### Research Directions in Quantum Field Theory and String Theory 2020

## The workshop for Prof. *Chaiho Rim*

임채호

Applications of AdS/CFT or Holographic duality

> Keun-Young Kim at GIST

> > HALLMAN, JOHN N. Joseph

1998년부터 저와 함께 세계 이곳 저곳을 돌아서 지금은 제 책꽃이에 자리 잡은 책이 하나 있습니다. 바로 임채호 교수님의 "등각장론" 입니다.



1998년부터 저와 함께 세계 이곳 저곳을 돌아서 지금은 제 책꽃이에 자리 잡은 책이 하나 있습니다. 바로 임채호 교수님의 "등각장론" 입니다.



### Research Directions in Quantum Field Theory and String Theory 2020

## The workshop for Prof. *Chaiho Rim*

임채호

Applications of AdS/CFT or Holographic duality

> Keun-Young Kim at GIST

> > HALLMAN, JOHN N. Joseph

## The beginning

### N D3 Branes







$$
Z_{\text{Gravity}}^{\text{On-Shell}} = Z_{\text{Field Theory}} \equiv e^{-W_{FT}}
$$

 $Z_{\rm String} = Z_{\rm Field\ Theory}$ 

$$
W_{FT} = S_{\text{gravity}}^{\text{on-shell}} + \mathcal{O}\left(1/N^2\right) + \mathcal{O}\left(1/\sqrt{\lambda}\right)
$$

## AdS space

#### Anti de Sitter (AdS) 1 ⇤ **d** d**ata** de Sitter (AdS) and a simple of being a solution to a simple  $\alpha$



*d*(*d* + 1)

⇥

i<br>I

symmetry and special conformal symmetries. As well as being regular, Anti-de Sitter space-

#### **time thermal AdS (AAdS)** the virtue of being a solution to a simple  $\sim$ 1 dimensional theory of gravity, namely the Einstein gravity action (19). The equations of motion are

the Einstein gravity action (19). The equations of motion are



symmetry and special conformal symmetry and symmetries. As well as  $\mathcal{A}$  as  $\mathcal{A}$ 

*,* (51)

#### Charged AdS (AAdS) To describe the physics of the global *U*(1) symmetry we should therefore add a Maxwell **I** Charged AdS (AAdS *ds*<sup>2</sup> = *L*2 *r*2 <u>| S</u> *f*(*r*) </r/> +// *dr*<sup>2</sup> *<sup>f</sup>*(*r*) <sup>+</sup> *dx<sup>i</sup>* We have required the Maxwell potential to vanish on the maxwell potential to vanish on the horizon,  $\overline{A}$ 0. The simplest argument for this condition is the simplest argument for this condition is that otherwise the  $\sim$

<sup>2</sup> *<sup>g</sup>µ <sup>d</sup>*(*<sup>d</sup>* 1)

<sup>2</sup>*L*<sup>2</sup> *<sup>g</sup>µ* <sup>=</sup>

<sup>2</sup> *<sup>g</sup>µ <sup>d</sup>*(*<sup>d</sup>* 1)

of the potential around the Euclidean time circle would remain nonzero when

2*g*<sup>2</sup>

<sup>2</sup>*L*<sup>2</sup> *<sup>g</sup>µ* <sup>=</sup>

In this expression we defined

Nordstrom-AdS black hole

Action	\n $S = \int d^{d+1}x \sqrt{-g} \left[ \frac{1}{2\kappa^2} \left( R + \frac{d(d-1)}{L^2} \right) - \frac{1}{4g^2} F^2 \right]$ \n
Solution	\n $ds^2 = \frac{L^2}{r^2} \left( -f(r)dt^2 + \frac{dr^2}{f(r)} + dx^i dx^i \right)$ \n
\n $f(r) = 1 - \left( 1 + \frac{r^2 \omega^2}{\gamma^2} \right) \left( \frac{r}{r_+} \right)^d + \frac{r^2 \omega^2}{\gamma^2} \left( \frac{r}{r_+} \right)^{2(d-1)} \underbrace{\gamma^2 = \frac{(d-1)g^2 L^2}{(d-2)\kappa^2}}$ \n	
\n $A_t = \underbrace{\omega} \left[ 1 - \left( \frac{r}{r_+} \right)^{d-2} \right]$ \n	
Electric flux	\n $T = \frac{1}{4\pi r_+} \left( d - \frac{(d-2)r^2 \omega^2}{\gamma^2} \right)$ \n
\n $Q = -\frac{L^{d-1}}{2\kappa^2 r_+^d} \left( 1 + \frac{r_+^2 \mu^2}{\gamma^2} \right) V_{d-1} = \mathcal{F} \left( \frac{T}{\mu} \right) V_{d-1} T^d$ \n	

2

while the Maxwell equation is the Maxwell equation of the Maxwell equation is the Maxwell equation of the Maxwell equation is

2*g*<sup>2</sup>

*dx<sup>i</sup>*

⇤*µFµ* = 0 *.* (58)

2

*,* (59)

⇤*µFµ* = 0 *.* (58)

Looking for solutions to these equations of the form (40) and (56) one finds the Reissner-

temperature can become zero continuously. Recall that with no chemical potential we could

An important feature of (63) relative to the zero chemical potential case (49) is that the

vanishing Euclidean time circle, indicating that the gauge connection is singular.

⇤*µFµ* = 0 *.* (58)

 $\mathbf{F}$ igure 4  $\mathbf{F}$ sity is sourced entirely by field  $\sim$  Operator.  *and*  $*r*$  *are left with the scale set*  $*r*$  *and the dimensionless ratio*  $*r*$ one must keep the field strength *n<sup>a</sup>Fab* fixed at the boundary rather than the potential *Aa*. It can be seen  $\textsf{Field} \simeq \textsf{Operator}$ 



field theory: 4D

Quantum operators

Holographic "duality"



"Strongly" coupled field theory: 4D

Quantum operators

## Non-equilibrium physics



Non-equilibrium process: transport coefficients (viscosity, conductivity)



#### Linear response



#### $\blacksquare$  Haloaranhic conductivity **Pholographic conductivity** action we will use is the Einstein-Maxwell action (54). The Einstein-Maxwell action (54). The background solution is given in  $\Box$ by the 4 dimensional Reissner-Nordstrom-AdS black hole, discussed around (59). Linearis-

**8** Einstein-Maxwell system following two independent equations

$$
S_{\rm EM} = \int_M \mathrm{d}^4 x \sqrt{-g} \left[ R - 2\Lambda - \frac{1}{4} F^2 \right]
$$

Reissner-Nordstrom-AdS black hole **T** = 1 ے۔<br>۷- Vordstrom *.* (5.6) **Exercise Exercise Exercise Constant and we have const** 

*r*+

of the potential around the Euclidean time circle would remain nonzero when

 $\sim$  Boundary field theory at finite temperature and density *x*) *<sup>f</sup> A<sup>x</sup>* <sup>+</sup> *L*2  $\sim$  Boundary tield theory at tinite temperature and density **in the condensation of the Gibbon** 





Strong coupling problems - QCD/nuclear physics



### Elliptic flow: shear viscosity





large elliptic flow small viscosity/entropy strong coupling

#### Experiment vs hydrodynamics simulation





Comparison between RHIC results and hydrodynamic simulations

Holographic  
\n(gravity) result 
$$
\eta = \frac{1}{16\pi G_5} \left(\frac{r_0}{L}\right)^3 = \frac{\pi}{8} N_c^2 T^3 \qquad \frac{\eta}{s} = \frac{1}{4\pi} \sim 0.08 \quad \text{(KSS bound)}
$$
\n
$$
s = \frac{1}{4G_5} \left(\frac{r_0}{L}\right)^3 = \frac{1}{2}\pi^2 N_c^2 T^3
$$

A friend of mine in nuclear physics joked…. The first useful paper to come out of string theory

Strong coupling problems - More than QCD/nuclear physics

#### Ultracold Fermi gas experiment

#### Observation of a Strongly Interacting Degenerate **Fermi Gas of Atoms**

K. M. O'Hara, S. L. Hemmer, M. E. Gehm, S. R. Granade, J. E. Thomas<sup>\*</sup>

+ Author Affiliations

Science 13 Dec 2002: Vol. 298, Issue 5601, pp. 2179-2182<br>DOI: 10.1126/science.1079107



Elliptic flow of a strongly interacting Fermi gas as a function of time after release from a cigar-shaped optical trap



#### Universal bound



Strong coupling problems AdS/CMT

### AdS/CMT

It is often said the conductivity is the first quantity to be measured and the last to be understood



#### Strong interaction

- $\sim$  No quasi particle picture & Fast thermalization
- $\sim$  No Fermi-liquid theory
- ~ "Strange metal" or "Non-Fermi-liquid"









#### Linear-T-resistivity





### Effective classical gravity for strong correlation



AdS/Quantum Information -Entanglement entropy





#### Entanglement Entropy





$$
S_A = -\text{tr}_A \,\rho_A \log \rho_A
$$

$$
\rho_A = \text{tr}_B \,\rho_{tot}
$$

The Simplest Example: two spins (2 qubits) (i)  $|\Psi\rangle = \frac{1}{2} |\hat{\uparrow}\rangle_{A} + |\downarrow\rangle_{A} |\otimes |\hat{\uparrow}\rangle_{B} + |\downarrow\rangle_{B}$  $\Rightarrow \rho_{\scriptscriptstyle{\text{A}}} = \text{Tr}_{\scriptscriptstyle{\text{B}}}\big[|\Psi\rangle\!\big\langle\Psi|\big]\! = \!\frac{1}{2}\,\left[\!\!\left| \uparrow \right\rangle_{\!\scriptscriptstyle{A}} + \big|\downarrow\big\rangle_{\!\scriptscriptstyle{A}}\right]\!\!\cdot\!\left[\!\!\left\langle \uparrow \right|_{\!\scriptscriptstyle{A}} + \big|\downarrow\big|_{\!\scriptscriptstyle{A}}\right].$ 

**Not Entangled** 

 $S_A = 0$ 

$$
\begin{aligned}\n\text{(ii)} \quad |\Psi\rangle &= \left| \left| \uparrow \right\rangle_A \otimes \left| \downarrow \right\rangle_B + \left| \downarrow \right\rangle_A \otimes \left| \uparrow \right\rangle_B \right| \, / \sqrt{2} \\
&\Rightarrow \rho_A = \text{Tr}_B \left[ |\Psi\rangle \langle \Psi| \right] = \frac{1}{2} \left[ \left| \uparrow \right\rangle_A \langle \uparrow|_A + \left| \downarrow \right\rangle_A \langle \downarrow|_A \right]\n\end{aligned}
$$

Entangled

 $S_{\alpha} = \log 2$ 

#### Entanglement Entropy



$$
S_A = -\text{tr}_A \rho_A \log \rho_A
$$

$$
\rho_A = \text{tr}_B \rho_{tot}
$$



$$
S_A = \frac{\text{Area}(\gamma_A)}{4G_N^{(d+2)}}
$$

Successful agreements with field theory computation





#### Entanglement Entropy and Quantum information



AdS/Quantum Information -Entanglement is not enough?

#### *<sup>t</sup>therm* ⇠ *<sup>t</sup>comp < K<sup>p</sup>* time to thermalize or get maximally complex **Complexity**

*Smax* = *K* log 2 maximum entropy

The thing to notice is the spectrum than the spectrum the spectrum division the classical and quantum division

*r<sup>h</sup>* is the horizon radius. At the left panel, *B* is the maximum codimension-one surface connecting



and *tR*.

### Holographic conjecture for complexity

the dual boundary conformal field theory (CFT). In this study, they consider the eternal

closure (inner region with the boundary) of all space-like codimension-one surfaces connecting *t<sup>L</sup>*

CV (complexity-volume) **CA** (complexity-action)

For and *I*<br> **E**<br>
Stanford and Susskind: 1406.2678] [Susskind: 1402.5674



$$
C_V = \max_{\partial \Sigma = t_L \cup t_R} \left[ \frac{V(\Sigma)}{G_N \ell} \right] \qquad C_A = \frac{I_{\text{WDW}}}{\pi \hbar}
$$

- Equation of motion **CONTENSIST** Bou
- **faces which connect and** *t*R and **is a length scale:** and *t* ampiguily **the number of the number of t**

[Brown, Roberts, Susskind Swingle and Zhao: 1509.07876, 1512.04993]



$$
\mathcal{C}_A=\frac{I_{\rm WDW}}{\pi\hbar}
$$

- The WOM patch associated with the MOUTH associated with the contraction of all space-like surface-like surface-<br>The concernity surface contractive surface con-- Boundary terms
	- Singularity

or

 $\bullet$  Complexity geometry is a Finsler geometry. **o** Complexity geometry is a Finsler geometry. *Hr*(*s*) = *ic*˙(*s*)*c*(*s*)  $\bullet$  Complexity geometry is a Finsler geometry.

*Hr*(*s*) = *ic*˙(*s*)*c*(*s*)

*F*˜(*Hl*(*s*)) is left-invariant. However, if we require the unitary invariance (2.14) we obtain

*F*˜(*Hl*(*s*)) is left-invariant. However, if we require the unitary invariance (2.14) we obtain

• Puzzle: for a given operator, the right(-invariant) complexity and Left(-invariant) complexity are different.  $\frac{1}{2}$  and  $\frac{1}{2}$  are different  $\text{complexity}$  are different.<br> $\tilde{D}(tt = 1)$ ,  $\tilde{D}(tt = 1)$ ,  $\tilde{D}(tt = 1)$ 

$$
\tilde{F}(H_r = i\dot{c}c^{-1}) \neq \tilde{F}(H_l = ic^{-1}\dot{c})
$$

<sup>1</sup> *, Hl*(*s*) = *ic*(*s*)

1*c*˙(*s*)*,* (2.8)

• By considering physical conditions, the puzzle is resolved: Left/right equivalence and bi-invariace.  $F$  $H_{\alpha}U^{\dagger}$  $\frac{1}{\sqrt{2\pi}}$  is a geodesic if and only if the constant generator  $\frac{1}{\sqrt{2\pi}}$   $\frac{1}{\sqrt{2\pi}}$   $\frac{1}{\sqrt{2\pi}}$ *c*<sup> $f$ </sup> ( $\pi_{\alpha}$ ) =  $f$  ( $U \pi_{\alpha} U'$ )  $\pi_{\alpha}$ *<sup>F</sup>*˜(*H<sup>r</sup>* <sup>=</sup> *icc*˙ 1) <sup>6</sup><sup>=</sup> *<sup>F</sup>*˜(*H<sup>l</sup>* <sup>=</sup> *ic*1*c*˙) (2.10) such that [54, 55]  $\tilde{F}(H_{\alpha}) = \tilde{F}(\hat{U}H_{\alpha}\hat{U}^{\dagger})$ )*,* 8*U* 2 SU(*n*)*,* (4.9)

$$
\tilde{F}(H_r = i\dot{c}c^{-1}) = \tilde{F}(H_l = ic^{-1}\dot{c})
$$

• SU(n) operator complexity is uniquely determined.  $\bullet$  SU(n) operator complexity is uniquely determined. *<sup>C</sup>*(*O*ˆ) = min*{F*˜(*H*¯ ) *<sup>|</sup>* <sup>8</sup> *H, s.t.,* ¯ exp(*iH*¯ ) = *<sup>O</sup>*ˆ*} ,* (2.19)

$$
\mathcal{C}(\hat{O}) = \min \left\{ \text{Tr}\sqrt{\bar{H}\bar{H}}^{\dagger} \mid \forall \bar{H}, s.t., \exp(-i\bar{H}) = \hat{O} \right\} \quad \text{(Finsler)}
$$
\n
$$
\mathcal{C}(\hat{O}) = \min \left\{ \left[ \text{Tr}\left(\bar{H}\bar{H}^{\dagger}\right)^{\frac{p}{2}} \right]^{\frac{1}{p}} \mid \forall \bar{H}, s.t., \exp(-i\bar{H}) = \hat{O} \right\}
$$

#### may sum them up. However, for a given costs,  $\alpha$  and  $\alpha$  a given costs (lengths)  $\alpha$ *<sup>|</sup>* <sup>8</sup> *H, s.t.,* ¯ exp(*iH*¯ ) = *<sup>O</sup>*<sup>ˆ</sup>  $Applications?$  $\mu$ , pplications?

o SYK model: complexity arowth in a chaotic model  $\frac{1}{2}$ • SYK model: complexity growth in a chaotic model  $\overline{O}$  CVK model. complexity arouth in a chaotic model  $m_{\rm H}$  sum them up. However, for a given curve, we may have two different costs(lengths)  $\sim$  $\bullet\,$  SYK model: complexity growth in a chaotic model  $\mathcal{O}(\mathcal{O})$  argue that the complexity may not be directly may not be directly observable and it is possible and it is possi **C** sin model: complexity growth in a chaofic model

#### paper [54]. The SYK model is a quantum-mechanical system comprised of *N* (an even integral majorana fermions in with the Hamiltonian state  $\mathbb{R}^n$ integer) Majorana fermions *<sup>i</sup>* with the Hamiltonian  $\mathcal{L} = 1.1$  Note that the complexity in Eq. (2.15) is no longer that the minimal mi Complexity growth

<sup>8</sup>*V, s.t.* exp(*iV* ) = *<sup>U</sup>*ˆ(*t*) = exp(*iH*(*<sup>J</sup> , N*)*t*)

*V V †*

í

**SK model** 
$$
H(\mathcal{J}, N) = \sum_{i < j < k < l}^{N} J_{ijkl} \chi_i \chi_j \chi_k \chi_l \qquad \text{(N Majorana Fermions)}
$$
\n
$$
\boxed{\text{menn = 0} \quad \text{variance} \quad \sigma^2 = \frac{6 \mathcal{J}^2}{N^3}}
$$
\n
$$
\boxed{\text{Complexity} \quad \mathcal{C}(t) = \min \left\{ \lambda \text{ Tr} \sqrt{V V^{\dagger}} \mid \forall V, \text{ s.t. } \exp(-iV) = \hat{U}(t) = \exp(-iH(\mathcal{J}, N)t) \right\}}
$$
\n
$$
\boxed{V - \sum_{n=1}^{2^{N/2}} (E_n t + 2\pi k_n) |n\rangle \langle n| \quad k_n \in \mathbb{N} \sum_{n=1}^{2^{N/2}} k_n = 0}
$$
\n
$$
\mathcal{C}(t) = \min \left\{ \sum_{n=1}^{2^{N/2}} |E_n t + 2\pi k_n| \middle| \forall k_n \in \mathbb{N}, \text{ s.t. } \sum_{n=1}^{2^{N/2}} k_n = 0 \right\}
$$
\n
$$
\begin{array}{c}\n\text{4000} \\
+ \text{4000} \\
-\frac{N - 18}{N - 2N} \\
- \text{4000} \\
-\frac{N - 18}{N - 2N} \\
\text{5000} \\
- \text{4000} \\
-\frac{N - 18}{N - 2N} \\
\text{6000} \\
\text{7000} \\
\text{8000} \\
\text{9000} \\
\text{10000} \\
\text{10000} \\
\text{1000} \\
\text{10
$$

*N*

2

*.* (2.15)

 $\mathcal{L}(\mathcal{X})$ 

<sup>6</sup>*<sup>J</sup>* <sup>2</sup>

*<sup>N</sup>*<sup>3</sup> *.* (2.14)

make a comment on other choices of *p* later. As discussed in the subsection, for a unitary

Here we first take = 1. Note that the complexity in Eq. (2.15) is no longer the minimal

geodesic of a Riemannian geometry but the minimal geodesic of a Finsler geometry. To

In the following discussions, we will focus on the case *p* = 1 in axiom G3. We will

tially complex. The statements about time statements about time scales for the statement  $\mathcal{C}$ 

and recurrences are assuming the actual evolution of the system is generated by what I'll

#### $\overline{\mathcal{L}}$  $\overline{\phantom{a}}$ *N/*2 *|Ent* + 2⇡*kn|*  $\overline{\phantom{a}}$ S  $\overline{\phantom{0}}$ 8*k<sup>n</sup>* 2 N*, s. t.* **Complexity growth** and the scaling transformation (2.32) to complex the case of fixing the case of fixing to the case of fixing the case of fixing total convert to the case of fixing total convert to the case of fixing to (5) Repeat steps (1)-(4) many times so that the average of *C*(*t*) converges. In the left panel of Fig. 2, we show the complexity growth for h*E*i = 1 and *N* =

16*,* 18*,* 20*,* 22. we find that the complexity grows linearly at early time! There is a crit-

energy *E*;

*C*(*t*) = min

$$
\mathcal{C}(t) = \min \left\{ \left. \sum_{n=1}^{2^{N/2}} |E_n t + 2\pi k_n| \right| \, \forall k_n \right\}
$$

ī Ï X<br>X

2

 $\mathcal{L}$ 

*n*=1

8 <

:

As the operator *V* in Eq. (2.16) has a diagonal form, Eq. (2.15) becomes

$$
\mathcal{C}(t) \approx \sum_{n=1}^{2^{N/2}} |E_n t - 2\pi |[E_n t/2\pi]]|
$$
\n
$$
[1.2]| = 1, [[1.
$$
\n
$$
\mathcal{C}(t) \approx \sum_{n=1}^{2^{N/2}} |E_n|t \qquad t < \frac{\pi}{E_{\text{max}}} \qquad \left( t_c \sim \frac{\pi}{E_{\text{max}}} \right) \sim \frac{2^{N/2}}{\langle E \rangle}
$$
\n
$$
\text{More general analysis:}
$$
\n
$$
\text{[total energy" } \langle E \rangle \approx \sum_{n=1}^{2^{N/2}} |E_n|
$$
\n
$$
\text{SYK information} \qquad \text{Work in progress}
$$
\n
$$
\left( \frac{E}{E} \right) = 2^{N/2} \langle E_{\text{max}}(\mathcal{J}, N) \rangle
$$
\n
$$
\left( \frac{E}{E} \right) = 2^{N/2} \langle E_{\text{max}}(\mathcal{J}, N) \rangle
$$
\n
$$
\left( \frac{E}{E} \right) = 2^{N/2} \langle E_{\text{max}}(\mathcal{J}, N) \rangle
$$
\n
$$
\text{For fixing J (consequently fixing Emax), see}
$$
\n
$$
\text{``Quantum complexity of time evolution with chaotic Hamiltonian'' [1905.05765]}
$$

**Example 1 |**<br>Equantum complexity of time evolution with "Quantum complexity of time evolution with 1*,* 1 su Balasubramanian, DeCross, Kar, Parrikar, Manazarta, 2014, Indiana di Manazarta, Balasubramanian, DeCross, Kar, Parrikar, . (2.36). (2.3 will be conserved; in discussion of the complexity of the system of To make the theory of time evolution with chaotic Hamiltonian" [1905.05765]<br>"Ralasubramanian DeCross Kar Parrikar may ask is "For an isolated system driven by a given energy *E*, how fast can the complexity **For fixing J (consequently fixing E\_max), see<br>"Quantum complexity of time evolution with chaotic Hamiltonian" [1905.05765]** 

; *.* (2.18)

## Summary and outlook

#### History of gauge/gravity duality

#### 97 98 99 00 01 02 03 04 05 06 07 08 09 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19



#### In a bigger context: overview on holographic duality







### Research Directions in Quantum Field Theory and String Theory 2020

## The workshop for Prof. *Chaiho Rim*



# T*ank you*

46