precision allowed by the uncertainty principle). In particular, this implies that soft mode states associated with different hard mode states are orthogonal

$$\langle \psi_{i_m}^{(m)} | \psi_{j_n}^{(n)} \rangle = \delta_{mn} \delta_{i_m j_n}. \quad (9)$$

We also take the states in the far region,  $|\phi_a\rangle$ , to be given by those of Hawking radiation emitted earlier, i.e. emitted from  $r \approx r_z$  to the asymptotic region before time  $t$ .  $S_{\text{rad}}$  in Eq. (5) is then the coarse-grained entropy of this early radiation.

We take the state in Eq. (5) to be normalized

$$\sum_n e^{S_{\text{bh}}(M-E_n)} e^{S_{\text{rad}}} \sum_{i_n=1} \sum_{a=1} |c_{ni_n a}|^2 = 1. \quad (10)$$

We also assume that the ultraviolet dynamics near the stretched horizon is chaotic, well scrambling the black hole state [5,6]. In particular, we assume that the coefficients  $c_{ni_n a}$  take generic values in the spaces of the hard and soft modes. This implies that statistically

$$|c_{ni_n a}| \sim \frac{1}{\sqrt{S_{\text{tot}}}}, \quad (11)$$

where

$$S_{\text{tot}} \equiv \left( \sum_n e^{S_{\text{bh}}(M-E_n)} \right) e^{S_{\text{rad}}} = \left( \sum_n e^{-\frac{E_n}{T_{\text{H}}}} \right) e^{S_{\text{bh}}(M)} e^{S_{\text{rad}}}. \quad (12)$$

The standard thermal nature of the black hole is then obtained upon tracing out the soft modes

$$\text{Tr}_{\text{soft}} |\Psi(M)\rangle \langle \Psi(M)| = \frac{1}{\sum_m e^{-\frac{E_m}{T_{\text{H}}}}} \sum_n e^{-\frac{E_n}{T_{\text{H}}}} |\{n_\alpha\}\rangle \langle \{n_\alpha\}| \otimes \rho_{\phi,n}, \quad (13)$$

where  $\rho_{\phi,n}$  are ( $n$ -dependent) reduced density matrices for the early radiation.

In a distant description, the system of a black hole and radiation evolves unitarily with the state taking the form of Eq. (5) at each moment in time. In particular, the entanglement entropy between the black hole and radiation

$$S_{\text{hard+soft}}^{\text{vN}} = S_{\text{rad}}^{\text{vN}} \quad (14)$$

follows the Page curve [11], where  $S_A^{\text{vN}}$  is the von Neumann entropy of subsystem  $A$ . Throughout the history of the black hole, the number of hard modes is much smaller than that of the soft modes. (Note that we are only interested in states that do not yield significant backreaction on spacetime, which limits the number of possible hard mode states.) Furthermore, the coarse-grained entropies of the soft modes and radiation are both of order  $M^2 l_{\text{p}}^2$ , except for the very beginning and end of the black hole evolution. We therefore have

$$\ln \dim \mathcal{H}_{\text{hard}} \ll S_{\text{bh}}(M - E_n), S_{\text{rad}} \approx O(M^2 l_{\text{p}}^2). \quad (15)$$

We stress that this relation holds both before and after the Page time, at which the coarse-grained entropy of the radiation becomes approximately equal to that of the black hole.

Incidentally, by performing the Schmidt decomposition in the space of soft-mode and radiation states for each  $n$ , the state in Eq. (5) can be written as

$$|\Psi(M)\rangle = \sum_n \sum_{i_n=1}^{\mathcal{N}_n} c_{i_n}^n |H_n\rangle |S_{n,i_n}\rangle |R_{n,i_n}\rangle, \quad (16)$$

where  $|H_n\rangle$ ,  $|S_{n,i_n}\rangle$ , and  $|R_{n,i_n}\rangle$  are states of the hard modes, soft modes, and radiation, respectively, and

$$\mathcal{N}_n = \min\{e^{S_{\text{bh}}(M-E_n)}, e^{S_{\text{rad}}}\}. \quad (17)$$

This expression elucidates why the entanglement argument for firewalls [12] does not apply here. The entanglement responsible for unitarity has to do with the summations of indices  $i_n$  (in fact, predominantly the vacuum index  $i_0$ ) shared between the soft-mode and radiation states, while the entanglement necessary for the interior spacetime (see below) has to do with the index  $n$ . These two are compatible because the number of terms associated with the sum over  $n$  is much smaller than  $\mathcal{N}_n$ .

Let us now discuss excitations. A small object in the zone, with the characteristic size  $d$  in the angular directions much smaller than the horizon,  $d \ll M l_{\text{p}}^2$ , can be described by annihilation and creation operators acting on the hard modes

$$b_\gamma = \sum_n \sqrt{n_\gamma} | \{n_\alpha - \delta_{\alpha\gamma}\} \rangle \langle \{n_\alpha\} |, \quad (18)$$

$$b_\gamma^\dagger = \sum_n \sqrt{n_\gamma + 1} | \{n_\alpha + \delta_{\alpha\gamma}\} \rangle \langle \{n_\alpha\} |. \quad (19)$$

In a distant description, a small object falling into the black hole is absorbed into the stretched horizon when it reaches there, whose information will be later sent back to ambient space by Hawking emission. This description, however, is not useful for addressing the question of what the falling object will actually see. Because of a large relative boost between the object and the distant reference frame, macroscopic time experienced by the object is mapped to an extremely

short time for a stationary observer at the location of the object. In particular, anything the object experiences inside the horizon occurs “instantaneously” for a stationary observer at  $r = r_s$ . Understanding object’s experiences, therefore, requires time evolution different from the distant one, specifically an evolution associated with the proper time of the object.

### 3 Effective Theory of the Black Hole Interior

The effective theory describing the black hole interior can be erected at each time  $t$  by coarse-graining the soft modes and radiation: the degrees of freedom that cannot be resolved by a fallen object in a timescale available to it. Suppose that the state of the system at time  $t$  (with the black hole put in the semiclassical vacuum) is given by Eq. (5) in a distant description. We can then define a set of coarse-grained states each of which is entangled with a specific hard mode state:

$$\|\{n_\alpha\}\rangle\rangle \propto \sum_{i_n=1}^{e^{S_{\text{bh}}(M-E_n)}} \sum_{a=1}^{e^{S_{\text{rad}}}} c_{ni_na} |\psi_{i_n}^{(n)}\rangle |\phi_a\rangle, \quad (20)$$

where we have used the same label as the corresponding hard mode state to specify the coarse-grained state, which we denote by the double ket symbol. Using Eq. (11), we find that the squared norm of the (non-normalized) state in the right-hand side is given by

$$\sum_{i_n=1}^{e^{S_{\text{bh}}(M-E_n)}} \sum_{a=1}^{e^{S_{\text{rad}}}} |c_{ni_na}|^2 = \frac{e^{-\frac{E_n}{T_{\text{H}}}}}{\left(\sum_m e^{-\frac{E_m}{T_{\text{H}}}}\right)} \left[1 + O\left(\frac{1}{e^{\#M^2 l_{\text{P}}^2}}\right)\right], \quad (21)$$

where the second term in the square brackets represents the size of statistical fluctuations, with  $\#$  representing some number that does not depend on  $Ml_{\text{P}}$ . Therefore, the normalized coarse-grained state  $\|\{n_\alpha\}\rangle\rangle$  is given by

$$\|\{n_\alpha\}\rangle\rangle = e^{\frac{E_n}{2T_{\text{H}}}} \sqrt{\sum_m e^{-\frac{E_m}{T_{\text{H}}}}} e^{S_{\text{bh}}(M-E_n)} e^{S_{\text{rad}}} \sum_{i_n=1} c_{ni_na} |\psi_{i_n}^{(n)}\rangle |\phi_a\rangle, \quad (22)$$

up to a fractional correction of order  $1/e^{\#M^2 l_{\text{P}}^2}$  in the overall normalization.

Using Eq. (22), the state in Eq. (5) can be written in the effective theory as

$$\|\Psi(M)\rangle\rangle = \frac{1}{\sqrt{\sum_m e^{-\frac{E_m}{T_{\text{H}}}}} \sum_n e^{-\frac{E_n}{2T_{\text{H}}}} |\{n_\alpha\}\rangle\rangle \|\{n_\alpha\}\rangle\rangle, \quad (23)$$

which takes the form of the standard thermofield double state in the two-sided black hole picture [13, 14]. We emphasize that in order to obtain the correct Boltzmann-weight coefficients,  $\propto e^{-E_n/2T_{\text{H}}}$ , it is important that the black hole has soft modes with the density of states given by

$e^{S_{\text{bh}}(E_{\text{soft}})}$ , and that the hard and soft modes are well scrambled, giving  $c_{ni_n a}$  that take values statistically independent of  $n$ . This coarse-graining leads to the apparent uniqueness of the infalling vacuum, despite the existence of exponentially many black hole microstates.

The annihilation and creation operators relevant for an infalling observer can be determined if the annihilation and creation operators acting on the coarse-grained states,  $\tilde{b}_\gamma$  and  $\tilde{b}_\gamma^\dagger$ , are defined:

$$a_\xi = \sum_\gamma (\alpha_{\xi\gamma} b_\gamma + \beta_{\xi\gamma} b_\gamma^\dagger + \zeta_{\xi\gamma} \tilde{b}_\gamma + \eta_{\xi\gamma} \tilde{b}_\gamma^\dagger), \quad (24)$$

$$a_\xi^\dagger = \sum_\gamma (\beta_{\xi\gamma}^* b_\gamma + \alpha_{\xi\gamma}^* b_\gamma^\dagger + \eta_{\xi\gamma}^* \tilde{b}_\gamma + \zeta_{\xi\gamma}^* \tilde{b}_\gamma^\dagger), \quad (25)$$

where  $b_\gamma$  and  $b_\gamma^\dagger$  are the operators in Eqs. (18, 19),  $\xi$  is the label in which the frequency  $\omega$  with respect to  $t$  is traded with the frequency  $\Omega$  associated with the infalling time, and  $\alpha_{\xi\gamma}$ ,  $\beta_{\xi\gamma}$ ,  $\zeta_{\xi\gamma}$ , and  $\eta_{\xi\gamma}$  are the Bogoliubov coefficients calculable using the standard field theory method. The generator of time evolution in the infalling description is then given by

$$H = \sum_\xi \Omega a_\xi^\dagger a_\xi + H_{\text{int}}(a_\xi, a_\xi^\dagger). \quad (26)$$

This gives the physics of a smooth horizon. The existence of the operators  $a_\xi$  and  $a_\xi^\dagger$  would imply that there is a subsector in the original microscopic theory encoding the experience of an object after it crosses the horizon, but how can the operators  $\tilde{b}_\gamma$  and  $\tilde{b}_\gamma^\dagger$  be constructed?

One way is simply to take

$$\tilde{b}_\gamma = \sum_n \sqrt{n_\gamma} \|\{n_\alpha - \delta_{\alpha\gamma}\}\rangle\langle\{n_\alpha}\|, \quad (27)$$

$$\tilde{b}_\gamma^\dagger = \sum_n \sqrt{n_\gamma + 1} \|\{n_\alpha + \delta_{\alpha\gamma}\}\rangle\langle\{n_\alpha}\|. \quad (28)$$

These operators can play the role of annihilation and creation operators in the space spanned by the coarse-grained states. In particular, their matrix elements are

$$\langle\langle\{\kappa_\alpha\} \|\tilde{b}_\gamma \|\{\lambda_\alpha\}\rangle\rangle = \sqrt{\lambda_\gamma} \delta_{\{\kappa_\alpha\}\{\lambda_\alpha - \delta_{\alpha\gamma}\}}, \quad (29)$$

$$\langle\langle\{\kappa_\alpha\} \|\tilde{b}_\gamma^\dagger \|\{\lambda_\alpha\}\rangle\rangle = \sqrt{\lambda_\gamma + 1} \delta_{\{\kappa_\alpha\}\{\lambda_\alpha + \delta_{\alpha\gamma}\}}, \quad (30)$$

up to corrections of order  $1/e^{\#M^2 l_P^2}$ . It is important to notice, however, that these operators do not satisfy the exact algebra of annihilation and creation operators at the microscopic level. Indeed,

$$[\tilde{b}_\beta, \tilde{b}_\gamma^\dagger] = \delta_{\beta\gamma} \left( \sum_m e^{-\frac{Em}{T_H}} \right) \sum_n e^{\frac{En}{T_H}} \sum_{i_n=1}^{e^{S_{\text{bh}}(M-E_n)}} \sum_{j_n=1}^{e^{S_{\text{bh}}(M-E_n)}} \sum_{a=1}^{e^{S_{\text{rad}}}} \sum_{b=1}^{e^{S_{\text{rad}}}} |\psi_{i_n}^{(n)}\rangle |\phi_a\rangle \langle \psi_{j_n}^{(n)} | \langle \phi_b |, \quad (31)$$

which is not the identity operator for  $\beta = \gamma$ . It is only in the space of coarse-grained states that these operators obey the algebra of annihilation and creation operators:

$$\langle\langle\{\kappa_\alpha\} \|\ [\tilde{b}_\beta, \tilde{b}_\gamma^\dagger] \|\{\lambda_\alpha\}\rangle\rangle = \delta_{\beta\gamma}, \quad (32)$$



$$\langle\langle \{\kappa_\alpha\} \parallel [\tilde{b}_\beta, \tilde{b}_\gamma] \parallel \{\lambda_\alpha\} \rangle\rangle = \langle\langle \{\kappa_\alpha\} \parallel [\tilde{b}_\beta^\dagger, \tilde{b}_\gamma^\dagger] \parallel \{\lambda_\alpha\} \rangle\rangle = 0, \quad (33)$$

which have corrections only of order  $1/e^{\#M^2 l_P^2}$ .

Can other microscopic operators be chosen as the annihilation and creation operators in the effective theory? One might think that any operators mapping a generic microstate of  $\|\{n_\alpha\}\rangle\rangle$  (i.e. a state in Eq. (22) with generic  $c_{ni_n a}$ ) to those of  $\|\{n_\alpha - \delta_{\alpha\gamma}\}\rangle\rangle$  and  $\|\{n_\alpha + \delta_{\alpha\gamma}\}\rangle\rangle$  would work as  $\tilde{b}_\gamma$  and  $\tilde{b}_\gamma^\dagger$ , respectively. This is, however, not the case. Since a single coarse-grained state  $\|\{n_\alpha\}\rangle\rangle$  corresponds to many microstates, the state obtained by acting such generic operators to a specific microstate, in particular the state  $\|\{n_\alpha\}\rangle\rangle$  involving the specific coefficients  $c_{ni_n a}$  appearing in the state of the system in Eq. (5), may not have appropriate inner products with the corresponding states  $\|\{m_\alpha\}\rangle\rangle$ 's ( $\{m_\alpha\} \neq \{n_\alpha\}$ ) involving the same  $c_{ni_n a}$ . This would mean that those microscopic operators do not serve as annihilation and creation operators in the effective theory erected on the state having these specific coefficients  $c_{ni_n a}$ .

As an example, consider the set of candidate operators

$$\tilde{b}_\gamma \stackrel{?}{=} c \sum_n \sqrt{n_\gamma} |f^{(n-)}\rangle \langle g^{(n)}|, \quad \tilde{b}_\gamma^\dagger \stackrel{?}{=} c^* \sum_n \sqrt{n_\gamma + 1} |g^{(n+)}\rangle \langle f^{(n)}|, \quad (34)$$

where  $c$  is a normalization constant,  $n_\pm \equiv \{n_\alpha \pm \delta_{\alpha\gamma}\}$ , and

$$|f^{(n)}\rangle = \sum_{i_n=1}^{e^{S_{\text{bh}}(M-E_n)}} f_{ni_n} |\psi_{i_n}^{(n)}\rangle, \quad |g^{(n)}\rangle = \sum_{i_n=1}^{e^{S_{\text{bh}}(M-E_n)}} g_{ni_n} |\psi_{i_n}^{(n)}\rangle \quad (35)$$

with generic coefficients satisfying  $\sum_{i_n} |f_{ni_n}|^2 = \sum_{i_n} |g_{ni_n}|^2 = 1$ . This gives

$$\langle\langle \{\kappa_\alpha\} \parallel \tilde{b}_\gamma \parallel \{\lambda_\alpha\} \rangle\rangle = c \sqrt{\lambda_\gamma} \delta_{\{\kappa_\alpha\}\{\lambda_\alpha - \delta_{\alpha\gamma}\}} O\left(\frac{1}{\sqrt{e^{S_{\text{bh}}(M-E_\kappa)} e^{S_{\text{bh}}(M-E_\lambda)} e^{S_{\text{rad}}}}}\right), \quad (36)$$

$$\langle\langle \{\kappa_\alpha\} \parallel \tilde{b}_\gamma \tilde{b}_\gamma^\dagger \parallel \{\lambda_\alpha\} \rangle\rangle = |c|^2 (\lambda_\gamma + 1) \delta_{\{\kappa_\alpha\}\{\lambda_\alpha\}} O\left(\frac{1}{e^{S_{\text{bh}}(M-E_\lambda)}}\right), \quad (37)$$

and there is no choice of  $c$  that can make both of these relations compatible with the algebra in the effective theory.

The consideration above provides an argument for the necessity of the dependence [15] of  $\tilde{b}_\gamma$  and  $\tilde{b}_\gamma^\dagger$  on the state of the system, in particular  $c_{ni_n a}$  in Eq. (5). This, however, still allows for operators other than those in Eqs. (27, 28).

Let us consider the operators

$$\tilde{b}_\gamma = c \sum_n \sqrt{n_\gamma} e^{\frac{E_{n_-} + E_n}{2T_{\text{H}}}} \sum_{i_{n_-}=1}^{e^{S_{\text{bh}}(M-E_{n_-})}} \sum_{j_n=1}^{e^{S_{\text{bh}}(M-E_n)}} \sum_{a=1}^{e^{S_{\text{rad}}}} c_{n_- i_{n_-} a} c_{n j_n a}^* |\psi_{i_{n_-}}^{(n-)}\rangle \langle \psi_{j_n}^{(n)}|, \quad (38)$$

$$\tilde{b}_\gamma^\dagger = c \sum_n \sqrt{n_\gamma + 1} e^{\frac{E_{n_+} + E_n}{2T_{\text{H}}}} \sum_{i_{n_+}=1}^{e^{S_{\text{bh}}(M-E_{n_+})}} \sum_{j_n=1}^{e^{S_{\text{bh}}(M-E_n)}} \sum_{a=1}^{e^{S_{\text{rad}}}} c_{n_+ i_{n_+} a} c_{n j_n a}^* |\psi_{i_{n_+}}^{(n+)}\rangle \langle \psi_{j_n}^{(n)}|, \quad (39)$$

where  $c$  is a real number, and  $E_{n_{\pm}}$  are the energies of the hard mode states  $|\{n_{\alpha} \pm \delta_{\alpha\gamma}\}\rangle$  as measured in the asymptotic region. Note that the combinations of  $c_{njna}$ 's appearing here,  $\sum_{a=1}^{e^{S_{\text{rad}}}} c_{mi_m a} c_{njna}^*$ , are those in the reduced density matrix for the hard and soft modes

$$\text{Tr}_{\text{rad}} |\Psi(M)\rangle \langle \Psi(M)| = \sum_m \sum_n \sum_{i_m=1}^{e^{S_{\text{bh}}(M-E_m)}} \sum_{j_n=1}^{e^{S_{\text{bh}}(M-E_n)}} \sum_{a=1}^{e^{S_{\text{rad}}}} c_{mi_m a} c_{njna}^* |\{m_{\alpha}\}\rangle |\psi_{i_m}^{(m)}\rangle \langle \{n_{\alpha}\}| \langle \psi_{j_n}^{(n)}|, \quad (40)$$

so that they can be determined purely from the state in the black hole region.

With this choice of  $\tilde{b}_{\gamma}$  and  $\tilde{b}_{\gamma}^{\dagger}$ , we obtain

$$\langle\langle \{\kappa_{\alpha}\} | \tilde{b}_{\gamma} | \{\lambda_{\alpha}\} \rangle\rangle = \frac{c}{e^{S_{\text{rad}}} \sum_m e^{-\frac{E_m}{T_{\text{H}}}}} \sqrt{\lambda_{\gamma}} \delta_{\{\kappa_{\alpha}\}\{\lambda_{\alpha}-\delta_{\alpha\gamma}\}}, \quad (41)$$

$$\langle\langle \{\kappa_{\alpha}\} | \tilde{b}_{\gamma}^{\dagger} | \{\lambda_{\alpha}\} \rangle\rangle = \frac{c}{e^{S_{\text{rad}}} \sum_m e^{-\frac{E_m}{T_{\text{H}}}}} \sqrt{\lambda_{\gamma} + 1} \delta_{\{\kappa_{\alpha}\}\{\lambda_{\alpha}+\delta_{\alpha\gamma}\}}, \quad (42)$$

and

$$\langle\langle \{\kappa_{\alpha}\} | \tilde{b}_{\gamma} \tilde{b}_{\gamma}^{\dagger} | \{\lambda_{\alpha}\} \rangle\rangle = \left( \frac{c}{e^{S_{\text{rad}}} \sum_m e^{-\frac{E_m}{T_{\text{H}}}}} \right)^2 (\lambda_{\gamma} + 1) \delta_{\{\kappa_{\alpha}\}\{\lambda_{\alpha}\}} \left[ 1 + O\left( \frac{e^{S_{\text{rad}}}}{e^{S_{\text{bh}}(M-E_{\lambda})}} \right) \right], \quad (43)$$

$$\langle\langle \{\kappa_{\alpha}\} | \tilde{b}_{\gamma}^{\dagger} \tilde{b}_{\gamma} | \{\lambda_{\alpha}\} \rangle\rangle = \left( \frac{c}{e^{S_{\text{rad}}} \sum_m e^{-\frac{E_m}{T_{\text{H}}}}} \right)^2 \lambda_{\gamma} \delta_{\{\kappa_{\alpha}\}\{\lambda_{\alpha}\}} \left[ 1 + O\left( \frac{e^{S_{\text{rad}}}}{e^{S_{\text{bh}}(M-E_{\lambda})}} \right) \right], \quad (44)$$

up to corrections of order  $1/e^{\#M^2 l_{\text{P}}^2}$ . We thus find that for

$$e^{S_{\text{rad}}} \ll e^{S_{\text{bh}}(M-E_{\lambda})} \approx e^{S_{\text{bh}}(M)}, \quad (45)$$

the second terms in the square brackets in Eqs. (43, 44) are negligible, so that the  $\tilde{b}_{\gamma}$  and  $\tilde{b}_{\gamma}^{\dagger}$  with

$$c = e^{S_{\text{rad}}} \sum_m e^{-\frac{E_m}{T_{\text{H}}}} \quad (46)$$

can play the role of the annihilation and creation operators in the effective theory. In fact, we can show that these operators also satisfy the required relations in Eqs. (32, 33) when the condition in Eq. (45) is satisfied, namely when the black hole is young.

On the other hand, if the black hole is old, i.e.  $e^{S_{\text{rad}}} \gg e^{S_{\text{bh}}(M)}$ , then the second terms in the square brackets dominate in Eqs. (43, 44), jeopardizing the possibility for the  $\tilde{b}_{\gamma}$  and  $\tilde{b}_{\gamma}^{\dagger}$  to serve as the annihilation and creation operators in the effective theory for any choice of  $c$ . Technically, this is because the factor obtained by acting  $b_{\gamma}^{\dagger}$  or  $b_{\gamma}$  to  $|\{\lambda_{\alpha}\}\rangle$

$$\sum_{i_{\lambda_{\pm}}=1}^{e^{S_{\text{bh}}(M-E_{\lambda_{\pm}})}} \sum_{j_{\lambda}=1}^{e^{S_{\text{bh}}(M-E_{\lambda})}} \sum_{a=1}^{e^{S_{\text{rad}}}} \sum_{b=1}^{e^{S_{\text{rad}}}} c_{\lambda_{\pm} i_{\lambda_{\pm}} a} c_{\lambda j_{\lambda} b}^* |\psi_{i_{\lambda_{\pm}}}^{(\lambda_{\pm})}\rangle |\phi_b\rangle \quad (47)$$

is dominated by the  $a = b$  terms if and only if the condition in Eq. (45) is met, giving the state proportional to

$$e^{S_{\text{bh}}(M-E_{\lambda_{\pm}})} e^{S_{\text{rad}}} \sum_{i_{\lambda_{\pm}}=1} \sum_{a=1} c_{\lambda_{\pm} i_{\lambda_{\pm}} a} |\psi_{i_{\lambda_{\pm}}}^{(\lambda_{\pm})}\rangle |\phi_a\rangle, \quad (48)$$

and hence to the  $\|\{\lambda_{\alpha} \pm \delta_{\alpha\gamma}\}\rangle\rangle$  obtained using the specific  $c_{n j_n a}$ 's appearing in the state of the system. This shows how the Page time can be relevant in the construction of the interior operators, despite the fact that the hard mode and radiation states take separable forms as in Eq. (13) throughout the history of the black hole. In fact, for an old black hole, we do not see how one can construct the appropriate annihilation and creation operators in the effective theory using only the information in the black hole reduced density matrix in Eq. (40).

Incidentally, a construction of  $\tilde{b}_{\gamma}$  and  $\tilde{b}_{\gamma}^{\dagger}$  that involve only radiation states is not possible. What allowed the construction of operators in Eqs. (38, 39) is the correlations between the attributes of the hard and soft modes coming from the constraints imposed on the black hole vacuum state (the requirement that it does not have any features associated with semiclassical excitations). Such correlations do not exist between the hard modes and radiation.

As discussed in Ref. [1], the effective theory of the interior erected as above describes only a limited spacetime region: the causal domain of the union of the zone and its mirror region on the spatial hypersurface at  $t$  (the time at which the effective theory is erected). The black hole singularity may be regarded as a manifestation of the fact that this theory is obtained by coarse-graining and hence represents a finite-dimensional, non-unitary system. Specific operators used in Eqs. (24, 25), for example those in Eqs. (38, 39), are selected presumably because they correspond to observables which classicalize within such a finite-dimensional system [2]. Locality seems to play a key role in this quantum-to-classical transition.

The fact that an effective theory represents only a limited spacetime region implies that the picture of the whole interior, as described by general relativity, can be obtained only by using multiple effective theories erected at different times. This is the sense in which the global spacetime in general relativity emerges from the microscopic description.

## 4 Large AdS Black Hole

After the original submission of this paper,<sup>3</sup> an interesting paper by Penington, Shenker, Stanford, and Yang appeared [10] which discusses related issues. In particular, these authors adopted the same machinery as the one used here to construct interior operators, which they referred to as the Petz map following the terminology used in quantum information science.

---

<sup>3</sup>The original version of this paper was submitted such that it appeared in an earlier announcement (submitted on Tue, 26 Nov 2019 14:02:29, EST). The appearance, however, was delayed due to a moderation by arXiv administration, which resulted in a larger arXiv number.

We claim that their models correspond to the situation in a large AdS black hole, which is distinct from that in a flat space or small AdS black hole because of different energetics. For a large AdS black hole, it makes sense to consider an excitation that has a frequency smaller than Hawking temperature and falls into the black hole, since the inverse Hawking temperature is (much) smaller than the horizon radius,  $1/T_{\text{H}} \ll r_+$ . Here,  $T_{\text{H}} = 3r_+/4\pi l^2$  is the Hawking temperature, and  $r_+$  and  $l$  are the horizon and AdS radii, respectively. This is in contrast with the case of a flat space or small AdS black hole, where  $1/T_{\text{H}} \sim r_+$ , so an excitation whose frequency is much smaller than  $T_{\text{H}}$  does not fall into the black hole, at least in the way that the equivalence principle is applicable.

For a large AdS black hole, states of the “relatively hard” modes ( $1/r_+ \ll \omega \lesssim T_{\text{H}}$ ) describing a falling object need not be correlated with the states of the other, “relatively soft” modes ( $\omega \lesssim 1/r_+$ ) as in Eq. (5), since the uncertainty in energy ( $\sim T_{\text{H}}$ ) is larger than the frequencies of the harder modes. In other words, the orthogonality condition in Eq. (9) should not be imposed, and the state of the system with the black hole put in the semiclassical vacuum can be written as

$$|\Psi(M)\rangle = \sum_{n=1}^{e^{S_{\text{code}}}} \sum_{i=1}^{e^{S_{\text{bh}}(M)}} \sum_{a=1}^{e^{S_{\text{rad}}}} c_{nia} |\{n_\alpha\}\rangle |\psi_i\rangle |\phi_a\rangle, \quad (49)$$

where  $e^{S_{\text{code}}}$  ( $\ll e^{S_{\text{bh}}(M)}$ ) is the dimension of the Hilbert space for the harder modes,  $S_{\text{bh}}(M) = \pi(2l^2 M/l_{\text{P}})^{2/3}$  is the density of states for the softer modes ( $\approx$  that of the black hole), and  $|\phi_a\rangle$  represents states of the auxiliary system to which the AdS system is coupled at the boundary.<sup>4</sup>

We can now define the normalized mirror states

$$\|\{n_\alpha\}\rangle\rangle = \sqrt{e^{S_{\text{code}}}} \sum_{i=1}^{e^{S_{\text{bh}}(M)}} \sum_{a=1}^{e^{S_{\text{rad}}}} c_{nia} |\psi_i\rangle |\phi_a\rangle. \quad (50)$$

The statistical errors for the normalizations are fractionally of order  $1/\sqrt{e^{S_{\text{bh}}(M)}e^{S_{\text{rad}}}}$ . Below, we focus on the regime  $S_{\text{rad}} \sim S_{\text{bh}}(M) \equiv S_{\text{bh}}$ , since we are interested in the Page transition, and denote errors of order  $1/e^{\#S_{\text{bh}}+\#S_{\text{rad}}}$  simply by  $1/e^{S_{\text{sys}}}$ . With this setup, we find that the softer mode states that are entangled with different harder mode states are nearly orthogonal due to the large dimensionality of the relevant Hilbert space:

$$\langle\langle \{\kappa_\alpha\} | \{\lambda_\alpha\} \rangle\rangle = O\left(\frac{1}{\sqrt{e^{S_{\text{bh}}}e^{S_{\text{rad}}}}}\right) \quad \text{for } \{\kappa_\alpha\} \neq \{\lambda_\alpha\}. \quad (51)$$

---

<sup>4</sup>For simplicity, here we have assumed that the energy gaps between different  $|\phi_a\rangle$ 's are smaller than  $\Delta \approx O(T_{\text{H}})$ : the precision with which the black hole mass is specified. To see the effect of the finiteness of the temperature in the auxiliary system (Hawking radiation), we need to include states of the auxiliary system with energy gaps larger than  $T_{\text{H}}$  and impose an energy constraint to the entire system. This makes the indices  $i$  and  $a$  to depend on the “energy bin”  $E_A$  to which radiation states belong, with the index  $i_A$  running over the  $A$ -dependent range of 1 to  $e^{S_{\text{bh}}(M-E_A)}$ . This leads, upon tracing out the harder and softer modes, to the thermal density matrix for the auxiliary system with finite temperature  $T_{\text{H}}$  (together with exponentially suppressed off-diagonal elements between  $|\phi_{aA}\rangle$ 's in the same bin). We do not take into account this complication here, since it is not relevant for our discussion.

The point, however, is that while these overlaps are small, of order  $1/e^{S_{\text{sys}}}$ , they are nonzero. This is in contrast to the case of a flat space or small AdS black hole in which the overlaps were virtually zero as in Eq. (9). We now see that this seemingly negligible difference allows, after the Page time, for choosing microscopic mirror operators to act purely on the auxiliary system, i.e. early radiation, as discussed in Ref. [10].

The analysis is very much analogous to that in Section 3. Let us consider the operators acting only on radiation states

$$\tilde{b}_\gamma = e^{S_{\text{code}}+S_{\text{bh}}} \sum_{n=1}^{e^{S_{\text{code}}}} \sqrt{n_\gamma} \sum_{i=1}^{e^{S_{\text{bh}}}} \sum_{a,b=1}^{e^{S_{\text{rad}}}} c_{n-ia} c_{nib}^* |\phi_a\rangle \langle \phi_b|, \quad (52)$$

$$\tilde{b}_\gamma^\dagger = e^{S_{\text{code}}+S_{\text{bh}}} \sum_{n=1}^{e^{S_{\text{code}}}} \sqrt{n_\gamma + 1} \sum_{i=1}^{e^{S_{\text{bh}}}} \sum_{a,b=1}^{e^{S_{\text{rad}}}} c_{n+ia} c_{nib}^* |\phi_a\rangle \langle \phi_b|. \quad (53)$$

This leads to

$$\langle\langle \{\kappa_\alpha\} | \tilde{b}_\gamma | \{\lambda_\alpha\} \rangle\rangle = \sqrt{\lambda_\gamma} \delta_{\{\kappa_\alpha\}\{\lambda_\alpha - \delta_{\alpha\gamma}\}}, \quad (54)$$

$$\langle\langle \{\kappa_\alpha\} | \tilde{b}_\gamma^\dagger | \{\lambda_\alpha\} \rangle\rangle = \sqrt{\lambda_\gamma + 1} \delta_{\{\kappa_\alpha\}\{\lambda_\alpha + \delta_{\alpha\gamma}\}}, \quad (55)$$

and

$$\langle\langle \{\kappa_\alpha\} | \tilde{b}_\beta \tilde{b}_\gamma^\dagger | \{\lambda_\alpha\} \rangle\rangle = \sqrt{\lambda_\beta + \delta_{\beta\gamma}} \sqrt{\lambda_\gamma + 1} \delta_{\{\kappa_\alpha\}\{\lambda_\alpha - \delta_{\alpha\beta} + \delta_{\alpha\gamma}\}} \left[ 1 + O\left(\frac{e^{S_{\text{bh}}}}{e^{S_{\text{rad}}}}\right) \delta_{\{\kappa_\alpha\}\{\lambda_\alpha\}} \right], \quad (56)$$

$$\langle\langle \{\kappa_\alpha\} | \tilde{b}_\beta^\dagger \tilde{b}_\gamma | \{\lambda_\alpha\} \rangle\rangle = \sqrt{\lambda_\beta - \delta_{\beta\gamma} + 1} \sqrt{\lambda_\gamma} \delta_{\{\kappa_\alpha\}\{\lambda_\alpha - \delta_{\alpha\beta} + \delta_{\alpha\gamma}\}} \left[ 1 + O\left(\frac{e^{S_{\text{bh}}}}{e^{S_{\text{rad}}}}\right) \delta_{\{\kappa_\alpha\}\{\lambda_\alpha\}} \right], \quad (57)$$

$$\langle\langle \{\kappa_\alpha\} | \tilde{b}_\beta \tilde{b}_\gamma | \{\lambda_\alpha\} \rangle\rangle = \sqrt{\lambda_\beta - \delta_{\beta\gamma}} \sqrt{\lambda_\gamma} \delta_{\{\kappa_\alpha\}\{\lambda_\alpha - \delta_{\alpha\beta} - \delta_{\alpha\gamma}\}}, \quad (58)$$

$$\langle\langle \{\kappa_\alpha\} | \tilde{b}_\beta^\dagger \tilde{b}_\gamma^\dagger | \{\lambda_\alpha\} \rangle\rangle = \sqrt{\lambda_\beta + \delta_{\beta\gamma} + 1} \sqrt{\lambda_\gamma + 1} \delta_{\{\kappa_\alpha\}\{\lambda_\alpha + \delta_{\alpha\beta} + \delta_{\alpha\gamma}\}}, \quad (59)$$

where we have omitted contributions that are guaranteed to be suppressed by  $1/e^{S_{\text{sys}}}$ . In order for the operators in Eqs. (52, 53) to be the annihilation and creation operators in the effective interior theory, the second terms in the square brackets in Eqs. (56, 57) must be negligible, which is the case if and only if

$$e^{S_{\text{bh}}} \ll e^{S_{\text{rad}}}, \quad (60)$$

i.e. the black hole is old. With Eq. (60), the algebra of annihilation and creation operators, Eqs. (32, 33), is satisfied in this effective theory.

It is easy to see that for a young black hole,  $e^{S_{\text{bh}}} \gg e^{S_{\text{rad}}}$ , one can construct valid annihilation

and creation operators that act only on the black hole softer modes:

$$\tilde{b}_\gamma = e^{S_{\text{code}}+S_{\text{rad}}} \sum_{n=1}^{e^{S_{\text{code}}}} \sqrt{n_\gamma} \sum_{i,j=1}^{e^{S_{\text{bh}}}} \sum_{a=1}^{e^{S_{\text{rad}}}} c_{n-ia} c_{nja}^* |\psi_i\rangle\langle\psi_j|, \quad (61)$$

$$\tilde{b}_\gamma^\dagger = e^{S_{\text{code}}+S_{\text{rad}}} \sum_{n=1}^{e^{S_{\text{code}}}} \sqrt{n_\gamma + 1} \sum_{i,j=1}^{e^{S_{\text{bh}}}} \sum_{a=1}^{e^{S_{\text{rad}}}} c_{n+ia} c_{nja}^* |\psi_i\rangle\langle\psi_j|. \quad (62)$$

These operators, however, lose their validity when the black hole becomes old. The operators analogous to those in Eqs. (27, 28), which act both on the black hole softer modes and radiation, can be used throughout the history of the black hole, i.e. regardless of its age.

We have seen that for a large AdS black hole, operators  $\tilde{b}_\gamma$  and  $\tilde{b}_\gamma^\dagger$  needed to describe the interior can be constructed after the Page time in a way that they act only on radiation degrees of freedom, while this is not the case in a flat space or small AdS black hole. The difference comes from the way the energy constraint is imposed on various degrees of freedom, which in turn is a consequence of the difference in relative size between the Hawking temperature and the frequencies of modes describing a falling object. This seems to suggest that the phenomenon of entanglement islands as originally discussed in Refs. [16, 17] is a specific feature to a large AdS black hole and systems similar to it. It would be interesting to study what is the corresponding bulk picture for a flat space or small AdS black hole.

## 5 Conclusions and Discussion

In this paper, we have shown that operators describing the experience of an observer falling into the horizon can be constructed without contradicting the unitary evolution of the black hole. The choice of these operators at the microscopic level is not unique. In particular, for a young black hole, we can choose them to depend only on the microscopic information in the black hole region. On the other hand, for an old black hole, the operators must involve radiation emitted earlier; for a flat space or small AdS black hole, they must act on both soft modes and early radiation, while for a large AdS black hole, soft(er) modes need not be involved. The differences between various cases come from the difference in energetics as well as the statistics associated with the coarse-graining performed to obtain the effective theory of the interior.

Before concluding, let us discuss the microscopic origin of this coarse-graining. From general considerations, we know that the dimension of the Hilbert space describing semiclassical physics in the interior region,  $e^{S_{\text{int}}}$ , is much smaller than the number of independent black hole or radiation states:  $S_{\text{int}} \ll S_{\text{bh}} \sim S_{\text{rad}}$  (except at the very beginning and end of the black hole evolution). This implies that to erect an effective theory of the interior, we must find very special degrees of freedom within those of the black hole and/or radiation, which are relevant for describing the semiclassical physics in the interior spacetime. How can such degrees of freedom be selected?

The physics at the semiclassical level should not depend sensitively on the microstate of the black hole or radiation. Furthermore, it must represent physics occurring in a smooth spacetime background; this requirement is presumably related with the fact that locality seems to play a key role in classicalization, i.e. multiply reproducing a (generically exponentially small) subset of quantum information contained in a state, generating the quantities that can be measured by a classical observer. Physics represented by the effective theories in Sections 3 and 4 is precisely such physics, but if and only if we allow for ambiguities/errors of  $e^{-O(S_{\text{sys}})}$ , where  $S_{\text{sys}}$  is of  $O(S_{\text{bh}}) \approx O(S_{\text{rad}})$ . In other words, what is insensitive to the details of the microstate is the values of the quantities calculated in these theories, e.g. correlation functions among field operators, defined up to the ambiguities exponentially suppressed in the system size.

This explains why the coarse-graining is involved in erecting an effective theory of the interior. We should emphasize, however, that this does not mean that we need to physically have an ensemble of microstates to obtain the physics of the interior. The physics represented by the effective theory exists for any single microstate, i.e. for any generic values of  $c_{ni_a}$  in Eq. (5) and  $c_{nia}$  in Eq. (49). It is simply that we are interested in the properties common to all the microstates in an ensemble, which correspond to the physics in a single classical spacetime. These properties necessarily involve ambiguities exponentially suppressed in the system size. As we have seen, these ambiguities lead to the consequence that a single operator in an effective theory can be realized in multiple ways in different sets of microscopic degrees of freedom even for a single, fixed microstate.

While the analysis in this paper has been performed in the context of the interior of a black hole, the same story for the choice of the relevant semiclassical degrees of freedom seems to apply in reconstructing the full Minkowski spacetime from a Rindler description, although in this case there is no early radiation degrees of freedom and there is no ambiguity in the resulting semiclassical theory (i.e. usual quantum field theory) as the system size is infinite.

In Ref. [10], the results of gravity path integrals are interpreted to arise from a statistical nature of bulk observables. We have seen that essentially the same phenomenon arises from coarse-graining performed to obtain an effective theory of the interior. While the precise relation between the two is not clear, it is interesting to point out that for a bulk of spacetime dimension larger than two, we can consider a bulk region in which semiclassical theory does not have an exponentially suppressed ambiguity by making a transverse spatial dimension infinitely large. This option, however, is not available for 2-dimensional near-AdS spacetime, which might give a reason for why the dual description of Jackiw-Teitelboim gravity involves an ensemble of theories.

The framework studied in this paper has a number of interesting consequences, including those for particle phenomenology and cosmology. As discussed in Ref. [2], the fact that the smooth interior requires chaotic dynamics at the stretched horizon presents an intriguing relation between the ultraviolet and infrared physics. This seems to suggest that a global symmetry must be broken at the string scale by an  $O(1)$  amount. Phenomenologically, it implies that the QCD axion has a

string origin or the relevant Peccei-Quinn symmetry arises as an approximate accidental symmetry at low energies, resulting from the choice of matter representations under gauge symmetry.

While the coherence and consistency of the picture presented here appear convincing to the author, they have not been derived from the fundamental theory. It is our hope that the analysis in this paper sheds light on how spacetime emerges at the fundamental level and provides a guide toward constructing a complete theory of quantum gravity.

## Acknowledgments

I would like to thank the organizers and participants of the KITP conference “Geometry from the Quantum”; lively and enjoyable discussions there have motivated me to post this latest version which integrates the contents of Section 4 into the main part in a more cohesive manner. This work was supported in part by the Department of Energy, Office of Science, Office of High Energy Physics under contract DE-AC02-05CH11231 and award DE-SC0019380, and in part by MEXT KAKENHI Grant Number 15H05895.

## References

- [1] Y. Nomura, “Reanalyzing an evaporating black hole,” *Phys. Rev. D* **99**, 086004 (2019) [arXiv:1810.09453 [hep-th]].
- [2] Y. Nomura, “Spacetime and universal soft modes — Black holes and beyond,” arXiv:1908.05728 [hep-th].
- [3] J. D. Bekenstein, “Black holes and entropy,” *Phys. Rev. D* **7**, 2333 (1973).
- [4] L. Susskind, L. Thorlacius and J. Uglum, “The stretched horizon and black hole complementarity,” *Phys. Rev. D* **48**, 3743 (1993) [hep-th/9306069].
- [5] P. Hayden and J. Preskill, “Black holes as mirrors: quantum information in random subsystems,” *JHEP* **09**, 120 (2007) [arXiv:0708.4025 [hep-th]].
- [6] Y. Sekino and L. Susskind, “Fast scramblers,” *JHEP* **10**, 065 (2008) [arXiv:0808.2096 [hep-th]].
- [7] S. W. Hawking, “Particle creation by black holes,” *Commun. Math. Phys.* **43**, 199 (1975) Erratum: [*Commun. Math. Phys.* **46**, 206 (1976)].
- [8] J. Maldacena, “The large N limit of superconformal field theories and supergravity,” *Int. J. Theor. Phys.* **38**, 1113 (1999) [*Adv. Theor. Math. Phys.* **2**, 231 (1998)] [hep-th/9711200].
- [9] S. W. Hawking, “Breakdown of predictability in gravitational collapse,” *Phys. Rev. D* **14**, 2460 (1976).



- [10] G. Penington, S. H. Shenker, D. Stanford and Z. Yang, “Replica wormholes and the black hole interior,” arXiv:1911.11977 [hep-th].
- [11] D. N. Page, “Information in black hole radiation,” Phys. Rev. Lett. **71**, 3743 (1993) [hep-th/9306083].
- [12] A. Almheiri, D. Marolf, J. Polchinski and J. Sully, “Black holes: complementarity or firewalls?,” JHEP **02**, 062 (2013) [arXiv:1207.3123 [hep-th]].
- [13] W. G. Unruh, “Notes on black hole evaporation,” Phys. Rev. D **14**, 870 (1976).
- [14] W. Israel, “Thermo field dynamics of black holes,” Phys. Lett. A **57**, 107 (1976).
- [15] K. Papadodimas and S. Raju, “State-dependent bulk-boundary maps and black hole complementarity,” Phys. Rev. D **89**, 086010 (2014) [arXiv:1310.6335 [hep-th]].
- [16] G. Penington, “Entanglement wedge reconstruction and the information paradox,” arXiv:1905.08255 [hep-th].
- [17] A. Almheiri, N. Engelhardt, D. Marolf and H. Maxfield, “The entropy of bulk quantum fields and the entanglement wedge of an evaporating black hole,” arXiv:1905.08762 [hep-th].