

HoloNet: Toward a Unified Einstein–Maxwell–Dilaton Framework of QCD

Hong-An Zeng

^a*Center for Theoretical Physics and College of Physics, Jilin University, Changchun 130012, China**

Lingxiao Wang

^b*RIKEN Interdisciplinary Theoretical and Mathematical Sciences (iTHEMS), Wako, Saitama 351-0198, Japan[†] and*

^c*Institute for Physics of Intelligence, Graduate School of Science,
The University of Tokyo, Bunkyo-ku, Tokyo 113-0033, Japan*

Mei Huang

^d*School of Nuclear Science and Technology, University of Chinese Academy of Sciences, Beijing 100049, China[‡]*

We propose HoloNet, a neural-network framework that unifies lattice QCD(LQCD) thermodynamics and holographic Einstein–Maxwell–Dilaton (EMD) theory within a data-to-holography pipeline. Instead of assuming specific functional forms, HoloNet learns the metric profile $A(z)$ and the gauge–dilaton coupling $f(\phi)$ directly from 2+1-flavor LQCD data at $\mu = 0$. These learned functions are embedded into the EMD equations, enabling the model to reproduce the lattice equation of state and baryon number fluctuations with high fidelity. Once trained, HoloNet provides a fully data-driven holographic description of QCD that extends naturally to finite density, allowing us to map the phase diagram and estimate the location of the critical end point (CEP). The reconstructed potential $V(\phi)$ and coupling $f(\phi)$ agree quantitatively with those obtained from holographic renormalization, demonstrating that HoloNet can consistently bridge different holographic models.

I. INTRODUCTION

The Quantum Chromodynamics (QCD) phase structure plays a crucial role in understanding the evolution of the early universe as well as dense matter properties inside the compact stars. It is widely believed that, at vanishing chemical potential, a crossover transition occurs at a temperature T_c . When extended to finite chemical potential, this crossover evolves into a first-order phase transition line [1]. The point where the crossover meets the first-order transition line is the critical point, which is of great experimental significance. The search for this critical point is a central goal of relativistic heavy-ion collision experiments at Relativistic Heavy Ion Collisions (RHIC) [2–7], as well as one of the scientific goals of upcoming facilities such as Facility for Antiproton and Ion Research (FAIR), Nuclotron-based Ion Collider Facility (NICA), and High Intensity Heavy-ion Accelerator Facility (HIAF).

Due to the sign problem [8–11], lattice QCD(LQCD) calculations at finite chemical potential remain extremely challenging. To study the QCD phase structure in the strong-coupling regime, many effective approaches have been employed to investigate the QCD phase diagram, including the Functional Renormalization Group (FRG) [12, 13], Dyson–Schwinger equations (DSEs) [14–17], the Random Matrix Model (RMM) [18], the Nambu–Jona-Lasinio (NJL) model [19], and its extension, the PNJL model [20–23]. The AdS/CFT corre-

spondence [24–27], also known as the holographic principle, has been developed as a powerful framework to address problems involving strong coupling, including the hard-wall model [28], the soft-wall model [29], and the V-QCD model [30], among others. Moreover, another bottom-up theoretical framework, the Einstein–Maxwell–Dilaton (EMD) model, has recently attracted considerable attentions. It incorporates a dilaton field that breaks conformal symmetry and a Maxwell gauge field that introduces a chemical potential, thereby extending the model to finite density. The model appears to be “just sufficient” for describing QCD-like systems and has been shown to capture the essential features of the QCD equation of state(EoS) successfully. Furthermore, it can be extended to include additional effects, such as external magnetic fields [31].

There are generally three approaches to determining the model. The first approach, following the spirit of Gubser-type models, assumes specific functional forms for the potential $V(\phi)$ and the coupling function $f(\phi)$ directly at the level of the action. The parameters of these functions are then fixed by comparing the model-predicted EoS on the boundary with LQCD data [32–38]. The second approach focuses on fixing the bulk geometry $A(z)$. In this case, data are used to determine the metric warp factor $A(z)$ and the coupling function $f(z)$ along the holographic direction. The corresponding potential $V(\phi)$ and coupling function $f(\phi)$ are then reconstructed, also known as the potential reconstruction method [39–48]. The third arises from the fact that the dilaton field couples directly to the bulk geometry. One may instead assume a dilaton profile $\phi(z)$ along the holographic direction, from which both the bulk geometry and the potential functions can be solved [49, 50].

* zengha20@mails.jlu.edu.cn

† lingxiao.wang@riken.jp

‡ huangmei@ucas.ac.cn

At the same time, the rapid development of machine learning [51] has endowed holographic models with significantly enhanced representational capabilities. In particular, the neural network approach enables a more efficient and effective solution of ordinary differential equations, especially for models in which the equations of motion contain functional dependencies that are difficult to handle analytically or numerically using traditional methods [52–58]. By introducing neural networks along the holographic direction [59–61], it becomes possible to use boundary data and reconstruct the bulk metric. Using this approach, we can construct holographic models driven directly by LQCD data.

Another key motivation for incorporating machine learning into holographic QCD models is to reduce the inherent arbitrariness in model construction. At present, different holographic models—or even the same model solved via different approaches—often yield different parameters, resulting in significant discrepancies in the reconstructed gravitational geometry. Beyond variations arising from the choice of LQCD data, much of this discrepancy stems from the a priori selection of functional forms within the models. By replacing these arbitrary choices with neural networks with minimal physics priors [51], one can largely suppress the human-imposed priors, thereby achieving an un-biased holographic QCD model [62, 63]. This approach allows different solution methods to be incorporated within a unified framework, enabling more consistent and reliable predictions.

In this work, we present HoloNet, a neural network-based approach to holographic QCD potential reconstruction. Our method directly learns the metric components $A(z)$ and coupling functions $f(\phi(z))$ from LQCD data, without assuming any specific functional forms. With necessary physics constraints, e.g., AdS boundary conditions, Stefan–Boltzmann limit, etc., we train our neural networks using 2+1 flavor LQCD data for the EoS and baryon number susceptibility at zero baryon chemical potential, achieving a fully data-driven reconstruction of the potential functions.

This paper is organized as follows. We first provide a brief introduction to the potential reconstruction EMD model. We then describe how to construct the neural network algorithm within this framework and explain the incorporation of constraints. Finally, we present comparisons with LQCD data and offer a discussion of the critical point predictions.

II. HOLOGRAPHIC EMD MODEL

We consider a 5-dimensional Einstein-Maxwell-dilaton (EMD) action:

$$S_E = \frac{1}{16\pi G_5} \int d^5x \sqrt{-g} \left[R - \frac{f(\phi)}{4} F^2 - \frac{1}{2} \partial_\mu \phi \partial^\mu \phi - V(\phi) \right]. \quad (1)$$

Here, f denotes the coupling function, the gauge field F^2 term provides the boundary baryon number density, the ϕ field is responsible for breaking conformal symmetry, and G_5 denotes the five-dimensional Newton’s constant.

We consider the following ansatz for the metric,

$$ds^2 = \frac{L^2 e^{2A(z)}}{z^2} \left[-g(z) dt^2 + \frac{dz^2}{g(z)} + d\vec{x}^2 \right], \quad (2)$$

where the metric component $A(z)$ is the warp factor. $z = 0$ corresponds to the asymptotic AdS boundary, and we set $L = 1$ in this work. The equations of motion can be solved by imposing the following boundary conditions. At the horizon $z = z_H$,

$$A_t(z_H) = g(z_H) = 0. \quad (3)$$

A_t represents the time component of the gauge field. At the AdS boundary $z = 0$,

$$\begin{aligned} A(0) &= -\sqrt{\frac{1}{6}} \phi(0), g(0) = 1, \\ A_t(0) &= \mu + \rho' z^2 + \dots \end{aligned} \quad (4)$$

Under the holographic duality, μ corresponds to the chemical potential in the boundary field theory, while ρ' corresponds to a quantity related to the baryon number density. The baryon number density can be calculated as:

$$\begin{aligned} \rho &= \left| \lim_{z \rightarrow 0} \frac{\partial \mathcal{L}}{\partial (\partial_z A_t)} \right| \\ &= -\frac{1}{16\pi G_5} \lim_{z \rightarrow 0} \left[\frac{e^{A(z)}}{z} f(\phi) \frac{d}{dz} A_t(z) \right]. \end{aligned} \quad (5)$$

\mathcal{L} denotes the Lagrangian density.

When the metric functions $A(z)$ and coupling functions $f(\phi)$ are undetermined, the equations of motion can be formally expressed in the following integral form. Based on Ref. [39], we have simplified the relevant expressions to make them more suitable for constructing the neural network,

$$\begin{aligned} \phi'(z) &= \sqrt{-6 \left(A'' - A'^2 + \frac{2}{z} A' \right)}, \\ A_t(z) &= \mu \frac{\int_{z_H}^z \frac{y}{e^{A_f}} dy}{\int_{z_H}^0 \frac{y}{e^{A_f}} dy}, \\ g(z) &= 1 + \frac{1}{\int_0^{z_H} y^3 e^{-3A} dy} \left[-\int_0^z y^3 e^{-3A} dy \right. \\ &\quad \left. + \left(\frac{\mu}{\int_0^{z_H} \frac{y}{e^{A_f}} dy} \right)^2 \hat{G} \right], \\ V(z) &= -3z^2 g e^{-2A} \left[A'' + 3A'^2 + \left(\frac{3g'}{2g} - \frac{6}{z} \right) A' \right. \\ &\quad \left. - \frac{1}{z} \left(\frac{3g'}{2g} - \frac{4}{z} \right) + \frac{g''}{6g} \right], \end{aligned} \quad (6)$$

where the expression of \hat{G} is

$$\hat{G} = \left| \frac{\int_0^{z_H} y^3 e^{-3A} dy}{\int_{z_H}^z y^3 e^{-3A} dy} \frac{\int_0^{z_H} y^3 e^{-3A} dy \int_0^y \frac{x}{e^A f} dx}{\int_0^z y^3 e^{-3A} dy \int_0^y \frac{x}{e^A f} dx} \right|. \quad (7)$$

We can easily obtain the temperature T , entropy density s , and baryon number density ρ .

$$\begin{aligned} T &= \frac{1}{4\pi} \frac{z_H^3 e^{-3A(z_H)}}{\int_0^{z_H} y^3 e^{-3A(z)} dy} \left[1 - \left(\frac{\mu}{\int_0^{z_H} \frac{y}{e^A f} dy} \right)^2 \right. \\ &\quad \left. \left(\int_0^{z_H} y^3 e^{-3A} dy \cdot \int_0^{z_H} \frac{x}{e^A f} dx \right. \right. \\ &\quad \left. \left. - \int_0^{z_H} y^3 e^{-3A} dy \int_0^y \frac{x}{e^A f} dx \right) \right], \quad (8) \\ s &= \frac{e^{3A(z_H)}}{4G_5 z_H^3}, \\ \rho &= \frac{1}{16\pi G_5} \frac{\mu}{\int_0^{z_H} \frac{y}{e^A f} dy}. \end{aligned}$$

Using thermodynamic relations, the free energy can be expressed as

$$F = - \int s dT - \rho d\mu. \quad (9)$$

The pressure is given by $p = -F$. It is worth noting that, in general holographic dualities, the free energy typically contains contributions from the AdS background and is therefore divergent[64–66]. To ensure thermodynamic consistency, it is usually necessary to regularize it so that the first law of thermodynamics holds. In this work, we implement a simplified regularization by appropriately choosing the lower limit of integration, which amounts to fixing the integration constant (the lower limit fixed at $T = 100$ MeV). This is because we are more concerned with the relative variation of the free energy. And the entropy at low temperatures is numerically closer to zero. We expect this to have an effect equivalent to subtracting the divergent terms in the action. Meanwhile, the energy density can be obtained as

$$\epsilon = -p + sT + \mu\rho. \quad (10)$$

The second-order baryon number susceptibility is defined as

$$\chi_2^B = \frac{1}{T^2} \frac{\partial \rho}{\partial \mu}. \quad (11)$$

In the above model, the unknown independent parameters include the horizon z_H , the chemical potential μ , metric component A , the coupling function f , and the five-dimensional Newton's constant G_5 [67]. On the dual QCD side, the independent parameters are temperature T and chemical potential μ . Now, the question is: *which parameter's variation induces the change of QCD temperature T ?*

Both the variation of z_H and the change of $A(z)$ can cause changes in the temperature T . A reasonable choice is to let different horizon positions z_H correspond to different temperatures T . This allows us to use the same function $A(z)$ at all temperatures. Optimizing a single function is always simpler than optimizing multiple ones. This is also why we did not reparameterize the horizon to $z_H = 1$ from the beginning.

So far, all independent variables have their own physical meanings: z_H and μ provide the degrees of freedom for temperature and chemical potential, while the functions $A(z)$ and $f(z)$ determine the values at each point on the (T, μ) phase diagram. The parameter G_5 sets the thermodynamic limit, which will be discussed later.

It is also worth noting that we can determine the model from LQCD data at zero chemical potential and then extend it to finite chemical potential. This is because the baryon number susceptibility, defined as the second derivative of the thermodynamic potential with respect to the chemical potential, already encodes information about the finite- μ regime. In the model, this information is encoded in the coupling function $f(z)$, which can be determined through the baryon number susceptibility. Once $f(z)$ is fixed, it in turn determines the thermodynamic quantities at finite chemical potential.

III. NEURAL-NETWORK APPROACH




FIG. 1. **HoloNet.** A neural network is constructed along the holographic direction. Different bulk spacetimes are placed on a common holographic coordinate and differ only by their horizon locations z_H . The functions $A(z)$ and $f(z)$ are implemented as sub-networks (schematically shown as three-layer networks). Hollow nodes represent learnable parameters, while solid nodes represent the fixed equation of motion. The sub-networks output $A(z)$ and $f(z)$ at each layer and feed them into the fixed network to compute thermodynamic quantities.

HoloNet: As mentioned above, our goal is to achieve a fully data-driven learning of the bulk geometry and its coupling to the gauge field. To this end, we employ deep

neural networks to parameterize the functions A and f . The network for $A(z)$ is a 4-layer fully connected architecture, *1-12-tanh-23-tanh-12-tanh-1-(-softplus)*, and the network for $f(z)$ is *1-12-tanh-23-tanh-1-softplus*, where the numbers denote the layer widths, *tanh* is the hyperbolic activation, and *softplus* is $\sigma(x) = \ln(1 + e^x)$. Each network takes the holographic coordinate z as input and outputs the corresponding value of $A(z)$ or $f(z)$. This architecture balances optimization efficiency with representational capacity. The outermost *-softplus* in $A(z)$ facilitates imposing constraints involving derivative behaviors of A , while the final *softplus* in $f(z)$ enforces its positivity. Further details will be provided later in the text.

It is well known that neural networks can be used to solve differential equations [54]. In our case, the equations of motion have already been reduced to the integral form (8), and, as discussed above, the bulk geometries of different black hole solutions can be reparameterized into a unified metric (with the temperature encoded in z_H). This allows the general differential-equation network to be simplified into the structure shown in Fig. 1.

Our construction has three key components: 1) **Nesting networks**. The model consists of a large global network—corresponding to the integral form of the equations of motion—with fixed structure and coefficients, together with two independent sub-networks representing the functions $A(z)$ and $f(z)$; 2) **Automatic differentiation**. Because different black hole solutions share the same $A(z)$, they can be aligned on a common holographic coordinate. In the overlapping region, both the fields and metric take identical numerical values, and different spacetimes differ only by their respective z_H . This stacking enables efficient evaluation of thermodynamic quantities and their gradients using automatic differentiation; 3) **Self-adaptive optimization**. The sub-networks dynamically generate the layer-wise values of $A(z)$ and $f(z)$. Previous approaches [62] treat these values as direct parameters of the global network, reconstructing the geometry through their optimization. By contrast, our model computes them on the fly through explicit neural networks. Although seemingly more elaborate, this design is essential. The key reason is that the relation between the lowest accessible temperature T_{\min} and the maximal holographic coordinate z_{\max} depends on the specific form of $A(z)$. Thus, the mapping of thermodynamic quantities along the holographic direction is not fixed but varies with $A(z)$. Methods that regard $A(z)$ as fixed must reserve a large buffer in the holographic coordinate to accommodate all possible mappings, incurring unnecessary computational cost. In our approach, z_{\max} is computed adaptively for the target T_{\min} at each iteration [31], ensuring that the depth of the global network remains constant. The model therefore adjusts automatically to the lattice data without wasting computational resources.

Optimization Objective. Once the neural network architecture is fixed, the next step is to choose an appropriate loss function. In our setup, the total loss consists

of two components,

$$L = L_{\text{LQCD}} + L_{\text{R}}, \quad (12)$$

where L_{LQCD} quantifies the deviation between the model predictions and the LQCD data, and L_{R} represents regularization terms associated with physical constraints. These constraints include the Stefan–Boltzmann limit, the scalar-field equation of motion, and the positivity of f . We explicitly introduce these constraints into the designs of neural networks to enforce the regularization terms to vanish exactly. The only explicit model-regularization term is $L_{\text{R}} = L_{\text{AdS}} = N(A(0) - 0)^2$, which measures the degree to which the network satisfies the AdS boundary condition. N is the total number of grid points along the holographic direction, and it keeps the two loss functions L_{LQCD} and L_{R} at the same order of magnitude. A detailed explanation of this *physics-driven deep learning* method [51] will be given in the next section.

The first term L_{LQCD} is defined as the mean square error (MSE) between the model predictions and the LQCD data for the EoS and baryon number susceptibility,

$$L_{\text{LQCD}} = \{L_s, L_\chi\}. \quad (13)$$

Here, entropy density error $L_s = \Sigma(s_{\text{NN}} - s_{\text{LQCD}})^2$, where NN denotes the values given by the neural network model, and LQCD denotes the LQCD data. $L_\chi = \Sigma(\chi_{2\text{NN}}^B - \chi_{2\text{LQCD}}^B)^2$ represents the baryon number susceptibility error. Since there are only two independent quantities in the thermodynamic quantities, it is unnecessary to include additional errors. In addition, our optimization strategy trains s and χ_2^B independently. This is because the equation of state at zero baryon number density is determined solely by the metric component A . In contrast, the baryon number susceptibility depends on both A and the coupling function f . Therefore, a more reasonable approach is to first determine A from the EoS (with the loss function $L_s + L_{\text{AdS}}$), and then extract f using the baryon number susceptibility data (with the loss function L_χ), rather than attempting to determine A simultaneously from both datasets. Furthermore, because there is no significant variation in the uncertainties within each dataset, we adopt the MSE loss.

Finally, the model is optimized using the Adam($lr = 1e-3$, $\text{betas} = (0.9, 0.999)$, $\text{eps} = 1e-8$) optimizer, which is a popular choice for training neural networks. The optimization process adjusts the parameters of the neural networks representing A and f to minimize the loss function.

IV. CONSTRAINTS

Our model is subject to certain physical and algorithmic constraints. Choosing an appropriate model architecture that naturally satisfies these constraints can improve accuracy and avoid the optimization complexities that arise when incorporating the constraints into




FIG. 2. The graphs of the A and f functions are shown, with red representing the optimized neural network results, black corresponding to an analytically guessed solution, blue depicting the machine learning results obtained from a prescribed functional form [68], and green indicating the outcomes of Bayesian analysis [69]. Additionally, the gray areas in the figures represent the z range over which the lattice data are available.

the loss function. The main constraints incorporated in our model and their corresponding solutions are as follows. Among these, the $A(z)$ constraint and the Stefan-Boltzmann limit are physical constraints, while the constraints on the dilaton field and the coupling function are intrinsic to the model itself.

$A(z)$ constraint. To ensure that the model satisfies the AdS boundary conditions, we impose the following constraints:

$$A(0) = 0. \quad (14)$$

Meanwhile, empirically, the function $A(z)$ should be a monotonically decreasing function. Therefore, we use the *softplus* activation function in the last layer, which helps the neural network architecture as much as possible conform to this prior behavior.

Stefan-Boltzmann limit. In some other discussions, the five-dimensional Newton's constant G_5 can also be treated as an adjustable parameter in the optimization process and, in principle, can be inferred from boundary LQCD data [68]. However, in our model, G_5 essentially serves the sole purpose of fixing the Stefan-Boltzmann limit at high temperatures. Admittedly, we cannot guarantee the validity of the holographic model in the extremely high-temperature regime, nor can we assert whether it should strictly adhere to the AdS/CFT duality limit. Nevertheless, since s/T^3 generally characterizes the number of effective degrees of freedom in the system, and the Stefan-Boltzmann limit from AdS/CFT, $(s/T^3)_{\text{AdS/CFT}}$, significantly overshoots the LQCD result $(s/T^3)_{\text{LQCD}}$ at high temperatures, this discrepancy arises because the AdS/CFT duality limit contains far more degrees of freedom than those captured by the 2+1 flavor LQCD data. Therefore, a reasonable choice is to fix G_5 such that the Stefan-Boltzmann limit matches that of LQCD.

In the UV limit as $z_H \rightarrow 0$, the temperature and entropy density can be easily obtained as

$$\lim_{z_H \rightarrow 0} T = \frac{1}{\pi z_H}, \quad \lim_{z_H \rightarrow 0} s = \frac{1}{4G_5 z_H^3}. \quad (15)$$

The Stefan-Boltzmann limit of LQCD is given by [70]:

$$\lim_{z_H \rightarrow 0} \frac{s}{T^3} = \frac{\pi^3}{4G_5} = 4 \times 5.209. \quad (16)$$

That is $G_5 = 0.372028$.

Derivative behavior of dilaton field. Motivated by prior knowledge, we employ the *-softplus* activation function at the outermost layer of the A network, which ensures that the following constraint is automatically satisfied in most cases,

$$-6 \left(A'' - A'^2 + \frac{2}{z} A' \right) > 0. \quad (17)$$

The *-softplus* function naturally enforces this inequality, effectively embedding the constraint into the network architecture. Consequently, no additional constraint term is required in the loss function, simplifying the overall loss design.

Moreover, neural networks typically prioritize optimizing low-frequency modes during training [71]. Since this model relies on higher-order derivatives, it is important to suppress the interference caused by high-frequency components at early stages and to ensure the smoothness of the functions, avoiding unphysical high-frequency degrees of freedom. To achieve this, the *softplus* activation function can be employed to attenuate the high-frequency modes of the neural network effectively. Of course, this suppression does not compromise the expressive power of the neural network. If necessary, after sufficiently long training, the influence of the earlier hidden layers can still




FIG. 3. The figures display the speed of sound and specific heat, with red solid lines representing our analytical results and the error bars indicating the lattice data [72]. As anticipated, these quantities exhibit excellent agreement once the model accurately satisfies the EoS.

enable the network to capture localized high-frequency patterns.

Positive-defined coupling function. In general, we impose no strong restrictions on the coupling function $f(z)$, except that the following integral requires $f(z)$ to be positive definite,

$$\int_0^{z_H} \frac{y}{e^{A(y)} f(y)} dy. \quad (18)$$

This is because this term appears in the denominator in (8) and therefore must not vanish (If it becomes zero, it would cause the baryon number susceptibility to diverge). A sufficient condition to ensure this is to require the function f to be positive, which prevents cancellations between positive and negative contributions in the integral. The *softplus* layer can effectively ensure this.

V. RECONSTRUCTION RESULTS

The LQCD data are taken from [72, 73]. From the LQCD data, through the optimization of the neural networks, we can reconstruct the bulk functions $A(z)$ and $f(z)$, as shown in Fig. 2.

A. Thermodynamic Observables

Fig. 4 compares the LQCD data (error bars) at zero chemical potential with the optimized neural network results (solid lines). The comparison covers four quantities: energy density, entropy density, pressure, and anomaly. Among these, the entropy density is used to optimize the network, while the energy density, pressure and anomaly automatically match the lattice results after optimization. At zero chemical potential, all these quantities depend only on the metric function $A(z)$.




FIG. 4. EoS comparison between neural network results and LQCD data [72]. The error bars represent the LQCD data, while the solid lines represent the neural network model results. The blue curve corresponds to the trace anomaly $\epsilon - 3p$, the yellow to the entropy density s , the green to the pressure p , and the red to the energy density ϵ . The entropy density and pressure are used in training the neural network model. Since there are only two independent thermodynamic variables, the trace anomaly and energy density generally agree with the lattice data automatically.

The baryon number susceptibility is shown in Fig. 5. It is jointly determined by the metric function $A(z)$ and the coupling function $f(z)$. Here, $A(z)$ is treated as a completely external parameter with respect to the baryon number susceptibility. The susceptibility is used to optimize $f(z)$, allowing the model to be extended to finite chemical potential.

As the EoS is accurately satisfied, the speed of sound and specific heat are also well reproduced. The related results can be found in Fig. 3.




FIG. 5. Baryon number susceptibility comparison between neural network result and LQCD data [73]. The black dots represent the LQCD results, with error bars omitted due to their negligible size. The red solid line represents the neural network model results. The optimized model exhibits a high level of quantitative agreement with the lattice results.

B. Closed-Form Expression

In addition, we present an approximate closed-form expression. This expression is derived by first employing the **PySR(python)** package [74] to perform symbolic regression and identify potential functional candidates, followed by manual inspection and refinement to propose a suitable analytical form for reference. That is,

$$\begin{aligned} A(z) &= a_1 z^4 - a_2 \log(1 + z^2) - a_3 \log(1 + a_4 z^4), \\ f(z) &= f_1 \operatorname{sech}(f_2(z + f_3)^3). \end{aligned} \quad (19)$$

The corresponding constants are $a_1 = 0.00037885$, $a_2 = 0.062182$, $a_3 = 0.21002$, $a_4 = 0.020314$, $f_1 = 0.31197$, $f_2 = 0.079030$, $f_3 = 0.34070$.

The analytic and neural-network results agree very well, with the analytic curves shown in black in Figs. 2, 6, 7, and 8. In the temperature range 130–400 MeV, the maximal relative discrepancies between the neural-network reconstruction and the LQCD data are of order $\epsilon_s \sim 10^{-5}$ for the entropy density and $\epsilon_{\chi_2^B} \sim 10^{-7}$ for the baryon number susceptibility. For the analytic reconstruction, the corresponding discrepancies are slightly larger, $\epsilon_s \sim 10^{-4}$ and $\epsilon_{\chi_2^B} \sim 10^{-5}$.

We can reconstruct the potential functions $V(\phi)$ and $f(\phi)$ using the learned $A(z)$ and $f(z)$. The results are shown in Fig. 6 and Fig. 7. The reconstructed potential functions exhibit quantitative agreement with those obtained through the holographic renormalization method [75]. It should be noted that in the $\phi \rightarrow 0$ region, the holographic renormalization scheme introduces a pole in $f(\phi)$, leading to a slight difference between the two approaches. This pole, in [75], was artificially introduced for computational convenience, has no physical significance, and can be removed. This consistency serves




FIG. 6. Reconstructed potential function $V(\phi)$ from neural network training. The black dashed line represents the potential obtained from the holographic renormalization method, while the blue solid line represents the potential obtained from the potential reconstruction neural network model. Within the ϕ range used in the numerical calculations, the values of $V(\phi)$ show a high degree of agreement.




FIG. 7. Coupling function $f(\phi)$ from neural network training. The black dashed line represents the coupling function obtained from the holographic renormalization method, while the blue solid line represents the coupling function obtained from the potential reconstruction neural network model. Within the ϕ range involved in the numerical calculations, the values of $f(\phi)$ are in close agreement.

as a crucial validation of our neural network approach. Eventually, our reconstructions support the following analytical forms of $V(\phi)$ and $f(\phi)$,

$$\begin{aligned} V(\phi) &= -12 \cosh(c_1 \phi) + c_2 \phi^2, \\ f(\phi) &= c_3 \operatorname{sech}(c_4(\phi + c_5)^3), \end{aligned} \quad (20)$$

where $c_1 = 0.69048$, $c_2 = 1.2777$, $c_3 = 0.31562$, $c_4 = 0.061371$, $c_5 = 0.35482$.

C. Extrapolation to CEP

We have also computed the locations of the CEP, the first-order phase transition line, and the crossover in the phase diagram in Fig. 8. Overall, our results are somewhat higher in temperature compared with most previous studies. Fortunately, these results fall within the region represented by our data, making them numerically reliable to a certain extent. Nevertheless, as they lie close to the boundary, we strongly recommend treating them merely as a reference. Access to lattice data at lower temperatures would enable further extrapolation and yield more robust and trustworthy results.




FIG. 8. The phase diagram is shown, where the red solid and dashed lines denote the first-order phase transition and crossover obtained from the neural network, and the black line indicates the analytical guess. The gray-shaded region represents the range in which the model predictions are reliable, obtained by extending the zero-chemical-potential equation of state to finite chemical potential through the baryon number susceptibility in the holographic model. The light-blue region indicates the part of the phase diagram where the CEP has been excluded [76]. Green ones represent DeWolfe-Gubser-Rosen-type HQCD models, and green left triangle [34], upward triangle [77], and downward triangle [78] correspond to related HQCD results. Blue dot, solid, and dashed lines denote the CEP, first-order lines, and crossovers from [79]. The pink and yellow regions show the 68% and 95% confidence-level CEP estimates from [69], with the blue pentagram indicating the maximum a posteriori result. yellow right triangle, purple square, and purple diamond represent the CEPs obtained from the PNJL [21], FRG [12], and DSE-FRG [80] approaches, respectively.

Finally, it is necessary to clarify an important point. The LQCD data employed here are restricted to a specific temperature range, which naturally corresponds to a certain region of z . This region is indicated by the gray-shaded area in Fig. 2, and our results are considered valid only within this range (derived from the neural network results). Upon extension to finite chemical po-

tential, there exists a corresponding region in the $T - \mu$ plane, highlighted in gray in Fig. 8. Other unmarked regions are either irrelevant to this consideration or entirely fall within the valid range.

VI. CONCLUSION AND DISCUSSION

In this work, we construct a fully data-driven potential-reconstruction holographic QCD model, HoloNet, where the metric components and coupling function are represented by two independent neural networks embedded along the holographic direction, eliminating any need for assumed functional forms. To maintain self-consistency without increasing model complexity, mild assumptions are imposed only on the final layers so that certain constraints are approximately satisfied, without restricting the model's expressive power. The network is trained on 2+1 flavor LQCD data for the entropy density and baryon number susceptibility, achieving very small errors, while other thermodynamic quantities—energy density, pressure, trace anomaly, speed of sound, and specific heat—naturally match the lattice results through thermodynamic relations. Since the lattice data span 130–400 MeV, the model provides reliable predictions within this temperature range.

We have also computed the QCD phase diagram and identified a CEP at $(T = 106 \text{ MeV}, \mu = 730 \text{ MeV})$ in our model. Although the functions $A(z)$ and $V(\phi)$ are similar to those used in many existing approaches, the CEP position is predominantly controlled by $f(\phi)$ and is highly sensitive to its precise form. As a result, our predicted CEP exhibits a noticeable deviation from most earlier results. Additional uncertainties arise because the equations of motion involve higher-order derivatives of $A(z)$ and $f(z)$, whose accuracy decreases near the edge of the region where the data can be reliably extrapolated. This limitation introduces further uncertainty in the CEP determination, though the results in these regions still provide a meaningful reference. Extending lattice data to slightly lower temperatures would enlarge the model's reliable domain and is likely to bring the CEP prediction into closer alignment with values commonly reported in the literature, offering a promising direction for future work.

Another issue worth discussing is temperature dependence. Since $g(z)$ depends on z_H , the values of $V(z)$ in the holographic coordinate also depend on z_H , which suggests that the form of $V(z)$ may be related to the specific temperature value. Meanwhile, ϕ appears to depend only on our A neural network and is independent of temperature, so V seems to be not only a function of ϕ , $V(\phi)$, but may also explicitly depend on temperature, $V(\phi, T)$. However, in practice, after incorporating the lattice data, the temperature dependence of V disappears. Numerically, it remains consistent with the form of $V(\phi)$ in the action, i.e., V depends only on ϕ . Relevant discussions can be found in the Appendix.

Finally, we compared our results with those obtained via the holographic renormalization method [75] and the potential-reconstruction approach [79] based on a prescribed ansatz for $A(z)$. These traditional methods generally differ because holographic renormalization assumes a specific form for $V(\phi)$, while potential reconstruction assumes a parameterized $A(z)$. In contrast, our fully machine-learning reconstruction makes no such ansatz yet reproduces results consistent with holographic renormalization, indicating that the two approaches are in fact equivalent. We also find that the pole of $f(\phi)$ at $z = 0$ that appears in holographic renormalization has no significant effect on the equation of state or the CEP location and can be regarded as a gauge choice. Since both potential reconstruction and holographic renormalization derive from the same action, their agreement provides an important validation of the self-consistency of the EMD framework. Geometrically, as noted earlier, the temperature T may be encoded in either the warp factor $A(z)$ or the horizon position z_H ; the latter is fixed in holographic renormalization for numerical convenience, whereas our

model allows it to vary. Because fixed and unfixed z_H spacetimes are related by diffeomorphisms, the consistency between our reconstructed potential and that from holographic renormalization further confirms the internal coherence of the framework.

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

We thank Dr. Daichi Takeda and Dr. Zhibin Li for helpful discussions. We thank the DEEP-IN working group at RIKEN-iTHEMS for support in the preparation of this paper. LW is supported by the RIKEN-TRIP initiative (RIKEN Quantum), JSPS KAKENHI Grant No. 25H01560, and JST-BOOST Grant No. JPMJBY24H9; MH is supported in part by the National Natural Science Foundation of China (NSFC) Grant Nos: 12235016, 12221005. HZ is supported by the Science and Technology Development Plan Project of Jilin Province, China Grant No. 20240101326JC.

-
- [1] Christian Schmidt and Sayantan Sharma. The phase structure of qcd. *Journal of Physics G: Nuclear and Particle Physics*, 44(10):104002, 2017.
 - [2] MM Aggarwal, Z Ahammed, AV Alakhverdyants, I Alekseev, J Alford, BD Anderson, D Arkhipkin, GS Averichev, J Balewski, LS Barnby, et al. Higher moments of net proton multiplicity distributions at rhic. *Physical review letters*, 105(2):022302, 2010.
 - [3] MM Aggarwal, Z Ahammed, AV Alakhverdyants, I Alekseev, BD Anderson, D Arkhipkin, GS Averichev, J Balewski, LS Barnby, S Baumgart, et al. An experimental exploration of the qcd phase diagram: the search for the critical point and the onset of de-confinement. *arXiv preprint arXiv:1007.2613*, 2010.
 - [4] L Adamczyk, JK Adkins, G Agakishiev, MM Aggarwal, Z Ahammed, I Alekseev, J Alford, CD Anson, A Aparin, D Arkhipkin, et al. Energy dependence of moments of net-proton multiplicity distributions at rhic. *Physical Review Letters*, 112(3):032302, 2014.
 - [5] Xiaofeng Luo and Nu Xu. Search for the qcd critical point with fluctuations of conserved quantities in relativistic heavy-ion collisions at rhic: an overview. *Nuclear Science and Techniques*, 28(8):112, 2017.
 - [6] Jaroslav Adam, L Adamczyk, JR Adams, JK Adkins, G Agakishiev, MM Aggarwal, Z Ahammed, I Alekseev, DM Anderson, A Aparin, et al. Nonmonotonic energy dependence of net-proton number fluctuations. *Physical review letters*, 126(9):092301, 2021.
 - [7] Mohamed Samy Abdallah, BE Aboona, Jaroslav Adam, Leszek Adamczyk, Joseph R Adams, J Kevin Adkins, Ishu Aggarwal, Madan Mohan Aggarwal, Zubayer Ahammed, Derek M Anderson, et al. Higher-order cumulants and correlation functions of proton multiplicity distributions in $s_{NN} = 3$ gev au+ au collisions at the rhic star experiment. *Physical Review C*, 107(2):024908, 2023.
 - [8] Owe Philipsen. The QCD equation of state from the lattice. *Prog. Part. Nucl. Phys.*, 70:55–107, 2013.
 - [9] Owe Philipsen. The qcd equation of state from the lattice. *Progress in Particle and Nuclear Physics*, 70:55–107, 2013.
 - [10] Gert Aarts. Introductory lectures on lattice QCD at nonzero baryon number. *J. Phys. Conf. Ser.*, 706(2):022004, 2016.
 - [11] Keitaro Nagata. Finite-density lattice QCD and sign problem: Current status and open problems. *Prog. Part. Nucl. Phys.*, 127:103991, 2022.
 - [12] Wei-jie Fu, Jan M Pawłowski, and Fabian Rennecke. Qcd phase structure at finite temperature and density. *Physical Review D*, 101(5):054032, 2020.
 - [13] Hui Zhang, Defu Hou, Toru Kojo, and Bin Qin. Functional renormalization group study of the quark-meson model with ω meson. *Physical Review D*, 96(11):114029, 2017.
 - [14] Fei Gao and Yu-xin Liu. Qcd phase transitions via a refined truncation of dyson-schwinger equations. *Physical Review D*, 94(7):076009, 2016.
 - [15] Si-xue Qin, Lei Chang, Huan Chen, Yu-xin Liu, and Craig D Roberts. Phase diagram and critical end point for strongly interacting quarks. *Physical Review Letters*, 106(17):172301, 2011.
 - [16] Chao Shi, Yong-long Wang, Yu Jiang, Zhu-fang Cui, and Hong-Shi Zong. Locate qcd critical end point in a continuum model study. *Journal of High Energy Physics*, 2014(7):1–10, 2014.
 - [17] Christian S Fischer, Jan Luecker, and Christian A Welzbacher. Phase structure of three and four flavor qcd. *Physical Review D*, 90(3):034022, 2014.
 - [18] MA Halasz, AD Jackson, RE Shrock, Misha A Stephanov, and JJM Verbaarschot. Phase diagram of qcd. *Physical Review D*, 58(9):096007, 1998.

- [19] Yoichiro Nambu and Giovanni Jona-Lasinio. Dynamical model of elementary particles based on an analogy with superconductivity. i. Physical review, 122(1):345, 1961.
- [20] Fei Sun, Kun Xu, and Mei Huang. Splitting of chiral and deconfinement phase transitions induced by rotation. Physical Review D, 108(9):096007, 2023.
- [21] Zhibin Li, Kun Xu, Xinyang Wang, and Mei Huang. The kurtosis of net baryon number fluctuations from a realistic polyakov–nambu–jona-lasinio model along the experimental freeze-out line. The European Physical Journal C, 79(3):245, 2019.
- [22] Takahiro Sasaki, Yuji Sakai, Hiroaki Kouno, and Masanobu Yahiro. Qcd phase diagram at finite baryon and isospin chemical potentials. Physical Review D—Particles, Fields, Gravitation, and Cosmology, 82(11):116004, 2010.
- [23] Larry McLerran, Krzysztof Redlich, and Chihiro Sasaki. Quarkyonic matter and chiral symmetry breaking. Nuclear Physics A, 824(1-4):86–100, 2009.
- [24] Juan Maldacena. The large- n limit of superconformal field theories and supergravity. International journal of theoretical physics, 38(4):1113–1133, 1999.
- [25] Edward Witten. Anti de sitter space and holography. arXiv preprint hep-th/9802150, 1998.
- [26] Steven S Gubser, Igor R Klebanov, and Alexander M Polyakov. Gauge theory correlators from non-critical string theory. Physics Letters B, 428(1-2):105–114, 1998.
- [27] Ofer Aharony, Steven S Gubser, Juan Maldacena, Hiroshi Ooguri, and Yaron Oz. Large n field theories, string theory and gravity. Physics Reports, 323(3-4):183–386, 2000.
- [28] Joshua Erlich, Emanuel Katz, Dam T Son, and Mikhail A Stephanov. Qcd and a holographic model of hadrons. Physical review letters, 95(26):261602, 2005.
- [29] Andreas Karch, Emanuel Katz, Dam T Son, and Mikhail A Stephanov. Linear confinement and ads/qcd. Physical Review D—Particles, Fields, Gravitation, and Cosmology, 74(1):015005, 2006.
- [30] Umut Gürsoy, Matti Järvinen, and Govert Nijs. Holographic qcd in the veneziano limit at a finite magnetic field and chemical potential. Physical Review Letters, 120(24):242002, 2018.
- [31] Rong-Gen Cai, Song He, Li Li, and Hong-An Zeng. Neural ordinary differential equations for mapping the magnetic qcd phase diagram via holography. arXiv preprint arXiv:2406.12772, 2024.
- [32] Oliver DeWolfe, Steven S Gubser, and Christopher Rosen. A holographic critical point. Physical Review D—Particles, Fields, Gravitation, and Cosmology, 83(8):086005, 2011.
- [33] Steven S Gubser and Abhinav Nellore. Mimicking the qcd equation of state with a dual black hole. Physical Review D—Particles, Fields, Gravitation, and Cosmology, 78(8):086007, 2008.
- [34] Joaquin Grefa, Jorge Noronha, Jacquelyn Noronha-Hostler, Israel Portillo, Claudia Ratti, and Romulo Rougemont. Hot and dense quark-gluon plasma thermodynamics from holographic black holes. Physical Review D, 104(3):034002, 2021.
- [35] Song He, Li Li, Zhibin Li, and Shao-Jiang Wang. Gravitational waves and primordial black hole productions from gluodynamics by holography. Science China Physics, Mechanics & Astronomy, 67(4):240411, 2024.
- [36] Rong-Gen Cai, Song He, Li Li, and Yuan-Xu Wang. Probing qcd critical point and induced gravitational wave by black hole physics. Physical Review D, 106(12):L121902, 2022.
- [37] Zhibin Li. Holographic entanglement properties in the qcd phase diagram from einstein-maxwell-dilaton models. Physical Review D, 110(4):046012, 2024.
- [38] Qingxuan Fu, Song He, Li Li, and Zhibin Li. Revisiting holographic model for thermal and dense qcd with a critical point. Journal of High Energy Physics, 2025(6):1–19, 2025.
- [39] Yi Yang and Pei-Hung Yuan. A Refined Holographic QCD Model and QCD Phase Structure. JHEP, 11:149, 2014.
- [40] Yi Yang and Pei-Hung Yuan. Confinement-deconfinement phase transition for heavy quarks in a soft wall holographic qcd model. Journal of High Energy Physics, 2015(12):1–22, 2015.
- [41] David Dudal and Subhash Mahapatra. Thermal entropy of a quark-antiquark pair above and below deconfinement from a dynamical holographic qcd model. Physical Review D, 96(12):126010, 2017.
- [42] Zhen Fang, Song He, and Danning Li. Chiral and deconfining phase transitions from holographic qcd study. Nuclear Physics B, 907:187–207, 2016.
- [43] Danning Li, Song He, Mei Huang, and Qi-Shu Yan. Thermodynamics of deformed ads5 model with a positive/negative quadratic correction in graviton-dilaton system. Journal of High Energy Physics, 2011(9):1–38, 2011.
- [44] Xun Chen, Danning Li, and Mei Huang. Criticality of qcd in a holographic qcd model with critical end point. Chinese Physics C, 43(2):023105, 2019.
- [45] Xun Chen, Lin Zhang, Danning Li, Defu Hou, and Mei Huang. Gluodynamics and deconfinement phase transition under rotation from holography. Journal of High Energy Physics, 2021(7):1–28, 2021.
- [46] Jing Zhou, Xun Chen, Yan-Qing Zhao, and Jialun Ping. Thermodynamics of heavy quarkonium in a magnetic field background. Physical Review D, 102(8):086020, 2020.
- [47] Xun Chen and Mei Huang. Machine learning holographic black hole from lattice qcd equation of state. Physical Review D, 109(5):L051902, 2024.
- [48] Zhibin Li, Kun Xu, and Mei Huang. The entanglement properties of holographic qcd model with a critical end point. Chinese Physics C, 45(1):013116, 2021.
- [49] Danning Li and Mei Huang. Dynamical holographic qcd model for glueball and light meson spectra. Journal of High Energy Physics, 2013(11):1–51, 2013.
- [50] Yidian Chen, Danning Li, and Mei Huang. The dynamical holographic qcd method for hadron physics and qcd matter. Communications in Theoretical Physics, 74(9):097201, 2022.
- [51] Gert Aarts, Kenji Fukushima, Tetsuo Hatsuda, Andreas Ipp, Shuzhe Shi, Lingxiao Wang, and Kai Zhou. Physics-driven learning for inverse problems in quantum chromodynamics. Nature Reviews Physics, 7(3):154–163, 2025.
- [52] Mugeon Song, Maverick SH Oh, Yongjun Ahn, and Keun-Young Kim. Ads/deep-learning made easy: simple examples. Chinese Physics C, 45(7):073111, 2021.
- [53] Byoungjoon Ahn, Hyun-Sik Jeong, Keun-Young Kim, and Kwan Yun. Holographic reconstruction of black hole spacetime: machine learning and entanglement entropy.

- Journal of High Energy Physics*, 2025(1):1–41, 2025.
- [54] Ricky TQ Chen, Yulia Rubanova, Jesse Bettencourt, and David K Duvenaud. Neural ordinary differential equations. *Advances in neural information processing systems*, 31, 2018.
 - [55] Xun Chen, Yidian Chen, and Kai Zhou. Data-driven einstein-dilaton model for pure yang-mills thermodynamics and glueball spectrum. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2507.06729*, 2025.
 - [56] Koji Hashimoto, Koshiro Matsuo, Masaki Murata, Gakuto Ogiwara, and Daichi Takeda. Machine-learning emergent spacetime from linear response in future tabletop quantum gravity experiments. *Machine Learning: Science and Technology*, 6(1):015030, 2025.
 - [57] Koji Hashimoto, Yuji Hirono, and Akiyoshi Sannai. Unification of symmetries inside neural networks: transformer, feedforward and neural ode. *Machine Learning: Science and Technology*, 5(2):025079, 2024.
 - [58] Byoungjoon Ahn, Hyun-Sik Jeong, Keun-Young Kim, and Kwan Yun. Deep learning bulk spacetime from boundary optical conductivity. *Journal of High Energy Physics*, 2024(3):1–30, 2024.
 - [59] Koji Hashimoto, Hong-Ye Hu, and Yi-Zhuang You. Neural ordinary differential equation and holographic quantum chromodynamics. *Mach. Learn. Sci. Tech.*, 2(3):035011, 2021.
 - [60] Tetsuya Akutagawa, Koji Hashimoto, and Takayuki Sumimoto. Deep learning and ads/qcd. *Physical Review D*, 102(2):026020, 2020.
 - [61] Koji Hashimoto, Hong-Ye Hu, and Yi-Zhuang You. Neural ordinary differential equation and holographic quantum chromodynamics. *Machine Learning: Science and Technology*, 2(3):035011, 2021.
 - [62] Koji Hashimoto, Sotaro Sugishita, Akinori Tanaka, and Akio Tomiya. Deep learning and holographic qcd. *Physical Review D*, 98(10):106014, 2018.
 - [63] Koji Hashimoto, Keisuke Ohashi, and Takayuki Sumimoto. Deriving the dilaton potential in improved holographic qcd from the meson spectrum. *Physical Review D*, 105(10):106008, 2022.
 - [64] Mark Henningson and Kostas Skenderis. The holographic weyl anomaly. *Journal of High Energy Physics*, 1998(07):023, 1998.
 - [65] Vijay Balasubramanian and Per Kraus. A stress tensor for anti-de sitter gravity. *Communications in Mathematical Physics*, 208(2):413–428, 1999.
 - [66] Sebastian De Haro, Kostas Skenderis, and Sergey N Solodukhin. Holographic reconstruction of spacetime and renormalization in the ads/cft correspondence. *Communications in Mathematical Physics*, 217(3):595–622, 2001.
 - [67] In which, A and potential function V are mutually determined and are not independent variables.
 - [68] Xun Chen and Mei Huang. Machine learning holographic black hole from lattice QCD equation of state. *Phys. Rev. D*, 109(5):L051902, 2024.
 - [69] Liqiang Zhu, Xun Chen, Kai Zhou, Hanzhong Zhang, and Mei Huang. Bayesian inference of the critical end point in a $(2+1)$ -flavor system from holographic qcd. *Physical Review D*, 112(2):026019, 2025.
 - [70] Szabolcs Borsanyi, Zoltan Fodor, Christian Hoelbling, Sandor D. Katz, Stefan Krieg, and Kalman K. Szabo. Full result for the QCD equation of state with $2+1$ flavors. *Phys. Lett. B*, 730:99–104, 2014.
 - [71] Zhi-Qin John Xu, Yaoyu Zhang, and Yanyang Xiao. Training behavior of deep neural network in frequency domain. *arXiv e-prints*, pages arXiv–1807, 2018.
 - [72] Alexei Bazavov, Tanmoy Bhattacharya, Carleton DeTar, H-T Ding, Steven Gottlieb, Rajan Gupta, P Hegde, UM Heller, Frithjof Karsch, Edwin Laermann, et al. Equation of state in $(2+1)$ -flavor qcd. *Physical Review D*, 90(9):094503, 2014.
 - [73] Szabolcs Borsanyi, Zoltan Fodor, Sandor D Katz, Stefan Krieg, Claudia Ratti, and Kalman Szabo. Fluctuations of conserved charges at finite temperature from lattice qcd. *Journal of High Energy Physics*, 2012(1):1–15, 2012.
 - [74] Miles Cranmer. Interpretable machine learning for science with pysr and symbolicregression. *jl. arXiv preprint arXiv:2305.01582*, 2023.
 - [75] Rong-Gen Cai, Song He, Li Li, and Yuan-Xu Wang. Probing QCD critical point and induced gravitational wave by black hole physics. *Phys. Rev. D*, 106(12):L121902, 2022.
 - [76] Szabolcs Borsanyi, Zoltan Fodor, Jana N Guenther, Paolo Parotto, Attila Pasztor, Claudia Ratti, Volodymyr Vovchenko, and Chik Him Wong. Lattice qcd constraints on the critical point from an improved precision equation of state. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2502.10267*, 2025.
 - [77] Yan-Qing Zhao, Song He, Defu Hou, Li Li, and Zhibin Li. Phase diagram of holographic thermal dense qcd matter with rotation. *Journal of High Energy Physics*, 2023(4):1–23, 2023.
 - [78] Mauricio Hippert, Joaquin Grefa, T Andrew Manning, Jorge Noronha, Jacquelyn Noronha-Hostler, Israel Portillo Vazquez, Claudia Ratti, Romulo Rougemont, and Michael Trujillo. Bayesian location of the qcd critical point from a holographic perspective. *Physical Review D*, 110(9):094006, 2024.
 - [79] Xun Chen and Mei Huang. Flavor dependent critical endpoint from holographic qcd through machine learning. *Journal of High Energy Physics*, 2025(2):1–27, 2025.
 - [80] Fei Gao and Jan M Pawłowski. Qcd phase structure from functional methods. *Physical Review D*, 102(3):034027, 2020.

SUPPLEMENTARY MATERIAL

Appendix A: temperature-independent potential

Our starting point is a temperature-independent potential $V(\phi)$. However, the result we obtain is an explicitly temperature-dependent potential $V(\phi, T)$. This discrepancy arises from the assumption that all black hole solutions share the same warp factor A , under which this temperature dependence naturally emerges from the equations of motion. Once this assumption is imposed, A no longer carries any temperature dependence, while $V(z)$ does, making it impossible to cancel the temperature dependence that appears in $V(\phi)$. To strictly remove this temperature dependence, one cannot use the same $A(z)$ function for every solution. Instead, the warp factor must be solved independently for each background. This is precisely the strategy employed in works such as [A1, A2].

This phenomenon is quite intriguing. What happens if we feed the lattice data into such a model? The result, as shown in Fig. A1, is remarkable: the model that fits the lattice data automatically eliminates the temperature dependence. In the figure, the influence of temperature on $V(z)$ is minimal, and the noticeable deviation occurs only below 130 MeV—outside the range covered by the lattice data, and thus not discussed further.

This implies that, in fact, we initially started from a temperature-dependent model, but through the optimization process, it was automatically iterated into a temperature-independent one. Therefore, the result is self-consistent with the potential as defined in the action. This is highly nontrivial, as the model imposes no soft or hard constraints in this regard; the behavior emerges solely from the information in the lattice data.




FIG. A1. The green, red, blue, and black curves in the figure correspond to temperatures of 65 MeV, 105 MeV, 182 MeV, and 331 MeV, respectively. In the region where lattice data are available (above about 130 MeV), these curves are almost indistinguishable. This indicates that the potential $V(z)$ consistent with the lattice data exhibits no temperature dependence, and consequently, the potential $V(\phi)$ is also temperature independent.

[A1] Romulo Rougemont, Joaquin Grefa, Mauricio Hippert, Jorge Noronha, Jacquelyn Noronha-Hostler, Israel Portillo, and Claudia Ratti. Hot qcd phase diagram from holographic einstein–maxwell–dilaton models. *Progress in Particle and Nuclear Physics*, 135:104093, 2024.

[A2] Rong-Gen Cai, Song He, Li Li, and Yuan-Xu Wang. Probing QCD critical point and induced gravitational wave by black hole physics. *Phys. Rev. D*, 106(12):L121902, 2022.