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Abstract. We undertake a first-principles analysis of the thermodynamics of a small body near a black hole horizon. In particular, we study the paradigmatic system of a quantum ideal gas in a small box hovering over the Schwarzschild horizon. We describe the gas in terms of free scalar quantum fields, both massive and massless, and we identify thermodynamic properties through the microcanonical distribution. The physics depends strongly on the distance of the box from the horizon, which we treat as a macroscopic thermodynamic variable. We find that the effective dimension of the system transitions from three-dimensional to two-dimensional as we approach the horizon, that Bekenstein’s bound fails when the box is adiabatically lowered towards the black hole, and that the pressure is highly anisotropic. The pressure difference between the upper and lower wall leads to an effective force that must be added to the gravitational acceleration. We also show that the approximation of quantum fields propagating on a fixed background for matter breaks down when the system is brought to microscopic distances from the horizon, in which case backreaction effects must be included.
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1. Introduction

1.1. This work. Motivation.

Bekenstein’s proposal of black hole entropy \cite{1} and Hawking’s derivation of black hole radiation \cite{2} signal our understanding of black holes as thermodynamic objects. Furthermore, the generalized second law of thermodynamics (GSL) \cite{1,3} asserts that black hole entropy adds up with matter entropy, and that their sum never decreases with time.

The GSL originates from the thermodynamic analysis of small bodies falling into a black hole, where by small we mean that their self-gravity is negligible. This analysis assumes that the entropy of those small bodies is the same that they would have in Minkowski spacetime. This assumption appears reasonable if the dimensions of the body are much smaller than the curvature radius of the spacetime. Nonetheless, it is problematic, black holes affect the spacetime causal structure, and hence, the Hamiltonian of any small body in its vicinity. Consequently, the presence of the horizon affects the density of states that defines the entropy in the microcanonical distribution.

In this paper, we undertake a first-principles analysis of the thermodynamics of a small body near a black hole horizon. The body under consideration is an ideal gas of bosons that is contained in a box hovering above the horizon. The box is assumed to be sufficiently small, so that both self-gravity and the backreaction to the black hole is negligible. Then, the relevant theory for the particles in the box is Quantum Field Theory in curved spacetime (QFTCS). For non-interacting particles, the evolution equation of the fields are linear; hence, all properties of the QFTCS are determined by the structure of the field modes. This allows us to evaluate the eigenvalues of the quantum field Hamiltonian, and then we identify all thermodynamic properties of the system through the microcanonical distribution. We analyse both the massless and the massive case. We find a strong dependence of thermodynamic variables on the distance of the box from the horizon.

This work is firstly motivated by the need to further understand the GSL, by constructing more accurate models. Bekenstein has argued that the GSL is guaranteed to be satisfied if all thermodynamic systems satisfy an entropy bound (EB) \cite{4}, namely, the ratio of the entropy $S$ to the energy $U$ obeys

$$\frac{S}{U} \leq 2\pi D,$$

(1)

where $D$ is a characteristic length scale: $D$ is usually taken equal to the radius of a sphere that encloses the system. There is independent evidence that this bound is satisfied in flat-space systems \cite{5}, in weakly gravitating systems \cite{6,7}, and in strongly gravitating, static systems \cite{13}. However, there is as yet no analysis for matter in the vicinity of a black hole horizon, which was the original set-up for Bekenstein’s EB. We undertake such an analysis in this work.

Our second aim is to understand how black hole horizons affect the statistical properties of matter. We are mainly interested in the coexistence of matter with black
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hole horizon through quantum effects. One example is the quantum buoyancy force that may be generated by Unruh radiation near the horizon \[14,15\]. There are very few works on the effects of black hole horizon on the quantum statistical of matter, which is very surprising, given the immense amount of research on quantum phenomena in the vicinity of black hole horizons. We analyse the relation to past works on the topic in Sec. 1.2. Our present analysis is a stepping stone to a more complex description of quantum statistical mechanics near the horizon that will also involve the effects of backreaction.

A third motivation for this work comes from the foundations of statistical mechanics. It is far from obvious how to extend the usual recipes of statistical mechanics to general relativity, where there is no preferred notion of time translation \[16\]. Furthermore, the fact that gravity is a long range force leads to important complications in the thermodynamic description \[17\], for example, the possibility that the canonical and the micro-canonical ensembles are inequivalent. In stationary spacetimes, a preferred notion of time translation exists, so it is possible to define a time-independent Hamiltonian for a class of systems. Then, we can analyse the thermodynamics of such systems using the microcanonical distribution. Whether the standard procedures of statistical mechanics remain physically meaningful in setups so much removed from the theory’s ordinary applications is an open issue. The systems studied here will test whether the predictions obtained from the microcanonical distribution remain consistent even in the extreme case where the thermodynamic system is very close to a black hole horizon.

1.2. Relation to past work

Padmanabhan et al analyzed the thermodynamical properties of a classical gas in a box near the horizon \[18,19\]. They used both a hydrodynamics description and a description in terms of classical statistical mechanics. These works look for an interplay between thermodynamic entropy of matter and the entropy of the horizon. For this reason they focus on a box that lies at a proper distance of the order of the Planck length from the horizon. Our analysis here considers quantum gases and covers a broader range of distances. We also show that backreaction cannot be ignored at small distances from the horizon, so that the idea of a test body at a Planck-scale proper distance from the horizon is not consistent.

In Ref. \[20\], 't Hooft analyzed the statistical mechanics of a gas of massive particles inside a large spherical shell that surrounds a black hole. The internal radius of the shell is barely larger than the Schwarzschild radius, while the external radius is very large. As in our analysis, matter inside the shell is treated at the level of QFTCS, i.e., backreaction is ignored. 't Hooft identifies a divergent entropy term \(S_{\text{div}}\) as the internal radius of the shell approaches the Schwarzschild radius, and in the formulation of the brick wall model for the black hole, he identifies \(S_{\text{div}}\) with the Bekenstein-Hawking entropy of the black hole. The small box analysed here is very different from the shell in
Quantum statistical mechanics near a black hole horizon

't Hooft’s model, in particular, it can be treated as a test body, for which backreaction is negligible. Still, the spherical symmetry of the system allows us to reproduce $S_{\text{div}}$ from the entropy of the small box.

Our analysis is also influenced by models of equilibrium black holes, i.e., models of black holes inside a box that coexist with their Hawking radiation [8–12]. Ref. [12] incorporated backreaction in this setting, and showed that a thermodynamically consistent description of black holes in a box implies the existence of a thin but macroscopic shell around the horizon, where Einstein’s equations fail. The shell likely consists of radiation with exotic thermodynamics—see, also Ref. [21] for a similar conclusion in a different context. However, [12] proceeds at a thermodynamic level of description making it necessary to analyze the thermodynamic properties of matter near the horizon at a deeper level, using quantum statistical mechanics as in the present paper.

1.3. Our results

We study the thermodynamics of a bosonic gas in a box hovering above a Schwarzschild black hole horizon at a proper distance significantly smaller than the Schwarzschild radius. There are different levels of description for this system, in increasing degree of generality: (i) a purely hydrodynamic / macroscopic analysis, (ii) a microscopic analysis using classical physics, (iii) a microscopic analysis with quantum physics and (iv) a microscopic quantum description that incorporates backreaction and self-gravity effects. In this paper, we work at level (iii), moving beyond past previous analyses that worked at levels (i) and (ii). To this end, it is necessary to describe matter with QFTCS, which provides the only consistent quantum description of matter in a background curved spacetime.

For free fields in a static spacetime, the QFTCS description is constructed solely from the properties of the single-particle Hamiltonian. We identify a general exact form for the density of states of this Hamiltonian, and then, we evaluate the relevant coefficients using a semi-classical approximation. We identify all thermodynamic quantities using standard methods from statistical mechanics.

Our most important findings are the following.

(i) Thermodynamic quantities like entropy and internal energy are well defined. This allows us to check for the validity of the Bekenstein bound. In the simplest interpretation, where $D$ in Eq. (1) is identified with the proper radius, we find that there is a regime of physically admissible parameters in which the bound is violated. In fact, a box that is lowered adiabatically towards the black hole will at some point violate Bekenstein’s bound. We discuss possible ways that the bound may be restored.

(ii) For radiation, the entropy scales as in a three-dimensional system at a sufficient distance from the horizon. We transition to an effectively two-dimensional system
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as we approach the horizon. For particles of mass \( m \), and temperatures \( T << m \), the system always scales as two-dimensional.

(iii) The pressures on the box walls are anisotropic. In particular, the pressure at the bottom wall (closer to the horizon) is always larger than the pressure at the top wall. For this reason, the system cannot be viewed as genuinely two-dimensional near the black hole, despite its scaling properties.

(iv) The pressure differential leads to an effective acceleration on the box that is induced by the horizon. This is a novel phenomenon, we can only compare it with the Unruh-Wald buoyancy, even if the physical origins are very different. However, the acceleration we derive here points towards the horizon and it adds to the gravitational acceleration. For a small box, this acceleration is rather insensitive to the properties of the gas or of the box, but it depends on the particles’ mass. Hence, it is not universal, like gravitational acceleration is.

(v) Our approximations fail when we bring the box to microscopic distances from the horizon. Backreaction must be taken into account: this is natural because keeping the box static requires increasingly stronger accelerations that diverge as we approach the horizon. Eventually, the whole system of the box and of the mechanism that keeps it static cannot be viewed as a test system, and its backreaction to the black hole must be taken into account. This means that the limit of taking the box to proper distance of order of the Planck length from the horizon is not well defined.

The structure of this paper is the following. In Sec. 2, we analyse the quantum theory of a bosonic field in a box at rest near a black hole horizon. In Sec. 3, we study the thermodynamics of (scalar) photons. In Sec. 4, we study the thermodynamics of massive particles at low temperatures. In Sec. 5, we summarize our results and discuss their implications.

2. The quantum theory of a gas in a box near the horizon

2.1. Setup

In this section, we analyse a bosonic field enclosed in a rectilinear box at rest near a black hole horizon, i.e., in an accelerated trajectory that cancels free-fall due to gravitational attraction.

We consider a Schwarzschild spacetime of mass \( M \),

\[
    ds^2 = - \left(1 - \frac{2GM}{r}\right)dt^2 + \left(1 - \frac{2GM}{r}\right)^{-1}dr^2 + r^2(d\theta^2 + \sin^2\theta d\phi^2),
\]

in terms of the standard coordinates \((t, r, \theta, \phi)\).

We assume that the dimensions of the box are much smaller than the Schwarzschild radius \( r_\ast = 2GM \). We take the lower wall of the box to lie at radial coordinate \( r = 2GM + \epsilon \), and the upper wall to lie at coordinate \( r = 2GM + \epsilon + L_x \).
We assume that $\epsilon \ll 2GM$ and that $L_x \ll 2GM$, but we make no assumption about the relation between $\epsilon$ and $L_x$. Then, the geometry near the horizon is approximately Rindler,

$$ds^2 = -a^2 x^2 dt^2 + dx^2 + dy^2 + dz^2,$$

(3)

where $a = (4GM)^{-1}$ is the surface gravity and $x = \sqrt{8GM(r - 2GM)}$ is the radial-proper length coordinate; $y$ and $z$ are local Cartesian coordinates on spheres of constant area. The lowest wall of the box lies at $x_1 = \sqrt{8GM\epsilon}$, the upper wall of the box lies at $x_2 = \sqrt{8GM(\epsilon + L_x)}$. We denote the length of the box in the $y$ coordinate by $L_y$ and in the $z$ coordinate by $L_z$.

The description of the local geometry near the horizon with the Rindler metric also applies to spherical symmetric dirty black holes [23], i.e., black holes that coexist with a spherically symmetric matter distribution. Hence, it also works for models of black holes in a box and in thermal equilibrium with their Hawking radiation as in Ref. [12].

The idealization of matter in a box does not make sense for black holes of stellar mass or smaller, because any physical box would be crashed by the strong tidal forces. However, such forces—generated by the Riemann tensor—are much weaker in supermassive black holes, and in this case the idealization of a gas in a bounding box is physically meaningful. For a black hole with $M = 10^9 M_\odot$, the Schwarzschild radius is of the order of $10^9$km. Hence, the geometry in a box of proper length 1m at proper distance 1km from the horizon is well described by the metric (3); and so is the geometry of a box of proper length 1km at proper distance 1m from the horizon.

We also note that the location of a bounding box in thermodynamics can only be viewed as a macroscopic variable (or macroscopic constraint [22]), and not as a microscopic one described by quantum theory. Since a physical box is made of atoms, its location can only be specified with an error larger than the atomic scale. Any suggestion that the error can be made as small as Planck’s length has no physical justification. This is an important point because the models of Padmanabhan [18] and ’t Hooft [20] mainly concentrate on a box and a shell at Planck proper distance from the horizon. This is only possible if one invokes new physics of Planck-scale origin—’t Hooft explicitly makes such an assumption [24].

We analyse a free scalar field inside the box, subject to the Klein-Gordon equation for Rindler spacetime,

$$\ddot{\Phi} - ax \partial_x(ax)\partial_x \Phi - (ax)^2(\partial_x^2 + \partial_y^2 + \partial_z^2 - m^2)\Phi = 0.$$  

(4)

We solve the Klein-Gordon equation subject to Dirichlet boundary conditions on the box

$$\Phi(\sqrt{8GM\epsilon}, y, x, t) = \Phi(\sqrt{8GM(\epsilon + L_x)}, y, z, t) = 0,$$

$$\Phi(x, 0, z, t) = \Phi(x, L_y, z, t) = \Phi(x, y, 0, t) = \Phi(x, y, L_z, t) = 0.$$  

(5)

The Dirichlet boundary conditions mimic walls that reflect particles elastically.

We look for mode solutions to Eq. (4) of the form $\exp[-i(\omega t - k_y y - k_z z)]f(x)$. 
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Substituting into Eq. (4), we obtain
\[ x^2 f'' + xf' + \left[ \frac{\omega^2}{a^2} - \kappa^2 x^2 \right] f = 0, \] (6)
where \( \kappa = \sqrt{k_y^2 + k_z^2 + m^2}. \)

The general solution of Eq. (6) is a linear combination of a modified Bessel function of the first type \( I_{\omega/a}(\kappa x) \) and of a modified Bessel function of the second type \( K_{\omega/a}(\kappa x) \) [25]. The implementation of the Dirichlet boundary conditions with the modified Bessel functions leads to an algebraic equation from which we can determine the energy eigenvalues only numerically. In this paper, we will obtain analytic expressions through the use of a semi-classical approximation.

2.2. The general form of the density of states

The thermodynamic analysis of a free-particle system does not require an explicit form of the energy eigenvalues, rather it suffices to identify the single-particle density of states at high energies. We will show that the general form of this quantity can be determined without any approximation. We will only employ a semiclassical approximation in order to determine specific coefficients that appear in the density of states. The semi-classical evaluation is accurate at high energies, hence gas temperatures. In Sec. 3, we will see that this approximation is reliable for temperatures significantly larger than the black hole’s Hawking temperature.

We go back to Eq. (6), and we change variables to \( \xi = \ln(ax) \). Eq. (6) becomes a Schrödinger-type equation
\[ f''(\xi) + \left[ E - U(\xi) \right] f(\xi) = 0, \] (7)
with ‘energy’ \( E = \frac{\omega^2}{a^2} \) and ‘potential’ \( U(\xi) = \frac{\kappa^2}{a^2} e^{2\xi} \).

Let us denote by \( V(\omega, \kappa) \) the number of eigenstates of Eq. (7) with energy less than \( \frac{\omega^2}{a^2} \). For large energies, where \( E \) becomes approximately continuous, \( V(\omega, \kappa) \) coincides with the area (actually length) of the classical energy surface
\[ \left( \frac{k_\xi}{\omega} \right)^2 + \frac{\kappa^2}{\omega^2} e^{2\xi} = 1 \]
on the \( \xi - k_\xi \) phase space. The symmetry of the energy surface under rescaling \( k_\xi \rightarrow \lambda k_\xi, \kappa \rightarrow \lambda \kappa, \) and \( \omega \rightarrow \lambda \omega \), implies that the function \( V(\omega, \kappa) \) is homogeneous of first order with respect to its arguments. Hence, we can express \( V(\omega, \kappa) \) in the convenient form \( V(\omega, \kappa) = \omega \zeta(\rho) \) for some function \( \zeta \) of \( \rho := (\kappa/\omega)^2 \).

Then, the number \( \Omega(\omega) \) of mode solutions to Eq. (4) with energy less that \( \omega \) is obtained by integrating \( V(\omega, \kappa) \) with respect to \( k_y \) and \( k_z \),
\[ \Omega(\omega) = \frac{L_y L_z}{\pi^2} \int dk_y dk_z V(\omega, \kappa) = \frac{L_y L_z}{\pi} \omega^3 \int_{\rho_{\min}}^{\rho_{\max}} d\rho \zeta(\rho). \] (8)
The maximal value $\rho_{\text{max}}$ is fixed by the boundary conditions. The minimal value $\rho_{\text{min}}$ is $m^2/\omega^2$ and it is obtained for $k_y = k_z = 0$. Hence,

$$\Omega(\omega) = \frac{L_y L_z}{\pi} \omega^3 \left[ F(\rho_{\text{max}}) - F(m^2/\omega^2) \right],$$

where

$$F(\rho) := \int_0^\rho d\rho' \zeta(\rho').$$

The density of states $g(\omega)$ is the derivative of $\Omega(\omega)$.

Eq. (9) applies to the regime where $\omega$ can be treated as continuous, and it does not involve any approximation. In particular, it implies that for $m = 0$, $\Omega(\omega)$ is always proportional to $\omega^3$. In this case, it is convenient to define the effective length $\bar{L}_x$ in the $x$ direction as

$$\bar{L}_x := \pi F(\rho_{\text{max}}),$$

so that

$$\Omega(\omega) = \bar{L}_x L_y L_z \omega^3.$$ (12)

Then, the number-of-states function is formally identical with that of a gas of massless particles in flat spacetime: the presence of the horizon has been fully incorporated in the definition of the effective length.

### 2.3. Density of states in a semi-classical approximation

Next, we evaluate the function $F(\rho)$ of Eq. (10) in a semi-classical approximation. The Wigner-Kramers-Brillouin (WKB) solutions to Eq. (7) are of the form

$$f(\xi) = \begin{cases} 
\frac{1}{\sqrt{k(\xi)}} \left( A e^{iS_1(\xi,\xi')} + B e^{-iS_1(\xi,\xi')} \right), & \xi < \xi_c \\
\frac{1}{\sqrt{\lambda(\xi)}} \left( C e^{-S_2(\xi,\xi')} + D e^{S_2(\xi,\xi')} \right), & \xi > \xi_c 
\end{cases}$$

where

$$k(s) = \sqrt{E - U(s)}, \quad \lambda(s) = \sqrt{U(s) - E},$$

$$S_1(\xi,\xi') = \int_\xi^{\xi'} k(s)ds, \quad S_2(\xi,\xi') = \int_\xi^{\xi'} \lambda(s)ds,$$

and $\xi_c = -\ln \sqrt{\rho}$ is the turning point. The form of the solution depends crucially on the relation of $\xi_c$ to $\xi_1$ and $\xi_2$. In particular, the box interior

- is classically forbidden if $\xi_c < \xi_1$;
- is classically allowed if $\xi_c > \xi_2$;
- contains a classically allowed and a classically forbidden region if $\xi_1 < \xi_c < \xi_2$.!
Since we are not interested in a precise evaluation of the energy levels, but on the density of states \( g(\omega) \) at the continuum limit, we are justified in ignoring the contribution from the classically forbidden regions. This approximation is often referred to as the geometric optics approximation to Schrödinger’s equation. Hence, we consider only the oscillating solutions in Eq. (13) subject to the boundary conditions

- \( f(\xi_1) = 0 \)
- \( f(\xi_2) = 0 \) if \( \xi_c > \xi_2 \); \( f(\xi_c) = 0 \), if \( \xi_c < \xi_2 \).

It follows that \( \sin S_1(\xi_1, \xi_2) = 0 \) for \( \xi_c > \xi_2 \), and \( \sin S_1(\xi_1, \xi_c) = 0 \) for \( \xi_c < \xi_2 \), \( \ell = 1, 2, \ldots \).

Changing the integration variable in \( S_1(\xi_1, \xi_2) = \ell \pi \) to \( q := \rho e^{2\xi} \), we obtain

\[
\frac{2\ell \pi a}{\omega} = \int_{\rho s_1}^{c(\rho s_2)} dq \frac{\sqrt{1 - q}}{q},
\]

where we defined \( s_1 = (ax_1)^2 = \frac{\epsilon}{2GM} \), \( s_2 = (ax_2)^2 = \frac{\epsilon + L_x}{2GM} \), and

\[
c(x) = \begin{cases} x, & x < 1 \\ 1, & x > 1 \end{cases}.
\]

For the eigenvalues \( \lambda_1 \), we straightforwardly evaluate the number-of-states function \( V(\kappa, \omega) = \omega \zeta(\rho) \), where

\[
\zeta(\rho) = \frac{1}{2\pi a} \int_{\rho s_1}^{c(\rho s_2)} dq \frac{\sqrt{1 - q}}{q}.
\]

The maximum value of \( \rho \) is

\[
\rho_{\text{max}} = \frac{1}{s_1} = \frac{2GM}{\epsilon}.
\]

Then, we calculate the function \( F(\rho) \) of Eq. (9),

\[
F(\rho) = \frac{1}{2\pi a} \times \left\{ \begin{array}{ll}
\frac{u(\rho s_2)}{s_2} - \frac{u(\rho s_1)}{s_1}, & \rho < \frac{1}{s_2} \\
\frac{u(\rho s_1)}{s_1} - \frac{u(\rho s_2)}{s_2}, & \rho > \frac{1}{s_2}
\end{array} \right.
\]

where

\[
u(x) = \frac{2}{3} \sqrt{1 - x} (1 + 2x) - \frac{2}{3} - 2x \tanh^{-1} \sqrt{1 - x}.
\]

The function \( F \) is increasing by construction; it is plotted in Fig. 1.

Eq. (20) implies that

\[
F(\rho_{\text{max}}) = F(s_1^{-1}) = \frac{1}{2\pi a} \frac{2}{3} \left( s_1^{-1} - s_2^{-1} \right).
\]

Hence, the effective length, Eq. (11), is

\[
\bar{L}_x = \frac{8}{3} (GM)^2 \left( \frac{1}{\epsilon} - \frac{1}{\epsilon + L_x} \right).
\]

Finally, we note that a version of Eq. (9) holds even with different boundary conditions on the box (Neumann or Robin). Then, the density of states \( g(\omega) \) is proportional to \( \omega^2 \) and only a proportionality constant in the entropy changes with the boundary conditions. The overall behaviour of the thermodynamic variables is not affected.
3. Photon gas

In this section, we specialize to the case of massless particles and we assume that the particle number is not preserved. Then, our system is thermodynamically identical with the photon gas, if we ignore the effects of polarization (scalar photons).

3.1. Thermodynamic functions

By Eqs. (9) and (22), the single-particle density of states for \( m = 0 \) is

\[
g(\omega) := \frac{d\Omega(\omega)}{d\omega} = \frac{3\bar{L}_x L_y L_z}{\pi^2} \omega^2 = \frac{3\bar{V}}{\pi^2} \omega^2, \tag{24}
\]

where we wrote \( \bar{V} = \bar{L}_x L_y L_z \). \( \bar{V} \)

The density of states is given by the standard expression for photons in flat spacetime, modulo the substitution of \( V \) with \( \bar{V} \). Hence, we can use the standard evaluation of the partition function \[26\]

\[
\log Z(\beta, \bar{V}) = -\int_0^\infty d\omega g(\omega) \log(1 - e^{-\beta \omega}) = \beta \int_0^\infty d\omega \frac{\Omega(\omega)}{e^{\beta \omega} - 1} = \frac{\pi^2}{15} \bar{V} \beta^{-3}. \tag{26}
\]

In the canonical distribution, we standardly identify \(-\beta^{-1} \log Z\) with the Helmholtz free energy, and thereby obtain the thermodynamic description of the system.

Physically, the canonical distribution presupposes that the walls of the box are diathermal and that the box is surrounded by a thermal bath at temperature \( \beta^{-1} \). The presence of such a bath would greatly complicate the analysis in a gravitational system, because it would gravitate and thus, change the spacetime geometry. A box in thermal contact with a gravitating thermal bath would not have the same thermodynamic properties with an isolated box in Schwarzschild spacetime—for an explicit example of the effects of a gravitating thermal bath, see Ref. [27]. We also note that no thermal fluid can coexist with a black hole horizon in a spherically symmetric system [28]. While there exist static, spherically symmetric solutions with Yang-Mills-Higgs and other types of fields outside the horizon [29,30], to the best of our knowledge, no such solution has an interpretation as a thermal bath.
When quantum effects are included, the natural QFT vacuum for a black hole in a box is the Hartle-Hawking vacuum. In this vacuum, Hawking radiation acts as a thermal bath of temperature \( T_H = (8\pi GM)^{-1} \). However, the Hawking temperature is too low: we will show, using the microcanonical distribution, that the temperature \( T \) of the box must be much larger than \( T_H \), otherwise the statistical-mechanics analysis is not consistent. Note also that the Hawking temperature is fixed uniquely by the black hole mass, so in the canonical distribution we would be restricted to boxes of temperature \( T_H \) in a given black hole, while in the microcanonical distribution all temperatures are possible. We conclude that the usual conditions for the validity of the canonical distributions are not available, and neither is the interpretation of \( \beta^{-1} \) as a temperature of a surrounding heat bath.

In standard statistical mechanics, the appropriate ensemble for an isolated box with adiabatic walls is the microcanonical one. The present system is non-extensive due to the presence of the gravitational field. In non-extensive systems, we cannot rely on standard theorems about the equivalence between the canonical and the microcanonical ensemble; in some cases the two ensembles are inequivalent—see, for example, Ref. [17]. Nonetheless, we can always interpret the partition function \( Z(\beta) \) as the Laplace transform of the density of states function \( \Gamma(E) \) (for the field), which defines the entropy in the microcanonical description by

\[
S(E) = \log \Gamma(E).
\]  

The inverse Laplace transform of \( Z(\beta) \) is standardly evaluated in the first-order saddle-point approximation [26], and it yields

\[
\Gamma(E) = \left[ 4(5/\pi^2)^{1/4}E^{5/4}\bar{V}^{-1/4} \right]^{-1/2} \exp \left( \frac{4}{3} \left( \frac{\pi^2}{5} \right)^{1/4} E^{3/4} \bar{V}^{1/4} \right),
\]  

which gives the standard expression for the photon entropy

\[
S(E, \bar{V}) = \frac{4}{3} \left( \frac{\pi^2}{5} \right)^{1/4} E^{3/4} \bar{V}^{1/4},
\]  

modulo terms of order \( \ln E/E \) and \( \ln \bar{V}/\bar{V} \).

Identifying \( E \) with the internal energy \( U \), we obtain results fully consistent with the canonical distribution. The difference is that the temperature is now defined as \( T := (\partial U/\partial S)_V \), and we need make no reference to a heat bath. Since energy is defined with respect to asymptotic time translations, and entropy is a scalar, the temperature \( T \) refers to observers at infinity. Assuming the validity of Tolman’s law, we can define a local temperature \( T_{loc}(x) = T \sqrt{-g_{00}(x)} = 4GMT/x \) associated to planes of constant Rindler coordinate \( x \) inside the box. This definition plays no role in our thermodynamic analysis, but is serves as a point of comparison with some heuristic arguments that appear in the literature.

The equations for entropy and internal energy are

\[
S = \frac{4\pi^2}{15} \bar{V}T^3, \quad U = \frac{\pi^2}{5} \bar{V}T^4.
\]
What changes from the flat-space case is the proportionality constant $\sigma$ (the Stefan-Boltzmann constant), in the relation $U = \sigma VT^4$,

$$\sigma = \frac{\pi^2 L_x}{5 L_x}. \quad (31)$$

### 3.2. Pressure

The entropy (29) is a function on the thermodynamic state space $\Gamma$, i.e., a manifold spanned by the variables $U, L_y, L_z, L_x$ and $\epsilon$. The ‘lengths’ $L_y, L_z, L_x$ and $\epsilon$ are coordinates of a submanifold $\Gamma_m$ of $\Gamma$ for the mechanical degrees of freedom. Any variation of the internal energy with fixed entropy defines an one-form on $\Gamma_m$

$$(dU)_{\Gamma_m} = - \left( \frac{\partial U}{\partial y^a} \right)_S dy^a, \quad (32)$$

where we used $y^a$ as a shorthand for the coordinates $(L_x, L_y, L_z, \epsilon)$.

All variables of $\Gamma_m$ are lengths that corresponds to changes in the location of a wall of the box. The derivatives in Eq. (32) lead to the definition of pressures. For this reason, we will refer to $(dU)_{\Gamma_m}$ as the pressure one-form. Since the system is not homogeneous, it cannot be described by a single scalar for pressure. Each vector field $X^a$ on $\Gamma_m$ defines a different change of the walls, hence, each contraction $(dU)_{\Gamma_m}(X)$ corresponds to a different type of pressure.

For example, to define the horizontal pressure $P_h$, we choose either of the vector fields $X_1 = \frac{1}{L_y L_z} \frac{\partial}{\partial L_y}$ or $X_2 = \frac{1}{L_y L_z} \frac{\partial}{\partial L_z}$. Then,

$$P_h := - \frac{1}{L_x L_z} \left( \frac{\partial U}{\partial L_y} \right)_{S,L_x L_z,\epsilon} = - \frac{1}{L_x L_z} \left( \frac{\partial U}{\partial L_y} \right)_{S,L_x, L_z, \epsilon} = \frac{1}{3} \rho, \quad (33)$$

where

$$\rho = \frac{U}{L_y L_z L_x} = \frac{\pi^2}{5 \frac{T^4 L_x}{L_x}} \quad (34)$$

is the average energy density in the box.

The pressure $P_b$ at the bottom of the box is obtained by moving the lower wall and keeping the upper wall fixed at $r = 2GM + \epsilon + L_x$. This corresponds to a vector field $X_b = \frac{1}{L_y L_z} \frac{\partial}{\partial L_x} - \frac{1}{L_y L_z} \frac{\partial}{\partial \epsilon}$. Then,

$$P_b := \frac{1}{L_y L_z} \left( \frac{\partial U}{\partial \epsilon} \right)_{S,\epsilon + L_x, L_y, L_z} = \frac{1}{3} \rho \left( -L_x \right) \left( \frac{\partial \log L_x}{\partial (\epsilon)} \right)_{\epsilon + L_x} = \left( 1 + \frac{L_x}{\epsilon} \right) P_h. \quad (35)$$

Note the positive sign in the derivative with respect to $\epsilon$, because the direction of the pressure is defined as opposite to the direction of increasing $\epsilon$.

The pressure $P_t$ at the top of the box is determined by the vector field $X_t = \frac{1}{L_y L_z} \frac{\partial}{\partial L_x}$,

$$P_t := - \frac{1}{L_y L_z} \left( \frac{\partial U}{\partial L_x} \right)_{S,\epsilon, L_y, L_z} = \frac{1}{3} \rho \left( \frac{\partial \log L_x}{\partial \log L_x} \right)_{\epsilon} = \left( 1 + \frac{L_x}{\epsilon} \right)^{-1} P_h. \quad (36)$$
The three pressures always satisfy

\[ P_b > P_h > P_t. \] (37)

The pressures \( P_h, P_b \) and \( P_t \) are defined with respect to the Schwarzschild coordinate system. However, the pressure form (32) provides an invariant description. To define the pressures with respect to a different coordinate system we have to use different vector fields \( X'_1, X'_2, X'_t, X'_b \) adapted to the different coordinates.

For the Rindler coordinates, \( \Gamma_m \) is spanned by \((L_x, L_y, x_1, x_2)\), and we define the vector fields

\[ X'_1 = \frac{1}{H_x L_z} \frac{\partial}{\partial L_y}, \quad X'_2 = \frac{1}{H_x L_y} \frac{\partial}{\partial L_y}, \quad X'_b = -\frac{1}{L_y L_z} \frac{\partial}{\partial x_1}, \quad X'_t = \frac{1}{L_y L_z} \frac{\partial}{\partial x_2}, \] (38)

where

\[ H_x = x_2 - x_1 = \sqrt{8GM(\epsilon + L_x)} - \sqrt{8GM\epsilon} \] (39)

is the proper length of the box in the radial direction.

The pressures \( P'_h, P'_b \) and \( P'_t \) in the Rindler frame are

\[ P'_h = \frac{L_x}{H_x} P_h, \quad P'_b = \frac{2\epsilon}{x_1} P_b, \quad P'_t = \frac{2(L_x + \epsilon)}{x_2} P_t. \] (40)

3.3. The small-box regime

The thermodynamics of the box with radiation depends crucially on the ratio \( \epsilon/L_x \). First, we explore the regime where \( \epsilon >> L_x \), i.e., we take the dimensions of the box to be much smaller than its radial distance from the horizon. Then, \( \bar{L}_x \approx \frac{8}{3} \left( \frac{GM}{\epsilon} \right)^2 L_x \), and \( \bar{V} = \frac{8}{3} \left( \frac{GM}{\epsilon} \right)^2 V \). Entropy and internal energy are proportional to the coordinate volume \( V \). Hence, in this regime, energy and entropy behave like extensive quantities, and it is meaningful to define an energy density \( \rho = U/V \) and an entropy density \( s = S/V \). In this regime, \( P_b \approx P_h \approx P_t \), i.e., pressure is almost isotropic, and the radiation satisfies the equation of state \( P = \frac{1}{3} \rho \).

We cannot take the box to be arbitrarily small. In Minkowski spacetime, the typical dimension \( L \) of a box bounding radiation must be much larger than the typical wavelength of the photons. This is also necessary in order to describe the single-photon density of states \( g(\omega) \) as a continuous function. Since the scale of relevant energies is determined by the temperature, a thermodynamic description requires that \( TL >> 1 \).

In the present context, the conditions \( TL_y >> 1 \) and \( TL_z >> 1 \) follow as in the flat space case. Regarding the \( x \) direction, we note that the continuum approximation to the eigenvalues of Eq. (7) follows from the requirement that \( (\omega/a)(\xi_2 - \xi_1) >> 1 \). The relevant scale for \( \omega \) is given by \( T \), hence,

\[ T >> \frac{1}{2GM \log(1 + L_x/\epsilon)}. \] (41)

For \( L_x/\epsilon << 1 \), Eq. (41) implies that

\[ L_x T >> \frac{\epsilon}{2GM}. \] (42)
Figure 2: The effective scaling dimension of a box of radiation as a function of the ratio $L_x/\epsilon$.

Eq. (42) can also be written as $L_x \gg 4\pi \epsilon (T_H/T)$, where $T_H$ is the Hawking temperature. We conclude that a thermodynamic description for $L_x \ll \epsilon$ is meaningful only for temperatures much larger than the black hole’s Hawking temperature. This is to be expected because the typical wavelength of Hawking radiation is of the order of the Schwarzschild radius, hence, it cannot be localized in a box of much smaller dimensions.

We also note that Eq. (42) can also be written as

$$H_x T_{loc}(x_1) \gg \left( \frac{x_1}{4GM} \right)^2.$$  

(43)

We obtain a much weaker condition than $H_x T_{loc}(x_1) \gg 1$, that follows from the naive translation of the Minkowski space condition $LT \gg 1$ to the present context.

3.4. The near-horizon regime

In the regime where $\epsilon \ll L_x, \tilde{L}_x \sim \epsilon^{-1}$. The total energy and entropy diverge as $\epsilon \to 0$,

$$S = \frac{8\pi S_{BH}}{45} \frac{AT^3}{\epsilon}, \quad U = \frac{2\pi S_{BH}}{15} \frac{AT^4}{\epsilon},$$  

(44)

where $S_{BH} = 4\pi G^2 M^2$ is the Bekenstein-Hawking entropy of the black hole. However, their ratio $S/U$ remains constant.

For fixed $\epsilon$, both entropy and energy scale proportional to the area $A = L_y L_z$. There is a transition from a three-dimensional to a two-dimensional system as we approach the horizon. We see this in Fig. 2, where we plot the effective scaling dimension $d_{eff} \equiv \log_2 [S(T, \epsilon, 2L_x, 2L_y, 2L_z)/S(T, \epsilon, L_x, L_y, L_z)]$ as a function of $L_x/\epsilon$.

However, we should refrain from interpreting the photon gas in this regime as a two-dimensional fluid, because the pressure in the horizontal direction $P_h$ is much smaller than the bottom pressure $P_b$. The system is highly non-extensive: we would not be able to construct (classical) hydrodynamic variables (e.g., an effective stress tensor), even if we restrict to a two dimensional brane around the horizon.

The divergence of the internal energy as $\epsilon \to 0$ implies that the approximation of treating the field as propagating on a background Schwarzschild spacetime breaks down near the horizon. Backreaction has to be taken into account. Keeping the box static near the horizon requires an external force. As the box approaches the horizon, the
force becomes increasingly large and it must be incorporated into a stress-energy tensor which will deform the horizon.

We can ignore backreaction as long as the box can be treated as a test body in Schwarzschild spacetime, i.e., as long as $U << M$. By Eq. (30), we obtain a constraint for the proper distance $x_1$ from the horizon,

$$\frac{x_1}{l_{Pl}} >> (T\sqrt{A}) \left( \frac{M}{m_{Pl}} \right) \left( \frac{T}{T_{Pl}} \right),$$

where $l_{Pl}, m_{Pl}$ and $T_{Pl}$ are the Planck length, Planck mass and Planck temperature respectively.

For $T \sim 10^3 K$, $M$ corresponding to a super-massive black hole and $L_y, L_z$ of the order of one centimeter, Eq. (45) implies that $\frac{x_1}{l_{Pl}} >> 10^{20}$, or, $x_1 >> 10^{-15} m$. From an operational point of view, the proper distance only takes macroscopic values, certainly it must be larger than the atomic scale, so the condition (45) poses no constraint. However, Eq. (45) demonstrates that we cannot take $x_1$ to be the Planck scale as in Ref. [18] while ignoring backreaction.

Finally, we note that the consistency condition (41) becomes in this regime

$$T >> \frac{4\pi T_H}{\log(L_x/\epsilon)} = \frac{2\pi T_H}{\log(H_x/x_1)}.$$

The requirement that $T >> T_H$ suffices to guarantee the validity of Eq. (46). However, for sufficiently large values of $H_x/x_1$, a temperature $T \sim T_H$ might be acceptable; the logarithmic dependence on $H_x/x_1$ makes it difficult to establish a sharp bound in an order-of-magnitude estimation.

The ratio $S/A$ given by Eq. (44) coincides with the expression obtained by 't Hooft [20] as the divergent term in the entropy of a large shell around the horizon for $\epsilon \to 0$. This equality is a consequence of spherical symmetry, as the two systems are different in size and they involve a sum over different modes.

Note that the inner surface of the shell in Ref. [20] is taken at proper distance of the order of the Planck length from the horizon, while we found that in this regime the QFTCS description is inadequate and backreaction must be taken into account. Backreaction is a more severe problem in t’ Hooft’s model, as a shell is hardly a test body like the one considered here. The restriction that $U << M$ leads to a more stringent restriction for $x_1$ than Eq. (46) in ‘t Hooft’s model for $T >> T_H$. However, it has been argued [31] that for $T = T_H$, the inclusion of a negative contribution from the Boulware vacuum that must be employed for the field in a brick wall model renders the total energy sufficiently small, so that the QFTCS description suffices.

3.5. Entropy bounds

The Bekenstein bound usually applies to isolated, weakly-gravitating systems, because of possible ambiguities in the definition of energy and of the length scale $D$ in other contexts. The system studied here is certainly not isolated, so any violation of the Bekenstein bound here does not truly invalidate it. But some variation of the entropy
bound should exist in the present context. After all, Bekenstein’s bound originates from the requirement that the GSL applies also to setups that involve test bodies falling into the black hole.

Here, we will proceed with the simplest assumption that the length scale $D$ in Eq. (1) is to be identified with the proper length of the smallest sphere that encloses the box. Then,

$$D = \frac{1}{2} \sqrt{H_x^2 + L_y^2 + L_z^2}. \tag{47}$$

Eqs. (30) imply that

$$\frac{S}{U} = \frac{4}{3T}, \tag{48}$$

i.e., the ratio $S/U$ is the same as in flat-space. Hence, Eq. (1) becomes

$$\frac{3\pi}{4} T \sqrt{H_x^2 + L_y^2 + L_z^2} \geq 1. \tag{49}$$

Clearly if $L_y, L_z$ are of order $H_x$ or larger, Eq. (49) holds easily because $TL_y \gg 1$ and $TL_z \gg 1$. This is only possible if $L_x \gg L_y, L_z$ and the box is not very close to the horizon.

This means that the contribution from the horizontal directions to any possible violation of the EB is negligible, so we can ignore it. Hence, we look for possible violations of the inequality

$$\frac{3\pi}{4} TH_x \geq 1. \tag{50}$$

In the small box regime, Eq. (50) becomes

$$L_x T > \frac{4}{3\pi} \sqrt{\frac{\epsilon}{2GM}}. \tag{51}$$

Eq. (51) is compatible with the condition (42) for the thermodynamic limit, but it is not guaranteed by it. Hence, there is a physically allowed regime of parameters, for which the EB in the form (49) fails. In the near-horizon regime, Eq. (50) becomes

$$\frac{9\pi}{16} (L_x T)(T/T_H) > 1. \tag{52}$$

If we can keep the temperature of the gas sufficiently large close to the horizon, there is no problem with the EB in the near-horizon regime. This may not be always possible, as we will see in the coming section.

3.6. Adiabatic lowering of the box

Suppose we prepare the box with the lower wall at some distance from the horizon. If the walls are adiabatic, then a quasi-static lowering of the box preserves the entropy $S$. By Eq. (29), the internal energy $U$ in an adiabatic process is proportional to $\bar{V}^{-1/3}$. This means that $U \sim \bar{L}_x^{-1/3}$. As the box approaches the horizon, $U \sim \epsilon^{1/3}$, i.e., the energy remains finite, and the approximation of the box as a test body remains accurate. This
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does not contradict Eq. (45), because the temperature \( T \) also decreases when we lower the box adiabatically.

The adiabatic lowering of the box leads to a decrease of the internal energy while entropy, and the proper length \( H_x \) remain constant. Hence, if adiabatic lowering continues up to small distances from the horizon, Bekenstein’s bound will be violated. It is straightforward to show that in the near-horizon regime

\[
\frac{S}{U} = 2GM \left( \frac{2^{11} \pi^2 A}{3^5 5 S x_1^2} \right)^{1/3}.
\]

(53)

In this regime \( D_x \simeq \frac{1}{2} \sqrt{8GM L_x + L_y^2 + L_z^2} \) does not depend on \( x_1 \). Hence, we find a violation of the Bekenstein bound for

\[
x_1 < 1.3 \sqrt{\frac{A(GM)^3}{SH^3_x}}.
\]

(54)

The Bekenstein bound fails for macroscopic values of \( x_1 \). In fact, it fails well before we reach the near-horizon regime.

There are two possible explanations for this failure. The first explanation is that the condition (49) is not an accurate representation of the entropy bound because the box is not isolated. We would have to go back to first principles and find a new expression for the entropy bound that is valid for small material bodies near a black hole horizon. The other explanation is that the energy of the system must also include the energy of the walls enclosing it \([32]\). As we will see, the latter diverges as the system approaches the horizon, hence, its contribution would keep the ratio \( S/U \) small.

The average energy density \( \rho \) is proportional to \( \bar{L}_x^{-1/3} \). As the box approaches the horizon, the horizontal pressure vanishes, \( P_h \sim \epsilon^{1/3} \); the pressure at the top wall also vanishes, \( P_t \sim \epsilon^{4/3} \); however, the pressure at the bottom diverges, \( P_b \sim \epsilon^{-2/3} \). This divergence implies that the box will eject the lower wall before the horizon. Furthermore, it implies that the energy of the walls that keep the system confined increases as we approach the horizon. This conclusion is compatible with the possibility that the Bekenstein bound of the form (49) persists if the energy of the walls is included in the total energy \([32]\). To test this possibility, we need an explicit model for the confining energy of the system—see, for example, \([33]\). This will be taken up in a future publication. However, we must point out that the divergence of the pressure and hence of the confinement energy occurs in the near-horizon regime, while the breakdown of Eq. (49) occurs well before the system enters this regime.

In general, the fact that \( P_b \neq P_t \) implies that there is a net total force acting on the box. We can evaluate this force by specifying how it is transmitted from the bottom to the top. Each mode of transmission corresponds to a vector field on \( \Gamma_m \) that is contracted with the pressure form (32). The simplest assumption is that the force is transmitted through \textit{rigid} box walls. This means that the proper length \( H_x \) remains constant in any displacement of the box.

Hence, for adiabatic lowering of the box, we evaluate the acceleration due to the
pressure difference

\[ a_S := -\frac{1}{U} \left( \frac{\partial U}{\partial \epsilon} \right)_{S,H_x,L_y,L_z} = -\frac{1}{3L_x} \left( 1 + \frac{L_x}{\epsilon} - \frac{1}{\sqrt{1 + \frac{L_x}{\epsilon}}} \right) < 0. \tag{55} \]

The negative sign of \( a_S \) means that the force it is directed towards the black hole.

Note that if the box were lowered isothermally, the acceleration would be

\[ a_T := -\frac{1}{U} \left( \frac{\partial U}{\partial \epsilon} \right)_{T,H_x,L_y,L_z} = -3a_S, \tag{56} \]

i.e., it would act as buoyancy, analogous to the one proposed by Unruh and Wald \cite{14}. However, as we mentioned, we are not aware of any static solution to Einstein’s equation with a heat bath at temperature \( T \) coexisting with a black hole horizon. Hawking radiation could provide such a bath, but, as shown in Sec. 3.3., its temperature is so low that the usual thermodynamic approximations for the radiation in the box do not apply.

In the small-box regime, \( a_S = -(6\epsilon)^{-1} \). This acceleration is comparable with the radial acceleration \( a_r = -\epsilon^{-1} \) of a static point-particle at radial distance \( \epsilon \) from the horizon. Near the horizon, \( a_S = -(3\epsilon)^{-1} \), and, expectedly, it diverges as \( \epsilon \to 0 \).

It is remarkable that, in the small-box regime, the acceleration \( a_S \) does not depend on temperature or on properties of the box. It appears to depend on the properties of the particles— for massive particles at low temperature, \( a_S = -\epsilon^{-1} \)—see below in Sec. 4.3. In this paper, we have seen this force only for static (or quasi-static) bodies. However, the mechanism that generates the force—the pressure difference in the radial direction—appears to be generic, and it is a consequence of the near-horizon geometry. Therefore, we conjecture that this acceleration could appear in other systems, for example, macroscopic bodies freely falling into the black hole.

4. Massive bosons

4.1. The number-of-states function

In this section, we analyze the thermodynamics of a box of massive bosons. We work in the regime where the temperature \( T \) is much smaller than the mass \( m \). This is not necessarily a low temperature regime: in Minkowski spacetime and for \( m \) of the order of the atomic masses, the regime \( T << m \) includes the classical non-relativistic gas at room temperature. This condition is also satisfied for Bose-Einstein condensates—see Ref. \cite{34} for a study of Bose-Einstein condensates in the brick wall model.

The opposite regime, of very high temperatures, \( T >> m \), can be studied by expanding \( F(m^2/\omega^2) \) in Eq. \( \ref{eq:9} \) as a series in \( (m/\omega)^2 \ll 1 \). This leads to

\[ \Omega(\omega) = \frac{V}{\pi^2} \omega^3 + \frac{2GMAm^2}{\pi^2} \log(1 + L_x/\epsilon)\omega + \frac{4Vm^4}{3\pi^2} \omega^{-1} + \ldots, \tag{57} \]

where \( A = L_yL_z \).
It is straightforward to show that the $m$-dependent terms change the massless case only by a small amount. There is no qualitative change, and for this reason, we will not elaborate on this regime. In contrast, the regime of $T << m$ exhibits a very different qualitative behavior, and it includes as a limit the case of the usual (non-relativistic, dilute) ideal gas.

For $m \neq 0$, Eq. (58) implies that there is minimum value of $\omega$,

$$\omega_{\text{min}}(\epsilon) = \frac{m}{\sqrt{\rho_{\text{max}}(\epsilon)}} = \frac{m}{\sqrt{\epsilon 2GM}},$$

which functions as an effective rest mass of the bosons.

For $T << m$, the values of $\omega$ around $\omega_{\text{min}}$ dominate. Hence, to evaluate the number-of-states function (9), we must expand $F(\rho)$ around $\rho_{\text{max}}$. To this end, we define $\xi := 1 - \rho/\rho_{\text{max}}$, which $\xi$ takes values in $[0, 1)$, and it is small for $\rho$ close to $\rho_{\text{max}}$.

To compute $F(\rho)$, we find the series

$$u(1 - \xi) \simeq -\frac{2}{3} + \frac{4}{15} \xi^{5/2} + \frac{4}{35} \xi^{7/2} + O(\xi^{9/2}).$$

Then,

$$F(\rho) = \frac{1}{2\pi a} \left( \frac{u(1)}{s_2} - \frac{u(1 - \xi)}{s_1} \right) = F(\rho_{\text{max}}) - \frac{1}{2\pi a} \frac{4}{15} s_1^{-1} \xi^{5/2} + O(\xi^{7/2}),$$

It is convenient to express the number-of-states function $\Omega$ in terms of $q := \omega - \omega_{\text{min}}$, the effective kinetic energy of a particle. By definition, $m^2/\omega^2 = \rho_{\text{max}}(1 - \xi)$, hence, $\omega/\omega_{\text{min}} = (1 - \xi)^{-1/2} = 1 + q/\omega_{\text{min}}$. To leading-order in $\xi$, $\xi \simeq \frac{2q}{\omega_{\text{min}}}$. Hence the number $\Omega(q)$ of states with energy less than $\omega_{\text{min}} + q$ is

$$\Omega(q) = \frac{L_y L_z}{\pi} \omega^3 \frac{1}{2\pi a} \left( F(\rho_{\text{max}}) - F(\rho) \right) \simeq \frac{L_y L_z}{\pi} (\omega_{\text{min}} + q)^3 \left( \frac{1}{2\pi a} \frac{4}{15} \left( \frac{2q}{\omega_{\text{min}}} \right)^{5/2} \frac{1}{s_1} \right) \simeq \eta(\epsilon) A q^{5/2} + O \left[ \left( \frac{q}{\omega_{\text{min}}} \right)^{7/2} \right].$$

where

$$\eta(\epsilon) = \frac{64\sqrt{2G^2M^2}}{15\pi^2\epsilon} \sqrt{\omega_{\text{min}}(\epsilon)} = \frac{16\sqrt{2m}(2GM)^{7/4}}{15\pi^2 \epsilon^{3/4}}.$$  

This expansion of $\Omega$ applies as long as $\xi << 1$, or equivalently if $q << \omega_{\text{min}}$. We will see that the average value of $q$ is of the order of the temperature $T$, hence, the expansion (60) is accurate for

$$\frac{T}{m} << \sqrt{\frac{\epsilon}{2GM}}.$$
This condition is much stronger than the usual condition $T << m$ for the non-relativistic regime. It implies that we cannot bring the box arbitrarily close to the horizon and still employ the expansion $T << m$. The proper distance $x_1$ from the horizon satisfies $x_1/2r_S >> T/m$, where $r_S$ is the Schwarzschild radius. For $T \sim 300^\circ K$, particle mass $m \sim 100$ amu and $M \sim 10^9 M_\odot$, $x_1 >> 1m$.

It is straightforward to show that as the system approaches the horizon ($s_1 \rightarrow 0$), $F(m^2/\omega^2)$ approaches a constant $-(3\pi s_2)^{-1}$ that is mass independent and much smaller than $F(\rho_{max})$; $F(\rho_{max})$ diverges on the horizon. This means that the dominant contribution to the density of states near the horizon is of the form (24) that corresponds to massless particles. Hence, the near-horizon behavior is mass independent and coincides with that of Sec. 3.4.

### 4.2. Thermodynamic functions

We proceed to the evaluation of thermodynamic observables using the grand-canonical distribution. For ideal gases, and in the limit of a large number of particles, the grand canonical distribution gives the entropy with the microcanonical distribution [26]. However, in the present context, the parameters $\beta$ and $z$ that appear in the grand-canonical distribution (see below) are not to be viewed as the inverse temperature and the fugacity of an external heat bath, but as arbitrary constants (Lagrange multipliers).

First, we write the number of particles

$$N(z, \beta, \epsilon, A) = \int_0^\infty dq \frac{dg(q)}{z^{-1}e^{\beta(\omega_{min}+q)}-1} + N_0 = \frac{A}{\lambda_{2D}^2} \text{Li}_{5/2}(ze^{-\beta\omega_{min}(\epsilon)}) + N_0,$$

where $\text{Li}_a(x) = \sum_{n=1}^\infty \frac{x^n}{n^a}$ is the polylogarithm function,

$$N_0 = \frac{ze^{-\beta\omega_{min}}}{1 - ze^{-\beta\omega_{min}}}$$

is the average occupation number for the single-particle level with $q = (\bar{l})$, and

$$\lambda_{2D}(\beta, \epsilon) = \sqrt{\frac{8\beta^{5/2}}{15\sqrt{\pi} \eta(\epsilon)}}$$

is the effective de Broglie wave-length of the system. The label 2D emphasizes that in this regime the system becomes effectively two-dimensional, as the particle number scales with the area $A$ and not with the volume $V = L_xL_yL_z$, or with an effective volume like $\bar{V}$ that was defined for photons. Note that $\lambda_{2D} \sim \epsilon^{3/8}$, and it becomes increasingly smaller as we approach the horizon.

† This term originates from the divergence of the Bose-Einstein distribution at $ze^{-\beta\omega_{min}} = 1$, and it is evaluated prior to the continuous limit. Note that $\omega_{min}$ here is defined as the lowest energy state after the continuous limit has been imposed. The actual minimum energy state $E_0$ is expected to differ from $\omega_{min}$ by a term of order unity. However, the explicit value of $E_0$ affects only the vacuum energy and pressure and not the other thermodynamic quantities of the system.
The grand-canonical partition function
\[
\log \Xi(z, \beta, \epsilon, A) = -\int_0^\infty dqg(q) \log(1 - ze^{-\beta(\epsilon + q)}) + \log(1 + N_0)
\]
\[
= \frac{A}{\lambda_{2D}^2} \text{Li}_{7/2}(ze^{-\beta\epsilon}) + \log(1 + N_0),
\]
is also proportional to the area \(A\), modulo the ground state contribution \(\log(1 + N_0)\).

The lowest energy for a single particle is \(\epsilon_{\text{min}}(\epsilon)\), so the internal energy has a vacuum contribution \(N \epsilon_{\text{min}}(\epsilon)\),
\[
U(z, \beta, \epsilon, A, N) = -\frac{\partial}{\partial \beta} \log \Xi = N \epsilon_{\text{min}}(\epsilon) + \frac{5}{2\beta} \left( \log \Xi - \log(1 + N_0) \right).
\]
The internal energy splits as \(U = U_0 + U_{\text{th}}\), where \(U_0 = N \epsilon_{\text{min}}(\epsilon)\) is the ground-state energy and \(U_{\text{th}} = \frac{5}{2\beta} \left( \log \Xi - \log(1 + N_0) \right)\) is the thermal energy; we call it thermal because it corresponds to the kinetic energy of the particles.

Next, we evaluate the entropy in the fundamental thermodynamic space by performing a double inverse Massieu transformation with respect to \(\beta\) and \(\beta \mu\) on Eq. (66),
\[
S = \log \Xi + \beta U - N(\beta \mu) = \left( \frac{\partial}{\partial T} (T \log \Xi) \right)_z - N \log z ,
\]
which yields
\[
S = \frac{A}{(\lambda_{2D}^2)^2} \left[ (\beta \epsilon_{\text{min}} - \log z) \text{Li}_{5/2}(ze^{-\beta\epsilon_{\text{min}}}) + \frac{7}{2} \text{Li}_{7/2}(ze^{-\beta\epsilon_{\text{min}}}) \right]
\]
\[
+ \left[ (N_0 + 1) \log(N_0 + 1) - N_0 \log N_0 \right].
\]
The height of the box \(L_x\) does not appear explicitly in the equation for entropy. It drops out completely in this regime. This is the reason why the system scales with area and behaves essentially as two dimensional. When the temperature drops to the regime \(T << m\), all gas molecules are constrained to move along the bottom of the box. Here we consider an ideal gas; obviously when the average distance \(\sqrt{A/N}\) between particles becomes of the order of the size of the particles, the ideal gas approximation makes no sense. We have to take self-interactions into account.

By Eq. (63), if \(\frac{N A}{\lambda_{2D}^2} > \zeta(\frac{5}{2})\), then \(N_0 > 0\), i.e., there is a non-zero number of particles in the Bose-Einstein condensate phase. This condition can be written equivalently as \(T < T_c\), where
\[
T_c = \frac{\pi^{3/5}}{2[2\zeta(\frac{5}{2})]^{2/5}} \left( \frac{N}{A} \right)^{\frac{4}{5}} \left( \frac{2\epsilon^3}{(GM)^{7/2}m^2} \right)^{\frac{1}{10}}.
\]
is the critical temperature for Bose-Einstein condensation. It follows that
\[
\frac{N_0}{N} = \begin{cases} 
0, & T \geq T_c \\
1 - \left( \frac{T}{T_c} \right)^{5/2}, & T \leq T_c
\end{cases}
\]
4.3. Specific regimes

**Dilute gas.** The dilute gas regime corresponds to \( z e^{-\beta_\omega_{\min}(\epsilon)} \ll 1 \), which implies that \( \text{Li}_\alpha(z') \simeq z' \). There is no Bose-Einstein condensate. We obtain

\[
N \simeq \frac{A}{\lambda^2 D} z e^{-\beta_\omega_{\min}(\epsilon)}, \quad U_{th} \simeq \frac{5}{2} NT.
\]

The entropy is

\[
S = \frac{7}{2} N + N \log \left( \frac{A}{N \lambda^2 D} \right) = \frac{7}{2} N + N \log \left( \frac{15\sqrt{\pi} A \eta(\epsilon)}{8N} \left( \frac{2}{5} \frac{U_{th}}{N} \right)^{5/2} \right). \tag{73}
\]

Since \( L_x \) does not appear explicitly in the fundamental equation (73), there is no pressure at the top of the box. It is straightforward to calculate the horizontal pressure

\[
P_h = \frac{2U_{th}}{5V} = \frac{NT}{V}, \tag{74}
\]

and the pressure at the bottom

\[
P_b = \frac{N \omega_{\min}}{2A\epsilon} + \frac{3U_{th}}{10A\epsilon} = \frac{N}{2A\epsilon} \left( \omega_{\min} + \frac{3}{2} NT \right). \tag{75}
\]

We also evaluate the acceleration on a box that is lowered adiabatically

\[
a_S = -\frac{L_x}{2\epsilon(L_x + \epsilon) \left( 1 - \frac{1}{\sqrt{1 + \frac{L_x}{\epsilon}}} \right)} + O(T/m). \tag{76}
\]

Despite the insensitivity of this acceleration on particle mass or temperature, it is different from that for massless particles, or for massive particles in the regime \( T >> m \). In the small-box regime, \( a_S = -\epsilon^{-1} \) and in the near-horizon regime, \( a_S = -(2\epsilon)^{-1} \).

**Dense gas.** Bose-Einstein condensates correspond to \( z = 1 \). In this case, the thermodynamic variables satisfy

\[
N - N_0 = \zeta(5/2) \frac{A}{\lambda^2 D}, \tag{77}
\]

\[
U_{th} = \frac{5\zeta(7/2)}{2\zeta(5/2)} (N - N_0) T \tag{78}
\]

\[
S = \frac{7\zeta(7/2)}{2\zeta(5/2)} (N - N_0) = \frac{7U_{th}}{5T}, \tag{79}
\]

i.e., entropy and thermal energy scale with the number of particles in the gas phase. The equations for pressure and acceleration are the same as in the dilute gas case.

The Bose-Einstein condensate phase exists for \( T < T_c \). However, a thermodynamic description is possible only if \( T_c \) is much greater than the Hawking temperature \( T_H \) of the black hole. Since by Eq. (70), \( T_c \) depends on the distance \( \epsilon \), the condition \( T_c >> T_H \) implies a lower bound to \( \epsilon \),

\[
\epsilon >> \left[ \frac{\zeta(5/2)^{4/3}}{2^{17/3} \pi^2} \frac{m^{2/3}}{GM(N/A)^{4/3}} \right] \simeq 0.003 \frac{m^{2/3}}{GM(N/A)^{4/3}}, \tag{80}
\]
Quantum statistical mechanics near a black hole horizon

or equivalently,

\[ x_1 \gg 0.5 \frac{m^{1/3}}{(N/A)^{2/3}}. \]  

(81)

For \( m = 100\text{amu} \) and \( \sqrt{A/N} \sim 3 \text{ nm} \) (air in room temperature), we find that \( x_1 \gg 10^{-34} \text{m} \). There is no significant constraint even if the location of the box were treated as a microscopic variable. We have to keep in mind that by condition \( (61) \), the Bose-Einstein condensate phase cannot persist in the near-horizon regime.

4.4. Entropy bounds

In the regime where \( L_x \gg \epsilon \), the gas of massive particles and the gas of massless particles have the same thermodynamic behavior. Hence, as shown in Sec. 3.5, the EB is violated.

For a dilute gas and for \( L_x \gg \epsilon \), Eqs. (72) and (73) apply. We note that entropy \( S \) varies as \( \log \epsilon \) while \( U \simeq N\omega_{\text{min}} \) decreases with \( \sqrt{\epsilon} \). Hence, we expect that there is a range of parameters such that the EB is violated when we bring the box sufficiently close to the horizon, while preserving the condition \( L_x \gg \epsilon \). The reader can straightforwardly verify a violation of the EB for \( T = 1K \), \( H_x = L_y = L_z = 1\text{cm} \) and \( x_1 = 1\text{m} \). Again, the EB is eventually violated when we lower a box adiabatically, where \( U \) decreases with \( \sqrt{\epsilon} \) while \( S \) remains constant.

In contrast, the entropy content of a Bose-Einstein condensate is negligible, hence, there is no violation of the EB, as long as \( L_x \gg \epsilon \).

5. Conclusions

We presented our motivation and our results in the Introduction. Here, we comment on the implications of our work.

First, the combination of QFTCS for the ideal gas dynamics and of the microcanonical distribution leads to a self-consistent description of the system studied here. We expect that the results can be generalized to larger class of small systems near the black hole horizon, including fermions and self-gravitating systems. We saw that there is a large and yet unexplored thermodynamic phenomenology of such systems, including the presence of acceleration due to anisotropic pressure. Its detailed study will enable, among others, a deeper understanding of the GSL, especially its grounding on the quantum-field theoretic description of thermodynamic systems.

Second, our results highlight the importance of backreaction for any discussion of horizon thermodynamics, as QFTCS fails for microscopic distances beyond the horizon, well before we approach the Planck length. We expect that a combination of the methods of Ref. [12] and the methods developed here could prove fruitful for implementing backreaction.

Finally, we note that the formulation of entropy bounds for small systems near a black hole need to be reappraised. We saw that the simplest implementation of
the Bekenstein bound fails, possibly because this bound applies primarily to isolated systems. It is important to understand how or whether this failure can be remedied, before proceeding to the formulation of a general entropy bound applicable to this class of systems.
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