

Jackiw-Teitelboim Gravity and Lorentzian Quantum Cosmology

Masazumi Honda,^{1,2} Hiroki Matsui,³ Kota Numajiri,⁴ and Kazumasa Okabayashi³

¹*Interdisciplinary Theoretical and Mathematical Sciences Program (iTHEMS), RIKEN, Wako 351-0198, Japan*

²*Graduate School of Science and Engineering, Saitama University,
255 Shimo-Okubo, Sakura-ku, Saitama 338-8570, Japan*

³*Center for Gravitational Physics and Quantum Information,
Yukawa Institute for Theoretical Physics, Kyoto University, 606-8502, Kyoto, Japan*

⁴*Department of Physics, Nagoya University, Nagoya 464-8602, Japan*

(Dated: December 31, 2024)

We directly evaluate the probability amplitudes in Jackiw-Teitelboim (JT) gravity using the Lorentzian path integral formulation. By imposing boundary conditions on the scale factor and the dilaton field, the Lorentzian path integral uniquely yields the probability amplitude without contradiction. Under Dirichlet boundary conditions, we demonstrate that the amplitude derived from the Lorentzian path integral is expressed in terms of the modified Bessel function of the second kind. Furthermore, we provide the determinant for various boundary conditions and perform a detailed analysis of the Lefschetz thimble structure and saddle points. In contrast to four-dimensional gravity, we show that the Hartle-Hawking no-boundary proposal is approximately valid in JT quantum cosmology. Furthermore, addressing quantum perturbation issues, we show that the quantum genesis of the two-dimensional universe occurs and exhibits perturbative regularity when the dilaton field is non-zero and large as an initial condition.

I. INTRODUCTION

In recent years, there has been growing interest in two-dimensional gravity theories, particularly in Jackiw-Teitelboim (JT) gravity [1, 2]. The JT gravity is a promising toy model for quantum gravity, as exactly solvable and renormalizable, unlike gravity theories in four or higher dimensions. Many studies focus on JT gravity in anti-de Sitter (AdS) space [3–6], which can be seen, e.g., as the near-horizon limit of an extreme black hole [3, 7] (see also Refs. [8, 9] for review).

Meanwhile, there has been progress in studying JT gravity in de Sitter (dS) space, which is relevant to our universe due to the positive cosmological constant and curvature. For dS space, the canonical and path integral quantization of JT gravity have been studied in the literature [10–20]. However, the equivalence between these two methods and the rigorous formulation of path integral in JT gravity remains unclear. In the path integral quantization of JT gravity in dS space, the probability amplitude analyses based on the Euclidean metric $g_{\mu\nu}^E$, particularly following the Hartle-Hawking no-boundary proposal [21], are commonly adopted.

The no-boundary proposal states that the wave function of the universe is given by the path integral over compact Euclidean geometries $g_{\mu\nu}^E$, with the geometric configuration of spacetime that has a 3-dimensional configuration as the only boundary. This proposal elegantly explains the quantum birth of the universe from nothing [22]. However, it has been criticized for various technical reasons, such as the convergence problems of the full integral over the Euclidean metric [23]. In gravity, these path integrals correspond to excited states associated with negative energy eigenstates [24], leading to debates about the validity of the Euclidean gravity approach.

To avoid these problems, the authors of Ref. [25] proposed to perform path integrals along the steepest descent path of a complex metric, where the real part of the action decreases rapidly. In particular, recent studies in quantum cosmology are based on a rigorous method called the Lorentzian path integral formalism [26]. Although the integral of the phase factor $e^{\frac{i}{\hbar}S[g_{\mu\nu}]}$ is not manifestly convergent (conditionally convergent at most), deforming the integration contour to the complex plane using Picard-Lefschetz theory [27–30] enables us to rewrite it in terms of integrals along Lefschetz thimbles (steepest descents), which are absolutely convergent.¹ The Lorentzian path integral provides a consistent method for quantum gravity, allowing detailed insights into the wave function of the universe [42, 43]. Furthermore, utilizing the resurgence theory and Lefschetz thimble analyses in combination [44],² we can definitely perform the gravitational path integral over the Lorentzian spacetime and reduce the ambiguity of the wave function of the universe.

In this paper, we explore the quantum genesis of the universe within two-dimensional spacetime, focusing on JT gravity as a renormalizable quantum gravity model [1, 2] through the Lorentzian path integral. Quantum cosmology based on the Lorentzian path integral is expected to be studied within a consistent framework of quantum gravity. For instance, Lorentzian quantum cosmology has been discussed in Hořava-Lifshitz (HL) gravity [46]. However, implementing the Lorentzian path in-

¹ There are several studies on the quantum tunneling phenomenon, employing the Picard-Lefschetz theory [31–41].

² A recent work [45] performed the Monte Carlo analysis using the generalized Lefschetz thimble method in Lorentzian quantum cosmology.

tegral in gravity theories beyond general relativity (GR) is usually challenging. In contrast, JT gravity is renormalizable and allows for the straightforward implementation of the Lorentzian path integral. Therefore, although it is confined to two-dimensional spacetime, the quantum genesis of the universe can be analyzed within a consistent quantum gravity theory.³

The dS space in JT gravity is known to correspond to the Kantowski-Sachs model [12], which represents a homogeneous four-dimensional universe with $S^1 \times S^2$ topology. The Lorentzian path integral of the Kantowski-Sachs model has been analyzed in Refs. [49–52].⁴ In particular, the authors of Refs. [50, 51] performed this analysis under the Euclidean boundary condition following the original version of the no-boundary proposal and tunneling proposal. On the other hand, we directly evaluate the JT probability amplitudes by performing the Lorentzian path integral, taking into account both the determinant and the physical boundary conditions where we mainly consider the Dirichlet boundary condition. Additionally, we provide a more detailed investigation of the thimble structure and discuss the perturbation problems of Lorentzian quantum cosmology in JT gravity. We show that the quantum genesis of the universe occurs and exhibits perturbative stability only when the dilaton field is non-zero and large as an initial condition.

The rest of the present paper is organized as follows. In Section II, we briefly review the canonical quantization of JT gravity to compare the probability amplitude obtained from the Lorentzian path integral. In Section III, we analyze the probability amplitude of JT gravity under the Dirichlet boundary condition utilizing the Lorentzian path integral approach. We show the amplitude derived from the path integral coincides with the minisuperspace solutions of the canonical quantization. We also provide the Lefschetz thimble structure and saddle point analysis in detail. The case with the Neumann boundary condition is discussed in Section IV. In Section V, we consider the problem of perturbations in quantum cosmology in the JT gravity and show that the perturbative regularity is preserved for the quantum genesis of the universe in the JT gravity. Section VI is devoted to conclusions. The Appendix A exhibits detailed calculations of the amplitude with precise prefactors under various boundary conditions.

II. CANONICAL QUANTIZATION OF JACKIW-TEITELBOIM GRAVITY

In this section, we review the canonical quantization of JT gravity, following the method outlined by Refs. [10, 11, 15], and derive the probability amplitude

of the universe to compare it with the results obtained from the Lorentzian path integral approach in the next section. Consider the action of JT gravity in Lorentzian signature,

$$S_{\text{JT}} = \frac{1}{2} \int_{\mathcal{M}} d^2x \sqrt{-g} \phi [R - 2\Lambda] - \int_{\partial\mathcal{M}} dy \sqrt{\gamma} \phi \mathcal{K}, \quad (1)$$

where the gravitational constant is normalized ($\frac{\phi}{8\pi G} \rightarrow \phi$). The dilaton field should be non-negative, $\phi \geq 0$, since a negative value results in an effective Newton constant $\frac{\phi}{8\pi G}$ that is also negative. This bound is also reasonable when considering the JT theory arising from the reduction of 4-dimensional spacetime. Here, Λ denotes a positive cosmological constant, g represents the two-dimensional spacetime metric on \mathcal{M} , and $\sqrt{\gamma}$ is the determinant of the induced metric γ_{ab} on the boundary $\partial\mathcal{M}$. The boundary term in the action is crucial for the variational principle to be applicable under Dirichlet boundary conditions for both the metric and dilaton fields.

We will use the following Arnowitt, Deser, and Misner (ADM) decomposition of the metric

$$ds^2 = -N^2(x, t) dt^2 + g_1(x, t) (dx + N_\perp(x, t) dt)^2, \quad (2)$$

where N is the lapse, N_\perp is the shift, and g_1 is the spatial metric. Then, t represents Lorentzian time, and x indicates the spatial direction within the range $0 \leq x < 2\pi$. After integrating by parts and using the boundary terms with the extrinsic curvature scalar $\mathcal{K} = \frac{1}{2N g_1} (\dot{g}_1 - 2N_{1|1}) = \frac{1}{2N g_1} (\dot{g}_1 - 2N'_\perp g_1 - N_\perp g'_1)$ where a vertical bar denotes covariant differentiation with respect to the spatial metric and $N_1 = g_1 N_\perp$, the action can then be written as,

$$S_{\text{JT}} = \int d^2x \left[\frac{\dot{\phi}}{N} \left(\frac{N_\perp}{2\sqrt{g_1}} g'_1 + \sqrt{g_1} N'_\perp - \frac{\dot{g}_1}{2\sqrt{g_1}} \right) \right] + \int d^2x \left[\frac{\phi'}{N} \left(\frac{N N'}{\sqrt{g_1}} - \sqrt{g_1} N_\perp N'_\perp + \frac{N_\perp}{2\sqrt{g_1}} \dot{g}_1 - \frac{N'_\perp}{2\sqrt{g_1}} g'_1 \right) - N \sqrt{g_1} \phi \Lambda \right], \quad (3)$$

where the dots denote derivatives with respect to t and the primes denote derivatives with respect to x . As usual, the action does not involve time derivatives of fields N and N_\perp and therefore

$$\Pi_N = \Pi_{N_\perp} = 0, \quad (4)$$

which act as primary constraints. The momenta conjugate to the dilaton and scale factor are,

$$\Pi_{g_1} = -\frac{\dot{\phi}}{2N\sqrt{g_1}} + \frac{N_\perp \phi'}{2N\sqrt{g_1}}, \quad (5)$$

$$\Pi_\phi = \frac{N_\perp}{2N\sqrt{g_1}} g'_1 + \frac{N'_\perp \sqrt{g_1}}{N} - \frac{\dot{g}_1}{2N\sqrt{g_1}}. \quad (6)$$

³ The case of three-dimensional spacetime is discussed in [47, 48].

⁴ The earlier works related to Kantowski-Sachs quantum cosmology were done in Refs. [53–56]

The canonical Hamiltonian is,

$$H = \int dx [N\mathcal{H} + N_\perp\mathcal{P}], \quad (7)$$

where

$$\mathcal{H} = 2\Pi_\phi\Pi_{g_1}\sqrt{g_1} - \left(\frac{\phi'}{\sqrt{g_1}}\right)' - \sqrt{g_1}\phi\Lambda, \quad (8)$$

$$\mathcal{P} = 2g_1\Pi'_{g_1} + \Pi_{g_1}g'_1 - \Pi_\phi\phi', \quad (9)$$

and the Hamiltonian and momentum constraints are respectively $\mathcal{H} \approx 0$ and $\mathcal{P} \approx 0$ in the Dirac sense. So far, our discussion has focused on classical approaches. We now move to the quantum theory, introducing fields as operators. In this framework, canonical quantization is performed formally by replacing the canonical momenta as

$$\hat{\Pi}_{g_1} = -i\hbar\frac{\delta}{\delta g_1(x)}, \quad \hat{\Pi}_\phi = -i\hbar\frac{\delta}{\delta\phi(x)}, \quad (10)$$

and the state is represented by wave functional denoted as $\Psi[g_1, \phi]$. In the quantum theory of gravity, the physical wave function $\Psi[g_1, \phi]$ has to satisfy the Hamiltonian and momentum constraints respectively,

$$\mathcal{H}\Psi[g_1, \phi] = 0, \quad \mathcal{P}\Psi[g_1, \phi] = 0, \quad (11)$$

where the Hamiltonian constraint equation is also referred to as the Wheeler-DeWitt (WDW) equation.

A. General Solutions

Following Refs. [10, 11], we can eliminate the momenta conjugate to the dilaton Π_ϕ by using a linear combination of the Hamiltonian and Momentum constraints,

$$\begin{aligned} 0 &\approx 2\Pi_{g_1}\sqrt{g_1}\mathcal{P} + \phi'\mathcal{H} \\ &= 2\sqrt{g_1} \left(g_1\Pi_{g_1}^2 - \frac{1}{4} \left(\frac{\phi'}{\sqrt{g_1}} \right)^2 - \frac{\Lambda}{4}\phi^2 \right)', \end{aligned} \quad (12)$$

and we have

$$4g_1\Pi_{g_1}^2 = \left(\frac{\phi'}{\sqrt{g_1}} \right)^2 + \Lambda\phi^2 - C, \quad (13)$$

where C is the constant for the on-shell configurations. Now, it is found that solving constraints (11) is equivalent to imposing the above conditions (13) and the momentum constraint (9) in the Dirac sense. In the quantum theory, we shall impose

$$\hat{\Pi}_{g_1}\Psi[g_1, \phi] = \pm \frac{\sqrt{\left(\frac{\phi'}{\sqrt{g_1}}\right)^2 + \Lambda\phi^2 - C}}{2\sqrt{g_1}}\Psi[g_1, \phi]. \quad (14)$$

Thus, we have the following solution [10, 11]

$$\Psi_\pm[g_1, \phi] = e^{\pm\frac{i}{\hbar}\int dx(Q - \phi'(x)\tanh^{-1}(\frac{Q}{\phi'(x)}))}, \quad (15)$$

$$Q = \sqrt{(\Lambda\phi(x)^2 - C)g_1(x) + \phi'(x)^2}, \quad (16)$$

where it can be shown that the above wave function satisfies the momentum constraint $\mathcal{P}\Psi_\pm[g_1, \phi] = 0$ [19]. The general solutions consist of a linear combination of $\Psi_+[g_1, \phi]$ and $\Psi_-[g_1, \phi]$, which describe the contracting and expanding configurations, respectively.

More general solutions would be given as a sum over various constant C and therefore can be written as [15],

$$\begin{aligned} \Psi[g_1, \phi] &= \int dC\tilde{\rho}(C)e^{+\frac{i}{\hbar}\int dx(Q - \phi'(x)\tanh^{-1}(\frac{Q}{\phi'(x)}))} \\ &+ \int dC\rho(C)e^{-\frac{i}{\hbar}\int dx(Q - \phi'(x)\tanh^{-1}(\frac{Q}{\phi'(x)}))}, \end{aligned} \quad (17)$$

where $\tilde{\rho}(C), \rho(C)$ are arbitrary complex functions of C . The norm of the wave function is not necessarily positive or conserved for all solutions of the WDW equation. Therefore, it has been argued that $\tilde{\rho}(C)$ and $\rho(C)$ should be chosen in a way that ensures both a positive and conserved norm (see, for instance, Ref. [12, 19] for a detailed discussion).

The solution (17) involves arbitrariness, making it difficult to determine which solution represents a physical one, especially in the absence of well-defined boundary conditions for the WDW equation. Ref. [12] suggests that the wave function of dS spacetime should consist of $\Psi_-[g_1, \phi]$: this describes the expanding configurations in the large g_1, ϕ limit. Thus, we can only take $\Psi_-[g_1, \phi]$, and $\rho(C)$ is chosen from some prescriptions. According to Ref. [15], $\rho(C)$ is determined as $\rho(C) = \sinh(2\pi\sqrt{C})$ by requiring that the wave function in this limit corresponds to the Schwarzian partition function. Consequently, when we assume the dilaton profile ϕ along a spatial slice with $du = \sqrt{g_1}dx$, and denote $l = \int \sqrt{g_1}dx$, the general solution results in the following form,

$$\begin{aligned} \Psi[l, \phi] &= \int_0^\infty dC \sinh(2\pi\sqrt{C}) \\ &\times e^{-\frac{i}{\hbar}\int_0^l du \left(\sqrt{\Lambda\phi^2 - C + (\partial_u\phi)^2} - \partial_u\phi \tanh^{-1} \left(\sqrt{1 + \frac{\Lambda\phi^2 - C}{(\partial_u\phi)^2}} \right) \right)} \\ &= \int_0^\infty dC \sinh(2\pi\sqrt{C}) e^{-\frac{il}{\hbar}\sqrt{\Lambda\phi^2 - C}}, \end{aligned} \quad (18)$$

where we take $\partial_u\phi = 0$ in the last expression. Then, by performing the integral we obtain [15],

$$\Psi[l, \phi] = \frac{l\Lambda\phi^2/\hbar}{l^2/\hbar^2 - 4\pi^2} K_2 \left(i\sqrt{\Lambda\phi^2(l^2/\hbar^2 - 4\pi^2)} \right), \quad (19)$$

where $K_\nu(z)$ is the modified Bessel function of the second kind. In large l, ϕ limit, we obtain

$$\Psi[l, \phi] \propto e^{-\frac{il}{\hbar}\sqrt{\Lambda\phi^2}}. \quad (20)$$

Ref. [15] also proposes another wave function written in terms of the modified Bessel function of the first kind $I_\nu(z)$ to realize the real wave function following the original Hartle-Hawking proposal. From the above discussion, the JT wave function is expected to be given by specific Bessel functions. In the next subsection, we will confirm that these results remain valid even if we take the minisuperspace approximation from the first place.

B. Minisuperspace Canonical Quantization

Hereafter, we shall evaluate the above results (19) or (20) by starting from the minisuperspace approximation. In the minisuperspace, g_1 , ϕ are independent of x , and we take the following ADM metric,

$$ds^2 = -N(t)^2 dt^2 + a(t)^2 dx^2. \quad (21)$$

In this setup, the action for JT gravity reduces

$$S_{\text{JT}} = -2\pi \int dt \left(\frac{\dot{q}\dot{\varphi}}{4N} + N\Lambda \right), \quad (22)$$

where we transformed the lapse function $N \rightarrow N/a\phi$,⁵ and defined $q(t) = a^2(t)$ and $\varphi(t) = \phi^2(t)$ for simplicity. Performing the canonical quantization, the canonical conjugate momenta are transformed into Hermitian operators,

$$\begin{aligned} \Pi_q &= -\pi \frac{\dot{\varphi}}{2N}, & \Pi_\varphi &= -\pi \frac{\dot{q}}{2N}, \\ \Rightarrow \hat{\Pi}_q &= -i\hbar \frac{\partial}{\partial q}, & \hat{\Pi}_\varphi &= -i\hbar \frac{\partial}{\partial \varphi}. \end{aligned} \quad (23)$$

The minisuperspace WDW equation for the JT gravity is written as

$$\left[\frac{\partial}{\partial \tilde{q}} \frac{\partial}{\partial \tilde{\varphi}} + 1 \right] \Psi[\tilde{q}, \tilde{\varphi}] = 0, \quad (24)$$

where $\tilde{q} = \frac{\pi q}{\hbar} \sqrt{\Lambda}$ and $\tilde{\varphi} = \frac{\pi \varphi}{\hbar} \sqrt{\Lambda}$. The general solution of the minisuperspace WDW equation (24) is given by a linear combination of a function $(\tilde{q}/\tilde{\varphi})^{\frac{m}{2}} F_m(2\sqrt{\tilde{q}\tilde{\varphi}})$ [12] where $F_m(z)$ is a specific Bessel function and m is the arbitrary real number. Ref. [50] showed that under the outgoing mode assumption describing expanding universe in large a, ϕ limit, the appropriate Bessel functions are the Hankel functions of the second kind $H_m^{(2)}(z)$. Thus, the wave function should take the following form,

$$\Psi_m[q, \varphi] = \left(\frac{q}{\varphi} \right)^{\frac{m}{2}} H_m^{(2)} \left(\frac{2\pi}{\hbar} \sqrt{\Lambda q \varphi} \right). \quad (25)$$

⁵ Shifting the lapse function corresponds to introducing a new time coordinate, τ which is related by $dt = \frac{d\tau}{a\phi}$.

which asymptotes

$$\Psi_m \left[q\varphi \gg \frac{1}{\Lambda} \right] \propto e^{-\frac{2\pi i}{\hbar} \sqrt{\Lambda q \varphi}}, \quad (26)$$

reproducing Eq. (20). Assuming correspondence with the Schwarzian theory [57] in large a, ϕ limit forces m to be -2 . On the other hand, Ref. [15] suggests that $F_m(z)$ should be taken as either $K_m(z)$ or $I_m(z)$ as previously discussed. Actually, it is impossible to determine which Bessel function is appropriate, and the value of m , solely by solving the WDW equation (24). In contrast, when (q_0, φ_0) and (q_1, φ_1) are fixed, the path integral approach provides a more straightforward way to obtain the physical probability amplitude. In the following section, we directly evaluate the JT probability amplitudes by performing the Lorentzian path integral and demonstrate the exact expression for the wave function written in terms of the modified Bessel function of the second kind, $K_0(z)$.

III. LORENTZIAN QUANTUM COSMOLOGY

Hereafter, we perform the path integral quantization of JT gravity and analyze the probability amplitude of the universe utilizing the Lorentzian path integral approach. The probability amplitude of JT gravity can be schematically given by the gravitational path integral

$$G[g, \phi] = \int_{\mathcal{M}} \mathcal{D}g_{\mu\nu} \mathcal{D}\phi \exp \left(\frac{i}{\hbar} S_{\text{JT}}[g_{\mu\nu}, \phi] \right). \quad (27)$$

In the minisuperspace approximation, utilizing the JT action (22), we can derive the Lorentzian probability amplitude as [58]⁶

$$G[q, \varphi] = \int dN(t_f - t_i) \int \mathcal{D}q \mathcal{D}\varphi \exp(iS_{\text{JT}}[N, q, \varphi]/\hbar), \quad (28)$$

where we proceed with the lapse integral and the path integral over all configurations of the scale factor $q(t)$ and dilaton field $\varphi(t)$ with the given initial ($t_i = 0$) and final ($t_f = 1$) values. In this paper, we mainly consider the integration of the lapse function over $N \in (0, \infty)$, and this choice of N ensures the causality [59]. Although one can also consider the integration on the entire real axis, $N \in (-\infty, \infty)$, this leads to the ambiguity of the wave function [44, 60, 61].

⁶ Here q, φ run from $-\infty$ to ∞ although they are originally positive. This treatment can avoid configurational difficulties from undetermined classical paths, which can happen when they are limited to positive domains [58]. This extension does not alter physical implications as long as we choose boundary conditions consistent with their positivities.

First, we assume the Dirichlet boundary condition in the Lorentzian path integral, where we fix the value of the scale factor and dilaton field at the two endpoints,⁷

$$\begin{aligned} q(t_i = 0) &= q_0, \quad \varphi(t_i = 0) = \varphi_0, \\ q(t_f = 1) &= q_1, \quad \varphi(t_f = 1) = \varphi_1. \end{aligned} \quad (29)$$

The equations of motion obtained by varying the JT action (22) with respect to $q(t)$ and $\varphi(t)$ are

$$\ddot{q} = 0, \quad \ddot{\varphi} = 0, \quad (30)$$

and we can get the analytical solutions of $q(t)$ and $\varphi(t)$ with the Dirichlet boundary condition (29).

For the JT action (22), the path integral under the Dirichlet boundary condition can be exactly evaluated, and we find the following expression (see Appendix A. for the detail derivation),

$$G[q_1, \varphi_1; q_0, \varphi_0] = \int_0^\infty \frac{dN}{4\hbar N} \exp\left(\frac{iS_{\text{on-shell}}[N]}{\hbar}\right), \quad (31)$$

where the on-shell action $S_{\text{on-shell}}[N]$ is written as,⁸

$$S_{\text{on-shell}}[N] = -\beta N - \frac{\gamma}{N}, \quad (32)$$

with

$$\beta = 2\pi\Lambda, \quad \gamma = \frac{\pi}{2}(q_1 - q_0)(\varphi_1 - \varphi_0). \quad (33)$$

Now, we consider the integral by using the steepest descents from saddle points. For this purpose, it is convenient to work in the following expression,

$$G(\hbar) = \frac{1}{4\hbar} \int_{-\infty}^{\infty} dx \exp[F_D(x)], \quad (34)$$

where we took $N = e^x$ and introduced

$$F_D(x) := \frac{i}{\hbar} S_{\text{on-shell}}(x) = \frac{i}{\hbar} \left[-\beta e^x - \frac{\gamma}{e^x} \right], \quad (35)$$

as the exponential part of the above integration. The saddle points are obtained by requiring that the derivative of the exponent in the action vanishes, i.e., $\frac{dF_D(x)}{dx} = 0$:

$$x_{s\pm}^{(m)} = \log\left(\pm\sqrt{\frac{\gamma}{\beta}}\right) + 2m\pi i \implies N_{s\pm} = \pm\sqrt{\frac{\gamma}{\beta}}, \quad (36)$$

⁷ When adopting the no-boundary prescription, the field value of the dilaton becomes imaginary in the Euclidean region [12]. Consequently, to precisely reproduce the no-boundary wave function via the Lorentzian path integral, it is necessary to set the initial condition of the dilaton field φ to be imaginary.

⁸ The on-shell action $S_{\text{on-shell}}[N]$ exactly corresponds with the on-shell action of the Kantowski-Sachs model, and the steepest-descent analysis has been conducted in Ref. [49]. However, the authors assume an Euclidean metric and do not specify the Lorentzian integration contour for the lapse function.

where $m \in \mathbb{Z}$, and we take the branch cut of the logarithmic function as the negative real axis such that $\log(-1) = -\pi i$.

It is a priori nontrivial whether or not complex saddle points contribute to the integral. A systematic way to see this is to find Lefschetz thimbles (steepest descents) associated with the saddles and then appropriately perform deformation of the integral contour to a superposition of the thimbles equivalent to the original integral. Important properties of the Lefschetz thimble \mathcal{J}_{x_s} associated with the saddle point x_s are (i) $\text{Im}[F_D(x)] = \text{Im}[F_D(x_s)]$ along $x \in \mathcal{J}_{x_s}$ and (ii) monotonically decreasing $\text{Re}[F_D(x)]$ as we get away from x_s along $x \in \mathcal{J}_{x_s}$. Then one can rewrite the integral as

$$G(\hbar) = \frac{1}{4\hbar} \sum_{x_s} n_{x_s} \int_{\mathcal{J}_{x_s}} dx \exp[F_D(x)], \quad (37)$$

where n_{x_s} called Stokes multiplier is an integer to determine how the saddle x_s contributes to the integral. While the integer n_{x_s} cannot change continuously as we change the parameters, it may discontinuously jump across particular regions of the parameters called Stokes lines. In this situation, the \hbar expansion gets a change of its form as varying the parameters. This is called the Stokes phenomenon that can occur when there are multiple saddle points with $\text{Im}[F_D(x_s)] = \text{Im}[F_D(x'_s)]$ for $x_s \neq x'_s$. It is known that on the Stokes lines, the Lefschetz thimbles pass multiple saddle points and the Stokes multiplier n_{x_s} is not unique. Therefore, the decomposition by the thimbles becomes ambiguous on the Stokes lines. In this situation, it is often useful to deform the parameters slightly away from the Stokes lines and try to take limits to approach the Stokes lines from different directions. There are various known examples where the thimble decomposition has terms with jumps of the Stokes multiplier across the Stokes lines while the total answer is continuous across the Stokes lines because of cancellation of the ambiguities against other ambiguities coming from the subtlety of resummation of perturbative series [44].

In our case, we have the two parameters and can consider two possible cases; the parameters β and γ have the same or opposite signs. In the case where the parameters have the same signs, the steepest-descent contours are shown in Fig. 1, and we can find that the contributing saddle point is given by $x_{s+}^{(0)} = \frac{1}{2} \log\left|\frac{\gamma}{\beta}\right|$ without any ambiguities. Its associated thimble is equivalent to the original integral contour \mathbb{R} by the Cauchy integration theorem. Then, changing the integral variable as $x = x_s + \delta x$, we can perform the path integral,

$$\begin{aligned} G(\hbar) &= \frac{1}{4\hbar} \int_{-\infty}^{\infty} d\delta x \exp[F_D(x_{s+}^{(0)} + \delta x)] \\ &= \frac{1}{4\hbar} \int_{-\infty}^{\infty} d\delta x \exp\left[-\frac{2i}{\hbar} \sqrt{\beta\gamma} \cosh(\delta x)\right] \\ &= \frac{1}{2\hbar} K_0\left(\frac{2i\sqrt{\beta\gamma}}{\hbar}\right) = -\frac{\pi i}{4\hbar} H_0^{(2)}\left(\frac{2\sqrt{\beta\gamma}}{\hbar}\right), \end{aligned} \quad (38)$$




FIG. 1. The contour plot of $\text{Re}[F_D(x)]$ over the complex x plane for $\beta = 1$, $\gamma = 1$, and $\hbar = 1$ as a representative of the case with the same signs of β and γ . The black (or red) circles correspond to $x_{s+}^{(m)}$ (or $x_{s-}^{(m)}$), while the blue dashed (or red dotted) lines represent the Lefschetz thimbles (or their duals). The black horizontal line indicates the original integration contour.

where $K_\nu(z)$ has the following integral representation for $\text{Re}[z] > 0$,⁹

$$K_\nu(z) = \frac{1}{2} \int_{-\infty}^{\infty} ds e^{-\nu s - z \cosh(s)}. \quad (39)$$

Thus, the probability amplitude (34) satisfies the minisuperspace WDW equation (24). The asymptotic form of $G(\hbar)$ with $\hbar \rightarrow 0$ leads to

$$G(\hbar) \simeq \frac{\pi^{\frac{1}{2}}}{4\hbar^{\frac{1}{2}}(\beta\gamma)^{\frac{1}{4}}} e^{-\frac{2i}{\hbar}\sqrt{\beta\gamma} - \frac{\pi i}{4}}, \quad (40)$$

which derives $G[q_1, \varphi_1] \propto e^{-\frac{2\pi i}{\hbar}\sqrt{\Lambda q_1 \varphi_1}}$ to be consistent with the solution (20). The existence of the real saddle point implies that the path integral describes classical evolution from (q_0, φ_0) to (q_1, φ_1) . In particular, if we consider the scenario where $q_0 = \varphi_0 = 0$, the classical initial singularity cannot be avoided, and perturbative effects cause the probability amplitude to become ill-defined, as we will demonstrate in Section V.

⁹ Our case corresponds to $\text{Re}[z] = 0$ and hence (39) is not directly available while (38) is correct as a result. To see this, one first rewrites the second line of (38) as $G(\hbar) = -\frac{\pi}{2}(Y_0(2\sqrt{\beta\gamma}/\hbar) + iJ_0(2\sqrt{\beta\gamma}/\hbar))$, where the Bessel functions $Y_0(z)$ and $J_0(z)$ have the integral representations: $Y_0(z) = \int_0^\infty ds \cos(z \cosh s)$ and $J_0(z) = \int_0^\infty ds \sin(z \cosh s)$, which are convergent for real z . Then (38) is derived by using the formula $K_\nu(iz) = -\frac{\pi}{2i^\nu}(Y_\nu(z) + iJ_\nu(z)) = -\frac{\pi}{2i^{\nu-1}}H_\nu^{(2)}(z)$.




FIG. 2. A similar plot to Figs. 1 with $\beta = 1$ and $\gamma = -1$, and $\hbar = 1$ as a representative of the case with the opposite signs of β and γ .

On the other hand, in the case where the parameters β and γ have opposite signs, the steepest-descent contours are shown in Fig. 2. We can find that the Lefschetz thimbles pass multiple saddle points and the thimble decomposition becomes ambiguous. To see the structures in more detail, we deform the parameter \hbar to be complex as $\hbar = |\hbar|e^{i\theta}$, perform the Lefschetz thimble analysis for complex \hbar and take the limits $\theta \rightarrow 0_\pm$ to approach real positive \hbar as in [44].¹⁰ After the complex deformation, the contour plots of $\text{Re}[F_D(x)]$ are illustrated in Fig. 3. From this figure, it is evident that the contributing saddle is the same irrespective of the sign of the deformation parameter θ . Specifically, the saddle is given by $x_{s+}^{(0)} = \frac{1}{2} \log \left| \frac{\gamma}{\beta} \right| - \frac{\pi i}{2}$.¹¹ Therefore, even though the parameters in Fig. 2 are located on the Stokes lines before the deformation, the Stokes jump does not occur. As in the previous case, changing the integral variable as

¹⁰ To ensure the convergence of the integral at $|x| \rightarrow \infty$, we shift the integral contour to imaginary direction as $\mathbb{R} - i\epsilon$ satisfying $\epsilon > |\theta|$. Therefore, if we take e.g. $\epsilon = \mathcal{O}(\theta)$ s.t. $\epsilon > |\theta|$, then it gives a natural deformation of $G(\hbar)$ to complex \hbar .

¹¹ When $\gamma/\beta < 0$, identification of the sign \pm of the saddle point $x_{s\pm}^{(m)}$ in (36) depends on how to take the branch cut. Here we take $\sqrt{\gamma} = e^{-\frac{\pi i}{2}}\sqrt{|\gamma|}$ for $\gamma < 0$. This is because, if we continuously change $\arg(\gamma)$ to connect $\gamma > 0$ and $\gamma < 0$, then there is a region in $\arg(\gamma) \in [0, \pi]$ where the integral of $G(\hbar)$ becomes divergent while we can keep it well-defined in the whole region of $\arg(\gamma) \in [-\pi, 0]$. Indeed Fig. 2 can be obtained by continuously changing $\arg(\gamma)$ in the region $\arg(\gamma) \in [-\pi, 0]$ from Fig. 1 and vice versa.




FIG. 3. Complex deformation of Fig. 2 with $\hbar = e^{i\theta}$. (a) $\theta = +\frac{\pi}{10}$, (b) $\theta = -\frac{\pi}{10}$.

$x = x_s + \delta x$, we can perform the path integral,

$$\begin{aligned}
 G(\hbar) &= \frac{1}{4\hbar} \int_{-\infty}^{\infty} d\delta x \exp \left[-\frac{2}{\hbar} \sqrt{|\beta\gamma|} \cosh(\delta x) \right] \\
 &= \frac{1}{2\hbar} K_0 \left(\frac{2\sqrt{|\beta\gamma|}}{\hbar} \right) = -\frac{\pi i}{4\hbar} H_0^{(2)} \left(-\frac{2i\sqrt{|\beta\gamma|}}{\hbar} \right),
 \end{aligned} \tag{41}$$

The asymptotic form of $G(\hbar)$ with $\hbar \rightarrow 0$ leads to

$$G(\hbar) \simeq \frac{\pi^{\frac{1}{2}}}{4\hbar^{\frac{1}{2}} |\beta\gamma|^{\frac{1}{4}}} e^{-\frac{2}{\hbar} \sqrt{|\beta\gamma|}}. \tag{42}$$

The probability amplitude is exponentially suppressed and describes the quantum evolution from (q_0, φ_0) to (q_1, φ_1) . In the scenario where $q_0 = 0$ and $\varphi_0 > \varphi_1$, these probability amplitudes correctly describe the two-dimensional quantum creation of the universe. By using $x_{s+}^{(0)}$, the saddle points in terms of the lapse function lie in the Euclidean direction, with $\text{Im}[N_{s+}^{(0)}] < 0$, indicating that the original version of the no-boundary proposal is approximately correct for JT gravity. This is in contrast to the four-dimensional case [44]. Depending on the sign of the parameters β and γ , the saddle points x_s can be real or complex, but in both cases, the probability amplitudes are written in terms of the modified Bessel function of the second kind $K_0(z)$ when the Dirichlet boundary condition is employed. In the next section, we will consider the JT probability amplitudes for Neumann boundary conditions.

IV. NEUMANN BOUNDARY CONDITION FOR JT GRAVITY

The Dirichlet boundary condition can be used to set the size of the universe to zero on the initial hypersurface, capturing the concept of the quantum creation of the universe from nothing. However, other boundary conditions such as Neumann, and Robin boundary conditions are possible in Lorentzian path integral [62–67]. In this section, we will consider the Neumann boundary condition for the scale factor and the dilaton field on the initial hypersurfaces.

We start with the following JT action,

$$S_{\text{JT}} = -2\pi \int dt \left(\frac{\dot{q}\dot{\varphi}}{4N} + N\Lambda \right) + S_B, \tag{43}$$

where we introduced the boundary term. Since the JT action S_{JT} depends on $q, \dot{q}, \varphi, \dot{\varphi}$, the variation of the action is given by

$$\begin{aligned}
 \delta S_{\text{JT}} &= -2\pi \int dt \left(\left[-\frac{\dot{\varphi}}{4N} \right] \delta q + \left[-\frac{\dot{q}}{N} \right] \delta \varphi \right) \\
 &\quad - \frac{\pi}{2N} \dot{\varphi} \delta q - \frac{\pi}{2N} \dot{q} \delta \varphi + \delta S_B,
 \end{aligned} \tag{44}$$

To derive the equation of motion, we can choose several boundary conditions for the scale factor and the dilaton field, including Dirichlet, Neumann, and Robin conditions, as well as specific boundary terms S_B located on the hypersurfaces at $t_{i,f} = 0, 1$. To apply the Neumann boundary condition for the scale factor and the dilaton field on the initial hypersurfaces, we assume the following boundary term,

$$S_B = \frac{1}{2} \int_{\partial\mathcal{M}} dy \sqrt{\gamma} \left(\frac{\dot{\phi}}{N} + \phi \mathcal{K} \right) = \frac{\pi}{2N} (\dot{q}\varphi + q\dot{\varphi})|_{t_i=0}, \tag{45}$$

where we fix the value of the scale factor and dilaton field at the two endpoints,

$$\begin{aligned} -\frac{\pi\dot{q}(t_i=0)}{2N} &= \Pi_\varphi^0, & -\frac{\pi\dot{\varphi}(t_i=0)}{2N} &= \Pi_q^0, \\ q(t_f=1) &= q_1, & \varphi(t_f=1) &= \varphi_1, \end{aligned} \quad (46)$$

where the canonical momenta are defined as $\Pi_{q,\varphi} = \frac{\partial L_{JT}}{\partial \dot{q}, \dot{\varphi}}$ in which L_{JT} is the JT Lagrangian. In Lorentzian path integral of the Kantowski-Sachs model, Refs. [50, 51] assumes different boundary term and condition following the no-boundary proposal and tunneling proposal. Now, we consider the simple boundary terms and conditions. For the above boundary condition (46), the path integral can be exactly evaluated (see Appendix A for the detail derivation). On the other hand, by using the initial momentum state,

$$|\Pi_q^0, \Pi_\varphi^0\rangle = \frac{1}{2\pi\hbar} \int_{-\infty}^{\infty} dq_0 d\varphi_0 e^{\frac{i}{\hbar}(\Pi_q^0 q_0 + \Pi_\varphi^0 \varphi_0)} |q_0, \varphi_0\rangle, \quad (47)$$

we can also and easily derive the probability amplitude for the Neumann boundary condition as a Fourier transform of another probability amplitude [66],

$$\begin{aligned} G[q_1, \varphi_1; \Pi_q^0, \Pi_\varphi^0] &= \\ \frac{1}{2\pi\hbar} \int_{-\infty}^{\infty} dq_0 d\varphi_0 e^{i(\Pi_q^0 q_0 + \Pi_\varphi^0 \varphi_0)/\hbar} G[q_1, \varphi_1; q_0, \varphi_0]. \end{aligned} \quad (48)$$

Thus, we can obtain

$$\begin{aligned} G[q_1, \varphi_1; \Pi_q^0, \Pi_\varphi^0] &= \\ \frac{1}{2\pi\hbar} \int dN e^{\frac{i}{\hbar} \left\{ -2\pi\Lambda N + \frac{2N\Pi_q^0\Pi_\varphi^0}{\pi} + q_1\Pi_q^0 + \varphi_1\Pi_\varphi^0 \right\}}, \end{aligned} \quad (49)$$

where in the lapse integration, the absence of a pole means there is no ambiguity in the integration contours. Now, we will consider the integration range of $N \in (0, \infty)$. The above integration can be performed for $\text{Im}[\hbar] < 0$ and we can obtain

$$G[q_1, \varphi_1; \Pi_q^0, \Pi_\varphi^0] = -\frac{ie^{\frac{i}{\hbar}(\Pi_q^0 q_1 + \Pi_\varphi^0 \varphi_1)}}{4(\pi^2\Lambda - \Pi_q^0\Pi_\varphi^0)}. \quad (50)$$

While the probability amplitude under Dirichlet boundary conditions corresponds to the solution (20) and (25), the amplitude under Neumann boundary conditions does not necessarily do so. When Π_q^0, Π_φ^0 are real, the probability amplitudes oscillate, representing the classical evolution of the universe. In contrast, when Π_q^0, Π_φ^0 are imaginary, the probability amplitudes become exponentially suppressed, corresponding to the quantum genesis of the universe.

V. QUANTUM PERTURBATION PROBLEMS

In the previous sections, we have calculated the probability amplitude of the scalar factor and dilaton field

based on the framework of Lorentzian quantum cosmology and JT gravity. However, since we consider cosmological genesis, it is necessary to address not only the background spacetime and homogeneous dilaton field but also perturbations as a practical problem. In Lorentzian quantum cosmology, the issue of spacetime perturbations has been extensively discussed so far [60–63, 68–80]. Now, we shall discuss the problem of perturbations in quantum cosmology within the JT gravity. Since the gravitational wave does not propagate in JT gravity, instead we shall consider a massless scalar field as the perturbations around the background,

$$\begin{aligned} S_\Phi &= -\frac{1}{2} \int_{\mathcal{M}} d^2x \sqrt{-g} [g^{\mu\nu} \nabla_\mu \Phi \nabla_\nu \Phi] \\ &= -\frac{1}{2} \int dt dx N a \left[-\frac{1}{N^2} \dot{\Phi}^2 + \frac{1}{a^2} \Phi'^2 \right]. \end{aligned} \quad (51)$$

We expand the real scalar field Φ as

$$\Phi(t, x) = \frac{1}{\sqrt{2\pi}} \sum_{n=-\infty}^{\infty} \Phi_n(t) e^{inx}, \quad (52)$$

where $\Phi_n(t) = \Phi_{-n}^*(t)$. By using the above expression, we obtain

$$S_\Phi = \frac{1}{2} \int dt N \sum_{n=-\infty}^{\infty} \left[\frac{q\varphi^{\frac{1}{2}}}{N^2} \dot{\Phi}_n \dot{\Phi}_{-n} - \frac{n^2}{q\varphi^{\frac{1}{2}}} \Phi_n \Phi_{-n} \right]. \quad (53)$$

where we transformed $N \rightarrow N/a\phi$, and defined $q(t) = a^2(t)$ and $\varphi(t) = \phi^2(t)$.

If the backreaction of the perturbation on the background can be neglected, the path integral is first evaluated for q and φ , and then the on-shell action of the perturbation is computed by finding the classical solution of the perturbation, utilizing the classical solutions of q and φ . The total on-shell action is given by $S_{\text{on-shell}}[N] + S_{\text{on-shell},\Phi}[N]$ and can be evaluated approximately by the saddle-point method of N integral. The probability amplitude of JT gravity, taking into account perturbations, is given by

$$\begin{aligned} G[q_1, \varphi_1, \Phi_n] &= \\ \int_0^\infty \frac{dN}{4\hbar N \cdot D(N)} e^{\frac{i}{\hbar}(S_{\text{on-shell}}[N] + S_{\text{on-shell},\Phi}[N])}, \end{aligned} \quad (54)$$

where $D(N)$ is the the functional determinant of Φ_n . Here, we do not evaluate functional determinants of perturbations, but they can be analyzed in principle. The above evaluation can be expected to provide a sufficiently accurate analysis.

For simplicity, we shall focus on the one-mode scalar field Φ_n . The equation of motion is given by

$$\frac{1}{N^2} \ddot{\Phi}_n + \frac{1}{N^2} \frac{\dot{\chi}}{\chi} \dot{\Phi}_n + \frac{n^2}{\chi^2} \Phi_n = 0, \quad (55)$$

where $\chi = q\varphi^{\frac{1}{2}}$. By using the solutions $q(t) = (q_1 - q_0)t + q_0$ and $\varphi(t) = (\varphi_1 - \varphi_0)t + \varphi_0$ and setting $q_0 = 0$ for simplicity, we obtain

$$\begin{aligned} \Phi_n(t) = & C_1 e^{-\frac{2nN \tan^{-1}\left(\frac{\sqrt{(t-1)\varphi_0 - t\varphi_1}}{\sqrt{\varphi_0}}\right)}{q_1\sqrt{\varphi_0}}} \\ & + C_2 e^{+\frac{2nN \tan^{-1}\left(\frac{\sqrt{(t-1)\varphi_0 - t\varphi_1}}{\sqrt{\varphi_0}}\right)}{q_1\sqrt{\varphi_0}}}. \end{aligned} \quad (56)$$

Now, we shall impose the following boundary conditions, $\lim_{\epsilon \rightarrow 0} \Phi_n(t = \epsilon) = 0$ and $\Phi_n(t = 1) = \Phi_{n1}$ since it is reasonable to assume the perturbation is sufficiently small as an initial condition, and we fix the coefficients $C_{1,2}$. By performing the integration by parts for the action (53) and using the equation of motion for $\Phi_n(t)$, we can get the on-shell action,

$$S_{\text{on-shell}, \Phi_n}[N] = \left[\frac{q\varphi^{\frac{1}{2}} \dot{\Phi}_n \Phi_{-n}}{2N} \right]_0^1. \quad (57)$$

Inserting the solution (56) into the on-shell action (57), we can get

$$\begin{aligned} S_{\text{on-shell}, \Phi_n}[N] = & \lim_{\epsilon \rightarrow 0} \frac{n\Phi_1^2}{2i} \times \\ & \coth \left(\frac{2nN \left(-\tan^{-1}\left(\frac{\sqrt{\varphi_0(\epsilon-1) - \varphi_1\epsilon}}{\sqrt{\varphi_0}}\right) + \tan^{-1}\left(\frac{i\sqrt{\varphi_1}}{\sqrt{\varphi_0}}\right) \right)}{q_1\sqrt{\varphi_0}} \right) \end{aligned} \quad (58)$$

For the complex saddle point N_s , we obtain the following expression,

$$S_{\text{on-shell}, \Phi_n}[N_s] = \begin{cases} -\frac{in}{2} \Phi_{n1}^2 & (\text{Im}[N_s] > 0), \\ +\frac{in}{2} \Phi_{n1}^2 & (\text{Im}[N_s] < 0), \end{cases} \quad (59)$$

For $\text{Im}[N_s] > 0$, the on-shell action of the perturbation leads to $\text{Re}[iS_{\text{on-shell}, \Phi_n}[N_s]/\hbar] > 0$, implying that the probability amplitude of the perturbation is inverse-Gaussian, which suggest the perturbation around background is not significantly suppressed. On the other hand, for $\text{Im}[N_s] < 0$, we can obtain a Gaussian probability amplitude for the perturbation and the scalar field perturbation is a ground state. In the case where $q_0 = 0$ and $\varphi_0 > \varphi_1$, the dominant saddle points lie in the Euclidean direction, where $\text{Im}[N_s] < 0$, and the probability amplitudes accurately describe the two-dimensional quantum genesis of the universe. The original formulation of the no-boundary proposal remains approximately valid and perturbative regularity is preserved. This result contrasts with that in the four-dimensional GR case, where the regularity is disrupted.

On the other hand, for the real saddle point N_s setting

$q_0 = \varphi_0 = 0$, we get

$$\begin{aligned} S_{\text{on-shell}, \Phi_n}[N_s] = & \lim_{\epsilon \rightarrow 0} \frac{in}{2} \Phi_{n1}^2 \\ & \times \frac{\left(1 + \cos \frac{4nN_s}{q_1\sqrt{\varphi_1}} \left(1 - \frac{1}{\sqrt{\epsilon}} \right) + i \sin \frac{4nN_s}{q_1\sqrt{\varphi_1}} \left(1 - \frac{1}{\sqrt{\epsilon}} \right) \right)}{\left(1 - \cos \frac{4nN_s}{q_1\sqrt{\varphi_1}} \left(1 - \frac{1}{\sqrt{\epsilon}} \right) - i \sin \frac{4nN_s}{q_1\sqrt{\varphi_1}} \left(1 - \frac{1}{\sqrt{\epsilon}} \right) \right)}. \end{aligned} \quad (60)$$

In the scenario where $q_0 = \varphi_0 = 0$, the dominant saddle points lie in the real direction, indicating that the perturbative on-shell action $S_{\text{on-shell}, \Phi_n}[N]$ can not be clearly defined and the probability amplitude of JT gravity is not well-defined.

VI. CONCLUSIONS

In this paper, we have studied the probability amplitude of dS spacetime in JT gravity. Our approach uses the Lorentzian path integral formalism, which differs from previous studies that primarily rely on solutions of the WDW equation or path integrals with Euclidean metrics. Instead, we have directly computed the JT probability amplitudes via the Lorentzian path integral, incorporating both determinant factors and physical boundary conditions. In particular, we focus on the Dirichlet boundary conditions for the scale factor and the dilaton field.

We have shown that under Dirichlet boundary conditions, the amplitude derived from the Lorentzian path integral takes a form expressed in terms of the modified Bessel function of the second kind, $K_0(z)$. Although the derived amplitude is consistent with the solutions of the WDW equation, previous works [12, 15] left ambiguity as to which Bessel function is appropriate to represent the JT wave function. Once the boundary conditions for the scale factor and the dilaton field are fixed, the Lorentzian path integral can determine a unique JT probability amplitude without contradiction. In addition, we provide a detailed analysis of the thimble structure associated with the path integral of JT gravity, carefully examining the relevant saddle points and their steepest descent contours to evaluate the quantum amplitudes accurately. The corresponding saddle points N_s lie on the real axis or the complex plane of the lapse function where $\text{Im}[N_s] < 0$. Therefore, our results suggest that the no-boundary proposal is approximately valid in the Lorentzian quantum cosmology of JT gravity, in contrast to four-dimensional Einstein gravity.

Furthermore, we have shown that a stable quantum genesis of the universe occurs only when the initial value of the dilaton field is non-zero and large. In other words, when the size of the universe approaches zero, the value of the dilaton field cannot be set to zero. This result implies that certain initial conditions, particularly a non-zero dilaton field, are necessary for a perturbatively stable universe to emerge from nothing in JT gravity.

In this study, we successfully evaluated the JT probability amplitude using the Lorentzian path integral with minisuperspace approximation. However, as shown in Section II, it is also possible to find a general solution to the WDW equation without relying on this approximation. We expect that the amplitude can be accurately evaluated beyond the minisuperspace by employing the Lorentzian path integral, and we plan to explore this extension in future work.

Additionally, JT gravity has been widely discussed in relation to holography, particularly in the context of the dS/CFT correspondence. It would be valuable to investigate the holographic dual of our findings to test this correspondence. We will consider this research in future

investigations.

ACKNOWLEDGEMENT

We would like to thank Takahiro Terada for useful comments and for carefully checking our manuscript. M. H. is supported by JST PRESTO Grant Number JPMJPR2117, JST CREST Grant Number JPMJCR24I3 and JSPS Grant-in-Aid for Transformative Research Areas (A) ‘‘Extreme Universe’’ JP21H05190 [D01]. This work is supported by Japan Society for the Promotion of Science (JSPS) KAKENHI Grant Numbers JP22H01222(M.H.), JP22KJ1782(H.M.), JP23K13100(H.M.), JP23KJ1090 (K.N.), and JP23KJ1162 (K.O.).

Appendix A: Computation of prefactor

In this appendix, we explicitly calculate the Lorentzian transition amplitude (28) under 1. Dirichlet-Dirichlet 2. Neumann-Neumann 3. Neumann-Dirichlet and Dirichlet-Neumann boundary conditions. The minisuperspace action is given as

$$\begin{aligned} S_{\text{JT}} &= -2\pi \int_{t_i}^{t_f} dt \left(\frac{1}{4N} \frac{dq}{dt} \frac{d\varphi}{dt} + N\Lambda \right) + S_B \\ &= -2\pi \int_0^1 d\tau \left(\frac{\dot{q}\dot{\varphi}}{4\tilde{N}} + \tilde{N}\Lambda \right) + S_B, \end{aligned} \quad (\text{A1})$$

where S_B is the boundary term other than the Gibbons-Hawking-York term to realize the boundary conditions. In the second line, we change the integration variable as $t \rightarrow \tau = (t - t_i)/(t_f - t_i)$ with $\tilde{N} = N(t_f - t_i)$. The dot denotes the derivation with respect to τ throughout this appendix. What we are interested in is the following part of the transition amplitude

$$P(N) := \int \mathcal{D}q \mathcal{D}\varphi \exp(iS_{\text{JT}}[N, q, \varphi]/\hbar). \quad (\text{A2})$$

We calculate this amplitude with the proper normalization prefactor under the mentioned boundary conditions. In the following, we omit the contribution from the cosmological constant in (A1) which is almost trivial, and focus on the contribution from the gravitational action with boundary terms. That is

$$P_{q\varphi}(N) := \int \mathcal{D}q \mathcal{D}\varphi \exp((iS_{q\varphi} + S_B)/\hbar), \quad (\text{A3})$$

with

$$S_{q\varphi} := -\frac{\pi}{2\tilde{N}} \int_0^1 d\tau (\dot{q}\dot{\varphi}). \quad (\text{A4})$$

As mentioned in the footnote around (28), we note that q and φ are extended to include negative values. This extension avoids the issues that arise from the non-unique classical paths, which can occur if the variables are restricted to be positive [58]. The consequences are not altered if we choose the boundary conditions consistent with their original positivities.

1. Dirichlet-Dirichlet

Here we consider the case with the following Dirichlet-Dirichlet type boundary conditions:

$$q(\tau = 0) = q_0, \varphi(0) = \varphi_0, q(1) = q_1, \varphi(1) = \varphi_1. \quad (\text{A5})$$

We note that the boundary action is not necessary here

$$S_B = 0.$$

To compute the prefactor, it is convenient to redefine the fields as

$$\tilde{q}(\tau) := q(\tau) - q_0 - (q_1 - q_0)\tau, \quad \tilde{\varphi}(\tau) := \varphi(\tau) - \varphi_0 - (\varphi_1 - \varphi_0)\tau, \quad (\text{A6})$$

which satisfy the boundary conditions

$$\tilde{q}(0) = \tilde{q}(1) = 0, \quad \tilde{\varphi}(0) = \tilde{\varphi}(1) = 0. \quad (\text{A7})$$

Note that this redefinition does not give a nontrivial Jacobian factor in the path integral. Additionally, let us consider the mode expansions

$$\tilde{q}(\tau) = \sum_{n=1}^{\infty} \tilde{q}_n \sin[\pi n \tau], \quad \tilde{\varphi}(\tau) = \sum_{n=1}^{\infty} \tilde{\varphi}_n \sin[\pi n \tau]. \quad (\text{A8})$$

These modes obviously satisfy the boundary conditions (A7). The real condition of q, φ demands real coefficients $\{\tilde{q}_n\}, \{\tilde{\varphi}_n\}$

Then, the gravitational action (A4) becomes

$$\begin{aligned} S_{q\varphi} &= -\frac{\pi}{2\tilde{N}} \int_0^1 d\tau \left[(\dot{\tilde{q}} + (q_1 - q_0)) (\dot{\tilde{\varphi}} + (\varphi_1 - \varphi_0)) \right] \\ &= -\frac{\pi^3}{4\tilde{N}} \sum_{n=1}^{\infty} n^2 \tilde{q}_n \tilde{\varphi}_n - \frac{\pi}{2\tilde{N}} (q_1 - q_0)(\varphi_1 - \varphi_0). \end{aligned} \quad (\text{A9})$$

The amplitude (A3) reduces to

$$\begin{aligned} P_{q\varphi}(N) &= C_{DD}(t_f, t_i) \exp \left[-\frac{i\pi}{2\hbar\tilde{N}} (q_1 - q_0)(\varphi_1 - \varphi_0) \right] \int \left(\prod_{n=1}^{\infty} d\tilde{q}_n d\tilde{\varphi}_n \right) \exp \left[-\frac{i\pi^3}{4\hbar\tilde{N}} \sum_{n=1}^{\infty} n^2 \tilde{q}_n \tilde{\varphi}_n \right] \\ &= C_{DD}(t_f, t_i) \exp \left[-\frac{i\pi}{2\hbar\tilde{N}} (q_1 - q_0)(\varphi_1 - \varphi_0) \right] \prod_{n=1}^{\infty} \left[2\pi \int d\tilde{\varphi}_n \delta \left(\frac{\pi^3}{4\hbar\tilde{N}} n^2 \tilde{\varphi}_n \right) \right] \\ &= C_{DD}(t_f, t_i) \exp \left[-\frac{i\pi}{2\hbar\tilde{N}} (q_1 - q_0)(\varphi_1 - \varphi_0) \right] \prod_{n=1}^{\infty} \left[\frac{8\hbar\tilde{N}}{\pi^2 n^2} \right], \end{aligned} \quad (\text{A10})$$

with some normalization constant $C_{DD}(t_f, t_i)$. Applying the zeta functional regularization

$$\begin{aligned} \prod_{n=1}^{\infty} c &= \exp \left(\sum_{n=1}^{\infty} \log c \right) = \exp(\zeta(0) \log c) = \exp \left(-\frac{1}{2} \log c \right) = c^{-1/2}, \\ \prod_{n=1}^{\infty} \frac{1}{n^2} &= \exp \left(-2 \sum_{n=1}^{\infty} \log n \right) = \exp(2\zeta'(0)) = \exp(-\log(2\pi)) = \frac{1}{2\pi}, \end{aligned} \quad (\text{A11})$$

we obtain

$$P_{q\varphi}(N; q_1, \varphi_1; q_0, \varphi_0) = \frac{C_{DD}(t_f, t_i)}{\sqrt{32\hbar N}(t_f - t_i)} \exp \left[-\frac{i\pi}{2\hbar N}(t_f - t_i)(q_1 - q_0)(\varphi_1 - \varphi_0) \right]. \quad (\text{A12})$$

The normalization condition is obtained from the relation

$$\int dq d\varphi P_{q\varphi}(N; q_1, \varphi_1; q, \varphi) P_{q\varphi}(N; q, \varphi; q_0, \varphi_0) = P_{q\varphi}(N; q_1, \varphi_1; q_0, \varphi_0). \quad (\text{A13})$$

Inserting (A12) into the above relation, the left-hand side gives

$$\begin{aligned}
(\text{L.H.S}) &= \left(\frac{1}{\sqrt{32\hbar\tilde{N}}} \right)^2 \frac{C_{DD}(t_f, t)C_{DD}(t, t_i)}{\sqrt{(t_f - t)(t - t_i)}} \int dq d\varphi \exp \left[- \frac{i\pi}{2\hbar N} \left[\frac{(q_1 - q)(\varphi_1 - \varphi)}{t_f - t} + \frac{(q - q_0)(\varphi - \varphi_0)}{(t - t_i)} \right] \right] \\
&= \left(\frac{1}{\sqrt{32\hbar\tilde{N}}} \right)^2 \frac{C_{DD}(t_f, t)C_{DD}(t, t_i)}{\sqrt{(t_f - t)(t - t_i)}} \exp \left[- \frac{i\pi}{2\hbar N} \left(\frac{q_1\varphi_1}{t_f - t} + \frac{q_0\varphi_0}{t - t_i} \right) \right] \\
&\quad \cdot 2\pi \int d\varphi \delta \left[\frac{\pi}{2\hbar N} \left(\frac{\varphi - \varphi_1}{t_f - t} + \frac{\varphi - \varphi_0}{t - t_i} \right) \right] \exp \left[\frac{i\pi}{2\hbar N} \left(\frac{q_1}{t_f - t} + \frac{q_0}{t - t_i} \right) \varphi \right] \\
&= 4\hbar N C_{DD}(t_f, t) C_{DD}(t, t_i) \left(\frac{1}{\sqrt{32\hbar\tilde{N}}} \right)^2 \frac{\sqrt{(t_f - t)(t - t_i)}}{t_f - t_i} \exp \left[- \frac{i\pi}{2\hbar N(t_f - t_i)} (q_1 - q_0)(\varphi_1 - \varphi_0) \right], \quad (\text{A14})
\end{aligned}$$

It is noticed that the consistent normalization factor is found as

$$C_{DD}(t_f, t_i) = \sqrt{\frac{2}{\hbar N(t_f - t_i)}}, \quad (\text{A15})$$

and the whole normalized transition amplitude (A1) with Dirichlet-Dirichlet type boundary condition results in

$$P(N; q_1, \varphi_1; q_0, \varphi_0) = \frac{1}{4\hbar N(t_f - t_i)} \exp \left[- \frac{i\pi}{\hbar} \left(\frac{1}{2N(t_f - t_i)} (q_1 - q_0)(\varphi_1 - \varphi_0) + 2N\Lambda(t_f - t_i) \right) \right]. \quad (\text{A16})$$

Compared to the 4-D GR solution [26], the main difference is that the prefactor in 2-D JT gravity case is proportional to N^{-1} rather than $N^{-1/2}$. This stems from the difference in the number of independent variables. On the other hand, the phase factor looks consistent, taking the conformal coupling and the dimensionality into account.

2. Neumann-Neumann

Next, we consider the case with the following Neumann-Neumann boundary conditions:

$$-\frac{\pi}{2\tilde{N}}\dot{q}(0) = \Pi_\varphi^0, \quad -\frac{\pi}{2\tilde{N}}\dot{\varphi}(0) = \Pi_q^0, \quad -\frac{\pi}{2\tilde{N}}\dot{q}(1) = \Pi_\varphi^1, \quad -\frac{\pi}{2\tilde{N}}\dot{\varphi}(1) = \Pi_q^1. \quad (\text{A17})$$

where $\tilde{N} = N(t_f - t_i)$. This condition is not realized as a classical solution unless $\Pi_\varphi^0 = \Pi_\varphi^1$ and $\Pi_q^0 = \Pi_q^1$. Indeed, the viable solution is only this coincident case even at the quantum level, as we will show later. The boundary term for this condition turns out to be

$$S_B := - \left(\Pi_\varphi^1 \varphi(1) + q(1) \Pi_q^1 - \Pi_\varphi^0 \varphi(0) - q(0) \Pi_q^0 \right). \quad (\text{A18})$$

As in the previous case, we redefine the fields as

$$\tilde{q}(\tau) := \dot{q}(\tau) + \frac{2\tilde{N}}{\pi} \Pi_\varphi^0 + \frac{2\tilde{N}}{\pi} (\Pi_\varphi^1 - \Pi_\varphi^0) \tau, \quad \tilde{\varphi}(\tau) := \dot{\varphi}(\tau) + \frac{2\tilde{N}}{\pi} \Pi_q^0 + \frac{2\tilde{N}}{\pi} (\Pi_q^1 - \Pi_q^0) \tau, \quad (\text{A19})$$

or equivalently

$$\tilde{q}(\tau) := q(\tau) + \frac{2\tilde{N}}{\pi} \Pi_\varphi^0 \tau + \frac{\tilde{N}}{\pi} (\Pi_\varphi^1 - \Pi_\varphi^0) \tau^2, \quad \tilde{\varphi}(\tau) := \varphi(\tau) + \frac{2\tilde{N}}{\pi} \Pi_q^0 \tau + \frac{\tilde{N}}{\pi} (\Pi_q^1 - \Pi_q^0) \tau^2, \quad (\text{A20})$$

which satisfies the boundary conditions

$$\dot{\tilde{q}}(0) = \dot{\tilde{q}}(1) = 0, \quad \dot{\tilde{\varphi}}(0) = \dot{\tilde{\varphi}}(1) = 0. \quad (\text{A21})$$

Note that this redefinition does not give a nontrivial Jacobian factor in the path integral.

We perform the mode expansion as

$$\tilde{q}(\tau) = \sum_{n=0}^{\infty} \tilde{q}_n \cos[\pi n \tau], \quad \tilde{\varphi}(\tau) = \sum_{n=0}^{\infty} \tilde{\varphi}_n \cos[\pi n \tau], \quad (\text{A22})$$

One can see that each basis obviously satisfies the boundary conditions. Then, the gravitational bulk action is reduced to

$$\begin{aligned}
S_{q\varphi} &= -\frac{\pi}{2\tilde{N}} \int_0^1 d\tau \left[\left(\dot{\tilde{q}} - \frac{2\tilde{N}}{\pi} (\Pi_\varphi^1 - \Pi_\varphi^0) \tau - \frac{2\tilde{N}}{\pi} \Pi_\varphi^0 \right) \left(\dot{\tilde{\varphi}} - \frac{2\tilde{N}}{\pi} (\Pi_q^1 - \Pi_q^0) \tau - \frac{2\tilde{N}}{\pi} \Pi_q^0 \right) \right] \\
&= -\frac{\pi^3}{4\tilde{N}} \sum_{n=1}^{\infty} n^2 (\tilde{q}_n \tilde{\varphi}_n) - (\Pi_\varphi^1 - \Pi_\varphi^0) \tilde{\varphi}_0 - (\Pi_q^1 - \Pi_q^0) \tilde{q}_0 - \frac{\tilde{N}}{3\pi} \left[\Pi_\varphi^1 (2\Pi_q^1 + \Pi_q^0) + \Pi_\varphi^0 (\Pi_q^1 + 2\Pi_q^0) \right] \\
&\quad + \left(\Pi_\varphi^1 \tilde{\varphi}(1) + \tilde{q}(1) \Pi_q^1 - \Pi_\varphi^0 \tilde{\varphi}(0) - \tilde{q}(0) \Pi_q^0 \right). \quad (\text{A23})
\end{aligned}$$

Adding the boundary terms, the entire action is written as

$$S_{q\varphi} + S_B = -\frac{\pi^3}{4\tilde{N}} \sum_{n=1}^{\infty} n^2 (\tilde{q}_n \tilde{\varphi}_n) - (\Pi_\varphi^1 - \Pi_\varphi^0) \tilde{\varphi}_0 - (\Pi_q^1 - \Pi_q^0) \tilde{q}_0 + \frac{\tilde{N}}{3\pi} \left[\Pi_\varphi^1 (\Pi_q^1 + 2\Pi_q^0) + \Pi_\varphi^0 (2\Pi_q^1 + \Pi_q^0) \right]. \quad (\text{A24})$$

Thus the amplitude (A3) is derived as

$$\begin{aligned}
P_{q\varphi}(N) &= C_{NN}(t_f, t_i) \exp \left[\frac{i\tilde{N}}{3\pi\hbar} \left[\Pi_\varphi^1 (\Pi_q^1 + 2\Pi_q^0) + \Pi_\varphi^0 (2\Pi_q^1 + \Pi_q^0) \right] \right] \\
&\quad \int \left(\prod_{n=0}^{\infty} d\tilde{q}_n d\tilde{\varphi}_n \right) \exp \left[-\frac{i\pi^3}{4\hbar\tilde{N}} \sum_{n=1}^{\infty} n^2 (\tilde{q}_n \tilde{\varphi}_n) - \frac{i}{\hbar} (\Pi_\varphi^1 - \Pi_\varphi^0) \tilde{\varphi}_0 - \frac{i}{\hbar} (\Pi_q^1 - \Pi_q^0) \tilde{q}_0 \right] \\
&= (2\pi)^2 C_{NN}(t_f, t_i) \exp \left[\frac{2i\tilde{N}}{\pi\hbar} \Pi_\varphi^1 \Pi_q^1 \right] \delta \left[\frac{\Pi_\varphi^1 - \Pi_\varphi^0}{\hbar} \right] \delta \left[\frac{\Pi_q^1 - \Pi_q^0}{\hbar} \right] \prod_{n=1}^{\infty} \frac{8\hbar\tilde{N}}{\pi^2 n^2}, \quad (\text{A25})
\end{aligned}$$

with normalization factor $C_{NN}(t_f, t_i)$. By applying the zeta functional regularization (A11), we obtain

$$P_{q\varphi}(N; \Pi_q^1, \Pi_\varphi^1; \Pi_q^0, \Pi_\varphi^0) = \frac{C_{NN}(t_f, t_i) \pi^2 \hbar^{\frac{3}{2}}}{\sqrt{2N}(t_f - t_i)} \exp \left[\frac{2iN(t_f - t_i)}{\pi\hbar} \Pi_\varphi^1 \Pi_q^1 \right] \delta \left[\Pi_\varphi^1 - \Pi_\varphi^0 \right] \delta \left[\Pi_q^1 - \Pi_q^0 \right] \quad (\text{A26})$$

The normalization condition is obtained from the relation

$$\int dp_q dp_\varphi P_{q\varphi}(N; \Pi_q^1, \Pi_\varphi^1; p_q, p_\varphi) P_{q\varphi}(N; p_q, p_\varphi; \Pi_q^0, \Pi_\varphi^0) = P_{q\varphi}(N; \Pi_q^1, \Pi_\varphi^1; \Pi_q^0, \Pi_\varphi^0). \quad (\text{A27})$$

Inserting (A26) into above relation, it goes to

$$(\text{L.H.S}) = \left(\frac{\pi^2 \hbar^{\frac{3}{2}}}{\sqrt{2N}} \right)^2 \frac{C_{NN}(t_f, t) C_{NN}(t, t_i)}{\sqrt{(t_f - t)(t - t_i)}} \exp \left[\frac{2iN(t_f - t_i)}{\pi\hbar} \Pi_\varphi^1 \Pi_q^1 \right] \delta \left[\Pi_\varphi^1 - \Pi_\varphi^0 \right] \delta \left[\Pi_q^1 - \Pi_q^0 \right]. \quad (\text{A28})$$

The consistent normalization is

$$\frac{C_{NN}(t_f, t_i) \pi^2 \hbar^{\frac{3}{2}}}{\sqrt{2N}(t_f - t_i)} = 1, \quad (\text{A29})$$

and the normalized transition amplitude (A1) is

$$P(N; \Pi_q^1, \Pi_\varphi^1; \Pi_q^0, \Pi_\varphi^0) = \exp \left[\frac{2iN(t_f - t_i)}{\pi\hbar} \Pi_\varphi^1 \Pi_q^1 - \frac{2i\pi}{\hbar} N \Lambda(t_f - t_i) \right] \delta \left[\Pi_\varphi^1 - \Pi_\varphi^0 \right] \delta \left[\Pi_q^1 - \Pi_q^0 \right] \quad (\text{A30})$$

Remarkably, this amplitude gives a non-zero value for only trivial transition with $\Pi_\varphi^1 = \Pi_\varphi^0$ and $\Pi_q^1 = \Pi_q^0$. This is consistent with the current system without the potential of q or φ .

3. Neumann-Dirichlet and Dirichlet-Neumann

Here we consider the case with initially Neumann- and finally Dirichlet-type boundary conditions:

$$-\frac{\pi}{2\tilde{N}}\dot{q}(0) = \Pi_\varphi^0, \quad -\frac{\pi}{2\tilde{N}}\dot{\varphi}(0) = \Pi_q^0, \quad q(1) = q_1, \quad \varphi(1) = \varphi_1. \quad (\text{A31})$$

The corresponding boundary action is given as

$$S_B := \Pi_\varphi^0 \varphi(0) + q(0) \Pi_q^0. \quad (\text{A32})$$

Note that the boundary term for the Dirichlet one is unnecessary. In this case, the following redefinition of the fields is useful:

$$\tilde{q}(t) := q(t) + \frac{2\tilde{N}}{\pi} \Pi_\varphi^0 (t-1) - q_1, \quad \tilde{\varphi}(t) := \varphi(t) + \frac{2\tilde{N}}{\pi} \Pi_q^0 (t-1) - \varphi_1, \quad (\text{A33})$$

which satisfies

$$\dot{\tilde{q}}(0) = \dot{\tilde{\varphi}}(0) = 0, \quad \tilde{q}(1) = \tilde{\varphi}(1) = 0. \quad (\text{A34})$$

Then we can perform the Fourier decomposition of these redefined fields

$$\tilde{q}(t) = \sum_{n=0}^{\infty} \tilde{q}_n \cos \left[\left(n + \frac{1}{2} \right) \pi t \right], \quad \tilde{\varphi}(t) = \sum_{n=0}^{\infty} \tilde{\varphi}_n \cos \left[\left(n + \frac{1}{2} \right) \pi t \right]. \quad (\text{A35})$$

The bulk action is reduced to

$$S_{q\varphi} = -\frac{\pi^3}{4\tilde{N}} \sum_{n=0}^{\infty} \tilde{q}_n \tilde{\varphi}_n \left(n + \frac{1}{2} \right)^2 - \frac{2\tilde{N}}{\pi} \Pi_q^0 \Pi_\varphi^0 - \left(\Pi_\varphi^0 \tilde{\varphi}(0) + \tilde{q}(0) \Pi_q^0 \right), \quad (\text{A36})$$

and the entire action is obtained by adding boundary action

$$S_{q\varphi} + S_B = -\frac{\pi^3}{4\tilde{N}} \sum_{n=0}^{\infty} \tilde{q}_n \tilde{\varphi}_n \left(n + \frac{1}{2} \right)^2 + \frac{2\tilde{N}}{\pi} \Pi_q^0 \Pi_\varphi^0 + \Pi_\varphi^0 \varphi_1 + \Pi_q^0 q_1. \quad (\text{A37})$$

Then the transition amplitude is

$$\begin{aligned} P_{q\varphi}(N; q_1, \varphi_1; \Pi_q^0, \Pi_\varphi^0) &= C_{ND}(t_f, t_i) \exp \left[\frac{i}{\hbar} \left(\frac{2\tilde{N}}{\pi} \Pi_q^0 \Pi_\varphi^0 + \Pi_\varphi^0 \varphi_1 + \Pi_q^0 q_1 \right) \right] \\ &\quad \int \left(\prod_{n=0}^{\infty} d\tilde{q}_n d\tilde{\varphi}_n \right) \exp \left[-\frac{i\pi^3}{4\hbar\tilde{N}} \sum_{n=0}^{\infty} \tilde{q}_n \tilde{\varphi}_n \left(n + \frac{1}{2} \right)^2 \right] \\ &= \frac{\pi C_{ND}(t_f, t_i)}{\sqrt{2\hbar N}(t_f - t_i)} \exp \left[\frac{i}{\hbar} \left(\frac{2N(t_f - t_i)}{\pi} \Pi_q^0 \Pi_\varphi^0 + \Pi_\varphi^0 \varphi_1 + \Pi_q^0 q_1 \right) \right], \end{aligned} \quad (\text{A38})$$

where we performed zeta-function regularization (A11) and

$$\prod_{n=0}^{\infty} \frac{1}{\left(n + \frac{1}{2} \right)^2} = \exp \left[-2 \sum_{n=0}^{\infty} \log \left(n + \frac{1}{2} \right) \right] = \exp[\log(2)] = 2. \quad (\text{A39})$$

The normalization $C_{ND}(t_f, t_i)$ cannot be determined alone. Hence we normalize by combining the amplitude under the Dirichlet-Neumann condition

$$-\frac{\pi}{2\tilde{N}}\dot{q}(1) = \Pi_\varphi^1, \quad -\frac{\pi}{2\tilde{N}}\dot{\varphi}(1) = \Pi_q^1, \quad q(0) = q_0, \quad \varphi(0) = \varphi_0. \quad (\text{A40})$$

Similar calculation leads to the corresponding amplitude

$$P_{q\varphi}(N; \Pi_q^1, \Pi_\varphi^1, q_0, \varphi_0) = \frac{\pi C_{DN}(t_f, t_i)}{\sqrt{2\hbar N}(t_f - t_i)} \exp \left[\frac{i}{\hbar} \left(\frac{2N(t_f - t_i)}{\pi} \Pi_q^1 \Pi_\varphi^1 - \Pi_\varphi^1 \varphi_0 - \Pi_q^1 q_0 \right) \right], \quad (\text{A41})$$

Then we set the normalization condition as

$$\int dp_q dp_\varphi P_{q\varphi}(N; q_1, \varphi_1 | p_q, p_\varphi) P_{q\varphi}(N; p_q, p_\varphi | q_0, \varphi_0) = P_{q\varphi}(N; q_1, \varphi_1; q_0, \varphi_0), \quad (\text{A42})$$

$$\int dq d\varphi P_{q\varphi}(N; \Pi_q^1, \Pi_\varphi^1 | q, \varphi) P_{(q\varphi)N}(N; q, \varphi | \Pi_q^1, \Pi_\varphi^1) = P_{q\varphi}(N; \Pi_q^1, \Pi_\varphi^1; \Pi_q^0, \Pi_\varphi^0). \quad (\text{A43})$$

From the first condition

$$\begin{aligned} (\text{L.H.S}) &= \frac{\pi^2 C_{ND}(t_f, t) C_{DN}(t, t_i)}{2\hbar N \sqrt{(t_f - t)(t - t_i)}} \int dp_q dp_\varphi \exp \left[\frac{i}{\hbar} \left(\frac{2N(t_f - t)}{\pi} p_q p_\varphi + p_\varphi \varphi_1 + p_q q_1 \right) \right] \\ &\quad \exp \left[\frac{i}{\hbar} \left(\frac{2N(t - t_i)}{\pi} p_q p_\varphi - p_\varphi \varphi_0 - p_q q_0 \right) \right] \\ &= \frac{\pi^4 C_{ND}(t_f, t) C_{DN}(t, t_i)}{2N^2(t_f - t_i) \sqrt{(t_f - t)(t - t_i)}} \exp \left[-\frac{i\pi}{2\hbar N(t_f - t_i)} (q_1 - q_0)(\varphi_1 - \varphi_0) \right] \\ (\text{R.H.S}) &= \frac{1}{4\hbar N(t_f - t_i)} \exp \left[-\frac{i\pi}{2\hbar N(t_f - t_i)} (q_1 - q_0)(\varphi_1 - \varphi_0) \right]. \end{aligned} \quad (\text{A44})$$

From the second condition

$$\begin{aligned} (\text{L.H.S}) &= \frac{\pi^2 C_{DN}(t_f, t) C_{ND}(t, t_i)}{2\hbar N \sqrt{(t_f - t)(t - t_i)}} \int dq d\varphi \exp \left[\frac{i}{\hbar} \left(\frac{2N(t - t_i)}{\pi} \Pi_q^0 \Pi_\varphi^0 + \Pi_\varphi^0 \varphi + \Pi_q^0 q \right) \right] \\ &\quad \cdot \exp \left[\frac{i}{\hbar} \left(\frac{2N(t_f - t)}{\pi} \Pi_q^1 \Pi_\varphi^1 - \Pi_\varphi^1 \varphi - \Pi_q^1 q \right) \right] \\ &= \frac{2\pi^4 \hbar C_{DN}(t_f, t) C_{ND}(t, t_i)}{N \sqrt{(t_f - t)(t - t_i)}} \exp \left[\frac{2iN(t_f - t_i)}{\pi \hbar} \Pi_q^0 \Pi_\varphi^0 \right] \delta[\Pi_\varphi^1 - \Pi_\varphi^0] \delta[\Pi_q^1 - \Pi_q^0], \\ (\text{R.H.S}) &= \exp \left[\frac{2iN(t_f - t_i)}{\pi \hbar} \Pi_\varphi^1 \Pi_q^1 \right] \delta[\Pi_\varphi^1 - \Pi_\varphi^0] \delta[\Pi_q^1 - \Pi_q^0]. \end{aligned} \quad (\text{A45})$$

Here we used the results of the Dirichlet-Dirichlet case (A16) and the Neumann-Neumann case (A30). These conditions suggest that

$$C_{ND} C_{DN} = \frac{N \sqrt{(t_f - t)(t - t_i)}}{2\pi^4 \hbar}. \quad (\text{A46})$$

If we take C_{ND} and C_{DN} having the same value,

$$C_{ND}(t_f, t_i) = C_{DN}(t_f, t_i) = \sqrt{\frac{N(t_f - t_i)}{2\pi^4 \hbar}} \quad (\text{A47})$$

the whole normalized amplitudes (A1) result in

$$P(N; q_1, \varphi_1; \Pi_q^0, \Pi_\varphi^0) = \frac{1}{2\pi \hbar} \exp \left[\frac{i}{\hbar} \left(\frac{2N(t_f - t_i)}{\pi} \Pi_q^0 \Pi_\varphi^0 + \Pi_\varphi^0 \varphi_1 + \Pi_q^0 q_1 - 2\pi N \Lambda(t_f - t_i) \right) \right], \quad (\text{A48})$$

$$P(N; \Pi_q^1, \Pi_\varphi^1 | q_0, \varphi_0) = \frac{1}{2\pi \hbar} \exp \left[\frac{i}{\hbar} \left(\frac{2N(t_f - t_i)}{\pi} \Pi_q^1 \Pi_\varphi^1 - \Pi_\varphi^1 \varphi_0 - \Pi_q^1 q_0 - 2\pi N \Lambda(t_f - t_i) \right) \right], \quad (\text{A49})$$

respectively. The lapse N is absent in the consequent amplitudes of the Dirichlet-Neumann and Neumann-Dirichlet case. This is consistent with the 4-D GR result [44].

[1] R. Jackiw, "Lower Dimensional Gravity," *Nucl. Phys. B* **252** (1985) 343–356.

[2] C. Teitelboim, "Gravitation and Hamiltonian Structure

- in Two Space-Time Dimensions,” *Phys. Lett. B* **126** (1983) 41–45.
- [3] A. Almheiri and J. Polchinski, “Models of AdS₂ backreaction and holography,” *JHEP* **11** (2015) 014, [arXiv:1402.6334 \[hep-th\]](#).
- [4] K. Jensen, “Chaos in AdS₂ Holography,” *Phys. Rev. Lett.* **117** no. 11, (2016) 111601, [arXiv:1605.06098 \[hep-th\]](#).
- [5] J. Maldacena, D. Stanford, and Z. Yang, “Conformal symmetry and its breaking in two dimensional Nearly Anti-de-Sitter space,” *PTEP* **2016** no. 12, (2016) 12C104, [arXiv:1606.01857 \[hep-th\]](#).
- [6] J. Engelsöy, T. G. Mertens, and H. Verlinde, “An investigation of AdS₂ backreaction and holography,” *JHEP* **07** (2016) 139, [arXiv:1606.03438 \[hep-th\]](#).
- [7] P. Nayak, A. Shukla, R. M. Soni, S. P. Trivedi, and V. Vishal, “On the Dynamics of Near-Extremal Black Holes,” *JHEP* **09** (2018) 048, [arXiv:1802.09547 \[hep-th\]](#).
- [8] D. Grumiller, J. Salzer, and D. Vassilevich, “Aspects of AdS₂ holography with non-constant dilaton,” *Russ. Phys. J.* **59** no. 11, (2017) 1798–1803, [arXiv:1607.06974 \[hep-th\]](#).
- [9] T. G. Mertens and G. J. Turiaci, “Solvable models of quantum black holes: a review on Jackiw–Teitelboim gravity,” *Living Rev. Rel.* **26** no. 1, (2023) 4, [arXiv:2210.10846 \[hep-th\]](#).
- [10] M. Henneaux, “QUANTUM GRAVITY IN TWO-DIMENSIONS: EXACT SOLUTION OF THE JACKIW MODEL,” *Phys. Rev. Lett.* **54** (1985) 959–962.
- [11] D. Louis-Martinez, J. Gegenberg, and G. Kunstatter, “Exact Dirac quantization of all 2-D dilaton gravity theories,” *Phys. Lett. B* **321** (1994) 193–198, [arXiv:gr-qc/9309018](#).
- [12] J. Maldacena, G. J. Turiaci, and Z. Yang, “Two dimensional Nearly de Sitter gravity,” *JHEP* **01** (2021) 139, [arXiv:1904.01911 \[hep-th\]](#).
- [13] D. Stanford and E. Witten, “JT gravity and the ensembles of random matrix theory,” *Adv. Theor. Math. Phys.* **24** no. 6, (2020) 1475–1680, [arXiv:1907.03363 \[hep-th\]](#).
- [14] J. Cotler, K. Jensen, and A. Maloney, “Low-dimensional de Sitter quantum gravity,” *JHEP* **06** (2020) 048, [arXiv:1905.03780 \[hep-th\]](#).
- [15] L. V. Iliesiu, J. Kruthoff, G. J. Turiaci, and H. Verlinde, “JT gravity at finite cutoff,” *SciPost Phys.* **9** (2020) 023, [arXiv:2004.07242 \[hep-th\]](#).
- [16] D. Stanford and Z. Yang, “Finite-cutoff JT gravity and self-avoiding loops,” [arXiv:2004.08005 \[hep-th\]](#).
- [17] U. Moitra, S. K. Sake, and S. P. Trivedi, “Jackiw-Teitelboim gravity in the second order formalism,” *JHEP* **10** (2021) 204, [arXiv:2101.00596 \[hep-th\]](#).
- [18] T. Anegawa, N. Iizuka, S. K. Sake, and N. Zenoni, “Is action complexity better for de Sitter space in Jackiw-Teitelboim gravity?,” *JHEP* **06** (2023) 213, [arXiv:2303.05025 \[hep-th\]](#).
- [19] K. K. Nanda, S. K. Sake, and S. P. Trivedi, “JT gravity in de Sitter space and the problem of time,” *JHEP* **02** (2024) 145, [arXiv:2307.15900 \[hep-th\]](#).
- [20] W. Buchmuller, A. Hebecker, and A. Westphal, “DeWitt wave functions for de Sitter JT gravity,” [arXiv:2412.09211 \[hep-th\]](#).
- [21] J. B. Hartle and S. W. Hawking, “Wave Function of the Universe,” *Phys. Rev. D* **28** (1983) 2960–2975.
- [22] A. Vilenkin, “Creation of Universes from Nothing,” *Phys. Lett. B* **117** (1982) 25–28.
- [23] G. W. Gibbons, S. W. Hawking, and M. J. Perry, “Path Integrals and the Indefiniteness of the Gravitational Action,” *Nucl. Phys. B* **138** (1978) 141–150.
- [24] A. D. Linde, “Quantum Creation of the Inflationary Universe,” *Lett. Nuovo Cim.* **39** (1984) 401–405.
- [25] J. J. Halliwell and J. Louko, “Steepest Descent Contours in the Path Integral Approach to Quantum Cosmology. 1. The De Sitter Minisuperspace Model,” *Phys. Rev. D* **39** (1989) 2206.
- [26] J. Feldbrugge, J.-L. Lehners, and N. Turok, “Lorentzian Quantum Cosmology,” *Phys. Rev. D* **95** no. 10, (2017) 103508, [arXiv:1703.02076 \[hep-th\]](#).
- [27] F. PHAM, “Vanishing homologies and the n variables saddlepoint method,” *Proc. Symp. Pure Math.* **40** (1983) 310–333.
- [28] M. V. Berry and C. J. Howls, “Hyperasymptotics for integrals with saddles,” *Proceedings: Mathematical and Physical Sciences* **434** no. 1892, (1991) 657–675.
- [29] C. J. Howls, “Hyperasymptotics for multidimensional integrals, exact remainder terms and the global connection problem,” *Proceedings of the Royal Society of London. Series A: Mathematical, Physical and Engineering Sciences* **453** no. 1966, (1997) 2271–2294.
- [30] E. Witten, “Analytic Continuation Of Chern-Simons Theory,” *AMS/IP Stud. Adv. Math.* **50** (2011) 347–446, [arXiv:1001.2933 \[hep-th\]](#).
- [31] Z.-G. Mou, P. M. Saffin, A. Tranberg, and S. Woodward, “Real-time quantum dynamics, path integrals and the method of thimbles,” *JHEP* **06** (2019) 094, [arXiv:1902.09147 \[hep-lat\]](#).
- [32] Z.-G. Mou, P. M. Saffin, and A. Tranberg, “Quantum tunnelling, real-time dynamics and Picard-Lefschetz thimbles,” *JHEP* **11** (2019) 135, [arXiv:1909.02488 \[hep-th\]](#).
- [33] P. Millington, Z.-G. Mou, P. M. Saffin, and A. Tranberg, “Statistics on Lefschetz thimbles: Bell/Leggett-Garg inequalities and the classical-statistical approximation,” *JHEP* **03** (2021) 077, [arXiv:2011.02657 \[hep-th\]](#).
- [34] H. Matsui, “Lorentzian path integral for quantum tunneling and WKB approximation for wave-function,” *Eur. Phys. J. C* **82** no. 5, (2022) 426, [arXiv:2102.09767 \[gr-qc\]](#).
- [35] K. Rajeev, “Lorentzian worldline path integral approach to Schwinger effect,” *Phys. Rev. D* **104** no. 10, (2021) 105014, [arXiv:2105.12194 \[hep-th\]](#).
- [36] T. Hayashi, K. Kamada, N. Oshita, and J. Yokoyama, “Vacuum decay in the Lorentzian path integral,” *JCAP* **05** no. 05, (2022) 041, [arXiv:2112.09284 \[hep-th\]](#).
- [37] J. Feldbrugge and N. Turok, “Existence of real time quantum path integrals,” *Annals Phys.* **454** (2023) 169315, [arXiv:2207.12798 \[hep-th\]](#).
- [38] J. Nishimura, K. Sakai, and A. Yosprakob, “A new picture of quantum tunneling in the real-time path integral from Lefschetz thimble calculations,” *JHEP* **09** (2023) 110, [arXiv:2307.11199 \[hep-th\]](#).
- [39] J. Feldbrugge, D. L. Jow, and U.-L. Pen, “Complex classical paths in quantum reflections and tunneling,” [arXiv:2309.12420 \[quant-ph\]](#).
- [40] J. Feldbrugge, D. L. Jow, and U.-L. Pen, “Crossing singularities in the saddle point approximation,”

- [arXiv:2309.12427 \[quant-ph\]](#).
- [41] D. Saito and N. Oshita, “Remote Hawking-Moss instanton and the Lorentzian path integral,” [arXiv:2409.03978 \[hep-th\]](#).
- [42] J.-L. Lehners, “Review of the no-boundary wave function,” *Phys. Rept.* **1022** (2023) 1–82, [arXiv:2303.08802 \[hep-th\]](#).
- [43] J.-L. Lehners, “NUTs, Bolts and Stokes Phenomena in the No-Boundary Wave Function,” [arXiv:2402.10501 \[gr-qc\]](#).
- [44] M. Honda, H. Matsui, K. Okabayashi, and T. Terada, “Resurgence in Lorentzian quantum cosmology: No-boundary saddles and resummation of quantum gravity corrections around tunneling saddle points,” *Phys. Rev. D* **110** no. 8, (2024) 083508, [arXiv:2402.09981 \[gr-qc\]](#).
- [45] C.-Y. Chou and J. Nishimura, “Monte Carlo studies of quantum cosmology by the generalized Lefschetz thimble method,” [arXiv:2407.17724 \[gr-qc\]](#).
- [46] H. Matsui and S. Mukohyama, “Hartle-Hawking no-boundary proposal and Hořava-Lifshitz gravity,” *Phys. Rev. D* **109** no. 2, (2024) 023504, [arXiv:2310.00210 \[gr-qc\]](#).
- [47] H.-Y. Chen, Y. Hikida, Y. Taki, and T. Uetoko, “Semi-classical saddles of three-dimensional gravity via holography,” 2024. <https://arxiv.org/abs/2403.02108>.
- [48] H.-Y. Chen, Y. Hikida, Y. Taki, and T. Uetoko, “The semi-classical saddles in three-dimensional gravity via holography and mini-superspace approach,” 2024. <https://arxiv.org/abs/2404.10277>.
- [49] J. J. Halliwell and J. Louko, “Steepest Descent Contours in the Path Integral Approach to Quantum Cosmology. 3. A General Method With Applications to Anisotropic Minisuperspace Models,” *Phys. Rev. D* **42** (1990) 3997–4031.
- [50] G. Fanaras and A. Vilenkin, “Jackiw-Teitelboim and Kantowski-Sachs quantum cosmology,” *JCAP* **03** no. 03, (2022) 056, [arXiv:2112.00919 \[gr-qc\]](#).
- [51] G. Fanaras and A. Vilenkin, “The tunneling wavefunction in Kantowski-Sachs quantum cosmology,” *JCAP* **08** (2022) 069, [arXiv:2206.05839 \[gr-qc\]](#).
- [52] S. Ghosh, A. Acharya, S. Gangopadhyay, and P. K. Panigrahi, “Lorentzian path integral in Kantowski-Sachs anisotropic cosmology,” *Phys. Rev. D* **109** no. 4, (2024) 043524, [arXiv:2310.15180 \[gr-qc\]](#).
- [53] J. Louko, “Canonizing the Hartle-hawking Proposal,” *Phys. Lett. B* **202** (1988) 201–206.
- [54] H.-D. Conradi, “Quantum cosmology of Kantowski-Sachs like models,” *Class. Quant. Grav.* **12** (1995) 2423–2440, [arXiv:gr-qc/9412049](#).
- [55] J. Louko and T. Vachaspati, “On the Vilenkin Boundary Condition Proposal in Anisotropic Universes,” *Phys. Lett. B* **223** (1989) 21–25.
- [56] G. Conti and T. Hertog, “Two wave functions and dS/CFT on $S^1 \times S^2$,” *JHEP* **06** (2015) 101, [arXiv:1412.3728 \[hep-th\]](#).
- [57] D. Stanford and E. Witten, “Fermionic Localization of the Schwarzian Theory,” *JHEP* **10** (2017) 008, [arXiv:1703.04612 \[hep-th\]](#).
- [58] J. J. Halliwell, “Derivation of the Wheeler-De Witt Equation from a Path Integral for Minisuperspace Models,” *Phys. Rev. D* **38** (1988) 2468.
- [59] C. Teitelboim, “Causality Versus Gauge Invariance in Quantum Gravity and Supergravity,” *Phys. Rev. Lett.* **50** (1983) 705.
- [60] J. Diaz Dorronsoro, J. J. Halliwell, J. B. Hartle, T. Hertog, and O. Janssen, “Real no-boundary wave function in Lorentzian quantum cosmology,” *Phys. Rev. D* **96** no. 4, (2017) 043505, [arXiv:1705.05340 \[gr-qc\]](#).
- [61] J. Feldbrugge, J.-L. Lehners, and N. Turok, “No rescue for the no boundary proposal: Pointers to the future of quantum cosmology,” *Phys. Rev. D* **97** no. 2, (2018) 023509, [arXiv:1708.05104 \[hep-th\]](#).
- [62] A. Di Tucci and J.-L. Lehners, “No-Boundary Proposal as a Path Integral with Robin Boundary Conditions,” *Phys. Rev. Lett.* **122** no. 20, (2019) 201302, [arXiv:1903.06757 \[hep-th\]](#).
- [63] A. Di Tucci, J.-L. Lehners, and L. Sberna, “No-boundary prescriptions in Lorentzian quantum cosmology,” *Phys. Rev. D* **100** no. 12, (2019) 123543, [arXiv:1911.06701 \[hep-th\]](#).
- [64] G. Narain, “On Gauss-bonnet gravity and boundary conditions in Lorentzian path-integral quantization,” *JHEP* **05** (2021) 273, [arXiv:2101.04644 \[gr-qc\]](#).
- [65] G. Narain, “Surprises in Lorentzian path-integral of Gauss-Bonnet gravity,” *JHEP* **04** (2022) 153, [arXiv:2203.05475 \[gr-qc\]](#).
- [66] M. Ailiga, S. Mallik, and G. Narain, “Lorentzian Robin Universe,” *JHEP* **01** (2024) 124, [arXiv:2308.01310 \[gr-qc\]](#).
- [67] M. Ailiga, S. Mallik, and G. Narain, “Lorentzian path-integral of Robin Universe,” [arXiv:2407.16692 \[gr-qc\]](#).
- [68] J. Feldbrugge, J.-L. Lehners, and N. Turok, “No smooth beginning for spacetime,” *Phys. Rev. Lett.* **119** no. 17, (2017) 171301, [arXiv:1705.00192 \[hep-th\]](#).
- [69] J. Feldbrugge, J.-L. Lehners, and N. Turok, “Inconsistencies of the New No-Boundary Proposal,” *Universe* **4** no. 10, (2018) 100, [arXiv:1805.01609 \[hep-th\]](#).
- [70] J. Diaz Dorronsoro, J. J. Halliwell, J. B. Hartle, T. Hertog, O. Janssen, and Y. Vreys, “Damped perturbations in the no-boundary state,” *Phys. Rev. Lett.* **121** no. 8, (2018) 081302, [arXiv:1804.01102 \[gr-qc\]](#).
- [71] J. J. Halliwell, J. B. Hartle, and T. Hertog, “What is the No-Boundary Wave Function of the Universe?,” *Phys. Rev. D* **99** no. 4, (2019) 043526, [arXiv:1812.01760 \[hep-th\]](#).
- [72] O. Janssen, J. J. Halliwell, and T. Hertog, “No-boundary proposal in biaxial Bianchi IX minisuperspace,” *Phys. Rev. D* **99** no. 12, (2019) 123531, [arXiv:1904.11602 \[gr-qc\]](#).
- [73] A. Vilenkin and M. Yamada, “Tunneling wave function of the universe,” *Phys. Rev. D* **98** no. 6, (2018) 066003, [arXiv:1808.02032 \[gr-qc\]](#).
- [74] A. Vilenkin and M. Yamada, “Tunneling wave function of the universe II: the backreaction problem,” *Phys. Rev. D* **99** no. 6, (2019) 066010, [arXiv:1812.08084 \[gr-qc\]](#).
- [75] M. Bojowald and S. Brahma, “Loops rescue the no-boundary proposal,” *Phys. Rev. Lett.* **121** no. 20, (2018) 201301, [arXiv:1810.09871 \[gr-qc\]](#).
- [76] A. Di Tucci and J.-L. Lehners, “Unstable no-boundary fluctuations from sums over regular metrics,” *Phys. Rev. D* **98** no. 10, (2018) 103506, [arXiv:1806.07134 \[gr-qc\]](#).

- [77] J.-L. Lehners, “Wave function of simple universes analytically continued from negative to positive potentials,” *Phys. Rev. D* **104** no. 6, (2021) 063527, [arXiv:2105.12075 \[hep-th\]](#).
- [78] H. Matsui, S. Mukohyama, and A. Naruko, “No smooth spacetime in Lorentzian quantum cosmology and trans-Planckian physics,” *Phys. Rev. D* **107** no. 4, (2023) 043511, [arXiv:2211.05306 \[gr-qc\]](#).
- [79] H. Matsui, “No smooth spacetime: Exploring primordial perturbations in Lorentzian quantum cosmology,” *Phys. Rev. D* **110** no. 2, (2024) 023503, [arXiv:2404.18609 \[gr-qc\]](#).
- [80] M. Ailiga, S. Mallik, and G. Narain, “Boundary choices and one-loop Complex Universe,” [arXiv:2410.19724 \[gr-qc\]](#).