

Evading the Trans-Planckian problem with Vaidya spacetimes

Ivan Booth[†], Bradley Creelman[†], Jessica Santiago[†], and Matt Visser[‡]

[†] *Department of Mathematics and Statistics, Memorial University of Newfoundland;
St. John's, NL A1C 5S7, Canada.*

[‡] *School of Mathematics and Statistics, Victoria University of Wellington;
PO Box 600, Wellington 6140, New Zealand.*

E-mail: ibooth@mun.ca, creelmanbjc@gmail.com;
santi.jsil@gmail.com, matt.visser@sms.vuw.ac.nz

ABSTRACT: Hawking radiation, when treated in the ray optics limit, exhibits the unfortunate *trans-Planckian problem* — a Hawking photon near spatial infinity, if back-tracked to the immediate vicinity of the horizon is hugely blue-shifted and found to have had trans-Planckian energy. (And if back-tracked all the way to the horizon, the photon is formally infinitely blue-shifted, and formally acquires infinite energy.) Unruh has forcefully argued that this implies that the Hawking flux represents a vacuum instability in the presence of a horizon, and that the Hawking photons are actually emitted from some region exterior to the horizon. We seek to make this idea more precise and somewhat explicit by building a purely kinematical model for Hawking evaporation based on two Vaidya spacetimes (outer and inner) joined across a thin time-like boundary layer. The kinematics of this model is already quite rich, and we shall defer consideration of the dynamics for subsequent work. In particular we shall present an explicit calculation of the the 4-acceleration of the shell (including the effects of gravity, motion, and the outgoing null flux) and relate this 4-acceleration to the Unruh temperature.

KEYWORDS: Hawking radiation, Unruh radiation, trans-Planckian problem, Vaidya spacetime, thin-shell formalism.

DATE: 27 September 2018; L^AT_EX-ed March 10, 2024

PACS: 04.70.Dy; 04.70.-s; 04.62.+v; 04.20.Jb

Contents

1	Introduction	2
2	Static approximation — no back reaction	4
3	Piecewise Vaidya spacetime	7
3.1	Vaidya spacetime in null coordinates	7
3.2	Matching null coordinates outside/inside	8
3.3	Thin-shell tangent and normal	8
3.4	Some technical asides	9
3.4.1	The on-shell induced Levi-Civita tensor	9
3.4.2	Exterior derivatives of tangent and normal vectors	10
3.4.3	Normal derivatives	10
3.5	Constant- w affine null vector	11
3.6	Constant- r observer and constant- r normal	11
4	Exterior geometry — outgoing Hawking radiation	12
4.1	Blueshift/redshift	12
4.2	Evading trans-Planckian physics	13
4.3	From Unruh temperature to Hawking temperature	15
5	Interior geometry — ingoing Hawking radiation	17
6	Evading the information puzzle	19
7	Models for evaporation scenarios	20
7.1	Mass matching case	21
7.2	Non equal masses	22
7.3	The empty-interior massive shell case	24
7.4	The “time matching” case	25
8	Discussion	26

1 Introduction

The main goal of this article is to develop a purely kinematical model (albeit very much a toy model) that would make it obvious how to evade the so-called “trans-Planckian” problem during early and intermediate stages of the Hawking evaporation process [1]. Unruh has repeatedly emphasized that Hawking’s original 1973 calculation is a *ray optics* calculation [2], not a *wave optics* calculation, and that Hawking’s 1973 calculation leads to manifest nonsense if you take any specific photon arriving at future null infinity and (in the ray optics approximation) back-track its null geodesic to a region that approaches too close to the horizon [3–5] — once the back-tracked null geodesic gets too close to the horizon the (locally measured) energy of the photon is gravitationally blue-shifted to ludicrously large energies; easily exceeding the Planck energy, and in fact easily exceeding the total mass-energy of the known universe. So Hawking’s *ray optics* calculation *cannot* be the whole story. Unruh prefers to phrase things roughly along these lines: The quantum vacuum (specifically the Unruh vacuum state) is unstable in the presence of a horizon, and you should look carefully at what escapes to future null infinity, *and what falls into the black hole*.

Indeed, the well-known textbook by Birrell & Davies [6] actually has a discussion on exactly this point: Birrell & Davis indicate how to calculate the renormalized stress energy tensor (static approximation, scalar field, no back reaction), and argue that at spatial infinity there is an outgoing positive energy flux, whereas near the horizon there is a *ingoing negative energy flux*. (This of course is how you get around the classical area increase theorem; the classical energy conditions are violated sufficiently close to the horizon [7–10].)

For the current article the basic idea we wish to explore is this: Find a toy model (albeit very much simplified) that captures enough of the key behaviour (outgoing positive flux at future null infinity, ingoing negative flux near the horizon), while still remaining reasonably tractable. There are several ways of attacking the problem:

- Take a general time-dependent spherically symmetric geometry, calculate the Einstein tensor G_{ab} , and see if you get anything interesting. (This is likely to be far too flexible a model and therefore unlikely to lead to any significant interesting physical insight.)
- Take a restricted time-dependent spherically symmetric geometry (say with only one free function in the metric components), calculate the Einstein tensor G_{ab} and see if you get anything interesting. (This is still likely to be far too flexible a model and still unlikely to lead to significant interesting physical insight.)
- At large distances, consider a (positive energy flux) outgoing Vaidya “shining star” solution [11, 12]; near the horizon consider a (negative energy flux) ingoing Vaidya solution; somehow match them in some intermediate region. This is the approach that we will adopt. Then there are two options:

- One could match across a thick shell; doing this would very much depend on the internal dynamics of the thick shell and be unlikely to lead to interesting physical insight. (For instance, one could think of a variant of the Mazur–Mottola thick-shell gravastars [13–18], but with the inner and outer regions now being distinct Vaidya spacetimes.)
- One could match across a thin shell using the Israel–Lanczos–Sen junction condition formalism [19–23]. (For instance, think of a variant of Mazur–Mottola-like thin-shell gravastars [24–26], but with the inner and outer regions now being distinct Vaidya spacetimes.) We shall explore the *kinematics* of such a model in the article below, leaving *dynamics* for future work.¹ (Somewhat related, but distinct in detail, considerations can be found in references [27–36].)

An advantage of the thin-shell model is that it is as simple as possible (while still capturing key physics). However it also has disadvantages:

- * One still needs to decide *where* the transition layer is to be located.
- * One still needs to make *some* choices regarding the internal dynamics of the transition layer.
- * One still needs to make some choices regarding how the coordinates are set up.
- * In view of the known sparsity of the Hawking flux [37–39], it should be noted that the Vaidya geometry is a good approximation only on average: a Vaidya-like model necessarily approximates the Hawking flux by a continuum limit.
- There is neither no real need for, nor advantage in, using generalized Vaidya spacetimes [40]. These all involve extra matter fields, and for our purposes result in more complications without leading to any extra physical insight.
- Thus we choose to focus on two (simple) Vaidya spacetimes matched across a thin shell. Figure 1 shows one of many possible Carter–Penrose diagrams.

To set the stage, let us first consider the static approximation, with the Hawking flux treated in the test-field limit (thereby temporarily ignoring back-reaction); this idealization closely follows Hawking’s original 1973 calculation [2]. Subsequently we shall add back reaction, kinematics, and eventually dynamics. This Vaidya-like model can be viewed as a very specific form of black hole “mimic”; as such this article is complementary to a recent article discussing general phenomenological features of generic black hole “mimics” [41].

¹That is, for the time being we shall only impose the first junction condition, the continuity of the metric, since it is purely kinematical; but for now we shall avoid discussing the second junction condition involving extrinsic curvatures — the second fundamental forms.




Figure 1. Carter–Penrose diagram (one of very many variations on the theme), suitable for matched outgoing and ingoing Vaidya spacetimes as a model for the Hawking evaporation process. This particular model assumes the existence of and pictures an *event* rather than *apparent* horizon.

2 Static approximation — no back reaction

Consider first the static approximation in which one ignores back-reaction from the Hawking flux and treats the spacetime geometry as purely Schwarzschild. (After the initial collapse phase, this is exactly the situation described in Hawking’s 1973 calculation; the Hawking flux is a steady test-flux — its effect on the black hole spacetime is ignored [2].) Outside the horizon introduce a thin layer located at some (*fixed*, at least for now) radial coordinate $r_s = 2G_N m + \epsilon$, from which we shall assume the Hawking radiation is emitted. (We set $c = 1$ and, for now, set $G_N = L_P/m_P$. We find it useful to keep Newton’s constant explicit for much of the discussion below.) Conserving energy for the test-flux implies that an equal but opposite ingoing negative energy flux is

emitted from the inside of this thin layer, falling into the black hole.

Now consider the following quantities:

- The (total) gravitational blueshift factor from spatial infinity down to the static thin shell at r_s is:

$$Z = 1 + z = \frac{1}{\sqrt{1 - \frac{2G_N m}{r_s}}} = \sqrt{\frac{r_s}{\epsilon}} \approx \sqrt{\frac{2G_N m}{\epsilon}}. \quad (2.1)$$

- A typical Hawking photon has energy $m_P^2/(8\pi m)$ near spatial infinity; but when blue-shifted down to the thin shell this becomes a locally measured energy of order $[m_P^2/(8\pi m)]\sqrt{2G_N m/\epsilon}$. For this blue-shifted energy to not exceed the Planck scale (and so avoid the trans-Planckian problem), we require

$$\frac{m_P}{8\pi m} \sqrt{\frac{2G_N m}{\epsilon}} \lesssim 1. \quad (2.2)$$

That is

$$\epsilon \gtrsim \frac{1}{32\pi^2} \frac{G_N m_P^2}{m} = \frac{1}{32\pi^2} \frac{m_P}{m} L_P. \quad (2.3)$$

But this $\epsilon = r_s - 2G_N m$ is a coordinate distance, not a proper distance.

- The equivalent proper distance measured along any surface of constant- t is

$$\begin{aligned} \ell &= \int_{2G_N m}^{r_s} \frac{dr}{\sqrt{1 - 2G_N m/r}} \approx \sqrt{2G_N m} \int_{2G_N m}^{2G_N m + \epsilon} \frac{dr}{\sqrt{r - 2G_N m}} \\ &= \sqrt{2G_N m} \left[2\sqrt{r - 2G_N m} \right]_{2G_N m}^{2G_N m + \epsilon}. \end{aligned} \quad (2.4)$$

That is

$$\ell \approx \sqrt{8G_N m \epsilon} \gtrsim \frac{L_P}{2\pi}. \quad (2.5)$$

So, as long as the thin layer is more than a (proper distance) Planck length above the horizon, the trans-Planckian problem is obviated.

- This picture has some resemblance to the “stretched horizon” (typically invoked by particle physicists) [42] and the “membrane paradigm” (typically invoked by classical general relativists) [43, 44].
- Even if we choose to work beyond the thin-layer approximation, for some “thick” shell, this analysis indicates that as long as the Hawking radiation is emitted from some region more than a (proper distance) Planck length above the horizon, then the trans-Planckian problem is still obviated.

- A thin shell held at fixed radial coordinate $r_s = 2G_N m + \epsilon$ undergoes a 4-acceleration of magnitude

$$A = \frac{G_N m / r_s^2}{\sqrt{1 - 2G_N m / r_s}}, \quad (2.6)$$

corresponding to a locally determined Unruh temperature

$$T_U = \frac{A}{2\pi} = \frac{G_N m / r_s^2}{2\pi \sqrt{1 - 2G_N m / r_s}}. \quad (2.7)$$

When redshifted to spatial infinity using the usual Tolman argument this becomes

$$T_{U,\infty} = \frac{A}{2\pi Z} = \frac{G_N m / a^2}{2\pi} = T_H \left(\frac{2G_N m}{r_s} \right)^2. \quad (2.8)$$

If, as is commonly though not universally advocated, we want the Unruh effect to *quantitatively* explain the Hawking effect, $T_{U,\infty} \approx T_H$, then we would need to assert $r_s \approx 2G_N m$, or equivalently $\epsilon \ll 2G_N m$. (Note that the Hawking flux cannot be *exactly* Planckian, at the very least there will be distortion due to: potential violations of adiabaticity, phase space constraints, and greybody factors [45].)

- Between these two constraints we have

$$\frac{1}{32\pi^2} \frac{m_P}{m} L_P \lesssim \epsilon \ll 2G_N m. \quad (2.9)$$

In terms of proper distance above the horizon this becomes

$$\frac{L_P}{2\pi} \lesssim \ell \ll 4G_N m. \quad (2.10)$$

So, at least in the static approximation, and if you want the Unruh effect to *quantitatively* explain the Hawking effect, then the natural place to put the thin shell is a few (proper) Planck lengths above the horizon.

- There is an alternative that we shall point out but not further explore: Put the shell well above the horizon, say at the unstable photon orbit, $r_s = 3G_N m$, or at the ISCO, $r_s = 6G_N m$. In this case the thermal flux reaching spatial infinity is given by the modified temperature $T_{U,\infty} = T_H (2G_N m / r_s)^2 \leq T_H$ which is always (by construction) less than the Hawking temperature. This modified temperature is $(\frac{4}{9})^{ths}$ of the usual Hawking temperature if the thin shell is placed at the unstable photon orbit, and $(\frac{1}{9})^{th}$ of the usual Hawking temperature if it is placed at the ISCO. That the numerical value of the temperature differs from Hawking's prediction is not entirely unexpected given that one no longer has null

curves skimming along and peeling off from the horizon — one is now interested in null curves emerging from the surface at r_s , and the key parameter is the 4-acceleration of that timelike surface. Taking this option destroys the connection between the Hawking temperature and the “peeling properties” of near-horizon null geodesics; and in this class of models it is very difficult to see why the Hawking temperature should be universally related to the surface gravity. Some related ideas along these lines are explored in [46, 47], but we shall not follow this route in the current article.

The task now is to (partially and somewhat crudely) include back-reaction effects by making the spacetime geometry time-dependent in an appropriate manner. We shall do this by letting both r_s and m become time dependent, and having the thin shell connect two Vaidya spacetimes as in Figure 1. Much of the preceding analysis (surprisingly much) survives the introduction of this partial back reaction and non-trivial kinematics.

3 Piecewise Vaidya spacetime

The Vaidya spacetime (sometimes known as the “shining star” spacetime) in its original version adds outgoing null radiation to Schwarzschild spacetime, and can be used as a good model for the exterior geometry of a spherical shining star [11, 12]. We shall consider both outgoing and ingoing Vaidya spacetimes, and combine the two to build a reasonable kinematical model for Hawking radiation.

3.1 Vaidya spacetime in null coordinates

Let us work in null coordinates (w, r, θ, ϕ) and write the Vaidya spacetime in the form

$$ds^2 = - \left(1 - \frac{2G_N m(w)}{r} \right) dw^2 \mp 2dwdr + r^2(d\theta^2 + \sin^2 \theta d\phi^2), \quad (3.1)$$

(see for example [11, 12]). Then, the only non-zero component of the Einstein tensor is

$$G_{ww} = \mp \frac{2G_N \dot{m}(w)}{r^2}, \quad (3.2)$$

where the overdot corresponds to a derivative with respect to w . The upper $-$ sign corresponds to outgoing Vaidya spacetime while the lower $+$ sign corresponds to ingoing Vaidya spacetime.

For convenience we rewrite this in the form

$$ds^2 = -f(w)^2 \left(1 - \frac{2G_N m(w)}{r} \right) dw^2 \mp 2f(w)dwdr + r^2(d\theta^2 + \sin^2 \theta d\phi^2), \quad (3.3)$$

which is equivalent to a coordinate transformation: $w \rightarrow \int f(w) dw$ so $dw \rightarrow f(w) dw$. Then the non-zero components of the Einstein tensor becomes

$$G_{ww} = \mp \frac{2 G_N f(w) \dot{m}(w)}{r^2}. \quad (3.4)$$

We then match outgoing to ingoing Vaidya spacetimes across a thin shell using the Israel–Lanczos–Sen formalism [19–23].

3.2 Matching null coordinates outside/inside

Using the metric in the form (3.3) there is no loss of generality in using a *common* coordinate w for *both* inside and outside. To keep it continuous we introduce two matching functions $f_{\pm}(w)$. Then we join the two metrics

$$ds^2 = -f_{\pm}(w)^2 \left(1 - \frac{2G_N m_{\pm}(w)}{r} \right) dw^2 - (\pm 2f_{\pm}(w) dw dr) + r^2 (d\theta^2 + \sin^2 \theta d\phi^2), \quad (3.5)$$

across the surface

$$(w, r_s(w), \theta, \phi). \quad (3.6)$$

In this instance, the metric is written with a $-(\pm \dots)$ so that the +’s and –’s in the metric and coordinate functions match up. Then subscript “+” functions correspond to the outside region and subscript “–” functions to the inside.

Thus the (toy) model is completely specified by the two mass functions $m_{\pm}(w)$, the two functions $f_{\pm}(w)$, and the location of the shell $r_s(w)$. More precisely it is the ratio $f_+(w)/f_-(w)$, rather than exact functions $f_{\pm}(w)$, that is physically relevant: Under a reparameterization $w \rightarrow h(w)$ we can modify both $f_{\pm}(w)$ though the ratio $f_0(w) = f_+(w)/f_-(w)$ remains fixed.

3.3 Thin-shell tangent and normal

With an overdot denoting d/dw , on the thin-shell we have the (non-normalized) tangent and normal vectors:

$$U^a = (1, \dot{r}_s(w), 0, 0)^a; \quad N_a = (-\dot{r}_s(w), 1, 0, 0)_a = \nabla_a(r - r_s(w)). \quad (3.7)$$

We now extend these vectors U^a and N_a to the entire manifold, and normalize them

$$u^a = \frac{U^a}{\sqrt{-g_{ab}U^aU^b}} = \frac{U^a}{\|U\|}; \quad n_a = \frac{N_a}{\sqrt{g^{ab}N_aN_b}} = \frac{N_a}{\|N\|}. \quad (3.8)$$

Note that by construction U^a and N_a depend only on w , not on r . The r -dependence in u^a and n_a rises only indirectly, via the normalizing functions.

For future convenience note:

$$g_{ab} = \left[\begin{array}{cc|cc} -f_{\pm}(w)^2 \left(1 - \frac{2G_N m_{\pm}(w)}{r}\right) & \mp f_{\pm}(w) & 0 & 0 \\ \mp f_{\pm}(w) & 0 & 0 & 0 \\ \hline 0 & 0 & r^2 & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & 0 & r^2 \sin^2 \theta \end{array} \right], \quad (3.9)$$

and

$$g^{ab} = \left[\begin{array}{cc|cc} 0 & \mp \frac{1}{f_{\pm}(w)} & 0 & 0 \\ \mp \frac{1}{f_{\pm}(w)} & \left(1 - \frac{2G_N m_{\pm}(w)}{r}\right) & 0 & 0 \\ \hline 0 & 0 & \frac{1}{r^2} & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & 0 & \frac{1}{r^2 \sin^2 \theta} \end{array} \right]. \quad (3.10)$$

Thence explicitly

$$U_a = \left(-f_{\pm}(w)^2 \left(1 - \frac{2G_N m_{\pm}(w)}{r}\right) \mp f_{\pm}(w) \dot{r}_s(w), \mp f_{\pm}(w); 0, 0 \right), \quad (3.11)$$

and

$$N^a = \left(\mp \frac{1}{f_{\pm}(w)}, \left(1 - \frac{2G_N m_{\pm}(w)}{r}\right) \pm \frac{\dot{r}_s}{f_{\pm}(w)}; 0, 0 \right). \quad (3.12)$$

The normalizing functions are explicitly given by:

$$\|U\| = \sqrt{-g_{ab} U^a U^b} = \sqrt{f_{\pm}(w)^2 \left(1 - 2G_N m_{\pm}(w)/r\right) \pm 2f_{\pm} \dot{r}_s(w)}, \quad (3.13)$$

and

$$\|N\| = \sqrt{g^{ab} N_a N_b} = \sqrt{\left(1 - 2G_N m_{\pm}(w)/r\right) \pm 2f_{\pm}(w)^{-1} \dot{r}_s(w)}, \quad (3.14)$$

whence

$$\|N\| = \frac{\|U\|}{f_{\pm}(w)}. \quad (3.15)$$

3.4 Some technical asides

We now undertake some technical calculations that will be used later on, when we calculate the 4-acceleration of the shell.

3.4.1 The on-shell induced Levi-Civita tensor

The on-shell metric determinant is

$$\sqrt{-g} = f_{\pm}(w) r^2 \sin \theta. \quad (3.16)$$

Further (this will be used in calculating the 4-acceleration)

$$N^a U^b - N^b U^a = (N^w U^r - N^r U^w) f_{\pm} \varepsilon^{ab}. \quad (3.17)$$

Here ε^{ab} is the induced Levi-Civita tensor on the w - r plane — specifically ε^{ab} is an antisymmetric 2-tensor, and in these particular (w, r, θ, ϕ) coordinates we have $\varepsilon^{wr} = f_{\pm}(w)^{-1} = -\varepsilon^{rw}$. Then

$$N^a U^b - N^b U^a = -([1 - 2G_N m_{\pm}/r] \pm 2f_{\pm}^{-1} \dot{r}_s) f_{\pm} \varepsilon^{ab} = -\|N\|^2 f_{\pm} \varepsilon^{ab}. \quad (3.18)$$

3.4.2 Exterior derivatives of tangent and normal vectors

Similarly (this will also be needed when we want to calculate the 4-acceleration of the moving thin shell), it is useful to consider the exterior derivative

$$\partial_a U_b - \partial_b U_a = -(\partial_w U_r - \partial_r U_w) f_{\pm}(w)^{-1} \varepsilon_{ab}, \quad (3.19)$$

where now ε_{ab} is an antisymmetric 2-form, and in these particular (w, r, θ, ϕ) coordinates we have $\varepsilon_{wr} = -f_{\pm}(w) = -\varepsilon_{rw}$, so that $\varepsilon^{ab} \varepsilon_{ab} = -2$. We note that

$$\partial_w U_r - \partial_r U_w = \partial_w(\mp f_{\pm}) - \partial_r(-f_{\pm}^2(1 - 2G_N m_{\pm}/r) \mp f_{\pm} \dot{r}_s) = f_{\pm}^2 \frac{2m_{\pm}}{r^2} \mp \dot{f}_{\pm}. \quad (3.20)$$

That is

$$\partial_a U_b - \partial_b U_a = \left(-f_{\pm}(w) \frac{2G_N m_{\pm}(w)}{r^2} \pm \frac{\dot{f}_{\pm}(w)}{f_{\pm}(w)} \right) \varepsilon_{ab}. \quad (3.21)$$

Meanwhile N_a is surface forming and so:

$$\partial_a N_b - \partial_b N_a = 0. \quad (3.22)$$

3.4.3 Normal derivatives

A more subtle result for the normal derivative (also needed when we want to calculate the 4-acceleration of the moving thin shell), starts from

$$N^a \partial_a = \mp \frac{1}{f_{\pm}(w)} \partial_w + \left[\left(1 - \frac{2G_N m_{\pm}(w)}{r} \right) \pm f_{\pm}(w)^{-1} \dot{r}_s \right] \partial_r, \quad (3.23)$$

whence

$$N^a \partial_a = \mp \frac{1}{f_{\pm}(w)} [\partial_w + \dot{r}_s \partial_r] + \left[\left(1 - \frac{2G_N m_{\pm}(w)}{r} \right) \pm 2f_{\pm}(w)^{-1} \dot{r}_s \right] \partial_r, \quad (3.24)$$

implying

$$N^a \partial_a = \mp \frac{1}{f_{\pm}(w)} U^a \partial_a + \|N\|^2 \partial_r = \mp \frac{1}{f_{\pm}(w)} \frac{d}{dw} + \|N\|^2 \partial_r. \quad (3.25)$$

3.5 Constant- w affine null vector

A particularly obvious and useful constant- w null vector, to be used for defining affine parameters on the radial null geodesics, is

$$k^a = (0, \pm f_{\pm}(w)^{-1}, 0, 0); \quad k_a = (-1, 0, 0, 0). \quad (3.26)$$

Here the \pm is chosen to ensure that k^a is future pointing in both regions. Now

$$k^b \nabla_b k^a = g^{ac} k^b \nabla_b k_c, \quad (3.27)$$

and it is easy to see that

$$k^b \nabla_b k_c = k^b (\nabla_b k_c - \nabla_c k_b) = k^b (\partial_b k_c - \partial_c k_b) = 0. \quad (3.28)$$

So $k^a = (0, \pm f_{\pm}^{-1}, 0, 0)$ is the tangent to an *affinely parameterized* null congruence.

3.6 Constant- r observer and constant- r normal

A “constant- r observer” (to be used for defining some notion of “distance” to the evolving apparent horizon), has 4-velocity

$$v^a = \frac{(1, 0, 0, 0)}{f_{\pm} \sqrt{1 - 2m_{\pm}/r}}; \quad v_a = \frac{(-f_{\pm}^2(1 - 2G_N m_{\pm}/r), \mp f_{\pm}, 0, 0)}{f_{\pm} \sqrt{1 - 2G_N m_{\pm}/r}}. \quad (3.29)$$

Near spatial infinity (where it makes sense to enforce $f \rightarrow 1$), this reduces to

$$v^a = (1, 0, 0, 0)^a; \quad v_a = (-1, \mp 1, 0, 0)_a. \quad (3.30)$$

In contrast, the non-normalized covariant vector normal to the surfaces of constant r is $(\nabla r)_a = (0, 1, 0, 0)_a$, and the unit normal to the constant r surfaces is

$$\widehat{(\nabla r)}_a = \frac{(0, 1, 0, 0)_a}{\sqrt{1 - 2G_N m_{\pm}/r}}. \quad (3.31)$$

For completeness we mention that

$$(\nabla r)^a = (\pm f^{-1}, 1 - 2G_N m_{\pm}/r, 0, 0)^a \quad (3.32)$$

and

$$\widehat{(\nabla r)}^a = \frac{(\pm f_{\pm}^{-1}, 1 - 2G_N m_{\pm}/r, 0, 0)^a}{\sqrt{1 - 2G_N m_{\pm}/r}}. \quad (3.33)$$

4 Exterior geometry — outgoing Hawking radiation

Let us now consider what happens in the outside region, between the thin shell at $r_s(w)$ and spatial infinity. It is convenient (and implies no loss of generality) to choose the w coordinate to set $f_+(w) \rightarrow 1$, and set $m_+(w) \rightarrow m(w)$, so that in this exterior region the metric is simply

$$ds^2 = - \left(1 - \frac{2G_N m(w)}{r} \right) dw^2 - 2dw dr + r^2 (d\theta^2 + \sin^2 \theta d\phi^2). \quad (4.1)$$

4.1 Blueshift/redshift

In a dynamic spacetime the general formula for the blueshift/redshift function is [48]

$$Z = 1 + z = \frac{(k_a V^a)_1}{(k_a V^a)_2}. \quad (4.2)$$

Here we are looking along a null geodesic described by the affine null tangent k_a , while $(V^a)_1$ and $(V^a)_2$ are the 4-velocities of the emitter and observer. In the current context

$$Z = 1 + z = \frac{(k_a u^a)}{(k_a v^a)}. \quad (4.3)$$

Here

$$k_a = (1, 0, 0, 0), \quad v_{\infty}^a = (1, 0, 0, 0), \quad \text{and} \quad u^a = \frac{(1, \dot{r}_s, 0, 0)^a}{\|(1, \dot{r}_s, 0, 0)^a\|}, \quad (4.4)$$

where v_{∞}^a is the stationary observer at infinity.

Thus, temporarily reinserting Newton's constant G_N for clarity (and remembering that we are choosing $f(w) \rightarrow 1$ in the exterior region) the blueshift/redshift from $r = r_s(w)$ to infinity is:

$$Z_{\infty}(w) = 1 + z = \frac{1}{\|(1, \dot{r}_s(w), 0, 0)^a\|} = \frac{1}{\|U\|}. \quad (4.5)$$

That is

$$Z_{\infty}(w) = \frac{1}{\sqrt{1 - 2G_N m(w)/r_s(w) + 2\dot{r}_s(w)}}. \quad (4.6)$$

Note how naturally and cleanly this generalizes the static result

$$Z_\infty = 1 + z = \frac{1}{\sqrt{1 - 2G_N m/r_s}}; \quad (4.7)$$

there are now (in this non-static evolving situation) contributions both from the gravitational field itself and from the motion of the thin-shell. This computation of $Z(w)$ has significance beyond the thin-shell models considered herein, and would perfectly well apply to a spherically-pulsating “shining star” spacetime, as long as the star has a sharp surface at $r_s(w)$ and as long as the stellar exterior is pure outgoing null flux.

It is also worthwhile doing an explicit consistency check by setting $m(w) \rightarrow 0$. Then

$$\begin{aligned} Z_\infty(w) &\rightarrow \frac{1}{\sqrt{1 + 2\dot{r}_s(w)}} \equiv \frac{1}{\sqrt{1 + 2(dr_s(w)/dw)}} = \frac{1}{\sqrt{1 + 2\frac{(dr_s/dt)}{(dw/dt)}}} = \frac{1}{\sqrt{1 + 2\frac{(dr_s/dt)}{1-(dr_s/dt)}}} \\ &= \sqrt{\frac{1 - (dr_s/dt)}{1 + (dr_s/dt)}}. \end{aligned} \quad (4.8)$$

This (as it should be) is the usual flat-space Doppler shift factor.

4.2 Evading trans-Planckian physics

As long as the black hole is “slowly evolving” we can use the adiabatic approximation to estimate the average energy of the Hawking photons reaching spatial infinity as

$$E(w) = \frac{m_P^2}{8\pi m(w)}. \quad (4.9)$$

This approximation is valid as long as the surface gravity satisfies $d\kappa/dw \ll \kappa^2$ [49, 50], that is, as long as $dm(w)/dw \ll m_P/T_P$. That is, this adiabaticity condition is equivalent to the total Hawking luminosity being much less than one Planck power, $L_H \ll m_P/T_P$. There is a similar adiabaticity condition for the validity of Unruh radiation [51].

When back-tracked to the thin shell, the Hawking photons will have blueshifted locally measured energy (in the rest frame u^a of the thin shell) given by

$$E_s(w) = \frac{m_P^2 Z(w)}{8\pi m(w)}. \quad (4.10)$$

We wish this $E_s(w)$ to be sub-Planckian, that is $E_s(w) \lesssim m_P$, so that

$$\frac{m_P}{8\pi m(w)\sqrt{1 - 2G_N m(w)/r_s(w) + 2\dot{r}_s(w)}} \lesssim 1. \quad (4.11)$$

Writing $r_s(w) = 2G_N m(w) + \epsilon(w)$, this can be recast as

$$\frac{m_P}{8\pi m(w)} \sqrt{\frac{r_s(w)}{\epsilon(w) + 2r_s(w)\dot{r}_s(w)}} \lesssim 1. \quad (4.12)$$

That is

$$\epsilon(w) + 2r_s(w)\dot{r}_s(w) \gtrsim \frac{m_P^2}{64\pi^2 m(w)^2} r_s(w). \quad (4.13)$$

Since for an *evaporating* black hole we must have $\dot{r}_s(w) < 0$, this certainly implies

$$\epsilon(w) \gtrsim \frac{m_P^2}{64\pi^2 m(w)^2} r_s(w). \quad (4.14)$$

Since we want the thin shell to lie outside the Schwarzschild radius, $r_s(w) > 2G_N m(w) = 2L_P m(w)/m_P$, this certainly implies

$$\epsilon(w) \gtrsim \frac{1}{32\pi^2} \frac{m_P}{m(w)} L_P. \quad (4.15)$$

This is now a w -dependent version of the result we previously obtained in the static approximation. (While this bound is generally true as long as evaporation overwhelms accretion, $\dot{r}_s(w) < 0$, it is only really a tight bound if both $|\dot{r}_s| \ll 1$ and $\epsilon(w) \ll 2m(w)$ are small enough.² Now $|\dot{r}_s| \ll 1$ will certainly be true during most of the lifetime of the black hole, as long as it is slowly and adiabatically evaporating. Furthermore we shall soon see that $\epsilon(w) \ll 2G_N m(w)$ will hold if we want the Unruh effect to quantitatively explain the Hawking radiation.)

Let us now estimate the proper distance between the location of the thin shell at $r_s(w) = 2G_N m(w) + \epsilon(w)$, and where the apparent horizon “would have formed”, noting that this is a “virtual” location that is not actually part of the physical spacetime. To do this, pick some arbitrary but fixed w_* and consider the geometry

$$ds^2 = -f_+(w_*)^2 \left(1 - \frac{2G_N m_+(w_*)}{r} \right) dw^2 - (2f_+(w_*) dw dr) + r^2 (d\theta^2 + \sin^2 \theta d\phi^2). \quad (4.16)$$

This instantaneously “freezes” the external geometry at the moment w_* , and then extrapolates it to regions $r < r_s(w_*)$, so that we can say something about where the apparent horizon “would have formed”. Indeed this “frozen” geometry is just Schwarzschild geometry in disguise, so all we need to do is to estimate the proper

²The transition from (4.13) to (4.14) is tight only if $|\dot{r}_s| \ll 1$.

The transition from (4.14) to (4.15) is tight only if $\epsilon(w) \ll 2m(w)$.

distance between $r_s(w_*) = 2G_N m(w_*) + \epsilon(w_*)$ and $2G_N m(w_*)$. But this is now standard

$$\ell = \int_{2G_N m(w_*)}^{2G_N m(w_*) + \epsilon(w_*)} \frac{dr}{\sqrt{1 - 2G_N m(w_*)/r}} \approx \int_{2G_N m(w_*)}^{2G_N m(w_*) + \epsilon(w_*)} \sqrt{\frac{2G_N m(w_*)}{r - 2G_N m(w_*)}} dr, \quad (4.17)$$

so that

$$\ell \approx \sqrt{8G_N m(w_*) \epsilon(w_*)}. \quad (4.18)$$

Since this was calculated for any fixed but arbitrary w_* we see

$$\ell \approx \sqrt{8G_N m(w) \epsilon(w)}. \quad (4.19)$$

But then in view of our bound on $\epsilon(w)$ we have

$$\ell \gtrsim \frac{L_P}{2\pi}. \quad (4.20)$$

So even in the presence of back-reaction and an evolving Vaidya spacetime geometry, to avoid trans-Planckian physics we need the Hawking photons to be emitted from a region at least a (proper) Planck length above where the apparent horizon would be expected to form. This estimate is subtle — but there is a good physics reason for the subtlety — one is making a counter-factual estimate of where the horizon “would have formed”, an estimate of a hypothetical location that is not part of the actual physical spacetime.

4.3 From Unruh temperature to Hawking temperature

Let us now calculate $A(w)$ the 4-acceleration of the thin-shell. This 4-acceleration $A(w)$ will be some function of $m(w)$ and $r_s(w)$, and their derivatives. (Calculating the 4-acceleration will be considerably more complicated than in the static approximation.) Spherical symmetry and orthogonality is enough to imply

$$A = n_a (u^b \nabla_b u^a) = n^a (u^b \nabla_b u_a) = n^a (u^b \nabla_b u_a - u^b \nabla_a u_b) = n^a u^b (u_{a,b} - u_{b,a}). \quad (4.21)$$

Thence

$$\begin{aligned} A &= \frac{1}{2} (n^a u^b - n^b u^a) (u_{a,b} - u_{b,a}) \\ &= \frac{1}{2 \|U\|^2 \|N\|} (N^a U^b - N^b U^a) \left(U_{a,b} - U_{b,a} - \frac{\{U_a \|U\|_{,b} - U_b \|U\|_{,a}\}}{\|U\|} \right) \\ &= \frac{1}{2 \|U\|^2 \|N\|} (N^a U^b - N^b U^a) (U_{a,b} - U_{b,a}) - \frac{N^a \partial_a \|U\|}{\|N\| \|U\|}. \end{aligned} \quad (4.22)$$

But, since in the current situation $f_+ \rightarrow 1$ we have $\|U\| = \|N\|$, and in view of equations (3.18) and (3.21) we have

$$\frac{1}{2}(N^a U^b - N^b U^a) (U_{a,b} - U_{b,a}) = \|U\|^2 \frac{2m(w)}{r^2}. \quad (4.23)$$

Similarly, in view of equation (3.25) we have

$$N^a \partial_a \|U\| = -\frac{d\|U\|}{dw} + \|U\|^2 \partial_r \|U\| = -\frac{d\|U\|}{dw} + \|U\| \frac{m(w)}{r^2}. \quad (4.24)$$

Combining all these results, the 4-acceleration of the thin shell is given by the quite compact and expressive formula

$$A(w) = \frac{1}{\|U\|} \frac{G_N m(w)}{r_s(w)^2} + \frac{1}{\|U\|^2} \frac{d\|U\|}{dw} = \frac{1}{\|U\|} \left(\frac{G_N m(w)}{r_s(w)^2} + \frac{d \ln \|U\|}{dw} \right). \quad (4.25)$$

This corresponds to a locally determined Unruh temperature

$$T_U(w) = \frac{A(w)}{2\pi} = \frac{1}{2\pi \|U\|} \left(\frac{G_N m(w)}{r_s(w)^2} + \frac{d \ln \|U\|}{dw} \right). \quad (4.26)$$

When redshifted to spatial infinity (using the previously calculated redshift factor), this becomes

$$T_{U,\infty}(w) = \frac{A(w)}{2\pi Z(w)} = \frac{A(w) \|U\|}{2\pi} = \frac{1}{2\pi} \left(\frac{G_N m(w)}{r_s(w)^2} + \frac{d \ln \|U\|}{dw} \right). \quad (4.27)$$

In terms of the adiabatically evolving Hawking temperature, $T_H(w) = 1/(8\pi G_N m(w))$, where we have set $\hbar = 1$ and $c = 1$, this is

$$T_{U,\infty}(w) = T_H(w) \left\{ \left(\frac{2G_N m(w)}{r_s(w)} \right)^2 + 4G_N m(w) \frac{d \ln \|U\|}{dw} \right\}. \quad (4.28)$$

That is

$$T_{U,\infty}(w) = T_H(w) \left\{ \left(\frac{2G_N m(w)}{r_s(w)} \right)^2 + 2G_N m(w) \frac{d \ln [1 - 2G_N m(w)/r_s(w) + 2\dot{r}_s(w)]}{dw} \right\}. \quad (4.29)$$

If we want the Unruh effect to *quantitatively* explain the Hawking effect, then we need

$$T_{U,\infty}(w) = \frac{A(w)}{2\pi Z(w)} \approx \frac{1}{8\pi G_N m(w)}. \quad (4.30)$$

This is equivalent to asserting

$$r_s(w) \approx 2G_N m(w); \quad G_N m(w) \frac{d\|U\|}{dw} \ll \|U\|. \quad (4.31)$$

Equivalently

$$r_s(w) \approx 2G_N m(w); \quad G_N m(w) \frac{dZ(w)}{dw} \ll Z(w). \quad (4.32)$$

So as in the static case, also in this Vaidya context, if we want the Unruh effect of the accelerated thin shell to *quantitatively* explain the Hawking effect, then we need the thin shell to hover just above the apparent horizon — more precisely, just above where the apparent horizon would otherwise be expected to form — at least one proper Planck length above the apparent horizon to avoid the trans-Planckian problem. Plus we need the “slowly evolving” adiabatic constraint on the evolution of the total redshift $Z(w)$. To obtain these results we only needed to consider the exterior region.

5 Interior geometry — ingoing Hawking radiation

Given that the “inner” geometry is ingoing Vaidya, described by some mass function $m_-(w)$, can we say anything reasonably explicit about the ingoing (negative energy) Hawking radiation and its impact on the central singularity? Can we say anything reasonably generic regarding the relevant Carter–Penrose diagrams? Since for current purposes we are interested only in the interior region we can, for the time being, set $f_-(w) \rightarrow 1$ and $m_-(w) \rightarrow m(w)$, so the inner metric takes the form

$$ds^2 = - \left(1 - \frac{2G_N m(w)}{r} \right) dw^2 + 2dw dr + r^2 (d\theta^2 + \sin^2 \theta d\phi^2). \quad (5.1)$$

Without further loss of generality we have

$$R_{abcd} R^{abcd} = C_{abcd} C^{abcd} = \frac{48[G_N m(w)]^2}{r^6}. \quad (5.2)$$

The orthonormal components of the Weyl tensor are (small) integer multiples of the quantity $G_N m(w)/r^3$:

$$C_{\hat{w}\hat{r}\hat{w}\hat{r}} = -2C_{\hat{w}\hat{\theta}\hat{w}\hat{\theta}} = -2C_{\hat{w}\hat{\phi}\hat{w}\hat{\phi}} = 2C_{\hat{r}\hat{\theta}\hat{r}\hat{\theta}} = 2C_{\hat{r}\hat{\phi}\hat{r}\hat{\phi}} = -C_{\hat{\theta}\hat{\phi}\hat{\theta}\hat{\phi}} = -\frac{2G_N m(w)}{r^3}. \quad (5.3)$$

So, the Weyl tensor is completely determined by the quantity $m(w)/r^3$, while the Ricci tensor is completely determined by $\dot{m}(w)/r^2$.

Now recall that the standard endpoints of the Hawking process are a naked singularity, a remnant, or complete evaporation [6].

- In the current setup, a (permanent) naked singularity would correspond to

$$\lim_{w \rightarrow \infty} m(w) = m_\infty < 0.$$

(This would be a very unnatural outcome, requiring the Hawking process to “overshoot” complete evaporation, and then drive the central mass *negative*. The current framework is not well-adapted to naked singularities.)³

- In the current setup, a remnant would correspond to either

$$\lim_{w \rightarrow \infty} m(w) = m_\infty > 0,$$

or at worst a slow asymptotic approach to zero central mass.

- In the current setup, complete evaporation would correspond to the central mass vanishing at some finite w_* :

$$\lim_{w \rightarrow w_*} m(w) = 0.$$

For $w < w_*$ the geometry is certainly singular at $r = 0$; for $w > w_*$ the geometry is certainly regular at $r = 0$. Understanding what happens precisely at $w = w_*$ and $r = 0$ is more delicate as we now consider.

Under very mild conditions (the existence of a Puiseux expansion [52–55], a condition that is much less restrictive than a Taylor expansion) one would have

$$m(w) \sim K_m (w_* - w)^\gamma H(w_* - w). \quad (5.4)$$

Here $H(x)$ is the Heaviside step function, and the critical exponent γ controls the behaviour of the final burst (of ingoing negative energy Hawking flux); K_m is some fixed but arbitrary constant. We impose $\gamma > 0$ so that the mass goes to zero at $w = w_*$.

In the immediate vicinity of the final evaporation point, $(w_*, 0, \theta, \phi)$, the null (causal) structure is determined by $0 = -dw^2 + 2dw dr = dw(2dr - dw)$, so the outgoing null ray is $r \sim \frac{1}{2}(w_* - w)$, while the ingoing null ray is given by $dw = 0$. So timelike trajectories (suitable for an observer) are of the form

$$r_o(w) \sim K_r (w_* - w) H(w_* - w); \quad K_r \in (1/2, \infty). \quad (5.5)$$

Here K_r is some fixed but arbitrary constant.

³The only naked singularity you can get in Schwarzschild spacetime is one with negative mass. Similarly for Vaidya, apart from instantaneous massless shell-focusing singularities at moments of black hole formation or final dispersal (see below), the only true naked singularities have negative mass.

Therefore, a timelike observer will see orthonormal Weyl components of the form

$$\frac{m(w)}{r_o(w)^3} \sim \frac{K_m}{K_r^3} (w_* - w)^{\gamma-3}, \quad (5.6)$$

and orthonormal Ricci components of the form

$$\frac{\dot{m}(w)}{r_o(w)^2} \sim \frac{K_m}{K_r^2} \gamma (w_* - w)^{\gamma-3}. \quad (5.7)$$

- For $\gamma > 3$ the orthonormal components smoothly approach zero.
- For $\gamma = 3$ the orthonormal components at least remain bounded.
- For $0 < \gamma < 3$, the orthonormal components blow up.⁴ This corresponds to so-called “cosmic flashing”, an instantaneous (and not particularly troublesome) glimpse of a naked singularity.⁵

Overall, in this framework, complete evaporation seems the most plausible outcome. For all of *these particular models* there will still be an “information puzzle” since *by construction* we have assumed the ingoing Vaidya spacetime (with $m_-(w) \neq 0$) to be valid all the way down to $r = 0$. (So there will be a true event horizon reaching back from the final evaporation point w_* , with concomitant hiding of information behind that event horizon.) To side-step the “information puzzle” one would need to modify the ingoing Vaidya spacetime near $r = 0$. (See figure 2 for a plausible Carter–Penrose diagram presenting the “standard” view, where there certainly *is* an “information puzzle” due to the *assumed* existence of the event horizon [57, 58].)

6 Evading the information puzzle

One way of evading the information puzzle is simply to set $m_-(w) \equiv 0$. This corresponds to the interior geometry being completely Minkowski, with all the matter of the “star” concentrated on the thin shell, and with an outgoing null flux in the exterior region (figure 3). Models of this type, though undoubtedly somewhat artificial, have previously been considered in the literature, and will be discussed more fully in subsection 7.3 below. (See for instance references [30, 32, 58], and the somewhat related [33, 59, 60]. Removing the black hole interior is also a key feature of the “fuzzball” proposal [61].)

⁴Remember that by hypothesis $\gamma > 0$.

⁵For general spherically symmetric spacetimes (instantaneous) naked massless shell-focusing singularities can also be visible at moments of black hole formation [56].




Figure 2. Plausible Carter–Penrose diagram focussing on the region near the endpoint of the Hawking evaporation process. (Under the assumption that a true event horizon forms.)

The major defect of these particular models is that the inner region is a Minkowski bubble surrounded by the collapsed star — more reasonable models using black holes with a regular core are also possible. (See for instance references [63–70].) It is the *assumption* that the mathematically delicate and physically operationally ill-defined concept of *event horizon* survives the introduction of quantum effects that is the source of the information puzzle [57, 58, 60, 71, 72].

7 Models for evaporation scenarios

The formalism we have developed up to this stage is quite generic. We have not yet made any specific choices as to the internal physics of the thin shell as there was already quite a bit that could be said at the purely kinematical level, treating the exterior and interior regions independently. We now link the exterior and interior regions by enforcing the most basic junction condition — the continuity of the spacetime metric. This requires (we now set $G_N \rightarrow 1$)

$$\left\{ - \left(1 - \frac{2m_+(w)}{r_s} \right) - 2\dot{r}_s \right\} = \left\{ -f_-(w)^2 \left(1 - \frac{2m_-(w)}{r_s} \right) + 2f_-(w)\dot{r}_s \right\}. \quad (7.1)$$




Figure 3. Plausible Carter–Penrose diagram for the Hawking evaporation process under the assumption that no event horizon ever forms.

(Here we have, without loss of generality, set $f_+(w) \rightarrow 1$.) Now let us look at some interesting possibilities with different mass relations.

7.1 Mass matching case

The “mass matching” condition, $m_+(\omega) = m_-(\omega) = m(\omega)$, corresponds to the interior and exterior Vaidya geometries having the same mass function. If we choose to impose the “mass matching” condition, then by (7.1) either $f_-(\omega) = -1$ or

$$f_-(\omega) = 1 + \frac{2\dot{r}_s}{1 - 2m(\omega)/r_s} = 1 - \frac{2|\dot{r}_s|}{1 - 2m(\omega)/r_s} \quad (7.2)$$

where (assuming evaporation) we used $\dot{r}_s < 0$. The $f_-(w) = -1$ option can be safely discarded: By our metric set-up (3.5) and with $m_+ = m_- = m$ this choice actually corresponds to attaching the outside metric to a copy of itself, and so represents a radiating white hole spacetime, rather than an evaporating black hole.

Now given that the matching surface is timelike and assuming that $\dot{r}_s < 0$ then it

follows directly from the form of the induced metric that

$$|\dot{r}_s| < \frac{1}{2} \left(1 - \frac{2m(\omega)}{r_s} \right). \quad (7.3)$$

Hence $f_-(w)$ in (7.2) is positive. Next defining $r_s = 2m(\omega) + \epsilon$, we have

$$|\dot{r}_s| < \frac{1}{2} \left(\frac{\epsilon}{2m + \epsilon} \right) \lesssim \frac{\epsilon}{4m(\omega)} \quad (7.4)$$

and so a near- $2m$ transition surface is necessarily slowly evolving. This already indicates that the mass matching condition can only be valid for extremely slow shell velocities and, and therefore, for a very slow evaporation. If we now substitute the value of ϵ that was previously found by analyzing the redshift condition,

$$\epsilon \approx \frac{1}{32\pi^2} \frac{m_P^2}{m(\omega)}, \quad (7.5)$$

then we obtain:

$$|\dot{r}_s| \lesssim \frac{1}{128\pi^2} \left(\frac{m_P}{m(\omega)} \right)^2. \quad (7.6)$$

In this way, we see that the simple requirement of a timelike matching surface already imposes a condition of very small radial velocity, ensuring that we are dealing with an adiabatic evolution.

7.2 Non equal masses

In the completely general case we can extract a quadratic equation for $f_-(\omega)$:

$$f_-^2(\omega) \left(1 - \frac{2m_-(\omega)}{r_s} \right) - 2f_-(\omega)\dot{r}_s - \left[\left(1 - \frac{2m_+(\omega)}{r_s} \right) + 2\dot{r}_s \right] = 0. \quad (7.7)$$

Solving this, we find:

$$f_-(\omega) = \frac{\dot{r}_s \pm \sqrt{\dot{r}_s^2 + (1 - 2m_-/r_s) [(1 - 2m_+/r_s) + 2\dot{r}_s]}}{(1 - 2m_-/r_s)}. \quad (7.8)$$

We want $f_-(\omega)$ to be real and so we must have

$$\dot{r}_s^2 + \left(1 - \frac{2m_-}{r_s} \right) \left[\left(1 - \frac{2m_+}{r_s} \right) + 2\dot{r}_s \right] > 0, \quad (7.9)$$

which we rearrange to yield

$$\dot{r}_s^2 + 2\dot{r}_s \left(1 - \frac{2m_-}{r_s}\right) + \left(1 - \frac{2m_-}{r_s}\right) \left(1 - \frac{2m_+}{r_s}\right) > 0. \quad (7.10)$$

This places bounds on acceptable values of the model parameters $m_{\pm}(w)$ and $r_s(w)$. Finding the zeros of this quadratic, the edge of the physically acceptable region must satisfy

$$\dot{r}_s = - \left(1 - \frac{2m_-}{r_s}\right) \pm \sqrt{\left(1 - \frac{2m_-}{r_s}\right)^2 - \left(1 - \frac{2m_-}{r_s}\right) \left(1 - \frac{2m_+}{r_s}\right)} \quad (7.11)$$

$$= - \left(1 - \frac{2m_-}{r_s}\right) \pm \sqrt{\frac{2}{r_s} \left(1 - \frac{2m_-}{r_s}\right) (m_+ - m_-)}. \quad (7.12)$$

Substituting $r_s = 2m_+ + \epsilon$, this becomes

$$\dot{r}_s = -1 + \frac{2m_-}{r_s} \pm \sqrt{\frac{2}{r_s^2} (2m_+ + \epsilon - 2m_-) (m_+ - m_-)}. \quad (7.13)$$

If we assume $\epsilon \ll 2 ||m_+ - m_-||$, we can approximate this by⁶

$$\dot{r}_s \approx -1 + \frac{2m_-}{r_s} \pm \sqrt{\frac{4(m_+ - m_-)^2}{r_s^2}} = -1 + \frac{2m_-}{r_s} \pm \frac{2||m_+ - m_-||}{r_s}. \quad (7.14)$$

Then in this case the edges of the physically acceptable region are given by

$$\dot{r}_s^- \approx -1 + \frac{4m_-}{r_s} - \frac{2m_+}{r_s} \approx -2 \left(1 - \frac{m_-}{m_+}\right) \quad \text{and} \quad \dot{r}_s^+ \approx -\frac{\epsilon}{2m_+} \quad (7.15)$$

for the $m_+ > m_-$ case. Symmetrically

$$\dot{r}_s^- \approx -\frac{\epsilon}{2m_+} \quad \text{and} \quad \dot{r}_s^+ \approx 2 \left(\frac{m_-}{m_+} - 1\right) \quad (7.16)$$

for the $m_+ < m_-$ case, which we will explore more closely in section 7.4. (For some scenarios, see figure 4.) So, requiring only that $f_-(w)$ has to be real, we already obtain strong restrictions for regions where the model is valid.

⁶We had already argued $\epsilon \ll 2m_+$ in order for the Unruh effect to be qualitatively linked to the Hawking effect; this $\epsilon \ll 2||m_+ - m_-||$ assumption is considerably stronger.




Figure 4. Possible scenarios for the radial velocity in the general case.

7.3 The empty-interior massive shell case

Consider the case of an “empty” interior; when the interior is simply a portion of Minkowski space. Applying $m_-(\omega) = 0$ in equation (7.1), we obtain:

$$-\left(1 - \frac{2m_+(\omega)}{r_s}\right) - 2\dot{r}_s = -f_-(\omega)^2 + 2f_-(\omega)\dot{r}_s, \quad (7.17)$$

implying

$$f_-(\omega)^2 - 2f_-(\omega)\dot{r}_s - \left(1 - \frac{2m_+(\omega)}{r_s} + 2\dot{r}_s\right) = 0. \quad (7.18)$$

Thence:

$$f_-(\omega) = \dot{r}_s \pm \sqrt{\dot{r}_s^2 + \left(1 - \frac{2m_+(\omega)}{r_s} + 2\dot{r}_s\right)} = \dot{r}_s \pm \sqrt{(1 + \dot{r}_s)^2 - \frac{2m_+(\omega)}{r_s}}. \quad (7.19)$$

We want $f_-(\omega)$ to be real, so substituting $r_s(\omega) = 2m_+(\omega) + \epsilon(\omega)$, we see

$$(1 + \dot{r}_s)^2 > \frac{2m_+(\omega)}{r_s} \approx 1 - \frac{\epsilon}{2m_+(\omega)}; \quad |1 + \dot{r}_s| \gtrsim 1 - \frac{\epsilon}{4m_+(\omega)}. \quad (7.20)$$

As (per assumption) $\dot{r}_s < 0$, and taking $|\dot{r}_s| < 1$, so that the evaporation is not ultra-rapid, this implies

$$\dot{r}_s \gtrsim -\frac{\epsilon}{4m_+(\omega)}; \quad |\dot{r}_s| \lesssim \frac{\epsilon}{4m_+(\omega)} \ll 1. \quad (7.21)$$

So in this case the velocity of the shell is extremely small, in accordance with the $|\dot{r}_s|$ limitations derived from adiabatic evaporation.




Figure 5. The allowed radial velocities for the time matching case.

7.4 The “time matching” case

If we enforce $f_+(\omega) = f_-(\omega) = 1$, so that coordinate time “runs at the same rate” on both sides of the shell, then the matching condition on the shell gives us:

$$m_+(\omega) = m_-(\omega) + 2r_s\dot{r}_s = m_-(\omega) - 2r_s|\dot{r}_s|. \quad (7.22)$$

From this we obtain $m_-(\omega) \geq m_+(\omega)$. We also want both $m_{\pm}(\omega) > 0$ individually. This gives us:

$$m_- - 2r_s|\dot{r}_s| > 0 \quad \Rightarrow \quad m_- > 2r_s|\dot{r}_s|. \quad (7.23)$$

If we substitute $r_s = 2m_+ + \epsilon$,

$$m_- > 2(2m_+ + \epsilon)|\dot{r}_s| \approx 4m_+|\dot{r}_s|, \quad (7.24)$$

giving us an upper limit for the speed of the shell:

$$|\dot{r}_s| < \frac{m_-(\omega)}{4m_+(\omega)}. \quad (7.25)$$

As $m_- > m_+$, we can use third scenario of figure 4:

$$\dot{r}_s > -1 + \frac{m_-}{m_+} \quad \text{or} \quad \dot{r}_s < -\frac{\epsilon}{2m_+}. \quad (7.26)$$

But the first condition gives us positive radial velocities (accretion dominating over the Hawking flux), so we just focus on the second condition. Requiring the interval on figure 5 to have a non-zero length we obtain the relatively weak condition $m_-(\omega) > 2\epsilon(\omega)$.

The interesting feature here is actually the fact that there is a *minimal* velocity for the evaporation rate of the black hole. Why does this happen? Having $m_- > m_+$ is something that is perhaps a bit unexpected and odd. For that to happen, the thin-shell will have to contain a negative-energy surface density. So the black hole will have to keep evaporating, in order to equilibrate this otherwise unstable situation.

8 Discussion

So what have we learned from this exercise? Perhaps the major conclusion to be drawn is that possible scenarios for the final state can be considerably more complex and varied than currently envisaged; and that the sheer number of *a priori* quite reasonable scenarios is quite large — perhaps unreasonably so. Considerable information can already be extracted at the kinematical level. For instance: (1) Whereas (outgoing) Hawking radiation does not actually seem to need to *cross* the horizon; there are nevertheless good quantitative reasons for believing the Hawking radiation arises from a region near the horizon — since otherwise there is no good physical reason to connect the surface gravity to the Hawking temperature; (2) If the interior Vaidya geometry has a nonzero mass $m_-(w) \neq 0$, then some version of the “information puzzle” is unavoidable; being evaded only by the use of an interior “regular black hole” or similar construction.

We have sketched a number of scenarios for the evaporation process, and indicated how very general kinematic considerations can nevertheless lead to interesting constraints on the range of validity of these double-Vaidya thin-shell models. We hope to turn our attention to dynamical issues in future work.

Acknowledgments

IB is supported by NSERC Discover Grant 2018-04873. BC was supported by a fellowship from the School of Graduate Studies at Memorial University as well as a stipend from NSERC Discovery Grants 261429-2013. JS is indirectly supported by the Marsden fund, administered by the Royal Society of New Zealand. MV is directly supported by the Marsden fund, administered by the Royal Society of New Zealand.

A poster presentation outlining some of these results was exhibited by JS at the conference “Probing the spacetime fabric: From concepts to phenomenology” (Trieste, Italy), and at the 2017 Schrödinger Institute summer school “Between Geometry and Relativity”. JS also presented these results in a seminar at Nottingham.

References

- [1] T. Jacobson, “Trans-Planckian redshifts and the substance of the space-time river”, Prog. Theor. Phys. Suppl. **136** (1999) 1; doi:10.1143/PTPS.136.1 [hep-th/0001085].
- [2] S. W. Hawking, “Black hole explosions”, Nature **248** (1974) 30. doi:10.1038/248030a0
- [3] W. G. Unruh, “Notes on black hole evaporation”, Phys. Rev. D **14** (1976) 870. doi:10.1103/PhysRevD.14.870
- [4] W. G. Unruh,
“Quantum noise in amplifiers and Hawking/dumb-hole radiation as amplifier noise”,
arXiv:1107.2669 [gr-qc].
- [5] S. Weinfurtner, E. W. Tedford, M. C. J. Penrice, W. G. Unruh and G. A. Lawrence,
“Classical aspects of Hawking radiation verified in analogue gravity experiment”,
Lect. Notes Phys. **870** (2013) 167; doi:10.1007/978-3-319-00266-8_8
[arXiv:1302.0375 [gr-qc]].
- [6] N. D. Birrell and P. C. W. Davies, “Quantum Fields in Curved Space”,
doi:10.1017/CBO9780511622632. Cambridge University Press (1982).
See especially pages 283–285.
- [7] M. Visser,
“Gravitational vacuum polarization. 4: Energy conditions in the Unruh vacuum”,
Phys. Rev. D **56** (1997) 936 doi:10.1103/PhysRevD.56.936 [gr-qc/9703001].
- [8] M. Visser,
“Gravitational vacuum polarization. 3:
Energy conditions in the (1+1) Schwarzschild space-time”,
Phys. Rev. D **54** (1996) 5123; doi:10.1103/PhysRevD.54.5123 [gr-qc/9604009].
- [9] M. Visser, “Gravitational vacuum polarization”, gr-qc/9710034.
- [10] J. M. Bardeen,
“The semi-classical stress-energy tensor in a Schwarzschild background, the information
paradox, and the fate of an evaporating black hole”, arXiv:1706.09204 [gr-qc].
- [11] P. Vaidya, “The gravitational field of a radiating star”,
Proc. Natl. Inst. Sci. India A **33** (1951) 264.
- [12] J. Griffiths and J. Podolsky,
“Exact Space-Times in Einstein’s General Relativity”,
Cambridge University Press (2009)
- [13] P. O. Mazur and E. Mottola,
“Gravitational condensate stars: An alternative to black holes”, gr-qc/0109035.
- [14] P. O. Mazur and E. Mottola, “Gravitational vacuum condensate stars”,
Proc. Nat. Acad. Sci. **101** (2004) 9545 doi:10.1073/pnas.0402717101 [gr-qc/0407075].
- [15] F. S. N. Lobo, “Stable dark energy stars”, Class. Quant. Grav. **23** (2006) 1525
doi:10.1088/0264-9381/23/5/006 [gr-qc/0508115].

- [16] M. Visser and D. L. Wiltshire, “Stable gravastars: An alternative to black holes?”, *Class. Quant. Grav.* **21** (2004) 1135 doi:10.1088/0264-9381/21/4/027 [gr-qc/0310107].
- [17] C. Cattoen, T. Faber and M. Visser, “Gravastars must have anisotropic pressures”, *Class. Quant. Grav.* **22** (2005) 4189 doi:10.1088/0264-9381/22/20/002 [gr-qc/0505137].
- [18] C. B. M. H. Chirenti and L. Rezzolla, “How to tell a gravastar from a black hole”, *Class. Quant. Grav.* **24** (2007) 4191 doi:10.1088/0264-9381/24/16/013 [arXiv:0706.1513 [gr-qc]].
- [19] W. Israel, “Singular hypersurfaces and thin shells in general relativity”, *Nuovo Cim. B* **44S10**, 1 (1966) [*Nuovo Cim. B* **44**, 1 (1966)]
Erratum: [*Nuovo Cim. B* **48**, 463 (1967)].
doi: 10.1007/BF02710419, 10.1007/BF02712210
- [20] K Lanczos,
“Flächenhafte verteilung der materie in der Einsteinschen gravitationstheorie”,
Annalen der Physik (Leipzig) **74** (1924) 518–540.
- [21] K. Lanczos,
“Untersuchung über flächenhafte verteilung der materie in der Einsteinschen gravitationstheorie”, 1922, unpublished.
- [22] N. Sen, “Über dei grenzbedingungen des schwerefeldes an unstetig keitsflächen”,
Annalen der Physik (Leipzig) **73** (1924) 365–396.
- [23] M. Visser, “Lorentzian wormholes: From Einstein to Hawking”,
(AIP Press, now Springer–Verlag, 1995, New York)
See for instance page 182, and related discussion in the subsequent pages.
- [24] P. Martín-Moruno, N. Montelongo-García, F. S. N. Lobo and M. Visser,
“Generic thin-shell gravastars”, *JCAP* **1203** (2012) 034;
doi:10.1088/1475-7516/2012/03/034 [arXiv:1112.5253 [gr-qc]].
- [25] F. S. N. Lobo, P. Martín-Moruno, N. Montelongo-García and M. Visser,
“Linearised stability analysis of generic thin shells”, doi:10.1142/9789814623995_0321
arXiv:1211.0605 [gr-qc].
- [26] F. S. N. Lobo, P. Martín-Moruno, N. Montelongo-García and M. Visser,
“Novel stability approach of thin-shell gravastars”, arXiv:1512.07659 [gr-qc].
- [27] D. G. Boulware, “Hawking radiation and thin shells”,
Phys. Rev. D **13** (1976) 2169. doi:10.1103/PhysRevD.13.2169
- [28] R. Parentani and T. Piran, “The internal geometry of an evaporating black hole”,
Phys. Rev. Lett. **73** (1994) 2805; doi:10.1103/PhysRevLett.73.2805 [hep-th/9405007].
- [29] L. Mersini-Houghton,
“Back-reaction of the Hawking radiation flux in Unruh’s vacuum on a gravitationally collapsing star II”, arXiv:1409.1837v2 [hep-th].
- [30] V. Baccetti, R. B. Mann and D. R. Terno,
“Horizon avoidance in spherically-symmetric collapse”, arXiv:1703.09369 [gr-qc].

- [31] T. Vachaspati, D. Stojkovic and L. M. Krauss,
“Observation of incipient black holes and the information loss problem”,
Phys. Rev. D **76** (2007) 024005 doi:10.1103/PhysRevD.76.024005 [gr-qc/0609024].
- [32] V. Baccetti, R. B. Mann and D. R. Terno,
“Role of evaporation in gravitational collapse”, arXiv:1610.07839 [gr-qc].
- [33] M. Saravani, N. Afshordi and R. B. Mann,
“Empty black holes, firewalls, and the origin of Bekenstein–Hawking entropy”,
Int. J. Mod. Phys. D **23** (2015) no.13, 1443007 doi:10.1142/S021827181443007X
[arXiv:1212.4176 [hep-th]].
- [34] G. L. Alberghi, R. Casadio, G. P. Vacca and G. Venturi,
“Gravitational collapse of a radiating shell”,
Phys. Rev. D **64** (2001) 104012 doi:10.1103/PhysRevD.64.104012 [gr-qc/0102014].
- [35] C. Barceló, S. Liberati, S. Sonego and M. Visser,
“Fate of gravitational collapse in semiclassical gravity”,
Phys. Rev. D **77** (2008) 044032 doi:10.1103/PhysRevD.77.044032
[arXiv:0712.1130 [gr-qc]].
- [36] C. Barceló, S. Liberati, S. Sonego and M. Visser,
“Revisiting the semiclassical gravity scenario for gravitational collapse”,
AIP Conf. Proc. **1122** (2009) 99 doi:10.1063/1.3141347 [arXiv:0909.4157 [gr-qc]].
- [37] F. Gray, S. Schuster, A. Van–Brunt, and M. Visser,
“The Hawking cascade from a black hole is extremely sparse”,
Class. Quant. Grav. **33** (2016) no.11, 115003; doi:10.1088/0264-9381/33/11/115003
[arXiv:1506.03975 [gr-qc]].
- [38] F. Gray and M. Visser,
“Greybody factors for Schwarzschild black holes: Path-ordered exponentials and
product integrals”, Universe **4** (2018) no.9, 93 doi:10.3390/universe4090093
[arXiv:1512.05018 [gr-qc]].
- [39] M. Visser, F. Gray, S. Schuster, and A. Van–Brunt,
“Sparsity of the Hawking flux”, arXiv:1512.05809 [gr-qc].
- [40] A. Wang and Y. Wu,
“Generalized Vaidya solutions”,
Gen. Rel. Grav. **31**, 107 (1999) doi:10.1023/A:1018819521971 [gr-qc/9803038].
- [41] R. Carballo-Rubio, F. Di Filippo, S. Liberati and M. Visser,
“Phenomenological aspects of black holes beyond general relativity”,
arXiv:1809.08238 [gr-qc].
- [42] L. Susskind, L. Thorlacius and J. Uglum,
“The stretched horizon and black hole complementarity”,
Phys. Rev. D **48**, 3743 (1993) doi:10.1103/PhysRevD.48.3743 [hep-th/9306069].
- [43] Kip S. Thorne, R. H. Price and D. A. Macdonald (eds.),

- “Black Holes: The Membrane Paradigm”, (Yale University Press, 1986).
- [44] Richard Price and Kip Thorne, “The Membrane Paradigm for Black Holes”, *Scientific American*. **258:4** (1988) 69–77. doi:10.1038/scientificamerican0488-69.
 - [45] M. Visser, “Thermality of the Hawking flux”, *JHEP* **1507** (2015) 009; doi:10.1007/JHEP07(2015)009 [arXiv:1409.7754 [gr-qc]].
 - [46] L. C. Barbado, C. Barceló and L. J. Garay, “Hawking radiation as perceived by different observers”, *Class. Quant. Grav.* **28** (2011) 125021 doi:10.1088/0264-9381/28/12/125021 [arXiv:1101.4382 [gr-qc]].
 - [47] L. C. Barbado, C. Barceló, L. J. Garay and G. Jannes, “Hawking versus Unruh effects, or the difficulty of slowly crossing a black hole horizon”, *JHEP* **1610** (2016) 161 doi:10.1007/JHEP10(2016)161 [arXiv:1608.02532 [gr-qc]].
 - [48] Hans Stephani. *Relativity: An Introduction to Special and General Relativity*, (Cambridge University Press, Cambridge, England, 1982-1990-2004)
 - [49] C. Barceló, S. Liberati, S. Sonego and M. Visser, “Hawking-like radiation from evolving black holes and compact horizonless objects”, *JHEP* **1102** (2011) 003 doi:10.1007/JHEP02(2011)003 [arXiv:1011.5911 [gr-qc]].
 - [50] C. Barceló, S. Liberati, S. Sonego and M. Visser, “Minimal conditions for the existence of a Hawking-like flux”, *Phys. Rev. D* **83** (2011) 041501 doi:10.1103/PhysRevD.83.041501 [arXiv:1011.5593 [gr-qc]].
 - [51] L. C. Barbado and M. Visser, “Unruh-DeWitt detector event rate for trajectories with time-dependent acceleration”, *Phys. Rev. D* **86** (2012) 084011 doi:10.1103/PhysRevD.86.084011 [arXiv:1207.5525 [gr-qc]].
 - [52] Victor Alexandre Puiseux, “Recherches sur les fonctions algébriques”, *J. Math. Pures Appl.* **15** (1850) 365–480.
 - [53] Victor Alexandre Puiseux, “Nouvelles recherches sur les fonctions algébriques”, *J. Math. Pures Appl.* **16** (1851) 228–240.
 - [54] C. Cattöen and M. Visser, “Generalized Puiseux series expansion for cosmological milestones”, doi:10.1142/9789812834300_0323 gr-qc/0609073.
 - [55] C. Cattöen and M. Visser, “Cosmological milestones and energy conditions”, *J. Phys. Conf. Ser.* **68** (2007) 012011 doi:10.1088/1742-6596/68/1/012011 [gr-qc/0609064].
 - [56] K. Lake, “Precursory singularities in spherical gravitational collapse”, *Phys. Rev. Lett.* **68**, 3129 (1992). doi:10.1103/PhysRevLett.68.3129
 - [57] M. Visser, “Physical observability of horizons”, *Phys. Rev. D* **90** (2014) no.12, 127502; doi:10.1103/PhysRevD.90.127502 [arXiv:1407.7295 [gr-qc]].

- [58] V. Baccetti, R. B. Mann and D. R. Terno, “Do event horizons exist?”,
Int. J. Mod. Phys. D **26** (2017) no.12, 1743008 doi:10.1142/S0218271817430088,
10.1142/S0218271817170088 [arXiv:1706.01180 [gr-qc]].
 - [59] V. Baccetti, V. Husain and D. R. Terno, “The information recovery problem”,
Entropy **19** (2017) 17 doi:10.3390/e19010017 [arXiv:1610.09864 [gr-qc]].
 - [60] A. Saini and D. Stojkovic, “Radiation from a collapsing object is manifestly unitary”,
Phys. Rev. Lett. **114** (2015) no.11, 111301 doi:10.1103/PhysRevLett.114.111301
[arXiv:1503.01487 [gr-qc]].
 - [61] S. D. Mathur, “The fuzzball proposal for black holes: An elementary review”,
Fortsch. Phys. **53** (2005) 793 doi:10.1002/prop.200410203 [hep-th/0502050].
 - [62] C. Barceló, S. Liberati, S. Sonego and M. Visser,
“Hawking-like radiation does not require a trapped region”,
Phys. Rev. Lett. **97** (2006) 171301 doi:10.1103/PhysRevLett.97.171301
[gr-qc/0607008].
 - [63] S. A. Hayward, “The disinformation problem for black holes (conference version)”,
gr-qc/0504037.
 - [64] S. A. Hayward, “The disinformation problem for black holes (pop version)”,
gr-qc/0504038.
 - [65] V. P. Frolov, “Notes on nonsingular models of black holes”,
Phys. Rev. D **94:10** (2016) 104056 doi:10.1103/PhysRevD.94.104056
[arXiv:1609.01758 [gr-qc]].
 - [66] S. A. Hayward, “Formation and evaporation of regular black holes”,
Phys. Rev. Lett. **96** (2006) 031103 doi:10.1103/PhysRevLett.96.031103 [gr-qc/0506126].
 - [67] J. M. Bardeen, “Black hole evaporation without an event horizon”,
arXiv:1406.4098 [gr-qc].
 - [68] A. Ashtekar and M. Bojowald, “Black hole evaporation: A paradigm”,
Class. Quant. Grav. **22** (2005) 3349 doi:10.1088/0264-9381/22/16/014 [gr-qc/0504029].
 - [69] R. Carballo-Rubio, F. Di Filippo, S. Liberati, C. Pacilio and M. Visser,
“On the viability of regular black holes”, JHEP **1807** (2018) 023
doi:10.1007/JHEP07(2018)023 [arXiv:1805.02675 [gr-qc]].
 - [70] C. Barceló, S. Liberati, S. Sonego and M. Visser, “Black Stars, Not Holes”,
Sci. Am. **301** (2009) no.4, 38. doi:10.1038/scientificamerican1009-38
 - [71] A. Alonso-Serrano and M. Visser, “Entropy/information flux in Hawking radiation”,
Phys. Lett. B **776** (2018) 10 doi:10.1016/j.physletb.2017.11.020
[arXiv:1512.01890 [gr-qc]].
 - [72] T. De Lorenzo, C. Pacilio, C. Rovelli and S. Speziale,
“On the effective metric of a Planck star”, Gen. Rel. Grav. **47:4** (2015) 41
doi:10.1007/s10714-015-1882-8 [arXiv:1412.6015 [gr-qc]].
-