

6-6-2017

# Magnetic Fields Threading Black Holes: Restrictions from General Relativity and Implications for Astrophysical Black Holes

David Garofalo

*Kennesaw State University*, [dgarofal@kennesaw.edu](mailto:dgarofal@kennesaw.edu)

Follow this and additional works at: <https://digitalcommons.kennesaw.edu/facpubs>



Part of the [Cosmology, Relativity, and Gravity Commons](#)

---

## Recommended Citation

Garofalo, D. *Astrophys Space Sci* (2017) 362: 121. doi:10.1007/s10509-017-3108-x

This Article is brought to you for free and open access by DigitalCommons@Kennesaw State University. It has been accepted for inclusion in Faculty Publications by an authorized administrator of DigitalCommons@Kennesaw State University. For more information, please contact [digitalcommons@kennesaw.edu](mailto:digitalcommons@kennesaw.edu).

# Magnetic fields threading black holes: restrictions from general relativity and implications for astrophysical black holes

David Garofalo<sup>1</sup>

Received: 26 April 2017 / Accepted: 24 May 2017  
© Springer Science+Business Media Dordrecht

**Abstract** The idea that black hole spin is instrumental in the generation of powerful jets in active galactic nuclei and X-ray binaries is arguably the most contentious claim in black hole astrophysics. Because jets are thought to originate in the context of electromagnetism, and the modeling of Maxwell fields in curved spacetime around black holes is challenging, various approximations are made in numerical simulations that fall under the guise of ‘ideal magneto-hydrodynamics’. But the simplifications of this framework may struggle to capture relevant details of real astrophysical environments near black holes. In this work, we highlight tension between analytic and numerical results, specifically between the analytically derived conserved Noether currents for rotating black hole spacetimes and the results of general relativistic numerical simulations (GRMHD). While we cannot definitively attribute the issue to any specific approximation used in the numerical schemes, there seem to be natural candidates, which we explore. GRMHD notwithstanding, if electromagnetic fields around rotating black holes are brought to the hole by accretion, we show from first principles that prograde accreting disks likely experience weaker large-scale black hole-threading fields, implying weaker jets than in retrograde configurations.

**Keywords** Black holes; Jets

## 1 Introduction

The advent of general relativistic simulations (Koide et al. 1998, 2000; De Villiers and Hawley 2003; De Villiers

et al. 2003, 2005; Gammie et al. 2003; Komissarov 2004; McKinney and Gammie 2004; McKinney 2006) of electromagnetic fields threading black holes required about two decades from the seminal analytic exploration of Blandford & Znajek (1977; henceforth BZ). But the BZ solution and numerical simulations have for the most part parted ways. For example, the BZ notion that the entire region outside the black hole and accretion disk behaves as though gravitational forces are negligible (the so-called force-free assumption), is not generally accepted. While simulations find that force-freeness in the polar region near black holes seems reasonable, plasma inertia becomes important elsewhere (Hirose et al. 2004; however see Komissarov 2004). Despite the fact that numerical simulations have made our exploration of black hole magnetospheres more realistic, there are crucial assumptions that may be problematic. Among these is the idea that the initial electromagnetic field within the accretion disk is independent of any detailed properties of the disk. In other words, in the initial setup for the simulations, conditions must be imposed on the electromagnetic field, but the nature of this setup is difficult to determine because we do not understand how these fields make their way into the inner disk region in the first place. Therefore, initial conditions are employed that may not be compatible with the physical principles that are operative in such environments. The assumed initial conditions may be in conflict with the way that the fields originate near the hole either by dynamo enhancement (Livio 2001; Beckwith et al 2011) or by inwards advection from elsewhere (Lubow et al. 1994; Heyvaerts et al. 1996). This question of the advection versus the dynamo origin of the large-scale electromagnetic field threading the black hole remains unresolved. In addition to the issue of the initial conditions on the field, GRMHD simulations solve what are known as the ‘ideal MHD’ equations in curved spacetime, representing approximations that likely

✉ D. Garofalo  
dgarofal@kennesaw.edu

<sup>1</sup> Department of Physics, Kennesaw State University, Marietta, GA 30060, USA

break down in the violent environment near black holes. Perhaps most importantly, however, GRMHD simulations are constrained in their treatment of the microscopic physics due to limitations in resolution. It is to these issues that we will appeal to in trying to understand the tension that emerges between basic principles and GRMHD results.

Our primary goal in this paper, however, is to derive constraints on the strength of the black hole-threading electromagnetic field from first principles. Because the energy allotted to the electromagnetic field comes from the total reservoir of energy available to the accreting black hole, the ways that accreting black holes can transfer energy is not arbitrary, but constrained by the specifics of the accretion process. As mentioned, the large-scale field is most likely either created in-situ by a disk dynamo, advected inwards from elsewhere, or some combination of the two processes. Under the assumption that these are the processes that determine the large-scale field, we identify constraints within general relativity on the energy transferrable to the large-scale field, and that such constraints fit uncomfortably within the picture emerging from GRMHD simulations.

In Sect. 2 we appeal to Noether’s theorem to obtain the conserved energy at infinity for an accretion disk around a rotating black hole in Kerr spacetime and derive the black hole spin constraints. These constitute well known results that when coupled to our emerging understanding of how accretion operates, produce powerful constraints. In Sect. 3 we discuss the implications for numerical simulations. In Sect. 4 we summarize and conclude.

## 2 A Kerr black hole: Noether current and energy conservation

From the recognition that

$$\mathcal{L}_K g_{ab} = 0, \tag{1}$$

where  $\mathcal{L}$  is the Lie derivative,  $g_{ab}$  is the metric, and  $K^a$  is a vector field,

$$K_{b;a} + K_{a;b} = 0, \tag{2}$$

which, via Noether’s theorem, implies the following conservation law

$$(K_b T^{ab})_{;a} = 0. \tag{3}$$

If  $K^a$  is the Killing vector associated with time translation,

$$C^a = K_b T^{ab} \tag{4}$$

is a conserved 4-vector corresponding to the flux of energy measured at radial infinity. Since

$$T^{ab} = T_{\text{matter}}^{ab} + T_{\text{E\&M}}^{ab} \tag{5}$$

where  $T_{\text{matter}}^{ab}$  is the matter part of the stress-energy tensor and  $T_{\text{E\&M}}^{ab}$  is the electromagnetic part of the stress-energy tensor, and the fact that

$$C^a = K_b (T_{\text{matter}}^{ab} + T_{\text{E\&M}}^{ab}), \tag{6}$$

the time-independence of the Kerr metric gives us a conserved energy with an exchange of that conserved energy between  $T_{\text{matter}}$  and  $T_{\text{E\&M}}$  but with the total remaining constant. This is all well understood. However, we now show that the mechanism providing the black hole with its large-scale electromagnetic field requires energy to be transferred from matter to electromagnetic fields in a way that depends on the value of the spin of the black hole, thus providing us with constraints on the strength of large-scale electromagnetic fields around rotating black holes. If the physical system under consideration involves the accretion of matter about a rotating black hole operating via the magnetorotational instability (MRI) for the transfer of energy and angular momentum, then the Killing vector  $K^a$  can be used to construct a conservation law for the circular geodesic orbits of the accretion disk. More specifically, we build on the analysis of Garofalo (2009) who evaluates


$$K_b p^b \tag{7}$$

and

$$L_b p^b \tag{8}$$

in Boyer–Lindquist coordinates, with  $p^a$  and  $L^a$  the 4-momentum vector for circular geodesics in the accretion disk and the Killing vector associated with azimuthal invariance of the Kerr metric, respectively, showing that a factor of 60 greater work (in the sense of a work-kinetic energy theorem) is needed in the high prograde regime compared to the high retrograde accretion regime. In other words, in order to produce a fixed accretion rate, the high prograde accreting disk will have to place 60 times as much of the conserved energy in electromagnetic form in the accretion disk compared to the high retrograde case. That analysis is done for the inner disk and therefore ignores the fact that retrograde and prograde disks live in different regions of the gravitational potential of the black hole, a crucial recognition. We generalize that result and show that it is true regardless of the region of the disk that is taken into analysis in the sense that it is true for the entire disk. The focal point in the current analysis, however, will be that while a greater total energy is available in the prograde regime, that additional energy is unlikely to end up in the large scale electromagnetic field in the proportions needed to thread prograde accreting black holes with stronger electromagnetic fields. This analysis occurs in Sect. 3.

Working with (7) and (8) which give us the conserved energy and angular momentum for circular geodesic orbits in the accretion disk, in units where  $c = G = M = 1$  ( $M$  the




**Fig. 1** Work versus spin required to produce a fixed accretion rate needed to extract a dimensionless angular momentum of 0.15 from the disk. The amount of electromagnetic energy required as input into the accretion disk at high prograde spin (*far right*) is about 2.2 times larger than at high retrograde spin (*far left*)

black hole mass,  $a$  the black hole spin, and  $r$  the radial coordinate) we obtain the following equations for prograde and retrograde disks (Bardeen et al. 1972).

$$\begin{aligned}
 E_{pro} &= (r^{3/2} - 2r^{1/2} + a)/(r^{3/4}(r^{3/2} - 3r^{1/2} + 2a)^{1/2}), \\
 E_{retro} &= (r^{3/2} - 2r^{1/2} - a)/(r^{3/4}(r^{3/2} - 3r^{1/2} - 2a)^{1/2}), \\
 L_{pro} &= (r^2 - 2ar^{1/2} + a^2)/(r^{3/4}(r^{3/2} - 3r^{1/2} + 2a)^{1/2}), \\
 L_{retro} &= (r^2 + 2ar^{1/2} + a^2)/(r^{3/4}(r^{3/2} - 3r^{1/2} - 2a)^{1/2}).
 \end{aligned}$$

From these we can determine the energy in electromagnetic form that is required in the accretion disk to produce the extraction of a fixed amount of angular momentum by evaluating differences in energy and angular momentum for specified regions of the disk. Our analysis does not require any complex computational strategies and can easily be reproduced. Equations (4) and (5) tell us that the conserved energy in the accretion disk amounts to a combination of matter and electromagnetic contributions. Therefore, as a greater amount of the total energy goes into electromagnetic form in order to ensure that the necessary angular momentum is extracted as determined by (8), less of that total is available for largescale electromagnetic fields threading the accretion disk. This is shown in Fig. 1, which tells us how this process depends on black hole spin and the orientation of the accretion disk. In particular, note the difference at the extremes of disk orientation, near the high spin regime. There is about a factor of 2.2 difference in energy. Because electromagnetic field energy goes like fields squared, largescale electromagnetic fields threading high spinning prograde accreting black holes should suffer a drop of about a factor of 1.48.

It is important to emphasize that such a result comes from first principles and is therefore independent of the precise character of spatially connected plasma. Therefore, whether one envisions a linear MRI-generated accretion or a turbulent MRI-based one, the basic fact that spatially separated



**Fig. 2** Work versus spin/orientation required to extract the angular momentum necessary to accrete material in a thin disk that extends to 30 gravitational radii normalized to the value at high retrograde spin

regions are electromagnetically coupled is subject to our conservation law constraint. In other words, the constraint is independent of the turbulent degree of the accretion disk.

In Fig. 2, we show the results obtained from relaxing the fixed angular momentum constraint and evaluating the work required to accrete matter in a thin disk with fixed outer boundary at 30 gravitational radii. While the total amount of angular momentum extraction is different for different black hole spins and orientations of the disk, the trend remains unchanged, namely that a greater work is required to produce an accretion event as the spin increases in the prograde direction.

In the next section we explore this constraint in the context of GRMHD simulations.

### 3 Implications for numerical simulations

In the previous section we showed that the fraction of conserved energy in the electromagnetic field needed to produce a given accretion rate is always larger in the prograde regime compared to the retrograde case. Because prograde disks have a greater amount of total energy available than retrograde ones, the fact that a greater amount of energy needs to be placed in electromagnetic fields does not by itself imply a difference between retrograde and prograde disks. However, the fact that prograde accretion disks live or occupy a region of the gravitational potential that is different from the retrograde disks, produces an important difference, one that has not yet been identified. The metric term associated with proper distance in the radial direction of the equatorial plane of the disk in Boyer–Lindquist coordinates is

$$g_{rr} = r^2/(r^2 - 2Mr + a^2),$$

where  $r$  is the radial distance,  $M$  is the black hole mass, and  $a$  is the dimensionless spin. While such a metric term does not discriminate between prograde and retrograde disks, the fact that prograde inner disk edges for high black hole spin approach the radial distance of  $1.23 GM/c^2$  while high spin retrograde disks are located at inner edges approaching the

325 radial value  $9 \text{ GM}/c^2$ , implies that proper distances between  
326 magnetically connected regions required to extract angular  
327 momentum, increase for prograde disks. This constitutes a  
328 basic asymmetry between retrograde and prograde disks that  
329 forces energy to be distributed in disks differently in order  
330 to accomplish the task of accreting material. In other  
331 words, the mechanism for angular momentum extraction in  
332 accretion disks forces the prograde disk to place a relatively  
333 greater amount of their electromagnetic energy into radially  
334 connecting plasma in the disk plane to compensate for the  
335 fact that proper distances are greater. Therefore, the fact that  
336 a greater amount of energy is available for more prograde  
337 disks, does not seem to allow prograde disks to be more effective,  
338 or even as effective, in extracting their angular momentum as retrograde disks.  
339 The increase in the energy is precisely compensated by the fact that greater radial distances  
340 must be connected for the MRI to operate. In short, there are two aspects of disk orientation that matter.  
341 The first is that for fixed radial locations such as from  $10 \text{ GM}/c^2$  to any other location further out in the disk (i.e for regions of the disk that are part of accretion disks that are either prograde or retrograde), retrograde disks require less work to extract their angular momentum than prograde disks. If the inner and outer disk radii were independent of orientation, therefore, our analysis shows that retrograde disks are favored energetically in their ability to provide more energy in large scale electromagnetic fields than prograde disks. The second involves the failure to circumvent this result by appealing to an additional reservoir of energy for prograde disks. Additional energy is available to prograde disks because they live in regions of higher gravitational potential, with the hope being that such additional reservoir of energy could be used to increase the amount of energy allotted to the large scale electromagnetic field. However, our analysis suggests that the mechanism for angular momentum extraction (i.e. the MRI) requires that the additional energy go into electromagnetic fields in the disk plane. In fact, because connections that establish the MRI produce radially longer field connections for prograde disks living closer to high spinning black holes, magnetic reconnection phenomena will become increasingly more important for disks near black holes. This suggests that high spinning prograde disks will struggle more than our analysis suggests in converting energy into large scale electromagnetic fields.

368 Our analysis shows the effectiveness of angular momentum extraction and thus accretion in black hole systems to depend crucially on disk orientation in a basic way. There is, in other words, an orientation symmetry-breaking effect in black hole accretion. Retrograde disks are relatively better suited for extracting their angular momentum and this can also enhance magnetic fields near the event horizon (Mikhailov et al. 2015).

376 Note that some GRMHD simulations do indeed produce lower accretion rates in prograde configurations (McKinney

and Gammie 2004). Despite the fact that simulations seem to track the analytic constraints, they still produce greater black hole-threading magnetic fields in the prograde direction, thereby violating our energy conservation constraints, resulting in stronger jets. While we cannot converge on the exact reason from first principles, the likely explanation for this violation may concern the following approximations. First, as discussed above, the electromagnetic field is assumed in the initial configuration, and its strength is spin-independent. This is true whether the initial electromagnetic configuration involves closed loops within the disk proper as in the earlier simulations (e.g. Hirose et al. 2004; McKinney and Gammie 2004) or loops that lead to the magnetically flooded black holes as in recent MADs (e.g. McKinney et al. 2012). As a result of this, all the work that the accretion disk would have done to produce that specific accretion rate, is assumed to occur without any of the conserved energy going into the production of magnetically connected, spatially separated, regions, in the disk. Therefore, all of that unconsumed energy can now be turned into a large-scale field by disk dynamo action. Second, the black hole spin dependence of the disk dynamo—the process that takes the disk field and turns it into large-scale field—is absent. In fact, in GRMHD there is no equation of the form

$$J^a = \sigma F^{ab} U_b \tag{9}$$

with  $J^a$  the current 4-vector,  $\sigma$  the large but finite conductivity,  $F^{ab}$  the  $(2, 0)$  Faraday tensor, and  $U_b$  the velocity one-form. Instead,  $\sigma$  is assumed to be infinite-valued, and the finite current density results from the assumption of zero proper electric fields according to

$$F^{ab} U_b = 0, \tag{10}$$

which, is referred to as the ‘ideal Ohm’s law’. Note that (9) actually constitutes a violation of special relativistic causality since it legislates an instantaneous current in reaction to the fields (Koide 2008). The exact impact of this remains poorly explored. In a sense, therefore, GRMHD does worse by implementing (10), which also, of course, implies in principle that magnetic reconnection is absent. However, numerical diffusion comes to the rescue in some respect by providing for dissipation of the electromagnetic field via turbulence, which is obviously a violation of (10). Does the numerical failure to uphold (10) imply strict compliance with (9)? That would surely be impossible. And, importantly, the black hole spin dependence in (9) is absent in GRMHD. The claim in GRMHD, however, is that the black hole spin dependence in (9) that is absent in GRMHD is a higher order effect and therefore negligible and that turbulence effectively subsumes the relevant physics without having to resort to (9) (see Lazarian et al. 2015 for a review). But even in the context of MHD turbulence mediated by the MRI, the chaotic non-linear process cannot

433 violate the underlying conservation principles. The impor- 487  
 434 tance of subgrid physics in the context of a non-ideal Ohm's 488  
 435 law is emphasized in Bucciantini and Del Zanna (2013), 489  
 436 where a more generalized general relativistic Ohm's law ap- 490  
 437 pears. 491

438 The possibility that energy is not properly treated or ac- 492  
 439 counted for in GRMHD simulations is not new. Meier (2012, 493  
 440 p. 700) documents the lack of energy conservation along a 494  
 441 magnetic field line in the simulations of McKinney (2006), 495  
 442 noting that the energy in matter and electromagnetic field 496  
 443 does not remain constant. In the notation used by McKinney 497  
 444 (2006), the total energy at infinity is split into the matter part 498  
 445 (superscript MA) and the electromagnetic part (superscript 499  
 446 EM) 500

447  
 448 
$$\mu = \gamma_\infty = \gamma_\infty^{\text{MA}} + \gamma_\infty^{\text{EM}}. \quad (11)$$
 501

449 While Meier's concern surrounds the physics of recollima- 502  
 450 tion and the accounting of the energy required for that pro- 503  
 451 cess, he emphasizes that not only does the total energy drop 504  
 452 by two orders of magnitude within only 100 gravitational 505  
 453 radii, but that the nature of this loss, i.e. where the energy 506  
 454 goes, is unclear. But this, as Meier points out, is perhaps not 507  
 455 surprising since the best simulations resolve regions that ex- 508  
 456 tend hundreds of meters for 10 solar mass black holes and 509  
 457 much larger for millions to billion solar mass black holes. 510  
 458 Energy redistribution on such scales cannot therefore be 511  
 459 properly treated and a kind of averaging must be adminis- 512  
 460 tered that allows the energy lost numerically to be reinserted 513  
 461 in the simulation, reintroduced as heat despite the absence 514  
 462 of the microphysics that physically accomplishes this. Be- 515  
 463 cause accurate Riemann solvers are computationally expen- 516  
 464 sive, most simulations adopt more approximate methods that 517  
 465 are also more diffusive (see White et al. 2016 for a discus- 518  
 466 sion of this). 519

467 The combination of the poor accounting of energy in 520  
 468 GRMHD together with the constraints from Noether's theo- 521  
 469 rem, suggest that the implementation of GRMHD simula- 522  
 470 tions is responsible in some way for smuggling in or out, in 523  
 471 a spin-dependent way, a source of energy that is not compat- 524  
 472 ible with the physics of black hole accretion. 525

473  
 474  
 475  
 476 **4 Conclusions** 526

477 We have argued from the perspective of conservation laws in 527  
 478 general relativity that electromagnetic fields threading black 528  
 479 holes that are brought to the hole by an accretion disk are 529  
 480 subject to constraints that emerge from the way that accre- 530  
 481 tion operates, namely magnetically connected, spatially sep- 531  
 482 arated regions. As a result of this, we have argued that not 532  
 483 only are accretion rates expected to be lower in the prograde 533  
 484 regime (as is in fact seen in GRMHD), but that prograde 534  
 485 disks likely accrete efficiently at the expense of their large- 535  
 486 scale electromagnetic fields. In other words, energetic pro- 536  
 cesses contingent on the strength of large-scale electromag- 537  
 netic fields will tend to be weaker for prograde accreting 538  
 black holes. Prograde accretion mediated by the MRI insta- 539  
 bility requires relatively more of the total available energy to 540  
 go into magnetic energy in the accretion disk (into radial and 541  
 azimuthal field components), leaving less for the generation 542  
 of large-scale electromagnetic fields. 543

509 Despite not being able to pinpoint the exact breakdown 510  
 511 implicit in the incompatibility between GRMHD and the re- 511  
 512 sults of Sect. 2, we have explored two possibilities. The first 512  
 513 is that the initial conditions adopted for the electromagnetic 513  
 514 field in the disk may amount to a violation of the transport 514  
 515 or creation of the field in-situ. And, the second, amounts to 515  
 516 a claim that turbulent diffusion and resistivity generated nu- 516  
 517 merically may be washing away important black hole spin 517  
 518 dependent microphysics. While we have motivated our re- 518  
 519 sults from first principles, a thorough understanding of this 519  
 520 dynamics requires detailed analysis of the complex astro- 520  
 521 physical transfer of energy from particles to fields, including 521  
 522 magnetic reconnection physics in non-ideal MHD or even 522  
 523 beyond the MHD simplification, most of which is currently 523  
 524 beyond the state-of-the art in numerical simulations of black 524  
 525 hole accretion. 525

526  
 527  
 528  
 529  
 530  
 531  
 532  
 533  
 534  
 535  
 536  
 537  
 538  
 539  
 540  
 541  
 542  
 543  
 544  
 545  
 546  
 547  
 548  
 549  
 550  
 551  
 552  
 553  
 554  
 555  
 556  
 557  
 558  
 559  
 560  
 561  
 562  
 563  
 564  
 565  
 566  
 567  
 568  
 569  
 570  
 571  
 572  
 573  
 574  
 575  
 576  
 577  
 578  
 579  
 580  
 581  
 582  
 583  
 584  
 585  
 586  
 587  
 588  
 589  
 590  
 591  
 592  
 593  
 594  
 595  
 596  
 597  
 598  
 599  
 600  
 601  
 602  
 603  
 604  
 605  
 606  
 607  
 608  
 609  
 610  
 611  
 612  
 613  
 614  
 615  
 616  
 617  
 618  
 619  
 620  
 621  
 622  
 623  
 624  
 625  
 626  
 627  
 628  
 629  
 630  
 631  
 632  
 633  
 634  
 635  
 636  
 637  
 638  
 639  
 640  
 641  
 642  
 643  
 644  
 645  
 646  
 647  
 648  
 649  
 650  
 651  
 652  
 653  
 654  
 655  
 656  
 657  
 658  
 659  
 660  
 661  
 662  
 663  
 664  
 665  
 666  
 667  
 668  
 669  
 670  
 671  
 672  
 673  
 674  
 675  
 676  
 677  
 678  
 679  
 680  
 681  
 682  
 683  
 684  
 685  
 686  
 687  
 688  
 689  
 690  
 691  
 692  
 693  
 694  
 695  
 696  
 697  
 698  
 699  
 700  
 701  
 702  
 703  
 704  
 705  
 706  
 707  
 708  
 709  
 710  
 711  
 712  
 713  
 714  
 715  
 716  
 717  
 718  
 719  
 720  
 721  
 722  
 723  
 724  
 725  
 726  
 727  
 728  
 729  
 730  
 731  
 732  
 733  
 734  
 735  
 736  
 737  
 738  
 739  
 740  
 741  
 742  
 743  
 744  
 745  
 746  
 747  
 748  
 749  
 750  
 751  
 752  
 753  
 754  
 755  
 756  
 757  
 758  
 759  
 760  
 761  
 762  
 763  
 764  
 765  
 766  
 767  
 768  
 769  
 770  
 771  
 772  
 773  
 774  
 775  
 776  
 777  
 778  
 779  
 780  
 781  
 782  
 783  
 784  
 785  
 786  
 787  
 788  
 789  
 790  
 791  
 792  
 793  
 794  
 795  
 796  
 797  
 798  
 799  
 800  
 801  
 802  
 803  
 804  
 805  
 806  
 807  
 808  
 809  
 810  
 811  
 812  
 813  
 814  
 815  
 816  
 817  
 818  
 819  
 820  
 821  
 822  
 823  
 824  
 825  
 826  
 827  
 828  
 829  
 830  
 831  
 832  
 833  
 834  
 835  
 836  
 837  
 838  
 839  
 840  
 841  
 842  
 843  
 844  
 845  
 846  
 847  
 848  
 849  
 850  
 851  
 852  
 853  
 854  
 855  
 856  
 857  
 858  
 859  
 860  
 861  
 862  
 863  
 864  
 865  
 866  
 867  
 868  
 869  
 870  
 871  
 872  
 873  
 874  
 875  
 876  
 877  
 878  
 879  
 880  
 881  
 882  
 883  
 884  
 885  
 886  
 887  
 888  
 889  
 890  
 891  
 892  
 893  
 894  
 895  
 896  
 897  
 898  
 899  
 900  
 901  
 902  
 903  
 904  
 905  
 906  
 907  
 908  
 909  
 910  
 911  
 912  
 913  
 914  
 915  
 916  
 917  
 918  
 919  
 920  
 921  
 922  
 923  
 924  
 925  
 926  
 927  
 928  
 929  
 930  
 931  
 932  
 933  
 934  
 935  
 936  
 937  
 938  
 939  
 940  
 941  
 942  
 943  
 944  
 945  
 946  
 947  
 948  
 949  
 950  
 951  
 952  
 953  
 954  
 955  
 956  
 957  
 958  
 959  
 960  
 961  
 962  
 963  
 964  
 965  
 966  
 967  
 968  
 969  
 970  
 971  
 972  
 973  
 974  
 975  
 976  
 977  
 978  
 979  
 980  
 981  
 982  
 983  
 984  
 985  
 986  
 987  
 988  
 989  
 990  
 991  
 992  
 993  
 994  
 995  
 996  
 997  
 998  
 999  
 1000

541	McKinney, J.C.: Mon. Not. R. Astron. Soc. <b>368</b> , 1561 (2006)	Mikhailov, A.G., Gnedin, Y.N., Belonovsky, A.V.: Astrophysics <b>58</b> , 595
542	McKinney, J.C., Gammie, C.F.: Astrophys. J. <b>611</b> , 977 (2004)	157 (2015) 596
543	McKinney, J.C., Tchekhovskoy, A., Blandford, R.D.: Mon. Not. R. Astron. Soc. <b>423</b> , 3083 (2012)	White, C.J., Stone, J.M.: Astrophys. J. Suppl. (2016, in press) 597
544	Meier, D.L.: Black Hole Astrophysics: The Engine Paradigm. Springer, Berlin (2012)	598
545		599
546		600
547		601
548		602
549		603
550		604
551		605
552		606
553		607
554		608
555		609
556		610
557		611
558		612
559		613
560		614
561		615
562		616
563		617
564		618
565		619
566		620
567		621
568		622
569		623
570		624
571		625
572		626
573		627
574		628
575		629
576		630
577		631
578		632
579		633
580		634
581		635
582		636
583		637
584		638
585		639
586		640
587		641
588		642
589		643
590		644
591		645
592		646
593		647
594		648