

# Topological censorship in spacetimes compatible with $\Lambda > 0$

Martin Lesourd<sup>1</sup> and Eric Ling<sup>2</sup>

<sup>1</sup>Black Hole Initiative, Harvard University, Cambridge, MA

<sup>2</sup>Rutgers University, New Brunswick, NJ

## Abstract

Currently available topological censorship theorems are meant for gravitationally isolated black hole spacetimes with cosmological constant  $\Lambda = 0$  or  $\Lambda < 0$ . Here, we prove a topological censorship theorem that is compatible with  $\Lambda > 0$  and which can be applied to whole universes containing possibly multiple collections of black holes. The main assumption in the theorem is that distinct black hole collections eventually become isolated from one another at late times, and the conclusion is that the regions near the various black hole collections have trivial fundamental group, in spite of there possibly being nontrivial topology in the universe.

## 1 Introduction

Topological censorship theorems show, under various physically motivated assumptions, that the topology of the region exterior to a black hole (Domain of Outer Communication, ‘DOC’) is restricted in various respects. The DOC is defined in terms of the conformal boundary,  $\mathcal{J}$ , which is associated to the spacetime. The causal character of  $\mathcal{J}$  is taken to be timelike, null or spacelike depending on whether these spacetimes model solutions to the Einstein field equations

$$\mathbf{G} \equiv \mathbf{Ric} - \frac{1}{2}\mathbf{g} R = \mathbf{T} - \Lambda \mathbf{g} \quad (1.1)$$

with cosmological constant  $\Lambda < 0, = 0, > 0$ , respectively. So far, topological censorship theorems have been proved in the context of  $\Lambda = 0$  and  $\Lambda < 0$ . In view of the currently preferred  $\Lambda$ CDM model which supports a cosmological constant  $\Lambda > 0$  [14], we shall seek to extend these theorems to this setting.

Typical topological censorship theorems are based on the following assumptions:

- the null energy condition<sup>1</sup>, i.e.  $\mathbf{Ric}(\mathbf{n}, \mathbf{n}) \geq 0$  for all null vectors  $\mathbf{n}$ ,
- global hyperbolicity of the DOC,
- a topological assumption concerning  $\mathcal{J}$ .

In the asymptotically flat setting ( $\Lambda = 0$ ), the conformal boundary is a disjoint union,  $\mathcal{J} = \mathcal{J}^+ \cup \mathcal{J}^-$ , of null hypersurfaces  $\mathcal{J}^+$  and  $\mathcal{J}^-$ . Both of these are topologically  $\mathbb{R} \times S^2$ , the DOC is defined as  $I^+(\mathcal{J}^-) \cup I^-(\mathcal{J}^+)$ , and the main theorem in this setting is that the DOC is simply connected [5], [6], [7], [10], [3].

In the more complicated case of timelike conformal boundaries, one obtains topological restrictions on the DOC involving the genus  $g$  of the surface ‘at infinity’, and the genus  $g_i$  of the horizon

<sup>1</sup>Various averaged versions thereof also suffice.

components [9].


Here, motivated by black hole solutions with  $\Lambda > 0$  (eg. Kerr-deSitter) and today's preferred cosmological models, we prove a topological censorship theorem for spacetimes compatible with  $\Lambda > 0$  with the following features.

- Although the theorem is intended to cover spacetimes that admit a future (and or past) spacelike conformal boundary  $\mathcal{J}$ , the theorem is not actually stated in terms of  $\mathcal{J}$ .
- The theorem applies to whole universes containing multiple black hole collections, rather than an isolated system like an asymptotically flat spacetime.
- The main geometric assumption is that the black holes eventually become isolated from one another, and by this it is meant that the intersection between the event horizon and a suitable spacelike hypersurface has multiple connected components, cf. [4] for such set-ups. One can think of this assumption as a consequence of certain PDE conjectures like Weak Cosmic Censorship and Final State, which say that generic gravitational collapse leads to a number of distinct black holes regions that eventually become isolated from one another.
- The conclusion is that a local form of topological censorship holds. Namely, the regions in the vicinity of the black holes have trivial  $\pi_1$  but there could be nontrivial topology elsewhere.


## 1.1 Examples

A basic question is whether assuming a simply connected spacelike  $\mathcal{J}$ , the null energy condition, and global hyperbolicity of the DOC  $\equiv I^+(\mathcal{J}^-) \cap I^-(\mathcal{J}^+)$ , is enough to show that  $I^+(\mathcal{J}^-) \cap I^-(\mathcal{J}^+)$  is simply connected? The following example illustrates that this is not so.

**Example 1: dS quotient.** Consider de-Sitter spacetime  $(\mathbb{R} \times S^3, g_{dS})$  and quotient out each  $S^3$  by the antipodal identification map. This results in a new spacetime  $(\mathbb{R} \times \mathbb{R}P^3, g_{dS})$ . This spacetime has compact past and future spacelike conformal boundaries, each with topology  $\mathbb{R}P^3$ . Now consider two open (topological) balls embedded in  $\mathcal{I}^+$  and  $\mathcal{I}^-$ ,  $B_+ \subset \mathcal{I}^+$  and  $B_- \subset \mathcal{I}^-$ , and consider the spacetime  $I^+(B_-) \cap I^-(B_+)$  with the inherited de-Sitter metric. This spacetime is globally hyperbolic, satisfies the null energy condition, has simply connected spacelike conformal boundaries but the DOC is not simply connected.




**Example 2: S-dS universal cover.** Now consider the family of Schwarzschild-de-Sitter (S-dS) black holes. These spacetimes are usually presented in one of two ways. One can either consider a compactified version with Cauchy surface is  $S^1 \times S^2$  or its universal cover with Cauchy surface  $\mathbb{R} \times S^2$ .




The  $S^1 \times S^2$  Cauchy surface is non-simply connected, but both components of  $\mathcal{S}$  are simply connected, since they have topology  $\mathbb{R} \times S^2$ , and moreover the DOC is simply connected with Cauchy surface  $\mathbb{R} \times S^2$ .

In the universal cover, there are multiple black hole regions. If we restrict attention to two connected components of  $\mathcal{S}$  that are facing each other, say  $\mathcal{S}_\alpha^+$  and  $\mathcal{S}_\alpha^-$  (where  $\mathcal{S}_\alpha^- \subset I^-(\mathcal{S}_\alpha^+)$ ), then each connected subset  $\text{DOC}_\alpha \equiv I^+(\mathcal{S}_\alpha^-) \cup I^-(\mathcal{S}_\alpha^+)$  is simply connected with Cauchy surface  $\mathbb{R} \times S^2$ .



**Example 3: S-dS cosmological geon.** The Schwarzschild  $\mathbb{R}P^3$  geon described in [5] arises from the following Cauchy surface: take the  $t = 0$  slice of the maximal extension of the Schwarzschild spacetime and identify antipodal points on the minimal and bifurcation  $S^2$  located at its throat of the  $t = 0$ . This leads to a manifold with a single end and whose topology is  $\mathbb{R}P^3 \setminus \{\text{pt}\}$ , and its maximal globally hyperbolic development is the so-called Schwarzschild  $\mathbb{R}P^3$  geon. We can construct a similar example in the context of S-dS. Start with the universal cover of S-dS, consider a single connected  $\text{DOC}_0$ . Take the  $t = 0$  Cauchy surface for  $\text{DOC}_0$  and identify antipodal points on the bifurcation  $S^2$  at the  $t = 0$  slice which lies at the intersection of the cosmological horizons. The resulting manifold has topology  $\mathbb{R}P^3 \setminus D^3$  (we write it in this form to emphasize that its boundary  $\partial(\mathbb{R}P^3 \setminus D^3) = S^2$  lies on the future event horizon). The maximal globally hyperbolic development of this  $\mathbb{R}P^3 \setminus D^3$  slice defines a new DOC,  $\text{DOC}_\alpha^*$ , which we can embed into one side of the maximally extended solution, as illustrated below.



Notice that in this example the region ‘near’ the black hole is topologically trivial and yet there is nontrivial topology beyond the cosmological horizon. One can think of this as a local form of topological censorship, where the immediate surroundings of each black hole region is topologically trivial, whilst allowing for nontrivial topology elsewhere.

## 1.2 The Set-Up

For the theorem to apply to universes as whole, we set it up as follows:

- $V$  is a Cauchy surface for  $(M, g)$ ,
- $\{\Sigma_i\}$  is a collection of surfaces in  $V$ , each  $\Sigma_i$  represents the boundary (with respect to  $V$ ) of a black hole region, each  $\Sigma_i$  is composed of possibly multiple disjoint connected subsets, but no compactness assumption is made on  $\Sigma_i$ ,
- each  $B_i \subset V$  represents regions of  $V$  which enter a collars worth into the black hole regions, i.e.  $B_i$  is diffeomorphic to  $\Sigma_i \times [0, \epsilon)$ ;
- these last two assumptions on  $B_i$  and  $\Sigma_i$  lead to the definition of  $E_i$  through the following relations

$$V = B_i \cup E_i \text{ for all } i \quad (1.2)$$

and

$$\Sigma_i = B_i \cap E_i, \quad B_i \simeq \Sigma_i \times [0, \epsilon) \quad (1.3)$$

- for each  $\Sigma_i$ , there is a **connected**, smooth sphere  $\Gamma_i$  that separates  $V$  and thus ‘envelops’ a black hole region (or collection)  $B_i$ , the separating property gives a well defined direction either towards or away from each black hole region  $B_i$ ,
- each  $\Gamma_i$  separates  $V$  and defines the following subsets


$$E_i = E_{1,i} \cup E_{2,i} \text{ and } \Gamma_i = E_{1,i} \cap E_{2,i} \quad (1.4)$$

- we call  $C$ , the subset defined by

$$\bigcap_i E_{2,i} \equiv C \subset V \quad (1.5)$$

the **cosmological core** of  $V$ , because it is in a sense what is left over after removing the regions  $E_{1,i}$  that are connected to the black hole regions  $B_i$ .

For S-dS these objects are represented as follows.



$$V = B_i \cup E_i = B_i \cup (E_{1,i} \cup E_{2,i})$$

Note also that if we return to the S-dS cosmological geon in Example 3, we can extend  $\text{DOC}_\alpha^*$  to a slightly larger spacetime - say  $M_\alpha^*$  such that  $\overline{\text{DOC}_\alpha^*} \subsetneq M^*$  - such that  $M^*$  admits surfaces  $\Gamma$  and  $\Sigma$  both diffeomorphic to  $S^2$ , and subsets  $E_1, E_2$  such that  $E_2$  is compact,  $\pi_1(E_1)$  is trivial, and the core,  $C = V - E_1$ , has nontrivial fundamental group, which moreover is finite due to the  $\mathbb{R}P^3$ .

### 1.3 The Theorem

The main theorem reads as follows.

**Theorem 1.** *Let  $(M, g)$  be a spacetime satisfying the null energy condition along with the following*

- (1)  *$V$  is a Cauchy hypersurface for  $M$ ,*
- (2) *for  $i \in \{1, 2, \dots, N\}$  (where  $N$  is either finite or  $N = \infty$ ), there is a (nonempty) collection of  $C^0$  surfaces  $\{\Sigma_i\} \subset V$ , each  $\Sigma_i$  separates  $V$  and defines the sets  $B_i$  and  $E_i$  where*

$$V = B_i \cup E_i \text{ for all } i \quad (1.6)$$

and

$$\Sigma_i = B_i \cap E_i, \quad B_i \simeq \Sigma_i \times [0, \epsilon] \quad (1.7)$$

- (3) *to each  $\Sigma_i$ , there is an associated  $\Gamma_i$  which is a smooth, connected, topological  $S^2$  which separates  $E_i$*

$$E_i = E_{1,i} \cup E_{2,i} \text{ and } \Gamma_i = E_{1,i} \cap E_{2,i} \quad (1.8)$$

*and which is inner trapped with respect to  $E_{1,i}$ ,*

- (4)  *$(M, g)$  **settles down at late time** with respect to the collection  $\{\Gamma_i\}$  (see Section 3 for a precise definition).*

Then

- *for  $N = 1$  we set  $E_{1,1} = E_1$ ,  $E_{2,1} = E_2$  and we obtain the following: (i)  $\pi_1(E_1)$  is always finite, (ii) if either  $E_2$  is noncompact or  $\pi_1(E_2)$  is infinite then  $\pi_1(E_1)$  is in fact trivial, (iii) if  $\pi_1(E_1)$  is finite and nontrivial, then  $E_2$  is diffeomorphic to the 3-disc,*
- *for  $N \geq 2$ , we obtain that  $\pi_1(E_{1,i})$  is trivial for all  $i$ , and each  $\Sigma_i$  is a finite collection of  $S^2$ s.*

The proof of Theorem 1 combines the compactness argument of Lemma 3 with a covering argument described in Section 3. Both are inspired from [1] but the details of the set-up and proof differ.

Assumptions (1), (2) and most of (3) serve to set-up the theorem, but the topological assumption in (3) that each  $\Gamma_i$  is an  $S^2$ , and the geometric assumption in (4) are crucial. The proof badly breaks down without these and indeed one ought not to expect such a theorem without them. The physical content of (4) is that black hole regions eventually become isolated from one another at late times, which is broadly speaking motivated by PDE conjectures like Weak Cosmic Censorship and Final State.


**For  $N \geq 2$ .** In this case the conclusion is rather strong:  $\pi_1(E_{1,i})$  is trivial and consequently

$$\pi_1(V) = \pi_1(C) \quad (1.9)$$

where

$$C \equiv \bigcap_i E_{2,i} \quad (1.10)$$

As illustrated below, there could be topology in  $C$  but the regions  $E_{1,i}$  for all  $i \in \{1, 2, \dots, N\}$  have trivial  $\pi_1$ . The shaded regions include all the black hole collections, i.e. all subsets  $E_{1,i} \cup B_i$ , and these are bounded by a separating  $\Gamma_i$ .



Note that one could probably further restrict  $C$ 's topology with further assumptions, for instance if  $(M, g)$  is assumed to admit a future spacelike conformal boundary diffeomorphic to  $\mathbb{R} \times S^2$ . We do not pursue this since such an assumption would defeat the purpose of allowing for nontrivial topology in the universe.

**For  $N = 1$ .** In this case we get the weaker conclusion that  $\pi_1(E_1)$  is either trivial or at most finite.

- When  $E_2$  is noncompact,  $\pi_1(E_1)$  is actually trivial. We can think of a slice which intersects the future event horizon and the spacelike conformal boundary  $\mathcal{J}^+$  of S-dS as an example.
- If  $E_2$  is compact, the argument is less constraining and we get that  $\pi_1(E_1)$  is finite, and moreover that if  $\pi_1(E_1)$  is nontrivial, then  $\pi_1(E_2)$  is finite. From there, we can actually upgrade the finiteness of  $\pi_1(E_2)$  to show that  $E_2$  must be a 3-disc. Note that we do not know of any spacetime examples where  $\pi_1(E_1)$  is finite, nontrivial, and  $E_2$  is a 3-disc. Whether or not this case can occur in a way that is consistent with the other assumptions of the theorem is an open question.
- The S-dS  $\mathbb{R}P^3$  geon from Example 3 has  $E_2$  compact,  $\pi_1(E_1)$  is trivial, and  $\pi_1(E_2)$  finite. Although this example is perfectly consistent with the theorem, we have not been able to show that if  $V$  is at all nontrivial, then it must be due to a finite  $\pi_1(E_2)$ . Whether this is attainable by some argument is also left as an open question.

**Acknowledgements.** M.Lesourd thanks the John Templeton and Gordon Betty Moore foundations for their support of the Black Hole Initiative. E.Ling thanks the Harold H. Martin Postdoctoral Fellowship. Finally, both authors would like to express their thanks to Prof. G. J. Galloway, with whom we discussed examples which greatly improved our understanding.

## 2 Compactness Lemma

### 2.1 Causal Preliminaries

We state some results from causal theory used in our set up. Standard references for these results are [2, 11, 13, 15].

A *spacetime* is a pair  $(M, g)$  where  $M$  is a smooth (at least  $C^3$ ) manifold which is Hausdorff and second-countable and  $g$  is a smooth (at least  $C^2$ ) Lorentzian metric on  $M$  such that  $(M, g)$  is time-orientable.

Our definition of timelike, null, and causal curves will follow [2]. Hence they are locally Lipschitz with respect to some auxiliary complete Riemannian metric  $h$  on  $M$  (the existence of  $h$  follows from the second-countable property of  $M$ ). Consequently, a locally Lipschitz curve  $\gamma$  can be parameterized by  $h$ -length [2, page 34] (i.e. there exists a reparameterization  $\tilde{\gamma}$  such that  $h(\tilde{\gamma}', \tilde{\gamma}') = 1$  almost everywhere). A future directed timelike, null, or causal curve  $\gamma: [a, b) \rightarrow M$  is *future inextendible* provided the domain of  $\tilde{\gamma}$  is of the form  $[\tilde{a}, \infty)$ . *Past inextendible* curves are defined time-dually.

Let  $S \subset M$ . The *timelike future* of  $S$ , denoted by  $I^+(S)$ , is the set of points  $p \in M$  such that there is a future directed timelike curve  $\gamma: [a, b) \rightarrow M$  such that  $\gamma(a) \in S$  and  $\gamma(b) = p$ . The *causal future* of  $S$ , denoted by  $J^+(S)$ , is the set of points  $p \in M$  such that there is a future directed causal curve  $\gamma: [a, b) \rightarrow M$  such that  $\gamma(a) \in S$  and  $\gamma(b) = p$ . From Proposition 2.4.18 in [2], we have

**Proposition 2.** *If  $q \in J^+(p) \setminus I^+(p)$ , then there exists a null geodesic from  $p$  to  $q$ .*

A set  $S \subset M$  is *achronal* provided  $I^+(S) \cap S = \emptyset$ . The *edge* of an achronal set  $S$ , denoted by  $\text{edge}(S)$ , is the set of points  $p \in S$  such that every neighborhood  $U$  of  $p$  contains points  $x \in I^-(p)$  and  $y \in I^+(p)$  and a timelike curve  $\gamma \subset U$  from  $x$  to  $y$  such that  $\gamma \cap S = \emptyset$ .

Let  $S \subset M$  be a closed and achronal set. The *future domain of dependence* of  $S$ , denoted by  $D^+(S)$ , is the set of points  $p \in M$  such that every past inextendible timelike curve from  $p$  intersects  $S$ . The *future Cauchy horizon* of  $S$ , denoted by  $H^+(S)$ , is the set of points  $p \in D^+(S)$  such that  $I^+(x) \cap D^+(S) = \emptyset$ . Alternatively, we have  $H^+(S) = D^+S \setminus I^-(D^+S)$ .

## 2.2 Proof of Lemma 3

In this section we prove the compactness lemma from [1] in sufficient generality for our purposes.

We drop the subscript  $i$  so that  $E_i, \Gamma_i$  become  $E, \Gamma$ . This will make no difference to the argument in Section 3, because we will apply Lemma 2 to each  $i$ , assuming that the assumptions of Lemma 3 hold for each  $i$ .

We fix a spacetime  $(M, g)$  with the following three properties.

- (1) There is a  $C^0$  Cauchy hypersurface  $V$  for  $M$ .
- (2) There exists a  $C^0$  surface  $\Sigma \subset V$  which separates  $V$  so that  $V = B \cup E$  and  $\Sigma = B \cap E$ . Assume  $E$  is connected.
- (3) There exists a compact and connected smooth surface  $\Gamma$  which separates  $E$  so that  $E = E_1 \cup E_2$  and  $\Gamma = E_1 \cap E_2$ .

**Remark 3.1.**

- We make no assumptions on the connectedness nor compactness of  $\Sigma$ . In general  $\Sigma$  may consist of several (possibly infinite) connected components.
- $\partial_V E = \text{edge}(E) = \Sigma = \text{edge}(B) = \partial_V B$
- $\partial_V E_1 = \text{edge}(E_1) = \Sigma \sqcup \Gamma$

With this set up, we make the following definitions.

- We say  $\Gamma$  is *inner trapped* if  $\theta = \text{div}_\Gamma K < 0$  on  $\Gamma$  where  $K$  is a smooth future directed inward pointing null normal vector field along  $\Gamma$ . Inward pointing is with respect to  $E_1$ .
- $(M, g)$  *settles down at late time* with respect to  $\Gamma, E$  if each inward pointing future inextendible null normal geodesic starting on  $\Gamma$  is either future complete or crosses  $H^+(E)$  (i.e. intersects it transversely).

We now prove the following.

**Lemma 3** (Compactness lemma). *Suppose  $\Gamma$  is inner trapped and  $(M, g)$  settles down at late time with respect to  $E, \Gamma$ . If  $(M, g)$  satisfies the null energy condition, then  $E_1$  is compact.*

Lemma 3 implies that  $\Sigma$  can only have a finite number of components. Its proof is established through a series of propositions.

**Proposition 4.**

$$H^+(E) \subset J^+(\Sigma) \setminus I^+(\Sigma)$$

*Proof.* We will establish the following inclusions.

$$H^+(E) \subset \partial I^+(B) \setminus \text{int}_V(B) \subset J^+(\Sigma) \setminus I^+(\Sigma)$$

The left inclusion: Let  $p \in H^+(E)$ . Then  $p \notin \text{int}_V(B)$  otherwise achronality of  $V$  would be violated. Since  $\Sigma \subset \partial I^+(B)$ , we may assume  $p \notin \Sigma$ . Let  $U$  be any open set about  $p$ . Let  $x \in I^+(p) \cap U$ . Then there is a past inextendible timelike curve from  $x$  which does not intersect  $E$ . Since  $V$  is a Cauchy surface, it must intersect  $B$ . Therefore  $U$  contains a point in  $I^+(B)$ . Let  $y \in I^-(p) \cap U$ . Seeking a contradiction, suppose there is a timelike curve  $\gamma$  from  $B$  to  $y$ . Then  $\gamma$  must start on  $\Sigma$  otherwise we would have  $p \notin D^+(E)$ . Therefore  $p \in I^+(\Sigma)$ . But  $\Sigma = \text{edge}(E)$ , so we can find a past inextendible timelike curve from  $p$  which doesn't meet  $E$ . This contradicts  $p \in D^+(E)$ . Therefore  $y \notin I^+(B)$ . Thus  $p \in \partial I^+(B)$ .

The right inclusion: Let  $p \in \partial I^+(B) \setminus \text{int}_V(B)$ . If  $p \in \Sigma$ , then we are done. So assume  $p \notin \Sigma$ . Therefore  $p \notin B$ . Since  $(M, g)$  is globally hyperbolic and hence causally simple, we have  $\partial I^+(B) = J^+(B) \setminus I^+(B)$ . Thus there exists a point  $q \neq p$  with  $q \in B$  and a causal curve  $\gamma$  from  $q$  to  $p$ . If  $q \in \text{int}_V(B)$ , then we can find a timelike curve  $\lambda$  from a point  $q' \in \text{int}_V(B)$  to a point on  $\gamma$ . Hence the push up lemma implies  $p \in I^+(q')$ , but this contradicts  $p \notin I^+(B)$ . Thus  $q \in \Sigma$ , and so  $p \in J^+(\Sigma) \setminus I^+(\Sigma)$ .  $\square$

**Corollary 5.** *Each point  $p \in H^+(E)$  lies on a null geodesic  $\gamma \subset H^+(E)$  starting from a point in  $\Sigma$ .*

*Proof.* Apply Proposition 2.  $\square$

**Definition 6.**

$$W = (\partial I^+E_2 \setminus \text{int}_V E_2) \cap D^+E.$$

**Proposition 7.** *Suppose  $\Gamma$  is inner trapped and  $(M, g)$  satisfies a late-time settling down assumption with respect to  $\Gamma, E$ . If  $(M, g)$  satisfies the null energy condition, then  $W$  is compact and meets  $H^+(E)$ .*

*Proof.* Put  $H = H^+(E)$ . Let  $T$  be a smooth unit future directed timelike vector field along  $\Gamma$ , and let  $K$  be a smooth inward pointing future directed null normal vector field along  $\Gamma$  which is normalized by  $g(K, T) = -1$  on  $\Gamma$ . Define  $\mu_x(t) = \exp_x tK(x)$ . Let  $\Phi: \text{dom}(\Phi) \subset \Gamma \times [0, \infty) \rightarrow M$  be given by  $\Phi(x, t) = \mu_x(t)$  where  $\text{dom}(\Phi)$  is the maximal open set in  $\Gamma \times [0, \infty)$  where  $\exp$  is defined. Define  $\Gamma_H = \{x \in \Gamma \mid \mu_x \cap H \neq \emptyset\}$ . Define  $s: \Gamma_H \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$  by  $s(x) =$  the parameter value on  $\mu_x$  where  $\mu_x$  meets  $H$ .

We show  $s$  is well-defined. Let  $x \in \Gamma_H$ , then there exists a  $t \in \mathbb{R}$  such that  $\mu_x(t) \in H$ . We know  $\mu_x(t) \notin \Sigma$  otherwise we could violate the achronality of  $V$  via the push up lemma. Since  $H$  is ruled by null geodesics by Corollary 5, we can find a point  $y \in H \setminus \Sigma$  and a null geodesic on  $H$  from  $y \rightarrow \mu_x(t)$ . Since  $\mu_x$  must cross  $H$ , there exists an  $\epsilon > 0$  such that  $\mu_x(t + \epsilon') \notin H$  for all  $0 < \epsilon' < \epsilon$ . By choosing  $\epsilon'$  small enough and  $y$  sufficiently close to  $\mu_x(t)$ , we can find a timelike curve from  $y$  to  $\mu_x(t + \epsilon')$ . Therefore, if there exists a time  $t_0 > t$  such that  $\mu_x(t_0) \in H$ , then we can find a future



directed timelike curve from  $y$  to  $\mu_x(t_0)$  by the push up lemma, but this contradicts  $y \in H^+(E)$ . Thus  $s$  is well-defined.

Now we show  $s$  is continuous. Let  $\{x_n\}$  be a sequence of points in  $\Gamma_H$  which converges to  $x \in \Gamma_H$ . For each  $x_n$ , there exists  $t_n$  such that  $\mu_{x_n}(t_n) \in H$  (i.e.  $s(x_n) = t_n$ ). Since  $x \in \Gamma_H$ , there exists a  $t$  such that  $\mu_x(t) \in H$ . Fix  $\epsilon > 0$ . Then  $\mu_x(t + \epsilon) \notin D^+(E)$  and since  $D^+(E)$  is closed, there is an open set  $U$  about  $\mu_x(t + \epsilon)$  such that  $U \cap D^+(E) = \emptyset$ . Let  $V = \Phi^{-1}(U)$ . Then  $\pi(V)$  is open where  $\pi: \Gamma \times [0, \infty) \rightarrow \Gamma$  is the projection map. Hence, there is an  $N$  such that  $x_n \in \pi(V)$  for all  $n > N$ . Consequently  $\mu_{x_n}(t + \epsilon) \in U$  for all  $n > N$ . Since  $U \cap D^+(E) = \emptyset$ , it follows that  $t_n \leq t + \epsilon$ . Similarly,  $\mu_x(t - \epsilon) \in \text{int}D^+(E)$  for all sufficiently small  $\epsilon > 0$ . Therefore a similar argument shows there exists an  $N'$  such that  $t_n \leq t - \epsilon$  for all  $n > N'$ . Thus  $t_n \rightarrow t$ , and so  $s$  is continuous.

For each  $x \in \Gamma$ , let  $r(x) = 2/|\theta(x)|$  where  $\theta(x) = \text{div}_\Gamma K(x)$ . Since  $\Gamma$  is compact, we define  $s_0 = \max_{x \in \Gamma} \{r(x)\}$ . Let  $\Gamma_0 = s^{-1}([0, s_0])$ . We define the function  $\hat{s}: \Gamma \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$  by  $\hat{s}(x) = s(x)$  if  $x \in \Gamma_0$  and  $s(x) = s_0$  if  $x \notin \Gamma_0$ . Continuity of  $s$  implies  $\partial_\Gamma \Gamma_0 \subset s^{-1}(s_0)$  and this implies  $\hat{s}$  is continuous. Let  $A = \{(x, t) \in \Gamma \times [0, \infty) \mid t \in [0, \hat{s}(x)]\}$ . Continuity of  $\hat{s}$  and compactness of  $\Gamma$  implies  $A$  is compact.

Now we show  $W \subset \Phi(A)$  from which compactness of  $W$  follows since  $W$  is closed. Fix  $x \in W$ . Then  $x \in \partial I^+(E_2)$  implies  $x \in J^+(E_2) \setminus I^+(E_2)$ . Therefore the push up lemma implies  $x \in J^+(\Gamma)$ . Hence  $x \in J^+(\Gamma) \setminus I^+(\Gamma)$ , and so there is a null geodesic  $\mu$  from a point  $x_0 \in \Gamma$  to  $x = \mu(t)$  for some  $t \geq 0$ . If  $t > \hat{s}(x_0)$ , then either  $\mu$  leaves  $D^+(E)$  by crossing  $H$  or leaves  $\partial I^+(E_2)$  by encountering a null focus point [13]. In either case we would have  $\mu(t) \notin W$  which is a contradiction. Therefore  $t \leq \hat{s}(x_0)$  which implies  $(x_0, t) \in A$  which implies  $x = \Phi(x_0, t) \in \Phi(A)$ . Hence  $W \subset \Phi(A)$ .

Lastly we show  $W$  meets  $H = H^+(E)$ . Suppose not. Then  $W$  is an achronal  $C^0$  hypersurface with boundary  $\Gamma$ . Let  $X$  be a past directed smooth timelike vector field on  $M$ . For each  $p \in W$ , the integral curve of  $X$  passing through  $p$  meets  $E$  in a unique point  $\tau(p)$ . Note  $\tau(p) \notin \text{int}_V E_2$  otherwise there would be a timelike curve from  $E_2$  to  $W$ . This defines a flow map  $\tau: W \rightarrow E_1$  which is injective since integral curves do not intersect. Therefore  $\tau$  is an open map by Brouwer's invariance of domain. Also,  $\tau$  is closed by compactness of  $W$ . Since  $E_1$  is connected (which follows because  $E$  and  $\Gamma$  are connected), we have  $\tau(W) = E_1$ . Therefore there is a timelike curve from  $p \in \Sigma$  to  $q \in W$ . But since  $\Sigma = \text{edge}(E)$ , we can find a past inextendible timelike curve from  $q$  which does not meet  $E$ . This is a contradiction.  $\square$

**Proposition 8.**

$$H^+(E_1) \subset H^+(E) \cup W$$

*Proof.* Again set  $H = H^+(E)$ . We have

$$H^+(E_1) \subset D^+(E_1) \subset D^+(E) = \partial D^+(E) \cup \text{int}(D^+(E)) = H \cup E \cup \text{int}(D^+(E)).$$

Fix  $p \in H^+(E_1)$ . If  $p \in H$ , then we are done. If  $p \in E$ , then  $p \in E_1$  by achronality. Hence  $p \in \text{edge}(E_1) = \Sigma \cup \Gamma \subset H \cup W$ . Lastly, suppose  $p \in \text{int}(D^+(E))$ . Then  $p \notin E_2$  since  $E_2 \subset \partial D^+(E)$ . Let  $U \subset \text{int}(D^+(E))$  be any open set around  $p$ . We have  $p \notin I^+(E_2)$  otherwise we could find a timelike curve from  $\text{int}_V E_2$  to  $p$  which contradicts  $p \in H^+(E_1)$ . Thus  $U$  contains a point not in  $I^+(E_2)$ . Let  $q \in I^+(p) \cap U$ . Then  $q \in D^+(E) \setminus D^+(E_1)$  which implies  $q \in I^+(E_2)$ . Since  $q \in U$ , we have  $p \in \partial I^+(E_2)$ . Hence  $p \in W$ .  $\square$

**Definition 9.** Let  $H_\Gamma^+(E_1)$  be the connected component of  $H^+(E_1)$  containing  $\Gamma$ .

**Proposition 10.** *Suppose  $\Gamma$  is inner trapped and  $(M, g)$  settles down at late time with respect to  $E, \Gamma$ . If  $(M, g)$  satisfies the null energy condition, then  $H_\Gamma^+(E_1)$  is compact.*

*Proof.* Again set  $H = H^+(E)$ . Let  $H_0$  be the union of components of  $H$  which meet  $W$  which is nonempty by Proposition 7. Let  $\Sigma_0 = \Sigma \cap H_0$ . By Corollary 5, there is a one-to-one correspondence between  $\Sigma_0$  and  $H_0$ . By Proposition 8, we have  $H_\Gamma^+(E_1) \subset W \cup H$ , but since  $W \cup H_0$  is connected, we have  $H_\Gamma^+(E_1) \subset W \cup H_0$ . We will show that there is in fact a compact subset  $H'_0 \subset H_0$  such that  $H_\Gamma^+(E_1) \subset W \cup H'_0$ . Then compactness will follow since  $H_\Gamma^+(E_1)$  is closed.

By Corollary 5,  $H_0$  is ruled by null geodesics emanating from  $\Sigma_0$ . Claim: Each such null geodesic meets  $W$  exactly once. To prove the claim, let  $T$  be a smooth unit future directed timelike vector field along  $\Sigma_0$ , and let  $K$  be a smooth inward pointing future directed null normal vector field along  $\Sigma_0$  which is normalized by  $g(K, T) = -1$  on  $\Gamma$ . Define  $\eta_x(t) = \exp_x tK(x)$ . Let  $\Phi: \text{dom}(\Phi) \subset \Sigma_0 \times [0, \infty) \rightarrow M$  be given by  $\Phi(x, t) = \eta_x(t)$  where  $\text{dom}(\Phi)$  is the maximal open set in  $\Sigma_0 \times [0, \infty)$  where  $\exp$  is defined. Let  $\pi: \Sigma_0 \times [0, \infty) \rightarrow \Sigma_0$  denote the projection map.  $\pi(W \cap H_0)$  is compact (and hence closed) because  $W$  is compact and  $H_0$  is closed. Now we prove  $\pi(W \cap H_0)$  is open. Fix  $x \in \pi(W \cap H_0)$ , then there is a  $t > 0$  such that  $\eta_x(t) \in W$ . Since  $W$  meets  $H_0$  transversally, there exists an  $\epsilon > 0$  such that  $\eta_x(t + \epsilon') \in I^+(E_2)$  for all  $0 < \epsilon' \leq \epsilon$ . Let  $U \subset I^+(E_2)$  be an open set about  $\eta_x(t + \epsilon)$ . Let  $V = \Phi^{-1}(U)$ . Then  $\pi(V) \subset \Sigma_0$  is open about  $x$ . For every  $y \in \pi(V)$ , there exists  $t_y$  such that  $\eta_y(t_y) \in U$ . Since  $\eta_y(0) \notin I^+(E_2)$  and  $\eta_y(t_y) \in I^+(E_2)$ , there exists a  $t'_y \in (0, t_y)$  such that  $\eta_y(t'_y) \in \partial I^+(E_2)$ . Since  $\eta_y \subset H \subset D^+(E)$ , we have  $\eta_y(t'_y) \in W$ . Thus  $\pi(V) \subset \pi(W \cap H_0)$  is the latter set is open. Since  $\pi(W \cap H_0)$  is both open and closed, we have  $\pi(W \cap H_0) = \Sigma_0$ . Therefore we have proved that each null geodesic on  $H_0$  meets  $W$ . Now suppose  $\eta$  is a null geodesic on  $H_0$  which meets  $W$  at  $\eta(t_1)$  and  $\eta(t_2)$  with  $t_2 > t_1$ . Since  $W$  meets  $H$  transversally, we can find a broken null geodesic from a point on  $\Gamma$  to  $\eta(t_2)$  where the break point occurs at  $\eta(t_1)$ . By the push up lemma, we can find a timelike curve from  $\Gamma$  to  $\eta(t_2)$  which implies  $\eta(t_2) \in I^+(E_2)$ . This is a contradiction. Therefore the claim is proved.

Define  $s: \Sigma_0 \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$  by  $s(x) =$  the parameter value on  $\eta_x$  where  $\eta_x$  meets  $W$ . By the above claim, we have  $s$  is well-defined. Moreover  $s$  is continuous by an analogous argument as used in the proof of Proposition 7. Define  $A = \{(x, t) \in \Sigma_0 \times [0, \infty) \mid t \in [0, s(x)]\}$ . Then  $A$  is compact which follows from continuity of  $s$  and compactness of  $\Sigma_0$ . Note that  $\Sigma_0$  is compact follows from  $\Sigma_0 = \pi(W \cap H_0)$ . Then  $H'_0 = \Phi(A)$  is compact. Now observe that  $H_0 \setminus H'_0 \subset I^+(E_2)$ . Hence  $H^+(E_1) \cap (H_0 \setminus H'_0) = \emptyset$ . Thus  $H_\Gamma^+(E_1) \subset W \cup H'_0$ .  $\square$

*Proof of Lemma 3 (Compactness Lemma):*

Let  $X$  be a past directed smooth timelike vector field on  $M$ . For each  $p \in H_\Gamma^+(E_1)$ , the integral curve of  $X$  passing through  $p$  meets  $E_1$  in a unique point  $\tau(p)$ . This defines a flow map  $\tau: H_\Gamma^+(E_1) \rightarrow E_1$ . Moreover  $H_\Gamma^+(E_1)$  is a  $C^0$  hypersurface with manifold boundary  $\Sigma_0 \sqcup \Gamma$ . Since integral curves do not intersect,  $\tau$  is injective. Therefore  $\tau$  is an open map by Brower's invariance of domain. Also,  $\tau$  is closed by compactness of  $H_\Gamma^+(E_1)$ . Since  $E_1$  is connected, we have  $E_1 = \tau(H_\Gamma^+(E_1))$ . Thus  $E_1$  is compact.  $\square$

*Remark.* From the compactness lemma, it follows that  $\Sigma_0 = \Sigma$  and  $H_0 = H$ . To see this, note that the proof of the compactness lemma shows  $\text{edge}(H_\Gamma^+(E_1)) = \text{edge}(E_1)$ . Hence  $\Sigma_0 \sqcup \Gamma = \Sigma \sqcup \Gamma$ . Therefore  $\Sigma_0 = \Sigma$  and  $H_0 = H$ .

## 3 Covering Argument

### 3.1 Set up

To prove Theorem 1 we will apply Lemma 3 in a suitably constructed covering spacetime. The actual construction of the covering is Riemannian in that we only ever construct coverings of initial data sets. It is then in the sense of Lemma 4 of [8] that these Riemannian covers generate Lorentzian covers for the spacetimes. We will repeatedly apply Lemma 3 to these covering spacetimes, and

we are permitted to do so by the assumptions of Theorem 1 and elementary properties of covering spacetimes that arise as globally hyperbolic developments.

The covering argument is similar to that in [1], but in [1] there is a single  $\Gamma$  (no subscript  $i$ ) and the subset  $E_2$  is assumed noncompact off the bat. Although this makes the contradiction with Lemma 3 immediate, it blurs some interesting cases that we will cover here. By splitting Theorem 1 into the subcases  $N = 1$  and  $N \geq 2$ , we can lift the assumption in [1] that  $E_2$  is noncompact for  $N \geq 2$ . As for  $N = 1$ , we allow for  $E_2$  to be compact and obtain an additional conclusions in that setting.

**For  $N = 1$ .** If there is a single black hole collection, the subscript  $i$  will be dropped. Note that  $i = 1$  does not imply that there is a single connected black hole region  $B$ , but rather that we work with a single connected separating surface  $\Gamma$ .  $E_2$  is simply what is not inside the region bounded by  $\Gamma$ .

**For  $N \geq 2$ .** For multiple black hole collections, the total black hole region is the disjoint union  $\bigcup_i B_i$ . By assumption, the subset  $E_{2,i}$  of  $V$  contains all other black hole collections, i.e.,  $B_{j(\neq i)} \subset E_{2,i}$ , and since  $V$  penetrates only a collar's worth into each  $B_i$  (i.e.  $B_i$  is diffeomorphic to  $\Sigma_i \times [0, \epsilon)$ ), we have that  $E_{2,i}$  closed and non-compact as a subset of  $V$ . This replaces the assumption that  $E_2$  is noncompact in [1].

Recall the assumptions of the main theorem:

- (1)  $V$  is a Cauchy surface for  $(M, g)$ ,
- (2) there exists a  $C^0$  surface  $\Sigma_i \subset V$  that separates  $V$  so that  $V = B_i \cup E_i$  and  $\Sigma_i = B_i \cap E_i$ ,
- (3) each  $\Gamma_i$  is a smooth, inner trapped, topological  $S^2$  that separates  $E_i$  so that  $E_i = E_{1,i} \cup E_{2,i}$  and  $\Gamma_i = E_{1,i} \cap E_{2,i}$ ,
- (4)  $(M, g)$  settles down at late time with respect to the collection  $\{\Gamma_i\}$ . By definition, we take this to mean that for all  $i$  each future-directed null geodesic emanating from  $\Gamma_i$  never crosses  $H^+(E_j)$  for any  $j \neq i$ , and if it is not future complete, then it crosses  $H^+(E_i)$ .

Notice that (4) implies that an inwards null geodesic from  $\Gamma_i$  cannot leave  $M$  by crossing  $H^+(E_j)$  for  $j \neq i$ , and that this is indeed part of what is meant by gravitationally isolated collections of black holes.

These assumptions place us in the setting of Lemma 3.

**Corollary 11.** *Let  $(M, g)$  be a spacetime that satisfies (1)-(2)-(3)-(4). Then  $E_{1,i}$  is compact. Equally, if  $N = 1$ , then  $E_1$  is compact.*

### 3.2 The Contradiction

We now prove the conclusions of the theorem:

- $N = 1$ : (a)  $\pi_1(E_1)$  is finite and if  $E_2$  is noncompact or  $\pi_1(E_2)$  is infinite, then  $\pi_1(E_1)$  is trivial, (b) if  $E_2$  is compact, then  $\pi_1(E_1)$  is a priori unrestricted, but if it is nontrivial, then  $E_2$  is a 3-disc,
- $N \geq 2$ : each  $\pi_1(E_{1,i})$  is trivial, and as consequence:  $\pi_1(V) = \pi_1(C)$  and each  $\Sigma_i$  is an  $S^2$ .

*Proof.*

- We start with  $N \geq 2$ .

As described above, each  $E_{1,i}$  is compact. Consider the manifold  $B_i \cup_{\Sigma_i} E_{1,i}$ . Since  $B_i$  is homeomorphic to  $\Sigma_i \times [0, \epsilon)$ ,  $E_{1,i}$  is a deformation retract of  $B_i \cup_{\Sigma_i} E_{1,i}$ . Denote  $B_i \cup_{\Sigma_i} E_{1,i}$  by  $E'_{i,1}$  and consider the universal covering space  $\widetilde{E'_{i,1}}$  of  $E'_{i,1}$  with projection map  $p : \widetilde{E'_{i,1}} \rightarrow E'_{i,1}$ . Let  $n$  denote the number of sheets occurring in the universal cover.

Assume that  $\pi_1(E_{1,i})$  is nontrivial, i.e., so that  $n \geq 2$ .

Since we want to be in the setting of Lemma 3, we want  $p^{-1}(\Gamma_i)$  to have compact components. This is guaranteed by our assumption that  $\Gamma_i$  is an  $S^2$ . We now have that  $\widetilde{\Gamma}_i = p^{-1}(\Gamma_i)$  is a disjoint union of  $S^2$ s, which we write as  $\widetilde{\Gamma}_i = \bigcup_{\alpha=1}^n \widehat{\Gamma}_i^\alpha$ . Together, these form the boundary components  $\partial \widetilde{E'_{i,1}}$ . Note also that each  $\widehat{\Gamma}_i^\alpha$  inherits the properties of  $\Gamma_i$ , i.e. smooth, and inner trapped with respect to the given direction.

Now attach, to each of these  $S^2$ s, a copy of  $E_{2,i}$  as they are attached in the base space. This defines the following manifold.

$$\widetilde{E'_{i,1}} \bigcup_{\bigcup_{\alpha} \widehat{\Gamma}_i^\alpha} E_{2,i} \equiv V_i^* \quad (3.11)$$

Since  $n \geq 2$ , there are at least two smooth  $S^2$ s, say  $\widehat{\Gamma}_i^1$  and  $\widehat{\Gamma}_i^2$ , that separate  $V_i^*$ . Pick one of these, say  $\widehat{\Gamma}_i^1$ . By construction,  $\widehat{\Gamma}_i^1$  separates  $V_i^*$  into two disjoint connected subsets, which we call  $Y'_i$  and  $Z_i$ , where  $Y'_i$  is the subset containing the regions  $B_i$  which come from the first factor in (3.11), and  $Z_i$  is simply the complement in  $V_i^*$ . Take the subset  $Y'_i$  and delete all the copies of  $B_i$ , and call the resulting subset  $Y_i$ . Using the fact that  $E_{2,i}$  exhausts all other regions  $B_j$  for  $j \neq i$ ,  $Y_i$  is noncompact.

Now consider the globally hyperbolic spacetime  $(M_i^*, g_i^*)$  with Cauchy surface  $V_i^*$  defined via [8, Lemma 4] so that  $(M_i^*, g_i^*)$  is a covering spacetime for  $(M_i, g_i)$ . Moreover, we can apply Lemma 3 to  $(M_i^*, g_i^*)$ , with  $Y_i$  playing the role of  $E_{1,i}$ . We can do this because the assumption of *settling down with respect to each  $\Gamma_i$*  lifts to  $(M_i^*, g_i^*)$  in the suitable way. That is, inward null geodesics from  $\widehat{\Gamma}_i^1$  are either future complete or leave  $(M_i^*, g_i^*)$  by intersecting  $H^+(Y_i \cup Z_i)$ . Should such a null geodesic behave otherwise, one could use the covering map to project it into the spacetime  $(M, g)$  to contradict the settling down assumption. We can now use Lemma 3 to get that  $Y_i$  is compact, contradicting the previous paragraph. Thus  $\pi_1(E_{i,1})$  is trivial.

- Now consider  $N = 1$ .

Delete the subscript  $i$  from the above argument and stop just before the construction of (3.11). If  $\pi_1(E_1)$  is infinite, then we get a contradiction with the compactness lemma as in (a). If  $E_2$  is noncompact, carry out the rest of the argument above and this yields the conclusion in (a), likewise if  $\pi_1(E_2)$  is infinite.

Consider now the case where  $E_2$  is compact. Denote the universal cover of  $E_2$  by  $q : \widetilde{E}_2 \rightarrow E_2$ .

Assume that  $\pi_1(E_2)$  is nontrivial. In that case, there will be multiple  $S^2$  components in  $\partial \widetilde{E}_2$ . In that case, the boundary  $\partial \widetilde{E}_2$  is a disjoint union  $\bigcup_{\beta=1}^m \widehat{\Gamma}^\beta$ , where  $m$  is the number of sheets of  $\widetilde{E}_2$  coming from  $\pi_1(E_2)$ .

To each  $\widehat{\Gamma}^\alpha$  occurring in  $\widetilde{E}_1$ , select some  $\beta \in \{1, \dots, m\}$  and attach a copy of  $\widetilde{E}_2$  by attaching  $\widehat{\Gamma}^\alpha$  to  $\widehat{\Gamma}^\beta$  as they are attached in the base space  $V$ . This leads to the following manifold.

$$\widetilde{E}_1 \bigcup_{\bigcup_{\alpha} \widehat{\Gamma}^\alpha \leftrightarrow \widehat{\Gamma}^\beta} \widetilde{E}_2 \quad (3.12)$$

Since  $m \geq 2$ , the manifold in (3.12) has multiple boundary components coming from  $\hat{\Gamma}^{\delta(\neq\beta)}$ , i.e., the components in  $\bigcup_{\beta=1}^m \hat{\Gamma}^\beta$  that have not been attached to  $\widetilde{E}'_1$ . We now attach each of these boundary components to another copy of  $E'_1$ . This leads to the following manifold.

$$\widetilde{E}'_1 \bigcup_{\cup_\alpha^n \hat{\Gamma}^\alpha \leftrightarrow \hat{\Gamma}^\beta} \widetilde{E}_2 \bigcup_{\cup_{\delta(\neq\beta)}^m \hat{\Gamma}^\delta} E'_1 \equiv V^* \quad (3.13)$$

To see that  $V^*$  is a covering space for  $V$ , it suffices to find a covering map  $r : V^* \rightarrow V$ . Define  $r$  to be the obvious covering map coming from  $p$  and  $q$  on the first two factors of (3.13), and define it to be the trivial covering map on each copy  $E'_1$  which appear in the third factor of (3.13).

Since  $n \geq 2$ , there are at least two smooth  $S^2$ s, say  $\hat{\Gamma}^1$  and  $\hat{\Gamma}^2$ , that separate  $V^*$ . Proceed as above and pick one of these, say  $\hat{\Gamma}^1$  to define the subsets  $Y$  and  $Z$ . As above, we consider the covering spacetime  $(M^*, g^*)$  of  $(M, g)$  with Cauchy surface  $V^*$ . Applying Lemma 3 with  $Y$  playing the role of  $E_1$ , it follows that  $Y$  is compact.

By our construction of (3.13),  $Y$  is noncompact due to the region  $B \subset E'_1 (= E_1 \cup B_1)$  in the third factor in (3.13), which contradicts the previous paragraph. Thus, having a nontrivial  $\pi_1(E_1)$  with compact  $E_2$  implies that  $m = 1$ . But now  $E_2$  is a compact 3-manifold with  $S^2$  boundary and trivial  $\pi_1$ .  $E_2$  is thus a contractible 3-manifold by [12, Prop. 3.7]. We can isolate this manifold  $E_2$ , fill in its boundary sphere  $\Gamma$  with a 3-disc. We now have a closed, simply connected 3-manifold. This is a homotopy 3-sphere by [12, Prop. 3.7], and thus a 3-sphere by the Poincaré conjecture.  $E_2$  is then the complement of a 3-disc with its boundary removed in  $S^3$ , and therefore a 3-disc.

## References

- [1] S. Browdy and G. Galloway, *Topological censorship and the topology of black holes*, Journal of Mathematical Physics **36** (1995), 4952-4961.
- [2] P. Chruściel, *Geometry of Black Holes*, Oxford University Press, Oxford, 2020.
- [3] P. Chruściel and G. Galloway, *Roads to topological censorship*, arXiv:1906.02151 (2019).
- [4] P. Chruściel and R. Mazzeo, *On “many black hole” vacuum spacetimes*, Classical and Quantum Gravity **20** (2003), 729-754.
- [5] J. Friedman, K. Schleich, and D. Witt, *Topological censorship*, Physical Review Letters **71** (1993), 1486-1489, erratum **75** (1995) 1872.
- [6] G. Galloway, *On the topology of the domain of outer communication*, Classical and Quantum Gravity **12** (1995), L99-L101.
- [7] G. Galloway, *A “finite infinity” version of the FSW topological censorship*, Classical and Quantum Gravity **13** (1996), 1472-1478.
- [8] G. Galloway and E. Ling, *Topology and Singularities in Cosmological Spacetimes Obeying the Null Energy Condition*, Communications in Mathematical Physics **360** (2017), 611-617.
- [9] G. Galloway, K. Schleich, D. Witt, and E. Woolgar, *Topological censorship and higher genus black holes*, Physical Review D **60** (1999).
- [10] G. Galloway and E. Woolgar, *The cosmic censor forbids naked topology*, Classical and Quantum Gravity **14** (1997), L1-L7.

- [11] S. Hawking and G. Ellis, *The large-scale structure of space-time*, Cambridge University Press, London, 1973.
- [12] A. Hatcher, *Notes on Basic 3-Manifold Topology*.
- [13] B. O'Neill, *Semi-Riemannian geometry*, Pure and Applied Mathematics, vol. 103, Academic Press Inc. [Harcourt Brace Jovanovich Publishers], New York, 1983.
- [14] Planck Collaboration, *Planck 2018 results*, Astronomy and Astrophysics **641** (2020).
- [15] R. Wald, *General Relativity*, University of Chicago Press, Chicago, IL, 1984.