True and coordinate singularity resolution in the planar AdS black hole

Lucía Menéndez-Pidal

In collaboration with Steffen Gielen

University Complutense of Madrid

lumene02@ucm.es



based on arXiv:2409.XXXX (coming out after the summer!)





LEVERHULME $\langle G|\hbar\rangle$ TRUST_____

Outline

I. The classical spacetime

II. Quantisation and Unitarity

III. Results and conclusions



The planar AdS black hole (BH) is a solution of the Einstein's equation with planar symmetry. The line element of the interior of the black hole can be written as [1]

$$ds^{2} = -N^{2}dr^{2} + v^{2/3} \left(e^{4k/3}dt^{2} + e^{-2k/3} (dx^{2} + dy^{2}) \right) \qquad \Lambda < 0$$

where N, k, and v are functions of r. (In the interior of the BH the radial coordinate is timelike).

- ∨ → "volume".
- $k \rightarrow Anisotropy variable (relative streching of g_{tt} with respect to g_{xx}).$
- N→ Lapse function.

The planar AdS black hole (BH) is a solution of the Einstein's equation with planar symmetry. The line element of the interior of the black hole can be written as [1]

$$ds^{2} = -N^{2}dr^{2} + v^{2/3} \left(e^{4k/3}dt^{2} + e^{-2k/3} (dx^{2} + dy^{2}) \right) \qquad \Lambda < 0$$

where N, k, and v are functions of r. (In the interior of the BH the radial coordinate is timelike).

- ∨ → "volume".
- $k \rightarrow Anisotropy variable (relative streching of g_{tt} with respect to g_{xx}).$
- N→ Lapse function.

We work in **Parametrised UniModular gravity** (or Henneaux and Teitelboim Unimodular gravity).

$$S_{PUM} = \frac{1}{\kappa} \int d^4x \left[\sqrt{-g} \left(\frac{1}{2} R - \Lambda \right) + \Lambda \partial_\mu 7 \right]$$

[1]: S. Hartnoll, JHEP 23 (2023) 2208.04348



The cosmological constant is now a dynamical variable (which happens) to be a constant of motion)

With this metric Ansatz, the action becomes

$$S_{PUM} = \frac{1}{\kappa} \int \mathrm{d}r \left[\frac{(k')^2 v^2 - (v')^2}{3Nv} - \Lambda Nv + \Lambda T' \right] \quad \text{where `mean}$$

[2]: S. Gielen and LMP, Class. Quant. Grav 37 and 39 (2020 and 2021), 2005.05357, 2109.02660

ns derivative with respect to r.



With this metric Ansatz, the action becomes

$$S_{PUM} = \frac{1}{\kappa} \int dr \left[\frac{(k')^2 v^2 - (v')^2}{3Nv} - \Lambda Nv + \Lambda T' \right] \quad \text{where `means}$$

Hence, the **Hamiltonian** and constraint become (after a suitable unit choice for κ):

$$\mathcal{H} = \frac{\sqrt{3}}{2} N v \left(\frac{\pi_k^2}{v^2} - \pi_v^2 + \Lambda \right) \implies \mathcal{C} = \frac{\pi_k^2}{v^2} - \pi_v^2 + \Lambda \approx 0$$

This Hamiltonian is exactly the same as the Hamiltonian of a flat homogeneous and isotropic **cosmology** with a free massless scalar field and dark energy [2]!

This toy model has 3 canonically conjugated pairs $\ \{T,\Lambda\}=\{k\}$

[2]: S. Gielen and LMP, Class. Quant. Grav 37 and 39 (2020 and 2021), 2005.05357, 2109.02660

s derivative with respect to r.

$$,\pi_k\} = \{v,\pi_v\} = 1$$

One can deparametrise the theory using T to find

$$v(T) = \sqrt{-\frac{\pi_k^2}{\Lambda} + 4\Lambda(T - T_0)^2}$$
$$k(T) = \frac{1}{2}\log\left|\frac{\pi_k - 2\Lambda(T - T_0)}{\pi_k + 2\Lambda(T - T_0)}\right|$$

 $+ k_{0}$

One can deparametrise the theory using T to find

$$v(T) = \sqrt{-\frac{\pi_k^2}{\Lambda} + 4\Lambda(T - T_0)^2}$$
$$k(T) = \frac{1}{2} \log \left| \frac{\pi_k - 2\Lambda(T - T_0)}{\pi_k + 2\Lambda(T - T_0)} \right|$$

This metric has two singularities:

- $v \rightarrow 0$ and $k \rightarrow \infty$ at T=T_=T₀- $\pi_k/2\Lambda$, this one is a **true singularity** (Kretschmann scalar diverges).
- $v \rightarrow 0$ and $k \rightarrow -\infty$ at T=T₊=T₀+ $\pi_k/2\Lambda$, this one is a **coordinate singularity** (Kretschmann is finite).

T₋ corresponds to the **BH singularity** and T₊ to the **BH horizon**.

 $+ k_{0}$

Kretschmann scalar diverges). **ularity** (Kretschmann is finite).

The constraint can be written as ${\cal C}=g^{AB}\pi_A\pi_B+\Lambda$ where

$$g_{AB} = \left(\begin{array}{cc} v^2 & 0\\ 0 & -1 \end{array}\right)$$

The constraint can be written as $\mathcal{C} = g^{AB} \pi_A \pi_B + \Lambda$ where $g_{AB} = \begin{pmatrix} v^2 & 0 \\ 0 & -1 \end{pmatrix}$

This leads to the **Wheeler-DeWitt equation**

$$(\Box + \Lambda)\Psi = \left(-\frac{1}{v^2}\partial_k^2 + \partial_v^2 + \frac{1}{v}\partial_v\right)$$

Where "box" is the Laplace-Beltrami operator associated with g.



The constraint can be written as $C = g^{AB} \pi_A \pi_B + \Lambda$ where $g_{AB} = \begin{pmatrix} v^2 & 0 \\ 0 & -1 \end{pmatrix}$

This leads to the **Wheeler-DeWitt equation**

$$(\Box + \Lambda)\Psi = \left(-\frac{1}{v^2}\partial_k^2 + \partial_v^2 + \frac{1}{v}\partial_v\right)$$

Where "box" is the Laplace-Beltrami operator associated with g.

We use **T** as relational time, so "box" becomes the Hamiltonian of the system hence the physical **inner product** is **DD**

$$\langle \Phi | \Psi \rangle = \int_0^\infty \mathrm{d} v \ v \int_{-\infty}^\infty \mathrm{d} k$$



 $\Phi^*\Psi$

The solutions to the Wheeler-DeWitt equation are **Bessel functions in a superposition of** cosmological constants

$$\Psi(v,k,\Lambda) = \int \frac{\mathrm{d}p}{2\pi} e^{ipk} \left(\alpha(p,\Lambda) J_{ip}(\sqrt{\Lambda}v) + \beta(p,\Lambda) J_{-ip}(\sqrt{\Lambda}v) \right)$$

However, this theory is not unitary (the operator "box" is not self-adjoint), but Unitarity can be restored by the boundary condition

$$\lim_{v \to 0} \left(\Phi^* \partial_v \Psi - \Psi \partial_v \Phi^* \right) =$$

= ()

The solutions to the Wheeler-DeWitt equation are **Bessel functions in a superposition of** cosmological constants

$$\Psi(v,k,\Lambda) = \int \frac{\mathrm{d}p}{2\pi} e^{ipk} \left(\alpha(p,\Lambda) J_{ip}(\sqrt{\Lambda}v) + \beta(p,\Lambda) J_{-ip}(\sqrt{\Lambda}v) \right)$$

However, this theory is not unitary (the operator "box" is not self-adjoint), but Unitarity can be restored by the boundary condition

$$\lim_{v \to 0} \left(\Phi^* \partial_v \Psi - \Psi \partial_v \Phi^* \right) =$$

This boundary condition ensures that there is no probability flux "past" v=0. The solutions to the Wheeler-DeWitt equation and the boundary condition are

$$\Psi(v,k,T) = \int \frac{\mathrm{d}p}{2\pi} e^{ipk} \sum_{n \in \mathbb{Z}} e^{i\Lambda_n^p T} \sqrt{\frac{-2\Lambda_n^p \sinh(|p|\pi)}{|p|\pi}} \alpha(p,\Lambda_n^p) K_{i|p|} \left(\sqrt{-\Lambda_n^p} v\right)$$

()

where
$$\Lambda^p_n = -e^{-\frac{(2n+1)\pi}{|p|} + \theta(p)}$$
 , Parametrises the self-adjoint effects of the self-adjoint effects

The parameter $\theta(p)$ is left up to choice. This will influence quantitatively the dynamics and could have applications. We choose

$$\theta(p) = \pi/|p|$$

extensions

where
$$\Lambda^p_n = -e^{-\frac{(2n+1)\pi}{|p|} + \theta(p)}$$
 , Parametrises the self-adjoint e

The parameter $\theta(p)$ is left up to choice. This will influence quantitatively the dynamics and could have applications. We choose

$$\theta(p) = \pi/|p|$$

Close to $v \rightarrow 0$, the Bessel functions look like plane waves

$$K_{i|p|}\left(\sqrt{-\Lambda_n^p}v\right) \xrightarrow[v \to 0]{} \frac{1}{2}\left(\Gamma(-i|p|)e^{i|p|\log\left(\frac{\sqrt{-\Lambda}}{2}v\right)} + \Gamma(i|p|)e^{-i|p|\log\left(\frac{\sqrt{-\Lambda}}{2}v\right)}\right)$$

Hence, close to the coordinate singularity and the BH singularity, the wave functions look like a superposition of plane waves both incoming and outgoing from the singularities.

extensions

To analyse singularity resolution, we calculate **expectation values of observables**

$$\begin{split} \left<\Psi\right| v \left|\Psi\right> &= \left< v \right>(T), \ \text{ where } \Psi \text{ is a suitable semiclassical state} \\ \downarrow \\ \alpha(p,\Lambda_n^p) &= e^{-(p-p_0)^2/(2\sigma_p^2) - (\Lambda_n^p - \Lambda_0)^2/(2\sigma_\Lambda^2)} \\ \text{ Gaussian superposition} \end{split}$$

We compare the quantum expectation values with classical trajectories for which

$$\langle \Psi | \Lambda | \Psi \rangle = \Lambda_{eff}, \quad \langle \Psi | p | \Psi \rangle$$

 $=\pi_{k,eff}$





T

Some comments on the figure

- Both the singularity and the black hole horizon are "resolved".
- The state is semiclassical (small variance) for T's in which the classical solution is well defined but then the variance grows.
- We are unsure the oscillations continue or stop after some point (numerics might not be reliable).
- Different values of the parameters influence the oscillations pattern.

d". classical solution is well defined but

nt (numerics might not be reliable). attern.

Conclusions:

- As it has also been shown in cosmology, BH singularity resolution can also occur in the WDW theory.
- Note tha the **resolution of the BH horizon could potentially be avoided** by choosing a different foliation of spacetime.

Possible future directions:

- LQC quantisation of the same spacetime
- Can the exterior of the BH tell us something about the interior? Junction conditions? Choice of self-adjoint extensions?
- How to go past homogeneity?

Thank you!



