

Kundt geometries in Brans-Dicke theory and the memory effect

Siddhant Siddhant¹, Indranil Chakraborty² and Sayan Kar^{1,2*}

¹ *Department of Physics*

Indian Institute of Technology Kharagpur,

721 302, India and

² *Centre for Theoretical Studies*

Indian Institute of Technology Kharagpur,

721 302, India

Abstract

We study Kundt geometries (*Kundt waves* as well as a *generalised Kundt metric*) in Brans-Dicke (BD) theory with emphasis on specific solutions and possible memory effects. Three solutions with different values of the BD scalar ($\omega = -2, +1, -3/2$) are presented for Kundt waves. In particular, for $\omega = -3/2$ we note that this value is directly fixed from the field equations and its solutions for the generalized Kundt metric. For all obtained solutions, we use geodesics and geodesic deviation to arrive at memory effects. Our results on displacement memory from the analysis of geodesic motion in Kundt wave spacetimes show a behaviour similar to that for negative scalar curvature geometries in General Relativity (GR). Performing a geodesic deviation analysis in the same Kundt wave spacetimes using a parallelly transported tetrad, reveals displacement memory only along a single spatial direction, for $\omega = -2$. For $\omega = +1, -3/2$ we find displacement memory from geodesic deviation along other directions as well. Thereafter, we move on to generalised Kundt spacetimes. Making use of solutions for timelike geodesics, we arrive at memory effects via geodesics and geodesic deviation. The analysis done here is in Fermi normal coordinates, choosing appropriate tetrads along the central timelike geodesic. Displacement memory along all three orthogonal spatial directions (X^1, X^2, X^3) is found – a feature resulting from the presence of nonzero *gyraton-like* terms in the metric. In summary, we confirm that distinct memory effects (different from their GR counterparts) are indeed present in diverse Kundt geometries in BD theory.

*Electronic address: siddhant@iitkgp.ac.in, indradeb@iitkgp.ac.in, sayan@phy.iitkgp.ac.in

I. INTRODUCTION

The detection of gravitational waves in binary mergers has opened up new prospects for testing theories of gravity in the strong field regime [1, 2]. Gravitational memory is one such unobserved strong field effect that can be used to test diverse theories of gravity. The gravitational wave memory effect is the residual permanent DC shift in the position (or velocity) caused due to the passage of a gravitational wave pulse [3].

The study of memory effects began in the work of Zel'dovich and Polnarev [4] who studied gravitational radiation emitted due to the motion of flybys/collapse of stars in a globular cluster. A few years later, Braginsky and Grishchuk [5] looked at motion of test particles in weak field, linearized gravity and coined the term *memory effect* to denote the change in the metric perturbation at early and late times. Geodesic deviation of test particles due to low frequency gravitational radiation at null infinity was investigated further by Ludvigsen [6]. Christodoulou, using full nonlinear GR showed the presence of memory due to the transport of energy and momentum of gravitational waves to null infinity [7]. This effect related to non-linearity was ascribed to gravitons produced by the radiation itself [8]. Memory effects are also possible in electrodynamics [9] and Yang-Mills theories [10, 11]. Interesting theoretical links to memory effects have been conjectured, of late, in the context of soft theorems and BMS symmetries [12]. It has been noted that the nonlinear memory effect can also be understood as a BMS transformation relating two inequivalent Minkowski vacua at future null infinity caused by the passage of gravitational waves (see the review [13] and the references cited therein).

Memory effects in non-flat backgrounds in GR have been studied in both dS [14, 15] (motivations from cosmology) and AdS spacetimes [16]. In [16], the authors have showed how to isolate the gravitational wave contribution from the background spacetime by resorting to Fermi normal coordinates and solving the geodesic deviation equation. They treated the wave as a perturbation over AdS spacetime caused due to scattering of massive/massless particles. In our work, we adopt the same method for studying memory effects in Kundt spacetimes. However, in our case, the setting is non-perturbative, since we deal with exact spacetimes representing gravitational waves.

Kundt spacetimes are exact radiative geometries consisting of nonexpanding, nonshearing and nontwisting null geodesic congruences (NGC) [17–19]. The spacetime admits various

wave solutions (pp waves, Siklos waves [20, 21]) owing to the presence of NGC whose tangent vector is generally not covariantly constant. Hence, the wave surfaces are not Cartesian planes. This non-planarity can be ascribed to the presence of matter or a cosmological constant [22]. Gyratons (spinning relativistic sources) are solutions obtained as a subclass of Kundt geometries [23–25]. Presence of gyratonic matter in a Kundt geometry imparts an angular momentum due to its intrinsic spin. Till date, most of the research around Kundt geometries have largely been focused on Einstein gravity [26–31]. There exists some recent work in Gauss-Bonnet [32] and quadratic gravity [33]. However, as far as we know, there does not exist any literature on such geometries in scalar tensor theories. Our article is one such attempt towards understanding Kundt solutions in the most basic scalar-tensor theory, BD gravity, using the memory effect as a tool.

There does exist previous work on memory effects in BD theory. As is well known, the BD scalar field produces a breathing mode along with the two additional polarizations $(+, \times)$ found in GR [34]. Lang computed GW waveforms for scalar and tensor modes separately in the PN approximation [35, 36]. Du and Nishizawa proposed a test of gravity for scalar tensor theories [37]. They found two distinct sets of memory contributions: T-memory (tensor) and S-memory (scalar). This scalar memory is a unique effect in such theories, unlike GR. Such scalar memory effect was used as a tool to understand the Vainshtein screening mechanism in BD gravity [38]. Asymptotically flat spacetimes in BD theory have been recently studied in [39, 40]. The BMS group [41] is retained for the tensorial case. There are degenerate vacua for the scalar sector related via Lorentz transformations. The BMS charge algebra has also been computed in [42].

Studying memory effects for such Kundt wave spacetimes in GR was initiated by two of us in [43], by analysing geodesics. Similar to exact plane wave spacetimes one can construct sandwich waves here by choosing appropriate limiting profiles [19, 44, 45]. This serves as a toy model of a gravitational wave burst, qualitatively. Interesting distinctions occur between negative and positive constant curvature solutions, particularly for the latter, where we found a new *frequency memory effect*. In this article, our motivation is two fold: a) try to understand differences in memory effects between GR and BD theory based on Kundt wave geometries b) differentiate between the nature of Kundt wave solutions and generalized

Kundt metric ¹ for the same value of ω . ² In the Kundt wave scenario, we solve explicitly three cases with different values of ω (-2,+1,-3/2). The first case ($\omega = -2$) resembles a constant negative scalar curvature. $\omega = +1$ consist of variable positive curvature. In these two cases we perform geodesic analysis to draw parallels between GR and BD theories. We also solve for $\omega = -3/2$ which helps in comparing solutions between Kundt wave metric and the full metric. This value of ω is arrived at, in the full metric scenario, directly from the field equations .

The cases having variable scalar curvature have singular solutions. Such solutions were also reported in [31] where they analysed Kundt spacetimes in GR having scalar field as matter. The Kundt metric obtained here is indeed singular. We discuss the nature of these singularities in detail. The coordinate ranges are chosen such that the geodesics are not inside the singular region. From our geodesic analysis it is shown that there is indeed focusing towards a singularity.

As for the methods employed, in all cases we first find out the metric by solving the relevant field equations. The scalar field is only dependent on the spatial coordinates in the cases of interest. Then we solve for the geodesic equations and try to analyse memory effects using them. Since we are working in non-flat backgrounds, another way to approach the problem is by solving the deviation equation. This entire calculation is done in Fermi normal coordinates [16]. Here the coordinate system is Cartesian and hence the notion of displacement and velocity memory effect is qualitatively similar to exact plane wave spacetimes [45–47]. In such Fermi coordinates, we construct tetrads along a given timelike geodesic. For the Kundt wave metric we can construct parallelly propagating tetrads. We find that only for the full metric it is not possible to obtain a set of parallelly propagating tetrads ³. Hence, they are Fermi-Walker transported. Thus, the deviation equation contains extra terms. After obtaining all the tetrads we find the relevant Riemann curvature in the tetrad frame. We split the background and gravitational wave terms (this is done by looking into each term and separating those terms which have factors proportional to the gravitational wave part from the metric). The relevant contribution coming from the background deviation is first calculated. Next, we solve for the deviation solely due to gravitational wave. This

¹In this paper, we refer to generalized Kundt metric with $\omega = -3/2$ as the *full metric*.

²Different value of ω gives two different theories.

³This is due to the presence of the *gyrator-like* terms in the full metric

brings out the memory piece in the spacetime metric. This entire geodesic deviation analysis can be extended to any radiative geometry in other gravity theories.

The organization of our paper is as follows. In Sec. II we lay out the basic framework employed in our entire paper. Section III deals with Kundt wave solutions. We devote Sec III A, B, C for $\omega = -2, +1, -3/2$ respectively. Section IV covers the case of generalized Kundt metric solutions. Finally, we summarise our work in Sec V with comments on possible extensions of the present work. We provide relevant expressions used in Sec IV, at the end in an appendix.

II. BASIC FRAMEWORK

A. Brans-Dicke gravity

Brans and Dicke seeking motivation from Mach's principle proposed this theory [48] where the Newtonian gravitational constant (G) is considered as the reciprocal of a scalar field. This is based on the idea of variability of inertial mass at different points in spacetime. The action for the BD theory in the Jordan frame is given below.

$$S = \int \sqrt{-g} \left[\phi R - \frac{\omega}{\phi} \nabla_\alpha \phi \nabla^\alpha \phi + 16\pi \mathcal{L}_m \right] d^4x \quad (1)$$

Here, ϕ denotes the scalar field, ω is the BD parameter and the \mathcal{L}_m denotes the matter Lagrangian. The value of ω is highly constrained from Solar System observations [49]. Different values of ω correspond to different theories. We initially work in the general scenario where it can take any general value. However we do analyse solutions for specific values $\omega = -2, +1, -3/2$. The motivations for choosing such values are discussed in the relevant sections. In all the cases considered here we solve for vacuum solutions ($\mathcal{L}_m = 0$). An interesting point to note is that the case of $\omega = -3/2$ is a solution in conformal relativity [50] and also equivalent to Palatini f(R) gravity [51].

The field equations are obtained by variation of $g_{\mu\nu}$ and ϕ . After performing a little algebra, we can write them in the standard form as shown below.

$$G_{\mu\nu} = \frac{\omega}{\phi^2}[\phi_{,\mu}\phi_{,\nu} - \frac{1}{2}g_{\mu\nu}\phi_{,\alpha}\phi^{,\alpha}] + \frac{1}{\phi}(\phi_{,\mu;\nu}) \quad (2)$$

$$\square\phi = 0 \quad (3)$$

The box operator is constructed using the Kundt spacetime metric.

B. Kundt Solutions

We try to solve for Kundt geometries [17–19] in Brans-Dicke theory. The generalized spacetime metric is given below.

$$ds^2 = -Hdu^2 - 2dudv - 2W_1dudx - 2W_2dudy + \frac{1}{P^2}(dx^2 + dy^2) \quad (4)$$

$$P \equiv P(u, x, y), H \equiv H(u, v, x, y), W_i \equiv W_i(u, v, x, y), \forall i \in \{x, y\}$$

The vector field $\mathbf{k} = \partial_v$ gives the NGC. The tangent to the spatial surfaces ($P\partial_x, P\partial_y$) and \mathbf{k} are orthogonal to each other. W_1, W_2 are gyraton-like ⁴ terms [23, 25]. These terms introduce angular momentum in the spacetime and correspond to spinning null sources.

We also work with Kundt wave metrics where the cross terms (W_1, W_2) are set to zero. The line element is given below.

$$ds^2 = -H(u, x, y)du^2 - 2dudv + \frac{dx^2 + dy^2}{P(u, x, y)^2} \quad (5)$$

The waves (denoted via the term $H(u, x, y)$) are viewed as propagating in the background spacetime [22, 27, 43].

We work with both these classes of spacetimes given in Eqs. (4) and (5). First, we consider Kundt wave spacetimes. In such cases one can set the BD parameter (ω) by hand. ⁵ Hence, using this freedom we construct positive and negative curvature solutions. Analyses of memory effects using geodesics in such spacetimes helps us in qualitatively understanding the differences w.r.t. GR [43]. The choices $\omega = -2, +1$ correspond to constant negative and variable positive scalar curvature respectively.

⁴For gyratons W_1, W_2, H have no dependence on coordinate v .

⁵They are not fixed from the field equations.

Finally, in the case of the full metric, the value of $\omega = -3/2$ is fixed from the field equations in BD theory. In order to distinguish such solutions with their Kundt wave metric counterparts, we also perform the same analysis with the same value of ω for the latter.

C. Memory effects and geodesic deviation equation

Apart from a geodesic analysis, one can understand memory from geodesic deviation. The memory effect for spacetimes having non-flat backgrounds have been analysed in [16] using geodesic deviation. In [16], the authors have given the motivation to study memory effects solely due to gravitational wave by going to Fermi normal coordinates and separating the background and gravitational wave part. Briefly, we state their methodology and go on to calculate memory effects for the Kundt metric. The geodesic deviation equation in Fermi coordinates ($t = X^0, X^i$)⁶ is given as,

$$\frac{d^2 X^i}{dt^2} = -R^i{}_{0j0} X^j \quad (6)$$

The spatial indices associated with the frame are denoted by i, j ($R^i{}_{0j0} = R^\mu{}_{\nu\rho\sigma} e^i{}_\mu e^\nu{}_0 e^\rho{}_j e^\sigma{}_0$). The tetrads $\{e^\alpha{}_a\}$ are parallelly propagated along the given geodesic with tangent vector given as $e^\alpha{}_0$. The tetrads and metric are related via ⁷ $\eta_{ij} = e^\alpha{}_i e^\beta{}_j g_{\alpha\beta}$. We assume that the total deviation vector is of the form $X^i = X^i_B + X^i_G$, where the suffixes B, G are for background and wave respectively. The same splitting is carried out for the Riemann tensor in the tetrad frame. The splitting of the Riemann tensor is done by noting the terms which are proportional to $H(u, x, y)$ ⁸ or its derivatives. Such terms denote the gravitational wave contribution while the other terms are due to background curvature or gyraton-like sources. Then, the equation (6) separates into these two equations which are shown below.

$$\frac{d^2 X^i_B}{dt^2} = -(R^i{}_{0j0})_B X^j_B \quad (7)$$

$$\frac{d^2 X^i_G}{dt^2} = -[(R^i{}_{0j0})_B + (R^i{}_{0j0})_G] X^j_G - (R^i{}_{0j0})_G X^j_B \quad (8)$$

⁶ t denotes the proper time along the geodesic and X^i give the three spatial coordinates.

⁷ η_{ab} denotes the Minkowski metric with components (-1,1,1,1).

⁸In the full metric scenario, the wave like term is $H(u, v, x, y)$ given in Eq.(4).

Solving the equation (8) gives the memory effect as it encodes solely the separation caused due the gravitational wave burst. The main advantage in going to such Fermi-normal coordinates is that they are basically Cartesian. The t -constant planes correspond to 3d Euclidean space. Hence, the notion of velocity and displacement memory effects are similar to exact plane wave spacetimes which has been extensively worked out in the literature [44–46]. An important feature to note is that Eqs.(6), (7) and (8) take this form only when the constructed tetrads are parallelly transported. For non-parallel transport all these equations are modified. In the generalized Kundt metric, we have constructed a set of Fermi-Walker transported tetrads. The reader may refer to Sec IV D where we have explicitly computed the modified deviation equation.

III. KUNDT WAVE METRIC

We solve for three particular cases $\omega = -2, +1, -3/2$. At first, we rewrite the metric in Eq.(5) below.

$$ds^2 = -H(u, x, y)du^2 - 2dudv + \frac{dx^2 + dy^2}{P(u, x, y)^2}$$

We consider the scalar field to be independent of v and hence, $\phi \equiv \phi(u, x, y)$. The components of Eq.(2) which are relevant for solving the field equations are listed below.⁹

$$G_{xx} = \frac{\omega}{2\phi^2}(\phi_{,x}^2 - \phi_{,y}^2) + \frac{1}{\phi}(\phi_{,xx} + \frac{P_{,x}}{P}\phi_{,x} - \frac{P_{,y}}{P}\phi_{,y}) \quad (9)$$

$$G_{yy} = \frac{\omega}{2\phi^2}(\phi_{,y}^2 - \phi_{,x}^2) + \frac{1}{\phi}(\phi_{,yy} + \frac{P_{,y}}{P}\phi_{,y} - \frac{P_{,x}}{P}\phi_{,x}) \quad (10)$$

$$G_{uu} = \frac{\omega}{\phi^2} \left(\phi_{,u}^2 + \frac{H}{2}P^2(\phi_{,x}^2 + \phi_{,y}^2) \right) + \frac{1}{\phi} \left(\phi_{,uu} - \frac{1}{2}P^2H_{,x}\phi_{,x} - \frac{1}{2}P^2H_{,y}\phi_{,y} \right) \quad (11)$$

$$G_{uv} = \frac{\omega}{2\phi^2}P^2(\phi_{,x}^2 + \phi_{,y}^2) \quad (12)$$

$$G_{xu} = \frac{\omega}{\phi^2}(\phi_{,x}\phi_{,u}) + \frac{1}{\phi}(\phi_{,xu} + \frac{P_{,u}}{P}\phi_{,x}) \quad (13)$$

$$G_{yu} = \frac{\omega}{\phi^2}(\phi_{,y}\phi_{,u}) + \frac{1}{\phi}(\phi_{,yu} + \frac{P_{,u}}{P}\phi_{,y}) \quad (14)$$

⁹The four other equations are the redundancies of the Einsteins field equations and hence are not required for obtaining the solutions.

We decompose the scalar field and the metric functions as:

$$\phi(u, x, y) = \alpha(u)\psi(x, y), \quad P(u, x, y) = \frac{\tilde{P}(x, y)}{U(u)}, \quad H(u, x, y) = H'(u)h(x, y). \quad (15)$$

Adding equations (9) and (10) and using separation of variables from equation (15) results in $\psi_{,xx} + \psi_{,yy} = 0$ (we know that $G_{xx} = G_{yy} = 0$ from the metric). The solution is,

$$\psi(x, y) = \log(x^2 + y^2) \quad (16)$$

From the metric, $G_{uv} = P^2\Delta \log P$ (where, $\Delta = (\partial_{xx} + \partial_{yy})$). Using this in equation (12) gives,

$$\tilde{P} = \frac{\sqrt{x^2 + y^2}}{[\log(x^2 + y^2)]^{\omega/2}} \quad (17)$$

The equations for the ‘ xu ’ and ‘ yu ’ components, as in (13),(14) and given the metric (5) we end up with

$$\frac{\omega}{\phi^2}(\phi_{,x}\phi_{,u}) + \frac{1}{\phi}(\phi_{,xu} + \frac{P_{,u}}{P}\phi_{,x}) = \left(\frac{P_{,u}}{P}\right)_{,x} \quad (18)$$

$$\frac{\omega}{\phi^2}(\phi_{,y}\phi_{,u}) + \frac{1}{\phi}(\phi_{,yu} + \frac{P_{,u}}{P}\phi_{,y}) = \left(\frac{P_{,u}}{P}\right)_{,y} \quad (19)$$

Both the above equations reduce to the same equation after using the separation of variables.

We have,

$$(\omega + 1)\frac{\alpha_{,u}}{\alpha} = \frac{U_{,u}}{U} \quad (20)$$

The Ricci scalar curvature is

$$R = 2P^2\Delta \log P = \frac{4\omega}{U^2[\log(x^2 + y^2)]^{\omega+2}} \quad (21)$$

The component of G_{uu} from the metric is given below.

$$G_{uu} = \frac{P^2}{2}(H_{,xx} + H_{,yy}) + 2\frac{P_{,uu}}{P} - 4\left(\frac{P_{,u}}{P}\right)^2 + H(-P_{,x}^2 - P_{,y}^2 + P(P_{,xx} + P_{,yy}))$$

Using equations (11) and (15) we get

$$\begin{aligned} & \frac{\tilde{P}^2}{2U^2}H'(u)(h_{,xx} + h_{,yy}) - 2\frac{U_{,uu}}{U} + H'(u)h\left(\frac{\tilde{P}(\tilde{P}_{,xx} + \tilde{P}_{,yy}) - \tilde{P}_{,x}^2 - \tilde{P}_{,y}^2}{U^2}\right) = \\ & \omega\left[\left(\frac{\alpha_{,u}}{\alpha}\right)^2 + \frac{H'h\tilde{P}^2}{2U^2}\left(\left(\frac{\psi_{,x}}{\psi}\right)^2 + \left(\frac{\psi_{,y}}{\psi}\right)^2\right)\right] + \frac{\alpha_{,uu}}{\alpha} - \frac{\tilde{P}^2}{2U^2}H'(u)\left(h_{,x}\frac{\psi_{,x}}{\psi} + h_{,y}\frac{\psi_{,y}}{\psi}\right) \end{aligned} \quad (22)$$

We set $U = 1$. From equations (20), (22) and (16) we find that $H'(u)$ is unconstrained. The xy dependent part of $H(u, x, y)$ becomes

$$h(x, y) = \log[\log(x^2 + y^2)] \quad (23)$$

This polarization term $h(x, y)$ is different from GR. We will point out the consequences of this difference on the nature of the memory effect, contrasting it with GR. Thus from our generic analysis (without specifying the value of ω) we find that only $H'(u)$ is unconstrained. We now discuss the various ω solutions.

A. Kundt waves for $\omega = -2$

1. Metric and geodesic analysis

We consider a scenario where the scalar curvature is constant. Hence, we set $\omega = -2$. Thus, scalar curvature is $R = -8$ and the metric function $\tilde{P} = \sqrt{x^2 + y^2}[\log(x^2 + y^2)]$. We perform a coordinate transformation $x = e^X \cos Y, y = e^X \sin Y$ ¹⁰. The metric in transformed coordinates (u,v,X,Y) becomes as follows.

$$ds^2 = -H'(u) \log(2X) du^2 - 2dudv + \frac{dX^2 + dY^2}{4X^2} \quad (24)$$

We choose $H'(u) = \frac{1}{2} \text{sech}^2 u$ as it qualitatively resembles a gravitational wave pulse. The geodesic equations for transverse coordinates become (u is an affine parameter):


$$\frac{d^2 X}{du^2} - \frac{1}{X} \left(\frac{dX}{du} \right)^2 + \frac{1}{X} \left(\frac{dY}{du} \right)^2 + X \text{sech}^2 u = 0 \quad (25)$$

$$\frac{d^2 Y}{du^2} - \frac{2}{X} \left(\frac{dX}{du} \right) \left(\frac{dY}{du} \right) = 0 \quad (26)$$


The above equations are solved numerically for a pair of geodesics in *Mathematica 10*. We set the initial coordinate velocities to zero for making them parallel.¹¹ The plot for X, Y directions are given below.

¹⁰We use this coordinate transformation for other values of ω

¹¹This same initial condition is used in other cases of ω too.



(a) Initial positions of x are 2(orange) and 5(blue) respectively.



(b) Initial positions of y are 2(orange), 5(blue) respectively.

FIG. 1: Displacement memory effect in Kundt waves with spatial 2-surfaces having constant negative curvature for Brans-Dicke theory.

We observe permanent displacement along only X-direction (see Fig.(1a)). There is no change in position in Y-direction as shown in the Fig.(1b). This is akin to GR where we also observed constant separation after the passage of the gravitational wave pulse.

2. Geodesic deviation analysis

The construction of a parallel propagating tetrad for Kundt spacetimes has been worked out in [52]. We rewrite the metric in (24) by substituting $\xi = X + iY, \bar{\xi} = X - iY$. For ease of identification we name these coordinates $(u, v, \xi, \bar{\xi})$ as the Bicak-Podolsky coordinates.

$$ds^2 = -H'(u) \log[\xi + \bar{\xi}] du^2 - 2dudv + \frac{d\xi d\bar{\xi}}{(\xi + \bar{\xi})^2} \quad (27)$$

This coordinate system exactly matches with the one presented in [52]. The tetrad constructed by satisfying the orthonormality condition is as follows.

$$\begin{aligned} e_0^\mu &= [\dot{v}, \dot{\xi}, \dot{\bar{\xi}}, 1] & e_1^\mu &= [-\dot{X}/2X, -2X, -2X, 0] \\ e_2^\mu &= [-\dot{Y}/2X, -2iX, 2iX, 0] & e_3^\mu &= [1 - \dot{v}, -\dot{\xi}, -\dot{\bar{\xi}}, -1] \end{aligned} \quad (28)$$

e_0^μ gives the tangent to the geodesic. It is thus always parallelly transported (obeys the geodesic equations). The tetrad e_3^μ is parallelly propagated while e_1^μ, e_2^μ are not. Hence, this two tetrads are rotated by an angle $\dot{\theta}_p = -\dot{Y}/X$. In the geodesic shown in Fig. 1, we

have $\dot{Y} = 0$ and so the rotation parameter is a constant. We take $\theta_p = 0$ so that the two tetrads e_1^μ, e_2^μ are also parallelly transported.

The non-zero Riemann tensor components in the tetrad basis, for both the background and the wave are shown below.

$$\begin{aligned} (R^1{}_{010})_B &= -\left(\frac{\dot{Y}}{X}\right)^2 & (R^1{}_{020})_B &= \frac{\dot{Y}\dot{X}}{X^2} & (R^2{}_{010})_B &= \frac{\dot{Y}\dot{X}}{X^2} \\ (R^2{}_{020})_B &= -\left(\frac{\dot{X}}{X}\right)^2 & (R^2{}_{020})_G &= -2H'(u) \end{aligned} \quad (29)$$

Substituting these expressions from Eq.(29) of the Riemann tensor components (as given in the tetrad basis) in Eqs.(7) and (8), we solve for the gravitational wave contribution to the geodesic deviation. We find that the nontrivial contribution due to the wave comes only along X^2 direction. Thus, both deviation and geodesic equation analysis claim the presence of memory.




FIG. 2: Deviation due to the gravitational wave only along X^2 direction.

Note the presence of a memory effect only along X^2 direction as evident from the plot in Fig. (2). The separation monotonically increases along this coordinate while it remains constant throughout for the other two directions.

B. Kundt waves for $\omega = +1$

1. Metric and Geodesic analysis

The curvature scalar and the metric function $P(x, y)$ for such a value of ω becomes

$$R = \frac{4}{[\log(x^2 + y^2)]^3} \quad \tilde{P}(x, y) = \frac{\sqrt{x^2 + y^2}}{[\log(x^2 + y^2)]^{1/2}} \quad (30)$$

We observe that the Ricci scalar diverges when $x^2 + y^2 = 1$. The metric in the transformed coordinates (X, Y) is,


$$ds^2 = -H'(u) \log[2X] du^2 - 2dudv + 2X(dX^2 + dY^2) \quad (31)$$

The geodesic equations for the spatial coordinates X, Y are provided [$H'(u) = \frac{1}{2} \text{sech}^2(u)$].


$$\frac{d^2 X}{du^2} + \frac{1}{2} \left[\frac{1}{X} \left(\frac{dX}{du} \right)^2 - \frac{1}{X} \left(\frac{dY}{du} \right)^2 \right] + \frac{\text{sech}^2 u}{8X^2} = 0 \quad (32)$$

$$\frac{d^2 Y}{du^2} + \left(\frac{1}{X} \right) \frac{dX}{du} \frac{dY}{du} = 0 \quad (33)$$

Eqs.(32) and (33) are solved numerically in *Mathematica 10*. The solutions for the coordinates X, Y are given below.



(a) Initial positions of x are 5(orange) and 3(blue) respectively.



(b) Initial positions of y are 3(orange), 2(blue) respectively.

FIG. 3: Displacement memory effect in Kundt waves with spatial 2-surfaces having variable positive curvature for Brans-Dicke theory.

We find no change in separation along Y direction as shown in Fig.(3b). Along the X direction, we find increasing separation between the geodesics after the departure of the pulse.

This is in sharp contrast to the profiles obtained in GR. In the latter case we found, from a geodesic analysis [43] that for positive curvature scenarios there is presence of *frequency memory effect*. This is related to the difference in the nature of the metric for the two theories. In BD theory, $h(X, Y) = \log(2X)$ (obtained by solving the field equations) whereas in GR we took it as $h(X, Y) = \frac{1}{2}(X^2 - Y^2)$ (usual expression found in + polarization). On extrapolating the geodesic trajectories to higher values of u , we find that the geodesics are inextendible beyond $X = 0$, signifying the singular nature of the metric solution at that point.

2. Geodesic Deviation analysis

We use the same technique as for $\omega = -2$. The metric in Bicak-Podolsky coordinates $(\xi, \bar{\xi})$ becomes

$$ds^2 = -H'(u) \log[\xi + \bar{\xi}] du^2 - 2dudv + (\xi + \bar{\xi}) d\xi d\bar{\xi} \quad (34)$$

The orthonormal tetrads for this metric turn out to be,

$$\begin{aligned} e_0^\mu &= [\dot{v}, \dot{\xi}, \dot{\bar{\xi}}, 1] & e_1^\mu &= \left[-(2X)^{1/2} \dot{X}, -\frac{1}{(2X)^{1/2}}, -\frac{1}{(2X)^{1/2}}, 0 \right] \\ e_2^\mu &= \left[-(2X)^{1/2} \dot{Y}, -\frac{i}{(2X)^{1/2}}, \frac{i}{(2X)^{1/2}}, 0 \right] & e_3^\mu &= [1 - \dot{v}, -\dot{\xi}, -\dot{\bar{\xi}}, -1] \end{aligned} \quad (35)$$

e_0^μ gives the tangent to the timelike central geodesic. Here, too, we need to rotate the dyads e_1^μ, e_2^μ by an angle $\theta_p = \frac{\dot{Y}}{2X}$ to make them parallel. \dot{Y} is zero as follows from the plot in Fig.(3b). The constant θ_p is taken to be zero.

The nonzero Riemann tensor components in the tetrad basis are given as:

Background

$$\begin{aligned} (R^1{}_{010})_B &= \frac{1}{2} \left(\frac{\dot{Y}}{X} \right)^2 & (R^1{}_{020})_B &= -\frac{\dot{Y} \dot{X}}{2X^2} \\ (R^2{}_{010})_B &= -\frac{\dot{Y} \dot{X}}{2X^2} & (R^2{}_{020})_B &= \frac{1}{2} \left(\frac{\dot{X}}{X} \right)^2 \end{aligned} \quad (36)$$

Gravitational wave

$$(R^1{}_{010})_G = -\frac{3}{8} \frac{H'(u)}{X^3} \quad (R^2{}_{020})_G = \frac{1}{8} \frac{H'(u)}{X^3} \quad (37)$$

Incorporating these expressions into Eqs.(7) and(8) we find the deviation due to the wave. The plots for deviation solely due to gravitational wave are given below.




FIG. 4: The behaviour of the deviation vectors X^1, X^2 are shown in the plots.

We distinctly observe displacement memory from these plots given in Fig.(4). There is also no frequency memory here—a fact evident from plotting the geodesics.

C. Kundt waves for $\omega = -\frac{3}{2}$

1. Metric and Geodesic analysis

Finally we analyse the scenario where $\omega = -3/2$. Our motivation for choosing such a value of ω is related to the 'generalised Kundt metric' (to be discussed later) for which the same value of ω is fixed by the field equations. Thus, in order to compare the effects of the presence and absence of gyratonic terms in the same BD theory (i.e. with the same ω), we perform the present analysis.

The curvature scalar and the metric function $P(x, y)$ in this case becomes

$$R = -\frac{6}{[\log(x^2 + y^2)]^{1/2}} \quad \tilde{P}(x, y) = \sqrt{x^2 + y^2}[\log(x^2 + y^2)]^{3/4} \quad (38)$$

We now have a variable negative curvature solution. The metric in this case is given below (same coordinate transformation from $\{x, y\} \rightarrow \{X, Y\}$).


$$ds^2 = -H'(u) \log[2X] du^2 - 2dudv + \frac{dX^2 + dY^2}{(2X)^{3/2}} \quad (39)$$

Here, too, we find solutions which are singular at $X = 0$. The geodesic equations for the X, Y coordinates are,

$$\frac{d^2 X}{du^2} - \frac{3}{4} \left[\frac{1}{X} \left(\frac{dX}{du} \right)^2 - \frac{1}{X} \left(\frac{dY}{du} \right)^2 \right] + \frac{\text{sech}^2 u}{\sqrt{2}} X^{1/2} = 0 \quad (40)$$

$$\frac{d^2 Y}{du^2} - \left(\frac{3}{2X} \right) \frac{dX}{du} \frac{dY}{du} = 0 \quad (41)$$

As before, solutions are obtained numerically using *Mathematica 10*. These are shown below.



(a) Initial positions of x are 8(orange) and 10(blue) respectively.

(b) Initial positions of y are 6(orange), 5(blue) respectively.

FIG. 5: Displacement memory effect in Kundt waves with spatial 2-surfaces having variable negative curvature for Brans-Dicke theory.

The plots in Fig.(5) highlight the nature of displacement memory. Along the X coordinate we see a permanent shift while there is no change along Y . There is no trace of velocity memory from the geodesic analysis. This is analogous to the GR case where we found that for both constant and variable negative curvature there is a permanent separation after the departure of the pulse. We also find that the geodesics do not cross beyond $X = 0$. This is due to the singular nature of the metric as discussed previously.

2. Geodesic Deviation analysis

We use the same methods as prescribed in the previous two subsections for calculating memory effects using geodesic deviation. The metric in the Bicak-Podolsky coordinates is

given below.

$$ds^2 = -H'(u) \log[\xi + \bar{\xi}] du^2 - 2dudv + \frac{d\xi d\bar{\xi}}{F(\xi, \bar{\xi})}; \quad F(\xi, \bar{\xi}) = (\xi + \bar{\xi})^{3/2} \quad (42)$$

The tetrads constructed along one of the timelike geodesics are shown below.

$$\begin{aligned} e_0^\mu &= [\dot{v}, \dot{\xi}, \dot{\bar{\xi}}, 1] & e_1^\mu &= [-\dot{X}/\sqrt{F}, -\sqrt{F}, -\sqrt{F}, 0] \\ e_2^\mu &= [-\dot{Y}/\sqrt{F}, -i\sqrt{F}, i\sqrt{F}, 0] & e_3^\mu &= [1 - \dot{v}, -\dot{\xi}, -\dot{\bar{\xi}}, -1] \end{aligned} \quad (43)$$

The tetrads are such that the tangent to the geodesic is given by e_0^μ . The spatial vectors e_1^μ, e_2^μ are given a rotation of angle $\theta_p = -\frac{3\dot{Y}}{4\dot{X}}$ to make them parallelly transported. Since, here too, \dot{Y} is zero (following the plot of Fig.(5b)), we set the constant θ_p to be zero.

The nonzero Riemann tensor components in this tetrad basis are given as:

Background

$$\begin{aligned} (R^1{}_{010})_B &= -\frac{3}{4} \left(\frac{\dot{Y}}{\dot{X}} \right)^2 & (R^1{}_{020})_B &= \frac{3\dot{Y}\dot{X}}{4X^2} \\ (R^2{}_{010})_B &= \frac{3\dot{Y}\dot{X}}{4X^2} & (R^2{}_{020})_B &= -\frac{3}{4} \left(\frac{\dot{X}}{\dot{X}} \right)^2 \end{aligned} \quad (44)$$

Gravitational wave

$$(R^1{}_{010})_G = -\frac{1}{2} \frac{H'(u)}{\sqrt{2X}} \quad (R^2{}_{020})_G = -\frac{3}{2} \frac{H'(u)}{\sqrt{2X}} \quad (45)$$

The plots for deviation solely due to gravitational wave are given below.




FIG. 6: The behaviour of the deviation vectors X^1, X^2 are shown in the plots.

Thus, we clearly see a displacement memory effect in this case as given in the plots of Fig.(6). There is no memory along X^3 direction. This is different from the $\omega = -2$ scenario where we have deviation only along one direction.

IV. GENERALIZED KUNDT METRIC

The generalized Kundt metric is written below along with the functional dependencies of the various metric components on the coordinates.

$$ds^2 = -Hdu^2 - 2dudv - 2W_1dudx - 2W_2dudy + \frac{1}{P^2}(dx^2 + dy^2)$$

where $P \equiv P(u, x, y)$, $H \equiv H(u, v, x, y)$, $W_i \equiv W_i(u, v, x, y)$, $\forall i \in \{x, y\}$

Such metrics have been previously analyzed in [31] with a minimally coupled scalar field, in GR. Here, we study vacuum solutions in B-D theory in the Jordan frame. We will initially try to solve for the metric and the BD scalar field. Later, we will try to analyse memory effects using geodesic and deviation equations.

A. Metric functions and the scalar field

From G^u_v component in equation (2) we find $\phi_{,v} = 0$ ¹². Field equations for G^u_x and G^u_y give

$$W_{1,vv} = W_{2,vv} = 0$$

Hence the functional forms of the W_i become:

$$W_1 = vV_1(u, x, y) \quad W_2 = vV_2(u, x, y) \quad (46)$$

This shows that the cross terms W_1, W_2 have linear dependence on v . Hence, they are not exactly gyratonic solutions [23–25]. We refer them as *gyraton-like* terms henceforth. The xx and yy components of the field equation (2) yields

$$\begin{aligned} & \frac{P^2}{4}(V_1^2 + 3V_2^2) + PV_1P_{,x} - P(PV_2)_{,y} + \frac{H_{,vv}}{2} \\ & = P^2 \left[\frac{\omega}{2\phi^2}(\phi_{,x}^2 - \phi_{,y}^2) + \frac{1}{\phi}(\phi_{,xx} - \Gamma_{xx}^x\phi_{,x} - \Gamma_{xx}^y\phi_{,y}) \right] \end{aligned} \quad (47)$$

¹²We exclude any other analytic functional dependence of ϕ on v

$$\begin{aligned}
& \frac{P^2}{4}(V_2^2 + 3V_1^2) + PV_2P_{,y} - P(PV_1)_{,x} + \frac{H_{,vv}}{2} \\
& = P^2 \left[\frac{\omega}{2\phi^2}(\phi_{,y}^2 - \phi_{,x}^2) + \frac{1}{\phi}(\phi_{,yy} - \Gamma_{yy}^y \phi_{,y} - \Gamma_{yy}^x \phi_{,x}) \right]
\end{aligned} \tag{48}$$

Adding equations (47) and (48) we find

$$P^2[V_1^2 + V_2^2 - V_{1,x} - V_{2,y}] + H_{,vv} = \frac{P^2}{\phi}(\phi_{,xx} + \phi_{,yy}) \tag{49}$$

Since P, V_1, V_2, ϕ are all independent of v , we must have $H_{,vv} = 0$. We consider the form for H as shown below.

$$H(u, v, x, y) = vM(u, x, y) \tag{50}$$

For Kundt wave spacetimes the metric function H was independent of coordinate v . We find that for the full metric there is a linear dependence on v . Hence, for this metric, we consider $H(u, v, x, y)$ as giving the notion of gravitational radiation. The field equation for G^u_u gives,

$$-P^2 \Delta \log(P) + \frac{P^2}{4}(V_1^2 + V_2^2 - 2(V_{1,x} + V_{2,y})) = -\frac{P^2 \omega}{2\phi^2}(\phi_{,x}^2 + \phi_{,y}^2) - \frac{P^2}{2\phi}(V_1 \phi_{,x} + V_2 \phi_{,y}) \tag{51}$$

The operator Δ has the same form as defined in the previous section. Eq.(3) after expanding in terms of metric functions leads to the following

$$\phi_{,xx} + \phi_{,yy} = V_1 \phi_{,x} + V_2 \phi_{,y} \tag{52}$$

Using equations (52) and (49) we rewrite equation (51) as

$$-P^2 \Delta \log(P) = \frac{P^2}{4} \left(V_1^2 + V_2^2 - \frac{4}{\phi}(V_1 \phi_{,x} + V_2 \phi_{,y}) - \frac{2\omega}{\phi^2}(\phi_{,x}^2 + \phi_{,y}^2) \right) \tag{53}$$

From the G^x_u component we get

$$\begin{aligned}
& P^2 \left[vP^2 \left(V_2 V_{2,x} - V_2 V_{1,y} + \frac{V_{1,yy} - V_{2,xy}}{2} \right) + vPP_{,y}(V_{1,y} - V_{2,x}) + \left(\frac{P_{,u}}{P} \right)_{,x} + \frac{M_{,x}}{2} \right. \\
& \left. + V_1 \frac{P_{,u}}{P} - \frac{V_{1,u}}{2} \right] = P^2 \left[\frac{\omega}{\phi^2} \phi_{,x} \phi_{,u} + \frac{\phi_{,xu}}{\phi} + \frac{V_1 \phi_{,u}}{2\phi} + \frac{P_{,u} \phi_{,x}}{P\phi} - \frac{P^2 v}{2\phi} \phi_{,y} (V_{1,y} - V_{2,x}) \right]
\end{aligned} \tag{54}$$

Similar to the analysis in the previous section, we decompose the scalar field and metric functions here as,

$$\phi(u, x, y) = \alpha(u)\psi(x, y), \quad P(u, x, y) = \frac{P'(x, y)}{U(u)}, \quad M(u, x, y) = h(u)N(x, y) + \mu(u). \tag{55}$$

We substitute (55) in (54) and consider only v^0 (v -independent) terms to get,

$$\frac{hN_{,x}}{2} - V_1 \left(\frac{U_{,u}}{U} + \frac{\alpha_{,u}}{2\alpha} \right) - 2 \frac{\psi_{,x}}{\psi} \left[\left(\frac{\omega + 1}{2} \right) \frac{\alpha_{,u}}{\alpha} - \frac{U_{,u}}{2U} \right] = 0 \quad (56)$$

The solution of (56) can be obtained either by setting the u -dependence or (x, y) dependence to be the same. We take the latter path.¹³ Hence, equation (56) breaks up into two equations which are as follows:

$$\frac{N_{,x}}{2} = -V_1 = -\frac{2\psi_{,x}}{\psi} \quad \left[\frac{N_{,y}}{2} = -V_2 = -\frac{2\psi_{,y}}{\psi} \right] \quad (57)$$

$$h + \frac{U_{,u}}{2U} + \left(\frac{\omega + 2}{2} \right) \frac{\alpha_{,u}}{\alpha} = 0 \quad (58)$$

Using the equations (57) and (52) we get an equation for $\psi(x, y)$. We solve it to obtain an analytic expression given as,

$$\psi(x, y) = \frac{1}{a + \log(x^2 + y^2)} \quad (59)$$

This form is quite similar to the one given earlier in equation (16). We get solutions for N, V_1, V_2 using equations (57) and (59).

$$N(x, y) = 4 \log[a + \log(x^2 + y^2)] \quad (60)$$

$$V_1 = -\frac{4x}{(x^2 + y^2)[a + \log(x^2 + y^2)]} \quad (61)$$

$$V_2 = -\frac{4y}{(x^2 + y^2)[a + \log(x^2 + y^2)]} \quad (62)$$

Using this known functional forms and inserting them in equation (53) we get $P'(x, y)$.

$$P'(x, y) = \frac{1}{[a + \log(x^2 + y^2)]^{\frac{\omega+2}{2}}} \quad (63)$$

We solve the field equation for G_u^v by disintegrating the equation in three parts which are dependent on the powers of v . From the v -independent part we get:

$$-2UU_{,u}(\mu + hN) - 4UU_{,uu} = 2U^2\omega \frac{\alpha_{,u}^2}{\alpha^2} + 2U^2 \frac{\alpha_{,uu}}{\alpha} + \frac{\alpha_{,u}}{\alpha} U^2(\mu + hN) \quad (64)$$

Separating the x, y and u -dependent parts yield two equations which are,

$$-2UU_{,u} = \frac{\alpha_{,u}}{\alpha} U^2 \quad (65)$$

$$-4UU_{,uu} = 2U^2\omega \frac{\alpha_{,u}^2}{\alpha^2} + 2U^2 \frac{\alpha_{,uu}}{\alpha} \quad (66)$$

¹³We initially set V_1 to be independent of u and find the solution to be self consistent.

Substituting functional form of $\alpha(u)$ in terms of $U(u)$ from (65) in (66) gives $\omega = -3/2$. Such a value of BD scalar admits traceless matter solution. It is also a solution of Conformal Relativity [50] and is equivalent to Palatini f(R) gravity [51]. We also find from Eq.(58) that $h(u) = 0$. From the v linear part of the field equation we again obtain Eq.(65). We set $U = 1$ (independent of u) and thus, α is also a constant (taken equal to unity). The scalar field becomes dependent only on x, y . From the order v^2 part of the field equation, we cannot constrain $\mu(u)$ as it reduces to an identity and hence it behaves as a free parameter. This parameter $\mu(u)$ denotes the gravitational wave contribution in the memory effect analysis using geodesics and geodesic deviations.¹⁴

B. Singular solutions

The Ricci scalar in the metric becomes

$$R = -\frac{6}{[a + \log(x^2 + y^2)]^{5/2}} \quad (67)$$

We comment on some features of our solutions (possibilities of singularities) obtained below. Such singular solutions have already been analysed in [31].

- There is a singularity in the solution at $r(=r_0) = e^{-a/2}$ (where $r = \sqrt{x^2 + y^2}$).
- This is a line singularity along the null direction. The circumference of the physical cylinder in the $x - y$ plane vanishes due to the form of the spatial metric. The singularity could be attributed to a source moving on a null path (like gyratons).
- The same nature of singularity is being observed for other solutions of Kundt waves having $\omega = +1, -3/2$ where $r = 0$.
- In all our analysis we have chosen ranges of x, y to be away from this singularity.

¹⁴Strictly speaking, the solutions obtained for the generalized Kundt metric does not stand on the same footing as compared to Kundt waves in terms of resembling a gravitational wave burst scenario. This is primarily due to the v -linear dependence in certain terms of the metric. Also, Eq.(70) shows that u does not act as an affine parameter, unlike the case for Kundt wave metrics. Hence, the notion of memory effects discussed for this solution is still an open issue and yet to be understood fully.

C. Geodesic analysis

We analyse the timelike geodesic equations for such a metric. Proper time is denoted by t and it acts as an affine parameter. The governing equations are as follows:

$$\begin{aligned} \ddot{x} - \dot{x}^2 \frac{P_{,x}}{P} - 2\dot{x}\dot{y} \frac{P_{,y}}{P} + \dot{y}^2 \frac{P_{,x}}{P} - \frac{v}{2} \mu P^2 V_1 \dot{u}^2 - \dot{v} \dot{u} P^2 V_1 \\ - v P^2 V_1^2 \dot{x} \dot{u} - \dot{u} \dot{y} v P^2 (V_1 V_2 + V_{1,y} - V_{2,x}) = 0 \end{aligned} \quad (68)$$

$$\begin{aligned} \ddot{y} - \dot{y}^2 \frac{P_{,y}}{P} - 2\dot{x}\dot{y} \frac{P_{,x}}{P} + \dot{x}^2 \frac{P_{,y}}{P} - \frac{v}{2} \mu P^2 V_2 \dot{u}^2 - \dot{v} \dot{u} P^2 V_2 \\ - v P^2 V_2^2 \dot{y} \dot{u} - \dot{u} \dot{x} v P^2 (V_1 V_2 - V_{1,y} + V_{2,x}) = 0 \end{aligned} \quad (69)$$

$$\ddot{u} - \frac{\mu}{2} \dot{u}^2 - V_1 \dot{x} \dot{u} - V_2 \dot{y} \dot{u} = 0 \quad (70)$$

$$-1 = -v \mu \dot{u}^2 - 2\dot{v} \dot{u} - 2v V_1 \dot{u} \dot{x} - 2v V_2 \dot{u} \dot{y} + \frac{(\dot{x}^2 + \dot{y}^2)}{P^2} \quad (71)$$

We see that u is not an affine parameter from Eq.(70). Substituting equation (71) in (68) and (69) we get

$$\ddot{x} - \dot{x}^2 \frac{P_{,x}}{P} - 2\dot{x}\dot{y} \frac{P_{,y}}{P} + \dot{y}^2 \frac{P_{,x}}{P} - \frac{P^2 V_1}{2} - \frac{V_1}{2} (\dot{x}^2 + \dot{y}^2) = 0 \quad (72)$$

$$\ddot{y} - \dot{y}^2 \frac{P_{,y}}{P} - 2\dot{x}\dot{y} \frac{P_{,x}}{P} + \dot{x}^2 \frac{P_{,y}}{P} - \frac{P^2 V_2}{2} - \frac{V_2}{2} (\dot{x}^2 + \dot{y}^2) = 0 \quad (73)$$

We solve these equations numerically in *Mathematica 10* to analyse their behaviour. The behaviour of all the coordinates of the geodesics are shown below. Apart from the transverse spatial coordinates x, y , we also show the plots of the coordinate u, v . We also plot the separation along x, y coordinate between the pair of geodesics for clarity.




FIG. 7: The variation of the coordinates are shown for two different geodesics with slightly varying initial conditions along x, y coordinates. We also show the change in separation between the two geodesics. The initial values are taken as 3,2,5,10 for the orange curve while for the blue curve these are 5,3,5,10 for the coordinates x, y, u, v respectively at affine parameter $t = -10$. The initial velocities are taken to be zero along x, y coordinates and 0.1 along the u coordinate. We consider $a = 5$ in our calculation.

In Fig.(7) we plot all the coordinates u, v, x, y of the generalized Kundt metric. We find that from (7c) and (7d) the separation along transverse spatial coordinates is increasing.

The other coordinates u, v does not show much difference initially for the two geodesics. Geodesic analysis along x, y directions shows that the curves tend to approach the region of singularity.

D. Geodesic deviation analysis

We start by rewriting the metric in Eq.(4) below in a modified fashion using the Bicak-Podolsky coordinates.

$$ds^2 = -v\mu(u)du^2 - 2dudv + 2v\bar{Q}dud\xi + 2vQdud\bar{\xi} + \frac{d\xi d\bar{\xi}}{P^2(\xi, \bar{\xi})} \quad (74)$$

Like in the previous case we have $\xi = x + iy, \bar{\xi} = x - iy$. The new metric functions Q, \bar{Q} are related to V_1, V_2 from (61) and (62) in this way.

$$Q = -\frac{V_1}{2} - i\frac{V_2}{2} = \frac{2\xi}{\xi\bar{\xi}[a + \log(\xi\bar{\xi})]} \quad (75)$$

$$\bar{Q} = -\frac{V_1}{2} + i\frac{V_2}{2} = \frac{2\bar{\xi}}{\xi\bar{\xi}[a + \log(\xi\bar{\xi})]} \quad (76)$$

The functional form of $P(\xi, \bar{\xi})$ is given below from Eq.(63).

$$P(\xi, \bar{\xi}) = \frac{1}{(a + \log[\xi\bar{\xi}])^{1/4}} \quad (77)$$

We write $P' = P$ since we have found that U is a constant (taken to be unity) from solving the field equations.

We construct the tetrads that satisfies the orthonormality relations.

$$\begin{aligned} e_0^\mu &= [\dot{v}, \dot{\xi}, \dot{\bar{\xi}}, \dot{u}] & e_1^\mu &= \left[-\frac{2}{\dot{u}} \left(\frac{\dot{x}}{2P} - \frac{v\dot{u}PV_1}{2} \right), -P, -P, 0 \right] \\ e_2^\mu &= \left[-\frac{2}{\dot{u}} \left(\frac{\dot{y}}{2P} - \frac{v\dot{u}PV_2}{2} \right), -iP, iP, 0 \right] & e_3^\mu &= \left[\frac{1 - \dot{v}\dot{u}}{\dot{u}}, -\dot{\xi}, -\dot{\bar{\xi}}, -\dot{u} \right] \end{aligned} \quad (78)$$

We can parallelly transport e_1^μ, e_2^μ along the geodesic by rotating the tetrads by an angle given below.

$$\dot{\theta}_p = \frac{(xy - y\dot{x})}{2[a + \log(x^2 + y^2)]} \quad (79)$$

We cannot transport e_3^μ parallelly along e_0^μ . It is only possible if we set $Q = \bar{Q} = 0$ (vanishing of the gyartonic-like cross terms). Thus, this tetrad undergoes Fermi-Walker

transport. Under such a transport, the RHS of the deviation equation gets modified from the usual expression (6) in the following way.

$$\frac{d^2 X^a}{dt^2} = -R^a{}_{tbt} X^b - 2 \left(\frac{D}{dt} e^\mu{}_b \right) e^a{}_\mu \frac{dX^b}{dt} - \left(\frac{D^2}{dt^2} e^\mu{}_b \right) e^a{}_\mu X^b \quad (80)$$

We can split up $e_3{}^\mu = A^\mu - e_0{}^\mu$. The non-parallel piece is due to $A^\mu = (\frac{1}{u}, 0, 0, 0)$. The second and third term in the RHS of Eq.(80) are nonzero due to this kind of transport. We can simplify the above equation as

$$\frac{d^2 X^a}{dt^2} = -R^a{}_{tbt} X^b - 2 \left(\frac{D}{dt} A^\mu \right) e^a{}_\mu \frac{dX^3}{dt} - \left(\frac{D^2}{dt^2} A^\mu \right) e^a{}_\mu X^3 \quad (81)$$

Separating the background and gravitational wave part (as shown in the case for Kundt wave metric) give us gravitational wave memory. The details of the calculation can be found in Appendix-I.

We show below the plots of the deviation vector that give rise to memory effect.




FIG. 8: The behaviour of the deviation vectors X^1, X^2, X^3 are shown in the plots.

From the plots in Fig.(8), it is quite evident there is displacement memory. Unlike the case

of Kundt waves, where there was no change along X^3 direction in all the cases considered in the paper, here all the spatial coordinates X^1, X^2, X^3 show memory effects.

V. CONCLUSIONS

In our work we have tried to analyze Kundt geometries in BD theory of gravity. We study and compare both cases of Kundt waves and the generalized Kundt metric (full metric). In the former case, we solve for three particular values of BD parameter ($\omega = -2, +1, -3/2$) while in the later we only solve for $\omega = -3/2$. The field equations fixes the value of ω as explicitly shown in Sec IIIA for the full metric. Moreover, we also try to differentiate the nature of *memory effect* observed here with GR [43] for the Kundt wave spacetimes. Using different but related methods (i.e. geodesic evolution and geodesic deviation) we have shown how memory effects can be useful while delineating the differences between the various cases analysed.

All the results in this paper are summarised in the two tables provided below. In the first one, we tabulate the various solutions of the metric functions obtained from solving the field equations corresponding to different values of ω . In the second table we provide the nature of memory effects obtained from solving geodesic equations and the geodesic deviation equations in all the cases.

KUNDT WAVE METRIC						
B. D. Parameter (ω)	Metric functions					
	g_{uu}	g_{uv}	g_{ux}	g_{uy}	g_{xx}	g_{yy}
-2	$-\frac{\log[\log(x^2+y^2)]}{2 \cosh^2(u)}$	-1	0	0	$\frac{[\log(x^2+y^2)]^{-2}}{x^2+y^2}$	$\frac{[\log(x^2+y^2)]^{-2}}{x^2+y^2}$
+1	$-\frac{\log[\log(x^2+y^2)]}{2 \cosh^2(u)}$	-1	0	0	$\frac{[\log(x^2+y^2)]}{x^2+y^2}$	$\frac{[\log(x^2+y^2)]}{x^2+y^2}$
$-\frac{3}{2}$	$-\frac{\log[\log(x^2+y^2)]}{2 \cosh^2(u)}$	-1	0	0	$\frac{[\log(x^2+y^2)]^{-\frac{3}{2}}}{x^2+y^2}$	$\frac{[\log(x^2+y^2)]^{-\frac{3}{2}}}{x^2+y^2}$
GENERALIZED KUNDT METRIC						
$-\frac{3}{2}$	$\frac{-v \operatorname{sech}^2(u)}{2}$	-1	$\frac{4vx(x^2+y^2)^{-1}}{(a+\log(x^2+y^2))}$	$\frac{4vy(x^2+y^2)^{-1}}{(a+\log(x^2+y^2))}$	$[a + \log(x^2 + y^2)]^{\frac{1}{2}}$	$[a + \log(x^2 + y^2)]^{\frac{1}{2}}$

TABLE I: Metric functions obtained as solutions for different ω .

KUNDT WAVE METRIC							
B. D. parameter (ω)	Scalar field(ϕ)	Memory using geodesics		Memory using geodesic deviation			Ricci Scalar
		Along X	Along Y	Along X_1	Along X_2	Along X_3	
-2	$\log(x^2 + y^2)$	Displacement memory	No evolution	No deviation	Separation increases	No deviation	-8
+1	$\log(x^2 + y^2)$	Displacement and velocity memory	No evolution	Separation increases	Separation decreases	No deviation	$\frac{4}{[\log(x^2+y^2)]^3}$
$-\frac{3}{2}$	$\log(x^2 + y^2)$	Displacement memory	No evolution	Separation increases	Separation increases	No deviation	$\frac{-6}{[\log(x^2+y^2)]^{\frac{5}{2}}}$
GENERALIZED KUNDT METRIC							
		Along x	Along y	Along X_1	Along X_2	Along X_3	
$-\frac{3}{2}$	$\frac{1}{a+\log(x^2+y^2)}$	Displacement and velocity memory	Displacement and velocity memory	Separation increases	Separation increases	Separation increases	$\frac{-6}{[a+\log(x^2+y^2)]^{\frac{5}{2}}}$

TABLE II: The nature of memory effect obtained for different ω using both geodesic equations and geodesic deviation equations.

At first, the field equations for vacuum BD theory in the Jordan frame were written and solved for the given class of metrics. The scalar field turns to be dependent only on the spatial coordinates (x, y or X, Y) as can be seen from Table II. We choose sandwich pulse profiles ($\text{sech}^2(u)$) in all of the cases for understanding memory as it resembles a toy model for gravitational wave burst events. We find in the case of Kundt waves that the value of ω is not fixed from the field equations. After obtaining the metric, we look at the relevant geodesic equations for each of the spatial coordinates, numerically. For the negative curvature solutions ($\omega = -2$: constant curvature, $\omega = -3/2$: varying curvature) we find

constant separation after the passage of the gravitational wave pulse and eventual focusing along one direction. In the other direction, the separation is completely unchanged (look at Figs.(1) and (5)). This is in qualitative agreement with the results in GR. For the positive curvature solution we find monotonically increasing separation (non-zero memory) along one direction while there is no change in the other as seen from the plots in Fig.(3). There is *no presence of frequency memory effect* in BD as was noted earlier, in the GR context. This is due to a different analytic form of the $h(X, Y) = \log[2X]$ term in the metric in Eq.(31). In the GR case, this polarization term was $h(X, Y) = \frac{1}{2}(X^2 - Y^2)$. It is obvious that the different expressions for this term in different theories are exclusively due to their respective field equations.

For the generalized Kundt metric, we perform a similar analysis as for the Kundt waves. The BD parameter ($\omega = -3/2$) is constant. This gives rise to a variable curvature scalar solution. We point out the singular nature of these solutions.¹⁵ It corresponds to a line singularity corresponding to a zero circumference cylinder. Such solutions in GR for Kundt spacetimes have been analysed in [31]. In our entire analysis on geodesics and deviation, the range of coordinates are chosen such that they are away from this singular region. The geodesic equations for all the coordinates are solved numerically. The geodesic analysis for the spatial components (x, y) show that the trajectories tend to approach the singular region (also true for Kundt waves). Thus, in principle, we study test particle motion in a singular spacetime containing gravitational waves. We plot the evolution for all coordinates since in this class of metrics, u is not an affine parameter (unlike Kundt waves). We observe monotonic change in separation along both the x, y coordinates (see Fig.(7)). Thus from the geodesic analysis we find that in $\omega = -3/2$ BD theory, the nature of a memory effect shows differences which may be attributed to the absence or presence of the gyraton-like terms in the line element.

The analysis of the geodesic deviation equation is done in Fermi normal coordinates as we are working in non-flat background spacetimes. In this type of coordinate system, the coordinates are inertial and similar to exact plane wave spacetimes. This can also be understood as a *timelike Penrose limit* of the central timelike geodesic in Kundt spacetimes [47]. We construct orthonormal tetrads along the central geodesic and observe they are parallelly

¹⁵The varying curvature scenarios for Kundt wave spacetimes are also described.

transported only for Kundt waves. We were unable to construct a parallel tetrad for the generalized Kundt spacetime. This is due to the nonvanishing *gyrator-like* terms present in Eq.(4). Hence, these tetrads perform Fermi-Walker transport. This leads to a modification in the geodesic deviation equation in the tetrad frame with additional corrections arising due to non-parallel transport (see Eq.(80)) along the central geodesic. The Riemann tensor in the tetrad frame (along with additional corrections present in the case of the full metric) is decomposed into a gravitational wave part and a background part. This is done by clubbing the terms which are proportional to the $H'(u)$ part of $H(u, x, y)$ in Eq.(5) as giving rise to a net gravitational wave contribution to the curvature.¹⁶ The rest of the terms are considered coming due to the background. Solving the respective deviation equation for the background (initially) and the wave (finally) gives us a quantitative measure of the gravitational wave memory effect.

The geodesic deviation analysis for the Kundt wave metric shows presence of displacement memory in all the three cases with certain characteristic differences. In the $\omega = -2$ case, the non-zero deviation occurs along one of the spatial directions and it is monotonically increasing. For the values of $\omega = +1, -3/2$ we find the separation is non-zero along both spatial directions. While in $\omega = -3/2$, the separations increase along both directions, in the other case we find both increase and decrease along the two different spatial directions. In the full metric scenario we find the separation is non-zero along all three spatial directions. There the deviation monotonically increases along all three coordinates. Thus, we explicitly find that displacement memory, though present in all the cases, is quantitatively different in all these scenarios. A Tissot ring would be a better visual aid for understanding this difference. In $\omega = -2$ the change would correspond to a line, while in $\omega = -3/2$ it would correspond to a plane with its area increased than the initial configuration. For $\omega = +1$, there may be an increase or decrease in area depending on initial configurations. In the full metric scenario, the deformation would take place on a 3-plane.

This entire geodesic deviation analysis is non-perturbative and can be readily applied to calculate memory effects for any spacetime containing gravitational radiation. Moreover, this analysis could also be recast using the \mathcal{B} -matrix formalism as introduced in [53] and the behaviour of the kinematic variables for timelike geodesic congruence can be computed.

¹⁶The same holds true for terms proportional to $\mu(u)$ (or its derivatives) in $H(u, v, x, y)$ given in Eq.(4)

One can also look for memories in impulsive gravitational wave spacetimes [54, 55] and compare the results obtained here by setting appropriate limits. Since $\omega = -3/2$ BD theory is equivalent to other gravitational theories (palatini $f(R)$ and conformal relativity), it will be interesting to make a comparative study of memory effects between all these theories. In our work, we could not find exact gyratonic solutions in BD. A more detailed analysis is required to find whether BD theory admits such solutions or not. Studying the interaction between the gravitational waves and the singularity would help us in better understanding the geometry of these solutions. Finally, a thorough understanding of nonlinear memory effect for Kundt wave spacetimes can shed more light on this aspect. A similar study for Robinson-Trautman solutions was done in [56] using the Newman-Penrose formalism.

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

S. S. thanks the Department of Physics, IIT Kharagpur, India for providing him with the opportunity to work on this project during his tenure as an integrated M.Sc. student. I. C. acknowledges Matthias Blau for discussions related to Fermi coordinates and associated tetrads. I. C. also thanks the University Grants Commission (UGC) of the Government of India for providing financial assistance through senior research fellowship (SRF) with reference ID: 523711.

-
- [1] B. Abbott *et al.* (LIGO Scientific, Virgo), *Phys. Rev. Lett.* **116**, 061102 (2016).
 - [2] E. Berti, K. Yagi, and N. Yunes, *Gen. Rel. Grav.* **50**, 46 (2018).
 - [3] M. Favata, *Class. Qtm. Grav.* **27**, 084036 (2010).
 - [4] Y. B. Zel'dovich and A. G. Polnarev, *Sov. Astron* **18**, 17 (1974).
 - [5] V. B. Braginsky and L. P. Grishchuk, *Sov. Phys. JETP* **62**, 427 (1985).
 - [6] M. Ludvigsen, *Gen. Rel. Grav.* **21**, 1205 (1989).
 - [7] D. Christodoulou, *Phys. Rev. Lett.* **67**, 1486 (1991).
 - [8] K. S. Thorne, *Phys. Rev. D* **45**, 520 (1992).
 - [9] L. Bieri and D. Garfinkle, *Class. Qtm. Grav.* **30**, 195009 (2013).
 - [10] M. Pate, A.-M. Raclariu, and A. Strominger, *Phys. Rev. Lett.* **119**, 261602 (2017).

- [11] N. Jokela, K. Kajantie, and M. Sarkkinen, *Phys. Rev. D* **99**, 116003 (2019).
- [12] A. Strominger and A. Zhiboedov, *J. High Energy Phys.* **01** (2016), 86.
- [13] A. Strominger, *Lectures on the Infrared Structure of Gravity and Gauge Theory* (2017) arXiv:1703.05448 [hep-th] .
- [14] Y. Hamada, M.-S. Seo, and G. Shiu, *Phys. Rev. D* **96**, 023509 (2017).
- [15] L. Bieri, D. Garfinkle, and N. Yunes, *Class. Qtm. Grav.* **34**, 215002 (2017).
- [16] C.-S. Chu and Y. Koyama, *Phys. Rev. D* **100**, 104034 (2019).
- [17] W. Kundt, *Z. Phys.* **163**, 77 (1961).
- [18] H. Stephani, D. Kramer, M. A. H. MacCallum, C. Hoenselaers, and E. Herlt, *Exact solutions of Einstein's field equations* (Cambridge Univ. Press, Cambridge, England, 2003).
- [19] J. B. Griffiths and J. Podolsky, *Exact Space-Times in Einstein's General Relativity* (Cambridge Univ. Press, Cambridge, England, 2009).
- [20] H. W. Brinkmann, *Math. Ann.* **94**, 119 (1925).
- [21] N. Rosen, *Phys. Z. Sowjetunion* **12**, 366 (1937).
- [22] J. Podolský and M. Ortaggio, *Classical and Quantum Gravity* **20**, 1685 (2003).
- [23] V. P. Frolov and D. V. Fursaev, *Phys. Rev. D* **71**, 104034 (2005).
- [24] V. P. Frolov, W. Israel, and A. Zelnikov, *Phys. Rev. D* **72**, 084031 (2005).
- [25] H. Kadlecová, A. Zelnikov, P. Krtouš, and J. Podolský, *Phys. Rev. D* **80**, 024004 (2009).
- [26] J. Podolský and M. Ortaggio, *Classical and Quantum Gravity* **18**, 2689 (2001).
- [27] M. Ortaggio and J. Podolský, *Classical and Quantum Gravity* **19**, 5221 (2002).
- [28] J. B. Griffiths, P. Docherty, and J. Podolský, *Class. Qtm. Grav.* **21**, 207 (2003).
- [29] A. Coley, S. Hervik, G. Papadopoulos, and N. Pelavas, *Class. Qtm. Grav.* **26**, 105016 (2009).
- [30] J. Podolský and R. Švarc, *Class. Qtm. Grav.* **30**, 205016 (2013).
- [31] T. Tahamtan and O. Svítek, *Eur. Phys. J. C* **77**, 384 (2017).
- [32] R. Švarc, J. Podolský, and O. Hruška, *Phys. Rev. D* **102**, 084012 (2020).
- [33] V. Pravda, A. Pravdová, J. Podolský, and R. Švarc, *Phys. Rev. D* **95**, 084025 (2017).
- [34] C. M. Will, *Living Rev. Rel.* **17**, 4 (2014).
- [35] R. N. Lang, *Phys. Rev. D* **89**, 084014 (2014).
- [36] R. N. Lang, *Phys. Rev. D* **91**, 084027 (2015).
- [37] S. M. Du and A. Nishizawa, *Phys. Rev. D* **94**, 104063 (2016).

- [38] K. Koyama, Phys. Rev. D **102**, 021502 (2020).
- [39] S. Tahura, D. A. Nichols, A. Saffer, L. C. Stein, and K. Yagi, arXiv:2007.13799 [gr-qc] .
- [40] S. Hou, in *9th International Workshop on Astronomy and Relativistic Astrophysics* (2020) arXiv:2011.02087 [gr-qc] .
- [41] H. Bondi, M. G. J. van der Burg, and A. W. K. Metzner, Proc. Roy. Soc. Lond. A **269**, 21 (1962).
- [42] S. Hou and Z.-H. Zhu, (2020), arXiv:2008.05154 [gr-qc] .
- [43] I. Chakraborty and S. Kar, Phys. Lett. B **808**, 135611 (2020).
- [44] P.-M. Zhang, C. Duval, G. W. Gibbons, and P. A. Horvathy, Phys. Lett. B **772**, 743 (2017).
- [45] I. Chakraborty and S. Kar, Phys. Rev. D **101**, 064022 (2020).
- [46] P.-M. Zhang, C. Duval, G. W. Gibbons, and P. A. Horvathy, Phys. Rev. D **96**, 064013 (2017).
- [47] G. M. Shore, JHEP **2018** (12), 133.
- [48] C. Brans and R. Dicke, Phys. Rev. **124**, 925 (1961).
- [49] S. Hou and Y. Gong, Eur. Phys. J. C **78**, 247 (2018).
- [50] M. P. Dabrowski, T. Denkiewicz, and D. Blaschke, Annalen Phys. **16**, 237 (2007).
- [51] T. P. Sotiriou and V. Faraoni, Rev. Mod. Phys. **82**, 451 (2010).
- [52] J. Bicak and J. Podolsky, J. Math. Phys. **40**, 4495 (1999).
- [53] M. O’Loughlin and H. Demirchian, Phys. Rev. D **99**, 024031 (2019).
- [54] P.-M. Zhang, C. Duval, and P. A. Horvathy, Class. Qtm. Grav. **35**, 065011 (2018).
- [55] S. Bhattacharjee, S. Kumar, and A. Bhattacharyya, Phys. Rev. D **100**, 084010 (2019).
- [56] P. Mao and X. Wu, JHEP **05** (2019), 058.

APPENDIX

Equation (81) can be split up into background and wave parts as was done in equations (7) and (8). The deviation due to background and gravitational wave can be obtained as given below.

$$\frac{d^2 X_B^a}{dt^2} = -(R^a{}_{ibt})_B X_B^b - 2 \left[\left(\frac{D}{dt} e^\mu{}_b \right) e^a{}_\mu \right]_B \frac{dX_B^b}{dt} - \left[\left(\frac{D^2}{dt^2} e^\mu{}_b \right) e^a{}_\mu \right]_B X_B^b \quad (82)$$

$$\begin{aligned}
\frac{d^2 X_G^a}{dt^2} &= -[(R^a{}_{tbt})_B + (R^a{}_{tbt})_G]X_G^b - (R^a{}_{tbt})_G X_B^b - 2 \left[\left\{ \left(\frac{D}{dt} e^\mu{}_b \right) e^a{}_\mu \right\}_B \right. \\
&+ \left. \left\{ \left(\frac{D}{dt} e^\mu{}_b \right) e^a{}_\mu \right\}_G \right] \left(\frac{dX^b}{dt} \right)_G - 2 \left[\left(\frac{D}{dt} e^\mu{}_b \right) e^a{}_\mu \right]_G \left(\frac{dX^b}{dt} \right)_B \\
&- \left[\left(\frac{D^2}{dt^2} e^\mu{}_b \right) e^a{}_\mu \right]_G X_B^b - \left[\left\{ \left(\frac{D^2}{dt^2} e^\mu{}_b \right) e^a{}_\mu \right\}_B + \left\{ \left(\frac{D^2}{dt^2} e^\mu{}_b \right) e^a{}_\mu \right\}_G \right] X_G^b
\end{aligned} \tag{83}$$

We give the non-rotated tetrad components used in the calculation

$$e^\mu{}_a = \begin{pmatrix} \dot{v} & \dot{\xi} & \dot{\bar{\xi}} & \dot{u} \\ P(-Q - \bar{Q})v - \frac{\dot{x}}{P\dot{u}} & -P & -P & 0 \\ iP(Q - \bar{Q})v - \frac{\dot{y}}{P\dot{u}} & -iP & iP & 0 \\ \frac{1-i\dot{v}}{\dot{u}} & -\dot{\xi} & -\dot{\bar{\xi}} & -\dot{u} \end{pmatrix} \tag{84}$$

The Riemann tetrad components are given below.

$$\begin{aligned}
(R^1{}_{010})_G &= \frac{1}{(x^2 + y^2)^3 (\log(x^2 + y^2) + 5)^{7/2}} [\dot{u}v(-2 \log(x^2 + y^2) - 11)(x^2 \cos(2\theta) \\
&- 2xy \sin(2\theta) - y^2 \cos(2\theta))(\dot{u}x^2 \mu(u)(\log(x^2 + y^2) + 5) \\
&+ \dot{u}y^2 \mu(u)(\log(x^2 + y^2) + 5))]
\end{aligned} \tag{85}$$

$$\begin{aligned}
(R^1{}_{020})_G &= -\frac{1}{(x^2 + y^2)^3 (\log(x^2 + y^2) + 5)^{7/2}} [\dot{u}v(2 \log(x^2 + y^2) + 11)(x^2 \sin(2\theta) \\
&+ 2xy \cos(2\theta) - y^2 \sin(2\theta))(\dot{u}x^2 \mu(u)(\log(x^2 + y^2) + 5) \\
&+ \dot{u}y^2 \mu(u)(\log(x^2 + y^2) + 5))]
\end{aligned} \tag{86}$$

$$\begin{aligned}
(R^2{}_{010})_G &= -\frac{1}{(x^2 + y^2)^3 (\log(x^2 + y^2) + 5)^{7/2}} [\dot{u}v(2 \log(x^2 + y^2) + 11)(x^2 \sin(2\theta) \\
&+ 2xy \cos(2\theta) - y^2 \sin(2\theta))(\dot{u}x^2 \mu(u)(\log(x^2 + y^2) + 5) \\
&+ \dot{u}y^2 \mu(u)(\log(x^2 + y^2) + 5))]
\end{aligned} \tag{87}$$

$$\begin{aligned}
(R^2{}_{020})_G &= \frac{1}{(x^2 + y^2)^3 (\log(x^2 + y^2) + 5)^{7/2}} [\dot{u}v(2 \log(x^2 + y^2) + 11)(x^2 \cos(2\theta) \\
&- 2xy \sin(2\theta) - y^2 \cos(2\theta))(\dot{u}x^2 \mu(u)(\log(x^2 + y^2) + 5) \\
&+ \dot{u}y^2 \mu(u)(\log(x^2 + y^2) + 5))]
\end{aligned} \tag{88}$$

All other non-vanishing components of the gravitational wave is zero.

$$(R^1{}_{030})_G = (R^3{}_{010})_G = (R^2{}_{030})_G = (R^3{}_{020})_G = (R^3{}_{030})_G = 0 \tag{89}$$

$$\begin{aligned}
(R^1{}_{010})_B &= \frac{1}{(x^2 + y^2)^3(\log(x^2 + y^2) + 5)^{7/2}} [\dot{u}v(-8x\dot{x} - 8y\dot{y})(-2\log(x^2 + y^2) \\
&- 11)(x^2 \cos(2\theta) - 2xy \sin(2\theta) - y^2 \cos(2\theta)) - \frac{1}{2}(x^2 + y^2)(\log(x^2 + y^2) \\
&+ 5)(-4xy(2\log(x^2 + y^2) + 11)(2\dot{u}\dot{v} \sin(2\theta) - \sqrt{\log(x^2 + y^2) + 5}(\dot{x}^2 \sin(2\theta) \\
&- 2\dot{x}\dot{y} + \dot{y}^2 \sin(2\theta))) + x^2(4\dot{u}\dot{v} \cos(2\theta)(2\log(x^2 + y^2) + 11) \\
&- \sqrt{\log(x^2 + y^2) + 5}(\dot{x}^2(\cos(2\theta)(4\log(x^2 + y^2) + 25) + 4\log(x^2 + y^2) + 27) \\
&+ \dot{y}^2(\cos(2\theta)(4\log(x^2 + y^2) + 19) - 4\log(x^2 + y^2) - 17) - 6\dot{x}\dot{y} \sin(2\theta))) \\
&+ y^2(\sqrt{\log(x^2 + y^2) + 5}(\dot{x}^2(\cos(2\theta)(4\log(x^2 + y^2) + 19) + 4\log(x^2 + y^2) + 17) \\
&+ \dot{y}^2(\cos(2\theta)(4\log(x^2 + y^2) + 25) - 4\log(x^2 + y^2) - 27) + 6\dot{x}\dot{y} \sin(2\theta)) \\
&- 4\dot{u}\dot{v} \cos(2\theta)(2\log(x^2 + y^2) + 11))] \tag{90}
\end{aligned}$$

$$\begin{aligned}
(R^1{}_{020})_B &= \frac{1}{2(x^2 + y^2)^3(\log(x^2 + y^2) + 5)^{7/2}} [-2\dot{u}v(-8x\dot{x} - 8y\dot{y})(2\log(x^2 + y^2) \\
&+ 11)(x^2 \sin(2\theta) + 2xy \cos(2\theta) - y^2 \sin(2\theta)) - (x^2 + y^2)(\log(x^2 + y^2) \\
&+ 5)(4xy \cos(2\theta)(2\log(x^2 + y^2) + 11)(2\dot{u}\dot{v} - (\dot{x}^2 + \dot{y}^2)\sqrt{\log(x^2 + y^2) + 5}) \\
&+ x^2(4\dot{u}\dot{v} \sin(2\theta)(2\log(x^2 + y^2) + 11) - \sqrt{\log(x^2 + y^2) + 5}(\dot{x}^2 \sin(2\theta)(4\log(x^2 + y^2) \\
&+ 25) + \dot{y}^2 \sin(2\theta)(4\log(x^2 + y^2) + 19) + 6\dot{x}\dot{y} \cos(2\theta))) \\
&+ y^2(\sqrt{\log(x^2 + y^2) + 5}(\dot{x}^2 \sin(2\theta)(4\log(x^2 + y^2) + 19) + \dot{y}^2 \sin(2\theta)(4\log(x^2 + y^2) \\
&+ 25) - 6\dot{x}\dot{y} \cos(2\theta)) - 4\dot{u}\dot{v} \sin(2\theta)(2\log(x^2 + y^2) + 11))] \tag{91}
\end{aligned}$$

$$\begin{aligned}
(R^1{}_{030})_B &= \frac{1}{(x^2 + y^2)^2(\log(x^2 + y^2) + 5)^{9/4}} [x^2(-(\dot{y} \sin(\theta)(2\log(x^2 + y^2) + 7) \\
&+ \dot{x} \cos(\theta)(2\log(x^2 + y^2) + 15))) + 2xy(2\log(x^2 + y^2) + 11)(\dot{x} \sin(\theta) - \dot{y} \cos(\theta)) \\
&+ y^2(\dot{y} \sin(\theta)(2\log(x^2 + y^2) + 15) + \dot{x} \cos(\theta)(2\log(x^2 + y^2) + 7))] \tag{92}
\end{aligned}$$

$$\begin{aligned}
(R^2_{010})_B &= \frac{1}{2(x^2 + y^2)^3(\log(x^2 + y^2) + 5)^{7/2}} [-2\dot{u}\dot{v}(-8x\dot{x} - 8y\dot{y})(2\log(x^2 + y^2) \\
&+ 11)(x^2 \sin(2\theta) + 2xy \cos(2\theta) - y^2 \sin(2\theta)) - (x^2 + y^2)(\log(x^2 + y^2) \\
&+ 5)(4xy \cos(2\theta)(2\log(x^2 + y^2) + 11)(2\dot{u}\dot{v} - (\dot{x}^2 + \dot{y}^2)\sqrt{\log(x^2 + y^2) + 5}) \\
&+ x^2(4\dot{u}\dot{v} \sin(2\theta)(2\log(x^2 + y^2) + 11) - \sqrt{\log(x^2 + y^2) + 5}(\dot{x}^2 \sin(2\theta)(4\log(x^2 + y^2) \\
&+ 25) + \dot{y}^2 \sin(2\theta)(4\log(x^2 + y^2) + 19) + 6\dot{x}\dot{y} \cos(2\theta))) \\
&+ y^2(\sqrt{\log(x^2 + y^2) + 5}(\dot{x}^2 \sin(2\theta)(4\log(x^2 + y^2) + 19) + \dot{y}^2 \sin(2\theta)(4\log(x^2 + y^2) \\
&+ 25) - 6\dot{x}\dot{y} \cos(2\theta)) - 4\dot{u}\dot{v} \sin(2\theta)(2\log(x^2 + y^2) + 11))] \quad (93)
\end{aligned}$$

$$\begin{aligned}
(R^2_{020})_B &= \frac{1}{(x^2 + y^2)^3(\log(x^2 + y^2) + 5)^{7/2}} [\dot{u}\dot{v}(-8x\dot{x} - 8y\dot{y})(2\log(x^2 + y^2) \\
&+ 11)(x^2 \cos(2\theta) - 2xy \sin(2\theta) - y^2 \cos(2\theta)) + \frac{1}{2}(x^2 + y^2)(\log(x^2 + y^2) \\
&+ 5)(-4xy(2\log(x^2 + y^2) + 11)(2\dot{u}\dot{v} \sin(2\theta) - \sqrt{\log(x^2 + y^2) + 5}(\dot{x}^2 \sin(2\theta) \\
&+ 2\dot{x}\dot{y} + \dot{y}^2 \sin(2\theta))) + x^2(4\dot{u}\dot{v} \cos(2\theta)(2\log(x^2 + y^2) + 11) \\
&- \sqrt{\log(x^2 + y^2) + 5}(\dot{x}^2(\cos(2\theta)(4\log(x^2 + y^2) + 25) - 4\log(x^2 + y^2) - 27) \\
&+ \dot{y}^2(\cos(2\theta)(4\log(x^2 + y^2) + 19) + 4\log(x^2 + y^2) + 17) - 6\dot{x}\dot{y} \sin(2\theta))) \\
&+ y^2(\sqrt{\log(x^2 + y^2) + 5}(\dot{x}^2(\cos(2\theta)(4\log(x^2 + y^2) + 19) - 4\log(x^2 + y^2) - 17) \\
&+ \dot{y}^2(\cos(2\theta)(4\log(x^2 + y^2) + 25) + 4\log(x^2 + y^2) + 27) + 6\dot{x}\dot{y} \sin(2\theta)) \\
&- 4\dot{u}\dot{v} \cos(2\theta)(2\log(x^2 + y^2) + 11))] \quad (94)
\end{aligned}$$

$$\begin{aligned}
(R^2_{030})_B &= \frac{1}{(x^2 + y^2)^2(\log(x^2 + y^2) + 5)^{9/4}} [x^2(\dot{x} \sin(\theta)(-2\log(x^2 + y^2) - 15) \\
&+ \dot{y} \cos(\theta)(2\log(x^2 + y^2) + 7)) - 2xy(2\log(x^2 + y^2) + 11)(\dot{x} \cos(\theta) + \dot{y} \sin(\theta)) \\
&+ y^2(\dot{x} \sin(\theta)(2\log(x^2 + y^2) + 7) - \dot{y} \cos(\theta)(2\log(x^2 + y^2) + 15))] \quad (95)
\end{aligned}$$

$$\begin{aligned}
(R^3_{010})_B &= \frac{1}{(x^2 + y^2)^2(\log(x^2 + y^2) + 5)^{9/4}} [x^2(-(\dot{y} \sin(\theta)(2\log(x^2 + y^2) + 7) \\
&+ \dot{x} \cos(\theta)(2\log(x^2 + y^2) + 15))) + 2xy(2\log(x^2 + y^2) + 11)(\dot{x} \sin(\theta) - \dot{y} \cos(\theta)) \\
&+ y^2(\dot{y} \sin(\theta)(2\log(x^2 + y^2) + 15) + \dot{x} \cos(\theta)(2\log(x^2 + y^2) + 7))] \quad (96)
\end{aligned}$$

$$\begin{aligned}
(R^3{}_{020})_B &= \frac{1}{(x^2 + y^2)^2 (\log(x^2 + y^2) + 5)^{9/4}} [x^2(\dot{x} \sin(\theta)(-2 \log(x^2 + y^2) - 15) \\
&+ \dot{y} \cos(\theta)(2 \log(x^2 + y^2) + 7)) - 2xy(2 \log(x^2 + y^2) + 11)(\dot{x} \cos(\theta) + \dot{y} \sin(\theta)) \\
&+ y^2(\dot{x} \sin(\theta)(2 \log(x^2 + y^2) + 7) - \dot{y} \cos(\theta)(2 \log(x^2 + y^2) + 15))] \quad (97)
\end{aligned}$$

$$(R^3{}_{030})_B = \frac{4}{(x^2 + y^2) (\log(x^2 + y^2) + 5)^{5/2}} \quad (98)$$

$$\left[\left(\frac{D}{dt} A^\mu \right) e^1{}_\mu \right]_B = \frac{2 \left(y \left(\sin(\theta) \dot{u} + 2\dot{y} \sqrt{\log(x^2 + y^2) + 5} \right) + x \left(2\dot{x} \sqrt{\log(x^2 + y^2) + 5} - \cos(\theta) \dot{u} \right) \right)}{\dot{u} (x^2 + y^2) (\log(x^2 + y^2) + 5)^{5/4}} \quad (99)$$

$$\left[\left(\frac{D}{dt} A^\mu \right) e^2{}_\mu \right]_B = \frac{-2x \sin(\theta) \dot{u} - 2y \cos(\theta) \dot{u} + 4y\dot{y} \sqrt{\log(x^2 + y^2) + 5} + 4x\dot{x} \sqrt{\log(x^2 + y^2) + 5}}{\dot{u} (x^2 + y^2) (\log(x^2 + y^2) + 5)^{5/4}} \quad (100)$$

$$\left[\left(\frac{D}{dt} A^\mu \right) e^3{}_\mu \right]_B = -\frac{2(\dot{u} - 2)(x\dot{x} + y\dot{y})}{\dot{u}(x^2 + y^2) (\log(x^2 + y^2) + 5)} \quad (101)$$

$$\left[\left(\frac{D}{dt} A^\mu \right) e^1{}_\mu \right]_G = \left[\left(\frac{D}{dt} A^\mu \right) e^2{}_\mu \right]_G = \left[\left(\frac{D}{dt} A^\mu \right) e^3{}_\mu \right]_G = 0 \quad (102)$$

$$\left(\frac{D^2}{dt^2} e^\mu{}_\nu \right) e^a{}_\mu X^b = \left(\frac{dB^\mu}{dt} + \Gamma^\mu_{\alpha\gamma} e_0{}^\alpha B^\gamma \right) e^a{}_\mu X^b \quad (103)$$

For background part, the contribution becomes as given below:

$$B^v = \frac{1}{2} \left(4vP^2 Q \bar{Q} + \frac{\bar{Q} \dot{\xi} + Q \dot{\bar{\xi}}}{\dot{u}} \right) \quad B^\xi = P^2 Q \quad B^{\bar{\xi}} = P^2 \bar{Q} \quad B^u = 0 \quad (104)$$

There is no contribution from the gravitational wave part.