

Black Hole Tomography: Unveiling Black Hole Ringdown via Gravitational Wave Observations

Ariadna Ribes Metidieri,^{1,*} Béatrice Bonga,^{1,†} and Badri Krishnan^{1,2,3,‡}

¹*Institute for Mathematics, Astrophysics and Particle Physics,*

Radboud University, Heyendaalseweg 135, 6525 AJ Nijmegen, The Netherlands

²*Max-Planck-Institut für Gravitationsphysik (Albert Einstein Institute), Callinstraße 38, 30167 Hannover, Germany*

³*Leibniz Universität Hannover, 30167 Hannover, Germany*

During the post-merger regime of a binary black hole merger, the gravitational wave signal consists of a superposition of quasi-normal modes (QNMs) of the remnant black hole. It has been observed empirically, primarily through numerical simulations and heuristic arguments, that the infalling radiation at the horizon is also composed of a superposition of QNMs. In this paper we provide an analytic explanation for this observation in the perturbative regime. Our analysis is based on a characteristic initial value formulation where data is prescribed on the horizon (modeled as a perturbed isolated horizon), and on a transversal null-hypersurface which registers the outgoing radiation. This allows us to reformulate the traditional QNM problem in a fully 4-dimensional setting. Using a mode-decomposition, we demonstrate that the radiation modes crossing \mathcal{H} are highly correlated with the outgoing modes crossing \mathcal{S} , and provide explicit expressions linking $\tilde{\Psi}_0$ at the horizon with $\tilde{\Psi}_4$ at null infinity.

I. INTRODUCTION

Binary black hole mergers are one of the most important natural phenomena where non-perturbative and dynamical aspects of general relativity play a key role. The process by which two black hole horizons merge and form a remnant black hole has several interesting aspects which so far have been primarily understood through numerical simulations. Similarly, the calculations of the emitted gravitational wave signal and developments of waveform models for the merger regime typically requires numerical relativity results. Apart from the merger itself, in the inspiral and post-merger regimes, analytical methods and black hole perturbation theory in particular, remain very useful. In this paper, we shall model the perturbative post-merger regime as a perturbed isolated horizon. This is part of a general quasi-local framework for studying black hole physics which has found many applications in quantum and classical gravity, including numerical relativity (see e.g. [1–4]).

The eventual goal here is one of the most important themes in gravitational wave astronomy, namely to obtain information about the merging compact objects (and other gravitational wave sources) from gravitational wave observations. Achieving this goal requires a detailed understanding of the problem using analytical or numerical solutions of the Einstein field equations. When we infer the masses and spins of the black holes from gravitational wave events, we need a gravitational wave signal model that incorporates the necessary effects with the appropriate degree of accuracy. More detailed information can be obtained in some circumstances. Black hole perturbation

theory turns out to be useful for this purpose in several cases. Here we mention two situations of particular relevance for this paper. For both of these examples, the horizon is very close to being *isolated* in the sense that its area is almost constant and it is useful to model the horizon as a perturbed isolated horizon:

- Consider first extreme mass ratio inspirals (EMRIs), in which a small compact object, like a stellar-mass black hole or neutron star, spirals into a supermassive black hole. These systems are one of the targets of the space-based gravitational-wave detector LISA. Given that the small object undergoes a large number of cycles in the field of the massive object, it might be possible to “map” the spacetime around the black hole and to infer its multipole moments with high accuracy [5]. Given that the multipole moments of a black hole are related to the geometry of the horizon (see e.g. [6]), we would in effect be measuring the horizon geometry using observations of these extreme-mass-ratio systems. To linear order in perturbation theory, the mass and angular momentum of the black hole do not change; these change only at second order in the amplitude of the radiation falling into the black hole. However, as we shall see, the higher multipole moments depend *linearly* in the down-horizon wave amplitude. Therefore, given a sufficiently loud GW signal, the spacetime mapping project could be used to measure time-dependent black hole multipole moments.
- The second example is the ringdown regime. After the binary black hole merger, the gravitational wave signal is a superposition of damped sinusoids referred to as quasi-normal modes (QNMs), with frequencies and damping times determined by the remnant black hole parameters. Sufficiently late in the post-merger regime, typically about ~ 6 –

* ariadna.ribesmetidieri@ru.nl

† bbonga@science.ru.nl

‡ badri.krishnan@ru.nl

$10GM/c^3$ after the peak of the waveform [7], perturbation theory becomes applicable. QNMs are special perturbations of a Kerr black hole that satisfy purely dissipative boundary conditions [8, 9]. Given the dissipative nature of QNMs, they are prescribed by a complex frequency $\omega_{\ell m n}$ (or alternatively a frequency and damping time). The complex frequencies are labeled by three integers (ℓ, m, n) : $\ell \geq 2$ and $|m| \leq \ell$ are the usual angular harmonic numbers, while $n \geq 0$ is the overtone index associated with the radial part of the solution. The fundamental mode refers to $n = 0$ while $n \geq 1$ are the overtones. For a Kerr black hole, the frequencies $\omega_{\ell m n}(M, a)$ have been calculated and tabulated [10, 11]; see also [12, 13] for reviews.

QNMs are seen both numerically in simulated binary black hole spacetimes (see e.g. [14, 15]) and observationally in data from the LIGO and Virgo observatories (see e.g. [16–20]). If the notion of correlations mentioned above is viable, then these must be evident in the infalling radiation at the remnant black horizon as well. This has been empirically shown to be the case in numerical simulations [21, 22], but an analytical proof is still missing. This paper aims to fill this gap in the literature. We shall show that, under certain reasonable assumptions within linear perturbation theory and in the situation when there is no external incoming radiation from past null infinity, the QNMs do indeed appear in the infalling radiation and in fact they do so with the same well-known frequencies and damping times mentioned above.¹

Our work is based on the characteristic initial value formalism (see e.g. [23–26]). In a companion paper [27] (henceforth referred to as “Paper I”), the application of this formalism in the context of tidally perturbed isolated horizons has been explained in great detail (see also [28–32]). In Paper I, the horizon was required to be exactly isolated so that the infalling horizon fluxes vanish identically. Here we drop this restriction. This allows us to pursue the idea of accessing the horizon geometry with gravitational wave observations by a method sometimes referred to as “black hole tomography” [33]. The underlying idea is that, when there is no incoming external radiation from past null infinity, both the infalling and outgoing radiation must be generated by the spacetime dynamics in the vicinity of the black hole. This indicates the possibility of correlations between the gravitational wave fluxes observed by gravitational wave detectors, and the flux of infalling radiation across the black hole horizon [34–38]. There is now strong numerical evidence that

such correlations do exist and can be used as a probe of the horizon dynamics.

Let us illustrate this for the black hole ringdown example. Observations of the QNMs by current and future gravitational-wave observatories provide a possible avenue of observationally testing the nature of the remnant object. The newly formed remnant horizon is initially distorted in the sense that horizon geometry is markedly different from the Kerr geometry. These differences can be quantified by appropriate horizon multipole moments. The horizon loses these distortions as it approaches its final Kerr state by *absorbing* just the right amount of gravitational radiation. This situation is depicted in Fig. 2. There are two aspects of this ringdown process that we wish to highlight:

- First, at sufficiently late times, the horizon geometry can be considered to be a perturbation of a Kerr horizon. This perturbation consists of two distinct, though related, aspects: i) the higher horizon multipole moments are perturbed away from the appropriate Kerr values; ii) there is a small amount of infalling radiation.
- Secondly, the properties of the infalling radiation are mirrored by the properties of the outgoing radiation that reaches future null infinity \mathcal{I}^+ and can potentially be detected by a gravitational-wave observatory. This is an empirical observation seen in various numerical simulations. A general proof of this empirical observation would establish the existence of correlations between the observed radiations and horizon dynamics; we could then infer properties of the horizon (which is otherwise inaccessible to us classically) based on gravitational-wave observations. It is evident that the details of these correlations must depend on the dynamical equations. Thus, when we infer properties of the horizon based on observations, we are assuming the validity of the Einstein equations and our conclusions about the infalling radiation would differ in other theories of gravity.

Given this context, we can now state the main results of this paper. We reformulate the QNM problem using the Newman-Penrose formalism tailored to isolated horizons of perturbed slowly spinning black holes. This formalism can be viewed as Schwarzschild perturbation theory using Newman-Penrose language with “atypical” gauge conditions. However, the appeal to the isolated horizon framework (which may seem cumbersome for the uninitiated) is exactly what motivated these peculiar, yet powerful, gauge conditions. This reformulation also sheds light on the minimal conditions required for QNM solutions to appear: the Schwarzschild QNM frequencies are obtained when we impose that the solutions to the perturbed Weyl scalars are analytic and that the spacetime is stable towards the future. This naturally selects solutions with no incoming radiation from past null infinity.

¹ To some extent, these results could have been anticipated from the Teukolsky-Starobinsky identities and/or the metric reconstruction procedure. Here, this link is made concrete and explicit.

ity; that there is no radiation from the horizon is already embedded in our construction from the start.

Second, we show that the outgoing field Ψ_4 on \mathcal{N} (which can be taken to coincide with \mathcal{I}^+) is determined by Ψ_0 on the horizon, and for the QNM case, the same modes appear in both places. We also provide an explicit formula linking the amplitudes of Ψ_0 at the horizon and those of Ψ_4 at \mathcal{N} . This can be considered as analytical evidence for black hole tomography in this perturbative context. We also clarify the link with the Teukolsky-Starobinsky identities which also relate Ψ_0 and Ψ_4 . Finally, we also provide explicit expressions for $\tilde{\Psi}_2$, which encodes geometric information about the horizon.

The plan for the rest of this paper is as follows. Sec. II reviews the standard formulations of the QNM problem and provides the necessary background for understanding perturbed isolated horizons. In Sec. III, we provide the explicit expressions describing the perturbed isolated horizon by a small flux of infalling gravitational radiation. In Sec. IV, we solve these expressions explicitly on the horizon and we relate our results to the Teukolsky-Starobinsky identities. Sec. V specializes to the QNM problem and in Sec. VI we show the explicit link between the horizon amplitudes of Ψ_0 with the amplitudes of Ψ_4 at null infinity. Finally, Sec. VII describes the Weyl scalar Ψ_2 . We conclude in Sec. VIII. In the appendices, we have collected supplementary material.

II. BACKGROUND

In this section, we collect the necessary background material which will be used in this paper. We begin with the standard formalism for defining and calculating QNMs within black hole perturbation theory. This is followed by setting up our calculational framework for perturbations of isolated horizons, which will later lead to a reformulation of QNMs.

A. Formulations of the quasi-normal mode problem

QNMs arise in various physical situations such as optical cavities, acoustics and bound quantum states (see e.g. [39]). These can be related to a scattering problem from a potential satisfying purely dissipative boundary conditions. We consider the one-dimensional wave equation with a potential $V(x)$

$$(\partial_t^2 - \partial_x^2 + V(x)) \psi(t, x) = 0. \quad (1)$$

QNMs correspond to solutions of the above equation which are purely outgoing at $x \rightarrow \pm\infty$, i.e.

$$\psi \sim e^{-i\omega(t-x)} \quad x \rightarrow \infty, \quad (2a)$$

$$\psi \sim e^{-i\omega(t+x)} \quad x \rightarrow -\infty. \quad (2b)$$

These boundary conditions imply that the system is dissipative with no in-coming energy from any part of the

boundary. Such solutions turn out to exist only for a discrete set of complex frequencies ω_j (labeled here by an integer j), which are independent of the initial data. Modes with $\text{Im}[\omega_j] < 0$ correspond to decaying solutions. These frequencies are referred to as either QNM or resonant frequencies. Alternatively, resonant frequencies are also defined as poles of the Green's function (first suggested in [40]). The importance of the QNMs lies in the fact that they determine the behavior of the solution of Eq. (1) at late times once all other waves have dissipated away from the system. Rigorous results are known for potentials of compact support (see e.g. [39]). In these cases, it can be shown that if $\psi(t, x)$ is a solution of Eq. (1) with sufficiently localized initial data then at late times

$$\psi(t, x) = \sum_{\text{Im}[\omega_j] > -\Omega} e^{-i\omega_j t} \psi_j(x) + \mathcal{O}(e^{-t\Omega}). \quad (3)$$

Here Ω is a positive real number, and the sum is over the least damped QNMs. Thus, at late times the solution can be written as an expansion over the QNMs (i.e. as damped sinusoids as far as their time evolution is concerned), and the expansion is dominated by the longest lived QNMs.

Following [9, 41] the above formalism is directly applicable to the QNMs of a black hole. Consider a Schwarzschild black hole of mass M with the usual metric outside the event horizon

$$ds^2 = -\left(1 - \frac{2M}{r}\right) dt^2 + \left(1 - \frac{2M}{r}\right)^{-1} dr^2 + r^2 d\Omega^2, \quad (4)$$

where $d\Omega^2 = d\theta^2 + \sin^2\theta d\phi^2$ and $\{t, r, \theta, \phi\}$ are the usual Schwarzschild coordinates. Following an angular mode decomposition of the perturbations to this metric, we obtain wave-equations of the form of Eq. (1) for the radial functions. The coordinate x in this case is the ‘‘tortoise coordinate’’ $dr_* = (1 - 2M/r)^{-1} dr$. The potentials are the well-known Regge-Wheeler and Zerilli potentials for the axial and polar perturbations, respectively. Applying the boundary conditions of Eq. (2) leads to the QNM frequencies $\omega_{\ell mn}(M)$ for a Schwarzschild black hole. A similar but somewhat more complicated analysis leads to the QNM frequencies $\omega_{\ell mn}(M, a)$ of a Kerr black hole of mass M and angular momentum J , with $a = J/M$.

While the above formalism is widely used, it is not entirely satisfactory when we wish to study the horizon; the tortoise coordinate r_* is not horizon penetrating since $r_* \rightarrow -\infty$ when $r \rightarrow 2M$. From a 4-dimensional perspective, the constant time slices for the Regge-Wheeler and Zerilli equations correspond to the spacelike hypersurfaces shown in Fig. 1. It is clear that these slices are not suitable for studying fluxes across the future horizon \mathcal{H}^+ or future null infinity \mathcal{I}^+ , nor correlations between these fluxes.

There have been several efforts to generalize the above discussion in horizon penetrating coordinates (see e.g. [42, 43] for the use of such coordinates in the more general context of black hole perturbation theory). One of




FIG. 1. This figure shows a portion of the maximally extended Schwarzschild spacetime with two different slicings. The top panel shows the constant time slices of Schwarzschild in the traditional formulation of black hole perturbation theory. The future horizon is \mathcal{H}^+ , the past horizon (the white hole) is \mathcal{H}^- , while past and future null infinity are \mathcal{I}^- and \mathcal{I}^+ , respectively. The singularity is at $r = 0$. All the constant time slices end up at the bifurcate cross-section \mathcal{B} of the horizon where $r_* \rightarrow -\infty$. The lower panel shows the same portion of spacetime but now in the ingoing Eddington-Finkelstein coordinates (v, r) . The constant v surfaces shown in the conformal diagram are null surfaces and r is a radial coordinate along these null surfaces.

the most developed formalisms is the use of hyperboloidal slices which intersect both \mathcal{H}^+ and \mathcal{I}^+ ; see e.g. [44–48]. These studies have been used primarily for numerical studies though it is certainly plausible that these could be used for analytical studies as well.

Here we shall pursue a different approach and pre-

scribe data on null surfaces rather than spacelike surfaces. Since one of our goals is to study possible correlations between fluxes across \mathcal{H}^+ and \mathcal{I}^+ , we would like to prescribe data directly on these surfaces and use these data to construct the near-horizon spacetime. Since both \mathcal{H}^+ and \mathcal{I}^+ are null surfaces, we are naturally led to the characteristic initial value formulation. Recent work by Mongwane *et al* [49] provides an important step in this direction. Working with the Bondi-Sachs [50] or Newman-Unti [51] form of the metric using the coordinates (u, τ, θ, ϕ) where u is the outgoing null coordinate $u = t - r_*$, Mongwane *et al* show that the Schwarzschild QNM frequencies are recovered. In their analysis, the boundary condition at the horizon appears in the behavior of certain metric coefficients as $\tau \rightarrow 2M$. We extend this analysis in three directions:

1. The inner boundary is taken to be a non-extremal isolated horizon. This allows us to extend the analysis to black holes with more general multipole moment structure, and allows us to study the infalling radiative flux across the horizon.
2. We shall see that the QNMs arising in our analysis nicely extend to past null infinity and it is clear that they satisfy the no-incoming radiation condition.
3. We use the Newman-Penrose formalism instead of metric formalism, which should allow for an easier generalization to the Kerr spacetime.

We will use the analog of the Bondi-Sachs coordinates near \mathcal{I}^+ , but now adapted to the future horizon \mathcal{H}^+ . The ingoing Eddington-Finkelstein coordinates (v, τ, θ, ϕ) for the Schwarzschild coordinates provide the prototypical example. Here $v = t + r_*$ and the metric in these coordinates is

$$ds^2 = - \left(1 - \frac{2M}{\tau} \right) dv^2 + 2dv d\tau + \tau^2 d\Omega^2. \quad (5)$$

We shall see that the above construction will yield a more transparent formulation of the QNM problem. In other respects however, the results are equivalent to the standard formulation. In particular, we shall obtain, as in the standard formulation, solutions which are divergent at spatial infinity.

B. Perturbed Isolated Horizons

The notion of isolated horizons, meant to model a black hole in equilibrium in an otherwise dynamical spacetime, is discussed in paper I. These horizons do not have any gravitational wave fluxes crossing the horizon. Here we relax this condition, include dynamical perturbations and allow for small amounts of infalling radiation. Before discussing these perturbed isolated horizons, let us first consider isolated horizons. It is not our purpose to repeat the various definitions here; readers can consult paper I




FIG. 2. Here Δ is a null surface (a perturbed isolated horizon) and the null surface \mathcal{N} transverse to it can be seen as an approximate version of future null infinity. In particular, the space of all allowed gravitational fields living in the shaded region is such that Δ is a perturbed isolated horizon. The Weyl tensor component Ψ_4 is responsible for the flux crossing \mathcal{N} while the Weyl tensor component Ψ_0 is responsible for fluxes across Δ .

for that purpose. Here we mostly aim to set up notation. Readers familiar with black hole perturbation theory can think of the Schwarzschild horizon, but modified with small amounts of shear for the null generator of the horizon. The gauge conditions we employ here will generally be tied to properties of the horizon, and this differs from those used typically, e.g. [41, 52]. Readers familiar with the Newman-Penrose formalism will also find this discussion familiar since we will use it extensively. A brief summary of the Newman-Penrose formalism is provided in Appendix A 1.

There are several relevant definitions here, with increasingly stringent conditions: Non-Expanding Horizon (NEH), weakly isolated horizon (WIH) and isolated horizon (IH). The basic object is a null surface Δ with topology $S^2 \times \mathbb{R}$. The “ S^2 part” of the surface are Riemannian manifolds and correspond to cross-sections of the horizon, while the “ \mathbb{R} part” are null curves. The degenerate metric on Δ is denoted by q_{ab} , and ℓ^a denotes a future-directed null-normal (unique up to rescalings by positive functions). There is a derivative operator D_a on Δ compatible with q_{ab} , and it is the pull-back of the spacetime derivative operator $D_a = \nabla_a$; an arrow on a covariant index, e.g. \underline{X}_a , denotes the pullback to Δ and can then only be contracted with vector fields tangent to Δ . The 1-form ω_a is a part of D_a and is defined as

$$D_a \ell^b = \omega_a \ell^b. \quad (6)$$

No conditions are imposed on D_a (or ω_a) on a NEH, on a WIH ω_a is time independent, while on a IH D_a is time independent. The surface gravity associated with ℓ^a is

$$\kappa_{(\ell)} = \omega_a \ell^a. \quad (7)$$

The 1-form ω_a projected to a cross-section determines the angular momentum and higher spin moments, while the curvature of the induced metric on the cross-section determines the mass multipole moments. Moreover, ω_a is entirely determined by its curl $D_{[a}\omega_{b]}$ and the divergence $D_a \omega^a$. The curl contains all the information about the angular momentum and higher spin multipole moments, while the divergence is a “gauge” quantity and specifying it determines the foliation.

Pick a cross-section S_0 , and introduce angular coordinates (θ, ϕ) or holomorphic coordinates (z, \bar{z}) on it. Use ℓ^a to transport these coordinates everywhere on Δ . Now construct the past-directed null geodesics starting with $-n^a$ at Δ , and let r be the affine parameter such that $n^a \nabla_a r = -1$. Finally, use parallel transport along $-n^a$ to obtain a coordinate system (v, r, θ, ϕ) or (v, r, z, \bar{z}) and a null tetrad in a neighborhood of Δ .

The phase space here is the spacetime (M, g_{ab}) of all solutions of the Einstein field equations such that Δ is an isolated horizon. This is tailored to the situation shown in Fig. 2 for a black hole approaching equilibrium. This could be the remnant black hole formed in a binary black hole merger, or from gravitational collapse. It could however also be modified for a black hole which was isolated in the past, such as in the inspiral phase of a binary black hole merger (in this case the black holes would be Kerr black holes in the distant past). For such situations, we would consider *past* directed null normals which are complete in the distant past.

For an isolated horizon, both the expansion $\theta_{(\ell)}$ and shear $\sigma_{ab}^{(\ell)}$ vanish identically, and for a perturbed isolated horizons they are both small. Following [33, 53], it turns out that we can still take surfaces with vanishing expansion but with non-vanishing shear. To see this, start with the Raychaudhuri equation in vacuum for the null-generators of Δ :

$$\mathcal{L}_\ell \theta_{(\ell)} = -\theta_{(\ell)}^2 - |\sigma_{(\ell)}|^2. \quad (8)$$

For a perturbed isolated horizon, $\theta_{(\ell)}$ is small. If $\theta_{(\ell)}$ were to vanish exactly, then the Raychaudhuri equation tells us that the shear should also vanish. This implies that $\sigma_{ab}^{(\ell)}$ is also of the first order of smallness on a perturbed isolated horizon. Since each term on the right-hand side of the Raychaudhuri equation is quadratic and thus of the second order of smallness, we conclude that within first-order perturbation theory, we must have

$$\mathcal{L}_\ell \theta_{(\ell)} = 0. \quad (9)$$

Assuming further that the expansion vanishes asymptotically at late times, it must vanish everywhere on Δ at first order. However, $\sigma_{ab}^{(\ell)}$ can now be non-vanishing. In

fact, non-vanishing shear represents the infalling flux of gravitational waves. In paper I we considered perturbations where the shear vanishes and so the horizon is still, exactly, an isolated horizon. The horizon multipole moments were allowed to vary. Here we allow for a non-vanishing shear as well.

III. PERTURBATIONS OF THE INTRINSIC HORIZON GEOMETRY

Before we can formulate the QNM problem, the first necessary ingredient is to specify the boundary data on the inner boundary, i.e. the horizon. To this end, we need to specify a perturbed isolated horizon as discussed earlier. In particular, we need to specify the free data and to determine the rest of the horizon geometry from this free data. The hurried reader can skip the details of this construction and look at the results in Eqs. (40) and (41).

In the following, we shall distinguish between two kinds of perturbations of a stationary black hole: tidal vs. radiative. Tidal perturbations as discussed in paper I, are time independent, and modeled as a variation of the horizon multipole moments. These variations are time independent and meant to model a well-separated binary system where the perturbation changes sufficiently slowly. Within this approximation, the horizon area, angular momentum and higher multipoles all remain time independent. This is however an approximation and a more accurate model includes the phenomenon of tidal heating, i.e. incorporating infalling fluxes of gravitational radiation across the horizon.

Let us now consider the necessary modifications to the horizon structure when we include infalling radiation. The tidal distortions represent, within phase space, a variation within the subspace of spacetimes admitting an isolated horizon; here we will go away from this subspace. There are two important fields that we need to consider at the horizon: The shear of ℓ^a is now allowed to be non-vanishing, and we shall keep terms linear in this quantity. A second, and related quantity is the Weyl tensor component Ψ_0 which again, vanishes identically on a isolated horizon and here will be taken to be of the first order of smallness.

Notationally, the perturbations to the spin coefficients, Weyl scalars, and tetrad components sourced by this radiative perturbation will be denoted with the symbol $\tilde{\sim}$. The background quantities will be denoted without any symbol unless otherwise explicitly specified. From this point onward, the analysis will be perturbative to first order in the radiative perturbation. So, whether a quantity without the $\tilde{\sim}$ symbol denotes a general quantity or its background value should be clear from the context. We will develop the following analysis for perturbations of a slowly rotating isolated horizon, as the background quantities specified in App. A 2 have been set to zero to simplify the analysis. However, notice that the same for-

malism applies as long as the background is taken to be an isolated horizon in the sense of Paper I, and in particular, the same discussion for the equations at the horizon goes through with very little modifications for a general isolated horizon (i.e., the Kerr isolated horizon). As in paper I, we shall follow the Newman-Penrose formalism and use the symbol “ \triangleq ” to denote equalities which are satisfied only at the horizon.

Let us briefly recall the construction of paper I. There, we started with prescribing a perturbation of the Weyl tensor component Ψ_2 on a single cross-section S_0 , which corresponds to a tidal perturbation of the horizon multipole moments. The field equations on an isolated horizon then guaranteed that Ψ_2 is time independent on the horizon: $D\Psi_2 = 0$. Introducing now a non-vanishing Ψ_0 at the horizon, it turns out that Ψ_2 may no longer be time independent at the horizon, and this dynamical evolution will be forced by Ψ_0 .

Using the gauge discussed in Paper I, and summarized in App. A, the perturbations to the tetrad components simplify greatly at the horizon. In particular since ℓ^a continues to have vanishing expansion at the horizon, we can define the null coordinate v as before following $\ell^a \nabla v = 1$. On the other hand, as we have just argued, the angular dyad (m^a, \bar{m}^a) will be perturbed as the geometry of the cross-sections is modified by the infalling radiation. Thus:

$$\tilde{\ell}^a \triangleq 0, \quad \tilde{m}^a \partial_a \triangleq \tilde{\xi}^z \partial_z + \tilde{\xi}^{\bar{z}} \partial_{\bar{z}}. \quad (10)$$

The radial coordinate r is the affine parameter along $-n^a$ and this continues to be true even in our present case; thus the radial coordinate r and n^a “adapt” to the infalling radiation so that we can take n^a to be unperturbed everywhere:

$$\tilde{n}^a = 0. \quad (11)$$

This coordinate is normalized such that it takes the value $r = 0$ at the horizon. Notice that this radial coordinate is related to the radial Schwarzschild coordinate \mathfrak{r} through $\mathfrak{r} = r + c$. The parameter c defined in Paper I, which appears in the background quantities (see Appendix A) represents the size of the unperturbed horizon, i.e.,

$$c = 1/(2\kappa_{(\ell)}) = R_0 = 2M \quad (12)$$

for a Schwarzschild background. The quantity c is related to the area radius of the horizon. In the simple case of a Schwarzschild black hole, this quantity coincides with the horizon radius. However, for a rotating black hole, the area radius and the horizon position differ ². Hence, we use this quantity here instead of the usual $2M$ factor to ease the generalization to more general backgrounds.

² For Kerr with mass M and angular momentum Ma , the horizon is located at $r_+ = M + \sqrt{M^2 - a^2}$ while the area radius is $c = \sqrt{2Mr_+}$.

Away from the horizon, we can no longer take ℓ^a to be unperturbed. More generally, away from the horizon, the remaining tetrad elements are perturbed so that

$$\ell^a \partial_a = \tilde{U} \partial_r + \tilde{X}^z \partial_z + \tilde{X}^{\bar{z}} \partial_{\bar{z}}, \quad (13)$$

$$\tilde{m}^a \partial_a = \tilde{\Omega} \partial_r + \tilde{\xi}^z \partial_z + \tilde{\xi}^{\bar{z}} \partial_{\bar{z}}. \quad (14)$$

Given our gauge conditions, it follows that the perturbation $\tilde{\Psi}_1$ needs to be of the same order of smallness as $\tilde{\Psi}_0$ so the field equations at the horizon are self-consistent. Gathering the perturbative versions of the angular field equations (see Eq. (A14) in Appendix A) with $\tilde{\Psi}_1 \sim \mathcal{O}(\tilde{\Psi}_0)$, we obtain the following set of equations which need to hold at the horizon

$$\bar{\partial} \tilde{\sigma} \triangleq \tilde{\Psi}_1 \quad (15a)$$

$$\bar{\partial} \tilde{\lambda} - \bar{\partial} \tilde{\mu} \triangleq \mu \tilde{\pi} - \tilde{\Psi}_3 \quad (15b)$$

$$-2\text{Re} \tilde{\Psi}_2 \triangleq \bar{\partial} \tilde{a} + \bar{\partial} \tilde{a} + \tilde{\partial} \tilde{a} + \tilde{\partial} \tilde{a} \quad (15c)$$

$$-2i\text{Im} \tilde{\Psi}_2 \triangleq \bar{\partial} \tilde{\pi} - \bar{\partial} \tilde{\pi}. \quad (15d)$$

Repeating the same procedure for the Weyl scalar's evolution equations (A17) yields

$$D \tilde{\Psi}_1 - \kappa_{(\ell)} \tilde{\Psi}_1 \triangleq \bar{\partial} \tilde{\Psi}_0 \quad (16a)$$

$$D \tilde{\Psi}_2 \triangleq \bar{\partial} \tilde{\Psi}_1 \quad (16b)$$

$$D \tilde{\Psi}_3 + \kappa_{(\ell)} \tilde{\Psi}_3 \triangleq \bar{\partial} \tilde{\Psi}_2 + 3\tilde{\pi} \tilde{\Psi}_2 \quad (16c)$$

$$D \tilde{\Psi}_4 + 2\kappa_{(\ell)} \tilde{\Psi}_4 \triangleq \bar{\partial} \tilde{\Psi}_3 - 3\tilde{\lambda} \tilde{\Psi}_2. \quad (16d)$$

Notice that the last two equations can be written as second-order differential equations so that it is clear that $\tilde{\Psi}_3$ and $\tilde{\Psi}_4$ are sourced by $\tilde{\Psi}_1$ and $\tilde{\Psi}_2$ respectively.³

$$D^2 \tilde{\Psi}_3 + \kappa_{(\ell)} D \tilde{\Psi}_3 \triangleq \bar{\partial}^2 \tilde{\Psi}_1 + 3\tilde{\Psi}_2 \tilde{\Psi}_1 \quad (17a)$$

$$D^2 \tilde{\Psi}_4 + 3\kappa_{(\ell)} D \tilde{\Psi}_4 + 2\kappa_{(\ell)}^2 \tilde{\Psi}_4 \triangleq \bar{\partial}^2 \tilde{\Psi}_2 - 3\mu \tilde{\Psi}_2 \tilde{\sigma} \quad (17b)$$

Finally, we can again rewrite the perturbative evolution equations for the spin coefficients at the horizon. The first equation in (A15) yields

$$\bar{\partial} \tilde{\kappa} \triangleq 0. \quad (18)$$

This expression implies that the $\tilde{\kappa}$ is only a function of the time coordinate v . Nevertheless, in our construction of the perturbed horizon, we would like the perturbed null

generators at the horizon ℓ to still be geodesic. Hence, we choose

$$\tilde{\kappa} \triangleq 0. \quad (19)$$

The remaining equations in (A15) yield

$$D \tilde{\sigma} - \kappa_{(\ell)} \tilde{\sigma} \triangleq \tilde{\Psi}_0 \quad (20a)$$

$$D \tilde{\pi} \triangleq \bar{\partial}(\tilde{\epsilon} + \tilde{\bar{\epsilon}}) + \tilde{\Psi}_1 \quad (20b)$$

$$D \tilde{a} - \bar{\delta}(\tilde{\epsilon} - \tilde{\bar{\epsilon}}) \triangleq -a(\tilde{\epsilon} - \tilde{\bar{\epsilon}}) - \bar{a} \tilde{\sigma} - \tilde{\Psi}_1 \quad (20c)$$

$$D \tilde{\mu} + \kappa_{(\ell)} \tilde{\mu} \triangleq -\mu(\tilde{\epsilon} + \tilde{\bar{\epsilon}}) + \bar{\partial} \tilde{\pi} + \tilde{\Psi}_2 \quad (20d)$$

$$D \tilde{\lambda} + \kappa_{(\ell)} \tilde{\lambda} \triangleq \bar{\partial} \tilde{\pi} + \mu \tilde{\sigma}. \quad (20e)$$

Notice that there is no differential equation specifying the time-evolution equation of $\tilde{\Psi}_0$ in Eq. (16). From this absence, one might conclude that the time dependence of $\tilde{\Psi}_0$ can be freely specified at the horizon. However, as we will discuss in detail in Sec. IV, this apparent freedom is restricted by the field equations through the Teukolsky equation for $\tilde{\Psi}_0$.⁴

For simplicity, we choose $\tilde{\epsilon}$ to be at least second order in the perturbation. By doing so, we are assuming the change in surface gravity to be negligible. Notice that this is a gauge choice, which is useful because it considerably simplifies the system of differential equations at the horizon. However, this choice is not unique. Another useful option, discussed in App. B is to fix $\tilde{\mu} \triangleq 0$, which forces $\tilde{\epsilon} \neq 0$ at the horizon. Regardless of the gauge choice the analysis carried out in this paper still applies.

Setting $\tilde{\epsilon} \triangleq 0$, the second and third differential equations in (20) simplify to

$$D \tilde{\pi} \triangleq \tilde{\Psi}_1, \quad D \tilde{a} \triangleq -\bar{a} \tilde{\sigma} - \tilde{\Psi}_1, \quad (21)$$

which relates the change in the cross-section's connection and rotation one-form with the perturbation of Ψ_1 .

It will also be useful to extract an angular equation for \tilde{a} by taking the $\bar{\partial}$ operator of Eq. (21)

$$\bar{\partial} D \tilde{a} \triangleq D \bar{\partial} \tilde{a} \triangleq -\tilde{\sigma} \bar{\partial} \tilde{a} - \bar{a} \bar{\partial} \tilde{\sigma} - \bar{\partial} \tilde{\Psi}_1, \quad (22)$$

where we have used that the unperturbed D and $\bar{\partial}$ operators at the horizon commute (see Eq. (A7)). Using the Schwarzschild value for the unperturbed connection and tetrad in Eqs. (A25) and (A26), we see that $\bar{\partial} \tilde{a} \triangleq \delta \tilde{a} + \tilde{a}^2 \triangleq \tilde{a}^2$. Further, using the complex conjugate of Eq. (15a) and Eq. (16b) we can rewrite Eq. (22) as

$$D \bar{\partial} \tilde{a} \triangleq -\bar{a}(\bar{a} \tilde{\sigma} + \tilde{\Psi}_1) - D \tilde{\Psi}_2, \quad (23)$$

³ Start by taking the D derivative of Eqs. (16c) and (16d). We can use the fact that the D and the $\bar{\partial}$ derivatives commute for the unperturbed quantities (see Eq. (A7)) to rewrite the terms $D \bar{\partial} \tilde{\Psi}_2 = \bar{\partial} D \tilde{\Psi}_2$ and $D \bar{\partial} \tilde{\Psi}_3 = \bar{\partial} D \tilde{\Psi}_3$. Using Eqs. (16b), Eq. (20b) and the gauge $\tilde{\epsilon} \triangleq 0$, we obtain Eq. (17a). Eq. (17b) follows from using Eqs. (16b) and (20d). Expanding all the terms and collecting the terms proportional to $\bar{\partial} \tilde{\Psi}_3 - 3\tilde{\lambda} \tilde{\Psi}_2$, we can the left-hand side of Eq. (16d) to simplify the expression and obtain Eq. (17b).

⁴ The radial dependence of Ψ_4 can be “freely” specified in the sense that there is no independent radial field equation for the perturbation to Ψ_4 . However, as discussed in Paper I, the radial dependence of Ψ_4 is restricted by the Teukolsky equation.

where we can identify the first term on the right-hand side with the right-hand side of Eq. (21). Hence, using again Eq. (21) we obtain

$$D\tilde{\delta}\tilde{a} \triangleq \tilde{a}D\tilde{a} - D\tilde{\Psi}_2 \Rightarrow D(\tilde{\delta}\tilde{a} - \tilde{a}\tilde{a} + \tilde{\Psi}_2) \triangleq 0, \quad (24)$$

where we have used $D\tilde{a} \triangleq 0$. Eq. (24) shows that the combination $\tilde{\delta}\tilde{a} - \tilde{a}\tilde{a} + \tilde{\Psi}_2$ is time-independent, i.e.,

$$\tilde{\delta}\tilde{a} - \tilde{a}\tilde{a} + \tilde{\Psi}_2 \triangleq g(z, \bar{z}) \quad (25)$$

with $g(z, \bar{z})$ a smooth function of the angular coordinates. The freedom in the connection of the cross-sections of the horizon was extensively discussed in Paper I, so we shall be brief. All of the functions $g(z, \bar{z})$ that leave the curvature of the cross-section invariant form an equivalence class. Different representatives of the equivalence class yield a different set of perturbed angular coordinates on the sphere. For simplicity, we choose the representative with $g(z, \bar{z}) \triangleq 0$ so that

$$\tilde{\delta}\tilde{a} - \tilde{a}\tilde{a} \triangleq -\tilde{\Psi}_2. \quad (26)$$

Combining this expression with the expression for the real part of $\tilde{\Psi}_2$ in Eq. (15) we obtain

$$\tilde{\delta}a + \tilde{\delta}\bar{a} \triangleq -\tilde{a}\tilde{a} - \tilde{a}\tilde{a} \Rightarrow \tilde{\delta}a + \tilde{\delta}\bar{a} \triangleq 0. \quad (27)$$

This implies that $\text{Re}[\tilde{\delta}a] \triangleq 0$, but it can also mean that $\tilde{\xi}^z \triangleq 0$. To see this, we will use the evolution equations for the tetrad at the horizon, i.e.,

$$D\Omega - \delta U = \kappa + \rho\Omega + \sigma\bar{\Omega}, \quad D\xi^i - \delta X^i = (\bar{\rho} + \epsilon - \bar{\epsilon})\xi^i + \sigma\bar{\xi}^i. \quad (28)$$

Perturbing these equations to first order and evaluating them at the horizon, we obtain

$$D\tilde{\Omega} - \delta\tilde{U} \triangleq 0, \quad D\tilde{\xi}^i - \delta\tilde{X}^i \triangleq \tilde{\sigma}\tilde{\xi}^i + (\tilde{\epsilon} - \tilde{\bar{\epsilon}})\xi^i, \quad (29)$$

where we have used that $\Omega = 0$, $U \triangleq 0$ and $D\xi^i \triangleq X^i \triangleq 0$ for the unperturbed tetrad components (see Eq. (A26)). Furthermore, to preserve the orthogonality of the perturbed tetrad vectors, we need to set at the horizon

$$\tilde{\Omega} \triangleq \tilde{U} \triangleq \tilde{X}^i \triangleq 0, \quad (30)$$

which is a solution of Eq. (29). Therefore, to fully determine the change of the tetrad vectors at the horizon we just need to solve

$$D\tilde{\xi}^z \triangleq (\tilde{\epsilon} - \tilde{\bar{\epsilon}})\xi^z, \quad D\tilde{\xi}^{\bar{z}} \triangleq \tilde{\sigma}\tilde{\xi}^{\bar{z}}, \quad (31)$$

which we obtained by simplifying the second expression in Eq. (29) with Eq. (30) and recalling that $\xi^{\bar{z}} = \tilde{\xi}^{\bar{z}} = 0$ for the background quantities. We see that the choice $\tilde{\epsilon} \triangleq 0$ implies that

$$D\tilde{\xi}^z \triangleq 0. \quad (32)$$

In other words, the perturbation $\tilde{\xi}^z$ is time-independent as pointed out in Paper I for time-independent perturbations of the Schwarzschild geometry, and we can set them to zero so the tetrad on the horizon's cross-section can be written as

$$m^A \partial_A \triangleq \xi^z \partial_z + \tilde{\xi}^{\bar{z}} \partial_{\bar{z}}. \quad (33)$$

From this expression it is straightforward to check that the area of the cross-section, denoted by S , changes only to second order in the perturbation as we assumed. Using

$$g_S^{\bar{z}\bar{z}} = g_S^{zz} = \xi^z \tilde{\xi}^{\bar{z}} \tilde{\xi}^z, \quad g_S^{zz} = 2\xi^z \tilde{\xi}^z \quad (34)$$

and inverting the metric of the cross-section, it follows that

$$A = \int dz d\bar{z} \sqrt{|g_S|} = \int dz d\bar{z} \left[\left(\frac{1}{\xi^z} \right)^2 + \text{O}[\tilde{\xi}^z \tilde{\xi}^{\bar{z}}] \right] \quad (35)$$

the perturbation to the area's cross-section is at least second order in the perturbation. In summary, the time-dependent perturbation due to $\tilde{\Psi}_0$ and $\tilde{\Psi}_1$ decouples from the time-independent perturbations due to the tidal distortion. This means that we can combine these two effects by simply adding the perturbations. Notice that the ‘‘transverse’’ tetrad component encodes the time-dependent perturbations and it is proportional to the shear.

Contrary to the perturbed horizon due to static tidal perturbations that we considered before in paper I, the foliation of the horizon is not freely specifiable anymore. To see this, consider the second equation in (16), which specifies the time evolution of $\tilde{\Psi}_2$. This equation needs to be consistent with Eq. (21) since the time-evolution of the spin coefficient $\tilde{\pi}$ is also sourced by $\tilde{\Psi}_1$. This means that $\tilde{\pi}$ and $\tilde{\Psi}_2$ need to be related. In particular, the equations

$$D\tilde{\Psi}_2 \triangleq \tilde{\delta}\tilde{\Psi}_1, \quad D\tilde{\pi} \triangleq \tilde{\Psi}_1 \quad (36)$$

need to be consistent with one another. To check this, we take the complex conjugate of the second equation and compute its $\tilde{\delta}$ derivative. Using that $D\tilde{\delta} \triangleq \tilde{\delta}D$, we obtain

$$D\tilde{\delta}\tilde{\pi} \triangleq D\tilde{\Psi}_2 \Rightarrow \tilde{\delta}\tilde{\pi} \triangleq \tilde{\Psi}_2 + f(z, \bar{z}). \quad (37)$$

Recall that the quantity $\tilde{\delta}\pi$ specifies the foliation of the horizon by cross-sections, as reviewed in Sec. II B. In paper I this quantity was pure gauge, as we could choose the foliation as we pleased. However, Eq. (37) implies that the value of $\tilde{\delta}\tilde{\pi}$ is not purely gauge anymore. As stressed by the function $f(z, \bar{z})$, if both $\tilde{\pi}$ and $\tilde{\Psi}_2$ are time independent, then any time-independent function $f(z, \bar{z})$ can be used to define $\tilde{\delta}\tilde{\pi}$, which is consistent with what we found in paper I. However, we see that when introducing a time-dependent perturbation, the time-dependent part of $\tilde{\delta}\pi$ is fully determined by Ψ_2 . Here, we will choose

the time-independent function to vanish $f(z, \bar{z}) = 0$, to separate the part of the perturbation sourced by the time-dependent part of $\tilde{\Psi}_0$. This equation naturally links the linear momentum of the horizon (related to the divergence of ω) with the force exerted on the hole due to $\tilde{\Psi}_0$ from a purely tidal perturbation encoded in $\tilde{\Psi}_2$, where we used the notation of Paper I in which $\hat{\sim}$ denotes a static perturbation due to tidal disruption. Therefore,

$$\partial\tilde{\pi} \triangleq \tilde{\Psi}_2. \quad (38)$$

Notice the different sign of Eq. (38) with the gauge choice in Eq. (123) of Paper I. This sign difference illustrates that while the force due to the tidal perturber is attractive, $\tilde{\Psi}_0$ is “kicking” the horizon in the opposite direction. Notice that the time-evolution equation for $\tilde{\mu}$ simplifies if we combine it with this “gauge choice” (38)

$$D\tilde{\mu} + \kappa_{(l)}\tilde{\mu} \triangleq \tilde{\Psi}_2 + \tilde{\Psi}_2 = 2\text{Re}\tilde{\Psi}_2. \quad (39)$$

This equation implies that the expansion of the null vector n cannot be chosen to vanish anymore. Rather, its evolution is sourced by the real part of $\tilde{\Psi}_2$.

Gathering Eqs. (15)-(39) we obtain a system of 15 differential equations to prescribe 10 quantities (the spin coefficients, Weyl scalars and tetrad functions $\tilde{\sigma}$, $\tilde{\pi}$, $\tilde{\mu}$, $\tilde{\lambda}$, \tilde{a} , $\tilde{\Psi}_1$, $\tilde{\Psi}_2$, $\tilde{\Psi}_3$, $\tilde{\Psi}_4$, and $\tilde{\xi}^{\bar{z}}$) as a function of the perturbation to $\tilde{\Psi}_0$. This implies that we can separate this system in a group of 10 differential equations that will be used to solve the initial data at the horizon using $\tilde{\Psi}_0$ as the source

$$D\tilde{\sigma} - \kappa_{(l)}\tilde{\sigma} \triangleq \tilde{\Psi}_0, \quad (40a)$$

$$D\tilde{\Psi}_1 - \kappa_{(l)}\tilde{\Psi}_1 \triangleq \tilde{\sigma}\tilde{\Psi}_0, \quad (40b)$$

$$D\tilde{\Psi}_2 \triangleq \tilde{\sigma}\tilde{\Psi}_1, \quad (40c)$$

$$D\tilde{\pi} \triangleq \tilde{\sigma}\tilde{\Psi}_1, \quad (40d)$$

$$D\tilde{\mu} + \kappa_{(l)}\tilde{\mu} \triangleq \tilde{\Psi}_2 + \tilde{\Psi}_2, \quad (40e)$$

$$D\tilde{\lambda} + \kappa_{(l)}\tilde{\lambda} \triangleq \tilde{\sigma}\tilde{\pi} + \mu\tilde{\sigma}, \quad (40f)$$

$$D\tilde{\Psi}_3 + \kappa_{(l)}\tilde{\Psi}_3 \triangleq \tilde{\sigma}\tilde{\Psi}_2 + 3\tilde{\pi}\tilde{\Psi}_2, \quad (40g)$$

$$D\tilde{\Psi}_4 + 2\kappa_{(l)}\tilde{\Psi}_4 \triangleq \tilde{\sigma}\tilde{\Psi}_3 - 3\tilde{\lambda}\tilde{\Psi}_2, \quad (40h)$$

$$D\tilde{a} \triangleq -\tilde{a}\tilde{\sigma} - \tilde{\Psi}_1, \quad (40i)$$

$$D\tilde{\xi}^{\bar{z}} \triangleq \tilde{\sigma}\tilde{\xi}^{\bar{z}}. \quad (40j)$$

As shown in the Appendix, the above equations can be combined to yield the following constraint equations

$$\partial\tilde{\lambda} - \bar{\partial}\tilde{\mu} \triangleq \mu\tilde{\pi} - \tilde{\Psi}_3, \quad (41a)$$

$$-2\text{Re}\tilde{\Psi}_2 \triangleq \bar{\partial}\tilde{a} + \partial\tilde{a} - \tilde{a}\tilde{a} - \tilde{a}\tilde{a}, \quad (41b)$$

$$-2i\text{Im}\tilde{\Psi}_2 \triangleq \bar{\partial}\tilde{\pi} - \partial\tilde{\pi}, \quad (41c)$$

$$\bar{\partial}\tilde{\sigma} \triangleq \tilde{\Psi}_1, \quad (41d)$$

$$\partial\tilde{\pi} \triangleq \tilde{\Psi}_2. \quad (41e)$$

These equations contain only angular derivatives, i.e. no radial or time derivatives. In the next section we shall solve Eqs. (40) (and hence also Eqs. (41)) explicitly.

IV. THE RELATIONSHIP BETWEEN $\tilde{\Psi}_0$ AND $\tilde{\Psi}_4$

The initial data at the horizon is determined by solving Eqs. (40) for the spin coefficients and Weyl scalars at the horizon as a function of the perturbation to Ψ_0 . The next step in obtaining the metric of a ringing-down black hole would be to integrate the radial equations with this initial data. This will be discussed in Sec. VII. However, since one of the goals of this work is to provide an explicit construction of the geometry of the perturbed, ringing-down horizon (and its neighborhood), we provide an explicit solution of Eqs. (40) in this section, which will be used in the following discussion.

The radial behavior of Ψ_4 is related to its angular and temporal behavior through the Teukolsky equation. This particular feature of Ψ_4 (which other spin coefficients and Weyl scalars do not share, e.g. Ψ_2) can be understood as a consequence of Ψ_4 not having an independent radial equation. Similarly, Ψ_0 does not have an independent time-evolution equation. As discussed above, this could give the impression that one can prescribe the time dependence of $\tilde{\Psi}_0$ (or alternatively of $\tilde{\sigma}$) “freely” at the horizon. This is, however, not true. The Weyl scalar Ψ_0 also satisfies a Teukolsky equation, which links its radial, angular, and temporal behavior. A remarkable feature of the Teukolsky equation for linear perturbations around a Schwarzschild background is that it is separable [41, 54]. This feature is also present in the coordinate system that we use in our construction. Hence, the solutions of the Teukolsky equations can be expressed as products of purely radial, purely angular, and purely temporal functions. This means in particular, that the form of $\tilde{\Psi}_0$ and $\tilde{\Psi}_4$ at the horizon will inherit a similar structure.

For completeness, we first show that the Teukolsky equations for $\tilde{\Psi}_0$ and $\tilde{\Psi}_4$ are separable. The Teukolsky equation for $\tilde{\Psi}_4$ was already discussed in [27], so we shall be brief. The Teukolsky equation for $\tilde{\Psi}_0$ can be easily obtained by using the transformation

$$\ell \leftrightarrow n, \quad m \leftrightarrow \bar{m} \quad (42)$$

on the Teukolsky equation for $\tilde{\Psi}_4$. Hence, we obtain the Teukolsky equations for $\tilde{\Psi}_0$ and $\tilde{\Psi}_4$

$$[D\Delta - \bar{\partial}\bar{\delta} + \mu D - (5\rho + 2\epsilon)\Delta - 4\mu(\rho + \epsilon) - 2\Psi_2]\tilde{\Psi}_0 = 0 \quad (43a)$$

$$[\Delta D - \bar{\partial}\bar{\delta} + 5\mu D + (4\epsilon - \rho)\Delta + 4\mu(5\epsilon - \rho) - 6\Psi_2]\tilde{\Psi}_4 = 0. \quad (43b)$$

Using that $(r+c)^2\bar{\partial}\bar{\delta}$ is independent of the r coordinate, we can separate the angular part of Eqs. (43a). Using

that Ψ_0 and Ψ_4 have spin-weight 2 and -2, we write the ansatz

$$\tilde{\Psi}_0 = \sum_{l,m} \psi_{lm}^{(0)}(v,r) {}_2Y_{lm}, \quad (44)$$

$$\tilde{\Psi}_4 = \sum_{l,m} \psi_{lm}^{(4)}(v,r) {}_{-2}Y_{lm} \quad (45)$$

which for every l, m yields the following two differential equations for the radial and temporal parts of $\tilde{\Psi}_0$ and $\tilde{\Psi}_4$

$$\mathcal{O}_{T_0} \tilde{\Psi}_0 = \sum_{l,m} [D\Delta + \mu D - (5\rho + 2\epsilon)\Delta - 4\mu(\rho + \epsilon) - 2\Psi_2 + \frac{(l+2)(l-1)}{2(r+c)^2}] \psi_{lm}^{(0)}(v,r) {}_2Y_{lm} = 0 \quad (46a)$$

$$\mathcal{O}_{T_4} \tilde{\Psi}_4 = \sum_{l,m} [\Delta D + 5\mu D + (4\epsilon - \rho)\Delta + 4\mu(5\epsilon - \rho) - 6\Psi_2 + \frac{(l+2)(l-1)}{2(r+c)^2}] \psi_{lm}^{(4)}(v,r) {}_{-2}Y_{lm} = 0 \quad (46b)$$

To proceed further, we use the inverse Fourier transform for $\psi_{lm}^{(0)} / \psi_{lm}^{(4)}$

$$\psi_{lm}^{(0,4)}(v,r) = \frac{1}{2\pi} \int_{-\infty}^{\infty} d\omega e^{-i\omega v} X_{lm}^{(0,4)}(r,\omega). \quad (47)$$

It is important to distinguish this from a resonant ex-

pansion as in Eq. (3). Here the ω are real frequencies while Eq. (3) is a discrete sum over modes with complex frequencies. We shall return to the resonant frequencies below when we discuss QNMs.

Using the Fourier modes yields the following two ODEs for the radial parts of $\tilde{\Psi}_0$ and $\tilde{\Psi}_4$ ⁵

$$U \partial_r^2 X_{lm}^{(0)} - [5\rho + 2\epsilon + \mu U + i\omega] \partial_r X_{lm}^{(0)} + [4\mu(\rho + \epsilon) + 2\Psi_2 - \frac{(l-1)(l+2)}{2(r+c)^2} + i\omega\mu] X_{lm}^{(0)} = 0 \quad (49a)$$

$$U \partial_r^2 X_{lm}^{(4)} + [\partial_r U - 5\mu U + 4\epsilon - \rho - i\omega] \partial_r X_{lm}^{(4)} + [6\Psi_2 - 4\mu(5\epsilon - \rho) - \frac{(l+2)(l-1)}{2(r+c)^2} + 5i\omega\mu] X_{lm}^{(4)} = 0. \quad (49b)$$

The spin coefficients and tetrad functions appearing in Eq. (49) are the background quantities (see Eqs. (A25) and (A26)), which only depend on the radial coordinate. Hence, from this expression, it is manifest that both Teukolsky equations, for $\tilde{\Psi}_0$ and $\tilde{\Psi}_4$, are separable also in our coordinate system.

Now that we have argued that both Teukolsky equations are separable, we can solve them. However, we cannot solve both Teukolsky equations for $\tilde{\Psi}_0$ and $\tilde{\Psi}_4$

simultaneously since the system of differential equations at the horizon (40) relates the initial values of these two quantities. In fact, a single solution of the radial Teukolsky equation for $\tilde{\Psi}_0$ is related to a combination of two independent solutions of the radial Teukolsky equation for $\tilde{\Psi}_4$ and vice versa. As we will discuss more in Sec. IV A, this relation is strongly tied to the Teukolsky-Starobinsky identities and will yield equivalent results.

Nonetheless, the previous discussion shows that we can find separable solutions for $\tilde{\Psi}_0$ and $\tilde{\Psi}_4$, i.e.,

$$\tilde{\Psi}_0 = \frac{1}{2\pi} \sum_{l,m} \left(\int d\omega e^{-i\omega v} X_{lm}^{(0)} Y_{lm}^{(1)} + \int d\bar{\omega} e^{i\bar{\omega} v} \bar{X}_{lm}^{(0)} Y_{lm}^{(2)} \right) \quad (50a)$$

$$\tilde{\Psi}_4 = \frac{1}{2\pi} \sum_{l,m} \left(\int d\omega e^{-i\omega v} X_{lm}^{(4)} Y_{lm}^{(3)} + \int d\bar{\omega} e^{i\bar{\omega} v} \bar{X}_{lm}^{(4)} Y_{lm}^{(4)} \right) \quad (50b)$$

where $Y_{lm}^{(i)}$ are functions of the angular coordinates $\{z, \bar{z}\}$ and $X_{lm}^{(0,4)}$ of the radial coordinate only. Given that

⁵ Notice that the static solution for the Teukolsky equations (46a) can be obtained through the ansatz $\psi_{lm}^{(0,4)}(v,r) = \psi_{lm}^{(0,4)}(r)$. The resulting differential equations for $\psi_{lm}^{(0,4)}(r)$ can be solved analytically in terms of the associated Legendre functions

$$X^{(0)}(r) = \frac{rK_0}{(r+c)^3} P_l^2 \left(1 + \frac{2r}{c} \right), \quad (48a)$$

$$X^{(4)}(r) = \frac{K_4}{r(r+c)} P_l^2 \left(1 + \frac{2r}{c} \right), \quad (48b)$$

with K_0 and K_4 integration constants.

the spin weight of the Weyl scalars Ψ_0 and Ψ_4 is well-defined, we can expand the angular functions in terms of the spin-weight spherical harmonics with spins $s = 2$ and -2 respectively. However, given the relationship between these two quantities at the horizon we can either choose $Y_{lm}^{(1)} \propto Y_{lm}^{(2)} \propto {}_2Y_{lm}$ or $Y_{lm}^{(3)} \propto Y_{lm}^{(4)} \propto -{}_2Y_{lm}$ without loss of generality, but not both simultaneously. Both choices yield completely analogous results, but the first one is less cumbersome for our purpose to show that all of the perturbed quantities are sourced by $\tilde{\Psi}_0$, so we shall choose $Y_{lm}^{(1)} = a_{lm}^- {}_2Y_{lm}$ and $Y_{lm}^{(2)} = a_{lm}^+ {}_2Y_{lm}$, where $a_{lm}^\pm(\omega)$ are functions of the frequency only.

Hence, at the horizon $r = 0$, we will use an ansatz for $\tilde{\Psi}_0$ of the form

$$\tilde{\Psi}_0 \triangleq \frac{1}{2\pi} \sum_{l,m} \left(\int d\omega a_{lm}^- e^{-i\omega v} + \int d\bar{\omega} a_{lm}^+ e^{i\bar{\omega} v} \right) {}_2Y_{lm}, \quad (51)$$

where the radial function is taken to be normalized to unity at the horizon $X_{lm}^{(0)}(r = 0) = 1$. Using Eq. (51) and the field equations at the horizon (40) we will then

derive an expression for $\tilde{\Psi}_4$ at the horizon of the form

$$\tilde{\Psi}_4 \triangleq \frac{1}{2\pi} \sum_{l,m} \left(\int d\omega [b_{lm}^- {}_2Y_{lm} + c_{lm}^- {}_2Y_{l,-m}] e^{-i\omega v} + \int d\bar{\omega} [b_{lm}^+ {}_2Y_{lm} + c_{lm}^+ {}_2Y_{l,-m}] e^{i\bar{\omega} v} \right). \quad (52)$$

As we will see below, we will find that the coefficients b_{lm}^\pm and c_{lm}^\pm are related to a_{lm}^\pm . Notice that the coefficients a_{lm}^\pm are not independent. This can be deduced by simply counting the degrees of freedom: $\tilde{\Psi}_0$ has two independent degrees of freedom (the polarizations of the infalling gravitational wave), while a_{lm}^\pm are two complex constants and have four degrees of freedom. However, how these quantities are related will also depend on properties of the frequencies, so we leave the relationship between these constants unspecified.

Using the ansatz for $\tilde{\Psi}_0$ at the horizon in Eq. (51) we can solve explicitly the system of differential equations (40) in the order $\tilde{\sigma}$, $\tilde{\Psi}_1$, \tilde{a} , $\tilde{\xi}^{\tilde{z}}$, $\tilde{\Psi}_2$, $\tilde{\pi}$, $\tilde{\mu}$, $\tilde{\lambda}$, $\tilde{\Psi}_3$ and finally, $\tilde{\Psi}_4$

$$\tilde{\sigma} \triangleq -\frac{1}{2\pi} \sum_{l,m} \left(\int_{-\infty}^{\infty} d\omega \frac{a_{lm}^-}{\kappa_{(l)} + i\omega} e^{-i\omega v} + \int_{-\infty}^{\infty} d\bar{\omega} \frac{a_{lm}^+}{\kappa_{(l)} - i\bar{\omega}} e^{i\bar{\omega} v} \right) {}_2Y_{lm}, \quad (53a)$$

$$\tilde{\Psi}_1 \triangleq \frac{1}{2\pi} \sum_{l,m} \left(\int_{-\infty}^{\infty} d\omega \frac{a_{lm}^- \sqrt{(l+2)(l-1)}}{\sqrt{2}c(\kappa_{(l)} + i\omega)} e^{-i\omega v} + \int_{-\infty}^{\infty} d\bar{\omega} \frac{a_{lm}^+ \sqrt{(l+2)(l-1)}}{\sqrt{2}c(\kappa_{(l)} - i\bar{\omega})} e^{i\bar{\omega} v} \right) {}_1Y_{lm}, \quad (53b)$$

$$\begin{aligned} \tilde{a} \triangleq \frac{1}{2\pi} \left(- \int d\omega \sum_{l,m} \frac{(-1)^m \bar{a}_{lm}^+ e^{-i\omega v}}{i\omega(\kappa_{(l)} + i\omega)} (\bar{a}_{-2} Y_{l-m} + \frac{\sqrt{(l+2)(l-1)}}{\sqrt{2}c} {}_{-1}Y_{l-m}) \right. \\ \left. + \int d\bar{\omega} \sum_{l,m} \frac{(-1)^m \bar{a}_{lm}^- e^{i\bar{\omega} v}}{i\bar{\omega}(\kappa_{(l)} - i\bar{\omega})} (\bar{a}_{-2} Y_{l-m} + \frac{\sqrt{(l+2)(l-1)}}{\sqrt{2}c} {}_{-1}Y_{l-m}) \right), \end{aligned} \quad (53c)$$

$$\tilde{\xi}^{\bar{z}} \triangleq \frac{\bar{\xi}_0^{\bar{z}}}{2\pi} \sum_{l,m} {}_2Y_{lm} \left(\int d\omega \frac{a_{lm}^- e^{-i\omega v}}{i\omega(\kappa_{(l)} + i\omega)} - \int d\bar{\omega} \frac{a_{lm}^+ e^{i\bar{\omega} v}}{i\bar{\omega}(\kappa_{(l)} - i\bar{\omega})} \right), \quad (53d)$$

$$\tilde{\Psi}_2 \triangleq \frac{1}{2\pi} \sum_{l,m} \frac{\sqrt{(l+2)(l+1)l(l-1)}}{2c^2} \left(\int_{-\infty}^{\infty} d\omega \frac{a_{lm}^-}{i\omega(\kappa_{(l)} + i\omega)} e^{-i\omega v} - \int_{-\infty}^{\infty} d\bar{\omega} \frac{a_{lm}^+}{i\bar{\omega}(\kappa_{(l)} - i\bar{\omega})} e^{i\bar{\omega} v} \right) Y_{lm}, \quad (53e)$$

$$\tilde{\pi} \triangleq \frac{1}{2\pi} \sum_{l,m} (-1)^m \frac{\sqrt{(l+2)(l-1)}}{\sqrt{2}c} \left(\int_{-\infty}^{\infty} d\omega \frac{\bar{a}_{lm}^+}{i\omega(\kappa_{(l)} + i\omega)} e^{-i\omega v} - \int_{-\infty}^{\infty} d\bar{\omega} \frac{\bar{a}_{lm}^-}{i\bar{\omega}(\kappa_{(l)} - i\bar{\omega})} e^{i\bar{\omega} v} \right) {}_{-1}Y_{l,-m}, \quad (53f)$$

$$\tilde{\mu} \triangleq \frac{1}{2\pi} \sum_{l,m} \frac{\sqrt{(l+2)(l+1)l(l-1)}}{2c^2} \left(\int_{-\infty}^{\infty} d\omega \frac{[a_{lm}^- Y_{lm} + (-1)^m \bar{a}_{lm}^+ Y_{l,-m}] e^{-i\omega v}}{i\omega(\kappa_{(l)}^2 + \omega^2)} - \int_{-\infty}^{\infty} d\bar{\omega} \frac{[a_{lm}^+ Y_{lm} + (-1)^m \bar{a}_{lm}^- Y_{l,-m}] e^{i\bar{\omega} v}}{i\bar{\omega}(\kappa_{(l)}^2 + \bar{\omega}^2)} \right), \quad (53g)$$

$$\begin{aligned} \tilde{\lambda} \triangleq \frac{1}{2\pi} \sum_{l,m} (-1)^m \left(\int_{-\infty}^{\infty} d\omega \frac{\bar{a}_{lm}^+ e^{-i\omega v}}{2ic^2\omega(\kappa_{(l)}^2 + \omega^2)} (2ic\omega - (l+2)(l-1)) + \right. \\ \left. \int_{-\infty}^{\infty} d\bar{\omega} \frac{\bar{a}_{lm}^- e^{i\bar{\omega} v}}{2ic^2\bar{\omega}(\kappa_{(l)}^2 + \bar{\omega}^2)} (2ic\bar{\omega} + (l+2)(l-1)) \right) {}_{-2}Y_{l,-m}, \end{aligned} \quad (53h)$$

$$\begin{aligned} \tilde{\Psi}_3 \triangleq -\frac{1}{2\pi} \sum_{l,m} \frac{\sqrt{(l+2)(l-1)}}{2\sqrt{2}c^3} \left(\int_{-\infty}^{\infty} d\omega \frac{[a_{lm-1}^- Y_{lm}(l+1)l + 3(-1)^m \bar{a}_{lm-1}^+ Y_{l,-m}] e^{-i\omega v}}{i\omega(\kappa_{(l)}^2 + \omega^2)} \right. \\ \left. - \int_{-\infty}^{\infty} d\bar{\omega} \frac{[a_{lm-1}^+(l+1)l {}_{-1}Y_{lm} + 3(-1)^m \bar{a}_{lm-1}^- Y_{l,-m}] e^{i\bar{\omega} v}}{i\bar{\omega}(\kappa_{(l)}^2 + \bar{\omega}^2)} \right), \end{aligned} \quad (53i)$$

$$\begin{aligned} \tilde{\Psi}_4 \triangleq \frac{1}{8\pi c^4} \sum_{l,m} \left(\int_{-\infty}^{\infty} d\omega \frac{[a_{lm}^-(l+2)(l+1)l(l-1) {}_{-2}Y_{lm} + 6c(-1)^m i\omega \bar{a}_{lm-2}^+ Y_{l,-m}] e^{-i\omega v}}{i\omega(\kappa_{(l)}^2 + \omega^2)(2\kappa_{(l)} - i\omega)} \right. \\ \left. - \int_{-\infty}^{\infty} d\bar{\omega} \frac{[a_{lm}^+(l+2)(l+1)l(l-1) {}_{-2}Y_{lm} - 6c(-1)^m i\bar{\omega} \bar{a}_{lm-2}^- Y_{l,-m}] e^{i\bar{\omega} v}}{i\bar{\omega}(\kappa_{(l)}^2 + \bar{\omega}^2)(2\kappa_{(l)} + i\bar{\omega})} \right). \end{aligned} \quad (53j)$$

It is important to note that this is *not* the most general solution to the system of differential equations in Eq. (40). One reason is that the assumption of a Fourier decomposition inherently restricts the solution set. Moreover, if we were to start from a different cross-section of the horizon and repeat the above procedure, we would find a mode decomposition on a *different* transverse null surface. We would thus need to be careful when comparing the mode frequencies obtained from the

two choices. Additionally, we have excluded certain unphysical, unstable particular solutions of the differential equations (40). For instance, the differential equation for $\tilde{\sigma}$ (40a) has a second particular solution of the form $c_1 e^{\kappa_{(l)} v}$, where $c_1(z, \bar{z})$ is a function of the angular coordinates. This particular solution corresponds to a shear perturbation that grows exponentially with time v (since $\kappa_{(l)} > 0$), thus implying that a small flux of gravitational waves causes the horizon to destabilize and have an ex-

ponentially growing deformation on the future. This behavior is not physical, so we discard it. Finally, as we discussed in Sec. III, in this paper we are only concerned with the perturbations caused by the radiative infalling flux of gravitational waves driven by $\tilde{\Psi}_0$. The system (40) also admits a solution for the perturbed geometry corresponding to a *static* tidal perturbation, which was discussed in great detail in Paper I. Hence, here we shall set the static solution to zero.

Despite these restrictions, the solution in Eq. (53) is sufficiently general for the application to the ringdown that we have in mind. In Sec. V, we will apply this solution to the latest phases of the ringdown, where the solution of the spin coefficients and Weyl scalars (53) will be expressible in terms of a sum over an infinite but discrete set of frequencies (the QNM frequencies). It can be shown that the frequencies in which the solution of $\tilde{\Psi}_0$ and $\tilde{\Psi}_4$ is spanned is the same for both quantities and in fact, for all the spin coefficients and Weyl scalars. A simplified proof of this statement will be provided in Sec. V. For now, we will just assume that the frequencies appearing in the decomposition of $\tilde{\Psi}_4$ need to be the same as those in the decomposition of $\tilde{\Psi}_0$.

A very similar solution to Eq. (53) could be derived to describe tidal heating during the inspiral, by considering a periodic solution of Eq. (53) with the frequency ω related to the orbital frequency of the compact object. Early work studying the geometry of the horizon due to tidal heating is performed in [55–57]. The application of the whole perturbative black hole tomography framework to relate the geometry of the horizon to the observed gravitational waves for an EMRI during the inspiral will be discussed in a companion paper.

Comparing Eq. (53j) with Eq. (52), we can identify the following constants which appear in Eq. (52)

$$b_{lm}^- = \frac{(l+2)(l+1)l(l-1)}{4c^4 i\omega(\kappa_{(l)}^2 + \omega^2)(2\kappa_{(l)} - i\omega)} a_{lm}^-, \quad (54a)$$

$$c_{lm}^- = \frac{3(-1)^m}{2c^3(\kappa_{(l)}^2 + \omega^2)(2\kappa_{(l)} - i\omega)} \bar{a}_{lm}^+, \quad (54b)$$

$$b_{lm}^+ = -\frac{(l+2)(l+1)l(l-1)}{4c^4 i\bar{\omega}(\kappa_{(l)}^2 + \bar{\omega}^2)(2\kappa_{(l)} + i\bar{\omega})} a_{lm}^+, \quad (54c)$$

$$c_{lm}^+ = \frac{3(-1)^m}{2c^3(\kappa_{(l)}^2 + \bar{\omega}^2)(2\kappa_{(l)} + i\bar{\omega})} \bar{a}_{lm}^-, \quad (54d)$$

which are all sourced by a_{lm}^\pm and its complex conjugates. Notice first that for a decomposition of the form (51), in which we can encode the angular part purely in a spin-weighted spherical harmonic of the appropriate spin, we obtain for $\tilde{\Psi}_4$ at the horizon an expression that not only depends on ${}_2Y_{lm}$ but also on ${}_2Y_{l,-m}$. This dependence could be simplified by rearranging the sum of $m = -l, \dots, l$ to $m' = l \dots -l$ for the terms with ${}_2Y_{l,-m}$. However, this would give rise to frequencies $\omega_{l,-m}$, which have not been defined for the moment. Once we determine that the integral over the frequencies ω_{lm} reduces

to a sum over the QNM frequencies, we will be able to use properties of these modes to simplify these expressions, but for the time being we shall keep the discussion general by maintaining the terms with negative index m in the harmonics.

We could consider two particular cases such that $\tilde{\Psi}_0$ and $\tilde{\Psi}_4$ only have the $e^{-i\omega v}$ modes. The first case follows by setting $a_{lm}^+ = 0$ and we obtain a “single-mode” excitation for $\tilde{\Psi}_0$. Then, the expression for $\tilde{\Psi}_4$ at the horizon shows that a single solution of the radial Teukolsky equation for $\tilde{\Psi}_0$ requires a combination of two linearly independent solutions of the radial Teukolsky equations for $\tilde{\Psi}_4$. The converse is also true, as can be seen by requiring a “single-mode” perturbation in $\tilde{\Psi}_4$, which can be attained by choosing the perturbation such that $b_{lm}^+ {}_2Y_{lm} + c_{lm}^+ {}_2Y_{l,-m} = 0$. This relationship between the boundary conditions at the horizon of $\tilde{\Psi}_0$ and $\tilde{\Psi}_4$ reminds us of the boundary conditions of the solution to the Teukolsky equation for $\tilde{\Psi}_4$ at the horizon and infinity, where having purely ingoing modes at the horizon implies a mixture between ingoing and outgoing modes far away and vice versa.

From the above discussion, it follows that $\tilde{\Psi}_4$ should be of the form

$$\tilde{\Psi}_4 = \frac{1}{2\pi} \sum_{l,m} \left(\int d\omega [b_{lm}^- X_{lm}^{(4)} {}_2Y_{lm} + c_{lm}^- Z_{lm}^{(4)} {}_2Y_{l,-m}] e^{-i\omega v} \right. \\ \left. \int d\bar{\omega} [b_{lm}^+ \bar{X}_{lm}^{(4)} {}_2Y_{lm} + c_{lm}^+ \bar{Z}_{lm}^{(4)} {}_2Y_{l,-m}] e^{i\bar{\omega} v} \right) \quad (55)$$

with the constants b_{lm}^\pm and c_{lm}^\pm given by Eq. (54) and the purely radial functions $X_{lm}^{(4)}$ and $Z_{lm}^{(4)}$ (a priori independent) normalized such that $X_{lm}^{(4)}(r=0) = \bar{X}_{lm}^{(4)}(r=0) = Z_{lm}^{(4)}(r=0) = \bar{Z}_{lm}^{(4)}(r=0) = 1$. Using this ansatz to solve the Teukolsky equation, we need to solve four independent equations, one for each term proportional to the constants b_{lm}^\pm and c_{lm}^\pm , i.e.,

$$\mathcal{O}_{T_4} \tilde{\Psi}_4 = 0 \Rightarrow \begin{cases} \mathcal{O}_{T_4} \left(X_{lm}^{(4)} e^{-i\omega v} {}_2Y_{lm} \right) = 0, \\ \mathcal{O}_{T_4} \left(\bar{X}_{lm}^{(4)} e^{i\bar{\omega} v} {}_2Y_{lm} \right) = 0, \\ \mathcal{O}_{T_4} \left(Z_{lm}^{(4)} e^{-i\omega v} {}_2Y_{l,-m} \right) = 0, \\ \mathcal{O}_{T_4} \left(\bar{Z}_{lm}^{(4)} e^{i\bar{\omega} v} {}_2Y_{l,-m} \right) = 0. \end{cases} \quad (56)$$

The first and third expressions yield exactly Eq. (49b) since the eigenvalue of the angular operator $\bar{\delta}\delta$ does not depend on the index m . Hence, it follows that $Z_{lm}^{(4)} = X_{lm}^{(4)}$. Further, since the spin coefficients and Weyl scalars for the background spacetime are real, the second and fourth expressions in Eq. (56), i.e., $\mathcal{O}_{T_4} \left(\bar{X}_{lm}^{(4)} e^{i\bar{\omega} v} {}_2Y_{lm} \right) = 0$ yields the complex conjugate of Eq. (49b), so $\bar{X}_{lm}^{(4)}$ is the complex conjugate of $X_{lm}^{(4)}$ and $\bar{Z}_{lm}^{(4)} = \bar{X}_{lm}^{(4)}$. Therefore, we only need to explicitly solve

the Teukolsky equation for the first term in Eq. (56), i.e., Eq. (49b), which yields

$$\begin{aligned} \tilde{\Psi}_4 = \frac{1}{2\pi} \sum_{l,m} \left(\int_{-\infty}^{\infty} d\omega e^{-i\omega v} [b_{lm-2}^- Y_{lm} + c_{lm-2}^- Y_{l,-m}] X_{lm}^{(4)} \right. \\ \left. + \int_{-\infty}^{\infty} d\bar{\omega} e^{i\bar{\omega} v} [b_{lm-2}^+ Y_{lm} + c_{lm-2}^+ Y_{l,-m}] \bar{X}_{lm}^{(4)} \right) \end{aligned} \quad (57)$$

where the radial function $X_{lm}^{(4)}$ is a combination of confluent Heun functions

$$\begin{aligned} X_{lm}^{(4)}(r) = k_1 H_c[(l-2)(l+3) + 5\iota, 5\iota, 3-\iota, 3, \iota, -\frac{r}{c}] \\ + k_2 \left(-\frac{r}{c}\right)^{\iota-2} H_c[l(l+1) + \iota^2, \iota(3+\iota), \iota-1, 3, \iota, -\frac{r}{c}] \end{aligned} \quad (58)$$

with $\iota = 2ci\omega$, and normalized such that

$$H_c[\alpha, \beta, \gamma, \delta, \sigma, z] = 1 - \frac{\alpha}{\gamma} z + O(z^2). \quad (59)$$

The function $\bar{X}_{lm}^{(4)}$ is just the complex conjugate of Eq. (58). The integration constants k_1 and k_2 must be chosen such that $\tilde{\Psi}_4(r=0)$ coincides with Eq. (53j). Although the confluent Heun functions are regular at the horizon, the prefactor $(-r/c)^{\iota-2}$ makes the second solution of the radial Teukolsky equation for $\tilde{\Psi}_4$ singular at the horizon. Given that we are searching for regular solutions at the horizon we could already discard this second solution by setting $k_2 = 0$. Nevertheless, we will not fix this constant to keep the discussion general. In Sec. V, we will show that k_2 should vanish after all, as it describes an unphysical unstable solution in the future.

Eqs. (57)-(59) fully specify the perturbation to the Weyl scalar Ψ_4 . In Refs. [58, 59], it was already proven that the Teukolsky equation could be solved analytically using confluent Heun functions, but the results here differ given that we use a different coordinate system and different gauge conditions.

Up to this point, we have been using the term ‘‘function’’ lightly to refer to the confluent Heun functions. However, an analytic ‘‘function’’ in the mathematical sense should have a representation in terms of a series with certain convergence properties. This is not always true for the confluent Heun functions, for which a uniformly convergent series can only be built from its regular singular point at the horizon to the irregular singular

point at $r = \infty$ for certain values of ω_{lm} , the so-called eigenfrequencies of the series [10, 60]. This is in principle not a problem, but imposing analyticity in the solution is a very strong requirement: to define a metric that gives rise to a well-behaved Riemann curvature tensor, we only need to require solutions that are finitely differentiable (at least C^2 so that the curvature is continuous [61]). However, in this first application of black hole tomography, we wish to describe the metric of a ringing-down black hole, which is an analytic solution. Requiring the solution for Ψ_4 (and the spacetime metric) to be analytic, i.e., that all the relevant functions have a valid series representation between the horizon and infinity, will give rise to the identification of ω with the frequencies of the QNMs ω_n , as we will see in Sec. V.

Further, we need to impose physical boundary conditions to our solution: no radiation can escape from the black hole and no radiation should leak into the spacetime from infinity. To specialize our general solution to this physical situation, we will need to impose boundary conditions for *both* $\tilde{\Psi}_0$ and $\tilde{\Psi}_4$ at the horizon and asymptotically. So in order to impose these boundary conditions, we first need to solve the radial differential equation (49a) for $\tilde{\Psi}_0$, which we obtain by using the Teukolsky operator for $\tilde{\Psi}_0$ over the ansatz

$$\begin{aligned} \tilde{\Psi}_0 = \frac{1}{2\pi} \sum_{l,m} \left(\int d\omega a_{lm}^- e^{-i\omega v} X_{lm}^{(0)} \right. \\ \left. + \int d\bar{\omega} a_{lm}^+ e^{i\bar{\omega} v} \bar{X}_{lm}^{(0)} \right) {}_2Y_{lm}. \end{aligned} \quad (60)$$

Analogously to the discussion for $\tilde{\Psi}_4$, the radial function $X_{lm}^{(0)}$ is obtained by solving $\mathcal{O}_{T_0} \tilde{\Psi}_0 = 0$, which yields Eq. (49a). The radial function $\bar{X}_{lm}^{(0)}$ satisfies the complex conjugate of Eq. (49a) and is therefore the complex conjugate of $X_{lm}^{(0)}$. This function is again assumed to be normalized such that $X_{lm}^{(0)}(r=0) = 1$. However, despite the similarity of the radial equations for $\tilde{\Psi}_0$ and $\tilde{\Psi}_4$, the radial part of $\tilde{\Psi}_0$ does not have a solution in terms of confluent Heun functions. Rather, the solution will be a mixture of polynomial terms, Heun functions, and their derivatives, i.e.,

$$\begin{aligned} X_{lm}^{(0)}(r) = k_3 \left(f_{lm}^{(1)}(r) H_c[(l-2)(l+3) + 5\iota, 5\iota, 3-\iota, 3, \iota, -\frac{r}{c}] + g_{lm}^{(1)}(r) \partial_r H_c[(l-2)(l+3) + 5\iota, 5\iota, 3-\iota, 3, \iota, -\frac{r}{c}] \right) \\ + k_4 \left(-\frac{r}{c} \right)^\iota \left(f_{lm}^{(2)} H_c[l(l+1) + \iota^2, \iota(3+\iota), \iota-1, 3, \iota, -\frac{r}{c}] + g_{lm}^{(2)}(r) \partial_r H_c[l(l+1) + \iota^2, \iota(3+\iota), \iota-1, 3, \iota, -\frac{r}{c}] \right) \end{aligned} \quad (61)$$

where $f_{lm}^{(1,2)}$ and $g_{lm}^{(1,2)}$ are complex, rational functions of r and the frequency ω_{lm} . The functions $f_{lm}^{(1)}$ and $g_{lm}^{(1)}$ are

regular at the horizon, as expected. The functions $f_{lm}^{(2)}$ and $g_{lm}^{(2)}$ behave as $1/r$ in the $r \rightarrow 0$ limit.

We give explicit expressions for these function in Eqs. (C1)-(C3) of Appendix C. As before, the integration constants k_3 and k_4 will be chosen such that the boundary condition at the horizon in Eq. (51) is satisfied.

A. The Teukolsky-Starobinsky identities

We showed that by projecting the field equations at the horizon, we can economically solve not only the geometry of the horizon but also directly relate $\tilde{\Psi}_0$ and $\tilde{\Psi}_4$ everywhere: Given that the boundary conditions at the horizon already provide the relationship between these two quantities, which can then be used as the boundary conditions to solve their respective Teukolsky equations. Alternatively, we could have used the Teukolsky-Starobinsky identities to show the relationship between the quantities $\tilde{\Psi}_0$ and $\tilde{\Psi}_4$ [62, 63]. These identities are fourth-order partial differential equations that can be derived by differentiating three times the radial and evolution equations (A18a) and (A17d) using the Δ and D derivative operators respectively, and using the perturbative version of the Bianchi identities (A18) and (A17) to remove the dependence on $\tilde{\Psi}_1$, $\tilde{\Psi}_2$ and $\tilde{\Psi}_3$. This number of derivatives can be shown to be the minimum needed to derive a differential equation for $\tilde{\Psi}_0$ sourced by $\tilde{\Psi}_4$ only (apart from the background quantities), and the other way around. In this sense, the result that we obtained is stronger as it involves fewer derivatives to relate $\tilde{\Psi}_0$ and $\tilde{\Psi}_4$.

Here, we present the Teukolsky-Starobinsky identities without proof, as they have been discussed extensively in the literature (see for instance [64])

$$\mathfrak{p}^4[(r+c)^4\tilde{\Psi}_0] = \mathfrak{D}^4[(r+c)^4\tilde{\Psi}_4] + \frac{3}{2}c\mathcal{L}_\xi\tilde{\Psi}_4, \quad (62a)$$

$$\mathfrak{p}^4[(r+c)^4\tilde{\Psi}_4] = \mathfrak{D}^4[(r+c)^4\tilde{\Psi}_0] - \frac{3}{2}c\mathcal{L}_\xi\tilde{\Psi}_0. \quad (62b)$$

The thorn operator and its primed version are combinations of the directional derivatives. In particular,

$$\mathfrak{p}\eta = (D - p\epsilon - q\bar{\epsilon})\eta, \quad \mathfrak{p}'\eta = (\Delta + p\gamma + q\bar{\gamma})\eta = \Delta\eta, \quad (63)$$

where the last equality in the second expression follows because we choose a coordinate system and tetrad such that the vectors ℓ^μ , n^μ , and m^μ are parallel propagated along n^α and henceforth $\gamma = 0$. In Eq. (63), p and q are well defined for each spin-coefficient and Weyl scalar (see for instance, Ref. [64]), and determine the spin-weight $s = (p - q)/2$ and the boost-weight $b = (p + q)/2$ of each quantity. The operator \mathfrak{p} raises the boost of the quantity on which it acts. Hence, if Ψ_4 has spin-weight -2 and boost-weight -2, $\mathfrak{p}\Psi_4$ has the same spin-weight and boost-weight -1. Similarly Δ acts as a boost-lowering

operator. The operator \mathcal{L}_ξ in Eq. (62) is

$$\mathcal{L}_\xi = -(r+c)[\mu\mathfrak{p} + \rho\Delta + \frac{p}{2}\Psi_2 + \frac{q}{2}\bar{\Psi}_2], \quad (64)$$

which for a Schwarzschild background simplifies to

$$\mathcal{L}_\xi = -(r+c)[\mu\partial_v] = \partial_v. \quad (65)$$

In the following, we show that our solution (Eq. (53), together with the solutions of the Teukolsky equations for $\tilde{\Psi}_0$ and $\tilde{\Psi}_4$ in Eqs. (57) and (60)) automatically satisfies the Teukolsky-Starobinsky identities. Furthermore, we can use Eq. (62b) to rewrite the radial part of $\tilde{\Psi}_0$ (Eq. (61)) more compactly.

We start by showing that the solution we found for $\tilde{\Psi}_4$ in Eq. (57) using the data at the horizon is consistent with the solution for $\tilde{\Psi}_0$ in Eq. (60) through the first expression in Eq. (62). Recalling the action of the eth operator on the spin-weighted spherical harmonics

$$\mathfrak{D}_s Y_{lm} = \frac{\sqrt{(l-s)(l+s+1)}}{\sqrt{2}(r+c)} {}_{s+1}Y_{lm}, \quad (66)$$

that the spin-weighted spherical-harmonics satisfy ${}_s\tilde{Y}_{l,m} = (-1)^{s+m}Y_{l,-m}$, and collecting terms proportional to $e^{-i\omega v}$ and $e^{i\omega v}$, we can rewrite Eq. (62a) as

$$\begin{aligned} \Delta^4[(r+c)^4\tilde{\Psi}_0] &= \frac{1}{8\pi} \sum_{l,m} \left\{ \int d\omega e^{-i\omega v} X_{lm}^{(4)} \times \right. \\ &\quad ({}_2Y_{lm}[l(l+1)(l+2)(l-1)b_{lm}^- - (-1)^m 6ci\omega \bar{c}_{lm}^+] + \\ &\quad {}_2Y_{l,-m}[l(l+1)(l+2)(l-1)c_{lm}^- - (-1)^m 6ci\omega \bar{b}_{lm}^+] \\ &\quad + \int d\bar{\omega} e^{i\bar{\omega} v} \bar{X}_{lm}^{(4)} \times \\ &\quad ({}_2Y_{lm}[l(l+1)(l+2)(l-1)b_{lm}^+ + (-1)^m 6ci\bar{\omega} \bar{c}_{lm}^-] + \\ &\quad \left. {}_2Y_{l,-m}[l(l+1)(l+2)(l-1)c_{lm}^+ + (-1)^m 6ci\bar{\omega} \bar{b}_{lm}^-] \right\}. \end{aligned} \quad (67)$$

Plugging in the expressions for the constants b_{lm}^\pm and c_{lm}^\pm (54) into the equation above, we see that the terms proportional to ${}_2Y_{l,-m}$ vanish, thus yielding

$$\Delta^4[(r+c)^4 X_{lm}^{(0)}] = \frac{l^2(l-1)^2(l+1)^2(l+2)^2 + 36c^2\omega^2}{16c^4 i\omega(\kappa_{(l)}^2 + \omega^2)(2\kappa_{(l)} - i\omega)} X_{lm}^{(4)} \quad (68)$$

and its complex conjugate. Notice that this expression is independent of the coefficients a_{lm}^\pm and b_{lm}^\pm/c_{lm}^\pm , as it should be. This identity provides a fourth-order differential equation for the radial part of $\tilde{\Psi}_0$, which can be solved through the integration of the confluent Heun function. Eq. (68) can be shown to hold either by taking the derivatives of Eq. (61) or by using the properties of the Heun function [58, 59]. Similarly, it can also be

shown that the solutions we found for $\tilde{\Psi}_0$ and $\tilde{\Psi}_4$ satisfy the second Starobinsky identity (62b).

Given that we have already shown that the Teukolsky-Starobinsky identities are satisfied everywhere, we will use the second expression in Eq. (62) to write the radial part of $\tilde{\Psi}_0$ in Eq. (61) in a compact form. The idea is to obtain an expression for $X_{lm}^{(0)}$ in terms of a derivative operator acting on $X_{lm}^{(4)}$. Using that $\tilde{\Psi}_0$ is of the form of Eq. (60) with the radial function for $\tilde{\Psi}_0$ in (61) normalized at the horizon $X_{lm}^{(0)}(r=0) = 1$, and using Eq. (57), we can rewrite Eq. (62b) as

$$\begin{aligned} \mathfrak{p}^4[(r+c)^4\tilde{\Psi}_4] = & \frac{1}{2\pi} \sum_{l,m} \left(\int d\omega e^{-i\omega v} X_{lm}^{(0)} \times \right. \\ & \left[\frac{a_{lm}^-}{4} l(l+1)(l-1)(l+2)_{-2} Y_{lm} + \frac{3}{2} c(-1)^m i\omega \bar{a}_{l,m-2}^+ Y_{l,-m} \right] \\ & + \int d\bar{\omega} e^{i\bar{\omega} v} \bar{X}_{lm}^{(0)} \times \\ & \left. \left[\frac{a_{lm}^+}{4} l(l+1)(l-1)(l+2)_{-2} Y_{lm} - \frac{3}{2} c(-1)^m i\bar{\omega} \bar{a}_{l,m-2}^- Y_{l,-m} \right] \right) \end{aligned} \quad (69)$$

Using Eq. (54), the first term in brackets can be simplified to

$$c^4 i\omega (\kappa_{(l)}^2 + \omega^2) (2\kappa_{(l)} - i\omega) [b_{l,m-2}^- Y_{lm} + c_{l,m-2}^- Y_{l,-m}]. \quad (70)$$

Plugging in Eq. (69), the expression for $\tilde{\Psi}_4$ (57) and taking into account that our solution for $\tilde{\Psi}_4$ is a linear combination of two solutions of the Teukolsky equation, we can obtain the radial function $X_{lm}^{(0)}$ by separating this equation in two terms, one proportional to $e^{-i\omega v}$, and the other to $e^{i\bar{\omega} v}$. Simplifying, we obtain the following analytic expression for $X_{lm}^{(0)}$

$$X_{lm}^{(0)} = \frac{e^{i\omega v} \mathfrak{p}^4[(r+c)^4 e^{-i\omega v} X_{lm}^{(4)}]}{c^4 i\omega (\kappa_{(l)}^2 + \omega^2) (2\kappa_{(l)} - i\omega)}, \quad (71)$$

which is independent of v . Therefore, the full solution for $\tilde{\Psi}_0$ is

$$\begin{aligned} \tilde{\Psi}_0 = \frac{1}{2\pi} \sum_{l,m} {}_2Y_{lm} \left(\int d\omega \frac{a_{lm}^-}{c^4 i\omega (\kappa_{(l)}^2 + \omega^2) (2\kappa_{(l)} - i\omega)} \mathfrak{p}^4[(r+c)^4 e^{-i\omega v} X_{lm}^{(4)}] \right. \\ \left. - \int d\bar{\omega} \frac{a_{lm}^+}{c^4 i\bar{\omega} (\kappa_{(l)}^2 + \bar{\omega}^2) (2\kappa_{(l)} + i\bar{\omega})} \mathfrak{p}^4[(r+c)^4 e^{i\bar{\omega} v} \bar{X}_{lm}^{(4)}] \right). \end{aligned} \quad (72)$$

Notice that Eq. (72) is a solution of the Teukolsky equation for $\tilde{\Psi}_0$ in (49a) and satisfies the boundary condition in (51), i.e.,

$$\tilde{\Psi}_0 \triangleq \frac{1}{2\pi} \sum_{l,m} {}_2Y_{lm} \left(\int d\omega a_{lm}^- e^{-i\omega v} + \int d\bar{\omega} a_{lm}^+ e^{i\bar{\omega} v} \right) \quad (73)$$

as expected. It can be shown that the expressions that we found for $\tilde{\Psi}_0$ and $\tilde{\Psi}_4$ (Eqs. (57) and (72)) satisfy the Teukolsky-Starobinsky identities (62), as well as their decoupled version (see Eq. (66) in [64])

$$\begin{aligned} \mathfrak{p}^4[(r+c)^4 \Delta^4((r+c)^4 \tilde{\Psi}_0)] = \bar{\delta}^4((r+c)^4 \bar{\delta}^4[(r+c)^4 \tilde{\Psi}_0]) \\ - \frac{9}{4} c^2 \mathcal{L}_\xi^2 \tilde{\Psi}_0 \end{aligned} \quad (74a)$$

$$\begin{aligned} \Delta^4[(r+c)^4 \mathfrak{p}^4((r+c)^4 \tilde{\Psi}_4)] = \bar{\delta}^4((r+c)^4 \bar{\delta}^4[(r+c)^4 \tilde{\Psi}_4]) \\ - \frac{9}{4} c^2 \mathcal{L}_\xi^2 \tilde{\Psi}_4 \end{aligned} \quad (74b)$$

and are a solution of the Teukolsky equation (49). As a side remark, a solution of the Teukolsky-Starobinsky identities in Eq. (62) will automatically satisfy their decoupled version (Eq. (74)), but the converse is not true. Since the decoupled system in Eq. (74) is of eighth order and the coupled Starobinsky identities in Eq. (62) are only fourth order, there exist solutions of Eq. (74) which are not solutions of (62). Hence, that our solution satisfies the decoupled version of these identities in Eq. (74) is a priori trivial and is regarded solely as a consistency check. The same logic applies to the Teukolsky equation and the coupled Teukolsky-Starobinsky identities: A solution of the Teukolsky equations (49) will automatically satisfy the Teukolsky-Starobinsky identities in Eq. (62), but the converse is not true. This is why we need to check whether Eq. (60) satisfies the Teukolsky equation (49a).

In this discussion, we only used the Teukolsky-Starobinsky identities to check the consistency of our solution, as well as to rewrite the solution of the Teukolsky equation for $\tilde{\Psi}_0$ in a more convenient way. However, we would like to remark that the horizon equations (40) already provide the link between $\tilde{\Psi}_0$ and $\tilde{\Psi}_4$ on the horizon, and their radial dependence can be found directly by solving the Teukolsky equation for these two quantities (49). The Teukolsky-Starobinsky identities further imply that the two independent solutions of the radial Teukolsky equation (58) for $\tilde{\Psi}_4$ are linked to those of $\tilde{\Psi}_0$, i.e., if $k_1 = 0$ in Eq. (58), then the constant $k_3 = 0$ needs to vanish in Eq. (72).

V. BOUNDARY CONDITIONS AND QUASINORMAL MODES

So far we have solved the field equations on a null hypersurface, which represents the isolated horizon, slightly perturbed by an infalling flux specified by $\tilde{\Psi}_0$. Given this initial data at the null hypersurface and the radial dependence of $\tilde{\Psi}_0$ and $\tilde{\Psi}_4$ specified in the bulk (through the solution of the radial Teukolsky equations (49)), we can integrate the field equations everywhere to obtain the full

spacetime solution. Additional restrictions must be imposed to obtain the QNMs. There are two natural sets of conditions that select the QNMs. The usual formulation of QNMs requires purely outgoing waves from the domain both at the horizon and infinity. Alternatively, and that is the path we will take here, requiring that the solutions are analytic and stable towards the future (i.e., we discard growing modes) also selects the QNMs. In Sec. VB, we verify explicitly that the second set of boundary conditions indeed is consistent with only outgoing radiation at future null infinity, no incoming radiation from past null infinity and ingoing modes at the horizon.

A. QNMs

We start by analyzing the convergence of the two independent solutions (58) to the radial Teukolsky equation for $\tilde{\Psi}_4$ (49b). Using the coordinate shift

$$x = r + c \quad (75)$$

and the transformation

$$X_{lm}^{(4)} = e^{i\omega x} y(x) \quad (76)$$

we can rewrite Eq. (49b) in the form of Eq. (1) in Ref. [65]

$$x(x-c)y'' + [B_1 + B_2x]y' + [\omega^2 x(x-c) - 2\eta\omega(x-c) + B_3]y = 0 \quad (77)$$

with

$$B_1 = -3c, \quad B_2 = 6 - 2ic\omega, \quad \eta = 2i - c\omega, \quad (78a)$$

$$B_3 = 6 - l(l+1) - 7ic\omega + 2c^2\omega^2. \quad (78b)$$

Notice that these coefficients *differ* from the ones in Eq. (11) of Ref. [65] for the Schwarzschild geometry⁶. This difference is to be expected since we are using a different coordinate system from the usual one. Since a priori, it is not obvious the solution of the differential equation (77) with the coefficients (78) coincides with the one in Refs. [60, 65], we explicitly construct the series expansion representation of the two independent solutions for the radial part of $\tilde{\Psi}_4$ ($X_{lm}^{(4,1)}$ and $X_{lm}^{(4,2)}$) and analyze their eigenfrequencies.

The first solution of Eq. (77) can be written as a regular series expansion around the regular singular point of the differential equation at $x = c$ ($r = 0$) [65]

$$y(x) = e^{i\omega x} x^{-1+2ic\omega} \sum_{k=0}^{\infty} a_k \left(\frac{x-c}{x} \right)^k, \quad (79)$$

⁶ In Ref. [65], the wave equation for the Schwarzschild background is expressed in the form of the generalized wave equation (77) with $c = 1$ and the coefficients $B_1 = -(2s+1)$, $B_2 = 2(s+1-i\omega)$, $\eta = -\omega$, and $B_3 = 2\omega^2 - l(l+1) + s(s+1) - (2s+1)i\omega$. These coefficients can be extracted by inspection from Eq. (11) of Ref. [65]. For a gravitational perturbation $s = 2$.

where the coefficients of the series are given by Eqs. (40) and (41) in Ref. [65]

$$\alpha_0 a_1 + \beta_0 a_0 = 0, \quad \alpha_k a_{k+1} + \beta_k a_k + \gamma_k a_{k-1} = 0, \quad (80)$$

with

$$\alpha_k = (k+1)(3+k-2ic\omega) \quad (81a)$$

$$\beta_k = 3 - l(l+1) - 2k^2 + 4ic\omega + 8c^2\omega^2 + k(-2+8ic\omega) \quad (81b)$$

$$\gamma_k = (k-2ic\omega)(k-2-2ic\omega). \quad (81c)$$

Note that the coefficients a_k also depend on the l index explicitly (through β_k) and on the m, n indices implicitly through the QNM frequencies. To avoid cluttering of notation, we suppress these indices. Then, the first independent solution of Eq. (49b) admits the series expansion

$$X_{lm}^{(4,1)} = e^{2i\omega r} \left(\frac{r+c}{c} \right)^{-1+2ic\omega} \sum_{k=0}^{\infty} a_k \left(\frac{r}{r+c} \right)^k, \quad (82)$$

which is regular around $r = 0$. The coefficient $a_0 = 1$ in Eq. (79) is chosen to coincide with the normalization of the confluent Heun function (59). However, notice that the confluent Heun function only has an analytic representation in the domain $r \in [0, \infty)$ when the convergence of the series (82) is uniform [65]. This occurs when the frequency ω is a root of the infinite fraction [65]

$$0 = \beta_0 - \frac{\alpha_0 \gamma_1}{\beta_1 - \frac{\alpha_1 \gamma_2}{\beta_2 - \dots}}, \quad (83)$$

which for the differential equation (77) with the coefficients (78) yields the quasinormal mode (QNMs) frequencies $\omega = \omega_{lmn}^{\text{QNM}}$ (see Tab. 1 in Ref. [60]). It is customary to sort the roots of Eq. (83) according to their ascendent imaginary values using the index n , which denotes the overtone number. In other words, the first solution of the Teukolsky equation (49b) is in reality given by

$$H_c[(l-2)(l+3)+5\ell, 5\ell, 3-\ell, 3, \ell, -\frac{r}{c}] \delta(\omega - \omega_n^{\text{QNM}}), \quad (84)$$

where we have once more suppressed the l, m harmonic indices from the frequencies. Notice that it is quite remarkable that we find the QNM frequencies $\omega = \omega_n$ by solving Eq. (83) given that the coefficients (Eq. (78)) appearing in the generalized spheroidal wave equation (77) are different from those found by Leaver in [60, 65]. This happens because the coefficients entering the three-term recurrence relation Eq. (81a), which are also the ones appearing in the infinite fraction (83), give rise to the same eigenfrequencies as those reported in Refs. [60, 65].

The second independent solution of Eq. (49b) can be obtained from Eq. (77) by further using the transformation

$$y(x) = (x-c)^{-2+2ic\omega} g(x), \quad (85)$$

which yields the following differential equation for $g(x)$

$$x(x-c)g'' + [\tilde{B}_1 + \tilde{B}_2 x]g' + [\omega^2 x(x-c) - 2\tilde{\eta}\omega(x-c) + \tilde{B}_3]g = 0 \quad (86)$$

with

$$\tilde{B}_1 = -3c, \quad \tilde{B}_2 = 2(1 + ic\omega), \quad \tilde{\eta} = 2i - c\omega \quad (87a)$$

$$\tilde{B}_3 = -l(l+1) - ic\omega + 2c^2\omega^2. \quad (87b)$$

The second independent solution of Eq. (49b)⁷ can be expanded in a regular series at the horizon using Eqs. (49)-(51) of Ref. [60], which yields

$$g(x) = e^{-i\omega x} x^{-3-2ic\omega} \sum_{k=0}^{\infty} b_k \left(\frac{x-c}{x}\right)^k \quad (88)$$

with

$$\tilde{\alpha}_0 b_1 + \tilde{\beta}_0 b_0 = 0, \quad \tilde{\alpha}_k b_{k+1} + \tilde{\beta}_k b_k + \tilde{\gamma}_k b_{k-1} = 0, \quad (89)$$

and

$$\tilde{\alpha}_k = (k+1)(k-1+2ic\omega) \quad (90a)$$

$$\tilde{\beta}_k = 3 - l(l+1) - 2k(k+1) - 4ic\omega(1+2k) + 8c^2\omega^2 \quad (90b)$$

$$\tilde{\gamma}_k = (k+2ic\omega)(k+2+2ic\omega). \quad (90c)$$

The convergence of the series (88) is uniform when the sum $\sum_k b_k$ is finite [65]. This occurs for the roots of equation (83) (replacing the coefficients α_k , β_k and γ_k by their counterparts in Eq. (90)). The eigenfrequencies turn out to be the complex conjugate of the QNM frequencies. This can be seen by comparing Eqs. (90) and (81a). The following relationship holds between these coefficients

$$\tilde{\beta}_k = \bar{\beta}_k, \quad \tilde{\alpha}_k \tilde{\gamma}_{k+1} = \bar{\alpha}_k \bar{\gamma}_{k+1}, \quad (91)$$

so the equation for the eigenfrequencies of the second solution is the complex conjugate of Eq. (83). Naturally, the solutions of this equation are the complex conjugates of the QNM frequencies. Then, the second solution of Eq. (49b) is

$$\delta(\omega - \bar{\omega}_n^{\text{QNM}}) \left(-\frac{r}{c}\right)^{-2+2ic\omega} \left(\frac{r+c}{c}\right)^{-3-2ic\omega} \sum_{k=0}^{\infty} b_k \left(\frac{r}{r+c}\right)^k \quad (92)$$

or using the confluent Heun function expression

$$\delta(\omega - \bar{\omega}_n^{\text{QNM}}) \left(-\frac{r}{c}\right)^{-2+\iota} H_c[l(l+1)+\iota^2, \iota(3+\iota), \iota-1, 3, \iota, -\frac{r}{c}]. \quad (93)$$

Therefore, the radial function $X_{lm}^{(4)}$ reads

$$\begin{aligned} X_{lm}^{(4)}(r) &= \sum_n k_{lmn}^{(1)} \delta(\omega_{lm} - \omega_{lmn}^{\text{QNM}}) e^{2i\omega_{lm} r} \left(\frac{r+c}{c}\right)^{-1+2ic\omega_{lm}} \sum_{k=0}^{\infty} a_k \left(\frac{r}{r+c}\right)^k \\ &+ \sum_n k_{lmn}^{(2)} \delta(\omega_{lm} - \bar{\omega}_{lmn}^{\text{QNM}}) \left(-\frac{r}{c}\right)^{-2+2ic\omega_{lm}} \left(\frac{r+c}{c}\right)^{-3-2ic\omega_{lm}} \sum_{k=0}^{\infty} b_k \left(\frac{r}{r+c}\right)^k \\ &= \sum_n k_{lmn}^{(1)} \delta(\omega_{lm} - \omega_{lmn}^{\text{QNM}}) H_c[(l-2)(l+3) + 10ic\omega_{lm}, 10ic\omega_{lm}, 3 - 2ic\omega_{lm}, 3, 2ic\omega_{lm}, -\frac{r}{c}] \\ &+ \sum_n k_{lmn}^{(2)} \delta(\omega_{lm} - \bar{\omega}_{lmn}^{\text{QNM}}) \left(-\frac{r}{c}\right)^{-2+2ic\omega_{lm}} H_c[l(l+1) - 4c^2\omega_{lm}^2, 2ic\omega_{lm}(3+2ic\omega_{lm}), 2ic\omega_{lm} - 1, 3, 2ic\omega_{lm}, -\frac{r}{c}], \end{aligned} \quad (94)$$

where $k_{lmn}^{(1,2)}$ are complex, dimensionless integration constants. Recall that we fixed the normalization of the radial solution of $\tilde{\Psi}_4$ to $X_{lm}^{(4)}(r=0) = 1$ in order to high-

light the role of the boundary conditions at the back hole horizon. Hence, using the second expression in Eq. (94) and the fact that the confluent Heun functions are normalized as in Eq. (59), it follows that the integration constants $k_{lmn}^{(1,2)}$ need to satisfy

$$\lim_{r \rightarrow 0} \sum_n \left(k_{lmn}^{(1)} + k_{lmn}^{(2)} \left(-\frac{r}{c}\right)^{-2+2ic\omega_{lmn}^{\text{QNM}}} \right) = 1. \quad (95)$$

⁷ Notice that these two solutions Eqs. (84) and (93) of Eq. (49b) are independent. This can be seen by computing the Wronskian of the two solutions.

This expression emphasizes that the second solution of the radial Teukolsky equation $X_{lm}^{(4,2)}$ is divergent at the horizon in these coordinates. Hence, for the boundary condition in Eq. (95) to be satisfied $k_{lmn}^{(2)} = 0 \forall n$ and $\text{Re}[\sum_n k_{lmn}^{(1)}] = 1, \text{Im}[\sum_n k_{lmn}^{(1)}] = 0$. Keeping only the regular solution at the horizon is reasonable in our case because we have explicitly constructed a coordinate system that is horizon penetrating, and therefore should be regular at the horizon. However, to keep the discussion

general, we shall not set $k_{lmn}^{(2)} = 0$ yet. We will keep these modes in our solution of $\tilde{\Psi}_4$ to show that these modes correspond to unstable perturbations and are thus not physical.

The series expansions for the two independent solutions of $\bar{X}_{lm}^{(4)}$ can be found analogously for $\bar{\omega}$. Combining the above discussion with Eq. (57) and integrating over ω and $\bar{\omega}$ yields

$$\begin{aligned} \tilde{\Psi}_4 = \frac{1}{2\pi} \sum_{lm} \sum_n \left[& (b_{lmn}^{-(1)} {}_{-2}Y_{lm} + c_{lmn}^{-(1)} {}_{-2}Y_{l,-m}) e^{-i\omega_{lmn}^{\text{QNM}} v} e^{2i\omega_{lmn}^{\text{QNM}} r} \left(\frac{r+c}{c}\right)^{-1+2ic\omega_{lmn}^{\text{QNM}}} \sum_{k=0}^{\infty} a_k \left(\frac{r}{r+c}\right)^k \\ & + (b_{lmn}^{-(2)} {}_{-2}Y_{lm} + c_{lmn}^{-(2)} {}_{-2}Y_{l,-m}) e^{-i\bar{\omega}_{lmn}^{\text{QNM}} v} \left(-\frac{r}{c}\right)^{2ic\bar{\omega}_{lmn}^{\text{QNM}}-2} \left(\frac{r+c}{c}\right)^{-3-2ic\bar{\omega}_{lmn}^{\text{QNM}}} \sum_{k=0}^{\infty} b_k \left(\frac{r}{r+c}\right)^k \\ & + (b_{lmn}^{+(1)} {}_{-2}Y_{lm} + c_{lmn}^{+(1)} {}_{-2}Y_{l,-m}) e^{i\bar{\omega}_{lmn}^{\text{QNM}} v} e^{-2i\bar{\omega}_{lmn}^{\text{QNM}} r} \left(\frac{r+c}{c}\right)^{-1-2ic\bar{\omega}_{lmn}^{\text{QNM}}} \sum_{k=0}^{\infty} \bar{a}_k \left(\frac{r}{r+c}\right)^k \\ & + (b_{lmn}^{+(2)} {}_{-2}Y_{lm} + c_{lmn}^{+(2)} {}_{-2}Y_{l,-m}) e^{i\omega_{lmn}^{\text{QNM}} v} \left(-\frac{r}{c}\right)^{-2ic\omega_{lmn}^{\text{QNM}}-2} \left(\frac{r+c}{c}\right)^{-3+2ic\omega_{lmn}^{\text{QNM}}} \sum_{k=0}^{\infty} \bar{b}_k \left(\frac{r}{r+c}\right)^k \Big], \end{aligned} \quad (96)$$

or in terms of the confluent Heun functions

$$\begin{aligned} \tilde{\Psi}_4 = \frac{1}{2\pi} \sum_{lmn} \left[& (b_{lmn}^{-(1)} {}_{-2}Y_{lm} + c_{lmn}^{-(1)} {}_{-2}Y_{l,-m}) e^{-i\omega_{lmn}^{\text{QNM}} v} H_c[(l-2)(l+3) + 10ic\omega_{lmn}^{\text{QNM}}, 10ic\omega_{lmn}^{\text{QNM}}, 3 - 2ic\omega_{lmn}^{\text{QNM}}, 3, 2ic\omega_{lmn}^{\text{QNM}}, -\frac{r}{c}] \\ & + (b_{lmn}^{-(2)} {}_{-2}Y_{lm} + c_{lmn}^{-(2)} {}_{-2}Y_{l,-m}) e^{-i\bar{\omega}_{lmn}^{\text{QNM}} v} \left(-\frac{r}{c}\right)^{2ic\bar{\omega}_{lmn}^{\text{QNM}}-2} H_c[l(l+1) + 4c^2\omega_{lm}^2, 2ic\omega_{lm}(3 + 2ic\omega_{lm}), 2ic\omega_{lm} - 1, 3, 2ic\omega_{lm}, -\frac{r}{c}] \\ & + (b_{lmn}^{+(1)} {}_{-2}Y_{lm} + c_{lmn}^{+(1)} {}_{-2}Y_{l,-m}) e^{i\bar{\omega}_{lmn}^{\text{QNM}} v} H_c[(l-2)(l+3) - 10ic\bar{\omega}_{lmn}^{\text{QNM}}, -10ic\bar{\omega}_{lmn}^{\text{QNM}}, 3 + 2ic\bar{\omega}_{lmn}^{\text{QNM}}, 3, -2ic\bar{\omega}_{lmn}^{\text{QNM}}, -\frac{r}{c}] \\ & + (b_{lmn}^{+(2)} {}_{-2}Y_{lm} + c_{lmn}^{+(2)} {}_{-2}Y_{l,-m}) e^{i\omega_{lmn}^{\text{QNM}} v} \left(-\frac{r}{c}\right)^{-2ic\omega_{lmn}^{\text{QNM}}-2} \\ & \quad H_c[l(l+1) - 4c^2\bar{\omega}_{lm}^2, -2ic\bar{\omega}_{lm}(3 - 2ic\bar{\omega}_{lm}), -2ic\bar{\omega}_{lm} - 1, 3, -2ic\bar{\omega}_{lm}, -\frac{r}{c}] \Big] \end{aligned} \quad (97)$$

where we have defined

$$b_{lmn}^{-(1,2)} = k_{lmn}^{(1,2)} b_{lm}^-, \quad c_{lmn}^{-(1,2)} = k_{lmn}^{(1,2)} c_{lm}^-. \quad (98a)$$

$$b_{lmn}^{+(1,2)} = \bar{k}_{lmn}^{(1,2)} b_{lm}^+, \quad c_{lmn}^{+(1,2)} = \bar{k}_{lmn}^{(1,2)} c_{lm}^+. \quad (98b)$$

From Eq. (96), it is straightforward to analyze the asymptotic behavior of $\tilde{\Psi}_4$. Let us first consider the solution at future null infinity \mathcal{I}^+ by taking the limit $v \rightarrow \infty$ (with $r = \text{cnt}$). In this limit, we need to study the be-

havior of

$$\begin{aligned} \lim_{\substack{v \rightarrow \infty \\ r = \text{cnt}}} \tilde{\Psi}_4 \sim & b_{lmn}^{-(1)} {}_{-2}Y_{lm} e^{-i\omega_{lmn}^{\text{QNM}} v} + c_{lmn}^{-(1)} {}_{-2}Y_{l,-m} e^{-i\omega_{lmn}^{\text{QNM}} v} \\ & + b_{lmn}^{-(2)} {}_{-2}Y_{lm} e^{-i\bar{\omega}_{lmn}^{\text{QNM}} v} + c_{lmn}^{-(2)} {}_{-2}Y_{l,-m} e^{-i\bar{\omega}_{lmn}^{\text{QNM}} v} \\ & + b_{lmn}^{+(1)} {}_{-2}Y_{lm} e^{i\bar{\omega}_{lmn}^{\text{QNM}} v} + c_{lmn}^{+(1)} {}_{-2}Y_{l,-m} e^{i\bar{\omega}_{lmn}^{\text{QNM}} v} \\ & + b_{lmn}^{+(2)} {}_{-2}Y_{lm} e^{i\omega_{lmn}^{\text{QNM}} v} + c_{lmn}^{+(2)} {}_{-2}Y_{l,-m} e^{i\omega_{lmn}^{\text{QNM}} v}, \end{aligned} \quad (99)$$

where the constant factors coming from the evaluation of the radial functions at $r = \text{cnt} \neq 0$ have been omitted. Recalling that the sum over the harmonic index m runs from $-l, \dots, l$, we can split this sum in two contributions $m = 0$ and $m \neq 0$. For $m = 0$ we can factor out the spin-weighted spherical harmonic contribution trivially. For

$m \neq 0$, we relabel the sum over $m \neq 0$ in the even terms of Eq. (99), so that we can factor out the spin-weighted spherical harmonic ${}_{-2}Y_{lm}$. To impose physical boundary conditions for this solution, it is important to recall some properties of the QNM frequencies. Given a quasinormal mode frequency

$$\omega_{lmn}^{\text{QNM}} = \text{Re}[w] + i\text{Im}[w], \quad (100)$$

- Its imaginary part is negative $\text{Im}[w] < 0$.
- We will follow the convention that $m \geq 0$, $\text{Re}[w] > 0$ and for $m < 0$, $\text{Re}[w] < 0$ for the regular modes (notice that for the mirror modes the opposite holds).
- For $m \neq 0$, $\bar{\omega}_{lmn}^{\text{QNM}} = -\omega_{l-mn}^{\text{QNM}}$.

With these properties, we can impose the stability of the modes towards the future in Eq. (99). For $m = 0$, Eq. (99) simplifies to

$$\begin{aligned} \lim_{\substack{v \rightarrow \infty \\ r = \text{cnt}, m=0}} \tilde{\Psi}_4 \propto & (b_{l0n}^{-(1)} + c_{l0n}^{-(1)}) e^{-i\omega_{l0n}^{\text{QNM}} v} \\ & + (b_{l0n}^{-(2)} + c_{l0n}^{-(2)}) e^{-i\bar{\omega}_{l0n}^{\text{QNM}} v} \\ & + (b_{l0n}^{+(1)} + c_{l0n}^{+(1)}) e^{i\bar{\omega}_{l0n}^{\text{QNM}} v} \\ & + (b_{l0n}^{+(2)} + c_{l0n}^{+(2)}) e^{i\omega_{l0n}^{\text{QNM}} v}. \end{aligned} \quad (101)$$

Separating the frequency $\omega_{l0n}^{\text{QNM}}$ in its real and imaginary parts, we see that the first and third terms in Eq. (101) are stable at \mathcal{I}^+ since the real part is a negative exponential, i.e.,

$$\lim_{\substack{v \rightarrow \infty \\ r = \text{cnt}, m=0}} e^{-i\omega_{l0n}^{\text{QNM}} v} = \lim_{\substack{v \rightarrow \infty \\ r = \text{cnt}, m=0}} e^{\text{Im}[\omega_{l0n}^{\text{QNM}}]v} e^{-i\text{Re}[\omega_{l0n}^{\text{QNM}}]v} \rightarrow 0, \quad (102)$$

and these modes decay exponentially as $v \rightarrow \infty$. On the contrary, the second and fourth terms in Eq. (101) are unstable given that they grow exponentially in the limit $v \rightarrow \infty$

$$\lim_{\substack{v \rightarrow \infty \\ r = \text{cnt}, m=0}} e^{i\omega_{l0n}^{\text{QNM}} v} = \lim_{\substack{v \rightarrow \infty \\ r = \text{cnt}, m=0}} e^{-\text{Im}[\omega_{l0n}^{\text{QNM}}]v} e^{i\text{Re}[\omega_{l0n}^{\text{QNM}}]v} \rightarrow \infty. \quad (103)$$

Hence, to impose physical boundary conditions we need to set

$$b_{l0n}^{\pm(2)} + c_{l0n}^{\pm(2)} = k_{l0m}^{(2)} (b_{l0}^{\pm} + c_{l0}^{\pm}) = 0. \quad (104)$$

This can be attained by either restricting the constants a_{l0}^{\pm} (see Eq. (54)) or by setting $k_{l0n}^{(2)} = 0$ in Eq. (58). Since we wish to keep the perturbation as general as possible we choose the last option, which yields

$$b_{l0n}^{-(2)} = c_{l0n}^{-(2)} = b_{l0n}^{+(2)} = c_{l0n}^{+(2)} = 0. \quad (105)$$

For the $m \neq 0$ case, Eq. (96) simplifies to

$$\begin{aligned} \lim_{\substack{v \rightarrow \infty \\ r = \text{cnt}, m \neq 0}} \tilde{\Psi}_4 \propto & (b_{lmn}^{-(1)} + c_{l-mn}^{+(1)}) e^{-i\omega_{lmn}^{\text{QNM}} v} \\ & + (b_{lmn}^{-(2)} + c_{l-mn}^{+(2)}) e^{-i\bar{\omega}_{lmn}^{\text{QNM}} v} \\ & + (b_{lmn}^{+(1)} + c_{l-mn}^{-(1)}) e^{i\bar{\omega}_{lmn}^{\text{QNM}} v} \\ & + (b_{lmn}^{+(2)} + c_{l-mn}^{-(2)}) e^{i\omega_{lmn}^{\text{QNM}} v}, \end{aligned} \quad (106)$$

where we have used $\bar{\omega}_{lmn}^{\text{QNM}} = -\omega_{l-mn}^{\text{QNM}}$ to obtain the same exponential terms that we had for the case $m = 0$. Using the same reasoning as before, we only keep stable modes on \mathcal{I}^+ , so we need to set

$$b_{lmn}^{\mp(2)} + c_{l-mn}^{\pm(2)} = k_{lmn}^{(2)} b_{lm}^{\mp} + k_{l-mn}^{(2)} c_{l-m}^{\pm} = 0. \quad (107)$$

In order not to restrict the form of the perturbation, we choose again $k_{lmn}^{(2)} = 0$, which yields

$$b_{l0n}^{-(2)} = c_{l0n}^{-(2)} = b_{l0n}^{+(2)} = c_{l0n}^{+(2)} = 0. \quad (108)$$

Further, at spatial infinity ($v \rightarrow \infty$ and $r \rightarrow \infty$), $\tilde{\Psi}_4$ scales as

$$\begin{aligned} \lim_{v, r \rightarrow \infty} \tilde{\Psi}_4 \propto & \frac{1}{r} b_{lmn}^{-(1)} {}_{-2}Y_{lm} e^{i\omega_{lmn}^{\text{QNM}} (-v+2r+2c \log r/c)} \\ & + \frac{1}{r} c_{lmn}^{-(1)} {}_{-2}Y_{l,-m} e^{i\omega_{lmn}^{\text{QNM}} (-v+2r+2c \log r/c)} \\ & + \frac{1}{r} b_{lmn}^{+(1)} {}_{-2}Y_{lm} e^{-i\bar{\omega}_{lmn}^{\text{QNM}} (-v+2r+2c \log r/c)} \\ & + \frac{1}{r} c_{lmn}^{+(1)} {}_{-2}Y_{l,-m} e^{-i\bar{\omega}_{lmn}^{\text{QNM}} (-v+2r+2c \log r/c)}. \end{aligned} \quad (109)$$

These direct ($\propto e^{-i\omega_{lmn}^{\text{QNM}} v}$) and mirror ($\propto e^{i\bar{\omega}_{lmn}^{\text{QNM}} v}$) terms correspond to outgoing modes at spatial infinity. Given the relationship between the gravitational wave strain and $\tilde{\Psi}_4$, we find outgoing gravitational radiation at \mathcal{I}^+ .

The same discussion goes through for $\tilde{\Psi}_0$. Starting from the radial Teukolsky equation (49a) we can again use the coordinate $x = r + c$ and perform the transformation

$$X_{lm}^{(0)} = e^{i\omega x} (x-c)^a x^b y(x), \quad a = 0, 2+2i\omega, \quad b = -2, -4 \quad (110)$$

to rewrite Eq. (49a) in the form of Eq. (77). Recall that the Teukolsky equation is a second-order differential equation, so it only has two independent solutions. How is then possible that we have these four transformations that leave the differential equation in the form of a generalized wave equation? The transformation with $a = 0$ and $b = -2, -4$ selects the first independent solution of the Teukolsky equation for $\tilde{\Psi}_0$, while $a = 2 + 2i\omega$ and $b = -2, -4$ selects the second solution. The existence of two transformations for a single solution of the Teukolsky equation shows a certain degeneracy of this method that was already hinted at in the discussion for $\tilde{\Psi}_4$: We

can have generalized wave equations with different coefficients B_i , η that nonetheless are solved by the same three-term recurrence relation. This is the case for the transformations $a = 0$ and $b = -2, -4$. The series representation for $X_{lm}^{(0,1)}$ that we obtain (using either value of b) is unique. For the sake of brevity, we only discuss the case $a = 0$, $b = -4$ for the first solution of Eq. (49a). The above transformation yields Eq. (77) with

$$B'_1 = c, \quad B'_2 = -2(1 + ic\omega), \quad \eta' = -2i - c\omega \quad (111)$$

$$B'_3 = 2 - l - l^2 + 5ic\omega + 2c^2\omega^2 \quad (112)$$

Using Eqs.(39)-(42) of Ref. [65], we can write the expansion of the first solution of $X_{l,m}^{(0)}$ as

$$X_{lm}^{(0,1)} = e^{2i\omega r} \left(\frac{r+c}{c} \right)^{-5+2ic\omega} \sum_{k=0}^{\infty} a'_k \left(\frac{r}{r+c} \right)^k, \quad (113)$$

where the coefficients a'_k satisfy Eq. (80) and the coefficients α'_k , β'_k and γ'_k are

$$\alpha'_k = (k+1)(k-1-2ic\omega) \quad (114a)$$

$$\beta'_k = 3 - l - l^2 - 2k^2 + 4ic\omega + 8c^2\omega^2 - 2k + 8ick\omega \quad (114b)$$

$$\gamma'_k = (k-2ic\omega)(k+2-2ic\omega). \quad (114c)$$

The series $\sum_k a'_k$ is finite when the frequencies are the QNM frequencies $\omega = \omega_n$. We again obtain this set of eigenfrequencies because the algebraic equation given by

the infinite fraction (83) is the same that we obtained for the first solution of $\tilde{\Psi}_4$. This occurs because the coefficients α'_k , β'_k and γ'_k are related with α_k , β_k and γ_k as follows

$$\beta'_k = \beta_k, \quad \alpha'_k \gamma'_{k+1} = \alpha_k \gamma_{k+1}. \quad (115)$$

Notice that this discussion constitutes proof that both $\tilde{\Psi}_0$ and $\tilde{\Psi}_4$ can be decomposed using the same set of eigenfrequencies, namely the QNM frequencies. Further, this is independent of the relationship between these two quantities at the horizon and the Teukolsky-Starobinsky identities.

The coefficient $a'_0 = 1$ is chosen so that Eq. (113) coincides with the first term in the small r limit expansion of Eq. (59), i.e.,

$$\tilde{\Psi}_0^{(1)} = 1 - \frac{2 + l(l+1) + 2ic\omega}{1 + 2ic\omega} + O(r^2). \quad (116)$$

Given that $\tilde{\Psi}_0$ and $\tilde{\Psi}_4$ are related through the Teukolsky-Starobinsky identities and that $k_{lmn}^{(2)}$ was set to zero by requiring the stability of the solution, the second independent radial solution $X_{lm}^{(0,2)}$ will also vanish.

Defining

$$a_{lmn}^{-(1)} = k_{lmn}^{(1)} a_{lm}^-, \quad a_{lmn}^{+(1)} = \bar{k}_{lmn}^{(1)} a_{lm}^+ \quad (117)$$

and taking into account that we have already set $k_{lmn}^{(2)} = 0$, $\tilde{\Psi}_0$ has the series expansion

$$\begin{aligned} \tilde{\Psi}_0 = \frac{1}{2\pi} \sum_{l,m,n} \left(a_{lmn}^{-(1)} e^{-i\omega_{lmn}^{\text{QNM}} v} e^{2i\omega_{lmn}^{\text{QNM}} r} \left(\frac{r+c}{c} \right)^{-5+2ic\omega_{lmn}^{\text{QNM}}} \sum_{k=0}^{\infty} a'_k \left(\frac{r}{r+c} \right)^k \right. \\ \left. + a_{lmn}^{+(1)} e^{i\bar{\omega}_{lmn}^{\text{QNM}} v} e^{-2i\bar{\omega}_{lmn}^{\text{QNM}} r} \left(\frac{r+c}{c} \right)^{-5-2i\bar{c}\omega_{lmn}^{\text{QNM}}} \sum_{k=0}^{\infty} \bar{a}'_k \left(\frac{r}{r+c} \right)^k \right) {}_2Y_{lm}. \end{aligned} \quad (118)$$

From this expression, we can evaluate the asymptotic behavior of $\tilde{\Psi}_0$ at spatial infinity

$$\begin{aligned} \lim_{v, r \rightarrow \infty} \tilde{\Psi}_0 \propto \frac{1}{r^5} a_{lmn}^{-(1)} e^{i\omega_{lmn}^{\text{QNM}}(-v+2r+2c \ln r/c)} \\ + \frac{1}{r^5} a_{lmn}^{+(1)} e^{-i\bar{\omega}_{lmn}^{\text{QNM}}(-v+2r+2c \ln r/c)} \end{aligned} \quad (119)$$

Notice that in Eq. (119) the modes decay in the future $v \rightarrow \infty$. Further, at i^0 ($r \rightarrow \infty$ and $v \rightarrow \infty$) $\tilde{\Psi}_0$ decays much faster than $\tilde{\Psi}_4$. The same holds for \mathcal{I}^+ , where the gravitational degrees of freedom are therefore specified by $\tilde{\Psi}_4$.

Summarizing, the above discussion shows that for an asymptotically flat spacetime with ingoing radiation at the horizon and outgoing radiation at infinity, we find

the following solution for $\tilde{\Psi}_0$

$$\begin{aligned} \tilde{\Psi}_0 = \frac{1}{2\pi} \sum_{l,m} \sum_{n=0}^{\infty} {}_2Y_{lm} \left(\frac{a_{lmn}^{-(1)} \mathfrak{b}^4[(r+c)^4 e^{-i\omega_{lmn}^{\text{QNM}} v} H_{lmn}]}{c^4 i \omega_{lmn} (\kappa_{(l)}^2 + \omega_{lmn}^2) (2\kappa_{(l)} - i\omega_{lmn})} \right. \\ \left. - \frac{a_{lmn}^+ \mathfrak{b}^4[(r+c)^4 e^{i\bar{\omega}_{lmn}^{\text{QNM}} v} \bar{H}_{lmn}]}{c^4 i \bar{\omega}_{lmn} (\bar{\kappa}_{(l)}^2 + \bar{\omega}_{lmn}^2) (2\bar{\kappa}_{(l)} + i\bar{\omega}_{lmn})} \right). \end{aligned} \quad (120)$$

where the index n denotes the overtone number, $\omega_n = \omega_{lmn}^{\text{QNM}}$ are the QNM frequencies for each l, m , and H_{lmn} is a shortcut for

$$\begin{aligned} H_{lmn} = H_c[(l-2)(l+3) + 10ic\omega_{lmn}, \\ 10ic\omega_{lmn}, 3 - 2ic\omega_{lmn}, 3, 2ic\omega_{lmn}, -\frac{r}{c}]. \end{aligned} \quad (121)$$

At the horizon, $\tilde{\Psi}_0$ takes the values

$$\tilde{\Psi}_0 \triangleq \frac{1}{2\pi} \sum_{l,m,n} {}_2Y_{lm} (a_{lmn}^- e^{-i\omega_n v} + a_{lmn}^+ e^{i\bar{\omega}_n v}) \quad (122)$$

where the coefficients a_{lmn}^\pm are defined in Eq. (117) and the inverse relation is given by

$$a_{lm}^\pm = \sum_n a_{lmn}^\pm \delta(\omega - \omega_{lmn}^{\text{QNM}}). \quad (123)$$

Similarly, the perturbation to $\tilde{\Psi}_4$ is given by

$$\begin{aligned} \tilde{\Psi}_4 = \frac{1}{2\pi} \sum_{l,m,n} & \left([b_{lmn}^{-(1)} - {}_2Y_{lm} + c_{lmn}^{-(1)} - {}_2Y_{l-m}] e^{-i\omega_n v} H_{lmn} \right. \\ & \left. + [b_{lmn}^{+(1)} - {}_2Y_{lm} + c_{lmn}^{+(1)} - {}_2Y_{l-m}] e^{i\bar{\omega}_n v} \bar{H}_{lmn} \right). \end{aligned} \quad (124)$$

In this section we have shown that imposing separability, analyticity and stability of the radial solution describing a quasi-isolated horizon yields the late stages of the ringdown, given that the solution has an expansion in terms of QNM frequencies. In this construction, we did not impose the standard outgoing radiation condition. Nevertheless, as we discuss next, our solutions naturally satisfy these.

B. Boundary conditions

As highlighted in Sec. II A, the QNM frequencies are often obtained by mapping the gravitational wave equation (e.g., the Regge-Wheeler/Zerilli or Teukolsky equations) to an eigenvalue problem with the following boundary conditions:

- No incoming radiation from \mathcal{I}^- ;
- Only ingoing/outgoing modes at $\mathcal{H}/\mathcal{I}^+$.

These boundary conditions discard the continuous spectrum of solutions to the wave-type equation, leaving only the discrete spectrum of QNM frequencies as the solution to the eigenvalue problem the differential equation is mapped to. Our solution also satisfies these boundary conditions, although we have not imposed them explicitly to arrive at the ringdown solution we presented. In fact, selecting analytic and stable solutions in the limit $v \rightarrow \infty$ already discards the unphysical outgoing/ingoing modes at the horizon/future null infinity. In the following, we show explicitly that this is indeed the case.

We start by discussing the absence of incoming radiation from \mathcal{I}^- . Given that the perturbed tetrad vectors are parallel propagated along n , we can use the perturbed tetrad discussed in Sec. III to naturally define a Bondi frame at \mathcal{I}^- , which has been attached to our spacetime manifold (see Fig. 3). The Bondi frame, denoted by a

subindex B is related to the perturbed spacetime tetrad through a conformal factor Ω (that vanishes on \mathcal{I}^-)

$$\ell_B^\mu = l^\mu, \quad n_B^\mu = \Omega^2 n^\mu, \quad m_B^\mu = \Omega^2 m^\mu. \quad (125)$$

For the moment, we will not need the particular form of the perturbed spacetime tetrad vectors, we have used the fact that they are parallel propagated along n to establish the connection between the tetrad at the horizon and that at \mathcal{I}^- , as we represent in Fig. 3. In Ref. [66], it was argued that the Weyl scalar Ψ_0 in an asymptotically flat spacetime *in the past*⁸ should decay along a past-directed null geodesics as

$$\Psi_0 = \Psi_0^{(0)} \Omega + \Psi_0^{(1)} \Omega^2 + O(\Omega^3), \quad (126)$$

where $\Psi_0^{(0)}$ is the value of Ψ_0 at \mathcal{I}^- and subsequent terms represent the coefficients of the Taylor expansion along the vector n (away from \mathcal{I}^- and into the spacetime). Notice that the discussion in Ref. [66] was non-perturbative, so the above argument is general (as long as the structure of \mathcal{I}^- is available) and should also apply to our example of a radiative perturbation. However, to be able to use the results in Ref. [66], we need to establish the connection between the conformal factor Ω and our coordinate system. Taking into account that we defined the coordinate r as the affine parameter along the past directed null geodesic with tangent vector $-n$, it follows that $\Omega = -1/r$. This means, in particular, that we can identify the coefficients in the Taylor expansion away from \mathcal{I}^- in Eq. (126) by expanding our perturbative solution for $\tilde{\Psi}_0$ in Eq. (72) in powers of $1/r$. Using Eq. (113), it follows that our ringdown solution has

$$\Psi_0^{(0)} = 0, \quad \Psi_0^{(I)} = 0, \quad I = 1, \dots, 4, \quad (127)$$

with $\Psi_0^{(5)}$ the first coefficient in the expansion that is nonvanishing.

In Ref. [66], it was argued that the sufficient conditions for the absence of incoming radiation through \mathcal{I}^- are that i) Ψ_0 decays at least as fast as $\Psi_0 \sim 1/r^3$ in the $r \rightarrow \infty$ limit, i.e., that $\Psi_0^{(0)} = \Psi_0^{(1)} = 0$, and ii) Ψ_1 satisfies the peeling condition at \mathcal{I}^- , i.e., it has the asymptotic behavior $\Psi_1 = \Psi_1^{(0)} \Omega^2$. No conditions on the fall-off of the Weyl scalars Ψ_I $I = 2, 3, 4$ were imposed to guarantee the absence of incoming radiation from \mathcal{I}^- .

From Eq. (127), we see that in our particular ringdown solution $\tilde{\Psi}_0$ satisfies an even sharper decay, since $\tilde{\Psi}_0^J$, $J = 2, 3, 4$ also vanish. Hence, the first condition is trivially satisfied for our ringdown solution. The second condition requires more work to assess: It can be explicitly checked by integrating the radial field equations, radial Bianchi identities and radial frame differential equations (Eqs. (A16), (A18) and (A22)). This can

⁸ The only assumption in Ref. [66] is the existence and regularity of the hypersurface \mathcal{I}^- , which our solution satisfies.




FIG. 3. Illustration of a portion of the horizon and \mathcal{S}^- between v_0 and v_1 . The null surface \mathcal{N} generated by past-directed null geodesics emanating from a particular cross-section of the horizon is also depicted. This representation illustrates how the tetrad basis defined at the horizon is parallel propagated along $-n^\mu$ to \mathcal{S}^- .

be done methodologically by rewriting the radial part of $\tilde{\Psi}_4$, $X_{lmn}^{(4)}$, as the fourth radial derivative of another function proportional to $X_{lmn}^{(0)}$ (see Sec. VII). This allows us to obtain analytic, explicit expressions for all the spin coefficients, Weyl scalars and frame functions in terms of $X_{lmn}^{(0)}$ and its derivatives. This procedure, although straightforward, is quite lengthy, so it will be presented explicitly elsewhere. However, by following this procedure, we have indeed checked that the second condition is also satisfied. Therefore, there is no incoming radiation from \mathcal{S}^- .

Next, we discuss whether the two remaining boundary conditions, the absence of outgoing radiation at the horizon and incoming radiation from \mathcal{S}^+ , are satisfied. Hence, we wish to identify the ingoing and outgoing modes of $\tilde{\Psi}_0$ and $\tilde{\Psi}_4$ at the horizon and infinity. The ingoing and outgoing modes can be easily identified in Schwarzschild coordinates $\{t, \mathbf{r}\}$, which are related to our coordinates through the transformation

$$t = v - \mathbf{r} - c \log |\mathbf{r} - c|, \quad \mathbf{r} = r + c. \quad (128)$$

Applying this transformation to $\tilde{\Psi}_0$ and $\tilde{\Psi}_4$ in their series expansion form Eqs. (82) and (113) and evaluating them at the horizon yields

$$\lim_{\mathbf{r} \rightarrow c} \tilde{\Psi}_{4,0} \propto e^{-i\omega_{lmn}(t+\mathbf{r})} |\mathbf{r} - c|^{-i\omega_{lmn}c}, \quad (129)$$

$$e^{i\bar{\omega}_{lmn}(t+\mathbf{r})} |\mathbf{r} - c|^{i\bar{\omega}_{lmn}c}$$

which shows that only ingoing modes are present. Similarly, when evaluating these expression in the limit $\mathbf{r} \rightarrow$

∞ , we see that the dominant modes are

$$\lim_{\mathbf{r} \rightarrow \infty} \tilde{\Psi}_I \propto e^{-i\omega_{lmn}(t-\mathbf{r})} \left(\frac{\mathbf{r}}{c}\right)^{-5+I+i\omega_{lmn}}, \quad (130)$$

$$e^{i\bar{\omega}_{lmn}(t-\mathbf{r})} \left(\frac{\mathbf{r}}{c}\right)^{-5+I-i\bar{\omega}_{lmn}}, \quad I = 0, 4,$$

which are outgoing. Therefore, by selecting an analytic solution that is stable for growing values in v , the QNM boundary conditions are automatically satisfied.

VI. PERTURBATIVE BLACK HOLE TOMOGRAPHY

The notion of ‘‘gravitational wave tomography’’ has been introduced in [33], that is, the horizon dynamics in the strong field region can be determined from gravitational waves in the weak field region. This is not surprising as there is growing evidence that there is a close interplay between properties of horizons and those of null infinity. Even in the equilibrium case, isolated horizons and null infinity share several mathematical structures [67–69]. More generally, the notion of inferring horizon dynamics from properties of the gravitational waveform has been put forward in [34–36, 38, 70]. In the ringdown regime specifically, several numerical studies have found empirically that the infalling fluxes at the horizon can be well modeled by a QNM expansion [21, 22, 71, 72]. These previous efforts have been all heuristic in nature or have been based on numerical observations. Our formalism provides support for gravitational wave tomography, for the first time, from analytical considerations in the perturbative regime.

Through Sec. II–V, we have stressed the relationship between $\tilde{\Psi}_0$ and $\tilde{\Psi}_4$ and made this explicit. However, we have not discussed black hole tomography in detail, i.e., how to reconstruct the geometry of the horizon from the observed gravitational wave. To make this relationship explicit, we first need to connect the asymptotic values of $\tilde{\Psi}_0$ and $\tilde{\Psi}_4$ with their respective behavior at the horizon. We sliced our spacetime using past-directed null geodesics, so to take the limit to \mathcal{S}^+ we would need to vary simultaneously the coordinates v, r at the appropriate rate. Instead, the analysis can be made more transparent by expressing $\tilde{\Psi}_0$ and $\tilde{\Psi}_4$ in a more convenient coordinate system. In particular, we will use hyperboloidal coordinates, which directly connect the horizon with future null infinity [44, 73, 74]. Given that in the gauge in which we expressed our solution, the coordinates v, r maintain their original meaning as the affine parameter along the generators of the horizon and the past-directed null geodesics, we can use the background coordinate transformation given in [74]

$$v = 2c(\tau + h(\sigma)), \quad r = \frac{c}{\sigma} - c \quad (131)$$

where $h(\sigma) = \frac{1}{\sigma} - \log \sigma$ is the height function, and $\sigma \in [0, 1]$ with $\sigma = 1$ being the horizon and $\sigma = 0$ future null infinity \mathcal{I}^+ .

From the expression we gave for $\tilde{\Psi}_4$ and $\tilde{\Psi}_0$ in series

$$\tilde{\Psi}_0 = \sigma^5 \sum_{l,m,n} \left\{ a_{lmn}^- e^{-2ci\omega_{lmn}(\tau+1)} \sum_{k=0}^{\infty} a'_k (1-\sigma)^k + a_{lmn}^+ e^{2ci\bar{\omega}_{lmn}(\tau+1)} \sum_{k=0}^{\infty} \bar{a}'_k (1-\sigma)^k \right\} {}_2Y_{lm}, \quad (132a)$$

$$\begin{aligned} \tilde{\Psi}_4 = \sigma \sum_{l,m,n} \left\{ (b_{lmn}^- {}_2Y_{lm} + c_{lmn}^- {}_2Y_{l,-m}) e^{-2ci\omega_{lmn}(\tau+1)} \sum_{k=0}^{\infty} a_k (1-\sigma)^k \right. \\ \left. + (b_{lmn}^+ {}_2Y_{lm} + c_{lmn}^+ {}_2Y_{l,-m}) e^{2ci\bar{\omega}_{lmn}(\tau+1)} \sum_{k=0}^{\infty} \bar{a}_k (1-\sigma)^k \right\} \end{aligned} \quad (132b)$$

where the coefficients a_k, a'_k in the series expansions are defined in Eq. (80), together with Eqs. (81a) and (114a)⁹. At the horizon, $\sigma = 1$ and the only non-vanishing coef-

form (see Eqs. (88) and (113)), it is straightforward to express them in terms of these hyperboloidal coordinates. We find

ficient in the series are $a_0 = \bar{a}_0 = a'_0 = \bar{a}'_0 = 1$, so we recover the boundary conditions at the horizon, which we rewrite as

$$\tilde{\Psi}_0 \triangleq \sum_{l,m,n} \left\{ \Psi_{0,lmn}^{H,-} e^{-2ci\omega_{lmn}(\tau+1)} + \Psi_{0,lmn}^{H,+} e^{2ci\bar{\omega}_{lmn}(\tau+1)} \right\} {}_2Y_{lm}, \quad (133a)$$

$$\begin{aligned} \tilde{\Psi}_4 \triangleq \sum_{l,m=0,n} \left\{ \Psi_{4,l0n}^{H,-} e^{-2ci\omega_{l0n}(\tau+1)} + \Psi_{4,l0n}^{H,+} e^{2ci\bar{\omega}_{l0n}(\tau+1)} \right\} {}_{-2}Y_{l0} \\ + \sum_{l,m \neq 0,n} \left\{ \Psi_{4,lmn}^{H,-} e^{-2ci\omega_{lmn}(\tau+1)} + \Psi_{4,lmn}^{H,+} e^{2ci\bar{\omega}_{lmn}(\tau+1)} \right\} {}_{-2}Y_{lm}, \end{aligned} \quad (133b)$$

where we have just renamed the coefficients in the $\tilde{\Psi}_0$

expansion as $\Psi_{0,lmn}^{H,\mp} = a_{lmn}^{\mp}$, and we have defined

$$\Psi_{4,l0n}^{H,\mp} = b_{l0n}^{\mp} + c_{l0n}^{\mp}, \quad (134a)$$

$$\Psi_{4,lmn}^{H,\mp} = b_{lmn}^{\mp} + c_{l-mn}^{\pm}, \quad m \neq 0. \quad (134b)$$

The expressions in Eq. (132) make evident that $\tilde{\Psi}_0$ decays much faster than $\tilde{\Psi}_4$ in the limit $\sigma \rightarrow 0$, i.e., while approaching \mathcal{I}^+ . As a consequence, $\tilde{\Psi}_4$ will be dominant in the radiation zone, and we shall focus only on this quantity. To leading order in σ , $\tilde{\Psi}_4$ at \mathcal{I}^+ reads

⁹ Notice that we have dropped the super-index (1) from Eq. (132a).

It should be understood that we have set $k_2 = 0$.

$$\begin{aligned}
\lim_{\sigma \rightarrow 0} \sigma^{-1} \tilde{\Psi}_4 &= \sum_{l,m=0,n} \left\{ \Psi_{4,l0n}^{H,-} e^{-2ci\omega_{l0n}(\tau+1)} \sum_k a_k + \Psi_{4,l0n}^{H,+} e^{2ci\bar{\omega}_{l0n}(\tau+1)} \sum_k \bar{a}_k \right\} {}_{-2}Y_{l0} \\
&+ \sum_{l,m \neq 0,n} \left\{ \Psi_{4,lmn}^{H,-} e^{-2ci\omega_{lmn}(\tau+1)} \sum_k a_k + \Psi_{4,lmn}^{H,+} e^{2ci\bar{\omega}_{lmn}(\tau+1)} \sum_k \bar{a}_k \right\} {}_{-2}Y_{lm} \\
&:= \sum_{l,m=0,n} \left\{ \Psi_{4,l0n}^{\mathcal{J}+,-} e^{-2ci\omega_{l0n}(\tau+1)} + \Psi_{4,l0n}^{\mathcal{J}+,+} e^{2ci\bar{\omega}_{l0n}(\tau+1)} \right\} {}_{-2}Y_{l0} \\
&+ \sum_{l,m \neq 0,n} \left\{ \Psi_{4,lmn}^{\mathcal{J}+,-} e^{-2ci\omega_{lmn}(\tau+1)} + \Psi_{4,lmn}^{\mathcal{J}+,+} e^{2ci\bar{\omega}_{lmn}(\tau+1)} \right\} {}_{-2}Y_{lm},
\end{aligned} \tag{135}$$

where we have defined the asymptotic angular modes $\Psi_{4,lmn}^{\mathcal{J}+,\pm}$ in relation with the horizon angular modes $\Psi_{4,lmn}^{H,\pm}$. The sums $\sum_{k=0}^{\infty} a_k$, and its complex conjugate, are convergent by construction and depend only on the QNM frequencies and the details of the background. Hence, these sums can be expressed as

$$\sum_{k=0}^{\infty} a_k = \mathcal{F}_{lmn}(\omega_{lmn}, c) \tag{136}$$

and similarly for its complex conjugate. Notice that to rewrite Eq. (132) in the form of Eq. (135), we have used that $\mathcal{F}_{l-mn} = \bar{\mathcal{F}}_{lmn}$ for $m \neq 0$ and the relationship between direct and mirror modes. From this discussion, it follows that the direct and mirror modes of $\tilde{\Psi}_4$ at the horizon and future null infinity are related by a constant. Namely,

$$\Psi_{4,lmn}^{\mathcal{J}+,-} = \Psi_{4,lmn}^{H,-} \mathcal{F}_{lmn}(\omega_{lmn}, c), \tag{137a}$$

$$\Psi_{4,lmn}^{\mathcal{J}+,+} = \Psi_{4,lmn}^{H,+} \bar{\mathcal{F}}_{lmn}(\bar{\omega}_{lmn}, c). \tag{137b}$$

This means, in particular, that if we can identify the presence of a given mode in the late stages of the ringdown of the detected gravitational wave, say the fundamental mode $n = 0$ in the $l = 2, m = 0$ gravitational wave strain (accounting for the relationship between the strain and $\tilde{\Psi}_4$), we can calculate the value of the amplitude $\Psi_{4,200}^{\mathcal{J}+,\pm}$ and through Eq. (137), that of $\Psi_{4,200}^{H,\pm}$, once the coefficient \mathcal{F}_{200} has been computed. An analogous discussion follows for any detected mode l, m, n . Further, notice that through Eq. (54), we can obtain $\Psi_{0,lmn}^{H,\pm}$, which will allow us to reconstruct the geometry of the horizon using Eq. (53). In particular, we can explicitly relate the modes of $\tilde{\Psi}_4$ at infinity with those of $\tilde{\Psi}_0$ at the horizon. For $m = 0$, we find

$$\Psi_{4,l0n}^{\mathcal{J}+,-} = \frac{K_l^2 \Psi_{0,l0n}^{H,-} + 6ic\omega_{l0n} \bar{\Psi}_{0,l0n}^{H,+}}{4c^4 i\omega_{l0n} (\kappa_{(\ell)}^2 + \omega_{l0n}^2) (2\kappa_{(\ell)} - i\omega_{l0n})} \mathcal{F}_{l0n} \tag{138a}$$

$$\Psi_{4,l0n}^{\mathcal{J}+,+} = - \frac{K_l^2 \Psi_{0,l0n}^{H,+} - 6ic\bar{\omega}_{l0n} \bar{\Psi}_{0,l0n}^{H,-}}{4c^4 i\bar{\omega}_{l0n} (\kappa_{(\ell)}^2 + \bar{\omega}_{l0n}^2) (2\kappa_{(\ell)} + i\bar{\omega}_{l0n})} \bar{\mathcal{F}}_{l0n} \tag{138b}$$

and for $m \neq 0$

$$\Psi_{4,lmn}^{\mathcal{J}+,-} = \frac{K_l^2 \Psi_{0,lmn}^{H,-} + (-1)^m 6ic\omega_{lmn} \bar{\Psi}_{0,lmn}^{H,-}}{4c^4 i\omega_{lmn} (\kappa_{(\ell)}^2 + \omega_{lmn}^2) (2\kappa_{(\ell)} - i\omega_{lmn})} \mathcal{F}_{lmn} \tag{139a}$$

$$\Psi_{4,lmn}^{\mathcal{J}+,+} = - \frac{K_l^2 \Psi_{0,lmn}^{H,+} - (-1)^m 6ic\bar{\omega}_{lmn} \bar{\Psi}_{0,lmn}^{H,+}}{4c^4 i\bar{\omega}_{lmn} (\kappa_{(\ell)}^2 + \bar{\omega}_{lmn}^2) (2\kappa_{(\ell)} + i\bar{\omega}_{lmn})} \bar{\mathcal{F}}_{lmn}, \tag{139b}$$

where we have introduced the shorthand notation $K_l = \sqrt{(l+2)(l+1)l(l-1)}$. These expressions can be inverted, and yield the modes of radiation at the horizon $\Psi_{0,lmn}^{H,\mp}$ as a function of the modes of the gravitational wave strain observed far away $\Psi_{4,lmn}^{\mathcal{J}+,\mp}$ (for the explicit expressions, see App. C).

The only thing left to complete this perturbative construction of black hole tomography is to estimate the values of the constants \mathcal{F}_{lmn} . Given that the sum \mathcal{F}_{lmn} is convergent when the coefficients a_k are computed using the eigenfrequencies, we can approximate it by a finite number of terms, i.e., we can approximate \mathcal{F}_{lmn} by $\mathcal{F}_{lmn}^{\text{app}}$, that we define as

$$\mathcal{F}_{lmn}^{\text{app}}(N) = \sum_{k=0}^N a_k, \tag{140}$$

where N will be chosen such that the sum has already converged. In Fig. 4, we show $\mathcal{F}_{lmn}^{\text{app}}$ as a function of N for the fundamental mode of $l = 2, 3, 4$ (for non-rotating black holes like the ones considered here, $\mathcal{F}_{l-mn} = \bar{\mathcal{F}}_{lmn}$ for $m \neq 0$, and $\mathcal{F}_{l0n} = \mathcal{F}_{l1n} = \dots = \mathcal{F}_{lln}$). The approximate value $\mathcal{F}_{lmn}^{\text{app}}$ converges quickly in all cases (for $N \gtrsim 30$ deviation of individual points with respect to the average value is at maximum of the order 10^{-7}). The value of $\mathcal{F}_{lmn}^{\text{app}}$ also converges quickly when we evaluate the coefficients a_k using higher overtones. In table I, we present approximate values of $\mathcal{F}_{lmn}^{\text{app}}$ for $l = 2, 3, 4$ and $n = 0, 1, 2$. Its real and imaginary parts are obtained as the averaged value of Eq. (140) for $N \in [30, 200]$. However, a word of caution is in order: the numerical techniques we use to evaluate the value of the QNM frequencies do not solve the infinite fraction (83) exactly. In practice, the QNM frequencies are obtained using some




FIG. 4. Convergence of $\mathcal{F}_{100}^{\text{app}}$ for $l = 2, 3, 4$ as a function of the number of elements in the sum N . Convergence is reached after $N > 10$ and around $N \gtrsim 30$ the deviation with respect to the mean is around 10^{-7} .

	$n = 0$	$n = 1$	$n = 2$
$l = 2$	$0.398 - 0.361i$	$0.823 + 0.753i$	$-1.695 + 3.470i$
$l = 3$	$0.241 - 0.502i$	$0.867 + 0.966i$	$-3.602 + 1.584i$
$l = 4$	$0.049 - 0.561i$	$1.016 + 0.936i$	$-3.885 + 0.838i$

TABLE I. Average values of $\mathcal{F}_{10n}^{\text{app}}$ for $l = 2, 3, 4$ and $n = 0, 1, 2$ and $N \in [30, 200]$.

approximation techniques, for instance, by truncating Eq. (83) by a large, but finite number of nested fractions. As a consequence, the QNM frequencies we use are also approximate. Given that Eq. (136) is only guaranteed to converge for the eigenfrequencies of Eq. (83), if we choose a sufficiently large $N \gg 100$, we would obtain numerical instabilities in Fig. 4¹⁰. Hence, the values presented in Tab. I are only meant to give an estimate of the order of magnitude of the constants \mathcal{F}_{lmn} , a more careful analysis would be needed to accurately evaluate them and assess their error. However, we can already see from Eq. (137) that if we were to detect the fundamental modes of the $l = 2, 3, 4$ mode in the gravitational strain, the magnitude of the amplitude of that mode at the horizon would be larger than observed at \mathcal{S}^+ given that $|\mathcal{F}_{100}| < 1$.

A. Dependence on the slicing

Finally, notice that the values reported in Tab. I are slicing dependent. In the following, we show this explicitly.

¹⁰ Heuristically, higher l narrows the stability region, i.e., for higher l , $\mathcal{F}_{lmn}^{\text{app}}$ destabilizes for smaller N .

The idea behind using an hyperboloidal slicing is to create a coordinate system that is regular both at the horizon and at \mathcal{S}^+ . To accomplish this, we introduced the height function $h(\sigma) = -2c(1/\sigma - \log \sigma)$ in Eq. (131) that removes the singularities of the coordinate system both at the horizon and infinity. The transformation in Eq. (131) expresses the Weyl scalar $\tilde{\Psi}_4$ in the so-called minimal gauge [47]. However, other gauge transformations that are regular for $\sigma \in [0, 1]$ are also possible and would give rise to a different slicing of the spacetime. As an example, we could consider the family of transformations

$$v = 2c \left(\hat{\tau} + \frac{1}{\sigma} - \log \sigma + f(\sigma) \right), \quad r = \frac{c}{\sigma} - c \quad (141)$$

where we are using the height function $\hat{h}(\sigma) = -2c(1/\sigma - \log(\sigma) + f(\sigma))$, with $f(\sigma)$ a real, regular function, and $f(0)$ and $f(1)$ finite. Applying this coordinate transformation to the Weyl scalar $\tilde{\Psi}_4$ and evaluating it at the horizon yields Eq. (133a) with $\tau \rightarrow \hat{\tau}$ and the functions

$$\hat{\Psi}_{4,lmn}^{H,-} = (b_{lmn-2}^- Y_{lm} + c_{lmn-2}^- Y_{l-m}) e^{-2ic\omega_{lmn} f(1)} \quad (142a)$$

$$\hat{\Psi}_{4,lmn}^{H,+} = (b_{lmn-2}^+ Y_{lm} + c_{lmn-2}^+ Y_{l-m}) e^{2ic\bar{\omega}_{lmn} f(1)}. \quad (142b)$$

Evaluating $\tilde{\Psi}_4$ at \mathcal{S}^+ (around $\sigma = 0$) in the coordinate system (141) yields the second expression in Eq. (135) with the functions

$$\hat{\Psi}_4^{\infty,-} = e^{2ic\omega_{lmn}(f(1)-f(0))} \sum_k a_k \hat{\Psi}_{4,lmn}^{H,-} \quad (143a)$$

$$\hat{\Psi}_4^{\infty,+} = e^{-2ic\bar{\omega}_{lmn}(f(1)-f(0))} \sum_k \bar{a}_k \hat{\Psi}_{4,lmn}^{H,+} \quad (143b)$$

to first order in σ . This expression explicitly evidences that changing the slicing by a function $f(\sigma)$ changes also the relationship between the value of $\tilde{\Psi}_4$ at the horizon and \mathcal{S}^+ , given that

$$\hat{\mathcal{F}}_{lmn} = e^{2ic\omega_{lmn}(f(1)-f(0))} \mathcal{F}_{lmn} \quad (144)$$

with \mathcal{F}_{lmn} defined in Eq. (136). This highlights the fact that the mapping between the horizon and \mathcal{S}^+ is slicing dependent. The physical meaning of this dependence is that by choosing different slicing we connect different cross-sections of the horizon with different points of \mathcal{S}^+ . To see this, consider a function $f(\sigma = 1) = 0$. Then, the minimal gauge in Eq. (131) and the transformation in Eq. (141) map the cross-section of the horizon S_v to two distinct points in \mathcal{S}^+ as we show in Fig. 5.

As long as we use a “time coordinate” that is linearly related to a “well-defined” notion of time of the background, changing the slicing will yield the same QNM frequencies, although the relationship between the modes at the horizon and far away will be different, as shown by Eq. (144). Still, notice that the discussion above relating the modes




FIG. 5. Illustration of a single $\tau = \text{cnt}$ and $\hat{\tau} = \text{cnt}$ slice with $f(1) = 0$. These two slices connect the same cross-section of the horizon S_v with two different points at \mathcal{I}^+ .

of $\tilde{\Psi}_0$ at the horizon, and those of $\tilde{\Psi}_4$ at \mathcal{I}^+ goes through by replacing $\mathcal{F} \rightarrow \hat{\mathcal{F}}$ using Eq. (144). Hence, the above discussion about black hole tomography still applies once we fix the gauge.

VII. $\tilde{\Psi}_2$ AT THE HORIZON AND NULL INFINITY

In this section, we also provide the explicit expressions for the scalar component of the Weyl tensor $\tilde{\Psi}_2$. In paper I, we found that the geometric information about the deformation of the horizon geometry was encoded in $\tilde{\Psi}_2$. In this dynamic setting, unfortunately, an interpretation in terms of horizon and field multipole moments, and related surficial and field Love numbers, is not straightforward. We will defer such an interpretation to later work.

To obtain an expression for $\tilde{\Psi}_2$ everywhere, we need to integrate its radial equation. For this, it comes in handy to derive a differential equation for the radial part of $\tilde{\Psi}_2$ as a function of $\tilde{\Psi}_4$. We start by taking the Δ derivative of Eq. (A18c)

$$\Delta^2 \Psi_2 - \Delta \bar{\delta} \Psi_3 = -3(\Delta \mu \Psi_2 + \mu \Delta \Psi_2) + \Delta(\bar{\pi} \Psi_3) + \Delta(\sigma \Psi_4) \quad (145)$$

where we have *not* yet expanded this equation to first order in the radiative perturbation. The second term on the left-hand-side can be rewritten as

$$\begin{aligned} \Delta \bar{\delta} \Psi_3 = & \bar{\delta}^2 \Psi_4 - 4\bar{\delta} \mu \Psi_3 - 4\mu \bar{\delta} \Psi_3 + 2\bar{\delta} \bar{\pi} \Psi_4 + 2\bar{\pi} \bar{\delta} \Psi_4 \\ & + \bar{\pi} \Delta \Psi_3 - \mu \bar{\delta} \Psi_3 - \bar{a} \mu \Psi_3 - \bar{\lambda} \bar{\delta} \Psi_3 + \bar{\lambda} a \Psi_3 - \Delta \bar{a} \Psi_3, \end{aligned} \quad (146)$$

where we used the commutation relation between δ and Δ in Eq. (A7) and Eq. (A18d). Plugging Eq. (146) in Eq. (145), expanding the $\bar{\delta}$, $\bar{\delta}$ operators in terms of the angular directional derivatives $\delta, \bar{\delta}$, using Eqs. (A18d), (A16b), (A16h), and $\pi = \alpha + \bar{\beta}$ we obtain

$$\begin{aligned} \Delta^2 \Psi_2 = & \delta^2 \Psi_4 - 4\delta \mu \Psi_3 - 5\mu \delta \Psi_3 + 4\delta(\beta \Psi_4) + \bar{\pi} \Delta \Psi_3 \\ & - \bar{\lambda} \bar{\delta} \Psi_3 - 3\mu \Delta \Psi_2 + 3(\mu^2 + |\lambda|^2) \Psi_2 \\ & + 2\beta \Delta \Psi_3 - 2(\mu\beta + \alpha\bar{\lambda}) \Psi_3 + \Delta(\sigma \Psi_4). \end{aligned} \quad (147)$$

Collecting the terms with Ψ_3 and using Eq. (A18c) to eliminate the terms $\delta \Psi_3$, we obtain

$$\begin{aligned} \Delta^2 \Psi_2 = & \delta^2 \Psi_4 + 4\delta(\beta \Psi_4) + (\bar{\alpha} + 3\beta) \delta \Psi_4 - 8\mu \Delta \Psi_2 \\ & + 4\beta(\bar{\alpha} + 3\beta) \Psi_4 + (3|\lambda|^2 - 12\mu^2) \Psi_2 \\ & + [\Delta(\sigma \Psi_4) - 4\delta \mu \Psi_3 - \bar{\lambda} \bar{\delta} \Psi_3 - 2\alpha \bar{\lambda} \Psi_3 \\ & + 5\mu \sigma \Psi_4 - 4\mu \bar{\pi} \Psi_3]. \end{aligned} \quad (148)$$

Now expanding to first order in the radiative perturbation around the Schwarzschild background, we see that the expression between squared parenthesis vanishes to first order in the perturbation. Rearranging the terms, we obtain that at first order

$$\begin{aligned} \Delta^2 \tilde{\Psi}_2 + 8\mu \Delta \tilde{\Psi}_2 + 12\mu^2 \tilde{\Psi}_2 = & \delta^2 \tilde{\Psi}_4 + 4\delta(\beta \tilde{\Psi}_4) \\ & + (\bar{\alpha} + 3\beta) \delta \tilde{\Psi}_4 + 4\beta(\bar{\alpha} + 3\beta) \tilde{\Psi}_4 \end{aligned} \quad (149)$$

Finally, rewriting this expression in terms of the $\bar{\delta}$ operator and taking into account that $\pi = 0$ for the background spacetime, we obtain the concise expression

$$\Delta^2 \tilde{\Psi}_2 + 8\mu \Delta \tilde{\Psi}_2 + 12\mu^2 \tilde{\Psi}_2 = \bar{\delta}^2 \tilde{\Psi}_4, \quad (150)$$

relating the perturbation of Ψ_2 with the gravitational wave. Notice that this is a second-order differential equation, and as such, we must check that its solution is a solution of the radial first-order differential equation for Ψ_2 (see Eq. (A18c) in App. A). The general solution of this differential equation is of the form

$$\begin{aligned} \tilde{\Psi}_2 = & \frac{q_1}{(r+c)^4} + \frac{q_2}{(r+c)^3} \\ & - \frac{1}{(r+c)^4} \int_0^r (r'+c)^5 \bar{\delta}^2 \tilde{\Psi}_4 dr' \\ & + \frac{1}{(r'+c)^3} \int_0^r (r'+c)^4 \bar{\delta}^2 \tilde{\Psi}_4 dr' \end{aligned} \quad (151)$$

where the integration constants $q_i = q_i(v, z, \bar{z})$ are functions on the horizon hypersurface. For the ringdown solution we discussed above, we can find an explicit solution in terms of a function g (and its complex conjugate \bar{g}), which we define as being proportional to the radial part of $\tilde{\Psi}_0$, $X_{lmn}^{(0)}$, i.e.,

$$g_{lmn}(r) = \frac{16(r+c)^4 c^4 i \omega_{lmn} (\kappa_{(l)}^2 + \omega_{lmn}^2) (2\kappa_{(l)} - i\omega_{lmn})}{l^2(l-1)^2(l+1)^2(l+2)^2 + 6^2 c^2 \omega_{lmn}^2} X_{lmn}^{(0)}. \quad (152)$$

Defining this function is useful because through the Teukolsky-Starobinsky identities, the radial part of $\tilde{\Psi}_4$ can be written as the fourth radial derivative of the function g

$$X_{lmn}^{(4)} = \Delta^4[g_{lmn}(r)]. \quad (153)$$

This allows to integrate Eq. (151) explicitly, yielding

$$\tilde{\Psi}_2 = \frac{q_1}{(r+c)^4} + \frac{q_2}{(r+c)^3} + \frac{1}{2\pi} \sum_{l,m,n} \frac{\sqrt{l(l+1)(l-1)(l+2)}}{2} \left\{ e^{-i\omega_{lmn}v} (b_{lmn}^- Y_{lm} + c_{lmn}^- Y_{l-m}) \Delta^2 \left[\frac{g}{(r+c)^2} \right] \right. \\ \left. + e^{i\bar{\omega}_{lmn}v} (b_{lmn}^+ Y_{lm} + c_{lmn}^+ Y_{l-m}) \Delta^2 \left[\frac{\bar{g}}{(r+c)^2} \right] \right\}. \quad (154)$$

The functions q_1 and q_2 are fixed by the boundary condition at the horizon in Eq. (53), and the condition that it satisfies the first-order radial differential equation for $\tilde{\Psi}_2$. Explicitly, we find

$$q_1 = \frac{1}{2\pi} \sum_{lmn} \frac{3c^2}{2} K_l (l^2 + l - 3) \left\{ \frac{(a_{lmn}^- Y_{lm} + (-1)^m \bar{a}_{lmn}^+ Y_{l,-m}) e^{-i\omega_{lmn}v}}{(K_l^2 - 6ic\omega_{lmn})(\kappa_{(\ell)}^2 + \omega_{lmn}^2)} + \frac{(a_{lmn}^+ Y_{lm} + (-1)^m \bar{a}_{lmn}^- Y_{l,-m}) e^{i\bar{\omega}_{lmn}v}}{(K_l^2 + 6ic\bar{\omega}_{lmn})(\kappa_{(\ell)}^2 + \bar{\omega}_{lmn}^2)} \right\} \quad (155a)$$

$$q_2 = -\frac{1}{2\pi} \sum_{lmn} \frac{3c}{2} K_l \left\{ (l^2 + l - 2 - 2ic\omega_{lmn}) \frac{(a_{lmn}^- Y_{lm} + (-1)^m \bar{a}_{lmn}^+ Y_{l,-m}) e^{-i\omega_{lmn}v}}{(K_l^2 - 6ic\omega_{lmn})(\kappa_{(\ell)}^2 + \omega_{lmn}^2)} \right. \\ \left. + (l^2 + l - 2 + 2ic\bar{\omega}_{lmn}) \frac{(a_{lmn}^+ Y_{lm} + (-1)^m \bar{a}_{lmn}^- Y_{l,-m}) e^{i\bar{\omega}_{lmn}v}}{(K_l^2 + 6ic\bar{\omega}_{lmn})(\kappa_{(\ell)}^2 + \bar{\omega}_{lmn}^2)} \right\} \quad (155b)$$

where we have defined $K_l = \sqrt{(l+2)(l+1)l(l-1)}$.

This explicit expression shows that the perturbation of Ψ_2 at the horizon does not vanish when $\tilde{\Psi}_4$ (or alternatively $\tilde{\Psi}_0$) is nonvanishing at the horizon. Additionally, Eq. (155) shows that the functions q_1 and q_2 do not vanish in general. However, if the constants a_{lmn}^\pm satisfy some relationship such that, e.g., $q_1 = 0$, then $q_2 = 0$. The converse is also true.

In paper I, we identified the term r^{-3} in $\tilde{\Psi}_2$ with the field mass monopole and the term r^{-4} with its field spin dipole. Furthermore, the Weyl scalar Ψ_2 at the horizon was related to the horizon multipole moments. Such an identification in the dynamic case is not obvious, as the scaling of the different l modes of the spherical harmonic decomposition is no longer directly associated with a given power of r . This is reminiscent of the structure of the field multipole moments in the post-Newtonian setting [75].

VIII. CONCLUSIONS

In this paper, we have applied the characteristic initial value formulation to study the near horizon geometry of perturbed horizon including the effects of small amounts of infalling radiation. In the context of a binary system,

this effect of infalling radiation in the horizon geometry is called tidal heating. We have focused our attention on the ringdown phase, and we have reformulated the black hole QNM problem in a fully 4-dimensional setting. We recover the usual Schwarzschild QNM frequencies. The reformulation also sheds light on the minimal conditions required for QNM solutions to appear. Specifically, we did not need to impose the absence of incoming modes, but found that demanding analyticity and stable solutions towards the future naturally selected the QNM frequencies. Furthermore, we showed that, in the presence of a small flux of infalling gravitational radiation, the unique solution of the perturbative equations when we demand a mode decomposition, separability of the horizon equations, analyticity and stability towards the future is this QNM solution. This may have ramifications for data analysis, as it makes transparent when the QNM description is valid.

Our analysis also addresses the ‘‘mystery’’ of why the infalling radiation has the same features as the ringdown waveform which is a superposition of damped sinusoidal signals. This is an example of black hole ‘‘tomography’’ in a perturbative setting: The present work can be seen as providing analytical support for the existence of correlations between gravitational wave observations and hori-

zon dynamics.

In forthcoming work, we will complete the final remaining step, i.e., reconstruct the near horizon metric. For the QNM case, this will yield an explicit spacetime metric near the remnant black hole resulting from a binary black hole merger when the final black hole is slowly spinning. We will also study physical aspects of this spacetime, such as properties of the light-ring and the effective potential near the black hole. The dynamical multipole moments of the horizon and asymptotic field, as well as the Love numbers will be further investigated along with implications for gravitational wave astronomy.

This analysis will also be particularly suited to the case of extreme-mass-ratio systems wherein linear perturbation theory provides an excellent approximation. This would eventually provide a different route to the spacetime mapping problem where one used the motion of a small object around a supermassive black hole to map the spacetime around it with great precision [5]. Here, one would be using the EMRI to measure the source multipole moments of the large black hole.

Our work highlights several open issues. There is the natural question of extending this work to arbitrary spins, i.e. for a general Kerr black hole. While technically challenging, there are no questions of principle in that direction. Furthermore, several works have found instabilities in the QNM frequencies as the effective potential is varied [76–80]. It would be interesting to investigate whether such instabilities occur also in our formulation of the QNM problem.

We have been working in the setting for which the

lowest multipole moments, namely the mass and angular momentum, do not change at linear order. This is a consequence of the assumption that the flux at the horizon is small. This approximation ensures that the horizon inherits many structures from the isolated horizon framework, simplifying its treatment. However, this assumption can, and will be, relaxed. This requires the horizon to be modeled as a dynamical horizon transitioning to the perturbed isolated horizon regime described in this study [81, 82]. Such a transition could be captured using second-order perturbation theory to account for the infalling flux, as this suffices to describe the spacelike nature of the dynamical horizon. A particularly exciting direction is to develop a second-order black hole tomography for the ringdown. This would enable us to investigate whether the nonlinearities observed at infinity correspond directly to those experienced by the horizon.

However, already at linear order we gained invaluable insight.

While we have not analyzed the multipole moments explicitly, it is clear that the higher multipole moments depend on the infalling radiation already at linear order. This is generically not accounted for in the self-force program, but might have potentially observable consequences for EMRI observations and the spacetime mapping problem.

ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

We are grateful to Abhay Ashtekar, Patrick Bourg, Scott Hughes, José Luis Jaramillo, and Bangalore Sathyaprakash for valuable discussions.

-
- [1] A. Ashtekar and B. Krishnan, *Living Rev. Rel.* **7**, 10 (2004), arXiv:gr-qc/0407042.
 - [2] I. Booth, *Can. J. Phys.* **83**, 1073 (2005), arXiv:gr-qc/0508107.
 - [3] E. Gourgoulhon and J. L. Jaramillo, *Phys. Rept.* **423**, 159 (2006), arXiv:gr-qc/0503113.
 - [4] S. A. Hayward, in *9th Marcel Grossmann Meeting on Recent Developments in Theoretical and Experimental General Relativity, Gravitation and Relativistic Field Theories (MG 9)* (2000) pp. 568–580, arXiv:gr-qc/0008071.
 - [5] F. D. Ryan, *Phys. Rev. D* **52**, 5707 (1995).
 - [6] A. Ashtekar, J. Engle, T. Pawłowski, and C. Van Den Broeck, *Class. Quant. Grav.* **21**, 2549 (2004), arXiv:gr-qc/0401114.
 - [7] I. Kamaretsos, M. Hannam, S. Husa, and B. S. Sathyaprakash, *Phys. Rev. D* **85**, 024018 (2012), arXiv:1107.0854 [gr-qc].
 - [8] C. V. Vishveshwara, *Nature* **227**, 936 (1970).
 - [9] S. Chandrasekhar and S. Detweiler, *Proceedings of the Royal Society of London. A. Mathematical and Physical Sciences* **344**, 441 (1975), <https://royalsocietypublishing.org/doi/pdf/10.1098/rspa.1975.0112>.
 - [10] E. W. Leaver, *Proc. Roy. Soc. Lond. A* **402**, 285 (1985).
 - [11] E. Berti, “Ringdown,” <https://pages.jh.edu/eberti2/ringdown/>, [Online; accessed 28-August-2024].
 - [12] E. Berti, V. Cardoso, and A. O. Starinets, *Class. Quant. Grav.* **26**, 163001 (2009), arXiv:0905.2975 [gr-qc].
 - [13] K. D. Kokkotas and B. G. Schmidt, *Living Rev. Rel.* **2**, 2 (1999), arXiv:gr-qc/9909058.
 - [14] M. Giesler, M. Isi, M. A. Scheel, and S. Teukolsky, *Phys. Rev. X* **9**, 041060 (2019), arXiv:1903.08284 [gr-qc].
 - [15] V. Baibhav, M. H.-Y. Cheung, E. Berti, V. Cardoso, G. Carullo, R. Cotesta, W. Del Pozzo, and F. Duque, *Phys. Rev. D* **108**, 104020 (2023), arXiv:2302.03050 [gr-qc].
 - [16] B. P. Abbott *et al.* (LIGO Scientific, Virgo), *Phys. Rev. Lett.* **116**, 221101 (2016), [Erratum: *Phys.Rev.Lett.* **121**, 129902 (2018)], arXiv:1602.03841 [gr-qc].
 - [17] B. P. Abbott *et al.* (LIGO Scientific, Virgo), *Phys. Rev. D* **100**, 104036 (2019), arXiv:1903.04467 [gr-qc].
 - [18] R. Abbott *et al.* (LIGO Scientific, Virgo), *Phys. Rev. D* **103**, 122002 (2021), arXiv:2010.14529 [gr-qc].
 - [19] M. Isi, M. Giesler, W. M. Farr, M. A. Scheel, and S. A. Teukolsky, *Phys. Rev. Lett.* **123**, 111102 (2019), arXiv:1905.00869 [gr-qc].
 - [20] C. D. Capano, M. Cabero, J. Westerweck, J. Abedi, S. Kastha, A. H. Nitz, Y.-F. Wang, A. B. Nielsen, and B. Krishnan, *Phys. Rev. Lett.* **131**, 221402 (2023), arXiv:2105.05238 [gr-qc].

- [21] P. Mourier, X. Jiménez Forteza, D. Pook-Kolb, B. Krishnan, and E. Schnetter, *Phys. Rev. D* **103**, 044054 (2021), arXiv:2010.15186 [gr-qc].
- [22] N. Khera, A. Ribes Metidieri, B. Bonga, X. Jiménez Forteza, B. Krishnan, E. Poisson, D. Pook-Kolb, E. Schnetter, and H. Yang, *Phys. Rev. Lett.* **131**, 231401 (2023), arXiv:2306.11142 [gr-qc].
- [23] A. D. Rendall, *Proceedings of the Royal Society of London Series A* **427**, 221 (1990).
- [24] P. T. Chrusciel and T.-T. Paetz, *Class. Quant. Grav.* **29**, 145006 (2012), arXiv:1203.4534 [gr-qc].
- [25] H. Friedrich and J. Stewart, *Proc. Roy. Soc. Lond. A* **A385**, 345 (1983).
- [26] H. Friedrich and A. D. Rendall, *Lect. Notes Phys.* **540**, 127 (2000), *einstein's Field Equations and their Physical Interpretation*, ed. by B. G. Schmidt, Springer, Berlin, 2000, arXiv:gr-qc/0002074 [gr-qc].
- [27] A. R. Metidieri, B. Bonga, and B. Krishnan, "Tidal deformations of slowly spinning isolated horizons," (2024), arXiv:2403.17114 [gr-qc].
- [28] J. Lewandowski, *Class. Quant. Grav.* **17**, L53 (2000), arXiv:gr-qc/9907058.
- [29] J. Lewandowski and C. Li, (2018), arXiv:1809.04715 [gr-qc].
- [30] J. Lewandowski and T. Pawłowski, *Int. J. Mod. Phys. D* **11**, 739 (2002), arXiv:gr-qc/0101008.
- [31] D. Dobkowski-Ryko, J. Lewandowski, and T. Pawłowski, *Phys. Rev. D* **98**, 024008 (2018), arXiv:1803.05463 [gr-qc].
- [32] J. Lewandowski and T. Pawłowski, *Class. Quant. Grav.* **31**, 175012 (2014), arXiv:1404.7836 [gr-qc].
- [33] A. Ashtekar, N. Khera, M. Kolanowski, and J. Lewandowski, *JHEP* **02**, 066 (2022), arXiv:2112.05608 [gr-qc].
- [34] L. Rezzolla, R. P. Macedo, and J. L. Jaramillo, *Phys. Rev. Lett.* **104**, 221101 (2010), arXiv:1003.0873 [gr-qc].
- [35] J. L. Jaramillo, R. P. Macedo, P. Moesta, and L. Rezzolla, *Phys. Rev. D* **85**, 084031 (2012), arXiv:1108.0061 [gr-qc].
- [36] J. L. Jaramillo, R. Panosso Macedo, P. Moesta, and L. Rezzolla, *Phys. Rev. D* **85**, 084030 (2012), arXiv:1108.0060 [gr-qc].
- [37] D. Alic, P. Mosta, L. Rezzolla, O. Zanotti, and J. L. Jaramillo, *Astrophys. J.* **754**, 36 (2012), arXiv:1204.2226 [gr-qc].
- [38] J. L. Jaramillo, R. P. Macedo, P. Moesta, and L. Rezzolla, *AIP Conf. Proc.* **1458**, 158 (2012), arXiv:1205.3902 [gr-qc].
- [39] S. Dyatlov and M. Zworski, *Mathematical theory of scattering resonances*, Vol. 200 (American Mathematical Soc., 2019).
- [40] C. Vishveshwara, *Physical Review D* **1**, 2870 (1970).
- [41] S. Chandrasekhar, *The mathematical theory of black holes* (Oxford Classic Texts in the Physical Sciences, 1985).
- [42] O. Sarbach and M. Tiglio, *Phys. Rev. D* **64**, 084016 (2001), arXiv:gr-qc/0104061.
- [43] B. Preston and E. Poisson, *Phys. Rev. D* **74**, 064010 (2006), arXiv:gr-qc/0606094.
- [44] A. Zenginoglu, *Class. Quant. Grav.* **25**, 145002 (2008), arXiv:0712.4333 [gr-qc].
- [45] R. Panosso Macedo and A. Zenginoglu, (2024), arXiv:2409.11478 [gr-qc].
- [46] A. Zenginoglu, *Am. J. Phys.* **92**, 965 (2024), arXiv:2404.01528 [gr-qc].
- [47] R. Panosso Macedo, J. L. Jaramillo, and M. Ansorg, *Phys. Rev. D* **98**, 124005 (2018), arXiv:1809.02837 [gr-qc].
- [48] R. Panosso Macedo, *Phil. Trans. Roy. Soc. Lond. A* **382**, 20230046 (2024), arXiv:2307.15735 [gr-qc].
- [49] B. Mongwane, S. Nkele, D. G. A. Duniya, and N. T. Bishop, (2024), arXiv:2407.06636 [gr-qc].
- [50] H. Bondi, M. G. J. van der Burg, and A. W. K. Metzner, *Proc. Roy. Soc. Lond. A* **269**, 21 (1962).
- [51] E. T. Newman and T. W. J. Unti, *J. Math. Phys.* **3**, 891 (1962).
- [52] K. Martel and E. Poisson, *Phys. Rev. D* **71**, 104003 (2005), arXiv:gr-qc/0502028.
- [53] S. W. Hawking and J. B. Hartle, *Commun. Math. Phys.* **27**, 283 (1972).
- [54] S. A. Teukolsky, *Phys. Rev. Lett.* **29**, 1114 (1972).
- [55] J. B. Hartle, *Phys. Rev. D* **9**, 2749 (1974).
- [56] S. O'Sullivan and S. A. Hughes, *Phys. Rev. D* **90**, 124039 (2014), [Erratum: *Phys. Rev. D* **91**, 109901 (2015)], arXiv:1407.6983 [gr-qc].
- [57] S. O'Sullivan and S. A. Hughes, *Phys. Rev. D* **94**, 044057 (2016), arXiv:1505.03809 [gr-qc].
- [58] P. P. Fiziev, *Phys. Rev. D* **80**, 124001 (2009).
- [59] P. P. Fiziev, "Classes of exact solutions to regge-wheeler and teukolsky equations," (2009), arXiv:0902.1277 [gr-qc].
- [60] E. W. Leaver, *Proceedings of the Royal Society of London. Series A, Mathematical and Physical Sciences* **402**, 285 (1985).
- [61] S. W. Hawking and G. F. R. Ellis, *The Large Scale Structure of Space-Time*, Cambridge Monographs on Mathematical Physics (Cambridge University Press, 2023).
- [62] S. A. Teukolsky and W. H. Press, *Astrophys. J.* **193**, 443 (1974).
- [63] A. Starobinsky and S. Churilov, *Journal of Experimental and Theoretical Physics - J EXP THEOR PHYS* **38** (1974).
- [64] A. Pound and B. Wardell, "Black hole perturbation theory and gravitational self-force," in *Handbook of Gravitational Wave Astronomy* (Springer Singapore, 2021) p. 1–119.
- [65] E. W. Leaver, *Journal of Mathematical Physics* **27**, 1238 (1986), https://pubs.aip.org/aip/jmp/article-pdf/27/5/1238/19245696/1238_1_online.pdf.
- [66] M. Walker and C. M. Will, *Phys. Rev. D* **19**, 3495 (1979).
- [67] A. Ashtekar and S. Speziale, *Phys. Rev. D* **109**, L061501 (2024), arXiv:2401.15618 [gr-qc].
- [68] A. Ashtekar and S. Speziale, *Phys. Rev. D* **110**, 044048 (2024), arXiv:2402.17977 [hep-th].
- [69] A. Ashtekar and S. Speziale, *Phys. Rev. D* **110**, 044049 (2024), arXiv:2407.03254 [hep-th].
- [70] A. Gupta, B. Krishnan, A. Nielsen, and E. Schnetter, *Phys. Rev. D* **97**, 084028 (2018), arXiv:1801.07048 [gr-qc].
- [71] Y. Chen *et al.*, *Phys. Rev. D* **106**, 124045 (2022), arXiv:2208.02965 [gr-qc].
- [72] X. J. Forteza and P. Mourier, *Phys. Rev. D* **104**, 124072 (2021), arXiv:2107.11829 [gr-qc].
- [73] D. Schinkel, M. Ansorg, and R. Panosso Macedo, *Class. Quant. Grav.* **31**, 165001 (2014), arXiv:1301.6984 [gr-qc].
- [74] M. Ansorg and R. P. Macedo, *Physical Review D* **93** (2016), 10.1103/physrevd.93.124016.

- [75] L. Blanchet, *Living Rev. Rel.* **17**, 2 (2014), arXiv:1310.1528 [gr-qc].
- [76] J. L. Jaramillo, R. Panosso Macedo, and L. Al Sheikh, (2020), arXiv:2004.06434 [gr-qc].
- [77] K. Destounis, R. P. Macedo, E. Berti, V. Cardoso, and J. L. Jaramillo, *Phys. Rev. D* **104**, 084091 (2021), arXiv:2107.09673 [gr-qc].
- [78] J. L. Jaramillo, *Class. Quant. Grav.* **39**, 217002 (2022), arXiv:2206.08025 [gr-qc].
- [79] V. Boyanov, K. Destounis, R. Panosso Macedo, V. Cardoso, and J. L. Jaramillo, *Phys. Rev. D* **107**, 064012 (2023), arXiv:2209.12950 [gr-qc].
- [80] V. Cardoso, S. Kastha, and R. Panosso Macedo, *Phys. Rev. D* **110**, 024016 (2024), arXiv:2404.01374 [gr-qc].
- [81] I. Booth, *Phys. Rev. D* **87**, 024008 (2013), arXiv:1207.6955 [gr-qc].
- [82] I. Booth and S. Fairhurst, *Phys. Rev. Lett.* **92**, 011102 (2004), arXiv:gr-qc/0307087.
- [83] R. Penrose and W. Rindler, *Spinors and Spacetime: 1. Two-Spinor Calculus and Relativistic Fields* (Cambridge, Uk: Univ. Pr. (1984) 458 P. (Cambridge Monographs On Mathematical Physics), 1984).
- [84] J. Stewart, *Advanced General Relativity* (Cambridge Monographs on Mathematical Physics, 1991).
- [85] J. N. Goldberg, A. J. MacFarlane, E. T. Newman, F. Rohrlich, and E. C. G. Sudarshan, *J. Math. Phys.* **8**, 2155 (1967).

Appendix A: The Newman-Penrose formalism and our coordinate system

1. The Newman-Penrose formalism in a nutshell

The results discussed in the main text are expressed in the language of the Newman-Penrose formalism, which we summarize in the following. Given that we want to exhaust the null structures of our spacetime (given by the quasi-isolated horizon and null infinity), it is natural to introduce a tetrad basis of four *null* vectors ($\ell^a, n^a, m^a, \bar{m}^a$) at each point of spacetime. These vectors satisfy the following inner-product relations

$$\ell \cdot n = -1, \quad m \cdot \bar{m} = 1, \quad (\text{A1})$$

with all other inner-products vanishing. The vector n is chosen to be a past-directed, null geodesic, affinely parametrized by the coordinate r , and emanating from a cross-section of the horizon at $r = 0$. Hence, n takes the form

$$n^a \nabla_a := -\frac{\partial}{\partial r}. \quad (\text{A2})$$

The motivation to use this coordinate system and tetrad was explained in great detail in Paper I, here we shall assume this form for the tetrad component n without proof. To satisfy the inner product relations in Eq. (A1),

the other basis vectors must be of the form:

$$\ell^a \nabla_a := D = \frac{\partial}{\partial v} + U \frac{\partial}{\partial r} + X \frac{\partial}{\partial z} + \bar{X} \frac{\partial}{\partial \bar{z}}, \quad (\text{A3a})$$

$$m^a \nabla_a := \delta = \Omega \frac{\partial}{\partial r} + \xi_1 \frac{\partial}{\partial z} + \xi_2 \frac{\partial}{\partial \bar{z}}. \quad (\text{A3b})$$

The frame function U is real while X, Ω, ξ_i are complex. Furthermore, as explained in Paper I, the frame functions can be chosen such that at the horizon the frame functions

$$U \triangleq \Omega \triangleq X \triangleq 0, \quad (\text{A4})$$

vanish. The symbol \triangleq denotes equality only at the horizon.

Associated with this vector basis at each point of spacetime we can also define directional covariant derivatives, which we denote

$$D := \ell^a \nabla_a, \quad \Delta := n^a \nabla_a, \quad \delta := m^a \nabla_a, \quad \bar{\delta} := \bar{m}^a \nabla_a. \quad (\text{A5})$$

The connection is represented as a set of 12 complex scalars, the spin coefficients, which are defined using the directional derivatives of the basis vectors:

$$D\ell = (\epsilon + \bar{\epsilon})\ell - \bar{\kappa}m - \kappa\bar{m}, \quad (\text{A6a})$$

$$Dn = -(\epsilon + \bar{\epsilon})n + \pi m + \bar{\pi}\bar{m}, \quad (\text{A6b})$$

$$Dm = \bar{\pi}\ell - \kappa n + (\epsilon - \bar{\epsilon})m, \quad (\text{A6c})$$

$$\Delta\ell = (\gamma + \bar{\gamma})\ell - \bar{\tau}m - \tau\bar{m}, \quad (\text{A6d})$$

$$\Delta n = -(\gamma + \bar{\gamma})n + \nu m + \bar{\nu}\bar{m}, \quad (\text{A6e})$$

$$\Delta m = \bar{\nu}\ell - \tau n + (\gamma - \bar{\gamma})m, \quad (\text{A6f})$$

$$\delta\ell = (\bar{\alpha} + \beta)\ell - \bar{\rho}m - \sigma\bar{m}, \quad (\text{A6g})$$

$$\delta n = -(\bar{\alpha} + \beta)n + \mu m + \bar{\lambda}\bar{m}, \quad (\text{A6h})$$

$$\delta m = \bar{\lambda}\ell - \sigma n + (\beta - \bar{\alpha})m, \quad (\text{A6i})$$

$$\bar{\delta}m = \bar{\mu}\ell - \rho n + (\alpha - \bar{\beta})m. \quad (\text{A6j})$$

Eq. (A6) is useful to understand the geometric meaning of the spin coefficients. Some important quantities for us are the optical scalars of ℓ and n : the expansion of ℓ and n are given by the real parts of ρ and μ respectively, while their twist is encoded in the imaginary part of these spin coefficients. The shears of ℓ and n are σ and λ . Apart from the optical scalars, the spin coefficients characterizing the tetrad basis are: κ and ν indicate that ℓ and n are geodesic, while the $\epsilon + \bar{\epsilon}$ and $\gamma + \bar{\gamma}$ are their respective accelerations. The quantity $a = \alpha - \bar{\beta}$ codifies the connection in the $m - \bar{m}$ plane, and is therefore related to the curvature of the 2-manifold spanned by m, \bar{m} .

Since the null tetrad is typically not a coordinate basis, the above definitions of the spin coefficients lead to non-trivial commutation relations:

$$\Delta D - D\Delta = (\epsilon + \bar{\epsilon})\Delta - \pi\delta - \bar{\pi}\bar{\delta} \quad (\text{A7a})$$

$$\delta D - D\delta = \kappa\Delta - (\bar{\rho} + \epsilon - \bar{\epsilon})\delta - \sigma\bar{\delta} \quad (\text{A7b})$$

$$\delta\Delta - \Delta\delta = -\bar{\pi}\Delta + \mu\delta + \bar{\lambda}\bar{\delta} \quad (\text{A7c})$$

$$\bar{\delta}\delta - \delta\bar{\delta} = (\bar{\rho} - \rho)\Delta + a\delta - a\bar{\delta}. \quad (\text{A7d})$$

The Weyl tensor C_{abcd} breaks down into five complex scalars

$$\Psi_0 = C_{abcd}\ell^a m^b \ell^c m^d, \quad \Psi_1 = C_{abcd}\ell^a m^b \ell^c n^d, \quad (\text{A8a})$$

$$\Psi_2 = C_{abcd}\ell^a m^b \bar{m}^c n^d, \quad \Psi_3 = C_{abcd}\ell^a n^b \bar{m}^c n^d, \quad (\text{A8b})$$

$$\Psi_4 = C_{abcd}\bar{m}^a n^b \bar{m}^c n^d. \quad (\text{A8c})$$

Projecting the Einstein field equations in the tetrad basis yields a system of 16 complex first-order differential equations relating the spin coefficients with the curvature scalars. These are the so-called Newman-Penrose field equations. The Bianchi identities, $\nabla_{[a}R_{bc]de} = 0$, are written explicitly as eight complex equations involving both the Weyl and Ricci tensor components, and three real equations involving only Ricci tensor components. See [41, 83, 84] for the full set of field equations and Bianchi identities (but beware that they use slightly different conventions such as the sign for the metric signature and normalization of the null tetrad, leading to some minus sign changes).

Contrary to the usual formulation of the Newman-Penrose field equations, it will be useful to introduce the notion of spin-weights and to work with the $\bar{\delta}$ operator for derivatives in the $m - \bar{m}$ plane. A tensor X projected on the $m - \bar{m}$ plane is said to have spin weight s if under a spin rotation $m \rightarrow e^{i\psi}m$, it transforms as $X \rightarrow e^{is\psi}X$. Thus, m^a itself has spin weight $+1$ while \bar{m}^a has weight -1 . For instance, the scalar $X = m^{a_1} \dots m^{a_p} \bar{m}^{b_1} \dots \bar{m}^{b_q} X_{a_1 \dots b_q}$ has spin weight $s = p - q$ and the Weyl tensor component Ψ_k has spin weight $2 - k$.

The $\bar{\delta}$ and δ operators are defined as

$$\bar{\delta}X = m^{a_1} \dots m^{a_p} \bar{m}^{b_1} \dots \bar{m}^{b_q} \delta X_{a_1 \dots b_q}, \quad (\text{A9})$$

$$\delta X = m^{a_1} \dots m^{a_p} \bar{m}^{b_1} \dots \bar{m}^{b_q} \bar{\delta} X_{a_1 \dots b_q}. \quad (\text{A10})$$

From Eqs. (A6i) and (A6j), after projecting onto the $m - \bar{m}$ plane, we get

$$\delta m^a = (\beta - \bar{\alpha})m^a, \quad \bar{\delta} m^a = (\alpha - \bar{\beta})m^a. \quad (\text{A11})$$

A short calculation shows that

$$\bar{\delta}X = \delta X + s(\bar{\alpha} - \beta)X, \quad \delta X = \bar{\delta}X - s(\alpha - \bar{\beta})X. \quad (\text{A12})$$

The $\bar{\delta}$ and δ act as spin raising and lowering operators. This means in particular, that when acting over the spin-weighted spherical harmonic basis defined in the 2-manifold spanned by m, \bar{m} , they satisfy the following useful relationships

$$\bar{\delta}_s Y_{lm} = \frac{1}{\sqrt{2}(r+c)} \sqrt{(l-s)(l+s+1)}_{s+1} Y_{lm}, \quad (\text{A13a})$$

$$\bar{\delta}_s Y_{lm} = -\frac{1}{\sqrt{2}(r+c)} \sqrt{(l+s)(l-s+1)}_{s-1} Y_{lm}, \quad (\text{A13b})$$

$$\bar{\delta}\bar{\delta}_s Y_{lm} = -\frac{(l-s)(l+s+1)}{2(r+c)^2} {}_s Y_{lm}. \quad (\text{A13c})$$

See [85] for further properties of the $\bar{\delta}$ operator and its connection to representations of the rotation group.

Rewriting the field equations and Bianchi identities using the $\bar{\delta}$ and δ operators (for those spin coefficients with a well-defined spin-weight) and splitting them into angular, evolution, and radial equations, we obtain the following five sets of differential equations, encompassing the system of angular equations for the spin coefficients

$$\bar{\delta}\rho - \bar{\delta}\sigma = \bar{\pi}\rho - \pi\sigma - \Psi_1, \quad (\text{A14a})$$

$$\delta\alpha - \bar{\delta}\beta = \mu\rho - \lambda\sigma + |\alpha|^2 + |\beta|^2 - 2\alpha\beta - \Psi_2, \quad (\text{A14b})$$

$$\bar{\delta}\lambda - \bar{\delta}\mu = \pi\mu - \bar{\pi}\lambda - \Psi_3, \quad (\text{A14c})$$

their evolution equations

$$D\rho - \bar{\delta}\kappa = \rho^2 + |\sigma|^2 + (\epsilon + \bar{\epsilon})\rho - \pi\kappa, \quad (\text{A15a})$$

$$D\sigma - \bar{\delta}\kappa = (\rho + \bar{\rho} + 3\epsilon - \bar{\epsilon})\sigma - \bar{\pi}\kappa + \Psi_0, \quad (\text{A15b})$$

$$D\alpha - \bar{\delta}\epsilon = (\rho + \bar{\epsilon} - 2\epsilon)\alpha + \beta\bar{\sigma} - \bar{\beta}\epsilon - \kappa\lambda + (\epsilon + \rho)\pi, \quad (\text{A15c})$$

$$D\beta - \delta\epsilon = (\alpha + \pi)\sigma + (\bar{\rho} - \bar{\epsilon})\beta - \mu\kappa - (\bar{\alpha} - \bar{\pi})\epsilon + \Psi_1, \quad (\text{A15d})$$

$$D\lambda - \bar{\delta}\pi = (\rho - 2\epsilon)\lambda + \bar{\sigma}\mu + \pi^2, \quad (\text{A15e})$$

$$D\mu - \bar{\delta}\pi = (\bar{\rho} - \epsilon - \bar{\epsilon})\mu + \sigma\lambda + \bar{\pi}\pi + \Psi_2, \quad (\text{A15f})$$

and their system of radial equations

$$\Delta\lambda = -2\lambda\mu - \Psi_4, \quad (\text{A16a})$$

$$\Delta\mu = -\mu^2 - |\lambda|^2, \quad (\text{A16b})$$

$$\Delta\rho = -\mu\rho - \sigma\lambda - \Psi_2, \quad (\text{A16c})$$

$$\Delta\sigma = -\mu\sigma - \bar{\lambda}\rho. \quad (\text{A16d})$$

$$\Delta\kappa = -\bar{\pi}\rho - \pi\sigma - \Psi_1, \quad (\text{A16e})$$

$$\Delta\epsilon = -\bar{\pi}\alpha - \pi\beta - \Psi_2, \quad (\text{A16f})$$

$$\Delta\pi = -\pi\mu - \bar{\pi}\lambda - \Psi_3, \quad (\text{A16g})$$

$$\Delta\beta = -\mu\beta - \alpha\bar{\lambda}, \quad (\text{A16h})$$

$$\Delta\alpha = -\beta\lambda - \mu\alpha - \Psi_3. \quad (\text{A16i})$$

Similarly, we can also split the eight complex Bianchi equations into a system describing the time-evolution of the Weyl scalars

$$D\Psi_1 - \bar{\delta}\Psi_0 = -\pi\Psi_0 + 2(2\rho + \epsilon)\Psi_1 - 3\kappa\Psi_2, \quad (\text{A17a})$$

$$D\Psi_2 - \bar{\delta}\Psi_1 = -\lambda\Psi_0 + \pi\Psi_1 + 3\rho\Psi_2 - 2\kappa\Psi_3, \quad (\text{A17b})$$

$$D\Psi_3 - \bar{\delta}\Psi_2 = -2\lambda\Psi_1 + 3\pi\Psi_2 + 2(\rho - \epsilon)\Psi_3 - \kappa\Psi_4, \quad (\text{A17c})$$

$$D\Psi_4 - \bar{\delta}\Psi_3 = -3\lambda\Psi_2 + 5\pi\Psi_3 + (\rho - 4\epsilon)\Psi_4, \quad (\text{A17d})$$

and their radial differential equations

$$\Delta\Psi_0 - \bar{\delta}\Psi_1 = -\mu\Psi_0 - \bar{\pi}\Psi_1 + 3\sigma\Psi_2, \quad (\text{A18a})$$

$$\Delta\Psi_1 - \bar{\delta}\Psi_2 = -2\mu\Psi_1 + 2\sigma\Psi_3, \quad (\text{A18b})$$

$$\Delta\Psi_2 - \bar{\delta}\Psi_3 = -3\mu\Psi_2 + \bar{\pi}\Psi_3 + \sigma\Psi_4, \quad (\text{A18c})$$

$$\Delta\Psi_3 - \bar{\delta}\Psi_4 = -4\mu\Psi_3 + 2\bar{\pi}\Psi_4. \quad (\text{A18d})$$

Notice that Eqs. (A14b), (A15c) and (A15d) can be rewritten in a more convenient way in terms of the 2-manifold connection a and the spin coefficient π . From the real and imaginary parts of Eq. (A14b) we can extract the following two equations

$$-2\text{Re}\Psi_2 = \delta a + \bar{\delta}\bar{a} - 2a\bar{a} - \mu(\rho + \bar{\rho}) + \lambda\sigma + \bar{\lambda}\bar{\sigma}, \quad (\text{A19a})$$

$$-2i\text{Im}\Psi_2 = \bar{\delta}\pi - \bar{\delta}\bar{\pi} - \mu(\rho - \bar{\rho}) + \lambda\sigma - \bar{\lambda}\bar{\sigma}. \quad (\text{A19b})$$

Furthermore, combining Eq. (A15c) with the complex conjugate of (A15d) we obtain

$$D\pi - \bar{\delta}(\epsilon + \bar{\epsilon}) = \pi(2\rho + \bar{\epsilon} - \epsilon) + 2\bar{\sigma}\bar{\pi} - \kappa\lambda - \bar{\kappa}\bar{\mu} + \bar{\Psi}_1 \quad (\text{A20a})$$

$$Da - \bar{\delta}(\epsilon - \bar{\epsilon}) = a(\rho + \bar{\epsilon} - \epsilon) + \rho\pi - \bar{\sigma}(\bar{\pi} + \bar{a}) - \kappa\lambda + \bar{\kappa}\bar{\mu} - \bar{\Psi}_1 \quad (\text{A20b})$$

This form of Eqs. (A14b), (A15c), and (A15d) is the one that we use in the derivations in Sec. III.

Finally, the frame functions U , Ω , X , and ξ^A defined in Eq. (A3) also satisfy time-evolution

$$D\Omega - \delta U = \kappa + \rho\Omega + \sigma\bar{\Omega}, \quad (\text{A21a})$$

$$D\xi^i - \delta X^i = (\bar{\rho} + \epsilon - \bar{\epsilon})\xi^i + \sigma\bar{\xi}^i. \quad (\text{A21b})$$

and radial equations

$$\Delta U = -(\epsilon + \bar{\epsilon}) - \pi\Omega - \bar{\pi}\bar{\Omega}, \quad (\text{A22a})$$

$$\Delta X^i = -\pi\xi^i - \bar{\pi}\bar{\xi}^i, \quad (\text{A22b})$$

$$\Delta\Omega = -\bar{\pi} - \mu\Omega - \bar{\lambda}\bar{\Omega}, \quad (\text{A22c})$$

$$\Delta\xi^i = -\mu\xi^i - \bar{\lambda}\bar{\xi}^i, \quad (\text{A22d})$$

which can be obtained from the commutation relations in Eq. (A7).

2. Summary of our gauge choices

In this work, we restrict ourselves to perturbations of a Schwarzschild isolated horizon. However, the framework we detail in the main text can in principle be applied to spacetimes that are *not* of type D, as long as they contain an isolated horizon (e.g., the Robinson-Trautman spacetime). This is because we do not impose that the two tetrad vectors ℓ and n be aligned along the two principal null directions of a type D spacetime. Instead, we require the two tetrad vectors ℓ and n to be geodesic, and one of them, ℓ , to be a null generator of the horizon. The tetrad vector n is chosen such that the tetrad basis is parallel propagated along it. Notice that this choice of tetrad coincides with aligning the two vectors ℓ and n along the principal null directions only for the Schwarzschild spacetime (so for instance, $\Psi_3 \neq 0$ in general, even for type D spacetimes). This particular choice of coordinate system and tetrad was detailed in Paper I. For completeness, here we recap the gauge choices we made in the main text both for the background spacetime and the perturbation.

For a general spacetime containing an isolated horizon, we choose the vector n^a to be an affinely parameterized geodesic, along which ℓ , m and itself are parallel propagated. Then, we have $\Delta n = \Delta\ell = \Delta m = 0$. From Eqs. (A6d), (A6e) and (A6f), this leads to

$$\gamma = \tau = \nu = 0. \quad (\text{A23})$$

We first impose these conditions in the commutation relations in Eqs. (A7). Then, setting $f = v$ in those equations leads to

$$\pi = \alpha + \bar{\beta}, \quad \mu = \bar{\mu}. \quad (\text{A24})$$

These must hold throughout the region where the coordinate system is valid.

When specifying the Schwarzschild isolated horizon as our unperturbed background (see Paper I for an explicit construction), the background spacetime can be shown to be the usual Schwarzschild spacetime in a special set of horizon-penetrating coordinates (analogous to the Eddington-Finkelstein ones), which we denote by (v, r, z, \bar{z}) . The nonvanishing spin coefficients and Weyl scalars in these coordinates are

$$\mu_{\circ} = -\frac{1}{c+r}, \quad a_{\circ} = \frac{z}{\sqrt{2}(r+c)}, \quad \epsilon_{\circ} = \frac{c}{4(c+r)^2}, \quad (\text{A25a})$$

$$\rho_{\circ} = -\frac{r}{2(c+r)^2}, \quad \Psi_2^{\circ} = -\frac{c}{2(c+r)^3}, \quad (\text{A25b})$$

and the unperturbed tetrad

$$l_{\circ}^a = \partial_v + \frac{r}{2(c+r)}\partial_r, \quad (\text{A26a})$$

$$n_{\circ}^a = -\partial_r, \quad (\text{A26b})$$

$$m_{\circ}^a = \frac{F_0}{(c+r)}\partial_z. \quad (\text{A26c})$$

We remove the subindex \circ to denote the unperturbed quantities whenever possible.

In the main text, we perturb the basis vectors as follows

$$\ell^a = \ell_{\circ}^a + \tilde{\ell}^a \quad (\text{A27a})$$

$$n^a = n_{\circ}^a + \tilde{n}^a \quad (\text{A27b})$$

$$m^a = m_{\circ}^a + \tilde{m}^a \quad (\text{A27c})$$

and analogously for \bar{m} . The perturbation to the basis vectors is taken to be of the form

$$\tilde{\ell}^a \partial_a = \tilde{U} \partial_r + \tilde{X}^A \partial_A \quad (\text{A28a})$$

$$\tilde{m}^a \partial_a = \tilde{\Omega} \partial_r + \tilde{\zeta}^A \partial_A \quad (\text{A28b})$$

where $A = \{z, \bar{z}\}$. The outgoing transverse vector n is unperturbed everywhere, so

$$\tilde{n} = 0. \quad (\text{A29})$$

At the horizon, the perturbing functions have been chosen such that

$$\tilde{\Omega} \triangleq \tilde{U} \triangleq \tilde{X}^i \triangleq 0, \tilde{\xi}^z \triangleq 0, \quad (\text{A30})$$

with

$$\tilde{\xi}^{\bar{z}} \neq 0, \quad \tilde{\xi}^z \neq 0 \quad (\text{A31})$$

the only nonzero quantities. This tetrad choice can be shown to still satisfy the orthonormality conditions

$$(\ell_o + \tilde{\ell}) \cdot n_o = -1, \quad (m_o + \tilde{m}) \cdot (\bar{m}_o + \tilde{\bar{m}}) = 1, \quad (\text{A32})$$

and to be compatible with the gauge choices we made at the horizon.

For the background and the perturbed spacetime we chose

$$\nu_o = \nu_o = \tau_o = 0, \quad \tilde{\gamma} = \tilde{\nu} = \tilde{\tau} = 0, \quad (\text{A33})$$

and we work in a gauge in which

$$\pi_o = \alpha_o + \bar{\pi}_o, \quad a_o = \alpha_o - \bar{\beta}_o. \quad (\text{A34})$$

The perturbation to these spin coefficients is expressed in a gauge where analogous expressions hold for these spin coefficients, so

$$\tilde{\pi} = \tilde{\alpha} + \tilde{\beta}, \quad \tilde{a} = \tilde{\alpha} - \tilde{\beta}. \quad (\text{A35})$$

Furthermore,

$$\mu = \bar{\mu}, \quad \rho = \bar{\rho} \quad (\text{A36})$$

and the same applies to the perturbed quantities. Regarding the conditions at the horizon, for the background

$$\Psi_0^\circ \triangleq \Psi_1^\circ \triangleq 0 \quad (\text{A37})$$

and the surface gravity $\kappa_{(\ell)}$ is related to the following spin coefficients

$$\epsilon_o + \bar{\epsilon}_o \triangleq \kappa_{(\ell)}, \quad \epsilon_o - \bar{\epsilon}_o \triangleq 0. \quad (\text{A38})$$

The perturbation to these quantities satisfy

$$\tilde{\Psi}_0 \neq 0, \quad \tilde{\Psi}_1 \neq 0, \quad \tilde{\epsilon} \triangleq 0. \quad (\text{A39})$$

This gauge choice is not unique. We could also choose instead $\tilde{\epsilon} \neq 0$ and $\tilde{\mu} \triangleq 0$, this choice is explained in App. B.

Finally, we can choose the expansion to vanish at the horizon to first order in the perturbation, i.e.,

$$\rho_o \triangleq 0, \quad \tilde{\rho} \triangleq 0. \quad (\text{A40})$$

The vector ℓ is chosen to be geodesic at the horizon

$$\kappa_o \triangleq 0, \quad \tilde{\kappa}_o \triangleq 0 \quad (\text{A41})$$

and the shear also vanishes for the background spacetime, but not for the perturbation

$$\sigma_o \triangleq 0, \quad \sigma \neq 0. \quad (\text{A42})$$

These choices are general as long as we work with an isolated horizon background (these would also be valid for Kerr if we work in the coordinate system given by the initial value formulation). Because we are restricting ourselves to Schwarzschild, we also have

$$\pi_o = \lambda_o = 0 \quad (\text{A43})$$

and

$$\Psi_0^\circ = \Psi_1^\circ = \Psi_3^\circ = \Psi_4^\circ = 0. \quad (\text{A44})$$

In the main text, we consider perturbations of a Schwarzschild isolated horizon, and therefore, these simplifications have been used.

Appendix B: Alternative gauge choice

Rather than considering $\tilde{\epsilon}$ to vanish at the horizon, we can choose instead a coordinate system such that the past directed lightcones coincide with those of the unperturbed spacetime. This choice corresponds to $\tilde{\mu} \triangleq 0$ and implies $\tilde{\mu} = 0$ given the radial equation for μ (A16b). Notice that given the remaining gauge freedom that we have, we cannot set both $\tilde{\epsilon} \triangleq 0$ and $\tilde{\mu} \triangleq 0$ simultaneously. In the following, we derive the system of ten differential equations that determine the initial data at the horizon and the respective constraint equations when $\tilde{\mu} = 0$. The procedure is the same as the one we used in the main text, so we shall be brief. Setting

$$\tilde{\mu} \triangleq 0, \quad \tilde{\epsilon} - \tilde{\bar{\epsilon}} \triangleq 0 \quad (\text{B1})$$

we obtain the following system of ten differential equations

$$D\tilde{\sigma} - \kappa_{(l)}\tilde{\sigma} \triangleq \tilde{\Psi}_0 \quad (\text{B2a})$$

$$D\tilde{\Psi}_1 - \kappa_{(l)}\tilde{\Psi}_1 \triangleq \tilde{\delta}\tilde{\Psi}_0 \quad (\text{B2b})$$

$$D\tilde{\Psi}_2 \triangleq \tilde{\delta}\tilde{\Psi}_1 \quad (\text{B2c})$$

$$D\tilde{\pi} \triangleq \tilde{\delta}(\epsilon + \bar{\epsilon}) + \tilde{\Psi}_1 \quad (\text{B2d})$$

$$\mu D(\tilde{\epsilon} + \tilde{\bar{\epsilon}}) - \tilde{\delta}\tilde{\delta}(\tilde{\delta} + \tilde{\bar{\epsilon}}) \triangleq \tilde{\delta}\tilde{\Psi}_1 + \tilde{\delta}\tilde{\Psi}_1 \quad (\text{B2e})$$

$$D\tilde{\lambda} + \kappa_{(l)}\tilde{\lambda} \triangleq \tilde{\delta}\tilde{\pi} + \mu\tilde{\sigma} \quad (\text{B2f})$$

$$D\tilde{\Psi}_3 + \kappa_{(l)}\tilde{\Psi}_3 \triangleq \tilde{\delta}\tilde{\Psi}_2 + 3\tilde{\pi}\tilde{\Psi}_2 \quad (\text{B2g})$$

$$D\tilde{\Psi}_4 + 2\kappa_{(l)}\tilde{\Psi}_4 \triangleq \tilde{\delta}\tilde{\Psi}_3 - 3\tilde{\lambda}\tilde{\Psi}_2 \quad (\text{B2h})$$

$$D\tilde{a} \triangleq -\tilde{a}\tilde{\sigma} - \tilde{\Psi}_1, \quad (\text{B2i})$$

$$D\tilde{\xi}^{\bar{z}} \triangleq \tilde{\sigma}\tilde{\xi}^{\bar{z}} \quad (\text{B2j})$$

and a group of five constraint equations

$$\tilde{\partial}\tilde{\lambda} \triangleq \mu\tilde{\pi} - \tilde{\Psi}_3 \quad (\text{B3a})$$

$$-2\text{Re}\tilde{\Psi}_2 \triangleq \tilde{\partial}\tilde{a} + \tilde{\partial}\tilde{a} + \tilde{\partial}a + \tilde{\partial}\tilde{a} \quad (\text{B3b})$$

$$-2i\text{Im}\tilde{\Psi}_2 \triangleq \tilde{\partial}\tilde{\pi} - \tilde{\partial}\tilde{\pi} \quad (\text{B3c})$$

$$\tilde{\partial}\tilde{\sigma} \triangleq \tilde{\Psi}_1 \quad (\text{B3d})$$

$$\tilde{\partial}\tilde{\pi} \triangleq \mu(\tilde{\epsilon} + \tilde{\bar{\epsilon}}) - \tilde{\Psi}_2. \quad (\text{B3e})$$

Notice that the expressions for $\tilde{\sigma}$, $\tilde{\Psi}_0$, $\tilde{\Psi}_2$ and $\tilde{\Psi}_4$ at the horizon do not change.

Appendix C: Complementary material

In this appendix, we compile some lengthy expressions that have been omitted from the main text for the sake of conciseness. In Eq. (61), we presented the solution to the radial Teukolsky equation for $\tilde{\Psi}_0$ as a function of Heun functions, their derivatives and the polynomial functions $f_{lm}^{(1,2)}$ and $g_{lm}^{(1,2)}$. These polynomial functions are

$$f_{lm}^{(1)} = \frac{h_0^{(1)}(r) + h_1^{(1)}(r)\omega + h_2^{(1)}(r)\omega^2 + h_3^{(1)}(r)\omega^3 + h_4^{(1)}(r)\omega^4}{16c^4(r+c)^2\omega(2\kappa_{(\ell)} - i\omega)(\kappa_{(\ell)}^2 + \omega^2)}, \quad (\text{C1a})$$

$$g_{lm}^{(1)} = \frac{r}{r+c} \frac{2r(r+c)(l^2+l-1) - (2r^2+c^2) - 4(r+c)^4\omega^2}{8c^5(2\kappa_{(\ell)} - i\omega)(\kappa_{(\ell)}^2 + \omega^2)}, \quad (\text{C1b})$$

$$f_{lm}^{(2)} = \frac{h_0^{(2)}(r) + h_1^{(2)}(r)\omega + h_2^{(2)}(r)\omega^2 + h_3^{(2)}(r)\omega^3 + h_4^{(2)}(r)\omega^4}{16c^4(r+c)^2\omega(2\kappa_{(\ell)} - i\omega)(\kappa_{(\ell)}^2 + \omega^2)}, \quad (\text{C1c})$$

$$g_{lm}^{(2)} = \frac{c^2}{r^2} g_{lm}^{(1)}, \quad (\text{C1d})$$

where we introduced the following auxiliary functions $h_i^{(1,2)}(r)$ for $i = 0, \dots, 4$

$$h_0^{(1)} = -i(-1+l)l(1+l)(2+l)r^2, \quad (\text{C2a})$$

$$h_1^{(1)} = 4c^3 - 2r[3c^2(-2+l+l^2) + c(-9+7l(1+l))r + 4(-2+l+l^2)r^2], \quad (\text{C2b})$$

$$h_2^{(1)} = -4i(c+r)^2[c^2+c(1-3l(1+l))r - 3(-2+l+l^2)r^2], \quad (\text{C2c})$$

$$h_3^{(1)} = 8(c+r)^4(2c+r), \quad (\text{C2d})$$

$$h_4^{(1)} = -16i(r+c)^6, \quad (\text{C2e})$$

and

$$h_0^{(2)} = -i(-1+l)l(1+l)(2+l)r, \quad (\text{C3a})$$

$$h_1^{(2)} = 2c(-3r+l(1+l)(c+r)), \quad (\text{C3b})$$

$$h_2^{(2)} = 4i(c+r)[c^2l(1+l) + c(-3+4l(1+l))r + 3(-2+l+l^2)r^2], \quad (\text{C3c})$$

$$h_3^{(2)} = -8(r+c)^4, \quad (\text{C3d})$$

$$h_4^{(2)} = -16i(r+c)^5. \quad (\text{C3e})$$

In Sec. VI, we discussed black hole tomography and showed that we could obtain explicit expressions relating the mode decomposition of $\tilde{\Psi}_4$ at future null infinity as a function of the modes of $\tilde{\Psi}_0$ at the horizon in Eqs. (138) and (139). These expressions can be inverted to describe the infalling gravitational radiation modes at the horizon as a function of the outgoing gravitational wave strain. Explicitly, we obtain for $m = 0$

$$\Psi_{0,l0n}^{H,-} = \frac{4c^4 i\omega_{l0n}(\kappa_{(\ell)}^2 + \omega_{l0n}^2)(2\kappa_{(\ell)} - i\omega_{l0n})}{\mathcal{F}_{l0n}(K_l^4 + 36c^2\omega_{l0n}^2)} (K_l^2 \Psi_{4,l0n}^{\mathcal{J}^+,-} + 6ic\omega_{l0n} \bar{\Psi}_{4,l0n}^{\mathcal{J}^+,-}) \quad (\text{C4a})$$

$$\Psi_{0,l0n}^{H,+} = -\frac{4c^4 i\bar{\omega}_{l0n}(\kappa_{(\ell)}^2 + \bar{\omega}_{l0n}^2)(2\kappa_{(\ell)} + i\bar{\omega}_{l0n})}{\mathcal{F}_{l0n}(K_l^4 + 36c^2\bar{\omega}_{l0n}^2)} (K_l^2 \Psi_{4,l0n}^{\mathcal{J}^+,+} - 6ic\bar{\omega}_{l0n} \bar{\Psi}_{4,l0n}^{\mathcal{J}^+,+}), \quad (\text{C4b})$$

and for $m \neq 0$

$$\Psi_{0,lmn}^{H,-} = \frac{4c^4 i \omega_{lmn} (\kappa_{(\ell)}^2 + \omega_{lmn}^2) (2\kappa_{(\ell)} - i\omega_{lmn})}{\mathcal{F}_{lmn} (K_l^4 + 36c^2 \omega_{lmn}^2)} (K_l^2 \Psi_{4,lmn}^{\mathcal{J}^+,-} + (-1)^m 6ic\omega_{lmn} \bar{\Psi}_{4,lmn}^{\mathcal{J}^+,-}) \quad (\text{C5a})$$

$$\Psi_{0,lmn}^{H,+} = - \frac{4c^4 i \bar{\omega}_{lmn} (\kappa_{(\ell)}^2 + \bar{\omega}_{lmn}^2) (2\kappa_{(\ell)} + i\bar{\omega}_{lmn})}{\mathcal{F}_{lmn} (K_l^4 + 36c^2 \bar{\omega}_{lmn}^2)} (K_l^2 \Psi_{4,lmn}^{\mathcal{J}^+,+} - 6(-1)^m ic\bar{\omega}_{lmn} \bar{\Psi}_{4,lmn}^{\mathcal{J}^+,+}). \quad (\text{C5b})$$

where again we use the notation $K_l = \sqrt{(l+2)(l+1)l(l-1)}$.
