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Abstract

We consider the stability of the maximally extended, sub-extremal Reissner-Nordström black hole in a Minkowski background. Prior work has shown that spherically symmetric perturbations from a massless scalar field cause the inner horizon of an R-N black hole to collapse. However, it may still be possible for an observer to travel through the inner horizon before it fully collapses, thus violating strong cosmic censorship. In this work, we show that, even if it is possible for an observer to pass through the inner horizon, the collapse of the inner horizon prevents them from accessing the white hole regions and the parallel universe regions of the maximally extended R-N space-time. Thus, even if strong cosmic censorship is false, the R-N wormhole is unlikely to exist in reality.

1 Introduction

General spherically symmetric Reissner-Nordström (R-N) black holes have both charge and mass, which are concentrated in a point-like singularity at \( r = 0 \). In the absence of perturbations, such black holes can be described by the R-N solution. When the black hole is sub-extremal, this solution describes a black hole with two horizons: an outer event horizon and an inner Cauchy horizon. The event horizon is the edge of the black hole, in the sense that anything that passes beyond the event horizon can never again reach the outside universe. Between the event horizon and the inner horizon, all mass-energy is inexorably drawn inwards. This is equivalent to the statement that the radial coordinate \( r \) is time-like in this region. However, inside the inner horizon, \( r \) again becomes space-like, so it is possible for mass-energy to travel outwards from the singularity. The inner horizon is also a Cauchy horizon. In other words, given generic boundary conditions outside the inner horizon, it is generally impossible to find a unique solution for the space-time inside the inner horizon [1], [2]. This signals a breakdown of determinism.

In 1973, Simpson and Penrose demonstrated that the R-N solution is unstable at the inner horizon [3]. Therefore, Penrose proposed that perturbations to the R-N solution destroy the non-uniqueness of the unperturbed solution. This is known as the strong cosmic censorship (SCC) conjecture [4]. More precisely, the SCC conjecture states that the instability at the inner horizon produces a singularity, preventing any observers from passing through it [5], [6]. If true, this would imply that the region of space-time inside the inner horizon is unphysical. Hence, the entire physical space-time manifold would be uniquely specified by boundary conditions, and determinism would be restored.

Given boundary conditions outside the inner horizon, the inner horizon defines the boundary of the region of space-time where a unique solution for the metric can be found. Thus, it is possible to unambiguously describe the evolution of the inner horizon. Previous research has analyzed the behavior of the inner horizon in the presence of a spherically symmetric distribution of mass-energy. Dafermos showed that the metric can be extended continuously beyond the inner horizon, even in the presence of neutral scalar perturbations [1], [4]. Later, Costa et. al. numerically demonstrated an analogous result for near-extremal Reissner-Nordström-de Sitter (RNdS) black holes [5]–[10].
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In some scenarios, the in-falling mass-energy compresses near the inner horizon, creating a null curvature singularity called the mass-inflation singularity \([11] – [21]\). At first, these results may appear to contradict those mentioned in the previous paragraph. However, because the mass-inflation singularity is a weak singularity, the metric is continuous at the Cauchy horizon \([18], [21]\). Altogether, the results in Refs. \([1], [4] – [10], [12] – [18], [21]\) suggest that the region inside the inner horizon may be accessible to observers. In this paper, we assume that it is possible for an observer to pass through the inner horizon. Under this assumption, we seek to determine the ultimate fate of such an observer.

Given that the space-time inside the Cauchy horizon cannot be uniquely specified, it is not possible to describe an observer’s trajectory inside the Cauchy horizon with certainty. However, if we assume that space-time can still be treated classically inside the inner horizon, it is possible to make concrete statements about the observer’s ultimate fate. In the unperturbed, maximally extended R-N space-time, the region between the inner horizon and the inner anti-horizon is a wormhole (see Figure 1), which leads to a white hole and a parallel universe. (In fact, the maximally extended R-N solution contains an infinite number of parallel universes). Using the Raychaudhuri equation \([22]\), we show that this wormhole collapses in the presence of spherically symmetric perturbations satisfying the null energy condition. More precisely, we show that any time-like or light-like observer who passes through the Cauchy horizon of a perturbed R-N black hole will inevitably hit the central singularity. Thus, we conclude that the parallel universes of the unperturbed R-N space-time are unphysical.

### 2 Unperturbed Reissner-Nordstrom Space-Time

#### 2.1 Reissner-Nordström Metric in Spherical Coordinates

In spherical coordinates, we may write the Reissner-Nordström metric as follows \([2]\). (Note that \(d\Omega^2\) is the line element for a 2-sphere).

\[
ds^2 = -\left(1 - \frac{r_s}{r} + \frac{r_Q^2}{r^2}\right)c^2dt^2 + \left(1 - \frac{r_s}{r} + \frac{r_Q^2}{r^2}\right)^{-1}dr^2 + r^2d\Omega^2
\]

The length scales \(r_s\) and \(r_Q^2\) are defined below. Let \(M\) and \(Q\) be the mass and charge of the black hole, respectively, and let \(\epsilon_0\) be the vacuum permittivity.

\[
r_s = \frac{2GM}{c^2}, \quad r_Q^2 = \frac{Q^2G}{4\pi\epsilon_0 c^4}
\]

The event horizon is located at \(r_+ = \frac{1}{2}\left(r_s + \sqrt{r_s^2 - 4r_Q^2}\right)\), while the inner Cauchy horizon is located at \(r_- = \frac{1}{2}\left(r_s - \sqrt{r_s^2 - 4r_Q^2}\right)\). In terms of \(r_+\) and \(r_-\), we may write the metric as follows.

\[
ds^2 = -\left(1 - \frac{r_-}{r}\right)\left(1 - \frac{r_+}{r}\right)c^2dt^2 + \left(1 - \frac{r_-}{r}\right)^{-1}\left(1 - \frac{r_+}{r}\right)^{-1}dr^2 + r^2d\Omega^2
\]

For conciseness, we introduce the function \(f (r)\).

\[
f (r) = \left(1 - \frac{r_-}{r}\right)\left(1 - \frac{r_+}{r}\right)
\]

In terms of \(f (r)\), we may write the metric as follows.

\[
ds^2 = -f (r)c^2dt^2 + f (r)^{-1}dr^2 + r^2d\Omega^2
\]

#### 2.2 Eddington-Finkelstein Coordinates

In any system of double null coordinates \(u\) and \(v\), a spherically symmetric metric takes the following form.

\[
ds^2 = -F (u, v)\, du\, dv + r^2 (u, v)\, d\Omega^2
\]
For \( u \) and \( v \), we use the double null coordinates used in Ref. \[21\]. Let us introduce the Eddington-Finkelstein radial coordinate \( r^* \), which is defined by the following relation.

\[
\frac{dr}{dr^*} = f(r)
\]  

(7)

Next, we define the surface gravity \( \kappa \) as follows. This represents the gravitational acceleration (divided by \( c^2 \)) at the inner horizon \[18, 21\]. (Note that \( \kappa \) is always positive for sub-extremal R-N black holes with non-zero charge).

\[
\kappa = -\frac{1}{2} \left. \frac{df}{dr} \right|_{r=r_-} = -\frac{1}{2r_-} \left( 1 - \frac{r_+}{r_-} \right)
\]  

(8)

Close to \( r = r_- \), we may approximate \( f(r) \) as follows.

\[
f(r) \approx -2\kappa (r - r_-)
\]  

(9)

Thus, close to the inner horizon, we may write the solution \( r(r^*) \) as follows. (Let \( A \) be an arbitrary real constant).

\[
r(r^*) = r_- + Ae^{-2\kappa r^*}
\]  

(10)

First, we consider the region outside the inner horizon \( (r > r_-) \). In order for \( r^* \) to be real, the constant \( A \) must be positive. For simplicity, we choose \( A = 1 \).

\[
e^{-2\kappa r^*} = r - r_-
\]  

(11)

Therefore, we may express \( r^* \) as a function of \( r \) outside the inner horizon as follows.

\[
r^* = -\frac{1}{2\kappa} \ln (r - r_-)
\]  

(12)

Next, we consider the region inside the inner horizon \( (r < r_-) \). In order for \( r^* \) to be real, the constant \( A \) must be negative. For simplicity, we choose \( A = -1 \).

\[
e^{-2\kappa r^*} = r_- - r
\]  

(13)

Therefore, we may express \( r^* \) as a function of \( r \) inside the inner horizon as follows.

\[
r^* = -\frac{1}{2\kappa} \ln |r - r_-|
\]  

(14)

Combining Equations 10 and 12, we may write \( r^* \) as follows.

\[
r^* = -\frac{1}{2\kappa} \ln |r - r_-|
\]  

(15)

Finally, we introduce the Eddington-Finkelstein null coordinates \( u \) and \( v \). (Note that there are two sets of null coordinates: one for the inner region, and one for the outer region).

\[
u = ct - r^* \quad v = ct + r^*
\]  

(16)

Recall the Reissner-Nordström metric in spherical coordinates.

\[
ds^2 = -f(r) c^2dt^2 + f(r)^{-1} dr^2 + r^2 d\Omega^2
\]  

(17)

Replacing \( r \) with \( r^* \), we may write the metric as follows.

\[
ds^2 = -f(r) c^2dt^2 + f(r) (dr^*)^2 + r^2 d\Omega^2
\]  

(18)

The function \( F(u, v) \) takes the following form. (Note that \( r(u, v) \) is the original radial coordinate \( r \) expressed as a function of \( u \) and \( v \)).

\[
F(u, v) = f(r(u, v))
\]  

(19)

Just outside the inner horizon, we may approximate \( F(u, v) \) as follows.

\[
F(u, v) \approx -2\kappa e^{\kappa (u-v)}
\]  

(20)

Just inside the inner horizon, we may approximate \( F(u, v) \) as follows.

\[
F(u, v) \approx 2\kappa e^{\kappa (u-v)}
\]  

(21)
2.3 Penrose Diagram for Unperturbed Reissner-Nordström Spacetime

In both null coordinate systems, the inner horizon lies at the limits $v \to \infty$ and $u \to -\infty$. This space-time has the following Penrose diagram.
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**Figure 1:** A section of the maximally extended Penrose diagram of an unperturbed Reissner-Nordstrom black hole. The values of the double-null coordinates $u$ and $v$ at the horizons are shown in blue.

In Figure 1, the bottom right square represents our universe, while the bottom left square represents a parallel universe. Because the parallel universe is inaccessible to any observer traveling from our universe, we may regard it as unphysical. With this in mind, all perturbations must enter the black hole through the event horizon in our universe.

On the $u = -\infty$ section of the Cauchy horizon, a more severe singularity occurs [15], [17], [19], [21]. Because of this, objects cannot pass through this section of the Cauchy horizon. Therefore, the wormhole region beyond the $u = -\infty$ section of the Cauchy horizon is unphysical. Hence, from here on, we shall primarily focus on the $v = +\infty$ section of the Cauchy horizon.

2.4 Kruskal-Szekeres Transformation on the $v$ Coordinate

The Eddington-Finkelstein double null coordinate system is the simplest double null coordinate system to derive from standard spherical coordinates. From here on, it will be most convenient to use the Eddington-Finkelstein coordinate $u$ as one of our double null coordinates. However, we note that there are two separate $v$ coordinates: one for the region outside the inner horizon and another for the region inside the inner horizon. Fortunately, it is possible to glue these two $v$ coordinates together by combining both of them into a single Kruskal-Szekeres coordinate $V$.

By convention, we choose the inner horizon to be at $V = 0$. We choose $V$ to be positive outside the inner horizon and negative inside the inner horizon. Outside the inner horizon, we define $V$ as follows.

$$V(v) = e^{-\kappa v} \quad (22)$$

Inside the inner horizon, we define $V$ as follows

$$V(v) = -e^{-\kappa v} \quad (23)$$

From these definitions, it is easy to see that $V > 0$ outside the inner horizon, $V < 0$ inside the inner horizon, and $V = 0$ at the inner horizon. Therefore, we have combined the two Eddington-Finkelstein $v$ coordinates into a single $V$ coordinate.
into a single Kruskal-Szekeres coordinate $V$. Since $u$ and $V$ are both null coordinates, the metric still takes the form given in Equation 6.

$$ds^2 = -F(u, V)\ du\ dV + r^2 (u, V)\ d\Omega^2$$

(24)

From Equations 20 and 21 we know how $F(u, v)$ behaves close to the inner horizon in Eddington-Finkelstein coordinates. Using basic calculus, we arrive at the following expression for $F(u, V)$ close to the inner horizon.

Just outside the inner horizon, we may approximate $F(u, V)$ as follows.

$$F(u, V) = 2 e^{\kappa u}$$

(25)

Just inside the inner horizon, we may approximate $F(u, V)$ as follows.

$$F(u, V) = 2 e^{\kappa u}$$

(26)

Therefore, close to the inner horizon, $F(u, V)$ is finite and continuous at all finite $u$.

$$F(u, V \approx 0) = 2 e^{\kappa u}$$

(27)

It is worth noting that we can perform this Kruskal-Szekeres transformation in the perturbed space-time just as we performed it in the unperturbed R-N space-time. Thus, even in the perturbed space-time, we may assume that the Cauchy horizon lies at $V = 0$.

### 3 Space-Time Dynamics and the Raychaudhuri Equation in General Double Null Coordinates

In this section, we describe the dynamics of an arbitrary spherically symmetric metric coupled to a massless Klein-Gordon scalar field. We also calculate the Raychaudhuri scalar $\Theta$ and describe its dynamics. Because these equations hold in arbitrary double null coordinates, we will leave $v$ uncapitalized throughout this section.

#### 3.1 Einstein Field Equations and Dynamics of the Scalar Field

If we allow $F(u, v)$ and $r^2 (u, v)$ to be arbitrary functions, the expression below can describe the metric of an arbitrary spherically-symmetric four-dimensional space-time.

$$ds^2 = -F(u, v)\ du\ dv + r^2 (u, v)\ d\Omega^2$$

(28)

Let $\phi$ be a massless Klein-Gordon scalar field. The Einstein field equations take the following form [18].

$$r_{, uu} - (\ln F)_{, u} r_{, u} + r (\phi_{, u})^2 = 0$$

(31)

$$r_{, vv} - (\ln F)_{, v} r_{, v} + r (\phi_{, v})^2 = 0$$

(32)

The scalar field $\phi$ satisfies the massless Klein-Gordon equation [18]. (We assume that $\phi$ is a spherically symmetric function, so there is no angular dependence).

$$\phi_{, uv} + \frac{1}{r} (r_{, u} \phi_{, v} + r_{, v} \phi_{, u}) = 0$$

(33)
Below, we have written the stress-energy tensor \( T_{\mu\nu}^{s} \) associated with the scalar field \( \phi \) \(^{[18]}\) (Unlike the previous equations, this equation uses the Greek indices \( \mu \) and \( \nu \), not the Latin indices \( u \) and \( v \)).

\[
T_{\mu\nu}^{s} = \frac{1}{4\pi G} \left( \phi_{,\mu} \phi_{,\nu} - \frac{1}{2} g_{\mu\nu} g^{\alpha\beta} \phi_{,\alpha} \phi_{,\beta} \right)
\]

Let \( k^\mu \) be an arbitrary null vector field. Then, it is not difficult to show that the scalar field \( \phi \) satisfies the null energy condition.

\[
T_{\mu\nu} k^\mu k^\nu \geq 0
\]

At the Cauchy horizon, infalling mass-energy creates a singularity called the mass inflation instability. In effect, the mass-energy "piles up" at the Cauchy horizon \([11\)–[21]. Below, we have included a figure to illustrate this effect with massless radiation.
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Figure 2: A Penrose diagram illustrating the formation of the mass inflation singularity at the Cauchy horizon. Light is emitted from the curve \( AB \) in the region \( U \). As it gets closer to the Cauchy horizon, the light waves become compressed and blue-shifted. This causes the energy of the light to increase without bound, creating a singularity.

As discussed in the introduction, the mass inflation instability is a weak singularity, which means that it is possible for an observer to pass through the Cauchy horizon \([18\), [21]).

### 3.2 Raychaudhuri Equation

For a more thorough derivation of all the statements in this subsection, please see Appendix A.

Let us define the vector fields \( \ell^\mu \) and \( n^\mu \) as follows.

\[
\ell^\mu = \begin{cases} 
F(u,v)^{-1}, & \text{if } \mu = v \\
0, & \text{otherwise}
\end{cases}
\]

\[
n^\mu = \begin{cases} 
2, & \text{if } \mu = u \\
0, & \text{otherwise}
\end{cases}
\]
We have the following expression for $\Theta$, the Raychaudhuri expansion scalar in the $v$ direction.

$$\Theta = 2F(u, v)^{-1} r(u, v)^{-1} \partial_v r(u, v)$$  \hspace{1cm} (38)$$

The scalar $\Theta$ obeys the Raychaudhuri equation, which is written below.

$$\ell^\mu \partial_\mu \Theta = -\frac{1}{2}\Theta^2 - R_{\mu\nu} \ell^\mu \ell^\nu$$  \hspace{1cm} (39)$$

Now, we impose the null energy condition $T_{\mu\nu} \ell^\mu \ell^\nu \geq 0$. This condition implies that $\partial_v \Theta \leq 0$.

4 Proof that R-N Wormholes are Unstable

4.1 Assumptions

We assume that the functions $F(u, V)$ and $r(u, V)$ are finite, positive, and continuous for all $u$ and $V$, except at the physical singularity. At all points $u, V$ not at the physical singularity or on the Cauchy horizon, we assume that $F(u, V)$ and $r(u, V)$ are twice continuously differentiable.

According to Refs. [13], [15], [17], [18], the radius of the Cauchy horizon decreases monotonically as $u$ decreases. In other words, for all points where $V = 0$, $r_u(u, V = 0)$ is positive and finite. We also assume that $r_u(u, V)$ is continuous for all $u$ and $V$ (including $V = 0$), except at the physical singularity. According to Refs. [17], [21], at a finite value $u = u_{\text{min}}$, the Cauchy horizon intersects with the physical singularity at $r = 0$.

According to Ref. [18], the derivative $r_v(u, V)$ approaches $+\infty$ as $V \to 0$ from the outside of the Cauchy horizon. Therefore, we assume that there is at least one point on the Cauchy horizon (which we call $u = u_1$) such that the same limit holds from both sides of the Cauchy horizon.

$$\lim_{V \to 0} r_\nu(u = u_1, V) = +\infty$$  \hspace{1cm} (40)$$

4.2 Theorem 1: Divergence of $r_\nu$ at the Cauchy Horizon

**Theorem 1.** Let the assumptions described in Subsection 4.1 be true. Then, for all $u \in (u_{\text{min}}, u_1]$, the following limit holds.

$$\lim_{V \to 0} r_\nu(u, V) = +\infty$$  \hspace{1cm} (41)$$

**Proof.** The proof of Theorem 1 can be found in Appendix B.

4.3 Theorem 2: Positivity of $r_\nu$

**Theorem 2.** Let the assumptions described in Subsection 4.1 be true. Then, $r_\nu(u, V) > 0$ for all $u \in (u_{\text{min}}, u_1]$, $V < 0$.

**Proof.** Let us consider an arbitrary value $u_{\text{test}} \in (u_{\text{min}}, u_1]$. From Theorem 2 we know that the following equation is true.

$$\lim_{V \to 0} r_\nu(u = u_{\text{test}}, V) = +\infty$$  \hspace{1cm} (42)$$

Therefore, there exists some real number $\epsilon > 0$ such that, whenever $0 < |V| < \epsilon$, $r_\nu(u = u_{\text{test}}, V) > 0$.

Recall Equation 38 for the Raychaudhuri scalar $\Theta$.

$$\Theta = 2F(u, v)^{-1} r(u, v)^{-1} \partial_v r(u, v)$$  \hspace{1cm} (43)$$

For any $u$ and $V$ in the physical space-time, if $r_\nu(u, V) > 0$, then $\Theta(u, V) > 0$.

Therefore, there exists some real number $\epsilon > 0$ such that, whenever $0 < |V| < \epsilon$, $\Theta(u = u_{\text{test}}, V) > 0$. 
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From Subsection 3.2 we know that $\partial_v \Theta \leq 0$. Therefore, for any $V < 0$, we know that $\Theta (u_{\text{test}}, V) > 0$.

This implies that $r, V (u_{\text{test}}, V) > 0$ for all $V < 0$.

Since $u_{\text{test}}$ is an arbitrary element of the interval $(u_{\text{min}}, u_1]$, we find that $r, V (u, V) > 0$ for all $u \in (u_{\text{min}}, u_1]$, $V < 0$.

### 4.4 Application to Wormholes

From the assumptions in Subsection 4.1 we know that $r (u, V = 0)$ decreases monotonically as $u$ decreases, eventually reaching zero at a finite value $u = u_{\text{min}}$.

According to Theorem 2 $r, V (u, V) > 0$ for all $u \in (u_{\text{min}}, u_1], V < 0$.

Therefore, for any $u$-value $u_0 \in (u_{\text{min}}, u_1)$ and any $V$-value $V_0 < 0$, we know that $r (u = u_0, V = V_0) < r (u = u_0, V = 0)$.

Since $r (u, V = 0)$ becomes arbitrarily small as $u \to u_{\text{min}}$, we find that for any $V$-value $V_0 < 0$, $r (u, V = V_0)$ becomes arbitrarily small as $u \to u_{\text{min}}$.

Therefore, any object that passes through the Cauchy horizon will inevitably hit the physical singularity $r = 0$ at a finite value of $u$.

Thus, the Penrose diagram for our space-time looks similar to the one below.
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**Figure 3:** Penrose diagram for a perturbed Reissner-Nordström black hole. The values of the double-null coordinates $u$ and $v$ at the horizons are shown in blue. Note that $u$ and $v$ are both Eddington-Finkelstein null coordinates.

### 5 Summary and Future Work

Under the assumptions of Subsection 4.1 we have shown that a Reissner-Nordström wormhole collapses in the presence of spherically symmetric perturbations from a massless scalar field. In the future, it would be
interesting to investigate the impact of a non-zero cosmological constant on the stability of a R-N wormhole. If the assumptions in Subsection 4.1 were true, it would probably be fairly straightforward to prove Theorems 1 and 2 in the presence of a cosmological constant. However, those assumptions rely heavily on numerical simulations performed in space-times with zero cosmological constant. Therefore, it is not yet clear whether the assumptions in Subsection 4.1 would still be valid.

In this article, we have held firmly to the assumption of spherical symmetry. In the future, it would be interesting to investigate the stability of non-spherically symmetric wormholes, such as those that arise from the Kerr-Newman solution. Additionally, it would be interesting to incorporate non-spherically symmetric distributions of mass-energy as perturbations.

As the wormhole collapses, it will eventually become sufficiently small that quantum effects become important. At this scale, the classical analysis performed in this paper is no longer valid. Hence, it is unknown whether the wormhole will continue to collapse or not. Future work is needed to assess the impact of quantum effects on the collapse of the wormhole.

Appendix A: Computation of the Expansion Scalar and the Raychaudhuri Equation in General Double Null Coordinates

Let $K$ be a scalar field, and let $\ell^\mu$ and $n^\mu$ be null vector fields. These quantities must satisfy the following conditions. (Note that $\nabla_\nu$ denotes a covariant derivative).

$$\ell^\mu n_\mu = -1$$ \hspace{1cm} (44)

$$\ell^\nu \nabla_\nu \ell^\mu = K \ell^\mu$$ \hspace{1cm} (45)

Then, we may define the expansion scalar $\Theta$ as follows.

$$\Theta = \nabla_\mu \ell^\mu - K$$ \hspace{1cm} (46)

Next, let us define the transverse metric $h_{\mu\nu}$.

$$h_{\mu\nu} = g_{\mu\nu} + \ell_\mu n_\nu + n_\mu \ell_\nu$$ \hspace{1cm} (47)

Finally, let us define the quantities $\sigma_{\mu\nu}$ and $\omega_{\mu\nu}$.

$$\sigma_{\mu\nu} = \frac{1}{2} \left( \nabla^\sigma \ell^\rho \right) \left( h_{\mu\rho} h_{\nu\sigma} + h_{\nu\rho} h_{\mu\sigma} \right) - \frac{1}{2} h_{\mu\nu} \Theta$$ \hspace{1cm} (48)

$$\omega_{\mu\nu} = \frac{1}{2} \left( \nabla^\sigma \ell^\rho \right) \left( h_{\mu\rho} h_{\nu\sigma} - h_{\nu\rho} h_{\mu\sigma} \right)$$ \hspace{1cm} (49)

The Raychaudhuri equation takes the following form $[22]$. (Note that $\sigma^2 := \sigma_{\mu\nu} \sigma^{\mu\nu}$, and likewise for $\omega^2$).

$$\ell^\mu \partial_\mu \Theta = - \frac{1}{2} \Theta^2 - \sigma^2 + \omega^2 - R_{\mu\nu} \ell^\mu \ell^\nu + K \Theta$$ \hspace{1cm} (50)

We use the index $u$, not to be confused with $\mu$, to denote the component of a vector in the positive $u$ direction. We use the index $v$, not to be confused with $\nu$, to denote the component of a vector in the positive $v$ direction. (Since the indices $u$ and $v$ denote specific directions, they do not follow the Einstein summation convention).

We are free to choose the vector fields $\ell^\mu$ and $n^\mu$, as long as they satisfy Equations 44 and 45. Therefore, we select the following expressions for these two vector fields.

$$\ell^\mu = \begin{cases} F(u,v)^{-1}, & \text{if } \mu = v \\ 0, & \text{otherwise} \end{cases}$$ \hspace{1cm} (51)
We may expand \( \ell^\beta \nabla_\beta \ell^\alpha \) as follows. (To avoid confusion with \( u \) and \( v \), we replace the indices \( \mu \) and \( \nu \) in Equation 45 with \( \alpha \) and \( \beta \)).

\[
\ell^\beta \nabla_\beta \ell^\alpha = \ell^\beta \left( \partial_\beta \ell^\alpha + \Gamma^\alpha_{\beta\gamma} \ell^\gamma \right) = \ell^\alpha \partial_\alpha \ell^\alpha + \Gamma^\alpha_{\alpha\nu} \left( \ell^\nu \right)^2
\]

We may write the Christoffel symbols \( \Gamma^\alpha_{\nu\nu} \) as follows.

\[
\Gamma^\alpha_{\nu\nu} = g^{\alpha\beta} \partial_\nu g_{\nu\beta}
\]

When \( \alpha \neq \nu \), we find that \( \ell^\beta \nabla_\beta \ell^\alpha = 0 \). Therefore, the only non-trivial component of Equation 45 occurs when \( \alpha = \nu \).

\[
\ell^\nu \partial_\nu \ell^\nu + \Gamma^\nu_{\nu\nu} \left( \ell^\nu \right)^2 = K \ell^\nu
\]

Thus, we have the following expression for the scalar \( K \).

\[
K = \partial_\nu \ell^\nu + \Gamma^\nu_{\nu\nu} \ell^\nu
\]

From Equation 46, we have the following definition for \( \Theta \).

\[
\Theta = \nabla_\alpha \ell^\alpha - K = \partial_\alpha \ell^\alpha + \Gamma^\alpha_{\alpha\gamma} \ell^\gamma = \partial_\nu \ell^\nu + \Gamma^\alpha_{\alpha\nu} \ell^\nu
\]

The index \( \alpha \) is summed, since it does not denote a specific coordinate direction. We may write the quantity \( \Gamma^\alpha_{\alpha\nu} \) as follows.

\[
\Gamma^\alpha_{\alpha\nu} = g^{\alpha\beta} \left( \partial_\nu g_{\alpha\beta} + \partial_\alpha g_{\nu\beta} - \partial_\beta g_{\alpha\nu} \right) = g^{\mu\nu} \partial_\nu g_{\mu\alpha} + g^{\nu\nu} \partial_\nu g_{\alpha\nu} + \frac{1}{2} g^{\phi\phi} \partial_\nu g_{\phi\alpha}
\]

Therefore, we may write \( \Theta \) as follows.

\[
\Theta = 2 F (u, v)^{-1} r (u, v)^{-1} \partial_\nu r (u, v)
\]

Recall the expression for the transverse metric \( h_{\mu\nu} \). (Note that we are now using the Greek indices \( \mu \) and \( \nu \)).

\[
h_{\mu\nu} = g_{\mu\nu} + \ell_\mu n_\nu + \ell_\nu n_\mu
\]

With \( \ell^\mu \) and \( n^\mu \) defined by Equations 51 and 52, it is easy to show that \( h_{\mu\nu} \) is non-zero if and only \( \mu = \nu = \theta \) or \( \mu = \nu = \phi \).

\[
h_{\mu\nu} = \begin{cases} 
    g_{\theta\theta} & \text{if } \mu = \nu = \theta \\
    g_{\phi\phi} & \text{if } \mu = \nu = \phi \\
    0 & \text{otherwise}
\end{cases}
\]

Now, we seek to prove that \( \sigma^2 = 0 \) and \( \omega^2 = 0 \). The tensors \( \sigma_{\mu\nu} \) and \( \omega_{\mu\nu} \) are zero unless both \( \mu \) and \( \nu \) are elements of the set \( \{ \theta, \phi \} \). The tensor \( \sigma_{\mu\nu} \) is symmetric in \( \mu \) and \( \nu \), while the tensor \( \omega_{\mu\nu} \) is anti-symmetric.
in \( \mu \) and \( \nu \). Because \( \omega_{\mu\nu} \) is anti-symmetric in \( \mu \) and \( \nu \), \( \omega_{\theta\theta} \) and \( \omega_{\phi\phi} \) must both be zero. Below, we prove that \( \omega_{\theta\phi} = 0 \).

\[
\omega_{\theta\phi} = \frac{1}{2} \left( \nabla^\theta \ell^\phi \right) (h_{\theta\phi} h_{\sigma\sigma} - h_{\phi\sigma} h_{\theta\sigma}) 
= \frac{1}{2} \left( \nabla^\phi \ell^\theta \right) h_{\theta\theta} h_{\phi\phi} - \frac{1}{2} \left( \nabla^\theta \ell^\phi \right) h_{\theta\theta} h_{\phi\phi} 
= \frac{1}{2} h_{\theta\theta} h_{\phi\phi} \left( \nabla^\phi \ell^\theta - \nabla^\theta \ell^\phi \right) 
= \frac{1}{2} h_{\theta\theta} h_{\phi\phi} g^{\theta\theta} g^{\phi\phi} (\nabla_\theta \ell_\phi - \nabla_\phi \ell_\theta) 
= \frac{1}{2} (\partial_\phi \ell_\theta - \partial_\theta \ell_\phi) 
= 0
\] (70)

Since all components of \( \omega_{\mu\nu} \) are zero, the scalar \( \omega^2 \) is also zero. Next, we prove that \( \sigma_{\theta\theta} = 0 \).

\[
\sigma_{\theta\theta} = \left( \nabla^\theta \ell^\theta \right) (h_{\theta\theta})^2 - \frac{1}{2} h_{\theta\theta} \Theta 
= \nabla_\theta \ell_\theta - \frac{1}{2} g_{\theta\theta} \Theta 
= -\Gamma_{\alpha\theta\theta} \ell^\alpha - \frac{1}{2} g_{\theta\theta} \Theta 
= \frac{1}{2} \ell^\nu \partial_\nu g_{\theta\theta} - \frac{1}{2} g_{\theta\theta} \Theta 
= F (u, v)^{-1} r (u, v) \partial_\nu r (u, v) - F (u, v)^{-1} r (u, v) \partial_\nu r (u, v) 
= 0
\] (71)

A similar calculation shows that \( \sigma_{\phi\phi} = 0 \). Now, we prove that \( \sigma_{\theta\phi} = 0 \).

\[
\sigma_{\theta\phi} = \frac{1}{2} \left( \nabla^\phi \ell^\theta \right) h_{\theta\theta} h_{\phi\phi} + \frac{1}{2} \left( \nabla^\theta \ell^\phi \right) h_{\theta\theta} h_{\phi\phi} - \frac{1}{2} h_{\theta\phi} \Theta 
= \frac{1}{2} \left( \nabla_\phi \ell_\theta + \nabla_\theta \ell_\phi \right) 
= -\Gamma_{\alpha\theta\phi} \ell^\alpha 
= 0
\] (72)

Because all components of \( \sigma_{\mu\nu} \) are zero, we have proven that \( \sigma^2 = 0 \) and \( \omega^2 = 0 \). Thus, the Raychaudhuri scalar \( \Theta \) obeys the following equation.

\[
\ell^\mu \partial_\mu \Theta = -\frac{1}{2} \Theta^2 - R_{\mu\nu} \ell^\mu \ell^\nu
\] (73)

We use the trace-reversed Einstein field equations to express \( R_{ab} \) in terms of the stress-energy tensor \( T_{ab} \).

\[
R_{ab} = \kappa T_{ab} - \frac{1}{2} \kappa g_{ab}
\] (74)

Next, we substitute the trace-reversed EFE into the Raychaudhuri equation. Because \( \ell^\mu \) is a null vector, the term involving the scalar \( T \) disappears.

\[
\ell^\mu \partial_\mu \Theta = -\frac{1}{2} \Theta^2 - \kappa T_{\mu\nu} \ell^\mu \ell^\nu
\] (75)

Now, we impose the null energy condition \( T_{\mu\nu} \ell^\mu \ell^\nu \geq 0 \). With this condition, it is clear that \( \ell^\mu \partial_\mu \Theta \) is strictly non-positive.

\[
\ell^\mu \partial_\mu \Theta \leq 0
\] (76)

Because the only non-zero component of \( \ell^\mu \) is \( \ell^\nu \), which is positive, we know that \( \partial_\nu \Theta \leq 0 \).
Appendix B: Proof of Theorem 1

We proceed via proof by contradiction. Let us assume that there is some point \( u_2 \in (u_{\text{min}}, u_1) \) such that the following is true.

\[
\lim_{V \to 0} r_{u,V} (u = u_2, V) \neq +\infty \tag{90}
\]

In any interval \( V \in (-\epsilon, 0) \cup (0, \epsilon) \), there will be at least one line \( V = V_1 \) such that the following inequality is true.

\[
r_{u,V} (u = u_2, V = V_1) < r_{u,V} (u = u_1, V = V_1) \tag{91}
\]

Because \( V_1 \neq 0 \), we know that \( r_{u,V} (u, V = V_1) \) is continuous for all \( u > u_{\text{min}} \). By the mean value theorem (Theorem 2.3.10 in Ref. [23]), we know that there must exist some point \( u_3 \in (u_2, u_1) \) such that \( r_{u,V} (u = u_3, V = V_1) > 0 \).

From Equation (29), we have the following expression for \( r_{u,V} \). (Since Equation (29) holds for any double null coordinate system, we may replace \( v \) with the Kruskal-Szekeres coordinate \( V \)).

\[
r_{u,V} = -\frac{r_{u} r_{V}}{r} - \frac{F}{4r} \left( 1 - \frac{r_{Q}^2}{r^2} \right) = -\frac{r_{u} r_{V}}{r} - \frac{F}{4r} + \frac{r_{Q}^2 F}{4r^3} \tag{92}
\]

The functions \( F(u, V) \), \( r(u, V) \), and \( r_{u}(u, V) \) are finite, positive, and continuous everywhere along the Cauchy horizon, except at the physical singularity. By contrast, \( r_{V}(u = u_1, V) \) grows without bound as \( V \to 0 \).

Therefore, if we choose \( V_1 \) to be sufficiently close to zero, we can make \( r_{u,V} (u = u_1, V = V_1) \) negative.

\[
r_{u,V} (u = u_1, V = V_1) < 0 \tag{93}
\]

Because \( r_{u,V} \) is continuous along the line \( V = V_1 \), there must be some interval around \( u = u_1 \) (meaning \( u_1 \) is not on the boundary) where \( r_{u,V} (u, V = V_1) < 0 \).

Let \( u = u_4 \) be a value such that \( u_4 < u_1 \) and \( r_{u,V} (u = u_4, V = V_1) \geq 0 \).

We also assume that \( u = u_4 \) is the first point to have \( r_{u,V} (u = u_4, V = V_1) \geq 0 \), in the sense that for all \( u \in (u_4, u_1) \), \( r_{u,V} (u, V = V_1) < 0 \). (This implies that \( r_{u,V} (u = u_4, V = V_1) = 0 \).)

Because \( r_{u,V} (u, V = V_1) < 0 \) for all \( u \in (u_4, u_1) \), we know that the following inequality is true.

\[
r_{V}(u = u_4, V = V_1) > r_{V}(u = u_1, V = V_1) \tag{94}
\]

On the closed interval \( I = [u_2, u_1] \), the functions \( F(u, V = V_1) \) and \( r(u, V = V_1) \) are continuous and positive. If we choose \( V_1 \) to be sufficiently close to \( V = 0 \), then \( r_{V}(u, V = V_1) \) will also be continuous and positive on \( I \).

According to Theorem 2.2.9 of Ref. [23] (also known as the extreme value theorem), \( F(u, V = V_1) \), \( r(u, V = V_1) \), and \( r_{u}(u, V = V_1) \) all have positive lower and upper bounds on \( I \).

Therefore, we may choose \( V_1 \) such that the following inequality holds for all \( u \in I \). (Note that this inequality compares \( r_{V} \) at the point \( u = u_1 \) to the right-hand side at all points \( u \in I \)).

\[
r_{V}(u = u_1, V = V_1) > \frac{F(u, V = V_1)}{4r_{u}(u, V = V_1)} + \frac{r_{Q}^2 F(u, V = V_1)}{4r(u, V = V_1)^2 r_{u}(u, V = V_1)} \tag{95}
\]

Using Equation (94) we obtain the following inequality for all \( u \in I \).

\[
r_{V}(u = u_4, V = V_1) > \frac{F(u, V = V_1)}{4r_{u}(u, V = V_1)} + \frac{r_{Q}^2 F(u, V = V_1)}{4r(u, V = V_1)^2 r_{u}(u, V = V_1)} \tag{96}
\]

Using Equations (29) and (96), we find that \( r_{u,V} (u = u_4, V = V_1) < 0 \). However, this conflicts with our earlier requirement that \( r_{u,V} (u = u_4, V = V_1) \geq 0 \).
Thus, we have established that, if there is some point \( u_2 \in (u_{\text{min}}, u_1) \) such that \( \lim_{V \to 0} r_{V}(u = u_2, V) \neq \infty \), we obtain a contradiction.

Therefore, for all \( u \in (u_{\text{min}}, u_1] \), we know that the following is true.

\[
\lim_{V \to 0} r_{V}(u, V) = +\infty
\]

(97)
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