

The generalized first law for more general matter

Hong Zhe Chen^{a,b}

^a*Perimeter Institute for Theoretical Physics,
31 Caroline St. N. Waterloo, Ontario N2L 2Y5, Canada*

^b*Department of Physics and Astronomy, University of Waterloo,
200 University Avenue West, Waterloo, Ontario, N2L 3G1, Canada*

E-mail: hchen2@perimeterinstitute.ca

ABSTRACT: In previous work, a first law of generalized entropy was derived from semiclassical gravitational dynamics around thermal setups using an assumed relation between the matter modular Hamiltonian and the gravitational stress tensor. Allowing for non-minimal coupling between curvature and any tensor matter fields, we show however, that the modular Hamiltonian of thermal states is given by the integrated bulk Noether current associated to time translation plus a spacetime boundary term. One generally cannot express this in terms of gravitational stress tensor components. Still, working with the correct expression for the modular Hamiltonian, we are able to recover a first law of generalized entropy, with added benefits over the previous result. Firstly, any Wald-Dong contributions to generalized entropy resulting from non-minimal coupling between matter and curvature are included. Secondly, in gravitational equations of motion, we allow for a non-vanishing stress tensor expectation value in the unperturbed background and state, and account for background field perturbations as part of its variation. Finally, the quantum matter is allowed to contribute nontrivially to asymptotic energy, *e.g.* as is necessary, even for a minimally coupled Maxwell field, to recover the expected thermodynamic first law of charged black holes.

Contents

1	Introduction	1
2	Preliminaries	6
3	Generalized entropy in thermal setups	17
3.1	Extending the proper thermal period	18
3.2	Generalized entropy as Noether charge and current	20
3.3	Modular Hamiltonian as Noether current	26
3.4	Continuation to Lorentzian signature	30
4	First law of generalized entropy	31
4.1	The classical calculation	33
4.2	Variation of the quantum part of generalized entropy	34
4.3	Operator variation of Noether current	35
4.4	Collecting all pieces	37
5	Discussion	39
A	Effective actions and entropy	42
B	Evolution on time-dependent backgrounds	50
C	Operator variation of the Noether current integral	57
D	Maxwell contributions to asymptotic quantities	59
E	UV-divergences and anomalies	63
E.1	UV-divergences of the effective action	63
E.2	Variations of the path integral measure	66
E.3	Anomalous correction to the modular Hamiltonian	76
E.4	Anomalies and the first law of generalized entropy	78

1 Introduction

Holographic duality provides an equivalence between theories of quantum gravity in asymptotically anti-de Sitter (AdS) spacetimes and strongly-coupled conformal field theories (CFTs) of a large number (*i.e.* N^2 -many) degrees of freedom residing on the spacetimes' boundaries. In recent years, the AdS/CFT correspondence has fuelled a surge of interest in connecting geometric quantities to quantum information measures of entanglement. Most

notable in these developments is the proposal by Ryu and Takayanagi [1, 2] relating the entanglement entropy of a region \mathcal{R} in the boundary CFT to the area of an extremal surface in the bulk spacetime. This can be understood as the leading contribution in a saddle-point approximation for Einstein gravity [3]. Corrections have since been found, both in the case of higher-curvature gravity [4–6] and at next-to-leading order in $1/N^2$, or equivalently in Newton’s constant G_N , [7, 8] giving the bulk formula for generalized entropy:

$$S_\sigma^{\text{gen}} = \langle S_\sigma^{\text{WD}} \rangle + S[\rho^{\text{mat}}] , \quad (1.1)$$

where σ is a codimension-two ‘quantum extremal’ surface [8, 9]¹, the Wald-Dong entropy S_σ^{WD} [6, 10, 11] is a local quantity evaluated on σ , reducing to the area A_σ

$$S_\sigma^{\text{WD}} = \frac{A_\sigma}{4G_N} \quad (\text{Einstein gravity}) \quad (1.2)$$

in the Einstein case, and $S[\rho^{\text{mat}}]$ is the (von Neumann) entropy of the bulk matter state ρ^{mat} in the region Σ bounded by σ and \mathcal{R} .

The name “generalized entropy” for the quantity (1.1) harks back to its origins in black hole thermodynamics, where the non-decreasing properties of (1.1), with σ now the black hole horizon on evolving time slices, has been interpreted as a generalized second law for black holes [12]. Indeed, (1.1) seems to be the natural generalization of horizon area, promoting classical laws of black hole thermodynamics to allow for the inclusion of quantum matter. For some more recent discussions of the dynamics of generalized entropy evaluated on or near horizons, see *e.g.* [13–15].


Among the laws of black hole thermodynamics, of particular focus in this note is the first law² which relates the variation of entropy to the variation of mass. The first law considers a setup that is thermal with respect to a flow $\xi = \partial_t$ in a certain time t — by this, we mean that the background and state have a Euclidean preparation that is symmetric under rotation in a thermal time direction $\tau = it$, generated by (the Wick rotation³ of) ξ — see Figure 1a. An example would be an eternal black hole in the Hartle-Hawking vacuum, whose Lorentzian evolution is illustrated in Figure 1b. In such cases where ξ is bifurcate, the bifurcation surface σ bipartitions a Cauchy surface into two pieces, with each piece corresponding to a region exterior to horizons generated by ξ . The generalized entropy S_σ^{gen} evaluated for the entangling surface σ is then interpreted as the entropy of one such half-space Σ .

At the classical level, S_σ^{gen} reduces to the Wald-Dong entropy S_σ^{WD} and the first law of black hole thermodynamics is perhaps most elegantly stated using Wald’s Noether charge

¹Being quantum extremal means that σ extremizes S_σ^{gen} among surfaces homologous to \mathcal{R} [9] — towards the end of appendix A, we briefly review the derivation of quantum extremality in holography. If multiple quantum extrema exist, the one which gives the smallest S_σ^{gen} is the one for which S_σ^{gen} gives the entropy of the boundary region \mathcal{R} .

²This first law in fact applies to any thermal setup, not just black holes. For instance, one may consider a Rindler wedge, which is thermal with respect to the boost direction (this would be generated by the ξ mentioned next in the text).

³Elsewhere in this paper, when the distinction is important, we will use superscripts $^{\text{E}\bullet}$ and $^{\text{L}\bullet}$ to mark Euclidean and Lorentzian objects.



(a) Euclidean path integral preparation of a thermal state on a rotation- (*i.e.* $U(1)$ -) symmetric Euclidean geometry.

(b) An eternal AdS black hole, exemplifying the physical evolution of a thermal setup prepared by panel a.

Figure 1: Euclidean preparation (a) and Lorentzian evolution (b) of a thermal setup. The Euclidean background in panel a is symmetric with respect to the flow E_ξ of thermal time τ . The state is prepared on the surface Σ , bounded in the bulk by the entangling surface σ , around which E_ξ generates rotations, and on the spacetime boundary by \mathcal{R} . In panel b, the Lorentzian time $t = -i\tau$ evolution corresponds to a boost L_ξ that generates horizons. The Σ , σ , and \mathcal{R} surfaces are embedded as shown (in the same colours as in panel a) in this Lorentzian geometry, with σ giving the bifurcation surface of the horizons. Elements of the first law of generalized entropy are written in the colours of the surfaces on which they respectively reside: the variations of the Dong entropy $\langle S_\sigma^{\text{WD}} \rangle$, the matter entropy $S[\rho^{\text{mat}}]$, and the asymptotic energy $\langle H_\xi^{\mathcal{M}} \rangle$. Sufficient conditions of the first law are for the unperturbed and linearized gravitational equations of motion, $\langle \mathbf{E}_g \rangle = 0$ and $\delta\langle \mathbf{E}_g \rangle = 0$, to hold on Σ .

formalism [10, 11]. Due to the symmetry of the metric generated by ξ , the Wald-Dong entropy S_σ^{WD} can be related [6] to a Noether charge (density) \mathbf{Q}_ξ [10, 11]⁴, corresponding to ξ , integrated along σ :

$$S_\sigma^{\text{WD}} = 2\pi \int_\sigma \mathbf{Q}_\xi, \quad (1.3)$$

In fact, (1.3) continues to hold for linear perturbations away from thermal setups⁵. It is then shown that classically, for perturbations between nearby on-shell configurations,

$$\delta S_\sigma^{\text{WD}} = 2\pi \int_\sigma \delta \mathbf{Q}_\xi = \delta H_\xi^{\mathcal{M}} \quad (1.4)$$

⁴The Noether charge entropy (1.3) is often simply referred to as the Wald entropy.

⁵Some details regarding how one can see (1.3) and the fact that it continues to hold at linear order in perturbations are explained later in this paper in footnote 39, below (3.34), and in footnotes 49 and 51.

where $H_\xi^{\mathcal{M}}$ is an asymptotic energy, *e.g.* including the ADM mass and angular momentum for Einstein gravity [11] and, in holographic setups, giving the energy in the boundary CFT corresponding to the ξ flow [16]. Thus, variations of entropy and energy are related in a manner reminiscent of the first law of thermodynamics. In fact, [16] found that for arbitrary perturbations, potentially to off-shell configurations, (1.4) simply receives a contribution given by an integral of linearized gravitational equations of motion $\delta\mathbf{E}_g$ for the perturbation (where $\mathbf{E}_g^{ab} = \frac{\delta I}{\delta g_{ab}}$ is the functional derivative of the action I in the metric g). Moreover, in the vacuum of AdS, sufficient symmetries exist such that [16] were able to argue the converse direction, that the first law (1.4) implies the linearized gravitational equations of motion are locally satisfied in the bulk.

In [17]⁶, these results were lifted to the semiclassical level, allowing for the presence of quantum matter in the bulk. It was presumed that the modular Hamiltonian K^{mat} corresponding to the bulk matter state $\rho^{\text{mat}} \propto e^{-2\pi K^{\text{mat}}}$ is given by the integral of components of a stress tensor T^{ab} :

$$K^{\text{mat}} \stackrel{?}{=} - \int_{\Sigma} \epsilon_a \xi_b T^{ab}, \quad (1.5)$$

where ϵ_a gives the volume form on codimension-one surfaces⁷, in this case Σ . The idea was then to leverage the first law of von Neumann entropy

$$\delta S[\rho^{\text{mat}}] = 2\pi \delta \rho^{\text{mat}} \langle K^{\text{mat}} \rangle \quad (1.6)$$

relating the variations of matter entropy $S[\rho^{\text{mat}}]$ and the expectation value of $\langle K^{\text{mat}} \rangle$. Here, $\delta \rho^{\text{mat}}$ means the variation of an expectation value due to the matter state perturbation $\delta \rho^{\text{mat}}$, fixing the operator. As $\langle T^{ab} \rangle$ conveniently sources the gravitational equations of motion, again one naively finds that linearized equations of motion $\delta \langle \mathbf{E}_g \rangle$ imply a first law

$$\delta S_\sigma^{\text{gen}} = \delta \langle H_\xi^{\mathcal{M}} \rangle \quad (1.7)$$

at linear order in the background and matter state perturbations. Additionally, as before, the converse direction can also be argued in the Poincaré vacuum.

There are, however, some inconvenient subtleties in this narrative. Firstly, the modular Hamiltonian is not, in general, related to the gravitational stress tensor as in (1.5)⁸, especially in the presence of non-minimal couplings between gravity and matter. For the

⁶See also [18, 19] for similar discussions in the context of causal diamonds.

⁷Note that our default convention for orienting constant time t surfaces such as Σ is similar to that of [11], taking the orientation to be given by $n_{(t)} \cdot \epsilon = n_{(t)}^a \epsilon_a$ with ϵ the spacetime volume form and $n_{(t)}$ the normal vector directed towards increasing t . This seems to disagree with [17], as seen by comparison of our (1.5) and their (3.6). (It is possible that [17] inherited a sign error from [16] — see footnote 55.) At any rate, writing out (1.5) explicitly, one has $-\int_{\Sigma} \epsilon_a \xi_b T^{ab} = \int_{\Sigma} d^d x \sqrt{\gamma_{\Sigma}} n_{(t)}^a \xi^b T_{ab}$ with γ_{Σ} the induced metric on Σ . Note also that it is the Lorentzian stress tensor that is written here — see section 3.4.

⁸To put it another way, for (1.5) to hold, the T^{ab} there is in general not the *gravitational* stress tensor appearing in gravitational equations of motion. In maximally-symmetric spacetimes for example, (1.5) typically holds (or at least gives the bulk part of the modular Hamiltonian) with the *canonical* stress tensor, whose components correspond to those of Noether currents. For the remainder of this paper, when we say “stress tensor”, we mean the gravitational stress tensor.

non-minimally coupled free scalar, for example, the modular Hamiltonian is always the canonical generator for the ξ time flow [20, 21]. Secondly, in the presence of non-minimal coupling, there is also potential for the matter sector to make additional contributions $\langle S_{\sigma}^{\text{mat,WD}} \rangle$ to the Wald-Dong entropy $\langle S_{\sigma}^{\text{WD}} \rangle$ — these have been called “Wald-like” terms in [7]. Such terms are not accounted for in the derivation of [17]. Drawing inspiration from the calculations of non-minimally coupled scalars, [22] suggests that these two aforementioned subtleties resolve each other — namely that the variations of Wald-like terms cancel against the incongruities between the modular Hamiltonian and the stress tensor integral. In this note, we shall bear out these claims in far greater generality than scalar field theory.

Yet, there are still more issues related to the size of background perturbations, *e.g.* perturbations δg of the metric, and what “linearized” means for gravitational equations of motion and the first law of generalized entropy (1.7). In previous work, *e.g.* [17, 22], the authors were content with perturbations $\delta g \sim O(G_N)$, say resulting from back-reaction of the matter state perturbation $\delta \rho^{\text{mat}}$. Then, part of the meaning of linearization, in their results, is that the gravitational equations of motion for the perturbation $\delta g \sim O(G_N)$ are written to leading order in G_N and the generalized first law (1.7) is obtained to zeroth order in G_N . This, for example, is what allows, in the argument summarized around (1.7), for the transition from $\delta_{\rho^{\text{mat}}} \langle K^{\text{mat}} \rangle$ in (1.6) to the full variation of the stress tensor $\delta \langle T^{ab} \rangle$ required to source the linearized gravitational equations $\delta \langle E_g^{ab} \rangle$ — note that, in general, there should also be a contribution to $\delta \langle T^{ab} \rangle$ resulting from the variation of the operator T^{ab} itself due to perturbations in the background fields. The assumption of δg being perturbatively small in G_N is also needed in previous work, if quantum fields make nontrivial contributions to the matter stress tensor in the unperturbed thermal setup. (Of course, in the Poincaré vacuum on which [17] is focused, the matter stress tensor vanishes.) This is because, implicit in the derivation of the first law (1.7) (even in its classical statement (1.4)) is the assumption that the unperturbed setup satisfies gravitational equations of motion — otherwise, these equations appear, multiplied by δg , as an extra term in the first law. To add quantum matter, one should therefore provide a term like $\langle T^{ab} \rangle \delta g_{ab}$ — something which the derivation described around (1.7) seems to miss. Of course, if $\delta g \sim O(G_N)$ and one is only interested in the first law up to $O(G_N)$ corrections, then this is a nonissue.

In contrast, we shall allow for background variations that are not perturbatively small in G_N — for example, one might envision turning on a classical gravitational wave background that is not suppressed by G_N . We shall find that, assuming gravitational equations linearized in the perturbations of the background fields and the matter state ρ^{mat} , the generalized first law (1.7) holds, also at linearized order in the perturbations. In fact, there will be no expansion in G_N , except possibly in justifying the semiclassical theory in the first place to frame it in the context of a full quantum gravity theory (see appendix A)⁹. The issues mentioned in the preceding paragraph simply resolve each other.

Altogether, we shall resolve all the issues mentioned in the preceding paragraphs very generally, considering arbitrary theories of gravity possibly non-minimally coupled to quan-

⁹If we pretend the semiclassical theory is a self-contained theory, and we take the generalized entropy formula (1.1) to be an exact notion of entropy in this theory, then we will find no further need to expand in G_N .

tum matter, which may consist of arbitrary tensor fields. We shall show how linearized gravitational equations of motion imply that the generalized entropy (1.1) satisfies the first law (1.7) relating variations of entropy and energy away from an arbitrary thermal setup. This will be in spite of the fact that, as we will find, the modular Hamiltonian of the matter state ρ^{mat} corresponds to the integral of a Noether current plus a boundary term, as opposed to a gravitational stress tensor T^{ab} component. Moreover, we allow for background perturbations unsuppressed by G_{N} . As an added bonus for working carefully with the correct expression for the modular Hamiltonian, we will also find that contributions of the matter sector to the asymptotic energy $H_{\xi}^{\mathcal{M}}$ automatically appear in the first law of generalized entropy. In [17], matter is taken to fall off sufficiently quickly at the spacetime boundary so as to not contribute new terms to the asymptotic energy. However, as we summarize in the discussion section 5 and explicitly show in appendix D, such terms, for the example of a minimally coupled quantum Maxwell field propagating on a black hole background, are important for recovering the expected thermodynamic first law of electrically charged black holes.

The remainder of this paper is organized as follows. We begin by establishing notation in section 2 for our semiclassical theory and re-express generalized entropy in terms of the theory’s effective action in a form bearing resemblance to Callan and Wilczek’s entropy formula [23]. With this, we shall show in section 3 that the matter modular Hamiltonian is in general given by the integral of the Noether current associated with the thermal time flow ξ plus a boundary term. In section 4 we proceed to show that the first law (1.7) of generalized entropy nonetheless holds, fully accounting for the variation of Wald-like contributions $\langle S_{\sigma}^{\text{mat,WD}} \rangle$ resulting from non-minimal coupling. Our results and possible future directions are discussed in section 5. Details relating our semiclassical approach, involving the effective action, to perhaps more conventional holographic entropy calculations, featuring quantum gravity partition functions, are included in appendix A¹⁰. Some intermediate results are derived in appendices B and C, including a generalization of our expression for the thermal modular Hamiltonian to give the instantaneous generator of time evolution on time-dependent backgrounds. In appendix D we consider the contribution that a Maxwell field makes to the asymptotic energy. Finally, in appendix E we describe how UV-divergences are renormalized in generalized entropy, and how the variation of the matter path integration measure might correct various quantities encountered in this paper.

2 Preliminaries

Let us begin by introducing some notation. In this note, we are motivated by the consideration of a quantum gravitational theory on a spacetime¹¹ with boundary \mathcal{M} . The theory will have a metric g and other background fields ϕ . On top of this background will live a

¹⁰Our approach is not entirely new, as we draw many connections to the use of effective actions in [9], but we have aimed to be more explicit than perhaps previous discussions existing in literature.

¹¹Our calculations here and in the remainder of the paper carry through just as well in spacetimes without boundaries, *e.g.* in de Sitter spacetime, simply by ignoring spacetime boundary terms. It is interesting to note that, in those cases, the RHS of first law (1.7), which we shall derive in section 4, is zero as there is no asymptotic energy.

graviton h and other quantum fields ψ . The action I will consist of a classical gravitational piece I^{grav} and a matter piece I^{mat} (with gravitons included in the latter, as discussed shortly):

$$I[g, h, \phi + \psi] = I^{\text{grav}}[g] + I^{\text{mat}}[g, h, \phi + \psi] . \quad (2.1)$$

More generally, we shall attach superscripts \bullet^{grav} and \bullet^{mat} to symbols when we wish to refer to the purely gravitational or the matter parts of some object¹². We shall clarify the appearance of the combination of arguments $(g, h, \phi + \psi)$ in these actions further below. The action is given by the integrals

$$I = \int \mathbf{L} + \int_{\mathcal{M}} \mathbf{L}^{\mathcal{M}} , \quad (2.2)$$

of Lagrangian densities

$$\mathbf{L} = \mathbf{L}^{\text{grav}} + \mathbf{L}^{\text{mat}} = \epsilon L , \quad \mathbf{L}^{\mathcal{M}} = \mathbf{L}^{\mathcal{M}, \text{grav}} + \mathbf{L}^{\mathcal{M}, \text{mat}} \quad (2.3)$$

over the bulk spacetime and its boundary \mathcal{M} respectively, where ϵ is the bulk volume form. As stated previously, in this paper, we shall allow for arbitrary tensor matter fields $\phi + \psi$ (unless required, we most often will notationally suppress tensor indices). As we explain in the following paragraph, our reason for allowing a boundary contribution $\int_{\mathcal{M}} \mathbf{L}^{\mathcal{M}}$ to the action is not to introduce extra degrees of freedom or dynamics on the boundary \mathcal{M} , but rather to ensure the bulk theory has a good variational principle. The effective action $W[g]$ is then given by the logarithm of a path integral:

$$W[g] = I^{\text{grav}}[g] + W^{\text{mat}}[g] , \quad W^{\text{mat}}[g] = -\log \int [dh][d\psi] e^{-I^{\text{mat}}[g, h, \phi + \psi]} . \quad (2.4)$$

As suggested by the above notation, we begin here by considering a Euclidean theory.

In this paper, we shall consider the situation where the fields $g + h$ and $\phi + \psi$ are required to satisfy certain boundary conditions at the spacetime boundary; we take the background fields g and ϕ to satisfy these and we shall suppose the boundary conditions then require the quantum fields h and ψ to have certain asymptotics on approach to the spacetime boundary \mathcal{M} . For example, in holography, g and ϕ would have the asymptotics of non-normalizable modes while h and ψ would behave like normalizable modes. Note that, even if h and ψ are required to vanish at the spacetime boundary \mathcal{M} , this does not necessarily imply that the boundary action $\int_{\mathcal{M}} \mathbf{L}^{\mathcal{M}}$ is independent of the quantum fields. One should think of this action as evaluated on the boundary limit of some IR cutoff surface — terms involving the quantum fields may yet be finite if they also contain compensating factors, say of the background fields, which become large in the boundary limit. In fact, the boundary action is sometimes required for the bulk theory to have a well-defined variational principle. Specifically, let us write the field variation of the bulk Lagrangian \mathbf{L} as

$$\delta_{\gamma} \mathbf{L} = \mathbf{E}_{\gamma} \delta \gamma + d\theta[\delta \gamma] , \quad (\gamma \in \{g, \phi, h, \psi\}) \quad (2.5)$$

¹²Note that some objects associated with h , ϕ , and ψ can only come from I^{mat} , so we will omit \bullet^{mat} superscripts on those objects. For example, we write for the equations of motion and symplectic potential terms to be introduced in (2.5) below: $\mathbf{E}_h = \mathbf{E}_h^{\text{mat}}$, $\mathbf{E}_{\phi} = \mathbf{E}_{\phi}^{\text{mat}} = \mathbf{E}_{\psi} = \mathbf{E}_{\psi}^{\text{mat}}$, and $\theta[\delta h, \delta \phi + \delta \psi] = \theta^{\text{mat}}[\delta h, \delta \phi + \delta \psi]$.

where

$$\frac{\delta I}{\delta \gamma} = \mathbf{E}_\gamma = E_\gamma \epsilon \quad (\gamma \in \{g, \phi, h, \psi\}, \delta \gamma \text{ away from } \mathcal{M}) \quad (2.6)$$

denotes equations of motion (multiplied by the spacetime volume form ϵ) and the symplectic potential θ accounts for boundary terms that arise when extracting the equations of motion. Then, in order for the equations of motion alone to be sufficient for extremizing the action I with respect to the fields (and thus for there to be a sensible classical limit), and for the path integral (2.4) to be sensible¹³, one must require¹⁴

$$\theta[\delta \gamma]|_{\mathcal{M}} = -\delta \gamma \mathbf{L}^{\mathcal{M}}|_{\mathcal{M}}, \quad (\gamma \in \{g, h, \phi, \psi\}, \delta \gamma \text{ preserves b.c.}) \quad (2.8)$$

for any field variations which preserve the boundary conditions on the spacetime boundary \mathcal{M} . One can verify that (2.8) is satisfied in holography, where $\int_{\mathcal{M}} \mathbf{L}^{\mathcal{M}}$ contains Gibbons-Hawking-like actions and boundary counterterm actions¹⁵. (As stated below however, when the entangling surface σ stretches to the spacetime boundary \mathcal{M} , in this paper, we do not allow $\int_{\mathcal{M}} \mathbf{L}^{\mathcal{M}}$ to contribute to Wald-Dong entropy — such contributions would be interpreted as counterterms to bulk generalized entropy that renormalize its IR divergence.

¹³To see what can go wrong in the path integral if one has non-vanishing $\theta|_{\mathcal{M}}$ but does not include a compensating boundary action, say taking $\mathbf{L}^{\mathcal{M}} = 0$, consider the argument leading to (2.13) below. The argument for $\delta_\phi W[g] = 0$ actually generally applies to any variation $\delta \phi$ which preserves the boundary conditions on the spacetime boundary \mathcal{M} and thus can be absorbed as a shift of the quantum fields. For such variations, we have

$$0 = \delta_\phi W[g] = \int_{\mathcal{M}} \langle \theta[\delta \phi] \rangle, \quad (\mathbf{L}^{\mathcal{M}} = 0 \text{ and } \delta \phi \text{ preserving boundary conditions}) \quad (2.7)$$

where we have made use of (2.13) in the second equality. (Actually, there may also be contributions due to variations of the path integral measure, but we leave such issues for appendix E.) However, this is obviously untrue in certain examples. For example, for a scalar field in holography, when one considers quantum fluctuations in the faster falling off normalizable modes, $\theta[\delta \phi]$, with $\delta \phi$ having the asymptotics of such a mode, is actually a c-number determined by the fixed non-normalizable modes. The resolution is to recognize that one must include in $\mathbf{L}^{\mathcal{M}}$ the holographic renormalization counterterm for the scalar field — see (5.106) in [24] and (2.11) in [25] — which cancels against the symplectic potential as in (2.8). A similar exercise can also be carried out for the metric g and graviton h in the quantum gravity path integral, prior to Legendre-transforming to the effective action as described in appendix A. One finds, in Einstein gravity, that including the usual Gibbons-Hawking boundary term as well as holographic renormalization counterterms — see (5.123) in [24] — in $\mathbf{L}^{\mathcal{M}}$ allows (2.8) to be satisfied. Legendre-transforming to the semiclassical theory at one-loop-in- G_N , one expects (2.8) to continue to hold as one expands in the graviton and discards all but the zeroth and second order terms.

¹⁴When we write, *e.g.* $\bullet_{\mathcal{M}}$ or $\bullet|_{\mathcal{M}}$ for tensors or forms, we mean not only evaluation at \mathcal{M} , but also projection to components along \mathcal{M} , unless indices are otherwise specified.

¹⁵For Einstein gravity and scalar fields where the modes falling off faster at the AdS boundary are path-integrated over while slower-falloff modes are fixed, $\int_{\mathcal{M}} \mathbf{L}^{\mathcal{M}}$ is precisely the sum of the Gibbons-Hawking action and counterterms needed for holographic renormalization — for the latter see (5.106) and (5.123) of [24]. In certain mass ranges of the scalar field, however, one can instead choose to swap the modes which are integrated over and those which are fixed by boundary conditions [25, 26]; then, one must adjust the boundary action $\int_{\mathcal{M}} \mathbf{L}^{\mathcal{M}}$ appropriately — see (2.16) in [25]. As described in [25] (and we discuss briefly in appendix D) an analogous choice exists for vector fields. In any case, we expect (2.8) to hold for a given choice of boundary conditions and the corresponding boundary action $\int_{\mathcal{M}} \mathbf{L}^{\mathcal{M}}$.

Rather, we consider $\int_{\mathcal{M}} \mathbf{L}^{\mathcal{M}}$ primarily to ensure that the bulk dynamics and path integral are well-defined.)

Let us now discuss the interpretation of the effective action. The effective action (2.4) can be either thought of as the (one-loop-in- G_N approximation of) the effective action for the metric or simply the logarithm of the partition function in a semiclassical theory where h is just an extra matter field — we leave the details of these descriptions to appendix A, but highlight here some key points. We recall that the first variations of effective actions provide nontrivial equations of motion. (This is described around (A.8).) Here, a nontrivial equation of motion for g is obtained from the first derivative of $W[g]$:

$$0 = \frac{\delta W[g]}{\delta g} = \mathbf{E}_g^{\text{grav}} + \frac{1}{2} \langle \mathbf{T} \rangle, \quad (\delta g \text{ away from } \mathcal{M}, g \text{ on-shell}) \quad (2.9)$$

where

$$\frac{\delta I_g^{\text{grav}}[g]}{\delta g_{ab}} \equiv (\mathbf{E}_g^{\text{grav}})^{ab} \equiv (E_g^{\text{grav}})^{ab} \epsilon \quad (\delta g \text{ away from } \mathcal{M}) \quad (2.10)$$

gives the gravitational part of the metric's equation of motion and

$$2 \frac{\delta W^{\text{mat}}[g]}{\delta g_{ab}} = \langle \mathbf{T}^{ab} \rangle, \quad 2(\mathbf{E}_g^{\text{mat}})^{ab} = \mathbf{T}^{ab} = T^{ab} \epsilon. \quad (\delta g \text{ away from } \mathcal{M}) \quad (2.11)$$

is the matter stress tensor¹⁶. (Actually, in the second equality, the stress tensor should generally also receive a contribution from the variation of the path integral measure with respect to the metric. We leave consideration of such contributions to appendix E, where we collectively discuss all anomalous corrections to quantities in this paper resulting from variations of the path integral measure.) The meaning of (2.9) is that the background metric g satisfying this equation of motion correctly captures the expectation value of the quantum field $\langle g + h \rangle^{\text{QG}} = g$, *i.e.* $\langle h \rangle^{\text{QG}} = 0$, in the quantum gravitational (QG) theory — see (A.9). Recall that the calculation of an effective action requires the removal of tadpoles. To get the generating functional at one-loop-order-in- G_N , this means the removal of terms in the action linear in h . The quadratic terms, on the other hand, are included in $I^{\text{mat}}[g, h, \phi + \psi]$ — see (A.16)¹⁷. By construction then, the expectation value $\langle h \rangle$ evaluated using the semiclassical action $I^{\text{mat}}[g, h, \phi + \psi]$ always vanishes:

$$\langle h \rangle = 0, \quad (2.12)$$

for any background g (see discussion above (A.17)). However, the graviton two-point function is nontrivial and, in particular, the matter stress tensor (2.11) receives contributions from the graviton owing to the terms in $I^{\text{mat}}[g, h, \phi + \psi]$ quadratic in h .

¹⁶As we shall show in section 3.4, the Euclidean stress tensor T^{ab} considered here is the negative of the Lorentzian stress tensor, *e.g.* as appears in (1.5).

¹⁷To go to higher orders in G_N , one should keep interaction terms involving h but remove the resulting loop diagrams contributing to h tadpoles. As emphasized in appendix A, the latter step presents an obstacle to expressing the effective action in the form (2.4), since it is not clear that a local modification to the action is sufficient to implement the prescription of killing loop tadpoles. Of course, gravity is infamously nonrenormalizable, so this higher-loop story is sketchy at best anyway. At any rate, we will be satisfied in this note to stay at one-loop-order-in- G_N .

In order to consider nontrivial gravitational equations of motion (2.9), we have thus distinguished the treatment of the metric and graviton from other background and quantum fields. These other fields, in contrast, only appear in the combination $\phi + \psi$ so that the background fields ϕ merely shift the quantum fields ψ . Note, in particular that, due to the path integration of ψ , (2.4) is independent of the bulk profile of ϕ . (One, might however, imagine that the near-boundary profile of ϕ specifies the boundary conditions imposed on $\phi + \psi$, on which the path-integral implicitly depends.) Hence, the first variation of (2.4) in ϕ vanishes trivially:

$$0 = \frac{\delta W[g]}{\delta \phi} = \langle \mathbf{E}_\phi \rangle . \quad (\delta \phi \text{ away from } \mathcal{M}) \quad (2.13)$$

This should be contrasted with the nontrivial gravitational equations of motion (2.9); indeed, one motivation for us to consider the gravitational effective action, as opposed to a partition function where g merely shifts h , is so that one can sensibly ask whether a given g is on-shell, as defined by (2.9).

From here on, we shall simply take the form of the action (2.1) as-is, with the path integral of (2.4) describing a semiclassical theory of quantum matter h, ψ on a classical background g, ϕ . In this theory, the path integral of (2.4) provides a definition of an expectation value in the semiclassical theory: for a given operator \mathcal{O} ,

$$\langle \mathcal{O} \rangle = \frac{\int [dh][d\psi] e^{-I^{\text{mat}}[g, h, \phi + \psi]} \mathcal{O}}{e^{-W^{\text{mat}}[g]}} . \quad (2.14)$$

In quantum field theory, one often thinks of a Euclidean path integral as preparing a state of quantum matter on a codimension-one time slice. One can then consider a subregion Σ on this slice¹⁸ with reduced state ρ^{mat} . Computing the expectation value of an operator \mathcal{O}_Σ on Σ using (2.14) is then thought of as tracing against the state ρ^{mat} . Namely,

$$\text{tr}(\rho^{\text{mat}} \mathcal{O}_\Sigma) = \langle \mathcal{O}_\Sigma \rangle , \quad (2.15)$$

or introducing the unnormalized state $\hat{\rho}^{\text{mat}}$,

$$\rho^{\text{mat}} = \frac{\hat{\rho}^{\text{mat}}}{\text{tr} \hat{\rho}^{\text{mat}}} , \quad \text{tr} \hat{\rho}^{\text{mat}} = e^{-W^{\text{mat}}[g]} , \quad (2.16)$$

we have

$$\text{tr}(\hat{\rho}^{\text{mat}} \mathcal{O}_\Sigma) = \int [dh][d\psi] e^{-I^{\text{mat}}[g, h, \phi + \psi]} \mathcal{O}_\Sigma . \quad (2.17)$$

Given the background (g, ϕ) and state ρ^{mat} of quantum fields (h, ψ) , we may calculate the generalized entropy of the region Σ — that is, the generalized entropy across the

¹⁸In the present discussion, we aim to be quite general and independent of holography. In particular, Σ need not be bounded in the bulk by a quantum extremal entangling surface σ . We recognize, however, there is some discussion to be had about gauging diffeomorphisms in the graviton path integral; one may ask, for example, how the region Σ , or equivalently the location of σ , is chosen in each configuration $g + h$ included in the graviton path integral computing $\hat{\rho}^{\text{mat}}$. We will leave such subtleties related to gauge-fixing to future work. In the discussion section 5, however, we speculate on how the formula (2.44) to be introduced below may provide a reasonable definition of generalized entropy for arbitrary regions, even in gauge theories.

codimension-two entangling surface σ which bi-partitions the initial time slice into Σ and its complement. This generalized entropy is given by

$$S_{\sigma}^{\text{gen}}[g] = \langle S_{\sigma}^{\text{WD}}[g, h, \phi + \psi] \rangle + S[\rho^{\text{mat}}] , \quad (2.18)$$

where the Wald-Dong entropy S_{σ}^{WD} is a local contribution given by the integral of some covariant local quantity along σ [6] — to be described further below — and $S[\rho^{\text{mat}}]$ is the von Neumann entropy of the reduced state ρ^{mat} in the region Σ :

$$S[\rho^{\text{mat}}] = -\text{tr}(\rho^{\text{mat}} \log \rho^{\text{mat}}) . \quad (2.19)$$

An alternative expression

$$S[\rho^{\text{mat}}] = 2\pi \langle K^{\text{mat}} \rangle + \log \text{tr} \hat{\rho}^{\text{mat}} \quad (2.20)$$

also exists in terms of the trace of the unnormalized state $\hat{\rho}^{\text{mat}}$ and the modular Hamiltonian K^{mat} , defined by

$$\hat{\rho}^{\text{mat}} = e^{-2\pi K^{\text{mat}}} . \quad (2.21)$$

In practice, it is often helpful to think of (2.19) as the $n \rightarrow 1$ limit of Rényi entropies

$$S_n[\rho^{\text{mat}}] = -\frac{1}{n-1} \log \text{tr}[(\rho^{\text{mat}})^n] , \quad (2.22)$$

$$S[\rho^{\text{mat}}] = \lim_{n \rightarrow 1} S_n[\rho^{\text{mat}}] = -\partial_n (\log \text{tr}[(\rho^{\text{mat}})^n])_{n=1} . \quad (2.23)$$

The discussion in the previous paragraph generally extends beyond setups that have simple Euclidean preparations — the background and quantum fields in (2.18) can be those that describe a physical Lorentzian background and $\hat{\rho}^{\text{mat}}$ can be an arbitrary state on a spatial region Σ with entangling surface σ in that Lorentzian system. The utility of (2.23), however, is most evident when a Euclidean preparation is possible and the Rényi entropies can be calculated using the replica trick¹⁹ — to discuss this, it is helpful now to introduce some notation useful for gluing together replicas of manifolds and fields.

Given a codimension-two surface σ in a (Euclidean) manifold with metric g , we shall use $g_{\times n}$ to denote the metric of the replicated manifold obtained by a ‘branched’ stitching together of n replicas of the original geometry, such that one moves from replica to replica as one goes around σ . We will define similar procedures $\bullet_{\times n}$ for other fields. The inverse operation, which we shall denote $\bullet_{\div n}$, corresponds to taking the orbifold around σ . The replicated manifold with other replicated background fields obtained from the $\bullet_{\times n}$ operation are precisely the background over which one expects to path-integrate in order to obtain the trace in the Rényi entropy (2.22). There is, however a subtlety that we must clarify: replication generally introduces or modifies conical singularities on σ ; *e.g.* if g is smooth on σ , then $g_{\times n}$ will have a conical singularity with total angle $2\pi n$ around σ . When we write

¹⁹One may also consider setups prepared by more complicated Schwinger-Keldysh path integrals, see *e.g.* [27]. In those cases, in the replica procedure described in the following paragraph, one should glue together copies of the Lorentzian and Euclidean geometries through which the Schwinger-Keldysh path integral runs.

an action involving fields replicated or orbifolded with $\bullet_{\times n}$ or $\bullet_{\div n}$, we shall *exclude* any modification to conical singularities as contributions to the action localized on σ resulting from the $\bullet_{\times n}$ or $\bullet_{\div n}$ operation. That is, if we define I_σ as the restriction of the integral defining I to a small a -radius neighbourhood $\mathcal{N}_a(\sigma)$ of σ , then we write

$$I_\sigma[g_{\times n}, h_{\times n}, (\phi + \psi)_{\times n}] = n I_\sigma[g, h, \phi + \psi] \quad (2.24)$$

(which vanishes in the $a \rightarrow 0$ limit when $(g, h, \phi + \psi)$ are smooth at σ) and, moreover, the action on the replicated configuration is precisely n times the original:

$$I[g_{\times n}, h_{\times n}, (\phi + \psi)_{\times n}] = n I[g, h, \phi + \psi] . \quad (2.25)$$

The path integral evaluation of $\text{tr}[(\rho^{\text{mat}})^n]$ in the Rényi entropy (2.22), and more generally the trace $\text{tr}[(\rho^{\text{mat}})^n \mathcal{O}_\Sigma]$ against an arbitrary operator \mathcal{O}_Σ on Σ , should similarly *not* acquire extra contributions to its action²⁰ localized on σ with increasing n . Thus, our notation allows us to simply write

$$\text{tr}[(\hat{\rho}^{\text{mat}})^n \mathcal{O}_\Sigma] = \int [dh][d\psi] \exp \left\{ -I^{\text{mat}}[g_{\times n}, h, \phi_{\times n} + \psi] \right\} \mathcal{O}_\Sigma . \quad (2.26)$$

While the RHS only has an obvious definition for $n \in \mathbb{N}$, the LHS suggests that analytic continuation to real $n > 0$ is possible. Then, applying (2.16) and (2.23) to (2.26) with $\mathcal{O}_\Sigma = \mathbb{1}$ allows for a calculation of the matter von Neumann entropy $S[\rho^{\text{mat}}]$.

To define the Wald-Dong entropy S_σ^{WD} appearing in the generalized entropy (2.18) however, it is also helpful to introduce the deformed replication operation $\bullet_{\tilde{\times} n}$ which involves an additional deformation in the tiny a -radius neighbourhood $\mathcal{N}_a(\sigma)$ of σ such that the conical properties of the field exactly at σ remain invariant under $\bullet_{\tilde{\times} n}$ — in particular, the opening angle around σ must not change. We shall also require the deformation respect the \mathbb{Z}_n -symmetry of the replicated field. For example, if g is smooth at σ , then $g_{\tilde{\times} n}$ is a \mathbb{Z}_n -symmetric geometry with a smoothed, *i.e.* regulated, conical singularity with large curvature in the neighbourhood $\mathcal{N}_a(\sigma)$ of σ , giving extra contributions to the action that become localized on σ in the limit $a \rightarrow 0$ of vanishing neighbourhood size. Thus, in contrast to (2.24), the $\bullet_{\tilde{\times} n}$ operation nontrivially modifies contributions to the action localized in $\mathcal{N}_a(\sigma)$; let us quantify this with

$$I_{\sigma, n}[g, h, \phi + \psi] \equiv \frac{1}{n} I[g_{\tilde{\times} n}, h_{\tilde{\times} n}, (\phi + \psi)_{\tilde{\times} n}] - I[g, h, \phi + \psi] \quad (2.27)$$

$$= \frac{1}{n} I_\sigma[g_{\tilde{\times} n}, h_{\tilde{\times} n}, (\phi + \psi)_{\tilde{\times} n}] - I_\sigma[g, h, \phi + \psi] . \quad (2.28)$$

Analogous to $\bullet_{\div n}$, it is helpful also to denote by $\bullet_{\tilde{\div} n}$ the deformed orbifolding that is the inverse operation to $\bullet_{\tilde{\times} n}$. Then, for any configuration $(g, h, \phi + \psi)$ which is \mathbb{Z}_n -symmetric

²⁰This is perhaps most obvious when starting with the path integral preparation of the state $\hat{\rho}^{\text{mat}}$ — here, the path integral is done on the unreplicated geometry and there is obviously no extra n -dependent contribution on σ . The prescription to get $\text{tr}[(\hat{\rho}^{\text{mat}})^n]$ is then merely to take n copies of this path integral and perform a branched-identification of the quantum fields along Σ between the different copies.

around σ , we can also define, for any n dividing n' ,

$$I_{\sigma, \frac{1}{n}}[g, h, \phi + \psi] \equiv n I[g_{\frac{\cdot}{\sigma} n}, h_{\frac{\cdot}{\sigma} n}, (\phi + \psi)_{\frac{\cdot}{\sigma} n}] - I[g, h, \phi + \psi] \quad (2.29)$$

$$= n I_{\sigma}[g_{\frac{\cdot}{\sigma} n}, h_{\frac{\cdot}{\sigma} n}, (\phi + \psi)_{\frac{\cdot}{\sigma} n}] - I_{\sigma}[g, h, \phi + \psi] . \quad (2.30)$$

While we have constructed $I_{\sigma, n}$ above in (2.27) and (2.29) for some discrete set of n , one can argue that an analytic continuation to real $n > 0$ is possible for any configuration $(g, h, \phi + \psi)$ (which need not have some $\mathbb{Z}_{n'}$ -symmetry). In particular, applying (2.24) and (2.25), we can recast (2.27) and (2.28) (as well as (2.29) and (2.30)) in the form

$$I_{\sigma, n}[g, h, \phi + \psi] = I[g_{\tilde{\times} n \frac{\cdot}{\sigma} n}, h_{\tilde{\times} n \frac{\cdot}{\sigma} n}, (\phi + \psi)_{\tilde{\times} n \frac{\cdot}{\sigma} n}] - I[g, h, \phi + \psi] \quad (2.31)$$

$$= I_{\sigma}[g_{\tilde{\times} n \frac{\cdot}{\sigma} n}, h_{\tilde{\times} n \frac{\cdot}{\sigma} n}, (\phi + \psi)_{\tilde{\times} n \frac{\cdot}{\sigma} n}] - I_{\sigma}[g, h, \phi + \psi] , \quad (2.32)$$

where $\bullet_{\tilde{\times} n \frac{\cdot}{\sigma} n} = \bullet_{\frac{\cdot}{\sigma} n \tilde{\times} n}$ has a natural meaning extended to real $n > 0$ as a deformation localized in the small neighbourhood $\mathcal{N}_a(\sigma)$ of σ such that the opening angle around exactly σ is divided by n . With the definition of $I_{\sigma, n}$ established, the Wald-Dong entropy [6]²¹ appearing in the generalized entropy formula (2.18) can now be defined as:

$$S_{\sigma}^{\text{WD}}[g, h, \phi + \psi] \equiv \partial_n I_{\sigma, n}[g, h, \phi + \psi]|_{n=1} = -\partial_n I_{\sigma, \frac{1}{n}}[g, h, \phi + \psi]|_{n=1} \quad (2.35)$$

$$= \partial_n \left(I[g_{\tilde{\times} n}, h_{\tilde{\times} n}, (\phi + \psi)_{\tilde{\times} n}] - n I[g, h, \phi + \psi] \right)_{n=1} \quad (2.36)$$

$$= \partial_n \left(-I[g_{\frac{\cdot}{\sigma} n}, h_{\frac{\cdot}{\sigma} n}, (\phi + \psi)_{\frac{\cdot}{\sigma} n}] - n I[g, h, \phi + \psi] \right)_{n=1} , \quad (2.37)$$

where, to obtain the expression (2.36), or equivalently (2.37), we have used (2.27). We shall see later in this section that the generalized entropy $S_{\sigma}^{\text{gen}}[g]$ defined in (2.18) has an expression very similar to (2.36), with the action I replaced by the effective action W .

In this paper, the parameter a describing the radius of the neighbourhood $\mathcal{N}_a(\sigma)$ of σ , in which $\bullet_{\tilde{\times} n}$ replicas and $\bullet_{\frac{\cdot}{\sigma} n}$ orbifolds are deformed, will always be a small value, whose vanishing limit is implicitly understood to be taken *last*, for those quantities that have

²¹In particular, focusing on the bulk metric field in holography, [6] considers a sequence g_n of smooth configurations which are \mathbb{Z}_n -symmetric around codimension-two surfaces σ_n , with $g_1 = g$ being the configuration on which the Wald-Dong entropy of $\sigma_1 = \sigma$ is to be calculated. As described around (A.24) in our appendix A, these metrics are bulk solutions which arise naturally from the boundary replica trick. Then, (3.6) in [6] reads

$$S_{\sigma}^{\text{WD}}[g] = -\partial_n \left(I[g_{n \frac{\cdot}{\sigma} n}] - I[g_{n \frac{\cdot}{\sigma} n}] \right)_{n=1} . \quad (2.33)$$

The “ S_{total} ” and “ S_{outside} ” of [6] respectively correspond to the two terms written in (2.33). (Contrary to what Figure 2 therein might suggest, one should evaluate “ S_{outside} ” as the action $I[g_{n \frac{\cdot}{\sigma} n}]$ *exactly up to*, but not including, the conical singularity of $g_{n \frac{\cdot}{\sigma} n}$ at σ_n . For example, to recover (3.21) therein, for the singular cone “ $a \rightarrow 0$ ” term of (3.20), it is important to take $\rho \rightarrow 0$ as the lower bound of the integral after making this cone singular but before evaluating $\partial_n|_{n=1} = \partial_{\epsilon}|_{\epsilon=0}$ and hence before sending $a \rightarrow 0$ in the regularized cone, *i.e.* finite a , term of (3.20).) The expression (2.33) can be seen to agree with (2.37):

$$-\partial_n \left(I[g_{n \frac{\cdot}{\sigma} n}] - I[g_{n \frac{\cdot}{\sigma} n}] \right)_{n=1} = -\partial_n \left(I[g_{\frac{\cdot}{\sigma} n}] - I[g_{\frac{\cdot}{\sigma} n}] \right)_{n=1} = -\partial_n I[g_{\frac{\cdot}{\sigma} n}]|_{n=1} - I[g] \quad (2.34)$$

where we have used (2.25) in the last equality.

finite $a \rightarrow 0$ limits. For instance, in higher-curvature theories, the action $I_\sigma[g_{\tilde{\times}_n}, \dots]$ in the neighbourhood $\mathcal{N}_a(\sigma)$ of σ typically diverges for smooth g and $n \neq 1$ in the $a \rightarrow 0$ limit, so, for $I_\sigma[g_{\tilde{\times}_n}, \dots]$ and $I_{\sigma,n}[g, \dots]$, a is understood to be small but finite. However, it has been shown [6] that this regulator can be safely removed for the Wald-Dong entropy (2.35) — after taking the n derivative and setting $n = 1$ in (2.35), one can take the $a \rightarrow 0$ limit and obtain a finite answer²².

To be clear, in this paper, we shall not allow the boundary part $\int_{\mathcal{M}} \mathbf{L}^{\mathcal{M}}$ of the action (2.2) to contribute to Wald-Dong entropy²³, even if the entangling surface σ stretches to the spacetime boundary \mathcal{M} . Our reasons for considering this part of the action in this paper are primarily dynamical, as described around (2.8). In holography however, apart from its role in dynamics, $\int_{\mathcal{M}} \mathbf{L}^{\mathcal{M}}$ also includes counterterms which implement holographic renormalization of the effective action. If we were to allow these counterterms to contribute to Wald-Dong entropy, then we would be renormalizing IR divergences of generalized entropy in the bulk and UV divergences of the CFT entropy. Thus, allowing Wald-Dong contributions of $\int_{\mathcal{M}} \mathbf{L}^{\mathcal{M}}$ would seem to give a bulk generalized entropy that is dual to a UV-renormalized²⁴ ‘CFT generalized entropy’ which includes Wald-Dong terms of the CFT theory needed to cancel UV divergences. In this paper, we are interested in studying the bulk first law of generalized entropy, which according to the intuition of previous work [16, 17], should be equivalent in holography to a first law of the CFT. While the bare von Neumann entropy of the CFT ought to satisfy the standard first law (1.6) of any von Neumann entropy, no sensible first law for the CFT generalized entropy is expected to hold as the CFT metric is nondynamical. This motivates us to exclude $\int_{\mathcal{M}} \mathbf{L}^{\mathcal{M}}$ from contributing to the bulk Wald-Dong entropy so that, in holography, the bulk generalized entropy we consider is dual to a bare von Neumann entropy and thus should possess a first law.

Before moving on, let us comment also briefly on how (2.35) relates to alternative expressions for Wald-Dong entropy (see *e.g.* [7]²⁵) given in terms of the symplectic potential

²²At the end of appendix E.1, we give an argument for the finiteness of generalized entropy in the $a \rightarrow 0$ limit. Given the parallels between (2.36) and the below (2.44), a similar argument would seem to apply to Wald-Dong entropy, with the effective action replaced by the action.

²³A way to make this consistent with (2.27) and (2.35), where the full action is used, is to view $\int_{\mathcal{M}} \mathbf{L}^{\mathcal{M}}$ as actually being evaluated on the boundary limit of IR cutoff surfaces which always remain at large proper separation from σ — the \bullet_{\times_n} and $\bullet_{\tilde{\times}_n}$ operations would then be indistinguishable to $\int_{\mathcal{M}} \mathbf{L}^{\mathcal{M}}$. The cutoff surfaces would thus have parts which run off to infinity at $\sigma \cap \mathcal{M}$. For example, this is the picture that one naturally has for a Euclidean AdS_3 planar black hole: in the standard black hole picture, one views the bifurcation surface σ and the IR cutoff surface as being parallel and thus never meeting; however, upon redrawing the spacetime as a global AdS ball, one finds that the two run off together to the AdS boundary at two points.

²⁴For a description of how UV divergences are renormalized in generalized entropy, see section E.1. The discussion there is written with the bulk generalized entropy in mind, but is expected to extend generically to any theory of quantum fields on fixed backgrounds. In the present discussion, the divergent parts of the holographic renormalization counterterms would play the part of “ $-I_{\text{div}}^{\text{mat}}[g]$ ” for the CFT.

²⁵The authors of [7], similar to [6], consider the Wald-Dong entropy (2.33) constructed using smooth bulk backgrounds g_n , as described in footnote 21. From (2.33), one can propose an expression for the Wald-Dong entropy analogous to (2.40):

$$S_\sigma^{\text{WD}}[g] \stackrel{?}{=} - \int_{\partial \mathcal{N}_0(\sigma)} \theta[\partial_n g_n \dot{\times}_n |_{n=1}] , \quad (2.38)$$

θ defined in (2.5):

$$S_\sigma^{\text{WD}}[g, h, \phi + \psi] = \partial_n I[g_{\tilde{\times} n \frac{\cdot}{\sigma}}, h_{\tilde{\times} n \frac{\cdot}{\sigma}}, (\phi + \psi)_{\tilde{\times} n \frac{\cdot}{\sigma}}] \Big|_{n=1} \quad (2.39)$$

$$\stackrel{?}{=} - \int_{\partial \mathcal{N}_0(\sigma)} \theta [\partial_n g_{\tilde{\times} n \frac{\cdot}{\sigma}}|_{n=1}, \partial_n h_{\tilde{\times} n \frac{\cdot}{\sigma}}|_{n=1}, \partial_n (\phi + \psi)_{\tilde{\times} n \frac{\cdot}{\sigma}}|_{n=1}] , \quad (2.40)$$

or, alternatively,

$$S_\sigma^{\text{WD}}[g, h, \phi + \psi] = - \partial_n I[g_{\times n \frac{\cdot}{\sigma}}, h_{\times n \frac{\cdot}{\sigma}}, (\phi + \psi)_{\times n \frac{\cdot}{\sigma}}] \Big|_{n=1} \quad (2.41)$$

$$\stackrel{?}{=} \int_{\partial \mathcal{N}_0(\sigma)} \theta [\partial_n g_{\times n \frac{\cdot}{\sigma}}|_{n=1}, \partial_n h_{\times n \frac{\cdot}{\sigma}}|_{n=1}, \partial_n (\phi + \psi)_{\times n \frac{\cdot}{\sigma}}|_{n=1}] , \quad (2.42)$$

where $\mathcal{N}_0(\sigma)$ denotes a zero-sized neighbourhood of σ (not to be confused with the $\mathcal{N}_a(\sigma)$ associated with $\bullet_{\tilde{\times} n}$, where $a \rightarrow 0$ should be taken only at the very end). To obtain the second lines (2.40) and (2.42), we note that, as described below (2.32), $\bullet_{\tilde{\times} n \frac{\cdot}{\sigma}}$ and, analogously, $\bullet_{\times n \frac{\cdot}{\sigma}}$ are deformations localized in the neighbourhood $\mathcal{N}_a(\sigma)$ of σ such that the opening angle around σ is respectively divided and multiplied by n . Since these act nontrivially only in the tiny neighbourhood $\mathcal{N}_a(\sigma)$, one expects the only sizable contribution to the variation of the action to come from the symplectic potential θ contribution — see (2.5) — surrounding the zero-sized neighbourhood $\mathcal{N}_0(\sigma)$ of σ . (Recall our convention is for the actions in (2.39) and (2.41) to exclude contributions from the strict conical singularities exactly at σ .) Implicit in all this, however, is the assumption that the $\partial_n|_{n=1}$ derivative can be taken inside the action to act on the Lagrangian. As [6]²⁶ finds, this is not generally the case in higher-curvature theories when the entangling surface σ has non-vanishing extrinsic curvature — here, taking n close to 1 gives rise to curvature contributions to the actions in (2.39) and (2.41) concentrated near the very centre of $\mathcal{N}_a(\sigma)$ which blow up as one approaches the entangling surface σ (even at finite a), promoting certain $O[(n-1)^2]$ terms of the Lagrangian to $O(n-1)$ contributions to the action, containing factors of the extrinsic curvature of σ . Nonetheless, it will be interesting to later compare (2.42) with a very similar expression derived from Noether charge, in the thermal case where the extrinsic curvatures of σ vanish.

To end this section, let us now use the deformed replication operation $\bullet_{\tilde{\times} n}$ defined above to derive a simple expression for generalized entropy in terms of the effective action

where, in taking the n derivative, an analytic continuation of $g_{n \frac{\cdot}{\sigma_n}}$ to real n near $n = 1$ is understood. The argument for (2.38) is quite similar to that for (2.40), following from naively evaluating the action variations of (2.33) using (2.5). Since the variations $\partial_n g_{n \frac{\cdot}{\sigma_n}}|_{n=1}$ and $\partial_n g_{n \frac{\cdot}{\sigma_n}}|_{n=1}$ agree except in $\mathcal{N}_a(\sigma)$, the equations of motion contributions arising from the two terms in (2.33) should cancel in the $a \rightarrow 0$ limit. What remains is the symplectic potential contribution (2.38) from the second term.

²⁶In particular, the finite a and “ $a \rightarrow 0$ ” terms in (3.18)-(3.20) of [6] respectively correspond to contributions to the two terms in (2.33); the offending (3.21) correction of [6] to (2.38) is part of the latter. This correction arises because the smooth \mathbb{Z}_n -symmetric backgrounds g_n have orbifolds $g_{n \frac{\cdot}{\sigma_n}}$ which, once analytically continued near $n = 1$, give large curvature contributions that diverge as one approaches σ_n in $g_{n \frac{\cdot}{\sigma_n}}$ such that certain $O[(n-1)^2]$ terms of the Lagrangian are promoted to $O(n-1)$ terms in $I[g_{n \frac{\cdot}{\sigma_n}}]$. (This is somewhat surprising since, for $n \in \mathbb{N}$, the orbifold $g_{n \frac{\cdot}{\sigma_n}}$ is smooth except *exactly at* the conically singular σ_n , which is excluded from $I[g_{n \frac{\cdot}{\sigma_n}}]$.)

W. Using (2.25) and (2.29), we can rewrite (2.26) in terms of the deformed replication operation $\bullet_{\tilde{\sigma}n}$:

$$\text{tr}[(\hat{\rho}^{\text{mat}})^n \mathcal{O}_\Sigma] = \int [dh][d\psi] \exp \left\{ -(I^{\text{mat}} + I_{\sigma, \frac{1}{n}}^{\text{mat}})[g_{\tilde{\sigma}n}, h, \phi_{\tilde{\sigma}n} + \psi] \right\} \mathcal{O}_\Sigma, \quad (2.43)$$

where we have made a change of path integration variables from the h and ψ appearing in (2.26) to $h_{\frac{1}{\tilde{\sigma}n}\tilde{\sigma}n} = h_{\tilde{\sigma}n\frac{1}{\tilde{\sigma}n}}$ and $\psi_{\frac{1}{\tilde{\sigma}n}\tilde{\sigma}n} = \psi_{\tilde{\sigma}n\frac{1}{\tilde{\sigma}n}}$ which we have renamed back to h and ψ above²⁷. Actually, due to transformations of the path integration measure resulting from this change of variables and the change in the background from $(g_{\times n}, \phi_{\times n})$ to $(g_{\tilde{\times}n}, \phi_{\tilde{\times}n})$, we generally expect an anomalous correction to (2.43); however, in this paper, we will relegate all variations of the path integral measure to the comprehensive discussion of appendix E. Setting this to the side, combining (2.16), (2.23), (2.35), and (2.43), a simple expression for the generalized entropy (2.18) is then given in terms of the effective action (2.4) evaluated on replicated backgrounds²⁸:

$$S_\sigma^{\text{gen}}[g] = \partial_n \left(W[g_{\tilde{\times}n}] - nW[g] \right)_{n=1}. \quad (2.44)$$

(In appendix E.2, we shall argue that the anomalous corrections to (2.43) mentioned above are absorbed into a corrected definition of Wald-Dong entropy, so that (2.44) still remains exactly correct.) This is just like the expression (2.36) for Wald-Dong entropy, but with the action I replaced by the effective action W . This lends weight to the intuition that the generalized entropy (2.44) of a semiclassical theory is the natural analogue of the Wald-Dong entropy of a classical theory. Moreover, (2.44) makes a clear connection between UV divergences in generalized entropy and the effective action $W[g]$; in particular, for an effective action $W[g]$ that is rendered UV finite from the renormalization of UV divergences between $I^{\text{grav}}[g]$ and $W^{\text{mat}}[g]$, we also expect the generalized entropy given by (2.44) to be UV finite. This is discussed further in appendix E.1. We also explain there why we expect (2.44) to remain finite as we take the zero-size limit of the regulator a for the smoothed conical singularities produced by the action of $\bullet_{\tilde{\sigma}n}$ on smooth backgrounds.

Our result (2.44) is essentially the Callan-Wilczek equation [23]²⁹, except that we have (not yet) specialized to thermal setups, characterized by a $U(1)$ -symmetry around the

²⁷It is natural to select boundary conditions for the quantum fields at σ such that they share the same conical properties as the background. Assuming the original background (g, ϕ) is smooth at σ , then in (2.26), the background $(g_{\times n}, \phi_{\times n})$ is conically singular with opening angle $2\pi n$ around σ , while the $(g_{\tilde{\times}n}, \phi_{\tilde{\times}n})$ of (2.43) are regulated to be smooth at σ . Note that $\bullet_{\frac{1}{\tilde{\sigma}n}\tilde{\sigma}n} = \bullet_{\tilde{\sigma}n\frac{1}{\tilde{\sigma}n}}$ has a natural definition, even acting on fields (h, ψ) which do not necessarily have \mathbb{Z}_n -symmetry around σ , as deforming, in the neighbourhood $\mathcal{N}_a(\sigma)$ of σ , conically singular configurations with opening angle $2\pi n$ at σ , so that they become smooth.

²⁸Note that, even though replicated fields are written in (2.43), since $I_{\sigma, 1}^{\text{mat}} = 0$, we see the pertinent quantity to consider for the difference between the generalized and matter von Neumann entropies is just $-\partial_n I_{\sigma, \frac{1}{n}}[g, h, \phi + \psi]|_{n=1}$, as appears in the Wald-Dong entropy (2.35).

²⁹In early work, *e.g.* [28, 29], the point that the calculation of $\text{tr}[(\hat{\rho}^{\text{mat}})^n]$ should exclude extra contributions from conical singularities produced by replication is often missed — see (2.5)-(2.6) and the discussion around (4.2) in [28] and (2.14)-(2.15) and section 3.1 in [29] — or the calculation of $\text{tr}[(\hat{\rho}^{\text{mat}})^n]$ is thought to be renormalized by the gravitational theory in a way that includes the contributions of conical singularities. (*C.f.* the discussion in our appendix E.1, where we however identify the renormalized quantity as a generalized, rather than von Neumann, entropy.) Consequently, the authors associate the entirety of (2.44)'s

entangling surface σ corresponding to a rotation in thermal time (recall our discussion of Figure 1a). In general, it seems practically unclear how one might compute $W[g_{\tilde{\sigma}n}]$ for real n near 1, in order to take the derivative (2.44)³⁰. However, in thermal setups, there is an obvious analytic continuation of the replicated background $(g_{\tilde{\sigma}n}, \phi_{\tilde{\sigma}n})$, obtained by varying the period of thermal time τ to $2\pi n$ (from its original period of 2π in g). With this, our goal in section 3 will be to establish a connection between the generalized entropy formulas (2.18) and (2.44) and Wald’s Noether charge formalism [10, 11] for computing entropy in thermal cases.

It is perhaps worth pausing to remark that (2.44), despite first appearances, differs from the standard holographic derivation of the generalized entropy formula from the boundary von Neumann entropy [7] — in appendix A we compare and contrast these approaches in detail. For the calculation of Rényi entropies in that context, the replicated boundary manifold forms a shell within which one is instructed to fill with a bulk path integral that produces smooth expectation values for background plus quantum fields. This can be shown to lead to the generalized entropy formula (2.18) [7] on a bulk solution g with an additional quantum extremal condition for σ [9], recovering the expected RT formula. In contrast, the replicated background $g_{\tilde{\sigma}n}$ of (2.44) has a regulated conical singularity around σ . As we have derived, (2.44) gives a formula for the generalized entropy (2.18) of an arbitrary entangling surface σ on an arbitrary background g . Of course, if evaluated on the same background solution with the same RT surface σ , (2.44) and the holographic results must agree to give (2.18). In appendix A, we show this agreement more directly, by relating our Callan-Wilczek formula (2.44) to the holographic calculation.

3 Generalized entropy in thermal setups

Here, we wish to relate the generalized entropy formulas (2.18) and (2.44) to Iyer and Wald’s Noether charge formalism [10, 11] in a thermal setting where, as described above (1.3), there is a Euclidean $U(1)$ rotation symmetry around the bulk entangling surface σ . Specifically, we seek to write the generalized entropy formula (2.18), with von Neumann

RHS with an entanglement *i.e.* von Neumann entropy. Instead, we maintain that the Wald-Dong entropy (2.35) should be distinguished from the matter von Neumann entropy, with the latter being truly given by (2.19) or (2.23) for some density matrix ρ^{mat} — see footnote 20.

³⁰This is to be contrasted with the action $I[g_{\tilde{\sigma}n}, h_{\tilde{\sigma}n}, (\phi + \psi)_{\tilde{\sigma}n}]$, which can be expressed in terms of $I_{\sigma,n}[g, h, \phi + \psi]$ as in (2.27) and thus be readily computed for real $n > 0$ as described around (2.32). One can, however provide a formal definition of $W[g_{\tilde{\sigma}n}]$ for real $n > 0$ as follows. The classical action $I^{\text{grav}}[g_{\tilde{\sigma}n}]$ can be analytically continued as described above, so it is sufficient to consider just the quantum matter piece $W^{\text{mat}}[g_{\tilde{\sigma}n}]$ (see (2.4)). As discussed around (2.32), the background $(g_{\tilde{\sigma}n}, \phi_{\tilde{\sigma}n})$ has a natural analytic continuation to non-integer n as a deformation of (g, ϕ) in the neighbourhood $\mathcal{N}_a(\sigma)$ of σ such that the opening angle around exactly σ is divided by n . On $(g_{\tilde{\sigma}n}, \phi_{\tilde{\sigma}n})$, one can evaluate the path integral over quantum fluctuations (h, ψ) which preserve the conical properties of the background fields at σ and further have boundary conditions fixed on the upper and lower faces of the codimension-one surface Σ — this path integral can be thought of as defining unnormalized density matrices of the matter on Σ that we call $\hat{\rho}_{\tilde{\sigma}n}^{\text{mat}} \equiv (\hat{\rho}_{\tilde{\sigma}n}^{\text{mat}})^{1/n}$. Then, analogous to (2.16), note that we have $\text{tr} \hat{\rho}_{\tilde{\sigma}n}^{\text{mat}} = e^{-W^{\text{mat}}[g_{\tilde{\sigma}n}]}$. Since our definitions for $\hat{\rho}_{\tilde{\sigma}n}^{\text{mat}}$ and $\hat{\rho}_{\tilde{\sigma}n}^{\text{mat}}$ are valid for non-integer n , this gives a formal definition for the analytic continuation of $W^{\text{mat}}[g_{\tilde{\sigma}n}]$.

entropy $S[\rho^{\text{mat}}]$ given by (2.20), as the sum of a Wald Noether charge (identified with the Wald-Dong entropy S_σ^{WD}) plus the expectation value of a modular Hamiltonian (and an effective action giving the second term of (2.20) by (2.16)). We shall find that the matter modular Hamiltonian density is given by the canonical form of the $U(1)$ rotation generator, *i.e.* the integral of a Noether current plus a boundary term, as opposed to some component of the gravitational stress tensor obtained by varying the matter action with respect to the metric. This is in agreement with existing work — see [22] section 4.1, [20], and [21] — which focus primarily on scalar field theory non-minimally coupled to curvature. We will aim to be more general, allowing for arbitrary vector and tensor fields.

We organize this section as follows. We shall start in section 3.1 by introducing notation relevant to computing generalized entropy using our Callan-Wilczek formula (2.44) in a thermal setup. In particular, we review a trick inspired by [30, 31] for extending the proper period of thermal time, *i.e.* producing the replicated background $(g_{\tilde{\sigma}n}, \phi_{\tilde{\sigma}n})$ appearing in (2.44). In section 3.2, we employ this trick to obtain an expression for generalized entropy in terms of integrals of Noether charge and current in the Iyer-Wald formalism [10, 11]. This result motivates equating the matter modular Hamiltonian K^{mat} with the matter Noether current integral plus a boundary term, at least as expectation values. In section 3.3, we argue that this is in fact an operator equality by considering expectation values with other operators; we also take a closer look at the role played by terms previously set aside in the derivation of section 3.2. Finally, in section 3.4, we move from Euclidean to Lorentzian signature, rewriting our main results in the latter; in particular, we explain how our conventions lead to the appearance of overall signs in the Noether current and charge when moving between the two signatures. This will prepare us for section 4, where we consider the first law of generalized entropy in Lorentzian signature involving state and background variations which may not necessarily permit simple Euclidean descriptions.


3.1 Extending the proper thermal period

We are interested here in (Euclidean) spacetimes g with a $U(1)$ symmetry — see Figure 1a. Let $\tau \sim \tau + 2\pi$ be the thermal time parameterizing the $U(1)$ direction, with $\tau = 0$ on the bulk surface Σ , the half-space for which generalized entropy is being computed. The bulk part of $\partial\Sigma$ is given by the entangling surface σ . The spacetime may or may not have a boundary; in case it does, let us call it \mathcal{M} and write the intersection of $\partial\Sigma$ with \mathcal{M} as \mathcal{R} . In a holographic setting, \mathcal{R} would be the boundary region whose von Neumann entropy is computed by the bulk generalized entropy across σ . Let

$$\xi = \partial_\tau \tag{3.1}$$

be the generator of the $U(1)$ symmetry in the thermal time direction.

Our starting point for obtaining an expression for the generalized entropy in terms of Wald’s Noether charge formalism is (2.44). Thus, to get started, let us now introduce a diffeomorphism which has the effect of replication $\bullet_{\tilde{\sigma}n}$ around the bulk entangling surface σ for $U(1)$ symmetric backgrounds — this trick is inspired by [30, 31] and explained in



(a) Extending the period of thermal time beyond 2π with locally fixed metric.

(b) A diffeomorphism of panel a such that the coordinate period of thermal time is back to 2π .

Figure 2: A background (g, ϕ) that is rotation- (*i.e.* $U(1)$ -) symmetric around a codimension-two surface σ has obvious analytic continuations for the replicated backgrounds $(g_{\times n}, \phi_{\times n})$ and $(g_{\tilde{\times} n}, \phi_{\tilde{\times} n})$ (with the latter illustrated here) to real n near $n = 1$. This is obtained by extending the period of thermal time τ to $2\pi n$, as illustrated in panel 2a. Here, the metric is locally kept fixed (except perhaps in a tiny neighbourhood $\mathcal{N}_a(\sigma)$ of σ) but the period of τ has been extended such that the two constant τ surfaces marked by slashes are identified. Alternatively, one can apply a diffeomorphism to the coloured regions such that thermal time τ retains its original period of 2π , resulting in panel 2b. For n close to 1, this involves perturbing the background by $((n-1)\mathcal{L}_\zeta g, (n-1)\mathcal{L}_\zeta \phi)$ within the region marked as $\mathcal{S}_2 \subset (\tau_1, \tau_2)$ — a qualitative sketch of the vector field ζ is shown. Within the infinitesimal region $\mathcal{S}_1 = \mathcal{N}_a(\sigma) \cap (\tau_1, \tau_2)$, one should smoothly fill in the background fields.

Figure 2. Choose two thermal times τ_1 and τ_2 and consider³¹ the thermal time interval (τ_1, τ_2) . Let $\kappa(\tau)$ be a smooth function interpolating from 0 to 2π within (τ_1, τ_2) , with all derivatives vanishing at τ_1 and τ_2 :

$$\kappa(\tau_1^+) = 0 \quad \kappa(\tau_2^-) = 2\pi \quad \kappa'(\tau_1^+) = \kappa'(\tau_2^-) = \kappa''(\tau_1^+) = \kappa''(\tau_2^-) = \dots = 0, \quad (3.2)$$

where we have used superscripts \bullet^- and \bullet^+ to respectively mean limits from below and above. We may then define

$$\zeta = \kappa \xi, \quad (3.3)$$

which generates a transformation that just about captures the effect of replication of $U(1)$ -symmetric fields around σ , up to a diffeomorphism:

$$\partial_n g_{\times n}|_{n=1} \stackrel{\text{diff}}{\sim} \mathcal{L}_\zeta g = 2(d\kappa)_{(a}\xi_{b)}, \quad \partial_n \phi_{\times n}|_{n=1} \stackrel{\text{diff}}{\sim} \mathcal{L}_\zeta \phi, \quad (3.4)$$

³¹When we write (τ_1, τ_2) , we always mean the thermal time interval going in the positive τ direction from τ_1 to τ_2 , even if $\tau_1 > \tau_2$ — recall the periodicity of τ .

where the Lie derivative of the metric was evaluated using

$$\nabla_{(a}\xi_{b)}=0, \quad \nabla_{(a}\zeta_{b)}=(d\kappa)_{(a}\xi_{b)}. \quad (3.5)$$

For simplicity, we shall, until the discussion in section 3.3, choose coordinates for $g_{\times n}$ such that the $\stackrel{\text{diff}}{\sim}$ in (3.4) become equalities (that is, we take the perspective of Figure 2b as opposed to Figure 2a). Note that the transformations (3.4) interpolate to doing nothing on τ_1 and τ_2 . So far, the choices of τ_1 , τ_2 , and κ , have been fairly arbitrary; we will soon leverage this arbitrariness in calculations below.

As indicated in (3.4) the transformations defined above describe the replication operation $\bullet_{\times n}$ applied to the background fields; as described by (2.24) and (2.25), recall that our convention is for functionals of such fields is to neglect any extra contributions arising from the introduction or modification of conical singularities produced by $\bullet_{\times n}$. In contrast, as made explicit therein, our Callan-Wilczek formula (2.44) for generalized entropy involves backgrounds produced by the deformed replication operation $\bullet_{\tilde{\times} n}$ which generates regulated conical singularities that should be included in the evaluation of the effective action. In particular, $\bullet_{\tilde{\times} n}$ is defined with an additional deformation in a tiny neighbourhood $\mathcal{N}_a(\sigma)$ of σ such that the opening angle (2π for smooth backgrounds) exactly at σ remains unchanged by $\bullet_{\tilde{\times} n}$. Let us phrase this in terms of augmenting our transformation (3.4). We divide the spacetime in the thermal time interval (τ_1, τ_2) into two pieces: $\mathcal{S}_1 = \mathcal{N}_a(\sigma) \cap (\tau_1, \tau_2)$, given by a tiny neighbourhood of σ within (τ_1, τ_2) , and \mathcal{S}_2 , the complement of \mathcal{S}_1 in (τ_1, τ_2) . Within \mathcal{S}_2 , we apply the transformation generated by ζ , as written in (3.4). Within \mathcal{S}_1 , we shall apply a deformation which smoothly interpolates to doing nothing near σ ; as with (3.4), we require that the transformation here is also trivial on $\tau_{1,2}$. The complete picture is illustrated in figure 2b.

3.2 Generalized entropy as Noether charge and current

Let us now consider the generalized entropy functional (2.44). Let us begin with the first term. Notice here that, to evaluate $W[g_{\tilde{\times} n}]$, in addition to replicating the metric g , we should also replicate other background fields ϕ — if, for example, the background ϕ is chosen so as to satisfy certain boundary conditions on \mathcal{M} , then $\phi_{\tilde{\times} n}$ will satisfy the requisite boundary conditions on the replicated spacetime boundary. (In this paper, we have tended to suppress ϕ as an argument of W because W is independent of the *bulk* profile of ϕ .) To proceed, we shall assume that a field configuration $(g, h, \phi + \psi)$ satisfies the required boundary conditions on the boundary of the spacetime if and only if $(g_{\tilde{\times} n}, h, \phi_{\tilde{\times} n} + \psi)$ satisfies the corresponding boundary conditions on the n -replicated spacetime boundary. We expect this to be the case, for example, when boundary conditions take the form of requiring h and ψ to scale at certain asymptotic rates on approach to the boundary. This allows us to write

$$W[g_{\tilde{\times} n}] = -\log \int [dh][d\psi] e^{-I[g_{\tilde{\times} n}, h, \phi_{\tilde{\times} n} + \psi]}, \quad (3.6)$$

where the boundary conditions for (h, ψ) in the path integral at the spacetime boundary are independent of n . Thus, the n dependence is mostly accounted for by the background

fields appearing in the action $I[g_{\tilde{\sigma}n}, h, \phi_{\tilde{\sigma}n} + \psi]$. We say “mostly” because it is conceivable that there may be an anomalous dependence of the integration measure on the background.

Reserving further discussion of such anomalous contributions to appendix E, using (3.4)³² and (3.6), we write³³

$$\partial_n W[g_{\tilde{\sigma}n}]|_{n=1} = \langle \tilde{\mathcal{K}}_\zeta \rangle \quad (3.7)$$

$$\tilde{\mathcal{K}}_\zeta \equiv (\delta_{g, \mathcal{L}_\zeta g} + \delta_{\phi, \mathcal{L}_\zeta \phi}) I[g, h, \phi + \psi] \quad (3.8)$$

$$\begin{aligned} &= \int_{\mathcal{S}_2} (\mathbf{E}_g \cdot \mathcal{L}_\zeta g + \mathbf{E}_\phi \cdot \mathcal{L}_\zeta \phi) \\ &\quad + \int_{\partial \mathcal{S}_2 \cap \mathcal{M}} \{ \boldsymbol{\theta}[\mathcal{L}_\zeta g, \mathcal{L}_\zeta \phi] + (\delta_{g, \mathcal{L}_\zeta g} + \delta_{\phi, \mathcal{L}_\zeta \phi}) \mathbf{L}^\mathcal{M} \} , \end{aligned} \quad (3.9)$$

with the equations of motion \mathbf{E} and symplectic potential $\boldsymbol{\theta}$ as defined in (2.5). In writing (3.9), we have dropped

$$\int_{\mathcal{S}_1} (\mathbf{E}_g \cdot \partial_n g_{\tilde{\sigma}n}|_{n=1} + \mathbf{E}_\phi \cdot \partial_n \phi_{\tilde{\sigma}n}|_{n=1}) = 0 \quad (3.10)$$

which vanishes due to the vanishing size³⁴ of \mathcal{S}_1 in the $a \rightarrow 0$ limit. In fact, due to (2.13), we could have also omitted the \mathbf{E}_ϕ term from the RHS of (3.7), but we have kept it around as it will be helpful for later discussion to consider the operator $\tilde{\mathcal{K}}_\zeta$ itself, rather than just its expectation value. In writing (3.9), we have also used the fact that $\partial_n g_{\tilde{\sigma}n}|_{n=1}$ and $\partial_n \phi_{\tilde{\sigma}n}|_{n=1}$ vanish on τ_1 and τ_2 .

For clarity, let us state that, in this paper, we shall take the orientation of m -dimensional surfaces, written explicitly as the boundary $\partial \Xi$ of some $(m+1)$ -dimensional region Ξ , to be the usual one induced from that of Ξ such that Stokes’ theorem is written

$$\int_{\Xi} d\gamma = \int_{\partial \Xi} \gamma \quad (3.11)$$

³²Note that we are assuming a diffeomorphism invariance of the action and hence effective action in utilizing the trick described in section 3.1 to implement $\bullet_{\tilde{\sigma}n}$. In holography, the boundary part $\int_{\mathcal{M}} \mathbf{L}^\mathcal{M}$ of the action, containing counterterms for holographic renormalization, is not invariant under diffeomorphisms carrying along fields and the cutoff surface in the transverse direction when the boundary spacetime dimension d is even — this is precisely the origin of the CFT Weyl anomaly. (A review is given in section 6.3.2 of [24].) In this paper, we shall take cutoff surfaces to be invariant under rotations in the thermal time direction and only assume that $\int_{\mathcal{M}} \mathbf{L}^\mathcal{M}$ is invariant under diffeomorphisms parallel to cutoff surfaces, such as that appearing in (3.4).

³³Note that this is essentially the calculation in section II of [31], except they seem to neglect $\boldsymbol{\theta}$ terms as well as any $\mathbf{L}^\mathcal{M}$ (see (II.4)-(II.7) therein). In the following calculation here, we shall find that a Dong-like or Noether charge contribution to the entropy (a contribution which should be distinguished from the bulk von Neumann entropy) can be extracted from (3.9) by appropriately adding and subtracting $\boldsymbol{\theta}$ terms around the entangling surface. Given that [31] never introduces such terms, the modular Hamiltonian [31] derives (see (II.9), (II.12), and (II.13) therein), an integral of the stress tensor components, likely does in general correspond to a valid von Neumann entropy. In appendix B, we present a calculation on time-dependent backgrounds that even more closely resembles [31] and point out there also how certain boundary terms were neglected by [31].

³⁴Recall that the expectation value in (3.7) is to be evaluated on the unperturbed background which is smooth at σ . For states that are not particularly pathological exactly at σ , there is no reason for $\langle \mathbf{E}_g \rangle$ or $\langle \mathbf{E}_\phi \rangle$ to become infinite at σ . Further, recall that $\partial_n g_{\tilde{\sigma}n}|_{n=1}$ and $\partial_n \phi_{\tilde{\sigma}n}|_{n=1}$ in \mathcal{S}_1 smoothly interpolates from (3.4) (which is finite) to zero at σ .

for any m -form γ . We shall also take the spacetime boundary \mathcal{M} to have the orientation induced in this way from the orientation of the bulk spacetime. Furthermore, when we take the intersection of two m -dimensional surfaces such that the intersection is itself also m -dimensional, we shall implicitly take the intersection to inherit the orientation of the first written surface. For example, $\partial\mathcal{S}_1 \cap \partial\mathcal{S}_2$ and $\partial\mathcal{S}_2 \cap \partial\mathcal{S}_1$ shall implicitly inherit the orientations of $\partial\mathcal{S}_1$ and $\partial\mathcal{S}_2$. As we proceed, we shall state conventions for orienting other surfaces as we need them.

Continuing with our calculation, let us now take advantage of the arbitrariness of τ_1 , τ_2 , and κ in order to take the limit $\tau_1 \rightarrow \tau_2^-$ where the thermal time interval (τ_1, τ_2) becomes vanishingly small. Note that (3.9) does not vanish in this limit because the Lie derivative $\mathcal{L}_\zeta \gamma$ of a general tensor field γ becomes sizable owing to the derivative of κ in $\zeta = \kappa \xi$ becoming large:

$$\mathcal{L}_\zeta \gamma_{b_1 \dots b_s}^{c_1 \dots c_r} = \zeta^a \nabla_a \gamma_{b_1 \dots b_s}^{c_1 \dots c_r} - \sum_{i=1}^r \gamma_{b_1 \dots b_s}^{c_1 \dots a \dots c_r} \nabla_a \zeta^{c_i} + \sum_{i=1}^s \gamma_{b_1 \dots a \dots b_s}^{c_1 \dots c_r} \nabla_{b_i} \zeta^a \quad (3.12)$$

$$\sim - \sum_{i=1}^r \gamma_{b_1 \dots b_s}^{c_1 \dots a \dots c_r} (d\kappa)_a \xi^{c_i} + \sum_{i=1}^s \gamma_{b_1 \dots a \dots b_s}^{c_1 \dots c_r} (d\kappa)_{b_i} \xi^a \quad (\tau_1 \rightarrow \tau_2^-) \quad (3.13)$$

with the sums being over the positions i of vector indices $\bullet^{c_1 \dots c_i \dots c_r}$ and dual-vector indices $\bullet_{b_1 \dots b_i \dots b_s}$ of the field γ in question. Thus, it is helpful to introduce the quantities [16]

$$(\mathbf{C}_\gamma)_a \equiv \sum_{i=1}^r (E_\gamma)_{c_1 \dots a \dots c_r}^{b_1 \dots b_s} \gamma_{b_1 \dots b_s}^{c_1 \dots c_i \dots c_r} \epsilon_{c_i} - \sum_{i=1}^s (E_\gamma)_{c_1 \dots c_r}^{b_1 \dots b_i \dots b_s} \gamma_{b_1 \dots a \dots b_s}^{c_1 \dots c_r} \epsilon_{b_i} , \quad (3.14)$$

so that

$$\lim_{\tau_1 \rightarrow \tau_2^-} \int_{\mathcal{S}_2} \mathbf{E}_\gamma \cdot \mathcal{L}_\zeta \gamma = -2\pi \int_{\tau_2} \xi^a (\mathbf{C}_\gamma)_a . \quad (3.15)$$

where τ_2 is shorthand for the $\tau = \tau_2$ surface.

To be clear, here and elsewhere in this paper, we shall take the orientation of constant time surfaces, *e.g.* the τ_2 surface of (3.15), to be given by the interior product of the normal vector $n_{(\tau)}$ of constant time slices, pointed in the direction of increasing τ , and the spacetime volume form

$$n_{(\tau)} \cdot \epsilon . \quad (\text{orientation of constant-time surfaces}) \quad (3.16)$$

Of course, if an d -dimensional surface is explicitly written as the boundary $\partial\Xi$ of some $(d+1)$ -dimensional region Ξ , then we will still take the orientation on $\partial\Xi$ to be the one induced by that of Ξ , even if part of $\partial\Xi$ lies on a constant-time surface. That is, the rules stated previously around (3.11) take priority.

Now, applying (3.15) to (3.9), we then find

$$\lim_{\tau_1 \rightarrow \tau_2^-} \tilde{\mathcal{K}}_\zeta = -2\pi \int_{\tau_2} \xi^a (\mathbf{C}_g + \mathbf{C}_\phi)_a + \lim_{\tau_1 \rightarrow \tau_2^-} \int_{\partial\mathcal{S}_2 \cap \mathcal{M}} \{ \theta[\mathcal{L}_\zeta g, \mathcal{L}_\zeta \phi] + (\delta_{g, \mathcal{L}_\zeta g} + \delta_{\phi, \mathcal{L}_\zeta \phi}) \mathbf{L}^\mathcal{M} \} . \quad (3.17)$$

In particular, from the definition (3.14) applied to the metric g ,

$$\mathbf{C}_g^a = -2\epsilon_b E_g^{ab} = -\epsilon_b (2E_g^{\text{grav}} + T)^{ab}, \quad (3.18)$$

where T^{ab} is the stress tensor (2.11)³⁵, we see in (3.17) the appearance of the term

$$2\pi \int_{\tau_2} \epsilon_a \xi_b T^{ab} \quad (3.19)$$

which, if $\tau_2 = 0$ is chosen to place the integral on Σ , matches 2π times the often-written expression (1.5) for the matter modular Hamiltonian³⁶. But, we shall soon see that the matter modular Hamiltonian K^{mat} should instead be identified with the integral $-\int_{\tau_2} \mathbf{J}_\xi^{\text{mat}}$ of a Noether current $\mathbf{J}_\xi^{\text{mat}}$ plus a boundary term. Roughly speaking, our calculations below will more generally bear out [22]’s observations (made there in scalar field theory) that (3.19) should contribute to both the matter modular Hamiltonian $2\pi K^{\text{mat}}$ and the matter part of the Wald-Dong entropy. In particular, rewriting the $(\mathbf{C}_g + \mathbf{C}_\phi)_a$ term of (3.17), we will be able to pick out: a Noether current integral $-2\pi \int_{\tau_2} \mathbf{J}_\xi$ whose matter part $-2\pi \int_{\tau_2} \mathbf{J}_\xi^{\text{mat}}$ contributes to $2\pi K^{\text{mat}}$; and a total derivative $2\pi \int_{\tau_2} d\mathbf{Q}_\xi$ whose contribution $-2\pi \int_\sigma \mathbf{Q}_\xi$ at the entangling surface is identified as the Wald-Dong part S_σ^{WD} of generalized entropy (2.18).

To separate out the Wald-Dong and modular Hamiltonian contributions to (3.17), let us now write down the definition of Noether currents and charges. For any vector field χ , the Noether current \mathbf{J}_χ is defined by [10, 11]

$$\mathbf{J}_\chi \equiv \theta[\mathcal{L}_\chi g, \mathcal{L}_\chi h, \mathcal{L}_\chi(\phi + \psi)] - \chi \cdot \mathbf{L}. \quad (3.20)$$

To define the Noether charge (up to a closed form), [16]³⁷ showed that one can generally express the Noether current in the form

$$\mathbf{J}_\chi \equiv d\mathbf{Q}_\chi + \chi^a \mathbf{C}_a, \quad \mathbf{C}_a \equiv \sum_{\gamma \in \{g, h, \phi, \psi\}} (\mathbf{C}_\gamma)_a \quad (3.21)$$

where \mathbf{Q}_χ is the Noether charge and \mathbf{C}_a is the sum of the $(\mathbf{C}_\gamma)_a$, defined above in (3.14), over all fields $\gamma \in \{g, \phi, h, \psi\}$. (Note that, for classically on-shell configurations, \mathbf{J}_χ becomes exact and thus closed — this is the expression of current conservation in Iyer-Wald formalism [10, 11].) Now, applying (3.21) with $\chi = \xi$ to the first integral of (3.17), we find

$$\begin{aligned} \lim_{\tau_1 \rightarrow \tau_2^-} \tilde{\mathcal{K}}_\xi = & 2\pi \left\{ \int_{\tau_2 \cap \mathcal{M}} \mathbf{Q}_\xi - \int_\sigma \mathbf{Q}_\xi + \int_{\tau_2} [\xi^a (\mathbf{C}_h + \mathbf{C}_\psi)_a - \mathbf{J}_\xi] \right\} \\ & + \lim_{\tau_1 \rightarrow \tau_2^-} \int_{\partial \mathcal{S}_2 \cap \mathcal{M}} \{ \theta[\mathcal{L}_\xi g, \mathcal{L}_\xi \phi] + (\delta_{g, \mathcal{L}_\xi g} + \delta_{\phi, \mathcal{L}_\xi \phi}) \mathbf{L}^\mathcal{M} \}. \end{aligned} \quad (3.22)$$

³⁵As remarked below (2.11), the stress tensor should also receive a contribution from the variation of the path integral measure — this is precisely one of the anomalous terms we dropped below (3.6).

³⁶The relative sign between (3.19) and (1.5) is a result of the fact that (3.19) is written with the Euclidean stress tensor, while (1.5) is written with the Lorentzian stress tensor. As we shall show in section 3.4, the two stress tensors are off by a sign.

³⁷See (5.11)-(5.12) in therein.

Here and elsewhere, we shall take the orientation of the codimension-two surfaces (*e.g.* the entangling surface σ , the boundary region $\mathcal{R} = \Sigma \cap \mathcal{M}$ on the initial time slice, and the intersection $\tau_2 \cap \mathcal{M}$ of the $\tau = \tau_2$ surface with the spacetime boundary \mathcal{M}) residing on the boundaries of constant-time surfaces to all have the orientation given by

$$n_{(r)} \cdot (n_{(\tau)} \cdot \epsilon), \quad (\text{orientation of codimension-two surfaces}) \quad (3.23)$$

where $n_{(\tau)}$ is the normal vector to the constant time surface, pointed in the direction of increasing τ (as in (3.16)), and $n_{(r)}$ is the other normal of the codimension-two surface in question, tangent to the constant time surface and pointed away from σ towards the spacetime boundary \mathcal{M} . (On the spacetime boundary, $n_{(r)}$ would correspond to the outward-directed normal vector of \mathcal{M} .) Again, the rules stated around (3.11) take priority for any surfaces explicitly written as the boundary $\partial\Xi$ of some higher dimensional region Ξ .

Let us now massage the spacetime boundary terms of (3.22) a bit. Using the definitions (3.20) and (3.21) for Noether current and charge, we have the relation

$$2\pi \int_{\tau_2 \cap \mathcal{M}} \mathbf{Q}_\xi = - \lim_{\tau_1 \rightarrow \tau_2^-} \int_{\partial \mathcal{S}_2 \cap \mathcal{M}} d\mathbf{Q}_\zeta = - \lim_{\tau_1 \rightarrow \tau_2^-} \int_{\partial \mathcal{S}_2 \cap \mathcal{M}} \theta[\mathcal{L}_\zeta g, \mathcal{L}_\zeta h, \mathcal{L}_\zeta(\phi + \psi)], \quad (3.24)$$

where, in the second equality, we have noted that the $\zeta \cdot \mathbf{L}$ and $\zeta^a \mathbf{C}_a$ terms arising from (3.20) and (3.21) do not involve any derivatives of ζ and thus have a negligible integral over $\partial \mathcal{S}_2 \cap \mathcal{M}$ in the $\tau_1 \rightarrow \tau_2^-$ limit. Additionally, using the relation (2.8) between the symplectic potential and quantum field variations of the boundary Lagrangian $\mathbf{L}^\mathcal{M}$, we have

$$(\delta_{g, \mathcal{L}_\zeta g} + \delta_{\phi, \mathcal{L}_\zeta \phi}) \mathbf{L}^\mathcal{M}|_\mathcal{M} = \mathcal{L}_\zeta \mathbf{L}^\mathcal{M}|_\mathcal{M} - (\delta_{h, \mathcal{L}_\zeta h} + \delta_{\psi, \mathcal{L}_\zeta \psi}) \mathbf{L}^\mathcal{M}|_\mathcal{M} \quad (3.25)$$

$$= \mathcal{L}_\zeta \mathbf{L}^\mathcal{M}|_\mathcal{M} + \theta[\mathcal{L}_\zeta h, \mathcal{L}_\zeta \psi]|_\mathcal{M}. \quad (3.26)$$

One can use the general identity

$$\mathcal{L}_\chi \gamma = \chi \cdot d\gamma + d(\chi \cdot \gamma) \quad (3.27)$$

for the Lie derivative of an arbitrary form field γ with respect to an arbitrary vector field χ to integrate the $\mathcal{L}_\zeta \mathbf{L}^\mathcal{M}$ appearing in (3.26):

$$\int_{\partial \mathcal{S}_2 \cap \mathcal{M}} \mathcal{L}_\zeta \mathbf{L}^\mathcal{M} = \int_{\partial \mathcal{S}_2 \cap \mathcal{M}} d(\zeta \cdot \mathbf{L}^\mathcal{M}) = -2\pi \int_{\tau_2 \cap \mathcal{M}} \xi \cdot \mathbf{L}^\mathcal{M} \quad (3.28)$$

Altogether, applying (3.24), (3.26), and (3.28) to the spacetime boundary terms of (3.22) simplifies the expression to

$$\lim_{\tau_1 \rightarrow \tau_2^-} \tilde{\mathcal{K}}_\zeta = 2\pi \left\{ - \int_\sigma \mathbf{Q}_\xi + \int_{\tau_2} [\xi^a (\mathbf{C}_h + \mathbf{C}_\psi)_a - \mathbf{J}_\xi] - \int_{\tau_2 \cap \mathcal{M}} \xi \cdot \mathbf{L}^\mathcal{M} \right\}. \quad (3.29)$$

Shortly in section 3.3, we will argue that the terms in (3.29) involving \mathbf{C}_h and \mathbf{C}_ψ not only have a vanishing expectation value, but are artifacts of the diffeomorphism implicit in using (3.4) to model replication. Setting these to the side, we see in (3.29) that we

have extracted Noether charge and current terms as we had hoped. Let us use superscripts \bullet^{grav} and \bullet^{mat} to denote quantities, *e.g.* the Noether current, derived respectively from the gravitational and matter actions I^{grav} and I^{mat} . Then, using the equality (3.7) between $\partial_n W[g_{\tilde{\chi}_n}]|_{n=1}$ and $\langle \tilde{\mathcal{K}}_\zeta \rangle$ (holding for any choice of τ_1 , τ_2 , and κ) we obtain, from the Callan-Wilczek expression (2.44) for generalized entropy,

$$S_\sigma^{\text{gen}}[g] = -2\pi \left\langle \int_\sigma \mathbf{Q}_\xi + \int_{\tau_2} \mathbf{J}_\xi^{\text{mat}} + \int_{\tau_2 \cap \mathcal{M}} \xi \cdot \mathbf{L}^{\mathcal{M}, \text{mat}} \right\rangle - W^{\text{mat}}[g], \quad (3.30)$$

where we have used (2.4) and

$$\mathbf{J}_\xi = \mathbf{J}_\xi^{\text{grav}} + \mathbf{J}_\xi^{\text{mat}} = -\xi \cdot \mathbf{L}^{\text{grav}} + \mathbf{J}_\xi^{\text{mat}}, \quad (3.31)$$

$$I^{\text{grav}}[g] = 2\pi \left(\int_{\tau_2} \xi \cdot \mathbf{L}^{\text{grav}} - \int_{\tau_2 \cap \mathcal{M}} \xi \cdot \mathbf{L}^{\mathcal{M}, \text{grav}} \right), \quad (3.32)$$

following from (2.2), (3.20), and the ξ rotation symmetry of the background metric g .

We can compare (3.30) with (2.16), (2.18), and (2.20), which read

$$S_\sigma^{\text{gen}}[g] = \langle S_\sigma^{\text{WD}}[g, h, \phi + \psi] \rangle + 2\pi \langle K^{\text{mat}} \rangle - W^{\text{mat}}[g]. \quad (3.33)$$

The peculiar minus sign of the first terms in (3.30) is an expected result of working in Euclidean signature³⁸ — we will see in section 3.4 how these signs arise when moving between Lorentzian and Euclidean signatures. As hinted in (1.3) (which acquires a sign on the RHS in Euclidean signature), in thermal setups, the Wald-Dong entropy can be equated to the integral of Noether charge on σ . Obviously, one can just compare the formulas for Noether charge entropy [11] and Wald-Dong entropy [6] to see that they are equal³⁹, but let us also give a more intuitive albeit rough explanation. Using (3.20) and (3.21) which relate Noether charge \mathbf{Q}_ξ to the symplectic potential θ , we can put the Noether charge integrated over σ in a form

$$-2\pi \int_\sigma \mathbf{Q}_\xi = \int_{\partial \mathcal{S}_1 \cap \partial \mathcal{S}_2} d\mathbf{Q}_\xi = \int_{\partial \mathcal{S}_1 \cap \partial \mathcal{S}_2} \theta[\mathcal{L}_\zeta g, \mathcal{L}_\zeta h, \mathcal{L}_\zeta(\phi + \psi)] \quad (3.34)$$

which closely resembles the formula (2.42) for the Wald-Dong entropy in terms of the symplectic potential. Let ι be a smoothed indicator function that vanishes outside $\mathcal{N}_a(\sigma)$ and is mostly identically 1 in $\mathcal{N}_a(\sigma)$ except for a fixed fraction of $\mathcal{N}_a(\sigma)$ near its boundary.

³⁸In this paper, we have decided to stay consistent with the way we define Noether current and charge (always according to (3.20) and (3.21)) as well as orientation (always according to the rules stated around (3.11), (3.16), and (3.23)) when moving between Euclidean and Lorentzian signatures. Alternatively, one can decide to move, in Euclidean signature, the sign on the Noether charge and current in (3.30) over to (3.20) or to the orientations of the constant-time surfaces and the entangling surface σ .

³⁹To see (1.3), compare Proposition 4.1 in [11] describing Noether charge with the general expression (1.5) for Wald-Dong entropy in [6]. (The extrinsic curvatures of the entangling surface σ appearing in the latter vanish in the thermal setup.) Notice what is sufficient for (1.3) to hold is for one to choose $\mathbf{Z} = 0$ for the Noether charge in Proposition 4.1 and either all fields to be ξ -symmetric, or for merely the metric g to be ξ -symmetric and additionally $\mathbf{Y} = 0$ to be chosen. (Through our derivation, it is evident that (3.30) is independent of the ambiguities \mathbf{Y} and \mathbf{Z} in Noether charge.) It will be convenient for us to take $\mathbf{Y} = 0$ and $\mathbf{Z} = 0$, seeing as quantum fluctuations in matter fields may not be ξ -symmetric.

Then, the action of $\iota\mathcal{L}_\zeta$ on fields is a deformation in $\mathcal{N}_a(\sigma)$ that has roughly the effect of producing the variation of a conical excess at exactly σ , just like the $\partial_n(\bullet_{\times n \frac{\tilde{\zeta}}{\sigma}})_{n=1}$ operation seen in (2.42). Replacing the $\partial_n(\bullet_{\times n \frac{\tilde{\zeta}}{\sigma}})_{n=1}$ field variations in (2.42) with this variation $\iota\mathcal{L}_\zeta \bullet$ and integrating the symplectic potential on $\partial\mathcal{N}_0(\sigma)$ where $\iota = 1$, we see that we recover⁴⁰ (3.34) with the limit of zero size for \mathcal{S}_1 . As noted below (2.42), the subtle corrections found by [6] that might modify that equation in higher curvature theories involve factors of extrinsic curvature which indeed vanish in the thermal setup considered here. We can also give a rough argument for this in the thermal case. Recall, as summarized below (2.42), the corrections to that equation are expected to come from curvature contributions to the action $I[g_{\times n \frac{\tilde{\zeta}}{\sigma}}, h_{\times n \frac{\tilde{\zeta}}{\sigma}}, (\phi + \psi)_{\times n \frac{\tilde{\zeta}}{\sigma}}]$ concentrated at the centre of $\mathcal{N}_a(\sigma)$ that become divergent on approach to σ for n close to 1 at finite a . For thermal setups, however, the metric g is symmetric in ξ and the statement $\partial_n g_{\times n \frac{\tilde{\zeta}}{\sigma}}|_{n=1} \stackrel{\text{diff}}{\sim} \iota\mathcal{L}_\zeta g$ becomes precise (*c.f.* section 3.1). Sufficiently close to σ , this is just a Lie derivative $\mathcal{L}_\zeta g$ in the $\zeta \propto \xi$ direction. Thus, the curvatures of $g_{\times n \frac{\tilde{\zeta}}{\sigma}}$ should give contributions to the action that, at n close to 1 and finite a , are no more divergent as one approaches σ than on the original manifold g . (This is a statement about curvatures near, but not exactly at σ ; recall that our convention, stated around (2.25), is to exclude from $I[g_{\times n \frac{\tilde{\zeta}}{\sigma}}, h_{\times n \frac{\tilde{\zeta}}{\sigma}}, (\phi + \psi)_{\times n \frac{\tilde{\zeta}}{\sigma}}]$ the strict conical singularity exactly at σ .)

Finally, moving onto the latter terms of (3.30) and (3.33), we see that equating these two expressions suggests

$$K^{\text{mat}} = - \int_{\tau_2} \mathbf{J}_\xi^{\text{mat}} - \int_{\tau_2 \cap \mathcal{M}} \xi \cdot \mathbf{L}^{\mathcal{M}, \text{mat}}, \quad (3.35)$$

at least as expectation values. In the below section 3.3, we shall argue that this is in fact correct as an operator equation, by considering correlators with other operators.

3.3 Modular Hamiltonian as Noether current

Our goal now is to show that the equality (3.35) between the matter modular Hamiltonian and the Noether current integral $-\int_{\tau_2} \mathbf{J}_\xi^{\text{mat}}$ does indeed hold as an operator equation. We shall do this by considering correlators of $\tilde{\mathcal{K}}_\zeta$ with other operators and comparing it with corresponding correlators of $S_\sigma^{\text{WD}} + 2\pi K^{\text{mat}}$. To do so, however, we must first understand the role played by the terms involving \mathbf{C}_h and \mathbf{C}_ψ appearing the second line of (3.29) which we previously set aside.

⁴⁰Our discussion here is obviously quite rough. For example, it is unable to resolve the **Y**- and **Z**-type ambiguities in Noether charge appearing in Proposition 4.1 of [11], specifically (52) therein, mentioned in footnote 39. To deal with the **Y**-type ambiguities which arise as exact contributions to the symplectic potential θ , we would need to be more careful in relating $\iota\mathcal{L}_\zeta$ to $\partial_n(\bullet_{\times n \frac{\tilde{\zeta}}{\sigma}})_{n=1}$; *e.g.* the former generates a transformation that is discontinuous at τ_2 for the matter fields which might not be ξ -symmetric. On the other hand, **Z**-type ambiguities give exact contributions to Noether charge \mathbf{Q}_ζ . To resolve **Y**- and **Z**-type ambiguities, when the entangling surface σ is not compact, *e.g.* reaching the spacetime boundary \mathcal{M} , one must also be cautious in writing the first equality of (3.34) as there may be extra contributions at $\partial\mathcal{S}_1 \cap \partial\mathcal{S}_2 \cap \mathcal{M}$. As noted in footnote 39 we should make the choice $\mathbf{Y} = 0$ and $\mathbf{Z} = 0$ in order to equate Wald-Dong and Noether charge entropies.

We will see later that those terms are merely artifacts of the diffeomorphism introduced in (3.4). Thus, it is helpful to begin by introducing the following operator:

$$\tilde{\mathcal{K}}_\zeta^{\text{diff}} \equiv \int_{\mathcal{S}_2} (\mathbf{E}_h \cdot \mathcal{L}_\zeta h + \mathbf{E}_\psi \cdot \mathcal{L}_\zeta \psi) . \quad (3.36)$$

The effect of inserting this operator into a Euclidean correlation function is, up to a transformation of the path integral measure, to apply the differential operator \mathcal{L}_ζ to all other (h, ψ) operators residing in \mathcal{S}_2 . Naively, we have

$$\langle \tilde{\mathcal{K}}_\zeta^{\text{diff}} \mathcal{O} \rangle = \langle (\delta_{h, \mathcal{L}_\zeta h} + \delta_{\psi, \mathcal{L}_\zeta \psi}) \mathcal{O} \rangle . \quad (3.37)$$

This is a consequence of replacing as the path integration variables

$$h \rightarrow h + \iota \mathcal{L}_\zeta h , \quad \psi \rightarrow \psi + \iota \mathcal{L}_\zeta \psi , \quad (3.38)$$

with ι a smoothed indicator function that identically vanishes outside \mathcal{S}_2 while, inside \mathcal{S}_2 , very rapidly interpolates to being a small constant (including on $\partial \mathcal{S}_2 \cap \mathcal{M}$; recall the boundary terms (2.8) cancel each other). This change of variables should induce a nontrivial variation of the path integral measure, giving an extra anomalous correction to (3.37) that one ought to absorb into the definition (3.36). To avoid derailing the current discussion however, we shall take (3.36) and (3.37) at face value, leaving the variation of the path integral measure to be discussed in appendix E.

To connect $\tilde{\mathcal{K}}_\zeta^{\text{diff}}$, as introduced in (3.36), to terms appearing in (3.29), we take the $\tau_1 \rightarrow \tau_2^-$ limit appearing in (3.29), using the identity (3.15):

$$\lim_{\tau_1 \rightarrow \tau_2} \tilde{\mathcal{K}}_\zeta^{\text{diff}} = -2\pi \int_{\tau_2} \xi^a (\mathbf{C}_h + \mathbf{C}_\psi)_a . \quad (3.39)$$

We see that these are precisely (minus) the \mathbf{C}_h and \mathbf{C}_ψ terms of (3.29), and we thus have

$$\lim_{\tau_1 \rightarrow \tau_2} (\tilde{\mathcal{K}}_\zeta + \tilde{\mathcal{K}}_\zeta^{\text{diff}}) = -2\pi \left(\int_\sigma \mathbf{Q}_\xi + \int_{\tau_2} \mathbf{J}_\xi + \int_{\tau_2 \cap \mathcal{M}} \xi \cdot \mathbf{L}^\mathcal{M} \right) . \quad (3.40)$$

(In fact, though it won't be of much use to us, (3.40) holds even without the $\tau_1 \rightarrow \tau_2^-$ limit⁴¹.) Note, from (3.37) that

$$\langle \tilde{\mathcal{K}}_\zeta^{\text{diff}} \rangle = 0 \quad (3.42)$$

so we were indeed justified previously in stating that the $(\mathbf{C}_h + \mathbf{C}_\psi)_a$ term of (3.29) has vanishing expectation value and can thus be neglected when evaluating the generalized entropy in (3.30).

⁴¹This can be shown, by a similar calculation to that presented in section 3.2, using: the definitions (3.9) and (3.36) for $\tilde{\mathcal{K}}_\zeta$ and $\tilde{\mathcal{K}}_\zeta^{\text{diff}}$; the definitions (3.20) and (3.21) for Noether charge and current; the identities (3.26) and (3.28) concerning the boundary Lagrangian $\mathbf{L}^\mathcal{M}$; and the following identity (see appendix B in [16]):

$$-d(\chi^a \mathbf{C}_a) = \sum_{\gamma \in \{g, h, \phi, \psi\}} \mathbf{E}_\gamma \cdot \mathcal{L}_\chi \gamma . \quad (3.41)$$

By comparing the correlation functions between $\tilde{\mathcal{K}}_\zeta$ and other operators with those of $S_\sigma^{\text{WD}} + 2\pi K^{\text{mat}}$, we will now argue using (3.40) and (3.37) that the identification (3.35) of the matter modular Hamiltonian K^{mat} with the matter Noether current integral $-\int_{\tau_2} \mathbf{J}_\xi^{\text{mat}}$, plus a boundary term, is indeed correct. For this purpose, it is sufficient to consider an arbitrary operator \mathcal{O}_Σ , which can be, for example, a product of local operators, inserted on the initial time slice Σ at $\tau = 0$. (We can evolve more general operators, say a sequence of operators at arbitrary Euclidean or Lorentzian times joined by some Schwinger-Keldysh contour, back to the Σ surface and consider the resulting ‘Heisenberg’-picture operator \mathcal{O}_Σ .) Reiterating (2.16) and (2.17), for such an operator, we have

$$\langle \mathcal{O}_\Sigma \rangle = \frac{\int [dh][d\psi] e^{-I[g,h,\phi+\psi]} \mathcal{O}_\Sigma}{e^{-W[g]}} = \frac{\text{tr}(\hat{\rho}^{\text{mat}} \mathcal{O}_\Sigma)}{\text{tr} \hat{\rho}^{\text{mat}}} \quad (3.43)$$

where $\hat{\rho}^{\text{mat}}$ evolves time by path integration from $\tau = 0$ to $\tau = 2\pi$. Now, we consider inserting $\tilde{\mathcal{K}}_\zeta$ into this expectation value. There are two cases to consider, depending on whether Σ lies in the thermal time interval (τ_1, τ_2) in which $\tilde{\mathcal{K}}_\zeta^{\text{diff}}$ resides. Let us first consider the easier case where Σ does not lie in (τ_1, τ_2) . Then, the insertion of $\tilde{\mathcal{K}}_\zeta$ defined in (3.9) simply gives — *c.f.* (3.6) and (3.7):

$$\langle \tilde{\mathcal{K}}_\zeta \mathcal{O}_\Sigma \rangle = - \frac{\partial_n \int [dh][d\psi] e^{-I[g_{\tilde{\zeta}_n}, h, \phi_{\tilde{\zeta}_n} + \psi]} \mathcal{O}_\Sigma \Big|_{n=1}}{e^{-W[g]}} \quad (\Sigma \not\subset (\tau_1, \tau_2)) \quad (3.44)$$

$$= \langle (S_\sigma^{\text{WD}}[g, h, \phi + \psi] + I^{\text{grav}}[g]) \mathcal{O}_\Sigma \rangle - \frac{\partial_n \text{tr}[(\hat{\rho}^{\text{mat}})^n \mathcal{O}_\Sigma] \Big|_{n=1}}{\text{tr} \hat{\rho}^{\text{mat}}} \quad (3.45)$$

$$= \langle (S_\sigma^{\text{WD}}[g, h, \phi + \psi] + I^{\text{grav}}[g] + 2\pi K^{\text{mat}}) \mathcal{O}_\Sigma \rangle, \quad (3.46)$$

where in the second equality, we have used (2.43) and (2.35) as well as, for the gravitational parts of the action and Wald-Dong entropy, (2.27). On the other hand, from (3.37) and (3.40)⁴²,

$$\lim_{\tau_1 \rightarrow \tau_2^-} \langle \tilde{\mathcal{K}}_\zeta \mathcal{O}_\Sigma \rangle = 2\pi \left\langle \left[- \int_\sigma \mathbf{Q}_\xi - \int_{\tau_2} \mathbf{J}_\xi - \int_{\tau_2 \cap \mathcal{M}} \xi \cdot \mathbf{L}^{\mathcal{M}} \right] \mathcal{O}_\Sigma \right\rangle. \quad (\Sigma \not\subset (\tau_1, \tau_2) \text{ in limit}) \quad (3.47)$$

Comparing (3.46) and (3.47) using (3.31) and (3.32) suggests, in this case,

$$S_\sigma^{\text{WD}}[g, h, \phi + \psi] + 2\pi K^{\text{mat}} = -2\pi \left(\int_\sigma \mathbf{Q}_\xi + \int_{\tau_2} \mathbf{J}_\xi^{\text{mat}} + \int_{\tau_2 \cap \mathcal{M}} \xi \cdot \mathbf{L}^{\mathcal{M}, \text{mat}} \right), \quad (3.48)$$

which, upon identifying the Wald-Dong entropy and Noether charge terms, gives the equality (3.35) we are after. However, we have arrived at (3.48) here by considering the case

⁴²As noted below it, (3.40) in fact holds without the $\tau_1 \rightarrow \tau_2^-$ limit; consequently, (3.47) does not actually require the limit, but merely that Σ lies outside (τ_1, τ_2) . This can be seen independently by consistency with (3.46), which (subject to $\Sigma \not\subset (\tau_1, \tau_2)$) is manifestly independent of τ_1, τ_2 , and the precise profile of the κ function used to define ζ in (3.3).

where no operators reside in (τ_1, τ_2) as the limit of vanishing interval size is taken; unfortunately, this is insufficient to distinguish whether $\tilde{\mathcal{K}}_\zeta^{\text{diff}}$ should also be included in (3.48) since

$$\langle \tilde{\mathcal{K}}_\zeta^{\text{diff}} \mathcal{O}_\Sigma \rangle = 0. \quad (\Sigma \not\subseteq (\tau_1, \tau_2)) \quad (3.49)$$

To distinguish $\tilde{\mathcal{K}}_\zeta + \tilde{\mathcal{K}}_\zeta^{\text{diff}}$ from $\tilde{\mathcal{K}}_\zeta$ and to understand why the \mathbf{C}_h and \mathbf{C}_ψ terms of (3.29) appeared in the calculation, let us now consider the case⁴³ where the initial time slice Σ intersects (τ_1, τ_2) . Now, (3.44) is not quite right as written for the following reason. Recall as explained below (3.4) that, owing to the diffeomorphism invariance of $W[g_{\tilde{\sigma}_n}]$, we were able to choose coordinates for $g_{\tilde{\sigma}_n}$ such that the $\tilde{\sim}^{\text{diff}}$ of (3.4) are treated as equalities; in particular, varying n changes the metric, but keeps the period of the τ coordinate fixed. Thus, we must remember that $\tilde{\mathcal{K}}_\zeta$ not only acts to vary the replication number n , but also to apply the diffeomorphism that realizes this. In contrast, in the RHS of (3.44), when n is varied, we have in mind that the period of thermal time is proportionately increased while the background remains locally invariant. The insertion of \mathcal{O}_Σ spoils diffeomorphism invariance and must be transformed accordingly:

$$\begin{aligned} \langle \tilde{\mathcal{K}}_\zeta \mathcal{O}_\Sigma \rangle &= - \frac{\partial_n \int [dh][d\psi] e^{-I[g_{\tilde{\sigma}_n}, h, \phi_{\tilde{\sigma}_n} + \psi]} \mathcal{O}_\Sigma \Big|_{n=1}}{e^{-W[g]}} - \langle (\delta_{h, \mathcal{L}_\zeta h} + \delta_{\psi, \mathcal{L}_\zeta \psi}) \mathcal{O}_\Sigma \rangle \end{aligned} \quad (3.50)$$

$$= \left\langle \left(S_\sigma^{\text{WD}}[g, h, \phi + \psi] + I^{\text{grav}}[g] + 2\pi K^{\text{mat}} - \tilde{\mathcal{K}}_\zeta^{\text{diff}} \right) \mathcal{O}_\Sigma \right\rangle, \quad (3.51)$$

where, in the second equality, we have now used (3.37). Outside of (τ_1, τ_2) , the diffeomorphism is trivial; thus, in the case of the previous paragraph, we were justified in brushing this subtlety under the rug. In the present case where Σ intersects (τ_1, τ_2) , however, $\tilde{\mathcal{K}}_\zeta^{\text{diff}}$ can act nontrivially on \mathcal{O}_Σ . Still, from (3.40), we again recover (3.48) and consequently (3.35).

To summarize, we have shown that $\tilde{\mathcal{K}}_\zeta^{\text{diff}}$ and the \mathbf{C}_h and \mathbf{C}_ψ terms appearing in (3.29) capture the effect of the extra diffeomorphism required to turn the $\tilde{\sim}^{\text{diff}}$ in (3.4) into equalities. As such, we have argued that these contributions are artifacts of the trick we introduced in section 3.1 as a proxy for extending the period of thermal time and should therefore be excluded from the modular Hamiltonian. Moreover, we have seen, by comparison of correlation functions with other operators, that (3.48), and thus our relation (3.35) between the matter modular Hamiltonian and Noether current, are indeed correct as operator equations.

Let us end by commenting that the arbitrariness of the choice of τ_2 in (3.35) and (3.48) is not at all surprising — the interpretation of this is simply that, for thermal states, the modular Hamiltonian K^{mat} is itself the generator of time evolution and thus commutes

⁴³As already mentioned below (3.40) and in footnote 42, much of the discussion in this section does not actually require us to take the limit of vanishing interval (τ_1, τ_2) size. But even if we do take the limit, it is still possible to do so such that Σ stays within (τ_1, τ_2) , *e.g.* by taking $\tau_1 \rightarrow 0^-$ and $\tau_2 \rightarrow 0^+$.

with the time evolution operator $e^{-\tau K^{\text{mat}}}$. (For the remaining sections of this paper, it will be simplest to take $\tau_2 = 0$, corresponding to the initial time slice Σ .) In appendix B, we derive the time evolution generator for quantum fields on backgrounds which are not ξ -symmetric — we find that the generator, modulo spacetime boundary, Gibbons-Hawking-like, and joint terms, is still the usual canonical one (see (B.16)), but the evolution operator is now a path-ordered exponential of an integral over a foliation of time slices (see (B.2)). Again, these more general results cannot be expressed in terms of gravitational stress tensor components, contrary to previous work [31].

3.4 Continuation to Lorentzian signature

In the discussion of the first law in section 4, we will consider the first law of generalized entropy in Lorentzian signature, involving variations which may not be easily described in terms of Euclidean preparation. Thus, before proceeding, let us take a moment now to discuss how various quantities considered so far in Euclidean signature are related to their Lorentzian counterparts⁴⁴.

We begin with the usual relations

$$\tau = it, \quad {}^E\xi = \partial_\tau = -i\partial_t = -i {}^L\xi, \quad d\tau = i dt, \quad {}^E\epsilon = i {}^L\epsilon \quad (3.52)$$

between Euclidean thermal time τ and the Lorentzian physical time t . Here, we have also written the relations between the thermal Killing vector ${}^E\xi$ and the Lorentzian Killing vector ${}^L\xi$. More generally, we shall use superscripts ${}^E\bullet$ and ${}^L\bullet$ to distinguish Euclidean and Lorentzian objects, for example, the volume forms ${}^E\epsilon$ and ${}^L\epsilon$ respectively in Euclidean and Lorentzian spacetimes. From the above, we see that Euclidean and Lorentzian time derivatives are related by

$$\mathcal{L}_{{}^E\xi} = -i \mathcal{L}_{{}^L\xi}. \quad (3.53)$$

We also have

$${}^E\mathbf{L} = -i {}^L\mathbf{L}, \quad {}^E\mathbf{E}_\gamma = -i {}^L\mathbf{E}_\gamma, \quad {}^E\theta[\delta\gamma] = -i {}^L\theta[\delta\gamma], \quad (\gamma \in \{g, h, \phi, \psi\}) \quad (3.54)$$

where the latter equalities follow from the first, giving the standard relation between Euclidean and Lorentzian Lagrangian densities. Note then that, consistently taking the definition of the stress tensor to be (2.11), we have from (3.52) and (3.54) the following relations

⁴⁴In this paper, we use the words “Euclidean” and “Lorentzian” rather loosely, specifying whether we are considering a spacetime with the time coordinate τ or $t = -i\tau$. Note that a configuration $(g, h, \phi + \psi)$ that has real Lorentzian components for all real t might yet fail to have real “Euclidean” components for all real τ . To give an example, a Lorentzian black hole metric rotating in the angular coordinate φ will typically have an imaginary $g_{\tau\varphi}$ component (unless one also Wick-rotates the angular velocity parameter by hand, which one must undo in the end anyway [32]). Thus, a path integral over real configurations in t might continue to a path integral involving complex configurations in τ . The conversions between “Euclidean” and “Lorentzian” objects in this section can be regarded as being evaluated on any configurations that might appear in a given path integral, real or otherwise.

between Euclidean and Lorentzian stress tensors⁴⁵:

$${}^{\text{E}}\mathbf{T}^{ab} = -i {}^{\text{L}}\mathbf{T}^{ab} \qquad {}^{\text{E}}T^{ab} = - {}^{\text{L}}T^{ab} . \quad (3.55)$$

Corollary to (3.52), (3.53), and (3.54) above, we have additionally

$${}^{\text{E}}\xi \cdot {}^{\text{E}}\mathbf{L} = - {}^{\text{L}}\xi \cdot {}^{\text{L}}\mathbf{L} , \qquad {}^{\text{E}}\boldsymbol{\theta}[\mathcal{L}_{{}^{\text{E}}\xi}\gamma] = - {}^{\text{L}}\boldsymbol{\theta}[\mathcal{L}_{{}^{\text{L}}\xi}\gamma] , \qquad (\gamma \in \{g, h, \phi, \psi\}) \quad (3.56)$$

In general, we will consistently use the same definitions to define quantities in terms of the Lagrangian, regardless of the spacetime signature. Consequently, by the above and the definitions (3.20) and (3.21),

$${}^{\text{E}}\mathbf{J}_{{}^{\text{E}}\xi} = - {}^{\text{L}}\mathbf{J}_{{}^{\text{L}}\xi} , \qquad {}^{\text{E}}\mathbf{Q}_{{}^{\text{E}}\xi} = - {}^{\text{L}}\mathbf{Q}_{{}^{\text{L}}\xi} . \quad (3.57)$$

With the minus signs in the above relations, we must be careful when rewriting our results in Lorentzian signature; for example, the minus signs of the Noether current and charge terms of (3.30), (3.35), and (3.48) disappear:

$$S_{\sigma}^{\text{WD}}[g, h, \phi + \psi] = - 2\pi \int_{\sigma} {}^{\text{E}}\mathbf{Q}_{{}^{\text{E}}\xi} = 2\pi \int_{\sigma} {}^{\text{L}}\mathbf{Q}_{{}^{\text{L}}\xi} , \quad (3.58)$$

$$K^{\text{mat}} = - \int_{\Sigma} {}^{\text{E}}\mathbf{J}_{{}^{\text{E}}\xi}^{\text{mat}} - \int_{\mathcal{R}} {}^{\text{E}}\xi \cdot {}^{\text{E}}\mathbf{L}^{\mathcal{M},\text{mat}} = \int_{\Sigma} {}^{\text{L}}\mathbf{J}_{{}^{\text{L}}\xi}^{\text{mat}} + \int_{\mathcal{R}} {}^{\text{L}}\xi \cdot {}^{\text{L}}\mathbf{L}^{\mathcal{M},\text{mat}} , \quad (3.59)$$

with the first line simply reiterating (1.3) for ξ -symmetric background geometries g . As already noted in footnote 38, we will also consistently stick with the conventions (3.16) and (3.23) for orienting surfaces, regardless of the spacetime signature⁴⁶.

4 First law of generalized entropy

Here, we wish to calculate the variation of generalized entropy, given by (2.18), due to perturbations of the bulk background fields g and ϕ and of the state ρ^{mat} of the quantum matter fields h and ψ . Taking the unperturbed setup to be thermal, as described in section 1 above (1.3) and considered in section 3, we aim to recover the first law of generalized entropy (1.7) as well as its necessary and sufficient conditions in terms of gravitational dynamics. As described in section 2 (and appendix A), we again work with a semiclassical theory with a quantum graviton h and other arbitrary matter background plus quantum tensor fields $\phi + \psi$ on a background geometry g . Our goal will be to evaluate the first variation of generalized entropy (2.18) under arbitrary variations $(\delta g, \delta \phi)$ and $\delta \rho^{\text{mat}}$ of the background fields and the state⁴⁷ of the quantum matter fields (h, ψ) . In the end, we shall find that when the gravitational equations of motion are satisfied for the unperturbed and

⁴⁵One must be careful when comparing time components of tensors between Euclidean and Lorentzian signatures. For instance, the time-time component of (3.55) reads ${}^{\text{E}}T^{\tau\tau} = - {}^{\text{L}}T^{\tau\tau} = {}^{\text{L}}T^{tt}$, where $\bullet^{\tau} = (d\tau)_a \bullet^a$ indicates contraction with $d\tau$ while $\bullet^t = (dt)_a \bullet^a$ indicates contraction with dt .

⁴⁶The normal vector $n_{(\tau)}$ in (3.16) and (3.23) is generalized in the obvious way to $n_{(t)}$ in Lorentzian signature, the future-directed normal of constant- t surfaces.

⁴⁷Perhaps we should comment on a previous work [33, 34] which ostensibly derived the first law for the generalized entropy. However, the work there essentially consisted of wrapping Wald's original classical

perturbed metrics and states, a first law emerges for generalized entropy. As in [16, 17], we can also look in a converse direction: we can see precisely what is required of the perturbed background and state for the satisfaction of the first law. As mentioned in the introductory section 1, our results generalize the results of [17] to address a multitude of subtleties related to non-minimal coupling and incongruities between the gravitational stress tensor and the matter modular Hamiltonian (discussed previously for scalars in [22]⁴⁸), background variations unsuppressed in G_N , and possible contributions to asymptotic energy from the matter sector. From here on, we shall work in Lorentzian signature, implicitly suppressing the L_\bullet superscripts used in section 3.4.

Our calculations here are organized as follows. It will be instructive for us to calculate the variations of the classical and quantum parts of generalized entropy (2.18) separately. Thus, we split the Wald-Dong entropy S_σ^{WD} into a classical purely gravitational part, arising from the gravitational action $I^{\text{grav}}[g]$, and the remaining quantum matter part arising from $I^{\text{mat}}[g, h, \phi + \psi]$:

$$S_\sigma^{\text{WD}}[g, h, \phi + \psi] = S_\sigma^{\text{grav,WD}}[g] + S_\sigma^{\text{mat,WD}}[g, h, \phi + \psi] . \quad (4.1)$$

In section 4.1, we start by calculating the variation of the purely classical gravitational piece $S_\sigma^{\text{grav,WD}}$ — this will follow along the same lines as, and thus permits a review of, the derivation of the classical first law of black hole thermodynamics [10, 11, 16, 35]. In section 4.2, we move onto the remaining quantum part of generalized entropy,

$$\langle S_\sigma^{\text{mat,WD}}[g] \rangle + S[\rho^{\text{mat}}] . \quad (4.2)$$

Using the first law of von Neumann entropy (1.6), the variation of the above is calculated and we obtain an answer involving the operator variation $2\pi \int \delta \mathcal{O} \mathbf{J}_\xi^{\text{mat}}$ of the matter

calculation [10] in expectation value brackets. (A summary of Wald’s classical calculation is illustrated below in section 4.1 for just the metric field; one can easily imagine including other classical fields.) The only significant novelty was the observation that the symplectic density $\langle \omega[\delta g, \delta h, \delta \phi, \delta \psi; \mathcal{L}_\xi h, \mathcal{L}_\xi \psi] \rangle$ (defined by (4.5) below) does not vanish. Rather, its integral over the bulk spatial region Σ was identified (seemingly by classical intuition) as the variation of the modular Hamiltonian K^{mat} ’s expectation value, and subsequently by the first law of von Neumann entropy (1.6), the variation $\delta S[\rho^{\text{mat}}]$ of the bulk matter entropy. Of course, in QFT, the objects δh and $\delta \psi$ require some explanation. In [33, 34], the variation of quantum operators is defined by absorbing the variation of the state ρ^{mat} . Specifically, [33, 34] considers a unitary transformation to the state $\rho^{\text{mat}} + \delta \rho^{\text{mat}} = U^\dagger \rho^{\text{mat}} U$ and then defines the variation $\delta \mathcal{O}$ of an operator \mathcal{O} according to $\mathcal{O} + \delta \mathcal{O} = U \mathcal{O} U^\dagger$ — see above (11) in [33] and above (3.21) in [34]. But, von Neumann entropy is invariant under unitary transformations. So, if unitary variations are all that is considered, then any variation to the interesting bulk von Neumann part $S[\rho^{\text{mat}}]$ of generalized entropy is precluded! Perhaps a resolution to this problem might be to allow the unitary transformation U to act on the full purification $|\varphi^{\text{mat,aux}}\rangle$ of $\rho^{\text{mat}} = \text{tr}_{\text{aux}} |\varphi^{\text{mat,aux}}\rangle \langle \varphi^{\text{mat,aux}}|$, *i.e.* $U|\varphi^{\text{mat,aux}}\rangle$. Upon tracing out the purifying auxiliary system, it is then possible to obtain non-unitary transformations — specifically, completely positive and trace preserving (CPTP) maps — to ρ^{mat} which modify the matter entropy. Still, one would need to verify $\int_\Sigma \langle \omega[\delta g, \delta h, \delta \phi, \delta \psi; \mathcal{L}_\xi h, \mathcal{L}_\xi \psi] \rangle \stackrel{?}{=} \delta_{\rho^{\text{mat}}} \langle K^{\text{mat}} \rangle$. Note that it is very important that it is the state variation $\delta_{\rho^{\text{mat}}} \langle K^{\text{mat}} \rangle = \text{tr}(\delta \rho^{\text{mat}} K^{\text{mat}})$ which appears here, since this is what appears in the first law of von Neumann entropy (1.6). So, in a sense, a significant portion of our work in this section and in appendix C can be interpreted as demonstrating that this equality is morally true (modulo some terms $\int_\Sigma \xi \cdot (\mathbf{E}_h \cdot \delta h + \mathbf{E}_\psi \cdot \delta \psi)$), with significant attention paid to distinguishing between variations of states and operators, as well as functional variations in background fields.

⁴⁸See, in particular, section 4.1 in [22].

Noether current, induced by perturbations of the background fields — such a contribution would have been discarded in previous works merely interested in background perturbations suppressed in G_N . As we explain in section 4.3, the calculation of this contribution is somewhat subtle as it is not merely given by the functional variation $\delta_g + \delta_\phi$ of the expression for $2\pi \int \mathbf{J}_\xi^{\text{mat}}$ written out in terms of the fields g , h , ϕ , and ψ . Having obtained the variations of all requisite pieces, we finally collect our results together in section 4.4 to recover the first law of generalized entropy.

4.1 The classical calculation

The calculation to determine the first variation of $S_\sigma^{\text{grav,WD}}[g]$ is straightforward, as it simply involves taking the functional variation δ_g resulting from the perturbation δg of the classical field g :

$$\delta S_\sigma^{\text{grav,WD}}[g] = \delta_g S_\sigma^{\text{grav,WD}}[g] = 2\pi \delta_g \int_\sigma \mathbf{Q}_\xi^{\text{grav}}, \quad (4.3)$$

where, in the last equality, we have used the fact that the unperturbed background metric g is boost-symmetric around σ so that the corrections to (1.3) vanish at linear order in perturbations, as hinted below that equation⁴⁹. The classical calculation relating the RHS of (4.3) to the variation of an asymptotic energy proceeds much the same as in [16]. One starts by calculating the variation of the Noether current defined in (3.20). Using the identity (3.27) for the Lie derivative, one has

$$\delta_g \mathbf{J}_\chi^{\text{grav}} = -\chi \cdot (\mathbf{E}_g^{\text{grav}} \cdot \delta g) + d(\chi \cdot \boldsymbol{\theta}^{\text{grav}}[\delta g]) + \boldsymbol{\omega}^{\text{grav}}[\delta g; \mathcal{L}_\chi g], \quad (4.4)$$

where the symplectic density is defined by

$$\boldsymbol{\omega}[\delta_1 \gamma; \delta_2 \gamma] \equiv \delta_1 \boldsymbol{\theta}[\delta_2 \gamma] - \delta_2 \boldsymbol{\theta}[\delta_1 \gamma]. \quad (4.5)$$

For the calculation at hand, we will use this with the vector field $\chi = \xi$. Using (3.21), the above can be related to the variation of the Noether charge $\mathbf{Q}_\xi^{\text{grav}}$:

$$d\left(\delta_g \mathbf{Q}_\xi^{\text{grav}} - \xi \cdot \boldsymbol{\theta}^{\text{grav}}[\delta g]\right) = \delta_g \left(d\mathbf{Q}_\xi^{\text{grav}} - \mathbf{J}_\xi^{\text{grav}}\right) - \xi \cdot (\mathbf{E}_g^{\text{grav}} \cdot \delta g) \quad (4.6)$$

$$= -\xi^a \delta_g \mathbf{C}_a^{\text{grav}} - \xi \cdot (\mathbf{E}_g^{\text{grav}} \cdot \delta g) \quad (4.7)$$

where the $\boldsymbol{\omega}^{\text{grav}}$ of (4.4) has vanished due to $\mathcal{L}_\xi g = 0$. Integrating (4.7) on Σ , we then find that the variation (4.3) of the purely gravitational part of the Wald-Dong entropy is given by

$$\delta S_\sigma^{\text{grav,WD}}[g] = 2\pi \int_{\mathcal{R}} \left(\delta_g \mathbf{Q}_\xi^{\text{grav}} - \xi \cdot \boldsymbol{\theta}^{\text{grav}}[\delta g]\right) + 2\pi \int_\Sigma \left[\xi^a \delta_g \mathbf{C}_a^{\text{grav}} + \xi \cdot (\mathbf{E}_g^{\text{grav}} \cdot \delta g)\right]. \quad (4.8)$$

⁴⁹To see that (1.3) persists classically at linear order in perturbations away from ξ -symmetric fields, see Theorem 6.1 (in particular, (93) and (95)) in [11] and notice that the corrections in (1.5) of [6] are quadratic in the extrinsic curvature.

If one were just considering a classical theory of the metric g , the interpretation of (4.8) as a first law then follows from identifying the integral over the boundary region \mathcal{R} as the variation of an asymptotic energy [10, 11]. It is straightforward to include other classical fields in this calculation, if one so desires, and we see that the classical first law of black hole thermodynamics (1.4) is manifest in (4.8): the vanishing of the latter terms in (4.8) involving the unperturbed and linearized equations of motion (see (3.14) and (3.18)) constitute the necessary and sufficient conditions for the classical first law.

4.2 Variation of the quantum part of generalized entropy

Let us move now to the remaining quantum part (4.2) of the generalized entropy (2.18). First of all, the first law of von Neumann entropy (1.6) applied to (3.59) gives

$$\delta S[\rho^{\text{mat}}] = 2\pi \delta_{\rho^{\text{mat}}} \langle K^{\text{mat}} \rangle = 2\pi \left(\int_{\Sigma} \delta_{\rho^{\text{mat}}} \langle \mathbf{J}_{\xi}^{\text{mat}} \rangle + \int_{\mathcal{R}} \xi \cdot \delta_{\rho^{\text{mat}}} \langle \mathbf{L}^{\mathcal{M}, \text{mat}} \rangle \right), \quad (4.9)$$

where, for an operator \mathcal{O}_{Σ} ,

$$\delta_{\rho^{\text{mat}}} \langle \mathcal{O}_{\Sigma} \rangle \equiv \text{tr}(\delta \rho^{\text{mat}} \mathcal{O}_{\Sigma}) \quad (4.10)$$

means the variation of an expectation value resulting only from the perturbation of the state ρ^{mat} , while fixing⁵⁰ the operator \mathcal{O}_{Σ} . In contrast, the variation of an expectation value $\langle \mathcal{O}_{\Sigma} \rangle$ such as⁵¹

$$\langle S_{\sigma}^{\text{mat}, \text{WD}}[g] \rangle = 2\pi \int_{\sigma} \langle \mathbf{Q}_{\xi}^{\text{mat}} \rangle \quad (4.12)$$

must account for both the state variation as well as the variation $\delta_{\mathcal{O}}$ of the operator, resulting from perturbations of the background g, ϕ :

$$\delta \langle \mathcal{O}_{\Sigma} \rangle = \delta_{\rho^{\text{mat}}} \langle \mathcal{O}_{\Sigma} \rangle + \langle \delta_{\mathcal{O}} \mathcal{O}_{\Sigma} \rangle, \quad (4.13)$$

for instance,

$$\delta \langle \mathbf{Q}_{\xi}^{\text{mat}} \rangle = \delta_{\rho^{\text{mat}}} \langle \mathbf{Q}_{\xi}^{\text{mat}} \rangle + \langle \delta_{\mathcal{O}} \mathbf{Q}_{\xi}^{\text{mat}} \rangle. \quad (4.14)$$

⁵⁰Here, “fixing” means fixing the expression of the operator written in terms of the field operators h, ψ and their *conjugate momenta* on Σ , as opposed to their time derivatives \mathcal{L}_{ξ} . It is the former that are truly operators on Σ , while time derivatives require a definition of evolution away from Σ . See section 4.3 for further discussion of this point.

⁵¹As written in (1.3) and explained in footnote 39 and below 3.34, the Wald-Dong entropy can be equated to the Noether charge for ξ -symmetric geometries g ; moreover, by Theorem 6.1 of [11], (1.3) continues to hold classically for linear perturbations from ξ -symmetric fields as explained in footnote 49. At the semiclassical level, the same proof for this theorem shows that the latter statement continues to hold as expectation values:

$$\delta \langle S_{\sigma}^{\text{WD}} \rangle = 2\pi \int_{\sigma} \delta \langle \mathbf{Q}_{\xi} \rangle \quad (4.11)$$

with, in the proof, $\mathcal{L}_{\xi} \langle \mathbf{X} \rangle = 0$ following from the ξ -symmetry of the unperturbed background and path integral. (Again, we should make the choice $\mathbf{Y} = 0$ and $\mathbf{Z} = 0$ — see footnote 39.)

Now, we use the definition (3.21) of $\mathbf{Q}_\xi^{\text{mat}}$ in terms of $\mathbf{J}_\xi^{\text{mat}}$ to write

$$\int_\Sigma \mathbf{J}_\xi^{\text{mat}} = \int_{\mathcal{R}} \mathbf{Q}_\xi^{\text{mat}} - \int_\sigma \mathbf{Q}_\xi^{\text{mat}} + \int_\Sigma \xi^a \mathbf{C}_a^{\text{mat}}, \quad (4.15)$$

allowing us to combine (4.9) with the variation of (4.12) to obtain

$$\begin{aligned} & \delta \langle S_\sigma^{\text{mat,WD}}[g] \rangle + \delta S[\rho^{\text{mat}}] \\ &= 2\pi \left(\int_{\mathcal{R}} \{ \delta \langle \mathbf{Q}_\xi^{\text{mat}} \rangle + \xi \cdot \delta_{\rho^{\text{mat}}} \langle \mathbf{L}^{\mathcal{M},\text{mat}} \rangle \} + \int_\Sigma \{ \xi^a \delta \langle \mathbf{C}_a^{\text{mat}} \rangle - \langle \delta \mathcal{O} \mathbf{J}_\xi^{\text{mat}} \rangle \} \right). \end{aligned} \quad (4.16)$$

We recognize the Noether charge and $\mathbf{C}_a^{\text{mat}}$ terms as elements that can be readily combined with those of (4.8) in the variation of the purely gravitational part $\delta S_\sigma^{\text{grav,WD}}[g]$ of generalized entropy. In section 4.3 below, we shall clarify the meaning of and calculate the final term in (4.16) involving the operator variation of the matter Noether current. When we combine all the pieces of the first law of generalized entropy in section 4.4, we shall also see how variations of the boundary Lagrangian $\mathbf{L}^{\mathcal{M},\text{mat}}$ and symplectic potential θ terms, such as that appearing in (4.8), can be cohesively combined in the complete expression for asymptotic energy.

Before proceeding, however, let us mention that the \mathbf{C}^{mat} of the second term in (4.16) can in fact be reduced to just the metric part $\mathbf{C}_g^{\text{mat}}$ (recall the definitions (3.14) and (3.21))⁵²:

$$\int_\Sigma \xi^a \delta \langle \mathbf{C}_a^{\text{mat}} \rangle = \int_\Sigma \xi^a \delta \langle (\mathbf{C}_g^{\text{mat}})_a \rangle. \quad (4.17)$$

For other background fields ϕ , shift-invariance of the ψ path integral results in trivial one-point functions for \mathbf{E}_ϕ , as noted in (2.13), so by definition (3.14),

$$\langle (\mathbf{C}_\phi)_a \rangle = 0. \quad (4.18)$$

By changing path integration variables according to the transformation (3.13), one can similarly argue

$$\langle (\mathbf{C}_h)_a \rangle = 0, \quad \langle (\mathbf{C}_\psi)_a \rangle = 0. \quad (4.19)$$

Actually, these relations are corrected by variations of the path integration measure, but we leave discussion of this to appendix E (see (E.41)).

4.3 Operator variation of Noether current

Now, we turn to the calculation of the operator variation $2\pi \int_\Sigma \delta \mathcal{O} \mathbf{J}_\xi^{\text{mat}}$ encountered in the variation (4.16) of the quantum part of generalized entropy. Note that this should not be

⁵²This ultimately traces back to our special treatment of the metric and graviton fields, with respect to which we have Legendre transformed to obtain an effective action — see appendix A. If we had performed similar Legendre transformations on other non-scalar fields for which (3.14) is nontrivial, we must also include their $\langle (\mathbf{C}_\phi^{\text{mat}})_a \rangle$.

confused⁵³ with the modular Hamiltonian variation $2\pi\delta K^{\text{mat}} = -\delta \log \hat{\rho}^{\text{mat}}$. Rather, the Noether current $\mathbf{J}_\xi^{\text{mat}}$ is always defined in terms of the Lagrangian and symplectic potential by (3.20), but can generally depend on the background fields g and ϕ .

Thus, to calculate this contribution, one might naively calculate, in the same manner as in (4.4),

$$(\delta_g + \delta_\phi)\mathbf{J}_\xi^{\text{mat}} = -\xi \cdot (\mathbf{E}_g^{\text{mat}} \cdot \delta g + \mathbf{E}_\phi^{\text{mat}} \cdot \delta \phi) + d(\xi \cdot \boldsymbol{\theta}^{\text{mat}}[\delta g, \delta \phi]) + \boldsymbol{\omega}^{\text{mat}}[\delta g, \delta \phi; \mathcal{L}_\xi h, \mathcal{L}_\xi \psi] . \quad (4.20)$$

To spell out the above calculation (4.20) explicitly, one writes $\mathbf{J}_\xi^{\text{mat}}$ as an expression in terms of fields (g, ϕ, h, ψ) on Σ as well as their \mathcal{L}_ξ time derivatives; then, the classical background fields (g, ϕ) (and their derivatives) are perturbed, while doing nothing to (h, ψ) and their \mathcal{L}_ξ time derivatives. This, however, is not quite what we want for $\delta_{\mathcal{O}}$.

Since time derivatives of quantum fields (h, ψ) are not truly operators on the initial surface Σ unless a time evolution is prescribed, we should instead consider the conjugate momenta of the quantum fields, which fundamentally are operators on Σ . To properly calculate $\delta_{\mathcal{O}}\mathbf{J}_\xi^{\text{mat}}$, therefore, we should write $\mathbf{J}_\xi^{\text{mat}}$ as an expression in terms of conjugate momenta of (h, ψ) , rather than their time derivatives, and fix these conjugate momenta as the background fields (g, ϕ) are perturbed. From the definition (3.20) of the current $\mathbf{J}_\xi^{\text{mat}}$,

$$\mathbf{J}_\xi^{\text{mat}} = \boldsymbol{\theta}^{\text{mat}}[\mathcal{L}_\xi g, \mathcal{L}_\xi \phi] + \tilde{\mathbf{H}}_\xi^{\text{mat}} \quad (4.21)$$

$$\tilde{\mathbf{H}}_\xi^{\text{mat}} \equiv \boldsymbol{\theta}[\mathcal{L}_\xi h, \mathcal{L}_\xi \psi] - \xi \cdot \mathbf{L}^{\text{mat}} , \quad (4.22)$$

we see that, modulo an extra $\boldsymbol{\theta}^{\text{mat}}[\mathcal{L}_\xi g, \mathcal{L}_\xi \phi]$, it is related to the symplectic potential $\boldsymbol{\theta}^{\text{mat}}[\mathcal{L}_\xi h, \mathcal{L}_\xi \psi]$ and Lagrangian $\xi \cdot \mathbf{L}^{\text{mat}}$ for the quantum fields h and ψ in the typical way expected for a Hamiltonian. Now, since the unperturbed background is ξ -symmetric, satisfying $\mathcal{L}_\xi g = 0$ and $\mathcal{L}_\xi \phi = 0$, the only contribution to the operator variation of the extra $\boldsymbol{\theta}^{\text{mat}}[\mathcal{L}_\xi g, \mathcal{L}_\xi \phi]$ term can come from the functional variation of the arguments $\mathcal{L}_\xi g$ and $\mathcal{L}_\xi \phi$:

$$\delta_{\mathcal{O}}\boldsymbol{\theta}^{\text{mat}}[\mathcal{L}_\xi g, \mathcal{L}_\xi \phi] = \boldsymbol{\theta}^{\text{mat}}[\mathcal{L}_\xi \delta g, \mathcal{L}_\xi \delta \phi] = (\delta_g + \delta_\phi)\boldsymbol{\theta}^{\text{mat}}[\mathcal{L}_\xi g, \mathcal{L}_\xi \phi] . \quad (4.23)$$

On the other hand, the variation of a Hamiltonian, such as $\int_\Sigma \tilde{\mathbf{H}}_\xi^{\text{mat}}$, expressed in terms of conjugate momenta, is equal to minus the variation of the corresponding Lagrangian, in this case $\int_\Sigma \xi \cdot \mathbf{L}^{\text{mat}}$, written in terms of time derivatives. Also properly accounting for

⁵³It is perhaps helpful to briefly summarize why it is $\int_\Sigma \delta_{\mathcal{O}}\mathbf{J}_\xi^{\text{mat}}$ rather than δK^{mat} that appears in our derivation of the first law of generalized entropy. Recall from our calculation in section 4.2 that the first law of von Neumann entropy (4.9) removes the need to consider δK^{mat} , setting the variation of von Neumann entropy equal just to the variation $2\pi\delta_{\rho^{\text{mat}}}\langle K^{\text{mat}} \rangle = 2\pi\int_\Sigma \delta_{\rho^{\text{mat}}}\langle \mathbf{J}_\xi^{\text{mat}} \rangle$ of the expectation value of the *unperturbed* K^{mat} operator, resulting only from the perturbation $\delta\rho^{\text{mat}}$ of the state. However, when re-expressing the variation $\delta\langle S_\sigma^{\text{WD}} \rangle = 2\pi\int_\sigma \delta\langle \mathbf{Q}_\xi \rangle$ of the Wald-Dong contribution to generalized entropy using the relation (4.15), one also obtains a term $-2\pi\int_\Sigma \delta\langle \mathbf{J}_\xi^{\text{mat}} \rangle$. This term can be split into two contributions, resulting from the perturbation of the matter state ρ^{mat} , and the perturbation of the operator itself due to changes in the background fields g and ϕ ; the former cancels against the variation of von Neumann entropy, while the latter survives and must be evaluated.

boundary contributions to the Hamiltonian and Lagrangian gives

$$\left\langle \delta_{\mathcal{O}} \left(\int_{\Sigma} \tilde{\mathbf{H}}_{\xi}^{\text{mat}} + \int_{\mathcal{R}} \xi \cdot \mathbf{L}^{\mathcal{M},\text{mat}} \right) \right\rangle = \left\langle (\delta_g + \delta_{\phi}) \left(- \int_{\Sigma} \xi \cdot \mathbf{L}^{\text{mat}} + \int_{\mathcal{R}} \xi \cdot \mathbf{L}^{\mathcal{M},\text{mat}} \right) \right\rangle . \quad (4.24)$$

In appendix C, we provide a more careful derivation for (4.24) which explains the presence of the terms on the boundary region $\mathcal{R} = \Sigma \cap \mathcal{M}$.

Putting (4.23) together with (4.24), we have that the operator variation of (4.21) is given by

$$\int_{\Sigma} \langle \delta_{\mathcal{O}} \mathbf{J}_{\xi}^{\text{mat}} \rangle = \int_{\Sigma} \langle (\delta_g + \delta_{\phi}) (\boldsymbol{\theta}^{\text{mat}}[\mathcal{L}_{\xi} g, \mathcal{L}_{\xi} \phi] - \xi \cdot \mathbf{L}^{\text{mat}}) \rangle + \int_{\mathcal{R}} \xi \cdot \langle (\delta_g + \delta_{\phi} - \delta_{\mathcal{O}}) \mathbf{L}^{\mathcal{M},\text{mat}} \rangle \quad (4.25)$$

$$= \int_{\Sigma} \langle (\delta_g + \delta_{\phi}) (\mathbf{J}_{\xi}^{\text{mat}} - \boldsymbol{\theta}[\mathcal{L}_{\xi} h, \mathcal{L}_{\xi} \psi]) \rangle + \int_{\mathcal{R}} \xi \cdot \langle (\delta_g + \delta_{\phi} - \delta_{\mathcal{O}}) \mathbf{L}^{\mathcal{M},\text{mat}} \rangle . \quad (4.26)$$

We have already calculated the functional variation of the Noether current $\mathbf{J}_{\xi}^{\text{mat}}$ in (4.20) above. From (4.23) and the ξ boost-invariance of the unperturbed background and path integral, we have for the symplectic potential $\boldsymbol{\theta}$ term of (4.26),

$$\langle (\delta_g + \delta_{\phi}) \boldsymbol{\theta}[\mathcal{L}_{\xi} h, \mathcal{L}_{\xi} \psi] \rangle = \langle (\delta_g + \delta_{\phi}) \boldsymbol{\theta}^{\text{mat}}[\mathcal{L}_{\xi} g, \mathcal{L}_{\xi} h, \mathcal{L}_{\xi}(\phi + \psi)] \rangle - \mathcal{L}_{\xi} \langle \boldsymbol{\theta}^{\text{mat}}[\delta g, \delta \phi] \rangle \quad (4.27)$$

$$= \langle \boldsymbol{\omega}^{\text{mat}}[\delta g, \delta \phi; \mathcal{L}_{\xi} h, \mathcal{L}_{\xi} \psi] \rangle . \quad (4.28)$$

Thus, using (4.20), with the vanishing (2.13) of the equation of motion's expectation value $\langle \mathbf{E}_{\phi} \rangle$, and the above, we find that (4.26) can be written as

$$\int_{\Sigma} \langle \delta_{\mathcal{O}} \mathbf{J}_{\xi}^{\text{mat}} \rangle = - \int_{\Sigma} \xi \cdot (\langle \mathbf{E}_g^{\text{mat}} \rangle \cdot \delta g) + \int_{\mathcal{R}} \xi \cdot \langle \boldsymbol{\theta}^{\text{mat}}[\delta g, \delta \phi] + (\delta_g + \delta_{\phi} - \delta_{\mathcal{O}}) \mathbf{L}^{\mathcal{M},\text{mat}} \rangle . \quad (4.29)$$

4.4 Collecting all pieces

Finally, we can put together (4.8) and (4.16) with (4.29) to get the total variation of generalized entropy (2.18) around a thermal setup:

$$\begin{aligned} \delta S_{\sigma}^{\text{gen}}[g] = & 2\pi \int_{\mathcal{R}} \{ \delta \langle \mathbf{Q}_{\xi} \rangle - \xi \cdot \langle \boldsymbol{\theta}[\delta g, \delta \phi] \rangle + \xi \cdot (\delta - \delta_g - \delta_{\phi}) \langle \mathbf{L}^{\mathcal{M},\text{mat}} \rangle \} \\ & + 2\pi \int_{\Sigma} [\xi^a \delta \langle (\mathbf{C}_g)_a \rangle + \xi \cdot (\langle \mathbf{E}_g \rangle \cdot \delta g)] \end{aligned} \quad (4.30)$$

Note that, for δg and $\delta \phi$ which preserve the boundary conditions⁵⁴ at the spacetime boundary \mathcal{M} , one has from (2.8) the simplification

$$- \langle \boldsymbol{\theta}[\delta g, \delta \phi] \rangle|_{\mathcal{M}} + (\delta - \delta_g - \delta_{\phi}) \langle \mathbf{L}^{\mathcal{M},\text{mat}} \rangle|_{\mathcal{M}} = \delta \langle \mathbf{L}^{\mathcal{M}} \rangle|_{\mathcal{M}} . \quad (4.31)$$

⁵⁴We are primarily interested in background variations which preserve the boundary conditions at the spacetime boundary \mathcal{M} , as it is only for such variations that it seems reasonable to ascribe a variation of asymptotic energy. So, for the remainder of this section, we will no longer reiterate this assumption. However, it seems from our derivation that the result (4.30) holds more generally, even allowing for variations in the background fields g and ϕ which alter the boundary conditions at \mathcal{M} . (In holography, such variations would correspond to varying sources in the CFT.)

so that we may write⁵⁵

$$\delta S_\sigma^{\text{gen}}[g] = 2\pi\delta\langle H_\xi^{\mathcal{M}} \rangle + 2\pi \int_\Sigma [\xi^a \delta \langle (\mathbf{C}_g)_a \rangle + \xi \cdot (\langle \mathbf{E}_g \rangle \cdot \delta g)] \quad (4.32)$$

where we have identified the asymptotic energy (*c.f.* (82) in [11]⁵⁶)

$$H_\xi^{\mathcal{M}} \equiv \int_{\mathcal{R}} (\mathbf{Q}_\xi + \xi \cdot \mathbf{L}^{\mathcal{M}}) . \quad (4.34)$$

Finally, let us comment now on the interpretation of our result (4.32). From (4.32), we see that the first law of generalized entropy is equivalent to

$$\delta S_\sigma^{\text{gen}}[g] = 2\pi\delta\langle H_\xi^{\mathcal{M}} \rangle \iff \int_\Sigma [\xi^a \delta \langle (\mathbf{C}_g)_a \rangle + \xi \cdot (\langle \mathbf{E}_g \rangle \cdot \delta g)] = 0 , \quad (4.35)$$

with $\mathbf{E}_g^{ab} = \epsilon E_g^{ab}$ being the metric equations of motion and we recall from (3.18) that $\mathbf{C}_g^a = -2\epsilon_b E_g^{ab}$. In particular, we see that if the gravitational equations of motion are satisfied by the unperturbed thermal background and state as well as at linear order by the perturbation, then the first law of generalized entropy holds:

$$0 = \langle E_g^{ab} \rangle = \delta \langle E_g^{ab} \rangle \implies \delta S_\sigma^{\text{gen}}[g] = 2\pi\delta\langle H_\xi^{\mathcal{M}} \rangle . \quad (4.36)$$

Conversely, assuming the unperturbed thermal setup is a solution to the gravitational equations of motion, then the first law implies an integral of the linear order gravitational

⁵⁵One may try to compare our (3.18) and (4.32) with (3.8) in [17], where the analogue of the last term in (4.32) has already been dropped (taking the unperturbed metric to be on-shell). Note, however, that their “ E_{ab}^g ” is obtained by varying the gravitational action with respect to the inverse metric g^{ab} , and so should be equated to our $-(E_g^{\text{grav}})_{ab} = -g_{ac} g_{bd} (E_g^{\text{grav}})^{cd}$ with $(E_g^{\text{grav}})^{ab}$ being given by the variation of the gravitational action with respect to the metric g_{ab} . On the other hand, we both use the same standard definition of the stress tensor. Accounting for all this, there is still an extra sign when comparing our (4.32) with their (3.8). This can likely be traced back to either a difference in defining the orientation of Σ — see (3.16) for our conventions — or a sign error inherited by [17] from [16].

In particular, we note the following apparent inconsistency in [16]. It is clear from the derivation of the expression (5.21) for the variation asymptotic energy that the integrand written there, to be called “ χ ” in (5.22), should be integrated using the orientation induced on “ $\partial\mathcal{C}$ ” as the boundary the Cauchy surface “ \mathcal{C} ”. Correspondingly, “ χ ” in (4.14) should be integrated using the orientation induced on “ B ” as part of the boundary $\partial\Sigma$ of Σ . However, the opposite orientation is used in writing the third equality in (4.17); it seems, to sensibly correct this inconsistency, one ought to flip the signs of everything on one side or the other of that equality. Note that the signs in (4.17) of [16] seems to have been directly inherited by (3.8) in [17].

⁵⁶Note that (80) in [11] defining the “ \mathbf{B} ” appearing in their (82) is analogous to our more locally written property (2.8) for $-\mathbf{L}^{\mathcal{M}}$. Apart from some intermediate equations which were integrated at least over the boundary spacial directions anyway, the derivations of the main results of this paper do not make use of the spatial locality of (2.8). So, there is no obvious harm in weakening (2.8) to:

$$\int_{t \cap \mathcal{M}} \xi \cdot \boldsymbol{\theta}[\delta\gamma] = - \int_{t \cap \mathcal{M}} \xi \cdot \delta_\gamma \mathbf{L}^{\mathcal{M}} , \quad (\gamma \in \{g, h, \phi, \psi\}, \delta\gamma \text{ preserves b.c.}) \quad (4.33)$$

for all constant time surfaces, denoted here by the shorthand t , and all field variations that preserve the boundary conditions at the spacetime boundary. This is just (80) in [11] with their “ \mathbf{B} ” replaced by $-\mathbf{L}^{\mathcal{M}}$.

equations of motion for the perturbation vanishes:

$$\delta S_{\mathcal{G}}^{\text{gen}}[g] = 2\pi \delta \langle H_{\xi}^{\mathcal{M}} \rangle \quad \implies \quad 0 = \int_{\Sigma} \xi_a \epsilon_b \delta \langle E_g^{ab} \rangle \quad (\langle E_g^{ab} \rangle = 0) . \quad (4.37)$$

In a holographic setting, [17] examined this converse direction⁵⁷, in the particular case where the unperturbed setup is the AdS vacuum with Σ being a half-ball centred on the boundary \mathcal{M} . It was found that sufficient symmetry exists there to translate, rotate, boost, and dilate the region Σ such that imposing the first law of generalized entropy for all half-balls Σ implies that the linearized equation $\delta \langle E_g^{ab} \rangle = 0$ vanishes locally everywhere.

5 Discussion

In this work, we have considered a semiclassical gravitational theory, allowing for arbitrary tensor⁵⁸ field matter that can couple non-minimally to curvature. We have seen in section 2, how generalized entropy in such a theory can be written in terms of the gravitational effective action in a Callan-Wilczek-like [23] form (2.44), involving backgrounds containing regulated conical singularities. With this, we showed in section 3 that the modular Hamiltonian for matter fields in thermal setups, which possess a rotation symmetry in thermal time, is generally given by the sum (3.35) (or, equivalently continued to Lorentzian signature, (3.59)) of the integrated bulk Noether current and a boundary term. In general, this does not coincide with components of the gravitational stress tensor (1.5), particularly in the presence of non-minimal coupling of matter to curvature. While the relationship (1.5) seemed to be an important assumption in the previous discussion [17] of the first law of generalized entropy, we were nonetheless able to recover similar relations between the generalized first law and gravitational dynamics in section 4 using our general expression (3.35) for the modular Hamiltonian. Let us now discuss some noteworthy features of our calculations, the generalizations they afford relative to previous work, and possible future directions to pursue.

As overviewed in section 2 and further expanded upon in appendix A, we have chosen to work with the gravitational effective action in this paper in order to relate gravitational dynamics to the first law of generalized entropy. Because we were working with the effective action, as opposed to simply the logarithm of the partition function, it was sensible to consider off-shell backgrounds, as in our generalized entropy formula (2.44). Of course, (2.44), evaluated on holographic RT surfaces, agrees the more standard holographic computation of generalized entropy seen in literature involving smooth bulk backgrounds, as shown in appendix A; for example, as reviewed there, [9] evaluates the effective action on smooth but off-shell backgrounds in order to take variations of the RT surface when deriving its

⁵⁷The derivation of the analogue of (4.32) in [17] was in the simplified setting of Einstein gravity and it is assumed that the modular Hamiltonian is given by the integral of components of the stress tensor, as summarized in section 1 around (1.5). Possible non-minimal couplings of matter to curvature, for example, would break that derivation. However, assuming (4.32), it seems the discussion of [17] beyond that point continues to hold.

⁵⁸Although, we do not anticipate much difficulty in extending our calculations to allow for spinor fields — it seems one would just need to work with vielbeins rather than a metric field.

quantum extremality. Indeed, as manifest in (2.44), there seems to be no obstruction⁵⁹ in using this Callan-Wilczek-like formula to define generalized entropy for any bulk region, not just those enclosed by RT surfaces in holography. Defining generalized entropy for arbitrary regions using the standard formula (2.18) is of course relatively straightforward for simple matter fields, *e.g.* scalar fields, but is made difficult when treating gravity dynamically; it is difficult to even assign graviton fluctuations to a particular region in a gauge-invariant manner⁶⁰. Yet, there does not seem to be any immediate difficulty in including gravitons in the evaluation of our Callan-Wilczek-like formula (2.44).

In fact, in evaluating the gravitational effective action, at least to one-loop-order in G_N , as described in section 2 and appendix A, it seems natural to include graviton fluctuations as an extra matter field. We should admit, however, that our treatment of the graviton is still not quite complete, because, as noted in footnote 18, we have yet to properly treat issues of gauge fixing. Naively, we do not anticipate much difficulty resulting from the introduction of ghost fields into the path integral defining the effective action. However, additional care must be taken if one wants the resulting effective action to be invariant under gauge transformations of the background field and independent of the gauge-fixing conditions for the graviton. Fortunately, past work by Vilkovisky and DeWitt [36, 37]⁶¹ has clarified how this can be achieved. An interesting question for future work to examine would be whether our Callan-Wilczek-like formula (2.44) gives a sensible notion of entropy for arbitrary regions in gravitational theories when evaluated using the gauge-fixed Vilkovisky-DeWitt effective action; *e.g.* does the generalized entropy thus obtained satisfy a sensible first law?

Using (2.44), we showed in section 3 that the modular Hamiltonian for quantum matter fields is given by the sum of the bulk Noether current plus a boundary term, as written in (3.35) in Euclidean signature, or equivalently, continued to Lorentzian signature, (3.59). By working carefully with this expression for the modular Hamiltonian (as opposed to the supposed expression (1.5) in terms of the stress tensor used in [17]) and accounting for matter contributions to Wald-Dong entropy, we derived the relation (4.32) between gravitational dynamics and the first law of generalized entropy. As foreshadowed in the introductory section 1, beyond being valid for matter non-minimally coupled to curvature where (1.5) generally fails, our approach extends beyond that of [17] in a couple other ways.

Firstly, while [17] implicitly assumes that background perturbations are suppressed in G_N due to the subtleties pointed out in section 1, our calculations make no such assumption. The fact that our results hold for arbitrary first order variations is not terribly surprising. After all, the classical first law for Noether charge entropy [10, 11] doesn't even make reference to a G_N parameter.

⁵⁹An objection may be to point out the difficulty in practically evaluating the analytic continuation in n for arbitrary regions. But of course, this issue plagues any replica calculation of entropy. One can nonetheless argue formally for the existence of an analytic continuation as described in footnote 30.

⁶⁰Therefore, the calculations in section 2 connecting the standard formula (2.18) to our Callan-Wilczek-like formula (2.44) are somewhat dubious in light of issues of gauge-fixing, as admitted in footnote 18. However, with this loose connection between (2.18) and (2.44) in mind, we are suggesting here that perhaps (2.44) should be taken as the definition of generalized entropy of arbitrary regions in gravitational theories, where (2.18) might be difficult to define.

⁶¹In footnote 62, we very briefly outline the general idea.

Secondly, our result (4.32) fully accounts for contributions of matter to the asymptotic energy $H_\xi^{\mathcal{M}}$ written in (4.34). This is to be contrasted with [17] which dedicates a paragraph to explaining that if matter is assumed to fall off sufficiently quickly at the spacetime boundary, then the matter sector should not modify the expression for asymptotic energy. Indeed, [17]’s derivation, as summarized in our section 1, would seem to suggest that the only direct appearances of matter in the relation between the generalized first law and gravitational dynamics are in the von Neumann entropy and as a source for the gravitational equations of motion. Again, our more general result echos intuition from the classical first law [10, 11] where matter and gravitational fields alike appear in the expression for asymptotic energy.

One need not be too creative to find an example where matter contributes directly to the asymptotic energy (4.34). The particularly simple but instructive example of a minimally coupled Maxwell field \mathbf{A} in an asymptotically-AdS spacetime is considered in appendix D. There, electrically charged black holes are considered with boundary conditions corresponding to fixed potential at the AdS boundary \mathcal{M} and to fixed charge density, as evaluated by Gauss’s law on boundary time slices. In either case, it is shown that the Maxwell field makes a nonvanishing contribution $\mathbf{Q}_\xi^{\text{Max}}|_{\mathcal{R}}$ to the Noether charge appearing in the asymptotic energy (4.34). For fixed potential boundary conditions, the Maxwell contribution $H_\xi^{\mathcal{M},\text{Max}}$ to asymptotic energy is given by the integral $\int_{\mathcal{R}} \mathbf{Q}_\xi^{\text{Max}} = -\mu_{\text{BH}} \mathcal{Q}_e$ and can be identified as the product of a fixed electric potential μ_{BH} and a fluctuating electric charge \mathcal{Q}_e . Thus, the first law of generalized entropy (4.32) with a quantum Maxwell field appropriately recovers the expected ‘grand canonical’ thermodynamic first law of electrically charged black holes with the appearance of a $\delta\langle H_\xi^{\mathcal{M},\text{Max}} \rangle = -\mu_{\text{BH}} \delta\langle \mathcal{Q}_e \rangle$ term. Obviously, the Maxwell contribution to the asymptotic energy, in particular the Noether charge $\mathbf{Q}_\xi|_{\mathcal{R}}$, is crucial to this result. For the fixed charge density boundary conditions, one must include an extra boundary action $\int_{\mathcal{M}} \mathbf{L}^{\mathcal{M},\text{Max}}$ so that the variational problem in \mathbf{A} is well-defined in the sense described around (2.8). It is found, in this case, that the two terms in the Maxwell part $H_\xi^{\mathcal{M},\text{Max}} = \int_{\mathcal{R}} (\mathbf{Q}_\xi^{\text{Max}} + \xi \cdot \mathbf{L}^{\mathcal{M},\text{Max}})$ of asymptotic energy, though each nonvanishing, exactly cancel each other. Thus, the expected ‘canonical’ thermodynamic first law is recovered with the absence of a charge variation term. These examples demonstrate the importance of matter contributions to both the Noether charge and boundary Lagrangian terms of the asymptotic energy (4.34).

Let us conclude by pointing out some directions for future work. Firstly, as already mentioned above, it would be interesting to carefully work out the details of gauge-fixing in relation to our Callan-Wilczek-like generalized entropy formula (2.44), including ghost fields and working with a gauge-invariant (*e.g.* Vilkovisky-DeWitt) effective action. The hope is that (2.44) might give a clean way to define generalized entropy for arbitrary regions in gauge theories.

Another area that lacks in clarity relates to the path integration measure for the quantum matter and how its variation might contribute to our calculations. In appendix E, we have sketched out how we expect these contributions to correct quantities encountered in this paper which have so far, in the main text, been naively obtained only from considerations of the action. We then argued that, while quantities like the matter stress tensor

might be corrected by variations of the path integration measure, the generalized first law result (4.32) is still expected to hold with the corrected quantities. It may be worthwhile to verify the admittedly abstract claims made in our appendix E by explicit calculation in some simple examples.

Finally, one can try to extend our calculation of the variation of generalized entropy to higher orders in perturbations, along the lines of [38]. In that paper, it was shown, for a classical bulk in holography, that second order gravitational equations about the vacuum can be derived by comparing the second variations of Wald-Dong entropy and asymptotic energy with the second variation of relative entropy in the CFT. To lift these results to the semiclassical level, one would need to evaluate the second variation of the bulk von Neumann entropy which, in turn, seems to require one to know how the bulk modular Hamiltonian varies away from thermal setups (specifically, the vacuum in the considerations of [38]). For perturbations that can be easily described by a deformation of the path integral preparation in the Euclidean past, the results in our appendix B might be useful. We derive there the instantaneous generator for time evolution on time-dependent backgrounds and write the modular Hamiltonian for states prepared on such backgrounds as the logarithm of a path-ordered exponential. (As in the time-independent case, we find that the instantaneous time evolution generator does not generally correspond to components of the gravitational stress tensor, contrary to previous work [31].) With this, one may be able to evaluate the second variation of bulk von Neumann entropy for perturbations corresponding to background variations in the Euclidean past, *e.g.* perturbations to the boundary conditions set by background field asymptotics at the Euclidean spacetime boundary corresponding to turning on CFT sources.

Acknowledgments

The author would like to thank Robert Myers for his comments and invaluable discussion on the drafts of this paper. Research at Perimeter Institute is supported in part by the Government of Canada through the Department of Innovation, Science, and Economic Development Canada and by the Province of Ontario through the Ministry of Colleges and Universities. The author is also supported by the Natural Sciences and Engineering Research Council of Canada through a Doctoral Canadian Graduate Scholarship. The author's attendance at various workshops and meetings were supported by the It-from-Qubit collaboration.

A Effective actions and entropy

In this appendix, we first review the basic relationship between connected generating functionals and effective actions in quantum field theory. This material can be found in standard quantum field theory texts, *e.g.* in sections 11.3 and 11.4 of [39], but we review it here to make our discussion self-contained. Then, we will describe how the standard holographic calculation of bulk generalized entropy, involving quantum gravity partition functions, relates to our Callan-Wilczek form (2.44) of generalized entropy computed using the effective

action. A reference which makes use effective actions, in the context of holographic entropy calculations is [9], though they are perhaps less explicit about this — see their first paragraph of section 4.1. We will aim to be more explicit and comment on connections to [9] as we proceed. Having everything setup in the end, as a brief aside, we present a parallel calculation to [9], deriving the quantum extremality of bulk entangling surfaces in holography, using our Callan-Wilczek equation (2.44). As elsewhere in this paper, we do not treat the particulars of gauge-fixing so our calculations involving gravitons are somewhat formal in this sense. A far more sophisticated discussion of how one can obtain field-reparametrization-invariant and gauge-invariant effective actions can be found in [36, 37]; for simplicity, we shall focus our discussion on the naive effective action introduced in standard QFT and leave issues of gauge-fixing to be examined in future work.

Let us consider a quantum field theory with a quantum field h on a background g , with an action $I^{\text{QG}}[g+h]$. As suggested by notation, the background metric and graviton in the main text of this paper take the roles of g and h . Other background fields ϕ and quantum fields ψ will be omitted in the present discussion for simplicity. They merely go along for the ride as extra path integrated fields $[d\psi]$ and extra arguments $\phi+\psi$ for the action. (We will not introduce bulk sources or Legendre transform these other fields, as we do for g and h below.) Further, the action $I^{\text{QG}}[g+h]$ should be distinguished from the semiclassical action $I[g,h]$ to be introduced below and used throughout this paper, starting in (2.1). If g and h are metric and graviton fields, then the meaning of the superscript on the action I^{QG} is that a path integral with this action gives expectation values $\langle \bullet \rangle^{\text{QG}}$ in the quantum gravity theory, at least symbolically.

Introducing a bulk source \mathbf{t} for the field $g+h$, the connected generating functional $E[\mathbf{t}]$ is given by

$$E[\mathbf{t}] \equiv -\log \int [dh] e^{-I^{\text{QG}}[g+h] - \frac{1}{2} \int \mathbf{t} \cdot (g+h)} . \quad (\text{A.1})$$

While $E[0]$ gives the partition function of the quantum gravity theory, the derivatives of $E[\mathbf{t}]$, of course, give the connected correlation functions of $g+h$. In particular, the one-point function is given by the first derivative:

$$2 \frac{\delta E[\mathbf{t}]}{\delta \mathbf{t}} = g + \langle h \rangle_{\mathbf{t}}^{\text{QG}} , \quad (\text{A.2})$$

where $\langle \bullet \rangle_{\mathbf{t}}^{\text{QG}}$ denotes the expectation value in the presence of the source \mathbf{t} . Due to the path-integration over h , $E[\mathbf{t}]$ is in fact independent of the bulk profile of the background g (though it can depend on the boundary conditions of $g+h$ at the spacetime boundary \mathcal{M} which may be implicitly specified by g).

The connected generating functional and effective action are related by a Legendre transformation. To describe this, it is helpful to define $\mathbf{t}[g]$ as the particular choice of the source \mathbf{t} such that g fully captures the expectation value of the complete field $g+h$, that is,

$$g + \langle h \rangle_{\mathbf{t}[g]}^{\text{QG}} \equiv g , \quad \text{i.e.} , \quad \langle h \rangle_{\mathbf{t}[g]}^{\text{QG}} = 0 , \quad (\text{A.3})$$

or equivalently, from (A.2),

$$2 \frac{\delta E[\mathbf{t}]}{\delta \mathbf{t}} \Big|_{\mathbf{t}[g]} = g . \quad (\text{A.4})$$

The effective action $W[g]$ is then given by⁶²

$$W[g] \equiv E[\mathbf{t}[g]] - \frac{1}{2} \int \mathbf{t}[g] \cdot g \quad (\text{A.5})$$

$$= -\log \int [dh] e^{-I^{\text{QG}}[g+h] - \frac{1}{2} \int \mathbf{t}[g] \cdot h} . \quad (\text{A.6})$$

In [9] — see the first paragraph of section 4.1 therein — the analogue⁶³ of our $\frac{1}{2}\mathbf{t}[g]$ would be called $-\epsilon T^{\text{bkg}}[g]$, and by defining the log of the partition function “off-shell”, they mean calculate the effective action $W[g]$ — see footnote 10 in [9]. While higher derivatives of $W[g]$ give one-particle-irreducible (1PI) correlation functions⁶⁴, the first derivative returns the source $\mathbf{t}[g]$, as can be seen from (A.4) and (A.5):

$$-2 \frac{\delta W[g]}{\delta g} = \mathbf{t}[g] \quad (\delta g \text{ away from } \mathcal{M}) . \quad (\text{A.7})$$

Setting the RHS of this equation to zero gives the quantum analogue of an equation of motion

$$-2 \frac{\delta W[g]}{\delta g} = \mathbf{t}[g] = 0 \quad (\delta g \text{ away from } \mathcal{M}, g \text{ on-shell}) \quad (\text{A.8})$$

with the meaning that a background profile g satisfying this equation fully captures the expectation value of the total field $g + h$ in the absence a source \mathbf{t} :

$$g + \langle h \rangle^{\text{QG}} = g , \quad i.e. , \quad \langle h \rangle^{\text{QG}} = 0 . \quad (g \text{ on-shell}) \quad (\text{A.9})$$

The on-shell condition (A.8) is precisely that written in (2.9). In fact, it is not difficult to see by definition (A.5) that (A.7) and the on-shell condition (A.8) are respectively equivalent

⁶²To give a brief description of Vilkovisky and de Witt’s field-reparametrization-invariant and gauge-invariant effective action [36, 37], the rough idea is as follows. Firstly, one must gauge-fix the path integral (in the usual way, introducing ghost fields) using “mean-field gauge conditions”, which vary as one applies gauge transformations to the background field. Further, one must work covariantly in the space of field configurations. Instead of sourcing the ‘difference of coordinates’ h between the points g and $g + h$ in the defining equation (A.6) for the effective action, one should instead consider the ‘geodesic distance’ between g and $g + h$ in the space of metric configurations; the source for this geodesic distance is then chosen to set the expectation value of the distance to zero.

⁶³The relative factor of $\frac{1}{2}$ comes from the fact that [9] doesn’t seem to use the conventional normalization (2.11) for stress tensors, while we have normalized \mathbf{t} so that its appearance in (A.7) is similar to a conventional stress tensor. Note also that they are sourcing fluctuations in the *inverse* metric, whereas our graviton h_{ab} gives fluctuations in the metric, so the comparison between our $\frac{1}{2}\mathbf{t}^{ab}[g]$ and their $-\epsilon (T^{\text{bkg}}[g])_{ab}$ is not exact.

⁶⁴For this reason, (A.5) is also known as the 1PI generating function in QFT. Note, however, that the more sophisticated Vilkovisky-DeWitt effective action mentioned in footnote 62 is not a 1PI generating functional [40].

to

$$-2\delta_g W[g] = \int \mathbf{t}[g] \cdot \delta g \quad (\delta g \text{ preserving b.c.}) \quad (\text{A.10})$$

$$= 0 \quad (\delta g \text{ preserving b.c., } g \text{ on-shell}) \quad (\text{A.11})$$

for all δg that preserve the boundary conditions at the spacetime boundary \mathcal{M} , *i.e.* can be absorbed as a shift in the path-integration variable h , but need not have compact support localized in the spacetime interior.

Throughout the majority of this paper, we have found it useful to think of $W[g]$ as simply giving the logarithm of the partition function in a local “semiclassical” theory of a quantum matter field h propagating on a classical background g . That is, we would like to think of the combination $I^{\text{QG}}[g+h] + \frac{1}{2} \int \mathbf{t}[g] \cdot h$ appearing in (A.6) as itself an action $I[g, h]$ local in g and h . (We will clarify what “semiclassical” means below (A.16).) But in general, $\mathbf{t}[g]$ is not local in g — from its definition (A.3), we see that $\frac{1}{2} \mathbf{t}[g]$ is precisely the sum of all amputated h tadpoles. However, this is local at leading loop order:

$$\mathbf{t}[g] = -2 \frac{\delta I^{\text{QG}}[g]}{\delta g} + O(G_{\text{N}}^0), \quad (\text{A.12})$$

where we have supposed that I^{QG} contains a constant prefactor $1/G_{\text{N}}$ such that loop expansion becomes synonymous with expanding⁶⁵ in G_{N} . Thus, if we are merely interested in evaluating (A.6) to one-loop order, that is, to order G_{N}^0 , we may throw out the nonlocal loop contributions to $\mathbf{t}[g]$, keeping only the local leading piece (A.12). The semiclassical action $I[g, h]$ can then be taken to be the zeroth-order and quadratic terms of $I^{\text{QG}}[g+h]$ expanded in h :

$$I[g, h] = I^{\text{QG}}[g] + \frac{1}{2} \iint h \cdot \frac{\delta^2 I^{\text{QG}}[g]}{\delta g^2} \cdot h \quad (\text{A.13})$$

Terms of higher power in h can be dropped as they would only contribute to the effective action (A.6) at order G_{N} and higher. Now, we have

$$W[g] = -\log \int [dh] e^{-I[g, h]} + O(G_{\text{N}}), \quad (\text{A.14})$$

where, by construction, $I[g, h]$ is local in g and h . This allows for the second interpretation of $W[g]$, as the logarithm of a partition function in a semiclassical theory with action I .

To connect further with the notation used in the main text from (2.1) onward, in the gravitational case, we can categorize the terms in (A.13) as:

$$I^{\text{grav}}[g] = I^{\text{QG}}[g] \quad (\text{A.15})$$

$$I^{\text{mat}}[g, h] = \frac{1}{2} \iint h \cdot \frac{\delta^2 I^{\text{QG}}[g]}{\delta g^2} \cdot h, \quad (\text{A.16})$$

⁶⁵Obviously, for the gravitational case, G_{N} is Newton’s constant. In the main text, where we consider additional matter fields $\phi + \psi$, we do not assume that their parts of the action contain factors of $1/G_{\text{N}}$. Then, the simple correspondence between expanding in G_{N} and in loops is lost; nonetheless, we will say “ n -loops-in- G_{N} ” to mean an order in G_{N} that would correspond to n -loop-order had the theory only contained g and h fields.

with the action of any extra matter fields $\phi + \psi$, if present, also added to I^{mat} . Thus, the graviton contributes to the matter stress tensor in the semiclassical theory, as described below (2.12). Indeed, the on-shell condition (A.8) for the background g now takes the expected semiclassical form (2.9) of an equality between a classical (higher-derivative equivalent of an) Einstein tensor $(E_g^{\text{grav}})^{ab}$ and a quantum matter stress tensor $\langle T^{ab} \rangle$.

In the main text, the locality of the action $I[g, h]$ in this semiclassical theory is useful because it permits the application of Iyer-Wald formalism when performing entropy calculations⁶⁶. While the original action $I^{\text{QG}}[g + h]$ was also local in the first place, the benefit of performing the Legendre transform (A.5) to obtain the effective action when doing entropy calculations is twofold. Firstly, one can much more concretely define a generalized entropy across an arbitrary entangling surface σ in an arbitrary background via (2.44). In contrast, as mentioned below (A.2), the (bulk profile of the) background is meaningless in the quantum gravity partition function $E[0]$. For instance, evaluating the partition function on the replicated background $g_{\tilde{\times}n}$ will give an answer independent of σ — the graviton path integral effectively erases any signature of σ , for example, invariably setting $\langle g_{\tilde{\times}n} + h \rangle^{\text{QG}}$ to a smooth on-shell configuration independent of σ . For this reason, [9] found it necessary to work with the effective action when deriving the quantum extremality of σ — we briefly review this further below as an aside. For the main text of this paper, however, the primary motivation behind working with the generating functional $W[g]$ is that it provides a nontrivial equation of motion for the metric (A.8), or expressed in the semiclassical formulation, (2.9). As we find in (4.36), linearized equations of motion for the metric enter as sufficient conditions for the first law of generalized entropy. Moreover, as written in (4.37), the first law implies the integral of certain components of the linearized equations vanishes; as mentioned there, this can be strengthened in certain maximally-symmetric setups to even locally set all components of the linearized equations to zero. This is a nontrivial result regarding how an information-theoretic statement and gravitational dynamics are mutually dependent.

Having listed some advantages of working with the effective action $W[g]$, we should however be mindful that, while the original quantum gravity theory, with action I^{QG} , and resulting modified theory, with action $I^{\text{QG}} + \frac{1}{2} \int \mathbf{t}[g] \cdot h$ which semiclassically becomes I , are related, they are not in general the same. For example, the expectation values $\langle \bullet \rangle^{\text{QG}}$ and $\langle \bullet \rangle$, computed respectively with these actions can differ, with the two related by $\langle \bullet \rangle = \langle \bullet \rangle_{\mathbf{t}[g]}^{\text{QG}}$. (Throughout the main text, we have referred almost exclusively to the latter expectation values calculated semiclassically — see (2.14).) This is the case if g is taken off-shell: while $\langle h \rangle^{\text{QG}}$ will take whatever value required to put the combination $g + \langle h \rangle^{\text{QG}}$ back on-shell, we will always invariably have $\langle h \rangle = 0$ — recall, by definition (A.3), the role of the source $\mathbf{t}[g]$ is precisely to ensure this. If, however, g is on-shell (A.8), then the vanishing of $\mathbf{t}[g]$

⁶⁶It is conceivable that one can find a way to work with the full nonlocal action $I^{\text{QG}}[g + h] + \frac{1}{2} \int \mathbf{t}[g] \cdot h$ appearing in the exact effective action $W[g]$ in (A.6), leveraging the fact that the nonlocal $\mathbf{t}[g]$ multiplies h , whose one-point function vanishes by the definition (A.3) of the source $\mathbf{t}[g]$. One can argue, for instance in calculations involving the first variation of the effective action $W^{\text{mat}}[g]$, the variation of the term $\frac{1}{2} \int \mathbf{t}[g] \cdot h$ does not contribute since it involves $\langle h \rangle_{\mathbf{t}[g]}^{\text{QG}} = 0$.

implies we can exactly take

$$I[g, h] = I^{\text{QG}}[g + h] \quad (g \text{ on-shell}) \quad (\text{A.17})$$

so that, for any operator \mathcal{O} ,

$$\langle \mathcal{O} \rangle^{\text{QG}} = \langle \mathcal{O} \rangle . \quad (g \text{ on-shell}) \quad (\text{A.18})$$

Furthermore, the connected generating functional and effective action will also agree:

$$E[0] = W[g] . \quad (g \text{ on-shell}) \quad (\text{A.19})$$

Given that, when g is taken off-shell, the semiclassical theory departs from the original quantum gravity theory we started out with, one might worry that the generalized entropy calculated in the former might be of little relevance in the context of the latter, especially since the $g_{\tilde{\chi}n}$ appearing in our generalized entropy formula (2.44) is clearly off-shell at $n \neq 1$. However, we shall argue that the generalized entropy calculated using the effective action W with (2.44) is precisely equivalent to the more standard entropy calculation in holography involving quantum gravity partition functions, which we now review⁶⁷.

Let us begin with some notation on the CFT side. We shall consider a CFT state ρ of the spacetime boundary region \mathcal{R} with boundary $\partial\mathcal{R} = \varsigma$. Further, we suppose that ρ is prepared by an appropriately normalized Euclidean path-integral over the boundary manifold \mathcal{M} with cuts on \mathcal{R} — for example, see Figure 1a, though there, it appears ς is empty or otherwise at infinity in the suppressed spatial directions. It is useful to also consider the unnormalized state

$$\hat{\rho} = \text{tr}(\hat{\rho})\rho \quad (\text{A.20})$$

obtained from the unnormalized path-integral. For instance, the CFT partition function on \mathcal{M} is given by $\text{tr} \hat{\rho}$. According to the replica trick (reviewed for the bulk state $\hat{\rho}^{\text{mat}}$ below (2.23)) higher moments $\text{tr} \hat{\rho}^n$ correspond to path integrals, *i.e.* partition functions, on n replicas of \mathcal{M} . These replicas are ‘branch’-stitched together along \mathcal{R} , but one should exclude any curvature singularities produced on ς — for later use, let us call the resulting manifold \mathcal{M}_n . (In the notation introduced above (2.24), $\mathcal{M}_n = \mathcal{M}_{\tilde{\chi}n}$.) To calculate the entropy of the state ρ , we can then apply (2.23), now to the boundary state:

$$S[\rho] = -\partial_n (\log \text{tr} \rho^n)_{n=1} = \partial_n (-\log \text{tr} \hat{\rho}^n + n \log \text{tr} \hat{\rho})_{n=1} . \quad (\text{A.21})$$

Holography equates the CFT partition function $\text{tr} \hat{\rho}^n$ on \mathcal{M}_n to the bulk quantum gravity partition function in an asymptotically-AdS spacetime with boundary \mathcal{M}_n , thus allowing (A.21) to be transformed into a bulk calculation. In particular, (again, focusing on just the gravitational fields g and h for simplicity) the holographic dictionary states that

$$-\log \text{tr} \hat{\rho}^n = E_n \equiv -\log \int [dh] e^{-I^{\text{QG}}[g_n+h]} , \quad (\text{A.22})$$

⁶⁷The discussion after this point is independent of having a local semiclassical theory, so there is no need to loop-expand W . Our goal will simply be to relate the holographic entropy calculation to (2.44), which can be taken to be our definition of generalized entropy in terms of the exact effective action W .

where g_n is any bulk background with boundary \mathcal{M}_n — note that the bulk partition function E_n is simply the connected generating functional $E[0]$ with sources turned off and evaluated on g_n . As noted below (A.2), the bulk profile of g_n in path integrals of the form (A.22) is immaterial due to the path integration over h (but we will make a choice for g_n momentarily). We therefore have, upon combining (A.21) and (A.22):

$$S[\rho] = \partial_n (E_n - nE_1)_{n=1} . \quad (\text{A.23})$$

We can now state our question concretely: can (A.23) be equated with our Callan-Wilczek formula (2.44) for generalized entropy across some entangling surface σ on some background g ? After all, (A.23) and (2.44) are tantalizingly similar, save for the use of E_n versus $W[g_{\tilde{x}_n}]$.

Given that the connected generating functional and effective action can be equated as in (A.19) if the background is put on-shell, it is natural now to make the definitive choice for g_n to be on-shell:

$$\delta_g W[g]|_{g=g_n} \equiv 0 , \quad (\delta g \text{ preserving b.c.}) \quad (\text{A.24})$$

for then

$$E_n = W[g_n] . \quad (\text{A.25})$$

But this still does not quite get us from (A.23) to the form of (2.44), but rather

$$S[\rho] = \partial_n (W[g_n] - nW[g_1])_{n=1} . \quad (\text{A.26})$$

It is this formula that [9] works mostly with — in particular, the “ \hat{I}_n ” introduced there in (4.1), and used to express generalized entropy by (4.3) and (4.4), is what we would call $W[g_n]/n$. Though (A.26) does not explicitly feature an entangling surface σ , as we soon review below, one is implicitly specified by the sequence of metrics g_n . By considering transformations δg_n of g_n which continue to diffeomorphisms δg_1 on g_1 , [9] go on to argue that generalized entropy is extremized by σ , *i.e.* σ is quantum extremal. With the exception of $n = 1$, the δg_n perturbations are generally off-shell, and it is ultimately the extremality of $W[g_n]$ that results in the quantum extremality of σ .

Our present goal, however, is to go from (A.26) to the Callan-Wilczek form (2.44) of generalized entropy which explicitly displays the entangling surface. Comparing the second terms of (A.26) and (2.44), we see that we should aim for a generalized entropy evaluated on the background g_1 . We now choose the entangling surface on g_1 as follows: for each integer $n \geq 2$, we expect the on-shell background g_n to share the \mathbb{Z}_n -symmetry of the boundary \mathcal{M}_n and thus possess a codimension-two surface σ_n that is fixed by this symmetry; we then suppose that this sequence of surfaces σ_n can be continued to give a well-defined surface σ_1 on g_1 — it is this surface that we will take to be the entangling surface σ appearing in the generalized entropy formula (2.44). With this, we can write down the difference between the entropy $S[\rho]$ written in (A.26) and the generalized entropy $S_{\sigma_1}^{\text{gen}}[g_1]$ given by (2.44),

$$S[\rho] - S_{\sigma_1}^{\text{gen}}[g_1] = \partial_n \left(W[g_n] - W[g_1|_{\tilde{x}_n}] \right)_{n=1} , \quad (\text{A.27})$$

with the aim to argue that this vanishes. For this purpose, it is helpful to recall the notation $\bullet_{\tilde{\sigma}n}$ introduced below (2.28) for the inverse operation to $\bullet_{\tilde{\sigma}n}$. Making use of this, (A.27) can be shown to vanish

$$S[\rho] - S_{\sigma_1}^{\text{gen}}[g_1] = (\partial_m + \partial_n) \left(W[g_{n\tilde{\sigma}_n n\tilde{\sigma}_n m}] - W[g_{1\tilde{\sigma}_1 m}] \right)_{\substack{m=1 \\ n=1}} \quad (\text{A.28})$$

$$= \partial_n W[g_{n\tilde{\sigma}_n n}] \Big|_{n=1} \quad (\text{A.29})$$

$$= 0, \quad (\text{A.30})$$

where, in the last equality, the on-shell condition (A.24) for g_1 was applied. We thus have the desired equivalence between the usual starting point (A.23) for holographically deriving generalized entropy, featuring the quantum gravity partition function, and our Callan-Wilczek equation (2.44) which involves the effective action W and explicitly displays the entangling surface.

Finally, as an aside, we conclude this appendix with a parallel calculation to [9], showing that σ_1 extremizes our Callan-Wilczek form (2.44) of generalized entropy $S_{\sigma_1}^{\text{gen}}[g_1]$. As in [9], let us consider perturbing the metric g_1 by a diffeomorphism $\delta g[\delta\sigma]$ which captures the effect of an arbitrary perturbation $\delta\sigma$ of the entangling surface away from σ_1 — that is, fixing the coordinate location of $\sigma = \sigma_1$ while perturbing the metric by $\delta g[\delta\sigma]$ is equivalent to perturbing the entangling surface by $\delta\sigma$ (while fixing the metric $g = g_1$)⁶⁸. Now, we simply evaluate the variation of (2.44):

$$\int_{\sigma} \delta\sigma \cdot \frac{\delta S_{\sigma}^{\text{gen}}[g_1]}{\delta\sigma} \Big|_{\sigma=\sigma_1} = \int \delta g[\delta\sigma] \cdot \left(\partial_n \frac{\delta W[g_{\tilde{\sigma}_1 n}]}{\delta g} \right)_{\substack{g=g_1 \\ n=1}} \quad (\text{A.31})$$

$$= \int \delta g[\delta\sigma] \cdot \left[\partial_n \left(\frac{\delta W[g_{\tilde{\sigma}_n n}]}{\delta g} \right)_{g=g_{n\tilde{\sigma}_n n}} \right]_{n=1} \quad (\text{A.32})$$

$$= 0, \quad (\text{A.33})$$

where, in the latter two equalities, we have made use of the on-shell condition (A.24) for g_n , in particular, (A.30) and

$$\frac{\delta W[g_{\tilde{\sigma}_n n}]}{\delta g} \Big|_{g=g_{n\tilde{\sigma}_n n}} = 0. \quad (\delta g \text{ away from } \mathcal{M}) \quad (\text{A.34})$$

Thus, we conclude that σ_1 is indeed quantum extremal in that it extremizes our Callan-Wilczek form (2.44) of generalized entropy.

⁶⁸Note that, since our generalized entropy equation (2.44) involves only g_1 , there is no need to extend δg to $g_{n \neq 1}$ as was done in [9]. However, it will still be useful in the following calculation to consider the on-shell metrics g_n .

B Evolution on time-dependent backgrounds

We saw in section 3.3 that, for a thermal state produced by evolution on background fields (g, ϕ) which are symmetric under rotations in thermal time τ generated by $\xi = \partial_\tau$, the matter modular Hamiltonian is given by the integral of a Noether current plus a boundary term, as written in (3.35). This operator then must generate evolution in time: for any pure states $|\Psi_0\rangle$ and $\langle\Psi_2|$ on slices of constant time, we have

$$\begin{aligned} \left\langle \Psi_2 \left| e^{(\tau_2 - \tau_0)(\int_\Sigma \mathbf{J}_\xi^{\text{mat}} + \int_{\mathcal{R}} \xi \cdot \mathbf{L}^{\mathcal{M}, \text{mat}})} \right| \Psi_0 \right\rangle &= \int_{|\Psi_0\rangle}^{\langle\Psi_2|} [dh, d\psi] e^{-I_{[\tau_0, \tau_2]}^{\text{mat}}} , \\ &(\mathcal{L}_\xi g = 0, \mathcal{L}_\xi \phi = 0) \end{aligned} \quad (\text{B.1})$$

where on the LHS, ξ -symmetry has allowed us to consider, without loss of generality, the initial slice Σ at $\tau = 0$; on the RHS, $I_{[\tau_0, \tau_2]}^{\text{mat}}$ denotes the action (to be dissected further below) in the spacetime interval $[\tau_0, \tau_2]$ over which the path integral is evaluated, with the states $|\Psi_0\rangle$ and $\langle\Psi_2|$ giving boundary conditions on the τ_0 and τ_2 surfaces respectively. (We intend on reserving the symbol τ_1 for another time between τ_0 and τ_2 , as discussed below. We shall work in Euclidean signature until the very end of this appendix, but a straightforward generalization to Lorentzian signature is possible.)

Our goal in this appendix will be to find the generalization to (B.1) in the case where the background fields g and ϕ are not necessarily symmetric with respect to rotations in thermal time generated by ξ . We will still take $\xi = \partial_\tau$ to be a vector field generating rotations in a ‘thermal time’ coordinate τ around a codimension-two surface σ — see Figure 1a — but the background fields will no longer be required to be symmetric under this rotation⁶⁹. (We will continue to take τ near σ such that it parametrizes proper angles around σ .) The general idea behind our calculations will be to identify the instantaneous generator $-\int_\tau \mathbf{H}_\xi^{\text{mat}} - \int_{\tau \cap \mathcal{M}} \mathbf{H}_\xi^{\mathcal{M}, \text{mat}}$ (here, τ being shorthand for a constant τ surface) for time evolution that satisfies

$$\left\langle \Psi_2 \left| \mathcal{T} e^{\int_{\tau_0}^{\tau_2} d\tau (\int_\tau \mathbf{H}_\xi^{\text{mat}} + \int_{\tau \cap \mathcal{M}} \mathbf{H}_\xi^{\mathcal{M}, \text{mat}})} \right| \Psi_0 \right\rangle = \int_{|\Psi_0\rangle}^{\langle\Psi_2|} [dh, d\psi] e^{-I_{[\tau_0, \tau_2]}^{\text{mat}}} , \quad (\text{B.2})$$

where \mathcal{T} indicates time-ordering. (One may recognize some resemblance of $\mathbf{H}_\xi^{\text{mat}}$ with the symbol $\tilde{\mathbf{H}}_\xi^{\text{mat}}$ from (4.22) in section 4.3 — indeed, we shall find that (4.22) gives part of the correct expression for $\mathbf{H}_\xi^{\text{mat}}$.) This will subsequently lead us to an expression for the modular Hamiltonian of states prepared on arbitrary backgrounds. Restricting our results to the ξ -symmetric case offers a consistency check of (B.1) and our derivation of the thermal modular Hamiltonian in section 3.

Before proceeding however, we should discuss precisely what is meant by the action $I_{[\tau_0, \tau_2]}^{\text{mat}}$. In addition to the bulk and spacetime boundary elements seen in (2.2), we must

⁶⁹Note that, for a given background and σ , one can generally have many possible choices of ξ , which correspond to different coordinatizations of the spacetime.

further introduce here additional Gibbons-Hawking-like contributions⁷⁰ to the action on the time slices τ_0 and τ_2 bounding the path integration spacetime region, where we fix the quantum field configurations according to the states $|\Psi_0\rangle$ and $\langle\Psi_2|$. Furthermore, we will also allow for the presence of “joint” terms at the corners $\tau_0 \cap \mathcal{M}$ and $\tau_2 \cap \mathcal{M}$ (here, and elsewhere when easily understood, we will use τ as shorthand for a constant τ surface). In all⁷¹,

$$I_{[\tau_0, \tau_2]}^{\text{mat}} = \int_{[\tau_0, \tau_2]} \mathbf{L}^{\text{mat}} + \left(\int_{\tau_2} - \int_{\tau_0} \right) \mathbf{L}^{\text{GH,mat}} + \left(\int_{\tau_2 \cap \mathcal{M}} - \int_{\tau_0 \cap \mathcal{M}} \right) \mathbf{L}^{\text{jt,mat}} + \int_{\partial[\tau_0, \tau_2] \cap \mathcal{M}} \mathbf{L}^{\mathcal{M}, \text{mat}}. \quad (\text{B.3})$$

Similar to $\mathbf{L}^{\mathcal{M}, \text{mat}}$, whose role is described around (2.8), the Gibbons-Hawking-like contribution $\mathbf{L}^{\text{GH,mat}}$ is required to allow the fixing of field configurations on codimension-1 surfaces to be consistent with a well-defined variational principle — namely, that the variation of the action, among the set of quantum field configurations permitted by boundary conditions, is given solely by bulk equations of motion. This is achieved by the identity⁷²

$$\theta[\delta h, \delta \psi]|_{\Xi} = -(\delta h + \delta \psi) \mathbf{L}^{\text{GH,mat}}|_{\Xi}. \quad (\text{codim.-1 surfaces } \Xi \text{ where } \delta h, \delta \psi = 0) \quad (\text{B.4})$$

This is analogous to (2.8)⁷³. (Indeed, as mentioned below (2.8), one expects Gibbons-Hawking-like terms to be included in $\mathbf{L}^{\mathcal{M}}$; as described there, the $\mathbf{L}^{\mathcal{M}}$ typically requires even more terms to implement (2.8) at the spacetime boundary.) The Gibbons-Hawking-like terms are supplemented here by the joint terms $\mathbf{L}^{\text{jt,mat}}$ where the bounding surface turns sharply at the spacetime boundary. Typically, joint terms are obtained simply from Gibbons-Hawking like terms in the limit where the surface acquires a sharp edge, *i.e.* “joint”, between two faces [42]; on the spacetime boundary, it may be that the contents of $\mathbf{L}^{\text{jt,mat}}$ are more complicated, just as $\mathbf{L}^{\mathcal{M}, \text{mat}}$ can contain more terms than $\mathbf{L}^{\text{GH,mat}}$. At any rate,

⁷⁰For Einstein gravity, one starts out with the usual Gibbons Hawking [41] Lagrangian density $-\frac{1}{8\pi G_N} n \cdot \epsilon \kappa$ on codimension-1 surfaces, where n and κ are the unit normal vector and trace of the extrinsic curvature (in the n direction) of the surface. To Legendre transform to the semiclassical theory, as described in appendix A, one should keep as part of $\mathbf{L}^{\text{GH,mat}}$ any terms in $-\frac{1}{8\pi G_N} (n \cdot \epsilon \kappa)[g + h]$ quadratic in h . More generally, one can expect contributions to $\mathbf{L}^{\text{GH,mat}}$ whenever the bulk matter action I^{mat} includes higher-than-first derivatives of matter fields.

⁷¹It will be convenient in later discussions to suppose that the joint terms $\mathbf{L}^{\text{jt,mat}}$ are chosen so that, when evaluating the norm of a state $|\Psi_0\rangle = |\Psi_2\rangle$ by taking the $\tau_0 \rightarrow \tau_2$ limit of (B.2), the joint terms vanish.

⁷²Suppose one views the difference of $\int_{\Xi} \mathbf{L}^{\text{GH}}$ on either side of a codimension-one surface Ξ as giving the bulk Lagrangian \mathbf{L} integrated across a thin shell (*i.e.* a neighbourhood) around Ξ , across which fields are smoothed. (This is easily seen in the example of Einstein gravity.) Then, (B.4) can be thought of as a consequence of considering the effect of field perturbations, which have support on one side of Ξ , on the bulk Lagrangian in the shell.

⁷³In (2.8), we considered also variations in the background fields (g, ϕ) essentially arguing that relations for these follow from those of the quantum fields (h, ψ) since ϕ and, prior to the Legendre transformation of the gravitational fields described in appendix A, g merely shift ψ and h . In this appendix, we will have no need to consider the analogue of (B.4) for background field variations (though we expect it to hold, if (g, ϕ) do indeed just shift (h, ψ) prior to the Legendre transformation) and consider (g, ϕ) simply as nondynamical fields on which the action I^{mat} depends.

analogous to (2.8) and (B.4), for any δh and $\delta\psi$ that preserve boundary conditions on \mathcal{M} and vanish on a codimension-one surface Ξ (e.g. a constant time surface) that intersects \mathcal{M} at a joint $\Xi \cap \mathcal{M}$, we expect the variation $(\delta h + \delta\psi)\mathbf{L}^{\text{jt,mat}}|_{\Xi \cap \mathcal{M}}$ to cancel against any localized contributions that $\theta[\delta h, \delta\psi]$ might produce at the joint when integrated across it from Ξ to \mathcal{M} . We will not speculate further on the precise forms of $\mathbf{L}^{\text{GH,mat}}$, $\mathbf{L}^{\text{jt,mat}}$, and $\mathbf{L}^{\mathcal{M},\text{mat}}$ as they mostly just get carried along in the following calculations.

One should note in (B.3), however, the absence⁷⁴ of a joint term at the entangling surface, or equivalently, a Gibbons-Hawking-like term on an infinitesimal surface $\partial\mathcal{N}_0(\sigma) \cap [\tau_1, \tau_2]$ cutting off a zero-sized neighbourhood $\mathcal{N}_0(\sigma)$ of σ from the remainder of the space-time region $[\tau_0, \tau_2]$. Instead, we shall impose, as an additional boundary condition at σ , that the set of configurations for the quantum fields permitted in the path integral (B.2) be smooth and not conically-singular with respect to the prescribed angle $\tau_2 - \tau_0$ between the τ_0 and τ_2 surfaces, *i.e.* they behave near σ as expected for smooth tensor fields restricted to a corner region with opening angle $\tau_2 - \tau_0$. *E.g.* graviton fluctuations h are limited to those which preserve this proper angle.

We are now ready to proceed with our calculations to determine the $\mathbf{H}_\xi^{\text{mat}}$ and $\mathbf{H}_\xi^{\mathcal{M},\text{mat}}$ appearing in (B.2). We will follow [31] closely, though we will point out the terms missed by the authors there which led to the misidentification of the modular Hamiltonian as the integral of stress tensor components. The idea will be to differentiate the RHS of (B.2) in τ_2 in order to identify $\int_{\tau_2} \mathbf{H}_\xi^{\text{mat}} + \int_{\tau_2 \cap \mathcal{M}} \mathbf{H}_\xi^{\mathcal{M},\text{mat}}$ as the resulting extra insertion in

$$\begin{aligned} \partial_{\tau_2} \left\langle \Psi_2 \left| \mathcal{T} e^{\int_{\tau_0}^{\tau_2} d\tau (\int_{\tau} \mathbf{H}_\xi^{\text{mat}} + \int_{\tau \cap \mathcal{M}} \mathbf{H}_\xi^{\mathcal{M},\text{mat}})} \right| \Psi_0 \right\rangle \\ = \left\langle \Psi_2 \left| \mathcal{T} \left(\int_{\tau_2} \mathbf{H}_\xi^{\text{mat}} + \int_{\tau_2 \cap \mathcal{M}} \mathbf{H}_\xi^{\mathcal{M},\text{mat}} \right) e^{\int_{\tau_0}^{\tau_2} d\tau (\int_{\tau} \mathbf{H}_\xi^{\text{mat}} + \int_{\tau \cap \mathcal{M}} \mathbf{H}_\xi^{\mathcal{M},\text{mat}})} \right| \Psi_0 \right\rangle. \end{aligned} \quad (\text{B.5})$$

We should emphasize in this manipulation that $\langle \Psi_2 |$ should be taken to be a fixed state (and does not evolve with τ_2 as the derivative is taken).

Now, by diffeomorphism invariance, differentiating the RHS of (B.2) in τ_2 , with fixed background fields g and ϕ , is equivalent to fixing the coordinate interval (τ_0, τ_2) but applying an infinitesimal diffeomorphism \mathcal{L}_ζ to the background fields which drags more spacetime into the interval. In fact, in section 3.1, we constructed precisely such a diffeomorphism, generated by the vector field ζ defined in (3.3) interpolating between zero at τ_1 , which we

⁷⁴Such terms near σ would obstruct the interpretation of the path integral in (B.2), when $\tau_0 = 0$ and $\tau_2 = 2\pi$, as giving matrix elements of an unnormalized state $\hat{\rho}^{\text{mat}}$ on the $\tau = 0$ surface Σ . Stitching together n replicas of the path integral by identifying and integrating over the states $|\Psi_0\rangle$ and $|\Psi_2\rangle$ between the replicas should allow one to calculate $\text{tr}[(\hat{\rho}^{\text{mat}})^n]$, as described around (2.26); since the quantum field values at σ should be integrated over in such traces, one does not expect their path integral representations to have any joint or Gibbons-Hawking-like terms at σ .

One can compare this with how, in the stitching process, the Gibbons-Hawking-like terms on the constant τ surfaces included in (B.3) cancel between replicas or, more generally, reproduce the bulk contributions to the action localized in an infinitesimally thin shell around the $\tau = 0$ surface Σ ; further, the joint terms at the spacetime boundary should similarly cancel between each other (once the normalization of the states $|\Psi_0\rangle$ and $|\Psi_2\rangle$ are accounted for — see footnote 71) or, more generally, reproduce contributions to $\mathbf{L}^{\mathcal{M},\text{mat}}$ localized on $\mathcal{R} = \Sigma \cap \mathcal{M}$. If one were to apply a similar analysis to joint terms at or Gibbons-Hawking-like terms around σ , one would find an extraneous leftover piece when attempting to evaluate $\text{tr}[(\hat{\rho}^{\text{mat}})^n]$.

take to be between τ_0 and τ_2 , and $2\pi\xi$ at τ_2 . This is illustrated in Figure 2b, though here we wish to apply this diffeomorphism everywhere between τ_1 and τ_2 , all the way up to σ , and we are not assuming that the background fields g and ϕ are ξ -symmetric. Thus, we are led to consider the perturbation of background fields

$$g \rightarrow g + \frac{\delta\tau_2}{2\pi} \mathcal{L}_\zeta g, \quad h \rightarrow h + \frac{\delta\tau_2}{2\pi} \mathcal{L}_\zeta h. \quad (\text{B.6})$$

In order to mimic $\tau_2 \rightarrow \tau_2 + \delta\tau_2$ using this trick, we must also transform the path integration variables so that the quantum fields satisfy appropriately perturbed boundary conditions around σ (recall the discussion in the paragraph preceding (B.5)). This can be achieved by

$$h \rightarrow h + \iota \mathcal{L}_\zeta h, \quad \psi \rightarrow \psi + \iota \mathcal{L}_\zeta \psi, \quad (\text{B.7})$$

where now $\iota(\tau)$ is a smooth function over $[\tau_1, \tau_2]$ that vanishes at τ_1 and τ_2 , but takes the small constant value $\delta\tau_2/(2\pi)$ almost everywhere in (τ_1, τ_2) . (We want to leave the quantum field configurations on the τ_0 and τ_2 surfaces fixed by $|\Psi_0\rangle$ and $\langle\Psi_2|$.)

Altogether, we then have

$$\begin{aligned} & -2\pi\partial_{\tau_2} \int_{|\Psi_0\rangle}^{\langle\Psi_2|} [dh, d\psi] e^{-I_{[\tau_0, \tau_2]}^{\text{mat}}} \\ & = \left\langle \Psi_2 \left| \mathcal{T}(\mathcal{K}_\zeta^{\text{mat}} + \mathcal{K}_\zeta^{\text{mat, diff}}) e^{\int_{\tau_0}^{\tau_2} d\tau (\int_\tau \mathbf{H}_\xi^{\text{mat}} + \int_{\tau \cap \mathcal{M}} \mathbf{H}_\xi^{\mathcal{M}, \text{mat}})} \right| \Psi_0 \right\rangle, \end{aligned} \quad (\text{B.8})$$

where, in analogy with (3.9) and (3.36),

$$\begin{aligned} \mathcal{K}_\zeta^{\text{mat}} & \equiv \int_{\mathcal{S}_2} (\mathbf{E}_g^{\text{mat}} \cdot \mathcal{L}_\zeta g + \mathbf{E}_\phi \cdot \mathcal{L}_\zeta \phi) + \int_{\partial\mathcal{S}_2} \boldsymbol{\theta}^{\text{mat}}[\mathcal{L}_\zeta g, \mathcal{L}_\zeta \phi] \\ & + 2\pi \int_{\tau_2} (\delta_{g, \mathcal{L}_\xi g} + \delta_{\phi, \mathcal{L}_\xi \phi}) \mathbf{L}^{\text{GH, mat}} + 2\pi \int_{\tau_2 \cap \mathcal{M}} (\delta_{g, \mathcal{L}_\xi g} + \delta_{\phi, \mathcal{L}_\xi \phi}) \mathbf{L}^{\text{jt, mat}} \\ & + \int_{\partial\mathcal{S}_2 \cap \mathcal{M}} (\delta_{g, \mathcal{L}_\zeta g} + \delta_{\phi, \mathcal{L}_\zeta \phi}) \mathbf{L}^{\mathcal{M}, \text{mat}}, \end{aligned} \quad (\text{B.9})$$

$$\mathcal{K}_\zeta^{\text{diff}} \equiv \int_{\mathcal{S}_2} (\mathbf{E}_h \cdot \mathcal{L}_\zeta h + \mathbf{E}_\psi \cdot \mathcal{L}_\zeta \psi) + \int_{\partial\mathcal{S}_2 \cap \partial\mathcal{S}_1} \boldsymbol{\theta}[\mathcal{L}_\zeta h, \mathcal{L}_\zeta \psi], \quad (\text{B.10})$$

and \mathcal{S}_1 and \mathcal{S}_2 are the spacetime region illustrated in Figure 2b, with a zero size $a \rightarrow 0$ for the neighbourhood $\mathcal{S}_1 = \mathcal{N}_0(\sigma) \cap (\tau_1, \tau_2)$ of σ in (τ_1, τ_2) . Put differently, \mathcal{S}_2 covers the thermal time interval (τ_1, τ_2) , but we should be mindful that its boundary $\partial\mathcal{S}_2$ includes an infinitesimal arc near σ which would be identified by $\partial\mathcal{S}_2 \cap \partial\mathcal{S}_1$ in Figure 2b — we explain this in the following paragraph. The interpretations of $\mathcal{K}_\zeta^{\text{mat}}$ and $\mathcal{K}_\zeta^{\text{diff}}$ are analogous to those of $\tilde{\mathcal{K}}_\zeta$ and $\tilde{\mathcal{K}}_\zeta^{\text{diff}}$ introduced in (3.9) and (3.36) in section 3: here, they implement the transformations (B.6) and (B.7) of the background and path integration variables. (Strictly speaking, (B.9) and (B.10) should also have anomalous corrections arising from the variations of the path integral measure in response to these transformations, but we leave discussion of such terms to appendix E.)

Before, proceeding, we should comment on some differences between the calculation here and that of section 3.1. Recall there that we were interested in evaluating the generalized entropy using our Callan-Wilczek formula (2.44) which required consideration of the deformed replicated backgrounds $(g_{\tilde{\Sigma}_n}, \phi_{\tilde{\Sigma}_n})$ containing regulated conical singularities. To reproduce the variation of these backgrounds from $n = 1$, we transformed the background fields with \mathcal{L}_ζ in the region we called \mathcal{S}_2 outside a tiny neighbourhood $\mathcal{N}_a(\sigma)$ of the entangling surface σ ; but within the region $\mathcal{S}_1 = \mathcal{N}_a(\sigma) \cap (\tau_1, \tau_2)$ inside the neighbourhood, we applied a transformation which interpolated to doing nothing exactly at σ . This is the situation illustrated in Figure 2b. Here, however, we simply wish to evaluate the effect of the \mathcal{L}_ζ transformation on the background fields within the thermal time interval (τ_1, τ_2) . The action in this interval is the $a \rightarrow 0$ limit of the action over \mathcal{S}_2 and we see from the variation of the latter that we must be careful to include symplectic potential θ^{mat} terms on $\partial\mathcal{S}_2$, in particular, the arc $\partial\mathcal{S}_2 \cap \partial\mathcal{S}_1$ near σ which becomes infinitesimal as $a \rightarrow 0$. Moreover, because the background fields (g, ϕ) are no longer assumed to be ξ -symmetric, the $\theta^{\text{mat}}[\mathcal{L}_\zeta g, \mathcal{L}_\zeta \phi] = \theta^{\text{mat}}[\mathcal{L}_\xi g, \mathcal{L}_\xi \phi]$ term on the τ_2 surface where $\zeta = 2\pi\xi$ is now nontrivial. In all, the θ^{mat} boundary term of (B.9) contains the following pieces⁷⁵:

$$\begin{aligned} & \int_{\partial\mathcal{S}_2} \theta^{\text{mat}}[\mathcal{L}_\zeta g, \mathcal{L}_\zeta \phi] \\ &= \int_{\partial\mathcal{S}_2 \cap \partial\mathcal{S}_1} \theta^{\text{mat}}[\mathcal{L}_\zeta g, \mathcal{L}_\zeta \phi] + 2\pi \int_{\tau_2} \theta^{\text{mat}}[\mathcal{L}_\xi g, \mathcal{L}_\xi \phi] + \int_{\partial\mathcal{S}_2 \cap \mathcal{M}} \theta^{\text{mat}}[\mathcal{L}_\zeta g, \mathcal{L}_\zeta \phi], \end{aligned} \quad (\text{B.11})$$

whereas only the analogue of the last piece appeared in (3.9). Obviously, there are also the Gibbons-Hawking-like and joint terms which additionally appear in (B.9) due to the fixing of quantum field configurations on the τ_2 surface. In [31], all boundary terms are neglected, which as we will see, leads to the false identification of the time translation generator $\mathbf{H}_\xi^{\text{mat}}$ with components of the stress tensor.

One can also compare the $\mathcal{K}_\zeta^{\text{diff}}$ introduced here in (B.10) to the $\tilde{\mathcal{K}}_\zeta^{\text{diff}}$ introduced in (3.36) of section 3.3. Just as $\tilde{\mathcal{K}}_\zeta^{\text{diff}}$ appeared as a byproduct of the way we modelled the extension of the proper time period using a diffeomorphism on background fields, $\mathcal{K}_\zeta^{\text{diff}}$ has appeared here resulting from the way we have similarly modelled the variation of the final thermal time τ_2 . In either case, the need to add these operators can be verified by the consideration of their effect on other operators inserted in the thermal time interval (τ_1, τ_2) , as described for $\tilde{\mathcal{K}}_\zeta^{\text{diff}}$ in section 3.3. (We shall not repeat the nearly identical analysis for $\mathcal{K}_\zeta^{\text{diff}}$ here.) Indeed, the need to include $\mathcal{K}_\zeta^{\text{diff}}$ in our present calculation (B.8) is made even more obvious by the variation in boundary conditions around σ , as described around (B.7) — this is captured by the $\theta[\mathcal{L}_\zeta h, \mathcal{L}_\zeta \psi]$ term included in (B.10). Note that, as in (3.36), the symplectic potential and boundary Lagrangian variation terms in response to (B.7) vanish

⁷⁵For simplicity, we have assumed that the foliation of the spacetime by constant time τ slices is such that there are no finite contributions due to $\theta^{\text{mat}}[\mathcal{L}_\zeta g, \mathcal{L}_\zeta \phi]$ integrated around the joints at the corners of $\partial\mathcal{S}_2$ (see Figure 2b). One expects this to be the case so long as the proper angles that constant time τ slices make with the spacetime boundary \mathcal{M} and the arc $\partial\mathcal{S}_2 \cap \partial\mathcal{S}_1$, as measured in the background (g, ϕ) , are invariant in time. (This should automatically be true for the joints bounding $\partial\mathcal{S}_2 \cap \partial\mathcal{S}_1$, which should always have opening angle $\pi/2$.) Otherwise, one must carry such contributions along in the calculation, much like the \mathbf{L}^{jt} term in (B.9).

on the spacetime boundary \mathcal{M} owing to (2.8). Moreover, there are no terms on the τ_1 and τ_2 surfaces owing to (B.4), nor are there contributions localized at the joints $\tau_1 \cap \mathcal{M}$ and $\tau_2 \cap \mathcal{M}$, given the description of the joint terms below that equation.

Let us now proceed with our goal of extracting the instantaneous generator of time evolution. Considering (B.5), we see that we must extract the generator $-\int_{\tau} \mathbf{H}_{\xi}^{\text{mat}} - \int_{\tau \cap \mathcal{M}} \mathbf{H}_{\xi}^{\mathcal{M}, \text{mat}}$ for time translations as an operator inserted to the left of the evolution operator, at the latest time τ_2 . Thus, similar to our calculation in sections 3.2 and 3.3, we will now take the $\tau_1 \rightarrow \tau_2^-$ limit⁷⁶ of (B.8), (B.9), and (B.10). Using (3.15), we obtain equations similar to (3.17) and (3.39):

$$\begin{aligned} \lim_{\tau_1 \rightarrow \tau_2^-} \mathcal{K}_{\zeta}^{\text{mat}} = & -2\pi \int_{\tau_2} \xi^a (\mathbf{C}_g^{\text{mat}} + \mathbf{C}_{\phi})_a \\ & + 2\pi \int_{\tau_2} (\delta_{g, \mathcal{L}_{\xi} g} + \delta_{\phi, \mathcal{L}_{\xi} \phi}) \mathbf{L}^{\text{GH}, \text{mat}} + 2\pi \int_{\tau_2 \cap \mathcal{M}} (\delta_{g, \mathcal{L}_{\xi} g} + \delta_{\phi, \mathcal{L}_{\xi} \phi}) \mathbf{L}^{\text{jt}, \text{mat}} \\ & + \lim_{\tau_1 \rightarrow \tau_2^-} \left\{ \int_{\partial \mathcal{S}_2} \boldsymbol{\theta}^{\text{mat}} [\mathcal{L}_{\zeta} g, \mathcal{L}_{\zeta} \phi] + \int_{\partial \mathcal{S}_2 \cap \mathcal{M}} (\delta_{g, \mathcal{L}_{\zeta} g} + \delta_{\phi, \mathcal{L}_{\zeta} \phi}) \mathbf{L}^{\mathcal{M}, \text{mat}} \right\}. \end{aligned} \quad (\text{B.12})$$

$$\lim_{\tau_1 \rightarrow \tau_2} \mathcal{K}_{\zeta}^{\text{diff}} = -2\pi \int_{\tau_2} \xi^a (\mathbf{C}_h + \mathbf{C}_{\psi})_a + \lim_{\tau_1 \rightarrow \tau_2^-} \int_{\partial \mathcal{S}_2 \cap \partial \mathcal{S}_1} \boldsymbol{\theta} [\mathcal{L}_{\zeta} h, \mathcal{L}_{\zeta} \psi]. \quad (\text{B.13})$$

If one ignores $\mathcal{K}_{\zeta}^{\text{diff}}$ as well as all terms in the latter lines in (B.12), then since the expectation value of the $(\mathbf{C}_{\phi})_a$ vanishes as written in (4.18), one would be tempted to identify the generator for time translations as $-\mathbf{H}_{\xi}^{\text{mat}} \stackrel{?}{=} -\xi_b (\mathbf{C}_g^{\text{mat}})^b = \epsilon_a \xi_b T^{ab}$ upon comparison of (B.5) with (B.8) and (B.12). This is the conclusion that [31] draws⁷⁷. But, of course, $\mathcal{K}_{\zeta}^{\text{diff}}$ and the other terms in (B.12) cannot simply be neglected — *e.g.* even if the action only consists of a bulk part $\int \mathbf{L}^{\text{mat}}$, with $\mathbf{L}^{\text{GH}, \text{mat}}$, $\mathbf{L}^{\text{jt}, \text{mat}}$, and $\mathbf{L}^{\mathcal{M}, \text{mat}}$ all vanishing, the symplectic potential $\boldsymbol{\theta}^{\text{mat}}$ terms can still be nontrivial, particularly if there is non-minimal coupling between matter and curvature.

To proceed, we next apply the definitions (3.20) and (3.21) of Noether charge and current. It will be simplest now to consider the sum of (B.12) and (B.13), rather than treating them separately as we did for $\tilde{\mathcal{K}}_{\zeta}$ and $\tilde{\mathcal{K}}_{\zeta}^{\text{diff}}$ in sections 3.2 and 3.3. Rewriting

⁷⁶Actually, taking this limit is not necessary but simplifies the calculation. Just as for (3.40), the expression (B.15) we eventually obtain for $\mathcal{K}_{\zeta}^{\text{mat}} + \mathcal{K}_{\zeta}^{\text{diff}}$ in fact continues to hold generally without the limit, as can be shown by a calculation analogous to the one mentioned in footnote 41 using additionally (3.34) (restricting now to just objects constructed from the matter action).

⁷⁷One can also compare this with the often-written expression (1.5) for the thermal modular Hamiltonian in terms of the stress tensor. (Note that the stress tensor written there is the Lorentzian stress tensor, differing by a sign from the Euclidean stress tensor written here — see (3.55).)

(B.12) and (B.13) in terms of Noether current and charge, we obtain

$$\begin{aligned}
\lim_{\tau_1 \rightarrow \tau_2^-} \left(\mathcal{K}_\zeta^{\text{mat}} + \mathcal{K}_\zeta^{\text{diff}} \right) = & 2\pi \left\{ \int_{\tau_2} \left(\boldsymbol{\theta}^{\text{mat}}[\mathcal{L}_\xi g, \mathcal{L}_\xi \phi,] - \mathbf{J}_\xi^{\text{mat}} + (\delta_{g, \mathcal{L}_\xi g} + \delta_{\phi, \mathcal{L}_\xi \phi}) \mathbf{L}^{\text{GH, mat}} \right) \right. \\
& + \int_{\tau_2 \cap \mathcal{M}} (\delta_{g, \mathcal{L}_\xi g} + \delta_{\phi, \mathcal{L}_\xi \phi}) \mathbf{L}^{\text{jt, mat}} + \int_{\partial \tau_2} \mathbf{Q}_\xi^{\text{mat}} \Big\} \\
& + \lim_{\tau_1 \rightarrow \tau_2^-} \left\{ \int_{\partial \mathcal{S}_2 \cap \partial \mathcal{S}_1} \boldsymbol{\theta}^{\text{mat}}[\mathcal{L}_\zeta g, \mathcal{L}_\zeta \phi, \mathcal{L}_\zeta h, \mathcal{L}_\zeta \psi] \right. \\
& \left. + \int_{\partial \mathcal{S}_2 \cap \mathcal{M}} \left(\boldsymbol{\theta}^{\text{mat}}[\mathcal{L}_\zeta g, \mathcal{L}_\zeta \phi] + (\delta_{g, \mathcal{L}_\zeta g} + \delta_{\phi, \mathcal{L}_\zeta \phi}) \mathbf{L}^{\mathcal{M, mat}} \right) \right\}, \tag{B.14}
\end{aligned}$$

where we have used (B.11) to split up the $\boldsymbol{\theta}^{\text{mat}}$ term of (B.12), and $\partial \tau_2$ is shorthand for the boundaries of the τ_2 surface. Similar to the manipulations leading to (3.29) in section 3.2, one can use (3.24) on \mathcal{M} and its analogue (3.34)⁷⁸ near σ , together with the identities (2.8) and (3.28) for the variation of the boundary Lagrangian (all now applied to quantities obtained just from the matter action), to greatly simplify the sum of the Noether charge term with the latter two lines of (B.14). One thus obtains

$$\begin{aligned}
\lim_{\tau_1 \rightarrow \tau_2^-} \left(\mathcal{K}_\zeta^{\text{mat}} + \mathcal{K}_\zeta^{\text{diff}} \right) = & 2\pi \left\{ \int_{\tau_2} \left(\boldsymbol{\theta}^{\text{mat}}[\mathcal{L}_\xi g, \mathcal{L}_\xi \phi,] - \mathbf{J}_\xi^{\text{mat}} + (\delta_{g, \mathcal{L}_\xi g} + \delta_{\phi, \mathcal{L}_\xi \phi}) \mathbf{L}^{\text{GH, mat}} \right) \right. \\
& \left. + \int_{\tau_2 \cap \mathcal{M}} \left(-\xi \cdot \mathbf{L}^{\mathcal{M, mat}} + (\delta_{g, \mathcal{L}_\xi g} + \delta_{\phi, \mathcal{L}_\xi \phi}) \mathbf{L}^{\text{jt, mat}} \right) \right\}. \tag{B.15}
\end{aligned}$$

Finally, comparing (B.5) with (B.8) and using (B.15), we find that the instantaneous generator $-\int_\tau \mathbf{H}_\xi^{\text{mat}} - \int_{\tau \cap \mathcal{M}} \mathbf{H}_\xi^{\mathcal{M, mat}}$ for time evolution satisfying (B.2) is given by

$$\mathbf{H}_\xi^{\text{mat}} = \mathbf{J}_\xi^{\text{mat}} - \boldsymbol{\theta}^{\text{mat}}[\mathcal{L}_\xi g, \mathcal{L}_\xi \phi,] - (\delta_{g, \mathcal{L}_\xi g} + \delta_{\phi, \mathcal{L}_\xi \phi}) \mathbf{L}^{\text{GH, mat}} \tag{B.16}$$

$$\mathbf{H}_\xi^{\mathcal{M, mat}} = \xi \cdot \mathbf{L}^{\mathcal{M, mat}} - (\delta_{g, \mathcal{L}_\xi g} + \delta_{\phi, \mathcal{L}_\xi \phi}) \mathbf{L}^{\text{jt, mat}}. \tag{B.17}$$

As a consistency check, we see that when the background fields g and ϕ are ξ -symmetric, $\mathbf{H}_\xi^{\text{mat}}$ and $\mathbf{J}_\xi^{\text{mat}}$ agree:

$$\mathbf{H}_\xi^{\text{mat}} = \mathbf{J}_\xi^{\text{mat}}, \quad \mathbf{H}_\xi^{\mathcal{M, mat}} = \xi \cdot \mathbf{L}^{\mathcal{M, mat}}, \quad (\mathcal{L}_\xi g = 0, \mathcal{L}_\xi \phi = 0) \tag{B.18}$$

and indeed the evolution equations (B.1) and (B.2) agree. The modular Hamiltonian for the thermal state prepared on such a ξ -symmetric background is given by the spatial integral $-\int_\Sigma \mathbf{J}_\xi^{\text{mat}}$ of the Noether current $\mathbf{J}_\xi^{\text{mat}}$ plus a boundary term $-\int_{\mathcal{R}} \xi \cdot \mathbf{L}^{\mathcal{M, mat}}$, as written in (3.35); more generally, for (unnormalized) states $\hat{\rho}^{\text{mat}} = e^{-2\pi K^{\text{mat}}}$ prepared by

⁷⁸Recall our conventions for defining the orientations of $\partial \mathcal{S}_1 \cap \partial \mathcal{S}_2$ versus $\partial \mathcal{S}_2 \cap \partial \mathcal{S}_1$ as stated after (3.11).

Euclidean path integration on backgrounds which are not symmetric in time τ , the modular Hamiltonian K^{mat} is given by

$$2\pi K^{\text{mat}} = -\log \mathcal{T} e^{\int_0^{2\pi} d\tau \left(\int_{\tau} \mathbf{H}_{\xi}^{\text{mat}} + \int_{\tau \cap \mathcal{M}} \mathbf{H}_{\xi}^{\mathcal{M},\text{mat}} \right)}. \quad (\hat{\rho}^{\text{mat}} \text{ prepared on } (g, \phi)) \quad (\text{B.19})$$

with $\mathbf{H}_{\xi}^{\text{mat}}$ and $\mathbf{H}_{\xi}^{\mathcal{M},\text{mat}}$ given by (B.16) and (B.17).

We end this appendix by commenting that, when moving between Euclidean and Lorentzian signatures, the operators $\mathbf{H}_{\xi}^{\text{mat}}$ and $\mathbf{H}_{\xi}^{\mathcal{M},\text{mat}}$, as defined by (B.16) and (B.17) in both signatures, is expected to acquire extra signs. This can be seen from (3.53), (3.54) (with a similar analytic continuation expected for the Lagrangian in each piece of the action (B.3)), (3.56), and (3.57):

$$\mathbf{E} \mathbf{H}_{\text{E}\xi}^{\text{mat}} = - \mathbf{L} \mathbf{H}_{\text{L}\xi}^{\text{mat}}, \quad \mathbf{E} \mathbf{H}_{\text{E}\xi}^{\mathcal{M},\text{mat}} = - \mathbf{L} \mathbf{H}_{\text{L}\xi}^{\mathcal{M},\text{mat}}, \quad (\text{B.20})$$

where we are using the notation of section 3.4. For instance, (B.2) reads in Lorentzian signature:

$$\left\langle \Psi_2 \left| \mathcal{T} e^{-i \int_{t_0}^{t_2} dt \left(\int_t \mathbf{L}_{\text{L}\xi}^{\text{mat}} + \int_{t \cap \mathcal{M}} \mathbf{L}_{\text{L}\xi}^{\mathcal{M},\text{mat}} \right)} \right| \Psi_0 \right\rangle = \int_{|\Psi_0\rangle}^{|\Psi_2\rangle} [dh, d\psi] e^{i \mathbf{L} I_{[t_0, t_2]}^{\text{mat}}}. \quad (\text{B.21})$$

Alternatively, one can go through our derivation starting in Lorentzian signature in the first place, finding that the $\mathbf{L} \mathbf{H}_{\text{L}\xi}^{\text{mat}}$ and $\mathbf{L} \mathbf{H}_{\text{L}\xi}^{\mathcal{M},\text{mat}}$ satisfying (B.21) are given by (B.16) and (B.17), with everything replaced by their Lorentzian counterparts.

C Operator variation of the Noether current integral

Recall, as part of our derivation of the first law of generalized entropy, we considered in section 4.3 the operator variation $\int_{\Sigma} \delta_{\mathcal{O}} \mathbf{J}_{\xi}^{\text{mat}}$ of the Noether current integral over the initial surface Σ . As we discuss around (4.21) to (4.24), evaluation of the operator variation $\delta_{\mathcal{O}} \mathbf{J}_{\xi}^{\text{mat}}$ is more subtle than simply taking the functional variation $\delta_g + \delta_{\phi}$ of (3.20) while fixing in this expression the quantum fields h and ψ and their time derivatives on Σ . Instead, one must be careful to fix the conjugate momenta of the quantum fields, rather than their time derivatives, as it is the former which are truly operators on the initial surface Σ .

As written in (4.21), we found that the Noether current $\mathbf{J}_{\xi}^{\text{mat}}$ can be split into a piece $\theta^{\text{mat}}[\mathcal{L}_{\xi} g, \mathcal{L}_{\xi} \phi]$, whose operator variation is easily calculated in (4.23) due to the ξ -symmetry of the unperturbed background fields, and a piece $\tilde{\mathbf{H}}_{\xi}^{\text{mat}}$, given by (4.22), whose spatial integral $\int_{\Sigma} \tilde{\mathbf{H}}_{\xi}^{\text{mat}}$ resembles a Hamiltonian with corresponding Lagrangian $\int_{\Sigma} \xi \cdot \mathbf{L}^{\text{mat}}$. This led us to speculate in (4.24) that, up to boundary terms, the operator variation of the Hamiltonian $\int_{\Sigma} \tilde{\mathbf{H}}_{\xi}^{\text{mat}}$, with the conjugate momenta of the quantum fields h and ψ fixed, is given simply by the functional variation $\delta_g + \delta_{\phi}$ of the Lagrangian $\int_{\Sigma} \xi \cdot \mathbf{L}^{\text{mat}}$, with the time derivatives of the quantum fields fixed. In this appendix, we point out that the argument for (4.24), in the case where the unperturbed background is stationary (*i.e.* $\mathcal{L}_{\xi} g = 0$ and $\mathcal{L}_{\xi} \phi = 0$) can be made precise from the (Lorentzian versions of the) results (B.16) and (B.17), together with the evolution equation (B.21), of appendix B — indeed notice that the $\tilde{\mathbf{H}}_{\xi}^{\text{mat}}$ defined in (4.22) and the boundary term appearing in (4.24) match the expressions

of $\mathbf{H}_\xi^{\text{mat}}$ and $\mathbf{H}_\xi^{\mathcal{M},\text{mat}}$ found in (B.16) and (B.17) for the instantaneous generator of time evolution, modulo Gibbons-Hawking-like and joint terms.

Let us start by considering (B.21) in the general case without any assumption of symmetry for the background fields. Notice on the LHS of (B.21) that $\mathbf{H}_\xi^{\text{mat}}$ and $\mathbf{H}_\xi^{\mathcal{M},\text{mat}}$ should be interpreted as operators constructed from the quantum fields and their conjugate momenta. In contrast, on the RHS, the action $I_{[t_0,t_2]}^{\text{mat}}$ (whose components are given in (B.3)) is written in terms of their time derivatives. Thus, taking the variation of (B.21) with respect to the background fields g and ϕ gives

$$\begin{aligned} & \left\langle \Psi_2 \left| \mathcal{T} \int_{t_0}^{t_2} dt \delta_{\mathcal{O}} \left(\int_t \mathbf{H}_\xi^{\text{mat}} + \int_{t \cap \mathcal{M}} \mathbf{H}_\xi^{\mathcal{M},\text{mat}} \right) e^{-i \int_{t_0}^{t_2} dt (\int_t \mathbf{H}_\xi^{\text{mat}} + \int_{t \cap \mathcal{M}} \mathbf{H}_\xi^{\mathcal{M},\text{mat}})} \right| \Psi_0 \right\rangle \\ &= - \int_{|\Psi_0\rangle}^{|\Psi_2\rangle} [dh, d\psi] e^{i I_{[t_0,t_2]}^{\text{mat}}} (\delta_g + \delta_\phi) I_{[t_0,t_2]}^{\text{mat}}. \end{aligned} \quad (\text{C.1})$$

(Actually, the RHS should also receive contributions from the variation of the path integral measure; we leave consideration of such anomalous contributions to appendix E.) Dividing by $t_2 - t_0$ and taking the $t_0 \rightarrow 0$ and $t_2 \rightarrow 0$ limit gives

$$\delta_{\mathcal{O}} \left(\int_\Sigma \mathbf{H}_\xi^{\text{mat}} + \int_{\mathcal{R}} \mathbf{H}_\xi^{\mathcal{M},\text{mat}} \right) = - \lim_{t_0, t_2 \rightarrow 0} \frac{1}{t_2 - t_0} (\delta_g + \delta_\phi) I_{[t_0,t_2]}^{\text{mat}}, \quad (\text{C.2})$$

where, upon recalling that $|\Psi_0\rangle$ and $|\Psi_2\rangle$ can be any pure states, we have written (C.2) as an operator equation. From the expression (B.3) for $I_{[t_0,t_2]}^{\text{mat}}$, we see that the limit on the RHS of (C.2) reduces it to integrals on the initial time slices Σ and \mathcal{R} in the bulk and spacetime boundary⁷⁹:

$$\lim_{t_0, t_2 \rightarrow 0} \frac{I_{[t_0,t_2]}^{\text{mat}}}{t_2 - t_0} = \int_\Sigma (\xi \cdot \mathbf{L}^{\text{mat}} + \mathcal{L}_\xi \mathbf{L}^{\text{GH},\text{mat}}) + \int_{\mathcal{R}} (-\xi \cdot \mathbf{L}^{\mathcal{M},\text{mat}} + \mathcal{L}_\xi \mathbf{L}^{\text{jt},\text{mat}}) \quad (\text{C.3})$$

Notice that (C.2) with (C.3) nearly gives us the equality (4.24) we are after — what remains is to treat the Gibbons-Hawking-like and joint terms in (C.3) and $\mathbf{H}_\xi^{\text{mat}}$ and $\mathbf{H}_\xi^{\mathcal{M},\text{mat}}$ in (B.16) and (B.17). To do so, we now specialize to the case where the unperturbed background fields and path integral (with which the expectation value in (4.24) is computed) are stationary:

$$\langle \delta_{\mathcal{O}} (\delta_g, \mathcal{L}_\xi g + \delta_\phi, \mathcal{L}_\xi \phi) \mathbf{L}^{\text{GH},\text{mat}} \rangle = \langle (\delta_g, \mathcal{L}_\xi \delta g + \delta_\phi, \mathcal{L}_\xi \delta \phi) \mathbf{L}^{\text{GH},\text{mat}} \rangle = \langle (\delta_g + \delta_\phi) \mathcal{L}_\xi \mathbf{L}^{\text{GH},\text{mat}} \rangle \quad (\text{C.4})$$

$$\langle \delta_{\mathcal{O}} (\delta_g, \mathcal{L}_\xi g + \delta_\phi, \mathcal{L}_\xi \phi) \mathbf{L}^{\text{jt},\text{mat}} \rangle = \langle (\delta_g, \mathcal{L}_\xi \delta g + \delta_\phi, \mathcal{L}_\xi \delta \phi) \mathbf{L}^{\text{jt},\text{mat}} \rangle = \langle (\delta_g + \delta_\phi) \mathcal{L}_\xi \mathbf{L}^{\text{jt},\text{mat}} \rangle. \quad (\text{C.5})$$

Thus, when the expectation value of (C.2) is taken with a path integral over a ξ -symmetric background, the operator variations of the Gibbons-Hawking-like and joint terms of the $\mathbf{H}_\xi^{\text{mat}}$ and $\mathbf{H}_\xi^{\mathcal{M},\text{mat}}$ (given by (B.16) and (B.17)) on the LHS cancel the functional variations of the corresponding terms on the RHS (given by (C.3)). Cancelling these terms, we immediately recover (4.24).

⁷⁹Note that the sign on the $\mathbf{L}^{\mathcal{M},\text{mat}}$ term arises from our conventions for orienting $\partial[t_1, t_2] \cap \mathcal{M}$ and \mathcal{R} as stated around (3.11) and (3.23).

D Maxwell contributions to asymptotic quantities

The point of this appendix will be to consider how quantum matter can contribute non-trivially to the asymptotic energy (4.34) appearing in the first law (4.32) of generalized entropy. We will consider the particularly simple but instructive example of a minimally coupled Maxwell field in asymptotically AdS spacetime. In the end, we will demonstrate how the Maxwell contributions to the Noether charge and boundary Lagrangian terms of the asymptotic energy (4.34) are important for recovering, from the generalized first law (4.32), the expected semiclassical thermodynamics of electrically charged black holes at fixed potential and fixed charge.

The Maxwell field is described by a (Lorentzian) bulk action

$$\int \mathbf{L}^{\text{Max}} = -\frac{1}{4} \int F^{ab} F_{ab} \epsilon , \quad \mathbf{F} = d\mathbf{A} . \quad (\text{D.1})$$

It is straightforward to show that this Maxwell action leads to the extra contributions

$$\theta^{\text{Max}}[\delta A] = \delta A_a F^{ab} \epsilon_b , \quad \mathbf{Q}_\chi^{\text{Max}} = -\frac{1}{2} \chi^c A_c F^{ab} \epsilon_{ab} \quad (\text{D.2})$$

to the symplectic potential and Noether charge associated to an arbitrary vector field χ . Another useful quantity for our discussion is the electric charge

$$\mathcal{Q}_e = \int_{t \cap \mathcal{M}} \mathbf{Q}_e \quad \mathbf{Q}_e = \frac{1}{2} \left(F^{ab} \epsilon_{ab} \right)_{t \cap \mathcal{M}} \quad (\text{D.3})$$

computed from Gauss's law evaluated on a time slice (denoted with the shorthand $t \cap \mathcal{M}$) at the spacetime boundary \mathcal{M} . From the CFT perspective, \mathbf{Q}_e gives the charge density of the current to which the bulk Maxwell field is dual [25].

The asymptotics of the background geometry and of the Maxwell field are known in an asymptotically-AdS spacetime. In asymptotically AdS spacetimes, the leading behaviour of metric and volume form components near the AdS boundary is given by

$$g_{ab} dx^a dx^b \sim \frac{dr^2}{r^2} + r^2 g_{\mu\nu}^{\text{CFT}} dy^\mu dy^\nu , \quad \epsilon_{r\mu_1 \dots \mu_d} \sim r^{d-1} , \quad (r \rightarrow \infty) \quad (\text{D.4})$$

where $x^a = (r, y^\mu)$ and y^μ are respectively coordinates of the bulk and AdS boundary at $r = \infty$, and $g_{\mu\nu}^{\text{CFT}}$ is the (finite) CFT metric. When studying the Maxwell contributions to asymptotic quantities, we will find that expressions only depend on the leading asymptotic behaviour of the metric and volume form (D.4), so we need not specify the geometry further. (If one so desires, for concreteness, one can fix the background geometry to that of the classical solution for an electrically charged black hole in the following discussions.)

It has been shown [25] that the allowed asymptotics for the Maxwell field in an asymptotically AdS spacetime is given by⁸⁰

$$\mathbf{A} \sim d\alpha + \mathbf{A}^+ + \mathbf{A}^- , \quad (r \rightarrow \infty) \quad (\text{D.5})$$

⁸⁰Note that $d\alpha$ may not necessarily be produced by a local gauge transformation. This is evident in the electrically charged black hole example to be considered shortly — analytically continuing to Euclidean signature, different values of μ_{BH} in (D.13) give different values for the Wilson loop running around the thermal time $\tau = it$ circle.

where

$$A_\mu^+ \sim O(r^{2-d}), \quad A_\mu^- \sim O(r^0), \quad (\text{D.6})$$

$$A_r^+ \sim O(r^{1-d}), \quad A_r^- \sim \begin{cases} O(r^{-3}) & d \neq 4 \\ O(r^{-3} \log r) & d = 4 \end{cases}, \quad (\text{D.7})$$

and correspondingly

$$\mathbf{F} \sim \mathbf{F}^+ + \mathbf{F}^-, \quad (r \rightarrow \infty) \quad (\text{D.8})$$

with

$$(F^+)^{r\mu} \sim O(r^{1-d}), \quad (F^-)^{r\mu} \sim \begin{cases} O(r^{-3}) & d \neq 4 \\ O(r^{-3} \log r) & d = 4 \end{cases}. \quad (\text{D.9})$$

As noted in [25, 43], the choice of boundary conditions at the AdS boundary is not necessarily unique for the Maxwell field, *e.g.* : in $d \geq 3$, one may choose to fix $\mathbf{A}|_{\mathcal{M}}$ at⁸¹ the AdS boundary \mathcal{M} (*i.e.* fix $d\alpha|_{\mathcal{M}}$ and $\mathbf{A}^-|_{\mathcal{M}}$), and consider field fluctuations falling off like \mathbf{A}^+ ; in $d \leq 3$, one can instead fix $r^{d-1}F^{r\mu}|_{\mathcal{M}}$ (*i.e.* fix \mathbf{A}^+) while considering fluctuations with the asymptotics of $d\alpha + \mathbf{A}^-$. Let us decompose the gauge field \mathbf{A} into a background part $\bar{\mathbf{A}}$ and a fluctuating quantum part $\tilde{\mathbf{A}}$

$$\mathbf{A} = \bar{\mathbf{A}} + \tilde{\mathbf{A}}, \quad (\phi_a = \bar{A}_a, \psi_a = \tilde{A}_a) \quad (\text{D.10})$$

where, in the more general notation used elsewhere in this paper, \bar{A}_a and \tilde{A}_a would have been denoted as ϕ_a and ψ_a . When $\mathbf{A}|_{\mathcal{M}}$ is fixed in $d \geq 3$, the quantum fluctuations $\tilde{\mathbf{A}}$ fall off like

$$\tilde{\mathbf{A}} \sim \tilde{\mathbf{A}}^+, \quad (\text{fixed } \mathbf{A}|_{\mathcal{M}} \text{ b.c., } r \rightarrow \infty) \quad (\text{D.11})$$

while, when $r^{d-1}F^{r\mu}|_{\mathcal{M}}$ is fixed in $d \leq 3$, they behave like

$$\tilde{\mathbf{A}} \sim d\tilde{\alpha} + \tilde{\mathbf{A}}^-. \quad (\text{fixed } r^{d-1}F^{r\mu}|_{\mathcal{M}} \text{ b.c., } r \rightarrow \infty) \quad (\text{D.12})$$

In $d = 3$, various hybrid boundary conditions are possible, one choice of which we will consider later. Restrictions must also be placed on the asymptotics of α , but all we will need is the condition that α remain finite at the asymptotic boundary \mathcal{M} in $d = 3$, as we later consider fluctuations in α . (Our discussion of boundary conditions is not comprehensive; yet more possibilities can be found in [25].)

It will be instructive to consider the asymptotic energy involved in the first law of generalized entropy for electrically charged black holes. For fixed boundary conditions, one can always absorb ambiguities in the choice of Maxwell field background $\bar{\mathbf{A}}$ into shifts of the quantum field $\tilde{\mathbf{A}}$. So, without loss of generality, let us fix $\bar{\mathbf{A}} = \mathbf{A}_{\text{BH}}$ to be the classical

⁸¹Recall, as specified in footnote 14, this notation means also projection onto \mathcal{M} , unless indices are otherwise specified.

solution for an electrically charged (possibly rotating) black hole — see, *e.g.* [44, 45] — which behaves asymptotically as

$$\mathbf{A}_{\text{BH}} \sim d\alpha_{\text{BH}} + \mathbf{A}_{\text{BH}}^+, \quad \mathbf{F}_{\text{BH}} \sim \mathbf{F}_{\text{BH}}^+, \quad \alpha_{\text{BH}} = \mu_{\text{BH}} t, \quad (r \rightarrow \infty) \quad (\text{D.13})$$

where, t is the time coordinate that is periodically identified $t \sim t - 2\pi i$ in the imaginary direction⁸², and the constant μ_{BH} gives the electric potential of the black hole⁸³. When the background $\bar{\mathbf{A}}$ has the asymptotics of (D.13), we will refer to (D.11) as fixed potential boundary conditions, since, where applicable ($d \geq 3$), they fix the electric potential to its background value in (D.13):

$$\mathbf{A}|_{\mathcal{M}} = \mu_{\text{BH}} dt \quad (\text{fixed } \mu \text{ b.c.}) \quad (\text{D.14})$$

as quantum fluctuations (D.11) in \mathbf{A} are suppressed near the AdS boundary. As hinted below (D.12), in $d = 3$ another interesting boundary condition to consider is given by a hybrid of (D.11) and (D.12), where the electric charge density \mathbf{Q}_e defined in (D.3) is fixed but the electric potential $\mu(y^\mu) = \mu_{\text{BH}} + \tilde{\mu}(y^\mu)$ is allowed to fluctuate⁸⁴:

$$\tilde{\mathbf{A}} \sim \tilde{\mathbf{A}}^+ + \tilde{\mu}(y^\mu) dt, \quad \tilde{\mathbf{Q}}_e = \frac{1}{2} \left[(\tilde{F}^+)^{ab} \epsilon_{ab} \right]_{t \cap \mathcal{M}} = 0. \quad (\text{fixed } \mathbf{Q}_e \text{ b.c., } r \rightarrow \infty) \quad (\text{D.16})$$

We shall refer to (D.16) as fixed charge density boundary conditions for the obvious reason that the charge density is fixed to its background value:

$$\mathbf{Q}_e = \mathbf{Q}_{e,\text{BH}} = \frac{1}{2} \left[(F_{\text{BH}}^+)^{ab} \epsilon_{ab} \right]_{t \cap \mathcal{M}}. \quad (\text{fixed } \mathbf{Q}_e \text{ b.c.}) \quad (\text{D.17})$$

Let us consider fixed potential boundary conditions first. It follows, from examination of the scaling (D.4) of asymptotic AdS and the scalings (D.7) of the Maxwell background

⁸²In this paper, we have always taken the Euclidean time coordinate $\tau = it$ to be periodic, rescaling as needed so that the period (*i.e.* inverse temperature) is 2π . Since the Killing vector $\partial_t = -i\partial_\tau$ of a thermal setup vanishes on the bifurcation surface σ , ∂_t must be tangent to the null geodesic generators of the horizon emanating from σ . For a rotating black hole, this means that we have chosen somewhat nonstandard angular coordinates which rotate along with the black hole horizon. Thus, what we have been calling the asymptotic “energy” $H_\xi^{\mathcal{M}}$, associated with our $\xi = \partial_t$, would also include what is called angular momentum in more standard language. (See the discussion around (90)-(91) in [11], whose ξ is proportional to ours.) Note however, that t is still (at least proportional to) the standard time coordinate and the one-form dt , *e.g.* appearing in \mathbf{A}_{BH} in (D.13), is unambiguous under time-dependent reparametrizations of other coordinates.

⁸³Specifically, μ_{BH} should be thought of as the difference in electric potential between the black hole horizon and the AdS boundary. By regularity of \mathbf{A}_{BH} , $\xi \cdot \mathbf{A}_{\text{BH}}$ vanishes at the bifurcation surface, so μ_{BH} is given by minus the electric potential at the AdS boundary. (Note that our convention is always to take \mathbf{A} to be smooth in the bulk, whereas some references, *e.g.* [45] sometimes exclude $\mu_{\text{BH}} dt$ and keep only the inexact part of \mathbf{A} , which by itself would be singular at bifurcation surface.)

⁸⁴Alternatively, one might fix the total charge \mathcal{Q}_e given in (D.3) but allow the electric potential $\mu(t)$ to fluctuate only as a function of time:

$$\tilde{\mathbf{A}} \sim \tilde{\mathbf{A}}^+ + \tilde{\mu}(t) dt, \quad \tilde{\mathcal{Q}}_e = \frac{1}{2} \int_{t \cap \mathcal{M}} (\tilde{F}^+)^{ab} \epsilon_{ab} = 0. \quad (\text{fixed } \mathcal{Q}_e \text{ b.c., } r \rightarrow \infty) \quad (\text{D.15})$$

(Note, however, that this boundary condition is not local in space.)

(D.13) and permitted field variations (D.11), that the Maxwell symplectic potential (D.2) vanishes when evaluated on the AdS boundary \mathcal{M} (in the admissible dimensions $d \geq 3$):

$$\theta^{\text{Max}}[\delta A]|_{\mathcal{M}} = 0, \quad \mathbf{L}^{\mathcal{M}, \text{Max}} = 0 \quad (\text{fixed potential b.c.}) \quad (\text{D.18})$$

and consequently, no extra boundary Lagrangian $\mathbf{L}^{\mathcal{M}, \text{Max}}$ must be added to satisfy (2.8). Thus, the Maxwell contribution to the asymptotic energy (4.34) can be written as

$$H_{\xi}^{\mathcal{M}, \text{Max}} = \int_{\mathcal{R}} \mathbf{Q}_{\xi}^{\text{Max}} = -\mu_{\text{BH}} \mathcal{Q}_e, \quad (\text{fixed potential b.c.}), \quad (\text{D.19})$$

where, in the second equality, we have extracted the nonvanishing part of the Noether charge (D.2) (given the asymptotics of the metric background (D.4), the Maxwell background (D.13), and quantum fluctuations (D.11)) and identified the electric charge \mathcal{Q}_e defined by (D.3). Note that, in the last expression of (D.19), only \mathcal{Q}_e depends on the quantum field $\tilde{\mathbf{A}}$. Thus, for fixed potential boundary conditions, the first law of generalized entropy (4.32) for perturbations from (the Hartle-Hawking state of) an electrically charged black hole receives the extra contribution

$$\delta \langle H_{\xi}^{\mathcal{M}, \text{Max}} \rangle = -\mu_{\text{BH}} \delta \langle \mathcal{Q}_e \rangle \quad (\text{D.20})$$

from the Maxwell field. We see that including the Maxwell field in the Noether charge part of the asymptotic energy is crucial for recovering the familiar thermodynamics of a fixed potential (*i.e.* grand canonical) ensemble.

Finally, let us consider the fixed charge density boundary conditions (D.16)⁸⁵ in $d = 3$. Now, the Maxwell symplectic potential (D.2) no longer vanishes at the AdS boundary \mathcal{M} :

$$\theta^{\text{Max}}[\delta A]|_{\mathcal{M}} = \delta \mu (F_{\text{BH}}^+)^{tr} \epsilon_r, \quad (\text{fixed } \mathbf{Q}_e \text{ b.c.}) \quad (\text{D.21})$$

so we must supplement the bulk Maxwell action (D.1) with a boundary term [25]

$$\int_{\mathcal{M}} \mathbf{L}^{\mathcal{M}, \text{Max}} = - \int_{\mathcal{M}} A_a F^{ab} \epsilon_b = - \int_{\mathcal{M}} \mu (F_{\text{BH}}^+)^{tr} \epsilon_r, \quad (\text{fixed } \mathbf{Q}_e \text{ b.c.}) \quad (\text{D.22})$$

so that (2.8) is satisfied. Note that appending this term to the action and integrating over the electric potential $\tilde{\mu}$ introduced in (D.16) is tantamount to performing a Laplace transform on the bulk path integral⁸⁶. As we will now describe, switching between fixed potential and fixed charge density boundary conditions corresponds precisely to the analogous

⁸⁵For the fixed total charge boundary conditions described by (D.15) in footnote 84, the discussion is essentially the same. Since those boundary conditions are non-local in space, one should consider the correspondingly non-local analogue (4.33), written in footnote 56, of the condition (2.8). The Maxwell part of the more general condition (4.33) is satisfied by again the choice of boundary Lagrangian $\mathbf{L}^{\mathcal{M}, \text{Max}}$ written in (D.22). Once various quantities are integrated over the boundary spatial directions, the discussion in the text goes through just as well for fixed total charge boundary conditions (D.15).

⁸⁶See [43] for a general discussion about switching between the fixed $\mathbf{A}|_{\mathcal{M}}$ and fixed $r^{d-1} F^{r\mu}|_{\mathcal{M}}$ boundary conditions described by (D.11) and (D.12), including the interpretation from the CFT perspective. Note that what they call a ‘‘Legendre transform’’ is actually a Laplace transform. (When describing thermodynamics, physicists are often not careful in distinguishing Legendre and Laplace transforms as the two become equivalent upon taking the saddle-point approximation of partition functions.)

Laplace transform between grand canonical and canonical thermodynamics. Extracting the finite part of the Noether charge (D.2) appearing in the asymptotic energy (4.34), one finds

$$\mathbf{Q}_\xi^{\text{Max}}|_{\mathcal{R}} = -\mu (F_{\text{BH}}^+)^{tr} \epsilon_{tr} . \quad (\text{fixed } \mathbf{Q}_e \text{ b.c.}) \quad (\text{D.23})$$

Comparing (D.23) to (D.22), we thus find that the Maxwell contribution to the asymptotic energy (4.34) now vanishes

$$H_\xi^{\mathcal{M},\text{Max}} = 0 . \quad (\text{fixed } \mathbf{Q}_e \text{ b.c.}) \quad (\text{D.24})$$

So, for fixed charge density boundary conditions, the Maxwell field does not contribute an extra term to the asymptotic energy appearing in the generalized first law (4.32). It is, of course, unsurprising from the thermodynamics standpoint that no term like (D.20) appears in the first law, as we are working with fixed charge (*i.e.* with boundary conditions (D.16), the black hole is now more akin to a system in the canonical rather than grand canonical ensemble). Note that, to see this, it was important to consider both the Noether charge and boundary Lagrangian parts of asymptotic energy (4.34), as the Maxwell contribution to each part, by itself, would be non-vanishing.

E UV-divergences and anomalies

In this appendix, we shall describe how various ‘anomalous’ corrections, resulting from variations of the path integral measure, fit into the narrative of this paper. We will open, in appendix E.1, with a brief discussion of the renormalization of UV divergences in the effective action and generalized entropy. This will naturally lead us to consider anomalous terms resulting from background field variations. In appendix E.2, we discuss such variations together with anomalous changes of path integration variables. There, we establish notation for and define the anomalous contributions to various quantities encountered throughout this paper, *e.g.* equations of motion, the symplectic potential, the stress tensor, Wald-Dong entropy, and Noether current and charge. With relevant notation established, we shall then catalogue all the appearances of possible anomalous corrections to the calculations of this paper: the derivations of the modular Hamiltonian from section 3 and the first law of generalized entropy from section 4 are covered in appendices E.3 and E.4 respectively. Ultimately, we shall argue that, while the Noether charge and modular Hamiltonian discussed in section 3 can generally receive anomalous contributions, the relationship between the first law of generalized entropy and the effective gravitational equations of motion derived in section 4 continues to hold with the appropriately corrected quantities.

E.1 UV-divergences of the effective action

Recall, for the purposes of evaluating the quantum gravity effective action to one-loop-order in G_N , the graviton can be treated in a semiclassical theory as just another matter field propagating on a classical background geometry g — see appendix A. As reviewed in chapter 6 of [46], the bare matter part of the effective action in semiclassical theories

$$W_{\text{bare}}^{\text{mat}}[g] = -\log \int [dh d\psi]_{\text{bare}} e^{-I^{\text{mat}}[g,h,\phi+\psi]} \quad (\text{E.1})$$

typically contains UV divergences, even in the simplest case of free quantum matter fields. These divergences are inherited, for example, by the bare stress tensor

$$2 \frac{\delta W_{\text{bare}}^{\text{mat}}[g]}{\delta g_{ab}} = \langle \mathbf{T}_{\text{bare}}^{ab} \rangle = \langle T_{\text{bare}}^{ab} \rangle \epsilon. \quad (\delta g \text{ away from } \mathcal{M}) \quad (\text{E.2})$$

However, in semiclassical theories, the divergences of $W_{\text{bare}}^{\text{mat}}[g]$ can be extracted as a local action $I_{\text{div}}^{\text{mat}}[g]$ containing divergent coefficients. Thus, the complete effective action

$$W[g] = I_{\text{bare}}^{\text{grav}}[g] + W_{\text{bare}}^{\text{mat}}[g] \quad (\text{E.3})$$

can nonetheless be rendered UV-finite if $I_{\text{bare}}^{\text{grav}}[g]$ contains similarly divergent terms which cancel against $I_{\text{div}}^{\text{mat}}[g]$. Then, we see that generalized entropy $S_{\sigma}^{\text{gen}}[g]$ defined in (2.18), also expressible in the Callan-Wilczek form (2.44) in terms of the effective action, must similarly be UV-finite⁸⁷, even though its constituent bare quantities, *e.g.* the classical Wald-Dong entropy $S_{\text{bare},\sigma}^{\text{grav,WD}}[g]$, arising from $I_{\text{bare}}^{\text{grav}}[g]$, and the von Neumann entropy $S[\rho^{\text{mat}}]$, are individually UV-divergent. (As we shall explain further below, taking the zero limit of the regulator a for the smoothed conical singularities produced by the $\bullet_{\frac{\tilde{\sigma}}{\sigma}n}$ operation in (2.44) is not expected to introduce any new divergences in generalized entropy absent in the effective action $W[g]$ evaluated on smooth g .)

Rather than working with divergent quantities, however, one can choose to renormalize by explicitly absorbing the divergences $I_{\text{div}}^{\text{mat}}[g]$ of the bare matter part $W_{\text{bare}}^{\text{mat}}[g]$ of the effective action into the bare gravitational action $I_{\text{bare}}^{\text{grav}}[g]$:

$$I_{\text{ren}}^{\text{grav}}[g] = I_{\text{bare}}^{\text{grav}}[g] + I_{\text{div}}^{\text{mat}}[g] \quad (\text{E.4})$$

$$W_{\text{ren}}^{\text{mat}}[g] = W_{\text{bare}}^{\text{mat}}[g] - I_{\text{div}}^{\text{mat}}[g], \quad (\text{E.5})$$

The above renormalized combinations are UV-finite, so that, for example, the correspondingly renormalized stress tensor

$$2 \frac{\delta W_{\text{ren}}^{\text{mat}}[g]}{\delta g_{ab}} = \langle \mathbf{T}_{\text{ren}}^{ab} \rangle = \langle T_{\text{ren}}^{ab} \rangle \epsilon \quad (\delta g \text{ away from } \mathcal{M}) \quad (\text{E.6})$$

is finite. Moreover, the classical Wald-Dong entropy $S_{\text{ren},\sigma}^{\text{grav,WD}}[g]$ arising from $I_{\text{ren}}^{\text{grav}}[g]$ is also finite. The divergences of $S_{\text{bare},\sigma}^{\text{grav,WD}}[g]$ will have been transferred by this renormalization process into the quantum part $\langle S_{\text{ren},\sigma}^{\text{mat,WD}}[g, h, \phi + \psi] \rangle$ of the Wald-Dong entropy⁸⁸, which is now responsible for cancelling the UV divergences of $S[\rho^{\text{mat}}]$ in the generalized entropy (2.18).

⁸⁷See, *e.g.* [28, 29]. However, unlike what is suggested in these references, note that the quantity given by the Callan-Wilczek formula (2.44) should generally not be confused with a von Neumann entropy — see footnotes 20 and 29. For example, one can apply (2.44) to just $W_{\text{bare}}^{\text{mat}}[g]$ to get the bare matter Wald-Dong plus von Neumann entropy, to $W_{\text{ren}}^{\text{mat}}[g]$ introduced below to get the renormalized matter Wald-Dong plus von Neumann entropy, or to $W[g]$ to get the full generalized entropy.

⁸⁸If one absorbs $I_{\text{div}}^{\text{mat}}[g]$ into the path integration measure, as written below in (E.7), then the divergent part of $S_{\text{bare},\sigma}^{\text{grav,WD}}[g]$ is specifically transferred to the anomalous contribution to $\langle S_{\text{ren},\sigma}^{\text{mat,WD}}[g, h, \phi + \psi] \rangle$, as we will describe further below (E.28) in appendix E.2.

One way to absorb $-I_{\text{div}}^{\text{mat}}[g]$ into the bare matter part of the effective action as in (E.5) is to define the renormalized path integral measure

$$[dh\,d\psi]_{\text{ren}} = e^{I_{\text{div}}^{\text{mat}}[g]} [dh\,d\psi]_{\text{bare}} . \quad (\text{E.7})$$

so that

$$W_{\text{ren}}^{\text{mat}}[g] = -\log \int [dh\,d\psi]_{\text{ren}} e^{-I^{\text{mat}}[g,h,\phi+\psi]} . \quad (\text{E.8})$$

Note that this explicitly introduces to the path integral measure an extra dependence on the metric via $I_{\text{div}}^{\text{mat}}[g]$. However, even before this renormalization, there may already have been metric dependence intrinsic to the bare path integral measure $[dh\,d\psi]_{\text{bare}}$, due for example to the metric-dependence of modes used to define path integration in the first place. This naturally segues into our discussion in the next section regarding the anomalous terms arising from the background-dependence of the path integration measure.

Before moving on, however, let us also alleviate some concerns regarding another possible source of UV-divergences in the generalized entropy formula (2.44) that might arise even if the effective action $W[g]$ evaluated on smooth backgrounds is finite. Recall that, implicit in the definition of the deformed replication $\bullet_{\tilde{\chi}_n}$ appearing in the RHS of (2.44), is a regulator a describing, for smooth g , the size of the neighbourhood $\mathcal{N}_a(\sigma)$ of σ over which the would-be conical singularity of $g_{\tilde{\chi}_n}$ is smoothed. Even while the effective action evaluated on smooth backgrounds is taken to be UV-finite, a concern that one might raise is whether the expression (2.44) for generalized entropy blows up as the limit $a \rightarrow 0$ is taken. For RT surfaces in holography, we certainly expect a UV-finite bulk effective action to lead to a UV-finite generalized entropy since one can alternatively write generalized entropy in terms of the effective action evaluated on smooth backgrounds g_n , as in (A.26), where there is obviously no additional regulator a to worry about. In fact, the calculation leading to (A.30) relating the two expressions (2.44) and (A.26) seems to suggest a more general argument for the finiteness of (2.44) under $a \rightarrow 0$ perhaps extending beyond holography. As in appendix A, let us denote by $\mathcal{M}_n = \mathcal{M}_{\tilde{\chi}_n}$ the spacetime boundary manifold replicated around $\varsigma = \sigma \cap \mathcal{M}$. Then, for a general g and σ , suppose that one can construct a sequence of smooth backgrounds g_n that satisfy boundary conditions on \mathcal{M}_n and are \mathbb{Z}_n -symmetric around codimension-two surfaces σ_n such that $g_1 = g$, $\sigma_1 = \sigma$, and the orbifolds $g_{n\tilde{\chi}_n}$ (and hence $g_{n\tilde{\chi}_n}$) can be analytically continued to real n near $n = 1$. (For example, [9] must have implicitly made this assumption for bulk solutions g and non-RT σ when verifying the quantum extremality of RT surfaces as described below (A.26).) Then, the calculation around (A.30) shows that the generalized entropy $S_{\sigma}^{\text{gen}}[g]$ defined by (2.44) is given by

$$S_{\sigma}^{\text{gen}}[g] = \partial_n \left(W[g_n] - nW[g_1] - W[g_{n\tilde{\chi}_n}] \right)_{n=1} , \quad (\text{E.9})$$

where the first two terms are manifestly independent of a while the last term can be expressed as

$$\partial_n W[g_{n\tilde{\chi}_n}] \Big|_{n=1} = \int \frac{\delta W[g]}{\delta g} \cdot \partial_n g_{n\tilde{\chi}_n} \Big|_{n=1} . \quad (\text{E.10})$$

Even for off-shell g , we expect this to be finite in the $a \rightarrow 0$ limit as it only involves the boundary-condition-preserving variation $\partial_n g_n \big|_{n=1}$ of the metric (as opposed to, *e.g.* higher powers of curvature which would become dangerously divergent in $\mathcal{N}_a(\sigma_n)$ at $n \neq 1$). We conclude therefore that the generalized entropy given by (E.9), or equivalently (2.44), is UV-finite even in the $a \rightarrow 0$ limit, provided the effective action $W[g]$ evaluated on smooth backgrounds is UV-finite, either by renormalization in the semiclassical theory, as described earlier in this appendix, or for some other reason.

E.2 Variations of the path integral measure

Let us begin by very formally describing the bare path integration measure. One can think of this as a ‘volume form’ on the space of UV-regulated field configurations $(g + h, \phi + \psi)$, which can be constructed out of ‘one-forms’ on this space, *i.e.* some basis of field fluctuation modes, which we schematically denote dh and $d\psi$, and some ‘metric determinant’ on the space of field configurations, which can generally vary with $(g + h, \phi + \psi)$. In general, the UV regulation of fluctuations can also depend on $(g + h, \phi + \psi)$. Thus, to display these dependences explicitly, we can formally write the bare path integration measure as

$$[dh, d\psi; g + h, \phi + \psi]_{\text{bare}} . \quad (\text{E.11})$$

Considering the semiclassical effective action, however, the background metric g itself plays a distinguished role. For instance, we might choose to evaluate the renormalized matter part (E.8) using the renormalized measure (E.7) — notice here that the absorbed counterterm action $I_{\text{div}}^{\text{mat}}[g]$ depends on the background metric g alone. Thus, we will allow for a slight generalization to the form of the path integration measure⁸⁹:

$$[dh, d\psi; g, h, \phi + \psi]_{\text{ren}} . \quad (\text{E.13})$$

From here on, we shall adopt this more general form and discard subscripts \bullet_{bare} and \bullet_{ren} ; unless otherwise specified, one is free to interpret the discussions after this point as referring either to bare or renormalized quantities.

It is perhaps helpful to pause briefly to connect our description of the path integration measure above with the simplified example of a quantum scalar field propagating on a classical background spacetime [47, 48]. Here, it is standard to define the path integration as being over the expansion coefficients of scalar field fluctuations with respect to eigenmodes of a differential operator, typically extracted from the terms in the action quadratic in the fluctuations. The orthonormalization of the eigenmodes is taken with respect to the usual inner product $(f_1, f_2) = \int \epsilon f_1^* f_2$ of scalar functions f_1, f_2 on a curved manifold. To

⁸⁹In fact, if we are only interested in using our semiclassical theory to compute the quantum gravity effective action up to $O(G_N)$ corrections, as described around (A.14), it may suffice to simply consider the measure

$$[dh, d\psi; g, \phi + \psi] , \quad (\text{E.12})$$

as graviton fluctuations are suppressed in G_N . We would then essentially be zooming in to the space of small metric fluctuations around g , which can be approximated by the ‘tangent space’ at the ‘point’ g .

connect with the language of the previous paragraph, this orthonormalization condition is what determines the ‘metric’ on the space of field configurations and it obviously depends on the spacetime metric. The UV-regulation of the bare path integration can be applied as a restriction on the eigenvalues of the differential operator, which is metric dependent. Furthermore, if, for example, the scalar is charged under a gauge symmetry carried by a Maxwell field, then the differential operator should also depend on the Maxwell field. Thus, we see that it is plausible for the path integration measure to depend on both the spacetime metric and matter fields.

Let us proceed now to discuss the anomalous terms that can arise from variations of the path integration measure. For this, we must appeal to the locality of the response of the path integral measure to variations in the background and to changes of path integration variables. By this, we mean that if we perturb the background (g, ϕ) or apply an infinitesimal transformation to the quantum fields (h, ψ) in a restricted spacetime neighbourhood in $(g + h, \phi + \psi)$, then only the path integration measure over quantum field fluctuations $(dh, d\psi)$ in that neighbourhood ought to be affected. Obviously, the metric-dependence of the $e^{I_{\text{div}}^{\text{mat}}[g]}$ factor in the renormalized measure (E.7) is local, since the action $I_{\text{div}}^{\text{mat}}[g]$ is local. To see that the response of the bare path integration measure should also be local to begin with, one can choose to define the path integration using quantum field fluctuation $(dh, d\psi)$ modes given by localized wavepackets⁹⁰ — it is then natural for the orthonormalization condition and UV-regulation of the wavepackets to be dependent only on the field profiles $(g + h, \phi + \psi)$ in the wavepackets’ regions of support. Moreover, if we reparameterize the quantum field fluctuations $(dh, d\psi)$ in a restricted spacetime neighbourhood, then we expect fluctuations corresponding to orthonormal wavepackets localized elsewhere in the spacetime to remain orthonormal.

Expressing this locality mathematically, we shall write the variation of the path integration measure resulting from a background perturbation $(\delta g, \delta \phi)$ as the insertion of operators living in the supports of δg and $\delta \phi$; by linearity in δg and $\delta \phi$ and using integrating by parts, we can generally write this as

$$(\delta g + \delta \phi)[dh, d\psi; g, h, \phi + \psi] = - [dh, d\psi; g, h, \phi + \psi] \int (\mathbf{E}_g^{\text{an}} \cdot \delta g + \mathbf{E}_\phi^{\text{an}} \cdot \delta \phi + d\boldsymbol{\theta}^{\text{an}}[\delta g, \delta \phi]) , \quad (\text{E.14})$$

where $\boldsymbol{\theta}^{\text{an}}$ is linear in its arguments. In contrast to their counterparts \mathbf{E}_g , \mathbf{E}_ϕ , and $\boldsymbol{\theta}[\delta g, \delta \phi]$ obtained from the Lagrangian \mathbf{L} , the operators \mathbf{E}_g^{an} , $\mathbf{E}_\phi^{\text{an}}$, and $\boldsymbol{\theta}^{\text{an}}[\delta g, \delta \phi]$ might not have simple expressions in terms of field operators; we shall simply take (E.14) to be their definition.

We can develop similar notation for changes $(\delta h, \delta \psi)$ of path integration variables. Here, δh and $\delta \psi$ denote linearized transformations acting on the space field configurations

⁹⁰Note that the path integration measure does not depend on the specific choice of modes *per se*, but rather the ‘volume form’ on the space of configurations, *e.g.* implied by an orthonormalization condition of the modes. Thus, the path integral does not care whether one chooses to consider, say, the eigenmodes of some differential operator, or a basis of localized wavepackets, so long as the modes satisfy the same orthonormalization condition and span the same space of UV-regulated fluctuations.

and can generally vary over this space, *i.e.* $(\delta h, \delta \psi)$ may not necessarily be c-numbers. In the same way that $(\delta g, \delta \phi)$ play the roles of linearization parameters in (E.14), it is helpful here to introduce a scalar c-number function ι over spacetime and consider the effect of the change of variables $(\iota \delta h, \iota \delta \psi)$ on the path integration measure, linearized in ι . Then, analogous to (E.14), we write

$$\begin{aligned} & \delta_\iota [d(h + \iota \delta h), d(\psi + \iota \delta \psi); g, h + \iota \delta h, \phi + \psi + \iota \delta \psi] \\ &= - [dh, d\psi; g, h, \phi + \psi] \int \{ (\mathbf{E}_{h, \delta h}^{\text{an}} + \mathbf{E}_{\psi, \delta \psi}^{\text{an}}) \iota + d(\boldsymbol{\theta}_{h, \delta h}^{\text{an}}[\iota] + \boldsymbol{\theta}_{\psi, \delta \psi}^{\text{an}}[\iota]) \} , \end{aligned} \quad (\text{E.15})$$

where $\boldsymbol{\theta}_{\gamma, \delta \gamma}^{\text{an}}[\iota]$ is linear in ι (and its derivatives). Furthermore, note that, for any function ι , we have by definition that

$$\mathbf{E}_{\gamma, \delta \gamma}^{\text{an}} \iota = \mathbf{E}_{\gamma, \iota \delta \gamma}^{\text{an}} , \quad \boldsymbol{\theta}_{\gamma, \delta \gamma}^{\text{an}}[\iota] = \boldsymbol{\theta}_{\gamma, \iota \delta \gamma}^{\text{an}}[1] . \quad (\gamma \in \{h, \psi\}) \quad (\text{E.16})$$

It will be helpful, therefore, to abbreviate

$$\boldsymbol{\theta}_{\gamma, \delta \gamma}^{\text{an}} = \boldsymbol{\theta}_{\gamma, \delta \gamma}^{\text{an}}[1] . \quad (\text{E.17})$$

Note that, owing to the shift-invariance of the ‘one-forms’ in the path integration measure,

$$[d(h + \delta h), d(\psi + \delta \phi); g, h, \phi + \psi] = [dh, d\psi; g, h, \phi + \psi] \quad (\text{c-number } \delta h, \delta \psi) , \quad (\text{E.18})$$

we have for c-number variations,

$$\mathbf{E}_{\psi, \delta \phi}^{\text{an}} = \mathbf{E}_{\phi}^{\text{an}} \cdot \delta \phi , \quad \boldsymbol{\theta}_{\psi, \delta \phi}^{\text{an}} = \boldsymbol{\theta}^{\text{an}}[\delta \phi] , \quad (\text{c-number } \delta \phi) \quad (\text{E.19})$$

where $\mathbf{E}_{\phi}^{\text{an}}$ and $\boldsymbol{\theta}^{\text{an}}[\delta \phi]$ are the same objects defined previously in (E.14); similarly, we can write⁹¹, for some \mathbf{E}_h^{an} and some $\boldsymbol{\theta}^{\text{an}}[\delta h]$ linear in δh ,

$$\mathbf{E}_{h, \delta h}^{\text{an}} = \mathbf{E}_h^{\text{an}} \cdot \delta h , \quad \boldsymbol{\theta}_{h, \delta h}^{\text{an}} = \boldsymbol{\theta}^{\text{an}}[\delta h] . \quad (\text{c-number } \delta h) \quad (\text{E.21})$$

Although the \mathbf{E}^{an} and $\boldsymbol{\theta}^{\text{an}}$ objects defined by (E.14) and (E.15) might not have obvious expressions in terms of fields and aren’t obtained simply from some Lagrangian, it is natural to include these anomalous terms as corrections to various operators. Perhaps the most obvious example is the matter stress tensor T^{ab} , whose expectation value is given by the first variation of the matter part $W^{\text{mat}}[g]$ of the effective action, as in the first equality of (2.11). Accounting for the variations of both the action and the path integral measure, we see that the full stress tensor can be expressed as

$$(\mathbf{E}_g^{\text{mat}} + \mathbf{E}_g^{\text{an}})^{ab} = \mathbf{T}^{ab} = T^{ab} \epsilon , \quad (\text{E.22})$$

⁹¹Note that if we had used the form (E.11) of the path integration measure instead of the more general (E.13), we would find that $\mathbf{E}_h^{\text{an}} = \mathbf{E}_g^{\text{an}}$ and $\boldsymbol{\theta}^{\text{an}}[\delta h] = \boldsymbol{\theta}^{\text{an}}[\delta g = \delta h]$ in (E.21) are also the same objects defined previously in (E.14). Moreover, if we neglect the graviton dependence of the measure, as suggested in (E.12) of footnote 89, we would have found

$$\mathbf{E}_{h, \delta h}^{\text{an}} = 0 , \quad \boldsymbol{\theta}_{h, \delta h}^{\text{an}} = 0 . \quad (\text{c-number } \delta h) \quad (\text{E.20})$$

This is just (E.21) with the δh on the RHS set to be negligibly small (to be consistent with the assumption of suppressed graviton fluctuations that led to (E.12)).

so that

$$0 = \frac{\delta W[g]}{\delta g_{ab}} = \left\langle (\mathbf{E}_g + \mathbf{E}_g^{\text{an}})^{ab} \right\rangle = (\mathbf{E}_g^{\text{grav}})^{ab} + \frac{1}{2} \left\langle \mathbf{T}^{ab} \right\rangle \quad (\delta g \text{ away from } \mathcal{M}, g \text{ on-shell}) \quad (\text{E.23})$$

gives the anomaly-corrected semiclassical equations of motion (2.9) for the metric g . Moreover, the property (E.18) of the path integration measure and the fact that ϕ only appears as a shift of ψ in both the action $I[g, h, \phi + \psi]$ and the measure $[dh, d\psi; g, h, \phi + \psi]$ gives

$$0 = \frac{\delta W[g]}{\delta \phi} = \langle \mathbf{E}_\phi + \mathbf{E}_\phi^{\text{an}} \rangle, \quad (\delta \phi \text{ away from } \mathcal{M}) \quad (\text{E.24})$$

correcting the more naively written (2.13). For the quantum fields $\gamma \in \{h, \psi\}$, the anomalous corrections $\mathbf{E}_{\gamma, \delta\gamma}^{\text{an}}$ and $\boldsymbol{\theta}_{\gamma, \delta\gamma}^{\text{an}}$ give the variations of the path integration measure in response to reparametrizations of the integration variables by $\delta\gamma$; thus, we have

$$\langle \mathbf{E}_h \cdot \delta h + \mathbf{E}_{h, \delta h}^{\text{an}} \rangle = 0, \quad \langle \mathbf{E}_\psi \cdot \delta \psi + \mathbf{E}_{\psi, \delta \psi}^{\text{an}} \rangle = 0, \quad (\text{E.25})$$

of which (E.24) is a special case, as seen from (E.19). (The above holds locally at any point in the interior of the spacetime region of path integration, because we can consider in (E.15) the perturbations $\iota \delta h$ and $\iota \delta \psi$ for any scalar function ι with arbitrary support away from the boundary of the region— recall also (E.16).)

It will be helpful also to define the anomalous corrections to other operators encountered in this paper, such as the Wald-Dong entropy, Noether charge, and Noether current. Let us begin with the Wald-Dong entropy which was naively given by (2.35) or equivalently (2.41). We shall analogously define the anomalous correction to the Wald-Dong entropy to be⁹²

$$[dh, d\psi; g, h, \phi + \psi] S_\sigma^{\text{WD, an}}[g, h, \phi + \psi] = \partial_n \left([d(h_{\times n \frac{\tilde{\cdot}}{\sigma}}, d(\psi_{\times n \frac{\tilde{\cdot}}{\sigma}}); g_{\times n \frac{\tilde{\cdot}}{\sigma}}, h_{\times n \frac{\tilde{\cdot}}{\sigma}}, \phi_{\times n \frac{\tilde{\cdot}}{\sigma}} + \psi_{\times n \frac{\tilde{\cdot}}{\sigma}}] \right)_{n=1} \quad (\text{E.26})$$

$$= \partial_n \left([d(h_{\times n \frac{\tilde{\cdot}}{\sigma}}, d(\psi_{\times n \frac{\tilde{\cdot}}{\sigma}}); g_{\times n}, h_{\times n \frac{\tilde{\cdot}}{\sigma}}, \phi_{\times n} + \psi_{\times n \frac{\tilde{\cdot}}{\sigma}}] - [dh, d\psi; g_{\times n}, h, \phi_{\times n} + \psi] \right)_{n=1}, \quad (\text{E.27})$$

so that the parenthesized difference in measures of (E.27) is precisely the anomalous correction of (2.43) mentioned below that equation. Consequently, if we correct the Wald-Dong entropy to be given by the naive (2.35), derived from the action, plus the anomalous correction (E.26) so that

$$S_\sigma^{\text{WD}}[g, h, \phi + \psi] = \partial_n I_{\sigma, n}[g, h, \phi + \psi]|_{n=1} + S_\sigma^{\text{WD, an}}[g, h, \phi + \psi], \quad (\text{E.28})$$

then the generalized entropy (2.18) is still given in terms of the effective action by (2.44), even after accounting for variations of the path integration measure⁹³. We note that,

⁹²Recall, from the discussion below (2.32) and (2.42) that $\bullet_{\times n \frac{\tilde{\cdot}}{\sigma}}$ has the interpretation, at any real $n > 0$ as a deformation localized in the tiny neighbourhood $\mathcal{N}_a(\sigma)$ of σ which multiplies the opening angle around exactly σ by n .

⁹³To clarify our conventions for notation in this section, we should state that, with the exception of the stress tensor T^{ab} defined by (E.22) and the Wald-Dong entropy defined by (E.28), the symbols for all other quantities shall retain their original meanings defined in the main text of this paper in terms of the action I . The addition of anomalous corrections to those other quantities shall be written explicitly.

through the renormalization (E.7) of the path integration measure, the divergent contribution to Wald-Dong entropy from the divergent action $I_{\text{div}}^{\text{mat}}[g]$ is transferred between the two terms in (E.28), but (E.28) as a whole remains invariant.

As in (2.42), we can try to express the anomalous contribution (E.26) to the Wald-Dong entropy in terms of the anomalous symplectic potential θ^{an} :

$$S_{\sigma}^{\text{WD,an}}[g, h, \phi + \psi] \stackrel{?}{=} \int_{\partial\mathcal{N}_0(\sigma)} \left(\theta^{\text{an}}[\partial_n g_{\times n \frac{\dot{\cdot}}{\sigma} n}|_{n=1}, \partial_n \phi_{\times n \frac{\dot{\cdot}}{\sigma} n}|_{n=1}] + \theta_{h, \partial_n h}^{\text{an}}|_{\times n \frac{\dot{\cdot}}{\sigma} n}|_{n=1} + \theta_{\psi, \partial_n \psi}^{\text{an}}|_{\times n \frac{\dot{\cdot}}{\sigma} n}|_{n=1} \right). \quad (\text{E.29})$$

However, we expect similar subtleties as for (2.42) to plague (E.29) as well. (This is perhaps most obvious in the case where one considers the renormalized path integration measure (E.7) which absorbs the factor $e^{I_{\text{div}}^{\text{mat}}[g]}$; the resulting extra contribution to the anomalous Wald-Dong entropy (E.26) from this factor can be calculated by applying the same procedure as in [6] to the action $-I_{\text{div}}^{\text{mat}}[g]$.) However, one can hope that when the extrinsic curvatures of the entangling surface σ vanish⁹⁴, as in thermal setups, corrections to (E.29) vanish, just as the corrections found by [6] to (2.42) vanish in these cases. Indeed, it will be interesting to compare (E.29) to a very similar expression for the anomalous contribution to a Noether charge integrated along σ , as we will discuss in appendix E.3.

Let us now consider the anomalous corrections to the \mathbf{C}_a forms and Noether charge, defined by (3.14) and (3.21), and the Noether current given by (3.20). Let us start with the $(\mathbf{C}_{\gamma})_a$ forms originally given by (3.14) for each field $\gamma \in \{g, h, \phi, \psi\}$. For the background fields, the generalization is obvious: tacking on superscripts \bullet^{an} to (3.14), we have

$$(\mathbf{C}_{\gamma}^{\text{an}})_a \equiv \sum_{i=1}^r (E_{\gamma}^{\text{an}})^{b_1 \dots b_s}_{c_1 \dots a \dots c_r} \gamma_{b_1 \dots b_s}^{c_1 \dots c_i \dots c_r} \epsilon_{c_i} - \sum_{i=1}^s (E_{\gamma}^{\text{an}})^{b_1 \dots b_i \dots b_s}_{c_1 \dots c_r} \gamma_{b_1 \dots a \dots b_s}^{c_1 \dots c_r} \epsilon_{b_i}. \quad (\gamma \in \{g, \phi\}) \quad (\text{E.30})$$

where

$$\mathbf{E}_{\gamma}^{\text{an}} = \epsilon E_{\gamma}^{\text{an}}. \quad (\text{E.31})$$

To define $(\mathbf{C}_{\gamma}^{\text{an}})_a$ for the quantum fields h and ψ , it is perhaps better to consider an alternative to the definition (3.14). For any vector field χ , it can be shown simply by writing \mathcal{L}_{χ} out in terms of covariant derivatives that $(\mathbf{C}_{\gamma})_a$ and $(\mathbf{C}_{\gamma}^{\text{an}})_a$ defined by (3.14) and (E.30) satisfy⁹⁵

$$\mathbf{E}_{\gamma} \cdot \mathcal{L}_{\chi} \gamma = \chi^a (\mathbf{B}_{\gamma})_a - d\{\chi^a (\mathbf{C}_{\gamma})_a\}, \quad (\text{E.32})$$

$$\mathbf{E}_{\gamma}^{\text{an}} \cdot \mathcal{L}_{\chi} \gamma = \chi^a (\mathbf{B}_{\gamma}^{\text{an}})_a - d\{\chi^a (\mathbf{C}_{\gamma}^{\text{an}})_a\}, \quad (\gamma \in \{g, \phi\}) \quad (\text{E.33})$$

⁹⁴One might, for example, try to argue, along the lines of the discussion after (3.34), that in these cases the action of $\bullet_{\times n \frac{\dot{\cdot}}{\sigma} n}$, for n close to 1 and finite a , produces a change in the path integration measure that is not particularly pathological on approach to σ .

⁹⁵See (B.2) in [16].

for some top-dimensional forms $(\mathbf{B}_\gamma)_a$ and $(\mathbf{B}_\gamma^{\text{an}})_a$; these serve as an alternative to (3.14) and (E.30) for defining $(\mathbf{C}_\gamma)_a$ and $(\mathbf{C}_\gamma^{\text{an}})_a$. Thus, a reasonable definition for the $(\mathbf{C}_\gamma^{\text{an}})_a$ of a quantum field $\gamma \in \{h, \psi\}$ is given by writing

$$\mathbf{E}_{\gamma, \mathcal{L}_\chi \gamma}^{\text{an}} \equiv \chi^a (\mathbf{B}_\gamma^{\text{an}})_a - d\{\chi^a (\mathbf{C}_\gamma^{\text{an}})_a\}, \quad (\gamma \in \{h, \psi\}) \quad (\text{E.34})$$

for some top-dimensional form $(\mathbf{B}_\gamma^{\text{an}})_a$. We note that $\mathbf{E}_{\gamma, \mathcal{L}_\chi \gamma}^{\text{an}}$ should be expressible in this form, because the change of integration variables $\delta\gamma = \mathcal{L}_\chi \gamma$ is linear in χ and depends on no higher derivatives of χ than its first, so the same statements should be true of $\mathbf{E}_{\gamma, \mathcal{L}_\chi \gamma}^{\text{an}}$ as defined in (B.19)⁹⁶. Obviously, we can define, in analogy with (3.21), the total anomalous \mathbf{C}_a^{an} form:

$$\mathbf{C}_a^{\text{an}} \equiv \sum_{\gamma \in \{g, h, \phi, \psi\}} (\mathbf{C}_\gamma^{\text{an}})_a. \quad (\text{E.39})$$

Before proceeding to discuss Noether charges and currents, let us pause briefly to examine the expectation values of the anomaly-corrected $\mathbf{C}_a + \mathbf{C}_a^{\text{an}}$ forms. Let us begin with the metric part. Notice from (3.14) and (E.30) that, in analogy with (3.18), we have

$$(\mathbf{C}_g + \mathbf{C}_g^{\text{an}})^a = -2\epsilon_b (E_g + E_g^{\text{an}})^{ab} = -\epsilon_b (2E_g^{\text{grav}} + T)^{ab}, \quad (\text{E.40})$$

involving the full stress tensor (E.22), accounting for metric variations in the path integration measure. Setting the expectation value of (E.40) to zero yields the semiclassical equations of motion (E.23) for the metric g . On the other hand, from (3.14), (E.30), and (E.34), one can argue that the expectation value of the anomaly-corrected $(\mathbf{C}_\gamma + \mathbf{C}_\gamma^{\text{an}})_a$ forms for the other background fields ϕ and the quantum fields (h, ψ) vanish by virtue of (E.24) and (E.25):

$$\langle (\mathbf{C}_\gamma + \mathbf{C}_\gamma^{\text{an}})_a \rangle = 0. \quad (\gamma \in \{\phi, h, \psi\}) \quad (\text{E.41})$$

To show the above for the case of the quantum fields $\gamma \in \{h, \psi\}$, note from (E.32) and (E.34) that the integral of $-\chi^a (\mathbf{C}_\gamma + \mathbf{C}_\gamma^{\text{an}})_a$ over any codimension-one region Ξ is expressible as

⁹⁶In particular, if we expand

$$\mathcal{L}_\chi \gamma = \chi^a (\delta_1)_a \gamma + \nabla_b \chi^a (\delta_2)_a{}^b \gamma, \quad (\gamma \in \{h, \psi\}) \quad (\text{E.35})$$

where the variations $(\delta_1)_a \gamma$ and $(\delta_2)_a{}^b \gamma$ are independent of χ , then we expect

$$\mathbf{E}_{\gamma, \mathcal{L}_\chi \gamma}^{\text{an}} = \chi^a \mathbf{E}_{\gamma, (\delta_1)_a \gamma}^{\text{an}} + \nabla_b \chi^a \mathbf{E}_{\gamma, (\delta_2)_a{}^b \gamma}^{\text{an}}. \quad (\gamma \in \{h, \psi\}) \quad (\text{E.36})$$

In (E.35) and (E.36), ∇ can be any derivative operator independent of the quantum fields (h, ψ) , but taking it to be the derivative operator preserving some volume form, *e.g.* the volume form ϵ of the background metric, makes it easy to see (E.34) is satisfied for

$$(\mathbf{B}_\gamma^{\text{an}})_a = \mathbf{E}_{\gamma, (\delta_1)_a \gamma}^{\text{an}} - \nabla_b \mathbf{E}_{\gamma, (\delta_2)_a{}^b \gamma}^{\text{an}}, \quad (\mathbf{C}_\gamma^{\text{an}})_a = -E_{\gamma, (\delta_2)_a{}^b \gamma}^{\text{an}} \epsilon_b, \quad (\gamma \in \{h, \psi\}) \quad (\text{E.37})$$

where

$$\mathbf{E}_{\gamma, (\delta_2)_a{}^b \gamma}^{\text{an}} = \epsilon E_{\gamma, (\delta_2)_a{}^b \gamma}^{\text{an}}. \quad (\gamma \in \{h, \psi\}) \quad (\text{E.38})$$

(These expressions for $(\mathbf{B}_\gamma^{\text{an}})_a$ and $(\mathbf{C}_\gamma^{\text{an}})_a$, with $(\delta_1)_a \gamma$ and $(\delta_2)_a{}^b \gamma$ defined by (E.35), again do not depend on the choice of the (h, ψ) -independent derivative operator ∇ .)

the integral of $\mathbf{E}_\gamma \cdot \mathcal{L}_{\iota\chi}\gamma + \mathbf{E}_{\gamma, \mathcal{L}_{\iota\chi}\gamma}^{\text{an}}$ over an infinitesimally thin slab with Ξ as one face, where ι is a smooth scalar function interpolating from one on Ξ to zero on the other face of the slab⁹⁷. Thus, (E.41) gives the anomaly-corrected versions of (4.18) and (4.19).

Now, to define the anomalous contribution to the Noether charge, we can employ a similar strategy as for (E.34). Notice from (3.20) and (3.21) that, in analogy to (E.32), the Noether charge can be defined as the total derivative part of the symplectic potential when using the product rule to strip derivatives from χ :

$$\theta[\mathcal{L}_\chi g, \mathcal{L}_\chi h, \mathcal{L}_\chi(\phi + \psi)] = \chi^a (\mathbf{C}_a + \epsilon_a L) + d\mathbf{Q}_\chi \quad (\text{E.42})$$

Thus, let us similarly define the anomalous correction $\mathbf{Q}_\chi^{\text{an}}$ such that

$$\theta^{\text{an}}[\mathcal{L}_\chi g, \mathcal{L}_\chi \phi] + \theta_{h, \mathcal{L}_\chi h}^{\text{an}} + \theta_{\psi, \mathcal{L}_\chi \psi}^{\text{an}} = \chi^a \mathbf{A}_a^{\text{an}} + d\mathbf{Q}_\chi^{\text{an}} \quad (\text{E.43})$$

for some \mathbf{A}_a^{an} . With \mathbf{C}_a^{an} and $\mathbf{Q}_\chi^{\text{an}}$ now defined, we can proceed to also define the anomalous correction $\mathbf{J}_\chi^{\text{an}}$ to the Noether current by analogy to (3.21):

$$\mathbf{J}_\chi^{\text{an}} = d\mathbf{Q}_\chi^{\text{an}} + \chi^a \mathbf{C}_a^{\text{an}}. \quad (\text{E.44})$$

Correcting (3.21) with this, we see from (E.40) and (E.41) that the exterior derivative

$$d\langle \mathbf{J}_\chi + \mathbf{J}_\chi^{\text{an}} \rangle = -2d\langle \epsilon_a \chi_b (E_g + E_g^{\text{an}})^{ab} \rangle \quad (\text{E.45})$$

vanishes when the anomaly-corrected semiclassical equations of motion (E.23) for the metric are satisfied; this expresses conservation of the Noether current $\langle \mathbf{J}_\chi + \mathbf{J}_\chi^{\text{an}} \rangle$.

We end this section by introducing some final anomalous ingredients relevant for considering perturbations which reach the boundary of spacetime regions over which path integration is carried out — *e.g.* at the spacetime boundary \mathcal{M} or, when one is interested in path integrals over only a portion of the bulk (as we were in appendix B), the bounding codimension-one surfaces on which the quantum field configurations are fixed. Let us begin by treating the latter types of surfaces. Suppose one starts out, with a path integral, with measure $[dh, d\psi; g, h, \phi + \psi]$, covering, for simplicity, a compact spacetime without boundary. Now, we bipartition the spacetime into two complementary regions \mathcal{S} and \mathcal{S}' . We shall take, as a fundamental property, the fact that path integrals over spacetime regions can be joined together or split apart along codimension-one surfaces. (Indeed, this is what permits the replica calculation of Rényi entropies, as described after (2.23) in section 2, and the interpretation of path integration as giving matrix elements of an evolution operator, as described in appendix B.) To be specific, suppose we fix, in our example, the quantum field configuration⁹⁸ on $\partial\mathcal{S} = \partial\mathcal{S}'$ to what we will denote with a state $|\Psi\rangle$ — this can be accomplished by inserting into the path integral a delta functional $\delta_{\partial\mathcal{S}, |\Psi\rangle}[h, \psi]$ which constrains

⁹⁷Alternatively, one can directly write $(\mathbf{C}_\gamma + \mathbf{C}_\gamma^{\text{an}})_a$, for $\gamma \in \{h, \psi\}$ in terms of equations of motion using (3.14) and (E.37).

⁹⁸Without loss of generality, we can focus on quantum field states corresponding to fixed field configurations on $\partial\mathcal{S}$. More general wave functionals on $\partial\mathcal{S}$ can then be constructed from the basis formed by these states.

the quantum fields (h, ψ) on $\partial\mathcal{S}$ to match $|\Psi\rangle$. We would like this delta functional to have the property that, when $\delta_{\partial\mathcal{S},|\Psi\rangle}[h, \psi]$ is integrated with some measure over the space of $|\Psi\rangle$, the identity is recovered. Then, we might naively hope to be able to split

$$\begin{aligned} & \int [dh, d\psi; g, h, \phi + \psi] \delta_{\partial\mathcal{S},|\Psi\rangle}[h, \psi] \bullet \\ & \stackrel{?}{=} \int [dh, d\psi; g, h, \phi + \psi]_{\mathcal{S},|\Psi\rangle} [dh, d\psi; g, h, \phi + \psi]_{\mathcal{S}',\langle\Psi|} \bullet, \end{aligned} \quad (\text{E.46})$$

where $[dh, d\psi; g, h, \phi + \psi]_{\mathcal{S},|\Psi\rangle}$ is the induced measure over quantum field fluctuations in \mathcal{S} which leave the configuration on $\partial\mathcal{S}$ fixed to $|\Psi\rangle$, and we similarly define $[dh, d\psi; g, h, \phi + \psi]_{\mathcal{S}',\langle\Psi|}$. But, of course, we know that integrals (even over finite dimensional spaces) do not generally factorize in this way. For specificity, let us consider using localized wavepackets for modes, which approximately diagonalize the metric over the space of quantum field fluctuations. Then, (E.46) is still problematic as it is possible for the metric in the directions ‘transverse’ to the ‘surface’ (in the space of field configurations) specified by the constraints of $|\Psi\rangle$ to be dependent on the location along the ‘surface’. In particular, it may be that the orthonormalization of the wavepackets centred on $\partial\mathcal{S}$ depends on the derivatives of fields across $\partial\mathcal{S}$ (and thus on the field configurations in the interiors of \mathcal{S} and \mathcal{S}'). To more generally allow for such dependences while still maintaining some notion of factorizability of the path integral, we thus write, instead of (E.46),

$$\begin{aligned} & \int [dh, d\psi; g, h, \phi + \psi] \delta_{\partial\mathcal{S},|\Psi\rangle}[h, \psi] \bullet \\ & = \int e^{-\int_{\partial\mathcal{S}} \mathbf{L}^{\text{GH,an}}} [dh, d\psi; g, h, \phi + \psi]_{\mathcal{S},|\Psi\rangle} e^{-\int_{\partial\mathcal{S}'} \mathbf{L}^{\text{GH,an}}} [dh, d\psi; g, h, \phi + \psi]_{\mathcal{S}',\langle\Psi|} \bullet, \end{aligned} \quad (\text{E.47})$$

where $\mathbf{L}^{\text{GH,an}}$ is some local operator. (Note that $\mathbf{L}^{\text{GH,an}}$ and the Gibbons-Hawking-like term \mathbf{L}^{GH} contributing to the action play analogous roles in that they capture the effects that derivatives of fields across a codimension-one surface have on the path integration measure and action when configurations are joined along the surface.) Thus, for bounded spacetime regions \mathcal{S} where field configurations are fixed on its codimension-one boundary, it is most natural to consider path integrals where the measure implicitly includes a factor of $e^{-\int_{\partial\mathcal{S}} \mathbf{L}^{\text{GH,an}}}$; explicitly

$$\int e^{-\int_{\partial\mathcal{S}} \mathbf{L}^{\text{GH,an}}} [dh, d\psi; g, h, \phi + \psi]_{\mathcal{S},|\Psi\rangle} \bullet. \quad (\text{E.48})$$

It follows that when we perturb the background fields, or when we perform a change of path integration variables (which preserves the quantum field configurations on the codimension-one surface set by $|\Psi\rangle$), we should account for variations

$$- \int_{\partial\mathcal{S}} \delta \mathbf{L}^{\text{GH,an}} \quad (\text{E.49})$$

of $\mathbf{L}^{\text{GH,an}}$ in addition to the terms displayed in (E.14) and (E.15). In particular, we note that, for changes of path integration variables $(\delta h, \delta \psi)$, we expect $(\delta h + \delta \psi) \mathbf{L}^{\text{GH,an}}$ and

$\theta_{h,\delta h}^{\text{an}} + \theta_{\psi,\delta\psi}^{\text{an}}$ to cancel against each other (analogous to (B.4)):

$$(\theta_{h,\delta h}^{\text{an}} + \theta_{\psi,\delta\psi}^{\text{an}})|_{\Xi} = -(\delta h + \delta\psi)\mathbf{L}^{\text{GH,an}}|_{\Xi} . \quad (\text{bulk codim.-1 } \Xi \text{ where } \delta h, \delta\psi = 0) \quad (\text{E.50})$$

We expect this identity to hold, because for any codimension-one surface Ξ , by design, $(\delta h + \delta\psi)e^{-\int_{\Xi}\mathbf{L}^{\text{GH,an}}}$ should recover the variation of the induced metric determinant over the space of quantum fluctuations localized around Ξ , in response to a change of variables $(\delta h, \delta\psi)$ with support on one side of Ξ (*c.f.* footnote 72).

There is, further, a more general set of considerations to support (B.4) and (E.50). If one considers classical field theory, then a desirable property of the full action over a spacetime region \mathcal{S} , including Gibbons-Hawking-like boundary contributions on $\partial\mathcal{S}$, is that it is extremized by solutions of the bulk equations of motion (as also mentioned around (B.4)). This is ensured if, for an arbitrary variation $(\delta h, \delta\psi)$ of the fields which preserve the boundary conditions at $\partial\mathcal{S}$, the boundary integrals $\int_{\partial\mathcal{S}}$ cancel in the response $\int_{\mathcal{S}}(\mathbf{E}_h \cdot \delta h + \mathbf{E}_{\psi} \cdot \delta\psi) + \int_{\partial\mathcal{S}}\theta[\delta h, \delta\psi] + \int_{\partial\mathcal{S}}(\delta h + \delta\psi)\mathbf{L}^{\text{GH}}$ of the action to $(\delta h, \delta\psi)$ — hence one requires (B.4). To put this in a more cumbersome way, we can say that, from the perspective of the action, the responses to $(\delta h, \delta\psi)$ and $(\iota\delta h, \iota\delta\psi)$ are indistinguishable, where ι is a smooth test function which is 1 everywhere in \mathcal{S} except an infinitesimally small neighbourhood of $\partial\mathcal{S}$ where it interpolates to zero, *i.e.* ι is a smoothed indicator function with support in \mathcal{S} . (The latter response consists of just the equations of motion part $\int_{\mathcal{S}}\iota(\mathbf{E}_h \cdot \delta h + \mathbf{E}_{\psi} \cdot \delta\psi) \rightarrow \int_{\mathcal{S}}(\mathbf{E}_h \cdot \delta h + \mathbf{E}_{\psi} \cdot \delta\psi)$.) Now, moving to our semiclassical theory, we can similarly demand the path integral measure's response to $(\delta h, \delta\psi)$ and $(\iota\delta h, \iota\delta\psi)$ be identical. This is reasonable, given that we expect the norm of the difference between the two vectors $(\delta h, \delta\psi)$ and $(\iota\delta h, \iota\delta\psi)$ in the space of field configurations to be vanishingly small in the limit where ι becomes an indicator function for \mathcal{S} — otherwise, the difference between $(\delta h, \delta\psi)$ and $(\iota\delta h, \iota\delta\psi)$ in the limit would seem to correspond to a direction in field space that is unconstrained by the action. Thus, it is natural to require (E.50) and interpret the role of $\mathbf{L}^{\text{GH,an}}$ in (E.48) as ensuring that the measure $e^{-\int_{\partial\mathcal{S}}\mathbf{L}^{\text{GH,an}}}[dh, d\psi; g, h, \phi + \psi]_{\mathcal{S}, |\Psi\rangle}$ varies smoothly over the space of field configurations over distances in the space deemed infinitesimal by consideration of variations of the action.

Thus far, we have considered codimension-one surfaces in the interior of the spacetime on which field configurations are fixed in a path integral. One can also consider the case where the path integral covers a full spacetime with boundary \mathcal{M} , where boundary conditions require the quantum fields (h, ψ) to scale appropriately on approach to \mathcal{M} such that $(g+h, \phi+\psi)$ have certain desired asymptotics. One can try to obtain a metric over the space of all field fluctuations, which can in general reach the spacetime boundary \mathcal{M} , by naive extension of the same metric one would apply to bounded fluctuations — *e.g.* for fluctuations of scalar fields, one can continue trying to apply the metric $(f_1, f_2) = \int \epsilon f_1^* f_2$ to scalar functions f_1, f_2 even if their support extends to the spacetime boundary \mathcal{M} . Then, one might naively try to integrate using the path integral measure $[dh, d\psi; g, h, \phi + \psi]$ induced by this metric, on the space of field configurations satisfying the boundary conditions. This can, however, be problematic as such fluctuations extending to the spacetime boundary generally have infinite norms, as in the case of non-normalizable modes in holography. (It

may often be the case that infinite-norm fluctuations are disallowed by the boundary conditions at the spacetime boundary \mathcal{M} . Even so, one might however still be concerned when seeking to perturb the boundary conditions, *e.g.* to compute CFT correlation functions in holography, being worried that the configuration space metric varies infinitely under the perturbation.) Moreover, even if we concern ourselves only with fluctuations of non-infinite norm, we should still require, as described in the previous paragraph, consistency between variations of the action and the path integration measure. In particular, one can again ask whether the action and path integral measure can tell the difference between fluctuations $(\delta h, \delta \psi)$ and $(\iota \delta h, \iota \delta \psi)$, where now $(\delta h, \delta \psi)$ can reach but preserve boundary conditions at \mathcal{M} and ι is a smoothed indicator function for a bounded region which covers the spacetime in a limit. Now due to (2.8), the action (2.2) including the boundary contribution $\int_{\mathcal{M}} \mathbf{L}^{\mathcal{M}}$ cannot tell such a difference. It is again natural to require that the difference between the two vectors $(\delta h, \delta \psi)$ and $(\iota \delta h, \iota \delta \psi)$ in the space of field configurations be vanishing. However, we see in (E.15) that the response of the path integral measure $[dh, d\psi; g, h, \phi + \psi]$ includes an extra $-\int_{\mathcal{M}}(\theta_{h, \delta h}^{\text{an}} + \theta_{\psi, \delta \psi}^{\text{an}})$ if $(\delta h, \delta \psi)$ is considered rather than $(\iota \delta h, \iota \delta \psi)$.

To resolve the issues raised in the previous paragraph, let us therefore include an extra factor in path integrals that reach the spacetime boundary \mathcal{M} ; for those path integrals with boundary \mathcal{M} for instance, analogous to (E.48), we shall integrate using

$$\int e^{-\int_{\mathcal{M}} \mathbf{L}^{\mathcal{M}, \text{an}} [dh, d\psi; g, h, \phi + \psi]} \bullet . \quad (\text{E.51})$$

Here, the role of the factor $e^{-\int_{\mathcal{M}} \mathbf{L}^{\mathcal{M}, \text{an}}}$ can be interpreted as renormalizing the configuration space metric on those field fluctuations which extend to the spacetime boundary \mathcal{M} , so that the vanishing, finiteness, or infiniteness of their norms is consistent with what one expects from consideration of the action. In particular, the discussion of the previous paragraph suggests

$$(\theta_{h, \delta h}^{\text{an}} + \theta_{\psi, \delta \psi}^{\text{an}})|_{\mathcal{M}} = -(\delta h + \delta \psi) \mathbf{L}^{\mathcal{M}, \text{an}}|_{\mathcal{M}} , \quad (\text{E.52})$$

analogous to (E.50). Moreover, since ϕ and, when considering the form (E.11) of the measure, g merely shift ψ and h , we also expect

$$\theta^{\text{an}}[\delta g, \delta \phi]|_{\mathcal{M}} = -(\delta g + \delta \phi) \mathbf{L}^{\mathcal{M}, \text{an}}|_{\mathcal{M}} . \quad (\text{E.53})$$

This should also hold for the more general form (E.13) of the path integration measure if it is obtained from (E.11) via (E.7) with $I_{\text{div}}^{\text{mat}}[g]$ a local action of the form (2.2), satisfying (2.8).

More generally, the boundary of the path integral region can include both portions in the interior and portions on the boundary of the spacetime; examples are the path integrals considered in appendix B over finite time intervals. As a general guide, one should incorporate $\mathbf{L}^{\text{GH}, \text{an}}$ and $\mathbf{L}^{\mathcal{M}, \text{an}}$ terms into the path integral measure when the corresponding \mathbf{L}^{GH} and $\mathbf{L}^{\mathcal{M}}$ terms appear in the action. In appendix B, we also considered the possibility of joint contributions $\mathbf{L}^{\text{jt}, \text{mat}}$ to the action where constant time slices and the spacetime boundary \mathcal{M} met. One might similarly anticipate corresponding $\mathbf{L}^{\text{jt}, \text{an}}$ contributions to

the path integral measure which have the property⁹⁹ that their variations cancel against any localized contributions the anomalous symplectic potential $\theta_{h,\delta h}^{\text{an}} + \theta_{\psi,\delta\psi}^{\text{an}}$ might produce when integrated across a joint, for δh and $\delta\psi$ which preserve boundary conditions on the surfaces meeting at the joint.

E.3 Anomalous correction to the modular Hamiltonian

With the notation set up in appendix E.2, we now proceed to show how various objects in our calculations of section 3, relating generalized entropy to Noether charge and current in thermal setups, are affected by anomalous variations of the path integral measure. We also comment on how the closely related calculations of appendix B are corrected.

Let us begin with the thermal case considered in section 3. The first appearance of anomalous corrections occurs in (3.7) and (3.8). As mentioned above these equations, one must additionally account for the variation of the path integral measure in response to the variations of the background fields; consequently, the full $\tilde{\mathcal{K}}_\zeta$ operator reads

$$\begin{aligned} \tilde{\mathcal{K}}_\zeta = & \int_{\mathcal{S}_2} [(\mathbf{E}_g + \mathbf{E}_g^{\text{an}}) \cdot \mathcal{L}_\zeta g + (\mathbf{E}_\phi + \mathbf{E}_\phi^{\text{an}}) \cdot \mathcal{L}_\zeta \phi] \\ & + \int_{\partial\mathcal{S}_2 \cap \mathcal{M}} \{ \theta[\mathcal{L}_\zeta g, \mathcal{L}_\zeta \phi] + \theta^{\text{an}}[\mathcal{L}_\zeta g, \mathcal{L}_\zeta \phi] + (\delta_{g,\mathcal{L}_\zeta g} + \delta_{\phi,\mathcal{L}_\zeta \phi}) (\mathbf{L}^\mathcal{M} + \mathbf{L}^{\mathcal{M},\text{an}}) \} . \end{aligned} \quad (\text{E.54})$$

From (E.30) (or (E.33)) and (E.34), one finds relations between the anomalous corrections to the equations of motion \mathbf{E}^{an} and the \mathbf{C}^{an} forms analogous to (3.15):

$$\lim_{\tau_1 \rightarrow \tau_2^-} \int_{\mathcal{S}_2} \mathbf{E}_\gamma^{\text{an}} \cdot \mathcal{L}_\zeta \gamma = -2\pi \int_{\tau_2} \xi^a (\mathbf{C}_\gamma^{\text{an}})_a , \quad (\gamma \in \{g, \phi\}) \quad (\text{E.55})$$

$$\lim_{\tau_1 \rightarrow \tau_2^-} \int_{\mathcal{S}_2} \mathbf{E}_{\gamma,\mathcal{L}_\zeta \gamma}^{\text{an}} = -2\pi \int_{\tau_2} \xi^a (\mathbf{C}_\gamma^{\text{an}})_a . \quad (\gamma \in \{h, \psi\}) \quad (\text{E.56})$$

Using (E.55), we can take the $\tau_1 \rightarrow \tau_2$ limit of (E.54) as in (3.17) to find

$$\begin{aligned} & \lim_{\tau_1 \rightarrow \tau_2^-} \tilde{\mathcal{K}}_\zeta \\ & = -2\pi \int_{\tau_2} \xi^a (\mathbf{C}_g + \mathbf{C}_g^{\text{an}} + \mathbf{C}_\phi + \mathbf{C}_\phi^{\text{an}})_a \\ & \quad + \lim_{\tau_1 \rightarrow \tau_2^-} \int_{\partial\mathcal{S}_2 \cap \mathcal{M}} \{ \theta[\mathcal{L}_\zeta g, \mathcal{L}_\zeta \phi] + \theta^{\text{an}}[\mathcal{L}_\zeta g, \mathcal{L}_\zeta \phi] + (\delta_{g,\mathcal{L}_\zeta g} + \delta_{\phi,\mathcal{L}_\zeta \phi}) (\mathbf{L}^\mathcal{M} + \mathbf{L}^{\mathcal{M},\text{an}}) \} . \end{aligned} \quad (\text{E.57})$$

Since our definition of $\mathbf{J}_\chi^{\text{an}}$ in (E.44) is simply (3.21) with \bullet^{an} superscripts tacked on, we can express the above in terms of anomaly-corrected currents and charges in much the same way as (3.22). Moreover, we have from (E.43) the relation

$$2\pi \int_{\tau_2 \cap \mathcal{M}} \mathbf{Q}_\xi^{\text{an}} = - \lim_{\tau_1 \rightarrow \tau_2^-} \int_{\partial\mathcal{S}_2 \cap \mathcal{M}} \left(\theta^{\text{an}}[\mathcal{L}_\zeta g, \mathcal{L}_\zeta \phi] + \theta_{h,\mathcal{L}_\zeta h}^{\text{an}} + \theta_{\psi,\mathcal{L}_\zeta \psi}^{\text{an}} \right) , \quad (\text{E.58})$$

⁹⁹One might also expect that, when the path integrals over two adjacent time intervals (τ_0, τ_1) and (τ_1, τ_2) are stitched together along τ_1 , the $\mathbf{L}^{\text{jt},\text{an}}$ terms at $\tau_1 \cap \mathcal{M}$ account for any contributions to $\mathbf{L}^{\mathcal{M},\text{an}}$ in the resulting joined path integral that are localized on $\tau_1 \cap \mathcal{M}$. (Cf. the second paragraph of footnote 74.)

analogous to (3.24). Using these equations, together with (2.8) and (E.52), we can also carry out the analogous simplification of spacetime boundary terms that led to (3.29). The result can be written as the corrected version of (3.40):

$$\lim_{\tau_1 \rightarrow \tau_2} (\tilde{\mathcal{K}}_\zeta + \tilde{\mathcal{K}}_\zeta^{\text{diff}}) = -2\pi \left[\int_\sigma (\mathbf{Q}_\xi + \mathbf{Q}_\xi^{\text{an}}) + \int_{\tau_2} (\mathbf{J}_\xi + \mathbf{J}_\xi^{\text{an}}) + \int_{\tau_2 \cap \mathcal{M}} \xi \cdot (\mathbf{L}^\mathcal{M} + \mathbf{L}^{\mathcal{M},\text{an}}) \right], \quad (\text{E.59})$$

where now, by (3.15) and (E.56),

$$\tilde{\mathcal{K}}_\zeta^{\text{diff}} \equiv \int_{\mathcal{S}_2} \left(\mathbf{E}_h \cdot \mathcal{L}_\zeta h + \mathbf{E}_{h, \mathcal{L}_\zeta}^{\text{an}} + \mathbf{E}_\psi \cdot \mathcal{L}_\zeta \psi + \mathbf{E}_{\psi, \mathcal{L}_\zeta}^{\text{an}} \right) \quad (\text{E.60})$$

$$\lim_{\tau_1 \rightarrow \tau_2} \tilde{\mathcal{K}}_\zeta^{\text{diff}} = -2\pi \int_{\tau_2} \xi^a (\mathbf{C}_h + \mathbf{C}_h^{\text{an}} + \mathbf{C}_\psi + \mathbf{C}_\psi^{\text{an}})_a \quad (\text{E.61})$$

similar to (3.36) and (3.39).

The interpretation of $\tilde{\mathcal{K}}_\zeta^{\text{diff}}$ is precisely that described by (3.37) which now holds exactly: it implements the variation of path integration variables described around (3.38). Indeed, the definition (E.60) of $\tilde{\mathcal{K}}_\zeta^{\text{diff}}$ now contains both the response of the action and the path integration measure to such a variation — the latter is exactly the anomalous correction mentioned below (3.38). Thus, by the same argument as given for (3.48) in section 3.3, we find that we should identify, for thermal setups,

$$\begin{aligned} S_\sigma^{\text{WD}}[g, h, \phi + \psi] + 2\pi K^{\text{mat}} \\ = \lim_{\tau_1 \rightarrow \tau_2} (\tilde{\mathcal{K}}_\zeta + \tilde{\mathcal{K}}_\zeta^{\text{diff}}) - I^{\text{grav}}[g] \\ = -2\pi \left[\int_\sigma (\mathbf{Q}_\xi + \mathbf{Q}_\xi^{\text{an}}) + \int_{\tau_2} (\mathbf{J}_\xi^{\text{mat}} + \mathbf{J}_\xi^{\text{an}}) + \int_{\tau_2 \cap \mathcal{M}} \xi \cdot (\mathbf{L}^{\mathcal{M}, \text{mat}} + \mathbf{L}^{\mathcal{M}, \text{an}}) \right], \end{aligned} \quad (\text{E.62})$$

where (3.31) and (3.32) were used in the last equality. Just as we equated the contributions (2.42) and (3.34) to the Wald-Dong and Noether charge entropies coming from the action, so too can we cast, using (E.43), the anomalous part to the Noether charge entropy in a form

$$-2\pi \int_\sigma \mathbf{Q}_\xi^{\text{an}} = \int_{\partial \mathcal{S}_1 \cap \partial \mathcal{S}_2} \left(\theta^{\text{an}}[\mathcal{L}_\zeta g, \mathcal{L}_\zeta \phi] + \theta_{h, \mathcal{L}_\zeta}^{\text{an}} + \theta_{\psi, \mathcal{L}_\zeta}^{\text{an}} \right), \quad (\text{E.63})$$

resembling the anomalous part (E.29) of the Wald-Dong entropy. One may hope¹⁰⁰ that, in the thermal case, (E.29) is indeed a correct expression for the anomalous part of Wald-Dong entropy and that the corrections analogous to those found by [6] vanish just as they do for (2.42). Then, arguing as below (3.34), we expect to also have

$$S_\sigma^{\text{WD}, \text{an}}[g, h, \phi + \psi] = -2\pi \int_\sigma \mathbf{Q}_\xi^{\text{an}}, \quad S_\sigma^{\text{WD}}[g, h, \phi + \psi] = -2\pi \int_\sigma (\mathbf{Q}_\xi + \mathbf{Q}_\xi^{\text{an}}), \quad (\text{E.64})$$

where the latter is the full Wald-Dong entropy (E.28), including the anomalous part $S_\sigma^{\text{WD}, \text{an}}$. It then follows from (E.62) and (E.64) that the thermal modular Hamiltonian is given by

$$K^{\text{mat}} = - \int_{\tau_2} (\mathbf{J}_\xi^{\text{mat}} + \mathbf{J}_\xi^{\text{an}}) - \int_{\tau_2 \cap \mathcal{M}} \xi \cdot (\mathbf{L}^{\mathcal{M}, \text{mat}} + \mathbf{L}^{\mathcal{M}, \text{an}}), \quad (\text{E.65})$$

¹⁰⁰See footnote 94.

which is also the generator for time evolution in this case.

More generally, one can consider time evolution on backgrounds which are not ξ -symmetric, as in appendix B. Since the calculations there mirror those of section 3 and anomalous corrections can be incorporated in nearly the same manner as above, we will not redo the calculations in detail. Instead, let us state the final result for the instantaneous generator $-\int_{\tau}(\mathbf{H}_{\xi}^{\text{mat}} + \mathbf{H}_{\xi}^{\text{an}}) - \int_{\tau \cap \mathcal{M}}(\mathbf{H}_{\xi}^{\mathcal{M},\text{mat}} + \mathbf{H}_{\xi}^{\mathcal{M},\text{an}})$ of time evolution. The anomalous corrections are given by the obvious analogues of (B.16) and (B.17):

$$\mathbf{H}_{\xi}^{\text{an}} = \mathbf{J}_{\xi}^{\text{an}} - \boldsymbol{\theta}^{\text{an}}[\mathcal{L}_{\xi}g, \mathcal{L}_{\xi}\phi] - (\delta_{g, \mathcal{L}_{\xi}g} + \delta_{\phi, \mathcal{L}_{\xi}\phi})\mathbf{L}^{\text{GH},\text{an}} \quad (\text{E.66})$$

$$\mathbf{H}_{\xi}^{\mathcal{M},\text{an}} = \xi \cdot \mathbf{L}^{\mathcal{M},\text{an}} - (\delta_{g, \mathcal{L}_{\xi}g} + \delta_{\phi, \mathcal{L}_{\xi}\phi})\mathbf{L}^{\text{jt},\text{an}}. \quad (\text{E.67})$$

E.4 Anomalies and the first law of generalized entropy

Let us proceed now to discuss how anomalous corrections affect our results (4.30) and (4.32) derived in section 4 relating the generalized first law and gravitational dynamics. As in section 4, we now move to Lorentzian signature — see section 3.4. Of course, the completely classical calculations of section 4.1 are unaffected by variations of the path integral measure.

The first encounter with anomalous corrections is in (4.9); the first law of von Neumann entropy (the first equality) continues to hold, but the modular Hamiltonian is corrected as we found in (E.65):

$$\delta S[\rho^{\text{mat}}] = 2\pi \left(\int_{\Sigma} \delta_{\rho^{\text{mat}}} \langle \mathbf{J}_{\xi}^{\text{mat}} + \mathbf{J}_{\xi}^{\text{an}} \rangle + \int_{\mathcal{R}} \xi \cdot \delta_{\rho^{\text{mat}}} \langle \mathbf{L}^{\mathcal{M},\text{mat}} + \mathbf{L}^{\mathcal{M},\text{an}} \rangle \right), \quad (\text{E.68})$$

By the definition (E.44) of the anomalous correction to Noether current, we have the analogue of (4.15):

$$\int_{\Sigma} \mathbf{J}_{\xi}^{\text{an}} = \int_{\mathcal{R}} \mathbf{Q}_{\xi}^{\text{an}} - \int_{\sigma} \mathbf{Q}_{\xi}^{\text{an}} + \int_{\Sigma} \xi^a \mathbf{C}_a^{\text{an}} \quad (\text{E.69})$$

so the variation (4.16) of the quantum part of generalized entropy now reads¹⁰¹

$$\begin{aligned} \delta \langle S_{\sigma}^{\text{mat},\text{WD}}[g] \rangle + \delta S[\rho^{\text{mat}}] = & 2\pi \left(\int_{\mathcal{R}} \{ \delta \langle \mathbf{Q}_{\xi}^{\text{mat}} + \mathbf{Q}_{\xi}^{\text{an}} \rangle + \xi \cdot \delta_{\rho^{\text{mat}}} \langle \mathbf{L}^{\mathcal{M},\text{mat}} + \mathbf{L}^{\mathcal{M},\text{an}} \rangle \} \right. \\ & \left. + \int_{\Sigma} \{ \xi^a \delta \langle \mathbf{C}_a^{\text{mat}} + \mathbf{C}_a^{\text{an}} \rangle - \langle \delta_{\mathcal{O}}(\mathbf{J}_{\xi}^{\text{mat}} + \mathbf{J}_{\xi}^{\text{an}}) \rangle \} \right). \end{aligned} \quad (\text{E.70})$$

Using (E.41), giving the anomaly-corrected versions of (4.18) and (4.19), we find again that it is actually only the metric part $(\mathbf{C}_g^{\text{mat}})_a + (\mathbf{C}_g^{\text{an}})_a$ of the \mathbf{C}_a forms that contributes to the above RHS.

¹⁰¹We are assuming here that the relation (E.64) between the anomalous corrections to the Wald-Dong and Noether charge entropies continues to hold, at least as expectation values, at linear order in perturbations. (C.f. footnote 51.)

The calculation of the operator variation of the Noether current proceeds much in the same manner as in section 4.3 and appendix C. We can repeat the argument of appendix C, but now using the time evolution generator corrected by (E.66) and (E.67) and also accounting for variations of the path integral measure correcting (C.1). The result is, in place of (4.24),

$$\begin{aligned} & \left\langle \delta_{\mathcal{O}} \left[\int_{\Sigma} \left(\tilde{\mathbf{H}}_{\xi}^{\text{mat}} + \tilde{\mathbf{H}}_{\xi}^{\text{an}} \right) + \int_{\mathcal{R}} \xi \cdot \left(\mathbf{L}^{\mathcal{M},\text{mat}} + \mathbf{L}^{\mathcal{M},\text{an}} \right) \right] \right\rangle \\ &= - \int_{\Sigma} \xi \cdot \langle (\mathbf{E}_g^{\text{mat}} + \mathbf{E}_g^{\text{an}}) \cdot \delta g + d(\boldsymbol{\theta}^{\text{mat}}[\delta g, \delta \phi] + \boldsymbol{\theta}^{\text{an}}[\delta g, \delta \phi]) \rangle \\ & \quad + \int_{\mathcal{R}} \xi \cdot \langle (\delta g + \delta \phi) (\mathbf{L}^{\mathcal{M},\text{mat}} + \mathbf{L}^{\mathcal{M},\text{an}}) \rangle , \end{aligned} \quad (\text{E.71})$$

where, analogous to (4.21),

$$\tilde{\mathbf{H}}_{\xi}^{\text{an}} \equiv \mathbf{J}_{\xi}^{\text{an}} - \boldsymbol{\theta}^{\text{an}}[\mathcal{L}_{\xi} g, \mathcal{L}_{\xi} \phi] , \quad (\text{E.72})$$

and we have made use of the vanishing expectation value (E.24) of the corrected equations of motion for ϕ . Now, using (4.21) and (E.72), together with the invariance of the unperturbed background fields and path integral under ξ , we have, similar to (4.23),

$$\delta_{\mathcal{O}} \left(\mathbf{J}_{\xi}^{\text{mat}} + \mathbf{J}_{\xi}^{\text{an}} - \tilde{\mathbf{H}}_{\mathcal{O}}^{\text{mat}} - \tilde{\mathbf{H}}_{\mathcal{O}}^{\text{an}} \right) = \delta_{\mathcal{O}} \left(\boldsymbol{\theta}^{\text{mat}}[\mathcal{L}_{\xi} g, \mathcal{L}_{\xi} \phi] + \boldsymbol{\theta}^{\text{an}}[\mathcal{L}_{\xi} g, \mathcal{L}_{\xi} \phi] \right) \quad (\text{E.73})$$

$$= \boldsymbol{\theta}^{\text{mat}}[\mathcal{L}_{\xi} \delta g, \mathcal{L}_{\xi} \delta \phi] + \boldsymbol{\theta}^{\text{an}}[\mathcal{L}_{\xi} \delta g, \mathcal{L}_{\xi} \delta \phi] \quad (\text{E.74})$$

$$\left\langle \delta_{\mathcal{O}} \left(\mathbf{J}_{\xi}^{\text{mat}} + \mathbf{J}_{\xi}^{\text{an}} - \tilde{\mathbf{H}}_{\mathcal{O}}^{\text{mat}} - \tilde{\mathbf{H}}_{\mathcal{O}}^{\text{an}} \right) \right\rangle = \mathcal{L}_{\xi} \langle \boldsymbol{\theta}^{\text{mat}}[\delta g, \delta \phi] + \boldsymbol{\theta}^{\text{an}}[\delta g, \delta \phi] \rangle . \quad (\text{E.75})$$

Applying the Lie derivative identity (3.27) to (E.75) and combining with (E.71), we then have the analogue of (4.29):

$$\begin{aligned} & \int_{\Sigma} \langle \delta_{\mathcal{O}} (\mathbf{J}_{\xi}^{\text{mat}} + \mathbf{J}_{\xi}^{\text{an}}) \rangle \\ &= - \int_{\Sigma} \xi \cdot \langle (\mathbf{E}_g^{\text{mat}} + \mathbf{E}_g^{\text{an}}) \cdot \delta g \rangle + \int_{\mathcal{R}} \xi \cdot \langle \boldsymbol{\theta}^{\text{mat}}[\delta g, \delta \phi] + \boldsymbol{\theta}^{\text{an}}[\delta g, \delta \phi] \rangle \\ & \quad + \int_{\mathcal{R}} \xi \cdot \langle (\delta g + \delta \phi - \delta_{\mathcal{O}}) (\mathbf{L}^{\mathcal{M},\text{mat}} + \mathbf{L}^{\mathcal{M},\text{an}}) \rangle . \end{aligned} \quad (\text{E.76})$$

At last, putting together the variations of the classical (4.8) and quantum (E.70) parts of generalized entropy, and applying (E.76), we obtain the final result

$$\begin{aligned} \delta S_{\sigma}^{\text{gen}}[g] = & 2\pi \int_{\mathcal{R}} \left\{ \delta \langle \mathbf{Q}_{\xi} + \mathbf{Q}_{\xi}^{\text{an}} \rangle - \xi \cdot \langle \boldsymbol{\theta}[\delta g, \delta \phi] + \boldsymbol{\theta}^{\text{an}}[\delta g, \delta \phi] \rangle \right. \\ & \left. + \xi \cdot (\delta - \delta_g - \delta_{\phi}) \langle \mathbf{L}^{\mathcal{M},\text{mat}} + \mathbf{L}^{\mathcal{M},\text{an}} \rangle \right\} \\ & + 2\pi \int_{\Sigma} [\xi^a \delta \langle (\mathbf{C}_g + \mathbf{C}_g^{\text{an}})_a \rangle + \xi \cdot \langle (\mathbf{E}_g + \mathbf{E}_g^{\text{an}}) \cdot \delta g \rangle] \end{aligned} \quad (\text{E.77})$$

in place of (4.30). As in (4.32) and (4.34), for variations δg and $\delta \phi$ that preserve boundary conditions at the spacetime boundary \mathcal{M} , we can use (2.8) and (E.53) to identify the first

integral in (E.77) as the variation of an asymptotic energy:

$$\delta S_{\sigma}^{\text{gen}}[g] = 2\pi \delta \langle H_{\xi}^{\mathcal{M}} \rangle + 2\pi \int_{\Sigma} [\xi^a \delta \langle (\mathbf{C}_g + \mathbf{C}_g^{\text{an}})_a \rangle + \xi \cdot (\langle \mathbf{E}_g + \mathbf{E}_g^{\text{an}} \rangle \cdot \delta g)] \quad (\text{E.78})$$

$$H_{\xi}^{\mathcal{M}} \equiv \int_{\mathcal{R}} \{ \mathbf{Q}_{\xi} + \mathbf{Q}_{\xi}^{\text{an}} + \xi \cdot (\mathbf{L}^{\mathcal{M}} + \mathbf{L}^{\mathcal{M},\text{an}}) \} . \quad (\text{E.79})$$

The interpretations of (E.77) and (E.78) are the same as for (4.30) and (4.32) of course, except now all anomalous corrections have been accounted for. In particular, notice that the equations of motion

$$(\mathbf{C}_g + \mathbf{C}_g^{\text{an}})^a = -2\epsilon_b (E_g + E_g^{\text{an}})^{ab} \quad (\text{E.80})$$

$$(E_g + E_g^{\text{an}})^{ab} = \left(E_g^{\text{grav}} + \frac{1}{2} T \right)^{ab} \quad (\text{E.81})$$

involve the full stress tensor (E.22) including the response of the path integral measure to metric variations.

References

- [1] S. Ryu and T. Takayanagi, *Holographic derivation of entanglement entropy from AdS/CFT*, *Phys. Rev. Lett.* **96** (2006) 181602 [[hep-th/0603001](#)].
- [2] S. Ryu and T. Takayanagi, *Aspects of Holographic Entanglement Entropy*, *JHEP* **08** (2006) 045 [[hep-th/0605073](#)].
- [3] A. Lewkowycz and J. Maldacena, *Generalized gravitational entropy*, *JHEP* **08** (2013) 090 [[1304.4926](#)].
- [4] T. Jacobson and R.C. Myers, *Black hole entropy and higher curvature interactions*, *Phys. Rev. Lett.* **70** (1993) 3684 [[hep-th/9305016](#)].
- [5] L.-Y. Hung, R.C. Myers and M. Smolin, *On Holographic Entanglement Entropy and Higher Curvature Gravity*, *JHEP* **04** (2011) 025 [[1101.5813](#)].
- [6] X. Dong, *Holographic Entanglement Entropy for General Higher Derivative Gravity*, *JHEP* **01** (2014) 044 [[1310.5713](#)].
- [7] T. Faulkner, A. Lewkowycz and J. Maldacena, *Quantum corrections to holographic entanglement entropy*, *JHEP* **11** (2013) 074 [[1307.2892](#)].
- [8] N. Engelhardt and A.C. Wall, *Quantum Extremal Surfaces: Holographic Entanglement Entropy beyond the Classical Regime*, *JHEP* **01** (2015) 073 [[1408.3203](#)].
- [9] X. Dong and A. Lewkowycz, *Entropy, Extremality, Euclidean Variations, and the Equations of Motion*, *JHEP* **01** (2018) 081 [[1705.08453](#)].
- [10] R.M. Wald, *Black hole entropy is the Noether charge*, *Phys. Rev. D* **48** (1993) 3427 [[gr-qc/9307038](#)].
- [11] V. Iyer and R.M. Wald, *Some properties of Noether charge and a proposal for dynamical black hole entropy*, *Phys. Rev. D* **50** (1994) 846 [[gr-qc/9403028](#)].
- [12] J.D. Bekenstein, *Black holes and entropy*, *Phys. Rev. D* **7** (1973) 2333.

- [13] A.C. Wall, *A proof of the generalized second law for rapidly changing fields and arbitrary horizon slices*, *Phys. Rev. D* **85** (2012) 104049 [[1105.3445](#)].
- [14] R. Bousso and N. Engelhardt, *Generalized Second Law for Cosmology*, *Phys. Rev. D* **93** (2016) 024025 [[1510.02099](#)].
- [15] R. Bousso, Z. Fisher, S. Leichenauer and A.C. Wall, *Quantum focusing conjecture*, *Phys. Rev. D* **93** (2016) 064044 [[1506.02669](#)].
- [16] T. Faulkner, M. Guica, T. Hartman, R.C. Myers and M. Van Raamsdonk, *Gravitation from Entanglement in Holographic CFTs*, *JHEP* **03** (2014) 051 [[1312.7856](#)].
- [17] B. Swingle and M. Van Raamsdonk, *Universality of Gravity from Entanglement*, [1405.2933](#).
- [18] T. Jacobson, *Entanglement Equilibrium and the Einstein Equation*, *Phys. Rev. Lett.* **116** (2016) 201101 [[1505.04753](#)].
- [19] T. Jacobson and M. Visser, *Gravitational Thermodynamics of Causal Diamonds in (A)dS*, *SciPost Phys.* **7** (2019) 079 [[1812.01596](#)].
- [20] H. Casini, F.D. Mazzitelli and E. Testé, *Area terms in entanglement entropy*, *Phys. Rev. D* **91** (2015) 104035 [[1412.6522](#)].
- [21] H. Casini, S. Grillo and D. Pontello, *Relative entropy for coherent states from Araki formula*, *Phys. Rev. D* **99** (2019) 125020 [[1903.00109](#)].
- [22] D.L. Jafferis, A. Lewkowycz, J. Maldacena and S.J. Suh, *Relative entropy equals bulk relative entropy*, *JHEP* **06** (2016) 004 [[1512.06431](#)].
- [23] C.G. Callan, Jr. and F. Wilczek, *On geometric entropy*, *Phys. Lett. B* **333** (1994) 55 [[hep-th/9401072](#)].
- [24] M. Ammon and J. Erdmenger, *Gauge/gravity duality: Foundations and applications*, Cambridge University Press, Cambridge (4, 2015).
- [25] D. Marolf and S.F. Ross, *Boundary Conditions and New Dualities: Vector Fields in AdS/CFT*, *JHEP* **11** (2006) 085 [[hep-th/0606113](#)].
- [26] I.R. Klebanov and E. Witten, *AdS / CFT correspondence and symmetry breaking*, *Nucl. Phys. B* **556** (1999) 89 [[hep-th/9905104](#)].
- [27] X. Dong, A. Lewkowycz and M. Rangamani, *Deriving covariant holographic entanglement*, *JHEP* **11** (2016) 028 [[1607.07506](#)].
- [28] S.N. Solodukhin, *One loop renormalization of black hole entropy due to nonminimally coupled matter*, *Phys. Rev. D* **52** (1995) 7046 [[hep-th/9504022](#)].
- [29] J.H. Cooperman and M.A. Luty, *Renormalization of Entanglement Entropy and the Gravitational Effective Action*, *JHEP* **12** (2014) 045 [[1302.1878](#)].
- [30] W. Nelson, *A Comment on black hole entropy in string theory*, *Phys. Rev. D* **50** (1994) 7400 [[hep-th/9406011](#)].
- [31] G. Wong, I. Klich, L.A. Pando Zayas and D. Vaman, *Entanglement Temperature and Entanglement Entropy of Excited States*, *JHEP* **12** (2013) 020 [[1305.3291](#)].
- [32] S.W. Hawking, C.J. Hunter and M. Taylor, *Rotation and the AdS / CFT correspondence*, *Phys. Rev. D* **59** (1999) 064005 [[hep-th/9811056](#)].
- [33] B.A. Costa, *Laws of black hole thermodynamics in semiclassical gravity*, *Class. Quant. Grav.* **37** (2020) 225004 [[1905.10823](#)].

- [34] B.A. Costa, *Energy, entropy, and spacetime: lessons from semiclassical black holes*, Ph.D. thesis, University of British Columbia, 2020.
- [35] T. Jacobson, G. Kang and R.C. Myers, *On black hole entropy*, *Phys. Rev. D* **49** (1994) 6587 [[gr-qc/9312023](#)].
- [36] G.A. Vilkovisky, *The Unique Effective Action in Quantum Field Theory*, *Nucl. Phys. B* **234** (1984) 125.
- [37] G.A. Vilkovisky, *The Gospel according to DeWitt*, in *Quantum Theory of Gravity: Essays in honor of the 60th birthday of Bryce S DeWitt*, S.M. Christensen, ed., (Bristol), pp. 169–209, Adam Hilger (1984).
- [38] T. Faulkner, F.M. Haehl, E. Hijano, O. Parrikar, C. Rabideau and M. Van Raamsdonk, *Nonlinear Gravity from Entanglement in Conformal Field Theories*, *JHEP* **08** (2017) 057 [[1705.03026](#)].
- [39] M.E. Peskin and D.V. Schroeder, *An Introduction to quantum field theory*, Addison-Wesley, Reading, USA (1995).
- [40] C.P. Burgess and G. Kunstatter, *On the Physical Interpretation of the Vilkovisky-de Witt Effective Action*, *Mod. Phys. Lett. A* **2** (1987) 875.
- [41] G.W. Gibbons and S.W. Hawking, *Action Integrals and Partition Functions in Quantum Gravity*, *Phys. Rev. D* **15** (1977) 2752.
- [42] G. Hayward, *Gravitational action for space-times with nonsmooth boundaries*, *Phys. Rev. D* **47** (1993) 3275.
- [43] E. Witten, *$SL(2, \mathbb{Z})$ action on three-dimensional conformal field theories with Abelian symmetry*, in *From Fields to Strings: Circumnavigating Theoretical Physics: A Conference in Tribute to Ian Kogan*, pp. 1173–1200, 7, 2003 [[hep-th/0307041](#)].
- [44] A. Chamblin, R. Emparan, C.V. Johnson and R.C. Myers, *Charged AdS black holes and catastrophic holography*, *Phys. Rev. D* **60** (1999) 064018 [[hep-th/9902170](#)].
- [45] M.M. Caldarelli, G. Cognola and D. Klemm, *Thermodynamics of Kerr-Newman-AdS black holes and conformal field theories*, *Class. Quant. Grav.* **17** (2000) 399 [[hep-th/9908022](#)].
- [46] N.D. Birrell and P.C.W. Davies, *Quantum Fields in Curved Space*, Cambridge Monographs on Mathematical Physics, Cambridge Univ. Press, Cambridge, UK (2, 1984), [10.1017/CBO9780511622632](#).
- [47] S.W. Hawking, *Zeta Function Regularization of Path Integrals in Curved Space-Time*, *Commun. Math. Phys.* **55** (1977) 133.
- [48] K. Fujikawa, *Comment on Chiral and Conformal Anomalies*, *Phys. Rev. Lett.* **44** (1980) 1733.