

Horizon Data: Existence Results and a Near-Horizon Equation on General Null Hypersurfaces

Miguel Manzano^{1*} and Marc Mars^{2†}

¹ Faculty of Mathematics, University of Vienna,
Oskar-Morgenstern-Platz 1, 1090 Vienna, Austria.

² Faculty of Sciences, University of Salamanca,
Plaza de la Merced 18, 37008 Salamanca, España.

December 2, 2025

Abstract

In a spacetime (\mathcal{M}, g) , a horizon is a null hypersurface where the deformation tensor $\mathcal{K} := \mathcal{L}_\eta g$ of a null and tangent vector η satisfies certain restrictions. In this work, we develop a formalism to study the geometry of *general* horizons (i.e. characterized by any \mathcal{K}), based on encoding the zeroth and first transverse derivatives of \mathcal{K} on null hypersurfaces detached from any ambient spacetime. We introduce the notions of *\mathcal{K} -tuple* and *non-isolation tensor*. The former encodes the order zero of \mathcal{K} , while the latter is a symmetric 2-covariant tensor that codifies the “degree of isolation” of a horizon. In particular, the non-isolation tensor vanishes for homothetic, Killing and isolated horizons. As an application we derive a *generalized near-horizon equation*, i.e., an identity that holds on any horizon (regardless of its topology or whether it contains fixed points), which relates the non-isolation tensor, a certain torsion one-form, and curvature terms. By restricting this equation to a cross-section one can recover the near-horizon equation of isolated horizons and the master equation of multiple Killing horizons. Our formalism allows us to prove two existence theorems for horizons. Specifically, we establish the necessary and sufficient conditions for a non-degenerate totally geodesic horizon with any prescribed non-isolation tensor to be embeddable in a spacetime satisfying any (non-necessarily Λ -vacuum) field equations. We treat first the case of arbitrary topology, and then show how the result can be strengthened when the horizon admits a cross-section.

1 Introduction

For the purposes of this paper, horizons are null hypersurfaces endowed with a privileged null and tangent vector field η which encodes certain symmetry property of the spacetime. They play a fundamental role in many gravitational contexts such as gravitational collapse, black hole uniqueness, singularity theorems, or null infinity, see e.g. [47, 51, 50, 8, 17, 28, 5, 20] and references therein. Prime

*m.manzano.rod@gmail.com

†marc@usal.es

examples of horizons are homothetic, conformal Killing and Killing horizons, but there are many other useful notions such as non-expanding, weakly isolated and isolated horizons [2, 4, 3, 23, 18, 21], or multiple Killing horizons [37]. Horizons usually mark the boundary of causally relevant regions of a spacetime, and their presence reveals interesting connections between its causal structure and the behaviour of symmetries, which often change causal character across the horizons. In particular, Killing horizons are linked to (local) isometries and hence to equilibrium states, whereas homothetic horizons arise for instance in self-similar evolution, most notably in critical gravitational collapse [19, 48]. In a more general context, homothetic horizons are also prominent objects in conformal geometry via the Fefferman-Graham ambient construction [15, 16].

The link between horizons and spacetime symmetries raises fundamental questions, such as what are the conditions for a spacetime to admit a horizon, or what data must be prescribed on a horizon so that it induces a specific type of symmetry. These issues have been widely studied in the literature, starting with the seminal work [45] where analytic, Ricci-flat (4-dimensional) spacetimes with a non-degenerate Killing horizon were shown to be uniquely determined by six functions on the horizon (a result that was later reformulated in more geometric terms, and extended to smooth spacetimes in [24]). For *degenerate* Killing horizons, several non-existence and uniqueness results have been proved, including non-existence of such horizons in static Λ -vacuum spacetimes [9, 6, 52], uniqueness of Schwarzschild-de Sitter [22] and (local) uniqueness of the Kerr-horizon data in the (electro)vacuum rotating case [29, 25, 27, 44, 14]. In the case where the horizon is of bifurcate type, i.e. it consists of two transverse null hypersurfaces, the problem can be analyzed from a characteristic initial value perspective. Relevant results in this regard are the formulation of the characteristic problem on bifurcate Killing horizons [49] (see also [11]), the analyticity of the spacetime metric for bifurcate Killing horizons defined by a hypersurface-orthogonal Killing vector [7], and the fact that bifurcate Killing horizons with closed torsion one-form give rise to (and arise from) static Killing vectors [10]. Motivated by these works, the purpose of the present paper is to introduce a formalism for describing horizons as manifolds *a priori detached from any ambient spacetime*, and to exploit it to study the interplay between the existence of spacetimes with symmetries and the geometric properties of the horizons. The key point of the formalism is that it allows one to work with *generic* notions of horizons (i.e. far less restrictive than those of homothetic or a Killing horizons), as well as to deal with spacetimes satisfying *any* (i.e. non-necessarily Λ -vacuum) field equations.

A particularly relevant object in this context is the so-called deformation tensor $\mathcal{K}[\eta] \stackrel{\text{def}}{=} \mathcal{L}_\eta g$ of a spacetime (\mathcal{M}, g) , which accounts for the “degree of symmetry” of (\mathcal{M}, g) along η . In fact, every notion of horizon imposes constraints on $\mathcal{K}[\eta]$ and/or its derivatives. For instance, $\mathcal{K}[\eta]$ and all its derivatives vanish on Killing horizons, and are proportional to derivatives of g on homothetic horizons, whereas isolated horizons impose restrictions only up to the first transverse derivative of $\mathcal{K}[\eta]$ [31]. We base our approach on capturing the geometric information of $\mathcal{K}[\eta]$ (more specifically, its zeroth and first orders at the horizon) in terms of *data*—i.e. a set of tensor fields—on a detached null hypersurface. In this way, the formalism enables us to consider *completely general* horizons (i.e. with arbitrary $\mathcal{K}[\eta]$ and with no restrictions of the topology of the horizon), and then study specific types of horizon by particularizing the data set. Besides, we shall maintain full generality regarding the generator η , which in particular is allowed to vanish on the horizon.

To capture the order zero of $\mathcal{K}[\eta]$ on a detached null hypersurface \mathcal{H} we introduce the concept of *metric \mathcal{K} -tuple* (cf. Definitions 4.1 and 4.2), which involves two functions α, \mathbf{p} and a covector \mathbf{q} , subject to

certain restrictions. This notion is tailored so that, once \mathcal{H} is embedded in a spacetime, the deformation tensor at the horizon is given by the quantities $\alpha\mathbf{U}, \mathbf{p}, \mathbf{q}$, where \mathbf{U} is computable from the data and a posteriori agrees with the second fundamental form of \mathcal{H} . In particular, a Killing horizon of order zero is described at a non-embedded level by a \mathcal{K} -tuple with $\{\alpha\mathbf{U} = 0, \mathbf{p} = 0, \mathbf{q} = 0\}$. A key result in this context is that, for arbitrary $\{\alpha, \mathbf{p}, \mathbf{q}\}$, any embedded null hypersurface can be turned into a zeroth-order horizon with deformation tensor given by $\alpha\mathbf{U}, \mathbf{p}, \mathbf{q}$ (Proposition 4.5). This is achieved by proving that the vector η can always be extended off the horizon in such a way that its deformation tensor matches the prescribed data. The extension of η is of course not unique, but its first order transverse derivative at the horizon is uniquely determined (equation (4.6)).

The task of capturing the order one of $\mathcal{K}[\eta]$ (i.e. its first transverse derivative) at a non-embedded level is more complicated, and involves commutators of Lie and covariant derivatives. For instance, isolated horizons [3] are totally geodesic null hypersurfaces for which the commutator $[\mathcal{L}_\eta, \bar{\nabla}]$ of the connection $\bar{\nabla}$ induced from the spacetime and the Lie derivative along η vanishes. For totally geodesic null hypersurfaces, $\bar{\nabla}$ is intrinsic to the horizon, hence $[\mathcal{L}_\eta, \bar{\nabla}] = 0$ is a property of the horizon and one can understand the tensor $[\mathcal{L}_\eta, \bar{\nabla}]$ as a measure of the “degree of non-isolation”. For general null hypersurfaces, however, the induced connection $\bar{\nabla}$ depends strongly on the choice of a *rigging* (i.e. a transverse vector along the hypersurface). Consequently, $[\mathcal{L}_\eta, \bar{\nabla}]$ is in general not suitable for characterizing horizon geometry, and one must find a tensor which encodes the same information as $[\mathcal{L}_\eta, \bar{\nabla}]$ in the totally geodesic case, but exhibits a better behavior under changes of rigging. In Section 4, we provide one such notion of non-isolation tensor $\mathbf{\Pi}^\eta$ (Definition 4.6), and show that in the embedded case it is related to the order one of $\mathcal{K}[\eta]$ (Lemma 4.11). In particular, $\mathbf{\Pi}^\eta$ vanishes for isolated, homothetic and Killing horizons.

An interesting application of the results above is the so-called *generalized near-horizon equation* (Theorem 5.1). This is an identity that holds on *any* \mathcal{K} -tuple, which relates the non-isolation tensor, the surface gravity κ of η , the extrinsic curvature of \mathcal{H} , a one-form ω , and the so-called *constraint tensor* \mathcal{R} [38, 32] (namely a tensor that encodes the tangential part of the ambient Ricci tensor at a non-embedded level). The one-form ω is an extension of the well-known *torsion one-form* in the sense that ω restricted to cross-sections (when they exist) coincides with it. Remarkably, the generalized near-horizon equation is valid for arbitrary topology (in particular, it does not require the existence of a cross-section), and for \mathcal{K} -tuples possibly containing fixed points of η . It also holds for arbitrary \mathcal{R} , hence for any field equations one may wish to impose. More important is the fact that its restriction to cross-sections enables to recover both the *near-horizon equation* of isolated horizons [3, Eq. (5.3)] and the *master equation* of multiple Killing horizons [37, Eq. (60)] as particular cases. For the purposes of this work, one key aspect of the generalized near-horizon equation is that, when κ is no-where zero, it allows one to determine algebraically the extrinsic curvature of the horizon (i.e. first transverse derivatives of the spacetime metric in the embedded case) from ω , $\mathbf{\Pi}^\eta$ and \mathcal{R} . This result turns out to be essential to prove existence of a spacetime with a symmetry from initial data prescribed on a horizon (Section 6).

Two main results of the paper arise from applying the framework to study the problem of how to construct a spacetime from data on a totally geodesic horizon with nowhere zero κ . We obtain two existence results (Theorems 6.4 and 6.8). The first one establishes the necessary and sufficient conditions to be satisfied by the data to ensure existence of a spacetime (\mathcal{M}, g) realizing the prescribed quantities. More precisely, the data consists of the order zero of the spacetime metric together with

freely prescribed quantities α , ω , $\mathbf{\Pi}^\eta$ and \mathcal{R} subject only to certain differential conditions, and the spacetime (\mathcal{M}, g) is such that α determines the vector field η on the embedded horizon, ω is the generalized torsion one-form, $\mathbf{\Pi}^\eta$ is the non-isolation tensor of η , and \mathcal{R} coincides with the tangential components of the ambient Ricci tensor. The necessary and sufficient conditions, on the other hand, are a set of differential equations that, in particular, provide evolution equations for α , ω and $\mathbf{\Pi}^\eta$ (or \mathcal{R}) along the null generators of the horizon (cf. (6.20)-(6.22)). These results therefore determine how to build spacetimes containing totally geodesic horizons with any “degree of non-isolation”, any topology, possibly with fixed points, and such that the spacetime Ricci tensor satisfies any field equations. Since horizons admitting a cross-section S are of particular relevance in General Relativity, in Theorem 6.8 we provide the corresponding existence theorem with initial data on S . As a particular case, Theorems 6.4 and 6.8 can be applied to construct spacetimes with non-expanding, weakly isolated or Killing horizons.

In the particular case when the non-isolation tensor $\mathbf{\Pi}^\eta$ vanishes identically and the constraint tensor \mathcal{R} is Λ -vacuum, the necessary and sufficient conditions (6.20)-(6.22) simplify drastically. The third condition becomes trivial, while the first one just states that the surface gravity is constant. Thus, the only relevant condition that remains is (6.21). Up to a simple redefinition of variables, this is precisely the defining condition of the notion of abstract Killing horizon data (AKH) introduced in [42]. In [42] and its follow up paper [43], AKH data with constant non-zero surface gravity was shown to give rise to a spacetime (\mathcal{M}, g) where the data can be embedded as a Killing horizon, and such that the Λ -vacuum field equations are satisfied to infinite order on the horizon. Asymptotic uniqueness of (\mathcal{M}, g) at the horizon was also proven. Given that in the present paper we are not assuming any field equations, the existence theorem we establish is necessarily weaker concerning the properties of the spacetime one constructs (nothing can be said about higher order transverse derivatives at the horizon). However, it is stronger in the sense that it allows for general non-isolation tensor $\mathbf{\Pi}^\eta$ and constraint tensor \mathcal{R} . In combination with suitable field equations, our result can potentially give rise to existence and uniqueness theorems to all orders for spacetimes beyond Λ -vacuum and/or admitting more general types of horizons.

The structure of the paper is as follows. In Section 2 we revisit the basic concepts and results of the formalism of hypersurface data [34, 35, 40, 30, 32], which is the mathematical framework used in the paper. Section 3 is devoted to studying commutators of Lie and covariant derivatives. In Section 4 we introduce the notions of \mathcal{K} -tuple and non-isolation tensor, which are then exploited in Section 5 to derive the generalized near-horizon equation. Finally, in Section 6 we demonstrate the aforementioned existence results in the case of totally geodesic initial data.

1.1 Notation and conventions

In this paper, all manifolds are smooth, connected and without boundary. Given a manifold \mathcal{M} we use $\mathcal{F}(\mathcal{M}) \stackrel{\text{def}}{=} C^\infty(\mathcal{M}, \mathbb{R})$, and $\mathcal{F}^*(\mathcal{M}) \subset \mathcal{F}(\mathcal{M})$ for the subset of no-where zero functions. The tangent bundle is denoted by $T\mathcal{M}$, and $\Gamma(T\mathcal{M})$ is the set of sections (i.e. vector fields). We use \mathcal{L} , d for the Lie derivative and exterior derivative. Both tensorial and abstract index notation will be employed. We work in arbitrary dimension $n \geq 2$ and use the following sets of indices:

$$\alpha, \beta, \dots = 0, 1, 2, \dots, n; \quad a, b, \dots = 1, 2, \dots, n; \quad A, B, \dots = 2, \dots, n. \quad (1.1)$$

When index-free notation is used (and only then) we shall distinguish covariant tensors with boldface. As usual, parenthesis (resp. brackets) denote symmetrization (resp. antisymmetrization) of indices. The symmetrized tensor product is defined by $A \otimes_s B \equiv \frac{1}{2}(A \otimes B + B \otimes A)$. We write $\text{tr}_B \mathbf{A}$ for the trace of a symmetric $(0, 2)$ -tensor \mathbf{A} with respect to a $(2, 0)$ -tensor B . Our notation and convention for the curvature operator of a connection D is

$$R^D(X, W)Z \stackrel{\text{def}}{=} (D_X D_W - D_W D_X - D_{[X, W]}) Z, \quad (1.2)$$

and we write \mathbf{Hess}^D for the Hessian operator of D . In any Lorentzian manifold (\mathcal{M}, g) , the scalar product of two vectors is written as $g(X, Y)$, and we use g^\sharp and ∇ for the inverse and the Levi-Civita derivative of g respectively. Our signature for Lorentzian manifolds (\mathcal{M}, g) is $(-, +, \dots, +)$.

2 Preliminaries: The formalism of hypersurface data

In this section, we present the basic notions of the hypersurface data formalism, and collect a number of results for later use. Since this work deals with null hypersurfaces, we only present the formalism in the null case. For further details we refer to [34, 35] (see also [40, 30, 32]).

Let \mathcal{H} be a smooth n -manifold endowed with a symmetric $(0, 2)$ -tensor field γ of signature $(0, +, \dots, +)$, a covector field ℓ and a scalar function $\ell^{(2)}$. The tuple $\{\mathcal{H}, \gamma, \ell, \ell^{(2)}\}$ defines **null metric hypersurface data** provided that the square $(n+1)$ -matrix

$$\mathcal{A} \stackrel{\text{def}}{=} \begin{pmatrix} \gamma_{ab} & \ell_a \\ \ell_b & \ell^{(2)} \end{pmatrix} \quad (2.1)$$

is non-degenerate everywhere on \mathcal{H} . A null metric data $\{\mathcal{H}, \gamma, \ell, \ell^{(2)}\}$ equipped with an additional symmetric $(0, 2)$ -tensor \mathbf{Y} defines **null hypersurface data** $\{\mathcal{H}, \gamma, \ell, \ell^{(2)}, \mathbf{Y}\}$.

Given null metric hypersurface data, one can uniquely define a symmetric $(2, 0)$ -tensor field P and a vector field n as the entries of the inverse of \mathcal{A} [34]. By construction, they satisfy

$$\gamma_{ab} n^b = 0, \quad (2.2) \quad \ell_a n^a = 1, \quad (2.3) \quad P^{ab} \ell_b + \ell^{(2)} n^a = 0, \quad (2.4) \quad P^{ab} \gamma_{bc} + n^a \ell_c = \delta_c^a. \quad (2.5)$$

Note that n is no-where zero and spans the radical $\text{Rad} \gamma|_p \stackrel{\text{def}}{=} \{X \in T_p \mathcal{H} \mid \gamma(X, \cdot) = 0\}$ of the degenerate tensor γ (cf. (2.2)-(2.3)). We call **generators** of \mathcal{H} the integral curves of n .

Remark 2.1. *We have fixed the signature of γ to be $(0, +, \dots, +)$ for concreteness. All results below apply when γ has signature $(0, -, \dots, -, +, \dots, +)$. The only difference is that the ambient spaces (\mathcal{M}, g) are no longer Lorentzian but semi-Riemannian (with same signature as the tensor \mathcal{A} in (2.1)).*

The following tensor fields play an important role in the hypersurface data formalism [35]:

$$\mathbf{F} \stackrel{\text{def}}{=} \frac{1}{2} d\ell, \quad \mathbf{s} \stackrel{\text{def}}{=} \mathbf{F}(n, \cdot), \quad \mathbf{U} \stackrel{\text{def}}{=} \frac{1}{2} \mathcal{L}_n \gamma, \quad (2.6) \quad \mathbf{r} \stackrel{\text{def}}{=} \mathbf{Y}(n, \cdot), \quad \boldsymbol{\omega} \stackrel{\text{def}}{=} \mathbf{s} - \mathbf{r}, \quad \kappa_n \stackrel{\text{def}}{=} -\mathbf{Y}(n, n). \quad (2.7)$$

Observe that \mathbf{U} is symmetric and \mathbf{F} is a 2-form, hence $\mathbf{s}(n) = 0$. Moreover, \mathbf{s} and \mathbf{U} verify [35]

$$\mathcal{L}_n \ell = 2\mathbf{s}, \quad (2.8) \quad \mathbf{U}(n, \cdot) = 0. \quad (2.9)$$

Since \mathcal{H} is not endowed with a metric tensor, we cannot define a Levi-Civita covariant derivative. However, it turns out that there exists a canonical notion of covariant derivative on \mathcal{H} . Specifically, given null metric hypersurface data $\{\mathcal{H}, \gamma, \ell, \ell^{(2)}\}$, the two conditions [35, Prop. 4.3]

$$\overset{\circ}{\nabla}_a \gamma_{bc} = -\ell_b \mathbf{U}_{ac} - \ell_c \mathbf{U}_{ab}, \quad (2.10) \quad \overset{\circ}{\nabla}_a \ell_b = \mathbf{F}_{ab} - \ell^{(2)} \mathbf{U}_{ab}, \quad (2.11)$$

uniquely define a torsion-free covariant derivative $\overset{\circ}{\nabla}$ on \mathcal{H} , called **metric hypersurface connection**. The curvature and Ricci tensors of $\overset{\circ}{\nabla}$ are denoted by $\overset{\circ}{R}{}^a{}_{bcd}$ and $\overset{\circ}{R}_{ab}$ respectively. The tensor $\overset{\circ}{R}_{ab}$ verifies $\overset{\circ}{R}_{[ab]} = \overset{\circ}{\nabla}_{[a}s_{b]}$ [35], so it is not symmetric in general. The following three identities involving $\overset{\circ}{\nabla}$ and $\overset{\circ}{R}_{ab}$ will be used later [35, 32]:

$$\overset{\circ}{\nabla}_a n^b = n^b s_a + P^{bf} U_{af}, \quad (2.12)$$

$$n^b \overset{\circ}{\nabla}_{(a} \theta_{b)} = \frac{1}{2} \mathcal{L}_n \theta_a + \frac{1}{2} \overset{\circ}{\nabla}_a (\theta(n)) - \theta(n) s_a - P^{bc} \theta_b U_{ac}, \quad \forall \theta \in \Gamma(T^* \mathcal{H}), \quad (2.13)$$

$$\overset{\circ}{R}_{(ab)} n^b = \frac{1}{2} \mathcal{L}_n s_a - 2P^{cd} U_{ac} s_d + P^{cd} \overset{\circ}{\nabla}_c U_{ad} - \overset{\circ}{\nabla}_a (\text{tr}_P \mathbf{U}) + (\text{tr}_P \mathbf{U}) s_a. \quad (2.14)$$

The connection $\overset{\circ}{\nabla}$ is not the only useful covariant derivative that can be constructed from a given data set. From hypersurface data one can define another torsion-free connection $\overline{\nabla}$ by [34]

$$\overline{\nabla}_X W \stackrel{\text{def}}{=} \overset{\circ}{\nabla}_X W - \mathbf{Y}(X, W) n, \quad \forall X, W \in \Gamma(T\mathcal{H}). \quad (2.15)$$

We call $\overline{\nabla}$ **hypersurface connection** since, as opposed to $\overset{\circ}{\nabla}$, it depends on the tensor field \mathbf{Y} .

The notions of rigging and embedded data [34, 35] connect the hypersurface data formalism with the geometry of embedded hypersurfaces. A null metric data is **(ϕ, ξ) -embedded** in a Lorentzian $(n+1)$ -manifold (\mathcal{M}, g) if there exists an embedding $\phi : \mathcal{N} \hookrightarrow \mathcal{M}$ and a **rigging** ξ —i.e. a vector field along $\phi(\mathcal{N})$, everywhere transverse to it—satisfying

$$\phi^*(g) = \gamma, \quad \phi^*(g(\xi, \cdot)) = \ell, \quad \phi^*(g(\xi, \xi)) = \ell^{(2)}. \quad (2.16)$$

Embeddedness of hypersurface data $\{\mathcal{H}, \gamma, \ell, \ell^{(2)}, \mathbf{Y}\}$ requires the additional condition

$$\frac{1}{2} \phi^*(\mathcal{L}_\xi g) = \mathbf{Y}. \quad (2.17)$$

When no ambiguity arises, we shall identify scalars and vectors on \mathcal{H} with their counterparts on $\phi(\mathcal{H})$. We will also use the word “abstract” for mathematical objects that can be defined irrespectively of whether or not the data is embedded in an ambient space, i.e., for quantities defined solely in terms of hypersurface data. Examples of abstract objects are γ , κ_n or the manifold \mathcal{H} .

In the embedded case, the tensors γ and \mathbf{U} are the first and second fundamental forms of $\phi(\mathcal{H})$ respectively, while $\nu \stackrel{\text{def}}{=} \phi_* n$ is the only vector field normal to $\phi(\mathcal{H})$ and satisfying $g(\xi, \nu) = 1$ [35]. Moreover, the Levi-Civita derivative ∇ of g is related to the connections $\overset{\circ}{\nabla}$, $\overline{\nabla}$ by [34, 35]

$$\nabla_X W = \overline{\nabla}_X W - \mathbf{U}(X, W) \xi = \overset{\circ}{\nabla}_X W - \mathbf{Y}(X, W) \nu - \mathbf{U}(X, W) \xi, \quad \forall X, W \in \Gamma(T\mathcal{H}). \quad (2.18)$$

Thus, $\overline{\nabla}$ is the covariant derivative induced from the Levi-Civita connection of the ambient space when the rigging ξ is used to split $T_p M$, $p \in \phi(\mathcal{H})$ as a direct sum [40], i.e. $T_p M = T_p \phi(\mathcal{H}) \oplus \text{span}(\xi|_p)$.

The hypersurface data formalism encodes information about the ambient curvature without the need of considering the hypersurface as embedded. Specifically, from (non-embedded) null hypersurface data $\{\mathcal{H}, \gamma, \ell, \ell^{(2)}, \mathbf{Y}\}$ one can define a symmetric $(0, 2)$ -tensor \mathcal{R} , called **constraint tensor**, as [38, 39, 32]

$$\begin{aligned} \mathcal{R}_{ab} \stackrel{\text{def}}{=} & \overset{\circ}{R}_{(ab)} - 2\mathcal{L}_n Y_{ab} - (2\omega(n) + \text{tr}_P \mathbf{U}) Y_{ab} - 2\overset{\circ}{\nabla}_{(a} \omega_{b)} - 2\omega_a \omega_b \\ & + 3\overset{\circ}{\nabla}_{(a} s_{b)} + s_a s_b - (\text{tr}_P \mathbf{Y}) U_{ab} + 2P^{cd} U_{d(a} (2Y_{b)c} + F_{b)c}). \end{aligned} \quad (2.19)$$

When the data is (ϕ, ξ) -embedded in (\mathcal{M}, g) , the Ricci tensor \mathbf{Ric}_g of g and \mathcal{R} satisfy $\phi^*(\mathbf{Ric}_g) = \mathcal{R}$ [32]. Thus, \mathcal{R} encodes *abstractly* the pull-back to \mathcal{H} of the ambient Ricci tensor. This makes the constraint tensor a core object within the formalism. The following expressions for the contractions

$\mathcal{R}(n, \cdot)$ and $\mathcal{R}(n, n)$ will be needed later [32]:

$$\mathcal{R}_{ab}n^b = -\overset{\circ}{\nabla}_a \kappa_n + \mathcal{L}_n \omega_a + (\text{tr}_P \mathbf{U}) \omega_a - \overset{\circ}{\nabla}_a (\text{tr}_P \mathbf{U}) + P^{cd} \left(\overset{\circ}{\nabla}_c U_{ad} - 2U_{ac} s_d \right), \quad (2.20)$$

$$\mathcal{R}_{ab}n^a n^b = -n(\text{tr}_P \mathbf{U}) + (\text{tr}_P \mathbf{U}) \kappa_n - P^{ad} P^{bc} U_{ac} U_{bd}. \quad (2.21)$$

Observe that the combination of (2.14) and (2.20) yields

$$\left(\mathcal{R}_{ab} - \overset{\circ}{R}_{(ab)} \right) n^b = \mathcal{L}_n \left(\omega_a - \frac{1}{2} s_a \right) - \overset{\circ}{\nabla}_a \kappa_n + (\omega_a - s_a) \text{tr}_P \mathbf{U}. \quad (2.22)$$

Any null (metric) hypersurface data is subject to a built-in gauge freedom that accounts for the fact that, at the embedded level, the choice of rigging is non-unique [34, 35]. The precise definition works as follows. Let $\{\mathcal{H}, \gamma, \ell, \ell^{(2)}, \mathbf{Y}\}$ be null hypersurface data, $z \in \mathcal{F}^*(\mathcal{N})$ a no-where zero function and V a vector field on \mathcal{H} . We call z, V **gauge parameters**, and define the **gauge-transformed data** by

$$\mathcal{G}_{(z,V)}(\gamma) \stackrel{\text{def}}{=} \gamma, \quad \mathcal{G}_{(z,V)}(\ell) \stackrel{\text{def}}{=} z(\ell + \gamma(V, \cdot)), \quad \mathcal{G}_{(z,V)}(\ell^{(2)}) \stackrel{\text{def}}{=} z^2(\ell^{(2)} + 2\ell(V) + \gamma(V, V)), \quad (2.23)$$

$$\mathcal{G}_{(z,V)}(\mathbf{Y}) \stackrel{\text{def}}{=} z\mathbf{Y} + (\ell + \gamma(V, \cdot)) \otimes_s dz + \frac{z}{2} \mathcal{L}_V \gamma. \quad (2.24)$$

The set $\{\mathcal{H}, \mathcal{G}_{(z,V)}(\gamma), \mathcal{G}_{(z,V)}(\ell), \mathcal{G}_{(z,V)}(\ell^{(2)}), \mathcal{G}_{(z,V)}(\mathbf{Y})\}$ is also null hypersurface data. Moreover, if $\{\mathcal{H}, \gamma, \ell, \ell^{(2)}, \mathbf{Y}\}$ is (ϕ, ξ) -embedded in (\mathcal{M}, g) , then the gauge-transformed data is also embedded in (\mathcal{M}, g) with same embedding but rigging $\mathcal{G}_{(z,V)}(\xi) \stackrel{\text{def}}{=} z(\xi + \phi_* V)$. The transformations (2.23)-(2.24) induce the following behaviour of $n, \mathbf{U}, \mathbf{s}, \omega, \overset{\circ}{\nabla}$ and $\bar{\nabla}$ [35, 39, 32]:

$$\mathcal{G}_{(z,V)}(n) = z^{-1}n, \quad (2.25) \quad \mathcal{G}_{(z,V)}(\mathbf{U}) = z^{-1}\mathbf{U}, \quad (2.26)$$

$$\mathcal{G}_{(z,V)}(\mathbf{s}) = \mathbf{s} + \frac{1}{2} \mathcal{L}_n (\gamma(V, \cdot)) + \frac{n(z)}{2z} (\ell + \gamma(V, \cdot)) - \frac{dz}{2z}, \quad (2.27) \quad \mathcal{G}_{(z,V)}(\omega) = \omega - \frac{dz}{z} + \mathbf{U}(V, \cdot), \quad (2.28)$$

$$\mathcal{G}_{(z,V)}(\overset{\circ}{\nabla}) - \overset{\circ}{\nabla} = \frac{1}{2z} (V \otimes \mathcal{L}_{zn} \gamma + n \otimes (\mathcal{L}_{zV} \gamma + 2\ell \otimes_s dz)), \quad (2.29) \quad \mathcal{G}_{(z,V)}(\bar{\nabla}) - \bar{\nabla} = V \otimes \mathbf{U}. \quad (2.30)$$

An interesting case occurs when a null hypersurface data is equipped with a **gauge-invariant vector field** $\bar{\eta}$ along the degenerate direction of γ (i.e. $\bar{\eta} \in \text{Rad} \gamma$). The gauge-invariance ensures that $\bar{\eta}$ is a property of the hypersurface itself, and enables to describe mathematically relevant situations—e.g. horizons [31, 41, 42, 43]—abstractly. In particular, letting $\alpha \in \mathcal{F}(\mathcal{H})$ be the proportionality function between $\bar{\eta}$ and n (i.e. $\bar{\eta} = \alpha n$), one can define the **surface gravity** κ of $\bar{\eta}$ as [31]

$$\kappa \stackrel{\text{def}}{=} n(\alpha) + \alpha \kappa_n. \quad (2.31)$$

This quantity is gauge-invariant. It is also well-defined and smooth everywhere on \mathcal{H} (even at the zeroes of $\bar{\eta}$), and in the embedded case it coincides with the standard notion of surface gravity, namely $\nabla_{\phi_* \bar{\eta}} \phi_* \bar{\eta} = \kappa \phi_* \bar{\eta}$ on $\{p \in \phi(\mathcal{H}) \mid \phi_* \bar{\eta}|_p \neq 0\}$.

3 The Lie derivative of a connection

Given a manifold endowed with a vector field Z and a connection D , one can define the tensor “**Lie derivative of D along Z** ”, which we denote by $\mathbb{L}[Z] \stackrel{\text{def}}{=} \mathcal{L}_Z D$. Tensor fields $\mathbb{L}[Z]$ have been widely studied (e.g. in [53], to which we refer for further details), albeit they are not so commonly used in the literature on hypersurface geometry. They, however, play a central role when the vector field Z is privileged in some sense (e.g. when it defines a horizon), as they encode geometric properties of Z and, at the same time, properties of the curvature tensor of D (see e.g. equation (3.4) below).

In the works [31, 41, 42, 43], various kinds of tensors “Lie derivative of a connection” have been defined

and analyzed, mostly for connections defined on the ambient space. In this paper, however, we take a slightly different approach and focus on tensors $\mathbb{Z}[Z]$ defined at the abstract level, i.e. for non-embedded hypersurface data. More specifically, we will introduce the tensor fields $\overset{\circ}{\Sigma} \stackrel{\text{def}}{=} \mathcal{L}_n \overset{\circ}{\nabla}$ and $\overline{\Sigma}[\bar{\eta}] \stackrel{\text{def}}{=} \mathcal{L}_{\bar{\eta}} \overline{\nabla}$, where as before $\bar{\eta}$ is a gauge-invariant vector field proportional to n . We will obtain their explicit expressions and analyze some of their properties. As we shall see, $\overline{\Sigma}[\bar{\eta}]$ plays an essential role in the study of abstract horizons. For instance, it is key for the derivation of the so-called generalized near-horizon equation (see Section 5), an identity that generalizes the well-known near-horizon equation of isolated horizons [2, 4, 3, 23, 18, 21] as well as the so-called master equation of multiple Killing horizons [37], to generic null hypersurfaces with any topology and with a possibly non-empty set of zeroes of $\bar{\eta}$.

Consider a smooth manifold \mathcal{V} endowed with an affine connection D and a vector field Z . The 1-contravariant, 2-covariant tensor field $\mathbb{Z}[Z] \stackrel{\text{def}}{=} \mathcal{L}_Z D$ is defined by [53]

$$\mathbb{Z}[Z](X, W) \stackrel{\text{def}}{=} \mathcal{L}_Z D_X W - D_X \mathcal{L}_Z W - D_{\mathcal{L}_Z X} W, \quad \forall X, W \in \Gamma(T\mathcal{V}). \quad (3.1)$$

This tensor is symmetric when D is torsion-free, which we shall assume from now on. The tensor $\mathbb{Z}[Z]$ is related to the commutator of Lie and covariant derivatives by [53]

$$\mathcal{L}_Z D_\alpha T_{\beta_1 \dots \beta_p} = D_\alpha \mathcal{L}_Z T_{\beta_1 \dots \beta_p} - \sum_{i=1}^p \mathbb{Z}[Z]^\mu_{\alpha \beta_i} T_{\beta_1 \dots \beta_{i-1} \mu \beta_{i+1} \dots \beta_p}. \quad (3.2)$$

When T is a symmetric $(0, 2)$ -tensor field, performing a standard cyclic permutation of indices in equation (3.2) yields

$$T_{\mu\sigma} \mathbb{Z}[Z]^\sigma_{\alpha\beta} = \frac{1}{2} (\mathcal{S}_{\alpha\beta\mu} + \mathcal{S}_{\beta\mu\alpha} - \mathcal{S}_{\mu\alpha\beta}), \quad \text{where} \quad \mathcal{S}_{\alpha\beta\mu} \stackrel{\text{def}}{=} D_\alpha \mathcal{L}_Z T_{\beta\mu} - \mathcal{L}_Z D_\alpha T_{\beta\mu}. \quad (3.3)$$

The following two identities link the tensor $\mathbb{Z}[Z]$ and the curvature tensor $R^{D\mu}_{\beta\nu\alpha}$ of D [53]:

$$\mathbb{Z}[Z]^\mu_{\alpha\beta} = D_\alpha D_\beta Z^\mu + R^{D\mu}_{\beta\nu\alpha} Z^\nu, \quad (3.4)$$

$$\mathcal{L}_Z R^{D\rho}_{\mu\alpha\beta} = D_\alpha \mathbb{Z}[Z]^\rho_{\beta\mu} - D_\beta \mathbb{Z}[Z]^\rho_{\alpha\mu}. \quad (3.5)$$

For later use, we now provide the relation between the tensors $\mathbb{Z}[Z]$, $\mathbb{Z}[\alpha Z]$ for any scalar function α .

Lemma 3.1. *Let \mathcal{V} be a manifold, Z a vector field, D a torsion-free connection, and α a scalar function. For any $X, W \in \Gamma(T\mathcal{V})$, the vector fields $\mathbb{Z}[\alpha Z](X, W)$ and $\mathbb{Z}[Z](X, W)$ are related by*

$$\mathbb{Z}[\alpha Z](X, W) = \alpha \mathbb{Z}[Z](X, W) + \mathbf{Hess}^D(\alpha)(X, W)Z + X(\alpha)D_W Z + W(\alpha)D_X Z. \quad (3.6)$$

Proof. In the computation, we shall use the identity $\mathcal{L}_{\alpha Z} W = \alpha \mathcal{L}_Z W - W(\alpha)Z$ several times. From the definition (3.1), it follows

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbb{Z}[\alpha Z](X, W) &= \alpha \mathcal{L}_Z D_X W - (D_X W)(\alpha)Z - D_X(\alpha \mathcal{L}_Z W - W(\alpha)Z) - D_{\alpha \mathcal{L}_Z X - X(\alpha)Z} W \\ &= \alpha \mathcal{L}_Z D_X W - (D_X W)(\alpha)Z - X(\alpha) \mathcal{L}_Z W - \alpha D_X \mathcal{L}_Z W \\ &\quad + X(W(\alpha))Z + W(\alpha)D_X Z - \alpha D_{\mathcal{L}_Z X} W + X(\alpha)D_Z W, \end{aligned}$$

which upon using (3.1), the fact that D is torsion-free (so that $-\mathcal{L}_Z W + D_Z W = D_W Z$) and the definition of the hessian operator of D , yields (3.6). \square

Now, any null metric hypersurface data $\{\mathcal{H}, \gamma, \ell, \ell^{(2)}\}$ gives rise to a vector field n that is privileged in the sense that its direction (but not its scale) remains unchanged by gauge transformations (cf. (2.25)). It therefore makes sense to introduce the tensor $\overset{\circ}{\Sigma} \stackrel{\text{def}}{=} \mathcal{L}_n \overset{\circ}{\nabla}$, which will in fact be useful later

for the calculation of $\bar{\Sigma}[\bar{\eta}]$. Observe that we do not reflect the n -dependence in the notation for $\overset{\circ}{\Sigma}$. The explicit expression of $\overset{\circ}{\Sigma}$ in terms of metric data is obtained next.

Lemma 3.2. *Let $\{\mathcal{H}, \gamma, \ell, \ell^{(2)}\}$ be null metric hypersurface data and define $\overset{\circ}{\Sigma} \stackrel{\text{def}}{=} \mathcal{L}_n \overset{\circ}{\nabla}$. Then,*

$$\overset{\circ}{\Sigma}^d{}_{ab} = n^d \left(2\overset{\circ}{\nabla}_{(a} s_{b)} + n(\ell^{(2)})U_{ab} \right) + P^{dc} \left(\overset{\circ}{\nabla}_a U_{bc} + \overset{\circ}{\nabla}_b U_{ca} - \overset{\circ}{\nabla}_c U_{ab} + 2s_c U_{ab} \right). \quad (3.7)$$

In particular, the contractions $\ell_f \overset{\circ}{\Sigma}^f{}_{ab}$ and $\gamma_{cf} \overset{\circ}{\Sigma}^f{}_{ab}$ read

$$\ell_f \overset{\circ}{\Sigma}^f{}_{ab} = 2\overset{\circ}{\nabla}_{(a} s_{b)} + n(\ell^{(2)})U_{ab} + \ell^{(2)} \mathcal{L}_n U_{ab}, \quad (3.8)$$

$$\gamma_{cf} \overset{\circ}{\Sigma}^f{}_{ab} = \overset{\circ}{\nabla}_a U_{bc} + \overset{\circ}{\nabla}_b U_{ca} - \overset{\circ}{\nabla}_c U_{ab} + \ell_c \mathcal{L}_n U_{ab} + 2s_c U_{ab}. \quad (3.9)$$

Proof. Particularizing (3.2) (resp. (3.3)) for $Z = n$, $D = \overset{\circ}{\nabla}$ and $T = \ell$ (resp. $T = \gamma$) yields

$$\ell_f \overset{\circ}{\Sigma}^f{}_{ab} = \overset{\circ}{\nabla}_a \mathcal{L}_n \ell_b - \mathcal{L}_n \overset{\circ}{\nabla}_a \ell_b \stackrel{\text{def}}{=} Q_{ab}, \quad (3.10)$$

$$\gamma_{cf} \overset{\circ}{\Sigma}^f{}_{ab} = \frac{1}{2} \left(\tilde{Q}_{abc} + \tilde{Q}_{bca} - \tilde{Q}_{cab} \right), \quad (3.11)$$

where $\tilde{Q}_{abc} \stackrel{\text{def}}{=} \overset{\circ}{\nabla}_a \mathcal{L}_n \gamma_{bc} - \mathcal{L}_n \overset{\circ}{\nabla}_a \gamma_{bc}$. It only remains to determine Q_{ab} , \tilde{Q}_{abc} to obtain (3.7)-(3.9). For Q_{ab} we use (2.8), (2.11) and $(\mathcal{L}_n \mathbf{F})_{ab} = \frac{1}{2}(d\mathcal{L}_n \ell)_{ab} = (ds)_{ab} = \overset{\circ}{\nabla}_a s_b - \overset{\circ}{\nabla}_b s_a$:

$$Q_{ab} = \overset{\circ}{\nabla}_a \mathcal{L}_n \ell_b - \mathcal{L}_n \overset{\circ}{\nabla}_a \ell_b = 2\overset{\circ}{\nabla}_a s_b - \mathcal{L}_n \left(F_{ab} - \ell^{(2)} U_{ab} \right) = 2\overset{\circ}{\nabla}_{(a} s_{b)} + n(\ell^{(2)})U_{ab} + \ell^{(2)} \mathcal{L}_n U_{ab}. \quad (3.12)$$

This proves (3.8). For the second we combine $\mathcal{L}_n \gamma = 2\mathbf{U}$ (cf. (2.6)) with (2.8) to get

$$\begin{aligned} \tilde{Q}_{abc} &= 2\overset{\circ}{\nabla}_a U_{bc} + \mathcal{L}_n (\ell_b U_{ac} + \ell_c U_{ab}) = 2\overset{\circ}{\nabla}_a U_{bc} + 2\ell_{(b} \mathcal{L}_n U_{c)a} + 2(\mathcal{L}_n \ell_{(b}) U_{c)a} \\ &\stackrel{(2.10)}{=} 2\overset{\circ}{\nabla}_a U_{bc} + 2\ell_{(b} \mathcal{L}_n U_{c)a} + 4s_{(b} U_{c)a}. \end{aligned} \quad (3.13)$$

Now, any $(0,3)$ -tensor of the form $t_{abc} = 2u_{(b} S_{c)a}$ with S_{ca} symmetric satisfies $t_{abc} + t_{bca} - t_{cab} = 2u_c S_{ab}$. Inserting (3.13) into (3.11) and using this property gives (3.9). To conclude the proof we use $\overset{\circ}{\Sigma}^d{}_{ab} = \delta_f^d \overset{\circ}{\Sigma}^f{}_{ab} \stackrel{(2.5)}{=} (P^{dc} \gamma_{cf} + n^d \ell_f) \overset{\circ}{\Sigma}^f{}_{ab} = P^{dc} \gamma_{cf} \overset{\circ}{\Sigma}^f{}_{ab} + n^d Q_{ab}$. Replacing here (3.12) and (3.9) yields (3.7) after using $P^{dc} \ell_c \stackrel{(2.4)}{=} -\ell^{(2)} n^d$. \square

As mentioned before, the case when a null hypersurface data $\{\mathcal{H}, \gamma, \ell, \ell^{(2)}, \mathbf{Y}\}$ admits a gauge-invariant vector field $\bar{\eta} = \alpha n$ with $\alpha \in \mathcal{F}(\mathcal{H})$ is particularly relevant, as it allows one to analyze the geometry of horizons. In these circumstances, the vector field $\bar{\eta}$ is privileged in the sense that it is a property of the abstract null hypersurface \mathcal{H} . Therefore, it is to be expected that a number of fundamental geometric properties of \mathcal{H} are encoded in tensor fields of the form $\mathcal{L}_{\bar{\eta}} D$ where D is an abstractly defined connection. The fact that most horizons are totally geodesic null hypersurfaces (hence characterized by null data with $\mathbf{U} = 0$), together with the relation (2.18) between the hypersurface connection $\bar{\nabla}$ and the Levi-Civita derivative of g in the embedded case, strongly suggests that the appropriate object for addressing horizon geometry is the tensor $\bar{\Sigma}[\bar{\eta}] \stackrel{\text{def}}{=} \mathcal{L}_{\bar{\eta}} \bar{\nabla}$. Accordingly, we devote the remainder of this section to deriving its explicit expression, and obtaining its gauge behaviour. The analysis of $\bar{\Sigma}[\bar{\eta}]$ will allow us to define a tensor field $\Pi^{\bar{\eta}}$ (see Section 4) whose properties are useful to characterize horizons at an abstract level. We start by deriving the explicit form of $\bar{\Sigma}[\bar{\eta}]$.

Lemma 3.3. *Let $\{\mathcal{H}, \gamma, \ell, \ell^{(2)}, \mathbf{Y}\}$ be null hypersurface data and $\bar{\eta} = \alpha n$, $\alpha \in \mathcal{F}(\mathcal{H})$ a gauge-invariant vector field. Then, the tensor field $\bar{\Sigma}[\bar{\eta}] \stackrel{\text{def}}{=} \mathcal{L}_{\bar{\eta}} \bar{\nabla}$ takes the form*

$$\bar{\Sigma}[\bar{\eta}]^c{}_{ab} = \alpha \overset{\circ}{\Sigma}^c{}_{ab} + 2P^{cd} (\overset{\circ}{\nabla}_{(a} \alpha) U_{b)d} + \left(\overset{\circ}{\nabla}_a \overset{\circ}{\nabla}_b \alpha + 2(\overset{\circ}{\nabla}_{(a} \alpha) \omega_{b)} + n(\alpha) Y_{ab} - \alpha (\mathcal{L}_n \mathbf{Y})_{ab} \right) n^c. \quad (3.14)$$

In particular, the contractions $\ell_c \bar{\Sigma}[\bar{\eta}]^c_{ab}$ and $\gamma_{fc} \bar{\Sigma}[\bar{\eta}]^c_{ab}$ read

$$\ell_c \bar{\Sigma}[\bar{\eta}]^c_{ab} = \overset{\circ}{\nabla}_a \overset{\circ}{\nabla}_b \alpha + 2(\overset{\circ}{\nabla}_{(a} \alpha) \omega_{b)} + n(\alpha) Y_{ab} + \alpha \left(2\overset{\circ}{\nabla}_{(a} s_{b)} - \mathcal{L}_n Y_{ab} + \mathcal{L}_n (\ell^{(2)} U_{ab}) \right), \quad (3.15)$$

$$\gamma_{fc} \bar{\Sigma}[\bar{\eta}]^c_{ab} = \alpha \left(\overset{\circ}{\nabla}_a U_{bf} + \overset{\circ}{\nabla}_b U_{af} - \overset{\circ}{\nabla}_f U_{ab} + \ell_f \mathcal{L}_n U_{ab} + 2s_f U_{ab} \right) + 2(\overset{\circ}{\nabla}_{(a} \alpha) U_{b)f}. \quad (3.16)$$

Proof. Definition (2.15) establishes the following relation between $\bar{\Sigma}[\bar{\eta}]$ and $\overset{\circ}{\Sigma}[\bar{\eta}] \stackrel{\text{def}}{=} \mathcal{L}_{\bar{\eta}} \overset{\circ}{\nabla}$ (not to be confused with $\overset{\circ}{\Sigma} \stackrel{\text{def}}{=} \mathcal{L}_n \overset{\circ}{\nabla}$):

$$\bar{\Sigma}[\bar{\eta}] = \overset{\circ}{\Sigma}[\bar{\eta}] + n \otimes \left(n(\alpha) \mathbf{Y} - \mathcal{L}_{\bar{\eta}} \mathbf{Y} \right) = \overset{\circ}{\Sigma}[\bar{\eta}] + n \otimes \left(n(\alpha) \mathbf{Y} - \alpha \mathcal{L}_n \mathbf{Y} - 2d\alpha \otimes_s \mathbf{r} \right).$$

Applying now Lemma 3.1 in the r.h.s. we conclude

$$\bar{\Sigma}[\bar{\eta}]^c_{ab} = \alpha \overset{\circ}{\Sigma}^c_{ab} + 2(\overset{\circ}{\nabla}_{(a} \alpha) \overset{\circ}{\nabla}_{b)} n^c + \left(\overset{\circ}{\nabla}_a \overset{\circ}{\nabla}_b \alpha + n(\alpha) Y_{ab} - \alpha (\mathcal{L}_n \mathbf{Y})_{ab} - 2(\overset{\circ}{\nabla}_{(a} \alpha) r_{b)} \right) n^c,$$

which becomes (3.14) upon using (2.12) and $\omega \stackrel{\text{def}}{=} \mathbf{s} - \mathbf{r}$. Equation (3.15) follows (3.8) after using $\ell_c P^{cd} U_{bd} \stackrel{(2.4)}{=} -\ell^{(2)} n^d U_{bd} \stackrel{(2.9)}{=} 0$ and $\ell_c n^c \stackrel{(2.3)}{=} 1$. Finally, (3.16) is obtained from (3.9) after noticing that $\gamma(n, \cdot) \stackrel{(2.2)}{=} 0$ and $\gamma_{fc} P^{cd} U_{bd} \stackrel{(2.5)}{=} (\delta_f^d - n^d \ell_f) U_{bd} \stackrel{(2.9)}{=} U_{bf}$. \square

The gauge transformations of $\bar{\Sigma}[\bar{\eta}]$ and the contraction $\ell(\bar{\Sigma}[\bar{\eta}])$ are as follows.

Lemma 3.4. *Let $\{\mathcal{H}, \gamma, \ell, \ell^{(2)}, \mathbf{Y}\}$ be null hypersurface data and $\bar{\eta} = \alpha n$, $\alpha \in \mathcal{F}(\mathcal{H})$ a gauge-invariant vector field. Then,*

$$\mathcal{G}_{(z,V)}(\bar{\Sigma}[\bar{\eta}]) = \bar{\Sigma}[\bar{\eta}] + \left(\alpha \mathcal{L}_n V - V(\alpha) n \right) \otimes \mathbf{U} + \alpha V \otimes \mathcal{L}_n \mathbf{U}, \quad (3.17)$$

$$\begin{aligned} \mathcal{G}_{(z,V)}(\ell(\bar{\Sigma}[\bar{\eta}])) &= z \left(\ell(\bar{\Sigma}[\bar{\eta}]) + \gamma(V, \bar{\Sigma}[\bar{\eta}]) \right) + z \left(\alpha \ell(\mathcal{L}_n V) - V(\alpha) + \alpha \gamma(V, \mathcal{L}_n V) \right) \mathbf{U} \\ &\quad + \alpha z \left(\ell(V) + \gamma(V, V) \right) \mathcal{L}_n \mathbf{U}. \end{aligned} \quad (3.18)$$

Proof. Since $\bar{\eta}$ is gauge-invariant, $\mathcal{G}_{(z,V)}(\bar{\Sigma}[\bar{\eta}]) = \mathcal{G}_{(z,V)}(\mathcal{L}_{\bar{\eta}} \bar{\nabla}) = \mathcal{L}_{\bar{\eta}}(\mathcal{G}_{(z,V)} \bar{\nabla}) \stackrel{(2.30)}{=} \mathcal{L}_{\bar{\eta}}(\bar{\nabla} + V \otimes \mathbf{U}) = \bar{\Sigma}[\bar{\eta}] + \mathcal{L}_{\bar{\eta}} V \otimes \mathbf{U} + V \otimes \mathcal{L}_{\bar{\eta}} \mathbf{U}$, from where (3.17) follows after using $\mathcal{L}_{\bar{\eta}} \mathbf{U} = \mathcal{L}_{\alpha n} \mathbf{U} \stackrel{(2.9)}{=} \alpha \mathcal{L}_n \mathbf{U}$. Equation (3.18) is a consequence of the gauge transformation of ℓ (cf. (2.23)). \square

For totally geodesic null hypersurfaces (i.e. when $\mathbf{U} = 0$), the tensor $\bar{\Sigma}[\bar{\eta}]$ is gauge-invariant while its contraction with ℓ exhibits the remarkably simple gauge-behaviour $\mathcal{G}_{(z,V)}(\ell(\bar{\Sigma}[\bar{\eta}])) = z\ell(\bar{\Sigma}[\bar{\eta}])$ (because $\gamma(\bar{\Sigma}[\bar{\eta}], \cdot) = 0$, by (3.16)). The restriction $\mathbf{U} = 0$, however, is quite limiting and excludes physically and mathematically relevant classes of horizons, for instance homothetic or conformal Killing horizons. In that case, the gauge properties of $\bar{\Sigma}[\bar{\eta}]$ become considerably more involved, which makes this tensor less suitable as a characterizing object. This motivates the introduction of the so-called non-isolation tensor $\mathbf{\Pi}^{\bar{\eta}}$, a tensor field closely related to $\bar{\Sigma}[\bar{\eta}]$ but with better gauge-behaviour. This is done in the next section.

4 Deformation tensor of an ambient vector: the notion of \mathcal{K} -tuple

Typically, horizons embedded in a spacetime (\mathcal{M}, g) are characterized by a privileged vector field $\eta \in \Gamma(T\mathcal{M})$ that becomes null and tangent to a null hypersurface $\phi(\mathcal{H}) \subset \mathcal{M}$. In this setting, the so-called deformation tensor $\mathcal{K}[\eta] \stackrel{\text{def}}{=} \mathcal{L}_{\eta} g$ plays a fundamental role; in particular $\mathcal{K}[\eta]|_{\phi(\mathcal{H})}$ is proportional

to g for homothetic or conformal Killing horizons, and vanishes for Killing horizons. Given the importance of $\mathcal{K}[\eta]$, it is natural to seek a *purely abstract* notion of horizon data that captures its value at $\phi(\mathcal{H})$. This leads us to the concept of (metric) \mathcal{K} -tuple, which we introduce next.

Definition 4.1. A set $\{\mathcal{H}, \gamma, \ell, \ell^{(2)}, \alpha, \mathbf{p}, \mathbf{q}\}$ is called **metric \mathcal{K} -tuple** if (i) $\{\mathcal{H}, \gamma, \ell, \ell^{(2)}\}$ is null metric hypersurface data, and (ii) $\alpha, \mathbf{p} \in \mathcal{F}(\mathcal{H})$, $\mathbf{q} \in \Gamma(T^*\mathcal{H})$ are two scalar functions and a covector field with gauge transformations

$$\mathcal{G}_{(z,V)}(\alpha) = z\alpha, \quad \mathcal{G}_{(z,V)}(\mathbf{q}) = z(\mathbf{q} + 2\alpha\mathbf{U}(V, \cdot)), \quad \mathcal{G}_{(z,V)}(\mathbf{p}) = z^2(\mathbf{p} + 2\mathbf{q}(V) + 2\alpha\mathbf{U}(V, V)). \quad (4.1)$$

If a metric \mathcal{K} -tuple is endowed with an additional symmetric $(0, 2)$ -tensor \mathbf{Y} , we call **\mathcal{K} -tuple** the set $\{\mathcal{H}, \gamma, \ell, \ell^{(2)}, \mathbf{Y}, \alpha, \mathbf{p}, \mathbf{q}\}$.

Given a metric \mathcal{K} -tuple, one can define a vector field $\bar{\eta} \in \text{Rad}\gamma$ and a function \mathfrak{w} by

$$\bar{\eta} \stackrel{\text{def}}{=} \alpha n, \quad \mathfrak{w} \stackrel{\text{def}}{=} \mathbf{q}(n). \quad (4.2)$$

It then follows from (2.9), (2.25) and (4.1) that both are gauge-invariant, i.e.

$$\mathcal{G}_{(z,V)}(\bar{\eta}) = \bar{\eta}, \quad \mathcal{G}_{(z,V)}(\mathfrak{w}) \stackrel{\text{def}}{=} \mathfrak{w}. \quad (4.3)$$

Recall that the surface gravity κ of $\bar{\eta}$ was defined in (2.31), and that it is also gauge-invariant. We now establish a connection between the abstract notion of \mathcal{K} -tuple and the deformation tensor of an *ambient* vector field. This is done through the concept of embeddedness of a \mathcal{K} -tuple, which endows the latter with a geometric interpretation.

Definition 4.2. Let $\{\mathcal{H}, \gamma, \ell, \ell^{(2)}, \alpha, \mathbf{p}, \mathbf{q}\}$ be a metric \mathcal{K} -tuple, and define the vector $\bar{\eta} \stackrel{\text{def}}{=} \alpha n$. Then, $\{\mathcal{H}, \gamma, \ell, \ell^{(2)}, \alpha, \mathbf{p}, \mathbf{q}\}$ is **(ϕ, ξ) -embedded** in a Lorentzian manifold (\mathcal{M}, g) if $\{\mathcal{H}, \gamma, \ell, \ell^{(2)}\}$ is (ϕ, ξ) -embedded in (\mathcal{M}, g) and, in addition, there exists an extension $\eta \in \Gamma(T\mathcal{M})$ of $\phi_*\bar{\eta}$ such that

$$\phi^*\mathcal{K}[\eta] = 2\alpha\mathbf{U}, \quad \phi^*(\mathcal{K}[\eta](\xi, \cdot)) = \mathbf{q}, \quad \phi^*(\mathcal{K}[\eta](\xi, \xi)) = \mathbf{p}, \quad (4.4)$$

where $\mathcal{K}[\eta] \stackrel{\text{def}}{=} \mathcal{L}_\eta g$ is the deformation tensor of η . For a \mathcal{K} -tuple $\{\mathcal{H}, \gamma, \ell, \ell^{(2)}, \mathbf{Y}, \alpha, \mathbf{p}, \mathbf{q}\}$, embeddedness requires that $\mathbf{Y} = \frac{1}{2}\phi^*(\mathcal{L}_\xi g)$ as well.

Remark 4.3. In the embedded case the quantities $\alpha\mathbf{U}$, \mathbf{q} and \mathbf{p} encode all the components of the deformation tensor $\mathcal{K}[\eta]$ at $\phi(\mathcal{H})$. Note also that the function \mathfrak{w} , defined in (4.2), satisfies $\phi^*(\mathcal{K}[\eta](\xi, \phi_*n)) = \mathfrak{w}$. We emphasize that $\alpha\mathbf{U}$, \mathbf{q} and \mathbf{p} are fully arbitrary and need not behave as if $\phi(\mathcal{H})$ was an actual horizon.

Naturally, two questions arise at this point. The first one is whether the gauge-behaviours (4.1) are consistent with changes in the rigging in the embedded case. The second is under which conditions an embedded null metric data can be completed with a tuple $\{\alpha, \mathbf{p}, \mathbf{q}\}$ satisfying (4.1) to obtain an embedded metric \mathcal{K} -tuple. These issues are addressed in the following remark and proposition.

Remark 4.4. Let $\{\mathcal{H}, \gamma, \ell, \ell^{(2)}, \alpha, \mathbf{p}, \mathbf{q}\}$ be a metric \mathcal{K} -tuple, (ϕ, ξ) -embedded in (\mathcal{M}, g) . Let η be the extension of $\phi_*\bar{\eta}$ off $\phi(\mathcal{H})$ according to Definition 4.2. The tensor $\mathcal{K}[\eta]$ is independent of the rigging, hence for (4.1) to be consistent with a change of rigging $\xi \rightarrow \xi' \stackrel{\text{def}}{=} z(\xi + \phi_*V)$, it must hold

$$\phi^*\mathcal{K}[\eta] = \mathcal{G}_{(z,V)}(2\alpha\mathbf{U}), \quad \phi^*(\mathcal{K}[\eta](\xi', \cdot)) = \mathcal{G}_{(z,V)}(\mathbf{q}), \quad \phi^*(\mathcal{K}[\eta](\xi', \xi')) = \mathcal{G}_{(z,V)}(\mathbf{p}). \quad (4.5)$$

The first equation follows from $\mathcal{G}_{(z,V)}(\alpha) = z\alpha$ and (2.26), while for the second and third one finds

$$\begin{aligned} \phi^*(\mathcal{K}[\eta](\xi', \cdot)) &= z\phi^*(\mathcal{K}[\eta](\xi + \phi_*V, \cdot)) = z(\mathbf{q} + 2\alpha\mathbf{U}(V, \cdot)) \stackrel{(4.1)}{=} \mathcal{G}_{(z,V)}(\mathbf{q}), \\ \phi^*(\mathcal{K}[\eta](\xi', \xi')) &= z^2\phi^*(\mathcal{K}[\eta](\xi + \phi_*V, \xi + \phi_*V)) = z^2(\mathbf{p} + 2\mathbf{q}(V) + 2\alpha\mathbf{U}(V, V)) \stackrel{(4.1)}{=} \mathcal{G}_{(z,V)}(\mathbf{p}). \end{aligned}$$

We conclude that (4.1) is indeed compatible with transformations of rigging at the embedded level.

Proposition 4.5. *Let $\{\mathcal{H}, \gamma, \ell, \ell^{(2)}\}$ be null metric hypersurface data (ϕ, ξ) -embedded in a Lorentzian manifold (\mathcal{M}, g) . Consider any two functions $\alpha, \mathbf{p} \in \mathcal{F}(\mathcal{H})$ and any covector $\mathbf{q} \in \Gamma(T^*\mathcal{H})$ satisfying (4.1), and define $\bar{\eta} \stackrel{\text{def}}{=} \alpha n$. Then the metric \mathcal{K} -tuple $\{\mathcal{H}, \gamma, \ell, \ell^{(2)}, \alpha, \mathbf{p}, \mathbf{q}\}$ can always be (ϕ, ξ) -embedded in (\mathcal{M}, g) , and embeddedness is equivalent to the extension η of $\phi_* \bar{\eta}$ off $\phi(\mathcal{H})$ satisfying*

$$\mathcal{L}_\xi \eta \stackrel{\phi(\mathcal{H})}{=} (\mathbf{q} - d\alpha)(n)\xi + \phi_* \left(\frac{1}{2}(\mathbf{p} - \alpha n(\ell^{(2)}))n + P(\mathbf{q} - 2\alpha s - d\alpha, \cdot) \right). \quad (4.6)$$

Proof. Equation (4.6) always admits solutions because it only restricts the first order transverse derivative of η at $\phi(\mathcal{H})$. Hence, we only need to prove that (4.6) holds if and only if $\{\mathcal{H}, \gamma, \ell, \ell^{(2)}, \alpha, \mathbf{p}, \mathbf{q}\}$ is (ϕ, ξ) -embedded in (\mathcal{M}, g) . Suppose first that the extension η verifies (4.6), and define $\mathcal{K}[\eta] \stackrel{\text{def}}{=} \mathcal{L}_\eta g$. Then (recall $s(n) = 0$, (2.3)-(2.5), and that $\phi_* n$ is normal to $\phi(\mathcal{H})$),

$$\begin{aligned} \phi^* \mathcal{K}[\eta] &= \phi^*(\mathcal{L}_\eta g) = \mathcal{L}_{\bar{\eta}} \gamma = \alpha \mathcal{L}_n \gamma = 2\alpha \mathbf{U}, \\ \phi^*(\mathcal{K}[\eta](\xi, \cdot))(X) &= \phi^*((\mathcal{L}_\eta g)(\xi, \cdot))(X) = \phi^*\left(\mathcal{L}_\eta(g(\xi, \cdot)) + g(\mathcal{L}_\xi \eta, \cdot)\right)(X) \\ &\stackrel{(2.16)}{=} (\mathcal{L}_{\bar{\eta}} \ell)(X) + (\mathbf{q} - d\alpha)(n)\ell(X) + P^{ab}(\mathbf{q}_b - 2\alpha s_b - \overset{\circ}{\nabla}_b \alpha)\gamma_{ac} X^c \\ &\stackrel{(2.5)}{=} \left(\alpha \mathcal{L}_n \ell + d\alpha + \mathbf{q}(n)\ell - d\alpha(n)\ell\right)(X) + (\delta_c^b - n^b \ell_c)(\mathbf{q}_b - 2\alpha s_b - \overset{\circ}{\nabla}_b \alpha)X^c \\ &\stackrel{(2.8)}{=} \left(2\alpha s + d\alpha + \mathbf{q}(n)\ell - d\alpha(n)\ell + \mathbf{q} - 2\alpha s - d\alpha - \mathbf{q}(n)\ell + d\alpha(n)\ell\right)(X) \\ &= \mathbf{q}(X), \quad \forall X \in \Gamma(T\mathcal{H}), \\ \phi^*(\mathcal{K}[\eta](\xi, \xi)) &= \phi^*((\mathcal{L}_\eta g)(\xi, \xi)) = \phi^*\left(\mathcal{L}_\eta(g(\xi, \xi)) + 2g(\mathcal{L}_\xi \eta, \xi)\right) \\ &\stackrel{(2.16)}{=} \alpha n(\ell^{(2)}) + 2\ell^{(2)}(\mathbf{q} - d\alpha)(n) + \mathbf{p} - \alpha n(\ell^{(2)}) + 2P^{ab}\ell_a(\mathbf{q}_b - 2\alpha s_b - \overset{\circ}{\nabla}_b \alpha) \\ &\stackrel{(2.4)}{=} \mathbf{p} + 2\ell^{(2)}(\mathbf{q} - d\alpha)(n) - 2\ell^{(2)}(\mathbf{q} - d\alpha)(n) = \mathbf{p}. \end{aligned}$$

By construction η fulfills (4.4), which proves that the \mathcal{K} -tuple $\{\mathcal{H}, \gamma, \ell, \ell^{(2)}, \alpha, \mathbf{p}, \mathbf{q}\}$ is (ϕ, ξ) -embedded, as well as the sufficiency of (4.6). For the necessity, assume that $\{\mathcal{H}, \gamma, \ell, \ell^{(2)}, \alpha, \mathbf{p}, \mathbf{q}\}$ is (ϕ, ξ) -embedded in (\mathcal{M}, g) . Then, by Definition 4.2 there exists an extension η of $\phi_* \bar{\eta}$ so that (4.4) holds. Such extension necessarily verifies (4.6) by [31, Thm. 4.1]. \square

As mentioned before, the tensor $\bar{\Sigma}[\bar{\eta}]$ is not ideal for characterizing the horizon geometry due to its gauge transformation properties. To describe horizon geometry in more favorable terms, we introduce a new tensor field $\mathbf{\Pi}^{\bar{\eta}}$, called the non-isolation tensor. We first present its abstract definition together with an alternative expression for it. Then we obtain its gauge transformation, and explore its geometric meaning by considering the embedded case.

Definition 4.6. *Consider a \mathcal{K} -tuple $\{\mathcal{H}, \gamma, \ell, \ell^{(2)}, \mathbf{Y}, \alpha, \mathbf{p}, \mathbf{q}\}$ with the corresponding gauge-invariant vector field $\bar{\eta} \stackrel{\text{def}}{=} \alpha n$. The **non-isolation tensor** $\mathbf{\Pi}^{\bar{\eta}}$ is the symmetric $(0, 2)$ -tensor field defined by*

$$\mathbf{\Pi}^{\bar{\eta}} \stackrel{\text{def}}{=} \ell(\bar{\Sigma}[\bar{\eta}]) - \frac{1}{2}(\alpha n(\ell^{(2)}) - \mathbf{p})\mathbf{U} - \alpha \ell^{(2)} \mathcal{L}_n \mathbf{U}. \quad (4.7)$$

Remark 4.7. *By inserting (3.15) into (4.7), one obtains the following alternative expression for $\mathbf{\Pi}^{\bar{\eta}}$:*

$$\mathbf{\Pi}_{ab}^{\bar{\eta}} = \overset{\circ}{\nabla}_a \overset{\circ}{\nabla}_b \alpha + 2(\overset{\circ}{\nabla}_{(a} \alpha) \omega_{b)} + 2\alpha \overset{\circ}{\nabla}_{(a} s_{b)} + n(\alpha) Y_{ab} - \alpha (\mathcal{L}_n \mathbf{Y})_{ab} + \frac{1}{2}(\alpha n(\ell^{(2)}) + \mathbf{p}) U_{ab}. \quad (4.8)$$

Remark 4.8. The name non-isolation tensor is justified by the fact that, when $\mathbf{U} = 0$ (i.e. when the abstract hypersurface has vanishing second fundamental form), it holds

$$\bar{\Sigma}[\bar{\eta}]^c{}_{ab} \stackrel{(3.14)}{=} \alpha \left(\bar{\Sigma}^c{}_{ab} - 2n^c \bar{\nabla}_{(a} s_{b)} \right) + n^c \ell_d \bar{\Sigma}[\bar{\eta}]^d{}_{ab} \stackrel{(3.7)}{=} n^c \ell_d \bar{\Sigma}[\bar{\eta}]^d{}_{ab} \stackrel{(4.7)}{=} n^c \Pi^{\bar{\eta}}_{ab}.$$

In this case, $\Pi^{\bar{\eta}} = 0$ is therefore equivalent to $\bar{\Sigma}[\bar{\eta}] \stackrel{\text{def}}{=} \mathcal{L}_{\bar{\eta}} \bar{\nabla} = 0$, which is the defining condition of an isolated horizon [3]. Thus, $\Pi^{\bar{\eta}}$ accounts for the “level of non-isolation” of a \mathcal{K} -tuple.

Lemma 4.9. Consider a \mathcal{K} -tuple $\{\mathcal{H}, \gamma, \ell, \ell^{(2)}, \mathbf{Y}, \alpha, \mathbf{p}, \mathbf{q}\}$ and let $\bar{\eta} \stackrel{\text{def}}{=} \alpha n$ be its associated gauge-invariant vector field. The gauge transformation of the non-isolation tensor $\Pi^{\bar{\eta}}$ is given by

$$\mathcal{G}_{(z,V)}(\Pi^{\bar{\eta}}_{ab}) = z\Pi^{\bar{\eta}}_{ab} + zV^c \left(\mathbf{q}_c U_{ab} + 2\bar{\nabla}_{(a}(\alpha U_{b)c}) - \bar{\nabla}_c(\alpha U_{ab}) \right). \quad (4.9)$$

Proof. We denote $\mathcal{G}_{(z,V)}$ -transformed quantities with a prime. We first derive the gauge transformation of the last two terms in (4.7). Using the transformation laws (2.23), (2.25)-(2.26) and (4.1), one gets

$$\begin{aligned} \left(\alpha' n'(\ell^{(2)'}) - \mathbf{p}' \right) \mathbf{U}' &= \frac{1}{z} \left(\alpha n \left(z^2 (\ell^{(2)} + 2\ell(V) + \gamma(V, V)) \right) - z^2 (\mathbf{p} + 2\mathbf{q}(V) + 2\alpha \mathbf{U}(V, V)) \right) \mathbf{U} \\ &= z \left(\alpha n(\ell^{(2)}) - \mathbf{p} \right) \mathbf{U} + 2 \left(\alpha n(z) (\ell^{(2)} + 2\ell(V) + \gamma(V, V)) \right. \\ &\quad \left. + z\alpha n \left(\ell(V) + \frac{1}{2} \gamma(V, V) \right) - z\mathbf{q}(V) - z\alpha \mathbf{U}(V, V) \right) \mathbf{U}, \\ &= z \left(\alpha n(\ell^{(2)}) - \mathbf{p} \right) \mathbf{U} + 2 \left(\alpha n(z) (\ell^{(2)} + 2\ell(V) + \gamma(V, V)) \right. \\ &\quad \left. + z\alpha \left(2s(V) + \ell(\mathcal{L}_n V) + \gamma(\mathcal{L}_n V, V) \right) - z\mathbf{q}(V) \right) \mathbf{U}, \\ \alpha' \ell^{(2)'} \mathcal{L}_{n'} \mathbf{U}' &= z^3 \alpha (\ell^{(2)} + 2\ell(V) + \gamma(V, V)) \mathcal{L}_{z^{-1}n} (z^{-1} \mathbf{U}) \\ &= \alpha (\ell^{(2)} + 2\ell(V) + \gamma(V, V)) (z \mathcal{L}_n \mathbf{U} - n(z) \mathbf{U}). \end{aligned}$$

It only remains to gauge-transform the right-hand side of (4.7) by using these two expressions as well as the transformation law for $\ell(\bar{\Sigma}[\bar{\eta}])$ in (3.18) to obtain

$$\Pi^{\bar{\eta}'} = z\Pi^{\bar{\eta}} + z\gamma(V, \bar{\Sigma}[\bar{\eta}]) + z(\mathbf{q} - d\alpha - 2\alpha s)(V) \mathbf{U} - z\alpha \ell(V) \mathcal{L}_n \mathbf{U},$$

which upon substituting $\gamma(\cdot, \bar{\Sigma}[\bar{\eta}])$ according to (3.16) gives (4.9). \square

A notion of “non-isolation tensor” was presented in [33, Def. 1] for an embedded null hypersurface \mathcal{H} with vanishing second fundamental form. While in [33] this object was not directly related to the Lie derivative of the spacetime Levi-Civita connection ∇ , by comparison with (3.4) it follows that it actually coincides with the tensor $\mathcal{L}_\nu \nabla$ restricted to directions tangent to \mathcal{H} . The notion of non-isolation tensor in [33], however, is not abstract, applies only in the case when $\mathbf{U} = 0$, and involves a null vector tangent to \mathcal{H} which is not allowed to vanish therein. In the more recent work [31, Eq. (5.6)], the authors provide a generalization of the non-isolation tensor to null hypersurfaces with arbitrary tensor \mathbf{U} embedded in a spacetime (\mathcal{M}, g) admitting a privileged vector field η that is null and tangent along the hypersurface, and which is allowed to vanish. Nevertheless, the definition of [31] was still non-abstract, as it arose from computing certain components of the tensor $\mathcal{L}_\eta \nabla$, and it involved the pull-back $\phi^*(\mathcal{L}_\xi \mathcal{K}[\eta])$. In the present paper we have developed a framework, based on the notion of \mathcal{K} -tuple, that enables us to define and study $\Pi^{\bar{\eta}}$ at a purely abstract level, and endow it with a clear geometric meaning that relates it to the tensor $\mathcal{L}_\eta \nabla$ in the embedded case, as we shall see next.

Consider a \mathcal{K} -tuple $\{\mathcal{H}, \gamma, \ell, \ell^{(2)}, \mathbf{Y}, \alpha, \mathbf{p}, \mathbf{q}\}$ that is (ϕ, ξ) -embedded in a Lorentzian manifold (\mathcal{M}, g) . Let η be an extension of $\phi_* \bar{\eta}$ off $\phi(\mathcal{H})$ such that (4.4) holds. We want to relate the non-isolation tensor $\mathbf{\Pi}^{\bar{\eta}}$ with $\mathcal{K}[\eta]$ via the tensor $\Sigma[\eta] \stackrel{\text{def}}{=} \mathcal{L}_\eta \nabla$. Particularizing (3.3) for $Z = \eta$, $D = \nabla$, $T = g$ and multiplying by $g^{\mu\lambda}$, one finds [31]

$$\Sigma[\eta]^\lambda_{\alpha\beta} = \frac{1}{2} g^{\mu\lambda} (\nabla_\alpha \mathcal{K}[\eta]_{\beta\mu} + \nabla_\beta \mathcal{K}[\eta]_{\alpha\mu} - \nabla_\mu \mathcal{K}[\eta]_{\alpha\beta}). \quad (4.10)$$

The tensor $\Sigma[\eta]$ is independent of the choice of rigging, hence its value at $\phi(\mathcal{H})$ must be gauge-invariant. The expression of $\Sigma[\eta]$ at $\phi(\mathcal{H})$ was obtained in [31, Lem. 5.2], and reads

$$\begin{aligned} \Sigma[\eta](e_a, e_b) &\stackrel{\phi(\mathcal{H})}{=} \left((\mathfrak{w} - n(\alpha)) U_{ab} - \alpha(\mathcal{L}_n \mathbf{U})_{ab} \right) \xi \\ &+ \left(\overset{\circ}{\nabla}_a \overset{\circ}{\nabla}_b \alpha + 2(\overset{\circ}{\nabla}_{(a} \alpha) \omega_{b)} + 2\alpha \overset{\circ}{\nabla}_{(a} s_{b)} + n(\alpha) Y_{ab} - \alpha(\mathcal{L}_n \mathbf{Y})_{ab} + \frac{1}{2} (\alpha n(\ell^{(2)}) + \mathbf{p}) U_{ab} \right) \phi_* n \\ &+ P^{cd} \left(2(\overset{\circ}{\nabla}_{(a} \alpha) U_{b)c} + U_{ab} (\mathbf{q}_c - \overset{\circ}{\nabla}_c \alpha) + \alpha(\overset{\circ}{\nabla}_a U_{bc} + \overset{\circ}{\nabla}_b U_{ca} - \overset{\circ}{\nabla}_c U_{ab}) \right) e_d, \end{aligned} \quad (4.11)$$

where $\{e_a\}$ is a local basis of $\Gamma(T\phi(\mathcal{H}))$, $\alpha, \mathbf{p}, \mathbf{q}$ are defined by (4.4), and $\mathfrak{w} \stackrel{\text{def}}{=} \mathbf{q}(n)$. Observe that the factor in parentheses in the second line of (4.11) is precisely $\mathbf{\Pi}^{\bar{\eta}}$ (cf. (4.8)). In fact, combining (2.4), (2.9) and the identity $n^c (\overset{\circ}{\nabla}_a U_{bc} + \overset{\circ}{\nabla}_b U_{ca} - \overset{\circ}{\nabla}_c U_{ab}) = -(\mathcal{L}_n \mathbf{U})_{ab}$, it is straightforward to prove [31]

$$\phi^*(g(\xi, \Sigma[\eta])) = \mathbf{\Pi}^{\bar{\eta}}. \quad (4.12)$$

This general identity, along with the gauge-invariance of $\Sigma[\eta]$ when $\mathcal{K}[\eta] = 2cg$, $c \in \mathbb{R}$, suggests that $\mathbf{\Pi}^{\bar{\eta}}$ is a suitable candidate for studying horizon geometry. We elaborate on this in the next remark.

Remark 4.10. Consider a metric \mathcal{K} -tuple $\{\mathcal{H}, \gamma, \ell, \ell^{(2)}, \alpha, \mathbf{p}, \mathbf{q}\}$ with $\alpha \mathbf{U} = c\gamma$, $\mathbf{q} = 2c\ell$ and $\mathbf{p} = 2c\ell^{(2)}$, where c is a gauge-invariant constant. Then, a direct calculation based on (2.10) and (4.9) gives

$$\begin{aligned} \alpha \left(\mathcal{G}_{(z,V)}(\mathbf{\Pi}^{\bar{\eta}}_{ab}) - z \mathbf{\Pi}^{\bar{\eta}}_{ab} \right) &= z V^c \left(\alpha \mathbf{q}_c U_{ab} + 2\alpha \overset{\circ}{\nabla}_{(a} (\alpha U_{b)c}) - \alpha \overset{\circ}{\nabla}_c (\alpha U_{ab}) \right) \\ &= cz V^c \left(2c\ell_c \gamma_{ab} + \alpha (2\overset{\circ}{\nabla}_{(a} \gamma_{b)c} - \overset{\circ}{\nabla}_c \gamma_{ab}) \right) \stackrel{(2.10)}{=} 2cz \ell(V) (c\gamma_{ab} - \alpha U_{ab}) = 0. \end{aligned}$$

When, in addition, the set of zeroes of α has empty interior¹ in \mathcal{H} , it follows that $\mathcal{G}_{(z,V)}(\mathbf{\Pi}^{\bar{\eta}}) = z \mathbf{\Pi}^{\bar{\eta}}$.

Now, the data $\{\mathcal{H}, \gamma, \ell, \ell^{(2)}\}$ is always (ϕ, ξ) -embeddable in a Lorentzian manifold (\mathcal{M}, g) [42, Thm. 4.2], and by Proposition 4.5 we know that $\{\mathcal{H}, \gamma, \ell, \ell^{(2)}, \alpha, \mathbf{p}, \mathbf{q}\}$ can also be embedded in (\mathcal{M}, g) . This means that there exists an extension $\eta \in \Gamma(T\mathcal{M})$ of $\phi_* \bar{\eta}$ so that $\mathcal{K}[\eta] = 2cg$ on $\phi(\mathcal{H})$ (cf. (2.16), Definition 4.2). Thus, $\phi(\mathcal{H})$ is either a zeroth-order homothetic horizon or a zeroth-order Killing horizon, depending on whether $c \neq 0$ or $c = 0$. By comparison with (3.17)–(3.18), it is immediate to see that the gauge-behaviours of $\bar{\Sigma}[\bar{\eta}]$ and $\ell(\bar{\Sigma}[\bar{\eta}])$ are significantly more involved than that of $\mathbf{\Pi}^{\bar{\eta}}$ in the homothetic case where $\mathbf{U} \neq 0$. In particular, when the extension η is an actual homothetic/Killing vector, $\Sigma[\eta]$ vanishes (by (4.10)) and consequently so does the non-isolation tensor $\mathbf{\Pi}^{\bar{\eta}}$ (by (4.12)). We therefore conclude that abstract homothetic/Killing horizons are characterized by \mathcal{K} -tuples with $\alpha \mathbf{U} = c\gamma$ and $\mathbf{\Pi}^{\bar{\eta}} = 0$, conditions that are both gauge-independent, as $\alpha \mathbf{U}$ is gauge-invariant (cf. (2.26), (4.1)) and $\mathbf{\Pi}^{\bar{\eta}}$ simply rescales under gauge transformations.

We conclude the section by providing the relation between the non-isolation tensor $\mathbf{\Pi}^{\bar{\eta}}$ and the first transverse derivative of the deformation tensor for a given embedded \mathcal{K} -tuple.

Lemma 4.11. Let $\{\mathcal{H}, \gamma, \ell, \ell^{(2)}, \mathbf{Y}, \alpha, \mathbf{p}, \mathbf{q}\}$ be a \mathcal{K} -tuple (ϕ, ξ) -embedded in a Lorentzian manifold

¹This restriction on the zero-set of α holds for smooth homothetic, conformal Killing and Killing horizons.

(\mathcal{M}, g) , and η be the corresponding extension of $\phi_* \bar{\eta} \stackrel{\text{def}}{=} \phi_*(\alpha n)$ off $\phi(\mathcal{H})$. Then,

$$\mathbf{\Pi} \bar{\eta} = -\frac{1}{2} \phi^* (\mathcal{L}_\xi \mathcal{K}[\eta] - \mathcal{L}_{\mathcal{W}} g), \quad (4.13)$$

where $\mathcal{K}[\eta] \stackrel{\text{def}}{=} \mathcal{L}_\eta g$ and $\mathcal{W}^\beta \stackrel{\text{def}}{=} g^{\beta\mu} \mathcal{K}[\eta]_{\mu\nu} \xi^\nu$.

Proof. Let $\Sigma[\eta] \stackrel{\text{def}}{=} \mathcal{L}_\eta \nabla$. Then $\xi_\lambda \Sigma[\eta]^\lambda_{\alpha\beta} \stackrel{(4.10)}{=} \frac{1}{2} \xi^\rho (2\nabla_{(\alpha} \mathcal{K}[\eta]_{\beta)\rho} - \nabla_\rho \mathcal{K}[\eta]_{\alpha\beta})$, therefore

$$\begin{aligned} \xi_\lambda \Sigma[\eta]^\lambda_{\alpha\beta} &= \xi^\mu \nabla_{(\alpha} \mathcal{K}[\eta]_{\beta)\mu} - \frac{1}{2} \xi^\mu \nabla_\mu \mathcal{K}[\eta]_{\alpha\beta} = \xi^\mu \nabla_{(\alpha} \mathcal{K}[\eta]_{\beta)\mu} - \frac{1}{2} \mathcal{L}_\xi \mathcal{K}[\eta]_{\alpha\beta} + (\nabla_{(\alpha} \xi^\mu) \mathcal{K}[\eta]_{\beta)\mu} \\ &= -\frac{1}{2} \mathcal{L}_\xi \mathcal{K}[\eta]_{\alpha\beta} + \nabla_{(\alpha} (\mathcal{K}[\eta]_{\beta)\mu} \xi^\mu). \end{aligned}$$

This expression can be rewritten as

$$g(\xi, \Sigma[\eta]) = -\frac{1}{2} (\mathcal{L}_\xi \mathcal{K}[\eta] - \mathcal{L}_{\mathcal{W}} g) \quad (4.14)$$

after noticing that $2\nabla_{(\alpha} \theta_{\beta)} = \mathcal{L}_{g^\sharp(\theta, \cdot)} g_{\alpha\beta}$ for any $\theta \in \Gamma(T^* \mathcal{M})$. Taking the pull-back of (4.14) to \mathcal{H} gives (4.13) because of (4.12). \square

5 A near-horizon equation on general null hypersurfaces

Given a Lorentzian manifold (\mathcal{M}, g) , an embedded null hypersurface \mathcal{H} is said to be **totally geodesic** if its second fundamental form $\mathbf{K}^\nu(X, W) \stackrel{\text{def}}{=} g(\nabla_X \nu, W)$, $X, W \in \Gamma(T\mathcal{H})$, vanishes on \mathcal{H} . Common examples of totally geodesic null hypersurfaces are non-expanding, weakly isolated and isolated horizons [2, 4, 3, 23, 18, 21], or Killing horizons [51, 17]. When $\mathbf{K}^\nu = 0$, any null (not necessarily everywhere non-zero) vector field η tangent to \mathcal{H} is proportional to ν , and therefore also verifies $g(\nabla_X \eta, W) = 0$. Thus, $\nabla_X \eta|_{\tilde{\mathcal{H}}}$ is null and tangent to $\tilde{\mathcal{H}}$. Denoting by \mathcal{S} the set of points of $\tilde{\mathcal{H}}$ where η vanishes, we can define a one-form $\mathbf{w}[\eta]$ on $\tilde{\mathcal{H}} \setminus \mathcal{S}$ by

$$\nabla_X \eta|_{\tilde{\mathcal{H}} \setminus \mathcal{S}} \stackrel{\text{def}}{=} \mathbf{w}[\eta](X) \eta \quad \forall X \in \Gamma(T\tilde{\mathcal{H}} \setminus \mathcal{S}). \quad (5.1)$$

Observe that the surface gravity of η is given by $\mathbf{w}\eta$ on $\tilde{\mathcal{H}} \setminus \mathcal{S}$. Note also that, in general, $\mathbf{w}[\eta]$ cannot be extended to \mathcal{S} is because the right-hand side of (5.1) vanishes, while $\nabla_X \eta$ need not be zero. If the null hypersurface \mathcal{H} comes from (ϕ, ξ) -embedded null hypersurface data $\{\mathcal{H}, \gamma, \ell, \ell^{(2)}, \mathbf{Y}\}$ with $\mathbf{U} = 0$, the combination of (2.18) and (5.1) yields

$$\mathbf{w}[\nu](X) \nu = \nabla_X \nu = \overset{\circ}{\nabla}_X n - \mathbf{Y}(X, n) \nu \stackrel{(2.12)}{=} (s - \mathbf{r})(X) \nu \stackrel{\text{def}}{=} \boldsymbol{\omega}(X) \nu, \quad (5.2)$$

so $\boldsymbol{\omega}$ is the abstract counterpart of $\mathbf{w}[\nu]$. When \mathcal{H} admits a cross-section S , $\mathbf{w}[\nu]|_S$ is related to the torsion one-form \mathbf{s} of S (viewed as a codimension-two spacelike submanifold), as follows:

$$\forall N \in \Gamma(TS)^\perp \text{ such that } g(N, \nu)|_S \neq 0, \text{ and } \forall X \in \Gamma(TS), \quad \mathbf{s}(X) \stackrel{\text{def}}{=} -\frac{g(\nabla_X \nu, N)}{g(\nu, N)} = -\mathbf{w}[\nu](X).$$

For the purposes of this section, two results from the literature are particularly relevant: the **near-horizon equation** [3, Eq. (5.3)] of isolated horizons, and the **master equation** [37, Eq. (60)] of multiple Killing horizons. An isolated horizon [3] is a totally geodesic embedded null hypersurface \mathcal{H}_{iso} with product topology $S \times \mathbb{R}$, and which admits a null, no-where zero tangent vector field $\eta \in \Gamma(T\mathcal{H}_{\text{iso}})$ such that $[\mathcal{L}_\eta, \mathcal{D}] = 0$ on \mathcal{H}_{iso} , where \mathcal{D} is the connection induced from the Levi-Civita derivative of

the ambient spacetime². Under the additional assumption of η having vanishing surface gravity on \mathcal{H}_{iso} , the near-horizon equation is an identity that holds on a cross-section S of \mathcal{H}_{iso} , which relates the one-form $\mathbf{w}[\eta]$, the Ricci tensor of the induced metric h on S , and the spacetime Ricci tensor along tangential directions. On the other hand, a multiple Killing horizon \mathcal{H}_m is a null hypersurface which is a Killing horizon with respect to at least two (linearly independent) Killing vector fields η_1, η_2 [37]. Again, when a multiple Killing horizon admits a cross-section S , the master equation is an identity on S which relates second derivatives of the proportionality function α between η_1 and η_2 on \mathcal{H}_m , the one-form $\mathbf{w}[\eta_1]$, the Ricci tensor of h , and the pull-back to S of the spacetime Ricci tensor.

While these equations have proven useful in a variety of situations (see e.g. [3, 26, 28, 13, 12, 1, 46] and references therein), they hold under very specific conditions. For isolated horizons, the hypersurface is totally geodesic, has product topology, typically satisfies energy conditions and/or the Einstein equations, and the near-horizon equation applies only on cross-sections where η does not vanish. For multiple Killing horizons, on the other hand, one needs two Killing vectors η_1, η_2 sharing a common horizon which in addition must admit a cross-section, and even in this setting the master equation is only valid at points when both η_1 and η_2 are non-zero.

At this stage, a natural question is whether one can obtain analogous equations for more general null hypersurfaces, e.g. for horizons with arbitrary topology, for null hypersurfaces containing points where η vanishes, or for other types of horizons (e.g. homothetic or conformal Killing horizons). This is the purpose of this section. More specifically, we shall obtain a generalized form of the near-horizon equation that holds for any null hypersurface \mathcal{H} equipped with a privileged tangent null vector field $\bar{\eta}$. This equation is fully covariant and holds on the whole \mathcal{H} (not only on a cross-section, which in fact need not exist). It also provides useful information about the constancy of the surface gravity of $\bar{\eta}$.

Theorem 5.1. *Consider a \mathcal{K} -tuple $\{\mathcal{H}, \gamma, \ell, \ell^{(2)}, \mathbf{Y}, \alpha, \mathbf{p}, \mathbf{q}\}$ with gauge-invariant vector field $\bar{\eta} \stackrel{\text{def}}{=} \alpha n$ and surface gravity $\kappa \stackrel{\text{def}}{=} n(\alpha) + \alpha \kappa_n$. Let $\overset{\circ}{R}_{ab}$ be the Ricci tensor of $\overset{\circ}{\nabla}$ and define $\mathcal{R}, \Pi^{\bar{\eta}}$ by (2.19), (4.7) respectively. Then, the following identities hold:*

$$\begin{aligned} 0 &= \overset{\circ}{\nabla}_a \overset{\circ}{\nabla}_b \alpha + 2\omega_{(a} \overset{\circ}{\nabla}_{b)} \alpha + \frac{\alpha}{2} \left(2\overset{\circ}{\nabla}_{(a} \omega_{b)} + 2\omega_a \omega_b + \mathcal{R}_{ab} - \overset{\circ}{R}_{(ab)} \right) \\ &\quad + \left(\kappa + \frac{\alpha}{2} \text{tr}_P \mathbf{U} \right) Y_{ab} + \frac{\alpha}{2} (\text{tr}_P \mathbf{Y}) U_{ab} - 2\alpha P^{cd} U_{c(a} Y_{b)d} - \Pi^{\bar{\eta}}_{ab} \\ &\quad + \frac{\alpha}{2} \left(\overset{\circ}{\nabla}_{(a} s_{b)} - s_a s_b \right) + \frac{1}{2} \left(\alpha n(\ell^{(2)}) + \mathbf{p} \right) U_{ab} - \alpha P^{cd} U_{c(a} F_{b)d}, \end{aligned} \quad (5.3)$$

$$0 = \overset{\circ}{\nabla}_a \kappa + \alpha \left(\mathcal{R}_{ab} n^b - (\text{tr}_P \mathbf{U}) \omega_a + \overset{\circ}{\nabla}_a (\text{tr}_P \mathbf{U}) \right) - P^{bc} \overset{\circ}{\nabla}_b (\alpha U_{ac}) - \Pi^{\bar{\eta}}_{ab} n^b, \quad (5.4)$$

$$0 = n(\kappa) - \Pi^{\bar{\eta}}_{ab} n^a n^b. \quad (5.5)$$

Proof. We shall repeatedly use the equalities $\mathbf{s}(n) = 0$, $\mathbf{U}(n, \cdot) = 0$, $\omega(n) \stackrel{(2.7)}{=} \kappa_n$ and $n(\alpha) + \alpha \kappa_n \stackrel{(2.31)}{=} \kappa$. Equation (5.3) follows immediately from multiplying (2.19) by $\frac{\alpha}{2}$ and using (4.8) to replace $\alpha \mathcal{L}_n \mathbf{Y}$ in terms of $\Pi^{\bar{\eta}}$. Contracting (5.3) with n^b and using (2.22) along with

$$\begin{aligned} n^b \overset{\circ}{\nabla}_a \overset{\circ}{\nabla}_b \alpha &= \overset{\circ}{\nabla}_a (n^b \overset{\circ}{\nabla}_b \alpha) - (\overset{\circ}{\nabla}_a n^b) \overset{\circ}{\nabla}_b \alpha \stackrel{(2.12)}{=} \overset{\circ}{\nabla}_a (n(\alpha)) - n(\alpha) s_a - P^{bf} U_{af} \overset{\circ}{\nabla}_b \alpha \\ &= \overset{\circ}{\nabla}_a \kappa - \alpha \overset{\circ}{\nabla}_a \kappa_n - \kappa_n \overset{\circ}{\nabla}_a \alpha - (\kappa - \alpha \kappa_n) s_a - P^{bc} U_{ac} \overset{\circ}{\nabla}_b \alpha, \\ n^b \overset{\circ}{\nabla}_{(a} s_{b)} &\stackrel{(2.13)}{=} \frac{1}{2} \mathcal{L}_n s_a - P^{bc} U_{ac} s_b, \quad n^b \overset{\circ}{\nabla}_{(a} \omega_{b)} \stackrel{(2.13)}{=} \frac{1}{2} \mathcal{L}_n \omega_a + \frac{1}{2} \overset{\circ}{\nabla}_a \kappa_n - \kappa_n s_a - P^{bc} \omega_b U_{ac}, \end{aligned}$$

²In the language of the hypersurface data formalism $\mathcal{D} \equiv \bar{\nabla}$, see Section 2. Moreover, When $\mathbf{U} = 0$ the connection \mathcal{D} is independent of the rigging [3]. This translates into $\bar{\nabla}$ being gauge invariant (cf. (2.30)).

one obtains

$$0 = \overset{\circ}{\nabla}_a \kappa - \alpha \overset{\circ}{\nabla}_a \kappa_n + \alpha \mathcal{L}_n \omega_a - P^{bc} U_{ac} \left(\overset{\circ}{\nabla}_b \alpha + 2\alpha s_b \right) - \Pi_{ab}^{\bar{\eta}} n^b \quad (5.6)$$

which, upon using (2.20) to rewrite $\mathcal{L}_n \omega$ in terms of $\mathcal{R}(n, \cdot)$, becomes (5.4). Multiplying (5.6) by n^a gives (5.5) since $\omega(n) = \kappa_n$. \square

Equation (5.3) is an abstract, covariant identity involving hypersurface data $\{\mathcal{H}, \gamma, \ell, \ell^{(2)}, \mathbf{Y}\}$, curvature terms (\mathcal{R}_{ab} and $\overset{\circ}{R}_{ab}$), derivatives of α , the surface gravity κ of $\bar{\eta}$, and the quantities \mathbf{p} and $\mathbf{\Pi}^{\bar{\eta}}$. Its derivation requires prescribing a \mathcal{K} -tuple, i.e. not only hypersurface data but also α , \mathbf{p} , and \mathbf{q} . However, \mathbf{p} only appears multiplied by \mathbf{U} , and \mathbf{q} only plays a role when one considers gauge transformations of the non-isolation tensor $\mathbf{\Pi}^{\bar{\eta}}$ (recall (4.7)-(4.9)). Furthermore, the quantities \mathbf{U} and $\mathbf{\Pi}^{\bar{\eta}}$ vanish for abstract Killing horizons—see the corresponding discussion in Section 4 as well as in [31, Sect. 6]—, in which case (5.3) only depends on hypersurface data plus the function α .

As mentioned before, (5.3) generalizes in several directions the already known forms of near-horizon [3, Eq. (5.3)] and master equations [37, Eq. (60)]. First, (5.3) holds *everywhere* on the hypersurface and not only on a specific cross-section (in fact, we are not assuming that such a section exists). Secondly, (5.3) does not require any topological assumption on the hypersurface apart from the requirement that it is two sided (or equivalently that the radical of γ admits a global nowhere zero section n [36]). This is also a significant difference with respect to the works [2, 4, 3, 23, 18, 21, 37] where the hypersurface is assumed to have a product topology $S \times \mathbb{R}$. Regarding the vector field $\bar{\eta}$ we have also kept full generality by allowing $\bar{\eta}$ to vanish on \mathcal{H} . Observe also that, by not restricting \mathbf{U} , \mathbf{p} and \mathbf{q} in any way, we have enforced neither any specific extension of $\bar{\eta}$ off $\phi(\mathcal{H})$ (cf. Proposition 4.5), nor any particular form of the deformation tensor of \mathcal{K}^η in case the data happens to be embedded. Finally, note that (5.3) has been obtained for a fully arbitrary constraint tensor \mathcal{R} . We have imposed neither energy conditions nor field equations of any kind. In view of the considerations above, we call (5.3) **generalized near-horizon equation**. The name is justified because (5.3) holds *everywhere on \mathcal{H}* , and whenever a cross-section S exists it also yields an equation therein, i.e. the pullback of (5.3) to S .

Let us conclude this section with an immediate corollary of equations (5.4)-(5.5) regarding the constancy of the surface gravity κ of $\bar{\eta}$. The function κ is constant along the null generators if and only if $\mathbf{\Pi}^{\bar{\eta}}(n, n) = 0$, and it is constant everywhere on \mathcal{H} if and only if

$$\Pi_{ab}^{\bar{\eta}} n^b = \alpha \left(\mathcal{R}_{ab} n^b - (\text{tr}_P \mathbf{U}) \omega_a + \overset{\circ}{\nabla}_a (\text{tr}_P \mathbf{U}) \right) - P^{bc} \overset{\circ}{\nabla}_b (\alpha U_{ac}).$$

Thus, for any \mathcal{K} -tuple satisfying $\mathbf{U} = 0$ and $\mathbf{\Pi}^{\bar{\eta}} = 0$ the surface gravity κ is automatically constant along the generators, whereas it is constant everywhere on \mathcal{H} provided the zero set of α in \mathcal{H} has empty interior and $\mathcal{R}(n, \cdot) = 0$.

6 Horizons in Lorentzian manifolds: existence results

Given a \mathcal{K} -tuple with $\mathbf{U} = 0$, the generalized near-horizon equation (5.3) takes the simplified form

$$\begin{aligned} 0 = & \kappa Y_{ab} - \Pi_{ab}^{\bar{\eta}} + \overset{\circ}{\nabla}_a \overset{\circ}{\nabla}_b \alpha + 2\omega_{(a} \overset{\circ}{\nabla}_{b)} \alpha \\ & + \alpha \left(\overset{\circ}{\nabla}_{(a} \omega_{b)} + \omega_a \omega_b + \frac{1}{2} \mathcal{R}_{ab} - \frac{1}{2} \overset{\circ}{R}_{(ab)} + \frac{1}{2} \overset{\circ}{\nabla}_{(a} s_{b)} - \frac{1}{2} s_a s_b \right). \end{aligned} \quad (6.1)$$

This expression allows one to determine the tensor \mathbf{Y} algebraically from metric data, the one-form ω , the function α and the tensors \mathcal{R} and $\mathbf{\Pi}^{\bar{\eta}}$, provided $\kappa \neq 0$ everywhere on \mathcal{H} . The purpose of this

section is to identify the conditions under which a data set of the form $\{\mathcal{H}, \gamma, \ell, \ell^{(2)}, \alpha, \omega, \Pi^{\bar{\eta}}, \mathcal{R}\}$ with $\kappa \neq 0$ can be (ϕ, ξ) -embedded in a Lorentzian manifold (\mathcal{M}, g) in such a way that $\frac{1}{2}\phi^*(\mathcal{L}_\xi g)$ coincides with the tensor \mathbf{Y} prescribed by the generalized near-horizon equation (6.1). One of the motivations for studying this problem comes from the fact that the full transverse expansion of the spacetime metric at Killing horizons with $\kappa \neq 0$ is uniquely determined by the order zero of the metric (i.e. $\{\gamma, \ell, \ell^{(2)}\}$, cf. (2.16)), a one-form that satisfies certain evolution equation along the generators, and all transverse derivatives of the ambient Ricci tensor at the horizon [41, 42]. In this context, it is not possible to provide the entire tensor \mathbf{Y} from the outset, but only a posteriori can one reconstruct it from first-order transverse derivatives of the spacetime metric (cf. (2.17)). It is therefore reasonable to follow a similar procedure starting with data $\{\mathcal{H}, \gamma, \ell, \ell^{(2)}, \omega, \alpha, \Pi^{\bar{\eta}}, \mathcal{R}\}$, thereby extending the previous result to totally geodesic null hypersurfaces without any restrictions on the non-isolation tensor. In particular, we need to understand which properties need to be imposed on this data to guarantee that the tensor \mathbf{Y} defined by (6.1) agrees, after all, with the tensor $\frac{1}{2}\phi^*(\mathcal{L}_\xi g)$ of the constructed spacetime.

The section is organized as follows. We begin by proving a number of identities for null data with $\mathbf{U} = 0$, which will be used later (Lemmas 6.1, 6.2 and 6.3). Then, we obtain (Theorem 6.4) the necessary and sufficient conditions for the existence of a Lorentzian manifold (\mathcal{M}, g) constructed from $\{\mathcal{H}, \gamma, \ell, \ell^{(2)}, \alpha, \omega, \Pi^{\bar{\eta}}, \mathcal{R}\}$, with no topological restriction on \mathcal{H} . We continue by addressing the case when \mathcal{H} admits a cross-section, prescribing suitable data therein and again proving existence of (\mathcal{M}, g) (Theorem 6.8). The section ends with four remarks on these results (Remarks 6.10 to 6.13).

Lemma 6.1. *Let $\{\mathcal{H}, \gamma, \ell, \ell^{(2)}\}$ be null metric hypersurface data with $\mathbf{U} = 0$, $\alpha \in \mathcal{F}(\mathcal{H})$ a scalar function and θ a covector field. Define the vector field $\bar{\eta} \stackrel{\text{def}}{=} \alpha n$. Then,*

$$\mathcal{L}_n(\overset{\circ}{\nabla}_a \theta_b) = \overset{\circ}{\nabla}_a(\mathcal{L}_n \theta_b) - 2\theta(n)\overset{\circ}{\nabla}_a s_b, \quad (6.2)$$

$$\begin{aligned} \mathcal{L}_{\alpha n}(\alpha \overset{\circ}{\nabla}_a \theta_b) &= \alpha \left(n(\alpha) \overset{\circ}{\nabla}_a \theta_b + \overset{\circ}{\nabla}_a(\alpha \mathcal{L}_n \theta_b) \right. \\ &\quad \left. + (\overset{\circ}{\nabla}_a \alpha) \overset{\circ}{\nabla}_b(\theta(n)) - 2\theta(n) \left(\alpha \overset{\circ}{\nabla}_a s_b + (\overset{\circ}{\nabla}_a \alpha) s_b \right) \right), \end{aligned} \quad (6.3)$$

$$\mathcal{L}_n \overset{\circ}{R}_{(ab)} = \mathcal{L}_n(\overset{\circ}{\nabla}_a s_b) - 2s_a \mathcal{L}_n s_b, \quad (6.4)$$

$$\mathcal{L}_{\bar{\eta}}(\overset{\circ}{\nabla}_a \overset{\circ}{\nabla}_b \alpha) = \alpha \overset{\circ}{\nabla}_a \overset{\circ}{\nabla}_b(n(\alpha)) + 2(\overset{\circ}{\nabla}_a \alpha) \overset{\circ}{\nabla}_b(n(\alpha)) - 2n(\alpha) \left(\alpha \overset{\circ}{\nabla}_a s_b + (\overset{\circ}{\nabla}_a \alpha) s_b \right). \quad (6.5)$$

Proof. Observe that in the case $\mathbf{U} = 0$ the tensor $\overset{\circ}{\Sigma}$ simplifies to (cf. (3.7))

$$\overset{\circ}{\Sigma}^c_{ab} = 2n^c \overset{\circ}{\nabla}_a s_b. \quad (6.6)$$

Equation (6.2) is the symmetrization of (3.2) in the case $Z = n$, $D = \overset{\circ}{\nabla}$ and $T = \theta$. For (6.3) we make use of the following identity for any function $\alpha \in \mathcal{F}(\mathcal{H})$ and any symmetric $(0, 2)$ -tensor T_{ab} :

$$\mathcal{L}_{\alpha n} T_{ab} = \alpha \mathcal{L}_n T_{ab} + 2(\overset{\circ}{\nabla}_a \alpha) T_{b)c} n^c. \quad (6.7)$$

Therefore,

$$\begin{aligned} \mathcal{L}_{\alpha n}(\alpha \overset{\circ}{\nabla}_a \theta_b) &= \alpha n(\alpha) \overset{\circ}{\nabla}_a \theta_b + \alpha \left(\alpha \mathcal{L}_n \overset{\circ}{\nabla}_a \theta_b + (\overset{\circ}{\nabla}_a \alpha) n^c \overset{\circ}{\nabla}_b \theta_c + (\overset{\circ}{\nabla}_b \alpha) n^c \overset{\circ}{\nabla}_a \theta_c \right) \\ &\stackrel{(2.13)}{=} \alpha \left(n(\alpha) \overset{\circ}{\nabla}_a \theta_b + \alpha \mathcal{L}_n \overset{\circ}{\nabla}_a \theta_b \right) + \alpha (\overset{\circ}{\nabla}_a \alpha) \left(\mathcal{L}_n \theta_b + \overset{\circ}{\nabla}_b(\theta(n)) - 2\theta(n) s_b \right) \\ &= \alpha \left(n(\alpha) \overset{\circ}{\nabla}_a \theta_b + \overset{\circ}{\nabla}_a(\alpha \mathcal{L}_n \theta_b) - 2\alpha \theta(n) \overset{\circ}{\nabla}_a s_b + (\overset{\circ}{\nabla}_a \alpha) \left(\overset{\circ}{\nabla}_b(\theta(n)) - 2\theta(n) s_b \right) \right), \end{aligned}$$

from where (6.3) follows at once. To prove (6.4) we first particularize (3.5) for $Z = n$, $D = \overset{\circ}{\nabla}$, and find $\mathcal{L}_n \overset{\circ}{R}_{(ab)} = \overset{\circ}{\nabla}_c \overset{\circ}{\Sigma}^c_{ab} - \overset{\circ}{\nabla}_{(a} \overset{\circ}{\Sigma}^c_{b)c}$. Now, using (6.6), $\mathbf{s}(n) = 0$ and the fact that $n^c \overset{\circ}{\nabla}_b s_c = -s_c \overset{\circ}{\nabla}_b n^c \stackrel{(2.12)}{=} -s_b \mathbf{s}(n) = 0$ and $n^c \overset{\circ}{\nabla}_c s_b = \mathcal{L}_n s_b - (\overset{\circ}{\nabla}_b n^c) s_c \stackrel{(2.12)}{=} \mathcal{L}_n s_b$, one obtains

$$\overset{\circ}{\nabla}_a \overset{\circ}{\Sigma}^c_{bc} = \overset{\circ}{\nabla}_a \left(n^c \overset{\circ}{\nabla}_c s_b \right) = \overset{\circ}{\nabla}_a (\mathcal{L}_n s_b) = \mathcal{L}_n (\overset{\circ}{\nabla}_a s_b),$$

where in the last step we have used (3.2) for $Z = n$, $D = \overset{\circ}{\nabla}$ and $T = \mathbf{s}$. On the other hand, since $2(\overset{\circ}{\nabla}_b n^c)(\overset{\circ}{\nabla}_{(a} s_{c)}) = 2s_b n^c (\overset{\circ}{\nabla}_{(a} s_{c)}) = s_b n^c \overset{\circ}{\nabla}_c s_a = s_b \mathcal{L}_n s_a$ and $\overset{\circ}{\nabla}_c n^c = 0$, it follows

$$\overset{\circ}{\nabla}_c \overset{\circ}{\Sigma}^c_{ab} = 2 \left(\mathcal{L}_n (\overset{\circ}{\nabla}_{(a} s_{b)}) - (\overset{\circ}{\nabla}_a n^c) (\overset{\circ}{\nabla}_{(b} s_{c)}) - (\overset{\circ}{\nabla}_b n^c) (\overset{\circ}{\nabla}_{(a} s_{c)}) \right) = 2 \left(\mathcal{L}_n (\overset{\circ}{\nabla}_{(a} s_{b)}) - s_{(a} \mathcal{L}_n s_{b)} \right).$$

From the last two identities, it is immediate to obtain (6.4). Finally, to demonstrate (6.5) we first use (6.7) and then apply (6.2) with $\theta_b = \overset{\circ}{\nabla}_b \alpha$ (note that $\overset{\circ}{\nabla}_a \overset{\circ}{\nabla}_b \alpha$ is symmetric in ab):

$$\begin{aligned} \mathcal{L}_{\bar{\eta}} (\overset{\circ}{\nabla}_a \overset{\circ}{\nabla}_b \alpha) &= \alpha \mathcal{L}_n (\overset{\circ}{\nabla}_a \overset{\circ}{\nabla}_b \alpha) + 2n^c (\overset{\circ}{\nabla}_{(a} \alpha) (\overset{\circ}{\nabla}_{b)} \overset{\circ}{\nabla}_c \alpha) \\ &= \alpha \mathcal{L}_n (\overset{\circ}{\nabla}_a \overset{\circ}{\nabla}_b \alpha) + 2(\overset{\circ}{\nabla}_{(a} \alpha) \left(\overset{\circ}{\nabla}_{b)} (n(\alpha)) - (\overset{\circ}{\nabla}_c \alpha) (\overset{\circ}{\nabla}_b n^c) \right) \\ &= \alpha \left(\overset{\circ}{\nabla}_{(a} (\mathcal{L}_n \overset{\circ}{\nabla}_{b)} \alpha) - 2n(\alpha) \overset{\circ}{\nabla}_{(a} s_{b)} \right) + 2(\overset{\circ}{\nabla}_{(a} \alpha) \left(\overset{\circ}{\nabla}_{b)} (n(\alpha)) - n(\alpha) s_{b)} \right). \end{aligned}$$

This yields (6.5) after noticing that $\mathcal{L}_n \overset{\circ}{\nabla}_b \alpha = \overset{\circ}{\nabla}_b (n(\alpha))$ and reorganizing terms. \square

Lemma 6.2. *Let $\{\mathcal{H}, \gamma, \ell, \ell^{(2)}\}$ be null metric hypersurface data with $\mathbf{U} = 0$. Consider a function $\alpha \in \mathcal{F}(\mathcal{H})$ and a covector field $\rho \in \Gamma(T^*\mathcal{H})$. Define*

$$\mathcal{B}_{ab} \stackrel{\text{def}}{=} \overset{\circ}{\nabla}_a \overset{\circ}{\nabla}_b \alpha + 2\rho_{(a} \overset{\circ}{\nabla}_{b)} \alpha + \alpha \left(\overset{\circ}{\nabla}_{(a} \rho_{b)} + \rho_a \rho_b - \frac{1}{2} \overset{\circ}{R}_{(ab)} + \frac{1}{2} \overset{\circ}{\nabla}_{(a} s_{b)} - \frac{1}{2} s_a s_b \right).$$

Then,

$$\mathcal{B}_{ab} n^b = \overset{\circ}{\nabla}_a (n(\alpha)) - (n(\alpha) + \alpha \rho(n)) (s_a - \rho_a) + \rho(n) \overset{\circ}{\nabla}_a \alpha + \frac{\alpha}{2} \mathcal{L}_n \rho_a + \frac{\alpha}{2} \overset{\circ}{\nabla}_a (\rho(n)). \quad (6.8)$$

Proof. Equation (6.8) follows from the combination of

$$n^b \overset{\circ}{\nabla}_a \overset{\circ}{\nabla}_b \alpha \stackrel{(2.12)}{=} \overset{\circ}{\nabla}_a (n(\alpha)) - n(\alpha) s_a, \quad (6.9)$$

$$\overset{\circ}{R}_{(ab)} n^b \stackrel{(2.14)}{=} \frac{1}{2} \mathcal{L}_n s_a, \quad (6.10)$$

the identity (2.13) for $\theta = \rho, \mathbf{s}$, and the fact that $\mathbf{s}(n) = 0$. \square

Lemma 6.3. *Let $\{\mathcal{H}, \gamma, \ell, \ell^{(2)}, \mathbf{Y}\}$ be null hypersurface data with $\mathbf{U} = 0$ that is (ϕ, ξ) -embedded in a Lorentzian manifold (\mathcal{M}, g) . Consider a gauge-invariant vector $\bar{\eta} \stackrel{\text{def}}{=} \alpha n \in \Gamma(T\mathcal{H})$, $\alpha \in \mathcal{F}(\mathcal{H})$, and define $\kappa \stackrel{\text{def}}{=} n(\alpha) + \alpha \omega(n)$ where ω is given by (2.7). Assume that $\tilde{\Pi}$ and $\tilde{\mathcal{R}}$ are two symmetric $(0, 2)$ -tensor fields satisfying*

$$\tilde{\Pi}(n, \cdot) = \alpha \mathcal{L}_n \omega + \omega(n) d\alpha + d(n(\alpha)), \quad (6.11)$$

$$\begin{aligned} \kappa Y_{ab} &= \tilde{\Pi}_{ab} - \overset{\circ}{\nabla}_a \overset{\circ}{\nabla}_b \alpha - 2\omega_{(a} \overset{\circ}{\nabla}_{b)} \alpha \\ &\quad - \alpha \left(\overset{\circ}{\nabla}_{(a} \omega_{b)} + \omega_a \omega_b + \frac{1}{2} \tilde{\mathcal{R}}_{ab} - \frac{1}{2} \overset{\circ}{R}_{(ab)} + \frac{1}{2} \overset{\circ}{\nabla}_{(a} s_{b)} - \frac{1}{2} s_a s_b \right). \end{aligned} \quad (6.12)$$

Then, the following identity holds:

$$\begin{aligned} 0 &= \left(\mathcal{L}_{\bar{\eta}} + \alpha \omega(n) \right) \tilde{\Pi}_{ab} - \alpha \overset{\circ}{\nabla}_{(a} (\tilde{\Pi}_{b)c} n^c) - \alpha \tilde{\Pi}(n, n) Y_{ab} \\ &\quad - 2(\alpha \omega_{(a} + \overset{\circ}{\nabla}_{(a} \alpha) \tilde{\Pi}_{b)c} n^c - \frac{\alpha}{2} \mathcal{L}_{\bar{\eta}} \tilde{\mathcal{R}}_{ab} + \frac{\alpha \kappa}{2} (\phi^*(\mathbf{Ric}_g)_{ab} - \tilde{\mathcal{R}}_{ab})). \end{aligned} \quad (6.13)$$

Proof. Throughout the proof we shall make use of the identities

$$\mathcal{L}_{\alpha n}(\alpha \theta_a \theta_b) = \alpha \left(n(\alpha) \theta_a \theta_b + 2\theta_{(a} \mathcal{L}_{\alpha n} \theta_{b)} \right), \quad \forall \theta \in \Gamma(T^*\mathcal{H}), \quad (6.14)$$

$$\mathcal{L}_{\bar{\eta}}(2\omega_{(a} \overset{\circ}{\nabla}_{b)} \alpha) = 2(\mathcal{L}_{\bar{\eta}} \omega_{(a} (\overset{\circ}{\nabla}_{b)} \alpha) + 2\omega_{(a} (\alpha \overset{\circ}{\nabla}_{b)} (n(\alpha)) + n(\alpha) \overset{\circ}{\nabla}_{b)} \alpha), \quad (6.15)$$

$$\mathcal{L}_{\bar{\eta}} \left(\frac{\alpha}{2} \tilde{\mathcal{R}}_{ab} \right) = \frac{\alpha}{2} \left(n(\alpha) \tilde{\mathcal{R}}_{ab} + \mathcal{L}_{\bar{\eta}} \tilde{\mathcal{R}}_{ab} \right), \quad (6.16)$$

$$\mathcal{L}_{\bar{\eta}} \left(\frac{\alpha}{2} \overset{\circ}{R}_{(ab)} \right) \stackrel{(6.4)}{=} \frac{\alpha}{2} \left(n(\alpha) \overset{\circ}{R}_{(ab)} + \alpha \mathcal{L}_n (\overset{\circ}{\nabla}_{(a} s_{b)}) + (\overset{\circ}{\nabla}_{(a} \alpha - 2\alpha s_{(a}) \mathcal{L}_n s_{b)}) \right), \quad (6.17)$$

First, notice that the contraction of (6.11) with n gives

$$\tilde{\Pi}(n, n) = \alpha n(\omega(n)) + \omega(n) n(\alpha) + n(n(\alpha)) = n(\alpha \omega(n) + n(\alpha)) = n(\kappa). \quad (6.18)$$

Equation (6.13) is derived by computing the $\mathcal{L}_{\bar{\eta}}$ -derivative of (6.12). For the l.h.s., one finds

$$\begin{aligned} \mathcal{L}_{\bar{\eta}}(\kappa Y_{ab}) &= \alpha n(\kappa) Y_{ab} + \kappa \mathcal{L}_{\bar{\eta}} Y_{ab} \stackrel{(6.18)}{=} \alpha \tilde{\Pi}(n, n) Y_{ab} + 2\kappa (\overset{\circ}{\nabla}_{(a} \alpha) (s_{b)} - \omega_b) + \alpha \kappa \mathcal{L}_n Y_{ab} \\ &\stackrel{(2.19)}{=} \alpha \tilde{\Pi}(n, n) Y_{ab} + 2\kappa (\overset{\circ}{\nabla}_{(a} \alpha) (s_{b)} - \omega_b) \\ &\quad + \alpha \kappa \left(\frac{1}{2} \overset{\circ}{R}_{(ab)} - \frac{1}{2} \phi^* (\mathbf{Ric}_g)_{ab} - \omega(n) Y_{ab} - \overset{\circ}{\nabla}_{(a} \omega_{b)} - \omega_a \omega_b + \frac{3}{2} \overset{\circ}{\nabla}_{(a} s_{b)} + \frac{1}{2} s_a s_b \right). \end{aligned} \quad (6.19)$$

For the r.h.s., we combine the definition of κ with the general identities (6.5), (6.3), (6.14) for $\theta = \omega, s$, and (6.15)-(6.17). Writing each derivative $\mathcal{L}_n \omega$ in terms of $\tilde{\Pi}(n, \cdot)$ according to (6.11), and equating the left and right hand sides, (6.13) follows after several simplifications take place. \square

Having the identities of Lemmas 6.1, 6.2 and 6.3 are at our disposal, we can now obtain the necessary and sufficient conditions for the existence of a Lorentzian manifold where a data set of the form $\{\mathcal{H}, \gamma, \ell, \ell^{(2)}, \omega, \alpha, \Pi, \mathcal{R}\}$ is embedded. This is done in the next theorem.

Theorem 6.4. *Let $\{\mathcal{H}, \gamma, \ell, \ell^{(2)}, \tilde{\omega}, \alpha, \tilde{\Pi}, \tilde{\mathcal{R}}\}$ be a tuple consisting of*

- (i) *null metric hypersurface data $\{\mathcal{H}, \gamma, \ell, \ell^{(2)}\}$ with $\mathbf{U} = 0$,*
- (ii) *a covector $\tilde{\omega} \in \Gamma(T^*\mathcal{H})$ with gauge behaviour $\mathcal{G}_{(z,V)}(\tilde{\omega}) = \tilde{\omega} - z^{-1} dz$,*
- (iii) *a function $\alpha \in \mathcal{F}(\mathcal{H})$ such that $\mathcal{G}_{(z,V)}(\alpha) = z\alpha$ and whose set of zeros has empty interior, and*
- (iv) *two symmetric $(0, 2)$ -tensor fields $\tilde{\Pi}, \tilde{\mathcal{R}}$ with gauge behaviours*

$$\mathcal{G}_{(z,V)}(\tilde{\Pi}) = z\tilde{\Pi}, \quad \mathcal{G}_{(z,V)}(\tilde{\mathcal{R}}) = \tilde{\mathcal{R}}.$$

Define $\bar{\eta} \stackrel{\text{def}}{=} \alpha n$ and $\kappa \stackrel{\text{def}}{=} n(\alpha) + \alpha \tilde{\omega}(n)$, and suppose that $\kappa \neq 0$ everywhere. Then, there exists a Lorentzian manifold (\mathcal{M}, g) , an embedding $\phi : \mathcal{H} \hookrightarrow \mathcal{M}$ and a rigging ξ such that

1. *$\{\mathcal{H}, \gamma, \ell, \ell^{(2)}\}$ is (ϕ, ξ) -embedded in (\mathcal{M}, g) ;*
2. *$\tilde{\omega} = s - \frac{1}{2} \phi^* (\mathcal{L}_\xi g)(n, \cdot)$;*
3. *$\Sigma[\eta](\phi_* X, \phi_* W) = \tilde{\Pi}(X, W) \phi_* n \quad \forall X, W \in \Gamma(T\mathcal{H})$, where η is any extension of $\phi_* \bar{\eta}$ off $\phi(\mathcal{H})$;*
4. *$\phi^* (\mathbf{Ric}_g) = \tilde{\mathcal{R}}$;*

if and only if the following conditions hold:

$$\tilde{\Pi}(n, \cdot) = \alpha \tilde{\mathcal{R}}(n, \cdot) + d\kappa, \quad (6.20)$$

$$\tilde{\Pi}(n, \cdot) = \alpha \mathcal{L}_n \tilde{\omega} + \tilde{\omega}(n) d\alpha + d(n(\alpha)), \quad (6.21)$$

$$\begin{aligned} 0 &= \left(\mathcal{L}_{\bar{\eta}} + \alpha \tilde{\omega}(n) \right) \tilde{\Pi}_{ab} - \alpha \overset{\circ}{\nabla}_{(a} (\tilde{\Pi}_{b)c} n^c) - \alpha \tilde{\Pi}(n, n) Y_{ab} \\ &\quad - 2(\alpha \tilde{\omega}_{(a} + \overset{\circ}{\nabla}_{(a} \alpha) \tilde{\Pi}_{b)c} n^c - \frac{\alpha}{2} \mathcal{L}_{\bar{\eta}} \tilde{\mathcal{R}}_{ab}. \end{aligned} \quad (6.22)$$

where \mathbf{Y} is the symmetric $(0, 2)$ -tensor defined by

$$\kappa Y_{ab} = \tilde{\Pi}_{ab} - \overset{\circ}{\nabla}_a \overset{\circ}{\nabla}_b \alpha - 2\tilde{\omega}_{(a} \overset{\circ}{\nabla}_{b)} \alpha - \alpha \left(\overset{\circ}{\nabla}_{(a} \tilde{\omega}_{b)} + \tilde{\omega}_a \tilde{\omega}_b + \frac{1}{2} \tilde{\mathcal{R}}_{ab} - \frac{1}{2} \overset{\circ}{R}_{(ab)} + \frac{1}{2} \overset{\circ}{\nabla}_{(a} s_{b)} - \frac{1}{2} s_a s_b \right). \quad (6.23)$$

Moreover, the pair (ϕ, ξ) satisfies $\frac{1}{2} \phi^*(\mathcal{L}_\xi g) = \mathbf{Y}$, hence the null hypersurface data $\{\mathcal{H}, \gamma, \ell, \ell^{(2)}, \mathbf{Y}\}$ is also (ϕ, ξ) -embedded in (\mathcal{M}, g) .

Remark 6.5. As already mentioned, we are interested in allowing for the existence of zeroes of $\bar{\eta}$ on \mathcal{H} . However, we do want to exclude the possibility that $\bar{\eta}$ vanishes on open subsets of \mathcal{H} , since on such subsets the available information would be very limited (e.g., α and $\mathbf{\Pi}^{\bar{\eta}}$ would be identically zero), and some of the previous results would no longer hold. Hence, we require that the zero set of α has empty interior on \mathcal{H} (cf. (iii)). This assumption is consistent with the well-known fact that Killing vectors cannot vanish on any codimension-one subset of a spacetime, unless they are identically zero.

Remark 6.6. For the quantities α , $\tilde{\omega}$, $\tilde{\mathbf{\Pi}}$ and $\tilde{\mathcal{R}}$ to satisfy 1.-4. a posteriori, one needs to prescribe the gauge-behaviours of (ii)-(iv) from the outset (recall (2.28), (4.1), (4.9) and the fact that, for embedded data, the constraint tensor is the pull-back of the ambient Ricci tensor, hence it is gauge-invariant).

Remark 6.7. The contraction of (6.20) with n yields $\tilde{\mathbf{\Pi}}(n, n) = \alpha \tilde{\mathcal{R}}(n, n) + n(\kappa)$. On the other hand, the contraction of (6.21) with n is (cf. (6.18)) $\tilde{\mathbf{\Pi}}(n, n) = n(\kappa)$. Since the set of zeroes of α has empty interior on \mathcal{H} , it follows that (6.20)-(6.21) imply $\tilde{\mathcal{R}}(n, n) = 0$. This is consistent with the Raychaudhuri equation for totally geodesic null hypersurfaces, namely (2.21) with $\mathbf{U} = 0$.

Proof. Suppose that 1.-4. hold and define

$$\mathbb{Y} \stackrel{\text{def}}{=} \frac{1}{2} \phi^*(\mathcal{L}_\xi g), \quad \mathbb{w} \stackrel{\text{def}}{=} \mathbf{s} - \mathbb{Y}(n, \cdot), \quad \mathbb{k}_n \stackrel{\text{def}}{=} -\mathbb{Y}(n, n), \quad \mathbb{k} \stackrel{\text{def}}{=} n(\alpha) + \alpha \mathbb{k}_n.$$

Consider any extension η of $\phi_* \bar{\eta}$ away from $\phi(\mathcal{H})$, and define the deformation tensor $\mathcal{K}[\eta] \stackrel{\text{def}}{=} \mathcal{L}_\eta g$, its components $\mathbf{p} \stackrel{\text{def}}{=} \phi^*(\mathcal{K}[\eta](\xi, \xi))$, $\mathbf{q} \stackrel{\text{def}}{=} \phi^*(\mathcal{K}[\eta](\xi, \cdot))$, and the tensor $\Sigma[\eta] \stackrel{\text{def}}{=} \mathcal{L}_\eta \nabla$. By construction, $\{\mathcal{H}, \gamma, \ell, \ell^{(2)}, \mathbb{Y}, \alpha, \mathbf{p}, \mathbf{q}\}$ is a \mathcal{K} -tuple (ϕ, ξ) -embedded in (\mathcal{M}, g) , so in particular it verifies (5.3) with constraint tensor $\tilde{\mathcal{R}}$ (by 4.) and $\mathbf{\Pi}^{\bar{\eta}} = \tilde{\mathbf{\Pi}}$ (by 3. and (4.12)), i.e.

$$\mathbb{k} Y_{ab} = \tilde{\Pi}_{ab} - \overset{\circ}{\nabla}_a \overset{\circ}{\nabla}_b \alpha - 2(\overset{\circ}{\nabla}_{(a} \alpha) \mathbb{w}_{b)} - \alpha \left(\overset{\circ}{\nabla}_{(a} \mathbb{w}_{b)} + \mathbb{w}_a \mathbb{w}_b - \frac{1}{2} \overset{\circ}{R}_{(ab)} + \frac{1}{2} \tilde{\mathcal{R}}_{ab} + \frac{1}{2} \overset{\circ}{\nabla}_{(a} s_{b)} - \frac{1}{2} s_a s_b \right). \quad (6.24)$$

Now, 2. entails $\tilde{\omega} = \mathbf{s} - \mathbb{Y}(n, \cdot) \stackrel{\text{def}}{=} \mathbb{w}$, hence $\kappa = n(\alpha) + \alpha \mathbb{k}_n = \mathbb{k}$. The combination of (6.24) and the fact that $\kappa \neq 0$ then yields $\mathbb{Y} = \mathbf{Y}$ (recall (6.23)), so that $\{\mathcal{H}, \gamma, \ell, \ell^{(2)}, \mathbb{Y} = \mathbf{Y}\}$ is hypersurface data (ϕ, ξ) -embedded in (\mathcal{M}, g) . Contracting (6.24) with n^b and using Lemma 6.2 for $\boldsymbol{\rho} = \tilde{\omega}$ and the definition of κ , one obtains

$$0 = \tilde{\Pi}_{ab} n^b - \overset{\circ}{\nabla}_a (n(\alpha)) - \tilde{\omega}(n) \overset{\circ}{\nabla}_a \alpha - \frac{\alpha}{2} \mathcal{L}_n \tilde{\omega}_a - \frac{\alpha}{2} \overset{\circ}{\nabla}_a (\tilde{\omega}(n)) - \alpha \tilde{\mathcal{R}}_{ab} n^b + \frac{\alpha}{2} \tilde{\mathcal{R}}_{ab} n^b \quad (6.25)$$

where we have added and subtracted $\frac{\alpha}{2} \tilde{\mathcal{R}}_{ab} n^b$. Substituting the plus term using (2.20) with $\boldsymbol{\omega} = \tilde{\omega}$ and $\kappa_n = \tilde{\omega}(n)$, equation (6.25) becomes (6.20). Once (6.20) is established, (6.21) follows directly after rewriting $\tilde{\mathcal{R}}_{ab} n^b$ according to (2.20) and using the definition of κ . Finally, the hypersurface data $\{\mathcal{H}, \gamma, \ell, \ell^{(2)}, \mathbf{Y}\}$ satisfies the hypotheses of Lemma 6.3 for $\boldsymbol{\omega} = \tilde{\omega}$. So, (6.13) holds, and since $\phi^*(\mathbf{Ric}_g) = \tilde{\mathcal{R}}$, (6.22) is established. Thus, 1.-4. \implies (6.20)-(6.22). Observe that the argument also shows that 1.-4. $\implies \frac{1}{2} \phi^*(\mathcal{L}_\xi g) = \mathbf{Y}$.

Let us now prove the converse, namely that (6.20)-(6.22) \implies 1.-4.. By [42, Thm. 4.2] we know that, given null metric hypersurface data together with *any* sequence $\{\mathbb{Y}^{(k)}\}_{k \in \mathbb{N}}$ of symmetric $(0, 2)$ -tensor fields on \mathcal{H} , there exists a Lorentzian manifold (\mathcal{M}, g) , an embedding $\phi : \mathcal{H} \hookrightarrow \mathcal{M}$ and an

affine-geodesic rigging ξ so that the data is (ϕ, ξ) -embedded in (\mathcal{M}, g) and $\mathbb{Y}^{(k)} = \frac{1}{2}\phi^*(\mathcal{L}_\xi^{(k)}g)$ for all $k \in \mathbb{N}$. We select the first term $\mathbb{Y}^{(1)}$ of the sequence $\{\mathbb{Y}^{(k)}\}_{k \geq 1}$ to be given by \mathbf{Y} , i.e. $\mathbb{Y}^{(1)} = \mathbf{Y}$. By construction, $\{\mathcal{H}, \gamma, \ell, \ell^{(2)}, \mathbb{Y}^{(1)} = \mathbf{Y}\}$ is (ϕ, ξ) -embedded in (\mathcal{M}, g) , so in particular 1. holds. Notice that, at this point, the objects $\tilde{\mathcal{R}}, \tilde{\Pi}, \tilde{\omega}$ are unrelated to the quantities $\mathcal{R}, \Pi^{\bar{\eta}}$ and ω constructed from $\{\gamma, \ell, \ell^{(2)}, \mathbb{Y}^{(1)} = \mathbf{Y}\}$ according to (2.19), (4.7) and (2.7), respectively. In fact, our main task is to demonstrate that the objects with and without tilde actually coincide. Since the constraint tensor for embedded hypersurface data satisfies $\phi^*(\mathbf{Ric}_g) = \mathcal{R}$, we have

$$\phi^*(\mathbf{Ric}_g)_{ab} \stackrel{(2.19)}{=} \overset{\circ}{R}_{(ab)} - 2\mathcal{L}_n Y_{ab} - 2\kappa_n Y_{ab} - 2\overset{\circ}{\nabla}_{(a}\omega_{b)} - 2\omega_a \omega_b + 3\overset{\circ}{\nabla}_{(a}s_{b)} + s_a s_b, \quad (6.26)$$

where $\omega \stackrel{\text{def}}{=} s - \mathbf{Y}(n, \cdot)$ and $\kappa_n \stackrel{\text{def}}{=} -\mathbf{Y}(n, n)$. Now, consider again any extension η of $\phi_* \bar{\eta}$ away from $\phi(\mathcal{H})$, and let $\Sigma[\eta] \stackrel{\text{def}}{=} \mathcal{L}_\eta \nabla$. Define the symmetric $(0, 2)$ -tensor $\Pi^{\bar{\eta}}$ according to (4.8), i.e.

$$\Pi_{ab}^{\bar{\eta}} \stackrel{\text{def}}{=} \overset{\circ}{\nabla}_a \overset{\circ}{\nabla}_b \alpha + 2(\overset{\circ}{\nabla}_{(a}\alpha) \omega_{b)} + 2\alpha \overset{\circ}{\nabla}_{(a}s_{b)} + n(\alpha)Y_{ab} - \alpha(\mathcal{L}_n \mathbf{Y})_{ab}, \quad (6.27)$$

so that

$$\Sigma[\eta](e_a, e_b) \stackrel{(4.11)}{=} \left(\overset{\circ}{\nabla}_a \overset{\circ}{\nabla}_b \alpha + 2(\overset{\circ}{\nabla}_{(a}\alpha) \omega_{b)} + 2\alpha \overset{\circ}{\nabla}_{(a}s_{b)} + n(\alpha)Y_{ab} - \alpha(\mathcal{L}_n \mathbf{Y})_{ab} \right) \phi_* n = \Pi_{ab}^{\bar{\eta}} \phi_* n. \quad (6.28)$$

Let us prove that $\omega = \tilde{\omega}$. This will be a consequence of the fact that \mathbf{Y} satisfies (6.23). Contracting (6.23) with n^b and using (6.20) to get rid of $\tilde{\mathcal{R}}_{ab} n^b$, and Lemma 6.2 for $\rho = \tilde{\omega}$, one finds

$$\begin{aligned} \kappa(s_a - \omega_a) &= \frac{1}{2}\tilde{\Pi}_{ab} n^b + \frac{1}{2}\overset{\circ}{\nabla}_a \kappa - \overset{\circ}{\nabla}_a(n(\alpha)) + \kappa(s_a - \tilde{\omega}_a) - \tilde{\omega}(n)\overset{\circ}{\nabla}_a \alpha - \frac{\alpha}{2}\mathcal{L}_n \tilde{\omega}_a - \frac{\alpha}{2}\overset{\circ}{\nabla}_a(\tilde{\omega}(n)) \\ &\stackrel{(6.21)}{=} \kappa(s_a - \tilde{\omega}_a) \end{aligned}$$

where in the last step we used the definition of κ to get rid of the term $\overset{\circ}{\nabla}_a \kappa$. Since $\kappa \neq 0$, we conclude that $\tilde{\omega} = \omega \stackrel{\text{def}}{=} s - \mathbf{Y}(n, \cdot) = s - \frac{1}{2}\phi^*(\mathcal{L}_\xi g)$, hence item 2. holds. Now, the data $\{\mathcal{H}, \gamma, \ell, \ell^{(2)}, \mathbb{Y}^{(1)} = \mathbf{Y}\}$ fulfills Lemma 6.3 for $\tilde{\Pi}, \tilde{\mathcal{R}}$ and $\omega = \tilde{\omega}$, so in particular (6.13) holds. This, together with (6.22), $\kappa \neq 0$ and the fact that the zero-set of α has empty interior ensures that $\phi^*(\mathbf{Ric}_g) = \tilde{\mathcal{R}}$, which proves 4.. Item 3. then follows from combining (6.23), (6.26), (6.27) and (6.28). This concludes the proof of (6.20)-(6.22) \implies 1.-4..

It only remains to show that the pair (ϕ, ξ) satisfies $\frac{1}{2}\phi^*(\mathcal{L}_\xi g) = \mathbf{Y}$ both under conditions 1.-4. and (6.20)-(6.22). We have already shown that 1.-4. $\implies \frac{1}{2}\phi^*(\mathcal{L}_\xi g) = \mathbf{Y}$, so it only remains to prove that (6.20)-(6.22) $\implies \frac{1}{2}\phi^*(\mathcal{L}_\xi g) = \mathbf{Y}$. Suppose that, from (6.20)-(6.22), one constructs any Lorentzian manifold (\mathcal{M}, g) satisfying 1.-4. but with $\frac{1}{2}\phi^*(\mathcal{L}_\xi g) = \mathbf{Y}' \neq \mathbf{Y}$. Then 1.-4. $\implies \mathbf{Y} = \frac{1}{2}\phi^*(\mathcal{L}_\xi g) = \mathbf{Y}' \neq \mathbf{Y}$, which is a contradiction. \square

Null hypersurfaces that admit a foliation by cross-sections are particularly interesting in General Relativity. For instance, in the standard characteristic initial value problem one prescribes data on two null hypersurfaces that intersect transversely on a spacelike surface, which forces them to admit cross-sections. In the following theorem, we address the case when \mathcal{H} has product topology $S \times \mathbb{R}$, S being a cross-section. We show that, given totally geodesic null metric data, together with suitable data on S plus two scalar functions and a symmetric $(0, 2)$ -tensor on the hypersurface, the existence of a Lorentzian manifold realizing the prescribed quantities is guaranteed.

Theorem 6.8. *Let $\{\mathcal{H}, \gamma, \ell, \ell^{(2)}\}$ be null metric hypersurface data with $\mathbf{U} = 0$. Assume that \mathcal{H} admits a cross-section $\iota : S \hookrightarrow \mathcal{H}$, i.e. a codimension-one submanifold which is intersected precisely once by each integral curve of n . Let $z \in \mathcal{F}^*(\mathcal{H})$, $V \in \Gamma(T\mathcal{H})$ be gauge parameters, and consider*

- (I) *two functions $\kappa, f \in \mathcal{F}(\mathcal{H})$ with gauge behaviour $\mathcal{G}_{(z,V)}(\kappa) = \kappa$, $\mathcal{G}_{(z,V)}(f) = \frac{1}{z}\left(f - \frac{n(z)}{z}\right)$, and*

such that κ vanishes nowhere on \mathcal{H} ;

- (II) a function $\bar{\alpha} \in \mathcal{F}(S)$ and a covector $\bar{\omega} \in \Gamma(T^*S)$, such that $\mathcal{G}_{(z,V)}(\bar{\alpha}) = z|_S \bar{\alpha}$, $\mathcal{G}_{(z,V)}(\bar{\omega}) = \bar{\omega} - (z^{-1}dz)|_S$;
- (III) a symmetric $(0,2)$ -tensor field \mathcal{T} in S with gauge behaviour $\mathcal{G}_{(z,V)}(\mathcal{T}) = z|_S \mathcal{T}$;
- (IV) a symmetric, gauge-invariant $(0,2)$ -tensor field $\tilde{\mathcal{R}}$ in \mathcal{H} such that $\tilde{\mathcal{R}}(n, n) = 0$.

Then, there exists a unique function $\alpha \in \mathcal{F}(\mathcal{H})$, one-form $\tilde{\omega} \in \Gamma(T^*\mathcal{H})$ and symmetric $(0,2)$ -tensor $\tilde{\Pi}$ on \mathcal{H} satisfying (6.20)-(6.22) and

$$\tilde{\omega}(n) = f, \quad \iota^* \alpha = \bar{\alpha}, \quad \iota^* \tilde{\omega} = \bar{\omega}, \quad \iota^* \tilde{\Pi} = \mathcal{T}, \quad \kappa = n(\alpha) + \alpha \tilde{\omega}(n). \quad (6.29)$$

Moreover, $\mathcal{G}_{(z,V)}(\alpha) = z\alpha$, $\mathcal{G}_{(z,V)}(\tilde{\omega}) = \tilde{\omega} - z^{-1}dz$, and $\mathcal{G}_{(z,V)}(\tilde{\Pi}) = z\tilde{\Pi}$. Therefore, by Theorem 6.4 there exists a Lorentzian manifold (\mathcal{M}, g) and an embedding pair (ϕ, ξ) , such that conditions 1.-4. hold, and $\frac{1}{2}\phi^*(\mathcal{L}_\xi g) = \mathbf{Y}$, with \mathbf{Y} given by (6.23).

Remark 6.9. Since $\bar{\alpha}, \bar{\omega}, \mathcal{T}$ are only defined on S , their gauge behaviours are only imposed therein.

Proof. Consider a basis $\{v_A\}$ of $\Gamma(TS)$, and extend it to \mathcal{H} by solving $\mathcal{L}_n v_A = 0$. Then $\{n, v_A\}$ form a basis of $\Gamma(T\mathcal{H})$ because $\det(\gamma(v_A, v_B))|_S \neq 0$ and $\mathcal{L}_n(\gamma(v_A, v_B)) = (\mathcal{L}_n \gamma)(v_A, v_B) = 2\mathbf{U}(v_A, v_B) = 0$. We now construct a function α , a one-form $\tilde{\omega}$ and a symmetric $(0,2)$ -tensor $\tilde{\Pi}$ such that conditions (6.20)-(6.22) of Theorem 6.4 hold:

1. We let $\alpha \in \mathcal{F}(\mathcal{H})$ be the only solution to the ODE $n(\alpha) = \kappa - \alpha f$ with initial data $\alpha \stackrel{S}{=} \bar{\alpha}$. Observe that the set $\{p \in \mathcal{H} : \alpha(p) = 0\}$ has empty interior on \mathcal{H} because $n(\alpha)|_p = \kappa|_p \neq 0$ at any point $p \in \mathcal{H}$ where $\alpha(p) = 0$.
2. To construct the one-form $\tilde{\omega} \in \Gamma(T^*\mathcal{H})$, we set its component along n to be given by $\tilde{\omega}(n) := f$, and the remaining components to be the unique solutions of the system of ODEs

$$\mathcal{L}_n(\tilde{\omega}(v_A)) = \tilde{\mathcal{R}}(n, v_A) + v_A(f), \quad \text{with} \quad \tilde{\omega}(v_A) \stackrel{S}{=} \bar{\omega}(v_A). \quad (6.30)$$

Note that $\kappa = n(\alpha) + \alpha \tilde{\omega}(n)$ by construction.

3. For the tensor $\tilde{\Pi}$, we proceed as follows:

(a) We set $\tilde{\Pi}(n, n) \stackrel{\text{def}}{=} n(\kappa)$.

(b) We let the components $\tilde{\Pi}(n, v_A)$ be the unique solutions of the system of ODEs

$$0 = \left(\mathcal{L}_n(\tilde{\Pi}_{ab} n^b) - \overset{\circ}{\nabla}_a(\tilde{\Pi}(n, n)) + 2\tilde{\Pi}(n, n)(s_a - \tilde{\omega}_a - \mathbf{Y}_{ab} n^b) - \alpha \mathcal{L}_n(\tilde{\mathcal{R}}_{ab} n^b) - n(\alpha) \tilde{\mathcal{R}}_{ab} n^b \right) v_A^a, \quad (6.31)$$

with initial data $\tilde{\Pi}(n, v_A) \stackrel{S}{=} \bar{\alpha} \tilde{\mathcal{R}}(n, v_A) + v_A(\kappa)$, and where \mathbf{Y} is defined by (6.23). Observe that (6.31) involves metric hypersurface data, the quantities α , $\tilde{\omega}$, $\tilde{\Pi}(n, n)$ and $\tilde{\mathcal{R}}$ which are already defined on \mathcal{H} , and the components $\tilde{\Pi}(n, v_A)$ (note that, besides in the term $\mathcal{L}_n(\tilde{\Pi}(n, v_A))$, they also appear algebraically inside $\mathbf{Y}(n, \cdot)$). The key point is that no terms of the form $\tilde{\Pi}(v_A, v_B)$ are present, hence (6.31) yields a unique solution for the components $\tilde{\Pi}(n, v_A)$.

(c) We let the components $\tilde{\Pi}(v_A, v_B)$ be the unique solutions of the system of ODEs

$$0 = \left((\mathcal{L}_n + \tilde{\omega}(n)) \tilde{\Pi}_{ab} - \overset{\circ}{\nabla}_{(a}(\tilde{\Pi}_{b)c} n^c) - \tilde{\Pi}(n, n) \mathbf{Y}_{ab} - 2\tilde{\omega}_{(a} \tilde{\Pi}_{b)c} n^c - \frac{\alpha}{2} \mathcal{L}_n \tilde{\mathcal{R}}_{ab} - (\overset{\circ}{\nabla}_{(a} \alpha) \tilde{\mathcal{R}}_{b)c} n^c \right) v_A^a v_B^b, \quad (6.32)$$

with initial data $\tilde{\Pi}(v_A, v_B) \stackrel{S}{=} \mathcal{T}(v_A, v_B)$, and where again \mathbf{Y} is given by (6.23).

Now that $\alpha, \tilde{\omega}, \tilde{\Pi}, \tilde{\mathcal{R}}$ are defined everywhere on \mathcal{H} , let us show that (I)-(IV) \implies (6.20)-(6.22). First, notice that (6.31) can be rewritten as

$$0 = \left(\mathcal{L}_n(\tilde{\Pi}_{ab}n^b - \alpha\tilde{\mathcal{R}}_{ab}n^b) - \overset{\circ}{\nabla}_a(\tilde{\Pi}(n, n)) + 2\tilde{\Pi}(n, n)(s_a - \tilde{\omega}_a - Y_{ab}n^b) \right) v_A^a. \quad (6.33)$$

On the other hand, contracting (6.23) with n^b , applying Lemma 6.2 with $\rho = \tilde{\omega}$, and using $n(\alpha) + \alpha\tilde{\omega}(n) = \kappa$ gives

$$-\kappa(s_a - \tilde{\omega}_a - Y_{ab}n^b) = \tilde{\Pi}_{ab}n^b - \frac{\alpha}{2}\mathcal{L}_n\tilde{\omega}_a - \overset{\circ}{\nabla}_a(n(\alpha)) - \frac{\alpha}{2}\overset{\circ}{\nabla}_a(\tilde{\omega}(n)) - \tilde{\omega}(n)\overset{\circ}{\nabla}_a\alpha - \frac{\alpha}{2}\tilde{\mathcal{R}}_{ab}n^b. \quad (6.34)$$

Inserting (6.34) into (6.33) and using (6.30), (a) and the fact that $v_A(n(\kappa)) = n(v_A(\kappa))$, one obtains

$$0 = \mathcal{L}_n\left(\tilde{\Pi}(n, v_A) - \alpha\tilde{\mathcal{R}}(n, v_A) - v_A(\kappa)\right) - \frac{2n(\kappa)}{\kappa}\left(\tilde{\Pi}(n, v_A) - \alpha\tilde{\mathcal{R}}(n, v_A) - v_A(\kappa)\right).$$

This is a system of ODEs for $\tilde{\Pi}(n, v_A) - \alpha\tilde{\mathcal{R}}(n, v_A) - v_A(\kappa)$ along the null generators of \mathcal{H} with vanishing initial data on S . Hence $\tilde{\Pi}(n, v_A) - \alpha\tilde{\mathcal{R}}(n, v_A) - v_A(\kappa) = 0$ is satisfied everywhere on \mathcal{H} . This proves that the contraction of (6.20) with v_A holds. For (6.20) to hold it only remains to verify that its contraction with n holds true, namely that $\tilde{\Pi}(n, n) = \alpha\tilde{\mathcal{R}}(n, n) + n(\kappa)$. This is automatically satisfied because $\tilde{\mathcal{R}}(n, n) = 0$ and we have enforced $\tilde{\Pi}(n, n) = n(\kappa)$.

To demonstrate (6.21) we combine (6.20), (6.30) and $\kappa = n(\alpha) + \alpha\tilde{\omega}(n)$ to get

$$\begin{aligned} 0 &= \tilde{\Pi}(n, v_A) - \alpha\tilde{\mathcal{R}}(n, v_A) - v_A(\kappa) = \tilde{\Pi}(n, v_A) - \alpha\left(\mathcal{L}_n(\tilde{\omega}(v_A)) - v_A(\tilde{\omega}(n))\right) - v_A(n(\alpha) + \alpha\tilde{\omega}(n)) \\ &= \tilde{\Pi}(n, v_A) - \alpha\mathcal{L}_n(\tilde{\omega}(v_A)) - v_A(\alpha\tilde{\omega}(n) - v_A(n(\alpha))). \end{aligned}$$

This establishes the validity of (6.21) contracted with v_A . Its contraction with n is $\tilde{\Pi}(n, n) = \alpha n(\tilde{\omega}(n)) + \tilde{\omega}(n)n(\alpha) + n(n(\alpha)) = n(\kappa)$, which is fulfilled by construction. Hence, (6.21) also holds.

Finally, to show that (6.22) is satisfied, we first note that (6.22) can be rewritten as

$$0 = (\mathcal{L}_n + \tilde{\omega}(n))\tilde{\Pi}_{ab} - \overset{\circ}{\nabla}_{(a}(\tilde{\Pi}_{b)c}n^c) - \tilde{\Pi}(n, n)Y_{ab} - 2\tilde{\omega}_{(a}\tilde{\Pi}_{b)c}n^c - \frac{\alpha}{2}\mathcal{L}_n\tilde{\mathcal{R}}_{ab} - (\overset{\circ}{\nabla}_{(a}\alpha)\tilde{\mathcal{R}}_{b)c}n^c \quad (6.35)$$

by using that the set $\{p \in \mathcal{H} : \alpha(p) = 0\}$ has empty interior on \mathcal{H} , together with (6.7) for $T = \tilde{\Pi}, \tilde{\mathcal{R}}$. To establish (6.35) we first note that its contraction with $v_A^a v_B^b$ is just (6.32), so it is verified by construction. Its contraction with $v_A^a n^b$ takes the form (6.31) after using (2.13) for $\theta = \tilde{\Pi}(n, \cdot)$ and $\tilde{\mathcal{R}}(n, n) = 0$, so it is also verified. Finally, the contraction of (6.35) with $n^a n^b$ is just $0 = \tilde{\Pi}(n, n)(\tilde{\omega}(n) + Y(n, n))$, but $\tilde{\omega}(n) + Y(n, n) = 0$ (as follows from multiplying (6.34) by n^a and using $\kappa = n(\alpha) + \alpha\tilde{\omega}(n)$ and $\tilde{\Pi}(n, n) = n(\kappa)$). So, all contractions of (6.35) are satisfied, and (6.22) holds. By how $\alpha, \tilde{\omega}, \tilde{\Pi}$ have been built, it is immediate that they satisfy $\tilde{\omega}(n) = f$, $\iota^*\alpha = \bar{\alpha}$, $\iota^*\tilde{\omega} = \bar{\omega}$ and $\iota^*\tilde{\Pi} = \mathcal{T}$.

Let us prove that $\alpha, \tilde{\omega}, \tilde{\Pi}$ have the gauge behaviours claimed in the theorem (and which are in accordance with the hypotheses (ii)-(iv) in Theorem 6.4). We consider gauge parameters $z \in \mathcal{F}^*(\mathcal{H}), V \in \Gamma(T\mathcal{H})$ and denote $\mathcal{G}_{(z, V)}$ -transformed quantities with a prime.

1. Using (2.25) and the gauge transformation of κ and f , it is immediate to get

$$n(\alpha) + \alpha f = \kappa = \kappa' = n'(\alpha') + \alpha' f' = n\left(\frac{\alpha'}{z}\right) + \frac{\alpha'}{z}f \implies 0 = n\left(\frac{\alpha'}{z} - \alpha\right) + \left(\frac{\alpha'}{z} - \alpha\right)f.$$

This is an ODE for $z^{-1}\alpha' - \alpha$ along the generators of \mathcal{H} , with vanishing initial data on S . Therefore, $\alpha' = z\alpha$ holds everywhere on \mathcal{H} .

2. To obtain the gauge-behaviour of $\tilde{\omega}$, we first notice that it satisfies

$$\mathcal{L}_n\tilde{\omega} = \tilde{\mathcal{R}}(n, \cdot) + df. \quad (6.36)$$

Indeed, its contraction with n is automatically satisfied because $\tilde{\mathcal{R}}(n, n) = 0$, and its contraction with v_A is just (6.30). The gauge-transformed $\tilde{\omega}'$ satisfies (6.36) with primes everywhere. Combining (6.36) and the gauge behaviour of f and $\tilde{\mathcal{R}}$, one finds

$$\begin{aligned} \mathcal{L}_n \left(\tilde{\omega}' - \left(\tilde{\omega} - \frac{dz}{z} \right) \right) &\stackrel{(2.25)}{=} z \mathcal{L}_{n'} \tilde{\omega}' + \tilde{\omega}'(n') dz - \mathcal{L}_n \tilde{\omega} + \frac{1}{z} d(n(z)) - \frac{n(z)}{z^2} dz \\ &\stackrel{(6.36)}{=} z df' + f' dz - df + \frac{1}{z} d(n(z)) - \frac{n(z)}{z^2} dz = 0. \end{aligned}$$

Again, since $\tilde{\omega}' - (\tilde{\omega} - z^{-1}dz) = 0$ on S , it follows that $\tilde{\omega}' = \tilde{\omega} - z^{-1}dz$ everywhere on \mathcal{H} .

3. Finally, to derive the transformation law of $\tilde{\Pi}$, we first note that

$$z^{-1} \tilde{\Pi}'(n, \cdot) \stackrel{(2.25)}{=} \tilde{\Pi}'(n', \cdot) \stackrel{(6.20)'}{=} \alpha' \tilde{\mathcal{R}}'(n', \cdot) + d\kappa' = \alpha \tilde{\mathcal{R}}(n, \cdot) + d\kappa \stackrel{(6.20)}{=} \tilde{\Pi}(n, \cdot), \quad (6.37)$$

so $\tilde{\Pi}'(n, \cdot) = z \tilde{\Pi}(n, \cdot)$. Observe that this states that $\tilde{\Pi}(n, \cdot)$ is gauge-invariant, which in turn is compatible with having imposed $n(\kappa) = \tilde{\Pi}(n, n)$. To obtain the gauge behaviour of the components $\tilde{\Pi}(v_A, v_B)$, we compute the $\mathcal{G}_{(z,V)}$ -transformation of (6.35). This requires the following two gauge-behaviours:

$$\left(\overset{\circ}{\nabla}_{(a} (\tilde{\Pi}_{b)c} n^c) \right)' = \overset{\circ}{\nabla}_{(a} (\tilde{\Pi}_{b)c} n^c) - \frac{\tilde{\Pi}(n, n)}{2z} \left(\mathcal{L}_{zV} \gamma_{ab} + 2\ell_{(a} \overset{\circ}{\nabla}_{b)} z \right), \quad (6.38)$$

$$\left(\kappa Y_{ab} - \tilde{\Pi}_{ab} \right)' = \kappa \left(z Y_{ab} + \ell_{(a} \overset{\circ}{\nabla}_{b)} z + \frac{1}{2} \mathcal{L}_{zV} \gamma_{ab} \right) - z \tilde{\Pi}_{ab}. \quad (6.39)$$

The first one uses (2.29) and the already mentioned gauge-invariance of $\tilde{\Pi}(n, \cdot)$. The second one requires a longer computation. An important step in the derivation is the property that $\overset{\circ}{R}_{(ab)} - \overset{\circ}{\nabla}_{(a} s_{b)} + s_a s_b$ is gauge invariant when $\mathbf{U} = 0$. This was already established under $\mathcal{G}_{(z,0)}$ -transformations in [42, Cor. 2.5]. For $\mathcal{G}_{(1,V)}$ -transformations, the result is a consequence of (2.27), (2.29) and $\overset{\circ}{\nabla}_a \gamma_{bc} \stackrel{(2.10)}{=} 0$, together with the general relation $\overset{\circ}{R}'_{ab} = \overset{\circ}{R}_{ab} + 2\overset{\circ}{\nabla}_{[c} C^c_{b]a} + 2C^c_{d[c} C^d_{b]a}$ between the Ricci tensors of two connections that differ by a tensor C . In the present case $C \stackrel{\text{def}}{=} \overset{\circ}{\nabla}' - \overset{\circ}{\nabla} = z^{-1} n \otimes \left(\frac{1}{2} \mathcal{L}_{zV} \gamma + \ell \otimes_s dz \right)$ by (2.29). With the gauge invariance of $\overset{\circ}{R}_{(ab)} - \overset{\circ}{\nabla}_{(a} s_{b)} + s_a s_b$ at hand, expression (6.39) follows from (6.23) after using (2.29), the already established gauge behaviours $\alpha' = z\alpha$ and $\tilde{\omega}' = \tilde{\omega} - z^{-1}dz$ as well as the gauge invariance of $\tilde{\mathcal{R}}$ and κ . We now compute

$$\begin{aligned} &\frac{1}{z} \mathcal{L}_n \tilde{\Pi}'_{ab} \stackrel{(2.25)}{=} \mathcal{L}_{n'} \tilde{\Pi}'_{ab} + \frac{2\overset{\circ}{\nabla}_{(a} z}{z} \tilde{\Pi}_{b)c} n^c \stackrel{(6.35)'}{=} -\tilde{\omega}'(n') \tilde{\Pi}'_{ab} + \overset{\circ}{\nabla}'_{(a} (\tilde{\Pi}'_{b)c} n'^c) + \tilde{\Pi}'(n', n') Y'_{ab} \\ &\quad + 2\tilde{\omega}'_{(a} \tilde{\Pi}'_{b)c} n'^c + \frac{\alpha'}{2} \mathcal{L}_{n'} \tilde{\mathcal{R}}'_{ab} + (\overset{\circ}{\nabla}'_{(a} \alpha') \tilde{\mathcal{R}}'_{b)c} n'^c + \frac{2\overset{\circ}{\nabla}_{(a} z}{z} \tilde{\Pi}_{b)c} n^c \\ &\stackrel{(6.38)}{=} -\frac{1}{z} \left(\tilde{\omega}(n) - \frac{n(z)}{z} \right) \tilde{\Pi}'_{ab} + \overset{\circ}{\nabla}_{(a} (\tilde{\Pi}_{b)c} n^c) + \tilde{\Pi}(n, n) \left(Y_{ab} + \frac{1}{\kappa z} (\tilde{\Pi}'_{ab} - z \tilde{\Pi}_{ab}) \right) \\ &\stackrel{(6.39)}{=} -\frac{1}{z} \left(\tilde{\omega}(n) - \frac{n(z)}{z} \right) \tilde{\Pi}'_{ab} + \frac{\alpha}{2} \mathcal{L}_n \tilde{\mathcal{R}}_{ab} + (\overset{\circ}{\nabla}_{(a} \alpha) \tilde{\mathcal{R}}_{b)c} n^c \\ &\stackrel{(6.35)}{=} -\frac{1}{z} \left(\tilde{\omega}(n) - \frac{n(z)}{z} \right) \tilde{\Pi}'_{ab} + (\mathcal{L}_n + \tilde{\omega}(n)) \tilde{\Pi}_{ab} + \frac{\tilde{\Pi}(n, n)}{\kappa z} (\tilde{\Pi}'_{ab} - z \tilde{\Pi}_{ab}) \\ \implies &0 = \left(\mathcal{L}_n + \tilde{\omega}(n) - \frac{n(z)}{z} - \frac{\tilde{\Pi}(n, n)}{\kappa} \right) (\tilde{\Pi}'_{ab} - z \tilde{\Pi}_{ab}). \end{aligned}$$

This is a system of ODEs for all components of $\tilde{\Pi}' - z \tilde{\Pi}$ along the null generators, with vanishing

initial data on S . Therefore, $\mathcal{G}_{(z,V)}(\tilde{\Pi}) = z\tilde{\Pi}$ everywhere on \mathcal{H} .

We conclude that the data $\{\mathcal{H}, \gamma, \ell, \ell^{(2)}, \alpha, \tilde{\omega}, \tilde{\Pi}, \tilde{\mathcal{R}}\}$ satisfies all the hypotheses of Theorem 6.4, and the last statement in the theorem is justified. \square

We conclude the paper with some comments on Theorems 6.4 and 6.8.

Remark 6.10. *The only restriction imposed on the tensor $\tilde{\mathcal{R}}$ prescribed in Theorems 6.4 and 6.8 is $\tilde{\mathcal{R}}(n, n) = 0$. This, as mentioned in Remark 6.7, is necessary for $\tilde{\mathcal{R}}$ to be consistent with the Raychaudhuri equation (2.21) with $\mathbf{U} = 0$. Except for this, no other condition is imposed, such as e.g. $\tilde{\mathcal{R}}$ being zero or proportional to γ . Theorems 6.4 and 6.8 are hence independent of any field equations.*

Remark 6.11. *In [41, 42], the authors introduce the notion of abstract Killing horizon data. This consists of null metric hypersurface data $\{\mathcal{H}, \gamma, \ell, \ell^{(2)}\}$ with $\mathbf{U} = 0$, a smooth function $\alpha \in \mathcal{F}(\mathcal{H})$ whose zero set has empty interior on \mathcal{H} , and a one-form $\tau \in \Gamma(T^*\mathcal{H})$ satisfying the conditions*

$$(a) \quad \alpha \mathcal{L}_n \tau = n(\alpha) \tau - \tau(n) d\alpha, \quad \text{and} \quad (b) \quad \alpha^{-1}(\tau - d\alpha) \text{ extends smoothly to all } \mathcal{H}.$$

The link between the one-form τ and $\omega \stackrel{\text{def}}{=} s - r$ is given by $\tau = d\alpha + \alpha\omega$, so condition (b) is automatically satisfied in our case. On the other hand, condition (a) gets rewritten in terms of ω as

$$0 = \mathcal{L}_n \omega + \omega(n) d\alpha + d(n(\alpha)).$$

This corresponds to (6.21) with $\tilde{\Pi} = 0$, which is consistent with the fact that Killing horizons have vanishing non-isolation tensor (cf. Remark 4.10). The problem of existence of a Λ -vacuum spacetime where a given abstract Killing horizon data can be embedded was analyzed in [42, Thm. 5.8], where it was found that it is sufficient to complement (a)-(b) with the condition that $\tau(n)$ is constant and non-zero. Since $\tau(n)$ is precisely κ , this constancy of κ is just (6.20). No trace of condition (6.22) appeared in [42], as in the Λ -vacuum case $\tilde{\mathcal{R}} = \Lambda\gamma$ and hence (6.22) is automatically satisfied whenever $\tilde{\Pi} = 0$.

All in all, the results in this section can be viewed as a generalization from the Killing horizon case in Λ -vacuum to the case of arbitrary vector fields $\bar{\eta}$ with no restrictions on the field equations. For such general setting we have demonstrated that (6.20) and (6.21) are not sufficient by themselves and they must be supplemented with (6.22) in order to guarantee the existence of a spacetime where the data can be embedded.

Remark 6.12. *When the null metric hypersurface data $\{\mathcal{H}, \gamma, \ell, \ell^{(2)}\}$ admits a cross-section S , the function f in Theorem 6.8 can be chosen to be zero without loss of generality. Indeed, for any choice of f , the ODE $n(\ln(z)) \stackrel{\mathcal{H}}{=} f$ admits a unique solution z for given initial data $z|_S \neq 0$ on S (and z must be no-where zero, because if $z(p) = 0$ at some $p \in \mathcal{H}$ then $n(z)|_p = 0$, and z would vanish everywhere along the null generator σ_p containing p , in particular at $\sigma_p \cap S$). One can therefore take $z, V \in \Gamma(T\mathcal{H})$ as gauge parameters, and construct a Lorentzian manifold (\mathcal{M}, g) according to Theorem 6.8, with $f' \stackrel{\text{def}}{=} \mathcal{G}_{(z,V)}(f) = 0$. Note that $n(\alpha) = \kappa \neq 0$ in this case, which implies that α vanishes at most at one point along each null generator of \mathcal{H} .*

Remark 6.13. *Theorem 6.8 naturally raises the question of under which conditions the constructed Lorentzian manifold (\mathcal{M}, g) admits a horizon, and if so, what are its defining properties. To address this issue, let us consider null metric data $\{\mathcal{H}, \gamma, \ell, \ell^{(2)}\}$ with $\mathbf{U} = 0$ and admitting a cross-section S , and prescribe $\kappa, f, \bar{\alpha}, \bar{\omega}$ and $\mathcal{T} = 0^3$ satisfying conditions (I)-(III) of Theorem 6.8, with the additional*

³Note that this requirement is gauge-invariant, as $\mathcal{G}_{(z,V)}(\mathcal{T}) \stackrel{S}{=} z\mathcal{T}$.

restriction that $n(\kappa) = 0$ on \mathcal{H} . We can then build the function α as in the proof of Theorem 6.8 (note that $\tilde{\mathcal{R}}$ plays no role in this construction), and define the vector field $\bar{\eta} \stackrel{\text{def}}{=} \alpha n$ on \mathcal{H} . Our aim now is to first find a suitable tensor $\tilde{\mathcal{R}}$ fulfilling condition (IV) of Theorem 6.8, and then construct the manifold (\mathcal{M}, g) and an extension $\eta \in \Gamma(T\mathcal{M})$ of $\phi_* \bar{\eta}$ so that

$$\mathcal{K}[\eta] \stackrel{\phi(\mathcal{H})}{=} 0; \quad (6.40) \quad \phi^*(\mathcal{L}_\xi \mathcal{K}[\eta]) = 0. \quad (6.41)$$

We let $\{n, v_A\}$ be a basis of $\Gamma(T\mathcal{H})$ such that $\mathcal{L}_n v_A \stackrel{\mathcal{H}}{=} 0$ and $v_A|_S \in \Gamma(TS)$, and $\tilde{\mathcal{R}}$ be a smooth, symmetric and gauge-invariant $(0, 2)$ -tensor field on \mathcal{H} satisfying

$$\alpha \tilde{\mathcal{R}}(n, \cdot) + d\kappa \stackrel{\mathcal{H}}{=} 0, \quad (6.42) \quad \left(\alpha \mathcal{L}_n \tilde{\mathcal{R}} + 2d\alpha \otimes_s \tilde{\mathcal{R}}(n, \cdot) \right)(v_A, v_B) \stackrel{\mathcal{H}}{=} 0. \quad (6.43)$$

Observe that the contraction of (6.42) with n yields $\alpha \tilde{\mathcal{R}}(n, n) \stackrel{\mathcal{H}}{=} 0$, and since the zero set of α has empty interior on \mathcal{H} (see the proof of Theorem 6.8), $\tilde{\mathcal{R}}(n, n) \stackrel{\mathcal{H}}{=} 0$ and $\tilde{\mathcal{R}}$ is in accordance with (IV). Now, we construct $\tilde{\Pi}(n, \cdot)$ as in the proof of Theorem 6.8. Observe that this tensor satisfies $\tilde{\Pi}(n, \cdot) = 0$ (because $\tilde{\Pi}(n, n) = n(\kappa) = 0$ and $\tilde{\Pi}(n, v_A) = \alpha \tilde{\mathcal{R}}(n, v_A) + v_A(\kappa) = 0$). Moreover, inserting $\tilde{\Pi}(n, \cdot) = 0$ and (6.43) into (6.32) gives

$$0 = (\mathcal{L}_n + \tilde{\omega}(n)) \tilde{\Pi}(v_A, v_B),$$

and since $\tilde{\Pi}(v_A, v_B)|_S = \mathcal{T}(v_A, v_B) = 0$, it follows that $\tilde{\Pi} = 0$ everywhere on \mathcal{H} .

At this point, we can construct a Lorentzian manifold (\mathcal{M}, g) according to Theorem 6.8, and check whether conditions (6.40)-(6.41) are fulfilled. We first notice that the data $\{\mathcal{H}, \gamma, \ell, \ell^{(2)}\}$ can always be supplemented with the function α (which satisfies $\mathcal{G}_{(z, V)}(\alpha) = z\alpha$, as already proven), a function $\mathfrak{p} \in \mathcal{F}(\mathcal{H})$ and a covector $\mathfrak{q} \in \Gamma(T^*\mathcal{H})$ with gauge behaviours (4.1). Then $\{\mathcal{H}, \gamma, \ell, \ell^{(2)}, \alpha, \mathfrak{p}, \mathfrak{q}\}$ is a metric \mathcal{K} -tuple and, by Proposition 4.5, it is (ϕ, ξ) -embedded in (\mathcal{M}, g) if and only if the extension η satisfies (4.6), in which case $\phi^* \mathcal{K}[\eta] = 2\alpha \mathbf{U} = 0$, $\phi^*(\mathcal{K}[\eta](\xi, \cdot)) = \mathfrak{q}$ and $\phi^*(\mathcal{K}[\eta](\xi, \xi)) = \mathfrak{p}$ (cf. Definition 4.2). Thus, for (6.40) to hold it suffices to fix $\mathfrak{q} = 0$ and $\mathfrak{p} = 0$, or equivalently the first transverse derivative of η to be given by (cf. Proposition 4.5)

$$\mathcal{L}_\xi \eta \stackrel{\phi(\mathcal{H})}{=} -n(\alpha)\xi - \phi_* \left(\frac{\alpha}{2} n(\ell^{(2)}) n + P(2\alpha s + d\alpha, \cdot) \right). \quad (6.44)$$

Finally, condition (6.41) is equivalent to $\tilde{\Pi} \stackrel{\mathcal{H}}{=} 0$ (or $\Pi^\eta \stackrel{\mathcal{H}}{=} 0$, by item 3. of Theorem 6.4). This follows from (4.13), since in the present case $\mathcal{W}|_{\phi(\mathcal{H})} = 0$ and $\phi^*(\mathcal{L}_\mathcal{W} g)$ only depends on the values of \mathcal{W} at $\phi(\mathcal{H})$. Both (6.40) and (6.41) hold, therefore $\phi(\mathcal{H})$ is a horizon in the sense that (\mathcal{M}, g) admits a vector η , null and tangent to $\phi(\mathcal{H})$, which also verifies $(\mathcal{L}_\eta g)|_{\phi(\mathcal{H})} = 0$ and $\phi^*(\mathcal{L}_\xi \mathcal{L}_\eta g) = 0$. Note that the condition $n(\kappa) = 0$ that we have imposed in this construction is necessary, otherwise $\tilde{\Pi}(n, n)$ cannot vanish identically (cf. proof of Theorem 6.8).

Acknowledgements

Both authors acknowledge funding from the grant PID2024-158938NB-I00 funded by MICIU/AEI/10.13039/501100011033 and by “ERDF A way of making Europe”. In addition, M. Mars acknowledges financial support under projects SA097P24 (JCyL) and RED2022-134301-T funded by MCIN/AEI/10.13039/501100011033, whereas M. Manzano acknowledges the Austrian Science Fund (FWF) [Grant DOI 10.55776/EFP6].

References

- [1] A. Alaei, M. Khuri, and H. Kunduri. Existence and uniqueness of near-horizon geometries for 5-dimensional black holes. *Journal of Geometry and Physics*, 144:370–387, 2019.
- [2] A. Ashtekar, C. Beetle, O. Dreyer, S. Fairhurst, B. Krishnan, J. Lewandowski, and J. Wiśniewski. Generic isolated horizons and their applications. *Physical Review Letters*, 85(17):3564, 2000.
- [3] A. Ashtekar, C. Beetle, and J. Lewandowski. Geometry of generic isolated horizons. *Classical and Quantum Gravity*, 19(6):1195, 2002.
- [4] A. Ashtekar, S. Fairhurst, and B. Krishnan. Isolated horizons: Hamiltonian evolution and the first law. *Physical Review D*, 62(10):104025, 2000.
- [5] A. Ashtekar and S. Speziale. Null infinity as a weakly isolated horizon. *Physical Review D*, 110(4):044048, 2024.
- [6] E. Bahuaud, S. Gunasekaran, H. K. Kunduri, and E. Woolgar. Static near-horizon geometries and rigidity of quasi-Einstein manifolds. *Letters in Mathematical Physics*, 112(6):116, 2022.
- [7] P. T. Chruściel. On analyticity of static vacuum metrics at nondegenerate horizons. *Acta Physica Polonica B*, 36:17–26, 2005.
- [8] P. T. Chruściel, J. L. Costa, and M. Heusler. Stationary black holes: Uniqueness and beyond. *Living Reviews in Relativity*, 15(1):1–73, 2012.
- [9] P. T. Chruściel, H. S. Reall, and P. Tod. On non-existence of static vacuum black holes with degenerate components of the event horizon. *Classical and Quantum Gravity*, 23(2):549, 2005.
- [10] P. T. Chruściel and M. Mars. On staticity of bifurcate Killing horizons. *Classical and Quantum Gravity*, 40(22):225012, 2023.
- [11] P. T. Chruściel and T.-T. Paetz. The many ways of the characteristic cauchy problem. *Classical and Quantum Gravity*, 29(14):145006, 2012.
- [12] D. Dobkowski-Ryłko, W. Kamiński, J. Lewandowski, and A. Szereszewski. The Near Horizon Geometry equation on compact 2-manifolds including the general solution for $g > 0$. *Physics Letters B*, 785:381–385, 2018.
- [13] M. Dunajski, J. Gutowski, and W. Sabra. Einstein–Weyl spaces and near-horizon geometry. *Classical and Quantum Gravity*, 34(4):045009, 2017.
- [14] M. Dunajski and J. Lucietti. Intrinsic rigidity of extremal horizons. *ArXiv:2306.17512*, 2025.
- [15] C. Fefferman and C. R. Graham. Conformal invariants. “Elie Cartan et les Mathématiques d’Aujourd’hui,” *Asterisque*, hors serie, pages 95–116, 1985.
- [16] C. Fefferman and C. R. Graham. *The Ambient Metric*. Princeton University Press, 2012.
- [17] V. Frolov and I. Novikov. *Black hole physics: basic concepts and new developments*, volume 96. Springer Science & Business Media, 2012.

- [18] E. Gourgoulhon and J. L. Jaramillo. A $3 + 1$ perspective on null hypersurfaces and isolated horizons. *Physics Reports*, 423:159–294, 2006.
- [19] C. Gundlach and J. M. Martin-Garcia. Critical phenomena in gravitational collapse. *Living Reviews in Relativity*, 10(1):5, 2007.
- [20] R. A. Hounnonkpe and E. Minguzzi. Horizon classification via Riemannian flows. In *Annales Henri Poincaré*, pages 1–33, 2025.
- [21] J. L. Jaramillo. Isolated horizon structures in quasiequilibrium black hole initial data. *Physical Review D*, 79(8):087506, 2009.
- [22] D. Katona and J. Lucietti. Uniqueness of the extremal Schwarzschild de Sitter spacetime. *Letters in Mathematical Physics*, 114(1):18, 2024.
- [23] B. Krishnan. Isolated Horizons in Numerical Relativity. PhD thesis, The Pennsylvania State University, University Park, U.S.A., 2002.
- [24] K. Kroenke and O. Petersen. The Asymptotic Expansion of the Spacetime Metric at the Event Horizon. *Annales Henri Poincaré*, 26:2315–2353, 2025.
- [25] H. K. Kunduri and J. Lucietti. A classification of near-horizon geometries of extremal vacuum black holes. *Journal of mathematical physics*, 50(8), 2009.
- [26] H. K. Kunduri and J. Lucietti. Static near-horizon geometries in five dimensions. *Classical and Quantum Gravity*, 26(24):245010, 2009.
- [27] H. K. Kunduri and J. Lucietti. Uniqueness of near-horizon geometries of rotating extremal AdS_4 black holes. *Classical and Quantum Gravity*, 26(5):055019, 2009.
- [28] H. K. Kunduri and J. Lucietti. Classification of near-horizon geometries of extremal black holes. *Living Reviews in Relativity*, 16:1–71, 2013.
- [29] J. Lewandowski and T. Pawłowski. Extremal isolated horizons: a local uniqueness theorem. *Classical and Quantum Gravity*, 20(4):587, 2003.
- [30] M. Manzano and M. Mars. Abstract formulation of the spacetime matching problem and null thin shells. *Physical Review D*, 109:044050, 2024.
- [31] M. Manzano and M. Mars. Null hypersurface data and ambient vector fields: Killing horizons of order zero and one. *Physical Review D*, 110:044070, 2024.
- [32] M. Manzano and M. Mars. The constraint tensor for null hypersurfaces. *Journal of Geometry and Physics*, 208:105375, 2025.
- [33] M. Mars. Stability of MOTS in totally geodesic null horizons. *Classical and Quantum Gravity*, 29(14):145019, 2012.
- [34] M. Mars. Constraint equations for general hypersurfaces and applications to shells. *General Relativity and Gravitation*, 45:2175–2221, 2013.
- [35] M. Mars. Hypersurface data: general properties and Birkhoff theorem in spherical symmetry. *Mediterranean Journal of Mathematics*, 17:1–45, 2020.

- [36] M. Mars. Abstract null geometry, energy-momentum map and applications to the constraint tensor. *Beijing Journal of Pure and Applied Mathematics*, 1(2):797–852, 2025.
- [37] M. Mars, T.-T. Paetz, and J. M. M. Senovilla. Multiple Killing horizons. *Classical and Quantum Gravity*, 35(15):155015, 2018.
- [38] M. Mars and G. Sánchez-Pérez. Double Null Data and the Characteristic Problem in General Relativity. *Journal of Physics A: Mathematical and Theoretical*, 56(3):035203, 2023.
- [39] M. Mars and G. Sánchez-Pérez. Covariant definition of Double Null Data and geometric uniqueness of the characteristic initial value problem. *Journal of Physics A: Mathematical and Theoretical*, 56(25):255203, 2023.
- [40] M. Mars and J. M. M. Senovilla. Geometry of General Hypersurfaces in Spacetime: Junction Conditions. *Classical and Quantum Gravity*, 10:1865, 1993.
- [41] M. Mars and G. Sánchez-Pérez. Transverse expansion of the metric at null hypersurfaces I. Uniqueness and application to Killing horizons. *Journal of Geometry and Physics*, 209:105416, 2025.
- [42] M. Mars and G. Sánchez-Pérez. Transverse expansion of the metric at null hypersurfaces II. Existence results and application to Killing horizons. *Journal of Geometry and Physics*, 217:105605, 2025.
- [43] M. Mars and G. Sánchez-Pérez. Killing and homothetic initial data for general hypersurfaces. *Classical and Quantum Gravity*, 42(12):125001, 2025.
- [44] D. Matejov and J. Podolský. Uniqueness of extremal isolated horizons and their identification with horizons of all type d black holes. *Classical and Quantum Gravity*, 38(13):135032, 2021.
- [45] V. Moncrief. Neighborhoods of Cauchy horizons in cosmological spacetimes with one Killing field. *Annals of Physics*, 141(1):83–103, 1982.
- [46] K. Moore and E. Woolgar. Bakry–émery Ricci curvature, x -minimal hypersurfaces, and near horizon geometries. *Journal of Mathematical Physics*, 64(2):022504, 2023.
- [47] R. Penrose. Gravitational collapse: The role of General Relativity. *Nuovo Cimento*, 1:252, 1969.
- [48] I. Rodnianski and Y. Shlapentokh-Rothman. The Asymptotically Self-Similar Regime for the Einstein Vacuum Equations. *Geometric and Functional Analysis*, 28(3):755–878, 2018.
- [49] I. Rácz. Stationary black holes as holographs. *Classical and Quantum Gravity*, 24(22):5541, 2007.
- [50] J. M. M. Senovilla. Singularity theorems and their consequences. *General Relativity and Gravitation*, 30(5):701–848, 1998.
- [51] R. M. Wald. *General Relativity*. Chicago, University of Chicago Press, 1984.
- [52] W. Wylie. Rigidity of compact static near-horizon geometries with negative cosmological constant. *Letters in Mathematical Physics*, 113, 2023.
- [53] K. Yano. *The Theory of Lie Derivatives and Its Applications*. North-Holland Publishing CO, 1957.