Perturbative quantum damping of cosmological expansion

Bogusław Broda

Department of Theoretical Physics, Faculty of Physics and Applied Informatics, University of Łódź, Pomorska 149/153, 90-236 Łódź, Poland

ABSTRACT

Perturbative quantum gravity in the framework of the Schwinger–Keldysh formalism is applied to compute lowest-order corrections to expansion of the Universe described in terms of the spatially flat Friedman–Lemaître–Robertson–Walker solution. The classical metric is approximated by a third degree polynomial perturbation around the Minkowski metric. It is shown that quantum contribution to the classical expansion, though extremely small, damps, i.e. slows down, the expansion (phenomenon of quantum friction).

1. Introduction

The aim of our work is to explicitly show the appearance of quantum generated damping, i.e. slowing down, of the present (accelerating) expansion of the Universe (phenomenon of quantum friction). In principle, quantum corrections to classical gravitational field can be perturbatively calculated in a number of ways. First of all, it is possible to directly derive quantum (one-loop) corrections to classical gravitational field from the graviton vacuum polarization (self-energy), in analogy to the case of the Coulomb potential in QED (see, for example, Berestetskii et al. [1]), the so-called Uehling potential. Such a type of calculations has been already performed for the Schwarzschild solution (Duff [7]), as well as for the spatially flat Friedman–Lemaître–Robertson–Walker (FLRW) metric (Broda [5]). Another approach refers to the energy–momentum tensor, and it has been applied to the Newton potential (see, for example, Bjerrum-Bohr et al. [3], and references therein), to the Reissner–Nordström and the Kerr–Newman solutions (see Donoghue et al. [6]), as well as to the Schwarzschild and the Kerr metrics (see Bjerrum-Bohr et al. [2]). Yet another approach uses the Schwinger–Keldysh (SK) formalism to the case of the Newton potential (see, for example, Park and Woodard [9]). It is argued that only the SK formalism is adequate for time-dependent potentials, hence in particular, in the context of cosmology (see, for example, Weinberg [10], and references therein). Because we aim to perturbatively calculate corrections to the spatially flat FLRW metric, we should use the SK formalism, as that is exactly the case

(time-dependence of gravitational field) the SK approach has been devised for.

The corrections we calculate are a quantum response to the spatially flat FLRW solution which is described by a small perturbation around the Minkowski metric. For definiteness, we confine ourselves to the classical perturbation given by a third degree polynomial. The final result is expressed in terms of the present time quantum correction q_0^Q to the classical deceleration parameter q_0^C. On the premises assumed, it appears that q_0^Q is positive, though obviously, it is extremely small.

2. Quantum damping

Our starting point is a general spatially flat FLRW metric

$$ds^2 \equiv g_{\mu\nu}\,dx^\mu\,dx^\nu = -dt^2 + a^2(t)\,d\boldsymbol{x}^2, \quad \mu,\nu = 0,1,2,3, \qquad (1)$$

with the cosmological scale factor $a(t)$. To satisfy the condition of weakness of the perturbative gravitational field $h_{\mu\nu}$ near our reference time $t = t_0$ (where t_0 could be the age of the Universe—the present moment) in the expansion

$$g_{\mu\nu}(x) = \eta_{\mu\nu} + h_{\mu\nu}(x), \qquad (2)$$

the metric should be normalized in such a way that it is exactly Minkowskian for $t = t_0$, i.e.

$$a^2(t) = 1 + h(t), \qquad h(t_0) = 0. \qquad (3)$$

(Let us note the analogy to the Newton potential ($\sim 1/r$), where the "reference radius" is in spatial infinity, i.e. $r_0 = +\infty$.) Then, in the block diagonal form,

E-mail address: bobroda@uni.lodz.pl.

$$h_{\mu\nu}(t, \boldsymbol{x}) = \begin{pmatrix} 0 & 0 \\ 0 & \delta_{ij} h(t) \end{pmatrix}, \quad i, j = 1, 2, 3. \tag{4}$$

To obtain quantum corrections to the classical gravitational field $h_{\mu\nu}^{C}(x)$, we shall use the one-loop effective field equation derived by Park and Woodard [9],

$$\mathcal{D}^{\mu\nu\varrho\sigma} h_{\varrho\sigma}^{Q}(t, \boldsymbol{x}) = \frac{\kappa^2}{10\,240\pi^3} \mathrm{D}^{\mu\nu\varrho\sigma} \partial^4 \int_0^t dt' \int d^3x'\, \theta(\Delta t - \Delta r)$$
$$\times \left[\ln\left(-\mu^2 \Delta x^2\right) - 1 \right] h_{\varrho\sigma}^{C}(t', \boldsymbol{x}'), \tag{5}$$

where $\Delta t \equiv t - t'$, $\Delta r \equiv |\boldsymbol{x} - \boldsymbol{x}'|$, $\Delta x^2 \equiv -(\Delta t)^2 + (\Delta r)^2$, and the mass scale μ is coming from the UV renormalization procedure (see Ford and Woodard [8]). Here $\kappa^2 = 16\pi G_N$, where G_N is the Newton gravitational constant. The operator $\mathcal{D}$ (the Lichnerowicz operator in the flat background) is of the form

$$\mathcal{D}^{\mu\nu\varrho\sigma} = \frac{1}{2} \left(\eta^{\mu\nu} \eta^{\varrho\sigma} \partial^2 - \partial^\mu \partial^\nu \eta^{\varrho\sigma} - \eta^{\mu\nu} \partial^\varrho \partial^\sigma \right.$$
$$\left. - \eta^{\mu(\varrho} \eta^{\sigma)\nu} \partial^2 + 2\partial^{(\mu} \eta^{\nu)(\varrho} \partial^{\sigma)} \right),$$

and for the minimally coupled massless scalar field

$$\mathrm{D}^{\mu\nu\varrho\sigma} = \Pi^{\mu\nu} \Pi^{\varrho\sigma} + \frac{1}{3} \Pi^{\mu(\varrho} \Pi^{\sigma)\nu} \tag{6}$$

with

$$\Pi^{\mu\nu} \equiv \eta^{\mu\nu} \partial^2 - \partial^\mu \partial^\nu.$$

For conformally coupled fields we have $\widetilde{\mathrm{D}}$ instead of D, where

$$\widetilde{\mathrm{D}}^{\mu\nu\varrho\sigma} \equiv -\frac{1}{9} \Pi^{\mu\nu} \Pi^{\varrho\sigma} + \frac{1}{3} \Pi^{\mu(\varrho} \Pi^{\sigma)\nu}.$$

Since the metric depends only on time, we can explicitly perform the spatial integration with respect to $\boldsymbol{x}'$ in (5), obtaining the integral kernel (time propagator)

$$\mathrm{K}(\Delta t) \equiv 4\pi \int_0^{\Delta t} dr\, r^2 \left\{ \ln\left[\mu^2 \left((\Delta t)^2 - r^2 \right) \right] - 1 \right\}$$
$$= \frac{4\pi}{3} (\Delta t)^3 \left[\ln\left(4\mu^2 \Delta t^2 \right) - \frac{11}{3} \right]. \tag{7}$$

For the time-dependent metric of the form

$$\begin{pmatrix} f(t) & \\ & \delta_{ij} h(t) \end{pmatrix},$$

the action of the operators $\mathcal{D}$, D and $\widetilde{\mathrm{D}}$ is given by

$$\mathcal{D} \begin{pmatrix} f(t) & \\ & \delta_{ij} h(t) \end{pmatrix} = \begin{pmatrix} 0 & \\ & -\delta_{ij} \frac{d^2}{dt^2} h(t) \end{pmatrix}, \tag{8}$$

$$\mathrm{D} \begin{pmatrix} f(t) & 0 \\ 0 & \delta_{ij} h(t) \end{pmatrix} = \begin{pmatrix} 0 & 0 \\ 0 & \frac{10}{3} \delta_{ij} \frac{d^4}{dt^4} h(t) \end{pmatrix}, \tag{9}$$

and

$$\widetilde{\mathrm{D}} \begin{pmatrix} f(t) & 0 \\ 0 & \delta_{ij} h(t) \end{pmatrix} = 0, \tag{10}$$

respectively. There are no mixing of diagonal and non-diagonal terms, and the empty blocks mean expressions which can be non-zero, but they are inessential in our further analysis. Thus, (5) assumes the simple form

$$\frac{d^2}{dt^2} h^{Q}(t) = -\frac{\kappa^2}{3072\pi^3} \frac{d^8}{dt^8} \left(\mathrm{K} \star h^{C} \right)(t), \tag{11}$$

where the integral kernel K is given by (7), and the convolution "$\star$" is standardly defined by

$$(\mathrm{K} \star \mathrm{F})(t) \equiv \int_0^t \mathrm{K}(t - t') \mathrm{F}(t')\, dt' = \int_0^t \mathrm{K}(t') \mathrm{F}(t - t')\, dt'. \tag{12}$$

One should note that due to the diagonal form of (4) and (8)–(10), no non-diagonal terms of the metric enter (11).

Since the upper limit of integration in (12) depends on t, the derivative of the convolution with respect to t is expressed by

$$\frac{d^n}{dt^n} (\mathrm{K} \star \mathrm{F})(t) = \left(\frac{d^n}{dt^n} \mathrm{K} \star \mathrm{F} \right)(t)$$
$$+ \sum_{k=1}^{n} \frac{d^{(n-k)}}{dt^{(n-k)}} \mathrm{K}(0) \frac{d^{(k-1)}}{dt^{(k-1)}} \mathrm{F}(t). \tag{13}$$

Using symmetry between K and F, Eq. (12), it is possible to distribute differentiation in (13) in several different ways. For practical purposes, further analysis, the most convenient form of the eighth derivative is the "symmetric" one, i.e.

$$\frac{d^8}{dt^8} (\mathrm{K} \star h^{C})(t) = \left(\frac{d^4}{dt^4} \mathrm{K} \star \frac{d^4}{dt^4} h^{C} \right)(t)$$
$$+ \sum_{k=1}^{4} \left[\frac{d^{(4-k)}}{dt^{(4-k)}} \mathrm{K}(0) \frac{d^{(k+3)}}{dt^{(k+3)}} h^{C}(t) \right.$$
$$\left. + \frac{d^{(4-k)}}{dt^{(4-k)}} h^{C}(0) \frac{d^{(k+3)}}{dt^{(k+3)}} \mathrm{K}(t) \right]. \tag{14}$$

To prevent the appearance of the mass scale μ, as well as "classical" divergences in the convolution, which could possibly come from singularities in the kernel (time propagator) K, we assume the following third degree polynomial form of the classical metric

$$h^{C}(\tau) = h_0 + h_1 \tau + h_2 \tau^2 + h_3 \tau^3. \tag{15}$$

Henceforth, for simplicity, instead of t we use the dimensionless unit of time, $\tau \equiv t/t_0$.

The well-defined form of Eq. (16) proofs that (15) has been properly selected. In fact, our choice is unique. First of all, let us observe that the UV renormalized equation of motion (11) is well-defined, at least by classical standards. This means that it may happen for some $h^{C}(\tau)$ that Eq. (11) is not integrable for the kernel (7), but non-integrabilities may appear also in standard classical field theory, e.g. self-energy of a point particle in classical electrodynamics. Hence, in our calculations, possible infinities are considered as "classical". Their presence depends on the form of h^{C}, and it could be interpreted, as usually in classical field theory, as inapplicability of the approach in such a type of problem. Therefore, following that point of view, we should avoid contributions from

$$\left. \frac{d^k}{dt^k} \mathrm{K}(t) \right|_{t=0}, \quad \text{for } k > 2,$$

because they generate singularities in Eq. (14), due to the singular form of the kernel.

Another issue concerns the mass scale μ present in (7), which results from renormalization procedure. There are the two possibilities. One can choose some "natural" mass scale μ, or one can confine oneself to μ-independent cases. The second possibility, if available, is preferable because it gives unambiguous results. For example, let us consider quantum corrections to black-hole

solutions. The Schwarzschild solution gives a μ-independent result (see Bjerrum-Bohr et al. [2]), whereas the Kerr solution yields a μ-dependent result (see Bjerrum-Bohr et al. [4]). In the latter case, the authors suggest to apply a coordinate transformation to remove the μ-dependence, but no explicit construction has been presented. Because of these difficulties, we are trying to avoid contributions from

$$\frac{d^k}{dt^k}\mathrm{K}(t), \quad \text{for } k < 4,$$

which are μ-dependent.

Then, the only possibility to get rid of the above mentioned troublesome terms admits exactly the products in the second part of the sum in (14). In turn, to nullify the unwanted first part of the sum in (14), $h^C(\tau)$ should be exactly of the form (15). The term before the summation sign in (14) vanishes.

Actually, the classical metric (15) does not belong to any favorite family of cosmological solutions, perhaps except for the linear case ($h_0 = -1$, $h_1 = 1$, $h_2 = h_3 = 0$), corresponding to pure radiation. In fact, no "observationally" realistic metric is given precisely, for example, by the matter-dominated cosmological scale factor $a(\tau) = \tau^{2/3}$, because firstly, the character of cosmological evolution depends on the epoch (time τ), and secondly, it is "contaminated" by other "matter" components, e.g. radiation and dark energy. Therefore, we should consider (15) as a phenomenological approximation of the actual cosmological evolution on the finite time interval $\tau \in [\tau_0, 1]$, $0 \leqslant \tau_0 < 1$.

Inserting (7) and (15) to (14), we derive from (11) the second order differential equation

$$\ddot{h}^Q(\tau) = \lambda\left(h_0\tau^{-2} - \frac{h_1}{3}\tau^{-1} + \frac{h_2}{3} - h_3\tau\right), \tag{16}$$

which can be easily integrated out with respect to τ, yielding

$$\dot{h}^Q(\tau) = \lambda\left(-h_0\tau^{-1} - \frac{h_1}{3}\log|\tau| + \frac{h_2}{3}\tau - \frac{h_3}{2}\tau^2\right) \tag{17}$$

and

$$h^Q = \lambda\left(-h_0\log|\tau| - \frac{h_1}{3}\left(\tau\log|\tau| - \tau\right) + \frac{h_2}{6}\tau^2 - \frac{h_3}{6}\tau^3\right), \tag{18}$$

where $\lambda \equiv \kappa^2/32\pi^2 t_0^2 \approx \frac{1}{2} \cdot 10^{-46}$. As a physical observable we are interested in, we take the deceleration parameter

$$q(\tau) \equiv -\frac{a(\tau)\ddot{a}(\tau)}{\dot{a}^2(\tau)} = 1 - 2\left[1 + h(\tau)\right]\frac{\ddot{h}(\tau)}{\dot{h}^2(\tau)}. \tag{19}$$

The quantum contribution to the deceleration parameter, namely, the lowest order contribution to (19) from (16)–(18), where $q(\tau) = q^C(\tau) + q^Q(\tau) + \mathcal{O}(\lambda^2)$, reads

$$q^Q = -\frac{2}{(\dot{h}^C)^2}\left[\ddot{h}^C h^Q + (1 + h^C)\left(\ddot{h}^Q - \frac{2\ddot{h}^C\dot{h}^Q}{\dot{h}^C}\right)\right]. \tag{20}$$

According to our previous discussion, the general set of classical fields that can be integrated out, and which provides unambiguous results is given by a third degree polynomial in τ. Thus, the decrease or increase of the expansion depends, in principle, on the set of 4 parameters. A full analysis of that issue is complex because the dependence is non-linear (see Eq. (20)) and multiparametric. Therefore it is impossible to give a general answer in a lucid and useful form. Instead, we will test, as a simple exercise, the following 3 examples related to individual powers of τ: $h(\tau) = \tau^k - 1$, for $k = 1, 2, 3$ ("-1" has been fixed for normalization purposes, i.e. $h(1) = 0$). According to Eq. (20), after few elementary calculations

we obtain the present time quantum contribution to the deceleration parameter $q^Q(1) = a_k\lambda$, where $a_1 = 8/3$, $a_2 = 3/2$, $a_3 = 10/9$. Since all these coefficients are positive, we deal with decrease of expansion for any power k.

To approximate the cosmological evolution by the (four-parameter) phenomenological metric (15), we impose the following two obvious boundary conditions

$$h^C(0) = -1 \quad \text{and} \quad h^C(1) = 0,$$

corresponding to

$$a^2(0) = 0 \quad \text{and} \quad a^2(1) = 1,$$

and implying

$$h_0 = -1 \quad \text{and} \quad h_1 + h_2 + h_3 = -h_0 = 1. \tag{21}$$

In this place various different further directions of proceeding could be assumed, depending on the question we pose.

Let us study the quantum contribution to the actual cosmological evolution. By virtue of (7) and (11), the "effective" time propagator determined by the sixth order derivative of the kernel K, behaves as $(\Delta t)^{-3}$, which follows from, e.g., dimensional analysis. Thus, the largest contribution to the convolution is coming from integration in the vicinity of $\tau \approx 1$ (because of large value of $(\tau - 1)^{-3}$). Therefore, we impose the next two additional conditions near the dominating point $\tau = 1$. Namely, h^C is supposed to yield the observed value of the Hubble constant

$$H_0 \equiv \frac{\dot{a}(1)}{a(1)} = \frac{1}{2}\dot{h}^C(1), \tag{22}$$

and the observed deceleration parameter $q_0 = q^C(1)$. Solving (19), (21) and (22) for h_k ($k = 1, 2, 3$), we obtain

$$h_1 = 3 - (3 + q_0)H_0,$$
$$h_2 = -3 + (4 + 2q_0)H_0,$$
$$h_3 = 1 - (1 + q_0)H_0. \tag{23}$$

To estimate only qualitative behavior of the present time quantum contribution to the accelerating expansion of the Universe, it is sufficient to insert to (23) the following crude approximation: $H_0 = 1$ and $q_0 = -\frac{1}{2}$. Now

$$h_1 = \frac{1}{2}, \qquad h_2 = 0, \qquad h_3 = \frac{1}{2},$$

yielding

$$\dot{h}^C(1) = 2, \qquad \ddot{h}^C(1) = 3.$$

By virtue of (16)–(18)

$$h^Q(1) = \frac{\lambda}{12}, \qquad \dot{h}^Q(1) = \frac{3\lambda}{4}, \qquad \ddot{h}^Q(1) = -\frac{5\lambda}{3},$$

and hence (see (20))

$$q_0^Q \equiv q^Q(1) = \frac{11\lambda}{6} = \frac{11\kappa^2}{192\pi^2 t_0^2} \sim 10^{-46}. \tag{24}$$

It is worth noting that a numerical analysis could be applied for fitting parameters h_k in (15) to observational values. It could, in principle, provide more realistic form of $h^C(\tau)$, but sill there would be a freedom in selecting fitting criteria.

3. Summary

In the framework of the SK (one-loop) perturbative quantum gravity, we have derived the value (24) expressing the order of the present time quantum contribution q_0^Q to the classical de-

celeration parameter q_0^C. The present time quantum contribution $q_0^Q \sim +10^{-46}$. It is positive but it is negligibly small in comparison to the observed (negative) value of the deceleration parameter, $q_0 \approx -\frac{1}{2}$. Therefore, we deal with an extremely small damping (slowing down) of the accelerating expansion of the Universe, which is of quantum origin (quantum friction).

One should stress, that in the course of our analysis we have confined ourselves to a particular case of a FLRW third degree polynomial perturbation around the Minkowski metric, and to minimally coupled massless scalar field (conformally coupled scalar field yields null contribution).

Finally, it would be desirable to compare our present result to our earlier computation (see Broda [5]), where we have obtained an opposite result, i.e. repulsion instead of damping. First of all, one should note that non-SK approaches are, in general, acausal for finite time intervals, because they take into account contributions coming from the future state of the Universe. This follows from the fact that the Feynman propagator has an "advanced tail", which is not contradictory in the context of (infinite time interval) S-matrix elements. Moreover, the present work concerns scalar field contributions to the metric, whereas the results of Broda [5] are determined by graviton contributions. In the both approaches, quantum contributions are trivial for conformal fields, which well corresponds to conformal flatness of the FLRW metric.

References

[1] V.B. Berestetskii, L.P. Pitaevskii, E.M. Lifshitz, Quantum Electrodynamics, vol. 4, second ed., Butterworth–Heinemann, 1982.
[2] N.E.J. Bjerrum-Bohr, J. Donoghue, B.R. Holstein, Quantum corrections to the Schwarzschild and Kerr metrics, Phys. Rev. D 68 (8) (2003) 084005.
[3] N.E.J. Bjerrum-Bohr, J. Donoghue, B.R. Holstein, Quantum gravitational corrections to the nonrelativistic scattering potential of two masses, Phys. Rev. D 67 (8) (2003) 084033.
[4] N.E.J. Bjerrum-Bohr, J.F. Donoghue, B.R. Holstein, Erratum: Quantum corrections to the Schwarzschild and Kerr metrics [Phys. Rev. D 68, 084005 (2003)], Phys. Rev. D 71 (March 2005) 069904.
[5] B. Broda, One-loop quantum gravity repulsion in the early Universe, Phys. Rev. Lett. 106 (10) (2011) 101303.
[6] J. Donoghue, B.R. Holstein, B. Garbrecht, T. Konstandin, Quantum corrections to the Reissner–Nordström and Kerr–Newman metrics, Phys. Lett. B 529 (2002) 132–142.
[7] M. Duff, Quantum corrections to the Schwarzschild solution, Phys. Rev. D 9 (1974) 1837–1839.
[8] L. Ford, R. Woodard, Stress tensor correlators in the Schwinger–Keldysh formalism, Class. Quantum Gravity 22 (9) (2005) 1637.
[9] S. Park, R. Woodard, Solving the effective field equations for the Newtonian potential, Class. Quantum Gravity 27 (24) (2010) 245008.
[10] S. Weinberg, Quantum contributions to cosmological correlations, Phys. Rev. D 72 (4) (2005) 043514.