

PAPER • OPEN ACCESS

Spacetime surgery for black hole fireworks

To cite this article: Wei-Chen Lin *et al* JCAP01(2025)098

View the [article online](#) for updates and enhancements.

You may also like

- [Optimization of the D Transactions by using Algorithm](#)
Ammar Faisal and Re
- [Optimization algorithm explosion based on e](#)
Ji Zhang, Yang Kai and
- [X-RAY SELECTED A GALAXIES ARE SIM GALAXIES OUT TO FROM CANDELS/CD](#)
D. J. Rosario, M. Moz

RECEIVED: March 2023

REVISED: July 30, 2023

ACCEPTED: December 1, 2023

PUBLISHED: January 23, 2024

Spacetime surgery for black hole fireworks

Wei-Chen Lin ^{a,b}, Dong-han Yeom ^{a,d,e,f} and Dejan Stojkovic^c

^aCenter for Cosmological Constant Problem, Extreme Physics Institute, Pusan National University,
Busan 46241, Republic of Korea

^bDepartment of Physics, Pusan National University,
Busan 46241, Republic of Korea

^cHEPCOS, Department of Physics, SUNY at Buffalo,
Buffalo, NY 14260, U.S.A.

^dDepartment of Physics Education, Pusan National University,
Busan 46241, Republic of Korea

^eResearch Center for Dielectric and Advanced Matter Physics, Pusan National University,
Busan 46241, Republic of Korea

^fLeung Center for Cosmology and Particle Astrophysics, National Taiwan University,
Taipei 10617, Taiwan

E-mail: archennlin@gmail.com, innocent.yeom@gmail.com, ds77@buffalo.edu

ABSTRACT: We construct an explicit model for the black hole to white hole transition (known as the black hole fireworks scenario) using the cut-and-paste technique. We model a black hole collapse using the evolution of a time-like shell in the background of the loop quantum gravity inspired metric and then the space-like shell analysis to construct the firework geometry. Our simple and well-defined analysis removes some subtle issues that were present in the previous literature [1] and makes the examination of the junction conditions easier. We further point out that the infalling and asymptotic observers, both in ours and the original scenario in ref. [1], encounter quite different physics. While the proper time of the bouncing for an infalling observer can be determined without ambiguity, the bouncing time interval for the asymptotic observer can be chosen arbitrarily by changing how one cuts and pastes spacetimes outside the event horizons. It is puzzling that the proper time of a distant (rather than infalling) observer is subject to randomness since the infalling observer is supposed to experience a stronger quantum gravity effect. This result might suggest that a black hole firework scenario does not allow for the existence of an effectively classical spacetime.

Contents

1 Introduction

2 The cut-and-paste procedure for the black hole firework

2.1 Time-like thin-shells and gravitational collapses

2.2 The construction of the black hole firework geometry introduced in ref. [1]

2.3 The simplified construction of the black hole firework geometry

3 Bouncing time-scale for black hole firework scenarios

3.1 Bouncing time scale with the δ parameter

3.2 Bouncing time for the comoving observer

3.3 Is an effective classical spacetime inside the horizons consistent with a tunneling picture?

4 Discussion

A The junction equations and solutions

A.1 Numerical results for the time-like shell

A.2 Space-like thin-shells and black hole fireworks

1 Introduction

The issue of formation and evaporation of a black hole is very important for understanding the nature of quantum gravity. In particular, this issue is related to the information problem of an evaporating black hole [2]. Is there a unitary theory of quantum gravity that explains the unitary evolution of evaporating black holes? If there is, is this theory consistent with the semi-classical description [3]? Will the classical singularity survive in the region where quantum gravitational effects are dominant [4, 5]?

It is clear that understanding the fate of the singularity is very important to obtain a complete answer to the black hole evaporation and the information loss problem. Intuitively, we may classify two ways. First, we may address this problem *by introducing a wave function*, i.e., by solving the Wheeler-DeWitt equation [6]. In this approach, we need to solve the Wheeler-DeWitt equation (or some version of it) and interpret the solution in the classical background, which is sometimes a subtle problem [7–10]; for an attempt to model quantum radiation from quantum background, see [11]. Second, we may remove the singularity by introducing an “effective metric” [12, 13] that does not have a singularity, but is still an effective

modification of the Hamiltonian which includes loop quantum gravitational effects [17]. With this modified Hamiltonian, one can solve a set of semi-classical equations and obtain a spacetime that includes loop quantum gravitational effects, e.g., resolution of the singularity.

A typical solution in the framework of the loop quantum gravity includes *bouncing* of the collapsing object [18, 19] (see also [20, 21]). Bouncing inside the horizon is a very surprising scenario, except for some technical issues [22]. However, in reality, it is not easy to generalize to global spacetimes in an evaporating background. In some cases, inconsistencies may arise [23]. In an evaporating background, the bouncing spacetimes need to consistently connect not only inside but also outside the horizon [24]. A similar spacetime structure happens in the more exotic proposal introduced in the Haggard-Rovelli model [25], where the quantum gravitational effects can accumulate outside the apparent horizon and modify the metric beyond it. The resulting spacetime might be realized by cutting and pasting spacetimes both inside and outside the apparent horizon. In [1], Han, Rovelli, and Soltani extend this idea to the black hole solution with quantum gravity modification, and give a bouncing model that has two horizons. The scenario proposed in [1, 25] is known as the *black hole fireworks*.

In this paper, we investigate this idea in the model in ref. [1], in which the spacetime contains both the inner and outer horizons and the proposed bouncing effect changes the topology of the spacetime to have only one asymptotic infinity. To simplify the discussion, we consider a time-like shell that describes a collapsing star interior and the dynamical formation of a black hole. In addition, we offer a simplified cut-and-paste procedure to accommodate a similar bouncing spacetime and to cover both the outer and inner apparent horizons. This simplified approach is technically well-defined and makes the examination of junction conditions more straightforward.

However, apart from the validity of the spacetime from the justification of junction conditions, in the resulting spacetimes constructed in both ref. [1] and this article, there exists a more fundamental issue. We notice this issue by tracking the trajectories of different observers theoretically existing in these spacetimes. The bouncing time interval measured by the distant observer can be chosen arbitrarily since it is determined mathematically by where one cuts and pastes the spacetimes outside the event horizons. In contrast, for an infalling observer who travels through the black and white hole apparent horizons and then out, the duration of the bounce measured by his proper time can be determined with little ambiguity. The unexpected outcome suggests that there may not be a semi-classical spacetime with the inner event horizon in the black hole fireworks scenario. Therefore, simply employing the cut-and-paste procedure is not adequate to describe the black hole fireworks, even assuming that tunneling outside the horizon is possible.




Figure 1. The Penrose diagram of the model in eq. (2.1). The solution has two horizons, r_+ and r_- , and a time-like center.

by the cut-and-paste procedure, which is very different from the bouncing time defined by a distant observer. We conclude that this fact challenges the existence of an effectively classical spacetime inside the horizons for the black-hole-firework scenario. Finally, in section 4 we summarize our results and discuss possible future research.

2 The cut-and-paste procedure for the black hole firework

In this section, we utilize the gravitational collapse of a time-like thin-shell to revisit the cut-and-paste procedure introduced in ref. [1], in which a black hole model with a quantum-corrected center proportional to $1/r^4$ is considered. We next reproduce a similar result for the spacetime by considering a simplified cut-and-paste procedure consisting of two spacelike hypersurfaces. Both the collapsing thin-shell and the space-like cuts modeling the black-to-white hole tunneling follow the formalism of the Israel junction conditions, and the construction is shown explicitly. We also briefly discuss the difference between the different cut-and-paste procedures.

2.1 Time-like thin-shells and gravitational collapses

We consider the black hole model defined in [1], which has a quantum-corrected center. The metric is

$$ds^2 = -f(r)dt^2 + \frac{1}{f(r)}dr^2 + r^2d\Omega^2,$$




Figure 2. Left: the Penrose diagram of the black hole solution, where the red lines are outer horizons and the blue lines are inner horizons. There exists a time-like shell solution that is oscillating between $r_{\min} \leq r \leq r_{\max}$, where r_{\max} is outside the outer horizon and r_{\min} is inside the inner horizon. Inside the shell, the geometry is Minkowski. This diagram represents the resulting spacetime after black hole formation.

oscillating behavior. At large values of r , the attractive term, $2M/r$, dominates and causes the collapse. At some minimal value of r , the repulsive term causes a bounce and prevents the collapsing object from reaching $r=0$, pushing it out to larger values of r where the attractive term again dominates and the cycle starts again.

Now, we review the thin-shell approximation of a collapsing time-like thin-shell solution. The metric outside and inside the shell is

$$ds_{\pm}^2 = -f_{\pm}(r)dt^2 + \frac{1}{f_{\pm}(r)}dr^2 + r^2d\Omega^2,$$

where $+$ and $-$ stand for outside and inside the shell, respectively. The metric outside the shell is




Figure 3. Left: the green dashed line indicates the single complex cut introduced in ref. [1], consists of two constant- t spacelike hypersurfaces and four null hypersurfaces. Right: the resulting spacetime is constructed by discarding the right piece to the cut and then pasting the two constant- t spacelike hypersurfaces together. This procedure leaves an empty area (light green) whose boundary is given by the four null hypersurfaces that are parts of the complex cut, and the metric of this area is determined by the continuity condition. Notice that pasting two constant- t spacelike hypersurfaces does not require the existence of any thin-shell, so the violation of the NEC is limited to the light green region.

where $\sigma(r)$ is the tension of the shell, and $\epsilon_{\pm} = \pm 1$ are the signs of the extrinsic curvatures. Here, extrinsic curvatures β_{\pm} are

$$\beta_{\pm} \equiv \frac{f_- - f_+ \mp 16\pi^2\sigma^2r^2}{8\pi\sigma r} = \epsilon_{\pm}\sqrt{\dot{r}^2 + f_{\pm}}.$$

Note that if $\epsilon_{\pm} = +1$, r increases along the outward normal direction, while if $\epsilon_{\pm} = -1$, r decreases along the outward normal direction. Therefore, we have to assume $\epsilon_{\pm} = 1$.

After simple computations, we obtain the equation:

$$\dot{r}^2 + V_{\text{eff}}(r) = 0,$$

where

$$V_{\text{eff}}(r) = f_+ - \frac{(f_- - f_+ - 16\pi^2\sigma^2r^2)^2}{64\pi^2\sigma^2r^2}.$$

Here, we interpret that $V_{\text{eff}} < 0$ corresponds to the region where classical trajectories are allowed. Therefore, the allowed region is determined by the condition $V_{\text{eff}} < 0$.




Figure 4. Left: the two green dashed lines indicate the simplified cutting procedure that we use. Right: the causal structure resulted from pasting two space-like slices.

on the general features of the procedure and of the resulting spacetime, which are sufficient for the discussions later. For more details, we refer the reader to the original paper.

In ref. [1], the authors introduce a single but complex cutting of spacetime which is composed of two constant- t hypersurfaces connecting to different spatial infinities and two different null hypersurfaces as shown in figure 3 (left). Then, by keeping only the region containing the collapsing thin-shell, the pasting procedure is simply given by identifying the two constant- t hypersurfaces to be the same as shown in figure 3 (right). This procedure leaves an empty region (the light green part in the figure), in which the metric is not determined by eq. (2.2) but is determined by the continuity of the metric at the boundary. Notice that pasting constant- t hypersurfaces does not require the existence of any thin-shell, and thus any possible violation of the null energy condition (NEC) is limited to the light green area. The resulting spacetime, which we will refer to as the **HRS model** in the rest of this work, is semi-classical everywhere and has only one asymptotic infinity. Lastly, the complex cutting procedure implemented here creates corners outside the outer event horizon, so the junction conditions must be satisfied to avoid the conical singularity [32]. To avoid this complexity, in the following subsection, we will consider a simplified cut-and-paste procedure to reproduce a similar bouncing model with the same global structure. This simplified procedure has the advantage that the junction conditions are more straightforward to examine.

space-like slices intersect each other inside the inner horizon like the cut shown in figure 3 (left), thus creating a corner. In either case, the intersecting point or the corner is deep inside the inner horizon, where a complete description of this intersection perhaps belongs to the realm of quantum gravity. Thus, we neglect the possible complications in this regime and simply consider the junction conditions of a general space-like shell given in figure 4 (right). In the formalism of the thin-shell approximation is similar to the case of a time-like shell we discussed in section 2.1, we leave the derivation and numerical examples in appendix A.

Though both resulting spacetimes have the same global structure, some differences arise due to the different cut-and-paste procedures used to model the bounce. Here, we make some remarks on the qualitative differences and some special features shared by both models. These will be important to the next section:

- 1. In the minimal model, the violation of the NEC happens along the shell and reaches infinity. Although the effect can approach zero asymptotically, violation of NEC is expected away from the black hole. In the HRS model, the possible violation of NEC can be limited to the light green region in figure 3 (right).¹
- 2. In the minimal model, there is no corner or intersection of thin-shells outside the event horizon. However, corners exist outside the event horizons in the HRS model. There is no guarantee that the corner conditions can be satisfied, for which the violation leads to the conical singularity.
- 3. In both of the models, one can choose having either a corner (formed by two null hypersurfaces in the HRS model or by two spacelike hypersurfaces in the minimal model) or intersections between the collapsing shell and the null/space-like hypersurfaces inside the inner event horizon.
- 4. Both of the models have only one asymptotic infinity, which is topologically different from the original classical spacetime given by the metric eq. (2.2).

Although there might be some interest in determining the exact range of the violation of the NEC and the corner conditions required in the HRS model, in the next section we follow remark 4 to argue that the existence of a semi-classical spacetime inside the inner horizon is improbable in both models by considering the bouncing time for different observers.

3 Bouncing time-scale for black hole firework scenarios

In this section, we discuss the bouncing time observed by different observers. We use the same assumption that the quantum gravity corrections should be small, i.e. $A \sim m_{Pl}^2 < 1$. In this limit, the parameter A plays no role in the leading order estimate, and therefore




Figure 5. Bouncing time in the Schwarzschild metric. In ref. [1], the trajectory of $V = V_1$ is undetermined by the corresponding spacetime diagram therein. However, the bouncing time, defined as $\mathcal{T} \equiv -4M \ln \delta$ in ref. [1], is rooted from a geometric relation in the Schwarzschild spacetime, eq. (3.1). It means that the duration of bouncing time defined in this way is related to the arbitrary cut in the spacetime.

3.1 Bouncing time scale with the δ parameter

Outside the horizon, the black hole is well approximated by the Schwarzschild solution. Assuming the Schwarzschild solution, the double-null coordinates U and V satisfy

$$UV = \left(1 - \frac{r}{2M}\right) e^{r/2M}$$

and

$$\frac{U}{V} = -e^{-t/2M},$$

in the region of interest (see figure 5). In figure 5, events A, B, and C are given by the intersections of a specific ingoing light ray $V = V_1$ with the constant- t hypersurfaces, $t = 0$ and $t = t_B$, and a constant- r trajectory $r = R$, respectively. Since t_B is an arbitrary constant, event A is just a special case with $t_B = 0$.

In terms of the Schwarzschild coordinate (t, r) , the locations of B and C are given by $(t_B, 2M + \Delta)$ and (t_C, R) , respectively. Using (3.1) and (3.2), one can show that the quantities Δ , t_B , and t_C satisfy the following relation

$$\frac{\left(\frac{R}{2M} - 1\right) e^{R/2M}}{\frac{\Delta}{2M} e^{(1+\Delta/2M)}} = e^{\tilde{T}/4M},$$

where $T/2 \approx -t_C$. In ref. [1], the term independent of R on the r.h.s. of eq. (3.5) is due to be the bouncing time of the black-to-white hole tunneling, $\mathcal{T} \equiv -4M \ln \delta$. However, we see that it is a special case of eq. (3.4), when $t_B = 0$ is chosen. Since the metric (2) and its approximation, Schwarzschild metric, are both static, choosing $t_B = 0$ to cut and paste the spacetime bears no special meaning. From the mathematical point of view, one can choose any other constant t_B -hypersurface to construct the resulting cut-and-pasted spacetime with a different bouncing time given by the similar definition from eq. (3.4): $\mathcal{T} \equiv -4M \ln \Delta$. This arbitrariness on the choice of the constant t_B -hypersurface to perform the cut-and-paste procedure gives the arbitrariness of the bouncing time defined in this way. Later, we will discuss the issue of this arbitrariness from the physical point of view. Before ending this subsection, we would like to point out that eq. (3.4) has a simple physical interpretation by itself. A distant observer shoots a ray of light radially into the black hole from point C. After $\tilde{T}/2$ of this observer's proper time elapsed, the observer would think the light is Δ away from the event horizon.

3.2 Bouncing time for the comoving observer

Apart from the asymptotic observer whose coordinate system is incomplete, there is another observer who is perhaps more relevant to the bouncing process. This is an observer comoving with the collapsing shell. Thus, a more appropriate physical time scale can be calculated as the proper time of the observer that crosses the event horizon.³ One can easily evaluate the proper time of the time-like shell that transitions from the black hole to the white hole phase.

$$\tau = 2 \left| \int_R^{r_{\min}} \frac{dr}{\sqrt{-V(r)}} \right|.$$

Here we use a collapsing shell of (pressureless) dust as a demonstration. In this case, the mass of the dust α is conserved and is given by $\alpha = 4\pi r^2 \sigma = \text{const.}$, where σ is the energy density of the shell. From the Israel junction conditions, we obtain

$$M = \alpha \sqrt{1 + \dot{r}^2} - \frac{\alpha^2}{2r},$$

where the overdot is the derivative with respect to the proper time along the timelike trajectory of the infalling shell. From this, one can compute the proper time elapsed along the trajectory for one complete cycle as follows

$$\tau = 2 \left| \int_{R_{\max}}^{r_{\min}} \frac{dr}{\sqrt{\left(\frac{M}{\alpha} + \frac{\alpha}{2r}\right)^2 - 1}} \right|.$$

To have R_{\max} finite, i.e. the shell is bounded, we must have $\alpha > M$, for which $R_{\max} = \frac{\alpha^2}{2M}$.




Figure 6. Left: due to the time-translation symmetry, there can be several equivalent spatial slices (red curves) that have a different coordinate time at infinity. Black dotted curves correspond to constant t hypersurfaces. Right: the bouncing time is the difference between $t = t_i$ and $t = t_b$, t_b is arbitrary.

where $C = \frac{M}{1 - \frac{M^2}{\alpha^2}}$ and $B = \frac{\alpha^2}{4(1 - \frac{M^2}{\alpha^2})}$. If we further consider large $R_{\max} \gg M$, based on the relation for R_{\max} , we also have $\alpha \sim 2R_{\max}$. Thus, the above integration is approximately given by

$$\tau \sim 2 \left| \int_{R_{\max}}^{r_{\min}} \frac{dr}{\sqrt{\left(\frac{\alpha}{2r}\right)^2 - 1}} \right| \sim 2 \left| \int_{R_{\max}}^{r_{\min}} \frac{dr}{\sqrt{\left(\frac{R_{\max}}{r}\right)^2 - 1}} \right| = 2\sqrt{R_{\max}^2 - r_{\min}^2}.$$

In this limit, the bouncing time is mostly determined by R_{\max} , while the exact value of r_{\min} is not that important. This is physically reasonable since in this limit, the shell's velocity relative to the center of the black hole is high when r is small. If we include the quantum gravity modification, i.e. using the metric in eq. (2.2) instead of the Schwarzschild solution, the shell will be repelled at some minimal radius due to the extra repulsive term AM^2/r^4 . Then we have to set the r_{\min} to be the bouncing point inside the horizon, which is determined by the condition $\dot{r} = 0$. For the case of $\alpha \gg M$, the condition $\dot{r} = 0$ can be written as

for the space-like hypersurface (left of figure 6). This means that the time difference between the $t = t_i$ (that can be chosen in the sufficient past) and $t = t_b$ (the bouncing time inside the horizon) is arbitrary in this setup (right of figure 6), which is similar to the setting in ref. [1]. According to the discussion in section 3.1, one may find a corresponding δ parameter to cut out the $t = t_b$ hypersurface. As already mentioned in ref. [1], the bouncing time for the distant observer is determined by how one cuts and pastes the spacetime outside the event horizon. The same argument is valid for the spacelike slicing considered in our case (see figure 6).

On the other hand, the bouncing time measured by the comoving observer discussed in section 3.2 is very different in this aspect. Based on the previous discussion, the contribution to the bouncing time around r_{\min} is small, so even if we cut out a certain portion of the spacetime as in figure 4, the corresponding proper time is only mildly affected by the cut-and-paste procedure. Interestingly, this bouncing time can be unambiguously determined in the model considered in ref. [1] since the trajectory of the shell (or surface of the collapsing star) is intact by the designed cut (see figure 4 in ref. [1] or figure 3 in this article).⁴ One can easily construct the scenario in which two observers (the comoving and the fixed-distant) begin their journeys at the same spacetime event when the shell is at some R_{\max} . After the whole period of the bounce, in the absence of any dissipation (as the assumption made in refs. [25] and [1]), the two observers meet each other again at the next $r = R_{\max}$. Without doubt, the two observers experience different durations of proper time. One might think of this as nothing but a generalization of the *twin paradox* result in Minkowski spacetime to a curved spacetime. However, the subtle issue here is that it is the distant observer's proper time that is subjected to arbitrariness instead of the proper time of the comoving observer who enters the regime where the quantum gravity effect is generally expected to be more dominant. From the mathematical construction discussed previously, we can see that it is due to the arbitrariness of choosing the cut-and-pasted hypersurface $t = t_b$ to obtain the resulting spacetime with a single asymptotic region, i.e. single past and future null infinity.

One might argue that the arbitrariness could be removed once we have the correct theory of quantum gravity. This is, in fact, argued by the authors of ref. [1]: “A quantum theory of gravity must provide the probability distribution of \mathcal{T} as a function of m . In the classical limit $\mathcal{T} \rightarrow \infty$ and black holes are eternal.” However, one should notice that the arbitrariness could not be removed entirely from this physical point of view. In this scenario, the black-to-white hole bounce is due to a quantum tunneling effect, which is intrinsically subjected to the randomness of the probability distribution as pointed out by the authors of ref. [1]. Even if the issue still exists. That is, in the resulting spacetime, the proper time experienced by the infalling observer can be determined unambiguously, even in the quantum tunneling scenario. The question is then: “Is an effective classical spacetime inside the horizons still valid?”

Now, let us further consider the semi-classical description of tunneling by considering the following thought experiment. We start with two maximally entangled particles

$$|\psi\rangle = \frac{1}{\sqrt{N}} \sum_i |i\rangle_{\text{in}} |i\rangle_{\text{out}},$$

where N is the number of accessible states. One particle ($|i\rangle_{\text{in}}$) falls into the black hole and is attached to the time-like shell, while the other particle ($|i\rangle_{\text{out}}$) stays outside the black hole horizon. Whatever the time evolution of the quantum state $|\psi\rangle$ is, as long as the interaction of $|i\rangle_{\text{in}}$ and $|i\rangle_{\text{out}}$ are restricted by the local operations and classical communication, the entanglement entropy between two particles must be a constant.

However, we expect that the observer outside the horizon will experience quantum tunneling near the space-like shell, where the tunneling indicates a time evolution of a superposition of histories which depends on the tunneling time. Hence, the quantum state outside the horizon must be a superposition of different histories, i.e.,

$$|i\rangle_{\text{out}} \rightarrow \sum_{j'} a_{j'}^{(i)} |j'\rangle_{\text{out}},$$

where the orthonormal basis $\{|i\rangle_{\text{out}}\}$ and $\{|j'\rangle_{\text{out}}\}$ are not equivalent in general.

In this context, let us define a semi-classical observer A which is inside the time-like shell. It is very reasonable to assume that the time evolution of the quantum state inside the black hole follows a single classical history. On the other hand, let us define a semi-classical observer B which is outside the horizon. As long as the observer B is semi-classical, this observer will select a specific quantum state ($|k'\rangle_{\text{out}}$) as an eigenstate such that

$$|i\rangle_{\text{out}} \rightarrow \sum_{j'} a_{j'}^{(i)} |j'\rangle_{\text{out}} \rightarrow a_{i'}^{(i)} |i'\rangle_{\text{out}},$$

where $|i'\rangle_{\text{out}}$ corresponds to the collapsed state from $|i\rangle_{\text{out}}$.

Now, let us think about the situation in which the observers A and B meet together eventually. The quantum state evolves

$$|\psi\rangle = \frac{1}{\sqrt{N}} \sum_i |i\rangle_{\text{in}} |i\rangle_{\text{out}} \rightarrow \frac{1}{\sqrt{N}} \sum_i a_{i'}^{(i)} |i\rangle_{\text{in}} |i'\rangle_{\text{out}}.$$

Of course, this evolution is not unitary, and the new quantum state does not guarantee maximum entanglement between two particles.

The paradoxical situation happens because we assumed semi-classical observers A and B . The tunneling process outside corresponds to branching out different histories with different durations of proper time, while the inside exists only one proper time history. If we consider the quantum state outside the black hole as a superposition of different histories, the paradoxical situation disappears. The quantum state outside the black hole is a superposition of different histories with different durations of proper time, while the inside exists only one proper time history. If we consider the quantum state outside the black hole as a superposition of different histories, the paradoxical situation disappears.

4 Discussion

In this paper, we revisited some aspects of the black hole fireworks (i.e. a black hole to white hole transition) scenario proposed in [1, 25]. We constructed an explicit model for black hole fireworks using the cut-and-paste technique. First, we used the evolution of a time-like shell in the background of the loop quantum gravity inspired metric to model the process of gravitational collapse. Then using the space-like shell analysis, we constructed the firework geometry. We used well-defined thin-shell techniques where all the relevant quantities are clearly defined. Thus, our analysis removes some subtle issues that were present in the previous literature.

We showed that the firework scenario requires specific conditions outside the event horizon, in principle the violation of the energy conditions. This can be expressed in terms of the tension of the space-like junction where the two metrics meet. In particular, we used a rather simple and well-studied space-like junction technique to create the black-to-white hole bounce with a single asymptotic region. For comparison, in ref. [1], a more complicated cut-and-paste procedure is utilized to achieve the same goal without violating the null energy condition far away from the horizon. However, such a cut corresponds to a hypersurface that changes its characteristic from spacelike to null, and thus, corners exist outside the outer event horizon. The tension conditions for such a scenario are highly non-trivial and might not be physically justifiable. We leave this issue for future work.

Apart from the issue of the junction condition mentioned above, we point out another fundamental issue related to the black hole firework scenarios in general. Such an issue exists both in the spacetime constructed here and in the original work [1], regardless of whether Israel junction conditions are strictly followed or not. Namely, due to the recursive cut-and-paste procedure aiming to obtain a spacetime with a single asymptotic region, the bouncing time interval defined by a distant observer suffers from the arbitrariness of the spacelike cut that one is free to choose. In contrast, this arbitrariness has little effect on the infalling observer in our model and, furthermore, has zero effect on the infalling observer living in the spacetime given in ref. [1]. We further argue that from the physical point of view, this arbitrariness for the distant observer cannot be removed. In contrast, as long as there exists an effective classical spacetime inside the event horizon, the bouncing time interval defined by the infalling observer does not have similar randomness. If accumulated quantum gravity effects outside of the horizon drive the bounce (as argued in ref. [1]) and indeed cause the randomness in the duration of the bounce, then the assumption of an effective classical spacetime inside the inner horizons in the firework scenario might not be justified.




Figure 7. Dynamics of the time-like shell. Top left: V_{eff} with $M = 10$, $A = 0.1$, and $\sigma_0 = 0.04$. are two bouncing points located at $r_{\text{max}} \simeq 19.9993$ and $r_{\text{min}} \simeq 0.795$. Note that the outer horizon is $r_+ = 19.9987$ and the inner horizon is $r_- = 0.8046$. Top right: V_{eff} around $r_{\text{min}} \simeq 0.795$. Bottom: β_+ (black) and β_- (red). This shows that for $r_{\text{min}} \leq r \leq r_{\text{max}}$, $\beta_{\pm} > 0$ conditions are satisfied.

Acknowledgments

DY and WL were supported by the National Research Foundation of Korea (Grants No. 2021R1C1C1008622, 2021R1A4A5031460). DS is partially supported by the US National Science Foundation, under Grants No. PHY-2014021 and PHY-2310363.

A The junction equations and solutions

A.1 Numerical results for the time-like shell

Figure 7 is an example that describes the gravitational collapse of a time-like shell and the formation of a black hole. Top left and right of figure 7 are V_{eff} , where we choose $M = 10$, $A = 0.1$, and $\sigma_0 = 0.04$. For these values of parameters, $r_+ = 19.9987$ and $r_- = 0.8046$. The effective potential V_{eff} has two turning points at $r_{\text{max}} \simeq 19.9993$ and $r_{\text{min}} \simeq 0.795$. The




Figure 8. Left: the space-like shells with $\epsilon_- = -1$ (upper) and $\epsilon_+ = +1$ (lower), where small arrows denote the outward normal direction. We paste the future of the upper shell (\tilde{f}_- , yellow-colored region) and the past of the lower shell (\tilde{f}_+ , orange-colored region). Right: after we paste two regions, we obtain the final causal structure of the black hole fireworks.

is outside the outer horizon and r_{\min} is inside the inner horizon. Using the cut-and-paste technique, we paste a Minkowski space inside the shell. On the right side of the figure, there are dashed curves. These curves apparently do not follow the thin-shell trajectory. However, assuming some properties of a star interior, it is reasonable to assume that a stationary shell is located outside the horizon [33].

A.2 Space-like thin-shells and black hole fireworks

To consider the black hole firework scenario, we need to cut and paste on top of figure 7. We introduce a space-like shell and use it to paste two space-like slices [28]. (All the operations we have implemented on the black hole solution described by the metric (2.2) are shown in figure 8 (left).)

The metric outside and inside the shell:

Here, we impose that

$$\tilde{f}_{\pm}(r) = -f(r) = -1 + \frac{2M}{r} - \frac{AM^2}{r^4},$$

in other words, the regions outside and inside the shell correspond to the black hole solution in question.

After imposing the junction equation [34], the result is

$$\epsilon_- \sqrt{\dot{r}^2 + \tilde{f}_-} - \epsilon_+ \sqrt{\dot{r}^2 + \tilde{f}_+} = 4\pi r \sigma(r),$$

where $\sigma(r)$ is the tension of the shell, and $\epsilon_{\pm} = \pm 1$ are the signs of the extrinsic curvatures. Here, the extrinsic curvatures $\tilde{\beta}_{\pm}$ are

$$\tilde{\beta}_{\pm} \equiv \frac{\tilde{f}_- - \tilde{f}_+ \mp 16\pi^2 \sigma^2 r^2}{8\pi \sigma r} = \epsilon_{\pm} \sqrt{\dot{r}^2 + \tilde{f}_{\pm}}.$$

Note that if $\epsilon_{\pm} = +1$, r increases along the outward normal direction (direction from the future to the past), while if $\epsilon_{\pm} = -1$, r decreases along the outward normal direction. Therefore, in our case, we assume that $\epsilon_+ = +1$ and $\epsilon_- = -1$. Hence, $\sigma < 0$ is required, and the energy condition must be violated. This is expected because of the repulsive term in eq.

After simple computations, we obtain the equation

$$\dot{r}^2 + \tilde{V}_{\text{eff}}(r) = 0,$$

where

$$\tilde{V}_{\text{eff}}(r) = \tilde{f}_+ - \frac{(\tilde{f}_- - \tilde{f}_+ - 16\pi^2 \sigma^2 r^2)^2}{64\pi^2 \sigma^2 r^2}.$$

We now need to assume the condition for the thin-shell. The energy conservation equation is

$$\dot{\sigma} = -2 \frac{\dot{r}}{r} (\sigma - \lambda),$$

where λ is the pressure of the shell. If we assume the equation of state of the space-like hypersurface $w_i = -\lambda_i/\sigma_i$ to be a constant, the generic solution of this equation is

$$\sigma(r) = \sum_i \frac{\sigma_{0i}}{r^{2(1+w_i)}},$$

where σ_{0i} are constants.

By assuming a specific function of the tension, we want to impose the following condition




Figure 9. Dynamics of a space-like shell. Left: V_{eff} with $M = 10$, $A = 0.1$, $\sigma_0 = -0.5$, and $w = -0.5$. This shows that the space-like shell covers the space from infinity to the center. Right: $\tilde{\beta}_+$ (black) and $\tilde{\beta}_-$ (red). This shows that $\tilde{\beta}_+ > 0$ and $\tilde{\beta}_- < 0$ as expected.




Figure 10. Another example of a space-like shell. Left: V_{eff} with $M = 10$, $A = 0.1$, $\sigma_0 = -0.5$, and $w = -0.5$. Again, the space-like shell covers the region from infinity to the center. Right: $\tilde{\beta}_+$ (black) and $\tilde{\beta}_-$ (red). This shows that $\tilde{\beta}_+ > 0$ and $\tilde{\beta}_- < 0$ as expected.

approaches zero at infinity ($w = -0.5$ and $\sigma \sim 1/r$), and thus the negative tension effects disappear at infinity.

After we cut and paste the spacetimes outside and inside the shell, we obtain the causal structure in figure 8. Outside the shell satisfies $\epsilon_- = -1$, while inside the shell satisfies $\epsilon_+ = +1$. We paste the future of the outer shell (yellow-colored region) and the past of the inner shell (orange-colored region). As a result, we obtain the final causal structure of the black hole fireworks (right of figure 8).

References

- [4] M. Bouhmadi-López et al., *Annihilation-to-nothing: a quantum gravitational boundary condition for the Schwarzschild black hole*, *JCAP* **11** (2020) 002 [[arXiv:1911.02129](#)] [[INSPIRE](#)].
- [5] A. Bogojevic and D. Stojkovic, *A nonsingular black hole*, *Phys. Rev. D* **61** (2000) 084011 [[gr-qc/9804070](#)] [[INSPIRE](#)].
- [6] B.S. DeWitt, *Quantum theory of gravity. 1. The canonical theory*, *Phys. Rev.* **160** (1967) [[INSPIRE](#)].
- [7] S. Brahma, C.-Y. Chen and D.-H. Yeom, *Annihilation-to-nothing: DeWitt boundary condition inside a black hole*, *Eur. Phys. J. C* **82** (2022) 772 [[arXiv:2108.05330](#)] [[INSPIRE](#)].
- [8] A. Saini and D. Stojkovic, *Nonlocal (but also nonsingular) physics at the last stages of gravitational collapse*, *Phys. Rev. D* **89** (2014) 044003 [[arXiv:1401.6182](#)] [[INSPIRE](#)].
- [9] E. Greenwood and D. Stojkovic, *Quantum gravitational collapse: non-singularity and non-locality*, *JHEP* **06** (2008) 042 [[arXiv:0802.4087](#)] [[INSPIRE](#)].
- [10] J.E. Wang, E. Greenwood and D. Stojkovic, *Schrodinger formalism, black hole horizons and singularity behavior*, *Phys. Rev. D* **80** (2009) 124027 [[arXiv:0906.3250](#)] [[INSPIRE](#)].
- [11] T. Vachaspati and D. Stojkovic, *Quantum radiation from quantum gravitational collapse*, *Lett. B* **663** (2008) 107 [[gr-qc/0701096](#)] [[INSPIRE](#)].
- [12] E. Ayon-Beato and A. Garcia, *New regular black hole solution from nonlinear electrodynamics*, *Phys. Lett. B* **464** (1999) 25 [[hep-th/9911174](#)] [[INSPIRE](#)].
- [13] P. Nicolini, A. Smailagic and E. Spallucci, *Noncommutative geometry inspired Schwarzschild black hole*, *Phys. Lett. B* **632** (2006) 547 [[gr-qc/0510112](#)] [[INSPIRE](#)].
- [14] V.P. Frolov, M.A. Markov and V.F. Mukhanov, *Black holes as possible sources of closed semiclosed worlds*, *Phys. Rev. D* **41** (1990) 383 [[INSPIRE](#)].
- [15] D.-H. Yeom and H. Zoe, *Constructing a counterexample to the black hole complementarity*, *Rev. D* **78** (2008) 104008 [[arXiv:0802.1625](#)] [[INSPIRE](#)].
- [16] M. Bouhmadi-López et al., *Traversable wormhole in Einstein 3-form theory with self-interaction potential*, *JCAP* **10** (2021) 059 [[arXiv:2108.07302](#)] [[INSPIRE](#)].
- [17] M. Bojowald, S. Brahma and D.-H. Yeom, *Effective line elements and black-hole models in canonical loop quantum gravity*, *Phys. Rev. D* **98** (2018) 046015 [[arXiv:1803.01119](#)] [[INSPIRE](#)].
- [18] A. Ashtekar, J. Olmedo and P. Singh, *Quantum transfiguration of Kruskal black holes*, *Phys. Lett.* **121** (2018) 241301 [[arXiv:1806.00648](#)] [[INSPIRE](#)].
- [19] A. Ashtekar, J. Olmedo and P. Singh, *Quantum extension of the Kruskal spacetime*, *Phys. Rev. D* **98** (2018) 126003 [[arXiv:1806.02406](#)] [[INSPIRE](#)].
- [20] C. Barceló, R. Carballo-Rubio and L.J. Garay, *Mutiny at the white-hole district*, *Int. J. Mod. Phys. D* **23** (2014) 1442022 [[arXiv:1407.1391](#)] [[INSPIRE](#)].
- [21] C. Barceló, R. Carballo-Rubio, L.J. Garay and G. Leaver, *The diffeomorphism group of*

- [24] A. Ashtekar and M. Bojowald, *Black hole evaporation: a paradigm*, *Class. Quant. Grav.* **22** (2005) 3349 [[gr-qc/0504029](#)] [[INSPIRE](#)].
- [25] H.M. Haggard and C. Rovelli, *Quantum-gravity effects outside the horizon spark black to white hole tunneling*, *Phys. Rev. D* **92** (2015) 104020 [[arXiv:1407.0989](#)] [[INSPIRE](#)].
- [26] W. Israel, *Singular hypersurfaces and thin shells in general relativity*, *Nuovo Cim. B* **44S** (1966) 1 [*Erratum ibid.* **48** (1967) 463] [[INSPIRE](#)].
- [27] C. Barceló, R. Carballo-Rubio and L.J. Garay, *Where does the physics of extreme gravitation collapse reside?*, *Universe* **2** (2016) 7 [[arXiv:1510.04957](#)] [[INSPIRE](#)].
- [28] S. Brahma and D.-H. Yeom, *Effective black-to-white hole bounces: the cost of surgery*, *Class. Quant. Grav.* **35** (2018) 205007 [[arXiv:1804.02821](#)] [[INSPIRE](#)].
- [29] R. Gaur and M. Visser, *Black holes, white holes, and near-horizon physics*, *JHEP* **05** (2020) 055 [[arXiv:2304.10692](#)] [[INSPIRE](#)].
- [30] H. Maeda, *Energy conditions for non-timelike thin shells*, *Class. Quant. Grav.* **40** (2023) 105001 [[arXiv:2306.07326](#)] [[INSPIRE](#)].
- [31] S.K. Blau, E.I. Guendelman and A.H. Guth, *The dynamics of false vacuum bubbles*, *Phys. Rev. D* **35** (1987) 1747 [[INSPIRE](#)].
- [32] J.P.W. Taylor, *Junction conditions at a corner*, *Class. Quant. Grav.* **21** (2004) 3705.
- [33] P. Chen, G. Domènech, M. Sasaki and D.-H. Yeom, *Stationary bubbles and their tunneling channels toward trivial geometry*, *JCAP* **04** (2016) 013 [[arXiv:1512.00565](#)] [[INSPIRE](#)].
- [34] R. Balbinot and E. Poisson, *Stability of the Schwarzschild-de Sitter model*, *Phys. Rev. D* **42** (1990) 395 [[INSPIRE](#)].
- [35] J. Hartle and T. Hertog, *Quantum transitions between classical histories*, *Phys. Rev. D* **92** (2015) 063509 [[arXiv:1502.06770](#)] [[INSPIRE](#)].