

Unveiling the electrodynamics of the first nonlinearly charged rotating black hole

Eloy Ayón-Beato^{1,*}

¹*Departamento de Física, CINVESTAV-IPN, Apartado Postal 14740, 07360 México D.F., México*

After many years of efforts, the first nonlinearly charged rotating black hole has been finally reported by García-Díaz in two recent works. This is an important result that was pending in General Relativity, since nonlinear generalizations of the Kerr-Newman solution were not yet known. Unfortunately, the Lagrangian supporting this configuration cannot be expressible in terms of the standard invariants using elementary functions. In the present work we circumvent this problem by using the formulations of nonlinear electrodynamics in terms of mixed electromagnetic eigenvalues, introduced by Salazar, García-Díaz and Plebański almost four decades ago. In doing so, we prove that the underlying theory becomes fully determined, and hence the new found nonlinearly charged stationary axisymmetric spacetimes correspond to exact solutions of a well-defined self-gravitating nonlinear electrodynamics whose fundamental structural functions are provided here.

In their seminal work on nonlinear electrodynamics [1] Salazar, García-Díaz and Plebański conclude: “... We consider a derivation of such solutions, which would generalize the Kerr-Newman solution for the case of the nonlinear rotating charges as an open challenging problem within the theory of exact solutions in general relativity.” Almost four decades later, after tireless and diverse efforts, not only by the Cinvestav group but by many others around the world, this challenge has been finally overtaken by Professor García-Díaz in two recent groundbreaking papers [2, 3].

His main hypothesis is the alignment of the metric null tetrad along the common eigenvectors of the electromagnetic fields. This condition was also assumed in [1] and in fact since the foundational book of Plebański on the subject [4]. However, its principal consequence had not been fully explored until the work of García-Díaz [2, 3]: the complete separability of the stationary axisymmetric electromagnetic fields. Concretely, the alignment condition implies that given a null tetrad for the metric

$$g = 2\theta^1 \otimes_s \theta^2 + 2\theta^3 \otimes_s \theta^4, \quad (1)$$

where the first pair of null one-forms are complex conjugates while the last two are real, the electromagnetic closed two-forms embodying the Faraday and Maxwell equations [5]

$$dF = 0 \quad \text{and} \quad d * P = 0, \quad (2)$$

respectively, are necessarily decomposed as

$$F + i * P = (D + iB)\theta^1 \wedge \theta^2 + (E + iH)\theta^3 \wedge \theta^4. \quad (3)$$

This means the null tetrad (1) are the common eigenvectors of the electromagnetic fields and the unique tetrad components E , B and D , H determine their eigenvalues, being real alternative invariants physically associated in the first pair to the intensity of electric field and magnetic induction and in the second to the electric induction and intensity of magnetic field [4]. They allow to express the standard invariants as

$$\mathcal{F} + i\mathcal{G} \equiv \frac{1}{4}F_{ab}F^{ab} + \frac{i}{4}F_{ab} * F^{ab} = -\frac{1}{2}(E + iB)^2, \quad (4a)$$

$$\mathcal{P} + i\mathcal{Q} \equiv \frac{1}{4}P_{ab}P^{ab} + \frac{i}{4}P_{ab} * P^{ab} = -\frac{1}{2}(D + iH)^2. \quad (4b)$$

Hence, as was brilliantly unveiled in [1] the description of nonlinear electrodynamic theories is not exhausted by their determination in terms of fundamental structural functions depending on the standard invariants as the Lagrangian $\mathcal{L}(\mathcal{F}, \mathcal{G})$ or its Legendre transform, the “Hamiltonian” $\mathcal{H}(\mathcal{P}, \mathcal{Q}) = \frac{1}{2}F_{\mu\nu}P^{\mu\nu} - \mathcal{L}$ [5]. Instead, thanks to the aligned tetrad invariants, it is not only possible to reformulate the theories using $\mathcal{L}(E, B)$ or $\mathcal{H}(D, H)$ [4], but also extra formulations are conceivable using mixed fundamental structural functions obtained from the subsequent Legendre transforms $\mathcal{M}^{(+)}(D, B) = BH - \mathcal{H}$ and $\mathcal{M}^{(-)}(E, H) = DE + \mathcal{L}$ depending on the inductions and intensities, respectively [1].

The relevance of the above discussion lies in the following. In his second work [3] García-Díaz proved that there exists a Lagrangian supporting the nonlinearly charged generalization of the Kerr-Newman black hole reported in his first work [2], which would imply this is the first analytic stationary axisymmetric solution for nonlinear electrodynamics found in the Literature. Unfortunately, he correctly argues that this Lagrangian is not expressible in terms of the standard invariants using elementary functions. In this work, we show that it is precisely in one of the mentioned mixed formulations where the related electrodynamics becomes fully determined.

The most transparent action principle describing the full dynamics of a self-gravitating nonlinear electrodynamics is derived from [1, 4]

$$S[g^{\mu\nu}, A_\mu, P^{\mu\nu}] = \int d^4x \sqrt{-g} \left[\frac{1}{16\pi} R - \frac{1}{4\pi} \left(\frac{1}{2} F_{\mu\nu} P^{\mu\nu} - \mathcal{H}(\mathcal{P}, \mathcal{Q}) \right) \right], \quad (5)$$

where R stands for the scalar curvature of the metric $g_{\mu\nu}$ given by the trace of the Ricci tensor $R_{\mu\nu} = R^\alpha_{\mu\alpha\nu}$.¹ The Maxwell–Faraday equations (2) are interconnectedly considered in the action principle as follows: on the one

¹ We use the custom notation of Misner, Thorne and Wheeler book, that differs in a sign with the employed in [1].

hand, according to the Faraday equation in (2), the field strength is necessarily expressed in terms of a vector potential $F_{\mu\nu} = \partial_\mu A_\nu - \partial_\nu A_\mu$, on the other hand varying the action with respect to A_μ gives precisely the Maxwell equation in (2). Since the resulting Maxwell equations are linear in terms of the conjugate antisymmetric tensor $P^{\mu\nu}$, the nonlinear contents is now encoded in the variation of the action with respect to this field, which gives rise to the constitutive or material relations

$$F_{\mu\nu} = \mathcal{H}_{\mathcal{P}} P_{\mu\nu} + \mathcal{H}_{\mathcal{Q}} * P_{\mu\nu}, \quad (6)$$

between both fields, where the ‘‘Hamiltonian’’ fundamental structural function $\mathcal{H}(\mathcal{P}, \mathcal{Q})$ defines the concrete electrodynamics. For example, the well-known Maxwell linear theory is given by $\mathcal{H}_M = \mathcal{P}$. Finally, the self-gravitating behavior is obtained from the metric variation, giving Einstein equations

$$G_{\mu\nu} = 8\pi T_{\mu\nu}, \quad (7a)$$

for the energy–momentum tensor

$$4\pi T_{\mu\nu} = F_{\mu\alpha} P_\nu^\alpha - g_{\mu\nu} \left(\frac{1}{2} F_{\alpha\beta} P^{\alpha\beta} - \mathcal{H} \right). \quad (7b)$$

The advantage of this action principle, with respect to the more straightforward involving the Lagrangian $\mathcal{L}(\mathcal{F}, \mathcal{G})$ instead of its ‘‘Hamiltonian’’ Legendre transform, is that it not only decomposes the complexity of nonlinear electrodynamics in simpler ingredients as shown, but also provides a schematic methodology for the searching of self-gravitating configurations: first, solve for $P_{\mu\nu}$ the now linear Maxwell equation in (2), second, inserting the result in the constitutive relations (6) of a given theory the nonlinear electromagnetic strength $F_{\mu\nu}$ is found, and third, with both results build the energy-momentum tensor (7b) in order to solve Einstein equations (7) (incidentally, García-Díaz has introduced a new approach in his recent work [3] that we will discuss later). However, it is crucial to emphasize that there are cases where the equivalence between both formalisms is not necessarily warranted; since the structural functions are Legendre transforms they are equivalent only when their conjugate relations, embodied here in the constitutive relations (6), are invertible [4]. We assume that such inversion is possible, which not necessarily implies it is expressed through elementary functions. Interesting examples of electrodynamics properly defined in terms of the ‘‘Hamiltonian’’ $\mathcal{H}(\mathcal{P}, \mathcal{Q})$, describing physically sensible nonlinearly charged configurations, but not allowing Lagrangians $\mathcal{L}(\mathcal{F}, \mathcal{G})$ being single elementary functions of the first pair of invariants (4a) are known. Particularly outstanding cases are those related to regular black holes [6] or more recently to Lifshitz black holes [7]. This is precisely the problem with the nonlinearly charged rotating black holes recently reported by García-Díaz [2, 3], even

worse the problem extend to the described formulation in terms of $\mathcal{H}(\mathcal{P}, \mathcal{Q})$ since an elementary dependence on the second pair of invariants (4b) does not seem possible either. It is precisely in this kind of situations where the mixed formulations of nonlinear electrodynamics introduced in [1] become relevant.

Before describing these formulations, it is pertinent to rewrite the derived field equations in the base of the aligned null tetrad, defined by (1) and (2), in addition to changing the dependence on the invariants to $\mathcal{H}(D, H)$, see [1, 4]. First, it is straightforward to substitute the aligned fields (3) into the Maxwell-Faraday equations (2) and use the first Cartan equations for the null tetrad (1). The resulting expressions are of little use here and can be consulted in [1]. After using decomposition (3), the constitutive relations (6) become

$$E + iB = (-\partial_D + i\partial_H)\mathcal{H}. \quad (8)$$

Regarding Einstein equations (7), following [1] it is useful to break them down in their traceless part and trace

$$S = 2(DE + BH)(\theta^1 \otimes_s \theta^2 - \theta^3 \otimes_s \theta^4), \quad (9a)$$

$$R = -4(DE - BH) - 8\mathcal{H}, \quad (9b)$$

where the tensor $S_{ab} \equiv R_{ab} - \frac{1}{4}Rg_{ab}$ is the traceless part of the Ricci tensor and the fields E and B are calculated from the constitutive relations (8).

We are now in a position to reformulate the equations using mixed structural functions defined by the subsequent Legendre transforms originally introduced in [1]

$$\mathcal{M}^{(+)} = BH - \mathcal{H}, \quad \mathcal{M}^{(-)} = DE + \mathcal{H}. \quad (10)$$

Notice that the constitutive relations (8) are equivalent to expressing the differential of \mathcal{H} as

$$d\mathcal{H} = -EdD + BdH, \quad (11)$$

that in turn specifies the other differentials by

$$d\mathcal{M}^{(+)} = EdD + HdB, \quad d\mathcal{M}^{(-)} = DdE + BdH, \quad (12)$$

giving the new forms of the constitutive relations for each formulation

$$E + iH = (\partial_D + i\partial_B)\mathcal{M}^{(+)}, \quad D + iB = (\partial_E + i\partial_H)\mathcal{M}^{(-)}, \quad (13)$$

and allowing to conclude that the functional dependence of the recently introduced structural functions is in fact mixed, i.e. $\mathcal{M}^{(+)} = \mathcal{M}^{(+)}(D, B)$ is a function of the electric and magnetic inductions and $\mathcal{M}^{(-)} = \mathcal{M}^{(-)}(E, H)$ is a function of the electric and magnetic intensities. For example, the linear Maxwell theory is recovered for

$$\mathcal{M}_M^{(+)} = \frac{1}{2}(D^2 + B^2), \quad \mathcal{M}_M^{(-)} = \frac{1}{2}(E^2 + H^2). \quad (14)$$

The Einstein equations (9) for these formulations are

$$S = 2(DE + BH)(\theta^1 \otimes_s \theta^2 - \theta^3 \otimes_s \theta^4), \quad (15a)$$

$$R = \pm 8\mathcal{M}^{(\pm)} \mp 4(DE + BH), \quad (15b)$$

where now the derived electromagnetic fields must be calculated from the appropriate constitutive relations (13) depending if we are working with the induction or intensity formulations.

The electrostatics we propose to support the nonlinearly charged stationary axisymmetric configurations recently reported in [2, 3] is determined by any of the following induction and intensity dependent structural functions

$$\mathcal{M}^{(\pm)} - \mathcal{M}_M^{(\pm)} \pm \frac{3}{4}\beta^2(q^2 + p^2) = \begin{cases} f(D, B), \\ f(E, H), \end{cases} \quad (16a)$$

where the common two-argument function is

$$f(x, y) = \frac{\beta^2}{4}(q^2 + p^2) - \beta\sqrt{(q^2 + p^2)[(x + \beta q)^2 + (y - \beta p)^2]}. \quad (16b)$$

This theory becomes the Maxwell limit (14) when the coupling constant β vanishes, describing the more interesting sector of the configurations [2, 3] where this limit is clearly achieved. In order to check that they are in fact exact solutions for this nonlinear electrostatics, it is time to outline now the clever new method devised by García-Díaz to understand the stationary axisymmetric sector of this kind of theories [3].

First, the general solution to the Maxwell-Faraday equations (2) implies the local existence of a pair of vector potentials

$$F = dA, \quad *P = dA^*. \quad (17)$$

Second, in a stationary axisymmetric spacetime with Killing vectors ∂_t and ∂_ϕ , these symmetries are only required in the gauge invariant field strengths F and $*P$ and not necessarily in the gauge fields A and A^* . However, it is possible to argue that there exist common gauges where both vector potentials are expressible as

$$A = A_t dt + A_\phi d\phi, \quad A^* = A_t^* dt + A_\phi^* d\phi, \quad (18)$$

with components independent of the Killing coordinates. Third, using this gauge to build the strengths (17) and changing to any preselected stationary axisymmetric null base (1) does not warrant to identically satisfies the decomposition (3). The imposition of (3) generates the alignment conditions: the demand that the components not appearing in (3) vanish, constraining the stationary axisymmetric vector potentials (18). Remarkably, these constraints are integrable for the stationary axisymmetric spacetimes studied by García-Díaz, and in general for the Carter-Plebański separable metric class [8, 9]. They give the same separable ansatz for the vector potentials that is obtained by Carter after demanding separability of charged Klein-Gordon equations, where the potentials are minimally coupled [8, 10]; the potential allowing the separability is necessarily determined up to a pair of single variable functions, one for each non-Killing coordinate. Fourth, this provides precise expressions for the

nontrivial tetrad components (3) which must be further constrained for the electrostatics of interest by the constitutive relations (13), since the right hand sides of the one-forms (12) constructed with them are not necessarily exact forms a priori. Denoting these inexact forms as $\delta\mathcal{M}^{(\pm)}$, a necessary and sufficient condition for which the obtained vector potentials be related to some electrostatics, and consequently these one-forms can be properly expressed as exact differentials, is to demand that they are closed, $d\delta\mathcal{M}^{(\pm)} = 0$, this is what García-Díaz dubbed the *KEY* conditions and are independent of the chosen formulation. The single variable functions satisfying them give rise to the vector potentials of a given electrostatics, whose structural function can be integrated in terms of local coordinates. It is important to emphasize that this integration always produces an arbitrary integration constant in the structural function, which at the level of action (5) can be reinterpreted as a cosmological constant. Reexpressing the thus obtained structural function in terms of the corresponding invariants is the remaining goal which, as the García-Díaz explicit example shows [2, 3], is not necessarily achieved in the $\mathcal{L}(E, B)$ or $\mathcal{H}(D, H)$ formulations. In his example, García-Díaz chose cubic dependent single variable functions to satisfy the *KEY* conditions and the resulting Lagrangian cannot be rewritten as a function of the invariants using elementary functions. Fortunately, this is not the case for the mixed formulations where the induction and intensity dependent structural functions have the simple expressions (16). The fifth and last step, is to solve Einstein equations (15) for the involved gravitational potentials, since after the previous steps all the components of the energy-momentum tensor (7b) are written as functions of the local coordinates.

The García-Díaz black hole obtained by following the above guidelines in [2] is

$$ds^2 = \Sigma d\theta^2 + \frac{\sin^2 \theta}{\Sigma} (adt - (r^2 + a^2)d\phi)^2 + \frac{\Sigma}{\Delta} dr^2 - \frac{\Delta}{\Sigma} (dt - a \sin^2 \theta d\phi)^2, \quad (19a)$$

$$A = \frac{p \cos \theta (1 - \beta a^2 \sin^2 \theta)}{\Sigma} (adt - (r^2 + a^2)d\phi) - \frac{qr (1 - \beta(r^2 + a^2))}{\Sigma} (dt - a \sin^2 \theta d\phi), \quad (19b)$$

$$A^* = \frac{q \cos \theta (1 - \beta a^2 \sin^2 \theta)}{\Sigma} (adt - (r^2 + a^2)d\phi) + \frac{pr (1 - \beta(r^2 + a^2))}{\Sigma} (dt - a \sin^2 \theta d\phi), \quad (19c)$$

where $\Sigma = r^2 + a^2 \cos^2 \theta$ and²

$$\Delta = r^2 + a^2 - 2mr + (q^2 + p^2) (1 - \beta(r^2 + a^2)). \quad (19d)$$

² Our constants are related to those of García-Díaz by $q = q_G(1 + \beta_G a^2)$, $p = p_G(1 + \beta_G a^2)$ and $\beta = \beta_G/(1 + \beta_G a^2)$.

For $\beta = 0$ the linearly charged Kerr-Newman black hole [11], in its dyonic version [12], is consistently recovered. The corresponding aligned null tetrad (1) can be straightforwardly read off from (19a) by recognizing the square sum in its first line as the tensorial “modulus” of a complex one-form, and by factorizing the squares difference of its second line. The aligned null tetrad electromagnetic invariants (3) are then build from the time component of the vector potentials (19b) and (19c) as

$$D = \frac{1}{a \sin \theta} \partial_\theta A_t^*, \quad B = -\frac{1}{a \sin \theta} \partial_\theta A_t, \quad (20a)$$

$$E = -\partial_r A_t, \quad H = -\partial_r A_t^*. \quad (20b)$$

It is straightforward to check that the resulting expressions satisfy the constitutive relations (13) for the structural functions (16). Since Einstein equations (15) are additionally satisfied, the configuration (19) found by García-Díaz in [2] is in fact a genuine stationary axisymmetric *exact* solution of the Einstein-nonlinear-electrodynamics system for the precise theory well-defined by the structural functions (16). It deserves all the credit as the first solution with these properties in the whole Literature. Its generalization reinterpreting the possible arbitrary constant of the structural function as a cosmological constant is characterized along similar lines and generates the second solution [3], which is consequently supported by the same electrodynamics (16).

Regarding the physical interpretation of these authentic *exact* solutions it is enlightening to emphasize their nonlinearly charged character. A careful evaluation gives in both solutions

$$\frac{1}{4\pi} \int_{S^2} *P = q, \quad \frac{1}{4\pi} \int_{S^2} F = p, \quad (21)$$

where S^2 is any sphere (not necessarily at infinity), so that the integration constants q and p are in fact the electric and magnetic charges of the nonlinear regime, respectively. This allows to assure, paraphrasing the famous quote of [1] with which we started, that the methods and resulting solutions recently discovered by García-Díaz in

[2, 3] *generalize the Kerr-Newman solution for the case of the nonlinear rotating charges* opening the door to understand many more of such configurations, so that they can be considered without a doubt as a milestone *within the theory of exact solutions in general relativity*.

I thank Professor A. García-Díaz for opening the doors for me to the intricacies of nonlinear electrodynamics and for keeping me up to date on his progress on the problem through the years. Recent discussions with D. Flores-Alfonso and M. Hassaine, as well as their corrections in the present manuscript, are also highly appreciated. This work has been partially funded by Grant No. A1-S-11548 from Conacyt.

* ayon-beato-at-fis.cinvestav.mx

- [1] H. Salazar, A. García and J. Plebański, *J. Math. Phys.* **28**, 2171 (1987).
- [2] A.A. García-Díaz, [arXiv:2112.06302 [gr-qc]].
- [3] A.A. García-Díaz, [arXiv:2201.10682 [gr-qc]].
- [4] J. Plebański, *Lectures on Non-Linear Electrodynamics* (Nordita, 1968).
- [5] M. Born and L. Infeld, *Proc. Roy. Soc. Lond. A* **144**, 425 (1934).
- [6] E. Ayón-Beato and A. García, *Phys. Rev. Lett.* **80**, 5056 (1998) [arXiv:gr-qc/9911046 [gr-qc]]; *Gen. Rel. Grav.* **31**, 629 (1999) [arXiv:gr-qc/9911084 [gr-qc]]; *Phys. Lett. B* **464**, 25 (1999) [arXiv:hep-th/9911174 [hep-th]]; *Phys. Lett. B* **493**, 149 (2000) [arXiv:gr-qc/0009077 [gr-qc]]; *Gen. Rel. Grav.* **37**, 635 (2005) [arXiv:hep-th/0403229 [hep-th]].
- [7] A. Alvarez, E. Ayón-Beato, H.A. González and M. Hassaine, *JHEP* **06**, 041 (2014) [arXiv:1403.5985 [gr-qc]].
- [8] B. Carter, *Commun. Math. Phys.* **10**, 280 (1968).
- [9] J. Plebański, *Annals Phys.* **90**, 196 (1975).
- [10] B. Carter, *Black Holes* (Les Houches Lectures), eds, B.S. DeWitt and C. DeWitt (Gordon and Breach, New York, 1972); *Gen. Rel. Grav.* **41**, 2873 (2009).
- [11] E.T. Newman, R. Couch, K. Chinnapared, A. Exton, A. Prakash and R. Torrence, *J. Math. Phys.* **6**, 918 (1965).
- [12] M. Demianski and E.T. Newman, *Bull. Acad. Pol. Sci. Ser. Sci. Math. Astron. Phys.* **14**, 653 (1966).