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#### Abstract

We consider a higher-dimensional hard wall model with an infrared (IR) cut-off in asymptotically AdS space and investigate its thermodynamics via the holographic renormalization method. We find a relation between the confinement temperature and the IR cut-off for any dimension. It is also shown that the entropy of $p$-branes with the number of coincident branes (the number of the gauge group) $N$ jumps from leading order in $\mathcal{O}\left(N^{0}\right)$ at the confining low temperature phase to $\mathcal{O}\left(N^{\frac{p+1}{2}}\right)$ at the deconfining high temperature phase like $D 3$-branes $(p=3)$ case. On the other hand, we calculate the configuration entropy (CE) of various magnitudes of an inverse temperature at an given IR cut-off scale. It is shown that as the inverse temperature grows up, the CE above the critical temperature decreases and AdS black hole ( BH ) is stable while it below the critical temperature is constant and thermal AdS (ThAdS) is stable. In particular, we also find that the CE below the critical temperature becomes constant and its magnitude increases as a dimension of AdS space increases.


## I. INTRODUCTION

The AdS/CFT duality has been originally based on the holographic principle which states that the description of a volume of space is able to be thought of as encoded on a boundary of such a region and conjectured to be a relationship between a gravitational theory in the bulk and a conformal field theory in the boundary [1-3]. In particular, it has been suggested that BH thermodynamics in AdS is the Hawking-Page transition between large BH and ThAdS, which in the CFT is dual to the confinement-deconfinement transition on a sphere [4].

The Dirichlet branes (D-branes) have been defined by Dirichlet boundary conditions in string theory, which has opened up a new window to explore the black hole entropy [5]. In extremal five-dimensional black hole, they have shown that its horizon area is non-vanishing and the Bekenstein-Hawking entropy is derived by counting the degeneracy of Bogomolny-Prasad-Sommerfield soliton bound states [6]. It has been extensively studied for extremal five-dimensional rotating charged BH [7], nonextremal five-dimensional BH 8] and non-extremal sixdimensional black string [9]. The entropies of $D p$-branes have been investigated [10].

The AdS/QCD hard wall model has been suggested in search in order to obtain the holographic dual theory from QCD [11, 12] via the holographic renormalization method [13, 14]. They have shown that it is able to describe the confinement-deconfinement transition for the gauge theory from BH thermodynamics in AdS [15, 16]. Recently, it has been found that the above result is consistent with that of the analysis of stability through employing the CE in hard wall model [17] and in soft wall model 18]. Furthermore the AdS/CFT correspondence holds in different dimensions [4] but their works [17, 18] focus on the case of the five-dimensional AdS. Thus, it

[^0]is intriguing that the issue is generalized to a variety of AdS space.

The paper is organized as follows: In the next section we briefly review the holographic renormalization method for the $d$-dimensional gravity action with the negative cosmological constant and investigate the relationship between the confinement temperature and the IR cut-off for the hard wall model at finite temperature. In particular we calculate the entropy of $p$-branes at the confining temperature phase and the deconfining temperature phase. In the next section, we also introduce the CE and explore thermodynamic instability for the hard wall model. In the last section we give our discussion.

## II. THERMODYNAMICS FOR THE HARD WALL MODEL

The $d$-dimensional gravity action $I$ with the negative cosmological constant [19, 20] is written as

$$
\begin{equation*}
I=I_{\mathrm{B}}+I_{\partial \mathrm{B}}+I_{\mathrm{ct}} \tag{2.1}
\end{equation*}
$$

where the bulk action $I_{\mathrm{B}}$ is given as

$$
\begin{equation*}
I_{\mathrm{B}}=-\frac{1}{16 \pi G_{d}} \int_{\mathcal{M}} d^{d} x \sqrt{-g}(\mathcal{R}-2 \Lambda) \tag{2.2}
\end{equation*}
$$

Here $G_{d}, \mathcal{R}$, and $\Lambda$ denote the $d$-dimensional Newton constant, Ricci scalar, and negative cosmological constant $\Lambda=-\frac{(d-1)(d-2)}{2 L^{2}}$. The boundary action $I_{\partial \mathrm{B}}$ is

$$
\begin{equation*}
I_{\partial \mathrm{B}}=-\frac{1}{8 \pi G_{d}} \int_{\partial \mathcal{M}} d^{d-1} x \sqrt{-\gamma} \Theta \tag{2.3}
\end{equation*}
$$

which is introduced to obtain equations of motion well behaved at the boundary of the action where $\gamma$ is the determinant of the metric of the boundary $\gamma_{a b}$ and $\Theta$ is the trace of extrinsic curvature. Then the boundary
energy-momentum tensor becomes

$$
\begin{equation*}
\frac{2}{\sqrt{-\gamma}} \frac{\delta I_{\partial \mathrm{B}}}{\delta \gamma^{a b}}=\Theta_{a b}-\gamma_{a b} \Theta \tag{2.4}
\end{equation*}
$$

The counterterm action $I_{\text {ct }}$ is added to the action to remove the divergence appearing as the boundary goes to infinity

$$
\begin{align*}
I_{\mathrm{ct}}= & \frac{1}{8 \pi G_{d}} \int_{\partial \mathcal{M}} d^{d-1} x \sqrt{-\gamma}\left\{\frac{d-2}{L}\right. \\
& +\frac{L R}{2(d-3)} \mathcal{F}(d-4)+\frac{L^{3}}{2(d-3)^{2}(d-5)}\left(R_{a b} R^{a b}\right. \\
& \left.\left.-\frac{d-1}{4(d-2)} R^{2}\right) \mathcal{F}(d-6)+\cdots\right\} \tag{2.5}
\end{align*}
$$

where $R$ is the boundary Ricci scalar which only depends on the induced metric $\gamma_{a b}$ and $\mathcal{F}(d)$ is step function, 1 when $d \geq 0,0$ otherwise.

ThAdS with the line element becomes

$$
\begin{equation*}
d s^{2}=\frac{r^{2}}{L^{2}}\left(-d t^{2}+d x_{i}^{2}\right)+\frac{L^{2}}{r^{2}} d r^{2} \tag{2.6}
\end{equation*}
$$

and substituting with $r=L^{2} / z$

$$
\begin{equation*}
d s^{2}=\frac{L^{2}}{z^{2}}\left(-d t^{2}+d x_{i}^{2}+d z^{2}\right) \tag{2.7}
\end{equation*}
$$

The Schwarzschild BH in AdS space is given as

$$
\begin{align*}
d s^{2}= & \frac{r^{2}}{L^{2}}\left[-\left(1-\frac{r_{h}^{d-1}}{r^{d-1}}\right) d t^{2}+d x_{i}^{2}\right] \\
& +\frac{L^{2}}{r^{2}}\left(1-\frac{r_{h}^{d-1}}{r^{d-1}}\right)^{-1} d r^{2} \tag{2.8}
\end{align*}
$$

and substituting with $r=L^{2} / z$

$$
\begin{align*}
d s^{2}= & \frac{L^{2}}{z^{2}}\left[-\left(1-\frac{z^{d-1}}{z_{h}^{d-1}}\right) d t^{2}+d x_{i}^{2}\right. \\
& \left.+\left(1-\frac{z^{d-1}}{z_{h}^{d-1}}\right)^{-1} d z^{2}\right] \tag{2.9}
\end{align*}
$$

which leads to the Hawking temperature of AdS BH $T_{H}=(d-1) /\left(4 \pi z_{h}\right)\left(T_{H} \equiv 1 / \beta\right)$ where $z_{h}$ is AdS BH horizon radius.

The bulk action $I_{\mathrm{B}}(2.2)$ for both geometries (2.7) and (2.9) becomes

$$
\begin{equation*}
I_{\mathrm{B}}=\frac{d-1}{8 \pi G_{d} L^{2}} \int d^{d} x \sqrt{-g} \tag{2.10}
\end{equation*}
$$

which has the interval $0<z \leq z_{0}$ via the IR cut-off in the hard wall model [21-23]. Here the inverse of $z_{0}$ may be interpreted as a IR energy cut-off in the dual gauge theory side. Furthermore the bulk action (2.10) becomes singular as the coordinate $z$ goes to zero. We may restrict ourselves to the regularized action densities,
which for AdS and AdS BH are written as

$$
\begin{align*}
\mathcal{I}_{\mathrm{B}}^{\mathrm{AdS}} & =\frac{(d-1) L^{d-2}}{k_{d}^{2}} \int_{0}^{\beta^{\prime}} d \tau \int_{\epsilon}^{z_{0}} \frac{d z}{z^{d}} \\
& =\frac{L^{d-2} \beta^{\prime}}{k_{d}^{2}}\left(\frac{1}{\epsilon^{d-1}}-\frac{1}{z_{0}^{d-1}}\right)  \tag{2.11}\\
\mathcal{I}_{\mathrm{B}}^{\mathrm{BH}} & =\frac{(d-1) L^{d-2}}{k_{d}^{2}} \int_{0}^{\beta} d \tau \int_{\epsilon}^{z_{\mathrm{m}}} \frac{d z}{z^{d}} \\
& =\frac{L^{d-2} \beta}{k_{d}^{2}}\left(\frac{1}{\epsilon^{d-1}}-\frac{1}{z_{\mathrm{m}}^{d-1}}\right) \tag{2.12}
\end{align*}
$$

with $k_{d}^{2}=8 \pi G_{d}$ and $\beta^{\prime}=\pi z_{h} \sqrt{1-\left(\epsilon / z_{h}\right)^{d-1}}$ [15]. Here $\epsilon$ is the ultraviolet regulator and $z_{\mathrm{m}} \equiv \min \left(z_{0}, z_{h}\right)$ denotes the minimum value of $z_{0}$ and $z_{h}$.

From Eqs. (2.3), (2.7) and (2.9), the boundary action densities are obtained as

$$
\begin{align*}
\mathcal{I}_{\partial \mathrm{B}}^{\mathrm{AdS}} & =-\frac{(d-1) L^{d-2} \beta^{\prime}}{k_{d}^{2}} \frac{1}{\epsilon^{d-1}}  \tag{2.13}\\
\mathcal{I}_{\partial \mathrm{B}}^{\mathrm{BH}} & =-\frac{(d-1) L^{d-2} \beta}{k_{d}^{2}}\left(\frac{1}{\epsilon^{d-1}}-\frac{1}{2 z_{h}^{d-1}}\right) . \tag{2.14}
\end{align*}
$$

The counterterm action $I_{\text {ct }}$ (2.5) for both geometries (2.7) and (2.9) results in a simple form

$$
\begin{equation*}
I_{\mathrm{ct}}=\frac{d-2}{k_{d}^{2} L} \int_{\partial \mathcal{M}} d^{d-1} x \sqrt{-\gamma} \tag{2.15}
\end{equation*}
$$

which leads to the counterterm action densities

$$
\begin{align*}
\mathcal{I}_{\mathrm{ct}}^{\mathrm{AdS}} & =\frac{(d-2) L^{d-2} \beta^{\prime}}{k_{d}^{2}} \frac{1}{\epsilon^{d-1}}  \tag{2.16}\\
\mathcal{I}_{\mathrm{ct}}^{\mathrm{BH}} & =\frac{(d-2) L^{d-2} \beta}{k_{d}^{2}}\left(\frac{1}{\epsilon^{d-1}}-\frac{1}{2 z_{h}^{d-1}}\right) \tag{2.17}
\end{align*}
$$

Thus, from the $d$-dimensional gravity action $I$ (2.1), the action densities become

$$
\begin{align*}
& \mathcal{I}_{\mathrm{AdS}}=-\frac{L^{d-2} \beta^{\prime}}{k_{d}^{2}} \frac{1}{z_{0}^{d-1}}  \tag{2.18}\\
& \mathcal{I}_{\mathrm{BH}}=-\frac{L^{d-2} \beta}{k_{d}^{2}}\left(\frac{1}{z_{\mathrm{m}}^{d-1}}-\frac{1}{2 z_{h}^{d-1}}\right) . \tag{2.19}
\end{align*}
$$

The difference between the action densities is defined as

$$
\begin{equation*}
\Delta \mathcal{I} \equiv \lim _{\epsilon \rightarrow 0}\left[\mathcal{I}_{\mathrm{BH}}-\mathcal{I}_{\mathrm{AdS}}\right] \tag{2.20}
\end{equation*}
$$

and

$$
\begin{align*}
& \Delta \mathcal{I}=\frac{4 \pi L^{d-2} z_{h}}{(d-1) k_{d}^{2}} \frac{1}{2 z_{h}^{d-1}} \text { for } z_{0}<z_{h}  \tag{2.21}\\
& \Delta \mathcal{I}=\frac{4 \pi L^{d-2} z_{h}}{(d-1) k_{d}^{2}}\left(\frac{1}{z_{0}^{d-1}}-\frac{1}{2 z_{h}^{d-1}}\right) \text { for } z_{0}>z_{h} \tag{2.22}
\end{align*}
$$

which leads to the critical temperature

$$
\begin{equation*}
T_{c}=\frac{2^{\frac{1}{d-1}}}{z_{0} \pi} \tag{2.23}
\end{equation*}
$$

After employing $\log Z=-I$ as the partition function, one can get the following thermal relation $F=$ $-T \log Z=T I$. The free energies for AdS case and AdS BH are given as

$$
\begin{gather*}
F_{\mathrm{AdS}}=-\frac{L^{d-2}}{k_{d}^{2} z_{0}^{d-1}}=-\frac{L^{d-2}}{8 \pi G_{d} z_{0}^{d-1}}  \tag{2.24}\\
F_{\mathrm{BH}}=-\frac{\pi^{d-1} L^{d-2}}{2 k_{d}^{2}} T^{d-1}=-\frac{(\pi L)^{d-2}}{16 G_{d}} T^{d-1}, \tag{2.25}
\end{gather*}
$$

which become respectively

$$
\begin{align*}
F_{\mathrm{AdS}} & =-\frac{L^{p}}{k_{p+2}^{2} z_{0}^{p+1}} \\
& =-\frac{L^{p}}{8 \pi G_{p+1} z_{0}^{p+1}} \text { for }\left(T_{c}>T\right)  \tag{2.26}\\
F_{\mathrm{BH}} & =-\frac{\pi^{p+1} L^{p}}{2 k_{p+2}^{2}} T^{p+1} \\
& =-\frac{(\pi L)^{p}}{16 G_{p+2}} T^{p+1} \text { for }\left(T_{c}<T\right) \tag{2.27}
\end{align*}
$$

where $d=p+2$ and $p$ is dimension of brane.

The supergravity solution reduces to $p+2$-dimensional AdS space $\left(A d S_{p+2}\right)$ times spheres (i.e. $A d S_{5} \times S_{5}$ for $D 3$ branes). The entropy of the non-dilatonic near-extremal $p$-branes is calculated from the leading order supergravity solution. The free energy of CFT side [24] is expected to have the form

$$
\begin{equation*}
F=-\alpha_{p} N^{\frac{p+1}{2}} T^{p+1} \tag{2.28}
\end{equation*}
$$

where $\alpha_{p}$ is a constant of order unity.
In the $D 3$-branes case (total dimension $D=10$ and $\left.p=3, \operatorname{AdS} S_{5} \times S^{5}\right)$, the free energy (2.27) is consistent with that in [4]

$$
\begin{equation*}
F_{\mathrm{BH}}=-\frac{\pi^{2}}{8} N^{2} T^{4} \tag{2.29}
\end{equation*}
$$

where the five-dimensional Newton constant $G_{5}$ and $\operatorname{AdS}$ radius $L$ are

$$
\begin{equation*}
G_{5}=\frac{8 \pi^{3} g^{2} \alpha^{\prime 4}}{L^{5}} \text { and } L^{4}=4 \pi g N \alpha^{\prime 2} \tag{2.30}
\end{equation*}
$$

In the $M 5$-branes case (total dimension $D=11$ and $p=$ $5, A d S_{7} \times S^{4}$ ), the free energy (2.27) becomes the free energy of AdS BH [24]

$$
\begin{equation*}
F_{\mathrm{BH}}=-\frac{2^{6} \pi^{3}}{3^{7}} N^{3} T^{6} \tag{2.31}
\end{equation*}
$$

where the seven-dimensional Newton constant $G_{7}$ and AdS radius $L$ are

$$
\begin{equation*}
G_{7}=\frac{3^{7} \pi^{2} L^{5}}{2^{10} N^{3}} \text { and } L^{9}=G_{7} \frac{N^{3}}{2^{4} \pi^{4}} \tag{2.32}
\end{equation*}
$$

In the $M 2$-branes case (total dimension $D=11$ and $p=$ $2, A d S_{4} \times S^{7}$ ), the free energy (2.27) becomes the free energy of AdS BH [24]

$$
\begin{equation*}
F_{\mathrm{BH}}=-\frac{2^{7 / 2} \pi^{2}}{3^{4}} N^{3 / 2} T^{3} \tag{2.33}
\end{equation*}
$$

where the four-dimensional Newton constant $G_{4}$ and AdS radius $L$ are

$$
\begin{equation*}
G_{4}=\frac{3^{4} L^{2}}{2^{15 / 2} N^{3}} \text { and } L^{9}=G_{4} \frac{2^{7 / 2} N^{3 / 2}}{\pi^{4}} \tag{2.34}
\end{equation*}
$$

On the other hand, the expectation value of the energy is given as

$$
\begin{equation*}
<E>=-\partial_{\beta} \log Z=\partial_{\beta} I \sim-F \tag{2.35}
\end{equation*}
$$

After employing the Gibbs-Duhem relation $S=\beta<E>$ $+\log Z=\beta<E>-I$, the entropies for AdS case and AdS BH are given as

$$
\begin{gather*}
S_{\mathrm{AdS}}=0 \sim N^{0} \text { for }\left(T_{c}>T\right)  \tag{2.36}\\
S_{\mathrm{BH}}=\frac{(d-1)(\pi L)^{d-2}}{16 G_{d}} T^{d-2},  \tag{2.37}\\
 \tag{2.38}\\
=\frac{(p+1)(\pi L)^{p}}{16 G_{p+1}} T^{p} \text { for }\left(T_{c}<T\right),
\end{gather*}
$$

where after employing the relation (2.35) between the expectation value of the energy and the free energy, and substituting the Gibbs-Duhem relation with the free energy (2.28), we can read

$$
\begin{equation*}
S_{\mathrm{BH}} \sim N^{\frac{p+1}{2}} T^{p} \sim N^{\frac{p+1}{2}} \tag{2.39}
\end{equation*}
$$

It is shown that the entropy of $p$-branes jumps from $\mathcal{O}\left(N^{0}\right)$ at the confining low temperature phase to $\mathcal{O}\left(N^{\frac{p+1}{2}}\right)$ at the deconfining high temperature phase like $D 3$-branes $(p=3)$ case, which is consistent with the jump in the entropy describing the change of degrees of freedom in the confinement-deconfinement phase transition of QCD [15, 16].

Now, we will check the above relation through explicitly calculating for specific cases. Adopting the fivedimensional Newton constant $G_{7}$ (2.30) and AdS radius $L(2.30)$, the entropy (2.38) in the $D 3$-branes case is given as

$$
\begin{equation*}
S_{\mathrm{BH}}=\frac{1}{2} \pi^{2} N^{2} T^{3} \sim N^{2} T^{3} \sim N^{2} \text { for } p=3 \tag{2.40}
\end{equation*}
$$

In the same way, employing the seven-dimensional Newton constant $G_{7}$ (2.32) and $\operatorname{AdS}$ radius $L$ (2.32) in the $M 5$-branes case, and the four-dimensional Newton constant $G_{4}(2.34)$ and AdS radius $L(2.34)$ in the $M 2$-branes

TABLE I: The CE of AdS BH and ThAdS for the various dimensions.

| $z_{h}$ | $d=4$ | $d=5$ | $d=6$ | $d=7$ | $d=8$ | $d=9$ | Type |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 0.01 | 17.95581731 | 17.95595568 | 17.95597083 | 17.95597251 | 17.95597269 | 17.95597271 | AdS BH |
| 0.05 | 16.34637939 | 16.34651777 | 16.34653292 | 16.34653460 | 16.34653469 | 16.34653473 | AdS BH |
| 0.1 | 15.65323222 | 15.65337059 | 15.65338574 | 15.65338741 | 15.65338760 | 15.65338762 | AdS BH |
| 0.5 | 14.55461993 | 14.55475830 | 14.55477345 | 14.55477513 | 14.55477521 | 14.55477533 | AdS BH |
| 0.7 | 14.04379431 | 14.04393268 | 14.04394783 | 14.04394950 | 14.04394969 | 14.04394971 | AdS BH |
| $z_{c}$ | 13.70732207 | 13.70746044 | 13.70747559 | 13.70747726 | 13.70747745 | 13.70747747 | AdS BH |
| $z_{h}>z_{c}$ | 13.56214063 | 13.50450336 | 13.46985271 | 13.44674434 | 13.43023742 | 13.41785715 | ThAdS |

Here, $z_{c}$ denotes the horizon radius at the critical temperature.
case, the entropies (2.38) are respectively

$$
\begin{gathered}
S_{\mathrm{BH}}=\frac{5}{128} \pi^{5} N^{3} T^{9} \sim N^{3} T^{9} \sim N^{3} \text { for } p=5,(2.41) \\
S_{\mathrm{BH}}=5 \sqrt{2} \pi^{5} N^{\frac{3}{2}} T^{9} \sim N^{\frac{3}{2}} T^{9} \sim N^{\frac{3}{2}} \text { for } p=2,(2.42)
\end{gathered}
$$

which correctly match with the above result $S_{\mathrm{BH}} \sim N^{\frac{p+1}{2}}$ (2.39).

Finally after employing thermal relation $C=-\beta \partial_{\beta} S$, the specific heat for AdS case and AdS BH are given as

$$
\begin{gather*}
C_{\mathrm{AdS}}=0 \text { for }\left(T_{c}>T\right)  \tag{2.43}\\
C_{\mathrm{BH}}=\frac{(d-1)(d-2)(\pi L)^{d-2}}{16 G_{d}} T^{d-2}  \tag{2.44}\\
=\frac{p(p+1)(\pi L)^{p}}{16 G_{p+2}} T^{p} \text { for }\left(T_{c}<T\right) \tag{2.45}
\end{gather*}
$$

In particular, since AdS BH for $T_{c}<T$ always has positive specific heat it is thermodynamically stable.

## III. CE OF THADS AND ADS BHS

After employing thermal relation $\partial_{\beta} I=M$, the mass for ThAdS is obtain as

$$
\begin{equation*}
M_{\mathrm{AdS}}=-\frac{L^{d-2}}{k_{d}^{2} z_{0}^{d-1}} \tag{3.1}
\end{equation*}
$$

and the mass for AdS BH becomes

$$
\begin{equation*}
M_{\mathrm{BH}}=\frac{(d-2) L^{d-2}}{2 k_{d}^{2} z_{h}^{d-1}} \tag{3.2}
\end{equation*}
$$

After adopting the relation between the mass and the density $\int_{0}^{z_{\mathrm{m}}} d z \rho(z)=M$, one can read the regularized density from the ThAdS mass [17]

$$
\begin{equation*}
\rho_{\mathrm{AdS}}=\frac{(d-1) L^{d-2}}{k_{d}^{2}} \frac{1}{z^{d}} \cos \left(\frac{2 \pi \epsilon^{d-1}}{z^{d-1}}\right) \tag{3.3}
\end{equation*}
$$

which leads to

$$
\begin{equation*}
\int_{\epsilon}^{z_{0}} \rho_{\mathrm{AdS}} d z=-\frac{L^{d-2}}{2 \pi k_{d}^{2} \epsilon^{d-1}} \sin \left(\frac{2 \pi \epsilon^{d-1}}{z_{0}^{d-1}}\right) \tag{3.4}
\end{equation*}
$$

which reduces to the mass of ThAdS $M_{\text {AdS }}$ (3.1) in the limit of $\epsilon \rightarrow 0$. The regularized density of the AdS BH mass is written as

$$
\begin{equation*}
\rho_{\mathrm{BH}}=-\frac{(d-1)(d-2) L^{d-2}}{2 k_{d}^{2}} \frac{1}{z^{d}} \cos \left(\frac{2 \pi \epsilon^{d-1}}{z^{d-1}}\right), \tag{3.5}
\end{equation*}
$$

and

$$
\begin{equation*}
\int_{\epsilon}^{z_{h}} \rho_{\mathrm{BH}} d z=-\frac{(d-2) L^{d-2}}{4 \pi k_{d}^{2} \epsilon^{d-1}} \sin \left(\frac{2 \pi \epsilon^{d-1}}{z_{h}^{d-1}}\right) \tag{3.6}
\end{equation*}
$$

which becomes the mass of AdS BH $M_{\mathrm{BH}}$ (3.2) in the limit of $\epsilon \rightarrow 0$.

When we consider the energy density $\rho(z)$ as the function of the position $z$ in $d$-dimensional space and its Fourier transforms $\rho(k)$ is written as

$$
\begin{equation*}
\rho(k)=\left(\frac{1}{\sqrt{2 \pi}}\right)^{d} \int \rho(z) e^{-i k \cdot z} d^{d} x \tag{3.7}
\end{equation*}
$$

and the modal fraction is defined as

$$
\begin{equation*}
\mathcal{F}(k)=\frac{|\rho(k)|^{2}}{\int|\rho(k)|^{2} d^{d} k} \tag{3.8}
\end{equation*}
$$

One may define the CE [25] as

$$
\begin{equation*}
S[\mathcal{F}]=-\int_{-\infty}^{\infty} \mathcal{F}(k) \log [\mathcal{F}(k)] d^{d} k \tag{3.9}
\end{equation*}
$$

As shown in Table I, we calculate the entropies for the variety of the dimension of AdS space from $d=4$ to $d=9$ and plot them as you see in Fig.1. Since the temperature $T$ is given as $T=(d-1) /\left(4 \pi z_{h}\right), z_{h}$ is inversely proportional to $T$. It is shown that as the inverse temperature increases, the CE above the critical temperature (2.23) decreases and AdS BH becomes stable while it below the critical temperature (2.23) is constant and ThAdS is stable. Furthermore, when there is AdS BH above the critical temperature in the stable phase, the CE increases


FIG. 1: Plot of the $d$-dimensional CE $S$ as a function of the horizon radius $z_{h}$ for $z_{0}=1, k_{d}=1\left(8 \pi G_{d}=1\right)$, and $L=1$. The black points denote the horizon radius $z_{c}$ at the critical temperatures for each dimension.
as the temperature increases, which correctly coincides with the expected result that the evaporation with arising from emitting AdS BH radiation increases faster at higher temperatures. These results are similar to that in 17].

## DISCUSSION

For any dimension we considered the hard wall model in the context of the AdS/CFT duality and explicitly presented the critical temperature $T_{c}=2^{\frac{1}{d-1}} /\left(z_{0} \pi\right)$ (2.23) via the holographic renormalization method. Then the entropy of $p$-branes jumps from leading order in $\mathcal{O}\left(N^{0}\right)$ at the confining low temperature phase below the critical temperature to $\mathcal{O}\left(N^{\frac{p+1}{2}}\right)$ at the deconfining high temperature phase above the critical temperature like $D 3$ branes $(p=3)$ case [16]. It was found for the hard wall model that AdS BH above the critical temperature (2.23) becomes stable while ThAdS below the critical temperature (2.23) is stable. We also obtained the same results through thermodynamic analysis of calculating the CE. It was shown that it is well held to describe the confinement-deconfinement transition for the gauge theory from BH thermodynamics in AdS for the higherdimensional hard wall model beyond the five-dimensional case 16]. In particular, we found that as the temperature grows up, the CE has constant until the critical temperature while it decreases beyond the critical temperature. This result is consistent with that in [17].

Our research here focused on the higher-dimensional hard wall model. Thus, it will be intriguing that the issue is generalized to the higher-dimensional soft wall model. Adopting the CE, one can explore not only its instability but also conventional hadrons and exotica ones [26].

On the other hand, it is possible to investigate the stability of the AdS black string solution via the CE. It provides a new window in order to check the GubserMitra conjecture 27, 28]. We hope that such kind issues will be carried out in near the future.
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