

Properties of Dynamical Black Hole Entropy

Manus R. Visser* and Zihan Yan†

*DAMTP, Centre for Mathematical Sciences, University of Cambridge,
Wilberforce Road, Cambridge, U.K. CB3 0WA*

13th March 2024

Abstract

We study the first law for non-stationary perturbations of a stationary black hole whose event horizon is a Killing horizon, that relates the first-order change in the mass and angular momentum to the change in the entropy of an arbitrary horizon cross-section. Recently, Hollands, Wald and Zhang [1] have shown that the dynamical black hole entropy that satisfies this first law, for general relativity, is $S_{\text{dyn}} = (1 - v\partial_v)S_{\text{BH}}$, where v is the affine parameter of the null horizon generators and S_{BH} is the Bekenstein-Hawking entropy, and for general diffeomorphism covariant theories of gravity $S_{\text{dyn}} = (1 - v\partial_v)S_{\text{Wall}}$, where S_{Wall} is the Wall entropy. They obtained the first law by applying the Noether charge method to non-stationary perturbations and arbitrary cross-sections. In this formalism, the dynamical black hole entropy is defined as an “improved” Noether charge, which is unambiguous to first order in the perturbation. In the present article we provide a pedagogical derivation of the physical process version of the non-stationary first law for general relativity by integrating the linearised Raychaudhuri equation between two arbitrary horizon cross-sections. Moreover, we generalise the derivation of the first law in [1] to non-minimally coupled matter fields, using boost weight arguments rather than Killing field arguments, and we relax some of the gauge conditions on the perturbations by allowing for non-zero variations of the horizon Killing field and surface gravity. Finally, for $f(\text{Riemann})$ theories of gravity we show explicitly using Gaussian null coordinates that the improved Noether charge is $S_{\text{dyn}} = (1 - v\partial_v)S_{\text{Wall}}$, which is a non-trivial check of [1].

arXiv:2403.07140v1 [hep-th] 11 Mar 2024

*mv551@cam.ac.uk

†zy286@cam.ac.uk

Contents

1	Introduction	3
1.1	Motivation	3
1.2	Dynamical Black Hole Entropy	6
1.3	Methodology: Raychaudhuriology and Noetherology	9
1.4	Plan of the Paper	11
2	Geometric Setup	12
2.1	Stationary Black Hole Background Geometry	12
2.2	Gauge Conditions for First-Order Non-Stationary Perturbations	16
2.3	Gaussian Null Coordinates in Affine Parameterisation	18
3	Dynamical Black Hole Entropy from Raychaudhuri Equation	21
3.1	The Physical Process First Law for Non-Stationary Perturbations	22
3.2	Relation to Bekenstein-Hawking Entropy of the Apparent Horizon	25
4	Dynamical Black Hole Entropy is Improved Noether Charge	29
4.1	Covariant Phase Space Formalism	29
4.2	The Non-Stationary Comparison First Law	31
4.3	The Physical Process First Law	34
4.4	The Linearised Second Law	35
4.5	Relation to Wall Entropy	36
4.6	Invariance under JKM Ambiguities to First Order	37
4.7	Exactness of the Symplectic Potential on the Horizon	38
4.8	Structural Analysis of the (Improved) Noether Charge	40
5	Examples of Dynamical Black Hole Entropy	42
5.1	General Relativity	42
5.2	$f(R)$ Gravity	44
5.3	$f(\text{Riemann})$ Theories	45
A	The Tale of Three Surface Gravities	48
B	Geometric Quantities in Gaussian Null Coordinates	51
B.1	Affine GNC	51
B.2	Killing GNC	52

1 Introduction

1.1 Motivation

The laws of black hole thermodynamics belong to the most remarkable discoveries of modern physics, since they combine general relativity, quantum field theory and thermodynamics into one overarching framework. Moreover, they provide a low-energy window into quantum gravity. The first law of black hole mechanics relates the variation of the mass M and angular momentum J of the black hole to the variation of the black hole entropy S [2, 3]

$$\delta M - \Omega_{\mathcal{H}} \delta J = T \delta S, \quad (1.1)$$

with $\Omega_{\mathcal{H}}$ being the angular velocity of the horizon. This variational relation holds for linear perturbations of stationary, axisymmetric black holes, whose event horizon is a Killing horizon, and we assumed the black hole is a solution to the vacuum gravitational field equations, and the perturbation satisfies the linearised field equations. The black hole temperature is universally given by the Hawking temperature [4]

$$T = \frac{\kappa}{2\pi}, \quad (1.2)$$

where κ is the surface gravity of the Killing horizon (and we have set $\hbar = c = k_B = 1$). The mass, angular momentum, and black hole entropy, on the other hand, depend on the gravitational theory under consideration. For instance, in general relativity the mass and angular momentum are given by the ADM formulae [5, 6], defined at spatial infinity, but in higher curvature gravity there are suitable generalisations of these definitions, see, e.g., [7–9] for the ADM mass in Lovelock gravity. In this article, however, we focus on the entropy of black holes. For general relativity, the black hole entropy S satisfies the Bekenstein-Hawking formula [2, 4]

$$S_{\text{BH}} = \frac{A}{4G}, \quad (1.3)$$

where A is the event horizon area and G is Newton’s constant. On the other hand, for an arbitrary diffeomorphism covariant theories of gravity, S is given by the Wald entropy,¹ which for a Lagrangian L consisting of contractions of the inverse metric and Riemann tensor, henceforth called $f(\text{Riemann})$ theories of gravity, takes the form [11, 12]

$$S_{\text{Wald}} = -8\pi \int_{\mathcal{C}(v)} dA \frac{\partial L}{\partial R_{uvuv}}. \quad (1.4)$$

Here v is the (future-directed) affine parameter along the outgoing null geodesics of the future horizon, u affinely parameterises the outgoing null geodesics of the horizon and is also future-directed, $\mathcal{C}(v)$ is a horizon cross-section at affine null time v , dA is a “volume” (area) element on $\mathcal{C}(v)$, and $\partial L / \partial R_{uvuv}$ is the functional derivative of the Lagrangian with respect to the Riemann tensor component R_{uvuv} , with the metric and connection held fixed.

Furthermore, the Bekenstein-Hawking entropy (1.3) satisfies a second law, i.e., $\partial_v S_{\text{BH}} \geq 0$: according to the area theorem [13] the surface area of the future event horizon is never decreasing in time in any dynamical process, if the null energy condition holds and weak cosmic censorship is valid. For arbitrary diffeomorphism covariant theories of gravity there is no equivalent second law for black hole entropy in a general context. Iyer and Wald [11] proposed a formula for dynamical black hole entropy for such general theories of gravity by evaluating the Wald entropy

¹Wald entropy seems to be standard terminology for (1.4) in the literature (see, e.g., [10]), even though this particular expression only appeared later in the work of Iyer and Wald [11]. The term Iyer-Wald entropy is reserved for their dynamical black hole entropy proposal (1.5), which they retracted in a note added to the journal version.

with only the boost-invariant tensor components of the dynamical fields (metric and matter) and their derivatives as input. This is known as the Iyer-Wald entropy

$$S_{\text{Iyer-Wald}}[\phi] = S_{\text{Wald}}[\mathfrak{I}\phi], \quad (1.5)$$

where $\phi = (g, \varphi)$ is the collective notation for the metric g and matter fields φ , and \mathfrak{I} is a projection operator that keeps only boost-invariant components (with respect to the Killing vector that generates local boosts near the horizon). As a result, the Iyer-Wald entropy contains only zero boost weight terms.² However, $S_{\text{Iyer-Wald}}$ does not seem to satisfy a second law, and it is not field redefinition invariant, as was noted in a revised version of [11].

Recently, Wall [10] derived a second law for higher curvature gravity in a perturbative context, that holds for linear non-stationary perturbations to a Killing horizon. His dynamical entropy proposal is constant to linear order for vacuum perturbations of the metric field, i.e., $\partial_\nu \delta S_{\text{Wall}} = 0$. Moreover, it is non-decreasing, $\partial_\nu \delta S_{\text{Wall}} \geq 0$, for perturbations that are sourced by an external stress-energy tensor, satisfying the null energy condition $\delta T_{\nu\nu} \geq 0$, and that ends as a stationary state, i.e., $\partial_\nu \delta S_{\text{Wall}}|_{\nu=+\infty} = 0$. For $f(\text{Riemann})$ theories of gravity the Wall entropy has an additional term compared to the Wald entropy (1.4), that depends on the extrinsic curvatures of the horizon in the ν - and u -directions, K_{ij} and \bar{K}_{ij} , respectively, and for more complicated theories there will be more terms. In particular, for $f(\text{Riemann})$ gravity the Wall entropy takes the form³ [10]

$$S_{\text{Wall}} = -8\pi \int_{\mathcal{C}(\nu)} dA \left(\frac{\partial L}{\partial R_{uvuv}} - 4 \frac{\partial^2 L}{\partial R_{uiuj} \partial R_{kvkl}} \bar{K}_{ij} K_{kl} \right). \quad (1.6)$$

The Wall entropy reduces to the Wald entropy on a Killing horizon, since $K_{ij} = 0$ on the future horizon and $\bar{K}_{ij} = 0$ on the past horizon. Remarkably, the Wall entropy matches to linear order in perturbation theory with the holographic entanglement entropy computed by Dong [15] for higher curvature gravity (see also [16] for a derivation of holographic entanglement entropy in quadratic gravity). Since the Dong and Wall entropies are derived in different contexts, and because it is not well understood whether their agreement is a coincidence or whether it holds more generally, we will refer to the dynamical black hole entropy proposal (1.6) as Wall entropy. More recently, the Wall entropy was proven to be gauge invariant to linear order in the perturbation, and was extended for effective field theories to second order in the perturbation [17] (see also [18]) and in a non-perturbative context [19]. Further, S_{Wall} has been generalised to any diffeomorphism covariant theory of gravity non-minimally coupled to scalar fields, gauge fields [20] and (non-gauged) vector fields [14]. And, a covariant entropy current for the Wall entropy in general theories of gravity was obtained in [1] (see also [17, 21]). At the bifurcation surface both $S_{\text{Iyer-Wald}}$ and S_{Wall} reduce to S_{Wald} , and for general relativity all the higher curvature black hole entropy definitions are equal to S_{BH} .

Now, let us discuss the regime of validity of these entropy functionals, especially for the black hole entropies that obey the first law (1.1). The second law for S_{BH} and the linearised second law for S_{Wall} hold for non-stationary situations and for any horizon cross-section, as $\partial_\nu S_{\text{BH}} \geq 0$ and $\partial_\nu \delta S_{\text{Wall}} \geq 0$ are valid for any time ν on the horizon, but this is not the case for the first law. There are two major limitations of the standard treatments of the first law of black hole thermodynamics:

- (i) the first law often does not hold for non-stationary perturbations of a stationary black hole, and, if it does,

²We introduce the notion ‘‘boost weight’’ of a tensor component in Section 2.3.

³The extrinsic curvature term in (1.6) has a different sign compared to equation (14) in [10], which is due to the fact that in our conventions the tangent ∂_u to the ingoing null geodesics at the future horizon is future-directed, whereas in [10] (and [14]) it is past-directed.

- (ii) the black hole entropy cannot be evaluated at an arbitrary cross-section of the event horizon of the perturbed non-stationary black hole.

We start with the first limitation (i). The Bekenstein-Hawking entropy and Wald entropy both are valid for arbitrary cross-sections of Killing horizons, since they are constant in Killing time for stationary black holes. That is, they obey the first law (1.1) for stationary perturbations of the Killing horizon. There are two versions of such a stationary first law [22]. First, the *stationary comparison version* of the first law compares two different, but infinitesimally close, stationary black hole geometries. Originally, Bekenstein [2] derived this first law by varying the parameters describing the Kerr-Newman black hole. Further, Bardeen, Carter and Hawking [3] (see also [23]) extended it, using the Komar integral method, to asymptotically flat, stationary, axisymmetric black holes in general relativity surrounded by fluid matter. And, Wald [12] derived the stationary comparison first law using the Noether charge method, showing that the black hole entropy of a Killing horizon is given by the Noether charge associated to the horizon Killing field integrated over a horizon cross-section.

Second, for the *physical process version* of the first law we consider a stationary black hole and slightly perturb it by a flux of ingoing matter. The standard derivation [22] assumes that the perturbation starts in a stationary state (at the bifurcation surface) and settles down to a stationary solution at future infinity. The physical process first law was originally derived for vacuum black hole solutions in general relativity [24], and was later extended to charged, stationary black holes by Gao and Wald [25] (see also [26]). In fact, it also holds for Rindler horizons [27], and more generally, for any causal horizon [28] and bifurcate Killing horizon [29].

All these derivations of the first law have in common that they assume the perturbation of the metric is stationary, i.e., $\delta(\mathcal{L}_\xi g_{ab}) = 0$, where \mathcal{L}_ξ is the Lie derivative with respect to the horizon generating Killing field. However, non-stationary perturbations of a stationary black hole also present a well-defined setup for the first law. This is precisely the setup in which Wall [10] derived the linearised second law for higher curvature gravity (see [21, 30–32] for a similar setup). To recap, in thermodynamic language, the Bekenstein-Hawking entropy and Wald entropy are valid for black holes in thermal equilibrium (with their Hawking radiation), but they do not describe the entropy of near-equilibrium black holes.

This brings us to the second limitation (ii). Iyer and Wald [11] generalised the first law using the Noether charge method to non-stationary perturbations, and showed that the Wald entropy (1.4) does satisfy a non-stationary first law. The caveat is, however, that the Wald entropy must be evaluated at the bifurcation surface in that case. But the entropy of non-stationary black holes evolves in principle over time, so the entropy at the bifurcation surface is generically not the same as as the entropy of other horizon cross-sections. It turns out that the Wald entropy on arbitrary cross-sections of a non-stationary black holes suffers from so-called JKM ambiguities, named after Jacobson, Kang and Myers (JKM) [33]. Hence, the Wald entropy cannot be the dynamical black hole entropy for arbitrary horizon slices. On the other hand, the Wall entropy does apply to non-stationary geometries, but it does not hold for arbitrary horizon cross-sections, since in the derivation of the physical process first law for Wall entropy it is assumed that the initial and final state of the perturbation are at the bifurcation surface and at future infinity, respectively [10].

Recently, Hollands, Wald and Zhang [1] have shown how to overcome these two limitations. They derived a first law for non-stationary perturbations of a stationary, axisymmetric black hole, whose event horizon is a Killing horizon, and obtained an unambiguous dynamical entropy functional satisfying the first law for arbitrary cross-sections of the perturbed event horizon. Their formula for the dynamical black hole entropy, reviewed below, differs from the Bekenstein-Hawking entropy and Wall entropy by a dynamical correction term. They derived the first law by applying the Noether charge method to non-stationary variations and arbitrary horizon cross-sections. In this formalism, the dynamical black hole entropy that satisfies the non-stationary

first law is defined as an “improved” Noether charge, which we review below. Further, their derivation of the first law holds for any diffeomorphism covariant Lagrangian for which the metric is the only dynamical field. We also note that the dynamical black hole entropy for general relativity was previously documented by Rignon-Bret in [34] (citing the upcoming work [1]), and he also proposed a different dynamical entropy for null surfaces that vanishes for every cross-section of a light cone in Minkowski spacetime. And, interestingly, in [35, 36] a boost charge was found that satisfies the same formula as the dynamical black hole entropy.

In this article we generalise and improve upon their work [1] in a number of ways, and we give a more pedagogical proof of the first law. That is, a) we explain how the non-stationary physical process first law simply follows from the Raychaudhuri equation; b) our gauge conditions for the perturbations are less restrictive, i.e., we do not fix the horizon Killing vector field nor the surface gravity; c) we derive the non-stationary first law for arbitrary theories of gravity non-minimally coupled to any bosonic matter field (whereas in [1] the metric is the only dynamical field); d) we evaluate the improved Noether charge explicitly for a generic $f(\text{Riemann})$ theory using Gaussian null coordinates and show that it equals the dynamical entropy formula in [1] (whereas in [1] they only do this for the quadratic gravity Lagrangian $\mathbf{L} = \epsilon R_{ab}R^{ab}$). In the rest of the introduction we review the main results of [1] in more detail and we explain how our work differs from it.

Note that the dynamical entropy for arbitrary higher curvature theories that satisfies the black hole first law does not necessarily hold in a fully non-perturbative regime outside the regime of validity of effective field theory, in which case black hole entropy might not even be well defined or it might be ambiguous. Throughout this paper we will be considering only perturbations off a stationary background to first order in perturbation theory (whereas in [1] they also consider second-order perturbations). Interestingly, this geometric setup is a sweet spot where the black hole entropy and energy can be defined in an unambiguous manner using the background Killing time, while the resulting expression for dynamical entropy S_{dyn} is nontrivial and different from the known entropy functionals for black holes discussed above (even for general relativity!). Further, in this setup the black hole temperature T in the first law (1.1) is still given by the Hawking temperature (1.2), since it is evaluated on the background Killing horizon. Below we do allow for perturbations that vary the surface gravity, but it turns out that they cancel out in the final form of the first law, which is an important consistency check that we perform.

1.2 Dynamical Black Hole Entropy

Let us now review the results in [1] for the non-stationary first law and the dynamical black hole entropy that satisfies this first law. The non-stationary first law for arbitrary horizon cross-sections still takes the form (1.1), where the mass and angular momentum terms are unchanged, but the entropy S is no longer equal to the Bekenstein-Hawking entropy for general relativity, or to the Wall entropy for higher curvature gravity. In fact, the dynamical black hole entropy differs from these entropy functionals on arbitrary horizon slices by a dynamical correction term. For general relativity, the dynamical black hole entropy was defined in [1] as

$$S_{\text{dyn}} = \left(1 - v \frac{d}{dv}\right) S_{\text{BH}}, \quad (1.7)$$

where v is the affine null parameter along the future horizon, ranging from $v = 0$ at \mathcal{B} to $v = \infty$ at future infinity. The derivative term is the dynamical correction term which vanishes on a Killing horizon, since the area is constant along the horizon, and it is zero on the bifurcation surface \mathcal{B} . Note that the product $v d/dv$ is invariant under the gauge transformation that rescales the affine parameter along each horizon generator, $v \rightarrow f(x^i)v$, where x^i are the codimension-2, spatial coordinates on the horizon. It is also noteworthy that S_{dyn} is smaller than S_{BH} , if the derivative of the horizon area dA/dv with respect to affine time is positive, which follows from

the area theorem. This suggests that the entropy (1.7) is associated to an area of a surface inside the event horizon. Indeed, as shown in [1], the dynamical black hole entropy is equal to the Bekenstein-Hawking entropy of the apparent horizon to linear order in perturbation theory. We also provide a pedagogical proof of this claim in the present paper.

Hollands, Wald and Zhang showed that the dynamical black hole entropy satisfies both a non-stationary comparison version and a physical process version of the first law. The comparison first law (1.1) compares two vacuum black hole geometries and holds for arbitrary cross-sections, hence the entropy is the same at all horizon cross-sections, i.e. $S_{\text{dyn}}[\mathcal{C}(v_1)] = S_{\text{dyn}}[\mathcal{C}(v_2)]$. In particular, the dynamical entropy at a cross-section $\mathcal{C}(v)$ is equal to the Bekenstein-Hawking entropy at the bifurcation surface, i.e. $S_{\text{dyn}}[\mathcal{C}(v)] = S_{\text{BH}}[\mathcal{B}]$, since S_{dyn} reduces to S_{BH} at \mathcal{B} . Thus, the dynamical black hole entropy is constant to first order for perturbations that only change the metric.

This will change when the perturbation changes the stress-energy tensor, i.e., $\delta T_{ab} \neq 0$, as is the case for the physical process first law, which reads

$$\Delta\delta M - \Omega_{\mathcal{H}}\Delta\delta J = T\Delta\delta S_{\text{dyn}}. \quad (1.8)$$

Here Δ stands for the difference between two horizon cuts $\mathcal{C}(v_1)$ and $\mathcal{C}(v_2)$, whereas δ denotes a linear perturbation around the stationary background. An immediate consequence of the physical process first law is that the dynamical black hole entropy (1.7) obeys the second law to first order in perturbation theory [1]. This can be seen as follows. For linearised perturbations that are sourced by external matter, described by a stress-energy tensor δT_{ab} , the variation of the mass and angular momentum of the black hole are related to the matter Killing energy flux $\Delta\delta E$ through the horizon between affine times v_1 and v_2

$$\Delta\delta M - \Omega_{\mathcal{H}}\Delta\delta J = \int_{v_1}^{v_2} dv \int_{\mathcal{C}(v)} dA \kappa v \delta T_{vv} = \Delta\delta E. \quad (1.9)$$

Combining this with the first law (1.1) yields

$$T\Delta\delta S_{\text{dyn}} = \int_{v_1}^{v_2} dv \int_{\mathcal{C}(v)} dA \kappa v \delta T_{vv}. \quad (1.10)$$

If the stress-energy variation satisfies the null energy condition, $\delta T_{vv} \geq 0$ then it follows immediately from (1.1) that the dynamical entropy is non-decreasing:

$$\Delta\delta S_{\text{dyn}} \geq 0. \quad (1.11)$$

This signals an important difference between the dynamical black hole entropy and Bekenstein-Hawking entropy, as noted in [1]. On the one hand, S_{BH} (the horizon area) already changes before matter crosses the horizon due to the teleological definition of the event horizon. On the other hand, the linearised second law implies that S_{dyn} only gets modified when matter crosses between v_1 and v_2 . If matter crosses the horizon at a later stage, for $v_3 > v_2$, then the dynamical entropy remains the same between v_1 to v_2 . This is because the change in the dynamical correction term $-v dS_{\text{BH}}/dv$ precisely cancels against the change in S_{BH} such that the dynamical entropy is unchanged. Thus, dynamical black hole entropy only changes locally in affine time.

Furthermore, the dynamical black hole entropy was generalised in [1] to higher curvature gravity, for which it was shown that

$$S_{\text{dyn}} = \left(1 - v \frac{d}{dv}\right) S_{\text{Wall}}. \quad (1.12)$$

Dynamical Black Hole Entropy Proposals	$S_{\text{Iyer-Wald}}$	S_{Wall}	S_{dyn}
CFL between \mathcal{B} and i_0	yes	yes	yes
CFL between $\mathcal{C}(v)$ and i_0	no	yes	yes
PPFL between \mathcal{B} and i^+	yes	yes	yes
PPFL between $\mathcal{C}(v_1)$ and $\mathcal{C}(v_2)$	no	no	yes
Linearised Second Law	no	yes	yes

Table 1: Proposals for dynamical black hole entropy. Here we compare the Iyer-Wald entropy (1.5), Wall entropy (1.6) and dynamical black hole entropy (1.12) and state whether they satisfy the first laws and linearised second law. The perturbations are first-order and non-stationary by default. CFL stands for comparison version of first law and PPFL means physical process version of the first law. We have also used the notation \mathcal{B} for the bifurcation surface, i_0 for spatial infinity, i^+ for future timelike infinity, $\mathcal{C}(v)$ for the horizon cross-section at affine time v . The CFL has not been proven for the Wall entropy, but can be deduced from the fact that S_{Wall} is constant on the horizon for vacuum perturbations, and at \mathcal{B} equals the Wald entropy. In fact, at \mathcal{B} all proposals agree and coincide with the Wald entropy: $S_{\text{Iyer-Wald}} \stackrel{\mathcal{B}}{=} S_{\text{Wall}} \stackrel{\mathcal{B}}{=} S_{\text{dyn}} \stackrel{\mathcal{B}}{=} S_{\text{Wald}}$. For general relativity, $S_{\text{Iyer-Wald}}$ and S_{Wall} are equal to the Bekenstein-Hawking entropy (1.3), whereas S_{dyn} is given by (1.7).

We provide a non-trivial check of this formula by an explicit calculation using Gaussian null coordinates for $f(\text{Riemann})$ theories, for which the Wall entropy is given by (1.6). More generally, the defining relation of the Wall entropy is that its second v -derivative is related to the vv -component of the gravitational field equations as [14]

$$\partial_v^2 \delta S_{\text{Wall}} = -2\pi \int_{\mathcal{C}(v)} dA \delta E_{vv}. \quad (1.13)$$

The physical process first law follows straightforwardly from this defining equation by multiplying it on both sides with $-v$, and then integrating over the affine parameter from v_1 to v_2

$$\kappa \int_{v_1}^{v_2} dv (-v \partial_v^2 \delta S_{\text{Wall}}) = 2\pi \int_{v_1}^{v_2} dv \int_{\mathcal{C}(v)} dA \kappa v \delta T_{vv}, \quad (1.14)$$

where we used the linearised gravitational field equation $\delta E_{vv} = \delta T_{vv}$. The right-hand side of this equation is 2π times the matter Killing energy flux (1.9), and we may rewrite the left-hand side using

$$-v \partial_v^2 \delta S_{\text{Wall}} = \partial_v ((1 - v \partial_v) \delta S_{\text{Wall}}) = \partial_v \delta S_{\text{dyn}}. \quad (1.15)$$

Thus, the physical process first law in higher curvature gravity follows from combining (1.9), (1.14) and (1.15), and identifying $T = \kappa/2\pi$, i.e.,

$$\Delta \delta M - \Omega_{\mathcal{H}} \Delta \delta J = T \Delta \delta \left(S_{\text{Wall}} - v \frac{d}{dv} S_{\text{Wall}} \right), \quad (1.16)$$

The linearised second law continues to hold for dynamical entropy in higher curvature gravity, since combining (1.14) and (1.15) yields

$$\partial_v \delta S_{\text{dyn}} = 2\pi \int_{\mathcal{C}(v)} dA v \delta T_{vv}. \quad (1.17)$$

If the perturbation is sourced by a stress-energy tensor that satisfies the null energy condition, $\delta T_{vv} \geq 0$, then S_{dyn} satisfies a linearised second law

$$\partial_v \delta S_{\text{dyn}} \geq 0. \quad (1.18)$$

Finally, in Table 1 we compare three different proposals for dynamical black hole entropy and indicate whether they obey the comparison first law, physical process first law and linearised second law.

1.3 Methodology: Raychaudhuriology and Noetherology

Hollands, Wald and Zhang [1] established the non-stationary first law for arbitrary horizon cross-sections by using the Noether charge method. Below we review this derivation and explain in more detail how we generalise and improve upon this derivation in the present work. However, in this article we also present a different, pedagogical derivation of the physical process version of the first law for general relativity, that was not given in [1]. That is, we derive the physical process first law by integrating the linearised Raychaudhuri equation between two arbitrary horizon cross-sections. For perturbations off a stationary black hole that satisfy the linearised Einstein equation, the Raychaudhuri equation reads to first order

$$\frac{d\delta\theta_v}{dv} = -8\pi G\delta T_{vv}, \quad (1.19)$$

where $\theta_v = (1/dA)\partial_v dA$ is the outgoing null expansion of the future horizon. Since the matter Killing energy variation is given by (1.9), we multiply on both sides by κv and integrate over the horizon between two cross-sections $\mathcal{C}(v_1)$ and $\mathcal{C}(v_2)$,

$$-\kappa \int_{v_1}^{v_2} dv \int_{\mathcal{C}(v)} dA v \frac{d\delta\theta_v}{dv} = 8\pi G \int_{v_1}^{v_2} dv \int_{\mathcal{C}(v)} dA \kappa v \delta T_{vv}. \quad (1.20)$$

Then, the right side is equal to the matter Killing energy flux $\Delta\delta E$ and the left side can be computed by integrating by parts, which gives rise to a boundary term and the integral of $\delta\theta_v$ along the horizon, which is equal to the horizon area change. Usually the boundary term is set to zero, because it is assumed that the perturbed black hole starts and ends in a stationary state, at $v = 0$ and $v = +\infty$, respectively. However, when we integrate between two intermediate cross-sections at v_1 and v_2 the boundary term is nonzero and proportional to

$$-\int_{\mathcal{C}(v)} dA (v\delta\theta_v) \Big|_{v_1}^{v_2} = -\Delta\delta \int_{\mathcal{C}(v)} dA v\theta_v = -\Delta\delta \left(v \frac{d}{dv} A \right). \quad (1.21)$$

Note in the second equality we are allowed to pull the δ through, since $\theta_v = 0$ on the background Killing horizon. (1.21) is precisely the dynamical correction term to the Bekenstein-Hawking entropy. As we will show in more detail in the paper, after combining all the different terms, one obtains the physical process first law (1.8), where the dynamical black hole entropy obeys (1.7). Thus, we see that the dynamical black hole entropy in general relativity follows in a straightforward way from Raychaudhuriology.

Now, in [1] Hollands, Wald and Zhang derived the physical process and comparison version of the first law for general diffeomorphism covariant Lagrangians that only depend on the metric by applying the Noether charge method [11, 12] to non-stationary perturbations. We generalise their derivation to the case where the metric is non-minimally coupled to arbitrary bosonic matter fields. Moreover, we allow for non-vanishing variations of the horizon generating Killing field and surface gravity, i.e., $\delta\xi^a \neq 0$ and $\delta\kappa \neq 0$, and show that the first law is independent of these variations. Below, we summarise the derivation of the non-stationary comparison first law. The main steps of the derivation are the same as in [1], such as (1.30) and (1.32), but some of the technicalities are different due to our less restrictive gauge conditions on the perturbation, especially (1.31).

We employ the fundamental variational identity (4.20) for general perturbations away from a stationary background with Killing field ξ^a ,

$$d(\delta_\phi \mathbf{Q}_\xi - \xi \cdot \Theta(\phi, \delta\phi)) = 0, \quad (1.22)$$

where we assumed the background equations of motion for the dynamical fields, collectively denoted as ϕ , and the linearised constraint equations are satisfied. This identity holds in particular

also for non-stationary perturbations, for which $\delta(\mathcal{L}_\xi g_{ab}) \neq 0$. Here, \mathbf{Q}_ξ is the Noether charge codimension-2 form with respect to ξ , $\Theta(\phi, \delta\phi)$ is the symplectic potential codimension-1 form, δ_ϕ denotes a field variation that does not act on the vector field ξ , so that $\delta_\phi \mathbf{Q}_\xi = \delta \mathbf{Q}_\xi - \mathbf{Q}_{\delta\xi}$, and δ acts both on the dynamical fields and on the vector field.

Next, we integrate the variational identity over a spacelike hypersurface with a single asymptotic boundary and a compact interior boundary at the horizon. Because of Stokes' theorem, the boundary integral at a cross-section \mathcal{S}_∞ of spatial infinity i_0 is equal to the boundary integral at a cross-section \mathcal{C} of the horizon

$$\int_{\mathcal{S}_\infty} (\delta_\phi \mathbf{Q}_\xi - \xi \cdot \Theta(\phi, \delta\phi)) = \int_{\mathcal{C}} (\delta_\phi \mathbf{Q}_\xi - \xi \cdot \Theta(\phi, \delta\phi)). \quad (1.23)$$

At asymptotic infinity we identify

$$\int_{\mathcal{S}_\infty} (\delta_\phi \mathbf{Q}_\xi - \xi \cdot \Theta(\phi, \delta\phi)) = \delta M - \Omega_{\mathcal{H}} \delta J, \quad (1.24)$$

where M and J are the mass and angular momentum of the black hole. The mass is well defined if a codimension-1 form \mathbf{B}_∞ exists such that

$$\Theta \stackrel{i_0}{=} \delta \mathbf{B}_\infty. \quad (1.25)$$

We assume the Killing field is normalised at infinity as $\xi^a = (\partial_t)^a + \Omega_{\mathcal{H}} (\partial_\vartheta)^a$, and we keep the time translation and rotational Killing fields fixed at asymptotic infinity, $\delta(\partial_t)^a = \delta(\partial_\vartheta)^a = 0$. Then one may define the mass and angular momentum as [12]

$$M = \int_{\mathcal{S}_\infty} (\mathbf{Q}_{\partial_t} - \partial_t \cdot \mathbf{B}_\infty), \quad (1.26)$$

$$J = - \int_{\mathcal{S}_\infty} \mathbf{Q}_{\partial_\vartheta}. \quad (1.27)$$

Note that $\partial_\vartheta \cdot \mathbf{B}_\infty$ does not appear in the formula for J , because ∂_ϑ is tangent to \mathcal{S}_∞ . For asymptotically flat solutions to general relativity, Iyer and Wald [11] showed that a \mathbf{B}_∞ exists that satisfies (1.25), and they recovered the correct ADM mass and angular momentum.

Further, for the interior boundary integral, Wald [12] evaluated it at the bifurcation surface \mathcal{B} , where $\xi^a = 0$, hence the term $\xi \cdot \Theta$ vanishes. He identified the black hole entropy with the Noether charge integrated over the bifurcation surface

$$\int_{\mathcal{B}} \delta_\phi \mathbf{Q}_\xi = \frac{\kappa}{2\pi} \delta S_{\text{Wald}}. \quad (1.28)$$

Subsequently, Iyer and Wald [11] showed that the Noether charge integral yields the Wald entropy formula (1.4) for arbitrary diffeomorphism covariant theories of gravity. The first law of black hole mechanics for such a general theory of gravity then follows from inserting (1.24) and (1.28) into the variational identity (1.23).

Alternatively, for arbitrary horizon cross-sections, the term $\xi \cdot \Theta$ does not vanish in general. Therefore, in that case Hollands, Wald and Zhang [1] proposed that the full interior integral should be proportional to the variation of the dynamical black hole entropy

$$\int_{\mathcal{C}} (\delta_\phi \mathbf{Q}_\xi - \xi \cdot \Theta(\phi, \delta\phi)) = \frac{\kappa}{2\pi} \delta S_{\text{dyn}}, \quad (1.29)$$

where κ is the surface gravity of the background Killing horizon. This identification leads to the desired non-stationary comparison first law (1.1) for arbitrary horizon cross-sections in

arbitrary diffeomorphism covariant theories. Crucially, the dynamical black hole entropy is only well defined if there exists a codimension-1 form $\mathbf{B}_{\mathcal{H}^+}$ such that [1]

$$\Theta \stackrel{\mathcal{H}^+}{=} \delta \mathbf{B}_{\mathcal{H}^+}, \quad \text{and} \quad \mathbf{B}_{\mathcal{H}^+} \stackrel{\mathcal{H}^+}{=} 0, \quad (1.30)$$

where the second equality holds on the background Killing horizon. The two properties (1.30) of $\mathbf{B}_{\mathcal{H}^+}$ together imply that $\xi \cdot \Theta \stackrel{\mathcal{C}}{=} \delta(\xi \cdot \mathbf{B}_{\mathcal{H}^+}) \stackrel{\mathcal{C}}{=} \kappa \delta(\xi \cdot \mathbf{B}_{\mathcal{H}^+} / \kappa_3)$. In [1] it was proven that such a $\mathbf{B}_{\mathcal{H}^+}$ form exists using Killing field arguments for general diffeomorphism covariant Lagrangians for which the metric is the only dynamical field. Alternatively, in this paper we construct a $\mathbf{B}_{\mathcal{H}^+}$ form assuming a fixed Gaussian null coordinates (GNC) system near the horizon, and using the associated boost weight arguments. Our proof of (1.30) holds for any diffeomorphism covariant Lagrangians that depends on the metric and arbitrary non-minimally coupled bosonic matter fields (see Section 4.7), and thus is more general than that in [1].

Further, in order for S_{dyn} to be well defined, we require

$$\delta_\phi \mathbf{Q}_\xi \stackrel{\mathcal{C}}{=} \kappa \delta(\mathbf{Q}_\xi / \kappa_3). \quad (1.31)$$

Here κ_3 is the surface gravity defined as $\kappa_3^2 \stackrel{\mathcal{H}^+}{=} -\frac{1}{2}(\nabla^a \xi^b)(\nabla_{[a} \xi_{b]})$ on the perturbed horizon. For a Killing horizon different definitions of surface gravity all coincide, but for a perturbed Killing horizon they differ from each other, hence we need to specify which surface gravity we refer to (see Section 2.2). We prove (1.31) in Section 4.8 using fixed GNC for general theories of gravity. The condition (1.31) does not appear in [1] since they keep the surface gravity fixed.

Finally, it follows from (1.30) and (1.31) that the dynamical black hole entropy can be defined as the *improved Noether charge* $\tilde{\mathbf{Q}}_\xi$ [37–43], i.e., [1]

$$S_{\text{dyn}} = \frac{2\pi}{\kappa_3} \int_{\mathcal{C}} \tilde{\mathbf{Q}}_\xi = \frac{2\pi}{\kappa_3} \int_{\mathcal{C}} (\mathbf{Q}_\xi - \xi \cdot \mathbf{B}_{\mathcal{H}^+}). \quad (1.32)$$

Note that at the bifurcation surface, where $\xi^a = 0$, and on a Killing horizon, where $\mathbf{B}_{\mathcal{H}^+} \stackrel{\mathcal{H}^+}{=} 0$, the dynamical black hole entropy reduces to Wald’s definition of black hole entropy as Noether charge. But for arbitrary cross-sections and non-stationary black holes, the term $\xi \cdot \mathbf{B}_{\mathcal{H}^+}$ gives a dynamical correction to Wald’s definition. In [1] it was shown that the improved Noether charge is related to the Wall entropy by (1.12) using a covariant definition of the Wall entropy current in general theories of gravity. Instead, in this paper we compute the improved Noether charge explicitly for some examples using GNC, and derive the dynamical entropy formula (1.7) for general relativity and its generalisation (1.12) for $f(\text{Riemann})$ theories (see Section 5). Moreover, since the improved Noether charge is invariant under the JKM ambiguities to leading order in the perturbation (see [1] for a proof, and also Section 4.6), Noetherology thus yields a unique dynamical black hole entropy for first-order perturbations off a stationary background.

1.4 Plan of the Paper

The paper is organised as follows. In Section 2 we introduce our geometric setup in more detail, describe our gauge conditions for the perturbation, and review Gaussian null coordinates in affine parameterisation. Further, in Section 3 we derive the physical process first law for non-stationary perturbations and arbitrary horizon cross-sections from the Raychaudhuri equation for null geodesic congruences. In Section 4 we explain how a comparison version and physical process version of the first law can be derived for arbitrary diffeomorphism covariant theories of gravity using the Noether charge formalism. In the final Section 5 we explicitly compute the dynamical entropy for three examples: general relativity, $f(R)$ gravity and $f(\text{Riemann})$ theories. Finally, Appendix A contains technical details about the definitions of surface gravity




Figure 1: Bifurcate Killing horizon \mathcal{H} . The horizon is comprised of two null surfaces \mathcal{H}^+ at $u = 0$, the future horizon, and \mathcal{H}^- at $v = 0$, the past horizon, that intersect at the bifurcation surface \mathcal{B} . The horizon generating Killing field is denoted by ξ^a , and $k^a = (\partial_v)^a$ and $l^a = (\partial_u)^a$ are the (future-directed) tangents to the affinely parameterised geodesics of \mathcal{H}^+ and \mathcal{H}^- , respectively, where v and u are the affine parameters. $\mathcal{C}(v)$ labels a cross-section of \mathcal{H}^+ at affine time v .

on a null hypersurface, and in Appendix B we compute the connection coefficients and covariant derivatives on the horizon in Gaussian null coordinates.

Our conventions mainly follow those in Wald’s textbook [44]. We assume a mostly positive signature metric, D is the number of spacetime dimensions, Latin indices a, b, c, \dots denote abstract spacetime indices, i, j, k, \dots denote codimension-2 spatial indices, (v, u, x^i) label the Gaussian null coordinates near the future event horizon, and we use boldface notation for differential forms. The orientation of the volume form is chosen to be $\epsilon = du \wedge dv \wedge \epsilon_C$ near the horizon, where ϵ_C is the spatial codimension-2 volume (area) form, see equation (4.3). We set $\hbar = c = 1$ in the entire paper, but keep Newton’s constant G explicit.

2 Geometric Setup

In this section we introduce the geometric setup of the paper (Section 2.1), we impose gauge conditions on the perturbations at the horizon (Section 2.2), and we review the Gaussian null coordinates based on an affine parameterisation of the null geodesics on the future event horizon (Section 2.3).

2.1 Stationary Black Hole Background Geometry

Consider a stationary black hole background geometry (\mathcal{M}, g) in D spacetime dimensions. We take the event horizon of the stationary black hole to be a bifurcate Killing horizon \mathcal{H} , and label the future horizon by \mathcal{H}^+ , the past horizon by \mathcal{H}^- and the codimension-2 bifurcation surface by \mathcal{B} . The Killing field that is normal to the Killing horizon is denoted by ξ^a . We assume ξ^a is a Killing symmetry of all the background dynamical fields, including the metric g and matter fields φ ,

$$\mathcal{L}_\xi g = 0, \quad \mathcal{L}_\xi \varphi = 0. \quad (2.1)$$

Below we describe some kinematic properties of bifurcate Killing horizons, for which we will derive a dynamical non-stationary first law in the following sections. Similar descriptions can be found for instance in [23, 45–47]. We are mainly interested in the part of the horizon \mathcal{H}^+ that lies to the future of \mathcal{B} , with cross-sections labelled by \mathcal{C} , since we will be deriving a dynamical black hole entropy associated to (perturbations of) these cross-sections.

We wish to decompose the background metric on \mathcal{H}^+ using the outgoing and ingoing null vector fields on \mathcal{H}^+ , k^a and l^a , respectively. Together (k^a, l^a) form a null zweibein basis, that is Lie transported by k^a , for a two-dimensional subspace of the tangent space of \mathcal{H}^+ . To construct the tangent null vector fields we employ an affine parameterisation for the null geodesic generators of the horizon, instead of a Killing parameterisation. The affine parameterisation is more convenient to describe the perturbation that we will introduce momentarily, since we want to keep the zweibein (k^a, l^a) fixed when we perturb the geometry, while at the same time we want to impose the gauge condition $\delta\xi^a \neq 0$ for the Killing field. In terms of the Killing parameterisation, the condition $\delta\xi^a \neq 0$ is incompatible with a fixed zweibein basis, if the Killing field is part of this basis. In terms of the affine parameterisation, on the other hand, this is not a problem, because, as we will explain, fixing k^a does not fix ξ^a if their proportionality constant (i.e., the surface gravity) on the horizon is allowed to vary.

The double null decomposition of the metric on \mathcal{H}^+ is carried out as follows:

1. Let the future horizon \mathcal{H}^+ be located at the null hypersurface $\tilde{u}(x) = 0$, for some smooth function $\tilde{u}(x^a)$. We define k_a as the normal to \mathcal{H}^+ that satisfies the affinely parameterised geodesic equation

$$k_a \overset{\mathcal{H}^+}{\propto} -\partial_a \tilde{u}, \quad k^b \nabla_b k^a \overset{\mathcal{H}^+}{=} 0. \quad (2.2)$$

The minus sign is chosen in the first expression so that k^a is future directed when \tilde{u} increases toward the future. From the first expression it follows that k^a is hypersurface orthogonal on \mathcal{H}^+ and that the irrotationality condition $k_{[a} \nabla_b k_{c]} \overset{\mathcal{H}^+}{=} 0$ holds. Since \mathcal{H}^+ is a null hypersurface its normal k_a is null

$$k^a k_a \overset{\mathcal{H}^+}{=} 0. \quad (2.3)$$

Because the normal is orthogonal to itself, it is also tangent to the null generators of \mathcal{H}^+ . Moreover, the second equality in (2.2) implies k^a is an affinely parameterised tangent, satisfying

$$k^a \overset{\mathcal{H}^+}{=} (\partial_v)^a, \quad (2.4)$$

where v is the affine parameter along the null geodesics of \mathcal{H}^+ . Without loss of generality, we choose $v = 0$ at the bifurcate surface \mathcal{B} , so that it is positive to the future of \mathcal{B} . This does not fix the affine parameter uniquely, since there is still a scaling freedom $v \rightarrow av$, where a can differ from generator to generator but is constant on each generator of \mathcal{H}^+ .

2. To isolate the codimension-2 part of the metric that is transverse to k^a , we need to introduce an auxiliary null vector field l^a , that is defined on \mathcal{H}^+ via

$$g_{ab} l^a l^b \overset{\mathcal{H}^+}{=} 0, \quad l^a k_a \overset{\mathcal{H}^+}{=} -1. \quad (2.5)$$

The normalisation minus one in the second condition is chosen so that if k^a is tangent to the (future-directed) outgoing null geodesics of \mathcal{H}^+ , then l^a is tangent to the (future-directed) ingoing null geodesics of \mathcal{H}^+ , hence it is tangent to the past horizon \mathcal{H}^- at \mathcal{B} . Note these conditions (2.5) do not specify l^a uniquely, because they are invariant under the transformation $l^a \rightarrow l^{a'} = l^a + \frac{1}{2} c_i c^i k^a + c^i m_i^a$, where c^i are arbitrary coefficients (with $i = 1, \dots, D-2$) and m_i^a are spacelike vectors on \mathcal{H}^+ that are orthogonal to k^a and l^a , $k_a m_i^a = 0 = l_a m_i^a$, and satisfy $g_{ab} m_i^a m_j^b = \delta_{ij}$.⁴ We will shortly describe our choice for l^a that is designed to be compatible with the Killing field ξ^a .

⁴Moreover, it can be shown that the geometries quantities appearing in the Raychaudhuri equation (see equation (3.4) below), i.e. the outgoing null expansion θ_v and the square of the shear and rotation, $\sigma^{ab} \sigma_{ab}$ and $\omega^{ab} \omega_{ab}$, also remain invariant under the transformation.

3. Once the choice of l^a is settled, we extend it off the future horizon by solving the affine null geodesic equation

$$l^b \nabla_b l^a = 0, \quad (2.6)$$

which will give the integral curves whose tangent vector is l^a . This guarantees that l^a is tangent to the past horizon on the whole of \mathcal{H}^- , which is hence located at $v = 0$. It also implies that l^a is null everywhere, $g_{ab} l^a l^b = 0$, since $l^b \nabla_b (l^a l_a) = 0$.

Since l^a is null and tangent to \mathcal{H}^- , it is also normal to it. Further, we denote the affine null distance away from the horizon by u and we identify

$$l^a = (\partial_u)^a. \quad (2.7)$$

Notice that u and \tilde{u} may differ away from the horizon, but they agree at the horizon where they both vanish.

4. Similarly, we can extend k^a off the future horizon. This is done by keeping the parameter v fixed along the null geodesics generated by l^a , and demanding that $k^a = (\partial_v)^a$ everywhere. In other words, we extend k^a such that it commutes with l^a , i.e., $[k, l]^a = 0$, which is equivalent to the requirement that the Lie derivative of l^a along k^b vanishes, i.e., $\mathcal{L}_k l^a = 0$. This means the extension of k^a off the horizon should satisfy

$$l^b \nabla_b k^a = k^b \nabla_b l^a. \quad (2.8)$$

This reflects the fact that different choices of l^a on \mathcal{H}^+ determine how we extend k^a off the horizon. The commutativity of k^a and l^a also means the parameters (u, v) can act as the null coordinates near the horizon, whose origin $u = v = 0$ is located at the bifurcate surface \mathcal{B} . Further, away from the horizon the parameter v is in general not affine, i.e., $k^b \nabla_b k^a \neq 0$, and k^a is not null, $k_a k^b \neq 0$. We also note the extension of k^a off the horizon implies the normalisation $l^a k_a = -1$ holds everywhere, since

$$l^b \nabla_b (l^a k_a) = l^a l^b \nabla_b k_a = l^a k^b \nabla_b l_a = \frac{1}{2} k^b \nabla_b (l^a l_a) = 0, \quad (2.9)$$

where in the first equality we used the affine geodesic equation (2.6), in the second equality we employed (2.8), and the last equality follows from the fact that l^a is null everywhere.

From the above construction it follows that the metric can be decomposed on \mathcal{H}^+ as

$$g_{ab} \stackrel{\mathcal{H}^+}{=} -k_a l_b - l_a k_b + \gamma_{ab}, \quad (2.10)$$

where $\gamma_{ab} = \gamma_{(ab)}$ is the intrinsic codimension-2 spatial metric of each cross-section of the future horizon, that is purely transverse, i.e., orthogonal to k^a and l^a on \mathcal{H}^+ , $\gamma_{ab} k^a \stackrel{\mathcal{H}^+}{=} 0 \stackrel{\mathcal{H}^+}{=} \gamma_{ab} l^a$. This double null decomposition does not extend away from the horizon, as the vector field k^a is not necessarily null off the horizon.

As we want to use this decomposition to study the bifurcate Killing horizon, below we demonstrate how the choice of (k^a, l^a) can be made compatible with the horizon generating Killing field ξ^a . We first review how this works on the horizon, and then we construct a ξ^a -compatible zweibein off the horizon. Since ξ^a is normal to \mathcal{H} , it is tangent to the null geodesic generators of \mathcal{H} . Along the future horizon it is thus proportional to k^a , whereas along the past horizon it is proportional to minus l^a , because ξ^a is past directed on \mathcal{H}^- whereas l^a is future directed. In fact, the precise relation between ξ^a and k^a on \mathcal{H}^+ immediately follows from the non-affine geodesic equation obeyed by ξ^a on the future horizon

$$\xi^b \nabla_b \xi^a \stackrel{\mathcal{H}^+}{=} \kappa \xi^a, \quad (2.11)$$

where $\kappa > 0$ is the surface gravity of the bifurcate Killing horizon.⁵ In other words, κ measures the failure of the Killing parameter τ , satisfying $\xi^a \nabla_a \tau = 1$, to be affine. The surface gravity is constant along each null generator of an arbitrary Killing horizon \mathcal{H} , i.e. $\xi^a \nabla_a \kappa = 0$ on \mathcal{H} , which essentially follows from the Killing equation $\nabla_{(a} \xi_{b)} = 0$ and the fact that κ is completely determined in terms of ξ^a by (2.11). Moreover, bifurcate Killing horizons have the additional property that κ does not vary from generator to generator (see [48] for a proof). Thus, κ is constant on any bifurcate Killing horizon, which is the zeroth law of black hole mechanics.

Now, comparing (2.11) with the affine geodesic equation (2.2) for k^a , one can show that the Killing field and the affinely parameterised tangent to \mathcal{H}^+ are related on the horizon by

$$\xi^a = (\partial_\tau)^a \stackrel{\mathcal{H}^+}{=} e^{\kappa\tau} k^a = e^{\kappa\tau} (\partial_\nu)^a, \quad (2.12)$$

where ν is the affine parameter of the null generators of \mathcal{H}^+ , satisfying $k^a \nabla_a \nu = 1$. This implies to the future of \mathcal{B} on \mathcal{H}^+ the relation between ν and the Killing parameter τ is given by⁶

$$\nu = \frac{1}{\kappa} \exp(\kappa\tau). \quad (2.13)$$

Next, we wish to express the Killing field in terms of k^a and l^a away from the horizon, which depends on the specific choice of k^a and l^a . We choose k^a and l^a off the horizon such that the Killing field everywhere takes the form

$$\xi^a = \kappa(\nu k^a - u l^a). \quad (2.14)$$

This ensures that ξ^a acts like a local Lorentz boost near the horizon and it respects the fact that $\xi^a = 0$ at \mathcal{B} , where $\nu = u = 0$. We now show that such a choice of zweibein (k^a, l^a) exists.

To extend the zweibein off the horizon in a ξ^a -compatible manner, we construct another affinely parameterised null vector field β^a that satisfies

$$\beta^a \beta_a = 0, \quad \xi^a \beta_a = -1, \quad \beta^a \nabla_a \beta^b = 0, \quad [\xi, \beta]^a = 0, \quad (2.15)$$

throughout spacetime, because ξ^a is defined everywhere in the background. Notice that β^a must be singular at the bifurcation surface, $\beta^a = O(1/\nu)$ at $\nu = 0$, whereas ξ^a vanishes there, $\xi^a = O(\nu)$ at $\nu = 0$, but this will not be a problem for our discussion below. Now (ξ^a, β^a) form a null zweibein basis for the tangent space of \mathcal{H} . Further, by denoting ρ the affine null distance away from the horizon \mathcal{H} along the geodesics to which β^a is tangent, we can see that

$$\beta^a = (\partial_\rho)^a, \quad (2.16)$$

where $\rho = 0$ at the Killing horizon \mathcal{H} . A ξ^a -compatible choice of (k^a, l^a) can be made by relating the affine parameters (u, ν) for the null geodesics generators of \mathcal{H} to the parameters (ρ, τ) , in the region to the future of \mathcal{B} , as follows⁷

$$\nu = \frac{1}{\kappa} \exp(\kappa\tau), \quad u = \rho \exp(-\kappa\tau). \quad (2.17)$$

The reasons for this choice for (u, ν) are threefold: 1) we want $u = 0$ to label the future horizon; 2) the relation (2.13) between ν and τ on \mathcal{H}^+ should hold; 3) we require the Killing symmetry to be manifest as a boost $(u, \nu) \mapsto (au, \nu/a)$, so the geometry and the matter fields should depend on (u, ν) in terms of the product uv . Since the Killing background should only depend on ρ

⁵On the past horizon we define the surface gravity via $\xi^b \nabla_a \xi^a \stackrel{\mathcal{H}^-}{=} -\kappa \xi^a$, such that κ is also positive on \mathcal{H}^- .

⁶This relation between ν and τ is only valid to the future of the bifurcation surface, since τ ranges from $-\infty$ at \mathcal{B} to $+\infty$ at future infinity. To the past of \mathcal{B} on \mathcal{H}^+ the vector field k^a is future directed while ξ^a is past directed, hence the relation becomes $\nu = -\frac{1}{\kappa} \exp(\kappa\tau)$, where the Killing parameter τ covers another patch of \mathcal{H}^+ .

⁷The inverse relation is: $\tau = \frac{1}{\kappa} \log(\kappa\nu)$, $\rho = \kappa uv$.

besides codimension-2 spatial parameters, and not on τ , by matching the codimension-2 data and by dimensional analysis it follows that $\rho = \kappa uv$.

Finally, the zweibein (k^a, l^a) is fully determined by our choice of (u, v) . In terms of (ξ^a, β^a) they can thus be expressed as

$$k^a = \frac{1}{\kappa v} \xi^a + \kappa u \beta^a, \quad l^a = \kappa v \beta^a. \quad (2.18)$$

Notice the powers of u and v match with the singularity of β^a and the zero value of ξ^a at \mathcal{B} , so that (k^a, l^a) are smooth at \mathcal{B} . By combining these two equations we reach at our desired expression (2.14) for ξ^a .

2.2 Gauge Conditions for First-Order Non-Stationary Perturbations

Next, we consider a linear perturbation of a stationary black hole background metric $g \rightarrow g + \epsilon \delta g$ and the stationary background matter fields $\varphi \rightarrow \varphi + \epsilon \delta \varphi$, where $\epsilon \ll 1$ is a small perturbation parameter. We are especially interested in first-order *non-stationary* perturbations, defined as⁸

$$\delta(\mathcal{L}_\xi g) \neq 0, \quad \delta(\mathcal{L}_\xi \varphi) \neq 0. \quad (2.19)$$

This means that the perturbed geometry is not a stationary black hole geometry, in particular the true event horizon of the perturbed black hole is not a Killing horizon. When perturbing a geometry there is a certain gauge freedom in which points are chosen to correspond in the two slightly different geometries. In order to simplify the derivation of the black hole first law for these linear non-stationary variations, we impose the following gauge conditions on the perturbations:

- a) The event horizon of the perturbed black hole geometry is identified with the bifurcate Killing horizon \mathcal{H} of the background geometry, i.e., \mathcal{H}^+ is still located at $u = 0$ and \mathcal{H}^- at $v = 0$ after the perturbation.
- b) The affinely parameterised null normals to \mathcal{H}^+ and \mathcal{H}^- are fixed under the variation,

$$\delta k^a = 0, \quad \delta l^a = 0, \quad (2.20)$$

and k^a remains the null normal to \mathcal{H}^+ and l^a remains null everywhere under the perturbation, which yield the following conditions on the variation of the metric:

$$k^a \delta g_{ab} \Big|_{\mathcal{H}^+} \stackrel{\mathcal{H}^+}{=} 0, \quad l^a \delta g_{ab} = 0. \quad (2.21)$$

Together with (2.14) this implies that $\xi^a \delta g_{ab} = 0$ on the Killing horizon \mathcal{H} . Moreover, we require that after the perturbation k^a is still affinely parameterised on \mathcal{H}^+ and l^a everywhere, i.e.,

$$\delta(k^a \nabla_a k^b) \Big|_{\mathcal{H}^+} \stackrel{\mathcal{H}^+}{=} 0, \quad \delta(l^a \nabla_a l^b) = 0. \quad (2.22)$$

These equations are equivalent to the conditions on the variation of the Christoffel connection: $k^a k^c \delta \Gamma_{ac}^b \Big|_{\mathcal{H}^+} \stackrel{\mathcal{H}^+}{=} 0$ and $l^a l^c \delta \Gamma_{ac}^b = 0$, respectively.

- c) The Killing vector field ξ^a remains null and tangent to the geodesic generators of the event horizon of the perturbed black hole,

$$\delta(g_{ab} \xi^a \xi^b) \Big|_{\mathcal{H}} \stackrel{\mathcal{H}}{=} 0, \quad \eta_a \delta \xi^a \Big|_{\mathcal{H}} \stackrel{\mathcal{H}}{=} 0. \quad (2.23)$$

⁸Note if the Killing field is allowed to vary, then it would contribute as: $\delta(\mathcal{L}_\xi g_{ab}) = \mathcal{L}_\xi \delta g_{ab} + \mathcal{L}_{\delta \xi} g_{ab}$.

where η^a is a spacelike vector orthogonal to both k^a and l^a , $k_a\eta^a = 0 = l_a\eta^a$. Together with condition (2.21), $\xi^a\delta g_{ab} \stackrel{\mathcal{H}}{=} 0$, the first equation implies $\xi_a\delta\xi^a \stackrel{\mathcal{H}}{=} 0$, in particular $k_a\delta\xi^a \stackrel{\mathcal{H}^+}{=} 0$ and $l_a\delta\xi^a \stackrel{\mathcal{H}^-}{=} 0$. Combined with the second equation in (2.23) this means on the future horizon $\delta\xi^a$ is proportional to k^a and on the past horizon to l^a .

We emphasise these gauge conditions do not fix the Killing field to be the same in the background and perturbed geometry — nor do they fix the auxiliary null vector field β^a defined in (2.15) —

$$\delta\xi^a \neq 0. \quad (2.24)$$

The Killing field is often held fixed in the variation, e.g. in [12], however it may vary for certain perturbations.⁹ For instance, if the horizon Killing field of a stationary, axisymmetric black hole is normalised as $\xi^a = (\partial_t)^a + \Omega_{\mathcal{H}}(\partial_\theta)^a$ and the time translation and rotational Killing fields are kept the same, $\delta(\partial_t)^a = 0$ and $\delta(\partial_\theta)^a = 0$, then for perturbations that change the angular horizon velocity, $\delta\Omega_{\mathcal{H}} \neq 0$, the Killing field ξ^a varies. Moreover, when the horizon Killing field is normalised so as not to have unit surface gravity, $\kappa \neq 1$, then by equation (2.14), $\xi^a = \kappa(vk^a - ul^a)$, the horizon Killing field varies if the surface gravity changes due to the perturbation, since (k^a, l^a) and (v, u) are fixed by assumption b), i.e.,

$$\delta\kappa \neq 0. \quad (2.25)$$

Perturbations that change the surface gravity were already considered in the original work on black hole mechanics by Bardeen, Carter and Hawking [3], and also for instance in [23, 46, 54]. Crucially, they showed [3] that the the surface gravity variation drops out in the first law of black hole mechanics, $\delta M = \frac{\kappa}{8\pi G}\delta A$, so that it can be interpreted as a proper fundamental equation in thermodynamics, $dE = TdS$. As we will see, in our non-stationary first law of black holes the variation of the surface gravity is also absent, which forms an important consistency check of the derivation.

Interestingly, the variation of the surface gravity is not uniquely defined for non-stationary variations of a Killing horizon, as there are different definitions of the surface gravity associated to a vector field, which all agree on Killing horizons, but they disagree from each other on the event horizon of a perturbed stationary black hole. This is relevant for our setup since it means we should be careful about which definition of (the variation) of the surface gravity we are using in the derivation of the first law. The three definitions of “surface gravity” κ_1, κ_2 , and κ_3 that we consider are [55] (see also [56])

$$\nabla_a(\xi_b\xi^b) = -2\kappa_1\xi_a, \quad (2.26)$$

$$\xi^b\nabla_b\xi^a = \kappa_2\xi^a, \quad (2.27)$$

$$(\nabla^a\xi^b)(\nabla_{[a}\xi_{b]}) = -2\kappa_3^2. \quad (2.28)$$

These surface gravities are usually defined on a Killing horizon \mathcal{H} , for which they are all the same: $\kappa_1 = \kappa_2 = \kappa_3 = \kappa$ (see, e.g., Sec. 12.5 in [44] for a proof). It is maybe less well known that these quantities are also well defined for any null hypersurface \mathcal{N} for which ξ_a is the normal (but not necessarily a Killing field). In particular, this means the surface gravities are well defined for non-stationary perturbations of Killing horizons to which the the horizon Killing field remains normal. The first quantity κ_1 is well defined because the normal to a null hypersurface is null on the surface, $\xi_b\xi^b = 0$ on \mathcal{N} , so $\nabla_a(\xi_b\xi^b)$ must be normal to \mathcal{N} , and is hence proportional to ξ^a . The second definition is the geodesic equation for ξ^a in non-affine parameterisation, which

⁹Another setup where a vector field ξ^a , that is not necessarily Killing, may change due to a perturbation, is when it depends on the background dynamical fields, i.e. $\xi^a = \xi^a(g, \varphi)$. This is relevant, for instance, for studying asymptotic Killing symmetries [49–51], symplectic symmetries, [52] and corner symmetries [43, 53].

holds because ξ^a is tangent to the null generators of \mathcal{N} , which are geodesics since \mathcal{N} is a null hypersurface. And the third definition is covariant, hence κ_3 is also well defined. We anticipate already that the third definition κ_3 is the one that is relevant for the Noether charge, associated with ξ^a , evaluated on a dynamical black hole horizon (see Section 5).

We emphasise, however, that these surface gravities are not constant on a generic null hypersurface. As stated above, on a Killing horizon the surface gravity is constant along each null generator, i.e. $\mathcal{L}_\xi \kappa = 0$. Remarkably, this property extends to the case of conformal Killing horizons [57], to which a conformal Killing vector is tangent, but only for the quantity κ_1 , not for κ_2 and κ_3 .¹⁰ Thus, it is a special property of (conformal) Killing horizons that they obey a “zeroth law”.¹¹

Furthermore, on any null surface \mathcal{N} the surface gravities are not entirely independent, but satisfy the additional relation (see equation (5) [55] in and (D.13) in [56])

$$\kappa_3 \stackrel{\mathcal{N}}{=} \frac{1}{2}(\kappa_1 + \kappa_2). \quad (2.29)$$

As we show in Appendix A this relation follows from the fact that $\xi_{[a}\nabla_b\xi_{c]} = 0$ at \mathcal{N} , which holds by Frobenius’s theorem since ξ_a is orthogonal to the hypersurface \mathcal{N} . We also derive the following expressions for the surface gravities in the Appendix A

$$\kappa_1 \stackrel{\mathcal{N}}{=} l^a \nabla_a (k_b \xi^b), \quad \kappa_2 \stackrel{\mathcal{N}}{=} -k^a \nabla_a (l_b \xi^b), \quad \kappa_3 \stackrel{\mathcal{N}}{=} l_{[a} k_{b]} \nabla^a \xi^b. \quad (2.30)$$

These expressions hold on any null hypersurface \mathcal{N} , where k^a is the affinely parameterised null normal to \mathcal{N} , and l^a is an auxiliary null vector field that commutes with k^a , satisfying $k_a l^a = -1$ on \mathcal{N} and $\mathcal{L}_k l^a = 0$. Crucially the equations in (2.30) are also valid if ξ^a is not a Killing field. Therefore, we can use them to compute the variations of the surface gravities for (non-stationary) perturbations of Killing horizons. From our gauge conditions in assumption b) we show in Appendix A that the variations are given by

$$\delta \kappa_1 \stackrel{\mathcal{H}^+}{=} l^a \nabla_a (k_b \delta \xi^b), \quad \delta \kappa_2 \stackrel{\mathcal{H}^+}{=} -k^a \nabla_a (l_b \delta \xi^b), \quad \delta \kappa_3 \stackrel{\mathcal{H}^+}{=} l_{[a} k_{b]} \nabla^a \delta \xi^b. \quad (2.31)$$

We note that for stationary perturbations all the variations of the surface gravity are the same, i.e. $\delta \kappa_1 = \delta \kappa_2 = \delta \kappa_3 = \delta \kappa$, but for non-stationary variations they do not agree. Thus, we see that for our gauge conditions the variations of the surface gravities depend only on the variation of the background Killing field.

2.3 Gaussian Null Coordinates in Affine Parameterisation

To simplify our calculations of the dynamical black hole entropy for $f(\text{Riemann})$ theories of gravity (see Section 5.3), here we introduce *Gaussian null coordinates* (GNC) labelled by (v, u, x^i) near the future horizon \mathcal{H}^+ . We use the affine parameter v of the null geodesic generators of \mathcal{H}^+ as one of the coordinates, and mark the location of \mathcal{H}^+ as $u = 0$. These coordinates are widely used in previous work on the second law of black hole mechanics in higher curvature gravity [10, 14, 21, 61]. They can be obtained using our construction of the zweibein (k^a, l^a) and the transverse metric γ_{ab} , as follows. We label a point on the horizon by the affine parameter v and codimension-two (with respect to the full spacetime) spatial coordinates x^i with $i = 1, \dots, D - 2$. We can choose such x^i after projecting out the directions labeled by k^a and l^a using the projection operator $\gamma_b^a \stackrel{\mathcal{H}^+}{=} \delta_b^a + k^a l_b + l^a k_b$ defined on the horizon. Then, following the geodesics generated by l^a away from the horizon, we label points with affine parameter u away from the point (v, x^i) on the horizon as (v, u, x^i) . This construction of the GNC system is illustrated in Figure 2.

¹⁰The definition κ_3 is also conformally invariant [55] and it does not vary from generator to generator on bifurcate conformal Killing horizons (see [58] for a proof).

¹¹A zeroth law has also been proven for isolated horizons in [59] (see also [60]), where the second definition of the surface gravity κ_2 was being used.




Figure 2: Gaussian null coordinates (v, u, x^i) . Here, \mathcal{H}^+ labels the future event horizon ($u = 0$) of the black hole, $\mathcal{C}(v)$ is a time slice of \mathcal{H}^+ at the null time v , k^a is the affinely parameterised (future-directed) tangent to the null geodesic generators of \mathcal{H}^+ , l^a is the affinely parameterised (future-directed) null vector field transverse to k^a , and m_i^a are $D - 2$ spacelike vector fields that are orthogonal to k^a and l^a .

In GNC gauge, the line element takes the form

$$ds^2 = -2 du dv - u^2 \alpha(v, u, x^i) dv^2 - 2u \omega_i(v, u, x^i) dv dx^i + \gamma_{ij}(v, u, x^i) dx^i dx^j, \quad (2.32)$$

and the inverse metric is given by

$$g^{ab} = \begin{pmatrix} u^2(\alpha + \omega_i \omega^i) & -1 & u \omega^i \\ -1 & 0 & 0 \\ u \omega^i & 0 & \gamma^{ij} \end{pmatrix}, \quad (2.33)$$

where γ^{ij} is the inverse of γ_{ij} , and $\omega^i = \gamma^{ij} \omega_j$. Note the metric components g_{uu} and g_{ui} vanish everywhere in GNC gauge. The u^2 dependence (instead of linear dependence) of g_{vv} is a result of the affine geodesic equation on the horizon

$$0 \stackrel{\mathcal{H}^+}{=} k^b \nabla_b k^a = \Gamma_{vv}^a = \frac{1}{2} g^{ab} (2 \partial_v g_{bv} - \partial_b g_{vv}), \quad (2.34)$$

which implies

$$\partial_u g_{vv} \stackrel{\mathcal{H}^+}{=} 0, \quad (2.35)$$

hence $g_{vv} \propto u^2$. In Appendix B we compute the Christoffel connection of the metric in GNC and give a prescription for how to calculate covariant derivatives on the horizon. There we also review non-affine GNC based on the Killing parameterisation of the null generators of \mathcal{H}^+ , in order to contrast it with the affine GNC used in the main body of the article.

We verify that the metric indeed satisfies the double null decomposition on the horizon, $g_{ab} \stackrel{\mathcal{H}^+}{=} -2k_{(a}l_{b)} + \gamma_{ab}$. The basis vector fields are defined as

$$k^a = \left(\frac{\partial}{\partial v} \right)^a, \quad l^a = \left(\frac{\partial}{\partial u} \right)^a, \quad m_i^a = \left(\frac{\partial}{\partial x^i} \right)^a \quad (2.36)$$

and, off the horizon, the dual covectors are given by

$$k_a = -(du)_a - u^2 \alpha (dv)_a - u \omega_i (dx^i)_a \quad (2.37)$$

$$l_a = -(\mathrm{d}v)_a \quad (2.38)$$

$$m_a^i = (\mathrm{d}x^i)_a - u\omega^i(\mathrm{d}v)_a \quad (2.39)$$

where we have raised the codimension-2 index i using the inverse transverse metric γ^{ij} . The transverse metric can be expressed as

$$\gamma_{ab} = \gamma_{ij}(\mathrm{d}x^i)_a(\mathrm{d}x^j)_b \stackrel{\mathcal{H}^+}{=} \gamma_{ij}m_a^i m_b^j. \quad (2.40)$$

Thus, using (2.37)-(2.40), one can check that on the horizon the double null decomposition (2.10) of the metric is satisfied. In the next section we explain how to extend this double null decomposition on an apparent horizon that is located at a distance ϵ from the event horizon.

Notice in (2.32) the metric functions in GNC have an arbitrary dependence on u, v and x^i for a generic geometry. However, for a stationary geometry the functions α, ω_i and γ_{ij} are further constrained. Namely, the isometry generated by the Killing field $\xi^a = \kappa(vk^a - ul^a)$ constrains the form of $\alpha, \omega_i, \gamma_{ij}$, such that they only depend on u, v through the product κuv [21, 61]. For a dynamical perturbation that does not respect the Killing symmetry, the metric functions will have arbitrary dependence on u and v after the perturbation.

In this article we work with a fixed GNC system. It follows from our gauge condition (2.22) that the affine parameters v and u of the null generators of \mathcal{H}^+ and \mathcal{H}^- , respectively, are fixed under the perturbation, and we also keep the spatial coordinates x^i fixed. Hence, a non-stationary perturbation of a stationary background changes only the metric functions

$$\begin{aligned} \alpha(\kappa uv, x^i) &\rightarrow \alpha(\kappa uv, x^i) + \delta\alpha(v, u, x^i), \\ \omega_i(\kappa uv, x^i) &\rightarrow \omega_i(\kappa uv, x^i) + \delta\omega_i(v, u, x^i), \\ \gamma_{ij}(\kappa uv, x^i) &\rightarrow \gamma_{ij}(\kappa uv, x^i) + \delta\gamma_{ij}(v, u, x^i). \end{aligned} \quad (2.41)$$

We now confirm that the fixed GNC system near \mathcal{H}^+ is compatible with our other gauge conditions for the perturbations in the previous section. The gauge condition (2.22) is equivalent to keeping (v, u) fixed. The second condition (2.21) implies

$$\delta g_{va} \stackrel{\mathcal{H}^+}{=} 0, \quad \delta g_{ua} = 0, \quad (2.42)$$

which holds for fixed GNC, because $\delta g_{vv} = -u^2\delta\alpha, \delta g_{vi} = -2u\delta\omega_i$ and $\delta g_{uv} = \delta g_{uu} = \delta g_{ui} = 0$. Thirdly, the condition (2.22) that k^a and l^a remain affinely parameterised after the perturbation is equivalent to

$$\delta\Gamma_{vv}^a \stackrel{\mathcal{H}^+}{=} 0, \quad \delta\Gamma_{uu}^a = 0. \quad (2.43)$$

The second equation is automatic for a fixed GNC system, since $\Gamma_{uu}^u = \Gamma_{uu}^v = \Gamma_{uu}^i = 0$. Writing out the first equation gives

$$0 \stackrel{\mathcal{H}^+}{=} \delta\Gamma_{vv}^a = \frac{1}{2}g^{ab}(2\partial_v\delta g_{bv} - \partial_b\delta g_{vv}). \quad (2.44)$$

This is satisfied for fixed GNC, because of $\delta g_{uv} = 0$ and

$$\partial_a\delta g_{vv} = -2u(\partial_a u)\delta\alpha - u^2\partial_a(\delta\alpha) \stackrel{\mathcal{H}^+}{=} 0, \quad \partial_v\delta g_{vi} = -2u\partial_v\delta\omega^i \stackrel{\mathcal{H}^+}{=} 0. \quad (2.45)$$

Next, since (k^a, l^a) and (v, u) are kept fixed, it follows from (2.31) that the variation of the horizon Killing field (2.14) can be expressed in a neighborhood of \mathcal{H}^+ as

$$\delta\xi^a = \left(\int_0^v \delta\kappa_2 \mathrm{d}v'\right) k^a - \left(\int_0^u \delta\kappa_1 \mathrm{d}u'\right) l^a, \quad (2.46)$$

where we assumed that the size of u is comparable to the perturbation parameter ϵ . This indeed satisfies $\xi_a \delta \xi^a \stackrel{\mathcal{H}^+}{=} 0$, because $u = 0$ at \mathcal{H}^+ , and $\eta_a \delta \xi^a \stackrel{\mathcal{H}^+}{=} 0$. Thus, the gauge conditions (2.23) on the variation of the horizon Killing field are also obeyed in GNC gauge.

Further, above we considered a fixed GNC system, but there is a gauge freedom in the choice of GNC, corresponding to the rescaling of the affine parameter along the horizon generators. That is, the form of the metric (2.32) is invariant under the coordinate transformation $v \rightarrow a(x^i)v$ and a simultaneous redefinition of the coordinate u . This gauge freedom is thoroughly studied in [61] (see also [21]), where the Wall entropy is proven to be gauge invariant to first order in the perturbation around a stationary black hole.

Finally, we introduce the so-called boost weight [10, 14, 21, 61], which is a useful notion to keep track of linear perturbations around a stationary background. In affine GNC (v, u, x^i) , the *boost weight* or *Killing weight* w of the components of a covariant tensor field $T_{a_1 \dots a_n}$ (with all indices lowered using the metric) is defined by

$$w = \text{number downstairs } v\text{-indices} - \text{number of downstairs } u\text{-indices.} \quad (2.47)$$

For example, T_{vv} has weight 2, X_{vijk} has weight 1, Y_{uuui} has weight -3 , et cetera. Now consider a weight w tensor field $T_{(w)}$ that is Lie derived by the horizon Killing field ξ^a , $\mathcal{L}_\xi T_{(w)} = 0$. In GNC, the Lie derivative of $T_{(w)}$ with respect to $\xi = \kappa(v\partial_v - u\partial_u)$ is [21]

$$(\mathcal{L}_\xi T)_{(w)} = \kappa(v\partial_v - u\partial_u + w)T_{(w)}. \quad (2.48)$$

Then, on the future horizon ($u = 0$), it can be shown that the solution to the stationarity condition, $\mathcal{L}_\xi T_{(w)} = 0$, for the tensor components is [14]

$$T_{a_1 \dots a_n}(v, 0, x^i) = C_{-w}(x^i)v^{-w}, \quad (2.49)$$

where $C_{-w}(x^i)$ is a function of the codimension-2 coordinates x^i . Note the tensor components blow up at the bifurcation surface $u = v = 0$ for positive boost weight, $w > 0$, except if $C_{-w}(x^i) = 0$. Thus, assuming the tensor field is regular everywhere on the future horizon, in particular at the bifurcate surface, we find that the function $C_{-w}(x^i)$ must vanish. We conclude that in GNC, near a future Killing horizon \mathcal{H}^+ with a bifurcation surface, *the components of a positive boost weight stationary tensor vanish on the Killing horizon \mathcal{H}^+ .*

Hence, whenever we encounter a stationary tensor with positive boost weight that is not being varied, it should be treated as zero on the horizon. Another corollary of the claim above is that a perturbed positive boost weight tensor that is stationary in the background is at least first order in the perturbation. This means that a product of perturbed positive boost weight tensors, that are stationary in the background, is at least second order in the perturbation, and can thus be neglected at first order. The boost weight thus gives a nice accounting of first-order perturbations around a stationary background, which is useful for deriving the non-stationary first black hole law. We will employ these boost weight arguments especially in Sections 4.7 and 5.3, as they greatly simplify the computation of the dynamical black hole entropy for higher curvature gravity to linear order in perturbation theory.

3 Dynamical Black Hole Entropy from Raychaudhuri Equation

In this section we derive a ‘‘physical process version’’ of the first law for non-stationary perturbations of a stationary black hole (Section 3.1). Our derivation is based on the Raychaudhuri equation and holds for black holes in general relativity. Furthermore, we show that the dynamical black hole entropy satisfying the first law is equal to the Bekenstein-Hawking entropy of the apparent horizon to first order in the perturbation (Section 3.2). This was proven prior to us in Appendix A of [1], but we also give a proof of this claim using GNC for pedagogical reasons.




Figure 3: Physical process first law for arbitrary cross-sections of a bifurcate Killing horizon. A small flux of matter, described by the stress-energy tensor variation δT_{ab} , crosses the future horizon \mathcal{H}^+ between two generic cross-sections $\mathcal{C}(v_1)$ and $\mathcal{C}(v_2)$. The first law relates the matter Killing energy flux, relative to the horizon generating Killing field ξ^a , through the horizon to the entropy change between $\mathcal{C}(v_1)$ and $\mathcal{C}(v_2)$ due to the perturbation. Usually it is assumed that $v_1 = 0$ and $v_2 = \infty$, but we keep the affine times arbitrary.

3.1 The Physical Process First Law for Non-Stationary Perturbations

Consider a stationary black hole solution to the vacuum Einstein equation and perturb it by throwing in a small amount of matter, described by the variation of the energy-momentum tensor δT_{ab} [24]. We assume the black hole is not destroyed by this infinitesimal physical process, so that, after the matter has fallen into the black hole, there still exists an event horizon. The physical process version of the first law relates the change in black hole entropy to the change in the mass and angular momentum of the black hole, due to the matter-energy flux through the horizon. In the standard treatment [22, 25, 47] of the physical process first law it is assumed that the black hole starts and ends in a stationary state. That is, the black hole horizon initially coincides with the bifurcation surface of the Killing horizon, corresponding to Killing time $\tau = -\infty$, and after the perturbation it settles down to a Killing horizon again at future infinity, $\tau = +\infty$. In this section, we will relax these assumptions by considering a non-stationary initial and final state for the black hole at two arbitrary times τ_1 and τ_2 . As a consequence, we show that more general boundary conditions yield a dynamical correction term to the Bekenstein-Hawking entropy.

We want to point out that a similar geometric setup was considered in [32], but the extra term in the physical process first law was interpreted as the membrane energy associated with the horizon fluid, instead of as a new contribution to the entropy. In addition, this term was also observed by Sorkin in [62], but he viewed it as “unwanted” and argued it to be zero by a suitable identification of the unperturbed and perturbed horizon.

To begin with, we define the matter Killing energy flux, relative to the horizon Killing field ξ^a , through the future horizon between two arbitrary cross-sections $\mathcal{C}(v_1)$ and $\mathcal{C}(v_2)$, where v_1 and v_2 are the affine “times”,

$$\Delta \delta E = \int_{v_1}^{v_2} dv \int_{\mathcal{C}(v)} dA \delta T_{ab} \xi^a k^b, \quad (3.1)$$

where $dA = \sqrt{\gamma} d^{D-2}x$ is the area element of a cross-section $\mathcal{C}(v)$ of the horizon at time v . Here the large Δ stands for the difference between two horizon cross-sections, whereas the small δ denotes the perturbation. Note the perturbation acts only on T_{ab} , and not on dA or ξ^a , since the stress-energy tensor vanishes in the unperturbed black hole background. Usually the

range of integration for ν is chosen from 0 (bifurcation surface) to ∞ (future infinity), but here we consider two arbitrary affine times. Assuming the horizon Killing field is normalised as $\xi^a = (\partial_t)^a + \Omega_{\mathcal{H}}(\partial_\vartheta)^a$, where $\Omega_{\mathcal{H}}$ is the angular velocity of the horizon, the matter Killing energy flux is related to the change in the mass and angular momentum of the black hole by [25, 47]

$$\int_{\nu_1}^{\nu_2} d\nu \int_{\mathcal{C}(\nu)} dA \delta T_{ab} \xi^a k^b = \Delta \delta M - \Omega_{\mathcal{H}} \Delta \delta J. \quad (3.2)$$

Next, we recall the outgoing null expansion $\theta_\nu = \nabla_a k^a$ of the future horizon is equal to the rate of change of an area element dA along the affine null parameter ν :

$$\theta_\nu dA = \frac{d}{d\nu}(dA), \quad (3.3)$$

where $dA = \sqrt{\gamma} d^{D-2}x$ is the area element of a cross-section of the horizon. The Raychaudhuri equation for the congruence of null geodesics of \mathcal{H}^+ is

$$\frac{d\theta_\nu}{d\nu} = -\frac{1}{D-2}\theta_\nu^2 - \sigma^{ab}\sigma_{ab} + \omega^{ab}\omega_{ab} - R_{ab}k^a k^b. \quad (3.4)$$

Here, σ_{ab} and ω_{ab} are the shear and rotation tensors, respectively, of the horizon generators with respect to the affine parameter ν . Since k^a is orthogonal to the hypersurface (the future horizon), the rotation tensor vanishes identically on the horizon: $\omega_{ab} = 0$. Further, the expansion and shear are quantities of first order in the perturbation, $\theta_\nu, \sigma_{ab} \sim \mathcal{O}(\epsilon)$, hence the quadratic terms θ_ν^2 and $\sigma^{ab}\sigma_{ab}$ in the Raychaudhuri equation may be neglected for the purpose of deriving the physical process first law.

Now, the physical process first law follows from varying the Raychaudhuri equation and assuming the linearised Einstein equation holds: $\delta R_{ab}k^a k^b = 8\pi G \delta T_{ab}k^a k^b$. Since on the horizon we have $\xi^a \stackrel{\mathcal{H}^+}{=} \kappa \nu k^a$, we multiply the varied Raychaudhuri equation on both sides by $\kappa \nu$ and integrate over the horizon between the affine times ν_1 and ν_2 . Then, recalling the affine parameter ν is fixed under the perturbation, (2.22), we find to first order in the perturbation

$$\kappa \int_{\nu_1}^{\nu_2} d\nu \int_{\mathcal{C}(\nu)} dA \nu \frac{d\delta\theta_\nu}{d\nu} = -8\pi G \int_{\nu_1}^{\nu_2} d\nu \int_{\mathcal{C}(\nu)} dA \delta T_{ab} \xi^a k^b. \quad (3.5)$$

Next, we integrate the left side of this equation by parts

$$\int_{\mathcal{C}(\nu)} dA \int_{\nu_1}^{\nu_2} d\nu \nu \frac{d\delta\theta_\nu}{d\nu} = \int_{\mathcal{C}(\nu)} dA (v\delta\theta_\nu) \Big|_{\nu_1}^{\nu_2} - \int_{\mathcal{C}(\nu)} dA \int_{\nu_1}^{\nu_2} d\nu \delta\theta_\nu. \quad (3.6)$$

Note, on the right-hand side, we may pull the variation to the front of the integrals, since the expansion θ_ν vanishes on the future Killing horizon of the unperturbed black hole. Moreover, it follows from (3.3) that the second term on the right side is minus the horizon area change. The boundary term on the right side vanishes in the standard derivation [22] of the physical process first law, where the range for ν is taken between 0 and ∞ , because the lower limit vanishes at the bifurcation surface $\nu_1 = 0$, and the upper limit is also zero because θ_ν vanishes faster than $1/\nu$ as $\nu_2 \rightarrow \infty$ for a stationary final state with a finite horizon area. However, this term does not vanish for two arbitrary affine times, and, crucially, gives a nontrivial dynamical correction to the Bekenstein-Hawking entropy. Hence, we find

$$\int_{\mathcal{C}(\nu)} dA \int_{\nu_1}^{\nu_2} d\nu \nu \frac{d\delta\theta_\nu}{d\nu} = -\Delta \delta \left(\int_{\mathcal{C}(\nu)} dA (1 - \nu\theta_\nu) \right). \quad (3.7)$$

Finally, we insert this equation and the matter Killing energy flux (3.2) into the integrated Raychaudhuri equation (3.5). This yields the physical process first law for arbitrary cross-sections of the horizon and non-stationary perturbations

$$\frac{\kappa}{2\pi} \Delta \delta S_{\text{dyn}} = \Delta \delta M - \Omega_{\mathcal{H}} \Delta \delta J, \quad (3.8)$$

where S_{dyn} is the dynamical black hole entropy of the cross-section \mathcal{C} of the horizon

$$S_{\text{dyn}}[\mathcal{C}] = \frac{1}{4G} \int_{\mathcal{C}(v)} dA (1 - v\theta_v). \quad (3.9)$$

This is equivalent to the formula (1.7) for S_{dyn} in the introduction, because of (3.3). A few comments are in order about the dynamical black hole entropy. First, the product $v\theta_v$ is gauge invariant under the scaling transformation $v \rightarrow a(x^i)v$, hence the entropy does not depend to first order in the perturbation on the choice of affine parameter. Further, the entropy does not depend on the auxiliary null vector field l^a and hence also does not depend on the ambiguities in its definition. Second, at the bifurcation surface the dynamical black hole entropy reduces to the standard Bekenstein-Hawking entropy, since $v = 0$ at \mathcal{B} . Third, for stationary variations we have $\delta\theta_v = 0$, because the expansion in the v -direction vanishes on a Killing horizon, hence we also recover the Bekenstein-Hawking entropy in that case. In the most general case, for arbitrary cross-sections and a non-stationary variation, the dynamical black hole entropy receives a correction term compared to the Bekenstein-Hawking entropy due to the nonzero expansion. If the expansion is positive, which follows from the null energy condition, then the entropy is smaller than the Bekenstein-Hawking entropy, suggesting that it is associated to a surface inside the event horizon (see our discussion in Section 3.2).

As an aside, we mention that the dynamical black hole entropy can also be expressed in terms of the Killing parameterisation of the null geodesics of the unperturbed Killing horizon. From the relation between the Killing time parameter τ and the affine parameter v , $\kappa v = \exp(\kappa\tau)$, it follows that

$$S_{\text{dyn}}[\mathcal{C}] = \frac{1}{4G} \int_{\mathcal{C}(\tau)} dA \left(1 - \frac{1}{\kappa} \theta_\tau \right), \quad (3.10)$$

where θ_τ is the expansion along the Killing parameter. Note that scaling the Killing field $\xi \rightarrow c\xi$ also rescales the surface gravity $\kappa \rightarrow c\kappa$, hence the product θ_τ/κ is reparameterisation invariant.

An important implication of the physical process first law is that the dynamical black hole entropy satisfies a “linearised” second law. This is because, assuming the null energy condition $\delta T_{ab}k^ak^b \geq 0$, the matter Killing energy flux (3.1) is non-negative, hence the dynamical black hole entropy is non-decreasing to first order in the perturbation

$$\Delta\delta S_{\text{dyn}} \geq 0. \quad (3.11)$$

Thus, for first-order perturbations sourced by external matter that satisfies the null energy condition, the dynamical black hole entropy obeys the classical second law of black hole thermodynamics.

There is, however, a fundamental difference between the Bekenstein-Hawking entropy, satisfying the area theorem, and dynamical black hole entropy, satisfying (3.11). On the one hand, the dynamical black hole entropy (3.9) changes only when matter crosses the horizon. This is because the physical process first law is valid for any two cross-sections, in particular also for times v_1 and v_2 that are very close to each other, hence the entropy change occurs locally. If there is no energy flux through the horizon between times v_1 and v_2 , then according to the first law the entropy does not change. On the other hand, Bekenstein-Hawking entropy already changes in anticipation of matter crossing the horizon. This follows from the fact that the black hole event horizon is defined in a teleological way as the causal boundary of the past of future null infinity. At future null infinity the horizon generators must have zero expansion, i.e. they are parallel. However, according to the Raychaudhuri equation (3.4), the expansion decreases if positive matter Killing energy crosses the future horizon. Hence, before matter even crosses the horizon, the generators must have positive expansion in order for the expansion to be zero at future infinity. In other words, the horizon area already increases before matter is thrown into the black hole.

To illustrate this point, we consider a stress-energy tensor that is proportional to a delta function on the horizon: $T_{vv} = c\delta(v - v_0)$, where c is a small constant and v_0 is the affine time when the matter source travels through the horizon. Then by the linearised Raychaudhuri equation (3.4) the derivative of the expansion is, to first order in the perturbation, proportional to a delta function:

$$\partial_v \theta_v = -c\delta(v - v_0). \quad (3.12)$$

The solution to this differential equation for the expansion is a step function

$$\theta_v = c - cH(v - v_0) = \begin{cases} c, & v < v_0, \\ 0, & v > v_0, \end{cases} \quad (3.13)$$

where H is the Heaviside step function. Note that we imposed the teleological boundary condition: $\theta_v = 0$ at future infinity. The expansion itself, on the other hand, is related to the derivative of the horizon area by (3.3), which hence has the shape of a kink, i.e. it increases until it reaches a constant at the time v_0 ,

$$A = \begin{cases} A_0 + c(v - v_0), & v < v_0, \\ A_0, & v > v_0. \end{cases} \quad (3.14)$$

Further, the dynamical entropy (3.9) of a black hole can be computed as follows

$$S_{\text{dyn}} = \frac{1}{4G}(1 - v\partial_v)A = \begin{cases} A_0 - cv_0, & v < v_0 \\ A_0, & v > v_0. \end{cases} \quad (3.15)$$

Thus, we conclude the profile of the Bekenstein-Hawking entropy (the horizon area) is a kink as a function of affine time, whereas the dynamical black hole entropy behaves more like a step function, i.e. it changes only when the matter source crosses the horizon, in agreement with the discussion above.

3.2 Relation to Bekenstein-Hawking Entropy of the Apparent Horizon

An apparent horizon is defined on a Cauchy surface as the boundary of an outer trapped region, which consists of surfaces whose outgoing null expansion is negative [63]. The apparent horizon is foliated by future marginally outer trapped surfaces, which means that its outgoing null expansion vanishes. The location of an apparent horizon is highly ambiguous as it depends on the choice of Cauchy slice. Nevertheless, for some fixed foliation of the spacetime, apparent horizons can provide a more local notion of the boundary of a black hole than the event horizon, as the expansion of a null geodesic congruence is defined locally. Thus, it is interesting to investigate the relation between the area entropy of an apparent horizon and the dynamical black hole entropy, as the latter also only changes locally in affine time. This relationship was previously established in [1].

Another reason to study the relationship between the entropy of the event horizon \mathcal{H}^+ and that of the apparent horizon \mathcal{A} , is that the apparent horizon must lie on or inside the event horizon. In a stationary background the apparent horizon of a Cauchy slice coincides with the cross-section of the Killing horizon at that slice. When non-stationary perturbations are switched on, however, the apparent horizon lies within the black hole, because the expansion θ_v is non-negative along the outgoing null geodesics of the event horizon — assuming the null energy condition and weak cosmic censorship — whereas the outgoing null expansion $\tilde{\theta}_{\tilde{k}}$ of the apparent horizon vanishes (along the null normal \tilde{k} to \mathcal{A}). Since the dynamical black hole entropy (3.9) is smaller than the area entropy of the event horizon, if $\theta_v \geq 0$, a natural question is whether the dynamical entropy is equal to the area entropy associated to an apparent horizon. In this section we show this is indeed the case for linear perturbations around a stationary black hole.




Figure 4: Apparent horizon \mathcal{A} at $u = \mathcal{U}(v, x^i)$, based on a spacetime foliation by affine Gaussian null coordinates. A constant- v section of the apparent horizon at $v = v_0$ is by construction a future marginally outer trapped surface $\mathcal{T}(v_0)$ with null normals l^a and \tilde{k}^a . The black hole event horizon \mathcal{H}^+ is located at $u = 0$, and $\mathcal{C}(v_0)$ is a cross-section at $v = v_0$. In a stationary background the apparent and black hole horizon coincide, but for a small non-stationary perturbation the apparent horizon lies slightly inside the black hole event horizon.

We foliate the spacetime using the GNC system near the future horizon \mathcal{H}^+ of the black hole. Suppose the GNC system is adapted such that \mathcal{H}^+ is still at $u = 0$ after the perturbation (assumption a) in Section 2.2). We denote the location of \mathcal{A} as $u = \mathcal{U}(v, x^i) \geq 0$, where we notice that it is in general not a null hypersurface, and its u -position depends on v and x^i , so it may look like a wiggly surface in GNC. We fix the spatial foliation of \mathcal{A} by demanding that every constant v surface within \mathcal{A} is future marginally outer trapped. Any other foliation of \mathcal{A} by $v \rightarrow v + f(x^i)$ in principle could be studied using different schemes for extending k^a (hence the v -coordinate) off the event horizon. Below we assume that the affine null distance $\mathcal{U}(v, x^i)$ to the event horizon, and its spacetime derivatives, are of first order in the perturbation, i.e. their magnitude is comparable to the perturbation parameter ϵ . We will work to first order in ϵ , hence we ignore quantities quadratic in \mathcal{U} and its derivatives.

First, we use GNC to define the null normals to any future marginally outer trapped surface $\mathcal{T}(v_0)$ at $v = v_0$, which is a constant v -slice of the apparent horizon $\mathcal{A} = \{u = \mathcal{U}(v, x^i)\}$. One of the null normals to \mathcal{T} is $l_a = -(\mathrm{d}v)_a$, (2.38), since \mathcal{T} is by construction a constant- v surface. The other null normal can be found by the condition that $\mathrm{d}u - (\partial_i \mathcal{U}) \mathrm{d}x^i \stackrel{\mathcal{T}}{=} 0$, so it reads

$$\tilde{k}_a \stackrel{\mathcal{T}}{=} -(\mathrm{d}u)_a + \partial_i \mathcal{U} (\mathrm{d}x^i)_a, \quad (3.16)$$

where we have chosen the sign of \tilde{k} such that it is future directed. Using the inverse metric (2.33) in GNC, we find

$$\tilde{k}^a = g^{ab} \tilde{k}_b \stackrel{\mathcal{T}}{=} \left(\frac{\partial}{\partial v} \right)^a + (D^i \mathcal{U} - \omega^i \mathcal{U}) \left(\frac{\partial}{\partial x^i} \right)^a + \mathcal{O}(\epsilon^2) \stackrel{\mathcal{T}}{=} k^a + (D^i \mathcal{U} - \omega^i \mathcal{U}) m_i^a + \mathcal{O}(\epsilon^2), \quad (3.17)$$

where $D^i = \gamma^{ij} D_j$, and D_i is the codimension-2 intrinsic covariant derivative.

Before decomposing the metric on $\mathcal{T}(v)$ in terms of the null normals l^a and \tilde{k}^a , we need to check the following consistency conditions up to first order:

1. \tilde{k}^a should be null at first order,

$$\tilde{k}^a \tilde{k}_a = k^a k_a + 2(D_i \mathcal{U} - \mathcal{U} \omega_i) k^a m_a^i + (D^i \mathcal{U} - \omega^i \mathcal{U})(D_j \mathcal{U} - \omega_j \mathcal{U}) m_i^a m_a^j = \mathcal{O}(\epsilon^2), \quad (3.18)$$

which follows from the relevant metric components in GNC.

2. \tilde{k}^a should obey the same condition as k^a when contracted with l_a :

$$\tilde{k}^a l_a = k^a l_a + (D^i \mathcal{U} - \omega^i \mathcal{U}) m_i^a l_a = -1, \quad (3.19)$$

because $g_{ua} = 0$ everywhere.

Using the null normals (\tilde{k}, l) , we carry out the following metric decomposition on \mathcal{T} ,

$$g_{ab} \stackrel{\mathcal{T}}{=} -2\tilde{k}_{(a} l_{b)} + \gamma_{ab}. \quad (3.20)$$

Note this equation is only valid to first order in ϵ . We employ this double null decomposition to study the expansion of the apparent horizon slice $\mathcal{T}(v)$ along the null normal \tilde{k}

$$\tilde{\theta}_{\tilde{k}} = \gamma_b^a \nabla_a \tilde{k}^b \stackrel{\mathcal{A}}{=} \gamma_b^a \nabla_a k^b + \gamma_b^a \nabla_a ((D^i \mathcal{U} - \omega^i \mathcal{U}) m_i^b). \quad (3.21)$$

To identify the second term as a codimension-2 total derivative, we consider

$$m_i^b = (\gamma_c^b - \tilde{k}^b l_c - l^b \tilde{k}_c) m_i^c = \gamma_c^b m_i^c - (D_i \mathcal{U} - 2\omega_i \mathcal{U}) l^b, \quad (3.22)$$

where we used $m_a^j m_i^a = \delta_i^j$. From this it follows that the second term in (3.21) can be written as

$$\gamma_b^a \nabla_a ((D^i \mathcal{U} - \omega^i \mathcal{U}) m_i^b) \stackrel{\mathcal{T}}{=} \gamma_b^a \nabla_a (\gamma_c^b ((D^i \mathcal{U} - \omega^i \mathcal{U}) m_i^c)) + \mathcal{O}(\epsilon^2) = D_i (D^i \mathcal{U} - \omega^i \mathcal{U}) + \mathcal{O}(\epsilon^2), \quad (3.23)$$

where we identified the projected covariant derivative as the codimension-2 intrinsic covariant derivative D_i .

Focusing on the first term in (3.21), we find

$$\gamma_b^a \nabla_a k^b = \frac{1}{2} \gamma_b^a g^{bc} (\partial_a g_{cv} + \partial_v g_{ac} - \partial_c g_{av}) \stackrel{\mathcal{T}}{=} \frac{1}{2} \gamma^{ac} (\partial_a g_{cv} + \partial_v g_{ac} - \partial_c g_{av}) \stackrel{\mathcal{T}}{=} \frac{1}{2} \gamma^{ac} \partial_v \gamma_{ac} \stackrel{\mathcal{T}}{=} \theta_v, \quad (3.24)$$

where we used the property that γ_b^a is a projection operator at first order. In the last equality, we have identified the ‘expansion’ of \mathcal{T} in the v -direction as

$$\frac{1}{2} \gamma^{ac} \partial_v \gamma_{ac} = \frac{1}{\sqrt{\gamma}} \partial_v \sqrt{\gamma} = \theta_v. \quad (3.25)$$

We emphasise this θ_v is an expansion along a *non-normal* k of \mathcal{T} , hence it may not vanish on \mathcal{T} , whereas for the event horizon θ_v is the outgoing null expansion, because k is the null normal of \mathcal{H}^+ .

Therefore, to first order in the perturbation, the expansion along \tilde{k} can be expressed as

$$\delta \tilde{\theta}_{\tilde{k}} \stackrel{\mathcal{T}}{=} \delta \theta_v(v, \mathcal{U}, x^i) + D_i (D^i \mathcal{U} - \omega^i \mathcal{U}), \quad (3.26)$$

Note that upon integration on a compact horizon, the second term on the right would vanish.

Now, we Taylor expand the first-order variation of the k -expansion $\theta_v(v, \mathcal{U}, x^i)$ around the location of the event horizon ($u = 0$),¹² and impose the defining condition for an apparent horizon that the \tilde{k} -expansion $\tilde{\theta}_{\tilde{k}}$ must vanish¹³

$$0 \stackrel{\mathcal{T}}{=} \delta \tilde{\theta}_{\tilde{k}}(v, \mathcal{U}, x^i) = \delta \theta_v(v, 0, x^i) + \mathcal{U}(v, x^i) \partial_u \theta_v(v, 0, x^i) + D_i (D^i \mathcal{U} - \omega^i \mathcal{U}). \quad (3.27)$$

¹²We can Taylor expand this around the event horizon to first order, because $\theta_v = \gamma_{ab} \nabla^a k^b$ is a covariant scalar function on spacetime to first order in the perturbation.

¹³We thank Bob Wald for pointing out an error in this equation in a previous version of the paper.

This equation is exact to first order in the perturbation parameter ϵ . We want to solve it for $\delta\theta_v(v, 0, x^i)$, since that appears in the variation of the dynamical black hole entropy (3.9). In order to do so, we make use of two facts about the expansion. First, we have that, to zeroth-order in the perturbation,

$$\partial_u\theta_v = \partial_u\left(\frac{1}{dA}\partial_v dA\right) = -\frac{1}{(dA)^2}(\partial_u dA)(\partial_v dA) + \frac{1}{dA}\partial_u\partial_v dA = \partial_v\left(\frac{1}{dA}\partial_u dA\right) = \partial_v\theta_u, \quad (3.28)$$

where $\theta_u = \gamma_{ab}\nabla^a l^b$ is the ingoing null expansion in the u -direction. Second, a boost weight analysis (see Section 2.3) on the event horizon suggests that, at zeroth order, the ingoing null expansion is proportional to v

$$\theta_u(v, 0, x^i) = -F(x^i)v, \quad (3.29)$$

for some function $F(x^i) > 0$. The expansion θ_u on the event horizon is negative because null geodesics are focusing in the u -direction. Using (3.28) and (3.29), we can obtain the solution to the apparent horizon condition (3.27) for the expansion θ_v of the perturbed event horizon

$$\delta\theta_v(v, 0, x^i) = \mathcal{U}(v, x^i)F(x^i) - D_i(D^i\mathcal{U} - \omega^i\mathcal{U}). \quad (3.30)$$

Next, we Taylor expand the area element dA of the apparent horizon at the affine time v , around the cross-section of the event horizon at v , which to leading order in the perturbation gives

$$\delta dA(v, \mathcal{U}, x^i) = \delta dA(v, 0, x^i) + \mathcal{U}(v, x^i)\partial_u dA(v, 0, x^i). \quad (3.31)$$

On the event horizon it follows from (3.29) that

$$\partial_u dA = \theta_u dA = -vF(x^i) dA. \quad (3.32)$$

By inserting this and (3.30) into (3.31), we obtain

$$\begin{aligned} \delta dA(v, \mathcal{U}, x^i) &= \delta dA(v, 0, x^i) - v dA(v, 0, x^i)\delta\theta_v(v, 0, x^i) - v dA(v, 0, x^i)D_i(D^i\mathcal{U} - \omega^i\mathcal{U}) \\ &= (1 - v\partial_v)\delta dA(v, 0, x^i) - v dA(v, 0, x^i)D_i(D^i\mathcal{U} - \omega^i\mathcal{U}). \end{aligned} \quad (3.33)$$

Hence, integrating this equation over the codimension-2 horizon slice at constant v yields

$$A(v, \mathcal{U}) = (1 - v\partial_v)A(v, 0), \quad (3.34)$$

where we have taken out the δ , as both sides are exact in the variation.

Thus, in general relativity the dynamical black hole entropy captures the area of the apparent horizon, to first order in the perturbation around a stationary black hole,

$$S_{\text{dyn}} = \frac{1}{4G}(1 - v\partial_v)A[\mathcal{C}_{\mathcal{H}^+}(v)] = \frac{A[\mathcal{T}(v)]}{4G}, \quad (3.35)$$

where $\mathcal{C}_{\mathcal{H}^+}(v)$ is the cross-section of the event horizon \mathcal{H}^+ at affine time v , and $\mathcal{T}(v)$ is the cross-section of the apparent horizon \mathcal{A} at v . We have seen that the dynamical black hole entropy satisfies a linearised second law, if the perturbation is sourced by stress-energy tensor that obeys the null energy condition. Therefore, the identification (3.35) implies that the Bekenstein-Hawking entropy of the apparent horizon is also non-decreasing. This agrees with the classical second law for the area of future outer trapping horizons [64] and dynamical horizons [65], which coincide in physical setups. Dynamical horizons are defined as spacelike hypersurfaces foliated by marginally trapped surfaces satisfying $\theta_{\text{out}} = 0$ and $\theta_{\text{in}} < 0$. The apparent horizon considered here also satisfies these conditions, so it is an example of a dynamical horizon and hence it should obey the second law.

4 Dynamical Black Hole Entropy is Improved Noether Charge

In this section we derive the dynamical black hole entropy, valid to leading order for non-stationary perturbations of a Killing horizon, for arbitrary diffeomorphism covariant theories of gravity using the Noether charge method, also known as covariant phase space formalism, developed in [11,12,37,38,66,67]. We first introduce our notation and briefly review the covariant phase space formalism (Section 4.1), where our treatment is slightly different from the standard one by Wald and collaborators, since we allow for variations of both the dynamical fields and the vector fields generating diffeomorphisms (see, e.g, [43,52,53] for similar treatments). Then we derive the non-stationary comparison version (Section 4.2) and the physical process version (Section 4.3) of the first law and show that the dynamical black hole entropy that appears in this first law is defined as an “improved” Noether charge. Furthermore, we analyse several aspects of the dynamical entropy: we show that it satisfies a linearised second law (Section 4.4); we discuss its relation to Wall entropy [10] (Section 4.5); and we demonstrate its invariance under JKM ambiguities [33] to leading order in perturbation theory (Section 4.6). We end with some technical details: we show using affine Gaussian null coordinates that the symplectic potential is a total variation when pulled back to the event horizon (Section 4.7); and we analyse the structure of the Noether charge and dynamical black hole entropy for arbitrary diffeomorphism covariant theories (Section 4.8).

4.1 Covariant Phase Space Formalism

We consider a general, classical theory of gravity with arbitrary matter fields in D spacetime dimensions, arising from a diffeomorphism covariant Lagrangian D -form \mathbf{L} , which can always be put in the form [11]

$$\mathbf{L} = L(g^{ab}, R_{abcd}, \nabla_{e_1} R_{abcd}, \dots, \nabla_{(e_1 \dots e_n)} R_{abcd}, \varphi_A, \nabla_{b_1} \varphi_A, \dots, \nabla_{(b_1 \dots b_m)} \varphi_A) \epsilon. \quad (4.1)$$

Here ϵ is the volume form, g^{ab} is the (inverse) spacetime metric, ∇ denotes the covariant derivative with respect to this metric, R_{abcd} is the Riemann curvature tensor of g_{ab} , and φ_A are arbitrary (bosonic) matter tensor fields with indices $A \equiv a_1 \dots a_s$. We use $\phi \equiv (g_{ab}, \varphi_A)$ to collectively denote all dynamical fields. Further, in the discussion below, we will use the notation

$$\epsilon_{a_1 \dots a_p} = \epsilon_{a_1 \dots a_p a_{p+1} \dots a_D}, \quad (4.2)$$

so, for example, ϵ_a denotes the spacetime volume form with one index displayed and the other indices suppressed. In addition, for later convenience, we set the orientation of the volume form on the horizon to be

$$\epsilon \stackrel{\mathcal{H}^+}{=} k \wedge l \wedge \epsilon_{\mathcal{C}} \quad (4.3)$$

where k, l should be interpreted as 1-forms, and $\epsilon_{\mathcal{C}}$ is the codimension-2 spatial “volume” (area) form of a horizon cross-section.

Under a first-order variation of the dynamical fields, the variation of \mathbf{L} can always be expressed as

$$\delta \mathbf{L} = \mathbf{E}(\phi) \delta \phi + d\mathbf{\Theta}(\phi, \delta \phi), \quad (4.4)$$

where

$$\mathbf{E}(\phi) \delta \phi = \frac{1}{2} \mathbf{E}_{ab} \delta g^{ab} + \mathcal{E}^A \delta \varphi_A, \quad (4.5)$$

and $\mathbf{E}_{ab} = E_{ab} \epsilon$ and $\mathcal{E}^A = \mathcal{E}^A \epsilon$ are the Euler-Lagrange equation of motion forms for g^{ab} and φ_A , respectively. Moreover, $\mathbf{\Theta}(\phi, \delta \phi)$ is the symplectic potential codimension-1 form, which is locally constructed out of $\phi, \delta \phi$ and their derivatives and is linear in $\delta \phi$.

Now let χ^a be an arbitrary smooth vector field, and consider a variation, $\delta\phi = \mathcal{L}_\chi\phi$, induced by a diffeomorphism generated by χ^a . Then, diffeomorphism covariance of \mathbf{L} implies that, under this variation, (4.4) becomes

$$\mathcal{L}_\chi\mathbf{L} = d(\chi \cdot \mathbf{L}) = \mathbf{E}(\phi)\mathcal{L}_\chi\phi + d\Theta(\phi, \mathcal{L}_\chi\phi). \quad (4.6)$$

The second equality follows from the Cartan-Killing equation

$$\mathcal{L}_\chi\mathbf{\Lambda} = d(\chi \cdot \mathbf{\Lambda}) + \chi \cdot d\mathbf{\Lambda}, \quad (4.7)$$

where $\mathbf{\Lambda}$ is some differential form, and $\chi \cdot \mathbf{\Lambda}$ means contraction of χ with the first index of $\mathbf{\Lambda}$, and from the fact that the Lagrangian form \mathbf{L} is a top form, hence $d\mathbf{L} = 0$. Equation (4.6) implies there exists a *Noether current* codimension-1 form \mathbf{J}_χ , associated to χ^a , that is closed on shell

$$\mathbf{J}_\chi = \Theta(\phi, \mathcal{L}_\chi\phi) - \chi \cdot \mathbf{L}. \quad (4.8)$$

The Noether current also satisfies an off-shell identity (see the appendix of [68] for a proof)

$$d(\mathbf{J}_\chi + \mathbf{C}_\chi) = 0. \quad (4.9)$$

This follows from using the generalised Bianchi identity,

$$\nabla^a(E_{ab} - c_{ab}) + \mathcal{E}^A \nabla_b \varphi_A = 0, \quad (4.10)$$

to express $\mathbf{E}(\phi)\mathcal{L}_\chi\phi = d\mathbf{C}_\chi$, with \mathbf{C}_χ the constraint codimension-1 form

$$\mathbf{C}_\chi = \left(-E^{ab} + c^{ab}\right) \chi_b \epsilon_a, \quad (4.11)$$

and

$$c^{ab} = \mathcal{E}^{aa_2 \dots a_s} \varphi_{a_2 \dots a_s}^b + \mathcal{E}^{a_1 a a_3 \dots a_s} \varphi_{a_1 a_3 \dots a_s}^b + \dots + \mathcal{E}^{a_1 \dots a_{n-1} a} \varphi_{a_1 \dots a_{n-1}}^b. \quad (4.12)$$

The constraint equations of motion for the metric are $E_{ab}\epsilon^b = 0$ and for the matter fields $c_{ab}\epsilon^b = 0$. We note that $c^{ab} = 0$, if φ is a scalar field.

Next, by the Poincaré lemma, and an explicit construction in [69], we can write

$$\mathbf{J}_\chi + \mathbf{C}_\chi = d\mathbf{Q}_\chi, \quad (4.13)$$

where \mathbf{Q}_χ is the *Noether charge* codimension-2 form associated to χ .

Furthermore, we consider a variation of the Noether current \mathbf{J}_χ that varies both the dynamical fields ϕ and the vector field χ

$$\begin{aligned} \delta\mathbf{J}_\chi &= \delta_\phi\Theta(\phi, \mathcal{L}_\chi\phi) + \Theta(\phi, \mathcal{L}_{\delta\chi}\phi) - \delta\chi \cdot \mathbf{L} - \chi \cdot \delta\mathbf{L} \\ &= \omega(\phi, \delta\phi, \mathcal{L}_\chi\phi) + \mathbf{J}_{\delta\chi} + d(\chi \cdot \Theta(\phi, \delta\phi)) - \chi \cdot \mathbf{E}(\phi)\delta\phi, \end{aligned} \quad (4.14)$$

where

$$\delta_\phi\Theta(\phi, \mathcal{L}_\chi\phi) = \delta\Theta(\phi, \mathcal{L}_\chi\phi) - \Theta(\phi, \mathcal{L}_{\delta\chi}\phi) \quad (4.15)$$

is the variation of the symplectic potential with respect to the fields only, and ω is the *symplectic current* codimension-1 form

$$\omega(\phi, \delta_1\phi, \delta_2\phi) = \delta_1\Theta(\phi, \delta_2\phi) - \delta_2\Theta(\phi, \delta_1\phi). \quad (4.16)$$

Inserting the variation of (4.13) for $\delta\mathbf{J}_\chi$, and similarly for $\mathbf{J}_{\delta\chi}$, into (4.14) yields

$$\omega(\phi, \delta\phi, \mathcal{L}_\chi\phi) = d(\delta_\phi\mathbf{Q}_\chi - \chi \cdot \Theta(\phi, \delta\phi)) - \delta_\phi\mathbf{C}_\chi + \chi \cdot \mathbf{E}(\phi)\delta\phi, \quad (4.17)$$

where

$$\delta_\phi \mathbf{Q}_\chi \equiv \delta \mathbf{Q}_\chi - \mathbf{Q}_{\delta\chi} \quad \text{and} \quad \delta_\phi \mathbf{C}_\chi \equiv \delta \mathbf{C}_\chi - \mathbf{C}_{\delta\chi} \quad (4.18)$$

are the field variations of the Noether charge \mathbf{Q}_ξ and constraint form \mathbf{C}_χ . This is known as the *fundamental identity* [67] of the covariant phase space formalism. We have allowed for variations of the vector field χ , since for our geometric setup they lead to nonzero variations of the surface gravity (see Section 2.2). We will show that in the first law for non-stationary perturbations of stationary black holes the variation of the horizon Killing field ξ^a cancels out. In particular, we check in Section 4.8 that the variation of the dynamical black hole entropy does not depend on $\delta\xi^a$. In a different context, variations of the vector field χ arise when it depends on the background dynamical fields, $\chi^a = \chi^a(\phi)$. The covariant phase space formalism for field-dependent vector fields is, for instance, studied in detail in [43, 46, 52, 53].

When we apply the fundamental identity on a stationary black hole background with horizon Killing vector field $\chi^a = \xi^a$, then the symplectic current evaluated on the Lie derivative of the fields along ξ^a vanishes

$$\omega(\phi, \delta\phi, \mathcal{L}_\xi\phi) = 0, \quad (4.19)$$

as it depends linearly on $\mathcal{L}_\xi\phi$, which is zero on a stationary background. Hence, the fundamental identity becomes

$$d(\delta_\phi \mathbf{Q}_\xi - \xi \cdot \Theta(\phi, \delta\phi)) = \delta_\phi \mathbf{C}_\xi - \xi \cdot \mathbf{E}(\phi) \delta\phi. \quad (4.20)$$

The term $\xi \cdot \mathbf{E}(\phi)$ vanishes when we pull it back to the horizon, as ξ is tangent to the horizon. As we will see shortly, this equation plays a central role in the derivation of the first law for non-stationary black holes.

4.2 The Non-Stationary Comparison First Law

Previously in [11, 12], a comparison version of the first law was derived for arbitrary diffeomorphism covariant theories of gravity using the Noether charge method. The entropy of stationary black holes was defined solely in terms of the Noether charge \mathbf{Q}_ξ integrated over a horizon cross-section. However, for dynamical black holes, the Noether charge has a major drawback — it is subject to JKM ambiguities [33] away from the bifurcation surface (see Section 4.6). And, at an arbitrary cross-section of the horizon, the Noether charge entropy does not satisfy a comparison first law for dynamical black holes. Here, for dynamical black holes obtained by perturbing stationary black holes with a bifurcate Killing horizon, we show a different definition of entropy (the “improved” Noether charge) does satisfy a comparison first law at linear order in perturbation theory. Similar results were previously obtained in [1].

We assume that the background field equations are satisfied, $\mathbf{E}(\phi) = 0$, and we require the perturbed fields to obey the linearised constraint equations, $\delta_\phi \mathbf{C}_\xi = 0$. Under these assumptions the fundamental variational identity (4.20) becomes

$$d(\delta_\phi \mathbf{Q}_\xi - \xi \cdot \Theta(\phi, \delta\phi)) = 0. \quad (4.21)$$

We integrate this expression over a codimension-1 spatial hypersurface between the horizon \mathcal{H}^+ and spatial infinity i_0 . Because of Stokes’ theorem, the boundary integral at a cross-section \mathcal{S}_∞ of i_0 is equal to the boundary integral at a cross-section \mathcal{C} of \mathcal{H}^+

$$\int_{\mathcal{S}_\infty} (\delta_\phi \mathbf{Q}_\xi - \xi \cdot \Theta(\phi, \delta\phi)) = \int_{\mathcal{C}} (\delta_\phi \mathbf{Q}_\xi - \xi \cdot \Theta(\phi, \delta\phi)). \quad (4.22)$$

For the boundary integral at infinity we make the identification

$$\int_{\mathcal{S}_\infty} (\delta_\phi \mathbf{Q}_\xi - \xi \cdot \Theta(\phi, \delta\phi)) = \delta M - \Omega_{\mathcal{H}} \delta J. \quad (4.23)$$

For stationary, axisymmetric black holes, the horizon Killing vector field may be normalised at spatial infinity as

$$\xi^a = (\partial_t)^a + \Omega_{\mathcal{H}}(\partial_\vartheta)^a, \quad (4.24)$$

where t, ϑ are the temporal and angular coordinates, respectively. Then, the variation of the canonical mass and angular momentum can be defined as

$$\delta M = \int_{\mathcal{S}_\infty} (\delta_\phi \mathbf{Q}_{\partial_t} - \partial_t \cdot \Theta(\phi, \delta\phi)), \quad \delta J = - \int_{\mathcal{S}_\infty} \delta_\phi \mathbf{Q}_{\partial_\vartheta}, \quad (4.25)$$

where $\partial_\vartheta \cdot \Theta = 0$ on \mathcal{S}_∞ , because ∂_ϑ is parallel to \mathcal{S}_∞ . The mass M is well defined if there exists a codimension-1 form $\mathbf{B}_\infty(\phi)$ at spatial infinity i_0 such that

$$\Theta(\phi, \delta\phi) \stackrel{i_0}{=} \delta \mathbf{B}_\infty(\phi). \quad (4.26)$$

The definitions of the mass and angular momentum are then

$$M = \int_{\mathcal{S}_\infty} (\mathbf{Q}_{\partial_t} - \partial_t \cdot \mathbf{B}_\infty), \quad (4.27)$$

$$J = - \int_{\mathcal{S}_\infty} \mathbf{Q}_{\partial_\vartheta}. \quad (4.28)$$

In [11], the exactness in δ of Θ at asymptotic infinity is shown for general relativity, assuming suitable fall-off conditions for the metric, and the form \mathbf{B}_∞ is explicitly constructed. Moreover, they recover the ADM definitions of the mass and angular momentum from (4.27) and (4.28).

Furthermore, for the boundary integral at the horizon, in the original works [11, 12] this was evaluated at the bifurcation surface, where $\xi \cdot \Theta = 0$. Subsequently, they identified the Noether charge with the black hole entropy, which for arbitrary theories of gravity is given by the Wald entropy (1.4),

$$\int_{\mathcal{B}} \delta_\phi \mathbf{Q}_\xi = \frac{\kappa}{2\pi} \delta S_{\text{Wald}}. \quad (4.29)$$

For stationary black holes the integral of the Noether charge is independent of the choice of horizon cross-section, so the choice for \mathcal{B} is innocuous. This is because the difference between integrals of \mathbf{Q}_ξ over different cross-sections is given by the integral of \mathbf{J}_ξ over the horizon in between. But, because of the stationarity condition $\mathcal{L}_\xi \phi = 0$ and the fact that the pullback of $\xi \cdot \mathbf{L}$ vanishes at the horizon, according to the definition of \mathbf{J}_ξ , (4.8), its pullback to \mathcal{H}^+ vanishes. However, for non-stationary perturbations (4.29) is really only true at the bifurcation surface, since $\mathcal{L}_\xi \phi \neq 0$ in the perturbed geometry. Further, for stationary perturbations it is not necessary to evaluate the boundary integral at \mathcal{B} . Indeed, Gao [54] (see also [46]) showed that the boundary integral, including the $\xi \cdot \Theta$ terms, gives the black hole entropy for arbitrary horizon cross-sections

$$\int_{\mathcal{C}} (\delta_\phi \mathbf{Q}_\xi - \xi \cdot \Theta(\phi, \delta\phi)) = \frac{\kappa}{2\pi} \delta S_{\text{Wald}} \quad \text{for} \quad \delta(\mathcal{L}_\xi \phi) = 0, \quad (4.30)$$

Gao established this identity for general relativity (using results from [3]), that is, he obtained the variation of S_{BH} from the left-hand side. But the identity holds more generally for any diffeomorphism covariant theory of gravity, which follows as a special case from our results.

We generalise these derivations by considering non-stationary perturbations and a spatial slice that extends from an arbitrary horizon cross-section to spatial infinity. Hence, we make the identification

$$\int_{\mathcal{C}} (\delta_\phi \mathbf{Q}_\xi - \xi \cdot \Theta(\phi, \delta\phi)) = \frac{\kappa}{2\pi} \delta S_{\text{dyn}} \quad \text{for} \quad \delta(\mathcal{L}_\xi \phi) \neq 0, \quad (4.31)$$




Figure 5: Penrose diagram of an eternal asymptotically flat black hole. The comparison version of the first law relates the variations of the black hole mass and angular momentum at spatial infinity to the variation of the entropy at the event horizon. At the bifurcation surface \mathcal{B} the entropy is given by the Wald entropy, and on an arbitrary cross-section \mathcal{C} the horizon entropy is the dynamical black hole entropy for non-stationary variations.

where κ is the surface gravity of the unperturbed Killing horizon. Hence, instead of only the Noether charge, the symplectic potential also contributes to the (variation of) the dynamical black hole entropy. Thus, by relating the two boundary integrals at \mathcal{S}_∞ and \mathcal{C} , (4.23) and (4.31) respectively, we arrive at the non-stationary comparison first law for arbitrary horizon slices

$$\delta M - \Omega_{\mathcal{H}} \delta J = \frac{\kappa}{2\pi} \delta S_{\text{dyn}}. \quad (4.32)$$

To serve as a well-posed definition for S_{dyn} , the variational formula (4.31) is subject to two consistency conditions:

- a) There exists a codimension-1 form $\mathbf{B}_{\mathcal{H}^+}(\phi)$ that satisfies

$$\Theta(\phi, \delta\phi) \stackrel{\mathcal{H}^+}{=} \delta \mathbf{B}_{\mathcal{H}^+}(\phi) \quad \text{and} \quad \mathbf{B}_{\mathcal{H}^+}(\phi) \stackrel{\mathcal{H}^+}{=} 0, \quad (4.33)$$

where Θ is the pullback of the symplectic potential to the horizon, and the second equality holds on the background Killing horizon. This condition implies

$$\xi \cdot \Theta(\phi, \delta\phi) \stackrel{\mathcal{C}}{=} \delta(\xi \cdot \mathbf{B}_{\mathcal{H}^+}(\phi)) \stackrel{\mathcal{C}}{=} \kappa \delta(\xi \cdot \mathbf{B}_{\mathcal{H}^+} / \kappa_3) \stackrel{\mathcal{C}}{=} \kappa \delta_\phi(\xi \cdot \mathbf{B}_{\mathcal{H}^+} / \kappa_3) \quad (4.34)$$

simply because, when δ is not acting on $\mathbf{B}_{\mathcal{H}^+}$, it vanishes in the stationary background.

- b) To extract the full variation δ , instead of just the field-only variation δ_ϕ , from the first term, we also require

$$\delta_\phi \mathbf{Q}_\xi \stackrel{\mathcal{C}}{=} \kappa \delta(\mathbf{Q}_\xi / \kappa_3), \quad (4.35)$$

where, κ_3 is the surface gravity defined in (2.28).

In Section 4.7 we prove condition a) for general diffeomorphism covariant theories of gravity. There we will use the general structure of symplectic potential Θ studied in [11], and we will work in GNC that allow us to use boost weight arguments. Later in Section 4.8, we prove condition b) in the same setup as the proof for a).

An immediate corollary of the above two conditions is that $\delta_\phi S_{\text{dyn}} = \delta S_{\text{dyn}}$, i.e., the field-only variation is equivalent to full variation of S_{dyn} . The reason for this is that a field variation does not act on κ_3 , since the surface gravity variation only depends on the variation of the vector field $\delta\xi^a$, see (2.31), assuming our gauge conditions for the perturbation hold. This implies $\delta_\phi \mathbf{Q}_\xi \stackrel{\mathcal{C}}{=} \kappa \delta_\phi(\mathbf{Q}_\xi / \kappa_3)$. Thus, combining this with (4.34), it follows that we can write

$$\delta_\phi \left(\int_{\mathcal{C}} \frac{2\pi}{\kappa_3} (\mathbf{Q}_\xi - \xi \cdot \mathbf{B}_{\mathcal{H}^+}) \right) = \delta S_{\text{dyn}}. \quad (4.36)$$

This means that at first order the variation of S_{dyn} is independent of $\delta\xi$. Thus the variation of the horizon Killing field, and hence also of the surface gravity, is absent in the first law.

Given that the two conditions above are satisfied, we can define the dynamical entropy as the *improved Noether charge* $\tilde{\mathbf{Q}}_\xi$ (see, e.g., [37–43]) up to linear order in the perturbation away from stationarity,

$$S_{\text{dyn}} = \frac{2\pi}{\kappa_3} \int_{\mathcal{C}} \tilde{\mathbf{Q}}_\xi = \frac{2\pi}{\kappa_3} \int_{\mathcal{C}} (\mathbf{Q}_\xi - \xi \cdot \mathbf{B}_{\mathcal{H}^+}). \quad (4.37)$$

At zeroth order in the perturbation, $\xi \cdot \mathbf{B}_{\mathcal{H}^+}(\phi) \stackrel{\mathcal{C}}{=} 0$, hence $\tilde{\mathbf{Q}}_\xi \stackrel{\mathcal{C}}{=} \mathbf{Q}_\xi$ for Killing horizons. Moreover, at the bifurcation surface, $\xi^a = 0$, hence we recover the Iyer-Wald result (4.29). Therefore, at the bifurcation surface and on Killing horizons, S_{dyn} reduces to the Wald entropy.

4.3 The Physical Process First Law

In the derivation of the comparison version of the first law above we treated the metric and matter field collectively, and defined the dynamical entropy in terms of the improved Noether charge for all fields ϕ . In this section we consider the case where an external minimal matter source, described by the stress-energy tensor T_{ab} , is switched on as a perturbation. We show that the same dynamical entropy (4.37) also satisfies a physical process version of first law associated with this external stress-energy tensor. This extends the proof of the physical process version of first law from the Raychaudhuri equation in Section 3.1 to arbitrary diffeomorphism covariant theories. A similar proof was given in [1].

In the presence of an external matter field, let us separate the total Lagrangian $\tilde{\mathbf{L}}$ into that of the original system $\mathbf{L}(\phi)$ and that of the external matter $\mathbf{L}^m(\psi)$:

$$\tilde{\mathbf{L}}(\phi, \psi) = \mathbf{L}(\phi) + \mathbf{L}^m(\psi), \quad (4.38)$$

where ψ is the external matter field. The variation of the original Lagrangian and external matter Lagrangian can be expressed as

$$\delta\mathbf{L} = \frac{1}{2} \mathbf{E}_{ab} \delta g^{ab} + \mathcal{E}^A \delta\varphi_A + d\Theta(\phi, \delta\phi), \quad \delta\mathbf{L}^m = -\frac{1}{2} \mathbf{T}_{ab} \delta g^{ab} + \mathbf{E}^m \delta\psi + d\Theta^m(g, \psi, \delta\psi), \quad (4.39)$$

where E_{ab}, \mathcal{E}^A are the metric and matter field equations of the original system, T_{ab} is the stress-energy tensor of the minimally coupled external matter fields, and E^m is the equation of motion for ψ . (The boldface symbols of the above equations of motion mean the product of that with the volume form ϵ .) Now, for the combined Lagrangian, the equation of motion for the metric takes the form

$$E_{ab} = T_{ab}, \quad (4.40)$$

exactly as a generalisation of the Einstein equation, $\frac{1}{8\pi G} G_{ab} = T_{ab}$ in the case of general relativity coupled to minimal matter sources.

We repeat the steps in Section 4.1 for the original Lagrangian, keeping in mind that we have switched on external matter sources. Then, if the equations of motion $\mathcal{E}^A = 0$ and $E_{ab} = T_{ab}$ are imposed, the fundamental identity (4.20) is modified as

$$d(\delta_\phi \mathbf{Q}_\xi - \xi \cdot \Theta(\phi, \delta\phi)) = -\delta T^{ab} \xi_b \epsilon_a - \frac{1}{2} \xi \cdot \mathbf{T}_{ab} \delta g^{ab}, \quad (4.41)$$

where we have inserted the constraint form $\mathbf{C}_\xi = -E^{ab} \xi_b \epsilon_a = -T^{ab} \xi_b \epsilon_a$.

Next, we integrate (4.41) on an interval interpolating between two slices $\mathcal{C}(v_1)$ and $\mathcal{C}(v_2)$ on the horizon \mathcal{H}^+ . The left-hand side then becomes the difference in the first-order variation of the dynamical entropy between $\mathcal{C}(v_1)$ and $\mathcal{C}(v_2)$,

$$\left(\int_{\mathcal{C}(v_2)} - \int_{\mathcal{C}(v_1)} \right) (\delta_\phi \mathbf{Q}_\xi - \xi \cdot \Theta(\phi, \delta\phi)) = \frac{\kappa}{2\pi} (\delta S_{\text{dyn}}(v_2) - \delta S_{\text{dyn}}(v_1)) = \frac{\kappa}{2\pi} \Delta \delta S_{\text{dyn}}, \quad (4.42)$$

and integrating the right-hand side of (4.41) yields (note $\xi \cdot \mathbf{T}_{ab}$ vanishes as ξ is tangent to the horizon)

$$-\int_{\mathcal{C}(v_1)}^{\mathcal{C}(v_2)} \delta T^{ab} \xi_b \epsilon_a = \int_{\mathcal{C}(v_1)}^{\mathcal{C}(v_2)} \delta T_{ab} k^a \xi^b \epsilon_{\mathcal{H}^+} = \int_{v_1}^{v_2} dv \int_{\mathcal{C}(v)} dA \delta T_{ab} \xi^a k^b. \quad (4.43)$$

Here the symmetry of T_{ab} is assumed, $\epsilon_{\mathcal{H}^+} = -l \wedge \epsilon_{\mathcal{C}}$ is the volume on the horizon, and we used the following property for the pullback of $T^{ab} \epsilon_a$ to the horizon:

$$\delta T^{ab} \epsilon_a = \delta T^{ab} \delta_a^c \epsilon_c \stackrel{\mathcal{H}^+}{=} -\delta T^{ab} k_a l^c \epsilon_c = -\delta T^{ab} k_a \epsilon_{\mathcal{H}^+}, \quad (4.44)$$

and we identified $l^c \epsilon_c = \epsilon_{\mathcal{H}^+}$.

Thus, we obtain a physical process first law between two arbitrary horizon slices

$$\Delta \delta S_{\text{dyn}} = \frac{2\pi}{\kappa} \int_{v_1}^{v_2} dv \int_{\mathcal{C}(v)} dA \delta T_{ab} \xi^a k^b, \quad (4.45)$$

which relates the difference in entropy between two horizon slices with the infalling null energy density of the external matter field across the horizon.




Figure 6: Physical process version of the first law. An external matter source, described by the stress-energy tensor variation δT_{ab} , crosses the horizon between two generic horizon slices $\mathcal{C}(v_1)$ and $\mathcal{C}(v_2)$.

4.4 The Linearised Second Law

Here, we derive a constant and non-decreasing second law for dynamical black hole entropy at the linearised level from the comparison version and the physical process version of first laws, respectively. This was also observed in [1].

The comparison first law holds for any horizon cross-section, which implies that the dynamical entropy variation at one cross-section $\mathcal{C}(v_1)$ is equal to the dynamical entropy variation at another cross-section

$$\delta S_{\text{dyn}}(v_1) = \delta S_{\text{dyn}}(v_2). \quad (4.46)$$

This suggests that, locally, the dynamical entropy satisfies a constant linearised second law

$$\partial_v \delta S_{\text{dyn}} = 0. \quad (4.47)$$

On the other hand, from the physical process first law we can prove a stronger second law, namely that the entropy is non-decreasing on the horizon, assuming the null energy condition $\delta T_{ab} k^a k^b \geq 0$ holds for the external matter source. This is just the local version of the physical process version of first law, (4.45), between two infinitesimally close slices on the horizon:

$$\partial_v \delta S_{\text{dyn}} = \frac{2\pi}{\kappa} \int_{\mathcal{C}(v)} dA \delta T_{ab} \xi^a k^b \geq 0. \quad (4.48)$$

For a typical field theory the stress-energy tensor is quadratic in the perturbation. In order to have a non-trivial increase in the entropy at first order, we may tune the perturbation parameter for the external matter source such that $\delta T_{ab}k^ak^b$ contributes to the first order perturbation of the entropy. That is, we set $\delta\phi \sim \mathcal{O}(\epsilon)$ but $\delta\psi \sim \mathcal{O}(\epsilon^{1/2})$ for some small bookkeeping parameter ϵ for the perturbation.

Thus, we conclude that the linearised second law for dynamical black hole entropy, that we derived for general relativity from the Raychaudhuri equation in Section 3.1, continues to hold for arbitrary theories of gravity.

4.5 Relation to Wall Entropy

Here, we investigate the relationship between the dynamical entropy, defined as an improved Noether charge, and the Wall entropy.¹⁴ This relationship was established before in [1]. In [10], the Wall entropy is defined in terms of the null-null component of the metric field equation as

$$\partial_v^2 \delta S_{\text{Wall}} = -2\pi \int_{\mathcal{C}(v)} dA \delta E_{ab} k^a k^b. \quad (4.49)$$

To obtain a similar expression for the dynamical entropy involving δE_{ab} , we contract the fundamental identity (4.20) with the null translation vector k and pull it back to a horizon cross-section

$$k \cdot d(\delta_\phi \tilde{\mathbf{Q}}_\xi) \stackrel{\mathcal{C}}{=} k \cdot \delta_\phi \mathbf{C}_\xi - k \cdot (\xi \cdot \mathbf{E}(\phi)) \delta\phi \stackrel{\mathcal{C}}{=} -\delta E^{ab} \xi_b (k \cdot \epsilon_a) \stackrel{\mathcal{C}}{=} \delta E_{ab} k^a \xi^b \epsilon_C, \quad (4.50)$$

where the second equality follows from the fact that $k \cdot (\xi \cdot \mathbf{E}(\phi))$ vanishes because ξ is proportional to k on the horizon, and $c_{ab} k^a \xi^b$ in the constraint form (see equation (4.12)) vanishes to first order in the perturbation for scalars or vectors. In the last equality, we used $\delta E^{ab} \epsilon_a \stackrel{\mathcal{H}^+}{=} -\delta E^{ab} k_a \epsilon_{\mathcal{H}^+}$ (using the same argument as (4.44)), and $k \cdot \epsilon_{\mathcal{H}^+} \stackrel{\mathcal{C}}{=} \epsilon_C$. Rearrange the above equation, we arrive at

$$\mathcal{L}_k(\delta_\phi \tilde{\mathbf{Q}}_\xi) = \delta E_{ab} k^a \xi^b \epsilon_C + d(k \cdot \delta_\phi \tilde{\mathbf{Q}}_\xi), \quad (4.51)$$

where we have used the Cartan-Killing equation (4.7). Further, integrating the above identity on some compact horizon slice $\mathcal{C}(v)$ and interpreting \mathcal{L}_k acting on scalar quantities as ∂_v , we find a similar expression as (4.48) for the dynamical entropy

$$\partial_v \delta S_{\text{dyn}} = \frac{2\pi}{\kappa} \int_{\mathcal{C}(v)} dA \delta E_{ab} \xi^a k^b. \quad (4.52)$$

By substituting the expression for the Killing field on the horizon $\xi^a \stackrel{\mathcal{H}^+}{=} \kappa v k^a$, this reads

$$\partial_v \delta S_{\text{ext}} = 2\pi v \int_{\mathcal{C}(v)} dA \delta E_{ab} k^a k^b = -v \partial_v^2 \delta S_{\text{Wall}}, \quad (4.53)$$

where in the second equality we used the definition of Wall entropy (4.49). As this should be valid at any affine time v , we have

$$\partial_v \delta S_{\text{ext}} = -v \partial_v^2 \delta S_{\text{Wall}} = -\partial_v (v \partial_v \delta S_{\text{Wall}}) + \partial_v \delta S_{\text{Wall}} = \partial_v ((1 - v \partial_v) \delta S_{\text{Wall}}). \quad (4.54)$$

Thus we find that the relation between dynamical entropy and Wall entropy is (after pulling out the δ)

$$S_{\text{dyn}} = (1 - v \partial_v) S_{\text{Wall}}, \quad (4.55)$$

¹⁴We only consider the case where the metric, scalar fields and vector fields are the dynamical fields. When matter fields with spin $s \geq 2$ are present, the Wall entropy may not be well defined unless certain ‘integrability conditions’ are satisfied by the matter fields. Once these conditions are imposed, there is a similar relation between the Wall entropy and S_{dyn} . This will be investigated in [70].

where the integration constant is zero because at the bifurcation surface \mathcal{B} we have the following matching condition:

$$S_{\text{dyn}} \stackrel{\mathcal{B}}{=} S_{\text{Wall}} \stackrel{\mathcal{B}}{=} S_{\text{Wald}} \quad (4.56)$$

from the properties of S_{dyn} and S_{Wall} . We check this relation (4.55) in Section 5.3 for any $f(\text{Riemann})$ theory by evaluating the improved Noether charge using GNC near the horizon.

Finally, by inserting the relation (4.55) for the dynamical entropy into the first law (4.32), we obtain the non-stationary comparison first law for general theories of gravity

$$\delta M - \Omega_{\mathcal{H}} \delta J = T \delta \left(S_{\text{Wall}} - v \frac{d}{dv} S_{\text{Wall}} \right). \quad (4.57)$$

4.6 Invariance under JKM Ambiguities to First Order

Here, we give a brief review of the Jacobson-Kang-Myers (JKM) ambiguities [33] (see also [11]) of covariant phase space quantities, and we prove that the dynamical black hole entropy defined above is invariant under these ambiguities for first-order perturbations of a stationarity background (see also [1]). We also mention that the Wall entropy has recently been proven to be unambiguous to first order in the perturbation [14].

In the differential form language, ambiguities arise for quantities that are defined up to exact terms. In the covariant phase space formalism, there are three different types of ambiguities present at different levels: for the Lagrangian form \mathbf{L} , the symplectic potential Θ and the Noether charge \mathbf{Q} . The JKM ambiguities are

$$\mathbf{L}(\phi) \rightarrow \mathbf{L}(\phi) + d\boldsymbol{\mu}(\phi), \quad (4.58)$$

$$\Theta(\phi, \delta\phi) \rightarrow \Theta(\phi, \delta\phi) + d\mathbf{Y}(\phi, \delta\phi), \quad (4.59)$$

$$\mathbf{Q}_{\chi} \rightarrow \mathbf{Q}_{\chi} + d\mathbf{Z}(\phi, \chi). \quad (4.60)$$

Here, $\mathbf{Y}(\phi, \delta\phi)$ is required to be linear in $\delta\phi$ and $\mathbf{Z}(\phi, \chi)$ must be linear in the vector field χ^a , in order to match Θ and \mathbf{Q}_{χ} , respectively.

Under the above ambiguities, the quantities of our interest transform as

$$\Theta(\phi, \delta\phi) \rightarrow \Theta(\phi, \delta\phi) + \delta\boldsymbol{\mu}(\phi) + d\mathbf{Y}(\phi, \delta\phi) \quad (4.61)$$

$$\mathbf{Q}_{\xi} \rightarrow \mathbf{Q}_{\xi} + \xi \cdot \boldsymbol{\mu}(\phi) + \mathbf{Y}(\phi, \mathcal{L}_{\xi}\phi) + d\mathbf{Z}(\phi, \xi). \quad (4.62)$$

and the variation of \mathbf{Q}_{ξ} transform as

$$\delta\mathbf{Q}_{\xi} \rightarrow \delta\mathbf{Q}_{\xi} + \delta\xi \cdot \boldsymbol{\mu}(\phi) + \xi \cdot \delta\boldsymbol{\mu}(\phi) + \mathbf{Y}(\phi, \mathcal{L}_{\delta\xi}\phi) + \mathbf{Y}(\phi, \mathcal{L}_{\xi}\delta\phi) + d(\delta\mathbf{Z}(\phi, \xi)), \quad (4.63)$$

where we have applied the product rule for δ to the variation of $\xi \cdot \boldsymbol{\mu}$ and \mathbf{Y} . Notice that in calculating $\delta\mathbf{Y}$, the only non-vanishing terms are those where δ is applied to the Lie derivative $\mathcal{L}_{\xi}\phi$, because $\mathcal{L}_{\xi}\phi = 0$ in the Killing background.

We are interested in the ambiguities in the field variation of the improved Noether charge, after which the dynamical entropy is defined,

$$\delta_{\phi} \tilde{\mathbf{Q}}_{\xi} = \delta_{\phi} \mathbf{Q}_{\xi} - \xi \cdot \Theta(\phi, \delta\phi). \quad (4.64)$$

Under the JKM ambiguities this transforms as

$$\begin{aligned} \delta_{\phi} \tilde{\mathbf{Q}}_{\xi} &\rightarrow \delta_{\phi} \tilde{\mathbf{Q}}_{\xi} + \mathbf{Y}(\phi, \mathcal{L}_{\xi}\delta\phi) - \xi \cdot d\mathbf{Y}(\phi, \delta\phi) + d(\delta\mathbf{Z}(\phi, \xi) - \mathbf{Z}(\phi, \delta\xi)) \\ &= \delta_{\phi} \tilde{\mathbf{Q}}_{\xi} + d(\xi \cdot \mathbf{Y}(\phi, \delta\phi) + \delta_{\phi} \mathbf{Z}(\phi, \xi)), \end{aligned} \quad (4.65)$$

where we have identified

$$\mathbf{Y}(\phi, \mathcal{L}_{\xi}\delta\phi) = \mathcal{L}_{\xi} \mathbf{Y}(\phi, \delta\phi) = d(\xi \cdot \mathbf{Y}(\phi, \delta\phi)) + \xi \cdot d\mathbf{Y}(\phi, \delta\phi), \quad (4.66)$$

using the background stationarity condition $\mathcal{L}_\xi\phi = 0$, and we notice

$$\delta_\phi\mathbf{Z}(\phi, \xi) = \delta\mathbf{Z}(\phi, \xi) - \mathbf{Z}(\phi, \delta\xi). \quad (4.67)$$

Thus, the ambiguities that arise in $\delta_\phi\tilde{\mathbf{Q}}_\xi$ are exact differentials, which vanish when integrated over a compact horizon cross-section, due to Stokes' theorem. Hence, because of the definition in (4.31), $\delta S_{\text{dyn}} = (2\pi/\kappa)\int_{\mathcal{C}}\delta_\phi\tilde{\mathbf{Q}}_\xi$, this implies the first-order variation of the dynamical black hole entropy is JKM-invariant. In other words, the dynamical entropy itself is unambiguous to leading order for perturbations off stationary backgrounds. It is straightforward to apply this discussion to the case where the gravitational and matter sectors are treated separately, as in Section 4.3, because we can treat the gravitational part of the Lagrangian independently.

4.7 Exactness of the Symplectic Potential on the Horizon

Here, we systematically analyse the structure of $\Theta(\phi, \delta\phi)$ using the powerful GNC near the future horizon and the associated boost weight argument, and we show that the symplectic potential in any diffeomorphism invariant theory would satisfy the consistency condition a) in Section 4.2 on a linearly perturbed Killing horizon. This is done by proving that, with a stationary background, $\Theta(\phi, \delta\phi)$ is exact in δ when pulled back to the horizon, i.e., there exists some $\mathbf{B}_{\mathcal{H}^+}(\phi)$ on the horizon such that

$$\Theta(\phi, \delta\phi) \stackrel{\mathcal{H}^+}{=} \delta\mathbf{B}_{\mathcal{H}^+}(\phi). \quad (4.68)$$

We also demonstrate that the $\mathbf{B}_{\mathcal{H}^+}$ satisfying this relation vanishes on the background Killing horizon. This relation (4.68) was also established in [1] using Killing field arguments, instead of boost weight arguments, for diffeomorphism covariant Lagrangians that depend only on the metric field. Below we provide an independent, more general proof for arbitrary diffeomorphism covariant Lagrangians that depend on the metric and any (non-minimally coupled) bosonic matter field.

According to Iyer and Wald [11], the most general form of the symplectic potential $\Theta(\phi, \delta\phi)$ is (up to certain JKM ambiguities)

$$\begin{aligned} \Theta(\phi, \delta\phi) = \epsilon_a \left(2X^{abcd}\nabla_d\delta g_{bc} + S^{abc}\delta g_{bc} \right. \\ \left. + \sum_{k=0}^{n-1} T_{(k)}^{abcdef_1\dots f_k}\delta\nabla_{(f_1\dots f_k)}R_{bcde} + \sum_{k=0}^{m-1} U_{(k)}^{aAb_1\dots b_k}\delta\nabla_{(b_1\dots b_k)}\varphi_A \right) \end{aligned} \quad (4.69)$$

for a general diffeomorphism covariant theory with Lagrangian form

$$\mathbf{L} = L(g^{ab}, R_{abcd}, \nabla_{e_1}R_{abcd}, \dots, \nabla_{(e_1\dots e_n)}R_{abcd}, \varphi_A, \nabla_{b_1}\varphi_A, \dots, \nabla_{(b_1\dots b_m)}\varphi_A)\epsilon. \quad (4.70)$$

Here,

$$X^{abcd} = \frac{\delta L}{\delta R_{abcd}} = \frac{\partial L}{\partial R_{abcd}} - \nabla_{e_1}\frac{\partial L}{\partial(\nabla_{e_1}R_{abcd})} + \dots + (-1)^n\nabla_{e_1\dots e_n}\frac{\partial L}{\partial(\nabla_{(e_1\dots e_n)}R_{abcd})} \quad (4.71)$$

which is the functional derivative of the Lagrangian L with respect to the Riemann tensor R_{abcd} , and S, T, U are some field-dependent tensors that can be derived from the Lagrangian using the methods elaborated in [11]. For our discussion, we do not need the details of these tensors but only their general index structure.

Consider the pullback of $\Theta(\phi, \delta\phi)$ to the horizon \mathcal{H}^+ . Expressing in GNC, we get

$$\Theta(\phi, \delta\phi) \stackrel{\mathcal{H}^+}{=} -l \wedge \epsilon_{\mathcal{C}} \left(2X^{abcd} \nabla_d \delta g_{bc} + S^{abc} \delta g_{bc} + \sum_{k=0}^{n-1} T_{(k)}^{abcde f_1 \dots f_k} \delta \nabla_{(f_1 \dots f_k)} R_{bcde} + \sum_{k=0}^{m-1} U_{(k)}^{uAb_1 \dots b_k} \delta \nabla_{(b_1 \dots b_k)} \varphi_A \right) \quad (4.72)$$

where we have kept the only non-vanishing $(D-1)$ -form ϵ_u when pulling back to the horizon, and identified

$$\epsilon_u = -l \wedge \epsilon_{\mathcal{C}}. \quad (4.73)$$

We analyse the structure term by term. First look at the T terms. Depending on the boost weight w of the combinations of indices $bcdef_1 \dots f_k$, we can write it as a sum of different weight combinations:

$$\begin{aligned} -l \wedge \epsilon_{\mathcal{C}} \sum_w T_{(1-w)} \delta(\nabla \dots R)_{(w)} &\stackrel{\mathcal{H}^+}{=} -l \wedge \epsilon_{\mathcal{C}} \sum_{w \geq 1} T_{(1-w)} \delta(\nabla \dots R)_{(w)} \\ &\stackrel{\mathcal{H}^+}{=} \delta \left(-l \wedge \epsilon_{\mathcal{C}} \sum_{w \geq 1} T_{(1-w)} (\nabla \dots R)_{(w)} \right). \end{aligned} \quad (4.74)$$

Here, we have neglected the detailed indices combination as we only care about the boost weight w they carry. The first equality holds as $T_{(1-w)}$'s with $w \leq 0$ are proportional to positive weight background quantities, which vanish. In the second equality we have ‘‘pulled the δ to the front’’ for the non-vanishing terms because, for a non-positive weight component $A_{(w \leq 0)}$ and any positive weight component $B_{(w > 0)}$, we always have

$$A_{(w \leq 0)} \delta B_{(w > 0)} = \delta (A_{(w \leq 0)} B_{(w > 0)}) - B_{(w > 0)} \delta A_{(w \leq 0)} \stackrel{\mathcal{H}^+}{=} \delta (A_{(w \leq 0)} B_{(w > 0)}) \quad (4.75)$$

as background positive-weight tensor components vanish on the horizon.

The same argument also works for the last term involving U :

$$-l \wedge \epsilon_{\mathcal{C}} \sum_{k=0}^{m-1} U_{(k)}^{uAb_1 \dots b_k} \delta \nabla_{(b_1 \dots b_k)} \varphi_A \stackrel{\mathcal{H}^+}{=} \delta \left(-l \wedge \epsilon_{\mathcal{C}} \sum_{w \geq 1} U_{(1-w)} (\nabla \dots \varphi)_{(w)} \right). \quad (4.76)$$

Now we just need to show the first two terms in $\Theta(\phi, \delta\phi)$ are exact. The easier one is the S -term:

$$S^{uab} \delta g_{ab} \stackrel{\mathcal{H}^+}{=} S^{uij} \delta \gamma_{ij} \stackrel{\mathcal{H}^+}{=} 0 \quad (4.77)$$

by our gauge conditions and boost weight analysis.

To deal with the first term involving X we first compute

$$\nabla_u \delta g_{vi} \stackrel{\mathcal{H}^+}{=} -\delta \omega_i, \quad \nabla_u \delta g_{ij} \stackrel{\mathcal{H}^+}{=} 2\delta \bar{K}_{ij}, \quad \nabla_v \delta g_{ij} \stackrel{\mathcal{H}^+}{=} 2\delta K_{ij}, \quad (4.78)$$

where $\bar{K}_{ij} = \frac{1}{2} \partial_u \gamma_{ij}$ and $K_{ij} = \frac{1}{2} \partial_v \gamma_{ij}$ are the extrinsic curvatures in the u - and v -directions, respectively, and we identify the vanishing components of X by a boost weight argument

$$X^{uviu} \stackrel{\mathcal{H}^+}{=} X^{uiju} \stackrel{\mathcal{H}^+}{=} X^{uijk} \stackrel{\mathcal{H}^+}{=} 0. \quad (4.79)$$

Then, expanding the possible combinations of indices b, c, d and keeping in mind the symmetries of the Riemann tensor, we obtain

$$-2l \wedge \epsilon_{\mathcal{C}} X^{abcd} \nabla_d \delta g_{bc} \stackrel{\mathcal{H}^+}{=} \delta (-4l \wedge \epsilon_{\mathcal{C}} X^{uijv} K_{ij}). \quad (4.80)$$

The final result is

$$\Theta(\phi, \delta\phi) \stackrel{\mathcal{H}^+}{=} \delta \left[-l \wedge \epsilon_C \left(4X^{ujv} K_{ij} + \sum_{w \geq 1} \left(T_{(1-w)}(\nabla \dots R)_{(w)} + U_{(1-w)}(\nabla \dots \varphi)_{(w)} \right) \right) \right] \quad (4.81)$$

Thus, we find

$$\mathbf{B}_{\mathcal{H}^+}(\phi) = -l \wedge \epsilon_C \left(4X^{ujv} K_{ij} + \sum_{w \geq 1} \left(T_{(1-w)}(\nabla \dots R)_{(w)} + U_{(1-w)}(\nabla \dots \varphi)_{(w)} \right) \right). \quad (4.82)$$

This closes the proof of exactness of $\Theta(\phi, \delta\phi)$ in δ on the horizon, which was used in Section 4.2 to define the dynamical black hole entropy. The boost weight of $\mathbf{B}_{\mathcal{H}^+}$ is +1, because X^{ujv} has weight 0 and K_{ij} has weight +1, hence it follows that $\mathbf{B}_{\mathcal{H}^+}$ vanishes on the background Killing horizon.

4.8 Structural Analysis of the (Improved) Noether Charge

In proving the exactness of $\Theta(\phi, \delta\phi)$, we have analysed its structure using GNC. A similar procedure can be carried out for the Noether charge \mathbf{Q}_ξ in any diffeomorphism covariant theory. We will do this in order to

- 1) Prove the consistency condition b) for the Noether charge, which is required for the dynamical entropy to well defined (see Section 4.2);
- 2) Analyse the general structure of the dynamical entropy, and highlight how it is different from the Wald entropy.

Structure of Noether Charge We first perform a structural analysis of the Noether charge in GNC. Iyer and Wald [11] showed that the most general form of the Noether charge is given by

$$\mathbf{Q}_\xi = \epsilon_{ab} \left(-X^{abcd} \nabla_{[c} \xi_{d]} + W^{abc} \xi_c \right) + \mathbf{Y}(g, \varphi, \mathcal{L}_\xi g, \mathcal{L}_\xi \varphi) + d\mathbf{Z} \quad (4.83)$$

where W^{abc} is given by the theory, \mathbf{Y} and \mathbf{Z} are two different types of JKM ambiguity [33] that arise for the Noether charge. As shown in Section 4.6, the dynamical black hole entropy is invariant under JKM ambiguities up to an exact term (which integrates to zero on compact slices), therefore, in the following discussion, we will set $\mathbf{Y} = 0$ and $d\mathbf{Z} = 0$ without loss of generality. These ambiguities will essentially cancel with the ambiguities appearing in $\xi \cdot \mathbf{B}_{\mathcal{H}^+}$ in the improved Noether charge.

When pulling back the Noether charge to a horizon slice, we obtain in GNC,

$$\mathbf{Q}_\xi \stackrel{\mathcal{C}(v)}{=} -2\epsilon_C \left(X^{uvcd} \nabla_{[c} \xi_{d]} + W^{uv} \xi_c \right). \quad (4.84)$$

Using equation (4.79), equation (2.30), and calculating $\nabla_{[u} \xi_{i]} \stackrel{\mathcal{H}^+}{=} \frac{1}{2} \omega_i \xi_u$ in GNC, we have

$$\mathbf{Q}_\xi \stackrel{\mathcal{C}(v)}{=} -2\epsilon_C \left(2\kappa_3 X^{uvuv} - \xi_u \tilde{W}^{uvu} \right). \quad (4.85)$$

where we defined $\tilde{W}^{uvu} = W^{uvu} - X^{uvui} \omega_i$. This expression of \mathbf{Q}_ξ contains both the background and the first-order contribution, so we are not immediately setting κ_3 and ξ_u to their background values κ and $-\kappa v$.

Consistency Condition for Noether Charge Using the structure of the Noether charge in GNC on the horizon, we now prove the consistency condition b) in Section 4.2. In GNC, we obtain from (4.85) the Noether charge associated to the varied Killing vector field $\delta\xi^a$:

$$\mathbf{Q}_{\delta\xi} \stackrel{\mathcal{C}(v)}{=} -4(\delta\kappa_3)X^{uvv}\epsilon_{\mathcal{C}} + 2(\delta\xi_u)\tilde{W}^{uvu}\epsilon_{\mathcal{C}} = -4(\delta\kappa_3)X^{uvv}\epsilon_{\mathcal{C}} = \frac{\delta\kappa_3}{\kappa}\mathbf{Q}_{\xi} \quad (4.86)$$

where we notice that the weight-1 quantity $\tilde{W}^{uvu} \stackrel{\mathcal{H}^+}{=} 0$ on the background, and in deriving the last equality, we have evaluated equation (4.85) at zeroth order. Then, we prove the consistency condition as required

$$\kappa\delta(\mathbf{Q}_{\xi}/\kappa_3) = \delta\mathbf{Q}_{\xi} - \frac{\delta\kappa_3}{\kappa}\mathbf{Q}_{\xi} = \delta\mathbf{Q}_{\xi} - \mathbf{Q}_{\delta\xi} = \delta_{\phi}\mathbf{Q}_{\xi}, \quad (4.87)$$

where we used $\kappa_3 = \kappa$ for the Killing horizon background.

We also make explicit a corollary of (4.86), when combined with consistency condition a), given in (4.33). That is, the field-only variation δ_{ϕ} is, in fact, equivalent to the full variation δ when it acts on S_{dyn} . We start the proof by acting with the full variation δ on the dynamical black hole entropy

$$S_{\text{dyn}} = \frac{2\pi}{\kappa_3} \int_{\mathcal{C}} (\mathbf{Q}_{\xi} - \xi \cdot \mathbf{B}_{\mathcal{H}^+}(\phi)), \quad (4.88)$$

which yields

$$\begin{aligned} \delta S_{\text{dyn}} &= 2\pi \int_{\mathcal{C}} (\delta(\mathbf{Q}_{\xi}/\kappa_3) - \xi \cdot \delta\mathbf{B}_{\mathcal{H}^+}/\kappa) \\ &= 2\pi \int_{\mathcal{C}} (\delta_{\phi}(\mathbf{Q}_{\xi}/\kappa) - \xi \cdot \delta_{\phi}\mathbf{B}_{\mathcal{H}^+}/\kappa) \\ &= \delta_{\phi} \left(\frac{2\pi}{\kappa} \int_{\mathcal{C}} (\mathbf{Q}_{\xi} - \xi \cdot \mathbf{B}_{\mathcal{H}^+}(\phi)) \right) = \delta_{\phi} S_{\text{dyn}}, \end{aligned} \quad (4.89)$$

where we have used the fact that $\mathbf{B}_{\mathcal{H}^+}(\phi) \stackrel{\mathcal{H}^+}{=} 0$ in the stationary background, $\mathbf{B}_{\mathcal{H}^+}(\phi)$ is independent of ξ so $\delta\mathbf{B}_{\mathcal{H}^+} = \delta_{\phi}\mathbf{B}_{\mathcal{H}^+}$, and $\kappa_3 = \kappa$ on the unperturbed Killing horizon. Also, note that δ_{ϕ} does not act on the surface gravities, since their variation depends on $\delta\xi^a$ only.

Structure of Improved Noether Charge To find the general structure for the improved Noether charge (hence the dynamical entropy), we calculate

$$\delta_{\phi}\mathbf{Q}_{\xi} \stackrel{\mathcal{C}(v)}{=} \delta_{\phi} \left(-4\kappa_3 X^{uvv}\epsilon_{\mathcal{C}} - 2\kappa_2 v \tilde{W}^{uvu}\epsilon_{\mathcal{C}} \right), \quad (4.90)$$

where we have inserted the background value $\xi_u = -\kappa_2 v$, as δ_{ϕ} does not vary ξ^a on the horizon. Moreover, under δ_{ϕ} we may identify $\kappa_2 = \kappa_3 = \kappa$, because they remain background values.

Combining (4.90) with the structural formula for $\xi \cdot \Theta(\phi, \delta\phi)$, which follows from the contraction $\xi \cdot \mathbf{B}_{\mathcal{H}^+}(\phi)$, we find the improved Noether charge at first order in perturbation theory takes the form

$$\begin{aligned} \delta_{\phi}\tilde{\mathbf{Q}}_{\xi} \stackrel{\mathcal{C}(v)}{=} & -4\kappa\delta(X^{uvv}\epsilon_{\mathcal{C}}) \\ & - \kappa v \delta \left[\epsilon_{\mathcal{C}} \left(2\tilde{W}^{uvu} + 4X^{uijv}K_{ij} + \sum_{w \geq 1} \left(T_{(1-w)}(\nabla \dots R)_{(w)} + U_{(1-w)}(\nabla \dots \varphi)_{(w)} \right) \right) \right]. \end{aligned} \quad (4.91)$$

Hence, the general structure of dynamical black hole entropy is

$$S_{\text{dyn}} = S_{\text{Wald}} + vS_+, \quad (4.92)$$

where

$$S_{\text{Wald}} = -8\pi \int_{\mathcal{C}(v)} X^{uvuv} \epsilon_{\mathcal{C}} \quad (4.93)$$

is the Wald entropy, and

$$S_+ = -2\pi \int_{\mathcal{C}(v)} \epsilon_{\mathcal{C}} \left(2\tilde{W}^{uvu} + 4X^{uijv} K_{ij} + \sum_{w \geq 1} \left(T_{(1-w)}(\nabla \dots R)_{(w)} + U_{(1-w)}(\nabla \dots \varphi)_{(w)} \right) \right) \quad (4.94)$$

is a collection of tensor components that have total boost weight +1. This implies directly that 1) when S_{dyn} is evaluated on a Killing horizon, S_+ vanishes, and the dynamical entropy reduces to the Wald entropy; 2) when S_+ is evaluated at the bifurcate surface, $v = 0$, the dynamical entropy also becomes the Wald entropy.

5 Examples of Dynamical Black Hole Entropy

In this section we calculate the dynamical black hole entropy explicitly, using the improved Noether charge formula (4.37), for three examples: general relativity, $f(R)$ gravity, and $f(\text{Riemann})$ theory, respectively. For general relativity and $f(R)$ gravity, a purely covariant computation is carried out, whereas in the case of $f(\text{Riemann})$ theories we employ Gaussian null coordinates and the associated boost weight analysis to simplify the calculation.

5.1 General Relativity

The Lagrangian form for general relativity with a cosmological constant Λ is

$$\mathbf{L} = \frac{1}{16\pi G} (R - 2\Lambda) \epsilon, \quad (5.1)$$

For this Lagrangian the symplectic potential is [11]

$$\Theta(\phi, \delta\phi) = \frac{1}{16\pi G} \epsilon_a g^{ab} g^{cd} (\nabla_c \delta g_{bd} - \nabla_b \delta g_{cd}) \quad (5.2)$$

and the Noether charge is given by

$$\mathbf{Q}_\xi = -\frac{1}{16\pi G} \epsilon_{ab} \nabla^a \xi^b. \quad (5.3)$$

We now decompose the symplectic potential and Noether charge on the horizon using the double null decomposition described in Section 2.1.

Symplectic Potential The contraction of ξ with $\Theta(\phi, \delta\phi)$ evaluated at an arbitrary cross-section \mathcal{C} of the horizon \mathcal{H}^+ is

$$\xi \cdot \Theta(\phi, \delta\phi) \stackrel{\mathcal{C}(v)}{=} -\frac{\kappa v}{16\pi G} \epsilon_{\mathcal{C}} k^b g^{cd} (\nabla_c \delta g_{bd} - \nabla_b \delta g_{cd}) \quad (5.4)$$

where we used that, on the horizon,

$$\epsilon \stackrel{\mathcal{H}^+}{=} k \wedge l \wedge \epsilon_{\mathcal{C}} \quad (5.5)$$

with $\epsilon_{\mathcal{C}}$ the codimension-2 area form. We calculate

$$k^b g^{cd} (\nabla_c \delta g_{bd} - \nabla_b \delta g_{cd}) = k^b \delta \Gamma_{cb}^c - \frac{1}{2} k^b g^{cd} \nabla_b \delta g_{cd} = k^b (\gamma_a^c - k^c l_a - l^c k_a) \delta \Gamma_{bc}^a - \delta K = -2\delta\theta_v \quad (5.6)$$

by using

$$k^b k^c l_a \delta \Gamma_{bc}^a = \delta \left(l_a k^b \nabla_b k^a \right) \stackrel{\mathcal{H}^+}{=} 0, \quad k^b l^c k_a \delta \Gamma_{bc}^a = -\delta \left(l^a k^b \nabla_b k_a \right) \stackrel{\mathcal{H}^+}{=} 0 \quad (5.7)$$

and

$$k^b \gamma_a^c \delta \Gamma_{bc}^a = -\frac{1}{2} k^b \gamma^{ac} \nabla_b \delta \gamma_{ac} \stackrel{\mathcal{H}^+}{=} -\delta \theta_\nu \quad (5.8)$$

where θ_ν is the expansion along the ν -direction, i.e., the trace of the ν -extrinsic curvature K_{ij} . Hence, we have

$$\xi \cdot \Theta(\phi, \delta\phi) \stackrel{\mathcal{C}(\nu)}{=} \frac{1}{8\pi G} \epsilon_{\mathcal{C}} \kappa \nu \delta \theta_\nu. \quad (5.9)$$

We may now pull the δ to the front, as $\theta_\nu = 0$ for the stationary background, so we obtain

$$\xi \cdot \Theta(\phi, \delta\phi) \stackrel{\mathcal{C}(\nu)}{=} \delta \left(\frac{1}{8\pi G} \epsilon_{\mathcal{C}} \kappa \nu \theta_\nu \right), \quad (5.10)$$

which verifies our proof that $\Theta(\phi, \delta\phi)$ is exact in δ on the horizon.

Noether Charge We expand

$$\mathbf{Q}_\xi = -\frac{1}{16\pi G} \epsilon_{ab} \nabla^a \xi^b \stackrel{\mathcal{C}(\nu)}{=} -\frac{1}{16\pi G} \epsilon_{\mathcal{C}} (k_a l_b - l_a k_b) \nabla^a \xi^b \stackrel{\mathcal{C}(\nu)}{=} \frac{\kappa_3}{8\pi G} \epsilon_{\mathcal{C}} \quad (5.11)$$

by using equation (2.30) for the surface gravity κ_3 .

Now, the full variation on the horizon gives

$$\delta \mathbf{Q}_\xi \stackrel{\mathcal{C}(\nu)}{=} \frac{\kappa}{8\pi G} \delta \epsilon_{\mathcal{C}} + \frac{1}{8\pi G} \epsilon_{\mathcal{C}} \delta \kappa_3, \quad (5.12)$$

where we have identified $\kappa_3 = \kappa$ on the background Killing horizon.

The $\delta\xi$ Noether charge, which we need to subtract from $\delta \mathbf{Q}_\xi$, reads

$$\mathbf{Q}_{\delta\xi} \stackrel{\mathcal{C}(\nu)}{=} -\frac{1}{16\pi G} \epsilon_{\mathcal{C}} (k_a l_b - l_a k_b) \nabla^a (\delta \xi^b) \stackrel{\mathcal{C}(\nu)}{=} \frac{1}{8\pi G} \epsilon_{\mathcal{C}} \delta \kappa_3, \quad (5.13)$$

where we used (2.31). So, we find

$$\delta_\phi \mathbf{Q}_\xi = \delta \mathbf{Q}_\xi - \mathbf{Q}_{\delta\xi} \stackrel{\mathcal{C}(\nu)}{=} \frac{\kappa}{8\pi G} \delta \epsilon_{\mathcal{C}}. \quad (5.14)$$

Dynamical Black Hole Entropy Finally, we obtain the entropy formula by evaluating (4.31) at an arbitrary slice $\mathcal{C}(\nu)$ of the horizon \mathcal{H}^+

$$\delta S_{\text{dyn}} = \frac{2\pi}{\kappa} \int_{\mathcal{C}(\nu)} (\delta_\phi \mathbf{Q}_\xi - \xi \cdot \Theta(\phi, \delta\phi)) = \frac{1}{4G} (1 - \nu \partial_\nu) \delta A = \delta \left(\frac{1}{4G} (1 - \nu \partial_\nu) A \right) \quad (5.15)$$

where

$$A = \int_{\mathcal{C}(\nu)} \epsilon_{\mathcal{C}} \quad (5.16)$$

is the area of $\mathcal{C}(\nu)$, and we have also identified

$$\partial_\nu \delta \epsilon_{\mathcal{C}} = \delta(\theta_\nu \epsilon_{\mathcal{C}}) = \epsilon_{\mathcal{C}} \delta \theta_\nu. \quad (5.17)$$

Here, the δ is pulled through as $\theta_\nu = 0$ on the background Killing horizon.

Therefore, to first order in the perturbation, we obtain the entropy formula for dynamical black holes in general relativity

$$S_{\text{dyn}} = \frac{1}{4G} (1 - \nu \partial_\nu) A, \quad (5.18)$$

which coincides with the formula derived from the Raychaudhuri equation, and it agrees with the result for the dynamical black hole entropy in [1].

5.2 $f(R)$ Gravity

The Lagrangian form for $f(R)$ gravity is

$$\mathbf{L} = f(R)\epsilon, \quad (5.19)$$

where $f(R) = a_0 + a_1 R + a_2 R^2 + \dots$ is a polynomial in R , with coupling constants a_0, a_1, a_2, \dots .

The symplectic potential for this Lagrangian is

$$\Theta(\phi, \delta\phi) = \epsilon_d \left(f'(R)(g^{bd}g^{ac} - g^{cd}g^{ab})\nabla_c \delta g_{ab} - \nabla_c(f'(R))(g^{bd}g^{ac} - g^{cd}g^{ab})\delta g_{ab} \right) \quad (5.20)$$

where $f'(R) = df/dR$, and the Noether charge is

$$\mathbf{Q}_\xi = -\epsilon_{ab} \left(f'(R)\nabla^a \xi^b + 2\xi^a \nabla^b(f'(R)) \right). \quad (5.21)$$

We carry out a similar procedure as in general relativity, by decomposing the volume form ϵ into ϵ_C, k and l .

Symplectic Potential The contraction of ξ with $\Theta(\phi, \delta\phi)$ on the horizon slice is

$$\begin{aligned} \xi \cdot \Theta(\phi, \delta\phi) &\stackrel{\mathcal{C}^{(v)}}{=} -\kappa\nu\epsilon_C \left(f'(R)k^a g^{bc} (\nabla_b \delta g_{ac} - \nabla_a \delta g_{bc}) - \nabla_c(f'(R))(k^b g^{ac} - k^c g^{ab})\delta g_{ab} \right) \\ &\stackrel{\mathcal{C}^{(v)}}{=} 2\kappa\nu\epsilon_C f'(R)\delta\theta_\nu \\ &\stackrel{\mathcal{C}^{(v)}}{=} 2\kappa\nu\partial_\nu (f'(R)\delta\epsilon_C) \end{aligned} \quad (5.22)$$

where we used (5.6), the gauge condition $k^a \delta g_{ab} \stackrel{\mathcal{H}^+}{=} 0$, and

$$k^c \nabla_c(f'(R)) = \partial_\nu(f'(R)) \stackrel{\mathcal{H}^+}{=} 0 \quad (5.23)$$

for a stationary background, and $\partial_\nu \delta\epsilon_C = \delta(\theta_\nu \epsilon_C) = \epsilon_C \delta\theta_\nu$ as above.

The above expression seems not to be exact in δ . However, it is exact, because, as in GR, we may pull through the δ from the expression after the second equality:

$$\xi \cdot \Theta(\phi, \delta\phi) \stackrel{\mathcal{C}^{(v)}}{=} \delta (2\kappa\nu\epsilon_C f'(R)\theta_\nu). \quad (5.24)$$

In the following calculation we will still use the expression after the third equality of (5.22), which is not manifestly exact, as it is more convenient.

Noether Charge The Noether charge reads (without imposing the stationary condition of the background geometry)

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbf{Q}_\xi &\stackrel{\mathcal{C}^{(v)}}{=} -\epsilon_C(k_a l_b - l_a k_b) \left(f'(R)\nabla^a \xi^b + 2\xi^a \nabla^b(f'(R)) \right) \\ &\stackrel{\mathcal{C}^{(v)}}{=} 2\kappa_3 f'(R)\epsilon_C - 2l_a \xi^a \epsilon_C \partial_\nu(f'(R)), \end{aligned} \quad (5.25)$$

where we have borrowed the results in general relativity. Hence, the variation reads

$$\delta\mathbf{Q}_\xi \stackrel{\mathcal{C}^{(v)}}{=} 2\delta\kappa_3 f'(R)\epsilon_C + 2\kappa\delta (f'(R)\epsilon_C) - 2(l_a \delta\xi^a)\epsilon_C \partial_\nu(f'(R)) - 2\kappa\nu\delta (\epsilon_C \partial_\nu(f'(R))) \quad (5.26)$$

and the Noether charge for $\delta\xi$ reads

$$\mathbf{Q}_{\delta\xi} \stackrel{\mathcal{C}^{(v)}}{=} 2\delta\kappa_3 f'(R)\epsilon_C - 2(l_a \delta\xi^a)\epsilon_C \partial_\nu(f'(R)). \quad (5.27)$$

Then the field variation of the Noether charge is

$$\delta_\phi \mathbf{Q}_\xi \stackrel{\mathcal{C}^{(v)}}{=} 2\kappa\delta(f'(R)\epsilon_C) - 2\kappa\nu\partial_\nu (\epsilon_C \delta(f'(R))), \quad (5.28)$$

where we have used $\delta(\epsilon_C \partial_\nu(f'(R))) = \epsilon_C \partial_\nu(\delta(f'(R))) = \partial_\nu(\epsilon_C \delta(f'(R)))$.

Dynamical Black Hole Entropy Combining the previous results, we obtain

$$\delta S_{\text{dyn}} = \frac{2\pi}{\kappa} \int_{\mathcal{C}^{(v)}} (\delta_\phi \mathbf{Q}_\xi - \xi \cdot \Theta(\phi, \delta\phi)) = 4\pi \delta \left((1 - v\partial_v) \int_{\mathcal{C}^{(v)}} f'(R) \epsilon_{\mathcal{C}} \right), \quad (5.29)$$

hence

$$S_{\text{dyn}} = (1 - v\partial_v) 4\pi \int_{\mathcal{C}^{(v)}} f'(R) \epsilon_{\mathcal{C}} = (1 - v\partial_v) S_{\text{JKM}}. \quad (5.30)$$

At the bifurcation surface this coincides with the JKM entropy [71], who showed that S_{JKM} satisfies a second law for $f(R)$ gravity, similar to the area theorem for general relativity. On a Killing horizon, where S_{JKM} is constant, the dynamical black hole entropy (5.30) coincides with the Wald entropy and JKM entropy.

5.3 $f(\text{Riemann})$ Theories

Next, we want to calculate $\delta_\phi \mathbf{Q}_\xi - \xi \cdot \Theta(\phi, \delta\phi)$ for $f(\text{Riemann})$ theories. Here, the Lagrangian is a functional of the form $L = f(g^{ab}, R_{abcd})$, containing contractions of the inverse metric and the Riemann tensor. The symplectic potential and the Noether charge are [72, 73]

$$\Theta(\phi, \delta\phi) = 2\epsilon_d \left(X^{dabc} \nabla_c \delta g_{ab} - \left(\nabla_c X^{dabc} \right) \delta g_{ab} \right) \quad (5.31)$$

and

$$\mathbf{Q}_\xi = -\epsilon_{cd} \left(X^{cdab} \nabla_a \xi_b + 2\xi_a \nabla_b X^{cdab} \right). \quad (5.32)$$

Here, we denote

$$X^{abcd} = \frac{\partial L}{\partial R_{abcd}}. \quad (5.33)$$

Unlike general relativity and $f(R)$ gravity, for which we could compute the entropy formula covariantly, for $f(\text{Riemann})$ theories we will use GNC, which abide our gauge conditions in Section 2.2, in order to find a local geometric expression for the entropy S_{dyn} . A similar calculation was done in [1] using Killing field arguments, instead of boost weight arguments, however they did not check that their expression (94) for S_{dyn} satisfies the expected relation (4.55) with the Wall entropy.

Symplectic Potential

Our second gauge condition (2.21) implies

$$\delta g_{va} \stackrel{\mathcal{H}^+}{=} 0 \quad \delta g_{ua} = 0. \quad (5.34)$$

We calculate the non-zero components of $\nabla_c \delta g_{ab}$ in GNC

$$\nabla_u \delta g_{vi} \stackrel{\mathcal{H}^+}{=} -\delta \omega_i, \quad \nabla_u \delta g_{ij} \stackrel{\mathcal{H}^+}{=} 2\delta \bar{K}_{ij}, \quad \nabla_v \delta g_{ij} \stackrel{\mathcal{H}^+}{=} 2\delta K_{ij}, \quad (5.35)$$

by using

$$\nabla_c \delta g_{ab} = g_{bd} \delta \Gamma_{ca}^d + g_{ad} \delta \Gamma_{cb}^d. \quad (5.36)$$

From the above expressions, we find

$$\begin{aligned} \xi \cdot \Theta(\phi, \delta\phi) &\stackrel{\mathcal{C}^{(v)}}{=} 2\kappa v \epsilon_{uv} \left(X^{uabc} \nabla_c \delta g_{ab} - \left(\nabla_c X^{uabc} \right) \delta g_{ab} \right) \\ &\stackrel{\mathcal{C}^{(v)}}{=} 2\kappa v \epsilon_{\mathcal{C}} \left(-2X^{uviu} \delta \omega_i + 2X^{uiju} \delta \bar{K}_{ij} + 2X^{uijv} \delta K_{ij} + X^{uijk} \nabla_k \delta g_{ij} - \left(\nabla_c X^{uijc} \right) \delta g_{ij} \right), \end{aligned} \quad (5.37)$$

where we have identified $\epsilon_{uv} \stackrel{\mathcal{H}^+}{=} \epsilon_{\mathcal{C}}$.

We use a boost weight argument to get

$$X^{uviu} \stackrel{\mathcal{H}^+}{=} X^{uiju} \stackrel{\mathcal{H}^+}{=} X^{uijk} \stackrel{\mathcal{H}^+}{=} \nabla_c X^{uijc} \stackrel{\mathcal{H}^+}{=} K_{ij} \stackrel{\mathcal{H}^+}{=} 0, \quad (5.38)$$

as these are proportional to positive weight affine GNC components on the background.

So, we have

$$\xi \cdot \Theta(\phi, \delta\phi) \stackrel{\mathcal{C}(v)}{=} \delta(4\kappa\nu\epsilon_{\mathcal{C}} X^{uijv} K_{ij}), \quad (5.39)$$

where we have pulled the δ to the front in the term $4\kappa\nu\epsilon_{\mathcal{C}} X^{uijv} \delta K_{ij}$, as

$$4\kappa\nu\epsilon_{\mathcal{C}} X^{uijv} \delta K_{ij} \stackrel{\mathcal{H}^+}{=} \delta(4\kappa\nu\epsilon_{\mathcal{C}} X^{uijv} K_{ij}) - \underbrace{K_{ij}}_{\stackrel{\mathcal{H}^+}{=} 0} \delta(4\kappa\nu\epsilon_{\mathcal{C}} X^{uijv}). \quad (5.40)$$

Also, this suggests that $\xi \cdot \Theta(\phi, \delta\phi)$ is exact in δ , i.e., $\xi \cdot \Theta(\phi, \delta\phi) \stackrel{\mathcal{H}^+}{=} \delta(\xi \cdot \mathbf{B}_{\mathcal{H}^+})$, as discussed in Section 4.7, where

$$\mathbf{B}_{\mathcal{H}^+} \stackrel{\mathcal{H}^+}{=} -4(l \wedge \epsilon_{\mathcal{C}}) X^{uijv} K_{ij}. \quad (5.41)$$

In general, on the horizon, whenever we have a product of a non-positive weight component on the background and the variation of a positive weight component, i.e., $A_{(w \leq 0)} \delta B_{(w > 0)}$, we may pull the δ through

$$A_{(w \leq 0)} \delta B_{(w > 0)} \stackrel{\mathcal{H}^+}{=} \delta(A_{(w \leq 0)} B_{(w > 0)}). \quad (5.42)$$

This will be used implicitly throughout our following calculations.

Noether Charge

First we calculate

$$\xi_a \stackrel{\mathcal{H}^+}{=} -\xi^v (du)_a, \quad \nabla_{[u} \xi_{v]} \stackrel{\mathcal{H}^+}{=} \kappa_3, \quad \nabla_{[u} \xi_{i]} \stackrel{\mathcal{H}^+}{=} -\frac{1}{2} \omega_i \xi^v, \quad \nabla_{[v} \xi_{i]} \stackrel{\mathcal{H}^+}{=} \nabla_{[i} \xi_{j]} \stackrel{\mathcal{H}^+}{=} 0, \quad (5.43)$$

so that

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbf{Q}_{\xi} &\stackrel{\mathcal{C}(v)}{=} -2\epsilon_{uv} \left(X^{uvab} \nabla_a \xi_b - 2\xi^v \nabla_b X^{uvub} \right) \\ &\stackrel{\mathcal{C}(v)}{=} -2\epsilon_{\mathcal{C}} \left(2\kappa_3 X^{uvuv} - \xi^v \omega_i X^{uvui} - 2\xi^v \nabla_v X^{uvuv} - 2\xi^v \nabla_i X^{uvui} \right), \end{aligned} \quad (5.44)$$

where we have expanded the summation over dummy index b . Further, we compute

$$\nabla_v X^{uvuv} = \partial_v X^{uvuv} - \omega_i X^{uvui} \quad (5.45)$$

and

$$\nabla_i X^{uvui} = D_i X^{uvui} + K_{ij} X^{uijv} + \bar{K}_{ij} X^{uiuj} + \frac{1}{2} \omega_i X^{uvui} + K X^{uvuv} \quad (5.46)$$

using Table 2. Finally, we obtain

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbf{Q}_{\xi} &\stackrel{\mathcal{C}(v)}{=} 4\epsilon_{\mathcal{C}} \left(\xi^v \left((\partial_v + K) X^{uvuv} + K_{ij} X^{uijv} + \bar{K}_{ij} X^{uiuj} + D_i X^{uvui} \right) - \kappa_3 X^{uvuv} \right) \\ &\stackrel{\mathcal{C}(v)}{=} 4\xi^v \left(\partial_v (X^{uvuv} \epsilon_{\mathcal{C}}) + \epsilon_{\mathcal{C}} (K_{ij} X^{uijv} + \bar{K}_{ij} X^{uiuj} + D_i X^{uvui}) \right) - 4\kappa_3 \epsilon_{\mathcal{C}} X^{uvuv} \end{aligned} \quad (5.47)$$

by identifying

$$\partial_v \epsilon_{\mathcal{C}} = K \epsilon_{\mathcal{C}}. \quad (5.48)$$

And we can compute

$$\mathbf{Q}_{\delta\xi} \stackrel{\mathcal{C}^{(v)}}{=} 4(\delta\xi^v) (\partial_v(X^{uvuv}\epsilon_{\mathcal{C}}) + \epsilon_{\mathcal{C}}(K_{ij}X^{uijv} + \bar{K}_{ij}X^{uiuj} + D_iX^{uvui})) - 4(\delta\kappa_3)\epsilon_{\mathcal{C}}X^{uvuv} \quad (5.49)$$

so that the field variation of the Noether charge is

$$\delta_\phi \mathbf{Q} \stackrel{\mathcal{C}^{(v)}}{=} 4\kappa v \delta (\partial_v(X^{uvuv}\epsilon_{\mathcal{C}}) + \epsilon_{\mathcal{C}}(K_{ij}X^{uijv} + \bar{K}_{ij}X^{uiuj} + D_iX^{uvui})) - 4\kappa \delta (\epsilon_{\mathcal{C}}X^{uvuv}), \quad (5.50)$$

where we inserted the background quantities $\xi^v = \kappa v$ and $\kappa_3 = \kappa$.

Dynamical Black Hole Entropy

Combining the above calculations, we finally have

$$\delta_\phi \mathbf{Q}_\xi - \xi \cdot \Theta(\phi, \delta\phi) \stackrel{\mathcal{C}^{(v)}}{=} 4\kappa \delta (-(1 - v\partial_v)(X^{uvuv}\epsilon_{\mathcal{C}}) + v\epsilon_{\mathcal{C}}(\bar{K}_{ij}X^{uiuj} + D_iX^{uvui})). \quad (5.51)$$

Here, we notice there is a codimension-2 total derivative term D_iX^{uvui} . This is related to the *entropy current* discussed in [21]. It is important when one discusses the local behaviour of entropy density-current on any horizon slice. In this paper, we investigate the entropy with respect to the whole horizon slice, and we assume the slice is compact. Hence, the total derivative will be integrated out and will not contribute to the black hole entropy.

The dynamical black hole entropy is obtained through

$$\begin{aligned} \delta S_{\text{dyn}} &= \frac{2\pi}{\kappa} \int_{\mathcal{C}^{(v)}} (\delta \mathbf{Q}_\xi - \xi \cdot \Theta(\phi, \delta\phi)) \\ &= -8\pi \int_{\mathcal{C}^{(v)}} d^{D-2}x ((1 - v\partial_v)\delta(\sqrt{\gamma}X^{uvuv}) - v\delta(\sqrt{\gamma}\bar{K}_{ij}X^{uiuj})). \end{aligned} \quad (5.52)$$

We further unpack the notations

$$\delta(\sqrt{\gamma}\bar{K}_{ij}X^{uiuj}) = \sqrt{\gamma}\bar{K}_{ij}\delta X^{uiuj} \quad (5.53)$$

and

$$\delta X^{uiuj} = 4 \frac{\partial X^{uiuj}}{\partial R_{vkl}} \delta R_{vkl}. \quad (5.54)$$

Using the boost weight analysis, the only non-vanishing term after applying the chain rule to δX^{uiuj} is proportional to δR_{vkl} . This is because δX^{uiuj} is of weight 2, and after the chain rule the non-vanishing terms should be products of a weight 0 or lower background term and a weight 2 or higher variation. In this case there is only one such term available, as written above. A more detailed analysis is provided in [14].

The Riemann component involved reads

$$\delta R_{vkl} \stackrel{\mathcal{H}^+}{=} g_{vu} \delta (\partial_v \Gamma_{lk}^u - \partial_l \Gamma_{vk}^u + \Gamma_{lk}^a \Gamma_{va}^u - \Gamma_{vk}^a \Gamma_{la}^u) = -\partial_v \delta K_{kl} \quad (5.55)$$

and we calculate

$$\begin{aligned} v\sqrt{\gamma}\bar{K}_{ij}\delta X^{uiuj} &\stackrel{\mathcal{H}^+}{=} -4v\sqrt{\gamma}\bar{K}_{ij} \frac{\partial X^{uiuj}}{\partial R_{vkl}} \partial_v \delta K_{kl} \\ &\stackrel{\mathcal{H}^+}{=} -4v\partial_v \left(\sqrt{\gamma}\bar{K}_{ij} \frac{\partial X^{uiuj}}{\partial R_{vkl}} \delta K_{kl} \right) + 4\sqrt{\gamma}(v\partial_v \bar{K}_{ij}) \frac{\partial X^{uiuj}}{\partial R_{vkl}} \delta K_{kl} \\ &\stackrel{\mathcal{H}^+}{=} 4(1 - v\partial_v) \left(\sqrt{\gamma}\bar{K}_{ij} \frac{\partial X^{uiuj}}{\partial R_{vkl}} \delta K_{kl} \right) \end{aligned} \quad (5.56)$$

by using the boost weight argument and applying the Killing equation (2.48) to \bar{K}_{ij} , i.e.,

$$(v\partial_v - 1)\bar{K}_{ij} \stackrel{\mathcal{H}^+}{=} 0. \quad (5.57)$$

Then, pulling the δ 's through and recovering the expression of X^{abcd} , we find

$$\delta S_{\text{dyn}} = -8\pi\delta \left((1 - v\partial_v) \int_{\mathcal{C}(v)} d^{D-2}x \sqrt{\gamma} \left(\frac{\partial L}{\partial R_{uvuv}} - 4 \frac{\partial^2 L}{\partial R_{uiuj} \partial R_{vkvl}} \bar{K}_{ij} K_{kl} \right) \right). \quad (5.58)$$

So, to first order in the perturbation, the dynamical entropy of the black hole is

$$S_{\text{dyn}} = -8\pi(1 - v\partial_v) \int_{\mathcal{C}(v)} d^{D-2}x \sqrt{\gamma} \left(\frac{\partial L}{\partial R_{uvuv}} - 4 \frac{\partial^2 L}{\partial R_{uiuj} \partial R_{vkvl}} \bar{K}_{ij} K_{kl} \right), \quad (5.59)$$

which is valid at any slice of the future horizon. In a covariant notation, the dynamical black hole entropy for $f(\text{Riemann})$ theory is

$$S_{\text{dyn}} = -8\pi(1 - v\partial_v) \int_{\mathcal{C}(v)} \epsilon_C k_a l_b k_c l_d \left(\frac{\partial L}{\partial R_{abcd}} - 4 \frac{\partial^2 L}{\partial R_{aecf} \partial R_{bgdh}} \bar{K}_{ef} K_{gh} \right). \quad (5.60)$$

Thus, we confirm this is related to the Wall entropy (1.6) for $f(\text{Riemann})$ theories by

$$S_{\text{dyn}} = (1 - v\partial_v) S_{\text{Wall}}, \quad (5.61)$$

as anticipated in Section 4.5.

Acknowledgement

We are grateful to Venkatesa Chandrasekaran, Ted Jacobson, Prahar Mitra, Antoine Rignon-Bret, Ronak Soni, Antony Speranza, Simone Speziale, Andrew Svesko, Erik Verlinde, Robert Wald and Aron Wall for extensive discussions. This work was supported in part by AFOSR grant FA9550-19-1-0260 ‘‘Tensor Networks and Holographic Spacetime’’, STFC grant ST/P000681/1 ‘‘Particles, Fields and Extended Objects’’, and an Isaac Newton Trust Early Career grant. MRV is supported by SNF Postdoc Mobility grant P500PT-206877 ‘‘Semi-classical thermodynamics of black holes and the information paradox’’. ZY is supported by an Internal Graduate Studentship of Trinity College, Cambridge. ZY is also grateful for the hospitality of KITP and UCSB, where this work was completed. This research was supported in part by grant NSF PHY-2309135 to KITP.

A The Tale of Three Surface Gravities

In this Appendix we derive some relations for the three surface gravities, and their variations, that are defined on an arbitrary null hypersurface \mathcal{N} through

$$\nabla_a(\xi_b \xi^b) \stackrel{\mathcal{N}}{=} -2\kappa_1 \xi_a, \quad (A.1)$$

$$\xi^b \nabla_b \xi^a \stackrel{\mathcal{N}}{=} \kappa_2 \xi^a, \quad (A.2)$$

$$(\nabla^a \xi^b)(\nabla_{[a} \xi_{b]}) \stackrel{\mathcal{N}}{=} -2\kappa_3^2, \quad (A.3)$$

where ξ_a is the normal to \mathcal{N} . We will not assume that ξ^a is a Killing field in this Appendix, hence \mathcal{N} is not necessarily a Killing horizon.

1. The first relation, (2.29), that we want to derive is [55, 56]

$$\kappa_3 \stackrel{\mathcal{N}}{=} \frac{1}{2}(\kappa_1 + \kappa_2). \quad (\text{A.4})$$

Proof: Since ξ^a is orthogonal to the null hypersurface, by Frobenius's theorem it satisfies the irrotationality condition on \mathcal{N}

$$\xi_{[a} \nabla_b \xi_{c]} \stackrel{\mathcal{N}}{=} 0. \quad (\text{A.5})$$

This is equivalent to

$$\xi_c \nabla_{[a} \xi_{b]} \stackrel{\mathcal{N}}{=} -\xi_{[a} \nabla_{b]} \xi_c + \xi_{[a} \nabla_{|c]} \xi_{b]}. \quad (\text{A.6})$$

Contracting both sides with $\nabla^a \xi^b$ yields

$$\xi_c (\nabla^a \xi^b) (\nabla_{[a} \xi_{b]}) \stackrel{\mathcal{N}}{=} -\xi_a (\nabla^{[a} \xi^{b]}) (\nabla_b \xi_c) + \xi_a (\nabla^{[a} \xi^{b]}) (\nabla_c \xi_b). \quad (\text{A.7})$$

Note if ξ^a were a Killing field, the two terms on the rhs would be equal to each other because of Killing's equation $\nabla_b \xi_c = -\nabla_c \xi_b$. However, for a generic null normal they differ from each other. Expanding the rhs gives

$$\begin{aligned} -\xi_a (\nabla^{[a} \xi^{b]}) (\nabla_b \xi_c) + \xi_a (\nabla^{[a} \xi^{b]}) (\nabla_c \xi_b) &= -\frac{1}{2} (\xi_a \nabla^a \xi^b) (\nabla_b \xi_c) + \frac{1}{2} (\xi_a \nabla^b \xi^a) (\nabla_b \xi_c) \\ &\quad + \frac{1}{2} (\xi_a \nabla^a \xi^b) (\nabla_c \xi_b) - \frac{1}{2} (\xi_a \nabla^b \xi^a) (\nabla_c \xi^b) \\ &\stackrel{\mathcal{N}}{=} -\frac{1}{2} \kappa_2 \xi^b \nabla_b \xi_c - \frac{1}{2} \kappa_1 \xi^b \nabla_b \xi_c + \frac{1}{2} \kappa_2 \xi^b \nabla_c \xi_b + \frac{1}{2} \kappa_1 \xi^b \nabla_c \xi^b \\ &\stackrel{\mathcal{N}}{=} -\frac{1}{2} \xi_c (\kappa_2^2 + 2\kappa_1 \kappa_2 + \kappa_1^2). \end{aligned} \quad (\text{A.8})$$

By equating this to the lhs of (A.7), which is equal to $-2\xi_c \kappa_3^2$, we obtain the simple relation (A.4) between the surface gravities. \square

2. Next, we prove the set of relations (2.30),

$$\kappa_1 \stackrel{\mathcal{N}}{=} l^a \nabla_a (k_b \xi^b), \quad \kappa_2 \stackrel{\mathcal{N}}{=} -k^a \nabla_a (l_b \xi^b), \quad \kappa_3 \stackrel{\mathcal{N}}{=} l_{[a} k_{b]} \nabla^a \delta \xi^b, \quad (\text{A.9})$$

where k^a is the affinely parameterised null normal to \mathcal{N} , and l^a is the auxiliary null vector fields, satisfying

$$k_a k^a \stackrel{\mathcal{N}}{=} 0, \quad k^b \nabla_b k^a \stackrel{\mathcal{N}}{=} 0, \quad l_a l^a \stackrel{\mathcal{N}}{=} 0, \quad k_a l^a \stackrel{\mathcal{N}}{=} -1, \quad k_a \xi^a \stackrel{\mathcal{N}}{=} 0, \quad l^b \nabla_b k^a = k^b \nabla_b l^a. \quad (\text{A.10})$$

Proof: We start by decomposing the vector field ξ^a in terms of the null vector fields k^a and l^a , i.e.

$$\xi^a = -(\xi^b l_b) k^a - (\xi^b k_b) l^a. \quad (\text{A.11})$$

The vector field ξ^a has no components along the codimension-2 spatial directions, since it has to be tangent to the null geodesic generators of \mathcal{N} . We first derive the expression for κ_1 . Contracting definition (A.1) with l^a and inserting the decomposition (A.11) for ξ^a once yields

$$-2\kappa_1 \xi_a l^a \stackrel{\mathcal{N}}{=} l^a \nabla_a (-(\xi_c l^c k_b + \xi_c k^c l_b) \xi^b) = -2l^a \nabla_a (\xi_c l^c \xi_b k^b) \stackrel{\mathcal{N}}{=} -2\xi_c l^c l^a \nabla_a (\xi_b k^b). \quad (\text{A.12})$$

In the final equality we used $\xi_b k^b \stackrel{\mathcal{N}}{=} 0$. Dividing both sides by $\xi^c l_c$ leads to the desired expression for κ_1 in (A.9).

Next, in order to derive the expression for κ_2 , we contract definition (A.2) with l_a and insert the decomposition (A.11) twice

$$\kappa_2 \xi^a l_a \stackrel{\mathcal{N}}{=} l_a (\xi^c l_c k^b + \xi^c k_c l^b) \nabla_b (\xi^c l_c k^a + \xi^c k_c l^a) \stackrel{\mathcal{N}}{=} l_a \xi^c l_c k^b \nabla_b (\xi^c l_c k^a) \stackrel{\mathcal{N}}{=} -\xi^c l_c k^b \nabla_b (\xi^c l_c). \quad (\text{A.13})$$

In the second equality we used $\xi^c k_c \stackrel{\mathcal{N}}{=} 0$ and $k^b \nabla_b (\xi^c k_c) \stackrel{\mathcal{N}}{=} 0$. And, to obtain the third equality, we employed $k^b \nabla_b k^a \stackrel{\mathcal{N}}{=} 0$ and $l_a k^a \stackrel{\mathcal{N}}{=} -1$. Thus, we find the expression for κ_2 in (A.9).

Finally, the expression for κ_3 is a consequence of relation (A.4) between the surface gravities

$$\kappa_3 \stackrel{\mathcal{N}}{=} \frac{1}{2} (l^a \nabla_a (k_b \xi^b) - k^a \nabla_a (l_b \xi^b)) = \frac{1}{2} (l_a k_b - l_b k_a) \nabla^a \xi^b, \quad (\text{A.14})$$

where the second equality follows from the assumption that l^a and k^a commute with each other, i.e. $\mathcal{L}_k l^a = k^b \nabla_b l^a - l^b \nabla_b k^a = 0$. \square

3. As an aside, we mention that the surface gravities also satisfy the relations

$$\kappa_1 \stackrel{\mathcal{N}}{=} \beta_a \xi_b \nabla^a \xi^b, \quad \kappa_2 \stackrel{\mathcal{N}}{=} -\beta_a \xi_b \nabla^b \xi^a, \quad \kappa_3 \stackrel{\mathcal{N}}{=} \beta_{[a} \xi_{b]} \nabla^a \xi^b, \quad (\text{A.15})$$

where β^a is an auxiliary null vector field that satisfies $\beta_a \xi^a = -1$ on \mathcal{N} , see (2.15). We will not use these expressions in the main text, however, since our gauge conditions keep k^a and l^a fixed (and not β^a and/or ξ^a).

4. Finally, we derive the variational relations (2.31) for the surface gravities

$$\delta \kappa_1 \stackrel{\mathcal{N}}{=} l^a \nabla_a (k_b \delta \xi^b), \quad \delta \kappa_2 \stackrel{\mathcal{N}}{=} -k^a \nabla_a (l_b \delta \xi^b), \quad \delta \kappa_3 \stackrel{\mathcal{N}}{=} l_{[a} k_{b]} \nabla^a \delta \xi^b. \quad (\text{A.16})$$

Proof: In taking the variation of (A.9) we assume that our gauge conditions in Section 2.2 hold on the null surface \mathcal{N} (instead of \mathcal{H}^+) or away from \mathcal{N} . In particular, (2.20) states that $\delta k^a = 0$, $\delta l^a = 0$, and together with (2.21) we have $\delta l_a = 0$ everywhere, but $\delta k_a = 0$ only holds on the null hypersurface (since $k^a \delta g_{ab} \stackrel{\mathcal{N}}{=} 0$). We immediately see that the variation of κ_2 depends only on the variation of the normal ξ^a , since the variation δ commutes with the partial derivative ∂_a . (Note the covariant derivatives in the expressions for κ_1 and κ_2 , (A.9), can be replaced with partial derivatives.)

To calculate the variation of κ_1 we have to do a bit more work. Since δk_a does not vanish away from \mathcal{N} , it is not immediately clear that the derivative $l^a \nabla_a (\xi^b \delta k_b)$ vanishes on \mathcal{N} . However, we now show that it does, by first writing it as $l^a k^c \xi^b \nabla_a \delta g_{bc}$, which follows from $\delta k^c = 0$ and $\xi^b \delta g_{bc} = k^c \delta g_{bc} = 0$ on \mathcal{N} . Since ξ^a is proportional to k^a on \mathcal{N} , we will consider the following quantity

$$l_c k^a k^b \delta \Gamma_{ab}^c = \frac{1}{2} l^c k^a k^b (2 \nabla_{(a} \delta g_{b)c} - \nabla_c \delta g_{ab}). \quad (\text{A.17})$$

The lhs vanishes because of the gauge condition (2.22), $\delta(k^a \nabla_a k^b) = 0$, and the first term on the rhs is zero since

$$k^a k^b \nabla_a \delta g_{bc} = k^a \nabla_a (k^b \delta g_{bc}) - k^a \nabla_a k^b (\delta g_{bc}) \stackrel{\mathcal{N}}{=} 0. \quad (\text{A.18})$$

Hence, it follows that

$$l^c k^a k^b \nabla_c \delta g_{ab} \stackrel{\mathcal{N}}{=} 0, \quad (\text{A.19})$$

which implies that $l^a \nabla_a (\xi^b \delta k_b)$ vanishes on \mathcal{N} . Therefore, also the variation of κ_1 only depends on the variation of ξ^a , and we obtain the first relation in (A.16).

To obtain the variation of κ_3 , we vary (A.4),

$$\delta \kappa_3 = \frac{1}{2} (\delta \kappa_1 + \delta \kappa_2). \quad (\text{A.20})$$

By inserting the expressions for $\delta \kappa_1$ and $\delta \kappa_2$ in (A.16) and using the fact that l^a and k^a commute, we arrive at the desired expression. \square

B Geometric Quantities in Gaussian Null Coordinates

In this Appendix we calculate the Christoffel connections and certain components of the covariant derivative in affine Gaussian null coordinates (v, u, x^i) and Killing (non-affine) Gaussian null coordinates (τ, ρ, x^i) . We recall these coordinates are related by the transformation (2.17),

$$v = \frac{1}{\kappa} \exp(\kappa\tau), \quad u = \rho \exp(-\kappa\tau). \quad (\text{B.1})$$

B.1 Affine GNC

The metric components in Gaussian null coordinates (u, v, x^i) , based upon the affine parametrisation of the null geodesics of the horizon, are given by (2.32),

$$g_{uu} = g_{ui} = 0, \quad g_{uv} = -1, \quad g_{vv} = -u^2\alpha, \quad g_{vi} = -u\omega_i, \quad g_{ij} = \gamma_{ij}, \quad (\text{B.2})$$

and the inverse metric components are

$$g^{uu} = u^2(\alpha + \omega^2), \quad g^{uv} = -1, \quad g^{ui} = u\omega^i, \quad g^{vv} = g^{vi} = 0, \quad g^{ij} = \gamma^{ij}, \quad (\text{B.3})$$

where γ^{ij} is the inverse of γ_{ij} , $\omega^i = \gamma^{ij}\omega_j$ and $\omega^2 = \gamma_{ij}\omega^i\omega^j$. The quantities α, ω_i and γ_{ij} generically depend on all coordinates (v, u, x^i) , but for stationary metrics with a boost Killing field $\xi = \kappa(v\partial_v - u\partial_u)$ they depend only on the product κuv and x^i .

The Christoffel connections on \mathcal{H}^+ in GNC can be computed to be

$$\Gamma_{uu}^u = \Gamma_{uv}^v = \Gamma_{uv}^u = \Gamma_{ui}^v = \Gamma_{uu}^i = 0 \quad (\text{B.4})$$

$$\Gamma_{uv}^u = \frac{1}{2}\partial_u(u^2\alpha) - \frac{1}{2}u\omega^i\partial_u(u\omega_i) \stackrel{\mathcal{H}^+}{=} 0 \quad (\text{B.5})$$

$$\Gamma_{ui}^u = \frac{1}{2}\partial_u(u\omega_i) + u\omega^j\bar{K}_{ij} \stackrel{\mathcal{H}^+}{=} \frac{1}{2}\omega_i \quad (\text{B.6})$$

$$\Gamma_{vv}^u = \frac{1}{2}u^2(\alpha + \omega^2)\partial_u(u^2\alpha) + \frac{1}{2}u^2\partial_v\alpha + \frac{1}{2}u^2\omega^i(u\partial_i\alpha - 2\partial_v\omega_i) \stackrel{\mathcal{H}^+}{=} 0 \quad (\text{B.7})$$

$$\Gamma_{vi}^u = \frac{1}{2}u^2(\alpha + \omega^2)\partial_u(u\omega_i) + \frac{1}{2}u^2\partial_i\alpha + u\omega^j(K_{ij} + u\partial_{[j}\omega_{i]}) \stackrel{\mathcal{H}^+}{=} 0 \quad (\text{B.8})$$

$$\Gamma_{ij}^u = K_{ij} - u^2(\alpha + \omega^2)\bar{K}_{ij} + uD_{(i}\omega_{j)} \stackrel{\mathcal{H}^+}{=} K_{ij} \quad (\text{B.9})$$

$$\Gamma_{vv}^v = -\frac{1}{2}\partial_u(u^2\alpha) \stackrel{\mathcal{H}^+}{=} 0 \quad (\text{B.10})$$

$$\Gamma_{vi}^v = -\frac{1}{2}\partial_u(u\omega_i) \stackrel{\mathcal{H}^+}{=} -\frac{1}{2}\omega_i \quad (\text{B.11})$$

$$\Gamma_{ij}^v = \bar{K}_{ij} \quad (\text{B.12})$$

$$\Gamma_{uv}^i = -\frac{1}{2}\gamma^{ij}\partial_u(u\omega_j) \stackrel{\mathcal{H}^+}{=} -\frac{1}{2}\omega^i \quad (\text{B.13})$$

$$\Gamma_{uj}^i = \bar{K}^i_j \quad (\text{B.14})$$

$$\Gamma_{vv}^i = \frac{1}{2}u\gamma^{ij}(\omega_j\partial_u(u^2\alpha) + \partial_j\alpha - 2\partial_v\omega_j) \stackrel{\mathcal{H}^+}{=} 0 \quad (\text{B.15})$$

$$\Gamma_{vj}^i = K^i_j + u\gamma^{ik}\partial_{[k}\omega_{j]} + \frac{1}{2}u\omega^i\partial_u(u\omega_j) \stackrel{\mathcal{H}^+}{=} K^i_j \quad (\text{B.16})$$

$$\Gamma_{jk}^i = \Gamma[\gamma]_{jk}^i - u\omega^i\bar{K}_{jk} \stackrel{\mathcal{H}^+}{=} \Gamma[\gamma]_{jk}^i \quad (\text{B.17})$$

where the extrinsic curvatures in the v - and u -directions are defined, respectively, as

$$K_{ij} = \frac{1}{2}\partial_v\gamma_{ij}, \quad \bar{K}_{ij} = \frac{1}{2}\partial_u\gamma_{ij}, \quad (\text{B.18})$$

and D_i is the intrinsic covariant derivative of the codimension-2 surface.

Finally, on the horizon, the components of the ν - and i -covariant derivatives of a tensor T are shown in Table 2.

∇	$T^{\dots a \dots}$	$T_{\dots a \dots}$
ν	$\nabla_\nu T^{\dots \nu \dots} = \partial_\nu T^{\dots \nu \dots} - \frac{1}{2} \omega_i T^{\dots i \dots}$ $\nabla_\nu T^{\dots u \dots} = \partial_\nu T^{\dots u \dots}$ $\nabla_\nu T^{\dots i \dots} = \partial_\nu T^{\dots i \dots} - \frac{1}{2} \omega^i T^{\dots u \dots} + K^i_j T^{\dots j \dots}$	$\nabla_\nu T_{\dots u \dots} = \partial_\nu T_{\dots u \dots} + \frac{1}{2} \omega^i T_{\dots i \dots}$ $\nabla_\nu T_{\dots \nu \dots} = \partial_\nu T_{\dots \nu \dots}$ $\nabla_\nu T_{\dots i \dots} = \partial_\nu T_{\dots i \dots} + \frac{1}{2} \omega_i T_{\dots \nu \dots} - K_i^j T_{\dots j \dots}$
i	$\nabla_i T^{\dots \nu \dots} = D_i T^{\dots \nu \dots} + \bar{K}_{ij} T^{\dots j \dots} - \frac{1}{2} \omega_i T^{\dots \nu \dots}$ $\nabla_i T^{\dots u \dots} = D_i T^{\dots u \dots} + K_{ij} T^{\dots j \dots} + \frac{1}{2} \omega_i T^{\dots u \dots}$ $\nabla_i T^{\dots j \dots} = D_i T^{\dots j \dots} + K_i^j T^{\dots \nu \dots} + \bar{K}_i^j T^{\dots u \dots}$	$\nabla_i T_{\dots u \dots} = D_i T_{\dots u \dots} - \bar{K}_i^j T_{\dots j \dots} - \frac{1}{2} \omega_i T_{\dots u \dots}$ $\nabla_i T_{\dots \nu \dots} = D_i T_{\dots \nu \dots} - K_i^j T_{\dots j \dots} + \frac{1}{2} \omega_i T_{\dots \nu \dots}$ $\nabla_i T_{\dots j \dots} = D_i T_{\dots j \dots} - \bar{K}_{ij} T_{\dots \nu \dots} - K_{ij} T_{\dots u \dots}$

Table 2: Components of tensor covariant derivatives on the horizon in affine GNC.

B.2 Killing GNC

In non-affine Gaussian null coordinates (τ, ρ, x^i) , based upon the Killing parameterisation of the null geodesics of the horizon, the metric components are

$$g_{\rho\rho} = g_{\rho i} = 0, \quad g_{\rho\tau} = -1, \quad g_{\tau\tau} = -\rho\tilde{\alpha}, \quad g_{\tau i} = -\rho\omega_i, \quad g_{ij} = \gamma_{ij}, \quad (\text{B.19})$$

and the inverse metric components are

$$g^{\rho\rho} = \rho\tilde{\alpha} + \rho^2\omega^2, \quad g^{\rho\tau} = -1, \quad g^{\rho i} = \rho\omega^i, \quad g^{\tau\tau} = g^{\tau i} = 0, \quad g^{ij} = \gamma^{ij} \quad (\text{B.20})$$

where γ^{ij} is the inverse of γ_{ij} , $\omega^i = \gamma^{ij}\omega_j$ and $\omega^2 = \gamma_{ij}\omega^i\omega^j$. The quantities ω_i and γ_{ij} are the same as for affine GNC, but $\tilde{\alpha}$ is different from the metric function α in affine GNC. $\tilde{\alpha}$ is related to α by $\tilde{\alpha} = -2\kappa + \rho\alpha$ where κ is the background surface gravity. All metric quantities in Killing GNC only depend on the coordinates (ρ, x^i) since τ is a Killing parameter.

The Christoffel connections in Killing GNC on the Killing horizon are

$$\Gamma_{\rho\rho}^\rho = \Gamma_{\rho\rho}^\tau = \Gamma_{\rho\tau}^\tau = \Gamma_{\rho i}^\tau = \Gamma_{\rho\rho}^i = 0 \quad (\text{B.21})$$

$$\Gamma_{\rho\tau}^\rho = \frac{1}{2} \partial_\rho(\rho\tilde{\alpha}) - \frac{1}{2} \rho\omega^i \partial_\rho(\rho\omega_i) \stackrel{\mathcal{H}}{=} \frac{1}{2} \tilde{\alpha} = -\kappa \quad (\text{B.22})$$

$$\Gamma_{\rho i}^\rho = \frac{1}{2} \partial_\rho(\rho\omega_i) + \rho\omega^j \bar{\mathcal{K}}_{ij} \stackrel{\mathcal{H}}{=} \frac{1}{2} \omega_i \quad (\text{B.23})$$

$$\Gamma_{\tau\tau}^\rho = \frac{1}{2} \rho(\tilde{\alpha} + \rho\omega^2) \partial_\rho(\rho\tilde{\alpha}) + \frac{1}{2} \rho \partial_\tau \tilde{\alpha} + \frac{1}{2} \rho^2 \omega^i (\partial_i \tilde{\alpha} - 2\partial_\tau \omega_i) \stackrel{\mathcal{H}}{=} 0 \quad (\text{B.24})$$

$$\Gamma_{\tau i}^\rho = \frac{1}{2} \rho(\tilde{\alpha} + \rho\omega^2) \partial_\rho(\rho\omega_i) + \frac{1}{2} \rho \partial_i \tilde{\alpha} + \rho\omega^j (\mathcal{K}_{ij} + \rho\partial_{[j}\omega_{i]}) \stackrel{\mathcal{H}}{=} 0 \quad (\text{B.25})$$

$$\Gamma_{ij}^\rho = \mathcal{K}_{ij} - \rho(\tilde{\alpha} + \rho\omega^2) \bar{\mathcal{K}}_{ij} + \rho D_{(i}\omega_{j)} \stackrel{\mathcal{H}}{=} \mathcal{K}_{ij} \quad (\text{B.26})$$

$$\Gamma_{\tau\tau}^\tau = -\frac{1}{2} \partial_\rho(\rho\tilde{\alpha}) \stackrel{\mathcal{H}}{=} -\frac{1}{2} \tilde{\alpha} = \kappa \quad (\text{B.27})$$

$$\Gamma_{\tau i}^\tau = -\frac{1}{2} \partial_\rho(\rho\omega_i) \stackrel{\mathcal{H}}{=} -\frac{1}{2} \omega_i \quad (\text{B.28})$$

$$\Gamma_{ij}^\tau = \bar{\mathcal{K}}_{ij} \quad (\text{B.29})$$

$$\Gamma_{\rho\tau}^i = -\frac{1}{2}\gamma^{ij}\partial_\rho(\rho\omega_j) \stackrel{\mathcal{H}}{=} -\frac{1}{2}\omega^i \quad (\text{B.30})$$

$$\Gamma_{\rho j}^i = \bar{\mathcal{K}}_j^i \quad (\text{B.31})$$

$$\Gamma_{\tau\tau}^i = \frac{1}{2}\rho\gamma^{ij}(\omega_j\partial_\rho(\rho\tilde{\alpha}) + \partial_j\tilde{\alpha} - 2\partial_\tau\omega_j) \stackrel{\mathcal{H}}{=} 0 \quad (\text{B.32})$$

$$\Gamma_{\tau j}^i = \mathcal{K}_j^i + \rho\gamma^{ik}\partial_{[k}\omega_{j]} + \frac{1}{2}\rho\omega^i\partial_\rho(\rho\omega_j) \stackrel{\mathcal{H}}{=} \mathcal{K}_j^i \quad (\text{B.33})$$

$$\Gamma_{jk}^i = \Gamma[\gamma]_{jk}^i - \rho\omega^i\bar{\mathcal{K}}_{jk} \stackrel{\mathcal{H}}{=} \Gamma[\gamma]_{jk}^i \quad (\text{B.34})$$

where the extrinsic curvatures in the τ - and ρ -directions are, respectively, given by

$$\mathcal{K}_{ij} = \frac{1}{2}\partial_\tau\gamma_{ij}, \quad \bar{\mathcal{K}}_{ij} = \frac{1}{2}\partial_\rho\gamma_{ij}. \quad (\text{B.35})$$

In Table 3 we summarise the components of the τ - and i -covariant derivatives of a tensor T on the horizon in Killing GNC.

∇	$T^{\dots a \dots}$	$T_{\dots a \dots}$
τ	$\begin{aligned} \nabla_\tau T^{\dots\tau\dots} &= \partial_\tau T^{\dots\tau\dots} + \kappa T^{\dots\tau\dots} - \frac{1}{2}\omega_i T^{\dots i \dots} \\ \nabla_\tau T^{\dots\rho\dots} &= \partial_\tau T^{\dots\rho\dots} - \kappa T^{\dots\rho\dots} \\ \nabla_\tau T^{\dots i \dots} &= \partial_\tau T^{\dots i \dots} - \frac{1}{2}\omega^i T^{\dots\rho\dots} + \mathcal{K}_j^i T^{\dots j \dots} \end{aligned}$	$\begin{aligned} \nabla_\tau T_{\dots\rho\dots} &= \partial_\tau T_{\dots\rho\dots} + \kappa T_{\dots\rho\dots} + \frac{1}{2}\omega^i T_{\dots i \dots} \\ \nabla_\tau T_{\dots\tau\dots} &= \partial_\tau T_{\dots\tau\dots} - \kappa T_{\dots\tau\dots} \\ \nabla_\tau T_{\dots i \dots} &= \partial_\tau T_{\dots i \dots} + \frac{1}{2}\omega_i T_{\dots\tau\dots} - \mathcal{K}_i^j T_{\dots j \dots} \end{aligned}$
i	$\begin{aligned} \nabla_i T^{\dots\tau\dots} &= D_i T^{\dots\tau\dots} + \bar{\mathcal{K}}_{ij} T^{\dots j \dots} - \frac{1}{2}\omega_i T^{\dots\tau\dots} \\ \nabla_i T^{\dots\rho\dots} &= D_i T^{\dots\rho\dots} + \mathcal{K}_{ij} T^{\dots j \dots} + \frac{1}{2}\omega_i T^{\dots\rho\dots} \\ \nabla_i T^{\dots j \dots} &= D_i T^{\dots j \dots} + \mathcal{K}_i^j T^{\dots\tau\dots} + \bar{\mathcal{K}}_i^j T^{\dots\rho\dots} \end{aligned}$	$\begin{aligned} \nabla_i T_{\dots\rho\dots} &= D_i T_{\dots\rho\dots} - \bar{\mathcal{K}}_i^j T_{\dots j \dots} - \frac{1}{2}\omega_i T_{\dots\rho\dots} \\ \nabla_i T_{\dots\tau\dots} &= D_i T_{\dots\tau\dots} - \mathcal{K}_i^j T_{\dots j \dots} + \frac{1}{2}\omega_i T_{\dots\tau\dots} \\ \nabla_i T_{\dots j \dots} &= D_i T_{\dots j \dots} - \bar{\mathcal{K}}_{ij} T_{\dots\tau\dots} - \mathcal{K}_{ij} T_{\dots\rho\dots} \end{aligned}$

Table 3: Components of tensor covariant derivatives on the horizon in Killing GNC.

References

- [1] S. Hollands, R.M. Wald and V.G. Zhang, *The Entropy of Dynamical Black Holes*, [arXiv:2402.00818].
- [2] J.D. Bekenstein, *Black holes and entropy*, *Phys. Rev. D* **7** (1973) 2333.
- [3] J.M. Bardeen, B. Carter and S.W. Hawking, *The Four laws of black hole mechanics*, *Commun. Math. Phys.* **31** (1973) 161.
- [4] S.W. Hawking, *Particle Creation by Black Holes*, *Commun. Math. Phys.* **43** (1975) 199.
- [5] R.L. Arnowitt, S. Deser and C.W. Misner, *The Dynamics of general relativity*, *Gen. Rel. Grav.* **40** (2008) 1997 [gr-qc/0405109].
- [6] T. Regge and C. Teitelboim, *Role of Surface Integrals in the Hamiltonian Formulation of General Relativity*, *Annals Phys.* **88** (1974) 286.

- [7] T. Jacobson and R.C. Myers, *Black hole entropy and higher curvature interactions*, *Phys. Rev. Lett.* **70** (1993) 3684 [[hep-th/9305016](#)].
- [8] D. Kastor, S. Ray and J. Traschen, *Mass and Free Energy of Lovelock Black Holes*, *Class. Quant. Grav.* **28** (2011) 195022 [[arXiv:1106.2764](#)].
- [9] J. Kastikainen, *Quasi-local energy and ADM mass in pure Lovelock gravity*, *Class. Quant. Grav.* **37** (2020) 025001 [[arXiv:1908.05522](#)].
- [10] A.C. Wall, *A Second Law for Higher Curvature Gravity*, *Int. J. Mod. Phys. D* **24** (2015) 1544014 [[arXiv:1504.08040](#)].
- [11] V. Iyer and R.M. Wald, *Some properties of Noether charge and a proposal for dynamical black hole entropy*, *Phys. Rev. D* **50** (1994) 846 [[gr-qc/9403028](#)].
- [12] R.M. Wald, *Black hole entropy is the Noether charge*, *Phys. Rev. D* **48** (1993) R3427 [[gr-qc/9307038](#)].
- [13] S.W. Hawking, *Gravitational radiation from colliding black holes*, *Phys. Rev. Lett.* **26** (1971) 1344.
- [14] A.C. Wall and Z. Yan, *Linearised Second Law for Higher Curvature Gravity and Non-Minimally Coupled Vector Fields*, [[arXiv:2402.05411](#)].
- [15] X. Dong, *Holographic Entanglement Entropy for General Higher Derivative Gravity*, *JHEP* **01** (2014) 044 [[arXiv:1310.5713](#)].
- [16] J. Camps, *Generalized entropy and higher derivative Gravity*, *JHEP* **03** (2014) 070 [[arXiv:1310.6659](#)].
- [17] S. Hollands, A.D. Kovács and H.S. Reall, *The second law of black hole mechanics in effective field theory*, *JHEP* **08** (2022) 258 [[arXiv:2205.15341](#)].
- [18] I. Davies and H.S. Reall, *Dynamical Black Hole Entropy in Effective Field Theory*, *JHEP* **05** (2023) 006 [[arXiv:2212.09777](#)].
- [19] I. Davies and H.S. Reall, *A non-perturbative second law of black hole mechanics in effective field theory*, [[arXiv:2312.07659](#)].
- [20] P. Biswas, P. Dhivakar and N. Kundu, *Non-minimal coupling of scalar and gauge fields with gravity: an entropy current and linearized second law*, *JHEP* **12** (2022) 036 [[arXiv:2206.04538](#)].
- [21] S. Bhattacharyya, P. Dhivakar, A. Dinda, N. Kundu, M. Patra and S. Roy, *An entropy current and the second law in higher derivative theories of gravity*, *JHEP* **09** (2021) 169 [[arXiv:2105.06455](#)].
- [22] R.M. Wald, *Quantum Field Theory in Curved Space-Time and Black Hole Thermodynamics*, Chicago Lectures in Physics, University of Chicago Press, Chicago, IL (1995).
- [23] B. Carter, *Republication of: Black hole equilibrium states*, *Gen. Rel. Grav.* **41** (2009) 2873.
- [24] S.W. Hawking and J.B. Hartle, *Energy and angular momentum flow into a black hole*, *Commun. Math. Phys.* **27** (1972) 283.
- [25] S. Gao and R.M. Wald, *The 'Physical process' version of the first law and the generalized second law for charged and rotating black holes*, *Phys. Rev. D* **64** (2001) 084020 [[gr-qc/0106071](#)].

- [26] A. Rignon-Bret, *Note on the physical process first law of black hole mechanics*, *Phys. Rev. D* **108** (2023) 024005 [arXiv:2303.06731].
- [27] T. Jacobson, *On the nature of black hole entropy*, *AIP Conf. Proc.* **493** (1999) 85 [gr-qc/9908031].
- [28] T. Jacobson and R. Parentani, *Horizon entropy*, *Found. Phys.* **33** (2003) 323 [gr-qc/0302099].
- [29] A.J. Amsel, D. Marolf and A. Virmani, *The Physical Process First Law for Bifurcate Killing Horizons*, *Phys. Rev. D* **77** (2008) 024011 [arXiv:0708.2738].
- [30] S. Sarkar and A.C. Wall, *Generalized second law at linear order for actions that are functions of Lovelock densities*, *Phys. Rev. D* **88** (2013) 044017 [arXiv:1306.1623].
- [31] S. Bhattacharjee, S. Sarkar and A.C. Wall, *Holographic entropy increases in quadratic curvature gravity*, *Phys. Rev. D* **92** (2015) 064006 [arXiv:1504.04706].
- [32] A. Mishra, S. Chakraborty, A. Ghosh and S. Sarkar, *On the physical process first law for dynamical black holes*, *JHEP* **09** (2018) 034 [arXiv:1709.08925].
- [33] T. Jacobson, G. Kang and R.C. Myers, *On black hole entropy*, *Phys. Rev. D* **49** (1994) 6587 [gr-qc/9312023].
- [34] A. Rignon-Bret, *Second law from the Noether current on null hypersurfaces*, *Phys. Rev. D* **108** (2023) 044069 [arXiv:2303.07262].
- [35] V. Chandrasekaran, E.E. Flanagan and K. Prabhu, *Symmetries and charges of general relativity at null boundaries*, *JHEP* **11** (2018) 125 [arXiv:1807.11499].
- [36] L. Ciambelli, L. Freidel and R.G. Leigh, *Null Raychaudhuri: canonical structure and the dressing time*, *JHEP* **01** (2024) 166 [arXiv:2309.03932].
- [37] R.M. Wald and A. Zoupas, *A General definition of 'conserved quantities' in general relativity and other theories of gravity*, *Phys. Rev. D* **61** (2000) 084027 [gr-qc/9911095].
- [38] D. Harlow and J.-Q. Wu, *Covariant phase space with boundaries*, *JHEP* **10** (2020) 146 [arXiv:1906.08616].
- [39] L. Freidel, M. Geiller and D. Pranzetti, *Edge modes of gravity. Part II. Corner metric and Lorentz charges*, *JHEP* **11** (2020) 027 [arXiv:2007.03563].
- [40] L. Freidel, M. Geiller and D. Pranzetti, *Edge modes of gravity. Part III. Corner simplicity constraints*, *JHEP* **01** (2021) 100 [arXiv:2007.12635].
- [41] K. Shi, X. Wang, Y. Xiu and H. Zhang, *Covariant phase space with null boundaries*, *Commun. Theor. Phys.* **73** (2021) 125401 [arXiv:2008.10551].
- [42] V. Chandrasekaran and A.J. Speranza, *Anomalies in gravitational charge algebras of null boundaries and black hole entropy*, *JHEP* **01** (2021) 137 [arXiv:2009.10739].
- [43] L. Freidel, R. Oliveri, D. Pranzetti and S. Speziale, *Extended corner symmetry, charge bracket and Einstein's equations*, *JHEP* **09** (2021) 083 [arXiv:2104.12881].
- [44] R.M. Wald, *General Relativity*, Chicago Univ. Pr., Chicago, USA (1984), 10.7208/chicago/9780226870373.001.0001.

- [45] B. Carter, *Mathematical foundations of the theory of relativistic stellar and black hole configurations*, in *Gravitation in Astrophysics: Cargèse 1986*, B. Carter and J.B. Hartle, eds., (Boston, MA), p. 63, Springer US (1987), DOI.
- [46] G. Compère, *An introduction to the mechanics of black holes*, in *2nd Modave Summer School in Theoretical Physics*, 11, 2006 [[gr-qc/0611129](#)].
- [47] E. Poisson, *A Relativist's Toolkit: The Mathematics of Black-Hole Mechanics*, Cambridge University Press (12, 2009), 10.1017/CBO9780511606601.
- [48] B.S. Kay and R.M. Wald, *Theorems on the Uniqueness and Thermal Properties of Stationary, Nonsingular, Quasifree States on Space-Times with a Bifurcate Killing Horizon*, *Phys. Rept.* **207** (1991) 49.
- [49] G. Barnich and F. Brandt, *Covariant theory of asymptotic symmetries, conservation laws and central charges*, *Nucl. Phys. B* **633** (2002) 3 [[hep-th/0111246](#)].
- [50] G. Barnich and C. Troessaert, *Aspects of the BMS/CFT correspondence*, *JHEP* **05** (2010) 062 [[arXiv:1001.1541](#)].
- [51] H. Adami, M.M. Sheikh-Jabbari, V. Taghiloo, H. Yavartanoo and C. Zwickel, *Symmetries at null boundaries: two and three dimensional gravity cases*, *JHEP* **10** (2020) 107 [[arXiv:2007.12759](#)].
- [52] G. Compère, P. Mao, A. Seraj and M.M. Sheikh-Jabbari, *Symplectic and Killing symmetries of AdS_3 gravity: holographic vs boundary gravitons*, *JHEP* **01** (2016) 080 [[arXiv:1511.06079](#)].
- [53] W. Donnelly and L. Freidel, *Local subsystems in gauge theory and gravity*, *JHEP* **09** (2016) 102 [[arXiv:1601.04744](#)].
- [54] S. Gao, *The First law of black hole mechanics in Einstein-Maxwell and Einstein-Yang-Mills theories*, *Phys. Rev. D* **68** (2003) 044016 [[gr-qc/0304094](#)].
- [55] T. Jacobson and G. Kang, *Conformal invariance of black hole temperature*, *Class. Quant. Grav.* **10** (1993) L201 [[gr-qc/9307002](#)].
- [56] A. Belin, R.C. Myers, S.-M. Ruan, G. Sárosi and A.J. Speranza, *Complexity equals anything II*, *JHEP* **01** (2023) 154 [[arXiv:2210.09647](#)].
- [57] C.C. Dyer and E. Honig, *Conformal Killing horizons*, *Journal of Mathematical Physics* **20** (1979) 409.
- [58] T. Jacobson and M. Visser, *Gravitational Thermodynamics of Causal Diamonds in $(A)dS$* , *SciPost Phys.* **7** (2019) 079 [[arXiv:1812.01596](#)].
- [59] A. Ashtekar, C. Beetle and S. Fairhurst, *Mechanics of isolated horizons*, *Class. Quant. Grav.* **17** (2000) 253 [[gr-qc/9907068](#)].
- [60] A. Ashtekar and B. Krishnan, *Isolated and dynamical horizons and their applications*, *Living Rev. Rel.* **7** (2004) 10 [[gr-qc/0407042](#)].
- [61] S. Hollands, A.D. Kovács and H.S. Reall, *The second law of black hole mechanics in effective field theory*, [[arXiv:2205.15341](#)].
- [62] R.D. Sorkin, *Two topics concerning black holes: Extremality of the energy, fractality of the horizon*, in *Heat Kernels and Quantum Gravity*, 8, 1995 [[gr-qc/9508002](#)].

- [63] S.W. Hawking and G.F.R. Ellis, *The Large Scale Structure of Space-Time*, Cambridge Monographs on Mathematical Physics, Cambridge University Press (2, 2023), 10.1017/9781009253161.
- [64] S.A. Hayward, *General laws of black hole dynamics*, *Phys. Rev. D* **49** (1994) 6467.
- [65] A. Ashtekar and B. Krishnan, *Dynamical horizons: Energy, angular momentum, fluxes and balance laws*, *Phys. Rev. Lett.* **89** (2002) 261101 [gr-qc/0207080].
- [66] J. Lee and R.M. Wald, *Local symmetries and constraints*, *J. Math. Phys.* **31** (1990) 725.
- [67] S. Hollands and R.M. Wald, *Stability of Black Holes and Black Branes*, *Commun. Math. Phys.* **321** (2013) 629 [arXiv:1201.0463].
- [68] V. Iyer and R.M. Wald, *A Comparison of Noether charge and Euclidean methods for computing the entropy of stationary black holes*, *Phys. Rev. D* **52** (1995) 4430 [gr-qc/9503052].
- [69] R.M. Wald, *On identically closed forms locally constructed from a field*, *Journal of Mathematical Physics* **31** (1990) 2378
<http://aip.scitation.org/doi/10.1063/1.528839>.
- [70] Z. Yan, “Black Hole Entropy in Higher Curvature Gravity with Higher Spin Fields.” In preparation.
- [71] T. Jacobson, G. Kang and R.C. Myers, *Increase of black hole entropy in higher curvature gravity*, *Phys. Rev. D* **52** (1995) 3518 [gr-qc/9503020].
- [72] T. Azeyanagi, G. Compère, N. Ogawa, Y. Tachikawa and S. Terashima, *Higher-Derivative Corrections to the Asymptotic Virasoro Symmetry of 4d Extremal Black Holes*, *Prog. Theor. Phys.* **122** (2009) 355 [arXiv:0903.4176].
- [73] P. Bueno, P.A. Cano, V.S. Min and M.R. Visser, *Aspects of general higher-order gravities*, *Phys. Rev. D* **95** (2017) 044010 [arXiv:1610.08519].