

# On AdS black holes in two-dimensional dilaton gravity

Uriel Noriega-Cornelio<sup>1</sup>, Alfredo Herrera-Aguilar<sup>2</sup>,  
Cupatitzio Ramírez-Romero<sup>1</sup>

<sup>1</sup>Facultad de Ciencias Físico Matemáticas, Benemérita Universidad Autónoma de Puebla, Ciudad Universitaria, Puebla, CP 72570, Puebla, México.

<sup>2</sup>Instituto de Física, Benemérita Universidad Autónoma de Puebla, Edificio IF-1, Ciudad Universitaria, Puebla, CP 72570, Puebla, México.

Corresponding author(s). E-mail(s): [uriel.noriegacor1@alumno.buap.mx](mailto:uriel.noriegacor1@alumno.buap.mx);  
[aherrera@ifuap.buap.mx](mailto:aherrera@ifuap.buap.mx); [cramirez@fcfm.buap.mx](mailto:cramirez@fcfm.buap.mx);

## Abstract

In this paper, we present three analytic AdS black hole solutions in a two-dimensional dilaton gravity theory, which contains two scalar fields non-minimally coupled to gravity. Our solutions I and II contain two arbitrary integration constants in the blackening factor  $f(r)$ , with which we can impose an extremality condition. Solution I coincides with a previously reported AdS black hole when one of the integration constants vanishes in  $f(r)$  and we have only one non-trivial scalar field. Solution III corresponds to an extreme black hole configuration with an asymptotically finite constant dilaton field. For all of our solutions, both non-extremal and extremal, the scalar curvature is constant and negative, corresponding to  $AdS_2$  spacetime. Thus, we show that pure  $AdS_2$  geometry arises outside the event horizon of all our black hole configurations, not only in the near horizon region. In order to elucidate their black hole nature, we explore the causal structure of solutions I and II with the aid of suitable Kruskal-like coordinates and Penrose diagrams. By employing the Hamilton-Jacobi method, we construct a boundary counter-term that renders a renormalized action with a vanishing variation. We use this finite action for the partition function in the semi-classical approximation. We establish a consistent Thermodynamics, verified by the first law, across all the black hole solutions presented, including the extreme case.

**Keywords:** Black Holes, Dilaton-Gravity, 2D Gravity, AdS Black Holes, Extremal Black Holes.

# 1 Introduction

The gauge/gravity correspondence [1], based on the relationship between a gravitational background and a quantum field theory living at the boundary, has shown to be a valuable tool for studying strongly coupled field theories.

In the gauge/gravity duality, the nongravitational system in thermal equilibrium at temperature  $T$  is in direct correspondence with a black hole with the Hawking temperature  $T$ . An AdS black hole in  $D + 1$  dimensions is described by

$$ds = l^2 \left( -r^2 f(r) dt^2 + \frac{dr^2}{r^2 f(r)} + r^2 dx_i dx^i \right), \quad (1)$$

where  $l$  stands for the *AdS* radius,  $r$  is the holographic or extra coordinate,  $x_i$  labels the coordinates in the spatial sector with  $i = 1, 2, \dots, D-1$ , and the function  $f(r)$ , known as the blackening factor, must asymptotically approach unity in order to recover the *AdS* background at infinity.

Two-dimensional anti-de Sitter,  $AdS_2$ , is a maximally symmetric spacetime invariant under the  $SO(2, 1)$  group. This invariance is relevant in the AdS/CFT duality because it corresponds to the conformal invariance of the theory living on the  $AdS_2$  boundary. In this paper we present three families of  $AdS_2$  black hole analytical solutions within the framework of a two-dimensional dilaton gravity theory, with two scalar fields non-minimally coupled to gravity and a metric given by

$$ds = l^2 \left( -r^2 f(r) dt^2 + \frac{dr^2}{r^2 f(r)} \right). \quad (2)$$

Two-dimensional black holes have been studied extensively in the literature, as they serve as models for testing ideas about the physics and Thermodynamics of black holes, with the intention to give insight into quantum gravity in higher dimensions. The *AdS* black hole solutions with two scalar fields presented here pursue the aim of contributing in this direction by incorporating in the blackening factor an extra constant of integration into play and serving as a toy configuration that could be straightforwardly generalized to higher dimensions.

Moreover, dilaton gravity models with one or multiple scalar fields have been used to study holographically non-conformal field theories with an underlying generalized conformal structure [2]. These theories are scale invariant, provided that their couplings also scale. The structure of these models is captured by Ward identities, relating the stress-energy tensor and scalar operators, which imply restrictions to the correlation functions of the scalar operators. The Sachdev-Ye-Kitaev (SYK) theory has an associated generalized conformal structure, studied holographically by two-dimensional dilaton gravity models with one or multiple scalar fields. It has been shown that the Ward identities governing this structure are obtained by means of the dual two-dimensional dilaton gravity theories.

As exemplified above, two-dimensional dilaton gravity models are frequently found in the literature as a result of dimensional reduction of systems defined in higher dimensions. The most known example is the extremal Reissner-Nordström (RN) black

hole solution of four-dimensional Einstein-Maxwell gravity (see, for instance, [3]). In this example, near  $AdS_2$  spacetime arises as the near-horizon geometry of the near-extremal RN black hole. For all of our two-dimensional black hole solutions presented, we encounter the extremality condition with a relation between the constants of integration in the metric. Interestingly, in this extremal scenario, we found that pure  $AdS_2$  spacetime emerges as the geometry outside the event horizon (not only near the horizon) of our extremal  $AdS$  black holes.

Thus, with the aim of studying the global spacetime structure of some of our black hole solutions, we employ an Eddington-Finkelstein type transformation of coordinates to show the causal structure of spacetime through the behavior of the light cones. Then, we construct a set of Kruskal patches and corresponding diagrams, adequate to explore the regions containing the outer and inner horizons for our solutions I and II. We depict interesting properties of these spacetimes making use of the appropriate Penrose diagram.

In particular, it is possible to deduce the thermodynamic quantities for black holes in two dimensions using the Euclidean path integral approximation for the partition function [4]

$$\mathcal{Z} \sim \exp\left(-\frac{1}{\hbar}I_E\right), \quad (3)$$

where  $I_E$  represents the Euclidean action evaluated in the classical solutions of the field equations and  $\hbar$  is the Planck constant. In order to use the saddle point approximation in (3), it is necessary to have an action that is finite on-shell and whose variation  $\delta I$  vanishes. In general, these conditions are not necessarily met by an action. As in higher dimensions, the on-shell action might diverge. This issue is commonly solved by the method of background subtraction [4], [5], which has been applied, for example, to study the Thermodynamics of the Witten black hole [6–8]. For our black hole solution I, presented below, both the on-shell action and  $\delta I$  diverge. Following the techniques developed in [9] and generalized in [10], we apply the method of Hamilton-Jacobi [11] to remove the aforementioned divergences. This method is based on constructing a boundary counter-term that renders a renormalized action  $\Gamma$  with suitable properties to be used in the approximation (3). Once we have the improved action  $\Gamma$  at hand, we compute the Thermodynamics of all the black hole configurations in the canonical ensemble using the standard approach and show that our field configurations accomplish the first law, even in the extremal case.

In the remainder of this paper, in section 2, we present the three families of  $AdS$  black hole solutions in two dimensions, considering two scalar fields, that solve the field equations derived from the corresponding scalar-tensor theory. In section 3, we extend the spacetime of solutions I and II, transforming first to Eddington-Finkelstein coordinates, and then to Kruskal coordinates designed to go through the outer and inner horizons; finally we present the Penrose diagram for these spacetimes. In section 4, we develop a consistent Thermodynamics for all the black hole configurations presented in this work. In order to do so, first we deduce the Hawking temperature by demanding regularity of the Euclidean spacetime with periodic time. We then show in detail how to construct the counter-term for the scalar-tensor or dilaton gravity theory in two dimensions considered here, obtaining in this manner a renormalized

action. This enables us to employ the approximation (3) to deduce consistent thermodynamic properties by means of the first law fulfillment. We compute the total energy  $M$  for the black hole solutions employing the gravitational Hamiltonian. Finally, we conclude in section 7 with some remarks.

## 2 Two-dimensional scalar-tensor theory and *AdS* black holes

We shall start by considering the following action in 1 + 1 dimensions

$$S = \int d^2x \sqrt{-g} e^{\sum_a \gamma_a \phi_a} \left( R + \sum_{b,c} \beta_{bc} (\partial^\mu \phi_b) (\partial_\mu \phi_c) - 2\Lambda \right), \quad (4)$$

where  $R$  is the Ricci scalar,  $g$  is the determinant of the metric,  $\Lambda$  is the cosmological constant,  $\phi_a$  are the scalar fields,  $\gamma_a$  are arbitrary real constant numbers,  $\beta_{bc}$  stands for a square symmetric matrix whose elements are arbitrary real constant numbers, and  $a, b, c = 1, 2, \dots, n$ , where  $n$  is the number of scalar fields. The action (4) has been employed in [2] to realize, holographically, the generalized conformal structure [12–14] of theories involving multiple scalar field operators, such as the SYK theory [15, 16].

The equations of motion following from this action are

$$\begin{aligned} R_{\mu\nu} + \sum_{a,b} \beta_{ab} \partial_\mu \phi_a \partial_\nu \phi_b - \frac{1}{2} g_{\mu\nu} \left( R + \sum_{a,b} \beta_{ab} \partial^\rho \phi_a \partial_\rho \phi_b - 2\Lambda \right) - \sum_a \gamma_a \nabla_\mu \partial_\nu \phi_a - \\ \sum_{a,b} \gamma_a \gamma_b \partial_\mu \phi_a \partial_\nu \phi_b + g_{\mu\nu} \left( \sum_{a,b} \gamma_a \gamma_b \partial^\rho \phi_a \partial_\rho \phi_b + \sum_a \gamma_a \nabla^2 \phi_a \right) = 0, \end{aligned} \quad (5)$$

and the scalar field equations

$$\gamma_a \left[ R + \sum_{b,c} \beta_{bc} \partial^\sigma \phi_b \partial_\sigma \phi_c - 2\Lambda \right] = 2 \sum_c \beta_{ac} \left( \nabla^2 \phi_c + \nabla^\mu \phi_c \sum_d \gamma_d \partial_\mu \phi_d \right), \quad (6)$$

here a slight difference is noted in comparison to [2] where the factor 2 is missing at the right-hand side of this equation.

We further consider a static configuration of two scalar fields under the metric ansatz (2) and arrive at the following Einstein field equations

**rr:**

$$\begin{aligned} & \beta_{11}\phi_1'(r)^2 + \beta_{22}\phi_2'(r)^2 + 2\beta_{12}\phi_1'(r)\phi_2'(r) + \gamma_1 \left( \frac{2}{r} + \frac{f'(r)}{f(r)} \right) \phi_1'(r) + \\ & \gamma_2 \left( \frac{2}{r} + \frac{f'(r)}{f(r)} \right) \phi_2'(r) + \frac{2l^2\Lambda}{r^2 f(r)} = 0, \end{aligned} \quad (7)$$

**tt:**

$$\begin{aligned} & \gamma_1\phi_1''(r) + \gamma_2\phi_2''(r) + \left( \gamma_1^2 - \frac{\beta_{11}}{2} \right) \phi_1'(r)^2 + \left( \gamma_2^2 - \frac{\beta_{22}}{2} \right) \phi_2'(r)^2 + \\ & (2\gamma_1\gamma_2 - \beta_{12}) \phi_1'(r)\phi_2'(r) + \left( \frac{1}{r} + \frac{f'(r)}{2f(r)} \right) (\gamma_1\phi_1'(r) + \gamma_2\phi_2'(r)) + \\ & \frac{l^2\Lambda}{r^2 f(r)} = 0, \end{aligned} \quad (8)$$

and the scalar field equations

$$\begin{aligned} & 2\beta_{11}\phi_1''(r) + 2\beta_{12}\phi_2''(r) + \beta_{11}\gamma_1\phi_1'(r)^2 + (2\beta_{12}\gamma_2 - \beta_{22}\gamma_1) \phi_2'(r)^2 + \\ & 2\beta_{11}\gamma_2\phi_1'(r)\phi_2'(r) + 2 \left( \frac{2}{r} + \frac{f'(r)}{f(r)} \right) (\beta_{11}\phi_1'(r) + \beta_{12}\phi_2'(r)) + \\ & \frac{\gamma_1}{r^2 f(r)} [r^2 f''(r) + 4r f'(r) + 2f(r) + 2l^2\Lambda] = 0, \end{aligned} \quad (9)$$

$$\begin{aligned} & 2\beta_{12}\phi_1''(r) + 2\beta_{22}\phi_2''(r) + (2\beta_{12}\gamma_1 - \beta_{11}\gamma_2) \phi_1'(r)^2 + \beta_{22}\gamma_2\phi_2'(r)^2 + \\ & 2\beta_{22}\gamma_1\phi_1'(r)\phi_2'(r) + 2 \left( \frac{2}{r} + \frac{f'(r)}{f(r)} \right) (\beta_{12}\phi_1'(r) + \beta_{22}\phi_2'(r)) + \\ & \frac{\gamma_2}{r^2 f(r)} [r^2 f''(r) + 4r f'(r) + 2f(r) + 2l^2\Lambda] = 0. \end{aligned} \quad (10)$$


## 2.1 $AdS_2$ black hole solutions

In this section we present some analytic black hole solutions for the previous equations of motion. Given that the scalar field solutions  $\phi_1$  and  $\phi_2$  were obtained keeping the constants  $\gamma_1$  and  $\gamma_2$  completely arbitrary we consider to rescale the scalar fields so that  $\gamma_1 = \gamma_2 = 1$ .

**Solution I.** In this case we consider the relation among the constants  $\Lambda = -\frac{1}{l^2}$  and  $\beta_{11} = \frac{(\beta_{12})^2}{\beta_{22}}$ . It can be shown that the field equations admit the following  $AdS$  black hole solution

$$ds^2 = l^2 \left[ - \left( 1 - \frac{c_1}{r} + \frac{c_2}{r^2} \right) r^2 dt^2 + \frac{dr^2}{\left( 1 - \frac{c_1}{r} + \frac{c_2}{r^2} \right) r^2} \right], \quad (11)$$

where  $c_1, c_2$  are arbitrary real constants.



**Fig. 1:** Solution I. Behavior of the scalar fields for some particular values of the constants. For these examples we fix  $c_3 = c_4 = 0$ ,  $\beta_{22} = 2$ ,  $\beta_{12} = 3$ ,  $c_1 = 4$ ,  $c_2 = 3$ . The dashed vertical lines represent the event horizon  $r_+ = 3$  where we observe a regular behavior of the scalar fields.

The scalar fields that support this metric are

$$\phi_1(r) = c_3 + \log \left[ \left( r - \frac{c_1}{2} \right)^{\sigma_1} \right], \quad \phi_2(r) = c_4 + \log \left[ \left( r - \frac{c_1}{2} \right)^{\sigma_2} \right], \quad (12)$$

where  $c_3, c_4$  are arbitrary real constants,  $\sigma_1 = \frac{\beta_{22}}{\beta_{22} - \beta_{12}}$  and  $\sigma_2 = -\frac{\beta_{12}}{\beta_{22} - \beta_{12}}$  (see Fig. 1). The outer  $r_+$  and inner  $r_-$  horizons for this solution are located at


$$r_{\pm} = \pm \sqrt{\frac{c_1^2}{4} - c_2} + \frac{c_1}{2}. \quad (13)$$

In order to preserve the signature of the metric, that is  $f(r) > 0$ , and for the scalar fields to be well-behaved for  $r > r_+ > 0$ , one of the following two conditions is required

$$c_1 > 0, \quad \frac{c_1^2}{4} \geq c_2, \quad r > \sqrt{\frac{c_1^2}{4} - c_2} + \frac{c_1}{2}, \quad (14)$$

$$c_1 \leq 0, \quad c_2 \leq 0, \quad r > \sqrt{\frac{c_1^2}{4} - c_2} + \frac{c_1}{2}. \quad (15)$$

An important remark is that this solution reproduces, as a particular case when  $c_1 = 0$ , the two-dimensional AdS black hole configuration in the group of the  $a$ - $b$  family of solutions in [10, 17], for  $b = 1$ .



**Fig. 2:** Solution II. Examples of curves representing the scalar fields with  $c_3 = c_4 = 0$ ,  $\beta_{22} = 2$ ,  $\beta_{12} = 3$ ,  $c_1 = 4$  and  $c_2 = 3$ . For this case, the event horizon is located at  $r_+ = 3$ , where the scalar fields have a singular behavior.

**Solution II.** Provided that  $\Lambda = 0$ ,  $\beta_{11} = 2\beta_{12} - \beta_{22}$ , the equations admit the same black hole solution (11), but for a somewhat different scalar field configuration

$$\phi_1(r) = c_3 + \log[(r^2 - c_1 r + c_2)^{\sigma_1}], \quad \phi_2(r) = c_4 + \log[(r^2 - c_1 r + c_2)^{\sigma_2}], \quad (16)$$

where  $c_3, c_4$  are arbitrary real constants,  $\sigma_1 = \frac{1}{2(\beta_{22} - \beta_{12})}$ ,  $\sigma_2 = -\frac{1}{2(\beta_{22} - \beta_{12})}$  (see Fig. 2). The horizons  $r_{\pm}$  for this solution have the same expression (13).

Again, in order to preserve the signature of the metric and for the scalar fields to be well-defined for  $r > r_+ > 0$ , one of the conditions (14) and (15) needs to be fulfilled.


Here we would like to remark that even when we have a vanishing cosmological constant  $\Lambda = 0$ , the negative curvature of the two-dimensional spacetime is reached thanks to the presence of the scalar fields non-minimally coupled to gravity.

**Solution III.** In this solution we consider  $\Lambda = 0$ ,  $\beta_{11} = 2$  and  $\beta_{22} = 2(\beta_{12} - 1)$ . Given these conditions we find the following black hole solution

$$ds^2 = l^2 \left[ - \left(1 - \frac{c_1}{2r}\right)^2 r^2 dt^2 + \frac{dr^2}{\left(1 - \frac{c_1}{2r}\right)^2 r^2} \right], \quad (17)$$

with the following scalar field configuration

$$\phi_1(r) = c_3 + \log[(r + c_5)^{\sigma_1}] - \log\left(r - \frac{c_1}{2}\right), \quad \phi_2(r) = c_4 + \log[(r + c_5)^{\sigma_2}], \quad (18)$$



**Fig. 3:** Solution III. Scalar field graphics with the following parameter values:  $c_3 = c_4 = 0$ ,  $\beta_{22} = 1$ ,  $\beta_{12} = 3$ ,  $c_1 = 4$  and  $c_5 = 3$ . We observe the regular behavior of the scalar field  $\phi_2(x)$  at the horizon  $r_H = 2$ .

where  $c_1$ ,  $c_3$ ,  $c_4$  and  $c_5$  are arbitrary real constants,  $\sigma_1 = \frac{\beta_{12}-1}{\beta_{12}-2}$ ,  $\sigma_2 = -\frac{1}{\beta_{12}-2}$  (see Fig. 3). The event horizon for this solution is located at

$$r_H = \frac{c_1}{2}. \quad (19)$$

In order to have  $f(r) > 0$  and the scalar fields to be well-behaved for  $r > r_H > 0$ , we require that

$$c_1 > 0, \quad \frac{c_1}{2} \geq -c_5, \quad \text{and} \quad r > \frac{c_1}{2}. \quad (20)$$

We would like to note that the black hole presented here corresponds to the extremal configuration of the metric solutions I and II, where we have the following relation between the constants of integration

$$c_2 = \frac{c_1^2}{4} \quad (21)$$

and the event horizon emerges as the union of the outer and inner horizons.

In order to clarify this point, we study the spacetime structure of solutions I and II in section 3.

It is interesting to remark that the scalar field configuration corresponding to the black solution III is completely different from those of solutions I and II in the extremal case due to the presence of an extra integration constant that cannot be recovered through field redefinitions and/or coordinate transformations. Notwithstanding, all three solutions share the same negative curvature (see below), with or without a cosmological constant.



**Constant curvature.** Finally, we would like to highlight that for all solutions presented above, the curvature scalar derived from the ansatz (2)

$$R = g^{\mu\nu} R_{\mu\nu} = -\frac{r^2 f''(r) + 4r f'(r) + 2f(r)}{l^2}, \quad (22)$$

results in a constant and negative quantity, an intrinsic property of the  $AdS_2$  spacetime

$$R = -\frac{2}{l^2}, \quad (23)$$

upon substitution of the metric function  $f(r)$ .

**Dilaton field.** At this point, it is helpful to define the dilaton field  $X(r)$  as the exponential function in the action (4)

$$X(r) = e^{\sum_a \phi_a}, \quad (24)$$

here  $a = 1, 2$ . As we will corroborate in the following sections, this quantity is essential in two-dimensional dilaton gravity models; for instance, it is associated with a conserved charge, defining in this way the corresponding dilatonic potential and determining the thermodynamical properties of the black holes. In addition, the value of the dilaton field at the horizon is encountered to define the entropy of the non-extremal black holes, giving the dilaton a relevant physical significance.


Furthermore, even though the scalar fields in the extremal solution III have an asymptotically singular behavior, as exemplified in Fig. 3, the dilaton field  $X(r)$  has a constant and finite behavior at infinity, see Fig 4. This property is significant (and unusual in dilatonic models) mainly because it leads to a finite on-shell action that we employ in the semiclassical approximation of the partition function without the necessity of a counterterm action, as we will see below.

## 2.2 $AdS_2$ geometry

As commented above, the  $AdS_2$  geometry emerges as the near-horizon limit of, for instance, the  $4D$  extremal or near-extremal RN black hole; for a pair of nice reviews see [18, 19]. In this example it is usually shown that, with an appropriate change of variables, the product of  $AdS_2$  space and a two-dimensional sphere  $S_2$ , with radius equal to the dilaton, is obtained near the event horizon. That suitable change of coordinates makes use of a small parameter that sizes the separation from the horizon; eventually this parameter is set to zero as a part of the near-horizon limit.

As stated in the last section, if the relation (21) is met in our two-dimensional solutions, the black holes become extremal. In this scenario we can implement the following change of coordinates

$$r = \frac{c_1}{2} (1 + \tilde{r}) \quad \text{and} \quad t = \frac{2}{c_1} \tilde{t}, \quad (25)$$



**Fig. 4:** Graphical representation of an example of the dilaton field  $X(r) = e^{\phi_1 + \phi_2} = \frac{r+3}{r-2}$  in the extremal solution III. We employ the following particular values:  $c_3 = c_4 = 0$ ,  $\beta_{22} = 1$ ,  $\beta_{12} = 3$ ,  $c_1 = 4$ ,  $c_5 = 3$  and  $\kappa = 3$ . We observe the asymptotically finite and constant value of the dilaton field  $X(r)$  and its singular behavior at the horizon  $r_H = 2$ , represented here with the dashed vertical line.

where there is no near-horizon parameter and the  $\tilde{r}$  coordinate has its origin at the horizon  $r_H = \frac{c_1}{2}$ .

Employing the change of coordinates (25) in the metric describing the extreme black hole solution (17), the resulting geometry description is given by the metric of the two-dimensional anti-de Sitter spacetime  $AdS_2$

$$ds^2 = l^2 \left( -\tilde{r}^2 d\tilde{t}^2 + \frac{d\tilde{r}^2}{\tilde{r}^2} \right). \quad (26)$$

It is important to note that, the fact that there is no need to use a parameter that impose the near-horizon validity of the change of coordinates, tells us that we have an  $AdS_2$  spacetime in all the region  $r_H < r$ . Moreover, we also point out that, despite the constant curvature of our solutions, the global causal structure, that we study in detail in the following section, reveals their black hole nature; see for instance [20] for another example of this kind.

### 3 Black hole global causal structure

Employing the coordinates  $(t,r)$ , the components of the metric have singularities at the outer and inner horizons. Therefore, in order to extend the spacetime trough this surfaces, we need to construct suitable coordinate patches.

In the case of solutions I and II, for radial null curves, the coordinates  $t$  and  $r$  are related in the following way

$$t = \pm \frac{1}{\sqrt{c_1^2 - 4c_2}} \log \left| \frac{\sqrt{c_1^2 - 4c_2} + c_1 - 2r}{\sqrt{c_1^2 - 4c_2} - c_1 + 2r} \right| + \text{constant}, \quad (27)$$

where the upper/lower sign refers to null curves in the direction of increasing/decreasing  $r$  (outgoing/ingoing light rays). From relation (27) we define the coordinate

$$r^* = \frac{1}{\sqrt{c_1^2 - 4c_2}} \log \left| \frac{\sqrt{c_1^2 - 4c_2} + c_1 - 2r}{\sqrt{c_1^2 - 4c_2} - c_1 + 2r} \right|, \quad (28)$$

such that  $t = \pm r^* + \text{constant}$ .

Now we introduce the null coordinates

$$u = t - r^* \quad \text{and} \quad v = t + r^*, \quad (29)$$

which are properly adapted to the description of null geodesics. It is easy to verify that ingoing null geodesics are described by  $v = \text{constant}$  while the outgoing ones obey  $u = \text{constant}$ . We can use the original coordinate  $r$  and replace  $t$  with the coordinate  $v$  or  $u$ . For example, if we choose the  $(v, r)$  coordinate system, known as ingoing Eddington-Finkelstein coordinates, the metric takes the form

$$ds^2 = -r^2 \left( 1 - \frac{c_1}{r} + \frac{c_2}{r^2} \right) dv^2 + 2dvdr. \quad (30)$$

We can verify that radial null curves satisfy the following conditions:

$$\frac{dv}{dr} = \begin{cases} 0 & \text{ingoing} \\ \frac{2}{r^2(1 - \frac{c_1}{r} + \frac{c_2}{r^2})} & \text{outgoing}, \end{cases} \quad (31)$$

from which we see that the light cones remain well-behaved at  $r_+$  and  $r_-$ . Furthermore, given that the function  $f(r) = 1 - \frac{c_1}{r} + \frac{c_2}{r^2} < 0$  for  $r_- < r < r_+$  all future directed paths of null or timelike particles are in the direction of decreasing  $r$ . This is not the case for the region  $0 < r < r_-$  where  $f(r) > 0$ , consequently, the future directed paths are not necessarily pointing inwards. Below we study these and other properties of the causal structure of solutions I and II by means of Kruskal coordinates.

### 3.1 Kruskal extension

From definitions (28) and (29), we see that the surface  $r = r_+$  is found to be at  $u = \infty$  or  $v = -\infty$ , so it is a good choice to construct the following null Kruskal coordinates

$$U_+ = \mp e^{-\kappa+u}, \quad V_+ = e^{\kappa+v}, \quad (32)$$

where the upper sign in  $U_+$  is used for  $r > r_+$  and the lower sign for  $r_- < r < r_+$ ; the quantity

$$\kappa_+ \equiv \frac{r_+^2}{2} f'(r_+) = \frac{1}{2} \sqrt{c_1^2 - 4c_2}, \quad (33)$$

is known as surface gravity<sup>1</sup>. Here the prime denotes derivatives with respect to  $r$  and we have made use of relation (13).

In order to have a metric with one timelike coordinate and one spacelike we define the following Kruskal coordinates

$$T_+ = \frac{1}{2} (V_+ + U_+), \quad R_+ = \frac{1}{2} (V_+ - U_+), \quad (35)$$

in terms of which the metric becomes

$$ds^2 = \frac{4}{(T_+^2 - R_+^2 + 1)^2} (-dT_+^2 + dR_+^2), \quad (36)$$

where we used the following identities

$$T_+^2 - R_+^2 = U_+ V_+ = 1 - \frac{2(2r - c_1)}{2r - c_1 + \sqrt{c_1^2 - 4c_2}}. \quad (37)$$

The form of the metric (36) tells us that solutions I and II are conformally equivalent to flat spacetime.

Using equation (37) to evaluate the metric (36) at  $r_+$  for solutions I and II

$$ds^2 = 4(-dT_+^2 + dR_+^2), \quad (38)$$

we appreciate the nonsingular nature of the outer horizon.

Some important remarks for this coordinates are


- From (36) we see that radial null curves look like they do in two-dimensional flat spacetime,  $T_+ = \pm R_+ + \text{constant}$ . In particular, from (37) we see that the outer horizon  $r_+$  is described by the straight lines  $T_+ = \pm R_+$ .
- From equation (37) we realize that  $r = \text{constant}$  curves are described now by hyperbolae  $T_+^2 - R_+^2 = \text{constant}$ . In particular we see that the  $AdS_2$  boundary  $r \rightarrow \infty$  is depicted by  $T_+^2 - R_+^2 \rightarrow -1$ .
- The range for these coordinates is  $-\infty < T_+ < \infty$ ,  $R_+^2 < T_+^2 + 1$ .
- By virtue of equations (13) and (37) we see that the inner horizon  $r_-$  is located at  $T_+^2 - R_+^2 \rightarrow \infty$ , consequently we need a new set of Kruskal coordinates to extend the spacetime in that direction.

---

<sup>1</sup>Given that we are dealing with static spacetimes, the event horizon  $r_+$  is a Killing horizon where the Killing vector representing time translations  $\xi^\alpha = (\partial_t)^\alpha$  becomes null. We can associate to this Killing horizon the quantity  $\kappa$  given by the relation

$$\kappa^2 = -\frac{1}{2} (\nabla^\beta \xi^\alpha) (\nabla_\beta \xi_\alpha). \quad (34)$$

When evaluated at  $r_+$ ,  $\kappa$  is known as the surface gravity  $\kappa_+$ .



**Fig. 5:** Kruskal diagram in coordinates  $(T_+, R_+)$ .


We can draw the Kruskal diagram in the plane  $T_+ - R_+$ , as shown in Figure 5, that illustrates the regions outside (I and IV) and inside (II and III)  $r_+$  up to an arbitrary cutoff point  $r_1 > r_-$ . We see that for  $r_- < r < r_+$  all null and timelike future directed paths are in the direction of decreasing  $r$  revealing that the null surface  $r_+$  is an event horizon.

As for the outer horizon  $r_+$  case, we construct a new set of Kruskal coordinates,  $T_-$  and  $R_-$ , adapted to the inner horizon  $r_-$ . In this case we define the null coordinates

$$U_- = \mp e^{-\kappa_- u}, \quad V_- = -e^{\kappa_- v}, \quad (39)$$

where the upper sign in  $U_-$  is used for  $r > r_-$  and the lower sign refers to  $r < r_-$  and  $\kappa_- = \frac{r_-^2}{2} f'(r_-)$ . The surface  $r_-$  is located at  $v \rightarrow \infty$  or  $u \rightarrow -\infty$ . As in the previous case we define the following Kruskal coordinates

$$T_- = \frac{1}{2}(V_- + U_-), \quad R_- = \frac{1}{2}(V_- - U_-), \quad (40)$$



**Fig. 6:** Kruskal diagram for coordinates  $(T_-, R_-)$ .

in terms of which the metric becomes

$$ds^2 = \frac{4}{(T_-^2 - R_-^2 + 1)^2} (-dT_-^2 + dR_-^2), \quad (41)$$

where we used the identities

$$T_-^2 - R_-^2 = U_- V_- = 1 - \frac{2(2r - c_1)}{2r - c_1 - \sqrt{c_1^2 - 4c_2}}. \quad (42)$$

The former equation (42) becomes identically zero when evaluated at the inner horizon  $r_-$  (13). Using this fact in equation (41), we realize that the metric is manifestly regular at  $r_-$ , i.e.  $ds^2 = 4(-dT_-^2 + dR_-^2)$ .

With this knowledge at hand, we draw the Kruskal diagram, as illustrated in Figure 6, for the region  $0 < r < r_1$  that contains the inner horizon  $r = r_-$ . A remarkable feature is that, for  $r < r_-$ , any surface  $r = \text{const}$  is a timelike surface, including the singularity  $r = 0$ . This is due to the re-interpretation of  $r$  as a spacelike coordinate because  $f > 0$  for  $r < r_-$ . Because of this, the singularity can be avoided, if so decided, by observers moving within the region  $0 < r < r_-$  of the black hole, since there,

the light cone's direction allows for this kind of motion. We illustrate this interesting feature in the following section.

### 3.2 Penrose diagram

In order to illustrate our two-dimensional spacetimes I and II in compact form, we construct their Penrose diagram, shown in Figure 7.

We employ the coordinate transformation

$$\tilde{U}_{\pm} = \arctan(U_{\pm}) \quad \text{and} \quad \tilde{V}_{\pm} = \arctan(V_{\pm}), \quad (43)$$

over the null Kruskal coordinates (32) and (39). The relations (35), (40) and the range of the coordinates  $(T_+, R_+)$ , which is the same for  $(T_-, R_-)$ , are employed to deduce that the range of the coordinates  $(U_+, V_+)$  and  $(U_-, V_-)$  is given by

$$-\infty < U_{\pm} < \infty \quad \text{and} \quad -1 < U_{\pm}V_{\pm}. \quad (44)$$

Taking into account this last relation and the transformation (43) we easily realize that the  $(\tilde{U}_+, \tilde{V}_+)$  and  $(\tilde{U}_-, \tilde{V}_-)$  coordinate domains are defined by the intersection of


$$-\frac{\pi}{2} < \tilde{U}_{\pm} < \frac{\pi}{2}, \quad -\frac{\pi}{2} < \tilde{V}_{\pm} < \frac{\pi}{2} \quad \text{and} \quad -1 < \tan(\tilde{V}_{\pm}) \tan(\tilde{U}_{\pm}). \quad (45)$$

From the relations (35) and (40), the metric expressions (36) and (41), and the transformation (43), we find the metric form

$$ds^2 = -4 \frac{d\tilde{U}_{\pm} d\tilde{V}_{\pm}}{\cos^2(\tilde{U}_{\pm} - \tilde{V}_{\pm})}. \quad (46)$$

From this equation we observe that the light cones are depicted with lines  $\tilde{U}_{\pm} = \text{constant}$  or  $\tilde{V}_{\pm} = \text{constant}$ . The outer and inner horizons  $r_+$  and  $r_-$  are described with the same straight lines  $\tilde{U}_{\pm} \tilde{V}_{\pm} = 0$  as in Kruskal coordinates. The timelike boundary  $r \rightarrow \infty$  is now depicted in a finite form by straight lines between the future timelike infinity  $i^+$  and the past timelike infinity  $i^-$  which, in the same way, are the past and future end points of the surfaces  $r = \text{constant}$ . Similarly, the singularity  $r = 0$  is illustrated by straight lines in this conformal diagram.

We use the Penrose diagram to illustrate the motion of an observer inside the  $AdS_2$  black holes I and II, as shown in Figure 7. Once the observer has crossed the outer horizon  $r = r_+$ , when moving towards the interior of the event horizon, the only possible direction implies decreasing  $r$ , in this region the coordinate  $r$  is timelike. After crossing the inner horizon  $r = r_-$  the coordinate  $r$  becomes spacelike and any direction is possible. If the observer decides to return to the inner horizon he will cross another copy of  $r_-$ . After that, the only option for the observer is to go towards the outer horizon because now the coordinate  $r$  becomes once again timelike. The observer goes out, from another copy of the outer horizon, to a new asymptotically  $AdS_2$  spacetime.



**Fig. 7:** Conformal diagram for the  $AdS_2$  black holes I and II. The spacetime boundary  $r \rightarrow \infty$  is represented by the dashed vertical straight lines and the singularity  $r = 0$  is depicted by the zigzag vertical ones. Here we illustrate a particular motion through a timelike path.



## 4 Thermodynamics

For higher dimensional black holes, the standard Bekenstein-Hawking relation states that the entropy is always found to be one quarter of the horizon area, in Planck units

$$S = \frac{A_H}{4G}. \quad (47)$$

In [10] it was shown that this formula also holds for the two-dimensional dilaton-gravity case with an effective Newton constant defined in terms of the dilaton field at the horizon  $G_{\text{eff}} = \frac{G_2}{X_H}$ , namely,

$$S = \frac{A_H}{4G_{\text{eff}}}. \quad (48)$$

To see how this relation takes place, we first recall that a sphere of radius  $r$  in  $d$  spatial dimensions has an area  $A_d = 2\pi^{d/2}r^{d-1}/\Gamma(d/2)$ . Then we make use of this formula in the  $d \rightarrow 1$  limit to compute  $A_1 = 2$ . When considering that in one dimension the sphere consists of two disjoint points, only one of them is associated with the horizon, such that  $A_H = A_1/2 = 1$ . By substituting this result into (48) we are led to

$$S = \frac{1}{4G_{\text{eff}}} = \frac{X_H}{4G_2}; \quad (49)$$

by further setting  $8\pi G_2 = 1$  we obtain the known result for the entropy of two-dimensional black holes [8–10, 21, 22]

$$S = 2\pi X_H, \quad (50)$$

a quantity that is completely determined by the event horizon. It is worth noticing that this is a universal result valid for any dilaton gravity model.

In this section, we verify this result for our solutions by employing the Euclidean treatment of quantum gravity [4]. In this approach, the partition function  $\mathcal{Z}$  is obtained by computing the path integral over the space of all periodic field configurations in Euclidean time. As stated above, the path integral is given by the approximation (3) under certain conditions. With this in mind, we construct a renormalized action  $\Gamma_{\text{reg}}$  with a regulating boundary  $r = r_{\text{reg}}$  and obtain the partition function for the canonical ensemble in this way. Finally, we compute the thermodynamic properties for our black hole configurations. We verify the results by accomplishing the quasi-local form of the first law of Thermodynamics.

### 4.1 Temperature

In order to deduce the Hawking temperature, following the approach first presented in [4], we consider regularity at the Euclidean horizon. As usual, see for example [23], we first Taylor expand the metric (2) near the outer horizon  $r_+$  and obtain

$$ds^2 = l^2 \left( -r_+^2 (r - r_+) f'(r_+) dt^2 + \frac{dr^2}{r_+^2 (r - r_+) f'(r_+)} + \dots \right). \quad (51)$$

Subsequently, we perform the Wick rotation  $t \rightarrow -it = t_E$ , and carrying out the change of coordinates

$$r = r_+ + \frac{r_+^2 f'(r_+)}{4l^2} \rho^2, \quad t_E = \frac{2}{f'(r_+) r_+^2} \eta, \quad (52)$$

we find the near-horizon Euclidean metric to be

$$ds^2 = \rho^2 d\eta^2 + d\rho^2 + \dots, \quad (53)$$

which we identify as Euclidean space in two dimensions in polar coordinates. In order to avoid a conical singularity at the Euclidean horizon  $\rho = 0$  it is necessary to take into account the periodicity

$$\eta \sim \eta + 2\pi, \quad \text{which means} \quad t_E \sim t_E + \frac{4\pi}{f'(r_+) r_+^2}. \quad (54)$$

Recalling that if we have a quantum field theory with a Wick rotated periodic time, with period  $\beta$ , then we have a theory with finite temperature  $T = \frac{1}{\beta}$ , assuming  $\hbar = 1$ . Therefore we have found that the Hawking temperature of the black hole solutions considered here is

$$T = \frac{f'(r_+) r_+^2}{4\pi}, \quad (55)$$

which, as we can appreciate from (33), is related to the surface gravity in the following way

$$T = \frac{\kappa_+}{2\pi} = \frac{1}{4\pi} \sqrt{c_1^2 - 4c_2}. \quad (56)$$

It is easy to see that the extreme solution III also has zero temperature because of the definition (55).

We see that the temperature (56) reproduces as a particular case, when  $c_1 = 0$ , the Hawking temperature for the AdS black hole of the  $a$ - $b$  family presented in [10] for  $b = 1$ .

In section 4.3, it will be helpful to relate the Hawking temperature  $T$  to a local proper temperature  $T_w$  measured at an arbitrary surface  $r = r_w > r_+$ . Given that the Hawking temperature is established by requiring the periodicity (54) in the Euclidean time  $t_E$  (or in the coordinate  $t$ ), we can employ the Euclidean relation between  $t_E$  (or  $t$ ) and the proper time  $\tau_w$  for a static observer placed at  $r_w$

$$d\tau_w^2 = g_{tt}(r_w) dt_E^2 = r_w^2 f(r_w) dt^2, \quad (57)$$

to obtain the redshift or Tolman relation<sup>2</sup> [24]

$$T_w = \frac{1}{r_w \sqrt{f(r_w)}} T. \quad (58)$$

---

<sup>2</sup>For asymptotically flat black holes,  $g_{tt} \rightarrow 1$  when  $r \rightarrow \infty$ , therefore, the Hawking temperature  $T$  corresponds to the local temperature  $T_w$  measured by an observer at infinity.

## 4.2 $AdS_2$ black hole partition function in two dimensions

From this section we consider the Euclidean version of the action (4) in 1+1 dimensions

$$I = \int_{\mathcal{M}} d^2x \sqrt{g} X \left( R + \sum_{b,c} \beta_{bc} (\partial^\mu \phi_b) (\partial_\mu \phi_c) - 2\Lambda \right) + 2 \int_{\partial\mathcal{M}} dx \sqrt{\gamma} X K, \quad (59)$$

where, as stated above,  $X = e^{\sum_a \phi_a}$  stands for the dilaton and  $a, b, c = 1, 2$ . We have added the Gibbons-Hawking-York term [4, 25] where  $\gamma_{ij} = g_{tt}$  is the induced metric on the boundary<sup>3</sup>  $r = \text{constant}$ , with  $r \rightarrow \infty$ , and  $K$  is the trace of the extrinsic curvature or second fundamental form.

We compute the thermodynamical properties for the black hole solutions presented in section 2.1 employing the partition function  $\mathcal{Z}$  given by the path integral weighted by the exponential of the Euclidean action  $I$  [4]

$$\mathcal{Z} = \int \mathcal{D}g \mathcal{D}\phi_a \exp \left( -\frac{1}{\hbar} I[g, \phi_a] \right), \quad (60)$$

with  $\mathcal{D}g$  and  $\mathcal{D}\phi_a$  denoting some measure for the metric and the scalar fields, respectively.

We might assume that the dominant contribution for the path integral comes from the solutions to the classical field equations, so that we can approximate

$$\mathcal{Z} \sim \exp \left( -\frac{1}{\hbar} I[g_{cl}, \phi_{a,cl}] \right). \quad (61)$$

Nevertheless, in order for the assumption to be valid, it is necessary to have an action that is finite on-shell and whose variation  $\delta I$  vanishes for the classical solutions  $g_{cl}$  and  $\phi_{a,cl}$ .

To evaluate the action (59), we shall incorporate an auxiliary regulator  $r \leq r_{\text{reg}}$ , treating the surface  $r = r_{\text{reg}}$  as a finite boundary; we recover the full spacetime by taking the limit  $r_{\text{reg}} \rightarrow \infty$ . For instance, computing the regulated on-shell action for solution I we arrive at

$$I_{\text{reg}} = 2x_0 \beta \left[ \left( r_{\text{reg}} - \frac{c_1}{2} \right)^2 + \frac{2\pi}{x_0} X_+ T - \left( \frac{c_1^2}{4} - c_2 \right) \right], \quad (62)$$

where  $X_+ = x_0 \sqrt{\frac{c_1^2}{4} - c_2}$  is the value of the dilaton at the horizon  $r_+$ , the constant  $x_0 = e^{c_3 + c_4}$  and remember that the period  $\beta = \frac{1}{T}$ , with  $T$  being the Hawking temperature (56). Note that the limit  $r_{\text{reg}} \rightarrow \infty$  in equation (62) diverges for the on-shell action I. Similarly, we further verify that variations of the fields, that preserve the

---

<sup>3</sup>Because we are dealing with a one-dimensional boundary, the subscripts  $i, j$  just keep track of the quantities related to the induced metric.

boundary conditions in solution I, lead to

$$\delta I = \lim_{r \rightarrow \infty} \delta I_{\text{reg}} \rightarrow \infty. \quad (63)$$

Following the techniques developed in [9, 10] we apply the method of Hamilton-Jacobi [11] to remove the divergences. This approach enables us to construct a boundary counter-term  $I_{ct}$  that renders the action finite on-shell and that is extremized by classical solutions of the field equations. This counter-term action is related to (59) in the following way

$$I = I_{ct} + \Gamma, \quad (64)$$

where the resulting renormalized action  $\Gamma$  is the one we are allowed to employ in the saddle point approximation (61). The boundary integral  $I_{ct}$  may depend on the fields and only on their tangential derivatives to the boundary in order for the actions  $I$  and  $\Gamma$  to lead to the same field equations.

In order to obtain the counter-term, the Hamiltonian derived from the action  $I$  is required to satisfy the constraint  $\mathcal{H} = 0$ . For the action (59) the associated Hamiltonian density is

$$\begin{aligned} \mathcal{H} = & 4(\beta_{12}^2 - \beta_{11}\beta_{22})(\pi^{ij}\gamma_{ij})^2 + 4\pi^{ij}\gamma_{ij}[(\beta_{22} - \beta_{12})\pi_{\phi_1} + (\beta_{11} - \beta_{12})\pi_{\phi_2}] \\ & + (\pi_{\phi_1} - \pi_{\phi_2})^2 + 8(\beta_{11} + \beta_{22} - 2\beta_{12})X^2\Lambda, \end{aligned} \quad (65)$$

here the canonical momenta,  $\pi^{ij}$  and  $\pi_{\phi_a}$ , conjugate to the fields are defined in terms of the change of the fields along the  $r$  direction<sup>4</sup>.

Varying the action with respect to the fields and evaluating it for a solution of the field equations, momenta appear as boundary terms

$$\delta I_{\text{on-shell}} = \int_{\partial\mathcal{M}} d\tau \sqrt{\gamma} \left[ \pi^{ij} \delta\gamma_{ij} + \sum_{a=1}^2 \pi_{\phi_a} \delta\phi_a \right], \quad (66)$$

in such a way that we can write them as functional derivatives of the on-shell action with respect to the fields at the boundary

$$\pi^{ij} = \frac{1}{\sqrt{\gamma}} \frac{\delta}{\delta\gamma_{ij}} (I_{\text{on-shell}}), \quad \pi_{\phi_a} = \frac{1}{\sqrt{\gamma}} \frac{\delta}{\delta\phi_a} (I_{\text{on-shell}}). \quad (67)$$

With equation (65) and the result (67), the Hamiltonian constraint  $\mathcal{H} = 0$  is written as a non-linear functional differential equation for the on-shell action, the Hamilton-Jacobi equation.

---

<sup>4</sup>For a thorough review of the Hamiltonian formulation for a general dilaton theory see [26].

Given that the counter-term action is, in the same way, required to solve the Hamilton-Jacobi equation we must have

$$\begin{aligned}
& 4(\beta_{12}^2 - \beta_{11}\beta_{22}) [\gamma_{ij} (\partial_{\gamma_{ij}} I_{ct})]^2 + [(\partial_{\phi_1} I_{ct}) - (\partial_{\phi_2} I_{ct})]^2 \\
& + 4\gamma_{ij} (\partial_{\gamma_{ij}} I_{ct}) [(\beta_{22} - \beta_{12})(\partial_{\phi_1} I_{ct}) + (\beta_{11} - \beta_{12})(\partial_{\phi_2} I_{ct})] \\
& + 8(\beta_{11} + \beta_{22} - 2\beta_{12}) X^2 \Lambda \gamma_{ij} = 0.
\end{aligned} \tag{68}$$

In order to solve the above non-linear differential equation we take advantage of the symmetries that  $I_{ct}$  must fulfill. First, it must be invariant under diffeomorphisms of  $\partial\mathcal{M}$ , accordingly the boundary integral takes the form

$$I_{ct} = \int_{\partial\mathcal{M}} d\tau \sqrt{\gamma} \mathcal{L}_{ct}(\phi_1, \phi_2), \tag{69}$$

where the scalar  $\mathcal{L}_{ct}$  does not depend on tangential derivatives to the boundary because the scalar fields  $\phi_a$  are invariant over time. Secondly the action (59) is invariant under the transformation

$$\begin{aligned}
g_{tt} & \rightarrow \frac{1}{g_{tt}}, \\
\phi_1 & \rightarrow \phi_1 + \frac{1}{2} \log(|g_{tt}|), \quad \phi_2 \rightarrow \phi_2 + \frac{1}{2} \log(|g_{tt}|).
\end{aligned} \tag{70}$$

We expect that the resulting action  $\Gamma$  respects the symmetries that the action  $I$  possesses, therefore  $I_{ct}$  must be invariant under (70). This is achieved by taking the ansatz:

$$I_{ct} = C \int_{\partial\mathcal{M}} d\tau \sqrt{g_{tt}} e^{\phi_1 + \phi_2}, \tag{71}$$

where  $C$  is an arbitrary constant.

The remaining part is to substitute the above expression for  $I_{ct}$  into the Hamilton-Jacobi equation (68), then it is straightforward to determine that

$$C = 2 \sqrt{-2\Lambda} \left( \frac{\beta_{11} + \beta_{22} - 2\beta_{12}}{\beta_{12}^2 - \beta_{11}\beta_{22} + 2(\beta_{11} + \beta_{22} - 2\beta_{12})} \right)^{\frac{1}{2}}. \tag{72}$$

According to (59), (64) and (71) the action  $\Gamma$  becomes

$$\begin{aligned}
\Gamma & = \int_{\mathcal{M}} d^2x \sqrt{g} X \left( R + \sum_{b,c} \beta_{bc} (\partial^\mu \phi_b) (\partial_\mu \phi_c) - 2\Lambda \right) + 2 \int_{\partial\mathcal{M}} dx \sqrt{\gamma} X K \\
& - C \int_{\partial\mathcal{M}} d\tau \sqrt{\gamma} X.
\end{aligned} \tag{73}$$

Returning to the case of solution I, substituting the values for  $\Lambda$  and  $\beta_{11}$  in (72) produces a counter-term with  $C = \frac{2}{l}$ . As before, employing the regulatory boundary

$r = r_{\text{reg}}$ , we compute the regulated on-shell action  $\Gamma_{\text{reg}}$  for this case:

$$\Gamma_{\text{reg}} = 2x_0\beta \left[ \left( r_{\text{reg}} - \frac{c_1}{2} \right)^2 + \frac{2\pi}{x_0} X_+ T - \left( \frac{c_1^2}{4} - c_2 \right) - r_{\text{reg}} \sqrt{f(r_{\text{reg}})} \left( r_{\text{reg}} - \frac{c_1}{2} \right) \right]. \quad (74)$$

Removing the regulator by taking the limit

$$\lim_{r_{\text{reg}} \rightarrow \infty} \Gamma_{\text{reg}} = 2x_0\beta \left[ \frac{2\pi}{x_0} X_+ T - \frac{1}{2} \left( \frac{c_1^2}{4} - c_2 \right) \right], \quad (75)$$

we verify the finite result for the renormalized on-shell action  $\Gamma$ . Furthermore, we compute that all variations of the fields, preserving the boundary conditions, in solution I lead to

$$\delta\Gamma = \lim_{r_{\text{reg}} \rightarrow \infty} \delta\Gamma_{\text{reg}} = 0. \quad (76)$$

Considering the result (75), we develop the remaining thermodynamic properties for the black hole solution I in the following section.

Equation (72) shows that there are no counter-terms for the remaining solutions presented in this work, as  $\Lambda = 0$  in those cases. However, we find that the on-shell actions for these solutions are appropriate finite actions to be used in the semi-classical approximation. This fact allows us to develop the thermodynamic properties presented below.

### 4.3 Canonical ensemble

In usual Thermodynamics a canonical ensemble is defined by the temperature and a variable determining the size of the system, that is to say, the volume. In [27] the author designs a system consisting of a spherical cavity, delimited by a cavity wall at radius  $r$ , enclosing a black hole at the center. The canonical ensemble of such a system is defined by the local constant temperature  $T_w(r)$  and the area of the cavity wall. The size of the system is not specified by spatial volume because the volume of a black hole is not defined at a constant Euclidean time.

Following the approach consisting in enclosing a black hole in a cavity developed in [6, 9, 10], here we perform a similar analysis. We give a physical meaning to the surface  $r_{\text{reg}}$  by imagining that it represents the wall of a ‘‘cavity’’  $r_w$  that maintains boundary conditions. The local temperature  $T_w$  measured at the wall is given by the Tolman relationship (58).

In two dimensions we can construct a conserved current  $j^\mu$  from any regular function  $f(\Phi)$  of a scalar field in the following way

$$j^\mu = \epsilon^{\mu\nu} \nabla_\nu f(\Phi), \quad (77)$$

where  $\epsilon$  is the Levi-Civita tensor in two dimensions. The associated conserved charge is

$$D_w = f(\Phi_w) = \int_\Sigma dr \sqrt{g_{rr}} j_\mu n^\mu, \quad (78)$$

where  $\Sigma$  is a surface of constant time with unitary normal vector  $n^\mu$  and a boundary located at  $r = r_w$ . Following [6] we choose the function  $f(\Phi) = X$ , with  $\Phi \equiv \phi_1 + \phi_2$ , so that we have the conserved dilaton charge

$$D_w = X_w, \quad (79)$$

where the subscript  $w$  indicates us that the charge depends on the location of the wall. Thus equation (79) gives us the dilaton charge contained within the cavity wall  $r_w$ . We assign to  $X_w$  an analogous role to that of the area of the cavity wall in higher dimensions.

As a result we have designed a cavity delimited by a wall  $r_w$  where we keep the temperature  $T_w$  and dilaton charge  $X_w$  fixed, hence the approximation (61) accounts for the partition function in the canonical ensemble

$$\mathcal{Z}(T_w, X_w) = \exp(-\Gamma_w), \quad (80)$$

where we have made  $\hbar = 1$ .

The corresponding Helmholtz free energy  $F_w$  is given by

$$F_w(T_w, X_w) = T_w \log \mathcal{Z} = -T_w \Gamma_w(T_w, X_w), \quad (81)$$

where again, the subscript reminds us that  $F_w$  is the Helmholtz free energy for the system inside the wall  $r = r_w$ .

On the other hand, the first law of Thermodynamics corresponding to this canonical ensemble reads

$$dE_w = T_w dS_w - \psi_w dX_w, \quad (82)$$

where  $E_w$  is the internal energy,  $S_w$  is the entropy and  $\psi_w$  is the chemical potential associated with the dilaton charge, the minus sign is intended to preserve the analogy with pressure in standard Thermodynamics. As usual, see for instance [28], from (82) and the Legendre transformation

$$F_w(T_w, X_w) = E_w(S_w, X_w) - T_w S_w, \quad (83)$$

we arrive to the equivalent formulation

$$dF_w = -S_w dT_w - \psi_w dX_w, \quad (84)$$

which in turn defines the entropy

$$S_w = - \left. \frac{\partial F_w}{\partial T_w} \right|_{X_w}, \quad (85)$$

and the dilaton chemical potential

$$\psi_w = - \left. \frac{\partial F_w}{\partial X_w} \right|_{T_w}. \quad (86)$$

We also ensure thermodynamic stability of all our black hole systems by verifying that the specific heat at constant dilaton charge is positive for all of them. This guarantees as well that the canonical ensemble and the saddle point approximation for the partition function are well defined.

In order to attain this aim we employ the definition for the specific heat at constant dilaton charge given by

$$C_w = \left. \frac{\partial E_w}{\partial T_w} \right|_{X_w}. \quad (87)$$

#### 4.3.1 Non-extremal solutions

**Solution I.** Using equations (58), (74), (81) and the fact that

$$X_w = x_0 \left( r_w - \frac{c_1}{2} \right), \quad (88)$$

for solution I, we calculate  $F_w$  and obtain

$$F_w = 2x_0 \left( \frac{X_w}{x_0} - \frac{T}{T_w} - \frac{2\pi}{x_0} X_+ T_w \right). \quad (89)$$

Based on (89) and (85) we compute the entropy of the black hole in this solution as follows<sup>5</sup>

$$S_w = S = - \left. \frac{\partial F_w}{\partial T_w} \right|_{X_w} = 4\pi X_+, \quad (90)$$

where we have used the relation<sup>6</sup>

$$\frac{T}{T_w} = \frac{1}{x_0} \sqrt{X_w^2 - X_+^2}. \quad (91)$$

We observe that the entropy of the black hole does not depend on the location of the wall  $r_w$  but on the value  $X_+$  of the dilaton at the horizon, just as in higher dimensions it depends on the area of the horizon. A universal form for the expression of the entropy is noted in (90) when compared to other two-dimensional dilaton gravity models [8–10, 21, 22].

As we deduced in (86) the chemical potential  $\psi_w$  associated to the conserved charge (79) is

$$\psi_w = - \left. \frac{\partial F_w}{\partial X_w} \right|_{T_w} = 2 \left( \frac{T_w}{T} \frac{X_w}{x_0} - 1 \right), \quad (92)$$

where relations (89) and (91) were used.

Following Brown and York [29] we derive the quasi-local energy  $E_w$  from the surface stress-energy-momentum tensor

$$T^{ij} := - \frac{2}{\sqrt{\gamma}} \frac{\delta \Gamma}{\delta \gamma_{ij}}, \quad (93)$$

---

<sup>5</sup>This expression for the entropy possesses a factor of 2 compared to (50) since our action (62) also has this factor when compared to the action given in [10].

<sup>6</sup>This identity is obtained from equation (58) by rewriting the Tolman factor in terms of  $X_w$  and  $X_+$ .



by contracting  $T^{ij}$  with  $\xi_i \xi_j$ , being  $\xi_i = \sqrt{g_{tt}} \delta_i^t$  the Killing vector related to time translations. Varying the action (73) we encounter that

$$T^{ij} = \frac{2x_0}{\gamma_{ij}} \left( \frac{X_w}{x_0} - \frac{T}{T_w} \right), \quad (94)$$

accordingly

$$E_w = \xi_i \xi_j T^{ij} = 2x_0 \left( \frac{X_w}{x_0} - \frac{T}{T_w} \right) \geq 0, \quad (95)$$

where the restrictions (14) and (15) have been used to assert that  $E_w$  is positive or zero.

On the other hand, performing a Legendre transformation on (83) we obtain that the internal energy  $E_w$  should obey

$$E_w(S, X_w) = F_w(T_w, X_w) + T_w S. \quad (96)$$

Hence, from equations (89) and (90) we found that

$$E_w(S, X_w) = 2x_0 \left( \frac{X_w}{x_0} - \frac{T}{T_w} \right), \quad (97)$$

and we see that the internal energy deduced in this manner is in complete agreement with the result (95).

Using the identity (91) and the expressions for entropy (90) and dilaton chemical potential (92) we verify the relation (82) for the internal energy (95) by showing that it obeys the first law of black hole Thermodynamics.

By taking the differential of (95) we find that

$$\begin{aligned} dE_w &= 2x_0 \left[ d \left( \frac{X_w}{x_0} \right) - d \left( \frac{T}{T_w} \right) \right] = 2x_0 \left[ d \left( \frac{X_w}{x_0} \right) - d \left( \frac{1}{x_0} \sqrt{X_w^2 - X_+^2} \right) \right] \\ &= 2 \left[ \left( 1 - \frac{X_w}{\sqrt{X_w^2 - X_+^2}} \right) dX_w + \frac{X_+}{\sqrt{X_w^2 - X_+^2}} dX_+ \right] \\ &= 2 \left[ \left( 1 - \frac{T_w}{T} \frac{X_w}{x_0} \right) dX_w + \frac{T}{\frac{1}{x_0} \sqrt{X_w^2 - X_+^2}} \frac{dS}{2} \right] \\ &= -\psi_w dX_w + T_w dS, \end{aligned} \quad (98)$$

where in the third equality we can track back how the divergences in  $\psi_w$  and  $T_w$  cancel each other at  $r_w = r_+$ , that is to say, at  $X_w = X_+$ , verifying that  $dE_w$  remains regular for all  $r_w \geq r_+$ , while in the fourth equality we used  $X_+ = 2\pi x_0 T$ . Here the subscript  $w$  indicates us that equation (98) remains valid no matter where the cavity wall is located along the  $r$  coordinate.

Relation (98) is one of the main results of this section and shows that our black hole configuration possesses a consistent Thermodynamics.

It is important to note that under the extremality condition (21) the entropy (90) of this black hole vanish, recall that  $X_+ = x_0 \sqrt{\frac{c_1^2}{4} - c_2}$ . Furthermore, it is easy to see that when using relation (21),  $\psi_w = E_w = T_w = 0$ . Hence, the first law is trivially fulfilled in the extremal case.

**Black hole mass.** Employing the ADM (1 + 1) decomposition, we compute the Hamiltonian for the Lorentzian version of the action (73) and arrive at

$$H = \int_{\Sigma_t} dr (N\mathcal{H} + N^r \mathcal{H}_r) + (N\epsilon + N^r P_{rr})|_B, \quad (99)$$

here we foliate the spacetime in space-like hypersurfaces  $\Sigma_t$  with boundary  $B$ ,  $N$  represents the lapse function and  $N^r$  is the shift vector,  $\mathcal{H}$  and  $\mathcal{H}_r$  are the Hamiltonian and momentum constraint respectively,  $P_{rr}$  denotes the canonical momenta conjugate to the induced metric  $g_{rr}$  in  $\Sigma_t$ . We verify that  $\epsilon$  corresponds to the quasi-local energy  $E_w$ , defined in the second equality of equation (95).

Evaluating the Hamiltonian (99) with a solution of the field equations we obtain

$$H = (N\epsilon + N^r P_{rr})|_B. \quad (100)$$

As stated in [30], this represents the total energy  $M$  for spacetimes whose lapse function does not asymptotically approach unity.

Substituting solution I in equation (100), noting that  $P_{rr} = 0$  for a static solution and  $N = \sqrt{|g_{tt}|}$ , we arrive at the total energy of the black hole

$$M = N\epsilon|_B = \lim_{r_w \rightarrow \infty} N E_w = x_0 \left( \frac{c_1^2}{4} - c_2 \right) = \frac{X_+^2}{x_0}, \quad (101)$$

where we observe that the two constants of integration in the blackening function  $f(r)$  are involved in the definition of the black hole mass. As the last equality states, the mass is proportional to the squared dilaton evaluated at the event horizon.

From (101) we easily see that the internal energy  $E_w$  is asymptotically equal to the mass  $M$ , red-shifted by the Tolman factor:

$$\lim_{r_w \rightarrow \infty} E_w = \lim_{r_w \rightarrow \infty} \frac{M}{r_w \sqrt{f(r_w)}}. \quad (102)$$

**Specific heat.** By using the aforementioned definition for the specific heat and the internal energy of this black hole solution (97) we arrive at

$$C_w = \frac{2}{x_0} \frac{X_w^2 - X_+^2}{T}, \quad (103)$$

where we have employed the expression for the Tolman factor  $\frac{T}{T_w} = \frac{1}{x_0} \sqrt{X_w^2 - X_+^2}$ . As we see from (103) the specific heat for this solution is always positive or zero, given that  $X_+ \leq X_w$  by design, yielding a stable configuration.

**Solution II.** In the case of the solution II, the counter-term action (71) obtained by the Hamilton-Jacobi method is identically zero, since  $\Lambda = 0$ , see equation (72). However, computing the on-shell action for this solution we find that

$$\Gamma_{\text{reg}} = \Gamma = -\frac{c_1}{T}, \quad (104)$$

is completely defined by the geometry of the black hole configuration and is a constant value independent of the position of the regulatory boundary  $r_{\text{reg}}$ . Moreover, evaluating  $\delta\Gamma$  for this solution, preserving the boundary conditions, we find that the variation is null. Given these properties, we are allowed to employ the semi-classical approximation (80) for the partition function. In this case, the system has a constant dilaton and, thus, a trivial dilatonic charge. Employing the same definitions as above, it can be easily shown that the internal energy  $E_w$  is null and that the entropy is a constant quantity. Consequently, the Thermodynamics of this system is consistent in a trivial manner,  $dE_w = T_w dS = 0$ , as expected for two-dimensional models without dilaton. Besides, by making use of the definition (87) we trivially obtain a null  $C_w$ , rendering a stable black hole solution.

### 4.3.2 Extremal solution

As stated before, solution III corresponds to an extreme black hole configuration with null Hawking temperature, see (55). Because of this fact, and for the sake of computation, we interpret the following thermodynamic results as the limiting quantities when  $T \rightarrow 0$ .

In the same manner as solution II, in the case at hand, the cosmological constant  $\Lambda = 0$ ; therefore, the counter-term vanishes by equations (71) and (72). Nevertheless, we will observe that the behavior of the dilaton field  $X_w$  in the following extremal case is described by an unusual blowing out as  $r \rightarrow \infty$ , but also by a blowing up on the horizon. As we will observe, these peculiarities will directly influence the value of the internal energy  $E_w$ . Furthermore, in this case, we obtain a finite on-shell action  $\Gamma$  and a vanishing variation  $\delta\Gamma$ , allowing us to apply the semiclassical approximation for the partition function.

**Solution III.** Evaluating the action (73) with the solution III we obtain the finite and constant on-shell action

$$\Gamma_{\text{reg}} = -\frac{2x_0}{T} \left( c_5 + \frac{c_1}{2} \right), \quad (105)$$

which we employ to compute the Helmholtz free energy

$$F_w(T_w, X_w) = -T_w \Gamma_w = 2(X_w - x_0), \quad (106)$$

here the definitions of the local temperature

$$T_w = \frac{1}{r_w - \frac{c_1}{2}} T, \quad (107)$$

and the dilaton charge

$$X_w = x_0 \frac{r_w + c_5}{r_w - \frac{c_1}{2}}, \quad (108)$$

for this solution, are applied.

We observe that the free energy (106) depends only on the dilaton charge, hence, the corresponding entropy

$$S_w = - \left. \frac{\partial F_w}{\partial T_w} \right|_{X_w} = 0, \quad (109)$$

coincides with the expected result for extreme black hole configurations in higher dimensions and two dimensional cases, see [31] and [32].

Thus, the chemical potential associated to the dilaton charge is the constant quantity

$$\psi_w = - \left. \frac{\partial F_w}{\partial X_w} \right|_{T_w} = -2. \quad (110)$$

Applying the Legendre transformation (96) to our solution, we realize that the internal  $E_w$  energy is equal to the Helmholtz free energy potential

$$E_w = F_w = 2(X_w - x_0). \quad (111)$$

We arrive at the same result for  $E_w$  employing the definition of Brown and York.

In this manner, it is easy to see from the results above that the first law of Thermodynamics for the extremal black hole presented in solution III

$$dE_w = T_w dS - \psi_w dX_w = 2 dX_w, \quad (112)$$

is accomplished.

**Black hole mass.** As we did for solution I, we interpret the boundary term (100) of the solution-valued Hamiltonian as the total energy  $M$  of the black hole

$$M = \lim_{r_w \rightarrow \infty} N E_w = 2x_0 \left( c_5 + \frac{c_1}{2} \right), \quad (113)$$

here, as above,  $N = \sqrt{|g_{tt}|}$  is the lapse function of the case at hand. We notice that, for this extreme black hole the mass is determined by the constant of integration  $c_1$  encountered in both the metric (17) and one scalar field, see (18), and by the constant  $c_5$  found in the two scalar fields.

**Specific heat.** For this extremal black hole we have the following internal energy

$$E_w = 2x_0 \left( c_5 + \frac{c_1}{2} \right) \frac{T_w}{T}; \quad (114)$$

that has been obtained with the aid of the relations (105), (106) and (111). By using the definition (87) we obtain the following constant and positive specific heat

$$C_w = \frac{2x_0}{T} \left( c_5 + \frac{c_1}{2} \right), \quad (115)$$

that ensures the stability of this extremal solution due to the relation for  $c_1$  and  $c_5$  given in (20) for having well-behaved scalar fields and the positiveness of  $x_0$  by definition.

With these results we realize that for all our solutions the specific heat at constant dilaton charge is positive or null (in the case of solution II), independently of the location of the cavity wall  $X_w$  employed in the canonical ensemble. In other words, there is no critical value  $X_{\text{crit}} > X_+$  at which the specific heat becomes negative. This fact ensures that all our black hole field configurations are thermodynamically stable without the need of a cavity wall.

## 5 Our setup in the diagonal frame

In order to express our theory (4) in a frame invariant manner, using the eigenvalues of the matrix  $\beta_{bc}$  as parameters, we perform an  $SO(2)$  transformation over the scalar fields, the  $\gamma$  and  $\beta$  parameters in the following way.

We first diagonalize the symmetric matrix  $\beta_{bc}$  of the action (4) through an  $SO(2)$  similarity transformation

$$C^T \beta C = L, \quad (116)$$

where  $C^T$  is the transpose of the orthogonal matrix  $C_{ab}$  with entries

$$\begin{aligned} c_{11} &= \frac{2\beta_{12}}{\left[4\beta_{12}^2 + \left(\beta_{22} - \beta_{11} + \sqrt{(\beta_{22} - \beta_{11})^2 + 4\beta_{12}^2}\right)^2\right]^{\frac{1}{2}}}, \\ c_{12} &= \frac{2\beta_{12}}{\left[4\beta_{12}^2 + \left(\beta_{22} - \beta_{11} - \sqrt{(\beta_{22} - \beta_{11})^2 + 4\beta_{12}^2}\right)^2\right]^{\frac{1}{2}}}, \\ c_{21} &= \frac{\beta_{22} - \beta_{11} + \sqrt{(\beta_{22} - \beta_{11})^2 + 4\beta_{12}^2}}{\left[4\beta_{12}^2 + \left(\beta_{22} - \beta_{11} + \sqrt{(\beta_{22} - \beta_{11})^2 + 4\beta_{12}^2}\right)^2\right]^{\frac{1}{2}}}, \\ c_{22} &= \frac{\beta_{22} - \beta_{11} - \sqrt{(\beta_{22} - \beta_{11})^2 + 4\beta_{12}^2}}{\left[4\beta_{12}^2 + \left(\beta_{22} - \beta_{11} - \sqrt{(\beta_{22} - \beta_{11})^2 + 4\beta_{12}^2}\right)^2\right]^{\frac{1}{2}}}, \end{aligned} \quad (117)$$

and  $L$  stands for the diagonal matrix

$$L = \begin{pmatrix} \lambda_+ & 0 \\ 0 & \lambda_- \end{pmatrix}, \quad (118)$$

with the eigenvalues

$$\lambda_{\pm} = \frac{\beta_{11} + \beta_{22} \pm \sqrt{(\beta_{22} - \beta_{11})^2 + 4\beta_{12}^2}}{2}. \quad (119)$$

By performing the corresponding  $SO(2)$  transformation on the scalar fields

$$C^T \Phi = \begin{pmatrix} c_{11} & c_{21} \\ c_{12} & c_{22} \end{pmatrix} \begin{pmatrix} \phi_1 \\ \phi_2 \end{pmatrix} = \begin{pmatrix} \tilde{\phi}_1 \\ \tilde{\phi}_2 \end{pmatrix} \quad (120)$$

we express them in the diagonal frame

$$\begin{aligned} \tilde{\phi}_1 &= c_{11} \phi_1 + c_{21} \phi_2, \\ \tilde{\phi}_2 &= c_{12} \phi_1 + c_{22} \phi_2. \end{aligned} \quad (121)$$

From equations (116) and (120) we verify that the kinetic term in the original action (4)

$$(\partial^\mu \phi_1, \partial^\mu \phi_2) \begin{pmatrix} \beta_{11} & \beta_{12} \\ \beta_{12} & \beta_{22} \end{pmatrix} \begin{pmatrix} \partial_\mu \phi_1 \\ \partial_\mu \phi_2 \end{pmatrix} = \beta_{11} \partial^\mu \phi_1 \partial_\mu \phi_1 + 2\beta_{12} \partial^\mu \phi_1 \partial_\mu \phi_2 + \beta_{22} \partial^\mu \phi_2 \partial_\mu \phi_2, \quad (122)$$

remains invariant under this transformation, but now is determined by the two eigenvalues

$$(\partial^\mu \tilde{\phi}_1, \partial^\mu \tilde{\phi}_2) \begin{pmatrix} \lambda_+ & 0 \\ 0 & \lambda_- \end{pmatrix} \begin{pmatrix} \partial_\mu \tilde{\phi}_1 \\ \partial_\mu \tilde{\phi}_2 \end{pmatrix} = \lambda_+ (\partial^\mu \tilde{\phi}_1) (\partial_\mu \tilde{\phi}_1) + \lambda_- (\partial^\mu \tilde{\phi}_2) (\partial_\mu \tilde{\phi}_2), \quad (123)$$

instead of the three parameters  $\beta_{ab}$ .

By further applying the  $SO(2)$  transformation on the  $\gamma$  parameters

$$C^T \Gamma = \begin{pmatrix} c_{11} & c_{21} \\ c_{12} & c_{22} \end{pmatrix} \begin{pmatrix} \gamma_1 \\ \gamma_2 \end{pmatrix} = \begin{pmatrix} \tilde{\gamma}_1 \\ \tilde{\gamma}_2 \end{pmatrix}, \quad (124)$$

we arrive at the following linear combinations

$$\begin{aligned} \tilde{\gamma}_1 &= c_{11} \gamma_1 + c_{21} \gamma_2, \\ \tilde{\gamma}_2 &= c_{12} \gamma_1 + c_{22} \gamma_2, \end{aligned} \quad (125)$$

that give us the  $\tilde{\gamma}$  parameters in the diagonal frame.

With the aid of the relations (120) and (124) we verify that

$$\gamma_1 \phi_1 + \gamma_2 \phi_2 = \Gamma^T C C^T \Phi = \tilde{\gamma}_1 \tilde{\phi}_1 + \tilde{\gamma}_2 \tilde{\phi}_2, \quad (126)$$

is an invariant quantity under the  $SO(2)$  transformation.

Thus, we arrive at the expression of the transformed action written in terms of the eigenvalues:

$$S = \int d^2x \sqrt{-g} e^{\tilde{\gamma}_1 \tilde{\phi}_1 + \tilde{\gamma}_2 \tilde{\phi}_2} \left( R + \lambda_+ (\partial^\mu \tilde{\phi}_1) (\partial_\mu \tilde{\phi}_1) + \lambda_- (\partial^\mu \tilde{\phi}_2) (\partial_\mu \tilde{\phi}_2) - 2\Lambda \right). \quad (127)$$

Moreover, if we want to set  $\tilde{\gamma}_1 = \tilde{\gamma}_2 = 1$  by imposing restrictions on the original  $\gamma$  parameters through relations (125) we arrive at

$$\gamma_1 = \gamma_2 = \frac{\left[ 4\beta_{12}^2 + \left( \beta_{22} - \beta_{11} + \sqrt{A} \right)^2 \right]^{\frac{1}{2}} - \left[ 4\beta_{12}^2 + \left( \beta_{22} - \beta_{11} - \sqrt{A} \right)^2 \right]^{\frac{1}{2}}}{2\sqrt{A}}, \quad (128)$$

with  $A = (\beta_{22} - \beta_{11})^2 + 4\beta_{12}^2$ . Thus, from the above relations we realize that we can set both  $\tilde{\gamma}$  parameters simultaneously to one with the help of the original  $\beta$  and  $\gamma$  parameters.

Therefore, the action invariance implies that the transformed theory is defined by two parameters ( $\lambda_+$  and  $\lambda_-$ ).

On the other hand, if we apply the conditions on the  $\beta$  parameters for each of the theories for which we have obtained solutions we find the following.

- Substituting the condition I,  $\beta_{12}^2 = \beta_{11}\beta_{22}$ , into the expressions for the matrix eigenvalues we obtain one trivial degree of freedom

$$\lambda_+ = \beta_{11} + \beta_{22}, \quad \lambda_- = 0. \quad (129)$$

Moreover, if we require to set  $\tilde{\gamma}_1 = \tilde{\gamma}_2 = 1$ , from (128) we need to impose the following restrictions

$$\gamma_1 = \gamma_2 = \frac{2(\sqrt{\beta_{22}} - \sqrt{\beta_{11}})}{\sqrt{\beta_{11}} + \sqrt{\beta_{22}}}. \quad (130)$$

- For the theory with condition II,  $\beta_{11} = 2\beta_{12} - \beta_{22}$ , the orthogonal matrix  $C$  is given by the following entries

$$\begin{aligned}
c_{11} &= \frac{\beta_{12}}{\left[ \beta_{12}^2 + \left( \beta_{22} - \beta_{12} + \sqrt{(\beta_{22} - \beta_{12})^2 + \beta_{12}^2} \right)^2 \right]^{\frac{1}{2}}}, \\
c_{12} &= \frac{\beta_{12}}{\left[ \beta_{12}^2 + \left( \beta_{22} - \beta_{12} - \sqrt{(\beta_{22} - \beta_{12})^2 + \beta_{12}^2} \right)^2 \right]^{\frac{1}{2}}}, \\
c_{21} &= \frac{\beta_{22} - \beta_{12} + \sqrt{(\beta_{22} - \beta_{12})^2 + \beta_{12}^2}}{\left[ \beta_{12}^2 + \left( \beta_{22} - \beta_{12} + \sqrt{(\beta_{22} - \beta_{12})^2 + \beta_{12}^2} \right)^2 \right]^{\frac{1}{2}}}, \\
c_{22} &= \frac{\beta_{22} - \beta_{12} - \sqrt{(\beta_{22} - \beta_{12})^2 + \beta_{12}^2}}{\left[ \beta_{12}^2 + \left( \beta_{22} - \beta_{12} - \sqrt{(\beta_{22} - \beta_{12})^2 + \beta_{12}^2} \right)^2 \right]^{\frac{1}{2}}}.
\end{aligned} \tag{131}$$

whereas its eigenvalues read

$$\lambda_{\pm} = \beta_{12} \pm \sqrt{(\beta_{22} - \beta_{12})^2 + \beta_{12}^2}. \tag{132}$$

The transformed scalar fields  $\tilde{\phi}_a$  and  $\tilde{\gamma}$  parameters are then given by (121) and (125), respectively, using relation (131).

Furthermore, from (128) we see that setting  $\tilde{\gamma}_1 = \tilde{\gamma}_2 = 1$  requires

$$\gamma_1 = \gamma_2 = \frac{\left[ \beta_{22} - \beta_{11} + \sqrt{2(\beta_{11}^2 + \beta_{22}^2)} \right]^{\frac{1}{2}} - \left[ \beta_{11} - \beta_{22} + \sqrt{2(\beta_{11}^2 + \beta_{22}^2)} \right]^{\frac{1}{2}}}{\sqrt{2} [\beta_{11}^2 + \beta_{22}^2]^{\frac{1}{4}}}. \tag{133}$$



- For the theory with conditions III,  $\beta_{11} = 2$  and  $\beta_{22} = 2(\beta_{12} - 1)$ , the orthogonal matrix  $C_{ab}$  possesses the following entries

$$\begin{aligned}
c_{11} &= \frac{\beta_{12}}{\left[ \beta_{12}^2 + \left( \beta_{12} - 2 + \sqrt{(\beta_{12} - 2)^2 + \beta_{12}^2} \right)^2 \right]^{\frac{1}{2}}}, \\
c_{12} &= \frac{\beta_{12}}{\left[ \beta_{12}^2 + \left( \beta_{12} - 2 - \sqrt{(\beta_{12} - 2)^2 + \beta_{12}^2} \right)^2 \right]^{\frac{1}{2}}}, \\
c_{21} &= \frac{\beta_{12} - 2 + \sqrt{(\beta_{12} - 2)^2 + \beta_{12}^2}}{\left[ \beta_{12}^2 + \left( \beta_{12} - 2 + \sqrt{(\beta_{12} - 2)^2 + \beta_{12}^2} \right)^2 \right]^{\frac{1}{2}}}, \\
c_{22} &= \frac{\beta_{12} - 2 - \sqrt{(\beta_{12} - 2)^2 + \beta_{12}^2}}{\left[ \beta_{12}^2 + \left( \beta_{12} - 2 - \sqrt{(\beta_{12} - 2)^2 + \beta_{12}^2} \right)^2 \right]^{\frac{1}{2}}}
\end{aligned} \tag{134}$$

and eigenvalues

$$\lambda_{\pm} = \beta_{12} \pm \sqrt{(\beta_{12} - 2)^2 + \beta_{12}^2}. \tag{135}$$

The expressions of the transformed scalar fields  $\tilde{\phi}_a$  and  $\tilde{\gamma}$  parameters are given by (121) and (125), respectively, making use of the  $C_{ab}$  matrix given by (134). Finally, to set  $\tilde{\gamma}_1 = \tilde{\gamma}_2 = 1$ , equation (128) requires

$$\gamma_1 = \gamma_2 = \frac{\left[ \beta_{12}^2 + (\beta_{12} - 2)^2 + (\beta_{12} - 2) \sqrt{B} \right]^{\frac{1}{2}} - \left[ \beta_{12}^2 + (\beta_{12} - 2)^2 - (\beta_{12} - 2) \sqrt{B} \right]^{\frac{1}{2}}}{\sqrt{2B}}, \tag{136}$$

where  $B = \beta_{12}^2 + (\beta_{12} - 2)^2$ .

By comparing the eigenvalues (132) and (135), and the  $\tilde{\gamma}$  parameters (125) for conditions II and III given by the orthogonal matrices with entries (131) and (134), respectively, we observe that the theory with the condition III is a particular case of the one with the condition II if we set  $\beta_{22} = 2\beta_{12} - 2$ .

## 6 Our setup within dilatonic action frameworks

We would like to remark that, in general, by starting from our action

$$I_s = \int d^2x \sqrt{-g} e^{\gamma_1 \phi_1 + \gamma_2 \phi_2} [R + \beta_{11} \partial^\mu \phi_1 \partial_\mu \phi_1 + 2\beta_{12} \partial^\mu \phi_1 \partial_\mu \phi_2 + \beta_{22} \partial^\mu \phi_2 \partial_\mu \phi_2 - 2\Lambda], \tag{137}$$

the interaction between the scalar fields  $\phi_1$  and  $\phi_2$  with the aid of the coupling constant  $\beta_{12}$  prevents its expression in the dilatonic form [10]

$$I_d = \int d^2x \sqrt{-g} [XR - U(X)\partial^\mu X \partial_\mu X - 2V(X)], \quad (138)$$

where  $X \equiv e^{\gamma_1 \phi_1 + \gamma_2 \phi_2}$  and the potential functions of the dilaton field  $U(X)$  and  $V(X)$  define different models.

However, if we consider the particular restriction between the  $\beta$  parameters

$$\beta_{11}\beta_{22} = \beta_{12}^2, \quad (139)$$

which is valid only for our family of solutions I, but not for families II and III, and rescale the scalar fields in the kinetic term of the action (137) as follows

$$\tilde{\phi}_1 = \sqrt{\beta_{11}} \phi_1, \quad \tilde{\phi}_2 = \sqrt{\beta_{22}} \phi_2, \quad (140)$$

we arrive at the following expression

$$e^{\frac{\gamma_1}{\sqrt{\beta_{11}}} \tilde{\phi}_1 + \frac{\gamma_2}{\sqrt{\beta_{22}}} \tilde{\phi}_2} \left[ \partial^\mu \tilde{\phi}_1 \partial_\mu \tilde{\phi}_1 + 2\partial^\mu \tilde{\phi}_1 \partial_\mu \tilde{\phi}_2 + \partial^\mu \tilde{\phi}_2 \partial_\mu \tilde{\phi}_2 \right], \quad (141)$$

that makes it clear that we need to accordingly fix the  $\gamma$  parameters as well

$$\gamma_1 = \sqrt{\beta_{11}}, \quad \gamma_2 = \sqrt{\beta_{22}}, \quad (142)$$

in order to have a kinetic term of the form required by (138)

$$\frac{1}{\tilde{X}} \partial^\mu \tilde{X} \partial_\mu \tilde{X}, \quad (143)$$

with  $\tilde{X} = e^{\tilde{\phi}_1 + \tilde{\phi}_2}$  and  $\tilde{U} = -\tilde{X}^{-1}$ .

Thus, we need to fulfill both conditions (139) and (142) on the  $\beta$  and  $\gamma$  parameters, along with the rescaling (140) of the scalar fields in order to recast our action (137) into the form (138).

This is a quite restrictive situation that in general is not met in all our families of scalar field solutions I-III since solutions II and III obey different restrictions on the  $\beta$  parameters and throughout the paper we have fixed  $\gamma_1 = \gamma_2 = 1$ , given that these parameters do not play any relevant role in our solutions. Thus, distinct parameter choices from conditions (139) and (142) in our solutions prevent us from reexpressing the action (137) in terms of the action (138).

Therefore, the action setup in terms of the *coupled* scalar fields  $\phi_1$  and  $\phi_2$  is in general quite different from the one defined in terms of the dilaton field  $X$ . Notwithstanding, there are especial situations in which the match can occur due to a vanishing kinetic factor  $\partial^\mu \tilde{X} \partial_\mu \tilde{X}$  as in the Jackiw-Teitelboim (JT) theory (see below).

On the other hand, a solution-generating scheme for the field equations derived from the action (138)

$$\begin{aligned} U(X)\nabla_\mu X\nabla_\nu X - \frac{1}{2}g_{\mu\nu}U(X)(\nabla X)^2 - g_{\mu\nu}V(X) + \nabla_\mu\nabla_\nu X - g_{\mu\nu}\nabla^2 X &= 0, \\ R + \partial_X U(X)(\nabla X)^2 + 2U(X)\nabla^2 X - 2\partial_X V(X) &= 0, \end{aligned} \quad (144)$$

is presented, for instance in [10, 34], and is given by the following relations<sup>7</sup>:

$$X = X(r), \quad ds^2 = \xi(r)d\tau^2 + \frac{1}{\xi(r)}dr^2, \quad (145)$$

with

$$\begin{aligned} \partial_r X &= e^{-Q(X)}, \\ \xi(X) &= w(X)e^{Q(X)} \left(1 - \frac{2M}{w(X)}\right), \end{aligned} \quad (146)$$

given that

$$\begin{aligned} Q(X) &:= Q_0 + \int^X dY U(Y), \\ w(X) &:= w_0 - 2 \int^X dY V(Y)e^{Q(Y)}. \end{aligned} \quad (147)$$

By keeping these expressions in mind, we would like to point out the following remarks regarding our solutions:

- Solution I: As we have seen, the setting  $\beta_{11}\beta_{22} = \beta_{12}^2$  in (137) alone does not yield a dilaton kinetic term of the form  $X^{-1}\partial_\mu X\partial^\mu X$ . Although, we would like to note that this restriction together with our specific scalar field configuration given by (12)

$$\phi_1(r) = c_3 + \log \left[ \left( r - \frac{c_1}{2} \right)^{\sigma_1} \right], \quad \phi_2(r) = c_4 + \log \left[ \left( r - \frac{c_1}{2} \right)^{\sigma_2} \right],$$

where  $c_1, c_3, c_4$  are arbitrary real constants,  $\sigma_1 = \frac{\beta_{22}}{\beta_{22}-\beta_{12}}$  and  $\sigma_2 = -\frac{\beta_{12}}{\beta_{22}-\beta_{12}}$ , yield a null kinetic term in the action (137). This fact along with the identification for the potential function of the dilaton field

$$V(X) = X\Lambda \quad (148)$$

transform our action into the JT one [33].

Thus, by further constructing the dilaton field from the above scalar field solutions (12),

$$X = x_0 \left( r - \frac{c_1}{2} \right), \quad (149)$$

---

<sup>7</sup>Here the Euclidean signature is employed as in [10, 34] for the sake of comparison.

where  $x_0 = e^{c_3+c_4}$ , and by implementing the solution-generating scheme for solutions (145)-(147) in order to obtain the metric function

$$\xi(r) = \left(1 - \frac{c_1}{r} + \frac{c_2}{r^2}\right) r^2, \quad (150)$$

where  $c_1$  and  $c_2$  are real constants of integration, we get our full *asymptotically AdS black hole* solution I with  $\Lambda = -\frac{1}{l^2}$ . Therefore, the field configuration I solves the field equations (144) derived from the JT action. As a consequence of the identification of these actions, the thermodynamic properties for this solution can be obtained following the method presented in [10, 34].

We would like to notice that in [10] it was shown that the metric function  $\xi(X)$ , derived in accordance to (146), is parameterized by a *single* constant of integration, while in our solution I, (150) is determined by *two* integration constants. To the best of our knowledge, this solution has not been explicitly presented and studied elsewhere within the framework of the JT theory.

It is worth mentioning as well that in [10, 34, 35] the authors report a similar *asymptotically flat black hole* solution with two constants of integration in the metric with a designed potential of the form

$$V(X) = -\frac{2M}{X^2} + \frac{Q^2}{4X^3}, \quad (151)$$

where  $M$  and  $Q$  are constants of integration.

The difference in the asymptotic properties of these black hole field configurations originates in the distinct potential functions (148) and (151) of the dilaton field employed when constructing the corresponding solutions.

We would like to recall an important property of the forthcoming field configurations II and III: even though, we have a null cosmological constant for both cases, the resulting spacetime solutions possess a constant and negative curvature corresponding to *AdS* spacetime.

- Solution II: For this field configuration we have  $\beta_{11} = 2\beta_{12} - \beta_{22}$ , a restriction different from (139) that implies that our action cannot be reformulated in the form (138) and constitutes a completely new setup; the metric function also has the form (11) and the scalar field configuration is given by the relations (16):

$$\phi_1(r) = c_3 + \log [(r^2 - c_1 r + c_2)^{\sigma_1}], \quad \phi_2(r) = c_4 + \log [(r^2 - c_1 r + c_2)^{\sigma_2}],$$

where  $c_3, c_4$  are arbitrary real constants,  $\sigma_1 = \frac{1}{2(\beta_{22}-\beta_{12})}$ ,  $\sigma_2 = -\frac{1}{2(\beta_{22}-\beta_{12})}$ , leading to a constant dilaton field  $X = x_0$ , and therefore a trivial kinetic term, with no cosmological constant.

One way to see that the action (138) and the corresponding field equations lead to a different family of solutions from ours consists in substituting the latter conditions ( $\nabla_\mu X = 0 = V(X)$ ) into (144) and comparing the properties of the resulting field configuration with those of our solution II. Thus, by doing this we obtain a configuration with  $R = 0$ , while solution II corresponds to an *AdS* black hole with

constant and negative curvature  $R = -\frac{2}{l^2}$ , unveiling the novelty property of our solution.

- **Solution III:** For this extremal solution we have  $\Lambda = 0$  and  $\beta_{11} = 2, \beta_{22} = 2(\beta_{12} - 1)$ , conditions on the  $\beta$  parameters that depart from (139), implying again that our action cannot be recast in the form (138), constituting a completely new model. The metric function and the scalar field configuration are respectively expressed by the relations (17) and (18):

$$\xi(r) = \left(r - \frac{c_1}{2}\right)^2,$$

$$\phi_1(r) = c_3 + \log[(r + c_5)^{\sigma_1}] - \log\left(r - \frac{c_1}{2}\right), \quad \phi_2(r) = c_4 + \log[(r + c_5)^{\sigma_2}],$$

where  $c_1, c_3, c_4$  and  $c_5$  are arbitrary real constants,  $\sigma_1 = \frac{\beta_{12}-1}{\beta_{12}-2}$  and  $\sigma_2 = -\frac{1}{\beta_{12}-2}$ . Accordingly, the above scalar field solutions yield the following dilaton field

$$X = x_0 \frac{r + c_5}{r - \frac{c_1}{2}}. \quad (152)$$

In order to prove that in this case our action (137) does not correspond to an action of the form (138), we can show that it is impossible to define a potential function of the dilaton field  $U(X)$  that renders such a match.

**Two-Dilaton Theories.** Finally, we would like to note that two dimensional dilaton gravity models of the form (137) have been studied previously within the so-called Two-Dilaton Theories (TDT) classification [36]. In that work the following action is presented

$$S_J = \int_{M_2} d^2x \sqrt{-g} [V_0^J(X, Y)R + V_1^J(X, Y)\nabla_\alpha X \nabla^\alpha X + V_2^J(X, Y)\nabla_\alpha Y \nabla^\alpha Y + V_3^J(X, Y)\nabla_\alpha X \nabla^\alpha Y + V_4^J(X, Y) + V_5^J(X, Y)f_m(S_n, \nabla_\alpha S_n, \dots)], \quad (153)$$

where  $R$  is the curvature scalar,  $X$  and  $Y$  are the dilaton fields, the functions  $V_i^J(X, Y)$  define the theory,  $f_m$  represents functions of some matter fields  $S_n$ . By employing the following identifications

$$V_0^J = XY, \quad V_1^J = \frac{Y}{X}\beta_{11}, \quad V_2^J = \frac{X}{Y}\beta_{22}, \quad V_3^J = 2\beta_{12}, \quad V_4^J = -2\Lambda XY, \quad V_5^J = 0,$$

with  $X = e^{\phi_1}, \quad Y = e^{\phi_2}$ .

$$(154)$$

we realize that the system (137) corresponds to a particular case of the models studied in the above reference.

## 6.1 Constant dilaton vacua in our setup and their stability

In order to study the possibility that our black hole solutions decay into field configurations with lower free energy within our setup, we look for constant dilaton vacua (CDV) with the same boundary conditions [10] in the canonical ensemble for all our solutions.

CDV are solutions that accomplish the field equations (144) with a constant boundary condition for the dilaton field  $X = X_0$  that renders  $V(X) = 0$ , a metric function (146) given by

$$\xi = c + ar - \frac{1}{2}\lambda r^2, \quad (155)$$

where  $a$ ,  $c$  and  $\lambda$  are constants, and the following condition for the curvature scalar

$$R^{CDV} = -\partial_r^2 \xi = \lambda = 2\partial_X V(X)|_{X_0}, \quad (156)$$

which determines  $\lambda$ . This boundary condition is valid for both the CDV and our black hole solutions in the canonical ensemble.

On the other hand, the canonical ensemble is determined by a cavity wall located out of the event horizon  $X_w > X_+$ , defining the same boundary condition for the dilaton, therefore  $X_0 = X_w$ , and hence  $X_0 > X_+$ .

We further need to express the dilaton field evaluated at the outer horizon  $X_+$  of a given black hole solution and compare it to  $X_0$  in order to elucidate whether the canonical ensemble and the corresponding free energy of the CDV are well-defined. If this is the case, we finally need to compare the free energies of both field configurations in order to establish which one is thermodynamically favored, i. e. whether tunneling from a black hole solution into a CDV or viceversa is a favorable process.

For the solution I of our model, we see from the relation (148) that the restriction  $V(X) = 0$  necessarily implies  $X_0 = 0$ . Given that the horizon is positive by definition  $X_+ > 0$ , we see that for this case  $X_+ > X_0$ , meaning that the obtained CDV solution does not possess a meaningful free energy since the cavity wall would be inside the event horizon.

Although, it is impossible to reduce the action (137) into (138) for the configurations II and III, we look for analogous solutions to the CDV by employing constant scalar fields  $\phi_1$  and  $\phi_2$ , arriving to a null scalar curvature  $R = 0$ , a result that differs from the negative and constant scalar curvature of our black hole configurations. This implies that the boundary conditions for the analogous CDV differ from the boundary conditions of solutions II and III in the same canonical ensemble, avoiding the comparison of their free energies.

Thus, our model does not exhibit appropriate CDV with a well-defined free energy that can be compared to the free energy of our black hole solutions and investigate the possibility of tunneling from one configuration into another.

## 7 Conclusions

In this paper we have presented three analytic *AdS* black hole solutions for models of two-dimensional dilaton gravity whose action is described by equation (4).

In the particular case when  $c_1 = 0$ , our solution I coincides with the two-dimensional AdS black hole configuration presented in [10, 17] as a part of the *a-b* family of black hole solutions, when his parameter  $b = 1$ .

For solutions I and II, we have extended the spacetime toward the interior of the black hole employing appropriate Kruskal-like coordinates, a construction developed in section 3, in order to prove the black hole nature of our black hole configurations. We

have found a resemblance with the causal structure of the RN black hole, revealing the event and apparent horizon character of  $r_+$  and  $r_-$ , respectively; we have illustrated this spacetime structure, in a compact form, with a Penrose diagram.

Under the extremality condition (21) and making use of appropriate change of variables (25), we were able to show that all our solutions present an  $AdS_2$  geometry outside the black hole, and not only at the near horizon region, as is the case for the extremal black hole configurations in higher dimensions, for example, the 4D extremal RN black hole.

We obtained intrinsically distinct configurations for the two scalar fields for all solutions. These scalar fields do not convert to each other by field redefinitions and/or coordinate transformations, even under extremality of the black hole configuration. Even though all our scalar field solutions share an asymptotic divergence property, we note that the dilaton field  $X(r)$ , for the extremal solution III, tends to a constant finite value when  $r \rightarrow \infty$ ; this kind of behavior is completely novel and is not usual for this kind of dilatonic models. Given that the dilaton is interpreted as the inverse effective Newton constant,  $G_{\text{eff}} = \frac{G_2}{X}$ , this unusual behavior may make the gravity strong asymptotically. Nevertheless, as we can see from equation (152), one can always modulate this behavior by imposing the following condition on the constant  $x_0 \rightarrow \infty$  in order for gravity to become asymptotically weak.

We have deduced a formula for the Hawking temperature that can be expressed in terms of the surface gravity  $\kappa$  for all of the solutions. In particular, this quantity turns out to be null in the case of the extreme solution III.

Finally, we have developed consistent Thermodynamics for all the black hole families presented in this work. For this purpose, we have employed the approximation (61) for the partition function  $\mathcal{Z}$  in the canonical ensemble. In order to use this approximation, we have constructed a renormalized action  $\Gamma$  (73) with the Hamilton-Jacobi method explained in detail in section 4.2. The essential part of this method is the construction of a boundary counter-term (71) that removes the divergences in the on-shell action and leaves a renormalized action that is certainly extremized by the solutions. In this procedure, we have defined the regulated on-shell action  $\Gamma_{\text{reg}}$  (74), with finite boundary  $r_{\text{reg}}$ , as a part of the limiting procedure for evaluating the on-shell action  $\Gamma$ . Besides, we have employed  $\Gamma_{\text{reg}}$  as the argument of the exponential in the approximation (80) for the partition function.

Following the approach of York [27], we have think of the black hole as to be in a cavity or a box whose frontier is placed at the wall  $r_w = r_{\text{reg}}$  that is in equilibrium with a thermal reservoir. In this manner, we have introduced the partition function in the canonical ensemble for our black hole configuration. This ensemble is defined by the local temperature  $T_w$ , which we have related to the Hawking temperature  $T$  employing a Tolman factor in equation (58), and a dilaton charge  $D_w$  (79), introduced in section 4.3. We have computed the Helmholtz free energy  $F_w$  in order to calculate the entropy  $S_w$  and the dilaton chemical potential  $\psi_w$ .

As we noted above, the entropy for the black hole in solution I

$$S_w = S = 4\pi X_+, \quad (157)$$

does not depend on  $r_w$  but on the value of the horizon  $r_+$ ; this is analogous to the case in higher dimensions where the entropy depends on the area of the event horizon. We have found that the form of (157) is in accordance with distinct dilaton gravity models, for example [8–10]. Following Brown and York [29], we have derived, from the quasi-local stress tensor (93), the proper energy density given by (95). This internal energy is also encountered in the Legendre transformation (96). Finally, we have verified that the first law of black hole Thermodynamics is fulfilled for the system enclosed by the cavity wall  $r_w$ , remaining regular for all  $r_w \geq r_+$ . This fact provides physical consistency to our black hole configuration, rendering a viable model from the thermodynamic viewpoint.

We have found that there is no counter-term for the black hole solutions II and III with cosmological constant  $\Lambda = 0$  in accordance with equation (72). Nonetheless, we have encountered the on-shell actions for these solutions to be adequate for the semi-classical approximation method with which we deduce consistent Thermodynamics. In the case of solution II, the constant dilaton leads to trivial Thermodynamics.

We have deduced a vanishing entropy for the extreme solution III, as one might expect. The internal energy  $E_w$  equals the Helmholtz free energy potential, proportional to the dilaton charge  $X_w$ . Consequently,  $E_w$  has a singular behavior at the horizon. Interestingly, these properties have been observed for extremal black holes in two-dimensional dilaton gravity with a gauge field in [32] and [37].

We have calculated the mass  $M$  of the black hole solutions, defined by the solution-valued Hamiltonian with a lapse function different from unity. For the black hole solution I, the mass is proportional to the squared dilaton evaluated at the event horizon  $X_+^2$ ; particularly,  $M$  depends on the two constants of integration  $c_1$  and  $c_2$  of the blackening function  $f(r)$ .

We have computed for all our solutions the specific heat at constant dilaton charge, and we have found that  $C_w$  is a positive or null quantity, independently of the location of the cavity wall  $X_w$ . This fact ensures the thermodynamic stability of all our field configurations without requiring a finite cavity.

We have written our action (4) in a frame invariant manner, in terms of the eigenvalues of the  $\beta_{ab}$  matrix, for all our conditions I, II and III. This enables us to realize that the theory with condition III is a particular case of the one with the condition II.

We would like to point out that it would be interesting to explore whether is it possible to generalize the results of this work to higher dimensions employing multiple scalar fields and considering anisotropy between the time and the spatial sector as in Lifshitz spacetimes.

Finally, we note that while preparing this article, a parallel work was published [38], where similar results were obtained (in particular the metric of solutions I-II) within the two-dimensional dilaton gravity with a different scalar field setup (with potentials  $U$  and  $V$  that differ from ours). The effective scalar-tensor theory emerges as the  $D \rightarrow 2$  limit of Einstein gravity with cosmological constant upon a Kaluza-Klein dimensional reduction.

**Acknowledgments.** All the authors are grateful to Manuel de la Cruz López, Jhony A. Herrera-Mendoza, Daniel F. Higuera-Borja, Julio A. Méndez-Zavaleta, Ulises Nuca-mendi, G. F. Torres del Castillo, Mehrab Momennia and Olivier Sarbach for fruitful



and illuminating discussions. The authors also thank the Editor A. Gomberoff and the anonymous reviewers of the journal *Annals of Physics* for their insightful feedback that increased the quality of our work. UNC acknowledges support from CONAH-CYT through a PhD Grant No.814574, AHA has benefited from grants CONAHCYT No. A1-S-38041 and VIEP-BUAP No. 242. Finally, AHA and CRR thank the Sistema Nacional de Investigadoras e Investigadores (SNII) for support.

## References

- [1] J. M. Maldacena, *The large  $N$  limit of superconformal field theories and supergravity*, *Int. J. Theor. Phys.* **38** 1113-33.
- [2] M. Taylor, *Generalized conformal structure, dilaton gravity and SYK*, *JHEP* **10** (2018).
- [3] J. Maldacena, D. Stanford, and Z. Yang, *Conformal symmetry and its breaking in two dimensional Nearly Anti-de-Sitter space*, *PTEP* **2016** (2016) 12.
- [4] G.W. Gibbons and S.W. Hawking, *Action integrals and partition functions in quantum gravity*, *Phys. Rev.* **D 15** (1977) 2752.
- [5] H. Liebl, D.V. Vassilevich and S. Alexandrov, *Hawking radiation and masses in generalized dilaton theories*, *Class. and Quant. Grav.* **14** (1997) 889.
- [6] G.W. Gibbons and M.J. Perry, *The physics of 2-D stringy space-times*, *Int. J. Mod. Phys.* **D1** (1992) 335–354.
- [7] M.D. McGuigan, C.R. Nappi and S.A. Yost, *Charged black holes in two-dimensional string theory*, *Nucl. Phys.* **B 375** (1992) 421.
- [8] C.R. Nappi and A. Pasquinucci, *Thermodynamics of two-dimensional black holes*, *Mod. Phys. Lett.* **A 7** (1992) 3337.
- [9] J.L. Davis and R. McNees, *Boundary counter-terms and the thermodynamics of 2D black holes*, *JHEP* **09** (2005) 072.
- [10] D. Grumiller and R. McNees, *Thermodynamics of black holes in two (and higher) dimensions*, *JHEP* **04** (2007) 074.
- [11] D. Martelli and W. Muck, *Holographic renormalization and ward identities with the Hamilton-Jacobi method*, *Nucl. Phys.* **B 654** (2003) 248.
- [12] A. Jevicki and T. Yoneya, *Space-time uncertainty principle and conformal symmetry in  $D$  particle dynamics*, *Nucl. Phys.* **B 535** (1998) 335.
- [13] A. Jevicki, Y. Kazama and T. Yoneya, *Quantum metamorphosis of conformal transformation in  $D3$ -brane Yang-Mills theory*, *Phys. Rev. Lett.* **81** (1998) 5072.

- [14] A. Jevicki, Y. Kazama and T. Yoneya, *Generalized conformal symmetry in D-brane matrix models*, *Phys. Rev. D* **59** (1999) 066001.
- [15] S. Sachdev and J. Ye, *Gapless spin fluid ground state in a random, quantum Heisenberg magnet*, *Phys. Rev. Lett.* **70** (1993) 3339.
- [16] A. Kitaev, *A simple model of quantum holography*, talks at KITP, University of California, Santa Barbara CA U.S.A. (2015).
- [17] M.O. Katanaev, W. Kummer and H. Liebl, *On the completeness of the black hole singularity in 2D dilaton theories*, *Nucl. Phys. B* **486** (1997) 353.
- [18] G. Sárosi, *AdS<sub>2</sub> holography and the SYK model*, *PoS, Modave* **2017** 001 (2018).
- [19] D. A. Trunin 2021, *Pedagogical introduction to the Sachdev–Ye–Kitaev model and two-dimensional dilaton gravity*, *Phys.-Usp.* **64** 219 (2021).
- [20] J. P. S. Lemos and P. M. Sá, *Black holes of a general two-dimensional dilaton gravity theory*, *Phys. Rev. D* **49** (1994) 2897.
- [21] J. Gegenberg, G. Kunstatter and D. Louis-Martinez, *Observables for two-dimensional black holes*, *Phys. Rev. D* **51** (1995) 1781.
- [22] D. Grumiller and R. Meyer, *Ramifications of lineland*, *Turk. J. Phys.* **30** (2006) 349.
- [23] S. A. Hartnoll, A. Lucas, and S. Sachdev, *Holographic quantum matter*, arXiv:1612.07324v3 [hep-th].
- [24] R. C. Tolman, *Relativity, thermodynamics, and cosmology*, Oxford University Press (1934).
- [25] J. York, James W., *Role of conformal three geometry in the dynamics of gravitation*, *Phys. Rev. Lett.* **28** (1972) 1082.
- [26] E. Dyer and K. Hinterbichler, *Boundary terms, variational principles, and higher derivative modified gravity*, *Phys. Rev. D* **79** (2009) 024028.
- [27] J. York, James W., *Black hole thermodynamics and the euclidean Einstein action*, *Phys. Rev. D* **33** (1986) 2092.
- [28] F. Reif, *Fundamentals of statistical and thermal physics*, McGraw-Hill Inc., New York, 1965.
- [29] J. D. Brown and J. W. York, *Quasilocal energy and conserved charges derived from the gravitational action*, *Phys. Rev. D* **47** (1993) 1407.

- [30] S. W. Hawking and G. T. Horowitz, *The gravitational Hamiltonian, action, entropy and surface terms*, *Class. Quantum Grav.* **13** (1996) 1487.
- [31] S. W. Hawking and G. T. Horowitz, *Entropy, area, and black hole pairs*, *Phys. Rev. D* **51** (1995) 4302.
- [32] A. Kumar and K. Ray, *Entropy of extremal black holes in two dimensions*, *Phys. Rev. D* **51** (1995) 5954.
- [33] R. Jackiw and C. Teitelboim in *Quantum Theory Of Gravity*, S. Christensen ed., Adam Hilger, Bristol (1984).
- [34] D. Grumiller, W. Kummer, D. Vassilevich, *Dilaton gravity in two dimensions*, *Physics Reports*, 369 (4), (2002) 327-430.
- [35] T. Klösch and T. Strobl, *Explicit global coordinates for Schwarzschild and Reissner - Nordström solutions*, *Class. Quantum Grav.* **13** (1996) 1191.
- [36] D. Grumiller, D. Hofmann, and W. Kummer, *Two-Dilaton Theories in Two Dimensions from Dimensional Reduction*, *Annals of Physics* **290** (2001) 69-82.
- [37] S. P. Trivedi, *Semiclassical extremal black holes*, *Phys. Rev. D* **47** (1993) 4233.
- [38] QY. Mao and H. Lü, *General Solutions of Einstein Gravity at  $D \rightarrow 2$* , *Eur. Phys. J. C* **83** (2023) 210.