Real time evolution of scalar fields in semiclassical gravity Phys. Rev. D **105** (2022) no.10, 105010 [arXiv:2010.13215 [gr-qc]]

Jana N. Guenther, Christian Hölbling, Lukas Varnhorst

11. Aug. 2022





Consider the collapse of a free, massless scalar field to a black hole.

Semiclassical gravity predicts Hawking radiation for late times.

Hawking [1]

One would expect this calculation to be very messy and to depend on the detailed nature of the gravitational collapse. However, as I shall show, one can derive an asymptotic form [...] which depends only on the surface gravity of the resulting black hole.

Can we numerically determine the field evolution during the collapse phase including back reaction?



Consider the collapse of a free, massless scalar field to a black hole.

Semiclassical gravity predicts Hawking radiation for late times.

Hawking [1]

One would expect this calculation to be very messy and to depend on the detailed nature of the gravitational collapse. However, as I shall show, one can derive an asymptotic form [...] which depends only on the surface gravity of the resulting black hole.

Can we numerically determine the field evolution during the collapse phase including back reaction?



Consider the collapse of a free, massless scalar field to a black hole.

Semiclassical gravity predicts Hawking radiation for late times.

Hawking [1]

One would expect this calculation to be very messy and to depend on the detailed nature of the gravitational collapse. However, as I shall show, one can derive an asymptotic form [...] which depends only on the surface gravity of the resulting black hole.

Can we numerically determine the field evolution during the collapse phase including back reaction?



Consider the collapse of a free, massless scalar field to a black hole.

Semiclassical gravity predicts Hawking radiation for late times.

Hawking [1]

One would expect this calculation to be very messy and to depend on the detailed nature of the gravitational collapse. However, as I shall show, one can derive an asymptotic form [...] which depends only on the surface gravity of the resulting black hole.

Can we numerically determine the field evolution during the collapse phase including back reaction?



Consider the collapse of a free, massless scalar field to a black hole.

Semiclassical gravity predicts Hawking radiation for late times.

Hawking [1]

One would expect this calculation to be very messy and to depend on the detailed nature of the gravitational collapse. However, as I shall show, one can derive an asymptotic form [...] which depends only on the surface gravity of the resulting black hole.

Can we numerically determine the field evolution during the collapse phase including back reaction?



Consider the collapse of a free, massless scalar field to a black hole.

Semiclassical gravity predicts Hawking radiation for late times.

Hawking [1]

One would expect this calculation to be very messy and to depend on the detailed nature of the gravitational collapse. However, as I shall show, one can derive an asymptotic form [...] which depends only on the surface gravity of the resulting black hole.

Can we numerically determine the field evolution during the collapse phase including back reaction?



Consider the collapse of a free, massless scalar field to a black hole.

Semiclassical gravity predicts Hawking radiation for late times.

Hawking [1]

One would expect this calculation to be very messy and to depend on the detailed nature of the gravitational collapse. However, as I shall show, one can derive an asymptotic form [...] which depends only on the surface gravity of the resulting black hole.

Can we numerically determine the field evolution during the collapse phase including back reaction?



Consider the collapse of a free, massless scalar field to a black hole.

Semiclassical gravity predicts Hawking radiation for late times.

Hawking [1]

One would expect this calculation to be very messy and to depend on the detailed nature of the gravitational collapse. However, as I shall show, one can derive an asymptotic form [...] which depends only on the surface gravity of the resulting black hole.

Can we numerically determine the field evolution during the collapse phase including back reaction?



Consider the collapse of a free, massless scalar field to a black hole.

Semiclassical gravity predicts Hawking radiation for late times.

Hawking [1]

One would expect this calculation to be very messy and to depend on the detailed nature of the gravitational collapse. However, as I shall show, one can derive an asymptotic form [...] which depends only on the surface gravity of the resulting black hole.

Can we numerically determine the field evolution during the collapse phase including back reaction?



Consider the collapse of a free, massless scalar field to a black hole.

Semiclassical gravity predicts Hawking radiation for late times.

Hawking [1]

One would expect this calculation to be very messy and to depend on the detailed nature of the gravitational collapse. However, as I shall show, one can derive an asymptotic form [...] which depends only on the surface gravity of the resulting black hole.

Can we numerically determine the field evolution during the collapse phase including back reaction?



Consider the collapse of a free, massless scalar field to a black hole.

Semiclassical gravity predicts Hawking radiation for late times.

Hawking [1]

One would expect this calculation to be very messy and to depend on the detailed nature of the gravitational collapse. However, as I shall show, one can derive an asymptotic form [...] which depends only on the surface gravity of the resulting black hole.

Can we numerically determine the field evolution during the collapse phase including back reaction?



Consider the collapse of a free, massless scalar field to a black hole.

Semiclassical gravity predicts Hawking radiation for late times.

Hawking [1]

One would expect this calculation to be very messy and to depend on the detailed nature of the gravitational collapse. However, as I shall show, one can derive an asymptotic form [...] which depends only on the surface gravity of the resulting black hole.

Can we numerically determine the field evolution during the collapse phase including back reaction?



Consider the collapse of a free, massless scalar field to a black hole.

Semiclassical gravity predicts Hawking radiation for late times.

Hawking [1]

One would expect this calculation to be very messy and to depend on the detailed nature of the gravitational collapse. However, as I shall show, one can derive an asymptotic form [...] which depends only on the surface gravity of the resulting black hole.

Can we numerically determine the field evolution during the collapse phase including back reaction?



Consider the collapse of a free, massless scalar field to a black hole.

Semiclassical gravity predicts Hawking radiation for late times.

Hawking [1]

One would expect this calculation to be very messy and to depend on the detailed nature of the gravitational collapse. However, as I shall show, one can derive an asymptotic form [...] which depends only on the surface gravity of the resulting black hole.

Can we numerically determine the field evolution during the collapse phase including back reaction?



Consider the collapse of a free, massless scalar field to a black hole.

Semiclassical gravity predicts Hawking radiation for late times.

Hawking [1]

One would expect this calculation to be very messy and to depend on the detailed nature of the gravitational collapse. However, as I shall show, one can derive an asymptotic form [...] which depends only on the surface gravity of the resulting black hole.

Can we numerically determine the field evolution during the collapse phase including back reaction?



[1] M. W. Choptuik, "Universality and scaling in gravitational collapse of a massless scalar field," Phys. Rev. Lett. ${\bf 70}$ (1993), 9-12

Semiclassical Einstein equation:

$$R_{\mu
u} - rac{1}{2}Rg_{\mu
u} = \langle \psi \mid T_{\mu
u} \mid \psi
angle$$

Choose state $\mid\psi
angle$ such that:

- Close to a classical state \rightarrow Coherent state.
- Expectation value is spherically symmetric.

Choose spherical symmetric coordinate system [1]

$$g_{\mu
u} = egin{pmatrix} lpha^2(t,r) & & & \ & -a^2(t,r) & & \ & & -r^2 & \ & & & -r^2\cos^2 heta \end{pmatrix}$$

Scalar field decomposition

Hamiltonian of the field can be written as

/



$$\sum_{0}^{l} (2l+1) \left(rac{lpha a_0}{a lpha_0} \Pi_l \Pi_l^{\dagger} + \phi_l^{\dagger} \sqrt{rac{a lpha_0}{lpha a_0}} K \sqrt{rac{a lpha_0}{lpha a_0}} \phi_l
ight)$$
 $K = q^T q + rac{l(l+1)}{r^2} lpha^2$

$$q = \sqrt{rac{lpha}{a}} r \partial_r \sqrt{rac{lpha}{a}} rac{1}{r}$$

Perform SVD:

 ∞

1-

- $K = V \omega^2 V^T$
- V: Mode functions.
- ω : Mode frequency

Scalar field quantization



Write Hamiltonian as

$$\mathcal{H} = b_+ W_r b_+^\dagger + b_-^\dagger W_r b_- + b_+ X_r b_- + b_-^\dagger X_r b_+^\dagger.$$

 $b_{\pm}^{\dagger}/b_{\pm}$ are the creation/annihilation operators with frequencies $\omega.$

$$egin{aligned} b_+(t) &= rac{1}{\sqrt{2}}(b_u(t)+b_v(t)) \quad b_-(t) &= rac{1}{\sqrt{2}}(b_u^\dagger(t)-b_v^\dagger(t)) \ b_-^\dagger(t) &= rac{1}{\sqrt{2}}(b_u^\dagger(t)-b_v^\dagger(t)) \ b_+^\dagger(t) &= rac{1}{\sqrt{2}}(b_u^\dagger(t)+b_v^\dagger(t)) \ b_u(t) &= rac{1}{\sqrt{2}}ig(b_+u(t)+b_i^\dagger u^*(t)ig)V\sqrt{\omega} \ b_u(t) &= rac{1}{\sqrt{2}}ig(b_+v(t)-b_-^\dagger v^*(t)ig)V\sqrt{\omega^{-1}} \end{aligned}$$

 \rightarrow Determine time evolution of u(t) and v(t).

Initialization:

$$u(0) = \frac{1}{\sqrt{\omega}}V^T$$
 and $v(0) = \sqrt{\omega}V^T$

As long as the metric is constant, the time evolution can be solved exactly

$$ig(u(t+\Delta t) \quad v(t+\Delta t)ig) = ig(u(t) \quad v(t)ig) \exp\left(-\mathrm{i} igg(egin{array}{c} 0 & \sqrt{rac{\partial lpha_0}{lpha a_0}} K\sqrt{rac{\partial lpha_0}{lpha a_0}} \\ rac{\partial lpha_0}{\partial lpha_0} & 0 \end{array}
ight) \Delta tigg)$$

Exponential can be explicitly evaluated by using SVD $K = V \omega^2 V^T$.

Time evolution is a Bogolyubov transformation.

Metric evolution

$$g_{\mu\nu} = \begin{pmatrix} \hat{\alpha}^2 \frac{d}{r} & & \\ & -\frac{r}{d} & & \\ & & -r^2 & \\ & & & -r^2 \cos^2 \theta \end{pmatrix}$$

 $\begin{aligned} \mathsf{ln}'(\hat{\alpha}) &= \langle \psi \mid h_r^0 \mid \psi \rangle \\ \mathsf{d}' + \mathsf{d} h_r^0 &= 1 - r \langle \psi \mid m_r \mid \psi \rangle \end{aligned}$

 h_r^0 and m_r are field operators:

$$\langle h_r^0 \rangle_{\psi} = \frac{1}{d^0 \hat{a}^0} \left(|l_{ur}|^2 + |l_{vr}|^2 + \sum_{l=0}^{\infty} (2l+1) \left((v_l^{\dagger} v_l)_r r + (q^0 u_l^{\dagger} u_l q^{0T})_r r) \right) \right)$$

$$\langle m_r \rangle_{\psi} = \frac{d^0 \hat{a}^0}{r^2} \sum_{l=0^{\infty}} (2l+1) \left(\frac{l(l+1)}{r^2} + M^2 \right) (u_l^{\dagger} u_l)_{rr}$$

- $|I_{ur}|^2 + |I_{vr}|^2$: Classical contribution
- u_l , v_l : Coefficient of creation and anihilation operators
- $q^0 = \sqrt{\hat{\alpha} dr} \partial_r \sqrt{\hat{\alpha} dr^{-3}}$ Discretized "derivative"

Combined evolution



l=0 approximation



Consider only the I = 0 modes.

 \rightarrow Divergences of $\langle {\cal T}_{\mu\nu}\rangle_\psi$ can be cancelled by normal ordering

Back reaction effects can be included.

Horizon seems to form earlier due to quantum effects.

l = 0 approximation



- Consider only the l = 0 modes.
- \rightarrow Divergences of $\langle T_{\mu\nu} \rangle_{\psi}$ can be cancelled by normal ordering

Back reaction effects can be included.

Horizon seems to form earlier due to quantum effects.

Including l > 0 modes



Classically, l > 0 modes break spherical symmetry.

In the quantum case, $\langle \psi \mid T_{\mu\nu} \mid \psi \rangle$ can be spherically symmetric even if I > 0 modes are excited.

 \rightarrow These modes must be included.

$$\mathcal{H} = \sum_{l=0}^{\infty} (2l+1) \left(\frac{\alpha a_0}{a \alpha_0} \Pi_l \Pi_l^{\dagger} + \phi_l^{\dagger} \sqrt{\frac{a \alpha_0}{\alpha a_0}} K \sqrt{\frac{a \alpha_0}{\alpha a_0}} \phi_l \right)$$

with

$$K = q^T q + \frac{l(l+1)}{r^2} \alpha^2$$

Additional divergence due to large *I* modes.



Classically, l > 0 modes break spherical symmetry.

In the quantum case, $\langle \psi \mid T_{\mu\nu} \mid \psi \rangle$ can be spherically symmetric even if I > 0 modes are excited.

 \rightarrow These modes must be included.

$$\mathcal{H} = \sum_{l=0}^{\infty} (2l+1) \left(\frac{\alpha a_0}{a \alpha_0} \mathsf{\Pi}_l \mathsf{\Pi}_l^{\dagger} + \phi_l^{\dagger} \sqrt{\frac{a \alpha_0}{\alpha a_0}} \mathsf{K} \sqrt{\frac{a \alpha_0}{\alpha a_0}} \phi_l \right)$$

with

$$K = q^T q + \frac{l(l+1)}{r^2} \alpha^2$$

Additional divergence due to large I modes.

Energy momentum tensor in curved space time can be calculated from the coincidence limit of the two-point function G(x, x').

For well behaved Hadamard states $|\psi\rangle$, the divergence structure is [1]

$$\lim_{x' \to x} \langle \psi \mid G(x, x') \mid \psi \rangle = \frac{u(x, x')}{\sigma(x, x')} + v(x, x') \ln \sigma(x, x') + w(x, x')$$

Here, $\sigma(x, x')$ is the geodesic distance between x and x' and u(x, x'), v(x, x') are state-independent function that depend only on the metric and w(x, x') is regular.

How does that translate to the sum of angular / modes?

Can one use a 1/l expansion to relate them? \rightarrow Work in progress.

[1] S. A. Fulling, M. Sweeny and R. M. Wald, "Singularity Structure of the Two Point Function in Quantum Field Theory in Curved Space-Time," Commun. Math. Phys. 63 (1978), 257-264



Dashed line: Normal ordering at t = 0.

Dotted line: Instantaneous normal ordering (Adiabatic approximation)

Approaches:

- Normal ordering
- Point splitting in θ direction [1]
- Subtraction of adiabtic time evolution
- Subtracting the evolution with $K = \frac{l(l+1)}{r^2} \alpha^2$



Dashed line: Normal ordering at t = 0.

Dotted line: Instantaneous normal ordering (Adiabatic approximation)

Approaches:

- Normal ordering
- Point splitting in θ direction [1]
- Subtraction of adiabtic time evolution
- Subtracting the evolution with $K = \frac{l(l+1)}{r^2} \alpha^2$



Dashed line: Normal ordering at t = 0.

Dotted line: Instantaneous normal ordering (Adiabatic approximation)

Approaches:

- Normal ordering
- Point splitting in θ direction [1]
- Subtraction of adiabtic time evolution
- Subtracting the evolution with $K = \frac{l(l+1)}{r^2} \alpha^2$



Dashed line: Normal ordering at t = 0.

Dotted line: Instantaneous normal ordering (Adiabatic approximation)

Approaches:

- Normal ordering
- Point splitting in θ direction [1]
- Subtraction of adiabatic time evolution
- Subtracting the evolution with $K = \frac{l(l+1)}{r^2} \alpha^2$



Dashed line: Normal ordering at t = 0.

Dotted line: Instantaneous normal ordering (Adiabatic approximation)

Approaches:

- Normal ordering
- Point splitting in θ direction [1]
- Subtraction of adiabatic time evolution
- Subtracting the evolution with $K = \frac{l(l+1)}{r^2} \alpha^2$



As suggested by [1], using Pauli-Villars fields with alternating signs and masses

 $m_2^2 + m_4^2 = m_1^2 + m_3^2 + m_5^2$ $m_2^4 + m_4^4 = m_1^4 + m_3^4 + m_5^4$

removes divergences for finite values of the masses.

Left side: $m_1 = 1$.

 B. Berczi, P. M. Saffin and S. Y. Zhou, "Gravitational collapse of quantum fields and Choptuik scaling," JHEP 02 (2022), 183 doi:10.1007/JHEP02(2022)183 [arXiv:2111.11400 [hep-th]].

- Free scalar field evolution can be solved exactly in a static metric.
- In varying metric a leap-frog-like algorithm allows to determine the evolution.
- In the I = 0 approximation, the back reaction can be calculated.
- Including higher *I* modes is work in progress, preliminary results with Pauli-Villars regularization.

Thank you!