

Dynamical Love for area quantized black holes

Sreejith Nair,^{1,*} Sumanta Chakraborty,^{2,†} and Sudipta Sarkar^{1,‡}

¹*Indian Institute of Technology, Gandhinagar, Gujarat-382355, India*

²*School of Physical Sciences, Indian Association for the Cultivation of Science, Kolkata-700032, India*

We show that the area-quantized black holes have non-zero dynamical tidal Love numbers for frequencies differing from the characteristic frequencies associated with the quantization spectrum. Intriguingly, the details of the quantization model can be determined by studying the spectrum of the dynamical tidal Love numbers. This provides a crucial observational tool to distinguish various models of the area-quantized black holes and also the area-quantized black holes from other exotic compact objects. We further provide implications for future gravitational wave detectors, e.g., LISA.

I. INTRODUCTION

Gravitational-wave measurements [1, 2] have provided us an opportunity to probe the near-horizon physics to an unprecedented level, just as the shadow measurements from the supermassive central regions of M 87 [3] and our own galaxy [4] have enlightened us about the gravitational dynamics near the photon sphere. The future gravitational-wave observations are aimed at an even better understanding of the gravitational interaction in the near-horizon regime. They are supposed to shed light on the nature of the gravitational theory and the compact objects sourcing these waves. In particular, we hope to test the black hole hypothesis, which asserts the existence of a one-way null surface, namely the event horizon. Therefore, it is essential to study various observational features of models beyond the standard black hole paradigm in general relativity.

Classically, the mass and the angular momentum of the black hole can vary continuously, and there are no restrictions on the variations of the area of the black hole horizon. However, the situation changes drastically if the area and the angular momentum of a black hole get quantized [5], as expected from quantum theories of gravity. Then the black hole can only undergo transitions to discrete mass/energy levels as it interacts with external perturbations, similar to the atomic transitions. Therefore, one expects non-trivial physics to emerge from the quantum nature of the black hole horizon, and hence it must be explored in detail. Among various possible models of such quantum black holes, the pioneering work by Bekenstein and Mukhanov [6] describes the area-quantized black holes. The area quantization has many interesting consequences on the emission spectrum of black holes, namely on the profile of the Hawking radiation [6–10] as well as on the quasi-normal mode spectrum [11–17].

Just as the quantum nature of the black hole horizon modifies the ringdown spectrum, it is also expected

that the system's response to tidal perturbations of an external tidal field will also be affected. Hence determining the tidal deformability of area-quantized black holes, characterized by the so-called tidal Love numbers, is of significant interest. Since the tidal deformation of the classical black hole solutions of general relativity vanishes identically [18–24], one would like to know whether the area-quantized black holes can be deformed by an external tidal field which may manifest as a non-zero tidal Love number. Furthermore, it will be of interest to determine if these results depend on the details of the nature of the area quantization.

In this letter, we report the existence of a non-zero frequency-dependent (dynamical) tidal Love number for an area-quantized black hole. The non-zero value of the tidal Love number arises from the fact that, while a classical black hole absorbs all the incident radiation, the area-quantized black hole would absorb selectively at specific characteristic frequencies. Therefore, the tidal Love numbers at arbitrary frequencies (including that of zero frequency) should be non-zero. Additionally, we will show that the behavior of the dynamical tidal Love number with frequency is dependent on the details of the area-quantization and hence is capable of distinguishing various models of area quantization. These results provide a new tool to study near-horizon physics using gravitational-wave observations, particularly the nature of compact objects.

The letter is organized as follows: In [Section II](#) we provide a brief review of the area quantized black holes. Then, in [Section III](#), we compute the tidal Love numbers of these area quantized black holes, which have been applied subsequently in [Section IV](#) to study the observability of these dynamical Love numbers in the context of gravitational wave measurements. Finally, we conclude with a discussion of the results.

Notations and Conventions: Throughout the paper we have used the mostly positive signature convention, i.e., the flat spacetime metric in the Cartesian coordinates look like: $\eta_{\mu\nu} = \text{diag.}(-1, +1, +1, +1)$. We have also set the fundamental constants G , \hbar , and c to unity.

*Electronic address: sreejithnair@iitgn.ac.in

†Electronic address: tpsc@iacs.res.in

‡Electronic address: sudiptas@iitgn.ac.in

II. AREA-QUANTIZED BLACK HOLES: A BRIEF REVIEW

Quantum effects on the black hole background gave rise to several interesting and intriguing effects. The discovery of the Hawking radiation from the event horizon led to the formulation of the black hole thermodynamics. However, these effects treat the black hole classically and assign to it an entropy proportional to horizon area and a temperature proportional to surface gravity. The area-entropy correspondence suggests that the microscopic degrees of freedom for gravity are encoded in the area of the black hole, and therefore, one may consider the area itself as a quantum entity. Similar arguments were put forward in various quantum theories of gravity, but the quantization rule, as derived in those models, depends on the specifics of the problem. Instead of getting involved in the intricate physics of quantum gravity, we will follow the route taken by Bekenstein and Mukhanov in [5, 6], where they considered the black hole area to be quantized in linear steps. This can be motivated by considering the black hole area to be an excited state of a bunch of harmonic oscillators generating the area, such that (restoring c , G and \hbar for the moment),

$$A = \alpha \ell_p^2 N . \quad (1)$$

Here, N is an integer, $\ell_p = \sqrt{\hbar G/c^2}$ and α depends on the specifics of the quantum gravity. In what follows, we will keep α arbitrary, as a $\mathcal{O}(1)$ constant and shall see the predictions arising from various choices of α . As a consequence of quantized area, the black hole cannot absorb all possible frequencies but will do so in discrete steps. For a rotating black hole, the frequency associated with the transition in the area from $N \rightarrow (N+n)$, corresponds to [13],

$$\omega_{N,n} = \left(\frac{\alpha \kappa}{8\pi} \right) n + 2\Omega_h + \mathcal{O}(N^{-1}) . \quad (2)$$

Here the angular momentum is also quantized as $J = \sqrt{j(j+1)}\hbar \simeq j\hbar$ (assuming $j \gg 1$) and the above frequency corresponds to a transition in the angular momentum, as $j \rightarrow j+2$. Also, in the above expression, κ is the surface gravity, and Ω_h is the angular velocity of the horizon for the Kerr spacetime. Note that the frequencies depend explicitly on the details of the quantizations through the parameter α and on the background spacetime through κ and Ω_h .

On the other hand, based on various models of gravity, it follows that uniform area quantization cannot be the full story. In particular, most of these quantum gravity models involve sub-leading corrections to the entropy of the black hole, which are supposed to be translated in the quantized area spectrum as well, such that [16, 25],

$$A_{\text{non}} = \alpha \ell_p^2 N (1 + CN^\nu) . \quad (3)$$

Here, α , C , and ν are the parameters arising from the underlying quantum theory of gravity. In this case as

well, when the black hole makes a transition from N to $(N+n)$ area level and from j to $(j+2)$ angular momentum level, the black hole absorbs the following frequency,

$$\omega_{N,n} = \left(\frac{\alpha \kappa}{8\pi} \right) [1 + C(1 + \nu)N^\nu] n + 2\Omega_h + \mathcal{O}(N^{-1}) . \quad (4)$$

Note that in the limit of $C \rightarrow 0$, we recover Eq. (2), as expected. Thus the black hole only absorbs the incoming radiation in the above frequencies, which depend on the details of the quantization scheme, as well as on the nature of the background spacetime. We will use these expressions to compute the variation of the tidal deformability of these area-quantized black holes with frequency.

III. DYNAMICAL TIDAL LOVE NUMBERS FOR AREA-QUANTIZED BLACK HOLES

As already mentioned in the previous sections, the tidal Love number for any compact object is essentially a measure of the deformation of the respective object caused by an external tidal field \mathcal{E} , whose spherical harmonic decomposition is governed by the components $\mathcal{E}_{\ell m}$ [26, 27]. These Love numbers are a faithful probe of the internal structure of the tidally deformed compact objects. In general, the tidal Love number $\lambda_{\ell m}$ of a compact object is given by the ratio of the induced moment $Q_{\ell m}$ associated with the (ℓ, m) mode of the spherical harmonic decomposition, with the external tidal field itself. From this definition, it is evident that $\lambda_{\ell m}$ has the dimension of $(\text{mass})^{2\ell+1}$, in units where the speed of light and Newton's constant have been chosen to be unity. It is often advantageous to define the dimensionless tidal Love number $k_{\ell m}$ through the following relation: $k_{\ell m} \sim (\lambda_{\ell m}/R^{2\ell+1})$, where R is the radius of the compact object. Moreover, the tidal Love numbers, in general, can be divided into electric and magnetic parts, depending on their parity. We would like to mention that, even though the tidal Love numbers can be derived for all the spherical harmonics (ℓ, m) . The most dominant contribution will come from the electric part and for quadrupolar deformation, corresponding to the choice $\ell = 2$ and is the one we will also concentrate on. In the general case, the change in the multipole moment $Q_{\ell m}$ due to an external tidal field $\mathcal{E}_{\ell m}$ is expressed as [27],

$$\delta Q_{\ell m} = -2 \frac{(\ell-2)!}{(2\ell-1)!!} k_{\ell m} R^{2\ell+1} \mathcal{E}_{\ell m} , \quad (5)$$

where, R is the radius of the compact object and $k_{\ell m}$ are the tidal Love numbers, with $\ell = 2$ and $m = 2$, being the one of prime interest. The tidal Love numbers $k_{\ell m}$ can also be computed from the change in the gravitational potential due to the deformation induced by $\mathcal{E}_{\ell m}$ and hence takes the form [27],

$$\delta U = \sum_{\ell m} \mathcal{U}_{\ell m} Y_{\ell m}(\theta, \phi) ;$$

$$\mathcal{U}_{\ell m} = \frac{r^\ell \mathcal{E}_{\ell m}}{\ell(\ell-1)} \left[1 + (2k_{\ell m} + i\omega\tau_0\nu_{\ell m}) \left(\frac{R}{r} \right)^{2\ell+1} \right]. \quad (6)$$

Here, $k_{\ell m}$'s are the tidal Love numbers, while τ_0 and $\nu_{\ell m}$'s are related to the tidal absorption of the deformed object. Intriguingly, it follows that for black holes in general relativity $k_{\ell m}$ identically vanishes [18–24], while any other compact objects are believed to experience quadrupolar deformation under external tidal fields [28–31]. In this work, we wish to explore if it remains true in the context of area-quantized black holes, and for that purpose, we will closely follow the Ref [24].

In order to have a gauge invariant formulation of the tidal Love number, it is useful to consider the Weyl scalars. Since tidal Love numbers are derived by constructing an asymptotic expansion of the deformed potential, due to the external tidal field, near infinity. Therefore, we use the Weyl scalar ψ_4 for our purpose [32, 33]. The dynamics of the Weyl scalar ψ_4 , associated with the perturbations of the Kerr Geometry of mass M and angular momentum a , can be separated into a radial and an angular part, as [34–36],

$$(r - ia \cos \theta)^4 \psi_4 = \int e^{-i\omega v} e^{im\tilde{\phi}} S(\theta) \mathcal{R}(r) dv, \quad (7)$$

where, $(v, r, \theta, \tilde{\phi})$ corresponds to the ingoing null coordinates. The angular part can be solved to yield spin-weighted spheroidal harmonics, while the radial part satisfies the following equation [24],

$$\left[\Delta \frac{d^2}{dr^2} + 2[(s+1)(r-M) - iK] \frac{d}{dr} + 2(2s-1)i\omega r - \lambda \right] \mathcal{R}(r) = 0, \quad (8)$$

with, $K = (r^2 + a^2)\omega - am$, $\lambda = E - 2am\omega + a^2\omega^2 - s(s+1)$, $s = -2$ and $\Delta = r^2 - 2aM + a^2$. To get an analytic handle to the above equation, we may consider the low-frequency approximation ($M\omega \ll 1$), as well as the near-horizon approximation ($r - r_+ \ll M$), such that the radial component $\mathcal{R}(r)$ of the gravitational perturbation can be described by the following differential equation [24],

$$\frac{d^2 \mathcal{R}(\xi)}{d\xi^2} + \left[\frac{(2ip-1)}{\xi} - \frac{(2ip+1)}{(\xi+1)} \right] \frac{d\mathcal{R}(\xi)}{d\xi} + \left[\frac{4ip}{(\xi+1)^2} - \frac{4ip}{\xi^2} - \frac{[\ell(\ell+1)-2]}{\xi(\xi+1)} \right] \mathcal{R}(\xi) = 0. \quad (9)$$

The dimensionless parameters ξ and p are defined as, $\xi \equiv (r-r_+)/r_+$ and $p \equiv (am-2M\omega r_+)/r_+$. The above equation has two linearly independent solutions in terms of the Hypergeometric functions, such that the most general solution is given by,

$$\mathcal{R}(\xi) = A\mathcal{R}_{\text{in}}(\xi) + B\mathcal{R}_{\text{out}}(\xi), \quad (10)$$

where, the two linearly independent solutions $\mathcal{R}_{\text{in}}(\xi)$ and $\mathcal{R}_{\text{out}}(\xi)$ take the following forms,

$$\mathcal{R}_{\text{in}}(\xi) = (1+\xi)^2 \xi^2 {}_2F_1[2-\ell, 3+\ell; 3+2ip; -\xi], \quad (11)$$

$$\mathcal{R}_{\text{out}}(\xi) = (1+\xi)^2 \xi^{-2ip} \times {}_2F_1[-\ell-2ip, 1+\ell-2ip; -1-2ip; -\xi]. \quad (12)$$

The above functions are referred to as the ingoing and the outgoing solutions, since in the near horizon limit, $\mathcal{R}_{\text{in}} \sim (r-r_+)^2$ and $\mathcal{R}_{\text{out}} \sim (r-r_+)^{-2ip}$, the ingoing and outgoing boundary conditions for ψ_4 , respectively [36]. For a classical black hole spacetime, there should not be any outgoing solution near the horizon, and hence the coefficient B must vanish in Eq. (10), such that ψ_4 is governed by $\mathcal{R}_{\text{in}}(\xi)$ alone. In which case, it was demonstrated in [24], that $k_{\ell m}$ identically vanishes (however, $\nu_{\ell m}$ is non-zero, see Eq. (6)).

Since we are interested in quantum black holes, we cannot set $B = 0$. This is because there are frequencies in which the black hole does not absorb the incoming radiation but rather reflects back, and hence we must have both \mathcal{R}_{in} and \mathcal{R}_{out} in the radial perturbation for a quantum black hole. In order to arrive at the tidal Love numbers, we first substitute the general solution $\mathcal{R}(\xi)$ from Eq. (10), into the expression for the Weyl scalar ψ_4 , as presented in Eq. (7). Subsequently, we expand the Weyl scalar in the tidal region, characterized by the condition $\xi \gg 1$, or, equivalently $(r/r_+) \gg 1$, leading to,

$$\psi_4 \sim r^{\ell-2} [1 + \mathcal{O}(r^{-1})] + r^{-\ell-3} (2k_{\ell m} + i\omega\tau_0\nu_{\ell m}) [1 + \mathcal{O}(r^{-1})]. \quad (13)$$

The first term in the above expansion is the growing term associated with the tidal source, while the second term is the response term of the compact object. Here, once again, $k_{\ell m}$ is the tidal Love number, and $\nu_{\ell m}$ corresponds to the tidal dissipation. The tidal Love number, in particular, have the following expression,

$$k_{\ell m}(\omega) = \frac{(\ell-2)!(\ell+2)!}{(2\ell)!(2\ell+1)!} \times \text{Re} \left[\frac{i(2M\omega r_+ - am)}{2(r_+ - r_-)} \left\{ \frac{1 - R_{\text{quantum}}(\omega)\Gamma(\omega)}{1 + R_{\text{quantum}}(\omega)\Gamma(\omega)} \right\} \prod_{j=1}^{\ell} \left(j^2 + 4 \frac{(2M\omega r_+ - am)^2}{(r_+ - r_-)^2} \right) \right]. \quad (14)$$

In the above expression, $R_{\text{quantum}}(\omega)$ corresponds to the

reflectivity of the quantum membrane, which is a func-

tion of the frequency of the perturbation described by ψ_4 . As we have discussed before, for a quantum black hole, the absorption takes place only at the characteristic frequencies, $\omega = \omega_{N,n}$, as fixed by the area quantization rule. Therefore, at these frequencies, the compact object behaves as a classical black hole, and hence the reflectivity will vanish identically. This motivates us to model the reflectivity of a quantum black hole as a sum of Hann Window functions centered at $\omega_{N,n}$, such that [15],

$$R_{\text{quantum}} = e^{\frac{i\pi M\omega}{2}} \left[1 - \sum_n \mathfrak{P}(\omega - \omega_{N,n}, D/2) \right]. \quad (15)$$

Here, \mathfrak{P} becomes unity at the characteristic frequencies $\omega_{N,n}$ and hence, the reflectivity identically vanishes as it should. In addition, we have introduced a width D , which depends on the mass and spin of the black hole and is determined from the fitting formula used in [15]¹. Fig. 1 shows the variation of $|R_{\text{quantum}}|^2$ with both uniform and non-uniform quantization of area, depicting expected behavior. Moreover, from the figure, it is clear that for non-uniform area quantization, the density of the characteristic frequencies within the LIGO frequency band is considerably larger compared to that of uniform quantization. Also, the phase of the reflectivity R_{quantum} is expected to depend on the dimensionless combination $M\omega$. We emphasize that the expression in Eq. (15) is based on reasonable physical considerations rather than some concrete microscopic computations.

Finally, to determine the variation of the tidal Love number with frequency, we also have to find out the quantity $\Gamma(\omega)$, appearing in Eq. (14), which can be obtained as,

$$\Gamma(\omega) \equiv \frac{\Gamma(\ell + 3)\Gamma(-1 - 2ip)\Gamma(\ell + 1 + 2ip)}{\Gamma(\ell - 1)\Gamma(3 + 2ip)\Gamma(\ell + 1 - 2ip)}, \quad (16)$$

where, p is dependent on the frequency, defined earlier. Observe that the tidal Love number $k_{\ell m}$ is a non-trivial function of the frequency ω , and also depends on the reflectivity $R_{\text{quantum}}(\omega)$, of the rotating quantum black hole. As evident, the exact form of $k_{\ell m}$ is dependent on both the real and imaginary parts of the reflectivity, as well as on the real and imaginary parts of the complex and frequency-dependent quantity $\Gamma(\omega)$. So, even if the reflectivity is a constant, the Love numbers will still change with the frequency of the perturbation.

In the limit of a classical black hole, R_{quantum} identically vanishes, and we recover the results of [24]. On the other hand, in Eq. (14), there is an overall factor of $(2M\omega r_+ - am)$. Therefore, for a non-rotating black hole, in the $\omega \rightarrow 0$ case, we have $k_{\ell m}(\omega) \rightarrow 0$ as well, irrespective of the fact that there is a non-trivial reflectivity




FIG. 1: The square of the magnitude of the reflectivity, i.e., $|R_{\text{quantum}}|^2$ (for brevity, in the plots we have written it as simply $|R|^2$) as a function of frequency for quantum black hole models with mass $M = 10M_{\odot}$ and rotation parameter $\chi = a/M = 0.3$. The top graph is for uniform quantization with $\alpha = 4 \log 2$ and the bottom graph is for non-uniform quantization with $\alpha = 4 \log 2$, $C = -1.38$, and $\nu = -0.01$.

associated with the quantum black hole. This seems to contradict the non-zero static Love numbers obtained for perfectly reflecting compact objects with non-rotating geometries in [28, 29]. This apparent discrepancy can be attributed to the existence of different branches of solutions of the hypergeometric differential equation based on whether its arguments are integers or not. In particular, the branch of the hypergeometric equation contributing in the dynamical case is different from those contributing in the static case. Thus, we will get around this difficulty by treating the dynamical and the static case separately, thereby reproducing the results of [28, 29]. This completes the discussion on the mathematical structure of the tidal Love number for a quantum black hole. We will now explore the consequences of Eq. (14) in the context of its observability in the present or future gravitational wave detectors. To compute the Love numbers, we will use the model of the reflectivity as described by Eq. (15).

IV. IMPLICATIONS FOR GRAVITATIONAL WAVE OBSERVATIONS

Let us now compute the tidal Love number of the most dominant ($\ell = 2, m = 2$) mode, for frequencies within the range of the LIGO. The tidal Love number

¹ Note that, in [15], the width was denoted by Γ .




FIG. 2: The tidal Love number for the most dominant mode k_{22} has been presented as a function of ω for various area quantized black holes with mass $M = 10M_{\odot}$ and $\chi = 0.3$. The orange line is for a classical Kerr black hole, which predicts zero tidal Love number. The three figures in the top describes uniform quantization with $\alpha = 8\pi, 4 \log 2$ and 2 respectively, from left to right. While the figures in the bottom describes non-uniform quantization with $C = -1.38, \nu = -0.01$ and $\alpha = 8\pi, 4 \log 2$ and 2 respectively, from left to right. The values of the parameters for non-uniform quantization are chosen so that there is no overlap between the transition frequencies.

k_{22} which depends on the details of the underlying quantum theory through the parameter α for the uniform area quantization and the parameters (α, C, ν) for non-uniform area quantization. The dependence of k_{22} on the background geometry will arise from the width D in the reflectivity and through the mass M and angular momentum a , respectively. Note that the computation of the tidal Love numbers, following Eq. (14), is based on the small frequency assumption, i.e., the expression is only applicable for those frequencies which satisfy $f \ll (1/2\pi)(c^3/GM)$. For $M = 10M_{\odot}$, the combination $(2\pi f)(GM/c^3)$ becomes $\mathcal{O}(10^{-2})$ at $f = 80$ Hz. This is why we have truncated the plots at precisely 80 Hz; beyond that, the small frequency approximation breaks down.

As evident from Fig. 2, in the case of uniform area quantization, with the choice $\alpha = 8\pi$, the Love number is non-zero and a slowly decreasing function of frequency in this frequency range. For this choice of parameters, there is no transition frequency within 80 Hz, and as a result, there is not much feature in the variation of the Love number. The same stands true for $\alpha = 4 \ln 2$ as well, while for $\alpha = 2$, a new feature starts to show up in the spectrum of the Love numbers. This is because there are values of transition frequencies within $f = 80$ Hz. As expected, the Love number vanishes exactly at the characteristic frequencies. This suggests that if the spectrum of the tidal Love number depicts some sharp features, with the tidal Love number vanishing at certain frequencies, for small frequencies, one can safely

say that the value of α must be small. On the other hand, for non-uniform area quantization, these features start to appear for $\alpha = 4 \ln 2$ as well for some choice of quantization parameters. Therefore, the analysis of the spectrum of the tidal Love number can not only provide information about the quantum nature of black holes, but will also tell us about the nature of the underlying quantum gravity, i.e., whether they predict a uniform or a non-uniform area quantization.

We can also predict what the future gravitational wave detectors, e.g., LISA, can say about the quantum nature of the black holes. The analysis presented here will be more important for LISA than LIGO. This is because the effect of the tidal Love number arises in the waveform $\sim \mathcal{O}(2.5 \text{ PN})$, which is a much higher order correction, given that the tidal Love number is indeed small, as evident from Fig. 2. For LISA, the inspiral happens over a much longer duration; therefore, though a small effect, it can eventually build up during the prolonged inspiral, making it observable for LISA. For this purpose, we need to consider how the tidal Love numbers will change for a supermassive black hole. If we consider the mass of the supermassive black hole to be $M = 10^4 M_{\odot}$, the small frequency approximation will be valid till $f = 80$ mHz, well within the proposed sensitivity level of LISA. The story will effectively repeat for LISA since, for uniform quantization, there will be no ‘quantum’ signature within the LISA frequency band unless the quantum parameter α is small. While for non-uniform quantization, there is a possibility to detect the ‘quantum’ signature even for

slightly larger values of α , thereby distinguishing between various models of quantum gravity, as well as distinguishing exotic compact objects from quantum black holes. Finally, note that in the zero-frequency limit, we have a non-zero tidal Love number, as expected, and another smoking gun test for non-classical nature of the tidally deformed compact object.

V. CONCLUSIONS

The quantum nature of black holes is a generic consequence of any models of quantum gravity that exist to date or is going to appear in the future. However, due to the micro-length scales involved in the analysis, possible experimental detection of such quantum effects has remained elusive till the detection of gravitational waves. Surprisingly, the characteristic frequencies of such a quantum black hole, arising from the inherent discreteness in the problem, fall within the detection regime of the current and also of the future gravitational wave detectors. Despite how much interesting it sounds, observationally detecting such discreteness is a challenge since the signal-to-noise ratio of the present generation of gravitational wave detectors is not so high, more so in the ringdown spectrum. Thus the ringdown part of a gravitational wave waveform is not the best place, at present, to search for the signatures of quantum effects in black holes. On the other hand, the inspiral regime is much better probed, and it is worthwhile to search for these putative quantum effects there.

The most interesting result, for classical black holes, in the inspiral phase corresponds to the vanishing of the tidal Love numbers. In other words, classical black holes cannot be deformed by an external tidal field. Thus any departure of the tidal Love numbers from zero would signify deviations from the classical black hole. Thus we expect non-trivial features in the tidal Love number for quantum black holes as well. Consistent with our expectation, it turned out that the tidal Love numbers for quantum black holes are non-zero, except for some characteristic frequencies associated with the discreteness of the area spectrum arising from quantum effects. In par-

ticular, the variation of the tidal Love number with frequency can distinguish quantum black holes from exotic compact objects and also can distinguish between various models of quantum gravity. For example, for an object of mass $10 M_{\odot}$, quantum black holes will demonstrate sharp features, with the Love number vanishing to zero for certain frequencies, in contrast with exotic compact objects, and all these within the frequency band of LIGO. Similarly, we can distinguish between various models of quantized black holes — for uniform area quantization, the spectrum of tidal Love numbers depict the sharp features only for small values of α , while for non-uniform area quantization, such features are present for intermediate values of α as well. The story continues for more massive compact objects as well, with the frequency range of interest being within the frequency band of LISA. Therefore, if such sharp features in the frequency spectrum of the tidal Love number are indeed observed in the low-frequency regime, they will favor the quantum black hole model, with its area being discretized in non-uniform steps. In the absence of such sharp features, we can conclusively argue that the compact object is not a quantum black hole. It will be interesting to see if similar features exist in tidal absorption as well and how to relate the same to the well-known phenomenon of tidal heating for rotating black holes.

Acknowledgements

The authors are thankful to Rajes Ghosh for extensive discussion. S.N. and S.S. also thank IACS, Kolkata, for hospitality, where part of this work was carried out. Research of S.C. is funded by the INSPIRE Faculty fellowship from DST, Government of India (Reg. No. DST/INSPIRE/04/2018/000893) and by the Start-Up Research Grant from SERB, DST, Government of India (Reg. No. SRG/2020/000409). The research of S. S. is supported by the Department of Science and Technology, Government of India, under the SERB CRG Grant (No. CRG/2020/004562). Research of S.N. is supported by the Prime Minister's Research Fellowship (ID-1701653), Government of India.

-
- [1] B. P. Abbott *et al.* [LIGO Scientific and Virgo], *Phys. Rev. Lett.* **116**, no.6, 061102 (2016).
 - [2] B. P. Abbott *et al.* [LIGO Scientific and Virgo], *Phys. Rev. Lett.* **116**, no.22, 221101 (2016) [erratum: *Phys. Rev. Lett.* **121**, no.12, 129902 (2018)].
 - [3] K. Akiyama *et al.* [Event Horizon Telescope], *Astrophys. J. Lett.* **875**, L1 (2019).
 - [4] K. Akiyama *et al.* [Event Horizon Telescope], *Astrophys. J. Lett.* **930**, no.2, L12 (2022).
 - [5] J. D. Bekenstein, *Lett. Nuovo Cim.* **11**, 467 (1974).
 - [6] J. D. Bekenstein and V. F. Mukhanov, *Phys. Lett. B* **360**, 7-12 (1995).
 - [7] S. Chakraborty and K. Lochan, *Phys. Lett. B* **789**, 276-286 (2019).
 - [8] S. Chakraborty and K. Lochan, *Universe* **3**, no.3, 55 (2017).
 - [9] S. Chakraborty and K. Lochan, *Int. J. Mod. Phys. D* **25**, no.12, 1644024 (2016).
 - [10] K. Lochan and S. Chakraborty, *Phys. Lett. B* **755**, 37-42 (2016).
 - [11] V. F. Foit and M. Kleban, *Class. Quant. Grav.* **36**, no.3, 035006 (2019).

- [12] V. Cardoso, V. F. Foit and M. Kleban, *JCAP* **08**, 006 (2019).
- [13] I. Agullo, V. Cardoso, A. D. Rio, M. Maggiore and J. Pullin, *Phys. Rev. Lett.* **126**, no.4, 041302 (2021).
- [14] S. Datta, K. S. Phukon and S. Bose, *Phys. Rev. D* **104**, no.8, 084006 (2021).
- [15] S. Datta and K. S. Phukon, *Phys. Rev. D* **104**, no.12, 124062 (2021).
- [16] K. Chakravarti, R. Ghosh and S. Sarkar, *Phys. Rev. D* **104**, no.8, 084049 (2021)
- [17] K. Chakravarti, R. Ghosh and S. Sarkar, *Phys. Rev. D* **105**, no.4, 044046 (2022)
- [18] T. Binington and E. Poisson, *Phys. Rev. D* **80**, 084018 (2009).
- [19] T. Damour and A. Nagar, *Phys. Rev. D* **80**, 084035 (2009).
- [20] B. Kol and M. Smolkin, *JHEP* **02**, 010 (2012).
- [21] P. Pani, L. Gualtieri, A. Maselli and V. Ferrari, *Phys. Rev. D* **92**, no.2, 024010 (2015).
- [22] P. Landry and E. Poisson, *Phys. Rev. D* **91**, 104018 (2015).
- [23] A. Le Tiec and M. Casals, *Phys. Rev. Lett.* **126**, no.13, 131102 (2021).
- [24] H. S. Chia, *Phys. Rev. D* **104**, no.2, 024013 (2021).
- [25] D. Kothawala, T. Padmanabhan and S. Sarkar, *Phys. Rev. D* **78**, 104018 (2008)
- [26] X. H. Zhang, *Phys. Rev. D* **34**, no.4, 991-1004 (1986).
- [27] Poisson, E. and Will, C.M. (2014) *Gravity: Newtonian, Post-Newtonian, Relativistic*, Cambridge Cambridge University Press.
- [28] T. Hinderer, *Astrophys. J.* **677**, 1216-1220 (2008).
- [29] V. Cardoso, E. Franzin, A. Maselli, P. Pani and G. Raposo, *Phys. Rev. D* **95**, no.8, 084014 (2017).
- [30] K. Chakravarti, S. Chakraborty, S. Bose and S. SenGupta, *Phys. Rev. D* **99**, no.2, 024036 (2019).
- [31] K. Chakravarti, S. Chakraborty, K. S. Phukon, S. Bose and S. SenGupta, *Class. Quant. Grav.* **37**, no.10, 105004 (2020).
- [32] E. Newman and R. Penrose, *J. Math. Phys.* **3**, 566-578 (1962).
- [33] P. Szekeres, *J. Math. Phys.* **6**, 1387-1391 (1965).
- [34] S. A. Teukolsky, *Phys. Rev. Lett.* **29**, 1114-1118 (1972).
- [35] S. A. Teukolsky, *Astrophys. J.* **185**, 635-647 (1973).
- [36] S. A. Teukolsky and W. H. Press, *Astrophys. J.* **193**, 443-461 (1974)