

Black string spectrum of shift-symmetric Horndeski theories

Luis Guajardo *

Instituto de Investigación Interdisciplinaria, Vicerrectoría Académica, Universidad de Talca - Talca, Chile

April 28, 2023

Abstract

In the present work, we study four-dimensional black strings in Horndeski models with translation invariance. Imposing that the scalar field depends on the string-generator coordinate, the Klein-Gordon equation admits a linear profile as a solution. This relaxation allows finding rotating, asymptotically $AdS_3 \times \mathbb{R}$ black strings, dressed with an effective cosmological constant. In this regard, we show that in the full spectrum of shift-symmetric Horndeski theories with Einstein limit, the scalar charge needs to be fixed in terms of the parameter space. This method is employed to concrete examples in order to illustrate the scheme we go along with. On the other hand, regarding the conserved charges, we compute them via the Euclidean method and show the fulfillment of the associated Smarr Law. Finally, we exhibit that our AdS strings are locally and globally stable under small fluctuations around the equilibrium.

1 Introduction

Black strings, black rings, or p -branes in general, are an interesting class of solutions that enrich the phenomenology outreached by General Relativity (GR). At the fundamental level, the Emparan-Reall black ring [1] illustrates that the classical uniqueness theorems [2–4] are no longer valid in five or higher dimensions. Being topologically distinct than black holes, these solutions feature an *extended* event horizon, in which the extra dimensions play a leading role in the existence of a linear unstable mode: the so-called Gregory-Laflamme (GL) instability [5].

Although the oxidation of the Schwarzschild black hole with extended Euclidean coordinates is trivial, at the time of introducing a cosmological constant the process gets more involved. A simple way to obtain exact black strings and p -branes with a negative cosmological constant in arbitrary $D = 3 + p$ dimensions is by introducing $p \geq 1$ massless scalar fields homogeneously distributed along the brane generator coordinates [6]. The main idea relies on the fact that these scalar fields can be minimally coupled to gravity, and the integration constant coming from the Klein-Gordon equation (hereon we will refer to it as the *scalar charge*) is fixed in terms of the cosmological constant. Surprisingly, it was shown that these strings do not trigger the GL instability [7].

Notwithstanding black strings were introduced as higher-dimensional objects, in four dimensions they have also provided interesting phenomena. In addition to the case $p = 1$ from ref. [6], the dynamic sector

*luis.guajardo.r-at-gmail.com

of Chern-Simons Modified Gravity (CSMG) [8] admits rotating and torsional black strings [9]. To be self-contained, the action considered in ref. [9] reads:

$$S[g_{\mu\nu}, \phi] = \frac{1}{2\kappa} \int d^4x \sqrt{-g} \left[R - 2\Lambda + \frac{\alpha}{4} \phi {}^*RR \right] - \frac{1}{2} \int d^4x \sqrt{-g} \nabla_\mu \phi \nabla^\mu \phi. \quad (1.1)$$

Here, $\kappa = 8\pi G$, ${}^*R^{\mu\nu\lambda\rho} = \frac{1}{2} \epsilon^{\lambda\rho\sigma\tau} R^{\mu\nu}{}_{\sigma\tau}$ is the dual of the Riemann tensor, and *RR is the Pontryagin density, defined as:

$${}^*RR \equiv \frac{1}{2} \epsilon^{\gamma\delta\tau\sigma} R^\mu{}_{\nu\gamma\delta} R^\nu{}_{\mu\tau\sigma}, \quad (1.2)$$

with $\epsilon^{\gamma\delta\tau\sigma}$ the Levi-Civita tensor. At this point, we would like to stress that unless otherwise stated, we will set throughout this manuscript a stationary and axisymmetric three-dimensional base manifold with one extended Euclidean coordinate ($p = 1$), that is, a metric tensor belonging to the following family:

$$ds^2 = -N^2(r) f(r) dt^2 + \frac{dr^2}{f(r)} + r^2 (J(r) dt + d\theta)^2 + dz^2. \quad (1.3)$$

The equations of motion obtained from the variation of (1.1) reads:

$$\begin{aligned} G_{\mu\nu} + \Lambda g_{\mu\nu} + \alpha C_{\mu\nu} &= \kappa \left(\nabla_\mu \phi \nabla_\nu \phi - \frac{1}{2} g_{\mu\nu} \nabla_\lambda \phi \nabla^\lambda \phi \right), \\ \square \phi + \frac{\alpha}{8\kappa} {}^*RR &= 0, \end{aligned}$$

where

$$C^{\mu\nu} = \nabla_\rho \phi \epsilon^{\rho\sigma\lambda(\mu} \nabla_\lambda R^{\nu)}{}_\sigma + \nabla_\rho \nabla_\sigma \phi {}^*R^{\sigma(\mu\nu)\rho}.$$

As noted in [9], the vanishing of the Pontryagin density on (1.3) is a valuable resource in obtaining the string solution, since the massless Klein-Gordon equation is recovered, $\square\phi = 0$. If one imposes the scalar field to be dependent on the string coordinate, $\phi = \phi(z)$, a linear profile is obtained:

$$\phi(z) = \omega z + c, \quad (1.4)$$

where the shift-symmetry of the field space (i.e., invariance under the map $\phi \mapsto \phi + C$) protects us to work with $c = 0$ without any loss of generality. Furthermore, they showed that solving the condition $C_{\mu\nu} = 0$ for the CSMG-string was enough to ensure compatibility with the full system of equations. As a consequence, the coupling constant α in the model (1.1) is in some sense untraceable for these CSMG-strings, and the solution can be thought as an extension of the Bañados-Teitelboim-Zanelli (BTZ) black hole [10]. As it was the case for the minimal coupling, the scalar charge is fixed in terms of the cosmological constant. Recently, the thermodynamic properties of these rotating CSMG-strings, as well as stability and string-soliton phase transitions have been discussed in detail in ref. [11].

To enter into the discussion that motivates this work, note as a simple example that the previous results [9, 11] remain to be valid if one swaps the Pontryagin density in (1.1) for the Gauss-Bonnet (GB) density,

$$\mathcal{G} = R^2 - 4R_{ab}R^{ab} + R_{abcd}R^{abcd}. \quad (1.5)$$

Indeed, the previous discussion is way more evident in this case, since the GB density identically vanishes on (1.3). This is because the Riemann tensor does not receive any contribution of the string sector, so the Gauss-Bonnet density on the four-dimensional ansatz is equivalent to its restriction to the three-dimensional

base manifold, leading to the vanishing of (1.5). Again, the contribution of the non minimal coupling $\phi\mathcal{G}$ will be lost and the scalar charge will be fixed in terms of Λ . However, it is important to remark that this “fixing” issue appearing in the previous examples is not generically applicable to other spacetimes. Usually, the introduction of the scalar field circumvents the uniqueness theorems by introducing a new degree of freedom in the system, and “hairy” solutions are likely to appear. In turn, when four dimensional planar black holes with axionic profiles are taken into account, one can obtain hairy black hole solutions [12, 13], and non trivial interactions between gravity and the scalar field in which the scalar charge sustain the mass of the black hole [14, 15]. In the case of black strings, this fixing issue appears as a consequence of the compatibility between the string and the transverse sector, which is of course required to solve the equations. In this work, we will show below that this is going to be always the case for a wide class of scalar-tensor theories (but not a universal statement). Sticking to four dimensions, we choose to start our explorations under Horndeski theory [16, 17], which is the most general scalar-tensor theory that study the interaction between gravity and a scalar field, keeping second order dynamics and avoid ghosts pathologies.

In a pragmatic, but still broad approximation, in the following lines we will generalize the minimally coupled case covering the shift-symmetric sector of Horndeski theories, that is, when the action is invariant under the mapping $\phi \mapsto \phi + c$. In terms of the modern Galileon formulation, the shift-symmetric sector of Horndeski theory can be written as [18, 19]:

$$S[g_{\mu\nu}, \phi] = \int d^4x \sqrt{-g} \sum_{n=2}^5 \mathcal{L}_n, \quad (1.6)$$

with

$$\begin{aligned} \mathcal{L}_2 &= G_2(X), \\ \mathcal{L}_3 &= -G_3(X)\square\phi, \\ \mathcal{L}_4 &= G_4(X)R + G_{4X}(X) [(\square\phi)^2 - \nabla_\mu \nabla_\nu \phi \nabla^\mu \nabla^\nu \phi], \\ \mathcal{L}_5 &= -\frac{G_{5X}(X)}{6} [(\square\phi)^3 - 3\nabla_\mu \nabla_\nu \phi \nabla^\mu \nabla^\nu \phi \square\phi + 2\nabla^\nu \nabla_\mu \phi \nabla^\alpha \nabla_\nu \phi \nabla^\mu \nabla_\alpha \phi] \\ &\quad + G_5(X)G^{\mu\nu} \nabla_\nu \nabla_\mu \phi. \end{aligned}$$

Here, R is the Ricci scalar, $G_{\mu\nu}$ is the Einstein tensor, $X = -\frac{1}{2}\nabla_\mu \phi \nabla^\mu \phi$ stands for the kinetic term, and the subscript G_X denotes the derivative with respect to X . If one imposes to the scalar field a purely string coordinate dependency, the shift symmetric sector is compatible with $\square\phi = 0$ and therefore, a linear profile for the scalar field is always a solution of the Klein-Gordon equation. Using this, we will show that as long as it admits an Einstein limit (defined in such a way that the Einstein-Hilbert model is recovered in absence of the scalar field, i.e., $G_4(0) = 1$), any model supporting a four dimensional black string solution with a linear profile for the scalar field imposes an additional restriction into its charge, fixing it in terms of the parameter space.

In the attempt to organize the following information, in Sec.2 we will explicitly give the requirements that lead to a four dimensional asymptotically $AdS_3 \times \mathbb{R}$ black string, arguing why the scalar charge fixes when the theory possesses an Einstein limit. We perform a thermodynamic analysis for the black string solutions in Sec. 3, also analyzing their stability around the equilibrium, and showing that the thermodynamic quantities satisfy a Smarr relation. We illustrate our results in Sec.4, and finally, Sec. 5 is devoted to our conclusions a further remarks.

2 Main Result

As we stated in the introduction, the ansatz for the metric and the scalar field makes the Klein-Gordon equation compatible with $\square\phi = 0$. To see this, let us start by analyzing the scalar equation for (1.6), given explicitly in Appendix B from ref. [20]. Within our context, and for a generic function $K(X)$, some useful properties appears:

$$\nabla_\mu X = -\nabla_\mu \phi \square\phi, \quad (2.1)$$

$$\nabla_\mu K(X) = -K_X \nabla_\mu \phi \square\phi, \quad (2.2)$$

$$\nabla^\mu [K(X) \nabla_\mu \phi] = \nabla^\mu K(X) \nabla_\mu \phi + K(X) \square\phi = \square\phi (-K_X \nabla^\mu \phi \nabla_\mu \phi + K(X)), \quad (2.3)$$

$$\nabla_\mu \nabla_\nu \phi = \square\phi \delta_\mu^z \delta_\nu^z \quad (2.4)$$

Moreover, since the Riemann tensor does not receive any contribution from the extended coordinate, all the mixed terms of the form $R_{\mu\nu} \nabla^\mu \phi$, $R_{\rho\mu\sigma\nu} \nabla^\nu \phi \nabla^\alpha \nabla^\beta \phi$, etc. also vanish. Therefore, $\square\phi = 0$ is always a solution for the Klein-Gordon equation, and we will assume from now on a linear profile for the scalar field, as in (1.4). As a consequence, the variations of $\mathcal{L}_3, \mathcal{L}_5$ with respect to the metric fields vanish, therefore any solution will be independent of the functions G_3 and G_5 . As a consequence, one does not need to impose parity invariance ($\phi \rightarrow -\phi$), since it will be recovered anyway. All these arguments invite us to study

$$S[g_{\mu\nu}, \phi] = \int d^4x \sqrt{-g} [\mathcal{L}_2 + \mathcal{L}_4], \quad (2.5)$$

with further details.

The variation of the action (2.5) with respect to the metric can be reduced, after inserting the relations (2.1) - (2.4), to:

$$\mathcal{E}_{\mu\nu} := G_4 G_{\mu\nu} - \frac{1}{2} g_{\mu\nu} G_2 - \frac{1}{2} G_{4X} R \nabla_\mu \phi \nabla_\nu \phi - \frac{1}{2} G_{2X} \nabla_\mu \phi \nabla_\nu \phi = 0. \quad (2.6)$$

Splitting the equations (2.6) to the transverse section of the string, and to the string coordinate, respectively reads:

$$G_4 G_{\mu\nu} - \frac{1}{2} G_2 g_{\mu\nu} = 0, \quad (2.7)$$

$$(2X G_{4X} - G_4) R - (G_2 - 2X G_{2X}) = 0. \quad (2.8)$$

Note that the transverse equations are reminiscent of an Einstein-Hilbert configuration, dressed with an *effective* cosmological constant Λ_e :

$$\Lambda_e \equiv -\frac{G_2}{2G_4}. \quad (2.9)$$

In order to obtain a black string solution, we require to match (2.7) with (2.8), yielding to the following restriction:

$$-\frac{3G_2}{G_4} = \frac{2X G_{2X} - G_2}{G_4 - 2X G_{4X}}, \quad (2.10)$$

So far, we have: Given nonzero functions $G_2(X), G_4(X)$ such that the constraint (2.10) is met, a four dimensional rotating black string can be constructed:

$$ds^2 = -N^2(r) f(r) dt^2 + \frac{dr^2}{f(r)} + r^2 (J(r) dt + d\theta)^2 + dz^2, \quad (2.11)$$

with

$$N(r) = 1, \quad J(r) = j_1 - \frac{j_2}{r^2}, \quad \phi(z) = \omega z, \quad (2.12)$$

$$f(r) = -\Lambda_e r^2 - M + \frac{j_2^2}{r^2}, \quad (2.13)$$

and Λ_e as in (2.9). The equation (2.10) is fixing the scalar charge in terms of the parameter space, which may include the *bare* cosmological constant Λ and eventually some other coupling constants from particular theories. The string will be asymptotically $AdS_3 \times \mathbb{R}$ if and only if in the parameter space $\frac{G_2}{G_4} > 0$ ¹, and it can be thought as an extension of the BTZ black hole, dressed with an effective cosmological constant Λ_e .

Of course, there are some subtleties that we are now in position to discuss. For example, one can impose $G_4(0) = 1$ for the model to have an Einstein limit in the absence of the scalar field. This requirement, while natural, is double-edged: on the one hand, it avoids the ill-definition of the denominators from eq. (2.9)-(2.10), but on the other hand, it is inducing the fixing of the scalar charge. To see this, let's think for a moment in the equation (2.10) as a differential equation. If so, we are looking for a relation between the functions $G_2(X), G_4(X)$ such that the equation is satisfied for all X , i.e., the charge is no longer fixed. Actually, (2.10) can be solved as a differential equation, and the functions $G_2(X), G_4(X)$ are related by

$$G_2(X) \propto \frac{G_4(X)^3}{X}.$$

However, for $G_4(0) = 1$ one obtains that $G_2(0)$ is ill-defined. This argument proves that for a scalar field as in (1.4), its charge is *always* rigid in the full spectrum of shift-symmetric Horndeski theories with Einstein limit.

Now that we know that the scalar charge is always fixed in the parameter space, some special cases might occur. For example, it might be the case that exists a nonzero value $X = x^*$ in the parameter space satisfying $G_4(x^*) = 0$. The equations on the base manifold (2.7) force $G_2(x^*)$ to vanish, so that the transverse section is trivial. In that scenario, the equations (2.9) and (2.10) are no longer valid, and the solution for the string can be found by solving

$$R = -\frac{G_{2X}}{G_{4X}} \Big|_{X=x^*}, \quad (2.14)$$

as long as the RHS is well-defined. Note that in this case one could obtain mathematically consistent, asymptotically $AdS_3 \times \mathbb{R}$ even in the absence of the kinetic term and the *bare* cosmological constant Λ . Furthermore, if $G_{2X}(x^*) = 0$ and $G_{4X}(x^*) \neq 0$, asymptotically flat strings are feasible.

On the other hand, suppose a nonzero $X = x^*$ such that $G_4(x^*) \neq 0$, but $2x^*G_{4X}(x^*) - G_4(x^*) = 0$, such that the metric contribution in (2.8) is lost. Then, the string sector is just setting an additional constraint, which has to be satisfied in order to solve the system. In this case, one is left with (2.7), and the following restrictions in the parameter space:

$$G_4(x^*) = 2x^*G_{4X}(x^*), \quad G_2(x^*) = 2x^*G_{2X}(x^*). \quad (2.15)$$

¹In the other case, when the effective cosmological constant is positive, the solution admits an extended cosmological horizon, see e.g. [21]. In this work, we are focusing the interest in AdS -strings, and we do not further elaborate on this case.

3 Black string Thermodynamics

Having the black string solutions from the previous section, we now turn into the thermodynamic analysis. We will focus in our AdS strings from the model (2.5), computing the thermodynamic quantities in the Euclidean approach [22, 23]. The partition function of a thermodynamic ensemble is identified with the Euclidean path integral, in the saddle point approximation around the continuation of the classical solution [23]. In doing so, the time coordinate is periodic and its period β is the inverse of the temperature, $\beta = T^{-1}$. The Euclidean action is then related to the Gibbs free energy \mathfrak{G} by:

$$S_E = \beta\mathfrak{G} = \beta\mathcal{M} - \mathcal{S} - \beta\Omega\mathcal{J}, \quad (3.1)$$

where $\mathcal{M}, \mathcal{S}, \mathcal{J}$ represents the mass, the entropy and the angular momentum of the black string respectively.

In order to obtain the Gibbs free energy, in our case will be enough to consider the Wick rotating ansatz ($t \rightarrow i\tau$) of the metric (1.3) [24]:

$$ds^2 = N(r)^2 f(r) d\tau^2 + \frac{dr^2}{f(r)} + r^2(iJ(r)d\tau + d\theta)^2 + dz^2, \quad (3.2)$$

together with an axionic profile for the scalar field, $\phi = \phi(z)$. The range for the integral will be $\tau \in [0, \beta]$, $r \geq r_h$, $\theta \in [0, \sigma]$, $z \in [0, L]$, where r_h represents the location of the extended event horizon for the string.

The main idea is to evaluate the action (2.5) on the ansatz (3.2) and rewrite it in a reduced Hamiltonian form:

$$S_E = \int d^4x [N\mathcal{H} + N^\varphi\mathcal{H}_\varphi] + B, \quad (3.3)$$

where B is a boundary term that matches the Euclidean action when the Hamiltonian constraints

$$\mathcal{H} = 0, \mathcal{H}_\varphi = 0$$

are satisfied. To fix the boundary term, one first imposes to the Euclidean action have an extreme around the solution, $\delta S_E = 0$, requiring at the same time that the variation of the boundary term, δB , cancels all the contributions coming from the variation of the bulk action [22]. In our case, the reduced Hamiltonian is given by

$$\mathcal{H} = G_4 f' - rG_2 - \frac{p^2}{2G_4 r^3}, \quad (3.4)$$

where $f' = \frac{df}{dr}$ and p is the conjugate momenta of $N^\varphi = J(r)$:

$$\mathcal{H}_\varphi = p'(r) = \left(\frac{G_4(X)J'(r)r^3}{N(r)} \right)'. \quad (3.5)$$

The field equations obtained from the variation respect the dynamic fields N, f, J, p, ϕ reads:

$$\begin{aligned} \mathcal{E}_N &:= \mathcal{H} = 0, \\ \mathcal{E}_f &:= G_4 N'(r) = 0, \\ \mathcal{E}_J &:= \mathcal{H}_\varphi = 0, \\ \mathcal{E}_p &:= -\frac{N(r)p}{G_4 r^3} - J'(r) = 0, \end{aligned}$$

$$\mathcal{E}_\phi := -\ddot{\phi} \left(G_{4X} f' - r G_{2X} + \frac{p^2 G_{4X}}{2G_4^2 r^3} \right) + \dot{\phi}^2 \ddot{\phi} \left(G_{4XX} f' - r G_{2XX} - \frac{p^2}{2r^3} \left[\frac{G_{4XX} G_4^2 - 2G_{4X}^2 G_4}{G_4^4} \right] \right) = 0,$$

where $\dot{\phi} = \frac{d\phi}{dz}$. It's easy to check the consistency of these equations with our black string solution (2.12)-(2.13).

At this point is important to recall that ω is fixed in terms of the parameter space, as we viewed in Sec. 2. Therefore, in this work we will consider a vanishing variation, $\delta\omega = 0$. Using this, the variation of the boundary term δB simply reads

$$\delta B = \beta\sigma L \left[-G_4(X)\delta f - J(r)\delta p \right] \Big|_{r=r_h}^{r=\infty}. \quad (3.6)$$

In virtue of the field equation $\mathcal{E}_J = 0$, one has that p is constant, and we normalize it to $p = 2j_2 G_4(X)$, just to match with the results exhibited in (2.13).

On the other hand, the temperature can be obtained by demanding to the Euclidean metric (3.2) not having conical singularities, which in fact yields:

$$T = \frac{N(r_h) f'(r_h)}{4\pi} = -\frac{\Lambda_e r_h^4 + j_2^2}{2\pi r_h^3}. \quad (3.7)$$

Using the above, the variation of the metric function are given by:

$$\delta f \Big|_{r=\infty} = -\delta M, \quad \delta f \Big|_{r=r_h} = -\frac{4\pi}{\beta} \delta r_h.$$

Working in the grand canonical ensemble, we obtain the following boundary term:

$$B = \beta\sigma L G_4 M - 4\pi\sigma L G_4 r_h - \beta\sigma L \Omega p, \quad (3.8)$$

where we have defined the angular velocity, Ω , as

$$\Omega \equiv J(\infty) - J(r_h) = \frac{j_2}{r_h^2}. \quad (3.9)$$

Therefore, the comparison between (3.1) and (3.8) allows to identify the thermodynamic quantities for the string. In terms of the extended horizon r_h , they are given by:

$$\mathcal{M} = G_4 \left(-\Lambda_e r_h^2 + \frac{j_2^2}{r_h^2} \right) \sigma L, \quad \mathcal{S} = 4\pi G_4 r_h \sigma L, \quad \mathcal{J} = 2G_4 j_2 \sigma L, \quad (3.10)$$

and in view of these results, the mass and the entropy are positive if $G_4(X) > 0$.

Using (3.10) and (3.7) into (3.1), one computes the Gibbs free energy \mathfrak{G} for the string:

$$\mathfrak{G}(T, \Omega) = \frac{4\pi^2 G_4 T^2}{\Lambda_e + \Omega^2} \sigma L. \quad (3.11)$$

Notice that the denominator is negative in order to have a positive temperature (3.7). With this, when $G_4(X) > 0$ one can check that

$$\frac{\partial^2 \mathfrak{G}}{\partial T^2} \leq 0, \quad \frac{\partial^2 \mathfrak{G}}{\partial \Omega^2} \leq 0, \quad \frac{\partial^2 \mathfrak{G}}{\partial T^2} \frac{\partial^2 \mathfrak{G}}{\partial \Omega^2} - \left(\frac{\partial^2 \mathfrak{G}}{\partial T \partial \Omega} \right)^2 \geq 0,$$

which means that \mathfrak{G} is a concave function, ensuring global stability. Furthermore, it is also interesting to study local stability, under small perturbations around the equilibrium. In our case, the specific heat capacity c_T and the isothermal compressibility reads

$$c_T = T \left(\frac{\partial \mathcal{S}}{\partial T} \right) = -\frac{8\pi^2 G_4 T}{\Lambda_e + \Omega^2} \sigma L \quad (3.12)$$

$$\kappa_T = \frac{1}{\mathcal{J}} \left(\frac{\partial \mathcal{J}}{\partial \Omega} \right) = \frac{\Lambda_e - 3\Omega^2}{\Omega(\Lambda_e + \Omega^2)} \quad (3.13)$$

To ensure the stability under thermal fluctuations, we require $G_4(X) > 0$. If that is the case, both quantities are positive, therefore the string is also stable under small fluctuations.

We end this section showing that the thermodynamic quantities (3.7), (3.10) satisfy a Smarr relation [25]. To see this, we closely follow the ideas from [26]. It is straightforward to check that the reduced action (3.3), (3.4) is invariant under the scalings:

$$\begin{aligned} \bar{r} &= \xi r, & \bar{f} &= \xi^2 f, & \bar{N} &= \xi^{-2} N, \\ \bar{\phi} &= \phi, & \bar{J} &= \xi^{-2} J, & \bar{p} &= \xi^2 p. \end{aligned}$$

From this scaling symmetry, a direct application of the Nöether theorem shows that the quantity

$$C(r) = [-G_4(X)(-r f' + 2f) - J(r)(-r p' + 2p)] \sigma L \quad (3.14)$$

is conserved, $C'(r) = 0$. Therefore one can evaluate the above expression at the infinity and the horizon, and $C(\infty) = C(r_h)$ must hold. This leads to

$$\begin{aligned} C(\infty) &= 2G_4(X) M \sigma L = 2\mathcal{M}, \\ C(r_h) &= (-G_4(X)(-4\pi T r_h) - 2J(r_h)p) \sigma L = T\mathcal{S} + 2\Omega\mathcal{J}. \end{aligned}$$

Hence, one gets

$$\mathcal{M} = \frac{1}{2} T\mathcal{S} + \Omega\mathcal{J}, \quad (3.15)$$

which is the Smarr relation.

4 Exploring *AdS* black strings with scalar field couplings

It is now simple to revisit, for instance, the minimally coupled case, which follows from $G_2(X) = -2\Lambda + X$ and $G_4(X) = 1$. Also note that our equations (2.7) and (2.8) reproduce (10) and (11) from ref. [6].

Another simple example is the non-minimal coupling between the scalar field and the Gauss-Bonnet density, $\phi\mathcal{G}$, as we briefly mentioned in the introduction. In the Galileons formulation, this coupling is given by $G_5(X) = -4 \ln X$, but since $G_5(X)$ plays no role in the solution, we are left again with the same results from [6], in agreement with our hand-waving explanation.

To provide a more involved example, let us expand the previous discussion by considering the following action principle:

$$S[g_{\mu\nu}, \phi] = \frac{1}{16\pi G} \int d^4x \sqrt{-g} \left[R - 2\Lambda - \frac{\eta}{2} \nabla_\mu \phi \nabla^\mu \phi - \alpha(\phi\mathcal{G} - 4G^{\mu\nu} \nabla_\mu \phi \nabla_\nu \phi + 8X \square \phi - 8X^2) \right], \quad (4.1)$$

in which the minimal coupling have been enriched with a parameter η (the one is taken to be non negative to avoid phantom scalars) and also complemented with an extra term that can be motivated in many ways. In fact, this extra contribution preserves the conformal invariance of the Klein-Gordon equation, as shown in ref. [27]. Very recently, in ref. [28] it was shown that the generalized scalar-tensor action from ref. [27] can be casted as a singular limit from D dimensional conformal scalar invariant theories [29, 30]. In other contexts, this theory admits asymptotically flat black holes [31], and some astrophysical constraints were imposed in ref. [32]. The same Lagrangian also appears by dimensional reductions from Lovelock theories [31, 33–35].

In terms of the Galileons, the action (4.1) is casted by defining $G_2(X) = -2\Lambda + \eta X + 8\alpha X^2$, $G_3(X) = -8\alpha X$, $G_4(X) = 1 + 4\alpha X$ and $G_5(X) = 4\alpha \ln X$. Note that the action here satisfy $G_4(0) = 1$, and therefore, our theorem for Sec 2 ensures that the scalar charge is a constant, written in terms of α , η , and Λ . This provides a complete exercise to illustrate all the possible scenarios that we have discussed previously.

First, note that if $\alpha > 0$, then $X = x^* = -\frac{1}{4\alpha}$ is a nonzero value satisfying $G_4(x^*) = 0$. Thus, the scalar charge is fixed by $\omega^2 = \frac{1}{2\alpha}$. As we saw in Sec. 2 we must have

$$G_2(x^*) = 0 \implies \Lambda = \frac{2 - \eta}{8\alpha},$$

and consequently, the metric function is obtained by solving (2.14), with:

$$\frac{G_{2X}}{G_{4X}} = \frac{\eta + 16\alpha X}{4\alpha} \Big|_{X=x^*} = \frac{\eta - 4}{4\alpha}.$$

Note that the equation (2.14) relates three independent functions, hence one expects a degenerate behavior. For example, fixing $N(r) = 1$ one can cast the metric as:

$$ds^2 = -f(r) dt^2 + \frac{dr^2}{f(r)} + r^2(J(r)dt + d\theta)^2 + dz^2, \quad (4.2)$$

$$f(r) = \frac{(\eta - 4)r^2}{24\alpha} + \frac{C_1}{r} + C_2 + \frac{1}{2r^2} \int r^4(J'(r))^2 dr, \quad \phi(z) = \frac{z}{\sqrt{2\alpha}}, \quad (4.3)$$

Here C_1, C_2 are integration constants coming from the equation (2.14), and $J(r)$ is a free function. One can note that for $\eta = 4$, the static case admits asymptotically flat solutions provided $\alpha > 0$, followed by a time scaling. We highlight that these solutions are degenerate because the *on-shell* action vanishes at the point $X = x^*$, therefore they cannot be seen neither as an extension of the BTZ black hole nor Schwarzschild black holes. For this reason, we do not further elaborate on this particular solution.

Aside of the mentioned case, applying the constraint (2.10) for the model (4.1) fixes the scalar charge ω in terms of Λ, α, η via a fourth order algebraic equation:

$$\alpha(6 - \eta)\omega^4 - (8\alpha\Lambda + \eta)\omega^2 - 2\Lambda = 0, \quad (4.4)$$

which can be solved explicitly:

$$\omega = \pm \left(\frac{(8\alpha\Lambda + \eta) \pm \sqrt{(8\alpha\Lambda + \eta)^2 + 8\alpha\Lambda(6 - \eta)}}{2\alpha(6 - \eta)} \right)^{1/2}. \quad (4.5)$$

Therefore, and using Λ_e as defined in (2.9), the metric for the black string in this theory can be cast as (2.12), (2.13):

$$ds^2 = -N^2(r)f(r) dt^2 + \frac{dr^2}{f(r)} + r^2(J(r)dt + d\theta)^2 + dz^2,$$

$$N(r) = 1, \quad f(r) = -\Lambda_e r^2 - M + \frac{j_2^2}{r^2}, \quad J(r) = j_1 - \frac{j_2}{r^2}, \quad \phi(z) = \omega z,$$

and

$$\Lambda_e = -\frac{\omega^2(\eta - 8\alpha\omega^2)}{4(1 + 4\alpha\omega^2)}, \quad (4.6)$$

where ω is defined in (4.5). The expression for Λ_e in terms of α, η and Λ is not illuminating, so we have decided not to display it. The black string is asymptotically $AdS_3 \times \mathbb{R}$ as long as $\Lambda_e < 0$, with an effective AdS_3 curvature radius given by

$$\frac{1}{\ell} \equiv -\Lambda_e. \quad (4.7)$$

Before starting the analysis of the scalar charge in the parameter space, and subsequently the black string solution, let us briefly comment some general aspects. Note in the first place that the parameter space contains three continuous parameters (α, Λ, η) , and we have imposed by hand $\eta \geq 0$ to avoid phantom scalars. In the following, we will further restrict ourselves to $\eta \in \{0, 1, 6\}$ because we can keep track of the phenomenology in the absence of the minimal coupling ($\eta = 0$), the standard case $\eta = 1$, and the ill-definition in the denominator in (4.5). Of course, other cases might be studied as well, but they don't provide further insights. For the same reasons, the case $\eta = 6$ is left as an Appendix A.

Secondly, the smooth limit $\alpha \rightarrow 0$ in (4.4) recovers the minimally coupled case from ref. [6]. One can directly check in virtue of (4.4) that the kinetic term was mandatory to avoid the vanishing of the cosmological constant Λ . We take this fact as an input to split the rest of the analysis depending on the sign of α .

Thirdly, although the action (4.1) does not possess parity invariance ($\phi \rightarrow -\phi$), as we mentioned in Sec. 2 it's recovered *on-shell*, thus the analysis can be carried out independent of the outer sign of ω . We will present some plots using the positive outer sign just for convenience. However, some differences are likely to appear because of the internal \pm sign in (4.5). We will refer to them as the *positive* and *negative* branches of ω , hoping that these nicknames can be illustrative of the different outcomes due to this sign.

Last but not least, since the case $G_4(x^*) = 0$ was discussed earlier, until the end of this section we will assume $G_4(X) = 1 + 4\alpha X \neq 0, \forall X$.

4.1 $\alpha > 0$

First, let's take a look in the $\eta = 0$ case, which means that the minimal coupling is absent. Regarding to the domain constraints imposed by (4.5), Λ has to be restricted to non-negative values, and the negative branch of ω is forbidden due to mathematical inconsistencies. Moreover, it follows from (4.6) that Λ_e is positive, thus cosmological horizons appear.

The standard coupling $\eta = 1$ is more interesting. First, both branches are allowed when Λ belongs to the interval

$$I = \left[\frac{-7 + 3\sqrt{5}}{16\alpha}, 0 \right]. \quad (4.8)$$

The negative branch ceases to exist outside this interval, in contrast with its positive counterpart (see Fig. 1 below). When Λ attains its minimum on I , both branches fix the scalar charge to the same value, $\omega^2 = \frac{3\sqrt{5}-5}{20\alpha}$. From this results, it is observed that the coupling constant α is in some sense a scale factor, so changing its value will not modify the conclusions. In the next figure, we illustrate both branches of ω in terms of Λ :




Figure 1: ω in terms of Λ , for $\alpha > 0$. The red plot (solid) corresponds to the positive branch of ω , that is, considering the $+$ sign in front of the inner square root in (4.5), and in blue (dashed) we plot its negative branch. Note that, for a given $\alpha > 0$ and $\Lambda \in I$, two possible values of ω are allowed. Since α is a scale factor, here we have set $\alpha = 0.01$ for plotting convenience.

In virtue of the eq. (4.6), the effective cosmological constant has a zero at

$$\omega^2 = 0, \quad \wedge \quad \omega^2 = \frac{1}{8\alpha}, \quad (4.9)$$

but $\omega = 0$ turns off the scalar field. Sticking to non vanishing values of ω , AdS strings are obtained for the minimally coupled case when

$$\omega^2 < \frac{1}{8\alpha}, \quad (4.10)$$

range that agrees with $G_4(X) > 0$ because

$$1 + 4\alpha X > 0 \iff \omega^2 < \frac{1}{2\alpha},$$

therefore, from the thermodynamic analysis performed in Sec. 3 we can ensure thermodynamic stability for these AdS strings. As we see in Fig.2 below, the negative branch always provides AdS -strings for all $\Lambda \in I$, while the positive branch do the same but in a restricted domain:

$$\frac{-7 + 3\sqrt{5}}{16\alpha} \leq \Lambda < -\frac{1}{64\alpha} \quad (4.11)$$




Figure 2: Λ_e in terms of Λ for positive values of α and $\eta = 1$. The black star is located at $\left(-\frac{1}{64\alpha}, 0\right)$, where the effective cosmological constant is zero. Recall that for $\eta = 0$, no event horizons appear.

From the previous discussion, and as it can be seen in the figure above, when Λ satisfies (4.11) both branches dress the string with an *AdS* asymptotic. A natural question is which solution is more probably. To answer this, one can compute their Gibbs free energies, putting the strings at the same temperature T and angular velocity Ω [36]. The branch with lower Gibbs energy will be preferred. For simplicity, we analyze the static case, $\Omega = 0$. In the general case, one should consider the restriction $\Lambda_e + \Omega^2 < 0$ in (3.11) that ensures a positive temperature (3.7). This induces additional constraints in Λ and α , but no new insights.

Let's work out these ideas. In the first place, we recast the generic expression for the Gibbs free energy (3.11) in terms of Λ_e and the extended horizon r_h :

$$\mathfrak{G} = G_4(X)\Lambda_e r_h^2. \quad (4.12)$$

Bathing both strings at the same temperature induces

$$\Lambda_e^+ r_h^+ = \Lambda_e^- r_h^-,$$

(the superscript refers to the branch used) which leads to

$$\Delta\mathfrak{G} \equiv \mathfrak{G}^+ - \mathfrak{G}^- = \Lambda_e^+ (r_h^+)^2 \left(G_4(X^+) - G_4(X^-) \frac{\Lambda_e^+}{\Lambda_e^-} \right), \quad (4.13)$$

The evaluation of the difference using both ω -branches (4.5) and their respective cosmological constants Λ_e^\pm (4.6) gives as a result that the positive branch is preferred, as we can see in the next figure:




Figure 3: Difference between the Gibbs energies computed for the positive and negative branches. In this plot, we have set $\alpha = 1$ and scaled the vertical axis by a 10^2 factor. The horizontal axis runs over the range (4.11), where both branches dress the string with an AdS asymptotic.

Recall that when Λ attain its minimum, the scalar charge (and therefore Λ_e) has the same value on both branches (c.f., Fig. 1). It follows that the difference between both Gibbs free energies will vanish. This corresponds to the zero on the left of the plot. On the other corner lies $\Lambda = -\frac{1}{64\alpha}$, in which case $\Lambda_e^+ = 0$.

4.2 $\alpha < 0$

For negative values of α , the domain for the positive branch is given by:

$$\begin{cases} \Lambda \geq -\frac{3}{4\alpha}, & \text{when } \eta = 0, \\ \Lambda \geq -\frac{7 + 3\sqrt{5}}{16\alpha}, & \text{when } \eta = 1, \end{cases}$$

In this region, both branches coexist. Nevertheless, the negative branch is also allowed for negative values of Λ , which is mathematically inconsistent for its positive counterpart. In the next figure, a typical plot representing the values of the scalar charge in terms of Λ :




Figure 4: ω in terms of Λ for negative values of α . The positive branch is not allowed for negative values of Λ , as expected from (4.5).

AdS strings are feasible only in the negative branch. Note that thermodynamic stability is ensured since $G_4(X) = 1 + 4\alpha X$ is always positive when $\alpha < 0$. We further notice that for $\eta = 0$, the value Λ_e is equal for both cases. In turn, evaluating Λ_e one gets:

$$\Lambda_e^+ - \Lambda_e^- = \frac{\eta \sqrt{(8\alpha\Lambda + \eta)^2 + 8\alpha\Lambda(6 - \eta)}}{3\alpha(6 - \eta)},$$

which clearly vanishes when $\eta = 0$. The representative plot to visualize the above is the following:




Figure 5: Λ_e in terms of Λ for negative values of α . Only the negative branch admits asymptotically *AdS* strings, for $\Lambda < 0$.

We end this section observing that in this region the value $x^* = \frac{1}{4\alpha}$ is such that $G_4(x^*) = 2$, but $G_4(x^*) - 2x^*G_{4X}(x^*) = 0$. As we saw in the Sec. 2, the string equation imposes a further constraint on G_2

(2.15), namely:

$$G_2(x^*) - 2x^*G_{2X}(x^*) = 0 \implies \Lambda = -\frac{\eta + 6}{8\alpha}. \quad (4.14)$$

Hence, applying these constraints to the effective cosmological constant (2.9), one gets

$$\Lambda_e = -\frac{G_2(x^*)}{2G_4(x^*)} = -\frac{\eta + 4}{8\alpha} > 0,$$

obtaining a cosmological horizon.

5 Discussion and further comments

In summary, in this work we have explored four dimensional black strings in the framework of Horndeski models with shift invariance. Imposing that the scalar field depends only on the coordinate that span the Euclidean extension, rotating and asymptotically $AdS_3 \times \mathbb{R}$ black strings in the full shift-symmetric spectrum were found, generalizing the prior results with minimal couplings [6]. In this regard, the string still is an extension of the BTZ black hole, but dressed with an effective cosmological constant. We also have shown that the existence of AdS -strings in absence of the *bare* cosmological constant is technically possible. The fixing of the scalar charge in the parameter space is possible as long as the theory admits an Einstein limit (i.e., $G_4(0) = 1$ in terms of the Galileon formulation of Horndeski theory [18, 19]). If that is not the case, one could have mathematically consistent hairy scenarios. For instance, the choice $G_2(X) = -2\Lambda G_4(X) = -2\Lambda\sqrt{-X}$ satisfies the string equation trivially (2.8), and therefore the scalar charge is no longer fixed.

Planar AdS black holes admits a soliton counterpart, conjectured to be the lowest energy solutions, and therefore they can be naturally chosen as the ground state of the theory [37]. In that case, phase transitions for the planar AdS black hole can occur [38]. In the general case, our solution (2.12)-(2.13) also admits a soliton-like counterpart, which can be obtained by a double analytic continuation ($t \mapsto i\chi, \theta \mapsto i\tau$) on the black string metric. Thus, one can also explore if phase transitions are possible in this case. Focusing on the static case for simplicity, the metric for the soliton reads

$$ds_{(s)}^2 = -\rho^2 d\tau^2 + \frac{d\rho^2}{g(\rho)} + g(\rho)d\chi^2 + dz^2, \quad (5.1)$$

where $g(\rho) = -\Lambda_e \rho^2 - \mu$, and μ is an integration constant. In order for both solutions to share the same asymptotic geometry and behavior, one imposes matching conditions at both boundary geometries, demanding periodicity in a suitable manner [39]. For instance, notice that in contrast with the black string, the soliton coordinate χ needs to be periodic to get rid off conical singularities. Its period $\sigma_{(s)}$ must be

$$\sigma_{(s)} = \frac{4\pi}{g'(\rho_0)},$$

where ρ_0 is the largest root of $g(\rho) = 0$, which induces an extra ingredient in the asymptotic geometry of the string. When the matching conditions are fulfilled, computing the difference between the Gibbs energies $\Delta\mathfrak{G} \equiv \mathfrak{G} - \mathfrak{G}_0$ leads directly to a phase transition at a critical temperature

$$T_c = \frac{\sqrt{-\Lambda_e}}{2\pi}.$$

Our results are similar to those of [11]: a first order phase transition is supported by the existence of the scalar field, the soliton is preferred when $T < T_c$ and the string in the other case, $T > T_c$.

We have also explored a concrete example using a quadratic choice for $G_2(X)$ (c.f. (4.1)). This allows us to find a range for Λ in which two different values for the scalar charge are possible, but no phase transitions between those configurations were observed. The difference between the Gibbs free energies vanishes on the boundary of the common interval (4.11), and one configuration is always preferred in its interior.

In this work we have centered the attention in the four dimensional scenario because Horndeski guarantees to be the most general scalar-tensor theory there. Very recently, a no-hair theorem for was proven for asymptotically flat and circular black holes in any shift-symmetric model, including higher derivative extensions of Horndeski models [41]. Unfortunately, lifting our ideas to higher dimensions is not an immediate task. Starting from the known fact that there is no analogue of the Horndeski result, higher order gravitational extensions are also allowed since the Gauss-Bonnet density (1.5) is no longer a total derivative, and its dynamics affects the equations (see, e.g., [40]). For the same reasons, the coupling $\phi\mathcal{G}$ loses translation symmetry in five dimensions, therefore the simple idea of casting a 4D shift-invariant model in five dimensions might have non-expected consequences. Our toy model (4.1) provides for an interesting example: casting (4.1) in $D = 5$ (using as a base manifold a four dimensional maximally symmetric spacetime and one extended coordinate), when the scalar field linearly depends on the string coordinate the matching between the transverse sector and the string coordinate is only consistent with the extension of flat space on the sphere. Nevertheless, if one restricts the problem just to analyze (2.5) as a particular case, one can go to arbitrary $D = d + 1$ dimensions, taking a d -dimensional Einstein manifold, and one extended coordinate.

For the same reasons as in the previous paragraph, exploring our toy model (4.1) in five dimensions also constitutes an interesting route to extend this work. Not only the mass parameter is lost in the attempt to match the transverse section with the string equation: since $\phi\mathcal{G}$ is non trivial, the latter possesses a z dependency that fixes the parameter space, forcing $\Lambda_e = 0$. It would be interesting to employ some known techniques to endow a mass parameter into the above extension. A valid option is to try with the introduction of additional sources, such as non-linear electrodynamics [42] (see [43] for a recent review), that have been widely explored as an excellent laboratory to provide a charge-to-mass ratios that circumvents massless situations [35, 44, 45]. Clearly, these incompatibilities are a consequence of the linear profile, and opens a window to seek for non-linear profiles for the scalar field.

The existence of linear unstable modes can also be a follow-up question for these strings. The minimally coupled case was proven to be stable [7], but in the general case the answer is not clear. Even if one sticks to recast the action (2.5) in five dimensions, the Klein-Gordon equation now considers arbitrary functions $G_2(X), G_4(X)$ that might trigger an instability. In that sense, some additional restrictions might help to stabilize these strings in the general setup.

Acknowledgements

I would like to thank M. Bravo-Gaete and K. Lara for useful comments. Also, I would like to express my gratitude to Instituto de Matemáticas (INSTMAT) of Universidad de Talca, for its hospitality during the preparation of this manuscript.

A Appendix: The $\eta = 6$ case

As it can be seen from (4.4), when $\eta = 6$ the scalar X is fixed in terms of a linear equation instead of a quadratic one (or equivalently, the scalar charge is fixed via a quadratic equation instead of a fourth order one). This leads to

$$\omega^2 = \frac{-\Lambda}{4\alpha\Lambda + 3}, \quad (\text{A.1})$$

whose solution exists when the RHS is non negative. Hence, for non-vanishing values of Λ , the RHS is positive for

$$\alpha < -\frac{3}{4\Lambda}. \quad (\text{A.2})$$

Computing Λ_e from (2.9), one gets

$$\Lambda_e = \frac{(16\alpha\Lambda + 9)\Lambda}{6(4\alpha\Lambda + 3)}, \quad (\text{A.3})$$

therefore, the effective cosmological constant is negative when

$$\begin{cases} -\frac{3}{4\Lambda} < \alpha < -\frac{9}{16\Lambda}, & \text{if } \Lambda > 0 \\ \alpha < -\frac{9}{16\Lambda} \vee \alpha > -\frac{3}{4\Lambda}, & \text{if } \Lambda < 0 \end{cases}$$

But, at the time of make it consistent with (A.2), one observes that AdS -strings are not possible for $\Lambda > 0$, and restricts α to

$$\alpha < -\frac{3}{4\Lambda},$$

when Λ is negative.

References

- [1] R. Emparan and H. S. Reall, Phys. Rev. Lett. **88**, 101101 (2002) doi:10.1103/PhysRevLett.88.101101 [arXiv:hep-th/0110260 [hep-th]].
- [2] W. Israel, Phys. Rev. **164**, 1776-1779 (1967) doi:10.1103/PhysRev.164.1776
- [3] B. Carter, Phys. Rev. Lett. **26**, 331-333 (1971) doi:10.1103/PhysRevLett.26.331
- [4] D. C. Robinson, Phys. Rev. Lett. **34**, 905-906 (1975) doi:10.1103/PhysRevLett.34.905
- [5] R. Gregory and R. Laflamme, Phys. Rev. Lett. **70**, 2837-2840 (1993) doi:10.1103/PhysRevLett.70.2837 [arXiv:hep-th/9301052 [hep-th]].
- [6] A. Cisterna and J. Oliva, Class. Quant. Grav. **35**, no.3, 035012 (2018) doi:10.1088/1361-6382/aa9f7b [arXiv:1708.02916 [hep-th]].
- [7] A. Cisterna, C. Henruez-Baez and J. Oliva, JHEP **01**, 052 (2020) doi:10.1007/JHEP01(2020)052 [arXiv:1909.05404 [hep-th]].

- [8] R. Jackiw and S. Y. Pi, *Phys. Rev. D* **68**, 104012 (2003) doi:10.1103/PhysRevD.68.104012 [arXiv:gr-qc/0308071 [gr-qc]].
- [9] A. Cisterna, C. Corral and S. del Pino, *Eur. Phys. J. C* **79**, no.5, 400 (2019) doi:10.1140/epjc/s10052-019-6910-5 [arXiv:1809.02903 [gr-qc]].
- [10] M. Banados, C. Teitelboim and J. Zanelli, *Phys. Rev. Lett.* **69**, 1849-1851 (1992) doi:10.1103/PhysRevLett.69.1849 [arXiv:hep-th/9204099 [hep-th]].
- [11] C. Corral, C. Erices, D. Flores-Alfonso and K. Lara, *Phys. Rev. D* **105**, no.2, 024050 (2022) doi:10.1103/PhysRevD.105.024050 [arXiv:2111.00912 [hep-th]].
- [12] T. Andrade and B. Withers, *JHEP* **05**, 101 (2014) doi:10.1007/JHEP05(2014)101 [arXiv:1311.5157 [hep-th]].
- [13] M. Baggioli, A. Cisterna and K. Pallikaris, *Phys. Rev. D* **104**, no.10, 104067 (2021) doi:10.1103/PhysRevD.104.104067 [arXiv:2106.07458 [hep-th]].
- [14] A. Cisterna, C. Erices, X. M. Kuang and M. Rinaldi, *Phys. Rev. D* **97**, no.12, 124052 (2018) doi:10.1103/PhysRevD.97.124052 [arXiv:1803.07600 [hep-th]].
- [15] A. Cisterna, L. Guajardo and M. Hassaine, *Eur. Phys. J. C* **79**, no.5, 418 (2019) [erratum: *Eur. Phys. J. C* **79**, no.8, 710 (2019)] doi:10.1140/epjc/s10052-019-6922-1 [arXiv:1901.00514 [hep-th]].
- [16] G. W. Horndeski, *Int. J. Theor. Phys.* **10**, 363-384 (1974) doi:10.1007/BF01807638
- [17] T. Kobayashi, *Rept. Prog. Phys.* **82**, no.8, 086901 (2019) doi:10.1088/1361-6633/ab2429 [arXiv:1901.07183 [gr-qc]].
- [18] C. Deffayet, X. Gao, D. A. Steer and G. Zahariade, *Phys. Rev. D* **84**, 064039 (2011) doi:10.1103/PhysRevD.84.064039 [arXiv:1103.3260 [hep-th]].
- [19] C. Deffayet and D. A. Steer, *Class. Quant. Grav.* **30**, 214006 (2013) doi:10.1088/0264-9381/30/21/214006 [arXiv:1307.2450 [hep-th]].
- [20] T. Kobayashi, M. Yamaguchi and J. Yokoyama, *Prog. Theor. Phys.* **126**, 511-529 (2011) doi:10.1143/PTP.126.511 [arXiv:1105.5723 [hep-th]].
- [21] G. W. Gibbons and S. W. Hawking, *Phys. Rev. D* **15**, 2738-2751 (1977) doi:10.1103/PhysRevD.15.2738
- [22] T. Regge and C. Teitelboim, *Annals Phys.* **88**, 286 (1974) doi:10.1016/0003-4916(74)90404-7
- [23] G. Gibbons and S. Hawking, *Phys. Rev. D* **15**, 2752-2756 (1977) doi:10.1103/PhysRevD.15.2752
- [24] M. Bravo Gaete, L. Guajardo and M. Hassaine, *JHEP* **04**, 092 (2017) doi:10.1007/JHEP04(2017)092 [arXiv:1702.02416 [hep-th]].
- [25] L. Smarr, *Phys. Rev. Lett.* **30** (1973), 71-73 [erratum: *Phys. Rev. Lett.* **30** (1973), 521-521] doi:10.1103/PhysRevLett.30.71

- [26] M. Banados and S. Theisen, *Phys. Rev. D* **72**, 064019 (2005) doi:10.1103/PhysRevD.72.064019 [arXiv:hep-th/0506025 [hep-th]].
- [27] P. G. S. Fernandes, *Phys. Rev. D* **103**, no.10, 104065 (2021) doi:10.1103/PhysRevD.103.104065 [arXiv:2105.04687 [gr-qc]].
- [28] E. Babichev, C. Charmousis, M. Hassaine and N. Lecoecur, [arXiv:2302.02920 [gr-qc]].
- [29] J. Oliva and S. Ray, *Class. Quant. Grav.* **29**, 205008 (2012) doi:10.1088/0264-9381/29/20/205008 [arXiv:1112.4112 [gr-qc]].
- [30] G. Giribet, M. Leoni, J. Oliva and S. Ray, *Phys. Rev. D* **89**, no.8, 085040 (2014) doi:10.1103/PhysRevD.89.085040 [arXiv:1401.4987 [hep-th]].
- [31] H. Lu and Y. Pang, *Phys. Lett. B* **809**, 135717 (2020) doi:10.1016/j.physletb.2020.135717 [arXiv:2003.11552 [gr-qc]].
- [32] C. Charmousis, A. Lehébel, E. Smyrniotis and N. Stergioulas, *JCAP* **02**, no.02, 033 (2022) doi:10.1088/1475-7516/2022/02/033 [arXiv:2109.01149 [gr-qc]].
- [33] R. A. Hennigar, D. Kubizňák, R. B. Mann and C. Pollack, *JHEP* **07**, 027 (2020) doi:10.1007/JHEP07(2020)027 [arXiv:2004.09472 [gr-qc]].
- [34] P. G. S. Fernandes, P. Carrilho, T. Clifton and D. J. Mulryne, *Class. Quant. Grav.* **39**, no.6, 063001 (2022) doi:10.1088/1361-6382/ac500a [arXiv:2202.13908 [gr-qc]].
- [35] M. Bravo-Gaete, L. Guajardo and J. Oliva, *Phys. Rev. D* **106**, no.2, 024017 (2022) doi:10.1103/PhysRevD.106.024017 [arXiv:2205.09282 [hep-th]].
- [36] S. W. Hawking and D. N. Page, *Commun. Math. Phys.* **87**, 577 (1983) doi:10.1007/BF01208266
- [37] G. T. Horowitz and R. C. Myers, *Phys. Rev. D* **59**, 026005 (1998) doi:10.1103/PhysRevD.59.026005 [arXiv:hep-th/9808079 [hep-th]].
- [38] S. Surya, K. Schleich and D. M. Witt, *Phys. Rev. Lett.* **86**, 5231-5234 (2001) doi:10.1103/PhysRevLett.86.5231 [arXiv:hep-th/0101134 [hep-th]].
- [39] A. Anabalón, P. Concha, J. Oliva, C. Quijada and E. Rodríguez, *Phys. Lett. B* **835**, 137521 (2022) doi:10.1016/j.physletb.2022.137521 [arXiv:2205.01609 [hep-th]].
- [40] A. Cisterna, S. Fuenzalida, M. Lagos and J. Oliva, *Eur. Phys. J. C* **78**, no.11, 982 (2018) doi:10.1140/epjc/s10052-018-6428-2 [arXiv:1810.02798 [hep-th]].
- [41] L. Capuano, L. Santoni and E. Barausse, [arXiv:2304.12750 [gr-qc]].
- [42] J. Plebanski, “LECTURES ON NON LINEAR ELECTRODYNAMICS,” RX-476.
- [43] D. P. Sorokin, *Fortsch. Phys.* **70**, no.7-8, 2200092 (2022) doi:10.1002/prop.202200092 [arXiv:2112.12118 [hep-th]].

- [44] A. Álvarez, M. Bravo-Gaete, M. M. Juárez-Aubry and G. V. Rodríguez, Phys. Rev. D **105**, no.8, 084032 (2022) doi:10.1103/PhysRevD.105.084032 [arXiv:2202.11252 [gr-qc]].
- [45] M. Bravo-Gaete, C. G. Gaete, L. Guajardo and S. G. Rodríguez, Phys. Rev. D **104**, no.4, 044027 (2021) doi:10.1103/PhysRevD.104.044027 [arXiv:2103.15634 [gr-qc]].