arXiv:2103.02998v3 [hep-th] 16 Apr 2021

Non-local Probes of Entanglement in the Scale-invariant Gravity

R. Pirmoradian[1] and M. Reza Tanhayi[1,2,*]

[1]Department of Physics, Central Tehran Branch, Islamic Azad University (IAUCTB), P.O. Box 14676-86831, Tehran, Iran
[2]School of Physics, Institute for Research in Fundamental Sciences (IPM) P.O. Box 19395-5531, Tehran, Iran

E-mail: *mtanhayi@ipm.ir

Abstract

In this paper, we study the generic action for the scale-invariant theory of gravity and then by making use of the holographic methods, we compute some specific holographic measures of entanglement. Precisely, we calculate the entanglement entropy, mutual and tripartite information and show that the mutual information is always positive while the tripartite information becomes negative. This indeed recovers the monogamy property of mutual information in this context.

Contents

1 Introduction and Motivation **1**

2 Scale-invariant Gravity in four dimensions **2**

3 Holographic Entanglement Entropy in the Scale-invariant Theory of Gravity **4**

4 Holographic mutual and tripartite Information **6**

5 Concluding Remarks **9**

1 Introduction and Motivation

It is well known that the gauge principle works well in providing a unified framework for the description of fundamental interactions. For example, by the means of the gauge theory, there is a satisfactory description of the electromagnetic, weak and strong interactions. But the story is somehow different for gravity since in the gravitational theory the spacetime coordinates appear as the dynamical fields and the gauge principle should be applied to the spacetime symmetries as well. There is a strong belief that the gauge theory could provide all the interactions including the gravitational interaction. Moreover, large-scale observation indicates that the observed matter in the universe might be described by theories with no fixed time and space scales [1,2]. In this way, finding scale-invariant theories of gravity seems to be important as long as such theories are in fact gauge theories.

Conformal transformation is generated by Poincare and scale (dilatation) and also special conformal transformations. The Poincare together with the scale transformations form a subgroup named the scale-invariant theory. In a generic situation, considering the scale versus the conformal invariance and also because of the two above mentioned main reasons, finding an acceptable scale-invariant gravity theory has attracted a lot of attention (see for example [3]). In the context of field theory, there is also an important question that in various dimensions whether scale-invariant quantum field theories lead to fully conformal field theories or not, for example in $d = 2$ dimensions see [4,5] and for $d \neq 4$ see [6]. In $d = 4$ this subject is interesting and studied extensively. It is claimed that scale-invariant conformal field theory in four dimensions should also be conformal field theory as well, though there is no comprehensive proof for this claim [7,8].

In this paper, we would like to further study different features of scale-invariant gravity in four dimensions. To proceed, we will first review the way of fixing the corresponding action of the conformal gravity in four dimensions. The theory of conformal gravity, up to dynamically trivial terms, is given by the following action [9,10]

$$I_{\rm CG} = -\frac{\kappa}{16\pi}\int d^4x\sqrt{-g}\left(R_{\mu\nu}R^{\mu\nu} - \frac{1}{3}R^2\right) + \text{total derivative terms}, \tag{1}$$

where κ is a dimensionless constant. It is well known that the total derivatives do not contribute to the equations of motion, however, such terms play a crucial role when one wants to have a well-defined variational principle. Also, boundary terms contribute to the physical quantities such as the free energy, the entanglement entropy and the correlation function of the holographic stress tensor. Thus in order to explore the scale-invariant theory, it is worth fixing the boundary terms. In four dimensions, there is a trivial boundary term; the Gauss-Bonnet term which is a natural total derivative term, after adding this boundary term, the action reads as follows [11]

$$I_{\rm CG} = -\frac{\kappa}{16\pi}\int d^4x\sqrt{-g}\left(R_{\mu\nu}R^{\mu\nu} - \frac{1}{3}R^2\right) + \Upsilon\int d^4x\sqrt{-g}\left(R_{\mu\nu\rho\sigma}R^{\mu\nu\rho\sigma} - 4R_{\mu\nu}R^{\mu\nu} + R^2\right), \tag{2}$$

where Υ is an arbitrary constant which we are going to fix it. To fix the constant Υ we use an asymptotic AdS geometry as a tuner. Indeed since the AdS geometry has a mathematically

well-defined boundary it may be used to fix the boundary terms. This is what we have learned from the holographic renormalization. An asymptotic AdS geometry may be parameterized as follows[1]

$$ds^2 = \frac{L^2}{r^2}\left(dr^2 + g_{ij}(x)dx^i dx^j\right), \qquad \text{with } \; g_{ij}(x) = \delta_{ij} + h_{ij}(x)r + \mathcal{O}(r^2). \tag{3}$$

Evaluating the action on this solution, usually, leads to divergent terms due to infinite volume limit (UV divergences) which could be regularized by adding proper boundary terms. This is, indeed, what we will do for the model under consideration. Namely, we fix the constant Υ in such a way that the resultant action becomes finite on an asymptotically AdS solution. Plugging the above solution into action (2) one finds

$$I_{\rm CG} = -\frac{\kappa}{16\pi}\int d^4x\left(-\frac{12}{r^4} - \frac{a_1}{2r^2} + \mathcal{O}(1)\right) + \Upsilon\int d^4x\left(\frac{24}{r^4} - \frac{a_1}{r^2} + \mathcal{O}(1)\right), \tag{4}$$

where a_1 is given in terms of the parameters appearing in the asymptotic expansion of the metric [12]. It is clear that the on-shell action is finite if one set $\Upsilon = -\frac{\kappa}{32\pi}$ and the action reads

$$I_{\rm CG} = -\frac{\kappa}{32\pi}\int d^4x\sqrt{-g}\left(R_{\mu\nu\rho\sigma}R^{\mu\nu\rho\sigma} - 2R_{\mu\nu}R^{\mu\nu} + \frac{1}{3}R^2\right), \tag{5}$$

which is, indeed, the Weyl squared action. In the next section we will redo the same procedure to write a generic action for the scale-invariant gravity in four dimensions.

The rest of the paper is organized as follows. In the next section, we will study the model and find its solutions. In section three, we will further study the mode and use holographic methods to compute holographic entanglement entropy. In section four, we will consider holographic mutual and tripartite information. Finally, we will briefly discuss our results and some possible future directions in the conclusion part.

2 Scale-invariant Gravity in four dimensions

Let us redo the same procedure as mentioned above for the scale-invariant gravity. The most general action of a scale-invariant four-dimensional gravity can be written as follows [10]

$$I_{SC} = -\frac{\kappa}{32\pi}\int d^4x\,\sqrt{-g}\,\left(\sigma_0 C_{\mu\nu\alpha\beta}C^{\mu\nu\alpha\beta} + R^2 + \sigma_1 {\rm GB}_4\right). \tag{6}$$

where $C_{\mu\nu\alpha\beta}$ is the Weyl tensor and σ_0, σ_1 and κ are dimensionless constant. ${\rm GB}_4$ stands for the standard Gauss-Bonnet term in four dimensions. Note that we rescale the action so that the coefficient of R^2 term is set to one. As we have already seen the Weyl squared term is regularized and there is no a divergent term when the action is evaluated on an asymptotically AdS geometry. Nonetheless, the on-shell action could still be divergent because of the R^2

[1]Note that the first subleasing term in the expansion of g_{ij} depends on the theory. For example in Einstein gravity the linear term is absent.

term. In what follows, we will fix the coefficient of Gauss-Bonnet term σ_1 such that to remove the divergent parts of R^2 term.
To proceed it is important to note that the asymptotic AdS geometry we are taking should be a solution of the equations of motion. As we have already mentioned this requires to have certain subleading terms in the asymptotic expansion of the metric. In the present case, the corresponding asymptotic behavior is

$$ds^2 = \frac{L^2}{r^2}\bigg(dr^2 + g_{ij}(x)dx^i dx^j\bigg), \qquad \text{with } \; g_{ij}(x) = \delta_{ij} + h_{ij}(x)r^2 + \mathcal{O}(r^3). \tag{7}$$

For this solution, the on-shell action reads

$$I_{SC} = -\frac{\kappa}{32\pi}\int d^4x \, \left[\sigma_0\mathcal{O}(1) + \left(\frac{144}{r^4} - \frac{6a_2}{r^2} + \mathcal{O}(1)\right) + +\sigma_1\left(\frac{24}{r^4} - \frac{a_2}{r^2} + \mathcal{O}(1)\right)\right]. \tag{8}$$

Again a_2 is given in terms of the parameters appearing in the asymptotic expansion of the metric [12]. To get a finite action one should set $\sigma_1 = -6$. As a result, we will consider the action of 4D scale-invariant gravity as follows

$$I_{SC} = -\frac{\kappa}{32\pi}\int d^4x\,\sqrt{-g}\,\left(\sigma_0 C_{\mu\nu\rho\sigma}C^{\mu\nu\rho\sigma} + R^2 - 6\mathrm{GB}_4\right), \tag{9}$$

which is guaranteed to get finite on-shell action for asymptotically AdS geometries. More explicitly the action may be written in the following form

$$I_{SC} = -\frac{\kappa}{32\pi}\int d^4x\,\sqrt{-g}\,\left[(\sigma_0 - 6)R^2_{\mu\nu\rho\sigma} - 2(\sigma_0 - 12)R^2_{\mu\nu} + (\frac{\sigma_0}{3} - 5)R^2\right]. \tag{10}$$

To conclude, we note that the most general action of scale-invariant (pure) gravity in four dimensions is a one-family parameter action. This paper aims to study the model on a generic point of the moduli space of the parameter. In our notation we recover conformal gravity at point $\sigma_0 \to \infty$ while at $\sigma_0 = 0$ one gets R^2 gravity.

The boundary Gauss-Bonnet term does not contribute to the equations of motion and the corresponding equations derived from the action (10) are as follows

$$\left(\nabla^\sigma\nabla^\rho - \frac{1}{2}R^{\sigma\rho}\right)C_{\mu\sigma\nu\rho} = \frac{1}{2\sigma_0}\left(RR_{\mu\nu} - g_{\mu\nu}\frac{R^2}{4} - \nabla_\mu\nabla_\nu R + g_{\mu\nu}\Box R\right), \tag{11}$$

where $\Box = \nabla^\mu\nabla_\mu$. These equations of motion admit several black hole solutions. Indeed, restricting to Einstein solutions, the above equations of motion are solved by the following black hole solutions (see for example [13])

$$ds^2 = \frac{L^2}{r^2}\left(-F(r)\,dt^2 + \frac{dr^2}{F(r)} + d\Sigma^2_{2,k}\right), \qquad F(r) = \lambda + kr^2 + c_3 r^3, \tag{12}$$

where L is the radius of curvature and $k = 1, -1, 0$ corresponds to $\Sigma_{2,k} = S^2, H_2, R^2$, respectively. Note that being Einstein solutions they satisfy $R_{\mu\nu} = \frac{3\lambda}{L^2}g_{\mu\nu}$ with $\lambda = \pm 1, 0$. It

is worth mentioning that for $\sigma_0 > 6$ it has Lifshitz solution which is given by (see [14] for Einstein-Weyl gravity)

$$ds^2 = \frac{L^2}{r^2}\left(-\frac{dt^2}{r^{2z}} + dr^2 + dx_1^2 + dx_2^2\right), \qquad z = \frac{\sigma_0 - 6 + \sqrt{(\sigma_0 - 6)(4\sigma_0 + 3)}}{\sigma_0 + 3}. \tag{13}$$

We note that for $\sigma_0 = 6$ the action (10) reads

$$I_{SI} = -\frac{3\kappa}{32\pi}\int d^4x\,\sqrt{-g}\,\left[4R_{\mu\nu}^2 - R^2\right], \tag{14}$$

which is the curvature squared terms.

3 Holographic Entanglement Entropy in the Scale-invariant Theory of Gravity

As mentioned earlier, the boundary terms contribute to the physical quantities such as the free energy and the entanglement entropy. Thus in order to further explore the role of the Gauss-Bonnet term in the scale-invariant gravity, let us study entanglement entropy. This non-local quantity measures the quantum entanglement between different degrees of freedom of the system. Similar to other non-local quantities, *e.g.* Wilson loop and correlation functions, entanglement entropy can be used to classify the critical points and also the various quantum phase transitions of the underlying theory. In quantum field theory, the entanglement entropy can be defined as follows [15, 16]. In a d dimensional quantum field theory for a constant time slice, one can define two spatial regions A and its complement $\bar{A}$. The present geometrical division can be translated to the corresponding total Hilbert space as $\mathcal{H} = \mathcal{H}_A \otimes \mathcal{H}_{\bar{A}}$. For subsystem A the reduced density matrix is defined by tracing the degrees of freedom of $\bar{A}$, as $\rho_A = \mathrm{Tr}_{\bar{A}}\,\rho$ where ρ is the total density matrix. The Von Neumann entropy can give us the entanglement entropy: $S_A = -\mathrm{Tr}_A\,\rho_A \log \rho_A$.
Entanglement entropy becomes infinite due to the infinite correlations between degrees of freedom near the boundary of the entangling surface [17, 18]. Although the entanglement entropy has some features which are useful to explore the Hilbert space of the theory, but from the quantum field theory point of view computing the entanglement entropy is complicated. Actually, analytic computation of entanglement entropy is only done in few cases. However, by virtue of the Anti de Sitter/Conformal Field Theory correspondence [19], in a seminal work, Ryu and Takayanagi proposed a simple geometric way to compute the entanglement entropy [20]. In this way, for a d dimensional conformal field theory which lives on the boundary of an AdS_{d+1} spacetime, holographic entanglement entropy is given by

$$S_{\mathrm{EE}} = \frac{\mathcal{A}_{\min}}{4G_N}, \tag{15}$$

where G_N is the Newton's constant and $\mathcal{A}_{\min}$ is the minimal surface in the bulk whose border at boundary of the bulk, coincides with the boundary of the entangling region. Thus the main

task is to find the specific minimal surface in the bulk. Since the model under consideration consists of gravity with higher-order terms, in order to compute the holographic entanglement entropy one should use the generalized Ryu-Takayanagi prescription [21–23]. In particular, for an action containing the most general curvature squared terms

$$I = -\frac{\kappa}{32\pi}\int d^4x\sqrt{-g}\Big(\lambda_1 R^2 + \lambda_2 R_{\mu\nu}R^{\mu\nu} + \lambda_3 R_{\mu\nu\rho\sigma}R^{\mu\nu\rho\sigma}\Big), \tag{16}$$

the holographic entanglement entropy can be obtained by minimizing the following entropy functional [23]

$$S_A{=}\frac{\kappa}{8}\int d^2\zeta\ \sqrt{\gamma}\ \left[2\lambda_1 R + \lambda_2\left(R_{\mu\nu}n_i^\mu n_i^\nu - \frac{1}{2}\mathcal{K}^i\mathcal{K}_i\right) + 2\lambda_3\left(R_{\mu\nu\rho\sigma}n_i^\mu n_j^\nu n_i^\rho n_j^\sigma - \mathcal{K}^i_{\mu\nu}\mathcal{K}_i^{\mu\nu}\right)\right], \tag{17}$$

with $i = 1, 2$ we denote the two transverse directions to a codimension-two hypersurface in the bulk, n_i^μ are two unit vectors and $\mathcal{K}^{(i)}$ stand for the traces of two extrinsic curvature tensors defined by

$$\mathcal{K}^{(i)}_{\mu\nu} = \pi^\sigma{}_\mu\pi^\rho{}_\nu\nabla_\rho(n_i)_\sigma, \qquad \text{with} \quad \pi^\sigma{}_\mu = \epsilon^\sigma{}_\mu + \xi\sum_{i=1,2}(n_i)^\sigma(n_i)_\mu\ , \tag{18}$$

where $\xi = -1$ for space-like and $\xi = 1$ for time-like vectors. Moreover, γ is the induced metric on the hypersurface with coordinates which are denoted by ζ.

In the scale-invariant theory, let us consider holographic entanglement entropy for a strip as an entangling region. To do so, it is useful to parametrize the AdS solution as follows

$$ds^2 = \frac{L^2}{r^2}(-dt^2 + dr^2 + dx^2 + dy^2), \tag{19}$$

by which for a constant time slice, the entangling region is given by

$$t = \text{constant}, \qquad -\frac{\ell}{2} \le y \le \frac{\ell}{2}, \qquad 0 \le x \le H, \tag{20}$$

where $H \gg \ell$ and H play an infrared regulator distance along the entangling surface. The corresponding codimension-two hypersurface in a constant time slice can be parameterized by $y = f(r)$. The induced metric becomes on the hypersurface becomes (noting that we set $L = 1$)

$$ds^2_{ind} = \frac{1}{r^2}\left[\left(f'(r)^2 + 1\right)dr^2 + dx^2\right], \tag{21}$$

where the *prime* stands for the derivative with respect to r. Moreover the two-unit vectors normal to the codimension-two hypersurface are and the normal vectors are obtained as follows

$$\begin{aligned} &\Sigma_1 \ : \ t = 0 && n_1 = \left\{\tfrac{1}{r}, 0, 0, 0\right\}, \\ &\Sigma_2 \ : \ x - f(r) = 0 && n_2 = \left\{0, -\tfrac{f'}{r\sqrt{f'^2+1}},\ \tfrac{1}{r\sqrt{f'^2+1}},\ 0\right\}. \end{aligned} \tag{22}$$

The corresponding extrinsic curvatures of the hypersurface are given by

$$\mathcal{K}^{(1)}_{\mu\nu}=0,\qquad \mathcal{K}^{(2)}_{\mu\nu}=\begin{pmatrix}0&0&0&0\\0&C_1&C_1f'&0\\0&C_1f'&C_1f'^2&0\\0&0&0&C_2\end{pmatrix} \tag{23}$$

where

$$C_1=\frac{2\left(1+f'^2\right)f'-2rf''}{2r^2(1+f'^2)^{5/2}},\qquad\qquad C_2=\frac{f'}{r^2\sqrt{1+f'^2},} \tag{24}$$

Actually, the main task is to minimize the entropy function (17) which for a slab entangling region it is given by

$$\begin{aligned}S=-\tfrac{\kappa}{2}\int dr\tfrac{\sqrt{f'^2+1}}{r^3}\Big(&1-40\lambda_1-8\lambda_2-4\lambda_3\\&-\tfrac{r^4}{2}\left[\lambda_2(2C_2+C_1\left(1+f'^2\right))^2+4\lambda_3\left(2{C_2}^2+{C_1}^2(1+f'^2)^2\right)\right]\Big),\end{aligned} \tag{25}$$

Now going back to the scale-invariant case and after replacing the related parameters, the holographic entanglement entropy for the strip is given by the following relation

$$S=\kappa H\left[-(\sigma_0-6)\left(\frac{1}{\epsilon}-\frac{2\pi\Gamma\left(\frac{3}{4}\right)^2}{\Gamma\left(\frac{1}{4}\right)^2}\,\frac{1}{\ell}\right)+(\sigma_0-6)\left(\frac{1}{\epsilon}\right)\right], \tag{26}$$

where ϵ is the UV cut-off of the theory. The first term is the contributions of the dynamical terms, though the last term is that of the Gauss-Bonnet term which obviously plays the role of the regulator [24]. It is also interesting to note that in the case of Einstein gravity, the result becomes

$$S_{\rm Ein}=\frac{H}{2G_N}\left(\frac{1}{\epsilon}-\frac{2\pi\Gamma\left(\frac{3}{4}\right)^2}{\Gamma\left(\frac{1}{4}\right)^2}\,\frac{1}{\ell}\right). \tag{27}$$

To conclude this section, we have shown that holographic entanglement entropy for an Einstein solution of the action (10) obtained from the dynamical part of the action is the same as that of Einstein gravity if we identify $\kappa=\frac{-1}{2(\sigma_0-6)G_N}$ which makes sense as long as $\sigma_0\neq 6$.

In the following section, we will consider other non-local measurements of entanglement, namely mutual information and tripartite information.

4 Holographic mutual and tripartite Information

Entanglement entropy plays a crucial role in various physical contexts, *e.g.* quantum information theory and black hole physics, however, it suffers some less pleasant features. For

example in the generic case, the appearance of the UV cut-off in the expression of entanglement entropy makes it a non-universal quantity. Thus considering other non-local quantities may help us to improve our knowledge of the Hilbert space of a quantum system. In the context of quantum information theory, many quantities were defined to overcome the shortcomings that we encountered using entanglement entropy. For example, mutual information for a system that has two disjoint parts is given by [25]

$$I^{[2]}(\equiv I)(A,B) = S(A) + S(B) - S(A \cup B), \tag{28}$$

where $S(A_i)$'s are the entanglement entropies and $S(A \cup B)$ is the entanglement entropy for the union of the two entangling regions. This is a finite quantity and quantifies the amount of information which is shared between two subsystems. intuitively, for three subregions, the tripartite information is defined by

$$\begin{aligned} I^{[3]}(A,B,C) = {} & S(A) + S(B) + S(C) - S(A \cup B) - S(A \cup C) \\ & - S(B \cup C) + S(A \cup B \cup C). \end{aligned} \tag{29}$$

In the above relations, $S(A_i \cup A_j)$ is the entanglement entropy for the union of the entangling regions. In this section, we use holographic methods to compute holographic mutual and tripartite information. It is worth mentioning that in writing the tripartite information, the union parts play an important role. To explore this point let us write the tripartite information in terms of the mutual information as follows

$$I^{[3]}(A,B,C) = I(A,B) + I(A,C) - I(A,B \cup C), \tag{30}$$

which helps us to investigate the sign of mutual information. Now the aim is to compute the mutual information. For two strips with the same length of ℓ separated by distance h, after making use of the corresponding holographic entanglement entropy, the holographic mutual information is given by

$$I(A,B) = \frac{4\pi H}{G_N} \frac{\Gamma(\frac{3}{4})^2}{\Gamma(\frac{1}{4})^2} \Big(\frac{1}{2\ell + h} + \frac{1}{h} - \frac{2}{\ell} \Big). \tag{31}$$



Figure 1: Schematic representation of two different configurations for computing the entanglement entropy of union of regions.




Figure 2: Schematic representation of competing configurations for three subregions. In the computation of $S(A \cup B)$ and $S(A \cup B \cup C)$ there are some configurations, where the minimal one must be used.

On the other hand, for three entangling regions with the same length ℓ separated by distance h, the main point is finding the union part of entanglement entropy. According to the holographic principle, a minimal configuration in the bulk space is needed. In Fig.2, we have plotted all possible diagrams of the union of three regions and $S(A_i \cup A_j)$ and $S(A \cup B \cup C)$ are given by the minimum among the possible diagrams. For two and three strips as the entangling regions with the same length, ℓ one can write

$$S(A_i \cup A_j) : \begin{cases} 2S(\ell) \equiv S_1 \\ S(2\ell + h) + S(h) \equiv S_2 \\ S(3\ell + 2h) + S(\ell + 2h) \equiv S_3 \end{cases}$$

and for three entangling regions one has

$$S(A \cup B \cup C) : \begin{cases} 3S(\ell) \equiv S_4 \\ S(3\ell + 2h) + S(\ell + 2h) + S(\ell) \equiv S_5 \\ S(2\ell + h) + S(\ell) + S(h) \equiv S_6 \\ S(3\ell + 2h) + 2S(h) \equiv S_7 \end{cases}$$

From these possible configurations, and after making use of the minimum expression in each case, the holographic tripartite information is obtained as follows

$$I^{[3]}(A, B, C) = 3S(\ell) - 2\min\{S_1, S_2\} - \min\{S_1, S_3\} + \min\{S_4, S_5, S_6, S_7\}, \tag{32}$$

noting that by $\min\{S_1, S_2\}$ we mean the minimum configuration between S_1 and S_2.
In the theory that we are dealing with, in figure 3, we have plotted numerically the mutual and tripartite information for some certain value of ℓ and h. The numerical results indicate that for the parameters that we have used, the mutual information is always positive, on the other hand, the tripartite information remains negative.




Figure 3: Numerical results for holographic mutual information (left plot) and tripartite information (right plot) as a function of the separation distance: for $\ell = 1.1, \cdots, 1.5$. Note in all cases $\mathrm{I}(A, B)$ is positive while for three regions the tripartite information remains negative.

5 Concluding Remarks

In this paper, we studied different features of holographic entanglement measures for the scale-invariant gravity in four dimensions. The action of the scale-invariant theory can indeed be parameterized by one family of free parameters say as σ_0. And for $\sigma_0 \to \infty$, the theory reduces to the four-dimensional conformal gravity, while at $\sigma_0 = 0$ it reduces to pure R^2 gravity. In this theory, we studied the holographic entanglement entropy and mutual and tripartite information. Actually, in the scale-invariant theory of gravity, for entangling regions A, B, C in the boundary field theory, the tripartite information obeys the following inequality

$$I^{[3]}(A, B, C) \leq 0. \tag{33}$$

The tripartite information is always negative. From the definition of the tripartite information, one can write the tripartite information in terms of the mutual information as the equation (30). An immediate result is

$$I(A, B) + I(A, C) \leq I(A, B \cup C), \tag{34}$$

that means the sign of tripartite information constraints the mutual information. This is equivalent to the monotonicity of mutual information implies certain bounds when applied to the long-distance expansion of the mutual information.

In the context of quantum information theory, for any measure of the information say as $F(A)$, the inequality of form $F(A, B) + F(A, C) \leq F(A, B \cup C)$ is known as monogamy relation indicating that the holographic mutual information is monogamous. This feature is characteristic of measures of quantum entanglement. In the context of quantum information

theory, the monogamy property is related to the security of quantum cryptography, noting that quantum entanglement, unlike the classical correlation, is not a shareable resource. In other words, entangled correlations between A and B cannot be shared with a third system C without spoiling the original entanglement [26,27]. We showed that scale-invariant gravity also respects the monogamy feature of the information.

As future work, we will study the other solutions of the scale-invariant gravity in four dimensions. For example, the theory that we have considered, for $\sigma_0 = 6$, exhibits a new solution. In this critical point, all entanglement entropies that we have computed are identically zero. This indicates that at this critical point the model may have a logarithmic vacuum solution. It is worth mentioning that adding the log term to an AdS solution may be identified to a deformation of the dual conformal field theory by an irrelevant operator, this is what we have learned form the gauge/gravity duality. Therefore, adding the log term might destroy the conformal symmetry of the model at UV, therefore studying the way of applying the duality of gauge/gravity becomes important. Nevertheless, following [28], one may assume that the deformation is sufficiently small and this term may be treated perturbatively. We leave the further investigation to other works.

Acknowledgments

We would like to thank M. Alishahiha for bringing out attention on his work [11] about the scale-invariant theory. So special thanks to him on behalf of all his supporting and generosity and also for his useful comments and hints. We would like to thank R. Vazirian for her helpful comments. R.P. would also like to thank A. Naseh and B. Taghavi for useful conversations and comments.

Appendix: Some useful mathematical relations

Here in this appendix, we present some useful relations that we have used in this paper. Let us choose a five-dimensional black hole solution with coordinate t, r, x, y, z as follows

$$\begin{pmatrix} -\frac{f(r)}{r^2} & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & \frac{1}{r^2 f(r)} & 0 & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & \frac{1}{r^2} & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & 0 & \frac{1}{r^2} & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & \frac{1}{r^2} \end{pmatrix}$$

The determinant of the induced metric reads as

$$\frac{1}{r^6 f(r)} + \frac{x'(r)^2}{r^6}$$

Therefore two normal vectors are obtained as

$$\left\{\frac{1}{\sqrt{\frac{r^2}{f(r)}}},0,0,0,0\right\},\quad \left\{0,-\frac{x'(r)}{\sqrt{r^2f(r)x'(r)^2+r^2}},\frac{1}{\sqrt{r^2f(r)x'(r)^2+r^2}},0,0\right\}$$

The non-zero component of the extrinsic curvature ten reads as

$$\mathcal{K}_{11}=\frac{-rf'(r)x'(r)+2f(r)^2x'(r)^3+2f(r)\left(x'(r)-rx''(r)\right)}{2r^2f(r)\left(f(r)x'(r)^2+1\right)^{5/2}}$$

$$\mathcal{K}_{12}=\frac{x'(r)\left(-rf'(r)x'(r)+2f(r)^2x'(r)^3+2f(r)\left(x'(r)-rx''(r)\right)\right)}{2r^2\left(f(r)x'(r)^2+1\right)^{5/2}}$$

$$\mathcal{K}_{21}=\frac{x'(r)\left(-rf'(r)x'(r)+2f(r)^2x'(r)^3+2f(r)\left(x'(r)-rx''(r)\right)\right)}{2r^2\left(f(r)x'(r)^2+1\right)^{5/2}}$$

$$\mathcal{K}_{22}=\frac{f(r)x'(r)^2\left(-rf'(r)x'(r)+2f(r)^2x'(r)^3+2f(r)\left(x'(r)-rx''(r)\right)\right)}{2r^2\left(f(r)x'(r)^2+1\right)^{5/2}}$$

$$\mathcal{K}_{33}=\frac{f(r)x'(r)}{r^2\sqrt{f(r)x'(r)^2+1}}$$

$$\mathcal{K}_{44}=\frac{f(r)x'(r)}{r^2\sqrt{f(r)x'(r)^2+1}}$$

and also one finds

$$R_{\mu\nu}n_i^\mu n_i^\nu=\frac{rf'(r)-4f(r)}{f(r)x'(r)^2+1}-\frac{f(r)x'(r)^2\left(r^2f''(r)-5rf'(r)+8f(r)\right)}{2\left(f(r)x'(r)^2+1\right)}+\frac{1}{2}\left(-r\left(rf''(r)-5f'(r)\right)-8f(r)\right)$$

$$R_{\mu\nu\alpha\beta}n_i^\mu n_i^\alpha n_j^\nu n_j^\beta=-2\left(\frac{f(r)x'(r)^2\left(r^2f''(r)-2rf'(r)+2f(r)\right)}{2\left(f(r)x'(r)^2+1\right)}-\frac{rf'(r)-2f(r)}{2\left(f(r)x'(r)^2+1\right)}\right)$$

After doing some straightforward algebra for a strip entangling region the integrand function becomes

$$\text{strip entegrand}=-\frac{x'(r)\left(f(r)\left(x'(r)^2-2\lambda\right)+1\right)}{r^3f(r)\left(\frac{1}{f(r)}+x'(r)^2\right)^{3/2}},$$

where we have used $\lambda_1=\lambda_3=\frac{\lambda}{2}$ and $\lambda_2=-2\lambda$.

References

[1] P. G. Ferreira and O. J. Tattersall, Phys. Rev. D **101** (2020) no.2, 024011 doi:10.1103/PhysRevD.101.024011 [arXiv:1910.04480 [gr-qc]].

[2] A. Salvio and A. Strumia, JHEP **06** (2014), 080 doi:10.1007/JHEP06(2014)080 [arXiv:1403.4226 [hep-ph]].

[3] Y. Nakayama, Phys. Rept. **569** (2015), 1-93 doi:10.1016/j.physrep.2014.12.003 [arXiv:1302.0884 [hep-th]].

[4] A. Iorio, L. O'Raifeartaigh, I. Sachs and C. Wiesendanger, Nucl. Phys. B **495** (1997), 433-450 doi:10.1016/S0550-3213(97)00190-9 [arXiv:hep-th/9607110 [hep-th]].

[5] V. Riva and J. L. Cardy, Phys. Lett. B **622** (2005), 339-342 doi:10.1016/j.physletb.2005.07.010 [arXiv:hep-th/0504197 [hep-th]].

[6] S. El-Showk, Y. Nakayama and S. Rychkov, Nucl. Phys. B **848** (2011), 578-593 doi:10.1016/j.nuclphysb.2011.03.008 [arXiv:1101.5385 [hep-th]].

[7] A. Dymarsky, Z. Komargodski, A. Schwimmer and S. Theisen, JHEP **10** (2015), 171 doi:10.1007/JHEP10(2015)171 [arXiv:1309.2921 [hep-th]].

[8] A. Naseh, Phys. Rev. D **94** (2016) no.12, 125015 doi:10.1103/PhysRevD.94.125015 [arXiv:1607.07899 [hep-th]].

[9] R. J. Riegert, Phys. Rev. Lett. **53** (1984), 315-318 doi:10.1103/PhysRevLett.53.315

[10] L. Alvarez-Gaume, A. Kehagias, C. Kounnas, D. Lüst and A. Riotto, Fortsch. Phys. **64** (2016) no.2-3, 176-189 doi:10.1002/prop.201500100 [arXiv:1505.07657 [hep-th]].

[11] M. Alishahiha, "On 4D Scale Invariant Gravity," unpublished.

[12] M. Henningson and K. Skenderis, JHEP **07** (1998), 023 doi:10.1088/1126-6708/1998/07/023 [arXiv:hep-th/9806087 [hep-th]].

[13] A. Kehagias, C. Kounnas, D. Lüst and A. Riotto, JHEP **05** (2015), 143 doi:10.1007/JHEP05(2015)143 [arXiv:1502.04192 [hep-th]].

[14] H. Lu, Y. Pang, C. N. Pope and J. F. Vazquez-Poritz, Phys. Rev. D **86** (2012), 044011 doi:10.1103/PhysRevD.86.044011 [arXiv:1204.1062 [hep-th]].

[15] C. G. Callan, Jr. and F. Wilczek, Phys. Lett. B **333** (1994), 55-61 doi:10.1016/0370-2693(94)91007-3 [arXiv:hep-th/9401072 [hep-th]].

[16] P. Calabrese and J. Cardy, J. Phys. A **42** (2009), 504005 doi:10.1088/1751-8113/42/50/504005 [arXiv:0905.4013 [cond-mat.stat-mech]].

[17] L. Bombelli, R. K. Koul, J. Lee and R. D. Sorkin, Phys. Rev. D **34** (1986), 373-383 doi:10.1103/PhysRevD.34.373

[18] M. Srednicki, Phys. Rev. Lett. **71** (1993), 666-669 doi:10.1103/PhysRevLett.71.666 [arXiv:hep-th/9303048 [hep-th]].

[19] J. M. Maldacena, Adv. Theor. Math. Phys. **2** (1998), 231-252 doi:10.1023/A:1026654312961 [arXiv:hep-th/9711200 [hep-th]].

[20] S. Ryu and T. Takayanagi, Phys. Rev. Lett. **96** (2006), 181602 doi:10.1103/PhysRevLett.96.181602 [arXiv:hep-th/0603001 [hep-th]].

[21] X. Dong, JHEP **01** (2014), 044 doi:10.1007/JHEP01(2014)044 [arXiv:1310.5713 [hep-th]].

[22] J. Camps, JHEP **03** (2014), 070 doi:10.1007/JHEP03(2014)070 [arXiv:1310.6659 [hep-th]].

[23] D. V. Fursaev, A. Patrushev and S. N. Solodukhin, Phys. Rev. D **88** (2013) no.4, 044054 doi:10.1103/PhysRevD.88.044054 [arXiv:1306.4000 [hep-th]].

[24] M. Alishahiha, A. F. Astaneh and M. R. Mohammadi Mozaffar, JHEP **02** (2014), 008 doi:10.1007/JHEP02(2014)008 [arXiv:1311.4329 [hep-th]].

[25] H. Casini and M. Huerta, JHEP **03** (2009), 048 doi:10.1088/1126-6708/2009/03/048 [arXiv:0812.1773 [hep-th]].

[26] P. Hayden, M. Headrick and A. Maloney, Phys. Rev. D **87** (2013) no.4, 046003 doi:10.1103/PhysRevD.87.046003 [arXiv:1107.2940 [hep-th]].

[27] S. Mirabi, M. R. Tanhayi and R. Vazirian, Phys. Rev. D **93**, no.10, 104049 (2016) doi:10.1103/PhysRevD.93.104049 [arXiv:1603.00184 [hep-th]].

[28] K. Skenderis, M. Taylor and B. C. van Rees, JHEP **09** (2009), 045 doi:10.1088/1126-6708/2009/09/045 [arXiv:0906.4926 [hep-th]].