

Strong gravitational lensing by a strongly naked null singularity

Suvankar Paul *

Department of Physics, Indian Institute of Technology, Kanpur 208016, India

Abstract

We study strong gravitational lensing in a static, spherically symmetric, naked singularity spacetime, without a photon sphere. The nature of the singularity is found to be lightlike. We discuss the characteristic lensing features of this naked singularity in the strong deflection limit. In spite of the absence of a photon sphere in this spacetime, the bending angle of light diverges, as it approaches the singularity. However, unlike black holes, it is found that the nature of this divergence is nonlogarithmic, and we derive an analytic formula for the same. Moreover, the relativistic rings produced due to strong lensing by the singularity are found to be well separated from each other, making them easy to resolve and possibly detect. These features are expected to be important in the study of strong lensing by ultracompact objects, especially ones without event horizons.

1 Introduction

General relativity (GR) is one of the most successful theories of gravity to date. It has so far passed many experimental tests, of which the deflection of light in a gravitational field is one of the most significant. In fact, this was the very first experimental test that was used to validate GR more than a century ago, in 1919 [1]. Most of these tests deal with gravity in the weak field limit — for example, gravity around the Sun or planets in our Solar System. With the advent of modern technology, it now looks possible to probe deeper — i.e., into the strong gravity regime. Indeed, the Event Horizon Telescope, and the recent imaging of the center of the M87 galaxy ([2]–[7]), along with the recent detection of gravitational waves by the LIGO-VIRGO Collaboration (see, for example, Refs. [8, 9]), has started a new era in observational astronomy to probe GR in regions of strong gravity.

Ubiquitous in such studies of strong gravity are black holes — singularities covered by an event horizon. It is commonly believed that the centers of galaxies are inhabited by supermassive black holes. This has led to a flurry of activities in the recent past which concern gravitational lensing in black hole backgrounds. Close to a black hole horizon, gravity might become strong, and it is imperative that here one goes beyond the weak field limit to understand lensing from these objects. In recent years such studies have been extended to objects that do not have an event horizon. One such spacetime that has received a lot of attention of late is that of a naked singularity. Although the cosmic censorship conjecture prohibits the formation of naked singularities [10], a plethora of recent studies in the literature have shown that it

*svnkr@iitk.ac.in

is possible to form such singularities as the end product of the gravitational collapse of massive objects under suitable initial conditions ([11]-[17]). Therefore, the study of naked singularities, or more generally, horizonless compact objects, is of interest. In this regard, a natural question that arises is how to distinguish such objects from black holes. Once again, gravitational lensing in the strong deflection limit acts as a significant tool to observationally distinguish between black holes and naked singularities, or horizonless objects. The pioneering work on gravitational lensing from naked singularities by Virbhadra and Ellis [18] appeared almost two decades ago. Ever since, different aspects of gravitational lensing by various horizonless objects, such as naked singularities ([19]-[25]), wormholes ([26]-[49]), Bosonic stars [50], gravastars [51], superspinars [52] (objects described by the Kerr metric having a rotation parameter, $a > M$ [53]), etc., have been studied and analyzed in detail. Recently, there have also been many other studies on the observational aspects of ultracompact objects ([54]-[57]) in the context of strong lensing. It has been observed from these studies that, while such objects may sometimes produce strong lensing features mimicking those of black holes, they might also differ dramatically from black holes, thus opening a possibility for their observational detection.

In this paper, we extend such analysis and consider a naked singularity recently proposed by Joshi *et al.* in Ref. [58], and we study its lensing features in the strong deflection limit. A curvature singularity (with or without an event horizon) can, in general, be classified into three categories — namely spacelike, timelike, and lightlike or null. For example, the Schwarzschild singularity is spacelike, the Reissner-Nordstrom (RN) singularity (for both the black hole and naked singularity cases) is timelike, and for references on null singularity, one may refer to Refs. [59, 60]. Null singularities are generally formed at late times inside the RN or Kerr black holes. The inner Cauchy horizons (which are inside the outer event horizons) in these black holes usually break up into two kinds of null singularities as the black holes become old [59, 60]. The interesting feature of the singularity that we consider in this paper is that it is found to be both null and naked. Moreover, as is well known, we can further classify a naked singularity based on whether it is cloaked by a photon sphere or not [18]. If a naked singularity is within a photon sphere, it is called a weakly naked singularity (WNS); otherwise, it is termed as a strongly naked singularity (SNS). They have their own characteristic strong lensing features, different from each other. A WNS generally produces strong lensing features similar to those of black holes — i.e., the bending angle diverges at some critical limit in both cases. A WNS can thus in principle act as a black hole mimicker. By contrast, an SNS that does not have any photon sphere is expected to show crucial differences from a WNS or a black hole. The naked singularity spacetime that we consider in this paper also does not contain a photon sphere [58], so it falls in the SNS category. Remarkably, what we will show below is that the bending angle still diverges at a specific critical limit, just like a WNS or a black hole. Further, it is well known that for strong lensing due to photon spheres (i.e., in black holes or WNSs), the characteristic divergence of the bending angle is logarithmic. Here, on the other hand, we show that this divergence is nonlogarithmic, and we derive an analytic formula for the same. These are novel results on strong lensing from a naked null singularity, which will be established in the rest of the paper.

This paper is organized as follows: in Sec. 2, we recall some features of the spacetime that we study. Then we briefly discuss the properties of null geodesics in this spacetime in Sec. 3. Section 4 deals with the bending of light in the strong deflection limit by the naked singularity, which is followed by a study of different observables in this scenario in Sec. 5. We then conclude with a summary and future directions

in Sec. 6. Throughout this work, we have used $c = G = 1$ units, unless otherwise specified.

2 Properties of the Naked Singularity Spacetime

We start with a static, spherically symmetric spacetime, recently proposed by Joshi *et al.* in Ref. [58], with the following line element expressed in (t, r, θ, ϕ) coordinates as

$$ds^2 = -\frac{dt^2}{\left(1 + \frac{M}{r}\right)^2} + \left(1 + \frac{M}{r}\right)^2 dr^2 + r^2 d\theta^2 + r^2 \sin^2 \theta d\phi^2, \quad (1)$$

where M is the ADM mass of the spacetime. The metric components g_{tt} and g_{rr} can be expanded in powers of $\frac{M}{r}$ as

$$\begin{aligned} g_{tt} &= -\left(1 + \frac{M}{r}\right)^{-2} = -\left[1 - \frac{2M}{r} + 3\left(\frac{M}{r}\right)^2 - \dots\right], \\ g_{rr} &= \left(1 + \frac{M}{r}\right)^2 = \frac{1}{\left(1 + \frac{M}{r}\right)^{-2}} = \frac{1}{\left[1 - \frac{2M}{r} + 3\left(\frac{M}{r}\right)^2 - \dots\right]}. \end{aligned} \quad (2)$$

Therefore, in the large- r limit, it resembles the Schwarzschild spacetime, and in the asymptotically infinite ($r \rightarrow \infty$) limit, it reduces to the flat Minkowski spacetime. Expressions of the Ricci and Kretschmann scalars of this spacetime appear in Ref. [58], and it can be shown that both diverge at $r = 0$, which corresponds to a curvature singularity of this spacetime at $r = 0$. Moreover, the g_{rr} term in Eq. (1) is always finite and positive for the whole range of $r > 0$. Therefore, the spacetime does not contain any event or absolute horizons, and hence the spacetime represented by the metric in Eq. (1) contains a globally naked singularity at $r = 0$. It is shown in Ref. [58] that the spacetime is seeded by an anisotropic fluid, which satisfies all the required energy conditions. It is also shown that the equation-of-state parameter of the anisotropic fluid tends to the value $-1/3$ as $r \rightarrow 0$, and it becomes $1/3$ in the limit as r tends to infinity.

It is important to study the causal structure of the spacetime. These are best represented by the corresponding maximally extended spacetime diagrams, or the Carter-Penrose (CP) diagrams. Figure 1 shows the CP diagram of the spacetime of Eq. (1). The diagram consists of two distinct regions, denoted by I and II. They are identical copies of each other, but causally disconnected. The different kinds of infinities are denoted by the following standard notations: $\mathcal{I}^\pm$ denote the future and past null infinities, respectively; $i^\pm$ denote the future and past timelike infinities, respectively; and i^0 denotes the spacelike infinity. The hypersurface $r = 0$ representing the singularity is denoted by the zigzagged line, corresponding to lightlike geodesics. As a result, the singularity at $r = 0$ will be lightlike or null in nature. Therefore, in addition to being globally naked, the singularity is also lightlike, which is an interesting and novel feature of this spacetime.




Figure 1: Carter-Penrose diagram of the spacetime represented by the metric in Eq. (1). There are two different regions in the diagram, denoted by I and II. They are completely identical, but causally disconnected. The corresponding past null infinity ($\mathcal{I}^-$), future null infinity ($\mathcal{I}^+$), past timelike infinity (i^-), future timelike infinity (i^+), and spacelike infinity (i^0) are shown. The surface $r = 0$ which represents the singularity is shown by the zigzagged line.

3 Characteristics of null geodesics

Let us now consider the nature of null geodesics in this spacetime. Since the spacetime is spherically symmetric, we can choose $\theta = \pi/2$ without any loss of generality. Moreover, it being a static, spherically symmetric spacetime, it admits two constants of motion—namely, the energy E and the z component of angular momentum L . The corresponding t and ϕ geodesic equations for photon motion are given by

$$\dot{t} = \left(1 + \frac{M}{r}\right)^2 E, \quad \text{and} \quad \dot{\phi} = \frac{L}{r^2}, \quad (3)$$

where the overdot represents a derivative with respect to the affine parameter along a null geodesic. From the normalization of the four-velocity of photons ($u^\mu u_\mu = 0$), we have

$$\dot{r}^2 + \frac{L^2}{r^2 \left(1 + \frac{M}{r}\right)^2} = E^2 \quad \text{or,} \quad \dot{r}^2 + V_{\text{eff}}(r) = E^2, \quad (4)$$

where $V_{\text{eff}}(r) = \frac{L^2}{(r+M)^2}$ is the effective potential for photon motion. At the turning point (r_{tp}), we have $\dot{r} = 0$, which yields from Eq. (4)

$$V_{\text{eff}}(r_{\text{tp}}) = \frac{L^2}{(r_{\text{tp}} + M)^2} = E^2 \quad \text{or,} \quad \frac{L}{E} = b(r_{\text{tp}}) = \sqrt{(r_{\text{tp}} + M)^2} = (r_{\text{tp}} + M), \quad (5)$$

where $b = L/E$ represents the impact parameter of a light ray, which is a constant of motion for that ray. In Fig. 2, we have plotted the effective potential and the corresponding light trajectories of the spacetime of Eq. (1). It is interesting to note from Fig. 2(a) that $V_{\text{eff}}(r)$ is finite everywhere and does not contain any extremum within the whole range of $r \in [0, \infty)$. The value of V_{eff} at the location of the singularity—i.e., at $r = 0$ —is given by $V_{\text{eff}}|_{r=0} = \frac{L^2}{M^2}$. Remember that the maximum of $V_{\text{eff}}(r)$ corresponds to the




Figure 2: (a) Plots of effective potential V_{eff} (in units of L^2) as functions of r (in units of M). (b) The associated trajectories of light. In these plots, we have shown two sets of rays. The blue ray has an impact parameter $b > b_{\text{cr}}$ ($b = 1.6M$ to be precise), and the magenta ray corresponds to a ray having an impact parameter $b < b_{\text{cr}} = M$. The boundary of the shadow region is shown by the black circle in (b). We have also shown the shadow boundary of the Schwarzschild spacetime with a red circle in (b) to illustrate the relative sizes of the shadows in these two spacetimes. These plots are in agreement with the corresponding plots (Figs. 1(e) and 1(f)) obtained in Ref. [58].

position of what is known as a photon sphere (in spherically symmetric spacetimes), which represents a spherical surface consisting of unstable light rings. The most significant feature of such a photon sphere is that light coming from a distant source either crosses the surface of the photon sphere and spirals into it without ever coming out of the surface, or goes very close to it, takes a number of turns around it, and finally moves out towards infinity. As a result, the sky of a distant observer gets divided into two distinct regions: a completely dark region devoid of light (known as the shadow region), and a bright region surrounding the shadow. Therefore, the photon sphere, in this case, plays the most significant role in producing the shadow region.

Since $V_{\text{eff}}(r)$ of the naked singularity spacetime does not have any extremum, as can be seen from Fig. 2(a), it does not possess any photon sphere, and naively we do not expect it to produce a shadow. Interestingly however, as shown in Ref. [58], this spacetime indeed produces a shadow. From Eq. (5), the value of the impact parameter b , for which a light ray has a turning point just at the singularity, can be obtained as $b|_{r_{\text{tp}}=0} = M$. This corresponds to the critical ray forming the boundary of the shadow. In Fig. 2(b), we have shown two sets of light rays — one representing a ray having impact parameter $b = 1.6M > b_{\text{cr}}$ (blue ray), and the other one having impact parameter $b < b_{\text{cr}} = M$ (magenta ray). We can see that any ray of light having an impact parameter $b > M$ will take a turn at some finite $r_{\text{tp}} > 0$. On the contrary, for light rays with impact parameters $b < M$, their geodesics will be incomplete and will be terminated at the singularity. Therefore, all such rays coming from a distant source are captured by the singularity, producing the shadow. It is worth noting here that, in the case of the Schwarzschild spacetime having the same ADM mass M , the corresponding critical impact parameter producing a shadow is given by $b_{\text{cr}}^{\text{Sch}} = 3\sqrt{3}M$. Hence, the size of the shadow of the naked singularity spacetime of Eq. (1) is smaller than that of the Schwarzschild shadow. This feature has also been reported in Ref. [58] in the case

of a spherical accretion by the Schwarzschild black hole and the naked singularity under consideration. We also have shown the boundaries of the shadow regions for both naked singularity (black circle) and Schwarzschild (red circle) spacetimes in Fig. 2(b) for illustrative purposes.

4 Bending of light in the strong field limit

An important property of a spacetime having a photon sphere is that as light rays come very close to the photon sphere, they take a number of turns before reaching the observer. As a result, the bending angle of light becomes large and diverges at the location of the photon sphere. Since, in the present naked singularity spacetime, the shadow is produced without a photon sphere, it will be interesting to study how the light bending angle behaves in such a scenario. For this purpose, let us rearrange Eq. (4) to the form

$$\dot{r} = \pm \sqrt{E^2 - \frac{L^2}{r^2 \left(1 + \frac{M}{r}\right)^2}} = \pm \sqrt{E^2 - \frac{L^2}{(r+M)^2}}. \quad (6)$$

Combining the above equation and the second expression of Eq. (3), we obtain

$$\frac{d\phi}{dr} = \frac{\dot{\phi}}{\dot{r}} = \pm \frac{L}{r^2 \sqrt{E^2 - \frac{L^2}{(r+M)^2}}} = \pm \frac{b}{r^2 \sqrt{1 - \frac{b^2}{(r+M)^2}}}. \quad (7)$$

Again, from Eq. (5), we know $b(r_{\text{tp}}) = (r_{\text{tp}} + M)$. Therefore, Eq. (7) can be rewritten as

$$\frac{d\phi}{dr} = \pm \frac{(r_{\text{tp}} + M)}{r^2 \sqrt{1 - \frac{(r_{\text{tp}} + M)^2}{(r+M)^2}}} = \pm \frac{(r_{\text{tp}} + M)(r + M)}{r^2 \sqrt{r^2 + 2(r - r_{\text{tp}})M - r_{\text{tp}}^2}}, \quad (8)$$

whose integration gives

$$\phi(r) = \phi_{\infty} \pm \int_r^{\infty} \frac{(r_{\text{tp}} + M)(r + M)}{r^2 \sqrt{r^2 + 2(r - r_{\text{tp}})M - r_{\text{tp}}^2}} dr \quad (9)$$

where ϕ_{∞} is the initial azimuthal angle made by the light ray when it originates from the source asymptotically. Therefore, the true angle of deflection of light due to the gravitational field produced by the naked singularity is given by

$$\alpha(r_{\text{tp}}) = 2 |\phi(r_{\text{tp}}) - \phi_{\infty}| - \pi, \quad \text{i.e.,} \quad \alpha(r_{\text{tp}}) = 2 \int_{r_{\text{tp}}}^{\infty} \frac{(r_{\text{tp}} + M)(r + M)}{r^2 \sqrt{r^2 + 2(r - r_{\text{tp}})M - r_{\text{tp}}^2}} dr - \pi. \quad (10)$$

The integration in Eq. (10) is elementary, and we obtain the analytic expression of $\alpha(r_{\text{tp}})$ as

$$\alpha(r_{\text{tp}}) = \frac{2M(r_{\text{tp}} + M)}{r_{\text{tp}}(r_{\text{tp}} + 2M)} + \frac{4(r_{\text{tp}} + M)^3}{r_{\text{tp}}^{3/2}(r_{\text{tp}} + 2M)^{3/2}} \arctan \left(\sqrt{1 + \frac{2M}{r_{\text{tp}}}} \right) - \pi. \quad (11)$$

Equivalently, the bending angle can also be obtained in terms of the impact parameter b , and it is given by

$$\alpha(b) = \frac{2Mb}{(b^2 - M^2)} + \frac{4b^3}{(b^2 - M^2)^{3/2}} \arctan \left(\sqrt{\frac{b+M}{b-M}} \right) - \pi. \quad (12)$$

As we can see from Eqs. (11) and (12), the bending angle diverges in the limit of the critical impact parameter — i.e., $b \rightarrow b_{\text{cr}} = M$ or equivalently, in the limit $r_{\text{tp}} \rightarrow 0$. To find out the nature of the divergence of α in these limiting cases, we first need to use the expansion of $\arctan(x)$ for the $x \geq 1$ case, given as $\arctan(x) = \frac{\pi}{2} - \frac{1}{x} + \frac{1}{3x^3} - \frac{1}{5x^5} + \dots$, for $x \geq 1$. Therefore, the expressions of $\alpha(r_{\text{tp}})$ and $\alpha(b)$ can be expanded, respectively, as

$$\begin{aligned} \alpha(r_{\text{tp}}) &= \left[\frac{2\pi(r_{\text{tp}} + M)^3}{r_{\text{tp}}^{3/2}(r_{\text{tp}} + 2M)^{3/2}} - \frac{2(r_{\text{tp}} + M)(2r_{\text{tp}} + 3M)}{(r_{\text{tp}} + 2M)^2} + \frac{4(r_{\text{tp}} + M)^3}{3(r_{\text{tp}} + 2M)^3} - \frac{4r_{\text{tp}}(r_{\text{tp}} + M)^3}{5(r_{\text{tp}} + 2M)^4} + \dots \right] - \pi, \\ \alpha(b) &= \left[\frac{2\pi(b/M)^3}{\left(\frac{b^2}{M^2} - 1\right)^{3/2}} - \frac{2(b/M)\left(\frac{2b}{M} + 1\right)}{\left(\frac{b}{M} + 1\right)^2} + \frac{4(b/M)^3}{3\left(\frac{b}{M} + 1\right)^3} - \frac{4(b/M)^3\left(\frac{b^2}{M^2} - 1\right)}{5\left(\frac{b}{M} + 1\right)^5} + \dots \right] - \pi. \end{aligned} \quad (13)$$

Hence, the divergences of $\alpha(r_{\text{tp}})$ in the limit $r_{\text{tp}} \rightarrow 0$, and $\alpha(b)$ in the limit $b \rightarrow b_{\text{cr}} = M$, respectively, take the form

$$\lim_{r_{\text{tp}} \rightarrow 0} \alpha(r_{\text{tp}}) = \frac{\pi}{\sqrt{2}} \left(\frac{M}{r_{\text{tp}}} \right)^{3/2} - \frac{4}{3} - \pi + \mathcal{O}[r_{\text{tp}}], \quad (14)$$

$$\lim_{b \rightarrow b_{\text{cr}}} \alpha(b) = \frac{(\pi/\sqrt{2})}{\left(\frac{b}{b_{\text{cr}}} - 1\right)^{3/2}} - \frac{4}{3} - \pi + \mathcal{O}\left[\left(\frac{b}{b_{\text{cr}}} - 1\right)\right]. \quad (15)$$

From Eqs. (14) and (15), we observe that the nature of the divergence of α in the limits $b \rightarrow b_{\text{cr}} = M$ or $r_{\text{tp}} \rightarrow 0$ is nonlogarithmic and is of polynomial type, which is a characteristic feature of this naked singularity. For completeness, let us recapitulate the different kinds of divergences of the bending angle in different situations.

Case 1: If a spacetime contains only a photon sphere (r_{ph}), which corresponds to the critical impact parameter $b = b_{\text{ph}}$, the bending angle diverges in the limit $r \rightarrow r_{\text{ph}}$ or $b \rightarrow b_{\text{ph}}$ as the light ray approaches the photon sphere from the $b > b_{\text{ph}}$ side. The corresponding divergence is logarithmic which was first shown by Bozza in Ref. [61], and later refined by Tsukamoto in Ref. [62]. If we write the metric of a general static, spherically symmetric spacetime as

$$ds^2 = -A(r)dt^2 + B(r)dr^2 + C(r)(d\theta^2 + \sin^2\theta d\phi^2), \quad (16)$$

then the corresponding formula for the bending angle in the limit $b \rightarrow b_{\text{ph}}$ will be given by [62]

$$\alpha(b) = -\bar{a} \log \left(\frac{b}{b_{\text{ph}}} - 1 \right) + \bar{b} + \mathcal{O}[(b - b_{\text{ph}}) \log(b - b_{\text{ph}})], \quad (17)$$

where the expressions of $\bar{a}$ and $\bar{b}$ are

$$\bar{a} = \sqrt{\frac{2AB}{C''A - CA''}} \Big|_{r_{\text{ph}}}, \quad \bar{b} = \bar{a} \log \left[r^2 \left(\frac{C''}{C} - \frac{A''}{A} \right) \right] \Big|_{r_{\text{ph}}} + I_R(r_{\text{ph}}) - \pi, \quad (18)$$

with a prime denoting a derivative with respect to r , and $I_R(r_{\text{ph}})$ is a constant that can be found in Ref. [62].

Case 2: If a spacetime contains both a photon (r_{ph}) and an antiphoton (r_{aph}) sphere,¹ the bending angle diverges in the limit $r \rightarrow r_{\text{ph}}$ or $b \rightarrow b_{\text{ph}}$ from both the $b > b_{\text{ph}}$ and the $b < b_{\text{ph}}$ sides. The nature of divergence due to the photon sphere — i.e., from the $b > b_{\text{ph}}$ side — is the same as described in Case 1. On the contrary, though the divergence due to the antiphoton sphere — i.e., from the $b < b_{\text{ph}}$ side — is also logarithmic in nature, its functional dependence is different from Case 1. The scenario has been discussed in detail in Ref. [54], and the corresponding formula of divergence from the $b < b_{\text{ph}}$ side is obtained as [54]

$$\alpha(b) = -\bar{a} \log \left(\frac{b_{\text{ph}}^2}{b^2} - 1 \right) + \bar{b} + \mathcal{O}[(b_{\text{ph}}^2 - b^2) \log(b_{\text{ph}}^2 - b^2)], \quad (19)$$

where the expressions of $\bar{a}$ and $\bar{b}$, in this case, are

$$\bar{a} = 2 \sqrt{\frac{2AB}{C''A - CA''}} \Big|_{r_{\text{ph}}}, \quad \bar{b} = \bar{a} \log \left[2r^2 \left(\frac{C''}{C} - \frac{A''}{A} \right) \left(\frac{r}{r_c} - 1 \right) \right] \Big|_{r_{\text{ph}}} + I_R(r_c) - \pi, \quad (20)$$

and r_c ($< r_{\text{ph}}$) is the radius for which $V_{\text{eff}}(r_c) = V_{\text{eff}}(r_{\text{ph}})$ [54]. Therefore, it is evident that the logarithmic divergences due to a photon sphere (Case 1) and an antiphoton sphere (Case 2) are quite different, which results in some important observational consequences as described in detail in Ref. [54].

Case 3: There exists a critical situation in between the previous two cases— namely, when the photon and antiphoton spheres merge together to form a point of inflection in the effective potential. Let us denote this point of inflection as r_0 ($= r_{\text{ph}} = r_{\text{aph}}$), and the corresponding impact parameter as b_0 ($= b_{\text{ph}}$). This scenario has been recently addressed by Tsukamoto in Ref. [63] for the Damour-Solodukhin wormhole. The importance of this analysis is that the corresponding divergence of the bending angle turns out to be nonlogarithmic, given by the following expression [63]:

$$\alpha(b) = \frac{\bar{a}}{\left(\frac{b}{b_0} - 1 \right)^{1/4}} + \bar{b} + \mathcal{O} \left[\left(\frac{b}{b_0} - 1 \right)^{3/4} \right], \quad (21)$$

where $\bar{a}$ and $\bar{b}$ are given by

$$\bar{a} = 2^{7/4} 3^{-1/4} = 2.5558, \quad \bar{b} = -\frac{4}{3} + I_R(r_0) - \pi = -2.1078. \quad (22)$$

¹By an antiphoton sphere, we refer to the minimum of the effective potential, just like a photon sphere corresponds to the maximum of the effective potential.

In the present analysis, we have seen from Eq. (14) or Eq. (15) that the spacetime of Eq. (1) also admits nonlogarithmic divergence, as in Case 3. Importantly, the nature of divergence is different from that of Case 3. In this case, the corresponding bending angle [from Eq. (15)] turns out to be

$$\alpha(b) = \frac{\bar{a}}{\left(\frac{b}{b_{\text{cr}}} - 1\right)^{3/2}} + \bar{b} + \mathcal{O}\left[\left(\frac{b}{b_{\text{cr}}} - 1\right)\right], \quad (23)$$

where $\bar{a} = \frac{\pi}{\sqrt{2}} = 2.2214$ and $\bar{b} = -\frac{4}{3} - \pi = -4.4749$, with $b_{\text{cr}} = M$.

For a spacetime having a photon sphere, a light ray with an impact parameter exactly equal to its critical value will arrive at the surface of the sphere tangentially, and in principle, remain there. Naturally, such a ray will have an infinite bending angle. For rays having impact parameters just above the critical value, their turning points will be close to the photon sphere, and they will make a large number of rotations before escaping to the observer. In other words, as the value of the impact parameter approaches its critical value from a larger one, the corresponding turning points of the rays will be closer to the photon sphere, and the closer the turning points are towards the photon sphere, the more the bending angle will be. Therefore, the divergence of the bending angle at the photon sphere occurs naturally. On the other hand, the notion of such a divergence of the bending angle without a photon sphere is interesting and deserves a careful analysis.




Figure 3: (a) Bending angle α as a function of the impact parameter b (in units of M). (b) A representative trajectory of light having impact parameter just greater than its critical value.

In Fig. 3(a), we have plotted the bending angle (α) as a function of the impact parameter (b), and in Fig. 3(b), the trajectory of a typical ray of light having an impact parameter just greater than the critical value for the present spacetime has been shown. We can see from Fig. 3(a) that $\alpha(b)$ diverges as $b \rightarrow b_{\text{cr}} = M$. Figure 3(b) is particularly important for us to understand the reason of this divergence. Since the singularity is lightlike, light rays originating from a distant source can come very close to it—or in fact, in the critical case, they can even skim along the singularity without being truly captured by it. So, even the critical ray, after reaching the singularity and taking a turn there, can in principle reach the observer. In doing so, such rays take many turns (infinite in the critical case) around the singularity before reaching the observer to produce a large deflection. Only the rays having impact parameters less

than the critical value are captured by the singularity, and the corresponding geodesics terminate without reaching the observer. Therefore, the nature of this naked singularity itself causes the bending angle to diverge.

5 Observables in Strong lensing

In this section, we consider various observables of gravitational lensing, in the strong deflection limit. The lens diagram is shown in Fig. 4. A ray of light is emitted by the source S and received by the observer




Figure 4: Lens diagram. Light is emitted by the source (S), passes through the gravitational field of the lensing object (L), and then is received by the observer (O). Both the source and the observer are situated at the asymptotically flat region. OLP is the optic axis, D_{OS} , D_{LS} , and D_{OL} represent the observer-source, lens-source, and observer-lens distances, respectively. The angular positions of the source (S) and the image (I) with respect to the optic axis are denoted by the angles δ and θ , respectively. The impact parameter and the bending angle are represented by b and α , respectively.

O, encountering the gravitational field produced by the lensing object L and then producing the image I. Both the source and the observer are situated at an asymptotically flat region, so that the bending is due to the lens alone. The corresponding lens equation can be expressed as [64]

$$\tan \delta = \tan \theta - \frac{D_{LS}}{D_{OS}} [\tan \theta + \tan(\alpha - \theta)], \quad (24)$$

where δ and θ are the angular positions of the source and the image, respectively, with respect to the optic axis, as shown in Fig. 4. D_{OS} and D_{LS} represent the observer-source distance and the lens-source distance, respectively, and α is the total bending angle. The impact parameter b can be written in terms of θ as

$$b = D_{OL} \sin \theta = \kappa \sin \theta \quad [\text{where } \kappa = D_{OL}], \quad (25)$$

with D_{OL} being the observer-lens distance. The radial (μ_r), tangential (μ_t), and total (μ) magnifications of the image are expressed as

$$\mu_r = \left(\frac{\partial \delta}{\partial \theta} \right)^{-1}, \quad \mu_t = \left(\frac{\sin \delta}{\sin \theta} \right)^{-1}, \quad \text{and} \quad \mu = \mu_t \cdot \mu_r = \left(\frac{\sin \delta}{\sin \theta} \frac{\partial \delta}{\partial \theta} \right)^{-1}. \quad (26)$$

We shall use the three relations of Eq. (26) for the rest of our calculations. Since we have an analytic formula for the bending angle, we can find out the expressions of the quantities in analytic forms. Using

Eqs. (12) and (25), we get

$$\alpha(\theta) = \frac{2M\kappa \sin \theta}{(\kappa^2 \sin^2 \theta - M^2)} + \frac{4\kappa^3 \sin^3 \theta}{(\kappa^2 \sin^2 \theta - M^2)^{3/2}} \arctan \left(\sqrt{\frac{\kappa \sin \theta + M}{\kappa \sin \theta - M}} \right) - \pi. \quad (27)$$

Using this $\alpha(\theta)$ in Eq. (24), we obtain the source position (δ) as a function of the image position (θ), and from $\delta(\theta)$, it is straightforward to evaluate the expressions of the magnifications as functions of θ . Note from Eq. (26) that, when $\delta = 0$ — i.e., when the source, lens and observer are perfectly aligned along the optic axis — μ_t diverges. In this scenario, the images form perfect concentric rings in the observer's sky, which are known as Einstein rings (when the bending of light is less than 2π), or relativistic Einstein rings (when light bends by more than 2π). Moreover, the singularities in magnification in the image plane are known as critical curves, and the corresponding locations in the source plane are called caustics, which produce the critical curves. The singularities in μ_r correspond to radial critical curves (RCCs) in the image plane and radial caustics (RCs) in the source plane, and similarly, the singularities in μ_t represent tangential critical curves (TCCs) in the image plane and tangential caustics (TCs) in the source plane. Clearly, therefore, the rings represent the TCCs, and correspondingly, $\delta = 0$ gives the TC.

Now, to obtain the angular positions of the rings, we set $\delta = 0$ in Eq. (24) and find

$$\tan[\alpha(\theta) - \theta] = \frac{D_{\text{OS}}}{D_{\text{LS}}} \left(1 - \frac{D_{\text{LS}}}{D_{\text{OS}}} \right) \tan \theta. \quad (28)$$

In our calculation, we have considered $D_{\text{OL}} = D_{\text{LS}} = \frac{1}{2}D_{\text{OS}}$. Therefore, the above equation yields

$$\tan[\alpha(\theta) - \theta] = \tan \theta, \quad \implies \quad \alpha(\theta) = m\pi + 2\theta \quad [m = 1, 2, 3, \dots]. \quad (29)$$

Since only the rays which take one or more complete rotations around the lens during its travel from the source to the observer can reach the observer, only even values of m will contribute to the ring formation in the observer's sky. Thus, the position of the n th ring (θ_n) can be conveniently determined from the points of intersections of the curves, $y_1(\theta_n) = \alpha(\theta_n)$ and $y_2(\theta_n) = 2n\pi + 2\theta_n$, with $n = 1, 2, \dots$. Even if we do not assume the condition $D_{\text{OL}} = D_{\text{LS}} = \frac{1}{2}D_{\text{OS}}$, we can still find out θ_n by similarly evaluating the points of intersections of the two curves, $y_1(\theta_n) = \tan[\alpha(\theta_n) - \theta_n]$ and $y_2(\theta_n) = \frac{D_{\text{OS}}}{D_{\text{LS}}} \left(1 - \frac{D_{\text{LS}}}{D_{\text{OS}}} \right) \tan \theta_n$, with $n = 1, 2, \dots$. Note that $n = 1$ represents the outermost ring, and as we increase n , the angular positions of the relativistic rings decrease, and the corresponding bending angle increases. The $n = \infty$ case represents the innermost critical ring which forms the edge of the shadow region, and its angular position is denoted by θ_∞ . This ring is produced by the critical ray having the impact parameter $b = b_{\text{cr}} = M$. In Fig. 5, we have plotted μ_r and μ_t of the images as functions of the image positions (θ). In the plots, the following parameter values are used :

$$M = 4.31 \times 10^6 M_\odot, \quad D_{\text{OL}} = D_{\text{LS}} = 7.86 \text{ kpc}, \quad \text{and} \quad D_{\text{OL}} = \frac{1}{2}D_{\text{OS}}.$$

The above mass and distance correspond to the supermassive central object (considered as a black hole, Sgr A*) of our Galaxy. Moreover, the unit of θ is expressed in arcseconds in the radial magnification plot, and in micro-arcseconds in the tangential magnification plot. We can see from Fig. 5(a) that the




Figure 5: Radial (μ_r) and tangential (μ_t) magnifications as functions of the image angular position (θ). Here, (a) represents the variation of μ_r , and (b) corresponds to the plot of μ_t . In this case, the point of divergence of μ_t denotes the angular position of the first (outermost) relativistic Einstein ring. Here, θ is expressed in arcseconds in the left figure (radial magnification), and in micro-arcseconds in the right figure (tangential magnification).

radial magnification never diverges, which signifies the absence of RCC or, correspondingly, RC in this spacetime. It can be shown that μ_r diverges only when $\frac{\partial \alpha(\theta)}{\partial \theta} > 0$, whereas, in the present scenario, $\frac{\partial \alpha(\theta)}{\partial \theta}$ is always negative, as $\alpha(\theta)$ continuously increases with decreasing θ . Therefore, the radial magnifications of the images always remain finite, ranging from 0 to 1. On the other hand, Fig. 5(b) shows that the tangential magnification μ_t (corresponding to $n = 1$) diverges at the angular position θ_1 , which marks the position of the outermost relativistic Einstein ring.

To perform a comparative analysis between the Schwarzschild black hole and the naked singularity, the angular positions of a few relativistic Einstein rings (bending angle $> 2\pi$) and the corresponding separations between two consecutive rings, defined as $s_n = \theta_n - \theta_{(n+1)}$, are tabulated in Table 1. To this end, it should be noted that, apart from these relativistic rings, there exists one more ring well outside this relativistic ring system, for which the bending angle is very small. This additional ring is known as the Einstein ring denoted as θ_E in Table 1. The angular positions (in arcseconds) of this ring for both the Schwarzschild black hole and the naked singularity are found to be almost equal. This signifies that, in the weak field limit, the naked singularity spacetime behaves like the Schwarzschild one, as stated earlier.

Things change dramatically in the strong deflection limit. As can be seen from Table 1, the rings in Schwarzschild spacetime are very close to each other and converge quickly. In fact, the angular separation between the first and the last ring ($\theta_1 - \theta_\infty$) is only 0.035497 micro-arcseconds. From the values of angular positions of the rings in Schwarzschild spacetime, we see that only the first ring can be resolved from the rest. On the other hand, in the naked singularity spacetime, the rings are well separated from each other, and many rings can be individually resolved from the ring system before they finally become convergent. To visualize this feature, we have plotted, in Fig. 6, the first five relativistic rings, as well as the last one, which forms the edge of the shadow, as seen by the observer.

Table 1: Angular positions of the Einstein ring (θ_E) and a few relativistic Einstein rings (θ_n) (bending angle $> 2\pi$) are shown for both the Schwarzschild black hole and the naked singularity spacetime. We have also shown the separation between two consecutive rings, $s_n = \theta_n - \theta_{n+1}$. Here, we have assumed the parameter values $M = 4.31 \times 10^6 M_\odot$, $D_{OL} = D_{LS} = 7.86$ kpc, and $D_{OL} = \frac{1}{2}D_{OS}$, which correspond to the supermassive central object (considered as a black hole, Sgr A*) of our Milky Way Galaxy. The angles are expressed in micro-arcseconds. Note that θ_E has a value of the order of arcseconds.

	Schwarzschild	Naked singularity of metric in Eq. (1)
θ_E	1.49745×10^6	1.49747×10^6
θ_1	28.280347	9.60106
θ_2	28.24494	7.75320
θ_3	28.24484	7.10409
θ_4	...	6.76498
θ_∞	28.24485	5.43573
s_1	0.035407	1.84786
s_2	0.00009	0.64911
s_3	...	0.33911
s_{50}	...	0.00290
$\theta_1 - \theta_\infty$	0.035497	4.16533




Figure 6: Relativistic Einstein rings as seen in the observer's sky. The outermost ring is shown in blue, and the innermost one, forming the edge of the shadow, is shown in black. The second, third, fourth and fifth rings are denoted in magenta, brown, green, and red, respectively.

From the figure also, we observe that the rings are well separated, and therefore, it acts as the most crucial and prominent distinguishing feature of this naked singularity. These features may prove to be critical for the detection of such naked singularities in futuristic experiments.

6 Summary

Currently, observational signatures of black holes and horizonless objects attract much attention. The Event Horizon Telescope has opened up the possibility of experimentally probing gravity in its strongest regime, near the event horizon of a black hole or close to a singularity. These might provide important clues towards understanding the nature of quantum gravity. A number of studies have appeared in the recent literature about how to make observational distinctions between objects with and without event horizons. A broad consensus in this regard is that sometimes the horizonless objects do possess distinguishing signatures from that of black holes, while in many cases, they are indistinguishable, and mimic black holes. In fact, it has recently been shown in Ref. [52] that a Kerr superspinner can produce a shadow having a size and shape similar to the first image of the center of the M87* galaxy captured by the EHT. In this scenario, it is important and interesting to glean further insight into the differences of strong gravitational lensing between black holes and horizonless objects.

In this paper, we have performed an extensive study of gravitational lensing in the strong deflection limit by a strongly naked null singularity proposed recently in Ref. [58]. We have shown that the naked singularity is lightlike, and then we have discussed its lensing properties. We have uncovered novel lensing phenomena that this spacetime might give rise to. First, we have shown that, in spite of being a strongly naked singularity, the bending angle of light diverges in a critical limit, which normally happens in a spacetime having a photon sphere. Moreover, we have found that the nature of this divergence is nonlogarithmic, contrary to black holes, and we have derived an analytic formula for the same. We have also analyzed various observables in this spacetime, and have found that the relativistic Einstein rings are well separated, and so, many of them can be easily resolved as compared to the Schwarzschild case. We believe that all these results are novel and add significantly to the existing literature.

An immediate extension of this work would be to find a rotating version of such a singularity, and to study its characteristic features as far as strong gravitational lensing is concerned. We leave this for a future work.

7 Acknowledgments

The author thanks T. Sarkar and R. Shaikh for a preliminary reading of the manuscript, and for providing useful suggestions.

References

- [1] F.W. Dyson, A. S. Eddington, and C. Davidson, *IX. A determination of the deflection of light by the suns gravitational field, from observations made at the total eclipse of May 29, 1919*, Philosophical Transactions of the Royal Society A 220, 291-333, 1920.

- [2] K. Akiyama et al (The Event Horizon Telescope Collaboration), *First M87 Event Horizon Telescope Results. I. The Shadow of the Supermassive Black Hole*, The Astrophysical Journal Letters, 875, No. 1, (2019) L1.
- [3] K. Akiyama et al (The Event Horizon Telescope Collaboration), *First M87 Event Horizon Telescope Results. II. Array and Instrumentation*, The Astrophysical Journal Letters, 875, No. 1, (2019) L2.
- [4] K. Akiyama et al (The Event Horizon Telescope Collaboration), *First M87 Event Horizon Telescope Results. III. Data Processing and Calibration*, The Astrophysical Journal Letters, 875, No. 1, (2019) L3.
- [5] K. Akiyama et al (The Event Horizon Telescope Collaboration), *First M87 Event Horizon Telescope Results. IV. Imaging the Central Supermassive Black Hole*, The Astrophysical Journal Letters, 875, No. 1, (2019) L4.
- [6] K. Akiyama et al (The Event Horizon Telescope Collaboration), *First M87 Event Horizon Telescope Results. V. Physical Origin of the Asymmetric Ring*, The Astrophysical Journal Letters, 875, No. 1, (2019) L5.
- [7] K. Akiyama et al (The Event Horizon Telescope Collaboration), *First M87 Event Horizon Telescope Results. VI. The Shadow and Mass of the Central Black Hole*, The Astrophysical Journal Letters, 875, No. 1, (2019) L6.
- [8] B. P. Abbott et al. (LIGO Scientific Collaboration and Virgo Collaboration), *GW151226: Observation of Gravitational Waves from a 22-Solar-Mass Binary Black Hole Coalescence*, Physical Review Letters 116, 241103, (2016).
- [9] B. P. Abbott et al. (LIGO Scientific Collaboration and Virgo Collaboration), *Observation of Gravitational Waves from a Binary Black Hole Merger*, Physical Review Letters 116, 061102, (2016).
- [10] R. Penrose, “*Golden Oldie*”: *Gravitational Collapse: The Role of General Relativity*, General Relativity and Gravitation 34, 1141 (2002).
- [11] P. S. Joshi and I. H. Dwivedi, *Naked singularities in spherically symmetric inhomogeneous Tolman-Bondi dust cloud collapse*, Physical Review D 47, 5357 (1993).
- [12] N. Banerjee and S. Chakrabarti, *Self-similar scalar field collapse*, Physical Review D 95, 024015 (2017).
- [13] K. Bhattacharya, D. Dey, A. Mazumdar, and T. Sarkar, *New class of naked singularities and their observational signatures*, Physical Review D 101, 043005 (2020).
- [14] S. L. Shapiro and S. A. Teukolsky, *Formation of naked singularities: The violation of cosmic censorship*, Physical Review Letters 66, 994 (1991).
- [15] R. Goswami and P. S. Joshi, *Spherical gravitational collapse in N dimensions*, Physical Review D 76, 084026 (2007).

- [16] P. S. Joshi, N. Dadhich, and R. Maartens, *Why do naked singularities form in gravitational collapse?*, Physical Review D 65, 101501(R) (2002).
- [17] T. Harada, H. Iguchi, and K. I. Nakao, *Naked singularity formation in the collapse of a spherical cloud of counterrotating particles*, Physical Review D 58, 041502(R) (1998).
- [18] K. S. Virbhadra and G. F. R. Ellis, *Gravitational lensing by naked singularities*, Physical Review D 65, 103004, 2002.
- [19] K. S. Virbhadra and C. R. Keeton, *Time delay and magnification centroid due to gravitational lensing by black holes and naked singularities*, Physical Review D 77, 124014 (2008).
- [20] G. N. Gyulchev and S. S. Yazadjiev, *Gravitational lensing by rotating naked singularities*, Physical Review D 78, 083004 (2008).
- [21] S. Sahu, M. Patil, D. Narasimha, and P. S. Joshi, *Can strong gravitational lensing distinguish naked singularities from black holes?*, Physical Review D 86, 063010 (2012).
- [22] D. Dey, K. Bhattacharya, and T. Sarkar, *Astrophysics of Bertrand space-times*, Physical Review D 88, 083532 (2013).
- [23] R. Shaikh, P. Kocherlakota, R. Narayan, and P. S. Joshi, *Shadows of spherically symmetric black holes and naked singularities*, Monthly Notices of the Royal Astronomical Society 482, 52 (2019).
- [24] P. Banerjee, S. Paul, and T. Sarkar, *On strong gravitational lensing in rotating Galactic space-times*, arXiv: 1804.07030 [gr-qc].
- [25] D. Dey, R. Shaikh, P. S. Joshi, *Perihelion Precession and Shadows near Black holes and Naked Singularities*, arXiv: 2003.06810 [gr-qc].
- [26] J. G. Cramer, R. L. Forward, M. S. Morris, M. Visser, G. Benford, and G. A. Landis, *Natural wormholes as gravitational lenses*, Physical Review D 51, 3117 (1995).
- [27] M. Safonova, D. F. Torres, and G. E. Romero, *Microlensing by natural wormholes: Theory and simulations*, Physical Review D 65, 023001 (2001).
- [28] K. K. Nandi, Y.-Z. Zhang, and A. V. Zakharov, *Gravitational lensing by wormholes*, Physical Review D 74, 024020 (2006).
- [29] F. Abe, *Gravitational microlensing by the Ellis wormhole*, The Astrophysical Journal 725, 787 (2010).
- [30] K. Nakajima and H. Asada, *Deflection angle of light in an Ellis wormhole geometry*, Physical Review D 85, 107501 (2012).
- [31] N. Tsukamoto, T. Harada, and K. Yajima, *Can we distinguish between black holes and wormholes by their Einstein-ring systems?*, Physical Review D 86, 104062 (2012).
- [32] C. Bambi, *Can the supermassive objects at the centers of galaxies be traversable wormholes? The first test of strong gravity for mm/sub-mm very long baseline interferometry facilities*, Physical Review D 87, 107501 (2013).

- [33] P. G. Nedkova, V. K. Tinchev, and S. S. Yazadjiev, *Shadow of a rotating traversable wormhole*, Physical Review D 88, 124019 (2013).
- [34] T. Ohgami and N. Sakai, *Wormhole shadows*, Physical Review D 91, 124020 (2015).
- [35] A. Abdujabbarov, B. Juraev, B. Ahmedov, and Z. Stuchlik, *Shadow of rotating wormhole in plasma environment*, Astrophysics and Space Science 361, 226 (2016).
- [36] N. Tsukamoto, *Strong deflection limit analysis and gravitational lensing of an Ellis wormhole*, Physical Review D 94, 124001 (2016).
- [37] N. Tsukamoto and T. Harada, *Light curves of light rays passing through a wormhole*, Physical Review D 95, 024030 (2017).
- [38] R. Shaikh and S. Kar, *Gravitational lensing by scalar-tensor wormholes and the energy conditions*, Physical Review D 96, 044037 (2017).
- [39] K. K. Nandi, R. N. Izmailov, A. A. Yanbekov, and A. A. Shayakhmetov, *Ring-down gravitational waves and lensing observables: How far can a wormhole mimic those of a black hole?*, Physical Review D 95, 104011 (2017).
- [40] K. Jusufi and A. Ovgun, *Gravitational lensing by rotating wormholes*, Physical Review D 97, 024042 (2018).
- [41] R. Shaikh, *Shadows of rotating wormholes*, Physical Review D 98, 024044 (2018).
- [42] A. Ovgun, *Light deflection by Damour-Solodukhin wormholes and Gauss-Bonnet theorem*, Physical Review D 98, 044033 (2018).
- [43] K. Jusufi, N. Sarkar, F. Rahaman, A. Banerjee, and S. Hansraj, *Deflection of light by black holes and massless wormholes in massive gravity*, The European Physical Journal C 78, 349 (2018).
- [44] K. K. Nandi, R. N. Izmailov, E. R. Zhdanov, and A. Bhattacharya, *Strong field lensing by Damour-Solodukhin wormhole*, Journal of Cosmology and Astroparticle Physics 07 (2018) 027.
- [45] G. Gyulchev, P. Nedkova, V. Tinchev, and S. Yazadjiev, *On the shadow of rotating traversable wormholes*, The European Physical Journal C 78, 544 (2018).
- [46] M. Amir, K. Jusufi, A. Banerjee, and S. Hansraj, *Shadow images of Kerr-like wormholes*, Classical and Quantum Gravity 36, 215007 (2019).
- [47] R. Shaikh, P. Banerjee, S. Paul, and T. Sarkar, *A novel gravitational lensing feature by wormholes*, Physics Letters B 789, 270 (2019).
- [48] R. Shaikh, P. Banerjee, S. Paul, T. Sarkar, *Strong gravitational lensing by wormholes*, Journal of Cosmology and Astroparticle Physics **07**, 028, 2019.
- [49] X. Wang, P. Li, C. Zhang, M. Guo, *A novel shadow from the thin-shell wormhole*, arXiv: 2007.03327 [gr-qc].

- [50] P. V. P. Cunha, J. A. Font, C. Herdeiro, E. Radu, N. Sanchis-Gual, and M. Zilhao, *Lensing and dynamics of ultracompact bosonic stars*, Physical Review D 96, 104040 (2017).
- [51] T. Kubo and N. Sakai, *Gravitational lensing by gravastars*, Physical Review D 93, 084051 (2016).
- [52] C. Bambi, K. Freese, S. Vagnozzi, and L. Visinelli, *Testing the rotational nature of the supermassive object M87* from the circularity and size of its first image*, Physical Review D 100, 044057 (2019).
- [53] E. G. Gimon, P. Horava, *Astrophysical violations of the Kerr bound as a possible signature of string theory*, Physics Letters B 672, 299 (2009).
- [54] R. Shaikh, P. Banerjee, S. Paul, and T. Sarkar, *Analytical approach to strong gravitational lensing from ultracompact objects*, Physical Review D 99, 104040, 2019.
- [55] P. V. P. Cunha, E. Berti, and C. A. R. Herdeiro, *Light-Ring Stability for Ultracompact Objects*, Physical Review Letters 119, 251102 (2017).
- [56] S. Hod, *On the number of light rings in curved space-times of ultracompact objects*, Physics Letters B 776, 1 (2018).
- [57] P. V. P. Cunha and C. A. R. Herdeiro, *Shadows and strong gravitational lensing: A brief review*, General Relativity and Gravitation 50, 42 (2018).
- [58] A. B. Joshi, D. Dey, P. S. Joshi and P. Bambhaniya, *Shadow of a naked singularity without photon sphere*, Physical Review D 102, 024022, (2020).
- [59] D. Marolf and A. Ori, *Outgoing gravitational shock wave at the inner horizon: The late-time limit of black hole interiors*, Physical Review D 86, 124026, (2012).
- [60] M. A. Scheel and K. S. Thorne, *Geometrodynamics: the nonlinear dynamics of curved space-time*, Physics-Uspekhi 57(4), 342, (2014).
- [61] V. Bozza, *Gravitational lensing in the strong field limit*, Physical Review D 66, 103001, 2002.
- [62] N. Tsukamoto, *Deflection angle in the strong deflection limit in a general asymptotically flat, static, spherically symmetric space-time*, Physical Review D 95, 064035, 2017.
- [63] N. Tsukamoto, *Nonlogarithmic divergence of a deflection angle by a marginally unstable photon sphere of the Damour-Solodukhin wormhole in a strong deflection limit*, Physical Review D 101, 104021, 2020.
- [64] K. S. Virbhadra and G. F. R. Ellis, *Schwarzschild black hole lensing*, Physical Review D 62, 084003, 2000.