

# NON-COMMUTATIVE KERR BLACK HOLE

Elisabetta Di Grezia\*

*Istituto Nazionale di Fisica Nucleare, Sezione di Napoli,*

*Complesso Universitario di Monte S. Angelo,*

*Via Cintia Edificio 6, 80126 Napoli, Italy and*

*Dipartimento di Scienze Fisiche, Complesso Universitario di Monte S. Angelo,*

*Via Cintia Edificio 6, 80126 Napoli, Italy*

Giampiero Esposito<sup>†</sup>

*Istituto Nazionale di Fisica Nucleare, Sezione di Napoli,*

*Complesso Universitario di Monte S. Angelo,*

*Via Cintia Edificio 6, 80126 Napoli, Italy*

(Dated: June 9, 2021)

## Abstract

This paper applies the first-order Seiberg–Witten map to evaluate the first-order non-commutative Kerr tetrad. The classical tetrad is taken to follow the locally non-rotating frame prescription. We also evaluate the tiny effect of non-commutativity on the efficiency of the Penrose process of rotational energy extraction from a black hole.

---

\*Electronic address: digrezia@na.infn.it

<sup>†</sup>Electronic address: giampiero.esposito@na.infn.it

## I. INTRODUCTION

In general relativity the problems concerning the singularities in gravitational collapse have led to important developments over decades and are still at the core of much insight into Einstein's theory [1].

In 1795 Laplace, relying upon Newtonian gravity, found that a very dense and massive object would appear black, because light would not be able to escape from it. Much later, in 1915, Einstein developed the theory of general relativity which predicts the possible existence of such dark objects, black holes, caused by singularities, which are objects with infinite curvature resulting from an infinite density, so that everything nearby is drawn into the black hole.

Soon after Einstein's seminal paper, Schwarzschild obtained in 1916 the first solution of the Einstein equation of general relativity, which described the space-time around a static spherically symmetric massive object, that does not have an angular momentum or charge. This was called, since then, the Schwarzschild metric.

Later, in 1963, Kerr discovered another solution [2], the Kerr metric, which describes the space-time outside a massive axi-symmetric rotating object. A rotating black hole has rotation in addition to the static black hole.

These two solutions describe the static and rotating black holes, respectively. Thus, black hole solutions of the Einstein equations are characterized by three parameters, i.e., mass  $M$ , angular momentum  $J$ , and charge  $Q$  by the no-hair, or uniqueness, theorem [3].

The description of a rotating black hole uses two of the three parameters: mass and angular momentum. The black hole mass, angular momentum and charge are conserved during the collapse of the star, because of global conservation laws. All other properties of the star collapsed to form the black hole are lost during the collapse (no-hair theorem). Then there are four laws, derived from standard laws of physics, which describe the thermodynamics of a black hole [4]. In particular the temperature  $T = \kappa/2\pi$  is the Hawking temperature of the black hole, and is defined by [4-9]:

$$T \equiv - \left( \frac{1}{4\pi\sqrt{-G_{00}G_{rr}}} \frac{dG_{00}}{dr} \right)_{r=r_H}. \quad (1.1)$$

The Kerr metric describes the space-time around a rotating or spinning singularity without charge and time-independent, i.e. the axi-symmetric gravitational field of a collapsed object

that has retained its angular momentum. Stellar black holes, on the other hand, are caused by the collapse of stars. A star is a very massive, rotating but charge-less object. Because charges of opposite sign cancel each other, stars are neutral. Hence, the space-time around a stellar black hole is described by the Kerr metric. Different coordinate systems are indeed used for the Kerr metric, and a coordinate system commonly used is the Boyer–Lindquist [10] which exploits spherical coordinates. These are easy to work with and some features are easily noticed, but it has a coordinate singularity at the event horizon. Thus, by using different coordinate systems, different properties or features of a rotating black hole can be described.

In the second half of the twentieth century, the black hole is no longer a theoretical construction, but it could be a real physical object because astronomers observed very small objects that emitted jets of particles with very high energy. They proposed black holes as the sources of these jets [11, 12]. In fact massive stars undergoing a gravitational collapse in the final state, are expected to become a black hole. Moreover, a rotating star will collapse in a spinning or rotating black hole. Thus, the Kerr metric is a good candidate to describe the space-time around the final state of a very massive star.

Rotating black holes, discovered by Kerr as exact solutions of general relativity equations, are of great astrophysical interest because their emissions provide a method for identifying and studying black holes.

There are several motivations for studying black holes and the metrics that describe the space-time around them; one is that they form objects which probably have to be understood in terms of quantum gravity: large mass at small size. Second, because stellar mass black holes give information about the *last stage in star evolution*; third, these black holes are important in cosmology since they could be *seeds of galaxy formation*. However, it is unclear whether they are properly described by the Kerr metric. Super-massive black holes can give information about the *very early universe era*.

Hence there are three general types of black holes: stellar black holes, primordial black holes and super-massive black holes, distinguished by their mass and size.

There are several ways in which black holes could be observed in an indirect way: X-rays, spectral shift, gravitational lensing. The only direct way to observe black holes is via gravitational waves. So far, no black hole has been directly observed.

In astrophysical contexts  $Q$  is negligible, because the electric charge is shortened out by

the surrounding plasma [13]. Thus, the variation in the observational properties of black holes is due to external parameters, such as the angle between the black hole spin vector and the line of sight, the gas accretion flow geometry and black hole spin  $j \equiv J/M^2 = a/M$ .

On choosing  $G = c = 1$  units, the Kerr metric in Boyer-Lindquist coordinates [10] reads as (we actually follow the sign conventions in Ref. [14])

$$ds^2 = - \left( 1 - \frac{2Mr}{\Sigma} \right) dt^2 + \frac{\Sigma}{\Delta} dr^2 + \Sigma d\theta^2 + \left\{ (r^2 + a^2) \sin^2 \theta + \frac{2M a^2 r \sin^4 \theta}{\Sigma} \right\} d\varphi^2 - \frac{4M a r \sin^2 \theta}{\Sigma} dt d\varphi, \quad (1.2)$$

where  $M$  is the mass of the black hole,  $a$  is its angular momentum per unit mass ( $0 \leq a \leq M$ ), and the functions  $\Delta, \Sigma$  are given by

$$\Delta \equiv r^2 + a^2 - 2Mr, \quad (1.3)$$

$$\Sigma \equiv r^2 + a^2 \cos^2 \theta. \quad (1.4)$$

For the Kerr metric, there is a unique sensible choice of observers and tetrads: the locally non-rotating frame for which the observers' world lines are  $r = \text{constant}, \theta = \text{constant}, \varphi = \omega t + \text{constant}$ . The corresponding basis of one-forms for such an observer is [14]

$$e^{(t)} = \sqrt{\frac{\Sigma \Delta}{A}} dt, \quad (1.5)$$

$$e^{(r)} = \sqrt{\frac{\Sigma}{\Delta}} dr, \quad (1.6)$$

$$e^{(\theta)} = \sqrt{\Sigma} d\theta, \quad (1.7)$$

$$e^{(\varphi)} = -\frac{2Mar \sin \theta}{\sqrt{\Sigma A}} dt + \sqrt{\frac{A}{\Sigma}} \sin \theta d\varphi, \quad (1.8)$$

where the function  $A$  is defined as

$$A \equiv (r^2 + a^2)^2 - a^2 \Delta \sin^2 \theta. \quad (1.9)$$

and each basis one-form in (1.5)–(1.8) reads as

$$e^{(i)} = e_{\mu}^{(i)} dx^{\mu}. \quad (1.10)$$

On the other hand, from the point of view of current developments in field theory, the axi-symmetry of the Kerr metric makes it interesting to study how non-commutativity would

affect it. Following Ref. [5], one can assume that non-commutativity of space-time can be encoded in the commutator of operators corresponding to space-time coordinates, i.e. (the integer  $D$  below is even)

$$[x^\mu, x^\nu] = i\Lambda^{\mu\nu}, \quad \mu, \nu = 1, 2, \dots, D, \quad (1.11)$$

where the antisymmetric matrix  $\Lambda^{\mu\nu}$  is taken to have block-diagonal form

$$\Lambda^{\mu\nu} = \text{diag}(\Lambda_1, \dots, \Lambda_{D/2}), \quad (1.12)$$

with

$$\Lambda_i = \Lambda \begin{pmatrix} 0 & 1 \\ -1 & 0 \end{pmatrix}, \quad \forall i = 1, 2, \dots, D/2, \quad (1.13)$$

the parameter  $\Lambda$  having dimension of length squared and being constant. The author of Ref. [5] solves the Einstein equations with mass density of a static, spherically symmetric, smeared particle-like gravitational source as (hereafter we work in  $G = c = \hbar = 1$  units)

$$\rho_\Lambda(r) = \frac{M}{(4\pi\Lambda)^{\frac{3}{2}}} e^{-\frac{r^2}{4\Lambda}}. \quad (1.14)$$

We here use a different non-commutative prescription (which also differs from the work in Refs. [15–18]) to analyze the modification of the Kerr metric.

The plan of the paper is as follows. In Sec. 2 we apply the first-order Seiberg–Witten map first obtained by Miao and Zhang [19] to the deformed Kerr metric. The resulting formulae turn out to be cumbersome and are, to our knowledge, the first systematic evaluation of a first-order Seiberg–Witten map when one starts from a classical tetrad which describes the Kerr geometry. Section 3 evaluates the modified efficiency of the Penrose process of rotational energy extraction from a Kerr black hole. Concluding remarks and open problems are presented in Sec. 4.

## II. $GL(2, C)$ GRAVITY AND FIRST-ORDER SEIBERG–WITTEN MAP

On considering  $SL(2, C)$  gravity in the ordinary space-time, the basic physical quantities are the tetrad  $e_\mu^a$  and spin-connection  $\omega_\mu^{ab}$ , the latter being given by

$$\omega_\mu^{ab} = \frac{1}{2} e^{a\nu} (e_{\nu,\mu}^b - e_{\mu,\nu}^b) - \frac{1}{2} e^{b\nu} (e_{\nu,\mu}^a - e_{\mu,\nu}^a) + \frac{1}{2} e^{a\nu} e^{b\sigma} (e_{\nu,\sigma}^c - e_{\sigma,\nu}^c) e_{c\mu}. \quad (2.1)$$

With a standard notation, the Latin letters  $a, b = 0, 1, 2, 3$  are Lorentz indices, which are raised and lowered by the Minkowski metric tensor  $\eta_{ab} = \text{diag}(-1, 1, 1, 1)$ , while Greek letters  $\mu, \nu = 0, 1, 2, 3$  are spacetime indices which are raised and lowered by the space-time metric

$$g_{\mu\nu} = e_\mu^a e_\nu^b \eta_{ab} = e_{b\mu} e_\nu^b. \quad (2.2)$$

The spin-connection and tetrad can be rewritten as a matrix-valued one-form with spinor notation, i.e.

$$e = e_\mu^a \gamma_a dx^\mu, \quad \omega = \frac{1}{2} \omega_\mu^{ab} \sigma_{ab} dx^\mu = \omega_\mu dx^\mu, \quad (2.3)$$

where  $\sigma_{ab} = -\frac{i}{4}[\gamma_a, \gamma_b]$  are  $SL(2, C)$  generators and  $\gamma_a$  are the Dirac  $\gamma$ -matrices satisfying the Clifford algebra anticommutation relations  $\{\gamma_a, \gamma_b\} = 2\eta_{ab}$ .

As is well described in [19], [20], the group  $SL(2, C)$  does not close on noncommutative spacetimes and it should be enlarged to a bigger group by including the additional generators 1 and  $\gamma_5 = i\gamma_0\gamma_1\gamma_2\gamma_3$ , so that  $SL(2, C)$  is enlarged to  $GL(2, C)$ . The tetrad should then be extended to include the additional generator  $\gamma_5\gamma_a$  (see the Appendix and Refs. [21], [22]). To sum up, the  $GL(2, C)$  spin-connection  $\widehat{\omega}_\mu$  and gauge parameter  $\widehat{\psi}$  can be decomposed as [19]

$$\widehat{\omega}_\mu = \frac{1}{2} \widehat{\omega}_\mu^{(0)ab} \sigma_{ab} + \widehat{a}_\mu^{(1)} + i \widehat{b}_{\mu 5}^{(1)} \gamma_5, \quad (2.4)$$

$$\widehat{\psi} = \frac{1}{2} \widehat{\psi}^{(0)ab} \sigma_{ab} + \widehat{\psi}^{(1)} + i \widehat{\psi}_5^{(1)} \gamma_5, \quad (2.5)$$

while the tetrad is generalized to

$$\widehat{e}_\mu = \widehat{e}_\mu^{(0)a} \gamma_a + \widehat{e}_{\mu 5}^{(1)a} \gamma_5 \gamma_a. \quad (2.6)$$

The Seiberg–Witten map [23] for the tetrad  $\widehat{e}_\mu$  is [19]

$$\widehat{e}_\mu + \delta_{\widehat{\psi}} \widehat{e}_\mu = \widehat{e}_\mu \left( e + \delta_\psi e, \omega + \delta_\psi \omega \right). \quad (2.7)$$

The solution of Eq. (2.7) up to first order in the non-commutativity tensor  $\Lambda^{\mu\nu}$  reads as [19]

$$\widehat{e}_\mu^{(0)a} = e_\mu^a, \quad (2.8)$$

$$\widehat{e}_{\mu 5}^{(1)a} = \frac{1}{4} \Lambda^{\lambda\sigma} \omega_\lambda^{fb} \left( \partial_\sigma e_\mu^c - \frac{1}{2} e_\mu^d \omega_\sigma^{ce} \eta_{ed} \right) \varepsilon_{fbc}{}^a, \quad (2.9)$$

where  $e_\mu^a$  in (2.8) is the classical tetrad.

In the Kerr geometry the only non-vanishing component of  $\Lambda^{\mu\nu}$  turns out to be  $\Lambda^{23}$  because the metric depends on  $(r, \theta)$  only, and hence we find (with our notation, the superscript  $(p, q)$  denotes  $p$  derivatives with respect to  $r$  and  $q$  derivatives with respect to  $\theta$ )

$$\begin{aligned} \hat{e}_{t5}^{(1)t} &= \frac{1}{2 \sqrt{\Sigma(r, \theta)} (A(r, \theta) \Sigma(r, \theta))^{\frac{3}{2}} \sqrt{\frac{\Sigma(r, \theta)}{\Delta(r, \theta)}}} \left\{ 257 M a \Lambda^{23} \times \right. \\ &\left( \frac{1}{\Delta(r, \theta)^2} (r (-\Sigma(r, \theta) \Delta^{(0,1)}(r, \theta)) + \Delta(r, \theta) \Sigma^{(0,1)}(r, \theta)) \times \right. \\ &\left. (33 \sin(\theta) \Sigma(r, \theta) A^{(0,1)}(r, \theta) + A(r, \theta) (-2 \cos(\theta) \Sigma(r, \theta) + \sin(\theta) \Sigma^{(0,1)}(r, \theta))) \right) \\ &+ \sin(\theta) \Sigma^{(1,0)}(r, \theta) (33 r \Sigma(r, \theta) A^{(1,0)}(r, \theta) \\ &\left. + A(r, \theta) (-34 \Sigma(r, \theta) + r \Sigma^{(1,0)}(r, \theta))) \right\}, \end{aligned} \quad (2.10)$$

$$\begin{aligned} \hat{e}_{\varphi 5}^{(1)t} &= \frac{1}{4 \sqrt{\frac{A(r, \theta)}{\Sigma(r, \theta)} \Sigma(r, \theta)^{\frac{9}{2}}}} \left\{ -257 \Lambda^{23} \left( \frac{\Sigma(r, \theta)}{\Delta(r, \theta)} \right)^{\frac{3}{2}} \times \right. \\ &(\sin(\theta) \Sigma(r, \theta) (\Sigma(r, \theta) A^{(0,1)}(r, \theta) \Delta^{(0,1)}(r, \theta) - \Delta(r, \theta) (A^{(0,1)}(r, \theta) \Sigma^{(0,1)}(r, \theta) \\ &+ \Delta(r, \theta) A^{(1,0)}(r, \theta) \Sigma^{(1,0)}(r, \theta))) + A(r, \theta) (2 \cos(\theta) \Sigma(r, \theta)^2 \Delta^{(0,1)}(r, \theta) - \Sigma(r, \theta) (2 \cos(\theta) \Delta(r, \theta) \\ &\left. + \sin(\theta) \Delta^{(0,1)}(r, \theta)) \Sigma^{(0,1)}(r, \theta) + \sin(\theta) \Delta(r, \theta) (\Sigma^{(0,1)}(r, \theta)^2 + \Delta(r, \theta) \Sigma^{(1,0)}(r, \theta)^2))) \right\}, \end{aligned} \quad (2.11)$$

$$\begin{aligned} \hat{e}_{r5}^{(1)r} &= \frac{1}{\Delta(r, \theta)^2 (A(r, \theta) \Sigma(r, \theta))^{\frac{3}{2}} \sqrt{\frac{\Delta(r, \theta) \Sigma(r, \theta)}{A(r, \theta)}}} \times \\ &\left\{ 4112 M a \sin(\theta) \Lambda^{23} \sqrt{\Sigma(r, \theta)} (r \Sigma(r, \theta) A^{(0,1)}(r, \theta) \Delta^{(0,1)}(r, \theta) - \Delta(r, \theta) (r A^{(0,1)}(r, \theta) \Sigma^{(0,1)}(r, \theta) \right. \\ &\left. + \Delta(r, \theta) (-A(r, \theta) + r A^{(1,0)}(r, \theta)) \Sigma^{(1,0)}(r, \theta)) \right\}, \end{aligned} \quad (2.12)$$

$$\begin{aligned} \hat{e}_{\theta 5}^{(1)r} &= \frac{1}{(A(r, \theta) \Sigma(r, \theta))^{\frac{3}{2}} \sqrt{\frac{\Delta(r, \theta) \Sigma(r, \theta)}{A(r, \theta)}}} \left\{ -256 M a \sin(\theta) \Lambda^{23} \sqrt{\Sigma(r, \theta)} \times \right. \\ &\left. (A(r, \theta) \Sigma^{(0,1)}(r, \theta) - r \Sigma^{(0,1)}(r, \theta) A^{(1,0)}(r, \theta) + r A^{(0,1)}(r, \theta) \Sigma^{(1,0)}(r, \theta)) \right\}, \end{aligned} \quad (2.13)$$

$$\begin{aligned} \hat{e}_{r5}^{(1)\theta} &= \frac{1}{\Delta(r, \theta) (A(r, \theta) \Sigma(r, \theta))^{\frac{3}{2}} \sqrt{\frac{\Delta(r, \theta) \Sigma(r, \theta)}{A(r, \theta)}}} \left\{ 256 M a \sin(\theta) \Lambda^{23} \sqrt{\frac{\Sigma(r, \theta)}{\Delta(r, \theta)}} \times \right. \\ &(A(r, \theta) (-\Sigma(r, \theta) \Delta^{(0,1)}(r, \theta) + \Delta(r, \theta) \Sigma^{(0,1)}(r, \theta)) \\ &+ r (\Sigma(r, \theta) (\Delta^{(0,1)}(r, \theta) A^{(1,0)}(r, \theta) - A^{(0,1)}(r, \theta) \Delta^{(1,0)}(r, \theta)) \\ &\left. + \Delta(r, \theta) (-\Sigma^{(0,1)}(r, \theta) A^{(1,0)}(r, \theta) + A^{(0,1)}(r, \theta) \Sigma^{(1,0)}(r, \theta))) \right\}, \end{aligned} \quad (2.14)$$

$$\hat{e}_{\theta 5}^{(1)\theta} = \frac{1}{\sqrt{\Delta(r, \theta)}} \hat{e}_{r 5}^{(1)r} = \frac{1}{\Delta(r, \theta) (A(r, \theta) \Sigma(r, \theta))^{\frac{3}{2}} \sqrt{\frac{\Delta(r, \theta) \Sigma(r, \theta)}{A(r, \theta)}}}$$

$$\left\{ 4112 M a \sin(\theta) \Lambda^{23} \sqrt{\frac{\Sigma(r, \theta)}{\Delta(r, \theta)}} (r \Sigma(r, \theta) A^{(0,1)}(r, \theta) \Delta^{(0,1)}(r, \theta) - \Delta(r, \theta) (r A^{(0,1)}(r, \theta) \Sigma^{(0,1)}(r, \theta) + \Delta(r, \theta) (-A(r, \theta) + r A^{(1,0)}(r, \theta)) \Sigma^{(1,0)}(r, \theta)) \right\}, \quad (2.15)$$

$$\hat{e}_{t 5}^{(1)\varphi} = \frac{1}{4 A(r, \theta)^2 \Sigma(r, \theta)^{\frac{7}{2}} \sqrt{\frac{\Delta(r, \theta) \Sigma(r, \theta)}{A(r, \theta)}}} \left\{ 257 \Lambda^{23} \left( \frac{\Sigma(r, \theta)}{\Delta(r, \theta)} \right)^{\frac{3}{2}} \times \right.$$

$$\left( \Sigma(r, \theta)^3 \Delta^{(0,1)}(r, \theta) (\Delta(r, \theta) A^{(0,1)}(r, \theta) - A(r, \theta) \Delta^{(0,1)}(r, \theta)) \right.$$

$$- 128 M^2 a^2 r \sin(\theta)^2 \Delta(r, \theta) (r A^{(0,1)}(r, \theta) \Sigma^{(0,1)}(r, \theta)$$

$$+ \Delta(r, \theta) (-A(r, \theta) + r A^{(1,0)}(r, \theta)) \Sigma^{(1,0)}(r, \theta) - \Delta(r, \theta)^2 \Sigma(r, \theta)^2 (A^{(0,1)}(r, \theta) \Sigma^{(0,1)}(r, \theta)$$

$$+ (\Delta(r, \theta) A^{(1,0)}(r, \theta) - A(r, \theta) \Delta^{(1,0)}(r, \theta)) \Sigma^{(1,0)}(r, \theta)$$

$$+ \Sigma(r, \theta) (128 M^2 a^2 r^2 \sin(\theta)^2 A^{(0,1)}(r, \theta) \Delta^{(0,1)}(r, \theta)$$

$$\left. \left. + A(r, \theta) \Delta(r, \theta)^2 (\Sigma^{(0,1)}(r, \theta)^2 + \Delta(r, \theta) \Sigma^{(1,0)}(r, \theta)^2) \right) \right\}, \quad (2.16)$$

$$\hat{e}_{\varphi 5}^{(1)\varphi} = \frac{1}{\Sigma(r, \theta)^{\frac{3}{2}} (A(r, \theta) \Sigma(r, \theta))^{\frac{3}{2}} \sqrt{\frac{\Delta(r, \theta) \Sigma(r, \theta)}{A(r, \theta)}}} \left\{ -4112 M a \sin(\theta)^2 \Lambda^{23} \sqrt{\frac{A(r, \theta)}{\Sigma(r, \theta)}} \left( \frac{\Sigma(r, \theta)}{\Delta(r, \theta)} \right)^{\frac{3}{2}} \times \right.$$

$$(r \Sigma(r, \theta) A^{(0,1)}(r, \theta) \Delta^{(0,1)}(r, \theta) - \Delta(r, \theta) (r A^{(0,1)}(r, \theta) \Sigma^{(0,1)}(r, \theta)$$

$$\left. \left. + \Delta(r, \theta) (-A(r, \theta) + r A^{(1,0)}(r, \theta)) \Sigma^{(1,0)}(r, \theta) \right) \right\}. \quad (2.17)$$

### III. MODIFIED EFFICIENCY OF THE PENROSE PROCESS

In this section we consider the process of rotational energy extraction from a black hole. In this process proposed by Penrose [24], a particle falling onto a black hole splits up into two fragments at some  $r > r_+$  where the effective potential  $V < 0$ , and energy can be extracted from a black hole with an ergosphere. We study the energetics of Kerr–Newman black hole by the Penrose process using charged particles in the non-commutative case, by focusing on negative-energy states. It turns out that the electromagnetic field makes it possible to extract energy from the black hole. In the function  $\Delta$  defined in Eq. (1.3) there is an additional term depending on the charge  $Q$  of the black hole, i.e.

$$\Delta = r^2 + a^2 - 2Mr + Q^2. \quad (3.1)$$

In this space-time there exists an electromagnetic field resulting from the presence of charge  $Q$ , hence the rotation of the black hole gives rise to a magnetic dipole potential in addition to the usual electrostatic potential. In the approximation when the metric and the electromagnetic field are both static and axisymmetric one has two integrals of motion  $E$  and  $L$ , i.e., the energy and the  $\varphi$ -component of the angular momentum per unit of rest mass of the particle, and if the particle has  $p_\theta = 0$  ( $p_i$  is the particle's 4-momentum) in the equatorial plane, it will stay in the plane for all time, i.e.  $p_\theta = 0$  all through the motion. Henceforth the effective potential for radial motion can be obtained by putting  $p_r = p_\theta = 0$  in the following equation of Ref. [25]:

$$E = -eA_t - g_{t\varphi}/g_{\varphi\varphi}(L - eA_\varphi) + (\sqrt{g_{t\varphi}^2 - g_{tt}g_{\varphi\varphi}})/g_{\varphi\varphi}[(L - eA_\varphi)^2 + g_{\varphi\varphi}(g^{rr}p_r^2 + g^{\theta\theta}p_\theta^2 + \mu^2)]^{1/2}.$$

If one of the fragments has negative energy (relative to infinity), it will be absorbed by the black hole while the other fragment will come out, by conservation of energy, with energy greater than the parent particle. This is known as the mechanism of energy extraction from the black hole. In fact, for a test particle of 4-momentum  $p^a = mu^a$ , the energy  $E = -p^a\xi_a$  need not be positive in the ergosphere, hence one can extract energy from a black hole by absorbing a particle with negative energy [26].

In the case of the Kerr-Newman black hole, the extracted energy can be given by the rotational and/or the electromagnetic energy [27]. One has to consider the conservation equations for the 4-momenta of the particles, and one can follow the recipe for energy extraction given in [25]. At the point of split, we assume that the 4-momentum is conserved, i.e.,  $p_1 = p_2 + p_3$  where  $p_i$  ( $i = 1, 2, 3$ ) denotes the 4-momentum of the  $i$ th particle. The above relation stands for the following three relations:

$$\begin{aligned} E_1 &= \mu_2 E_2 + \mu_3 E_3, \\ l_1 &= \mu_2 l_2 + \mu_3 l_3, \\ \dot{r}_1 &= \mu_2 \dot{r}_2 + \mu_3 \dot{r}_3, \end{aligned} \tag{3.2}$$

where we have set  $\mu_1 = 1$ . The other conservation relation follows from the conservation of charge:

$$\lambda_1 = \mu_2 \lambda_2 + \mu_3 \lambda_3, \tag{3.3}$$

where the quantities  $\mu_i, l_i, \lambda_i, E_i, r_i$  refer to the  $i$ -th particle. These relations contain in all eleven parameters, seven of which are freely specifiable. The choice of these parameters will

be constrained by the requirements that particle 1 should reach the point of split where  $V < 0$  for some suitable  $\lambda$ , so that particle 2 can have  $E_2 < 0$  and particle 3 has a runaway orbit.

The most important question in the black hole energetics is the efficiency of the energy extraction process, for example from a supermassive black hole, that is one of the many important parameters of any model in Active Galactic Nuclei. It is therefore very pertinent to examine how efficient the Penrose process is.

The efficiency  $\eta$  is indeed defined as

$$\eta \equiv \frac{\text{gain in energy}}{\text{input energy}} = \mu_3 \frac{E_3}{E_1} - 1, \quad (3.4)$$

and it can be calculated in the presence or absence of charge, and/or electromagnetic interactions. It is known that  $\eta_{\text{max}} \sim 20.7\%$  for the pure extreme Kerr case, in absence of electromagnetic fields [28]. However, there is no upper limit on  $\eta$  in presence of electromagnetic field [29].

To evaluate the non-commutativity contribution we are interested in formulae which rely upon the tetrad formalism, because the Seiberg–Witten map is naturally expressed in terms of the tetrad rather than the metric. For this purpose, we express  $\mu E$  in the form [14]

$$\mu E = -p^{(a)} e_{t(a)} = -p^{(a)} \eta_{ab} e_t^{(b)},$$

and we bear in mind that, in the equatorial plane,  $\theta = \pi/2$ ,  $p^{(a)} = \mu(\gamma, 0, 0, \gamma V_\varphi)$ ,  $\Sigma = r^2$ , where  $V_\varphi$  is the only non-vanishing 3-velocity component. The classical form of  $\mu E$  is

$$\mu E^0 = \mu \gamma A(r, \theta)^{-1/2} \left( 2 M a V_\varphi + r \Delta(r, \theta)^{1/2} \right), \quad (3.5)$$

while the non-commutative contribution resulting from  $\hat{e}_{\mu 5}^{(1)a}$  (see (2.6) and (2.9)) is

$$\begin{aligned} \mu E^{NC5} &= \frac{\sqrt{\Delta(r, \theta)}}{4 r^4 (A(r, \theta))^{\frac{3}{2}}} \\ &\left\{ 257 \gamma \mu \Lambda^{23} \left( \frac{4 M a r^5 (-32 A(r, \theta) + 33 r A^{(1,0)}(r, \theta))}{r^2} \right. \right. \\ &+ \frac{1}{\sqrt{\Delta(r, \theta)}} \left( 2 r^2 V_\varphi (r (128 M^2 a^2 + r^2 \Delta(r, \theta)) A^{(1,0)}(r, \theta) \right. \\ &\left. \left. - A(r, \theta) (128 M^2 a^2 + 2 r^2 \Delta(r, \theta) + r^3 \Delta^{(1,0)}(r, \theta))) \right) \right\}. \quad (3.6) \end{aligned}$$

To first order in  $\Lambda^{23}$ , one has therefore

$$\mu E^{(I)} = \mu E^0 + \mu E^{NC5}. \quad (3.7)$$

The efficiency  $\eta$  defined in (3.4) reduces to

$$\eta = \mu E^{(I)} - 1, \quad (3.8)$$

for  $E_1 = 1$ ,  $\mu_3 E_3 = \mu E^{(I)}$ . This implies, for the extreme Kerr–Newman black hole at the horizon ( $\Delta = 0$ ) in the absence of charge,  $Q = 0$ , the classical efficiency  $\eta_{cl} = [\sqrt{2} - 1]/2$  as in [25] ( $\mu = 1$  for particles), while

$$\eta = [\sqrt{2} - 1]/2 - \frac{16448 M^2 a^2 \Lambda^{23}}{r^3} \gamma \left( \frac{1}{A(r, \theta)} \right)^{\frac{3}{2}} V_\varphi \left( -r A^{(1,0)}(r, \theta) + A(r, \theta) \right). \quad (3.9)$$

In presence of non-commutativity, the efficiency of a given energy-extraction event depends on the competition between two factors in Eq. (3.9), i.e., the standard geometric term, and the non-commutative one. If the maximum is set at 0.207 we have a bound on  $\Lambda^{23}$ , it must be very small, and this agrees with our hypothesis.

#### IV. CONCLUDING REMARKS

On the astrophysical side, several mechanisms have been proposed to account for the power engine for active galactic nuclei, X-ray binaries, and quasars. One of the most suggestive is that considered in general relativity, the Penrose mechanism, that predicts the extraction of energy from a rotating black hole. In the presence of non-commutativity the total energy of a particle receives a contribution from the non-commutativity parameter in the efficiency. In this case the extraction of energy from a non-commutative Kerr–Newman black hole can become more efficient, although we expect only a tiny gain since the approximate formula (3.9) for  $\eta$  results from a perturbative expansion with a small value of  $\Lambda^{23}$ . Our result might apply to the general behaviour of negative-energy states and energy extraction process.

We have considered a Kerr black hole immersed in a non-commutative background (cf. Ref. [30]) which is perturbative, that is, which does not appreciably alter the geometrical background although it would affect significantly the motion of particles. With this assumption the background geometry has been taken as the one described by the Kerr metric, perturbatively modified by non-commutativity. Further developments in sight are as follows.

(i) One has to prove that the Seiberg–Witten map yields a solution of non-commutative field equations, at least up to some order in the non-commutativity. For this purpose, we

are considering the expansion of the action functional of Ref. [20], and we hope to be able to present our results in a separate paper. Recent original work on non-commutative geometry and the Kerr solution can be found in Ref. [31], but the above issue, regarding Seiberg–Witten map and non-commutative field equations, remains unsolved therein as well.

(ii) One can instead make the star product diffeomorphism covariant [32, 33], so that the Seiberg–Witten map or twist become unnecessary.

(iii) One might perform a detailed study of black-hole thermodynamics in the non-commutative background of Refs. [34, 35] pertaining to the applicability of the Penrose process in relativistic astrophysics (such applicability was indeed questioned by Bardeen et al. in Ref. [14]).

(iv) Non-commutativity might provide the seed necessary to accelerate the fragments to relativistic speeds, without having to assume that the black hole is immersed in a magnetic field [36].

### Acknowledgments

We are much indebted to Paolo Aschieri for correspondence and several scientific discussions, and we are grateful to the INFN for financial support. G. Esposito is grateful to the Dipartimento di Scienze Fisiche of Federico II University, Naples, for hospitality and support; he dedicates the present work to Maria Gabriella.

### Appendix A: General form of $4 \times 4$ matrices

It is a simple but non-trivial property that any  $4 \times 4$  matrix can be expressed in the form [21], [22]

$$M_i^j = a\delta_i^j + b_\mu(\gamma^\mu)_i^j + \frac{1}{2}c_{\mu\nu}(\zeta^{\mu\nu})_i^j + d_\mu(\zeta^\mu)_i^j + e(\gamma^5)_i^j, \quad (\text{A1})$$

where

$$(\zeta^{\mu\nu})_i^j \equiv \frac{1}{2} [(\gamma^\mu)_i^k(\gamma^\nu)_k^j - (\gamma^\nu)_i^k(\gamma^\mu)_k^j], \quad (\text{A2})$$

$$(\zeta^\mu)_i^j \equiv (\gamma^5)_i^l(\gamma^\mu)_l^j. \quad (\text{A3})$$

- 
- [1] Christodoulou D 2009 *The Formation of Black Holes in General Relativity* (European Mathematical Society)
- [2] Kerr R P 1963 *Phys. Rev. Lett.* **11** 237
- [3] Wald R M 1984 *General Relativity* (Chicago: University of Chicago Press); Carter B 1972 “Black hole equilibrium states” in *Black Holes*, Les Houches Summer School, eds. De Witt B S and DeWitt–Morette C (New York: Gordon & Breach)
- [4] Hawking S W and Ellis G F R 1973 *The Large Scale Structure of Space-Time* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press)
- [5] Nicolini P 2005 *J. Phys. A: Math. Gen.* **38** L631
- [6] Nicolini P, Smailagic A and Spallucci E 2006 *Phys. Lett. B* **632** 547
- [7] Ansoldi S, Nicolini P and Smailagic A 2007 *Phys. Lett. B* **645** 261
- [8] Spallucci E, Smailagic A and Nicolini P 2009 *Phys. Lett. B* **670** 649
- [9] Nicolini P 2009 *Int. J. Mod. Phys. A* **24** 1229
- [10] Boyer R H and Lindquist R W 1967 *J. Math. Phys.* **8** 265
- [11] Dhavan V, Mirabel I F and Rodriguez L F 2000 *Ap. J.* **543** 373
- [12] Tomsik J A and Corbel S 2003 *Ap. J.* **582** 933
- [13] Blandford R D and Znajek R 1977 *Mon. Not. R. Astron. Soc.* **179** 433
- [14] Bardeen J M, Press W H and Teukolsky S A 1972 *Ap. J.* **178** 347
- [15] Chamseddine A H 2001 *Phys. Lett. B* **504** 33
- [16] Aschieri P, Blohmann C, Dimitrijevic M, Meyer F, Schupp P and Wess J 2005 *Class. Quantum Grav.* **22** 3511
- [17] Chaichian M, Tureanu A and Zet G 2008 *Phys. Lett. B* **660** 573
- [18] Mukherjee P and Saha A 2008 *Phys. Rev. D* **77** 064014
- [19] Miao Y G and Zhang S J 2010 arXiv:1004.2118 [hep-th]
- [20] Aschieri P and Castellani L 2009 *JHEP* **06** 086
- [21] DeWitt B S 1965 *Dynamical Theory of Groups and Fields* (New York: Gordon & Breach)
- [22] Esposito G 2008 *Found. Phys.* **38** 96
- [23] Seiberg N and Witten E 1999 *JHEP* **99** 09 032
- [24] Penrose R 1971 *Nature* **229** 177

- [25] Bhat M, Dhurandhar S and Dadhich N 1985 *J. Astrophys. Astr.* **6** 85
- [26] Penrose R 2002 *Gen. Rel. Grav.* **34** 1141
- [27] Christodoulou D 1970 *Phys. Rev. Lett.* **25** 1596
- [28] Chandrasekhar S 1983 *The Mathematical Theory of Black Holes* (Oxford: Clarendon Press)
- [29] Parthasarathy S, Wagh S M, Dhurandhar S V and Dadhich N 1986 *Ap. J.* **307** 38
- [30] Kim H C, Park M I, Rim C and Yee J H 2008 *JHEP* **10** 060
- [31] Angulo SantaCruz C, Batic D and Nowakowski M 2010 *J. Math. Phys.* **51** 082504
- [32] Vassilevich D V 2009 *Class. Quantum Grav.* **26** 145010
- [33] Vassilevich D V 2010 *Class. Quantum Grav.* **27** 095020
- [34] Banerjee R, Majhi B R and Samanta S 2008 *Phys. Rev. D* **77** 124035
- [35] Banerjee R, Majhi B R and Modak S K 2009 *Class. Quantum Grav.* **26** 085010
- [36] Wagh S M, Dhurandhar S V and Dadhich N 1985 *J. Astrophys. Astr.* **290** 12