

On “Primordial magnetic seed field amplification by gravitational waves”

Christos G. Tsagas

Section of Astrophysics, Astronomy and Mechanics, Department of Physics
Aristotle University of Thessaloniki, Thessaloniki 54124, Greece

Abstract

We consider the amplification of cosmological magnetic fields by gravity waves as it was recently presented in [1]. The latter study confined to infinitely conducting environments, arguing that on spatially flat Friedmann backgrounds the gravito-magnetic interaction proceeds always as if the universe were a perfect conductor. We explain why this is not the case and then re-examine the Maxwell-Weyl coupling at the limit of ideal magnetohydrodynamics. We find a scale misinterpretation in the results of [1], which prevented the authors from recognising the main effect of the interaction, namely the superadiabatic amplification of the B -field on large scales. In this brief comment we draw attention to these issues and also take a closer look at the gauge-invariance and the nonlinearity of the approach proposed in [1].

1 Introduction

Studies of the interaction between electromagnetic fields and gravitational waves are not new and several authors have studied the coupling and the possible energy transfer between the Weyl and Maxwell fields. A mechanism for the amplification of large-scale magnetic fields by gravity waves of similar size soon after inflation was recently proposed in [2, 3]. Both of the interacting sources are produced during inflation when small-scale quantum fluctuations freeze as classical fields once outside the horizon. In the poorly conductive environment of early reheating the analysis (see [3] for details) indicated a resonant magnetic amplification proportional to the square of the field’s scale and also to the amount of the gravitationally induced shear anisotropy. These features meant that Weyl-curvature distortions could provide a very efficient early-universe dynamo of superhorizon-sized magnetic fields. For example, fields with a current comoving scale of approximately 10 kpc and a strength of $\sim 10^{-34}$ G, like those proposed in [4], could be amplified by many orders of magnitude by the end of reheating. Although the amplified B -field is still far too weak to have any effect on the expansion dynamics, it could be strong enough to sustain the galactic dynamo after recombination.

The same gravito-magnetic interaction has been applied to infinitely conductive cosmological environments in [1]. Central to that study is the claim that on spatially flat Friedmann-Robertson-Walker (FRW) backgrounds the Maxwell-Weyl coupling proceeds always as if the universe were a perfect conductor. We argue here that this is not the case and explain why the above mentioned paper arrived at the opposite result. We also find that [1] has not properly

interpreted and applied the long-wavelength effects of the gravito-magnetic interaction. This has prevented the authors from recognising the main effect of the Maxwell-Weyl coupling, namely the large-scale superadiabatic amplification of the B -field. With this comment we draw attention to the aforementioned issues and in the process take a closer look at the gauge-invariance and the nonlinearity of the approach proposed in [1].

2 Electric curl and spatial geometry

During the lifetime of the universe the electric properties of the cosmic medium vary. One would therefore like to know how changes in the conductivity of the cosmological environment affect the gravito-magnetic interaction. In section III.B of [1] it is argued that such changes leave the Maxwell-Weyl coupling unaffected and that this interaction proceeds always as if the universe were a perfect conductor. This conclusion follows the claim that irrespective of the electric properties of the plasma the gravitationally induced, second order, electric field (E_a) is curl-free (i.e. $\text{curl}E_a = 0$) provided the zero order FRW model has flat spatial sections. This is not the case, however, because

$$(\text{curl}E_a)^\cdot = -\Theta\text{curl}E_a + \mathcal{R}_{ab}\tilde{B}^b - \text{curl}\mathcal{J}_a - \text{D}^2B_a \quad (1)$$

at second perturbative order. Here Θ is the volume expansion, \mathcal{R}_{ab} is the first-order 3-Ricci tensor, \tilde{B}_a is the first order magnetic field, \mathcal{J}_a is the spatial current and $\text{D}^2 = \text{D}_a\text{D}^a$ is the 3-dimensional Laplacian operator. Therefore, even when $\text{curl}E_a$ initially vanishes, there are sources in the right-hand side of (1) that will generally lead to a nonzero electric curl. Note that the 3-curvature distortions and the magnetic field fluctuations are caused by the gravity waves, while the electric current depends on the conductivity of the medium. Consequently, the gravitationally induced electric field is not necessarily curl-free and the gravito-magnetic interaction does not always proceed as if the conductivity of the universe were infinite. In [1], the authors arrived at the opposite conclusion because they considered the second time-derivative of $\text{curl}E_a$ instead of the first, namely the expression (see Eq. (29) in [1])

$$(\text{curl}E_a)^\cdot + \frac{7}{3}\Theta(\text{curl}E_a)^\cdot - \text{D}^2\text{curl}E_a + \left[\frac{7}{9}\Theta^2 + \frac{1}{6}(\mu - 9p) + \frac{5}{3}\Lambda\right]\text{curl}E_a = \text{curl}K_a. \quad (2)$$

In the above, which holds at the second perturbative level, the pair μ and p represents the density and the pressure of the matter, Λ is the cosmological constant and K_a is a gravito-magnetic source term. Arguing that $\text{curl}K_a$ vanishes when the FRW background is spatially flat (see Eq. (30) in [1]), the paper claims that the electric field will remain curl-free if it was so initially. However, in their assessment the authors have a priori set $(\text{curl}E_a)^\cdot = 0$ in Eq. (2), although this is not the case because of (1).

3 Large-scale gravito-magnetic effects

By switching the electric curl off the study of [1] bypasses all the effects of finite conductivity and therefore applies exclusively to idealised perfectly conductive universes. At the ideal MHD limit, the gravito-magnetic interaction is monitored by (see sections II.C and IV.B in [1])

$$\dot{B}_a + \frac{2}{3}\Theta B_a = \sigma_{ab}\tilde{B}^b \equiv I_a, \quad (3)$$

where σ_{ab} is the transverse shear component, \tilde{B}_a is the original magnetic field and B_a is the total one (i.e. the original plus the gravitationally induced perturbation). In what follows we will briefly review and re-examine the effects of the Maxwell-Weyl coupling as presented in [1].

Setting $\sigma_{ab}\tilde{B}^b \equiv I_a$, the paper evaluated the gravito-magnetic source term in the right-hand side of (3). Substituted back into Eq. (3), the results led to the following evolution laws for the gravitationally induced large-scale B -field in the radiation epoch

$$B_{Rad} = \tilde{B}_0 \left(\frac{a_0}{a}\right)^2 \left\{ 1 + \frac{2}{3} \left(\frac{\sigma}{H}\right)_0 \left(\frac{a_0}{a} - 1\right) + \frac{5}{6} \left(\frac{\sigma}{H}\right)_0 \left[\left(\frac{a}{a_0}\right)^2 - 1\right] \right\}, \quad (4)$$

and during the dust era

$$B_{Dust} = \tilde{B}_0 \left(\frac{a_0}{a}\right)^2 \left\{ 1 + \frac{2}{3} \left(\frac{\sigma}{H}\right)_0 \left[\left(\frac{a_0}{a}\right)^{3/2} - 1\right] + 2 \left(\frac{\sigma}{H}\right)_0 \left(\frac{a}{a_0} - 1\right) \right\}, \quad (5)$$

respectively (see Eqs. (46), (47) in [1]). Above a is the scale factor, H is the Hubble parameter and the zero suffix indicates the onset of the gravito-magnetic interaction. We note that the dominant modes of both solutions argue for a superadiabatic-type amplification of the B -field (i.e. $B = \text{constant}$ for radiation and $B \propto a^{-1}$ for dust), which can prove crucial if sustained for long. This effect has been bypassed in [1] because the range of these solutions was not properly assessed. The reader is left with the impression that results (4) and (5) hold exclusively at infinite wavelengths (see section IV.B.1 in [1]), where in fact they cover all finite superhorizon scales.¹ We make this clarification now because, as we will see below, the correct range of (4) and (5) is essential for the proper interpretation of the Weyl curvature effects on B .

Following [1], the final solution for the gravitationally induced magnetic field during both the radiation and the dust eras is

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

where $\mu_\gamma \propto a^{-4}$ is the radiation energy density (see Eq. (51) in [1]). In relation to this expression, however, there are two issues that require attention and clarification.

(i) The first issue is the presence of $\lambda_{\tilde{B}}$, the scale of the original magnetic field, in the right-hand side of (8). This field has been assigned a zero wavenumber (see section IV.B in [1]),

¹One can quickly verify the scales that solutions (4) and (5) apply to. Assuming dust, for example, the gravito-magnetic source term in the right-hand side of (4) reads

$$I_{(e)}(\tau) = \left[D_1 J_{5/2} \left(2\ell\tau^{1/3}/a_0 H_0 \right) + D_2 Y_{5/2} \left(2\ell\tau^{1/3}/a_0 H_0 \right) \right] \tau^{-5/2}, \quad (6)$$

where $\tau = t/t_0$ is the normalised time variable and ℓ the wavenumber of the gravitational wave (see Eq. (48) in [1]). Finite scales lying well outside the horizon have $\ell\tau^{1/3}/a_0 H_0 \ll 1$. Then, using the initial conditions of [1] (see Eqs. (42)-(44) there) and the series expansion of the Bessel functions $J_{5/2}$, $Y_{5/2}$, expression (6) reduces to

$$I(\tau) = 2\sigma_0 \tilde{B}_0 \tau^{-5/3} - \sigma_0 \tilde{B}_0 \tau^{-10/3}. \quad (7)$$

Inserted into Eq. (3) the above leads to solution (5), which therefore applies to all finite super-Hubble lengths. Similarly one can show that the radiation-era solution (6) also holds on all finite superhorizon scales.

which means an ill defined wavelength for it (i.e. $\lambda_{\tilde{B}} = \infty$). The latter can lead to confusion if not treated carefully. For example, the presence of $\lambda_{\tilde{B}}$ in the above suggests an infinitely strong induced B -field. The confusion is caused because expression (8) has been obtained after replacing λ_{GW} with $\lambda_{\tilde{B}}$ in Eqs. (49) and (50) of [1]. Presumably the aim was to incorporate the scale of the original magnetic field in the final result, while avoiding the mathematical complications of a nonzero wavenumber for \tilde{B} (see section IV.B of [1]). Irrespective of the motivation, this substitution should have not taken place. Note that assigning a nonzero wavenumber to \tilde{B} allows for a very useful relation between λ_B , λ_{GW} and $\lambda_{\tilde{B}}$ (see Eq. (10) in [3]).

(ii) The second issue has to do with the scales expression (8) applies to. According to [1] (see section IV.B.2 after Eq. (51)), the range of this solution spans all finite wavelengths irrespective of their size relative to the horizon. This can not be the case because (8) implies $B \propto a^{-2}$, while the long-wavelength formulae (4) and (5) give $B = \text{constant}$ and $B \propto a^{-1}$ respectively. At best Eq. (8) works for scales that have already crossed inside the horizon. However, the magnetic amplification seen in (8) has taken place earlier and outside the Hubble radius. To demonstrate this consider a mode that enters the horizon in the radiation era. While on super-Hubble lengths $B = \text{constant}$ and therefore at horizon crossing (HC) the gravitationally induced B -field is

$$B_{HC} \simeq \tilde{B}_0 \left[1 + \left(\frac{a_{HC}}{a_0} \right)^2 \left(\frac{\sigma}{H} \right)_0 \right] \left(\frac{a_0}{a_{HC}} \right)^2 = \tilde{B}_0 \left[1 + \left(\frac{\lambda_{\tilde{B}}}{\lambda_H} \right)_0^2 \left(\frac{\sigma}{H} \right)_0 \right] \left(\frac{a_0}{a_{HC}} \right)^2, \quad (9)$$

since $(\lambda_{\tilde{B}}/\lambda_H)_0 = a_{HC}/a_0$. This means that the magnetic growth seen in (8) comes from the superadiabatic amplification of the field on large scales. It also suggests that the longer the mode stays outside the Hubble radius (i.e. for $(\lambda_{\tilde{B}}/\lambda_H)_0^2 \gg (\sigma/H)_0$), the stronger the growth. These issues have not been properly interpreted and presented in [1]. In fact, despite being the main effect of the interaction, the large-scale superadiabatic magnetic amplification was bypassed and disregarded as completely negligible (see section V after Eq. (60) in [1]). The reason is the above mentioned incorrect assessment of the range of (4) and (5). Treating these expressions strictly as infinite wavelength solutions, has prevented the authors from recognising the correct scale of (4), (5) and (8) and then from realising that the superadiabatic growth of the B -field can be sustained over many expansion timescales. In the latter case (i.e. when $(a_{HC}/a_0)^2 \gg (\sigma/H)_0$) we can have substantial amplification, relative to the adiabatic case, despite the typically very small value of the ratio $(\sigma/H)_0$.

Overall, the outcome of the gravito-magnetic interaction on large scales and in perfectly conducting cosmological environments is different from the one given in [1]. Well outside the Hubble radius the evolution of the gravitationally induced B -field does not obey Eq. (8) and it is not proportional to the square of the field's scale. Instead, the Maxwell-Weyl coupling triggers a qualitative change in the long-wavelength magnetic evolution, which leads to a substantial superadiabatic-type amplification of the field. It should be noted, however, that the MHD limit is an idealised environment and therefore one would like to know the role of finite conductivity before reaching any conclusion about the effects of the gravito-magnetic coupling on cosmological B -fields. Having said that, studies of the same interaction on spatially flat FRW backgrounds of high but finite electrical conductivity have led to similar effects (see Eq. (28) in [3]). Nevertheless, the analytical results of that paper were based on a rather oversimplified model for the conductivity of the universe. If the results of [3] are reproduced within more real-

istic environments, they may open the way for a very substantial amplification of cosmological magnetic fields by Weyl-curvature effects alone.

4 Gauge-invariance and nonlinearity

The gauge problem in cosmological perturbations is basically mathematical in nature, caused by the absence of a unique way of mapping the background spacetime onto the perturbed one. As a result, the perturbation of a given quantity depends on the aforementioned mapping (i.e. it is gauge dependent), unless the quantity in question vanishes in the background (in the majority of cases - see [5] for details). The physical consequence of gauge dependence is the occasional appearance of spurious (gauge) modes in the solutions of the perturbed equations. Probably the best way around the gauge problem is to monitor physical perturbations by means of gauge-independent variables.

As stated in [1], the aim is to provide a gauge-invariant, and nonlinear treatment of the gravito-magnetic interaction in its full mathematical sense. The approach consists of integrating the magnetic induction equation at the ideal MHD limit (see Eq. (3) above and also sections II.C and IV.B in [1]). The variable I_a in the right-hand side of (3) vanishes at first-order and is therefore a gauge-independent second-order perturbation. Because B_a has nonzero linear value, however, the second order magnetic perturbation in the left-hand side of (3) is gauge-dependent by construction [5].² Using the evolution formulae for σ_{ab} and \tilde{B}_a , the paper calculated the wave-equation of I_a and provided the associated solutions. These are free from gauge-related ambiguities. The problems appeared when the above mentioned solutions were substituted into the right-hand side of (3), which was then solved for B_a . This step and the resulting expressions (i.e. Eqs. (49)-(51) in [1]) are no longer gauge-invariant because of the gauge-dependence of B_a [5]. Once the authors switched back to the gauge-dependent vector B_a , the gauge-problem inevitably re-emerged in their analysis.

The approach of [2, 3] considers a weakly magnetised FRW background perturbed by gravity-wave distortions and the gravito-magnetic interaction is studied at the linear level. In [1] one needs to employ four spacetimes. The first is the zero-order unperturbed FRW universe, the second is a first-order FRW universe permeated by a weak and homogeneous magnetic field, the third is a first-order FRW universe endowed with gravity-wave perturbations and the fourth is the second-order spacetime where the Maxwell-Weyl coupling takes place (see section II in [1]). This is a rather selective setting and the increase in complexity is not compensated by gains in physical insight. By construction, the second-order formulae of [1] contain only the gravito-magnetic terms and all other nonlinear effects (including the magnetic effects on the shear) are excluded. As a result, the nonlinear evolution equations for \tilde{B}_a , σ_{ab} and B_a are the same with the linear ones of [2, 3].³ This is why both approaches lead to the same power-law $B \propto (\sigma/H)_0 a^{-1}$

²To circumvent the gauge-dependence of B_a the paper introduced the auxiliary variable β_a , with $\beta_a \equiv \tilde{B}_a + 2\Theta B_a/3$ (see section II.C in [1]), which has zero linear value and is therefore a gauge-invariant perturbation at second order. This quantity is of limited practical use, however, because one still needs to solve for the gauge-dependent vector B_a to extract useful information about the evolution of the field. Also note that at the MHD limit $\beta_a \equiv I_a$ (see sections II.C, IV.B in [1] or Eq. (3) here), which makes the auxiliary variable β_a redundant.

³Expressions (4) and (10), the latter with $\Lambda = 0$, of [1] are identical to Eqs. (2b) and (4) in [3]. Also, at the MHD limit, the magnetic wave equation of [3] (see Eq. (3) there) and expression (12) in [1] reduce to Eq. (3) here.

for the large-scale gravitationally induced B -field in the dust era (compare Eq. (5) above to solution (28) in [3]). The reason for the overall agreement between the linear and the nonlinear treatments is the selective setting of [1], which is too restrictive and makes that study linear in all but name. From the mathematical perspective also the work is not complete because it does not properly address the constraint issue. For example, the vorticity has been switched off completely (see section II in [1]) without explaining how this is done in the magnetic presence, irrespective of the fluid's conductivity and beyond the linear level. We note that the aforementioned constraints are imposed to isolate the gravity-wave perturbations by guaranteeing that all traceless tensors remain transverse at all times, a highly nontrivial issue for any nonlinear study.

5 Discussion

The Maxwell-Weyl coupling and the possible energy transfer between the two fields has a relatively long research history. This interaction has been proposed as a very efficient (resonant) amplification mechanism of large-scale magnetic fields during the poorly conductive stages of early reheating [2, 3]. The same mechanism was recently studied at the MHD limit in [1] under the claim that, when the background spatial geometry is Euclidean, the gravito-magnetic interaction proceeds always as if the universe were a perfect conductor. Here we explained why this is not the case and also demonstrated that the effects of the Maxwell-Weyl coupling were not properly interpreted and presented in [1]. We showed, in particular, that the aforementioned paper has assigned to infinite wavelengths solutions that hold on all finite super-Hubble scales. This has prevented the authors from recognising the main effect of the gravito-magnetic interaction, namely the superadiabatic amplification of the B -field, and misled them into disregarding its implications as completely negligible. With this brief comment we have attempted to draw attention and clarify these issues, while in the process we took a closer look at the gauge-invariance and the nonlinearity of the formalism proposed in [1].

Acknowledgments

The author would like to thank Gerold Betschart, Caroline Zunckel, Peter Dunsby and Mattias Marklund for their comments.

References

- [1] G. Betschart, C. Zunckel, P.K.S. Dunsby and M. Marklund, Phys. Rev D **72**, 123514 (2005).
- [2] C.G. Tsagas, P.K.S Dunsby and M. Marklund, Phys. Lett. B **561**, 17 (2003).
- [3] C.G. Tsagas, Phys. Rev. D **72**, 123509 (2005).
- [4] A-C. Davis, K. Dimopoulos, T. Prokopec, O. Törnkvist, Phys. Lett. B **501**, 165 (2001); K. Dimopoulos, T. Prokopec, O. Törnkvist and A-C. Davis, Phys. Rev. D **65**, 063505 (2002).
- [5] J.M. Stewart and M. Walker, Proc. R. Soc. A, **341**, 49 (1974); J.M. Stewart, Class. Quantum Grav. **7**, 1169 (1990); G.F.R Ellis and M. Bruni, Phys. Rev. D **40**, 1804 (1989).