

The Penrose Inequality as a Constraint on the Low Energy Limit of Quantum Gravity

Åsmund Folkestad

Center for Theoretical Physics, Massachusetts Institute of Technology, Cambridge, MA 02139, USA
Kavli Institute for Theoretical Physics, University of California, Santa Barbara, CA 93106, USA

We construct initial data violating the AdS Penrose inequality using scalars with various potentials. Since the Penrose inequality can be derived from basic entries in the AdS/CFT dictionary, we argue that it is a new swampland condition, ruling out holographic UV completion for theories that violate it. We produce exclusion plots on scalar couplings violating the inequality, and we find no violations for top-down potentials. In the special case where the dominant energy condition holds, we use GR techniques to prove the AdS Penrose inequality in all dimensions greater than two, assuming spherical, planar, or hyperbolic symmetry. However, our violations show that this result cannot be generically true with only the null energy condition, and we give an analytic sufficient condition for violation of the Penrose inequality, constraining couplings and the exponential behavior of scalar potentials.

INTRODUCTION

Whether or not singularities are hidden behind event horizons is one of the longstanding open questions in general relativity. In [1] Penrose showed that if (1) the answer to this is affirmative, and (2) collapsing matter settles down to Kerr, then the existence of certain special surfaces σ that appear in regions of strong gravity implies a lower bound on the spacetime mass:

$$G_N M \geq \sqrt{\frac{\text{Area}[\sigma]}{16\pi}} \quad (1)$$

(in an asymptotically flat four-dimensional spacetime). A proof of this inequality, named after Penrose, would amount to evidence in favor of singularities being hidden, but the inequality has not been proven except in special cases [2, 3] (see [4] for a review).

Recently, Engelhardt and Horowitz [5] derived an AdS version of the Penrose inequality (PI), assuming the AdS/CFT-dictionary, but not cosmic censorship nor anything about the endpoint of gravitational collapse. This suggests that hypothetical bulk matter allowing violation of the PI in AdS is incompatible with the AdS/CFT dictionary, and that the PI can serve as a new swampland condition [6–8], detecting theories that cannot be UV completed in holography.

In this article we construct violations of the PI for various scalar potentials, and produce exclusion plots in coupling space, delineating regions where we know that the PI is violated. Since the PI turns out to constrain neutral scalars, we find that it is clearly distinct from the weak gravity conjecture (WGC) [7], which pertains to charged matter. Next, we present numerical evidence that supersymmetry is a sufficient condition for the PI. We also present an analytical sufficient condition on scalar couplings for a theory to violate the PI. Similar to the Breitenlohner-Freedman bound [9, 10], this condition gives a necessary condition for the stability of pure AdS. Finally, while our work shows that generic theories respecting the null energy condition (NEC) violate

the PI, we are able to prove it for all dimensions greater than two when assuming the dominant energy condition (DEC) and spherical, planar, or hyperbolic symmetry.

THE PENROSE INEQUALITY IN ADS/CFT

Consider an apparent horizon σ in an asymptotically AdS $_{d+1}$ (AAAdS) spacetime with mass M , meaning that the expansion of the outwards null geodesic congruence fired from σ is vanishing, while the inwards expansion is negative. Assuming the holographic dictionary, Ref. [5] derived that

$$\text{Area}[\sigma] \leq A_{\text{BH}}(M), \quad (2)$$

where $A_{\text{BH}}(M)$ is the area of the most entropic static black hole of mass M in the theory. This is the proposed AdS version of the PI, and by knowing the function $A_{\text{BH}}(M)$, Eq. (2) can be rewritten to give a lower bound on the mass, similar to Eq. (1) (see for example [11]).

The argument of [5] relied on (1) the HRT entropy formula [12–15], (2) the existence of the so-called coarse grained CFT state, whose von-Neumann entropy equals $\text{Area}[\sigma]/4G_N$ [16, 17], and (3) the fact that there exists a gravitational path integral for the microcanonical ensemble which has stationary black holes as saddles [18, 19]. The argument also makes the reasonable assumption that there is no spontaneous breaking of time translation symmetry in the CFT microcanonical ensemble, so that the microcanonical ensemble is dual to a stationary black hole.¹ Additionally, σ had to satisfy two technical conditions: that it becomes a proper trapped surface when perturbed slightly inwards, and that σ is outermost minimal, meaning that there exists a spacelike or null hypersurface bounded by σ and the conformal boundary on

¹ We thank Don Marolf for pointing this out.

which no other surface is smaller (see [16, 17] for precise conditions).

CONSTRAINING SCALAR POTENTIALS

Working with scalar fields and spherical symmetry in the classical limit,² we will see that many scalar potentials that violate the DEC violate Eq. (2) as well. DEC-violating scalars are important, since they appear in top-down constructions of AdS/CFT after dimensional reduction of compact dimensions [21]. A generic DEC violating scalar potential will not even have a positive mass theorem (PMT) [22, 23], and in these theories the PI is automatically violated, but we will also find that theories resisting all our attempts at violating the PMT will frequently violate the PI.

The theories we consider have the action

$$\frac{1}{8\pi G_N} \int d^{d+1}x \sqrt{-g} \left[\frac{1}{2}R + \frac{d(d-1)}{2L^2} - \frac{1}{2}|\nabla\phi|^2 - V(\phi) \right], \quad (3)$$

for a scalar potential V satisfying $V(0) = V'(0) = 0$. To look for violations of the PI, we will construct asymptotically AdS _{$d+1$} initial data on a partial Cauchy surface Σ bounded by σ and the conformal boundary, such that (1) σ is an apparent horizon satisfying all the technical conditions relevant for Eq. (2), and (2) Σ can be provably be completed into a full dataset on a complete hypersurface. This is sufficient to test if the PI holds for σ ; the full spacetime is not needed.

What scalar potentials $V(\phi)$ should we consider? Ref. [24] proved an AdS₄ PI, using GR techniques rather than holography, and assuming spherical symmetry and the DEC. In the appendix, assuming the ordinary gravitational mass is finite, we prove the following generalization (conjectured to be true in [11]):

Theorem 1. *Consider an asymptotically AdS _{$d+1 \geq 3$} spacetime with spherical ($k = 1$), planar ($k = 0$), or hyperbolic symmetry ($k = -1$), satisfying the Einstein equations $G_{ab} - \frac{d(d-1)}{2L^2}g_{ab} = 8\pi G_N T_{ab}$ and the DEC: $T_{ab}u^a v^a \geq 0$ for all timelike u^a, v^a . If σ is a symmetric outermost marginally trapped surface with respect to a connect component of the conformal boundary with mass M , then*

$$\frac{16\pi G_N}{(d-1)\Omega_k} M \geq k \left(\frac{\text{Area}[\sigma]}{\Omega_k} \right)^{\frac{d-2}{d-1}} + \frac{1}{L^2} \left(\frac{\text{Area}[\sigma]}{\Omega_k} \right)^{\frac{d}{d-1}}. \quad (4)$$

Here Ω_k is the volume of the $(d-1)$ -dimensional unit sphere, the plane, or the unit hyperbolic space (or a compactification thereof, in the latter two cases). While Ω_k

might be infinite, the ratios $\text{Area}[\sigma]/\Omega_k$ and M/Ω_k are well defined. Furthermore, taking $k = 1$ and $L \rightarrow \infty$ we get the PI for spherically symmetric asymptotically flat space.

Now, the proof of the above theorem applies for an apparent horizon which is outermost marginally trapped, which is not always the same as outermost minimal. To see this, we note that the outwards (inwards) null expansion θ_+ (θ_-) of a surface $\hat{\sigma}$ contained in a spacelike hypersurface Σ can be written (in an appropriate normalization of the null normals) [25]

$$\sqrt{2}\theta_{\pm} = \pm\mathcal{K} + K^a_a - K_{ab}n^a n^b, \quad (5)$$

where \mathcal{K} is the mean curvature of $\hat{\sigma}$ in Σ , K_{ab} the extrinsic curvature of Σ in spacetime, and n^a the outwards unit normal to $\hat{\sigma}$ in Σ . Marginally trapped means $\theta_+ = 0$ (and $\theta_- \leq 0$), while minimal requires $\mathcal{K} = 0$. However, in the following we are going to work at a moment of time-symmetry, which implies $K_{ab} = 0$, and so the two types of surfaces coincide. Thus, in order to look for violations in our setup, we need to consider theories violating the DEC, which for Eq. (3) means potentials that are negative somewhere.

As mentioned, these theories arise in top-down constructions of AdS _{$d+1$} /CFT _{d} after dimensional reduction, but we can also see their relevance from a bottom up perspective. By studying solutions of the Klein-Gordon equation in AAdS _{$d+1$} spacetimes, it is seen that the bulk dual of a light CFT scalar single trace primary operator that is relevant must have a negative squared mass $m^2 = \partial_\phi^2 V(\phi)|_{\phi=0}$, leading to DEC violation. This is seen using the standard expression for the scaling dimension Δ of the boundary operator dual to ϕ (in ‘‘standard quantization’’) [26]: $\Delta = d/2 + \sqrt{(d/2)^2 + m^2 L^2}$. $\Delta < d$ indeed means negative m^2 , which is allowed as long as the Breitenlohner-Freedman (BF) bound [9, 10] is satisfied: $m^2 L^2 \geq m_{\text{BF}}^2 L^2 = -d^2/4$.

Hair, Black Hole Uniqueness, Positive Mass and Compact Dimensions

Before constructing initial data, a few subtleties and known results should be addressed.

First, the reference black hole of mass M appearing in Eq. (2) is the one that dominates the microcanonical ensemble at that mass, which is the one with the largest entropy [19]. Thus, if for mass M there exist hairy black holes with higher entropy than AdS-Schwarzschild, we seemingly have to construct these before claiming a violation of the holographic PI. Black hole uniqueness is not established in AdS, so this seems like a difficult task. However, spherical symmetry allows significant simplification. In the static spherically symmetric case, Ref. [27] recently proved that the NEC implies

$$A_{\text{BH}}(M) \leq A_{\text{AdS-Schwarzschild}}(M), \quad (6)$$

² See [20] for possible semiclassical generalizations of the AdS PI.

so any potential spherical static hairy black holes cannot dominate the microcanonical ensemble. Since the theories we consider here respect the NEC, we thus know that AdS-Schwarzschild is the correct black hole to compare to in Eq. (2), assuming we can take the reference black hole to be spherically symmetric. This is reasonable, and amounts to the assumption that the CFT microcanonical ensemble does not break translational symmetry spontaneously. There is also a more direct argument: there exists a generalized microcanonical path integral [18] that fixes not only the total CFT energy, but also the one-point function of the CFT stress tensor. Modifying the argument of [5] by maximizing over all states with fixed homogeneous energy density rather than just total energy would ensure that the comparison black hole is also a spherically symmetric one. However, it has not been studied whether the path integral of [18] is ghost or tachyon free, so it is not clear if this argument holds up.

Second, it has been proven that the PMT holds even in certain theories violating the DEC. The prime example is in supersymmetric theories [9, 10, 28], but in Einstein-scalar theory more general results are known. It was proved in [29, 30] that the PMT holds if the scalar potential $V(\phi)$ can be written as

$$V(\phi) = \frac{d(d-1)}{2L^2} + (d-1)W'(\phi)^2 - dW(\phi)^2 \quad (7)$$

for some real function $W(\phi)$ defined for all $\phi \in \mathbb{R}$ and satisfying $W'(0) = 0$ (provided we only turn on the scalar mode with fastest falloff [31–33], which is what we do here). W looks like a superpotential, but supersymmetry is not required. Either way, we refer to W as a superpotential. It is not known whether the existence of W is a necessary condition for the existence of a PMT; the proofs of [29, 30] only show that it is sufficient.

Third, suppose that an AAdS $_{d+1}$ solution can be uplifted to a spacetime with compact internal dimensions. If our initial data lifts to something other than a product metric, then it is not a priori obvious that a violation of the lower dimensional PI implies a violation of the higher dimensional one. It could in principle be that the PI only is valid with compact dimensions included (even for top-down constructions), but our numerical findings argues against this, since top-down potentials seem to respect the lower dimensional PI, as we will see.³

³ Furthermore, for the top-down potential $V = 1 - \cosh \sqrt{2}\phi$ [34], Ref. [35] shows that area of the uplifted surface is always larger than the area one gets by naively assuming the relevant product metric. Thus, the dimensionally reduced PI holds when the full PI holds.

Constructing Initial Data

Let us now describe how we construct initial data. A spacelike initial dataset for the Einstein-Klein-Gordon system on a manifold Σ at a moment of time symmetry consists of a Riemannian metric γ_{ab} and a scalar profile ϕ on Σ that together satisfy the Einstein constraint equations. The extrinsic curvature K_{ab} and time-derivative of ϕ on Σ are both vanishing. Next, we want the initial data to have finite mass and evolve to an asymptotically AdS $_{d+1}$ spacetime, which constrains ϕ to fall off sufficiently fast. Furthermore, we demand σ to be outermost minimal, so that we can test Eq. (2) ($K_{ab} = 0$ implies that σ is extremal, and so the technical “stability” condition on σ is automatically satisfied [17]).

To make the procedure explicit, we pick our coordinate system on Σ to be

$$ds^2 = \frac{dr^2}{1 + \frac{r^2}{L^2} - \frac{\omega(r)}{r^{d-2}}} + r^2 d\Omega^2, \quad r \in [r_0, \infty), \quad (8)$$

where $\omega(r)$ is a real function and $d\Omega^2$ is the metric of a round unit $(d-1)$ -sphere. The marginally trapped surface σ is the sphere at $r = r_0 > 0$, and since we are considering a spacelike manifold, we need $\omega(r) \leq r^{d-2} + r^d L^{-2}$. As discussed in [25], the above coordinates break down only at locally stationary spheres, where the former inequality becomes an equality. Since we want σ to be outermost minimal, one coordinate system of the form (8) must be enough to cover Σ . In these coordinates, the solution to the constraint equations for a general scalar profile reads (see for example [21, 25])

$$\begin{aligned} \omega(r) &= e^{-h(r)} \left[\omega(r_0) + \int_{r_0}^r d\rho \frac{e^{h(\rho)} \rho^{d-1} \chi(\rho)}{d-1} \right], \\ h(r) &= \frac{1}{d-1} \int_{r_0}^r d\rho \rho \phi'(r)^2, \\ \chi(r) &= \left(1 + \frac{r^2}{L^2} \right) \phi'(r)^2 + 2V(\phi). \end{aligned} \quad (9)$$

To construct particular initial datasets, we must provide the profile $\phi(r)$ on $[r_0, \infty)$, together with value for r_0 . The constant $\omega(r_0)$ is fixed by the condition of σ being marginally trapped, since at a moment of time-symmetry we compute that

$$\sqrt{2}\theta_{\pm} = \pm \frac{d-1}{r} \sqrt{1 + \frac{r^2}{L^2} - \frac{\omega(r)}{r^{d-2}}}, \quad (10)$$

which sets $\omega(r_0) = r_0^{d-2} + r_0^d L^{-2}$. Finally, we complete our initial dataset by gluing a CPT-conjugate copy of the initial dataset to itself along σ (possible since σ is extremal – see [16, 17] for details).

Let’s now choose a concrete scalar profile. We consider two types of profiles, either

$$\phi(r) = \sum_{k=0}^3 \text{sign}(\eta_k) \left(\frac{|\eta_k|}{r} \right)^{\Delta+2k}, \quad (11)$$

or

$$\phi(r) = \begin{cases} \mu \log(r/R_0) & r_0 \leq r \leq R_0 \\ 0 & R_0 \leq r \end{cases}. \quad (12)$$

After picking numerical values of r_0 and either $\{\eta_k\}$ or $\{\mu, R_0\}$, we can compute the integrals (9) numerically to obtain an initial dataset $(\omega(r), \phi(r))$, for which we can obtain the mass as $16\pi G_N M = (d-1)\text{Vol}[S^{d-1}]\omega(\infty)$. The only remaining thing to check is that $\omega(r)$ never exceeds $r^{d-2} + r^d L^{-2}$ for $r > r_0$. As long as this is true, σ satisfies the technical conditions required for the holographic derivation of Eq. (2).

Why do we choose the profiles (11) and (12)? By minimizing the mass at fixed r_0 , we are maximizing the chance of violating the PI, since smaller M means smaller $A_{\text{BH}}(M)$. Hence, we want large regions of nonzero scalar field in order to accumulate negative energy through the potential, while minimizing the positive gradient contribution from $\chi(r)$. Thus, we want a scalar that falls off slowly and with minimal non-monotonic behavior. A logarithmic profile achieves this, but it requires compact support in order to have the requisite asymptotics. The profile (11) has the slowest possible falloff compatible with non-compact support and standard Dirchelet boundary conditions. One could imagine trying to improve our profiles by having a constant condensate in a large region, before dropping the scalar to zero. However, from Eq. (9) we see that the contribution where ϕ has a gradient gets a relative exponential enhancement, so a region of constant ϕ is not particularly helpful, and might work against us by postponing the gradients to large r , where the positive $r^2 \phi'(r)^2$ term in χ contributes more.

We now generate a particular dataset by first drawing r_0 with a uniform distribution from the range $(10^{-2}L, 20L)$, allowing both small and large black holes. For the profile (11), we draw the coefficients η_k from the range $(-3r_0, 3r_0)$, again with a uniform distribution. For the profile (12) we draw $\mu \in (0, 10)$ and $R_0 - r_0 \in (0, 100L)$. The parameter ranges are chosen partly through trial and error – if we increase the parameter ranges for η_k or μ , we mostly produce invalid datasets where $\omega(r) = r^{d-2} + r^d L^2$ at some finite $r > r_0$. This is not surprising, since if ϕ gets a large amplitude, $\omega'(r)$ becomes large as well, causing $\omega(r)$ to overshoot $r^{d-2} + r^d L^{-2}$ near r_0 .⁴ Either way, the extent that our sampling of the space of profiles $\phi(r)$ is suboptimal corresponds to how much our exclusion plots below can be improved in the future.

⁴ One can check that we must have $\omega'(r_0) \leq d \frac{r_0^{d-1}}{L^2} + (d-2)r_0^{d-3}$ in order to avoid overshooting $r^{d-2} + r^d L^{-2}$ near $r = r_0$, which gives that $\phi'(r_0)$ should be $\mathcal{O}(r_0^{-1})$, justifying the parametric dependence on r_0 chosen for μ and η_k .




FIG. 1. Plot of computed area ratios for various scalar potentials, with an ensemble of 10^4 initial data sets for each potential. None of the generated solutions violate the PI.

Coupling Exclusion Plots

To get warmed up, let us first study $d = 3$ and the potential

$$V(\phi) = -\frac{9}{16}\phi^2 + 9\phi^3 + 11\phi^4, \quad (13)$$

which has $m^2 = \frac{1}{2}m_{\text{BF}}^2$ (the exact value of m^2 is not important for the qualitative story). This theory does not have a superpotential, since solving (7) gives that a real $W(\phi)$ can only exist on a finite interval. However, we find no negative mass solutions after generating 10^5 initial datasets. Nevertheless, this theory violates the PI. For example, the profile

$$\phi(r) = -\left(\frac{3.8}{r}\right)^\Delta \left[1 + \left(\frac{3.2}{r}\right)^2 - \left(\frac{2.4}{r}\right)^4\right], \quad (14)$$

with $r_0 = 2.5L$ yields

$$A[\sigma]/A_{\text{AdS-Schwarzschild}}(M) \approx 1.2, \quad G_N M \approx 7L. \quad (15)$$

As shown by Penrose's original argument [1], the dataset (14) cannot settle down to a stationary black hole, so it will either collapse to a naked singularity, or we will have a Coleman-DeLuccia type decay [36],⁵ where the conformal boundary terminates in finite time (in the static cylinder), and where the event horizon grows to infinite area.

Let's now repeat the analysis for multiple potentials. In Fig. 1 we show histograms of computed ratios $A[\sigma]/A_{\text{AdS-Schwarzschild}}(M)$ in a large ensemble of initial datasets with potentials either (1) coming from dimensional reduction of $D = 11$ [34, 37], Type IIB [38] or

⁵ We thank Juan Maldacena for suggesting this possibility.




FIG. 2. Exclusion plot couplings for the potential $V(\phi) = \frac{1}{4}m_{\text{BF}}^2\phi^2 + g_3\phi^3 + g_4\phi^4$ in $d+1 = 4$. Couplings below the orange dots are ruled out by the PI, while couplings below the blue dots are ruled out by positive mass. Blue and orange lines are quadratic fits, and couplings above the black dashed line give potentials which has superpotentials. Slightly above the blue and orange markers, we have found no violations after the construction of 10^5 initial data sets. The dotted gray line, here coinciding with the blue, shows the exclusion boundary from the analytical condition (16).

massive Type IIA SUGRA [39], or (2) corresponding to a free tachyonic scalar (respecting the BF bound). We see that the PI holds for all our initial datasets. This does not amount to a proof that the PI holds, but it provides some evidence, since for other potentials we will easily be able to produce violations while sampling from the same space of scalar profiles. This is an important consistency check on our proposal, since if the PI was violated for top-down constructions, it presumably cannot serve as a constraint on low energy theories.⁶

Consider now $d = 3$ and a potential with fixed $m^2 = \frac{1}{2}m_{\text{BF}}^2$, and with varying cubic and quartic couplings g_3, g_4 . Take $g_3 \geq 0$ without loss of generality. For a given value of g_3 , we can gradually lower g_4 until we find a violation of the PI or the PMT. In Fig. 2 we plot the highest value for g_4 for which we are able to find a violation. Furthermore, we plot the region in (g_3, g_4) space in which a superpotential exists. The region of coupling space below the orange (blue) dots is ruled out by the PI (PMT). For $g_3 > 0$, the PI is a stronger condition than the PMT – at least in the space of initial data we are sampling. For reasons we do not understand, at $g_3 = 0$ where \mathbb{Z}_2 symmetry is restored, the PI and PMT are violated at the same time. However, \mathbb{Z}_2 symmetry does not appear to always guarantee coincidence, as shown in Fig. 3. Nevertheless, for $d = 3$ and a potential $V = \frac{1}{2}m^2\phi^2 + g_4\phi^4$, we

⁶ Note that for the $d = 4$ top-down potential, we only consider the logarithmic profile, since the potential saturates the BF bound, so the mass formula requires modification for scalar profiles with non-compact support (see for example [40]).




FIG. 3. Exclusion plot on couplings for the potential $V(\phi) = \frac{1}{4}m_{\text{BF}}^2\phi^2 + g_4\phi^4 + g_6\phi^6$ in $d+1 = 4$. The same description as in Fig. 2 applies, except the orange and blue lines are interpolations rather than fits.

do find that the PI and PMT exclusion lines do coincide, and furthermore that exclusion line is well described by the analytical condition given in the next section.

Note that there are no immediately obvious changes in the potential as we cross the line into territory where we violate the PI. No new extrema develop.

AN ANALYTIC BOUND ON COUPLINGS

So far we have given numerical bounds on couplings, through violation of the PI. We can also give analytical bounds, although they are somewhat weaker, and rely on violation of the PMT (which implies PI violation). Consider the scalar profile (12), and a potential $V = \sum_{n=2}^{\infty} g_n\phi^n$. It is in fact possible to solve the integrals (9) analytically in terms of gamma functions, and while the solution is somewhat involved, the leading part of $\omega(\infty)$ in the limit $R_0 \rightarrow \infty$ is simple, yielding

$$\frac{\lambda\omega(\infty)}{R_0^d} = \frac{\mu^2}{L^2} + 2 \sum_{n=2}^{\infty} n!g_n \left[\frac{\mu(1-d)}{\lambda} \right]^n, \quad (16)$$

$$\lambda \equiv d(d-1) + \mu^2, \quad (17)$$

up to $\mathcal{O}(R_0^{-2})$ corrections, and with the dependence on r_0 subleading. A sufficient condition for violation of the PMT and PI is for the RHS of (16) to be negative for some $\mu \in \mathbb{R}$. As an illustration, we included the exclusion line obtained from Eq. (16) in Figs. 2 and 3. As an additional example, a potential of the form $V = \sum_i A_i e^{\alpha_i\phi}$ (with $V(0) = V'(0) = 0$) violates the PMT if the following function is negative for some μ :

$$f(\mu) = 1 + 2L^2 \sum_i \frac{(d-1)^2 A_i \alpha_i^2}{\mu^2 + \alpha_i \mu (d-1) + d(d-1)}. \quad (18)$$

The special case $V = A(1 - \cosh \alpha \phi)$ can be seen to always violate the PMT if $\alpha \geq 2\sqrt{\frac{d}{d-1}}$. Stronger bounds can be given for a particular A .

DISCUSSION

There is by now a robust trend of proposing constraints on gravity theories in order for black holes to be well behaved semiclassically [7, 41], and for these constraints to later be proven in holography. Examples are the absence of global symmetries, charge completeness, compactness of gauge groups [42, 43], the hiding of trapped surfaces [44], and the Penrose inequality itself [5]. We have shown that the holographic version of the PI is generically false in GR, and argued that it thus serves as a new swampland condition. As an example, we showed that it can be used to constrain scalar potentials.

One constraint on low energy quantum gravity, argued in [45] to not yet have a completely satisfactory proof, is the WGC [7] (see [46, 47] for partial results). While the uncharged PI studied here is clearly independent of (or stronger than) the WGC, it is interesting to ask whether the charged version of the PI could imply the AdS version of the WGC for scalars, or some other new bound on scalar $U(1)$ couplings. Separately, both the charged PI and the WGC are connected to weak cosmic censorship (the hiding of singularities behind event horizons); it has in fact been shown that violation of the WGC in AdS_4 implies violation of weak cosmic censorship [48–51]. It would be interesting to see if they are directly connected to each other, and adapting our approach to charged scalars could shed light on this. If violation of the WGC implies violation of the charged PI, the contrapositive could furnish a holographic proof the WGC for complex scalars.

Finally, it is worth pointing out that since the HRT formula is the main ingredient for deriving the holographic PI, an alternative interpretation of our findings is that the HRT formula is invalid in our violating spacetimes, even if there is a CFT dual. This would be interesting, but it seems highly unlikely, given that we work with regular complete initial datasets at a moment of time symmetry, and so the usual Euclidean replica derivation [15] of the RT formula should hold for these spacetimes.

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

It is a pleasure to thank Netta Engelhardt and Gary Horowitz for comments on an earlier draft of this manuscript, and Aditya Dhumuntarao, Netta Engelhardt, Gary Horowitz, Veronika Hubeny, Marcus Khuri, Juan Maldacena, Don Marolf, and Cumrun Vafa for discussions. My research is supported in part by the

John Templeton Foundation via the Black Hole Initiative, NSF grant no. PHY-2011905, and an Aker Scholarship. This research was also supported in part by the Heising-Simons Foundation, the Simons Foundation, and NSF grant no. PHY-1748958.

APPENDIX: PROVING ADS PENROSE INEQUALITIES

Consider an AAdS_{d+1} spacetime with spherical, planar, or hyperbolic symmetry, and consider a double null gauge

$$ds^2 = -2e^{-f(x^+, x^-)} dx^+ dx^- + r(x^+, x^-)^2 d\Omega_k^2, \quad (19)$$

where $d\Omega_k^2$ locally is the canonical (unit) metric on the sphere ($k = 1$), plane ($k = 0$) or hyperbolic space ($k = -1$). Define $k_{\pm}^a = (\partial_{\pm})^a$, which has associated null expansions $\theta_{\pm} = (d-1)r^{-1}\partial_{\pm}r$. The quantity

$$\mu(x^+, x^-) = r^d \left[\frac{k}{r^2} - \frac{2\theta_+\theta_-}{k_+ \cdot k_-(d-1)^2} + \frac{1}{L^2} \right], \quad (20)$$

can be seen to reduce to the spacetime mass when evaluated at $r = \infty$, up to an overall factor. The null-null components of the Einstein equations (in units where $8\pi G_N = 1$) reduce to

$$\begin{aligned} \frac{rT_{\pm\pm}}{d-1} &= -\partial_{\pm}f\partial_{\pm}r - \partial_{\pm}^2r, \\ \frac{rT_{+-}}{d-1} &= \partial_+\partial_-r + \frac{d^2 - 3d + 2}{2(d-1)r} \left[e^{-f} \left(k + \frac{r^2}{L^2} \right) + 2\partial_+r\partial_-r \right]. \end{aligned} \quad (21)$$

Proceeding similarly to Hayward in Ref. [52], we compute $\partial_{\pm}\mu$ and use Eqs. (21) to eliminate $\partial_{\pm}r, \partial_{\pm}^2r, \partial_+\partial_-r$ in favor of $\theta_{\pm}, T_{\pm\pm}, T_{+-}$, yielding

$$\partial_{\pm}\mu = \frac{16\pi G_N e^f r^d}{(d-1)^2} (T_{+-}\theta_{\pm} - \theta_{\mp}T_{\pm\pm}) + \frac{2r^d}{(d-1)L^2}\theta_{\pm}. \quad (22)$$

But the DEC implies that $T_{\pm\pm} \geq 0$ and $T_{+-} \geq 0$. Thus, $\pm\partial_{\pm}\mu$ is positive in an untrapped region ($\theta_+ \geq 0, \theta_- \leq 0$), and so there μ is monotonically non-decreasing in an outwards spacelike direction. Evaluating μ on a marginally trapped surface that can be deformed to infinity along a path that is untrapped gives that $kr^{d-2} + r^d L^{-2} \leq \mu(\infty)$. Introducing the relevant numerical factor to convert to mass (the same one used to convert $\omega(\infty)$ to the mass in the main text) now gives Theorem 1.

-
- [1] R. Penrose, Naked singularities, *Annals of the New York Academy of Sciences* **224**, 125 (1973).
 - [2] G. Huisken and T. Ilmanen, The Inverse Mean Curvature Flow and the Riemannian Penrose Inequality, *Journal of Differential Geometry* **59**, 353 (2001).

- [3] H. L. Bray, Proof of the Riemannian Penrose Inequality Using the Positive Mass Theorem, *Journal of Differential Geometry* **59**, 177 (2001).
- [4] M. Mars, Present status of the Penrose inequality, *Class. Quant. Grav.* **26**, 193001 (2009), arXiv:0906.5566 [gr-qc].
- [5] N. Engelhardt and G. T. Horowitz, Holographic argument for the Penrose inequality in AdS spacetimes, *Phys. Rev. D* **99**, 126009 (2019), arXiv:1903.00555 [hep-th].
- [6] C. Vafa, The String landscape and the swampland (2005), arXiv:hep-th/0509212.
- [7] N. Arkani-Hamed, L. Motl, A. Nicolis, and C. Vafa, The string landscape, black holes and gravity as the weakest force, *JHEP* **06**, 060, hep-th/0601001.
- [8] H. Ooguri and C. Vafa, On the geometry of the string landscape and the swampland, *Nucl. Phys.* **B766**, 21 (2007), hep-th/0605264.
- [9] P. Breitenlohner and D. Z. Freedman, Positive energy in anti-de Sitter backgrounds AND gauged extended supergravity, *Phys. Lett.* **B115**, 197 (1982).
- [10] P. Breitenlohner and D. Z. Freedman, Stability in Gauged Extended Supergravity, *Annals Phys.* **144**, 249 (1982).
- [11] I. Itkin and Y. Oz, Penrose Inequality for Asymptotically AdS Spaces, *Phys. Lett. B* **708**, 307 (2012), arXiv:1106.2683 [hep-th].
- [12] S. Ryu and T. Takayanagi, Holographic derivation of entanglement entropy from AdS/CFT, *Phys.Rev.Lett.* **96**, 181602 (2006), arXiv:hep-th/0603001 [hep-th].
- [13] S. Ryu and T. Takayanagi, Aspects of Holographic Entanglement Entropy, *JHEP* **0608**, 045, arXiv:hep-th/0605073 [hep-th].
- [14] V. E. Hubeny, M. Rangamani, and T. Takayanagi, A Covariant holographic entanglement entropy proposal, *JHEP* **0707**, 062, arXiv:0705.0016 [hep-th].
- [15] A. Lewkowycz and J. Maldacena, Generalized gravitational entropy, *JHEP* **1308**, 090, arXiv:1304.4926 [hep-th].
- [16] N. Engelhardt and A. C. Wall, Decoding the Apparent Horizon: Coarse-Grained Holographic Entropy, *Phys. Rev. Lett.* **121**, 211301 (2018), arXiv:1706.02038 [hep-th].
- [17] N. Engelhardt and A. C. Wall, Coarse Graining Holographic Black Holes, *JHEP* **05**, 160, arXiv:1806.01281 [hep-th].
- [18] J. D. Brown and J. W. York, Jr., The Microcanonical functional integral. I. The Gravitational field, *Phys. Rev. D* **47**, 1420 (1993), arXiv:gr-qc/9209014.
- [19] D. Marolf, Microcanonical Path Integrals and the Holography of small Black Hole Interiors, *JHEP* **09**, 114, arXiv:1808.00394 [hep-th].
- [20] R. Bousso, A. Shahbazi-Moghaddam, and M. Tomasevic, Quantum Penrose Inequality, *Phys. Rev. Lett.* **123**, 241301 (2019), arXiv:1908.02755 [hep-th].
- [21] T. Hertog, G. T. Horowitz, and K. Maeda, Negative energy density in Calabi-Yau compactifications, *JHEP* **05**, 060, arXiv:hep-th/0304199.
- [22] R. Schoen and S. T. Yau, Proof of the positive mass theorem. ii, *Comm. Math. Phys.* **79**, 231 (1981).
- [23] E. Witten, A Simple Proof of the Positive Energy Theorem, *Commun. Math. Phys.* **80**, 381 (1981).
- [24] V. Husain and S. Singh, Penrose inequality in anti-de Sitter space, *Phys. Rev. D* **96**, 104055 (2017), arXiv:1709.02395 [gr-qc].
- [25] N. Engelhardt and Å. Folkestad, General bounds on holographic complexity, *JHEP* **01**, 040, arXiv:2109.06883 [hep-th].
- [26] E. Witten, Anti-de Sitter space and holography, *Adv. Theor. Math. Phys.* **2**, 253 (1998), hep-th/9802150.
- [27] Z.-Q. Xiao and R.-Q. Yang, On Penrose inequality in holography (2022), arXiv:2204.12239 [hep-th].
- [28] G. W. Gibbons, C. M. Hull, and N. P. Warner, The stability of gauged supergravity, *Nucl. Phys.* **B218**, 173 (1983).
- [29] W. Boucher, Positive energy without supersymmetry, *Nucl. Phys.* **B242**, 282 (1984).
- [30] P. K. Townsend, Positive Energy and the Scalar Potential in Higher Dimensional (Super)gravity Theories, *Phys. Lett. B* **148**, 55 (1984).
- [31] A. J. Amsel and D. Marolf, Energy Bounds in Designer Gravity, *Phys. Rev. D* **74**, 064006 (2006), [Erratum: *Phys.Rev.D* 75, 029901 (2007)], arXiv:hep-th/0605101.
- [32] A. J. Amsel, T. Hertog, S. Hollands, and D. Marolf, A Tale of two superpotentials: Stability and instability in designer gravity, *Phys. Rev. D* **75**, 084008 (2007), [Erratum: *Phys.Rev.D* 77, 049903 (2008)], arXiv:hep-th/0701038.
- [33] T. Faulkner, G. T. Horowitz, and M. M. Roberts, New stability results for Einstein scalar gravity, *Class. Quant. Grav.* **27**, 205007 (2010), arXiv:1006.2387 [hep-th].
- [34] M. Cvetič, M. J. Duff, P. Hoxha, J. T. Liu, H. Lu, J. X. Lu, R. Martinez-Acosta, C. N. Pope, H. Sati, and T. A. Tran, Embedding AdS black holes in ten-dimensions and eleven-dimensions, *Nucl. Phys. B* **558**, 96 (1999), arXiv:hep-th/9903214.
- [35] N. Engelhardt and Å. Folkestad, Negative complexity of formation: the compact dimensions strike back, *JHEP* **07**, 031, arXiv:2111.14897 [hep-th].
- [36] S. Coleman and F. D. Luccia, Gravitational effects on and of vacuum decay, *Phys. Rev. D* **21**, 3305 (1980).
- [37] H. Lu and C. N. Pope, Exact embedding of N=1, D = 7 gauged supergravity in D = 11, *Phys. Lett. B* **467**, 67 (1999), arXiv:hep-th/9906168.
- [38] H. Lu, C. N. Pope, and T. A. Tran, Five-dimensional N=4, SU(2) x U(1) gauged supergravity from type IIB, *Phys. Lett. B* **475**, 261 (2000), arXiv:hep-th/9909203.
- [39] M. Cvetič, H. Lu, and C. N. Pope, Gauged six-dimensional supergravity from massive type IIA, *Phys. Rev. Lett.* **83**, 5226 (1999), arXiv:hep-th/9906221.
- [40] T. Hertog and G. T. Horowitz, Towards a big crunch dual, *JHEP* **07**, 073, arXiv:hep-th/0406134 [hep-th].
- [41] T. Banks and N. Seiberg, Symmetries and Strings in Field Theory and Gravity, *Phys. Rev. D* **83**, 084019 (2011), arXiv:1011.5120 [hep-th].
- [42] D. Harlow and H. Ooguri, Symmetries in quantum field theory and quantum gravity, *Commun. Math. Phys.* **383**, 1669 (2021), arXiv:1810.05338 [hep-th].
- [43] D. Harlow and H. Ooguri, Constraints on Symmetries from Holography, *Phys. Rev. Lett.* **122**, 191601 (2019), arXiv:1810.05337 [hep-th].
- [44] N. Engelhardt and Å. Folkestad, Holography abhors visible trapped surfaces, *JHEP* **07**, 066, arXiv:2012.11445 [hep-th].
- [45] D. Harlow, B. Heidenreich, M. Reece, and T. Rudelius, The Weak Gravity Conjecture: A Review (2022), arXiv:2201.08380 [hep-th].
- [46] S. Hod, A proof of the weak gravity conjecture, *Int. J. Mod. Phys. D* **26**, 1742004 (2017), arXiv:1705.06287 [gr-qc].
- [47] M. Montero, A Holographic Derivation of the Weak Gravity Conjecture, *JHEP* **03**, 157, arXiv:1812.03978

- [48] G. T. Horowitz, J. E. Santos, and B. Way, Evidence for an Electrifying Violation of Cosmic Censorship, *Class. Quant. Grav.* **33**, 195007 (2016), arXiv:1604.06465 [hep-th].
- [49] T. Crisford and J. E. Santos, Violating the Weak Cosmic Censorship Conjecture in Four-Dimensional Anti-de Sitter Space, *Phys. Rev. Lett.* **118**, 181101 (2017), arXiv:1702.05490 [hep-th].
- [50] T. Crisford, G. T. Horowitz, and J. E. Santos, Testing the Weak Gravity - Cosmic Censorship Connection, *Phys. Rev. D* **97**, 066005 (2018), arXiv:1709.07880 [hep-th].
- [51] G. T. Horowitz and J. E. Santos, Further evidence for the weak gravity — cosmic censorship connection, *JHEP* **06**, 122, arXiv:1901.11096 [hep-th].
- [52] S. A. Hayward, Gravitational energy in spherical symmetry, *Phys. Rev. D* **53**, 1938 (1996), arXiv:gr-qc/9408002.