

Quantum bit threads

Andrew Rolph^{a,b}

^a*Institute for Theoretical Physics, University of Amsterdam, 1090 GL Amsterdam, The Netherlands*

^b*Martin A. Fisher School of Physics, Brandeis University, Waltham, MA 02453, USA*

E-mail: andrew.d.rolph@gmail.com

ABSTRACT: We give a bit thread prescription that is equivalent to the quantum extremal surface prescription for holographic entanglement entropy. Our proposal is inspired by considerations of bit threads in doubly holographic models, and equivalence is established by proving a generalisation of the Riemannian max-flow min-cut theorem. We explore our proposal's properties, and discuss ways in which islands and spacetime are emergent phenomena from the quantum bit thread perspective.

Contents

1	Introduction	1
2	Quantum bit threads	3
2.1	Bit threads and double holography	3
2.2	Warm up proposals	5
2.3	Quantum bit thread proposal	6
2.3.1	Comments	7
2.3.2	Quantum bit threads near the QES	8
3	Proof of equivalence to the QES prescription	9
3.1	From the quantum bit thread prescription to a dual optimisation problem	10
3.2	From the dual optimisation problem to the QES prescription	12
4	Discussion and future directions	17

1 Introduction

The connection between quantum information and geometry is one of the deepest aspects of quantum gravity to have emerged in recent decades. Nowhere perhaps is this connection more apparent than in the Ryu-Takayanagi formula which relates von Neumann entropies in holographic CFTs to geometric objects in their bulk duals [1]:

$$S(A) = \frac{1}{4G_N} \min_{m \sim A} \text{Area}(m). \quad (1.1)$$

The minimisation is over bulk surfaces homologous to boundary subregion A .

Bit threads [2] are a flow-based reformulation of holographic entanglement entropy introduced to address some of the conceptual issues arising from the surface-based Ryu-Takayanagi prescription. Bit threads replace the process of minimising over surfaces with maximising over flows. In the original, ‘classical’ bit thread prescription, the von Neumann entropy of boundary region A equals the maximum flux of a divergenceless, norm-bounded vector field $v^\mu(x)$ out of that boundary region¹:

$$S(A) = \max_v \int_A n_\mu v^\mu \text{ subject to the constraints } \nabla_\mu v^\mu = 0 \text{ and } |v| \leq \frac{1}{4G_N}. \quad (1.2)$$

Equivalence of this prescription to Ryu-Takayanagi follows from a generalisation of the max flow-min cut theorem (MFMC) to continuous Riemannian manifolds [3]. The classical

¹In integrations we leave the $d^d x \sqrt{\gamma}$ implicit.

Ryu-Takayanagi surface, as a minimal area surface, acts a bottleneck for the classical bit threads.

Both the Ryu-Takayanagi formula and bit thread prescription (1.2) are only valid for time symmetric states and only accurate to leading order in the CFT's coupling and central charge. To be accurate at finite CFT coupling, the Ryu-Takayanagi formula must be modified to account for higher curvature corrections to the bulk gravitational action [4–6], and these corrections are accounted for in the bit thread formulation with a spacetime dependent norm bound [7]. To be accurate at finite central charge, the Ryu-Takayanagi formula is modified to the quantum extremal surface (QES) prescription [8], which includes a bulk entanglement entropy contribution:

$$S(A) = \min_{m \sim A} \left(\frac{\text{Area}(m)}{4G_N} + S_{\text{bulk}}(\sigma(m)) \right) \quad (1.3)$$

$\sigma(m)$ is the subregion of the bulk slice whose boundary is $\partial\sigma(m) = A \cup m$.

Quantum corrections to the bit thread prescription were briefly considered in the original paper [2], where the authors qualitatively suggested that the quantum correction be accounted for by allowing the bit threads (integral curves of v) to start and end at points in the bulk. Loosely speaking the physical idea is to allow bit threads to tunnel between entangled bulk degrees of freedom. This has a hope of capturing the bulk entanglement entropy term given in (1.3) because threads tunnelling across the Ryu-Takayanagi surface allows for additional flux from A roughly in proportion to the amount entanglement across that surface. Bit threads starting and ending at bulk points amounts to modifying the classical prescription's divergencelessness condition $\nabla_\mu v^\mu = 0$, but no concrete proposal has been given, though see [9] for a discrete formulation of bit threads on MERA tensor networks with sources and sinks.

In finding a quantum bit thread prescription, one natural place to look for inspiration is in doubly holographic models [10]. The benefit of these models is that the bulk entanglement entropy can be computed using the classical Ryu-Takayanagi formula in one higher dimension. In these models the quantum bit thread prescription in AdS_{d+1} in a sense follows directly from the behaviour of classical bit threads along boundary in the highest dimensional picture. These models also give us an interesting bit thread interpretation of islands.

Our main result is a quantum bit thread prescription, that we prove is equivalent to the QES prescription. Let $\sigma(m)$ be a bulk subregion whose boundary is $\partial\sigma(m) = m \cup A$, which can be thought of as the time slice of a ‘candidate’ entanglement wedge for A . Our proposal is that

$$S(A) = \max_v \int_A n_\mu v^\mu \quad \text{subject to } |v| \leq \frac{1}{4G_N} \text{ and } \forall(m \sim A) : \left(- \int_{\sigma(m)} \nabla_\mu v^\mu(x) \leq S(\sigma(m)) \right). \quad (1.4)$$

This prescription is valid for time symmetric states and accurate to all orders in G_N .

Outline

In section 2 we gain some intuition for quantum bit threads by considering classical bit threads in doubly holographic models, and we propose and comment on a quantum bit thread prescription. In section 3 we prove equivalence of our quantum bit thread prescription to the quantum extremal surface prescription, using tools from convex optimisation. Lastly, in section 4 we conclude with some discussion of the connection of quantum bit threads with ER=EPR, emergent spacetime, and islands, and talk about possible future directions to work towards.

Note: As this work neared completion we learned of work by Cesar Agon and Juan Pedraza [11] which has partial overlap in scope, inasmuch as they also study modifications of the bit thread proposal to account for bulk quantum corrections, and we have arranged to submit simultaneously to arXiv.

2 Quantum bit threads

In this section we will give a flow-based bit thread prescription which is equivalent to the quantum extremal surface (QES) prescription [8]

$$S(A) = \min_{m \sim A} \left(\frac{\text{Area}(m)}{4G_N} + S_{\text{bulk}}(\sigma(m)) \right) \quad (2.1)$$

where $\sigma(m)$ is the subregion of the bulk slice whose boundary is $\partial\sigma(m) = A \cup m$ ². We assume time reflection symmetry in order to separate the challenges of creating covariant and quantum bit thread prescriptions.

2.1 Bit threads and double holography

First we take a small but instructive diversion to consider quantum bit threads in doubly holographic models. In double holography we have three equivalent descriptions [10]: a CFT_d , which has a gravitational AdS_{d+1} dual with a bulk matter CFT_{d+1} , which in turn is holographically dual to gravity in AdS_{d+2} . See Fig. 1. The advantage of such models is that the bulk entanglement entropy in AdS_{d+1} can be calculated holographically. We can use the classical Ryu-Takayanagi formula, if we assume the quantum corrections in AdS_{d+2} to be subleading.

In doubly holographic models the quantum bit thread prescription in a sense follows directly from the behaviour of classical bit threads along the boundary branes in the highest dimensional picture. Classical bit threads start at A and can travel through, leave and join the boundary branes in the AdS_{d+2} picture, though they cannot start or end on them [3]. In the AdS_{d+1} picture, these look like bit threads starting and ending at bulk points.

The bulk is classical in the AdS_{d+2} picture, so we use the classical bit thread prescription given in (1.2). As Fig. 1b illustrates, the bit threads separate into those that stay on

²The generalised entropy that features in the QES prescription has two sources of UV divergences: from the bulk entanglement entropy, and from counterterms in the gravitational action. We assume that these divergences cancel each other rendering the generalised entropy finite and regulator independent [12–15]. S_{bulk} is implicitly the finite piece of the bulk entanglement entropy, and G_N the renormalised Newton’s constant.




Figure 1: Bit threads in a doubly holographic model. In (b) the bulk is classical and the bit threads divergenceless. Some blue ‘classical’ bit threads go from A to \bar{A} by moving through the AdS_{d+1} boundary, while other red ‘quantum’ threads move into the bulk. In (a) we see how this looks from the AdS_{d+1} perspective: bit threads that start and end at bulk points, jumping across the RT surface. How many can appear and disappear is determined by the AdS_{d+1} entanglement structure through the AdS_{d+2} geometry.

the boundary and those that move into the bulk. The one novelty is that what the G_N appearing in the norm bound depends on whether the flow is through the bulk or along the boundary. The flux of bit threads into the bulk from any subregion of the boundary is bounded the subregion’s RT surface.

How does this all look from the AdS_{d+1} perspective? As Fig. 1a depicts, some bit threads appear to jump over the RT surface, and double holography gives us an interesting interpretation of these threads as moving into the higher dimensional bulk. The flux density from the boundary of AdS_{d+2} equals the divergence of v on the AdS_{d+1} boundary, and the bound on flux off subregions of the AdS_{d+2} boundary translates to

$$\left| \int_{\sigma} \nabla_{\mu} v^{\mu} \right| \leq S_{\text{bulk}}(\sigma) \quad (2.2)$$

for any and all subregions σ of the AdS_{d+1} Cauchy slice.

This property of flow configurations in doubly holographic models is very suggestive for how to modify the bit thread prescription to account for quantum corrections. We now turn to consider such modifications. In the discussion section we will revisit doubly holographic models when we discuss islands from the quantum bit thread perspective.

2.2 Warm up proposals

We do not claim there to be a unique quantum bit thread prescription. That should not surprise us as even the original classical prescription is non-unique; one can trivially generate a family of mathematically equivalent prescriptions by redefining $v^\mu(x) \rightarrow f(x)\tilde{v}^\mu(x)$, which superficially look different from the original prescription because $\nabla_\mu \tilde{v}^\mu \neq 0$. The proposals we will discuss are not as trivially equivalent as that, but the point stands.

Proposal I

In order to illustrate what makes some formulations more desirable than others, we consider a short series of iterative improvements, starting from the crudest way to account for quantum corrections in the bit thread formulation, which is to add the entropy of the bulk homology region for the classical RT surface to the final answer by hand

$$S(A) = \max_v \left(\int_A n_\mu v^\mu \right) + S_{\text{bulk}}(\sigma(m_{RT})) \quad \text{subject to } |v| \leq \frac{1}{4G_N} \text{ and } \nabla_\mu v^\mu = 0. \quad (2.3)$$

This is inaccurate beyond the leading order correction in G_N . There are two other reasons why this prescription is rubbish. Firstly, it requires detailed foreknowledge about the bulk state and geometry, including where the RT surface will be, in order to know what S_{bulk} to add. As in the classical prescription, the threads should have as little foreknowledge about the bulk as possible. Secondly, the quantum correction is added by hand, rather than determined dynamically by the threads themselves, like the area term is.

Proposal II

We can do a little better with a prescription that modifies the divergencelessness condition,

$$S(A) = \max_v \left(\int_A n_\mu v^\mu \right) \quad \text{subject to } |v| \leq 1 \text{ and } \nabla_\mu v^\mu(x) = -J(x) \quad (2.4)$$

with source function J to be determined. We assume that the maximal flow saturates the norm bound on the QES, and then, by the divergence theorem

$$\int_A n_\mu v^\mu = - \int_{\sigma(m)} \nabla_\mu v^\mu + \int_m n_\mu v^\mu \quad (2.5)$$

(where the normal vector is outward pointing on m , and inward pointing on A) we see that to capture the bulk entropy term and match the QES prescription we require

$$\int_{\sigma(m_{QES})} J(x) = S_{\text{bulk}}(\sigma(m_{QES})) \quad (2.6)$$

Thus J is some kind of density function for the bulk von Neumann entropy. Such density functions have been considered before, first in [16], and dubbed entanglement contours. In a follow up paper we will explore entanglement contours in detail [17].

In previous work, bit thread flux density was interpreted as an entanglement contour [18], which seems different from our proposal, which is that the divergence of the flow field equals an entanglement contour, but the connection is made in doubly holographic models where $\nabla_\mu v^\mu$ in the AdS_{d+1} picture equals the flux density of bit threads off the boundary in the AdS_{d+2} picture.

The prescription (2.4) is an improvement on (2.3) because the bulk entanglement entropy is accounted for dynamically by the bit threads with only a simple and local modification to the divergencelessness condition, but it is still unsatisfactory because it requires foreknowledge of where the QES surface will be, in order to know what source function J to use.

2.3 Quantum bit thread proposal

Proposal III

The last prescription we consider requires no foreknowledge and is accurate to all orders in G_N . It replaces the divergencelessness condition with a constraint on the flux into all bulk regions $\sigma(m)$ whose boundary is $\partial\sigma(m) = m \cup A$:

$$S(A) = \max_v \int_A n_\mu v^\mu, \quad |v| \leq \frac{1}{4G_N}, \quad \forall(m \sim A) : \left(- \int_{\sigma(m)} \nabla_\mu v^\mu \leq S_{\text{bulk}}(\sigma(m)) \right). \quad (2.7)$$

Each $\sigma(m)$ can be thought of as a timeslice of a candidate entanglement wedge of A , and the divergence constraint applies to every such candidate entanglement wedge.

How is this prescription equivalent to the QES prescription? Consider an arbitrary surface m homologous to A , and its associated bulk region $\sigma(m)$. The constraints and the divergence theorem (2.5) bound the flux out of A

$$\int_A n_\mu v^\mu \leq \frac{\text{Area}(m)}{4G_N} + S_{\text{bulk}}(\sigma(m)) \quad (2.8)$$

for all $m \sim A$. We can try to saturate this inequality and so turn it into an equality by minimising the right hand side over surfaces m homologous to A , which minimises on $m = m_{\text{QES}}$, and maximising the left hand side with respect to v . The inequality is saturated if we assume that there exists a flow field configuration v that:

1. Satisfies the constraints of our prescription (2.7).
2. Has $v^\mu = n^\mu/4G_N$ on the QES, with n^μ the unit normal.
3. Saturates the divergence bound when $m = m_{\text{QES}}$:

$$- \int_{\sigma(m_{\text{QES}})} \nabla_\mu v^\mu = S_{\text{bulk}}(\sigma(m_{\text{QES}})) \quad (2.9)$$

This existence assumption is reasonable, though the precise argument for why is somewhat involved, so to avoid interrupting the flow we will come back to it at the end of the section. With the assumption, (2.8) becomes

$$\max_v \int_A n_\mu v^\mu = \min_{m \sim A} \left(\frac{\text{Area}(m)}{4G_N} + S_{\text{bulk}}(\sigma(m)) \right) \quad (2.10)$$

which establishes equivalence of our quantum bit thread prescription to the QES prescription. We will give a rigorous proof of equivalence to the QES prescription which does not rely on existence assumptions in section 3.

2.3.1 Comments

We have modified the classical bit thread proposal by replacing the $\nabla_\mu v^\mu = 0$ condition with a constraint that allows bit threads to start and end at bulk points, but that limit the number of threads that can end in a given region. Our prescription is non-local in that it involves a constraint on the behaviour of the flow over macroscopic codimension-1 regions, though perhaps this cannot be improved upon given the non-local nature of bulk entanglement.

The classical bit thread prescription is recovered by rescaling v by $4G_N$ then taking the limit $G_N \rightarrow 0$, which gives

$$\max_v \frac{1}{4G_N} \int_A v \text{ subject to } |v| \leq 1 \text{ and } \forall(m \sim A) : \int_{\sigma(m)} \nabla_\mu v^\mu(x) \geq 0 \quad (2.11)$$

For the divergence constraint to hold for all $\sigma(m)$ requires $\nabla_\mu v^\mu(x) \geq 0$ for all x . This constraint we may further tighten, without affecting the optimum, to $\nabla_\mu v^\mu(x) = 0$, which is the divergencelessness constraint of the original bit thread prescription, because positive sources for v in the bulk cannot possibly increase the flux from A .

If the global bulk state is pure, then our divergence constraint implies (taking $\sigma(m) = \Sigma$)

$$\int_\Sigma \nabla_\mu v^\mu(x) \geq 0. \quad (2.12)$$

Thus for pure states the flux out of bulk slice is non-negative; there cannot be more bit threads that end than start at points in the bulk.

Even when the QES and the classical RT surface are not close together (in Planck units), our quantum bit thread prescription (2.7) is still correct and equivalent to the QES prescription, as we will prove in section 3. Such situations have been of recent interest in the context of the black hole information paradox [19, 20]. The QES and classical RT surfaces are often perturbatively close to each other, due to the bulk entanglement entropy term having a G_N suppression relative to the area term, but there are cases when the bulk entanglement across a candidate QES is sufficiently large to overcome the relative G_N suppression. As the bulk entanglement across the QES increases, there may come a point where its position jumps discontinuously. Fig. 2 shows what is happening from the quantum bit thread perspective. As one increases the bulk entanglement across the minimal




Figure 2: Flux-maximising flows for two different states on the same bulk slice, which illustrates the quantum extremal surface phase transition from the bit thread perspective. The QES, depicted by the green dashed line, is always the bottleneck to the flow. In (a) there is little entanglement across the QES, and the QES is l_P away from the minimal-area classical RT surface. In (b) the bulk entanglement has increased until a new bottleneck appears in the bulk region where the flow is constrained to reappear, which generally will not be close to the classical RT surface.

area RT surface, more and more threads are allowed to jump across that bottleneck, but eventually the threads become maximally packed in some new region where they are forced to reappear due to the divergence constraint, and a new bottleneck emerges at the quantum extremal surface. As the bulk entanglement increases there is a continuous change in the flow vector field, in contrast to the discontinuous jump of the extremal surface, and there is still a bottleneck to the flow, but it is no longer the minimal area surface. The QES is *always* the bottleneck to the flow.

The divergence constraint in our quantum bit thread prescription is similar to the property of flows in doubly holographic models we found earlier, which was

$$\forall \sigma \subseteq \Sigma : \quad \left| \int_{\sigma} \nabla_{\mu} v^{\mu} \right| \leq S_{\text{bulk}}(\sigma). \quad (2.13)$$

Doubly holographic models are a subset of all holographic models, so, for consistency, their flows, which satisfy (2.13), must also satisfy the constraints of our quantum bit thread prescription given in (2.7), which they do. The property (2.13) would be too tight a constraint to impose in general holographic models; it is the large central charge of the bulk matter in doubly holographic models that allows the bulk entropy to be large enough for (2.13) to be satisfied for any $\sigma \subset \Sigma$.

2.3.2 Quantum bit threads near the QES

Now we come back to justifying the assumption that was key to establishing equivalence of prescriptions, that there exists a flow field v that satisfies the conditions given in (2.9),

one of which was that it saturates the norm bound with $v^\mu = n^\mu/4G_N$ on the QES. There is cause to question this assumption because in the classical prescription (with $\nabla_\mu v^\mu = 0$) it is *not* possible to saturate the norm bound $|v| \leq 1$ on any surface homologous to A other than the minimal area one without violating the norm bound elsewhere. In the quantum prescription however, due to the non-zero divergence of v , threads can start and end on surfaces and this makes it possible for the norm bound to be saturated on a non-minimal area surface, such as the QES, without the norm bound being violated immediately off the surface.

Since by assumption the bit threads of a flux maximising flow are maximally packed on the QES, the most sensible place to check whether the norm bound will be violated is in the neighbourhood of the QES. From the definition of the QES, shape deformations of its generalised entropy vanish to first order,

$$\frac{\delta}{\delta m(x)} \left(\frac{\text{Area}(m)}{4G_N} + S_{\text{bulk}}(\sigma(m)) \right) = \frac{K(x)}{4G_N} + \frac{\delta}{\delta m(x)} S_{\text{bulk}}(\sigma(m)) = 0 \quad (2.14)$$

on the QES, with K the trace of the extrinsic curvature. Suppose now also that the divergence bound is saturated not only for $m = m_{\text{QES}}$ as in (2.9), but for first order shape deformations away from the QES too, then

$$\nabla_\mu v^\mu(x) = -\frac{\delta}{\delta m(x)} S_{\text{bulk}}(\sigma(m)) \quad (2.15)$$

on the QES. By assumption $|v| = 1$ on the QES, and what we now check is whether our supposition (2.15) is sufficient to ensure that the norm bound $|v| \leq 1$ is not violated at first order in directions perpendicular to the QES. This requires $v^\mu \partial_\mu |v| = 0$ on the QES. This equation was called the ‘linear obstruction equation’ in [7] and shown to be equivalent to

$$\nabla_\mu v^\mu(x) = \frac{K(x)}{4G_N} \quad (2.16)$$

on any surface on which $v^\mu = n^\mu/4G_N$ (which for us is the QES). Now if (2.16) were incompatible with the constraints of our prescription then we would be in trouble, but (2.14) and (2.15) do together imply (2.16), which shows that the supposition (2.15) (which is within our prescription’s constraints) is sufficient.

3 Proof of equivalence to the QES prescription

At the end of the last section we did a local analysis in the neighbourhood of the QES and found strong evidence for the existence of flux maximising flows that make the quantum bit thread and QES prescriptions equivalent. In this section, with a completely different approach, we prove equivalence³. We will use tools from convex optimisation, which were also used by the authors of [3] to prove equivalence of the classical Ryu-Takayanagi and bit thread prescriptions.

³To a physicist’s level of rigour.

The key tool is the application of Lagrangian duality, the basic idea of which is to

1. Take a constrained optimisation problem, the ‘primal’.
2. Introduce Lagrange multiplier terms to enforce the constraints.
3. Optimise over the original variables, leaving us with a new optimisation problem called the ‘dual’.

For us the primal problem is the quantum bit thread prescription, and the target dual problem is the quantum extremal surface prescription. The steps to finding the Lagrangian dual of a constrained optimisation problem which we’ve enumerated are mathematically straightforward, and we do not need to go into the general theory of Lagrangian duality and convex optimisation, but readers who would like to learn more of the mathematical background can read the nice review in section 2 of [3] and references therein.

The only non-trivial result from convex optimisation we need is Slater’s condition, which is a sufficient condition for strong duality to hold. Strong duality means that the optima of the primal and dual problems are the equal. Without strong duality the primal and dual optimisation problems are not equivalent, which to this section’s purpose would be quite fatal.

3.1 From the quantum bit thread prescription to a dual optimisation problem

Lagrangian dualisation begins with a constrained optimisation problem. Our bit thread proposal meets the definition of a special class of optimisation problems, called concave optimisation problems, because both the objective function we are maximising over

$$\sup_v \int_A v \tag{3.1}$$

and the constraints we are imposing

$$\frac{1}{4G_N} - |v| \geq 0 \tag{3.2}$$

and

$$- \int_{\sigma(m)} \nabla_\mu v^\mu \leq S_{\text{bulk}}(\sigma(m)) \quad : \forall \{\sigma(m) \subseteq \Sigma, \partial\sigma(m) = m \cup A\} \tag{3.3}$$

are concave functions of v . Each $\sigma(m)$ can be thought of as a time slice of a ‘candidate’ entanglement wedge of A . S_{bulk} is the bulk von Neumann entropy. In our simplified notation $\int_A v$ is short for $\int_A \sqrt{h} n_\mu v^\mu$ with n the inward pointing unit normal to the bulk Cauchy slice, and we suppress the argument of v and the measure on Σ .

Slater’s condition states that strong duality holds for convex or concave optimisation problems if there exists a strictly feasible point in the domain of the primal problem. A strictly feasible point is a point that satisfies the constraints, including strictly satisfying the non-linear constraints. For us (3.2) is the only non-linear constraint that needs to be strictly satisfied, and $v = 0$ is a strictly feasible point, so strong duality holds. This

establishes that our quantum bit thread proposal is equivalent to whatever optimisation problems we can turn it into using our Lagrangian dualisation procedure⁴.

The next step of the procedure is to add Lagrange multiplier terms for each constraint. Let Ω_A be the set of all surfaces homologous to A . The divergence constraint given by (3.3) applies to every element of Ω_A . We also need to impose the inequality constraint (3.2) at each point in the bulk time slice Σ . Adding Lagrange multiplier terms for these constraints gives

$$\sup_v \inf_{\mu, \phi} \left[\int_A v + \int_{\Sigma} \phi(x) \left(\frac{1}{4G_N} - |v| \right) + \int_{\Omega_A} d\mu(m) \left(\left(\int_{\Sigma} \chi(\sigma(m), x) \nabla_{\mu} v^{\mu} \right) + S_{\text{bulk}}(\sigma(m)) \right) \right] \quad (3.4)$$

where μ is a (non-negative) measure on Ω_A , ϕ a non-negative⁵ scalar function on Σ , and $\chi(\sigma(m), x)$ the characteristic function for $\sigma(m) \subseteq \Sigma$ defined by

$$\chi(\sigma(m), x) := \begin{cases} 1 & \text{for } x \in \sigma(m) \\ 0 & \text{otherwise.} \end{cases} \quad (3.5)$$

Minimising with respect to the Lagrange multipliers μ and ϕ would return us to the primal problem. Instead, we maximise with respect to the original variable v , after integrating the $\nabla_{\mu} v^{\mu}$ term by parts which gives⁶

$$\inf_{\mu, \phi} \sup_v \left[\left(1 - \int_{\Omega_A} d\mu(m) \right) \int_A v + \int_{\Sigma} \left(\phi(x) \left(\frac{1}{4G_N} - |v| \right) - v^{\mu} \partial_{\mu} \left(\int_{\Omega_A} d\mu(m) \chi(\sigma(m), x) \right) \right) + \int_{\Omega_A} d\mu(m) S_{\text{bulk}}(\sigma(m)) \right] \quad (3.6)$$

The supremum of this with respect to v is $+\infty$, unless

$$\int_{\Omega_A} d\mu(m) = 1 \quad (3.7)$$

and

$$\phi(x) \geq \left| \partial_{\mu} \int_{\Omega_A} d\mu(m) \chi(\sigma(m), x) \right|. \quad (3.8)$$

Since we are minimising with respect μ and ϕ , we certainly want to avoid the region of the domain of the optimisation problem (3.6) where either of (3.7) and (3.8) are not satisfied

⁴As in [3] we assume that what is true about convex optimisation problems with a finite number of constraints is also true when there are an infinite number of constraints.

⁵Lagrange multipliers usually enforce equality constraints, while we have inequality constraints, so μ and ϕ are actually a generalisation called Karush–Kuhn–Tucker multipliers, which is also why μ and ϕ need to be non-negative.

⁶We have assumed that the orders of integration can be reversed.

and the optimum is $+\infty$. With that in mind, (3.6) is equivalent to

$$\inf_{\mu, \phi} \left[\frac{1}{4G_N} \int_{\Sigma} \phi(x) + \int_{\Omega_A} d\mu(m) S_{\text{bulk}}(\sigma(m)) \right] \quad (3.9)$$

as long as we impose (3.7) and (3.8) as constraints. The constraint (3.7) tells us that μ is a probability measure on Ω_A . The minimisation of (3.9) with respect to ϕ is trivial; it saturates the inequality (3.8). This leaves us with a Lagrangian dual to our quantum bit thread prescription, which is to find

$$\begin{aligned} \inf_{\mu} \left[\frac{1}{4G_N} \int_{\Sigma} \left| \partial_{\mu} \int_{\Omega_A} d\mu(m) \chi(\sigma(m), x) \right| + \int_{\Omega_A} d\mu(m) S_{\text{bulk}}(\sigma(m)) \right] \\ \text{subject to } \int_{\Omega_A} d\mu(m) = 1 \end{aligned} \quad (3.10)$$

What remains to show is that this dual problem is equivalent to the QES prescription. We have two ways of showing this.

3.2 From the dual optimisation problem to the QES prescription

Argument 1

Our first argument starts by noting that if in (3.10) we could take the $\int_{\Omega_A} d\mu(m)$ outside of the norm, then our optimisation problem would be (still with the constraint $\int_{\Omega_A} d\mu(m) = 1$)

$$\begin{aligned} & \inf_{\mu} \left[\int_{\Omega_A} d\mu(m) \left(\frac{1}{4G_N} \int_{\Sigma} |\partial_{\mu} \chi(\sigma(m), x)| + S_{\text{bulk}}(\sigma(m)) \right) \right] \\ &= \inf_{\mu} \left[\int_{\Omega_A} d\mu(m) \left(\frac{\text{Area}(m)}{4G_N} + S_{\text{bulk}}(\sigma(m)) \right) \right] \\ &= \inf_{m \sim A} \left[\frac{\text{Area}(m)}{4G_N} + S_{\text{bulk}}(\sigma(m)) \right] \end{aligned} \quad (3.11)$$

which is the QES prescription and what we wanted. The first equality follows from the normal derivative of the characteristic function $\chi(\sigma(m), x)$ being a surface delta function on m .

The first term in (3.10) can be thought of as the norm of the integral of such surface delta functions over those $m \in \Omega_A$ on which $\mu(m)$ has support. What stops us from taking $\int_{\Omega_A} d\mu(m)$ outside the norm is that μ can have support on surfaces whose contributions to $\int_{\Sigma} \left| \partial_{\mu} \int_{\Omega_A} d\mu(m) \chi(\sigma(m), x) \right|$ partially cancel against each other inside the norm. For this cancellation to happen with a pair of surfaces m_1 and m_2 , their intersection needs to be a codimension-1 subspace of Σ with oppositely oriented surface normals, an example of which is shown in Fig. 3. To spell out the issue, for the m_1 and m_2 shown in Fig. 3 the following is not true:

$$\int_{\Sigma} |\partial_{\mu} \chi(\sigma(m_1), x) + \partial_{\mu} \chi(\sigma(m_2), x)| = \int_{\Sigma} (|\partial_{\mu} \chi(\sigma(m_1), x)| + |\partial_{\mu} \chi(\sigma(m_2), x)|). \quad (3.12)$$




Figure 3: m_1 and m_2 are two surfaces homologous to A whose intersection is such that their contributions to the first term in (3.10) partially cancel. By cutting and pasting we can define new surfaces m_3 and m_4 with lower total bulk entropy and whose contributions to the first term in (3.11) do not cancel.

What we can do if μ has support at $m_1, m_2 \in \Omega_A$ is define new surfaces m_3 and m_4 , also in Ω_A , from the union and intersection of the homology regions,

$$\sigma(m_3) := \sigma(m_1) \cup \sigma(m_2) \quad (3.13)$$

$$\sigma(m_4) := \sigma(m_1) \cap \sigma(m_2) \quad (3.14)$$

and a new measure μ' on Ω_A which replaces the equal parts of the support at m_1 and m_2 with support at m_3 and m_4 . $m_3 \cap m_4$ is not codimension-1 on Σ , and changing the measure this way does not change the first term in (3.10). It can also only decrease the entropy term because of strong subadditivity of the bulk entropies:

$$\begin{aligned} S_{\text{bulk}}(\sigma(m_1)) + S_{\text{bulk}}(\sigma(m_2)) &\geq S_{\text{bulk}}(\sigma(m_1) \cap \sigma(m_2)) + S_{\text{bulk}}(\sigma(m_1) \cup \sigma(m_2)) \\ &= S_{\text{bulk}}(\sigma(m_3)) + S_{\text{bulk}}(\sigma(m_4)) \end{aligned} \quad (3.15)$$

For an arbitrary measure μ we imagine repeating this process over and over until we are left with a measure with support only on surfaces which do not cancel one another inside the norm of (3.10), and whose evaluation in the objective function of the Lagrangian dual can not be greater than that of the original measure. This establishes that (3.10) and (3.11) are equivalent, and so our quantum bit thread prescription and the QES prescription are equivalent.

Argument 2⁷

Strong subadditivity of the bulk entropies is also key to the second way of arguing equivalence of our Lagrangian dual problem to the QES prescription. We start from an entropy inequality that follows from the strong subadditivity relation being repeatedly applied to the von Neumann entropies of N regions [21]:

$$\sum_{i=1}^N S(X_i) \geq S(\cup_i X_i) + S(\cup_{\{i,j\}} X_i \cap X_j) + \dots + S(\cap_i X_i). \quad (3.16)$$

⁷We thank Matt Headrick for coming up with this.

We apply this relation to an arbitrary set of N bulk subregions $\sigma(m_i)$ (with as usual $\partial\sigma(m_i) = m_i \cup A$). The argument of the n th term on the right hand side of (3.16) is the bulk region $r(n/N)$, which is the union of all points which are in at least a fraction n/N of those bulk subregions $\{\sigma(m_i)\}$,

$$r(n/N) := \{x \in \Sigma : \psi(x) \geq n/N\} \quad (3.17)$$

with $\psi(x)$ the fraction of $\{\sigma(m_i)\}$ that contain the point x ,

$$\psi(x) := \frac{1}{N} \sum_{i=1}^N \chi(\sigma(m_i), x) \quad (3.18)$$

With these definitions (3.16) becomes

$$\sum_{i=1}^N S_{\text{bulk}}(\sigma(m_i)) \geq \sum_{i=1}^N S_{\text{bulk}}(r(i/N)) \quad (3.19)$$

which in the $N \rightarrow \infty$ limit (after dividing both sides by N) becomes

$$\int_{\Omega_A} d\mu(m) S_{\text{bulk}}(\sigma(m)) \geq \int_0^1 dp S_{\text{bulk}}(r(p)) \quad (3.20)$$

with μ again an arbitrary probability measure on Ω_A . This is the first relation we need to prove equivalence of (3.10) to the QES prescription.

In the $N \rightarrow \infty$ limit, $\psi(x)$ as defined in (3.18) becomes the expression that appears in the first term of (3.10):

$$\psi(x) = \int_{\Omega_A} d\mu(m) \chi(\sigma(m), x). \quad (3.21)$$

From the fact that μ is a probability measure, ψ satisfies $0 \leq \psi(x) \leq 1$ and $\psi(x)|_{\partial\Sigma} = \chi(A, x)$, where $\chi(A, x)$ is the characteristic function of $A \subseteq \partial\Sigma$, whose domain is $\{x \in \partial\Sigma\}$ and equals 1 for $x \in A$ and 0 for $x \notin A$.

From the codimension-0 subregions we defined earlier

$$r(p) := \{x \in \Sigma : \psi(x) \geq p\}, \quad (3.22)$$

where p is now a continuous variable in $[0, 1]$, we define the associated codimension-1 level sets $m(p) := \partial r(p) \setminus A$. This definition allow us to rewrite the first term in the objective function of (3.10) as the average area of the level sets $m(p)$ (recalling that the normal derivative of a characteristic function is a surface delta function):

$$\begin{aligned} \int_{\Sigma} \left| \partial_{\mu} \int_{\Omega_A} d\mu(m) \chi(\sigma(m), x) \right| &= \int_{\Sigma} |\partial_{\mu} \psi(x)| \\ &= \int_0^1 dp \text{Area}(m(p)) \end{aligned} \quad (3.23)$$





Figure 4: It from qubit threads? The figure depicts three pairs of holographic CFTs with differing degrees of entanglement between them, showing how quantum bit threads are a mechanism (at least pictorially) for bulk spacetime emergence. The red lines depict a flux-maximising flow configuration, the dashed red lines represent microscopic wormholes that the bit threads travel through, and the fuzzy red region represents the macroscopic wormhole.

This is the second relation we need, which in combination with (3.20), allows us to write the objective function of our Lagrangian dual optimisation problem as


$$\int_0^1 dp \left(\frac{\text{Area}(m(p))}{4G_N} + S_{\text{bulk}}(r(p)) \right). \quad (3.24)$$

$r(p)$ with its associated level set $m(p)$ is determined by μ through (3.21) and (3.22). Minimising this function with respect to μ is equivalent to the QES prescription; the function is minimised when μ only has support at the QES surface, when

$$\begin{aligned} \psi(x) &= \int_{\Omega_A} d\mu(m) \chi(\sigma(m), x) \\ &= \chi(\sigma(m_{QES}), x). \end{aligned} \quad (3.25)$$



(a) AdS_{d+2} picture.



(b) AdS_{d+1} picture.

Figure 5: Quantum bit threads in the island phase of a doubly holographic model. A and \bar{A} are a pair of CFT_d 's, and the lines with arrows are representative of a flux-maximising flow from A to \bar{A} . From the AdS_{d+1} perspective, the quantum bit threads start from A , disappear at some bulk point, reappear elsewhere, then end on \bar{A} . Some reach \bar{A} by reappearing in the island region \mathcal{I} , whose boundary $\partial\mathcal{I}$ is an emergent bottleneck for quantum bit threads in the island phase.

4 Discussion and future directions

Quantum bit threads give an interesting perspective on $ER = EPR$ [22] and the emergence of spacetime from entanglement. Consider the set up shown in Fig. 4, which depicts unentangled, weakly entangled, and strongly entangled pairs of holographic CFTs. Our prescription tells us that the number of threads that can jump from one bulk to the other is limited by the bulk entanglement entropy. In the first pair of CFTs, the state is unentangled between them, so no threads can jump. In the second pair, the CFTs are weakly entangled, and we suppose that there are a few EPR pairs shared between the two bulk spacetimes which allows an order $\mathcal{O}(1)$ number of threads to jump across. Rather than thinking of the quantum bit threads as jumping discontinuously from one bulk to the other, one could alternatively imagine that each quantum bit thread, loosely speaking, travels between bulks through its own wormhole of Planck scale cross section. In the last pair of CFTs we keep adding EPR pairs until eventually we form an entangled pair of black holes joined by a classical wormhole. If we take this microscopic wormhole idea seriously, then the natural interpretation of what has happened is that the $\mathcal{O}(G_N^{-1})$ microscopic wormholes have coalesced into a single macroscopic wormhole. This speculative interpretation, that bit threads are in some sense Planck scale wormholes, and that bulk spacetimes are built from them, is a direction it would be interesting to explore further.

Fig. 5 shows a flux-maximising flow configuration in the island phase of a doubly holographic set up⁸. To capture the $\text{Area}(\partial\mathcal{I})$ term of the island formula, in the AdS_{d+2} picture some bit threads in the flux-maximising flow must rejoin the boundary in the island region and travel through $\partial\mathcal{I}$. From the quantum bit thread perspective in AdS_{d+1} , islands are regions of the bulk where, due to the entanglement structure of the bulk state, the bit threads of flux-maximising flows are constrained to reappear; so many that a new bottleneck emerges. The island phase transition is not discontinuous for bit threads like it is for the surfaces involved. The island is disjoint from the rest of A 's entanglement wedge, but they are connected by the quantum bit threads that jump from one to the other; another manifestation of $ER=EPR$. In some sense islands are an emergent phenomenon that materialise when too many quantum bit threads try to reappear in a bulk region.

We found a prescription for quantum bit threads, but we assumed time reflection symmetry, and no α' corrections to the gravitational action. There is not yet a covariant bit thread prescription, but once there is one task would be to combine it with the work in this paper, and with bit threads in higher curvature gravity [7], to create a bit thread prescription as widely applicable as current Ryu-Takayanagi type holographic entanglement entropy constructions.

We can ask whether there are other quantum bit thread prescriptions than the ones we have discussed. We do not know whether it is possible to have a prescription that modifies the divergence constraint in a local way, say to $\nabla_\mu v^\mu(x) = J(x)$, without needing an oracle

⁸We expect that the comments we make here about islands and quantum bit threads are true for more than just doubly holographic models. We use these models because the behaviour of flux-maximising quantum bit thread flows follows immediately from the behaviour of classical bit threads in the highest dimensional picture, which are easier to work with.

to tell us where the QES will be as in proposal II.

We have proven equivalence of one particular proposal to the QES prescription, but not uniqueness, nor, as we have mentioned, should we expect uniqueness. One step in this direction is to ask the extent to which one could loosen or tighten constraints in the prescription we have given. Our stance has been to place constraints on v that are sufficiently strong so that the flux through A does not exceed $S(A)$, but no stronger than that. One such tightening of constraints would be to turn the divergence inequality constraint into an equality, but this is too strong; it would require (2.15) to be satisfied at each x for all surfaces m that pass through that point, which is generally impossible.

Acknowledgments

I would like to thank Matt Headrick and Qiang Wen for useful discussions and comments on an earlier draft. I would also like to thank Gurbir Arora, Ben Freivogel, Harsha Hampapura and Juan Pedraza for useful discussions. This research was supported by the Stichting Nederlandse Wetenschappelijk Onderzoek Instituten (NWO-I), DoE grant DE-SC0009987 and the Simons Foundation.

References

- [1] S. Ryu and T. Takayanagi, *Holographic derivation of entanglement entropy from the anti-de Sitter space/conformal field theory correspondence*, *Physical Review Letters* **96** (May, 2006).
- [2] M. Freedman and M. Headrick, *Bit threads and holographic entanglement*, *Comm. Math. Phys.* *352*, 407 (2017) (Apr., 2016) [[arXiv:1604.00354](#)].
- [3] M. Headrick and V. E. Hubeny, *Riemannian and lorentzian flow-cut theorems*, *Class. Quant. Grav.* *35*: 10 (2018) (Oct., 2017) [[arXiv:1710.09516](#)].
- [4] X. Dong, *Holographic entanglement entropy for general higher derivative gravity*, *JHEP* *1401:044,2014* (Oct., 2013) [[arXiv:1310.5713](#)].
- [5] J. Camps, *Generalized entropy and higher derivative gravity*, [arXiv:1310.6659](#).
- [6] A. Bhattacharyya and M. Sharma, *On entanglement entropy functionals in higher derivative gravity theories*, *JHEP* *1410 (2014) 130* (May, 2014) [[arXiv:1405.3511](#)].
- [7] J. Harper, M. Headrick, and A. Rolph, *Bit threads in higher curvature gravity*, *J. High Energ. Phys. (2018) 2018: 168* (July, 2018) [[arXiv:1807.04294](#)].
- [8] N. Engelhardt and A. C. Wall, *Quantum extremal surfaces: Holographic entanglement entropy beyond the classical regime*, *JHEP* *01 (2015) 073* (Aug., 2014) [[arXiv:1408.3203](#)].
- [9] C.-B. Chen, F.-W. Shu, and M.-H. Wu, *Quantum bit threads of mera tensor network in large c limit*, [arXiv:1804.00441](#).
- [10] A. Almheiri, R. Mahajan, J. Maldacena, and Y. Zhao, *The page curve of hawking radiation from semiclassical geometry*, [arXiv:1908.10996](#).
- [11] C. Agon and J. Pedraza, *Quantum bit threads and holographic entanglement*, (To appear) (May, 2021).

- [12] S. N. Solodukhin, *Conical singularity and quantum corrections to the entropy of a black hole*, *Physical Review D* **51** (Jan, 1995) 609–617.
- [13] L. Susskind and J. Uglum, *Black hole entropy in canonical quantum gravity and superstring theory*, *Physical Review D* **50** (Aug, 1994) 2700–2711.
- [14] S. N. Solodukhin, *Entanglement entropy of black holes*, *Living Rev. Relativity* *14*, (2011), 8 (Apr., 2011) [[arXiv:1104.3712](#)].
- [15] T. Faulkner, A. Lewkowycz, and J. Maldacena, *Quantum corrections to holographic entanglement entropy*, [arXiv:1307.2892](#).
- [16] Y. Chen and G. Vidal, *Entanglement contour*, *J. Stat. Mech.* (2014) P10011 (June, 2014) [[arXiv:1406.1471](#)].
- [17] A. Rolph, *Entanglement contours*, (To appear) (2021).
- [18] J. Kudler-Flam, I. MacCormack, and S. Ryu, *Holographic entanglement contour, bit threads, and the entanglement tsunami*, *J. Phys. A: Math. Theor.* *52* (2019) 325401 (Feb., 2019) [[arXiv:1902.04654](#)].
- [19] A. Almheiri, N. Engelhardt, D. Marolf, and H. Maxfield, *The entropy of bulk quantum fields and the entanglement wedge of an evaporating black hole*, [arXiv:1905.08762](#).
- [20] G. Penington, *Entanglement wedge reconstruction and the information paradox*, [arXiv:1905.08255](#).
- [21] H. Casini and M. Huerta, *On the rg running of the entanglement entropy of a circle*, [arXiv:1202.5650](#).
- [22] J. Maldacena and L. Susskind, *Cool horizons for entangled black holes*, [arXiv:1306.0533](#).