

Perturbations in Horndeski theory above anisotropic cosmological background

S. Mironov^{a,b,c1}, A. Shtennikova^{a,b,d2}

^a*Institute for Nuclear Research of the Russian Academy of Sciences,
60th October Anniversary Prospect, 7a, 117312 Moscow, Russia*

^b*Institute for Theoretical and Mathematical Physics,
Lomonosov Moscow State University, Moscow 119991, Russia*

^c*NRC “Kurchatov Institute”, 123182, Moscow, Russia*

^d*Department of Particle Physics and Cosmology, Physics Faculty,
M.V. Lomonosov Moscow State University,
Vorobjevy Gory, 119991 Moscow, Russia*

Abstract

Considering an anisotropic cosmological background is an interesting and simultaneously challenging problem of theoretical physics, since we not only assume a high degree of anisotropy in the early stages of the Universe, but also observe it to a small degree until now. In this paper we have constructed the unconstrained action for the perturbations above Bianchi I type background in the most general scalar-tensor theory of gravity, the Horndeski theory, and evaluate the effect of the deviation from the anisotropic background on the previously established stable solution obtained in previous works.

1 Introduction

Horndeski theory [1–4] (See [5] for a review) is the most general scalar-tensor theory of gravity with second derivatives in the equations of motion, which makes it interesting in matters of constructing new models of dark matter, dark energy, wormholes, and so on. However, the construction of stable solutions to the theory is limited by the so-called no-go theorem [6, 7]. It was formulated in the case of a homogeneous and isotropic cosmological background and for a spherically symmetric background. The options for avoiding it were also widely considered [7–21].

However, the list of problems considered in the context of Horndeski theory does not end here, and there are papers that consider anisotropic background [22, 23]. From a cosmological point of view, it is generally assumed that the universe was highly anisotropic in its early inflation stages [24–26] and in addition, some degree of anisotropy is also present in current observations. In this context, studying and constructing potentially non-singular solutions in the case of an anisotropic background becomes relevant.

¹sa.mironov.1@physics.msu.ru

²shtennikova@inr.ru

In the previously considered models there exists a no-go theorem, which prohibits stable solutions in the general Horndeski theory on the whole time axis. However, the theorem is formulated for isotropic background, so the question arises whether the existence of this theorem is a consequence of high symmetry of spacetime. This question requires further study. On the other hand, the authors of the paper considered a way to circumvent the no-go theorem in the isotropic case [21]. In the fact that we consider lagrangian with special relation between function, so, that only scalar degree of freedom is non-dynamical above homogeneous isotropic background and no-go theorem is not applicapable. Earlier for this situation stable solutions of Bounce and Genesis types were constructed. In this paper we show that this way no longer works, and the solution is actually unstable. This becomes apparent if we introduce a small anisotropy into the existing solution. The result is actually important, as it illustrates that trying to get rid of one of the degrees of freedom of a system over a particular background sometimes leads to pathologies over nearby solutions.

In this paper, we consider perturbations of the metric and scalar field above a homogeneous but anisotropic Bianchi type I background. We integrate out the non-dynamical variables in partly gauge invariant form and construct the unconstrained action for the perturbations. We also show how the quadratic action reduces to the isotropic case of the Friedmann universe and checked how the deviation from the isotropic background affects the previously obtained[21] stable solution.

2 Perturbations about anisotropic background

We consider the Horndeski theory with the following Lagrangian:

$$S = \int d^4x \sqrt{-g} (\mathcal{L}_2 + \mathcal{L}_3 + \mathcal{L}_4), \quad (1a)$$

$$\mathcal{L}_2 = F(\pi, X), \quad (1b)$$

$$\mathcal{L}_3 = K(\pi, X) \square \pi, \quad (1c)$$

$$\mathcal{L}_4 = -G_4(\pi, X) R + 2G_{4X}(\pi, X) \left[(\square \pi)^2 - \pi_{;\mu\nu} \pi^{;\mu\nu} \right], \quad (1d)$$

where π is the scalar field, $X = g^{\mu\nu} \pi_{,\mu} \pi_{,\nu}$, $\pi_{,\mu} = \partial_\mu \pi$, $\pi_{;\mu\nu} = \nabla_\nu \nabla_\mu \pi$, $\square \pi = g^{\mu\nu} \nabla_\nu \nabla_\mu \pi$, $G_{4X} = \partial G_4 / \partial X$, etc.

In this paper we consider anisotropic background:

$$ds^2 = dt^2 - (a^2(t)dx^2 + b^2(t)dy^2 + c^2(t)dz^2). \quad (2)$$

The decomposition of metric perturbations $h_{\mu\nu}$ into helicity components in this case has the form

$$h_{00} = 2\Phi \quad (3a)$$

$$h_{0i} = -\partial_i \beta + Z_i^T, \quad (3b)$$

$$h_{ij} = -2\frac{H_i}{H} \Psi g_{ij} - 2\partial_i \partial_j E - (\partial_i W_j^T + \partial_j W_i^T) + h_{ij}^{TT}, \quad (3c)$$

where Φ, β, Ψ, E are scalar fields, H_i is the corresponding Hubble parameter (here and further $i = a, b, c$) and $H = \frac{1}{3}(H_a + H_b + H_c)$, Z_i^T, W_i^T are transverse vector fields ($\partial_i Z_i^T = \partial_i W_i^T = 0$), h_{ij}^{TT} is transverse traceless tensor. We also denote the perturbation of scalar field $\delta\pi = \chi$.

The action for tensor perturbations has the form:

$$S_h^{(2)} = \int dt d^3x a^3 \left[\frac{A_5}{2} (\dot{h}_{ij})^2 - A_2 (\Delta_a^2 h_{ij}^{TT} + \Delta_b^2 h_{ij}^{TT} + \Delta_c^2 h_{ij}^{TT}) \right]. \quad (4)$$

Here dot denotes the derivative with respect to the cosmic time t , $\Delta_a = a^{-1}\partial_x$, $\Delta_b = b^{-1}\partial_y$, $\Delta_c = c^{-1}\partial_z$, coefficients A_i are the combinations of the Lagrangian functions and their derivatives.

Similar to the isotropic case, vector perturbations are non-dynamical and scalars are the most challenging. Without loss of generality we partly use the gauge freedom and gauge away the longitudinal component $\partial_i \partial_j E$ from the very beginning. Then the second-order action for scalar sector has the form:

$$\begin{aligned} S^{(2)} = \int dx abc & \left(\frac{1}{6} A_1 \sum_{i \neq j} \dot{\Psi}_i \dot{\Psi}_j + \frac{A_2}{2} \sum_{\substack{i=a,b,c \\ i \neq j \neq k}} \Delta_i \Psi_j \Delta_i \Psi_k + A_3 \Phi^2 \right. \\ & + \Phi (A_4^i \Delta_i^2 \beta) + A_5 \sum_{\substack{i=a,b,c \\ i \neq j \neq k}} \dot{\Psi}_i (\Delta_j^2 \beta + \Delta_k^2 \beta) + \Phi (A_6^i \dot{\Psi}_i) + \frac{A_7}{2} \Phi \sum_{\substack{i=a,b,c \\ i \neq j \neq k}} \Delta_i^2 (\Psi_j + \Psi_k) \\ & + \Phi (A_8^i \Delta_i^2 \chi) + \dot{\chi} (A_9^i \Delta_i^2 \beta) + \chi (A_{10}^i \ddot{\Psi}_i) + A_{11} \Phi \dot{\chi} + \chi (A_{12}^i \Delta_i^2 \beta) \\ & + \chi \sum_{i,j} \frac{1}{2} A_{13}^{ij} (\Delta_i^2 \Psi_j + \Delta_j^2 \Psi_i) + A_{14} (\dot{\chi})^2 + A_{15}^i (\Delta_i \chi)^2 + A_{17} \Phi \chi + \chi (A_{18}^i \dot{\Psi}_i) \\ & + A_{20} \chi^2 + \frac{1}{2} \sum_{\substack{i,j=a,b,c \\ i \neq j}} B^{ij} \Psi_i \dot{\Psi}_j - \Psi_a (B^{ab} \Delta_y^2 \beta + B^{ac} \Delta_z^2 \beta) + \Psi_b (B^{ab} \Delta_x^2 \beta + B^{bc} \Delta_z^2 \beta) \\ & \left. + \Psi_c (B^{ac} \Delta_x^2 \beta - B^{bc} \Delta_y^2 \beta) \right). \quad (5) \end{aligned}$$

Here $\Psi_i = \bar{H}_i \Psi$ and $\bar{H}_i = H_i/H$ and we assume summation by dummy indices. The explicit form of these coefficients can be found in the Appendix A³. The choice of notations A_i is related to the attempt to show the correspondence between the isotropic and anisotropic cases; the coefficients B^{ij} , in turn, correspond to the terms that do not exist in the isotropic case. The use of auxiliary variables Ψ_i is due to the convenience and shortness of the presentation.

3 Gauge invariant variables

In this section, we reduce (5) to a single variable using the gauge invariant variables.

³Note that all coefficients in before the spatial derivatives, except for A_1 and A_2 , suffer a "splitting". This is due to the anisotropy of the background in consideration. The coefficients A_1 and A_2 also undergo "splitting", but only when $\mathcal{L}_5$ summand of the general Horndeski theory is considered.

Because we have already partially fixed the gauge by putting $\partial_i \partial_j E = 0$, action (5) is invariant under the residual gauge transformations:

$$\Phi \rightarrow \Phi + \dot{\xi}_0, \quad \beta \rightarrow \beta - \xi_0, \quad \chi \rightarrow \chi + \xi_0 \dot{\pi}, \quad \Psi \rightarrow \Psi + \xi_0 H. \quad (6)$$

Based on this, we can introduce gauge-invariant variables:

$$\mathcal{X} = \chi + \dot{\pi} \beta, \quad (7a)$$

$$\mathcal{Y}_i = \Psi_i + H_i \beta, \quad (7b)$$

$$\mathcal{Z} = \Phi + \dot{\beta}. \quad (7c)$$

In terms of these variables, the action is rewritten as follows:

$$\begin{aligned} S^{(2)} = \int dx \, abc \left(\frac{1}{6} A_1 \sum_{i \neq j} \dot{\mathcal{Y}}_i \dot{\mathcal{Y}}_j + \frac{A_2}{2} \sum_{\substack{i=a,b,c \\ i \neq j \neq k}} \Delta_i \mathcal{Y}_j \Delta_i \mathcal{Y}_k + A_3 \mathcal{Z}^2 + \mathcal{Z} (A_6^i \dot{\mathcal{Y}}_i) \right. \\ + \frac{A_7}{2} \mathcal{Z} \sum_{\substack{i=a,b,c \\ i \neq j \neq k}} \Delta_i^2 (\mathcal{Y}_j + \mathcal{Y}_k) + \mathcal{Z} (A_8^i \Delta_i^2 \mathcal{X}) + \mathcal{X} (A_{10}^i \ddot{\mathcal{Y}}_i) + A_{11} \mathcal{Z} \dot{\mathcal{X}} \\ + \mathcal{X} \sum_{i,j} \frac{1}{2} A_{13}^{ij} (\Delta_i^2 \mathcal{Y}_j + \Delta_j^2 \mathcal{Y}_i) + A_{14} (\dot{\mathcal{X}})^2 + (A_{15}^i (\Delta_i \mathcal{X})^2) + A_{17} \mathcal{X} \mathcal{Z} \\ \left. + \mathcal{X} (A_{18}^i \dot{\mathcal{Y}}_i) + A_{20} \mathcal{X}^2 + C_3^{ab} \mathcal{Y}_a \dot{\mathcal{Y}}_b + C_3^{bc} \mathcal{Y}_c \dot{\mathcal{Y}}_b + C_3^{ac} \mathcal{Y}_a \dot{\mathcal{Y}}_c \right). \end{aligned} \quad (8)$$

The variable $\mathcal{Z}$ is obviously non-dynamical and we can derive a $\mathcal{Z}$ -constraint which has the following form:

$$\mathcal{Z} = -\frac{1}{2} \frac{1}{A_3} \left((A_8^i \Delta_i^2 \mathcal{X}) + A_6^i \dot{\mathcal{Y}}_i + A_{11} \dot{\mathcal{X}} \frac{A_7}{2} \sum_{\substack{i=a,b,c \\ i \neq j \neq k}} \Delta_i^2 (\mathcal{Y}_j + \mathcal{Y}_k) + \mathcal{X} A_{17} \right). \quad (9)$$

Then we substitute $\mathcal{Y}_i = \bar{H}_i \mathcal{Y}$ and replace the variables as linear combination:

$$\zeta = \mathcal{Y} + \eta \mathcal{X}, \quad \text{where } \eta = 9 \frac{A_{11} A_4 + 2 A_3 A_8}{(4 (\bar{H}_a \bar{H}_b + \bar{H}_a \bar{H}_c + \bar{H}_b \bar{H}_c) A_1 A_3 - 27 A_4^2)}, \quad (10)$$

here and further

$$A_4 = \frac{1}{3} \sum_{l=a,b,c} A_4^l \bar{H}_l, \quad A_8 = \frac{1}{3} \sum_{l=a,b,c} A_8^l \bar{H}_l. \quad (11)$$

The introduction of the new variable ζ is intended to distinguish the explicitly non-dynamic variable $\mathcal{X}$. This is not the only way to introduce the dynamical variable, we can also leave $\mathcal{Y}$ to be a constraint. Physically, of course, the result will not depend on the choice of the variables, but the form of the action may change.

The action in terms of the variables $\mathcal{X}$ and ζ is as follows:

$$S^{(2)} = \int dx \, abc \left(\left(\dot{\zeta} \right)^2 \left(\frac{2}{3} A_1 (\bar{H}_a \bar{H}_b + \bar{H}_a \bar{H}_c + \bar{H}_b \bar{H}_c) - \frac{9}{2} \frac{A_4^2}{A_3} \right) - \dot{\zeta} \mathcal{X} C_3 \right. \\ \left. - \frac{1}{2A_3} (\mathcal{X} C_1 - \zeta C_2)^2 + M \mathcal{X}^2 + \zeta^2 (m + C_4) + \mathcal{X} \zeta C_5 \right), \quad (12)$$

where

$$C_1 = \Sigma_a \frac{k_x^2}{a^2} + \Sigma_b \frac{k_y^2}{b^2} + \Sigma_c \frac{k_z^2}{c^2}, \quad (13a)$$

$$C_2 = \Theta_a \frac{k_x^2}{a^2} + \Theta_b \frac{k_y^2}{b^2} + \Theta_c \frac{k_z^2}{c^2}, \quad (13b)$$

$$C_3 = \Lambda_a \frac{k_x^2}{a^2} + \Lambda_b \frac{k_y^2}{b^2} + \Lambda_c \frac{k_z^2}{c^2}, \quad (13c)$$

$$C_4 = \Pi_a \frac{k_x^2}{a^2} + \Pi_b \frac{k_y^2}{b^2} + \Pi_c \frac{k_z^2}{c^2}, \quad (13d)$$

$$C_5 = \Xi_a \frac{k_x^2}{a^2} + \Xi_b \frac{k_y^2}{b^2} + \Xi_c \frac{k_z^2}{c^2}, \quad (13e)$$

where $\Lambda_i, \Xi_i, \Pi_i, \Theta, M, m$ and Σ_i are the linear combinations of A_i , which can be found in Appendix B.

As we said above, it is now clearly seen that the variable $\mathcal{X}$ is non-dynamical and the corresponding constraint is:

$$\mathcal{X} = \frac{1}{C_1^2 - 2MA_3} \left((C_1 C_2 + A_3 C_5) \zeta - A_3 C_3 \dot{\zeta} \right) \quad (14)$$

Upon substitution (14) into (12), we get

$$S^{(2)} = \int dx \, abc \left(\left(\dot{\zeta} \right)^2 \left(\frac{2}{3} A_1 (\bar{H}_a \bar{H}_b + \bar{H}_a \bar{H}_c + \bar{H}_b \bar{H}_c) - \frac{9}{2} \frac{A_4^2}{A_3} + \frac{1}{2} \frac{A_3 C_3^2}{C_1^2 - 2MA_3} \right) + \right. \\ \left. + \zeta^2 \left(C_4 + \frac{C_1 C_2 C_5}{C_1^2 - 2MA_3} + \frac{1}{2} \frac{1}{abc} \left[abc \frac{C_1 C_2 C_3}{C_1^2 - 2MA_3} \right] \right) + \right. \\ \left. + \zeta^2 \left(m + \frac{1}{2} \frac{A_3 C_5^2 + 2C_2^2 M}{C_1^2 - 2MA_3} + \frac{1}{2} \frac{1}{abc} \frac{d}{dt} \left[\frac{abc A_3 C_3 C_5}{C_1^2 - 2MA_3} \right] \right) \right). \quad (15)$$

In action (15) the first term is the kinetic term, the second one is gradient term (proportional to k^2), and the third one corresponds to the mass of the field ζ .

4 Isotropic limit

In the isotropic case $b = a, c = a$ the coefficients C_i , respectively, change to:

$$C_1 = A_4 \frac{(2A_1A_{11} + 9A_4A_8) k^2}{(4A_1A_3 - 9A_4^2) a^2}, \quad (16a)$$

$$C_2 = \frac{2}{3} A_1 \frac{k^2}{a^2}, \quad (16b)$$

$$C_3 = \frac{9A_4A_8 + 2A_1A_{11}}{3A_3} \frac{k^2}{a^2}, \quad (16c)$$

$$C_4 = \left(A_2 + \frac{1}{2} \frac{1}{a} \frac{d}{dt} \left[\frac{A_4A_1a}{A_3} \right] \right) \frac{k^2}{a^2}, \quad (16d)$$

$$C_5 = 0, \quad (16e)$$

$$m = M = 0. \quad (16f)$$

And action (15) takes the form:

$$S^{(2)} = \int dt d^3x a^3 \left(\mathcal{G}_S (\dot{\zeta})^2 - \mathcal{F}_S \frac{(\vec{\nabla} \zeta)^2}{a^2} \right), \quad (17)$$

where

$$\mathcal{G}_S = \frac{4}{9} \frac{A_3A_1^2}{A_4^2} - A_1, \quad (18a)$$

$$\mathcal{F}_S = -\frac{1}{a} \frac{d}{dt} \left[\frac{aA_1A_7}{3A_4} \right] - A_2 = \frac{1}{a} \frac{d}{dt} \left[\frac{aA_5 \cdot A_7}{2A_4} \right] - A_2. \quad (18b)$$

which corresponds to the known result.

5 Testing the stability of the Bounce solution with respect to small anisotropy

To further analyze the theory, we consider the action (5) in the unitary gauge $\chi = 0$ and direct the momentum $\vec{k}$ along the x-axis, so $\vec{k} = (k_x, 0, 0)$. Then by varying the action with respect to the fields Φ and β we obtain the following constraint equations

$$\Phi = \frac{A_1}{3A_4^x} \left(\dot{\Psi}_b + \dot{\Psi}_c - (H_a - H_b) \Psi_b - (H_a - H_c) \Psi_c \right) \quad (19a)$$

$$\begin{aligned} k_x^2 \beta = & \frac{1}{A_4^x} \left(\left(\dot{\Psi}_i A_4^i \right) - \frac{1}{3} A_1 k_x^2 (\Psi_b + \Psi_c) \right) \\ & + \frac{2}{3} \frac{A_1 A_3}{(A_4^x)^2} \left((H_a - H_b) \Psi_b + (H_a - H_c) \Psi_c - (\dot{\Psi}_b + \dot{\Psi}_c) \right) \end{aligned} \quad (19b)$$

After removing the constraints, we get the following action on the Ψ variable

$$S^{(2)} = \int dt d^3x abc \left(\mathcal{G}_S \left(\dot{\Psi} \right)^2 + M \Psi^2 + \mathcal{F}_S \frac{k_x^2}{a^2} \Psi^2 \right), \quad (20)$$

where

$$\mathcal{G}_S = \frac{2}{9} \frac{A_3 A_1^2}{(A_4^x)^2} (\bar{H}_b + \bar{H}_c)^2 - \frac{2}{3} \frac{A_1}{A_4^x} (A_4^y \bar{H}_b + A_4^z \bar{H}_c) (\bar{H}_b + \bar{H}_c) + \frac{2}{3} A_1 \bar{H}_b \bar{H}_c, \quad (21a)$$

$$\mathcal{F}_S = -2A_2 \bar{H}_b \bar{H}_c - \frac{1}{9a^3} (\bar{H}_b + \bar{H}_c)^2 \frac{d}{dt} \left[\frac{A_1^2 a^3}{A_4^x} \right] + \frac{A_1^2}{9A_4^x} (\bar{H}_b^2 - \bar{H}_c^2) (H_b - H_c), \quad (21b)$$

the explicit value of M is not important to us now. Even though we resolved the constraints again in unitary gauge, the speed of sound coincides with one which we obtained from the action (15).

Let us now consider a model with the following Lagrangian

$$\mathcal{L} = \frac{\pi^2 - \tau^2}{3(\tau^2 + \pi^2)^2} - \frac{\pi^2 X}{(\tau^2 + \pi^2)^2} + \frac{\pi X}{3(\tau^2 + \pi^2)} \square \pi + \frac{1}{2} R. \quad (22)$$

This Lagrangian was obtained in the Ref.[21] and corresponds to the situation where in the action (17) $A_4 = 0$. This model has an isotropic bounce solution with out dynamical scalar modes. Let us check whether the solution remains stable if we consider an anisotropic bounce - deviate from the isotropic case in two directions:

$$H_a = \frac{t}{(\tau^2 + t^2)} + \frac{\alpha}{(\tau^2 + t^2)^{3/2}}, \quad H_b = \frac{t}{(\tau^2 + t^2)} - \frac{\alpha}{(\tau^2 + t^2)^{3/2}}, \quad H_c = \frac{t}{(\tau^2 + t^2)}. \quad (23)$$

Here the parameter τ defines the bounce amplitude and α the degree of deviation from the isotropic case (See Pic.1).




Figure 1: Hubble parametrs $H_a(t), H_b(t), H_c(t)$, when we choose $\alpha = 10, \tau = 10$. The bounce solution is characterized by the presence of a twist at the origin and tending to 0 at $\pm$ infinity.

To analyze the stability of the scalar field, we numerically plot the square of the speed of sound $c_S^2(2)$:




Figure 2: The square of the speed of sound c_s^2 , when we choose $\alpha = 0.1, \tau = 10$ (left panel) and $\alpha = 1, \tau = 20$ (right panel). In this case, the square of the speed of sound will have at least 2 symmetric singular points and tends to 0 as universe becomes isotropic.




Figure 3: Zoom of the neighborhood of singular points of the square of the speed of sound c_s^2 for parameters $\alpha = 0.1, \tau = 10$.

The plots Pic.3 show that in the theory (22) the scalar field becomes unstable even with a small deviation from the isotropic background. This tells us that the result obtained earlier in Ref.[21] is a very special case directly related to the background isotropy.

6 Conclusion

In this paper, we construct an action for tensor and scalar modes of perturbations of the metric and scalar fields over an anisotropic background, and check whether the previously obtained solution

for the universe with bounce remains stable. It turned out that the stability of perturbations in the universe with bounce is directly related to its isotropy and even at small deviations from it the square of the speed of sound diverges and become negative. However, our result still opens a wide avenue for finding stable solutions and supports the quest for power spectra of anisotropic models of the early Universe.

Acknowledgements

The authors wish to thank Kasper Peeters for developing and maintaining `cadabra2` software [\[27\]](#), with which most of the calculations were performed. This work has been supported by Russian Science Foundation grant 19-12-00393.

Appendix A

In this Appendix we collect the expressions for coefficients A_i entering the quadratic action. Here and below the small Latin indices run the values a, b, c and we consider that $i \neq j \neq k$:

$$A_1 = -6G_4 + 12G_{4X}((\dot{\pi}))^2, \quad (24)$$

$$A_2 = 2G_4, \quad (25)$$

$$\begin{aligned} A_3 = & F_X((\dot{\pi}))^2 + 2F_{XX}((\dot{\pi}))^4 + 4(H_a + H_b + H_c) K_X((\dot{\pi}))^3 - K_\pi((\dot{\pi}))^2 \\ & - K_{X\pi}((\dot{\pi}))^4 + 2(H_a + H_b + H_c) K_{XX}((\dot{\pi}))^5 - 2(H_a H_b + H_a H_c + H_b H_c) G_4 \\ & + 14(H_a H_b + H_a H_c + H_b H_c) G_{4X}((\dot{\pi}))^2 + 32(H_a H_b + H_a H_c + H_b H_c) G_{4XX}((\dot{\pi}))^4 \\ & - 10(H_a + H_b + H_c) G_{4X\pi}((\dot{\pi}))^3 - 2(H_a + H_b + H_c) G_{4\pi}(\dot{\pi}) \\ & + 8(H_a H_b + H_a H_c + H_b H_c) G_{4XX\pi}((\dot{\pi}))^6 - 4(H_a + H_b + H_c) G_{4X\pi}((\dot{\pi}))^5, \end{aligned} \quad (26)$$

$$\begin{aligned} A_4^i = & 2K_X((\dot{\pi}))^3 - 2(H_j + H_k) G_4 + 8(H_j + H_k) G_{4X}((\dot{\pi}))^2 \\ & - 4G_{4X\pi}((\dot{\pi}))^3 - 2G_{4\pi}(\dot{\pi}) + 8(H_j + H_k) G_{4XX}((\dot{\pi}))^4, \end{aligned} \quad (27)$$

$$A_5 = -\frac{1}{3}A_1 \quad (28)$$

$$A_6^i = -A_4^i \quad (29)$$

$$A_7 = \frac{1}{3}A_1 \quad (30)$$

$$\begin{aligned} A_8^i = & 2K_X((\dot{\pi}))^2 - 2G_{4\pi} + 4(H_j + H_k) G_{4X}(\dot{\pi}) + 8(H_j + H_k) G_{4XX}((\dot{\pi}))^3 \\ & - 4G_{4X\pi}((\dot{\pi}))^2, \end{aligned} \quad (31)$$

$$A_9^i = -A_8^i \quad (32)$$

$$A_{10}^i = -A_8^i \quad (33)$$

$$\begin{aligned} A_{11} = & -2F_X(\dot{\pi}) - 4F_{XX}((\dot{\pi}))^3 + 2K_{X\pi}((\dot{\pi}))^3 + 2K_\pi(\dot{\pi}) - 4(H_a + H_b + H_c) K_{XX}((\dot{\pi}))^4 \\ & - 6(H_a + H_b + H_c) K_X((\dot{\pi}))^2 - 12(H_b H_c + H_a H_c + H_a H_b) G_{4X}(\dot{\pi}) \\ & - 48(H_b H_c + H_a H_c + H_a H_b) G_{4XX}((\dot{\pi}))^3 + 16(H_a + H_b + H_c) G_{4X\pi}((\dot{\pi}))^2 \\ & + 2(H_a + H_b + H_c) G_{4\pi} - 16(H_a H_b + H_a H_c + H_b H_c) G_{4XX\pi}((\dot{\pi}))^5 \\ & + 8(H_a + H_b + H_c) G_{4X\pi}((\dot{\pi}))^4, \end{aligned} \quad (34)$$

$$\begin{aligned}
A_{12} = & 2F_X(\dot{\pi}) + 2(H_a + H_b + H_c)K_X((\dot{\pi}))^2 - 2K_\pi(\dot{\pi}) \\
& + 4(H_bH_c + H_aH_c + H_aH_b)G_{4X}(\dot{\pi}) + 2G_{4\pi\pi}(\dot{\pi}) - 2G_{4\pi}H_a \\
& + 8(H_aH_b + H_aH_c + H_bH_c)G_{4XX}((\dot{\pi}))^3 - 8(H_a + H_b + H_c)G_{4X\pi}((\dot{\pi}))^2,
\end{aligned} \tag{35}$$

$$A_{13}^{ij} = -2G_{4\pi} + 4G_{4X}(\ddot{\pi}) + 4G_{4X}H_k(\dot{\pi}) + 4G_{4X\pi}((\dot{\pi}))^2 + 8G_{4XX}(\ddot{\pi})(\dot{\pi})^2 \tag{36}$$

$$\begin{aligned}
A_{14} = & 2F_{XX}((\dot{\pi}))^2 + F_X - K_\pi - K_{X\pi}((\dot{\pi}))^2 + 2(H_a + H_b + H_c)K_{XX}((\dot{\pi}))^3 \\
& + 2(H_a + H_b + H_c)K_X(\dot{\pi}) - 6(H_a + H_b + H_c)G_{4X\pi}(\dot{\pi}) \\
& + 16(H_aH_b + H_aH_c + H_bH_c)G_{4XX}((\dot{\pi}))^2 + 2(H_aH_b + H_aH_c + H_bH_c)G_{4X}, \\
& - 4(H_a + H_b + H_c)G_{4X\pi}((\dot{\pi}))^3 + 8(H_aH_b + H_aH_c + H_bH_c)G_{4XXX}((\dot{\pi}))^4,
\end{aligned} \tag{37}$$

$$\begin{aligned}
A_{15}^i = & -F_X + K_\pi - K_{X\pi}((\dot{\pi}))^2 - 2K_{XX}(\ddot{\pi})(\dot{\pi})^2 - 2K_X(\ddot{\pi}) \\
& - 2(H_j + H_k)K_X(\dot{\pi}) + 6G_{4X\pi}(\ddot{\pi}) + 6(H_j + H_k)G_{4X\pi}(\dot{\pi}) \\
& + 4G_{4XX\pi}(\ddot{\pi})(\dot{\pi})^2 - 4(H_j + H_k)G_{4XX\pi}((\dot{\pi}))^3 - 8(H_j + H_k)G_{4XXX}(\ddot{\pi})(\dot{\pi})^3 \\
& - 12(H_j + H_k)G_{4XX}(\dot{\pi})(\ddot{\pi}) - 4\left(H_j^2 + \left(\dot{H}_j\right) + H_k^2 + \left(\dot{H}_k\right) + 3H_jH_k\right)G_{4XX}((\dot{\pi}))^2 \\
& + 2G_{4X\pi\pi}((\dot{\pi}))^2 - 2\left(\left(\dot{H}_j\right) + H_j^2 + \left(\dot{H}_k\right) + H_k^2 + H_jH_k\right)G_{4X},
\end{aligned} \tag{38}$$

$$\begin{aligned}
A_{17} = & F_\pi - 2F_{X\pi}((\dot{\pi}))^2 - 8(H_bH_c + H_aH_c + H_aH_b)G_{4X\pi}((\dot{\pi}))^2 \\
& + 2(H_a + H_b + H_c)G_{4\pi\pi}(\dot{\pi}) - 8(H_aH_b + H_aH_c + H_bH_c)G_{4XX\pi}((\dot{\pi}))^4 \\
& + 4(H_a + H_b + H_c)G_{4X\pi\pi}((\dot{\pi}))^3 + K_{\pi\pi}((\dot{\pi}))^2 - 2(H_a + H_b + H_c)K_{X\pi}((\dot{\pi}))^3 \\
& + 2(H_aH_c + H_bH_c + H_aH_b)G_{4\pi},
\end{aligned} \tag{39}$$

$$\begin{aligned}
A_{18}^i = & -2F_X(\dot{\pi}) - 2K_{X\pi}((\dot{\pi}))^3 + 2K_\pi(\dot{\pi}) - 4K_{XX}(\ddot{\pi})(\dot{\pi})^3 - 4K_X(\dot{\pi})(\ddot{\pi}) \\
& - 4(H_a + H_b + H_c)K_X((\dot{\pi}))^2 - 4\left(\left(\dot{H}_j\right) + \left(\dot{H}_k\right) + (H_j + H_k)^2 + \right. \\
& \left. 2H_bH_c + 2H_aH_b + 2H_aH_c\right)G_{4X}(\dot{\pi}) + 4G_{4X\pi\pi}((\dot{\pi}))^3 + 8G_{4XX\pi}(\ddot{\pi})(\dot{\pi})^3 \\
& + 12G_{4X\pi}(\dot{\pi})(\ddot{\pi}) + 8(H_a + H_b + H_c)G_{4X\pi}((\dot{\pi}))^2 + 2(H_j + H_k + 2H_i)G_{4\pi} \\
& - 8\left((H_j + H_k)^2 + \left(\dot{H}_j\right) + \left(\dot{H}_k\right) + 2H_iH_j + 2H_iH_k + H_jH_k\right)G_{4XX}((\dot{\pi}))^3 \\
& - 8(H_j + H_k)G_{4XX\pi}((\dot{\pi}))^4 - 16(H_j + H_k)G_{4XXX}(\ddot{\pi})(\dot{\pi})^4 \\
& - 32(H_j + H_k)G_{4XX}(\ddot{\pi})(\dot{\pi})^2 - 4(H_j + H_k)G_{4X}(\ddot{\pi}),
\end{aligned} \tag{40}$$

$$\begin{aligned}
A_{20} = & \frac{1}{2} F_{\pi\pi} - F_{X\pi\pi} ((\dot{\pi}))^2 - 2 F_{XX\pi} (\ddot{\pi}) ((\dot{\pi}))^2 - F_{X\pi} (\ddot{\pi}) \\
& - (H_a + H_b + H_c) F_{X\pi} (\dot{\pi}) + K_{\pi\pi} (\ddot{\pi}) + (H_a + H_b + H_c) K_{\pi\pi} (\dot{\pi}) + K_{X\pi\pi} (\ddot{\pi}) ((\dot{\pi}))^2 \\
& - (H_a + H_b + H_c) K_{X\pi\pi} ((\dot{\pi}))^3 - 2 (H_a + H_b + H_c) K_{XX\pi} (\ddot{\pi}) ((\dot{\pi}))^3 \\
& - \left((H_a + H_b + H_c)^2 + \left(\dot{H}_a \right) + \left(\dot{H}_b \right) + \left(\dot{H}_c \right) \right) K_{X\pi} ((\dot{\pi}))^2 \\
& - 2 (H_a + H_b + H_c) K_{X\pi} (\dot{\pi}) (\ddot{\pi}) + \frac{1}{2} K_{\pi\pi\pi} ((\dot{\pi}))^2 - 2 \left(\frac{d}{dt} [H_a H_b + H_a H_c + H_b H_c] \right. \\
& + H_a^2 (H_b + H_c) + H_b^2 (H_a + H_c) + H_c^2 (H_a + H_b) + 3 H_a H_b H_c \Big) G_{4X\pi} (\dot{\pi}) \\
& + 6 (H_a + H_b + H_c) G_{4X\pi\pi} (\dot{\pi}) (\ddot{\pi}) + 2 \left((H_a + H_b + H_c)^2 + \left(\dot{H}_a \right) \right. \\
& + \left(\dot{H}_b \right) + \left(\dot{H}_c \right) \Big) G_{4X\pi\pi} ((\dot{\pi}))^2 + 4 (H_a + H_b + H_c) G_{4XX\pi\pi} (\ddot{\pi}) ((\dot{\pi}))^3 \\
& - 4 (H_a H_b + H_a H_c + H_b H_c) G_{4XX\pi\pi} ((\dot{\pi}))^4 - 8 (H_a H_b + H_a H_c + H_b H_c) G_{4XXX\pi} (\ddot{\pi}) ((\dot{\pi}))^4 \\
& - 16 (H_a H_b + H_a H_c + H_b H_c) G_{4XX\pi} (\ddot{\pi}) ((\dot{\pi}))^2 - 4 \left(\frac{d}{dt} [H_a H_b + H_a H_c + H_b H_c] \right. \\
& + H_a^2 (H_b + H_c) + H_b (H_a + H_c) + H_c^2 (H_a + H_b) + 3 H_a H_b H_c \Big) G_{4XX\pi} ((\dot{\pi}))^3 \\
& + 2 (H_a + H_b + H_c) G_{4X\pi\pi\pi} ((\dot{\pi}))^3 - 2 (H_a H_b + H_a H_c + H_b H_c) G_{4X\pi} (\ddot{\pi}) \\
& + \left(\left(\dot{H}_c \right) + H_c^2 + \left(\dot{H}_b \right) + H_b^2 + H_b H_c + \left(\dot{H}_a \right) + H_a^2 + 2 H_a H_c + H_a H_b \right) G_{4\pi\pi},
\end{aligned} \tag{41}$$

$$B^{ab} = \frac{1}{3} (H_b - H_a) A_1, \tag{42}$$

$$B^{bc} = \frac{1}{3} (H_c - H_b) A_1, \tag{43}$$

$$B^{ac} = \frac{1}{3} (H_c - H_a) A_1. \tag{44}$$

Appendix B

$$D_1 = \frac{2}{3} (H_a - H_b) \bar{H}_a \bar{H}_b + \frac{2}{3} (H_c - H_b) \bar{H}_b \bar{H}_c + \frac{2}{3} (H_a - H_c) \bar{H}_a \bar{H}_c + \tag{45}$$

$$+ \frac{1}{3} \sum_{\substack{i,j=a,b,c \\ i \neq j}} \frac{d}{dt} [\bar{H}_i \bar{H}_j], \tag{46}$$

$$D_2 = \frac{1}{abc} \frac{d}{dt} [abc D_1], \tag{47}$$

$$A = \frac{2}{3} A_1 (\bar{H}_a \bar{H}_b + \bar{H}_a \bar{H}_c + \bar{H}_b \bar{H}_c) - \frac{9}{2} \frac{A_4^2}{A_3}. \tag{48}$$

In this section we denote

$$A_4 = \frac{1}{3} \sum_{l=a,b,c} A_4^l \bar{H}_l, \quad A_8 = \frac{1}{3} \sum_{l=a,b,c} A_8^l \bar{H}_l, \quad A_{18} = \sum_{l=a,b,c} A_{18}^l \bar{H}_l, \tag{49}$$

and as usual $i \neq j \neq k$.

$$\Theta_i = \frac{1}{3} A_1 (\bar{H}_j + \bar{H}_k), \quad (50)$$

$$\Lambda_i = \frac{1}{3A_3} (9A_4A_8^i + A_1A_{11} (\bar{H}_j + \bar{H}_k)), \quad (51)$$

$$\begin{aligned} \Xi_i = & \frac{1}{2} \left[-2A_{13}^{ij} \bar{H}_j - 2A_{13}^{ik} \bar{H}_k - 4\eta A_2^{jk} \bar{H}_j \bar{H}_k - \eta \frac{d}{dt} \left[\frac{A_1 A_4 (\bar{H}_i + \bar{H}_k)}{A_3} \right] - \right. \\ & \frac{1}{3} \frac{d}{dt} \left[\frac{A_1 A_{11} (\bar{H}_i + \bar{H}_k)}{A_3} \right] + \frac{1}{3A_3} (-3A_8^i + 2A_1 \eta (\bar{H}_j + \bar{H}_k)) \sum_{l=a,b,c} A_4^l \dot{\bar{H}}_l + \\ & \left. + \frac{1}{3} \frac{A_1}{A_3} (A_{11} + 3\eta A_4) (\bar{H}_j + \bar{H}_k) H (\bar{H}_i - \bar{H}_j - \bar{H}_k) + \frac{1}{3A_3} A_1 A_{17} (\bar{H}_j + \bar{H}_k) \right], \end{aligned} \quad (52)$$

$$\begin{aligned} \Pi_i = & \frac{1}{2} \left[\frac{1}{2} \frac{d}{dt} \left[\frac{A_1 A_4 (\bar{H}_j + \bar{H}_k)}{A_3} \right] - \frac{1}{3} \frac{A_1}{A_3} (\bar{H}_j + \bar{H}_k) \sum_{l=a,b,c} A_4^l \dot{\bar{H}}_l + \right. \\ & \left. + \frac{1}{2} \frac{A_1 A_4 H}{A_3} (\bar{H}_j + \bar{H}_k) (\bar{H}_j + \bar{H}_k - \bar{H}_i) + 2A_2^{jk} \bar{H}_j \bar{H}_k \right], \end{aligned} \quad (53)$$

$$\Sigma_i = \frac{1}{3} A_1 \eta (\bar{H}_j + \bar{H}_k) - A_8^i, \quad (54)$$

$$\begin{aligned} M = & -\frac{1}{2} \frac{1}{abc} \frac{d}{dt} \left[abc \left(-\frac{1}{2} \frac{A_{11} A_{17}}{A_3} + \eta (\dot{\eta}) A + \eta \left(-A_{18} + 2 \sum_{l=a,b,c} A_8^l \dot{\bar{H}}_l - 3\dot{A}_8 - \right. \right. \right. \\ & \left. \left. - \frac{3}{2} \frac{A_{17} A_4}{A_3} - 9A_8 H + \frac{1}{2} \frac{A_{11}}{A_3} \sum_{l=a,b,c} A_4^l \dot{\bar{H}}_l \right) \right] - \frac{1}{4} \frac{A_{17}^2}{A_3} + A_{20} + \frac{1}{2} A (\dot{\eta})^2 + \\ & + (\dot{\eta}) \left(-A_{18} + 2 \sum_{l=a,b,c} A_8^l \dot{\bar{H}}_l - 3\dot{A}_8 - \frac{3}{2} \frac{A_{17} A_4}{A_3} - 9A_8 H + \frac{1}{2} \frac{A_{11}}{A_3} \sum_{l=a,b,c} A_4^l \dot{\bar{H}}_l \right) + \\ & + \eta \left(-\frac{1}{2} \frac{A_{17}}{A_3} \sum_{l=a,b,c} A_4^l \dot{\bar{H}}_l + \frac{1}{2} \frac{1}{abc} \frac{d}{dt} \left[\frac{abc A_{11}}{A_3} \sum_{l=a,b,c} A_4^l \dot{\bar{H}}_l \right] \right) + \\ & + \eta^2 \left(\frac{1}{2} A_1 D_2 + \frac{1}{2} D_1 (\dot{A}_1) - \frac{1}{4} \frac{1}{A_3} \left(\sum_{l=a,b,c} A_4^l \dot{\bar{H}}_l \right)^2 + \frac{3}{4} \frac{1}{abc} \frac{d}{dt} \left[\frac{abc A_4}{A_3} \sum_{l=a,b,c} A_4^l \dot{\bar{H}}_l \right] \right), \end{aligned} \quad (55)$$

$$m = \left(A_1 D_2 + D_1 \dot{A}_1 \right) - \frac{1}{A_3} \left(\sum_{l=a,b,c} A_4^l \dot{\bar{H}}_l \right)^2 + \frac{1}{abc} \frac{d}{dt} \left[\frac{abc A_4}{A_3} \sum_{l=a,b,c} A_4^l \dot{\bar{H}}_l \right]. \quad (56)$$

References

- [1] Gregory Walter Horndeski. “Second-order scalar-tensor field equations in a four-dimensional space”. In: *Int. J. Theor. Phys.* 10 (1974), pp. 363–384. DOI: [10.1007/BF01807638](#).
- [2] Alberto Nicolis, Riccardo Rattazzi, and Enrico Trincherini. “The Galileon as a local modification of gravity”. In: *Phys. Rev. D* 79 (2009), p. 064036. DOI: [10.1103/PhysRevD.79.064036](#). arXiv: [0811.2197 \[hep-th\]](#).
- [3] C. Deffayet, Gilles Esposito-Farese, and A. Vikman. “Covariant Galileon”. In: *Phys. Rev. D* 79 (2009), p. 084003. DOI: [10.1103/PhysRevD.79.084003](#). arXiv: [0901.1314 \[hep-th\]](#).
- [4] D. B. Fairlie, J. Govaerts, and A. Morozov. “Universal field equations with covariant solutions”. In: *Nucl. Phys. B* 373 (1992), pp. 214–232. DOI: [10.1016/0550-3213\(92\)90455-K](#). arXiv: [hep-th/9110022](#).
- [5] Tsutomu Kobayashi. “Horndeski theory and beyond: a review”. In: *Rept. Prog. Phys.* 82.8 (2019), p. 086901. DOI: [10.1088/1361-6633/ab2429](#). arXiv: [1901.07183 \[gr-qc\]](#).
- [6] M. Libanov, S. Mironov, and V. Rubakov. “Generalized Galileons: instabilities of bouncing and Genesis cosmologies and modified Genesis”. In: *JCAP* 08 (2016), p. 037. DOI: [10.1088/1475-7516/2016/08/037](#). arXiv: [1605.05992 \[hep-th\]](#).
- [7] Tsutomu Kobayashi. “Generic instabilities of nonsingular cosmologies in Horndeski theory: A no-go theorem”. In: *Phys. Rev. D* 94.4 (2016), p. 043511. DOI: [10.1103/PhysRevD.94.043511](#). arXiv: [1606.05831 \[hep-th\]](#).
- [8] Yong Cai et al. “The Effective Field Theory of nonsingular cosmology”. In: *JHEP* 01 (2017), p. 090. DOI: [10.1007/JHEP01\(2017\)090](#). arXiv: [1610.03400 \[gr-qc\]](#).
- [9] Paolo Creminelli et al. “Stability of Geodesically Complete Cosmologies”. In: *JCAP* 11 (2016), p. 047. DOI: [10.1088/1475-7516/2016/11/047](#). arXiv: [1610.04207 \[hep-th\]](#).
- [10] R. Kolevatov et al. “Cosmological bounce and Genesis beyond Horndeski”. In: *JCAP* 08 (2017), p. 038. DOI: [10.1088/1475-7516/2017/08/038](#). arXiv: [1705.06626 \[hep-th\]](#).
- [11] Yong Cai and Yun-Song Piao. “A covariant Lagrangian for stable nonsingular bounce”. In: *JHEP* 09 (2017), p. 027. DOI: [10.1007/JHEP09\(2017\)027](#). arXiv: [1705.03401 \[gr-qc\]](#).
- [12] Yong Cai et al. “The Effective Field Theory of nonsingular cosmology: II”. In: *Eur. Phys. J. C* 77.6 (2017), p. 369. DOI: [10.1140/epjc/s10052-017-4938-y](#). arXiv: [1701.04330 \[gr-qc\]](#).
- [13] S. Mironov, V. Rubakov, and V. Volkova. “Bounce beyond Horndeski with GR asymptotics and γ -crossing”. In: *JCAP* 10 (2018), p. 050. DOI: [10.1088/1475-7516/2018/10/050](#). arXiv: [1807.08361 \[hep-th\]](#).
- [14] S. Mironov, V. Rubakov, and V. Volkova. “Genesis with general relativity asymptotics in beyond Horndeski theory”. In: *Phys. Rev. D* 100.8 (2019), p. 083521. DOI: [10.1103/PhysRevD.100.083521](#). arXiv: [1905.06249 \[hep-th\]](#).

- [15] S. Mironov, V. Rubakov, and V. Volkova. “Subluminal cosmological bounce beyond Horndeski”. In: *JCAP* 05 (2020), p. 024. DOI: [10.1088/1475-7516/2020/05/024](https://doi.org/10.1088/1475-7516/2020/05/024). arXiv: [1910.07019](https://arxiv.org/abs/1910.07019) [hep-th].
- [16] Amara Ilyas et al. “DHOST Bounce”. In: *JCAP* 09 (2020), p. 002. DOI: [10.1088/1475-7516/2020/09/002](https://doi.org/10.1088/1475-7516/2020/09/002). arXiv: [2002.08269](https://arxiv.org/abs/2002.08269) [gr-qc].
- [17] Amara Ilyas et al. “Emergent Universe and Genesis from the DHOST Cosmology”. In: *JHEP* 01 (2021), p. 141. DOI: [10.1007/JHEP01\(2021\)141](https://doi.org/10.1007/JHEP01(2021)141). arXiv: [2009.10351](https://arxiv.org/abs/2009.10351) [gr-qc].
- [18] Yulia Ageeva, Pavel Petrov, and Valery Rubakov. “Horndeski genesis: consistency of classical theory”. In: *JHEP* 12 (2020), p. 107. DOI: [10.1007/JHEP12\(2020\)107](https://doi.org/10.1007/JHEP12(2020)107). arXiv: [2009.05071](https://arxiv.org/abs/2009.05071) [hep-th].
- [19] Y. Ageeva et al. “Toward evading the strong coupling problem in Horndeski genesis”. In: *Phys. Rev. D* 102.2 (2020), p. 023519. DOI: [10.1103/PhysRevD.102.023519](https://doi.org/10.1103/PhysRevD.102.023519). arXiv: [2003.01202](https://arxiv.org/abs/2003.01202) [hep-th].
- [20] Y. Ageeva, P. Petrov, and V. Rubakov. “Nonsingular cosmological models with strong gravity in the past”. In: *Phys. Rev. D* 104.6 (2021), p. 063530. DOI: [10.1103/PhysRevD.104.063530](https://doi.org/10.1103/PhysRevD.104.063530). arXiv: [2104.13412](https://arxiv.org/abs/2104.13412) [hep-th].
- [21] S. Mironov and A. Shtennikova. “Stable cosmological solutions in Horndeski theory”. In: (Dec. 2022). arXiv: [2212.03285](https://arxiv.org/abs/2212.03285) [gr-qc].
- [22] Alexei A. Starobinsky, Sergey V. Sushkov, and Mikhail S. Volkov. “Anisotropy screening in Horndeski cosmologies”. In: *Phys. Rev. D* 101.6 (2020), p. 064039. DOI: [10.1103/PhysRevD.101.064039](https://doi.org/10.1103/PhysRevD.101.064039). arXiv: [1912.12320](https://arxiv.org/abs/1912.12320) [hep-th].
- [23] Rafkat Galeev et al. “Anisotropic cosmological models in Horndeski gravity”. In: *Phys. Rev. D* 103.10 (2021), p. 104015. DOI: [10.1103/PhysRevD.103.104015](https://doi.org/10.1103/PhysRevD.103.104015). arXiv: [2102.10981](https://arxiv.org/abs/2102.10981) [gr-qc].
- [24] V. A. Belinsky, I. M. Khalatnikov, and E. M. Lifshitz. “Oscillatory approach to a singular point in the relativistic cosmology”. In: *Adv. Phys.* 19 (1970), pp. 525–573. DOI: [10.1080/00018737000101171](https://doi.org/10.1080/00018737000101171).
- [25] C. B. Collins and S. W. Hawking. “Why is the Universe isotropic?” In: *Astrophys. J.* 180 (1973), pp. 317–334. DOI: [10.1086/151965](https://doi.org/10.1086/151965).
- [26] V. a. Belinsky, I. m. Khalatnikov, and E. m. Lifshitz. “A General Solution of the Einstein Equations with a Time Singularity”. In: *Adv. Phys.* 31 (1982), pp. 639–667. DOI: [10.1080/00018738200101428](https://doi.org/10.1080/00018738200101428).
- [27] Kasper Peeters. “Cadabra2: computer algebra for field theory revisited”. In: *J. Open Source Softw.* 3.32 (2018), p. 1118. DOI: [10.21105/joss.01118](https://doi.org/10.21105/joss.01118).