

A Multipole-Based Framework for Kerr Black Hole Mimickers: From General Construction to a Specific Case of Study

Claudio Gambino^{1,*}

¹*Dipartimento di Fisica, Sapienza Università di Roma & INFN, Sezione di Roma, Piazzale Aldo Moro 5, 00185, Roma, Italy*

We present a novel framework for constructing solutions to the Einstein equations with an arbitrary multipolar structure, providing a systematic method to identify physically reasonable energy-momentum tensors that source black hole mimickers. As an example, we investigate an anisotropic fluid with a gaussian-like energy-density profile that, at linearized level, satisfies all energy and causality conditions while producing a gravitational field with the exact same multipolar structure as Kerr black holes. In the spinless case, we obtain a fully non-perturbative solution that, depending on the parameter choices, describes either a horizonless Schwarzschild mimicker or a static regular black hole model with a resolved curvature singularity.

CONTENTS

I. Introduction	1
II. Gaussian structure functions	2
III. Kerr mimicker	4
IV. Source phenomenology	5
V. Non-perturbative generalization in the static limit	7
A. Perturbative approach	9
B. Non-perturbative solution	10
VI. Conclusions	12
Acknowledgments	13
A. Perturbative Einstein equations	13
References	14

I. INTRODUCTION

Black hole physics is one of the most active and productive research areas in physics, with a long history of theoretical advancements [1–3] and, more recently, experimental breakthroughs such as gravitational-wave detection [4, 5] and black hole imaging [6, 7]. The distinctiveness of black holes (BHs) among compact objects arises from multiple aspects, including thermodynamic properties [8, 9], the no-hair theorem [10, 11], and the presence of event horizons and curvature singularities. Indeed, classical BHs, such as the Schwarzschild and Kerr solutions, feature an event horizon (with both an outer and an inner horizon in the Kerr case) where light emitted from near it experiences infinite gravitational redshift as

seen by a distant observer, as well as a central curvature singularity where spacetime curvature diverges.

These extreme properties suggest that our current theories of gravity are incomplete in high-curvature regimes, and a quantum theory of gravity may predict objects resembling BHs but differing in key aspects, particularly at short distances [12–25] (see Refs. [26, 27] for recent reviews). This perspective has driven increasing interest in BH mimickers, namely compact objects that reproduce some BH properties but deviate from them in certain limits [28–33]. Beyond theoretical motivations, BH mimickers provide concrete models for exotic compact objects that could be probed experimentally, aiding in searches for new physics [34–37].

One approach to constructing BH mimickers is to impose on them the exact same multipolar structure as classical BHs [38, 39]. While the Schwarzschild metric has only a monopole moment (mass), Kerr BHs possess a well-defined infinite set of multipole moments uniquely determined by their mass and angular momentum [40–44]. However, as in Newtonian gravity, a given set of multipole moments can be sourced by an infinite number of different matter configurations. Thus, the observation of gravitational effects matching Kerr’s multipolar structure does not necessarily imply the presence of an actual Kerr BH. Furthermore, it remains an open question whether stable, physically consistent compact objects that precisely approach Kerr geometry at infinity can exist [45–47].

In fact, while a spherically symmetric object always approaches the Schwarzschild metric at large distances, stationary spacetimes do not lead to a unique asymptotic structure. Indeed, BH uniqueness theorem states that Kerr is the unique axisymmetric, stationary BH solution in General Relativity [10, 11, 48–50], but there are two ways in which such theorem can be avoided: either considering non-vacuum solutions or horizonless objects (or both). In this regard, finding solutions that exactly share the asymptotic structure of Kerr is not a trivial task, and a systematic study of this topic could improve our understanding of BH uniqueness theorems in higher dimensions as well as establishing a relation between the Kerr uniqueness in four dimensions and its multipolar

* claudio.gambino@uniroma1.it

structure.

The goal of this paper then is to take a step forward in addressing this question, by investigating whether a stable rotating matter-energy configuration that (i) satisfies energy and causality conditions and (ii) induces a spacetime that precisely approaches the Kerr geometry at large distances, thereby sharing its entire multipolar structure, can exist or not.

To achieve this, we employ the momentum-space formalism in General Relativity developed in [51], where it was shown that, order by order in an angular momentum expansion, the Fourier transform of a linearized energy-momentum tensor (EMT) naturally organizes into a *form factor* expansion. This formulation establishes a direct correspondence between form factors and gravitational multipoles. Since form factors characterize the source itself, this approach generalizes the well-known Newtonian concept of source multipoles [52] to the relativistic regime. However, fixing the multipolar structure does not uniquely determine the source, meaning that for a given set of form factors defining the EMT, there exists an equivalence class of physically distinct sources generating the same multipolar structure.

The differences among these sources are captured by *structure functions*, which are analytic functions of the transferred momentum that encode the internal structure of the source. Analogously to particle physics, setting structure functions to unity corresponds to consider a point-like fundamental object, as demonstrated in [51] where imposing Kerr's multipoles with an identity structure function led to a ring-shaped singular source generating Kerr geometry. In this paper, we introduce a non-trivial structure function to smear the singular source found in [51], thereby constructing an EMT sourcing a gravitational field that asymptotically approaches the Kerr metric.

As a specific case of study of this very general approach, by imposing a gaussian structure function we derive a linearized EMT that describes an anisotropic rotating fluid sourcing a Kerr mimicker while satisfying energy and causality conditions. The source is characterized by its mass, angular momentum, and additional fundamental length scales R_n , which must be suitably tuned for physical viability. There exists a region in parameter space where the EMT ceases to be real-valued; these configurations are excluded. However, for every physically allowed configuration, the EMT satisfies causality and the positive energy conditions.

Although this argument holds exactly within the angular momentum expansion, our approach is linearized in the gravitational coupling constant, and the generalization to a fully non-perturbative Kerr mimicker remains an open problem for future works. As a preliminary step, we derive the full non-perturbative solution in the non-rotating limit, yielding to a Schwarzschild mimicker. This solution depends only on the mass and a single characteristic length scale R , with a threshold value R^* such that for $R > R^*$, the BH mimicker is physically

reasonable and horizonless. This configuration represents a compact object with no event horizon and a smeared curvature singularity that mimics a Schwarzschild BH. For $R < R^*$, causality is violated and an inner and an outer horizons emerge.

The paper is structured as follows. In Sec. II, we review the momentum-space formalism in General Relativity and define the gaussian structure functions. In Sec. III, after defining some master integrals, we perform the explicit Fourier transform of a chosen linearized EMT, motivating such choice. In Sec. IV, we match this EMT with an anisotropic rotating fluid ansatz, deriving the energy density, pressure, and rotational velocity to explore the phenomenology of different parameter configurations. In Sec. V, we specialize to the non-rotating case, finding a full non-perturbative solution and analyzing its properties. Finally, Sec. VI contains our conclusions.

Conventions. We work in the mostly positive signature and in four spacetime dimensions with $\eta_{00} = -1$ and in natural units $\hbar = c = 1$, whereas we keep the gravitational coupling constant G explicit. Greek indices are for spacetime components $\mu, \nu = 0, 1, \dots, 4$ and Latin indices are for space components only $i, j = 1, 2, 3$.

II. GAUSSIAN STRUCTURE FUNCTIONS

Let us consider a four-dimensional flat background in General Relativity. Using cartesian coordinates (t, x, y, z) , we can write the Fourier transform of a generic time-independent EMT as

$$T_{\mu\nu}(\vec{x}) = \int \frac{d^3\vec{q}}{(2\pi)^3} e^{-i\vec{q}\cdot\vec{x}} T_{\mu\nu}(\vec{q}), \quad (1)$$

sourcing a stationary gravitational field

$$h_{\mu\nu}(\vec{x}) = \frac{\kappa}{2} \int \frac{d^3\vec{q}}{(2\pi)^3} \frac{e^{-i\vec{q}\cdot\vec{x}}}{q^2} P_{\mu\nu,\rho\sigma} T^{\rho\sigma}(\vec{q}), \quad (2)$$

where

$$g_{\mu\nu} = \eta_{\mu\nu} + \kappa h_{\mu\nu} + O(G^2), \quad (3)$$

with $\kappa^2 = 32\pi G$ and with $P_{\mu\nu,\rho\sigma}$ the transverse projector of the propagator in some gauge. Notice that from here on we will keep understood that both the metric and the EMT are time-independent, writing for instance $T(\vec{q}) \equiv T(q)$.

From the momentum-space formalism in General Relativity introduced in [51], considering a stationary source described only by mass and spin, defining u^μ as the four-velocity of its center of mass and $S^{\mu\nu}$ its density spin tensor such that $S^{\mu\nu}u_\nu = q^\mu u_\mu = 0$, it is possible to describe a generic EMT in terms of the so-called *form factors*, directly related to the multipolar structure of the induced gravitational field. Such EMT is then described

by

$$T^{\mu\nu}(q) = m u^\mu u^\nu \sum_{\ell=0}^{+\infty} F_{2\ell,1} \zeta^{2\ell} + m S^{\mu\sigma} q_\sigma S^{\nu\lambda} q_\lambda \sum_{\ell=0}^{+\infty} F_{2\ell,2} \zeta^{2\ell} + \frac{i}{2} m \left(u^\mu S^{\nu\sigma} q_\sigma + u^\nu S^{\mu\sigma} q_\sigma \right) \sum_{\ell=0}^{+\infty} F_{2\ell+1,3} \zeta^{2\ell}, \quad (4)$$

where

$$\zeta = \sqrt{-q^\mu S_\mu{}^\nu S_\nu{}^\sigma q_\sigma}, \quad (5)$$

and with $F_{\ell,n}$ constant form factors where $F_{0,1} = F_{1,3} = 1$ are fixed such that angular momentum and mass are normalized to their ADM value.

We choose a reference frame in which the source sits in the origin, resulting in $u^\mu = (1, 0, 0, 0)$, and considering the rotational axis parallel to the z -axis we have

$$S^{ij} = \begin{pmatrix} 0 & a & 0 \\ -a & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & 0 \end{pmatrix}, \quad (6)$$

where a is the angular momentum density defined as usual as $a = J/m$ with J and m respectively the asymptotic angular momentum and mass of the source. Since we are working in four spacetime dimensions $\zeta = aq_\perp$, where $q_\perp^2 = q_x^2 + q_y^2$. Moreover, we want to characterize the source in terms of the asymptotic behavior of the generated metric perturbation, hence we can add analytical functions of q^2 that correspond to local contributions without modifying the asymptotic structure, *i.e.* the multipole moments [51]. Finally Eq. (4) can be generalized to

$$\begin{aligned} T^{00}(q) &= m F_1(aq_\perp) K_1(q^2), \\ T^{ij}(q) &= m (s \times q)^i (s \times q)^j F_2(aq_\perp) K_2(q^2), \\ T^{0i}(q) &= -\frac{i}{2} m (s \times q)^i F_3(aq_\perp) K_3(q^2), \end{aligned} \quad (7)$$

where we have introduced the spin vector $s^i = (0, 0, a)$ as

$$\begin{aligned} T^{00}(x) &= m \frac{e^{-\frac{z^2}{4R_1^2}}}{4\pi^{3/2} R_1} \int_0^{+\infty} dq_\perp q_\perp e^{-q_\perp^2 R_1^2} J_0(q_\perp \rho) \left(\cos(q_\perp a) - (aq_\perp)^2 F_2(aq_\perp) \right), \\ T^{ij}(x) &= -m (s \times \partial_x)^i (s \times \partial_x)^j \frac{e^{-\frac{z^2}{4R_2^2}}}{4\pi^{3/2} R_2} \int_0^{+\infty} dq_\perp q_\perp e^{-q_\perp^2 R_2^2} J_0(q_\perp \rho) F_2(q_\perp a), \\ T^{0i}(x) &= \frac{1}{2} m (s \times \partial_x)^i \frac{e^{-\frac{z^2}{4R_3^2}}}{4\pi^{3/2} R_3} \int_0^{+\infty} dq_\perp q_\perp e^{-q_\perp^2 R_3^2} J_0(q_\perp \rho) \frac{\sin(q_\perp a)}{q_\perp a}. \end{aligned} \quad (11)$$

¹ Hereon, for physically reasonable EMTs we mean sources that do not violate any energy or causality conditions.

$S^{ij} = \varepsilon^{ijk} s_k$ with ε^{ijk} the Levi-Civita symbol and where we have defined

$$F_n(aq_\perp) = \sum_{\ell=0}^{+\infty} F_{\ell,n} \left(a^2 q_\perp^2 \right)^\ell. \quad (8)$$

As explained in [51], the form factors that enter in Eq. (7) are directly related to the multipoles of the gravitational field sourced by the EMT, and imposing that such matter source generates the exact same multipolar structure of Kerr BHs one gets

$$\begin{aligned} F_1(aq_\perp) + (aq_\perp)^2 F_2(aq_\perp) &= \cos(aq_\perp), \\ F_3(aq_\perp) &= \frac{\sin(aq_\perp)}{aq_\perp}. \end{aligned} \quad (9)$$

Once fixed Eq. (9), for every choice of the $K_n(q^2)$ we get different matter sources all inducing the Kerr multipolar structure. For this reason, and in analogy with particle physics, we can call the K_n 's *structure functions*. Indeed, choosing $K_n(q^2) = 1$ means to consider point-like fundamental objects (see [51]), while non-trivial structure functions correspond to give an internal structure to the source. Our goal then is to find a suitable choice of the structure functions in order to identify a physically reasonable¹ EMT sourcing a Kerr BH mimicker, *i.e.* a rotating compact object inducing a spacetime with the same multipolar structure of Kerr. To this extent we choose a gaussian structure function defined as

$$K_n(q^2) = e^{-q^2 R_n^2}, \quad (10)$$

where R_n is a new typical length scale of the source, such that now the EMT is described by a , m and R_n , with the normalization of (10) chosen such that the ADM normalization of mass and angular momentum holds.

Finally, we can write the explicit expression of the EMT for the case of gaussian structure functions, reading²

² In this paper we will neglect the so called *residual factors* discussed in [51].

However, in Eq. (11) we are still left with a free parameter, namely the form factor $F_2(aq_\perp)$. Indeed, as shown in [51, 53], the four-dimensional case is special and mass and stress form factors are degenerate as can be seen from (9). This is due to the fact that in four dimensions the stress form factor can be gauged away at infinity, and does not contribute to the multipolar structure, even though its presence modifies the source. Once again we have a class of equivalence of physically different matter sources that induce the same multipolar structure, hence, for our purposes, $F_2(aq_\perp)$ can be suitably chosen.

In the next section we will discuss a well motivated

$$\begin{aligned}\mathcal{I}_c(\rho, z; R_c) &= m \frac{e^{-\frac{z^2}{4R_c^2}}}{4\pi^{3/2}R_c} \int_0^{+\infty} dq_\perp q_\perp e^{-q_\perp^2 R_c^2} J_0(q_\perp \rho) \cos(q_\perp a), \\ \mathcal{I}_s(\rho, z; R_s) &= m \frac{e^{-\frac{z^2}{4R_s^2}}}{4\pi^{3/2}R_s} \int_0^{+\infty} dq_\perp q_\perp e^{-q_\perp^2 R_s^2} J_0(q_\perp \rho) \frac{\sin(q_\perp a)}{q_\perp a},\end{aligned}\quad (12)$$

where $\rho^2 = x^2 + y^2$. Considering the integral [54]

$$\begin{aligned}\int_0^{+\infty} x^\mu e^{-\alpha x^2} J_\nu(\beta x) dx &= \\ \frac{\beta^\nu \Gamma(\frac{\nu+\mu+1}{2})}{2^{\nu+1} \alpha^{\frac{\nu+\mu+1}{2}} \Gamma(\nu+1)} {}_1F_1\left(\frac{\nu+\mu+1}{2}; \nu+1; -\frac{\beta^2}{4\alpha}\right),\end{aligned}\quad (13)$$

valid when $Re(\alpha) > 0$ and $Re(\mu + \nu) > -1$, we can express both integrals in terms of a series of Kummer con-

$$\begin{aligned}\mathcal{I}_c(\rho, z; R_c) &= m \frac{e^{-\frac{z^2}{4R_c^2}}}{8\pi^{3/2}R_c^3} \sum_{n=0}^{+\infty} (-1)^n \frac{n!}{(2n)!} \left(\frac{a^2}{R_c^2}\right)^n {}_1F_1\left(n+1; 1; -\frac{\rho^2}{4R_c^2}\right), \\ \mathcal{I}_s(\rho, z; R_s) &= m \frac{e^{-\frac{z^2}{4R_s^2}}}{8\pi^{3/2}R_s^3} \sum_{n=0}^{+\infty} (-1)^n \frac{n!}{(2n+1)!} \left(\frac{a^2}{R_s^2}\right)^n {}_1F_1\left(n+1; 1; -\frac{\rho^2}{4R_s^2}\right).\end{aligned}\quad (15)$$

As far as we know there is no known way to resum the series in Eq. (15), but there exist particular cases in which an analytic expression can be found. One of these is the spinless case, *i.e.* the static limit, in which $a = 0$. In this case the master integrals simply reduce to

$$\mathcal{I}_{c,s}(\rho, z; R) \Big|_{a=0} = m \frac{e^{-\frac{r^2}{4R^2}}}{8\pi^{3/2}R^3}, \quad (16)$$

with $r^2 = x^2 + y^2 + z^2$, and the source reduces to a Schwarzschild mimicker.

As mentioned before, due to the redundancy of the stress form factor in four-dimensional spacetime, we can arbitrarily fix it in order to explicitly express the EMT

choice of the stress form factor, and we will give an explicit result for the integrals in Eq. (11), studying the phenomenology of the source and testing energy and causality conditions in order to prove it to be physically reasonable.

III. KERR MIMICKER

Let us first compute the two master integrals that will appear later in the definition of the EMT, such as

fluent hypergeometric functions ${}_1F_1(a; b; c)$. Considering then

$$\begin{aligned}\int_0^{+\infty} dq_\perp q_\perp^{2n+1} e^{-R^2 q_\perp^2} J_0(\rho x) &= \\ = \frac{n!}{2R^{2(n+1)}} {}_1F_1\left(n+1; 1; -\frac{\rho^2}{4R^2}\right),\end{aligned}\quad (14)$$

and writing the trigonometric functions in terms of power series one gets

in Eq. (11). The case we are going to discuss is for a vanishing stress form factor $F_2(q_\perp a) = 0$. This corresponds to $T^{ij}(x) = 0$, leading to naturally dub the EMT as gaussian-smearred Israel source, since in the limit in which $R_n \rightarrow 0$ the EMT reduces to the Israel one [53, 55, 56].

Indeed, the Israel EMT describes a disk of radius a that violates energy and causality conditions, rotating at super-luminal speed and being singular at $\rho = a$, resembling the Kerr curvature ring-singularity. However, it has been shown that the Israel EMT sources the linearized Kerr geometry [55, 56], so what we expect from our mimicking EMT characterized by the length scales R_n , is to smear the curvature ring-singularity and recover

the Kerr limit for $R_n \rightarrow 0$, while satisfying both energy and causality conditions. So then with this choice the EMT reads

$$\begin{aligned} T_I^{00}(x) &= \mathcal{I}_c(\rho, z; R_1), \\ T_I^{ij}(x) &= 0, \\ T_I^{0i}(x) &= \frac{1}{2}(s \times \partial_x)^i \mathcal{I}_s(\rho, z; R_3). \end{aligned} \quad (17)$$

Even though we are going to focus on the gaussian-smearred Israel source, it is worth mentioning another possible and well-motivated choice of the stress form factors. Despite the fact that we are working in four dimensions, it is known that for Myers-Perry BHs [57] (Kerr generalization in higher dimensional spacetimes) an explicit analytic expression of the form factors can be given as well [51]. In this case the stress form factor is no longer redundant, and in order to match the Myers-Perry multipolar structure the expression of the form factors in arbitrary dimensions read

$$\begin{aligned} F_2^{(d)}(\zeta) &= -\frac{1}{2\zeta} \mathcal{Z}_1^{(d)}(\zeta), & F_3^{(d)}(\zeta) &= \mathcal{Z}_0^{(d)}(\zeta), \\ F_1^{(d)}(\zeta) &= \zeta^2 F_2^{(d)}(\zeta) + F_3^{(d)}(\zeta), \end{aligned} \quad (18)$$

where

$$\mathcal{Z}_n^{(d)}(\zeta) = \frac{\Gamma(d/2)}{2^{2-d}(d-1)^{\frac{d-2}{2}}} \zeta^{-\frac{d-2}{2}} J_{n+\frac{d-2}{2}}\left(\frac{d-1}{2}\zeta\right), \quad (19)$$

and with $d = D - 1$ the number of space dimensions and J_n first kind Bessel functions.

Considering then the $d = 3$ case of Eq. (18), the EMT associated with such form factors corresponds to the smooth Kerr limit of its Myers-Perry mimicker version in higher dimensions, and in this case the form factors read

$$\begin{aligned} F_1(aq_\perp) &= \frac{1}{2} \left(\cos(aq_\perp) + \frac{\sin(aq_\perp)}{aq_\perp} \right), \\ F_2(aq_\perp) &= \frac{1}{2} \left(\cos(aq_\perp) - \frac{\sin(aq_\perp)}{aq_\perp} \right), \\ F_3(aq_\perp) &= \frac{\sin(aq_\perp)}{aq_\perp}. \end{aligned} \quad (20)$$

This is just another well-motivated example for choosing a different mimicking source, leaving a detailed discussion about it, or other EMTs, for future works.

IV. SOURCE PHENOMENOLOGY

In this section we will express explicitly Eq. (17) in cylindrical coordinates and we will match the EMT with an anisotropic rotating fluid, laying the groundwork for its non-perturbative generalization. Then we will study

different parameter setups and show that for some configurations, at linear order, the gaussian-smearred Israel source does not violate any energy or causality condition.

Let us consider a cylindrical coordinate system (t, ρ, ϕ, z) in which

$$x = \rho \cos \phi, \quad y = \rho \sin \phi, \quad (21)$$

where the flat background in this coordinates reads $\eta_{\mu\nu} = \text{diag}(-1, 1, \rho^2, 1)$. Moreover, since we are in a reference frame in which the spin is aligned with the z -axis, the tensorial structure that appears in the EMT of the previous section is simplified to

$$T_I^{\mu\nu} = \begin{pmatrix} \mathcal{I}_c(R_1) & 0 & \frac{a}{2\rho} \partial_\rho \mathcal{I}_s(R_3) & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 \\ \frac{a}{2\rho} \partial_\rho \mathcal{I}_s(R_3) & 0 & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 \end{pmatrix}. \quad (22)$$

It is worth noticing that by construction the mimicker shares the same symmetries of the Kerr geometry, namely axial and equatorial symmetries. Hence, the mimicker EMT does not depend on the ϕ coordinate. For this reason, for simplicity of notation, here on we will leave understood the fact that every function depends on ρ and z , keeping explicit the parametric dependence on R_n .

Now in order to write it in a covariant way, having in mind a non-perturbative extension by solving the Einstein equations exactly, we make an ansatz in which we consider such matter source as a rotating anisotropic fluid, described in general by

$$T^{\mu\nu} = \epsilon u^\mu u^\nu + p_\rho l_\rho^\mu l_\rho^\nu + p_\phi l_\phi^\mu l_\phi^\nu, \quad (23)$$

where $u^\mu = \gamma(1, 0, \Omega, 0)$ is the four-velocity of the fluid normalized to $u^\mu u_\mu = -1$, Ω is the angular rotational velocity³ of the fluid, $\gamma = (1 - \rho^2 \Omega^2)^{-1/2}$ is the relativistic Lorentz factor and $l_\rho^\mu = (0, 1, 0, 0)$ and $l_\phi^\mu = \gamma(\rho \Omega, 0, 1/\rho, 0)$ are space-like four-vectors normalized to $(l_\phi)^\mu (l_\phi)_\mu = (l_\rho)^\mu (l_\rho)_\mu = 1$, respectively parallel to the ρ and ϕ directions. Moreover, in order to correctly interpret the physical content embedded in the EMT, the four-vectors in Eq. (23) are orthogonal to each other. In this way the eigenvalues of the EMT, associated with energy density and stresses, correspond respectively to ϵ , p_ρ and p_ϕ .

Finally, we specify what are the positive energy and causality conditions that we are going to consider. Defining a generic time-like vector $U^\mu = \alpha_1 u^\mu + \alpha_2 l_\rho^\mu + \alpha_3 l_\phi^\mu$, imposing $\alpha_1^2 = 1 + \alpha_2^2 + \alpha_3^2$ such that $U^\mu U_\mu = -1$, the weak energy condition reads

$$\xi = U_\mu U_\nu T^{\mu\nu} \geq 0, \quad (24)$$

³ Notice that the rotational velocity is not constant in general but is a function of ρ and z ($\Omega = \Omega(\rho, z)$).

from which replacing the ansatz in Eq. (23) we can reduce it to

$$\epsilon \geq 0, \quad \xi_\rho = \epsilon + p_\rho \geq 0, \quad \xi_\phi = \epsilon + p_\phi \geq 0. \quad (25)$$

The causality condition, on the other hand, requires that any characteristic velocity of the fluid must be smaller than the speed of light, meaning that the rotational speed and the sound speeds of the fluid must be sub-luminal. We can define the tangential rotational speed as $v = \rho\Omega$, from which the causality condition imposes that $|v| < 1$. The same check must be done for the sound speed, defined as $c_n^2 = \partial p_n / \partial \epsilon$, in our case for both p_ρ and p_ϕ . Then the causality condition imposes that $c_n^2 < 1$. We will see that for the proposed ansatz there exist regions where $c_n^2 < 0$, indicating that in those regions the fluid may be unstable under linear perturbations of the pressure [58, 59]. However, we will not consider it as a rule-out condition, since stability may be granted in the full non-perturbative version of the mimicking EMT.

Focusing on Eq. (22) and matching it with the ansatz in Eq. (23), for the gaussian-smearing Israel source one gets

$$\begin{aligned} \epsilon &= \frac{\mathcal{I}_c(R_1) + \sqrt{\mathcal{I}_c(R_1)^2 - (a\partial_\rho \mathcal{I}_s(R_3))^2}}{2}, \\ \Omega &= \frac{\mathcal{I}_c(R_1) - \sqrt{\mathcal{I}_c(R_1)^2 - (a\partial_\rho \mathcal{I}_s(R_3))^2}}{a\rho\partial_\rho \mathcal{I}_s(R_3)}, \\ p_\phi &= \frac{-\mathcal{I}_c(R_1) + \sqrt{\mathcal{I}_c(R_1)^2 - (a\partial_\rho \mathcal{I}_s(R_3))^2}}{2}, \\ p_\rho &= 0. \end{aligned} \quad (26)$$

As a minimum requirement for the source to be physically reasonable the functions in Eq. (26) must be real-valued, hence we must have

$$\mathcal{I}_c(R_1)^2 \geq (a\partial_\rho \mathcal{I}_s(R_3))^2. \quad (27)$$

In order to satisfy this condition we parametrize the two typical length scales as $R_1 = R$ and $R_3 = \alpha R$, and it has been found that imposing $\alpha < 1$ it is possible to find parameter configurations such that the condition in Eq. (27) is satisfied. Notice that from here on in every plot we will set $m = G = 1$, in order to express every quantity in units of G and m , keeping the dimensions understood.

The first case of study is for $\alpha = 0.99$. Fixing the value of the angular momentum density to a reference value of $a = 0.8$, the weak energy condition is studied in Fig. 1 for different values of R . For this configuration the threshold radius for which Eq. (27) is satisfied is $R_{\alpha=0.99}^* \approx 0.84$. So then we will consider only values $R > R_{\alpha=0.99}^*$. Moreover, notice that from here on we will study the source phenomenology keeping fixed the angular momentum for different values of R and α , since from Eq. (15) we can see that the angular momentum always enters in a ratio with the R parameter. Likewise, the dependency on z in Eq. (15) enters just as a gaussian dumping factor, hence

for simplicity we will always consider $z = 0$ in the following study, since it does not affect the phenomenology. From Fig. 1 one can see that the energy condition is sat-




FIG. 1. On the top the energy density and on the bottom the ξ_ϕ variable for the study of the energy condition of the gaussian-smearing Israel source for $a = 0.8$, $z = 0$, $\alpha = 0.99$ in units of $G = m = 1$.

isfied since both ϵ and ξ_ϕ are always positive. Moreover, the energy-density preserves a gaussian-like profile even in the presence of rotation, and increases its central value with R becoming smaller.

Then, in order to check causality, in Fig. 2 both rotational and sound speed are studied. It can be seen that the tangential rotational velocity is always $|v| < 1$, decaying to $|v| \rightarrow 0$ for $\rho \rightarrow +\infty$, while for values approaching $R \rightarrow R_{\alpha=0.99}^*$ one gets $|v| \rightarrow 1$ for some ρ . On the other hand the sound speed develops an imaginary part. Even though $|Re(c_\phi)| < 1$, respecting causality, the presence of an imaginary part is a signal of instability under linear perturbations of the pressure. As already discussed, in this paper we will not consider it as a rule-out condition for the source, since in the full non-perturbative generalization of the EMT the presence of gravity could restore stability.

Finally, Fig. 3 shows the pressure in the ϕ -direction. The central pressure is vanishing, and it develops a peak for $\rho \approx 2R$. Moreover the fact that the pressure is negative is not concerning and does not violate any positive energy conditions since $\xi_\phi > 0$.




FIG. 2. On the top the tangential rotational speed and on the bottom the sound speed in the ϕ -direction of the gaussian-smearred Israel source for $a = 0.8$, $z = 0$, $\alpha = 0.99$ in units of $G = m = 1$.




FIG. 3. Pressure in the ϕ -direction of the gaussian-smearred Israel source for $a = 0.8$, $z = 0$, $\alpha = 0.99$ in units of $G = m = 1$.

Another case of study is for $\alpha = 0.8$, showing in Fig. 4 the relevant plots, and where in this case the threshold value for Eq. (27) is $R_{\alpha=0.8}^* \approx 1.35$. As we can see, also for $\alpha = 0.8$ energy and causality conditions are satisfied, noticing that $R_{\alpha=0.8}^* > R_{\alpha=0.99}^*$. The fact that such threshold increases for a smaller α means that the more R_1 and R_3 differ, keeping $R_1 > R_3$, the more both typical

lengths must be bigger in order to make the EMT real-valued. Other than this we can see that the phenomenology of the two cases is very similar, differing only for the reference central and peak values of each quantity.

Finally, we can conclude that the gaussian-smearred Israel source defined in Eqs. (23) and (26), for a certain parameter-space region, describes a physically reasonable EMT sourcing a gravitational field with the exact same multipolar structure of Kerr BHs by construction. Even though we discussed a specific example, the procedure outlined in Sec. II is completely generic, and in principle it is possible to find many other satisfactory examples for linearized Kerr mimickers by choosing different structure functions and different stress form factors. Still, the point of the presented approach is to generalize such linear description to a full non-perturbative solution of Einstein equations. However, solving the Einstein equations for a generic stationary rotating spacetime ansatz is not an easy task, and as a starting point towards it, in the next section we will find the non-perturbative generalization in the non-rotating case for $a = 0$, showing how the source satisfies energy and causality conditions and studying the spacetime induced by such EMT.

V. NON-PERTURBATIVE GENERALIZATION IN THE STATIC LIMIT

Let us consider the non-rotating limit ($a = 0$) of the source in Eq. (23). In such limit $\Omega = 0$ as well as $p_\rho = 0$ and $p_\phi = 0$, and the source, now static, becomes spherically symmetric, as already noticed in Eq. (16). Since we now have a spherically symmetric source, we can move to spherical coordinates (t, r, θ, ϕ) , from which such EMT at linear level reads

$$\tilde{T}^{\mu\nu} = \epsilon_0(r)u^\mu u^\nu, \quad (28)$$

where

$$\epsilon_0(r) = m \frac{e^{-\frac{r^2}{4R^2}}}{8\pi^{3/2}R^3} \quad (29)$$

and $u^\mu = (1, 0, 0, 0)$ is the four-velocity of the static fluid. Even though the fluid is pressureless at linear level, a pressure term could arise at non-perturbative level, hence the ansatz from which we will solve Einstein equations is a perfect fluid such as

$$T^{\mu\nu} = (\epsilon(r) + p(r))u^\mu u^\nu + p(r)g^{\mu\nu}, \quad (30)$$

where $\lim_{G \rightarrow 0} p = 0$ and $\lim_{G \rightarrow 0} \epsilon = \epsilon_0$, so that $\lim_{G \rightarrow 0} T^{\mu\nu} = \tilde{T}^{\mu\nu}$, and with the sound speed defined as $c_p^2 = \partial p / \partial \epsilon$.

Then, in order to solve the Einstein equations using Eq. (30) as the source, imposing a static spherically symmetric ansatz we can reduce the problem to solving the Tolman–Oppenheimer–Volkoff (TOV) equations [60, 61].




FIG. 4. On the top-left the energy density, on the top-right the ξ_ϕ variable for the study of the energy condition, on the mid-left the tangential rotational speed, on the mid-right the sound speed in the ϕ direction and on the bottom the pressure in the ϕ -direction of the gaussian-smearred Israel source for $a = 0.8$, $z = 0$, $\alpha = 0.8$ in units of $G = m = 1$.

Furthermore, in order to close the system of three ordinary differential equations (ODEs) in four variables, we need an equation of state (EOS). However the only prescription our system has to satisfy is the $G \rightarrow 0$ limit, and so we can choose whatever EOS we want as long as such limit is preserved. Another way of closing the system without specifying any EOS is to fix a specific energy-density profile. This approach is more suitable for our setup since the only requirement we have to satisfy is $\lim_{G \rightarrow 0} \epsilon(r) = \epsilon_0(r)$. Nevertheless, in the next subsection we will solve Einstein equations perturbatively without specifying any energy-density profile, showing that the leading order of both metric and pressure are independent by it. Then in the following we will fix a specific profile and solve the TOV equations for different values of the parameter R .

A. Perturbative approach

Let us define the ansatz for the metric, *i.e.* the most generic static spherically symmetric spacetime, defined by

$$ds^2 = F_t(r)dt^2 + F_r(r)dr^2 + r^2(d\theta^2 + \sin^2\theta d\phi^2), \quad (31)$$

which is the background metric onto which the EMT in Eq. (30) is defined. As we mentioned before, at first we can try to solve the Einstein equations perturbatively in the gravitational constant, by expanding both the metric and the EMT as

$$\begin{aligned} \epsilon(r) &= \sum_{n=0}^{+\infty} \epsilon_n(r)G^n, \quad p(r) = \sum_{n=0}^{+\infty} p_n(r)G^n, \\ F_t(r) &= \sum_{n=0}^{+\infty} F_t^{(n)}(r)G^n, \quad F_r(r) = \sum_{n=0}^{+\infty} F_r^{(n)}(r)G^n, \end{aligned} \quad (32)$$

where the only conditions we have to impose are Eq. (29) and

$$p_0 = 0, \quad F_t^{(0)} = -1, \quad F_r^{(0)} = 1, \quad (33)$$

as well as asymptotic flatness and regularity at the origin at every order in G . So then considering Einstein equations

$$G_{\mu\nu} = R_{\mu\nu} - \frac{1}{2}g_{\mu\nu}R = \frac{\kappa^2}{4}T_{\mu\nu}, \quad (34)$$

we can solve them order by order in the Newton constant as

$$G_{\mu\nu}^{(n+1)} = \frac{\kappa^2}{4}T_{\mu\nu}^{(n)}, \quad (35)$$

where n is the order in G in which both quantities are expanded in.

At linear order, Einstein equations reduce to two first-order ODEs for $F_t^{(1)}$ and $F_r^{(1)}$, from which imposing the

right boundary conditions, such as regularity for $r = 0$ and asymptotic flatness, they read (see Appendix A)

$$\begin{aligned} F_t^{(1)} &= \frac{2Gm}{r} \text{Erf}\left(\frac{r}{2R}\right), \\ F_r^{(1)} &= \frac{2Gm}{r} \text{Erf}\left(\frac{r}{2R}\right) - \frac{2Gm}{R\sqrt{\pi}} e^{-\frac{r^2}{4R^2}}, \end{aligned} \quad (36)$$

and they are plotted in Fig. 5 for different values of R . As we can see, the metric at linear level is regular at $r = 0$ and asymptotically approaches the flat metric, satisfying the boundary conditions. Interestingly, the temporal




FIG. 5. On the top the temporal component and on the bottom the radial component of the linearized metric in the static limit in units of $G = m = 1$.

metric component at $r = 0$ for $R \lesssim 1.1$ develops a zero for some $r = r^*$ and becomes positive for $r < r^*$. This is due to the fact that for R smaller and smaller the system moves towards the BH limit $R \rightarrow 0$, where the Schwarzschild horizon is formed at $r = 2$. On the other hand for the radial metric component $1 + F_r^{(1)}(0) = 1$ for every value of R , even though for $R \rightarrow 0$ its peak value diverges, approaching the BH limit in which there is a divergence at $r = 0$.

Once the linear order metric is fixed, we can consider the next-to-leading order in perturbations of both the metric and the EMT, and although in order to find $\epsilon_1, F_t^{(2)}$ and $F_r^{(2)}$ we need to impose an EOS, the leading order of the pressure is uniquely fixed. Indeed, for the

pressure, Eq. (35) for $n = 1$ reduces to a single ODE, from which imposing the boundary condition $\lim_{r \rightarrow +\infty} p = 0$, it reads

$$p_1 = \frac{Gm^2}{32\pi R^4} \left(-1 + \text{Erf}^2\left(\frac{r}{2R}\right) \right) + \epsilon_0(r) \frac{Gm}{r} \text{Erf}\left(\frac{r}{2R}\right), \quad (37)$$

depicted in Fig. 6 for different values of R . We can see that the central pressure $p_1(0)$ increases as the value of the typical length scale R becomes smaller. Indeed, the Schwarzschild limit for $R \rightarrow 0$ leads to a singular EMT of infinite energy-density and pressure enclosed in a single point at $r = 0$.




FIG. 6. Linearized pressure in the static limit in units of $G = m = 1$.

B. Non-perturbative solution

As mentioned before, to go to higher orders in the G expansion, an EOS is needed, and hence to find a full non-perturbative solution by solving the TOV equations we need to specify the relation between the energy density and the pressure. However, in the present setup a more suitable way of proceeding is to fix a specific profile of $\epsilon(r)$ instead of an EOS.

Considering the reparametrization of the metric

$$F_r(r) = \left(1 - \frac{2GM(r)}{r} \right)^{-1}, \quad (38)$$

where for $r \rightarrow +\infty$ one gets $M(r) \rightarrow m$, the TOV equations read

$$\begin{aligned} M'(r) &= 4\pi r^2 \epsilon(r), \\ p'(r) &= \frac{G(4\pi r^3 p(r) + M(r))(p(r) + \epsilon(r))}{r(2GM(r) - r)}, \\ \frac{F_t'(r)}{2F_t(r)} &= -\frac{p'(r)}{p(r) + \epsilon(r)}. \end{aligned} \quad (39)$$

Then, the simplest choice we can make for the energy-density profile is just

$$\epsilon(r) = \epsilon_0(r), \quad (40)$$

with the advantage of being generic and applicable also for the non-perturbative generalization of the rotating gaussian-smearred Israel source discussed in Sec. IV. Therefore, in the following we are going to study the full solution given by imposing Eq. (40) in the TOV equations.

From this choice, replacing Eq. (40) into (39), it is possible to integrate the mass function as

$$M(r) = m \text{Erf}\left(\frac{r}{2R}\right) - \frac{mr}{R\sqrt{\pi}} e^{-\frac{r^2}{4R^2}}, \quad (41)$$

where the boundary condition is already imposed. This leads to a full analytical description of the radial component of the metric, as shown in Fig. 7. Differently with




FIG. 7. The inverse of the radial component of the metric in the static limit. On the top we show configurations for values of $R \geq R^*$, on the bottom for values of $R < R^*$ in units of $G = m = 1$.

respect to the rotating case, for the source in Eq. (30) both the energy density and the pressure are always real-valued. However, as we will see explicitly later on, there is still a threshold value $R^* \approx 0.86$ below which the source is no longer physically reasonable (the speed sound becomes superluminal), and so we will focus on those configurations such that $R \geq R^*$.

From Fig. 7 then, we can see that for certain values of R two horizons arise and a space-like region is formed. Indeed, from Eq. (41) it is possible to show that for $R \approx 0.52$, F_r^{-1} has a single zero, and for $R \lesssim 0.52$ a space-like region where the metric change sign is formed with an outer and inner horizons arising. However, we will see that physically reasonable solutions admit only values of the typical length scale above the threshold $R \geq R^*$, and so the range of parameters that allow for an horizon violate causality conditions. Still, relaxing the energy and causality conditions, such a model could be used to investigate regular BH solutions with a resolved curvature singularity.

Then we can study the pressure and the temporal metric component by solving numerically the TOV, as shown in Fig. 8. On one hand, regarding the pressure phe-




FIG. 8. On the top the temporal component of the metric, on the bottom the pressure in the static limit in units of $G = m = 1$.

nomenology, similarly to the linearized limit, for $R \rightarrow 0$ we have $p(0) \rightarrow +\infty$, coherently with the Schwarzschild limit. On the other hand, it is interesting to notice that approaching the threshold limit of $R \rightarrow R^*$ the metric approaches $F_t(0) \rightarrow 0$, suggesting that for $R < R^*$ the metric develops coordinate singularities as well as a sign change in the space-like region.

Finally we can show the behavior of the sound speed in Fig. 9, from which we can see that for $R \rightarrow R^*$ the

sound speed reaches $c_p(0) \rightarrow 1$. This means that for




FIG. 9. Sound speed in the static limit in units of $G = m = 1$.

$R < R^*$, the source develops a super-luminal sound speed violating causality. Indeed, the causality condition is the only nontrivial one since the weak energy condition is satisfied whenever $\epsilon > 0$ and $\epsilon + p > 0$, and since the pressure is always positive, as well as ϵ , it is automatically satisfied.

Finally, since we derived both pressure and energy-density, we can reconstruct the EOS of the source. Normalizing both p and ϵ to their central values, respectively $p_c = p(0)$ and $\epsilon_c = \epsilon(0)$, we can see in Fig. 10 how for two specific configurations both curves resemble a polytropic behavior. Indeed, the numerical EOS is well-




FIG. 10. EOS for normalized pressure and energy-density in the static limit in units of $G = m = 1$.

approximated by a polytropic system such that

$$p(r) \approx p_c \left(\frac{\epsilon(r)}{\epsilon_c} \right)^\gamma, \quad (42)$$

where γ is the polytropic exponent. We can fit Eq. (42) with the numerical EOS, obtaining different polytropic exponents at the varying of R , depicting such behavior in Fig. 11.




FIG. 11. Fit results between the polytropic ansatz and the numerical EOS in the static limit in units of $G = m = 1$.

Summarizing, we showed that considering the spinless limit $a = 0$ of the gaussian-smearred Israel source it is possible to find a full non-perturbative solution of the Einstein equations satisfying both energy and causality conditions. Such a solution can be classified as a Schwarzschild mimicker, describing for $R \approx R^*$ an ultra-compact object. Indeed, even though the energy density smoothly decreases without a sharp boundary, we can define an effective radius as the root-mean-square radius weighted with the energy density function as in

$$R_{eff} = \sqrt{\frac{\int_0^{+\infty} r^2 \epsilon_0(r) r^2 dr}{\int_0^{+\infty} \epsilon_0(r) r^2 dr}} = \sqrt{6}R. \quad (43)$$

Then, defining an effective compactness

$$C_{eff} = \frac{Gm}{R_{eff}}, \quad (44)$$

for the threshold limit of $R^* \approx 0.86$ we get the maximum effective compactness of $C_{eff}^* \approx 0.47$.

VI. CONCLUSIONS

Employing the momentum space formalism of General Relativity we have built a framework that allows us to construct non-singular EMTs inducing a gravitational field with any desired multipolar structure. From it, we have built a linearized EMT with a gaussian-like energy-density profile, describing an anisotropic rotating fluid sourcing a Kerr mimicker with the exact same multipolar structure of Kerr BHs. Such an approach is completely generic [51] (holds also in higher dimensional spacetimes) and allows for the construction of, in principle, an infinite number of physically different sources related by the same asymptotic structure, defining an equivalence class of EMTs. Among them, we studied the gaussian-smearred Israel source, providing many insights for the actual feasibility of such approach, proving the existence, at least

at linear level, of a physical reasonable source for a Kerr mimicker.

Such source, sharing the same symmetries of the Kerr metric, is described by mass, angular momentum and two extra parameters interpreted as typical length scales, parametrized as $R_1 = R$ and $R_3 = \alpha R$. For $\alpha \geq 1$ the EMT is not real-valued everywhere, hence it must be discarded since does not describe a physical source. However, we argued that for $\alpha < 1$ there exists a parameter-space region in which the configuration is physically viable, and in particular such regions correspond to the case where $R > R_{\alpha=0.99}^* \approx 0.84$ and $R > R_{\alpha=0.8}^* \approx 1.35$, respectively for the two cases of study we discussed.

Within their respective real-value threshold in Eq. (27), we proved that both configurations satisfy the positive energy and causality conditions, even though in both cases the sound speed develops an imaginary part. This can be likely related to instabilities of linearized pressure perturbations [58, 59], but we do not consider such instabilities as rule-out conditions for the physical feasibility of the source. Indeed, even if our argument is valid at every order in the angular momentum expansion, it holds only for linearized gravity, and a full non-perturbative generalization of the studied Kerr mimicker could make the source stable after non-linear gravitational effects are taken into account.

To this extent, limiting ourselves to the static limit ($a = 0$), we found a non-perturbative solution of the Einstein equations for the gaussian-smearred Israel source, now acting as a Schwarzschild mimicker induced by a perfect fluid. Since the source is now spherically symmetric, and described only by mass and the R length scale, the problem is reduced to solving the TOV equations, where an EOS has to be imposed in order to close the system of differential equations. However, instead of imposing an EOS, we fixed the explicit expression of the energy-density to be equivalent to its linearized limit.

Solving then the stellar-structure equations we found that for $R \lesssim 0.52$ inner and outer horizons are formed and causality is violated, suggesting that such regime is describing a regular BH model with resolved singularity. On the other hand, for $R > 0.52$ the source produces a horizonless Schwarzschild mimicker, such that in the parameter-space region where $R \geq R^* \approx 0.86$ satisfies every positive energy and causality conditions, with an everywhere real-valued sound speed suggesting stability under pressure perturbations. Finally, recovering the EOS we found a polytropic-like behavior, while studying the compactness of the mimicker, after defining an effective radius in Eq. (43), we argued that the maximum effective compactness the mimicker can reach at the physical threshold of $R \approx R^*$ is $C_{eff}^* \approx 0.47$.

We stress the fact that the particular Kerr mimicker model studied in this paper is just a specific example of the general framework presented in this work. There may be more sophisticated choices of the stress form factor and/or the structure functions that leads to different models with different phenomenology. Indeed, a careful

study on the equivalence class of Kerr mimicking EMTs could lead to direct relations between physical viability conditions and the functions that characterize the source, providing a faster and more efficient framework to build BH mimickers.

Regarding the gaussian-smearred Israel source discussed in this paper, even though a full non-perturbative generalization for such source is challenging, a starting point could be working perturbatively in the angular momentum, finding a non-linear solution order by order in the multipole expansion. Moreover, for the static case in which a solution is already found, a more detailed study of the system could ensure stability and enlarge our phenomenological knowledge of such Schwarzschild mimicker.

Finally, future works could also focus on a detailed study of the parameter-space regions in which a horizon is formed. This model in fact could offer many insights for regular BH models and how eventual horizonless BH mimickers collapse and develop event horizons. Indeed for the source we studied in this paper (even in the rotating case), it always exists a lower bound value for the R parameter to ensure physical viability, suggesting that regular horizonless mimickers can collapse in regular BHs and eventually violating energy and/or causality conditions.

ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

I would like to thank Massimo Bianchi, Paolo Pani, and Fabio Riccioni for their useful comments and suggestions throughout the writing process of this paper, and Simone D'Onofrio for insightful discussions at the time this project started. I also acknowledge the hospitality of the Universitat de Barcelona/ICCUB during the final stages of this paper's completion. This work is partially supported by Sapienza University of Rome ("Progetti per Avvio alla Ricerca - Tipo 1", protocol number AR1241906DC8FF32).

Appendix A: Perturbative Einstein equations

Let us consider the first-order perturbative Einstein equations in (35) with $n = 0$, where $T_{\mu\nu}^{(0)} = \tilde{T}_{\mu\nu}$ as in Eq. (28). At this order the problem is reduced to solving a system of two first-order ODEs, such as

$$\begin{aligned} \frac{F_r^{(1)} + rF_r'^{(1)}}{r^2} &= \frac{e^{-\frac{r^2}{4R^2}} Gm}{\sqrt{\pi}R^3}, \\ F_r^{(1)} + rF_t'^{(1)} &= 0. \end{aligned} \quad (\text{A1})$$

The solution of the equation in $F_r^{(1)}$ then reads

$$F_r^{(1)} = \frac{C}{r} + \frac{2Gm}{r} \text{Erf}\left(\frac{r}{2R}\right) - \frac{2Gm}{R\sqrt{\pi}} e^{-\frac{r^2}{4R^2}}, \quad (\text{A2})$$

with C as an integration constant. Imposing now the boundary condition for which

$$\lim_{r \rightarrow 0} F_r^{(1)} < +\infty, \quad (\text{A3})$$

one has to impose that $C = 0$, from which we obtain the result in Eq. (36).

Replacing the previous result into Eq. (A1), for the linearized metric temporal component one gets the equation

$$\frac{F_t'^{(1)}}{r} = \frac{2Gm}{\sqrt{\pi}Rr^2} e^{-\frac{r^2}{4R^2}} - \frac{2Gm}{r^3} \text{Erf}\left(\frac{r}{2R}\right), \quad (\text{A4})$$

which solution reads

$$F_t^{(1)} = C + \frac{2Gm}{r} \text{Erf}\left(\frac{r}{2R}\right). \quad (\text{A5})$$

Finally, imposing asymptotic flatness

$$\lim_{r \rightarrow 0} F_t^{(1)} = 0, \quad (\text{A6})$$

the integration constant must be fixed to $C = 0$, leading to the expression in Eq. (36).

Moving to second order in perturbation theory, namely Eq. (35) for $n = 1$, replacing Eqs. (36) inside the Einstein equation, one is able to isolate a first-order ODE for the leading order of the pressure

$$p_1' = \frac{Gm^2}{8\pi^2 R^4 r} e^{-\frac{r^2}{2R^2}} - \frac{Gm^2}{8\pi^{3/2} R^3 r^2} \text{Erf}\left(\frac{r}{2R}\right) e^{-\frac{r^2}{4R^2}}. \quad (\text{A7})$$

The solution is straightforward and it reads

$$p_1 = C + \frac{Gm^2}{32\pi R^4} \text{Erf}^2\left(\frac{r}{2R}\right) + \epsilon_0(r) \frac{Gm}{r} \text{Erf}\left(\frac{r}{2R}\right), \quad (\text{A8})$$

from which imposing a vanishing pressure at infinity

$$\lim_{r \rightarrow +\infty} p_1 = 0, \quad (\text{A9})$$

the integration constant has to be fixed at the value of $C = -\frac{Gm^2}{32\pi R^4}$, from which we derived Eq. (37).

- [1] K. Schwarzschild, Sitzungsber. Preuss. Akad. Wiss. Berlin (Math. Phys.) **1916**, 189 (1916), [arXiv:physics/9905030](#).
- [2] R. P. Kerr, *Phys. Rev. Lett.* **11**, 237 (1963).
- [3] C. W. Misner, K. S. Thorne, and J. A. Wheeler, *Gravitation* (W. H. Freeman, San Francisco, 1973).
- [4] B. P. Abbott *et al.* (LIGO Scientific, Virgo), *Phys. Rev. Lett.* **116**, 061102 (2016), [arXiv:1602.03837 \[gr-qc\]](#).
- [5] B. P. Abbott *et al.* (LIGO Scientific, Virgo), *Phys. Rev. D* **100**, 104036 (2019), [arXiv:1903.04467 \[gr-qc\]](#).
- [6] K. Akiyama *et al.* (Event Horizon Telescope), *Astrophys. J. Lett.* **875**, L1 (2019), [arXiv:1906.11238 \[astro-ph.GA\]](#).
- [7] K. Akiyama *et al.* (Event Horizon Telescope), *Astrophys. J. Lett.* **930**, L17 (2022), [arXiv:2311.09484 \[astro-ph.HE\]](#).
- [8] J. M. Bardeen, B. Carter, and S. W. Hawking, *Commun. Math. Phys.* **31**, 161 (1973).
- [9] S. W. Hawking, *Nature* **248**, 30 (1974).
- [10] W. Israel, *Phys. Rev.* **164**, 1776 (1967).
- [11] B. Carter, *Phys. Rev. Lett.* **26**, 331 (1971).
- [12] S. B. Giddings, *Phys. Rev. D* **46**, 1347 (1992), [arXiv:hep-th/9203059](#).
- [13] O. Lunin and S. D. Mathur, *Nucl. Phys. B* **623**, 342 (2002), [arXiv:hep-th/0109154](#).
- [14] S. D. Mathur, *Fortsch. Phys.* **53**, 793 (2005), [arXiv:hep-th/0502050](#).
- [15] S. A. Hayward, *Phys. Rev. Lett.* **96**, 031103 (2006), [arXiv:gr-qc/0506126](#).
- [16] I. Bena and N. P. Warner, *Phys. Rev. D* **74**, 066001 (2006), [arXiv:hep-th/0505166](#).
- [17] I. Bena, C.-W. Wang, and N. P. Warner, *JHEP* **11**, 042 (2006), [arXiv:hep-th/0608217](#).
- [18] S. D. Mathur, (2008), [arXiv:0810.4525 \[hep-th\]](#).
- [19] V. P. Frolov, *Phys. Rev. D* **94**, 104056 (2016), [arXiv:1609.01758 \[gr-qc\]](#).
- [20] P. A. Cano, S. Chimento, T. Ortín, and A. Ruipérez, *Phys. Rev. D* **99**, 046014 (2019), [arXiv:1806.08377 \[hep-th\]](#).
- [21] R. Carballo-Rubio, F. Di Filippo, S. Liberati, C. Pacilio, and M. Visser, *JHEP* **07**, 023 (2018), [arXiv:1805.02675 \[gr-qc\]](#).
- [22] A. Simpson and M. Visser, *JCAP* **02**, 042 (2019), [arXiv:1812.07114 \[gr-qc\]](#).
- [23] A. Simpson, P. Martin-Moruno, and M. Visser, *Class. Quant. Grav.* **36**, 145007 (2019), [arXiv:1902.04232 \[gr-qc\]](#).
- [24] M. Bianchi, D. Consoli, A. Grillo, J. F. Morales, P. Pani, and G. Raposo, *Phys. Rev. Lett.* **125**, 221601 (2020), [arXiv:2007.01743 \[hep-th\]](#).
- [25] M. Bianchi, D. Consoli, A. Grillo, J. F. Morales, P. Pani, and G. Raposo, *JHEP* **01**, 003 (2021), [arXiv:2008.01445 \[hep-th\]](#).
- [26] N. Afshordi *et al.* (2024) [arXiv:2410.14414 \[gr-qc\]](#).
- [27] R. Carballo-Rubio *et al.*, (2025), [arXiv:2501.05505 \[gr-qc\]](#).
- [28] V. Cardoso and P. Pani, *Nature Astron.* **1**, 586 (2017), [arXiv:1709.01525 \[gr-qc\]](#).
- [29] Z. Mark, A. Zimmerman, S. M. Du, and Y. Chen, *Phys. Rev. D* **96**, 084002 (2017), [arXiv:1706.06155 \[gr-qc\]](#).
- [30] R. Carballo-Rubio, F. Di Filippo, S. Liberati, and M. Visser, *Phys. Rev. D* **98**, 124009 (2018), [arXiv:1809.08238 \[gr-qc\]](#).
- [31] J. Mazza, E. Franzin, and S. Liberati, *JCAP* **04**, 082 (2021), [arXiv:2102.01105 \[gr-qc\]](#).
- [32] V. Cardoso and F. Duque, *Phys. Rev. D* **105**, 104023 (2022), [arXiv:2204.05315 \[gr-qc\]](#).
- [33] R. Casadio, A. Kamenshchik, and J. Ovalle, *Phys. Rev. D* **109**, 024042 (2024), [arXiv:2401.03980 \[gr-qc\]](#).
- [34] V. Cardoso and P. Pani, *Living Rev. Rel.* **22**, 4 (2019), [arXiv:1904.05363 \[gr-qc\]](#).
- [35] J. Abedi, H. Dykaar, and N. Afshordi, *Phys. Rev. D* **96**, 082004 (2017), [arXiv:1612.00266 \[gr-qc\]](#).
- [36] X. Jiang, P. Wang, H. Yang, and H. Wu, *Eur. Phys. J. C* **81**, 1043 (2021), [Erratum: *Eur. Phys. J. C* 82, 5 (2022)], [arXiv:2107.10758 \[gr-qc\]](#).
- [37] R. Shaikh, *Mon. Not. Roy. Astron. Soc.* **523**, 375 (2023), [arXiv:2208.01995 \[gr-qc\]](#).
- [38] F. D. Ryan, *Phys. Rev. D* **52**, 5707 (1995).
- [39] G. Pappas and T. A. Apostolatos, *Phys. Rev. Lett.* **108**, 231104 (2012), [arXiv:1201.6067 \[gr-qc\]](#).
- [40] R. P. Geroch, *J. Math. Phys.* **11**, 1955 (1970).
- [41] R. P. Geroch, *J. Math. Phys.* **11**, 2580 (1970).
- [42] R. O. Hansen, *J. Math. Phys.* **15**, 46 (1974).
- [43] K. S. Thorne, *Rev. Mod. Phys.* **52**, 299 (1980).
- [44] Y. Gürsel, *General Relativity and Gravitation* **15**, 737 (1983).
- [45] J. L. Friedman, *Commun. Math. Phys.* **63**, 243 (1978).
- [46] V. Cardoso, P. Pani, M. Cadoni, and M. Cavaglia, *Phys. Rev. D* **77**, 124044 (2008), [arXiv:0709.0532 \[gr-qc\]](#).
- [47] G. Moschidis, *Commun. Math. Phys.* **358**, 437 (2018), [arXiv:1608.02035 \[math.AP\]](#).
- [48] S. W. Hawking, *Commun. Math. Phys.* **25**, 152 (1972).
- [49] S. W. Hawking and G. F. R. Ellis, *The Large Scale Structure of Space-Time*, Cambridge Monographs on Mathematical Physics (Cambridge University Press, 2023).
- [50] D. C. Robinson, *Phys. Rev. Lett.* **34**, 905 (1975).
- [51] M. Bianchi, C. Gambino, P. Pani, and F. Ricciioni, (2024), [arXiv:2412.01771 \[gr-qc\]](#).
- [52] B. Bonga and H. Yang, *Phys. Rev. D* **104**, 084040 (2021), [arXiv:2106.08342 \[gr-qc\]](#).
- [53] C. Gambino, P. Pani, and F. Ricciioni, *Phys. Rev. D* **109**, 124018 (2024), [arXiv:2403.16574 \[hep-th\]](#).
- [54] I. S. Gradshteyn and I. M. Ryzhik, *Table of Integrals, Series, and Products* (1943).
- [55] W. Israel, *Phys. Rev. D* **2**, 641 (1970).
- [56] H. Balasin and H. Nachbagauer, *Class. Quant. Grav.* **11**, 1453 (1994), [arXiv:gr-qc/9312028](#).
- [57] R. C. Myers and M. J. Perry, *Annals Phys.* **172**, 304 (1986).
- [58] L. Rezzolla and O. Zanotti, *Relativistic Hydrodynamics* (Oxford University Press, 2013).
- [59] P. Romatschke and U. Romatschke, *Relativistic Fluid Dynamics In and Out of Equilibrium*, Cambridge Monographs on Mathematical Physics (Cambridge University Press, 2019) [arXiv:1712.05815 \[nucl-th\]](#).
- [60] R. C. Tolman, *Phys. Rev.* **55**, 364 (1939).
- [61] J. R. Oppenheimer and G. M. Volkoff, *Phys. Rev.* **55**, 374 (1939).