Isotropisation in the Approach to a Singularity

Jerome Quintin

Max Planck Institute for Gravitational Physics (Albert Einstein Institute), Potsdam, Germany



Max-Planck-Institut für Gravitationsphysik Albert-Einstein-Institut



Copernicus Webinar Series October 25th, 2021

Mainly based on Ganguly & JQ [arXiv:2109.11701]

Motivation

• The early universe can be explained by a period of inflation after the big bang

 \longrightarrow produces a flat, isotropic universe with scale-invariant curvature perturbations

 However, other alternatives exist that could also explain the early universe

 \longrightarrow often involves physics 'before the big bang'

• E.g., bouncing cosmology, where the 'primordial physics' occurs during a **contracting phase** (prior to a bounce and the onset of standard big bang cosmology with radiation domination)

Bouncing cosmology

 \checkmark Flatness problem: $\Omega = 1$, where ($8\pi G_{\rm N} = 1$ throughout this talk)

$$\Omega \equiv \frac{\rho_{\text{matter}}}{3H^2} = 1 + \frac{k}{(aH)^2} \,,$$

is an attractor for $\dot{a} < 0$ and 1 + 3w > 0 ($w \equiv p/\rho$):

Friedmann eqs.
$$\implies \frac{\mathrm{d}|\Omega-1|}{\mathrm{d}t} = (1+3w)\left(\frac{\dot{a}}{a}\right)\Omega(\Omega-1)$$

- $\checkmark\,$ Horizon problem: comoving horizon $|aH|^{-1}$ is very large initially and shrinks
- ✓ Structure formation problem: certain fields can generate scale-invariant scalar perturbations, e.g.,
 - adiabatic 'dust field' Wands [gr-qc/9809062], Finelli & Brandenberger [hep-th/0112249]
 - entropic negative exponential scalar field (ekpyrotic) Lehners et

al. [hep-th/0702153], Buchbinder et al. [hep-th/0702154]

Bouncing cosmology

X Anisotropy problem: anisotropies typically tend to grow and dominate over everything else as $a \searrow 0$ (in the approach to the would-be big crunch singularity)

For different components with $\rho^{(w)} \propto a^{-3(1+w)}$ (w < 1),

$$3H^2 = \Lambda - \frac{k}{a^2} + \frac{\rho_0^{(\text{mat.})}}{a^3} + \frac{\rho_0^{(\text{rad.})}}{a^4} + \frac{\rho_0^{(\text{ani.})}}{a^6}$$

(This does not appear to be a problem for matter with w > 1.)

- ⇒ Any bouncing alternative to inflation that wants to be viable and legitimately considered must solve these problems:
 - anisotropies must not disrupt the contracting background that generates the right perturbations;
 - anisotropies must not disrupt the bounce.

Anisotropy evolution in GR with a perfect fluid

Consider a Bianchi type-I metric:

$$g_{\mu\nu} \mathrm{d}x^{\mu} \mathrm{d}x^{\nu} = -\mathrm{d}t^2 + a(t)^2 \sum_{i=1}^3 e^{2\beta_{(i)}(t)} (\mathrm{d}x^i)^2 \,, \quad \sum_{i=1}^3 \beta_{(i)}(t) = 0$$

 $a_{(i)} = a e^{\beta_{(i)}} \,, \quad \ln a = \langle \ln a_{(i)} \rangle \,, \quad H \equiv \dot{a}/a = \langle H_{(i)} \rangle \,, \quad H_{(i)} = H + \dot{\beta}_{(i)}$

• Hypersurface with timelike unit normal u^{μ} has

$$\underbrace{K_{\mu\nu}}_{\text{extr. curv.}} = (\underbrace{g_{\mu\nu} + u_{\mu}u_{\nu}}_{h_{\mu\nu}})H + \underbrace{\sigma_{\mu\nu}}_{\text{shear}}, \quad \sigma_i^j = \dot{\beta}_{(i)}\delta_i^{\ j}, \quad \sigma^2 \equiv \frac{1}{2}\sigma_{ij}\sigma^{ij} = \frac{1}{2}\sum_{i=1}^3 \dot{\beta}_{(i)}^2$$

Einstein field equations ⇒ FLRW + shear anisotropy component:

$$\begin{split} 3H^2 &= \rho + \sigma^2 \,, \quad 2\dot{H} = -(\rho + p) - 2\sigma^2 \\ \dot{\sigma}_i{}^j + 3H\sigma_i{}^j &= 0 \implies \ddot{\beta}_{(i)} + 3H\dot{\beta}_{(i)} = 0 \implies \dot{\beta}_{(i)} \propto a^{-3} \\ \implies p_\sigma &= \rho_\sigma = \sigma^2 = \frac{1}{2}\sum_{i=1}^3 \dot{\beta}_{(i)}^2 \propto a^{-6} \end{split}$$

Anisotropy evolution in GR with a perfect fluid

- ► Shear anisotropy component behaves as a set of massless scalar fields $\mathcal{L} = -\frac{1}{2} \partial_{\mu} \beta_I \partial^{\mu} \beta^I$, i.e., with stiff EoS
- When the shear anisotropy component dominates,

$$H^2 \sim \sigma^2 \propto a^{-6} \implies a(t) \sim |t|^{1/3}$$

- \longrightarrow Kasner singularity as $t \nearrow 0$
- Tuning the initial conditions for anisotropies to remain subdominant would be quite huge (see additional slides)

Ekpyrosis

• How about scalar fields with negative exponential potential?

$$\mathcal{L} = \sum_{I} \left(-\frac{1}{2} \partial_{\mu} \phi_{I} \partial^{\mu} \phi_{I} + V_{I} e^{-c_{I} \phi_{I}} \right) , \quad V_{I} > 0 , \ c_{I}^{2} > 6$$

- Those can arise as moduli of higher-dim. brane constructions in string theory (e.g., distance between 'end-of-the-world' branes)
- Background scaling solution:

$$a(t) \propto (-t)^{1/\epsilon}, \quad \epsilon \equiv -\frac{\dot{H}}{H^2} = \frac{1}{2} \left(\sum_{I} c_{I}^{-2} \right)^{-1} > 3, \quad w = \frac{2\epsilon}{3} - 1 > 1$$

 Direction ⊥ to background trajectory in field space generates scale-invariant scalar perturbations

Isotropisation in ekpyrosis

• Ekpyrotic fields dilute anisotropies

$$3H^2 = \dots + \frac{\rho_0^{(\text{ani.})}}{a^6} + \frac{\rho_0^{(\text{ek.})}}{a^{2\epsilon}}, \qquad \epsilon > 3$$

 Highly efficient and even robust to large anisotropic, curved, and inhomogeneous ICs Garfinkle et al. [0808.0542], figure below addapted from Ijjas et al. [2006.04999]



Isotropisation with massive gravity

• In GR:

$$S \supset \int \mathrm{d}^3 x \mathrm{d}t \, a^3 \left(\frac{1}{2} \dot{\beta}_{(i)}^2\right) \stackrel{\delta_{\beta_{(i)}} S=0}{\Longrightarrow} \quad \ddot{\beta}_{(i)} + 3H \dot{\beta}_{(i)} = 0$$

But if the graviton has a mass m_g:

$$S \supset \int \mathrm{d}^3 x \mathrm{d}t \, a^3 \left(\frac{1}{2} \dot{\beta}^2_{(i)} - \frac{1}{2} m_g^2 \beta_{(i)}^2 \right) \stackrel{\delta_{\beta_{(i)}} S = 0}{\Longrightarrow} \ddot{\beta}_{(i)} + 3H \dot{\beta}_{(i)} + m_g^2 \beta_{(i)} = 0$$

 If m²_g ≫ H², then anisotropies behave like an oscillating massive field with matter EoS in average: the EOMs are solved for

$$\beta_{(i)}(t) \propto \frac{\sin(m_g t)}{m_g t}, \quad H(t) = \frac{2}{3t} \implies \rho_{\sigma} = \frac{1}{2} \sum_{i=1}^{3} \left(\dot{\beta}_{(i)}^2 + m_g^2 \beta_{(i)}^2 \right) \propto a^{-3}$$

- ⇒ Anisotropies may be subdominant even during matter domination!
- \Rightarrow Solves many issues of "matter bounce cosmology" at once

Lin, Brandenberger & JQ [1711.10472]

Isotropisation with massive gravity

• 0-mode tensor perturbations \equiv anisotropies:

$$\delta g_{ij} = a^2 \gamma_{ij} \implies \sigma_i{}^j = \frac{1}{2} \dot{\gamma}_i{}^j$$
$$\implies S \supset \int d^3 x dt \, a^3 \left((\dot{\gamma}_i{}^j)^2 - (\vec{\nabla} \gamma_i{}^j)^2 - m_g^2 (\gamma_i{}^j)^2 \right)$$
$$\vec{\nabla}_{\stackrel{j}{\Longrightarrow} 0}^{\gamma_i{}^j \to 0} \quad \ddot{\gamma}_i{}^j + 3H \dot{\gamma}_i{}^j + m_g^2 \gamma_i{}^j = 0 \quad \longrightarrow \gamma_i{}^j \text{ suppressed}$$

- ⇒ Solves the large tensor-to-scalar ratio problem of matter bounce cosmology JQ et al. [1508.04141], Li, JQ et al. [1612.02036]
- $m_g \lesssim \mathcal{O}(10^{-23}\,{\rm eV})$ today $\implies m_g$ would have had to be time dependent to have $m_g > |H_{\rm bounce}|$
- Adding a mass to a spin-2 field typically excites 3 new d.o.f.
- Only the 2 standard polarisation modes if Lorentz invariance is partially broken Dubovsky *et al.* [hep-th/0411158], Lin & Labun [1501.07160], Lin & Sasaki [1504.01373], Domènech *et al.* [1701.05554], Lin & Mukohyama [1708.03757], Kuroyanagi *et al.* [1710.06789]

Isotropisation with a non-perfect fluid

Details in Ganguly & JQ [arXiv:2109.11701] from here on

Ignoring heat transfer,

$$T_{\mu\nu} = \rho u_{\mu}u_{\nu} + ph_{\mu\nu} + \pi_{\mu\nu}$$

 \rightarrow EOMs are modified:

$$\dot{\rho} + 3H(\rho + p) = -\pi^{ij}\sigma_{ij}, \qquad \dot{\sigma}_i{}^j + 3H\sigma_i{}^j = \pi_i{}^j$$

· A fluid with shear viscosity has an anisotropic stress according to

$$\pi_{ij} = -2\eta\sigma_{ij}$$

 AdS/CFT points to a universal lower bound on shear viscosity e.g., Son & Starinets [0704.0240]

$$\frac{\eta}{s} \ge \frac{1}{4\pi}$$

From kinetic theory,

$$\eta \sim c_{\rm s} \rho \ell_{\rm mfp}$$

Toy model: finite-temperature interacting field theory

• Canonical scalar field, minimally coupled to gravity, with potential

$$V(\phi) = \frac{1}{2}m^2\phi^2 + \frac{\lambda}{4!}\phi^4$$

Extreme regimes:

- ▶ $T \ll m$, matter-like, $\rho \sim a^{-3}$ ▶ $T \gg m/\lambda$, radiation-like, $\rho \sim a^{-4} \propto T^4$
- At high-T, the $\lambda \phi^4$ self interaction implies a cross-section

$$\sigma \sim \frac{\lambda^2}{T^2} \implies \ell_{\rm mfp} \sim \frac{1}{n\sigma} \sim \frac{1}{\lambda^2 T} \implies \eta \sim \rho \ell_{\rm mfp} \sim \frac{T^3}{\lambda^2} \propto a^{-3}$$

Note that $\eta/s \sim 1/\lambda^2 \ge 1$ for $\lambda \le 1$

• Shear evolution (
$$\eta = \kappa/a^3$$
, $\kappa > 0$):

$$\dot{\sigma}_i{}^j + 3H\sigma_i{}^j = \pi_i{}^j = -2\eta\sigma_i{}^j \implies \dot{\sigma}_i{}^j + 3H\sigma_i{}^j = -2\frac{\kappa}{a^3}\sigma_i{}^j$$

• Assuming radiation domination initially (FLRW), $a(t) = \sqrt{t/t_0}$ $(t, t_0 < 0)$ and the solution reads

$$\sigma^2 \propto \frac{1}{a^6} \exp\left(-\frac{8\kappa|t_0|}{a}\right) \xrightarrow{a\searrow 0} 0$$

 \otimes Caveat: one cannot trust this all the way to $a\searrow 0$ since viscosity only makes sense on length scales smaller than the size of the system, here when $\ell_{\rm mfp} < |H|^{-1}$, but $\ell_{\rm mfp} \sim T^{-1} \sim a$ and $H^2 \sim \rho \sim a^{-4}$

 \otimes In the similar spirit, it does not make sense to take the $\lambda\searrow 0$ limit

- Consider a situation where shear is already dominating the universe
- ► Can the viscosity from the subdominant radiation-like interacting scalar field isotropise the universe while in the regime l_{mfp} < |H|⁻¹?
- Let's numerically solve

$$\begin{split} \dot{\rho} + 4H\rho &= \frac{4T_0^3}{\lambda^2} \left(\frac{a_0}{a}\right)^3 \sigma^2, \qquad \dot{\sigma}_i{}^j + 3H\sigma_i{}^j = -\frac{2T_0^3}{\lambda^2} \left(\frac{a_0}{a}\right)^3 \sigma_i{}^j \\ \lambda &= 10^{-3}, \quad H_0 = -10^{-50}, \quad \frac{\sigma_0^2}{\rho_0} = 10^{15} \end{split}$$



- Is this robust to the inclusion of curvature anisotropies?
- In a Bianchi type-IX spacetime,

$$h^{i}{}_{j} = a^{2} \operatorname{diag} \left(e^{2\beta_{+} + 2\sqrt{3}\beta_{-}}, e^{2\beta_{+} - 2\sqrt{3}\beta_{-}}, e^{-4\beta_{+}} \right)$$

$$U(\beta_{+},\beta_{-}) = \frac{1}{4}e^{-8\beta_{+}} - e^{-2\beta_{+}}\cosh\left(2\sqrt{3}\beta_{-}\right) + e^{4\beta_{+}}\sinh^{2}\left(2\sqrt{3}\beta_{-}\right)$$

$$\begin{aligned} 3H^2 &= \rho + \sigma^2 + \frac{1}{a^2} U(\beta_+, \beta_-) \,, \quad -2\dot{H} = \rho + p + 2\sigma^2 + \frac{2}{3a^2} U(\beta_+, \beta_-) \\ \dot{\rho} + 3H(\rho + p) &= 4\eta\sigma^2 \,, \quad \ddot{\beta}_{\pm} + 3H\dot{\beta}_{\pm} + \frac{1}{6a^2}\partial_{\beta_{\pm}}U = -2\eta\dot{\beta}_{\pm} \,, \quad \sigma^2 = 3(\dot{\beta}_+^2 + \dot{\beta}_-^2) \end{aligned}$$



What about other cosmic fluids exhibiting viscosity

- Consider a gas of nearly pressureless dust-like matter: this is typically unstable to gravitational collapse
- ► Fluid with small sound speed ⇒ gravitational instability ⇒ black hole formation JQ & Brandenberger [1609.02556], Chen et al. [1609.02571]
- Black holes attract each other gravitationally (they 'interact')
 a 'fluid of black holes' is viscous
- Small black holes ($R \ll |H|^{-1}$), dilute gas:

$$\sigma \sim \left(\frac{R}{c_{\rm s}^2}\right)^2, \qquad \ell_{\rm mfp} \sim \frac{1}{n\sigma} \sim \frac{c_{\rm s}^4}{\rho R}, \qquad \eta \sim c_{\rm s}\rho\ell_{\rm mfp} \sim \frac{c_{\rm s}^5}{R} \approx {\rm const.}$$
$$\dot{\sigma}_i{}^j + 3H\sigma_i{}^j = -2\eta\sigma_i{}^j \implies \sigma^2 \sim \frac{e^{4\eta|t|}}{a^6}, \ |t| \searrow 0$$

Dilute dust-like black hole gas

If the background is matter dominated at first (FLRW),

$$\frac{\sigma^2}{\rho} = \left(\frac{a_0}{a}\right)^3 \exp\left[-\frac{4\eta}{3|H_0|} \left(1 - \left(\frac{a}{a_0}\right)^{3/2}\right)\right]$$

▶ One has isotropisation only if σ^2/ρ is decreasing, which can happen if

$$\eta > \frac{3}{2}|H_0| \equiv \eta_{\min}$$



Dilute dust-like black hole gas

 $\,\otimes\,\,$ The problem here is that $\eta > \eta_{
m min}$ only if

 $c_{\rm s}^5 > R|H_0|\,,$

but recall that viscosity only makes sense if $\ell_{\rm mfp} < |H|^{-1},$ which amounts to

 $c_{\rm s}^4 \lesssim R|H|$.

Therefore, a dilute gas of black holes cannot realistically be viscous enough to isotropise a dust-like contracting universe

Let's push the black hole gas picture to the limit

- Imagine large black holes $(R \sim |H|^{-1})$ that dominate the universe near a big crunch
- Conjectured to be the state of matter at high density in the early universe, e.g., in string theory Banks & Fischler [many papers], Veneziano [e.g., hep-th/0312182], Masoumi & Mathur [1406.5798], Masoumi [1505.06787], JQ, Brandenberger, Gasperini & Veneziano [1809.01658], Mathur [2009.09832]
- Consider a volume with N ~ V/R³ black holes:

$$\begin{split} E &\sim NM \sim \frac{V}{R^2} \,, \quad S \sim NR^2 \sim \frac{V}{R} \implies S \sim \sqrt{EV} \\ \Longrightarrow \ T &= \left(\frac{\partial S}{\partial E}\right)_V^{-1} \sim \sqrt{\frac{E}{V}} = \sqrt{\rho} \,, \quad p = T \left(\frac{\partial S}{\partial V}\right)_E = \frac{E}{V} = \rho \end{split}$$

- Stiff $p=\rho$ fluid with $s\equiv S/V\sim \sqrt{\rho}$

• No shear by construction since we recover the Friedmann equation

$$\rho = \frac{E}{V} \sim \frac{1}{R^2} \sim H^2$$

Dense black hole gas viscosity

As before

$$\sigma \sim R^2$$
, $\ell_{\rm mfp} \sim \frac{1}{n\sigma} \sim R$, $\eta \sim \frac{1}{R} \sim |H| \sim \sqrt{\rho}$, $\frac{\eta}{s} = {\rm const.}$

• So for $\eta = \kappa |H|$ with κ of order 1, we have

$$\dot{\sigma}_i{}^j + 3H\sigma_i{}^j = 2\kappa H\sigma_i{}^j \implies \sigma^2 \propto \frac{1}{a^{6-4\kappa}}$$

⇒ forbids anisotropies from winning over compared to the 'stiff background' with $\rho \propto a^{-6}$:

$$\frac{\sigma^2}{\rho} \propto a^{4\kappa} \stackrel{a\searrow 0}{\longrightarrow} 0$$

- In other words, anisotropies can never develop
- Only microphysical example of $\eta \propto \sqrt{\rho}$, which was known as a parametrisation to lead to an isotropic singularity (full isotropisation by the time a = 0) Belinski [1310.5112], Belinski & Henneaux, Ganguly & Bruni [1902.06356], Ganguly [2008.02286]

Summary

- In GR with a $T_{\mu\nu}$ satisfying the DEC, anisotropies always end up dominating in a contracting universe
 - \longrightarrow it's a problem for bouncing cosmology
 - \rightarrow e.g., it would involve fine tuning the ICs in matter domination more than to resolve the curvature problem of standard big bang cosmology (see additional slides)
- Ekpyrosis ($p_\phi > \rho_\phi$) appears well suited and robust as a resolution to this problem
- Other resolutions exist though:
 - massive gravity
 - viscous fluid (any realistic interacting fluid)
 - other modified gravity (e.g., limiting curvature sakakihara, Yoshida, Takahashi & JQ [2005.10844]; see additional slides)

Summary

Isotropisation due to viscosity:

- Finite- $T \lambda \phi^4$ theory can robustly isotropise the universe to radiation-dominated FLRW for $\mathcal{O}(100)$ *e*-folds, but not all the way to arbitrarily small *a*
 - \longrightarrow could still be part of a bigger scenario
- Dust-like fluid as a dilute gas of black holes exhibits viscosity, but not enough to remain isotropic
 - \longrightarrow still BKL unstable, so no good for matter bounce
- Hypothetical dense black hole gas is viscous ($\eta\propto\sqrt{\rho})$ and is robust against the growth of anisotropies

 \longrightarrow relevant for stringy constructions proposing this state of matter

 $\Rightarrow \mbox{ Realistic fluids have interactions at the microscopic level and therefore viscosity, which can often play an important role in the cosmology$ $$\low$ e.g., gravitational wave damping$$

Thank you for your attention!

I acknowledge support from the following agencies:





Additional slides

How much of a problem?

Can't we fine-tune the initial conditions? Levy [1611.08972]

Recall

$$\Omega_k \equiv \frac{\rho^{(\text{curv.})}}{3H^2} \propto \frac{1}{(aH)^2} = \frac{1}{\dot{a}^2}$$

• Flatness problem in standard big bang cosmology (say radiation dominated with $a \propto \sqrt{t}$, $T \propto 1/a$):

$$\frac{\Omega_k(t_{\text{today}})}{\Omega_k(t_{\text{Pl}})} = \frac{t_{\text{today}}}{t_{\text{Pl}}} = \left(\frac{T_{\text{Pl}}}{T_{\text{today}}}\right)^2 \approx e^{146}$$

 \longrightarrow Exaggerated here, but that's why we typically say that we need 60 e-folds of inflation, where

$$\mathcal{N} \propto \ln(a|H|)$$

• Say we want 60 *e*-folds of matter-dominated contraction now with

$$a \propto |t|^{2/3} \implies |H| \propto a^{-3/2}$$

 $\implies \mathcal{N} \equiv \ln\left(\frac{a|H|}{a_0|H_0|}\right) = \frac{1}{2}\ln\left(\frac{a_0}{a}\right)$

• Anisotropy problem ($f \equiv \rho^{(\mathrm{ani.})} / \rho^{(\mathrm{mat.})}$):

$$\frac{f}{f_0} = \left(\frac{a}{a_0}\right)^{-3} = e^{6\mathcal{N}} \stackrel{!}{=} e^{360}$$

- Big fine-tuning problem. Way more than the flatness problem of standard big bang cosmology
- \Rightarrow Very hard to get 'stable' matter-dominated contraction

Limiting (extrinsic) curvature

$$\mathcal{L} \supset \chi \mathcal{I} - V(\chi) \stackrel{\delta_{\chi} S=0}{\Longrightarrow} \mathcal{I} = V'(\chi) \qquad [\text{here } \mathcal{I} = \mathcal{I}(K_{\mu\nu}, h_{\mu\nu}, \mathcal{D}_{\mu})]$$
$$|V'(\chi)| \leq \text{const.} \implies |\mathcal{I}| \leq \text{const.}$$

• Can we construct $\mathcal{I} \propto \sigma^2$ in Bianchi I? Sure:

$$\mathcal{I} \equiv K^{\mu}{}_{\nu}K^{\nu}{}_{\mu} - \frac{1}{3}(K^{\mu}{}_{\mu})^2 \stackrel{\text{BI}}{=} 6\sigma^2$$

• Then, introduce a new vector field A_{μ} with

$$\mathcal{L} \supset \lambda (A_{\mu}A^{\mu} + 1) \stackrel{\delta_{\lambda}S \equiv 0}{\Longrightarrow} A_{\mu}A^{\mu} = -1$$

 \longrightarrow defines a hypersurface with normal unit timelike vector $n^{\mu} = A^{\mu}$, so then $\mathcal{I} = \nabla^{\mu}A_{\nu}\nabla^{\nu}A_{\mu} - \frac{1}{3}(\nabla^{\mu}A_{\mu})^2$ and the whole theory has

$$\mathcal{L} \supset \frac{R}{2} + \lambda (A_{\mu}A^{\mu} + 1) + \chi \left(\nabla^{\mu}A_{\nu}\nabla^{\nu}A_{\mu} - \frac{1}{3}(\nabla^{\mu}A_{\mu})^2 \right) - V(\chi)$$

→ generalised mimetic/cuscuton/æther gravity in which shear anisotropies cannot blow up! Sakakihara, Yoshida, Takahashi & JQ [2005.10844]