

Dynamical gravastars may evade no-go results for exotic compact objects

Stephen L. Adler*

Institute for Advanced Study, Einstein Drive, Princeton, NJ 08540, USA.

Using graphs plotted from the Mathematica notebooks posted with our paper “Dynamical Gravastars”, we show that a dynamical gravastar has no hard surface, and that a second light sphere resides in the deep interior where there is maximum time dilation. These facts may permit dynamical gravastars to evade no-go results for exotic compact objects relating to light leakage inside the shadow, and nonlinear instabilities arising from an interior light sphere. Testing either of these surmises will require further detailed modeling calculations. We also discuss the effect of replacing the sigmoidal function in the gravastar calculation by a unit step function, and we analyze why the dynamical gravastar evades the singularities predicted by the Penrose and Hawking singularity theorems, despite satisfying both the null and strong energy conditions.

I. INTRODUCTION

The EHT observations [1] of Sg A* and M87 confirm the presence of the basic exterior spacetime geometry expected for a black hole, but leave open the question of what lies inside the light sphere. Is it a true mathematical black hole, or a novel type of relativistic star or “exotic compact object” [2]? In a recent paper [3] we have presented a theory of “dynamical gravastars”, based on using as input only the Tolman-Oppenheimer-Volkoff equations and an assumed equation of state, with continuous pressure $p \geq 0$ and a jump in the interior density ρ from a relativistic matter state $\rho = 3p$ to a state with $p + \rho = \beta$, where $0 < \beta \ll 1$. We presented results in [3] and in online supplementary material in the form of Mathematica notebooks [4] for the cases $B = .1, .01, .001$, respectively labeled TOV.1, TOV.01, TOV.001. Our purpose here is to present additional plots obtained from the notebooks TOV.01 and TOV.001 to address objections that have been raised to interpreting the EHT observations as indicating anything other than a true black hole. The analyses in the following sections show that these objections may be evaded by the internal structure of dynamical gravastars. Further confirmation will require detailed simulations and computations beyond what can be inferred from the Mathematica notebooks [4] alone.

*Electronic address: adler@ias.edu

II. LIGHT LEAKAGE INSIDE THE SHADOW

The first objection that has been raised against an exotic compact object mimicking the galactic center black hole Sg A*, or the extragalactic hole M87, concerns the dark space within the imaged ring, i.e., the lack of observed emission inside the shadow. If a postulated exotic object has a surface, then as suggested in [5], reviewed in [6], and simulated in detail in the EHT analysis paper VI [7], the energy of a hot accretion inward flow striking the surface will be thermalized, giving a surface luminosity as viewed from large distances that would violate bounds set by the EHT observations.

However, this argument does not directly apply to the dynamical gravastar analyzed in [3]. In Fig. 1 we plot the density $\rho(r)$ from the TOV.01 notebook versus radius r , and in Fig. 2 we give the similar plot from the TOV.001 notebook. In both cases we see that there is no sharply defined surface at which the density jumps to its maximum value. Instead, the density increases smoothly as r decreases from the vicinity of the nominal boundary, approaching its maximum value in both cases at a radius of about 0.82 times the nominal boundary radius. Thus, energy from an accretion flow will be dissipated over a range of radii, and the thermalization and resulting external luminosity may be significantly less than when calculated assuming a sharp surface. Detailed simulations based on the dynamical gravastar density profile will be needed to assess whether the objections raised in the case of a sharp surface still apply.

III. COLLAPSE RESULTING FROM AN INTERIOR SECOND LIGHT SPHERE

The second objection that has been raised against an exotic compact object mimicking Sg A* or M87 concerns the existence of a second, interior light sphere and possible associated nonlinear instabilities. The argument, developed in the papers [8]-[10], [11] and [12], [13], shows that on topological grounds one in general expects an even number of light spheres around a spherically symmetric exotic compact object. The outer one is the usual one, which is unstable in the sense that light near this sphere moves away from it, either inwards or outwards. But the general topological argument shows that there is also an inner light sphere which is stable in the sense that light moves towards it, from inside and outside. This leads to possible nonlinear instabilities of the exotic compact object, associated with the nonlinear growth of null geodesic modes. If the relevant time scale for instability growth is not cosmological in magnitude, this can lead to collapse or explosion of the object on observable time scales.

Writing the metric as

$$ds^2 = B(r)dt^2 - A(r)dr^2 - r^2(d\theta^2 + \sin^2\theta d\phi^2) \quad , \quad (1)$$

the photon sphere radius is determined [14] by solution(s) of the equation

$$\frac{d}{dr} \left(\frac{r^2}{B(r)} \right) = 0 \quad , \quad (2)$$

which can be expanded as

$$Q(r) \equiv 2 - \frac{r}{B(r)} \frac{dB(r)}{dr} = 0 \quad . \quad (3)$$

Writing $B(r) = e^{\nu(r)}$ as in [3], this becomes

$$Q(r) \equiv 2 - r \frac{d\nu(r)}{dr} = 0 \quad . \quad (4)$$

This can be rewritten by substituting the TOV equations [3]¹

$$\begin{aligned} \frac{dm(r)}{dr} &= 4\pi r^2 \rho(r) \quad , \\ A(r)^{-1} \equiv e^{-\lambda(r)} &= 1 - \frac{2m(r)}{r} \quad , \\ \frac{d\nu(r)}{dr} &= \frac{N_\nu}{1 - 2m(r)/r} \quad , \\ N_\nu(r) &= (2/r^2)(m(r) + 4\pi r^3 p(r)) \quad , \\ \frac{dp(r)}{dr} &= - \frac{\rho(r) + p(r)}{2} \frac{d\nu(r)}{dr} \quad , \end{aligned} \quad (5)$$

which after some algebraic rearrangement gives

$$Q(r) = 3 - \frac{1 + 8\pi r^2 p(r)}{1 - 2m(r)/r} \quad . \quad (6)$$

Since $r^2 p(r)$ and $m(r)/r$ both vanish at $r = 0$ and at $r = \infty$, one has $Q(0) = Q(\infty) = 2$. This implies that $Q(r)$ must have an even number of zeros (this is the radial version of the more general topological argument of [8], [9]) and so in addition to the usual light sphere at $r \simeq 3M$ there must be a second light sphere. In Fig. 3 we plot $Q(r)$ as calculated in the TOV.01 notebook, and we see that in addition to the external light sphere at $r \simeq 49.5$ there is a second zero crossing of $Q(r)$, indicating another light sphere, at the interior point $r \simeq 3.5$. A similar plot of $Q(r)$ from the

¹ We are ignoring a possible very small cosmological constant contribution, so dispense with the caret notation used in the TOV equations in [3].

TOV.001 notebook is given in Fig. 7, in which the exterior light sphere is far off scale to the right, and the second zero crossing can be seen at $r \simeq 11.5$.

To assess the stability of the interior light sphere, we follow the analysis of [12], who show that stability (instability) corresponds to a negative (positive) value of the second derivative of the potential V'' , which (omitting a positive factor $L^2/(A(r)r^4)$, with L the angular momentum) is given by

$$V''(r) = 2 - r^2 B''(r)/B(r) \quad , \quad (7)$$

which can be rewritten in terms of quantities appearing in the TOV equations as

$$\begin{aligned} V''(r) &= 2 - r^2(\nu''(r) + \nu'(r)^2) \quad , \\ \nu'(r) &= \frac{N_\nu(r)}{(1 - 2m(r)/r)} \quad , \\ dN_\nu(r)/dr &= - (4/r^3)(m(r) + 4\pi r^3 p(r)) + (2/r^2)(dm(r)/dr + 12\pi r^2 p(r) + 4\pi r^3 dp(r)/dr) \quad , \\ \nu''(r) &= \frac{dN_\nu(r)/dr}{1 - 2m(r)/r} + \frac{2N_\nu(r)(r^{-1}dm(r)/dr - m(r)/r^2)}{(1 - 2m(r)/r)^2} \quad . \end{aligned} \quad (8)$$

In Fig. 4 we plot $V''(r)$ for the TOV.01 notebook, showing that it is positive at the outer light sphere radius of $r \simeq 49.5$, indicating instability, and may be negative at the inner light sphere radius of $r \simeq 3.5$. In Fig. 5 we repeat this plot with a much finer vertical scale, showing that $V''(r)$ is negative, indicating stability, at the inner light sphere radius of $r \simeq 3.5$. In Fig. 8, we plot $V''(r)$ for the TOV.001 notebook, showing that it is negative, again indicating stability, at the inner light sphere radius $r \simeq 11.5$.

Stability of the inner light ring raises the possibility of a pileup of null geodesics at that radius, leading to a possible dynamical instability that, on a sufficiently long time scale, could blow up or collapse an exotic compact object [15]–[17], [10]. Simulations for two models of bosonic compact objects in [10] suggests that for these models this instability occurs on physically accessible time scales, ruling out these compact objects as candidates for black hole mimickers. However, for gravastars the situation may be very different, and this objection may be evaded. In Fig. 6 we plot $\nu(r) = \log B(r) = \log g_{00}(r)$ for the TOV.01 notebook, which shows that the inner light sphere radius corresponds to an exponentially small $\nu(r)$, and therefore an exponentially large time dilation. In Fig. 9 we give a similar plot for the TOV.001 notebook, showing that the smallness of $\nu(r)$ at the inner light sphere radius is even more extreme, and the trend shows that as β approaches zero, the trend of $\nu(r)$ at the inner light sphere radius is to even smaller values than

shown in Figs. 6 and 9. This means that for parameters giving physically realistic gravastars, the time scale for instability development at the inner light sphere may be very large on a cosmological time scale. Again, detailed gravastar simulations will be needed to assess whether the objections raised in [10] are relevant.

IV. RESULTS WHEN A SIGMOIDAL JUMP IS REPLACED BY A UNIT STEP JUMP

The calculations of the previous sections based on the Mathematica notebooks associated with [3] were all done with a density jump smoothed by a sigmoidal function

$$\theta_\epsilon(x) = \frac{1}{1 + e^{-x/\epsilon}} \quad , \quad (9)$$

with $\epsilon = .001$. By changing one line of Mathematica code, $\theta_\epsilon(x)$ can be replaced by a Heaviside step function $\theta(x)$, represented by the Mathematica function `UnitStep[x]`. When this is done in the TOV.01 notebook, the initial value of the metric exponent $\nu(x)$, denoted by `nuinit` in the program, has to be retuned from `nuinit = -21.255` to `nuinit = -23.628` in order to achieve the boundary condition $\nu(\infty) = 0$. This results in a substantial change in the nominal boundary from $2M \simeq 33$ to $2M \simeq 60$, but the qualitative features of the solution are not altered. In Figures 10, 11, and 12 we give the results obtained in the unit step jump case that are analogous to those shown in Figures 1, 3, and 5 obtained respectively from the sigmoidal function case. The conclusions reached above are unchanged. Similar results to those for the unit step are obtained from a sigmoidal density jump when one takes $\epsilon = .00001$ in place of $\epsilon = .001$.

V. WHY BLACK HOLE SINGULARITY THEOREMS DO NOT APPLY

The gravastar solutions developed in [3] do not have central singularities. So why do the classic singularity theorems of general relativity fail to apply? One might think that this is because of the negative interior energy density $\rho < 0$ which violates both the “weak energy condition” $\rho \geq 0, \rho + p \geq 0$ and the “dominant energy condition” $\rho \geq |p|$. However, the seminal Penrose singularity theorem [18] uses the null energy condition $\rho + p \geq 0$, which is obeyed by the assumption $\rho + p = B > 0$, and the subsequent Hawking theorem [19] uses the “strong energy condition” $\rho + p \geq 0, \rho + 3p \geq 0$, which is also obeyed by $\rho + p = B > 0, p > 0$. So the failure of these theorems to apply is not a result of the breakdown of an energy condition assumption.

However, as emphasized in the retrospective [20] on the Penrose theorem and its successors, an “initial/boundary condition is absolutely essential in the theorems”. For example, the Penrose

theorem assumes the presence of a closed, future-trapped surface. But because the dynamical gravastar solution has $B(r) > 0$ and $A(r)^{-1} = 1 - 2m(r)/r > 0$, as shown in the graphs of [3], there is no trapped surface, corresponding to the fact that there is neither an event horizon nor an apparent horizon [21]. Hence despite obeying the null energy condition, the dynamical gravastar does not satisfy the conditions needed for the Penrose singularity theorem. Similarly, the Hawking theorem requires a negative extrinsic curvature relative to the positive time axis over some spacelike surface, and this is not present in the gravastar because there are no horizons. Hence despite obeying the strong energy condition, the dynamical gravastar does not satisfy the conditions needed for the Hawking singularity theorem. We believe these results are significant, because the strong and null energy conditions are the natural relativistic generalization of the intuitive nonrelativistic notion that matter should have a nonnegative energy density.

VI. DISCUSSION

We remark that none of the features emphasized here, that a dynamical gravastar has no hard surface, that a second light sphere resides in the deep interior where there is maximum time dilation, and that the Penrose and Hawking singularity theorems are evaded, could have been anticipated in advance without a numerical solution of the TOV equations with a density jump.

-
- [1] The Event Horizon Telescope Collaboration, *Phys. Rev. Lett.* **125**, 141104 (2020), arXiv:2010.01055.
 - [2] V. Cardoso and P. Pani, *Living Rev. Relativ.* **22**, 4 (2019), arXiv:1904.05363.
 - [3] S. L. Adler, *Phys. Rev. D* **106**, 104061 (2022), arXiv:2209.02537.
 - [4] For active links directly accessing the Mathematica notebooks used in [3], and also accessing a simplified and annotated notebook prepared for the Mathematica Community, see the abstract of [3]. These notebooks were written in Mathematica version 12.2. They use the functions Exp, Log, Print, Plot, and Show, which were introduced in version 1.0; NDSolve and Evaluate, which were introduced in version 2.0; and LogPlot, which was introduced in version 6.0.
 - [5] F. Yuan and R. Narayan, *Ann. Rev. Astronomy and Astrophysics* **52**, 529 (2014), arXiv:1401.0586.
 - [6] R. Narayan and I. Yi, *Astrophysical Journal* **452**, 710 (1995), arXiv:astro-ph/9411059.
 - [7] The Event Horizon Telescope Collaboration, *Astrophysical Journal Letters* **930**, L17 (2022), open access.
 - [8] P. V. P. Cunha, E. Berti, and C. A. R. Herdeiro, *Phys. Rev. Lett.* **119**, 251102 (2017), arXiv:1708.04211.
 - [9] P. V. P. Cunha and C. A. R. Herdeiro, *Phys. Rev. Lett.* **124**, 181101 (2020), arXiv:2003.06445.

- [10] P. V. P. Cunha, C. Herdeiro, E. Radu, and N. Sanchis-Gual, *Phys. Rev. Lett.* (in press), arXiv:2207.13713.
- [11] R. Ghosh and S. Sarkar, *Phys. Rev. D* **104**, 044019 (2021), arXiv:2107.07370.
- [12] V. Cardoso, A.S. Miranda, E. Berti, H. Witek, and V. T. Zanchin, *Phys. Rev. D* **79**, 064016 (2009), arXiv:0812.1806.
- [13] S. Hod, *Physics Letters B* **739**, 383 (2014), arXiv:1412.3808.
- [14] S. L. Adler and K. S. Virbhadra, *General Relativity and Gravitation* **54**, 93 (2022), arXiv:2205.04628.
- [15] J. Keir, *Class. Quant. Grav.* **33**, 135009 (2016), arXiv:1404.7036.
- [16] V. Cardoso, L. C. B. Crispino, C. F. B. Macedo, H. Okawa, and P. Pani, *Phys. Rev. D* **90**, 044069 (2014), arXiv:1406.5510.
- [17] G. Benomio, *Anal. Part. Diff. Eq.* **14**, 2427 (2021), arXiv:1809.07795.
- [18] R. Penrose, *Phys. Rev. Lett.* **14**, 57 (1965).
- [19] S. W. Hawking, *Proc. Roy. Soc. Lond. A* **300**, 187 (1967).
- [20] J. M. M. Senovilla and D. Garfinkle, “The 1965 Penrose singularity theorem”, arXiv:1410.5226.
- [21] S. L. Adler, *Int. J. Mod. Phys. D* **30**, 2142023 (2021), arXiv:2105.07521.




FIG. 1: Plot of the density $\rho(r)$ for the TOV.01 notebook. The nominal boundary is $2M \simeq 33$.




FIG. 2: Plot of the density $\rho(r)$ for the TOV.001 notebook. The nominal boundary is $2M \simeq 55,200$.




FIG. 3: Plot of $Q(r)$ for the TOV.01 notebook. The exterior light sphere is the zero at $r = 3M \simeq 49.5$; there is an interior second light sphere at $r \simeq 3.5$.




FIG. 4: The quantity V'' of Eq. (36) of Cardoso et. al [16] for the TOV.01 notebook, with the positive factors L^2/r^4 scaled out. One sees that V'' is positive at $r \simeq 49.5$, and may be negative at $r \simeq 3.5$.




FIG. 5: The quantity V'' of Eq. (36) of Cardoso et. al [16] for the TOV.01 notebook, with the positive factors L^2/r^4 factored out, plotted with a much finer vertical scale than used in Fig. 4. One sees that V'' is negative at $r \simeq 3.5$.




FIG. 6: Plot of $\nu(r)$ for the TOV.01 notebook. The large negative value at $r \simeq 3.5$ corresponds to a large time dilation.




FIG. 7: Plot of $Q(r)$ for the TOV.001 notebook. The exterior light sphere is a zero at $r = 3M \simeq 82,800$, far off scale to the right; there is an interior second light sphere at $r \simeq 11.5$.




FIG. 8: The quantity V'' of Eq. (36) of Cardoso et. al [16] for the TOV.001 notebook, with the positive factors L^2/r^4 factored out. One sees that V'' is negative at $r \simeq 11.5$.




FIG. 9: Plot of $\nu(r)$ for the TOV.001 notebook. The large negative value at $r \simeq 11.5$ corresponds to a large time dilation.




FIG. 10: Plot of the density $\rho(r)$ for the TOV.01 notebook when the sigmoidal jump used in Fig. 1 is replaced by a unit step jump. The nominal boundary is now $2M \simeq 60$.




FIG. 11: Plot of $Q(r)$ for the TOV.01 notebook when the sigmoidal jump used in Fig. 3 is replaced by a unit step jump. The exterior light sphere is the zero at $r = 3M \simeq 90$; there is an interior second light sphere at $r \simeq 3.7$.




FIG. 12: The quantity V'' of Eq. (36) of Cardoso et. al [16] for the TOV.01 notebook when the sigmoidal jump used in Fig. 5 is replaced by a unit step jump, with the positive factors L^2/r^4 factored out. One sees that V'' is negative at $r \simeq 3.7$.