

# A remark on the quasilocal calculation of tidal heating: energy transfer through the quasilocal surface

Albert Huber\*

UAS Technikum Wien - Department of Applied Mathematics and Physics, Höchstädtplatz  
6, 1200 Vienna, Austria

## Abstract

In this note, using the quasilocal formalism of Brown and York, the flow of energy through a closed surface containing a gravitating physical system is calculated in a way that augments earlier results on the subject by Booth and Creighton. To this end, by performing a variation of the total gravitational Hamiltonian (bulk plus boundary part), it is shown that associated tidal heating and deformation effects generally are larger than expected. This is because this variation leads to previously unrecognized correction terms, including a bulk-to-boundary inflow term that does not appear in the original calculation of the time derivative of the Brown-York energy and leads to corrective extensions of Einstein's quadrupole formula in the large sphere limit.

*Key words:* quasilocal energy, gravitational Hamiltonian, tidal heating, bulk-to-boundary inflow

## Introduction

The influence of tidal deformation and heating effects on a nearly isolated gravitating systems due to external fields was successfully treated and described by Booth and Creighton in [6]. Instead of using pseudotensorial techniques, which were more popular at the time [11, 16, 20], the authors used the Brown-York quasilocal formalism to address the problem. Specifically, in order to describe the interaction of a spatially and temporally bounded gravitating system with an external tidal field, they performed a variation of the boundary part of the total gravitational Hamiltonian, which allowed them to calculate energy and momentum fluxes on a quasilocal surface and thus determine the tidal work done by an external gravitational field in the so-called 'buffer zone'. Taking advantage of the fact that the associated quasilocal energy expression coincides

---

\*hubera@technikum-wien.at

with the Arnowitt-Deser-Misner energy at spatial infinity [2, 8, 15] and the Trautman-Bondi-Sachs energy at null infinity [4, 7, 17, 21], the authors provided two interesting applications of their formulae.

First, the authors calculated the energy flux due to gravitational waves through a quasilocal surface in the wave zone (near infinity) to obtain the correct mass loss for a system radiating gravitational waves.

Second, the authors calculated the tidal heating of a self-gravitating body interacting with an external tidal field in the local asymptotic reference frame of the body. While this effect typically occurs for arbitrary pairs of bodies moving around each other in non-circular orbits, the example discussed in [6] is one that is familiar from the solar system, namely the tidal deformation and associated tidal heating of the Gallilean moon Io by Jupiter, which is generally held responsible for the strong volcanic activity on Jupiter's satellite.

As will be shown in the second section of this work (after a brief overview of the essentials of the considered quasilocal geometric framework in the first section), particularly with respect to the latter application, the analysis of Booth and Creighton can be extended in one particular respect: The mass-energy transfer through the quasilocal surface can alternatively be calculated by varying the total gravitational Hamiltonian (bulk plus boundary parts), which, in contrast to the results originally obtained by the authors, leads to the emergence of correction terms, that is, a confined stress-energy term and a bulk-to-boundary inflow term that combines the dynamical degrees of freedom of the bulk with those of the boundary. Although this does not change the validity of the original results of Booth and Creighton (the authors considered a case in which the correction terms become zero), it is nevertheless argued in the present work that especially the latter term must be taken into account in the quasilocal calculation of more violent tidal deformations and heating effects than those treated in [6], especially in cases of tidal deformations of celestial bodies revolving in circular motion around each other, where there is considerable mass and/or radiation transfer through the quasilocal surface (possibly due to the collapse of one of the bodies). To illustrate this, a comparatively simple geometric example is treated in section three of this work, namely the mass-energy inflow through the quasilocal surface of a spatially and temporally bounded gravitating system caused by gravito-electromagnetic fields. Using this example, it is argued that corrections to the time derivative of the Brown-York mass occur and lead to corrections to Einstein's quadrupole formula in the large sphere limit; corrections that should find applications in Einstein-Hilbert gravity not only in the special case treated in this work, but in many cases of interest, including the description of, for example, tidal deformation and tidal heating effects caused by accretion phenomena or merger processes in relativistic  $N$ -body systems.

## 1 Geometric Setting and quasilocal Action

For the purpose of deriving the correction terms mentioned in the introduction, it is necessary to introduce the quasilocal framework discussed in [5, 6] and

review some of the important aspects of the underlying geometric model. To that end, a spacetime  $(\mathcal{M}, g)$  with manifold  $\mathcal{M} = M \cup \partial M$  shall be considered, which is foliated by a family of  $t = \text{const.}$ -hypersurfaces  $\{\Sigma_t\}$ . Evolving continuously between two fixed instants of time  $\Sigma_1$  and  $\Sigma_2$ , this spacetime shall be assumed to be temporally and spatially bounded. That is to say, it shall be assumed to be bounded by a timelike hypersurface  $\mathcal{B}$  in such way that there holds  $\partial M = \Sigma_1 \cup \Sigma_2 \cup \mathcal{B}$ , where none of the embedded boundary parts shall strictly be assumed to be smooth; however, the timelike portion  $\mathcal{B}$  shall be assumed to be connected for the sake of simplicity. Moreover, the timelike boundary part shall be assumed to be foliated by a collection of two-surfaces  $\{\Omega_t\}$  such that  $\mathcal{B} = \{\cup_t \Omega_t : t_1 \leq t \leq t_2\}$ . As a result of the fixings made, it is ensured that both spatial boundary parts  $\Sigma_1$  and  $\Sigma_2$  are given in such a way that they contain a pair of two-surfaces  $\Omega_1$  and  $\Omega_2$ , respectively, which bifurcate  $\Sigma_1$  and  $\Sigma_2$  locally.

The worldtube thus obtained divides spacetime into two distinct parts, an interior part  $\mathcal{M}$  and an exterior part  $\bar{\mathcal{M}}$ ; and that in such a way that the interior part  $\mathcal{M}$  is contained in the Lorentzian manifold  $\bar{\mathcal{M}}$  of an associated ambient spacetime  $(\bar{\mathcal{M}}, \bar{g})$  such that  $\mathcal{M} \subset \bar{\mathcal{M}}$  and hence  $\Sigma_1, \Sigma_2, \mathcal{B} \subset \bar{\mathcal{M}}$ .

Given this specific geometric setting, one can now select a time evolution vector field  $t^a$  which can be decomposed in components perpendicular and parallel to the leaves of the spacelike foliation of the local spacetime  $(\mathcal{M}, g)$ . This means that  $t^a$  can be written - everywhere except at the timelike boundary  $\mathcal{B}$  - in the form  $t^a = Nn^a + N^a$ , where  $N$  is the lapse function,  $N^a$  is the shift vector field and  $n^a$  represents a forward-pointing timelike unit vector field orthogonal to the folia of  $(\mathcal{M}, g)$ . At the timelike boundary  $\mathcal{B}$ , however, the same vector field must be decomposed alternatively in the form  $t^a = \mathcal{N}v^a + \mathcal{N}^a$ , where  $\mathcal{N}$  is the boundary lapse function,  $\mathcal{N}^a$  is the boundary shift vector field and  $v^a$  is a forward-pointing timelike unit vector field being orthogonal to  $\Omega_t$  and tangent to  $\mathcal{B}$ . By the selection of a time flow vector field, a time parameter  $t$  can now be fixed by solving the relation  $L_t t = 1$  (according to which  $L_t$  represents the Lie derivative along  $t^a$ ).

Next, it may be assumed that there exists an outward-pointing spacelike unit normal to  $\mathcal{B}$ , henceforth denoted by  $u^a$ , which is usually non-orthogonal to the timelike generator  $n^a$ , but orthogonal to another timelike unit vector field  $v^a$  that is tangent to  $\mathcal{B}$ . At the same time, there is a spacelike vector field  $s^a$  which is orthogonal to the timelike generator  $n^a$ . Due to the non-orthogonality of the two vector fields  $n^a$  and  $u^a$ , there must exist a scalar field  $\eta \equiv u_a n^a$ , which vanishes only for the special case of a timelike boundary which is exactly orthogonal to all leaves of its spacelike foliation. This scalar field also occurs in the relation  $s_a v^a \equiv -\eta$  and in the decomposition relations  $v^a = \lambda(n^a - \eta u^a)$ ,  $s^a = \lambda(u^a + \eta n^a)$  and  $n^a = \lambda(v^a + \eta s^a)$ ,  $u^a = \lambda(s^a - \eta v^a)$ , whose validity follows directly from that of the normalization conditions  $u^a u_a = s^a s_a = -n^a n_a = -v^a v_a = 1$ , where  $\lambda = \frac{1}{\sqrt{1+\eta^2}}$  is a boost parameter. This boost parameter also occurs in the relation  $\mathcal{N} = \lambda N$  between the standard lapse function  $N$  and the boundary lapse function  $\mathcal{N}$ , which occur in the volume elements of spacetime and that of the embedded spacelike boundary hypersurface, i.e.  $\sqrt{-g} = N\sqrt{h}$  and  $\sqrt{-\gamma} =$

$\mathcal{N}\sqrt{q}$ . These relations, in turn, apply with respect to the determinant of the four-metric  $g_{ab}$  of  $(\mathcal{M}, g)$ , its induced three-metrics  $h_{ab} = g_{ab} + n_a n_b$  on  $\Sigma_t$  and  $\gamma_{ab} = g_{ab} - u_a u_b$  on  $\mathcal{B}$  and the two-metric  $q_{ab} = g_{ab} + n_a n_b - s_a s_b = g_{ab} - u_a u_b + v_a v_b$  that is induced by  $g_{ab}$  on  $\Omega_t$ .

Ultimately, as a byproduct of considering all these definitions, Hayward's quasilocal action [13]

$$S_G[g] = \frac{1}{16\pi} \left( \int_M R \omega_g + 2 \int_{\Sigma_1}^{\Sigma_2} K \omega_h + 2 \int_{\mathcal{B}} \Theta \omega_\gamma + 2 \int_{\Omega_1}^{\Omega_2} \sinh^{-1} \eta \omega_q \right) \quad (1)$$

can finally be set up, where, in this context,  $R = g^{ab} R_{ab}$  denotes the Ricci scalar of the spacetime  $(\mathcal{M}, g)$  and  $K = h^{ab} K_{ab}$  and  $\Theta = \gamma^{ab} \Theta_{ab}$  term the scalar extrinsic curvatures of the spacelike folia  $\Sigma_t$  and the timelike boundary  $\mathcal{B}$  of  $(\mathcal{M}, g)$ . Moreover, as can be seen, the different volume elements  $\omega_g := \sqrt{-g} d^4 x$ ,  $\omega_h := \sqrt{h} d^3 x$ ,  $\omega_\gamma := \sqrt{-\gamma} dt d^2 x$  and  $\omega_q := \sqrt{q} d^2 x$  enter the definition of this quasilocal action.

Following closely the steps taken in [5, 8], the well-known decomposition relation  $R = {}^{(3)}R + K_{ab} K^{ab} - K^2 + 2\nabla_b (K n^b - a^b)$  for the Ricci scalar can be used to re-write the given modified Einstein-Hilbert action functional in the form

$$S_G[g] = \frac{1}{16\pi} \left( \int_M [{}^{(3)}R + K_{ab} K^{ab} - K^2] \omega_g + \right. \quad (2)$$

$$\left. + 2 \int_{\mathcal{B}} [\Theta + \eta K - a_b u^b] \omega_\gamma + 2 \int_{\Omega_1}^{\Omega_2} \sinh^{-1} \eta \omega_q \right).$$

Furthermore, by using the additional relations  $P^{ab} = \frac{\sqrt{h}}{16\pi} (K^{ab} - h^{ab} K)$ ,  $K_{ab} = \frac{1}{2N} (\dot{h}_{ab} - 2D_{(a} N_{b)})$  and  $\frac{\sqrt{-g}}{16\pi} (K_{ab} K^{ab} - K^2) = P_{ab} \dot{h}^{ab} - \frac{8\pi N}{\sqrt{h}} (P_{ab} P^{ab} - \frac{1}{2} P^2) - 2P_{ab} D^a N^b$  and  $k = \lambda(\Theta + \eta K - a_b u^b + \lambda(v\nabla)\eta)$ , where  $k = q^{ab} k_{ab} = q^{ab} \nabla_a s_b$  represents the extrinsic curvature of the spacelike intersection surfaces  $\Omega_t$  formed in relation to  $s^a$ , one finds that Hayward's Trace  $K$  action (2) can alternatively be written in the form

$$S_G[g] = \int dt \int_{\Sigma_t} d^3 x [P_{ab} \dot{h}^{ab} - N\mathcal{H} - \mathcal{H}_a N^a] + \quad (3)$$

$$+ \frac{1}{8\pi} \int dt \int_{\Omega_t} \omega_q [Nk - (K_{ab} - K h_{ab}) N^a s^b - \lambda \mathcal{N}(v\nabla)\eta] + \frac{1}{8\pi} \int_{\Omega_1}^{\Omega_2} \sinh^{-1} \eta \omega_q,$$

where  $\mathcal{H} = \frac{8\pi}{\sqrt{h}} (P_{ab} P^{ab} - \frac{1}{2} P^2) - \frac{\sqrt{h}}{16\pi} {}^{(3)}R$  and  $\mathcal{H}_a = -2D_b P_a^b$  are the well-known Hamiltonian and momentum constraints of the traditional Hamiltonian formulation of general relativity discovered by Arnowitt, Deser and Misner.

Moreover, using that  $Nk - (K_{ab} - Kh_{ab})N^a s^b = \mathcal{N}\mathfrak{K} - \lambda(\mathcal{N}\nabla)\eta - (\mathcal{N}\nabla)v_a u^a$ , where  $\mathfrak{K} = q^{ab}\mathfrak{K}_{ab} = q^{ab}\nabla_a u_b$  represents the extrinsic curvature of the spacelike intersection surfaces  $\Omega_t$  formed in relation to  $u^a$ , one finds that

$$S_G[g] = \int dt \int_{\Sigma_t} d^3x [P_{ab}h^{ab} - N\mathcal{H} - \mathcal{H}_a N^a] + \quad (4)$$

$$+ \frac{1}{8\pi} \int dt \int_{\Omega_t} \dot{\omega}_q \sinh^{-1} \eta + \int dt \int_{\Omega_t} d^2x [\mathcal{N}\mathfrak{h} + \mathfrak{h}_a \mathcal{N}^a],$$

where  $\mathfrak{h} = \frac{\sqrt{q}}{8\pi}\mathfrak{K}$ ,  $\mathfrak{h}_a = -\frac{\sqrt{q}}{8\pi}u^c q_a^b \nabla_b v_c$  and the overdot denotes the Lie derivative with respect to  $t^a$ .

As a result of these specifications, the generalized gravitational Hamiltonian

$$H = \int_{\Sigma_t} (N\mathcal{H} + \mathcal{H}_a N^a) d^3x - \int_{\Omega_t} (\mathcal{N}\mathfrak{h} + \mathfrak{h}_a \mathcal{N}^a) d^2x \quad (5)$$

is found, whose precise form was first determined by Brown and York in the course of their field-theoretical generalization of Hamilton-Jacobi theory [8]. Given with respect to the canonical variables  $(h^{ab}, P_{ab})$  and  $(\sqrt{q}, \sinh^{-1} \eta)$ , this generalized gravitational Hamiltonian provides a feasible quasilocal description of the total amount of energy-momentum of a gravitational field with spatially and temporally finite dimensions, which represents an alternative to more traditional pseudotensorial descriptions of the subject<sup>1</sup>.

An important characteristic of the given generalized Hamiltonian is the fact that it splits up into a bulk part  $H_{Bulk} = \int_{\Sigma_t} (N\mathcal{H} + \mathcal{H}_a N^a) d^3x$  and a boundary part  $H_{Boundary} = -\int_{\Omega_t} (\mathcal{N}\mathfrak{h} + \mathfrak{h}_a \mathcal{N}^a) d^2x$ , where, as already indicated, the boundary part  $H_{Boundary}$  coincides in an asymptotically flat spacetime in the so-called large sphere limit with well-known candidates for the total quasilocal stress-energy-momentum of the gravitational field itself - with that of Arnowitt, Deser and Misner at spacelike infinity and that of Bondi and Sachs at null infinity.

## 2 Gravitational Hamiltonian and tidal Heating

As a next step, one may consider Einstein's equations

$$G_{ab} = 8\pi T_{ab}, \quad (6)$$

and use them to define the quasilocal charge

$$E = \int_{\Sigma_t} (N\varepsilon - p_a N^a) \omega_h - \int_{\Omega_t} (\mathcal{N}e - j_a \mathcal{N}^a) \omega_q, \quad (7)$$

---

<sup>1</sup>For a detailed review, see for instance [19].

for which the decomposition relations  $T_{ab} = \varepsilon n_a n_b + n_a p_b + p_a n_b + S_{ab}$  and  $\tau_{ab} = \varepsilon v_a v_b + v_a j_b + j_a v_b + s_{ab}$  may be taken into account, whose validity implies that  $T_{ab} t^a n^b = N\varepsilon - p_a N^a$  and  $\tau_{ab} t^a v^b = \mathcal{N}e - j^a \mathcal{N}^a$  holds true with respect to any given pair of (totally general) stress-energy and surface stress-energy tensors  $T_{ab}$  and  $\tau_{ab}$ . Here, it may be noted that the fields  $p_a = h_a^c T_{cb} n^b$  and  $j_a = q_a^c \tau_{cb} v^b$  represent the mass-energy and surface mass-energy fluxes and  $S_{ab} = h_a^c h_b^d T_{cd}$  and  $s_{ab} = q_a^c q_b^d \tau_{cd}$  represent the stress and surface stress tensors of matter fields located within the bounded spacetime region  $\mathcal{M} \subset \bar{\mathcal{M}}$ . It may also be noted that the deduced quasilocal charge again consists of two parts; a bulk part  $E_{Bulk} = \int_{\Sigma_t} (N\varepsilon - p_a N^a) \omega_h$  and a boundary part  $E_{Boundary} = - \int_{\Omega_t} (\mathcal{N}e - j_a \mathcal{N}^a) \omega_q$ .

Next, using the decompositions mentioned above, taking into account local conservation laws  $\nabla_a T_c^a \cdot N n^c = \nabla_a T_c^a \cdot N^c = 0$  and assuming that  $\mathfrak{L}_t$  denotes the induced Lie-derivative at  $\Sigma_t$  pointing along  $t^a$ , the generalized continuity and contracted generalized Euler equations

$$\mathfrak{L}_t \varepsilon = (ND)\varepsilon - \varepsilon NK - ND_a p^a - 2(pD)N - NS_{ab} K^{ab} \quad (8)$$

and

$$\mathfrak{L}_t p_a \cdot N^a = (ND)(p_a N^a) - ND_b S_a^b N^a - S_a^b N^a D_b N - NK p_a N^a - \varepsilon(ND)N \quad (9)$$

are found; results that were first published quite some time ago in [22] (though in terms of some slightly different conventions). It may be noted that in the present context the definitions  $(ND) := N^a D_a$  and  $(pD) := p^a D_a$  have been used.

Employing these relations and also the constraint relation  $\mathcal{D}_a \tau_b^a = \pi^a = \gamma_b^a T_{ac} u^c$ , in respect to which  $\mathcal{D}_a \tau_b^a = \gamma_b^d \gamma_c^e \nabla_e \tau_d^c$  applies, the temporal variation of the functional  $E$  can straightforwardly be calculated by Lie dragging it along the flow of the time evolution vector field  $t^a$  and using Gauss' law on various occasions. This variation yields the expression

$$\frac{dE}{dt} = \int_{\Sigma_t} (\dot{N}\varepsilon - p_a \dot{N}^a + \frac{N}{2} S_{ab} \dot{h}^{ab}) \omega_h - \int_{\Omega_t} (\dot{\mathcal{N}}e - j_a \dot{\mathcal{N}}^a + \frac{\mathcal{N}}{2} s_{ab} \dot{q}^{ab} - \mathfrak{X}) \omega_q \quad (10)$$

in the case that the definitions  $s_{ab} = q_a^c q_b^d \tau_{cd}$  and  $b^a \equiv (v\nabla)v^a$  are used. The integrand  $\mathfrak{X}$  of the occurring boundary integral expression consists of two parts, i.e.

$$\mathfrak{X} = \mathfrak{X}_1 + \mathfrak{X}_2, \quad (11)$$

where

$$\mathfrak{X}_1 = \mathcal{N}^2 \pi_a v^a + \mathcal{N} \pi_a \mathcal{N}^a \quad (12)$$

represents the confined stress-energy term and

$$\mathfrak{X}_2 = -\frac{\eta}{\lambda} \mathcal{N}^2 \varepsilon + \eta \mathcal{N}^2 p_a v^a + \eta \mathcal{N} p_a \mathcal{N}^a - \frac{\mathcal{N}^2}{\lambda} p_a u^a + \lambda \mathcal{N} S_{ab} v^a u^b + \lambda S_{ab} \mathcal{N}^a u^b \quad (13)$$

represents the bulk-to-boundary inflow term, as can be concluded from the fact that the bulk expressions  $\varepsilon$ ,  $p_a$  and  $S_{ab}$  enter into its definition<sup>2</sup>. Here, it may be noted that the relations  $N_a s^a = -\eta\mathcal{N}$ ,  $N\varepsilon - p_a N^a = \frac{\mathcal{N}}{\lambda}\varepsilon - \mathcal{N}p_a v^a - p_a \mathcal{N}^a$ ,  $N^2 p_a s^a = \frac{\mathcal{N}^2}{\lambda} p_a u^a$  and  $S_{ab} s^a N^b = \lambda\mathcal{N}S_{ab} v^a u^b + \lambda S_{ab} \mathcal{N}^a u^b$  have been used to obtain this particular form of relation (13). Moreover, it should be noted that the use of Einstein's equations in the given context is not necessary, but rather practical, since all calculations could also be performed exclusively with geometric quantities.

However, to see the benefit of the chosen approach, one may use once more Einstein's field equations to obtain the following result

$$\begin{aligned} \frac{dH}{dt} = & \int_{\Sigma_t} (\dot{N}\mathcal{H} - \mathcal{H}_a \dot{N}^a + \frac{N}{2} \mathcal{Q}_{ab} \dot{h}^{ab}) d^3x - \\ & - \int_{\Omega_t} (\dot{\mathcal{N}}\mathfrak{h} - \mathfrak{h}_a \dot{\mathcal{N}}^a + \frac{\mathcal{N}}{2} \mathfrak{Q}_{ab} \dot{q}^{ab} - \sqrt{q}\mathfrak{X}) d^3x \end{aligned} \quad (14)$$

for the temporal variation of the gravitational Hamiltonian, where

$$\begin{aligned} \mathcal{Q}_{ab} = & \frac{\sqrt{h}}{8\pi} \{ {}^{(3)}R_{ab} - 2K_{ac}K_b^c + KK_{ab} - \frac{1}{N} [\dot{K}_{ab} + (ND)K_{ab} + D_a D_b N] - \\ & - \frac{1}{2} h_{ab} \left( {}^{(3)}R + K^2 - K_{cd}K^{cd} - \frac{2}{N} [\dot{K} + (ND)K + D_a D^a N] \right) \} \end{aligned} \quad (15)$$

and

$$\mathfrak{Q}_{ab} = \frac{\sqrt{q}}{8\pi} (\mathfrak{K}_{ab} - (\mathfrak{K} - b_a u^a) q_{ab}). \quad (16)$$

To obtain a purely geometric expression, one may take advantage of the fact that relations (12) and (13) can be rewritten in the form

$$\mathfrak{X}_1 = \mathcal{N}^2 \mathcal{D}_a \tau_b^a v^b + \mathcal{N} \mathcal{D}_a \tau_b^a \mathcal{N}^a \quad (17)$$

and

$$\begin{aligned} \mathfrak{X}_2 = & -\frac{\eta}{\lambda} \mathcal{N}^2 \mathcal{H} - \frac{1}{2} \eta \mathcal{N}^2 \mathcal{H}_a v^a - \frac{1}{2} \eta \mathcal{N} \mathcal{H}_a \mathcal{N}^a - \\ & + \frac{\mathcal{N}^2}{2\lambda} \mathcal{H}_a u^a + \lambda \mathcal{N} \mathcal{Q}_{ab} v^a u^b + \lambda \mathcal{Q}_{ab} \mathcal{N}^a u^b. \end{aligned} \quad (18)$$

What is both astonishing and appealing about results (10) and (14) is that the occurring bulk and boundary integral expressions look very similar; only the correction terms prevent an exact similarity. But not only this similarity

---

<sup>2</sup>Note that the bulk fields  $\varepsilon$ ,  $p_a$  and  $S_{ab}$  can, of course, be re-expressed on the boundary in terms of associated boundary fields. However, in order to highlight the fact that these fields can be used to interpret  $\int_{\Omega_t} \mathfrak{X}_2 \omega_q$  as a bulk-to-boundary inflow, the form of  $\varepsilon$ ,  $p_a$  and  $S_{ab}$  has been intentionally left unchanged at this point.

is interesting: From the structure of (14) it can be generally concluded that a change of the matter content of a spatially and temporally bounded gravitating system always depends on how the individual components of the metric evolve over time. Moreover, it can be concluded that such a change also strongly depends on the structure of the occurring correction terms, which can be interpreted physically as a bounded mass energy distribution plus a non-vanishing bulk to boundary inflow that combines the dynamical degrees of freedom of the bulk with those of the boundary; even if it is assumed that the considered local gravitational field is stationary.

As far as the quasilocal calculation of tidal heating effects is concerned, the results obtained so far are of interest because in Booth and Creighton only the boundary expression

$$\frac{dW}{dt} = \int_{\Omega_t} (-\dot{\mathcal{N}}e + j_a \dot{\mathcal{N}}^a + \frac{\mathcal{N}}{2} s^{ab} \dot{q}_{ab}) \omega_q \quad (19)$$

was used as a basis for the calculations made, not the full expression (10), which is equivalent to (14). Consequently, however, the question arises whether or not said correction terms could play a role in the determination of the tidal heating effects mentioned.

Unsurprisingly, this turns out not to be the case. In fact, it is easy to show that the formula (19) used by the authors occurs as a special case of the relations (10) and (14) derived in this work under one single assumption. To see this, one may recall that in [6] it is required that the on-shell vacuum field equations

$$R_{ab} = 0 \quad (20)$$

hold; a requirement which, in view of the derivations of this work, results in the fact that the bulk part and the correction terms in (10) become zero and thereby (10) reduces to the form

$$\frac{dE}{dt} = - \int_{\Omega_t} (\dot{\mathcal{N}}e - j_a \dot{\mathcal{N}}^a + \frac{\mathcal{N}}{2} s_{ab} \dot{q}^{ab}) \omega_q. \quad (21)$$

However, using now the fact that  $\dot{q}^{ab} = -q^{ac} q^{bd} \dot{q}_{cd}$ , one finds that expressions (19) and (21) exactly match. Thus, the results of the work of Booth and Creighton occur as a special case of the results deduced in this work.

It is important to note in this context that the results of Booth and Creighton were originally intended to show that quasilocal methods lead to the same consistent results as pseudotensorial methods (which, surprisingly, all lead to the very same expression, regardless of the choice of the energy-momentum complex and gauge conditions [11, 16]). In fact, the compatibility is not very surprising from today's viewpoint in that it has been shown by Chang, Chen and Nester [10] that any energy-momentum pseudotensor leads to an associated Hamiltonian boundary term, so that it becomes clear that - within the quasilocal Hamiltonian framework - pseudotensors either give rise to distinct Dirichlet type



boundary conditions or to Neumann type boundary conditions; all of which are algebraic in terms of the metric. Consequently, however, since the tidal heating results obtained in the literature appear to be independent of the choice of boundary conditions, it is hardly surprising that the purely quasilocal calculation of Booth and Creighton leads to very similar results as those of earlier works on the subject that used the pseudotensorial approach. This is not least the case because, in the approximate calculations mentioned, the precise form of the boundary conditions is not essential, because the results obtained by using different boundary conditions deviate from each other only in higher order.

However, in contrast to the results of earlier pseudotensorial approaches, the quasilocal results are not only entirely general, they are also coordinate independent, which, however, raises the question of whether they could in principle be used to determine tidal deformations and heating effects in more sophisticated and physically challenging situations; that is, in situations where not only fluctuations of the external gravitational field of the body are considered, but also changes of the interior field of the body are taken into account. After all, it is quite possible for bodies to become very strongly tidally deformed and heated during gravitational interaction with another, more massive celestial body, which can ultimately lead to the collapse and disintegration of the body and its accretion by its much more massive companion. In such a situation, with both celestial bodies typically orbiting each other in circular motion, one would probably expect matter to be constantly escaping from the system through the quasilocal surface, whereas it may be assumed (inspired by the Newtonian theory of gravity) that said surface represents the gravisphere, i.e. the spatially finite sphere of influence of the collapsing body under consideration. Since the quasilocal calculation of tidal heating by Booth and Creighton is not designed to describe such effects at all, it seems justified to extend the results found by the authors in such a way that a description of the effects mentioned becomes possible. This has been done in this section by specifying how the quasilocal Hamiltonian changes with time, thereby allowing one to predict how the matter content, and hence the mass-energy, of a spatially and temporally bounded gravitating system changes relative to its local physical environment. It can be assumed that pseudotensorial methods lead to similar results, although further studies of such an approach may be in order.

### 3 A simple example: gravito-electromagnetic Fields

Since the phenomena described at the end of the preceding section are difficult to deal with even when using the linearized approximation of general relativity, it makes sense to demonstrate the usefulness of equations (10) and (14) by means of a simple geometrical example. To this end, this section discusses the mass-energy inflow through the quasilocal surface of a spatially and temporally bounded gravitating system caused by gravito-electromagnetic fields. To describe this effect, a perturbative metric of the form

$$g_{ab} = \eta_{ab} + e_{ab} \quad (22)$$

shall be considered, which is defined in such a way that  $|e_{ab}| \ll 1$  applies. Using the perturbation field  $e_{ab}$  appearing in (22) to define the trace-reversed gravitaional potential  $\psi_{ab} = e_{ab} - \frac{1}{2}\eta_{ab}e$ , which is subject to the conditions  $\partial^a \psi_{ab} = 0$ , one finds that the linearized Einstein's equations reduce to the form

$$\square \psi_{ab} = 16\pi T_{ab}, \quad (23)$$

whereas it has tacitly been assumed at this stage that  $e_{ab}$  is chosen in such a way that the conditions  $|\psi_{00}| \gg |\psi_{jk}|$  and  $|\psi_{0i}| \gg |\psi_{jk}|$  are met, which is surely the case if it is assumed for simplicity's sake that  $T_{jk} = 0$  for  $j, k = 1, 2, 3$ . However, this is tantamount to requiring that  $S_{ab} = h_a^c h_b^d T_{cd} = 0$ . By defining next the fields  $\psi_{00}(x) \equiv \phi(x)$  and  $\psi_{0k}(x) \equiv 2A_k(x)$ , one finds that the linearized field equations read

$$\square \phi = 16\pi \varepsilon, \quad \square A_k = 16\pi p_k, \quad (24)$$

where  $k = 1, 2, 3$  shall apply in the present context. The form of solutions of the Poisson equation found above is known, i.e.

$$\phi(t, \vec{x}) = \int \frac{\phi(t - |\vec{x} - \vec{y}|, \vec{y})}{|\vec{x} - \vec{y}|} d^4 y \quad (25)$$

and

$$\vec{A}(t, \vec{x}) = \int \frac{\vec{A}(t - |\vec{x} - \vec{y}|, \vec{y})}{|\vec{x} - \vec{y}|} d^4 y, \quad (26)$$

and it is clear that these solutions can be used to define gravielectric and gravimagnetic field strengths  $\vec{\mathcal{E}} := \frac{1}{2}\vec{\nabla}\phi$  and  $\vec{\mathcal{B}} := \vec{\nabla} \times \vec{A}$ . These expressions then yield gravito-electromagnetic pendants to the Maxwell equations and the Lorentz force law, i.e. the following set of relations

$$\vec{\nabla} \vec{\mathcal{E}} = 4\pi \varepsilon \quad (27)$$

$$\vec{\nabla} \vec{\mathcal{B}} = 0 \quad (28)$$

$$\vec{\nabla} \times \vec{\mathcal{E}} = -\partial_t \vec{\mathcal{B}} \quad (29)$$

$$\vec{\nabla} \times \vec{\mathcal{B}} = -4\pi \vec{p} + \partial_t \vec{\mathcal{E}} \quad (30)$$

and

$$\vec{F} = m \left( \vec{\mathcal{E}} + 4\vec{v} \times \vec{\mathcal{B}} \right), \quad (31)$$

which have to be met for the sake of consistency. The resulting line element of the metric reads

$$ds^2 = -(1 + \phi) dt^2 + 2A_k dt dx^k + (1 - \phi) \delta_{jk} dx^j dx^k \quad (32)$$

in Cartesian coordinates.

With these expressions at hand, one now finds that relation (10) takes the form

$$\frac{dE}{dt} = \int_{\Sigma_t} (\dot{N}\varepsilon - p_a\dot{N}^a)\omega_h - \int_{\Omega_t} (\dot{N}e - j_a\dot{N}^a + \frac{\mathcal{N}}{2}s_{ab}\dot{q}^{ab} - \mathfrak{X})\omega_q, \quad (33)$$

where  $\varepsilon$  and  $p_k$  are solutions of (24). The crucial observation in this context is that the second corrective part  $\mathfrak{X}_2$  of the integrand  $\mathfrak{X}$  is different from zero. It reads

$$\mathfrak{X}_2 = -\frac{\eta}{\lambda}\mathcal{N}^2\varepsilon + \eta\mathcal{N}^2p_av^a + \eta\mathcal{N}p_a\mathcal{N}^a - \frac{\mathcal{N}^2}{\lambda}p_a u^a. \quad (34)$$

Imagining now that the two-surface  $\Omega_t$  is a sphere at infinity, it becomes clear that the corresponding integral expression will also be different from zero, i.e.  $\int_{\Omega_t \equiv S_\infty} \mathfrak{X}_2\omega_q \neq 0$ . Consequently, one sees that the corrections to the time derivative of the Brown-York mass given in this work must be taken into account even in the quasilocal treatment of gravito-electromagnetic effects. However, this makes it clear that there is a non-vanishing bulk-to-boundary mass-energy inflow in such a case, which is why the correction terms to the time derivative of the Brown-York mass terms, which result from the time derivative of the total quasilocal gravitational Hamiltonian, cannot be disregarded, since they lead to corrections to Einstein's quadrupole formula (for the given case in which Einstein's field equations for a non-vanishing matter source are satisfied). After all, it may ultimately be expected that the occurring corrections to Einstein's quadrupole formula should be observable (and therefore experimentally verifiable) in one way or another.

This should also apply quite particularly to tidal deformation and tidal heating effects. Specifically, the situation is such that in the gravitational interactions observable in reality, of course, not only the outer vacuum field of the body fluctuates (as assumed by the approximation used in the pseudotensorial works mentioned in the introduction and in the work of Booth and Creighton), but also the inner field of the body. The changes in the matter source associated with these effects can cause mass-energy to flow out of the system at sometimes very high velocities (just think of relativistic jet streams in accreting supermassive black holes). Very similar phenomena are also to be expected for mergers of bodies, which are also partly described on the basis of the linearized approximation of the theory [1, 3, 9, 10, 12, 14, 18]. Thus, it seems highly advisable to consider the correction terms found in the present work in regards to the effects of tidal heating; especially as long as it remains unclear which order of magnitude the correction terms are most likely to have in a given physical setting.

## Conclusion

In the present work, previous results by Booth and Creighton on quasilocal tidal heating were extended in that the mass-energy transfer through the quasilocal surface was calculated in a different manner, namely by varying the total gravitational Hamiltonian (bulk plus boundary parts) and not only the boundary part. As it turned out, all the results obtained are fully compatible with Booth's and Creighton's work if it is assumed that the vacuum field equations of the theory are satisfied (as the authors actually did in their work). However, if this is not true, correction terms must be taken into account, one of which specifies how mass flows from the bulk into the boundary. To show the feasibility of the obtained results, a comparatively simple geometric example was treated in section three of the work, namely the mass-energy inflow through the quasilocal surface of a spatially and temporally bounded gravitating system caused by gravito-electromagnetic fields. This simple example was used to show that the matter content of a spatially and temporally bounded gravitating system can change with time such that mass-energy flows through the quasilocal surface and thereby escapes from the system. From this insight, it was concluded that the obtained results can be used to describe tidal deformation and tidal heating effects in more challenging physical situations, such as in the description of accretion phenomena or merger processes in relativistic  $N$ -body systems.

### Acknowledgements:

I want to greatly thank Ivan Booth for reading through and suggesting improvements to the first draft of the manuscript. Moreover, I want to thank Friedrich Kupka most cordially for sharing his (obviously very profound) background knowledge on various phenomenological effects playing a role in the evolution of real compact massive objects in outer space. Although none of these effects are addressed in any way in my work, I still very much enjoyed our discussions and used them as a source of motivation for completing the paper.

## References

- [1] Marek A Abramowicz and P Chris Fragile. Foundations of black hole accretion disk theory. *Living Reviews in Relativity*, 16(1):1–88, 2013.
- [2] Richard Arnowitt, Stanley Deser, and Charles W Misner. Republication of: The dynamics of general relativity. *General Relativity and Gravitation*, 40(9):1997–2027, 2008.
- [3] Luc Blanchet. Gravitational radiation from post-newtonian sources and inspiralling compact binaries. *Living Reviews in Relativity*, 17(1):1–187, 2014.
- [4] Hermann Bondi, M Gr J Van der Burg, and AWK Metzner. Gravitational waves in general relativity, vii. waves from axi-symmetric isolated system.

- Proceedings of the Royal Society of London. Series A. Mathematical and Physical Sciences*, 269(1336):21–52, 1962.
- [5] IS Booth and RB Mann. Moving observers, nonorthogonal boundaries, and quasilocal energy. *Physical Review D*, 59(6):064021, 1999.
  - [6] Ivan S Booth and Jolien DE Creighton. Quasilocal calculation of tidal heating. *Physical Review D*, 62(6):067503, 2000.
  - [7] J David Brown, Stephen R Lau, James W York, et al. Energy of isolated systems at retarded times as the null limit of quasilocal energy. *Physical Review D*, 55(4):1977, 1997.
  - [8] J David Brown and James W York Jr. Quasilocal energy and conserved charges derived from the gravitational action. *Physical Review D*, 47(4):1407, 1993.
  - [9] Eric Burns. Neutron star mergers and how to study them. *Living Reviews in Relativity*, 23(1):1–177, 2020.
  - [10] Chia-Chen Chang, James M Nester, and Chiang-Mei Chen. Pseudotensors and quasilocal energy-momentum. *Physical Review Letters*, 83(10):1897, 1999.
  - [11] Marc Favata. Energy localization invariance of tidal work in general relativity. *Physical Review D*, 63(6):064013, 2001.
  - [12] Ryan Hamerly and Yanbei Chen. Event horizon deformations in extreme mass-ratio black hole mergers. *Physical Review D*, 84(12):124015, 2011.
  - [13] Geoff Hayward. Gravitational action for spacetimes with nonsmooth boundaries. *Physical Review D*, 47(8):3275, 1993.
  - [14] Uzair Hussain and Ivan Booth. Deformation of horizons during a merger. *Classical and Quantum Gravity*, 35(1):015013, 2017.
  - [15] Robert B Mann, Donald Marolf, and Amitabh Virmani. Covariant counter-terms and conserved charges in asymptotically flat spacetimes. *Classical and quantum gravity*, 23(22):6357, 2006.
  - [16] Patricia Purdue. Gauge invariance of general relativistic tidal heating. *Physical Review D*, 60(10):104054, 1999.
  - [17] Rainer K Sachs. Gravitational waves in general relativity viii. waves in asymptotically flat space-time. *Proceedings of the Royal Society of London. Series A. Mathematical and Physical Sciences*, 270(1340):103–126, 1962.
  - [18] Gerhard Schäfer and Piotr Jaranowski. Hamiltonian formulation of general relativity and post-newtonian dynamics of compact binaries. *Living reviews in relativity*, 21(1):1–117, 2018.

- [19] LB Szabados. Quasi-local energy-momentum and angular momentum in gr: a review article living rev. *Relativity*, 7(4), 2004.
- [20] Kip S Thorne. Tidal stabilization of rigidly rotating, fully relativistic neutron stars. *Physical Review D*, 58(12):124031, 1998.
- [21] A Trautman. Gravitation: An introduction to current research, ed. I. Witten, 1962.
- [22] James W York Jr. Kinematics and dynamics of general relativity. *Sources of gravitational radiation*, pages 83–126, 1979.