

Primordial magnetic seed field amplification by gravitational waves: comment on gr-qc/0503006

Christos G. Tsagas

DAMTP, Centre for Mathematical Sciences, University of Cambridge
Wilberforce Road, Cambridge CB3 0WA, UK

Abstract

The potential amplification of primordial seed magnetic fields by gravitational waves was discussed in [1], wherein a mechanism was proposed and an amplification of several orders of magnitude was obtained. Recently, this mechanism was revisited in [2] and the original results were recovered both qualitatively and quantitatively. Despite this, the comparison of the two papers is misleading and reaches erroneous conclusions that need to be clarified.

Relatively recently, a scenario for the amplification of primordial, inflation produced magnetic seeds through gravitational wave interactions was proposed in the literature [1]. The mechanism operates soon after inflation and within standard electromagnetic theory. This purely gravitational strengthening of the initial field can be quite substantial when the two sources have comparable wavelengths (see [1] for details). The main results of [1] are given in Eqs. (21) and (25). These are summarised in the expression (see Eq. (26) in [1])

$$\frac{B}{\rho_\gamma^{1/2}} \simeq \left[1 + 10 \left(\frac{\lambda_{\tilde{B}}}{\lambda_H} \right)_0^2 \left(\frac{\sigma}{H} \right)_0 \right] \left(\frac{\tilde{B}}{\rho_\gamma^{1/2}} \right)_0 . \quad (1)$$

obtained after dividing (21) and (25) by $\rho_\gamma^{1/2}$ (see section 4 in [1]). Here \tilde{B} and $\lambda_{\tilde{B}}$ are respectively the magnitude and the scale of the original magnetic field, B is the gravitationally induced field and λ_H is the horizon size. Also $\rho_\gamma \propto a^{-4}$ is the radiation density and a is the cosmological scale factor. The parameter $\Sigma = \sigma/H$ describes the gravitationally induced shear anisotropy and the zero suffix indicates the initial time. The later is taken to be the end of inflation and the beginning of the standard Big Bang expansion. Note that the universe is described by a spatially flat FRW cosmology containing a single perfect fluid and a weak magnetic field with $B \ll \rho$ (see [1] for details). The gravitationally induced shear is expressed as (see Eqs. (27), (28) in [1])

$$\Sigma_0 \simeq \left(\frac{\lambda_H}{\lambda_{GW}} \right)_0 \left(\frac{H}{m_{Pl}} \right) , \quad (2)$$

where λ_{GW} is the length scale of the gravity waves. The above combine to give (see Eq. (29) in [1])

$$\frac{B}{\rho_\gamma^{1/2}} \simeq \left[1 + 10 \left(\frac{\lambda_{\tilde{B}}}{\lambda_H} \right)_0 \left(\frac{\lambda_{\tilde{B}}}{\lambda_{GW}} \right)_0 \left(\frac{H}{m_{Pl}} \right) \right] \left(\frac{\tilde{B}}{\rho_\gamma^{1/2}} \right)_0 . \quad (3)$$

This provides the spectrum of the gravitationally induced comoving primordial magnetic field today. We note that expressions (1) and (3) correspond to the dominant mode of B (see section 4 in [1]). We also emphasise that $\lambda_{\tilde{B}}$ is always assumed larger than the horizon but finite (see section 3 in [1]). Finally, paper [1] focusses on the ‘resonant’ case of $\lambda_{\tilde{B}} \sim \lambda_{GW}$, which leads to an induced

field on the same scale (see section 3 and Eq. (13) in [1]). For reasonable parameter values, the amplification of \tilde{B} reaches up to 13 or 14 orders of magnitude (see section 5 in [1]).

In [2] the authors estimated the magnitude of the amplified magnetic field through a different route and arrived at the same results. To be precise, the equations in [2] that correspond to (1) and (3) are (see Eqs (50) and (53) in [2])

$$\frac{B}{\rho_\gamma^{1/2}} \simeq \left[1 + \frac{1}{10} \left(\frac{\lambda_{\tilde{B}}}{\lambda_H} \right)_0^2 \left(\frac{\sigma}{H} \right)_0 \right] \left(\frac{\tilde{B}}{\rho_\gamma^{1/2}} \right)_0 \quad (4)$$

and

$$\frac{B}{\rho_\gamma^{1/2}} \simeq \left[1 + \frac{1}{10} \left(\frac{\lambda_{\tilde{B}}}{\lambda_H} \right)_0 \left(\frac{H}{m_{Pl}} \right) \right] \left(\frac{\tilde{B}}{\rho_\gamma^{1/2}} \right)_0 \quad (5)$$

respectively. Recalling that $\lambda_{\tilde{B}} \sim \lambda_{GW}$ in (3), which is also used in [2] to obtain Eq. (5) from (4) via (2), one immediately sees that the pairs (1), (4) and (3), (5) are the same. In fact, the two sets are identical save for a minor difference in the numerical factors inside the brackets, which seems to reflect notation-type differences. For instance, $\lambda_{\tilde{B}} = a/n$ in (1), whereas $\lambda_{\tilde{B}} = 2\pi a/n$ in (4) (see the π -related factors in Eqs. (48), (49) of [2]).

Paper [2] then estimates the residual B field using the parameter values proposed in [1]. Not surprisingly, the amplification is up to 13 orders of magnitude (see section V). Paper [2] therefore has recovered the results of [1] both qualitatively and quantitatively (also compare the last paragraph in the introduction of [2] to the last part of the introduction in [1]). Despite this, the authors claim that there are significant differences in the behaviour of the induced B fields between the two papers (see sections VI and VII in [2]). Note that this claim is not related to the above mentioned difference in the numerical factors of (1), (3) and (4), (5). In what follows we will look closer at the authors' claim and respond to it.

We begin by noting that the results of [1] are never explicitly cited in [2] (see sections V, VI in [2]). As a result, it is difficult for the reader to compare the two papers directly and eventually leads to erroneous conclusions (see cases (i) and (ii) below).

(i) It is claimed, in section VI of [2], that Eq. (21) of [1] (i.e Eq. (1) above) has unphysical behaviour at $n \rightarrow 0$ (i.e. at $\lambda_{\tilde{B}} \rightarrow \infty$). Let us consider the validity of this claim.

As stated after Eq. (3) above, the background magnetic field of [1] has large (superhorizon) but finite coherence length. This means that results (1) and (3) (i.e. Eqs. (21), (25), (26) and (29) in [1]) should not be used at the homogeneous mode limit. To see the behaviour of the B field at infinite wavelengths, one only needs to drop the Laplacians from the associated propagation equations in [1]. Then, the dominant homogeneous magnetic mode evolves as $B \propto a^{-1}$ for dust and $B = \text{constant}$ for radiation. These results are explicitly stated in [1] (see footnote 3, section 4) and also agree with those obtained in [2] (see Eqs. (45), (46) there and below)

$$B_{Dust}^{(0)} = \tilde{B}_0 \left(\frac{a_0}{a} \right)^2 \left[1 + \frac{2}{3} \left(\frac{\sigma}{H} \right)_0 \left\{ \left(\frac{a_0}{a} \right)^{3/2} - 1 \right\} + 2 \left(\frac{\sigma}{H} \right)_0 \left(\frac{a}{a_0} - 1 \right) \right], \quad (6)$$

$$B_{Rad}^{(0)} = \tilde{B}_0 \left(\frac{a_0}{a} \right)^2 \left[1 + \frac{2}{3} \left(\frac{\sigma}{H} \right)_0 \left(\frac{a_0}{a} - 1 \right) + \frac{5}{6} \left(\frac{\sigma}{H} \right)_0 \left\{ \left(\frac{a}{a_0} \right)^2 - 1 \right\} \right]. \quad (7)$$

Clearly, the dominant magnetic mode in (6) is $\propto a^{-1}$ and the one in (7) is constant. The former corresponds to dust and the latter to radiation, just like the ones obtained in [1]. Therefore, there is nothing unphysical in Eq. (21) of [1]. In fact, the results of [2] at infinite wavelengths were already predicted in [1].

(ii) In the same section, VI, the authors also claim significant differences between the finite wavelength results of the two papers (see also at the end of VII). One can show that this claim is unfounded by simply putting the results of the two papers side by side

$$\frac{B}{\rho_\gamma^{1/2}} \simeq \left[1 + 10 \left(\frac{\lambda_{\tilde{B}}}{\lambda_H} \right)_0^2 \left(\frac{\sigma}{H} \right)_0 \right] \left(\frac{\tilde{B}}{\rho_\gamma^{1/2}} \right)_0, \quad \frac{B}{\rho_\gamma^{1/2}} \simeq \left[1 + \frac{1}{10} \left(\frac{\lambda_{\tilde{B}}}{\lambda_H} \right)_0^2 \left(\frac{\sigma}{H} \right)_0 \right] \left(\frac{\tilde{B}}{\rho_\gamma^{1/2}} \right)_0. \quad (8)$$

Expression (8a) is Eq. (26) from [1] and (8b) is Eq. (50) from [2]. Both clearly show the same behaviour for B . However, Eq. (8a) is not cited in [2] and the above comparison is never made in the paper. Instead, Eq. (8b) is surprisingly compared to a third expression for B (also obtained in [2] - see Eq. (56))

$$B = \tilde{B}_0 \left(\frac{a}{a_0} \right)^2 \left[1 + \left(\frac{\sigma}{H} \right)_0 \left(\frac{\lambda_{GW}}{\lambda_H} \right)_0^2 f(\sqrt{a}; k) + \mathcal{O}(a^{-1/2}) \right], \quad (9)$$

where $f(\sqrt{a}; k)$ is an unspecified oscillatory function. Because (8b) and (9) appeared dissimilar, the authors claimed significant differences in the results of the two papers. Both the comparison and the claim are meaningless, however, since paper [1] and its results have been excluded from the process.

Although we cannot comment on the validity of Eq. (9), we would like to point out that equations which appear different are not necessarily incompatible. We also note that Eqs. (8) correspond to superhorizon scales only. Moreover, (9) does not look very different from Eqs. (8). After dividing with $\rho_\gamma^{1/2}$ and recalling that $\lambda_{GW} \sim \lambda_{\tilde{B}}$ the three equations look more similar. It appears therefore that expression (9) has not yet reached its final form.

We close this comment by noting that both papers make the same assumptions for their models. The difference is that in [1] the initial magnetic setup applies to zero perturbative order, whereas in [2] it has been pushed up to the linear level (see section 2 in [1] and sections II and II.B.1 in [2]). Therefore, one would naturally expect to see the linear results of [1] reproduced at second order in [2]. Indeed, this is exactly what happens. In other words, the approach of [2] remains linear in practice and this is why it does not offer any new information. The latter should have also been expected because the authors made no provision for any additional effects in their study.

References

- [1] C.G. Tsagas, P.K.S Dunsby and M. Marklund, Phys. Lett. B, **561**, 17 (2003) (astro-ph/0112560)
- [2] G. Betshart, C. Zunckel, P.K.S. Dunsby and M. Marklund, gr-qc/0503006