

Hadamard property of the Unruh state for massless fermions on Kerr spacetime : the large a case

Dietrich HÄFNER and Christiane KLEIN

ABSTRACT. In [7], the Unruh state for massless fermions on a Kerr spacetime was constructed and the authors showed its Hadamard property in the case of very slowly rotating black holes $|a| \ll M$. In this note, we extend this result to the full non extreme case $|a| < M$.

1. INTRODUCTION

When studying quantum fields in black hole spacetimes, one crucial and non-trivial step is the choice of state for the quantum field at hand. Ideally, the state should be motivated by the physical situation. One state which satisfies this condition for a variety of black hole spacetimes is the Unruh state [26] - it appears as the final state when one considers the collapse of a star to a black hole, see e.g. [11], [9].

Moreover, the selected state should be physically reasonable, in the sense of satisfying the Hadamard property, see e.g. [6] for why this is the necessary condition. In this note, we will consider the microlocal formulation of the Hadamard property due to Radzikowski [23]. The Unruh state is also favourable in this regard. It was first constructed and its Hadamard property shown for the wave equation on the Schwarzschild spacetime by Dappiaggi-Moretti-Pinamonti [3], and this proof has since been expanded to other spherically symmetric black hole spacetimes [2, 14].

However, astrophysical black holes are expected to be rotating, and therefore not spherically symmetric. Rotating black holes are described by the Kerr spacetime. Constructing explicit Hadamard states in the case of the Kerr spacetime is more complicated because of the lack of a global timelike Killing vector field in the exterior region. Nonetheless, Gérard, Wrochna and the first author have recently constructed the Unruh state for massless Dirac fields on the Kerr spacetime in [7] (see [9] for an earlier construction of the Unruh state on block I also in the massive charged case). They have also shown its Hadamard property, but only under the condition that the angular momentum per unit mass a of the black hole is small. In [9], [7], to circumvent the lack of a global timelike Killing field, the data are separated in data for solutions going to the black hole horizon and solutions going to infinity by means of asymptotic velocities constructed in the framework of scattering theory, see [10]. Two different Killing vector fields are then used to construct the state. Later on, the second author constructed the Unruh state for the Klein-Gordon equation on the De Sitter Kerr spacetime in [16] and showed its Hadamard property, again under the condition that the angular momentum

2010 *Mathematics Subject Classification.* 81T13, 81T20, 35S05, 35S35.

Key words and phrases. Quantum Field Theory on curved spacetimes, Hadamard states, Dirac equation, Kerr spacetime, Hawking temperature.

Acknowledgments. We thank Stefan Hollands and Michał Wrochna for helpful comments on an earlier version of this paper. We also acknowledge support from the ANR funding ANR-20-CE40-0018-01.

per unit mass of the black hole is small. The scattering construction is there replaced by an argument using the fast decay of the field (see e.g. [5], [12]).

The assumption of small angular momentum is an important shortcoming, since most black holes are expected to rotate rapidly, see [1] and [25]. The restriction is used in [7] to show the Hadamard property. For sufficiently small a , any geodesic in the black hole exterior M_I (see Section 3 for the definition) either reaches the past black hole horizon or past null infinity or meets a region, where both vector fields which have been used to construct the Unruh state are timelike. For those geodesics who reach either the past black hole horizon or past null infinity, a refinement of a strategy of Moretti [19], see also [13], [8], showing a Hadamard property from characteristic data was used. This argument works the same way in the large a case. Yet, for large a not all other geodesics meet a region where both relevant vector fields are timelike.

In this note, we extend the result of [7] to all subextreme values of the angular momentum $|a| < M$. This requires a precise analysis of the situation on the backward/forward trapped set. The argument therefore only concerns the geodesic flow and should in principle apply also to other fields. Note, however, that in the case of the De Sitter Kerr metric other problems arise, in particular in the full range of angular momentum, it is up to today unknown if the wave equation has growing modes or not. We refer to [7] for a full review of the literature.

The paper is organized as follows. In Section 2-4, we revise the necessary constructions to define the Unruh state in Section 5, where the main result of this paper is stated. Sections 2-4 essentially summarizes the constructions in [7], we also refer to [7] for more details and additional references. In Section 6, we prove our main result.

2. THE DIRAC AND WEYL OPERATORS

In this section, we summarize some elementary facts about Dirac and Weyl operators. For details of the construction, we refer to [7].

2.1. Notation. Let (M, g) be an oriented and time oriented Lorentzian manifold of dimension 4. We denote by $\Omega_g \in \wedge^4 M$ the volume form associated to g and by $d\text{vol}_g = |\Omega_g|$ the volume density.

If $\mathcal{S} \xrightarrow{\pi} M$ is a vector bundle, we denote by $C^\infty(M; \mathcal{S})$ the space of its smooth sections. In the case when \mathcal{S} is a complex vector bundle, we denote its anti-dual bundle by \mathcal{S}^* . The complex conjugate bundle (obtained by considering the fibers as complex vector spaces with the opposite complex structure) is denoted by $\overline{\mathcal{S}}$.

If \mathcal{X} is a complex vector space, we denote by $L_h(\mathcal{X}, \mathcal{X}^*)$, resp. $L_a(\mathcal{X}, \mathcal{X}^*)$, the space of Hermitian, resp. anti-Hermitian forms on \mathcal{X} . Generally, if $\beta \in L(\mathcal{X}, \mathcal{X}^*)$, i.e. if β is a sesquilinear form, we denote by $\overline{\psi_1} \cdot \beta \psi_2$ its evaluation on $\psi_1, \psi_2 \in \mathcal{X}$. If instead $\beta \in C^\infty(M; \text{End}(\mathcal{S}, \mathcal{S}^*))$, the same notation is used for the fiberwise evaluation of $\psi_1, \psi_2 \in C^\infty(M; \mathcal{S})$.

2.2. Dirac and Weyl operators. Let (M, g) be a globally hyperbolic spacetime of dimension 4, equipped with its unique spin structure. From the spin structure, one obtains in a canonical way a spinor bundle $\mathcal{S} \xrightarrow{\pi} M$ of rank 4, a spin connection $\nabla^{\mathcal{S}}$, and a representation γ of the Clifford bundle $\text{Cl}(M, g)$ in $\text{End}(\mathcal{S})$. One also obtains a positive energy Hermitian form β , and a complex conjugation κ acting on the fibers of \mathcal{S} . The massless Dirac operator \not{D} acting on smooth sections of the canonical spinor

bundle \mathcal{S} over M is the differential operator defined as

$$\mathbb{D} = g^{\mu\nu} \gamma(e_\mu) \nabla_{e_\nu}^{\mathcal{S}},$$

where (e_0, \dots, e_3) is a local frame of TM . In the massless case, it is well known that the whole analysis can be reduced to the *Weyl equation*

$$\mathbb{D}\phi = 0, \quad (2.1)$$

which accounts for half of the degrees of freedom. We call \mathbb{D} the associated Weyl operator. More precisely, one can identify \mathcal{S} with $\mathbb{S}^* \oplus \mathbb{S}^\#$, where $\mathbb{S}^* = \overline{\mathbb{S}^\#}$ is the bundle of even Weyl spinors. We have

$$\Gamma(X) = \beta\gamma(X) \in C^\infty(M, \text{End}(\mathbb{S}^*, \mathbb{S})), \quad X \in C^\infty(M; TM) \quad (2.2)$$

and

$$\mathbb{D} = g^{\mu\nu} \Gamma(e_\mu) \nabla_{e_\nu}^{\mathcal{S}}. \quad (2.3)$$

If S is a space-like Cauchy surface, the Cauchy problem

$$\begin{cases} \mathbb{D}\phi = 0, \\ r_S\phi = \varphi \in C_c^\infty(S; \mathbb{S}_S^*), \end{cases} \quad (2.4)$$

where \mathbb{S}_S^* is the restriction of \mathbb{S}^* to S and $r_S\phi = \phi|_S$, has a unique solution $\phi =: \mathbb{U}_S\varphi$ in the space of smooth space-compact solutions, $\text{Sol}_{\text{sc}}(M)$. ϕ *space-compact* means that the intersection of $\text{supp } \phi$ with any space-like Cauchy surface is compact.

The *principal symbol* of \mathbb{D} is the section $\sigma_{\mathbb{D}} \in C^\infty(T^*M \setminus o; \text{End}(\mathbb{S}^*, \mathbb{S}))$ given by

$$\sigma_{\mathbb{D}}(x, \xi) = \Gamma(g^{-1}(x)\xi), \quad (x, \xi) \in T^*M \setminus o. \quad (2.5)$$

By [7, Lemma 3.1], the Weyl operator \mathbb{D} is pre-normally hyperbolic, i.e., there exists a differential operator \mathbb{D}' such that $(\sigma_{\mathbb{D}} \circ \sigma_{\mathbb{D}'})(x, \xi) = (\xi \cdot g^{-1}(x)\xi)\mathbf{1}$. As a consequence, the *characteristic manifold* of \mathbb{D} defined as

$$\text{Char}(\mathbb{D}) = \{(x, \xi) \in T^*M \setminus o : \sigma_{\mathbb{D}}(x, \xi) \text{ is not invertible}\}.$$

is given by

$$\text{Char}(\mathbb{D}) = \{(x, \xi) \in T^*M \setminus o : \xi \cdot g^{-1}(x)\xi = 0\} =: \mathcal{N}.$$

Its two connected components are

$$\mathcal{N}^\pm := \mathcal{N} \cap \{(x, \xi) \in T^*M \setminus o : \pm v \cdot \xi > 0 \ \forall v \in T_x M \text{ future directed timelike}\}. \quad (2.6)$$

If $v \cdot \xi > 0$ for all $v \in T_x M$ which are future directed timelike, we say that ξ is future pointing.

2.3. L^2 solutions. Let $\text{Sol}_{\text{sc}}(M)$ be the space of smooth space-compact solutions of $\mathbb{D}\phi = 0$, $\phi \in C^\infty(M; \mathbb{S}^*)$. The *current* $J(\phi_1, \phi_2) \in C^\infty(M; T^*M)$ defined by

$$J(\phi_1, \phi_2) \cdot X := \overline{\phi_1} \cdot \Gamma(X)\phi_2, \quad X \in C^\infty(M; TM), \quad \phi_i \in \text{Sol}_{\text{sc}}(M), \quad (2.7)$$

satisfies

$$\nabla^a J_a(\phi_1, \phi_2) = 0, \quad \phi_i \in \text{Sol}_{\text{sc}}(M). \quad (2.8)$$

For a smooth hypersurface S , let $i : S \rightarrow M$ be the canonical injection. Since $\nabla^a J_a \Omega_g = d(g^{-1}J \lrcorner \Omega_g)$, we deduce from Stokes' formula that

$$\int_{\partial U} i^*(g^{-1}J(\phi_1, \phi_2) \lrcorner \Omega_g) = 0, \quad \phi_i \in \text{Sol}_{\text{sc}}(M), \quad (2.9)$$

if U is any open set whose boundary ∂U is a union of smooth hypersurfaces, such that $\text{supp } J(\phi_1, \phi_2) \cap \partial U$ is compact. Let $S \subset M$ be a smooth hypersurface. To express

$$\int_S i^*(g^{-1}J \lrcorner \Omega_g)$$

for J a 1-form on M , we choose a vector field $l = l^a$ transverse to S , future pointing and a 1-form $\nu = \nu_a dx^a$ on M such that $TS = \text{Ker } \nu$, normalized so that $\nu \cdot l = 1$. We obtain:

$$i^*(g^{-1}J \lrcorner \Omega_g) = (\nu \cdot g^{-1}J) i^*(l \lrcorner \Omega_g). \quad (2.10)$$

Let now $S \subset M$ be any smooth Cauchy surface (with the convention that a Cauchy surface does not need to be space-like). We set

$$\begin{aligned} (\phi_1 | \phi_2)_{\mathbb{D}} &:= i \int_S i^*(g^{-1}J(\phi_1, \phi_2) \lrcorner \Omega_g) \\ &= i \int_S \bar{\varphi}_1 \cdot \Gamma(g^{-1}\nu) \phi_2 \ i^* d\text{vol}_g, \end{aligned} \quad (2.11)$$

where $i^* d\text{vol}_g = |i^*(l \lrcorner \Omega_g)|$.

From (2.9), we see that the r.h.s. in (2.11) is independent on the choice of the Cauchy surface S . If S is space-like with future pointing normal n , we obtain

$$(\phi_1 | \phi_2)_{\mathbb{D}} = i \int_S \bar{\varphi}_1 \cdot \Gamma(n) \phi_2 \ d\text{vol}_h, \quad (2.12)$$

where $d\text{vol}_h = i_n^* d\text{vol}_g$. By the properties of β , $i\Gamma(n)$ is positive definite, which shows that $(\cdot | \cdot)_{\mathbb{D}}$ is a Hilbertian scalar product on $\text{Sol}_{\text{sc}}(M)$. We can reformulate this as being a scalar product on the Cauchy data on a spacelike hypersurface Σ defined by

$$\bar{\varphi}_1 \cdot \nu_{\Sigma} \varphi_2 = i \int_{\Sigma} \bar{\varphi}_1 \cdot \Gamma(n) \varphi_2 \ d\text{vol}_h, \quad \varphi_i \in C_c^{\infty}(\Sigma; \mathbb{S}_{\Sigma}^*). \quad (2.13)$$

Definition 2.1. The Hilbert space $\text{Sol}_{L^2}(M)$, called the *space of L^2 solutions*, is the completion of $\text{Sol}_{\text{sc}}(M)$ for the scalar product $(\cdot | \cdot)_{\mathbb{D}}$.

Note that $\text{Sol}_{L^2}(M) \subset L_{\text{loc}}^2(M; \mathbb{S})$ continuously, so elements of $\text{Sol}_{L^2}(M)$ are distributional solutions of $\mathbb{D}\phi = 0$.

2.4. Action of Killing vector fields. Let X be a complete Killing vector field on (M, g) . Let \mathcal{L}_X be the corresponding Lie derivative on spinors. Then \mathcal{L}_X preserves $\text{Sol}_{\text{sc}}(M)$. By [7, Proposition 3.5], we have

Proposition 2.2. *The operator $i^{-1}\mathcal{L}_X$ with domain $\text{Sol}_{\text{sc}}(M)$ is essentially selfadjoint on the Hilbert space $\text{Sol}_{L^2}(M)$.*

3. THE KERR SPACETIME

3.1. Boyer-Lindquist blocks. We now recall the relevant facts on Kerr black hole geometry. We fix $0 < |a| < M$, i.e. we consider the *subextreme* Kerr case. One sets

$$\begin{aligned} \Delta &= r^2 - 2Mr + a^2, \quad \rho^2 = r^2 + a^2 \cos^2 \theta, \\ \sigma^2 &= (r^2 + a^2)^2 - a^2 \Delta \sin^2 \theta = (r^2 + a^2)\rho^2 + 2a^2 Mr \sin^2 \theta, \end{aligned}$$

and $r_{\pm} = M \pm \sqrt{M^2 - a^2}$ for the two roots of Δ as a function of r .

The Boyer-Lindquist blocks are the manifolds (M_I, g) , (M_{II}, g) , where

$$M_I = \mathbb{R}_t \times]r_+, +\infty[_r \times \mathbb{S}_{\theta, \varphi}^2,$$

$$M_{II} = \mathbb{R}_t \times]r_-, r_+[_r \times \mathbb{S}_{\theta, \varphi}^2,$$

$\theta \in]0, \pi[$, $\varphi \in \mathbb{R}/2\pi\mathbb{Z}$ are the spherical coordinates on \mathbb{S}^2 , and

$$g = - \left(1 - \frac{2Mr}{\rho^2}\right) dt^2 - \frac{4aMr \sin^2 \theta}{\rho^2} dt d\varphi + \frac{\rho^2}{\Delta} dr^2 + \rho^2 d\theta^2 + \frac{\sigma^2}{\rho^2} \sin^2 \theta d\varphi^2.$$

(We will not need to consider the third Boyer-Lindquist block M_{III} corresponding to $r \in]-\infty, r_-[$). The global coordinates (t, r, θ, φ) on M_I, M_{II} are called *Boyer-Lindquist coordinates*. The vector field $\nabla t = g^{-1}(dt, \cdot) = -\frac{\sigma^2}{\rho^2 \Delta} (\partial_t + \frac{2Mar}{\sigma^2} \partial_\varphi)$ is timelike on (M_I, g) and one fixes the time orientation of (M_I, g) by declaring $-\nabla t$ to be future directed. By convention, the time orientation of M_{II} is the one inherited from its embedding into K^* , see 3.3.2 below. (M_I, g) is globally hyperbolic.

3.2. Time reversal. When considering the gluing of various blocks into a larger spacetime, it is useful to introduce the following notation. If (M, g) is a spacetime, we denote by (M', g) the same Lorentzian manifold with the opposite time orientation. So, $\text{id} : (M, g) \rightarrow (M', g)$ is an isometric involution reversing the time orientation. If (M, g) admits a spinor bundle $\mathcal{S} \xrightarrow{\pi} M$, then so does (M', g) . We will generally decorate with primes the objects associated to (M', g) .

3.3. The K^* and *K spacetimes. We now recall the *Kerr-star* and *star-Kerr* coordinates, which allow to glue together M_I and M_{II} along parts of $\{r = r_+\}$. As pre-announced, we will remove from K^* and *K the parts corresponding to the third Boyer-Lindquist block M_{III} .

3.3.1. *The K^* spacetime.* We set

$$K^* = \mathbb{R}_{t^*} \times]r_-, +\infty[_r \times \mathbb{S}_{\theta, \varphi^*}^2,$$

equipped with the metric

$$g = g_{tt} dt^{*2} + 2g_{t\varphi} dt^* d\varphi^* + g_{\varphi\varphi} d\varphi^{*2} + 2dt^* dr - 2a \sin^2 \theta d\varphi^* dr + \rho^2 d\theta^2.$$

The global coordinates $(t^*, r, \theta, \varphi^*)$ are called *Kerr-star coordinates*. We will denote by $\partial_{r^*}, \partial_{\theta^*}$, the coordinate vector fields $\partial_r, \partial_\theta$ of the Kerr-star coordinates. We time orient K^* by declaring that the null vector $-\partial_{r^*}$ is future directed.

3.3.2. *Embedding M_I and M_{II} into K^* .* Let $x(r)$ and $\Lambda(r)$ for $r \in]r_-, r_+[\cup]r_+, +\infty[$ be such that

$$\frac{dx}{dr} = \frac{r^2 + a^2}{\Delta}, \quad \frac{d\Lambda}{dr} = \frac{a}{\Delta}. \quad (3.1)$$

We define the map $j^* : M_I \cup M_{II} \rightarrow K^*$ by:

$$t^* \circ j^* = t + x(r), \quad r \circ j^* = r, \quad \theta \circ j^* = \theta, \quad \varphi^* \circ j^* = \varphi + \Lambda(r),$$

which allows to identify isometrically (M_I, g) resp. (M_{II}, g) with (M_I^*, g) , resp. (M_{II}^*, g) , where

$$M_I^* = K^* \cap \{r_+ < r\}, \quad M_{II}^* = K^* \cap \{r_- < r < r_+\}.$$

Using j^* , one can glue M_I with M_{II} inside K^* along the *future horizon*:

$$\mathcal{H}_+ = \mathbb{R}_{t^*} \times \{r = r_+\} \times \mathbb{S}_{\theta, \varphi}^2.$$

The embedding of M_I and M_{II} into K^* respects the time orientation. For coherence of notation, we will use the following definition.

Definition 3.1. We set

$$M_{I \cup II} := (j^*)^{-1}(K^*) = M_I \cup M_{II} \cup \mathcal{H}_+,$$

with the spacetime structure inherited from K^* .

The spacetime $(M_{I \cup II}, g)$ is globally hyperbolic.

3.3.3. *The *K spacetime.* Similarly, we set

$${}^*K = \mathbb{R}_{*t} \times]r_-, +\infty[_r \times \mathbb{S}_{\theta, * \varphi}^2,$$

equipped with the metric

$$g = g_{tt}d^{*t}{}^2 + 2g_{t\varphi}d^{*t}d^{*\varphi} + g_{\varphi\varphi}d^{*\varphi}{}^2 - 2d^{*t}dr + 2a \sin^2 \theta d^{*\varphi}dr + \rho^2 d\theta^2.$$

The global coordinates $({}^*t, r, \theta, {}^*\varphi)$ are called *star-Kerr coordinates* and as before ∂_{*r} , $\partial_{*\theta}$ denote the coordinate vector fields ∂_r , ∂_θ of the star-Kerr coordinates. We time orient *K by declaring that the null vector ∂_{*r} is future directed.

3.3.4. *Embedding M_I and M_{II} into *K .* Again, the map $*j : M_I \cup M_{II} \rightarrow K^*$ defined by:

$${}^*t \circ *j = t - x(r), \quad r \circ *j = r, \quad \theta \circ *j = \theta, \quad {}^*\varphi \circ *j = \varphi - \Lambda(r),$$

allows to identify isometrically (M_I, g) resp. (M_{II}, g) with $({}^*M_I, g)$, resp. $({}^*M_{II}, g)$, where

$${}^*M_I = {}^*K \cap \{r_+ < r\}, \quad {}^*M_{II} = {}^*K \cap \{r_- < r < r_+\}.$$

Using $*j$, one can glue M_I with M_{II} inside *K along the *past horizon*:

$$\mathcal{H}_- = \mathbb{R}_{*t} \times \{r = r_+\} \times \mathbb{S}_{\theta, * \varphi}^2. \quad (3.2)$$

The embedding of M_I (resp. M_{II}) into *K respects (resp. reverses) the time orientation.

In the original Boyer–Lindquist coordinates, the future and past horizons \mathcal{H}_+ and \mathcal{H}_- are reached at infinite values of t .

3.4. **Conformal extension of M_I .** The Penrose conformal extension of M_I is obtained by setting $\hat{g} = w^2 g$, where $w = r^{-1} \in]0, r_+^{-1}[$. \hat{g} extends as a smooth, non-degenerate metric to $w \in]-\infty, r_+^{-1}[$. For $\epsilon_0 > 0$ small enough, \hat{g} is Lorentzian for $w \in]-\epsilon_0, r_+^{-1}[$. We define the conformal extension of M_I as

$$\hat{M}_I := \mathbb{R}_{t^*} \times]-\epsilon_0, r_+^{-1}]_w \times \mathbb{S}_{\theta, \varphi^*}^2.$$


Past null infinity is then the null hypersurface

$$\mathcal{I}_- = \mathbb{R}_{t^*} \times \{w = 0\} \times \mathbb{S}_{\theta, \varphi^*}^2. \quad (3.3)$$

In an analogous way, extending \hat{g} expressed in coordinates $({}^*t, w, \theta, {}^*\varphi)$ to

$$\mathbb{R}_{*t} \times]-\epsilon_0, r_+^{-1}]_w \times \mathbb{S}_{\theta, * \varphi}^2$$

allows to define *future null infinity* $\mathcal{I}_+ = \mathbb{R}_{*t} \times \{w = 0\} \times \mathbb{S}_{\theta, * \varphi}^2$, see Figure 1 for the conformal diagram.

FIGURE 1. The conformal extensions of M_I .

The time orientations of the conformal extensions of M_I are inherited from the time orientation of M_I .

3.5. The Kerr-Kruskal extension. Let

$$\kappa_{\pm} = \frac{r_{\pm} - r_{\mp}}{2(r_{\pm}^2 + a^2)} \quad (3.4)$$

be the surface gravities of the black hole and Cauchy horizons. The *Kerr-Kruskal extension* M is the manifold (M, g) with:

$$M = \mathbb{R}_U \times \mathbb{R}_V \times \mathbb{S}_{\theta, \varphi}^2.$$

One defines r as a smooth function on M by the equation:

$$\frac{r - r_+}{UV} = G(r), \text{ for } G(r) = e^{-2\kappa_+ r} (r - r_-)^{r_-/r_+}.$$

M is then equipped with the metric [20, Proposition 3.5.3]:

$$\begin{aligned} g = & \frac{G^2(r)a^2 \sin^2 \theta}{4\kappa_+^2 \rho^2} \frac{(r - r_-)(r + r_+)}{(r^2 + a^2)(r_+^2 + a^2)} \left(\frac{\rho^2}{r^2 + a^2} + \frac{\rho_+^2}{r_+^2 + a^2} \right) (U^2 dV^2 + V^2 dU^2) \\ & + \frac{G(r)(r - r_-)}{2\kappa_+^2 \rho^2} \left(\frac{\rho^4}{(r^2 + a^2)^2} + \frac{\rho_+^4}{(r_+^2 + a^2)^2} \right) dU dV \\ & + \frac{G^2(r)a^2 \sin^2 \theta}{4\kappa_+^2 \rho^2} \frac{(r + r_+)^2}{(r_+^2 + a^2)^2} (U dV - V dU)^2 \\ & + \frac{G(r)a \sin^2 \theta}{\kappa_+^2 \rho^2 (r_+^2 + a^2)} (\rho_+^2 (r - r_-) + (r^2 + a^2)(r + r_+)) (U dV - V dU) d\varphi^{\#} \\ & + \rho^2 d\theta^2 + \left(r^2 + a^2 + \frac{2Mra^2 \sin^2 \theta}{\rho^2} \right) \sin^2 \theta d\varphi^{\#2}, \end{aligned} \quad (3.5)$$

where $\rho_+ = \rho(r_+, \theta)$. The global coordinates $(U, V, \theta, \varphi^{\#})$ on M are called *KBL coordinates*. The Lorentzian manifold (M, g) is globally hyperbolic. The submanifolds $\mathcal{H}_R := \{U = 0\}$, $\mathcal{H}_L := \{V = 0\}$ are called the *long horizons*, and they intersect at the *crossing sphere* $S(r_+) := \{U = V = 0\}$. The following changes of coordinates allow to

embed isometrically $M_I, M_{II}, M'_I, M'_{II}$ into M , respecting the time orientations:

$$\begin{aligned}
U &= e^{-\kappa_+ t}, \quad V = e^{\kappa_+ t^*}, \quad \text{on } M_I, \\
U &= -e^{-\kappa_+ t}, \quad V = e^{\kappa_+ t^*} \quad \text{on } M_{II}, \\
U &= -e^{-\kappa_+ t}, \quad V = -e^{\kappa_+ t^*} \quad \text{on } M'_I, \\
U &= e^{-\kappa_+ t}, \quad V = -e^{\kappa_+ t^*} \quad \text{on } M'_{II}, \\
\varphi^\# &= \frac{1}{2}(\varphi^* + {}^*\varphi - \frac{a}{r_+^2 + a^2}(t^* + {}^*t)) = \varphi - \frac{a}{r_+^2 + a^2}t.
\end{aligned} \tag{3.6}$$

We recall that if M is a spacetime, M' stands for the Lorentzian manifold M with the reversed time orientation. By slightly altering this rule, we denote by

$$\begin{aligned}
M_I &= \{U > 0, V > 0\}, \quad M_{II} = \{U < 0, V > 0\}, \\
M_{I'} &= \{U < 0, V < 0\}, \quad M_{II'} = \{U > 0, V < 0\},
\end{aligned}$$

the four quadrants of $M \setminus (\mathcal{H}_L \cup \mathcal{H}_R)$.

3.6. Killing vector fields. An important role is played by the two Killing vector fields:

$$\begin{aligned}
v_{\mathcal{J}} &= \partial_t = \kappa_+(-U\partial_U + V\partial_V) - \Omega_{\mathcal{H}}\partial_{\varphi^\#}, \\
v_{\mathcal{H}} &= \partial_t + \Omega_{\mathcal{H}}\partial_{\varphi} = \kappa_+(-U\partial_U + V\partial_V),
\end{aligned}$$

where $\Omega_{\mathcal{H}} = \frac{a}{r_+^2 + a^2}$ is the *angular velocity* of the horizon. The vector field $v_{\mathcal{H}}$ is tangent to \mathcal{H}_- (in *K), while $v_{\mathcal{J}}$ is tangent to \mathcal{J}_- (in the conformal extension \hat{M}_I of M_I). None of these Killing fields is globally timelike in M_I . The ergoregions are defined as the regions where the field becomes spacelike. For $v_{\mathcal{J}}$ we find

$$g(v_{\mathcal{J}}, v_{\mathcal{J}}) > 0 \quad \Leftrightarrow \quad \rho^2 - 2Mr < 0. \tag{3.7}$$

For $v_{\mathcal{H}}$, the ergoregion is given by

$$g(v_{\mathcal{H}}, v_{\mathcal{H}}) > 0 \Leftrightarrow \left(1 - \frac{2Mr}{\rho^2}\right) + \frac{4aMr \sin^2 \theta}{\rho^2} \Omega_{\mathcal{H}} - \frac{\sigma^2}{\rho^2} \sin^2 \theta \Omega_{\mathcal{H}}^2 < 0. \tag{3.8}$$

3.7. Hamiltonian flow. In this subsection, we will study the bicharacteristics in M_I . Let $p(x, \xi) = g_x^{-1}(\xi, \xi)$ and $G = G_r + G_\theta = \rho^{-2} g_x^{-1}(\xi, \xi)$, where [4]

$$G_r = \Delta \xi_r^2 - \frac{1}{\Delta} ((r^2 + a^2)\xi_t + a\xi_\varphi)^2, \tag{3.9}$$

$$G_\theta = \xi_\theta^2 + \frac{1}{\sin^2 \theta} (a \sin^2 \theta \xi_t + \xi_\varphi)^2. \tag{3.10}$$

Bicharacteristics are flow lines of the Hamiltonian vector field H_p contained in $\{p = 0\} \setminus o$.

Definition 3.2. Let $\gamma(s)$ be a maximally extended bicharacteristic. We say that $\gamma(s)$ is trapped as $s \rightarrow +\infty$ if there exist $r_+ < r_0 < R_0 < \infty$ such that $r_0 \leq r(\gamma(s)) \leq R_0$ for all $s \geq 0$ (and as a consequence, $\gamma(s)$ exists for all $s \geq 0$). Let Γ^- be the union of all trapped geodesics as $s \rightarrow +\infty$. Γ^+ is defined similarly as all trapped geodesics when $s \rightarrow -\infty$. The trapped set K is defined as $K = \Gamma^+ \cap \Gamma^-$.

Let $\tilde{\xi} = (\xi_t, \xi_r, \xi_\varphi, \xi_\theta)$. By [4, Proposition Proposition 3.2], the trapped set is characterized by

$$K = \{G = \partial_r G_r = \xi_r = 0, \tilde{\xi} \neq 0\} \subset T^*M \setminus o. \tag{3.11}$$

By [4, Proposition 3.5], [18, Proposition 12.2.26] we know that

$$\Gamma^\pm = \left\{ (r, \hat{x}; \xi_r, \hat{\xi}) : (\hat{x}, \hat{\xi}) \in \hat{K}; \xi_r = \pm \text{sgn}(r - r'_{\hat{x}, \hat{\xi}}) \sqrt{\Phi_{\hat{x}, \hat{\xi}}(r) \Delta_r^{-1}} \right\}, \quad (3.12)$$

where $\Phi_{\hat{x}, \hat{\xi}}(r) = -G(r, \hat{x}, 0, \hat{\xi})$, \hat{K} is the projection of the trapped set to $(\hat{x}; \hat{\xi}) = (t, \theta, \varphi; \xi_t, \xi_\theta, \xi_\varphi)$ and $r'_{\hat{x}, \hat{\xi}}$ is the unique solution of $\Phi_{\hat{x}, \hat{\xi}}(r) = 0$. It is a submanifold of $T^*(\mathbb{R} \times \mathbb{S}^2)$ of codimension one. Let $\pi : T^*M_I \rightarrow M_I$ be the base projection.

Lemma 3.3. *If $(x, \xi) \in (T^*M_I \setminus o) \setminus ((\Gamma^- \cap \{\xi_t < 0\}) \cup (\Gamma^+ \cap \{\xi_t > 0\}))$, then $\pi(\gamma(s))$ meets \mathcal{H}_- or \mathcal{I}_- at some point y_0 .*

Proof. The lemma is an immediate consequence of [17, Proposition 5.7, Proposition 5.38] for \mathcal{H}_- and \mathcal{I}_- replaced by \mathcal{H}_+ and \mathcal{I}_+ and Γ^\pm by Γ^\mp . At \mathcal{H}_- and \mathcal{I}_- , however, the coordinates used in [17] are singular. We therefore use the symmetry $t \leftrightarrow -t$, $\varphi \leftrightarrow -\varphi$ of the metric. This symmetry sends t^* , φ^* to $-t^*$, $-\varphi^*$ and therefore \mathcal{H}_+ to \mathcal{H}_- and \mathcal{I}_+ to \mathcal{I}_- , as well as ξ_t to $-\xi_t$. \square

4. TRACES

4.1. Decomposition of $\text{Sol}_{L^2}(M_I)$. Following [7], there exists an orthogonal decomposition

$$\text{Sol}_{L^2}(M_I) = \text{Sol}_{L^2, \mathcal{H}_-}(M_I) \oplus \text{Sol}_{L^2, \mathcal{I}_-}(M_I), \quad (4.1)$$

where $\text{Sol}_{L^2, \mathcal{H}_-}(M_I) = P_{\mathcal{H}_-} \text{Sol}_{L^2}(M_I)$, $\text{Sol}_{L^2, \mathcal{I}_-}(M_I) = P_{\mathcal{I}_-} \text{Sol}_{L^2}(M_I)$ and $P_{\mathcal{H}_- / \mathcal{I}_-}$ are suitable projections separating solutions going to the past horizon from those going to past null infinity. These projections are constructed by means of asymptotic velocities, we refer to [7], [10] for details.

4.2. Traces on \mathcal{H}_- . For $\phi \in \text{Sol}_{\text{sc}}(M_I)$, we set

$$\mathbb{T}_{\mathcal{H}_-} \phi = \phi|_{\mathcal{H}_-} \in C^\infty(\mathcal{H}_-; \mathbb{C}^2), \quad (4.2)$$

which is clearly well defined. We denote by $L^2(\mathcal{H}_-)$ the completion of $C_c^\infty(\mathcal{H}_-; \mathbb{C}^2)$ for the (degenerate) scalar product

$$(\phi|\phi)_{\mathcal{H}_-} = -i \int_{\mathcal{H}_-} \bar{\phi} \cdot \Gamma(\nabla V) \phi |g|^{\frac{1}{2}} dU d\theta d\varphi^\#, \quad (4.3)$$

where we recall that $(U, V, \theta, \varphi^\#)$ are the KBL coordinates, see Subsect. 3.5, in terms of which $\mathcal{H}_- = \{0\}_V \times]0, +\infty[_U \times \mathbb{S}_{\theta, \varphi^\#}^2$. By [7, Proposition 7.1], $\mathbb{T}_{\mathcal{H}_-}$ uniquely extends to a bounded operator $\mathbb{T}_{\mathcal{H}_-} : \text{Sol}_{L^2}(M_I) \rightarrow L^2(\mathcal{H}_-)$ with $\text{Ker } \mathbb{T}_{\mathcal{H}_-} = \text{Sol}_{L^2, \mathcal{I}_-}(M_I)$. The proof of this proposition also shows that $(\cdot|\cdot)_{\mathcal{H}_-}$ is positive semidefinite. Let us set:

$$\mathcal{S}_{\mathcal{H}_-} : \text{Sol}_{\text{sc}}(M_I) \ni \phi \mapsto \phi \cdot \mathbf{i}|_{\mathcal{H}_-} \in C^\infty(\mathcal{H}_-; \mathbb{C}), \quad (4.4)$$

so that

$$\mathcal{S}_{\mathcal{H}_-} \phi = \mathbb{T}_{\mathcal{H}_-} \phi \cdot \mathbf{i}.$$

Here, \mathbf{i} is one basis vector of a suitable spin frame, we refer to [7] for details.

Definition 4.1. We denote by $L^2(\mathcal{H}_-; \mathbb{C})$ the closure of $C_c^\infty(\mathcal{H}_-; \mathbb{C})$ for the scalar product

$$(\mathbf{f}_1|\mathbf{f}_1) = \kappa_+^{-1} \frac{1}{\sqrt{2}} C_1^2 \int_{\mathbb{R}_U^+ \times \mathbb{S}_{\theta, \varphi^\#}^2} |p_+(\theta)| |\mathbf{f}_1|^2 \sin \theta dU d\theta d\varphi^\#,$$

where

$$C_1 = e^{-\kappa_+ r_+ / 2} (r_+ - r_-)^{M/2r_+}, \quad p_+(\theta) = r_+ + ia \cos \theta. \quad (4.5)$$

Then the map

$$\mathcal{S}_{\mathcal{H}_-} : \text{Sol}_{L^2, \mathcal{H}_-}(\mathbb{M}_I) \rightarrow L^2(\mathcal{H}_-; \mathbb{C}) \text{ is unitary,}$$

see [7, Proposition 7.3].

4.3. Traces on \mathcal{I}_- .

4.3.1. *Conformal rescaling.* Following [10, Subsect. 8.3], we consider the conformally rescaled metric

$$\hat{g} = w^2 g, \quad w = r^{-1},$$

which can be smoothly extended to the domain $\mathbb{R}_{t^*} \times [0, r_+^{-1}]_w \times \mathbb{S}_{\theta, \varphi}^2$, with $\mathcal{I}_- = \mathbb{R}_{t^*} \times \{0\}_w \times \mathbb{S}_{\theta, \varphi}^2$. Denoting with hats the objects canonically attached to (\mathbb{M}_I, \hat{g}) , we have:

$$\hat{\Gamma}(v) = \Gamma(v), \quad \hat{\mathbb{D}} = w^{-3} \mathbb{D}w. \quad (4.6)$$

4.3.2. *Traces on \mathcal{I}_- .* For $\phi \in \text{Sol}_{\text{sc}}(\mathbb{M}_I)$ we set:

$$\mathbb{T}_{\mathcal{I}_-} \phi := \hat{\phi}|_{\mathcal{I}_-}, \quad \hat{\phi} = w^{-1} \phi \in \text{Sol}_{\text{sc}}(\hat{\mathbb{D}}). \quad (4.7)$$

We denote by $L^2(\mathcal{I}_-)$ the completion of $C_c^\infty(\mathcal{I}_-; \mathbb{C}^2)$ for the scalar product:

$$(\hat{\phi}|\hat{\psi})_{\mathcal{I}_-} = -i \int_{\mathcal{I}_-} \bar{\hat{\phi}} \cdot \hat{\Gamma}(\hat{\nabla} w) \hat{\psi} |\hat{g}|^{\frac{1}{2}} dt^* d\theta d\varphi^*.$$

By [7, Proposition 7.4], $\mathbb{T}_{\mathcal{I}_-}$ uniquely extends to a bounded operator $\mathbb{T}_{\mathcal{I}_-} : \text{Sol}_{L^2}(\mathbb{M}_I) \rightarrow L^2(\mathcal{I}_-)$ with $\text{Ker } \mathbb{T}_{\mathcal{I}_-} = \text{Sol}_{L^2, \mathcal{H}_-}(\mathbb{M}_I)$. The proof also shows that $(\cdot|\cdot)_{\mathcal{I}_-}$ is positive semidefinite. Let us set

$$\mathcal{S}_{\mathcal{I}_-} : \text{Sol}_{\text{sc}}(\mathbb{M}_I) \ni \phi \mapsto \hat{f}_0 = \hat{\phi} \cdot \hat{o}|_{\mathcal{I}_-} \in C^\infty(\mathcal{I}_-; \mathbb{C}), \quad (4.8)$$

so that

$$\mathcal{S}_{\mathcal{I}_-} \phi = \mathbb{T}_{\mathcal{I}_-} \phi \cdot \hat{o}.$$

Here, $\hat{o} = o$ is one basis vector of a suitable spin frame, we refer to [7] for details.

Definition 4.2. We denote by $L^2(\mathcal{I}_-; \mathbb{C})$ the closure of $C_c^\infty(\mathcal{I}_-; \mathbb{C})$ for the scalar product

$$(\hat{f}_0|\hat{f}_0) = \frac{1}{\sqrt{2}} \int_{\mathbb{R}_{t^*} \times \mathbb{S}_{\theta, \varphi}^2} |\hat{f}_0|^2 \sin \theta dt^* d\theta d\varphi^*.$$

By [7, Proposition 7.6], the map

$$\mathcal{S}_{\mathcal{I}_-} : \text{Sol}_{L^2, \mathcal{I}_-}(\mathbb{M}_I) \rightarrow L^2(\mathcal{I}_-, \sin \theta dt^* d\theta d\varphi^*) \text{ is unitary.}$$

We recall [7, Proposition 7.7]

Proposition 4.3. (1) *The map $\mathcal{S}_{\mathbb{M}_I} = \mathcal{S}_{\mathcal{H}_-} \oplus \mathcal{S}_{\mathcal{I}_-}$ from $\text{Sol}_{L^2}(\mathbb{M}_I)$ to $L^2(\mathcal{H}_-; \mathbb{C}) \oplus L^2(\mathcal{I}_-; \mathbb{C})$ is unitary.*

(2) *One has*

$$\begin{aligned} \mathcal{S}_{\mathcal{H}_-} \circ i^{-1} \mathcal{L}_{\mathcal{H}} &= -i^{-1} \kappa_+(U \partial_U + \frac{1}{2}) \circ \mathcal{S}_{\mathcal{H}_-}, \\ \mathcal{S}_{\mathcal{I}_-} \circ i^{-1} \mathcal{L}_{\mathcal{I}} &= i^{-1} \partial_{t^*} \circ \mathcal{S}_{\mathcal{I}_-}, \end{aligned}$$

Remark 4.4. Proposition 4.3 is an asymptotic completeness result, we refer to [7] and [10] for details.

4.4. Decomposition of $\text{Sol}_{L^2}(\text{M})$. By [7, Proposition C.12], $\Sigma_{\text{M}} = \{U = V\}$ is a space-like Cauchy surface in M . Let us also set

$$\Sigma_{\text{I}} := \Sigma_{\text{M}} \cap \text{M}_{\text{I}} = \{t = 0\} \cap \text{M}_{\text{I}}, \quad \Sigma_{\text{I}'} := \Sigma_{\text{M}} \cap \text{M}_{\text{I}'} = \{t = 0\} \cap \text{M}_{\text{I}'},$$

so that by [7, (C.18)]

$$\Sigma_{\text{M}} = \Sigma_{\text{I}} \cup \Sigma_{\text{I}'} \cup S(r_+).$$

Since $S(r_+)$ is of measure 0 in Σ_{M} for the induced Riemannian metric, this implies for the corresponding L^2 spaces of Cauchy data that:

$$L^2(\Sigma_{\text{M}}) \ni f \mapsto f|_{\Sigma_{\text{I}}} \oplus f|_{\Sigma_{\text{I}'}} \in L^2(\Sigma_{\text{I}}) \oplus L^2(\Sigma_{\text{I}'})$$

is unitary, where we denote by $L^2(\Sigma)$ the completion of $C_c^\infty(\Sigma; \mathbb{S}_\Sigma^*)$ for the scalar product ν_Σ , see (2.13). This yields a unitary map:

$$\text{Sol}_{L^2}(\text{M}) \ni \phi \mapsto \phi_{\text{I}} \oplus \phi_{\text{I}'} \in \text{Sol}_{L^2}(\text{M}_{\text{I}}) \oplus \text{Sol}_{L^2}(\text{M}_{\text{I}'}), \quad (4.9)$$

where ϕ_{I} , resp. $\phi_{\text{I}'}$ are the restrictions of ϕ to M_{I} , resp. $\text{M}_{\text{I}'}$.

Next, we observe that while M'_{I} and $\text{M}_{\text{I}'}$ are strictly speaking different, they can be identified as spacetimes through the isometry

$$R : \text{M}_{\text{I}'} \ni (U, V, \theta, \varphi^\#) \mapsto (-U, -V, \theta, \varphi^\#) \in \text{M}'_{\text{I}}$$

which preserves the orientation and time-orientation. We also denote by $R : \text{Sol}_{L^2}(\text{M}_{\text{I}'}) \rightarrow \text{Sol}_{L^2}(\text{M}'_{\text{I}})$ the unitary map

$$R\phi = \phi \circ R.$$

4.5. Traces on the long horizon and at infinity.

4.5.1. Traces on the long horizon. Recall that $\mathcal{H}_L = \{V = 0\}$ is the left long horizon in M , which decomposes as

$$\mathcal{H}_L = \mathcal{H}_- \cup \mathcal{H}'_- \cup S(r_+), \quad \mathcal{H}_- = \{V = 0, U > 0\}, \quad \mathcal{H}'_- = \{V = 0, U < 0\} = R(\mathcal{H}_-).$$

To ease notation, \mathcal{H}_L will be simply denoted by \mathcal{H} in the sequel. Let us denote by $\mathbf{L}^2(\mathcal{H})$ the completion of $C_c^\infty(\mathcal{H}; \mathbb{C}^2)$ for the scalar product

$$(\phi|\phi)_{\mathcal{H}} = -i \int_{\mathcal{H}} \bar{\phi} \cdot \Gamma(\nabla V) \phi |g|^{\frac{1}{2}} dU d\theta d\varphi^\#.$$

Clearly we have

$$\mathbf{L}^2(\mathcal{H}) \sim \mathbf{L}^2(\mathcal{H}_-) \oplus \mathbf{L}^2(\mathcal{H}'_-)$$

with obvious notations. We denote

$$\mathbf{T}_{\mathcal{H}_-} \phi := \mathbf{T}_{\mathcal{H}_-} \phi_{\text{I}}, \quad \mathbf{T}_{\mathcal{H}'_-} \phi := R \mathbf{T}_{\mathcal{H}_-} R \phi_{\text{I}'},$$

and

$$\mathbf{T}_{\mathcal{H}} := \mathbf{T}_{\mathcal{H}_-} \oplus \mathbf{T}_{\mathcal{H}'_-} : \text{Sol}_{L^2}(\text{M}) \rightarrow \mathbf{L}^2(\mathcal{H}).$$

Similarly, we denote by $L^2(\mathcal{H}; \mathbb{C})$ the closure of $C_c^\infty(\mathcal{H}; \mathbb{C})$ for the scalar product

$$(\mathbf{f}_1|\mathbf{f}_1) = \kappa_+^{-1} \frac{1}{\sqrt{2}} C_1^2 \int_{\mathbb{R}_U \times \mathbb{S}_{\theta, \varphi^\#}^2} |p_+(\theta)| |\mathbf{f}_1|^2 \sin \theta dU d\theta d\varphi^\#,$$

so that

$$L^2(\mathcal{H}; \mathbb{C}) \sim L^2(\mathcal{H}_-; \mathbb{C}) \oplus L^2(\mathcal{H}'_-; \mathbb{C}).$$

We set

$$\mathcal{S}_{\mathcal{H}_-} \phi := \mathcal{S}_{\mathcal{H}_-} \phi_{\text{I}}, \quad \mathcal{S}_{\mathcal{H}'_-} \phi := R \mathcal{S}_{\mathcal{H}_-} R \phi_{\text{I}'},$$

and

$$\mathcal{S}_{\mathcal{H}} := \mathcal{S}_{\mathcal{H}_-} \oplus \mathcal{S}_{\mathcal{H}'_+} : \text{Sol}_{L^2}(\mathcal{M}) \rightarrow L^2(\mathcal{H}; \mathbb{C}).$$

4.5.2. *Traces at infinity.* We set

$$T_{\mathcal{I}'_-} \phi := T_{\mathcal{I}'_-} \phi_{\text{I}}, \quad T_{\mathcal{I}'_+} \phi := T_{\mathcal{I}'_+} R\phi_{\text{I}'},$$

$$\mathcal{S}_{\mathcal{I}'_-} \phi := \mathcal{S}_{\mathcal{I}'_-} \phi_{\text{I}}, \quad \mathcal{S}_{\mathcal{I}'_+} \phi := \mathcal{S}_{\mathcal{I}'_+} R\phi_{\text{I}'},$$

4.5.3. *Summary.* The following theorem is [7, Theorem 7.8], it summarizes the construction.

Theorem 4.5. *The map*

$$\mathcal{S}_{\mathcal{M}} := \mathcal{S}_{\mathcal{H}} \oplus \mathcal{S}_{\mathcal{I}'_-} \oplus \mathcal{S}_{\mathcal{I}'_+} : \text{Sol}_{L^2}(\mathcal{M}) \rightarrow L^2(\mathcal{H}; \mathbb{C}) \oplus L^2(\mathcal{I}'_-; \mathbb{C}) \oplus L^2(\mathcal{I}'_+; \mathbb{C}) \quad (4.10)$$

is unitary.

The geometric situation is illustrated in Figure 2.




FIGURE 2. The Kerr-Kruskal spacetime with Cauchy surface $\Sigma_{\mathcal{M}}$.

Remark 4.6. (1) The constructions of this section are based on the scattering theory developed in [10]. Whereas the operators $T_{\mathcal{H}_-}$ and $T_{\mathcal{I}'_-}$ are defined without a reference to a tetrad, for the definition of $\mathcal{S}_{\mathcal{H}_-}$ and $\mathcal{S}_{\mathcal{I}'_-}$ we use tetrads which are suitable renormalizations of Kinnersley's tetrad to make them smooth up to the past horizon resp. past null infinity.

(2) Using a tetrad, the Dirac equation can be written as

$$\partial_t \Psi - iH\Psi = 0$$

with a selfadjoint operator H on a suitable Hilbert space. Asymptotic velocities as constructed in [10] are then selfadjoint operators P^\pm such that

$$J(P^\pm) = s - \lim_{t \rightarrow \pm\infty} e^{-itH} J\left(\frac{r^*}{t}\right) e^{itH}$$

for all continuous functions J going to zero at infinity.

5. THE UNRUH STATE IN IN THE KERR-KRUSKAL SPACETIME

5.1. Hadamard states for the Weyl equation. States are usually defined by their spacetime covariances. It turns out that for the Weyl equation, it is more useful to define the state ω by its *solution space covariances*, i.e. operators $C^\pm \in B(\text{Sol}_{L^2}(M))$ such that

$$C^\pm \geq 0, \quad C^+ + C^- = \mathbf{1}. \quad (5.1)$$

For this paper, we only need the definition in terms of solution space covariances. We refer to [7] for the definition in terms of spacetime covariances and the link between both. It turns out that for the Weyl equation, a characterisation of Hadamard states in terms of wave front sets of L^2 solutions can be given, see [7, Theorem 4.3]:

Theorem 5.1. *Suppose that*

$$\text{WF}((C^\pm)^{\frac{1}{2}}\phi) \subset \mathcal{N}^\pm \quad \forall \phi \in \text{Sol}_{L^2}(M). \quad (5.2)$$

Then the state ω is a Hadamard state.

Definition 5.2. The *Unruh state* ω_M is the quasi-free state on $\text{CAR}(M)$ with solution space covariances:

$$C_M^\pm = \mathcal{S}_M^{-1} (\mathbf{1}_{\mathbb{R}^\pm}(-i^{-1}\partial_U) \oplus \mathbf{1}_{\mathbb{R}^\pm}(i^{-1}\partial_{t^*}) \oplus \mathbf{1}_{\mathbb{R}^\mp}(i^{-1}\partial_{t^*})) \mathcal{S}_M. \quad (5.3)$$

We refer to [7] and references therein for the definition of the $\text{CAR}(M)$ algebra. We also recall the two main results of [7]:

Theorem 5.3. (1) *The Unruh state ω_M is a pure state.*

(2) *The restriction $\omega_{M_{\text{I} \cup \text{II}}}$ of ω_M to $M_{\text{I} \cup \text{II}}$ is a pure state.*

(3) *The restriction $\omega_{M_{\text{I}}}$ of ω_M to M_{I} has covariances*

$$C_{M_{\text{I}}}^\pm = \mathcal{S}_{M_{\text{I}}}^{-1} \left(\chi_{\mathcal{H}_-^\pm} (-i^{-1}\kappa_+(U\partial_U + \frac{1}{2})) \oplus \chi_{\mathcal{H}_-^\pm} (i^{-1}\partial_{t^*}) \right) \mathcal{S}_{M_{\text{I}}}$$

for

$$\chi_{\mathcal{H}_-^\pm}(\lambda) = \mathbf{1}_{\mathbb{R}^\pm}(\lambda), \quad \chi_{\mathcal{H}_-^\pm}(\lambda) = (1 + e^{\mp T_{\text{H}}^{-1}\lambda})^{-1}, \quad (5.4)$$

where $T_{\text{H}} = (2\pi)^{-1}\kappa_+$ is the Hawking temperature.

(4) *The restriction $\omega_{M_{\text{I}'}}$ of ω_M to $M_{\text{I}'}$ is the image of $\omega_{M_{\text{I}}}$ under R , and has covariances*

$$C_{M_{\text{I}'}}^\pm = R \circ C_{M_{\text{I}}}^\mp \circ R.$$

Theorem 5.4. *There exists $0 < a_0 \leq 1$ such that if $|a|M^{-1} < a_0$, then the restriction $\omega_{M_{\text{I} \cup \text{II}}}$ of the Unruh state ω_M to $M_{\text{I} \cup \text{II}}$ is a Hadamard state.*

The hypothesis that a is small is crucial in the proof of Theorem 5.4, but is not needed in Theorem 5.3. The main result of this note states that Theorem 5.4 holds in the full subextreme range.

Theorem 5.5. *Theorem 5.4 holds for all $0 < |a| < M$.*

6. PROOF OF THEOREM 5.5

The only place where the smallness assumption on $|a|$ is used in the proof of Theorem 5.4 in [7] is in the proof of Proposition 8.7., claiming that $\omega_{M_{\text{I}}}$ is a Hadamard state. Thus the only thing to prove is

Proposition 6.1. *Let $0 < |a| < M$. Then $\omega_{M_{\text{I}}}$ is a Hadamard state.*

By Theorem 5.1, it suffices to prove that

$$\text{WF}((C_{M_I}^\pm)^{\frac{1}{2}}\phi) \subset \mathcal{N}^\pm, \quad \forall \phi \in \text{Sol}_{L^2}(M_I). \quad (6.1)$$

We will prove only the $+$ case, the $-$ case being analogous. Let $q_0 = (x_0, \xi_0) \in \text{WF}((C_{M_I}^+)^{\frac{1}{2}}\phi)$ and let γ be the null bicharacteristic in T^*M from q_0 . Let $\pi : T^*M \rightarrow M$ the base projection. In [7], three cases have been distinguished :

Case 1: $\pi(\gamma)$ intersects \mathcal{I}_- at some point y_0 .

Case 2: $\pi(\gamma)$ intersects \mathcal{H}_- at some y_0 .

Case 3: $\pi(\gamma)$ doesn't intersect \mathcal{H}_- or \mathcal{I}_- .

Only case 3 required the smallness assumption. Therefore, the only thing to do is to treat case 3 without this assumption. By Lemma 3.3, case 3 corresponds to $q_0 \in (\Gamma^- \cap \{\xi_t < 0\}) \cup (\Gamma^+ \cap \{\xi_t > 0\})$. In the following, we will only consider M_I .

6.1. Preparations. The key formula we will use is (see [7, Equation (8.7)]):

$$C_{M_I}^\pm = P_{\mathcal{H}_-} \circ \chi_{\mathcal{H}_-}^\pm (i^{-1}\mathcal{L}_{\mathcal{H}}) + P_{\mathcal{I}_-} \circ \chi_{\mathcal{I}_-}^\pm (i^{-1}\mathcal{L}_{\mathcal{I}}).$$

An important fact is that the projections $P_{\mathcal{H}_-}$ and $P_{\mathcal{I}_-}$ commute with functions of $i^{-1}\mathcal{L}_{\mathcal{H}}$ and $i^{-1}\mathcal{L}_{\mathcal{I}}$. We obtain

$$(C_{M_I}^+)^{1/2}\phi = (\chi_{\mathcal{H}_-}^+)^{\frac{1}{2}}(i^{-1}\mathcal{L}_{\mathcal{H}})P_{\mathcal{H}_-}\phi + (\chi_{\mathcal{I}_-}^+)^{\frac{1}{2}}(i^{-1}\mathcal{L}_{\mathcal{I}})P_{\mathcal{I}_-}\phi =: \phi_{\mathcal{H}} + \phi_{\mathcal{I}}. \quad (6.2)$$

Note that if $\phi \in \text{Sol}_{L^2}(M_I)$, so are $P_{\mathcal{H}_-}\phi$ and $P_{\mathcal{I}_-}\phi$. The following lemma is equivalent to [7, Lemma 8.6].

Lemma 6.2. *Let $X = v_{\mathcal{H}}$ or $v_{\mathcal{I}}$ and recall that $i^{-1}\mathcal{L}_X$ is the selfadjoint generator of a unitary group on $\text{Sol}_{L^2}(M_I)$. Let $\chi^\pm \in L^\infty(\mathbb{R})$ be such that $\chi^\pm - \mathbf{1}_{\mathbb{R}^\pm} \in O(\langle \lambda \rangle^{-\infty})$ and $\text{sing supp } \chi^\pm \subset \mathbb{R}^\pm \cup \{0\}$ is compact. Then one has:*

$$\text{WF}(\chi^\pm(i^{-1}\mathcal{L}_X)\phi) \subset \{(x, \xi); X \cdot \xi > 0\} \text{ for all } \phi \in \text{Sol}_{L^2}(M_I).$$

Note that similar results have been obtained in [15, Theorem 8.4.8], [24, Theorem 2.8] and [22].

Proof. The proof is essentially the same as for [7, Lemma 8.6]. We repeat it here for the convenience of the reader. We consider the case of $X = v_{\mathcal{I}} = \partial_t$, the other case being analogous. Let us denote $\phi^+ = \chi^+(i^{-1}\mathcal{L}_X)\phi$. Let $q_0 = (x^0, \xi^0) = (t^0, r^0, \varphi^0, \theta^0, \xi_t^0, \xi_r^0, \xi_\varphi^0, \xi_\theta^0)$ with $\xi_t^0 < 0$.

Let $\vartheta \in C^\infty(\mathbb{R})$ be such that $\vartheta(\xi_t^0) = 1$, $\vartheta(\lambda) = 1$ for $\lambda \ll 0$ and $\vartheta(\lambda) = 0$ for $\lambda > 0$ and $\lambda \in \text{sing supp } \chi^+$. Setting $\chi_\infty = \vartheta\chi^+ \in O(\langle \lambda \rangle^{-\infty})$, by functional calculus we have

$$\vartheta(i^{-1}\mathcal{L}_X)\phi^+ = \chi_\infty(i^{-1}\mathcal{L}_X)\phi. \quad (6.3)$$

In coordinates, $\mathcal{L}_X\phi = M(t)\partial_t M(t)^{-1}\phi$ for some smooth family of invertible fiber endomorphisms $M(t)$. It follows that

$$\vartheta(i^{-1}\mathcal{L}_X)\phi^+ = M(t)\vartheta(i^{-1}\partial_t)M(t)^{-1}\phi^+.$$

Let $A \in \Psi^0$ be a properly supported pseudo-differential operator (in the sense of the usual calculus on manifolds), elliptic at q_0 and microsupported in a small conic neighborhood Γ_0 of q_0 . Since $\xi_t^0 < 0$, the symbol of $\vartheta(i^{-1}\partial_t)$ equals 1 on Γ_0 away from o . Therefore, the operator

$$B := A \circ M(t)\vartheta(i^{-1}\partial_t)M(t)^{-1}$$

belongs to Ψ^0 and is elliptic at q_0 , and similarly one can show that $A \circ \chi_\infty(i^{-1}\partial_t)$ belongs to $\Psi^{-\infty}$. Thus, by acting on both sides of (6.3) with A we find $B\phi^+ \in C^\infty$. Consequently, $q_0 \notin \text{WF}(\phi^+)$.

The proof of the minus sign version of the statement is analogous. \square

6.2. Characterisation of \mathcal{N}^+ . Let us consider a generic null covector $\xi \in T_x^*M_I$ for some $x \in M_I$. Then one has the following general result

Lemma 6.3. *Let $x \in M_I$ and $\xi \in T_x^*M_I$ a null covector. Then ξ is future pointing iff $\xi \cdot (-\nabla t) > 0$.*

Proof. We use abstract index notation. ξ_a is future directed if and only if $-\xi^b = -g^{ab}\xi_a$ is future directed if and only if $\overline{C}_x(-\xi^b) = \overline{C}_x(-\nabla t)$, where $\overline{C}_x(u)$ is the causal cone at x containing u . By [21, Lemma 5.29, Exercise 5.3], this holds if and only if $\xi_a(-\nabla t)^a = g_{ab}\xi^a(-\nabla t)^b > 0$. \square

ξ must satisfy $g^{-1}(\xi, \xi) = 0$, and therefore $G = G_r + G_\theta = 0$, where G_r and G_θ are as given in (3.9) and (3.10). It can for example be specified by picking any $(\xi_r, \xi_\theta, \xi_\varphi) \in \mathbb{R}^3$ arbitrary, and setting

$$\xi_t = -\frac{2Mar}{\sigma^2}\xi_\varphi \pm \sqrt{\frac{\Delta}{\sigma^2} \left(\Delta\xi_r^2 + \xi_\theta^2 + \frac{\rho^4}{\sigma^2 \sin^2 \theta} \xi_\varphi^2 \right)}. \quad (6.4)$$

Note that the root is non-vanishing, unless either $\Delta = 0$ or $(\xi_r, \xi_\theta, \xi_\varphi) = 0$, and hence also $\xi_t = 0$.

Lemma 6.4. *If we choose the + sign in (6.4), then ξ is future pointing. If we choose the - sign, then ξ is past pointing.*

Proof. Let ξ_t be determined as above. By Lemma 6.3, it suffices to check that $\xi \cdot (-\nabla t) > 0$. Then

$$\xi \cdot (-\nabla t) = \frac{\sigma^2}{\rho^2 \Delta} \xi_t + \frac{2Mar}{\rho^2 \Delta} \xi_\varphi = \pm \frac{\sigma^2}{\rho^2 \Delta} \sqrt{\frac{\Delta}{\sigma^2} \left(\Delta\xi_r^2 + \xi_\theta^2 + \frac{\rho^4}{\sigma^2 \sin^2 \theta} \xi_\varphi^2 \right)}.$$

Therefore, $\pm \xi \cdot (-\nabla t) > 0$ if one chooses the \pm sign in (6.4).

Since the coordinates used above do not cover the axis of rotation, we have to consider it separately. Due to the symmetry of the spacetime under reflection along the equatorial plane, it is sufficient to consider the north pole. To do so, we use stereographic coordinates on the sphere, given by

$$x_1 = \sin \theta \cos \varphi \quad x_2 = \sin \theta \sin \varphi, \quad \xi_\theta = \cot \theta (x_1 \xi_1 + x_2 \xi_2), \quad \xi_\varphi = x_1 \xi_2 - x_2 \xi_1.$$

Following the computation in [4], one finds that on the axis, and in this new coordinate system, one can express the condition $G = 0$ as

$$\begin{aligned} \Delta \xi_r^2 - \frac{(r^2 + a^2)^2}{\Delta} \xi_t^2 + \xi_1^2 + \xi_2^2 &= 0 \\ \Leftrightarrow \xi_t &= \pm \sqrt{\frac{\Delta}{(r^2 + a^2)^2} (\xi_1^2 + \xi_2^2 + \Delta \xi_r^2)}. \end{aligned}$$

Similarly, one finds that on the axis $-\nabla t = \frac{r^2 + a^2}{\Delta} \partial_t$, since $\partial_\varphi = x_1 \partial_{x_2} - x_2 \partial_{x_1}$ vanishes there. Therefore

$$\xi \cdot (-\nabla t) = \pm \frac{r^2 + a^2}{\Delta} \sqrt{\frac{\Delta}{(r^2 + a^2)^2} (\xi_1^2 + \xi_2^2 + \Delta \xi_r^2)}.$$

This is positive (negative) if one chooses the upper (lower) sign. \square

It is interesting to note that

$$\begin{aligned} \frac{\Omega_{\mathcal{H}}}{a} - \frac{2Mr}{\sigma^2} &\geq \frac{1}{r^2 + a^2} - \frac{2Mr}{\sigma^2} \\ &= \frac{1}{\sigma^2(r^2 + a^2)} (\rho^2(r^2 + a^2) + 2a^2Mr \sin^2 \theta - 2Mr(r^2 + a^2)) \\ &= \frac{\rho^2 \Delta}{\sigma^2(r^2 + a^2)} \end{aligned} \quad (6.5)$$

which is positive if $\Delta > 0$.

6.3. Analysis on the trapped set. Let us now consider the trapped set. Recall that the trapped set is characterized by

$$K = \{G = \partial_r G_r = \xi_r = 0, \tilde{\xi} \neq 0\} \subset T^*M \setminus o.$$

Assume that we have chosen ξ with $\xi_r = 0$ and ξ_t given by one of the two options in (6.4), so that $G = 0$ is satisfied. Note that $(r^2 + a^2)\xi_t + a\xi_\varphi = 0$, $G = 0$ entails $\tilde{\xi} = 0$. The condition $\partial_r G_r = 0$, $\tilde{\xi} \neq 0$ can then be rewritten in the following way [4]:

$$\begin{aligned} 4r\Delta\xi_t - \partial_r\Delta((r^2 + a^2)\xi_t + a\xi_\varphi) &= 0 \\ \Leftrightarrow (2r\Delta - (r - M)(r^2 + a^2))\xi_t - (r - M)a\xi_\varphi &= 0 \\ \Leftrightarrow \xi_t [r^2(r - 3M) + a^2(r + M)] - a\xi_\varphi(r - M) &= 0. \end{aligned} \quad (6.6)$$

Note that on the trapped set $\xi_t = 0$ entails $\tilde{\xi} = 0$. We therefore suppose $\xi_t \neq 0$ in the following. Multiplying (6.6) by ξ_t in the first line, one obtains the condition

$$\xi_t(\xi_t + \Omega_0\xi_\varphi) > 0, \quad (6.7)$$

where we have set $\Omega_0(r) = a/(r^2 + a^2)$.

Lemma 6.5. $\{\xi_t < 0\} \cap \{\xi \cdot v_{\mathcal{H}} > 0\} \cap K = \emptyset$.

Proof. Note that on the axis of rotation, in the coordinate system (t, r, x_1, x_2) discussed above, one finds $v_{\mathcal{H}} = \partial_t$, and therefore on the axis the condition $\xi \cdot v_{\mathcal{H}} > 0$ reduces to $\xi_t > 0$. We can thus work away from the axis of rotation.

The only way for (x, ξ) to be in the intersection $\{\xi_t < 0\} \cap \{\xi \cdot v_{\mathcal{H}} > 0\}$ is by having $-\Omega_{\mathcal{H}}\xi_\varphi < \xi_t < 0$, and therefore $a\xi_\varphi > 0$, since $a^{-1}\Omega_{\mathcal{H}} > 0$. If we also demand that $(x, \xi) \in K$, by (6.5) and (6.7), we need to take the minus-sign for the root in (6.4), with ξ_θ chosen small enough so that

$$\Omega(\xi_\theta) := \left| \frac{\xi_t}{a\xi_\varphi} \right| = \frac{2Mr}{\sigma^2} + \sqrt{\frac{\Delta}{\sigma^2} \left(\frac{\rho^4}{\sigma^2 a^2 \sin^2 \theta} + \frac{\xi_\theta^2}{a^2 \xi_\varphi^2} \right)} < \frac{\Omega_{\mathcal{H}}}{a}. \quad (6.8)$$

To exclude this possibility, we need to take into account the trapped set condition $\partial_r G_r = 0$ in more detail. Starting from (6.6) and considering that ξ_t and $a\xi_\varphi$ are of opposite sign, one finds

$$\begin{aligned} \xi_t [r^2(r - 3M) + a^2(r + M)] - a\xi_\varphi(r - M) &= 0 \\ \Leftrightarrow -\Omega(\xi_\theta) [r^2(r - 3M) + a^2(r + M)] - (r - M) &= 0 \\ \Leftrightarrow -[r^2(r - 3M) + a^2(r + M)] &= \frac{(r - M)}{\Omega(\xi_\theta)}. \end{aligned} \quad (6.9)$$

Since $(r - M) > 0$ in M_I , and by (6.8), one obtains the estimate

$$\begin{aligned} - [r^2(r - 3M) + a^2(r + M)] &> \frac{a(r - M)}{\Omega_{\mathcal{H}}} \\ \Leftrightarrow P(r) := r^3 - 3Mr^2 + (r_+^2 + 2a^2)r - Mr_+^2 &< 0. \end{aligned} \quad (6.10)$$

Using that $r^2 - 2Mr > -a^2$ in M_I , one obtains

$$\partial_r P(r) = 3r^2 - 6Mr + r_+^2 + 2a^2 > r_+^2 - a^2 = 2(M^2 - a^2 + M\sqrt{M^2 - a^2}) > 0,$$

so $P(r)$ is strictly monotonically increasing on M_I as long as $|a| < M$. Moreover,

$$P(r_+) = r_+^3 - 3Mr_+^2 + r_+^3 + 2a^2r_+ - Mr_+^2 = 2r_+\Delta(r_+) = 0.$$

Therefore, $P(r) > 0$ on M_I , in contradiction to (6.10). This concludes the lemma. \square

6.4. The backward/forward trapped sets. Recall from Section 3 that the backward/forward trapped sets are described by the condition

$$\Gamma^\pm = \left\{ (r, \hat{x}; \xi_r, \hat{\xi}) : (\hat{x}, \hat{\xi}) \in \hat{K}; \xi_r = \pm \text{sgn}(r - r'_{\hat{x}, \hat{\xi}}) \sqrt{\Phi_{\hat{x}, \hat{\xi}}(r) \Delta_r^{-1}} \right\}.$$

Here $\Phi_{\hat{x}, \hat{\xi}}(r) = -G(r, \hat{x}, 0, \hat{\xi})$, \hat{K} is the projection of the trapped set to $(t, \theta, \varphi; \xi_t, \xi_\theta, \xi_\varphi)$ and $r'_{\hat{x}, \hat{\xi}}$ is the unique solution of $\Phi_{\hat{x}, \hat{\xi}}(r) = 0$. \hat{K} is a submanifold of $T^*(\mathbb{R} \times \mathbb{S}^2)$ of codimension one. The condition on ξ_r ensures that $(r, \hat{x}; \xi_r, \hat{\xi})$ in the backward/forward trapped set is null, i.e. satisfies a relation of the form (6.4).

Proposition 6.6. *If $\xi \cdot \partial_t > 0$ or $\xi \cdot v_{\mathcal{H}} > 0$, $(x, \xi) \in \Gamma^\pm$, then ξ is future-pointing.*

Proof. Assume $(x, \xi) = (r, \hat{x}, \xi_r, \hat{x}) \in \Gamma^\pm$. Let us start with the case $\xi_t < 0$, but $\xi \cdot v_{\mathcal{H}} > 0$. This amounts to $\xi_t > -\Omega_{\mathcal{H}} \xi_\varphi$. Since $(\hat{x}, \hat{\xi}) \in \hat{K}$, there must be a radius \hat{r} such that $(\hat{r}, \hat{x}, 0, \hat{\xi})$ is in the trapped set. However, by Lemma 6.5, no such \hat{r} exists.

It then remains to consider the case $\xi_t > 0$. Since $\xi \in T_x^* M_I$ is null, ξ_t is given by (6.4) evaluated at r . Assume that ξ is past pointing. Then, by Lemma 6.4, ξ_t is given by the lower sign in (6.4). Together with $\xi_t > 0$, this implies that $a\xi_\varphi < 0$ and leads to the upper bound

$$\xi_t < \frac{2Mr}{\sigma^2} |a\xi_\varphi| < \frac{1}{r^2 + a^2} |a\xi_\varphi| < \frac{\Omega_{\mathcal{H}}}{a} |a\xi_\varphi|, \quad (6.11)$$

by an application of (6.5).

Next, we focus on the condition for $(\hat{x}, \hat{\xi}) \in \hat{K}$. Let us assume that \hat{r} is the radius so that $(\hat{r}, \hat{x}, 0, \hat{\xi}) \in \hat{K}$. Then we must have $\partial_{\hat{r}} G_{\hat{r}} = 0$. However, given the bound (6.11) and the fact that ξ_t and $a\xi_\varphi$ are of opposite sign, it follows from the proof of Lemma 6.5 that no such \hat{r} exists. Therefore, this case is excluded. In other words: any $(x, \xi) \in \Gamma^\pm$ that satisfies $\xi \cdot \partial_t > 0$ or $\xi \cdot v_{\mathcal{H}} > 0$ is future pointing. \square

6.5. Proof of Proposition 6.1. Let $(x, \xi) \in \text{WF}((C_{M_I}^\pm)^{\frac{1}{2}} \phi)$, $\phi \in \text{Sol}_{L^2}(M_I)$. From Lemma 3.3 and the remarks at the beginning of this section it is clear that we only have to consider the case $(x, \xi) \in \Gamma^\pm$. From the key formula (6.2) and Proposition 6.2 we see that either $\xi \cdot \partial_t > 0$ or $\xi \cdot v_{\mathcal{H}} > 0$. Thus, ξ is future pointing by Proposition 6.6. As the other cases are already treated, the Unruh state is Hadamard by Theorem 5.1. \square

REFERENCES

- [1] T. T. Ananna, C. M. Urry, E. Treister, R. C. Hickox, F. Shankar, C. Ricci, N. Cappelluti, S. Marchesi, T. J. Turner, *Accretion History of AGNs. III. Radiative Efficiency and AGN Contribution to Reionization*, *Astrophys. J.* **903** (2020) no.2, 85.
- [2] M. Brum, S.E. Jorás, *Hadamard state in Schwarzschild-de Sitter spacetime*, *Class. Quant. Grav.* **32** (2015), 015013.
- [3] C. Dappiaggi, V. Moretti, N. Pinamonti, *Rigorous construction and Hadamard property of the Unruh state in Schwarzschild spacetime*, *Adv. Theor. Math. Phys.* **15** (2011), 355–447.
- [4] S. Dyatlov, *Asymptotics of linear waves and resonances with applications to black holes*, *Comm. Math. Phys.* **335** (2015), 1445-1485 .
- [5] S. Dyatlov, *Exponential energy decay for Kerr-de Sitter black holes beyond event horizons*, *Math. Res. Lett.* **18** (2011), 1023-1035.
- [6] C. J. Fewster, R. Verch, *The Necessity of the Hadamard Condition*, *Class. Quant. Grav.* **30** (2013), 23 .
- [7] C. Gérard, D. Häfner, M. Wrochna, *The Unruh state for massless fermions on Kerr spacetime and its Hadamard property*, *Ann. Sci. Ecole Norm. Sup.* **56** (2023), 127-196.
- [8] C. Gérard, M. Wrochna, *Construction of Hadamard states by characteristic Cauchy problem*, *Anal. PDE* **9** (2016) 1, 111-149.
- [9] D. Häfner, *Creation of fermions by rotating charged black holes*, *Mémoires de la SMF* **117** (2009).
- [10] D. Häfner, J.-P. Nicolas, *Scattering of massless Dirac fields by a Kerr black hole*, *Rev. Math. Phys.* **16** (2004), 29–123.
- [11] S.W. Hawking, *Particle creation by black holes*, *Comm. Math. Phys.* **43** (1975), 199–220.
- [12] P. Hintz, A. Vasy, *Analysis of linear waves near the Cauchy horizon of cosmological black holes*, *J. Math. Phys.*, vol. 58 (2017), p. 081509.
- [13] S. Hollands, *Aspects of Quantum Field Theory on Curved Spacetime*, PhD thesis, University of York, 2000.
- [14] S. Hollands, R. M. Wald, J. Zahn, *Quantum instability of the Cauchy horizon in Reissner–Nordström–deSitter spacetime*, *Class. Quant. Grav.* **37** (2020), 11.
- [15] L. Hörmander, *The Analysis of Linear Partial Differential Operators I*, Springer Classics in Mathematics 2003.
- [16] C. Klein, *Construction of the Unruh state for a real scalar field on the Kerr-de Sitter spacetime*, *Ann. Henri Poincaré* **24** (2023), 2401-2442.
- [17] P. Millet, *Optimal decay for solutions of the Teukolsky equation on the Kerr metric for the full subextremal range $|a| < M$* , arXiv:2302.06946.
- [18] P.Millet, *The Teukolsky equation on subextremal Kerr spacetimes*, PhD thesis, Université Grenoble Alpes, 2023.
- [19] V. Moretti, *Quantum out-states holographically induced by asymptotic flatness: invariance under space-time symmetries, energy positivity and Hadamard property*, *Comm. Math. Phys.* **279** (2008), 31-75.
- [20] B. O’Neill, *The geometry of Kerr black holes*, A.K. Peters, Wellesley (1995).
- [21] B. O’Neill, *Semi-Riemannian Geometry with applications to Relativity*, Academic Press 1983.
- [22] N. Pinamonti, K. Sanders, R. Verch, *Local incompatibility of the microlocal spectrum condition with the KMS property along spacelike directions in quantum field theory on curved spacetime*, *Lett. Math. Phys.* (2019), 10.1007/s11005-019-01164-0.
- [23] M. Radzikowski, *A local-to-global singularity theorem for quantum field theory on curved spacetime*, *Comm. Math. Phys.* **180** (1996), 1–22.
- [24] A. Strohmaier, R. Verch, M. Wollenberg, *Microlocal analysis of quantum fields on curved spacetimes: Analytic wavefront sets and Reeh-Schlieder theorems*, *J. Math. Phys.* **43** (2002), 5514–5530.
- [25] K. S. Thorne, *Disk accretion onto a black hole. 2. Evolution of the hole*, *Astrophys. J.* **191** (1974), 507-520.

[26] W. G. Unruh, *Notes on black-hole evaporation*, Phys. Rev. D 14 (1976), 870–892.

UNIVERSITÉ GRENOBLE ALPES, INSTITUT FOURIER, 100 RUE DES MATHS, 38610 GIÈRES, FRANCE
Email address: `dietrich.hafner@univ-grenoble-alpes.fr`

UNIVERSITÉ GRENOBLE ALPES, INSTITUT FOURIER, 100 RUE DES MATHS, 38610 GIÈRES, FRANCE,
CY CERGY PARIS UNIVERSITÉ, 2 AVENUE ADOLPHE CHAUVIN, 95302 CERGY-PONTOISE, FRANCE
Email address: `christiane.klein@univ-grenoble-alpes.fr`