

# Self-Sustained Penrose Excitation of Accretion Disks: A Spin-Regulated Mechanism for Super-Eddington Quasar Luminosities

JUN WAKABAYASHI<sup>1</sup>

<sup>1</sup>*Independent Researcher, Japan*

## ABSTRACT

Quasars often radiate at several to ten times the Eddington limit of their central SMBHs. We propose a self-sustained, equatorial Penrose-like excitation that operates at the ISCO–ergoregion interface just outside the horizon as the spin approaches unity ( $a_* \rightarrow 1$ ). In this picture the equatorial return layer becomes plasmoid-dominated; a magnetically assisted Penrose split ( $E - \Omega_H L < 0$  for one branch) sends a negative-energy branch into the hole and a gain branch outward as a narrow equatorial quasi-beam, which reheats the inner disk and extracts angular momentum, thereby self-regulating the spin ceiling. Even modest effective coupling ( $\epsilon_{\text{coup}} \sim 10^{-2}$ – $10^{-1}$ ) yields on average  $2$ – $3 \times L_{\text{Edd}}$ , with occasional  $5$ – $10\times$  episodes when the dissipation footprint is extended and transparent ( $R_{\text{eff}} \sim 10^2$ – $10^3 r_g$ ). We adopt a phenomenological framework and do not fix the microphysics; the results depend on a small set of effective parameters (plotted luminosities are *isotropic-equivalent* unless noted). Crucially, the mechanism is confined to the ergoregion and equatorial disk—i.e., it is horizon-exterior and therefore empirically testable; we provide observational hooks and explicit falsification criteria. Beyond mechanism, the framework yields immediate observing guidance: a triad of hard-X shoulder, lag hardening, and equator-aligned X-ray polarization as a joint trigger for high-spin, high- $\lambda$  candidates. Practically, this enables targeted scheduling (20–120 keV coverage and polarimetry) and a falsifiable pathway to separate equatorial radiative feedback from polar BZ power.

*Keywords:* Quasars — Accretion, accretion disks — Black hole physics — Relativistic processes

## 1. INTRODUCTION

Quasars are among the most luminous persistent sources in the Universe. While thin-disk models reproduce many spectral features, two puzzles persist: (1) frequent super-Eddington luminosities by factors of several to ten; (2) spins saturating near, but not exceeding, the Kerr limit. These suggest an additional energy channel. We posit self-sustained Penrose excitation: near-extremal spins allow horizon-scale structures to couple to the ergoregion, repeatedly energizing the disk via equatorial beams and extracting angular momentum to enforce the spin ceiling. By “self-sustained” we mean a feedback loop in which spin-energy extraction elevates the disk luminosity while simultaneously extracting angular momentum; the latter throttles further spin-up from accretion, keeping the system near the activation threshold. In short: extraction  $\rightarrow$  disk reheating ( $L_{\text{self}}$  up) + spin-down ( $a_*$  kept near  $a_{\text{th}}$ )  $\rightarrow$  continued activation. Prior approaches typically addressed either super-Eddington luminosity (e.g., slim disks) or

spin regulation (e.g., BZ/MAD), but not both within a single causal channel. Here we instead place the energy split at the ISCO–ergoregion interface and route the gain branch into an equatorial, radiation-dominated feedback loop that both boosts  $L$  and extracts  $J$ , thus tying the two puzzles together.

Recent reviews have noted persistent tensions between thin-disk expectations and observations—e.g., systematically large continuum-emitting sizes from microlensing and reverberation, and wavelength-dependent lags exceeding simple reprocessing models (e.g., [E. M. Cackett & A. Zoghbi 2021](#); [M. Sun et al. 2020](#)). These tensions motivate considering *additional inner-disk heating* beyond local viscous dissipation. Near  $a_* \rightarrow 1$ , an *equatorial, magnetically assisted Penrose-like split* provides a *testable route* to such reheating (Sec. 2.3), with observational hooks and falsification criteria (Sec. 3.1).

*Scope and modeling stance.*—We present a phenomenological framework: the microphysics of beam formation, transport, and equatorial deposition is intentionally kept agnostic, while the *observable consequences* of such coupling are made explicit and falsifiable. This stance allows clean confrontation with data now and provides a

clear interface to future GRMHD/plasma studies that could instantiate the coupling agent.

*Boundary conditions are not fixed near  $a_* \rightarrow 1$ .*—Much of the literature treats the inner disk, magnetosphere, and ergoregion with effectively fixed cross-component boundary conditions. We instead emphasize that near-extremal spin the boundaries themselves evolve: frame dragging enlarges and reshapes the ergoregion, the ISCO approaches it, and the equatorial return path becomes thin and resistive. In this coupled regime an equatorial current sheet is generically required by the global field topology; shear and flux loading drive plasmoid-dominated reconnection; and the resulting split redistributes  $(E, L)$  so that a negative-energy branch is absorbed by the hole while a gain branch vents as a narrow equatorial quasi-beam, part of which returns to heat the inner disk.

## 2. THEORETICAL FRAMEWORK

All elements invoked below act outside the event horizon; the coupling operates in the ergoregion and deposits energy in the equatorial flow, avoiding assumptions about interior or singularity-scale physics.

### 2.1. Kerr Energy Reservoir

For a Kerr black hole of mass  $M$  and spin  $a_*$ , the extractable rotational energy is

$$E_{\text{rot}}(a_*) = \left[ 1 - \sqrt{\frac{1}{2} \left( 1 + \sqrt{1 - a_*^2} \right)} \right] Mc^2, \quad (1)$$


reaching  $\sim 0.29 Mc^2$  as  $a_* \rightarrow 1$ .

### 2.2. Spin-Triggered Coupling

We posit a threshold spin  $a_{\text{th}}$  above which an ergoregion-coupled agent activates. The effective coupling follows

$$\epsilon_{\text{coup}}(a_*) = \begin{cases} 0, & a_* \leq a_{\text{th}}, \\ \epsilon_{\text{max}} \left( \frac{a_* - a_{\text{th}}}{1 - a_{\text{th}}} \right)^n, & a_* > a_{\text{th}}, \end{cases} \quad (2)$$

where  $\epsilon_{\text{max}}$  is the saturation cap and  $n$  controls activation sharpness. *Activation threshold.* The equatorial coupling turns on steeply once the spin exceeds a threshold  $a_{\text{th}}$ . In our fiducial calibration, the rise is rapid near  $a_* \simeq 0.97$ , setting the lever for both luminosity boost and spin regulation (cf. Eqs. (2)–(11)).



**Figure 1.** Spin-triggered onset governed by Eq. (2): peak  $L_{\text{tot}}/L_{\text{Edd}}$  (dimensionless) versus  $a_*$  (dimensionless); dashed vertical line at  $a_{\text{th}} = 0.97$ .

Unless noted, we adopt the following fiducials for figures and estimates:  $M = 10^9 M_{\odot}$ ,  $\eta_{\text{acc}} = 0.1$ ,  $\epsilon_{\text{max}} = 0.1$ ,  $n = 2$ ,  $R_0 = 10^2$ , and  $\alpha = 50$ ; the illustrative threshold is  $a_{\text{th}} \simeq 0.97$ . *Micro-bridge.* While we keep micro-physics agnostic, the fiducial range  $\epsilon_{\text{coup}} \sim 10^{-2} - 10^{-1}$  is broadly consistent with energy-release fractions seen in near-horizon, plasmoid-dominated reconnection in recent GRMHD studies. For the present framework we only assume that  $\epsilon_{\text{coup}}$  rises sharply above  $a_{\text{th}}$  and saturates below  $\epsilon_{\text{max}}$ ; detailed calibration is left for future simulations.

*Phenomenological parameters and physical ranges.*—The cap  $\epsilon_{\text{max}}$  limits equatorial deposition efficiency by energy-budget and pair-compactness constraints;  $n$  controls activation sharpness above  $a_{\text{th}}$  as an effective criticality index of the coupling geometry.  $(R_0, \alpha)$  regulate the dissipation footprint to maintain transparency, trading compactness against reprocessing. We restrict these to physically plausible ranges and view them as interfaces for future GRMHD/plasma calibration, not curve-fitting knobs.

*Sensitivity and saturation.*—The activation  $\epsilon_{\text{coup}}(a_*)$  is intentionally steep:  $(a_{\text{th}}, n)$  set the narrowness of the “spin ceiling”. In practice  $\epsilon_{\text{coup}}$  and the leakage fraction depend nonlinearly on flux loading and  $\dot{M}$ , with possible saturation arbitrarily close to the extremal limit. We therefore treat  $(a_{\text{th}}, n, \epsilon_{\text{max}}, \alpha)$  as calibration parameters to be fixed by future GRMHD-in-ergoregion testbeds.

*Power partition.*—We allow the extracted rotational power to partition between a polar BZ jet and an equatorial feedback channel:

$$P_{\text{ext}} = P_{\text{jet}} + P_{\text{eq}}, \quad f_{\text{BZ}} + f_{\text{eq}} = 1.$$

Near  $a_* \rightarrow 1$ ,  $f_{\text{eq}}$  can become substantial (radio-quiet, radiation-dominated states), while  $f_{\text{BZ}}$  dominates in

radio-loud systems; hybrid states are possible in transient MAD-like regimes.


### 2.3. Mechanism sketch: a leaky equatorial return path

*Projectile sufficiency.*—Reconnection ejecta (plasmoids) in the ergoregion carry specific energy  $E$  and angular momentum  $L$ . A Penrose split requires a branch with  $E - \Omega_H L < 0$  (horizon condition).<sup>2</sup> Tension-driven redistribution during ejection changes  $L$  by  $\Delta L \sim \mathcal{O}(r_g v_\phi)$  and reconnection outflows can reach  $v \sim 0.1\text{--}0.5c$  in high- $S$  sheets; hence tens-of-percent shifts in  $L$  suffice to place a fraction on the negative-energy branch, with the complement forming the *positive-energy branch* (equatorial quasi-beam). Near-extremal spin brings the ISCO into close contact with the ergoregion and enforces an equatorial return current sheet at their interface. Shear and flux loading thin the sheet until it becomes tearing-unstable; reconnection then ejects plasmoids as a chain of narrow, equator-following pulses. These ejecta provide the “projectile” required by a Penrose-like energy split: within the ergoregion, a fraction of the flow is placed on negative-energy-at-horizon trajectories while the counterpart gains energy and escapes. The extraction condition is simply

$$E - \Omega_H L < 0, \quad (3)$$

so the black hole’s rotational energy pays for the escaping branch. The centrifugal barrier and toroidal tension form an equatorial nozzle, so a growing fraction of the circuit power vents as a collimated equatorial quasi-beam while the DC return still closes globally. A modest back-flow coupling ( $\epsilon_{\text{coup}} \sim 10^{-2}\text{--}10^{-1}$ ) suffices to heat the inner disk and regenerate magnetic flux, closing a self-sustained loop. The active zone and leakage fraction increase monotonically with spin (and also depend nonlinearly on flux loading and accretion rate), with possible saturation arbitrarily close to the extremal limit.

<sup>2</sup> Notation follows Fig. 2.



**Figure 2. Equatorial Penrose trigger: negative vs. positive branches.** Plasma from the inner disk/plunging region enters the ergosphere and splits kinematically: a *negative-energy branch* with  $E - \Omega_H L < 0$  falls through the *event horizon* ( $r_H$ ), while a *positive-energy branch* emerges as an equatorial quasi-beam that reheats the inner rim near  $r_{ISCO}$ . Landmarks—ergosurface,  $r_{ISCO}$ , and the equatorial return current sheet (blue ribbon)—are indicated; branches are shown as *red solid* (positive) and *blue dashed* (negative) to match Eq. (3).

*Why an equatorial, quasi-collimated branch?*—Near  $a_* \rightarrow 1$  the combination of (i) the equatorial centrifugal barrier, (ii) strong toroidal fields generated by shear (hoop stress), and (iii) pressure deficits carved by intermittent reconnection outflows forms an “equatorial nozzle”. The *positive-energy branch* therefore propagates as a narrow, radiation-supported quasi-beam rather than escaping along the poles. Because the transport remains largely collisionless/Poynting-dominated until it reprocesses in the inner disk, and because the dissipation footprint is extended ( $R_{\text{eff}} \sim 10^2\text{--}10^3 r_g$ ), the pair compactness along the beam stays low, consistent with the transparency requirement of Eq. (6).

#### 2.4. Self-Sustained Penrose Excitation

The mean extraction power is  $\langle P_{\text{ext}} \rangle = E_{\text{rot}}/\tau$ , and with duty cycle  $d$  the instantaneous power during active phases is  $P_{\text{ext}} \sim \langle P_{\text{ext}} \rangle/d$ . Here  $\tau$  denotes the effective extraction e-folding timescale of the rotational-energy reservoir, i.e.,  $\langle P_{\text{ext}} \rangle = E_{\text{rot}}/\tau$  using Eq. (1).

#### 2.5. Disk Dissipation and Scale

A fraction  $\epsilon_{\text{coup}}(a_*)$  of  $P_{\text{ext}}$  is deposited into the disk:

$$L_{\text{self}} = \epsilon_{\text{coup}} P_{\text{ext}}, \quad (4)$$

and the dissipation spreads over an effective radius

*Self-transparency (physical note).*—The scaling  $R_{\text{eff}} \approx R_0[1 + \alpha(\epsilon_{\text{coup}}/\epsilon_{\text{max}})] r_g$  phenomenologically captures geometric spreading, multi-zone deposition, and increased scattering mean free paths as the equatorial quasi-beam heats and rarefies the inner disk corona. Our results require  $R_{\text{eff}} \sim 10^2\text{--}10^3 r_g$  during bright episodes to keep the pair compactness low (cf. Sec. 2.6).

$$R_{\text{eff}} \approx R_0 \left[ 1 + \alpha \left( \frac{\epsilon_{\text{coup}}}{\epsilon_{\text{max}}} \right) \right] r_g, \quad (5)$$

with  $r_g = GM/c^2$ , fiducial  $R_0 \sim 10^2$  and  $\alpha \sim 50$ .

#### 2.6. Transparency (Compactness Constraint)

Transparency requires pair compactness

$$\ell = \frac{L_{\text{self}} \sigma_T}{4\pi R_{\text{eff}} m_e c^3} \lesssim 30, \quad (6)$$

which couples Eqs. (4) and (5) and motivates  $R_{\text{eff}} \sim 10^2\text{--}10^3 r_g$  during bright episodes. We adopt  $\ell \lesssim 30$  as a conservative transparency threshold following classic compactness arguments; the precise value depends on geometry and spectrum and can be re-tuned in data applications. See, e.g., (R. Svensson 1984; A. P. Lightman & A. A. Zdziarski 1987).

#### 2.7. Spin and Mass Evolution

The horizon angular frequency is

$$\Omega_H = \frac{a_* c^3}{2GM(1 + \sqrt{1 - a_*^2})}, \quad (7)$$

where  $r_H = r_g(1 + \sqrt{1 - a_*^2})$  and  $r_g = GM/c^2$ . Evolution obeys

$$\frac{dM}{dt} = \frac{dM_{\text{acc}}}{dt} - \frac{P_{\text{ext}}}{c^2}, \quad (8)$$

$$\frac{dJ}{dt} = \frac{dJ_{\text{acc}}}{dt} - \frac{P_{\text{ext}}}{\Omega_H}, \quad (9)$$


$$\frac{da_*}{dt} = \frac{c}{GM^2} \frac{dJ}{dt} - 2a_* \frac{1}{M} \frac{dM}{dt}. \quad (10)$$

#### 2.8. Net Luminosity


$$L_{\text{tot}} = L_{\text{acc}} + L_{\text{self}}, \quad L_{\text{acc}} \approx \eta_{\text{acc}} \left( \frac{dM_{\text{acc}}}{dt} \right) c^2, \quad (11)$$

which links the dynamical solution (Eqs. (8)–(10)) to observables.


*Energetic sanity check (one-line).*—With  $M_{\text{BH}} = 10^9 M_\odot$  [ $Mc^2 \simeq 1.8 \times 10^{63}$  erg] and  $E_{\text{rot}} \sim 0.1 Mc^2$ , a reservoir e-fold  $\tau = 10^7$  yr,  $\epsilon_{\text{coup}} = 0.05$ , and duty  $d = 0.2$  yield  $L_{\text{self}} \sim (E_{\text{rot}}/\tau)(\epsilon_{\text{coup}}/d) \approx 1.4 \times 10^{47}$  erg s $^{-1} \sim 1.1 L_{\text{Edd}}$ , and 2–3  $L_{\text{Edd}}$  when combined with concurrent accretion, while  $da_*/dt < 0$  prevents overspin.



**Figure 3.** Torque balance and equilibrium spin from Eqs. (8)–(10) with  $\Omega_H$  in Eq. (7). **(a)**  $da/dt$  (dimensionless per unit time; units per model) versus  $a$  (dimensionless); the horizontal line marks  $\dot{a} = 0$ . **(b)** Equilibrium spin  $a_{\text{eq}}$  (dimensionless) versus  $\epsilon_{\text{coup}}$  (dimensionless); the shaded band shows a plausible range.



**Figure 4.** Representative time track of  $a_*$  (dimensionless) solved from Eqs. (8)–(10).



**Figure 5.** Using Eqs. (1), (2), and (11). **(a)** Equilibration time  $\tau_{\text{eq}}$  (units as labeled in the figure) versus  $\epsilon_{\text{coup}}$  (dimensionless). **(b)**  $L/L_{\text{Edd}}$  (dimensionless) versus  $a_{\text{eq}}$  (dimensionless); points labeled by  $\epsilon_{\text{coup}}$ .

### 3. RESULTS


The figures embedded in Sec. 2 visualize each theoretical ingredient immediately after the defining equations to avoid misalignment between formulae and diagnostics. Here we summarize cross-implications and observational hooks.

### 3.1. Observational Hooks

*Why this matters.* What to look for and how to falsify, in plain terms.

*Recall.* Activation  $\epsilon_{\text{coup}}(a_*)$  and power  $P_{\text{eq}} = \epsilon_{\text{coup}} \dot{M} c^2 g(\ell)$  (cf. Eqs. (2), (11)), with transparency set by compactness  $\ell$  (Eq. (6)). These establish the trends in the plots below.

We highlight three testable signatures expected to co-occur at high spin and high Eddington ratio under transparency ( $\ell \lesssim 30$ ): (i) a hard X-ray high-energy excess (“shoulder”) favored over a featureless continuum by  $\Delta\text{AICc}/\text{BIC} \geq 6$  in the observed 20–120 keV band (rest  $\sim 0.3\text{--}1$  MeV at  $z \gtrsim 6$ ); (ii) lag hardening—X $\rightarrow$ UV/optical lags increase with photon energy; (iii) equator-aligned X-ray polarization with rising degree at high spin/high  $\lambda$ . **Falsify** if  $\geq 2$  of these are absent in a high-spin, high- $\lambda$  sample after excluding heavy absorption/extreme inclination and  $\ell \gtrsim 30$  cases. *At a glance.* How power repartitions at high  $\lambda$  across mechanisms.




**Figure 6. What each hook should look like (linked to the equations).** (a) Fe K $\alpha$  lag (in  $r_g/c$ ) versus  $a_{\text{eq}}$ . (b) Observable fraction (hard X/MeV or polarization) versus  $a_{\text{eq}}$ .


**Table 1. Bottom line:** the equatorial channel sustains  $L/L_{\text{Edd}} > 1$  *and* imposes a spin ceiling  $a_{\text{eq}} \approx a_{\text{th}}$ , complementary to slim-disk (no ceiling) and BZ/MAD (polar power,  $a_{\text{eq}} \sim 0.5\text{--}0.7$ ).

|                  | $L/L_{\text{Edd}} > 1$  | spin ceiling  | channel                        |
|------------------|-------------------------|---|--------------------------------|
| Slim disk        | yes (advective)         | no  | radiation (disk)               |
| BZ/MAD           | indirect                | yes ( $a_{\text{eq}} \sim 0.5\text{--}0.7$ )                  | polar Poynting (jet)           |
| <b>This work</b> | <b>yes (equatorial)</b> | <b>yes (<math>a_{\text{eq}} \approx a_{\text{th}}</math>)</b> | <b>equatorial Penrose-like</b> |





**Figure 7. Viable region lies *outside* the  $\ell=30$  contour (a).**  $R_{\text{eff}} = 100 r_g$ . Color encodes peak  $L_{\text{tot}}/L_{\text{Edd}}$ ; the black contour marks  $\ell=30$ .



**Figure 8. Viable region lies *outside* the  $\ell=30$  contour (b).**  $R_{\text{eff}} = 1000 r_g$ . Color encodes peak  $L_{\text{tot}}/L_{\text{Edd}}$ ; the black contour marks  $\ell=30$ .

#### 4. DISCUSSION

These bounds align with Fig. 7-8 and are sufficient to reach  $L/L_{\text{Edd}} \sim 2-3$  with rarer  $5-10\times$  excursions. Slim disks allow modest super-Eddington flows but no spin ceiling. BZ/MAD explain jet power yet not the radiative dominance of radio-quiet quasars. This framework ties hyperluminous output and the spin ceiling via near-extremal, equatorial coupling.

*Relation to Blandford-Znajek jets.* BZ is polar/Poynting-dominated; our mechanism is equatorial/radiative. Hybrid states and an anti-correlated see-saw are expected; counterexamples (simultaneously strong jets and high radiative output) can occur in transitional MAD-like regimes.

*Power partition between polar and equatorial channels.*—We model the spin-extraction power as a partition between a polar Blandford-Znajek (BZ) channel and an equatorial feedback channel,

$$P_{\text{tot}} = P_{\text{BZ}} + P_{\text{eq}}, \quad (12)$$

$$P_{\text{BZ}} = f_{\text{BZ}} P_{\text{ext}}, \quad P_{\text{eq}} = f_{\text{eq}} P_{\text{ext}}, \quad (13)$$

$$f_{\text{BZ}} + f_{\text{eq}} = 1. \quad (14)$$

This partition predicts an anti-correlation between radio-jet dominance and equatorial reheating diagnostics within the high- $a_*$ , high- $\lambda$  subset, with hybrid states possible in transient MAD phases. Our claim is modest: in the high-spin, high-Eddington subset,  $f_{\text{eq}}$  is statistically non-zero and sometimes dominant; in others,  $f_{\text{BZ}}$  may prevail. Outside this subset we make no claim.

#### VALIDATION ROADMAP: OBSERVATIONS AND SIMULATIONS

**Observational fronts.** (i) *Polarization vs. spin:* search for a step-like rise of optical/UV polarization fractions and azimuthal rotations across  $a_* \simeq a_{\text{th}}$ . (ii) *Lag broadening:* FeK $\alpha$  and BLR reverberation lags should broaden in high  $L/L_{\text{Edd}}$  episodes at near-threshold spins. (iii) *Spectral compactness:* hard X/MeV excesses consistent with low pair-compactness at  $R_{\text{eff}} \sim 10^2-10^3 r_g$ . (iv) *See-saw with BZ:* anti-correlation between radio-jet dominance and equatorial reheating diagnostics, with transitional hybrid states.

**Simulation fronts.** (i) GRMHD-in-ergoregion testbeds to calibrate the effective coupling law  $\epsilon_{\text{coup}}(a_*)$  and its slope  $n$ ; (ii) radiative transfer with pair kinetics to refine the  $\ell$  threshold; (iii) semi-analytic population modeling to predict the duty distribution  $d$  vs. spin. These can be plugged into the present framework without altering its falsifiable structure.

*What would falsify this framework (kill shots).*—We explicitly delineate outcome patterns under which the equatorial channel is unnecessary. In the high-spin, high- $\lambda$  subset (e.g.,  $a_* \gtrsim 0.8$ ,  $\lambda \equiv L_{\text{bol}}/L_{\text{Edd}} \gtrsim 0.3$ ), any of the following, if established *as a population trend*, would falsify our claim:

1. Systematic absence of the EUV/soft-X/MeV excess (no “shoulder”) and systematically weak high-ionization lines (He II, N V, C IV) relative to the parent population.
2. Reverberation lags from X→UV showing no energy dependence (no inward reheating signature).
3.  $L_{\text{bol}}$  not anti-correlated (even weakly) with  $a_*$  within the bright subset (no self-regulated spin-down imprint).
4. Optical/X-ray polarization failing to favor equatorial angles or degrees when near-threshold spins are inferred.

If *two or more* items above hold simultaneously for the same high-spin, high- $\lambda$  subset, we would consider  $f_{\text{eq}} \rightarrow 0$  supported and this mechanism unnecessary.

#### 5. CONCLUSION

Self-sustained Penrose excitation near extremal Kerr SMBHs can inject rotational energy into the accretion disk, yielding sustained  $2-3\times$  Eddington with rarer  $5-10\times$  episodes while enforcing a spin ceiling.

## APPENDIX

**Table 2. Candidate Gallery** — Representative objects; values are indicative.

| Name       | $z$   | $M_{\text{BH}}/M_{\odot}$ | $L/L_{\text{Edd}}$ | Notes  |
|------------|-------|---------------------------|--------------------|--|
| TON 618    | 2.219 | $\sim 6.6 \times 10^{10}$ | $\sim 3$           | Extremely massive; radio-loud; literature refs. <sup><i>a</i></sup>      |
| J2157-3602 | 4.75  | $\sim 3.4 \times 10^9$    | $\gtrsim 10$       | Hyper-luminous; super-Eddington episode indications. <sup><i>b</i></sup> |
| J0100+2802 | 6.30  | $\sim 1.2 \times 10^{10}$ | $\sim 2$           | $z > 6$ luminous quasar. <sup><i>c</i></sup>                             |
| J0439+1634 | 6.51  | $\sim 7 \times 10^9$      | $\sim 2-3$         | Possible lensing history. <sup><i>d</i></sup>                            |

NOTE—Values are illustrative; per-object sourcing is out of scope.

<sup>*a*</sup>Virial-factor dominated systematics; radio-loud bias possible.

<sup>*b*</sup>Bolometric/line-width systematics  $\gtrsim 0.3$  dex.

<sup>*c*</sup>High- $z$  mass methods differ (reflection vs. continuum).

<sup>*d*</sup>Historical lensing debate; values assume de-lensing consensus.

## CAUTIONARY NOTE.

Claims here are modular and falsifiable. Alternative mechanisms may dominate in other classes.

## AUTHOR CONTRIBUTIONS

Conceptualization, modeling, analysis, visualization, and writing: J. Wakabayashi.

## COMPETING INTERESTS

The author declares no competing interests.

## DATA AND CODE AVAILABILITY

All figures can be regenerated from scripts in the accompanying repository; data sources and acquisition steps are documented in a README.

An archived OSF snapshot of Version 1 with CHECKSUMS.txt will be provided: **OSF DOI:** doi:10.17605/OSF.IO/62GZV (replace with final DOI).

## COMMUNICATION AND MEDIA

Media note: The paper and its reproducibility package are the sole authoritative sources.

## ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

This work stands on decades of insight into black-hole accretion, spin, and energy extraction. I am indebted to the community that built the modern framework of quasar physics—from classical Penrose energy extraction and disk theory to spin-jet coupling and polarimetry—and to teams who made public data and tools available.

*Use of large language models.* Large language model assistants (Google Gemini and OpenAI ChatGPT) were used for drafting support (editing for clarity, formatting suggestions, and figure placement/LaTeX troubleshooting). No novel data, equations, or results were produced by these tools. No confidential or unpublished data were provided to them. All analysis, derivations, and conclusions are by the author, who takes full responsibility for the content; the models are not authors.

I also thank colleagues and readers who provided critical comments on early drafts. Any remaining errors are mine.

*Software:* `latexmk`, AASTeX701

## REFERENCES

- Abramowicz, M. A., Czerny, B., Lasota, J.-P., & Szuszkiewicz, E. 1988, *The Astrophysical Journal*, 332, 646, doi: [10.1086/166683](https://doi.org/10.1086/166683)
- Blandford, R. D., & Znajek, R. L. 1977, *Monthly Notices of the Royal Astronomical Society*, 179, 433, doi: [10.1093/mnras/179.3.433](https://doi.org/10.1093/mnras/179.3.433)
- Cackett, E. M., & Zoghbi, A. 2021, *iScience*, 24, 102557, doi: [10.1016/j.isci.2021.102557](https://doi.org/10.1016/j.isci.2021.102557)
- Connor, T., Stern, D., Bañados, E., & Mazzucchelli, C. 2021, *ApJL*, 922, L24, doi: [10.3847/2041-8213/ac37b5](https://doi.org/10.3847/2041-8213/ac37b5)
- Lai, S., Wolf, C., Onken, C. A., & Bian, F. 2023, *MNRAS*, 521, 3682, doi: [10.1093/mnras/stad651](https://doi.org/10.1093/mnras/stad651)
- Lightman, A. P., & Zdziarski, A. A. 1987, *ApJ*, 319, 643
- Penrose, R. 1969, *Nuovo Cimento Rivista Serie*, 1, 252
- Reynolds, C. S. 2014, *SSRv*, 183, 277, doi: [10.1007/s11214-013-0006-6](https://doi.org/10.1007/s11214-013-0006-6)
- Sun, M., et al. 2020, arXiv e-prints
- Svensson, R. 1984, *MNRAS*, 209, 175, doi: [10.1093/mnras/209.2.175](https://doi.org/10.1093/mnras/209.2.175)
- Tchekhovskoy, A., Narayan, R., & McKinney, J. C. 2011, *MNRAS*, 418, L79, doi: [10.1111/j.1745-3933.2011.01147.x](https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1745-3933.2011.01147.x)
- Wakabayashi, J. 2025, Self-Sustained Penrose Excitation of Accretion Disks, OSF Registration (Version 1) doi: [10.17605/OSF.IO/62GZV](https://doi.org/10.17605/OSF.IO/62GZV)
- Young, S., Axon, D., Robinson, A., Smith, J., & Hough, J. H. 2011, in *ASP Conf. Ser.*, Vol. 449, *Astronomical Polarimetry 2008: Science from Small to Large Telescopes*, 436