arXiv:2211.08342v2 [gr-qc] 7 Mar 2023

A positive cosmological constant as a geometrical artifact

Pantelis S. Apostolopoulos[1,a] **and Christos Tsipogiannis**[1,b]

Abstract. We revisit the classical mechanism to produce $d-$dimensional spacetimes via Kaluza-Klein compactification. We made the assumption that the $(d+1)-$dimensional bulk geometry $\mathcal{M}$ admits a Homothetic Vector Field (HVF) $\mathbf{H}$ relaxing the existence of a zero i.e. $\mathbf{H} \neq 0$ holds on $\mathcal{M}$ and the homothetic bivector $F_{ab}(\mathbf{H}) = 0$. Under these circumstances we identify the origin of a positive cosmological constant in the $d-$dimensional spacetime as the homothetic factor representing a geometrical artifact of late time state of the $(d+1)-$dimensional bulk spacetime.

Keywords: Homothety; Self-similarity; Kaluza-Klein Compactification; Conformal Symmetries.

[1]Department of Environment, Ionian University
Mathematical Physics and Computational Statistics Research Laboratory
Panagoula 29100, Island of Zakynthos, Greece

E-mail: [a]papostol@ionio.gr

E-mail: [b]v20tsip@ionio.gr

There is a long history regarding the efforts to "restore" our 4D world from the reduction of higher dimensional geometries. This program has been initiated by Kaluza [1] and Klein [2] aiming to introduce a unified theory of gravity and electromagnetism. The essential idea was that the extra dimension can be compactified (i.e. is small enough w.r.t the remaining four spacetime dimensions) and the metric functions are independent from it (the "cylinder" condition). Later this condition was relaxed and replaced with a periodic dependence of the fields where the "cylinder" geometry arises (see e.g. [3], [4], [5]). The above program has been widely used and new high dimensional theories appeared. For example, the weakness of gravity at short scales ($\gtrsim$ 1mm) follows from the existence of compact extra spatial dimensions large enough compared with the weak scale [6], [7]. At the same time, another theory appeared where, instead of compactification, the "return" to 4D gravity is achieved if we assume that the spacetime geometry is a 3-brane (hypersurface) embedded in a 5D bulk spacetime and the 3-brane becomes the boundaries of a finite fifth dimension [8], [9]. In the latter case, the bulk spacetime can be either $\Lambda-$vacuum (AdS) or with arbitrary matter component where the mirage term on the 3-brane retains its form, but the black hole mass is replaced by the covariantly defined integrated mass of the bulk matter [10].

In the present work we revisit the above scheme and focus on a geometrical (symmetry) point of view. Throughout this paper, the following conventions have been used: the pair $(\mathcal{M}, \mathbf{g})$ denotes the $(d+1)-$dimensional bulk spacetime manifold endowed with a Lorentzian metric of signature $(-,+,+,+,...)$, bulk $(d+1)-$dimensional indices are denoted by capital Latin letters $A, B, ... = 0, 1, 2, ..., d$ and Greek letters denote $d-$dimensional indices $\alpha, \beta, ... = 0, 1, 2, 3, ..., (d-1)$.

Self-similar models are characterized by the existence of a global smooth vector field $\mathbf{H}$ on the spacetime $(\mathcal{M}, \mathbf{g})$ satisfying

$$\mathcal{L}_{\mathbf{H}} g_{AB} = 2\psi g_{AB} \tag{1}$$

where ψ =const. is the *homothetic factor* and essentially represents the *constant* scale amplification or dilation of the geometrical and dynamical variables. The properties underlying a self-similar $(d+1)-$dimensional spacetime depend on whether the homothetic vector field possesses a zero or a fixed point p such that $\mathbf{H}(p) = 0$ and $p \in \mathcal{M}$. In particular, for $d = 4$ it is a well known result that the existence of a zero $\mathbf{H}(p) = 0$ implies that the spacetime is of Petrov type III or N or O and the Ricci tensor has a Segré type $[(2, 11)]$ or $[(3, 1)]$ at p [11]. In addition, it can be proved straightforwadly that when $\mathbf{H}(p) = 0$ for some $p \in \mathcal{M}$ then the homothetic bivector $F_{ab}(\mathbf{H}) \equiv \frac{1}{2}(H_{a;b} - H_{b;a})$ is well-defined and *nowhere zero* in $(\mathcal{M}, \mathbf{g})$ (if it was zero then $\mathbf{H} = \mathbf{0}$ everywhere in $\mathcal{M}$). These features also describe the general case of a $(d+1)-$dimensional spacetime by using exactly the same method as in the 4D models. In some sense, the above consequences of the existence of a zero are undesirable since in most cases they impose severe restrictions on the geometry and the dynamics of the associated model leading either to physically unsound models or models with very special (and hence unrealistic)

properties.

On the other hand, by relaxing the existence of a zero for the homothetic vector field i.e. $\mathbf{H} \neq \mathbf{0}$ everywhere in $\mathcal{M}$ the situation is changed dramatically because in this case we can always choose a coordinate system adapted to $\mathbf{H}$ which is usually referred as *geodesic* coordinates. The metric takes the form

$$ds^2 = g_{AB}dx^A dx^B = e^{2\psi w}\hat{g}_{AB}(x^\gamma)dx^A dx^B \tag{2}$$

where $\mathbf{H} = \partial_w$ and the $\hat{g}_{AB}(x^\gamma)$ does not depend on w hence it admits $\mathbf{H}$ as Killing Vector Field (KVF). In case where the bulk spacetime is Locally Rotationally Symmetric (LRS) [12] then it is straightforward to generalize the 4-dimensional result stating that the quantity w represents a dimensionless scale invariant variable [13]. Although in models where the rotational symmetry is broken this property of the coordinate w is far from obvious, however we shall continue to assume that $w = t/r$ essentially corresponds to the ratio of some space r and time t scales hence the dimensionless quantities of the bulk spacetime are scale invariant.

We note that in the literature the self-similar metric (2) is referred as the *Einstein frame* and the $\hat{g}_{AB}(x^\gamma)$ as the *physical* or *Jordan frame*. Still, the resulting dynamical equations maintain their formidable complexity and one should make some additional geometric assumptions e.g. the existence of extra symmetries for g_{AB} or that the spacetime is algebraically special, losing in that way features of the general case. Nevertheless the nowhere vanishing of $\mathbf{H}$ permit us to make a different type of simplification of the general problem. In fact, if the Petrov type of the Weyl tensor is constant and the Ricci tensor has the same Segré type in all over the spacetime it follows that we can assume without any loss of generality the vanishing of the homothetic bivector $F_{ab}(\mathbf{H}) = 0$ on $\mathcal{M}$ [11]. In this case the most general form of the $(d+1)-$dimensional metric is

$$ds^2 = e^{2\psi w}\left[dw^2 + \tilde{g}_{\alpha\beta}(x^\gamma)dx^\alpha dx^\beta\right] \tag{3}$$

i.e. g_{AB} is conformally related to a $(d+1)$ *global decomposable* spacetime $\hat{g}_{AB}$ admitting the *covariantly constant* vector field $\hat{\mathbf{H}} = \partial_w$ and $\tilde{g}_{\alpha\beta}(x^\gamma)$ is the metric of the $d-$dimensional geometry.

Then, from the Ricci identities we get

$$R_{AB}H^B = 0 = \hat{R}_{AB}H^B \tag{4}$$

where $R_{AB}, \hat{R}_{AB}$ are the Ricci tensors of the Einstein and physical frame respectively.

Furthermore, equation (3) implies that $R_{AB}, \hat{R}_{AB}$ are related via the remarkably simple relation

$$\hat{R}_{AB} = R_{AB} + (d-2)\,\psi^2\left(\hat{g}_{AB} - \hat{H}_A\hat{H}_B\right). \tag{5}$$

Using (4), equation (5) gives

$$\tilde{R}_{\alpha\beta} = R_{\alpha\beta} + (d-2)\,\psi^2\tilde{g}_{\alpha\beta}. \tag{6}$$

Consequently, assuming a specific matter configuration for the self-similar $(d+1)$ −dimensional bulk spacetime in the Einstein frame, one ends up with an *effective* $d-$*dimensional theory with a positive cosmological constant which is determined by the homothetic factor* ψ in the Einstein frame.

Clearly the above construction is closely related with the recently proposed method in ref. [14] (see also [15] for a treatment using a similar mechanism in a spherically symmetric geometry and [16], [17]) where an appropriate compactification of the n internal dimensions leads to an effective 4D theory in the physical frame which can have both accelerating and decelerating periods. However there are two important differences: first we have given a clear geometrical interpretation of the $(d+1)$ Einstein frame as representing a general self-similar metric. On the other hand, it is well known that self-similar models have sound physical significance since they describe (very often) the asymptotic states of more general models. This fact has lead to the "similarity hypothesis" stating that under certain physical circumstances which have never been precisely specified, general cosmological or astrophysical solutions will naturally evolve to a self-similar model [18]. Therefore we expect that self-similar $(d+1)$ −dimensional bulk solutions will play a similar role like the 4d counteparts hence this expectation is in full agreement with the fact that scale-invariant models arise as *equilibrium* or *fixed* points in the dynamical state space and may act as past or future attractors of general models [19], [20]. In addition, in the majority of the problems of physical interest, the HVF is always a gradient vector field (see e.g. [21]-[24] for a 4D treatment) hence $F_{AB}(\mathbf{H})=0$ (for the case of a (proper) Conformal Vector Field, it has been shown recently [25] the significance of the vanishing of the conformal bivector in constructing viable scalar field models in a spherically symmetric 4D spacetime).

In this sense and assuming that these heuristic arguments are true for general bulk matter configurations, the metric (3) maybe represents the *most general solution of a* $(d+1)-$*dimensional model at early or late times*. In addition, we have identified the origin of the positive cosmological constant in the $d-$dimensional spacetime as the homothetic factor hence *a geometrical artifact of late time state* of the $(d+1)$ −dimensional bulk spacetime.

A second difference with [14] is that we do not assume a Ricci flat $(d+1)$ −dimensional bulk spacetime since, in the spirit of the above mentioned late time behaviour and using equation (6), this will always lead to an empty effective $d-$dimensional model with a positive cosmological constant. In fact this is exactly the situation with the Kasner-type models considered in [14] which always admit a proper HVF [26] irrespective the dimension. In contrast, we have a non-empty bulk $R_{AB}\neq 0$ giving rise to a *non-empty* $d-$dimensional spacetime. Consider for example a $(d+1)$ −dimensional bulk energy-momentum tensor of the form

$$T_{AB}=(\rho+p)\,u_A u_B+p\,(g_{AB}-e_A e_B) \tag{7}$$

with $e^A=e^{-\psi w}\delta^A_w$ a global nowhere zero smooth vector field and $u_A e^A=0$. The above type of bulk energy-momentum can be interpreted as an anisotropic fluid in the $(d+1)$ −dimensional

spacetime or equivalently as "perfect" fluid confined in a $d-$dimensional hypersurface. To see this more clear we remark that the existence of the homothety implies that $\rho = \hat{\rho}(x^\alpha)e^{-2\psi w}$ and $p = \hat{p}(x^\alpha)e^{-2\psi w}$ for some smooth *positive* functions $\hat{\rho}(x^\alpha), \hat{p}(x^\alpha)$. Hence in the Einstein frame the bulk energy-momentum (7) is written

$$T_{AB} = [\hat{\rho}(x^\alpha) + \hat{p}(x^\alpha)]\, \hat{u}_A \hat{u}_B + \hat{p}(x^\alpha)\, (\hat{g}_{AB} - \delta^w_A \delta^w_B)\,. \tag{8}$$

Using (4) we get $\hat{p}(x^\alpha) = \hat{\rho}(x^\alpha)/(d-1)$. Then, by means of the usual Kaluza-Klein compactification scheme the effective $n-$dimensional Einstein Field Equations in the physical frame are

$$\hat{R}_{\alpha\beta} = \hat{\rho}(x^\alpha)\hat{u}_\alpha \hat{u}_\beta + \frac{1}{d-1}\hat{\rho}(x^\alpha)\, (\hat{g}_{\alpha\beta} + \hat{u}_\alpha \hat{u}_\beta) + (d-2)\, \psi^2 \hat{g}_{\alpha\beta} \tag{9}$$

i.e. we get an *effective $d-$dimensional perfect fluid (radiation) model plus an effective positive cosmological constant* $\Lambda = (d-2)\,\psi^2$.

As another example we consider the case of bulk perfect fluid

$$T_{AB} = (\rho + p)\, u_A u_B + p g_{AB}. \tag{10}$$

Following a similar approach we obtain

$$\hat{R}_{\alpha\beta} = 2\hat{\rho}(x^\alpha)\hat{u}_\alpha \hat{u}_\beta + (d-2)\, \psi^2 \hat{g}_{\alpha\beta} \tag{11}$$

i.e. a *stiff perfect fluid*.

Let us remark that in *all* the examples considered above, there exist *exact* and *analytical* self-similar models [27] for which the Einstein Field Equations are satisfied for the specific bulk matter setups (7) and (8). Of course, in order to have a complete picture of the procedure followed here, one should seek for appropriate bulk solutions and show that a self-similar model is the future attractor. If this is the case, then the proposal of the present article might provide an alternative explanation of the appearance and dominance of a positive cosmological constant at late times in the $d-$dimensional spacetime and the matter dominated epoch at early times.

Data availability Data sharing not applicable to this article as no datasets were generated or analysed during the current study.

[1] T. Kaluza, Sitzungsber. Preuss. Akad. Wiss. Berlin (Math. Phys.) **1921** (1921), 966-972 doi:10.1142/S0218271818700017 [arXiv:1803.08616 [physics.hist-ph]].
[2] O. Klein, Quantentheorie und funfdimensionale Relativitatstheorie, Zeits. Phys. **37** (1926) 895
[3] J. M. Overduin and P. S. Wesson, Phys. Rept. **283** (1997), 303-380 doi:10.1016/S0370-1573(96)00046-4 [arXiv:gr-qc/9805018 [gr-qc]].
[4] J. Ponce de Leon, Gen. Rel. Grav., **20** (1988), p. 539
[5] Paul S. Wesson, Astrophysical Journal v.394, **394** (1992), p. 19
[6] N. Arkani-Hamed, S. Dimopoulos and G. R. Dvali, Phys. Lett. B **429** (1998), 263-272 doi:10.1016/S0370-2693(98)00466-3 [arXiv:hep-ph/9803315 [hep-ph]].

[7] I. Antoniadis, N. Arkani-Hamed, S. Dimopoulos and G. R. Dvali, Phys. Lett. B **436** (1998), 257-263 doi:10.1016/S0370-2693(98)00860-0 [arXiv:hep-ph/9804398 [hep-ph]].
[8] L. Randall and R. Sundrum, Phys. Rev. Lett. **83** (1999), 3370-3373 doi:10.1103/PhysRevLett.83.3370 [arXiv:hep-ph/9905221 [hep-ph]].
[9] L. Randall and R. Sundrum, Phys. Rev. Lett. **83** (1999), 4690-4693 doi:10.1103/PhysRevLett.83.4690 [arXiv:hep-th/9906064 [hep-th]].
[10] P. S. Apostolopoulos and N. Tetradis, Phys. Lett. B **633** (2006), 409-414 doi:10.1016/j.physletb.2005.12.015 [arXiv:hep-th/0509182 [hep-th]].
[11] G. S. Hall, *Symmetries and Curvature Structure in General Relativity*(World Scientific Lecture Notes in Physics: Volume 46, 2004).
[12] P. S. Apostolopoulos and J. G. Carot, J. Phys. Conf. Series **8** (2005) 28-33.
[13] B. J. Carr and A. A. Coley, *Self-similarity in general relativity*, 1999 Class. Quantum Grav. **16** R31-R71.
[14] P. K. Townsend and M. N. R. Wohlfarth, Phys. Rev. Lett. **91** (2003) 061302.
[15] J. Ponce de Leon, JCAP **03** (2008), 021 doi:10.1088/1475-7516/2008/03/021 [arXiv:0802.1953 [gr-qc]].
[16] J. Ponce de Leon, Grav. Cosmol. **14** (2008), 241-247 doi:10.1134/S0202289308030067 [arXiv:0712.4301 [gr-qc]].
[17] S. Rippl, C. Romero and R. K. Tavakol, Class. Quant. Grav. **12** (1995), 2411-2422 doi:10.1088/0264-9381/12/10/004 [arXiv:gr-qc/9511016 [gr-qc]].
[18] B. J. Carr and A. A. Coley, Gen. Rel. Grav. **37** (2005), 2165-2188 doi:10.1007/s10714-005-0196-7 [arXiv:gr-qc/0508039 [gr-qc]].
[19] J. Wainwright and G. F. R. Ellis (Editors), *Dynamical Systems in Cosmology* (Cambridge University Press, Cambridge 1997).
[20] A. A. Coley, *Dynamical Systems and Cosmology*, (Kluwer, Academic Publishers 2003).
[21] P. S. Apostolopoulos, *Self-similar Bianchi models: I. Class A models*, 2003 Class. Quantum Grav. **20** 3371-3384 (*Preprint* gr-qc/0306119).
[22] P. S. Apostolopoulos, *On tilted perfect fluid Bianchi type VI_0 self-similar models*, 2004 Gen. Relativ. Grav. **36** 1939-1945 (*Preprint* gr-qc/0310033).
[23] P. S. Apostolopoulos, *Self-similar Bianchi models: II. Class A models*, 2005 Class. Quantum Grav. **22** 323-338 (*Preprint* gr-qc/0411102).
[24] P. S. Apostolopoulos, *Equilibrium points of the tilted perfect fluid Bianchi type VI_h state space*, 2005 Gen. Relativ. Grav. **37** 937-952 (*Preprint* gr-qc/0407040).
[25] P. S. Apostolopoulos, [arXiv:2211.01084 [gr-qc]].
[26] M. Tsamparlis and P. S. Apostolopoulos, J. Math. Phys. **41** (200) 7573 (arXiv:gr-qc/0006083).
[27] P. S. Apostolopoulos, in preparation.