

The fate of boundary terms in dimensional reductions

Robert J. Saskowski

*Leinweber Center for Theoretical Physics, Randall Laboratory of Physics
The University of Michigan, Ann Arbor, MI 48109-1040, USA*

E-mail: rsaskows@umich.edu

ABSTRACT: Gibbons-Hawking-York (GHY) terms are typically neglected when performing dimensional reductions of gravitational theories. We consider the reduction of such terms for both two-derivative and four-derivative theories in general dimensions. We demonstrate a robust consistency wherein the GHY term in the original, higher-dimensional theory translates directly to the appropriate GHY term in the dimensionally reduced theory. In particular, this gives a novel way of generating such terms for higher-derivative corrections. We carry out this procedure for Gauss-Bonnet, Chern-Simons modified, and $f(R)$ gravities to derive novel boundary terms.

Contents

1	Introduction and summary	1
2	Two-derivative reduction	4
2.1	Einstein-Hilbert action	4
2.2	Gibbons-Hawking-York term	6
3	Four-derivative reduction	8
3.1	Gauss-Bonnet	8
3.2	Mixed Chern-Simons term	11
3.3	$f(R)$ gravity	12
4	Discussion	14
A	Submanifolds	16
B	Proofs of variations	17
B.1	$\text{Tr}[R \wedge R] \wedge A$	17
B.2	$f(R, F^2)$	18

1 Introduction and summary

The idea of dimensionally reducing a gravitational theory was considered nearly a century ago by Kaluza [1] and Klein [2]. Such reductions have since found broad application from string theory compactifications [3] to practical experiments [4]. The classic example is the Scherk-Schwarz reduction [5], wherein the internal space is taken to be a group manifold which becomes the gauge group of the effective lower-dimensional theory. In general, one gets an infinite tower of massive states controlled by the size of the compact internal dimensions. Much work has been done on classifying for which reductions it is consistent to truncate this tower, both in terms of the allowed geometries (see *e.g.* [6–9]) and the effect of higher-derivatives (see *e.g.* [10–12]). However, in such studies, the emphasis is often placed exclusively on the bulk gravitational action, and integration by parts is performed without concern for the resulting boundary terms. This is acceptable if we are only interested in local data: equations of motion, conserved currents, symmetries, and Noether identities depend only on the Lagrangian density. Nevertheless, ignoring the boundary terms is equivalent to not specifying boundary conditions and makes the variational principle ill-posed.

It was shown by York [13] and Gibbons and Hawking [14] that in order for the Dirichlet variational problem to be well-defined, the bulk Einstein-Hilbert action,

$$S_{\text{EH}} = \frac{1}{2\kappa_D} \int_{\mathcal{M}} d^D x \sqrt{-g} R, \quad (1.1)$$

must be supplemented by a Gibbons-Hawking-York (GHY) boundary term

$$S_{\text{GHY}} = \frac{1}{\kappa_D} \int_{\partial\mathcal{M}} d^{D-1} x \sqrt{-h} K, \quad (1.2)$$

where R is the Ricci scalar for the metric $g_{\mu\nu}$ on the spacetime manifold \mathcal{M} , $\kappa_D = 8\pi G_N^{(D)}$ is the standard gravitational coupling in D dimensions, h_{ab} is the induced metric on the boundary $\partial\mathcal{M}$, and K is the trace of the second fundamental form of $\partial\mathcal{M}$. This is because varying an action with second-order derivatives, as in (1.1), leads to terms schematically of the form $\partial\partial\delta g_{\mu\nu}$, which, after integration by parts, lead to boundary terms proportional to $\partial\delta g_{\mu\nu}|_{\partial\mathcal{M}}$. Such terms are not automatically removed by the Dirichlet boundary conditions,

$$\delta g_{\mu\nu}|_{\partial\mathcal{M}} = 0, \quad (1.3)$$

so we must add the GHY term (1.2) to cancel them. This has since been generalized to a variety of higher-derivative theories of gravity, see *e.g.* [15–28]. There are also corresponding generalizations to more general boundaries (spacelike, null, non-smooth, *etc.*) [29–35] and to more general boundary conditions (Neumann, Robin, mixed, *etc.*) [36–39].

Such GHY terms are desirable as they ensure the path integral has the correct composition properties [14] and the action is functionally differentiable [40]. They are also necessary to define conserved charges at infinity using the ADM prescription [41], and these charges crucially depend on the choice of boundary conditions [42, 43]. For holographic theories, these ADM charges are identified with the charges of the dual field theory, and the GHY terms are necessary (but generally not sufficient) to regulate the IR divergences of the bulk action in holographic renormalization [44]. Furthermore, the entire contribution to semiclassical black hole entropy comes from the GHY term [45]. As such, it is important to understand the role of boundary terms.

The dimensional reduction of an action with a well-posed variational principle should lead to a reduced action with a well-posed variational principle. Hence, it is natural to expect that the dimensional reduction of a GHY term should yield the corresponding GHY term for the lower-dimensional theory. Indeed, it was observed in [46] that the circle reduction of the GHY term (1.2) for the Einstein-Hilbert action yields precisely the GHY term for the lower-dimensional theory. Refs. [47, 48] found similar results in sphere reductions to 2d, although they kept only one KK scalar and omitted the KK gauge field. One motivation for us is to show that this continues to hold for more general reductions. A second motivation is that we are interested in *constructing* GHY terms. The procedure of computing GHY terms for theories is oftentimes tedious, especially for higher-derivative theories, since one must vary the action and determine what boundary terms will give the same answer after variation. We propose that dimensional reduction is often a more straightforward approach to obtaining such terms.

As we will see, the story for two-derivative theories is rather uneventful; the extra terms that arise on the boundary from dimensional reduction are always canceled by equal and opposite terms that arise from integrating the bulk action by parts. In particular, we perform a group manifold reduction of the Einstein-Hilbert action and its GHY term on a unimodular Lie group and show that the reduction simply amounts to

$$\frac{1}{\kappa_D} \int_{\partial\mathcal{M}} d^D x \sqrt{-\hat{h}} \hat{K} \rightarrow \frac{1}{\kappa_d} \int_{\partial\mathcal{B}} d^d x \sqrt{-h} K. \quad (1.4)$$

This is simply the statement that the only term in the two-derivative action that needs a GHY term is the Einstein-Hilbert term, so no interesting new terms arise.

However, at the four-derivative level, we use this procedure to generate new GHY terms. In particular, dimensionally reducing the Gauss-Bonnet action allows us to easily show that the combination

$$\int_{\mathcal{M}} d^D x \sqrt{-g} R_{\mu\nu\rho\sigma} U^{\mu\nu\rho\sigma} - 4 \int_{\partial\mathcal{M}} d^{D-1} x \sqrt{-h} U^{\mu\nu\rho\sigma} n_\mu K_{\nu\rho} n_\sigma \quad (1.5)$$

leads to a well-posed Dirichlet variation of the metric, where $U_{\mu\nu\rho\sigma}$ is any tensor with the symmetries of the Riemann tensor that does not contain derivatives of the metric. We also demonstrate that the procedure can be used in reverse. Knowing only the answer for $D = 4$ [49], we show that the term

$$\int_{\mathcal{M}} \text{Tr}[R \wedge R] \wedge A_{(D-4)} + 4 \int_{\partial\mathcal{M}} \text{CS}(K) \wedge A_{(D-4)} \quad (1.6)$$

has a well-posed Dirichlet variation, where A_{D-4} is a $(D-4)$ -form field and $\text{CS}(K)$ is the abelian Chern-Simons term for the extrinsic curvature. Finally, we use the dimensional reduction of $f(R)$ gravity to derive the appropriate GHY term for $f(R, T)$ gravity:

$$\int_{\mathcal{M}} d^D x \sqrt{-g} [f(R, T) + \mathcal{L}_{\text{matter}}] + 2 \int_{\partial\mathcal{M}} d^{D-1} x \sqrt{-h} \partial_R f(R, T) K, \quad (1.7)$$

where T is the trace of the stress-energy tensor. Of these three main results, the first was shown by [50], while the other two are novel as far as we know.

The rest of this paper is organized as follows. In Section 2, we show the two-derivative group manifold reduction gives precisely the lower-dimensional GHY term. In Section 3, we investigate the effects of adding higher-derivative corrections and their corresponding GHY terms. In particular, we consider the Gauss-Bonnet term, the $A \wedge \text{Tr} R \wedge R$ term, and $f(R)$ gravity. We conclude in Section 4 and discuss future directions. Some technical details are relegated to the appendices.

Conventions

We use a mostly positive metric signature $(-, +, +, \dots, +)$. We take the Riemann and Ricci tensors to be given by

$$R^\mu{}_{\nu\rho\sigma} = \partial_\rho \Gamma^\mu_{\sigma\nu} - \partial_\sigma \Gamma^\mu_{\rho\nu} + \Gamma^\mu_{\rho\lambda} \Gamma^\lambda_{\sigma\nu} - \Gamma^\mu_{\sigma\lambda} \Gamma^\lambda_{\rho\nu},$$

and $R_{\mu\nu} = R^\rho{}_{\mu\rho\nu}$, respectively. We choose to weight our antisymmetrizations as $A_{[\mu\nu]} = \frac{1}{2}(A_{\mu\nu} - A_{\nu\mu})$ and our symmetrizations as $A_{(\mu\nu)} = \frac{1}{2}(A_{\mu\nu} + A_{\nu\mu})$. $\epsilon_{\mu\nu\dots}$ is always taken to represent the Levi-Civita tensor and never the tensor density. The boundary is always assumed to be a smooth timelike hypersurface, and we take the normal to be outward-pointing and have unit norm.

2 Two-derivative reduction

In this section, we consider a generic two-derivative theory of gravity with action

$$S = \frac{1}{2\kappa_D} \int_{\mathcal{M}} d^D x \sqrt{-\hat{g}} \left(\hat{R} + \hat{\mathcal{L}}_{\text{matter}} \right) + \frac{1}{\kappa_D} \int_{\partial\mathcal{M}} d^{D-1} x \sqrt{-\hat{h}} \hat{K}, \quad (2.1)$$

where $\hat{\mathcal{L}}_{\text{matter}}$ is some unspecified matter Lagrangian, which may contain a cosmological constant. We will follow the convention that hats denote D -dimensional fields. We will use early capital Latin letters for D -dimensional rigid indices and late capital Latin letters for D -dimensional curved indices. Our index-splitting convention is summarized as

$$M \rightarrow \{\mu, i\}, \quad A \rightarrow \{\alpha, a\}.$$

We will treat the reduction of the bulk Einstein-Hilbert action and the boundary GHY term as two steps.

2.1 Einstein-Hilbert action

Let us do a standard group manifold reduction on a Lie group \mathcal{G} , with metric¹ [5]

$$ds^2 = g_{\mu\nu}(x) dx^\mu dx^\nu + g_{ij}(x) \eta^i \eta^j, \quad \eta^i = \sigma^i + A^i, \quad (2.2)$$

such that the spacetime manifold \mathcal{M} becomes a fibration, $\mathcal{G} \rightarrow \mathcal{M} \rightarrow \mathcal{B}$, over a base manifold \mathcal{B} . Here the coordinates \hat{x}^M correspond to \mathcal{M} , x^μ to \mathcal{B} , and y^i to \mathcal{G} . $g_{\mu\nu}$ is naturally the metric on \mathcal{B} and g_{ij} is a matrix of scalars charged under \mathcal{G} . A^i is a principal \mathcal{G} -connection, with curvature given locally by

$$F^i = dA^i - \frac{1}{2} f^i{}_{jk} A^j \wedge A^k, \quad (2.3)$$

where $f^i{}_{jk}$ are the structure constants of $\mathfrak{g} = \text{Lie}(\mathcal{G})$. The gauge field naturally has an associated gauge-covariant derivative, which we denote as D . Given a \mathfrak{g} -valued form t^i , D acts as

$$Dt^i = dt^i - f^i{}_{jk} A^j \wedge t^k. \quad (2.4)$$

The σ^i are the left-invariant one-forms of \mathcal{G} , satisfying the Maurer-Cartan equation,

$$d\sigma^i = -\frac{1}{2} f^i{}_{jk} \sigma^j \wedge \sigma^k, \quad (2.5)$$

¹Note that we are working in the “string” frame. This is done for computational convenience and will not affect the end conclusion, as we may always perform a Weyl rescaling of the metric.

and generate right isometries of the metric. We may define the Cartan-Killing metric as

$$\kappa_{ij} = -\frac{1}{2}f_{\ell i}^k f_{kj}^\ell, \quad (2.6)$$

which is used to lower \mathfrak{g} indices. We will not assume that \mathcal{G} is semisimple and hence κ_{ij} may be degenerate (or even vanishing). Hence, the inverse κ^{ij} is generally not well-defined. However, we will assume that \mathcal{G} is unimodular, as this is required to get a consistent truncation [5], and so

$$f^i{}_{ij} = 0. \quad (2.7)$$

Let e^α denote the vielbein associated to $g_{\mu\nu}$ and e^a the vielbein associated with g_{ij} . A natural choice of vielbein is

$$\hat{e}^\alpha = e^\alpha, \quad \hat{e}^a = e_i^a \eta^i, \quad (2.8)$$

such that $ds^2 = \eta_{\alpha\beta} \hat{e}^\alpha \hat{e}^\beta + \delta_{ab} \hat{e}^a \hat{e}^b$. The corresponding spin connection on \mathcal{M} is obtained from the first Cartan structure equation

$$d\hat{e}^A + \hat{\omega}^A{}_B \wedge \hat{e}^B = 0, \quad (2.9)$$

and has components

$$\begin{aligned} \hat{\omega}^{\alpha\beta} &= \omega^{\alpha\beta} - \frac{1}{2}e_i^a F_{\alpha\beta}^i \hat{e}^a, \\ \hat{\omega}^{\alpha b} &= -P_\alpha{}^{bc} \hat{e}^c - \frac{1}{2}e_i^b F_{\alpha\beta}^i \hat{e}^\beta, \\ \hat{\omega}^{ab} &= Q_\alpha{}^{ab} \hat{e}^\alpha + \frac{1}{2}\mathcal{C}_{c,ab} \hat{e}^c, \end{aligned} \quad (2.10)$$

where ω denotes the spin connection associated with \mathcal{B} , and we have defined

$$\begin{aligned} P_\alpha{}^{ab} &= e^{i(a} D_\alpha e_i^{b)}, \\ Q_\alpha{}^{ab} &= e^{i[a} D_\alpha e_i^{b]}, \\ \mathcal{C}_{c,ab} &= f^i{}_{jk} \left[e_i^c e_a^j e_b^k + e_i^b e_a^j e_c^k - e_i^a e_b^j e_c^k \right]. \end{aligned} \quad (2.11)$$

Q naturally behaves as a composite \mathcal{G} -connection. It is straightforward to compute the Riemann tensor from the second Cartan structure equation,

$$\hat{R}^{AB} = d\hat{\omega}^{AB} + \hat{\omega}^A{}_C \wedge \hat{\omega}^{CB}. \quad (2.12)$$

Correspondingly, the Ricci tensor components are

$$\begin{aligned} \hat{R}_{\alpha\beta} &= R_{\alpha\beta} - \frac{1}{2}F_{\alpha\gamma}^i F_{\beta\gamma}^j g_{ij} - D_\beta P_{\alpha cc} - P_{\alpha cd} P_\beta{}^{cd}, \\ \hat{R}_{\alpha b} &= \frac{1}{2}D_\gamma \left(e_i^b F_{\alpha\gamma}^i \right) + \frac{1}{2}e_i^a F_{\alpha\gamma}^i e_b^j D_\gamma e_j^a + \frac{1}{2}e_i^b F_{\alpha\gamma}^i P_{\gamma cc}, \\ \hat{R}_{ab} &= -D^\gamma P_{\gamma ab} - P_{\gamma ad} \left(e_b^i D_\gamma e_i^d \right) + \frac{1}{4}e_i^a e_j^b F_{\gamma\delta}^i F_{\gamma\delta}^j + P_{\gamma db} Q_{\gamma da} - 2P_{\gamma a[b} P_{\gamma c]c} \\ &\quad - \frac{1}{4}\mathcal{C}_{f,ac} f_{jk}^i e_i^f e^{jb} e^{kc}. \end{aligned} \quad (2.13)$$

The Ricci scalar is

$$\hat{R} = R - \frac{1}{4} F_{\alpha\beta}^i F_{\alpha\beta}^j g_{ij} - 2\nabla^\gamma P_{\gamma cc} - P_{\gamma cc} P^{\gamma dd} - (P_\gamma^{ab})^2 - V, \quad (2.14)$$

where

$$V = \frac{1}{4} \left(f_{jk}^i f_{mn}^\ell g_{il} g^{jm} g^{kn} + 2f_{jk}^i f_{il}^j g^{kl} \right) \quad (2.15)$$

is the scalar potential. The metric determinant decomposes as

$$\sqrt{-\hat{g}} = \sqrt{-g} \sqrt{\det g_{ij}}. \quad (2.16)$$

Now, we plug (2.14) and (2.16) into the action and integrate by parts. Jacobi's formula implies that

$$\partial_\gamma \sqrt{\det g_{ij}} = \sqrt{\det g_{ij}} P_{\gamma cc}. \quad (2.17)$$

We are then left with the bulk gravitational action

$$S_{\text{EH}} = \frac{1}{2\kappa_d} \int_{\mathcal{B}} d^d x \sqrt{-g} \sqrt{\det g_{ij}} \left[R - \frac{1}{4} g_{ij} F_{\alpha\beta}^i F_{\alpha\beta}^j + (P_{\gamma cc})^2 - (P_\mu^{ab})^2 - V \right], \quad (2.18)$$

at the cost of a boundary term

$$-\frac{1}{\kappa_d} \int_{\partial\mathcal{B}} d^{d-1} x \sqrt{-g} \sqrt{\det g_{ij}} n^\gamma P_{\gamma cc}, \quad (2.19)$$

where we have absorbed the factor arising from the volume of \mathcal{G} into κ_d . Note that we will not be concerned with the reduction of $\hat{\mathcal{L}}_{\text{matter}}$ since we are interested only in what happens to the GHY terms.

2.2 Gibbons-Hawking-York term

Now, we turn our attention to the boundary. Denote the spacelike outward-pointing unit normal as \hat{n}_M . As a matter of notation,² we will use underbars to denote indices that have been projected onto the boundary using the first fundamental form,³ $\hat{h}^A_B = \delta_B^A - \hat{n}^A \hat{n}_B$. That is,

$$\mathfrak{T}_{\underline{A}} \equiv \hat{h}_A^B \mathfrak{T}_B, \quad (2.20)$$

for any tensor \mathfrak{T} . Note that expressions of the form $\nabla_A \mathfrak{T}_{\underline{B}}$ should be interpreted as $\nabla_A (h_B^C \mathfrak{T}_C)$ rather than $h_B^C \nabla_A \mathfrak{T}_C$. The second fundamental form of $\partial\mathcal{M}$ is given by the Lie derivative of \hat{h} along \hat{n} :

$$\hat{K}_{AB} = \frac{1}{2} \mathcal{L}_{\hat{n}} \hat{h}_{AB}. \quad (2.21)$$

The normal \hat{n}_M should be independent of y^i , and, since \mathcal{G} is closed, we will assume that

$$\hat{n}^\alpha = n^\alpha, \quad \hat{n}^a = 0. \quad (2.22)$$

²Although not the most standard choice of notation, this is necessary to keep clear the distinction between rigid vs curved, bulk vs boundary, and internal vs external indices.

³Strictly speaking, \hat{h} is only the induced metric after being pulled back to the boundary. As a standard abuse of language, we will generally not distinguish between bulk indices that have been projected and those that have been properly pulled back to the boundary.

This is automatically satisfied whenever $\partial\mathcal{M}$ is a level set, which is given by a constraint $\mathfrak{f}(\hat{x}) = 0$ [46]. This is because the standard KK reduction takes \mathfrak{f} to be independent of y , which leads to a boundary of the form $\partial\mathcal{M} = \partial\mathcal{B} \times \mathcal{G}$. So, the normal form is given by

$$\hat{n} = \frac{\partial_\mu \mathfrak{f}}{\hat{g}^{\nu\rho} \partial_\nu \mathfrak{f} \partial_\rho \mathfrak{f}} dx^\mu, \quad (2.23)$$

which has no components along the internal directions. Since $\hat{g}^{\mu\nu} = g^{\mu\nu}$, the normal remains unchanged under dimensional reduction. For example, boundaries defined by a radial cutoff $r = R_c$ are level sets.

Using (2.10) and (2.21), we may compute the extrinsic curvature components

$$\hat{K}_{\underline{\alpha}\underline{\beta}} = K_{\underline{\alpha}\underline{\beta}}, \quad K_{\underline{a}\underline{b}} = \frac{1}{2} e_i^b F_{\gamma\underline{\alpha}}^i n^\gamma, \quad \hat{K}_{\underline{a}\underline{b}} = n^\gamma P_{\gamma\underline{a}\underline{b}}, \quad (2.24)$$

with trace

$$\hat{K} = K + n^\gamma P_{\gamma cc}. \quad (2.25)$$

Furthermore, since the normal has no component along \mathcal{G} , it is clear that the metric determinant decomposes as

$$\sqrt{-\hat{h}} = \sqrt{-h} \sqrt{\det g_{ij}}. \quad (2.26)$$

Thus, the GHY term becomes

$$S_{\partial\text{EH}} = \frac{1}{\kappa_d} \int_{\partial\mathcal{B}} d^{d-1}x \sqrt{-h} \sqrt{\det g_{ij}} (K + n^\gamma P_{\gamma cc}). \quad (2.27)$$

Combining this with the boundary term (2.19), we are left with just the d -dimensional GHY term:

$$\frac{1}{\kappa_d} \int_{\partial\mathcal{B}} d^{d-1}x \sqrt{-h} \sqrt{\det g_{ij}} K. \quad (2.28)$$

Cancellations such as this were also noticed in [46–48] for more specialized reductions.

At this point, it is interesting to remark that the dimensional reduction also implicitly reduces our boundary conditions, in the sense that the D -dimensional Dirichlet boundary condition for pure gravity,

$$\delta\hat{g}_{MN}|_{\partial\mathcal{M}} = 0, \quad (2.29)$$

becomes the Dirichlet boundary conditions for the reduced theory,

$$\delta g_{\mu\nu}|_{\partial\mathcal{B}} = 0, \quad \delta A_\mu^i|_{\partial\mathcal{B}} = 0, \quad \delta g_{ij}|_{\partial\mathcal{B}} = 0. \quad (2.30)$$

We also see that the number of degrees of freedom,

$$\frac{d(d-3)}{2} + (d-2)(D-d) + \frac{(D-d)(D-d+1)}{2} = \frac{D(D-3)}{2}, \quad (2.31)$$

remains unchanged, as we would expect.

3 Four-derivative reduction

We now turn our attention to higher-derivative theories. As we saw in the previous section, we can dimensionally reduce GHY terms to obtain the GHY terms for lower-dimensional theories. We may put this to use as a procedure for *generating* GHY terms. Of course, the addition of higher-derivative terms brings subtleties since the equations of motion are no longer two-derivative in general. The simplest approach is to specify additional boundary data, as will be the case for $f(R)$ gravity. This corresponds to the fact that higher-derivative theories generically have more degrees of freedom than their two-derivative cousins. Alternatively, we may work with actions that lead to two-derivative equations of motion, such as the Lovelock actions [51, 52]. Other possibilities, which we will not explore here, include the use of auxiliary fields [53–55] as well as field redefinitions [20] to leverage the perturbative nature of higher-derivative corrections.

3.1 Gauss-Bonnet

We now consider the reduction of a Gauss-Bonnet term

$$S_{\text{GB}} = \frac{1}{2\kappa_D} \int_{\mathcal{M}} d^D x \sqrt{-\hat{g}} \hat{\mathcal{X}}_4, \quad \hat{\mathcal{X}}_4 = \hat{R}^{ABCD} \hat{R}_{ABCD} - 4\hat{R}^{AB} \hat{R}_{AB} + \hat{R}^2. \quad (3.1)$$

The appropriate GHY term is [16, 17]

$$S_{\partial\text{GB}} = \frac{1}{\kappa_D} \int_{\partial\mathcal{M}} d^{D-1} x \sqrt{-\hat{h}} \hat{\mathcal{Q}}_3, \\ \hat{\mathcal{Q}}_3 = -\frac{2}{3} \hat{K}^3 + 2\hat{K} \hat{K}^{\underline{AB}} \hat{K}_{\underline{AB}} - \frac{4}{3} \hat{K}_{\underline{AB}} \hat{K}^{\underline{BC}} \hat{K}_{\underline{C}}^{\underline{A}} - 4 \left(\hat{\mathcal{R}}_{\underline{AB}} - \frac{1}{2} \hat{\mathcal{R}} \hat{h}_{\underline{AB}} \right) \hat{K}^{\underline{AB}}, \quad (3.2)$$

where $\hat{\mathcal{R}}_{\underline{AB}}$ and $\hat{\mathcal{R}}$ are the induced Ricci tensor and scalar on the boundary, respectively. Note that varying the action (3.1) (with the GHY term (3.2)) results in equations of motion that are second-order in derivatives, and hence the metric does not propagate any additional degrees of freedom compared to Einstein gravity. As such, it is sufficient to specify only Dirichlet boundary conditions, $\delta\hat{g}_{MN}|_{\partial\mathcal{M}} = 0$.

Since the GHY term is more involved than the preceding cases, and since we will be mainly interested in the curvature and field strength terms, we will use a simplified circle reduction ansatz⁴

$$ds^2 = g_{\mu\nu} dx^\mu dx^\nu + (dz + A_\mu dx^\mu)^2. \quad (3.3)$$

Hence, A is now just a $U(1)$ gauge field and $d = D - 1$. This will be sufficient to tell us the GHY terms, which we may then easily check. We again label the normal vector as \hat{n}_M and assume $\hat{n}_\alpha = n_\alpha$, $\hat{n}_{\bar{z}} = 0$. The vielbein is naturally

$$\hat{e}^\alpha = e^\alpha, \quad \hat{e}^{\bar{z}} = dz + A. \quad (3.4)$$

⁴Of course, such an ansatz will never be a consistent truncation, but it suffices for constructing lower-dimensional GHY terms.

The Riemann tensor is easily found to be

$$\begin{aligned}\hat{R}_{\alpha\beta\gamma\delta} &= R_{\alpha\beta\gamma\delta} - \frac{1}{2}F_{\alpha\beta}F_{\gamma\delta} - \frac{1}{2}F_{\alpha[\gamma}F_{\beta]\delta}, \\ \hat{R}_{\alpha\beta\gamma\bar{z}} &= -\frac{1}{2}\nabla_\gamma F_{\alpha\beta}, \\ \hat{R}_{\alpha\bar{z}\beta\bar{z}} &= \frac{1}{4}F_{\alpha\gamma}F_{\beta}{}^\gamma.\end{aligned}\tag{3.5}$$

The Ricci tensor components are thus

$$\hat{R}_{\alpha\beta} = R_{\alpha\beta} - \frac{1}{2}F_{\alpha\gamma}F_{\beta}{}^\gamma, \quad \hat{R}_{\alpha\bar{z}} = \frac{1}{2}\nabla^\gamma F_{\alpha\gamma}, \quad \hat{R}_{\bar{z}\bar{z}} = \frac{1}{4}F^2,\tag{3.6}$$

and the Ricci scalar is

$$\hat{R} = R - \frac{1}{4}F^2.\tag{3.7}$$

The Gauss-Bonnet action thus becomes

$$\begin{aligned}S_{\text{GB}} &= \frac{1}{2\kappa_d} \int_{\mathcal{B}} d^d x \sqrt{-g} \left(\mathcal{X}_4 - \frac{3}{2}R_{\alpha\beta\gamma\delta}F^{\alpha\beta}F^{\gamma\delta} + 4R_{\alpha\beta}F^{\alpha\gamma}F^{\beta}{}_\gamma - \frac{1}{2}RF^2 + (\nabla F)^2 \right. \\ &\quad \left. - 2(\nabla^\alpha F_{\alpha\beta})^2 + \frac{3}{16}(F^2)^2 - \frac{3}{8}F^4 \right),\end{aligned}\tag{3.8}$$

where \mathcal{X}_4 is the d -dimensional Gauss-Bonnet term. This may be integrated by parts to give

$$\begin{aligned}S_{\text{GB}} &= \frac{1}{2\kappa_d} \int_{\mathcal{B}} d^d x \sqrt{-g} \left(\mathcal{X}_4 - \frac{1}{2}R_{\alpha\beta\gamma\delta}F^{\alpha\beta}F^{\gamma\delta} + 2R_{\alpha\beta}F^{\alpha\gamma}F^{\beta}{}_\gamma - \frac{1}{2}RF^2 + \frac{3}{16}(F^2)^2 - \frac{3}{8}F^4 \right) \\ &\quad + \frac{1}{\kappa_d} \int_{\partial\mathcal{B}} d^{d-1}x \sqrt{-h} \left(-n_\gamma F_{\alpha\beta} \nabla^\alpha F^{\beta\gamma} + n^\alpha F_{\alpha\beta} \nabla_\gamma F^{\beta\gamma} \right).\end{aligned}\tag{3.9}$$

Note that we have not used any equations of motion, so this expression is valid regardless of any other couplings we add to the action.

We may split this boundary term into its normal and tangential projections and rewrite the tangential bulk covariant derivatives ∇ in terms of the boundary covariant derivative \mathcal{D} (see Appendix A for a summary of the relevant mathematics). The normal projections cancel, and we are left with

$$\begin{aligned}-n_\gamma F_{\alpha\beta} \nabla^\alpha F^{\beta\gamma} + n^\alpha F_{\alpha\beta} \nabla_\gamma F^{\beta\gamma} &= -n_\gamma F_{\alpha\beta} \mathcal{D}^\alpha F^{\beta\gamma} + n^\alpha F_{\alpha\beta} \mathcal{D}_\gamma F^{\beta\gamma} - K^{\alpha\beta} F_{\alpha\gamma} F_{\beta}{}^\gamma \\ &\quad + K^{\alpha\beta} F_{\alpha\gamma} F_{\beta\delta} n^\gamma n^\delta - K F_{\gamma\alpha} F_{\delta}{}^\alpha n^\gamma n^\delta.\end{aligned}\tag{3.10}$$

Now we turn to the boundary. The metric (3.3) leads to the second fundamental form components

$$\hat{K}_{\underline{\alpha}\underline{\beta}} = K_{\underline{\alpha}\underline{\beta}}, \quad K_{\underline{\alpha}\bar{z}} = \frac{1}{2}F_{\gamma\alpha}n^\gamma, \quad \hat{K}_{\bar{z}\bar{z}} = 0,\tag{3.11}$$

with trace

$$\hat{K} = K.\tag{3.12}$$

To find the induced Riemann tensor on the boundary, $\hat{\mathcal{R}}_{\underline{ABCD}}$, we may use the Gauss equation,

$$\hat{\mathcal{R}}_{\underline{ABCD}} = \hat{R}_{\underline{ABCD}} + \hat{K}_{\underline{AC}}\hat{K}_{\underline{BD}} - \hat{K}_{\underline{BC}}\hat{K}_{\underline{AD}}, \quad (3.13)$$

along with (3.5) and (3.11) to get

$$\begin{aligned} \hat{\mathcal{R}}_{\underline{\alpha\beta\gamma\delta}} &= \mathcal{R}_{\underline{\alpha\beta\gamma\delta}} - \frac{1}{2}F_{\underline{\alpha\beta}}F_{\underline{\gamma\delta}} - \frac{1}{2}F_{\underline{\alpha}[\underline{\gamma]}F_{\underline{\beta}]\underline{\delta}}, \\ \hat{\mathcal{R}}_{\underline{\alpha\beta\gamma\bar{z}}} &= -\frac{1}{2}\mathcal{D}_{\underline{\gamma}}F_{\underline{\alpha\beta}}, \\ \hat{\mathcal{R}}_{\underline{\alpha\bar{z}\beta\bar{z}}} &= \frac{1}{4}F_{\underline{\alpha\gamma}}F_{\underline{\beta}}^{\underline{\gamma}}, \end{aligned} \quad (3.14)$$

where \mathcal{D} again denotes the boundary covariant derivative. This underscores the fact that the induced Riemann tensor contains only intrinsic data about the boundary. In particular, note that (3.14) is exactly what we would expect if we forgot about the bulk and just reduced the boundary $\partial\mathcal{M}$ on a circle,

$$d\sigma^2 = h_{\mu\nu}dx^\mu dx^\nu + \left(dz + A_{\underline{\mu}}dx^\mu\right)^2.$$

This is as expected from our discussion in Section 2.2.

The induced Ricci tensor is thus

$$\hat{\mathcal{R}}_{\underline{\alpha\beta}} = \mathcal{R}_{\underline{\alpha\beta}} - \frac{1}{2}F_{\underline{\alpha\gamma}}F_{\underline{\beta}}^{\underline{\gamma}}, \quad \hat{\mathcal{R}}_{\underline{\alpha\bar{z}}} = \frac{1}{2}\mathcal{D}^{\underline{\gamma}}F_{\underline{\alpha\gamma}}, \quad \hat{\mathcal{R}}_{\underline{z\bar{z}}} = \frac{1}{4}F_{\underline{\alpha\beta}}F^{\underline{\alpha\beta}}, \quad (3.15)$$

and the induced Ricci scalar is

$$\hat{\mathcal{R}} = \mathcal{R} - \frac{1}{4}F_{\underline{\alpha\beta}}F^{\underline{\alpha\beta}}. \quad (3.16)$$

Thus, the GHY term (3.2) becomes

$$\begin{aligned} S_{\partial\text{GB}} &= \frac{1}{\kappa_d} \int_{\partial\mathcal{B}} d^{d-1}x \sqrt{-h} \left[\mathcal{Q}_3 + 2K^{\underline{\alpha\beta}}F_{\underline{\alpha\gamma}}F_{\underline{\beta}}^{\underline{\gamma}} - \frac{1}{2}KF_{\underline{\alpha\beta}}F^{\underline{\alpha\beta}} - 2\mathcal{D}^{\underline{\gamma}}F_{\underline{\alpha\gamma}}F_{\underline{\delta\alpha}}n^{\underline{\delta}} \right. \\ &\quad \left. - K^{\underline{\alpha\beta}}F_{\underline{\gamma\alpha}}F_{\underline{\delta\beta}}n^{\underline{\gamma}}n^{\underline{\delta}} + KF_{\underline{\gamma\alpha}}F_{\underline{\delta}}^{\underline{\alpha}}n^{\underline{\gamma}}n^{\underline{\delta}} \right]. \end{aligned} \quad (3.17)$$

Combining (3.17) with the boundary term in (3.9), and suitably integrating by parts, we get an effective lower-dimensional GHY term

$$\frac{1}{\kappa_d} \int_{\partial\mathcal{B}} d^{d-1}x \sqrt{-h} \left[\mathcal{Q}_3 + \left(K_{\underline{\alpha\beta}} - \frac{1}{2}Kh_{\underline{\alpha\beta}} \right) F^{\underline{\alpha\gamma}}F_{\underline{\gamma}}^{\underline{\beta}} \right]. \quad (3.18)$$

In particular, \mathcal{Q}_3 is the GHY term corresponding to Gauss-Bonnet, so the remaining piece must be associated with the $RF\bar{F}$ term. Indeed, we observe that this term may be written as

$$-\frac{1}{2}R_{\alpha\beta\gamma\delta}F^{\alpha\beta}F^{\gamma\delta} + 2R_{\alpha\beta}F^{\alpha\gamma}F_{\gamma}^{\beta} - \frac{1}{2}RF^2 = -\frac{1}{2}R_{\alpha\beta}{}^{\gamma\delta} \left(F^{\alpha\beta}F_{\gamma\delta} - 4\delta_{[\gamma}^{[\alpha}F^{\beta]\epsilon}F_{\delta]\epsilon} + \delta_{[\gamma}^{[\alpha}\delta_{\delta]}^{\beta]}F^2 \right). \quad (3.19)$$

We may then pull out the same combination of field strengths from the GHY term, (3.18). In particular, the tensors we have available to work with are $K_{\alpha\beta}$, $h_{\alpha\beta}$, and n_α . Thus, we see that the GHY term may be rewritten as

$$\frac{1}{\kappa_d} \int_{\partial\mathcal{B}} d^{d-1}x \sqrt{-h} \left[\mathcal{Q}_3 + \left(F^{\alpha\beta} F_{\gamma\delta} - 4\delta_{[\gamma}^{[\alpha} F^{\beta]\epsilon} F_{\delta]\epsilon} + \delta_{[\gamma}^{[\alpha} \delta_{\delta]}^{\beta]} F^2 \right) n_\alpha n_\delta K_{\beta\gamma} \right]. \quad (3.20)$$

In particular, this suggests that, in general, a term of the form $U^{\alpha\beta\gamma\delta} R_{\alpha\beta\gamma\delta}$, where $U^{\alpha\beta\gamma\delta}$ has the same symmetries as the Riemann tensor and contains no derivatives of the metric, will have an associated GHY term of $-4U^{\alpha\beta\gamma\delta} n_\alpha n_\delta K_{\beta\gamma}$. Indeed, this is the case, as was originally shown in [50].

Notice that the particular combination appearing in (3.20) means that the normal components of F precisely cancel. As a result, we do not have to introduce additional boundary conditions for $\delta(n^\mu F_{\mu\nu})$, and we continue to have a well-defined Dirichlet problem.⁵ This is because we started with the Gauss-Bonnet action, for which the Dirichlet boundary conditions are sufficient, and this continues to hold after dimensional reduction. More generally, the GHY term $-4U^{\alpha\beta\gamma\delta} n_\alpha n_\delta K_{\beta\gamma}$ will be sufficient to allow Dirichlet boundary conditions for the metric, but may create problems for other fields appearing in U , such as A_μ . However, at least for the case of a gauge field, this could presumably be fixed by the addition of a Hawking-Ross term [56].

3.2 Mixed Chern-Simons term

We have seen that we can reduce an action for which we know the GHY term to obtain GHY terms for the reduced action. We can also go in reverse. That is, we can start with a lower-dimensional action and infer what must generate that GHY term upon reduction. We will demonstrate this for the case of the mixed Chern-Simons term in 5d:

$$S_{\text{CS}}^{(5)} = \frac{1}{2\kappa_5} \int_{\mathcal{M}} \text{Tr} \left[\hat{R} \wedge \hat{R} \right] \wedge \hat{A}_{(1)}, \quad (3.21)$$

where

$$\text{Tr} \left[\hat{R} \wedge \hat{R} \right] = \hat{R}^{AB} \wedge \hat{R}_{BA} = \frac{1}{4} \hat{R}_{MNAB} R_{PQ}{}^{BA} d\hat{x}^M \wedge d\hat{x}^N \wedge d\hat{x}^P \wedge d\hat{x}^Q, \quad (3.22)$$

and $\hat{A}_{(1)}$ is a one-form field. Terms such as these notably appear in the action of $\mathcal{N} = 2$, $D = 5$ supergravity [57]. The appropriate GHY term is not known. However, we may perform a restricted circle reduction

$$ds^2 = g_{\mu\nu} dx^\mu dx^\nu + dz^2, \quad \hat{A} = \phi dz. \quad (3.23)$$

This results in the 4d Chern-Simons modified gravity (see *e.g.* [58])

$$S_{\text{CS}}^{(4)} = \frac{1}{2\kappa_4} \int_{\mathcal{B}} \text{Tr} \left[\hat{R} \wedge \hat{R} \right] \phi, \quad (3.24)$$

⁵Since δA_μ vanishes everywhere on $\partial\mathcal{B}$, the tangential derivative must also vanish. Thus, having tangential components of the field strength does not adversely affect the consistency of the variational principle.

which is just a scalar coupled to the Chern-Pontryagin term. This is known to require a GHY term [49]

$$S_{\partial\text{CS}}^{(4)} = \frac{2}{\kappa_4} \int_{\partial\mathcal{B}} \text{CS}(K) \phi, \quad \text{CS}(K) = \text{Tr}[K \wedge \mathcal{D}K] = \frac{1}{2} K_\mu^\alpha \mathcal{D}_\nu K_{\rho\alpha} dx^\mu \wedge dx^\nu dx^\rho, \quad (3.25)$$

which, notably, depends on the third fundamental form. This is precisely the boundary term required for the Hirzebruch signature index theorem [59].

In particular, the reduction (3.23) is quite simple: The extrinsic curvature and boundary covariant derivatives reduce trivially as

$$\hat{K}_{\alpha\beta} = K_{\alpha\beta}, \quad \hat{K}_{\alpha\bar{z}} = K_{\bar{z}\bar{z}} = 0, \quad \hat{\mathcal{D}}_\alpha \hat{K}_{\beta\gamma} = \mathcal{D}_\alpha K_{\beta\gamma}. \quad (3.26)$$

This implies that the 4d GHY term (3.25) should arise from a 5d GHY term

$$S_{\partial\text{CS}}^{(5)} = \frac{2}{\kappa_5} \int_{\partial\mathcal{M}} \text{CS}(\hat{K}) \wedge \hat{A}_{(1)}. \quad (3.27)$$

It is important to emphasize that if this did not yield a well-posed variational principle in 5D, then it would lead to an ill-posed variational principle in 4D. Since this is not the case, we can be confident that (3.27) gives a well-posed variation.

More generally, one might consider the D -dimensional action

$$S_{\text{CS}}^{(D)} = \frac{1}{2\kappa_D} \int_{\mathcal{M}} \text{Tr}[\hat{R} \wedge \hat{R}] \wedge \hat{A}_{(D-4)}, \quad (3.28)$$

where $\hat{A}_{(D-4)}$ is a $(D-4)$ -form. Using a torus reduction

$$ds^2 = g_{\mu\nu} dx^\mu dx^\nu + \delta_{ij} dz^i dz^j, \quad A_{(D-4)} = \phi dz^1 \wedge \cdots \wedge dz^{D-4}, \quad (3.29)$$

it is clear that the corresponding GHY term should be

$$S_{\partial\text{CS}}^{(D)} = \frac{2}{\kappa_D} \int_{\partial\mathcal{M}} \text{CS}(\hat{K}) \wedge \hat{A}_{(D-4)}. \quad (3.30)$$

We verify this in Appendix B.1.

3.3 $f(R)$ gravity

Let us now consider the case of $f(R)$ gravity. The bulk action is given by [60]

$$S_{f(R)} = \frac{1}{2\kappa_D} \int_{\mathcal{M}} d^D x \sqrt{-\hat{g}} f(\hat{R}), \quad (3.31)$$

where $f(\hat{R})$ is a smooth function of \hat{R} . The corresponding GHY term is simply given by [15, 18, 61–63]

$$S_{\partial f(R)} = \frac{1}{\kappa_D} \int_{\partial\mathcal{M}} d^{D-1} x \sqrt{-\hat{h}} f'(\hat{R}) \hat{K}. \quad (3.32)$$

Note that, in general, this does not lead to second-order equations of motion, except for the special case $f(\hat{R}) = \hat{R} - 2\Lambda$. As a result, it is insufficient to specify Dirichlet boundary

conditions alone,⁶ and we must fix the additional degrees of freedom. In particular, we will have a good variational principle so long as $\delta(f'(\hat{R}))$ vanishes on the boundary. This is most naturally accomplished by

$$\delta(f'(\hat{R}))|_{\partial\mathcal{M}} = f''(\hat{R})\delta\hat{R}|_{\partial\mathcal{M}} = 0 \implies \delta\hat{R}|_{\partial\mathcal{M}} = 0. \quad (3.33)$$

As a result, $f(\hat{R})$ theories with $f''(\hat{R}) \neq 0$ have an extra degree of freedom compared with two-derivative Einstein gravity. The condition (3.33) may seem a bit unsettling at first glance; however, this approach suffices to correctly reproduce the ADM energy and the semiclassical Wald entropy [19]. Alternatively, it is well known that (3.31) is classically equivalent to an $\omega = 0$ Brans-Dicke theory with action [64–69]

$$S_{\text{BD}} = \frac{1}{2\kappa_D} \int_{\mathcal{M}} d^D x \sqrt{-\hat{g}} \left[f(\varphi) + f'(\varphi)(\hat{R} - \varphi) \right], \quad (3.34)$$

in which case the condition (3.33) is just the Dirichlet boundary condition for the scalar, $\delta\varphi|_{\partial\mathcal{M}} = 0$.

It is now straightforward to reduce the bulk action (3.31), again using our restricted circle reduction (3.3):

$$S_{f(R)} = \frac{1}{2\kappa_d} \int_{\mathcal{B}} d^d x \sqrt{-g} f\left(R - \frac{1}{4}F^2\right). \quad (3.35)$$

We may expand this formally as a series

$$S_{f(R)} = \frac{1}{2\kappa_d} \int_{\mathcal{B}} d^d x \sqrt{-g} \sum_{n=0}^{\infty} \frac{1}{n!} f^{(n)}(R) \left(-\frac{1}{4}F^2\right)^n. \quad (3.36)$$

Reducing the GHY action, we get

$$S_{\partial f(R)} = \frac{1}{\kappa_d} \int_{\partial\mathcal{B}} d^{d-1}x \sqrt{-h} f'\left(R - \frac{1}{4}F^2\right) K, \quad (3.37)$$

which may also be expanded as a power series

$$S_{\partial f(R)} = \frac{1}{\kappa_d} \int_{\partial\mathcal{B}} d^{d-1}x \sqrt{-h} \sum_{n=0}^{\infty} \frac{1}{n!} f^{(n+1)}(R) \left(-\frac{1}{4}F^2\right)^n K. \quad (3.38)$$

Hence, matching term by term, we see that combinations of the form

$$\frac{1}{2\kappa_d} \int_{\mathcal{B}} d^d x \sqrt{-g} f^{(n)}(R) (F^2)^n + \frac{1}{\kappa_d} \int_{\partial\mathcal{B}} d^{d-1}x \sqrt{-h} f^{(n+1)}(R) (F^2)^n K, \quad (3.39)$$

will have a well-posed variational problem so long as we fix appropriate boundary conditions. Naïvely, we would expect to have

$$\delta\left(R - \frac{1}{4}F^2\right)\Big|_{\partial\mathcal{B}} = 0, \quad (3.40)$$

⁶However, Dirichlet boundary conditions are sufficient if one restricts to maximally symmetric backgrounds [18].

which is the dimensional reduction of (3.33). However, in separating the terms order by order, we have implicitly decoupled R from F^2 . As a result, we must impose slightly stricter boundary conditions:

$$\delta g_{\mu\nu}|_{\partial\mathcal{B}} = 0, \quad \delta A_\mu|_{\partial\mathcal{B}} = 0, \quad \delta R|_{\partial\mathcal{B}} = 0, \quad \delta F^2|_{\partial\mathcal{B}} = 0. \quad (3.41)$$

More generally, given an action

$$S_{f(R,F^2)} = \frac{1}{2\kappa_d} \int_{\mathcal{B}} d^d x \sqrt{-g} f(R, F^2), \quad (3.42)$$

where f is again a smooth function, the above discussion tells us that it is sufficient to add a boundary term

$$S_{\partial f(R,F^2)} = \frac{1}{\kappa_d} \int_{\partial\mathcal{B}} d^{d-1} x \sqrt{-h} \partial_R f(R, F^2) K, \quad (3.43)$$

so long as we have the boundary conditions in Eq. (3.41). This is indeed the case, as is shown in Appendix B.2.

If the only matter content is a Maxwell field, then F^2 is proportional to the trace of the stress-energy tensor, T . This suggests a further generalization to $f(R, T)$ gravity (see *e.g.* [70]):

$$S_{f(R,T)} = \frac{1}{2\kappa_d} \int_{\mathcal{B}} d^d x \sqrt{-g} [f(R, T) + \mathcal{L}_{\text{matter}}], \quad (3.44)$$

which should have a GHY term

$$S_{\partial f(R,T)} = \frac{1}{\kappa_d} \int_{\partial\mathcal{B}} d^{d-1} x \sqrt{-h} \partial_R f(R, T) K, \quad (3.45)$$

subject to the boundary condition

$$\delta T|_{\partial\mathcal{B}} = 0. \quad (3.46)$$

This is straightforward to check, as the proof is identical to that for the case of the $f(R, F^2)$ action.

4 Discussion

We have investigated what happens to GHY terms upon dimensional reduction and found that this method is useful for producing GHY terms without having to work out any variations. In particular, we always get precisely the GHY terms of the reduced theory. This is in disagreement with the result of [71], which found that the circle reduction from 5d to 4d produces an additional abelian Chern-Simons term for the KK gauge field; however, it seems to be the case that the result of [71] differs because the authors neglected to consider the boundary term (2.19) when integrating the bulk action by parts. As a result, the scalar derivative remained uncanceled, which, after the use of the equations of motion, resulted in the seeming appearance of an abelian Chern-Simons term.

It is worth noting that nothing prevented the four-derivative analysis from being applied to a full group manifold reduction, such as in (2.2), keeping all the scalars. However, it is considerably more technically involved and it does not seem that much insight would

be gained from including the scalars. In particular, the GHY terms do not affect the equations of motion,⁷ so our current investigation is orthogonal to the usual worries about the consistency of truncations.

In some sense, this work is a proof of principle. It would be interesting to see if more diverse and exciting GHY terms can be obtained using this prescription. In particular, the GHY surface terms for the Lovelock lagrangians [51, 52]

$$\mathcal{X}_{2n} = \frac{1}{2^n} \delta_{\nu_1 \dots \nu_{2n}}^{\mu_1 \dots \mu_{2n}} R_{\mu_1 \mu_2}^{\nu_1 \nu_2} \dots R_{\mu_{2n-1} \mu_{2n}}^{\nu_{2n-1} \nu_{2n}}, \quad (4.1)$$

are known to be given by [16, 17],

$$\mathcal{Q}_{2n-1} = 2n \int_0^1 dt \delta_{\beta_1 \dots \beta_{2n-1}}^{\alpha_1 \dots \alpha_{2n-1}} K_{\alpha_1}^{\beta_1} \left[\frac{1}{2} \mathcal{R}_{\alpha_2 \alpha_3}^{\beta_2 \beta_3} - t^2 K_{\alpha_2}^{\beta_2} K_{\alpha_3}^{\beta_3} \right] \dots \left[\frac{1}{2} \mathcal{R}_{\alpha_{2n-2} \alpha_{2n-1}}^{\beta_{2n-2} \beta_{2n-1}} - t^2 K_{\alpha_{2n-2}}^{\beta_{2n-2}} K_{\alpha_{2n-1}}^{\beta_{2n-1}} \right]. \quad (4.2)$$

In principle, our procedure should then be able to extract the GHY terms for terms of the form $R^2 F F$. We expect they would show up in a combination akin to (3.20), where the normal components of F cancel, but with sufficient cleverness, one should be able to extract the general form, as in (3.20).

A second application of the present work is an $f(\mathcal{X}_4)$ term. This action and its corresponding GHY term are given by [23]

$$\frac{1}{2\kappa_D} \left[\int_{\mathcal{M}} d^D x \sqrt{-g} f(\mathcal{X}_4) + \int_{\partial\mathcal{M}} d^{D-1} x \sqrt{-h} f'(\mathcal{X}_4) \mathcal{Q}_3 \right], \quad (4.3)$$

which must then be supplemented by the extra boundary condition

$$\delta \mathcal{X}_4|_{\partial\mathcal{M}} = 0, \quad (4.4)$$

analogous to Eq. (3.33) for $f(R)$ gravity. In principle, we have already reduced \mathcal{X}_4 and \mathcal{Q}_3 , so there is no obstruction to writing down the reduced action. However, it is more complicated to deal with the leftover derivatives. It would be interesting to see if any new insights can be gained.

Finally, one might ask if something similar can be done for counterterms. Counterterms are required to have a finite action and are important for holographic renormalization [44], and holographically correspond to the usual CFT counterterms. However, they are also more subtle than the GHY terms. For example, two-derivative gauged supergravity in D dimensions requires a counterterm [74]

$$\frac{1}{2\kappa_D} \int_{\partial\mathcal{M}} d^{D-1} x \sqrt{-h} \left[W(\phi) + \frac{L}{(D-3)} \mathcal{R} + \frac{L^3}{(D-3)^2(D-5)} \left(\mathcal{R}_{\alpha\beta}^2 - \frac{D-1}{4(D-2)} \mathcal{R}^2 \right) \right], \quad (4.5)$$

where L is the inverse AdS radius, and the terms above are sufficient for $D \leq 6$. In particular, the coefficients are all dependent on the dimension and the leading term $W(\phi)$ depends on the matter content of the theory. We leave this problem to future work.

⁷Although not relevant to the current work, it should be noted that boundary terms can affect the equations of motion in ADM reductions, see *e.g.* [72, 73].

Acknowledgements

I would like to thank Jim Liu for comments on the draft. This work was supported in part by the U.S. Department of Energy under grant DE-SC0007859 and in part by a Leinweber Summer Research Award.

A Submanifolds

Here, we summarize some useful mathematics regarding codimension-one submanifolds, mostly following [75]. Viewing the spacetime as the normal bundle over the boundary, we write the metric as

$$g_{\mu\nu} = h_{\mu\nu} + n_\mu n_\nu, \quad (\text{A.1})$$

where, after being appropriately pulled back, $n_\mu n_\nu$ is naturally identified as the metric of the normal space, and $h_{\mu\nu}$ is the induced metric on the boundary. Indices are raised and lowered using the bulk metric, $g_{\mu\nu}$. Thus, n_μ naturally forms an einbein for the normal space. Written in terms of a frame e^α , we have

$$\eta_{\alpha\beta} = h_{\alpha\beta} + n_\alpha n_\beta. \quad (\text{A.2})$$

The extrinsic curvature is given by

$$K_{\alpha\beta} = h_\alpha^\gamma h_\beta^\delta \nabla_\gamma n_\delta, \quad (\text{A.3})$$

and so we may write

$$n^\alpha K_{\beta\gamma} = n^\alpha h_\beta^\delta h_\gamma^\epsilon \nabla_\delta n_\epsilon = h_\beta^\delta h_\gamma^\epsilon \nabla_\delta (n^\alpha n_\epsilon) = -h_\beta^\delta h_\gamma^\epsilon \nabla_\delta h_\epsilon^\alpha. \quad (\text{A.4})$$

Given a tangential vector V^α such that $n_\alpha V^\alpha = 0$, the intrinsic derivative \mathcal{D} is defined as the projection of the covariant derivative onto the boundary

$$\mathcal{D}_\alpha V^\beta \equiv h^\gamma_\alpha h^\beta_\delta \nabla_\gamma V^\delta = h^\gamma_\alpha \nabla_\gamma V^\beta + n^\beta K_{\alpha\delta} V^\delta, \quad (\text{A.5})$$

where the second equality follows from (A.4). This extends linearly to tensors with multiple tangential indices and is the unique covariant derivative compatible with the induced metric on the boundary, $\mathcal{D}_\alpha h_{\beta\gamma} = 0$. The associated connection coefficients $\gamma^\mu_{\nu\rho}$ are precisely the Christoffel symbols for the induced metric h :

$$\gamma^\mu_{\nu\rho} = \frac{1}{2} h^{\mu\sigma} (\partial_\nu h_{\rho\sigma} + \partial_\rho h_{\nu\sigma} - \partial_\sigma h_{\nu\rho}). \quad (\text{A.6})$$

The associated curvature is the intrinsic Riemann curvature, in the sense that

$$[\mathcal{D}_\gamma, \mathcal{D}_\delta] V^\alpha = \mathcal{R}^\alpha_{\beta\gamma\delta} V^\beta. \quad (\text{A.7})$$

The intrinsic derivative can be extended to act on vectors with normal indices W^α , in the sense that $h^\alpha_\beta W^\beta = 0$, by

$$\mathcal{D}_\alpha W^\beta = h^\gamma_\alpha n^\beta n_\delta \nabla_\gamma W^\delta = h^\gamma_\alpha \nabla_\gamma W^\beta - n_\delta K_\alpha^\beta W^\delta, \quad (\text{A.8})$$

where the second equality again follows from (A.4). This makes \mathcal{D} compatible with the normal metric $n_\alpha n_\beta$. The associated curvature is the outer curvature, which vanishes for a codimension-one submanifold:

$$[\mathcal{D}_\alpha, \mathcal{D}_\beta]W^\gamma = 0. \quad (\text{A.9})$$

This is just the statement that the normal space is one-dimensional and hence cannot have any non-trivial curvature.

For tensors with both normal and tangential indices, we act with $h_\alpha^\beta \nabla_\beta$ and tangentially project indices that were originally tangential and normally project indices that were originally normal. \mathcal{D} then acts on indices that are not specifically tangential or normal by first projecting onto the tangential and normal components and then acting according to the preceding definitions. In particular,

$$\mathcal{D}_\alpha g_{\beta\gamma} = \mathcal{D}_\alpha (h_{\beta\gamma} + n_\beta n_\gamma) = 0. \quad (\text{A.10})$$

B Proofs of variations

Here, we present several proofs that our proposed GHY terms do indeed lead to a well-posed variational problem.

B.1 $\text{Tr}[R \wedge R] \wedge A$

Consider the action

$$S = \int_{\mathcal{M}} \text{Tr}[R \wedge R] \wedge A_{(D-4)} + 4 \int_{\partial\mathcal{M}} \text{CS}(K) \wedge A_{(D-4)}, \quad (\text{B.1})$$

subject to Dirichlet boundary conditions,

$$\delta g_{\mu\nu}|_{\partial\mathcal{M}} = 0. \quad (\text{B.2})$$

For the purposes of verifying the variational principle is well-posed, it is easiest to work with this action expressed in local coordinates:⁸

$$\begin{aligned} S = & \frac{1}{4} \int_{\mathcal{M}} d^D x \sqrt{-g} \epsilon^{\mu_1 \dots \mu_D} R_{\mu_1 \mu_2 \rho \sigma} R_{\mu_3 \mu_4}{}^{\sigma \rho} A_{\mu_5 \dots \mu_D} \\ & + 2 \int_{\partial\mathcal{M}} d^{D-1} x \sqrt{-h} \epsilon^{\mu_1 \dots \mu_D} n_{\mu_1} K_{\underline{\mu}_2}{}^\nu \mathcal{D}_{\underline{\mu}_3} K_{\underline{\mu}_4 \nu} A_{\mu_5 \dots \mu_D}. \end{aligned} \quad (\text{B.3})$$

Varying this action with respect to the metric yields [49]

$$\begin{aligned} \delta S = & \frac{1}{2} \int_{\mathcal{M}} d^D x \sqrt{-g} \epsilon^{\mu_1 \dots \mu_D} R_{\rho \sigma \mu_1 \mu_2} \delta R^{\rho \sigma}{}_{\mu_3 \mu_4} A_{\mu_5 \dots \mu_D} \\ & + 4 \int_{\partial\mathcal{M}} d^{D-1} x \sqrt{-h} \epsilon^{\mu_1 \dots \mu_D} n_{\mu_1} \delta K_{\underline{\mu}_2}{}^\nu \mathcal{D}_{\underline{\mu}_3} K_{\underline{\mu}_4 \nu} A_{\mu_5 \dots \mu_D}. \end{aligned} \quad (\text{B.4})$$

⁸Note we have rescaled by an overall factor of $(D-4)!$.

up to irrelevant terms. We have

$$\delta R^\mu{}_{\nu\rho\sigma} = \nabla_\rho \delta \Gamma^\nu_{\mu\sigma} - \nabla_\sigma \delta \Gamma^\nu_{\mu\rho}, \quad (\text{B.5})$$

and

$$\delta \Gamma^\nu_{\mu\rho} = \frac{1}{2} g^{\nu\sigma} (\nabla_\mu \delta g_{\sigma\rho} + \nabla_\rho \delta g_{\mu\sigma} - \nabla_\sigma \delta g_{\mu\rho}). \quad (\text{B.6})$$

Hence, integrating by parts yields

$$\begin{aligned} \delta S = & - \int_{\mathcal{M}} d^D x \sqrt{-g} \epsilon^{\mu_1 \dots \mu_D} \nabla_{\mu_3} (R_{\rho\sigma\mu_1\mu_2} A_{\mu_5 \dots \mu_D}) \delta \Gamma^\rho_{\sigma\mu_4} \\ & + \int_{\partial\mathcal{M}} d^{D-1} x \sqrt{-h} \epsilon^{\mu_1 \dots \mu_D} n_{\mu_1} \left(-2 R^{\rho\sigma}{}_{\mu_2\mu_3} n_\sigma n^\lambda \nabla_\lambda \delta g_{\rho\mu_4} + 4 \delta K_{\underline{\mu}_2}{}^\nu \mathcal{D}_{\underline{\mu}_3} K_{\underline{\mu}_4\nu} \right) A_{\mu_5 \dots \mu_D}, \end{aligned} \quad (\text{B.7})$$

where we have dropped the tangential derivatives of the metric variation since these necessarily vanish on the boundary. The first term needs to be further integrated by parts to obtain the equations of motion, but it will not affect the boundary term so we leave it alone. Finally, making use of the Codazzi equation

$$n^\mu R_{\mu\nu\rho\sigma} = \mathcal{D}_\sigma K_{\nu\rho} - \mathcal{D}_\rho K_{\nu\sigma}, \quad (\text{B.8})$$

along with

$$\delta K_{\underline{\mu}\nu} = \frac{1}{2} h_\mu{}^\rho h_\nu{}^\sigma n^\lambda \nabla_\lambda \delta g_{\rho\sigma}. \quad (\text{B.9})$$

we see that the boundary term vanishes.

B.2 $f(R, F^2)$

Consider the action

$$S = \int_{\mathcal{M}} d^D x \sqrt{-g} f(R, F^2) + 2 \int_{\partial\mathcal{M}} d^{D-1} x \sqrt{-h} \partial_R f(R, F^2) K, \quad (\text{B.10})$$

subject to the boundary conditions

$$\delta g_{\mu\nu}|_{\partial\mathcal{B}} = 0, \quad \delta A_\mu|_{\partial\mathcal{B}} = 0, \quad \delta R|_{\partial\mathcal{B}} = 0, \quad \delta F^2|_{\partial\mathcal{B}} = 0. \quad (\text{B.11})$$

The Dirichlet condition on the metric automatically implies that $\delta h_{\underline{\mu}\nu} = 0$. Varying this action results in

$$\begin{aligned} \delta S = & \int_{\mathcal{M}} d^D x \sqrt{-g} \left[-\frac{1}{2} g^{\mu\nu} \delta g_{\mu\nu} f(R, F^2) + \partial_R f(R, F^2) (R^{\mu\nu} \delta g_{\mu\nu} + g^{\mu\nu} \delta R_{\mu\nu}) \right. \\ & \left. + 2 \partial_{F^2} f(R, F^2) F^\mu{}_\rho F^{\nu\rho} \delta g_{\mu\nu} + 4 \partial_{F^2} f(R, F^2) F^{\mu\nu} \partial_\mu \delta A_\nu \right] \\ & + 2 \int_{\partial\mathcal{M}} d^{D-1} x \sqrt{-h} \left[\partial_R^2 f(R, F^2) \delta R + \partial_R \partial_{F^2} f(R, F^2) \delta F^2 + \partial_R f(R, F^2) \delta K \right]. \end{aligned} \quad (\text{B.12})$$

It is straightforward to compute

$$\delta R_{\mu\nu} = \nabla_\rho \delta \Gamma^\rho_{\mu\nu} - \nabla_\nu \delta \Gamma^\rho_{\mu\rho}, \quad (\text{B.13})$$

and so, using the definition of the Christoffel symbols,

$$g^{\mu\nu}\delta R_{\mu\nu} = g^{\mu\nu}\nabla^\rho(\nabla_\nu\delta g_{\mu\rho} - \nabla_\rho\delta g_{\mu\nu}). \quad (\text{B.14})$$

We may also compute

$$\delta K = \frac{1}{2}n^\gamma h^{\underline{\mu\nu}}\nabla_\gamma\delta g_{\mu\nu}. \quad (\text{B.15})$$

Now we plug this back into (B.12), integrate by parts, and use the generalized Stokes theorem to get

$$\begin{aligned} \delta S = \int_{\mathcal{M}} d^D x \sqrt{-g} & \left[\left(\partial_R f(R, F^2) R^{\mu\nu} - \nabla^\mu \nabla^\nu \partial_R f(R, F^2) + \square \partial_R f(R, F^2) g^{\mu\nu} - \frac{1}{2} g^{\mu\nu} f(R, F^2) \right. \right. \\ & \left. \left. + 2 \partial_{F^2} f(R, F^2) F^\mu{}_\rho F^{\nu\rho} \right) \delta g_{\mu\nu} - 4 \nabla_\mu (\partial_{F^2} f(R, F^2) F^{\mu\nu}) \delta A_\nu \right] \\ & + 2 \int_{\partial\mathcal{M}} d^{D-1} x \sqrt{-h} \left[\partial_R^2 f(R, F^2) \delta R + \partial_R \partial_{F^2} f(R, F^2) \delta F^2 + 4 \partial_{F^2} f(R, F^2) F^{\mu\nu} n_\mu \delta A_\nu \right], \end{aligned} \quad (\text{B.16})$$

where we have already discarded terms that depend on $\delta g_{\mu\nu}|_{\partial\mathcal{M}}$ and its tangential derivatives. We see that the first two lines are our equations of motion, and the third line vanishes per our boundary conditions, (B.11). Hence, the variational principle is well-posed.

References

- [1] T. Kaluza, *Zum Unitätsproblem der Physik*, *Sitzungsber. Preuss. Akad. Wiss. Berlin (Math. Phys.)* **1921** (1921) 966 [[1803.08616](#)].
- [2] O. Klein, *Quantum Theory and Five-Dimensional Theory of Relativity.*, *Z. Phys.* **37** (1926) 895.
- [3] P. Candelas, G.T. Horowitz, A. Strominger and E. Witten, *Vacuum configurations for superstrings*, *Nucl. Phys. B* **258** (1985) 46.
- [4] G. Obied, C. Dvorkin, E. Gonzalo and C. Vafa, *Dark dimension and decaying dark matter gravitons*, *Phys. Rev. D* **109** (2024) 063540 [[2311.05318](#)].
- [5] J. Scherk and J.H. Schwarz, *How to Get Masses from Extra Dimensions*, *Nucl. Phys. B* **153** (1979) 61.
- [6] M.J. Duff, B.E.W. Nilsson, C.N. Pope and N.P. Warner, *On the Consistency of the Kaluza-Klein Ansatz*, *Phys. Lett. B* **149** (1984) 90.
- [7] M. Cvetič, H. Lu and C.N. Pope, *Consistent Kaluza-Klein sphere reductions*, *Phys. Rev. D* **62** (2000) 064028 [[hep-th/0003286](#)].
- [8] M. Cvetič, G.W. Gibbons, H. Lu and C.N. Pope, *Consistent group and coset reductions of the bosonic string*, *Class. Quant. Grav.* **20** (2003) 5161 [[hep-th/0306043](#)].
- [9] K. Lee, C. Strickland-Constable and D. Waldram, *Spheres, generalised parallelisability and consistent truncations*, *Fortsch. Phys.* **65** (2017) 1700048 [[1401.3360](#)].
- [10] H.-Y. Chang, E. Sezgin and Y. Tanii, *Dimensional reduction of higher derivative heterotic supergravity*, *JHEP* **03** (2022) 081 [[2110.13163](#)].

- [11] J.T. Liu and R.J. Saskowski, *Consistent truncations in higher derivative supergravity*, *JHEP* **09** (2023) 136 [[2307.12420](#)].
- [12] J.T. Liu and R.J. Saskowski, *Rounding out the story of higher derivative consistent truncations*, *JHEP* **02** (2024) 108 [[2310.07876](#)].
- [13] J.W. York, Jr., *Role of conformal three geometry in the dynamics of gravitation*, *Phys. Rev. Lett.* **28** (1972) 1082.
- [14] G.W. Gibbons and S.W. Hawking, *Action Integrals and Partition Functions in Quantum Gravity*, *Phys. Rev. D* **15** (1977) 2752.
- [15] N.H. Barth, *The Fourth Order Gravitational Action for Manifolds With Boundaries*, *Class. Quant. Grav.* **2** (1985) 497.
- [16] C. Teitelboim and J. Zanelli, *Dimensionally continued topological gravitation theory in Hamiltonian form*, *Class. Quant. Grav.* **4** (1987) L125.
- [17] R.C. Myers, *Higher Derivative Gravity, Surface Terms and String Theory*, *Phys. Rev. D* **36** (1987) 392.
- [18] M.S. Madsen and J.D. Barrow, *De Sitter Ground States and Boundary Terms in Generalized Gravity*, *Nucl. Phys. B* **323** (1989) 242.
- [19] E. Dyer and K. Hinterbichler, *Boundary Terms, Variational Principles and Higher Derivative Modified Gravity*, *Phys. Rev. D* **79** (2009) 024028 [[0809.4033](#)].
- [20] S. Cremonini, J.T. Liu and P. Szepietowski, *Higher Derivative Corrections to R-charged Black Holes: Boundary Counterterms and the Mass-Charge Relation*, *JHEP* **03** (2010) 042 [[0910.5159](#)].
- [21] A. Guarnizo, L. Castaneda and J.M. Tejeiro, *Boundary Term in Metric $f(R)$ Gravity: Field Equations in the Metric Formalism*, *Gen. Rel. Grav.* **42** (2010) 2713 [[1002.0617](#)].
- [22] J. Smolic and M. Taylor, *Higher derivative effects for 4d AdS gravity*, *JHEP* **06** (2013) 096 [[1301.5205](#)].
- [23] P. Bueno, P.A. Cano, A.O. Lasso and P.F. Ramírez, *$f(\text{Lovelock})$ theories of gravity*, *JHEP* **04** (2016) 028 [[1602.07310](#)].
- [24] A. Teimouri, S. Talaganis, J. Edholm and A. Mazumdar, *Generalised Boundary Terms for Higher Derivative Theories of Gravity*, *JHEP* **08** (2016) 144 [[1606.01911](#)].
- [25] N. Deruelle, N. Merino and R. Olea, *Einstein-Gauss-Bonnet theory of gravity: The Gauss-Bonnet-Katz boundary term*, *Phys. Rev. D* **97** (2018) 104009 [[1709.06478](#)].
- [26] P. Bueno, P.A. Cano and A. Ruipérez, *Holographic studies of Einsteinian cubic gravity*, *JHEP* **03** (2018) 150 [[1802.00018](#)].
- [27] U. Lindström and O. Sarioğlu, *Gravitational duality, Palatini variation and boundary terms: a synopsis*, *Class. Quant. Grav.* **40** (2023) 085003 [[2210.10383](#)].
- [28] J. Erdmenger, B. Heß, I. Matthaïakakis and R. Meyer, *Universal Gibbons-Hawking-York term for theories with curvature, torsion and non-metricity*, *SciPost Phys.* **14** (2023) 099 [[2211.02064](#)].
- [29] J.B. Hartle and R. Sorkin, *Boundary Terms in the Action for the Regge Calculus*, *Gen. Rel. Grav.* **13** (1981) 541.

- [30] G. Hayward, *Gravitational action for space-times with nonsmooth boundaries*, *Phys. Rev. D* **47** (1993) 3275.
- [31] K. Parattu, S. Chakraborty, B.R. Majhi and T. Padmanabhan, *A Boundary Term for the Gravitational Action with Null Boundaries*, *Gen. Rel. Grav.* **48** (2016) 94 [[1501.01053](#)].
- [32] K. Parattu, S. Chakraborty and T. Padmanabhan, *Variational Principle for Gravity with Null and Non-null boundaries: A Unified Boundary Counter-term*, *Eur. Phys. J. C* **76** (2016) 129 [[1602.07546](#)].
- [33] S. Chakraborty, *Boundary Terms of the Einstein–Hilbert Action*, *Fundam. Theor. Phys.* **187** (2017) 43 [[1607.05986](#)].
- [34] P.A. Cano, *Lovelock action with nonsmooth boundaries*, *Phys. Rev. D* **97** (2018) 104048 [[1803.00172](#)].
- [35] D. Brizuela and M. de Cesare, *Generalized boundary conditions in closed cosmologies*, *Phys. Rev. D* **107** (2023) 104054 [[2303.04007](#)].
- [36] J. York, *Boundary terms in the action principles of general relativity*, *Found. Phys.* **16** (1986) 249.
- [37] C. Krishnan and A. Raju, *A Neumann Boundary Term for Gravity*, *Mod. Phys. Lett. A* **32** (2017) 1750077 [[1605.01603](#)].
- [38] C. Krishnan, K.V.P. Kumar and A. Raju, *An alternative path integral for quantum gravity*, *JHEP* **10** (2016) 043 [[1609.04719](#)].
- [39] C. Krishnan, S. Maheshwari and P.N. Bala Subramanian, *Robin Gravity*, *J. Phys. Conf. Ser.* **883** (2017) 012011 [[1702.01429](#)].
- [40] T. Padmanabhan, *A short note on the boundary term for the Hilbert action*, *Mod. Phys. Lett. A* **29** (2014) 1450037.
- [41] S.W. Hawking and G.T. Horowitz, *The Gravitational Hamiltonian, action, entropy and surface terms*, *Class. Quant. Grav.* **13** (1996) 1487 [[gr-qc/9501014](#)].
- [42] J.D. Brown and J.W. York, Jr., *Quasilocal energy and conserved charges derived from the gravitational action*, *Phys. Rev. D* **47** (1993) 1407 [[gr-qc/9209012](#)].
- [43] G. Odak and S. Speziale, *Brown-York charges with mixed boundary conditions*, *JHEP* **11** (2021) 224 [[2109.02883](#)].
- [44] M. Bianchi, D.Z. Freedman and K. Skenderis, *Holographic renormalization*, *Nucl. Phys. B* **631** (2002) 159 [[hep-th/0112119](#)].
- [45] J.D. Brown and J.W. York, Jr., *The Microcanonical functional integral. 1. The Gravitational field*, *Phys. Rev. D* **47** (1993) 1420 [[gr-qc/9209014](#)].
- [46] F. Mueller-Hoissen, *Gravity Actions, Boundary Terms and Second Order Field Equations*, *Nucl. Phys. B* **337** (1990) 709.
- [47] A. Svesko, E. Verheijden, E.P. Verlinde and M.R. Visser, *Quasi-local energy and microcanonical entropy in two-dimensional nearly de Sitter gravity*, *JHEP* **08** (2022) 075 [[2203.00700](#)].
- [48] S. Gukov, V.S.H. Lee and K.M. Zurek, *Near-horizon quantum dynamics of 4D Einstein gravity from 2D Jackiw-Teitelboim gravity*, *Phys. Rev. D* **107** (2023) 016004 [[2205.02233](#)].

- [49] D. Grumiller, R.B. Mann and R. McNees, *Dirichlet boundary value problem for Chern-Simons modified gravity*, *Phys. Rev. D* **78** (2008) 081502 [[0803.1485](#)].
- [50] A.D. Barvinsky and S.N. Solodukhin, *Nonminimal coupling, boundary terms and renormalization of the Einstein-Hilbert action and black hole entropy*, *Nucl. Phys. B* **479** (1996) 305 [[gr-qc/9512047](#)].
- [51] D. Lovelock, *Divergence-free tensorial concomitants*, *Aequat. Math.* **4** (1970) 127.
- [52] D. Lovelock, *The Einstein tensor and its generalizations*, *J. Math. Phys.* **12** (1971) 498.
- [53] M. Cvetič, S. Nojiri and S.D. Odintsov, *Black hole thermodynamics and negative entropy in de Sitter and anti-de Sitter Einstein-Gauss-Bonnet gravity*, *Nucl. Phys. B* **628** (2002) 295 [[hep-th/0112045](#)].
- [54] N. Deruelle, M. Sasaki, Y. Sendouda and D. Yamauchi, *Hamiltonian formulation of $f(\text{Riemann})$ theories of gravity*, *Prog. Theor. Phys.* **123** (2010) 169 [[0908.0679](#)].
- [55] E. Altas and B. Tekin, *Constraints and Time Evolution in Generic $f(\text{Riemann})$ Gravity*, [2405.12037](#).
- [56] S.W. Hawking and S.F. Ross, *Duality between electric and magnetic black holes*, *Phys. Rev. D* **52** (1995) 5865 [[hep-th/9504019](#)].
- [57] R.C. Myers, M.F. Paulos and A. Sinha, *Holographic Hydrodynamics with a Chemical Potential*, *JHEP* **06** (2009) 006 [[0903.2834](#)].
- [58] R. Jackiw and S.Y. Pi, *Chern-Simons modification of general relativity*, *Phys. Rev. D* **68** (2003) 104012 [[gr-qc/0308071](#)].
- [59] T. Eguchi, P.B. Gilkey and A.J. Hanson, *Gravitation, Gauge Theories and Differential Geometry*, *Phys. Rept.* **66** (1980) 213.
- [60] T.P. Sotiriou and V. Faraoni, *$f(R)$ Theories Of Gravity*, *Rev. Mod. Phys.* **82** (2010) 451 [[0805.1726](#)].
- [61] S. Nojiri and S.D. Odintsov, *Finite gravitational action for higher derivative and stringy gravities*, *Phys. Rev. D* **62** (2000) 064018 [[hep-th/9911152](#)].
- [62] R. Casadio and A. Gruppiso, *On boundary terms and conformal transformations in curved space-times*, *Int. J. Mod. Phys. D* **11** (2002) 703 [[gr-qc/0107077](#)].
- [63] A. Balcerzak and M.P. Dabrowski, *Gibbons-Hawking Boundary Terms and Junction Conditions for Higher-Order Brane Gravity Models*, *JCAP* **01** (2009) 018 [[0804.0855](#)].
- [64] P. Teyssandier and P. Tourrenc, *The Cauchy problem for the $R + R^2$ theories of gravity without torsion*, *J. Math. Phys.* **24** (1983) 2793.
- [65] B. Whitt, *Fourth Order Gravity as General Relativity Plus Matter*, *Phys. Lett. B* **145** (1984) 176.
- [66] J.D. Barrow and S. Cotsakis, *Inflation and the Conformal Structure of Higher Order Gravity Theories*, *Phys. Lett. B* **214** (1988) 515.
- [67] J.D. Barrow, *The Premature Recollapse Problem in Closed Inflationary Universes*, *Nucl. Phys. B* **296** (1988) 697.
- [68] D. Wands, *Extended gravity theories and the Einstein-Hilbert action*, *Class. Quant. Grav.* **11** (1994) 269 [[gr-qc/9307034](#)].

- [69] T. Chiba, *1/R gravity and scalar - tensor gravity*, *Phys. Lett. B* **575** (2003) 1 [[astro-ph/0307338](#)].
- [70] T. Harko, F.S.N. Lobo, S. Nojiri and S.D. Odintsov, *f(R, T) gravity*, *Phys. Rev. D* **84** (2011) 024020 [[1104.2669](#)].
- [71] H. Kim and J.S. Oh, *Abelian Chern-Simons term as a Kaluza-Klein dimensional reduction of the Gibbons-Hawking surface term*, [2403.17977](#).
- [72] I.Y. Park, *Dimensional reduction to hypersurface of foliation*, *Fortsch. Phys.* **62** (2014) 966 [[1310.2507](#)].
- [73] I.Y. Park, *Reduction of BTZ spacetime to hypersurfaces of foliation*, *JHEP* **01** (2014) 102 [[1311.4619](#)].
- [74] A. Batrachenko, J.T. Liu, R. McNees, W.A. Sabra and W.Y. Wen, *Black hole mass and Hamilton-Jacobi counterterms*, *JHEP* **05** (2005) 034 [[hep-th/0408205](#)].
- [75] A.J. Speranza, *Geometrical tools for embedding fields, submanifolds, and foliations*, [1904.08012](#).