

PREPARED FOR SUBMISSION TO JHEP

Beyond 2-to-2: Geometrization of Entanglement Wedge Connectivity in Holographic Scattering

Bowen Zhao

Beijing Institute of Mathematical Sciences and Applications, Beijing, China

E-mail: bowenzhao@bimsa.cn

ABSTRACT: We extend recent discussions on generalization of the Connected Wedge Theorem about 2-to-2 holographic scattering problem to n -to- n scatterings ($n > 2$). In this broader setting, the theorem provides a weaker necessary condition for the connectedness of boundary entanglement wedges than previously identified. Besides, we prove a novel sufficient condition for this connectedness. We also present a analysis of the criteria ensuring a non-empty entanglement wedge intersection region \mathcal{S}_E . These results refine the holographic dictionary between geometric connectivity and quantum entanglement for general multi-particle scattering.

KEYWORDS: AdS/CFT Correspondence, Holographic Entanglement Entropy, Entanglement Wedge, Scattering Amplitudes, Superadditivity

Contents

1	Introduction	1
1.1	Notations and Assumptions	3
2	Review and Preliminary	4
2.1	Boundary setup of n -to- n scattering	4
2.2	Causal Anchoring Principle	6
2.3	Intersections among wedge horizons	6
2.4	Characterization of connected entanglement wedges	8
3	Generalizing the n-to-n Connected Wedge Theorem	9
3.1	An improvement of the n -to- n connected wedge theorem	9
3.2	Consequences of connected entanglement wedges	13
3.3	Generalized bulk scattering regions	18
4	Conclusion and Discussion	19
4.1	An observation about different generalizations of the 2-to-2 connected wedge theorem	19
4.2	Future Direction	20

1 Introduction

The AdS/CFT correspondence posits a duality between a quantum gravity theory in an asymptotically Anti-de Sitter (AdS) spacetime M and a conformal field theory (CFT) on its boundary ∂M [1, 2]. A foundational requirement is the consistency of causal structure between the bulk and the boundary. Gao and Wald proved that, assuming the null energy condition and global hyperbolicity, bulk causality cannot violate boundary causality: if two boundary points are connected by a causal curve through the bulk, they are also connectable by a causal curve restricted to the boundary [3].

A more profound consistency requirement emerges for asymptotic quantum tasks involving multiple boundary regions. Consider an asymptotic n -to- n scattering configuration on ∂M , specified by n disjoint input regions V_1, \dots, V_n and n disjoint output regions W_1, \dots, W_n . Local scattering processes can occur in the bulk that have no direct boundary counterpart, termed bulk-only scattering.

For the 2-to-2 case ($n = 2$), the Connected Wedge Theorem (CWT) [4] establishes that for such a bulk-only process, the associated boundary regions V_1 and V_2 must share $O(1/G_N)$ mutual information, $I(V_1 : V_2) \sim O(1/G_N)$. This implies that a local bulk scattering process necessitates nonlocal boundary protocols.

Via the Hubeny-Rangamani-Ryu-Takayanagi (HRRT) formula, this large mutual information has a geometric interpretation: the entanglement wedge of $V_1 \cup V_2$ becomes connected. Under standard assumptions (AdS-hyperbolicity, the null energy condition, and the maximin construction for HRRT surfaces), the CWT can be stated geometrically [4]:

Theorem 1.1. *Under standard assumptions, for a 2-to-2 bulk-only scattering configuration, the entanglement wedge of $V_1 \cup V_2$ is connected.*

Recent works have elevated the statement of the Connected Wedge Theorem to a precise equivalence [5, 6]. It shows that the existence of $O(1/G_N)$ mutual information between the two input regions V_1 and V_2 is equivalent to the non-emptiness of a generalized bulk scattering region, denoted \tilde{S}_E . This region is defined as the intersection between the entanglement wedge of the union of input regions (excluding the wedges of the individual input regions) and the entanglement wedge of the union of output regions (similarly excluding the wedges of individual output regions). This result provides a complete geometric characterization of quantum nonlocal scattering for the 2-to-2 case. We refer the reader to [5] for a comprehensive review on 2-to-2 scattering.

In this paper, we extend this analysis to general asymptotic n -to- n scattering processes with $n > 2$. A necessary condition for the connectedness of the input entanglement wedge $\mathcal{E}(V_1 \cup \dots \cup V_n)$ was previously derived in ref. [7].

Theorem 1.2. *Under standard assumptions, if the 2-to-all graph $\Gamma_{2 \rightarrow \text{all}}$ is connected, then the entanglement wedge $\mathcal{E}(V_1 \cup \dots \cup V_n)$ is connected.*

The 2-to-all graph $\Gamma_{2 \rightarrow \text{all}}$ is defined as the graph whose vertices $\{1, \dots, n\}$ represent n input regions V_1, \dots, V_n . An edge $j - k$ between vertices j and k is inserted if

$$J^+[\mathcal{E}(V_j)] \cap J^+[\mathcal{E}(V_k)] \cap J^-[\mathcal{E}(W_1)] \cdots \cap J^-[\mathcal{E}(W_n)] \neq \emptyset. \quad (1.1)$$

where J^\pm denotes the causal future/past in the bulk spacetime and \mathcal{E} denotes an entanglement wedge.

Our main contributions are as follows. We first prove a weaker necessary condition for wedge connectedness than Theorem 1.2 (Section 3.1). Specifically, we show that connectedness of $\mathcal{E}(V_1 \cup \dots \cup V_n)$ can be guaranteed by a much simpler condition:

Theorem 1.3. *Assume the standard conditions listed in Assumption 1. If there exists a pair $i \neq j$ such that*

$$J^+[\mathcal{E}_W(V_i)] \cap J^+[\mathcal{E}_W(V_j)] \cap \bigcap_{k=1}^n J^-[\mathcal{E}_W(W_k)] \neq \emptyset \quad (1.2)$$

then the entanglement wedge $\mathcal{E}(V_1 \cup \dots \cup V_n)$ is connected.

In particular, our theorem only requires existence of one pair $k \neq l$ satisfying (1.2) while the previous theorem requires at least $n - 1$ such pairs. The proof reveals an even weaker condition than stated above, though with a less transparent physical interpretation.

We then provide a new, independent sufficient condition for the connectedness of the input entanglement wedges, including

Theorem 1.4. *Assume the standard conditions listed in Assumption 1. If $\mathcal{E}(V_1 \cup \dots \cup V_n)$ and $\mathcal{E}(W_1 \cup \dots \cup W_n)$ are both connected, then there exists at least a pair of enlarged output regions \tilde{W}_i and \tilde{W}_j satisfying $(Y_i \cup Y_j)^c = \tilde{W}_i \cup \tilde{W}_j$ and that*

$$\mathcal{E}(V_1 \cup \dots \cup V_n) \cap \mathcal{E}(\tilde{W}_i \cup \tilde{W}_j) \neq \emptyset, \quad (1.3)$$

where $Y_1 \cup \dots \cup Y_n$ is the causal complement of output regions $W_1 \cup \dots \cup W_n$

See Theorem 3.1 below for a complete statement.

Finally, motivated by the pivotal role of the entanglement wedge intersection $\mathcal{S}_E = \mathcal{E}(V_1 \cup V_2) \cap \mathcal{E}(W_1 \cup W_2)$ in the complete characterization of 2-to-2 scattering, we analyze its generalization for n -to- n processes. We provide a necessary condition for $\mathcal{S}_E \neq \emptyset$ (Theorem 3.2). Our analysis indicates that for $n > 2$, a non-trivial \mathcal{S}_E is governed by a more restrictive criterion than the simple connectedness of the input and output wedges, reflecting the increased complexity of multi-party scattering.

The paper is organized as follows. Section 2.1 reviews the n -to- n scattering setup on ∂M . Section 2.2 recalls the causal anchoring principle. Section 2.3 summarizes key geometric observations on null sheet intersections. Section 2.4 reviews lemmas for characterizing multi-wedge connectivity. Our main results on necessary conditions and sufficient conditions for wedge connectedness are presented in Sections 3.1 and 3.2, respectively. Section 3.3 discusses conditions for $\mathcal{S}_E \neq \emptyset$. We conclude with a discussion in Section 4. In particular, section 4.1 compares different null sheet constructions.

1.1 Notations and Assumptions

Here we summarize the notations, conventions, and assumptions used throughout this paper.

We adopt natural units with $\hbar = c = 1$ and set the AdS length scale $l_{\text{AdS}} = 1$, while keeping Newton's constant G_N explicit. Our notation follows ref. [8], using the mostly-plus metric signature.

- **Spacetime regions:** Bulk regions are denoted by script letters $(\mathcal{U}, \mathcal{V}, \mathcal{W}, \dots)$, while boundary regions use straight capitals (U, V, W, \dots) . The same symbol may denote either a causal diamond or its Cauchy surface, with the meaning clear from context.
- **Cauchy slices:** Bulk Cauchy slices are denoted by Σ with appropriate subscripts, boundary Cauchy slices by $\hat{\Sigma}$ with subscripts. By abuse of notation, Σ may also refer to Cauchy slices of the conformally compactified spacetime.
- **Causal structure:** The bulk causal future/past of region \mathcal{V} is $J^\pm[\mathcal{V}]$; for boundary region V , we write $J^\pm[V]$ for bulk causal influence and $\hat{J}^\pm[V]$ for boundary causal influence.
- **Domains of dependence:** The bulk domain of dependence of \mathcal{V} is $\mathcal{D}[\mathcal{V}]$; the boundary domain of dependence of V is $\hat{D}[V]$. The future and past horizons of a causal domain V is $\hat{H}^\pm[V]$.

- **Entanglement structures:** For boundary region V , we denote the entanglement wedge by $\mathcal{E}(V)$, causal wedge by $\mathcal{C}(V)$, and HRRT surface by $\text{RT}(V)$.
- **Complements:** The causal complement (bulk or boundary) uses prime notation ($'$), while set-theoretic complement within a Cauchy slice uses superscript c .

Assumption 1. *We assume throughout that:*

1. *The bulk spacetime M satisfies the null curvature condition;*
2. *HRRT surfaces can be found via a maximin procedure;*
3. *The spacetime is AdS-hyperbolic (the conformal compactification $\overline{M} = M \cup \partial M$ admits a Cauchy slice);*
4. *The spacetime region between some Cauchy slice preceding $\mathcal{E}(V_1 \cup V_2)$ and some Cauchy slice following $\mathcal{E}(W_1 \cup W_2)$ is singularity-free.*
5. *The global boundary state is pure, ensuring that a boundary region V and its causal complement V' share the same HRRT surface.*

2 Review and Preliminary

2.1 Boundary setup of n -to- n scattering

The set-up of n -to- n asymptotic scattering is discussed in detail in ref. [7]. We summarize the setup here with a slightly different formulation.

The boundary configuration for the n -to- n scattering process consists of input points c_1, c_2, \dots, c_n and output points r_1, r_2, \dots, r_n . Let $\hat{\Sigma}_1$ be a boundary spacelike Cauchy slice containing all c_i 's and Let $\hat{\Sigma}_2$ be a boundary spacelike Cauchy slice containing all r_j 's. A case of $n = 3$ is shown in Figure 1 for illustration.

Recall that the input/decision regions and output regions are defined as

$$\begin{aligned} V_i &= \hat{J}^+(c_i) \cap \hat{J}^-(r_1) \cap \dots \cap \hat{J}^-(r_n), \\ W_i &= \hat{J}^-(r_i) \cap \hat{J}^+(c_1) \cap \dots \cap \hat{J}^+(c_n) \end{aligned}$$

which are all non-empty sets on the boundary by construction. That is, each input c_i can causally signal all outputs and each output r_i can be causally signaled by all inputs c_i . Meanwhile, we require pairwise intersection among these input and output regions to be empty, i.e.

$$\begin{aligned} V_i \cap V_j &= \emptyset, & W_i \cap W_j &= \emptyset, & \forall i \neq j \\ V_i \cap W_j &= \emptyset, & & & \forall i, j \end{aligned} \tag{2.1}$$

That is, we require 2-to- n and n -to-2 scattering regions are empty on the boundary.

We will that these requirements force the null rays from c_i 's and r_j 's form a lattice on the timelike boundary ∂M . To explain this, we label future antipodal points of c_i by α_i




Figure 1. Boundary set-up of 3-to-3 scattering process. Points c_1, \dots, c_n denote inputs while points r_1, \dots, r_n denote outputs. The point α_i is the conjugate point of c_i while the point β_j is the conjugate point of r_j . Input regions V_i , with spacelike boundary points a_i and b_i , and output regions W_j , with spacelike boundary points e_j and f_j , are also shown.

and past antipodal points of r_j by β_j . For example, α_1 the future antipodal point of c_1 on ∂M , that is, the two future-directed null geodesics emanating from c_1 converge at α_1 . Similarly, the two past-directed null geodesics from r_j converge at β_j .

To start with, we label c_i and r_j such that the number increases to the right, or c_1, \dots, c_n and r_1, \dots, r_n are ordered counterclockwise when viewed from the future time direction. Since the boundary is topologically $S^1 \times \mathbb{R}^1$, we always count modulo n ; that is, $1 = n + 1 \pmod n$, $0 = n \pmod n$ and $-1 = n - 1 \pmod n$ etc. We choose an arbitrary input point to be c_1 , and the labels of all other input points then follow from the ordering. We still have the freedom to choose which output point is r_1 .

Since c_1 could causally signal all output points, its future antipodal point α_1 must lie between two *adjacent* output points. We can use the freedom of labeling r_1 to choose r_1 to be the output point to the right of α_1 . Then, it follows that α_i must lie between r_{i-1} and r_i for all $i \in \{1, \dots, n\}$. As a result, we have $\alpha_1, r_1, \dots, \alpha_n, r_n$ cyclically ordered (counterclockwise when viewed from future direction) on $\hat{\Sigma}_2$ (we can choose $\hat{\Sigma}_2$ to also contain all α_i 's).

Similarly, since r_j can be causally signaled by all c_i , its past antipodal point β_j must lie between two *adjacent* input points. It is not difficult to see that β_j is forced to lie between c_j and c_{j+1} (Figure 1). Therefore, on $\hat{\Sigma}_1$ (chosen to also contain all β_j 's), we have $c_1, \beta_1, \dots, c_n, \beta_n$ in cyclic order, whose future light rays to the right and to the left form a coordinate lattice on ∂M . These light rays are also past light rays to the left and to the right, respectively, from $\alpha_1, r_1, \dots, \alpha_n, r_n$.

Figure 1 summarizes the setup for $n = 3$. Since we use the flat metric for the conformal boundary ∂M as usual, one can trust one's intuition in generalizing Figure 1 to general n .

We also label X_j and Y_i associated to β_j and α_i . That is,

$$\begin{aligned} X_i &= \hat{J}^+[\beta_i] \cap \hat{J}^-[\alpha_1] \cap \cdots \cap \hat{J}^-[\alpha_n], \\ Y_i &= \hat{J}^-[\alpha_i] \cap \hat{J}^+[\beta_1] \cap \hat{J}^-[\beta_n], \end{aligned}$$

Since c_i and α_i are antipodal to each other, V_i and Y_i will show up together in following analysis. Similar is true for X_j and W_j . For later convenience, we also label spacelike boundaries of V_i , following [7]. Let a_i be the common boundary between V_i and X_{i-1} and b_i be the common boundary between V_i and X_{i+1} . Let e_i be the common boundary between W_i and Y_i and f_i be the common boundary between W_i and Y_{i+1} . We note that the relative labelling of c_i and α_i differs from that in ref. [5] (the α_2 there would be α_1 here).

2.2 Causal Anchoring Principle

We recall a crucial observation made in ref. [5]. The Gao-Wald Theorem implies that for a boundary causal domain $V = \hat{J}^-[p] \cap \hat{J}^+[q]$, the bulk causal wedge is $J^+[p] \cap J^-[q]$. Taking c_1 as an example, both the causal surface of V_1 and that of Y_1^c lie on the null sheet $\partial J^+[c_1]$, equaling its intersection with appropriate bulk Cauchy slices.

Theorems in ref. [9] generalize the Gao-Wald Theorem to homology regions:

$$\mathcal{E}(V) \cap \partial M = \hat{D}(V), \quad (2.2)$$

$$J^\pm[RT(V)] \cap \partial M = \hat{J}^\pm[\partial V]. \quad (2.3)$$

$$(2.4)$$

Specifically, null sheets emanating from HRRT surfaces of a causal domain V are anchored at $\hat{J}^\pm[\partial V]$ on ∂M . The same is true for null sheets emanating from causal surfaces, due to the causal wedge-entanglement wedge inclusion.

In asymptotically global AdS spacetimes, matter/curvature distorts bulk null sheets \mathcal{N} relative to their pure AdS counterparts \mathcal{N}' , but their boundary restrictions $\mathcal{N} \cap \partial M$ coincide. Our proof strategy therefore uses boundary null rays from relevant points to constrain the bulk geometry of entanglement wedges and causal wedges.

2.3 Intersections among wedge horizons

The following proofs rely extensively on geometric relations among null sheets emanating from HRRT surfaces. We therefore summarize the key results here.

Lemma 2.1. *Let c_1, c_2 be two distinct points on a boundary Cauchy slice of the timelike boundary ∂M . Then the intersection of their boundary causal futures consists of two points,*

$$\hat{J}^+[c_1] \cap \hat{J}^+[c_2] = \{p, q\}.$$

Consider two bulk causal boundaries \mathcal{N}_1 and \mathcal{N}_2 satisfying

$$\mathcal{N}_1 \cap \partial M = \hat{J}^+[c_1], \quad \mathcal{N}_2 \cap \partial M = \hat{J}^+[c_2].$$

Then the intersection of the two null sheets

$$\mathcal{R} = \mathcal{N}_1 \cap \mathcal{N}_2$$

is a continuous, spacelike, simple (non-self-intersecting) curve with endpoints p_1 and p_2 . In addition, \mathcal{R} lies entirely in the bulk except for its endpoints. We will denote such intersecting curves as ridges.

Equivalently, $\mathcal{N}_1 \cup \mathcal{N}_2$ cut the full spacetime into four parts.

Remark 2.2. Lemma 2.1 obviously applies to $\mathcal{R} = \partial J^+[c_1] \cap \partial J^+[c_2]$. In the following, we apply the lemma to the intersection of two null sheets emanating from HRRT surfaces that are anchored at $\partial \hat{J}^+[c_i]$, e.g. $\mathcal{R}_{V_1, V_2} = \partial J^+[RT(V_1)] \cap \partial J^+[RT(V_2)]$.

That two causal boundaries cut the full spacetime into four parts fails in general. Counter examples can be easily constructed in Minkowski using compact sets with non-convex boundaries.

Proof. By assumption, $\mathcal{N}_i \cap \partial M = \partial \hat{J}^+[c_i]$, so $p, q \in \mathcal{R}$. Let α_1 be the future antipodal point of c_1 . Note that $\partial \hat{J}[c_1] = \partial \hat{J}^-[c_1]$ consists of two parts: one part connects p to α_1 and to q , denoted by γ_1 , while the other part connects p to c_1 and to q , denoted by γ_2 . Then $\gamma_1, \gamma_2 \subset \mathcal{N}_1$ and moreover, γ_1 is to the future of \mathcal{N}_2 and γ_2 is to the past of \mathcal{N}_2 .

It is a standard result that causal boundaries such as \mathcal{N}_1 and \mathcal{N}_2 are codimension-one C^0 submanifolds in \bar{M} (see e.g. Theorem 8.1.3 in [8]). Then \mathcal{N}_2 continuously separates the spacetime \bar{M} and hence also \mathcal{N}_1 into two parts: to the future of \mathcal{N}_2 and to the past of \mathcal{N}_2 . Therefore, \mathcal{R} must be homotopic to both γ_1 and γ_2 on \mathcal{N}_1 . In other words, one should be able to continuously deform γ_1 and γ_2 along \mathcal{N}_1 , keeping γ_1 to the future of \mathcal{N}_2 and γ_2 to the future of \mathcal{N}_2 , until they coincide. This proves the Lemma. \square

Corollary 2.3. Let c_1, c_2 and β be three distinct points on a boundary Cauchy slice of the timelike boundary ∂M . Then the intersection of their boundary causal futures are pairwise nonempty. Consider three bulk causal boundaries $\mathcal{N}_1, \mathcal{N}_2$ and \mathcal{N}_3 satisfying

$$\mathcal{N}_1 \cap \partial M = \hat{J}^+[c_1], \quad \mathcal{N}_2 \cap \partial M = \hat{J}^+[c_2], \quad \mathcal{N}_3 \cap \partial M = \hat{J}^+[\beta].$$

Then the three null sheets intersect at a single point

$$O = \mathcal{R}_{\mathcal{N}_1, \mathcal{N}_2} \cap \mathcal{R}_{\mathcal{N}_1, \mathcal{N}_3} = \mathcal{R}_{\mathcal{N}_1, \mathcal{N}_2} \cap \mathcal{R}_{\mathcal{N}_2, \mathcal{N}_3} = \mathcal{R}_{\mathcal{N}_1, \mathcal{N}_3} \cap \mathcal{R}_{\mathcal{N}_2, \mathcal{N}_3} = \mathcal{N}_1 \cap \mathcal{N}_2 \cap \mathcal{N}_3.$$

Proof. Since c_1, c_2, β are distinct points on a spacelike boundary Cauchy slice, the ridge $\mathcal{R}_{\mathcal{N}_1, \mathcal{N}_2} = \mathcal{N}_1 \cap \mathcal{N}_2$ is transverse to \mathcal{N}_3 . Therefore, $\mathcal{R}_{\mathcal{N}_1 \cap \mathcal{N}_2} \cap \mathcal{N}_3$ is nonempty and is of dimension 0. We only need to exclude the possibility that $\mathcal{R}_{\mathcal{N}_1 \cap \mathcal{N}_2} \cap \mathcal{N}_3$ consists of multiple points.

Suppose $\mathcal{R}_{\mathcal{N}_1 \cap \mathcal{N}_2} \cap \mathcal{N}_3$ consists of more than one point, then $\mathcal{R}_{\mathcal{N}_1 \cap \mathcal{N}_2}$ both enters and leaves the future (or past) of \mathcal{N}_3 at least once. This implies that at least one of \mathcal{N}_1 and \mathcal{N}_2 enters and leaves the future/past of \mathcal{N}_3 . This contradicts the previous observations that two such null sheets as $\mathcal{N}_3 \cup \mathcal{N}_1$ or $\mathcal{N}_3 \cup \mathcal{N}_2$ separate the spacetime into four parts. \square

Corollary 2.4. *Let c_1, c_2 and β_1, β_2 be four distinct points on a boundary Cauchy slice of the timelike boundary ∂M . Let $\mathcal{N}_1 = \partial J^+[\mathcal{U}_1]$ and $\mathcal{N}_2 = \partial J^+[\mathcal{U}_2]$ be two bulk future causal boundaries satisfying*

$$\mathcal{N}_1 \cap \partial M = \hat{J}^+[c_1], \quad \mathcal{N}_2 \cap \partial M = \hat{J}^+[c_2].$$

Let $\mathcal{N}_3 = \partial J^-[\mathcal{U}_3]$ and $\mathcal{N}_4 = \partial J^-[\mathcal{U}_4]$ be two bulk past causal boundaries satisfying

$$\mathcal{N}_3 \cap \partial M = \hat{J}^+[\beta_1], \quad \mathcal{N}_4 \cap \partial M = \hat{J}^+[\beta_2].$$

Then the possible configurations of the four null sheets are

- $J^+[\mathcal{U}_1] \cap J^+[\mathcal{U}_2] \cap J^-[\mathcal{U}_3] \cap J^-[\mathcal{U}_4] \neq \emptyset$, or equivalently, $\mathcal{D}[\mathcal{U}'_1] \cap \mathcal{D}[\mathcal{U}'_2] \cap \mathcal{D}[\mathcal{U}'_3] \cap \mathcal{D}[\mathcal{U}'_4] = \emptyset$.
We also refer to this configuration as $\mathcal{R}_{\mathcal{U}_1, \mathcal{U}_2}$ lies below $\mathcal{R}_{\mathcal{U}_3, \mathcal{U}_4}$.
- $J^+[\mathcal{U}_1] \cap J^+[\mathcal{U}_2] \cap J^-[\mathcal{U}_3] \cap J^-[\mathcal{U}_4] = \emptyset$, or equivalently, $\mathcal{D}[\mathcal{U}'_1] \cap \mathcal{D}[\mathcal{U}'_2] \cap \mathcal{D}[\mathcal{U}'_3] \cap \mathcal{D}[\mathcal{U}'_4] \neq \emptyset$.
We also refer to this configuration as $\mathcal{R}_{\mathcal{U}_1, \mathcal{U}_2}$ lies above $\mathcal{R}_{\mathcal{U}_3, \mathcal{U}_4}$.

Remark 2.5. *These results exclude two additional possible arrangements of two pairs of causal boundaries considered in our previous work: that the two ridges intertwining, i.e. one spiraling around the other and that two ridges intersect at more than one point.*

2.4 Characterization of connected entanglement wedges

Lastly, we recall some basic facts about a multiparty entanglement wedge being connected or multiparty mutual information being nonzero.

Lemma 2.6. *Consider a union of disjoint subsets $V_1 \cup \dots \cup V_n$ and its causal complement $X_1 \cup \dots \cup X_n = (V_1 \cup \dots \cup V_n)'$. The following are equivalent:*

1. $\mathcal{E}(V_1 \cup \dots \cup V_n)$ is connected.
2. For any nontrivial (nonempty) bipartition of $V_1 \cup \dots \cup V_n = A \cup B$, the mutual information $I(A : B) > 0$.
3. $\mathcal{E}(X_1 \cup \dots \cup X_n)$ is fully disconnected¹.

Further,

Lemma 2.7. *If $\mathcal{E}(X_1 \cup \dots \cup X_n)$ is fully disconnected, i.e. $\mathcal{E}(X_1 \cup \dots \cup X_n) = \mathcal{E}(X_1) \cup \dots \cup \mathcal{E}(X_n)$, or equivalently*

$$S(X_1 \cup \dots \cup X_n) = S(X_1) + \dots + S(X_n)$$

in terms of entropy. Then any subset $A \subseteq X_1 \cup \dots \cup X_n$ also has fully disconnected entanglement wedge, i.e.

$$\mathcal{E}(A) = \cup_{X_i \in A} \mathcal{E}(X_i)$$

or in terms of entropy,

$$S(A) = \sum_{X_i \in A} S(X_i)$$

¹Since there are partially connected cases when $n > 2$, we use fully disconnected to refer to the case of $\mathcal{E}(X_1 \cup \dots \cup X_n) = \mathcal{E}(X_1) \cup \dots \cup \mathcal{E}(X_n)$

Proof. If $\mathcal{E}(A)$ is connected or partially connected, then its HRRT surfaces are composed of a union of surfaces with strictly smaller total area than $\cup_{X_i \in A} RT(X_i)$. Combining with $\cup_{X_j \notin A} RT(X_j)$, this gives a candidate HRRT surface for $X_1 \cup \dots \cup X_n = A \cup A^c$ with strictly smaller area than $\cup_i RT(X_i)$. This would contradict the condition that $\mathcal{E}(X_1 \cup \dots \cup X_n)$ is fully disconnected. \square

Lemma 2.8. *Consider a union of disjoint subsets $V_1 \cup \dots \cup V_n$. If the entanglement wedge of any pair is connected or $I(V_i : V_j) > 0, \forall i \neq j$, then $\mathcal{E}(V_1 \cup \dots \cup V_n)$ is connected.*

Proof. Recall from Lemma 2.6 that $\mathcal{E}(V_1 \cup \dots \cup V_n)$ being connected implies $I(A : B) > 0$ any nontrivial (nonempty) bipartition of $V_1 \cup \dots \cup V_n = A \cup B$. Then the Lemma follows directly from the monotonicity of mutual information or strong subadditivity. \square

Remark 2.9. *If one only assumes that $\mathcal{E}(V_1 \cup \dots \cup V_n)$ is connected, the entanglement wedge of any pair could be disconnected. Simple examples can be constructed in pure AdS_3 .*

In light of the $\Gamma_{2 \rightarrow \text{all}}$ graph introduced by ref. [7], we can introduce a mutual information graph $\tilde{\Gamma}$ whose vertices $1, 2, \dots, n$ representing input region V_i 's and whose edge $i - j$ representing $I(V_i : V_j) > 0$.

Lemma 2.10. *If the mutual information graph $\tilde{\Gamma}$ is connected, then $\mathcal{E}(V_1 \cup \dots \cup V_n)$ is fully connected.*

A special case is that pairwise mutual information $I(V_i : V_j) > 0, \forall i \neq j$.

Proof. For a set $V_1 \cup \dots \cup V_n$ to have fully connected entanglement wedges, any nontrivial (nonempty) bipartition of $V_1 \cup \dots \cup V_n = A \cup B$ should have strictly positive mutual information, i.e.

$$I(A : B) > 0.$$

If $\tilde{\Gamma}$ is connected, then for any bipartition $V_1 \cup \dots \cup V_n = A \cup B$, there would exist $V_i \in A$ and $V_j \in B$ such that $I(V_i : V_j) > 0$. Then applying inductively the monotonicity of mutual information $I(V_1 : V_2 \cup V_3) \geq I(V_1 : V_2)$, one would have

$$I(A : B) \geq I(V_i : V_j) > 0.$$

\square

3 Generalizing the n-to-n Connected Wedge Theorem

3.1 An improvement of the n-to-n connected wedge theorem

Let us start with giving a slightly different proof of the n -to- n connected wedge theorem, which also reveals that the necessary condition of ref. 1.2 can be further weakened as stated in Theorem 1.3.

For the purpose of explanation, let us pick Σ_1 to be a bulk Cauchy slice bounded by $\hat{\Sigma}_1$ and containing relevant HRRT surfaces². Similarly, let Σ_2 be a bulk Cauchy slice bounded by $\hat{\Sigma}_2$ that contains relevant HRRT surfaces.

²This is always possible because HRRT surfaces of disjoint, spacelike-separated boundary regions can be minimal on the same Cauchy slice [10].




Figure 2. Illustration of the surface \mathcal{Z}_{in} formed by future null sheets emanating from $RT(V_i)$ for $n = 3$. Green curves in Σ_1 and Σ_2 lie on $\partial J^+[\mathcal{E}(V_i)]$ while red curves in Σ_1 and Σ_2 lie on $\partial J^-[\mathcal{E}(W_j)]$. The ridges $\mathcal{R}_{V_i, V_{i+1}} = \partial J^+[\mathcal{E}(V_i)] \cap \partial J^+[\mathcal{E}(V_{i+1})]$ are labeled explicitly. Note that $n + 1 = 1$ because of the S^1 topology.

We consider the geometric surface \mathcal{Z}_{in} formed by the union of all future-pointing null sheets $\mathcal{N}_{V_i} = \partial J^+[RT(V_i)]$ that emanate from $RT(V_i)$, truncated at their mutual intersections (see Figure 2 for an illustration with $n = 3$). The surface \mathcal{Z}_{in} is therefore made up of null sheets intersecting at a net of vertices and (subsets of) ridges. Noting that \mathcal{N}_{V_i} is also the future horizon of $\mathcal{E}(V_i)$ ³, this surface \mathcal{Z}_{in} is also the future boundary of the compact set $\cap_{i=1}^n \mathcal{E}(V_i)$. Also note that \mathcal{Z}_{in} and Σ_1 bound a compact subset of $\overline{M} = M \cup \partial M$, which will be denoted by \mathcal{Z}_B .

We also consider past-pointing null sheets $\mathcal{N}_{W_j} = \partial J^-[RT(W_j)]$ that emanates from $RT(W_j)$'s. Note that \mathcal{N}_{W_j} is also the past horizon of $\mathcal{E}(W_j)$. By the causal anchoring principle, $\mathcal{N}_{V_i} \cap \partial M$ and $\mathcal{N}_{W_j} \cap \partial M$, are just light rays emitted from c_i and r_j , respectively.

Due to the cyclic boundary ordering $V_1, X_1, \dots, V_n, X_n$ (and similarly for the outputs), the null sheet \mathcal{N}_{W_i} , which is anchored at the spatial boundaries b_i and a_{i+1} of X_i , is topologically constrained to intersect the surface \mathcal{Z}_{in} . We assert that this intersection \mathcal{C}_i , is a simple curve with endpoints precisely at b_i and a_{i+1} . The argument proceeds in two steps. First, within the bulk region \mathcal{Z}_B bounded by \mathcal{Z}_{in} and the Cauchy slice Σ_1 , the intersection is homotopic to $\mathcal{N}_{W_i} \cap \Sigma_1$, which is itself homotopic to the HRRT surface $RT(X_i)$ within Σ_1 . Second, Lemma 2.1 excludes the possibility of homotopically trivial closed loops in the intersection: $\mathcal{N}_{W_j} \cap \mathcal{N}_{V_i}$ is a simple ridge in \mathcal{N}_{V_i} and \mathcal{Z}_{in} is made up of intersecting null sheets \mathcal{N}_{V_i} 's. This concludes that \mathcal{C}_i is a simple curve without disconnected

³Recall that superscript prime indicates causal complements




Figure 3. Illustration of focusing calculation when $n = 3$. Panel (a) shows the geometric structure \mathcal{Z}_{in} cut by $\partial J^-[\mathcal{E}(W_i)]$ (compare with Figure 2), where future null sheets emanating from $RT(V_i)$ are shown in green and past null sheets emanating from $RT(W_i)$ are shown in red. The curves $\mathcal{C}_i = \partial J^-[\mathcal{E}(W_i)] \cap \mathcal{Z}_{in}$ is shown as $b_i - d_i - a_{i+1}$ (counting modulo n). Panel (b) show the \mathcal{Z}_{in} in a flatten fashion where S_{W_i} is the intersection of null sheet $\partial J^-[\mathcal{E}(W_i)]$ with Σ_1 , i.e. $S_{W_i} = \partial J^-[\mathcal{E}(W_i)] \cap \Sigma_1$. Arrows indicate the direction along which null expansion θ decreases. Panels (c) and (d) are similar to panels (a) and (b) but for partially connected scenarios.

components. A simple illustration for the $n = 3$ case is provided in Figure 3(a). Moreover, each curve \mathcal{C}_i must have segments in at least the adjacent null sheets \mathcal{N}_{V_i} and $\mathcal{N}_{V_{i+1}}$, though it may also cross other sheets that constitute \mathcal{Z}_{in} .

If all simple curves $\mathcal{C}_i = \mathcal{N}_{W_i} \cap \mathcal{Z}_{in}$ are distinct, we can build a geometric structure

and perform a calculation similar to that used in ref. [4] to prove CWT.

First, consider the simpler situation where the intersection point $d_i = \mathcal{N}_{W_i} \cap \mathcal{R}_{V_i, V_{i+1}} = \mathcal{N}_{W_i} \cap \mathcal{N}_{V_i} \cap \mathcal{N}_{V_{i+1}}$ (which Corollary 2.3 guarantees d_i is a single point on the ridge $\mathcal{R}_{V_i, V_{i+1}}$) lies on the curve \mathcal{C}_i . In this case, \mathcal{C}_i is confined to the \mathcal{N}_{V_i} and $\mathcal{N}_{V_{i+1}}$ components of \mathcal{Z}_{in} . A spacelike curve $\gamma_i \subseteq \mathcal{N}_{V_i}$ can then directly connect the endpoints d_{i-1} and d_i , thereby linking to \mathcal{C}_{i-1} and \mathcal{C}_i .

In general, d_i may not lie on \mathcal{C}_i , which occurs when \mathcal{C}_i has segments on other null sheet components of \mathcal{Z}_{in} beyond \mathcal{N}_{V_i} and $\mathcal{N}_{V_{i+1}}$. To handle this, we redefine \mathcal{C}_i by joining two ridge segments: the portion of ridge $\mathcal{N}_{W_i} \cap \mathcal{N}_{V_i}$ from b_i to d_i and the portion of ridge $\mathcal{N}_{W_i} \cap \mathcal{N}_{V_{i+1}}$ from a_{i+1} to d_i . This newly defined curve (still denoted \mathcal{C}_i) remains distinct from the others. With this adjustment, we can again connect the adjacent curves and using a spacelike curve $\gamma_i \subseteq \mathcal{N}_{V_i}$ between the points d_{i-1} and d_i .

Denote by $\tilde{\gamma}_i$ the curve concatenated from three parts: the portion of \mathcal{C}_{i-1} from a_i to d_{i-1} , γ_i and the portion of \mathcal{C}_i from d_i to b_i . Then $\tilde{\gamma}_i$ is a curve on \mathcal{N}_{V_i} homotopic to $RT(V_i)$; moreover

$$|\tilde{\gamma}_i| \leq |RT(V_i)| \quad (3.1)$$

by the fact that the null expansion $\theta \leq 0$ on null sheets emanating from extremal surfaces, along the direction away from extremal surfaces. We further note that

$$\cup_i \tilde{\gamma}_i = \cup_i \gamma_i + \cup_i \mathcal{C}_i. \quad (3.2)$$

On \mathcal{N}_{W_i} , pushing \mathcal{C}_i along past null generators until one encounters Σ_1 , one gets

$$|\mathcal{C}_i| \geq |\mathcal{N}_{V_i} \cap \Sigma_1| \geq |RT(X_i)|. \quad (3.3)$$

because $\theta \leq 0$ along the past direction on \mathcal{N}_{W_i} . We also used that $RT(X_i)$ is minimal among all surfaces on Σ_1 that homologous to X_i , by our choice of Σ_1 . Combining (3.1), (3.2) and (3.3), one gets

$$\sum_i |RT(V_i)| \geq \sum_i |RT(X_i)|, \quad (3.4)$$

where the inequality is strict if $\cup \gamma_i$ is nonempty. In the above calculation we neglect additional endpoints of null generators due to focusing inside \mathcal{N}_{V_i} or \mathcal{N}_{W_j} (see ref. [4] or ref. [5] for details). Including these only makes the inequality stronger. Equation (3.4) implies that $\mathcal{E}(V_1 \cup \dots \cup V_n)$ cannot be fully disconnected.

To address partially connected configurations, we generalize the construction of the surface \mathcal{Z}_{in} . In all cases, this surface is defined as $\mathcal{Z}_{in} = \partial J^+[\mathcal{E}(V_1 \cup \dots \cup V_n)]$ (up to mutual intersections). For a partially connected scenario, \mathcal{Z}_{in} is formed from the future null sheets emanating from the HRRT surfaces of a set of possibly enlarged input regions. These regions take the form $V_k \cup X_k \cup \dots \cup V_{k+l}$ and remain separated by a subset of the original complement regions X_j 's. A key consequence of entanglement wedge nesting is that this new surface \mathcal{Z}_{in} lies inside the compact region \mathcal{Z}_B . In other words, this new \mathcal{Z}_{in} lies causally below the original \mathcal{Z}_{in} formed solely from \mathcal{N}_{V_i} .

This inclusion relation ensures that the new intersection curves $\mathcal{C}_i = \mathcal{N}_{W_j} \cap \mathcal{Z}_{in}$ (defined for the X_j that remain as complements of the enlarged input regions) remain simple and

distinct from one another. With this geometric structure in place, one can perform a length calculation analogous to the previous fully connected case. This calculation leads to the conclusion that the length of the HRRT surface for the total input region must exceed the sum $\sum |RT(X_j)|$, where the sum runs only over the X_j appearing as complements. This inequality presents a contradiction, thereby proving that $\mathcal{E}(V_1 \cup \dots \cup V_n)$ cannot be in a partially connected state.

The preceding geometric proof establishes a general criterion: any condition that ensures the intersection curves are distinct is sufficient to conclude that is connected. This criterion can be formulated as the requirement that for all distinct output pairs $i \neq j$,

$$[\bigcap_{k=1}^n \mathcal{E}(V'_k)] \cap [\mathcal{E}(W'_i) \cap \mathcal{E}(W'_j)] = \emptyset, \quad (3.5)$$

or rephrased in pairwise terms,

$$\forall i \neq j, \exists k \neq l \text{ such that } \mathcal{E}(V'_k) \cap \mathcal{E}(V'_l) \cap \mathcal{E}(W'_i) \cap \mathcal{E}(W'_j) = \emptyset. \quad (3.6)$$

A particularly useful, more explicit condition that implies (3.6) is the following:

$$\exists k \neq l \text{ such that } \mathcal{E}(V'_k) \cap \mathcal{E}(V'_l) \cap \bigcap_{i=1}^n \mathcal{E}(W'_i) = \emptyset \quad (3.7)$$

or equivalently

$$\exists k \neq l \text{ such that } J^+[\mathcal{E}(V_k)] \cap J^+[\mathcal{E}(V_l)] \cap \left(\bigcap_{i=1}^n J^-[\mathcal{E}(W_i)] \right) \neq \emptyset \quad (3.8)$$

This is strictly weaker than the original connected graph $\Gamma_{2 \rightarrow \text{all}}$ condition of ref. [7]. In short terms, we only require the existence of one instance of $2 \rightarrow \text{all}$ while connected graph $\Gamma_{2 \rightarrow \text{all}}$ requires at least $n - 1$ such instances.

3.2 Consequences of connected entanglement wedges

We now discuss the consequences of $\mathcal{E}(V_1 \cup \dots \cup V_n)$ being connected. When $\mathcal{E}(V_1 \cup \dots \cup V_n)$ is known to be fully connected, instead of \mathcal{Z}_{in} formed from future null sheets emanating from $RT(V_i)$, it would be more natural to consider the future horizon of $\mathcal{E}(V_1 \cup \dots \cup V_n)$, which is formed by future null sheets \mathcal{N}_{X_i} emanating from $RT(X_i)$. Accordingly, we consider past-pointing null sheets emanating from $RT(Y_i)$ instead of $RT(W_i)$.

We first show that one consequence of $\mathcal{E}(V_1 \cup \dots \cup V_n)$ being connected is

$$\exists k \neq l, \text{ such that } J^-[RT(Y_k)] \cap J^-[RT(Y_l)] \cap \mathcal{E}(V_1 \cup \dots \cup V_n) \neq \emptyset \quad (3.9)$$

or in geometric terms, there exists a ridge $\mathcal{R}_{Y_k, Y_l} = \partial J^-[RT(Y_k)] \cap \partial J^-[RT(Y_l)]$ lying below all $\mathcal{R}_{X_i, X_j} = \partial J^+[RT(X_i)] \cap \partial J^+[RT(X_j)], \forall i \neq j$ (since $\mathcal{E}(V_1 \cup \dots \cup V_n) = \bigcap_{i=1}^n \mathcal{E}(X'_i)$).

Equation (3.9) has a direct scattering process interpretation if we also assume that $\mathcal{E}(W_1 \cup \dots \cup W_n)$ is connected. Recall from Lemma 2.6 that $\mathcal{E}(W_1 \cup \dots \cup W_n)$ being connected is equivalent to $\mathcal{E}(Y_1 \cup \dots \cup Y_n)$ being fully disconnected. The latter then implies

that $\mathcal{E}(Y_k \cup Y_l), \forall k \neq l$ is disconnected by Lemma 2.7, or equivalently the two components of $(Y_k \cup Y_l)^c$ have a connected entanglement wedge. We refer to the two components of $(Y_k \cup Y_l)^c$ as modified output regions:

$$\tilde{W}_k = W_k \cup Y_{k+1} \cup \dots \cup W_{l-1}, \quad \tilde{W}_l = W_l \cup Y_{l+1} \cup \dots \cup W_{k-1} \quad (3.10)$$

Note that we are counting modulo n as always; that is, $n+1 = 1 \pmod n$, $0 = n \pmod n$, $-1 = n-1 \pmod n$ etc. One can accordingly define modified output points \tilde{r}_k and \tilde{r}_l such that $\tilde{W}_k \subseteq \hat{J}^-[\tilde{r}_k]$ and $\tilde{W}_l \subseteq \hat{J}^-[\tilde{r}_l]$. See Figure 5 (a) for an illustration of $n = 3$. Then (3.9) can be rephrased as

$$\exists k \neq l, \text{ such that } \mathcal{E}(V_1 \cup \dots \cup V_n) \cap \mathcal{E}(\tilde{W}_k \cup \tilde{W}_l) \neq \emptyset, \quad (3.11)$$

or in pairwise terms,

$$\exists k \neq l, \text{ such that } \forall i \neq j, \quad \mathcal{E}(\tilde{V}_i \cup \tilde{V}_j) \cap \mathcal{E}(\tilde{W}_k \cup \tilde{W}_l) \neq \emptyset \quad (3.12)$$

if one defines $\tilde{V}_i \cup \tilde{V}_j = (X_i \cup X_j)'$ similarly.

We argue by contradiction. If $J^-[\mathcal{RT}(Y_k)] \cap J^-[\mathcal{RT}(Y_l)] \cap \mathcal{E}(V_1 \cup \dots \cup V_n) = \emptyset$ for all pairs $k \neq l$, or in geometric terms if \mathcal{R}_{Y_k, Y_l} lies above all ridges involved in $\mathcal{E}(V_1 \cup \dots \cup V_n)$, i.e. $\cup_{i \neq j} \mathcal{R}_{X_i, X_j}$, then we would get a geometric structure similar to the one used in section 3.1. A similar calculation would lead to

$$|\mathcal{RT}(X_i)| \geq |\mathcal{RT}(V_i)|, \quad (3.13)$$

which contradicts that $\mathcal{E}(V_1 \cup \dots \cup V_n)$ is connected.

Let us give more details. Since the argument is similar as in section 3.1, we will recycle the symbols from there. Denote the future horizon of $\mathcal{E}(V_1 \cup \dots \cup V_n)$, or the surface formed by future-pointing null sheets from $\mathcal{RT}(X_i)$ up to their intersections, still by \mathcal{Z}_{in} . By a similar argument as in section 3.1, $\mathcal{N}_{Y_k} = \partial J^-[\mathcal{E}(Y_k)]$ intersects \mathcal{Z}_{in} at a simple curve \mathcal{C}_i with endpoints a_i and b_i . The key is to realize that if \mathcal{R}_{Y_k, Y_l} lies above all ridges $\cup_{i \neq j} \mathcal{R}_{X_i, X_j}$, then the set of $\mathcal{C}_i = \mathcal{N}_{Y_i} = \mathcal{Z}_{in}$ are all distinct. In this case, one can perform the same calculation as in Section 3.1 to conclude equation 3.13. See Figure 4 for an illustration of $n = 3$.

Another consequence follows from the fact that $\mathcal{E}(X_i \cup X_j), \forall i \neq j$ is disconnected by Lemma 2.6 and Lemma 2.7. Let us consider the case of $n = 3$ first. We denote the boundary causal diamond $\hat{J}^+[\beta_1] \cap \hat{J}^+[\beta_2] \cap \hat{J}^-[\alpha_1] \cap \hat{J}^-[\alpha_3]$ by \tilde{Y}_1 ⁴. Then the past-pointing null sheet emanating from $\mathcal{RT}(\tilde{Y}_1)$ would intersect Σ_1 at a curve homologous to $\mathcal{RT}(X_1 \cup V_2 \cup X_2)$. If the ridge $\mathcal{R}_{\tilde{Y}_1, Y_2} = \partial J^-[\mathcal{RT}(\tilde{Y}_1)] \cap \partial J^-[\mathcal{RT}(Y_2)]$ lies above \mathcal{R}_{X_1, X_2} , we would get the geometric structure shown in Figure 4(c). A familiar calculation using the fact that on null sheets emanating from extremal surfaces $\theta \leq 0$ along the direction away from extremal surfaces would reveal

$$|\mathcal{RT}(X_1)| + |\mathcal{RT}(X_2)| \geq |\mathcal{RT}(V_2)| + |\mathcal{RT}(V_1 \cup X_1 \cup V_2)|. \quad (3.14)$$

⁴This is analogous to the 2-to- $n-1$ scattering region discussed in ref. [7], which is shown to be nonempty






Figure 4. Illustration of the geometric structure used in deriving existence of a pair $k \neq l$ such that $\mathcal{E}(V_1 \cup \dots \cup V_n) \cap \mathcal{E}(\tilde{W}_k \cup \tilde{W}_l) \neq \emptyset$. Panel (a) shows the geometric structure \mathcal{Z}_{in} (future horizon of $\mathcal{E}(V_1 \cup \dots \cup V_n)$) cut by $\partial J^-[\mathcal{E}(Y_i)]$, where future null sheets emanating from $RT(X_i)$ are shown in red and past null sheets emanating from $RT(Y_j)$ are shown in green. The curves $\mathcal{C}_i = \partial J^-[\mathcal{E}(Y_i)] \cap \mathcal{Z}_{in}$ is shown as $a_i - d_i - b_i$. Panel (b) show the \mathcal{Z}_{in} in a flatten fashion where S_{V_i} is the intersection of null sheet $\partial J^-[\mathcal{E}(Y_i)]$ with Σ_1 , i.e. $S_{V_i} = \partial J^-[\mathcal{E}(Y_i)] \cap \Sigma_1$. Arrows indicate the direction along which null expansion θ decreases.



(a)



(b)

Figure 5. Illustration of modified input and output regions for $n = 3$. Panel (a) show that $RT(Y_2) \cup RT(Y_3)$ can be regarded as HRRT surfaces of $\mathcal{E}(W_2 \cup \tilde{W}_3)$, where $\tilde{W}_3 \supseteq W_3 \cup Y_1 \cup W_1$. We get an effective $c_2, c_3 \rightarrow r_2, \tilde{r}_3$ scattering. Panel (b) shows that $RT(X_1) \cup RT(X_2)$ can be regarded as HRRT surfaces of $\mathcal{E}(\tilde{V}_1 \cup V_2)$, where $\tilde{V}_1 \supseteq V_3 \cup X_3 \cup V_1$. We get an effective $\tilde{c}_1, c_2 \rightarrow r_1, r_2$ scattering. Note that in this case output regions are enlarged although output points r_1, r_2 remain unchanged.

Since this contradicts the fact that $\mathcal{E}(X_1 \cup X_2)$ is disconnected, the only way out is to have the ridge $\mathcal{R}_{\tilde{Y}_1, Y_2}$ lie below \mathcal{R}_{X_1, X_2} or

$$J^+[\mathcal{E}(X_1)] \cap J^+[\mathcal{E}(X_2)] \cap J^-[\mathcal{E}(Y_2)] \cap J^-[\mathcal{E}(\tilde{Y}_1)] = \emptyset, \quad (3.15)$$

We note that X_1, X_2 and \tilde{Y}_1, Y_2 would appear as input regions and output regions of a modified 2-to-2 scattering process $\tilde{c}_1, c_2 \rightarrow r_1, r_2$ (Figure 5 (b)), where \tilde{c}_1 is defined through $\hat{J}^+[\tilde{c}_1] \supseteq \hat{D}^+[V_3 \cup X_3 \cup V_1]$. Output regions \tilde{W}_1 and \tilde{W}_2 are enlarged accordingly although r_1, r_2 remain unchanged. Note that $\mathcal{E}(V_1 \cup \dots \cup V_n)$ being fully connected cannot ensure that $\mathcal{E}(\tilde{W}_1 \cup \tilde{W}_2)$ being connected. But if $\mathcal{E}(\tilde{W}_1 \cup \tilde{W}_2)$ is connected, then (3.15) can be rephrased as

$$\mathcal{E}(V_1 \cup V_2 \cup V_3) \cap \mathcal{E}(\tilde{W}_1 \cup \tilde{W}_2) \neq \emptyset, \quad (3.16)$$

or in pairwise terms

$$\mathcal{E}(\tilde{V}_1 \cup V_2) \cap \mathcal{E}(\tilde{W}_1 \cup \tilde{W}_2) \neq \emptyset. \quad (3.17)$$

Now we generalize the discussion to general n -to- n scattering. Recall that left-pointing and right-pointing light rays from $c_1, \beta_1, \dots, c_n, \beta_n$ form a lattice on $\hat{J}^+[\hat{\Sigma}_1] \cap \hat{J}^-[\hat{\Sigma}_2]$. Then for any HRRT surfaces appearing in partially connected phases of $V_1 \cup \dots \cup V_n$, we can get a homologous surface as intersection of Σ_1 with a past-pointing null sheets from some HRRT surface in the future (like $RT(\tilde{Y})_1$ in the $n = 3$ case). One can then construct similar geometric structures as above and carry out similar calculations. In summary, since for all $i \neq j$, $\mathcal{E}(X_i \cup X_j)$ is disconnected, we have

$$\mathcal{E}(V_1 \cup \dots \cup V_n) \cap \mathcal{R}_{\tilde{Y}_i, \tilde{Y}_j} \neq \emptyset, \quad (3.18)$$

where \tilde{Y}_i and \tilde{Y}_j are defined such that $\hat{J}^-[\tilde{Y}_i] \cap \hat{\Sigma}_1$ and $\hat{J}^-[\tilde{Y}_j] \cap \hat{\Sigma}_1$ are exactly two components of $(X_i \cup X_j)^c$. Regard X_i, X_j and hence β_i, β_j as components of an effective 2-to-2 scattering process, the antipodal points r_i, r_j remain as output points although the two output regions \tilde{W}_i and \tilde{W}_j get enlarged. If $\mathcal{E}(\tilde{W}_i \cup \tilde{W}_j)$ is assumed to be connected, we can rephrase (3.18) as

$$\mathcal{E}(V_1 \cup \dots \cup V_n) \cap \mathcal{E}(\tilde{W}_i \cup \tilde{W}_j) \neq \emptyset. \quad (3.19)$$

For $n = 3$, that $\mathcal{E}(V_1 \cup V_2 \cup V_3)$ is connected is equivalent to the following two sets of conditions:

- $|RT(X_1)| + |RT(X_2)| + |RT(X_3)| \leq |RT(V_1)| + |RT(V_2)| + |RT(V_3)|$,
- $I(X_i : X_j) = 0$ pairwise.

The second item exactly expresses that $\sum_{i=1}^3 |RT(X_i)|$ has less area than partially connected phases. So the above two consequences are complete in this sense. However, for $n > 3$, $\mathcal{E}(X_1 \cup \dots \cup X_n)$ being fully disconnected cannot be completely characterized by pairwise considerations. In particular, that $\mathcal{E}(V_1 \cup \dots \cup V_n)$ is connected would imply that any subset of $X_1 \cup \dots \cup X_n$, not merely any pair, would have fully disconnected entanglement wedges. This presents an intrinsically multi-party constraint that is not captured

by our current pairwise framework. While our pairwise analysis yields several robust necessary and sufficient conditions, a full characterization of this structure remains an open problem, pointing to a natural direction for future work utilizing genuinely multi-party entanglement measures.

We summarize discussions in this Section in the following theorem.

Theorem 3.1. *Assume conditions in Assumption 1. If the entanglement wedge $\mathcal{E}(V_1 \cup \dots \cup V_n)$ is connected, then the following statements hold:*

1. *If $\mathcal{E}(W_1 \cup \dots \cup W_n)$ is also connected, there exists a pair of enlarged output regions \tilde{W}_i and \tilde{W}_j satisfying $(Y_i \cup Y_j)^c = \tilde{W}_i \cup \tilde{W}_j$ and that*

$$\mathcal{E}(V_1 \cup \dots \cup V_n) \cap \mathcal{E}(\tilde{W}_i \cup \tilde{W}_j) \neq \emptyset. \quad (3.20)$$

Or in pairwise terms,

$$\mathcal{E}(\tilde{V}_k \cup \tilde{V}_l) \cap \mathcal{E}(\tilde{W}_i \cup \tilde{W}_j) \neq \emptyset, \forall k \neq l \quad (3.21)$$

where $\tilde{V}_k \cup \tilde{V}_l = (X_k \cup X_l)'$.

2. *For any pair X_i and X_j , one can define a modified 2-to-2 scattering process. Let $\tilde{V}_i \cup \tilde{V}_j = (X_i \cup X_j)^c$ be the enlarged input regions. Define two enlarged output regions \tilde{W}_i and \tilde{W}_j through $\tilde{W}_{i,j} = \hat{J}^-[r_{i,j}] \cap \hat{J}^+[\tilde{V}_i] \cap \hat{J}^+[\tilde{V}_j]$. Then we have*

$$\mathcal{E}(V_1 \cup \dots \cup V_n) \cap \mathcal{E}(\tilde{W}_i \cup \tilde{W}_j) \neq \emptyset, \forall i \neq j, \quad (3.22)$$

if $\mathcal{E}(\tilde{W}_i \cup \tilde{W}_j)$ is connected.

3.3 Generalized bulk scattering regions

In the 2-to-2 asymptotic scattering problem, a generalized bulk scattering region

$$\mathcal{S}_E = \mathcal{E}(V_1 \cup V_2) \cap \mathcal{E}(W_1 \cup W_2) \quad (3.23)$$

or the modified version

$$\tilde{\mathcal{S}}_E = [\mathcal{E}(V_1 \cup V_2)/(\mathcal{E}(V_1) \cup \mathcal{E}(V_2))] \cap [\mathcal{E}(W_1 \cup W_2)/(\mathcal{E}(W_1) \cup \mathcal{E}(W_2))] \quad (3.24)$$

was identified to characterize connectedness of $\mathcal{E}(V_1 \cup \dots \cup V_n)$ and $\mathcal{E}(W_1 \cup \dots \cup W_n)$. Here we trivially generalize the above bulk scattering region as

$$\mathcal{S}_E = \mathcal{E}(V_1 \cup \dots \cup V_n) \cap \mathcal{E}(W_1 \cup \dots \cup W_n) \quad (3.25)$$

and discuss necessary conditions for $\mathcal{S}_E \neq \emptyset$.

Theorem 3.2. *Assume the standard conditions listed in Assumption 1. If $\mathcal{E}(V_1 \cup \dots \cup V_n)$ and $\mathcal{E}(W_1 \cup \dots \cup W_n)$ are connected and furthermore,*

$$\mathcal{E}(V_1 \cup \dots \cup V_n) \cap \mathcal{E}(Y'_i) \cap \mathcal{E}(Y'_j) \neq \emptyset, \forall i \neq j, \quad (3.26)$$

then $\mathcal{S}_E = \mathcal{E}(V_1 \cup \dots \cup V_n) \cap \mathcal{E}(W_1 \cup \dots \cup W_n) \neq \emptyset$.

Remark 3.3. *In particular, one can use focusing calculations, which should be very familiar by now, to show that if $I(V_i : V_j) > 0, \forall i \neq j$ or if V_i 's have pairwise connected entanglement wedges, then (3.26) is necessarily satisfied.*

Proof. We first note that $\mathcal{E}(V_1 \cup \dots \cup V_n) \cap \mathcal{E}(W_1 \cup \dots \cup W_n) \neq \emptyset$ is equivalent to the future horizon of $\mathcal{E}(V_1 \cup \dots \cup V_n)$ and the past horizon of $\mathcal{E}(W_1 \cup \dots \cup W_n)$ intersects because both $\mathcal{E}(V_1 \cup \dots \cup V_n)$ and $\mathcal{E}(W_1 \cup \dots \cup W_n)$ are compact set.

We use a similar geometric structure as before. Consider the upper horizon of $\mathcal{E}(V_1 \cup \dots \cup V_n)$ or \mathcal{Z}_{in} in the notation of section 3.2. As argued above, $\mathcal{N}_{Y_i} = \partial J^-[\mathcal{E}(Y_i)]$ intersect \mathcal{Z}_{in} at a simple curve \mathcal{C}_i , with endpoints of ∂V_i , i.e. a_i and b_i . Moreover, \mathcal{C}_i together with the boundary future horizon $\hat{H}^+[V_i]$ of V_i bounds a compact set D_i on \mathcal{Z}_{in} , which is topologically a disk. An important feature is that D_i 's are arranged cyclically on \mathcal{Z}_{in} since V_i are arranged cyclically on ∂M . The condition (3.26) states that $D_i \cap D_j \neq \emptyset$ for all pairs $i \neq j$. We only need to prove the following claim: pairwise intersection among D_i 's imply common intersections among all D_i 's.

We proceed by induction. When $n = 2$, the claim is trivially true. Suppose the claim holds for n , we need to show it holds for $n + 1$.

By induction hypothesis, $D_c = D_1 \cap \dots \cap D_n \neq \emptyset$. Suppose $D_{n+1} \cap D_c = \emptyset$. Then D_{n+1} lies in between D_c and $\hat{H}^+[V_{n+1}]$. Since D_c results from intersecting the first n sets, its boundary ∂D_c is composed of segments from the boundaries ∂D_k of the constituent sets. The condition $D_c \cap D_{n+1} = \emptyset$ implies that D_{n+1} lies entirely outside D_c . Given the specific convex structure of our setup (where each D_i is a subset of intersecting null sheets), this forces D_{n+1} and D_c to be separated by at least one full boundary component. Consequently, there must exist at least one set D_k (for $1 \leq k \leq n$) whose boundary contributes a segment to ∂D_c that completely separates D_c from D_{n+1} . For such a D_k , it follows geometrically that $D_k \cap D_{n+1} = \emptyset$. This directly contradicts our initial assumption that all pairs $D_i \cap D_j \neq \emptyset$. \square

4 Conclusion and Discussion

Similar to the proofs of CWT and n -to- n , the proofs given here will also work for semiclassical spacetimes that satisfy the quantum maximin formula [11] and the quantum focusing conjecture [12].

4.1 An observation about different generalizations of the 2-to-2 connected wedge theorem

We make an observation that would help to understand relations among different generalizations of the 2-to-2 and n -to- n connected wedge theorems.

We noted that there are two null sheets anchored to $\hat{J}^+[c_i]$ appeared in the proofs: the future-pointing null sheet \mathcal{N}_{V_i} emanating from $RT(V_i)$ and the past-pointing null sheet \mathcal{N}_{Y_i} emanating from $RT(Y_i)$. Similarly, for $\hat{J}^+[\beta_i]$, we would consider the future-pointing null sheet \mathcal{N}_{X_i} emanating from $RT(X_i)$ and the past-pointing null sheet \mathcal{N}_{W_i} emanating from $RT(W_i)$.

One can argue for an positioning relation between \mathcal{N}_{V_i} and \mathcal{N}_{Y_i} . First note that the future pointing null sheet \mathcal{N}_{V_i} from $RT(V_i)$ is the future horizon of $\mathcal{E}(V_1^c)$. On the boudnary ∂M , $\hat{D}[V_1^c]$ contains Y_1 (since $Y_1 \subseteq \hat{J}^-[c_1]$ and c_1 is antipodal point of c_1), thus $\mathcal{E}(Y_1) \subseteq \mathcal{E}(V_1^c)$ by entanglement wedge nesting. This implies that $RT(Y_1)$ is spacelike separated from \mathcal{N}_{V_i} and $RT(Y_1)$ lies closer to Y_i than $\mathcal{N}_{V_i} \cap \Sigma_2$. Similarly, the past null sheet \mathcal{N}_{Y_i} is the past horizon of $\mathcal{E}(Y_i^c)$ and $\mathcal{E}(Y_i^c) \supseteq \mathcal{E}(V_i)$ implies that $RT(V_i)$ is spacelike separated from \mathcal{N}_{Y_i} and $RT(V_i)$ lies closer to V_i than $\mathcal{N}_{Y_i} \cap \Sigma_1$. Lastly, Lemma 2.1 requires two causal boundaries like \mathcal{N}_{V_i} and \mathcal{N}_{Y_i} intersect at a simple ridge. However, \mathcal{N}_{V_i} lies closer to V_i (or closer to ∂M) than \mathcal{N}_{Y_i} on Σ_1 while \mathcal{N}_{Y_i} lies closer to Y_i (or closer to ∂M) than \mathcal{N}_{V_i} on Σ_2 . If they intersect, they must intersect at more than one curve. To avoid contradiction with causality, they have empty intersection. One can also derive this fact from the maximum principle using a similar argument as in refs. [13] or [10].

A similar reasoning would show that \mathcal{N}_{X_i} do not intersect with \mathcal{N}_{W_i} and \mathcal{N}_{X_i} lies closer to X_i than \mathcal{N}_{W_i} (or equivalently \mathcal{N}_{W_i} lies closer to W_i than \mathcal{N}_{X_i}).

In the generalized 2-to-2 connected wedge theorem by ref. [14], a bulk region

$$\mathcal{S}'_E = J^+[\mathcal{E}(V_1)] \cap J^+[\mathcal{E}(V_2)] \cap J^-[\mathcal{E}(W_1)] \cap J^-[\mathcal{E}(W_1)] \quad (4.1)$$

is used, whose nonemptiness was shown to imply connectedness of $\mathcal{E}(V_1 \cup V_2)$. On the other hand, in the generalized 2-to-2 connected wedge theorem by refs. [5, 6, 15], another bulk region

$$\mathcal{S}_E = \mathcal{E}(V_1 \cup V_2) \cap \mathcal{E}(W_1 \cup W_2) \quad (4.2)$$

is used, whose nonemptiness was shown to follow from connectedness of $\mathcal{E}(V_1 \cup V_2)$ and $\mathcal{E}(W_1 \cup W_2)$.

The bulk region \mathcal{S}'_E involves \mathcal{N}_{V_i} and \mathcal{N}_{W_i} while the bulk region \mathcal{S}_E involves \mathcal{N}_{Y_i} and \mathcal{N}_{X_i} . The above observation on the inclusion relation between \mathcal{N}_{V_i} and \mathcal{N}_{Y_i} or between \mathcal{N}_{X_i} and \mathcal{N}_{W_i} would immediately imply that

$$\mathcal{S}'_E \subseteq \mathcal{S}_E, \quad (4.3)$$

as one would expect from the two generalization of the 2-to-2 connected wedge theorem.

A similar remark applies to the n -to- n scattering problem discussed here. The bulk region

$$J^+[\mathcal{E}(V_i)] \cap J^+[\mathcal{E}(V_j)] \cap J^-[\mathcal{E}(W_k)] \cap J^-[\mathcal{E}(W_l)], \quad , i \neq j, k \neq l$$

involved in the necessary condition (Theorem 1.3) is contained in the bulk region

$$J^-[\mathcal{E}(Y_k)] \cap J^-[\mathcal{E}(Y_l)] \cap J^+[\mathcal{E}(X_i)] \cap J^+[\mathcal{E}(X_j)] \neq \emptyset$$

in the sufficient condition (Theorem 3.1).

4.2 Future Direction

For multiparty $n > 2$ scattering processes, the holographic dictionary seems less transparent than in the $n = 2$ case. Specifically, the condition $\mathcal{S}_E \neq \emptyset$ appears more restrictive than the mere connectedness of $\mathcal{E}(V_1 \cup \dots \cup V_n)$ and $\mathcal{E}(W_1 \cup \dots \cup W_n)$. Our analysis addresses this

complexity by reducing the problem to a pairwise framework and yields several concrete results. This approach finds justification in the intrinsic structure of holographic states, which are constrained and cannot support purely GHZ-like tripartite entanglement [16].

The results presented here, while not yet a complete/equivalent geometric characterization, significantly extend the core principle established for 2-to-2 scattering: nontrivial boundary quantum protocols are faithfully encoded in specific, non-local geometric signatures within the bulk spacetime. A full equivalent characterization for $n > 2$ will likely require the genuinely multi-party information-theoretic tools.

In this study, we focus on finding necessary or sufficient conditions for connected entanglement wedges. Another viewpoint would be to find necessary or sufficient conditions for bulk-only scattering [17], i.e.

$$\cap_i J^+[c_i] \cap \cap_j J^-[r_j] \neq \emptyset \text{ while } \cap_i \hat{J}^+[c_i] \cap \cap_j \hat{J}^-[r_j] \neq \emptyset. \quad (4.4)$$

Lastly, further generalization of discussions here to higher dimensions could also be of interest.

References

- [1] J. Maldacena, *The large- n limit of superconformal field theories and supergravity*, *International journal of theoretical physics* **38** (1999) 1113.
- [2] E. Witten, *Anti de sitter space and holography*, *arXiv preprint hep-th/9802150* (1998) .
- [3] S. Gao and R.M. Wald, *Theorems on gravitational time delay and related issues*, *Classical and Quantum Gravity* **17** (2000) 4999.
- [4] A. May, G. Penington and J. Sorce, *Holographic scattering requires a connected entanglement wedge*, *Journal of High Energy Physics* **2020** (2020) 1.
- [5] B. Zhao, *A proof of generalized connected wedge theorem*, *JHEP* **2025** (2025) xxx [[2509.23119](#)].
- [6] C. Lima, S. Pasterski and C. Waddell, *On sufficient conditions for holographic scattering*, *arXiv preprint arXiv:2509.26264* (2025) .
- [7] A. May, J. Sorce and B. Yoshida, *The connected wedge theorem and its consequences*, *Journal of High Energy Physics* **2022** (2022) 1.
- [8] R.M. Wald, *General relativity*, University of Chicago press (2024).
- [9] M. Headrick, V.E. Hubeny, A. Lawrence and M. Rangamani, *Causality & holographic entanglement entropy*, *Journal of High Energy Physics* **2014** (2014) 1.
- [10] A.C. Wall, *Maximin surfaces, and the strong subadditivity of the covariant holographic entanglement entropy*, *Classical and Quantum Gravity* **31** (2014) 225007.
- [11] C. Akers, N. Engelhardt, G. Penington and M. Usatyuk, *Quantum maximin surfaces*, *Journal of High Energy Physics* **2020** (2020) 1.
- [12] R. Bousso, Z. Fisher, S. Leichenauer and A.C. Wall, *Quantum focusing conjecture*, *Physical Review D* **93** (2016) 064044.
- [13] G.J. Galloway, *Maximum principles for null hypersurfaces and null splitting theorems*, *arXiv preprint math/9909158* (1999) .

- [14] A. May, *Holographic quantum tasks with input and output regions*, *Journal of High Energy Physics* **2021** (2021) 1.
- [15] S. Leutheusser and H. Liu, *Superadditivity in large n field theories and performance of quantum tasks*, *Physical Review D* **112** (2025) 046001.
- [16] V. Balasubramanian, M.J. Kang, C. Cummings, C. Murdia and S.F. Ross, *Purely ghz-like entanglement is forbidden in holography*, *arXiv preprint arXiv:2509.03621* (2025) .
- [17] J. Maldacena, D. Simmons-Duffin and A. Zhiboedov, *Looking for a bulk point*, *Journal of High Energy Physics* **2017** (2017) 1.