

# Quantum time in near-horizon zone of black hole

H. Hadi\* and F. Darabi †

Department of Physics, Azarbaijan Shahid Madani University, Tabriz

June 22, 2022

## Abstract

We apply quantum description of time, based on Page and Wootters' mechanism, for near horizon region of black hole. It is indicated that this method of quantization of time which is a modified form of PaW approach and has been proposed in [21] can not be applied in this particular quantum region of black hole, fully. The time evolving of the system and flow of time, measurement problem, recording the history of near-horizon zone and also a consistent definition of the arrow of time are controversial in PaW approach in this particular region even by considering the previous modifications which exist in this literature. The clock ambiguity also is investigated and a unique definition of clock is defined in near horizon region of black hole.

## 1 Introduction

Time indicates itself as a classical parameter in the Schrödinger equation. This parameter feature of time is as opposed to other physical quantities such as position or momentum. Physically this interpretation of time is indicated by a classical clock in the laboratory. It seems that this is acceptable for all practical purposes, however, we should define a fully quantum description of time. One can find some of the proposals in [1, 2, 3, 4, 5, 6, 7, 8, 9, 10, 11]. There are some controversial issues about these proposals [12, 13, 14, 15, 16]. One of these proposal is Page and Wootters mechanism (PaW) which consider time as a quantum degree of freedom [17, 18, 19, 20]. In this paradigm, all variables of the system are defined by quantum operators and one of them is assumed to be clock system which consider the dynamical evolution of the rest of system.

However, this proposal criticized by [7] when applied into constrained systems. In PaW approach prominent problem is in defining the variables as operators and particularly there is controversial issues to define a certain variable

---

\*email: hamedhadi1388@gmail.com

†email: f.darabi@azaruniv.edu

as clock. In physical constrained systems, the physical observable variables are those which have vanishing Poisson brackets with constraints. In other words, the physical variables are invariant under symmetries of theory (gauge invariant). However in the systems that the Hamiltonian is one of the constraints, the other constraints which have vanishing Poisson brackets with Hamiltonian do not evolve and will not be a good candidates for clock. Page and Wootters tried to overcome this problem by introducing kinematical variables which do not have vanishing Poisson brackets. Therefore these variables can evolve. However, this leads to kinematical Hilbert space which does not admit a probabilistic interpretation.

In [26] by using a different set of physical quantities, it is tried to find a solution for above problem. This quantities are relational Dirac observables which are like a "evolving constants" [5]. The mentioned proposal applies the evolving constant approach to the construction of observables in canonical quantum gravity with PaW mechanism by a relational time for generally covariant systems.

The other proposal to overcome the criticism for PaW mechanism is considered by formalizing measurements through the von Neumann prescription [21]. Which is extended to generalized observable POVMs. In this approach all quantum predictions can be obtained by conditioning the global, timeless state  $|\Psi\rangle\rangle$ . The correct quantum propagator and also the correct statistic for measurement which performed at different times are the advantage of this approach that are absent in PaW mechanism.

In this investigation the review of PaW approach is done for near-horizon zone of black hole which is a straightforward modification of PaW mechanism for near-horizon zone which has been done by authors [27]. In addition some of the criticisms of this mechanism are reconsidered in this particular vicinity of black hole. The zone of the black hole has unusual features, especially the vacuum of the near horizon is frozen vacuum [28] which leads to violation of equivalence principle of general relativity and is constructed by non-local behavior of vacuum in near horizon region of black hole. To clarify this feature, we should emphasize that the complementarity concept of black hole <sup>1</sup> seems that is violated by firewall constructed in horizon which leads to violation of equivalence principle of GR. In order to get ride of firewall concept for preserving complementarity and equivalence principle the  $ER = EPR$  correspondence [29] has been posed. In other words the firewall is a proposal to overcome the AMPS's paradox [30] however,  $ER = EPR$  conjecture overcomes the paradox and also preserves the equivalence principle and complementarity of black hole.

The AMPS claims that by accepting the complementarity of black hole the three following assumption leads to contradiction:

- 1 An evaporating black hole preserves quantum information without destroying it. This property is called the unitary evolution of the black

---

<sup>1</sup>The complementarity claims that the space-time created by a black hole source cannot be probed by static or infalling observer alone but both of them together can probe the whole space-time

hole.

- 2 The infalling observer crossing the event horizon of the black hole does not recognize any unusual property in horizon.
- 3 Relativistic effective quantum field theory is consistent for an static outside observer and he/she can work with the theory.

AMPS argues the late radiation  $B$  of an old black hole <sup>2</sup> is maximally entangled with early radiation  $R_B$ . Regarding assumptions 1 and 3 require the late radiation  $B$  to be entangled with a subsystem of early radiation  $R_B$ . On the other hand, the assumption 2 leads to entanglement between  $B$  and the system of interior radiation  $A$  of the black hole. Considering these assumptions all together leads to violation of monogamy of entanglement [32, 33]. It asserts that if two quantum states are maximally entangled then none of them cannot be entangled with third party. To overcome this paradox AMPS argues that the entanglement between late radiation  $B$  and interior states  $A$  breaks down. This phenomenon leads to release of energy in the horizon of black hole. This high amount of energy is firewall which also leads to extend the singularity to horizon and admits that there is no spacetime in the interior of horizon [30, 34].

One of the solution for AMPS's paradox is  $ER = EPR$  conjecture. This conjecture overcomes AMPS's puzzle beside maintaining the equivalence principle in near horizon of black hole. The  $ER = EPR$  proposal claims that the  $ER$  bridge has a correspondence with  $EPR$  pair. This means that  $ER$  bridge is created by  $EPR$  correlation in the micro-states of two entangled black holes [29]. This result is based on the works [35, 36]. In other words one can assert that  $EPR$  correlated quantum system has a weakly coupled Einstein gravity description or  $ER$  bridge is nothing but a highly quantum object. Even in a more provocative idea, some physicist claim that for every singlet state there exists a quantum bridge of this type. For more discussion of AMPS's paradox and some controversial ideas and solutions for it refer to [37]. However, by considering the  $ER = EPR$  conjecture with details for an old black hole one confronts with violation of equivalence principle in near-horizon zone by admitting a particular property for this region. This unusual behavior of zone is a frozen vacuum which an infalling or static observer of a black hole cannot excite the vacuum there. This feature assigns an unusual behavior for near horizon that violates the equivalence principle.

In this paper we first review PaW approach which is formulated by measurements through the von Neumann prescription in section two. In section three we apply PaW approach for the near horizon vicinity of black holes. In the next sections we indicate that this approach has some controversial issues in near-horizon zone. Although some of these problems have been solved in PaW mechanism in usual quantum mechanics in Hilbert space, we indicate that there are controversial discussions for PaW approach in near-horizon zone of black hole, yet. In section four it is investigated that recording history is not

---

<sup>2</sup>An old black hole is the one which radiated half of it radiation away [31]

possible by PaW mechanism in horizon zone. The arrow of time is considered for horizon vicinity in section five. The time ambiguity and measurement problem for PaW approach in near-horizon vacuum of black hole are considered in sections six and seven, respectively. At the end we have a conclusion section.

## 2 Review of PaW mechanism through the von Neumann prescription

In this section we review the PaW mechanism from [21] by definition of quantum operator for time in Hilbert space. This picture of PaW approach claims to give a consistent quantum description of time, based on PaW conditional probabilities mechanism. The main structure of this proposal is reviewed, briefly, in this section but in section seven the complete conditional probability and measurement problem for PaW approach is given and it is indicated that this proposal cannot be apply fully for near-horizon zone of black hole. Now we review the PaW approach which is given by three following parts.

- 1) The Hilbert space  $\mathcal{H}_R$  of a system can be considered under an enlarged space as

$$\mathbb{H} = \mathcal{H}_C \otimes \mathcal{H}_R, \quad (1)$$

where  $\mathcal{H}_C$  is the space of ancillary system which is called the clock system. This system is equipped with canonical coordinates  $T$  and  $\Omega$  which represent position and momentum and can be interpreted as time and energy indicator of evolving system. Canonical indicator of  $T$  and  $\Omega$  are defined as follows

$$[T, \Omega] = i \quad (2)$$

The index  $R$  in Hilbert space  $\mathcal{H}_R$  is for the "rest system" which we will use it when in PaW approach the system is divided in two subsystems of "clock" and "rest".

- 2) One can describe the constraint operator of the system by following relation

$$\mathbb{H} = \hbar\Omega \otimes I_R + I_C \otimes H_R \quad (3)$$

where  $H_R$  is the system Hamiltonian and  $I_R$  and  $I_C$  are identity operator of  $\mathcal{H}_R$  and  $\mathcal{H}_C$ , respectively.

- 3) Next we define a physical vector of the system  $|\Psi \gg$  which has following feature

$$\mathbb{H}|\Psi \gg = 0 \quad (4)$$

double-Ket  $|\Psi \gg$  is defined on  $\mathcal{H}_C \otimes \mathcal{H}_R$ . The state  $|\Psi \gg$  is physical vector of the model and is constrained by Hamiltonian  $\mathbb{H}$  with null eigenvalue.  $|\Psi \gg$  is static state and does not evolve and represents the full history of the system  $R$  consistently with Wheeler-Dewitt equation [38]. One can derive the state  $|\psi \gg_R$  of the system by conditioning on solution

$|\Psi \gg$  with projection of generalized eigenvector time operator  $T$  which is given by

$$|\psi(t) \rangle_{R=T} \langle t | \Psi \gg \quad (5)$$

where  $|\psi(t) \rangle$  is time dependent and the time projection of static state  $|\Psi \gg$ . The time operator has following definition

$$T|t \rangle_C = t|t \rangle_C, \quad C \langle t' | t \rangle_C = \delta(t - t'). \quad (6)$$

where  $|t \rangle_C$  is the eigenvector of time operator  $T$  with eigenvalue  $t$  in clock system  $C$ .

Now the important puzzle is if one can derive the Schrodinger equation from Wheeler-DeWitt equation (4). According PaW mechanism and by writing equation (4) in position representation in  $\mathcal{H}_R$  one can derive the Schrodinger equation by following steps. First  $|t \rangle_C$  is proected from left over equation (4)

$${}_C \langle t | \mathbb{H} | \Psi \gg \quad (7)$$

then we have

$$i \frac{d}{dt} |\psi(t) \rangle = H_R |\psi(t) \rangle \quad (8)$$

where we applied the following relation for  $|\Psi \gg$ ,

$$|\Psi \gg = \int dt |t \rangle_C \otimes |\psi(t) \rangle_R \quad (9)$$

Although the wheeler-DeWitt equation (4) gives a timeless picture for universe system with eigenvectors  $|\Psi \gg$  by null eigenvalues, one can derive from it the Schrodinger equation which has time interpretation in its formalism.

### 3 Frozen vacuum and quantized time in near-horizon zone of black hole

In this section, we consider the near horizon of black hole and frozen vacuum of it and then apply the PaW mechanism through the von Neumann prescription for near horizon vicinity. We review our previous paper [27] which is a straightforward modification of PaW mechanism of previous section in a particular region. It is important to note that in PaW approach one can consider time quantum degree of freedom as an abstract purification space without any physical relevance. However, considering time quantum degree of freedom as a dynamical degree of freedom which is connected to a physical system has more physical significance. This representation of clock to define time can be described as an operational definition of time which is appropriate for proper

time [22, 23]. In whole of the paper we assign time quantum degree of freedom as dynamical degree of the freedom which is relevant to some physical system.

Now the PaW approach is reviewed in near-horizon zone. The quantum state of the near horizon is the vacuum state as follows

$$|\Psi \gg\rangle = \sum_{n=0}^{\infty} x^n |n \rangle_a |n \rangle_b \quad (10)$$

where  $|n \rangle_a$  and  $|n \rangle_b$  are the states of inside and outside of the horizon, respectively. In whole of the paper, Hilbert space of the interior and exterior of the horizon are indicated by  $A$  and  $B$  respectively. However, the clock system  $C$  is related to  $B$  and rest system  $R$  to  $A$ . The Hamiltonian of Hilbert space  $\mathcal{H}_R$  of the interior of black hole horizon is written as follows

$$H_R = - \sum_{n=0}^{\infty} x^{-n} |n \rangle_{aa} \langle n|, \quad (11)$$

The ancillary system which does the role of clock system is the Hilbert space  $\mathcal{H}_C$  of the exterior of black hole's horizon. The Hamiltonian for this Hilbert space is

$$H_C = \sum_{n=0}^{\infty} x^{-n} |n \rangle_{bb} \langle n|, \quad (12)$$

Notice that  $H_C$  and  $H_R$  indicate the local Hamiltonian of exterior (clock system) and interior (rest system) of the horizon of black hole, respectively. To obtain the wheeler-DeWitt equation for this mode one can use equations (12) and (11) into equations (3),(4) as follows

$$\left( \sum_{n=0}^{\infty} x^{-n} |n \rangle_{bb} \langle n| \otimes I_R - I_C \otimes \sum_{n=0}^{\infty} x^{-n} |n \rangle_{aa} \langle n| \right) |\Psi \gg\rangle = 0 \quad (13)$$

where  $|\Psi \gg\rangle$  here is the frozen vacuum state (10).

To derive the proper time evolution of the interior of black hole's states by PaW approach the exterior observer can use his/her own subsystem states as follows

$$|\psi(t) \rangle_b = e^{-iH_b t/\hbar} |\psi(0) \rangle_b \quad (14)$$

Then to obtain the proper time evolution of the interior of black hole before falling into it, the observer can use the following equation

$$|\psi(t) \rangle_a = \psi(t) |\Psi \gg\rangle = e^{-iH_a t/\hbar} |\psi(0) \rangle_a \quad (15)$$

to obtain the time evolution of the inside of black hole. For more details and timeless picture of wheeler-DeWitt equation refer to [27].

## 4 Recording history and flow of time in near-horizon zone

It seems that there is no flow of time in PaW picture, however, the flow of time is emerged in this picture by dividing the subsystem of rest of the universe in three sub-parts, "observer" (is only interpreted as memory), the "observed" and a sequence of ancillas. These sub-parts can perform measurements and store their results and then constructing a history [25].

In this section we consider the history recording of near horizon region which is needed for describing the time flow in PaW approach. In doing so, suppose an static observer, Bob, hovers near horizon performing measurement on the observed to record what has happened. We assume the Bob's memory starts in a blank state  $|r \rangle_M^{\otimes N}$  at  $t = 0$ . The observed is in state  $|\psi(t) \rangle$  and  $|n \rangle_i$  for  $i = 1, 2, 3, \dots$  are eigenstates of observable in subsystem  $i$ . Now suppose that Bob and the observed evolve under an effective time-dependent Hamiltonian. Since Bob is in the exterior of horizon  $B$  we use  $b$  instead of  $i$ . Bob measures the observable with an operator in his subsystem at time  $t = 1$ . In this case the local Hamiltonian operator (12) would be suitable for measurement. However any operator can be adopted to do this work and the final result of this section does not change. This operation changes the state to

$$|n \rangle_b \otimes |r \rangle_M^{\otimes N} \rightarrow |n_{saw1} \rangle_b |r \rangle_M^{\otimes N-1} |1 \rangle_b \quad (16)$$

where  $|n_{saw1} \rangle_b$  corresponds to state  $|1 \rangle_b$  which is the outcome of the measurement. A local permutation over observed can lead to, for example, the following state

$$|n_{saw1} \rangle_b |r \rangle_M^{\otimes N-1} |2 \rangle_b \quad (17)$$

For the next step, Bob measures the state again which result in

$$|n_{saw1} \rangle_b |n_{saw2} \rangle_b |r \rangle_M^{\otimes N-2} |2 \rangle_b \quad (18)$$

here the state  $|n_{saw2} \rangle_b$  corresponds to  $|2 \rangle_b$ . Finally a sequence of events is recorded by Bob such as eigenvalues of  $|1 \rangle_b, |2 \rangle_b, |3 \rangle_b, \dots$ . He does this by a sequence of ancillas ( $|n_{saw1} \rangle_b, |n_{saw2} \rangle_b, |n_{saw3} \rangle_b, \dots$ ). These states can be the states of the "pointers" in near-horizon region where Bob hovers there.

Now suppose Alice an in-falling observer is falling into the black hole. If she knows the Hawking radiation states  $R_B$  and without meeting Bob she is aware of the interior states  $A$  by  $ER = EPR$  correspondence which asserts that the interior states  $A$  are a map of early Hawking radiation  $R_B$  ( $A = R_B$  donkey map) [27, 29]. On the other hand, Alice is aware of exterior states  $B$  by her knowledge of black hole which claims that the exterior states  $B$  are purified by interior  $A$ . However, if Alice meets the Bob she will confront with contradiction because, according to donkey map ( $A = R_B$ ), we have ( $|n \rangle_{R_B} \rightarrow |n \rangle_a$ ). Alice without meeting Bob will confirm that the states  $|n \rangle_a$  ( $A$ ) purify the subsystem  $B$  which are  $|n \rangle_b$  but by meeting Bob she admits that what purify  $A$  are the states ( $|n_{saw1} \rangle_b |1 \rangle_b, |n_{saw2} \rangle_b |2 \rangle_b, |n_{saw3} \rangle_b |3 \rangle_b, \dots$ ). Anyway this a

contradiction and is not possible. Therefore Bob or even Alice herself are not able to record the history in near-horizon zone.

We considered the subsystem  $B$  which play the role of clock system and divided it into "pointer" (ancillas), "observed" and "observer" (only consist of memory system), however one can divide the subsystem  $A$ , too, which play the role of the rest system in PaW approach. Anyway recording the history for both subsystems are not possible because there is symmetry for subsystems  $A$  and  $B$ . To explain it more, suppose the subsystem  $A$  with local Hamiltonian  $H_R$  like as previous subsystem  $B$  is divided to  $|n_{sawi} \rangle_b |i \rangle_b$  where  $i = 1, 2, 3, \dots$ <sup>3</sup>. Again we know from donkey map that the early Hawking radiation  $R_B$  is a map of interior space  $A$  which can be represented by  $|n \rangle_{R_B} \rightarrow |n_{sawi} \rangle_b |i \rangle_b$ . In other words whatever happen near horizon, the vacuum there is a frozen vacuum (10). For more information about this behavior refer to [27, 28].

Although the PaW mechanism can be applied in near-horizon zone, recording history in this region is not possible. Therefore PaW approach cannot overcome criticism [25] fully and flow of time is a controversial concept here.

## 5 No arrow of time in near-horizon zone

As a whole the PaW mechanism by itself gives rise to time-reversal symmetric dynamical law like as unitary quantum theory. In other words to recognize the arrow of time one has to impose a quantity which increase or decrease continuously under a dynamical law. Entanglement between observer and observed in the rest universe is one of the proposal for arrow of time in PaW picture [25]. This definition is not applicable for near-horizon zone when one uses the PaW approach.

In order to define arrow of time in near-horizon zone we explain it as follows. Suppose the pointer states in zone of black hole. We will define the increase of entanglement between "pointer" and the "observed" as arrow of time. One can define the entanglement between the "observer" and the "observed" as a criterion of arrow of time, however, we choose pointer instead of observer. This choice does not make any difference in the physical results here. Now, assume that the rest system  $A$  which is the interior states of black hole horizon, consist of pointers and observed. The observed and the pointer in premeasurement process are as follows

$$|\psi \rangle_{pab} \approx |n \rangle_p \otimes \sum_n^\infty x^n |n \rangle_a |n \rangle_b \quad (19)$$

where  $|n \rangle_p$ ,  $|n \rangle_a$  and  $|n \rangle_b$  are states of pointer, interior and exterior of the horizon, respectively. The pointer  $p$  is in premeasurement state and is not in any interaction with inside or outside of the horizon, yet. In this case the

---

<sup>3</sup>Here like as above the subsystem is partitioned in three sub-parts but for simplicity we consider  $A$  by dividing it in two sub-parts. The final result is independent of more partitioning.



pointer can be written by inside states  $A$  as follows

$$|\psi\rangle_{pab} = \sum_n^{\infty} x^n |n\rangle_p |n\rangle_a |n\rangle_b \quad (20)$$

equations (19) and (20) are called premeasurement. The pointer also can be interpreted as memory state for recording to keep track of what happens for the observed  $|n\rangle_b$ . Then the arrow of time can be described by increasing the entanglement between pointer and the observed regarding that the entanglement never decreases on the rest under the evolution generated by  $H_R$ . However, being of pointer for keeping track of observed in the rest system is not possible and it leads to contradiction, because the infalling observer who falls into the black hole can only confront with a frozen vacuum which is given by (10). In other words the pointer and observed  $|n\rangle_p |n\rangle_a$ , regarding the  $ER = EPR$  correspondence, must be a map of early Hawking radiation states  $R_B$

$$|n\rangle_{R_B} \rightarrow |n\rangle_p |n\rangle_a \quad (21)$$

On the other hand an infalling observer, Alice, by her knowledge of black hole knows that  $R_B$  and  $B$  are maximally entangled. Alice in her journey of falling into the black hole, will confront with  $B$  and also is aware of what purifies  $B$  is the inside state  $A$ . If Alice recognizes the early Hawking radiation  $R_B$  before premeasurement of (19) and (20) then she will confront with contradiction because what she expects of inside state  $A$  is only purified state of  $B$  and it cannot be  $|n\rangle_p |n\rangle_a$ . Therefore in order to avoid this contradiction, there must be no possibility of pointer  $p$  for recording the track of observed. This admits that the criterion of entanglement between pointer and observed is not applicable in this region. The frozen vacuum of near-horizon zone is an obstacle to create or excite any particle or pointer there. Therefore the entanglement is not a suitable criterion for considering the arrow of time for PaW approach in near horizon vicinity of black hole.

## 6 Near-horizon zone and the unique clock

The other problem which can be considered in PaW picture is, that one can partition the total Hilbert space of the universe in infinity many inequivalent ways into tensor-product structure. Therefore there are several choice of clock-rest system which is called clock ambiguity [25].

First we consider clock ambiguity by details and then indicate that how it works in near-horizon zone. The clock ambiguity problem is as follows. One can choose a suitable orthonormal basis  $|k\rangle$  in the overall Hilbert space  $\mathcal{H}$ ,

$$|\psi\rangle = \sum_k \alpha_k |k\rangle. \quad (22)$$

where  $|k\rangle$  can be written as  $|t\rangle_C |\phi_t\rangle_R$  in a given tensor product structure

$\mathcal{H} = \mathcal{H}_C \otimes \mathcal{H}_R$ . Next, consider a different state of the universe, such as

$$|\tilde{\psi}\rangle = \sum_k \beta_k |\tilde{k}\rangle. \quad (23)$$

We know that there is a unitary operator  $S$  such that  $|\tilde{\psi}\rangle = S|\psi\rangle$ . Therefore we have

$$|\psi\rangle = \sum_k \beta_k S^\dagger |k\rangle = \sum_k \beta_k |\tilde{k}\rangle \quad (24)$$

where  $|\tilde{k}\rangle = S^\dagger |k\rangle$

The clock ambiguity claims that as long as one can choose basis  $|\tilde{k}\rangle = |t\rangle_{\tilde{C}}$   $|\phi_t\rangle_{\tilde{R}}$  by a different bipartite tensor product structure and since there are countless such choices, therefore it leads to different description of evolution of the rest.

There is no clock ambiguity because of following reasons

Case one : There is no interaction between subsystems  $C$  and  $R$ : In this case there is no ambiguity in clock definition. The tensor product structure of the system of clock and rest is  $\mathcal{H}_C \otimes \mathcal{H}_R$  and since the clock and rest are non-interacting the Hamiltonian is given by  $H = H_C \otimes I_R + I_C \otimes H_R$ . By applying the PaW approach the relative state  $|\phi_t\rangle_R$  is evolved by a unitary evolution as follows

$$|\phi_t\rangle_R = \exp(-iH_R t) |\phi_0\rangle_R \quad (25)$$

To make it clarify, for any state  $|k\rangle \in \mathcal{H}$  and a tensor product structure by a unitary mapping is written as follows

$$|k\rangle = \sum_{a,b} U_{a,b}^k |a\rangle_C |b\rangle_R \quad (26)$$

where  $|a\rangle_C |b\rangle_R$  are some basis states. Two tensor product structures are equivalent if and only if there elements  $U_{i,j}^k$  and  $\tilde{U}_{a,b}^k$  are related by local unitaries  $P$  and  $Q$

$$U_{i,j}^k = \sum_{a,b} P_i^a Q_j^b \tilde{U}_{a,b}^k \quad (27)$$

These two tensor product structures are equivalent if  $S = P \otimes Q$ . Then there is no any ambiguity in defining clock system.

Case one (in near-horizon zone): This case in near-horizon zone is applicable and there is no any ambiguity at all. Assume the states interior and exterior of the horizon as  $A$  and  $B$ , respectively. When we restrict our self to  $ER = EPR$  paradigm, for black hole the frozen vacuum (10) is the only state in near-horizon zone. One can define a local unitary operator for subsystems  $A$  and  $B$  separately. According to above explanations the ability of defining a local unitary operator is enough condition to claim that there is no any clock ambiguity.

Case two : There is interaction between subsystems  $C$  and  $R$ : In this case the new tensor product structure is not equivalent with old structure. The unitary  $S$  has the form

$$S = \exp\{-i(S_C + S_R + S_{CR})\} \quad (28)$$

where  $S_{CR}$  operates as an interaction term between two subsystems of the original tensor product structure. If the Hamiltonian of the system has following relation with  $S$

$$[H, S] = 0, \quad \text{or} \quad [H, S_{CR}] = 0 \quad (29)$$

then there is no any concern about ambiguity of the clock because  $S$  would have a trivial local action on state. When  $[H, S] \neq 0$  then  $H$  is the sum of two non-interacting terms of  $C$  and  $R$  in the tensor product structure which defined by  $U_{i,j}^k$ . However in new tensor product structure which defined by  $\tilde{U}_{a,b}^i$  the Hamiltonian will have an interacting term as follows

$$H = H_{\tilde{c}} \otimes I_{\tilde{R}} + I_{\tilde{C}} \otimes H_{\tilde{R}} + h_{\tilde{C}} \otimes h_{\tilde{R}} \quad (30)$$

Therefore, because of interaction terms, which leads to non-equivalent tensor product structure, there is no ambiguity here too. In other words, although there is no local unitary operators which provide the condition (27), we have  $|\phi_t\rangle_{\tilde{R}} \neq \exp(-iH_{\tilde{R}}t)|\phi_0\rangle_{\tilde{R}}$ . Therefore there is no clock ambiguity in the case when there is interaction between clock and rest system. However it is important to note that we have to define another clock and rest in order to work in this new basis.

Case two (in near-horizon zone): When we apply the second case that there are interaction terms between subsystems, in the near-horizon zone we have to note that defining an interaction term by changing the basis and non-unitary tensor product structures is not possible. Therefore without the possibility of non-unitary transformation in new tensor product structure in near horizon of black hole, we would have a unique clock system. To clarify this issue, suppose  $A$  and  $B$  are the quantum states of inside and outside of the near horizon vicinity, respectively. Like as previous sections,  $B$  is the clock system space and  $A$  is the system of rest. If there were an interaction between clock ( $B$ ) and rest ( $A$ ) systems, then the relative state of  $B$  would change, for example, from  $|n\rangle_b$  to  $|n\rangle_{\tilde{b}}$ . This changes of basis for  $B$  leads to contradiction. Suppose an in-falling observer Alice who knows the early Hawking radiation states  $R_B$  want to fall into black hole. She is aware of  $A$  the state of inside by knowledge of her black hole by the map ( $A = R_B$ ) and also knows that  $B$  is purified by  $A$ . If there is an interaction terms between  $A$  and  $B$ , then Alice will confront with the states  $|n\rangle_{\tilde{b}}$  which are not the purified states of  $|n\rangle_a$  that she expected to confront with them.

In order to avoid contraction the only state of the near horizon zone is (10) and changing of the basis is restricted to only unitary tensor product

structure in this particular region. Therefore there is no possibility of any interaction between clock and rest systems. In other words all of the tensor product structure are equivalent in this zone. So there is only one possibility of constructing clock system and this clock is unique.

## 7 Measurement and time problem in near-horizon of black hole

The PaW mechanism can be applied on a certain system sequentially which is suitable to describe statistic of measurements. Here we will follow and review the von Neumann method [24] and [21] but with restricting it to particular region of horizon . This proposal which overcomes to some criticisms in PaW picture in usual Hilbert space, is investigated in near-horizon zone and it is indicated that in this region the method is not applicable.

In doing so, suppose a measurement apparatus which can describe the process in terms of a memory systems  $M$ . Before the measurement the memory system is in a ready state  $|r\rangle_M$  and will be in a state  $|i\rangle_M$  contains the measurement outcome after. By assuming the measurement is done at time  $t_1$  one can write the following relation

$$|\psi(t_1)\rangle_a \otimes |r\rangle_M \rightarrow \sum_i \hat{K}_i |\psi(t_1)\rangle_a \otimes |i\rangle_M \quad (31)$$

Now we put (15) into the equation (31) which is given by

$$|\psi(t_1)\rangle_a \otimes |r\rangle_M = {}_b\langle \psi(t_1) | \Psi \rangle \rangle \otimes |r\rangle_M \rightarrow \sum_i (\hat{K}_i) ({}_b\langle \psi(t_1) | \Psi \rangle \rangle) \otimes |i\rangle_M \quad (32)$$

Now we put equation (10) into equation (32)

$$|\psi(t_1)\rangle_a \otimes |r\rangle_M \rightarrow \sum_{n=0}^{\infty} \sum_i x^n (\hat{K}_i) ({}_b\langle \psi(t_1) | n \rangle_a | n \rangle_b) \otimes |i\rangle_M \quad (33)$$

where  $K_i$  are Kraus operators fulfilling the normalization condition  $\sum_i K_i^\dagger K_i = I$ . For the special case projective nondegenerate von Neumann measurements, the  $K_i = |i\rangle\langle i|$  are projectores on the eigenspaces relative to the eigenvalues  $|i\rangle$  of the observable. Therefore (33) becomes

$$|\psi(t_1)\rangle_a \otimes |r\rangle_M \rightarrow \sum_i \psi_i(t_1) |i\rangle_a \otimes |i\rangle_M \quad (34)$$

The probability of getting outcome  $i$  is as follows

$$P(i|t_1) = \|K_i |\psi(t_1)\rangle_a\|^2 \quad (35)$$

The state of system  $a$  immediately after recorded by memory  $M$  is

$$|\phi_i\rangle_a = K_i |\psi(t_1)\rangle_a / \sqrt{P(i|t_1)} \quad (36)$$

Now, we consider the above process in PaW approach in near-horizon zone. In doing so, we suppose that the interior of horizon of black hole  $A$ , rest system  $R$  consists of both "observed" which labeled by  $a$  and the ancillary memory system which labeled by  $M$ . In order to insert the memory system which is needed for von Neumann prescription for measurement process, we have to indicate its role by a Hamiltonian. As we mentioned before the Hamiltonian of the near-horizon zone without memory system is  $H = H_C \otimes I_R + I_C \otimes H_R$ . However when we need to insert memory system too for measurement process the Hamiltonian is given by

$$H = H_C \otimes I_R + I_C \otimes H_R(t) \quad (37)$$

where  $H_R(t) = H_a(t) + \delta(t - t_1)h_{aM}$ . Therefore the Hamiltonian (37) is written as follows

$$H = H_C \otimes I_R + I_C \otimes H_a(t) + I_C \otimes h_{aM}\delta(t - t_1) \quad (38)$$

Notice that it is assumed  $a$  and  $M$  except for a strong coupling between them at time  $t_1$  and since  $M$  is a memory then there is no free dynamic for it. In other words,  $h_{aM}$  is related to a unitary operator which is responsible of mapping (34).

As we mentioned in the previous sections, recording memory and the existence of interaction terms in the Hamiltonian are in conflict with near-horizon properties of black hole. In this prescription of measurement the memory recording is done by relation (34) and the interaction in the Hamiltonian indicates itself in (38). However we know that these definitions are not possible in black hole's zone.

One of the main criticism to the PaW approach is that the mechanism cannot provide a correct propagator or the correct two time correlation. This means that after the first time measurement, the clock remains stuck. One of the proposal to overcome this criticism is in [21]. We reviewed this proposal in this section and indicated that it is not applicable for near-horizon zone. Therefore, the problem of remaining the clock stuck is maintained in black hole's zone.

## 8 Conclusion

Here we reconsidered PaW mechanism in near-horizon zone and some of properties and controversial ideas of it in this particular vicinity. It is indicated that recording the history of system in near-horizon zone is not possible. This system is the vacuum state of black hole's horizon. For an infalling observer into the black hole or static observer in near-horizon zone recording history in  $ER = EPR$  paradigm and frozen vacuum of near horizon leads to controversial issues.

The second result is that there is no arrow of time for the vacuum state of near horizon. Like as unitary quantum theory there is no arrow of time in PaW mechanism. If the arrow of time in this approach is considered, it must be imposed by separate postulate which under dynamical law a particular property increases. In PaW approach by dividing one of subsystems in two

systems "observed" and "pointer" which pointer is for recording track of the evolution of system, and by using entanglement property of these two systems, we indicated that this entanglement property does not provide a consistent mechanism for recognizing the arrow of time in near-horizon zone. Although the entanglement is a good feature for considering the arrow of time in PaW approach, it is not applicable in this particular area of black hole.

In addition we considered the time ambiguity for the region of near horizon. It seems that there is no ambiguity in clock definition of system in PaW mechanism like as there is no any ambiguity that we have for common Hilbert space. The main result of this part is that, as long as, it is not possible to have a interaction term between clock and rest systems then there is only one unique clock by using PaW approach in near horizon region of black hole. In usual Hilbert space, although there is no ambiguity in clock system and definition of it, by interaction term we have to define a new clock system. In near horizon vicinity there is only one unique clock because all of the changes of the basis are locally unitary which provide the unitary of the whole system.

For final conclusion we investigated the other problem in PaW approach which refers to fact that at first measurement, the clock remains stuck. This feature does not allow a correct propagator or correct two-time correlations. There is a proposal in this literature to overcome this criticism by using conditioning through a von Neumann description of the measurement interaction. We reconsidered this proposal in near-horizon zone. As long as there is no interaction terms and memory recording in zone then this proposal is not applicable in this region.

At the end it is important to note that, since near-horizon zone is very particular region which one expects to have both quantum mechanics and general relativity there then investigating for quantum gravity in near-horizon is more helpful than in usual Hilbert space in curved space or weak gravity. Time problem in quantum mechanics and also in canonical quantization of general relativity are very controversial issues which, we think, near-horizon zone is very suitable place for investigating this problem.

## 9 Acknowledgments

This work is based upon research funded by Iran National Science Foundation (INSF) under project No 99033073.

## References

- [1] E.C.G. Stueckelberg, Remarks on the creation of pairs of particles in the theory of relativity, *Helv. Phys. Acta* 14, 322 (1941); E.C.G. Stueckelberg, *La Mecanique du point materiel en theorie de relativite et en theorie des quanta*, *Helv. Phys. Acta* 15, 23 (1942).

- [2] H.D. Zeh, Emergence of classical time from a universal wavefunction, *Phys. Lett. A* 116,9 (1986).
- [3] R.P. Feynman, Simulating physics with computers, *Int. J. Theor. Phys.* 21, 467 (1982); R.P. Feynman, Quantum Mechanical Computers, *Found. Phys.* 16, 507 (1986); N. Margolus “Physics-like models of computation”, *Physica D* 10, 81 (1984).
- [4] C. Rovelli, Relational quantum mechanics, *Int. J. of Theor. Phys.* 35, 1637 (1996).
- [5] C. Rovelli, Time in quantum gravity: An hypothesis, *Phys. Rev. D* 43, 442 (1991).
- [6] D.N. Page and W.K. Wootters, Evolution without evolution: Dynamics described by stationary observables, *Phys. Rev. D*, 27, 2885 (1983).
- [7] K.V. Kuchar, Time and interpretations of quantum gravity, *Proc. 4th Canadian Conference on General Relativity and Relativistic Astrophysics*, eds. G. Kunstatter, D. Vincent, and J. Williams (World Scientific, Singapore, 1992), pg. 69-76.
- [8] J. Cotler, F. Wilczek, Entangled histories, *Phys. Scr.* 014004 (2016), arXiv:1502.02480 (2015).
- [9] Y. Aharonov, S. Popescu, J. Tollaksen, in *Quantum Theory: A Two-Time Success Story* (Springer, 2014) pg. 21- 36, arXiv:1305.1615 (2013).
- [10] D. Sels, M. Wouters, The thermodynamics of time, arXiv:1501.05567 (2015).
- [11] H. Salecker, E.P. Wigner, Quantum limitations of the measurement of space-time distances, *Phys. Rev.* 109, 571 (1958).
- [12] W.G. Unruh, R.M. Wald, Time and the interpretation of canonical quantum gravity, *Phys. Rev. D* 40, 2598 (1989).
- [13] E. Anderson, The problem of time in quantum gravity, arXiv:1009.2157v2 (2010).
- [14] K.V. Kuchar, in *Quantum Gravity 2: a Second Oxford Symposium* ed. C.J. Isham, R. Penrose and D.W. Sciama (Clarendon, Oxford 1981); K.V. Kuchar, in *Conceptual Problems of Quantum Gravity* ed. A. Ashtekar and J. Stachel (Birkhäuser, Boston 1991); C.J. Isham, in *Integrable Systems, Quantum Groups and Quantum Field Theories* ed. L.A. Ibort and M.A. Rodriguez (Kluwer, Dordrecht 1993), gr-qc/9210011; K.V. Kuchar, in *The Arguments of Time* ed. J. Butterfield (Oxford University Press, Oxford 1999).
- [15] R.D. Sorkin, Role of time in the sum-over-histories framework for gravity, *Int. J. Theor. Phys.* 33, 523 (1994).

- [16] D.N. Page, in *Physical Origins of Time Asymmetry*, eds. J.J. Halliwell, et al., (Cambridge Univ. Press, 1993), arXiv:gr-qc/9303020.
- [17] V. Vedral, *Time, (inverse) temperature and cosmological inflation as entanglement*, arXiv:1408.6965 (2014).
- [18] T. Banks, *TCP, quantum gravity, the cosmological constant and all that...*, Nucl. Phys. B 249, 332 (1985); R. Brout, *On the concept of time and the origin of the cosmological temperature*, Found. Phys. 17, 603 (1987); R. Brout, G. Horwitz, D. Weil, *On the onset of time and temperature in cosmology*, Phys. Lett. B 192, 318 (1987); R. Brout, Z. Phys. B 68, 339 (1987).
- [19] R. Brunetti, K. Fredenhagen, M. Hoge, *Time in quantum Physics: from an external parameter to an intrinsic observable*, Found. Phys. 40, 1368 (2010); R. Brunetti, K. Fredenhagen, *Time of occurrence observable in quantum mechanics*, Phys. Rev. A 66, 044101 (2002).
- [20] *In the context of cavity QED, a similar approach to quantizing a parameter was presented in: M. Wilczewski M. Czachor Phys. Rev. A 80, 013802 (2009).*
- [21] V. Giovannetti, S. Lloyd, L. Maccone, *Quantum time*, Phys. Rev. D 92, 045033 (2015), arXiv: 1504.04215 (2015)
- [22] S.A. Basri, *Operational foundation of Einstein's general theory of relativity*, Rev. Mod. Phys. 37, 288 (1965).
- [23] J.W. Kummer, S.A. Basri, *Time in general relativity*, Intern. J. Th. Phys. 2, 255 (1969).
- [24] J. von Neumann, *Mathematical Foundations of Quantum Mechanics* (Princeton Univ. Press, 1955).
- [25] C. Marletto and V. Vedral, *Evolution without evolution and without ambiguities*, Phys. Rev. D 95, 043510 (2017).
- [26] R. Gambini, R.A. Porto, J. Pullin, S. Torterolo, *onditional probabilities with Dirac observables and the problem of time in quantum gravity* Phys. Rev. D 79, 041501(R) (2009).
- [27] H. Hadi and F. Darabi, *Time evolution of the inside of the black hole's horizon*, The European Physical Journal C 82, 537 (2022). <https://doi.org/10.1140/epjc/s10052-022-10505-8>
- [28] R. Bousso, *Violations of the equivalence principle by a non-locally reconstructed vacuum at the black hole horizon*, Phys. Rev. Lett. 112, 041102 (2014).
- [29] J. Maldacena, L. Susskind, *Cool horizon for entangled black holes*, Fortsch.Phys. 61 (2013) 781-811 arXiv:1306.0533v2(2013).



- [30] A. Almheiri, D. Marolf, J. Polchinski and J. Sully, Black Holes: Complementarity or Firewalls? JHEP02(2013)062 arXiv:1207.3123 [hep-th].
- [31] D. N Page, Average entropy of a subsystem, Phys. Rev. Lett. 71, 1291 (1993), arXiv:gr-qc/9305007; D. N. Page, Black hole information, arXiv:hep-th/9305040 (1993).
- [32] B. M. Terhal, Is entanglement monogamous?, IBM Journal of Research and Development 48, (2004) arXiv:quant-ph/0307120 (2003).
- [33] M. Koashi and A. Winter, Monogamy of quantum entanglement and other correlations, Phys. Rev. A 69, 022309 (2004), arXiv:quant-ph /0310037.
- [34] A. Almheiri, D. Marolf, J. Polchinski, D. Stanford, and J. Sully, An apologia for firewalls, arXiv:1304.6483 (2013).
- [35] W. Israel, Thermofield dynamics of black holes, Phys. Lett. A 57, 107 (1976).
- [36] J. M. Maldacena, Eternal black holes in anti-de Sitter, JHEP 0304, 021 (2003) [hep-th/0106112].
- [37] S. Lloyd, J. Preskill, Unitarity of black hole evaporation in the final-state projection models, JHEP 08 126 (2014).
- [38] B.S. DeWitt, Quantum theory of gravity. I. The canonical theory, Phys. Rev. 160, 1113 (1967).