

Probing decoupled throats of AdS_D Black Holes in $D=6, 7^*$

Weichao Bu (卜维超)[†] Yang Lei (雷扬)[‡]

Institute for Advanced Study & School of Physical Science and Technology, Soochow University, No.1 Shizi Street, Suzhou 215006, P.R. China

Abstract: The Kerr/CFT correspondence establishes a correspondence between extremal black holes in higher dimensions and a chiral conformal field theory (CFT) in their near-horizon limit. A generalization of this framework, known as the EVH/CFT correspondence, has been developed for four- and five-dimensional AdS black holes. It was further proposed in [1] that, for $\text{AdS}_{D=6,7}$ black holes, a generalized duality between $(D-2)$ -dimensional geometry and $(D-3)$ -dimensional field theory may emerge in a suitably defined extremal vanishing horizon (EVH) limit. In this work, we show that, in the EVH limit, the near-EVH geometries of these $\text{AdS}_{D=6,7}$ black holes reduce to lower-dimensional black holes whose metrics are conformally related to solutions of Einstein-Maxwell-Maxwell-dilaton (EMMD) gravity. This structural resemblance suggests a potential route toward the microscopic counting of non-AdS black hole entropy via higher-dimensional AdS/CFT techniques.

Keywords: Black holes, AdS/CFT, Holography

DOI: 10.1088/1674-1137/ae5ef2 **CSTR:**

I. INTRODUCTION

To date, all gravitational-wave observations of black-hole mergers have been consistent with the Kerr description of black holes [2]. Understanding the quantum effects associated with Kerr black holes is therefore crucial for identifying potential signatures of quantum gravity. A major observational milestone is the confirmation of Hawking's area theorem [3], which states that the total event horizon area of black holes cannot decrease over time. In particular, recent observations demonstrate that the final horizon area after a merger exceeds the sum of the areas of the two initial black holes [4, 5].

Understanding the microscopic states of black holes is a cornerstone test for any candidate theory of quantum gravity. Two main approaches have been developed to study this problem across different frameworks.

- The $\text{AdS}_3/\text{CFT}_2$ correspondence provides a particularly transparent setting, since the powerful Virasoro symmetry completely determines the microscopic states of black holes in the near-horizon region [6]. This idea was later generalized to higher-dimensional extremal

black holes through the Kerr/CFT correspondence [7] (and further to the extremal black hole/CFT correspondence [8–10]). These correspondences assert that the generic AdS_2 geometry emerging in the near-horizon limit of extremal black holes admits boundary conditions under which a Virasoro algebra governs the dynamics, independently of the details of the higher-dimensional black hole in the UV¹⁾.

- Within the $\text{AdS}_{d+1}/\text{CFT}_d$ ($d = D - 1 > 2$) framework, the microscopic states of AdS black holes can be reproduced by counting gauge-invariant operators in the dual superconformal field theories. Remarkable progress has been made in understanding black holes in AdS_4 [12–16], AdS_5 [17–20], AdS_6 [14, 21], and AdS_7 [19, 22–24]. See [25] for a recent review. Most of these studies focus on BPS black holes, for which the counting of gauge-invariant states in the dual weakly coupled field theory remains valid. An exception is [26], which undertakes a field-theoretic computation to understand the entropy of near-BPS AdS_5 black holes.

The two approaches have been investigated in a unified framework for BPS black holes in AdS_D spacetimes.

Received 1 January 2026; Accepted 13 April 2026

* Supported by National Natural Science Foundation of China (NSFC) No.12305081, the Priority Academic Program Development of Jiangsu Higher Education Institutions (PAPD), and the NSFC-Royal Society International Collaboration Grant No.W2421035

[†] E-mail: ring6030asdfghj@gmail.com

[‡] E-mail: leiyang@suda.edu.cn

1) There are also extensions of this idea to non-extremal black holes, where the Virasoro symmetry is realized as a geometric symmetry of the phase space of perturbations [11].



Content from this work may be used under the terms of the Creative Commons Attribution 3.0 licence. Any further distribution of this work must maintain attribution to the author(s) and the title of the work, journal citation and DOI. Article funded by SCOAP³ and published under licence by Chinese Physical Society and the Institute of High Energy Physics of the Chinese Academy of Sciences and the Institute of Modern Physics of the Chinese Academy of Sciences and IOP Publishing Ltd

Two possible perspectives have been considered in the literature. One is to consider gravitational Cardy limits [27], in which the charges and angular momenta are rescaled so as to render the black hole ultra-spinning. The near-horizon geometry in these limits is generically of AdS₂ or AdS₃ type [28, 29], where the Virasoro algebra can determine the dynamics in the near-horizon limit. Another approach builds on earlier studies of the Extremal Vanishing Horizon (EVH) limit of black holes [30–41] and explores AdS₅ black holes in the BPS-EVH limit [1]. In the EVH limit, the black hole area $S_0 \sim A$ is taken to zero while the central charge c diverges, so that the product cA remains fixed. Given the expansion of the entropy S in terms of the temperature T :

$$S(T, Q_i, J_a) = S_0(Q_i, J_a) + S_1(Q_i, J_a)T + S_2(Q_i, J_a)T^2 + \dots, \quad (1)$$

The dynamics of the extremal black hole can be activated in this limit by setting $S_0 = 0$, thereby circumventing the instability problem associated with AdS₂ geometry [42], and the geometry is enhanced to AdS₃ if $S_1 \neq 0$. In the supersymmetric AdS₅ black hole model, an extremal pinched BTZ black hole emerges in the near-EVH regime, consistent with the $S \sim T$ relation [1, 30–32, 34–37]. Moreover, since the microscopic states of the AdS₅ black hole can be computed via the superconformal indices of $\mathcal{N} = 4$ SYM, the authors of [1] demonstrated that a Cardy-like formula—used to count the degeneracies of states in an emergent CFT₂ [43]—can be derived from the inverse Laplace transform of the $\mathcal{N} = 4$ superconformal indices. This work represents a significant step toward proving the Kerr/CFT correspondence from the perspective of AdS/CFT, at least in the BPS limit. However, neither of these works can be considered to complete the proof of Kerr/CFT from AdS/CFT, since the mechanism underlying the emergent Virasoro algebra remains unclear.

An interesting generalization of EVH black holes proposed in [1, 30–41] involves emergent EVH configurations in the IR limit of AdS₆ [44] and AdS₇ black holes [45, 46]. These black holes can be appropriately embedded in ten-dimensional string theory and eleven-dimensional M-theory [47, 48]. The extremal limit of higher-dimensional AdS black holes requires more charges and angular momenta to be supported [8, 49, 50]. This is because gravitational interactions are stronger in higher dimensions, which requires more gauge forces or rotations to balance and achieve extremal black holes.

On the other hand, when more charges and spatial dimensions are present, we might expect that (1) can exhibit higher-order scalings, $S \sim T^2$ or $S \sim T^3$, by fine-tuning the charges and angular momenta, i.e., setting $S_0(Q_i, J_a) = S_1(Q_i, J_a) = 0$ [31, 32, 35]. However, we will

clarify that near-EVH black holes in rotating AdS₆ and AdS₇ can be defined without being restricted to the near-BPS limit, as previously proposed in [1], and can instead be realized through general near-extremal limits. We carefully examine the scaling relations between entropy S and temperature T for these black holes. Our analysis shows that their near-horizon geometries, in both $D = 6$ and $D = 7$, reduce to lower-dimensional black holes whose metrics are conformally equivalent to those of Einstein–Maxwell–Maxwell–Dilaton (EMMD) gravity, suggesting a close connection. These black holes emerging from EVH limits no longer have AdS asymptotics. However, as the microscopic states of supersymmetric AdS_{6,7} black holes can be reproduced from the dual SCFT, we should, in principle, use the higher-dimensional SCFTs to understand the quantum states dual to these EMMD black holes. This may be an essential step toward understanding holographic duals of non-AdS black holes.

The paper is organized as follows. In Section 2, we review the concept of near-EVH limits for Kerr–AdS₅ black holes based on [1, 32, 35]. In Sections 3.1 and 3.2, we investigate the near-EVH phases in AdS₆ and AdS₇ black holes, respectively, within this geometric framework. Specifically, for AdS₆, the near-EVH geometry corresponds to a four-dimensional EMMD black hole with $S \sim T^2$. In AdS₇, we find both $S \sim T$ and $S \sim T^3$ configurations, which are realized as a BTZ black hole and a five-dimensional EMMD black hole, respectively. Finally, in Section 4, we discuss the holographic implications of these near-EVH limits, and conclude in Section 5.

II. REVIEW OF AdS₅

Investigations of the (near-)EVH limits of AdS₅ black holes were initiated for static R-charged solutions in [30, 34] and further developed in [31]. Subsequent studies of the EVH limits of Kerr–RN–AdS₅ black holes and their dual field-theory interpretations began with [32], while an index-based account of the emergent IR CFT₂ and its entropy was later provided in [1]. Generic AdS₅ black holes in U(1)³ gauged supergravity carry three charges and two angular momenta. The most general non-supersymmetric solution of this type was constructed in [51], building on earlier works [52–56]. However, the full generality of these solutions renders them rather complicated. For the purpose of capturing the essential physics of near-EVH limits and their holographic interpretation via superconformal indices [1], it suffices to consider the simpler special solutions presented in [32, 54]. We therefore restrict our analysis to these special cases.

The black hole solution under consideration, studied in [1, 10], carries two equal charges and is described by the following five-dimensional metric [54]:

$$\begin{aligned}
ds_5^2 &= H^{-\frac{4}{3}} \left[-\frac{X}{\rho^2} (dt - a \sin^2 \theta \frac{d\phi}{\Xi_a} - b \cos^2 \theta \frac{d\psi}{\Xi_b})^2 + \frac{C}{\rho^2} \left(\frac{ab}{f_3} dt - \frac{b}{f_2} \sin^2 \theta \frac{d\phi}{\Xi_a} - \frac{a}{f_1} \cos^2 \theta \frac{d\psi}{\Xi_b} \right)^2 \right. \\
&\quad \left. + \frac{Z \sin^2 \theta}{\rho^2} \left(\frac{a}{f_3} dt - \frac{1}{f_2} \frac{d\phi}{\Xi_a} \right)^2 + \frac{W \cos^2 \theta}{\rho^2} \left(\frac{b}{f_3} dt - \frac{1}{f_1} \frac{d\psi}{\Xi_b} \right)^2 \right] + H^{\frac{2}{3}} \left[\frac{\rho^2}{X} dr^2 + \frac{\rho^2}{\Delta_\theta} d\theta^2 \right], \\
H &= 1 + \frac{q}{\rho^2}, \quad \rho^2 = r^2 + a^2 \cos^2 \theta + b^2 \sin^2 \theta, \quad \Delta_\theta = 1 - a^2 \cos^2 \theta - b^2 \sin^2 \theta \\
f_1 &= a^2 + r^2, \quad f_2 = b^2 + r^2, \quad f_3 = (a^2 + r^2)(b^2 + r^2) + qr^2, \\
X &= \frac{(a^2 + r^2)(b^2 + r^2)}{r^2} - 2m + (a^2 + r^2 + q)(b^2 + r^2 + q), \\
C &= f_1 f_2 \left(X + 2m - \frac{q^2}{\rho^2} \right), \quad \Xi_a = 1 - a^2, \quad \Xi_b = 1 - b^2, \\
Z &= -b^2 C + \frac{f_2 f_3}{r^2} [f_3 - r^2(a^2 - b^2)(a^2 + r^2 + q) \cos^2 \theta], \\
W &= -a^2 C + \frac{f_1 f_3}{r^2} [f_3 + r^2(a^2 - b^2)(b^2 + r^2 + q) \sin^2 \theta]. \tag{2}
\end{aligned}$$

The corresponding thermodynamic quantities are as follows:

$$\begin{aligned}
\Omega_a &= \frac{a(r_+^4 + r_+^2 b^2 + r_+^2 q + b^2 + r_+^2)}{(r_+^2 + a^2)(r_+^2 + b^2) + qr_+^2}, \quad \Omega_b = \frac{b(r_+^4 + r_+^2 a^2 + r_+^2 q + a^2 + r_+^2)}{(r_+^2 + a^2)(r_+^2 + b^2) + qr_+^2}, \quad \Phi_1 = \Phi_2 = \frac{\sqrt{q^2 + 2mqr_+^2}}{(r_+^2 + a^2)(r_+^2 + b^2) + qr_+^2}, \\
\Phi_3 &= \frac{qab}{(r_+^2 + a^2)(r_+^2 + b^2) + qr_+^2}, \quad J_a = \frac{\pi a(2m + q\Xi_b)}{4G_N \Xi_b \Xi_a^2}, \quad J_b = \frac{\pi b(2m + q\Xi_a)}{4G_N \Xi_a \Xi_b^2}, \quad Q_1 = Q_2 = \frac{\pi \sqrt{q^2 + 2mq}}{4G_N \Xi_a \Xi_b}, \\
Q_3 &= -\frac{\pi abq}{4G_N \Xi_a \Xi_b}, \quad S = \frac{\pi^2 [(r_+^2 + a^2)(r_+^2 + b^2) + qr_+^2]}{2G_N \Xi_a \Xi_b r_+}, \quad T = \frac{2r_+^6 + r_+^4(1 + a^2 + b^2 + 2q) - a^2 b^2}{2\pi r_+ [(r_+^2 + a^2)(r_+^2 + b^2) + qr_+^2]}, \\
E &= \frac{\pi}{8G_N \Xi_a^2 \Xi_b^2} [2m(2\Xi_a + 2\Xi_b - \Xi_a \Xi_b) + q(2\Xi_a^2 + 2\Xi_b^2 + 2\Xi_a \Xi_b - \Xi_a^2 \Xi_b - \Xi_b^2 \Xi_a)]. \tag{3}
\end{aligned}$$

This solution is parametrized by four independent parameters, (a, b, m, q) , and we set the cosmological constant to $g = 1$. Here the Newton constant G_N is related to the rank of the $SU(N)$ gauge group in $\mathcal{N} = 4$ SYM by $\frac{\pi}{2G_N} = N^2$. These expressions fully characterize the thermodynamic state of the black hole. The solution and its thermodynamic data play a central role in the subsequent analysis of the near-EVH limit and the emergence of an effective two-dimensional conformal description.

The EVH and near-EVH limits are defined as in [32]¹⁾

$$\text{EVH} : a = r_+ = 0; \quad \text{near-EVH} : a = \lambda \epsilon^2, \quad r = \epsilon x, \tag{4}$$

where the $\epsilon \rightarrow 0$ limit is taken alongside the near-horizon limit. The EVH point is treated as the ground state, while the near-EVH limit can be regarded as an excited sector of the theory, since it has a non-vanishing temperature of order ϵ . The corresponding geometries in the (near-)EVH

limits are, respectively, a pinched AdS₃ and a BTZ black hole. The entropy of the BTZ black hole scales as $S \sim N^2 \epsilon$, which remains finite if we keep $N^2 \epsilon$ fixed as $N \rightarrow \infty$. For the classical description of gravity to be valid, $N^2 \epsilon$ should be taken to be large.

We are especially interested in the near-EVH limit combined with the BPS condition, which incorporates supersymmetry

$$E = J_a + J_b + Q_1 + Q_2 + Q_3, \tag{5}$$

and the extremality condition, which requires the horizons to be degenerate. The chemical potentials that satisfy the supersymmetry condition are generically complex, and it is useful to define the following chemical potentials:

$$\Delta_i = \beta(1 - \Phi_i), \quad \omega_I = \beta(1 - \Omega_I), \quad i = 1, 2, 3; \quad I = 1, 2, \tag{6}$$

1) The EVH limit is defined by $b = r_+ = 0$ in [1] and remains valid in the $q = 0$ limit. Due to the symmetry between the a and b parameters, this does not change the essential physics.

and are subject to the linear constraint:

$$\Delta_1 + \Delta_2 + \Delta_3 - \omega_a - \omega_b = 2\pi i. \quad (7)$$

This renders the parameters (q, m) generically complex unless the radius of the horizon is determined by a real constraint.

$$r_0^2 = \frac{ab}{1+a+b}. \quad (8)$$

This condition eliminates closed timelike curves in space-time. Solutions that satisfy both the supersymmetry condition (5) and the horizon-size condition (8) have real charges and entropy and are parametrized by (q, m) as

$$\begin{aligned} q &= \frac{(a+b)(1+a)(1+b)}{1+a+b}, \\ m &= \frac{(a+b)^2(1+a)(1+b)(2+a+b)}{2(1+a+b)}. \end{aligned} \quad (9)$$

Combining the BPS conditions (5) and (8) with the EVH conditions (4), we find that the entropy of the black hole is given by

$$S = \frac{\pi b}{1-b} \sqrt{\frac{b\lambda}{1+b}} N^2 \epsilon. \quad (10)$$

The corresponding decoupling metric for AdS₅ takes the following form:

$$\begin{aligned} ds^2 &= \left(\frac{h}{\sin\theta}\right)^{-\frac{4}{3}} \left[h^2 ds_3^2 + h^2 \frac{b^2 d\theta^2}{1-b^2 \sin^2\theta} \right. \\ &\quad \left. + \frac{1-b^2 \sin^2\theta \cos^2\theta}{(1-b)^2 \sin^2\theta} d\tilde{\psi}^2 \right], \\ h &= \sin\theta + \frac{1}{b \sin\theta}, \quad \tilde{\psi} = \psi - (1-b)t, \end{aligned} \quad (11)$$

where, in the EVH limit, ds_3^2 is taken to be the metric of AdS₃

$$ds_3^2 = -\frac{x^2}{\ell_3^2} d\tau^2 + \frac{\ell_3^2}{x^2} dx^2 + x^2 d\tilde{\chi}^2, \quad \ell_3 = \frac{b}{1+b}, \quad t = \frac{1+b}{b} \tau, \quad (12)$$

In the near-EVH case, however, ds_3^2 is replaced by the extremal BTZ geometry:

$$ds_3^2 = -\frac{(x^2 - x_0^2)^2}{\ell_3^2 x^2} d\tau^2 + \frac{\ell_3^2 x^2 dx^2}{(x^2 - x_0^2)^2} + x^2 \left(d\tilde{\chi} - \frac{x_0^2}{\ell_3 x^2} d\tau \right)^2. \quad (13)$$

This geometry is called pinched because the periodicity

of the S^1 direction, $\tilde{\chi} = \epsilon\phi$, is $2\pi\epsilon$.

We are now ready to explain the entropy (10) of the BPS-EVH black hole from computations in the dual $\mathcal{N} = 4$ SYM, using (13) and following [1]. It has been shown in various works [17–20, 57] that the entropy functional in the large- N limit of $\mathcal{N} = 4$ SYM is

$$\begin{aligned} S &= \ln Z + (J_a + Q_3)\omega_a + (J_b + Q_3)\omega_b + (Q_1 - Q_3)\Delta_1 \\ &\quad + (Q_2 - Q_3)\Delta_2 + 2\pi i Q_3 \\ \ln Z &= \frac{N^2}{2} \frac{\Delta_1 \Delta_2 \Delta_3}{\omega_a \omega_b}, \quad \Delta_1 + \Delta_2 + \Delta_3 - \omega_1 - \omega_b = 2\pi i, \end{aligned} \quad (14)$$

where the chemical potentials are taken to be complex to avoid cancellations between the bosonic and fermionic degrees of freedom [12]. Upon performing a saddle-point approximation with respect to the chemical potentials $\Delta_i, \omega_a, \omega_b$, one finds that the entropy functional (14) reproduces the BPS black-hole entropy [56].

$$S = 2\pi \sqrt{Q_1 Q_2 + Q_1 Q_3 + Q_2 Q_3 - \frac{N^2}{2}(J_a + J_b)}. \quad (15)$$

The entropy formula (15) is consistent with that for the black hole with two equal charges (3) in the BPS limit. Therefore, the BPS-EVH limit of the entropy (10) should also be encoded in the superconformal indices of $\mathcal{N} = 4$ SYM and in the entropy functional (14).

As shown in [1], the near-EVH limit splits the extremization of the entropy functional within the saddle-point approximation into two steps. In the large- N limit, with the EVH condition $N^2\epsilon$ held fixed, the charges scale as $Q_3 \sim J_a \sim N^2\epsilon^2$, while $Q_{1,2} \sim J_b \sim N^2$. Under this scaling, the saddle-point approximation of the functional in (14) is justified only for $\Delta_{1,2}$ and ω_b , but not for ω_a . Therefore, setting $\Delta_1 = \Delta_2 = \Delta$ in the solution (2) and performing the ω_b and Δ integrals first, we obtain

$$e^S = \int d\omega_a \exp \left[\frac{N^2 \hat{\Delta}^2}{2\omega_a} \left(\frac{\hat{\Delta}}{\hat{\omega}_b} - 1 \right) + 2\pi i Q_3 \right] e^{\omega_a (J_a + Q_3)}, \quad (16)$$

where $\hat{\Delta}$ and $\hat{\omega}_b$ denote the values of the chemical potentials that satisfy the saddle-point equations. The expression (16) closely resembles the Cardy formula of a two-dimensional CFT. It may be viewed as a functional of the rescaled modulus $\tilde{\omega}_a = \epsilon\omega_a$. Since $N^2\epsilon$ is fixed and large, the extremization over $\tilde{\omega}_a$ is justified and precisely reproduces the near-EVH entropy given in (10).

This computation strongly supports the emergence of an effective two-dimensional conformal field theory in the near-horizon limit. The resulting EVH 2D CFT is closely related to the Kerr/CFT correspondence, although their central charges differ by a factor of $\sqrt{2}$, a discrepancy that may stem from different choices of time

coordinate between AdS₅ and AdS₃ [1, 30, 32, 34]. This result should therefore be viewed as a key first step toward uncovering the microscopic mechanism underlying the Kerr/CFT correspondence within the framework of AdS/CFT.

However, this does not constitute sufficient evidence to claim that the EVH/CFT correspondence (a more special version of the Kerr/CFT correspondence) has been derived from AdS/CFT. First, although the central charge in the Cardy formula matches that of Kerr/CFT, its origin on the field-theory side remains obscure. It is unclear how this central charge, which is geometrically defined by the AdS₂ throat in the gravity picture, can be derived from the algebraic data of $\mathcal{N} = 4$ SYM, such as operator conformal dimensions or the central charge of $\mathcal{N} = 4$ SYM. Second, it is not understood how operators transforming under the 4D superconformal algebra PSU(2, 2|4) organize into representations of the Virasoro algebra¹⁾. This conceptual tension is reflected in the mismatch between the local symmetries of AdS₅ in the UV and AdS₃ in the IR. Moreover, it remains unclear whether the general SL(3, \mathbb{Z}) families of AdS black holes corresponding to root-of-unity configurations [58–67] admit such a near-EVH decoupling limit. These issues will not be discussed in this paper.

III. AdS BLACK HOLES IN D = 6, 7

AdS_D black holes in D = 6 and 7 dimensions exhibit a considerably richer structure than their four- and five-dimensional counterparts. Of particular interest are solutions that either possess known holographic duals or admit consistent embeddings into string theory. Notable examples include AdS₆ black holes with two independent angular momenta and one R-charge [44], as well as AdS₇ black holes carrying up to three angular momenta and two distinct R-charges [46]. This classification closely mirrors the properties of superconformal field theories in d = 5 and 6 dimensions [68]. Moreover, these black hole solutions are of intrinsic interest owing to their realizations as specific brane configurations in string theory or M-theory [47, 48].

The metric of AdS_D can be expressed in coordinates comprising the time t and radial coordinate r , together with $\lfloor \frac{D-1}{2} \rfloor$ azimuthal angles ϕ_i and $\lfloor \frac{D-2}{2} \rfloor$ latitude coordinates y_α on the sphere. To be precise, we set $D = 2n + 1$ for odd dimensions and $D = 2n$ for even dimensions. The coordinates y_α are related to the direction cosines μ_i of the unit sphere $S^{\lfloor D/2 \rfloor}$ via the Jacobi transformation:

$$\mu_i^2 = \frac{\prod_{\alpha=1}^{n-1} (a_i^2 - y_\alpha^2)}{\prod_{k \neq i} (a_i^2 - a_k^2)}, \quad i = 1, \dots, \left\lfloor \frac{D-1}{2} \right\rfloor, \quad (17)$$

This automatically satisfies the constraint $\sum_{i=1}^{\lfloor D/2 \rfloor} \mu_i^2 = 1$. Here, each a_i parametrizes a rotation in the corresponding ϕ_i direction. The symbol \prod' indicates that the product omits any vanishing factor. In the case of even D , we set $a_n = 0$. This coordinate system, introduced in [50], provides a natural framework for generalizing Kerr–AdS black holes to include NUT charges. It also offers several structural advantages: for example, the metric on S^{D-2} becomes diagonal in these coordinates, and the coordinates y_α and r appear in a highly symmetric manner throughout the metric.

In this section, we describe the corresponding (near-)EVH limits of the AdS_D black holes with $D = 6, 7$. An analysis of the thermodynamics of these black holes indicates that they exhibit $S \sim T^{D-4}$ scaling in the near-BPS and near-EVH limits [1]. These scaling relations between entropy and temperature were conjectured to hint at a possible AdS_{D-2}/CFT_{D-3} duality emerging in the IR. In this section, we primarily provide two clarifications regarding these models.

- The near-BPS condition is not required to define the near-EVH limits.

- The near-EVH geometry is not that of AdS_{D-2} black holes, but rather that of black holes which are solutions to EMD theories [69] on a $(D-2)$ -dimensional manifold.

A. AdS₆ black hole

The AdS₆ black hole is a solution of the $\mathcal{N} = 4$ SU(2) gauged supergravity theory in six dimensions, which includes a graviton, a two-form potential, a scalar, a one-form potential, and the SU(2) Yang–Mills gauge potential. The bosonic part of the Lagrangian is given by [44, 70]

$$\begin{aligned} \mathcal{L}_6 = & R \star 1 - \frac{1}{2} \star d\varphi \wedge d\varphi - \frac{1}{2X^2} \left(\star F_{(2)} \wedge F_{(2)} + \star F'_{(2)} \wedge F'_{(2)} \right) \\ & - \frac{1}{2} X^4 \star F_{(3)} \wedge F_{(3)} + \left(9X^2 + \frac{12}{X^2} - \frac{1}{X^6} \right) \star 1 \\ & - A_{(2)} \wedge \left(\frac{1}{2} dA_{(1)} \wedge dA_{(1)} + \frac{1}{\sqrt{2}} A_{(2)} \wedge dA_{(1)} \right. \\ & \left. + \frac{1}{3} A_{(2)} \wedge A_{(2)} + \frac{1}{2} F'_{(2)} \wedge F'_{(2)} \right). \end{aligned} \quad (18)$$

For convenience, we adopt the following ansatz to de-

1) Evidence suggests that the emergence of the Virasoro algebra in the near-EVH limit is tied to the chiral algebra mechanism [1], since one of the components of the Virasoro generators $J_a + Q_3$ is a Schur operator. However, the set of letters contributing to the entropy and transforming under the Virasoro algebra also includes non-Schur operators. Therefore, a generalization of the chiral algebra mechanism appears necessary to account for the Virasoro symmetry emerging in near-EVH limits.

scribe the AdS₆ black hole solutions of this theory.

$$y_\alpha = (y, z), \quad (a_1, a_2, a_3) \equiv (a, b, 0). \quad (19)$$

The charged, rotating AdS₆ solution in the asymptotic static frame is given by ¹⁾ [10, 44]

$$\begin{aligned} ds^2 = & H^{\frac{1}{2}} \left[\frac{(r^2 + y^2)(r^2 + z^2)}{X} dr^2 + \frac{(r^2 + y^2)(y^2 - z^2)}{Y} dy^2 \right. \\ & + \frac{(r^2 + z^2)(z^2 - y^2)}{Z} dz^2 - \frac{X}{H^2(r^2 + y^2)(r^2 + z^2)} \mathcal{A}^2 \\ & + \frac{Y}{(r^2 + y^2)(y^2 - z^2)} \left((1 + r^2)(1 - z^2)d\tilde{t} - (a^2 + r^2)(a^2 - z^2)d\tilde{\phi}_1 \right. \\ & \left. - (b^2 + r^2)(b^2 - z^2)d\tilde{\phi}_2 - \frac{qr\mathcal{A}}{H(r^2 + y^2)(r^2 + z^2)} \right)^2 \\ & + \frac{Z}{(r^2 + z^2)(z^2 - y^2)} \left((1 + r^2)(1 - y^2)d\tilde{t} - (a^2 + r^2)(a^2 - y^2)d\tilde{\phi}_1 \right. \\ & \left. \left. - (b^2 + r^2)(b^2 - y^2)d\tilde{\phi}_2 - \frac{qr\mathcal{A}}{H(r^2 + y^2)(r^2 + z^2)} \right)^2 \right], \quad (20) \end{aligned}$$

where the functions in the metric are explicitly specified

$$\begin{aligned} X &= (r^2 + a^2)(r^2 + b^2) + [r(r^2 + a^2) + q][r(r^2 + b^2) + q] - 2mr \\ Y &= -(1 - y^2)(a^2 - y^2)(b^2 - y^2), \\ Z &= -(1 - z^2)(a^2 - z^2)(b^2 - z^2) \\ H &= 1 + \frac{qr}{(r^2 + y^2)(r^2 + z^2)} \\ \mathcal{A} &= (1 - y^2)(1 - z^2)d\tilde{t} - (a^2 - y^2)(a^2 - z^2)d\tilde{\phi}_1 \\ &\quad - (b^2 - y^2)(b^2 - z^2)d\tilde{\phi}_2. \quad (21) \end{aligned}$$

Without loss of generality, following [44], we adopt the convention that the coordinates y and z are restricted to the region

$$-a \leq y \leq a \leq z \leq b. \quad (22)$$

The coordinates $\tilde{\phi}_i$ and \tilde{t} are related to the standard Boyer–Lindquist coordinates, in which the S^1 directions ϕ_i are 2π -periodic, via

$$\tilde{t} = \frac{t}{\Xi_a \Xi_b}, \quad \tilde{\phi}_1 = \frac{\phi_1}{a \Xi_a (a^2 - b^2)}, \quad \tilde{\phi}_2 = \frac{\phi_2}{b \Xi_b (b^2 - a^2)}. \quad (23)$$

This redefinition is introduced to simplify notation, fol-

lowing [50]. Thermodynamic quantities can be computed directly from the metric (20), yielding the following expressions [14, 44, 71, 72].

$$\begin{aligned} E &= \frac{2\pi m}{3G_N \Xi_a \Xi_b} \left[\frac{1}{\Xi_a} + \frac{1}{\Xi_b} + \frac{q}{2m} \left(1 + \frac{\Xi_b}{\Xi_a} + \frac{\Xi_a}{\Xi_b} \right) \right], \\ S &= \frac{2\pi^2 [(r_+^2 + a^2)(r_+^2 + b^2) + qr_+]}{3G_N \Xi_a \Xi_b}, \\ J_a &= \frac{2\pi m a}{3G_N \Xi_a^2 \Xi_b} \left(1 + \frac{\Xi_b q}{2m} \right), \quad J_b = \frac{2\pi m b}{3G_N \Xi_a \Xi_b^2} \left(1 + \frac{\Xi_a q}{2m} \right), \\ T &= \frac{2r_+^2 (1 + r_+^2) (2r_+^2 + a^2 + b^2) - (1 - r_+^2) (r_+^2 + a^2) (r_+^2 + b^2) + 4qr_+^3 - q^2}{4\pi r_+ [(r_+^2 + a^2)(r_+^2 + b^2) + qr_+]}, \\ \Omega_a &= \frac{a[(r_+^2 + 1)(r_+^2 + b^2) + qr_+]}{(r_+^2 + a^2)(r_+^2 + b^2) + qr_+}, \quad \Omega_b = \frac{b[(r_+^2 + 1)(r_+^2 + a^2) + qr_+]}{(r_+^2 + a^2)(r_+^2 + b^2) + qr_+}, \\ \Phi &= \frac{\sqrt{q^2 + 2mqr_+}}{(r_+^2 + a^2)(r_+^2 + b^2) + qr_+}, \quad Q = \frac{\pi \sqrt{q^2 + 2mq}}{G_N \Xi_a \Xi_b}. \quad (24) \end{aligned}$$

The Newton constant G_N is related to the field-theory constant by $\frac{27\sqrt{2}}{5\pi} \frac{N^{\frac{5}{2}}}{\sqrt{8 - N_f}} = G_N^{-1}$ [21], where N_f denotes the number of flavors. These quantities obey the first law of black-hole thermodynamics [44].

We are particularly interested in the (near-)EVH limit, where the extremal black-hole horizon scales as ϵ and $N^{\frac{5}{2}} \epsilon^2$ is held fixed so as to retain nontrivial dynamics. In this framework, the exact EVH limit corresponds to the ground state of the near-EVH geometry, characterized by a vanishing horizon. Achieving such a configuration requires careful parameter tuning, particularly because in spacetime dimensions $D \geq 6$, the existence of extremal AdS black holes typically requires additional charges and angular momenta to balance the gravitational potential.

The EVH limit is generically defined as:

$$a \equiv 0, \quad r = \epsilon x, \quad r_+ = \epsilon x_+, \quad t = \epsilon \tau, \quad q = 0. \quad (25)$$

The blackening factor exhibits a vanishing horizon for the following choice of parameters:

$$X(r) = (r^2 + b^2)(r^2 + 1)r^2, \quad (26)$$

This indicates that the limit yields the ground-state geometry. However, the function Y and the coordinate y in the metric (20) vanish within the definition domain (22), while $\tilde{\phi}_1$ becomes singular in the EVH limit (25). They therefore need to be appropriately normalized. The solution that is compatible with both the definition domain (22) and the Jacobi transformation (17) in this EVH limit is:

¹⁾ We use the static frame rather than the other ψ_i coordinates, as it is appropriate for computing thermodynamic quantities and is also suitable for taking the near-EVH limits later.

$$\begin{aligned} y &= a \cos \theta_1, \quad z = b \cos \theta_2, \quad a\tilde{\phi}_1 = -\frac{\phi_1}{b^2}, \\ 0 \leq \theta_1 &\leq \pi, \quad 0 \leq \theta_2 \leq \frac{\pi}{2}. \end{aligned} \quad (27)$$

The geometry yields

$$\begin{aligned} ds^2 &= -\frac{(1+r^2)(1-b^2 \cos^2 \theta_2)}{1-b^2} dt^2 + \frac{r^2+b^2 \cos^2 \theta_2}{(r^2+1)(r^2+b^2)} dr^2 \\ &+ r^2 \cos^2 \theta_2 (d\theta_1^2 + \sin^2 \theta_1 d\phi_1^2) \\ &+ \frac{r^2+b^2}{1-b^2} \sin^2 \theta_2 d\phi_2^2 + \frac{r^2+b^2 \cos^2 \theta_2}{1-b^2 \cos^2 \theta_2} d\theta_2^2. \end{aligned} \quad (28)$$

A special limit is $z \rightarrow b$, where the geometry manifestly decouples into global AdS₄, spanned by (t, r, θ_1, ϕ_1) , and an S^2 compact manifold spanned by (θ_2, ϕ_2) .

We are now ready to explore the near-EVH limit. This limit is implemented by the following scalings:

$$a = \lambda \epsilon^2, \quad q = bx_+ \epsilon + q^{(3)} \epsilon^3, \quad r_+ = \epsilon x_+ + y_3 \epsilon^3, \quad (29)$$

Together with the coordinate transformation (27), the range (22) is preserved. The scaling between a and ϵ was proposed as a possible generalization of the near-EVH limits found in the AdS₅ black hole counterparts [1]. The parameter $q^{(3)}$ must be chosen to guarantee the existence of the extremal horizon, where the temperature vanishes. To see this, we introduce an ϵ^3 -order perturbation of the radial coordinate in (29). The temperature T does not vanish at order ϵ for generic values of $q^{(3)}$, which results in the scaling relation $S \sim T^2$:

$$\begin{aligned} S &= \frac{2\pi^2 b x_+^2}{3G_N(1-b)} \epsilon^2 \\ T &= \frac{-2bx_+ q^{(3)} + (3+4b+3b^2)x_+^4 - b^2 \lambda^2 + 2y_3 b^2 x_+}{4\pi b(1+b)x_+^3} \epsilon + \mathcal{O}(\epsilon^3). \end{aligned} \quad (30)$$

The temperature vanishes at order ϵ if $q^{(3)}$ satisfies

$$q^{(3)} = \left(2 + \frac{3}{2b} + \frac{3b}{2}\right) x_+^3 - \frac{b\lambda^2}{2x_+} + y_3 b. \quad (31)$$

Higher-order terms in ϵ do not affect the expansion (30) or the extremality constraint (31). By iterating this procedure to fix the coefficients in the ϵ expansion, the black hole becomes a decoupled near-EVH extremal black hole. If the decoupling conditions do not satisfy (31), the near-EVH black holes are generically non-extremal.

Therefore, the near-EVH scaling relations are possible even without imposing the near-BPS condition proposed in [1]. In the near-EVH limit, the dynamics of in-

terest is restricted to

$$\frac{\epsilon^2}{G} \sim N^{\frac{5}{3}} \epsilon^2 \quad \text{fixed}, \quad \epsilon \rightarrow 0. \quad (32)$$

Although the $S \sim T^2$ scaling relation is not unique to the EVH limit, the particular scaling of a with ϵ was motivated by potential generalizations of near-EVH limits in the context of AdS₅ black holes [1]. Meanwhile, the scaling of q with ϵ is chosen to ensure the persistence of an extremal horizon in the limit. Moreover, this ansatz naturally incorporates near-BPS EVH limits without further adjustment.

The BPS limit of AdS₆ black holes and the corresponding field theory interpretation have been discussed in [14]. The supersymmetry condition yields

$$E = J_a + J_b + Q. \quad (33)$$

As in AdS₅ [1, 73], the parameter q that satisfies the supersymmetry condition is generically complex unless the BPS value of the horizon size r_0 is chosen:

$$q = (a+b+ab)r_+ - r_+^3 + i(1+a+b)(r_+^2 - r_0^2), \quad r_0^2 = \frac{ab}{1+a+b}. \quad (34)$$

The chemical potentials at the BPS points are defined as follows.

$$\Delta = \lim_{r_+ \rightarrow r_0} \beta(1-\Phi), \quad \omega_a = \lim_{r_+ \rightarrow r_0} \beta(1-\Omega_a), \quad \omega_b = \lim_{r_+ \rightarrow r_0} \beta(1-\Omega_b), \quad (35)$$

which are generically complex and subject to the condition

$$\omega_a + \omega_b - 3\Delta = 2\pi i. \quad (36)$$

This condition will be crucial for reproducing the black hole entropy from the superconformal indices, as will be discussed in Section 4. As a generalization of the EVH-BPS limit of AdS₅, Ref. [1] considered the combined near-BPS and near-EVH limits of an AdS₆ black hole, where the horizon size reduces to

$$x_+ = \sqrt{\frac{b\lambda}{1+b}}. \quad (37)$$

Besides, in the BPS limit, the entropy of the black hole is given by:

$$S = \frac{2\pi^2 b^2 \lambda}{3G_N(1-b^2)} \epsilon^2, \quad (38)$$

which remains finite in the near-EVH limit. This is precisely a special case of the near-extremal black hole described by (30).

The near-EVH metric, with extremality determined by the condition (29), is¹⁾:

$$d\tilde{s}^2 = H^{\frac{1}{2}} \left[\cos^2 \theta_2 \epsilon^2 x^2 \frac{dx^2}{(x-x_+)^2} + \epsilon^2 \cos^2 \theta_2 x^2 d\theta_1^2 + \epsilon^2 x^2 \cos^2 \theta_2 \sin^2 \theta_1 d\phi_1^2 - \frac{(x-x_+)^2 [b^2 \sin^2 \theta_2 d\phi_2 - \epsilon b(1-b^2 \cos^2 \theta_2) d\tau]^2}{(xb \cos \theta_2 + x_+ \sec \theta_2)^2 (1-b^2)^2} + \frac{b^2 \cos^2 \theta_2}{1-b^2 \cos^2 \theta_2} d\theta_2^2 + \frac{b^2 \sin^2 \theta_2 \cos^2 \theta_2 (1-b^2 \cos^2 \theta_2) (bx+x_+)^2}{(1-b^2)^2 (x_+ + xb \cos^2 \theta_2)^2} d\phi_2^2 \right] H = 1 + \frac{x_+}{xb \cos^2 \theta_2}. \quad (39)$$

The decoupled geometry behaves differently for different values of θ_2 . We therefore consider two limits. In the $\theta_2 \rightarrow 0$ limit (28), the four-dimensional black hole, decoupled from the IR limit of the AdS₆ black hole, is parametrized by the coordinates $(\tau, x, \theta_1, \phi_1)$, and its metric takes the following form:

$$d\tilde{s}^2 = H^{\frac{1}{2}} \left[\epsilon^2 ds_4^2 + \frac{b^2}{1-b^2} d\Omega_2^2 \right], \quad d\Omega_2^2 = d\theta_2^2 + \sin^2 \theta_2 d\phi_2^2. \quad (40)$$

The decoupled four-dimensional black hole can be written as follows:

$$ds_4^2 = -\frac{(x-x_+)^2}{(x+\frac{x_+}{b})^2} d\tau^2 + \frac{x^2 dx^2}{(x-x_+)^2} + x^2 d\theta_1^2 + x^2 \sin^2 \theta_1 d\phi_1^2. \quad (41)$$

Typically, the metric (41) is conformally related to the extremal EMMD black hole solutions [69, 74], which are also reviewed in Appendix A. For instance, the EMMD solution with $N_1 = N_2 = 2$ reads:

$$ds_{\text{EMMD}}^2 = \frac{\tilde{r}+q_2}{\tilde{r}+q_1} \left[-\frac{(\tilde{r}-\mu)\tilde{r}}{(\tilde{r}+q_2)^2} dt^2 + \frac{(\tilde{r}+q_1)^2}{\tilde{r}(\tilde{r}-\mu)} d\tilde{r}^2 + (\tilde{r}+q_1)^2 (d\theta_1^2 + \sin^2 \theta_1 d\phi_1^2) \right]. \quad (42)$$

Without loss of generality, we assume that $q_2 > q_1$. The metric within the square brackets in (42) is precisely the

decoupled near-EVH geometry (41) upon identifying

$$\mu = 0, \quad x_+ = q_1, \quad \frac{x_+}{b} = q_2 - q_1, \quad x = \tilde{r} + q_1. \quad (43)$$

If the BPS condition is imposed [1], the horizon size x_+ and charge q are both fixed by the rotation parameters, which correspond to special values of the two U(1) charges in the EMMD theory.

Recall that in AdS₅ black hole models, the EVH limit yields a pinched AdS₃ geometry in Poincaré coordinates, whereas the near-EVH limit leads to a pinched BTZ geometry [1, 30–32]. This can be understood holographically: the BTZ geometry is dual to thermal excitations above the AdS₃ vacuum. The situation in the AdS₆ black hole model studied here is qualitatively different. In the exact EVH limit, the geometry described by (28) contains a decoupled global AdS₄ submanifold, whose $r \rightarrow 0$ limit reduces to four-dimensional Minkowski spacetime. The decoupled black hole geometry (41) can therefore be regarded as an excitation above this vacuum, since setting $x_+ = 0$ indeed recovers Minkowski spacetime. Although the decoupled black hole solution (41) is asymptotically flat at leading order in the near-EVH decoupling limit, higher-order corrections — following the framework of EMMD theory with a cosmological constant [69] — could, in principle, introduce an effective cosmological constant. However, such contributions do not affect the leading infrared physics of the near-EVH limit, and we will not pursue them further in this work.

This near-EVH limit of black holes can be further generalized to non-extremal models, whose decoupled geometries can be conformally related to non-extremal EMMD black holes. The corresponding near-EVH limit (29) should be replaced by

$$q = b \sqrt{x_+ x_-} \epsilon + q^{(3)} \epsilon^3, \quad (44)$$

which yields the four-dimensional decoupled black hole geometry

$$ds_4^2 = -\frac{(x-x_+)(x-x_-)d\tau^2}{(x+\frac{\sqrt{x_+ x_-}}{b})^2} + \frac{x^2 dx^2}{(x-x_+)(x-x_-)} + x^2 (d\theta_1^2 + \sin^2 \theta_1 d\phi_1^2). \quad (45)$$

This geometry is conformally related to the non-extremal EMMD black hole (42) under the identification

$$q_1 + \mu = x_+, \quad x_- = q_1, \quad \frac{\sqrt{x_+ x_-}}{b} = q_2 - q_1, \quad x = \tilde{r} + q_1, \quad (46)$$

1) The temperature of an extremal black hole must be zero. We choose $q^{(3)}$ in (29) appropriately to make T identically vanish. However, any such choice does not affect the leading order in the near-EVH limit of AdS₆ black holes.

In this context, the conformal factor can be absorbed into the dilaton, reflecting a change of frame.

B. AdS₇ black hole

The AdS₇ black hole with two R-charges and three

angular momenta possesses a richer parameter space. Such solutions can be obtained via a consistent reduction from D = 11 supergravity on S⁴ [75–77]. The bosonic part of the Lagrangian of the D = 7 SO(5) supergravity theory is given by

$$\begin{aligned} \mathcal{L}_7 = R \star 1 + 2 \left(8X_1 X_2 + \frac{4(X_1 + X_2)}{X_1^2 X_2^2} - \frac{1}{X_1^4 X_2^4} \right) \star 1 - \frac{1}{2} \sum_{I=1}^2 d\varphi_I \wedge \star d\varphi_I \\ - \frac{1}{2} \sum_{I=1}^2 \frac{1}{X_I^2} F'_{(2)} \wedge \star F'_{(2)} - \frac{1}{2} X_1^2 X_2^2 F_{(4)} \wedge \star F_{(4)} + F_{(4)} \wedge A_{(3)} + F_{(2)}^1 \wedge F_{(2)}^2 \wedge A_{(3)}. \end{aligned} \quad (47)$$

The most general AdS₇ black hole solution of this kind was constructed analytically in [46]; it includes all the known special solutions with one rotation turned off [78, 79], equal charges [45], or equal angular momenta [80, 81]. The most general solution to 7d gauged supergravity in the asymptotically static frame (t, r, y, z, ϕ_i) , with $i = 1, 2, 3$, is given explicitly in [46].

$$\begin{aligned} ds^2 = (H_1 H_2)^{\frac{1}{2}} \left[-\frac{(1+r^2)(1-y^2)(1-z^2)}{\Xi_1 \Xi_2 \Xi_3} dt^2 + \frac{(r^2+y^2)(r^2+z^2)}{U} dr^2 + \frac{(r^2+y^2)(y^2-z^2)y^2}{(1-y^2)(a_1^2-y^2)(a_2^2-y^2)(a_3^2-y^2)} dy^2 \right. \\ + \frac{(r^2+z^2)(z^2-y^2)z^2}{(1-z^2)(a_1^2-z^2)(a_2^2-z^2)(a_3^2-z^2)} dz^2 + \frac{(r^2+a_1^2)(a_1^2-y^2)(a_1^2-z^2)}{\Xi_1(a_1^2-a_2^2)(a_1^2-a_3^2)} d\phi_1^2 + \frac{(r^2+a_2^2)(a_2^2-y^2)(a_2^2-z^2)}{\Xi_2(a_2^2-a_1^2)(a_2^2-a_3^2)} d\phi_2^2 \\ \left. + \frac{(r^2+a_3^2)(a_3^2-y^2)(a_3^2-z^2)}{\Xi_3(a_3^2-a_1^2)(a_3^2-a_2^2)} d\phi_3^2 + \frac{1-H_1^{-1}}{1-(s_2/s_1)^2} K_1^2 + \frac{1-H_2^{-1}}{1-(s_1/s_2)^2} K_2^2 \right]. \end{aligned} \quad (48)$$

where, for simplicity, we also set the cosmological constant to $g^2 = 1$. The factors in the metric are defined as follows (with $i, j, k = 1, 2, 3$ denoting distinct indices).

$$\begin{aligned} s_I = \sinh \delta_I, \quad c_I = \cosh \delta_I, \quad \Xi_i = 1 - a_i^2, \quad I = 1, 2, \quad H_I = 1 + \frac{2ms_I^2}{(r^2+y^2)(r^2+z^2)} \\ U(r) = \frac{(1+r^2)\prod_{i=1}^3(r^2+a_i^2)}{r^2} - 2m + m(s_1^2 + s_2^2) \left(2r^2 + \sum_{i=1}^3 a_i^2 \right) + \frac{4m^2 s_1^2 s_2^2}{r^2} \\ - \frac{2m(s_1^2 + s_2^2)a_1 a_2 a_3}{r^2} + \frac{2m(c_1 - c_2)^2}{r^2} (a_1 + a_2 a_3)(a_2 + a_1 a_3)(a_3 + a_1 a_2) + \frac{m(c_1 - c_2)^2}{2} \left[2 \sum_{i=1}^3 a_i^2 + 8a_1 a_2 a_3 \right. \\ \left. + (a_1 + a_2 + a_3)(a_2 + a_3 - a_1)(a_1 + a_3 - a_2)(a_1 + a_3 - a_2) \right] \\ K_1 = \frac{c_1 + c_2}{2s_1} \mathcal{A}[y^2, z^2, 0] + \frac{c_1 - c_2}{2s_1} \mathcal{Y}, \quad K_2 = \frac{c_1 + c_2}{2s_2} \mathcal{A}[y^2, z^2, 0] - \frac{c_1 - c_2}{2s_2} \mathcal{Y} \\ \mathcal{A}[y^2, z^2, 0] = \frac{(1-y^2)(1-z^2)}{\Xi_1 \Xi_2 \Xi_3} dt - \sum_{i=1}^3 \frac{a_i(a_i^2 - y^2)(a_i^2 - z^2)}{\Xi_i(a_i^2 - a_j^2)(a_i^2 - a_k^2)} d\phi_i \\ \mathcal{Y} = \frac{(1-y^2)(1-z^2)[1 - (a_1^2 + a_2^2 + a_3^2) - 2a_1 a_2 a_3]}{\Xi_1 \Xi_2 \Xi_3} dt + \sum_{i=1}^3 \frac{a_i(a_i^2 - y^2)(a_i^2 - z^2)[1 - (a_i^2 - a_j^2 - a_k^2) + \frac{2a_j a_k}{a_i}]}{\Xi_i(a_i^2 - a_j^2)(a_i^2 - a_k^2)} d\phi_i, \end{aligned} \quad (49)$$

and, without loss of generality, the y - and z -coordinates are taken to lie in the region

$$0 \leq a_1 \leq y \leq a_2 \leq z \leq a_3 \leq 1. \quad (50)$$

The parameterization of this metric differs slightly from that used in the AdS₅ and AdS₆ black hole solutions, for which redefining the charge parameter as $q_I = 2ms_I^2$ is particularly convenient. However, this simplification does not apply to the AdS₇ solution given in (48), because of

the $(c_1 - c_2)$ term in the blackening factor. The resulting expression becomes tractable only in the equal-charge case. The event horizon is located at r_+ , defined as the largest root of $U(r) = 0$. In the AdS₅ and AdS₆ cases, one can invert this relation to express m explicitly in terms of the horizon radius, yielding a convenient form of the blackening factor. In contrast, for AdS₇, the function $U(r)$

is quadratic in m , which significantly complicates such an inversion. This increased complexity enriches the structure of the parameter space and opens new possibilities for exploring distinct EVH decoupling limits.

The thermodynamic quantities of the AdS₇ black hole (48) are computed using the Komar integral [46]:

$$\begin{aligned} S &= \frac{\pi^3}{4G_N \Xi_1 \Xi_2 \Xi_3} \frac{\sqrt{\mathcal{S}(r_+)}}{r_+}, & T &= \frac{r_+^2 U'(r_+)}{4\pi \sqrt{\mathcal{S}(r_+)}} \\ J_1 &= \frac{\pi^2 m}{16G_N \Xi_1 \prod_{j=1}^3 \Pi_j} \left[4a_1 c_1 c_2 + 4(1 - c_1 c_2)(a_2 + a_1 a_3)(a_3 + a_1 a_2) \right. \\ &\quad \left. + (c_1 - c_2)^2 \left(2a_2 a_3 + a_1 \left(1 + 2\Xi_1 - \sum_{j=1}^3 \Xi_j \right) \right) \left(1 + 2a_1 a_2 a_3 - \sum_{j=1}^3 \Xi_j \right) \right] \\ Q_1 &= \frac{\pi^2 m s_1}{4G_N \Xi_1 \Xi_2 \Xi_3} \left[2c_1 - (c_1 - c_2)(a_1^2 + a_2^2 + a_3^2 + 2a_1 a_2 a_3) \right], \end{aligned} \quad (51)$$

with the angular velocity given by

$$\begin{aligned} \Omega_1 &= \frac{1}{\mathcal{S}(r_+)} \left[\frac{1}{2} \left(\prod_{i=1}^3 (r_+^2 + a_i^2) + 2ms_1^2 (r_+^2 - a_1 a_2 a_3) \right) \times (a_1 (1 + r_+^2)(r_+^2 + a_2^2)(r_+^2 + a_3^2) + 2ms_2^2 (a_1 r_+^2 - a_2 a_3)) \right. \\ &\quad \left. + \frac{1}{2} \left(\prod_{i=1}^3 (r_+^2 + a_i^2) + 2ms_2^2 (r_+^2 - a_1 a_2 a_3) \right) \times (a_1 (1 + r_+^2)(r_+^2 + a_2^2)(r_+^2 + a_3^2) + 2ms_1^2 (a_1 r_+^2 - a_2 a_3)) \right. \\ &\quad \left. - m(c_1 - c_2)^2 (r_+^2 + a_2^2)(r_+^2 + a_3^2) \left\{ 2(r_+^2 - a_1)(a_1 + a_2 a_3)(a_2 + a_1 a_3)(a_3 + a_1 a_2) \right. \right. \\ &\quad \left. \left. + (1 + a_1)^2 (a_1 + a_2 a_3)(1 - a_1 - a_2 - a_3)(1 - a_1 + a_2 + a_3) \right\} \right], \end{aligned} \quad (52)$$

together with chemical potentials as

$$\begin{aligned} \Phi_1 &= \frac{2mr_+^2 s_1 c_1 [\prod_i (r_+^2 + a_i^2) + 2ms_2^2 (r_+^2 - a_1 a_2 a_3)]}{\mathcal{S}(r_+)} - \frac{mr_+^2 s_1 (c_1 - c_2)}{\mathcal{S}(r_+)} \left[(a_1^2 + a_2^2 + a_3^2 + 2a_1 a_2 a_3) \right. \\ &\quad \left. \times \left(\prod_i (r_+^2 + a_i^2) + 2ms_2^2 (r_+^2 - 2a_1 a_2 a_3) \right) + 4ms_2^2 (a_1 + a_2 a_3)(a_2 + a_1 a_3)(a_3 + a_1 a_2) \right], \end{aligned} \quad (53)$$

where the function \mathcal{S} is defined as:

$$\mathcal{S}(r) = \prod_{i=1}^2 \left[(r^2 + a_1^2)(r^2 + a_2^2)(r^2 + a_3^2) + 2ms_i^2 (r^2 - a_1 a_2 a_3) \right] + 2m(c_1 - c_2)^2 (r^2 + a_1^2)(r^2 + a_2^2)(r^2 + a_3^2)(a_1 + a_2 a_3)(a_2 + a_1 a_3)(a_3 + a_1 a_2). \quad (54)$$

The charges, angular momenta, and chemical potentials for other indices can be obtained by permuting the indices. The energy is given by

$$\begin{aligned} E &= \frac{m\pi^2}{8G_N \Xi_1 \Xi_2 \Xi_3} \left[\sum_{i=1}^3 \frac{2}{\Xi_i} - 1 + \frac{5(s_1^2 + s_2^2)}{2} + \frac{s_1^2 + s_2^2}{2} \sum_{i=1}^3 \left(\frac{2(1 + a_i^2 - \Sigma_2 - 2\Pi_1)}{\Xi_i} - \Xi_i \right) \right] + \frac{m\pi(c_1 - c_2)^2}{32G_N \Xi_1 \Xi_2 \Xi_3} \left[-10\Sigma_2 - 16\Pi_1 + 11\Sigma_4 \right. \\ &\quad \left. + 13\Pi_{22} + 32\Pi_1 \Sigma_2 - 3(\Sigma_6 + 5\Pi_{42} + 4\Pi_1^2) - 16\Pi_1 \Sigma_2^2 + \Pi_{62} + 3\Pi_{44} - 5\Pi_1^2 \Sigma_2 + 8\Pi_1 (2\Pi_2 + \Pi_{42}) + \Pi_1^2 (\Sigma_4 + 3\Pi_{22}) \right], \end{aligned} \quad (55)$$

where the factors are defined in [46].

$$\begin{aligned}\Sigma_n &= a_1^n + a_2^n + a_3^n, & \Pi_n &= a_1^n a_2^n a_3^n, \\ \Pi_{nm} &= a_1^n (a_2^m + a_3^m) + a_2^n (a_1^m + a_3^m) + a_3^n (a_1^m + a_2^m).\end{aligned}\quad (56)$$

These quantities were checked in [46] to satisfy the first law of thermodynamics, as a consistency check of the solution's validity. The thermodynamics of more specialized solutions were also studied in [73, 82]. The supersymmetry condition for this solution¹⁾ is given by

$$E = Q_1 + Q_2 - J_1 - J_2 - J_3, \quad (57)$$

This imposes a relation among the charges:

$$a_1 + a_2 + a_3 = \frac{2}{1 - e^{\delta_1 + \delta_2}}. \quad (58)$$

This is supplemented by a constraint on the horizon size that satisfies

$$r_0^2 = \frac{a_1 a_2 + a_2 a_3 + a_1 a_3 - a_1 a_2 a_3}{1 - a_1 - a_2 - a_3} \quad (59)$$

To fully determine the parameters describing the BPS black hole, we define the chemical potentials in the BPS limit as

$$\Delta_I = \beta(\Phi_I + 1), \quad \omega_I = \beta(\Omega_I + 1), \quad (60)$$

which is subject to the constraint

$$\sum_{i=1}^3 \omega_i - 2 \sum_{I=1}^2 \Delta_I = 2\pi i. \quad (61)$$

We are also interested in identifying potential (near-)EVH limits of these black hole solutions. To systematically explore such limits, we adopt the following guidelines:

- The near-horizon limit is defined by taking $\epsilon \rightarrow 0$, with the radial coordinate rescaled as $r = \epsilon x$ so that ϵ is dimensionless.
- The entropy S and the temperature T are assumed to scale with ϵ as follows:

$$S \sim \epsilon^n, \quad T \sim \epsilon^{m-n+1}, \quad m, n \in \mathbb{Z}, \quad (62)$$

This, in turn, fixes the scaling of the entropy function and the blackening factor:

$$\mathcal{S}(r_+) \sim \epsilon^{2n+2}, \quad U'(r_+) \sim \epsilon^m. \quad (63)$$

For simplicity, we restrict our analysis to integer-valued m and n .

Our task is to determine the scalings of the parameters a_i and q_I that match (63), in order to achieve the near-EVH scalings of the entropy and temperature (62). In this paper, we restrict to cases with $S \sim T^k$ for some integer k , which can be interpreted within field theories exhibiting scaling symmetry, while excluding Lifshitz scaling [83] and hyperscaling-violating scalings [84].

Therefore, the possible solutions are:

$$\begin{aligned}(m, n) = (1, 1): & \quad S \sim T \\ (m, n) = (2, 2): & \quad S \sim T^2 \\ (m, n) = (3, 3): & \quad S \sim T^3.\end{aligned}\quad (64)$$

Within these choices, the $S \sim T$ near-EVH limits are well known to produce pinched BTZ-like geometries in the IR. Just as the near-EVH BTZ black holes emerging from static R-charged AdS₅ black holes are supported by two charges of order G_N^{-1} and one perturbative R-charge [30], the BTZ geometry in the near-EVH limit of AdS₇ black holes can be supported by two angular momenta of order G_N^{-1} and one perturbative angular momentum.

More nontrivial are the scalings $S \sim T^2$ and $S \sim T^3$. Previous analyses of the near-EVH limit in AdS₆ identify $S \sim T^2$ as signaling the emergence of a $D=4$ EMD black hole in the infrared. In AdS₇, however, no suitable parameter regime exists that realizes a consistent near-EVH limit with $S \sim T^2$. On the other hand, the case $S \sim T^3$ has previously been identified in the near-EVH limit of AdS₇ black holes [1]. In the following, we present the specific parameter choices that define each of these limits and describe the corresponding infrared geometries.

Example: $D=3$ decoupled geometry

It has been observed [27, 50] that AdS₃ and the BTZ geometry can appear in the near-horizon limit of AdS₇ black holes. Such limits can be achieved by taking two nonvanishing angular momenta and treating the third as perturbative.

We can simply take the near-EVH limit as

$$s_I \equiv 0, \quad a_3 = r_+ = 0, \quad r = \epsilon x, \quad (65)$$

while the near-EVH limit is defined as

1) Our conventions for the BPS condition follow [46] and differ from those for AdS_{5,6} BPS black holes by the replacement $a_i \rightarrow -a_i$.

$$a_3 = \lambda\epsilon^2, \quad r_+ = \epsilon x_+. \quad (66)$$

Note that these solutions reduce exactly to the Kerr-AdS₇ black holes [49, 50] and are incompatible with the supersymmetry condition (58). Their thermodynamic quantities are given by

$$\begin{aligned} E &= \frac{m\pi^2}{4G_N\Xi_1\Xi_2\Xi_3} \left(\sum_{i=1}^3 \frac{1}{\Xi_i} - \frac{1}{2} \right), \\ J_i &= \frac{ma_i\pi^2}{4G_N\Xi_i(\prod_{j=1}^3 \Xi_j)}, \\ S &= \frac{\pi^2}{4G_N r_+} \prod_{i=1}^3 \frac{r_+^2 + a_i^2}{\Xi_i}, \quad \Omega_i = \frac{a_i\Xi_i}{r_+^2 + a_i^2}, \\ T &= \frac{1}{2\pi} \left[r_+(1+r_+^2) \sum_{i=1}^3 \frac{1}{r_+^2 + a_i^2} - \frac{1}{r_+} \right]. \end{aligned} \quad (67)$$

The near-EVH limits defined in (66) thus result in

$$\begin{aligned} S \sim T \sim \epsilon, \\ \lim_{\epsilon \rightarrow 0} \frac{S}{T} &= \frac{\pi^3 a_1^2 a_2^2}{2G_N(1-a_1^2)(1-a_2^2)(1+\frac{1}{a_1^2} + \frac{1}{a_2^2} - \frac{\lambda}{r_+^4})}, \end{aligned} \quad (68)$$

This confirms that the near-EVH limit is reasonable. The black hole geometry in the limit (66) takes the following form:

$$\begin{aligned} ds_7^2 &= \epsilon^2 \frac{y^2 z^2}{a_1^2 a_2^2} ds_3^2 + \frac{y^2(y^2 - z^2)}{(1-y^2)(a_1^2 - y^2)(a_2^2 - y^2)} dy^2 \\ &+ \frac{z^2(z^2 - y^2)}{(1-z^2)(a_1^2 - z^2)(a_2^2 - z^2)} dz^2 \\ &+ \frac{(1-y^2)(a_1^2 - y^2)(a_2^2 - y^2)}{y^2(y^2 - z^2)} \\ &\times \left(-\frac{a_1(a_1^2 - z^2)}{\Xi_1(a_1^2 - a_2^2)} d\phi_1 - \frac{a_2(a_2^2 - z^2)}{\Xi_2(a_2^2 - a_1^2)} d\phi_2 \right)^2 \\ &+ \frac{(1-z^2)(a_1^2 - z^2)(a_2^2 - z^2)}{z^2(z^2 - y^2)} \\ &\times \left(-\frac{a_1(a_1^2 - y^2)}{\Xi_1(a_1^2 - a_2^2)} d\phi_1 - \frac{a_2(a_2^2 - y^2)}{\Xi_2(a_2^2 - a_1^2)} d\phi_2 \right)^2, \end{aligned} \quad (69)$$

where the three-dimensional part is a pinched AdS₃ geometry in the EVH limit.

$$ds_3^2 = -\frac{x^2}{l_3^2} d\tau^2 + \frac{l_3^2}{x^2} dx^2 + x^2 d\tilde{\phi}_3^2, \quad l_3^2 = \frac{a_1^2 a_2^2}{a_1^2 + a_2^2 + a_1^2 a_2^2}, \quad (70)$$

and a pinched extremal BTZ in the near-EVH limits, with

the extremality condition $r_+ = r_-$:

$$ds_3^2 = -\frac{(x^2 - x_+^2)^2}{l_3^2 x^2} d\tau^2 + \frac{l_3^2 x^2}{(x^2 - x_+^2)^2} dx^2 + x^2 \left(\frac{x_+^2}{l_3 x^2} d\tau - d\tilde{\phi}_3 \right)^2. \quad (71)$$

In string theory, a local AdS₃ geometry arises as the near-horizon limit of a bound state consisting of n_1 D1-branes, n_5 D5-branes, and a momentum charge P along a common compact direction. The D1-branes, viewed as instantons inside the D5-branes, together with the momentum charge, give rise to a two-dimensional conformal field theory known as the D1–D5 CFT. This theory has central charge $c = 6n_1 n_5$, which counts the number of degrees of freedom in the bound state. We refer the reader to [85] for a comprehensive review. In the context of R-charged AdS₅ black holes, a local AdS₃ geometry similarly emerges in the near-EVH limit when two R-charges are present. The three R-charges, corresponding to the Cartan generators of the SO(6) R-symmetry, represent different species of giant gravitons. The effective theory arising from two species of giant gravitons, localized at their intersection, has degrees of freedom proportional to the product of the two macroscopic R-charges, yielding a central charge $c \sim Q_1 Q_2$ [30, 34]. Similarly, for Kerr–AdS₇ black holes in the near-EVH limit, the central charge of the dual CFT₂ associated with the emergent AdS₃ is proportional to the product of two angular momenta:

$$c \sim l_3 \sim a_1 a_2 \sim J_1 J_2. \quad (72)$$

This suggests that the CFT₂ dual to the emergent AdS₃ resides on the intersection of dual-giant-like objects in AdS₇ [86].

Example: $D = 5$ decoupled geometry

Since the $S \sim T^3$ near-EVH limit exists in equal-charge AdS black holes with three distinct angular momenta, we take the equal-charge solution [45] to examine its near-EVH geometry for simplicity. Therefore, we take $q = 2ms_1^2 = 2ms_2^2$. In particular, in the BPS limit, the horizon size is completely fixed by the rotation parameters (59). Therefore, the EVH-BPS limit associated with taking $r_+ \sim \epsilon$ is completely fixed by the scalings of the rotation parameters, independent of whether the charges are taken to be equal or not.

The EVH limit that yields $S \sim T^3$ is defined as

$$a_1 = a_2 = 0, \quad q = 0, \quad r = \epsilon x, \quad x_+ = 0, \quad t = \epsilon\tau. \quad (73)$$

To ensure a well-defined geometry in this limit, consistent with (50), we choose the parametrization

$$y^2 = a_1^2 \cos^2 \theta_1 + a_2^2 \sin^2 \theta_1, \quad z = a_3 \cos \theta_2, \quad (74)$$

We can automatically translate from the Jacobi coordinates (17) to the spherical coordinates (θ_1, θ_2) . In these coordinates, the EVH geometry of the AdS₇ black hole (48) is parameterized by $(t, r, \theta_1, \theta_2, \phi_i)$ with $i = 1, 2, 3$.

$$\begin{aligned} ds^2 = & -\frac{(1-a_3^2 \cos^2 \theta_2)}{1-a_3^2} (1+r^2) dt^2 + \frac{r^2+a_3^2 \cos^2 \theta_2}{(r^2+1)(r^2+a_3^2)} dr^2 \\ & + r^2 \cos^2 \theta_2 (d\theta_1^2 + \sin^2 \theta_1 d\phi_1^2 + \cos^2 \theta_1 d\phi_2^2) \\ & + \frac{r^2+a_3^2 \cos^2 \theta_2}{1-a_3^2 \cos^2 \theta_2} d\theta_2^2 + \frac{r^2+a_3^2}{1-a_3^2} \sin^2 \theta_2 d\phi_3^2. \end{aligned} \quad (75)$$

In the limit $\theta_2 \rightarrow 0$, the geometry decouples into global AdS₅, spanned by $(t, r, \theta_1, \phi_{1,2})$, and an S^2 , spanned by (θ_2, ϕ_3) . We adopt the metric ansatz of [45] and implement the following near-EVH limits

$$a_1 = \lambda_1 \epsilon^2, \quad a_2 = \lambda_2 \epsilon^2, \quad q = a_3 x_+^2 \epsilon^2 + q^{(4)} \epsilon^4, \quad r = \epsilon x + y_4 \epsilon^3. \quad (76)$$

It is convenient to define the new coordinate $y = w \epsilon^2$.

$$w^2 = \lambda_1^2 \cos^2 \theta_1 + \lambda_2^2 \sin^2 \theta_1. \quad (77)$$

The entropy and temperature in the near-EVH limit (76) are then determined by the perturbative ansatz (76).

$$\begin{aligned} S &= \frac{\pi^3 a_3 x_+^3 \epsilon^3}{4G_N (1-a_3)} + \mathcal{O}(\epsilon^4) \\ T &= \frac{(1+a_3+a_3^2)x_+^4 + a_3^2 \lambda_1 \lambda_2 - q^{(4)} a_3 + 2y_4 a_3^2 x_+}{a_3(1+a_3)\pi x_+^3} \epsilon + \mathcal{O}(\epsilon^2), \end{aligned} \quad (78)$$

confirming the $S \sim T^3$ scaling in this limit for generic values of $q^{(4)}$. The special value of $q^{(4)}$ for which the temperature vanishes is determined to be

$$q^{(4)} = \left(1 + \frac{1}{a_3} + a_3\right) x_+^4 + a_3 \lambda_1 \lambda_2 + 2y_4 a_3 x_+. \quad (79)$$

In this paper, we do not consider such fine-tuned values, as we are interested in the general near-EVH decoupling limits. The relations (78) hold even without imposing the BPS condition, thereby generalizing the EVH-BPS limit of AdS₇ proposed in [1]. If the supersymmetry condition is imposed, the horizon size satisfies $x_+ = x_0$, where

$$x_0^2 = \frac{a_3(\lambda_1 + \lambda_2)}{1-a_3}, \quad (80)$$

and the entropy of the EVH-BPS black hole is given by

$$S = \frac{\pi^3}{4G_N} \left(\frac{a_3}{1-a_3}\right)^{\frac{5}{2}} (\lambda_1 + \lambda_2)^{\frac{3}{2}} \epsilon^3. \quad (81)$$

We now apply the near-EVH limit given in (76) to the AdS₇ black hole metric. As in the AdS₆ case, the angular coordinate θ_2 , which ranges from 0 to $\frac{\pi}{2}$, governs the emergence of distinct, decoupled geometries in the near-horizon region. In the limit $\theta_2 \rightarrow 0$, the metric reduces to the following five-dimensional form:

$$ds_7^2 = H^{\frac{2}{3}} \left[\epsilon^2 ds_5^2 + \frac{a_3^2}{(1-a_3)} d\Omega_2^2 \right], \quad d\Omega_2^2 = d\theta_2^2 + \sin^2 \theta_2 d\phi_3^2, \quad (82)$$

where the five-dimensional geometry is given by:

$$\begin{aligned} ds_5^2 &= -\frac{(x^2-x_+^2)^2}{(x^2+\frac{x_+}{a_3})^2} dt^2 + \frac{x^4 dx^2}{(x^2-x_+^2)^2} + x^2 d\Omega_3^2, \\ d\Omega_3^2 &= d\theta_1^2 + \sin^2 \theta_1 d\phi_1^2 + \cos^2 \theta_1 d\phi_2^2. \end{aligned} \quad (83)$$

Moreover, the geometry described by (83) is conformally related to a $D=5$ EMMD black hole with exponents $(N_1, N_2) = (1, 2)$. In the extremal limit, the latter is given by (cf. (116)):

$$d\tilde{s}_5^2 = \frac{(x^2+q_2-q_1)^{\frac{3}{2}}}{x^{\frac{4}{3}}} \left[-\frac{(x^2-q_1)^2 dt^2}{(x^2+q_2-q_1)^2} + \frac{x^4 dx^2}{(x^2-q_1)^2} + x^2 d\Omega_3^2 \right]. \quad (84)$$

By identifying the EMMD charges q_1 and q_2 (assuming, without loss of generality, that $q_1 < q_2$) with the parameters of the AdS₇ solution, we obtain:

$$x_+^2 = q_1, \quad \frac{x_+^2}{a_3} = q_2 - q_1, \quad q_2 > q_1. \quad (85)$$

The near-EVH limit of AdS₇ black holes exhibits several structural similarities with the AdS₆ case analyzed in Section 3.1. First, in both cases, the emergent, decoupled near-EVH geometry of an AdS_D black hole is an asymptotically flat EMMD-type solution in $(D-2)$ dimensions. In the formal limit in which the Boyer–Lindquist rotation parameter tends to infinity, these geometries reduce to Reissner–Nordström black holes, a regime that lies outside the domain of validity of the near-EVH approximation. Second, as in the AdS₆ case, the correspondence between the near-EVH limit of the AdS₇ black hole and the five-dimensional EMMD description also extends to non-extremal configurations. This generalization is achieved by modifying the near-EVH scaling in (76) to incorporate a subleading correction:

$$q = a_3 x_+ x_- \epsilon^2 + q^{(4)} \epsilon^4, \quad (86)$$

This yields the following decoupled five-dimensional metric, conformal to the EMMD black hole metric in $D = 5$:

$$ds_5^2 = -\frac{(x^2 - x_+^2)(x^2 - x_-^2)}{(x^2 + \frac{x_+ x_-}{a_3})^2} d\tau^2 + \frac{x^4 dx^2}{(x^2 - x_+^2)(x^2 - x_-^2)} + x^2 d\Omega_3^2. \quad (87)$$

Finally, in both AdS₆ and AdS₇ settings, the EMMD decoupling limit becomes fully explicit only when the direction-cosine coordinate is fixed at the special value $\theta_2 \rightarrow 0$. This choice forces z to approach its upper bound, thereby collapsing S^2 (spanned by μ_i^2) to S^1 . The physical implications of this parameter restriction will be addressed in Section 3.3.

C. Discussion

The AdS_D black holes in $D = 6$ and $D = 7$ analyzed in this section exhibit an infrared scaling relation $S \sim T^{D-4}$, signaling the emergence of an effective $(D-2)$ -dimensional geometry in the decoupling limit. These on-shell geometries are conformally related to EMMD black holes [69]. Furthermore, the rich parameter space of AdS₇ also allows three-dimensional BTZ geometries to emerge in the decoupling limit. The decoupled geometries discussed in this work can be viewed as ground states—analogue to AdS₂—that encode the ground-state degeneracy of the higher-dimensional black holes. A key distinction, however, is that the near-EVH limit permits excitations along additional directions, giving rise to a lower-dimensional effective field theory. In this picture, extremal EMMD black holes—characterized by vanishing temperature—correspond to the ground states of these lower-dimensional effective theories. There is also a structural difference between the AdS₃-type near-EVH geometry and the EMMD-type geometry. The former corresponds to a pinched, locally AdS₃ spacetime, in which the compact S^1 direction has period $2\pi\epsilon$ and the dr^2 component remains of order ϵ^0 [1, 32, 87]. In contrast, the near-EVH limits of AdS_{D=6,7} exhibit a decoupling structure of the form:

$$ds_D^2 = \epsilon^2 ds_{\text{EMMD}}^2 + d\Omega_2^2, \quad (88)$$

This resembles a class of non-relativistic geometries known as MpT spacetimes [88]. We will revisit these observations in Section 5.

In both the near-EVH limits of AdS₆ and AdS₇ black holes, the lower-dimensional EMMD geometry becomes explicit in the limit $\theta_2 \rightarrow 0$, which effectively reduces the S^2 parameterized by the direction cosines to an S^1 . Giv-

en the analogous structures in the two models, we shall use AdS₆ to illustrate the underlying physical picture. From a string-theory viewpoint, the AdS₆ background is supported by a D4–D8 bound state in massive type-IIA supergravity [70]. The limit $\theta_2 \rightarrow 0$ selects a sector in which excitations are confined to modes that do not probe the shrinking direction—i.e., collective low-energy modes of the bound state that are effectively four-dimensional. The resulting EMMD theory—with its metric, two gauge fields, and a dilaton—thus provides a consistent infrared description of this non-conformal, decoupled sector. Its microscopic origin should be traceable to an appropriate subsector of the dual five-dimensional SCFT. Because a more detailed understanding of this system in terms of giant gravitons is still lacking, we leave a more complete analysis for future work.

Several limitations in our study deserve mention. First, we have restricted our analysis to (near-)EVH limits in which the rotation parameters scale with ϵ as integer powers, following the approach of [1, 32]. While most generic scaling choices do not yield a well-defined decoupling limit with a smooth horizon geometry, it may be worthwhile to explore more exotic scalings—such as those involving non-integer powers—that could be dual to other decoupled sectors in the holographic field theory. Second, our discussion has been confined to on-shell solutions of supergravity in $D = 6, 7$ [44, 45]. An interesting open question is whether these supergravity Lagrangians (18) and (47) can be related off-shell to the EMMD theory Lagrangian, for example, (102). Such a connection would help clarify how EMMD theories emerge from fine-tuned decoupled vacua of ten-dimensional string theory or 11D supergravity via specific brane configurations.

As reviewed in Appendix A, the supergravity framework admits three distinct classes of EMMD black hole geometries, labeled by a pair of integers (N_1, N_2) satisfying:

$$N_1 + N_2 = \frac{2(D-2)}{D-3}. \quad (89)$$

For $D > 5$, this constraint cannot be satisfied by any pair of integers—a fact that may be related to the observation that the AdS₇ black hole is the highest-dimensional AdS black hole that is embeddable in string theory and admits a known superconformal field theory dual. For lower dimensions, the possible integer pairs (taking $N_1 < N_2$ without loss of generality by symmetry) are:

$$\begin{aligned} D = 4 : & \quad (N_1, N_2) = (2, 2), \quad (1, 3), \\ D = 5 : & \quad (N_1, N_2) = (1, 2). \end{aligned} \quad (90)$$

It remains unclear why the near-EVH limits of AdS_{6,7}

black holes yield EMD black holes of types (2,2) and (1,2), respectively, whereas the (1,3) type—to the best of our knowledge—does not appear in the near-EVH limits studied here. It is also possible that such a solution could emerge from the near-EVH limit of as-yet-unknown supergravity solutions in $D = 6$ or 7 , which would be an interesting direction for future work.

IV. HOLOGRAPHY WITH $S \sim T^{D-4}$

The entropy of BPS AdS_D black holes is known via microstate counting in the dual superconformal field theory [14, 21–24, 89]. These results can be used to study the entropy of the emergent $(D-2)$ -dimensional geometries that arise in the near-extremal vanishing horizon (EVH) limit. Although the extremization of the entropy functional in $D = 6$ and 7 shares certain similarities, it differs from that in the near-EVH limit for AdS₅. This further confirms that the near-EVH decoupling geometries in $D = 6$ and 7 , whose entropy scales as $S \sim T^{D-4}$, are not of BTZ type.

As an example, consider the AdS₆ black hole. Its entropy is given by extremizing the functional [14, 21]

$$S = i \frac{\pi}{3G_N} \frac{\Delta^3}{\omega_a \omega_b} + \Delta Q + \omega_a J_a + \omega_b J_b + \Lambda(3\Delta - \omega_a - \omega_b + 2\pi i), \quad (91)$$

where Λ is a Lagrange multiplier that enforces the constraint among the chemical potentials. Extremizing this functional via the saddle-point approximation yields

$$\frac{\partial S}{\partial \Delta} = \frac{\partial S}{\partial \omega_a} = \frac{\partial S}{\partial \omega_b} = 0, \quad (92)$$

simplifies the entropy expression to

$$S = 2\pi i \Lambda. \quad (93)$$

To ensure that the entropy is real for real physical charges, Λ must be purely imaginary. This, in turn, leads to two constraint equations involving S [14]:

$$\begin{aligned} Q \frac{S^2}{4\pi^2} + \frac{J_a + J_b}{6G_N} S - \frac{Q^3}{27} &= 0 \\ \left(\frac{S}{2\pi}\right)^3 - \frac{\pi}{3G_N} \left(\frac{S}{2\pi}\right)^2 - \frac{Q^2}{6\pi} S + \frac{\pi}{3G_N} J_a J_b &= 0. \end{aligned} \quad (94)$$

Solving these equations yields the BPS entropy in terms of the charges and angular momenta:

$$S = \frac{\pi}{Q} \left[\sqrt{(J_a + J_b)^2 \frac{\pi^2}{9G_N^2} + \frac{4}{27} Q^3} - (J_a + J_b) \frac{\pi}{3G_N} \right], \quad (95)$$

subject to the charge constraint:

$$\begin{aligned} \frac{1}{Q} \left[\sqrt{(J_a + J_b)^2 \frac{\pi^2}{9G_N^2} + \frac{4}{27} Q^3} - (J_a + J_b) \frac{\pi}{3G_N} \right] \\ = \frac{2\pi}{3G_N} Q^2 \frac{Q^2 + (J_a + J_b)Q - 27J_a J_b}{3(J_a + J_b)^2 \frac{\pi^2}{G_N^2} + 3 \frac{\pi^2}{G_N^2} (J_a + J_b)Q - 8Q^4}. \end{aligned} \quad (96)$$

In the EVH limit $Q = J_a = 0$, the right-hand side vanishes identically, while the left-hand side remains proportional to the entropy S . Hence, the entropy vanishes in this limit.

In the near-EVH limit specified by (29), together with the BPS condition, the entropy expression (38) can be reproduced by extremizing the functional in (91). This mechanism differs significantly from the near-EVH case in AdS₅ (see (14), where the entropy scales as $N^2 \epsilon$ due to an extremization between terms of order N^2 and $N^2 \epsilon^2$, leading to the emergence of a 2D Cardy formula [1]). In the AdS₆ case, the thermodynamic quantities scale as follows:

$$\begin{aligned} S &\sim i \frac{\pi}{3G_N} \frac{\Delta^3}{\omega_a \omega_b} \sim N^{\frac{5}{2}} \epsilon^2, & \Delta &\sim \omega_b \sim \epsilon, & Q &\sim J_b \sim N^{\frac{5}{2}} \epsilon \\ J_a &\sim N^{\frac{5}{2}} \epsilon^3, & \omega_a &\sim 2\pi i + O(\epsilon). \end{aligned} \quad (97)$$

Since the angular momentum J_a is subleading compared to J_b and Q , it can be neglected at leading order. Incorporating the near-EVH scaling relations (97) into the entropy functional, together with the chemical potential constraint, correctly reproduces the black hole entropy in the near-EVH limit (38).

The entropy of the AdS₇ black hole is reproduced by the following functional [19, 25, 46, 73]

$$= -\frac{\pi^2}{8G_N} \frac{\Delta^4}{\omega_1 \omega_2 \omega_3} + Q\Delta - \sum_{i=1}^3 J_i \omega_i - \Lambda \left(\sum_{i=1}^3 \omega_i - 4\Delta - 2\pi i \right). \quad (98)$$

This can be derived from either a 6d SCFT or the 5d $\mathcal{N} = 2$ Yang-Mills theory on S^5 [90]. The entropy, evaluated in the saddle-point approximation, is still captured by the Lagrange multiplier (93) due to the homogeneity of this functional. To obtain a real-valued physical entropy for real charges and angular momenta, the entropy is determined by two equations

$$\begin{aligned} S^2 &= \frac{4\pi^4 (J_1 J_2 + J_2 J_3 + J_1 J_3) - 2G_N \pi^2 Q^3}{\pi^2 - 8G_N Q} \\ \frac{2S^4}{\pi^4} + \left(\frac{J_1 + J_2 + J_3}{G_N} - \frac{3Q^2}{\pi^2} \right) S^2 + \frac{Q^4}{8} - \frac{4\pi^2}{G_N} J_1 J_2 J_3 &= 0. \end{aligned} \quad (99)$$

In the exact EVH limit where $J_{1,2} = Q = 0$, the constraint

(99) implies that the entropy vanishes, consistent with the computation on the gravity side. In the near-EVH limit (76), the thermodynamic quantities scale with ϵ as:

$$\omega_1 \sim \omega_2 \sim i\pi, \quad \Delta \sim \omega_3 \sim \epsilon, \quad J_1 \sim J_2 \sim N^3 \epsilon^4, \quad J_3 \sim Q \sim N^3 \epsilon^2. \quad (100)$$

Therefore, the contributions from the angular momenta $J_{1,2}$ are entirely subleading in the near-EVH limit, where $N^3 \epsilon^3$ is held fixed. This phenomenon is reminiscent of the case in which one extremizes the AdS₆ entropy functional rather than that of AdS₅, in which the subleading angular momenta are crucial for deriving the Cardy formula.

A few remarks are in order.

- First, the contribution from the nearly vanishing angular momenta is subleading, yielding an inhomogeneous entropy functional that does not decompose into a two-step extremization procedure, which is consistent with the fact that the near-EVH geometry is not of the BTZ type.

- Second, we propose interpreting the entropy functional in the limit (97) as that of an EMD black hole. It is important to note that EMD black holes carry no angular momentum and exhibit no angular velocities [69]. To establish this correspondence, the quantities in (97) must be mapped to the thermodynamic variables of EMD black holes in the decoupled limit. Furthermore, the explicit EMD metric depends mildly on the coordinate θ_2 , which is integrated out in the near-EVH black hole entropy expressions (38) and (81). Consequently, the near-EVH black hole entropy effectively averages over a family of EMD geometries, rendering the matching between the EMD black hole entropy and the near-EVH limit more subtle. This additional degree of freedom can be absorbed into a redefinition of the lower-dimensional Newton constant.

- Finally, the EVH limits are defined by setting a certain subset of charges and angular momenta to zero, leading to enhanced supersymmetry. This is equivalent to defining appropriate subsectors of the superconformal field theories dual to the AdS_{6,7} black holes.

However, all of these holographic aspects lie beyond the scope of the present work.

V. CONCLUSION AND FUTURE WORK

In this work, we systematically explore possible near-horizon decoupled geometries in higher-dimensional AdS black holes embedded in string theory and M-theory [48]. Thanks to their high dimensionality and rich parameter space, the $D = 6, 7$ black holes admit model-dependent

decoupled geometries of dimension $D \geq 4$ that are conformal to black hole solutions of EMD gravity. These generalize the universal AdS₂ throats that appear in the near-horizon limits of extremal black holes. (Our analysis is restricted to leading order in the near-EVH limit, which may be insensitive to the presence of a cosmological constant in the decoupled EMD geometries.)

As summarized in Table 1, the emergence of these distinct decoupled geometries has several crucial holographic implications. Most notably, the near-EVH limits in $D = 6, 7$ yield EMD spacetimes rather than pure AdS _{$D-2$} factors, directly indicating that the decoupled low-energy sectors do not exhibit standard conformal invariance. Instead, the presence of a running dilaton in the EMD solutions suggests that the dual infrared effective field theories may be governed by generalized scaling symmetries or hyperscaling-violating properties [84, 91, 92], rather than by traditional CFTs.

The first open question is to characterize the microscopic states dual to the classes of decoupled EMD black holes (41) and (83), which are asymptotically flat [69, 74]. By rigorously embedding these non-AdS geometries into the well-defined near-EVH limits of AdS₆ and AdS₇, we establish a controlled, top-down holographic framework. This provides a clear pathway to tackle the microstate-counting problem for non-AdS black holes. Specifically, the distinctive thermodynamic scaling $S \sim T^{D-4}$ observed in these limits offers a macroscopic prediction for the density of states, setting a precise target for future field-theoretic computations and partition-function evaluations in the dual IR theory. The field theories dual to these black holes should be viewed as decoupled subsectors of the higher-dimensional dual SCFTs in $D = 5, 6$ [21–23]. However, these subsectors are not as well studied as the well-understood counterpart in $\mathcal{N} = 4$ SYM, namely Spin Matrix theory [93–99]. A major challenge is that the SCFTs in $D = 5, 6$, and especially the $6d$ $\mathcal{N} = (2, 0)$ theory, remain far from fully understood, as they lack weakly coupled descriptions [100], though efforts to construct Lagrangian descriptions exist [101]. Despite these challenges, our analysis indicates that the decoupled subsectors of SCFTs in $D = 5, 6$ provide a natural framework for describing the holographic duals to asymptotically flat EMD black holes. Ultimately, these models suggest a novel strategy: utilizing higher-dimen-

Table 1. A summary of the decoupled geometries that appear in the near-EVH limit is provided.

Black hole	Allowed near horizon decoupled geometry
AdS ₄	AdS ₂ , BTZ
AdS ₅	AdS ₂ , BTZ
AdS ₆	AdS ₂ , EMD in $D = 4$
AdS ₇	AdS ₂ , BTZ or EMD in $D = 5$

sional AdS/CFT embeddings to decode the microscopic states of flat or non-AdS black holes, thereby offering a concrete example of holography beyond the standard AdS/CFT correspondence.

Analytic solutions for black objects in higher dimensions are more readily available in asymptotically flat spacetimes. Notable examples include the Myers–Perry black holes with the maximal number of independent rotations [102], the Cvetic–Youm solution incorporating U(1) charges in arbitrary dimensions [103], and solutions with nontrivial horizon topologies such as black rings [104–106] and black saturns [107]. For comprehensive reviews, see [108]. These configurations may give rise to even richer geometric structures in the near-EVH regime [109, 110].

Unlike AdS₅ black holes, whose near-horizon limits are pinched AdS₃/BTZ geometries [31, 35, 87], the near-EVH limits of AdS_{D=6,7} black holes are of the following forms

$$ds_D^2 = \epsilon^2 \Omega \times ds_{\text{EMMD}_{D-2}}^2 + ds_{S^2}^2, \quad (101)$$

where Ω is a conformal factor. These geometries are similar to the recently introduced MpT geometries, which generalize non-relativistic Newton–Cartan geometry so that Dp-brane actions admit well-defined non-relativistic limits [88, 111]. The form of the decoupled geometry (101) in the near-EVH limits of AdS_{6,7} suggests that these backgrounds can be studied from the perspective of non-relativistic strings and branes. They might provide non-perturbative configurations in non-relativistic string theory at finite temperature.

The EMD geometries emerging in the near-EVH limits of AdS_D black holes are specific to certain gauged supergravity models, whereas AdS₂ throats universally appear in the near-horizon region of near-extremal black holes. Although finite-energy excitations break the strict AdS₂ boundary conditions, their dynamics are universally captured by Jackiw–Teitelboim (JT) gravity—a nearly-AdS₂ theory proposed to be dual to the Sachdev–Ye–Kitaev (SYK) model [112–116]. This framework accounts for the linear term $S_1 T$ in the low-temperature entropy expansion $S = S_0 + S_1 T$; see [117, 118] for pedagogical treatments. Extensions to three dimensions have also been explored, providing a higher-dimensional analogue of the near-AdS₂/SYK correspondence [119]. These developments have been further applied to study the dynamics of near-BPS AdS₅ black holes and to identify mass gaps [120]. In our context, the EMD black holes serve as novel low-energy effective geometries in the infrared, characterized by the higher power-law scaling $S \sim T^{D-4}$. They may similarly be understood as gravitational duals to strongly coupled low-energy sectors, much like higher-dimensional generaliza-

tions of the SYK model capturing nontrivial infrared dynamics.

ACKNOWLEDGEMENT

We thank Yan Liu, Hong Lv, Sanjaye Ramgoolam, and Ziqi Yan for useful discussions, and the anonymous referee for helpful comments on an earlier draft. Y.L. also thanks Nordita, Eurostrings 2025, and the Niels Bohr Institute, where this work is being carried out.

APPENDIX A: REVIEW OF EMD GRAVITY

In this section, we briefly review the Einstein–Maxwell–Maxwell–Dilaton gravity model studied in [69, 74]. The Lagrangian of the D-dimensional supergravity under consideration is given by

$$\frac{1}{e} \mathcal{L} = R - \frac{1}{2} (\partial\phi)^2 - \frac{1}{4} e^{a_1\phi} F_1^2 - \frac{1}{4} e^{a_2\phi} F_2^2 - V(\phi), \quad (A1)$$

where a_1 and a_2 are the dilaton coupling constants. To obtain analytic solutions within this supergravity theory, it is convenient to parameterize the couplings as

$$a_1^2 = \frac{4}{N_1} - \frac{2(D-3)}{D-2}, \quad a_2^2 = \frac{4}{N_2} - \frac{2(D-3)}{D-2}, \quad (A2)$$

Here, N_i are positive integers in the context of supergravity. We focus in particular on black hole solutions that satisfy

$$a_1 a_2 = -\frac{2(D-3)}{D-2}. \quad (A3)$$

Under this condition, analytic solutions with two independent charges can be constructed, as shown in [69].

The general solutions to the field equations derived from the action (102) take the following form:

$$\begin{aligned} ds^2 &= -(H_1^{N_1} H_2^{N_2})^{-\frac{D-3}{D-2}} f dt^2 + (H_1^{N_1} H_2^{N_2})^{\frac{1}{D-2}} \left(\frac{dr^2}{f} + r^2 d\Omega_{D-2}^2 \right) \\ A_1 &= \frac{\sqrt{N_1} c_1}{s_1} \frac{dt}{H_1}, \quad A_2 = \frac{\sqrt{N_2} c_2}{s_2} \frac{dt}{H_2} \\ \phi &= \frac{1}{2} N_1 a_1 \ln H_1 + \frac{1}{2} N_2 a_2 \ln H_2, \quad f = 1 - \frac{\mu}{r^{D-3}} \\ H_1 &= 1 + \frac{\mu s_1^2}{r^{D-3}}, \quad H_2 = 1 + \frac{\mu s_2^2}{r^{D-3}}, \end{aligned} \quad (A4)$$

subject to the constraints

$$N_1 a_1 + N_2 a_2 = 0, \quad N_1 + N_2 = \frac{2(D-2)}{D-3}. \quad (A5)$$

In four dimensions ($D=4$), the possible solutions include $(N_1, N_2) = (2, 2), (1, 3), (3, 1)$, while in five dimensions ($D=5$) the only admissible pairs are $(N_1, N_2) = (2, 1), (1, 2)$. We now examine each of these cases in turn.

$D=4$ geometry with $(N_1, N_2) = (2, 2)$

This symmetric choice of parameters, with $a_1 = -a_2 = 1$, yields a particularly simple and elegant solution. We define the charge parameters as

$$q_1 = \mu s_1^2, \quad q_2 = \mu s_2^2, \quad (\text{A6})$$

The metric in (A4) simplifies to

$$ds^2 = -\frac{r(r-\mu)}{(r+q_1)(r+q_2)} dt^2 + \frac{(r+q_1)(r+q_2)}{r(r-\mu)} dr^2 + (r+q_1)(r+q_2) d\Omega_2^2. \quad (\text{A7})$$

To make its underlying conformal structure explicit, we factor the metric. Assuming, without loss of generality, that $q_2 - q_1 = q > 0$, we can recast it in the form

$$ds^2 = \frac{r+q_2}{r+q_1} \left[-\frac{(r-\mu)r}{(r+q_2)^2} dt^2 + \frac{(r+q_1)^2}{r(r-\mu)} dr^2 + (r+q_1)^2 d\Omega_2^2 \right]. \quad (\text{A8})$$

This conformal representation shows that the solution interpolates between different geometries while preserving the same asymptotics; the prefactor plays a crucial role.

$D=4$ geometry with $(N_1, N_2) = (1, 3)$

Owing to the symmetry between N_1 and N_2 , it suffices to analyze the $(1, 3)$ case, since the $(3, 1)$ solution is its direct counterpart. The corresponding dilaton couplings are fixed as follows:

$$a_1 = \sqrt{3}, \quad a_2 = -\frac{1}{\sqrt{3}}. \quad (\text{A9})$$

In this asymmetric configuration, the metric (105) reduces to:

$$ds^2 = -\frac{r(r-\mu)}{\sqrt{(r+q_1)(r+q_2)^3}} dt^2 + \frac{\sqrt{(r+q_1)(r+q_2)^3}}{r(r-\mu)} dr^2 + \sqrt{(r+q_1)(r+q_2)^3} d\Omega_2^2. \quad (\text{A10})$$

Expressing this metric in a conformally rescaled frame yields a clearer geometric interpretation:

$$ds^2 = \sqrt{\frac{r+q_1}{r+q_2}} \left[-\frac{r(r-\mu)}{(r+q_1)(r+q_2)} dt^2 + \frac{(r+q_2)^2 dr^2}{r(r-\mu)} + (r+q_2)^2 d\Omega_2^2 \right]. \quad (\text{A11})$$

$D=5$ geometry with $(N_1, N_2) = (1, 2)$

We now consider a five-dimensional example with $(N_1, N_2) = (1, 2)$. The corresponding dilaton couplings are given by:

$$a_1 = \sqrt{\frac{8}{3}}, \quad a_2 = -\sqrt{\frac{2}{3}}. \quad (\text{A12})$$

The full metric in this case reads

$$ds^2 = -\frac{r^2(r^2-\mu)dt^2}{(r^2+q_1)^{\frac{2}{3}}(r^2+q_2)^{\frac{4}{3}}} + \frac{(r^2+q_1)^{\frac{1}{3}}(r^2+q_2)^{\frac{2}{3}}}{r^2-\mu} dr^2 + (r^2+q_1)^{\frac{1}{3}}(r^2+q_2)^{\frac{2}{3}} d\Omega_3^2. \quad (\text{A13})$$

A clearer picture of the geometry emerges upon applying the coordinate transformation.

$$x^2 = r^2 + q_1, \quad q = q_2 - q_1 > 0. \quad (\text{A14})$$

In these new coordinates, the metric takes the following conformally flat form:

$$ds^2 = \frac{(x^2+q)^{\frac{2}{3}}}{x^{\frac{4}{3}}} \left[-\frac{(x^2-q_1)(x^2-q_1-\mu)dt^2}{(x^2+q)^2} + \frac{x^4 dx^2}{(x^2-q_1)(x^2-q_1-\mu)} + x^2 d\Omega_3^2 \right]. \quad (\text{A15})$$

This final form reduces to the standard five-dimensional RN black hole upon setting $q = 0$.

References

- [1] Goldstein, K., Jejjala, V., Lei, Y., van Leuven, S., and Li, W., *JHEP* **02**, 154 (2020)
- [2] Abac, A. G., *et al.*, *Phys. Rev. Lett.* **136**, 041403 (2026)
- [3] Hawking, S. W., *Commun. Math. Phys.* **25**, 152 (1972)
- [4] Tang, S.-P., Wang, H.-T., Li, Y.-J., and Fan, Y.-Z., *Sci. Bull.* **71**, 83 (2026)

- [5] Abac, A. G., *et al.*, *Phys. Rev. Lett.* **135**, 111403 (2025)
- [6] Strominger, A., *JHEP* **02**, 009 (1998)
- [7] Guica, M., Hartman, T., Song, W., and Strominger, A., *Phys. Rev. D* **80**, 124008 (2009)
- [8] Lu, H., Mei, J.-w., Pope, C. N., and Vazquez-Poritz, J. F., *Phys. Lett. B* **673**, 77 (2009)
- [9] Chow, D. D. K., Cvetič, M., Lu, H., and Pope, C. N., *Phys. Rev. D* **79**, 084018 (2009)
- [10] Lu, H., Mei, J., and Pope, C. N., *JHEP* **04**, 054 (2009)
- [11] Frolov, V. P., Krtous, P., and Kubiznak, D., *Living. Rev. Rel.* **20**, 6 (2017)
- [12] Kinney, J., Maldacena, J. M., Minwalla, S., and Raju, S., *Commun. Math. Phys.* **275**, 209 (2007)
- [13] Benini, F., Hristov, K., and Zaffaroni, A., *JHEP* **05**, 054 (2016)
- [14] Choi, S., Hwang, C., Kim, S., and Nahmgoong, J., *J. Korean Phys. Soc.* **76**, 101 (2020)
- [15] Choi, S., Hwang, C., and Kim, S., *JHEP* **09**, 096 (2024)
- [16] Choi, S. and Hwang, C., *JHEP* **03**, 068 (2020)
- [17] Cabo-Bizet, A., Cassani, D., Martelli, D., and Murthy, S., *JHEP* **10**, 062 (2019)
- [18] Benini, F. and Milan, E., *Phys. Rev. X* **10**, 021037 (2020)
- [19] Choi, S., Kim, J., Kim, S., and Nahmgoong, J., (2018).
- [20] Goldstein, K., Jejjala, V., Lei, Y., van Leuven, S., and Li, W., *JHEP* **04**, 216 (2021)
- [21] Choi, S. and Kim, S., *JHEP* **08**, 228 (2024)
- [22] Nahmgoong, J., *JHEP* **02**, 092 (2021)
- [23] Bobev, N., David, M., Dimitrov, V., and Hong, J., *JHEP* **11**, 159 (2025)
- [24] Hosseini, S. M., Hristov, K., and Zaffaroni, A., *JHEP* **05**, 121 (2018)
- [25] Zaffaroni, A., *Living. Rev. Rel.* **23**, 2 (2020)
- [26] Larsen, F., Nian, J., and Zeng, Y., *JHEP* **06**, 001 (2020)
- [27] David, M., Nian, J., and Pando Zayas, L. A., *JHEP* **11**, 041 (2020)
- [28] Sadeghian, S., Sheikh-Jabbari, M. M., and Yavartanoo, H., *JHEP* **10**, 081 (2014)
- [29] Kunduri, H. K., Lucietti, J., and Reall, H. S., *Class. Quant. Grav.* **24**, 4169 (2007)
- [30] Balasubramanian, V., de Boer, J., Jejjala, V., and Simon, J., *JHEP* **05**, 067 (2008)
- [31] de Boer, J., Johnstone, M., Sheikh-Jabbari, M. M., and Simon, J., *Phys. Rev. D* **85**, 084039 (2012)
- [32] Johnstone, M., Sheikh-Jabbari, M. M., Simon, J., and Yavartanoo, H., *JHEP* **04**, 045 (2013)
- [33] Fareghbal, R., Gowdigere, C. N., Mosaffa, A. E., and Sheikh-Jabbari, M. M., *Phys. Rev. D* **81**, 046005 (2010)
- [34] Fareghbal, R., Gowdigere, C. N., Mosaffa, A. E., and Sheikh-Jabbari, M. M., *JHEP* **08**, 070 (2008)
- [35] Sheikh-Jabbari, M. M. and Yavartanoo, H., *JHEP* **10**, 013 (2011)
- [36] Yavartanoo, H., *Eur. Phys. J. C* **72**, 2256 (2012)
- [37] Yavartanoo, H., *Nucl. Phys. B* **863**, 410 (2012)
- [38] Yavartanoo, H., *Eur. Phys. J. C* **72**, 1911 (2012)
- [39] Noorbakhsh, S. M. and Vahidinia, M. H., *JHEP* **01**, 042 (2018)
- [40] Sadeghian, S., Sheikh-Jabbari, M. M., Vahidinia, M. H., and Yavartanoo, H., *Nucl. Phys. B* **900**, 222 (2015)
- [41] Sadeghian, S. and Yavartanoo, H., *Class. Quant. Grav.* **33**, 095006 (2016)
- [42] Maldacena, J. M., Michelson, J., and Strominger, A., *JHEP* **02**, 011 (1999)
- [43] Cardy, J. L., *Nucl. Phys. B* **270**, 186 (1986)
- [44] Chow, D. D. K., *Class. Quant. Grav.* **27**, 065004 (2010)
- [45] Chow, D. D. K., *Class. Quant. Grav.* **25**, 175010 (2008)
- [46] Bobev, N., David, M., Hong, J., and Mouland, R., *JHEP* **09** (2023) 143, [Erratum: *JHEP* **09**, 198 (2023)].
- [47] Cvetič, M., *et al.*, *Nucl. Phys. B* **558**, 96 (1999)
- [48] Duff, M. J., TASI lectures on branes, black holes and Anti-de Sitter space, in *9th CRM Summer School: Theoretical Physics at the End of the 20th Century*, pages 3–125, 1999.
- [49] Gibbons, G. W., Lu, H., Page, D. N., and Pope, C. N., *Phys. Rev. Lett.* **93**, 171102 (2004)
- [50] Chen, W., Lu, H., and Pope, C. N., *Class. Quant. Grav.* **23**, 5323 (2006)
- [51] Wu, S.-Q., *Phys. Lett. B* **707**, 286 (2012)
- [52] Gutowski, J. B. and Reall, H. S., *JHEP* **04**, 048 (2004)
- [53] Cvetič, M., Lu, H., and Pope, C. N., *Phys. Rev. D* **70**, 081502 (2004)
- [54] Chong, Z. W., Cvetič, M., Lu, H., and Pope, C. N., *Phys. Rev. D* **72**, 041901 (2005)
- [55] Chong, Z. W., Cvetič, M., Lu, H., and Pope, C. N., *Phys. Rev. Lett.* **95**, 161301 (2005)
- [56] Kunduri, H. K., Lucietti, J., and Reall, H. S., *JHEP* **04**, 036 (2006)
- [57] Hosseini, S. M., Hristov, K., and Zaffaroni, A., *JHEP* **07**, 106 (2017)
- [58] Cabo-Bizet, A. and Murthy, S., *JHEP* **09**, 184 (2020)
- [59] Benini, F., Colombo, E., Soltani, S., Zaffaroni, A., and Zhang, Z., *Class. Quant. Grav.* **37**, 215021 (2020)
- [60] Arabi Ardehali, A. and Murthy, S., *JHEP* **10**, 207 (2021)
- [61] Jejjala, V., Lei, Y., van Leuven, S., and Li, W., *JHEP* **11**, 047 (2021)
- [62] Aharony, O., Benini, F., Mamroud, O., and Milan, E., *Phys. Rev. D* **104**, 086026 (2021)
- [63] Cabo-Bizet, A., *JHEP* **02**, 134 (2023)
- [64] Colombo, E., *JHEP* **12**, 013 (2022)
- [65] Aharony, O., Mamroud, O., Nowik, S., and Weissman, M., *Phys. Rev. D* **109**, 085015 (2024)
- [66] Jejjala, V., Lei, Y., van Leuven, S., and Li, W., *JHEP* **10**, 105 (2023)
- [67] Cabo-Bizet, A., (2020).
- [68] Nahm, W., *Nucl. Phys. B* **135**, 149 (1978)
- [69] Lu, H., *JHEP* **09**, 112 (2013)
- [70] Cvetič, M., Lu, H., and Pope, C. N., *Phys. Rev. Lett.* **83**, 5226 (1999)
- [71] Mishra, M. and Virmani, A., *JHEP* **06**, 087 (2022)
- [72] Wu, D. and Wu, S.-Q., *JHEP* **11**, 031 (2021)
- [73] Cassani, D. and Papini, L., *JHEP* **09**, 079 (2019)
- [74] Lu, G.-Y., Yang, M.-N., and Lu, H., *JHEP* **11**, 066 (2025)
- [75] Nastase, H., Vaman, D., and van Nieuwenhuizen, P., *Nucl. Phys. B* **581**, 179 (2000)
- [76] Nastase, H., Vaman, D., and van Nieuwenhuizen, P., *Phys. Lett. B* **469**, 96 (1999)
- [77] Liu, J. T. and Minasian, R., *Phys. Lett. B* **457**, 39 (1999)
- [78] Wu, S.-Q., *Phys. Lett. B* **705**, 383 (2011)
- [79] Chow, D. D. K., (2011).
- [80] Chong, Z. W., Cvetič, M., Lu, H., and Pope, C. N., *Phys. Lett. B* **626**, 215 (2005)
- [81] Cvetič, M., Gibbons, G. W., Lu, H., and Pope, C. N., (2005).
- [82] Larsen, F. and Paranjape, S., *JHEP* **10**, 198 (2021)
- [83] Kachru, S., Liu, X., and Mulligan, M., *Phys. Rev. D* **78**, 106005 (2008)
- [84] Dong, X., Harrison, S., Kachru, S., Torroba, G., and Wang, H., *JHEP* **06**, 041 (2012)

- [85] David, J. R., String theory and black holes, Other thesis, 1999.
- [86] Gupta, V., *Phys. Lett. B* **853**, 138650 (2024)
- [87] de Boer, J., Sheikh-Jabbari, M. M., and Simon, J., *Class. Quant. Grav.* **28**, 175012 (2011)
- [88] Blair, C. D. A., Lahnsteiner, J., Obers, N. A., and Yan, Z., *Phys. Rev. Lett.* **132**, 161603 (2024)
- [89] Crichigno, P. M. and Jain, D., *JHEP* **09**, 124 (2020)
- [90] Kántor, G., Papageorgakis, C., and Richmond, P., *JHEP* **01**, 017 (2020)
- [91] Ogawa, N., Takayanagi, T., and Ugajin, T., *JHEP* **01**, 125 (2012)
- [92] Huijse, L., Sachdev, S., and Swingle, B., *Phys. Rev. B* **85**, 035121 (2012)
- [93] Harmark, T., Kristjansson, K. R., and Orselli, M., *JHEP* **09**, 115 (2007)
- [94] Harmark, T. and Orselli, M., *JHEP* **11**, 134 (2014)
- [95] Harmark, T. and Wintergerst, N., *Phys. Rev. Lett.* **124**, 171602 (2020)
- [96] Baiguera, S., Harmark, T., and Wintergerst, N., *JHEP* **02**, 188 (2021)
- [97] Baiguera, S., Harmark, T., Lei, Y., and Wintergerst, N., *JHEP* **04**, 029 (2021)
- [98] Baiguera, S., Harmark, T., and Lei, Y., *JHEP* **02**, 191 (2022)
- [99] Baiguera, S., Harmark, T., and Lei, Y., *JHEP* **04**, 075 (2023)
- [100] Chang, C.-M., *JHEP* **09**, 016 (2019)
- [101] Lambert, N., *Phys. Lett. B* **798**, 134948 (2019)
- [102] Myers, R. C. and Perry, M. J., *Annals. Phys.* **172**, 304 (1986)
- [103] Cvetič, M. and Youm, D., *Nucl. Phys. B* **477**, 449 (1996)
- [104] Emparan, R. and Reall, H. S., *Phys. Rev. Lett.* **88**, 101101 (2002)
- [105] Emparan, R. and Reall, H. S., *Class. Quant. Grav.* **23**, R169 (2006)
- [106] Bena, I., Ross, S. F., and Warner, N. P., *Class. Quant. Grav.* **31**, 165015 (2014)
- [107] Elvang, H. and Figueras, P., *JHEP* **05**, 050 (2007)
- [108] Obers, N. A., *Lect. Notes Phys.* **769**, 211 (2009)
- [109] Ghodsi, A., Golchin, H., and Sheikh-Jabbari, M. M., *JHEP* **09**, 036 (2014)
- [110] Golchin, H., Sheikh-Jabbari, M. M., and Ghodsi, A., *JHEP* **10**, 194 (2013)
- [111] Blair, C. D. A., Lahnsteiner, J., Obers, N. A., and Yan, Z., *JHEP* **02**, 024 (2025)
- [112] Almheiri, A. and Polchinski, J., *JHEP* **11**, 014 (2015)
- [113] Engelsöy, J., Mertens, T. G., and Verlinde, H., *JHEP* **07**, 139 (2016)
- [114] Cvetič, M. and Papadimitriou, I., *JHEP* **12** (2016) 008, [Erratum: *JHEP* 01, 120 (2017)].
- [115] Maldacena, J., Stanford, D., and Yang, Z., *PTEP* **2016**, 12C104 (2016)
- [116] Maldacena, J. and Stanford, D., *Phys. Rev. D* **94**, 106002 (2016)
- [117] Sárosi, G., *PoS Modave2017*, 001 (2018)
- [118] Mertens, T. G. and Turiaci, G. J., *Living. Rev. Rel.* **26**, 4 (2023)
- [119] Cotler, J. and Jensen, K., *JHEP* **02**, 079 (2019)
- [120] Boruch, J., Heydeman, M. T., Iliesiu, L. V., and Turiaci, G. J., *JHEP* **07**, 220 (2025)