M agnetic elds, strings and cosm ology

Massim o Giovannini¹

Centro \Enrico Ferm i", V ia Panisperna 89/A, 00184 Rom e, Italy Department of Physics, Theory Division, CERN, 1211 Geneva 23, Switzerland massimo.giovannini@cern.ch

> To appear in the book String theory and fundam ental interactions published on the occasion of the celebration of the 65th birthday of G abriele Veneziano, eds.M. G asperini and J.M aharana (Lecture N otes in P hysics, Springer B erlin/H eidelberg, 2007), www.springerlink.com /content/1616-6361.

1 Halfa century of large-scale magnetic elds

1.1 A prem ise

The content of the present contribution is devoted to large-scale magnetic elds whose origin, evolution and implications constitute today a rather intriguing triple point in the phase diagram of physical theories. Indeed, sticking to the existing literature (and refraining from dramatic statements on the historical evolution of theoretical physics) it appears that the subject of large-scale magnetization thrives and prosper at the crossroad of astrophysics, cosm ology and theoretical high-energy physics.

Following the kind invitation of Jnan M aharana and M aurizio G asperini, I am delighted to contribute to this set of lectures whose guideline is dictated by the inspiring e orts of G abriele Veneziano in understanding the fundam ental forces of N ature. My voice joins the choir of gratitude proceeding from the whole physics community for the novel and intriguing results obtained by G abriele through the various stages of his manifold activity. I nally ought to convey my personal thankfulness for the teachings, advices and generous clues received during the last freen years.

1.2 Length scales

The typical magnetic eld strengths, in the Universe, range from few G (in the case of galaxies and clusters), to few G (in the case of planets, like the earth or Jupiter) and up to 10^{12} G in neutron stars. Magnetic elds are not only observed in planets and stars but also in the interstellar medium, in the intergalactic medium and, last but not least, in the intra-cluster medium.

M agnetic elds whose correlation length is larger than the astronom ical unit $(1AU = 1:49 \quad 10^{3} \text{ cm})$ will be named large-scale m agnetic elds. In fact, m agnetic elds with approximate correlation scale comparable with the earth-sun distance are not observed (on the contrary, both the m agnetic eld of the sun and the one of the earth have a clearly distinguishable localized structure). M oreover, in m agnetohydrodynam ics (M HD), the m agnetic di usivity scale (i.e. the scale below which m agnetic elds are di used because of the nite value of the conductivity) turns out to be, am usingly enough, of the order of the AU.

1.3 The early history

In the forties large-scale magnetic eld had no empirical evidence. For instance, there was no evidence of magnetic elds associated with the galaxy as a whole with a rough correlation scale of ¹ 30kpc. More speci cally, the theoretical situation can be summarized as follows. The seminal contributions of H. A liven [1] convinced the community that magnetic elds can have a very large life-time in a highly conducting plasma. Later on, in the seventies, A liven will be awarded by the N obel prize \for fundam ental work and discoveries in magnetohydrodynam ics with fruitful applications in di erent parts of plasm a physics".

U sing the discoveries of A liven, Ferm i [2] postulated, in 1949, the existence of a large-scale magnetic eld permeating the galaxy with approximate intensity of G and, hence, in equilibrium with the cosm ic rays²

A liven [3] did not react positively to the proposal of Ferm i, insisting, in a som ehow opposite perspective, that cosm ic rays are in equilibrium with stars and disregarding com pletely the possibility of a galactic magnetic eld. Today we do know that this may be the case for low energy cosm ic rays but certainly

¹ Recall that $1 \text{ kpc} = 3.085 \quad 10^{21} \text{ cm}$. M oreover, $1 \text{ M pc} = 10^{3} \text{ kpc}$. The present size of the H ubble radius is H₀¹ = 1.2 10^{28} cm 4.1 10 M pc for h = 0.73.

 $^{^2}$ In this contribution magnetic elds will be expressed in Gauss. In the SI units $1T = 10^4 \, \rm G$.Forpractical reasons, in cosm ic ray physics and in cosm obgy it is also useful to express the magnetic eld in G eV 2 (in units h = c = 1). Recalling that the B ohrm agneton is about 5:7 $\,$ 10 $^{11} \, \rm M$ eV =T the conversion factor will then be 1G = 1:95 $\,$ 10 $^{20} \, \rm GeV^2$. The use of G auss (G) instead of Tesla (T) is justi ed by the existing astrophysical literature where magnetic elds are typically expressed in G auss.

not for the most energetic ones around, and beyond, the knee in the $\cos m$ ic ray spectrum .

At the historical level it is am using to notice that the mentioned controversy can be fully understood from the issue 75 of Physical Review where it is possible to consult the paper of Ferm i [2], the paper of A lfven [3] and even a paper by R.D.R ichtm yer and E.Teller [4] supporting the view s and doubts of A lfven.

In 1949 Hiltner [5] and, independently, Hall [6] observed polarization of starlight which was later on interpreted by D avis and G reenstein [7] as an e ect of galactic magnetic eld aligning the dust grains.

A coording to the presented chain of events it is legitim ate to conclude that

the discoveries of A liven were essential in the Ferm iproposal who was pondering on the origin of cosm ic rays in 1938 before leaving Italy ³ because of the infam ous fascist legislation;

the idea that cosm ic rays are in equilibrium with the galactic magnetic elds (and hence that the galaxy possess a magnetic eld) was essential in the correct interpretation of the rst, fragile, optical evidence of galactic magnetization.

The origin of the galactic m agnetization, according to [2], had to be som ehow prim ordial. It should be noticed, for sake of com pleteness, that the observations of H iltner [5] and H all [6] took place from N ovem ber 1948 to January 1949. The paper of Ferm i [2] was submitted in January 1949 but it contains no reference to the work of H iltner and H all. This indicates the Ferm i was probably not aware of these optical measurements.

The idea that large-scale magnetization should somehow be the remnant of the initial conditions of the gravitational collapse of the protogalaxy idea was further pursued by Ferm i in collaboration with S. Chandrasekar [8, 9] who tried, rather ambitiously, to connect the magnetic eld of the galaxy to its angular momentum.

1.4 The m iddle ages

In the flies various observations on polarization of C rab nebula suggested that the M ilky W ay is not the only magnetized structure in the sky. The e ective new twist in the observations of large-scale magnetic elds was the developm ent (through the flies and sixties) of radio-astronom ical techniques. From these measurements, the rst unam biguous evidence of radio-polarization from the M ilky W ay (M W) was obtained (see [10] and references therein for an account of these developm ents).

It was also soon realized that the radio-Zeem an e ect (counterpart of the optical Zeem an splitting em ployed to determ ine the magnetic eld of the sun)

³ The author is indebted with Prof. G. Cocconi who was so kind to share his personal recollections of the scienti c discussions with E. Ferm i.

could o er accurate determ ination of (locally very strong) magnetic elds in the galaxy. The observation of Lyne and Sm ith [11] that pulsars could be used to determ ine the column density of electrons along the line of sight opened the possibility of using not only synchrotron em ission as a diagnostic of the presence of a large-scale magnetic eld, but also Faraday rotation. For a masterly written introduction to pulsar physics the reader may consult the book of Lyne and Sm ith [12].

In the seventies all the basic experim ental tools for the analysis of galactic and extra-galactic magnetic elds were ready. A round this epoch also extensive review s on the experim ental endeavors started appearing and a very nice account could be found, for instance, in the review of Heiles [13].

It became gradually evident in the early eighties, that measurements of large-scale magnetic elds in the MW and in the external galaxies are two complementary aspects of the same problem. While MW studies can provide valuable informations concerning the local structure of the galactic magnetic eld, the observation of external galaxies provides the only viable tool for the reconstruction of the global features of the galactic magnetic elds.

Since the early seventies, some relevant attention has been paid not only to the magnetic elds of the galaxies but also to the magnetic elds of the clusters. A cluster is a gravitationally bound system of galaxies. The boal group (i.e. our cluster containing the MW, Androm eda together with other

fly galaxies) is an irregular cluster in the sense that it contains few ergalaxies than typical clusters in the Universe. Other clusters (like Com a, Virgo) are more typical and are then called regular or Abell clusters. As an order of magnitude estimate, Abell clusters can contain 10^3 galaxies.

1.5 New twists

In the nineties magnetic elds have been measured in single A bell clusters but around the turn of the century these estimates became more reliable thanks to improved experimental techniques. In order to estimate magnetic elds in clusters, an independent know ledge of the electron density along the line of sight is needed. Recently Faraday rotation measurements obtained by radio telescopes (like VLA⁴) have been combined with independent measurements of the electron density in the intra-cluster medium. This was made possible by the maps of the x-ray sky obtained with satellites measurements (in particular ROSAT⁵). This improvement in the experimental capabilities seems to have partially settled the issue comming the measurements of the early nineties and implying that also clusters are endowed with a magnetic eld of G strength which is not associated with individual galaxies [15, 16].

⁴ The Very Large A may Telescope, consists of 27 parabolic antennas spread over a surface of 20 km² in Socorro (New Mexico)

⁵ The RO egten SATellite (ying from June 1991 to February 1999) provided m aps of the x-ray sky in the range 0:1{2:5 keV.A catalog of x-ray bright A bell clusters was com piled.

5

W hile entering the new millennium the capabilities of the observers are really confronted with a new challenge: the possibility that also superclusters are endowed with their own magnetic eld. Superclusters are (loosely) gravitationally bound system s of clusters. An example is the local supercluster form ed by the local group and by the VIRGO cluster. Recently a large new sample of Faraday rotation measures of polarized extragalactic sources has been compared with galaxy counts in Hercules and Perseus Pisces (two nearby superclusters) [17]. First attem pts to detect m agnetic leds associated with superclusters have been reported [18]. A cautious and conservative approach suggests that these fragile evidences must be corroborated with more conclusive observations (especially in the light of the, som etim es dubious, independent determ ination of the electron density ⁶). How ever it is not excluded that as the nineties gave us a merevidence of cluster magnetism, the new m illennium m ay give us m ore solid understanding of supercluster m agnetism. In the present historical introduction various experim ental techniques have been swiftly mentioned. A more extensive introductory description of these techniques can be found in [19].

1.6 H opes for the future

The hope for the near future is connected with the possibility of a next generation radio-telescope. A long this line the SKA (Square K ibm eter A rray) has been proposed [16] (see also [20]). W hile the technical features of the instrument cannot be thoroughly discussed in the present contribution, it suces to notice that the collecting area of the instrument, as the name suggest, will be of 10^6 m^2 . The speci cations for the SKA require an angular resolution of 0:1 arcsec at 1:4 GHz, a frequency capability of 0:1{25 GHz, and a eld of view of at least 1 deg² at 1:4 GHz [20]. The number of independent beam s is expected to be larger than 4 and the number of instantaneous pencil beam s will be roughly 100 with a maximum primary beam separation of about 100 deg at low frequencies (becoming 1 deg at high frequencies, i.e. of the order of 1 GHz). These speci cations will probably allow full sky surveys of Faraday Rotation.

The frequency range of SKA is rather suggestive if we compare it with the one of the P lanck experiment [21]. P lanck will operate in 9 frequency channels from 30 to, approximately, 900 GHz. While the three low-frequency channels (from 30 to 70 GHz) are not sensitive to polarization the six high-frequency channels (between 100 and 857 GHZ) will be denitely sensitive to CMB polarization. Now, it should be appreciated that the Faraday rotation signal

 $^{^{6}}$ In [14] it was cleverly argued that informations on the plasma densities from direct observations can be gleaned from detailed multifrequency observations of few giant radio-galaxies (GRG) having dimensions up to 4 Mpc. The estimates based on this observation suggest column densities of electrons between 10 6 and 10 5 cm 3 .

decreases with the frequency as ². Therefore, for lower frequencies the Faraday Rotation signal will be larger than in the six high-frequency channels. Consequently it is legitim ate to hope for a furifful interplay between the next generation of SKA-like radio-telescopes and CMB satellites. Indeed, as suggested above, the upper branch of the frequency capability of SKA alm ost overlaps with the lower frequency of P lanck so that possible e ects of large-scale magnetic elds on CMB polarization could be, with som e luck, addressed with the com bined action of both instrum ents. In fact, the same e mechanism leading to the Faraday rotation in the radio leads to a Faraday rotation of the CMB provided the CMB is linearly polarized. These considerations suggest, as emphasized in a recent topical review, that CMB anisotropies are germ and to several aspects of large-scale magnetization [22]. The considerations reported so far suggest that during the next decade the destiny of radio-astronom y and CMB physics will probably be linked together and not only for reasons of convenience.

1.7 Few burning questions

In this general and panoram ic view of the history of the subject we started from the relatively old controversy opposing E.Ferm i to H.A lfven with the still uncertain but foreseeable future developments. While the nature of the future developments is inextricably connected with the advent of new instrumental capabilities, it is legitimate to remark that, in more than fly years, magnetic elds have been detected over scales that are progressively larger. From the historical development of the subject a series of questions arises naturally:

what is the origin of large-scale magnetic elds?

are magnetic elds primordial as assumed by Fermimore than fly years ago?

even assuming that large-scale magnetic elds are primordial, is there a theory for their generation?

is there a way to understand if large-scale m agnetic elds are really prim ordial?

In what follows we will not give de nite answers to these in portant questions but we shall be content of outlining possible avenues of new developments.

The plan of the present lecture will be the following. In Sect. 2 the main theoretical problems connected with the origin of large-scale magnetic elds will be discussed. In Sect. 3 the attention will be focused on the problem of large-scale magnetic eld generation in the framework of string cosm ological model, a subject where the pre-big bang model, in its various incamations, plays a crucial rôle. But, nally, large-scale magnetic elds are really prim ordial? Were they really present prior to matter-radiation equality? A modest approach to these in portant questions suggests to study the physics of magnetized CMB anisotropies which will be introduced, in its essential lines, in Sect. 4. The concluding remarks are collected in Sect. 5.

2 M agnetogenesis

W hile in the previous Section the approach has been purely historical, the experimental analysis of large-scale magnetic elds prompts a collection of interesting theoretical problem s. They can be summarized by the following chain of evidences (see also [19]):

In spiral galaxies m agnetic elds follow the orientation of the spiral arm s, where m atter is clustered because of di erential rotation. W hile there m ay be an asym m etry in the intensities of the m agnetic eld in the northerm and southern em isphere (like it happens in the case of the M ilky W ay) the typical strength is in the range of the G.

Locally magnetic elds may even be in the mG range and, in this case, they may be detected through Zeem an splitting techniques.

In spiral galaxies the magnetic eld is predom inantly toroidal with a poloidal component present around the nucleus of the galaxy and extending for, roughly, 100 pc.

The correlation scale of the magnetic eld in spirals is of the order of 30 kpc.

In elliptical galaxies magnetic elds have been measured at the G level but the correlation scale is shorter than in the case of spirals: this is due to the di erent evolutionary history of elliptical galaxies and to their lack of di erential rotation;

A bell clusters of galaxies exhibit magnetic elds present in the so-called intra-cluster medium : these elds, always at the G level, are not associated with individual galaxies;

superclusters m ight also be m agnetized even if, at the m om ent, conclusions are prem ature, as partially explained in Section 1 (see also [18] and [19]).

The statements collected above rest on various detection techniques ranging from Faraday rotation, to synchrotron emission, to Zeeman splitting of clouds of molecules with an unpaired electron spin. The experimental evidence swiftly summarized above seems to suggest that dierent and distant objects have magnetic elds of comparable strength. The second suggestion seems also to be that the strength of the magnetic elds is, in the rst (sim plistic) approximation, independent on the physical scale.

These empirical coincidences rem inds a bit of one of the motivations of the standard hot big-bang model, namely the observation that the light elements are equally abundant in rather di erent parts of our Universe. The approximate equality of the abundances in plies that, unlike the heavier elements, the light elements have primordial origin. The four light isotopes D, ³He, ⁴He and ⁷Li are mainly produced at a speci c stage of the hot big bang model named

nucleosynthesis occurring below the a typical tem perature of 0.8 M eV when neutrinos decouple from the plasm a and the neutron abundance evolves via free neutron decay [23]. The abundances calculated in the sim plest big-bang nucleosythesis m odel agree fairly well with the astronom ical observations.

In similar terms it is plausible to argue that large-scale magnetic elds have comparable strengths at large scales because the initial conditions for their evolutions were the same, for instance at the time of the gravitational collapse of the protogalaxy. The way the initial conditions for the evolution of large-scale magnetic elds are set is generically named magnetogenesis [19].

There is another comparison which might be useful. Back in the seventies the so-called Harrison-Zeldovich spectrum was postulated. Later, with the developm ents of in ationary cosm ology the origin of a at spectrum of curvature and density pro leshas been justied on the basis of a period of quasi-de Sitter expansion named in ation. It is plausible that in some in ationary models not only the uctuations of the geometry are amplied but also the uctuations of the gauge elds. This happens if, for instance, gauge couplings are e ectively dynam ical. As the Harrison-Zeldovich spectrum can be used as initial condition for the subsequent New tonian evolution, the prim ordial spectrum of the gauge elds can be used as initial condition for the subsequent M HD evolution which may lead, eventually, to the observed large-scale magnetic elds. The plan of the present section is the following. In Subsect. 2.1 som e general ideas of plasm a physics will be sum marized with particular attention to those tools that will be m ore relevant for the purposes of this lecture. In Subsect. 22 the concept of dynam o amplication will be introduced in a simplied perspective. In Subsect. 2.3 it will be argued that the dynam o am pli cation, in one of its potential incarnations, necessitates som e initial conditions or as we say in the pargon, some seed eld. In Subsect. 2.4 a panoram ic view of astrophysical seeds will be presented with the aim of stressing the common aspects of, som etim es diverse, physical mechanism s. Subsect. 2.5 and 2.6 the two basic approaches to cosm ological magnetogenesis will be illustrated. In the rst case (see Subsect. 2.5) m agnetic elds are produced inside the Hubble radius at a given stage in the life of the Universe. In the second case (see Subsect. 2.6) vacuum uctuations of the hypercharge eld are ampli ed during an in ationary stage of expansion. Subsection 2.7 deals with the major problem of in ationary magnetogenesis, namely conformal (Weyl) invariance whose breaking will be one of the them es of string cosm ological mechanism s for the generation of large-scale magnetic elds.

2.1 M agnetized plasm as

Large-scale magnetic elds evolve in a plasma, i.e. a system offen illustrated as the fourth state of matter. A swe can walk in the phase diagram of a given chem ical element by going from the solid to the liquid and to the gaseous state with a series of diverse phase transitions, a plasm a can be obtained by ionizing a gas. A typical example of weakly coupled plasma is therefore an

9

ionized gas. Examples of strongly coupled plasm as can be found also in solid state physics. An essential physical scale that has to be introduced in the description of plasm a properties is the so-called Debye length that will be discussed in the following paragraph.

D i erent descriptions of a plasm a exist and they range from e ective uid m odels of charged particles [24, 25, 26, 27] to kinetic approaches like the ones pioneered by V lasov [28] and Landau [29]. From a physical point of view, a plasm a is a system of charged particles which is globally neutral for typical length-scales larger than the D ebye length $_{\rm D}$:

$$_{\rm D} = \frac{r}{\frac{T_0}{8 n_0 e^2}};$$
 (1)

where T_0 is the kinetic temperature and n_0 the mean charge density of the electron-ion system, i.e. n_e ' $n_i = n_0$. For a test particle the C oulom b potential will then have the usual C oulom b form but it will be suppressed, at large distances by a Yukawa term, i.e. $e^{r=0}$. In the interstellar medium there are three kinds of regions which are conventionally dened:

H regions, where the H ydrogen is predom inantly in m olecular form (also denoted by H II);

H regions (where Hydrogen is in atom ic form);

and H regions, where Hydrogen is ionized, (also denoted by HI).

In the H⁺ regions the typical tem perature T_0 is of the order of 10{20 eV while for n_0 let us take, for instance, $n_0 = 3 = 10^2$ cm⁻³. Then _D = 30 km.

For r $_{D}$ the C oulom b potential is screened by the global e ect of the other particles in the plasm a. Suppose now that particles exchangem on entum through two-body interactions. Their cross section will be of the order of $_{em}^{2} = T_{0}^{2}$ and the mean free path will be $_{m \ fp}^{2} = (2 \ em \ n_{0})$, i.e. recalling Eq. (1) $_{D}$ $_{m \ fp}^{2}$. This means that the plasm a is a weakly collisional system which is, in general, not in local therm odynam ical equilibrium and this is the reason why we introduced T_{0} as the kinetic (rather than therm odynam ic) tem perature.

The last observation can be made even more explicit by de ning another important scale, namely the plasma frequency which, in the system under discussion, is given by

$$!_{pe} = \frac{4 n_0 e^2}{m_e} / 2 \frac{n_0}{10^3 \text{ cm}^3} \text{ M H z};; \qquad (2)$$

where m_e is the electron mass. Notice that, in the interstellar medium (i.e. for n_0 ' 10 ² cm ³) Eq. (2) gives a plasm a frequency in the GHz range. This observation is important, for instance, in the treatment of Faraday rotation since the plasm a frequency is typically much larger than the Larm or frequency i.e.

$$!_{Be} = \frac{eB_0}{m_e} ' 18:08 \frac{B_0}{10^{-3} \text{ G}} \text{ kH z;}$$
(3)

im plying, for B₀ ' G, !_{Be} ' 20H z. The same hierarchy holds also when the (free) electron density is much larger than in the interstellar medium, and, for instance, at the last scattering between electrons and photons for a redshift z_{dec} ' 1100 (see Sect. 4).

The plasm a frequency is the oscillation frequency of the electrons when they are displaced from their equilibrium conguration in a background of approximately xed ions. Recalling that v_{ther} ' $T_0 = m_e$ is the thermal velocity of the charge carriers, the collision frequency $!_c$ ' $v_{ther} = m_{fp}$ is always much smaller than $!_{pe}$ ' $v_{ther} = _{D}$. Thus, in the idealized system described so far, the follow ing hierarchy of scales holds:

$$D m_{fp}; !_{c} !_{pe};$$
 (4)

which m eans that before doing one collision the system undergoes m any oscillations, or, in other words, that the m ean free path is not the shortest scale in the problem .U sually one de nes also the plasm a parameter $N = n_0^{-1} L_D^{-3}$, i.e. the num ber of particles in the D ebye sphere. In the approximation of weakly coupled plasm a N 1 which also imply that the m ean kinetic energy of the particles is larger than the m ean inter-particle potential.

The spectrum of plasm a excitations is a rather vast subject and it will not strictly necessary for the following considerations (for further details see[24, 25, 26]). It is su cient to remark that we can envisage, broadly speaking, two regimes that are physically di erent:

typical length-scales much larger than $_{D}$ and typical frequencies much smaller than $!_{pe}$;

typical length-scales sm aller (or com parable) with $_{\rm D}\,$ and typical frequencies much larger than $!_{\rm pe}.$

In the rst situation reported above it can be shown that a single uid description su ces. The single uid description is justiled, in particular, for the analysis of the dynam o instability which occurs for dynam ical times of the order of the age of the galaxy and length-scales larger than the kpc. In the opposite regime, i.e. ! $!_{pe}$ and L $_{D}$ the single uid approach breaks down and a multi- uid description is mandatory. This is, for instance, the branch of the spectrum of plasm a excitation where the displacement current (and the related electrom agnetic propagation) cannot be neglected. A more reliable description is provided, in this regime, by the V lasov-Landau (i.e. kinetic) approach [28, 29] (see also [25]).

Consider, therefore, a two-uid system of electrons and protons. This system will be described by the continuity equations of the density of particles, i.e.

$$\frac{\partial n_e}{\partial t} + r \qquad (pv_e) = 0; \qquad \frac{\partial n_p}{\partial t} + r \qquad (pv_p) = 0; \qquad (5)$$

and by the momentum conservation equations

$$m_e n_e \frac{\theta}{\theta t} + v_e \quad r v_e = e n_e E + v_e \quad B \quad r p_e \quad C_{ep}; \quad (6)$$

$$m_{p}n_{p} \frac{\partial}{\partial t} + v_{p} \quad rv_{p} = en_{p} E + v_{p} \quad B \quad rp \quad C_{pe}:$$
(7)

Equations (5), (6) and (7) must be supplemented by M axwell equations reading, in this case

$$r = 4 e_{p}(n n_{e});$$
 (8)

$$r = 0;$$
 (9)

$$r = E + \frac{\partial B}{\partial t} = 0; \tag{10}$$

$$\mathbf{r} \quad \mathbf{B} = \frac{\mathbf{Q}\mathbf{E}}{\mathbf{Q}\mathbf{t}} + 4 \mathbf{e} (\mathbf{n}_{\mathrm{p}}\mathbf{v}_{\mathrm{p}} - \mathbf{n}_{\mathrm{e}}\mathbf{v}_{\mathrm{e}}) \mathbf{:}$$
(11)

The two uid system of equations is rather useful to discuss various phenom ena like the propagation of electrom agnetic excitations at nite charge density both in the presence and in the absence of a background magnetic eld [24, 25, 26]. The previous observation implies that a two-uid treatment is mandatory for the description of Faraday rotation of the Cosm ic M icrow ave Background (CM B) polarization. This subject will not be speci cally discussed in the present lecture (see, for further details, [30] and references therein).

Instead of treating the two uids as separated, the plasm a may be considered as a single uid de ned by an appropriate set of global variables:

$$J = e(n_p v_p \quad n_e v_e); \qquad (12)$$

$$q = e(n_p \quad n_e); \tag{13}$$

$$m = (m_{e}n_{e} + m_{p}n_{p});$$
 (14)

$$v = \frac{m_{e}n_{e}v_{e} + n_{p}m_{p}v_{p}}{m_{e}n_{e} + m_{p}n_{p}};$$
 (15)

where J is the global current and $_q$ is the global charge density; $_m$ is the totalm ass density and v is the so-called bulk velocity of the plasm a. From the de nition of the bulk velocity it is clear that v is the centre-offm ass velocity of the electron-ion system. The interesting case is the one where the plasm a is globally neutral, i.e. $n_p ' n_p = n_0$, im plying, from M axwell and continuity equations the follow ing equations

$$r = 0; r J = 0; r B = 0:$$
 (16)

The equations reported in Eq. (16) are the st characterization of MHD equations, i.e. a system where the total current as well as the electric and magnetic elds are all solenoidal. The remaining equations allow to obtain

the relevant set of conditions describing the long wavelength modes of the magnetic eld i.e.

$$r = 4 J;$$
 (17)

$$r = \frac{QB}{Qt} :$$
 (18)

In Eq. (17), the contribution of the displacem ent current has been neglected for consistency with the solenoidal nature of the total current (see Eq. (16)). Two other relevant equations can be obtained by sum m ing and subtracting the m om entum conservation equations, i.e. Eqs. (6) and (7). The result of this procedure is

$$_{m} \frac{\partial v}{\partial t} + v \quad r v = J \quad B \quad r P \tag{19}$$

$$E + v \quad B = \frac{J}{-} + \frac{1}{en_q} (J \quad B \quad r p);$$
 (20)

where $n_q ' n_0 ' n_e$ and $P = p_e + p_p$. Equation (19) is derived from the sum of Eqs. (6) and (7) and in (19) J B is the Lorentz force term which is quadratic in the magnetic eld. In fact using Eq. (17)

J B =
$$\frac{1}{4}$$
 (r B) B: (21)

Note that to derive Eq. (20) the lim it $m_e = m_p ! 0$ must be taken, at some point. There are some caveats related to this procedure since viscous and collisionale ects m ay be relevant [25]. Equation (20) is sometimes called one-uid generalized 0 hm law. In Eq. (20) the term J B is nothing but the H all current and r p_e is often called therm oelectric term. Finally the term J = is the resistivity term and is the conductivity of the one-uid description. In Eq. (20) the pressure has been taken to be isotropic. Neglecting, the H all and therm oelectric term s (that m ay play, how ever, a rôle in the B ierm ann battery m echanism for m agnetic eld generation) the 0 hm law takes the form

$$J = (E + v B)$$
: (22)

U sing Eq. (22) together with Eq. (17) it is easy to show that the 0 hm ic electric eld is given by

$$E = \frac{r B}{4} \quad v B :$$
 (23)

U sing then Eq. (23) into Eq. (18) and exploiting known vector identities we can get the canonical form of the magnetic di usivity equation

$$\frac{\partial B}{\partial t} = r$$
 (v B) $+\frac{1}{4}r^{2}B$; (24)

which is the equation to be used to discuss the general features of the dynam o instability.

MHD can be studied into two di erent (but com plem entary) lim its

the ideal (or superconducting) lim it where the conductivity is set to in nity (i.e. the ! 1 lim it);

the real (or resistive) lim it where the conductivity is nite.

The plasm a description following from MHD can be also phrased in terms of the conservation of two interesting quantities, i.e. the magnetic ux and the magnetic helicity [27, 31]:

$$\frac{d}{dt} \begin{bmatrix} Z \\ B \\ d \end{bmatrix} = \frac{1}{4} \begin{bmatrix} Z \\ r \\ r \\ B \\ d \end{bmatrix}$$
(25)

$$\frac{d}{dt} \quad d^3 x A \quad B = \frac{1}{4} \quad d^3 x B \quad r \quad B : \qquad (26)$$

In Eq. (25), is an arbitrary closed surface that moves with the plasma. In the ideal MHD limit the magnetic ux is exactly conserved and the the ux is sometimes said to be frozen into the plasma element. In the same limit also the magnetic helicity is conserved. In the resistive limit the magnetic ux and helicity are dissipated with a rate proportional to 1= which is small provided the conductivity is su ciently high. The term appearing at the right hand side o Eq. (26) is called magnetic gyrotropy.

The conservation of the magnetic helicity is a statement on the conservation of the topological properties of the magnetic ux lines. If the magnetic eld is completely stochastic, the magnetic ux lines will be closed loops evolving independently in the plasm a and the helicity will vanish. There could be, how – ever, more complicated topological situations where a single magnetic loop is twisted (like some kind of M obius stripe) or the case where the magnetic loops are connected like the rings of a chain. In both cases the magnetic helicity will not be zero since it measures, essentially, the number of links and twists in the magnetic ux lines. The conservation of the magnetic ux and of the magnetic helicity is a consequence of the fact that, in ideal M HD, the O hm ic electric eld is always orthogonal both to the bulk velocity eld and to the magnetic eld. In the resistive M HD approximation this is no longer true [27].

2.2 Dynam os

The dynam o theory has been developed starting from the early flies through the eighties and various extensive presentations exist in the literature [32, 33, 34]. Generally speaking a dynam o is a process where the kinetic energy of the plasm a is transferred to m agnetic energy. There are dierent sorts of dynam os. Som e of the dynam os that are currently addressed in the existing literature are large-scale dynam os, sm all-scale dynam os, nonlinear dynam os, -dynam os...

It would be di cult, in the present lecture, even to review such a vast literature and, therefore, it is more appropriate to refer to some review articles where the modern developments in dynam o theory and in mean eld electrodynamics are reported [35, 37]. As a qualitative example of the dynam o

action it is practical do discuss the magnetic di usivity equation obtained, from general considerations, in Eq. (24).

Equation (24) simply stipulates that the rst time derivative of the m agnetic elds intensity results from the balance of two (physically di erent) contributions. The rst term at the right hand side of Eq. (24) is the the dynam o term and it contains the bulk velocity of the plasma v. If this term dom inates the magnetic eld may be amplied thanks to the di erential rotation of the plasma. The dynam o term provides then the coupling allowing the transfer of the kinetic energy into magnetic di usivity whose e ect is to dam p the magnetic eld intensity. D e ning then as L the typical scale of spatial variation of the magnetic eld intensity, the typical time scale of resistive phenom ena turns out to be

$$t' 4 L^2$$
: (27)

In a non-relativistic plasm a the conductivity goes typically as $T^{3=2}$ [24,25]. In the case of planets, like the earth, one can wonder why a sizable m agnetic eld can still be present. One of the theories is that the dynam o term regenerates continuously the magnetic eld which is dissipated by the di usivity term [32]. In the case of the galactic disk the value of the conductivity ⁷ is given by '7 10⁷Hz. Thus, for L' kpct '10⁹ (L=kpc)² æc.

Equation (27) can also give the typical resistive length scale once the timescale of the system is specified. Suppose that the timescale of the system is given by $t_U = H_0^{-1} = 10^{18}$ sec where H_0 is the present order of magnitude of the Hubble parameter. Then

$$L = \frac{r}{\frac{t_U}{t_U}};$$
 (28)

leading to L AU. The scale (28) gives then the upper limit on the di usion scale for a magnetic eld whose lifetime is comparable with the age of the Universe at the present epoch. Magnetic elds with typical correlation scale larger than L are not a ected by resistivity. On the other hand, magnetic elds with typical correlation scale L < L are di used. The value L AU is consistent with the phenom enological evidence that there are no magnetic elds coherent over scales smaller than 10⁵ pc.

The dynam o term m ay be responsible for the origin of the magnetic eld of the galaxy. The galaxy has a typical rotation period of 3 10^6 yrs and comparing this gure with the typical age of the galaxy, O (10^{10} yrs), it can be appreciated that the galaxy perform ed about 30 rotations since the time of the protogalactic collapse.

The e ectiveness of the dynam o action depends on the physical properties of the bulk velocity eld. In particular, a necessary requirement to have a

⁷ It is common use in the astrophysical applications to work directly with = $(4)^{-1}$. In the case of the galactic disks = 10^{26} cm² Hz.

potentially successful dynam o action is that the velocity eld is non-m irrorsymmetric or that, in other words, hv r vi € 0. Let us see how this statement can be made reasonable in the framework of Eq. (24). From Eq. (24) the usual structure of the dynam o term may be derived by carefully averaging over the velocity led according to the procedure of [41, 42]. By assuming that the motion of the uid is random and with zero mean velocity the average is taken over the ensemble of the possible velocity elds. In more physical terms this averaging procedure of Eq. (24) is equivalent to average over scales and times exceeding the characteristic correlation scale and time of the velocity eld. This procedure assumes that the correlation scale of the magnetic eld is much bigger than the correlation scale of the velocity eld which is required to be divergence-less (r v = 0). In this approximation the magnetic di usivity equation can be written as:

$$\frac{@B}{@t} = (r B) + \frac{1}{4} r^{2}B; \qquad (29)$$

where

$$= \frac{0}{3}hv r vi; \qquad (30)$$

is the so-called -term in the absence of vorticity. In Eqs. (29){ (30) B is the magnetic eld averaged over times longer that $_0$ which is the typical correlation time of the velocity eld.

The fact that the velocity eld must be globally non-mirror symmetric [33] suggests, already at this qualitative level, the deep connection between dynam o action and fully developed turbulence. In fact, if the system would be, globally, invariant under parity transform ations, then, the term would simply be vanishing. This observation may also be related to the turbulent features of cosm ic system s. In cosm ic turbulence the system s are usually rotating and, moreover, they possess a gradient in the matter density (think, for instance, to the case of the galaxy). It is then plausible that parity is broken at the level of the galaxy since term s like r m r v are not vanishing 3].

The dynam o term, as it appears in Eq. (29), has a simple electrodynam ical meaning, namely, it can be interpreted as a mean ohm ic current directed along the magnetic eld:

$$J = B :$$
 (31)

Equation stipulates that an ensemble of screw-like vortices with zero mean helicity is able to generate loops in the magnetic ux tubes in a plane orthogonal to the one of the original eld. As a simple (and known) application of Eq. (29), it is appropriate to consider the case where the magnetic eld pro le is given by a sort of Chem-Sim ons wave

$$B_x(z;t) = f(t) \sin kz; \quad B_y = f(t) \cos kz; \quad B_z(k;t) = 0;$$
 (32)

For this prometic magnetic gyrotropy is non-vanishing, i.e. B r $B = kf^2$ (t). From Eq. (29), using Eq. (32) f (t) obeys the following equation

$$\frac{df}{dt} = k \qquad \frac{k^2}{4} \quad f \tag{33}$$

adm its exponentially growing solutions for su ciently large scales, i.e. k < 4 j j. Notice that in this naive example the term is assumed to be constant. However, as the ampli cation proceeds, may develop a dependence upon $\beta \hat{j}$, i.e. ! $_0(1 \quad \beta^2 \hat{j}) \ _0[1 \quad \hat{f}(t)]$. In the case of Eq. (33) this modi cation will introduce non-linear term s whose e ect will be to stop the grow th of the magnetic eld. This regime is often called saturation of the dynam o and the non-linear equations appearing in this context are sometimes called Landau equations [33] in analogy with the Landau equations appearing in hydrodynam ical turbulence.

In spite of the fact that in the previous example the velocity eld has been averaged, its evolution obeys the N avier-Stokes equation which we have already written but without the di usion term

$${}_{m} \frac{\partial v}{\partial t} + (v r)v ^{2}v = rP + J B; \qquad (34)$$

where is the therm alviscosity coe cient. There are idealized cases where the Lorentz force term can be neglected. This is the so-called force free approximation. Dening the kinetic helicity as = r v, the magnetic di usivity and N avier-Stokes equations can be written in a rather simple and symmetric form

$$\frac{\partial B}{\partial t} = r \qquad (v \quad B) + \frac{1}{4} r^{2}B;$$

$$\frac{\partial}{\partial t} = r \qquad (v \quad) + r^{2}: \qquad (35)$$

In MHD various dimensionless ratios can be de ned. The most frequently used are the magnetic Reynolds number, the kinetic Reynolds number and the Prandtl number:

- - T

$$R_{m} = vL_{B} ; \qquad (36)$$

$$R = \frac{VL_v}{;}$$
(37)

$$Pr = \frac{R_m}{R} = \frac{L_B}{L_v} ;$$
 (38)

where L_B and L_v are the typical scales of variation of the magnetic and velocity elds. If R_m 1 the system is said to be magnetically turbulent. If R 1 the system is said to be kinetically turbulent. In realistic situations the plasma is both kinetically and magnetically turbulent and, therefore, the ratio of the two R eynolds numbers will tell which is the dom inant source of turbulence. There have been, in recent years, various studies on the developm ent of magnetized turbulence (see, for instance, [27]) whose features di er slightly from

the ones of hydrodynam ic turbulence. W hile the details of this discussion will be left aside, it is relevant to mention that, in the early Universe, turbulence may develop. In this situation a typical phenomenon, called inverse cascade, can take place. A direct cascade is a process where energy is transferred from large to small scales. Even more interesting, for the purposes of the present lecture, is the opposite process, namely the inverse cascade where the energy transfer goes from small to large length-scales. One can also generalize the the concept of energy cascade to the cascade of any conserved quantity in the plasma, like, for instance, the helicity. Thus, in general terms, the transfer process of a conserved quantity is a cascade.

The concept of cascade (either direct or inverse) is related with the concept of turbulence, i.e. the class of phenom ena taking place in uids and plasm as at high R eynolds num bers. It is very di cult to reach, with terrestrial plasm as, the physical situation where the m agnetic and the kinetic R eynolds num bers are both large but, in such a way that their ratio is also large i.e.

$$R_{m}$$
 1; R 1; $Pr = \frac{R_{m}}{R}$ 1: (39)

The physical regim e expressed through Eqs. (39) rather common in the early Universe. Thus, MHD turbulence is probably one of the key aspects of magnetized plasm a dynam ics at very high tem peratures and densities. Consider, for instance, the plasm a at the electrow eak epoch when the tem perature was of the order of 100 GeV. One can compute the Reynolds numbers and the P randtl number from their de nitions given in Eqs. (36) { (38). In particular,

$$R_m = 10^{17}; \qquad R = 10^{11}; \qquad Pr' = 10^6;$$
 (40)

which can be obtained from Eqs. (36){ (38) using as ducial parameters v ' 0:1, T= , ' (T) 1 and L ' 0:01 H $_{ew}^{1}$ ' 0:03 cm for T ' 100 GeV.

If an inverse energy cascade takes place, m any (energetic) m agnetic dom ains coalesce giving rise to a m agnetic dom ain of larger size but of sm aller energy. This phenom enon can be viewed, in m ore quantitative term s, as an e ective increase of the correlation scale of the m agnetic eld. This consideration plays a crucial rôle for the viability of m echanism s w here the m agnetic eld is produced in the early U niverse inside the H ubble radius (see Subsect. 2.5).

2.3 Initial conditions for dynam os

A coording to the qualitative description of the dynam o instability presented in the previous subsection, the origin of large-scale magnetic elds in spiral galaxies can be reduced to the three keywords: seeding, ampli cation and ordering. The rst stage, i.e. the seeding, is the most controversial one and will be brie y reviewed in the following sections of the present review . In more quantitative terms the ampli cation and the ordering may be sum marized as follows:

during the 30 rotations perform ed by the galaxy since the protogalactic collapse, the magnetic eld should be amplied by about 30 e-folds;

if the large scale magnetic eld of the galaxy is, today, O(G) the magnetic eld at the onset of galactic rotation might have been even 30 = folds smaller, i.e. $O(10^{-19}G)$ over a typical scale of $30\{100 \text{ kpc.};$

assuming perfect ux freezing during the gravitational collapse of the protogalaxy (i.e. ! 1) the magnetic eld at the onset of gravitational collapse should be 0 (10 23) G over a typical scale of 1 M pc.

This picture is oversimplied and each of the three steps mentioned above can be questioned. In what follows the main sources of debate, emerged in the last ten years, will be brie y discussed.

There is a simple way to relate the value of the magnetic elds right after gravitational collapse to the value of the magnetic eld right before gravitational collapse. Since the gravitational collapse occurs at high conductivity the magnetic ux and the magnetic helicity are both conserved (see, in particular, Eq. (25)). Right before the form ation of the galaxy a patch of matter of roughly 1 M pc collapses by gravitational instability. Right before the collapse the mean energy density of the patch, stored in matter, is of the order of the critical density of the Universe. Right after collapse the mean matter density of the protogalaxy is, approximately, six orders of magnitude larger than the critical density.

Since the physical size of the patch decreases from 1 M pc to 30 kpc the magnetic eld increases, because of ux conservation, of a factor $(_{a}=_{b})^{2=3}$ 10^{4} where $_{a}$ and $_{b}$ are, respectively the energy densities right affer and right before gravitational collapse. The correct initial condition in order to turn on the dynam o instability would be β j 10^{23} G auss over a scale of 1 M pc, right before gravitational collapse.

The estimates presented in the last paragraph are based on the (rather questionable) assumption that the ampli cation occurs over thirty e-folds while the magnetic ux is completely frozen in. In the real situation, the achievable ampli cation is much smaller. Typically a good seed would not be 10 19 G after collapse (as we assumed for the simplicity of the discussion) but rather [35]

$$\mathbf{j}$$
 \mathbf{j} \mathbf{j} $\mathbf{10}^{13}$ \mathbf{G} : (41)

The galactic rotation period is of the order of 3 10° yrs. This scale should be compared with the typical age of the galaxy. All along this rather large dynamical time-scale the e ort has been directed, from the flies, to the justication that a substantial portion of the kinetic energy of the system (provided by the di erential rotation) may be converted into magnetic energy amplifying, in this way, the seed eld up to the observed value of the magnetic

eld, for instance in galaxies and in clusters. In recent years a lot of progress has been m ade both in the context of the sm all and large-scale dynam os [36, 37] (see also [38, 39, 40]). This progress was also driven by the higher resolution of the num erical simulations and by the im provem ent in the understanding of the largest m agnetized system that is rather close to us, i.e. the sun [37]. M ore com plete accounts of this progress can be found in the second paper of R ef. [36] and, m ore com prehensively, in R ef. [37]. A part from the aspects involving solar physics and num erical analysis, better physical understanding of the rôle of the m agnetic helicity in the dynam o action has been reached. This point is crucially connected with the two conservation laws arising in M HD, i.e. the m agnetic ux and m agnetic helicity conservations whose relevance has been already emphasized, respectively, in Eqs. (25) and (26). Even if the rich interplay between sm all and large scale dynam os is rather in portant, let us focus on the problem of large-scale dynam o action that is, at least super cially, m ore central for the considerations developed in the present lecture.

A leady at a qualitative level it is clear that there is a clash between the absence ofm irror-sym metry of the plasm a, the quasi-exponential amplication of the seed and the conservation of magnetic ux and helicity in the high (or more precisely in nite) conductivity limit. The easiest clash to understand, intuitively, is the ux conservation versus the exponential amplication: both ux freezing and exponential amplication have to take place in the same superconductive (i.e. 1! 0) limit. The clash between helicity conservation and dynam o action can be also understood in general terms: the dynam o action implies a topology change of the con guration since the magnetic ux lines cross each other constantly [36].

O ne of the recent progress in this fram ework is a more consistent form ulation of the large-scale dynam o problem [36, 37]: large scale dynam os produces small scale helical elds that quench (i.e. prematurely saturate) the e ect. In other words, the conservation of the magnetic helicity can be seen, according to the recent view, as a fundam ental constraint on the dynam o action. In connection with the last point, it should be mentioned that, in the past, a rather di erent argument was suggested [46]: it was argued that the dynam o action not only leads to the amplication of the large-scale eld but also of the random eld component. The random eld would then suppress strongly the dynam o action. A coording to the considerations based on the conservation of the magnetic helicity this argument seem s to be incorrect since the increase of the random component would also entail and increase of the rate of the topology change, i.e. a magnetic helicity non-conservation.

The possible applications of dynam o mechanism to clusters is still under debate and it seems more problem atic. The typical scale of the gravitational collapse of a cluster is larger (roughly by one order of magnitude) than the scale of gravitational collapse of the protogalaxy. Furtherm ore, the mean mass density within the Abell radius (' 1.5h ¹ M pc) is roughly 10³ larger than the critical density. Consequently, clusters rotate much less than galaxies. Recall that clusters are form ed from peaks in the density eld. The present overdensity of clusters is of the order of 10^3 . Thus, in order to get the intra-cluster magnetic eld, one could think that magnetic ux is exactly conserved and, then, from an intergalactic magnetic eld β j> 10 ⁹ G an intra cluster magnetic eld β j> 10 ⁷ G can be generated. This simple estim ate show swhy it

is rather in portant to in prove the accuracy of magnetic eld measurements in the intra-cluster medium : the change of a single order of magnitude in the estimated magnetic eld may imply rather di erent conclusions for its origin.

2.4 A strophysical m echanism s

M any (if not all) the astrophysical mechanisms proposed so far are related to what is called, in the jargon, a battery. In short, the idea is the following. The explicit form of the generalized 0 hm ic electric eld in the presence of therm oelectric corrections can be written as in Eq. (20) where we set $n_q = n_e$ to stick to the usual conventions⁸

$$E = v \quad B + \frac{r \quad B}{4} \quad \frac{r P_e}{en_e}:$$
(42)

By comparing Eq. (23) with Eq. (42), it is clear that the additional term at the right hand side, receives contribution from a temperature gradient. In fact, restoring for a moment the Boltzmann constant k_B we have that since $P_e = k_B n_e T_e$, the additional term depends upon the gradients of the temperature, hence the name therm celectric. It is interesting to see under which conditions the curl of the electric eld receives contribution from the therm celectric e ect. Taking the curl of both sides of Eq. (42) we obtain

r
$$E = \frac{1}{4}r^{2}B + r(v B) \frac{rn_{e} rP_{e}}{en_{e}^{2}} = \frac{@B}{@t};$$
 (43)

where the second equality is a consequence of M axwell's equations. From Eq. (43) it is clear that the evolution of the magnetic eld inherits a source term i the gradients in the pressure and electron density are not parallel. If $r P_e k r n_e a$ fully valid solution of Eq. (43) is B = 0. In the opposite case a seed magnetic eld is naturally provided by the therm celectric term. The usual (and rather general) observation that one can make in connection with the geom etrical properties of the therm celectric term is that cosm ic ionization fronts may play an important rôle. For instance, when quasars em it ultraviolet photons, cosm ic ionization fronts are produced. Then the intergalacticm edium may be ionized. It should also be recalled, how ever, that the temperature gradients are usually norm alto the ionization front. In spite of this, it is also plausible to think that density gradients can arise in arbitrary directions due to the stochastic nature of density uctuations.

⁸ For simplicity, we shall neglect the H all contribution arising in the generalized O hm law. The H all contribution would produce, in Eq. (42) a term J $B = n_{e}e$ that is of higher order in the magnetic eld and that is proportional to the Lorentz force. The H all term will play no rôle in the subsequent considerations. How ever, it should be borne in m ind that the H all contribution m ay be rather interesting in connection with the presence of strong magnetic elds like the ones of neutron stars (i.e. 10^{13} G). This occurrence is even m ore interesting since in the outer regions of neutron stars strong density gradients are expected.

In one way or in another, astrophysical mechanisms for the generation of magnetic elds use an incamation of the therm oelectric e ect [43] (see also [44, 45]). In the sixties and seventies, for instance, it was rather popular to think that the correct \geometrical" properties of the therm oelectric term may be provided by a large-scale vorticity. As it will also be discussed later, this assumption seems to be, at least naively, in contradiction with the form ulation of in ationary models whose prediction would actually be that the large-scale vector m odes are completely washed-out by the expansion of the U niverse. Indeed, all along the eighties and nineties the idea of primordial vorticity received just a minor attention.

The attention then focused on the possibility that objects of rather sm all size m ay provide intense seeds. A fter all we do know that these objects m ay exist. For instance the C rab nebula has a typical size of a roughly 1 pc and a magnetic eld that is a fraction of the m G. These seeds will then com bine and di use leading, ultimately, to a weaker seed but with large correlation scale. This aspect, m ay be, physically, a bit controversial since we do observe m agnetic elds in galaxies and clusters that are ordered over very large length scales. It would then seem necessary that the seed elds produced in a sm all object (or in several sm all objects) undergo some type of dynamical self-organization whose nall e ect is a seed coherent over length-scales 4 or 5 orders of m agnitude larger than the correlation scale of the original battery.

An interesting idea could be that qualitatively di erent batteries lead to some type of conspiracy that m ay produce a strong large scale seed. In [43] it has been suggested that Population III stars m ay become m agnetized thanks to a battery operating at stellar scale. Then if these stars would explode as supernovae (or if they would eject a m agnetized stellar wind) the pre-galactic environm entm ay be m agnetized and the rem nants of the process incorporated in the galactic disc. In a complem entary perspective, a similar chain of events m ay take place over a di erent physical scale. A battery could arise, in fact in active galactic nuclei at high red-shift. Then the m agnetic eld could be ejected leading to intense elds in the lobes of \young" radio-galaxies. These elds will be som ehow inherited by the \older" disc galaxies and the nal seed eld m ay be, according to [43] as large as 10⁹ G at the pre-galactic stage.

In sum m ary we can therefore say that:

both the prim ordial and the astrophysical hypothesis for the origin of the seeds dem and an e cient (large-scale) dynam o action;

due to the constraints arising from the conservation of magnetic helicity and magnetic ux the values of the required seed elds may turn out to be larger than previously thought at least in the case when the ampli cation is only driven by a large-scale dynam o action 9 ;

⁹ The situation may change if the magnetic elds originate from the combined action of small and large scale dynamos like in the case of the two-step process described in [43].

m agnetic ux conservation during gravitational collapse of the protogalaxy m ay increase, by compressional amplication, the initial seed of even 4 orders of m agnitude;

compressional amplication, as well as large-scale dynamo, are much less e ective in clusters: therefore, the magnetic eld of clusters is probably connected to the specic way the dynamo saturates, and, in this sense, harder to predict from a specic value of the initial seed.

2.5 M agnetogenesis: inside the Hubble radius

O ne of the weaknesses of the astrophysical hypothesis is connected with the sm allness of the correlation scale of the obtained magnetic elds. This type of im passe led the community to consider the option that the initial conditions for the M HD evolution are dictated not by astrophysics but rather by cosm ology. The rst ones to think about cosm ology as a possible source of large-scale magnetization were Zeldovich [47, 48], and Harrison [49, 50, 51].

The emphasis of these two authors was clearly di erent. W hile Zeldovich thought about a magnetic eld which is uniform (i.e. hom ogeneous and oriented, for instance, along a speci c Cartesian direction) Harrison som ehow anticipated the more modern view by considering the possibility of an inhom ogeneous magnetic eld. In the scenario of Zeldovich the uniform magnetic eld would induce a slight anisotropy in the expansion rate along which the

m agnetic eld is aligned. So, for instance, by considering a constant (and uniform) m agnetic eld pointing along the & C artesian axis, the induced geometry com patible with such a con guration will fall into the B ianchi-I class

$$ds^2 = dt^2 =$$

By solving E instein equations in this background geom etry it turns out that, during a radiation dom inated epoch, the expansion rates along the \hat{x} and the \hat{y} 2 plane change and their di erence is proportional to the m agnetic energy density [47, 48]. This observation is not only relevant form agnetogenesis but also for C osm ic M icrow ave Background (CM B) an isotropies since the di erence in the expansion rate turns out to be proportional to the tem perature an isotropy. W hile we will get back to this point later, in Section 4, as far as m agnetization is concerned we can just rem ark that the idea of Zeldovich was that a uniform m agnetic eld would modify the initial condition of the standard hot big bang m odel where the U niverse would start its evolution already in a radiation-dom inated phase.

The model of Harrison [49, 50, 51] is, in a sense, more dynamical. Following earlier work of Bierm ann [52], Harrison thought that inhom ogeneous MHD equations could be used to gennerate large-scalem agnetic elds provided the velocity eld was turbulent enough. The Bierm ann battery was simply a battery (as the ones described above in this session) but operating prior to decoupling of matter and radiation. The idea of Harrison was instead that vorticity was already present so that the e ective M HD equations will take the form

$$\frac{\varrho}{\varrho} (a^2 + \frac{e}{m_p}B) = \frac{e}{4 - m_p}r^2B; \qquad (45)$$

where, as previously de ned, = r = v and m_p is the ion m ass. Equation (45) is written in a conform ally at Friedmann-Robertson-W alker m etric of the form

$$ds^2 = G dx dx = a^2 () [d^2 dx^2];$$
 (46)

where is the conform altim e coordinate and where, in the conform ally at case, $G = a^2$ (), being the four-dimensional M inkowskim etric. If we now postulate that some vorticity was present prior to decoupling, then Eq. (45) can be solved and the magnetic eld can be related to the initial vorticity as

$$B \qquad \frac{m_p}{e!} \frac{a_i}{a}^2 \qquad (47)$$

If the estimate of the vorticity is made prior to equality (as originally suggested by Harrison [49]) of after decoupling as also suggested, a bit later, in Ref. [53], the result can change even by two orders of magnitude. Prior to equality j (t) ' 0:1=t and, therefore, β_{eq} j 10²¹G. If a similar estimate is made after decoupling the typical value of the generated magnetic eld is of the order of 10¹⁸ G.So, in this context, the problem of the origin of magnetic elds is circum vented by postulating an appropriate form of vorticity whose origin must be explained.

The Harrison mechanism is just one of the rst examples of magnetic eld generation inside the Hubble radius. In cosm oboy we de ne the Hubble radius as the inverse of the Hubble parameter, i.e. $r_{H} = H^{-1}$ (t). The rst possibility we can think of implies that magnetic elds are produced, at a given epoch in the life of the Universe, inside the Hubble radius, for instance by a phase transition or by any other phenom enon able to generate a charge separation and, ultim ately, an electric current. In this context, the correlation scale of the eld is much smaller that the typical scale of the gravitational collapse of the proto-galaxy which is of the order of the M pc. In fact, if the Universe is decelerating and if the correlation scale evolves as the scale factor, the H ubble radius grows much faster than the correlation scale. Of course, one might invoke the possibility that the correlation scale of the magnetic eld evolves m ore rapidly than the scale factor. A well founded physical rationale for this occurrence is what is norm ally called inverse cascade, i.e. the possibility that m agnetic (as well as kinetic) energy density is transferred from sm all to large scales. This im plies, in real space, that (highly energetic) sm all scale m agnetic domains may coalesce to form magnetic domains of smaller energy but over larger scales. In the best of all possible situations, i.e. when inverse cascade is very e ective, it seems rather hard to justify a growth of the correlation scale that would eventually end up into a M pc scale at the onset of gravitational collapse.



F ig. 1. Evolution of the correlation scale for m agnetic elds produced inside the Hubble radius. The horizontal thick dashed line m arks the end of the radiation-dom inated phase and the onset of the m atter-dom inated phase. The horizontal thin dashed line m arks the m om ent of e^+ {e annihilation (see also footnoote 2). The full (vertical) lines represent the evolution of the Hubble radius during the di erent stages of the life of the U niverse. The dashed (vertical) lines illustrate the evolution of the correlation scale of the m agnetic elds. In the absence of inverse cascade the evolution of the correlation scale is given by the (inner) vertical dashed lines. If inverse cascade takes place the evolution of the correlation scale is faster than the rst power of the scale factor (for instance a⁵⁻³) but always slower than the Hubble radius.

In Fig.1 we report a schem atic illustration of the evolution of the H ubble radius R_H and of the correlation scale of the magnetic eld as a function of the scale factor. In Fig.1 the horizontal dashed line sim ply marks the end of the radiation-dom inated phase and the onset of the matter dom inated phase: while above the dashed line the H ubble radius evolves as a^2 (where a is the scale factor), below the dashed line the H ubble radius evolves as a^{3-2} .

We consider, for simplicity, a magnetic eld whose typical correlation scale is as large as the Hubble radius at the electro-weak epoch when the temperature of the plasm a was of the order of 100 G eV. This is roughly the regime contemplated by the considerations presented around Eq. (40). If the correlation scale evolves as the scale factor, the Hubble radius at the electroweak epoch (roughly 3 cm) projects today over a scale of the order of the astronom ical unit. If inverse cascades are invoked, the correlation scale may grow, depending on the species of factures of the cascade, up to 100 A J. or even up to 100 pc. In both cases the nal scale is too small if com pared with the typical scale of the gravitational collapse of the proto-galaxy. In Fig. 1 a particular model for the evolution of the correlation scale (a) has been reported 10.

¹⁰ Notice, as it will be discussed later, that the inverse cascade lasts, in principle, only down to the time of e^+ e annihilation (see also thin dashed horizontal line in Fig. 1) since for temperatures smaller than T_{e^+} the Reynolds number

2.6 In ationary m agnetogenesis

If m agnetogenesis takes place inside the Hubble radius the main problem is therefore the correlation scale of the obtained seed eld. The cure for this problem is to look for a mechanism producing magnetic elds that are coherent over large-scales (i.e. M pc and, in principle, even larger). This possibility may arise in the context of in ationary models. In ationary models may be conventional (i.e. based on a quasi-de Sitter stage of expansion) or unconventional (i.e. not based on a quasi-de Sitter stage of expansion). Unconventional in ationary models are, for instance, pre-big bang models that will be discussed in more depth in Section 3.

The rationale for the previous statem ent is that, in in ationary models, the zero-point (vacuum) uctuations of elds of various spin are am plied. Typically uctuations of spin 0 and spin 2 elds. The spin 1 elds enjoy how ever of a property, called W eyl invariance, that seem s to forbid the am plication of these elds. W hile W eyl invariance and its possible breaking will be the speci c subject of the following subsection, it is useful for the moment to look at the kinem atical properties by assuming that, indeed, also spin 1 eld can be am plied.

Since during in ation the Hubble radius is roughly constant (see Fig. 2), the correlation scale evolves much faster than the Hubble radius itself and, therefore, large scalem agnetic dom ains can naturally be obtained. Notice that, in Fig. 2 the (vertical) dashed lines illustrate the evolution of the Hubble radius (that is roughly constant during in ation) while the full line denotes the evolution of the correlation scale. Furtherm ore, the horizontal (dashed) lines mark, from top to bottom, the end of the in ationary phase and the onset of the matter-dom inated phase. This phenom enon can be understood as the gauge counterpart of the super-adiabatic am pli cation of the scalar and tensorm odes of the geom etry. The main problem, in such a fram ework, is to get large am plitudes for scale of the order of the M pc at the onset of gravitational collapse. M odels where the gauge couplings are electively dynam ical (breaking, consequently, the W eyl invariance of the evolution equations of A belian gauge m odes) may provide rather intense magnetic elds.

The two extrem e possibilities mentioned above may be sometimes combined.For instance, it can happen that magnetic elds are produced by superadiabatic amplication of vacuum uctuations during an in ationary stage of expansion. A fifer exiting the horizon, the gauge modes will reenter at dierent moments all along the radiation and matter dom inated epochs. The spectrum of the primordial gauge elds after reentry will not only be determined by the amplication mechanism but also on the plasma e ects. As soon as the magnetic inhom ogeneities reenter, some other physical process, taking place inside the Hubble radius, may be triggered by the presence of large scale magnetic

drops below 1. This is the result of the sudden drop in the number of charged particles that leads to a rather long m ean free path for the photons.

elds. An example, in this context, is the production of topologically nontrivial con gurations of the hypercharge eld (hyperm agnetic knots) from a stochastic background of hypercharge elds with vanishing helicity [54, 55, 56] (see also [59, 57, 58, 60, 61]).



F ig. 2. Evolution of the correlation scale if magnetic elds would be produced by superadiabatic ampli cation during a conventional in ationary phase. The dashed vertical lines denote, in the present gure, the evolution of the Hubble radius while the full line denotes the evolution of the correlation scale (typically selected to sm aller than the Hubble radius during in ation).

2.7 B reaking of conform al invariance

р

Consider the action for an Abelian gauge eld in four-dimensional curved space-time 7

$$S_{em} = \frac{1}{4} d^4 x G F F :$$
 (48)

Suppose, also, that the geom etry is characterized by a conform ally at line element of Friedmann-Robertson-Walker type as the one introduced in Eq. (46). The equations of motion derived from Eq. (48) can be written as

U sing Eq. (46) and recalling that $p - \overline{G} = a^4$ (), we will have

$$G F = a^4 ()_{a^2 ()} \overline{a^2 ()} F = F$$
 (50)

where the second equality follows from the explicit form of the metric. Equation (50) shows that the evolution equations of A belian gauge elds are the

same in at space-time and in a conformally at FRW space-time. This property is correctly called W eyl invariance or, more ambiguously, conform al invariance. W eyl invariance is realized also in the case of chiral (massless) fermions always in the case of conformally at space-times.

O ne of the reasons of the success of in ationary models in making predictions is deeply related with the lack of conformal invariance of the evolution equations of the uctuations of the geom etry. In particular it can be shown that the tensor modes of the geom etry (spin 2) as well as the scalar modes (spin 0) obey evolution equations that are not conformally invariant. This means that these modes of the geom etry can be amplied and eventually affect, for instance, the temperature autocorrelations as well as the polarization power spectra in the microwave sky.

To amplify large-scale magnetic elds, therefore, we would like to break conform al invariance. Before considering this possibility, let us discuss an even more conservative approach consisting in studying the evolution of A belian gauge elds coupled to another eld whose evolution is not W eyl invariant. An elegant way to achieve this goal is to couple the action of the hypercharge

eld to the one of a complex scalar eld (the Higgs eld). The Abelian-Higgs model, therefore, leads to the following action

7.

$$S = d^4 x G G (D) D m^2 \frac{1}{4} F F;$$
 (51)

where D = 0 ieA and F = 0 [A]. Using Eq. (46) into Eq. (51) and assuming that the complex scalar eld (as well as the gauge elds) are not a source of the background geom etry, the canonical action for the norm alm odes of the system can be written as

$$S = d^{3}xd$$
 (D) D + $\frac{a^{00}}{a}m^{2}a^{2}$ $\frac{1}{4}F$ F ; (52)

where = a ; D = @ ieA and F = @ A . From Eq. (52) it is clear that also when the Higgs eld is massless the coupling to the geometry breaks explicitly W eyl invariance. Therefore, current density and charge density uctuations will be induced. Then, by employing a V lasov-Landau description sim ilar the resulting magnetic eld will be of the order of B_{dec} 10⁴⁰ T²_{dec} [62] which is, by far, too small to seed any observable eld even assuming, optim istically, perfect ux freezing and maximale ciency for the dynam o action. The results of [62] disproved earlier claims (see [63] for a critical review) neglecting the rôle of the conductivity in the evolution of large-scale magnetic elds after in ation.

The rst attempts to analyze the Abelian-Higgs model in De Sitter space have been made by Turner and W idrow [66] who just listed such a possibility as an open question. These two authors also analyzed di erent scenarios where conform al invariance for spin 1 elds could be broken in 4 space-time dimensions. Their rst suggestion was that conform al invariance may be broken, at an elective level, through the coupling of photons to the geometry

[69]. Typically, the breaking of conform al invariance occurs through products of gauge- eld strengths and curvature tensors, i.e.

$$\frac{1}{m^2}F F R ; \frac{1}{m^2}R F F g ; \frac{1}{m^2}F F R$$
 (53)

where m is the appropriate mass scale; R and R are the Riem ann and Ricci tensors and R is the Ricci scalar. If the evolution of gauge elds is studied during phase of de Sitter (or quasi-de Sitter) expansion, then the ampli cation of the vacuum uctuations induced by the couplings listed in Eq. (53) is m inute. The price in order to get large ampli cation should be, according to [66], an explicit breaking of gauge-invariance by direct coupling of the vector potential to the Ricci tensor or to the Ricci scalar, i.e.

In [66] two other di erent models were proposed (but not scrutinized in detail) namely scalar electrodynamics and the axionic coupling to the Abelian eld strength.

D olgov [68] considered the possible breaking of conform al invariance due to the trace anom aly. The idea is that the conform al invariance of gauge elds is broken by the triangle diagram where two photons in the external lines couple to the graviton through a loop of ferm ions. The local contribution to the elective action leads to the vertex $\binom{P-g}{g}^{l+}$ F F where is a numerical coe cient depending upon the number of scalars and ferm ions present in the theory. The evolution equation for the gauge elds, can be written, in Fourier space, as

$$A_{k}^{00} + \frac{1}{8} H A_{k}^{0} + k^{2} A_{k} = 0;$$
(55)

and it can be shown that only if > 0 the gauge elds are amplied. Furthermore, only is 8 substantial amplication of gauge elds is possible.

In a series of papers [70, 71, 72] the possible e ect of the axionic coupling to the ampli cation of gauge elds has been investigated. The idea is here that conform a linvariance is broken through the explicit coupling of a pseudo-scalar eld to the gauge eld (see Section 5), i.e.

$$p - g_{c} = m \frac{1}{8 M} F F'; \qquad (56)$$

where F' is the dual eld strength and where c is a numerical factor of order one. Consider now the case of a standard pseudoscalar potential, for instance m²², evolving in a de Sitter (or quasi-de Sitter space-time). It can be shown, rather generically, that the vertex given in Eq. (56) leads to negligible amplication at large length-scales. The coupled system of evolution equations to be solved in order to get the amplied eld is

$$B^{00} r^2 B \frac{em}{2 M} r B = 0;$$
 (57)

$$^{20} + 2H ^{0} + m^{2}a^{2} = 0;$$
 (58)

where $B = a^2 B$. From Eq. (57), there is a maximally amplied physical frequency

$$!_{m ax} ' \frac{em}{2 M} - m_{ax} ' \frac{em}{2} m$$
(59)

where the second equality follows from $a^{3=2}M \operatorname{cosm} t$ (i.e. $-m \operatorname{ax} M M$). The ampli cation for ! $!_{m \operatorname{ax}}$ is of the order of exp $[m \operatorname{em} = (2 \operatorname{H})]$ where H is the Hubble parameter during the de Sitter phase of expansion. From the above expressions one can argue that the modes which are substantially amplifed are the ones for which $!_{m \operatorname{ax}} H$. The modes interesting for the large-scale magnetic elds are the ones which are in the opposite range, i.e. $!_{m \operatorname{ax}} H$. Clearly, by low ering the curvature scale of the problem the produced seeds may be larger and the conclusions much less pessim istic [72].

A nother interesting idea pointed out by Ratra [67] is that the electrom agnetic eld may be directly coupled to the in aton eld. In this case the coupling is specified through a parameter , i.e. e' F F where ' is the in aton eld in Planck units. In order to get sizable large-scale magnetic elds the elective gauge coupling must be larger than one during in ation (recall that ' is large, in Planck units, at the onset of in ation).

In [73] it has been suggested that the evolution of the Abelian gauge coupling during in ation induce the grow th of the two-point function of magnetic inhom ogeneities. This model is di erent from the one previously discussed [67]. Here the dynam ics of the gauge coupling is not related to the dynam ics of the in aton which is not coupled to the Abelian eld strength. In particular, r_B (M pc) can be as large as 10¹². In [73] the M HD equations have been generalized to the case of evolving gauge coupling. Recently a scenario sim ilar to [73] has been discussed in [74].

In the perspective of generating large scale magnetic elds G asperini [75] suggested to consider the possible mixing between the photon and the graviphoton eld appearing in supergravity theories (see also, in a related context [76]). The graviphoton is the massive vector component of the gravitational supermultiplet and its interaction with the photon is specified by an interaction term of the type F G where G is the led strength of the massive vector. Large-scale magnetic elds with $r_B \mbox{ Mpc}$) 10³⁴ can be obtained if 0 (1) and for a mass of the vector m 10th TeV.

Bertolam i and M ota [77] argue that if Lorentz invariance is spontaneously broken, then photons acquire naturally a coupling to the geometry which is not gauge-invariant and which is similar to the coupling considered in [66].

3 W hy string cosm ology?

The moment has come to review my personal interaction with Gabriele Veneziano on the study of large-scale magnetic elds. W hile we had other 15 joined papers with Gabriele (together with di erent combinations of authors) two of them [80, 81] (both in collaboration with Maurizio Gasperini)

are directly related to large-scale magnetic elds. Both papers reported in Refs. [80, 81] appeared in 1995 while I was completing my Phd at the theory division of CERN.

M y scienti c exchange with G abriele Veneziano started at least four years earlier and the rst person mentioning Gabriele to me was Sergio Fubini. At that time Sergio was professor of Theoretical Physics at the University of Turin and I had the great opportunity of discussing physics with him at least twice a month. Sergio was rather intrigued by the possibility of getting precise m easurem ents on m acroscopic quantum phenom ena like super uidity, superconductivity, quantization of the resistivity in the (quantum) Halle ect. I started working, under the supervision of Maurizio G asperini, on the spectral properties of relic gravitons and we bum ped into the concept of squeezed state [82], a generalization of the concept of coherent state (see, for instance, [85, 84, 83]). Sergio got very interested and, I think, he was independently thinking about possible applications of squeezed states to superconductivity, a topic that became later on the subject of a paper [86]. Sergio even suggested a review by Rodney Loudon [87], an author that I knew already beacuse of his inspiring book on quantum optics [88]. Ref. [87] together with a physics report of B.L. Schum aker [89] was very useful form y understanding of the sub ject. Now adays a very complete and thorough presentation of the intriguing problem s arising in quantum optics can be found in the book of Leonard M andel and Em il W olf 1901.

It is am using to notice the following parallelism between quantum optics and the quantum treatment of gravitational uctuations. W hile quantum optics deals with the coherence properties of system s ofm any photons, we deal, in cosm ology, with the coherence properties of m any gravitons (or phonons) excited during the time-evolution of the background elds. The background elds act, e ectively, as a "pump eld". This term inology, now generally accepted, is exactly borrowed by quantum optics where the pump eld is a laser. In the sixties and seventies the main problem of optics can be sum marized by the following question: why is classical optics so precise? Put it into di erent words, it is known that the interference of the amplitudes of the radiation eld (the so-called Young interferom etry) can be successfully treated at a classical level. Quantum e ects, in optics, arise not from the rst-order interference e ects (Young interferom etry) but from the second-order interference e ects, i.e. the so-called H anbury-B row n-T w iss interferom etry [90] w here the quantum nature of the radiation eld is manifest since it leads, in the jargon introduced by M andel [90] to light which is either bunched or anti-bunched. A similar problem also arises in the treatment of cosm ological perturbations when we ask the question of the classical limit of a quantum mechanically generated uctuation (for instance relic gravitons).

The interaction with Sergio led, few years later, to a talk that I presented at the physics department of the University of Torino. The title was Correlation properties of m any photons system s. I mentioned my interaction with Sergio

Fubini since it was Sergio who suggested that, eventually, I should talk to G abriele about squeezed states.

During the rst few months of 1991, G abriele submitted a sem inal paper on the cosm ological implications of the low energy string e ective action [91]. This paper, together with another one written in collaboration with M aurizio G asperini [92] represents the rst formulation of pre-big bang m odels. A relatively recent introduction to pre-big bang m odels can be found in Ref. [93].

In [80, 81] it was argued that the string cosm ological scenario provided by pre-big bang models [91, 92] would be ideal for the generation of largescale magnetic elds. The rationale for this statem ent relies on two di erent observations:

in the low energy string e ective action gauge elds are coupled to the dilaton whose expectation value, at the string energy scale, gives the uni ed value of the gauge and gravitational coupling;

from the mathematical analysis of the problem it is clear that to achieve a sizable amplication of large-scale magnetic elds it is necessary to have a pretty long phase where the gauge coupling is sharply growing in time [80].

Let us therefore elaborate on the two mentioned points. In the string frame the low-energy string elective action can be schematically written as [94, 95, 96]

$$S_{e} = d^{4}x^{p} - G \frac{e'}{2 \frac{2}{s}} R + G @ '@ ' \frac{1}{12}H H$$
$$+ \frac{e'}{4}F F + e' - \frac{i}{2} a_{D_{a}} + hc: + R^{2} + \dots + O(g^{2}) + \dots + G(g^{2}) + \dots +$$

In Eq. (60) the ellipses stand, respectively, for an expansion in powers of $(_{s}=L)^{2}$ and for an expansion in powers of the gauge coupling constant $g^{2} = e'$. This action is written in the so-called string fram emetric where the dilaton eld ' is coupled to the Einstein-H ilbert term.

Concerning the action (60) few general comments are in order

the relation between the P lanck and string scales depends on time and, in particular, $\frac{v^2}{P} = e' \frac{2}{s}$; the present ratio between the P lanck and string scales gives the value, i.e. $g(_0) = e'_{_0} = \frac{v}{P} (_0) = \frac{1}{s}$;

in four space-time dimensions the antisymmetric tensor eld H can be written in terms of a pseudo-scalar eld, i.e.

$$H = e' \underline{p} - \underline{G} \theta ; \qquad (61)$$

In critical superstring theory the dilaton eld must have a potential that vanishes in the weak coupling limit (i.e. ' ! 1). Moreover, from the direct

tests of Newton law at short distances it should also happen that the mass of the dilaton is such that $m_{,} > 10^{-4}$. This requirement may be relaxed by envisaging non-perturbative mechanisms where the dilaton is electively decoupled from the matter elds and where a massless dilaton leads to observable violations of the equivalence principle.

From the structure of the action (60), A belian gauge elds are amplied if the gauge coupling is dynam ical. Consider, in fact, the equations of motion for the hypercharge eld strength

$$e e' G F = 0;$$
 (62)

where F = @[A]. In the Coulomb gauge where $A_0 = 0$ and r = 0the equation for the rescaled vector potential $A = e^{\prime = 2}A$ becomes, for each independent polarization and in Fourier space,

$$A_{k}^{00} + k^{2} g \frac{1}{g}^{00} A_{k} = 0;$$
 (63)

where, as usual, the prime denotes a derivation with respect to the conform al time coordinate. In Eq. (63) k denotes the comoving wave-number From the structure of Eq. (63) there exist two dimenstreads are shork $\frac{1}{2}$ ig (g⁻¹)⁰ j the solution on Eq. (63) is oscillatory. In the opposite limit, i.e. k² ig (g⁻¹)⁰ j the general solution can be written as

$$A_{k}() = \frac{C_{1}(k)}{g()} + \frac{C_{2}(k)}{g()}^{Z} g^{2}(^{0})d^{0};$$
(64)

where $C_1(k)$ and $C_2(k)$ are two arbitrary constants. These two constants can be xed by imposing quantum mechanical initial conditions for ! 1. Thus, depending on the evolution of g() the Fourier amplitude A_k can be amplied.

It can be shown [80, 81] that the the amplied magnetic energy density depends on the ratio between the value of the gauge coupling at the reentry and at the exit of the typical scale of the gravitational collapse, i.e.

$$r(k) = \frac{1}{d \ln k} \frac{d_{B}}{a^{4}} \frac{k^{4}}{a^{4}} \frac{g_{re}}{g_{ex}}^{2} :$$
 (65)

The parameter r(k) measures the relative weight of the magnetic energy density in units of the radiation background. To turn on the galactic dynam o in its simplest realization one should require that $r(k_G) = 10^{-34}$ for a typical comoving wave-num ber corresponding to the typical scale of the gravitational collapse of the protogalaxy. As explained before, this requirement seems to be too optimistic in the light of the most recent understanding of the dynam o theory. The limit $r(k_G) = 10^{-24}$ seems more reasonable.

The fact that the gauge coupling must be sharply growing in order to produce large-scale magnetic elds ts extremely well with the pre-big bang dynamics where, indeed, the gauge coupling is expected to grow. The second requirement to obtain a phenom enologically viable mechanism for the amplication of large-scale gauge elds turned out to be the existence of a pretty long stringy phase.

The "stringy" phase is simply the epoch where quadratic curvature corrections start being in portant and lead to an elective dynamics where the dilaton

eld is linearly growing in the cosm ic time coordinate (see [93] and references therein). Towards the end of the stringy phase the dilaton freezes to its (constant) value and the Universe gets dom inated by radiation. One possibility for achieving the transition to radiation is represented by the back-reaction effects of the produced particles [102]. In particular, the short wavelength modes play, in this context a crucial rôle. It is interesting that while the magnetic energy spectrum produced during the stringy phase is quasi- at and the value of r ($k_{\rm G}$) can be as large as 10 8 im plying a protogalactic magnetic eld of the order of 10 10 G . Under these conditions the dynam o mechanism would even be super uous since the compressional ampli cation alone can amplify the seed eld to its observed value.

The results reported above may be \tested" in a fram ework where the prebig bang dynam ics is solvable. Consider, in particular, the situation where the evolution of the dilaton eld as well as the one of the geometry is treated in the presence of a non-local dilaton potential [97, 98, 99, 100, 101].

In the E instein fram e description, the asym ptotics of the (four-dim ensional) pre-big bang dynam ics can be written as [102]

$$a()' a \frac{r}{2_{0}}; \quad a = e^{\prime_{0}=2} \frac{2(\overline{3}+1)}{\overline{p_{3}}};$$

$$i' = i_{0} \ln 2 \frac{p_{\overline{3}}}{\overline{p_{3}}} \frac{p_{\overline{3}}+1}{\overline{p_{\overline{3}}}} \frac{p_{\overline{3}}}{\overline{p_{3}}} \frac{p_{\overline{3}}}{\overline{p_{3}}};$$

$$H = \frac{1}{2}; \quad i'^{0} = \frac{p_{\overline{3}}}{\overline{p_{3}}}; \quad (66)$$

for ! 1, and

$$a()' a_{+} \frac{r}{2_{0}}; \qquad a_{+} = e^{'_{0}=2} \frac{p_{\overline{3}}}{2(\overline{3} 1)};$$

$$i'_{+} = i'_{0} \ln 2 \frac{p_{\overline{3}}}{3} \ln \frac{p_{\overline{3}}}{p_{\overline{3}}} + p_{\overline{3}} \ln \frac{p_{\overline{3}}}{2_{0}};$$

$$H_{+} = \frac{1}{2}; \qquad i'_{+}^{0} = \frac{p_{\overline{3}}}{2}; \qquad (67)$$

for ! + 1. In Eqs. (66) and (67), $H = a^0=a$ and, as usual, the prime denotes a derivation with respect to T he branch of the solution denoted by

m inus describes, in the E instein frame, an accelerated contraction, since the rst derivative of the scale factor is negative while the second is positive. The branch of the solution denoted with plus describes, in the E instein frame, a decelerated expansion, since the rst derivative of the scale factor is positive while the derivative is negative. In both branches the dilaton grows and its derivative is always positive-de nite (i.e. $'^{0} > 0$) as required by the present approach to bouncing solutions. The num erical solution corresponding to the asymptotics given in Eqs. (66) and (67) is reported in Fig. 3



F ig. 3. The evolution of the scale factor in conform al time for a bouncing m odel regularized via non-local dilaton potential in the E instein fram e.

In the Schrödinger description the vacuum state evolves, unitarily, to a multimode squeezed state, in full analogy with what happens in the case of relic gravitons [103, 104, 105]. In the following the same process will be discussed within the Heisenberg representation. The two physical polarizations of the photon can then be quantized according to the standard rules of quantization in the radiation gauge in curved space-times:

$$\hat{A}_{i}(x;) = \frac{X}{(2)^{3=2}} \frac{d^{3}k}{d^{2}k^{3}} \hat{a}_{k}; e_{i}A_{k} ()e^{ik} + \hat{a}_{k}^{y}; e_{i}A_{k} ()^{2}e^{ik} ; (68)$$

and

$$^{*}_{i}(x;) = \frac{X ^{2}}{(2)^{3-2}} \frac{d^{3}k}{k_{i}; e_{i} k_{i}} (e_{i} k_{i}) e^{ik x} + a^{y}_{k_{i}; e_{i} k_{i}} (e_{i} k_{i})^{2} e^{ik x};$$
 (69)

where e_i (k) describe the polarizations of the photon and

 $_{k}() = A_{k}^{0}(); \qquad [\hat{a}_{k}; ; \hat{a}_{p}^{y}] = (3) (k p):$ (70)

The evolution equation for the mode functions will then be, in Fourier space,

Magnetic elds, strings and cosm ology 35

$$A_{k}^{00} + k^{2} g(g^{1})^{00} A_{k} = 0;$$
 (71)

i.e. exactly the same equation obtained in (63). The pump eld can also be expressed as:

$$g(g^{-1})^{0} = \frac{r^{0}}{4} \frac{r^{0}}{2}$$
 : (72)

The maxim ally amplied modes are then the ones for which

$$k_{max}^2 ' jg (g^{-1})^{\omega} j;$$
 (73)

The Fourierm odes appearing in Eq. (71) have to be norm alized while they are inside the horizon for large and negative \cdot . In this lim it the initial conditions provided by quantum mechanics are

$$A_{k}() = \frac{1}{p \cdot \frac{1}{2k}} e^{-ik}; \quad k() = -i \cdot \frac{k}{2} e^{-ik}:$$
 (74)

In the limit ! +1 the positive and negative frequency modes will be



Fig. 4. The evolution of the mixing coe cients for k ' k $_{\rm km\ ax}$ in units of $_0$.

m ixed, so that the solution will be represented in the plane wave orthonorm al basis as

$$A_{k}() = \frac{p}{\frac{2k}{2k}} c_{k}(k)e^{ik} + c_{k}(k)e^{ik} ;$$

$$A_{k}^{0}() = i\frac{k}{2}c_{k}(k)e^{ik} c_{k}(k)e^{ik} : (75)$$

where c (k) are the (constant) m ixing coe cients. The following two relations fully determ ine the square modulus of each of the two m ixing coe cients in terms of the complex wave-functions obeying Eq. (71):

$$\dot{\mathbf{r}}_{+}$$
 (k) $\dot{\mathbf{f}}$ $\dot{\mathbf{r}}$ (k) $\dot{\mathbf{f}}$ = i(A[?]_k A_k A_k[?]); (76)

$$\dot{\mathbf{j}}_{\mathbf{k}_{+}}(\mathbf{k})\dot{\mathbf{j}} + \dot{\mathbf{j}}_{\mathbf{k}_{+}}(\mathbf{k})\dot{\mathbf{j}} = \frac{1}{\mathbf{k}^{2}} \mathbf{j}_{\mathbf{k}}\mathbf{j} + \mathbf{k}^{2}\mathbf{j}_{\mathbf{k}_{+}}\mathbf{j}^{2} \mathbf{k}_{\mathbf{k}_{+}}\mathbf{j}^{2} \mathbf{k}_{\mathbf{k}_{+}}$$

A fier having numerically computed the time evolution of the properly normalized mode functions, Eqs. (76) and (77) can be used to infer the value of the relevant mixing coe cient (i.e. c (k)). Equation (76) is, in fact, the W ronskian of the solutions. If the second-order di erential equation is written in the form (71), the W ronskian is always conserved throughout the time evolution of the system. Since, from Eq. (74), the W ronskian is equal to 1 initially, it will be equal to 1 all along the time evolution. Thus, from Eq. (76) $\dot{\mathbf{p}}_{+}$ (k) $\dot{\mathbf{j}} = \dot{\mathbf{p}}$ (k) $\dot{\mathbf{j}} + 1$. The fact that the W ronskian m ust always be equal to 1 is the m easure of the precision of the algorithm.

In Figs. 4 and 5 the num erical calculation of the spectrum is illustrated for di erent values of k. In Fig. 5 the m ixing coe cients are reported for m odes k $k_{m\,ax}$. In Fig. 4 the m ixing coe cients are reported for m odes around $k_{m\,ax}$. Clearly, from Fig. 5 a smaller k leads to a larger m ixing coe cient which m eans that the spectrum is rather blue. Furtherm ore by com paring the ampli cation of di erent m odes it is easy to infer that the scaling law is $j_{c_{+}}(k)f_{-}^{2} + j_{-}(k)f_{-}^{2} / (k=k_{m\,ax})^{n_{g}}$, with n_{g} 3:46, which is in excellent agreem ent with the analytical determ ination of the m ixing coe cients leading to $n_{g} = 2 \ \overline{3}$ 3:46 [see below, Eq. (8)].

The second piece information that can be drawn from Fig. 4 concerns $k_{m\mbox{ ax}}$, whose speci $c\mbox{ value}$

$$k_{max}' = \frac{p_{\overline{5}}}{0} \frac{0.5}{0}$$
: (78)

can be determ ined num erically for di erent values of $_{\rm 0}$.

For the value of k_{max} reported in Eq. (78), the obtained m ixing coe cient is 1, i.e. j: $(k_{max})j'$ 1.A coording to Fig. 4 as we move from k_{max} to larger k, $(j_{t_{+}}(k)\hat{f} + j_{c}(k)\hat{f})$ ' $(j_{t_{+}}(k)\hat{f} - j_{c}(k)\hat{f})$ implying that jc (k)j 0. M oreover, from the left plot of Fig. 5 it can be appreciated that

$$\dot{\mathbf{r}} (\mathbf{k}_{m ax}) \dot{\mathbf{j}} = 1; \qquad \log (\dot{\mathbf{r}}_{+} (\mathbf{k}_{m ax}) \dot{\mathbf{j}} + \dot{\mathbf{r}} (\mathbf{k}_{m ax}) \dot{\mathbf{j}}) = \log 3 \ ' \ 0.477: (79)$$

Thus the absolute norm alization and slope of the relevant mixing coe cient can be num erically determined to be

$$\dot{p}(k)\hat{j} = \frac{k}{k_{max}} \hat{j}^{2^{p}\overline{3}}$$
 (80)

It can be concluded that Eq. (80) is rather accurate as far as both the slope and the absolute norm alization are concerned. The num erical estim ates presented so far can be also corroborated by the usual analytical treatm ent based on the matching of the solutions for the mode functions before and


Fig. 5. The num erical estim ate of the m ixing coe cients in the case k $_0$ 1.

after the bounce. The evolution of the modes described by Eq. (71) can be approximately determined from the exact asymptotic solutions given in Eqs. (66) and (67), and in plying that $'^{0}$ $'^{5}\overline{3}=$. Thus the solutions of Eq. (71) can be obtained in the two asymptotic regimes, i.e. for 1

$$A_{k}; () = \frac{p}{2} e^{i_{2}(+1=2)} H^{(1)} (k);$$
(81)

and for

1

$$A_{k;+}() = \frac{p_{--}}{2} e^{i_{\overline{2}}(+1=2)} c H^{(1)}(k) + c e^{i(+1=2)} H^{(2)}(k);$$
(82)

where H $^{(1;2)}$ (z) are Hankel functions of rst and second kind whose related indices are n n

$$=\frac{p_{\overline{3}}}{2}; \qquad =\frac{p_{\overline{3}}+1}{2}; \qquad (83)$$

The time scale $_1$ denes the width of the bounce and, typically, $_1$ 0.

The phases appearing in Eqs. (81) and (82) are carefully chosen so that

$$\lim_{l \to 1} A_{k} = \frac{1}{\frac{p}{2k}} e^{-ik} :$$
 (84)

U sing then the appropriate m atching conditions

$$A_{k;} (_{1}) = A_{k;+} (_{1});$$

$$A_{k;}^{0} (_{1}) = A_{k;+}^{0} (_{1});$$
(85)

and de ning $x_1 = k_1$, the obtained m ixing coe cients are

$$c_{+}$$
 (k) = $i - \frac{1}{4} x_{1} e^{i (+ + 1) = 2}$ $- \frac{+ + 1}{x_{1}} H^{(1)} (x_{1}) H^{(1)} (x_{1})$

37

$$+ H^{(1)}(x_{1})H^{(1)}_{+1}(x_{1}) + H^{(1)}_{+1}(x_{1})H^{(1)}(x_{1});$$

$$c (k) = i_{\overline{4}}x_{1}e^{i_{(-)}=2} - \frac{+ + 1}{x_{1}}H^{(2)}(x_{1})H^{(1)}(x_{1})$$

$$+ H^{(2)}(x_{1})H^{(1)}_{+1}(x_{1}) + H^{(2)}_{+1}(x_{1})H^{(1)}(x_{1});$$

$$(87)$$

satisfying the exact W ronskian normalization condition $\dot{c}_{+}(k)^{2}$ $\frac{1}{10}$ (k) $\frac{2}{1}$ = 1. In the small argument limit, i.e. $k_1 = k_0$ 1 the leading term in Eq. (87) leads to

c (k)
$$' \frac{i2^{+}}{4} e^{i(-)=2} x_1 (+ 1) () () (88)$$

If we now insert the values given in Eq. (83) it turns out that c (k) ' 0.41 k_{1j} The spectral slope agrees with the num erical estimate, as already stressed. The absolute normalization cannot be determined from Eq. (88), where the sm allargum ent lim it has already been taken. In order to determ ine the absolute norm alization the speci c value of k_{max-1} has to be inserted in Eq. (87). The result of this procedure, taking 1 = 0 is jc $(k_{max}) f = 0.14$, which is roughly a factor of 10 sm aller than the interpolating form ula given in Eq. (80).

The observation that a dynam ical gauge coupling im plies a viable mechanism for the production of large-scale magnetic elds can be interesting in general term s and, m ore speci cally, in the context of the pre-big bang m odels. In fact, in pre-big bang models, not only the uctuations of the hypercharge eld are amplied. In the minimal case we will have to deal with the uctuations of the tensor [82, 106] and scalar [107] m odes of the geom etry and with

the uctuations of the antisym metric tensor eld [108, 109]. The amplied tensor modes of the geometry lead to a stochastic background of gravitational waves (GW) with violet spectrum both in the GW amplitude and energy density. In Fig. 6 the GW signal is parametrized in term s of the logarithm of $_{GW} = _{GW} = _{c}$, i.e. the fraction of critical energy density present (today) in GW . On the horizontalaxis of Fig. 6 the logarithm of the present (physical) frequency is reported. In conventional in ation-10 16 Hz, $_{\rm G\,W}$, is constant (or slightly decreasing) as ary models, for a function of the present frequency. In the case of string cosm ological models $_{GW}$ / ³ ln , which also implies a steeply increasing power spectrum. This possibility spurred various experimental groups to analyse possible directs limits on the scenario arising from speci c instruments such as resonant m ass detectors [110] and m icrow ave cavities [111, 112]. These attempts are justi ed since the signal of pre-big bang m odels m ay be rather strong at high frequencies and, anyway, much stronger than the conventional in ationary prediction

The sensitivity of a pair of VIRGO detectors to string cosm obgical gravitons has been speci cally analysed [113] with the conclusion that a VIRGO

M agnetic elds, strings and cosm ology 39



Fig.6.The spectrum of relic gravitons from various cosm ologicalm odels presented in term sofh 2 $_{\rm GW}$.

pair, in its upgraded stage, can certainly probe wide regions of the parameter space of these models. If we maxim ize the overlap between the two detectors [113] or if we reduce (selectively) the pendulum and pendulum 's internal modes contribution to the therm alnoise of the instrum ents, the visible region (after one year of observation and with SNR = 1) of the parameter space will get even larger. Unfortunately, as in the case of the advanced LIGO detectors, the sensitivity to a at $_{\rm GW}$ will be irrelevant for ordinary in ationary models also with the advanced VIRGO detector. It is worth mentioning that growing energy spectra of relic gravitons can also arise in the context of quintessential in ationary models [114, 115]. In this case $_{\rm GW}$ / \ln^2 (see [15] for a full discussion).

The spectra of gravitational waves have features that are, in some sense, complementary to the ones of the large-scale magnetic elds. The parameter space leading to a possible signal of relic (pre-big bang) gravitons with wideband interferom eters has only a small overlap with the region of the parameter space leading to sizable large-scale magnetic elds. This conclusion can be evaded if the coupling of the dilaton to the hypercharge eld is, in the action, of the type e 'F F [116] where the parameter has values 1 and 1=2, respectively, for heterotic and type I superstrings. In particular, in the case = 1=2, it is possible to nd regions where both large-scale magnetic elds

= 1=2, It is possible to nd regions where both large-scale magnetic elds and relic gravitons are copiously produced.

Let us nally discuss the scalar uctuations of the geom etry. The spectrum of the scalar modes is determined by the spectrum of the K alb-R am ond axion (s). If the axions would be neglected, the spectrum of the curvature uctuations would be sharply increasing, or as we say in the jargon, the spectrum would be violet in full analogy with the spectrum of the tensor modes of the geom etry. This result [107] has been recently analyzed in the light of a recent controversy (see [97, 98]) and references therein).

If the Kab-Ram ond axions are consistently included in the calculation, it is found that the large-scale spectrum of curvature perturbations becomes at [109] and essentially inherits the spectrum of the Kab-Ram ond axions. If the axions decay (after a phase of coherent oscillations) the curvature perturbations will be adiabatic as in the case of conventional in ationary models but with some important quantitative di erences [109] since, in this case, the CMB normalization is explained in terms of the present value of the string curvature scale and in terms of the prim ordial slope of the axion spectrum.

4 Prim ordial or not prim ordial, this is the question ...

W hile diverse theoretical models for the origin of large-scale magnetism can certainly be questioned on the basis of purely theoretical considerations, direct observations can tell us something more speci c concerning the epoch of form ation of large-scale magnetic elds. It would be potentially useful to give some elements of response to the following burning question: are really magnetic elds primordial?

The plan of the present section is the following. In Subsect. 4.1 di erent meanings of the term primordial will be discussed. It will be argued that CMB physics can be used to constrain large-scale magnetic elds possibly present prior to matter-radiation equality. In Subsect. 4.2 the scalar CMB anisotropies will be speci cally discussed by deriving the appropriate set of evolution equations accounting for the presence of a fully inhom ogeneous magnetic eld. In Subsect. 4.3 the evolution of the di erent species com posing the pre-decoupling plasm a will be solved, in the tight-coupling approximation and in the presence of a fully inhom ogeneous magnetic eld. Finally Subsect. 4.4 contains various num erical results and a strategy for parameter extraction.

4.1 Pre-equality magnetic elds

The term prim ordial seems to have slightly di erent meanings depending on the perspective of the various communities converging on the study of largescale magnetic elds. Radio-astronomers have the hope that by scrutinizing the structure of magnetic elds in distant galaxies it would be possible, in the future, to understand if the observed magnetic elds are the consequence of a strong dynam o action or if their existence precedes the form ation of galaxies.

If the magnetic eld does not ips its sign from one spiral arm to the other, then a strong dynam o action can be suspected [117]. In the opposite case the magnetic eld of galaxies should be prim ordial i.e. present already at the onset of gravitational collapse. In this context, prim ordial sim ply m eans protogalactic. An excellent review on the evidence of magnetism in nearby galaxies can be found in [118]. In Fig. 7 a schem atic view of the M ilky W ay is presented. The magnetic eld follows the spiral arm. There have been claims, in the literature, of 3 to 5 eld reversals. The arrows in Fig. 7 indicate one of



F ig. 7. The schematic map of the MW is illustrated. Following [119] the origin of the two-dimensional coordinate system are in the Galactic center. The two large arrows indicate one of the possible (3 or 5) eld reversals observed so far.

the possible eld reversals. One reversal is certain beyond any doubt. A nother indication that would support the prim ordial nature of the magnetic eld of galaxies would be, for instance, the evidence that not only spirals but also elliptical galaxies are magnetized (even if the magnetic eld seems to have correlation scale shorter than in the case of spirals). Since elliptical galaxies have a much less e cient rotation, it seems di cult to postulate a strong dynam o action. W e will not pursue here the path of speci c astrophysical signatures of a truly pre-galactic magnetic eld and e refer the interested reader to [117, 118].

As a side rem ark, it should also be mentioned that magnetic elds may play a rôle in the analysis of rotation curves of spiral galaxies. This aspect has been investigated in great depth by E.Battaner, E.F lorido and collaborators also in connection with possible e ects of large-scale magnetic elds on structure form ation [120, 121, 122, 123] (see also [124] and references therein).

The large-scale magnetic elds produced via the parametric amplication of quantum uctuations discussed earlier in the present lecture may also be de ned primordial but, in this case, the term primordial has a much broader signification embracing the whole epoch that precedes the equality between matter and radiation taking place, approximately, at a redshift $z_{eq} = 3230$ for $h^2_{m0} = 0.134$ and $h^2_{r0} = 4.15$ 10⁵. Consequently, large-scale magnetic elds may a ect, potentially, CMB anisotropies [19]. Through the years, various studies have been devoted to the elds of large-scale magnetic elds on the vector and tensor CMB anisotropies [128, 129] (see also [125] and references therein for some recent review articles).

The implications of fully inhom ogeneous magnetic elds on the scalar modes of the geometry remain comparatively less explored. By fully inhomogeneous we mean stochastically distributed elds that do not break the spatial isotropy of the background [125, 126].

CM B anisotropies are custom arily described in terms of a set of carefully chosen initial conditions for the evolution of the brightness perturbations of the radiation eld. One set of initial conditions corresponds to a purely adiabatic m ode. There are, how ever, m ore com plicated situations where, on top of the adiabatic m ode there is also one (or m ore) non-adiabatic m ode(s). A m ode, in the present term inology, sim ply m eans a consistent solution of the governing equations of the m etric and plasm a uctuations, i.e. a consistent solution of the perturbed E instein equations and of the low er multipoles of the B oltzm ann hierarchy.

The simplest set of initial conditions for CMB anisotropies, implies, in a CDM fram ework, that a nearly scale-invariant spectrum of adiabatic uctuations is present after matter-radiation equality (but before decoupling) for typical wavelengths larger than the Hubble radius at the corresponding epoch [130].

It became relevant, through the years, to relax the assumption of exact adiabaticity and to scrutinize the implications of a more general mixture of adiabatic and non-adiabatic initial conditions (see [132, 133, 134] and references therein). In what follows it will be argued, along a similar perspective, that large-scalem agnetic elds slightly modify the adiabatic paradigm so that their typical strengths may be constrained. To achieve such a goal, the rst step is to solve the evolution equations of magnetized cosm obgical perturbations well before matter-radiation equality. The second step is to follow the solution through equality (and up to decoupling). On a more technical ground, the second step amounts to the calculation of the so-called transfer matrix [135] whose speci c form is one of the the subjects of the present analysis.

4.2 Basic Equations

Consider then the system of cosm ological perturbations of a at Friedmann-Robertson-Walker (FRW) Universe, characterized by a conformal time scale factor a() (see Eq. (46)), and consisting of a mixture of photons, baryons, CDM particles and massless neutrinos. In the following the basic set of equations used in order to describe the magnetized curvature perturbations will be introduced and discussed. The perspective adopted here is closely related to the recent results obtained in Refs. [136, 137] (see also [138, 139] for interesting developments).

In the conform ally Newtonian gauge [140, 141, 142, 143, 144], the scalar uctuations of the metric tensor $G = a^2$ () are parametrized in terms of the two longitudinal uctuations i.e.

$$G_{00} = 2a^{2}() (;x); \qquad G_{ij} = 2a^{2}() (;x)_{ij};$$
 (89)

where $_{ij}$ is the K roeneker .W hile the spatial curvature will be assumed to vanish, it is straightforward to extend the present considerations to the case when the spatial curvature is not negligible.

Magnetic elds, strings and cosm ology 43

In spite of the fact that the present discussion will be conducted within the conform ally Newtonian gauge, it can be shown that gauge-invariant descriptions of the problem are possible [137]. Moreover, speci c non-adiabatic modes (like the ones related to the neutrino system) may be more usefully described in di erent gauges (like the synchronous gauge). The rationale for the last statement is that the neutrino isocurvature modes may be singular in the conform ally Newtonian gauge. These issues will not be addressed here but have been discussed in the existing literature (see, for instance, [143, 144] and references therein). Furthermore, for the benet of the interested reader it is appropriate to mention that the relevant theoretical tools used in the present and in the following paragraphs follows the conventions of a recent review [144].

H am iltonian and m om entum constraints

The Ham iltonian and momentum constraints, stemming from the (00) and (0i) components of the perturbed E instein equations are:

$$r^{2}$$
 3H (H + ⁰) = 4 G a^{2} [t + _B]; (90)

$$r^{2}(H + ^{0}) = 4 G a^{2} (p_{t} + _{t})_{t} + \frac{r}{4} (E - B)_{t}$$
 (91)

where $H = a^{0}=a$ and the prime denotes a derivation with respect to the conform altime coordinate . In writing Eqs. (00) and (91) the following set of conventions has been adopted

$$t(x) = (x) + (x) + c(x) + b(x);$$
(92)

$$_{B}(\mathbf{x}) = \frac{B^{2}(\mathbf{x})}{8 a^{4}(\mathbf{x})};$$
(93)

$$(p_t + t) + (x) = (p + t) + (x) + (p + t) + (x) + (p_t + t) + (x) + ($$

Concerning Eqs. (92), (93) and (94) the following comments are in order:

in Eq.92) the total density uctuation of the plasm a, i.e. $_{t}(;x)$ receives contributions from all the species of the plasm a;

in Eq. 93) the uctuation of the magnetic energy density $_{\rm B}$ (;x) is quadratic in the magnetic eld intensity;

in Eq.94) $_{t}(;x) = Q_{t}v_{t}^{i}$ is the divergence of the total peculiar velocity while (;x), (;x), $_{c}(;x)$ and $_{b}(;x)$ are the divergences of the peculiar velocities of each individual species, i.e. photons, neutrinos, CDM particles and baryons.

The second term appearing at the right hand side of Eq. (91) is the divergence of the Poynting vector. In M HD the O hm ic electric eld is subleading and, in particular, from the M HD expression of the O hm law we will have

E B
$$' \frac{(r B) B}{4}$$
: (95)

Since the Universe, prior to decoupling, is a very good conductor, the ideal M HD limit can be safely adopted in the rst approximation (see also [145]); thus for ! 1 (i.e. in nite conductivity limit) the contribution of the Poynting vector vanishes. In any case, even if would be nite but large, the second term at the right hand side of Eq. (91) would be suppressed in comparison with the contribution of the divergence of the total velocity eld.

The total (unperturbed) energy density and pressure of the mixture, i.e.

$$t = + + c + b + ;$$

 $p_t = p + p + p_c + p_b + p :$ (96)

determ ine the evolution of the background geom etry according to Friedmann equations:

$$H^{2} = \frac{8 G}{3} a^{2} t;$$
 (97)

$$H^{2} H^{0} = 4 G a^{2} (t + p_{t});$$
 (98)

$$_{t}^{0} + 3H (_{t} + p_{t}) = 0$$
: (99)

Notice that in Eq. (96) the contribution of the cosm ological constant has been included. If the dark energy is parametrized in terms of a cosm ological constant (i.e. p = 0), then, $^{0} = 0$. Furtherm one, the contribution of to the background evolution is negligible prior to decoupling. Slightly di erent situations (not contemplated by the present analysis) may arise if the dark energy is parametrized in terms of one (or more) scalar degrees of freedom with suitable potentials.

D ynam ical equation and an isotropic stress (es)

The spatial components of the perturbed Einstein equations, im ply, instead

$${}^{00} + H ({}^{0} + 2 {}^{0}) + (H^{2} + 2H^{0}) + \frac{1}{2}r^{2} () {}^{j}_{i}$$

$$\frac{1}{2}@_{i}@^{j} () = 4 Ga^{2} (p_{t} + p_{B}){}^{j}_{i} {}^{j}_{i} {}^{j}_{i} {}^{j}_{i} {}^{j}_{i} {}^{(100)}$$

Equation (100) contains, as source term s, not only the total uctuation of the pressure of the palsma, i.e. p_{t} , but also

$$p_{\rm B}(\mathbf{x}) = \frac{B^2(\mathbf{x})}{24 a^4(\mathbf{x})} = \frac{B(\mathbf{x})}{3}$$
 (101)

$$\tilde{i}_{i}(x) = \frac{1}{4 a^{4}} B_{i}B^{j} - \frac{1}{3}B^{2} i$$
 (102)

M oreover, in Eq. (100), ${}_{i}^{j}(;x)$ is the anisotropic stress of the uid. As it will be mentioned in a moment (and later on heavily used) the main source of anisotropic stress of the uid is provided by neutrinos which free-stream from temperature smaller than the M eV. Notice that both the anisotropic stress of the uid, i.e. ${}_{i}^{j}(;x)$ and the magnetic anisotropic stress, i.e. ${}_{i}^{j}(;x)$, are, by de nition, traceless.

U sing this last observation, Eq. (100) can be separated into two independent equations. Taking the trace of Eq. (100) we do get

⁽⁰⁾ + H (⁰ + 2 ⁰) + (2H ⁰ + H ²) +
$$\frac{1}{3}$$
r² () = 4 G a² (p + p): (103)

By taking the di erence between Eq. (100) and Eq. (103) the following (traceless) relation can be obtained:

$$Q_i Q^j () \frac{1}{3} i^j r^2 () = 8 G a^2 (i^j + i^j);$$
(104)

By applying the di erential operator $@_j@^i$ to both sides of Eq. (104) we do obtain the following interesting relation:

$$r^{4}$$
 () = 12 G a^{2} [(p +) r^{2} + (p +) r^{2} _B]; (105)

where the param etrization

$$\theta_{j} \theta_{i}^{i} \theta_{j}^{j} = (p +)r^{2}; \quad \theta_{j} \theta_{i}^{i} \theta_{j}^{j} = (p +)r^{2}_{B};$$
(106)

has been adopted. In Eq. (105) (;x) is related with the quadrupolem om ent of the (perturbed) neutrino phase-space distribution. In Eq. (105) $_{\rm B}$ (;x) parametrizes the (norm alized) magnetic anisotropic stress. It is relevant to remark at this point that in the MHD approximation adopted here the two main sources of scalar anisotropy associated with magnetic elds can be parametrized in terms of $_{\rm B}$ (;x) and in terms of the dimensionless ratio

$$_{B}(\mathbf{x}) = \frac{_{B}(\mathbf{x})}{(\mathbf{x})}:$$
(107)

Since both $_{\rm B}$ (;x) and $_{\rm B}$ (;x) are quadratic in the magnetic eld intensity a non-G aussian contribution may be expected. $_{\rm B}$ (;x) is the magnetic energy density referred to the photon energy density and it is constant to a very good approximation if magnetic ux is frozen into the plasma element.

There is, in principle, a third contribution to the scalar problem coming from magnetic elds. Such a contribution arises in the evolution equation of the photon-baryon peculiar velocity and amounts to the divergence of the Lorentz force. W hile the mentioned equation will be derived later in this section, it is relevant to point out here that the MHD Lorentz force can be expressed solely in terms of $_{\rm B}$ (;x) and $_{\rm B}$ (;x). In fact a wellknown vector identity stipulates that

$$Q_{i}B_{j}Q^{j}B^{i} = r [(r B) B]_{2}^{1}r^{2}B^{2}:$$
 (108)

From the de nition of $_{\rm B}$ in terms of $_{\rm i}^{\rm j}$, i.e. Eq. (106), it is easy to show that

$$r^{2}_{B} = \frac{3}{16 a^{4}} @_{i}B_{j}@^{j}B^{i} \frac{1}{2}r^{2}_{B}:$$
 (109)

Using then Eq. (108) into Eq. (109) and recalling that

=

$$4 r [J B] = r [(r B) B];$$
 (110)

we obtain:

$$r^{2}_{B} = \frac{3}{16 a^{4}} r [(r B) B] \frac{r^{2}_{B}}{4}:$$
 (111)

Curvature perturbations

Two important quantities must now be introduced. The rst one, conventionally denoted by , is the density contrast on uniform curvature hypersurfaces 11 , i.e.

$$H\frac{(t+B)}{t}:$$
 (112)

The de nition (112) is invariant under in nitesim al coordinate transform ations. In fact, while $_{\rm B}$ is automatically gauge-invariant (since the magnetic eld vanishes at the level of the background) and $_{\rm t}$ transform as [144]

$$! ~~=~ + H ;$$

t ! ~ t ~ t : (113)

for

$$! ~~=~ + ~^{0}$$
$$x^{i} ! ~~x^{i} = ~x^{i} + ~^{0}{}^{i} : \qquad (114)$$

Recalling Eq. (99), Eq. (112) can also be written as

$$= + \frac{t^{+}}{3(t^{+} p_{t})} :$$
 (115)

The second variable we want to introduce, conventionally denoted by R is the curvature perturbation on com oving orthogonal hypersurfaces¹², i.e.

¹¹ Since, as it will be discussed, is gauge-invariant, we can also interpret it as the curvature uctuation on uniform density hypersurfaces, i.e. the uctuation of the scalar curvature on the hypersurface where the total density is uniform.

¹² It is clear, from the de nition (116) that the second term at the right hand side is proportional, by the momentum constraint (91), to the total peculiar velocity of the plasm a which is vanishing on com oving (orthogonal) hypersurfaces.

Magnetic elds, strings and cosm ology 47

$$R = \frac{H(H + {}^{0})}{H^{2} H^{0}}; \qquad (116)$$

Inserting Eq. (115) and (116) into Eq. (90), the H am iltonian constraint takes then the form

$$= R + \frac{r^{2}}{12 G a^{2} (p_{t} + t)}:$$
(117)

Equation (117) is rather interesting in its own right and it tells that, in the long wavelength $\lim it$,

$$' R + O(k^{2}):$$
 (118)

W hen the relevant wavelengths are larger than the Hubble radius (i.e.k 1) the density constrast on uniform curvature hypersurfaces and the curvature uctuations on com oving orthogonal hypersurfaces coincide. Since the ordinary Sachs-W olfe contribution to the gauge-invariant temperature uctuation is dom inated by wavelengths that are larger than the Hubble radius afterm atter radiation equality (but before radiation decoupling), the calculation of (or R), in the long wavelength limit, will essentially give us the Sachs-W olfe

plateau. A remark on the de nition given in Eq. (112) is in order. The variable

m ust contain the total uctuation of the energy density. This is crucial since the H am iltonian constraint is sensitive to the total uctuation of the energy density. If the magnetic energy density $_{\rm B}$ is correctly included in the de nition of , then the H am iltonian constraint (117) m aintains its canonical form.

Equations (117) and (118) can be used to derive the appropriate transfer m atrices, allowing, in turn, the estimate of the Sachs-W olfe plateau. For this purpose it is in portant to deduce the evolution equation for . The evolution of

can be obtained from the evolution equation of the total density uctuation which reads, in the conform ally New tonian gauge,

$${}^{0}_{t} \quad 3 \; {}^{0}(p_{t} + t) + (p_{t} + t) + 3H (p_{t} + t) + 3H p_{had} = \frac{E}{a^{4}} {}^{J}$$
(119)

The technique is now rather simple. We can extract t from Eq. (115)

$$t = 3(t + p_t)(t + t) = B$$
: (120)

Inserting Eq. (120) into Eq. (119) we get to the wanted evolution equation for .Before doing that it is practical to discuss the case when the relativistic uid receives contributions from di erent species that are simultaneously present. In the realistic case, considering that the cosm ological constant does not uctuate, we will have four di erent species.

For deriving the evolution equation of , it is practical (and, to some extent, conventional) to separate the pressure uctuation into an adiabatic component supplem ented by a non-adiabatic contribution:

$$P_{t} = \frac{P_{t}}{t} + \frac{P_{t}}{\delta}$$
 (121)

In a relativistic description of gravitational uctuations, the pressure uctuates both because the energy density uctuates (rst term at the right hand side of Eq. (121)) of because the speci c entropy of the plasma, i.e. & uctuates (rst term at the right hand side of Eq. (121)). The subscripts appearing in the two terms at the right-hand side of Eq. (121) simply mean that the two di erent variations must be taken, respectively, at constant & (i.e. &= 0) and at constant $_{t}$ (i.e. $_{t} = 0$).

Here is an example of the usefulness of this decomposition. Consider, for instance, a mixture of CDM particles and radiation. In this case the coe cient of the rst term at the right hand side of Eq. (121) can be written as

$$\frac{\mathbf{p}}{\mathbf{t}} = \frac{1}{3} \frac{\mathbf{r}}{\mathbf{c} + \mathbf{r}}; \qquad (122)$$

where we simply used the fact that $p_r = r^{-3}$ and that t = r + c. Now, the quantity appearing in Eq. (122) must be evaluated at constant &, i.e. for & = 0. The speci c entropy, in the CDM radiation system, is given by $\& = T^{3}=n_{c}$ where T is the temperature and n_{c} is the CDM concentration. The relative uctuations of the speci c entropy can then be de ned and they are

$$S = \frac{\delta}{\delta} = \frac{3}{4} \frac{r}{r} - \frac{c}{c}; \qquad (123)$$

where it has been used that $r' T^4$ and that $c' m n_c$ (m is here the typical mass of the CDM particle). Requiring now that S = 0 we do get c = (3=4)(c=r) r. Thus, inserting c into Eq. (122), the following relation can be easily obtained:

$$\frac{P_{t}}{t} = \frac{4_{r}}{3(3_{c} + 4_{r})} = \frac{p_{t}^{0}}{t} = c_{s}^{2}:$$
(124)

The second and third equalities in Eq. (124) follow from the de nition of the total sound speed for the CDM -radiation system. This occurrence is general and it is not a peculiarity of the CDM -radiation system so that we can write, for an arbitrary mixture of relativistic uids:

$$\frac{\mathbf{p}_{t}}{\mathbf{r}} = \frac{\mathbf{p}_{t}^{0}}{\overset{0}{\mathbf{r}}} = \mathbf{c}_{s}^{2} :$$
(125)

The de nition of relative entropy uctuation proposed in Eq. (123) is invariant under in nitesim all gauge transform ations [144] and it can be generalized by introducing two interesting variables namely

$$r = H \xrightarrow{r}_{c}; \quad c = H \xrightarrow{c}_{c}: \quad (126)$$

U sing the continuity equations for the CDM and for radiation, i.e. $_{r}^{0} = 4H_{r}$ and $_{c}^{0} = 3H_{c}$, Eq. (126) can be also written as

$$r = + \frac{r}{4}; \quad c = + \frac{c}{3};$$
 (127)

where $r = r_r r_r$ and $c = c_r r_r$. Thus, using Eq. (127), the relative uctuation in the speci c entropy introduced in Eq. (123) can also be written as

$$S = 3(_{c} _{r}):$$
 (128)

It is a simple exercise to verify that Eqs. (123) and (128) have indeed the same physical content.

Up to now the coe cient of the rst term at the right-hand side of Eq. (121) has been computed. Let us now discuss the second term appearing at the right hand side of Eq. (121). Conventionally, the whole second term is often denoted by p_{had} , i.e. non-adiabatic pressure variation. From Eq. (123) de ning the relative uctuation in the speci c entropy, i.e. S = &=&, the following equation can be written:

$$p_{had} = \frac{p_t}{k} \quad \& \quad \frac{p_t}{S} \quad S:$$
(129)

Now, S must be evaluated, inside the round bracket, for t = 0. The result will be

$$\frac{P_{c}}{S} = \frac{4}{3} \frac{c r}{3 c + 4 r};$$
(130)

Recalling the de nition of sound speed and using Eq. (130) into Eq. (129), we do get

$$p_{had} = c_s^2 c_s S:$$
(131)

If the mixture of uids is more complicated the discussion presented so far can be easily generalized. If more than two uids are present, we can still separate, formally, the pressure uctuation as

$$p_t = c_s^2 + p_{had}$$
: (132)

However, if more than two uids are present, the non-adiabatic pressure density uctuation has a more complicated form that reduces to the one previously computed in the case of two uids:

$$p_{had} = \frac{1}{6H} \int_{t}^{X} \int_{ij}^{0} (c_{si}^{2} + c_{sj}^{2}) S_{ij};$$

$$S_{ij} = 3(i + j); \quad c_{si}^{2} = \frac{p_{i}^{0}}{0};$$
(133)

where S_{ij} are the relative uctuations in the entropy density that can be computed in term softhe density contrasts of the individual uids. The indices

i and jrun over all the components of the plasm a. A ssum ing a plasm a form ed by photons, neutrinos, baryons and CDM particles we will have that various entropy uctuations are possible. For instance

$$S_{c} = 3(c_{c}); \quad S = 3(c_{c}); \quad \quad (134)$$

where the ellipses stand for all the other possible combinations. From the de nition of relative entropy uctuations it appears that S = S. Finally, with obvious notations, while c_s^2 denotes the total sound speed, c_{si}^2 and c_{si}^2 denote the sound speeds of a generic pair of uids contributing S_{ij} to p_{had} , i.e.

$$c_{s}^{2} = \frac{p_{t}^{0}}{0}; \quad c_{si}^{2} = \frac{p_{i}^{0}}{0}; \quad c_{sj}^{2} = \frac{p_{j}^{0}}{0}:$$
 (135)

In the light of Eq. (134), also the physical interpretation of Eq. (132) becomes more clear. The contribution of p_{had} arises because of the inherent multiplicity of uid present in the plasma. Thanks to Eq. (132) using Eq. (120) in Eq. (119) we can obtain the evolution equation for which becomes

$$D = \frac{H}{p_{t} + t} p_{had} + \frac{H}{p_{t} + t} c_{s}^{2} \frac{1}{3} B \frac{t}{3}$$
(136)

The evolution equation for R can also be directly obtained by taking the rst time derivative of Eq. (117), i.e.

$${}^{0} = R^{0} + \frac{r^{2} 0}{12 G a^{2} (p_{t} + t)} + \frac{H (3c_{s}^{2} + 1)r^{2}}{12 G a^{2} (p_{t} + t)};$$
(137)

By now inserting Eq. (137) into Eq. (136) and by using the momentum constraint of Eq. (91) to eliminate $_{\rm t}$ we do get the following expression:

$$R^{0} = \frac{H}{p_{t} + t} p_{had} + \frac{H}{p_{t} + t} c_{s}^{2} \frac{1}{3} B$$

$$\frac{H c_{s}^{2} r^{2}}{4 G a^{2} (p_{t} + t)} + \frac{H r^{2} ()}{12 G a^{2} (p_{t} + t)}$$
(138)

It could be nally remarked that Eq. (138) can be directly derived from Eq. (103). For this purpose The de nition (116) can be derived once with respect to . The obtained result, once inserted back into Eq. (103) reproduces Eq. (138).

4.3 Evolution of di erent species

Up to now the global variables de ning the evolution of the system have been discussed in a uni ed perspective. The evolution of the global variables is determ ined by the evolution of the density contrasts and peculiar velocities of the di erent species. Consequently, in the following paragraphs, the evolution of the di erent species will be addressed.

Photons and baryon

The evolution equations of the low est multipoles of the photon-baryon system amount, in principle, to the following two sets of equations:

$${}^{0}_{b} = 3 {}^{0}_{b};$$
 (139)

$${}^{0}_{b} + H_{b} = r^{2} + \frac{r}{a^{4}} \frac{[J B]}{b} + \frac{4}{3} \frac{a_{e}x_{e}}{b} r (b);$$
 (140)

and

$$^{0} = 4 \, {}^{0} \, \frac{4}{3} \, ;$$
 (141)

$${}^{0} + \frac{r^{2}}{4} + r^{2} = an_{e}x_{e T} (b)$$
 (142)

Equation (140) contains, as a source term, the divergence of the Lorentz force that can be expressed in terms of $_{\rm B}$ (;x) and $_{\rm B}$ (;x), as already pointed out in Eqs. (111).

At early times photons and baryons are tightly coupled by Thompson scattering, as it is clear from Eqs. (140) and (142) where $_{\rm T}$ denotes the Thompson cross section and $n_{\rm e}$ $x_{\rm e}$ the concentration of ionized electrons. To cast light on the physical nature of the tight coupling approximation let us subtract Eqs. (142) and (140). The result will be

$$(_{b})^{0} + an_{e} x_{e} 1 + \frac{4}{3} (_{b}) = \frac{r^{2}}{4} + H_{b} \frac{r [J B]}{a^{4} b} (143)$$

From Eq. (143) it is clear that any deviation of ($_{\rm b}$) swiftly decays away. In fact, from Eq. (143), the characteristic time for the synchronization of the baryon and photon velocities is of the order of $(x_{\rm e}n_{\rm e}_{\rm T})^{-1}$ which is small compared with the expansion time. In the lim it $_{\rm T}$! 1 the tight coupling is exact and the photon-baryon velocity eld is a unique physical entity which will be denoted by $_{\rm b}$. From the structure of Eq. (143), the contribution of the magnetic elds in the M HD lim it only enters through the Lorentz force while the damping term is always provided by Thom pson scattering.

To derive the evolution equations for the photon-baryon system in the tight coupling approximation we can add Eqs. (140) and (142) taking into account that $_{\rm b}$ ' = $_{\rm b}$. Of course, also the evolution equations of the density contrasts will depend upon $_{\rm b}$. Consequently the full set of tightly coupled evolution equations for the photon-baryon uid can be written as:

$${}^{0} = 4 {}^{0} \frac{4}{3} {}_{b}$$
(144)

$$_{\rm b}^{0} = 3 \,^{0} \,_{\rm b};$$
 (145)

$${}^{0}_{b} + \frac{HR_{b}}{(1+R_{b})} {}^{b} + \frac{r^{2}}{4(1+R_{b})} + r^{2} = \frac{3}{4} \frac{r}{a^{4}} \frac{[J B]}{(1+R_{b})}; \quad (146)$$

where

$$R_{b}() = \frac{3}{4} \frac{b()}{()} = \frac{698}{z+1} \frac{h^{2}}{0.023} :$$
 (147)

The set of equations (144), (145) and (146) have to be used in order to obtain the correct initial conditions to be im posed on the evolution for the integration of the brightness perturbations.

If we assume, e ectively, that $_{\rm T}$! 1 we are working to lowest order in the tight coupling approximation. This means that the CMB is electively isotropic in the baryon rest fram e.To discuss CMB polarization in the presence of magnetic elds one has to go to higher order in the tight coupling expansion. However, as far as the problem of initial conditions is concerned, the lowest order treatment su ces, as it will be apparent from the subsequent discussion.

N eutrinos

A fler neutrino decoupling the (perturbed) neutrino phase space distribution evolves according to the collision less Boltzm ann equation. This occurrence im – plies that to have a closed system of equations describing the initial conditions it is mandatory to improve the uid description by adding to the evolution of the monopole (i.e. the neutrino density contrast) and of the dipole (i.e. the neutrino peculiar velocity) also the quadrupole, i.e. the quantity denoted by

and appearing in the expression of the anisotropic stress of the uid (see Eqs. (105) and (106)).

The derivation of the various multipoles of the perturbed neutrino phase space distribution is a straightforward (even if a bit lengthy) calculation and it has been performed, for the set of conventions employed in the present lecture, in Ref. [144]. The result is, in Fourier space,

$$^{\circ} = 4 \ ^{\circ} \ \frac{4}{3}$$
; (148)

$${}^{0} = \frac{k^{2}}{4}r^{2} + k^{2} \qquad k^{2} ; \qquad (149)$$

$$^{0} = \frac{4}{15} \qquad \frac{3}{10} \text{kF}_{3}$$
: (150)

In Eq. (150) F $_3$ is the octupole of the (perturbed) neutrino phase space distribution. The precise relation of the multipole moments of F with the density contrast and the other plasm a quantities is as follow s:

=
$$F_{0}$$
; = $\frac{3}{4}kF_{1}$; = $\frac{F_{2}}{2}$: (151)

Form ultipoles larger than the quadrupole, i.e. > 2 the Boltzm ann hierarchy reads:

$$F^{0} = \frac{k}{2'+1} [F_{('1)} ('+1)F_{('+1)}]:$$
(152)

In principle, to give initial conditions we should specify, at a given time after neutrino decoupling, the values of all the multipoles of the neutrino phase space distribution. In practice, if the initial conditions are set deep in the radiation epoch, the relevant variables only extend, for the purpose of the initial conditions, up to the octupole. Speci c examples will be given in a m om ent.

CDM component

The CDM component is in some sense, the easier. In the standard case the evolution equations do not contain neither the magnetic eld contribution nor the anisotropic stress. The evolution of the density contrast and of the peculiar velocity are simply given, in Fourier space, by the following pair of equations:

$$_{c}^{0} = 3 \, _{c}^{0}$$
 (153)

$$_{\rm c}^0 + H_{\rm c} = k^2$$
: (154)

M agnetized adiabatic and non-adiabatic m odes

The evolution equations of the uid and metric variables will now be solved deep in the radiation-dom inated epoch and for wavelengths much larger than the Hubble radius, i.e. $j_{\rm k}$ j 1. In the present lecture only the magnetized adiabatic mode will be discussed. However, the treatment can be usefully extended to the other non-adiabatic modes. For this purpose we refer the interested reader to [136] (see also [143]). Moreover, since this lecture has been conducted within the conform ally Newtonian gauge, there is no reason to change. How ever, it should be noticed that fully gauge-invariant approaches are possible [137]. To give the avour of the possible sim plic cations obtainable in a gauge-invariant fram ework we can just use gauge-invariant concepts to classify more precisely the adiabatic and non adiabatic modes. For this purpose, in agreem ent with Eq. (126), let us de ne the gauge-invariant density contrasts on uniform curvature hypersurfaces for the di erent species of the pre-decoupling plasm a:

$$=$$
 $+\frac{1}{4};$ $=$ $+\frac{1}{4};$ (155)

$$_{c} = + \frac{c}{3}; \qquad _{b} = + \frac{b}{3}:$$
 (156)

In term s of the variables of Eqs. (155) { (156) the evolution equations for the density contrasts, i.e. Eqs. (144), (148), (154) and (154), acquire a rather sym m etric form :

$$^{0} = \frac{b}{3}; \quad ^{0} = \frac{}{3}; \quad (157)$$

$$_{c}^{0} = \frac{c}{3}; \qquad _{b}^{0} = \frac{b}{3}:$$
 (158)

From Eqs. (157) and (158) we can easily deduce a rather important property of uid mixtures: in the long wavelength limit the relative uctuations in the speci c entropy are conserved. Consider, for instance, the CDM -radiation m ode. In this case the non vanishing entropy uctuations are

$$S_{c} = 3(c_{c}); \quad S_{c} = 3(c_{c}):$$
 (159)

U sing Eqs. (157) and (158) the evolution equations for S $_{\rm c}$ and S $_{\rm c}$ can be readily obtained and they are

$$S_{c}^{0} = (b_{c}); \quad S_{c}^{0} = (c_{c}); \quad (160)$$

O utside the horizon the divergence of the peculiar velocities is O $(jk - j^2)$, so the uctuations in the speci c entropy are approximately constant in this lim it. This conclusion implies that if the uctuations in the speci c entropy are zero, they will still vanish at later times. Such a conclusion can be evaded if the uids of the mixture have a relevant energy-momentum exchange or if bulk viscous stresses are present [148, 149].

A mode is therefore said to be adiabatic $i = c_{c} = c_{b}$. Denoting by i and j two generic gauge-invariant density contrasts of the uids of the mixture, we say that the initial conditions are non-adiabatic if, at least, we can nd a pair of uids for which if j.

As an example, let us work out the speci c form of the magnetized adiabatic mode. Let us consider the situation where the Universe is dominated by radiation after weak interactions have fallen out of them al equilibrium but before matter-radiation equality. This is the period of time where the initial conditions of CMB anisotropies are usually set both in the presence and in the absence of a magnetized contribution. Since the scale factor goes, in conform al time, as a () ' and H ' ¹, Eq. (90) can be solved for jk j 1. The density contrasts can then be determined, in Fourier space, to low est order in k as:

$$= = 2_{i} R_{B};$$

$$= c = \frac{3}{2} \frac{3}{i} \frac{3}{4} R_{B};$$
(161)

where the fractional contribution of photons to the radiation plasm a, i.e. R has been introduced and it is related to R $\,$, i.e. the fractional contribution of m assless neutrinos, as

R = 1 R; R =
$$\frac{r}{1+r}$$
;
r = $\frac{7}{8}$ N $\frac{4}{11}$ $\frac{4=3}{0.681}$ $\frac{N}{3}$: (162)

In Eq. (161) $_{i}(k)$ denotes the initial value of the metric uctuation in Fourier space. It is useful to remark that we have treated neutrinos as part of the

radiation background. If neutrinos have a mass in the meV range, they are nonrelativistic today, but they will be counted as radiation prior to matterradiation equality. Concerning Eq. (161) the last remark is that, of course, we just kept the lowest order in $k \le j < 1$. It is possible, however, to write the solution to arbitrary order in k as explicitly shown in Ref. [43].

Let us then write Eq. (105) in Fourier space and let us take into account that the background is dom inated by radiation. The neutrino quadrupole is then determ ined to be

$$= \frac{R}{R}_{B} + \frac{k^{2}}{6R}(i + i); \qquad (163)$$

where $_{i}(k)$ is the initial (Fourier space) value of the metric uctuation de ned in Eq. (89).

Let us then bok for the evolution of the divergences of the peculiar velocities of the di erent species. Let us therefore write Eqs. (146), (149) and (153) in Fourier space. By direct integration the following result can be obtained:

$$_{\rm b} = \frac{k^2}{4} [2_{\rm i} + R_{\rm B} \quad 4_{\rm B}]; \qquad (164)$$

$$= \frac{k^2}{2} \quad i \quad \frac{R}{2} \quad + k^2 \quad \frac{R}{R} \quad B;$$
(165)

$$_{\rm c} = \frac{k^2}{2}$$
 i: (166)

As a consistency check of the solution, Eqs. (164), (165) and (166) can be inserted into Eq. (91). Let us therefore write Eq. (91) in Fourier space

$$k^{2}H_{i} = 4 G a^{2} \frac{4}{3} (1 + b) b + \frac{4}{3} + c c;$$
 (167)

where we used that ${}^{0}_{i} = 0$ and we also used the tight-coupling approximation since $= {}_{b} = {}_{b}$. Notice that in Eq. (91) the term arising from the Poynting vector has been neglected. This approximation is rather sound within the present M HD treatment. In Eq. (167) R_b 1 (see Eq. (147) for the de nition of R_b) since we are well before matter-radiation equality. The same observation can be made for the CDM contribution which is negligible in comparison with the radiative contribution provided by photons and neutrinos. Taking into account these two observations we can rew rite Eq. (167) as

$$k^{2}H_{i} = 2H^{2}(R_{b} + R);$$
 (168)

where Eqs. (97) and (98) have been used. Inserting then Eqs. (164) and (165) into Eq. (168) it can be readily obtained that the left hand side exactly equals the right hand side, so that the momentum constraint is enforced.

The nal equation to be solved is the one describing the evolution of the anisotropic stress, i.e. Eq. (150). Inserting Eqs. (163) and (165) into Eq.

(150) we do get an interesting constraint on the initial conditions on the two longitudinal uctuations of the geometry introduced in Eqs. (89), namely:

$$_{i} = _{i} 1 + \frac{2}{5}R + \frac{R}{5} (4 _{B} R _{B}):$$
 (169)

Concerning the magnetized adiabatic mode the following comments are in order:

the peculiar velocities are always suppressed, with respect to the other terms of the solution, by a factor k jwhich is smaller than 1 when the wavelength is larger than the Hubble radius;

in the lim it $_{\rm B}$! 0 and $_{\rm B}$! 0 the magnetized adiabatic mode presented here reproduces the well known standard results (see for instance [142]);

the di erence between the two longitudinal uctuations of the metric is due, both to the presence of magnetic and uid anisotropic stresses;

the longitudinal uctuations of the geometry are both constant outside the horizon and prior to matter-radiation equality; this result still holds in the presence of a magnetized contribution as it is clearly demonstrated by the analytic solution presented here.

The last interesting exercise we can do with the obtained solution is to compute the important variables R and introduced, respectively, in Eqs. (116) and (115). Since both and are constants for $j_k j < 1$ and for $<_{eq}$, also R will be constant. In particular, by inserting Eq. (169) into Eq. (116), the following expression can be obtained:

$$R_{i} = \frac{3}{2} 1 + \frac{4}{15}R_{i} \frac{R}{5} (4_{B} R_{B});$$
 (170)

where $R_i(k)$ denotes the initial value, in Fourier space, of the curvature perturbations. In numerical studies it is sometimes useful to relate the initial values of and , i.e. $_i$ and $_i$ to R_i . This relation is expressed by the following pair of formulae that can be derived by inverting Eq. (170) and by using Eq. (169):

$$_{i} = \frac{10}{15 + 4R} R_{i} \frac{2R (4 _{B} R_{B})}{15 + 4R};$$

$$_{i} = 2 \frac{5 + 2R}{15 + 4R} R_{i} \frac{2}{5} \frac{R (5 + 2R)}{15 + 4R} (4 _{B} R_{B}):$$
(171)

From the Ham iltonian constraint written in the form (117) it is easy to deduce, in the lim it j_k j 1 that $_i(k) = R_i(k)$ The same result can be obtained through a di erent, but also instructive, path. Consider the de nition of given either in Eq. (112) or (115). The variable can be expressed in term s of the partial density contrasts de ned in Eqs. (155) and (156). M ore precisely, from the de nitions of the two sets of variables it is easy to show that M agnetic elds, strings and cosm ology 57

$$= \frac{\overset{0}{} + \overset{0}{} + \overset{0}{} + \overset{0}{} \overset{0}{} + \overset{0}{} \overset{0}{} + \overset{0}{} ; \qquad B = \frac{B}{3(p_{t} + t)}; \qquad (172)$$

Thus, to obtain it su ces to nd , , $_{\rm b}$ and $_{\rm c}$ evaluated at the initial time and on the adiabatic solution. U sing Eqs. (161) and (169) into Eqs. (155) and (156) we obtain, as expected,

$$= = _{c} = _{b} = _{i} + \frac{i}{2} + \frac{R}{4} _{B} : \qquad (173)$$

This result was expected, since, as previously stressed, for the adiabatic mode all the partial density contrasts must be equal. Inserting now Eq. (173) into Eq. (172) and recalling that the CDM and baryon contributions vanish deep in the radiation epoch, we do get

$$= _{i} + \frac{i}{2} = R_{i}; \qquad (174)$$

where the last equality follows from the de nition of (116) evaluated deep in the radiation epoch and for the adiabatic solution derived above.

Up to now, as explained, attention has been given to the m agnetized adiabatic m ode. There are, how ever, also other non adiabatic m odes that can enter the gam e.W e w ill not go, in this lecture, through the derivation of the various non-adiabatic m odes. It is how ever useful to give at least the result in the case of the m agnetized CDM -radiation m ode. In such a case the full solution to the same set of equations adm itting the adiabatic solutions can be written as For the case of the CDM -radiation m ode the solution, in the lim it < 1 and k < 1 can be written as

$$= 1 - \frac{1}{1}; = 1 - \frac{1}{1};$$

$$= 4 - \frac{1}{1} - \frac{1}{1} - \frac{1}{1};$$

$$= 4 - \frac{1}{1} - \frac{1}{1} - \frac{1}{1};$$

$$= 3 - \frac{1}{1} - \frac{3}{4}R - \frac{1}{1};$$

$$= \frac{1}{3} - \frac{1}{1} - \frac{3}{4}R - \frac{1}{1};$$

$$= \frac{1}{3} - \frac{1}{1} - \frac{2}{1};$$

$$= \frac{1}{3} - \frac{1}{1} - \frac{2}{1};$$

$$= \frac{1}{3} - \frac{1}{1} - \frac{2}{1};$$

$$= \frac{1}{3} - \frac{1}{1} - \frac{2}{1} + \frac{1}{3} - \frac{2}{1} + \frac{1}{3} - \frac{2}{1} + \frac{1}{3} - \frac{2}{1} + \frac{1}{3} - \frac{1}{1} - \frac{1}{3} + \frac{1}{3} - \frac{1}{3} - \frac{1}{3} + \frac{1}{3} - \frac{1}{3} - \frac{1}{3} + \frac{1}{3} - \frac{1}{$$

$$= \frac{R}{R}_{B} + \frac{k^{2} \frac{2}{1}}{6R} (1 1) \frac{3}{1}; \qquad (175)$$

where

$${}_{1} = \frac{15 + 4R}{8(15 + 2R)} S + \frac{3}{4}R {}_{B};$$

$${}_{1} = \frac{15 4R}{8(15 + 2R)} S + \frac{3}{4}R {}_{B};$$
(176)

In Eq. (175) the following notation for the non-vanishing entropy uctuations has been employed:

$$S_{c} = S_{c} = S$$
 : (177)

In deriving Eq. (175) it is practical to use a form of the scale factor (obtained by solving Eqs. (97), (98) and (99) for a mixture of matter and radiation) which explicitly interpolates between a radiation-dom inated regime and a matter-dom inated regime:

$$a() = a_{eq} - \frac{2}{1} + 2 - \frac{2}{1} ; \quad 1 + z_{eq} = \frac{1}{a_{eq}} = \frac{h^2 m 0}{h^2 r^0}; \quad (178)$$

where m_0 and r_0 are evaluated at the present time and the scale factor is normalized in such a way that $a_0 = 1$. In Eq. (178) $_1 = (2=H_0)^{\circ} \frac{1}{a_{eq} = m_0}$. In term s of $_1$ the equality time is

$$_{eq} = \begin{pmatrix} p \\ \overline{2} & 1 \end{pmatrix}_{1} = 119.07 \quad \frac{h^{2} m 0}{0.134} \quad ^{1} M pc;$$
 (179)

i.e. 2_{eq} ' 1. In this fram ework the total optical depth from the present to the critical recombination epoch, i.e. 800 < z < 1200 can be approximated analytically, as discussed in [150]. By dening the redshift of decoupling as the one where the total optical depth is of order 1, i.e. (z_{dec} ; 0) ' 1, we will have, approximately

$$z_{dec}$$
 ' 1139 $\frac{b}{0.0431}$ '; $_{1} = \frac{0.0268}{0.6462 + 0.1125 \ln (b=0.0431)}$; (180)

where h = 0.73. From Eqs. (180) and (178) it follows that for 1100 z_{dec} 1139, 275 M pc $_{dec}$ 285 M pc.

Equations (178) and (179) will turn out to be relevant for the elective num erical integration of the brightness perturbations which will be discussed later on. For num erical purposes the late-time cosm ological parameters will be xed, for a spatially at Universe, as 13

 $! = 2:47 \quad 10^{5}; \quad !_{b} = 0:023; \quad !_{c} = 0:111; \quad !_{m} = !_{b} + !_{c};$ (181)

where $!_{X} = h^{2}_{X}$ and $= 1_{m}$; the present value of the Hubble param - eter H₀ will be xed, for num erical estimates, to 73 in units of km = (secM pc).

¹³ The values of the cosm ological parameters introduced in Eq. (181) are compatible with the ones estimated from WMAP-3 [131, 151, 152] in combination with the

Transfer m atrix and Sachs-W olfe plateau

Before presenting som e num erical approaches suitable for the analysis of magnetized CMB anisotropies it is useful to discuss a class of analytical estimates that allow the calculation of the so-called Sachs-W olfe plateau. The idea, in short, is very simple. We have the evolution equation for given in Eq. (136). This evolution equation can be integrated across the matter-radiation transition using the interpolating form of the scale factor proposed in Eq. (178).

Consider, rst, the case of the magnetized adiabatic mode where $p_{had} = 0$. Deep in the radiation-dom insted epoch, for $_{eq}$, c_s^2 ! 1=3 and, from Eq. (136), $^0 = 0$, so that

$$= {}_{i}' R_{i}; \qquad {}_{i} = \frac{3}{2} {}_{i} 1 + \frac{4}{15}R \qquad \frac{R}{5} (4_{B} R_{B}): \qquad (182)$$

W hen the Universe becomes matter-dominated, after $_{eq}$, c_s^2 ! 0 and the second term at the right hand side of Eq. (136) does contribute significantly at decoupling (recall that for $h^2_{matter} = 0.134$, $_{dec} = 2.36_{eq}$). Consequently, from Eq. (136), recalling that $c_s^2 = 4a_{eq} = [3 (3a + 4a_{eq})]$, we obtain

$$f = i \frac{3aR}{4(3a + 4a_{eq})}; \quad Bf = Bi$$
; (183)

The inclusion of one (or more) non-adiabatic modes changes the form of Eq. (136) and, consequently, the related solution (183). For instance, in the case of the CDM -radiation non-adiabatic mode the relevant terms arising in the sum (133) are $S_c = S_c = S_i$ where S_i is the (constant) uctuation in the relative entropy density initially present (i.e. for $_{eq}$). If this is the case $p_{had} = c_s^2 \ _c S_i$ and Eq. (136) can be easily solved. The transfer matrix for magnetized CMB anisotropies can then be written as

In the case of a m ixture of (m agnetized) adiabatic and CDM -radiation m odes, we nd, for a > $a_{\rm eq}$

$$M ! 1; M_{S} ! \frac{1}{3}; M_{B} ! \frac{R}{4};$$

$$M_{SS} ! 1; M_{SB} ! 0; \qquad (185)$$

[\]G old" sam ple of SN Ia [153] consisting of 157 supernovae (the furthest being at redshift z = 1.75). We are aware of the fact that W MAP-3 data alone seem to favour a slightly smaller value of $!_m$ (i.e. 0:126). Moreover, W MAP-3 data may also have slightly di erent im plications if combined with supernovae of the SN LS project [154]. The values given in Eq. (181) will just be used for a realistic num erical illustration of the methods developed in the present investigation.

and M $_{\rm BB}$! 1.E quations (184) and (185) m ay be used, for instance, to obtain the magnetized curvature and entropy uctuations at photon decoupling in terms of the same quantities evaluated for $_{\rm eq}$. A full num erical analysis of the problem con m s the analytical results sum marized by Eqs. (184) and (185). The most general initial condition for CMB anisotropies will then be a combination of (correlated) uctuations receiving contribution from $p_{\rm had}$ and from the fully inhom ogeneous magnetic eld. To illustrate this point, the form of the Sachs-W olfe (SW) plateau in the sudden decoupling lim it will now be discussed.

To compute the SW contribution we need to solve the evolution equation of the monopole of the temperature uctuations in the tight coupling limit, i.e. from Eqs. (145) and (146),

$$^{(0)} + \frac{HR_{b}}{1+R_{b}} ^{0} + \frac{k^{2}}{3} \frac{1}{1+R_{b}} = 4 ^{(0)} + \frac{4HR_{b}}{1+R_{b}} ^{0} \frac{4}{3}k^{2} \frac{k^{2}}{3(1+R_{b})} (_{B} 4_{B}):$$
(186)

In the sudden decoupling approximation the visibility function, i.e. K () = 0 () e () and the optical depth, i.e. () are approximated, respectively, by ($_{dec}$) and by ($_{dec}$) (see [155, 156] for an estimate of the width of the last scattering surface). The power spectra of , S and _B are given, respectively, by:

$$P(k) = A - \frac{k}{k_p} ; P_S(k) = A_S - \frac{k}{k_p} ;$$
 (187)

P (k) = F (")
$$\frac{-2}{B_{L}} \frac{k}{k_{L}}^{2"}$$
; (188)

where A , A $_{\rm S}$ and ${\rm \overline{}_{B\ L}}$ are constants and

$$F (") = \frac{4 (6 ") (2 \hat{f}")}{"(3 2")^{2} ("=2)};$$

$$-\frac{B_{L}}{B_{L}} = \frac{B_{L}}{-}; \qquad B_{L} = \frac{B_{L}^{2}}{8}; \qquad -a^{4} () (): \qquad (189)$$

To deduce Eqs. (187), (188) and (189) the magnetic eld has been regularized, according to a common practice [128, 125, 126], over a typical comoving scale $L = 2 = k_L$ with a Gaussian window function and it has been assumed that the magnetic eld intensity is stochastically distributed as

$$hB_{i}(k;)B^{j}(p;)i = \frac{2^{2}}{k^{3}}P_{i}^{j}(k)P_{B}(k;)^{(3)}(k+p); \qquad (190)$$

where

$$P_{i}^{j}(k) = \frac{j}{k} \frac{k_{i}k^{j}}{k^{2}}; P_{B}(k;) = A_{B} \frac{k}{k_{p}}$$
": (191)

As a consequence of Eq. (190) the magnetic eld does not break the spatial isotropy of the background geom etry. The quantity k_p appearing in Eqs. (187) and (191) is conventional pivot scale that is 0.05M pc(see [132, 133, 134] for a discussion of other possible choices). Equations (188) and (189) hold for 0 < " < 1. In this limit the P (k) (see Eq. (188)) is nearly scale-invariant (but slightly blue). This means that the e ect of the magnetic and therm al di usivity scales (related, respectively, to the nite value of the conductivity and of the therm al di usivity coe cient) do not a ect the spectrum [126]. In the opposite limit, i.e. " 1 the value of the mode-coupling integral appearing in the two-point function of the magnetic energy density (and of the magnetic anisotropic stress) is dom inated by ultra-violet e ects related to the mentioned di usivity scales [126]. Using then Eqs. (187),(188) and (189) the C can be computed for the region of the SW plateau (i.e. for multipoles '< 30):

$$C_{*} = \frac{A}{25} Z_{1} (n_{r}; ') + \frac{9}{100} R^{2} \frac{-2}{B_{L}} Z_{2} (; ') \frac{4 P}{25} \overline{A A_{S}} Z_{1} (n_{rs}; ') \cos_{rs} + \frac{4}{25} A_{S} Z_{1} (n_{s}; ') \frac{3 P}{25} \overline{A} R - \frac{-}{B_{L}} Z_{3} (n_{r}; "; ') \cos_{br} + \frac{6 P}{25} \overline{A_{S}} R - \frac{-}{B_{L}} Z_{3} (n_{s}; "; ') \cos_{bs} ;$$
(192)

where the functions $\rm Z_{1}$, $\rm Z_{2}$ and $\rm Z_{3}$

$$Z_{1}(n; ') = \frac{2}{4} \frac{k_{0}}{k_{p}} \sum_{p=1}^{n-1} 2^{n} \frac{(3 n) ' + \frac{n-1}{2}}{2 2 \frac{n}{2} ' + \frac{5}{2} \frac{n}{2}};$$
(193)

$$Z_{2}("; `) = \frac{2}{2} 2^{2}"F(") \frac{k_{0}}{k_{L}} = \frac{2^{2}}{2} \frac{(2 \ 2^{n}) (`+")}{2 \ \frac{3}{2}} (`+") (194)$$

$$Z_{3}(\mathbf{n};";`) = \frac{2}{4}2"2^{\frac{n+1}{2}} \stackrel{p}{\mathbf{F}} (") \frac{\mathbf{k}_{0}}{\mathbf{k}_{L}} \frac{\mathbf{k}_{0}}{\mathbf{k}_{p}} \frac{\frac{n+1}{2}}{\mathbf{k}_{p}}$$
$$\frac{\frac{5}{2}}{\frac{2}{4}} \frac{\mathbf{n}}{2} \frac{\mathbf{n}}{2} \frac{\mathbf{k}_{0}}{\mathbf{k}_{p}} + \frac{\mathbf{n}}{2} + \frac{\mathbf{n}}{4} \frac{1}{4}}{\frac{1}{4}};$$
(195)

are de ned in terms of the magnetic tilt " and of a generic spectral index n which may correspond, depending on the speci c contribution, either to n_r (adiabatic spectral index), or to n_s (non-adiabatic spectral index) or even to $n_{rs} = (n_r + n_s)=2$ (spectral index of the cross-correlation). In Eq. (192) r_s , r_s , r_s and r_{sb} are the correlation angles. In the absence of magnetic and non-adiabatic contributions and for Eqs. (192) and Eq. (193) in ply that for

 $n_r = 1$ (Harrison-Zeldovich spectrum) '('+1)C = A = 25 and W M AP data [130] would in ply that $A = 2.65 = 10^{-9}$. Consider then the physical situation where on top of the adiabatic m ode there is a magnetic contribution. If there is no correlation between the magnetized contribution and the adiabatic contribution, i.e. $b_r = -2$, the SW plateau will be enhanced in comparison with the case when magnetic elds are absent. The same estuation arises when the two components are anti-correlated (i.e. $\cos_{br} < 0$). However, if the uctuations are positively correlated (i.e. $\cos_{br} < 0$) the cross-correlation adds negatively to the sum of the two autocorrelations of and $_B$ so that the total result m ay be an overall reduction of the power with respect to the case $b_r = -2$. In Eq. (193),(194) and (195) $k_0 = -0^{-1}$ where $_0$ is the present observation time.

4.4 Num erical analysis

The main idea of the num erical analysis is rather simple. Its implementation, how ever, may be rather complicated. In order to capture the simplicity out of the possible complications we will proceed as follows. We will rst discuss a rather naive approach to the integration of CMB anisotropies. Then, building up on this example, the results obtainable in the case of magnetized scalar modes will be illustrated.

Sim plest toy m odel

Let us therefore apply the O ccam razor and let us consider the simplest situation we can imagine, that is to say the case where

- magnetic elds are absent;
- neutrinos are absent;
- photons and baryons are described within the tight-coupling approximation to lowest order (i.e. $_{\rm T}$! 1);

initial conditions are set either from the adiabatic mode or from the CDM - radiation mode.

This is clearly the simplest situation we can envisage. Since neutrinos are absent there is no source of anisotropic stress and the two longitudinal uctuations of the metric are equal, i.e. = . Consequently, the system of equations to be solved becomes

$$R^{0} = \frac{k^{2} c_{s}^{2} H}{H^{2} H^{0}} \qquad \frac{H}{p_{t} + t} P_{had}; \qquad (196)$$

$$^{0} = 2H \frac{H^{0}}{H} H \frac{H^{0}}{H} R;$$
 (197)

$$^{0} = 4 \quad ^{0} \quad \frac{4}{3} \quad _{b};$$
 (198)

Magnetic elds, strings and cosm ology 63

$${}^{0}_{b} = \frac{HR_{b}}{R_{b}+1} {}^{b} + \frac{k^{2}}{4(1+R_{b})} + k^{2} ; \qquad (199)$$

$$c_{2}^{0} = 3^{0} c_{3}$$
 (200)

$${}_{c}^{0} = H_{c} + k^{2}$$
 : (201)

W e can now use the explicit form of the scale factor discussed in Eq. (178) which implies:

$$H = \frac{1}{1} \frac{2(x + 1)}{x(x + 2)};$$

$$H^{0} = \frac{2}{1} \frac{x^{2} + 2x + 4}{x^{2}(x + 2)^{2}};$$

$$H^{2} = H^{0} = \frac{1}{1} \frac{2(3x^{2} + 6x + 4)}{x^{2}(x + 2)^{2}};$$
(202)

where x = -1.W ith these speci cations the evolution equations given in (196) { (201) become

$$\frac{dR}{dx} = \frac{4}{3} \frac{x (x + 1) (x + 2)}{(3x^2 + 6x + 4)^2}$$
; (203)

$$\frac{d}{dx} = \frac{3x^2 + 6x + 4}{x(x+1)(x+2)}R = \frac{5x^2 + 10x + 6}{x(x+1)(x+2)};$$
(204)

$$\frac{d}{dx} = \frac{4(3x^2 + 6x + 4)}{x(x+1)(x+2)}R \qquad \frac{4(5x^2 + 10x + 6)}{x(x+1)(x+2)} \qquad \frac{4}{3} \sim \frac{1}{5}; \quad (205)$$

$$\frac{d^{\sim}_{b}}{dx} = \frac{2R_{b}}{R_{b}+1}\frac{(x+1)}{x(x+2)} + \frac{2}{4(1+R_{b})} + \frac{2}{x(x+2)};$$
 (206)

$$\frac{d_{c}}{dx} = \frac{3(3x^{2} + 6x + 4)}{x(x + 1)(x + 2)}R \qquad \frac{3(5x^{2} + 10x + 6)}{x(x + 1)(x + 2)} \qquad \tilde{c}; \qquad (207)$$

$$\frac{d\tilde{c}}{dx} = \frac{2(x+1)}{x(x+2)}\tilde{c} + \frac{2}{x(x+2)}$$
(208)

In Eqs. (203) { (208) the following rescalings have been used:

$$= k_{1}; \quad \sim_{b} = 1_{b}; \quad \sim_{c} = 1_{c}:$$
 (209)

The system of equations (203) { (208) can be readily integrated by giving initial conditions for at x_i 1. In the case of the adiabatic mode (which is the one contem plated by Eqs. (203) { (208) since we set $p_{had} = 0$) the initial conditions are as follows

$$R (x_{i}) = R ; \qquad (x_{i}) = \frac{2}{3}R ;$$

$$(x_{i}) = 2 ; \qquad \sim_{b} (x_{i}) = 0;$$

$$C (x_{i}) = \frac{3}{2} ; \qquad \sim_{c} (x_{i}) = 0: \qquad (210)$$

It can be shown by direct num erical integration that the system (203) { (208) gives a reasonable sem i-quantitative description of the acoustic oscillations. To simplify initial conditions even further we can indeed assume a at Harrison-Zeldovich spectrum and set R = 1.

The same philosophy used to get to this simplied form can be used to integrate the full system. In this case, however, we would miss the important contribution of polarization since, to zeroth order in the tight-coupling expansion, the CMB is not polarized.

Integration of brightness perturbations

To discuss the polarization, we have to go (at least) to rst-order in the tight coupling expansion [157, 158, 159]. For this purpose, it is appropriate to introduce the evolution equations of the brightness perturbations of the I, Q and U Stokes parameters characterizing the radiation edd. Since the Stokes parameters Q and U are not invariant under rotations about the axis of propagation the degree of polarization $P = (Q^2 + U^2)^{1=2}$ is custom arily introduced [159, 160]. The relevant brightness perturbations will then be denoted as $_{I}$, $_{P}$. This description, reproduces, to zeroth order in the tight coupling expansion, the uid equations that have been presented before to set initial conditions prior to equality. For instance, the photon density contrast and the divergence of the photon peculiar velocity are related, respectively, to the monopole and to the dipole of the brightness perturbation of the intensity eld, i.e. $= 4_{ID}$ and $= 3k_{II}$. The evolution equations of the brightness

perturbations can then be written, within the conventions set by Eq. (89)

$${}^{0}_{I}$$
 + (ik + 0) ${}_{I}$ + ik = 0 + ${}^{0}_{I0}$ + ${}^{V}_{b}$ $\frac{1}{2}P_{2}$ () S_{P} ; (211)

$${}^{0}_{P}$$
 + (ik + 0) ${}_{P}$ = $\frac{{}^{0}}{2}$ [1 P_{2} ()]S_P; (212)

$$v_{b}^{0} + H v_{b} + ik + \frac{ik}{4R_{b}} \begin{bmatrix} B & 4_{B} \end{bmatrix} + \frac{0}{R_{b}} (v_{b} + 3i_{II}) = 0;$$
 (213)

Equation (213) is nothing but the second relation obtained in Eq. (140) having introduced the quantity $ikv_b = b$. The source terms appearing in Eqs. (211) and (212) include a dependence on $P_2() = (3 \ ^2 \ 1)=2$ (P.() denotes, in this fram ew ork, the '-th Legendre polynom ial); $; = \hat{k} \quad \hat{n}$ is simply the projection of the Fourier wave-num ber on the direction of the photon momentum. In Eqs. (211) and (212) the source term S_P is denoted as

$$S_{P}(k;) = I_{2}(k;) + P_{0}(k;) + P_{2}(k;):$$
 (214)

The evolution equations in the tight coupling approximation will now be integrated num erically. More details on the tight coupling expansion in the presence of a magnetized contribution can be found in [136].

The norm alization of the numerical calculation is enforced by evaluating, analytically, the Sachs W olfe plateau and by deducing, for a given set of spectral indices of curvature and entropy perturbations, the am plitude of the power spectra at the pivot scale. Here is an example of this strategy. The Sachs W olfe (SW) plateau can be estimated analytically from the evolution equation of R (or) by using the technique of the transferm atrix appropriately generalized to the case where, on top of the adiabatic and non-adiabatic contributions the magnetic elds are consistently taken into account. The main result is expressed by Eq. (192).

If the SW plateau is determ ined by an adiabatic component supplemented by a (subleading) non-adiabatic contribution both correlated with the magnetic eld intensity the obtainable bound may not be so constraining (even well above the nG range) due to the proliferation of param eters. A possible strategy is therefore to x the parameters of the adiabatic mode to the values determ ined by W MAP-3 and then explore the e ect of a magnetized contribution which is not correlated with the adiabatic mode. This implies, in Eq. (192) that $A_s = 0$ and br = -2. Under this assumption, in Figs. 8 and 9 the bounds on B_{L} are illustrated. The nature of the constraint depends, in this case, both on the amplitude of the protogalactic eld (at the present epoch and sm oothed over a typical com oving scale $L = 2 = k_L$) and upon its spectral slope, i.e. ". In the case " < 0.5 the magnetic energy spectrum is nearly scale-invariant. In this case, di usivity e ects are negligible (see, for instance, [19, 125]). As already discussed, if " 1 the di usivity e ects (both therm aland m agnetic) dom in ate the m ode-coupling integral that lead to the magnetic energy spectrum [19, 125].

In Fig.8 the magnetic eld intensity should be below the di erent curves if the adiabatic contribution dom inates the SW plateau.Di erent choices of the pivot scale k_p and of the sm oothing scale k_L , are also illustrated. In Fig.8



Fig. 8. Bounds on the protogalactic eld intensity as a function of the magnetic spectral index " for di erent values of the parameters de ning the adiabatic contribution to the SW plateau.

the scalar spectral index is xed to $n_r = 0.951$ [131]. In Fig. 9 the two curves corresponding, respectively, to $n_r = 0.8$ and $n_r = 1$ are reported.



Fig. 9. Same plot as in Fig. 8 but with emphasis on the variation of n_r .

If " < 0.2 the bounds are com paratively less restrictive than in the case " ' 0:9. The cause of this occurrence is that we are here just looking at the largest wavelengths of the problem .As it will become clear in a moment, interm ediate scales will be more sensitive to the presence of fully inhom ogeneous magnetic elds.

A coording to F igs. 8 and 9 for a given value of the m agnetic spectral index and of the scalar spectral index the am plitude of the m agnetic eld has to be su ciently sm all not to a ect the dom inant adiabatic nature of the SW plateau. Therefore F igs. 8 and 9 (as well as other sim ilar plots) can be used to norm alize the num erical calculations for the power spectra of the brightness perturbations, i.e.

$$\frac{k^{3}}{2^{2}} j_{I}(k;)^{2}; \qquad \frac{k^{3}}{2^{2}} j_{P}(k;)^{2}; \qquad \frac{k^{3}}{2^{2}} j_{I}(k;) p(k;)^{2}; \qquad (215)$$

Let us then assume, for consistency with the cases reported in Figs. 8 and 9, that we are dealing with the situation where the magnetic eld is not correlated with the adiabatic mode. It is then possible to choose a de nite value of the magnetic spectral index (for instance = 0:1) and a de nite value of the adiabatic spectral index, i.e. n_r (for instance $n_r = 0.951$, in agreement with [131]). By using the SW plateau the normalization can be chosen in such a way the the adiabatic mode dom inates over the magnetic contribution. In the mentioned case, Fig. 8 in plies $B_L < 1:14 = 10^{-8}$ G for a pivot scale $k_p = 0.002$ M pc⁻¹. Since the relative weight of the power spectra given in Eqs. (187) and (188) is xed, it is now possible to set initial conditions for the adiabatic mode according to Eqs. (161) { (163), (164) { (166) and (169) deep in the radiation-dom inated phase. The initial time of integration will be

chosen as $_{i} = 10^{6}_{1}$ in the notations discussed in Eq. (178). According to Eq. (179), this choice in plies that $_{i}$ eq.

The power spectra of the brightness perturbations, i.e. Eq. (215), can be then computed by numerical integration. C learly the calculation will depend upon the values of $!_m$, $!_b$, $!_c$ and R. We will simply x these parameters to their ducial values reported in Eqs. (181) (see also (147)) and we will take N = 3 in Eq. (162) determining, in this way the fractional contribution of the neutrinos to the radiation plasm a.

The rst interesting exercise, for the present purposes, is reported in Fig. 10 where the power spectra of the brightness perturbations are illustrated for a wave-number $k = 0.1 \text{ M pc}^{-1}$. Concerning the results reported in Fig. 10 di erent comments are in order:

for " = 0.1 and p = 0.951, the SW plateau in poses $B_L < 1.14 = 10^8 G$; from Fig.10 it follows that a magnetic eld of only 30 nG (i.e. marginally incompatible with the SW bound) has a large e ect on the brightness perturbations as it can be argued by comparing, in Fig. 10, the dashed curves (corresponding to 30 nG) to the full curves which illustrate the case of vanishing magnetic els;

the situation where $\underline{B} > nG$ cannot be simply sum marized by saying that the amplitudes of the power spectra get larger since there is a combined e ect which both increases the amplitudes and shifts slightly the phases of the oscillations;

from the qualitative point of view, it is still true that the intensity oscillates as a cosine, the polarization as a sine;

the phases of the cross-correlations are, com paratively, the most a ected by the presence of the magnetic $\mbox{ eld}$.

The features arising in Fig. 10 can be easily illustrated for other values of and for di erent choices of the pivot or sm oothing scales. The general lesson that can be drawn is that the constraint derived only by looking at the SW plateau are only a necessary condition on the strength of the magnetic edd. They are, however, not su cient to exclude observable e ects at sm aller scales. This aspect is illustrated in the plot at the left in Fig. 11 which captures a detail of the cross-correlation. The case when $B_L = 0$ can be still distinguished from the case $B_L = 0.5$ nG. Therefore, recalling that for the same choice of param eters the SW plateau in plied that $B_L < 11.4$ nG, it is apparent that the interm ediate scales lead to m ore stringent conditions even for nearly scale-invariant spectra of magnetic energy density. For the range of param eters of Fig. 11 we will have that $B_L < 0.5$ nG which is more stringent than the condition deduced from the SW plateau by, roughly, one order of magnitude.

If "increases to higher values (but always with " < 0.5) by keeping xed B_L (i.e. the strength of the magnetic eld smoothed over a typical length scale $L = 2 = k_L$) the amplitude of the brightness perturbations gets larger in comparison with the case when the magnetic eld is absent. This aspect is illustrated in the bottom plot of Fig. 11 where the logarithm (to base 10)



Fig. 10. The power spectra of the brightness perturbations for a typical wavenumber k = 0.1M pc⁻¹. The values of the parameters are specified in the legends. The pivot scale is $k_p = 0.002$ M pc⁻¹ and the sm oothing scale is $k_L = M$ pc⁻¹ (see Figs. 8 and 9).



F ig.11.A detail of the cross-correlation (top). The autocorrelation of the intensity at $_{dec}$ as a function of ", i.e. the magnetic spectral index (bottom).

of the intensity autocorrelation is evaluated at a xed wave-number (and at $_{dec}$) as a function of ". The full line (corresponding to a $B_L = 10 \text{ nG}$) is progressively divergent from the dashed line (corresponding to $B_L = 0$) as " increases.

In Fig.12 the power spectra of the brightness perturbations are reported at $_{\rm dec}$ and as a function of k. In the two plots at the top the autocorrelation of the intensity is reported for di erent values of B $_{\rm L}$ (left plot) and for different values of " at xed B $_{\rm L}$ (right plot). In the two plots at the bottom the polarization power spectra are reported always at $_{\rm dec}$ and for di erent values of B $_{\rm L}$ at xed ". The position of the rst peak of the autocorrelation of the intensity is, approximately, $k_{\rm d}$ ' 0:017 M pc 1 . The position of the rst peak of the cross-correlation is, approximately, 3=4 of $k_{\rm d}$. From this consideration, again, we can obtain that $B_{\rm L}$ < 0:3 nG which is more constraining than the SW condition.

Up to now the adiabatic mode has been considered in detail. We could easily add, how ever, non-adiabatic modes that are be partially correlated with the adiabatic mode. It is rather plausible, in this situation, that by adding

new parameters, also the allowed value of the magnetic eld may increase. Similar results can be achieved by deviating from the assumption that the magnetic eld and the curvature perturbations are uncorrelated. This aspect can be understood already from the analytical form of the SW plateau (192). If there is no correlation between the magnetized contribution and the adiabatic contribution, i.e. $_{\rm br}$ = =2, the SW plateau will be enhanced in comparison with the case when magnetic elds are absent. The same esituation arises when the two components are anti-correlated (i.e. $\cos b_{\rm tr} < 0$). However, if the uctuations are positively correlated (i.e. $\cos b_{\rm tr} > 0$) the cross-correlation adds negatively to the sum of the two autocorrelations of R and B so that the total result may be an overall reduction of the power with respect to the case $b_{\rm tr} = =2$.



F ig. 12. The power spectra of the brightness perturbations at $_{\rm dec}$ for the parameters reported in the legends.

From Fig.12 various features can be appreciated. The presence of magnetic elds, as already pointed out, does not a ect only the amplitude but also the phases of oscillations of the various brightness perturbations. Moreover, an increase in the spectral index " also implies a quantitative di erence in the intensity autocorrelation.

5 Concluding rem arks

There is little doubts that large-scale magnetic exist in nature. These elds have been observed in a number of di erent astrophysical system s. The main question concerns therefore their origin. String cosm obgicalm odels of pre-big bang type still represent a viable and wellm otivated theoretical option.

Simple logic dictates that if the origin of the large-scale magnetic elds is primordial (as opposed to astrophysical) it is plausible to expect the presence of magnetic elds in the primeval plasma also before the decoupling of radiation from matter. CMB anisotropies are germane to several aspect of large-scale magnetization. CMB physics may be the tool that will nally enable us either to con m or to rule out the primordial nature of galactic and clusters magnetic elds seeds. In the next we to ten years the forthcom ing CMB precision polarization experiments will be sensitive in, various frequency channels between 30 G H z and, roughly 900 G H z. The observations will be conducted both via satellites (like the P lanck satellite) and via ground based detectors (like in the case of the Q U IET arrays). In a com plem entary view, the SK A telescope will provide full-sky surveys of Faraday rotation that may even get close to 20 G H z.

In an optim istic perspective the forthcom ing experimental data together with the steady progress in the understanding of the dynam o theory willhopefully explain the rationale for the ubiquitous nature of large-scale magnetization. In a pessimistic perspective, the primordial nature of magnetic seeds will neither be con meed nor ruled out. It is wise to adopt a model-independent approach by sharpening those theoretical tools that may allow, in the near future, a direct observational test of the elects of large-scale magnetic elds on CMB anisotropies. Som ele orts along this perspective have been reported in the present lecture. In particular, the following results have been achieved:

scalar CMB anisotropies have been described in the presence of a fully inhom ogeneous magnetic eld;

the employed formalism allows the extension of the usual CMB initial conditions to the case when large-scale magnetic elds are present in the game;

by going to higher order in the tight coupling expansion the evolution of the brightness perturbations has been computed num erically;

it has been shown that the magnetic elds may a ect not only the amplitude but also the relative phases of the D oppler oscillations;

from the analysis of the cross-correlation power spectra it is possible to distinguish, num erically, the e ects of a magnetic eld as smallas 0.5 nG.

It is interesting to notice that a magnetic eld in the range 10 10 {10 11 G is still viable according to the present considerations. It is, therefore, not excluded that large-scale magnetic elds may come from a primordial eld of the order of 0:1-0:01 nG present prior to gravitational collapse of the protogalaxy. Such a eld, depending upon the details of the gravitational collapse may be

ampli ed to the observable level by compressional ampli cation. The present problem s in achieving a large dynam o ampli cation m ay therefore be less relevant than for the case when the seed eld is in the range 10 $^{9}\rm nG$ = 10 $^{18}\rm nG$. To con rm this type of scenario it will be absolutely essential to introduce the magnetic eld background into the current strategies of parameter extraction.

The considerations reported in the present lecture provide already the fram ework for such an introduction. In particular, along a m inim alist perspective, the inclusion of the m agnetic eld background boils down to add two new extra-param eters: the spectral slope and am plitude of the m agnetic

eld (conventionally sm oothed over a typical com oving scale of M pc size). The m agnetic eld contribution will then slightly m odify the adiabatic paradigm by introducing, already at the level of initial conditions, a subleading non-G aussian (and quasi-adiabatic) correction.

References

- 1. H.Alfven : Arkiv.M at.F.Astr., o.Fys. 29 B, 2 (1943).
- 2. E.Ferm i: Phys.Rev.75, 1169 (1949).
- 3. H.Alfven: Phys. Rev. 75, 1732 (1949).
- 4. R.D. Richtmyer, E. Teller: Phys. Rev. 75, 1729 (1949).
- 5. W .A.Hiltner: Science 109, 165 (1949).
- 6. J.S.Hall: Science 109, 166 (1949).
- 7. L.J.D avis J.L.G reenstein: A strophys. J. 114, 206 (1951).
- 8. E. Ferm i, S. Chandrasekar: A strophys. J. 118, 113 (1953).
- 9. E. Ferm i, S. Chandrsekar: A strophys. J. 118, 116 (1953).
- 10. R.W ielebinski, J.Shakeshaft: Nature195, 982 (1962).
- 11. A.G.Lyne, F.G.Sm ith: Nature 218, 124 (1968).
- 12. A. G. Lyne, F. G. Sm ith: Pulsar Astronomy, (Cambridge University Press, Cambridge, UK, 1998).
- 13. C. Heiles: Annu. Rev. A stron. A strophys. 14, 1 (1976).
- 14. P. P.K ronberg: Rep. Prog. Phys. 57, 325 (1994).
- 15. F.Govoni, L.Feretti: Int. J.M od. Phys. D 13, 1549 (2004).
- 16. B M. Gaensler, R. Beck, L. Feretti: New Astron. Rev. 48, 1003 (2004).
- 17. Y.Xu, P.P.K ronberg, S.Habib, Q.W. Dufton: A strophys. J. 637, 19 (2006).
- 18. P. P.K ronberg : A stron. Nachr. 327, 517 (2006).
- 19. M.Giovannini: Int.J.M od.Phys.D 13, 391 (2004).
- 20. See http://www.skatelescope.org form ore inform ations.
- 21. See http://www.rssd.esa.int form ore inform ations.
- 22. M.Giovannini: Class.Quant.Grav.23,R1 (2006).
- 23. J.Bernstein, L.S.Brown and G.Feinberg: Rev.M od. Phys. 61, 25 (1989).
- 24. T.J.M Boyd, J.J.Serson: The physics of plasm as, (Cambridge University Press, Cambridge, UK, 2003).
- 25. N.A.K rall, A.W. Trivelpiece: Principles of Plasm a Physics, (San Francisco Press, San Francisco 1986).
- 26. F. Chen: Introduction to Plasm a Physics, (Plenum Press, New York 1974).
- 27. D.Biskam p: Non-linear Magnetohydrodynamics (Cambridge University Press, Cambridge, 1994).
- 28. A. V lasov: Zh. Eksp. Teor. Fiz. 8, 291 (1938); J. Phys. 9, 25 (1945).
- 29. L.D. Landau: J. Phys. U S.S.R. 10, 25 (1945).
- 30. M.Giovannini: Phys. Rev.D 71, 021301 (2005).
- 31. M.Giovannini: Phys. Rev. D 58, 124027 (1998).
- 32. E.N. Parker: Cosm ical Magnetic Fields (Clarendon Press, Oxford, 1979).
- 33. Ya.B. Zeldovich, A.A. Ruzmaikin, D.D. Sokolo: Magnetic Fields in Astrophysics (Gordon Breach Science, New York, 1983).
- 34. A.A.Ruzmaikin, A.M.Shukurov, D.D.Sokolo : Magnetic Fields of Galaxies, (K luwer A cadem ic Publisher, D ordrecht, 1988).
- 35. R.Kulsrud: Annu.Rev.Astron.Astrophys. 37, 37 (1999).
- 36. A. Lazarian, E. Vishniac, J. Cho: A strophys. J. 603, 180 (2004); Lect. Notes Phys.: 614, 376 (2003).
- 37. A.Brandenburg, K.Subram anian: Phys. Rept. 417, 1 (2005).
- 38. A. Brandenburg, A. Bigazzi, K. Subramanian: Mon. Not. Roy. A stron. Soc. 325,685 (2001).
- 39. K. Subram anian, A. Brandenburg: Phys. Rev. Lett. 93, 205001 (2004).
- 40. A. Brandenburg, K. Subram anian: Astron. Astrophys. 439, 835 (2005).
- 41. S.I.Vainshtein, Ya.B.Zeldovich: Usp.Fiz.Nauk. 106, 431 (1972).
- 42. W .H.M atthaeus, M.L.Goldstein, S.R.Lantz: Phys. Fluids 29, 1504 (1986).
- 43. M.J.Rees: Lect. Notes Phys. 664, 1 (2005).
- 44. K. Subram anian, D. Narashima, S. Chitre: Mon. Not. Roy. A stron. Soc. 271, L15 (1994).
- 45. N.Y. Gnedin, A. Ferrara, E.G. Zweibel: A strophys. J. 539, 505 (2000).
- 46. R.Kulsrud, S.erson: A strophys. J. 396, 606 (1992).
- 47. Ya. Zeldovich, I. Novikov: The structure evolution of the Universe (Chicago University Press, Chicago, 1971), Vol. 2.
- 48. Ya. Zeldovich: Sov. Phys. JETP 21, 656 (1965).
- 49. E.Harrison: Phys. Rev. Lett. 18, 1011 (1967).
- 50. E.Harrison: Phys. Rev. 167, 1170 (1968).
- 51. E.Harrison: Mon. Not. R.A str. Soc. 147, 279 (1970).
- 52. L.Bierm ann: Z.Naturf. 5A, 65 (1950).
- 53. I.M ishustin, A.Ruzm aikin: Sov. Phys. JETP 34, 223 (1972).
- 54. M.Giovannini: Phys. Rev. D 61,063004 (2000).
- 55. M.Giovannini: Phys. Rev. D 61, 063502 (2000).
- 56. G. Piccinelli, A. Ayala: Lect. Notes Phys. 646, 293 (2004).
- 57. D.Boyanovsky, H.J.de Vega, M.Sim ionato: Phys. Rev. D 67, 123505 (2003).
- 58. D. Boyanovsky, M. Simionato, H. J. de Vega: Phys. Rev. D 67, 023502 (2003).
- 59. M. Giovannini, M. E. Shaposhnikov, Phys. Rev. D 57, 2186 (1998).
- 60. K.Bam ba: arX iv hep-ph/0611152.
- 61. A. Sanchez, A. Ayala, G. Piccinelli: arX iv hep-th/0611337.
- 62. M. Giovannini, M. E. Shaposhnikov: Phys. Rev. D 62, 103512 (2000).
- 63. M. Giovannini, M. Shaposhnikov: Proc. of CAPP2000 (July 2000, Verbier Switzerland) eprint Archive [hep-ph/0011105].
- 64. E. Calzetta, A. Kus, F. Mazzitelli: Phys. Rev. D, 57, 7139 (1998).
- 65. A.Kus, E.Calzetta, F.Mazzitelli, C.Wagner: PhysLett. B 472, 287 (2000).
- 66. M.S.Turner, L.M.W idrow: Phys. Rev.D 37, 2734 (1988).
- 67. B.Ratra: A strophys. J. Lett. 391, L1 (1992).
- 68. A.Dolgov: Phys. Rev. D 48, 2499 (1993).
- 69. I.D rum m ond, S.H athrell: PhysRev.D 22, 343 (1980).

- 74 Massim o Giovannini
- 70. S.Carroll, G.Field, R.Jackiw: Phys. Rev. D 41, 1231 (1990).
- 71. W.D.Garretson, G.Field, S.Carroll: Phys. Rev. D 46, 5346 (1992).
- 72. G.Field, S.Carroll Phys. Rev. D: 62, 103008 (2000).
- 73. M.Giovannini: Phys. Rev. D 64, 061301 (2001).
- 74. K. Bam ba, J. Yokoyam a, e-print A rchive [astro-ph/0310824].
- 75. M .Gasperini, Phys. Rev. D 63, 047301 (2001)
- 76. L.Okun, Sov. Phys. JETP 56, 502 (1982).
- 77. O.Bertolam iD.M ota, Phys.Lett.B 455, 96 (1999).
- 78. M. Giovannini, Phys. Rev. D 62, 123505 (2000).
- 79. L.H.Ford, PhysRev.D 31, 704 (1985).
- 80. M. Gasperini, M. Giovannini, G. Veneziano: Phys. Rev. Lett. 75, 3796 (1995).
- 81. M. Gasperini, M. Giovannini, G. Veneziano: Phys. Rev. D 52, 6651 (1995).
- 82. M. Gasperini, M. Giovannini: Phys. Rev. D 47, 1519 (1993).
- 83. H.Yuen: Phys. Rev. A 13, 2226 (1976).
- 84. A.O.Barut, L.Girardello:Commun.Math.Phys.21,41 (1971).
- 85. D.Stoler: Phys. Rev. D 1, 3217 (1970); D.Stoler: Phys. Rev. D 4, 2309 (1971).
- 86. S. Fubini, A. Molinari: Nucl. Phys. Proc. Suppl. 33C, 60 (1993).
- 87. R.Loudon: J.M od. Opt. 34, 709 (1987).
- 88. R. Loudon: The quantum theory of light (Clarendon Press, Oxford, 1983).
- 89. B.L.Schum aker: Phys. Rept. 135, 318 (1986).
- 90. L. M andel, E. W olf: Optical coherence and quantum optics, (Cambridge University Press, Cambridge UK, 1995).
- 91. G. Veneziano: Phys. Lett. B 265, 287 (1991).
- 92. M. Gasperini, G. Veneziano: A stropart. Phys. 1, 317 (1993).
- 93. M. Gasperini, G. Veneziano: Phys. Rept. 373, 1 (2003).
- 94. C.Lovelace: Phys.Lett.B 135, 75 (1984).
- 95. E. Fradkin, A. Tseytlin: Nucl. Phys. B 261, 1 (1985)
- 96. C.Callan at al: Nucl.Phys.B 262, 593 (1985).
- 97. M. Gasperini, M. Giovannini, G. Veneziano: Phys. Lett. B 569, 113 (2003).
- 98. M. Gasperini, M. Giovannini, G. Veneziano: Nucl. Phys. B 694, 206 (2004).
- 99. K.A.Meissner, G.Veneziano: Mod. Phys. Lett. A 6, 3397 (1991).
- 100. K.A.MeissnerG.Veneziano:Phys.Lett.B 267, 33 (1991).
- 101. M. Gasperini, J. Maharana, G. Veneziano: Nucl. Phys. B 472, 349 (1996).
- 102. M . G iovannini: C lass. Q uant. G rav. 21, 4209 (2004).
- 103. M. Gasperini, M. Giovannini: Phys. Rev. D 47, 1519 (1993).
- 104. M. Gasperini, M. Giovannini: Phys. Lett. B 301, 334 (1993).
- 105. M. Giovannini: Phys. Rev. D 61, 087306 (2000).
- 106. R. Brustein, M. Gasperini, M. Giovannini, G. Veneziano, Phys. Lett. B 361, 45 (1995).
- 107. R. Brustein, M. Gasperini, M. Giovannini, V. F. Mukhanov, G. Veneziano, Phys. Rev. D 51, 6744 (1995).
- 108. K.Enqvist M.S.Sloth:Nucl.Phys.B 626, 395 (2002); M.S.Sloth:Nucl.Phys.B 656, 239 (2003).
- 109. V.Bozza, M.Gasperini, M.Giovannini, G.Veneziano: Phys.Rev.D 67 (2003) 063514.

V.Bozza, M.Gasperini, M.Giovannini, G.Veneziano: Phys.Lett.B 543, 14 (2002).

- 110. P.A stone et al.: A stron. A strophys. 351, 811 (1999).
- 111. Ph.Bernard, G.Gemme, R.Parodi, E.Picasso: Rev.Sci.Instrum. 72, 2428 (2001).

Magnetic elds, strings and cosm ology

- 112. A.M. Cruise: Class. Quantum Grav. 17, 2525 (2000);
- A.M.Cruise: Mon.Not.R.Astron.Soc 204, 485 (1983).
- 113. D. Babusci and M. Giovannini: Int.J. M od. Phys. D 10 477 (2001);
 - D.Babusci and M.Giovannini: Class.Quant.Grav.17,2621 (2000).
- 114. P.J.E. Peebles, A.Vilenkin: Phys. Rev. D 59, 063505 (1999).
- 115. M .G iovannini: C lass.Q uant.G rav. 16, 2905 (1999);
 - M.Giovannini:Phys.Rev.D 60,123511 (1999).
 - D.Babusciand M.Giovannini:Phys.Rev.D 60,083511 (1999);
 - M.Giovannini:Phys.Rev.D 58,083504 (1998).
- 116. M. Gasperini, S. Nicotri: e-print [hep-th/0511039].
- 117. R.Beck: A stron N achr. 327, 512 (2006).
- 118. R.Beck, A.Brenburg, D.Moss, A.Skhurov, D.Sokolo : Annu.Rev.Astron. Astrophys. 34, 155 (1996).
- 119. J.Vallee: A strophys. J. 566, 261 (2002).
- 120. E.Battaner, E.Florido: Mon. Not. R.Astron. Soc 277, 1129 (1995).
- 121. E. Battaner, E. Florido, J. Jim enez-V incente: A stron A strophys. 326, 13 (1997).
- 122. E. Florido, E. Battaner: A stron A strophys. 327, 1 (1997).
- 123. E.Florido, et al.: arX iv astro-ph/0609384.
- 124. E.Battaner, E.Florido, Fund. Cosm ic Phys. 21, 1 (2000).
- 125. K. Subram anian: A stron N achr. 327, 399 (2006).
- 126. M .G iovannini:Class.Quant.Grav.23,R1 (2006).
- 127. A. Brandenburg, K. Subram anian: Phys. Rept. 417, 1 (2005);
 A. Lazarian, E. Vishniac, J. Cho: A strophys. J. 603, 180 (2004); Lect. Notes Phys. 614, 376 (2003).
- 128. J.Barrow, K. Subram anian: Phys. Rev. Lett. 81, 3575 (1998);
 - J.Barrow, K.Subramanian: Phys.Rev.D 58,83502 (1998);
 - C.T sagas, R.M aartens: Phys. Rev.D 61, 083519 (2000);
 - A.Mack, T.Kahniashvili, A.Kosowsky: Phys. Rev. D 65, 123004 (2002);
 - A.Lewis: Phys.Rev.D 70,043518 (2004);
 - T.Kahniashvili, B.Ratra: Phys. Rev. D 71, 103006 (2005).
- 129. G.Chen et al: A strophys. J. 611, 655 (2004);
 - P.D. Naælsky et al.: A strophys.J. 615, 45 (2004); L.Y. Chiang, P.Naælsky: Int.J.M od.Phys.D 14, 1251 (2005);
 - L.Y.Chiang, P.D.Naselsky, O.V.Verkhodanov, M.J.W ay: A strophys.J. 590, L65 (2003);
 - D.G.Yam azakiet al.: A strophys. J. 625, L1 (2005).
- 130. H. V. Peiris et al., [W MAP Collaboration]: A strophys. J. Suppl. 148, 213 (2003).
- 131. D. Spergelet al. [W MAP Collaboration]: arX iv astro-ph/0603449.
- 132. K. Enqvist, H. Kurki-Suonio J. Valiviita: Phys. Rev. D 62, 103003 (2000).
- 133. H.Kurki-Suonio, V.M uhonen J.Valiviita: Phys. Rev. D 71,063005 (2005).
- 134. K. Moodley, M. Bucher, J. Dunkley, P.G. Ferreira C. Skordis: Phys. Rev. D 70, 103520 (2004).
- 135. M.Giovannini: Phys. Rev. D 73, 101302 (2006).
- 136. M. Giovannini: Phys. Rev. D 74, 063002 (2006).
- 137. M. Giovannini: Class. Quant. Grav. 23, 4991 (2006).
- 138. J.D. Barrow, R.M. aartens, C.G.T sagas: arX iv astro-ph/0611537.
- 139. T.Kahniashvili, B.Ratra: arX iv astro-ph/0611247.

75

- 76 Massim o Giovannini
- 140. E.Harrison: Rev.M od. Phys. 39,862 (1967).
- 141. J.M .Bardeen: Phys.Rev.D 22, 1882 (1980).
- 142. C.-P.M a E.Bertschinger: A strophys. J. 455, 7 (1995).
- 143. M.Giovannini:Phys.Rev.D 70,123507 (2004).
- 144. M .G iovannini: Int.J.M od.Phys.D 14, 363 (2005).
- 145. M .Giovannini:Phys.Rev.D 71,021301 (2005).
- 146. J.Bardeen, P.Steinhardt, M.Turner: Phys. Rev. D 28, 679 (1983).
- 147. R.Brandenberger, R.Kahn, W.Press: Phys.Rev.D 28, 1809 (1983).
- 148. M .G iovannini: Phys. Lett. B 622, 349 (2005).
- 149. M .G iovannini:Class.Quant.Grav.22, 5243 (2005).
- 150. W .Hu N. Sugiyam a: A strophys. J. 444, 489 (1995); ibid. 471, 30 (1996).
- 151. H. V. Peiris et al. [M M A P collaboration]: A strophys. J. Suppl. 148, 213 (2003).
- 152. L. Page et al. [M M A P collaboration]: arX iv astro-ph/0603450.
- 153. A.G.Riess et al, Astrophys. J. 607, 665 (2005).
- 154. P.A stier et al, astro-ph/0510447.
- 155. P.Naselsky, I.Novikov: A strophys. J. 413, 14 (1993).
- 156. H. Jorgensen, E. Kotok, P. Naælsky, IN ovikov: A stron. A strophys. 294, 639 (1995).
- 157. P.J.E. Peebles, J.T. Yu: A strophys. J. 162, 815 (1970).
- 158. A.G.Doroshkevich, Ya.B.Zeldovich, R.A.Sunyaev: Sov.Astron. 22, 523 (1978).
- 159. M. Zaldarriaga D. D. Harari: Phys. Rev. D 52 (1995) 3276.
- 160. S. Chandrasekar: Radiative Transfer, (Dover, New York, US, 1966).