

Holography dual of accelerating and rotating black hole in Nariai limit

Shu Luo^{a*}

^a*School of Physics, University of Science and Technology of China, Hefei, Anhui 230026, China*

(Dated: January 3, 2025)

In this study, we investigate some widely-known holography properties of accelerating and rotating black hole, described by rotating C-metric, especially the case in Nariai limit, which are related to Kerr-CFT correspondence but differs in that the outer horizon will coincide the acceleration horizon and the extremal geometry is described by dS_2 rather than AdS_2 . In order to achieve this goal we define a regularized Komar mass with physical interpretation of varying the horizon area from massless limit to general case. We also reduce the action to a 2-dimensional JT-type action and discuss some of its properties.

I. INTRODUCTION

Recently, with the intensive study on the AdS-CFT correspondence, many properties of the duality between quantum gravity systems and gauged fields have been revealed. A rather similar holography composition is about Kerr-CFT duality, which relates to many familiar spacetime, including those belonging to the general type-D family, Plebanski-Demianski solutions [1]. A special type of them named C-metric [2] is supposed to describe accelerating black holes, and has much relation to other interesting spacetime, including Ernst solution and Melvin solution, etc.

To reveal the duality between the spacetime and the corresponding CFT, we first need to clarify the thermodynamic variables of the black hole. The first problem of presenting the first law of rotating C-metric lies on the definition of mass of the accelerating black hole. There have been some researches in this realm. In [3] the authors defined the Boost mass of an accelerating black hole by extending the usual definition of ADM mass to asymptotic boosting case. Other considerations include keeping the deficit angle unchanged to construct the integrable mass of a black hole with acceleration in AdS spacetime [4]. Similar construction based on integrability (but with no cosmic string tension served as thermodynamic variables) can be seen in [5]. There are many other related works based on these ideas [6–10]. Yet these constructions still differ from each others in some ways. It's a question whether mass should be constructed to reflect both the alterations of the area of event horizon and the acceleration horizon, or merely the event horizon area. As pointed out in [4], the construction of the first kind may face the problem of multi-boundary, which causes challenges in the analogy to thermodynamics when trying to relate two different surface gravity to two different temperature, and raises the problem of thermodynamic equilibrium, although there have been some discussions on calculating the action as well as partition function of gauge-gravity holography duality with an arbitrary number of boundaries [11]. Still, this treatment seems more physical when approaching extremity (Sec.VI). Then we will face the problem of the infinite area of the acceleration horizon, and we need a regularization with physical rationality. In [12, 13] we have already seen some similar constructions, at least for the regularization of the area, where the authors considered the alterations of a C-metric from a massless accelerating background. Some similar treatment can be seen in [14, 15].

The extremal Kerr-de-Sitter spacetime, in which the event horizon coincides with the cosmological horizon, can be described by rotating Nariai geometry, whose general form, in Poincare coordinate, is Eq.(4.6). In non-rotating case this can reduce to $dS_2 \times S^2$. Due to quantum fluctuations, the Nariai solutions are unstable and, once created, they decay through the quantum tunneling process into a slightly non-extremal dS spacetime [16]. Another interesting feature of Nariai solution is the instanton related to quantum decay of the dS space accompanied by the creation of a dS black hole pair. The Nariai limit of the C-metric was analyzed in detail in [17], arguing that the geometry of the Nariai C-metric is $dS_2 \times \tilde{S}^2$, where \tilde{S}^2 is the deformed 2-sphere. Although generally there are concerns about multi-boundaries, rotating C-metric in this limit can also be regarded as in full thermodynamic equilibrium, in which naturally the temperature calculated at two different horizons now coincide [18].

At the same time, since the pioneer work of [19], many interesting properties of the near-horizon limit of extremal Kerr spacetime (NHEK) have been revealed. It is believed that parallel to the crucial properties of duality between quantum gravity in AdS_3 and the 2-D conformal theory (due to pure symmetry considerations) [20], the NHEK spacetime is a fibered product of two-dimensional anti-de Sitter space and two-sphere. The spacetime with a fixed θ is precisely warped AdS_3 , with which the deformation of the radius of S^1 fibration over AdS_2 can lead to an $SL(2, R) \times U(1)$ isometry group. For Nariai case we only need to replace $AdS_3(AdS_2)$ by $dS_3(dS_2)$, and the isometry group does not change [21]. At the same time, consistent boundary conditions can select an asymptotical symmetry group (ASG) that is precisely the same group [22]. Moreover, it was found that there is “hidden symmetry” of scalar wavefunction in both “near” and “far” region, in which the operator can serve as a quadric $SL(2, R)$ Casimir operator [23].

It seems that the near-horizon limit of Nariai C-metric spacetime is similar to usual near-extremal ones, but there are something quite different. Asymptotically, the rotating Nariai spacetime is naturally foliated by a timelike radial coordinate and the foliations are spacelike. The similarity of Nariai-CFT dual and dS -CFT dual leads to the fact that the dual conformal field

* e-mail address: ls040629@mail.ustc.edu.cn

theory (CFT) is expected to live on a space-like surface and the time coordinate emerges from a Euclidean CFT. Such CFTs turn out to be non-unitary, being exotic compared with standard examples of CFTs [24]. Still, according to the traditional interpretation, if the CFT dual to dS spacetime is supposed to live on the spacelike boundary \mathcal{I}_+ , then there is the problem of how to interpret the observer and observables, including how to perform asymptotically precise measurements [25]. Yet recently, in lower dimensional dS_2 gravity, the systematic theory of holography has been built [26], in which the computation of the no-boundary wavefunction of the universe is essentially identical to the computation of the partition function for the euclidean AdS_2 case, and it is tempting to think that the Hamiltonian of the system is also related to some kind of unitary evolution of the microstates in the static patch. This may relate the finite dimension of de-Sitter quantum gravity Hilbert space to the fact that the mass of black holes in dS space cannot be infinite [27, 28]. All these efforts are hopeful in finding the microscopic quantum theory that is in dual to at least a patch of de-Sitter spacetime.

In this study, we investigate the possible mass construction and first law of rotating C-metric based on Komar integral on the acceleration horizon. We also present the basic results related to holography properties of Nariai C-metric to CFT. Finally, we reduce the rotating C-metric to 2 dimension to fit the form of Jackiw-Teitelboim gravity theory, serving for possible further explorations in the future. The paper is organized as follows: in Sec.II, we introduce the basic properties of rotating C-metric, which is aimed for mastering the macroscopic picture of the spacetime, which has very different properties compared to ordinary spacetime. In Sec.III A, we present the first law of rotating C-metric with gauge fields based on the definition of regularized Komar mass calculated on acceleration horizon, in which we follow the formal way to derive the law. In Sec.III B, we define another type of mass, relating to the observables in the “static” reference frame, which relies on the spacetime position and is unbounded when approaching the acceleration horizon. In Sec.IV, we show the duality of warped CFT_2 and the Nariai limit of the rotating C-metric, which is described by $dS_2 \times S^2$ geometry. We follow the common procedure, analyzing the central charge corresponding to isometric group and proving its prediction of the microscopic entropy using Cardy formula exactly coincides the result of macroscopic entropy by Hawking-Bekenstein formula. In Sec.V, we reduce the spacetime to 2 dimension and reproduce the action in JT gravity form and discuss the equation governing the motion to the first order.

II. BASIC PROPERTIES OF ROTATING C-METRIC

The most general form of type-D electrovacuum solution family was firstly achieved by [1], and among them there exist one type of metric describing rotating and accelerating black hole:

$$ds^2 = \frac{1}{\Omega^2} \left[-\frac{\Delta}{\rho^2} (dt - a \sin^2 \theta \Delta_\phi d\phi)^2 + \frac{\rho^2}{\Delta} dr^2 + \frac{\rho^2}{P} d\theta^2 + \frac{P \sin^2 \theta}{\rho^2} [adt - (r^2 + a^2) \Delta_\phi d\phi]^2 \right] \quad (2.1)$$

where

$$\Omega = 1 - \alpha r \cos \theta, \quad P = 1 - 2\alpha m \cos \theta + \alpha^2 (a^2 + e^2) \cos^2 \theta, \quad (2.2)$$

$$\rho^2 = r^2 + a^2 \cos^2 \theta, \quad \Delta = (r^2 - 2mr + a^2 + e^2)(1 - \alpha^2 r^2), \quad (2.3)$$

with the vector potential for the gauged field is given by

$$A = -\frac{er}{r^2 + a^2 \cos^2 \theta} (dt + a \sin^2 \theta \Delta_\phi d\phi), \quad (2.4)$$

among three parameters, a , e and m are all interpreted as their usual meaning, i.e., the mass, the charge and the angular momentum-mass ratio. α 's meaning is clear under massless and spinless case, which is the acceleration of the point particle at the origin of the coordinates. Δ_ϕ is a constant that has to be fixed.

This metric has been intensively studied for many years [2, 29–32], and here we briefly summarize some properties as well as physical interpretation of the solution. The original form of C-metric is supposed to describe two casually separated black holes which accelerate away due to the presence of cosmic strings, reflected by conical singularities. Yet since the rewriting of the metric form by [33], and resulting in Eq.(2.1), this solution can also be regarded as one single accelerating black hole. From Eq.(2.1) it is obvious that the limit $\alpha = 0$ responds to a common Kerr metric with two horizons, one Cauchy horizon and one event horizon. However, a rather small but nonzero α will cause tremendous alteration of the spacetime.

First, the metric has a conformal factor Ω whose root corresponds to conformal infinity. Because the explicit meaning of all the coordinates, here we tacitly approve that the range of all coordinates are $0 < r < \infty$, $0 < \theta < \pi$, $-\infty < t < \infty$. Then it's clear that when $0 < \theta < \frac{\pi}{2}$ when r approaches $\frac{1}{\alpha \cos \theta}$ we arrive at the conformal infinity \mathcal{I}^+ , but when $\frac{\pi}{2} < \theta < \pi$ even when r approaches to infinity we have no such boundary. Another crucial difference from common solution is the existence of conical

singularity. Take a $t, r = \text{const}$ spatial surface we get the induced metric

$$ds^2 = \frac{1}{\Omega^2} \left[\frac{(r^2 + a^2 \cos^2 \theta)}{P} d\theta^2 + \frac{P \sin^2 \theta (r^2 + a^2)^2 - \Delta a^2 \sin^4 \theta}{r^2 + a^2 \cos^2 \theta} \Delta_\phi^2 d\phi^2 \right], \quad (2.5)$$

and if we naively take $\Delta_\phi = 1$ as $\theta \rightarrow 0$ and $\theta \rightarrow \pi$ we have deficit angle $\delta_0 = 2\pi[-\alpha^2(a^2 + e^2) + 2\alpha m]$ and $\delta_\pi = 2\pi[-\alpha^2(a^2 + e^2) - 2\alpha m]$ respectively, which takes different value. Recall that there is also conical singularity of Kerr spacetime in Boyer-Lindquist coordinate, but as they take the same value when $\theta = 0$ and $\theta = \pi$ we can easily move it out by redefining the period of the circulate coordinate ϕ . Yet here things are more similar to Taub-Nut spacetime, when we can not move out two singularities at the same time unless we admit t also have a certain period [34], which of course cause causality problems. So now and in the following treatment we aim to move out the conical singularity of the north pole we by taking $\Delta_\phi = \frac{1}{1 - 2\alpha m + \alpha^2(a^2 + e^2)}$ and leave the rest singularity of the south pole to the strut of a cosmic string. In this way we must suppose the string with tension

$$\mu = \frac{m\alpha}{1 - 2m\alpha + \alpha^2 a^2}. \quad (2.6)$$

and this time ϕ can take its value in $[0, 2\pi]$. More importantly, in Sec.III, this treatment plays a crucial role in explaining the origin of our regularized mass and horizon area formula, whose similar treatment can be traced back to [12]. Some recent results considering the thermodynamics of black hole with deficit angle can be seen in [35] and so on.

In order to clarify the global structure of the spacetime, we use the method introduced in [30] to plot the conformal diagram of the C-metric. For simplicity we only consider the construction for $a = e = 0$ case only, and now the metric reduce to

$$ds^2 = \frac{1}{\Omega^2} \left(-Q dt^2 + \frac{dr^2}{Q} + \frac{r^2 d\theta^2}{P} + Pr^2 \sin^2 \theta d\phi^2 \right), \quad (2.7)$$

where

$$Q = 1 - \frac{2m}{r}. \quad (2.8)$$

As usual we define $r_* = \int Q^{-1} dr$ and $u = t - r_*, v = t + r_*$, and when in region $r \in (0, 2m)$, we define $U = \exp(-\frac{\alpha u}{2\kappa_0}), V = \exp(\frac{\alpha v}{2\kappa_0})$, and now the metric turns to be

$$ds^2 = \frac{2m}{r(1 - \alpha r \cos \theta)^2} (1 - \alpha^2 r^2)(1 + \alpha r)^{-\frac{\kappa_c}{\kappa_0}} (1 - \alpha r)^{-\frac{\kappa_a}{\kappa_0}} dU dV, \quad (2.9)$$

in which

$$\kappa_0 = \frac{2\alpha m}{1 - 4\alpha^2 m^2}, \quad \kappa_c = \frac{1}{2(1 + 2\alpha m)}, \quad \kappa_a = -\frac{1}{2(1 - 2\alpha m)}, \quad (2.10)$$

and physical condition naturally requires that $\kappa_c > 0, \kappa_0 > 0, \kappa_a < 0$. We also have the relation

$$UV = (1 + \alpha r)^{\frac{\kappa_c}{\kappa_0}} |1 - \alpha r|^{\frac{\kappa_a}{\kappa_0}} \left(1 - \frac{r}{2m}\right). \quad (2.11)$$

If we further define conformal coordinates $\tilde{U} = \tan U, \tilde{V} = \tan V$, we see two special case: $r = 0, UV = 1, \tilde{U} + \tilde{V} = \frac{\pi}{2}$ (singularity) and $r = 2m, UV = 0, \tilde{U}\tilde{V} = 0$ (event horizon). In this way we can plot part B of Fig.1 as well as its three boundaries. The rest work is quite similar. In the region $r \in (2m, \frac{1}{\alpha})$, we redefine U and V as $U = -\exp(-\frac{\alpha u}{2\kappa_0}), V = \exp(\frac{\alpha v}{2\kappa_0})$, (one can see more details in [2]), and we can preserve both the relation Eq.(2.9) and Eq.(2.11). As $\kappa_a < 0, r = \frac{1}{\alpha}$ now corresponds to $UV = -\infty$, and either there is $\tilde{V} = \frac{\pi}{2}, \tilde{U} < 0$ or $\tilde{U} = -\frac{\pi}{2}, \tilde{V} > 0$. These are two accelerating horizons \mathcal{H}_a . In the region $r > \frac{1}{\alpha}$, we redefine $U = -\exp(-\frac{\alpha u}{2\kappa_0}), V = -\exp(\frac{\alpha v}{2\kappa_0})$, and now the total conformal factor is

$$\tilde{\Omega}^2 = (1 - \alpha r \cos \theta)^2 \cos^2 \tilde{U} \cos^2 \tilde{V}, \quad (2.12)$$

so now we are left with three possibilities: the first is when $\theta = 0$, and the boundary relates to the root of $\cos \tilde{U}$ or $\cos \tilde{V}$, (that is precisely where $r = \frac{1}{\alpha}$) as shown in Fig.1. The second case is when $\theta \in (0, \frac{\pi}{2})$, and the root of $\tilde{\Omega}$ satisfies a hypersurface which is spacelike:

$$UV = \left(1 + \frac{1}{\cos \theta}\right)^{\frac{\kappa_c}{\kappa_0}} \left(-1 + \frac{1}{\cos \theta}\right)^{\frac{\kappa_a}{\kappa_0}} \left(-1 + \frac{1}{2m\alpha \cos \theta}\right), \quad (2.13)$$

as shown in Fig.2. But in the third case when $\theta \in [\frac{\pi}{2}, \pi]$ we are left with a condition that the metric tensor component itself is finite even when r approaches infinity, so there is no necessity for conformal boundary \mathcal{I}^+ to be the location where $\tilde{\Omega} = 0$. Instead, we should confirm the location of this boundary by the relation Eq.(2.11), i.e., $r = \infty, UV = 0$. So this corresponds precisely to the boundary \mathcal{I}^+ of part C as shown in Fig.3.

In conclusion, the nonzero α gives the whole structure some very different properties. The Penrose diagram is proved to be relied on the value of θ , and as θ increasing from 0 to $\frac{\pi}{2}$ we can imagine the deformation of the boundary \mathcal{I}^+ of Fig.1 to that of Fig.3. Moreover, we can even make more coordinate extension in the horizontal direction. When the rotation is also taken into account, we only need to combine Fig.1-Fig.3 to Penrose diagram of Kerr spacetime, i.e., extending in the vertical direction as well.

Now the question arises that whether the C-metric is in accordance to the definition of asymptotic flat spacetime. Although seemingly this metric has very different behavior when approaching no matter spatial infinity i^0 or null infinity \mathcal{I}^+ , actually according to the study of [29, 36], the most general C-metric (with both rotation and charge) satisfies the condition for an asymptotically empty and flat spacetime (M, g_{ab}) proposed in [37]:

1. (M, g_{ab}) can be embedded in a larger spacetime (\hat{M}, \hat{g}_{ab}) , and existing a C^∞ function $\tilde{\Omega}$ on which satisfying $g_{ab} = \tilde{\Omega}^2 \hat{g}_{ab}$
2. $\tilde{\Omega} = 0$ on $\partial\hat{M}$ while $\nabla\tilde{\Omega} \neq 0$ on $\partial\hat{M}$.
3. The manifold of orbits of the restriction of the vector field $n^a = \nabla^a\tilde{\Omega}$ to $\partial\hat{M}$ is diffeomorphic to S^2 .
4. $\tilde{\Omega}^{-2}R_{ab}$ has a smooth limit to $\partial\hat{M}$.




Figure 1: The Penrose diagram for the global structure of C-metric in the case of $\theta = 0$.




Figure 2: The Penrose diagram for the global structure of C-metric in the case of $\theta \in (0, \frac{\pi}{2})$.

We now present one more specific property of the C-metric. Using the form of the induced metric in Eq.(2.5), we can calculate the topology of a given $t, r = \text{const}$ surface. The result is as expected:

$$\int_S R_{(2)} \epsilon_{ab} = 8\pi[1 + \alpha^2(a^2 + e^2)], \quad (2.14)$$

where S is any $t, r = \text{const}$ surface and $R_{(2)}$ is the scalar curvature of the surface, and the coordinate θ is supposed to vary from




Figure 3: The Penrose diagram for the global structure of C-metric in the case of $\theta \in [\frac{\pi}{2}, \pi]$.

0 to π on S . Now we can use Gauss-Bonnet theorem to attain

$$\frac{1}{4\pi} \int_S R_{(2)} \epsilon_{ab} + \frac{\Delta\theta}{2\pi} = 2, \quad (2.15)$$

in which $\Delta\theta$ is the sum of the two deficit angle in the north pole and south pole. This confirms that $t, r = \text{const}$ surface is a 2-sphere even when r approaches the acceleration horizon \mathcal{H}_a .

III. FIRST LAW OF ROTATING C-METIC

A. The construction of Komar mass with angle regularization

Now we consider the general definition of Komar mass in a given spacetime. According to [38], in an asymptotic flat and stable spacetime (not necessarily static), one can always find a timelike killing vector ξ^a , and Komar mass can be defined as

$$M_S = -\frac{1}{8\pi} \int_S \epsilon_{abcd} \nabla^c \xi^d, \quad (3.1)$$

where here S is a certain topological two-sphere.

The crucial property of Komar mass is as follows:

$$M_S = M_{S_{\mathcal{H}}} - \frac{1}{4\pi} \int_{\Sigma} \epsilon_{abcd} R^a_e \xi^e, \quad (3.2)$$

where Σ is the hypersurface whose boundaries are S and a cross section of event horizon $S_{\mathcal{H}}$ respectively, and R_{ab} is the Ricci tensor. This is natural considering the identities

$$\nabla_a k^a = 0, \quad \nabla_a \nabla^a k^b = -R^b_a k^a, \quad (3.3)$$

and the first one permits the existence of killing-Yano two form

$$k^a = \nabla_b \omega^{ba}. \quad (3.4)$$

Eq.(3.2) argues that for a vacuum solution Komar mass will be a constant no matter how far we calculate it from the black hole horizon. Similar argument can make sense when we specifically consider a axial symmetric spacetime with two commutative killing vector ξ^a, ϕ^a , and ϕ^a corresponds to a periodic coordinate, in which we can naturally extend this definition to Komar angular momentum:

$$J_S = \frac{1}{16\pi} \int_S \epsilon_{abcd} \nabla^c \phi^d, \quad (3.5)$$

Now before constructing the specific form of the mass, we review the method first introduced in [13], i.e., by variable replacement

$$(\alpha r)^{-1} = 1 + \epsilon(1 - \chi), \quad \cos \theta = 1 - \epsilon\chi, \quad (3.6)$$

to focus on the small region near the cosmic string in the north pole of the acceleration horizon, where ϵ is a infinitesimal and χ is considered as a coordinate function. Then on a $t = \text{const}$ hypersurface the metric can be rewritten in the form

$$ds^2 = \frac{\Delta_\phi}{\epsilon} \left(\frac{1}{\alpha^2} + a^2 \right) \left[\frac{d\chi^2}{2\chi(1-\chi)} + 2\chi d\phi^2 + O(\epsilon) \right], \quad (3.7)$$

where $\Delta_\phi = \frac{1}{1-2\alpha m + \alpha^2(a^2 + e^2)}$. The spacetime is described by 4 parameters: m, a, α and e , yet in this limit we can abstractly owe the whole structure to three parameters: Δ_ϕ, ϵ and $u \equiv \frac{1}{\alpha^2} + a^2$. If we want to calculate true thermodynamical sums with a fixed back ground, we should always stay in a regularized frame in which the asymptotic form of Eq.(3.7) unchanged. Thus we force the following condition

$$\frac{\Delta_\phi u}{\epsilon} = \frac{\bar{\Delta}_\phi \bar{u}}{\bar{\epsilon}}, \quad (3.8)$$

which is different from some previous discussion of keeping the deficit angle in the south pole or equivalently, the tension of the string a constant. The RHS of Eq.(3.8) has particular meaning when it corresponds to nothing but a flat spacetime, and now we will see why this is important in interpreting the difference of a C-metric and an accelerating background.

For simplicity we first consider the $a = e = 0$ case, in which one may consider an integral very close to Eq.(3.1) but with a δ - regularization:

$$M = \frac{1}{4\pi} \int_\delta^\pi \frac{\Delta_\phi \sin \theta d\theta}{(1 - \alpha r \cos \theta)^2} \left[m(1 - \alpha^2 r^2) + r^2 \left(1 - \frac{2m}{r} \right) \alpha \frac{\cos \theta - \alpha r}{1 - \alpha r \cos \theta} \right], \quad (3.9)$$

in which the S in Eq.(3.1) has been chosen to be a $r = t = \text{const}$ surface so the r in Eq.(3.9) is a fixed value. For $r < \frac{1}{\alpha}$ it takes the value

$$M = \Delta_\phi [m + O(\delta^2)], \quad (3.10)$$

and as $\delta \rightarrow 0$ is precisely turns back to the expected value. But when $r = \frac{1}{\alpha}$, we have

$$M^{(\delta)} = \Delta_\phi \left[m + \frac{1 - 2m\alpha}{4\alpha} \left(-\frac{4}{\delta^2} + \frac{2}{3} + O(\delta^2) \right) \right], \quad (3.11)$$

where the first term proportional to m can be denoted by M_{bh} , while the second term denoted by M_a . At the same time we can use the formula $\kappa^2 = -\frac{1}{2} \nabla^a K^b \nabla_a K_b$, in which κ is the surface gravity of a given killing horizon and K^a is the corresponding killing normal vector of the horizon (here just ξ^a) to attain

$$\kappa_{bh} \equiv \kappa|_{r_+} = \frac{1 - 4\alpha^2 m^2}{4m}, \quad \kappa_a \equiv \kappa|_{r_0} = \alpha(1 - 2\alpha m), \quad (3.12)$$

in which $r_0 = \frac{1}{\alpha}$ stands for the position of the acceleration horizon. And we also have the result

$$\mathcal{A}_{bh} \equiv \mathcal{A}|_{r_+} = \frac{4\pi \Delta_\phi m}{1 - 4\alpha^2 m^2}, \quad \mathcal{A}_a \equiv \mathcal{A}|_{r_0} = \frac{2\pi \Delta_\phi}{\alpha^2} \left(\frac{2}{\delta^2} - \frac{1}{3} + O(\delta^2) \right), \quad (3.13)$$

the latter of which also under δ - regularization scheme. If all the sums with upside indices (δ) are taken as their regular terms, then we have the Smarr formula

$$M^{(\delta)} \equiv M_{bh} + M_a^{(\delta)} = \frac{\kappa_{bh} \mathcal{A}_{bh}}{4\pi} - \frac{\kappa_a \mathcal{A}_a^{(\delta)}}{4\pi}, \quad (3.14)$$

and then there is a question why there is a minus sign before the second term, but this has no surprise if we recall the in the case of de-Sitter entropy calculation: there is also a minus sign [39]. We can also have a formal derivation for the minus sign, in which actually we should change κ_a in Eq.(3.12) to its opposite number. According to the original definition of the surface gravity, we have

$$Y_a \xi^a = -2\kappa Y_a \nabla^2 (\xi_b \xi^b), \quad (3.15)$$

in which Y^a is a certain timelike and future-oriented vector located at the a certain horizon (say, one separating region A from C and one separating region A from B in Fig.2), and then we notice that as ξ^a is also future oriented on the second one while past-oriented on the first one. At the same time we have $\xi_a \xi^a < 0$ in region A and $\xi^a \xi_a > 0$ in region B and C , so $Y_a \nabla^2 (\xi_b \xi^b) > 0$ and we have $\kappa > 0$ on the first one while $\kappa < 0$ for the second one. In this sense we will absorb the minus sign into κ in the following thermodynamic identities. Note that the Komar mass with δ - regularization always gives the sum m as long as our surface is inside the acceleration horizon. What actually is useful is only in the case that two horizons (event horizon and acceleration horizon) coincide.

Now with the interpretation of Eq.(3.8) we may find a crucial relation

$$\mathcal{A}_a^{(\delta)} = \Delta \mathcal{A}_a |_{\epsilon \approx \delta^2}, \quad (3.16)$$

which shows that the regularized acceleration horizon area is just the change from a certain accelerating background to a massive C-metric. Explicitly, here we expect the relation

$$(1 - 2\alpha m)\alpha^2 \delta^2 = \bar{\alpha} \bar{\delta}^2, \quad (3.17)$$

and as long as we are not faced with extreme case ($2m\alpha \rightarrow 1$) we can regard this argument rational. In extreme case we face a problem that even the regularized area is infinite, and actually we see the 0 multiply ∞ into a unconfirmed sum, so we get another reason for a minus sign in Eq.(3.14) (with no sign change of κ): we need to cancel the nonzero contribution of two $\kappa \mathcal{A}$ to give the same result when we consider the common extremal (say, extremal RN) black hole, in which we only need one finite horizon area but the surface gravity goes to 0. This, on the other hand, illustrate the necessity to consider the whole term of the mass, reflecting the variation in both the event horizon and acceleration horizon. In conclusion, in the following derivation of the first law we may always regard one more condition, that is, the perturbation of the spacetime never change the asymptotic behavior of the metric presented in Eq.(3.7) and then we can naively take the regular term in any circumstance to represent a certain ‘‘real’’ change in the system’s total mass, i.e., there is

$$\Delta M_a = \frac{\kappa_a \Delta \mathcal{A}_a}{4\pi}. \quad (3.18)$$

Before entering the abstract derivation we present the result for general rotating C-metric in Eq.(2.1). Take the sphere integral of Komar mass M at the acceleration horizon \mathcal{H}_a , We find

$$M_a^{(\delta)} = \Delta_\phi \frac{(1 + \alpha^2 a^2)^2 + 2\alpha m(5a^2 \alpha^2 - 1) + e^2 \alpha^2 (1 + a^2 a^2)}{6\alpha(1 + a^2 \alpha^2)}, \quad (3.19)$$

$$2\Omega_a J_a = \frac{2\Delta_\phi \alpha^2 a^2 m}{1 + a^2 \alpha^2}, \quad \kappa_a \mathcal{A}_a^{(\delta)} = \frac{2\pi}{3\alpha}, \quad (3.20)$$

where the downside indices a means we consider the second term only related to the acceleration horizon. The symbol Ω , J , Φ and \mathcal{Q} take their usual meaning in black hole thermodynamics (notice to distinguish the angular velocity Ω here from the conformal factor). We get the general Smarr formula

$$M_a^{(\delta)} - 2\Omega_a J_a = \frac{\kappa_a \mathcal{A}_a^{(\delta)}}{4\pi}, \quad (3.21)$$

and if we bring the rest term in M there is

$$M_{bh} = m - \frac{e^2 \alpha}{1 + \alpha^2 a^2}, \quad A_{bh} = 4\pi \Delta_\phi \frac{r_+^2 + a^2}{1 - (\alpha r_+)^2}, \quad \kappa_{bh} = \frac{[1 - (\alpha r_+)^2][mr_+ - (a^2 + e^2)]}{r_+(r_+^2 + a^2)}, \quad (3.22)$$

(note here M_{bh} is only a symbol and is calculated at \mathcal{H}_a rather than \mathcal{H}_{bh}), and

$$J_a = \Delta_\phi^2 m a, \quad \Omega_{bh} = \frac{\Delta_\phi a}{a^2 + r_+^2}, \quad \Phi_{bh} = \frac{e r_+}{a^2 + r_+^2}, \quad \Phi_a = \frac{e \alpha}{1 + (\alpha a)^2}, \quad (3.23)$$

so the Smarr relation

$$M_{bh} - 2\Omega_{bh} J_a - \Phi_{bh} \mathcal{Q} + \Phi_a \mathcal{Q} = \frac{\kappa_{bh} \mathcal{A}_{bh}}{4\pi}, \quad (3.24)$$

is also satisfied, and sum these two identities together we easily get the total Smarr formula, in which M is the total Komar mass $M^{(\delta)} \equiv M_a^{(\delta)} + M_{bh}$ calculated at the acceleration horizon.




Figure 4: The sketch map, in which we consider the union of S_{bh} , S_a and H_T .

We then briefly derive the first law using the method in [40]. If we take S_{bh} the cross section of the event horizon while the other one the surface a little bit inside the acceleration horizon S_a (i.e., we don't take $r = \frac{1}{\alpha}$ at the first time in Eq.(3.9) but by first calculate the specific integral and then take the limit, which always give a $\Delta_\phi m$). Like the previous method [14] to illustrate through Wald formalism [41, 42], in constructing the whole 2-sphere to apply Stokes theorem, we need to avoid intersecting the cosmic string (or conical singularity) as at that position the manifold is not smooth. This is shown in Fig.4, in which S_w can be regarded as the union of S_{bh} , S_a and the tube H_T . To apply specific calculation we need to take the gauge in which $\delta \xi^a = \delta \phi^a = 0$, thus $\delta K^a = \xi^a + \delta \Omega_{\mathcal{H}} m^a$, which guarantees the position of the horizon is unchanged. If we set n^a to satisfy $n^a K_a = 1$ on the horizon in all circumstance, then there is relation

$$\delta n^a K_a + \delta K^a n_a = 0, \quad (3.25)$$

which is useful for later calculation. If we restrict the perturbation to preserve time and rotation invariance of the solution, then we also have $\mathcal{L}_K \delta K = 0$. If we denote δg_{ab} by h_{ab} , then

$$\delta \kappa_{bh} = -\frac{1}{2} K^a \nabla^b h_{ab} - \delta \Omega_{bh} n_{[a} K_{b]} \nabla^a \phi^b = -n_{[a} K_{b]} K^a \nabla^{[c} h^b]_c - \delta \Omega_{bh} n_{[a} K_{b]} \nabla^a \phi^b, \quad (3.26)$$

we then multiply LHS and RHS with the induced volume ϵ_{cd} and integrating on S_{bh} to get

$$\mathcal{A}_{bh} \delta \kappa_{bh} = -8\pi \delta \Omega_{bh} J_{bh} - \int_{S_{bh}} \epsilon_{abcd} K^a \nabla^{[c} h^b]_c, \quad (3.27)$$

which can be combined with the relation

$$\int_{S_a} \epsilon_{abcd} K^a \nabla^{[c} h^b]_c = 4\pi \delta M_{bh} \quad (3.28)$$

and Stokes formula of S_w to give

$$4\pi \delta M_{bh} + \mathcal{A} \delta \kappa_{bh} + 8\pi \delta \Omega_{bh} J_a = \int_{\Sigma} \epsilon_{abcd} K^a \nabla_e \nabla^{[f} h^e]_f + \int_{H_T} \epsilon_{abcd} K^a \nabla^{[c} h^b]_c. \quad (3.29)$$

Now consider the relation

$$\delta R = 2 \nabla_e \nabla^{[f} h^e]_f - h^{ab} R_{ab}, \quad (3.30)$$

and the Einstein equation, we have

$$4\pi\delta M_{bh} + \mathcal{A}_{bh}\delta\kappa_{bh} + 8\pi\delta\Omega_{bh}J_a = \int_{\Sigma} \epsilon_{abcd}K^a T_{de}h^{de} + 2\delta\Omega_{bh} \int_{\Sigma} \epsilon_{abcd}T_d^a m^d + \frac{1}{2}\delta \int_{\Sigma} \epsilon_{abcd}K^a R + \int_{H_T} \epsilon_{abcd}K^a \nabla^{[c}h^b]_c, \quad (3.31)$$

The contribution of energy-momentum tensor to RHS is due to two terms, one gauged field and one cosmic string. The gauge field part is just

$$\phi_{bh}\delta\mathcal{Q} - \mathcal{Q}\delta\phi_{bh} - \phi_a\delta\mathcal{Q} + \mathcal{Q}\delta\phi_a, \quad (3.32)$$

then we can combine Eq.(3.31) with the variance of Smarr formula Eq.(3.24), Einstein equation to attain the final expression

$$\delta M_{bh} - \Omega_{bh}\delta J_a - \Phi_{bh}\delta\mathcal{Q} - \left(\frac{\kappa_{bh}\delta\mathcal{A}_{bh}}{8\pi} - \Phi_a\delta\mathcal{Q}\right) = \frac{1}{8\pi} \int_{H_T} \epsilon_{abcd}K^a \nabla^{[c}h^b]_c, \quad (3.33)$$

It seems that the RHS might not be presented simply by a sum like $l\delta\mu$, in which both terms are expressed in spacetime parameters, and in [43, 44] it is argued that there is no unambiguous correspondence between the deficit angle and the cosmic string tension. If we restrict the variation phase space on the 4-dimension parameter space (m, a, α, e) , then we have

$$h_{ab} = \delta g_{ab} = \frac{\delta g_{ab}}{\delta m}\delta m + \frac{\delta g_{ab}}{\delta a}\delta a + \frac{\delta g_{ab}}{\delta \alpha}\delta \alpha + \frac{\delta g_{ab}}{\delta e}\delta e, \quad (3.34)$$

and the explicit form of the right side can be attained, in a form of variation of several parameters. Another possible method to achieve a integrable relation is by reparameterization of the Killing vector [14], replacing ξ^a with $N(m, a, \alpha)\xi^a$, but then we may face the problem that term

$$\frac{r_+^2(a^2\alpha + r_+ - 2m)}{(1 - \alpha^2 r_+^2)(a^2\alpha - m)m}\delta m + \frac{ar_+(m + \alpha r_+ m - 2\alpha a^2)}{(1 - \alpha^2 r_+^2)(a^2\alpha - m)m}\delta a, \quad (3.35)$$

is not integrable. Still, there are other choices to define a integrable mass corresponding to deficit angle [10]. As for the reason why the added term related to cosmic string does not show in the Smarr formula, [45] argues that this is due to Euler's homogeneous function theorem, which is different from Taub-Nut case [7].

As for the acceleration mass M_a , by similar analyses, by taking $K^a = \xi^a + \Omega_a\phi^a$ we can attain

$$\delta M_a^{(\delta)} - \Omega_a\delta J_a - \frac{\kappa_a\delta\mathcal{A}_a^{(\delta)}}{8\pi} = 0, \quad (3.36)$$

and by summing Eq.(3.33) and Eq.(3.36) together we can get the total first law of the rotating C-metric with gauged field:

$$\delta M^{(\delta)} - \Omega_a\delta J_a - \frac{\kappa_a\delta\mathcal{A}_a^{(\delta)}}{8\pi} - \frac{\kappa_{bh}\delta\mathcal{A}_{bh}}{8\pi} - \Omega_{bh}\delta J_a - \Phi_{bh}\delta\mathcal{Q} + \Phi_a\delta\mathcal{Q} = \frac{1}{8\pi} \int_{H_T} \epsilon_{abcd}K^a \nabla^{[c}h^b]_c. \quad (3.37)$$

B. Another definition of mass with physical meaning

The Komar mass is constructed with the existence of timelike killing vector field. If we don't require the vector to be killing, we can have many other different mass expression. Then we have to pay the price that the mass is not a constant even if there no matter field, but we can still find some physical interpretation of such masses. Here we construct a mass that is related to the relative observable property of a spacetime in a "static" coordinate. This is motivated by the fact that in the massless limit C-metric can turn back to Minkowski spacetime described by Rindler coordinate by a simple coordinate transformation, while there are many differences in some non-diffeomorphic invariant quantities in a Rindler observer and Minkowski observer [46]. As a prerequisite we first present similar identities of Eq.(3.2) in more general case, i.e., ξ^a doesn't have to be a killing vector. According to the Ricci identity for no-deflection gravity theory, we have

$$\nabla_a\nabla_b\xi_c + \nabla_b\nabla_c\xi_a - 2\nabla_b\nabla_{(a}\xi_{c)} = R_{abc}{}^d\xi_d, \quad (3.38)$$

and by rotate the index (a, b, c) we can attain other two similar identities, then we can linear use their linear combination and make the contraction to get

$$\nabla_b\nabla^b\xi_a = \nabla_a(\nabla_b\xi^b) - R_a{}^d\xi_d. \quad (3.39)$$

In this subsection we focus on no-rotation case, and at this time the normalized vector U^a is the four-speed related to ξ^a through $U^a = |\xi^b \xi_b|^{-\frac{1}{2}} \xi^a$, and then we can construct the related projective metric h_{ab} as $\delta_a^c = U^c U_a + h_a^c$, and any contraction of h_{ab} and U^a is zero. In this way we can make decomposition

$$\nabla_a \xi_b = (U_a^c + h_a^c)(U_b^d + h_b^d) \nabla_c \xi_d, \quad (3.40)$$

and then by following the common definition in Raychaudhuri equation [47], i.e., $B_{ab} = h_a^c h_b^d \nabla_c \xi_d$, $\theta = \text{Tr}(B_{ab})$, we find

$$\nabla_a \xi^a = \theta - U^c U^d \nabla_c \xi_d. \quad (3.41)$$

Of course for killing vector this sum is equal to 0. But for generic vector it's not. Now considering

$$d\omega = -2\epsilon_{abcd} \nabla_f \nabla^f \xi^a, \quad (3.42)$$

in which ω is the 2-form equal to $\omega_{ab} = \epsilon_{abcd} \nabla^c \xi^d$, and combining this with Eq.(3.39) and Eq.(3.41) we have to replace Eq.(3.2) by

$$M_S = M_{S\mathcal{H}} - \frac{1}{4\pi} \int_{\Sigma} \epsilon_{abcd} (\nabla^a (\theta - U^c U^d \nabla_c \xi_d) - R^a_e \xi^e), \quad (3.43)$$

generally the difference between the mass calculated at different 2-sphere is different, and as we will see in the following calculation, it will grow to infinity as we approach the acceleration horizon.

So now we turn back to physical meaning. We first present the massless limit of Eq.(2.1), i.e.,

$$ds^2 = \frac{1}{(1 - \alpha r \cos \theta)^2} \left[- (1 - \alpha^2 r^2) dt^2 + \frac{dr^2}{(1 - \alpha^2 r^2)} + r^2 (d\theta^2 + \sin^2 \theta d\phi^2) \right], \quad (3.44)$$

and a single coordinate transformation

$$z = \frac{\sqrt{1 - \alpha^2 r^2}}{\alpha(1 - \alpha r \cos \theta)}, \quad \rho = \frac{r \sin \theta}{1 - \alpha r \cos \theta}, \quad \tau = \alpha t, \quad (3.45)$$

is enough to change the metric to the form

$$ds^2 = -z^2 d\tau^2 + d\tau^2 + d\rho^2 + \rho^2 d\phi^2, \quad (3.46)$$

which is precisely the Minkowski metric in Rindler coordinate [48]. To transform to the usual flat coordinate we need a further transformation $Z = \pm z \cosh \tau$, $T = \pm z \sinh \tau$. Then T and Z is respectively interpreted as the time and one spatial coordinate of an inertial observer. In this circumstance we face two alternatives, one with the usual definition, i.e., to choose the ξ^a to be just $(\frac{\partial}{\partial t})^a = \alpha(\frac{\partial}{\partial \tau})^a$. The second choice is also natural: to choose ξ^a as $(\frac{\partial}{\partial T})^a$. If we use the second definition we are going to calculate something observed by a static observer, in the understanding that the whole spacetime background is accelerating and moving away from it. Of course in the massless case both construction end up with $M_S = 0$ for any $r = \text{const}$ 2-sphere as expected. But difference emerge if spacetime parameter $m \neq 0$. This time we cannot easily change the metric to a form very close to Rindler metric if we remain the new coordinates defined by Eq.(3.45). The vector must also differ from simply $(\frac{\partial}{\partial T})^a$. The most appropriate choice is

$$\xi^a = \sinh \tau \sqrt{1 - \alpha^2 r^2} \left[\left(1 - \frac{2m}{r}\right) (\cos \theta - \alpha r) \left(\frac{\partial}{\partial r}\right)^a + \sqrt{\frac{1 - \frac{2m}{r}}{1 - 2\alpha m \cos \theta}} \frac{\sin \theta}{r} \left(\frac{\partial}{\partial \theta}\right)^a \right] + \frac{\cosh \tau}{z} \left(\frac{\partial}{\partial \tau}\right)^a, \quad (3.47)$$

and clearly when $m = 0$ this is just $(\frac{\partial}{\partial T})^a$, considering the relation

$$\left(\frac{\partial}{\partial z}\right)^a = \sqrt{1 - \alpha^2 r^2} \left[(\cos \theta - \alpha r) \left(\frac{\partial}{\partial r}\right)^a + \frac{\sin \theta}{r} \left(\frac{\partial}{\partial \theta}\right)^a \right], \quad (3.48)$$

together with

$$\left(\frac{\partial}{\partial T}\right)^a = \sinh \tau \left(\frac{\partial}{\partial z}\right)^a + \frac{\cosh \tau}{z} \left(\frac{\partial}{\partial \tau}\right)^a. \quad (3.49)$$

The reason for choosing the form Eq.(3.47) is from two different angles, actually from two special case of C-metric: one Rindler

and one Schwarzschild. One can confirm that ξ^a now satisfies

$$\xi^a \xi_a = -1 + \frac{2m}{r}, \quad (3.50)$$

which is in accordance to the one calculated from the killing vector in Schwarzschild spacetime. At the same time, it is not equal to that of C-metric but just as in massless limit the norm only differs in a conformal factor Ω^2 , which precisely describes the effect of choosing a different “static” observer. Now we can use Eq.(3.1) to calculate the mass on a certain $t, r = \text{const}$ 2-sphere as

$$M_S = m \cosh(\alpha t) \left[\frac{\sqrt{1 - \alpha^2 r^2} \operatorname{arctanh}(\alpha r)}{\alpha r} + \frac{2}{\sqrt{1 - \alpha^2 r^2}} \frac{\operatorname{arctanh}(\alpha r) - \alpha r}{\alpha r} \right], \quad (3.51)$$

we note that the second term in Eq.(3.51) is a pure acceleration effect, as when $\alpha = 0$ it is always 0. But when the observer approaches the acceleration horizon this term quickly becomes dominant and finally unbounded while the first term reduces to 0. Around the trace of the black hole, i.e., $r \approx 0$ the first term still exists and the whole mass becomes $m \cosh(\alpha t)$, and it is notable that this is exactly the observed mass (actually its energy) in a inertial reference system for a point particle whose acceleration is α and 3-speed is $v = \tanh(\alpha t)$. Then if we abandon the $\cosh(\alpha t)$ term we can get a mass with some physical meaning.

IV. HOLOGRAPHY DUAL OF ROTATING C-METRIC IN NARIAI LIMIT

We first consider the specific form of the metric in Nariai limit [18, 49]. In this limit we had better set $\Delta_\phi = 1$, because as illustrated in Sec.III, otherwise most of the expressions in the near-extremal metric will be singular. And now we can still read the thermodynamic variables easily by the replacement

$$M \rightarrow \frac{M}{\Delta_\phi}, \quad \mathcal{A} \rightarrow \frac{\mathcal{A}}{\Delta_\phi}, \quad J \rightarrow \frac{J}{\Delta_\phi^2}, \quad \Omega \rightarrow \Delta_\phi \Omega, \quad \mathcal{Q} \rightarrow \frac{\mathcal{Q}}{\Delta_\phi}, \quad (4.1)$$

obviously the Smarr relation is unchanged, and the only thing to change in the first law will be to extend the tube H_T to both north and south pole. From the expression in Eq.(2.1), we see generally there should be three horizons, at the location $r = r_-$, $r = r_+$ and $r = \frac{1}{\alpha}$, in which r_- and r_+ satisfy the relation $r_+ r_- = a^2 + e^2$, $r_+ + r_- = 2m$. Now we take the limit in which r_+ approaches $\frac{1}{\alpha}$, rather than the usual treatment of $r_- \rightarrow r_+$ [5]. In this limit the definition of those metric functions in Eq.(2.2) and Eq.(2.3) reads as

$$\Omega = 1 - \alpha r \cos \theta, \quad P = (1 - \cos \theta)(1 - \alpha r_- \cos \theta), \quad (4.2)$$

$$\rho^2 = r^2 + a^2 \cos^2 \theta, \quad \Delta = -\frac{1}{\alpha}(r - r_-)(1 - \alpha r)^2(1 + \alpha r), \quad (4.3)$$

and now we focus on the near horizon limit of this solution. As usual we introduce the dimensionless coordinates as in [19]:

$$r \rightarrow \frac{\alpha r - 1}{\lambda}, \quad t \rightarrow \frac{\lambda t}{b}, \quad \phi \rightarrow \phi + \tilde{b} t, \quad (4.4)$$

in which

$$b = \frac{1 + \alpha^2 a^2}{2(1 - \alpha r_-)\alpha}, \quad \tilde{b} = -\frac{\alpha a^2}{1 + \alpha^2 a^2}, \quad (4.5)$$

and we get

$$ds^2 = \Gamma(\theta) \left[r^2 dt^2 - \frac{dr^2}{r^2} + \gamma(\theta) d\theta^2 + \beta(\theta) (d\phi + \zeta r dt)^2 \right] \quad (4.6)$$

where

$$\Gamma(\theta) = \frac{(1 + \alpha^2 a^2 \cos^2 \theta)}{2\alpha^2 (1 - \cos \theta)^2 (1 - \alpha r_-)}, \quad \gamma(\theta) = \frac{2(1 - \alpha r_-)}{(1 - \cos \theta)(1 - \alpha r_- \cos \theta)} \quad (4.7)$$

and

$$\beta(\theta) = \frac{2(1 - \alpha r_-)(1 - \cos \theta)(1 - \alpha r_- \cos \theta)(1 + a^2 \alpha^2)^2 \sin^2 \theta}{(1 + \alpha^2 a^2 \cos^2 \theta)^2} \quad (4.8)$$

$$\zeta = \frac{a\alpha}{(1 + a^2 \alpha^2)(1 - \alpha r_-)}. \quad (4.9)$$

Eq.(4.6) is precisely the type of Nariai limit [39]. Meanwhile, the gauge field reads as (after a gauge transformation to move out a infinite constant)

$$A = -\frac{e}{1 + a^2 \alpha^2 \cos^2 \theta} \left[\frac{1 - a^2 \alpha^2 \cos^2 \theta}{2(1 - \alpha r_-)} r dt + a \alpha \sin^2 \theta d\phi \right], \quad (4.10)$$

As presented in the introduction, the Nariai C-metric geometry is $dS_2 \times \tilde{S}^2$, in which \tilde{S}^2 is the deformed 2-sphere. Thus the isometry group of this geometry is generated by

$$\xi_{-1} = \left(\frac{\partial}{\partial t} \right)^a, \quad \xi_0 = t \left(\frac{\partial}{\partial t} \right)^a - r \left(\frac{\partial}{\partial r} \right)^a, \quad (4.11)$$

$$\xi_1 = \left(\frac{1}{2r^2} + \frac{t^2}{2} \right) \left(\frac{\partial}{\partial t} \right)^a - tr \left(\frac{\partial}{\partial r} \right)^a - \frac{\zeta}{r} \left(\frac{\partial}{\partial \phi} \right)^a, \quad L_0 = \left(\frac{\partial}{\partial \phi} \right)^a, \quad (4.12)$$

which satisfies the $SL(2, R) \times U(1)$ algebra:

$$[\xi_0, \xi_{\pm 1}] = \pm \xi_{\pm 1}, \quad [\xi_{-1}, \xi_{+1}] = \xi_0. \quad (4.13)$$

in which $\xi_{\pm 1,0}$ serve as the $SL(2, R)$ generators while L_0 serves as the $U(1)$ generator. This is precisely the whole generators of the symmetric group of warped CFT_2 . And just as explained before, this originates from the fact that every cross section of Nariai geometry fixing θ is a warped dS_3 spacetime with symmetry breaking (deforming the S^1 radius fibered on dS_2), whose isometry group is exactly $SL(2, R) \times U(1)$. The identification of ϕ and $\phi + 2\pi$ plays the role of taking finite temperature when discussing the dual conformal field theory [50, 51], while another coordinate corresponds to Lorentz time. The next step is to confirm the asymptotic symmetry group (ASG) of the geometry. ASG is defined as quotient group:

$$ASG = \frac{\text{All allowed diffeomorphisms}}{\text{Trivial diffeomorphisms}}, \quad (4.14)$$

where ‘‘Allowed’’ restricts the generator of the diffeomorphism to preserve certain asymptotic condition of the spacetime. The meaning of ‘‘Trivial’’ here relies on the following symplectic structure:

$$\{Q_\xi, \Phi\} = \mathcal{L}_\xi \Phi, \quad (4.15)$$

in which $\{, \}$ denotes the Dirac brackets, when there exists constraints in the phase space of the system. Then in General Relativity the calculation of Q_ξ is typically only effective as the boundary terms, and when the boundary integration gives zero value it will be a trivial diffeomorphism. Here as first pointed out in [19], to keep the asymptotic structure of Nariai geometry, the perturbation from the original metric should be

$$h_{\mu\nu} \sim \mathcal{O} \left(\begin{array}{cccc} r^2 & 1 & 1/r & 1/r^2 \\ & 1 & 1/r & 1/r \\ & & 1/r & 1/r^2 \\ & & & 1/r^3 \end{array} \right), \quad (4.16)$$

and thus the most general generator of the diffeomorphism to preserve the asymptotic condition is

$$\xi_\epsilon = \epsilon(\phi) \left(\frac{\partial}{\partial \phi} \right)^a - r \epsilon'(\phi) \left(\frac{\partial}{\partial r} \right)^a, \quad (4.17)$$

and we can express it in the basis $\xi_n = \xi(-\exp^{-in\phi})$ which satisfies the Virasoro algebra

$$i[\xi_m, \xi_n] = (m - n)\xi_{m+n}, \quad (4.18)$$

and the next question is to confirm the central charge of this CFT. At the quantum level, Eq.(4.18) can be applied central extension to satisfy the most general form of Virasoro algebra, and the central charge is defined to be

$$c = 12i \lim_{r \rightarrow \infty} Q_{\xi_m} [\mathcal{L}_{\xi_{-m}} g, g], \quad (4.19)$$

where [52]

$$Q_{\xi}[h, g] = \frac{1}{8\pi} \int_S dS_{ab} (\xi^b \nabla^a h + \xi_c \nabla^b h^{ca} + \xi^a \nabla_c h^{cb} + \frac{1}{2} h \nabla^a \xi^b + \frac{1}{2} h^{ac} \nabla_c \xi^b + \frac{1}{2} h^{bc} \nabla^a \xi_c). \quad (4.20)$$

In spacetime of the form Eq.(4.6), we can get the central charge

$$c = 3\zeta \int_0^\pi \sin \theta \Gamma(\theta) \sqrt{\beta(\theta) \gamma(\theta)} d\theta, \quad (4.21)$$

Now this central charge term is again a positive infinite value, which accords to the requirement of near-extremal limit of the Cardy formula for entropy calculating. In this limit of the two chiral temperatures one is a finite sum while another precisely vanishes [53], and the partition function will mostly comes from the contribution of vacuum state, no matter for unitary or non-unitary case [51]. However, as there is no guarantee that the CFT is unitary, it is more likely that we are calculating something more similar to pseudo entropy rather than entanglement entropy [24]. Its regular term reads as

$$c^{(\delta)} = -\frac{a}{\alpha(1 - \alpha r_-)}, \quad (4.22)$$

Although in non-extremal case there exists two different temperatures, in extremal limit there is no such problem [18]. Thus we can choose the temperature on the event horizon and write in the expression

$$T_{bh} = \frac{\kappa_{bh}}{2\pi} = \frac{(r_+ - r_-)[1 - (\alpha r_+)^2]}{4\pi(r_+^2 + a^2)}, \quad (4.23)$$

in which we regard a still as a free parameter independent of the variance in r_+ , and we write the angular velocity as

$$\Omega_{bh} = \frac{a}{a^2 + r_+^2}, \quad (4.24)$$

As usual, in the near-extremal limit, the bound states of the Nariai C-metric with boundary condition Eq.(4.16) is only regarded as in duality to a chiral half of the 2-D CFT. On gravity side, we need to adopt the interpretation of Frolov-Thorne state [54], which serves as the same role of Hawking-Hartle states in extremal limit, according to Equivalence principle. The energy of certain normal modes with angular quantum number m observed by ZAMO observers near the horizon and energy ϵ observed by distant observers have the match

$$\tilde{\epsilon} = \epsilon - m\Omega_{\mathcal{H}}, \quad (4.25)$$

and in extremal limit we cannot neglect the contribution of the second term in RHS, so the effective temperature of left moving modes should be calculated as

$$T_L = -\lim_{r_+ \rightarrow \frac{1}{\alpha}} \frac{T_{bh}}{\Omega_{bh}^{ext} - \Omega_{bh}} = \frac{(1 - \alpha r_-)[1 + (a\alpha)^2]}{4\pi a\alpha}, \quad (4.26)$$

here the minus sign is a natural choice as the limit is taken from the inner side. Then by using the Cardy entropy formula, we have

$$S_{CFT} = \frac{\pi^2}{3} c^{(\delta)} T_L = -\frac{\pi[1 + (a\alpha)^2]}{12\alpha^2} = \frac{1}{4} \mathcal{A}^{(\delta)}, \quad (4.27)$$

which exactly reproduces Hawking-Bekenstein formula of the black hole entropy.

As discussed in the introduction, this application of the Cardy formula is speculative. There is no conclusive evidence that quantum gravity in a de Sitter background is in fact unitary, given that it only appears as a metastable vacuum in string theory. At the same time, it is not understood how the rotating Nariai geometry maps to a thermal state in the CFT. Therefore, although satisfying, the above formula requires further explanation [49].

V. REDUCTION TO JT GRAVITY MODEL

First consider the Einstein-Hilbert action of the general form in 4 dimension [55]

$$I_G = -\frac{1}{16\pi G_4} \int d^4x \sqrt{-g} R - \frac{1}{8\pi G_4} \int_{\Sigma} \sqrt{\gamma} K, \quad (5.1)$$

in which G_4 is the 4-D Newton constant, Σ is the conformal boundary of Poincare patch, and with the metric given by

$$ds^2 = f(\theta) g_{ab} dx^a dx^b + h(\theta) \Phi^2 d\theta^2 + p(\theta) \Phi^2 (d\phi + A_a dx^a)^2, \quad (5.2)$$

where a, b stands for coordinates t, r and Φ^2 is regarded as the dilation, while A_a stands for the gauge field, which merely depends on t, r . Follow the most common Kaluza-Klein dimension reduction procedure, we are able to express Eq.(5.1) as

$$\begin{aligned} I_G = & -\frac{1}{8G_4} \int_0^\pi d\theta \int d^2x \sqrt{-g_2} \left[\sqrt{h(\theta)p(\theta)} (\Phi^2 R_2 - 2\Phi \nabla^2 \Phi) - \frac{1}{4} \Phi^4 \frac{\sqrt{h(\theta)p(\theta)^3}}{f(\theta)} F_{ab} F^{ab} \right. \\ & \left. + \frac{(f'(\theta))^2}{2f(\theta)} \sqrt{\frac{p(\theta)}{h(\theta)}} - \frac{2f(\theta)}{\sqrt{h(\theta)}} \left((\sqrt{p(\theta)})'' - \frac{h'(\theta)}{2h(\theta)} (\sqrt{p(\theta)})' \right) \right] \\ & - \frac{1}{4G_4} \int_0^\pi d\theta \int dt \sqrt{\gamma_2} \sqrt{f(\theta)h(\theta)p(\theta)} \Phi^2 K_2. \end{aligned} \quad (5.3)$$

where g_2, γ_2 stands for the determinant of the 2-D metric of g_{ab} and its induced metric γ_{ab} on $r = \infty$ respectively, R_2 stands for the 2-D scalar curvature, and K_2 is the extrinsic curvature of $r = \infty$. We have thrown out sums that is nonzero when g_{ab} is flat in the boundary term. At the same time, we should not forget the contribution of the EM action. If we suppose the vector potential of the form

$$\tilde{A} = k(\theta) A_a dx^a + b(\theta) d\phi, \quad (5.4)$$

then EM action $I_{EM} = \frac{1}{16\pi G_4} \int d^4x F^2$ can be reduced to

$$\begin{aligned} I_{EM} = & \frac{1}{8G_4} \int_0^\pi d\theta \int d^2x \sqrt{-g} \left[\frac{\sqrt{h(\theta)p(\theta)}}{f(\theta)} k^2(\theta) \Phi^2 F_{ab} F^{ab} + 2(k'(\theta) - b'(\theta))^2 \sqrt{\frac{p(\theta)}{h(\theta)}} A_a A^a \right. \\ & \left. + 2 \frac{f(\theta)}{\sqrt{h(\theta)p(\theta)}} \frac{b'(\theta)^2}{\Phi^2} \right] + \text{boundary terms related to phase modes.} \end{aligned} \quad (5.5)$$

Now we focus on the reduced metric and abandon these indices in following calculation. When the rotating C-metric is in the usual extremal limit, i.e., $r_+ = r_- = r_e$, and

$$f(\theta) = \frac{1 + u^2 \cos^2 \theta}{2(1 - \alpha r_e \cos \theta)^2}, \quad h(\theta) = \frac{1 + u^2 \cos^2 \theta}{2(1 - \alpha r_e \cos \theta)^4}, \quad p(\theta) = \frac{\sin^2 \theta (1 + u^2)^2}{2(1 + u^2 \cos^2 \theta)}, \quad (5.6)$$

in which $u = \frac{a}{r_e}$, and we have

$$\begin{aligned} I_G = & -\frac{1 + u^2}{8G_4} \int d^2x \sqrt{-g} \left[\frac{\Phi^2 R - 2\Phi \nabla^2 \Phi}{1 - \alpha^2 r_e^2} - \frac{\Phi^4}{2} \left(\frac{1 + u^2}{2} \right)^2 \frac{u + (u^2 - 1) \arctan u}{u^3} F_{ab} F^{ab} \right. \\ & \left. + \frac{u + (1 - u^2) \arctan u}{u} \right] - \frac{1 + u^2}{8\sqrt{2}G_4} \int dt \sqrt{\gamma} g(\alpha r_e, u) \Phi^2 K, \end{aligned} \quad (5.7)$$

where

$$\begin{aligned} g(x, y) = & \frac{1}{2} \left[\frac{2y^2(x^2 + 1) + 4x^2 \sqrt{1 + y^2}}{(x^2 - 1)^2} \frac{\sqrt{1 + y^2}}{x^2 + y^2} \right. \\ & \left. + \frac{y^2}{(x^2 + y^2)^{3/2}} \left(\ln \left(\frac{1 + x}{1 - x} \right) + \ln \left(\frac{x + y^2 + \sqrt{1 + y^2} \sqrt{x^2 + y^2}}{x - y^2 + \sqrt{1 + y^2} \sqrt{x^2 + y^2}} \right) \right) \right], \end{aligned} \quad (5.8)$$

and the static solution corresponds to

$$\Phi_0^2 = 2r_e^2, \quad g_{ab}dx^a dx^b = \frac{2r_e^2}{1 - \alpha^2 r_e^2} \left(-r^2 dt^2 + \frac{dr^2}{r^2} \right), \quad A_a = \frac{2ar_e r}{(1 - \alpha^2 r_e^2)(a^2 + r_e^2)} \delta_{at}, \quad (5.9)$$

In extremal limit, the gauge field is described by

$$k(\theta) = -e \frac{u^2 + 1}{2u} \frac{1 - u^2 \cos^2 \theta}{1 + u^2 \cos^2 \theta}, \quad b(\theta) = -e \frac{u \sin^2 \theta}{1 + u^2 \cos^2 \theta}, \quad (5.10)$$

and bring them into Eq.(5.5) in we are able to get

$$I_{EM} = \frac{e^2(1+u^2)}{8G_4} \int d^2x \sqrt{-g} \frac{(1+u^2)^2}{4u^2} \left[\frac{1-u^2}{(1+u^2)^2} + \frac{\arctan u}{u} \right] \Phi^2 F_{ab} F^{ab} + \frac{2}{\Phi^2} \left[\frac{u^2-1}{(1+u^2)^2} + \frac{\arctan u}{u} \right], \quad (5.11)$$

as we see, the crucial relation $k(\theta) - b(\theta) = -e \frac{1-u^2}{2u}$ guarantees that the reduced EM field is still massless. Here, parameter e is not independent given two action parameters and static solution, but can be expressed as $\frac{\Phi_0^2}{2}(1-u^2)$.

In our Nariai limit

$$f(\theta) = \frac{1 + \alpha^2 a^2 \cos^2 \theta}{2(1 - \cos \theta)^2}, \quad (5.12)$$

$$h(\theta) = \frac{1 + \alpha^2 a^2 \cos^2 \theta}{2(1 - \cos \theta)^3 (1 - \alpha r_- \cos \theta)}, \quad (5.13)$$

$$p(\theta) = \frac{\sin^2 \theta (1 - \alpha r_- \cos \theta) (1 + a^2 \alpha^2)^2}{2(1 - \cos \theta) (1 + \alpha^2 a^2 \cos^2 \theta)}, \quad (5.14)$$

we have the regularized action

$$I^{(\delta)} = -\frac{1 + a^2 \alpha^2}{16G_4} \int d^2x \sqrt{g} \left[-\frac{1}{6} (\Phi^2 R - 2\Phi \nabla^2 \Phi) - \frac{\Phi^4}{4} g_1(\alpha a, \alpha r_-) F_{ab} F^{ab} + g_2(\alpha a, \alpha r_-) - \frac{1 + a^2 \alpha^2}{4G_4} \int dt \frac{5\alpha^2 a^2 - 1}{3\sqrt{1 + \alpha^2 a^2}} \sqrt{\gamma} K \right], \quad (5.15)$$

where

$$g_1(x, y) = \frac{x^3 + xy + (1+x^2)(x^2-y)\arctan x}{x^3} (1+x^2), \quad (5.16)$$

$$g_2(x, y) = \frac{2}{3}y + \frac{7}{3} + 2(y-x^2) \frac{\arctan x}{x} + 3 \frac{2y+x^2-1}{x^2+1}, \quad (5.17)$$

and the static solution is

$$\Phi_0^2 = \frac{2}{\alpha^2}, \quad g_{ab}dx^a dx^b = \frac{1}{\alpha^2(1 - \alpha r_-)} \left(r^2 dt^2 - \frac{dr^2}{r^2} \right), \quad A_a = \frac{ra\alpha}{(1 - \alpha r_-)(1 + a^2 \alpha^2)} \delta_{at}. \quad (5.18)$$

Meanwhile, the gauge field is given by

$$k(\theta) = -\frac{e(1 - \alpha^2 a^2 \cos^2 \theta)(1 + \alpha^2 a^2)}{2(1 + \alpha^2 a^2 \cos^2 \theta)a\alpha}, \quad b(\theta) = -\frac{ea\alpha \sin^2 \theta}{1 + a^2 \alpha^2 \cos^2 \theta}, \quad (5.19)$$

so the reduced EM action is

$$I_{EM} = \frac{e^2(1+a^2\alpha^2)}{16G_4} \int d^2x \frac{(1+a^2\alpha^2)^2}{2a^2\alpha^2} \left[\frac{\arctan a\alpha}{a\alpha} + \frac{1-a^2\alpha^2}{(1+a^2\alpha^2)^2} \right] \Phi^2 F_{ab} F^{ab} + \frac{4}{\Phi^2} \left[\frac{\arctan a\alpha}{a\alpha} + \frac{a^2\alpha^2-1}{(1+a^2\alpha^2)^2} \right], \quad (5.20)$$

Further processing needs us to make the transformation

$$\Phi = \Phi_0(1 + \phi), \quad g_{ab} \rightarrow g_{ab} \frac{\Phi_0}{\Phi}, \quad (5.21)$$

where ϕ stands for usual definition of dilation field and should be distinguished from the angular coordinate introduced in previous chapters. We only keep up to the first order perturbation of the field ϕ , and then the bulk term of Eq.(5.7) (usual extremal action) turns into

$$I = \text{ground terms} - \frac{\Phi_0^2(1+u^2)}{8G_4} \int d^2x \sqrt{g} [a_1 \phi (R - \Lambda) + a_2 \phi \Phi_0^2 F_{ab} F^{ab}], \quad (5.22)$$

where

$$a_1 = \frac{2}{1 - \alpha^2 r_e^2}, \quad (5.23)$$

$$\Lambda = \frac{1}{a_1 \Phi_0^2} \left[1 - 2 \frac{1-u^2}{u} \arctan u + 3 \left(\frac{1-u^2}{1+u^2} \right) \right], \quad (5.24)$$

$$a_2 = \left(\frac{1+u^2}{2} \right)^2 \frac{(1-u^2) \arctan u}{u^3} - \frac{5(1+u^2)^2 + 3(1-u^2)^2}{8u^2}, \quad (5.25)$$

For Nariai case things are rather similar, which also accords to the general form of JT gravity model. As usual, when considering the on-shell action, we can integrate out the dilation configuration and get the equation of motion for metric:

$$a_1(R - \Lambda) + a_2 \Phi_0^2 F_{ab} F^{ab} = 0, \quad (5.26)$$

At the same time with variation of the EM field we can get the Maxwell equation as expected. With the variation of the metric we can get the EOM of dilation:

$$\nabla_a \nabla_b \phi - g_{ab} \nabla^2 \phi - g_{ab} \frac{\Lambda}{2} \phi = -8\pi T_{ab}, \quad (5.27)$$

after this procedure by adding the counter term to regularize, we have the boundary term as a Schwarzian action (proportional to $\text{Sch}\{t, \tau\} \equiv \frac{t'''}{t'} - \frac{3}{2} \left(\frac{t''}{t'} \right)^2$), whose contribution comes from re-parameterization of the conformal boundary (Schwarzian modes). As the rest process is much like the common treatment of JT gravity [55–62], we omit them here.

VI. CONCLUSION AND DISCUSSION

In this study, we present the first law of thermodynamics of the rotating C-metric, reveal the holography duality between the rotating C-metric in Nariai limit and warped CFT₂, and reduce the action to 2 dimension in order to find the correspondence of the extremal black hole to JT gravity solution.

Many difficulties have been found when intending to construct the first law of rotating C-metric. Although there have been many attempts in this realm, either the result is based on parameter perturbation and integrability analyses, which lacks geometrical explanation, or we have the awkward result that the mass of C-metric is zero. The main problems include the treatment of the infinite area of acceleration horizon and the existence of conical singularity, accompanied with cosmic string. The first one leads to the debate on whether the mass defined by us should indeed contain contribution from the acceleration or not. The second one, on the other hand, the variation of the cosmic string can also contribute to the first law, and only by some redefinition of the mass we can reproduce integrability. Still, based on most simple definition of the Komar integral, and choosing the acceleration horizon instead of null infinity, we can have a result that is both nonzero and can reflect the variation of the area in both horizons (event horizon and acceleration horizon). This needs the regularization of the area and also, Komar integral, in order to reflect

the “true” mass together with horizon area considering the black hole solution from the background metric inspired by cosmic string. Moreover, thanks to the redefinition of the circular coordinate, we find the contribution to Smarr formula of two horizons to cancel each other when the event horizon and acceleration horizon coincide. If we merely consider the variation of the event horizon we are supposed to get a nonzero one, which is not typical for extremal black hole. But still this procedure lacks rigorous proof in mathematical level, because we have to imagine the 2-sphere on the acceleration horizon to have two sides, inner one for calculating the black hole mass, outer one for calculating the “acceleration” mass.

Based on the analyses of the thermodynamic variables, we can confidently handle the holography duality when the event horizon and the acceleration horizon coincide, which is exactly the Nariai limit of the rotating C-metric. We find the results are still as expected: the results of the entropy obtained by two dual aspects finally agree with each other, which again proves the correctness of Nariai-CFT correspondence. Still, because there is no existing self-consistent theory to describe the quantum gravity in spacetime with positive cosmological constant, we still lack specific details in presenting this holography dual, and the deeper reason for the results to occur is still unclear. All these problems require profound thoughts in the future. Finally, because there have been a large amount of interesting properties contained in JT gravity system, we present the reduction of the action to the JT form for both the usual extremal limit and Nariai limit of the rotating C-metric, which can provide the basis to many well-known treatments to investigate further quantum effects in this frame.

VII. ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

The author is grateful for discussions with Xin Meng and Yu-Sen Zhou.

-
- [1] J. F. Plebanski and M. Demianski, *Annals Phys.* **98**, 98 (1976).
 - [2] J. B. Griffiths and J. Podolsky, *Exact Space-Times in Einstein’s General Relativity*, Cambridge Monographs on Mathematical Physics (Cambridge University Press, Cambridge, 2009).
 - [3] K. Dutta, S. Ray, and J. Traschen, *Classical and Quantum Gravity* **23**, 335352 (2005).
 - [4] M. Appels, R. Gregory, and D. Kubizk, *Physical Review Letters* **117** (2016), 10.1103/physrevlett.117.131303.
 - [5] M. Astorino, *Physics Letters B* **760**, 393405 (2016).
 - [6] N. H. Rodrguez and M. J. Rodriguez, “First law for kerr taub-nut ads black holes,” (2021), arXiv:2112.00780 [hep-th] .
 - [7] A. B. Bordo, F. Gray, R. A. Hennigar, and D. Kubizk, *Classical and Quantum Gravity* **36**, 194001 (2019).
 - [8] H.-S. Liu, H. L., and L. Ma, *Journal of High Energy Physics* **2022** (2022), 10.1007/jhep10(2022)174.
 - [9] R. Gregory, Z. L. Lim, and A. Scoins, “Thermodynamics of many black holes,” (2020), arXiv:2012.15561 [gr-qc] .
 - [10] A. Anabaln, F. Gray, R. Gregory, D. Kubizk, and R. B. Mann, *Journal of High Energy Physics* **2019** (2019), 10.1007/jhep04(2019)096.
 - [11] P. Saad, S. H. Shenker, and D. Stanford, “Jt gravity as a matrix integral,” (2019), arXiv:1903.11115 [hep-th] .
 - [12] D. M. Eardley, G. T. Horowitz, D. A. Kastor, and J. Traschen, *Phys. Rev. Lett.* **75**, 3390 (1995).
 - [13] S. W. Hawking, G. T. Horowitz, and S. F. Ross, *Phys. Rev. D* **51**, 4302 (1995).
 - [14] A. Ball and N. Miller, *Classical and Quantum Gravity* **38**, 145031 (2021).
 - [15] H. Kim, N. Kim, Y. Lee, and A. Poole, *The European Physical Journal C* **83** (2023), 10.1140/epjc/s10052-023-12266-4.
 - [16] R. Bousso and S. W. Hawking, *Phys. Rev. D* **54**, 6312 (1996).
 - [17] . J. C. Dias and J. P. S. Lemos, *Physical Review D* **68** (2003), 10.1103/physrevd.68.104010.
 - [18] I. Booth and R. Mann, *Nuclear Physics B* **539**, 267306 (1999).
 - [19] M. Guica, T. Hartman, W. Song, and A. Strominger, *Phys. Rev. D* **80**, 124008 (2009).
 - [20] J. D. Brown and M. Henneaux, *Commun. Math. Phys.* **104**, 207 (1986).
 - [21] M. F. A. R. Sakti and P. Burikham, *The European Physical Journal C* **84** (2024), 10.1140/epjc/s10052-024-12537-8.
 - [22] I. Bredberg, C. Keeler, V. Lysov, and A. Strominger, *Nuclear Physics B - Proceedings Supplements* **216**, 194210 (2011).
 - [23] A. Castro, A. Maloney, and A. Strominger, *Physical Review D* **82** (2010), 10.1103/physrevd.82.024008.
 - [24] K. Doi, J. Harper, A. Mollabashi, T. Takayanagi, and Y. Taki, *Physical Review Letters* **130** (2023), 10.1103/physrevlett.130.031601.
 - [25] E. Witten, “Quantum gravity in de sitter space,” (2001), arXiv:hep-th/0106109 [hep-th] .
 - [26] J. Maldacena, G. J. Turiaci, and Z. Yang, “Two dimensional nearly de sitter gravity,” (2020), arXiv:1904.01911 [hep-th] .
 - [27] R. Bousso, *Journal of High Energy Physics* **2000**, 038038 (2000).
 - [28] M. Parikh and E. Verlinde, *Journal of High Energy Physics* **2005**, 054054 (2005).
 - [29] A. Ashtekar and T. Dray, *Commun. Math. Phys.* **79**, 581 (1981).
 - [30] J. B. Griffiths, P. Krtous, and J. Podolsky, *Class. Quant. Grav.* **23**, 6745 (2006), arXiv:gr-qc/0609056 .
 - [31] G. Arenas-Henriquez, R. Gregory, and A. Scoins, *Journal of High Energy Physics* **2022** (2022), 10.1007/jhep05(2022)063.
 - [32] G. Arenas-Henriquez, A. Cisterna, F. Diaz, and R. Gregory, “Accelerating black holes in 2 + 1 dimensions: Holography revisited,” (2023), arXiv:2308.00613 [hep-th] .
 - [33] K. Hong and E. Teo, *Class. Quant. Grav.* **20**, 3269 (2003), arXiv:gr-qc/0305089 .
 - [34] C. W. Misner, *J. Math. Phys.* **4**, 924 (1963).
 - [35] M. Appels, R. Gregory, and D. Kubizk, *Journal of High Energy Physics* **2017** (2017), 10.1007/jhep05(2017)116.
 - [36] T. Dray, *Gen. Rel. Grav.* **14**, 109 (1982).
 - [37] A. Ashtekar and R. O. Hansen, *J. Math. Phys.* **19**, 1542 (1978).
 - [38] A. Komar, *Phys. Rev.* **113**, 934 (1959).

- [39] D. A. Galante, “Modave lecture notes on de sitter space & holography,” (2023), [arXiv:2306.10141 \[hep-th\]](#) .
- [40] D. A. Rasheed, “Non-linear electrodynamics: Zeroth and first laws of black hole mechanics,” (2003), [arXiv:hep-th/9702087 \[hep-th\]](#) .
- [41] R. M. Wald, [Physical Review D](#) **48**, R3427R3431 (1993).
- [42] V. Iyer and R. M. Wald, [Physical Review D](#) **50**, 846864 (1994).
- [43] D. Kofro, [General Relativity and Gravitation](#) **52** (2020), [10.1007/s10714-020-02741-8](#).
- [44] R. Geroch and J. Traschen, [Phys. Rev. D](#) **36**, 1017 (1987).
- [45] M. Astorino, G. Compère, R. Oliveri, and N. Vandevoorde, [Phys. Rev. D](#) **94**, 024019 (2016).
- [46] L. C. B. Crispino, A. Higuchi, and G. E. A. Matsas, [Rev. Mod. Phys.](#) **80**, 787 (2008).
- [47] A. Raychaudhuri, [Phys. Rev.](#) **98**, 1123 (1955).
- [48] W. Rindler, [American Journal of Physics](#) **34**, 1174 (1966).
- [49] D. Anninos and T. Hartman, [Journal of High Energy Physics](#) **2010** (2010), [10.1007/jhep03\(2010\)096](#).
- [50] H. R. Afshar, [Journal of High Energy Physics](#) **2020** (2020), [10.1007/jhep02\(2020\)126](#).
- [51] A. Aggarwal, A. Castro, S. Detournay, and B. Mhlmann, [SciPost Physics](#) **15** (2023), [10.21468/scipostphys.15.2.056](#).
- [52] G. Barnich and F. Brandt, [Nuclear Physics B](#) **633**, 382 (2002).
- [53] A. Ghosh, H. Maxfield, and G. J. Turiaci, [Journal of High Energy Physics](#) **2020** (2020), [10.1007/jhep05\(2020\)104](#).
- [54] V. P. Frolov and K. S. Thorne, [Phys. Rev. D](#) **39**, 2125 (1989).
- [55] U. Moitra, S. K. Sake, S. P. Trivedi, and V. Vishal, [Journal of High Energy Physics](#) **2019** (2019), [10.1007/jhep11\(2019\)047](#).
- [56] T. G. Mertens and G. J. Turiaci, [Living Reviews in Relativity](#) **26** (2023), [10.1007/s41114-023-00046-1](#).
- [57] H. T. Lam, T. G. Mertens, G. J. Turiaci, and H. Verlinde, [Journal of High Energy Physics](#) **2018** (2018), [10.1007/jhep11\(2018\)182](#).
- [58] Z. Yang, [Journal of High Energy Physics](#) **2019** (2019), [10.1007/jhep05\(2019\)205](#).
- [59] P. Saad, “Late time correlation functions, baby universes, and eth in jt gravity,” (2019), [arXiv:1910.10311 \[hep-th\]](#) .
- [60] D. L. Jafferis, D. K. Kolchmeyer, B. Mukhametzhanov, and J. Sonner, “Jt gravity with matter, generalized eth, and random matrices,” (2023), [arXiv:2209.02131 \[hep-th\]](#) .
- [61] D. Harlow and D. Jafferis, “The factorization problem in jackiw-teitelboim gravity,” (2019), [arXiv:1804.01081 \[hep-th\]](#) .
- [62] A. R. Brown, H. Gharibyan, H. W. Lin, L. Susskind, L. Thorlacius, and Y. Zhao, [Physical Review D](#) **99** (2019), [10.1103/physrevd.99.046016](#).