

# ANTIGRAVITATING BUBBLES WITH THE NON-MINKOWSKIAN ASYMPTOTICS

Andro BARNAVELI and Merab GOGBERASHVILI

Institute of Physics of the Georgian Academy of Sciences,  
Tamarashvili str. 6, Tbilisi 380077, Republic of Georgia.  
(E-mail: barbi@iberiapac.ge ; gogber@physics.iberiapac.ge ).

## Abstract

The conventional approach describes the spherical domain walls by the same state equation as the flat ones. In such case they also must be gravitationally repulsive, what is seemingly in contradiction with Birkhoff's theorem. However this theorem is not valid for the solutions which do not display Minkowski geometry in the infinity.

In this paper the solution of Einstein equations describing the stable gravitationally repulsive spherical domain wall is considered within the thin-wall formalism for the case of the non-Minkowskian asymptotics.

For the last two decades great attention has been paid to the investigation of gravitational properties of topological structures such as domain walls, strings and monopoles. It was obtained, that cosmic strings do not produce any gravitational force on the surrounding matter locally while global monopoles, global strings and planar domain walls exhibited repulsive nature [1, 2, 3]. In this paper we shall consider some problems which arose at studying the gravitational properties of spherical domain walls and show the existence of the solution of Einstein's equations corresponding to a stable gravitationally repulsive spherical domain wall.

It is assumed, that the flat domain walls are described by the state equation [1]:

$$\sigma = p = \text{const}; \quad (1)$$

where  $\sigma$  is the surface density and  $p$  is the strong tension in two spatial directions. This state equation corresponds to de Sitter's expansion in the wall-plane and the borders of the wall running away with the horizon. One can speak about the gravitational field of the wall only in the normal direction to the wall. If, for such objects, it is possible to use Newtonian approximation with the mass described by Tolman's formula

$$M = \int_0^Z (T_0^0 - T_1^1 - T_2^2 - T_3^3) \rho \, g dV = \int_0^Z (\sigma + 2p) \rho \, g dV = \int_0^Z \rho \, g dV; \quad (2)$$

then the tension  $p$  acts as a repulsive source of gravity and the planar domain wall has a negative gravitational mass exhibiting repulsive gravitational field [1].

It is natural to think that the same behavior (gravitational repulsion) must occur for the spherical domain walls (bubbles), since usually it is assumed that they are described by the same state equations (1) (e.g. see [4, 5]). On the other hand, according to Birkhoff's theorem, the empty space, surrounding any spherical body (including bubbles), is described by Schwarzschild metric. This metric contains the parameter  $m$  (corresponding to the mass of gravitating body)

$$m = - \int_0^{\infty} T_0^0 p \, dV; \quad (3)$$

which independently of the state equation is positive. While for planar domain walls (stretching the horizon) the negative gravitational mass (2) can be admissible, for bubbles the negativeness of mass (3) from the first glance looks surprising, since  $T_0^0$  is positively defined everywhere.

The above-mentioned problem emerged also when investigating bubble dynamics within the thin-wall formalism [6]. It was obtained that active gravitational mass of the spherical domain wall is positive, i.e. its gravitational field is attractive [4, 5, 7]. The disagreements in gravitational properties of planar and spherical domain walls were explained by instability of the latter [5], or by existence of a positive energy source stabilizing the bubble [7]. However there still remain various paradoxes (appearing in the models with large pressure [5, 8, 9]) which can be solved only if bubbles with the state equation (1) are repulsive.

The negative mass problem can be solved by the assumption that domain walls are not described by the state equation (1). One must take into account the flux out from the volume of integration, or some external forces stabilizing the domain wall. As a result a state equation can have a principally different form and both the spherical and planar walls can be gravitationally attractive. The other possible solution of discrepancy may be the assumption that the planar domain walls are described by the state equation (1) while the bubbles are not.

Recently we have investigated the bubble dynamics within the thin-wall formalism when the state equation for spherical domain walls nevertheless has the form (1). We have found a solution describing repulsive spherical domain walls without the Schwarzschild geometry [11], but only in the case when the time coordinate changes its direction on the wall-surface.

In this paper we consider the different case, when the domain walls are described by the state equation (1), the time flow has the same direction in whole space, however the metric far from the spherical domain wall is not Minkowskian. We show that in such case there also exists a solution of the Einstein equations which corresponds to a gravitationally repulsive stable bubble.

The assumption about non-Minkowskian asymptotics is reasonable, since in the case of spherical domain walls it is impossible to surround the full source by any

boundary inside the horizon (just as it is for planar domain walls). The domain wall is only the "part" of the scalar field solution which fills the whole Universe up to horizon and which has a nonzero vacuum expectation value even in the infinity. The result is that the quantity  $\int_R T_{00} dS$  is not a 4-vector of energy-momentum and one can not define the energy simply as  $\int T_{00} dx dy dz$ . For example, the energy density of an expanding spherical domain wall remains constant (see (1)) despite increasing of its surface, i.e., this object "takes" the energy from vacuum.

In pure Einstein's theory it has been proved that the total energy carried by an isolated system, generating an asymptotic Minkowski geometry, is positive [10]. Due to the essential role played by the asymptotic condition this theorem can not be applied to solutions of Einstein's theory which do not display a Minkowskian asymptotic structure. In order to demonstrate that the sign of the gravitational potential depends on the asymptotic geometry let us consider the zero-zero component of the metric tensor for the isolated source in Newton's approximation

$$g_{00} = g_{00}^1 + \phi;$$

where  $g_{00}^1$  is the asymptotic value of metric tensor and

$$\phi = g_{00} - g_{00}^1 \quad (4)$$

is Newton's potential.

When far from the source we have Minkowskian geometry, then  $g_{00}^1$  reaches the maximal value, 1, and, since  $g_{00} < 1$ ,  $\phi$  is always negative, i.e., we have gravitational attraction. For non-Minkowskian asymptotics, when  $g_{00}^1 < 1$ ; Newton's potential (4) can be positive or zero depending on the state equation of the source. The examples of sources with non-Minkowskian asymptotics and with unusual gravitational behavior, as it was mentioned above, are topological objects [1, 2, 3].

Since the exact solution of the coupling Einstein-Higgs equations for the spherically domain wall is unknown we shall work within the thin-wall formalism. Then Einstein's equations describing motion of spherical domain walls in the case when the time flow has the same direction in whole space have the form [4, 6]:

$$\frac{\ddot{r}}{f_+ + R^2} - \frac{\dot{r}^2}{f_- + R^2} = -GR; \quad (5)$$

where  $\ddot{r} = d^2r/d\tau^2$  and  $f_{\pm}$  are the zero-zero components of the metric tensor in the outer and inner regions of the bubble;  $G$  is the gravitational constant,  $R$  is the bubble radius and the overdot denotes the derivative with respect to proper time  $\tau$  on the shell.

Let us investigate a general case of a spherically symmetrical charged bubble, when the metric outside the bubble is

$$f_{\pm} = 1 - \frac{2Gm}{r} - \frac{Ge^2}{r^2} - G_+ r^2;$$

while inside we have

$$f = 1 - G r^2;$$

where  $\frac{8}{3}$ , being the vacuum energy density in the outer and inner regions. The parameters  $m$  and  $e$  are the Schwarzschild mass and the charge of the shell, respectively, and  $g_{00}^1 = 1$  is the value of the metric tensor in the infinity.

Now the equation of motion (5) takes the form

$$s \frac{1}{R^2 + 1} + G R^2 \frac{2Gm}{R} + \frac{G e^2}{R} - q \frac{1}{R^2 + 1} - G R^2 = - G R :$$

Finding  $m$  from this equation we obtain:

$$m = \frac{1}{2G} R \left( \frac{a}{2} R + \frac{e^2}{2R} + R^2 \frac{q}{R^2 + 1} - G R^2 \right); \quad (6)$$

where  $a = 1 + G^{-2}$ .

It is easy to understand the meaning of terms in (6). The first term is the asymptotical energy of the Higgs field forming the bubble. The second term represents the volume energy of the bubble (a difference between the old and new vacuum energy densities) and the energy of gravitational self-interaction of the shell (the surface-surface binding energy). The third term is the electrostatic energy lying in the three-space outside the bubble. The last term contains the kinetic energy of the shell and the surface-volume binding energy.

Introducing new dimensionless variables

$$z = \frac{R b^{1=6}}{(2m)^{1=3}}; \quad 0 = \frac{b^{1=2}}{2}; \quad (7)$$

where  $b = a^2 + 4^{-2} G$ ; and dimensionless parameters

$$A = a b^{1=2}; \quad E = 4^2 (2m)^{2=3} b^{2=3}; \\ Q^2 = e^2 (2m)^{4=3} b^{1=6}; \quad D = (2m)^{2=3} b^{1=3};$$

we can represent the equation of motion (6) as

$$\frac{dz}{d\tau}^2 + U(z) = E;$$

which is identical to that of the point-like particle with the energy  $E$ , moving in one dimension under the influence of the potential

$$U(z) = \frac{A}{z^2} - \frac{2A}{z} - 1 + \frac{Q^2}{z} + D z + \frac{1}{z^4} - 1 + \frac{Q^2}{z} + D z^{\frac{1}{2}}; \quad (8)$$

In the equilibrium state

$$z|_{z=z_0} = 0; \quad \frac{\partial U(z)}{\partial z} \Big|_{z=z_0} = 0;$$

where  $z_0$  is the equilibrium point,  $U(z_0) = E$  and one can find the critical mass and the equilibrium radius of the bubble

$$m_0 = \frac{4}{bU_0^{3=2}}; \quad R_0 = \frac{2z_0}{b^{1=2}U_0^{1=2}}; \quad (9)$$

where  $U_0 = |U(z_0)| > 0$ . Note that  $m_0$  is negative for the positive  $b$ .

For the real trajectories potential (8) must be negative since  $E < 0$ . Such a potential, for the case of uncharged shells,  $Q = 0$ , and with  $m > 0$ , was discussed in [9, 12], while for the case of Minkowskian asymptotics,  $D = 0$  and  $m < 0$ , in [11]. Investigating potential (8) in [11] we have found that in case when  $D = 0$  it has the single maximum and equilibrium state with (9) is unstable for any values of parameters. However in the case when  $D \neq 0$  the term  $Dz$  in (8) for some values of  $D$  causes the appearing of a minimum of the potential and gives the stable configuration.

Here we would like to note that sometimes for applications it is more easy to evaluate the critical radius and mass of the bubble directly from the equation (6) imposing the conditions [4]

$$R_0 = 0; \quad \frac{\partial m(R; R_0)}{\partial R} \Big|_{R=0} = 0; \quad (10)$$

The sign of the last term in equation (6) is principal when we investigate the problem of stability of the spherical shells. For the ordinary matter this sign is negative, thus

$$\frac{\partial m(R; R_0)}{\partial (R^2)} \Big|_{R=0} < 0$$

and the equilibrium state (10) is stable if the function  $m(R; R_0 = 0)$  takes a maximum value at the point  $R_0$  [4]. For the case of domain walls, due to Tolman's formula (2), sign of the last term in (6) is positive,

$$\frac{\partial m(R; R_0)}{\partial (R^2)} \Big|_{R=0} > 0;$$

and the equilibrium state (10) is stable if the function  $m(R; R_0 = 0)$  takes a minimum at the point  $R_0$  [4].

Now let us discuss some particular cases.

The simplest example of the antigravitating stable configuration is the case of the Minkowskian metric inside the bubble,  $f = 1$ , and the Schwarzschild metric with the

non-Minkowskian asymptotics,  $f_+ = 1$   $2m = r$ , outside the bubble. In this case equation (6) has the form :

$$m = \frac{G}{2} R^2 - \frac{G^2}{2} R^2 \frac{1}{R^2 + 1}; \quad (11)$$

From this equation it is easy to find using (10) the radii of the critical configurations:

$$R_0 = \frac{2}{3G};$$

one of which (with the lower sign) is stable, since  $\partial^2 m / \partial R^2|_{R=0} > 0$  for this value of  $R$ .

Inserting the value of  $R_0$  into (11) one can find that the mass of such configuration is negative.

In more simplified case, if we neglect the second term in equation (11), the critical radius and mass of the configuration are

$$R_0 = \frac{2}{4G}; \quad m_0 = -\frac{1}{4G};$$

This is a stable configuration, since  $R_0$  is a minimum point of the function  $m(R; R=0)$ .

As the other example let us consider the case when the surface density in equation (6) can be neglected. However, as it was mentioned above, its sign governs the stability of the system. From relations (10) for this case one can find

$$R_0^2 = \frac{1}{6G(a)} \left( 1 + \frac{1}{2} \frac{12ae^2}{a} \right); \quad (12)$$

$$m_0 = \frac{R}{G} \left( 2 + \frac{1}{2} \frac{12ae^2}{a} \right); \quad (13)$$

From these relations one can notice that the stable configuration is possible only for the negative  $a = -$ . The sign of the mass of the critical bubble depends on values of parameters  $a, e$  and for different models can be positive, negative or zero.

The next example of the stable spherical remnant of the false vacuum surrounded by a spherical domain wall and with non-Minkowskian asymptotics is the global monopole. We want to treat the monopole problem within the thin-wall approximation, i.e. we could regard that the whole variation of the scalar field forming the monopole is concentrated near some value of the radius  $R_0$ . In the spherical coordinates the zero-zero component of the energy-momentum tensor of the global monopole configuration reads (see for example [2]):

$$T_0^0 = -\frac{1}{2} \frac{1}{r^2} + \frac{1}{2} \frac{1}{\partial r} \frac{1}{\partial r} + \frac{1}{4} \left( \frac{1}{r^2} - 1 \right)^2; \quad (14)$$

where

$$= 0 \quad r < R_0;$$

$$= 1 \quad r > R_0;$$

In other words, we are modeling the monopole by a pure false vacuum inside the core, and an exactly true vacuum at the exterior. In the outer region (14) does not contain a constant term. Thus for the monopole the outer vacuum energy density  $\epsilon_+$  is zero. In the inner region  $\epsilon_- = \epsilon_0$ , and we have

$$\epsilon = \epsilon_+ = 0; \quad \epsilon_- = \frac{8}{3} \frac{r^4}{4}; \quad (15)$$

For the surface density of the monopole within the thin-wall approximation we find

$$= \int_{R_0}^{R_0+\delta} T_0^0 dr = \int_{R_0}^{R_0+\delta} \frac{r^4}{4} dr + \int_{R_0}^{R_0+\delta} \frac{2}{r^2} dr = \frac{r^4}{4} + \frac{2}{R_0^2}; \quad (16)$$

where  $R_0$  is the width of the wall. Thus  $\frac{2}{R_0^2}$  and we can neglect it in equation (6) for the monopole.

We can find the quantity in (6), formed from the first term of (14), from the solution of Einstein's equations for the monopole:

$$g_{00} = 1 + \frac{8G}{r} \int_0^r T_0^0 r^2 dr = 1 + \frac{2Gm}{r}; \quad (17)$$

where

$$= \frac{8G}{r} \int_0^r T_0^0 r^2 dr = 8G \frac{r^2}{2} \neq 0; \quad (18)$$

Using expressions (15), (16) and (18) from (12) and (13) for the monopoles radius and mass we find:

$$R_0 = \left( \frac{2}{3G} \right)^{1/2} = \frac{2}{\sqrt{3G}};$$

$$m = \frac{3^{3/2}}{3G^{3/2-1/2}} = \frac{16}{3\sqrt{3}} < 0;$$

These values are in good agreement with the exact solutions for the global monopole obtained in paper [2].

At the end we would like to notice that in case of t'Hooft-Polyakov's monopole the gauge field energy cancels nonzero energy of scalar field in infinity. Thus  $\epsilon_- = 0$  and we have the ordinary Schwarzschild metric, as it was considered in paper [13].

The research described in this publication was made possible in part by Grant MXL200 of Georgia Government and the International Science Foundation.

## R e f e r e n c e s

- [1] A . Vilenkin and E . P . S . Shellard, *Cosmic Strings and Other Topological Defects* (Cambridge Univ. Press, Cambridge, 1994).
- [2] D . Harari and C . Lousto, *PhysRev.D* 42 (1990) 2626.
- [3] D . Harari and P . Sikivie, *Phys. Rev.D* 37 (1988) 3438.
- [4] V . A . Berezin, V . A . Kuzm in and I . I . Tkachev, *PhysRev.D* 36 (1987) 2919.
- [5] J . Ipser and P . Sikivie, *PhysRevD* 30 (1984) 712.
- [6] W . Israel, *Nuovo Cim .B* 44 (1966) 1.
- [7] C . Lopez, *PhysRevD* 30 (1984) 313.
- [8] O . Gr n, *PhysRev.D* 31 (1985) 2129.
- [9] S . K . Blau, E . I . Guendelman and A . H . Guth, *PhysRev.D* 35 (1987) 1747.
- [10] R . Schoen and S . T . Yau, *Math.Phys.* 79 (1981) 231.
- [11] A . Bamaveli and M . Gogberashvili, *GRG* 26 (1994) 1117;  
in "New Frontiers in Gravitation" (Hadron Press, Palm Harbor, 1996); hep-ph/9505412.
- [12] A . Aurilia, R . K issack, R . M ann and E . Spallucci, *PhysRev.D* 35 (1987) 2961.
- [13] Y . Cho and P . Freund, *PhysRev.D* 12 (1975) 1588.