

Generalized Entropy Implies Varying- G : Horizon Area Dependent Field Equations and Black Hole-Cosmology Coupling

Hengxin Lü,^{1,*} Sofia Di Gennaro,^{1,†} and Yen Chin Ong^{1,2,‡}

¹*Center for Gravitation and Cosmology, College of Physical Science and Technology, Yangzhou University, 180 Siwangting Road, Yangzhou City, Jiangsu Province 225002, China*

²*Shanghai Frontier Science Center for Gravitational Wave Detection, School of Aeronautics and Astronautics, Shanghai Jiao Tong University, Shanghai 200240, China*

When the Bekenstein-Hawking entropy is modified, ambiguity often arises concerning whether the Hawking temperature or the thermodynamic mass should be modified. The common practice, however, is to keep the black hole solution the same as that in general relativity. On the other hand, if Jacobson’s method of deriving Einstein equations from thermodynamic is valid in the general settings, then given a generalized entropy one should first derive the corresponding modified gravity, and then look for the compatible black hole solution before investigating its thermodynamics. We comment on some properties and subtleties in this approach. In particular, we point out that generically generalized entropy would lead to a varying effective gravitational “constant” theory, where G_{eff} depends on the horizon area. We discuss in what ways such theories are discernible from general relativity despite its seemingly jarring differences, and how to make sense of area-dependent field equations. As a consequence we show that in the Jacobson’s approach, the standard quantum gravitational logarithmic correction to Bekenstein-Hawking entropy is equivalent to a running gravitational “constant”. A horizon area dependent G_{eff} could also lead to a coupling between black hole masses and cosmological expansion, a scenario that has been studied recently in the literature, but so far lacks strong theoretical motivation. In the Tsallis case, we show that the thermodynamic mass for a Schwarzschild black hole is just a constant multiple of its ADM mass, which is considerably simpler than the approach not utilizing the Jacobson’s method.

I. INTRODUCTION: GENERALIZED ENTROPY AND MODIFIED GRAVITY

In standard general relativity (GR), black holes have an entropy that is proportional to the horizon area. More precisely, in the units that $c = \hbar = 1$, the Bekenstein-Hawking entropy is simply $S = A/4G$. What this entropy *means*, however, remains unclear even after half a century. In the efforts to make sense of black hole entropy, various attempts have been made in the literature, which consider modifications to the Bekenstein-Hawking entropy, such as Barrow entropy [1], Tsallis(-Cirto) entropy [2, 3], Kaniadakis entropy [4–6] and Sharma-Mittal entropy [7], just to name a few popular ones (entropy that generalizes these was constructed in [8]).

One of the conceptual problems that arise from these generalized entropy is how to make sense of the corresponding first law of black hole thermodynamics¹. Let us consider only the uncharged and non-rotating case for simplicity. In GR the first law is straightforward²: $dM = TdS$, where M is the ADM mass of the black hole and $T = 1/8\pi GM$ its Hawking temperature. However, once the entropy S is modified to some new \tilde{S} , ambigu-

ity follows. In the literature, one can typically find two approaches (see, e.g., the discussions in [11]):

- (1) Keep the Schwarzschild mass M the same as thermodynamic mass. One should then define a temperature by $T_{\tilde{S}} := \partial M / \partial \tilde{S}$.
- (2) Keep the Hawking temperature, in which case the thermodynamic mass is changed into $E \neq M$, and the first law becomes $dE = Td\tilde{S}$.

In either case, one assumes that the black hole solution remains unchanged from that of GR³. The first option appears to be somewhat problematic because at first glance there might be two temperatures – one instinctual objection is that the standard Hawking temperature still exists since it is what one obtains from Wick rotating the metric in the usual manner and imposing regularity in the Euclidean period. It is not clear how to make sense of two temperatures; are they both physical? This criticism requires further examination, since the whole Wick rotation technique rests on the fact that in finite temperature quantum field theory, the Euclidean action e^{-S} is formally identified with the Boltzmann factor $e^{-\beta H}$ in the partition function, which in turn implies that the standard Boltzmann-Gibbs distribution has been assumed. For example, if the Tsallis correction is introduced, we

* mx120220337@stu.yzu.edu.cn

† sofia.digennaro@gmail.com

‡ ycong@yzu.edu.cn

¹ In cosmological applications, there are even more confusions [9].

² This does not mean that it is always simple. In asymptotically anti-de Sitter spacetimes, the concept of mass is notoriously tricky [10].

³ Another option is to demand that $M = E$ and T remains the same as one would obtain from a *modified* solution, i.e., that theory is no longer GR, but not necessarily obtained via the Jacobson’s method. See, for example, the discussions in [12, 13].

should consider the ‘‘Tsallis factor’’ [14–16] in place of the Boltzmann factor. In other words, it is not at all obvious how the ‘‘cyclic imaginary time = temperature’’ identification, which is also tied to the regularization of the Euclidean manifold (to be free of conical singularity), is affected once a new statistical distribution is assumed. If everything is done consistently, perhaps there is only one well-defined temperature. This is an interesting question that nevertheless will not be pursued in this work, though it should be further investigated in view of interests in the field (see, e.g., [17] for discussions concerning various ‘‘temperatures’’). However, it is worth mentioning that another common approach in the literature is to take the modified entropy, and compute the modified temperature via $dM = TdS$, and then find the metric that would give such an entropy upon Wick-rotation. In view of our discussion above, this may not be consistent because it seems to have implicitly assumed the usual Boltzmann-Gibbs entropy instead of a generalized one. In addition, the metric so obtained may not be unique, see [18] for more discussions regarding similar approaches in the generalized uncertainty principle literature.

In the current manuscript, the more crucial issue we are interested in is the following: applying generalized entropy directly to GR solutions may not be consistent, but can we do better? We know from Jacobson’s seminal work [19] that one could start from thermodynamics considerations and obtain the Einstein field equations. In view of this, it can be argued that if the entropy is modified, we may no longer have the same black hole solution since the underlying theory is also modified. Indeed there are good motivations to study either modified gravity or generalized entropy. Yet, the relations between the two remain somewhat obscure and largely unexplored. There are some recent works in this direction, especially in the context of Barrow entropy [20–22]. In [21], the case of Tsallis entropy was also discussed. However, there are still some subtleties that deserve further discussions and clarifications.

In the following, assuming that the parameter of the generalized entropy is constant, we will point out several interesting results:

- (1) If we use the Jacobson’s approach, then the temperature is already chosen to be the standard Hawking one, and so what should be changed is the thermodynamic energy.
- (2) Unlike the GR case, the Jacobson’s method generically yields field equations that depend on the horizon area.
- (3) If the modification of entropy is non-geometric in origin, i.e., the area of the horizon remains unmodified, then the Jacobson’s method would give us a varying gravitational constant theory.
- (4) Points (2) and (3) imply that the varying gravitational constant is horizon area dependent.

We will then discuss whether such a theory is distinguishable from GR *in practice*. (The answer is ‘yes’, but not as straightforward as one might think as we need to be careful about the physical observables.) More importantly, we have to make sense of the consequences of having horizon area-dependent field equations, which renders the field equations quasi-local at best.

The structure of the manuscript is as follows. In Sec.(II) we start by reviewing the Jacobson’s method for deriving the Einstein field equations and then apply it to generalized entropies, using Tsallis entropy as a concrete example. We comment on the subtleties in the Barrow case. We also state the general theorem that generalized entropy leads to area-dependence field equations. Then in Sec.(III) we derive the thermodynamic mass of Tsallis-corrected Schwarzschild black hole, noting the difference with the previous results in the literature. In Sec.(IV) we attempt to understand area dependent field equations. Then in Sec.(V) we briefly discuss some cosmological implications of such theories, including the possibility that black hole masses may be coupled with cosmological expansion. Finally, we conclude in Sec.(VI) with more comments.

II. JACOBSON’S METHOD APPLIED TO GENERALIZED ENTROPY

Let us briefly review Jacobson’s method, which essentially makes use of the Clausius relation $\delta Q = TdS$. First, we consider the heat flow across the horizon given by the matter flux

$$\delta Q = -\kappa \int_{\mathcal{H}} \lambda T_{ab} k^a k^b d\lambda dA, \quad (1)$$

where A is the area of the horizon \mathcal{H} with k^a denoting the tangent vector of the horizon generators, κ the surface gravity, and λ is an appropriate affine parameter. The Raychaudhuri equation gives the variation of the area as

$$\delta A = \int_{\mathcal{H}} \theta d\lambda dA = - \int_{\mathcal{H}} \lambda R_{ab} k^a k^b d\lambda dA, \quad (2)$$

where θ is the expansion of the horizon generators. Finally applying $\delta Q = TdS$, where $T = \kappa/2\pi$ is proportional to the surface gravity⁴, we obtain

$$-\kappa \int_{\mathcal{H}} \lambda T_{ab} k^a k^b d\lambda dA = -\frac{\kappa}{2\pi} \int_{\mathcal{H}} \lambda R_{ab} k^a k^b d\lambda dS. \quad (3)$$

Then, with $S = A/4G$, this becomes

$$-\kappa \int_{\mathcal{H}} \lambda T_{ab} k^a k^b d\lambda dA = -\frac{\kappa}{2\pi} \frac{1}{4G} \int_{\mathcal{H}} \lambda R_{ab} k^a k^b d\lambda dA. \quad (4)$$

⁴ In more general settings, the temperature is not necessary proportional to κ , see for example, the discussion in [23], in which the temperature is derived via the Euclidean grand canonical ensemble (Brown–York) procedure.

This can only be valid if $T_{ab}k^ak^b = (1/8\pi G)R_{ab}k^ak^b$ for all null vector k^a , therefore we must have

$$(8\pi G)T_{ab} = R_{ab} + fg_{ab} \quad (5)$$

for some function f . Finally, taking the covariant derivative and applying the contracted Bianchi identity

$$\nabla^a R_{ab} = \frac{1}{2}\nabla_b R, \quad (6)$$

fixes f to be

$$f = \Lambda - \frac{R}{2}, \quad (7)$$

where Λ is an integration constant that would serve as the cosmological constant once we substitute f back into Eq.(5) and obtain the Einstein field equations.

Now we move on to discuss generalized entropy. To aid our discussions, let us look at a concrete example. Consider the black hole entropy under Tsallis entropy correction, which is motivated from non-extensive statistics:

$$S_T = \frac{A_0}{4G} \left(\frac{A}{A_0} \right)^\delta = \frac{A_0^{1-\delta}}{4G} A^\delta, \quad (8)$$

where A_0 is a constant and $\delta > 0$ is the Tsallis parameter (not to be confused with the variations in preceding equations). Now, the LHS of Eq.(3) remains *unchanged* since Tsallis modification only changes the entropy expression; it does not modify the horizon area. The RHS, however, is modified. Assuming δ is constant, we end up with:

$$\begin{aligned} -\kappa \int_{\mathcal{H}} \lambda T_{ab} k^a k^b d\lambda dA &= -\frac{\kappa}{2\pi} \frac{A_0^{1-\delta}}{4G} \int_{\mathcal{H}} \lambda R_{ab} k^a k^b d\lambda dA^\delta \\ &= -\frac{\kappa}{2\pi} \frac{A_0^{1-\delta}}{4G} \int_{\mathcal{H}} \lambda R_{ab} k^a k^b \delta A^{\delta-1} d\lambda dA. \end{aligned} \quad (9)$$

That is,

$$-\kappa \int_{\mathcal{H}} \left[T_{ab} - \frac{1}{8\pi G} A_0^{1-\delta} \delta A^{\delta-1} R_{ab} \right] \lambda k^a k^b d\lambda dA = 0, \quad (10)$$

which then implies

$$8\pi G_{\text{eff}} T_{ab} = R_{ab} + fg_{ab}, \quad (11)$$

where the effective gravitational constant is

$$G_{\text{eff}} = \frac{G}{\delta} \left(\frac{A}{A_0} \right)^{1-\delta}. \quad (12)$$

To get the modified version of the Einstein field equations, we have to take a covariant derivative and apply the contracted Bianchi identity. This results in

$$8\pi \nabla^a (G_{\text{eff}} T_{ab}) = \frac{1}{2} \nabla_b R + \nabla_b f. \quad (13)$$

At this stage, we have two choices: we can assume [24] either that the conservation law is $\nabla^a (G_{\text{eff}} T_{ab}) = 0$, which is arguably more natural, or that it is still $\nabla^a (GT_{ab}) = 0$. If we assume the former, then the resulting field equations read

$$R_{ab} - \frac{1}{2} g_{ab} R + g_{ab} \Lambda = 8\pi G_{\text{eff}} T_{ab}. \quad (14)$$

This is of course just GR but with G replaced by G_{eff} . On the other hand, if we choose the latter, then we can obtain a considerably more complicated scenario

$$8\pi G T_{ab} \nabla^a \left[\frac{1}{\delta} \left(\frac{A}{A_0} \right)^{1-\delta} \right] = \frac{1}{2} \nabla_b R + \nabla_b f. \quad (15)$$

In the special case that the spacetime is stationary, this would still reduce to GR with G_{eff} . This is the case mentioned in [21]. Note the subtle difference: if the conservation law is $\nabla^a (G_{\text{eff}} T_{ab}) = 0$, there is no need to impose stationary condition to obtain Eq.(14).

At this point, we are ready to draw some conclusions. The most important observation is that the analysis above would follow through, *mutatis mutandis*, as long as in Eq.(3) the RHS is modified but the LHS is not, or more generally the LHS is modified in a different manner than the RHS. The only exception would be if both sides are modified in the same manner, as in the case of Barrow entropy analyzed in [21]. In that case, the horizon becomes fractalized⁵ so its area is $A^{1+\Delta/2}$ for some $0 \leq \Delta \leq 1$. Fundamentally the area law remains unchanged $S = \mathcal{A}/4G$, where now $\mathcal{A} = A^{1+\Delta/2}$. Thus one expects that Jacobson's method would simply give standard GR. However, in order to write down a Schwarzschild-like metric for which constant r spacelike surfaces are still S^2 , Ref.[21] argues that we could view the area as unchanged, but that the entropy changes to Barrow entropy $S_B = A^{1+\Delta/2}/4G$. This would amount to an effective theory in which the fractal structure is not visible, but nevertheless it affects the thermodynamics. The LHS and RHS are modified in the same manner in Eq.(3), but only *re-interpreted* in the subsequent step. Namely, one starts with

$$\int_{\mathcal{H}} \lambda T_{ab} k^a k^b d\lambda dA^{1+\frac{\Delta}{2}} = \frac{\eta}{2\pi} \int_{\mathcal{H}} \lambda R_{ab} k^a k^b d\lambda dA^{1+\frac{\Delta}{2}}, \quad (16)$$

from which we get

$$\int_{\mathcal{H}} \lambda \left(T_{ab} - \frac{\eta}{2\pi} R_{ab} \right) \left(1 + \frac{\Delta}{2} \right) A^{\frac{\Delta}{2}} k^a k^b d\lambda dA = 0, \quad (17)$$

⁵ Such a possibility was actually suggested earlier by Sorkin in [25], but he did not write down the form of the area law modification. Sorkin proposed that fractal structures due to horizon fluctuation may arise on scales between the Planck scale ℓ_P and $(r_+ \ell_P^2)^{1/3}$. One recognizes that the latter scale actually corresponds to the minimum error in the length measurement due to quantum gravity effect [26–28].

and consequently

$$\left(T_{ab} - \frac{1}{8\pi G}R_{ab}\right)\left(1 + \frac{\Delta}{2}\right)A^{\frac{\Delta}{2}} = fg_{ab}. \quad (18)$$

It is at this step that one re-interprets A as the area of the black hole (instead of $A^{1+\frac{\Delta}{2}}$).

The resulting field equations has no G_{eff} , but instead the cosmological constant is rescaled

$$\Lambda \mapsto \frac{\Lambda}{\left(1 + \frac{\Delta}{2}\right)A^{\frac{\Delta}{2}}}. \quad (19)$$

Thus, despite the fact that both Tsallis and Barrow entropies have the form A to some power, their modified gravity behaves quite differently. This is due to Barrow entropy arising from a geometric correction, whereas Tsallis entropy is the result of the modification of the underlying statistical mechanics distribution.

Even so, there are still some ambiguities as to *when* we re-interpret the Barrow correction as merely an entropy correction that does not change the smooth horizon at the effective theory level. If we do so already at the beginning in Eq.(3), then Eq.(16) would be changed to

$$\int_{\mathcal{H}} \lambda T_{ab} k^a k^b d\lambda dA = \frac{\eta}{2\pi} \int_{\mathcal{H}} \lambda R_{ab} k^a k^b d\lambda dA^{1+\frac{\Delta}{2}}, \quad (20)$$

in which the LHS is simply an integration with respect to A instead of $A^{1+\frac{\Delta}{2}}$. The result would then be similar to the Tsallis case, with G_{eff} instead of a re-scaled Λ . Still, for both choices, in the vacuum case we will get just the Schwarzschild metric as in GR.

We see that in general, Jacobson's method leads to field equations that depend on the horizon area. In fact, the Bekenstein-Hawking entropy (up to a multiplicative constant) is unique in the sense that the field equations are area independent. To see this, we simply observe the following result:

Theorem 1 *If on the RHS of Eq.(3) in the Jacobson's method we have an entropy correction to the horizon area law of the form $S = F(A)/4G$ for some differentiable function F , then $G_{\text{eff}} = G/F'(A)$.*

Here the prime denotes derivative with respect to the area. Then we immediately observe that:

Corollary 1.1 (Uniqueness of Area Law) G_{eff} is independent of A if and only if the area law holds, i.e., $S = \eta A$ for some constant η .

The proof is straightforward (follows the same calculation we did for the Tsallis example). We emphasize that this result is non-trivial, it is *not* simply defining G_{eff} by setting $F(A)/4G = A/4G_{\text{eff}}$, in which case there would be no derivative of F .

In any case, this poses a serious question: does a generic gravity theory resulted from generalized entropy make sense only in spacetimes with a horizon? One way to avoid

this situation is to allow the parameter in the generalized entropy to be a function. For example, in [20], when the Barrow parameter Δ is taken to be a function of r , the resulting modified field equations also have explicit area dependence, but with suitably chosen Δ the area dependence can be cancelled. This is similar⁶ to the argument in [29, 30] in which Barrow entropy is assumed to run with energy scale and behaves at least as $\Delta \sim 1/A \ln A$.

III. EXAMPLE: SCHWARZSCHILD BLACK HOLE WITH TSALLIS MODIFICATION

Next, we note that in the derivation following Jacobson, the temperature is already chosen to be $T = \kappa/2\pi$, which is the standard Hawking expression, not the one defined by $\partial M/\partial S_T$, though the κ here is the surface gravity $1/4G_{\text{eff}}M$ instead of $1/4GM$. This is because the G in the Schwarzschild solution of GR should now be replaced by G_{eff} . The thermodynamic mass can be obtained following the method in [21] or [11]. Both of these, however, assume the standard Schwarzschild metric of GR⁷, and so not compatible with the Jacobson's method. Unfortunately, despite already worked out G_{eff} , Ref.[21] overlooked that the Schwarzschild solution should now be modified⁸.

To obtain the correct thermodynamic mass E , one begins with the first law

$$\int \frac{1}{T} dE = \int dS_T. \quad (21)$$

The Schwarzschild equation now has horizon located at $r_h = 2G_{\text{eff}}M$. This leads to

$$dE = \frac{1}{32\pi G_{\text{eff}}^2 M} dA. \quad (22)$$

We note that upon substituting $A = 4\pi r_h^2$ into Eq.(12),

$$G_{\text{eff}} = M^{\frac{2(\delta-1)}{1-2\delta}} f(\delta)^{\frac{1}{1-2\delta}}, \quad (23)$$

where we have defined

$$f(\delta) := \frac{(16\pi)^{\delta-1} A_0^{1-\delta} \delta}{G}. \quad (24)$$

⁶ Though the argument for the running behavior therein is different: it is the requirement that for large black holes the leading term in the entropy, expanded as a series of Δ , recovers the Bekenstein-Hawking form.

⁷ There is a typo in the coefficient of the thermodynamic mass of [11] in the power of 2, upon fixing this it is the same as the result in [21].

⁸ One may think that since the Schwarzschild solution is a vacuum solution, it is not affected by $G \mapsto G_{\text{eff}}$ on the RHS of the field equations. This is unfortunately not true. In standard GR, G in the Schwarzschild radius comes from considering the non-vacuum Newtonian limit (Poisson's equation), which would inherit the G_{eff} .

This function tends to $1/G$ as $\delta \rightarrow 1$ in the GR limit. (Though recall that we are assuming δ to be fixed, so f is really a constant.) With some simplifications we can obtain

$$dE = \frac{1}{G_{\text{eff}}} d(G_{\text{eff}}M), \quad (25)$$

and finally upon integration the thermodynamic mass is given by a simple expression⁹

$$E = \frac{1}{2\delta - 1} M. \quad (26)$$

The factor $f(\delta)$ does not appear in the final expression. In the limit $\delta \rightarrow 1$, we recover $E = M$ for the standard GR result. This is a vast simplification compared to the results in [11, 21], in which $E \propto M^{2\delta-1}$. We also note that the condition $\delta > 1/2$ should be imposed to have a positive thermodynamic mass. Despite the differences in the approaches, this is the same bound obtained in [21] from the consideration of Bekenstein bound. In the Tsallis-Jacobson case, the issue of Bekenstein bound violation [34, 35] never arises (as argued in [21] we do not consider it as a violation if it is only off by a constant prefactor).

One of the advantages of the Jacobson's method is that we can check that with Eq.(23) for the expression of G_{eff} , the Tsallis entropy for fixed M is monotonically decreasing towards 0 on the interval $\delta \in (1/2, \infty)$, although the expression A^δ might suggest that it diverges in the limit $\delta \rightarrow \infty$. On the other hand, Tsallis entropy tends to a constant $A_0/4G$ as $\delta \rightarrow 0$, whereas G_{eff} in Eq.(23) goes to zero. This is problematic since $G_{\text{eff}} \rightarrow 0$ should imply the lack of gravity, and so there is no black hole, yet the entropy is nonzero. Thankfully this unphysical situation is avoided due to the positive energy bound $\delta > 1/2$.

Another interesting observation is as follows. In GR, the Smarr relation is $M = 2TS$, whereas for a "typical" thermodynamic system one expects¹⁰ $E = TS$ (a special case of the Euler equation). This can be obtained if we set $\delta = 3/2$ in Eq.(26). This would correspond to a "volume law" for the entropy (which is expected for ordinary systems like a box of gas) instead of an area law given by the Bekenstein-Hawking entropy, and thus serves as a consistency check of the result in Eq.(26).

⁹ This form of thermodynamic mass that only differs from the ADM mass by a constant (which in turn depends on the modification parameter) is previously known in the literature. For example, in bumblebee gravity the Schwarzschild-like solution [31] has energy $E = \sqrt{1+l}M$, where l is a parameter in the theory [33]. Likewise, in Kalb-Ramond gravity, one finds [32] $E = M/\sqrt{\ell+1}$ for some parameter ℓ . Both l and ℓ in these theories measure the degree of Lorentz violation.

¹⁰ Another way to obtain $E = TS$ is by introducing a pressure term that is associated with the "thermodynamic force" in GR [36]. In that case, one finds $E = M/2$.

IV. DISTINGUISHABILITY FROM GENERAL RELATIVITY AND MAKING SENSE OF AREA DEPENDENCE

Imagine a planet Earth in an alternate universe governed by the field equations Eq.(14), in which the area A in G_{eff} is the area of the cosmological apparent horizon. In such a world, local experiments would have always measured G_{eff} instead of G . If δ is sufficiently close to 1, the effect of varying G_{eff} would be difficult to detect, though its effect may show up in cosmological contexts (see Sec.(V)), or astrophysical observations over a long time (for example, orbital changes in binary system whose masses are constant). Thus, physicists in such a world would eventually devise a theory of gravity identical to GR, and they would call G_{eff} as simply some \mathbb{G} . The situation gets somewhat tricky when we consider black holes in such a universe. Since black holes have their own horizon, this means that the value of the G_{eff} for black holes depends on their horizon area¹¹, and is distinct from the "global" cosmological G_{eff} . Nevertheless, their astronomers would not have realized this; to them, the effect of the different value of G_{eff} is simply interpreted as the mass of the black hole. In other words, only $G_{\text{eff}}M$ is observable, which if they have never suspected that \mathbb{G} can vary, then they would just interpret $G_{\text{eff}}M \equiv \mathbb{G}\mathcal{M}$ and deduce that the black hole has ADM mass \mathcal{M} , although it is really M . It would not make sense to fix M to constrain δ , as M cannot be determined independently from astrophysical observations; it is only accessible from a God's eye view. Note that the "bare gravitational constant" G itself in the defining expression of G_{eff} is physically unobservable.

In the above scenario we have assumed that the cosmological horizon gives rise to G_{eff} that governs gravity for all the objects inside the horizon¹². This seems to suggest a non-local effect at work, which some may deem to be not so desirable (but of course non-local extensions of GR is not rare either). One could also contemplate the possibility that away from the horizon, the value of G_{eff} decreases as a function of proper distance. This does not change our above discussions by much, since the change in the value of $G_{\text{eff}}M$ of an astronomical body due to its local motion that changes its distance to the cosmolog-

¹¹ The situation is actually even more complicated as one should somehow take into account the presence of multiple horizons. In GR we do not usually consider the expanding universe background when we discuss local black hole physics, so one might think that we can likewise ignore the cosmological horizon when we study black holes. However, this does not seem feasible because the cosmological horizon does imbue its G_{eff} to all massive bodies in the universe. Therefore, the G_{eff} for black holes must be a combination of the local and global values.

¹² One may be tempted to think that horizon modifies G into G_{eff} , and so ordinary objects without horizon would just feel G . However, this is not supported by the field equations. In the GR case, there is no A -dependence in the field equations so everything is governed by G . For the modified case, however, we cannot conclude that horizonless objects feel G .

ical horizon would be imperceptible. Of course, careful observations may show some hints of a varying G_{eff} as it values changes with cosmological expansion. There is a vast literature on constraining varying gravitational constants, see, e.g. [37–42].

The point is that *we* could live in such a world already governed by Tsallis entropy without even realizing. We would then treat G_{eff} as a constant \mathbb{G} and everything would just be GR. Note that the factor $1/\delta$ in G_{eff} is quite subtle. We only obtained it by going through the Jacobson’s derivation. If we had simply equate the actual entropy of the black hole in a Tsallis-Jacobson universe to the Bekenstein-Hawking entropy the naive inhabitants might prescribe to their black holes, i.e.,

$$\frac{A_0^{1-\delta}}{4G} A^\delta = \frac{A}{4\tilde{G}_{\text{eff}}}, \quad (27)$$

this would give instead,

$$\tilde{G}_{\text{eff}} = G \left(\frac{A}{A_0} \right)^{1-\delta}, \quad (28)$$

which is off by a $1/\delta$ factor compared to Eq.(12). The reason was discussed right after Theorem 1.

Similar conclusions can be reached for other non-geometric modifications to Bekenstein-Hawking entropy. Thus to summarize: if we take the influence of entropy on gravity seriously and accept that the Jacobson’s method is universal, we are forced to accept that this generically leads to field equations that depend on the horizon area, and also generically the theory has an effective gravitational “constant” $G_{\text{eff}} = G_{\text{eff}}(A)$. Nevertheless inhabitants in such a universe likely would not realize this from local or even astrophysical measurements unless they are very careful (though there could be stronger hints coming from cosmology, see below). The area dependence in the field equations is somewhat bizarre, but can be dealt with in at least three manners depending on one’s philosophy:

- (1) If deemed undesirable, we could take this result as a *reductio ad absurdum* and conclude that Jacobson’s method – for some reason – only holds for entropy that satisfies the area law $S \propto A$.
- (2) If deemed undesirable, we can conclude that generalized entropy parameters cannot be constant, but rather must be chosen so as to cancel the area-dependence in the field equations.
- (3) The derivation is sound and the result is what it is, *fait accompli* – just accept it.

We prefer the last option, and would argue that it is actually not so strange. For example, following Theorem 1 in Sec.(II) that $S = F(A)/4 \Rightarrow G_{\text{eff}} = G/F'(A)$, the standard quantum gravity correction with a logarithmic term $S = A/4G + \text{const.} \ln(A)$ now implies that

$$G_{\text{eff}} = \frac{G}{1 + \frac{C_1}{A}}, \quad (29)$$

where C_1 is a constant. This is not too different from the running gravitational constant scenario one obtains from renormalization group argument in asymptotically safe gravity (ASG; see, for example, [43–46]):

$$G(k) = \frac{G(k_0)}{1 + C_2 k^2}, \quad (30)$$

where k_0 is a reference energy scale and C_2 another constant. We can assume $G(k_0)$ is the measured gravitational constant at our relatively low energy scale. In the literature k is often taken to be inversely proportional to a distance scale. In fact in [47], the authors argued that k is horizon area dependent and is explicitly given by $k = \text{const.}/\sqrt{A}$. This means $G(k)$ would recover the form in Eq.(29). Such a running behavior is more palatable since for large black holes, $G(k)$ essentially reduces to $G(k_0)$. The Jacobson’s method therefore provides a link between the standard quantum gravitational correction of Bekenstein-Hawking entropy and the ASG approach.

We also remark that in the literature, *distance*-dependent gravitational constant has been discussed [48–51], e.g., a Yukawa potential type dependence in the context of the “fifth force”:

$$G(r) = G_\infty \left(1 + \alpha e^{-r/\lambda} \right), \quad (31)$$

for some characteristic length scale λ . Here α is a constant or another function of r . In comparison the area dependent version is arguably even less problematic (in terms of being well-defined), as the area of the event horizon of a black hole is coordinate independent. (For the cosmological case, the apparent horizon is observer dependent, but there is already a preferred frame in cosmology anyway.)

V. COSMOLOGICAL IMPLICATIONS

We also note that, due to the reasons outlined in Footnote 11, the G_{eff} for black holes should not simply be a function of its horizon area, but must also depend on the overall global, cosmological horizon area. But then, since $G_{\text{eff}}M$ is observed as $\mathbb{G}\mathcal{M}$, the overall effect is that the mass of black holes is coupled to cosmological expansion, a possibility recently investigated in the literature [52–58], essentially parametrized as:

$$\mathcal{M}(a) = \mathcal{M} \left(\frac{a}{a_i} \right)^k, \quad (32)$$

where a_i is the value of the scale factor when the black hole forms with initial mass \mathcal{M}_i , and the coupling parameter k is bounded between the range $-3 \leq k \leq 3$ from a causality constraint. The initial claim was that the best fit is $k \approx 3$ [52, 53]. However, recently Ref.[57] argued that current estimates of the supermassive black hole mass density based on the black hole mass – bulge mass relation probably exclude $k = 3$, but left the possibility of

$k > 2$ opens. The problem, however, is that in our case, we do not actually know how the G_{eff} due to black hole horizon combines with the $G_{\text{eff}} = \mathbb{G}$ of the cosmological horizon, and thus we do not know how \mathcal{M} looks like as a function of a . Nevertheless, perhaps with some assumptions, reasonable models can be constructed for future study. The point is that, Jacobson’s method applied to Tsallis entropy (and other generalized entropy) provides a *theoretical basis* for the possibility of the coupling between black hole masses and cosmological expansion, which was hitherto not available (the possible coupling was proposed phenomenologically without a theoretical motivation). In our picture, this coupling is simply due to the different G_{eff} ’s, it does not imply that black holes are a “source” for dark energy as originally claimed [53].

Although a full analysis of cosmology in the Tsallis-Jacobson approach is beyond the scope of this work. A few interesting observations are worth a quick mention. Let us consider a Friedmann–Lemaître–Robertson–Walker universe with flat spatial section. Following [59], we apply the Tsallis correction to the apparent horizon at $R = 1/H$, where $H = \dot{a}/a$ is the Hubble parameter. Applying the conservation law $\nabla^a (G_{\text{eff}} T_{ab}) = 0$ yields a modified fluid equation¹³

$$\dot{\rho} + 3H(\rho + p) + 2(1 - \delta)\rho H \left(1 - \frac{1}{H^2} \frac{\ddot{a}}{a}\right) = 0. \quad (33)$$

This gives rise to certain complications. For example, we can no longer work with $\rho(t) \propto 1/a(t)^3$ for pressureless matter as per usual. Unfortunately, the acceleration equation is the same as in GR, but with G replaced by G_{eff} , so there is no chance for accelerated expansion with just normal matter. The Tsallis-Jacobson cosmology thus differs from the earlier Tsallis cosmology approach in [60]. What is potentially interesting is that

$$\frac{\dot{G}_{\text{eff}}}{G_{\text{eff}}} = (1 - \delta)2H \left(1 - \frac{1}{H^2} \frac{\ddot{a}}{a}\right). \quad (34)$$

In terms of the modified fluid equation, we can write

$$\dot{\rho} + 3H(\rho + p) = -\rho \frac{\dot{G}_{\text{eff}}}{G_{\text{eff}}}, \quad (35)$$

which is indeed the known general behavior for varying Newton’s constant cosmology, see, e.g., [61]. Eq.(34) is interesting as it vanishes for a pure de Sitter spacetime with scale factor $a(t) = a_0 e^{Ht}$, where H is a constant. As long as the expansion rate is not faster than the pure de Sitter case, and if $\delta = 1 - \varepsilon < 1$, then $\dot{G}_{\text{eff}} > 0$. We can therefore expect early Universe to have a smaller value of effective Newton’s constant, which could help to

ameliorate the arrow of time problem¹⁴ [62, 63], and may also help to relax the Hubble tension and S_8 tension [64, 65] (see, however, [66]). Then, as the Universe becomes asymptotically de-Sitter (as indicated by observations), $\dot{G}_{\text{eff}} \sim 0$ and we have an almost constant G_{eff} . In other words, curiously, the growth of G_{eff} is kept in check by the late time quasi-de Sitter geometry. This connection between G_{eff} and de Sitter geometry may tie in with the proposal in [61] that varying- G may provide an effective “cosmological constant”. Despite all these prospects, we do expect that observational constraints would likely tightly constrain δ to be very close to 1 as the correction term cannot be too large (especially during the early epochs when the universe is not close to de-Sitter-like). But again, in general, one must be careful about what is exactly observable [67].

VI. CONCLUSION: ENTROPY FIXES THE GRAVITY THEORY

The link between gravity and entropy has been widely discussed, but many facets remain unclear and mysterious. In this work, we have taken a closer look at the influences of generalized entropy on black holes and cosmology. We argued that if we first consider the effect of generalized entropy on the gravitational theory itself via the Jacobson’s method, instead of taking GR solution and impose the entropy correction *a posteriori*, the results are quite different. The former approach is arguably more consistent, but is not without problems. Namely, the field equations are now at best quasi-local, being dependent on the area of the horizon. How does one make sense of spacetimes with no horizon in such a theory? If one naively takes absence of horizon as the same as $A \rightarrow 0$, this would seem to imply that gravity requires horizon – without horizon, G_{eff} is zero. Of course, area dependence can also be interpreted as a mass-energy dependence (for a Schwarzschild black hole, the relation between area and mass is straightforward; for apparent horizon in FLRW cosmology, it is implicit via the Friedmann equation). In this sense, the situation is similar to the Brans-Dicke theory in which the effective gravitational constant G is replaced by the inverse of a scalar field: $G_{\text{eff}} = \phi^{-1}$, wherein the scalar field itself is related to the matter field by $\square\phi = 8\pi/(3 + 2\omega)T$, where ω is the Brans-Dicke coupling constant and $T = T^a_a$ is the trace of the energy-momentum tensor. Our situation is still somewhat different, however, as vacuum solutions can affect A , and non-vacuum solutions with no horizons *do not*. The roles of an effective gravitational constant have been explored in the literature (see, e.g., [68, 69]),

¹³ If so desired, \ddot{a}/a can be substituted with the acceleration equation, so that the fluid equation is expressed entirely in terms of the Hubble parameter H .

¹⁴ This also works for the G_{eff} in Eq.(29), namely we observe that $G_{\text{eff}} \rightarrow 0$ when $A \rightarrow 0$ (or $k \rightarrow \infty$ in the ASG approach; i.e. gravity weakens at high energy scale).

but in view of our findings, there are clearly still rooms for future investigations.

The Jacobson’s approach would also be more restrictive – once a generalized entropy is given, there is a modified gravity that corresponds to it. This means we can no longer consider, for example, Barrow or Tsallis correction on top of another modified gravity theory. Such a restriction is good as it avoids proliferation of generalizations in the absence of guiding principles. Note that we are not claiming that there is a one-to-one map between generalized entropy and modified gravity; as not all modified gravity theories can be derived via the Jacobson’s method.

There are, in any case, interesting physics that follow from the Jacobson’s approach, as we have seen from our example (Tsallis-Jacobson gravity). Therefore, we would suggest that further research should be carried out to examine if other generalized entropy can lead to new features once their corresponding modified gravity is

derived, especially in cosmological contexts. For example, we expect that “Kaniadakis-Jacobson cosmology” would be quite different from Kaniadakis cosmology [70]. Finally we should emphasize that in this work, we have only considered the simplest scenario in which the generalized entropy parameter is assumed to be constant. However, there are good reasons to suspect that it would run with energy scale, just like in the case of Barrow entropy [22, 29, 30]. What happens then to the corresponding modified gravity theory? Clearly more research is needed.

To conclude, the relationship between generalized entropy and modified gravity calls for more studies, as there is a potential that this might lead to interesting theories or models that can tie in with other proposals in the literature. At the very least, it forces us to think deeper about some very important questions: how to consistently modify gravity and thermodynamics? Is GR unique in some thermodynamical sense?

-
- [1] John D. Barrow, “The Area of a Rough Black Hole”, *Phys. Lett. B* **808** (2020) 135643, [arXiv:2004.09444 [gr-qc]].
- [2] Constantino Tsallis, “Possible Generalization of Boltzmann-Gibbs Statistics”, *J. Statist. Phys.* **52** (1988) 479.
- [3] Constantino Tsallis, Leonardo J. L. Cirto, “Black Hole Thermodynamical Entropy”, *Eur. Phys. J. C* **73** (2013) 2487, [arXiv:1202.2154 [gr-qc]].
- [4] Giorgio Kaniadakis, “Statistical Mechanics in the Context of Special Relativity”, *Phys. Rev. E* **66** (2002) 056125, [arXiv:cond-mat/0210467 [cond-mat.stat-mech]].
- [5] Giorgio Kaniadakis, “Statistical Mechanics in the Context of Special Relativity II”, *Phys. Rev. E* **72** (2005) 036108, [arXiv:cond-mat/0507311 [cond-mat.stat-mech]].
- [6] Niki Drepanou, Andreas Lymperis, Emmanuel N. Saridakis, Kuralay Yesmakhanova, “Kaniadakis Holographic Dark Energy and Cosmology”, *Eur. Phys. J. C* **82** (2022) 5, 449, [arXiv:2109.09181 [gr-qc]].
- [7] A. Sayahian Jahromi, S. A. Moosavi, H. Moradpour, J. P. Morais Graça, I. P. Lobo, I. G. Salako, A. Jawad, “Generalized Entropy Formalism and a New Holographic Dark Energy Model”, *Phys. Lett. B* **780** (2018) 21, [arXiv:1802.07722 [gr-qc]].
- [8] Shin’ichi Nojiri, Sergei D. Odintsov, Valerio Faraoni, “How Fundamental Is Entropy? From Non-extensive Statistics and Black Hole Physics to the Holographic Dark Universe”, *Phys. Rev. D* **105** (2022) 4, 044042, [arXiv:2201.02424 [gr-qc]].
- [9] Hussain Gohar, Vincenzo Salzano, “On the Foundations of Entropic Cosmologies: Inconsistencies, Possible Solutions and Dead End Signs”, *Phys. Lett. B* **855** (2024) 138781, [arXiv:2307.01768 [gr-qc]].
- [10] Yunjiao Gao, Zhenbo Di, Sijie Gao, “General Mass Formulas for Charged Kerr-AdS Black Holes”, [arXiv:2304.10290 [gr-qc]].
- [11] H. Moradpour, A. H. Ziaie, Iarley P. Lobo, J. P. Morais Graça, U. K. Sharma, A. Sayahian Jahromi, “The Third Law of Thermodynamics, Non-extensivity, and Energy Definition in Black Hole Physics”, *Mod. Phys. Lett. A* **37** (2022) 12, 2250076, [arXiv:2106.00378 [gr-qc]].
- [12] Shin’ichi Nojiri, Sergei D. Odintsov, Valerio Faraoni, “Area-Law Versus Rényi and Tsallis Black Hole Entropies”, *Phys. Rev. D* **104** (2021) 084030, [arXiv:2109.05315 [gr-qc]].
- [13] Shin’ichi Nojiri, Sergei D. Odintsov, Valerio Faraoni, “Alternative Entropies and Consistent Black Hole Thermodynamics”, *Int. J. Geom. Meth. Mod. Phys.* **19** (2022) 13, 2250210, [arXiv:2207.07905 [gr-qc]].
- [14] Tatsuaki Wada, “Model-Free Derivations of the Tsallis Factor: Constant Heat Capacity Derivation”, *Phys. Lett. A* **318** (2003) 491, [arXiv:cond-mat/0208205 [cond-mat.stat-mech]].
- [15] Eicke Ruthotto, “Physical Temperature and the Meaning of the Q Parameter in Tsallis Statistics”, [arXiv:cond-mat/0310413 [cond-mat.stat-mech]].
- [16] Michel Baranger, “Why Tsallis Statistics?”, *Physica A: Stats. Mec. Appl.* **305** (2002) 27.
- [17] İlim Çimdiker, Mariusz P. Dąbrowski, Hussain Gohar, “Equilibrium Temperature for Black Holes with Nonextensive Entropy”, *Eur. Phys. J. C* **83** (2023) 169, [arXiv:2208.04473 [gr-qc]].
- [18] Yen Chin Ong, “A Critique on Some Aspects of GUP Effective Metric”, *Eur. Phys. J. C* **83** (2023) 209, [arXiv:2303.10719 [gr-qc]].
- [19] Ted Jacobson, “Thermodynamics of Spacetime: The Einstein Equation of State”, *Phys. Rev. Lett.* **75** (1995) 1260, [arXiv:gr-qc/9504004].
- [20] Mahnaz Asghari, Ahmad Sheykhi, “Observational Constraints of the Modified Cosmology Through Barrow Entropy”, *Eur. Phys. J. C* **82** (2022) 388, [arXiv:gr-qc/2110.00059].
- [21] Sofia Di Gennaro, Hao Xu, Yen Chin Ong, “How Barrow Entropy Modifies Gravity: With Comments on Tsallis Entropy”, *Eur. Phys. J. C* **82** (2022) 11, 1066, [arXiv:2207.09271 [gr-qc]].
- [22] Ankit Anand, Ruben Campos Delgado, “Modified Gravity Theories From the Barrow Hypothesis”, [arXiv:2403.13687 [gr-qc]].
- [23] David Kubizňák, Marek Liška, “Can Bekenstein’s Area Law Preval in Modified Theories of Gravity?”, *Phys. Rev.*

- D **108** (2023) 12, L121501, [arXiv:2307.16201 [hep-th]].
- [24] Alfio Bonanno, Georgios Kofinas, Vasilios Zarikas, “Effective Field Equations and Scale-Dependent Couplings in Gravity”, *Phys. Rev. D* **103** (2021) 10, 104025, [arXiv:2012.05338 [gr-qc]].
- [25] Rafael D. Sorkin, “How Wrinkled is the Surface of a Black Hole?”, Proceedings of the First Australasian Conference on General Relativity and Gravitation, edited by David Wiltshire, pp. 163-174 (University of Adelaide, 1996), [arXiv:gr-qc/9701056].
- [26] Frigyes Károlyházy, “Gravitation and Quantum Mechanics of Macroscopic Objects”, *Nuovo Cim. A* **42** (1966) 390.
- [27] Yee Jack Ng, Hendrik van Dam, “Limitation to Quantum Measurements of Spacetime Distances”, *Annals N. Y. Acad. Sci.* **755** (1995) 579, [arXiv:hep-th/9406110].
- [28] Yu.L. Bolotin, Vladimir V. Yanovsky, “Barrow Entropy and Spacetime Foam”, [arXiv:2405.16862 [gr-qc]].
- [29] Sofia Di Gennaro, Yen Chin Ong, “Sign Switching Dark Energy from a Running Barrow Entropy”, *Universe* **8** (2022) 10, 541, [arXiv:2205.09311 [gr-qc]].
- [30] Jiayi Xia, Yen Chin Ong, “Upper Bound of Barrow Entropy Index from Black Hole Fragmentation”, *Universe* **10** (2024) 4, 177, [arXiv:2404.09278 [gr-qc]].
- [31] Rodolfo Casana, André Cavalcante, Felipe Peixoto Poulis, Esdras Barbosa dos Santos, “An Exact Schwarzschild-Like Solution in a Bumblebee Gravity Model”, *Phys. Rev. D* **97** (2018) 10, 104001, [arXiv:1711.02273 [gr-qc]].
- [32] Wentao Liu, Di Wu, Jieci Wang, “Static Neutral Black Holes in Kalb-Ramond Gravity”, [arXiv:2406.13461 [hep-th]].
- [33] Yu-Sen An, “Notes on Thermodynamics of Schwarzschild-Like Bumblebee Black Hole”, *Phys. Dark Univ.* **45** (2024) 101520, [arXiv:2401.15430 [gr-qc]].
- [34] Everton M. C. Abreu, Jorge Ananias Neto, “Statistical Approaches and the Bekenstein Bound Conjecture in Schwarzschild Black Holes”, *Phys. Lett. B* **835** (2022) 137565, [arXiv:2207.13652 [gr-qc]].
- [35] Gabriella V. Ambrósio, Michelly S. Andrade, Paulo R. F. Alves, Cleber N. Costa, Jorge Ananias Neto, Ronaldo Thibes, “Exploring Modified Kaniadakis Entropy: Mond Theory and the Bekenstein Bound Conjecture”, [arXiv:2405.14799 [gr-qc]].
- [36] Yen Chin Ong, “A Maximum Force Perspective on Black Hole Thermodynamics, Quantum Pressure, and Near-Extremality”, *Eur. Phys. J. C* **83** (2023) 11, 1068, [arXiv:2309.04110 [gr-qc]].
- [37] Aditya Vijaykumar, Shasvath J. Kapadia, Parameswaran Ajith, “Constraints on the Time Variation of the Gravitational Constant Using Gravitational-Wave Observations of Binary Neutron Stars”, *Phys. Rev. Lett.* **126** (2021) 14, 141104, [arXiv:2003.12832 [gr-qc]].
- [38] Ke Wang, Lu Chen, “Constraints on Newton’s Constant from Cosmological Observations”, *Eur. Phys. J. C* **80** (2020) 6, 570, [arXiv:2004.13976 [astro-ph.CO]].
- [39] De-Chang Dai, “Variance of Newtonian Constant From Local Gravitational Acceleration Measurements”, *Phys. Rev. D* **103** (2021) 6, 064059, [arXiv:2103.11157 [gr-qc]].
- [40] Riccardo Barbieri, Stefano Savastano, Lorenzo Speri, Andrea Antonelli, Laura Sberna, Ollie Burke, Jonathan R. Gair, Nicola Tamanini, “Constraining the Evolution of Newton’s Constant With Slow Inspirals Observed From Spaceborne Gravitational-Wave Detectors”, *Phys. Rev. D* **107** (2023) 6, 064073, [arXiv:2207.10674 [gr-qc]].
- [41] Jiachen An, Yadong Xue, Zhoujian Cao, Xiaokai He, Bing Sun, “The Effect of the Gravitational Constant Variation on the Propagation of Gravitational Waves”, *Phys. Lett. B* **844** (2023) 138108, [arXiv:2307.15382 [gr-qc]].
- [42] Bing Sun, Jiachen An, Zhoujian Cao, “Probe the Gravitational Constant Variation via the Propagation of Gravitational Waves”, *Phys. Lett. B* **848** (2024) 138350, [arXiv:2308.00233 [gr-qc]].
- [43] Max Niedermaier, “The Asymptotic Safety Scenario in Quantum Gravity – An Introduction”, *Class. Quant. Grav.* **24** (2007) R171, [arXiv:gr-qc/0610018].
- [44] Jan M. Pawłowski, Dennis Stock, “Quantum Improved Schwarzschild-(A)dS and Kerr-(A)dS Space-times”, *Phys. Rev. D* **98** (2018) 10, 106008, [arXiv:1807.10512 [hep-th]].
- [45] Astrid Eichhorn, Aaron Held, “Black Holes in Asymptotically Safe Gravity and Beyond”, [arXiv:2212.09495 [gr-qc]].
- [46] Alessia Platania, “Black Holes in Asymptotically Safe Gravity”, In: Bambi, C., Modesto, L., Shapiro, I. (eds) *Handbook of Quantum Gravity*. Springer, Singapore, [arXiv:2302.04272 [gr-qc]].
- [47] Chiang-Mei Chen, Yi Chen, Akihiro Ishibashi, Nobuyoshi Ohta, Daiki Yamaguchi, “Running Newton Coupling, Scale Identification and Black Hole Thermodynamics”, *Phys. Rev. D* **105** (2022) 10, 106026, [arXiv:2204.09892 [hep-th]].
- [48] Yasunori Fujii, “Dilaton and Possible Non-Newtonian Gravity”, *Nature* **234** (1971) 5.
- [49] Daniel R. Long, “Why Do We Believe Newtonian Gravitation at Laboratory Dimensions?”, *Phys. Rev. D* **9** (1974) 850.
- [50] David R. Mikkelsen, Michael J. Newman, “Constraints on the Gravitational Constant at Large Distances”, *Phys. Rev. D* **16** (1977) 919.
- [51] P. Hut, “A Constraint on the Distance Dependence of the Gravitational Constant”, *Phys. Lett. B* **99** (1981) 174.
- [52] Duncan Farrah, Sara Petty, Kevin Croker, Gregory Tarle, Michael Zevin, Evanthia Hatziminaoglou, Francesco Shankar, Lingyu Wang, David L Clements, Andreas Efstathiou, Mark Lacy, Kurtis A. Nishimura, Jose Afonso, Chris Pearson, Lura K Pitchford, “A Preferential Growth Channel for Supermassive Black Holes in Elliptical Galaxies at $z < 2$ ”, *ApJ* **943** (2023) 133, [arXiv:2212.06854 [astro-ph.GA]].
- [53] Duncan Farrah, Kevin S. Croker, Gregory Tarlé, Valerio Faraoni, Sara Petty, Jose Afonso, Nicolas Fernandez, Kurtis A. Nishimura, Chris Pearson, Lingyu Wang, Michael Zevin, David L Clements, Andreas Efstathiou, Evanthia Hatziminaoglou, Mark Lacy, Conor McPartland, Lura K Pitchford, Nobuyuki Sakai, Joel Weiner, “Observational Evidence for Cosmological Coupling of Black Holes and Its Implications for an Astrophysical Source of Dark Energy”, *Astrophys. J. Lett* **944** (2023) L31, [arXiv:2302.07878 [astro-ph.CO]].
- [54] Sohan Ghodla, Richard Easther, M. M. Briel, J.J. Eldridge, “Observational Implications of Cosmologically Coupled Black Holes”, *Open J. Astrophys.* **6** (2023), [arXiv:2306.08199 [astro-ph.CO]].
- [55] Shi-Jie Gao, Xiang-Dong Li, “Can Cosmologically-Coupled Mass Growth of Black Holes Solve the Mass Gap Problem?”, *Astrophys. J.* **956** (2023) 2, 128, [arXiv:2307.10708 [astro-ph.HE]].
- [56] Luca Amendola, Davi C. Rodrigues, Sumit Kumar, Miguel Quartin, “Constraints on Cosmologically Coupled Black

- Holes From Gravitational Wave Observations and Minimal Formation Mass”, *Mon. Not. Roy. Astron. Soc.* **528** (2024) 2, 2377, [arXiv:2307.02474 [astro-ph.CO]].
- [57] Mark Lacy, Athena Engholm, Duncan Farrah, Kiana Ejercito, “Constraints on Cosmological Coupling From the Accretion History of Supermassive Black Holes”, *Astrophys. J. Lett.* **961** (2024) 2, L33, [arXiv:2312.12344 [astro-ph.CO]].
- [58] Kevin S. Croker, Gregory Tarlé, Steve P. Ahlen, Brian G. Cartwright, Duncan Farrah, Nicolas Fernandez, Rogier A. Windhorst, “DESI Dark Energy Time Evolution is Recovered by Cosmologically Coupled Black Holes”, [arXiv:2405.12282 [astro-ph.CO]].
- [59] Rong-Gen Cai, Li-Ming Cao, Ya-Peng Hu, “Corrected Entropy-Area Relation and Modified Friedmann Equations”, *JHEP* **08** (2008) 090, [arXiv:0807.1232 [hep-th]].
- [60] Ahmad Sheykhi, “Modified Friedmann Equations from Tsallis Entropy”, *Phys. Lett. B* **785** (2018) 118, [arXiv:1806.03996 [gr-qc]].
- [61] Ekim Taylan Hammeli, Brahim Lamine, Alain Blanchard, Isaac Tutusaus, “Time-Dependent G in Einstein’s Equations as an Alternative to the Cosmological Constant”, *Phys. Rev. D* **101** (2020) 063513, [arXiv:1910.08325 [astro-ph.CO]].
- [62] Brian Greene, Kurt Hinterbichler, Simon Judes, Maulik K. Parikh, “Smooth Initial Conditions From Weak Gravity”, *Phys. Lett. B* **97** (2011) 178, [arXiv:0911.0693 [hep-th]].
- [63] David Sloan, George Ellis, “Solving the Cosmological Entropy Issue with a Higgs Dilaton”, *Phys. Rev. D* **99** (2019) 6, 063518, [arXiv:1810.06522 [gr-qc]].
- [64] Valerio Marra, Leandros Perivolaropoulos, “A Rapid Transition of G_{eff} at $z_t \simeq 0.01$ as a Solution of the Hubble and Growth Tensions”, *Phys. Rev. D* **104** (2021) 2, L021303, [arXiv:2102.06012 [astro-ph.CO]].
- [65] Lavinia Heisenberg, Hector Villarrubia-Rojo, Jann Zosso, “Simultaneously Solving the H_0 and σ_8 Tensions With Late Dark Energy”, *Phys. Dark Univ.* **39** (2023) 101163, [arXiv:2201.11623 [astro-ph.CO]].
- [66] Ziad Sakr, Domenico Sapone, “Can Varying the Gravitational Constant Alleviate the Tensions?”, *JCAP* **03** (2022) 03, 034, [arXiv:2112.14173 [astro-ph.CO]].
- [67] Adam Moss, Ali Narimani, Douglas Scott, “Let’s Talk About Varying G ”, *Int. J. Mod. Phys. D* **19** (2010) 2289, [arXiv:1004.2066 [astro-ph.CO]].
- [68] Valerio Faraoni, “Black Hole Entropy in Scalar-Tensor and $f(R)$ Gravity: An Overview”, *Entropy* **12** (2010) 1246, [arXiv:1005.2327 [gr-qc]].
- [69] Ram Brustein, Dan Gorbonos, Merav Hadad, “Wald’s Entropy Is Equal to a Quarter of the Horizon Area in Units of the Effective Gravitational Coupling”, *Phys. Rev. D* **79** (2009) 044025, [arXiv:0712.3206 [hep-th]].
- [70] Giuseppe Gaetano Luciano, “Kaniadakis Entropy in Extreme Gravitational and Cosmological Environments: A Review on the State-Of-The-Art and Future Prospects”, [arXiv:2406.11373 [astro-ph.CO]].