1

# DESY 94-208 hep-th/9411094

# On the Local Equilibrium Condition

Hermann He ling

Deutsches Elektronen (Synchrotron (DESY), Notkestra e 85, D (22603 H am burg, G erm any

A physical system is in local equilibrium if it cannot be distinguished from a global equilibrium by \in nitesim mally localized measurements". This should be a natural characterization of local equilibrium, but the problem is to give a precise meaning to the qualitative phrase \in nitesim ally localized measurements". A solution is suggested in form of a Local Equilibrium C ondition (LEC), which can be applied to linear relativistic quantum eld theories but not directly to sel nteracting quantum elds. The concept of local temperature resulting from LEC is compared to an old approach to local temperature based on the principle of maxim alentropy. It is shown that the principle of maxim alentropy does not always lead to physical states if it is applied to relativistic quantum eld theories.

#### 1. Introduction

An understanding of nature seem s to be easier at very small length scales than at larger length scales. This is our every day experience here at DESY, where we analyze ZEUS data <sup>1</sup> to test predictions of the asym ptotically free QCD.

The smaller the observables the less can be resolved: whatever the state of a physical system is, it cannot be distinguished from the vacuum state if the localization regions of the observables are shrinked to a point. This is the content of the Principle of Local Stability [7], [8]. W hat can be said about the state of a physical system if the localization region of a measurement is not completely shrinked to a point, but is \innitesimally localized"? From general relativity we know that because of the Equivalence Principle gravitation is locally constant. In [10] a formulation of a Quantum Equivalence Principle (QEP) was suggested. According to QEP the states of all physical system s are locally constant. QEP was investigated in the R indler spacetim  $e^2$ and it was shown that the Hawking {Bisognano{ W ichm an tem perature [9], [1], [2] is a consequence

#### ofQEP [10].

In this paper we try to characterize local equilibrium states by form ulating a condition for \innitesim ally localized m easurem ents". This condition is presented in the next section. The next section starts with a collection of some m ore or less known facts and a presentation of our nom enclature. In the last section we com pare our approach to local equilibrium to an approach based on the principle of m axim al entropy.

#### 2. Local Equilibrium Condition

In a quantum mechanical system of nite degrees of freedom the expectation value < A > of any observable A in a state < > can be characterized by a density matrix

$$\langle A \rangle = \frac{\operatorname{Tr} A}{\operatorname{Tr}}$$
: (1)

If one introduces the modular H am iltonian H by

where  $\sim$  is a number introduced for later convenience, the modular evolution

$$(A) = e^{iH^{\circ}} A e^{-iH}$$

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>1</sup> For a description of the ZEUS detector see e.g. [13]. <sup>2</sup>TheR indlerspacetime is a wedge in the M inkow skispacetime ( $tj < x^{(1)}$ ). It is a simple model of a black hole.

can be de ned. Cyclicity of the trace gives the KMS{condition [11], [12]

< (A) 
$$B > = < B_{+i^{*}} (A) > :$$
 (2)

In quantum eld theory the right hand side of (1) does not exist but the KMS {condition (2) can be used directly to characterize the state [6], [8]. For simplicity we concentrate on the Klein {G ordon eld (x) in M inkow ski spacetime.

If the system is in a global equilibrium state < > with temperature 1= the modular H am iltionan is nothing but the H am ilton operator, H<sup>r</sup> = H, which generates the time evolution t along an inertial time coordinate t in the M inkowski spacetime

$$t (0;x) = e^{iHt} (0;x)e^{iHt} = (t;x):$$

The parameter ~ represents the inverse tem perature of the system. If we replace the modular evolution in (2) by the time evolution  $_{\rm t}$  and perform a Fourier transformation of the KMS{ condition, the 2{point function < (x<sup>0</sup>) (x) > is representable in terms of a state independent commutator [10]

< 
$$(x^{0}) (x) > =$$
 (3)  
 $\frac{i}{2^{\sim}} d [ (x); (x^{0})] \operatorname{coth} - (i)$ 

U sing the well known non {equal time commutator for a massless K lein {G ordoneld

$$[(x); (x^{0})] = \frac{1}{2} \operatorname{sign}(t \ t^{0}) \ ((x \ x^{0})^{2})$$

we obtain for the 2 { point function

<  $(x^{0})$   $(x)> = \frac{1}{4}$ 

(4)

where

 $= t^{0} t \frac{p}{(\mathbf{x}^{0} \cdot \mathbf{x})^{2}} \text{ i; } \_= 2^{p} \overline{(\mathbf{x}^{0} \cdot \mathbf{x})^{2}}$ 

We understand local equilibrium as a state which cannot be distinguished from a global equilibrium state by \in nitesim ally localized measurements". If the localization region of an observable A ism ade smaller and smaller the expectation value < A > of the observable A in a local equilibrium state < > should become more and m ore identical to the expectation value < A > of A in an equilibrium state < > at a certain tem perature . To describe the shrinking of the localization region of an observable A we use a one{parametric scaling procedure A.

For the n {point observable  $A = (x_1) ::: (x_n)$  the scaling procedure is de ned as [7], [5], [10]

$$A = N()^{n} (x_{1}) ::: (x_{n})$$
 (5)

where (with respect to inertial coordinates x )

$$(x) = x + (x x)$$
 (6)

is a 1-parametric scaling di eom orphism with  $_1x = x$  and  $_0x = x$ . In the limit ! 0 the localization points  $x_1 ::: x_n$  of the n {point observable A are scaled into the point x. The scaling function N () has to be adjusted in such a way that the scaling limit of the n {point function, lim<sub>!0</sub> < A >; is well de ned. A suitable scaling function for the K lein {G ordon eld is N () = .

A coording to the Quantum Equivalence Principle (QEP) [10] the scaled observable A has to full two requirements for small values of the scaling parameter : the expectation value < A > has to be locally constant around the scaling point x and its the scaling limit, lim  $!_0 < A >$ ; has to be continuous in x. In linear quantum eld theories the rst requirement can be written as the extrem um conditon

$$\lim_{t \to 0} \frac{d}{d} < A > = 0:$$
 (7)

Therefore the state nontrivial information about the state of a linear quantum eld is beyond the state order in .

We say that a state < > ful ls the Local Equilibrium C ondition in the point x , if it does not di er from a global equilibrium state < > of tem perature 1= up to second order in the scaling parameter

$$\lim_{t \to 0} \frac{d^2}{d^2} < A > < A > = 0: (8)$$

For a massless K lein (G ordon eld the equilibrium part of LEC can be calculated from (4)

$$\lim_{t \to 0} \frac{d^2}{d^2} < \frac{2}{(x^0)} (x^0) = \frac{1}{12^2} : (9)$$

Let us apply LEC to Hadamard states. Hadamard states are de nable in linear quantum eld theories and are quasifire states<sup>3</sup> with a speci c singularity structure: the symmetric part of the 2{point{function is identical with Hadamard's fundamental solution of the wave equation [4]

$$< f (x^{0}); (x)g> = \frac{u}{u} + v \ln + w$$
 (10)

where is the square of the geodesic distance between  $x^0$  and x. The functions u;v;w are regular in x and  $x^0$ . The information about the state is contained in w; u and v are state independent and are uniquely xed by the geometry of the spacetime. It is conjectered that the 2{point function of any physical state of the K lein{G ordon eld can locally be approximated by a H adam and state B]. A ssum ing the validity of this conjecture<sup>4</sup> the equilibrium state can be approximated by a state of the form

 $\langle f(x^{0}); (x)g \rangle = \frac{u}{u} + v \ln + w : (11)$ 

It follows that LEC reduces to

$$w(x;x) = w(x;x)$$
 (12)

since the state independent singular parts  $u = ;v \ln$  cancel because of the di erence in (8) and since the state dependent parts w ( $x^0; x$ ) and w ( $x^0; x$ ) are regular in the lim it ! 0. This means that LEC does not depend on the scaling function in the sense that Eqn (6) can be replaced by any one{parametric scaling di eomorphism which has x as a xpoint. We are therefore allowed to call 1= a bcaltem perature. C om bining (9) and (12) we see that all

H adam and states of the m assless K lein (G ordon eld with a non {negative w (x ;x ) have the localtem perature

$$1 = = \frac{p}{12 w (x; x)}$$

in the scaling point x . Hadam and states with a negative w (x ;x ) have an imaginary local tem – perature and therefore cannot be local equilibrium states.

How can one describe local equilibrium states in curved spacetimes? In curved spacetimes the existence of global equilibrium states can no longer be expected. Therefore LEC cannot be applied directly. Nevertheless let us insist on our \global rst { local next" point of view : before one can de ne local equilibrium one has to know what equilibrium in a nite region of spacetime is. If a physical system is in uenced by a rapidly changing gravitational force, it is intuitively clear that the system has to react, i.e. it has to change its state. But stationarity is an important characteristic quality of equilibrium . We therefore exclude non { stationary gravitational elds from the nite spacetime region 0 where we would like to investigate local equilibrium states. This can be done by assuming that in the region 0 there is a tim elike Killing eld @=@t. Quantitatively we characterize equilibrium states in the region O by carrying over the concept of local K M S { states from the M inkowski spacetime  $[\beta]$ . A local KMS{ state  $< >_{,0}$  in the region 0 of tem perature 1= has a 2{point function  $< (x^0)$  (t;x)> ; which is analytical in the open interval 0 < Im t <continuous in the closed interval 0 Imt and ful ls the KMS{conditon

for all points  $\mathbf{x} = (\mathbf{t}; \mathbf{x}); \mathbf{x}^0$  in O. (The step from the 2{point function to arbitrary observables is straightforward and therefore not writen down.) To form ulate LEC in the spacetime region O, one has to replace the reference state < > in (8) by the local KMS{state < >  $_{r0}$ .

In [10] it was shown that the derivative condition (7) has to be modiled if one wants to form ulate QEP for asymptotically free quantum eld theories like QCD, since the running coupling constant does not smoothly become zero in the short distance lim it ! 0, but logarithm ically. Because of the same reason the second derivative condition (8) needs a modil caton if one wants to characterize local equilibrium states for sel nteracting quantum elds.

 $<sup>^3</sup>$  A state is called quasifiee if its truncated n{point{ functions vanish for n  $\pm$  2.

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>4</sup> For a massless K lein {G ordon eld the following conclusions can directly be proven without this conjecture by using (4).

## 3. LEC versus the principle of maxim alentropy

G lobal equilibrium states in nonrelativistic quantum theories can be obtained by the extrem alization of a certain functional: the entropy. The entropy of a state  $< > = Tr^{()}$  is defined as

$$S = Tr^{n} \ln^{n}$$

where  $^{=}$  = Tr is the normalized density matrix. Consider the set of states with a given expectation value for the Ham ilton operator

$$E = \langle H \rangle \tag{13}$$

A global equilibrium state is characterizeable as the state of maximal entropy within this set. From the variational equation for the normalized density matrix, (S + c(1 < 1>) + (E < H>))= 0; where c and are Lagrange multipliers for the normalization condition  $Tr^{-1}$  and the constraint (13) respectively, one gets

= e <sup>H</sup>

It turns out that is the inverse tem perature of the system .

To determ ine the state of a system with a nonuniform temperature it was suggested [14] that the principle of maximal entropy has to be applied to a local form of the constraint (13)

$$(\mathbf{x}) = \langle \mathbf{H} (\mathbf{x}) \rangle \tag{14}$$

where H (x) is the H am iltion density at time zero. This leads to a continuum of Lagrangem ultipliers

(x) and the density m atrix

$$= e^{ \int_{a}^{R} d^{3}x (x)H(x)} :$$
 (15)

1= (x) is interpreted as the local tem perature of the system [14]. For the current status of this approach we refer to [15] and references therein.

W hat is the relation between the local tem perature 1= introduced in the last section and the local tem perature 1= (x) obtained with the principle of maxim alentropy?

Let us choose a (x) which is linear in  $x^{(1)}$ 

 $(x) = x^{(1)}$ 

Then the modular H am iltonian of the density matrix (15)  $\frac{7}{2}$ 

$$H' = d^3 x x^{(1)} H (x)$$
 (16)

becomes the generator of a boost transformation in  $x^{(1)}$  {direction and for the modular evolution of the K lein {G ordoneld one nds

$$(0;x) = (x^{(1)} \sinh x^{(1)} \cosh x^{(2)};x^{(3)})$$

This system was studied in [10] and it was shown that only one value of the parameter  $\sim$  is allowed by QEP, namely  $\sim = 2$ . We conclude that the principle of maxim alentropy does not always lead to physical states. Consequently the interpretation of 1= (x) as a local temperature does not make sense in general.

For the allowed parameter  $\sim = 2$  the 2{point function of the K lein {G ordon eld in state given by (16) is just the 2{point function of the vacuum state in the M inkowski spacetime [1], [2], i.e. the local temperature in the sense of LEC is identically zero

$$1 = 0$$

0 n the other hand the local tem perature from the principle of maxim alentropy

$$\frac{1}{(x)} = \frac{1}{2 x^{(1)}}$$

is the Unruh tem perature of an uniform ly accelerated detector, where the Unruh tem perature is m easured with respect to the local proper time in the detector [8].

The two concepts of local tem perature refer to di erent time concepts. The local tem perature concept from the principle of maximal entropy refers to a time de ned by a certain subclass of the modular evolutions. (It would be interesting to know under which conditions this approach makes sense physically.) In the M inkow ski spacetime the local tem perature concept of LEC is related to a time given by the clock of an experiment at rest.

#### A cknow ledgm ents

We would like to thank R.Haag for helpful and stimulating discussions. We also thank U.

Bannier, D. Buchholz, K. Fredenhagen, K. {H. Rehren and R.D. Tscheuschner for discussions. The support from the ZEUS collaboration is acknow ledged with great appreciation.

### REFERENCES

- Bisognano, J.J. and W ichm ann, E H.On the duality condition for a Herm itean scalar eld. J.M ath. Phys. 16, 985 (1975)
- Bisognano, J.J. and W ichm ann, E H.On the duality condition for quantum elds. J.M ath. Phys. 17, 303 (1976)
- 3. Buchholz, D. and Junglas, P. On the existence of equilibrium states in local quantum eld theory. Commun. M ath. Phys. 121, 255 (1989)
- DeW itt, B.S. and Brehme, R.W. Radiation damping in a gravitational eld. Ann. Phys. 9,220 (1961)
- 5. Fredenhagen, K. and Haag, R. Generally covariant quantum eld theory and scaling lim its. Commun.M ath. Phys. 108, 91 (1987)
- Haag, R., Hugenholtz, N. M. and W innink, M.On the equilibrium states in quantum statistical mechanics. Commun. Math. Phys. 5, 215 (1967)
- Haag, R., Namhofer, H. and Stein, U. On quantum eld theories in gravitational background.Commun.Math.Phys.94,219 (1984)
- Haag, R. Local quantum physics. Berlin: Springer (1992)
- 9. Hawking, S.W. Particle creation by black holes.Commun.Math.Phys.43, 199 (1975)
- 10.He ling, H. On the Quantum Equivalence Principle.Nucl.Phys.B 415, 243 (1994)
- 11. K ubo, R. Statistical m echanical theory of irreversible processes I.J.M ath.Soc.Japan 12, 570 (1957)
- 12. Martin, P. C. and Schwinger, J. Theory of many particle systems: I. Phys. Rev. 115, 1342 (1959)
- 13. ZEUS Collab., M. Derrick et al. Initial study of deep inelastic scattering with ZEUS at HERA.Phys.Lett.B 303, 183 (1993)
- 14. Zubarev, D. N. Nonequilibrium statistical thermodyanmics.New York:ConsultantsBureau (1974)

15. Zubarev, D. N. and Tokarchuk, M. V. Nonequilibrium therm o eld dynamics and the nonequilibrium statistical operator method. I. Basic relations. Theor. M ath. Phys. 88, 876 (1992)