

Comment on “Absence of abelian Higgs hair for extremal black holes”

Filipe Bonjour and Ruth Gregory

Centre for Particle Theory, Durham University, South Road, Durham, DH1 3LE, U.K.

(4 September 1998)

PACS numbers: 04.70.-s, 11.27.+d, 98.80.Cq

hep-th/9809029

DTP/98/63

The issue of what hair a black hole can wear has been an ongoing and interesting story. The hair in question in this comment is abelian-Higgs hair, which may occur because a $U(1)$ vortex can pierce, or even end, on a black hole [2]. In the letter of Chamblin et. al. [1] this issue was explored for charged black holes, and it was argued that while the results of [2] were qualitatively the same for nonextremal black holes, in the extremal limit a completely new phenomenon occurred, and the flux of the vortex was expelled from the black hole, rather like flux is expelled from a superconductor. The evidence presented was a set of plots in which the flux lines of the vortex consistently wrapped the black hole, even for very thin vortices. We have re-examined this system, and while we do find flux expulsion for thick strings, we do not agree that thin vortices are expelled.

The equations for the vortex were solved numerically in [1], using a technique first described in [2]. The basic idea is to discretize on a grid in r and θ , and to use a relaxation procedure. The only subtlety is that one of the boundaries – the horizon – does not have fixed boundary conditions, but must also be relaxed to a solution, therefore there is a choice of *initial* conditions, and it turns out that this is a key issue. We use exactly the same numerical techniques as [1,2], but with a variety of initial conditions on the horizon. We chose three representative data sets corresponding to setting core, exterior, and an intermediate sinusoidal form for the vortex fields.

As can be seen, if we impose the core initial conditions we reproduce the results of [1], but if we choose vacuum or sinusoidal initial conditions for a thin vortex we get a very different result and find that the vortex does indeed pierce the horizon. We have also computed the energies of these solutions to compare with the plot of [1], and find that the piercing solutions do indeed have lower energy for large black holes.

Let us examine why we obtain different results to [1]. The answer clearly lies in the initial conditions chosen, in [1] core initial conditions were used, however, we find that different initial conditions give different results. The problem is that for the extremal black hole, the horizon in the spatial section is singular, albeit a singularity at infinite proper distance away. Great care must therefore be taken with interpreting numerical work, and a variety of different approaches must be used. We believe the piercing solution is the correct one for thin strings for the following reasons: First, its energy is lower, second, it makes more physical sense – what would the equilibrium solution for the black hole/vortex system be otherwise? And finally, the numerical data for the piercing solution was much more robust. Because the horizon is an infinite spacelike distance away, if X is set to zero there, the method can never lift it from zero, it simply tries to sweep all the variation in the fields as close to the horizon as it can to minimise the errors.

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

Our thanks to Roberto Emparan, Konrad Kuijken and Andrew Sornborger for useful discussions.




FIG. 1. A plot of the P -contours for $E = 10, N = 1, \beta = 1$ for the three initial data sets on the horizon; the sinusoidal and vacuum data sets give the same picture.

-
- [1] A.Chamblin, J.M.A.Ashbourn-Chamblin, R.Emparan and A.Sornborger, *Phys. Rev. Lett.* **80** 4373 (1998).
 - [2] A.Achúcarro, R.Gregory and K.Kuijken, *Phys. Rev. D* **52** 5729 (1995).