

Instability of nonsingular black holes in nonlinear electrodynamics

Antonio De Felice^a and Shinji Tsujikawa^b

^a*Center for Gravitational Physics and Quantum Information,*

Yukawa Institute for Theoretical Physics, Kyoto University, 606-8502, Kyoto, Japan

^b*Department of Physics, Waseda University, 3-4-1 Okubo, Shinjuku, Tokyo 169-8555, Japan*

(Dated: October 2, 2024)

We show that nonsingular black holes realized in nonlinear electrodynamics are always prone to Laplacian instability around the center because of a negative squared sound speed in the angular direction. This is the case for both electric and magnetic BHs, where the instability of one of the vector-field perturbations leads to enhancing a dynamical gravitational perturbation in the even-parity sector. Thus, the background regular metric is no longer maintained in a steady state. Our results suggest that the construction of stable, nonsingular black holes with regular centers, if they exist, requires theories beyond nonlinear electrodynamics.

I. INTRODUCTION

The vacuum black hole (BH) solutions predicted in General Relativity (GR) possess curvature singularities at their centers ($r = 0$). Under several physical assumptions of spacetime and matter, Penrose showed that such singularities arise as an endpoint of the gravitational collapse [1]. However, the existence of singularity-free BHs is not precluded by relaxing some of these assumptions. For example, the nonsingular BH proposed by Bardeen [2] has a regular center due to the absence of global hyperbolicity of spacetime postulated in Penrose's theorem. Since quantum corrections to GR may manifest themselves in extreme gravity regimes, it is important to investigate whether curvature singularities can be eliminated in extended theories of gravity or matter.

It is known that nonlinear electrodynamics (NED) in the framework of GR allows the existence of spherically symmetric and static (SSS) BHs with regular centers [3–12]. The Lagrangian \mathcal{L} of NED depends on $F = -(1/4)F_{\mu\nu}F^{\mu\nu}$ nonlinearly, where $F_{\mu\nu} = \partial_\mu A_\nu - \partial_\nu A_\mu$ is the field strength of a covector field A_μ . The action of Einstein-NED theory is given by

$$S = \int d^4x \sqrt{-g} \left[\frac{M_{\text{Pl}}^2}{2} R + \mathcal{L}(F) \right], \quad (1.1)$$

where g is the determinant of a metric tensor $g_{\mu\nu}$, M_{Pl} is the reduced Planck mass, and R is the Ricci scalar. For example, Euler-Heisenberg theory [13] in quantum electrodynamics has a low-energy effective Lagrangian $\mathcal{L} = F + \alpha F^2$, where αF^2 is a correction to the Maxwell term F . NED also accommodates Born-Infeld theory [14] with the Lagrangian $\mathcal{L} = \mu^4 [1 - \sqrt{1 - 2F/\mu^4}]$, in which the electron's self-energy is nondivergent by the finiteness of F . These subclasses of NED, when coupled with GR, give rise to hairy BH solutions [15–18], but there are in general curvature singularities at $r = 0$ unless the functional form of $\mathcal{L}(F)$ is further extended.

The common procedure for realizing nonsingular BHs in NED is to assume the existence of regular metrics and reconstruct the Lagrangian \mathcal{L} from the field equations of motion [3]. In particular, for the magnetic BH, one can

directly express \mathcal{L} as a function of F [5]. Nonsingular electric BHs constructed in this manner have finite values of F and the electric field everywhere. For magnetic BHs, there is the divergence of F at $r = 0$, but the force exerted on a charged test particle is finite at any distance r including $r = 0$ [6]. Nonsingular BHs can be designed to meet standard energy conditions, but not all regular solutions do [19]. For instance, violation of dominant energy conditions occurs for some regular BHs [2, 20].

Thus, at the background level, there are consistent regular BHs in NED evading Penrose's theorem. To see whether these BHs do not suffer from theoretical pathologies, we need to address their linear stability by analyzing perturbations on the SSS background. The BH perturbations in NED were studied in Refs. [21–25] by focusing on the stability outside the outer horizon. It was found that there are viable parameter spaces in which the nonsingular BHs are plagued by neither ghosts nor Laplacian instabilities. However, the BH stability inside the horizon, especially around its center, is still unclear and has not been investigated to our best knowledge. In this letter, we will show that all nonsingular BHs in NED, including both electric and magnetic ones, are unstable due to the angular Laplacian instability around $r = 0$.

II. NONSINGULAR BHS IN NED

The line element on the SSS background is given by

$$ds^2 = -f(r)dt^2 + h^{-1}(r)dr^2 + r^2(d\theta^2 + \sin^2\theta d\varphi^2), \quad (2.1)$$

where f and h are functions of the radial distance r . We consider the following covector-field configuration

$$A_\mu = [A_0(r), 0, 0, -q_M \cos\theta], \quad (2.2)$$

where A_0 is a function of r , and q_M is a constant corresponding to a magnetic charge. Since the theory (1.1) has $U(1)$ gauge invariance, $A_\mu \rightarrow A_\mu + \partial_\mu \chi_{\text{gauge}}$, the longitudinal component $A_1(r)$ has been eliminated by choosing the gauge field as $\chi_{\text{gauge}}(r) = -\int^r A_1(\rho)d\rho$.

Varying the action (1.1) with respect to A_0 , f , and h , it follows that

$$\left(\sqrt{h/f} r^2 \mathcal{L}_{,F} A_0'\right)' = 0, \quad (2.3)$$

$$h' - \frac{1-h}{r} = \frac{r}{M_{\text{Pl}}^2 f} (f \mathcal{L} - h A_0'^2 \mathcal{L}_{,F}), \quad (2.4)$$

$$\frac{f'}{f} - \frac{h'}{h} = 0, \quad (2.5)$$

where a prime represents the derivative with respect to r , and $\mathcal{L}_{,F} \equiv d\mathcal{L}/dF$. The explicit form of F is given by

$$F = \frac{h A_0'^2}{2f} - \frac{q_M^2}{2r^4}. \quad (2.6)$$

From Eq. (2.5), we obtain $f = Ch$, where C is a constant. Using time reparametrization invariance, we can impose $f \rightarrow 1$ as $r \rightarrow \infty$, whereas the asymptotic flatness sets $h \rightarrow 1$ at spatial infinity. Then we have $C = 1$, so that

$$f = h. \quad (2.7)$$

With this condition, Eqs. (2.3) and (2.4) give

$$A_0' = \frac{q_E}{r^2 \mathcal{L}_{,F}}, \quad (2.8)$$

$$\mathcal{L} = r^{-2} [q_E A_0' + M_{\text{Pl}}^2 (r f' + f - 1)], \quad (2.9)$$

where q_E is a constant corresponding to an electric charge. Taking the r -derivative of Eq. (2.9) and combining it with Eq. (2.8) to eliminate $\mathcal{L}_{,F}$, we obtain

$$2q_E r^4 A_0'^2 + M_{\text{Pl}}^2 (2f - 2 - r^2 f'') r^4 A_0' + 2q_E q_M^2 = 0, \quad (2.10)$$

which algebraically determines A_0' in terms of f and its second radial derivative.

We are interested in nonsingular BHs with regular centers. To avoid the singularities of Ricci scalar R , Ricci squared $R_{\mu\nu} R^{\mu\nu}$, Riemann squared $R_{\mu\nu\rho\sigma} R^{\mu\nu\rho\sigma}$ at $r = 0$, we require that f is expanded around $r = 0$ as [26]

$$f(r) = 1 + \sum_{n=2}^{\infty} f_n r^n, \quad (2.11)$$

where f_n 's are constants. The deviation of $f(0)$ from 1 results in conical singularities. Any power of n smaller than 2 leads to curvature singularities. Substituting Eq. (2.11) and its second radial derivative into Eq. (2.10), two branches of A_0' have the leading-order terms $\pm \sqrt{-(q_E q_M)^2 / (q_E r^2)}$. This means that there exist real solutions to A_0' only if

$$q_E q_M = 0. \quad (2.12)$$

Thus, the presence of dyon BHs with $q_E \neq 0$ and $q_M \neq 0$ is forbidden from the regularity of f at $r = 0$. From Eq. (2.12), either q_E or q_M must be 0. This non-existence of regular BH solutions breaks the electromagnetic duality present in linear electrodynamics, where the property of BHs is determined by their mass and total charge $q_T = \sqrt{q_E^2 + q_M^2}$ (see e.g., [27, 28]).

A. Purely electric BHs

For $q_E \neq 0$ and $q_M = 0$, the nonvanishing solution to A_0' follows from Eq. (2.10), such that

$$A_0' = \frac{M_{\text{Pl}}^2 (r^2 f'' - 2f + 2)}{2q_E}. \quad (2.13)$$

Using the regular metric (2.11) around $r = 0$, we have

$$A_0' = \frac{2M_{\text{Pl}}^2 f_3}{q_E} r^3 + \frac{5M_{\text{Pl}}^2 f_4}{q_E} r^4 + \mathcal{O}(r^5), \quad (2.14)$$

which approaches 0 as $r \rightarrow 0$. Substituting Eq. (2.13) into Eqs. (2.6) and (2.9), we obtain

$$F = \frac{M_{\text{Pl}}^4 (r^2 f'' - 2f + 2)^2}{8q_E^2}, \quad (2.15)$$

$$\mathcal{L} = \frac{M_{\text{Pl}}^2}{2} \left(f'' + \frac{2f'}{r} \right). \quad (2.16)$$

Around $r = 0$, these behave as $F = 2M_{\text{Pl}}^4 f_3^2 r^6 / q_E^2 + \mathcal{O}(r^7)$ and $\mathcal{L} = 3M_{\text{Pl}}^2 (f_2 + 2f_3 r) + \mathcal{O}(r^2)$, which are both finite.

The nonsingular BH proposed by Ayon-Beato and Garcia [3] is characterized by the metric components

$$f = h = 1 - \frac{2Mr^2}{(r^2 + r_0^2)^{3/2}} + \frac{r_0^2 r^2}{(r^2 + r_0^2)^2}, \quad (2.17)$$

where M and r_0 are constants. At large distances, Eq. (2.17) approaches the Reissner-Nordström (RN) metric components $f = h = 1 - 2M/r + q_E^2 / (2M_{\text{Pl}}^2 r^2)$, with the correspondence $q_E = \sqrt{2} M_{\text{Pl}} r_0$. Around $r = 0$, the metric (2.17) is related to the coefficients in Eq. (2.11) as $f_2 = -(2M - r_0) / r_0^3$, $f_3 = 0$, and $f_4 = (3M - 2r_0) / r_0^5$. So long as $f_2 < 0$, i.e., $r_0 < 2M$, the central region of BHs is approximately described by the de Sitter spacetime, which generates pressure against gravity.

For a given regular metric f , we know both F and \mathcal{L} as functions of r from Eqs. (2.15) and (2.16). In this case, we can also express \mathcal{L} as a function of F , provided that r is explicitly written in terms of F .

B. Purely magnetic BHs

For $q_M \neq 0$ and $q_E = 0$, Eqs. (2.8) and (2.9) give

$$A_0' = 0, \quad (2.18)$$

$$\mathcal{L} = M_{\text{Pl}}^2 r^{-2} (r f' + f - 1), \quad (2.19)$$

with $F = -q_M^2 / (2r^4)$. Using the expansion (2.11), the Lagrangian is regular as $\mathcal{L} = M_{\text{Pl}}^2 (3f_2 + 4f_3 r) + \mathcal{O}(r^2)$ around $r = 0$. For a given $f(r)$, we can explicitly express \mathcal{L} as a function of F by using Eq. (2.19). The nonsingular BH proposed by Dymnikova [7] corresponds to the metric components

$$f = h = 1 - \frac{4M}{\pi r} \left[\arctan\left(\frac{r}{r_0}\right) - \frac{r_0 r}{r^2 + r_0^2} \right], \quad (2.20)$$

where $r_0 = \pi q_M^2 / (16M_{\text{Pl}}^2 M)$ to recover the magnetic RN solution $f = 1 - 2M/r + q_M^2 / (2M_{\text{Pl}}^2 r^2)$ at large distances. In this case, the Lagrangian is known as

$$\mathcal{L} = -\frac{q_M^2}{2(r^2 + r_0^2)^2} = -\frac{q_M^2}{(\sqrt{2}r_0 + \sqrt{-q_M^2/F})^2}. \quad (2.21)$$

This recovers the standard Maxwell Lagrangian $\mathcal{L} = F$ as $F \rightarrow -0$ (i.e., in the limit $r \rightarrow \infty$).

III. ANGULAR LAPLACIAN INSTABILITIES OF NONSINGULAR BHS

To study the linear stability of electric and magnetic BHs, we consider metric and vector-field perturbations on the SSS background (2.1) [29–31]. For the components of metric perturbations $h_{\mu\nu}$, we choose

$$\begin{aligned} h_{tt} &= f(r)H_0(t, r)Y_l(\theta), & h_{tr} &= H_1(t, r)Y_l(\theta), & h_{t\theta} &= 0, \\ h_{t\varphi} &= -Q(t, r)(\sin\theta)Y_{l,\theta}(\theta), & h_{rr} &= f^{-1}(r)H_2(t, r)Y_l(\theta), \\ h_{r\theta} &= h_1(t, r)Y_{l,\theta}(\theta), & h_{r\varphi} &= -W(t, r)(\sin\theta)Y_{l,\theta}(\theta), \\ h_{\theta\theta} &= 0, & h_{\varphi\varphi} &= 0, & h_{\theta\varphi} &= 0, \end{aligned} \quad (3.1)$$

where $Y_l(\theta)$ is the $m = 0$ component of spherical harmonics $Y_{lm}(\theta, \varphi)$. On the SSS background, we can focus on the axisymmetric modes ($m = 0$) without loss of generality. The covector-field perturbation δA_μ has the following components

$$\begin{aligned} \delta A_t &= \delta A_0(t, r)Y_l(\theta), & \delta A_r &= \delta A_1(t, r)Y_l(\theta), \\ \delta A_\theta &= 0, & \delta A_\varphi &= -\delta A(t, r)(\sin\theta)Y_{l,\theta}(\theta), \end{aligned} \quad (3.2)$$

where the choice $\delta A_\theta = 0$ is an outcome of the presence of $U(1)$ gauge symmetry.¹ We note that the gauge choice (3.1) completely fixes the residual gauge degrees of freedom under the infinitesimal transformation $x^\mu \rightarrow x^\mu + \xi^\mu$.

The three perturbations Q , W , δA belong to those in the odd-parity sector, while the six perturbations H_0 , H_1 , H_2 , h_1 , δA_0 , δA_1 correspond to those in the even-parity sector. We focus on the multiple modes $l \geq 2$ and expand the action (1.1) up to second order in perturbed fields. The total quadratic-order action can be expressed as $\mathcal{S}^{(2)} = \int dt dr (\mathcal{L}_1 + \mathcal{L}_2)$, where \mathcal{L}_1 and \mathcal{L}_2 are given in Appendix A. We introduce the following Lagrange multipliers

$$\chi = r\dot{W} - rQ' + 2Q - \frac{2\mathcal{L}_{,Fr}A'_0}{M_{\text{Pl}}^2} \delta A, \quad (3.3)$$

$$V = \delta A'_0 - \delta \dot{A}_1 + \frac{A'_0}{2}(H_0 - H_2), \quad (3.4)$$

¹ Since there is $U(1)$ gauge invariance under the transformation, $A_\mu \rightarrow A_\mu + \partial_\mu \chi_{\text{gauge}}$, we can eliminate the even-parity mode $\delta A_\theta = \delta A_2(t, r)Y_{l,\theta}(\theta)$ by choosing the perturbed gauge field $\delta \chi_{\text{gauge}} = -\delta A_2(t, r)Y_l(\theta)$ and making the field redefinitions $\delta A_0^{\text{new}} = \delta A_0 - \delta \dot{A}_2$, $\delta A_1^{\text{new}} = \delta A_1 - \delta A'_2$.

where a dot represents the derivative with respect to t . The dynamical fields χ and V correspond to the odd-parity gravitational perturbation and the even-parity electromagnetic perturbation, respectively. We also have the odd-parity electromagnetic mode δA and the even-parity gravitational mode ψ defined by

$$\psi = rH_2 - Lh_1, \quad \text{where } L = l(l+1). \quad (3.5)$$

Following the procedure explained in Appendix A, the second-order action, after the elimination of all nondynamical perturbations and the integration by parts, is expressed in the form

$$\tilde{\mathcal{S}}^{(2)} = \int dt dr \left(\dot{\vec{\Psi}}^t \mathbf{K} \dot{\vec{\Psi}} + \vec{\Psi}^t \mathbf{G} \vec{\Psi}' + \vec{\Psi}^t \mathbf{M} \vec{\Psi} + \vec{\Psi}^t \mathbf{S} \vec{\Psi} \right), \quad (3.6)$$

where \mathbf{K} , \mathbf{G} , \mathbf{M} are 4×4 symmetric matrices with components like K_{11} , \mathbf{S} is a 4×4 antisymmetric matrix, and

$$\vec{\Psi}^t = (\chi, \delta A, \psi, V). \quad (3.7)$$

In the eikonal limit ($l \gg 1$), we will derive the linear stability conditions for electric and magnetic BHs. Unlike past related works [21, 25], our results can be applied to the stability for both $f > 0$ and $f < 0$.

A. Purely electric BHs

For $q_E \neq 0$ and $q_M = 0$, the dynamical system of perturbations is decomposed into the odd-parity sector with $\vec{\Psi}_A^t = (\chi, \delta A)$ and the even-parity sector with $\vec{\Psi}_B^t = (\psi, V)$. When $f > 0$, the positivities of \mathbf{K}_A and \mathbf{K}_B , which are the 2×2 kinetic matrices of \mathbf{K} associated with $\vec{\Psi}_A^t$ and $\vec{\Psi}_B^t$ respectively, determine the no-ghost conditions of four dynamical perturbations. So long as

$$\mathcal{L}_{,F} > 0, \quad (3.8)$$

both \mathbf{K}_A and \mathbf{K}_B are positive definite. For $f < 0$, the no-ghost conditions are determined by the positivities of matrices \mathbf{G}_A and \mathbf{G}_B associated with $\vec{\Psi}_A^t$ and $\vec{\Psi}_B^t$ respectively. They are satisfied with the inequality (3.8).

For $f > 0$, the radial propagation speeds c_r measured by a proper time $\tau = \int f dt$ are known by substituting the WKB-form solutions $\vec{\Psi}^t = \vec{\Psi}_0^t e^{-i(\omega t - kr)}$ into their perturbation equations, where $\vec{\Psi}_0^t$ is a constant vector composed of $(\vec{\Psi}_0^t)_A$ and $(\vec{\Psi}_0^t)_B$. This leads to the algebraic equations $\mathbf{U}_A(\vec{\Psi}_0^t)_A = 0$ and $\mathbf{U}_B(\vec{\Psi}_0^t)_B = 0$, where \mathbf{U}_A and \mathbf{U}_B are 2×2 matrices. The existence of non-vanishing solutions to $(\vec{\Psi}_0^t)_A$ and $(\vec{\Psi}_0^t)_B$ requires that $\det \mathbf{U}_A = 0$ and $\det \mathbf{U}_B = 0$. Taking the large ω and k limits, both equations lead to $(\omega^2 - k^2 f^2)^2 = 0$. Substituting $\omega = k f c_r$ into this relation, we find

$$c_r^2 = 1, \quad \text{for all } \vec{\Psi}^t = (\chi, \delta A, \psi, V). \quad (3.9)$$

When $f < 0$, we exploit the WKB solution in the form $\vec{\Psi}^t = \vec{\Psi}_0^t e^{-i(\omega r - kt)}$. This results in the dispersion relation

$(\omega^2 f^2 - k^2)^2 = 0$ for both $\vec{\Psi}_A^t$ and $\vec{\Psi}_B^t$. Then, after the substitution of $\omega = kc_r/(-f)$, we obtain the same squared radial propagation speeds as those in Eq. (3.9).

For $f > 0$, the angular propagation speeds c_Ω are derived by taking the large ω and l limits in $\det \mathbf{U}_A = 0$ and $\det \mathbf{U}_B = 0$. From $\det \mathbf{U}_A = 0$, we obtain the dispersion relation $(r^2 \omega^2 - Lf)^2 = 0$. Substituting $\omega = c_\Omega l \sqrt{f}/r$ into this relation and taking the limit $l \gg 1$, we find

$$c_\Omega^2 = 1, \quad \text{for } \vec{\Psi}_A^t = (\chi, \delta A). \quad (3.10)$$

The two solutions following from $\det \mathbf{U}_B = 0$ are

$$c_\Omega^2 = 1, \quad \text{for } \psi, \quad (3.11)$$

$$c_\Omega^2 = c_E^2 \equiv \frac{\mathcal{L}_{,F}}{\mathcal{L}_{,F} + 2F\mathcal{L}_{,FF}}, \quad \text{for } V. \quad (3.12)$$

Since $M_{44}/K_{44} = -c_E^2(l^2 f/r^2)$ for $l \gg 1$, we can identify c_E^2 as the squared angular propagation speed of V . When $f < 0$, using the WKB-form solution $\vec{\Psi}^t = \vec{\Psi}_0^t e^{-i(\omega r - kt)}$ with $\omega = c_\Omega l/(\sqrt{-f}r)$ results in the same values of c_Ω^2 as those given in Eqs. (3.10)-(3.12).

B. Purely magnetic BHs

For $q_M \neq 0$ and $q_E = 0$, the system is separated into two sectors: type (C) with $\vec{\Psi}_C^t = (\chi, V)$ and type (D) with $\vec{\Psi}_D^t = (\delta A, \psi)$ [25, 32]. When $f > 0$, the positivities of 2×2 kinetic matrices \mathbf{K}_C and \mathbf{K}_D in each sector are ensured under the condition (3.8). This is also the case for $f < 0$, where the positivities of matrices \mathbf{G}_C and \mathbf{G}_D determine the no-ghost conditions.

Using the WKB-form solution $\vec{\Psi}^t = \vec{\Psi}_0^t e^{-i(\omega t - kr)}$ for $f > 0$, we obtain the two algebraic equations $\mathbf{U}_C(\vec{\Psi}_0^t)_C = 0$ and $\mathbf{U}_D(\vec{\Psi}_0^t)_D = 0$ in type C and D sectors, respectively. Taking the large ω and k limits for $\det \mathbf{U}_C = 0$ and $\det \mathbf{U}_D = 0$, we find that all four dynamical perturbations have the luminal squared radial propagation speeds $c_r^2 = 1$. This property also holds for $f < 0$.

For the sector (C) with $f > 0$, taking the large ω and l limits for $\det \mathbf{U}_C = 0$ leads to the squared angular propagation speeds

$$c_\Omega^2 = 1, \quad \text{for } \vec{\Psi}_C^t = (\chi, V). \quad (3.13)$$

From the other equation $\det \mathbf{U}_D = 0$, we obtain

$$c_\Omega^2 = c_M^2 \equiv \frac{\mathcal{L}_{,F} + 2F\mathcal{L}_{,FF}}{\mathcal{L}_{,F}}, \quad \text{for } \delta A, \quad (3.14)$$

$$c_\Omega^2 = 1, \quad \text{for } \psi. \quad (3.15)$$

Since $M_{22}/K_{22} = -c_M^2 l^2 f/r^2$ for $l \gg 1$, we can identify c_M^2 as the squared angular propagation speed of δA . Unlike the electric BH, the odd-parity electromagnetic perturbation δA has a nontrivial propagation speed different from 1. Again, the results (3.13)-(3.15) are valid for $f < 0$.

IV. INSTABILITY OF NONSINGULAR BHS

For the electric BH, we compute Eq. (3.12) by differentiating Eq. (2.8) and using the relation $F = A_0'^2/2$. This gives $\mathcal{L}_{,FF} = -q_E(rA_0'' + 2A_0')/(r^3 A_0'' A_0'^3)$ and hence $c_E^2 = -rA_0''/(2A_0')$. By using Eq. (2.13), we obtain

$$c_E^2 = c_f^2 \equiv -\frac{r(r^2 f''' + 2r f'' - 2f')}{2(r^2 f'' - 2f + 2)}, \quad (4.1)$$

which depends on f and its r derivatives alone.

For the magnetic BH, we take the F derivative of Eq. (2.19) and exploit the relation $F = -q_M^2/(2r^4)$. Then, we find that c_M^2 in Eq. (3.14) reduces to c_f^2 in Eq. (4.1). Thus, for a given metric function $f(r)$, the squared angular propagation speeds c_E^2 and c_M^2 can be expressed in a unified manner.

Let us consider the nonsingular BH with the expansion (2.11) of f around $r = 0$. Since $f > 0$ in this regime, the t and r coordinates play the timelike and spacelike roles, respectively. The expansion of c_f^2 leads to

$$c_f^2 = -\frac{3}{2} - \frac{5f_4}{4f_3}r + \frac{25f_4^2 - 36f_3f_5}{8f_3^2}r^2 + \mathcal{O}(r^3), \quad (4.2)$$

which is valid for $f_3 \neq 0$. Nonsingular BHs like (2.17) and (2.20) correspond to $f_3 = 0$, in which case we have

$$c_f^2 = -2 - \frac{9f_5}{10f_4}r + \frac{81f_5^2 - 140f_4f_6}{50f_4^2}r^2 + \mathcal{O}(r^3). \quad (4.3)$$

Thus, in both cases, the leading-order terms of c_f^2 are negative. For the metric function $f = 1 + f_n r^n + \mathcal{O}(r^{n+1})$, we have $c_f^2 = -n/2 + \mathcal{O}(r)$ and hence $c_f^2 \leq -1$ for $n \geq 2$.

We study the behavior of dynamical perturbations V and ψ around $r = 0$ for the electric BH. Expressing those fields as $V = \tilde{V}(t)e^{ikr}$ and $\psi = \tilde{\psi}(t)e^{ikr}$ for $f > 0$ and taking the limits $l \gg 1$ and $l \gg kr$, the time-dependent parts approximately obey the differential equations

$$\ddot{\tilde{V}} + c_f^2 \frac{fl^2}{r^2} \tilde{V} = \frac{f^2 \Omega_f c_f^4 M_{P1}^2}{r^3 q_E} \tilde{\psi}, \quad (4.4)$$

$$\ddot{\tilde{\psi}} + \frac{fl^2}{r^2} \tilde{\psi} = \frac{l^2 q_E}{r c_f^2 M_{P1}^2} \tilde{V}, \quad (4.5)$$

where $\Omega_f \equiv r^2 f'' - 2f + 2$. If we use the expansion $f = 1 + f_n r^n + \mathcal{O}(r^{n+1})$ around $r = 0$, we have that $\Omega_f = (n^2 - n - 2)f_n r^n + \mathcal{O}(r^{n+1})$. It is possible to close Eqs. (4.4) and (4.5) for one single variable, say $\tilde{\psi}$, finding

$$\ddot{\tilde{\psi}} + \frac{(1 + c_f^2) fl^2}{r^2} \tilde{\psi} + \frac{c_f^2 f^2 l^4}{r^4} \tilde{\psi} \simeq 0, \quad (4.6)$$

where we have neglected the term $-(f^2 c_f^2 \Omega_f l^2 / r^4) \tilde{\psi}$. Assuming the solution to Eq. (4.6) in the form $\tilde{\psi}(t) \propto e^{-i\omega t}$, we obtain

$$\omega^2 = c_f^2 \frac{fl^2}{r^2}, \quad \omega^2 = \frac{fl^2}{r^2}. \quad (4.7)$$

Since $c_f^2 < 0$ in a non-empty set centered around $r = 0$, there is always a growing-mode solution ($\omega^2 = c_f^2 f l^2 / r^2$) besides a stable one ($\omega^2 = f l^2 / r^2$). However, the presence of the former is enough to make the nonsingular BH unstable. We note that \tilde{V} obeys the same form of a fourth-order differential equation as Eq. (4.6), so that the two dynamical perturbations ψ and V in the even-parity sector (B) are subject to exponential growth.

The enhancement of ψ and V works as a backreaction to the background BH solution. Then, the background metric is no longer maintained as the steady forms like (2.17) and (2.20). For the magnetic BH, the same exponential growth of dynamical perturbations occurs for ψ and δA in the sector (D). Such instability is generic for all nonsingular BHs constructed in the framework of NED—including those of Bardeen with metric $f = 1 - 2Mr^2/(r^2 + r_0^2)^{3/2}$ [2] and Hayward with metric $f = 1 - 2Mr^2/(r^3 + 2Mr_0^2)$ [20].

A typical time scale of instability arising from the negative value of c_f^2 around $r = 0$ is estimated as

$$t_{\text{int}} \simeq \frac{r}{\sqrt{-c_f^2} l}. \quad (4.8)$$

We recall that $-c_f^2$ is of order c^2 , where we restored the speed of light c . Since the distance r associated with Laplacian instability is less than the outer horizon radius r_h , t_{int} is much shorter than r_h/c for $l \gg 1$. If we consider a BH with $r_h = 10$ km, we have $t_{\text{int}} \lesssim 10^{-5}/l$ sec.




FIG. 1. We plot c_f^2 and f versus r/r_0 for the metric (2.20) with $M = 4r_0$. At the distance $r < \sqrt{2}r_0$, we have $c_f^2 < 0$. For the metric (2.17), c_f^2 exhibits similar behavior around $r = 0$.

The above results show that nonsingular BHs in NED are always plagued by angular Laplacian instability around $r = 0$. For example, the BH solution (2.20) has

the following squared angular propagation speed

$$c_f^2 = \frac{r^2 - 2r_0^2}{r^2 + r_0^2}. \quad (4.9)$$

As we estimated in Eq. (4.3), we have $c_f^2 = -2$ at $r = 0$. While c_f^2 approaches 1 as $r \rightarrow \infty$, c_f^2 is negative in the region $r < \sqrt{2}r_0$.

In Fig. 1, we plot c_f^2 and f for $M = 4r_0$, in which case there are two horizons at $r_1 = 0.69r_0$ and $r_2 = 6.44r_0$. Since the expression (4.9) is valid at any distance $r \geq 0$ (as we showed in Sec. III), there is angular Laplacian instability for $r < \sqrt{2}r_0$ (including the region $r_1 \leq r < \sqrt{2}r_0$ with $f < 0$). The crucial point is that nonsingular BHs always have a finite range of r where f is expanded as Eq. (2.11) around $r = 0$, in which regime c_f^2 is always negative. In Appendix B, we will confirm that the angular Laplacian instability is robust irrespective of the presence/absence of ghosts and the rescaling of dynamical perturbations.

V. CONCLUSIONS

We have shown that nonsingular BHs in NED are inevitably subject to angular Laplacian instability around $r = 0$. This result holds for both electric and magnetic BHs, as the form (4.1) of c_f^2 is universal to both cases. The Laplacian instability we found is a physical one, in that the even-parity gravitational perturbation ψ is subject to exponential growth through the angular instability of vector-field perturbations (V for the electric BH and δA for the magnetic BH). The backreaction of enhanced perturbations to the background would not keep the regular metrics like (2.17) and (2.20) as they are.

Our no-go result for the absence of stable static nonsingular BHs is valid for NED, but this is not the case for more general theories. For example, it is of interest to study what happens by incorporating an additional scalar field ϕ as the Lagrangian $\mathcal{L}(\phi, X, F)$ [33–35], where X is a scalar kinetic term. If such theories with dynamical degrees of freedom still lead to the instability of regular BHs, nonlocal versions of the ultraviolet completion of gravity such as those proposed in Refs. [36–39] may be the clue to the construction of stable nonsingular BHs.

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

We thank Valeri Frolov for useful discussions. The work of ADF was supported by the Japan Society for the Promotion of Science Grants-in-Aid for Scientific Research No. 20K03969. ST was supported by the Grant-in-Aid for Scientific Research Fund of the JSPS No. 22K03642 and Waseda University Special Research Project No. 2024C-474.

APPENDIX A: SECOND-ORDER PERTURBED ACTION

The second-order action of perturbations, which is obtained after the integration with respect to θ and φ , can

$$\begin{aligned} \mathcal{L}_1 = & a_0 H_0^2 + H_0 [a_1 H_2' + La_2 h_1' + (a_3 + La_4) H_2 + La_5 h_1 + La_6 \delta A] + Lb_1 H_1^2 + H_1 (b_2 \dot{H}_2 + Lb_3 \dot{h}_1) \\ & + c_0 H_2^2 + LH_2 (c_1 h_1 + c_2 \delta A) + L(d_0 \dot{h}_1^2 + d_1 h_1^2) + Lh_1 (d_2 \delta A_0 + d_3 \delta A') \\ & + s_1 (\delta A_0' - \delta \dot{A}_1)^2 + (s_2 H_0 + s_3 H_2 + Ls_4 \delta A) (\delta A_0' - \delta \dot{A}_1) + L(s_5 \delta A_0^2 + s_6 \delta A_1^2), \end{aligned} \quad (\text{A.1})$$

$$\begin{aligned} \mathcal{L}_2 = & L[p_1 (r\dot{W} - rQ' + 2Q)^2 + p_2 \delta A (r\dot{W} - rQ' + 2Q) + p_3 \delta \dot{A}^2 + p_4 \delta A'^2 + Lp_5 \delta A^2 + (Lp_6 + p_7) W^2 \\ & + (Lp_8 + p_9) Q^2 + p_{10} Q \delta A_0 + p_{11} Q h_1 + p_{12} W \delta A_1], \end{aligned} \quad (\text{A.2})$$

where we used the condition $h = f$, and

$$\begin{aligned} a_0 = & \frac{r^2}{8} A_0'^2 (\mathcal{L}_{,F} + A_0'^2 \mathcal{L}_{,FF}), & a_1 = & -\frac{M_{\text{Pl}}^2 r f}{2}, & a_2 = & \frac{M_{\text{Pl}}^2 f}{2}, & a_3 = & -\frac{M_{\text{Pl}}^2}{2} - \frac{r^2}{4} (2\mathcal{L} - A_0'^2 \mathcal{L}_{,F} + A_0'^4 \mathcal{L}_{,FF}), \\ a_4 = & -\frac{M_{\text{Pl}}^2}{4}, & a_5 = & \frac{M_{\text{Pl}}^2 (f+1) + r^2 (\mathcal{L} - A_0'^2 \mathcal{L}_{,F})}{4r}, & a_6 = & \frac{q_M}{2r^2} (\mathcal{L}_{,F} - A_0'^2 \mathcal{L}_{,FF}), & b_1 = & -a_4, \\ b_2 = & M_{\text{Pl}}^2 r, & b_3 = & 2a_4, & c_0 = & -\frac{a_3}{2}, & c_1 = & -a_5, & c_2 = & -a_6, & d_0 = & -a_4, & d_1 = & \frac{f}{2r^4} (M_{\text{Pl}}^2 r^2 - q_M^2 \mathcal{L}_{,F}), \\ d_2 = & -A_0' \mathcal{L}_{,F}, & d_3 = & -\frac{q_M f \mathcal{L}_{,F}}{r^2}, & s_1 = & \frac{r^2}{2} (\mathcal{L}_{,F} + A_0'^2 \mathcal{L}_{,FF}), & s_2 = & A_0' s_1, & s_3 = & -A_0' s_1, \\ s_4 = & -\frac{q_M A_0' \mathcal{L}_{,FF}}{r^2}, & s_5 = & \frac{\mathcal{L}_{,F}}{2f}, & s_6 = & -\frac{f \mathcal{L}_{,F}}{2}, \end{aligned} \quad (\text{A.3})$$

$$\begin{aligned} p_1 = & \frac{M_{\text{Pl}}^2}{4r^2}, & p_2 = & \frac{d_2}{r}, & p_3 = & s_5, & p_4 = & s_6, & p_5 = & \frac{q_M^2 \mathcal{L}_{,FF} - r^4 \mathcal{L}_{,F}}{2r^6}, & p_6 = & -\frac{M_{\text{Pl}}^2 f}{4r^2}, \\ p_7 = & d_1, & p_8 = & \frac{M_{\text{Pl}}^2}{4r^2 f}, & p_9 = & -\frac{d_1}{f^2}, & p_{10} = & -\frac{d_3}{f^2}, & p_{11} = & -A_0' f p_{10}, & p_{12} = & -f^2 p_{10}, \end{aligned} \quad (\text{A.4})$$

where s_4 vanishes for both the electric BH ($q_M = 0$) and the magnetic BH ($A_0' = 0$). The second-order Lagrangians (A.1) and (A.2) with the coefficients (A.3) and (A.4) are valid both for $f > 0$ and $f < 0$.

We incorporate the dynamical fields V and χ as the forms of Lagrange multipliers

$$\tilde{\mathcal{L}}_1 = \mathcal{L}_1 - s_1 \left[\delta A_0' - \delta \dot{A}_1 + \frac{A_0'}{2} (H_0 - H_2) - V \right]^2, \quad (\text{A.5})$$

$$\tilde{\mathcal{L}}_2 = \mathcal{L}_2 - Lp_1 \left[r\dot{W} - rQ' + 2Q - \frac{2\mathcal{L}_{,F} r A_0'}{M_{\text{Pl}}^2} \delta A - \chi \right]^2. \quad (\text{A.6})$$

Then, we consider the action $\tilde{\mathcal{S}}^{(2)} = \int dt dr (\tilde{\mathcal{L}}_1 + \tilde{\mathcal{L}}_2)$ equivalent to $\mathcal{S}^{(2)}$. We also introduce the dynamical perturbation $\psi = rH_2 - Lh_1$ and express H_2 in terms of ψ and h_1 . Since H_0^2 vanishes in $\tilde{\mathcal{L}}_1$, the variation of $\tilde{\mathcal{S}}^{(2)}$ with respect to H_0 allows one to express h_1 in terms of the other fields. After deriving the perturbation equations of motion for H_1 , δA_0 , δA_1 , Q , and W , we can eliminate these fields from $\tilde{\mathcal{S}}^{(2)}$. After the integration by parts, we finally obtain the second-order action of the form (3.6)

be written in the form $\mathcal{S}^{(2)} = \int dt dr (\mathcal{L}_1 + \mathcal{L}_2)$, where

containing four dynamical perturbations χ , δA , ψ , V , and their t, r derivatives.

APPENDIX B: NO-GHOST CONDITIONS

Let us discuss the no-ghost conditions in more detail. For the electric BH, we have $\mathcal{L}_{,F} = q_E / (r^2 A_0') = 2q_E^2 / (M_{\text{Pl}}^2 r^2 \Omega_f)$ from Eqs. (2.8) and (2.13). For the magnetic BH, we obtain $\mathcal{L}_{,F} = M_{\text{Pl}}^2 r^2 \Omega_f / (2q_M^2)$ from Eq. (2.19). Then, in both cases, the no-ghost condition (3.8) is equivalent to

$$\Omega_f = r^2 f'' - 2f + 2 > 0. \quad (\text{A.1})$$

Using the expansion (2.11) around $r = 0$, this inequality translates to $\Omega_f = 4f_3 r^3 + 10f_4 r^4 + \mathcal{O}(r^5) > 0$, which is always satisfied if $f_3 > 0$ (and if $f_4 > 0$ for the BH solution with $f_3 = 0$).

For the electric BH in the range $f > 0$, the second-order action of even-parity perturbations contains kinetic

terms of V and ψ , as

$$\tilde{\mathcal{S}}^{(2)} = \int dt dr \left(\frac{q_E^2 r^2}{l^2 f \Omega_f M_{\text{Pl}}^2 c_f^4} \dot{V}^2 + \frac{M_{\text{Pl}}^2 f}{l^4} \dot{\psi}^2 \dots \right), \quad (\text{A.2})$$

Thus, in the limit that $r \rightarrow 0$, there is no strong coupling associated with the vanishing kinetic terms. Under the no-ghost condition $\Omega_f > 0$ together with the regular condition $f > 0$ around $r = 0$, the coefficients of \dot{V}^2 and $\dot{\psi}^2$ are both positive. One can perform the field definitions

for V and ψ to make the kinetic terms in Eq. (A.2) canonical. However, this does not modify the squared angular propagation speed c_f^2 . Indeed, Eq. (4.6) shows the invariance under the field redefinition $\tilde{\psi} \rightarrow \mathcal{F}(r, l)\tilde{\psi}$, where \mathcal{F} depends on r and l . For the magnetic BH, the same property for the invariance of c_f^2 also holds under the redefinition of δA and ψ . Therefore, the angular instability around $r = 0$ is always present irrespective of no-ghost conditions and the rescaling of dynamical perturbations.

-
- [1] R. Penrose, *Phys. Rev. Lett.* **14**, 57 (1965).
[2] J. Bardeen, *Proceedings of International Conference GR5 (Tbilisi, USSR, 1968)*.
[3] E. Ayon-Beato and A. Garcia, *Phys. Rev. Lett.* **80**, 5056 (1998), arXiv:gr-qc/9911046.
[4] E. Ayon-Beato and A. Garcia, *Phys. Lett. B* **464**, 25 (1999), arXiv:hep-th/9911174.
[5] E. Ayon-Beato and A. Garcia, *Phys. Lett. B* **493**, 149 (2000), arXiv:gr-qc/0009077.
[6] K. A. Bronnikov, *Phys. Rev. D* **63**, 044005 (2001), arXiv:gr-qc/0006014.
[7] I. Dymnikova, *Class. Quant. Grav.* **21**, 4417 (2004), arXiv:gr-qc/0407072.
[8] S. Ansoldi, in *Conference on Black Holes and Naked Singularities* (2008) arXiv:0802.0330 [gr-qc].
[9] L. Balart and E. C. Vagenas, *Phys. Rev. D* **90**, 124045 (2014), arXiv:1408.0306 [gr-qc].
[10] L. Balart and E. C. Vagenas, *Phys. Lett. B* **730**, 14 (2014), arXiv:1401.2136 [gr-qc].
[11] Z.-Y. Fan and X. Wang, *Phys. Rev. D* **94**, 124027 (2016), arXiv:1610.02636 [gr-qc].
[12] M. E. Rodrigues and M. V. de Sousa Silva, *JCAP* **06**, 025 (2018), arXiv:1802.05095 [gr-qc].
[13] W. Heisenberg and H. Euler, *Z. Phys.* **98**, 714 (1936), arXiv:physics/0605038.
[14] M. Born and L. Infeld, *Proc. Roy. Soc. Lond. A* **144**, 425 (1934).
[15] H. Yajima and T. Tamaki, *Phys. Rev. D* **63**, 064007 (2001), arXiv:gr-qc/0005016.
[16] S. Fernando and D. Krug, *Gen. Rel. Grav.* **35**, 129 (2003), arXiv:hep-th/0306120.
[17] R.-G. Cai, D.-W. Pang, and A. Wang, *Phys. Rev. D* **70**, 124034 (2004), arXiv:hep-th/0410158.
[18] T. K. Dey, *Phys. Lett. B* **595**, 484 (2004), arXiv:hep-th/0406169.
[19] H. Maeda, *JHEP* **11**, 108 (2022), arXiv:2107.04791 [gr-qc].
[20] S. A. Hayward, *Phys. Rev. Lett.* **96**, 031103 (2006), arXiv:gr-qc/0506126.
[21] C. Moreno and O. Sarbach, *Phys. Rev. D* **67**, 024028 (2003), arXiv:gr-qc/0208090.
[22] B. Toshmatov, Z. Stuchlík, J. Schee, and B. Ahmedov, *Phys. Rev. D* **97**, 084058 (2018), arXiv:1805.00240 [gr-qc].
[23] B. Toshmatov, Z. Stuchlík, and B. Ahmedov, *Phys. Rev. D* **98**, 085021 (2018), arXiv:1810.06383 [gr-qc].
[24] B. Toshmatov, Z. Stuchlík, B. Ahmedov, and D. Malafarina, *Phys. Rev. D* **99**, 064043 (2019), arXiv:1903.03778 [gr-qc].
[25] K. Nomura, D. Yoshida, and J. Soda, *Phys. Rev. D* **101**, 124026 (2020), arXiv:2004.07560 [gr-qc].
[26] V. P. Frolov, *Phys. Rev. D* **94**, 104056 (2016), arXiv:1609.01758 [gr-qc].
[27] C. W. Misner and J. A. Wheeler, *Annals of Physics* **2**, 525 (1957).
[28] A. De Felice and S. Tsujikawa, *Phys. Rev. D* **109**, 084022 (2024), arXiv:2312.03191 [gr-qc].
[29] T. Regge and J. A. Wheeler, *Phys. Rev.* **108**, 1063 (1957).
[30] F. J. Zerilli, *Phys. Rev. Lett.* **24**, 737 (1970).
[31] V. Moncrief, *Phys. Rev. D* **10**, 1057 (1974).
[32] C.-Y. Chen, A. De Felice, and S. Tsujikawa, *JCAP* **07**, 022 (2024), arXiv:2404.09377 [gr-qc].
[33] L. Heisenberg, *JCAP* **10**, 054 (2018), arXiv:1801.01523 [gr-qc].
[34] R. Kase and S. Tsujikawa, *Phys. Rev. D* **107**, 104045 (2023), arXiv:2301.10362 [gr-qc].
[35] C. F. S. Pereira, D. C. Rodrigues, M. V. d. S. Silva, J. C. Fabris, M. E. Rodrigues, and H. Belich, arXiv:2409.09182 [gr-qc].
[36] L. Modesto, *Phys. Rev. D* **86**, 044005 (2012), arXiv:1107.2403 [hep-th].
[37] T. Biswas, E. Gerwick, T. Koivisto, and A. Mazumdar, *Phys. Rev. Lett.* **108**, 031101 (2012), arXiv:1110.5249 [gr-qc].
[38] L. Modesto and L. Rachwal, *Nucl. Phys. B* **889**, 228 (2014), arXiv:1407.8036 [hep-th].
[39] E. T. Tomboulis, *Phys. Rev. D* **92**, 125037 (2015), arXiv:1507.00981 [hep-th].