

# The generalized uncertainty principle impact onto the black hole thermodynamic phase transition

Zhong-Wen Feng,<sup>1</sup> \* Xia Zhou,<sup>1</sup> Shi-Qi Zhou,<sup>1</sup>

1. *Physics and Space Science College, China West Normal University, Nanchong, 637009, China*

**Abstract:** In this work, we conducted a study regarding the local thermodynamic quantities and the phase transition of a black hole subject to the generalized uncertainty principle. The results demonstrate that both the positive and negative generalized uncertainty principle parameters  $\beta_0$  can significantly affect the thermodynamic evolution, stability, critical behavior and phase transition of the black hole. For  $\beta_0 > 0$ , the black hole forms a thermodynamically inert remnant with a finite temperature and mass but zero local heat capacity in the last stages of evolution. Meanwhile, it has one second-order phase transitions and two Hawking-Page-type phase transitions. The Gross-Perry-Yaffe phase transition occurs for both large black hole state and small black hole state. For  $\beta_0 < 0$ , the Gross-Perry-Yaffe phase transition occurs only for large black hole state, and the temperature and heat capacity of remnant is finite, whereas its mass is zero. This indicates the remnant is metastable and would be in the Hawking-Page-type phase transition forever.

## 1 Introduction

The Planck scale is well known as the minimum scale in nature. In the vicinity of it, many works claimed that the smooth spacetimes is replaced by the foamy structure that caused by the quantum gravity (QG) [1–4]. Therefore, the Planck scale can be regarded as a demarcation line between the classical gravity and the QG. For a long time, it is believed that the properties of different physical systems would be properly changed at Planck scale due to the effect of QG. For example, when the Heisenberg Uncertainty Principle (HUP) approaches the Planck scales, it should be modified to the so-called Generalized Uncertainty Principle (GUP). In this sense, Kempf, Mangano and Mann proposed one of the most adopted GUP with a quadratic term in momentum as follows:

$$\Delta x \Delta p \geq \frac{\hbar}{2} \left[ 1 + \beta_0 \frac{\ell_p^2 \Delta p^2}{\hbar^2} \right], \quad (1)$$

where  $\ell_p$  is the Planck length, and  $\beta_0$  is a dimensionless GUP parameter. Meanwhile, inequality (1) is equivalent to the modified fundamental commutation relation  $[x_i, p_i] = i\hbar\delta_{ij} [1 + \beta_0 \ell_p^2 p^2 / \hbar^2]$  with the position operator  $x_i$  and momentum operator  $p_i$ . Theoretically, the GUP parameter is always taken to be positive and of the order of unity, so that the results are only efficient at the Planck length. However, if this assumption is ignored, Eq. (1) can be treated by phenomenology for constraining bound of GUP parameter from experimental and observational [5–13]. With those, it is believed that some new physics may appear [14].

Despite the GUP with a positive parameter plays an important role in many physical systems, such as gravitational theory and astrophysics [15–20], black hole physics [21–25], cosmology [26–29], quantum physics [30–33], and leads to some interesting results. It still beneficial to investigate how GUP with a negative  $\beta_0$  affects the classical theories [7, 34–36]. Recently, it is found that Chandrasekhar limit fails with positive GUP parameter and leads to mass of white dwarfs to be arbitrarily large [37, 38]. For solving this paradoxical situation, Ong suggests taking  $\beta_0 < 0$ , which naturally restore the Chandrasekhar limit [36]. Furthermore, in order to be compatible with the previous work of thermodynamics of black holes, the Hawking temperatures with both positive and negative GUP parameters have been substantively revised in Ref. [39], which can be expressed as follows:

$$T_H^{\text{GUP}} = \begin{cases} \frac{Mc^2}{4\pi\beta_0} \left( 1 - \sqrt{1 - \frac{\beta_0 \hbar c}{GM^2}} \right), & \beta_0 > 0, \\ -\frac{Mc^2}{4\pi|\beta_0|} \left( 1 - \sqrt{1 + \frac{|\beta_0| \hbar c}{GM^2}} \right), & \beta_0 < 0, \end{cases} \quad (2)$$

---

\*Email: zwfengphy@163.com

where  $M$  is the mass of the Schwarzschild (SC) black hole. The modified Hawking temperatures reproduce the original cases for  $\beta_0 \rightarrow 0$ . Moreover, according to the first law of black hole thermodynamics  $dM = TdS$ , the GUP corrected entropy associated with Eq. (2) reads

$$S^{\text{GUP}} = \begin{cases} 2\pi \left\{ \frac{GM^2}{c^3\hbar} \left( 1 + \sqrt{1 - \frac{\beta_0}{GM^2}} \right) - \frac{\beta_0}{c^2} \ln \left[ M \left( 1 + \sqrt{1 - \frac{\beta_0}{GM^2}} \right) \right] \right\}, & \beta_0 > 0, \\ 2\pi \left\{ \frac{GM^2}{c^3\hbar} \left( 1 + \sqrt{1 + \frac{|\beta_0|}{GM^2}} \right) + \frac{|\beta_0|}{c^2} \ln \left[ M \left( 1 + \sqrt{1 + \frac{|\beta_0|}{GM^2}} \right) \right] \right\}, & \beta_0 < 0, \end{cases} \quad (3)$$

where the logarithmic corrections on the RHS are consistent with the expectation of QG theories. The original area law of the entropy  $S = 4\pi GM^2/c^3\hbar$  is recovered in HUP. According to Eq. (2) and Eq. (3), it is worth noting that whether  $\beta_0 > 0$  or  $\beta_0 < 0$ , the pictures of Hawking radiation are deviate from the classical one, which prevent the black hole total evaporation and resolve the catastrophic behavior of Hawking radiation in the last stages of evolution. The detailed discussions about Eq. (2) and Eq. (3), please see Refs. [36, 39].

On the other hand, the thermodynamic properties and evolution of black holes can be described not only by the Hawking temperature and the corresponding entropy, but also by the their phase structures and critical phenomena. To our knowledge, the study of the thermodynamic phase transition of black hole starts by Hawking and Page, who pointed out the existence of a thermodynamic phase transition in the asymptotically anti-de Sitter (AdS) SC black hole (i. e. Hawking-Page phase transition) when its temperature reaches a certain value. Furthermore, this pioneering work demonstrates the deeper-seated relation between confinement and deconfinement phase transition of gauge field in the AdS/CFT correspondence [40]. Since the AdS term can be considered as a reflective surface, the AdS black holes have inherent thermal stability in some case, which is beneficial for people to study its behavior of thermodynamic phase transition. Therefore, inspired by the classical theory of Hawking-Page phase transition, the phase structures and critical phenomena of a variety of complicated AdS spacetimes have been explored [41–47].

In parallel with research on AdS black holes, people are also exploring the phase structures and critical phenomena of the non-AdS spacetimes. In Ref. [48], the author found a non-equilibrium second order phase transition in the charged Reissner-Nordström spacetime. Subsequently, the phenomena of phase transition of Kerr-Newman black hole was proved by Davies [49]. By utilizing the path-integral formulation of Einstein's theory, the Gross-Perry-Yaffe (GPY) phase transition, which occurs for a hot flat space without black holes decay into the large black hole state, was found in Ref. [50]. Recently, the quantum gravity corrections to the thermodynamic phase transition and critical behavior of black hole have attracted a lot attentions [51–56]. In particular, when considering the effect of GUP, the modified thermodynamics of black holes in a cavity is different from the original case, whereas the corresponding thermodynamic phase transition and critical behavior is similar to those of the AdS black hole [57, 58]. Hence, those results works may provide a new perspective for thermodynamic properties and evolution of black holes.

Nevertheless, it should be note that those results obtained in the framework of GUP are all based on the positive parameters. The thermodynamic phase transition and critical behavior with a negative GUP parameter has not been involved. However, based on the arguments in Refs. [36, 39] and Eqs. (2)-(3), it makes this study possible. Therefore, in this paper, we study the thermodynamic stability, critical behavior and phase transition of SC black hole in the framework of GUP with both positive and negative parameters, respectively. It turns out that, the positive/negative GUP parameters can change the thermodynamic structure of black holes in varying degrees, which are different from those of the standard Hawking-Page phase transition and GPY phase transition.

The rest of this paper is organized as follows: in section 2, we investigate the GUP corrected Hawking temperature and specific heat of SC black hole in a cavity. Then, the issue of black hole remnants and the corresponding thermodynamic stability are discussed. According to the modified thermodynamic quantities, the thermodynamic criticality and phase transition of SC black hole is analyzed in detail in Section 3. The conclusion and discussion are contained in Section 4. Throughout this paper we adopt the convention  $\hbar = c = k_B = 1$ .

## 2 The GUP corrected thermodynamic quantities in a cavity

Following the argument in Ref. [59], in order to detect the thermodynamic evolution and the phase transition of a black hole, one should enclose SC black hole in a cavity to keep it in a quasilocal thermally stable.

Suppose the radius of the cavity is  $r$  and using Eq. (2), the GUP corrected local temperature for the observer on the cavity can be expressed as follows:

$$T_{\text{local}}^{\text{GUP}} = \begin{cases} \frac{M}{4\pi\beta_0} \left(1 - \frac{2GM}{r}\right)^{-\frac{1}{2}} \left(1 - \sqrt{1 - \frac{\beta_0}{GM^2}}\right), & \beta_0 > 0, \\ -\frac{M}{4\pi|\beta_0|} \left(1 - \frac{2GM}{r}\right)^{-\frac{1}{2}} \left(1 - \sqrt{1 + \frac{|\beta_0|}{GM^2}}\right), & \beta_0 < 0, \end{cases} \quad (4a)$$

where is implemented by the redshift factor of the metric. Mathematically, the modifications are not only sensitively dependent on mass  $M$ , but also on the GUP parameters  $\beta_0$ . It respects original local temperature  $T_{\text{local}}^{\text{original}} = \frac{c^3\hbar}{8\pi GM} \left(1 - \frac{2GM}{r}\right)^{-\frac{1}{2}}$  in the limit  $\beta_0 \rightarrow 0$ . For  $\beta_0 > 0$ , Eq. (1) shows that the black hole terminates evaporating as its mass approaches  $M'_0 = \sqrt{\beta_0/G} = m_p\sqrt{\beta_0}$ , which leads to a “conservative” remnant with mass  $M_{\beta_0>0}^{\text{res}} = M'_0$  and temperature  $T_{\beta_0>0}^{\text{res}} = T'_0 = \frac{m_p}{4\pi\sqrt{\beta_0}} \left(1 - \sqrt{1 - \frac{1}{Gm_p^2}}\right)$ . However, if  $\beta_0 < 0$ , it turns out to be a “unconventional” black hole remnant, which has no rest mass but only pure temperature  $T''_0 = 1/\sqrt{4\pi|\beta_0|}$ . Despite the remnant with zero rest mass is quite different from those of previous works, it still has been discussed in Refs. [7, 34, 53]. Meanwhile, the remnant is regarded as reasonable when considering the evolution equation of SC black hole and its sparsity of Hawking radiation. In Ref. [39], the author demonstrates the black hole cannot be evaporate completely in finite time, and the corresponding Hawking radiation becomes extremely sparse. Therefore, at the end of evaporation, there exists a metastable, long-lived remnant that approaches zero rest mass asymptotically for  $\beta_0 < 0$ . In order to further investigation the relationship between the local temperature and mass for different GUP parameters, e. g.  $\beta_0 = \pm 1$ , we plot Fig. 1 by fixing  $r = 10$  and  $G = 1$ .




Figure 1: The original and GUP corrected local temperature ( $\beta_0 = \pm 1$ ) as a function of mass. We set  $r = 10$  and  $G = 1$

In Fig. (1), the black solid curve corresponds to original local temperature while the red dashed curve and blue dotted curve represent the GUP corrected cases with  $\beta_0 = 1$  and  $\beta_0 = -1$ , respectively. It is obvious that all the three kinds of local temperature have the minimum values in the “ $T_{\text{local}} - M$ ” plane, which can be easy numerically obtained if needed ( $(M_1, T_1) = (3.333, 0.021)$ ) for the original case;  $(M'_1, T'_1) = (3.384, 0.0212)$  for  $\beta = 1$  case;  $(M''_1, T''_1) = (3.284, 0.020)$  for  $\beta_0 = -1$  case). Those inflection points naturally divide the evolution of black hole into two branches. The left branch represents the early stages of evolution, one can see that original and GUP corrected local temperatures follow a same qualitative behavior, which diverge at  $M_2 = r/2G$ , and gradually decrease with the decrease of mass before they reach the inflection points. This implies the effect of GUP is negligible at big scale. The right branches show the

final destination of the black hole: the original local temperature diverges as  $M \rightarrow 0$ , which eventually leads to “information paradox”. However, under the influence of GUP, SC black hole stops Hawking radiation and leave remnant at the end of evolution. For  $\beta > 0$ , the red dashed curve terminates at  $M'_0 = M_{\beta_0 > 0}^{\text{res}} = 1$  with the  $T'_0 = T_{\beta_0 > 0}^{\text{res}} \approx 0.089$ , whereas the remnant for  $\beta < 0$  has an infinitely small value  $M''_0 = M_{\beta_0 < 0}^{\text{res}}$  with the temperature  $T''_0 = T_{\beta_0 < 0}^{\text{res}} \approx 0.282$ , as we have discussed above.

According to the previous works, one usually classifies the SC black hole as a large black hole and a small black hole depending on the two branches in Fig. 1. For confirming this viewpoint, it is necessary to study the thermodynamic stability of the black hole, which is determined by the heat capacity. Firstly, by using the first law of thermodynamics, the local energy is

$$E_{\text{local}}^{\text{GUP}} = \int_{M_0}^M T_{\text{local}}^{\text{GUP}} dS^{\text{GUP}} = \begin{cases} \frac{r}{G} \left[ \sqrt{1 - \frac{2(\beta_0 G)^{\frac{1}{2}}}{r}} - \sqrt{1 - \frac{2GM}{r}} \right], & \beta_0 > 0, \\ \frac{r}{G} \left( 1 - \sqrt{1 - \frac{2GM}{r}} \right), & \beta_0 < 0. \end{cases} \quad (5a)$$

Note that the lower limit of integration  $M_0$  varies with the positive and negative of  $\beta_0$ . When  $\beta_0 \rightarrow 0$  the original local free energy  $E_{\text{local}}^{\text{original}} = r \left( 1 - \sqrt{1 - 2GM/r} \right) / G$  is recovered, which has the same expression as Eq. (5b). Next, according to the definition  $\mathcal{C} = (\partial E_{\text{local}} / \partial T_{\text{local}})_r$ , the GUP corrected heat capacity within the boundary  $r$  is given by

$$\mathcal{C}_{\text{local}}^{\text{GUP}} \begin{cases} \frac{4\pi M \beta_0 (r - 2GM) \sqrt{1 - \frac{\beta_0}{GM^2}}}{\beta_0 - M (r - GM) \left( 1 - \sqrt{1 - \frac{\beta_0}{GM^2}} \right)}, & \beta_0 > 0, \\ \frac{4\pi M |\beta_0| (r - 2GM) \sqrt{1 + \frac{|\beta_0|}{GM^2}}}{|\beta_0| + M (r - GM) \left( 1 - \sqrt{1 + \frac{|\beta_0|}{GM^2}} \right)}, & \beta_0 < 0. \end{cases} \quad (6a)$$

By setting  $r = 10$  and  $G = 1$ , the original and GUP corrected specific heat as a function of mass for different values of  $\beta_0$  is reflected in Fig. 2.




Figure 2: The original and GUP corrected specific heat ( $\beta_0 = \pm 1$ ) as a function of mass. We set  $r = 10$  and  $G = 1$

As seen from Fig. 2, the black solid curve for the original heat capacity  $\mathcal{C}^{\text{original}} = 8\pi GM^2 (r - 2GM) / (3GM - r)$  goes to zero when  $M = M_0 = 0$ , whereas the red dotted curve for  $\mathcal{C}_{\beta_0 > 0}^{\text{GUP}}$  vanishes at  $M'_0$ , resulting in a ther-

modynamically inert remnant. We are more concerned about what happens when  $\beta_0 < 0$ . It is easy to find that the blue dotted curve for the modified heat capacity with negative GUP has a same behavior as the original case and the positive correction case when the mass of the black hole is large enough. However, it approaches a non-zero value when the mass becomes to  $M_0''$ , which is caused by the thermal interaction between metastable remnant and the environment. In particular, the similar results can be found in the framework of rainbow gravity (RG) [51, 60], which indicates GUP and RG have a deeper connection. Furthermore, all the curves have the vertical asymptotes at the locations where the local temperatures reach the minimum values, namely  $M_1$ ,  $M_1'$  and  $M_1''$ . This means the black hole changes from stable ( $\mathcal{C} > 0$ ) to unstable ( $\mathcal{C} < 0$ ) through a second order phase transition.

Now, based on the discussions on the modified local temperature and the modified heat capacity, one can confirm that the SC black hole can be classify into two branches depending on its mass scale, i.e., the large black hole and the small black hole. The stability and region of mass of the small/large black hole with positive and negative GUP parameters are presented in Table 1.

Table 1: Stability and region of mass of the small/large black hole with different values of GUP parameter

GUP parameter	Branches	Stability	Region of mass
$\beta_0 > 0$	small	unstable	$M_0' < M < M_1'$
	large	stable	$M_1' < M < M_2$
$\beta_0 < 0$	small	unstable	$M_0'' < M < M_1''$
	large	stable	$M_1'' < M < M_2$

Table 1 shows that, whether the GUP parameter is positive or negative, there are always an unstable small black hole (SBH) and a stable large black hole (LBH) in the system. Obviously, the stability determines that SBH cannot exists for a long time, it would decay into the remnants or stable LBH quickly. In this process, some interesting thermodynamic phase transitions that never appears in the original case can be found by analyzing the free energy of LBH and SBH.

### 3 Free energy and phase transition

For analyzing the thermodynamic criticality and phase transition of a black hole, one introduces the free energy in an isothermal cavity as  $F_{\text{on}} = E_{\text{local}} - T_{\text{local}}S$ . By substituting Eq. (3)-Eq. (5), the GUP corrected free energy is given by:

$$F_{\text{on}}^{\text{GUP}} = \begin{cases} \frac{r}{G} \left( \sqrt{1 - \frac{2(\beta_0 G)^{\frac{1}{2}}}{r}} - \sqrt{1 - \frac{2GM}{r}} \right) - \frac{M\Theta}{2\sqrt{1 - \frac{2GM}{r}}}, & \beta_0 > 0, & (7a) \\ \frac{r}{G} \left( 1 - \sqrt{1 - \frac{2GM}{r}} \right) - \frac{M\Xi}{2\sqrt{1 - \frac{2GM}{r}}}, & \beta_0 < 0, & (7b) \end{cases}$$

where  $\Theta = 1 - \left(1 - \sqrt{1 - \beta_0/GM^2}\right) \ln \left[M \left(1 + \sqrt{1 - \beta_0/GM^2}\right)\right]$  and  $\Xi = 1 - \left(1 - \sqrt{1 + |\beta_0|/GM^2}\right) \ln \left[M \left(1 + \sqrt{1 + |\beta_0|/GM^2}\right)\right]$ . In the limit  $\beta_0 \rightarrow 0$ , the original free energy is recovered. By fixing  $r = 10$  and  $G = 1$ , the original and modified free energy versus their local temperatures are presented in Fig. 3.




Figure 3: (a) The original free energy versus the original local temperature. (b) and (c) The GUP corrected free energy versus the modified temperature for different values of  $\beta_0$ . In all cases we take  $r = 10$  and  $G = 1$ .

Fig. 3(a) depicts the relationship between the original local temperature and its local temperature. The horizontal line refers to the free energy of hot flat space (HFS)  $F_{\text{on}}^{\text{HFS}} = 0$  in the Minkowski spacetime that without black hole. The red dashed curve for energy of LBH intersects the  $F_{\text{on}}^{\text{HFS}}$  at  $T_c$ , leads to a first-order Hawking-Page transition. With the decrease of temperature, the free energy of SC black hole exhibits a cusp, and a second-order phase transition appears at critical point  $T_1$  corresponding to the mass  $M_1$ . For  $T_1 < T < T_c$ , the HFS is most probable since  $F_{\text{on}}^{\text{LBH}}$  and  $F_{\text{on}}^{\text{SBH}}$  is higher than  $F_{\text{on}}^{\text{HFS}}$ , while the relation of free energy changes as  $F_{\text{on}}^{\text{LBH}} < F_{\text{on}}^{\text{HFS}} < F_{\text{on}}^{\text{SBH}}$  for  $T > T_c$ , which implies that the HFS and the unstable SBH eventually collapses into the stable LBH. Moreover, according to the viewpoints in Ref. [50], it finds that the GPY phase transition occurs for the LBH.

Next, let us focus on Fig. 3(b) and Fig. 3(c) for the modified cases with different GUP parameters, e.g.  $\beta_0 = \pm 1$ . It is worth noting that the spacetime is always curved due to the remnants of black hole in the frame work of GUP. Hence, the HFS should be replaced by the hot curved space (HCS). As the counterpart of the original one, the HCS and its free energy  $F_{\text{on}}^{\text{HCS}}$  are effectively influence the phase transition of SC black hole.

As seen from Fig. 3(b), when the temperature is lower than  $T_c^{(2)}$ , the behaviors of the modified free energy are analogous to those in Fig. 3(a). A second-order phase transition point and a Hawking-Page-type phase transition occur at inflection point  $T_1'$  and  $T_c^{(1)}$ , respectively. The free energy of LBH is smaller than those of SBH and the HCS for  $T_c^{(1)} < T < T_c^{(2)}$ , resulting the GPY phase transition appears for the LBH. However, for  $T > T_c^{(2)}$ , there are some interesting results that different from original one: (i) an additional Hawking-Page-type phase transition can be found at  $T_c^{(2)}$  since the free energy of SBH intersect with  $F_{\text{on}}^{\text{HCS}}$  at this point. (ii) The energy of SBH decrease below  $F_{\text{on}}^{\text{HCS}}$  as long as  $T_c^{(2)} < T < T_0'$ , which indicates that the HCS decay into SBH via the GPY phase transition. Therefore, when considering the positive GUP parameter, the GPY phase transition also occurs for SBH. (iii) the  $F_{\text{on}}^{\text{SBH}}$  is always higher than those LBH and remnant for  $T > T_c^{(2)}$ , the unstable SBH decays into the stable LBH or remnant eventually.

In Fig. 3(c), the inflection point  $T_c^{(1)''}$  is the Hawking-Page-type phase transition temperature between  $F_{\text{on}}^{\text{LBH}} > 0$  and  $F_{\text{on}}^{\text{LBH}} < 0$ . Besides, one can see a second-order phase transition since far left end of the blue curve for  $F_{\text{on}}^{\text{SBH}}$  meets red dashed curve at  $T_1''$ . On the other hand, considering the remnant without rest mass as we have discussed in section 3, the  $F_{\text{on}}^{\text{SBH}}$  can not reach the intersection point  $T_c^{(2)''}$  in a finite time. Therefore, it turns out the black hole remnant that caused by negative GUP parameter is metastable, and can be “frozen” in the Hawking-Page-type phase transition for a long time, which is consistent with the analysis of the Hawking temperature in Eq. (4b) and the specific heat in Eq. (5b). Meanwhile, this result is reminiscent viewpoints of black hole in Corpuscular Gravity (CG), that is the black holes can be regarded as a condensate at the critical point of a quantum phase transition [61, 62]. Along the line of CG theory, the remnant can be considered an additional metastable tiny black hole (TBH) of the system. With this, it finds that both the unstable SBH and metastable TBH would collapses into stable LBH eventually. Furthermore, the free energy of LBH is always lower than those of SBH and HCS for  $T > T_c^{(1)''}$ , showing the GPY phase

transition only appears for the LBH.

## 4 Conclusion and Discussion

Quantum gravity corrections to thermodynamics of black hole alter the behaviors for both the evolution and the phase transition. We explore the effect of the generalized uncertainty principle to investigate the local thermodynamic quantities, thermal stability and phase transitions of SC black hole. First of all, based on the modified Hawking temperature that have been proposed by Ong, we derived the GUP corrected local temperature  $T_{\text{local}}^{\text{GUP}}$ , local energy  $E_{\text{local}}^{\text{GUP}}$  and local specific heat  $C_{\text{local}}^{\text{GUP}}$ . Those modifications show that the positive/negative GUP can stop the Hawking radiation and form two different kinds of remnant at the end of evaporation (see Fig. 1). When  $\beta_0 > 0$ , the SC black hole leaves a thermodynamically inert remnant with a finite temperature and mass but zero local heat capacity, while the remnant becomes metastable and has a non-zero heat capacity and a finite temperature but zero rest mass for  $\beta_0 < 0$ . Then, according to those modified local thermodynamic quantities, we further calculate the GUP corrected free energy  $F_{\text{on}}^{\text{GUP}}$ . By analyzing the  $F_{\text{on}} - T_{\text{on}}$  in Fig. 3, the phase transition behaviors of SC black hole in the frame work of GUP are obtained: If  $\beta_0 > 0$ , the SC black hole exists two Hawking-Page-type phase transition and one second phase transition, whereas the original case only has one Hawking-Page phase transition and one second phase transition. As long as  $T_c^{(1)} < T < T_c^{(2)}$ , the free energy obeys  $F_{\text{on}}^{\text{LBH}} < F_{\text{on}}^{\text{SBH}} < F_{\text{on}}^{\text{HFS}}$ , which leads to the GPY phase transition dose no only occurs for the LBH but also for the SBH. Meanwhile, the relation of free energies also shows that unstable SBH eventually collapses into the stable LBH or remnant. If  $\beta_0 < 0$ , it finds one Hawking-Page-type critical point and one second phase transition critical point when  $T > T_0''$ . However, for  $T = T_0''$ , the  $F_{\text{on}}^{\text{SBH}}$  is infinitely close to the horizontal line. Considering the black hole leaves a remnant with no rest mass at that temperature  $T = T_0''$ , it is deemed as metastable, and be ‘‘frozen’’ in the Hawking-Page-type phase transition for a long time. Besides, on the basis of CG theory, the remnant can be also regarded as an additional TBH state of the system. Finally, we find the unstable SBH and and metastable eventually collapses into stable the LBH. This scenario is different from the original and positive correction cases.

## References

- [1] K. Konishia, G.Paffutib, P. Provero, Phys. Lett. B **234**, 276 (1990). DOI: [10.1016/0370-2693\(90\)91927-4](https://doi.org/10.1016/0370-2693(90)91927-4)
- [2] M.Maggiore, Phys. Lett. B **319**, 83 (1993). [arXiv:gr-qc/9403008](https://arxiv.org/abs/gr-qc/9403008)
- [3] L. J. Garay, Int. J. Mod. Phys. A **10**, 145 (1995). [arXiv:hep-th/9904025](https://arxiv.org/abs/hep-th/9904025)
- [4] G. Amelino-Camelia, Int. J. Mod. Phys. D **11**, 35 (2002). [arXiv:hep-th/9604045](https://arxiv.org/abs/hep-th/9604045)
- [5] S. Das, E. C. Vagenas, Phys. Rev. Lett. **101**, 221301 (2008). DOI: [10.1103/PhysRevLett.101.221301](https://doi.org/10.1103/PhysRevLett.101.221301)
- [6] S. Ghosh, Class. Quantum Gravity **31**, 025025 (2014). [arXiv:1303.1256](https://arxiv.org/abs/1303.1256)
- [7] F. Scardigli, R. Casadio, Eur. Phys. J. C **75**, 425 (2015). [arXiv:1407.0113](https://arxiv.org/abs/1407.0113)
- [8] D. Gao, M. Zhan, Phys. Rev. A **94**, 013607 (2016). [arXiv:1607.04353](https://arxiv.org/abs/1607.04353)
- [9] Z.-W. Feng, S.-Z. Yang, H.-L. Li, X.-T. Zu, Phys. Lett. B **768**, 81 (2017). [arXiv:1610.08549](https://arxiv.org/abs/1610.08549)
- [10] S. Kouwn, Phys. Dark Univ. **21**, 76 (2018). [arXiv:1805.07278](https://arxiv.org/abs/1805.07278)
- [11] P. Bushev, J. Bourhill, M. Goryachev, N. Kukharchyk, E. Ivanov, S. Galliou, M. Tobar, S. Danilishin, Phys. Rev. D **100**, 066020 (2019). [arXiv: 1903.03346](https://arxiv.org/abs/1903.03346)
- [12] S. Giardino, V. Salzano, [arXiv:2006.01580](https://arxiv.org/abs/2006.01580)
- [13] J. C. S. Neves, Eur. Phys. J. C **80**, 343 (2020). [arXiv:1906.11735](https://arxiv.org/abs/1906.11735)

- [14] F. Marin, F. Marino, M. Bonaldi, M. Cerdonio, L. Conti, P. Falferi, R. Mezzena, A. Ortolan, G. A. Prodi, L. Taffarelo, G. Vedovato, A. Vinante, J.-P. Zendri, Nat. Phys. **9**, 71 (2013). DOI: [10.1038/nphys2503](https://doi.org/10.1038/nphys2503)
- [15] M. Salah, F. Hammad, M. Faizal, A. F. Ali, J. Cosmol. Astropart. Phys. **02**, 035 (2017). [arXiv:1608.00560](https://arxiv.org/abs/1608.00560)
- [16] F. Scardigli, G. Lambiase, E. C. Vagenas, Phys. Lett. B **767**, 242 (2017). [arXiv:1611.01469](https://arxiv.org/abs/1611.01469)
- [17] L. Buoninfante, G. G. Luciano, L. Petruzzello, Eur. Phys. J. C **79**, 663 (2019). [arXiv:1903.01382](https://arxiv.org/abs/1903.01382)
- [18] H. Moradpour, A. H. Ziaie, S. Ghaffari, F. Feleppa, Mon. Not. R. Astron. Soc. **488**, L69 (2019). [arXiv:1907.12940](https://arxiv.org/abs/1907.12940)
- [19] R. Casadioab, F. Scardigli, Phys. Lett. B **807**, 135558 (2020). DOI: [10.1016/j.physletb.2020.135558](https://doi.org/10.1016/j.physletb.2020.135558)
- [20] P. Chen, Y. C. Ong, D.-H. Yeom, Phys. Rep. **603**, 1 (2015). [arXiv:1412.8366](https://arxiv.org/abs/1412.8366)
- [21] Z. W. Feng, H. L. Li, X. T. Zu, S. Z. Yang, Eur. Phys. J. C **76**, 212 (2016). [arXiv:1604.04702](https://arxiv.org/abs/1604.04702)
- [22] H.-L. Li, Z.-W. Feng, S.-Z. Yang, X.-T. Zu, Eur. Phys. J. C **78**, 768 (2018). DOI: [10.1140/epjc/s10052-018-6252-8](https://doi.org/10.1140/epjc/s10052-018-6252-8)
- [23] S. Barman, Eur. Phys. J. C **78**, 768 (2018). [arXiv:1907.09228](https://arxiv.org/abs/1907.09228)
- [24] H. Hassanabadi, E. Maghsoodi, W. S. Chung, Eur. Phys. J. C **79**, 358 (2019). DOI: [10.1140/epjc/s10052-019-6871-8](https://doi.org/10.1140/epjc/s10052-019-6871-8)
- [25] A. Iorio, G. Lambiase, P. Pais, F. Scardigli, Phys. Rev. D, **101**, 105002 (2020). DOI: [10.1103/PhysRevD.101.105002](https://doi.org/10.1103/PhysRevD.101.105002)
- [26] T. Zhu, J.-R. Ren, M.-F. Li, Phys. Lett. B **674**, 204 (2009). [arXiv:0811.0212](https://arxiv.org/abs/0811.0212)
- [27] W. Chemissany, S. Das, A. F. Ali, E. C. Vagenas, J. Cosmol. Astropart. Phys. **12**, 017 (2011). [arXiv:1111.7288](https://arxiv.org/abs/1111.7288)
- [28] K. Zeynali, F. Darabi, H. Motavalli, J. Cosmol. Astropart. Phys. **12**, 033 (2012). [arXiv:1206.0891](https://arxiv.org/abs/1206.0891)
- [29] K. Atazadeh, F. Darabi, Phys. Dark Univ. **16**, 87 (2017). [arXiv:1701.00060](https://arxiv.org/abs/1701.00060)
- [30] S. Das, R. B. Mann, Phys. Lett. B **704**, 596 (2011). [arXiv:1109.3258](https://arxiv.org/abs/1109.3258)
- [31] H. Verma, T. Mitra, B. P. Mandal, Europhys. Lett. **123**, 30009 (2018). [arXiv:1808.00766](https://arxiv.org/abs/1808.00766)
- [32] E. C. Vagenas, L. Alasfar, S. M. Alsaleh, A. F. Ali, Nucl. Phys. B **931**, 72 (2018). [arXiv:1706.06502](https://arxiv.org/abs/1706.06502)
- [33] D. Park, E. Jung, Phys. Rev. D **101**, 066007 (2020). [arXiv:2001.02850](https://arxiv.org/abs/2001.02850)
- [34] P. Jizba, H. Kleinert, F. Scardigli, Phys. Rev. D **81**, 084030 (2010). [arXiv:0912.2253](https://arxiv.org/abs/0912.2253)
- [35] B.J. Carr, J. Mureika, P. Nicolini, J. High Energy Phys. **07**, 052 (2015). [arXiv:1504.07637](https://arxiv.org/abs/1504.07637)
- [36] Y. C. Ong, J. Cosmol. Astropart. Phys. **09**, 015 (2018). [arXiv:1804.05176](https://arxiv.org/abs/1804.05176)
- [37] M. Moussa, Adv. High Energy Phys. **2015**, 343284 (2015). [arXiv:1512.04337](https://arxiv.org/abs/1512.04337)
- [38] R. Rashidi, Ann. Phys. **374**, 434 (2016). [arXiv:1512.06356](https://arxiv.org/abs/1512.06356)
- [39] Y. C. Ong, J. High Energy Phys. **10**, 195 (2018). [arXiv:1806.03691](https://arxiv.org/abs/1806.03691)
- [40] S.W. Hawking, D.N. Page, Commun. Math. Phys. **87**, 577 (1983). DOI: [10.1007/BF01208266](https://doi.org/10.1007/BF01208266)
- [41] D. Kubiznak, R. B. Mann, J. High Energy Phys. **07**, 033 (2018). [arXiv:1205.0559](https://arxiv.org/abs/1205.0559)
- [42] S.-W. Wei, Y.-X. Liu, Phys. Rev. Lett. **115**, 111302 (2015). [arXiv:1502.00386](https://arxiv.org/abs/1502.00386)
- [43] S. H. Hendi, R. B. Mann, S. Panahiyan, B. E. Panah, Phys. Rev. D **95**, 021501 (2017). [arXiv:1702.00432](https://arxiv.org/abs/1702.00432)



- [44] M.-S. Ma, R.-H. Wang, Phys. Rev. D **96**, 024052 (2017). [arXiv:1707.09156](#)
- [45] A. Dehyadegari, A. Sheykhi, Phys. Rev. D **98**, 024011 (2017). [arXiv:1711.01151](#)
- [46] S.-W. Wei, Y.-X. Liu, Phys. Rev. D **101**, 104018 (2020). [arXiv:2003.14275](#)
- [47] M. Rostamia, J. Sadeghibac, S. Miraboutalebi, Phys. Dark Universe **29**, 100590 (2020). [DOI: 10.1016/j.dark.2020.100590](#)
- [48] D. Pavón, Phys. Rev. D **43** (1991) 2495. [DOI: 10.1088/0264-381/6/12/018](#)
- [49] P.C.W. Davies, Class. Quantum Gravity **6** (1989) 1909. [DOI: 10.1103/PhysRevD.43.2495](#)
- [50] D. J. Gross, M. J. Perry, L. G. Yaffe, Phys. Rev. D **25**, 330 (1982). [DOI: 10.1103/PhysRevD.43.2495](#)
- [51] Y. Gim, W. Kim, J. Cosmol. Astropart. Phys. **05**, (2015) 002. [arXiv:1501.04702](#)
- [52] Z.-W. Feng, S.-Z. Yang, Phys. Lett. B **772**, (2017) 737. [arXiv:1708.06627](#)
- [53] Y.-W. Kim, S. K. Kim, Y.-J. Park, Eur. Phys. J. C **76**, 557 (2016). [arXiv:1607.06185](#)
- [54] S. Upadhyay, S. H. Hendi, S. Panahiyan, B. E. Panah, Prog. Theor. Exp. Phys. **2018**, 093E01 (2018). [arXiv:1809.01078](#)
- [55] M. Shahjalal, Phys. Lett. B **784**, 6 (2018). [DOI: 10.1016/j.physletb.2018.07.032](#)
- [56] Z.-W. Feng, D.-L. Tang, D.-D. Feng, S.-Z. Yang, Mod. Phys. Lett. A **35**, 2050010 (2020). [arXiv:1710.04496](#)
- [57] M.-S. Ma, Y.-S. Liu, Adv. High Energy Phys. **2018**, 1257631 (2018). [arXiv:1810.06955](#)
- [58] Y. Chen, H.-L. Li, [arXiv:2001.11193](#)
- [59] J. W. York, Phys. Rev. D, **33**, 2092 (1986). [DOI: 10.1103/PhysRevD.33.2092](#)
- [60] Y.-W. Kim, S. K. Kim, Y.-J. Park, Eur. Phys. J. C **76**, 557 (2016). [DOI: 10.1140/epjc/s10052-016-4393-1](#)
- [61] R. Casadio, A. Orlandi, J. High Energy Phys. **1308**, 025 (2013). [arXiv:1302.7138](#)
- [62] R. Casadio, A. Giugno, O. Micu, A. Orlandi, Phys. Rev. D **90**, 084040 (2014). [arXiv:1405.4192](#)