

Weak cosmic censorship with quantum-corrected black holes



ISCTE-University Institute of Lisbon & CENTRA-IST & IT-IUL

EREP 2024 - Coimbra

July 25<sup>th</sup>, 2024

- I. Cosmic Censorship Conjecture (CCC) and its status
- 2. The quantum BTZ black hole
- 3. Testing CCC with quantum-corrected BHs

Mainly based on:

\* Antonia M. Frassino, JVR and Andrea P. Sanna, JHEP 07 (2024) 226 [arXiv:2405.04597]

# The Weak Cosmic Censorship Conjecture

#### **Determinism in classical physics**

I. Newtonian physics is deterministic.



 General Relativity (GR) is an extension of Newtonian gravity. However, determinism does not carry over automatically...

#### **Determinism in classical physics**

I. Newtonian physics is deterministic.



2. General Relativity (GR) is an extension of Newtonian gravity.

However, determinism does not carry over automatically...

Gravitational collapse can lead to curvature singularities at which point GR loses its predictive power.

- I. Formally infinite curvature. Signals breakdown of theory.
- 2. Commonly 'encountered' in the interior of BHs. (Exception: cosmological singularities)

If so, damage is contained, because information cannot propagate across the event horizon to the exterior.

3. But if some process could lead to the formation of a naked singularity — a curvature singularity not cloaked by a horizon — we could be in trouble!



## Weak Cosmic Censorship Consjecture (wCCC)

I. Formulated by Penrose in 1969 to protect the deterministic picture of classical evolution in gravitational collapse:
[Penrose (1969)]

Assuming physically reasonable matter and genericity of initial conditions, a regular configuration cannot develop naked singularities under gravitational collapse with the classical equations of motion, unless they are veiled by event horizons.

## Weak Cosmic Censorship Consjecture (wCCC)

I. Formulated by Penrose in 1969 to protect the deterministic picture of classical evolution in gravitational collapse:
[Penrose (1969)]

Assuming physically reasonable matter and genericity of initial conditions, a regular configuration cannot develop naked singularities under gravitational collapse with the classical equations of motion, unless they are veiled by event horizons.

- 2. This is a respectfully old conjecture, and remains so. Despite <u>numerous</u> attempts to (dis)prove it.
- 3. It is a cornerstone of major mathematical developments in GR.

**4.** Note: Weak Cosmic Censorship ≠ Strong Cosmic Censorship.

Collapse of shells of null dust satisfies Penrose inequalities — which supports wCCC.
 [Penrose (1973)]

- Collapse of shells of null dust satisfies Penrose inequalities which supports wCCC.
   [Penrose (1973)]
- Wald's thought experiment: attempts to destroy the event horizon of extremal rotating and/or charged BHs with test particles are unsuccessful. [Wald (1974)]



Point particles with dangerously high spin/charge bounce before reaching the black hole, instead of disrupting the horizon.

#### Very long list of variations:

- Different spacetime dimensions.
- Inclusion of cosmological constant.
- Test fields.
- Rotating thin shells.

#### + ...

#### Very long list of variations:

- Different spacetime dimensions.
- Inclusion of cosmological constant.
- Test fields.
- Rotating thin shells.
- + ...

All attempts either:

- failed.
- succeeded, but approximation were later understood to be invalid.
- managed to produce naked singularities but scenarios require exotic matter or infinite fine-tuning.

## The Quantum BTZ Black Hole

#### Semi-classical gravity

 In the absence of a complete theory of quantum gravity, it is common to resort to solving the semi-classical Einstein equations:

 $G_{\mu\nu}(g_{\alpha\beta}) = 8\pi G \left\langle T_{\mu\nu}(g_{\alpha\beta}) \right\rangle$ renormalized stress tensor of quantum matter fields

#### Semi-classical gravity

 In the absence of a complete theory of quantum gravity, it is common to resort to solving the semi-classical Einstein equations:

$$G_{\mu\nu}(g_{\alpha\beta}) = 8\pi G \left\langle T_{\mu\nu}(g_{\alpha\beta}) \right\rangle$$
renormalized stress tensor of quantum matter fields

• Still, computing  $\langle T_{\mu\nu} \rangle$  and solving the coupled system of equations:

is often a *daunting task*.

Typical approach: assume backreaction to be small and work perturbatively.

## Braneworld gravity

In very special cases, alternative non-perturbative approaches are possible.

One such approach is offered by 'holography':

[Maldacena (1998)] [Witten (1998)] [Gubser, Klebanov, Polyakov (1998)]



## Braneworld gravity

In very special cases, alternative non-perturbative approaches are possible.

One such approach is offered by 'holography':

[Maldacena (1998)] [Witten (1998)] [Gubser, Klebanov, Polyakov (1998)]

quantum theory of 3DAdS4/CFT3gravity in a 4Dconformal fieldsdualityAdS spacetime

 A consistent description of a Conformal Field Theory in a dynamical spacetime is captured by the Karch-Randall model:

Gravity is recovered on a lower dimensional AdS<sub>3</sub> braneworld supporting also quantum fields. [Karch, Randall (2001)]



This braneworld scenario allows the construction of quantum black holes:

[Emparan, Horowitz, Myers (2000)] [Emparan, Fabbri, Kaloper (2002)] [Emparan, Frassino, Way (2020)]

This braneworld scenario allows the construction of quantum black holes:

[Emparan, Horowitz, Myers (2000)] [Emparan, Fabbri, Kaloper (2002)] [Emparan, Frassino, Way (2020)]

 Instead of starting with pure AdS<sub>4</sub> spacetime, now take an *accelerated* black hole in AdS — the AdS C-metric — and slice it with a Karch-Randall brane.



This braneworld scenario allows the construction of quantum black holes:

```
[Emparan, Horowitz, Myers (2000)]
[Emparan, Fabbri, Kaloper (2002)]
[Emparan, Frassino, Way (2020)]
```

 Instead of starting with pure AdS<sub>4</sub> spacetime, now take an *accelerated* black hole in AdS — the AdS C-metric — and slice it with a Karch-Randall brane.



Discard the side containing the cosmic string.

This braneworld scenario allows the construction of quantum black holes:

[Emparan, Horowitz, Myers (2000)] [Emparan, Fabbri, Kaloper (2002)] [Emparan, Frassino, Way (2020)]

 Instead of starting with pure AdS<sub>4</sub> spacetime, now take an *accelerated* black hole in AdS — the AdS C-metric — and slice it with a Karch-Randall brane.



- Discard the side containing the cosmic string.
- Then glue along the brane with another copy to obtain a two-sided brane.

This braneworld scenario allows the construction of quantum black holes:

[Emparan, Horowitz, Myers (2000)] [Emparan, Fabbri, Kaloper (2002)] [Emparan, Frassino, Way (2020)]

 Instead of starting with pure AdS<sub>4</sub> spacetime, now take an *accelerated* black hole in AdS — the AdS C-metric — and slice it with a Karch-Randall brane.



- Discard the side containing the cosmic string.
- Then glue along the brane with another copy to obtain a two-sided brane.

#### The quantum BTZ black hole (qBTZ)

The resulting geometry on the 3D brane is a quantum backreacted version of the (classical) BTZ black hole: [Bañados, Teitelboim, Zanelli (1992)]

$$\begin{split} \mathrm{d}s^2 &= g_{tt} \, \mathrm{d}t^2 + g_{\phi\phi} \, \mathrm{d}\phi^2 + 2g_{t\phi} \, \mathrm{d}t \, \mathrm{d}\phi + g_{rr} \, \mathrm{d}r^2 \\ g_{tt} &= -\frac{8\sqrt{1-\tilde{a}^2} \, \nu \, \ell_3 \, (\tilde{a}^2 - \kappa x_1^2 + 1)}{(\tilde{a}^2 + \kappa x_1^2 - 3)^3 \sqrt{\frac{4\tilde{a}^2 \ell_3^2 (\kappa x_1^2 - 2)}{(\tilde{a}^2 + \kappa x_1^2 - 3)^2} + r^2}} + \frac{16\tilde{a}^2 - 4 \, (\tilde{a}^2 + 1) \, \kappa x_1^2}{(\tilde{a}^2 + \kappa x_1^2 - 3)^2} - \frac{r^2}{\ell_3^2} \, , \\ g_{\phi\phi} &= r^2 - \frac{8\tilde{a}^2 \sqrt{1-\tilde{a}^2} \nu \ell_3^3 \, (\tilde{a}^2 - \kappa x_1^2 + 1)}{(\tilde{a}^2 + \kappa x_1^2 - 3)^3 \sqrt{\frac{4\tilde{a}^2 \ell_3^2 (\kappa x_1^2 - 2)}{(\tilde{a}^2 + \kappa x_1^2 - 3)^2} + r^2}} \, , \\ g_{t\phi} &= -\frac{4\tilde{a}\ell_3 \, (\tilde{a}^2 - \kappa x_1^2 + 1)}{(3 - \tilde{a}^2 - \kappa x_1^2)^2} \left( 1 + \frac{2\sqrt{1-\tilde{a}^2} \nu \ell_3}{(3 - \tilde{a}^2 - \kappa x_1^2)} \, \sqrt{\frac{4\tilde{a}^2 \ell_3^2 (\kappa x_1^2 - 2)}{(\tilde{a}^2 + \kappa x_1^2 - 3)^2} + r^2}} \right) \, , \\ g^{rr} &= H(r) = \frac{r^2}{\ell_3^2} - \frac{8 \, (1 - \tilde{a}^2)^{3/2} \, \nu \ell_3 \, (\tilde{a}^2 - \kappa x_1^2 + 1) \, \sqrt{\frac{4\tilde{a}^2 \ell_3^2 (\kappa x_1^2 - 2)}{(\tilde{a}^2 + \kappa x_1^2 - 3)^2} + r^2}} \\ &+ \frac{16\tilde{a}^2 \ell_3^2 \, (\tilde{a}^2 - \kappa x_1^2 + 1)^2}{r^2 \, (\tilde{a}^2 - \kappa x_1^2 + 1)^2} + \frac{4 \, [(\tilde{a}^2 + 1) \, \kappa x_1^2 - 4\tilde{a}^2]}{(\tilde{a}^2 + \kappa x_1^2 - 3)^2} \, . \end{split}$$

[Emparan, Frassino, Way (2020)]

I. The qBTZ metric is parametrized by {  $\nu$  ,  $\ell_3$  ,  $x_1$  ,  $\tilde{a}$  ,  $\kappa$  }.

- u controls the quantum backreaction. Classical BTZ is recovered when u 
  ightarrow 0.
- $\ell_3$  is the AdS<sub>3</sub> length. (Inverse of the cosmological constant on the brane.)
- $x_1$  and  $\tilde{a}$  are related to the physical mass and angular momentum of the BH:

$$M = \frac{1}{2\mathcal{G}_3} \frac{-\kappa x_1^2 + \tilde{a}^2(4 - \kappa x_1^2)}{(3 - \kappa x_1^2 - \tilde{a}^2)^2}, \qquad J = \frac{\ell_3}{\mathcal{G}_3} \frac{\tilde{a}(1 - \kappa x_1^2 + \tilde{a}^2)}{(3 - \kappa x_1^2 - \tilde{a}^2)^2}.$$

•  $\kappa = \pm 1, 0$  is a discrete parameter.

**2.** The qBTZ geometry still features a singularity at r = 0.

**3.** Event horizon is located at the largest root of  $g^{rr} = H(r)$ , if it exists:



Testing Cosmic Censorship with Quantum Black Holes

#### Mass vs. spin diagram of the classical BTZ spacetime





+ Curve of extremal qBTZ spacetimes depends on the backreaction parameter  $\nu$ .

+ Region of parameter space occupied by BHs grows with backreaction.



+ Curve of extremal qBTZ spacetimes depends on the backreaction parameter  $\nu$ .

Region of parameter space occupied by BHs grows with backreaction.



+ Curve of extremal qBTZ spacetimes depends on the backreaction parameter  $\nu$ .

+ Region of parameter space occupied by BHs grows with backreaction.



+ Curve of extremal qBTZ spacetimes depends on the backreaction parameter  $\nu$ .

Region of parameter space occupied by BHs grows with backreaction.

## Strategy 'à la' Wald

 Work in the test particle approximation, with the absorbed particle imparting linear perturbations on the mass and angular momentum of the BH.

![](_page_31_Figure_2.jpeg)

## Strategy 'à la' Wald

- Work in the test particle approximation, with the absorbed particle imparting linear perturbations on the mass and angular momentum of the BH.
- **I.** Pick an **extremal** background BH. Fix  $\ell_3$ ,  $x_1$ ,  $\tilde{a}$ .  $\nu = \nu_{ext}(x_1, \tilde{a}, \ell_3)$  automatically fixed.
- 2. Translate to physical quantities of the initial BH,  $M_0$  and  $J_0$ .

![](_page_32_Figure_4.jpeg)

## Strategy 'à la' Wald

- Work in the test particle approximation, with the absorbed particle imparting linear perturbations on the mass and angular momentum of the BH.
- I. Pick an **extremal** background BH. Fix  $\ell_3$ ,  $x_1$ ,  $\tilde{a}$ .  $\nu = \nu_{ext}(x_1, \tilde{a}, \ell_3)$  automatically fixed.
- 2. Translate to physical quantities of the initial BH,  $M_0$  and  $J_0$ .
- **3**. Variations  $\delta M$  and  $\delta J$  can also be converted to variations of the BH parameters  $\delta x_1$  and  $\delta \tilde{a}$ .
- **4.** Finally, determine sign of  $\delta H_{min} = [\ldots]\delta M + [\ldots]\delta J$ .

![](_page_33_Figure_6.jpeg)

Since  $\delta H_{min} = [\dots]\delta M + [\dots]\delta J$ , we still need a relation between  $\delta J$  and  $\delta M$ .

Only particles with sufficiently low angular momentum are absorbed:

$$\frac{\delta J}{\delta M} < \ell_{max}$$

In the most threatening case,

$$\delta J = \ell_{max} \cdot \delta M$$

such perturbation yields, <u>exactly</u>,

$$\delta H_{min} = 0$$

![](_page_34_Figure_8.jpeg)

Since  $\delta H_{min} = [...]\delta M + [...]\delta J$ , we still need a relation between  $\delta J$  and  $\delta M$ .

Only particles with sufficiently low angular momentum are absorbed:

$$\frac{\delta J}{\delta M} < \ell_{max}$$

In the most threatening case,

 $\delta J = \ell_{max} \cdot \delta M$ 

such perturbation yields, <u>exactly</u>,  $\delta H_{min} = 0$ 

i.e., BH remains extremal. Event horizon is <u>not</u> destroyed.

![](_page_35_Figure_8.jpeg)

Numerical assessment, still under the test particle assumption, but considering particles of *finite* mass ( $\delta M / M \not\ll 1$ ):

![](_page_36_Figure_2.jpeg)

- + Cosmic censorship is respected.
- + Quantum backreaction typically strengthens cosmic censorship.

# Conclusions

#### Conclusions

- Weak Cosmic Censorship is still an open subject.
- Weak Cosmic Censorship is key to self-consistency of classical gravity.
- Potential violations of the weak cosmic censorship conjecture would represent an opportunity to learn about quantum gravity.

#### Take-home message:

Wald's old thought experiment applied to quantum-corrected black holes — including the effects of quantum backreaction in an exact manner endorses the weak cosmic censorship conjecture.

- Weak Cosmic Censorship is still an open subject.
- Weak Cosmic Censorship is key to self-consistency of classical gravity.
- Potential violations of the weak cosmic censorship conjecture would represent an opportunity to learn about quantum gravity.

#### Take-home message:

Wald's old thought experiment applied to quantum-corrected black holes — including the effects of quantum backreaction in an exact manner endorses the weak cosmic censorship conjecture.

Thank you.