

The No-Go theorem in cubic subclass of Horndeski theory for spherically symmetric dynamical background.

S. Mironov^{1,2,3,*} and M. Sharov^{1,2,†}

¹*Institute for Nuclear Research of the Russian Academy of Sciences,
60th October Anniversary Prospect, 7a, 117312 Moscow, Russia*

²*Institute for Theoretical and Mathematical Physics, MSU, 119991 Moscow, Russia*

³*NRC, "Kurchatov Institute", 123182, Moscow, Russia*

We consider a general dynamical, spherically symmetric background in the cubic subclass of Horndeski theory and obtain the quadratic action for the perturbations using the DPSV approach. We analyse the stability conditions for high-energy modes and study the issue of the no-go theorem in the current subclass of Horndeski theory. We formulate the no-go theorem for weak dependence on one variable (time or radial) and derive its generalization to the cases which could be reduced by coordinate transformation to scenarios where the scalar field has weak dependence on one of the coordinates. Moreover we show that wide class of singular solutions are also prohibited within the cubic subclass of Horndeski theory.

I. Introduction

Scalar-tensor theories (including Horndeski theory) represent a group of models of modified gravity and have a wide range of applications. We study the stability of classical solutions in Horndeski theory, which is the most general scalar-tensor theory of gravity with an additional scalar field and second-order equations of motion, which in turn guarantees the absence of Ostrogradski ghosts [1–5], see [6] for a review. This class of theories is interesting due to the possibility of violating the Null Energy Condition (NEC) [7], which subsequently allows the existence of stable (at least locally) solutions with modified gravity such as various cosmologies without singularities [8–13] and compact objects including traversable wormholes [14, 15]. To build any physically acceptable solution, it is necessary to check the stability conditions, and this is the main subject of our work.

So far, a full stability analysis in Horndeski theory, at least for the high momenta regime, has been performed only for static spherically symmetric and cosmological backgrounds [5, 16–18]. The structure of the stability conditions in these cases allows one to formulate the no-go theorem for a fully stable non-singular solution for a static spherically symmetric background [15, 19] and cosmological background [20–22] in Horndeski theory, see [23] for a review of studies on healthy solutions in scalar-tensor theories. The no-go theorem was also proved within the context of multi-Galileon theory [24, 25]. Existing studies partly cover the case of a general dynamical spherically symmetric background in which perturbations were considered only in the odd-parity sector (according to the Regge-Wheeler classification of perturbations [26]) of Horndeski theory [27, 28]. The case of a shift-symmetric scalar field (i.e. $\pi(r, t) = q \cdot t + \psi(r)$) with static background metric functions was separately considered due to its connection to hairy black hole solutions [29, 30]. However, the stability analysis in the just outlined case was performed only for the odd-parity sector [31].

We consider a general dynamical, spherically symmetric background in the subclass $L_2 + L_3$ (cubic subclass) of Horndeski theory [13, 15]. The only perturbation in the cubic subclass of Horndeski theory that differs from GR is the scalar mode, which contributes to the even sector of perturbations, both tensor modes are similar to GR because the gravity is not modified in this subclass. For simplicity, we analyze the behavior of linear perturbations using the DPSV approach [12, 32]. In higher subclasses of Horndeski theory, the DPSV trick breaks down for a spherically symmetric background [33, 34] and it is not usable to derive quadratic action in full Horndeski theory.

The background we consider here is covered by the ADM formalism and the method of Hamiltonian analysis [35], see [36] for a review. Note that the unitary gauge which is often imposed with the ADM formalism assumes the scalar field gradient is timelike at any point. In this paper we do not make such an assumption.

The Lagrangian of the cubic subclass of Horndeski theory reads as

$$L = -\frac{1}{2\kappa}R + F(\pi, X) + K(\pi, X)\square\pi, \quad (1)$$

where $\kappa = 8\pi G$, R is the Ricci scalar, π is the Galileon field, F and K are arbitrary Lagrangian functions, and $X = \nabla_\mu\pi\nabla^\mu\pi$, $\square\pi = \nabla_\mu\nabla^\mu\pi$.

* sa.mironov.1@physics.msu.ru

† sharov.mr22@physics.msu.ru

II. Stability conditions

In the current subclass of Horndeski theory, it is possible to integrate out metric perturbations from the quadratic action using the Einstein equations [15]. This method (DPSV approach) allows one to calculate the quadratic action for the second derivatives of the perturbation χ of the scalar field π , and it can be used to obtain high-momentum stability conditions. We derive them in this section. The quadratic Lagrangian for the Galileon reads

$$\begin{aligned} L^{(2)} = & [F_X + K_X \square \pi - K_\pi + \nabla_\nu (K_X \nabla^\nu \pi)] \nabla_\mu \chi \nabla^\mu \chi \\ & + [2(F_{XX} + K_{XX} \square \pi) \nabla^\mu \pi \nabla^\nu \pi - 2(\nabla^\mu K_X) \nabla^\nu \pi - 2K_X \nabla^\mu \nabla^\nu \pi] \nabla_\mu \chi \nabla_\nu \chi \\ & - \kappa K_X^2 X^2 \nabla_\mu \chi \nabla^\mu \chi + 4\kappa K_X^2 X \nabla^\mu \pi \nabla^\nu \pi \nabla_\mu \chi \nabla_\nu \chi, \end{aligned} \quad (2)$$

where $K_X = \partial K / \partial X$, etc. A dynamical, spherically symmetric background metric in 4-dimensional space-time can be written in the following form

$$ds^2 = a^2(r, t) dt^2 - b^2(r, t) dr^2 - c^2(r, t) \gamma_{\alpha\beta} dx^\alpha dx^\beta, \quad (3)$$

where x^α and $\gamma_{\alpha\beta}$ are coordinates and metric on the unit 2-dimensional sphere. In terms of the background metric (3), the quadratic action (2) takes the form

$$S^{(2)} = \int d^4x \sqrt{-g} \left[a^{-2} \mathcal{K}^{00} \dot{\chi}^2 - (ab)^{-1} \mathcal{K}^{tr} \dot{\chi} \chi' - b^{-2} \mathcal{K}^{rr} (\chi')^2 - c^{-2} \mathcal{K}^\Omega \gamma^{\alpha\beta} \partial_\alpha \chi \partial_\beta \chi + \dots \right], \quad (4)$$

where the omitted terms contain fewer derivatives of χ , dot and prime denote derivatives w.r.t. time and radial coordinate. The coefficients \mathcal{K} are given in the Appendix A. The dispersion relation reads

$$\mathcal{K}^{00} \omega^2 = \mathcal{K}^{rr} k_r^2 + \mathcal{K}^\Omega k_\phi^2 + \mathcal{K}^{tr} \omega k_r. \quad (5)$$

The necessary conditions for the absence of gradient instabilities, for high momenta are as follows:

$$\mathcal{K}^{tr} k_r^2 + 4\mathcal{K}^{00} (\mathcal{K}^{rr} k_r^2 + \mathcal{K}^\Omega k_\phi^2) \geq 0. \quad (6)$$

Since k_r and k_ϕ are independent, the necessary set of conditions for the absence of gradient instabilities has the form

$$\begin{cases} \mathcal{K}^\Omega \mathcal{K}^{00} \geq 0 \\ \mathcal{K}^{rr} \geq -\frac{(\mathcal{K}^{tr})^2}{4\mathcal{K}^{00}} \end{cases}. \quad (7)$$

Additionally we require $\mathcal{K}^{00} > 0$ to ensure that the scalar perturbation is not a ghost. The speeds of propagation of perturbations in radial and angular directions are

$$c_r = \frac{\partial \omega}{\partial k_r} = \frac{a}{b} \left(\frac{\mathcal{K}^{tr}}{\mathcal{K}^{00}} \pm \frac{\sqrt{(\mathcal{K}^{tr})^2 + 4\mathcal{K}^{00} \mathcal{K}^{rr}}}{2\mathcal{K}^{00}} \right), \quad (8)$$

$$c_\phi = \frac{\partial \omega}{\partial k_\phi} = \frac{a}{c} \left(\sqrt{\frac{\mathcal{K}^\Omega}{\mathcal{K}^{00}}} \right). \quad (9)$$

The set of necessary stability conditions for the high momentum regime, specifically the absence of ghosts and gradient instabilities is as follows

$$\mathcal{K}^{00} > 0, \quad (10a)$$

$$\mathcal{K}^\Omega \geq 0, \quad (10b)$$

$$\mathcal{K}^{rr} \geq -\frac{(\mathcal{K}^{tr})^2}{4\mathcal{K}^{00}}. \quad (10c)$$

Here we do not study stability for low-momenta perturbations (tachyonic instabilities).

III. No-go theorem.

A. Dependence on both variables.

We follow the method shown in [15] to construct an argument for the no-go theorem in the static case. The main idea is to show that the manually introduced variable \mathcal{Q} is always singular when the stability condition (10a) is satisfied.

The background metric was introduced above in (3). The Galileon field is also dynamical and spherically symmetric $\pi = \pi(r, t)$. In the context of a Lorentzian wormhole which we consider in this section the coordinate r runs from $-\infty$ to $+\infty$ and the metric coefficients are strictly positive and bounded from below:

$$a(r, t) \geq a_{min} > 0, \quad b(r, t) \geq b_{min} > 0, \quad c(r, t) \geq R_{min} > 0, \quad (11)$$

the R_{min} here is the effective radius of the throat. The metric coefficients imply the following asymptotic behavior for the asymptotically flat wormhole

$$a(r, t) \rightarrow a_{\pm}, \quad b(r, t) \rightarrow b_{\pm}, \quad c(r, t) \rightarrow \pm r, \quad \text{as } r \rightarrow \pm\infty, \quad (12)$$

where a_{\pm} are positive constants.

Our purpose is to expand the stability analysis to the dynamical case and check whether there could be a stable solution with properties (11) within the cubic subclass of Horndeski theory (1). The argument of the no-go theorem in the static case is quite technical and we show that it does not cover the dynamical case.

We use the expressions for \mathcal{K}^{00} (31a) and the Einstein equations to obtain the following relation

$$\frac{2}{a} \pi'^2 \mathcal{K}^{00}(r, t) = -\mathcal{Q}' - \frac{1}{2} \kappa a \mathcal{Q}^2 + \mathcal{Y}(r, t). \quad (13)$$

Here we introduced an additional function \mathcal{Y} which is zero in the case of static scalar field, its explicit form can be found in the Appendix B. Now all metric functions and the scalar field depend on both t and r . The expression for \mathcal{Q} reads

$$\mathcal{Q} = \frac{1}{c} \left(2 \frac{c}{a} K_X \pi'^3 + \frac{d c'}{\kappa a} \right). \quad (14)$$

In (13) we used the combination of Einstein equations that has form

$$T_0^0 - T_r^r = -\frac{2}{\kappa c} \left(\frac{a}{b} \left(\frac{c'}{ab} \right)' + \frac{b}{a} \frac{\partial}{\partial t} \left(\frac{\dot{c}}{ab} \right) \right). \quad (15)$$

Now we return to (13) and use the stability condition (10a) to get the following inequality.

$$\frac{\mathcal{Q}'}{\mathcal{Q}^2} < + \frac{\mathcal{Y}(r, t)}{\mathcal{Q}^2}, \quad C = \frac{1}{2\kappa a}. \quad (16)$$

After integration from r to $r' > r$ it reads as

$$\mathcal{Q}^{-1}(r, t) - \mathcal{Q}^{-1}(r', t) < \int_r^{r'} \frac{\mathcal{Y}(r, t) - \frac{1}{2\kappa a} \mathcal{Q}^2}{\mathcal{Q}^2} dr. \quad (17)$$

We write the equation (13) in this particular way because of its similarity to the static case. We will use the equation (17) to examine the possibility of violating the no-go theorem. In a static case, the variable \mathcal{Q}^{-1} has to cross zero at some point, so \mathcal{Q} is always singular.

This problem can be solved in the dynamical case by choosing the function \mathcal{Y} in such a way that the right-hand side of (17) is strictly positive in the limits $r' \rightarrow -\infty$ and $r \rightarrow +\infty$ for any moment of time.

Suppose that for some r' , $\mathcal{Q}(r') > 0$ then for each fixed value of t the integral on the right-hand side of the inequality (17) is positive for $r \rightarrow -\infty$ and $\mathcal{Q}^{-1}(r, t)$ is bounded from above by a positive number, opposite to the static limit where it is bounded by a negative number. If \mathcal{Q} is negative for some value of r , according to the constraint (17), it could remain negative for $r \rightarrow +\infty$ (in the opposite case to static case).

On the other hand, in the preceding analysis we have considered only the stability condition (10a), so, in principle, a different no-go theorem may reappear if more necessary restrictions (10) are imposed on the system.

B. Dependence on time coordinate.

The case of only time-dependent metric functions $a(t)$, $b(t)$ and the scalar field $\pi(t)$ also has a no-go theorem. Note that the metric function $c(r, t)$ can depend on both variables.

$$2\frac{bc}{a}(\dot{\pi})^2\mathcal{K}^{rr} = -\frac{\partial}{\partial t}\left(\frac{2c}{a^3b}K_X(\dot{\pi})^3 - \frac{d}{\kappa} \frac{\dot{c}}{ab}\right) + \kappa K_X(\dot{\pi})^3\left(\frac{2c}{a^3b}K_X(\dot{\pi})^3 - \frac{d}{\kappa} \frac{\dot{c}}{ab}\right), \quad (18)$$

The new variable analogous to (14) is introduced as follows

$$\mathcal{O} = \frac{1}{c}\left(\frac{2c}{a^3b}K_X(\dot{\pi})^3 - \frac{d}{\kappa} \frac{\dot{c}}{ab}\right). \quad (19)$$

The proof of this no-go theorem [20] is similar to the static case with simple changes.

IV. No-go theorem for a weak dependence on time

Let us consider a scenario with a weak time dependence for $t \in G$ (G is any set of time values) and for any r . We are going to use the fact that the additional function $\mathcal{Y}(r, t) = 0$ in the case of the static Galileon field $\pi(r, t) = \pi(r)$. We split it as

$$\pi(r, t) = \tilde{\pi}(r) + \phi(r, t), \quad (20)$$

$$\lim_{t \rightarrow t_0} \frac{\phi(r, t)}{\tilde{\pi}(r)} = 0, \quad t_0 \in G, \quad \forall r. \quad (21)$$

Here and below all functions with tilde depend only on the radial coordinate, while generally functions depend on both the radial and time variables. The absence of ghost instabilities in dynamical case is provided by (10a). Now we can use (20) and (21) to turn right hand side of (13) into:

$$\frac{2}{a}\pi'^2\mathcal{K}^{00}(r, t) = -\tilde{\mathcal{Q}}' - \frac{d-1}{d}\kappa\tilde{a}\tilde{\mathcal{Q}}^2 + \tilde{\mathcal{A}}\varepsilon(r, t). \quad (22)$$

Here we have used the fact that all terms of \mathcal{Y} contain time derivatives of background functions. The left hand side of (22) is positive, there we do not separate weak time dependence. Due to the weak dependence on t , $\varepsilon(r, t)$ is a small function. In general $\tilde{\mathcal{Q}} \neq 0$ and due to (10a)

$$\frac{\tilde{\mathcal{Q}}'}{\tilde{\mathcal{A}}\tilde{\mathcal{Q}}^2} < -\frac{1}{2\tilde{\mathcal{A}}}\kappa\tilde{a} + \frac{\varepsilon(r, t)}{\tilde{\mathcal{Q}}^2}. \quad (23)$$

The metric functions \tilde{a} and \tilde{c} are bounded from below by positive numbers. The last term of (23) is of next order in comparison to the first one and then the right-hand side of (23) is strictly negative. As a result, the relation (23) implies that

$$\frac{\tilde{\mathcal{Q}}'}{\tilde{\mathcal{Q}}^2} < -C. \quad (24)$$

We obtain an inequality similar to the static limit of (16), hence $\tilde{\mathcal{Q}}$ should become singular at some r . Note that the argument works only if time dependence is weak in considered time region for *any* radial coordinate. Otherwise the argument breaks – the particular example was discussed in Sec.III A.

Above, we assumed $\tilde{\mathcal{Q}} \neq 0$. Now, if $\tilde{\mathcal{Q}} = 0$, the argument is not applicable and the equality (22) takes the following form

$$\frac{2}{a}\pi'^2\mathcal{K}^{00}(r, t) = \tilde{\mathcal{A}}\varepsilon(r, t) > 0. \quad (25)$$

The main difference from the static background case is in the presence of dynamical perturbations. Due to the weak dependence on the time coordinate, we can omit all terms that contain higher orders of small functions, and (25) can be satisfied by choosing ε . However, in the cases of small \mathcal{K}^{00} , \mathcal{K}^{rr} is of zero order and generally remains finite, hence the sound speeds (8) and (9) become infinitely large.

V. No-go theorem for weak dependence on radial coordinate

In full analogy to Sec. IV one can extend the cosmological no-go theorem to the case of weak scalar field dependence on the radial coordinate

$$\pi(r, t) = \tilde{\pi}(t) + \phi(r, t), \quad (26)$$

$$\lim_{r \rightarrow r_0} \frac{\phi(r, t)}{\tilde{\pi}(r)} = 0, \quad r_0 \in G, \quad \forall t. \quad (27)$$

The absence of gradient instabilities in the general case is provided by

$$\mathcal{K}^{rr} \geq -\frac{(\mathcal{K}^{tr})^2}{4\mathcal{K}^{00}}, \quad (28)$$

K^{tr} contains radial derivatives and in weak r dependence is of the order ε , so the theorem returns to III B. Sections IV and V show that any stable non-singular solution should not have regions with a weak scalar field dependence of any variable, time or radial. Common compact objects in expanding universe have asymptotic regions with weak radial coordinate dependence, which is commonly used as an asymptotic function behavior. One of the ways to avoid the no-go for compact objects is to make partial derivatives of the scalar field oscillate similarly in space/time direction.

VI. Generalized no-go theorem

We note that the additional functions $\mathcal{Y}(r, t)$ and $\mathcal{J}(r, t)$, as was mentioned before, vanish in the cases of only time- and radial-dependent the scalar field respectively. In the present section, we study the possibility to set these functions to zero through the redefinition of coordinates. After making a coordinate redefinition $(r, t) \rightarrow (\tilde{r}, \tilde{t})$ we can obtain a new set of stability conditions, and the expression (17) from the radial no-go theorem modifies as follows:

$$\mathcal{Q}^{-1}(\tilde{r}, \tilde{t}) - \mathcal{Q}^{-1}(\tilde{r}', \tilde{t}) < -C(\tilde{r}' - \tilde{r}) + \int_{\tilde{r}}^{\tilde{r}'} \frac{\mathcal{Y}'[\tilde{r}, \tilde{t}]}{\mathcal{Q}^2} d\tilde{r}. \quad (29)$$

The main idea is to choose new coordinates in such a way that the scalar field $\pi(r, t)$ becomes a function with a weak dependence on the time or radial coordinate to reduce the case to the previous no-go theorems. To achieve this, the selected curve should always have the gradient of the scalar field close to its tangent vector, while the coordinate lines of another variable should match the contour lines of the scalar field in the region around the curve. The coordinate transformation must be diffeomorphic and result in a background metric of the form (3). The chosen integration curve should be either timelike or spacelike to avoid the changes of metric signature. Due to the existence of both radial and time no-go theorems, both types of curves are allowed. For the no-go theorem with weak time dependence, the integration curve should be timelike, and for the weak radial dependence it should be spacelike.

The proposed method shares certain similarities with the choosing of unitary gauge in the ADM formalism [39]. Note, however, that in our case there is no global restriction on the scalar field, while the unitary gauge requires everywhere a time-like gradient of the scalar field. Our requirement for the gradient of the scalar field is to be time-like or space-like on a particular curve only.

Below we consider an example of a scalar field that does not satisfy the conditions of the weak no-go theorem but the generalized no-go theorem is applicable. The ansatz for the scalar field has the form

$$\pi(r, t) = \cosh(rt). \quad (30)$$

The proof is shown in the picture, where we find one spacelike curve^{*1} which is gradient curve for the scalar field, for this reason it is possible to make a coordinate transformation to replace the integration along the radial axis with the integration along a selected curve on which the conditions of the no-go theorem IV are met.

^{*1} This is valid for arbitrary metric functions, at least for large coordinate values, as the metric should be asymptotically flat.




FIG. 1. The black lines are contour lines of the scalar field that were projected on the coordinate plane. The blue dashed lines corresponded to the light cone. The red line is the gradient line and the new integration curve. The green area does not affect the integration curve

VII. Conclusion

In this work, we have analyzed the cubic subclass of Horndeski theory using the DPSV approach [12] and derived the stability conditions for high-momenta modes about dynamic, spherically symmetric background. This approach does not allow one to get a full set of stability conditions including tachyonic instabilities (low-momenta regime), but the conditions for high momentum and frequencies was derived, specifically the conditions for absence of ghost and gradient instabilities, and also the propagation speeds of perturbations were obtained. In the cubic subclass of Horndeski theory no-go theorems exists for static spherically-symmetric backgrounds and cosmological scenarios [15, 20], we have generalized it to backgrounds with weak dependence on radial or time coordinate. It is clear that in many physically viable solutions there should be regions, especially asymptotic, that satisfy the conditions of the generalized no-go theorem. For example a star in the expanding universe will have weak radial dependence in some region for any time and it is one appropriate case for applying the no-go theorem for weak radial dependence. Even though, it was shown that the proof of the no-go theorem is not straightforwardly applicable to the general dynamical case, we have shown a possible way to bypass the mathematical argument of the no-go theorem in the dynamical case. However, constructing a stable solution encounters difficulties due to the lack of arbitrary functions to build a solution without solving the PDE system (36).

We have also derived the further step of generalizing of the no-go theorem which allows us to reduce the dependence of the scalar field to one variable. This generalization of the no-go theorem includes the wide class of backgrounds that have mild restrictions only on the scalar field (excluding only exotic examples) and let all metric functions be fully arbitrary. Now the no-go theorem applies not only to non-singular solutions: cases such as bouncing universe with black hole are also restricted. The sufficient conditions of the no-go theorem includes the presence of either a timelike or a spacelike gradient curve which does not contain a scalar field singularity, so it does not contradict the fact of existence of a singularity in the whole system. These restrictions make almost any ansatz for the scalar field and metric functions corresponding to a compact object or a cosmological solution incompatible with the stability conditions in the cubic subclass of Horndeski theory, regardless of the presence of a singularity.

Acknowledgements

The authors are grateful to A. Shtennikova, V. Volkova, Y. Ageeva for valuable discussions. The authors wish to thank Kasper Peeters for developing and maintaining cadabra2 software [40], with which most of the calculations were performed. The work on this project has been supported by Russian Science Foundation grant № 24-72-10110, <https://rscf.ru/project/24-72-10110/>.

VIII. Appendix

A. Effective Metric

$$\begin{aligned}
\mathcal{K}^{00} = & F_X + 2F_{XX}(\dot{\pi})^2 a^{-2} - K_\pi - 4K_X c' \pi' b^{-2} c^{-1} + 2K_X b' \pi' b^{-3} + 4K_X \dot{c} \pi a^{-2} c^{-1} \\
& + 2K_X \dot{b} \pi a^{-2} b^{-1} - 2K_X \pi'' b^{-2} + 2K_{XX} b' \pi' (\dot{\pi})^2 a^{-2} b^{-3} - 2K_{XX} \dot{b} \pi (\pi')^2 a^{-2} b^{-3} - 2K_{XX} b' (\pi')^3 b^{-5} \\
& - 4K_{XX} c' \pi' (\dot{\pi})^2 a^{-2} b^{-2} c^{-1} + 4K_{XX} \dot{c} (\dot{\pi})^3 a^{-4} c^{-1} + 2K_{XX} \dot{b} (\dot{\pi})^3 a^{-4} b^{-1} - 2K_{XX} \pi'' (\dot{\pi})^2 a^{-2} b^{-2} \\
& + 2K_{XX} \pi'' (\pi')^2 b^{-4} - K_{X\pi} (\dot{\pi})^2 a^{-2} - K_{X\pi} (\pi')^2 b^{-2} - K_X^2 (\pi')^4 b^{-4} k \\
& - 2K_X^2 (\pi')^2 (\dot{\pi})^2 a^{-2} b^{-2} k + 3K_X^2 (\dot{\pi})^4 a^{-4} k,
\end{aligned} \tag{31a}$$

$$\begin{aligned}
\mathcal{K}^{tr} = & -4F_{XX} \pi' \dot{\pi} a^{-2} b^{-2} - 4K_X a' \dot{\pi} a^{-3} b^{-2} - 4K_X \pi' \dot{b} a^{-2} b^{-3} + 4K_X \dot{\pi}' a^{-2} b^{-2} \\
& - 4K_{XX} a' (\dot{\pi})^3 a^{-5} b^{-2} + 4K_{XX} \dot{b} (\pi')^3 a^{-2} b^{-5} - 8K_{XX} \pi' \dot{c} (\dot{\pi})^2 a^{-4} b^{-2} c^{-1} \\
& + 8K_{XX} c' \pi' (\pi')^2 a^{-2} b^{-4} c^{-1} - 4K_{XX} \dot{\pi}' (\pi')^2 a^{-2} b^{-4} + 4K_{XX} \dot{\pi}' (\dot{\pi})^2 a^{-4} b^{-2} \\
& + 4K_{XX} a' \pi' (\pi')^2 a^{-3} b^{-4} - 4K_{XX} \pi' \dot{b} (\dot{\pi})^2 a^{-4} b^{-3} \\
& + 4K_{X\pi} \pi' \dot{\pi} a^{-2} b^{-2} + 8\dot{\pi} K_X^2 (\pi')^3 a^{-2} b^{-4} k - 8\pi' K_X^2 (\dot{\pi})^3 a^{-4} b^{-2} k,
\end{aligned} \tag{31b}$$

$$\begin{aligned}
\mathcal{K}^{rr} = & F_X - 2F_{XX} (\pi')^2 b^{-2} - K_\pi \\
& - 4K_X c' \pi' b^{-2} c^{-1} - 2K_X a' \pi' a^{-1} b^{-2} + 2K_X \ddot{\pi} a^{-2} + 4K_X \dot{c} \pi a^{-2} c^{-1} - 2K_X \dot{a} \pi a^{-3} \\
& + 4K_{XX} c' (\pi')^3 b^{-4} c^{-1} + 2K_{XX} a' (\pi')^3 a^{-1} b^{-4} - 2K_{XX} \ddot{\pi} (\pi')^2 a^{-2} b^{-2} \\
& - 4K_{XX} \dot{c} \pi (\pi')^2 a^{-2} b^{-2} c^{-1} - 2K_{XX} a' \pi' (\dot{\pi})^2 a^{-3} b^{-2} + 2K_{XX} \dot{a} \pi (\pi')^2 a^{-3} b^{-2} \\
& + 2K_{XX} \ddot{\pi} (\dot{\pi})^2 a^{-4} - 2K_{XX} \dot{a} (\dot{\pi})^3 a^{-5} + K_{X\pi} (\pi')^2 b^{-2} + K_{X\pi} (\dot{\pi})^2 a^{-2} \\
& + 3K_X^2 (\pi')^4 b^{-4} k - 2K_X^2 (\pi')^2 (\dot{\pi})^2 a^{-2} b^{-2} k - K_X^2 (\dot{\pi})^4 a^{-4} k,
\end{aligned} \tag{31c}$$

$$\begin{aligned}
\mathcal{K}^\Omega = & F_X - 2K_X \pi'' b^{-2} - 2K_X c' \pi' b^{-2} c^{-1} + 2K_X b' \pi' b^{-3} \\
& - 2K_X a' \pi' a^{-1} b^{-2} + 2K_X \ddot{\pi} a^{-2} + 2K_X \dot{c} \pi a^{-2} c^{-1} + 2K_X \dot{b} \pi a^{-2} b^{-1} - 2K_X \dot{a} \pi a^{-3} \\
& + 2K_{XX} \pi'' (\pi')^2 b^{-4} - 2K_{XX} b' (\pi')^3 b^{-5} - 4K_{XX} \pi' \dot{\pi} \pi' a^{-2} b^{-2} + 2K_{XX} \dot{b} \pi (\pi')^2 a^{-2} b^{-3} \\
& + 2K_{XX} a' \pi' (\dot{\pi})^2 a^{-3} b^{-2} + 2K_{XX} \ddot{\pi} (\dot{\pi})^2 a^{-4} - 2K_{XX} \dot{a} (\dot{\pi})^3 a^{-5} - K_{X\pi} (\pi')^2 b^{-2} \\
& + K_{X\pi} (\dot{\pi})^2 a^{-2} - K_X^2 \left((\pi')^2 a^2 - K_\pi - (\dot{\pi})^2 b^2 \right)^2 a^{-4} b^{-4} k.
\end{aligned} \tag{31d}$$

B. The possibility of algebraic generalization of no-go theorem

We have already discussed two limits of the no-go theorem. The way of generalization should include both of them. In Sec.III A we see the lack of possibility of building an argument for the no-go theorem using only one stability condition. The purpose of this section is to find a more general combination and study whether the no-go theorem holds or not in the dynamical case.

In full analogy with \mathcal{Y} in extension of the static no-go theorem (13), for the cosmological no-go theorem we introduce an additional function $\mathcal{J}(r, t)$ which definition has the following form

$$\mathcal{J}(r, t) = 2 \frac{b^2}{a^2} (\dot{\pi})^2 \mathcal{K}^{rr} + 2 \frac{b}{ac} \frac{\partial}{\partial t} \left(\frac{c}{a^3 b} (\dot{\pi})^3 K_X \right) - k K_X (\dot{\pi})^3 \frac{b}{a^3 c} \left(\frac{2c}{a^3 b} K_X (\dot{\pi})^3 - \frac{2}{k} \frac{\dot{c}}{ab} \right) + T_t^t - T_r^r. \tag{32}$$

The explicit expressions for the additional functions read as

$$\begin{aligned}
\mathcal{Y}(r, t) = & \ddot{\pi} K_X \left(-2(\pi')^2 a^{-2} b^{-2} + 2(\dot{\pi})^2 a^{-4} \right) \\
& + \dot{\pi} \left[-2F_X \dot{\pi} a^{-2} + 4F_{XX} \dot{\pi} (\pi')^2 a^{-2} b^{-2} + 2K_\pi \dot{\pi} a^{-2} + K_X (2\dot{\pi} \pi'' a^{-2} b^{-2} + 4c' \pi' \dot{\pi} a^{-2} b^{-2} c^{-1} \right. \\
& + 4\dot{c} (\pi')^2 a^{-2} b^{-2} c^{-1} - 2b' \pi' \dot{\pi} a^{-2} b^{-3} + 6\dot{b} (\pi')^2 a^{-2} b^{-3} - 2a' \pi' \dot{\pi} a^{-3} b^{-2} + 2\dot{a} (\pi')^2 a^{-3} b^{-2} \\
& \left. - 4\dot{c} (\dot{\pi})^2 a^{-4} c^{-1} - 2\dot{b} (\dot{\pi})^2 a^{-4} b^{-1} - 2\dot{a} (\dot{\pi})^2 a^{-5} \right) + K_{XX} \left(4\dot{\pi}' (\pi')^3 a^{-2} b^{-4} - 4\dot{\pi} \pi'' (\pi')^2 a^{-2} b^{-4} \right. \\
& \left. - 8c' \dot{\pi}' (\pi')^3 a^{-2} b^{-4} c^{-1} + 4b' \dot{\pi}' (\pi')^3 a^{-2} b^{-5} - 4\dot{b} (\pi')^4 a^{-2} b^{-5} - 4a' \dot{\pi}' (\pi')^3 a^{-3} b^{-4} + 8\dot{c} (\pi')^2 (\dot{\pi})^2 a^{-4} b^{-2} c^{-1} \right. \\
& \left. + 4\dot{b} (\pi')^2 (\dot{\pi})^2 a^{-4} b^{-3} \right) - 2K_{X\pi} \dot{\pi} (\pi')^2 a^{-2} b^{-2} + K_X^2 \left(-4\dot{\pi}' (\pi')^4 a^{-2} b^{-4} k + 6(\pi')^2 (\dot{\pi})^3 a^{-4} b^{-2} k \right) \Big], \tag{33}
\end{aligned}$$

$$\begin{aligned}
\mathcal{J}(r, t) = & \pi'' K_X \left(-2(\dot{\pi})^2 a^{-2} b^{-2} + 2(\pi')^2 b^{-4} \right) \\
& + \pi' \left[2F_X (\pi')^2 b^{-2} + 4F_{XX} (\pi')^2 (\dot{\pi})^2 a^{-2} b^{-2} - 2K_\pi (\pi')^2 b^{-2} + K_X \left(-4c' (\pi')^3 b^{-4} c^{-1} - 2b' (\pi')^3 b^{-5} \right. \right. \\
& \left. - 2a' (\pi')^3 a^{-1} b^{-4} + 2\ddot{\pi} (\pi')^2 a^{-2} b^{-2} + 4c' \pi' (\dot{\pi})^2 a^{-2} b^{-2} c^{-1} + 4\dot{c} \dot{\pi} (\pi')^2 a^{-2} b^{-2} c^{-1} + 2b' \pi' (\dot{\pi})^2 a^{-2} b^{-3} \right. \\
& \left. - 2\dot{b} \dot{\pi} (\pi')^2 a^{-2} b^{-3} + 6a' \pi' (\dot{\pi})^2 a^{-3} b^{-2} - 2\dot{a} \dot{\pi} (\pi')^2 a^{-3} b^{-2} \right) - 2K_{X\pi} (\pi')^2 (\dot{\pi})^2 a^{-2} b^{-2} \\
& + K_{XX} \left(-8c' (\pi')^3 (\dot{\pi})^2 a^{-2} b^{-4} c^{-1} - 4a' (\pi')^3 (\dot{\pi})^2 a^{-3} b^{-4} + 4\ddot{\pi} (\pi')^2 (\dot{\pi})^2 a^{-4} b^{-2} - 4\pi' \dot{\pi}' (\dot{\pi})^3 a^{-4} b^{-2} \right. \\
& \left. + 8\dot{c} (\pi')^2 (\dot{\pi})^3 a^{-4} b^{-2} c^{-1} + 4\dot{b} (\pi')^2 (\dot{\pi})^3 a^{-4} b^{-3} + 4a' \pi' (\dot{\pi})^4 a^{-5} b^{-2} - 4\dot{a} (\pi')^2 (\dot{\pi})^3 a^{-5} b^{-2} \right) \\
& \left. + K_X^2 \left(-6(\pi')^4 (\dot{\pi})^2 a^{-2} b^{-4} k + 4(\pi')^2 (\dot{\pi})^4 a^{-4} b^{-2} k \right) \right]. \tag{34}
\end{aligned}$$

The following particular equality has a relatively compact form

$$\begin{aligned}
2\dot{\pi} \pi' \left(\frac{a^2}{b^2} \mathcal{Y} + \frac{b^2}{a^2} \mathcal{J} \right) = & -2a^2 \dot{\pi} \frac{\partial}{\partial r} \left(K_X \dot{\pi}^2 (\pi')^2 \frac{1}{b^2 a^4} \right) + 2b^2 \pi' \frac{\partial}{\partial t} \left(K_X \dot{\pi}^2 (\pi')^2 \frac{1}{a^2 b^4} \right) \\
& + \frac{2}{3} \dot{\pi} \pi' K_X c^6 \left[\frac{a^3}{b} \frac{\partial}{\partial r} \left((\pi')^3 \frac{1}{a^3 b^3 c^6} \right) - \frac{b^3}{a} \frac{\partial}{\partial t} \left((\dot{\pi})^3 \frac{1}{a^3 b^3 c^6} \right) \right] \\
& + 2 \left(\frac{(\pi')^2}{b^2} - \frac{\dot{\pi}^2}{a^2} \right) \left(-K_X^2 \frac{(\pi')^2 \dot{\pi}^2}{a^2 b^2} k - K_\pi + F_X \right). \tag{35}
\end{aligned}$$

Generalization of the no-go theorem argument in the dynamical case with radial dependence is not straightforward due to non-linearity in the stability conditions (10c).

C. Solving the system of motion equations for background field

It is possible to get a combination of Einstein equations that does not contain Lagrangian functions K, F and their derivatives

$$\begin{aligned}
S = & \frac{(\pi')^2}{ab} \left[\left(\frac{a^2 c}{b} \left(\frac{a}{c} \right)' \right)' \frac{1}{c^2} + \frac{\partial}{\partial t} \left(\frac{1}{bc} \frac{\partial}{\partial t} (ac) \right) - \frac{2\dot{a}\dot{c}}{bc} \right] \\
& + \frac{(\dot{\pi})^2}{ab} \left[\frac{\partial}{\partial t} \left(\frac{a^2 c}{b} \frac{\partial}{\partial t} \left(\frac{a}{c} \right) \right) \frac{1}{c^2} + \left(\frac{1}{bc} (ac)' \right)' - \frac{2a'c'}{bc} \right] \\
& + \frac{4\dot{\pi}\pi'}{b^2 c} \left(\dot{c}' - \frac{\dot{b}}{b} c' - \frac{a'}{a} \dot{c} \right) \tag{36}
\end{aligned}$$

This combination is similar to the one shown in [38] for $G_4 = 1$ and $F_4 = 0$, the absence of Lagrangian functions there is a feature of the cubic subclass of Horndeski theory.

The relation (36) is the second-order nonlinear PDE for a , b , c , π with their special asymptotics. The method of Lagrangian reconstruction that aims to evade PDEs is frequently used to obtain stable solutions in Horndeski theory [37, 38]. However, in our case (36) does not contain the Lagrangian functions, so it is impossible to avoid solving PDEs while constructing a solution in the cubic subclass of Horndeski theory opposite to the higher subclasses of it. The proof of absence of the no-go theorem should include the way to construct stable non-singular solution, and we do not provide it.

-
- [1] G. W. Horndeski, “Second-order scalar-tensor field equations in a four-dimensional space,” *Int. J. Theor. Phys.* **10** (1974) 363.
- [2] A. Nicolis, R. Rattazzi and E. Trincherini, “The Galileon as a local modification of gravity,” *Phys. Rev. D* **79** (2009), 064036 [arXiv:0811.2197 [hep-th]].
- [3] C. Deffayet, S. Deser and G. Esposito-Farese, “Generalized Galileons: All scalar models whose curved background extensions maintain second-order field equations and stress-tensors,” *Phys. Rev. D* **80** (2009), 064015 [arXiv:0906.1967 [gr-qc]].
- [4] C. Deffayet, G. Esposito-Farese and A. Vikman, “Covariant Galileon,” *Phys. Rev. D* **79** (2009), 084003 [arXiv:0901.1314 [hep-th]].
- [5] T. Kobayashi, M. Yamaguchi and J. Yokoyama, “Generalized G-inflation: Inflation with the most general second-order field equations,” *Prog. Theor. Phys.* **126**, 511-529 (2011) [arXiv:1105.5723 [hep-th]].
- [6] T. Kobayashi, “Horndeski theory and beyond: a review,” *Rept. Prog. Phys.* **82**, no.8, 086901 (2019) [arXiv:1901.07183 [gr-qc]].
- [7] V. A. Rubakov, “The Null Energy Condition and its violation,” *Phys. Usp.* **57** (2014), 128-142 [arXiv:1401.4024 [hep-th]].
- [8] P. Creminelli, M. A. Luty, A. Nicolis and L. Senatore, “Starting the Universe: Stable Violation of the Null Energy Condition and Non-standard Cosmologies,” *JHEP* **12** (2006), 080 [arXiv:hep-th/0606090 [hep-th]].
- [9] P. Creminelli, A. Nicolis and E. Trincherini, “Galilean Genesis: An Alternative to inflation,” *JCAP* **11** (2010), 021 [arXiv:1007.0027 [hep-th]].
- [10] P. Creminelli, K. Hinterbichler, J. Khoury, A. Nicolis and E. Trincherini, “Subluminal Galilean Genesis,” *JHEP* **02** (2013), 006 [arXiv:1209.3768 [hep-th]].
- [11] Y. F. Cai, D. A. Easson and R. Brandenberger, “Towards a Nonsingular Bouncing Cosmology,” *JCAP* **08** (2012), 020 [arXiv:1206.2382 [hep-th]].
- [12] C. Deffayet, O. Pujolas, I. Sawicki and A. Vikman, “Imperfect Dark Energy from Kinetic Gravity Braiding,” *JCAP* **10**, 026 (2010) [arXiv:1008.0048 [hep-th]].
- [13] D. A. Easson, I. Sawicki and A. Vikman, “G-Bounce,” *JCAP* **11** (2011), 021 [arXiv:1109.1047 [hep-th]].
- [14] V. A. Rubakov, “Can Galileons support Lorentzian wormholes?,” *Teor. Mat. Fiz.* **187**, no.2, 338-349 (2016) [arXiv:1509.08808 [hep-th]].
- [15] V. A. Rubakov, “More about wormholes in generalized Galileon theories,” *Theor. Math. Phys.* **188** (2016) no.2, 1253-1258 [arXiv:1601.06566 [hep-th]].
- [16] T. Kobayashi, H. Motohashi and T. Suyama, “Black hole perturbation in the most general scalar-tensor theory with second-order field equations I: the odd-parity sector,” *Phys. Rev. D* **85** (2012), 084025 [erratum: *Phys. Rev. D* **96** (2017) no.10, 109903] [arXiv:1202.4893 [gr-qc]].
- [17] T. Kobayashi, H. Motohashi and T. Suyama, “Black hole perturbation in the most general scalar-tensor theory with second-order field equations II: the even-parity sector,” *Phys. Rev. D* **89** (2014) no.8, 084042 [arXiv:1402.6740 [gr-qc]].
- [18] S. A. Mironov and A. M. Shtennikova, “Perturbations in Horndeski Theory above Anisotropic Cosmological Background,” *JETP Lett.* **119**, no.5, 339-344 (2024) [arXiv:2305.19171 [gr-qc]].
- [19] O. A. Evseev and O. I. Melichev, “No static spherically symmetric wormholes in Horndeski theory,” *Phys. Rev. D* **97**, no.12, 124040 (2018) [arXiv:1711.04152 [gr-qc]].
- [20] M. Libanov, S. Mironov and V. Rubakov, “Generalized Galileons: instabilities of bouncing and Genesis cosmologies and modified Genesis,” *JCAP* **08**, 037 (2016) [arXiv:1605.05992 [hep-th]].
- [21] T. Kobayashi, “Generic instabilities of nonsingular cosmologies in Horndeski theory: A no-go theorem,” *Phys. Rev. D* **94**, no.4, 043511 (2016) [arXiv:1606.05831 [hep-th]].
- [22] S. Mironov, “Mathematical Formulation of the No-Go Theorem in Horndeski Theory,” *Universe* **5** (2019) no.2, 52
- [23] S. Mironov and V. Volkova, “Non-singular cosmological scenarios in scalar-tensor theories and their stability: a review,” [arXiv:2409.16108 [gr-qc]].
- [24] R. Kolevatonov and S. Mironov, “Cosmological bounces and Lorentzian wormholes in Galileon theories with an extra scalar field,” *Phys. Rev. D* **94** (2016) no.12, 123516 [arXiv:1607.04099 [hep-th]].
- [25] S. Akama and T. Kobayashi, “Generalized multi-Galileons, covariantized new terms, and the no-go theorem for nonsingular cosmologies,” *Phys. Rev. D* **95** (2017) no.6, 064011 [arXiv:1701.02926 [hep-th]].
- [26] T. Regge and J. A. Wheeler, “Stability of a Schwarzschild singularity,” *Phys. Rev.* **108** (1957) 1063.
- [27] S. Mironov, M. Sharov and V. Volkova, “Linear stability of a time-dependent, spherically symmetric background in beyond Horndeski theory and the speed of gravity waves,” [arXiv:2408.01480 [gr-qc]].
- [28] S. Mironov, M. Sharov and V. Volkova, “Time-dependent, spherically symmetric background in Kaluza-Klein compactified Horndeski theory and the speed of gravity waves,” [arXiv:2408.06329 [gr-qc]].

- [29] K. Takahashi and T. Suyama, “Linear perturbation analysis of hairy black holes in shift-symmetric Horndeski theories: Odd-parity perturbations,” *Phys. Rev. D* **95** (2017) no.2, 024034 [[arXiv:1610.00432\[gr-qc\]](#)].
- [30] E. Babichev, C. Charmousis and N. Lecoeur, “Exact black hole solutions in higher-order scalar-tensor theories,” [[arXiv:2309.12229 \[gr-qc\]](#)].
- [31] H. Ogawa, T. Kobayashi and T. Suyama, “Instability of hairy black holes in shift-symmetric Horndeski theories,” *Phys. Rev. D* **93** (2016) no.6, 064078 [[arXiv:1510.07400 \[gr-qc\]](#)].
- [32] R. Kolevator, S. Mironov, V. Rubakov, N. Sukhov and V. Volkova, “Perturbations in generalized Galileon theories,” *Phys. Rev. D* **96** (2017) no.12, 125012 [[arXiv:1708.04262 \[hep-th\]](#)].
- [33] S. Mironov and V. Volkova, “Properties of perturbations in beyond Horndeski theories,” *Int. J. Mod. Phys. A* **33** (2018) no.27, 1850155 [[arXiv:1712.09909 \[hep-th\]](#)].
- [34] S. Mironov and V. Volkova, “DPSV trick for spherically symmetric backgrounds,” *Nucl. Phys. B* **1004**, 116550 (2024) [[arXiv:2306.17791 \[hep-th\]](#)].
- [35] D. Langlois and K. Noui, “Hamiltonian analysis of higher derivative scalar-tensor theories,” *JCAP* **07**, 016 (2016) [[arXiv:1512.06820 \[gr-qc\]](#)].
- [36] D. Langlois, “Dark energy and modified gravity in degenerate higher-order scalar–tensor (DHOST) theories: A review,” *Int. J. Mod. Phys. D* **28** (2019) no.05, 1942006 [[arXiv:1811.06271 \[gr-qc\]](#)].
- [37] S. Mironov, V. Rubakov and V. Volkova, “More about stable wormholes in beyond Horndeski theory,” *Class. Quant. Grav.* **36** (2019) no.13, 135008 [[arXiv:1812.07022 \[hep-th\]](#)].
- [38] S. Mironov, V. Rubakov and V. Volkova, “In hot pursuit of a stable wormhole in beyond Horndeski theory,” *Phys. Rev. D* **107** (2023) no.10, 104061 [[arXiv:2212.05969 \[gr-qc\]](#)].
- [39] J. Gleyzes, D. Langlois, F. Piazza and F. Vernizzi, “Healthy theories beyond Horndeski,” *Phys. Rev. Lett.* **114** (2015) no.21, 211101 [[arXiv:1404.6495 \[hep-th\]](#)].
- [40] K. Peeters, Cadabra2: computer algebra for field theory revisited, *J. Open Source Softw.* 3 (2018), no. 32 1118.