

Causality and Stability from Acoustic Geometry

Ignacy Sawicki^a, Georg Trenkler^{a,b} and Alexander Vikman^a

^aCEICO, FZU-Institute of Physics of the Czech Academy of Sciences, Na Slovance 1999/2, 182 00, Prague 8, Czechia.

^bInstitute of Theoretical Physics, Faculty of Mathematics and Physics, Charles University, V Holešovičkách 2, 180 00 Prague 8, Czechia.

E-mail: sawicki@fzu.cz, trenkler@fzu.cz, vikman@fzu.cz

Abstract. Scalar-tensor theories with derivative interactions form backgrounds which spontaneously break Lorentz invariance. We investigate the dynamics of free scalar perturbations on general anisotropic backgrounds — relativistic sound waves or phonons moving in general media. We demonstrate that the phonons move on null geodesics of an acoustic spacetime described by its own metric and own connection featuring nonmetricity with respect to the usual spacetime metric. We give distinct physical interpretations to the covariant acoustic metric and its contravariant inverse. The first defines acoustic rays with corresponding phase velocities, wavefront motion and therefore causality. The latter defines four momenta orthogonal to their rays and therefore the dispersion relation. We classify all the possible types of acoustic geometry and provide a physical interpretation for each of them.

We discuss the phonon properties that general moving observers, inequivalent owing to the local dynamical breaking of Lorentz invariance, would measure. Ghosts and true gradient instabilities are to be read off from invariant properties of the acoustic metric — its signature and determinant — and therefore common to all. However, the choice of the observer's frame can cause some confusion and paradoxes, including apparent instabilities. For instance, complex phonon energies can appear entirely due to the ill-posedness of the Cauchy problem in the frame chosen. On the other hand, unbounded negative phonon energies can appear, without ghosts or gradient instabilities, for observers moving supersonically, when phonon Cherenkov radiation can be emitted.

The action for phonons also gives an acoustically covariantly conserved energy-momentum tensor (EMT) which is, however, not conserved in the usual spacetime. Nonetheless, in the presence of an acoustic timelike Killing vector, the acoustic Hamiltonian functional is a conserved charge in both the acoustic and in the usual spacetimes, and even has the same value in both. Thus, the acoustic Hamiltonian can be used to bound the motion of phonons interacting with other species living in the usual spacetime.

Contents

1	Introduction	1
2	Acoustic metric: Construction, Geodesics and Hyperbolicity	4
2.1	The eikonal ansatz and the acoustic metric	4
2.2	Acoustic geodesics and nonmetricity	7
2.3	Acoustic metric signature: hyperbolicity and ghosts	8
2.4	Action and the acoustic energy-momentum tensor	10
3	Acoustic physics: Causality, Stability and Horizons	13
3.1	The acoustic metric and an observer	13
3.2	Acoustic metric and Cauchy surface	19
3.3	Positivity of Hamiltonian	27
3.4	Acoustic metric and sound horizons	33
4	Geometries of acoustic cones and dispersion relations	39
5	Acoustic metrics: Illustrative examples	46
5.1	Gordon’s metric and the Mach cone	46
5.2	k-Essence	48
5.3	Kinetic gravity braiding	50
6	Discussion and summary	53
6.1	Summary of notation and results	55
	References	57

1 Introduction

Initial conditions of the universe and the nature of the dark sector remain open problems in cosmology. Searches for a solution have resulted in the discovery of a rich set of scalar-tensor theories, such as k-essence [1–4], kinetic gravity braiding [5, 6] or galileons [7, 8] and generalized galileons [5, 9] which feature first and even second-order derivative interactions. Eventually it was realised [10] that all these theories belong to the previously discovered class of Horndeski theories [11], which itself was then extended not in the least to include even higher-order derivatives and sufficient degeneracy to not propagate extra degrees of freedom [12–15]. For reviews see ref. [16, 17], but our results are also relevant for other classes of theories, see e.g. [18–21].

These models are often (almost) shift-symmetric and have solutions in which the derivative terms are large. Such backgrounds spontaneously violate Lorentz invariance, and, what is of particular interest to us here, cause small fluctuations of the scalar field to propagate differently than e.g. light. When viewed in such a manner, k-essence can be understood as a relativistic perfect superfluid with a non-luminal sound speed for perturbations. This has been exploited e.g. in cosmology to modify the predictions of standard inflation [22] or to model the effect of clustering dark energy [23, 24]. The key object which determines such properties is the acoustic — or effective — metric for perturbations, which in cosmology is

usually obtained by constructing an effective action for perturbations on the homogeneous cosmological background. As a result of the homogeneity and isotropy of the background universe, this acoustic metric can contain up to two time-dependent parameters, the signs of which describe whether the perturbations are ghosts or not and whether there are gradient instabilities. Both of these are usually considered to be catastrophic pathologies which render the background unstable on very short timescales and are used to eliminate such solutions and theories from further consideration [19, 25]. However, gradient instabilities can be demoted almost to the level of tachyonic instabilities if UV physics can change the dispersion relation on scales parametrically lower than the cutoff or the strong coupling scale, see e.g. [26, 27]. On the other hand, ghost instabilities totally depend on interactions and can be rather benign, for cosmological applications of ghostly Effective Field Theories (EFT) see [28–30], while ghostly systems with a finite number of degrees of freedom can even be manifestly stable [31–33].

The main question we would like to address here is how one should assess the consistency, in particular stability, of general anisotropic backgrounds. Such questions often arise in cosmologically motivated setups such as those involving compact objects in these theories, where screening essentially suppresses the scalar field’s interactions — k-mouflage [34] or Vainshtein [35, 36], various exact solutions e.g. [37–39], EFT setups for black holes [40–43], gravitational-wave emission from binaries [44, 45] or gravitational-wave backgrounds in the presence of dark energy [46], but also in apparently unrelated physics — e.g. in analogue gravity setups, in which superfluid flows are used as analogues to study curved spacetime and phenomena such as Hawking radiation are modelled by the physics of phonons in this medium [47, 48].

The consistency of some choices of coefficients of operators in these theories and therefore the range of permitted background configurations at low energies has been questioned by appealing to the analyticity of the S-matrix in the UV [49–52]. For some theories, for reasons that are still not entirely clear, it is possible to obtain similar bounds in the low-energy theory itself by requiring that the phase speed be at most luminal [53], or a more sophisticated version where time advances with respect to the light cone resolvable within the EFT are forbidden [54–56] — usually called “causality” bounds. In addition, even on the level of the classical background, in the presence of superluminality there exists a possibility that a time machine — a background with closed locally future directed signal trajectories — could be constructed, see e.g. [49, 57]. It is not clear whether such backgrounds can be constructed within the regime of validity of the EFT. In any case, even without gravity, backreaction from quantum corrections appears to prevent such problematic backgrounds from being formed [58–60]. In any case, presence of superluminality on the (semi)classical level does not necessarily imply a violation of causality [58, 61–65].

As is usually the case, stability is determined by the response of the backgrounds to small perturbations. The perspective we would like to promote here is that we can abstract the precise model and background since, as we will show, the physics of interest is contained in the acoustic metric associated to the particular model and background. In essence, the background configuration is a medium, and the acoustic metric is the covariant encoding of the properties of general media relevant to the propagation of relativistic sound waves. In particular in the limit of high frequencies, the evolution of small fluctuations occurs along characteristic surfaces of the acoustic spacetime — the acoustic equivalent of light cones. Using the analogy with standard results in general relativity, we study the properties of the acoustic cone in detail to determine the physical meaning of its properties and geometry

and the relation to stable evolution for the fluctuations. Our discussion is similar to that of [66, 67] where the relative geometry of the light-cone and acoustic cone was used to determine conditions under which evolution can be stable. We put emphasis on the full 3+1d analysis, revealing that certain aspects remain hidden or at least ambiguous in lower dimensions.

In section 2.1 we demonstrate that the acoustic metric needs to be Lorentzian if the fluctuations are to be a proper degree of freedom described by a hyperbolic system of partial differential equations (PDEs), as may have been expected [68, 69]. What is usually called the gradient instability actually signifies a loss of this hyperbolicity and a constraint (elliptical) nature of the equations of motion. Then, we propose that the signature of the acoustic metric determines whether the fluctuations are ghosts or healthy degrees of freedom. These are coordinate-invariant statements upon which all the observers will agree and which reduce to the usual notion for backgrounds with high symmetry.

High-frequency scalar fluctuations propagate in the acoustic spacetime on its null geodesics and only depend on the usual spacetime implicitly. In section 2.2, we show for the first time that the connection of the acoustic spacetime has nonmetricity with respect to the usual metric of a type that guarantees that vector currents conserved in the acoustic spacetime, correspond to ones conserved in the spacetime. We also define an acoustically conserved energy-momentum tensor for fluctuations, which can be used to produce currents conserved in the spacetime whenever the acoustic metric has symmetries.

Hyperbolicity implies that evolution is causal and is associated with the acoustic cone, which is generally different to the light cone. There are in fact two such acoustic cones encoding the same information: one describes rays and the phase velocity of the phonons. The other — momenta and the dispersion relation. The acoustic metric transforms as a tensor and therefore the acoustic cones and the observables they determine are not invariant. This allows us to discuss two effects which can be confused with physical instabilities, but which are rather only related to coordinate choices. In section 3.2, we discuss whether the initial value problem (IVP) can well-posed i.e. solved for general initial data with a smooth dependence thereof. We show that it cannot if the rays point toward coordinate "past", or equivalently when energies of some modes are complex. Frequently this is misinterpreted as a breakdown of hyperbolicity or at least evidence of ghosts.

In section 3.4, we discuss the physics when the observer is moving supersonically: we demonstrate that the appearance of sound horizons and therefore a Mach cone is directly related to the existence of modes with negative (but real) energy *in this frame*. Both of these coordinate problems can become physical in the presence of a second degree of freedom, such as gravity.

In section 3.3, we consider the Hamiltonian functional for perturbations as is more usual. We show that the conclusions match those one obtains by considering the geometry of the cones: for a Lorentzian acoustic metric, the Hamiltonian is bounded provided that the frame is a good Cauchy frame and the motion is not supersonic. We prove that when the acoustic metric has a timelike Killing vector, the acoustic Hamiltonian is not only a conserved charge in the acoustic space-time, but it is simultaneously conserved in the usual spacetime. One can then use it to bound the motion of phonons even when they interact with other species moving in the spacetime metric.

Finally, in section 4, we classify the possible acoustic metrics according to the acoustic eigensystem, explicitly constructing the cones for all Lorentzian acoustic metrics and the associated dispersion relations. In section 5 by illustrating our construction with worked examples from simple scalar-tensor theories. We close with a discussion and summary of our

main results in section 6.

2 Acoustic metric: Construction, Geodesics and Hyperbolicity

2.1 The eikonal ansatz and the acoustic metric

We begin by discussing the propagation of short wave-length modes of a scalar field ϕ in a general medium provided by a background configuration of the same field or other matter fields Ψ_I and gravity $g_{\mu\nu}$. This leads to notions of an acoustic metric along with its associated characteristic surfaces, cones of influence and dispersion relations. Here we follow the general consideration from [47, 68, 70–73].

Our general setup comprises some spacetime metric $g_{\mu\nu}$, the dynamics of which is controlled by the theory of gravity, which can be Einstein’s general relativity (GR) or some modified gravity. Following the well-established tradition, we call the null-cone (also sometimes called isotropic cone) of this spacetime metric $g_{\mu\nu}$ the *light cone* and call the speed of propagation along this cone as the *speed of light* which we normalise to unity. However, the reader should keep in mind that while in the case of vanishing backgrounds ϕ , Ψ_I including the electromagnetic field and spacetime curvature, light must propagate on this light cone, on a general background this *might no longer* be the case. We assume that observers which only interact with gravity move on geodesics of $g_{\mu\nu}$ and that at least some degrees of freedom do propagate on the light cone.¹

We do not specify the theory of ϕ yet, only assuming that the equations of motion for all fields involved are second-order in derivatives. For instance, this theory could be k-essence [2, 3, 74], more general kinetic gravity braiding [5] or ϕ can be non-minimally coupled through derivatives to other fields such as the electromagnetic tensor, see e.g. [75] and for more recent works e.g. [76, 77]. The background $\bar{\phi}(x^\mu)$ or backgrounds of other fields $\bar{\Psi}_I(x^\mu)$ will in general be not Lorentz invariant and therefore small fluctuations $\pi = \delta\phi$ around it can propagate at speeds different to the speed of light even in the massless (i.e. gapless) case. One can understand this as a propagation in an effective acoustic spacetime which has essentially all the features of the standard one from the point of view of geometry and geodesics. As we will demonstrate, we are dealing with a theory with multiple metrics. We presume that both the background solution $\bar{\phi}$ and the perturbed one $\phi = \bar{\phi} + \pi$ satisfy the equations of motion as do the other fields involved. We can include gravity and ϕ and all other fields as elements of $\Psi_I = \bar{\Psi}_I + \pi_I$, so that $\pi_I = (\pi, \psi_I)$.

Assuming that the perturbations are small and vary on scales much shorter than the background we can employ the standard eikonal approximation,

$$\pi_I = \Re \mathcal{A}_I(x) \exp(i\mathcal{S}(x)/\epsilon), \quad (2.1)$$

where \Re means that we take the real part only. In this ansatz the auxiliary parameter ϵ is then taken sufficiently close to the limit $\epsilon \rightarrow 0$, to allow us to assume that $\mathcal{A}_I(x)$ varies slowly compared to the phase. In the formal limit $\epsilon \rightarrow 0$, the surfaces $\mathcal{S} = \text{const}$ are the characteristic surfaces (or wavefronts) for this linearized system. At the leading order,

¹In a situations when $g_{\mu\nu}$ is demoted from its usual physical meaning, for instance, when no degrees of freedom propagate along its light cone, or when no Lorentz invariant vacuum is available, or when observers are coupled not to $g_{\mu\nu}$ but something else, one could use as a fiducial metric the effective metric of some other degree of freedom.

$\mathcal{O}(\epsilon^{-2})$, the condition that one can find $\mathcal{A}_I(x)$ from the linearized system of second order PDE reads

$$\det\left(\mathcal{P}^{IJ\mu\nu}\partial_\mu\mathcal{S}\partial_\nu\mathcal{S}\right) = 0, \quad (2.2)$$

where $\mathcal{P}^{IJ\mu\nu}\partial_\mu\partial_\nu$ is the so-called principal symbol of the second order differential operator of the linearized system of equations of motion. In many physically interesting cases, either for particular backgrounds, or even for *all* backgrounds as it is in kinetic gravity braiding (as it was demonstrated in [5]), equation (2.2) factorises into a product of terms like

$$Z^{\mu\nu}\partial_\mu\mathcal{S}\partial_\nu\mathcal{S} = 0, \quad (2.3)$$

where $Z^{\mu\nu}$ is a tensor formed from functions of the background configurations of the spacetime metric, the scalar, all other fields and their derivatives. In the rest of the paper we consider this factorisable situation assuming it is applicable for the fluctuations of the scalar field under consideration π . For a more mathematically inclined discussion of the non-factorisable case see [68]. As we will discuss here, $Z^{\mu\nu}$ really acts as an (inverse or contravariant) metric for the fluctuations π .

Our main goal is to concentrate on this physically relevant, but still relatively simple, case of one factorised scalar degree of freedom to achieve a maximally transparent and physically intuitive discussion. Other factorised degrees of freedom can be added by induction. Also note that any tensor conformally related to $Z^{\mu\nu}$ is equivalent from the point of view of eq. (2.3). We will discuss the choice of proper normalisation later, but it has no influence on most of the discussion in this paper.

We can associate a momentum covector to the characteristic surface,²

$$P_\mu = \partial_\mu\mathcal{S}. \quad (2.4)$$

The momentum P_μ is then a null covector for the inverse metric, and the surface

$$Z^{\mu\nu}P_\mu P_\nu = 0 \quad (2.5)$$

is a null surface of constant phase \mathcal{S} .

We can recover the direction travel of constant-phase surfaces, and therefore the phase four-velocity, by requiring that on some curve parameterised by λ (the ray)

$$0 = d\mathcal{S} = \partial_\mu\mathcal{S} \frac{dx^\mu}{d\lambda} d\lambda. \quad (2.6)$$

Thus $P_\mu dx^\mu/d\lambda = 0$ and the constant phase surface with momentum P_μ moves in the direction $dx^\mu/d\lambda$ orthogonal to P_μ . We demand that for any P_μ there be a unique ray, requiring a linear relationship $dx^\mu/d\lambda = M^{\mu\nu}P_\nu$ with some non-degenerate $M^{\mu\nu}$. By Eq. (2.3) one obtains³ that $M^{\mu\nu} \propto Z^{\mu\nu}$ and the conformal factor can be set correctly by the judicious choice of the λ as an affine parameter. We can thus define the ray vector

$$\frac{dx^\mu}{d\lambda} = N^\mu \equiv Z^{\mu\nu}P_\nu, \quad \text{so that} \quad N^\mu P_\mu = 0. \quad (2.7)$$

²Strictly speaking, the momentum should be $\partial_\mu\mathcal{S}/\epsilon$ but the auxiliary parameter ϵ is only used to keep track of orders of expansion and can be set to unity after that.

³If this proportionality condition were not satisfied, the momentum P_μ would satisfy two independent quadratic equations which would overconstrain the system.

In particular, a *phonon*, as we colloquially call the quasiparticle which is a quantum of the perturbation π , has four-velocity N^μ and four-momentum P^μ . When this standard construction is carried out for electromagnetism in vacuum, $g^{\mu\nu}$ appears instead of $Z^{\mu\nu}$ and for a light wave with momentum p_μ , the ray vector is $p^\mu = g^{\mu\nu}p_\nu$. The orthogonality of the ray and the momentum for light is just the statement that the momentum is null, $p^\mu p_\mu = 0$ and the ray is just the Poynting vector of the electromagnetic wave.

Instead here, the vectors N^μ and P^μ are not coincident and we have the statement of orthogonality for $N^\mu P_\mu = 0$. Thus, if one of the two vectors is timelike with respect to $g_{\mu\nu}$, the other is spacelike. In fact the orthogonality conditions can be interpreted as a kind of on-shell condition, defining the direction of travel N^μ of a momentum mode P_μ . Propagation is subluminal provided N^μ is g -timelike⁴

$$g_{\mu\nu}N^\mu N^\nu < 0, \quad (2.8)$$

while superluminal propagation is described by g -spacelike wave four-velocities

$$g_{\mu\nu}N^\mu N^\nu > 0. \quad (2.9)$$

We stress that owing to Eq. (2.6) the four-momentum P_μ is necessarily g -spacelike for the usual *subluminal* propagation.

When the second metric is introduced, there are now two structures mapping vectors to covectors and one needs to be careful with notation. In this paper, we will always raise and lower indices using the spacetime metric $g_{\mu\nu}$ and its inverse, $g^{\mu\nu}$, as per usual. It can easily be seen that $Z_{\mu\nu} = g_{\mu\alpha}g_{\nu\beta}Z^{\alpha\beta}$ is *not* the inverse of $Z^{\mu\nu}$. Rather, provided that $Z^{\mu\nu}$ is not degenerate, a new tensor $S_{\mu\nu}$ exists with

$$Z^{\mu\rho}S_{\rho\nu} = \delta_\nu^\mu, \quad (2.10)$$

and the pair $S_{\mu\nu}/Z^{\mu\nu}$ give an alternative to $g_{\mu\nu}/g^{\mu\nu}$ to assign dual one forms (covectors) to vectors and vice versa. With the definition (2.10), the equation for P_μ (2.5) can be rewritten as an equation for the rays N^μ ,

$$S_{\mu\nu}N^\mu N^\nu = 0. \quad (2.11)$$

The rays are null vectors of $S_{\mu\nu}$, while the momenta are null covectors of $Z^{\mu\nu}$. As we will see, the respective null surfaces form cones which are distinct from the point of view of the spacetime — to distinguish them, we will call them the *ray cone* or *N-cone* (2.11) and the *momentum cone* or *P-cone* (2.5) respectively. In the end, both of the acoustic cones encode the same information, which we will demonstrate.

We also need to be careful about specifying the meaning of timelike, spacelike and null. We will use the prefix g -, Z - and S - (e.g. Z -timelike) to specify with respect to which metric the (co)-vectors are timelike/spacelike. Introducing $S_{\mu\nu}$ gives a simple formula

$$P_\mu = S_{\mu\nu}N^\nu, \quad (2.12)$$

inverting the relation (2.7). Later we are going to illustrate our results plotting N^μ and

$$P^\mu = S_\nu^\mu N^\nu, \quad (2.13)$$

so that the linear operator S_ν^μ can be thought of as playing the role of an *effective mass tensor* relating four-velocity with canonical four-momentum even for gapless waves. We discuss this tensor in section 3.1, showing that $\det S_\nu^\mu > 0$ is required for the existence of acoustic cones.

⁴We work in the $(-+++)$ signature for the spacetime metric $g_{\mu\nu}$.

2.2 Acoustic geodesics and nonmetricity

Let us now make the claim that $S_{\mu\nu}/Z^{\mu\nu}$ are really an (inverse) metric more concrete by illustrating that we can replicate the whole geometrical machinery of general relativity.

We can define a covariant derivative compatible with $Z^{\mu\nu}$ and give it a torsion-free connection; $\bar{\nabla}_\alpha Z^{\mu\nu} = 0$ (e.g. [78])⁵ Applying this acoustic covariant derivative to (2.5), we obtain two equations as an analogue of the geodesic equation,⁶

$$N^\mu \bar{\nabla}_\mu N^\lambda = 0 \quad \text{and} \quad N^\mu \bar{\nabla}_\mu P_\nu = 0, \quad (2.14)$$

where we have used the fact that P_μ is a derivative of a scalar and multiplied by $Z^{\lambda\nu}$ to obtain the first equation from the second. We should interpret the first equation (2.14) as meaning that the ray vectors are parallel transported along themselves and therefore, when integrated, give the Z -null geodesics of the acoustic metric $Z^{\mu\nu}$. The second equation implies that momentum covectors are parallel transported in $Z^{\mu\nu}$ along their associated rays. Note that there are no such equations for the momentum *vector* $P^\mu = g^{\mu\nu} P_\nu$ or for parallel transport along P^μ .

Using the standard procedure for metric-compatible connections, we can find an explicit expression for the acoustic Christoffel symbols in the derivative $\bar{\nabla}_\mu$

$$\bar{\Gamma}_{\mu\nu}^\alpha = \frac{1}{2} Z^{\alpha\beta} (\partial_\mu S_{\beta\nu} + \partial_\nu S_{\beta\mu} - \partial_\beta S_{\mu\nu}). \quad (2.15)$$

The difference between the acoustic and the usual Christoffel symbols is given by the disformation tensor⁷

$$L^\alpha{}_{\mu\nu} = \bar{\Gamma}_{\mu\nu}^\alpha - \Gamma_{\mu\nu}^\alpha = \frac{1}{2} Z^{\alpha\beta} (\nabla_\mu S_{\beta\nu} + \nabla_\nu S_{\beta\mu} - \nabla_\beta S_{\mu\nu}), \quad (2.16)$$

where ∇_μ is the usual covariant derivative compatible with the gravitational spacetime metric: $\nabla_\alpha g_{\mu\nu} = 0$. On the other hand, the derivative $\bar{\nabla}_\mu$ is not compatible with the spacetime metric and gives the nonmetricity tensor $Q_{\alpha\mu\nu}$ according to

$$\bar{\nabla}_\alpha g_{\mu\nu} = Q_{\alpha\mu\nu} = -L_{\mu\alpha\nu} - L_{\nu\alpha\mu}. \quad (2.17)$$

Following [80, 81], we expand the acoustic nonmetricity tensor into

$$Q_{\alpha\mu\nu} = g_{\mu\nu} W_\alpha + \mathcal{Q}_{\alpha\mu\nu}, \quad (2.18)$$

where $\mathcal{Q}_{\alpha\mu\nu}$ is trace-free in indices μ, ν and W_α denotes the Weyl vector

$$W_\alpha = \frac{1}{4} g^{\mu\nu} \bar{\nabla}_\alpha g_{\mu\nu}. \quad (2.19)$$

The acoustic nonmetricity in (2.17) has

$$W_\alpha = -\frac{1}{4} Z^{\mu\nu} \nabla_\alpha S_{\mu\nu} = -\frac{1}{4} \partial_\alpha \ln |\det S_\mu^\nu|, \quad (2.20)$$

⁵Compatibility with $Z^{\mu\nu}$ implies compatibility with $S_{\mu\nu}$.

⁶In the lowest order in eikonal approximation, we know the acoustic metric only up to a conformal factor Ω . This factor $S_{\alpha\beta} \rightarrow \Omega S_{\alpha\beta}$ would change the affinely parametrised geodesic equations (2.14) to the generic, non-affine parametrisation $N^\nu \bar{\nabla}_\nu N^\beta = -N^\beta N^\nu \partial_\nu \Omega$, with the acoustic null vector still transported parallel to itself, c.f. [79, pg. 7].

⁷Note that acoustic geodesics generically do not map to the usual spacetime geodesics, as $N^\nu \bar{\nabla}_\nu N^\beta = N^\nu \nabla_\nu N^\beta + N^\nu L_{\nu\alpha}^\beta N^\alpha$ so that $N^\nu \nabla_\nu N^\beta = -N^\nu L_{\nu\alpha}^\beta N^\alpha$ and generically N^μ is not transported parallel to itself in the usual spacetime sense.

where S_β^α is defined⁸ in eq. (2.13). An implication of eq. (2.20) is the simple relation between the acoustic and spacetime divergences of a vector:

$$\bar{\nabla}_\mu V^\mu = \frac{1}{\sqrt{\det S_\beta^\alpha}} \nabla_\mu \left(\sqrt{\det S_\beta^\alpha} V^\mu \right). \quad (2.21)$$

We can continue this geodetic picture by deriving the geodesic deviation equation — again, the equation only exists for the closely separated geodesics with tangent ray vectors N^μ and separation vector ξ^μ , and not for P_μ . The derivation proceeds as usual, giving

$$N^\mu \bar{\nabla}_\mu \left(N^\nu \bar{\nabla}_\nu \xi^\alpha \right) = \mathcal{R}[Z]^\alpha{}_{\mu\nu\beta} N^\mu N^\nu \xi^\beta, \quad (2.22)$$

with $\mathcal{R}[Z]^\alpha{}_{\mu\nu\beta}$ the Riemann curvature tensor of the $S_{\mu\nu}/Z^{\mu\nu}$ metric formed from Christoffel symbols defined by eq. (2.15).

2.3 Acoustic metric signature: hyperbolicity and ghosts

If $Z^{\mu\nu}$ is to be a metric, it must be non-degenerate and therefore the consideration for $S_{\mu\nu}$ is equivalent. To describe a causal structure a metric must have Lorentzian signature. The same is required to allow for a well-posed formulation of the Cauchy problem, i.e. for the initial value problem (IVP) for ϕ . This is necessary so that the differential operator describing the propagation of perturbations be hyperbolic. This is then equivalent to the existence of cones of influence. We will recover this standard result for the spacetime metric also for the acoustic spacetime setting up the discussion without making reference to the spacetime metric.

Let us choose an arbitrary vector U^μ . We only require that it not be null with respect to $S_{\mu\nu}$ and we do not normalise it. We associate a covector u_μ to it,

$$u_\mu \equiv S_{\mu\nu} U^\nu, \quad S_{\mu\nu} U^\mu U^\nu = -\alpha \neq 0, \quad (2.23)$$

We can now define a projector

$$\bar{\perp}_\nu^\mu = \delta_\nu^\mu + \frac{U^\mu u_\nu}{\alpha}, \quad (2.24)$$

onto a subspace orthogonal to U^μ and the associated induced inverse metric on this subspace, $\bar{\Delta}^{\mu\nu} = Z^{\alpha\beta} \bar{\perp}_\alpha^\mu \bar{\perp}_\beta^\nu$. To be specific, this hypersurface is orthogonal in the Z -metric

$$\bar{\Delta}^{\mu\nu} \equiv Z^{\mu\nu} + \frac{U^\mu U^\nu}{\alpha}, \quad \bar{\perp}_\nu^\mu \equiv \bar{\Delta}^{\mu\lambda} S_{\lambda\nu}. \quad (2.25)$$

where the expressions here allow for the arbitrary normalisation of U^μ .

The momentum covector can be decomposed,

$$P_\mu = \frac{\omega_Z}{\alpha} u_\mu + \bar{K}_\mu, \quad \text{with} \quad \bar{K}_\mu \equiv \bar{\perp}_\mu^\nu P_\nu, \quad (2.26)$$

⁸It is important to stress that $\det S_\nu^\mu \equiv \varepsilon^{\alpha\beta\gamma\sigma} \varepsilon_{\alpha'\beta'\gamma'\sigma'} S_\alpha^{\alpha'} S_\beta^{\beta'} S_\gamma^{\gamma'} S_\sigma^{\sigma'} / 4!$ is a scalar quantity, contrary to $\det S_{\mu\nu} \equiv -g \varepsilon^{\alpha\beta\gamma\sigma} \varepsilon_{\alpha'\beta'\gamma'\sigma'} S_{\alpha\alpha'} S_{\beta\beta'} S_{\gamma\gamma'} S_{\sigma\sigma'} / 4!$, where $\varepsilon_{\alpha\beta\gamma\sigma}$ denotes the totally antisymmetric Levi-Civita tensor, and as usual $g = \det g_{\mu\nu}$ see e.g. [70, pg. 250].

and we can carry this through to the characteristic equation (2.3),

$$Z^{\mu\nu} P_\mu P_\nu = -\frac{1}{\alpha} \left(\omega_Z^2 - \alpha \bar{\Delta}^{\mu\nu} \bar{K}_\mu \bar{K}_\nu \right) = 0. \quad (2.27)$$

If there exists any such vector U^μ that the tensor $\alpha \bar{\Delta}^{\mu\nu}$ is positive definite then the characteristic surface described by (2.27) is a cone. This is only possible if the signature of the acoustic metric is Lorentzian — (3,1) or (1,3) — and then U^μ is S -timelike. Equivalently, u_μ is Z -timelike, a covector lying inside the cone.⁹

Since $Z^{\mu\nu}$ and $S_{\mu\nu}$ are inverses, they have the same signature. We are nonetheless still left with two possible hyperbolic signatures. We *define* the *ghost* as having the acoustic metric $Z^{\mu\nu}$ of the *opposite signature* to the one of the fiducial spacelike metric $g^{\mu\nu}$. We assume that, at least some standard healthy degrees of freedom propagate in the usual spacetime metric, for lack of a better term we call such a standard degree of freedom — a *non-ghost*. Which one is which is a just convention, but for this paper:

- Signature (3,1) (mostly plus) represents a healthy degree of freedom,
- Signature (1,3) (mostly minus) is the invariant definition of a ghost.

For both of these cases, and only for these cases, the determinant of the metric Z (and S) is negative and the null surface (2.27) is a cone and causal evolution is possible.

The null surfaces of metrics with other signatures are not cones. Usually this sort of pathological situation is referred to as a gradient instability. It means the differential operator is no longer hyperbolic and the system cannot be solved as an initial value problem. Attempting to do so leads to exponentially growing modes which rapidly dominate the solution.

The cone eq. (2.27) is quadratic in ω_Z — there are two roots which build the two *nappes* of the cone — the future and past. In the Z -frame one root is positive and one negative. If two acoustic metrics differ only by the overall sign (implying a switch of signatures between (3,1) and (1,3)), the cones are the same. The difference is that since $N^\mu = Z^{\mu\nu} P_\nu$, the upper nappe of the ray cone is mapped by the acoustic metric to the lower nappe of the P-cone for a ghost, as opposed to the the upper-to-upper mapping for a non-ghost. This is a Lorentz-invariant geometrical statement valid in any frame and we propose should be considered the defining difference between ghosts and non-ghosts. Since they have acoustic cones, ghosts are proper dynamical degrees of freedom with normal causal evolution — it is only that their four-momenta are taken from the nappe opposite to that of the non-ghosts.

In solving the Cauchy problem and in any consideration of causality, one has to select the as future one of the nappes of the ray cone.¹⁰ For a single isolated degree of freedom, any such choice is fine. Whatever we call the future also defines, through the acoustic metric, the choice of relevant future nappe of the P-cone and therefore the sign of energies of the modes.

However, in the presence of a second metric, e.g. the spacetime metric $g_{\mu\nu}$ and other matter fields propagating in it, the choice of future must be consistent between all the degrees

⁹Note that we are not guaranteed that $\alpha > 0$ even when U^μ is S -timelike — this depends on which of the two Lorentzian signatures S/Z -have.

¹⁰Note that any two distinct S -null vectors N_1^μ and N_2^μ belonging to the same nappe of their cone have a negative product in acoustic geometry, i.e. $S_{\mu\nu} N_1^\mu N_2^\nu < 0$, for non-ghosts. Conversely, $S_{\mu\nu} N_1^\mu N_2^\nu > 0$ implies that the vectors lie in opposite nappes. By the maps (2.7) and (2.12), these inequalities apply also to the covectors $P_{1,2\mu}$ and their metric $Z^{\mu\nu}$ in the same manner. For ghosts, these inequalities are reversed.

of freedom. Thus one is forced to designate as the future nappe of the acoustic N-cone that cone half which has overlap with what is designated as the future nappe of the light cone. Then the mapping between the P-cone and ray-cone nappes through the acoustic metric, determines also the relative energies of the modes of the different degrees of freedom and makes ghosts have physical implications. A situation in which the ray cone overlaps both nappes is acausal (see section 3.2). On the other hand, if the N-cone does not overlap with the light cone at all, one cannot uniquely select the future nappe and there are two non-equivalent time orientations (see section 3.4).

The covector u_μ defined in eq. (2.23) describes a surface Σ_u , $u_\mu = \partial_\mu \Sigma_u$ with induced metric $\bar{\Delta}^{\mu\nu}$. For Lorentzian $Z^{\mu\nu}$, if Σ_u is Z -spacelike, i.e. outside of the cone, it provides a spatial hypersurface on which initial values can be set up for the Cauchy problem. We will use the shorthand that u_μ is a *good Cauchy frame* for the scalar when this is the case, i.e. whenever in eq. (2.27) the tensor

$$\mathcal{Z}_2^{\mu\nu} \equiv \alpha \bar{\Delta}^{\mu\nu} = Z^{\mu\alpha} u_\alpha Z^{\nu\beta} u_\beta - (Z^{\alpha\beta} u_\alpha u_\beta) Z^{\mu\nu} \succ 0, \quad (2.28)$$

where we use the symbol \succ to mean positive definite. This condition is quadratic in $Z^{\mu\nu}$ and therefore not sensitive to the overall sign of the metric. (2.28) is purely spatial with respect to u^μ : $\mathcal{Z}_2^{\mu\nu} u_\mu = 0$. This tensor was obtained in [82] as a test for gradient instabilities — see our discussion on page 20.

We stress that unless we already know the signature, one cannot identify which of the directions is timelike by testing the norm of just one of the vectors. Absent prior knowledge of the ghost status of the background, we have to first determine whether we are in a good Cauchy frame, and therefore whether $\bar{\Delta}^{\mu\nu}$ is spatial or not, and only then check for ghostness.

2.4 Action and the acoustic energy-momentum tensor

Let us illustrate our construction. Given a local action $S[\Psi_I]$ describing the dynamics of the fields Ψ_I containing no higher than their second derivatives, we obtain as the equations of motion a system,

$$\mathcal{E}_I(\nabla\nabla\Psi_J, \nabla\Psi_J, \Psi_J) = 0. \quad (2.29)$$

Linearising the above and potentially performing the diagonalisation of the kinetic term as discussed around eq. (2.3) yields for the fluctuation of the scalar field:

$$\tilde{Z}^{\mu\nu} \nabla_\mu \nabla_\nu \pi + V_\pi^\mu \nabla_\mu \pi + M_\pi^2 \pi = V_J^\mu \nabla_\mu \psi_J + \mu_J \psi_J, \quad (2.30)$$

where the tensors $\tilde{Z}^{\mu\nu}$, V_π^μ , M_π^2 , V_J^μ and μ_J depend on background quantities only and the fields ψ_J represent the small fluctuations of the other degrees of freedom, while ∇_μ is the usual covariant derivative compatible with the spacetime metric $g_{\mu\nu}$. Since equation (2.30) originates from a local action, then V_π^μ can only be of the form¹¹

$$V_\pi^\mu = \nabla_\nu \tilde{Z}^{\mu\nu}, \quad (2.31)$$

which we will assume from here on.

¹¹For timelike V_π^μ this term is similar to friction, which from an action can only appear as fictitious, related to an explicit time-dependence of the kinetic term, i.e. the metric, like it is the case in cosmology. Otherwise one cannot obtain friction from the usual local action.

We are free to change the normalisation of $\tilde{Z}^{\mu\nu}$ by an overall background-dependent conformal rescaling without changing the leading eikonal approximation (2.5) along with causality and stability. When $\tilde{Z}^{\mu\nu}$ is Lorentzian and non-singular, choosing

$$Z^{\mu\nu} \equiv (\det \tilde{Z}_\beta^\alpha)^{-1/2} \tilde{Z}^{\mu\nu}, \quad \text{or equivalently} \quad \tilde{Z}^{\mu\nu} = (\det Z_\beta^\alpha)^{-1/2} Z^{\mu\nu}, \quad (2.32)$$

we rewrite the equation of motion for perturbations (2.30) as a sourced (or mixed) Klein-Gordon equation

$$\bar{\square}\pi + \bar{M}^2\pi = \bar{V}_J^\mu \bar{\nabla}_\mu \psi_J + \bar{\mu}_J \psi_J, \quad (2.33)$$

where $\bar{\square} \equiv Z^{\mu\nu} \bar{\nabla}_\mu \bar{\nabla}_\nu$ being the d'Alembert operator in the curved *acoustic* spacetime, with acoustic covariant derivative $\bar{\nabla}_\mu$ compatible with the new acoustic metric $Z^{\mu\nu}$. Here the barred quantities are rescaled by the scalar $\sqrt{\det Z_\nu^\mu}$ as $\bar{M}^2 = \sqrt{\det Z_\nu^\mu} M_\pi^2$, etc.

In what follows, we will deal mostly with the high-frequency limit of the dynamics. The choice of normalisation $Z^{\mu\nu}$ does not affect the conclusions. The effective background dependent mass \bar{M}^2 and mixing terms on the right of eq. (2.33) do not contribute in this limit. However, the \bar{V}_J^μ and $\bar{\mu}_J$ terms would lead to the quasiparticle oscillations (similar to neutrino oscillations in Standard Model) between phonon π and other species ψ_J . This would result in the non-conservation of flux. At the subleading order in eikonal, beyond geometric optics, both the effective mass \bar{M}^2 and the mixing terms $\bar{\mu}_J$ and \bar{V}_J^μ would contribute.

To simplify our discussion and to concentrate on acoustic geometry let us neglect these terms. In this simplified case equation of motion (2.33) arises from the quadratic action for fluctuations,

$$S_2 = -\frac{1}{2} \int d^4x \sqrt{-S} Z^{\mu\nu} \partial_\mu \pi \partial_\nu \pi, \quad (2.34)$$

where as usual $S \equiv \det(S_{\mu\nu})$ is the metric determinant of the Lorentzian covariant acoustic metric. This action is still interesting for physical applications. In particular, it is well known that fluctuations in gapless *k-essence*/ $P(X)$ are described by this action, see e.g. [58] and older papers for irrotational superfluid [72, 83]. Moreover, cosmological scalar perturbations of general, not only shift-symmetric, kinetic gravity braiding are also described¹² in this way, see e.g. [85]. Clearly the equation of motion in this case is just a wave equation

$$\bar{\square}\pi \equiv Z^{\mu\nu} \bar{\nabla}_\mu \bar{\nabla}_\nu \pi = 0. \quad (2.35)$$

On the other hand, by varying this action with respect to the acoustic metric¹³, we can obtain an acoustic energy-momentum tensor (EMT) [72]:

$$\mathbb{T}_{\mu\nu} = -\frac{2}{\sqrt{-S}} \frac{\delta S_2}{\delta Z^{\mu\nu}} = \partial_\mu \pi \partial_\nu \pi - \frac{1}{2} S_{\mu\nu} Z^{\alpha\beta} \partial_\alpha \pi \partial_\beta \pi, \quad (2.36)$$

where we have used $\delta Z = -Z S_{\mu\nu} \delta Z^{\mu\nu}$. One needs to be careful with raising and lowering indices here, so we are using the notation

$$\mathbb{T}_{\mu\nu} \equiv S_{\mu\lambda} \mathbb{T}_\nu^\lambda, \quad \text{and} \quad \bar{\mathbb{T}}^{\mu\nu} \equiv Z^{\mu\lambda} \mathbb{T}_\lambda^\nu. \quad (2.37)$$

It is the tensor \mathbb{T}_ν^μ that would be obtained through the Noether procedure (see [66]) and it is the one which, on equations of motion, is covariantly conserved with respect to $\bar{\nabla}_\mu$,

$$\bar{\nabla}_\mu \mathbb{T}_\nu^\mu = \bar{\square}\pi \partial_\nu \pi = 0. \quad (2.38)$$

¹²The factorisation and the description above may fail, see e.g. [84]

¹³Even though $Z^{\mu\nu}$ is not our dynamical variable.

Notice that the form of the EMT is as for a canonical scalar field with the complications of the background and non-linear kinetic terms appearing only through the acoustic metric. The dynamics for small fluctuations in arbitrary scalar-field theories is as for a canonical scalar field with the space-time metric replaced with the acoustic metric.

This result implies that in regions where $Z^{\mu\nu}$ is constant, there is symmetry with respect to time and spatial translations and therefore the momentum and energy of the *fluctuations* π is conserved. This is equivalent to the situation in curved spacetime where quantities such as momenta and energy are conserved only in regions where the metric $g_{\mu\nu}$ can be taken as constant (or it has Killing vectors with their associated conserved charges).

It should be stressed that the covariant conservation of acoustic EMT using $\bar{\nabla}_\mu$ generically does not imply conservation of acoustic EMT with respect to ∇_μ . Indeed, using (2.16) on equation of motion (2.38), the spacetime non-conservation of the acoustic EMT reads

$$\nabla_\mu \mathbb{T}_\nu^\mu = \frac{1}{2} Z^{\alpha\beta} (\mathbb{T}_\alpha^\mu \nabla_\nu S_{\beta\mu} - \mathbb{T}_\nu^\mu \nabla_\mu S_{\alpha\beta}) . \quad (2.39)$$

However, in the presence of symmetries of the acoustic metric, the covariant acoustic conservation of the corresponding current implies also the usual spacetime covariant conservation, see eq. (3.47).

Given the rederivation of all the standard GR machinery for $Z^{\mu\nu}$, we are really dealing with a theory with two metrics: (i) $g_{\mu\nu}/g^{\mu\nu}$, and (ii) $S_{\mu\nu}/Z^{\mu\nu}$ (inequivalent tensors with respect to $g_{\mu\nu}$, but really just a metric and its inverse).

Descending in (2.35) to the next order in the eikonal approximation (2.1), $\mathcal{O}(\epsilon^{-1})$, we obtain an equation for the amplitude \mathcal{A}

$$N^\mu \partial_\mu |\mathcal{A}|^2 + \bar{\nabla}_\mu N^\mu |\mathcal{A}|^2 = 0 , \quad (2.40)$$

which is just a statement of flux conservation in the acoustic metric — the change in the intensity $|\mathcal{A}|^2$ along the direction of propagation N^μ is determined by the divergence of the bundle of rays in the *acoustic* metric $Z^{\mu\nu}$. In the eikonal approach, the amplitude is transported with a material derivative containing the group velocity for the wave (see e.g. [86, pg. 367]). Since in eq. (2.40) we have the same $N^\mu \nabla_\mu$ as for momentum transport (2.14), the phase and group velocities are always equal. Let us remark here that while the normalisation of $Z^{\mu\nu}$ does not influence the speed of propagation and causality, since the integral curves of N^μ are independent of it, it does seemingly affect the conservation of the flux, since N^μ is inside the derivative in eq. (2.40). However, a change of normalisation is a background-dependent conformal transformation of the acoustic metric (2.32) also requires the redefinition of the acoustic covariant derivative $\bar{\nabla}_\mu$. We then obtain an equation with the same form as eq. (2.40) for a different amplitude. In fact, since the non-metricity is Weyl-integrable, eq. (2.20), we can exchange the amplitude for a charge density ρ which is conserved in the *spacetime* itself, while moving along the acoustic geodesics N^μ ,¹⁴

$$\nabla_\mu (\rho N^\mu) = 0 , \quad \text{where} \quad \rho \equiv \sqrt{\det(S_\beta^\alpha)} |\mathcal{A}|^2 . \quad (2.41)$$

In general cases, even if the principal symbol factorises at $\mathcal{O}(\epsilon^{-2})$ and a diagonal basis for the fields Ψ_I can be picked, the flux-conservation equation from $\mathcal{O}(\epsilon^{-1})$ may remain

¹⁴We note that the velocity vector in the conserved current, N^μ , is not normalised, contrary to the usual practice. This makes the equation agnostic as to its norm in the spacetime $g_{\mu\nu} N^\mu N^\nu$ which could even vanish.

mixed (e.g. see the recent work in refs [87, 88]). The flux in (2.40) would then be not quite conserved without affecting the stability and causality arguments of this paper.

Since eq. (2.41) is the high-frequency approximation to (2.35) which is in turn an approximation to the perturbed equation of motion (2.33), ρN^μ is just the shift current carried by small fluctuations in the high-frequency limit and approximately conserved whenever the effective mass \overline{M}^2 and mixing terms in eq. (2.33) can be neglected, though ρ is *not* the shift charge.

For a discussion of the physics of the lowest order in eikonal, beyond geometrical optics, and the complications arising from kinetic and mass mixing see e.g. [88].

3 Acoustic physics: Causality, Stability and Horizons

We now turn to the core of this paper: the geometry of the acoustic cone from the point of view of some observer which defines their frames and coordinates with respect to the spacetime metric $g_{\mu\nu}$. In the natural Z -frame we defined in eq. (2.24), the acoustic cone is isotropic and the discussion usually applied to the spacetime metric is valid. We shall see that introducing a second metric uncovers new features.

We will begin by discussing what an observer would see, in particular showing that from their point of view — in the g -frame defined by the spacetime metric and the four-velocity of the chosen observer — the ray cone and the P-cone are no longer the same surface — for example, if one is g -spacelike, the other is g -timelike. We discuss the dispersion relation as perceived by the observer and the phase velocities of the wave fronts as resulting from the geometry of these cones.

The two cones are nonetheless dual to each other and their geometry encodes the same information. We demonstrate that the good choice of frame in which information propagates only into the future is equivalent to requiring that the P-cones cover the spatial hypersurface, i.e. the energy is real for a mode with arbitrary spatial momentum. This choice of a good Cauchy surface allows us to determine in the standard manner if the scalar is a ghost. We then discuss the relation of this frame to the boundedness of the Hamiltonian for fluctuations.

In the g -frame, there is a separate set of conditions which determine whether information can propagate in all the directions of the spatial hypersurface — whether or not sound horizons of the scalar are present for an observer. We prove that this is equivalent to having negative-energy modes be available to this observer. The production of Cherenkov radiation becomes possible in the frame in which there is a sound horizon.

3.1 The acoustic metric and an observer


Let us introduce an observer with four velocity u^μ , associated to the usual matter sector — this means that we will normalise u^μ using the spacetime metric in the usual way $g_{\mu\nu}u^\mu u^\nu = -1$. We then have the usual projector onto this observer’s spatial hypersurface

$$h_\nu^\mu \equiv \delta_\nu^\mu + u^\mu u_\nu. \quad (3.1)$$

We can now decompose the momentum and ray vectors analogously to (2.26),

$$\begin{aligned} P_\mu &= \omega u_\mu + k_\mu, & k_\mu &= h_\mu^\nu P_\nu, \\ N^\mu &= \mathcal{U}u^\mu + r^\mu, & r^\mu &= h_\nu^\mu N^\nu, \end{aligned} \quad (3.2)$$

Figure 1: Relative geometry of the acoustic cones with respect to the light cone in the rest frame of an isotropic medium with a *subluminal* sound speed. (a) The light cone is in green. The acoustic ray cone in orange is inside the light cone and is centred on the observer’s worldline u^μ in this frame. A selection of ray vectors is highlighted on the future nappe of the ray cone. In dark blue we plot the cone formed by the momentum vectors $P^\mu = g^{\mu\nu} P_\nu$. The P-cone is *ig*-spacelike and also centred on u^μ in this frame. We have highlighted some momenta in the upper nappe of the P-cone corresponding to the future-facing ray vectors — the association between these two nappes implies that the scalar is not a ghost. (a) Phase velocity of light rays (green) and the outgoing scalar modes (orange) plotted as the change in the position of a wavefront in the chosen frame. The medium is at rest for the observer, so the phase velocity is isotropic around the origin. (c) Wave-vector surface (n_μ , see eq. (3.6)) for the observer at rest: light in green, scalar in blue. The momentum vectors are spacelike for subluminal sound speeds and centred on the observer. All wave vectors come from the upper P-nappe for a non-ghost scalar.



with ω the frequency of the mode with four momentum P_μ as would be measured by an observer with u^μ . Thus, the corresponding phonon has energy ω and spatial momentum k_μ .¹⁵ For the ray, \mathcal{U} gives the time from the point of view of u^μ at which the front passes the point given by the spatial vector r^μ .

We can similarly decompose the characteristic equation (2.5), to obtain the explicit dispersion relation as seen in the frame u_μ as its roots, $\omega_\pm(k)$.

$$\omega_\pm(k_\mu) = -\frac{Z^{uv} k_\nu}{Z_{uu}} \mp \frac{\sqrt{Z_2^{\mu\nu} k_\mu k_\nu}}{Z_{uu}}. \quad (3.3)$$

¹⁵Throughout the paper we use Planck units $\hbar = c = G_N = 1$.

We have used the index u to signify contracting with u_μ , so that $Z^{uu} \equiv Z^{\mu\nu}u_\mu u_\nu = -\alpha$. Note the appearance of $Z_2^{\mu\nu}$, defined in eq. (2.28), in the square root.

Moreover, we would like to emphasise that $Z_2^{\mu\nu}$ is *quadratic* in components of $Z^{\mu\nu}$ therefore $\omega_\pm(k)$ is invariant under conformal transformations $Z^{\mu\nu} \rightarrow \Omega Z^{\mu\nu}$. This property is crucial as ω_\pm is a physical observable, while the acoustic metric in most cases can only be found up to a conformal factor in the leading eikonal approximation. On the other hand, the frequency is a first degree homogeneous function of spatial momenta, as $\omega_\pm(\lambda^2 k_\mu) = \lambda^2 \omega_\pm(k_\mu)$. This is also a physically crucial property, as due to the scaling symmetry of the leading eikonal approximation the four-momenta P_μ are also defined only up to rescaling

$$P_\mu \rightarrow \lambda^2 P_\mu. \quad (3.4)$$

The good Cauchy condition (2.28) guarantees that there is a real solution ω_\pm for any spatial momentum k_μ . We discuss how this is related to the usual notion of a Cauchy surface in section 3.2.

For a wave with ray N^μ we can then define the speed of the wave *relative* to the observer or the phase three-velocity as

$$v_p^\mu \equiv \frac{N^\nu h_\nu^\mu}{-N^\alpha u_\alpha} = \frac{r^\mu}{\mathcal{U}}. \quad (3.5)$$

This may seem non-standard, but as opposed to the usual phase-velocity definition from the dispersion relation, $\omega(k)/k$, v_p^μ is a tensor and transforms appropriately even when the speed of the waves is superluminal. The phase velocity is relative to an observer u^μ , but this is the desired physical property. It can be checked that for light, with l^μ a g -null ray vector, $g_{\mu\nu}v_p^\mu(l)v_p^\nu(l) = 1$ with this definition, and therefore the phase velocity is the speed of light for every observer, as it should be (see the discussion around eq. (3.20)).

In analogy with eq. (3.5), we can also define a similar object based on the momentum four-covector,

$$n_\mu \equiv \frac{h_\mu^\nu P_\nu}{-u^\alpha P_\alpha} = \frac{k_\mu}{\omega}, \quad (3.6)$$

for which the on-shell condition $N^\mu P_\mu = 0$ gives $v_p^\mu n_\mu = 1$. n_μ gives the wave-vector surface in three dimensions, equivalent to the dispersion relation, and can also be seen as a direction-dependent refractive index. In fact this object is the key quantity in theory of propagation of electromagnetic waves in anisotropic media, see [89, pg. 334]. While these observer-dependent objects are the ones usually discussed in wave optics, and are proper tensors, they nonetheless transform non-trivially under a change of observer. As a result, operations such as addition of three-velocities are not particularly natural.

It is worth mentioning that the phase velocity v_p^μ and the direction-dependent refractive index n_μ are both physical observables and are independent of the rescaling of four-momentum P_μ (3.4) and of a similar rescaling of the rays N^μ .

Again using the decompositions (3.2) and the on-shell condition $N^\mu P_\mu = 0$ we have that an observer u^μ would see the rays and momenta as

$$r^\mu k_\mu = \omega \mathcal{U}. \quad (3.7)$$

In general it is possible for the phase velocity to have an antiparallel *component* to the mode's momentum, $v_p^\mu k_\mu < 0$. This occurs whenever the energy of the mode is negative in the frame of the observer, $\omega < 0$ (see section 3.4) or the mode's ray points toward the past, $\mathcal{U} < 0$ (see the section on bad Cauchy frames 3.2). Note that changing the signature of $Z^{\mu\nu}$ to a ghost

one does not change any of these properties — for the same ray vector, both the energy ω and the spatial momentum k_μ are reversed and therefore the phase velocity is the same as for the healthy mode. We illustrate a simple configuration of the P- and ray cones in fig. 1.

With the definition of phase velocity (3.5), the operator $N^\mu \bar{\nabla}_\mu$ in the equation for transport of momentum (2.14) can be reinterpreted as a material derivative for the phase in the frame of the observer u^μ , with the phase velocity playing the role of the flow velocity,

$$N^\mu \bar{\nabla}_\mu = \mathcal{U} \left(u^\mu \bar{\nabla}_\mu + v_p^\mu \bar{\nabla}_\mu \right). \quad (3.8)$$

When $Z^{\mu\nu}$ is sufficiently constant, the covariant derivatives reduce to partial derivatives and we recover the standard expression for a material derivative.

With the projector (3.1) and definition (2.28), we can also rewrite the tensor $\bar{\Delta}^{\mu\nu}$ as

$$\bar{\Delta}^{\mu\nu} = -\frac{\mathcal{Z}_2^{\mu\nu}}{Z^{uu}} = \left(Z^{\alpha\beta} - \frac{Z^{u\alpha} Z^{u\beta}}{Z^{uu}} \right) h_\alpha^\mu h_\beta^\nu. \quad (3.9)$$

We can see that, in the g -frame, $\bar{\Delta}^{\mu\nu}$ and $\mathcal{Z}_2^{\mu\nu}$ are spatial and that $\bar{\Delta}^{\mu\nu}$ is in fact the Schur complement of the $u^\mu u^\nu$ block of the metric $Z^{\mu\nu}$. This observation allows us to use some standard results for determinants and inverses, in particular,

$$\det Z^{\mu\nu} = Z^{uu} \det_u \bar{\Delta}^{\mu\nu} = -(Z^{uu})^{-2} \det_u \mathcal{Z}_2^{\mu\nu}. \quad (3.10)$$

where \det_u signifies that the determinant is taken in the three-dimensional subspace orthogonal to u^μ .

The General Acoustic Metric Given the g -timelike u^μ , any general symmetric (2,0) tensor including the acoustic metric $Z^{\mu\nu}$ can be decomposed as

$$Z^{\mu\nu} = -D u^\mu u^\nu + C h^{\mu\nu} - u^\mu q^\nu - u^\nu q^\mu + \sigma^{\mu\nu}, \quad (3.11)$$

with, a spatial vector $u_\mu q^\mu = 0$ with norm $q^2 \equiv q_\mu q^\mu \geq 0$ and a symmetric, spatial and traceless tensor $\sigma^{\mu\nu}$, $u^\mu \sigma_{\mu\nu} = \sigma_\mu^\mu = 0$. While this construction may appear unnecessarily general, all of these terms are present in the acoustic metric of the kinetic gravity braiding scalar-tensor theory even in the natural unitary-gauge coordinates (see section 5.3) and therefore can be concretely realised. This is a well-defined set of models featuring consistent backgrounds for which it is not possible to boost to the rest frame of the medium, where q^μ vanishes. We need the fully relativistic approach proposed here to understand such cases.

Using decomposition (3.11), we can rewrite the characteristic equation (2.5) as a direct analogue of the Fresnel equation for the refractive index (3.6) as used in crystal optics, see [89, pg. 334],

$$(C h^{\mu\nu} + \sigma^{\mu\nu}) n_\mu n_\nu + 2 n_\mu q^\mu = D, \quad (3.12)$$

which implicitly defines the dispersion relation. It is interesting to note that due to the “drag” q^μ this Fresnel equation possesses a linear term in refractive index n_μ . This linear term can be removed by the shift $n_\mu = \bar{n}_\mu + c_\mu$, provided $\det(\mathcal{Z}_2^{\mu\nu} - q^\mu q^\nu) \neq 0$.

We can define a matrix

$$Z_\nu^\mu \equiv Z^{\mu\alpha} g_{\nu\alpha}, \quad S_\nu^\mu = (Z^{-1})_\nu^\mu \quad (3.13)$$

which is an operator and has the advantage that its determinant transforms as a scalar.¹⁶ Then since $\det Z_\nu^\mu = g \det(Z^{\mu\nu})$, if $g_{\mu\nu}$ is Lorentzian and itself has cones as characteristic surfaces, then the requirement of the existence of the acoustic cone discussed in section 2.3 is equivalent to¹⁷

$$\det Z_\nu^\mu > 0. \quad (3.14)$$

with the determinant for the general acoustic metric given by

$$\begin{aligned} \det(Z_\nu^\mu) = & DC^3 + C^2q^2 - \frac{1}{2}(q^2 + CD)\sigma^{\mu\nu}\sigma_{\mu\nu} + \\ & + \frac{1}{3}D\sigma^{\mu\nu}\sigma_\mu^\rho\sigma_{\rho\nu} + q^\mu q^\nu \left(\sigma_\mu^\rho\sigma_{\rho\nu} - C\sigma_{\mu\nu} \right). \end{aligned} \quad (3.15)$$

We also have the relation $\det(S_\nu^\mu)\det(Z_\beta^\alpha) = 1$. We will henceforth assume that acoustic cones exist and therefore condition (3.14) is satisfied.

In the frame u_μ we then have

$$\mathcal{Z}_2^{\mu\nu} = D(C h^{\mu\nu} + \sigma^{\mu\nu}) + q^\mu q^\nu, \quad (3.16)$$

and the dispersion relation (3.3) becomes

$$\omega_\pm = \frac{q^\mu k_\mu}{D} \pm \frac{\sqrt{\mathcal{Z}_2^{\mu\nu} k_\mu k_\nu}}{D}. \quad (3.17)$$

We then have for the phase velocity

$$v_{\text{p}}^\mu = \frac{Ck^\mu + \sigma^{\mu\nu}k_\nu + \omega q^\mu}{\omega D + q^\alpha k_\alpha} = \frac{q^\mu}{D} \pm \frac{\mathcal{Z}_2^{\mu\nu} k_\nu}{D\sqrt{\mathcal{Z}_2^{\alpha\beta} k_\alpha k_\beta}}. \quad (3.18)$$

We can also recover this phase three-velocity from the usual definition of the *group*-velocity, v_{gr}^μ , when starting from the dispersion relation (3.3),

$$v_{\text{gr}}^\mu \equiv \frac{\partial\omega(k)}{\partial k_\mu} = v_{\text{p}}^\mu. \quad (3.19)$$

As discussed on page 12, the group velocity for this class of theories is equal to the phase velocity since they are dispersionless and we see this result here. The presence of the tensor $\sigma^{\mu\nu}$ or/and the “drag” q^μ makes the phase velocity deviate from the direction of k^μ . Only for such media and in such frames where both q^μ and $\sigma^{\mu\nu}$ vanish, one obtains from (3.18) and (3.17) that

$$v_{\text{p}}^\mu = \frac{\omega(k)h^{\mu\nu}k_\nu}{h^{\alpha\beta}k_\alpha k_\beta} = \frac{\omega(k)}{k} \frac{k^\mu}{k}, \quad (3.20)$$

¹⁶We note the apparent similarity of this matrix to the combination $g^{\mu\lambda}f_{\lambda\nu}$ the square root of which appears as the fundamental new object in massive gravity [90] and in bimetric theory [91]

¹⁷In principle $g^{\mu\nu}$ could be singular, while $Z^{\mu\nu}$ is not, in which case, the determinant (3.14) would diverge and yet this would not signify an issue for $Z^{\mu\nu}$. For the purpose of this work, we are interested in spacetimes without singularities, so we will not complicate the discussion to include such edge cases.

recovering the often used definition of the phase velocity. In particular, even for perfect fluids this restricted expression (3.20) works only in comoving frames. Following the standard solid-state physics approach, see e.g. [92, pg. 33], one can also define the “reciprocal effective mass tensor” as

$$(M^{-1})^{\mu\nu} \equiv \frac{\partial^2 \omega_{\pm}}{\partial k_{\mu} \partial k_{\nu}} = \frac{\partial v_{\text{gr}}^{\mu}}{\partial k_{\nu}} = \pm \frac{(\mathcal{Z}_2^{\mu\nu} \mathcal{Z}_2^{\alpha\beta} - \mathcal{Z}_2^{\mu\alpha} \mathcal{Z}_2^{\nu\beta}) k_{\alpha} k_{\beta}}{D (\mathcal{Z}_2^{\alpha\beta} k_{\alpha} k_{\beta})^{3/2}}. \quad (3.21)$$

Contrary to the “effective mass” eq. (2.13), this tensor is responsible for the inertia of the phonon in case an external force acts to influence its motion. It is worth noting that this tensor is (i) obviously symmetric, (ii) purely spatial $(M^{-1})^{\mu\nu} u_{\nu} = 0$ due to (2.28), (iii) transverse $(M^{-1})^{\mu\nu} k_{\nu} = 0$ to the three-momentum k_{μ} and (iv) invariant under conformal transformations $Z^{\mu\nu} \rightarrow \Omega Z^{\mu\nu}$. Thus, for forces along the spatial momenta of the phonon or in the limit of very high spatial momenta, the inertia of the phonon diverges. Furthermore, for an arbitrary spatial covector e_{μ} due to positive-definiteness of eq. (2.28) and the Cauchy–Bunyakovsky–Schwarz inequality one obtains

$$(\mathcal{Z}_2^{\mu\nu} \mathcal{Z}_2^{\alpha\beta} - \mathcal{Z}_2^{\mu\alpha} \mathcal{Z}_2^{\nu\beta}) k_{\alpha} k_{\beta} e_{\mu} e_{\nu} = (\mathcal{Z}_2^{\mu\nu} e_{\mu} e_{\nu}) (\mathcal{Z}_2^{\alpha\beta} k_{\alpha} k_{\beta}) - (\mathcal{Z}_2^{\mu\nu} e_{\mu} k_{\nu})^2 \geq 0, \quad (3.22)$$

where equality is only possible for $e_{\mu} \propto k_{\mu}$. Hence the sign of $(M^{-1})^{\mu\nu} e_{\mu} e_{\nu}$ is the same as the sign of $\pm D$. As one can foresee, in a good Cauchy frame the forward P-cone nappe is given by ω_+ , see eq. (3.31), thus the sign in (3.21) is “+”. Further, for a non-ghost and a good Cauchy frame $D > 0$ so that this “reciprocal effective mass tensor” is a non-negative contravariant second rank tensor. On the other hand, for a ghost in a good Cauchy frame $D < 0$ so that this “reciprocal effective mass tensor” is non-positive definite.

The phase velocity is only defined for those modes for which $\mathcal{Z}_2^{\mu\nu} k_{\mu} k_{\nu} > 0$, i.e. for those for which ω is real; as we will show, the others do not propagate. We stress that this non-propagation of some modes k_{μ} is observer-dependent and is the outcome of having acoustic cones which are not invariant with respect to Lorentz boosts.

The condition of positive definiteness of $\mathcal{Z}_2^{\mu\nu}$ (2.28) is then equivalent to the statement that all its tensor invariants are positive, namely:

$$\begin{aligned} \text{tr } \mathcal{Z}_2 &= 3DC + q^2 > 0 \\ (\text{tr } \mathcal{Z}_2)^2 - \mathcal{Z}_{2\mu\nu} \mathcal{Z}_2^{\mu\nu} &= D (6DC^2 + 4Cq^2 - 2q^{\mu} q^{\nu} \sigma_{\mu\nu} - D\sigma^{\mu\nu} \sigma_{\mu\nu}) > 0 \\ \det_u \mathcal{Z}_2^{\mu\nu} &= -D^2 \det(Z^{\mu\nu}) > 0 \end{aligned} \quad (3.23)$$

with the last equality resulting from the Schur-complement relationship (3.9) and always satisfied for a Lorentzian $Z^{\mu\nu}$. As we will demonstrate in the next section, these conditions together with the hyperbolicity condition (3.14) are then a sufficient and necessary condition for u_{μ} to be a good Cauchy frame.

For completeness, the inverse of $\mathcal{Z}_2^{\mu\nu}$ is

$$\begin{aligned} D(\det \mathcal{Z}_2^{\alpha}) (\mathcal{Z}_2^{-1})^{\mu\nu} &= \left(C(q^2 + CD) - q^{\rho} \sigma_{\rho\kappa} q^{\kappa} - \frac{D}{2} \sigma_{\rho\kappa} \sigma^{\rho\kappa} \right) h^{\mu\nu} \\ &\quad - Cq^{\mu} q^{\nu} + 2q^{(\mu} \sigma^{\nu)\rho} q_{\rho} - (q^2 + CD) \sigma^{\mu\nu} + D\sigma^{\mu\rho} \sigma_{\rho}^{\nu}, \end{aligned} \quad (3.24)$$

and this expression can be used to calculate $S_{\mu\nu}$ using the standard results involving the Schur complement.

3.2 Acoustic metric and Cauchy surface

We now would like to ask when a g -frame, orthonormal in the metric $g_{\mu\nu}$ can be used to evolve the scalar fluctuations. We take a g -timelike velocity u^μ with projector (3.1) as the induced metric on Σ_u .

To simplify notation, we pick coordinates adapted to this g -frame with $u_\mu = -\delta_\mu^0$, i.e. a comoving frame. This allows us to write the index 0 as being in the u_μ g -timelike direction and the lowercase Latin indices as being along the g -spatial directions in the standard manner. Notice that $u^\mu = -g^{\mu 0}$.

Decomposing the ray cone equation (2.11) in these coordinates yields:

$$\mathcal{U}^2 S^{00} + 2\mathcal{U} S_i^0 r^i + S_{ij} r^i r^j = 0 \quad (3.25)$$

with $\mathcal{U} = -N^\mu u_\mu$, the time coordinate of the cone at spatial vector r^i . Notice that in these coordinates $S_{00} \neq S^{00} = S_{\mu\nu} u^\mu u^\nu$.

The ray cone describes the motion of phase and therefore the propagation of wavefronts. To be able to set up the Cauchy problem in some coordinates with Σ_u as the hypersurface for arbitrary initial conditions, information in these coordinates must not propagate into the coordinates' past, i.e. the upper nappe of the ray cone must be completely above Σ_u , $\mathcal{U} > 0$. This is only possible if the ray cone does not intersect Σ_u anywhere but the origin, i.e.

$$S_{ij} r^i r^j = 0 \quad \Rightarrow \quad r^i = 0. \quad (3.26)$$

This implies that S_{ij} must be either positive or negative definite, since otherwise $S_{ij} r^i r^j = 0$ is itself a cone of spatial directions on which Σ_u is cut.

If the ray cone does intersect Σ_u along directions r_*^i , we are dealing with a bad Cauchy frame and propagation of information is instantaneous along r_*^i or in *this particular frame* even into the *coordinate* past. This means that we are not free to choose any arbitrary set of initial conditions on the hypersurface Σ_u . However, if in a different frame the situation is normal — there exists a good Cauchy frame at all — as a result of general covariance of the underlying theory, the solution obtained there, appropriately transformed, must also be the solution in the bad Cauchy frame.

Since $\overline{\Delta}^{\mu\nu}$ is a Schur complement (3.9) and spatial, it is the inverse of the spatial part of the metric $S_{\mu\nu}$,

$$\overline{\Delta}^{\mu\lambda} \left(S_{\alpha\beta} h_\lambda^\alpha h_\nu^\beta \right) = h_\nu^\mu. \quad (3.27)$$

and therefore by eq. (3.10)

$$\det S_{ij} = -\frac{Z^{00}}{\det Z_\nu^\mu}. \quad (3.28)$$

with $Z^{00} = Z^{\mu\nu} u_\mu u_\nu = -\alpha \neq 0$. Since we assumed hyperbolicity in the first place, this selects a sign for the eigenvalues of S_{ij} and therefore gives the good Cauchy condition

$$\frac{1}{Z^{00}} S_{ij} \prec 0 \quad (3.29)$$

independent of whether we have a ghost not. If satisfied, Σ_u is a good Cauchy surface for *both* ghosts and healthy degrees of freedom.

Let us now recover what the above requirement means from the point of view of the P-cone. In the Z -frame we defined the induced metric $\overline{\Delta}^{\mu\nu}$ on the hypersurface Σ_u (2.25).

From the point of view of the metric $g_{\mu\nu}$ this is just a tensor and not the induced metric on the same Σ_u . By eqs (3.9) and (3.27), the good Cauchy condition (3.29) can be expressed in terms of the tensor $\mathcal{Z}_2^{\mu\nu} = \alpha \bar{\Delta}^{\mu\nu}$ defined in eq. (2.28) as

$$\mathcal{Z}_2^{ij} \equiv \alpha \bar{\Delta}^{ij} = -Z^{00} (S^{-1})^{ij} = Z^{0i} Z^{0j} - Z^{00} Z^{ij} \succ 0. \quad (3.30)$$

Thus the condition that — in our chosen frame — no information propagates into the past and therefore we are free to choose arbitrary initial conditions (i.e. the standard setup for the Cauchy problem) is equivalent to the statement that \mathcal{Z}_2^{ij} is positive definite and the roots of the dispersion relation (3.3) are real for all modes k_i in this frame. Note that having the same sign for both ω_{\pm} is a symptom of neither a ghost or a Cauchy-frame problem — see section 3.4.

In terms of cone geometry, the reality of ω for all k_i can be phrased as the P-cone covering Σ_u completely, or equivalently u_{μ} being inside the P-cone, as was discussed in [66]. However, since the scalar could be a ghost, the overall sign of $Z^{\mu\nu}$ is a priori unknown and whether u_{μ} is Z -timelike cannot be determined by testing for the sign of $Z^{\mu\nu} u_{\mu} u_{\nu}$. In fact, provided $\det Z_{\nu}^{\mu} > 0$ and therefore the acoustic metric is Lorentzian, we have the following:

- If \mathcal{Z}_2 is positive definite, Σ_u is a Cauchy surface, and $Z^{00} < 0$ means that the scalar is healthy and $Z^{00} > 0$ implies it is a ghost — as per usual;
- If \mathcal{Z}_2 is not positive definite, Σ_u is not a Cauchy surface and $Z^{00} < 0$ means that the scalar is a ghost and $Z^{00} > 0$ implies it is healthy — the opposite to the usual case. This is so since the chosen u_{μ} is Z -spacelike.

Thus prior to answering whether the acoustic metric implies that the scalar is a ghost, one must first check the status of the Cauchy surface in the chosen coordinates.

The spatial tensor \mathcal{Z}_2^{ij} was already discussed in [82], where it was referred to as a Lorentz-invariant condition for avoiding gradient instabilities. The gradient instability appears when there the system is not hyperbolic and there is no cone at all. Here, rather, condition (3.30) is a statement about the chosen frame u_{μ} and therefore is not a Lorentz invariant quantity.

In particular, when superluminality is present, at least a part of the P-cone is g -timelike. Then there is no guarantee that even if condition (3.30) is satisfied in one frame, it will be so in another one, related through a Lorentz boost. Provided that we are not in an acausal situation we discuss on page 26, we are guaranteed that there will be at least one frame where condition (3.30) is true.

Bad Cauchy frame Let us give a brief overview of what changes when we have a bad Cauchy frame for the scalar. The time coordinate of the ray associated to the spatial momentum k_i can be related to the matrix \mathcal{Z}_2^{ij} through

$$\mathcal{U}_{\pm} = N_{\pm}^0 = -Z^{\mu\nu} P_{\nu} u_{\mu} = \pm \sqrt{\mathcal{Z}_2^{ij} k_i k_j}. \quad (3.31)$$

We can see now that when Σ_u is a good Cauchy surface, the rays with $\mathcal{U} > 0$ all come from the upper nappe of the ray cone. Intersections of the ray cone with constant time surfaces (i.e. the wavefronts) are ellipsoids which may or may not contain the origin (see fig. 1b and section 3.4). In a bad Cauchy frame, with $\mathcal{Z}_2^{ij} \not\succeq 0$, a part of the upper N-nappe points toward the coordinate past: as a result, the wavefronts are no longer closed — see fig. 2 for

an illustration. Moreover, the lower N-nappe also has a part pointing to positive \mathcal{U} , moving to the coordinate future. Since $\mathcal{U} = 0$ corresponds to $\mathcal{Z}_2^{ij} k_i k_j = 0$, each of the nappes of the ray cones is constructed by two branches separated by $\mathcal{U} = 0$, and the momenta for which $\mathcal{Z}_2^{ij} k_i k_j < 0$ and are not in the ray cone at all.

To solve for the evolution one must pick the correct retarded Green's function. In a good Cauchy frame, this is just given by the *upper* nappe of the ray cone, which is future-facing, $\mathcal{U} > 0$. The Green's function should transform continuously under Lorentz boosts even when they are large enough to make the frame a bad Cauchy frame, i.e. where the upper N-nappe faces partially into the coordinate past, $\mathcal{U} < 0$. Thus we should still continue to construct the retarded Green's function from the complete upper N-nappe to maintain the correct covariance of the solutions. The logic of setting up the Green's function in this way was demonstrated in ref. [58]. In a bad Cauchy frame, one might be tempted to construct the retarded Green's function from the coordinate-future parts of both the N-nappes (see for example ref. [93]), but appealing to the geometry of the cones shows that this would lead to an inequivalent solution and in fact is a source of apparent instabilities if one tries to do it. The complication is that one needs to be careful to include the correct branches of the dispersion relation and not to attempt to include the modes for which $\mathcal{Z}_2^{ij} k_i k_j < 0$ — they do not propagate at all, or equivalently, are not in the ray cone.

Despite the simple geometrical picture above, what is seen by an observer in a bad Cauchy frame is related to the root structure and therefore not trivial — for the modes with momenta

$$\mathcal{Z}_2^{ij} k_{*i} k_{*j} = 0, \quad (3.32)$$

as a result of eq. (3.7), the phase speed diverges on a cone of spatial directions orthogonal to the momentum cone (3.32), $r^i k_{*i} = 0$. Moreover, inside this spatial cone, the phase speed is directed in the opposite sense to that given by the r^i (since $\mathcal{U} < 0$). We illustrate this in fig. 2.


The same tensor \mathcal{Z}_2^{ij} controls the energy difference between the two roots (3.3) of the dispersion relation,

$$\omega_+ - \omega_- = -\frac{2}{Z^{00}} \sqrt{\mathcal{Z}_2^{ij} k_i k_j}. \quad (3.33)$$

In a good Cauchy frame, each of the roots corresponds to a different P-nappe. Acoustic metrics for non-ghosts map future-facing rays onto the what is usually called the forward-moving upper nappe of the P-cone formed solely by ω_+ . For ghosts — ω_+ still maps to the future-facing N-nappe but constructs the lower P-nappe — $\omega_+ < 0$ and therefore it is sometimes said that ghosts move backward in time. This is not the correct interpretation, since the direction of motion is related to the ray and not the momentum. Note that ω_{\pm} can have the opposite sign to the expected for some modes even in a good Cauchy frame — we describe this effect related to supersonic motion in section 3.4.

The frame is a bad Cauchy frame whenever the u_{μ} direction is not Z -timelike. Then, Z^{00} has the opposite sign to the usual one and intersections of constant energy (ω) surfaces with the P-cone (i.e. the dispersion relation) do not include the momenta for which $\mathcal{Z}_2^{ij} k_i k_j < 0$ (see fig. 2c). The modes which *in this frame* propagate instantaneously have momenta k_{*i} , eq. (3.32) and $\omega_+ = \omega_-$, forming the outer edge of the projection of the P-cone onto Σ_u . The momenta with $\mathcal{Z}_2^{ij} k_i k_j < 0$ are then not in the P-cone at all and Σ_u is not fully covered. In this bad Cauchy frame, both the roots ω_{\pm} form parts of both the P-nappes — the future P-nappe contains both what would *naively* be called forward- and backward moving modes.

Figure 2: Appearance of cones in a bad Cauchy frame for a medium with isotropic *superluminal* sound speed in its own rest frame. Colour coding of surfaces as in fig. 1. (a) The ray cone (orange) is g -spacelike. Selected rays in the future nappe are marked in yellow; those in the past nappe are marked in red. In this bad Cauchy frame, the ray cone cuts the spatial hypersurface (gray plane) and the future nappe propagates information into the *coordinate* past; conversely, the past nappe crosses into the *coordinate* future. For proper Lorentz covariance of solutions, in this frame the modes corresponding to the complete future nappe (yellow) should be selected for the retarded Green’s function. For non-ghosts, the acoustic metric maps the upper N-nappe to the complete upper P-nappe (blue with highlighted modes), even in this frame. The observer’s world line is outside the P-cone and the P-cone does not cover every spatial momentum. Thus the initial conditions cannot be set arbitrarily on the spatial hypersurface and therefore it is not a Cauchy surface. (b) Motion of phase in this frame (phase velocity). Outgoing modes from the upper N-nappe propagating into the coordinate past, appear as an incoming wavefront (dashed), absorbed during the production of the pulse. In the remaining directions, an outgoing wavefront is produced (solid orange). The two branches are separated by the (red) spatial cone of directions with instantaneous propagation speed. (c) The wave-vector surface is g -timelike and does not contain the frame’s energy/time direction. This means that some of the momentum directions are not covered by the P-cone, and therefore some spatial momentum modes *of this frame* do not propagate at all. The complete upper P-nappe is constructed from both the roots of the dispersion relation (3.3): ω_+ (solid) maps onto the coordinate future rays ($\bar{U} > 0$, solid wavefront in fig. 2b and ω_- (dashed) maps onto the (dashed) apparently incoming rays ($\bar{U} < 0$).



This results in two branches for phase speeds for the future modes, one outgoing (formed by the usual ω_+ branch) and one apparently incoming (from ω_-) as shown in fig. 2. We have to include the whole future P-nappe (i.e the lower P-nappe for ghosts). This again

is the natural geometrical construction — the Fourier transform of the Green’s function is constructed from a single P-nappe and even when we boost to a bad Cauchy frame, this is still the case. The roots arrange themselves in such a manner that the future N-nappe is constructed exactly by the same single P-nappe in any frame.

The presence of frames where the Cauchy problem is ill-posed provides a loophole to the argument from [94]. Indeed, there it was implicitly used that all observers are equivalent. However, in the superluminal case, the maximal possible boost corresponds to motion along the P-cone, $Z^{00} = 0$. This would correspond to the maximally negative energy density measured by an observer for whom causality is meaningfully defined. This energy density is bounded, provided the P-cone is inside of the light cone in the in direction of the NEC violation. Clearly an observer/source cannot freely create data which makes the Cauchy problem ill-posed. Thus, superluminality can save us from non-perturbative instabilities caused by the unbounded negative energies of the whole system. However, the reason is not the same as in [93]. This issue requires a detailed case-by-case study.

Momentum-space volume The same Z_2^{ij} also appears when we integrate out the P^0 direction of the Lorentz-invariant momentum-space volume forcing it to be on shell, which appears in any phase-space integration (e.g. [95]). In our notation the standard expression for the integral over four-momentum of a quantity $\mathcal{O}(P)$ is given as

$$I = \int \frac{d^4 P}{(2\pi)^4} H(-N^\mu u_\mu) \delta(N^\mu P_\mu) \mathcal{O}(P), \quad (3.34)$$

where the delta function ensures the momenta are on-shell in the acoustic metric and $H(N^0)$ is the Heaviside function picking out the future part of the of the ray cone and with N^0 given in our chosen coordinates by Eq. (3.31) and the rays should be thought of as functions of the momenta, $N^\mu = Z^{\mu\nu} P_\nu$.

In a good Cauchy frame $N^0 > 0$ for all the rays of the future nappe, $Z_2 \succ 0$, and this integration can be performed in the standard manner, giving

$$I = \int \frac{d^3 k}{(2\pi)^3} \frac{1}{\mathcal{U}_+} \mathcal{O}(\omega(k_j), k_i) = \int \frac{d^3 k}{(2\pi)^3} \frac{1}{\sqrt{Z_2^{ij} k_i k_j}} \mathcal{O}(\omega(k_j), k_i). \quad (3.35)$$

and the remaining spatial momentum integration can proceed without any further restrictions. Z_2^{ij} appears here quite naturally as the spatial metric induced on Σ_u by $Z^{\mu\nu}$. Note that this integral is perfectly well-behaved for ghosts.

However, if the chosen frame is a bad Cauchy frame, the P-cone does not cover all the spatial momenta and no on-shell modes exist for some k_i . The P_0 integration leads to a restricted domain for the spatial momenta, $Z_2^{ij} k_i k_j > 0$. Moreover, mirroring the previous discussion, care would need to be taken to only pick the momenta corresponding to the upper ray nappe. Taking all this into account, setting up any computation in a bad Cauchy frame would be at least extremely non-standard if not impossible.

Frames and gauges The previous discussion demonstrated that not all frames are good for evolving a system causally. Problems can appear in the presence of superluminality and anisotropy.

One of the corollaries of this is that the unitary gauge might fail. In cosmology, the unitary gauge is a frequently deployed simplification when describing e.g. physics during

inflation or for dark energy, in which the slicing is chosen so that scalar perturbations π are zero. This is equivalent to choosing as the frame the gradient of the scalar,

$$u_\mu = -\frac{\partial_\mu\phi}{\sqrt{2X}}, \quad 2X \equiv -\partial^\alpha\phi\partial_\alpha\phi \quad (3.36)$$

with the requirement that the scalar field gradient be g -timelike. This is now readily extended to formulate effective field theories for the scalar, by enumerating all operators compatible with the remaining rotational symmetry on the spatial slice in this frame, for example for inflation [96] or dark energy [97].

The unitary gauge is perfectly safe on isotropic backgrounds. However, when the background configuration is sufficiently inhomogeneous (e.g. large spatial derivatives $\partial_i X$), the tensor Z_2^{ij} in the frame (3.36) can stop being positive definite – for large enough q^μ or $\sigma^{\mu\nu}$ one of the invariants (3.23) can become negative. In such a case, the EFT description defined in the unitary gauge breaks down. However, it is not true that the underlying covariant theory has broken down — this problem is the result of the breakdown of the unitary gauge itself. Provided that on this anisotropic background we still have $\det Z_\mu^\mu > 0$ and therefore the system remains hyperbolic, there exists a good Cauchy frame in which we could evolve the scalar with such a background successfully. We demonstrate on an explicit example in section 5.3, that it is possible to pick a theory in which an anisotropic background is perfectly causal (hyperbolic) and a non-ghost and yet the unitary gauge is a bad Cauchy surface.

Multiple degrees of freedom The setup presented above allows for an easy generalisation to multiple degrees of freedom. In principle, every field has its own acoustic metric. When the background are irrelevant, it is the usual spacetime metric. If the principal symbol (2.2) is factorisable — it takes the form of another tensor such as $Z^{\mu\nu}$. The question of whether it is possible to sensibly evolve the fields together boils down to whether there exists a choice of frame in which the upper nappes of all the ray cones are in the future and the lower nappes of all the ray cones are in the past. Since the relative geometry of cones is Lorentz-invariant, the existence of such a good choice of coordinates is observer independent.

Equivalently, we need to find a common covector u_μ which is timelike with respect to the P-cones of all the degrees of freedom. Condition (2.28) needs to be satisfied for each of the inverse acoustic metrics simultaneously. Since at least gravity is always present and presumably not a ghost, we have already satisfied this condition for all the degrees of freedom for which the spacetime metric is the acoustic metric by choosing u_μ to be g -timelike, $u_\mu u^\mu < 0$.

If there is no superluminality for any of the fields, then any g -timelike u_μ (or g -spacelike Σ_u) gives a good Cauchy frame. Notice however, that the covariant g -timelike definition still can change meaning once coordinates are specified when horizons are present. For example, inside the Schwarzschild horizon in the static coordinates, timelike means mostly radial. So bad coordinates can still be chosen without superluminality if one is too naive.

In general, even if there is superluminality and a u_μ common to the interior of all the P-cones (or some Σ_u exterior to all the ray cones) can be chosen, there is locally at least one set of coordinates in which the evolution can be calculated in the standard manner. In other frames, some of the fields may appear to evolve acausally, but this is just a question of trying to set up the Cauchy problem on a surface which is not a good Cauchy surface and not all possible initial conditions are allowed. The true solution is related to the one from the good Cauchy frame by a boost.

Relation to Well-Posedness The question of well posedness of quasi-linear partial differential equations is usually approached in the first-order formalism. We will demonstrate here that the conditions for weak hyperbolicity for the scalar field are the same as those for choosing a good Cauchy frame for a hyperbolic operator.

The usual approach (we follow [98]) is to start with the linearised second-order equation of motion (2.30) in some chosen set of coordinates,

$$\partial_t^2 \pi + 2B^i \partial_t \partial_i \pi - A^{ij} \partial_i \partial_j \pi = 0, \quad (3.37)$$

with $B^i \equiv Z^{0i}/Z^{00}$ and $A^{ij} \equiv -Z^{ij}/Z^{00}$ where we have assumed that constant-time surfaces are not characteristic ($Z^{00} \neq 0$), we can perform the factorisation as in eq. (2.2), and we have already dropped the lower-derivative terms not important for the high-frequency limit relevant for causality and well-posedness.

The standard procedure then calls for defining $w \equiv \partial_t \pi$, taking a Fourier transform in the spatial directions and rewriting eq. (3.37) as a first-order system for the state vector $\vec{u} = (|k|\pi, w)$, with $|k|$ the magnitude of the spatial momentum:

$$\partial_t \vec{u} = P(ik_i) \vec{u} \quad \text{with} \quad P(ik_i) = |k| \begin{pmatrix} 0 & 1 \\ -A^{ij} \hat{k}_i \hat{k}_j & -2iB^i \hat{k}_j \end{pmatrix} \quad (3.38)$$

with $\hat{k}_i \equiv k_i/|k|$. Given the preceding discussion, we note that the Fourier transform for the fluctuation field π are only well defined if the ray cones originating from any point on the spatial hypersurface do not intersect it anywhere but their origins.

The system (3.37) is then weakly hyperbolic whenever the eigenvalues of the principal symbol $P(ik)$ are imaginary, i.e.

$$\lambda_{\pm} = -i \frac{Z^{0i} \hat{k}_j}{Z^{00}} \pm \frac{i}{Z^{00}} \sqrt{Z_2^{ij} \hat{k}_i \hat{k}_j} \quad (3.39)$$

By comparing this expression with the dispersion relation (3.3), we can immediately see that the eigenvalues of the principal symbol should be identified with the energies of the modes,

$$\lambda_{\pm} = i \frac{\omega_{\pm}}{|k|}. \quad (3.40)$$

Weak hyperbolicity therefore is exactly the same requirement as the P-cone's covering the spatial hypersurface, i.e. that we are in a good Cauchy frame of a hyperbolic PDE. Usually to establish weak hyperbolicity, one assumes that the chosen coordinates are spacelike with respect to any possible ray cones and then the weak hyperbolicity establishes that the system was hyperbolic in the first place. With possible superluminality, we do not a priori know that a g -spacelike surface that we pick for the IVP is also S -spacelike. In our setup, the coordinate-invariant condition on the determinant of the acoustic metric (3.14) establishes the hyperbolicity of the linearised equation (2.29) and the existence of cones while the usual weak hyperbolicity condition then confirms that the chosen coordinates are good to evolve the system further.

A much more difficult question is whether the full linearised system containing the scalar and gravity is well posed. If it is possible to factorise the acoustic metrics (2.2) for some chosen background, the principal symbol for the combined state vector of would be block diagonal and therefore the conclusions for our linearised scalar equation are independent

of those of gravity. Our requirement that the P-cones of all the fields have a common timelike eigenvector is equivalent to the necessary condition that the system for all the fields is weakly hyperbolic. Then as a result of the block-diagonal form, strong hyperbolicity can be ascertained for each field separately.

The well-posedness of the full non-linear system is even more difficult to assess and beyond the modest aims of this paper. Already the equation of motion for kinetic gravity braiding is not of the form covered by the Leray theorem (e.g. see [99, pg. 252]). Nonetheless, some headway has been made confirming this desirable property for the Horndeski theories, e.g. [100].

Necessarily acausal setups Let us now turn to sound-cone configurations which are truly acausal — no choice of coordinates exists which would be a good Cauchy frame, or in which the complete differential operator is weakly hyperbolic. In particular, this occurs whenever the P-cones do not overlap, not having even one vector that would be timelike for both the metrics, e.g. $g^{\mu\nu}$ and $Z^{\mu\nu}$. This means that there is no spatial hypersurface which would be covered by both the cones and in *all frames* the energies ω_{\pm} of some modes of at least one of the fields are complex.

This pathological setup is equivalent to the situation when the ray cone of one degree of freedom intersects both the future and past of the second (see figure 3a). No hypersurface exterior to both the cones can be found.


To elucidate the acausality, let us imagine an experiment where a grid of detectors is set up to coordinize the spacetime of some observer u^{μ} . The origin of both the space and time coordinate is set to the event of producing a scalar pulse at the location of the observer. A detector upon the passing of the scalar-wave pulse through it responds by sending a *light* signal back to the observer which encodes the triggered detector’s coordinates. The observer can then use this information to reconstruct the path taken by the pulse.

In a good Cauchy frame, the reconstructed path has positive time and space coordinates, in the usual manner. In a bad Cauchy frame, for a pulse sent in a direction r^i which cuts the spatial hypersurface, $S_{ij}r^i r^j < 0$, the reconstructed time coordinate will be negative. This gives the apparently incoming phase velocity discussed in fig. 2b. However, the signal from any detector is always received by the observer *after* the pulse is produced and the problem is only related to the reconstructed coordinates and not to causal ordering. In the necessarily acausal setup, the light signal from the detectors arrives *before* the pulse is produced and therefore there is no well-defined causal ordering of events. This is the pathological setup.

When more degrees of freedom are present, it is possible to construct situations in which there exist common Cauchy surfaces for pairs of the fields, but not one for all the degrees of freedom together. This situation is also pathological.

An interesting direction for further study would be to understand whether it is even possible within some effective description to evolve into an acausal one from good initial conditions. The effective theory of fluctuations appears to become strongly coupled whenever $Z^{\mu\nu}u_{\mu}u_{\nu} \rightarrow 0$, since canonically normalising the fluctuations causes the interaction terms to diverge. As long as one can change the frame to remove this singularity, this is just a frame/coordinate problem. However, if the background evolves to the vicinity of true acausality, no such frame changes exist anymore. Since one should be able to reduce the evolution of the background over a small-enough time step to that of the fluctuations, such an acausal configuration should never be reached within the region of validity of the theory. This is in spirit similar to the setup in ref. [60], where it is argued that any space-dependent

Figure 3: Cone configurations in which one of the acoustic cones has no common vectors with the light cone. Colours as in fig. 1. (a) *Truly acausal configuration:* The future acoustic ray cone (orange) overlaps with both the future and past lightcone nappes (green). There is no spatial hypersurface outside of both the ray cones. Thus in *any* possible frame information propagates both into the future and past and the initial value problem cannot be set up. Equivalently, the acoustic P-cone (blue) does not overlap with the lightcone and there is no common timelike-direction for both of them. Evolving this system is impossible. See page 26. (b) *Necessarily transonic configuration :* The acoustic ray cone is completely g -spacelike. Equivalently, the acoustic P-cone intersects both the upper and lower nappes of the lightcone — in any possible frame, there are always negative energy modes available for both the fields. A Cherenkov-like emission process is kinematically allowed from any source. Possibly more problematically, there are two disjoint classes of spatial hypersurfaces which identify different nappes of the acoustic ray cone as the future. See page 38.



background of a single field which contains a closed null geodesic curve in the acoustic metric would lead to new irremovable divergences and therefore its formation would be prevented by divergent quantum corrections.

Summary We have thus demonstrated that even if the acoustic cone exists, it is possible to choose a frame in which the Cauchy problem cannot be solved. To be able to evolve the system in the usual manner, we need to make sure that the g -spatial hypersurface Σ_u is also S -spacelike. We showed that this is equivalent to picking a Z -timelike covector u_μ to define our frame. This requirement of the good Cauchy frame is equivalent to weak hyperbolicity of the differential operator. The sign of Z^{00} depends on *both* whether the surface is a good Cauchy surface and on whether the degree of freedom is a ghost. We have shown that u_μ is Z -timelike iff the tensor $Z_2^{\mu\nu}$ is positive definite. In a good Cauchy frame, $Z^{00} > 0$ implies we have a ghost, while in a bad Cauchy frame, this is exactly a non-ghost. When multiple degrees of freedom are present, these conditions must be satisfied for all of them simultaneously. If they cannot (there is no timelike covector which common to all inverse metrics) then it is impossible to set up initial conditions and evolve. This is a truly acausal situation which is pathological.

3.3 Positivity of Hamiltonian

We have thus far discussed the requirement for the existence of acoustic cones and their geometric configuration consistent with a unique causality and the possibility of formulating

the IVP. However, the usual discussion about stability focuses on the fact that the Hamiltonian for perturbations is not bounded from below. These two properties are closely related (but not identical) which we will demonstrate here. As usual we will foliate the spacetime with g -spacelike equal time t hypersurfaces Σ equipped with coordinates \mathbf{x} . The Lagrange functional corresponding to the quadratic action for perturbations (2.34)

$$L[\pi] = -\frac{1}{2} \int_{\Sigma} d^3\mathbf{x} \sqrt{-S} Z^{\mu\nu} \partial_{\mu}\pi \partial_{\nu}\pi, \quad (3.41)$$

defines the canonical momentum through the variational derivative with respect to $\dot{\pi} \equiv \partial_t \pi$

$$\Pi = \frac{\delta L}{\delta \dot{\pi}} = -\sqrt{-S} \left(Z^{00} \dot{\pi} + Z^{0i} \partial_i \pi \right). \quad (3.42)$$

Then the Hamiltonian functional given by¹⁸

$$H[\pi, \Pi] = \int_{\Sigma} d^3\mathbf{x} \Pi \dot{\pi} - L, \quad (3.43)$$

takes the form

$$H = \frac{1}{2} \int_{\Sigma} d^3\mathbf{x} \sqrt{-S} \left(\frac{Z}{Z^{00}} \left(\Pi + \sqrt{-S} Z^{0i} \partial_i \pi \right)^2 + Z^{ij} \partial_i \pi \partial_j \pi \right). \quad (3.44)$$

It is straightforward to check that

$$H = - \int_{\Sigma} d^3\mathbf{x} \sqrt{-S} \mathbb{T}_0^0, \quad (3.45)$$

where the acoustic EMT, $\mathbb{T}^{\mu\nu}$, is given by (2.37). Note that this Hamiltonian only corresponds to a conserved charge, when there is a time-like (acoustic) Killing (co)vector field ξ_{μ} satisfying $\bar{\nabla}_{\mu} \xi_{\nu} + \bar{\nabla}_{\nu} \xi_{\mu} = 0$. Indeed, the corresponding Noether current

$$\bar{J}^{\mu} = -\mathbb{T}_{\beta}^{\mu} Z^{\nu\beta} \xi_{\nu}, \quad \text{is covariantly conserved} \quad \bar{\nabla}_{\mu} \bar{J}^{\mu} = 0, \quad (3.46)$$

and the choice of time coordinate for (3.45) corresponds to $Z^{\mu\nu} \xi_{\nu} \partial_{\mu} = \delta_0^{\mu} \partial_{\mu} = \partial_t$. It is important to stress that owing to relation (2.21), the acoustic-covariant conservation of \bar{J}^{μ} implies that rescaled current

$$J^{\mu} = \sqrt{\det S_{\gamma}^{\sigma}} \bar{J}^{\mu}, \quad \text{is covariantly conserved} \quad \nabla_{\mu} J^{\mu} = 0, \quad (3.47)$$

in the usual sense. The conserved charge is then *invariant* with respect to the rescaling above

$$H = \int_{\Sigma} d^3\mathbf{x} \sqrt{-S} \bar{J}^0 = \int_{\Sigma} d^3\mathbf{x} \sqrt{-g} J^0. \quad (3.48)$$

For the conservation of the Hamiltonian we have

$$\frac{dH}{dt} = - \oint_{\partial\Sigma} d^2\sigma_i \sqrt{-S} \bar{J}^i = - \oint_{\partial\Sigma} d^2\sigma_i \sqrt{-g} J^i, \quad (3.49)$$

where the integral is taken over the 2d boundary of the hypersurfaces Σ

$$\bar{J}^i = -\mathbb{T}_0^i = -Z^{i\alpha} \dot{\pi} \partial_{\alpha} \pi. \quad (3.50)$$

¹⁸here we assume that $\dot{\pi}$ is expressed through π and Π using (3.42).

Without the timelike acoustic Killing vector the above Hamiltonian is not conserved.

To be bounded from below, the Hamiltonian (3.44) requires that $Z^{00} < 0$ and that $Z^{ij} \succ 0$ (positive definite). For a more detailed analysis, we use the Schur complement relations (3.9), (3.10) and definition (2.28) of \mathcal{Z}_2^{ij} to re-express the Hamiltonian (3.53) as

$$H = \frac{\sigma}{2} \int_{\Sigma} \frac{d^3\mathbf{x}}{\sqrt{\det \mathcal{Z}_2}} \left(\frac{\det \mathcal{Z}_2}{(Z^{00})^2} \Pi^2 + \mathcal{Z}_2^{ij} \partial_i \pi \partial_j \pi \right) - \int_{\Sigma} d^3\mathbf{x} \left(\frac{Z^{0i}}{Z^{00}} \right) \Pi \partial_i \pi, \quad (3.51)$$

where

$$\sigma = -\frac{|Z^{00}|}{Z^{00}}, \quad \text{and} \quad \det \mathcal{Z}_2 = \det \mathcal{Z}_2^{ij}, \quad (3.52)$$

and we assumed that Z^{00} does not change the sign along the hypersurface Σ . As implied by eq. (3.10), for a hyperbolic system $\det \mathcal{Z}_2 > 0$ always. Only if the Cauchy problem is well-posed on Σ is Hamiltonian mechanics meaningful. Then, by the discussion of section 3.2, $\mathcal{Z}_2^{ij} \succ 0$ and the first integral in (3.51) is definite — either positive for non-ghosts ($\sigma = +1$), or negative for ghosts ($\sigma = -1$) and therefore bounded from one side. In both these cases, the dispersion relation (3.3) implies that there are no linear instabilities, i.e. frequencies $\omega(k)$ are real for all spatial momenta k_{μ} . The second term does not depend on σ .

If for a hyperbolic system with superluminality we have chosen a foliation where the IVP is ill posed, \mathcal{Z}_2^{ij} is not positive definite, and has signature $(-, -, +)$. The dispersion relation (3.3) will demonstrate linear instabilities (complex energies) for some wave vectors. The bullet-points discussion on page 20 in this pathological situation implies:

- for non-ghosts $\sigma = -1$ and the negative energies are associated with the kinetic term and the gradient energy along *one* principal spatial direction. The dispersion relation (3.3) meanwhile implies that the other two principal spatial directions are associated with a linear instability
- for ghosts $\sigma = +1$ and the negative energies are associated with gradients in *two* principal spatial directions, as in the dispersion relation, while the kinetic energy is positive.

These would-be linear instabilities are artifacts of the incorrect choice of foliation and cannot be exploited by a local source, see [58]. Nonetheless, preferred symmetric frame (e.g. spherically symmetric and static foliation) may be a frame where the Cauchy problem is ill-posed as discussed in [39, 66]. Then performing the analysis in 2d, for a ghost one might miss the negative energies completely. Indeed, one could be satisfied that the radial and kinetic terms are positive and therefore miss both, the linear instability in two other directions and the ghost nature of the field π . This can be crucial for investigating stability of spherically symmetric objects, see e.g. [39, 42, 66, 101].

The Hamilton equations of motion corresponding to eq. (3.51) are

$$\begin{aligned} \dot{\Pi} &= -\frac{\delta H}{\delta \pi} = \partial_i \left(\sigma \frac{\mathcal{Z}_2^{ij} \partial_j \pi}{\sqrt{\det \mathcal{Z}_2}} - \frac{Z^{0i}}{Z^{00}} \Pi \right), \\ \dot{\pi} &= \frac{\delta H}{\delta \Pi} = \frac{\sqrt{\det \mathcal{Z}_2}}{(Z^{00})^2} \sigma \Pi - \frac{Z^{0i}}{Z^{00}} \partial_i \pi. \end{aligned} \quad (3.53)$$

with σ selected as above. Substituting Π from the second equation into the first one obtains the usual wave equation (2.35).

Further, one show that the Hamiltonian density

$$\mathcal{H} = \frac{1}{2} \frac{\det \mathcal{Z}_2}{(Z^{00})^2} \Pi^2 + \frac{1}{2} \mathcal{Z}_2^{ij} \partial_i \pi \partial_j \pi - \sqrt{\det \mathcal{Z}_2} \left(\frac{Z^{0i}}{Z^{00}} \right) \Pi \partial_i \pi, \quad (3.54)$$

as a function of Π and $\partial_i \pi$ can violate convexity even on a correct Cauchy surface and in the ghost-free case for which this expression is written above. If convexity is violated, the Hamiltonian density fails to be bounded from below. The second derivatives are

$$\frac{\partial^2 \mathcal{H}}{\partial \Pi^2} = \frac{\det \mathcal{Z}_2}{(Z^{00})^2}, \quad \frac{\partial^2 \mathcal{H}}{\partial \Pi \partial \partial_i \pi} = -\sqrt{\det \mathcal{Z}_2} \left(\frac{Z^{0i}}{Z^{00}} \right), \quad \frac{\partial^2 \mathcal{H}}{\partial \partial_i \pi \partial \partial_j \pi} = \mathcal{Z}_2^{ij}. \quad (3.55)$$

Taking into account the Sylvester criterion and positive definiteness of \mathcal{Z}_2^{ij} one finds that \mathcal{H} is convex, if the determinant of the matrix of second derivatives $\hat{\mathcal{H}}''$ is positive. Using the Schur formula one obtains that

$$\det \hat{\mathcal{H}}'' = \left(\frac{\det \mathcal{Z}_2}{Z^{00}} \right)^2 (1 - z^2), \quad \text{where} \quad z^2 = (\mathcal{Z}_2^{-1})_{ij} Z^{0i} Z^{0j}, \quad (3.56)$$

with the inverse $(\mathcal{Z}_2^{-1})_{ij}$ defined as usual, $(\mathcal{Z}_2^{-1})_{ik} \mathcal{Z}_2^{kj} = \delta_i^j$, see eq. (3.24). Hence for $z^2 > 1$, for sufficiently large Z^{0i} , the Hamiltonian density is not convex and is not bounded from below. As we demonstrate in section 3.4, the frame where $z^2 > 1$ corresponds to a supersonic frame when one measures time along a four-velocity lying outside of the N-cone. There we also discuss that a particle in this supersonic rest frame can spontaneously emit Cherenkov radiation, see fig. 4. Thus, the appearance of Cherenkov radiation is in one to one correspondence with the unboundedness of the acoustic Hamiltonian in a good Cauchy frame.

For most hyperbolic systems one can find other foliations where $Z^{0i} = 0$ or where at least these acoustic *shift* vectors (using ADM language [102]) are sufficiently small, $z^2 < 1$ and the Hamiltonian is bounded. The only exception is where such a frame does not exist at all. We have classified exhaustively the possible cone configurations in section 4 and this problematic situation is described and discussed in fig. 3b, see also fig. 5a for a useful and more intuitive physical analogy. Thus, without a symmetry or a dynamical preference for such foliation with large Z^{0i} and without a source, this unbounded from below Hamiltonian cannot lead to any instability, with the only exceptional case mentioned above. Indeed, an instability should be visible in an arbitrary frame in which the Cauchy problem is well posed (Ref. [66] reaches similar conclusions).

The above unboundedness is entirely owing to the second term of eq. (3.51),

$$\Phi = \int_{\Sigma} d^3 \mathbf{x} \left(\frac{Z^{0i}}{Z^{00}} \right) \Pi \partial_i \pi, \quad (3.57)$$

mixing momentum with the field. It is instructive to calculate the time evolution of this term giving the negative energies. For simplicity one can assume stationary acoustic geometry. Taking time derivatives of Π and π and using Hamilton equations of motion (3.53) one obtains

$$\begin{aligned} \frac{d\Phi}{dt} = \int_{\Sigma} d^3 \mathbf{x} \frac{Z^{0i}}{Z^{00}} \left[\partial_k \left(\frac{\mathcal{Z}_2^{kj} \partial_j \pi}{\sqrt{\det \mathcal{Z}_2}} \right) \partial_i \pi + \Pi \partial_i \left(\frac{\sqrt{\det \mathcal{Z}_2}}{(Z^{00})^2} \Pi \right) \right] - \\ - \oint_{\partial \Sigma} d^2 \sigma_i \frac{Z^{0i}}{Z^{00}} \Pi \frac{Z^{0k}}{Z^{00}} \partial_k \pi, \end{aligned} \quad (3.58)$$

where on the way we have utilized Gauss's theorem. Furthermore, it is useful to consider sufficiently small spatial volumes where the acoustic geometry is almost constant in comparison with the high-frequency perturbations. In this approximation of almost constant acoustic geometry this expression takes the form of the surface integral:

$$\begin{aligned} \frac{d\Phi}{dt} \simeq \oint_{\partial\Sigma} d^2\sigma_i \left[\frac{Z^{0i}}{Z^{00}} \left(\frac{1}{2} \frac{\sqrt{\det\mathcal{Z}_2}}{(Z^{00})^2} \Pi^2 - \Pi \frac{Z^{0k}}{Z^{00}} \partial_k \pi \right) + \right. \\ \left. + \frac{Z^{0k}}{Z^{00}} \frac{\mathcal{Z}_2^{ij}}{\sqrt{\det\mathcal{Z}_2}} \partial_j \pi \partial_k \pi - \frac{1}{2} \frac{Z^{0i}}{Z^{00}} \frac{\mathcal{Z}_2^{kj}}{\sqrt{\det\mathcal{Z}_2}} \partial_j \pi \partial_k \pi \right]. \end{aligned} \quad (3.59)$$

Thus, we have confirmed that time evolution of Φ is given entirely by the data on the boundary $\partial\Sigma$ under our approximation, as was observed in [82]. Moreover, energy conservation (3.49) implies then that, in this high-frequency approximation, the evolution of the first σ -dependent term in (3.51) for H is also given by a surface integral, i.e. entirely by boundary data. Naively one could think that we can specify boundary data which would fix or even forbid the growth of Φ providing in this way a lower bound for the Hamiltonian. However, for the only case in which unbounded negative energies are possible, i.e. in the supersonic case, a part of the boundary $\partial\Sigma$ becomes S-spacelike and corresponds to the *future* of the evolution. It is not physical to impose boundary data in the future in the IVP and therefore the boundary character of the time derivative of Φ does not save the system from unbounded negative energies. One can illustrate the peculiarities of the supersonic regime by considering static solutions.

Static Waves Let us find static configurations of perturbations $(\bar{\pi}, \bar{\Pi})$ for $\sigma = +1$. Expressing $\bar{\Pi}$ from the second Hamilton equation (3.53) and plugging into the first we obtain

$$\partial_i \left(\left(\mathcal{Z}_2^{ij} - Z^{0i} Z^{0j} \right) \frac{\partial_j \bar{\pi}}{\sqrt{\det\mathcal{Z}_2}} \right) = 0. \quad (3.60)$$

This second order PDE can either be elliptic¹⁹ allowing only for the trivial solutions completely determined by the boundary data²⁰ or be hyperbolic — in which case nontrivial solutions are possible. These solutions would be waves “propagating” not in the four-dimensional spacetime, but just inside of the three-dimension spatial foliation. Crucially the type of this equation can change from region to region in the Cauchy hypersurface Σ . It may happen that elliptic an region has holes where the equation (3.60) is hyperbolic.

Let us introduce the spatial covariant derivative $\vec{\nabla}_i$ compatible with \mathcal{Z}_2^{ij} so that

$$\vec{\nabla}_k \mathcal{Z}_2^{ij} = 0. \quad (3.61)$$

Recall that a foliation corresponding to the well-posed Cauchy problem implies that \mathcal{Z}_2^{ij} is positive definite and corresponds to a proper euclidean contravariant metric in 3d space Σ . Now we can raise and lower Latin indices using this metric or its inverse. Furthermore, it is convenient introduce a unit 3d spatial vector

$$Z^i = \frac{Z^{0i}}{z}, \quad \text{where as in (3.56) we use} \quad z^2 = (\mathcal{Z}_2^{-1})_{ij} Z^{0i} Z^{0j}, \quad (3.62)$$

¹⁹Note that only the static equation of motion can be elliptic, while we assume that the equation of motion is a usual hyperbolic acoustic wave equation (2.35).

²⁰In simple topology if this equation is elliptic everywhere vanishing boundary conditions imply $\bar{\pi} = 0$ and correspondingly $\bar{\Pi} = 0$.

along with the associated orthogonal projector

$$\mathcal{P}^{ik} = \mathcal{Z}_2^{ik} - Z^i Z^k, \quad (3.63)$$

and decomposition of the covariant derivative

$$\vec{\nabla}^k = Z^k Z^i \vec{\nabla}_i + \mathcal{P}^{ki} \vec{\nabla}_i \equiv Z^k \vec{\nabla}_Z + \vec{\nabla}^{k\perp}. \quad (3.64)$$

Using this 3d covariant notation one can write (3.60) as

$$\vec{\nabla}_i \left(\left(\mathcal{Z}_2^{ij} - z^2 Z^i Z^j \right) \partial_j \bar{\pi} \right) = 0, \quad (3.65)$$

which using (3.64) expands to

$$\left(z^2 - 1 \right) \vec{\nabla}_Z^2 \bar{\pi} - \vec{\nabla}_i^\perp \vec{\nabla}^{i\perp} \bar{\pi} + \vec{\nabla}_i \left((z^2 - 1) Z^i \right) \vec{\nabla}_Z \bar{\pi} + \left(\vec{\nabla}_i^\perp \bar{\pi} \right) \vec{\nabla}_Z Z^i = 0. \quad (3.66)$$

This equation is elliptic for $z^2 < 1$ and hyperbolic — for $z^2 > 1$. Thus, for $z^2 > 1$ this is a wave equation with “time” in direction along Z^i and “speed of propagation” $1/\sqrt{z^2 - 1}$. We show in section 3.4 that z^2 is related to supersonic motion of the observer, see eq. (3.81). The same object appears in the partition function for phonons obtained in [103]. It is worth mentioning that a similar emergence of Lorentz signature from disformally transformed euclidean metrics has been considered in [104, 105].

Now we insert the solution $(\bar{\pi}, \bar{\Pi})$ into the Hamiltonian (3.51) to obtain

$$\bar{H} = \frac{1}{2} \int_\Sigma \frac{d^3 \mathbf{x}}{\sqrt{\det \mathcal{Z}_2}} \left(\mathcal{Z}_2^{ij} - z^2 Z^i Z^j \right) \partial_i \bar{\pi} \partial_j \bar{\pi}, \quad (3.67)$$

which on the equation of motion (3.65) becomes just a total derivative,

$$\bar{H} = \frac{1}{2} \int_\Sigma \frac{d^3 \mathbf{x}}{\sqrt{\det \mathcal{Z}_2}} \vec{\nabla}_i \left(\left(\mathcal{Z}_2^{ij} - z^2 Z^i Z^j \right) \bar{\pi} \partial_j \bar{\pi} \right) = \frac{1}{2} \oint_{\partial \Sigma} d^2 \sigma_i \frac{\left(\mathcal{Z}_2^{ij} - z^2 Z^i Z^j \right)}{\sqrt{\det \mathcal{Z}_2}} \bar{\pi} \partial_j \bar{\pi}. \quad (3.68)$$

Thus, the value of the extremal Hamiltonian is completely determined by data on the 2d boundary $\partial \Sigma$ of the 3d Cauchy hypersurface Σ . Note that this is true regardless of the nature, hyperbolic or elliptic, of equation (3.65).

It is worth mentioning that even in case of the existence of the Killing vector ξ_μ and a foliation orthogonal to it, the value of the Hamiltonian for these static solutions can be nonvanishing. Moreover, the corresponding 2d boundary data can be perfectly compatible with the vanishing of Hamiltonian time derivative in (3.49) as for staticity $\dot{\pi} = 0$ and current (3.50) is vanishing. One can expect that the type of equation (3.66) defines the type of boundary data needed. In particular, in the hyperbolic case, the problem of finding the static configuration can be ill-posed when trying to provide conditions in the “future” of Z^i . Arguably, the most interesting situation occurs when in different regions of Σ equation (3.66) have different types. In that case one would need to solve the elliptic equation in some regions with new internal boundaries separating hyperbolic and elliptic regimes. Note that this can happen even in a purely stationary case. Crucially the boundary data are usually not provided on such internal boundaries. Appearance of such "holes" with hyperbolic type of (3.66) inside of elliptic regions would also allow for nontrivial solutions extending also in elliptic regions. Of course, these static solutions, if exist, do extremise the Hamiltonian

functional due to vanishing of both functional derivatives in (3.53). Further, it is useful to note that one can also extremise the local Hamiltonian density (3.44) as a function of Π and $\partial_i \pi$. In that case conditions for extremum are the second equation from (3.53) and the first equation from there without the partial derivative. Thus, the local extremum (saddle point) is reached on zero eigenvectors of Z^{ik} as

$$\left(Z_2^{ij} - z^2 Z^i Z^j \right) \partial_j \tilde{\pi} \propto Z^{ij} \partial_j \tilde{\pi} = 0. \quad (3.69)$$

For positive definite Z^{ik} there are only trivial solutions. However, even nontrivial configurations $\tilde{\pi}$ existing only for $z > 1$ have vanishing Hamiltonian (3.67). Clearly $\tilde{\pi}$ also satisfy (3.65). However, these algebraic solutions $\tilde{\pi}$ build a subclass among $\bar{\pi}$. The key difference between these configurations is that $\tilde{\pi}$ may not satisfy boundary conditions, while $\bar{\pi}$ is capable of that.

3.4 Acoustic metric and sound horizons

In constructing the Z -frame in section 2.3 we chose not to use the spacetime metric. Nonetheless, in the presence of two metrics, there are two independent ways of mapping vectors to covectors and therefore we could have chosen a different construction. We can start off from the four-vector $u^\mu = g^{\mu\nu} u_\nu = S_\nu^\mu U^\nu$ and define a new covector

$$v_\mu \equiv S_{\mu\nu} u^\nu, \quad u^\mu v_\mu = -\beta \neq 0, \quad (3.70)$$

i.e. $\beta = -S_{\mu\nu} u^\mu u^\nu$. We can now define a different projector $\underline{\perp}_\nu^\mu$, onto the subspace orthogonal to u^μ , and the associated induced metric on this subspace, $\underline{\Delta}_{\mu\nu}$.

$$\underline{\Delta}_{\mu\nu} \equiv S_{\mu\nu} + \frac{v_\mu v_\nu}{\beta}, \quad \underline{\perp}_\nu^\mu \equiv \underline{\Delta}_{\mu\lambda} Z^{\lambda\nu} \quad (3.71)$$

It may be somewhat surprising, but this projector is not the same as that defined in the Z -frame in eq. (2.25), $\bar{\perp}_\nu^\mu \neq \underline{\perp}_\nu^\mu$, since they are projecting orthogonally to distinct vectors U^μ and u^μ respectively. Similarly, the two induced metrics are *not* inverses of each other, $(\underline{\Delta}_{\mu\nu})^{-1} \neq \bar{\Delta}^{\mu\nu}$. Nonetheless, $\underline{\Delta}_{\mu\nu}$ is also spatial,

$$\underline{\Delta}_{\mu\nu} = \left(S_{\alpha\beta} - \frac{S_{u\alpha} S_{u\beta}}{S_{uu}} \right) h_\mu^\alpha h_\nu^\beta, \quad (3.72)$$

where the u index is a contraction with u^μ . Similarly to eq. (3.9), $\underline{\Delta}_{\mu\nu}$ is the Schur complement of the $u_\mu u_\nu$ block of the metric $S_{\mu\nu}$, and we again have

$$\det S_{\mu\nu} = S_{uu} \det_u \underline{\Delta}_{\mu\nu}, \quad (3.73)$$

and we have the inverse relationship between $\underline{\Delta}_{\mu\nu}$ and the spatial part of the metric $Z^{\mu\nu}$

$$\underline{\Delta}_{\nu\rho} \left(Z^{\alpha\beta} h_\alpha^\rho h_\beta^\mu \right) = h_\nu^\mu. \quad (3.74)$$

We will call the frame based on v_μ with the induced spatial metric (3.71) the S -frame. Thus, the S -frame decomposition of the momentum and ray vectors is different than in eq. (2.26) and is the one natural for the rays,

$$N^\mu = \frac{\mathcal{U}_S}{\beta} u^\mu + \underline{R}^\mu, \quad \text{with} \quad \underline{R}^\mu \equiv \underline{\perp}_\nu^\mu N^\nu, \quad (3.75)$$

and therefore provides also the natural decomposition for the ray null surface,

$$S_{\mu\nu}N^\mu N^\nu = -\frac{1}{\beta} \left(\mathcal{U}_S^2 - \beta \underline{\Delta}_{\mu\nu} \underline{R}^\mu \underline{R}^\nu \right) = 0. \quad (3.76)$$

which gives the reality of \mathcal{U}_S in this frame whenever the metric $S_{\mu\nu}$ has Lorentzian signature and the induced metric $\underline{\Delta}_{\mu\nu}$ is spatial. This reality condition informs us about the fact that the rays can point in any spatial direction and therefore that there are no sound horizons for the propagation of scalar waves. In other words, whenever the tensor

$$\mathcal{S}_{2\mu\nu} \equiv \beta \underline{\Delta}_{\mu\nu} = S_{\mu\alpha} u^\alpha S_{\nu\beta} u^\beta - S_{\alpha\beta} u^\alpha u^\beta S_{\mu\nu} \succ 0 \quad (3.77)$$

is positive definite, then the ray cone covers all the directions \underline{R}^μ and the observer with four-velocity u^μ is subsonic (u^μ is S -timelike). This is a *different* condition to (2.28) and both, neither, but also just one of them could be satisfied depending on the setup. Condition (3.77) is again quadratic in $S_{\mu\nu}$, so is satisfied in both the (3, 1) and (1, 3) signatures and it depends on the choice of observer u^μ .

The situation now is analogous to that described in section 3.2, with the metrics $Z^{\mu\nu}$ and $S_{\mu\nu}$ exchanged. We can thus again pick a set of coordinates in which $u_\mu = -\delta_\mu^0$. Now, for the observer $u^\mu = -g^{\mu 0}$, the phase velocity (3.5) is given by $v_p^i = r^i/\mathcal{U}$ with \mathcal{U} a solution to the ray null cone eq. (3.25),

$$\mathcal{U}_{[\pm]} = -\frac{S_i^0 r^i}{S^{00}} \mp \frac{\sqrt{\mathcal{S}_{2ij} r^i r^j}}{S^{00}}, \quad (3.78)$$

with $\mathcal{S}_{2ij} = S_i^0 S_j^0 - S^{00} S_{ij}$ in the chosen coordinates, an equivalent of the dispersion relation (3.3), while the mode's energy can be expressed through the equivalent of eq. (3.31),

$$\omega_{[\pm]} = -P_0 = -S_{\mu\nu} N^\mu u^\nu = \pm \sqrt{\mathcal{S}_{2ij} r^i r^j}. \quad (3.79)$$

By the relation between $\underline{\Delta}_{\mu\nu}$ and the spatial part of $Z^{\mu\nu}$ (3.74),

$$\mathcal{S}_{2ij} \succ 0 \quad \Leftrightarrow \quad \frac{1}{S^{00}} Z^{ij} \prec 0. \quad (3.80)$$

Analogously to the discussion in section 3.2, for a subsonic observer, $\mathcal{S}_{2ij} \succ 0$. Phase velocities are real for all directions r^i , so there is no sound horizon. Note the root subscripts in (3.78) and (3.79) — the split of the roots here is in principle different than that of section 3.2, where they are solutions to the dispersion relation (3.3). The roots $[+]/[-]$ split the modes into positive and negative energies, eq. (3.79). The roots $+/-$ of section 3.2 split the modes into those moving to the coordinate future and past, eq. (3.31). In the simple case of good Cauchy and subsonicity, $\mathcal{U}_+ = \mathcal{U}_{[+]} > 0$, $\omega_+ = \omega_{[+]} > 0$ for a non-ghost while $\mathcal{U}_+ = \mathcal{U}_{[-]} > 0$, $\omega_+ = \omega_{[-]} < 0$ for a ghost.

On the other hand, for a supersonic observer, $\mathcal{S}_{2ij} \not\succeq 0$, u^μ is outside the ray cone. For directions with $\mathcal{S}_{2ij} r^i r^j < 0$ no propagation occurs, phase velocities are not real and these directions are not in the P-cone. The system has a conical sound horizon given by the spatial directions r_*^i , $\mathcal{S}_{2ij} r_*^i r_*^j = 0$, constructed by modes with $\omega = 0$ — this is the Mach/Cherenkov cone which would be produced by a source moving supersonically with velocity u^μ and interacting with the medium. All the propagating modes, both positive and negative energy,

move inside this cone. For the supersonic observer, the future N-nappe is constructed by both the roots $\mathcal{U}_{[+]}$ and $\mathcal{U}_{[-]}$, which in a good Cauchy frame are both positive and make up the roots \mathcal{U}_+ . For a non-ghost degree of freedom, the acoustic metric still maps this future N-nappe to the upper P-nappe, but the modes $\mathcal{U}_{[-]}$ correspond to negative energies $\omega_{[-]} < 0$, while $\mathcal{U}_{[+]}$ map onto $\omega_{[+]} > 0$. By eq. (3.7), the phase velocity of the $\mathcal{U}_{[-]}$ modes has a component antiparallel to k_μ . For a ghost, the $[\pm]$ indices and therefore the sign of the energies are exchanged. See fig. 4 for an illustration.

Note that the sign of S^{00} is not in general the same as that of Z^{00} . Using the Schur complement form of matrix inverse, we can express

$$S^{00} = \frac{1}{Z^{00}} (1 - z^2) \quad \text{with} \quad z^2 \equiv Z^{0i} \left(\mathcal{Z}_2^{-1} \right)_{ij} Z^{0j} \quad (3.81)$$

where z^2 already appeared in the Hamiltonian discussion in eqs (3.56) and (3.62). Using the Sherman-Morrison formula and the matrix determinant lemma we can express this as

$$(S^{00})^{-1} = -(Z^{00})^2 \det Z'_\nu{}^\mu \det Z^{ij}. \quad (3.82)$$

We thus find that for Lorentzian acoustic metrics, S^{00} has the opposite sign to $\det Z^{ij}$. $S^{00} < 0$ then either implies that $Z^{ij} \succ 0$, and energies of all the modes are positive and by eq. (3.74) there are no sound horizons. Or Z^{ij} has two negative eigenvalues and therefore there is a sound horizon and the scalar is a ghost. We recover the statement that $z^2 = 1$ is the transonic point with $z^2 > 1$ implying the observer is supersonic.²¹

We reiterate here that since \mathcal{S}_{2ij} and \mathcal{Z}_2^{ij} are not directly related, the choice of a bad Cauchy frame and the existence of sound horizons are in general completely independent phenomena. Depending on the metric $Z^{\mu\nu}$ any one or both can occur.


The sonar metric We can relate \mathcal{S}_{2ij} to the acoustic equivalent of the radar metric of ref. [70, pg. 84]. We can construct a spacetime metric by measuring distances in the using proper-time elapse at an observer between emission and return of electromagnetic radar signals bounced off reflectors located throughout the space. Following their setup, but measuring the acoustic spacetime by sending sonar pulses, the overall proper coordinate time delay $d\mathcal{U}$ resulting from propagating scalar waves from and then back to an observer located at coordinate dr^i away is given by using eq. (3.78) for \mathcal{U} which gives us as the sonar metric γ_{ij}

$$d\ell^2 = -\frac{1}{2} g^{00} (d\mathcal{U}_+ - d\mathcal{U}_-)^2 = \gamma_{ij} dr^i dr^j, \quad \gamma_{ij} \equiv -\frac{g^{00}}{(S^{00})^2} \mathcal{S}_{2ij}. \quad (3.83)$$

where we had to assume that we are on a good Cauchy surface, so that we can produce arbitrary pulses in the first place and we have to make sure we perform the correct mapping between \mathcal{U}_\pm and $\mathcal{U}_{[\pm]}$ depending on whether we are in a supersonic frame. The $g^{00} = g_{\mu\nu} u^\mu u^\nu$ appears from the transformation of coordinate time \mathcal{U} to the proper time of u^μ in the coordinates $u_\mu = -\delta_\mu^0$, $d\tau = \sqrt{-g^{00}} d\mathcal{U}$. As u^μ approaches the transonic point $S^{00} = 0$, the time taken for the signal to return diverges, and so does the sonar distance. Past the transonic point, \mathcal{S}_2 is not positive definite and therefore distances in some directions become complex — propagation is not allowed there. Since $S_{\mu\nu}$ appears quadratically, the sonar

²¹Notice that for a supersonic observer, ghosts modes inside the equivalent of the Mach cone can have positive energy and therefore their emission would be kinematically forbidden.

Figure 4: Cone geometry in a good Cauchy frame of an observer moving supersonically with respect to an isotropic medium. Colour coding of surfaces as in fig. 1. (a) A subluminal ray cone (orange) is g -timelike and therefore there exist boosted frames in which the time direction lies outside it. The ray cone then does not cover the whole surface Σ_u and propagation does not occur in all directions – there is a spatial sound horizon (Mach cone). The g -spacelike P-cone in this frame cuts the surface Σ_u — mode energies are not definite. For a non-ghost, the acoustic metric maps the complete upper ray-cone nappe to the complete upper P-cone nappe (highlighted with light blue), including the part below Σ_u , so the outgoing rays have energies of both signs. The surface of the Mach cone/sound horizon is constructed by the modes with $\omega = 0$. Cherenkov radiation is the emission of the negative energy modes from a source at rest in this supersonic frame. For ghosts, the acoustic metric maps the upper N-nappe to the lower P-nappe (highlighted in magenta), so ghosts can have positive energy for a supersonic observer. (b) Phase-velocity direction and magnitude for outgoing non-ghost scalar waves (orange) vs light (green). Inset shows complete wavefronts, while the graphic zooms in around the Mach cone (light blue). The \mathcal{U}_+ rays are constructed by both the positive energy modes (solid, $\mathcal{U}_{[+]}$ branch) with phase velocities with a component parallel to the mode’s momentum k_μ and the negative energy modes (dashed, $\mathcal{U}_{[-]}$ branch), with an antiparallel component, see eq. (3.7). (c) The wave-vector surface formed by the *upper* P-nappe ω_+ (i.e. for non-ghosts) is hyperboloidal. It is constructed by two branches — the solid corresponding to positive mode energies $\omega_{[+]}$ and mapping onto the solid part of the wavefront in fig. 4b, and the dashed constructed by modes with negative energies $\omega_{[-]}$ and mapping onto the dashed part of the wavefront. The separatrix is conical and made out of modes with spatial momentum for which the energy is zero.



distance is not sensitive to whether the scalar is a ghost or healthy. Given the relation (3.74), the sonar metric can also be written as

$$\gamma_{ij} = -\frac{g^{00}}{S^{00}} (Z^{-1})_{ij}. \quad (3.84)$$

Multiple degrees of freedom and Cherenkov radiation So far, we have discussed a frame issue with no physical implications: we have demonstrated that when a part of the ray cone is g -timelike, i.e. scalar fluctuations are subluminal in those directions, there are choices of observers for whom sound horizons exist. However, this has physical consequences once we have other fields or even just particles coupled to the scalar, not in the least gravity.

In particular, if a massive particle moving with velocity u^μ has an interaction vertex with a subluminal scalar, a sound horizon appears in the particle's rest frame the moment u^μ is outside the ray cone, $S_{\mu\nu}u^\mu u^\nu > 0$ (for a non-ghost scalar). The negative energies of the scalar modes are now physical, meaning that it becomes kinematically allowed to conserve on-shell both energy and spatial momentum while emitting a single scalar mode with negative energy, a new tree-level three-point process which otherwise would not be permitted. This leads to Cherenkov radiation. The surface of the Mach/Cherenkov cone is formed by the scalar modes which have zero energy in the rest frame of the particle, $\mathcal{S}_{2ij}r_*^i r_*^j = 0$, while the actual energy loss occurs into the negative energy modes inside the cone (see the worked example in section 5.1 for details). A modern derivation of the rate of this process is given in e.g. [106, 107]. This is an instability, resulting in the particle shedding momentum. As a result, the particle slows down toward the rest frame of the medium and the process is arrested once $S_{\mu\nu}u^\mu u^\nu = 0$.

The instability rate depends on the details of the interaction vertex and indeed the cutoff beyond which the scalar's background configuration becomes transparent to the particle, but is finite since the phase-space volume is finite. Moreover, this is really an instability which only appears in the presence of a source: without a source, a change of frame removes the negative energy modes, so nothing can happen spontaneously.

Such a Cherenkov-like process is also kinematically allowed when instead of the supersonic particle, we have a massless mode, e.g. a graviton, which interacts with the scalar. In our language, we can pick a graviton with ray l^μ (i.e. momentum l_μ) and ask if the ray is outside of the acoustic ray cone, $S_{\mu\nu}l^\mu l^\nu > 0$. If so, the graviton is kinematically allowed to lose energy by producing scalar Cherenkov radiation. In particular, if the acoustic ray cone is fully inside the lightcone, a graviton of any energy can shed it into the scalar at some finite rate determined, as for the massive particle, by the vertex, spin dependence and cutoff. The scale independence of the massless cones means that this process does not stop until all the supersonic gravitons at energies below the cutoff decay into the slower-moving scalar. Indeed, any superluminal massless mode would be allowed to decay into the slower graviton/photon in an equivalent finite fashion. The detailed calculation of rates of these processes is model dependent (requires knowledge of the interactions) and is outside of the scope of this paper, but they are finite. In reality the validity of this description is also limited at low momenta by the curvature scale of the metrics, beyond which acoustic momentum is no longer conserved in any case.

Let us end this section by considering two more unusual setups: (i) an acoustic metric, in which the ray cone is partially g -timelike and partially g -spacelike (class II according to the classification of section 4), and (ii) a situation where the *ray* cones are completely disjoint

(class Ib *ibid*). In both of these cases, common exteriors of the ray cones still exist, so the Cauchy problem is well-posed in at least some frames — we will assume we have picked the frame such that this is the case. However, it is *impossible* to boost to a frame in which the medium is at rest.

In (i) (see fig. 6a for an illustration), the rays of the scalar which are g -spacelike are all outside of the lightcone, and therefore they are kinematically allowed to emit gravitons. On the other hand, the rays of the gravitons which are S -spacelike are outside of the acoustic ray cone and therefore they are kinematically allowed to decay into the scalar. We thus end up with a sequestration of the modes by the direction of propagation. Any acoustic P-nappe overlaps with only a single light P-nappe and therefore a frame can be chosen in which all mode energies are positive from the point of view of an external observer. As we demonstrate in section 5.3, such a background with a class II metric can be constructed in the kinetic gravity braiding model.

In (ii), the situation is even more extreme. Since the ray cones do not contain any parts of each other, any mode of either species is kinematically allowed to emit modes of the other (see fig. 3b). In a good Cauchy frame, the phase space volume is still finite and therefore the rate of instability is also finite. From the point of view of the fluctuations, the decay process does not stop, but energy would be conserved when the metrics are constant and an equilibrium would in principle be reached as a result of detailed balance. From this point of view, this relative cone geometry does not appear a catastrophic pathology.


Nonetheless, there are issues which could be considered problematic and which lead e.g. [66] to dismiss such configurations. In particular, the P-cones of the two metrics in the setup (ii) both overlap in both their nappes. This means that there is no frame at all where the energies of both the degrees of freedom are all positive. This means that a massive particle with any g -timelike velocity u^μ will be able to emit scalar Cherenkov radiation, accelerating toward the unreachable rest frame of the medium formed by the scalar background. This process cannot stop without some limit appearing from a cutoff. However, again, this happens at a finite rate determined by the interaction vertex and only occurs in the presence of an external source.

Secondly, there are now two inequivalent choices of futures: we can declare that the upper nappe of the acoustic ray cone is the future, together the upper lightcone, or that it is the lower nappe of the acoustic ray cone. These two choices lead to disjoint sets of good Cauchy surfaces, but such surfaces can still be found. The proper resolution of this is to consider whether at any point in the evolution the background where such that the cones overlapped. If so, this determines the future acoustic nappe and the proper Cauchy surfaces to be used.

Whichever choice is made, it is possible to construct a process with total zero acoustic four-momentum involving only future-facing modes from both the ray cones, since the P-cones intersect in both nappes. In this sense, this property is similar to the situation with a ghost in the rest-frame of an isotropic medium: for the correct choice of outgoing momenta of both the ghostly scalar and e.g. gravity, total acoustic momentum can sum to zero. One could expect that the such a class Ib background itself would be destabilised by such spontaneous emission processes with a finite rate dependent on the interaction vertex and might not ever form.

Nonetheless, this last problem is *not* limited to class Ib metrics. It is enough to consider two fluids with *subluminal* sound speeds moving past each other supersonically but still subluminally, i.e. with their ray cones inside the light cone (see fig. 5a). The corresponding

Figure 5: A background configuration formed by two subluminal fluids moving supersonically with respect to each other. Red ray cone in panel (a) corresponds to the purple P-cone in panel (b), while the orange ray-cone corresponds to the blue P-cone. (a) Both the future ray cones are inside the light cone, so any g -spacelike hypersurface is a good Cauchy surface in the standard manner. Despite the non-intersection of the two ray cones, the larger surrounding lightcone gives an unambiguous choice of the future nappes. (b) The corresponding future P-nappe of the either fluid’s P-cone intersects both the future and past P-nappe of the other fluid. This is a coordinate-invariant statement and therefore, in any possible frame, there are negative energy modes of at least one of the fluids. In the presence of an interaction between the fluids, decay processes into modes of both fluids with total zero acoustic momentum would be kinetically allowed and in principle would act to destabilise this supersonic background if the process were fast enough. This relative P-cone geometry is equivalent to that in the case of the scalar’s ray cone being completely outside of the light cone, class Ib as in fig. 3b.



P-cone configuration (fig. 5b) is analogous to the problematic fig. 3b, with each nappe intersecting both the nappes of the other P-cone, despite the fact that neither is the light cone. Thus any such instability arising from spontaneous emission in class Ib should also appear for these supersonic fluid configurations which are not an unusual laboratory setup.

4 Geometries of acoustic cones and dispersion relations

In section 2.3, we already established that any non-singular acoustic metric with signature (3,1) or (1,3) — representing non-ghosts and ghosts, respectively — is hyperbolic and therefore its characteristic surface is a cone. This boils down to the requirement (3.14), $\det Z_\nu^\mu > 0$.

Since the spacetime metric has indeterminate signature, it is not always possible to diagonalise the matrix Z_ν^μ over reals (it is not necessarily symmetric). This happens when it is not possible to boost to the rest frame of the medium. The eigensystems of the possible acoustic metrics allow us to classify them. We will demonstrate that the classification is determined by the relative geometry of the light cone and the acoustic cone.

The eigenvalues λ_I and eigenvectors v_I^μ of the acoustic metric $Z^{\mu\nu}$,

$$Z_\nu^\mu v_I^\nu = \lambda_I v_I^\mu, \quad (4.1)$$

where the capital Latin indices enumerate the eigenvectors. To obtain the eigenvalues, we solve the standard characteristic equation. In this section we present the full classification of

possible acoustic metrics according to the eigensystem, discussing its physical meaning and presenting the possible types of dispersion relations and phase velocities for a dispersionless system. We will demonstrate that the metric $S_{\mu\nu}$ belongs to the same class as $Z^{\mu\nu}$ and that both have cones are characteristic surfaces (they are bi-hyperbolic) whenever condition (3.14) is satisfied.

We exploit the the work categorising the possible form of the energy-momentum tensor in refs [70, pg. 293] and [108], and apply it to the different physics of the acoustic metric. A similar classification was carried for bimetric theories in [109]. In 3+1 dimensions $Z^{\mu\nu}$ belongs to one of four classes.

- I. $Z^{\mu\nu}$ is diagonalisable with a real spectrum; none of the eigenvectors are g -null;
- II. $Z^{\mu\nu}$ is diagonalisable with a complex spectrum; none of the eigenvectors are g -null
- III. There is a twice repeated eigenvalue associated to a g -null eigenvector.
- IV. There is a thrice repeated eigenvalue associated to a g -null eigenvector.


Only for class I do the eigenvectors form a tetrad. Nonetheless, it is always possible to choose a canonical form for the other classes of metrics using the appropriate choice of standard tetrad for the basis. For clarity, we will label the the tetrad directions (ω, k_i) for Z^{IJ} and t, x^i for S_{IJ} . In a general frame $Z^{\mu\nu}$ has ten independent entries. We can perform three boosts and three rotations, fixing six of the entries. Thus in general, we should expect to obtain four free parameters for each metric class. This is true for all metrics, except those in class IV, where an additional degeneracy reduces the free parameters to three.

The first two classes are of most physical interest, with class III and IV limiting cases. For completeness we will consider each of the cases in turn. In the relevant 2 + 1-dimensional subspace in the coordinates where the metric takes the canonical form, the relative orientation of the acoustic cone to the light cone can be described as:

- I. The acoustic P-cone is centred on the direction ω (class Ia, see fig. 1) or one of the other principal directions k_i (class Ib, see fig. 3).
- II. The acoustic cone is tilted in the $\omega - k_x$ plane so that in one direction it is g -timelike and in the other — g -spacelike. It is thus impossible to boost to the medium's rest frame where the cone would be symmetrical (see fig. 6a).
- III. The acoustic cone nappe *touches* the upper light cone nappe along the eigen-covector and is completed to either include a part of the upper light-cone nappe (class IIIa) or not (class IIIb). Limiting case between class I and class II (see fig. 6c).
- IV. The acoustic cone *intersects* the light cone exactly twice. One intersection is along the g -null eigenvector v_0^μ with the surfaces of the cones tangent to each other there. The other intersection is along the g -null direction v_1^μ with $v_1^\mu v_{1\mu} = v_1^\mu v_{0\mu} = 0$ with the surfaces of the cones tangent to each other there. (see fig. 6e).

In the following we will demonstrate by explicit construction that the hyperbolicity condition (3.14) is equivalent to the existence of the cones, whatever the class of the metric. For some of the classes the cones will not be obvious in the canonical coordinates because of the existence of sound horizons and therefore negative energies.

Figure 6: Relative arrangement of acoustic cones with respect to the light cone for acoustic metrics in class II, III and IV. For class Ia see fig. 1, for class Ib — fig. 3. Cone colours as in fig. 1a with selected rays in future N-nappes shaded. Shading of selected momenta in P-cone based on choice of non-ghost signature. Lower panels are cuts through the cones at a constant height, demonstrating more precisely the intersection directions and relative arrangement. (a)-(b): Class II metrics have cones that are both partially g -timelike and g -spacelike and cannot be brought into the rest frame through a Lorentz boost. (c)-(d): Class III metrics have cones which *touch* but do not intersect the light cone in exactly one direction (and can intersect in pairs of others). This is a limiting case between class I and II. (e)-(f): Class IV metrics have cones which *intersect* at the null eigenvector with the two cones tangent to each other at one of the intersections.



Class I: $Z^{\mu\nu}$ diagonalisable over reals

This is the most intuitive case. Here there are four real eigenvalues λ_I , and Z^μ_ν has four normalisable orthogonal eigenvectors of which one must be g -timelike, e.g. v_0^μ which is the observer's velocity for which the medium is at rest. It is only for this class that the frame can be chosen so that the medium is at rest, $q^\mu = 0$.

In these coordinates, the acoustic metric is diagonal, $Z^{IJ} = \text{diag}(-\lambda_0, \lambda_1, \lambda_2, \lambda_3)$ and its null surface, described by eq. (2.3), is just

$$0 = Z^{IJ} P_I P_J = -\lambda_0 \omega^2 + \sum_i \lambda_i k_i^2. \quad (4.2)$$

This surface is a cone for 0, 2 or all 4 of the λ_I negative. Setups with an odd number of negative eigenvalues are not hyperbolic and therefore cannot be solved as an IVP. The S_{IJ} acoustic metric is diagonal with eigenvalues λ_I^{-1} , so the P-cone and the ray cone for this class

of metrics either both exist or both do not and both lie in the same (sub)class. The tensors $\mathcal{Z}_2^{IJ} = \text{diag}(0, \lambda_0\lambda_1, \lambda_0\lambda_2, \lambda_0\lambda_3)$ while $\mathcal{S}_{2IJ} = \lambda_0^{-1} \text{diag}(0, \lambda_1^{-1}, \lambda_2^{-1}, \lambda_3^{-1})$ in these coordinates.

We subdivide the class into class Ia where the central direction of the cone is g -timelike (illustrated in fig. 1) and class Ib, where the central direction of the cone is g -spacelike, e.g. v_1^μ (see fig. 3a).

Class Ia:

- All $\lambda_I > 0$; non-ghost (signature (3, 1)): cone symmetric around v_0^μ with up to three distinct sound speeds corresponding to g -spacelike eigendirections v_i^μ , $c_{s,i}^2 = \lambda_i/\lambda_0$.
- All $\lambda_I < 0$; ghost (signature (1, 3)): The cone is identical to the above case, but for overall sign difference giving ghost signature.

For class Ia, the tensors \mathcal{Z}_2^{IJ} and \mathcal{S}_{2IJ} are both positive definite, and therefore this frame is a good Cauchy frame with no sound horizons.

Class Ib:

- $\lambda_{0,1} < 0$, $\lambda_{2,3} > 0$; non-ghost (signature (3, 1)): On its own this setup is just a mislabelling of the time and space directions, but in the presence of any other degrees of freedom, the consistency of this setup is fragile. Provided that $\lambda_0/\lambda_1 < 1$, this is *not* acausal and a Cauchy surface can be found, i.e. we are in the configuration of fig. 3b. Otherwise, no Cauchy surface exists and we have the configuration of fig. 3a.
- $\lambda_0 > 0$, $\lambda_1 > 0$, other $\lambda_{2,3} < 0$; ghost (signature (1, 3)): The acoustic metric differs by an overall sign from the previous and represents a ghost.

In class Ib, neither \mathcal{Z}_2^{IJ} nor \mathcal{S}_{2IJ} are positive definite, so this frame is not a good Cauchy frame and sound horizons are present. When $|\lambda_0| < |\lambda_1|$, the P-cone does not overlap with the lightcone and we are in the acausal setup, fig. 3a.

In the whole of class I, the determinant (3.14) is

$$\det Z_J^I = \lambda_0\lambda_1\lambda_2\lambda_3 > 0 \quad (4.3)$$

It is easy to see that this condition is identical to the one provided by the above cone constructions (4.2).

Class II: $Z^{\mu\nu}$ diagonalisable with complex eigenvalues

See fig. 6a. There are two real eigenvalues (λ_2 and λ_3) corresponding to g -spacelike eigenvectors and a complex conjugate pair $\lambda' \pm i\lambda''$ with $\lambda', \lambda'' \neq 0$. The acoustic metric and its inverse can then be written in a canonical real form as

$$Z^{IJ} = \begin{pmatrix} -\lambda' & \lambda'' & 0 & 0 \\ \lambda'' & \lambda' & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & \lambda_2 & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & 0 & \lambda_3 \end{pmatrix}, \quad S_{IJ} = (\lambda'^2 + \lambda''^2)^{-1} \begin{pmatrix} -\lambda' & \lambda'' & 0 & 0 \\ \lambda'' & \lambda' & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & \frac{(\lambda'^2 + \lambda''^2)}{\lambda_2} & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & 0 & \frac{(\lambda'^2 + \lambda''^2)}{\lambda_3} \end{pmatrix} \quad (4.4)$$

with $I = 0$ corresponding to a g -timelike direction (see [70, pg. 293]). We then have

$$\det Z_J^I = (\lambda'^2 + \lambda''^2)\lambda_2\lambda_3 > 0. \quad (4.5)$$

Hyperbolicity in this class requires that λ_2 and λ_3 have the same sign but does not constrain the non-diagonal block. By inspection, S_{IJ} is also class II.

Then, in the canonical frame, the characteristic surface for Z^{IJ} can be written as²²

$$Z^{IJ}P_IP_J = -\lambda' \left(\omega^2 + \frac{2\lambda''}{\lambda'} \omega k_x - k_x^2 - \frac{\lambda_2}{\lambda'} k_y^2 - \frac{\lambda_3}{\lambda'} k_z^2 \right) = 0. \quad (4.6)$$

The cone's opening angle in the $k_y = k_z = 0$ plane is $\pi/2$ and therefore it always includes both timelike and spacelike parts of the lightcone in its interior, but it is never acausal and therefore a good Cauchy frame exists. We have $Z_2^{IJ} = \text{diag}(0, \lambda'^2 + \lambda''^2, \lambda'\lambda_2, \lambda'\lambda_3)$ while $S_{2IJ} = (\lambda'^2 + \lambda''^2)^{-1} \text{diag}(0, 1, \lambda'/\lambda_2, \lambda'/\lambda_3)$. The four possibilities can be categorised as

- $\lambda' > 0, \lambda_{2,3} > 0$, non-ghost signature (3,1). The canonical frame is a good Cauchy frame and so are sound horizons.
- $\lambda' < 0, \lambda_{2,3} < 0$, ghost signature (1,3): as above, but the scalar is a ghost.
- $\lambda' < 0, \lambda_{2,3} > 0$, non-ghost signature (3,1): The canonical frame is a bad Cauchy frame and has a sound horizon. k_x acts as the Z -timelike direction for the acoustic cone.
- $\lambda' > 0, \lambda_{2,3} < 0$, ghost signature (1,3): as above, but the scalar is a ghost.

Class III: Double null eigenvector

See fig. 6c. For this class, coordinates can be chosen in which the acoustic metric and its inverse are both reduced to the canonical form

$$Z^{IJ} = \begin{pmatrix} -\lambda - \mu & \mu & 0 & 0 \\ \mu & \lambda - \mu & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & \lambda_2 & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & 0 & \lambda_3 \end{pmatrix}, \quad S_{IJ} = \lambda^{-2} \begin{pmatrix} -\lambda + \mu & -\mu & 0 & 0 \\ -\mu & \lambda + \mu & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & \lambda^2/\lambda_2 & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & 0 & \lambda^2/\lambda_3 \end{pmatrix}. \quad (4.7)$$

Z^{IJ} has two g -spacelike eigenvectors with eigenvalues λ_2 and λ_3 and a repeated eigenvalue λ corresponding to the g -null eigen-covector $(1, 1, 0, 0)$ along which the acoustic cone and the lightcone touch but do not intersect. This configuration of the cones can be seen as a boundary between class Ia and class II, where the class Ia cone is tilted exactly so as to touch the lightcone, just before crossing it to become class II or when class II is tilted just before it becomes class Ib. This canonical choice of coordinates is such that μ has the minimum possible magnitude, so the medium cannot be put in a rest frame through any boost.

S_{IJ} is also class III with the mapping $\mu \rightarrow -\mu/\lambda^2$ and $\lambda \rightarrow \lambda^{-1}$, so either both the ray and P-cones exist or both do not. The determinant of Z_J^I is positive when

$$\det Z_J^I = \lambda^2 \lambda_2 \lambda_3 > 0, \quad (4.8)$$

²² $P_0 = -\omega$ in our convention.

i.e. whenever $\lambda_{2,3}$ have the same sign. We also have $Z_2^{IJ} = \text{diag}(0, \lambda^2, (\lambda + \mu)\lambda_2, (\lambda + \mu)\lambda_3)$, so whenever $(\lambda + \mu)\lambda_{2,3} < 0$ this canonical frame is not a good Cauchy frame. $S_{2IJ} = \lambda^{-2} \text{diag}(0, 1, (\lambda - \mu)/\lambda_2, (\lambda - \mu)/\lambda_3)$, so a sound horizon is present in this frame whenever $(\lambda - \mu)/\lambda_{2,3} < 0$ — constant ω slices of the P-cone are not closed. In class III, there is no frame which is both a good Cauchy frame and has no sound horizons.

We can perform a boost in the x direction with parameter at least

$$\begin{aligned} v &> \frac{\lambda - \mu}{\lambda + \mu}, & \frac{\mu}{\lambda} &> 0 \\ v &< \frac{\lambda + \mu}{\lambda - \mu}, & \frac{\mu}{\lambda} &< 0 \end{aligned} \quad (4.9)$$

which brings the characteristic surface to the form

$$\begin{aligned} Z^{\bar{I}\bar{J}} P_{\bar{I}} P_{\bar{J}} = & -\lambda \left((1 - v^2) (\bar{\omega}^2 - k_{\bar{x}}^2) + (1 - v)^2 \frac{\mu}{\lambda} (\bar{\omega}^2 + k_{\bar{x}}^2) \right) \\ & + 2(1 - v)^2 \frac{\mu}{\lambda} \bar{\omega} k_{\bar{x}} - \frac{\lambda_2}{\lambda} k_y^2 - \frac{\lambda_3}{\lambda} k_z^2 = 0, \end{aligned} \quad (4.10)$$

Provided that λ_2 and λ_3 have a common sign, this surface is a cone, just as in condition (4.8). Then, in the $\bar{y} = \bar{z} = 0$ plane, the cone is given by

$$\bar{\omega} = -k_{\bar{x}}, \quad \frac{\lambda(1 + v) - \mu(1 - v)}{\lambda(1 + v) + \mu(1 - v)} k_{\bar{x}}, \quad (4.11)$$

so it always lies on the light cone in one direction.²³ We can now split this class into two subclasses, similarly to 4. Subclasses are preserved under inversion of the metric.

Class IIIa: the upper nappe of the acoustic cone includes a part of the upper nappe of the light-cone. This acoustic metric separates class Ia and class II:

- $\lambda > 0, \lambda_{2,3} > 0$, non-ghost signature (3, 1).
- $\lambda < 0, \lambda_{2,3} < 0$, ghost signature (1, 3).

Class IIIb: the upper nappe of the acoustic cone does not include the upper nappe of the lightcone. We have an extra condition from requiring that the N-cones are not acausal, giving $\mu < 0$. In such a case, the upper P-cone nappe includes a part of the past light cone. The two possible cases are

- $\lambda < 0, \lambda_{2,3} > 0$, non-ghost signature (3, 1).
- $\lambda > 0, \lambda_{2,3} < 0$, ghost signature (1, 3).

Class IV: Triple null eigenvector

See fig. 6e. For this class, coordinates can be chosen in which the acoustic metric is reduced to the canonical form

$$Z^{IJ} = \lambda \begin{pmatrix} -1 & 0 & \sigma & 0 \\ 0 & 1 & \sigma & 0 \\ \sigma & \sigma & 1 & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & 0 & \rho \end{pmatrix}, \quad S_{IJ} = \lambda^{-1} \begin{pmatrix} -1 + \sigma^2 & \sigma^2 & -\sigma & 0 \\ \sigma^2 & 1 + \sigma^2 & -\sigma & 0 \\ -\sigma & -\sigma & 1 & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & 0 & \rho^{-1} \end{pmatrix} \quad (4.12)$$

²³Since $P_0 = -\omega$, the first solution in eq. (4.11) is the null eigenvector of this class.

This Z^{IJ} has one g -spacelike eigenvector with eigenvalue $\rho\lambda$ and the thrice-repeated eigenvalue λ associated with the null eigenvector $v_0^\mu = (1, 1, 0, 0)$. The acoustic cone intersects the light cone in exactly two directions. v_0^μ and $v_1^\mu = (1, -1, 0, 0)$, but with the acoustic and light cones tangent to each other at v_1^μ .

Determinant positivity is

$$\det Z_J^I = \lambda^4 \rho > 0, \quad (4.13)$$

which is satisfied whenever $\rho > 0$ and does not depend on σ . We also have

$$Z_2^{IJ} = \lambda^2 \begin{pmatrix} 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & 1 & \sigma & 0 \\ 0 & \sigma & 1 + \sigma^2 & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & 0 & \rho \end{pmatrix} \quad \mathcal{S}_{2IJ} = \lambda^{-2} \begin{pmatrix} 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & 1 & -\sigma & 0 \\ 0 & -\sigma & 1 & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & 0 & \frac{1-\sigma^2}{\rho} \end{pmatrix} \quad (4.14)$$

Z_2^{IJ} is positive definite for any σ , so this canonical frame is always a good Cauchy frame. On the other hand, \mathcal{S}_{2IJ} is only positive definite for $\sigma^2 < 1$. Otherwise there is a sound horizon and constant ω slices of the P-cone do not close. We can boost the canonical frame in the k_x direction with speed at least

$$v > \frac{\sigma^2 - 1}{\sigma^2 + 1}. \quad (4.15)$$

In these boosted coordinates the P-cone is described by

$$Z^{\bar{I}\bar{J}} P_{\bar{I}} P_{\bar{J}} = -\bar{\omega}^2 + k_{\bar{x}}^2 + k_{\bar{y}}^2 - 2\gamma_v(1-v)\sigma k_{\bar{y}}(\bar{\omega} - k_{\bar{x}}) + \rho k_{\bar{z}}^2 = 0, \quad (4.16)$$

with γ_v the Lorentz factor. In these new coordinates with v satisfying (4.15), constant $\bar{\omega}$ hypersurfaces are ellipsoids and constant $k_{\bar{x}}, k_{\bar{y}}, k_{\bar{z}}$ surfaces are hyperboloids, provided that $\rho > 0$. Thus we explicitly have a cone for all σ and obtain a condition equivalent to eq. (4.13). We can also show that

- $\lambda > 0$: signature is (3,1) and the scalar is a non-ghost
- $\lambda < 0$: signature is (1,3) and the scalar is a ghost.

At first glance it is not clear whether S_{IJ} belongs to class IV. It can be brought to the standard form by first performing a rotation in the x - y plane by the angle $\sin \theta = \sigma/\sqrt{4+\sigma^2}$ and then boosting in the new y -direction with parameter $v = -\sigma/\sqrt{4+\sigma^2}$. In these new coordinates, we have

$$S_{IJ} = \lambda^{-1} \begin{pmatrix} -1 & 0 & -\frac{\sigma}{\sqrt{4+\sigma^2}} & 0 \\ 0 & 1 & -\frac{\sigma}{\sqrt{4+\sigma^2}} & 0 \\ -\frac{\sigma}{\sqrt{4+\sigma^2}} & -\frac{\sigma}{\sqrt{4+\sigma^2}} & 1 & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & 0 & \rho^{-1} \end{pmatrix}, \quad (4.17)$$

an explicit Class IV metric with replacements $\lambda \rightarrow \lambda^{-1}$, $\sigma \rightarrow -\sigma/\sqrt{4+\sigma^2}$, $\rho \rightarrow \rho^{-1}$. The constant t sections are ellipsoids and constant x and y sections and z — hyperboloids. Thus we have shown that condition (4.13) is sufficient to determine if a cone exists also for this class.

We have thus demonstrated that for all possible non-singular acoustic metrics $Z^{\mu\nu}$, an acoustic cone exists whenever $\det Z_\nu^\mu > 0$. This is a necessary and sufficient condition for Z and the P-cone, but also we are guaranteed under this condition that an acoustic ray-cone will exist for the metric $S_{\mu\nu}$. Whether it is possible to go into the rest-frame of the medium created by the background depends on which class the metric falls into. The discussion we have presented in section 3 is general and applies to all the classes.

5 Acoustic metrics: Illustrative examples

In this section, we will give some examples of acoustic metrics and study their properties. In particular we will study the Gordon's metric [110] — the acoustic metric for an isotropic medium, as well as two classes of scalar-tensor models, *k-essence* [2, 74] and kinetic gravity braiding [5, 111].

5.1 Gordon's metric and the Mach cone

Let us make things concrete using a well-studied example — an isotropic medium with phonons propagating at sound speed c_s . This is a metric frequently used in the analogue gravity community to model curved spacetime using superfluids (see the review [47]). The acoustic metric is given by Gordon's metric [110],

$$Z^{\mu\nu} = c_s^{-2}(c_s^2 g^{\mu\nu} - (1 - c_s^2)u^\mu u^\nu), \quad (5.1)$$

where the medium's flow velocity is given by u^μ . Both u^μ and c_s are in principle all functions of spacetime location. For the purpose of this section, we assume that u^μ is subluminal (g -timelike), while c_s is arbitrary but real. This means it is possible to diagonalise $Z^{\mu\nu}$ over reals and therefore it is class I. In the medium's rest frame, the acoustic metric is $S_{\mu\nu} = \text{diag}(-c_s^2, 1, 1, 1)$ while its inverse — $Z^{\mu\nu} = c_s^{-2} \text{diag}(-1, c_s^2, c_s^2, c_s^2)$, see figure 1 for an illustration. The dispersion relation given by the P-cone (2.3) is just $\omega^2 = c_s^2 \delta^{ij} k_i k_j$ while the ray cone is given by $c_s^2 \dot{U}^2 = \delta_{ij} r^i r^j$. As should be expected, the rest frame is a good Cauchy frame and there is no sound horizon.

Performing a boost with speed v (Lorentz factor γ_v), the metrics in the new coordinates take the form

$$Z^{\mu\nu} = \frac{\gamma_v^2}{c_s^2} \begin{pmatrix} -(1 - v^2 c_s^2) & (1 - c_s^2)v \\ (1 - c_s^2)v & c_s^2 - v^2 \\ & & c_s^2 \gamma_v^{-2} \end{pmatrix}, \quad S_{\mu\nu} = \gamma_v^2 \begin{pmatrix} -(c_s^2 - v^2) & -(1 - c_s^2)v \\ -(1 - c_s^2)v & (1 - v^2 c_s^2) \\ & & \gamma_v^{-2} \end{pmatrix}. \quad (5.2)$$

where to save space we have collapsed two dimensions into a single coordinate.

We can compute \mathcal{Z}_2^{ij} and \mathcal{S}_{2ij} in this boosted frame according to eq. (3.30) and (3.77), obtaining:

$$\mathcal{Z}_2^{ij} = c_s^{-2} \begin{pmatrix} 1 & 0 \\ 0 & \gamma_v^2 (1 - c_s^2 v^2) \end{pmatrix}, \quad \mathcal{S}_{2ij} = c_s^2 \begin{pmatrix} 1 & 0 \\ 0 & \gamma_v^2 \left(1 - \frac{v^2}{c_s^2}\right) \end{pmatrix}. \quad (5.3)$$

where again we have suppressed the third dimension, identical to the second.

In the subluminal case, $c_s < 1$, no boost with $v < 1$ can change the sign of Z^{00} or any of the eigenvalues of \mathcal{Z}_2^{ij} . All frames are good Cauchy frames. On the other hand, a

supersonic boost $v > c_s$ moves the ray cone out of the time direction of the observer (S_{00} changes sign). Equivalently, eigenvalues of \mathcal{S}_{2ij} change sign and therefore the wave cannot propagate in directions for which $\mathcal{S}_{2ij}r^i r^j < 0$; a sound horizon has appeared. Z^{ij} changes the sign of one eigenvalue, giving negative energies in the boosted frame for some modes. See fig. 4 for an illustration.

When a particle interacting with scalar moves in the boosted frame, it will now produce a shockwave — the Cherenkov/Mach cone. Its outer surface is given by $\mathcal{S}_{2ij}r^i r^j = 0$ in the particle’s frame, or equivalently, by $\omega = 0$ modes in this frame. In particular, we have in the particle’s rest frame

$$\begin{aligned} N_v^\mu &= \left(\frac{\gamma_v v (1 - c_s^2)}{\sqrt{v^2 - c_s^2}}, \gamma_v \sqrt{v^2 - c_s^2}, c_s \right) k. \\ P_{v\mu} &= \frac{\gamma_v^{-1}}{\sqrt{v^2 - c_s^2}} \left(0, -c_s, \gamma_v \sqrt{v^2 - c_s^2} \right) k. \end{aligned}$$

The spatial vector N^i points along the shockwave in positive 1-direction (let us call this ‘right’), behind the particle, while the spatial vector P_i is orthogonal to it and points forward (to the ‘left’) in the direction of motion of the particle. Interpreting this through the geodesic equations (2.14), means that the modes P_i are created at the particle and then in its rest-frame propagate to the right along the shockwave cone with phase speed

$$v_p = \frac{\sqrt{N^i N_i}}{N^0} = \gamma_{c_s} \sqrt{v^2 - c_s^2} \quad (5.4)$$

The cone opening half-angle in the particle rest frame is given by

$$\cos \alpha_v = \frac{\gamma_{c_s} \sqrt{v^2 - c_s^2}}{v}, \quad (5.5)$$

with the rays pointing right, while momenta point left. Momentum conservation fixes k for this angle to be zero, so no energy loss occurs at the outer surface of the cone (although see section 3.3 for a discussion of zero-energy modes living on the Mach cone). However, the modes with rays moving to the left of the fluid velocity u^μ inside the Mach cone have negative energies from the point of view of the particle and therefore their production is kinematically allowed, leading to energy loss and the full Cherenkov formula.

Transforming back to the medium’s rest frame, we obtain the expressions for the vectors in the medium’s frame,²⁴

$$\begin{aligned} N^\mu &= \left(\frac{v^2}{\sqrt{v^2 - c_s^2}}, -\frac{c_s^2}{\sqrt{v^2 - c_s^2}}, c_s \right) k, \\ P_\mu &= \left(-\frac{c_s^2 v}{\sqrt{v^2 - c_s^2}}, -\frac{c_s^2}{\sqrt{v^2 - c_s^2}}, c_s \right) k. \end{aligned} \quad (5.6)$$

The spatial part of these vectors is *aligned* in the medium’s rest frame (although $N^\mu P_\mu = 0$ as required). We recover the standard formula for the Cherenkov cone half-angle,

$$\cos \alpha_{\text{lab}} = \frac{c_s}{v} = \frac{1}{nv}, \quad (5.7)$$

²⁴Note the negative sign in P_0 . In our convention, that is positive energy in the covector.

with n the index of refraction and the phase speed from N^μ as $v_p = c_s$. Since the rays and momenta are both pointing to the left in the medium's rest-frame, the shockwave is moving together with the particle.

Let us briefly discuss the situation when the sound speed is superluminal, $c_s > 1$. The P-cone is now g -timelike, while the ray-cone is g -spacelike, so their possible behaviour under boosts is now reversed. It can be seen that a boost with $v > c_s^{-1}$ changes the sign of S_{11} in eq. (5.2) and equivalently the eigenvalues of Z_2^{ij} in eq. (5.3). The ray cone now intersects Σ_v and *in this frame* has directions with instantaneous propagation (see fig. 2) and others sending information into the coordinate past — an apparent causal paradox *for this observer* and therefore a bad Cauchy frame. Equivalently, the P-cone no longer includes the time direction of this frame, Z^{00} changes sign and the cone no longer covers all the directions on Σ_v — there exist spatial momenta k_i which have complex energies ω_\pm .

While we have not derived any new properties here, we have explicitly demonstrated how our covariant approach allows us to derive the geometry of the Mach cone, phase velocities and their transformations using standard Lorentz boosts.

5.2 k-Essence

k-essence is a class of scalar-tensor models where with a non-canonical kinetic term involved only first derivatives of the scalar field ϕ ,

$$\mathcal{L} = K(X, \phi), \quad (5.8)$$

where $X \equiv -\phi_{,\mu}\phi^{,\mu}/2$ is the canonical kinetic term. The properly normalised acoustic inverse metric takes the form

$$Z^{\mu\nu} = \frac{1}{\sqrt{D\mathcal{L}_{,X}}} \left(g^{\mu\nu} - \frac{\mathcal{L}_{,XX}}{\mathcal{L}_{,X}} \phi^{,\mu}\phi^{,\nu} \right), \quad (5.9)$$

with $D \equiv \mathcal{L}_{,X} + 2X\mathcal{L}_{,XX}$. This can be inverted to give the metric for rays

$$S_{\mu\nu} = \sqrt{D\mathcal{L}_{,X}} \left(g_{\mu\nu} + \frac{\mathcal{L}_{,XX}}{D} \phi_{,\mu}\phi_{,\nu} \right). \quad (5.10)$$

For both the tensors above, $\partial_\mu\phi$ is always an eigenvector. Moreover, it is an eigenvector for the energy-momentum tensor (EMT) for the *k-essence* scalar field,

$$T_{\mu\nu} = \mathcal{L}_{,X}\phi_{,\mu}\phi_{,\nu} + g_{\mu\nu}\mathcal{L}. \quad (5.11)$$

The acoustic metric represents a hyperbolic system (i.e. the cones exist) only when $\det Z_\nu^\mu = \mathcal{L}_{,X}^{-3}D^{-1} > 0$, which we will assume.

There are three separate cases:

Timelike $\partial_\mu\phi$: Class Ia

Time-like $\partial_\mu\phi$ corresponds to irrotational hydrodynamics and can be normalised to become a velocity vector, $u_\mu = -\partial_\mu\phi/\sqrt{2X}$. The lagrangian can be identified with the pressure $P = \mathcal{L}$, the energy density is $\mathcal{E} = 2XP_{,X} - P$. We can then rewrite the metric (5.9) as

$$Z^{\mu\nu} = \frac{1}{\mathcal{E}_{,X}c_s^3} \left(-u^\mu u^\nu + c_s^2 h^{\mu\nu} \right), \quad S_{\mu\nu} = \mathcal{E}_{,X}c_s \left(-c_s^2 u_\mu u_\nu + h_{\mu\nu} \right), \quad (5.12)$$

with $D = \mathcal{E}_{,X}$ and the sound speed given by

$$c_s^2 = \frac{P_{,X}}{\mathcal{E}_{,X}} = \left(\frac{\partial P}{\partial \mathcal{E}} \right)_\phi. \quad (5.13)$$

When cones exist, the signature implies we have a non-ghost for $\mathcal{E}_{,X} > 0$ and a ghost whenever $\mathcal{E}_{,X} < 0$. This metric can always be diagonalised with real eigenvalues, with the timelike eigenvector u^μ with eigenvalue $\mathcal{E}_{,X}^{-1} c_s^{-3}$ and three spacelike eigenvectors with shared eigenvalue $\mathcal{E}_{,X}^{-1} c_s^{-1}$, i.e. all k-essence metrics with timelike $\partial_\mu \phi$ are class Ia and describe an isotropic medium — they are equivalent to the Gordon metric (5.1) up to normalisation. The frame u_μ is the rest-frame of the medium and is always a good Cauchy frame with no sound horizon.

Spacelike $\partial_\mu \phi$: Class Ia

This case is particularly interesting for static solutions, see e.g. ref. [112]. For spacelike $\partial_\mu \phi$ we can introduce a unit vector $l_\mu \equiv \partial_\mu \phi / \sqrt{-2X}$, so that

$$Z^{\mu\nu} = \frac{1}{\sqrt{D\mathcal{L}_{,X}}} (\mathcal{L}_{,X} g^{\mu\nu} + 2X \mathcal{L}_{,XX} l^\mu l^\nu). \quad (5.14)$$

The signature then implies that $\mathcal{L}_{,X} > 0$ is a non-ghost, while $\mathcal{L}_{,X} < 0$ is a ghost. The metric is diagonalisable over reals with non-null eigenvectors and always class Ia.

In the frame of eigenvectors, the sound speed is not isotropic, but rather has a preferred direction l^μ in which it is not luminal, but rather

$$c_{s,l}^2 = \frac{\mathcal{L}_{,X} + 2X \mathcal{L}_{,XX}}{\mathcal{L}_{,X}}. \quad (5.15)$$

This is the inverse of the sound speed in timelike case of section 5.2, a result which was first obtained in ref. [112]. The sound speed is luminal in the other eigendirections.

Null $\partial_\mu \phi$: Class III

In particular this case is relevant for plane-wave backgrounds $\phi(t-x)$ which are exact solutions for all shift-symmetric k-essence theories [58]. The gradient $\phi_{,\mu}$ is a null eigenvector with eigenvalue $\mathcal{L}_{,X}$. Consider a timelike unit vector V^μ , then

$$r_\mu = \frac{\phi_{,\mu} + V_\mu (V^\lambda \phi_{,\lambda})}{V^\lambda \phi_{,\lambda}}, \quad (5.16)$$

is a spacelike unit vector, $r^\mu r_\mu = 1$, orthogonal to V^μ . Two other spacelike vectors e_1^μ and e_2^μ orthogonal to V^μ and r^μ are also orthogonal to $\phi_{,\mu}$. These spacelike vectors are also eigenvectors with the eigenvalues $\mathcal{L}_{,X}$. We can use $(V_\mu, r_\mu, e_{1\mu}, e_{2\mu})$ as a basis and rewrite the acoustic metric (5.10) as

$$Z^{\mu\nu} = \mathcal{L}_{,X}^{-1} \left(-V^\mu V^\nu + r^\mu r^\nu + \sum_i e_i^\mu e_i^\nu \right) + \frac{(V^\lambda \phi_{,\lambda})^2 \mathcal{L}_{,XX}}{\mathcal{L}_{,X}^2} (r^\mu r^\nu - V^\mu V^\nu - V^\mu r^\nu - V^\nu r^\mu). \quad (5.17)$$

Given the null eigenvector, this metric is of the form of class III, eq. (4.7), with

$$\lambda = \lambda_2 = \lambda_3 = \mathcal{L}_{,X}^{-1}, \quad \mu = (V^\lambda \phi_{,\lambda})^2 \frac{\mathcal{L}_{,XX}}{\mathcal{L}_{,X}^2}. \quad (5.18)$$

Note that in the null $\phi_{,\mu}$ case, $X = 0$ and $\mathcal{L}_{,X}$ and $\mathcal{L}_{,XX}$ do not depend on the choice of V^μ . Thus only the value of μ changes when different frames are chosen.

The cone exists whenever $\mathcal{L}_{,X} \neq 0$, but $\mathcal{L}_{,X} > 0$ is required for non-ghosts. These properties are independent of the sign of $\mathcal{L}_{,XX}$. However, the frame defined by V^μ is *not* good Cauchy frame whenever $\mathcal{L}_{,X} + (V^\lambda \phi_{,\lambda})^2 \mathcal{L}_{,XX} < 0$ while a sound horizon is present for $\mathcal{L}_{,X} - (V^\lambda \phi_{,\lambda})^2 \mathcal{L}_{,XX} < 0$. Nonetheless, a good choice of frame always exists.

5.3 Kinetic gravity braiding

Kinetic gravity braiding [5, 6] is a subclass of Horndeski scalar-tensor theories [11] in which the scalar does not derivatively couple to curvature in the action and therefore the acoustic metric of the scalar and gravity can be straightforwardly demixed [111]. The Lagrangian is given by

$$\mathcal{L} = K(X) - G(X)\square\phi \quad (5.19)$$

where $X \equiv -\phi_{,\mu}\phi^{,\mu}/2$ is the canonical kinetic term and we have specialised to the shift symmetric case in which K and G only depend on X and not the field ϕ . The kinetic operator still mixes with gravity in this theory, but can be demixed and then the acoustic metric is

$$\tilde{Z}^{\mu\nu} = \sqrt{-S}Z^{\mu\nu} = \Omega g^{\mu\nu} + \Xi \nabla^\mu \phi \nabla^\nu \phi + 2\nabla^{(\mu} (G_{3X} \nabla^{\nu)} \phi), \quad (5.20)$$

where the proper normalisation can be obtained by computing the determinant of this matrix and where

$$\begin{aligned} \Omega &= K_X - 2G_X \square\phi + G_{XX} \nabla^\rho \phi \nabla^\sigma \phi \nabla_\rho \nabla_\sigma \phi - \frac{2}{M_{\text{P}}^2} X^2 G_X^2, \\ \Xi &= -K_{XX} + G_{XX} \square\phi - \frac{4}{M_{\text{P}}^2} X G_X^2. \end{aligned} \quad (5.21)$$

where the terms involving the reduced Planck mass M_{P} are generated in the demixing process. The essential difference with respect to the *k-essence* metric (5.9) is the appearance of second derivatives of the background which implies that a second preferred direction appears in the acoustic metric in addition to $\partial_\mu \phi$. This implies that $Z^{\mu\nu}$ depends on the connection of the spacetime metric, but second derivatives have been removed by the demixing process.

The existence of two independent vectors in the acoustic metric means that even in the case of a *g*-timelike $u_\mu \equiv -\partial_\mu \phi / \sqrt{2X}$, and therefore a hydrodynamical interpretation for the scalar, the frame u_μ is not comoving. The constant- ϕ slicing usually provides natural coordinates in which to describe the scalar-field theory in a general manner using effective operators. In the below we will demonstrate that in kinetic gravity braiding it is possible to construct backgrounds which give hyperbolic $Z^{\mu\nu}$ and the fluctuations are non-ghosts and yet one of the usual assumptions about good media is violated:

- The constant- ϕ slicing is a bad Cauchy frame and therefore this set of coordinates is not appropriate to determine how the system evolves.
- It is not possible to boost to a rest frame and therefore the metric is not diagonalisable over reals, i.e. it lies in class II.

Thus kinetic gravity braiding provides the simplest example of a concrete and consistent theory in which background solutions exist which cannot be described using the usual effective

theory approach, or the medium described by the background can not be put in the rest frame and therefore the machinery of this paper must be employed to study it.

For the purpose of minimal examples, let us send $M_{\text{P}} \rightarrow \infty$ and assume that the spacetime metric is Minkowski. We now construct a spherically symmetric background with a *timelike* $\partial_\mu \phi$, picking as an ansatz

$$\phi(t, r) = \mu t + \varphi(r). \quad (5.22)$$

Under these assumptions, we have $2X = \mu^2 - \varphi'^2 > 0$. The only non-vanishing components of the acoustic metric are:

$$\begin{aligned} \tilde{Z}_t^t &= K_X + \mu^2 K_{XX} - 2(G_X + XG_{XX})\varphi'', & (5.23) \\ \tilde{Z}_r^r &= K_X - \varphi'^2 K_{XX}, \\ \tilde{Z}_r^t &= -\tilde{Z}_t^r = \mu\varphi' K_{XX}, \\ \tilde{Z}_\theta^\theta &= \tilde{Z}_\phi^\phi = \tilde{Z}_t^t - \mu^2 K_{XX} + G_{XX}\mu^2\varphi'' + 2G_X \frac{\varphi'}{r} \end{aligned}$$

This ansatz is not necessarily a stationary solution to the problem — for our purposes, we need it to be a valid background configuration only momentarily. As our conditions, we instead require that the model functions K and G and gradients of φ are chosen in such a manner that the acoustic metric is hyperbolic everywhere, eq. (3.14), and that the fluctuations are non-ghosts everywhere (correct signature). For *this form* of the acoustic metric, this reduces to

$$\begin{aligned} \tilde{Z}_t^t \tilde{Z}_r^r + (\tilde{Z}_r^t)^2 &> 0 && \text{cone existence,} & (5.24) \\ \tilde{Z}_\theta^\theta &> 0 && \text{non-ghost.} \end{aligned}$$

For consistency with spherical symmetry, φ' should vanish at the centre, unless the centre is hidden by a horizon. Since we have switched gravity off, we would not see this, but see the solutions in ref. [37] for a similar construction. We will assume here that our background is valid beyond some minimal radius and that $\varphi'\varphi'' < 0$, so that the scalar's spatial gradient decays with radius and our configuration is localised.

Failure of unitary gauge

Here we will construct a background in which the frame of $u_\mu = -\partial_\mu \phi / \sqrt{2X}$ is not a good Cauchy frame. By the discussion of section 3.2, this happens whenever u_μ is Z -spacelike. Since we have already ensured that the scalar not be a ghost, conditions (5.24), u_μ is a bad Cauchy frame whenever

$$\tilde{Z}^{\mu\nu} u_\mu u_\nu > 0 \quad \text{bad Cauchy.} \quad (5.25)$$

We specialise to the specific model $K(X) = X$. Without loss of generality, we take $\varphi' > 0$. A possible background which is hyperbolic everywhere and nowhere a ghost is then given by

$$0 < G_X < -XG_{XX} \quad (5.26)$$

$$\sigma < 2(G_X + XG_{XX})\varphi'' < 1 \quad (5.27)$$

with $\sigma = 0$. For this choice, $G_X \phi' / r > 0$ and this contribution in \tilde{Z}_θ^θ does not ever change the signature. The requirement that the frame u_μ be a bad Cauchy frame only changes the above conditions by the replacement $\sigma \rightarrow 2X/\mu^2$, so tightening the range of possible G_X .

It is possible to satisfy all these conditions simultaneously, even though condition (5.26) does place quite an unnatural condition on the function G_X — locally it must be at least $X^{-\alpha}$ with $\alpha > 1$ in the region of interest for this kind of configuration. We also have that for the metric (5.23) the radial sound speed is $c_s^2 = (1 - 2(G_X + XG_{XX})\phi'')^{-1}$. We thus see that the bad Cauchy frame occurs when either the sound speed is very large, so even a small spatial gradient ϕ' makes u_μ Z -spacelike or in the limit of $X \rightarrow 0$, a nearly null u_μ , where change of frames between the static coordinates and comoving is large and the sound speed does not have to exceed that of light significantly.

This establishes the fact that it is possible in kinetic gravity braiding to construct classically consistent backgrounds on which it is not possible to write the dynamics for fluctuations in the standard effective approach of using the unitary gauge.

Class II acoustic spacetimes

Class II metrics are not diagonalisable over reals (see section 4). This means that for the class of background described by eq. (5.22) we need to introduce a non-zero K_{XX} to provide an off-diagonal term. We then need to satisfy everywhere the conditions (5.24) and, in addition, if the discriminant of the eigenvalue equation for the (tr) block of the acoustic metric is negative, the metric is not diagonalisable, i.e. we need

$$(\tilde{Z}_t^t - \tilde{Z}_r^r)^2 < 4(\tilde{Z}_r^t)^2 \quad \text{class II} \quad (5.28)$$

We specialise to a model with $G_{XX} = 0$ keeping K general with $K_X > 0$. Picking $\phi' > 0$ and $G_X > 0$ allows us to disregard the ϕ' term in Z_θ^θ and conditions (5.24) are satisfied everywhere when, for example

$$-\frac{K_X}{2X} < K_{XX} < \frac{K_X}{\phi'^2} \quad \text{and} \quad 2G_X\phi'' < 0 \quad (5.29)$$

for any g -timelike $\partial_\mu \phi$. On such a background, the acoustic metric is class II whenever

$$-K_X < 2XK_{XX} < 0 \quad \text{and} \quad (\mu + \phi')^2 K_{XX} < 2G_X\phi'' < (\mu - \phi')^2 K_{XX}. \quad (5.30)$$

Thus a small (but non-zero) K_{XX} creates the possibility that the acoustic metric is class II when ϕ'' also of appropriate magnitude. We reiterate that for the purpose of this example, we have selected conditions which are sufficient but not necessary. Other conditions can be found even in the setup (5.22). In general kinetic gravity braiding theories background with superluminality are very generic especially in the presence of anisotropy and therefore one can expect that such class II configuration are very generic.

We have thus shown that kinetic gravity braiding is a theory which is capable of providing backgrounds which are classically consistent but can violate properties typically assumed: that it is always possible to go to the background's rest frame or that a unitary gauge provides a good set of coordinates in which to study the evolution of the system. This was not possible in the *k-essence* class of theories, on any allowed background.

6 Discussion and summary

We have presented a very general covariant construction for the behaviour of small scalar fluctuations on general anisotropic backgrounds in a large class of theories. When the momentum and frequency of the fluctuations (phonons) is much higher than the scale of variations of the background, a clear separation can be made between the two and the background can be seen as giving an effective — acoustic — metric for a dispersionless geometric optics (acoustics) of phonons. Whenever the scalar-field principal symbol is factorisable, the theory of the free fluctuations behaves as if they were fluctuations of a non-interacting canonical scalar-field theory in a different spacetime, which is instead described by the acoustic metric.

The natural acoustic connection (2.15) is not compatible with the spacetime metric. A disformation tensor (2.16) appears encoding the nonmetricity of the acoustic spacetime. The nonmetricity should not be completely arbitrary — it is produced from the background scalar configuration. We have so far proven that the Weyl-vector part (2.20) is always a derivative of scalar, so that every acoustically conserved vector current has an associated one conserved in the spacetime (2.21). Understanding the restrictions on the forms of the non-metricity is an interesting open question.

From the point of the dynamics of small fluctuations, the spacetime metric $g_{\mu\nu}$ appears only implicitly through its contribution to the acoustic spacetime and it is the acoustic metric that describes the properties of the fluctuations and the space in which they move. Analogously to the usual case, we have shown that the existence of acoustic cones and therefore causal evolution is related to the Lorentzian signature of the acoustic metric. We have verified that cones exist for all possible types of non-singular Lorentzian acoustic metrics, including the non-diagonalisable ones. With any other signature, the equation of motion is not hyperbolic which results in true gradient instabilities which would be seen by all observers. We have also proposed that the natural definition of a ghost fluctuation is through the signature of the Lorentzian acoustic metric being the other choice than for the spacetime. This is also coordinate invariant and therefore all observers would agree on the ghost nature of the fluctuations.

The presence of two metrics gives a richer geometrical structure: each metric can be used to associate different covectors to a vector and two different notions of orthogonality now exist. As a result, there are in fact two distinct acoustic cones from the point of view of the spacetime metric. One is constructed by the null vectors of the covariant acoustic metric (2.11) — this *ray cone* describes the motion of the phase or wavefronts in space, determining the phase velocity (3.5). The second — the P-cone constructed by the null covectors of the inverse (contravariant) acoustic metric (2.5)— gives the four-momenta of the modes and is the covariant description of the dispersion relation or a covariant notion of a refractive index (3.6). The ray vectors and the momenta are orthogonal (2.7) in the usual sense, which gives the on-shell relation. As a result, the phase velocity (3.5) is only parallel to the spatial momentum (3.2) in the simplest case of an isotropic background in its rest frame. Otherwise, the two directions are distinct and the usual formula fails. Our approach has allowed us derive the proper description with correct transformation properties for phase velocities and diffraction indices for general media.

The acoustic spacetime picture is not just local — we have shown that rays are acoustic null geodesics and momentum is parallel transported along them. The geodesic deviation equation and therefore the notion of lensing is sensitive to the acoustic curvature. Moreover, phonon flux (i.e. amplitude of fluctuations) is also conserved in this acoustic spacetime, at

least when kinetic mixing is low. Analogously to cosmography with light, observations of scalar fluctuations, if they were possible, would reconstruct the acoustic spacetime instead of the usual one.

Just as in the case of the usual null vectors of the spacetime metric where the distinction between rays and momenta does not bring new information, the geometry of each of the two cones contains exactly the same information; it is just differently presented. We have demonstrated explicitly how to recover any of the information from either cone.

In the case of subluminal propagation of the scalar fluctuations, it is possible to pick a frame which is supersonic with respect to the speed of fluctuations. This then results in the existence of a sound horizon — the supersonic Mach cone — beyond which the scalar fluctuations cannot move and the surface of which is delineated by zero-energy modes. We have shown that from the point of view of the P-cone, negative-energy modes for non-ghosts appear in directions inside the momentum equivalent of the Mach cone. A source at rest in a frame with a sound horizon is kinematically allowed to shed energy, creating Cherenkov radiation.

In the case of superluminal phonons, it is possible to pick a frame in which information (the rays) propagate into the frame’s coordinate past and therefore not all initial conditions are possible to set up on the spatial hypersurface. Such a situation is not acausal, but it is a bad choice of frame for the Cauchy problem. We have shown that this situation is equivalent to some spatial momentum directions not being in the P-cone. This results in a dispersion relation giving complex energies for some momenta and therefore an apparent instability. Rather such a situation is related to a bad choice of coordinates. We have also related this to the usual proof of weak hyperbolicity, turning it around — usually a tacit assumption of subluminality is made and therefore any spatial slice is equivalent. Weak hyperbolicity then implies that the acoustic metric is Lorentzian. For us, the system is hyperbolic in the first place, so a lack of weak hyperbolicity is a statement of a bad choice of coordinates.

We have proven that when the chosen frame is not a good Cauchy frame, the sign of the kinetic term for the fluctuations reverses — non-ghosts look like ghosts and vice versa. A spatial tensor $Z_2^{\mu\nu}$, quadratic in the acoustic metric and therefore invariant under the change of the overall metric sign, needs to be positive definite for the frame to be a good Cauchy frame. This can be confirmed by checking the sign of three tensor invariants and therefore is not expensive computationally.

We have also investigated the Hamiltonian for perturbations, confirming the geometrical picture. Choosing a good Cauchy frame which is subsonic gives a bounded Hamiltonian. For a supersonic observer, it is unbounded, just as the P-cone picture suggests. This is not a catastrophic instability, depending rather on a source to produce Cherenkov radiation. Going to a bad Cauchy frame, also makes the Hamiltonian unbounded, changing the sign of the kinetic term and a gradient direction. While this is clearly visible in our 3+1 dimensional analysis, in a simplified 1+1 dimensional subspace e.g. in spherical symmetry, it is very easy to dismiss a healthy mode as a ghost, or vice versa – declare that a ghost’s Hamiltonian is bounded from below and healthy.

We have also constructed an acoustic energy-momentum tensor quadratic in fluctuations which is covariantly conserved in the acoustic geometry on equations of motion. If the acoustic metric has a timelike Killing vector, the acoustic Hamiltonian is a conserved charge in the acoustic spacetime analogously to the usual case. Somewhat unexpectedly, the structure of the non-metricity tensor is such that this acoustic Hamiltonian is a conserved charge also in the usual spacetime, with even the same value. The implication is that the acoustic

Hamiltonian can be used to bound motion even in interactions with species moving in the usual spacetime. An interesting open question is to what extent this is general, e.g. whether acoustic Killing vectors are also spacetime Killing vectors.

In this paper we have only covered the free theory, not attempting to build interactions into this acoustic picture. Self-interaction terms could be expanded as a theory for fluctuations on top of the acoustic spacetime, and processes would conserve the acoustic momentum and energy if the acoustic metric were sufficiently constant. The interesting question is what would be conserved in processes involving fluctuations of fields living in different metric. We leave this for future work.

6.1 Summary of notation and results

Quantity	Name	Defining equation
$\mathcal{S} = \text{const surfaces}$	wavefronts	(2.1)
$P_\mu = \partial_\mu \mathcal{S}$	momentum covector	(2.4)
$Z^{\mu\nu}$	contravariant (inverse) acoustic metric	(2.3)
$S_{\mu\nu} = (Z^{-1})_{\mu\nu}$	covariant acoustic metric	(2.10)
$Z^{\mu\nu} P_\mu P_\nu = 0$	acoustic null surface	(2.5)
$N^\mu = Z^{\mu\nu} P_\nu$	ray vector	(2.7)
$N^\mu P_\mu = 0$	on-shell orthogonality of N^μ and P_μ	(2.7)
$P_\mu = \omega u_\mu + k_\mu$	P_μ -decomposition	(3.2)
$N^\mu = \mathcal{U} u^\mu + r^\mu$	N^μ -decomposition	(3.2)
$v_p^\mu = \frac{r^\mu}{\mathcal{U}}$	phase velocity	(3.5)
$n_\mu = \frac{k_\mu}{\omega}$	refractive index	(3.6)
$v_p^\mu n_\mu = 1$	duality of v_p^μ and n_μ	(3.6)
$Z^{00} = Z^{\mu\nu} u_\mu u_\nu$	coefficient of kinetic term	(3.28)
$\mathcal{Z}_2^{ij} = Z^{0i} Z^{0j} - Z^{00} Z^{ij}$	Z -frame spatial inverse metric for P-cone	(3.30)
$z^2 = Z^{0i} (Z_2^{-1})_{ij} Z^{0j}$	sonicity parameter	(3.56)
$\mathcal{U}_+(k_\mu)/\mathcal{U}_-(k_\mu)$	time coordinate of future/past moving rays	(3.31)
$\omega_+(k_\mu)/\omega_-(k_\mu)$	energy of future/past moving modes	(3.3)
$S^{00} = \frac{1}{Z^{00}} (1 - z^2) = 0$	transonic point	(3.81)
$\mathcal{S}_{2ij} = S_i^0 S_j^0 - S^{00} S_{ij}$	S -frame spatial metric for ray cone	(3.78)
$\mathcal{U}_{[+]}(r^\mu)/\mathcal{U}_{[-]}(r^\mu)$	time coordinate of positive/negative energy rays	(3.78)
$\omega_{[+]}(r^\mu)/\omega_{[-]}(r^\mu)$	energy of positive/negative energy modes	(3.79)

	N-cone	P-cone	Page
frame independent			
hyperbolicity cone existence	$\det S_{\nu}^{\mu} > 0$	$\det Z_{\nu}^{\mu} > 0$	17
gradient instability non-hyperbolicity	$\det S_{\nu}^{\mu} < 0$	$\det Z_{\nu}^{\mu} < 0$	17
acausality	either N-nappe overlaps with future and past lightcone	P-cone does not overlap with lightcone	27
necessarily transonic	N-cone does not overlap with lightcone	either P-nappe overlaps with future and past lightcone	27
ghost = signature mismatch future for non-ghost future for ghost	$S_{\mu\nu}$ has signature (1,3) upper N-nappe upper N-nappe	$Z^{\mu\nu}$ has signature (1,3) upper P-nappe lower P-nappe	9
subluminal sound speed superluminal sound speed	N^{μ} g -timelike N^{μ} g -spacelike	P_{μ} g -spacelike P_{μ} g -timelike	14
frame dependent			
Good Cauchy surface non-ghost ghost	future N-nappe above Σ_u closed wavefronts \mathcal{U}_+ — future N-nappe $S_{ij} \succ 0$ $S_{ij} \prec 0$	u_{μ} Z -timelike $Z_2^{ij} \succ 0$, all ω_{\pm} real all modes k_i covered ω_+ — future P-nappe $Z^{00} < 0$ $Z^{00} > 0$	22 20 21 20
Bad Cauchy surface only for superluminality non-ghost ghost	upper N-nappe cuts Σ_u non-closed wavefronts both \mathcal{U}_{\pm} form future N-nappe $S_{ij} \not\succeq 0$ $S_{ij} \not\prec 0$	u_{μ} Z -spacelike $Z_2^{ij} \not\succeq 0$, some ω_{\pm} complex no modes k_i with $Z_2^{ij} k_i k_j < 0$ both ω_{\pm} form future P-nappe $Z^{00} > 0$ $Z^{00} < 0$	22 20 21 20
No Sound horizon subsonic observer ($z^2 < 1$) non-ghost ghost	u^{μ} S -timelike $S_{2ij} \succ 0$, all $\mathcal{U}_{[\pm]}$ real propagation in all directions r^i $\mathcal{U}_{[+]}$ — future non-ghost N-nappe $S^{00} < 0$ $S^{00} > 0$	P-cone does not cut Σ_u wave-vector surface ellipsoidal $\omega_{[+]}$ — future non-ghost P-nappe $Z^{ij} \succ 0$ $Z^{ij} \prec 0$	36 34 35
Sound horizon supersonic observer ($z^2 > 1$) non-ghost ghost	u^{μ} S -spacelike $S_{2ij} \not\succeq 0$, some $\mathcal{U}_{[\pm]}$ complex no propagation in directions r^i with $S_{2ij} r^i r^j < 0$ both $\mathcal{U}_{[\pm]}$ form future N-nappe $S^{00} > 0$ $S^{00} < 0$	P-cone cuts Σ_u wave-vector surface hyperboloidal both $\omega_{[\pm]}$ form future P-nappe $Z^{ij} \not\succeq 0$ $Z^{ij} \not\prec 0$	36 34 35

Acknowledgements

It is a pleasure to thank Eugeny Babichev, Christos Charmousis, Gilles Esposito-Farèse, Igor Khavkine, Guillermo Lara, Shinji Mukohyama, Antonio Padilla, Francesco Serra, Leonardo Trombetta and Vicharit Yingcharoenrat for very useful discussions and criticisms. I. S. was supported by GAČR project 24-10780S, G. T. acknowledges support of GAČR project 20-28525S, while the work of A. V. was supported by the European Structural and Investment Funds and the Czech Ministry of Education, Youth and Sports (Project FORTE CZ.02.01.01/00/22 008/0004632).

References

- [1] C. Armendariz-Picon, T. Damour, and V. F. Mukhanov, “k - inflation,” *Phys. Lett. B* **458** (1999) 209–218, [arXiv:hep-th/9904075](#).
- [2] C. Armendariz-Picon, V. F. Mukhanov, and P. J. Steinhardt, “Essentials of k-essence,” *Phys. Rev. D* **63** (2001) 103510, [arXiv:astro-ph/0006373](#).
- [3] C. Armendariz-Picon, V. F. Mukhanov, and P. J. Steinhardt, “A dynamical solution to the problem of a small cosmological constant and late-time cosmic acceleration,” *Phys. Rev. Lett.* **85** (2000) 4438–4441, [arXiv:astro-ph/0004134](#).
- [4] J. Garriga and V. F. Mukhanov, “Perturbations in k-inflation,” *Phys. Lett.* **B458** (1999) 219–225, [arXiv:hep-th/9904176](#).
- [5] C. Deffayet, O. Pujolas, I. Sawicki, and A. Vikman, “Imperfect Dark Energy from Kinetic Gravity Braiding,” *JCAP* **10** (2010) 026, [arXiv:1008.0048](#) [[hep-th](#)].
- [6] T. Kobayashi, M. Yamaguchi, and J. Yokoyama, “G-inflation: Inflation driven by the Galileon field,” *Phys. Rev. Lett.* **105** (2010) 231302, [arXiv:1008.0603](#) [[hep-th](#)].
- [7] 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](#)].
- [8] C. Deffayet, G. Esposito-Farese, and A. Vikman, “Covariant Galileon,” *Phys. Rev. D* **79** (2009) 084003, [arXiv:0901.1314](#) [[hep-th](#)].
- [9] 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](#)].
- [10] T. Kobayashi, M. Yamaguchi, and J. Yokoyama, “Generalized G-inflation: Inflation with the most general second-order field equations,” *Prog. Theor. Phys.* **126** (2011) 511–529, [arXiv:1105.5723](#) [[hep-th](#)].
- [11] G. W. Horndeski, “Second-order scalar-tensor field equations in a four-dimensional space,” *Int. J. Theor. Phys.* **10** (1974) 363–384.
- [12] M. Zumalacárregui and J. García-Bellido, “Transforming gravity: from derivative couplings to matter to second-order scalar-tensor theories beyond the Horndeski Lagrangian,” *Phys. Rev. D* **89** (2014) 064046, [arXiv:1308.4685](#) [[gr-qc](#)].
- [13] 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](#)].
- [14] D. Langlois and K. Noui, “Degenerate higher derivative theories beyond Horndeski: evading the Ostrogradski instability,” *JCAP* **02** (2016) 034, [arXiv:1510.06930](#) [[gr-qc](#)].
- [15] H. Motohashi and T. Suyama, “Third order equations of motion and the Ostrogradsky instability,” *Phys. Rev. D* **91** (2015) no. 8, 085009, [arXiv:1411.3721](#) [[physics.class-ph](#)].

- [16] 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 \[gr-qc\]](#).
- [17] T. Kobayashi, “Horndeski theory and beyond: a review,” *Rept. Prog. Phys.* **82** (2019) no. 8, 086901, [arXiv:1901.07183 \[gr-qc\]](#).
- [18] T. Clifton, P. G. Ferreira, A. Padilla, and C. Skordis, “Modified Gravity and Cosmology,” *Phys. Rept.* **513** (2012) 1–189, [arXiv:1106.2476 \[astro-ph.CO\]](#).
- [19] A. Joyce, B. Jain, J. Khoury, and M. Trodden, “Beyond the Cosmological Standard Model,” *Phys. Rept.* **568** (2015) 1–98, [arXiv:1407.0059 \[astro-ph.CO\]](#).
- [20] P. Bull *et al.*, “Beyond Λ CDM: Problems, solutions, and the road ahead,” *Phys. Dark Univ.* **12** (2016) 56–99, [arXiv:1512.05356 \[astro-ph.CO\]](#).
- [21] L. Heisenberg, “A systematic approach to generalisations of General Relativity and their cosmological implications,” *Phys. Rept.* **796** (2019) 1–113, [arXiv:1807.01725 \[gr-qc\]](#).
- [22] E. Silverstein and D. Tong, “Scalar speed limits and cosmology: Acceleration from D-ccleration,” *Phys. Rev. D* **70** (2004) 103505, [arXiv:hep-th/0310221](#).
- [23] P. Creminelli, G. D’Amico, J. Norena, L. Senatore, and F. Vernizzi, “Spherical collapse in quintessence models with zero speed of sound,” *JCAP* **1003** (2010) 027, [arXiv:0911.2701 \[astro-ph.CO\]](#).
- [24] I. Sawicki, V. Marra, and W. Valkenburg, “Seeding supermassive black holes with a non-vortical dark-matter subcomponent,” *Phys. Rev. D* **88** (2013) 083520, [arXiv:1307.6150 \[astro-ph.CO\]](#).
- [25] R. P. Woodard, “Ostrogradsky’s theorem on Hamiltonian instability,” *Scholarpedia* **10** (2015) no. 8, 32243, [arXiv:1506.02210 \[hep-th\]](#).
- [26] N. Arkani-Hamed, H.-C. Cheng, M. A. Luty, and S. Mukohyama, “Ghost condensation and a consistent infrared modification of gravity,” *JHEP* **05** (2004) 074, [arXiv:hep-th/0312099](#).
- [27] E. Babichev, S. Ramazanov, and A. Vikman, “Recovering $P(X)$ from a canonical complex field,” *JCAP* **11** (2018) 023, [arXiv:1807.10281 \[gr-qc\]](#).
- [28] R. R. Caldwell, “A Phantom menace?,” *Phys. Lett. B* **545** (2002) 23–29, [arXiv:astro-ph/9908168](#).
- [29] J. M. Cline, M. Puel, T. Toma, and Q. S. Wang, “Phantom fluid cosmology: Impact of a phantom hidden sector on cosmological observables,” *Phys. Rev. D* **108** (2023) no. 9, 095033, [arXiv:2308.12989 \[hep-ph\]](#).
- [30] J. M. Cline, “Phantom Fluid Cosmology -or- Ghosts for Gordon,” in . 1, 2024. [arXiv:2401.02958 \[hep-ph\]](#).
- [31] C. Deffayet, S. Mukohyama, and A. Vikman, “Ghosts without Runaway Instabilities,” *Phys. Rev. Lett.* **128** (2022) no. 4, 041301, [arXiv:2108.06294 \[gr-qc\]](#).
- [32] C. Deffayet, A. Held, S. Mukohyama, and A. Vikman, “Global and local stability for ghosts coupled to positive energy degrees of freedom,” *JCAP* **11** (2023) 031, [arXiv:2305.09631 \[gr-qc\]](#).
- [33] V. Errasti Díez, J. Gaset Rifà, and G. Staudt, “Foundations of ghost stability,” [arXiv:2408.16832 \[hep-th\]](#).
- [34] E. Babichev, C. Deffayet, and R. Ziour, “k-Mouflage gravity,” *Int. J. Mod. Phys. D* **18** (2009) 2147–2154, [arXiv:0905.2943 \[hep-th\]](#).
- [35] A. I. Vainshtein, “To the problem of nonvanishing gravitation mass,” *Phys. Lett.* **B39** (1972) 393–394.

- [36] N. Kaloper, A. Padilla, and N. Tanahashi, “Galileon Hairs of Dyson Spheres, Vainshtein’s Coiffure and Hirsute Bubbles,” *JHEP* **10** (2011) 148, [arXiv:1106.4827 \[hep-th\]](#).
- [37] E. Babichev and G. Esposito-Farèse, “Time-Dependent Spherically Symmetric Covariant Galileons,” *Phys. Rev. D* **87** (2013) 044032, [arXiv:1212.1394 \[gr-qc\]](#).
- [38] T. Kobayashi and N. Tanahashi, “Exact black hole solutions in shift symmetric scalar–tensor theories,” *PTEP* **2014** (2014) 073E02, [arXiv:1403.4364 \[gr-qc\]](#).
- [39] E. Babichev, C. Charmousis, G. Esposito-Farèse, and A. Lehébel, “Stability of Black Holes and the Speed of Gravitational Waves within Self-Tuning Cosmological Models,” *Phys. Rev. Lett.* **120** (2018) no. 24, 241101, [arXiv:1712.04398 \[gr-qc\]](#).
- [40] G. Franciolini, L. Hui, R. Penco, L. Santoni, and E. Trincherini, “Effective Field Theory of Black Hole Quasinormal Modes in Scalar-Tensor Theories,” *JHEP* **02** (2019) 127, [arXiv:1810.07706 \[hep-th\]](#).
- [41] L. Hui, A. Podo, L. Santoni, and E. Trincherini, “Effective Field Theory for the perturbations of a slowly rotating black hole,” *JHEP* **12** (2021) 183, [arXiv:2111.02072 \[hep-th\]](#).
- [42] J. Khoury, T. Noumi, M. Trodden, and S. S. C. Wong, “Stability of hairy black holes in shift-symmetric scalar-tensor theories via the effective field theory approach,” *JCAP* **04** (2023) 035, [arXiv:2208.02823 \[hep-th\]](#).
- [43] S. Mukohyama and V. Yingcharoenrat, “Effective field theory of black hole perturbations with timelike scalar profile: formulation,” *JCAP* **09** (2022) 010, [arXiv:2204.00228 \[hep-th\]](#).
- [44] C. de Rham, A. J. Tolley, and D. H. Wesley, “Vainshtein Mechanism in Binary Pulsars,” *Phys. Rev. D* **87** (2013) no. 4, 044025, [arXiv:1208.0580 \[gr-qc\]](#).
- [45] F. Dar, C. De Rham, J. T. Deskins, J. T. Giblin, and A. J. Tolley, “Scalar Gravitational Radiation from Binaries: Vainshtein Mechanism in Time-dependent Systems,” *Class. Quant. Grav.* **36** (2019) no. 2, 025008, [arXiv:1808.02165 \[hep-th\]](#).
- [46] P. Creminelli, G. Tambalo, F. Vernizzi, and V. Yingcharoenrat, “Dark-Energy Instabilities induced by Gravitational Waves,” *JCAP* **05** (2020) 002, [arXiv:1910.14035 \[gr-qc\]](#).
- [47] C. Barcelo, S. Liberati, and M. Visser, “Analogue gravity,” *Living Rev. Rel.* **8** (2005) 12, [arXiv:gr-qc/0505065](#).
- [48] C. Coviello, M. L. Chiofalo, D. Grasso, S. Liberati, M. Mannarelli, and S. Trabucco, “Gravitational Waves and Black Hole perturbations in Acoustic Analogues,” [arXiv:2410.00264 \[gr-qc\]](#).
- [49] A. Adams, N. Arkani-Hamed, S. Dubovsky, A. Nicolis, and R. Rattazzi, “Causality, analyticity and an IR obstruction to UV completion,” *JHEP* **10** (2006) 014, [arXiv:hep-th/0602178](#).
- [50] A. Nicolis, R. Rattazzi, and E. Trincherini, “Energy’s and amplitudes’ positivity,” *JHEP* **05** (2010) 095, [arXiv:0912.4258 \[hep-th\]](#).
- [51] B. Bellazzini, F. Riva, J. Serra, and F. Sgarlata, “Beyond Positivity Bounds and the Fate of Massive Gravity,” *Phys. Rev. Lett.* **120** (2018) no. 16, 161101, [arXiv:1710.02539 \[hep-th\]](#).
- [52] A. J. Tolley, Z.-Y. Wang, and S.-Y. Zhou, “New positivity bounds from full crossing symmetry,” *JHEP* **05** (2021) 255, [arXiv:2011.02400 \[hep-th\]](#).
- [53] X. O. Camanho, J. D. Edelstein, J. Maldacena, and A. Zhiboedov, “Causality Constraints on Corrections to the Graviton Three-Point Coupling,” *JHEP* **02** (2016) 020, [arXiv:1407.5597 \[hep-th\]](#).
- [54] M. Carrillo Gonzalez, C. de Rham, V. Pozsgay, and A. J. Tolley, “Causal effective field theories,” *Phys. Rev. D* **106** (2022) no. 10, 105018, [arXiv:2207.03491 \[hep-th\]](#).

- [55] F. Serra and L. G. Trombetta, “Five-point superluminality bounds,” *JHEP* **06** (2024) 117, [arXiv:2312.06759 \[hep-th\]](#).
- [56] F. Serra and L. G. Trombetta, “IR Bounds on Theories with Spontaneously-Broken Lorentz Symmetry,” [arXiv:2412.19745 \[hep-th\]](#).
- [57] J. Evslin, “Stability of Closed Timelike Curves in a Galileon Model,” *JHEP* **03** (2012) 009, [arXiv:1112.1349 \[hep-th\]](#).
- [58] E. Babichev, V. Mukhanov, and A. Vikman, “k-Essence, superluminal propagation, causality and emergent geometry,” *JHEP* **02** (2008) 101, [arXiv:0708.0561 \[hep-th\]](#).
- [59] C. Burrage, C. de Rham, L. Heisenberg, and A. J. Tolley, “Chronology Protection in Galileon Models and Massive Gravity,” *JCAP* **07** (2012) 004, [arXiv:1111.5549 \[hep-th\]](#).
- [60] D. E. Kaplan, S. Rajendran, and F. Serra, “Wrong Signs are Alright,” [arXiv:2406.06681 \[hep-th\]](#).
- [61] S. Liberati, S. Sonego, and M. Visser, “Faster than c signals, special relativity, and causality,” *Annals Phys.* **298** (2002) 167–185, [arXiv:gr-qc/0107091](#).
- [62] J.-P. Bruneton, “On causality and superluminal behavior in classical field theories. Applications to k-essence theories and MOND-like theories of gravity,” *Phys. Rev.* **D75** (2007) 085013, [arXiv:gr-qc/0607055](#).
- [63] J.-P. Bruneton and G. Esposito-Farese, “Field-theoretical formulations of MOND-like gravity,” *Phys. Rev.* **D76** (2007) 124012, [arXiv:0705.4043 \[gr-qc\]](#).
- [64] J. U. Kang, V. Vanchurin, and S. Winitzki, “Attractor scenarios and superluminal signals in k-essence cosmology,” *Phys. Rev.* **D76** (2007) 083511, [arXiv:0706.3994 \[gr-qc\]](#).
- [65] R. Geroch, “Faster Than Light?,” [arXiv:1005.1614 \[gr-qc\]](#).
- [66] E. Babichev, C. Charmousis, G. Esposito-Farèse, and A. Lehébel, “Hamiltonian unboundedness vs stability with an application to Horndeski theory,” *Phys. Rev. D* **98** (2018) no. 10, 104050, [arXiv:1803.11444 \[gr-qc\]](#).
- [67] G. Esposito-Farese, “Hamiltonian vs stability in alternative theories of gravity,” in *54th Rencontres de Moriond on Gravitation*. 5, 2019. [arXiv:1905.04586 \[gr-qc\]](#).
- [68] D. Raetzl, S. Rivera, and F. P. Schuller, “Geometry of physical dispersion relations,” *Phys. Rev. D* **83** (2011) 044047, [arXiv:1010.1369 \[hep-th\]](#).
- [69] I. Khavkine, “Characteristics, Conal Geometry and Causality in Locally Covariant Field Theory,” [arXiv:1211.1914 \[gr-qc\]](#).
- [70] L. D. Landau and E. M. Lifshitz, *Course of Theoretical Physics, Vol. 2, Classical Theory of Fields*. Pergamon Press, 1980.
- [71] R. Courant and D. Hilbert, *Methods of Mathematical Physics, Vol. 2*. Wiley-Interscience, 1989.
- [72] V. Moncrief, “Stability of stationary, spherical accretion onto a Schwarzschild black hole,” *ApJ* **235** (1980) 1038.
- [73] W. G. Unruh, “Experimental black hole evaporation,” *Phys. Rev. Lett.* **46** (1981) 1351–1353.
- [74] C. Armendariz-Picon, T. Damour, and V. F. Mukhanov, “k-Inflation,” *Phys. Lett.* **B458** (1999) 209–218, [arXiv:hep-th/9904075](#).
- [75] C. Itzykson and J. B. Zuber, *Quantum Field Theory*. International Series In Pure and Applied Physics. McGraw-Hill, New York, 1980.
- [76] S. Mironov, A. Shtennikova, and M. Valencia-Villegas, “Reviving Horndeski after GW170817 by Kaluza-Klein compactifications,” *Phys. Lett. B* **858** (2024) 139058, [arXiv:2405.02281 \[hep-th\]](#).

- [77] E. Babichev, C. Charmousis, B. Muntz, A. Padilla, and I. D. Saltas, “Horndeski speed tests with scalar-photon couplings,” [arXiv:2407.20339 \[gr-qc\]](#).
- [78] C. de Rham and R. H. Ribeiro, “Riding on irrelevant operators,” *JCAP* **11** (2014) 016, [arXiv:1405.5213 \[hep-th\]](#).
- [79] E. Poisson, *A Relativist’s Toolkit: The Mathematics of Black-Hole Mechanics*. Cambridge University Press, 2009.
- [80] J. D. McCrea, “Irreducible decompositions of non-metricity, torsion, curvature and Bianchi identities in metric-affine spacetimes,” *Class. Quant. Grav.* **9** (1992) 553–568.
- [81] F. W. Hehl, J. D. McCrea, E. W. Mielke, and Y. Ne’eman, “Metric affine gauge theory of gravity: Field equations, Noether identities, world spinors, and breaking of dilation invariance,” *Phys. Rept.* **258** (1995) 1–171, [arXiv:gr-qc/9402012](#).
- [82] A. Nicolis and R. Rattazzi, “Classical and quantum consistency of the DGP model,” *JHEP* **06** (2004) 059, [arXiv:hep-th/0404159](#).
- [83] N. Bilic, “Relativistic acoustic geometry,” *Class. Quant. Grav.* **16** (1999) 3953–3964, [arXiv:gr-qc/9908002](#).
- [84] S. Mironov and V. Volkova, “DPSV trick for spherically symmetric backgrounds,” *Nucl. Phys. B* **1004** (2024) 116550, [arXiv:2306.17791 \[hep-th\]](#).
- [85] D. A. Dobre, A. V. Frolov, J. T. Gálvez Gherzi, S. Ramazanov, and A. Vikman, “Unbraiding the Bounce: Superluminality around the Corner,” *JCAP* **03** (2018) 020, [arXiv:1712.10272 \[gr-qc\]](#).
- [86] K. S. Thorne and R. D. Blandford, *Modern classical physics: optics, fluids, plasmas, elasticity, relativity, and statistical physics*. Princeton University Press, Princeton, 2017.
- [87] J. M. Ezquiaga and M. Zumalacárregui, “Gravitational wave lensing beyond general relativity: birefringence, echoes and shadows,” *Phys. Rev. D* **102** (2020) no. 12, 124048, [arXiv:2009.12187 \[gr-qc\]](#).
- [88] N. Menadeo and M. Zumalacárregui, “Gravitational wave propagation beyond General Relativity: geometric optic expansion and lens-induced dispersion,” [arXiv:2411.07164 \[gr-qc\]](#).
- [89] L. D. Landau and E. M. Lifshitz, *Course of Theoretical Physics, Vol. 8, Electrodynamics of Continuous Media*. Pergamon Press, Second English Edition, Revised and enlarged ed., 1984.
- [90] C. de Rham, G. Gabadadze, and A. J. Tolley, “Resummation of Massive Gravity,” *Phys. Rev. Lett.* **106** (2011) 231101, [arXiv:1011.1232 \[hep-th\]](#).
- [91] S. F. Hassan and R. A. Rosen, “Bimetric Gravity from Ghost-free Massive Gravity,” *JHEP* **02** (2012) 126, [arXiv:1109.3515 \[hep-th\]](#).
- [92] J. Callaway, *Quantum Theory of the Solid State*. Academic Press, San Diego, Second Edition ed., 1991.
- [93] S. Dubovsky, T. Gregoire, A. Nicolis, and R. Rattazzi, “Null energy condition and superluminal propagation,” *JHEP* **0603** (2006) 025, [arXiv:hep-th/0512260 \[hep-th\]](#).
- [94] I. Sawicki and A. Vikman, “Hidden Negative Energies in Strongly Accelerated Universes,” *Phys. Rev. D* **87** (2013) no. 6, 067301, [arXiv:1209.2961 \[astro-ph.CO\]](#).
- [95] S. Weinberg, *The quantum theory of fields. 1: Foundations*. Cambridge University Press, Cambridge, 2013.
- [96] C. Cheung, P. Creminelli, A. L. Fitzpatrick, J. Kaplan, and L. Senatore, “The Effective Field Theory of Inflation,” *JHEP* **03** (2008) 014, [arXiv:0709.0293 \[hep-th\]](#).

- [97] G. Gubitosi, F. Piazza, and F. Vernizzi, “The Effective Field Theory of Dark Energy,” *JCAP* **02** (2013) 032, [arXiv:1210.0201 \[hep-th\]](#).
- [98] O. Sarbach and M. Tiglio, “Continuum and Discrete Initial-Boundary-Value Problems and Einstein’s Field Equations,” *Living Rev. Rel.* **15** (2012) 9, [arXiv:1203.6443 \[gr-qc\]](#).
- [99] R. M. Wald, *General relativity*. Univ. of Chicago Press, Chicago, repr. ed., 2009.
- [100] A. D. Kovács and H. S. Reall, “Well-posed formulation of Lovelock and Horndeski theories,” *Phys. Rev. D* **101** (2020) no. 12, 124003, [arXiv:2003.08398 \[gr-qc\]](#).
- [101] K. Takahashi, H. Motohashi, and M. Minamitsuji, “Linear stability analysis of hairy black holes in quadratic degenerate higher-order scalar-tensor theories: Odd-parity perturbations,” *Phys. Rev. D* **100** (2019) no. 2, 024041, [arXiv:1904.03554 \[gr-qc\]](#).
- [102] R. L. Arnowitt, S. Deser, and C. W. Misner, “The Dynamics of general relativity,” *Gen. Rel. Grav.* **40** (2008) 1997–2027, [arXiv:gr-qc/0405109](#).
- [103] I. Kourkoulou, A. Nicolis, and K. Parmentier, “Low-temperature thermal corrections to a superfluid’s equation of state,” [arXiv:2212.12555 \[hep-th\]](#).
- [104] S. Mukohyama and J.-P. Uzan, “From configuration to dynamics: Emergence of Lorentz signature in classical field theory,” *Phys. Rev. D* **87** (2013) no. 6, 065020, [arXiv:1301.1361 \[hep-th\]](#).
- [105] J. Kehayias, S. Mukohyama, and J.-P. Uzan, “Emergent Lorentz Signature, Fermions, and the Standard Model,” *Phys. Rev. D* **89** (2014) no. 10, 105017, [arXiv:1403.0580 \[hep-th\]](#).
- [106] G. D. Moore and A. E. Nelson, “Lower bound on the propagation speed of gravity from gravitational Cherenkov radiation,” *JHEP* **09** (2001) 023, [arXiv:hep-ph/0106220](#).
- [107] J. W. Elliott, G. D. Moore, and H. Stoica, “Constraining the new Aether: Gravitational Cerenkov radiation,” *JHEP* **08** (2005) 066, [arXiv:hep-ph/0505211](#).
- [108] G. S. Hall, “The classification of the ricci tensor in general relativity theory,” *J. Phys. A* **9** (1976) no. 4, 541.
- [109] S. F. Hassan and M. Kocic, “On the local structure of spacetime in ghost-free bimetric theory and massive gravity,” *JHEP* **05** (2018) 099, [arXiv:1706.07806 \[hep-th\]](#).
- [110] W. Gordon, “Zur Lichtfortpflanzung nach der Relativitätstheorie,” *Annalen Phys.* **377** (1923) no. 22, 421–456.
- [111] O. Pujolas, I. Sawicki, and A. Vikman, “The Imperfect Fluid behind Kinetic Gravity Braiding,” *JHEP* **11** (2011) 156, [arXiv:1103.5360 \[hep-th\]](#).
- [112] C. Armendariz-Picon and E. A. Lim, “Haloes of k-essence,” *JCAP* **0508** (2005) 007, [arXiv:astro-ph/0505207 \[astro-ph\]](#).