We study the potential of gravitational wave astronomy to observe the quantum aspects of black holes. According to Bekenstein’s quantization, we find that black hole area discretization can have observable imprints on the gravitational wave signal from an inspiraling binary black hole. We study the impact of the quantization on tidal heating. We model the absorption lines and compute gravitational wave flux due to tidal heating in such a case. By including the quantization we find the dephasing of the gravitational wave, to our knowledge it has never been done before. We discuss the observability of the phenomena in different parameter ranges of the binary. We show that in inspiral it leads to vanishing tidal heating for high spin. Therefore measuring non-zero tidal heating can rule out area quantization. We also argue that if area quantization is present in nature then our current modeling with reflectivity can possibly probe the Hawking radiation which may bring important information regarding the information loss paradox from the observational side.

I. INTRODUCTION

Since the observation of GW190514 [1] gravitational wave (GW) astronomy has grown to be one of the dominant contributors to astrophysical observations. These observations have led to an unprecedented probe of strong gravity [2]. Properties of vacuum spacetime, propagation of GW, violation of Lorentz invariance have been tested rigorously, which has resulted in stringent bounds on the mass of the graviton and violations of Lorentz invariance [3–5]. We also have begun to investigate the properties of these dark compact objects, both in inspiraling binary as well as in the merger.

To resolve the information-loss paradox Planck scale modifications of black hole (BH) horizons and BH structure have been proposed [6, 7]. Other exotic compact object (ECOs) have also been proposed for multiple reasons [8, 9]. To probe the nature of the compact objects in binary, several tests have been proposed too [10–21].

In General Relativity, the horizon of the classical BHs (CBHs) are perfect absorbers [22–25]. This is due to the causal structure of the geometry of CBH. This null surface, which is the defining feature of a CBH, is a one-way membrane. Due to the nature of the horizon, the boundary conditions for any perturbations at the horizon are considered to be ingoing boundary conditions [26]. But in the case of the ECOs, it is not necessary to take ingoing boundary condition [27]. Modification of the boundary conditions of the perturbation quantities at near horizon region brings changes to the observable quantities.

Having such scopes we have begun to investigate the nature of these “so-called” black holes in detail. It has also become possible to address the question, whether there are quantum gravity corrections near horizon scales. And if they are indeed present then what are the possible observational impact of that?

In this work, we focus primarily on the possibility that the GWs emitted from an inspiraling binary BH merger can carry imprints regarding the quantum properties of the BHs. In some works, this question has been posed and has been addressed primarily in the context of the postmerger [27–29]. In this work, we will focus on the possibility of observing these effects in the inspiral phase.

II. QUANTUM BLACK HOLES

It is expected that the quantum BHs (QBHs) have a discrete energy spectrum. As a result, it has been put forward that they will behave in a similar manner as the excited atoms [30–35]. The area of BHs in such a case behaves like an adiabatic invariant and gives rise to a “Bohr-Sommerfeld-like” quantization of the area spectrum,

\[ A_N = \alpha \ell_P^2 N, \]  

where \( \ell_P = \) is the Planck length, \( N \) a positive integer, and \( \alpha \) a non-negative number.

Bekenstein and Mukhanov had concluded that BHs must have a discrete spectrum of mass and investigated the emission spectrum [32, 36]. In loop quantum gravity too BH area has been shown to be quantized [37–41]. Interestingly, as we will demonstrate, despite the area quantization being related to the Planck scale, it can leave observable imprints on GWs.

In Ref. [29] how the area quantization leads to an absorption spectrum has been studied in detail. They have argued that the “astrophysical BHs act as “magnifying lenses,” in the sense that they bring the Planck-scale dis-
cretization of the horizon within the realm of GW observations. In the present work, we will investigate the impact of such quantization on the inspiral phase of a binary.

III. EFFECT OF AREA QUANTIZATION

Effect of area quantization for a spinning BH has been explicitly computed in Ref. [29, 42]. As our work depends on it, we will shortly review the results here. A spinning BH, which is represented by a Kerr metric, is parametrized by its mass (M) and angular momentum (J). Since the area of the horizon (A) of the BH can completely be determined in terms of M and J, it can be used to represent M in terms of A and J:

\[ M = \sqrt{\frac{A}{16\pi} + \frac{4\pi J^2}{A}}. \]

Considering the area quantization and quantization of J = ħj (0 ≤ j ≤ αN/8π) Ref. [29] found that,

\[ M_{N,j} = \sqrt{\frac{\alpha N}{16\pi} + \frac{4\pi j^2}{N\alpha}}. \]

This set of \( M_{N,j} \) constitutes the mass spectrum of QBH for a set \( \{N, j\} \).

By focusing on the dominant GW mode (l = 2, m = 2) which is most interesting for astrophysical systems (in quasicircular binary inspiral) and considering the transition \( M_{N,j} \rightarrow M_{N+\Delta N,j+2} \) in Ref. [29] it is shown that the frequency at which a BH can have non-zero absorption is,

\[ \omega_n = \frac{n\kappa}{8\pi} + 2\Omega_H \]

where \( \kappa \) is the surface gravity and \( \Omega_H \) is the angular velocity of the horizon\(^1\). Note, for higher modes of GW with \( l > 2 \) different transitions will also contribute. Which will bring out more interesting features. But throughout our current work, we will assume that this relation is valid and will study the consequence of it in the inspiral phase.

Assuming Hawking radiation as the decay channel in Ref. [29] the width (\( \Gamma \)) of the lines have been calculated and demonstrated. We use these numerically calculated values of \( \Gamma \), that has been provided to us by the authors of Ref. [29], to find an analytical fitting function for \( \Gamma \) as follows,

\[ M\Gamma = 1.005 e^{(-6.42+1.8\chi^2+1.9\chi^2-1.1\chi^4)}. \]

In Fig. 1 we plot the analytical function (red curve) and the numerical data (blue dotted curve) with respect to dimensionless spin parameter (\( \chi \)) in the upper panel. In lower panel we plot the error in the fitting. We find that for entire range of \( \chi \) error is less than 8%, while for \( \chi \leq .85 \) it is less than 2%. Error is highest for \( \chi = .9, \) i.e \( \sim 8\% \).

IV. MODELLING THE ABSORPTION: TIDAL HEATING

A CBH absorbs radiation of frequency \( \omega > m\Omega_H \) (where m is the azimuthal number of the wave and \( \Omega_H \) is the BH angular velocity) but amplifies radiation of smaller frequency, due to superradiance [43]. The components of a binary experience each other’s tidal fields during the inspiral phase. If the bodies are (at least partially) absorbing, these tides backreact on the orbit. As a result, energy and angular momentum is transferred from their spin into the orbit. This phenomena is called tidal heating [44–46]. At the position of the horizon of a CBH tidal fields satisfy the ingoing boundary condition which picks out how a CBH’s spin is transferred to the orbit. This effect is due to the dissipative nature of the CBH horizons. This allows for tests of the nature of compact objects.

As has been discussed earlier, a QBH can absorb (emit) GW only in some discrete frequency values, unlike CBH where the process is continuous across the frequency

---

\(^1\) When GW frequency does not match with the frequency in Eq. (4), the absorption is more likely to be suppressed rather than being exactly equal to zero. This is primarily because the particular details of the frequency dependencies of the absorption should depend on the details of the microscopic theory of quantum gravity, that one lacks).
band. Therefore in the presence of area quantization tidal heating should contribute only to those frequency values that are allowed by Eq. (4). This can be modeled by assuming that the BHs have a frequency-dependent reflectivity $R(f)$. Therefore, in this section we will try to model the reflectivity of a QBH.

The primary focus of our current work is to investigate what is the implication of such an effect in the tidal heating of a QBH in a binary, which was partially addressed in Ref. [29]. In Ref. [47, 48] it has been established how the tidal heating in ECOs can get modified. It has been established that this can be done by defining the Horizon parameter ($H$) and multiplying the TH flux of CBH with $H$ [21, 49, 50]. For horizonless bodies, $H = 0$ and for CBH $H = 1$, and “anything” in-between can be modeled assuming $0 < H < 1$. In Ref. [47] it has been established that $H = 1 - |R|^2$ at $O(e^0)$. Where the position of the reflective surface ($r_s$) is defined in terms of $\epsilon$ and the position of the horizon ($r_H$), if the body were a CBH, as $r_s = r_H(1 + \epsilon)$. In the current work, this process can be continued assuming $\epsilon = 0$ and the reflectivity $R$ is frequency-dependent. Rather than constructing $R(f)$, it is much easier to construct $H(f)$ in the current case. We will follow that route here. Once the frequency-dependent Horizon parameter ($H(f)$) is defined, frequency-dependent reflectivity can be constructed by assuming $H(f) = 1 - |R(f)|^2$. Note, in this method only $|R(f)|$ can be constructed and it will not be possible to construct the phase of the reflectivity (which becomes relevant when $\epsilon \neq 0$ [51]). Note, once the reflectivity is constructed, irrespective of how, it can not only be used for TH computation but also any kind of study regarding QBH. In inspiral along with TH excited resonance modes can also contribute [52, 53]. To study such behavior reflectivity constructed in this work can be used too.

We observe that for QBH, TH will contribute only at those GW frequencies ($f$) where $f = \omega_n/2\pi$ At these GW frequencies $H(f_n) = 1$ should be satisfied, where $2\pi f_n = \omega_n$. Since there is a non-zero line width $r$, TH should also contribute in the frequency range $f_n - r/2 < f < f_n + r/2$, following a pattern of absorption line structure. Everywhere else $H(f) = 0$ should be satisfied. This can be done by constructing an absorption line at $f_n - r/2 < f < f_n + r/2$ for each $n$ and add them. Therefore, $H(f)$ can be defined as follows:

$$H(f) = \sum_{n=0}^{n_{max}} P_n(f)$$

(6)

$$P_n(f) = \Psi(f - f_n, \frac{r}{2})$$

(7)

where $\Psi(f - f_n, \frac{r}{2})$ is a Hann window function defined as follows,

$$\Psi(x, y) = \begin{cases} 
0, & x \leq -y \\
0.5 + 0.5 \cos(2\pi \frac{5y}{y}), & -y \leq x \leq y \\
0, & x \geq y 
\end{cases}$$

(8)

In Fig. 2 we plot $H(f)$ for multiple parameter sets. Black and blue plot represents $\chi = .9$, where black curve has $\alpha =$ and green curve represents $\alpha =$. The first line falls on top of each other in this case, since $f_0$ depends only on the spin. With a lower value of $\alpha$ in the black curve, the lines are very close to each other compare to the green curve where the $\alpha$ value is larger. Similar phenomena happen for $\chi = .7$, which is represented by the other two curves. Note the width of the lines is larger for a higher spin. This can be understood by comparing the red and the black curve.

\[
\omega_n = n \frac{\kappa \alpha}{8 \pi} + 2\Omega_H, \quad n_{max} = \text{Ceiling}\left[\frac{8\pi}{\kappa \alpha}(\omega_{\text{contact}} - \omega_0)\right] \\
\kappa = \frac{\sqrt{1 - \chi^2}}{2M(1 + \sqrt{1 - \chi^2})}, \quad \Omega_H = \frac{\chi}{2M(1 + \sqrt{1 - \chi^2})}.
\]

In Ref [29] critical values of $\alpha$, say $\alpha_{\text{crit}}(\chi)$, below which lines start to overlap, has been calculated as a function of spin. By taking sufficiently small $\alpha$ it is possible to get $H(f) \rightarrow 1$. Therefore, in frequency range $f > f_0$ it can mimic the result of CBH. This happens because for $\alpha < \alpha_{\text{crit}}$ the closely spaced lines starts to overlap with each other. As a result, their contributions get added up to give a “semi-uniform” value of $H(f)$. Although for small values of $\alpha$, $H \rightarrow 1$, it can not mimic CBH result exactly.

For CBH there is no lowest value of $f$ below which TH vanishes. But for QBH if $f < f_0$, then TH vanishes, even for very small values of $\alpha$. This phenomena is very
different from CBH, where TH will be non-zero not only for \( f > f_0 \) but also for \( 0 < f < f_0 \).

Once \( \mathcal{H}(f) \) is constructed, flux for TH of QBH in a binary can be defined by multiplying \( \mathcal{H}(f) \) to the TH flux for CBH, namely \( \mathcal{F}(f) \). Therefore, the flux for QBH, namely \( \mathcal{F}_{\text{QBH}}(f) = \mathcal{H}(f)\mathcal{F}_{\text{CBH}}(f) \). Using this definition, we express the total flux due to TH of a binary QBH in the following manner,

\[
\mathcal{F}_{\text{TH,QBH}} = \mathcal{H}^{(1)}\mathcal{F}_{\text{CBH}}^{(1)} + \mathcal{H}^{(2)}\mathcal{F}_{\text{CBH}}^{(2)},
\]

where, \( M_i \) and \( \chi_i \) is the mass and the dimensionless spin of the \( i \)th QBH, mass ratio \( q = M_2/M_1 \), and \( \mathcal{H}^{(i)} \) is the horizon parameter, and \( \mathcal{F}^{(i)} \) is flux of the \( i \)th body if it were a CBH (expression can be found in Ref. [54–57]).

In Fig. 3 we have plotted a representative example of fractional flux due to TH of QBH with respect to the flux at infinity. Due to the area quantization, TH flux has a discretized structure that is determined by the area quantization parameter \( \alpha \). But as expected, the discretized structure follows the CBH envelope. For all of the curves the components of the binaries are equally massive, i.e. \( q = 1 \). Individual mass of the components are \( 30M_\odot \). The red and the black curve represents \( \chi = .85 \) and \( \alpha = 20 \), \( 4\pi \) respectively. The blue curve is for \( \chi = .9 \) and \( \alpha = 6 \). Note, this plot is just for representation purpose only, as we will discuss later, there will be no TH for these spin values.

We deduce the GW phase involving tidal heating by using Eq. (2.7) of Ref. [58] (see [59] for the details). We find the phase shift due to the associated horizon absorption to be,

\[
\Psi_{\text{TH,QBH}} = \frac{3}{128\nu} \left( \frac{1}{v} \right)^5 \left[ \frac{10}{9} v^5 \Psi_5 (3 \log (v) + 1) - \frac{5}{168} v^7 \Psi_5 (952\nu + 995) + \frac{5}{9} v^8 (3 \log (v) - 1) (-4\Psi_8 + \Psi_5 \psi_{SO}) \right],
\]

\[
\psi_{SO} \equiv \frac{1}{6} \left[ (-56\nu - 73\sqrt{1 - 4\nu} + 73) (\hat{L}\hat{S}_1) \chi_1 + (-56\nu + 73\sqrt{1 - 4\nu} + 73) (\hat{L}\hat{S}_2) \chi_2 \right].
\]

These expressions will be used later to calculate the dephasing which will lead us to understand the observability of the area quantization.

V. OBSERVABILITY IN THE INSPIRAL

In the previous section, we have discussed the impact of area quantization on the inspiral phase, and how they can be modeled. In this section, we will focus more on the details of the observability of this phenomena.

A. Absorption frequency vs contact frequency

For a given spin \( \chi \) and \( \alpha \) there is a lowest absorption frequency, i.e. \( \omega_0 = 2\Omega_H \). Above this frequency, TH will be present for QBH. The range of frequency covered in an inspiral up to merging of the two bodies in a binary is bounded from above by the frequency corresponding to the length scale of the radial surface position of the bodies. In a binary, the closest reach in the inspiral is \( r_{H1} + r_{H2} \), where they touch each other. Using Kepler’s third law, corresponding frequency to this length can be found as,

\[
f_{\text{contact}} = \frac{1}{\pi M_1} \sqrt{\frac{1 + q}{(1 + \sqrt{1 - \chi_1^2} + q + q\sqrt{1 - \chi_2^2})^3}},
\]

where \( q = M_2/M_1 \).

Note that both of the frequencies \( f_0, f_{\text{contact}} \) are functions of mass and spin. Where \( f_0 \) is the lowest frequency
FIG. 4. We plot $f_0/f_\text{contact} < 1$ region with respect to the individual spins of the binary components for mass ratio $q = 1$ in blue and $q = .42$ in orange. The dashed lines show the boundary. Note, we are focusing only on the observability first body’s quantum nature. This is why the plot is asymmetric between $\chi_1$ and $\chi_2$ even for $q = 1$. A similar kind of result can be found if we focus on the observability of the second body’s quantum nature.

of the TH lines for QBH and $f_\text{contact}$ is the upper frequency before they merge, above which TH phenomenon is not relevant. Hence, non-zero discretized structure of TH flux can only be observed iff $f_0 \leq f_\text{contact}$. In Fig. 4 we plot $f_0/f_\text{contact} < 1$ region with respect to the individual spins of the binary components for mass ratio $q = 1$ in blue and $q = .42$ in orange. The dashed lines show the boundary. Note, we are focusing only on the observability of the first body’s quantum nature. This is why the plot is asymmetric between $\chi_1$ and $\chi_2$, even for $q = 1$. A similar kind of result can be found if we focus on the observability of the second body’s quantum nature. This result implies that if a body is spinning very fast ($\chi_1 > 0.679667$) then above a critical value $q = q_{\text{critical}}(\chi_2)$ TH will not be present. We find that for $q_{\text{critical}} < .384646$ for entire range of $\chi_1$ and $\chi_2$, $f_0 < f_\text{contact}$ will be satisfied. In the parameter range where TH is expected to be absent for QBH, a model selection strategy with the Bayes factor can be used to test for the presence of “classical TH” to distinguish between CBH and QBH. It has been addressed in Ref. [55].

To measure $\alpha$ and $\Gamma$ it is necessary to measure at least one higher frequency absorption line namely $f_1$. Therefore, $\alpha$, $\Gamma$ will be measurable only if $f_1 < f_\text{contact}$. In Fig. 5 we plot first body’s $f_0$ and $f_1$ for $\alpha = 20, 25$ along with the contact frequencies for different parameter values of the binary. For equal mass binaries ($q = 1$), $f_0$ is $> f_\text{contact}$ (dashed red and green line) for higher spin of the first body. This is in accordance with Fig. 4 and illustrates the argument described in earlier paragraphs. This also shows that for smaller $q$, $f_0 < f_\text{contact}$ for all spin values of the first body (dotted green and red line).

FIG. 5. We plot first body’s $f_0$ and $f_1$ for $\alpha = 20, 25$ along with the contact frequencies for different parameter values of the binary. For equal mass binaries ($q = 1$), $f_1$ (solid black line) is $> f_\text{contact}$ (dashed red and green line) for higher spin of the first body. This is in accordance with Fig. 4 and illustrates the argument described in earlier paragraphs. This also shows that as discussed before, for smaller $q$, $f_0 < f_\text{contact}$ for all spin values of the first body (dotted green and red line).

FIG. 6. We plot different contact frequencies of the binaries for ($\chi_2 = .1$, $q = .3$) in red dashed curve and ($\chi_2 = .95$, $q = 10^{-5}$) in green dashed curve. We also plot $f_1$ for $\alpha = 30, 110, 16\pi$ in blue black, and purple.

Similar behavior is shown by $f_1$ curves (solid blue and purple curves). But in this case the value of $\alpha$ becomes an important parameter. By increasing $\alpha$, $f_1$ curves can be shifted upwards, as has been illustrated by the blue curve ($\alpha = 25$) having higher values than the purple curve ($\alpha = 20$) for all $\chi_1$ values. Therefore for equal mass binaries ($q = 1$), beyond a maximum value, say $\alpha_{\text{max}}$, $f_1 > f_\text{contact}$ for all $\chi_1$. Note, $\alpha_{\text{max}}$ is a function of the component spins. Hence, even if area quantization is present in nature, we can only measure it using TH iff $\alpha < \alpha_{\text{max}}(\chi_1, \chi_2, q)$. This can be understood by noting that the red dashed curve intersects with $f_1$ curves at smaller $\chi_1$ values for higher $\alpha$. But the intersection points move towards higher $\chi_1$ values for the green dashed curves. This implies that $\alpha_{\text{max}}$ will be a
of respect to spin. But except for the absence of TH it is not

function of the binary parameters.

We calculate \( \alpha_{\text{max}} \) by using \( f_1 = f_{\text{contact}} \). We find,

\[
\alpha_{\text{max}} = 32\pi \frac{1 + \sqrt{1 - \chi_1^2}}{\sqrt{1 - \chi_1^2}} \left( 1 + q \right) \sqrt{1 + \chi_1^2 + q \sqrt{1 - \chi_2^2}}
\]

\[
\alpha_{\text{max}} = \frac{16\pi \chi_1}{\sqrt{1 - \chi_1^2}}.
\]

In Fig. 9 we show the value of \( \alpha_{\text{max}} \) for different binary parameters. As can be seen in the plot in the upper left corner, for high values of \( \chi_1 \) in equal mass binaries (\( q = 1 \)), \( \alpha_{\text{max}} \) < 0. In equal mass binaries we find the maximum observable \( \alpha_{\text{max}} \sim 54 \). If \( \alpha \) is very high (\( \mathcal{O}(10) \)) in nature, then to observe them in equal mass binaries we need \( \chi_1 \to 0 \) and \( \chi_2 \to 1 \). In the figures for \( M_1 > M_2 \) we restrict ourselves with \( \chi_1 \leq .85 \), primarily because beyond this value \( \alpha_{\text{max}} \) can take extremely large values, i.e. \( \alpha_{\text{max}} > 600 \) for \( \chi_1 \sim .998 \).

Note, for \( M_1 > M_2, \alpha_{\text{max}} \) reaches the minimal values in the mid range of \( \chi_1 \) and grows after that. This can be understood from Fig. 6. Dashed red and green curves are the \( M_1 f_{\text{contact}} \) for \( q = .3, \chi_2 = .1 \) and \( q = 10^{-5}, \chi_2 = .95 \) respectively. Blue, black, and purple curves represents \( f_1 \) for \( \alpha = 30, 110, 16\pi \) respectively. We find that the \( M_1 f_{\text{contact}} \) frequency curves can intersect \( M_1 f_1 \) curves at two points \( \chi_1 = \chi_\text{low}, \chi_\text{high} \). As a result, for \( \chi_1 > \chi_\text{low} \), \( \alpha_{\text{max}} \) starts to decrease and for \( \chi_1 > \chi_\text{high} \), \( \alpha_{\text{max}} \) starts to increase.

The reason for such behavior is connected with the different behavior of \( M_1 f_{\text{contact}} \) and \( M_1 f_1 \) as a function of \( \chi_1 \). \( f_{\text{contact}} \) is a monotonically increasing function with respect to spin. But \( M_1 f_1 \) can have a maxima for a range of \( \alpha \). This is primarily because \( M_1 f_1 \) when \( \chi_1 = 1 \) is fixed to the value of \( 1/2\pi \), which is independent of \( \alpha \). But \( M_1 f_{\text{contact}} \) at \( \chi_1 = 1 \) increases with increasing \( \chi_2 \) and decreasing \( q \).

If \( f_1(\chi_1 = 1) = 1/(2\pi M_1) < f_{\text{contact}}(\chi_1 = 1) \) then even for arbitrarily large values of \( \alpha \) there will be at least one intersection point between \( f_1 \) and \( f_{\text{contact}} \) near \( \chi_1 = 1 \). In Fig. 6 this phenomena is being exhibited by \( \alpha = 110 \) curve. In Fig. 7 we have plotted the region that satisfies \( f_1(\chi_1 = 1) < f_{\text{contact}}(\chi_1 = 1) \). We find for \( q \leq 0.384646 \) this condition is satisfied for the entire range of \( \chi_2 \).

Note, in Fig. 6 \( \alpha = 110 \) curve has a maxima while there are no maximas present for lower values of \( \alpha \) shown in Fig. 5. For a fixed \( \alpha \) the condition for extrema of \( f_1 \) is \( f_1'(\chi_1) = 0 \), where prime denotes the derivative with respect to \( \chi_1 \). This results as,

\[
\alpha = \frac{16\pi (1 + \sqrt{1 - \chi_1^2})}{\chi_1}.
\]

It is easy to verify that the right hand side of Eq. (15) has a minimum value of 16\( \pi \). Hence for \( \alpha < 16\pi \) this condition will not be satisfied and there will not be any extrema. This is supported by the figures also. Interestingly, in literature the range of expected values is \( 1 < \alpha < 30 \) [27]. Therefore in this physical range maxima will never occur. Hence, Fig. 9 implies that for \( q \leq 1 \) entire physical range can be probed. This can help us in putting bound on \( \alpha \) from observation.

B. Dephasing due to TH of QBH

Using Eq. (10) we calculate the dephasing as a function of \( \alpha \). A useful estimator to describe the effects of \( \alpha \) in the phase is the total number of GW cycles (\( \equiv N \)) that accumulates within a given frequency band of the detectors. In terms of the frequency-domain phase \( \Psi(f) \) this can be defined as,

\[
N = \frac{1}{2\pi} \int_{f_{\text{min}}}^{f_{\text{max}}} f df \left( \frac{d^2\Psi(f)}{df^2} \right).
\]

By substituting Eq. (10) into Eq. (16) the relative number of GW cycles (\( \equiv \Delta N \)) that is contributed by this effect and accumulated within the frequency band \( f \in [f_{\text{min}}, f_{\text{max}}] \) is calculated. We take \( f_{\text{min}} = .5 \text{ mHz}, f_{\text{max}} = f_{\text{ISCO}} \). We compute dephasing \( \delta \phi = 2\pi \Delta N \) by taking into account of non-zero \( \alpha \). We find that above \( \chi = .359405, \delta \phi = 0 \) and below it \( \delta \phi \sim \mathcal{O}(10^{-1}) \).

This can be understood by noting in Fig. 8 below \( \chi = .359405, f_0 > f_{\text{ISCO}} \). In such cases there will be no tidal heating contribution for QBH. This is a telltale signature, as for CBH in EMRI \( \delta \phi_{\text{CBH}} \sim \mathcal{O}(10^2)/\mathcal{O}(10^3) \) for \( \chi = 3(9) \). Therefore, it can safely be said that absence of any TH is a potential signature of area quantization. But unfortunately, except for the absence of TH it is not
and $\chi$. This can help us in estimating $\tau$. As a result we will have observational information regarding Hawking radiation as well as the nature of the quantum states of QBH. This therefore, has the potential to shed light on the information loss paradox from the side of the observation. Note, it is unlikely that TH can be used for that purpose unless spin of the bodies are low and signal to noise ratio (SNR) is very high. But this way of probing Hawking radiation by measuring $\Gamma$ will be valid even in merger and postmerger phase.

VII. OBSERVABILITY

In our work, we establish that due to the presence of area quantization effect of TH becomes vanishingly small. Above $\chi \sim .36$ it result in vanishing TH. Therefore, measuring no TH in EMRI will be an indication towards area quantization, this aspect was proposed in Ref. [29]. We agree with their claim after a detailed investigation. However, below $\chi \sim .36$ as TH is not exactly equal to zero, with high SNR $\alpha$ and $\Gamma$ can be measured. This will be investigated in recent future. Another key point is, we have not included the effect of resonances which can modify our conclusion.

Although for high spins, TH vanishes exactly below ISCO frequency, $f_0$ and $f_1$ are less than contact frequency. This implies that the frequency corresponding to the area quantization will be in the range of the merger and postmerger phase frequencies. It remains to see if this will lead to any observable consequences.

The vanishing of TH for high spins implies that there will not be any absorption of GW flux in the inspiral phase. As a result, this can lead to ergo region instability [61, 62], which can have observable consequences. This requires a detailed investigation. Note, that the information of area quantization is solely captured by the first term in Eq. (4), while the second term corresponds to angular momentum states of the QBH. For $\ell = m = 2$ mode the second term is similar to the $m\Omega_H$ that connects the frequency at the far range to the frequency at the near horizon range. This indicates that even for a different area quantization law if Eq. (2) holds only the first term will get modified while the second term will stay intact for $\ell = m = 2$ mode. In such a case for nonzero $\chi$ there will always be a minimum frequency $\propto \Omega_H$ below which TH vanishes. Therefore non-vanishing TH can be a strong indication of a violation of area quantization.

2 From inspiraling binary upper bound on the Hawking temperature has been found in Ref. [60]. However this value is very high with respect to the expected value of the Hawking temperature of these systems.
FIG. 9. We plot the $\alpha_{\text{max}}$ above which $f_1$ will not be observable before the binary merges. Since the comparison arises due to the $f_{\text{contact}}$, it depends on $\chi_2$ and the mass ratio $q = \frac{M_2}{M_1}$. $\alpha_{\text{max}}$ has been plotted in the colour bar w.r.t. $q$ and $\chi_2$. This establishes that for the reasonable values of $\alpha_{\text{max}}$, $f_1$ can definitely be observed for most of the cases.

VIII. DISCUSSION

In this work we have explored the possibility of observing BH area quantization using tidal heating. We have argued that this can be done by assuming a frequency dependent reflectivity of the BH. We have explicitly constructed a model for such reflectivity. Once implemented we find, as expected, the tidal heating flux becomes quantized, unlike classical black holes. Using the quantized structure of the tidal heating flux we find the expression of phase of QBH binary. Since in the presence of area quantization there is a minimum frequency $f_0$ below which there is no tidal heating for QBH, it will be impossible to distinguish between QBH and horizonless compact objects in the range $f < f_0$. To address it, we studied under what condition $f_0 < f_{\text{contact}}$. We find that below a critical mass ratio $q_{\text{critical}} < .384646$ for all the binary parameters $f_0 < f_{\text{contact}}$ is satisfied. We have also found the expression for $\alpha_{\text{max}}$ for a set of binary parameters. We find that for equal mass binary observable $\alpha_{\text{max}} < 54$. For binaries with $q < .1$ entire physical range, $1 < \alpha < 30$ is observable. By calculating dephasing we demonstrate that in EMRI the effect of area quantization is very strong in the sense that the effect of TH vanishes for higher values of spin. This is drastically different from CBH where TH can add several cycles in the phase. We also discuss the possibility to probe Hawking radiation by measuring $\Gamma$.

To model the lines we have used the Hann window function. They can also be modeled with Lorentzian pro-
to find the analytical expression of the line width. We thank Adrián del Rio and Vitor Cardoso for reading an earlier draft of the paper carefully and giving us valuable suggestions. We thank Yash Bhargava, Bhaskar Biswas, and Soumak Maitra for useful discussions. SD would like to thank University Grants Commission (UGC), India, for financial support for a senior research fellowship. KSP acknowledges the support of the Science and Engineering Research Board (SERB), India, and the Netherlands Organisation for Scientific Research (NWO). This work was done with partial support provided by the Tata Trusts. This paper has been assigned LIGO Document Number LIGO-P2000115.

ACKNOWLEDGEMENT

It is a pleasure to thank Adrián del Rio and Vitor Cardoso for providing us numerical data that has been used to complete this work.

We would like to thank all of the essential workers who put their health at their risk during the COVID-19 pandemic, without whom we would not have been able to complete this work.