

Primeval symmetries

R. Aldrovandi,¹ R. R. Cuzinatto,^{1,*} and L. G. Medeiros¹

¹Instituto de Física Teórica, Universidade Estadual Paulista
Rua Pamplona 145, CEP 01405-900, São Paulo, SP, Brazil.

Abstract

A detailed examination of the Killing equations in Robertson–Walker coordinates shows how the addition of matter and/or radiation to a de Sitter Universe breaks the symmetry generated by four of its Killing fields. The product $U = a^2 \dot{H}$ of the squared scale parameter by the time-derivative of the Hubble function encapsulates the relationship between the two cases: the symmetry is maximal when U is a constant, and reduces to the 6-parameter symmetry of a generic Friedmann–Robertson–Walker model when it is not. As the fields physical interpretation is not clear in these coordinates, comparison is made with the Killing fields in static coordinates, whose interpretation is made clearer by their direct relationship to the Poincaré group generators via Wigner-Inönü contractions.

Keywords: Killing fields, Standard model, de Sitter model

1 Introduction

Symmetry considerations are enough to fix the general form

$$ds^2 = c^2 dt^2 - a^2(t) \left[\frac{dr^2}{1 - \kappa r^2} + r^2 d\theta^2 + r^2 \sin^2 \theta d\phi^2 \right] \quad (1)$$

of the Friedmann–Robertson–Walker (FRW) interval [1, 2]. Homogeneity and isotropy of the space-section ensure a minimum of 6 symmetry generators, but this number can be higher for particular expressions of the scale parameter $a(t)$. The expression above holds for any spacetime whose space-section is homogeneous and isotropic and includes, consequently, de Sitter (dS) spacetimes. Some coordinate systems may be specifically more convenient for the latter, such as the static line element [3]

$$ds^2 = \left(1 - \frac{\bar{r}^2}{L^2}\right) c^2 d\bar{t}^2 - \frac{d\bar{r}^2}{\left(1 - \frac{\bar{r}^2}{L^2}\right)} - \bar{r}^2 d\theta^2 - \bar{r}^2 \sin^2 \theta d\phi^2, \quad (2)$$

but expression (1) provides a simpler, unified view of all the homogeneous isotropic Universes. Our objective here will be to analyse the isometries in the general case, with emphasis on the relationship between the de Sitter ten-parameter group of motions and the FRW six-parameter symmetry.

We shall adopt a working picture which has formal — and, nowadays, observational — advantages: the Universe starts in an inflationary era modeled by a pure de Sitter model with cosmological constant Λ , whose maximal symmetry is later partially broken by the addition of radiation and matter. It is subsequently described by the standard FRW model with a cosmological constant.

*rodrigo@ift.unesp.br

The ten-generator de Sitter group is a deformation [4, 5] of the Poincaré group \mathcal{P} , and its Lie algebra has, in consequence, a preferred basis in which the generators have clear physical interpretations. The Poincaré group — the group of motions [6] of flat Minkowski spacetime M — is an Inönü-Wigner contraction [7] of the de Sitter group — the group of motions of de Sitter spacetime dS . And $\mathcal{P} = \mathcal{L} \circledast \mathcal{T}$, the semi-direct product of the Lorentz group \mathcal{L} and the group \mathcal{T} of translations on M . Minkowski spacetime is the quotient $M = \mathcal{P}/\mathcal{L}$. The \mathcal{P} Lie algebra has a general form given by commutators

$$[\mathcal{L}, \mathcal{L}] = \mathcal{L}; \quad [\mathcal{L}, \mathcal{T}] = \mathcal{T}; \quad [\mathcal{T}, \mathcal{T}] = 0,$$

where \mathcal{L} and \mathcal{T} represent generic generators of the Lorentz sub-group of the translation sub-group.

Now, each dS spacetime is characterized by a pseudo-radius (or horizon) L . The de Sitter group has also a Lorentz sub-group, but the translations differ from their Poincaré counterparts: their generators are dimensionless and do not constitute a sub-group. The general form of the Lie algebra is

$$[\mathcal{L}, \mathcal{L}] = \mathcal{L}; \quad [\mathcal{L}, \mathcal{T}] = \mathcal{T}; \quad [\mathcal{T}, \mathcal{T}] = \frac{1}{L^2} \mathcal{L}.$$

The Inönü-Wigner contraction corresponds to taking the limit $L \rightarrow \infty$, after changing the \mathcal{T} generators' dimensions through multiplication by convenient constants. Comparison of the two commutation tables provide clear physical meanings for the dS generators from those, well-known, of the \mathcal{P} generators. That is, for example, where viewing the \mathcal{T} generators as translations on dS space comes from.

In FRW coordinates the homogeneous cosmological models are unified and more easily compared with each other [8, 9], but the dS generators have not clear interpretations. The Killing fields for metric (2) have an immediate relationship to \mathcal{P} generators — precisely through the Inönü-Wigner contraction.

Our aim here is not only to exhibit the Killing fields for metric (1), using the FRW coordinates to correlate the dS and general FRW symmetries: it is also to give them simple physical interpretations. With that in mind we shall also recall the Killing fields for metric (2), establish the transformations between the two systems, and examine the contractions in both cases.

The Killing fields in FRW coordinates are given in Section 2. It turns out that the vanishing or not of their timelike components tally with the constancy or not of the parameter $U(t) = a^2(t)\dot{H}$. There are ten Killing fields when U is time-independent, corresponding to the dS case; otherwise that number drops to six, corresponding to the FRW models with a cosmological constant (Λ - FRW Universes). Details are given in Appendix A. Section 3 discusses the static coordinates Killing fields. The transformations relating both coordinate systems are given in Appendix B. Section 4 is devoted to the contractions of the generators and their physical interpretation.

2 FRW and dS symmetries in comoving coordinates

A Killing vector field $\xi^{(P)}$ with $P = 1, 2, \dots, n$, n being the number of parameters of the symmetry group, will be here indicated by its covariant components $\xi_\alpha^{(P)} = \xi_\alpha^{(P)}(x^0, x^1, x^2, x^3)$, i.e., $\xi^{(P)} = (\xi_0^{(P)}, \xi_1^{(P)}, \xi_2^{(P)}, \xi_3^{(P)})$, in terms of which the Killing equations take on the simple forms

$$\nabla_\alpha \xi_\beta + \nabla_\beta \xi_\alpha = \partial_\alpha \xi_\beta^{(P)} + \partial_\beta \xi_\alpha^{(P)} - 2\Gamma^\gamma_{\alpha\beta} \xi_\gamma^{(P)} = 0. \quad (3)$$

Each Killing field — one for each independent integration constant — will be a vector field [10, 11, 12]

$$\xi^{(P)} = \xi^{(P)\alpha} \partial_\alpha. \quad (4)$$

We shall from now on omit index $^{(P)}$, take $c = 1$ and, in Eq.(1), adopt the usual practice [13] of considering also coordinate $x^1 = r$ as non-dimensional, besides $x^2 = \theta$ and $x^3 = \phi$. The

length/time dimension will be carried by the scale function $a(t)$. Equations (3) turn out to be

$$\partial_0 \xi_0 = 0 ; \quad (5)$$

$$\partial_1 \xi_0 + \partial_0 \xi_1 - 2H \xi_1 = 0 ; \quad (6)$$

$$\partial_2 \xi_0 + \partial_0 \xi_2 - 2H \xi_2 = 0 ; \quad (7)$$

$$\partial_3 \xi_0 + \partial_0 \xi_3 - 2H \xi_3 = 0 ; \quad (8)$$

$$\partial_2 \xi_1 + \partial_1 \xi_2 - \frac{2}{r} \xi_2 = 0 ; \quad (9)$$

$$\partial_3 \xi_1 + \partial_1 \xi_3 - \frac{2}{r} \xi_3 = 0 ; \quad (10)$$

$$\partial_3 \xi_2 + \partial_2 \xi_3 - 2 \cot \theta \xi_3 = 0 ; \quad (11)$$

$$(1 - \kappa r^2) \partial_1 \xi_1 - \kappa r \xi_1 - a^2 H \xi_0 = 0 ; \quad (12)$$

$$\partial_2 \xi_2 + r (1 - \kappa r^2) \xi_1 - a^2 H r^2 \xi_0 = 0 ; \quad (13)$$

$$\partial_3 \xi_3 + \sin \theta \cos \theta \xi_2 + r (1 - \kappa r^2) \sin^2 \theta \xi_1 - a^2 H r^2 \sin^2 \theta \xi_0 = 0 . \quad (14)$$

The fastidious process to find the analytic solutions follows the standard procedure of taking crossed derivatives of the equations and eliminating unwanted terms. We shall only comment on a particular case: take ∂_0 of (12), use (5) in order to eliminate $\partial_0 \xi_0$, and (6) to substitute $\partial_0 \xi_1$. This leads, after using (12) again to replace $\partial_1 \xi_1$, to the second-order equation for the r -dependence of component ξ_0 :

$$(1 - \kappa r^2) \partial_1 \partial_1 \xi_0 - \kappa r \partial_1 \xi_0 + U(t) \xi_0 = 0 , \quad (15)$$

where we have introduced the symmetry-controlling parameter

$$U(t) = a^2 \dot{H} , \quad (16)$$

with $H(t) = \frac{\dot{a}(t)}{a(t)}$ the usual Hubble function. The Friedmann equations are

$$H^2 = \frac{8\pi G}{3} \rho + \frac{\Lambda}{3} - \frac{\kappa}{a^2} , \quad (17)$$

$$U \equiv a^2 \dot{H} = -\frac{3}{2} \left[\frac{8\pi G}{3} (\rho + p) \right] a^2 + \kappa , \quad (18)$$

where Λ is the cosmological constant ($= \frac{3}{L^2}$ in terms of the de Sitter radius L), p and ρ are the source pressure and density, and κ is the curvature parameter with values in the set $\{-1, 0, +1\}$.

The role of function $U(t)$ becomes clear from taking ∂_0 of (15) and using (5) to obtain

$$\dot{U} \xi_0 = 0 . \quad (19)$$

Hence, either $\xi_0 = 0$ or $\dot{U} = 0$, or both. For the time being, let us focus on the second case, when U is a constant. Equation (18) says that this will happen when $(\rho + p) = 0$, so that $U = \kappa$. Requirement $(\rho + p) = 0$ is fulfilled when **(i)** $\rho = p = 0$, the vacuum solution of (17, 18), by definition the dS model; **(ii)** $p = -\rho$, an exotic equation of state which just simulates the cosmological constant. Whichever the choice, a and H will be the scale factor and the Hubble function for the dS solution [9]:

$$a(t) = A \cosh \frac{t}{L} + \sqrt{A^2 - \kappa L^2} \sinh \frac{t}{L} , \quad (20)$$

with the arbitrary initial condition $A = a(0)$ and

$$H(t) = \frac{1}{L} - \frac{2\kappa L}{\kappa L^2 + e^{2\frac{t}{L}} (A + \sqrt{A^2 - \kappa L^2})^2} . \quad (21)$$

We see thus that $\xi_0 \neq 0$ is precisely the case of de Sitter solutions. Otherwise, $a(t)$ is unconstrained and may be any of the solutions for the Standard Model. Summing up:

$$\xi_0 \begin{cases} = 0 & \text{when } U \text{ is not a constant (FRW spacetime)} \\ \neq 0 & \text{when } U = \kappa \text{ is a constant (dS spacetime)}. \end{cases}$$

The particular expressions of the scale parameter $a(t)$ for which the symmetry is higher are now clear: they are those for which $U = (a \ddot{a} - \dot{a}^2)$ is an integral of motion.

The detailed procedure leading to the component ξ_0 is the subject of Appendix A. The other components ξ_i are obtained by analogous techniques, and are simply listed in the same appendix, where it is also indicated how to calculate the Killing fields in their final forms, namely

$$\begin{aligned} S_0 &= \sqrt{1 - \kappa r^2} (\partial_t - H D) \\ S_i &= x^i (\partial_t - H D) + \kappa H \partial_i - \frac{(1 - \kappa^2)}{2} \left(\frac{1}{a^2 H} - H r^2 \right) \partial_i \\ T_i &= -\sqrt{1 - \kappa r^2} \partial_i \\ J_i &= \epsilon_{ij}^k x^j \partial_k. \end{aligned} \tag{22}$$

The Hubble function H will be given by (21) whenever it turns up: it appears just in S_0 and S_i , present only in the dS case. Some interpretation is possible at this stage. Each field T_i is a translation generator, the factor $\sqrt{1 - \kappa r^2}$ accounting for curvature. The same would hold for S_0 , a time-translation on a curved space from which space expansion (term $H D$) is subtracted. The J_i 's have the usual aspect of rotation generators. Generators S_i , however, elude any simple putting into words.

The commutation table for the fields (22) exhibits the dS group algebra in comoving coordinates:

$$[S_0, S_i] = -\kappa \frac{1}{L^2} T_i - (1 - \kappa^2) \frac{1}{L} S_i \tag{23}$$

$$[S_0, T_i] = -\kappa S_i + (1 - \kappa^2) \frac{1}{L} T_i \tag{24}$$

$$[S_0, J_i] = 0 \tag{25}$$

$$[S_i, S_j] = \kappa \frac{1}{L^2} \epsilon_{ij}^k J_k \tag{26}$$

$$[S_i, T_j] = -\delta_{ij} S_0 - (1 - \kappa^2) \frac{1}{L} \epsilon_{ij}^k J_k \tag{27}$$

$$[S_i, J_j] = -\epsilon_{ij}^k S_k \tag{28}$$

$$[T_i, T_j] = -\kappa \epsilon_{ij}^k J_k \tag{29}$$

$$[T_i, J_j] = -\epsilon_{ij}^k T_k \tag{30}$$

$$[J_i, J_j] = \epsilon_{ij}^k J_k. \tag{31}$$

At first sight, this table has a plain enough meaning. Equations (23-28) involve those generators which are absent in the generic FRW case. Only Eqs.(29-31) appear in that case, and represent the groups of motions of a sphere S^3 (if $\kappa = +1$), of a hyperbolic 3-space (if $\kappa = -1$) and of the euclidian space \mathbb{E}^3 (if $\kappa = 0$) — just the expected Universe space-sections in the Standard Model [14]. These groups are, respectively, $SO(4) = SO(3) \otimes SO(3)$, $SO(3,1) = \mathcal{L}$ and the Euclidean Group. They also exhibit the bundle aspect [11] of the spaces involved, important for its generality: the translations are “horizontal”, responsible for the space homogeneity. They span the space itself, and their commutator (29) exhibits the space curvature κ as a tag multiplying the “vertical”, rotation-related generators.

And here comes a difficulty: the same holds for de Sitter spaces. Their translation commutators (23) and (26) display the spacetime curvature $1/L^2$ in their vertical components, along the Lorentz generators. The trouble is that the translation de Sitter generators $\{S_k\}$ are not the translation generators $\{T_k\}$ of the Λ -FRW Universe. This seems to preclude any possible passage from a dS model to a Standard Model. Notice, however, that any linear combination of Killing fields

is also a Killing field. It might happen that the de Sitter generator basis provided by the FRW coordinates be not the most convenient, but some combination which, in the passage, also reduces to those appearing in Eqs.(29-31). To examine this question, a better understanding of the physical meanings of the above Killing fields is necessary. We proceed then to obtain clearer interpretations for them by studying their relationships with the Poincaré generators. We will then: (i) repeat the procedure for the dS solution written in static coordinates; and (ii) convert the dS generators from the static coordinates to the FRW comoving coordinates, consistently recovering S_0 , S_i , T_i and J_i . Step (ii) requires, however, a previous step (iii): to obtain the general transformation between FRW coordinates — for the three possible values of κ — and static dS invariant coordinates. Steps (i) and (ii) are undertaken in the following section though, for economy, the results are just listed. The transformations themselves are left to Appendix B. Relations to the Poincaré generators are discussed in the subsequent sections.

3 Symmetry relations in static and comoving coordinates

In FRW coordinates the radial coordinate r is dimensionless, while $a(t)$ and t (with $c = 1$) have length dimension. In the static coordinates of line-element (2), \bar{r} has length dimension, as well as the de Sitter horizon pseudo-radius L and time \bar{t} . The angular coordinates are the same in both systems.

Integration of the Killing equations for metric (2) leads to the covariant components $\bar{\xi}_\mu$ as functions of the coordinates $\bar{x}^0 = \bar{t}$, $\bar{x}^1 = \bar{r}$, $\bar{x}^2 = \theta$ and $\bar{x}^3 = \phi$. The contravariant Killing components $\bar{\xi}^\mu = \bar{g}^{\mu\nu} \bar{\xi}_\nu$ will then give directly the generators $\bar{X}_N = \bar{\xi}_N^\mu \bar{\partial}_\mu$ associated to the ten integration constants. After a transformation from the static (\bar{r}, θ, ϕ) to Cartesian coordinates (now with length dimension) $\bar{x} = \bar{r} \sin \theta \cos \phi$; $\bar{y} = \bar{r} \sin \theta \sin \phi$; $\bar{z} = \bar{r} \cos \theta$, the operators \bar{X}_N are obtained as:

$$\begin{aligned}
T_0 &= \partial_{\bar{t}} ; \\
B_i &= -\frac{1}{\sqrt{1-\frac{\bar{r}^2}{L^2}}} \cosh \frac{\bar{t}}{L} \bar{x}^i \partial_{\bar{t}} - L \sqrt{1-\frac{\bar{r}^2}{L^2}} \sinh \frac{\bar{t}}{L} \bar{\partial}_i ; \\
P_i &= -\frac{1}{L} \frac{1}{\sqrt{1-\frac{\bar{r}^2}{L^2}}} \sinh \frac{\bar{t}}{L} \bar{x}^i \partial_{\bar{t}} - \sqrt{1-\frac{\bar{r}^2}{L^2}} \cosh \frac{\bar{t}}{L} \bar{\partial}_i ; \\
\bar{J}_i &= \epsilon_{ij}^k \bar{x}^j \bar{\partial}_k ,
\end{aligned} \tag{32}$$

The physical interpretation of these symmetries arises from the analysis of the limit $L \rightarrow \infty$, when these dS operators should reduce to the Poincaré generators: boosts, rotations and temporal and spatial translations. The commutation table of the generators above is:

$$\begin{aligned}
[T_0, B_i] &= -P_i & [T_0, P_i] &= -\frac{1}{L^2} B_i & [T_0, \bar{J}_i] &= 0 \\
[B_i, B_j] &= \epsilon_{ij}^k \bar{J}_k & [B_i, P_j] &= -\delta_{ij} T_0 & [B_i, \bar{J}_j] &= -\epsilon_{ij}^k B_k \\
[P_i, P_j] &= -\frac{1}{L^2} \epsilon_{ij}^k \bar{J}_k & [P_i, \bar{J}_j] &= -\epsilon_{ij}^k P_k & [\bar{J}_i, \bar{J}_j] &= \epsilon_{ij}^k \bar{J}_k .
\end{aligned} \tag{33}$$

Both sets of operators (S_0, S_i, T_i, J_i) and $(T_0, B_i, P_i, \bar{J}_i)$ are generators of the dS group. The coordinate transformations connecting both sets are also responsible for the conversion of the FRW line element (1) into the de Sitter static interval (2). Appendix B describes in detail how to obtain these general transformation laws, valid for all values of κ and for an arbitrary initial condition

$a(0) = A$ for the scale factor. They are the *generalized Robertson transformation*,¹

$$\begin{aligned}\bar{r} &= r a(t), \quad a(t) = A \cosh \frac{t}{L} + \sqrt{A^2 - \kappa L^2} \sinh \frac{t}{L}, \\ \bar{t} &= L \ln \left[\tau(\kappa) \frac{a(t) \left(H(t) + \frac{\sqrt{1 - \kappa r^2}}{L} \right)}{\sqrt{1 - \frac{[r a(t)]^2}{L^2}}} \right], \quad \tau(\kappa) = \begin{cases} \frac{L}{2A}, & \kappa = 0 \\ 1, & \kappa = -1 \\ \frac{1}{i}, & \kappa = +1 \end{cases}.\end{aligned}\quad (34)$$

From (34) we write dS Killing fields in comoving coordinates (S_0, S_i, T_i, J_i) in terms of dS Killing fields in static coordinates $(T_0, B_i, P_i, \bar{J}_i)$:²

$$\begin{aligned}S_0 &= T_0 \\ S_i &= \left(1 - \frac{\kappa^2}{2}\right) \left[\tau(\kappa) - \frac{\kappa}{\tau(\kappa)}\right] P_i + \left(1 - \frac{\kappa^2}{2}\right) \left[\tau(\kappa) + \frac{\kappa}{\tau(\kappa)}\right] \frac{1}{L} B_i \\ T_i &= \frac{1}{2} \left[\frac{1}{\tau(\kappa)} + \kappa \tau(\kappa)\right] L P_i - \frac{1}{2} \left[\frac{1}{\tau(\kappa)} - \kappa \tau(\kappa)\right] B_i \\ J_i &= \bar{J}_i.\end{aligned}\quad (35)$$

Substituting $\tau(\kappa)$ as given in (34) for each value of κ , we find the results of Table 1.

<i>Correspondence between dS generators</i>	
static dS coordinates	comoving FRW coordinates
T_0	S_0
P_i	$\kappa = 0 \quad \frac{A}{L} S_i + \frac{1}{2A} T_i$ $\kappa = -1 \quad S_i$ $\kappa = +1 \quad i S_i$
B_i	$\kappa = 0 \quad A S_i - \frac{L}{2A} T_i$ $\kappa = -1 \quad -T_i$ $\kappa = +1 \quad i T_i$
J_i	J_i

Table 1: Relations between dS generators in static (barred) coordinates and FRW (unbarred) coordinates.

The comoving operators S_0, S_i, T_i , and J_i are obtained, directly or through linear combinations, from the dS generators in the familiar static coordinates. They will tend, consequently, to well-defined Poincaré generators when $L \rightarrow \infty$, just as T_0, P_i, I_i and \bar{J}_i . Next section is concerned with this point.

4 Contraction from dS to Poincaré algebras

4.1 Limit $L \rightarrow \infty$ in static coordinates

In the limit $L \rightarrow \infty$, keeping only terms to first order in (\bar{t}/L) ,

$$\sqrt{1 - \frac{\bar{r}^2}{L^2}} = 1 - \frac{\bar{r}^2}{L^2} + O\left(\frac{\bar{r}^4}{L^4}\right); \quad \sinh \frac{\bar{t}}{L} = \frac{\bar{t}}{L} + O\left(\frac{\bar{t}^3}{L^3}\right); \quad \cosh \frac{\bar{t}}{L} = 1 + \frac{1}{2} \frac{\bar{t}^2}{L^2} + O\left(\frac{\bar{t}^4}{L^4}\right).$$

The limits of generators P_i and B_i in (32) can be directly obtained:

$$P_i \longrightarrow -\frac{1}{L} \frac{\bar{t}}{L} \bar{x}^i \partial_{\bar{t}} - \bar{\partial}_i \quad \therefore \quad P_i \longrightarrow -\bar{\partial}_i, \quad (36)$$

¹ $\tau(\kappa)$ is an integration constant. The convenience of a complex number for the case $\kappa = +1$ is justified in Appendix B.

²Acknowledgement is due to an unknown referee for calling the authors' attention to these general equalities.

which we recognize as the *spatial translations* generator on Minkowski space. On the other hand,

$$B_i \longrightarrow (\bar{x}^i \partial_{\bar{t}} + \bar{t} \bar{\partial}_i) \quad (37)$$

are the *boost* generators of the Poincaré algebra. T_0 and \bar{J}_i are not affected by the limit $L \rightarrow \infty$, and are immediately recognized as generators of *temporal translations* and of *rotations*.

For $L \rightarrow \infty$, the dS algebra (33) reduces to:

$$\begin{aligned} [T_0, B_i] &= -P_i & [T_0, P_i] &= 0 & [T_0, \bar{J}_i] &= 0 \\ [B_i, B_j] &= \epsilon_{ij}^k \bar{J}_k & [B_i, P_j] &= -\delta_{ij} T_0 & [B_i, \bar{J}_j] &= -\epsilon_{ij}^k B_k \\ [P_i, P_j] &= 0 & [P_i, \bar{J}_j] &= -\epsilon_{ij}^k T_k & [\bar{J}_i, \bar{J}_j] &= \epsilon_{ij}^k \bar{J}_k, \end{aligned} \quad (38)$$

which is exactly the commutation table for the Poincaré Lie algebra [15].

4.2 Limit $L \rightarrow \infty$ in comoving coordinates

Let us consider separately the three values of κ :

1. $\kappa = 0$: Equations (22) become:

$$\begin{aligned} S_0 &= (\partial_t - H D) ; & S_i &= x^i \partial_t - \left[\frac{1}{2} \left(\frac{1}{a^2 H} - H r^2 \right) \partial_i + H x^i D \right] \\ T_i &= -\partial_i ; & J_i &= \epsilon_{ij}^k x^j \partial_k, \end{aligned} \quad (39)$$

where, according to Eqs. (20, 21), $a(t) = A e^{t/L}$ and $H = \frac{1}{L}$. When $L \gg 1$, a divergence problem turns up in one of the terms of S_i . In fact,

$$-\frac{1}{2} \left(\frac{1}{a^2 H} \right) \partial_i = -\frac{1}{2} \left(\frac{L}{A e^{2t/L}} \right) \partial_i \simeq -\frac{1}{2A} L \left(1 - \frac{2t}{L} \right) \partial_i = \frac{1}{2A} L T_i + \frac{t}{A} \partial_i .$$

The first term diverges for $L \rightarrow \infty$. This difficulty can be overcome by redefining the S_i so as to exclude this undesirable term. This is fair enough: the problematic term is linear in other generators of the set, T_i , and any linear combination of generators is also a generator. Consider the change

$$S_i \rightarrow \left(\frac{A}{L} S_i + \frac{1}{2A} T_i \right) = P_i . \quad (40)$$

This redefinition not only eliminates the divergence, but also has the form of P_i in FRW coordinates – according to Table 1 – which propitiates the interpretation of the combinations (40) as spatial translation generators. Physical interpretation further suggests the modification

$$T_i \rightarrow \left(-A S_i + \frac{L}{2A} T_i \right) = -B_i . \quad (41)$$

We already know that B_i has the meaning of boosts in the Poincaré limit. There is no problem for $S_0 = \left(\partial_t - \frac{1}{L} D \right)$ in the limit $L \rightarrow \infty$:

$$\lim_{L \rightarrow \infty} S_0 = \partial_t = T_0 , \quad (42)$$

which is interpreted as the time–translation generator. The rotation comoving generators J_i are not affected by the limit $L \rightarrow \infty$. Using Eqs.(40), (41) and (42), it is then an easy task to show that the commutation table (23-31) coincides with the Poincaré algebra (38) when $L \rightarrow \infty$.

2. $\kappa = -1$: Equations (22) are now

$$\begin{aligned} S_0 &= \sqrt{1+r^2} (\partial_t - H D) ; & S_i &= x^i \partial_t - H (\partial_i + x^i D) \\ T_i &= -\sqrt{1+r^2} \partial_i ; & J_i &= \epsilon_{ij}^k x^j \partial_k, \end{aligned} \quad (43)$$

where

$$H(t) = \frac{1}{L} + \frac{2L}{e^{2\bar{t}}(A + \sqrt{A^2 + L^2})^2 - L^2} \Rightarrow \lim_{L \rightarrow \infty} H(t) \simeq \frac{1}{(A+t)}.$$

Inserted in (43), the last expression above leads to the Poincaré generators in comoving coordinates. Yet, it is difficult to attribute the usual interpretation (translations, boosts, rotations) to the generators in this coordinate system. To recover the conventional meaning, it is necessary to restore the dimension to the comoving FRW coordinates — see Appendix B, Eqs. (78-79). The result is

$$\begin{aligned} S_0 &= \partial_{\bar{t}} = T_0; & S_i &= -\bar{\partial}_i = P_i; \\ T_i &= -\left(\bar{x}^i \frac{\partial}{\partial \bar{t}} + \bar{t} \frac{\partial}{\partial \bar{x}^i}\right) = -B_i; & J_i &= \epsilon_{ij}^k \bar{x}^j \frac{\partial}{\partial \bar{x}^k} = \bar{J}_i, \end{aligned} \quad (44)$$

which provide direct interpretations as generators: S_0 for time dislocation; S_i for spatial translations; T_i for boosts and J_i for rotations.

3. $\kappa = +1$: This case is quite analogous to that for $\kappa = -1$, up to a point: some imaginary generators appear. This is to be expected: for $\kappa = 0$ and -1 the space sections are open non-compact spaces, while for $\kappa = +1$ it is the compact sphere S^3 . Translations with parameters α^k on that sphere, for example, are obtained by exponentiating $\alpha^k S_k$, and a factor “ i ” is necessary to make them finite, as befits the S^3 compact group of motions $SO(4)$. The results are summed up in Table 2.

Inönü-Wigner Contraction for dS				
static dS coordinates				
		generator	$L \rightarrow \infty$ version	
		T_0	$\partial_{\bar{t}}$	
		P_i	$-\bar{\partial}_i$	
		B_i	$(\bar{x}^i \partial_{\bar{t}} + \bar{t} \bar{\partial}_i)$	
		J_i	$\epsilon_{ij}^k \bar{x}^j \bar{\partial}_k$	
comoving FRW coordinates				
generator		$L \rightarrow \infty$ version		
S_0	κ	r and x^i without dimension	r and x^i with dimension	
	0	∂_t		$\partial_{\bar{t}}$
	-1	$\sqrt{1+r^2} \left(\partial_t - \frac{1}{(1+t)} D \right)$		$\partial_{\bar{t}}$
	+1	$\sqrt{1-r^2} \left(\partial_t - \frac{i}{(1+it)} D \right)$		$\partial_{\bar{t}}$
S_i	κ	r and x^i without dimension	r and x^i with dimension	
	0	$S_i \rightarrow \left(\frac{A}{L} S_i + \frac{1}{2A} T_i = P_i \right)$		$-\bar{\partial}_i$
	-1	$x^i \partial_t - \frac{1}{(1+t)} (\partial_i + x^i D)$		$-\bar{\partial}_i$
	+1	$x^i \partial_t + \frac{i}{(1+it)} (\partial_i - x^i D)$		$-i (-\bar{\partial}_i)$
T_i	κ	r and x^i without dimension	r and x^i with dimension	
	0	$T_i \rightarrow \left(-A S_i + \frac{L}{2A} T_i \right) = -B_i$		$-(\bar{x}^i \partial_t + \bar{t} \bar{\partial}_i)$
	-1	$-\sqrt{1+r^2} \bar{\partial}_i$		$-(\bar{x}^i \partial_t + \bar{t} \bar{\partial}_i)$
	+1	$-\sqrt{1-r^2} \bar{\partial}_i$		$-i (\bar{x}^i \bar{\partial}_t + \bar{t} \bar{\partial}_i)$
J_i	r and x^i without dimension		r and x^i with dimension	
	$\epsilon_{ij}^k x^j \partial_k$		$\epsilon_{ij}^k \bar{x}^j \bar{\partial}_k$	

Table 2: Comparison between contractions of the dS generators in the static and comoving systems.

Generators S_0 , S_i , T_i , and J_i are suitable for recognizing the symmetry breaking between dS and FRW: S_0 and S_i disappear unless $a(t)$ is a dS solution. They are not, however, convenient for comparison with the Poincaré generators when $L \rightarrow \infty$: length dimension must be restored to space coordinates r , x^i beforehand. Once this is done the T_i , for example, which in comoving coordinates might be associated to spatial translations (in spatial sections with $\kappa = -1, 0, +1$), acquire the meaning of boosts when written in barred coordinates (with dimension). And the problem raised at the end of Section 2 has a simple answer: the de Sitter generators $\{S_k\}$ are not to be regarded, by themselves, as spanning the space section. Only some linear combinations of the S_k and the T_k are. There is consequently no problem in considering a possible passage from a dS model to a Standard Model.

5 Final Remarks

The FRW coordinates are suitable to examine the relationship between the dS and Standard Model symmetries, but the static coordinates are more appropriate to obtain physical interpretations of their generators. For the nowadays observationally favored $\kappa = 0$ case, boosts and translations are certain linear combinations of the FRW Killing fields, with factors necessary to adapt their dimensions.

It goes without saying that many questions remain in the open. For instance, how could it happen that matter/radiation be “added” to a primeval dS Universe? We have, quite naturally, supposed the cosmological *constant* Λ to be really *constant* in coordinate time. There is no contradiction neither with Einstein’s equations nor with energy conservation to have a time-dependent $\Lambda(t)$ — provided matter/radiation is created or destroyed so as to maintain the energy balance [16]. An evolving $\Lambda(t)$, with very high values — providing for inflation — at the primordial Universe but subsequently (and quickly) decreasing towards its present stable value, could provide a model. The negative point is, of course, the absence of any dynamics for $\Lambda(t)$ — which, by the way, is equivalent to a scalar field in a homogeneous Universe. Such a dynamics is usually put by hand, as in the inflaton scenery. It would be preferable that such dynamics be brought forth by some fundamental theory or principle.

The problem of the transition between accelerated and decelerated cosmological solutions is certainly more embracing than that of the transition between the dS and FRW paradigms. A suitable modeling of the equation of state for the cosmic fluid can describe the transition — an example is given in [17], and Ref.[18] is an effort in that direction.

It is a fascinating point that the Levi-Civita connection for dS satisfies a Yang-Mills equation, so that dS spacetimes are, in a sense, also gauge theories. A gauge theory has its proper dynamics. Partial breaking of gauge theories are no novelty, but here it would involve spacetime itself. An attempt, using the formalism of extended gauge theories [19], is under study.

Acknowledgements

An unknown referee is thanked for useful suggestions. R.A. thanks to Conselho Nacional de Pesquisas (CNPq), Brazil and R.R.C. and L.G.M. are grateful to Fundação de Amparo à Pesquisa do Estado de São Paulo (FAPESP), Brazil, for support (grants 02/05763-8 and 02/10263-4 respectively).

A The Killing components ξ_μ

We obtain here the component ξ_0 when it does not vanish (that is, in the dS case $U = \kappa$), as a typical example of the general integration procedure. The steps consist mainly of taking crossed derivatives of Eqs.(5-14), up to a point in which a decoupled equation for the x^ν -dependence of the component ξ_μ is obtained.

The radial dependence of ξ_0 is given by the integration of (15). Substituting $U = \kappa$, we rewrite it as

$$\partial_1 [(1 - \kappa r^2) \partial_1 \xi_0 + \kappa r \xi_0] = 0 .$$

The term between square-brackets must be a constant in r , but not with respect to the others coordinates:

$$(1 - \kappa r^2) \partial_1 \xi_0 + \kappa r \xi_0 = \tau_1 (\theta, \phi) , \quad (45)$$

whose solution is the homogeneous ($\tau_1 = 0$) solution plus a particular one, $\xi_0 = \xi_0^h + \xi_0^p$. The first comes immediately: $\xi_0^h = \tau_2 (\theta, \phi) \sqrt{1 - \kappa r^2}$. A particular solution of (45) is of the form $\xi_0^p = \tau_1 (\theta, \phi) r$, as easily verified by substitution. Thus,

$$\xi_0 = \tau_1 (\theta, \phi) r + \tau_2 (\theta, \phi) \sqrt{1 - \kappa r^2} , \quad (46)$$

where $\tau_1 (\theta, \phi)$ and $\tau_2 (\theta, \phi)$ must be obtained from the other equations of the system (5-14).

The θ -dependence of ξ_0 is obtained by taking ∂_0 of Eq.(13), using (7), (6) and (5) to eliminate respectively $\partial_0 \xi_2$, $\partial_0 \xi_1$ and $\partial_0 \xi_0$ and then using Eq.(13) to substitute $\partial_2 \xi_2$. The result is

$$\partial_2 \partial_2 \xi_0 + r (1 - \kappa r^2) \partial_1 \xi_0 + U r^2 \xi_0 = 0 . \quad (47)$$

From (46) follows

$$[\partial_2 \partial_2 \tau_1 (\theta, \phi) + \tau_1 (\theta, \phi)] r + \partial_2 \partial_2 \tau_2 (\theta, \phi) \sqrt{1 - \kappa r^2} = 0 .$$

If the above equality is to be verified for any value of r , the coefficients of the functions r and $\sqrt{1 - \kappa r^2}$ must vanish independently:

$$\partial_2 \partial_2 \tau_1 (\theta, \phi) + \tau_1 (\theta, \phi) = 0 , \quad \text{and} \quad \partial_2 \partial_2 \tau_2 (\theta, \phi) = 0 . \quad (48)$$

from which we have

$$\tau_1 (\theta, \phi) = \tau_3 (\phi) \sin \theta + \tau_4 (\phi) \cos \theta , \quad \text{and} \quad \tau_2 (\theta, \phi) = \tau_5 (\phi) \theta + \tau_6 (\phi) . \quad (49)$$

This concludes the θ -dependence's determination for ξ_0 : inserting the last two expressions in (46),

$$\xi_0 = r [\tau_3 (\phi) \sin \theta + \tau_4 (\phi) \cos \theta] + \sqrt{1 - \kappa r^2} [\tau_5 (\phi) \theta + \tau_6 (\phi)] . \quad (50)$$

Concerning the ϕ -dependence: calculate ∂_0 of (14) and use (8), (7), (6) and (5) to eliminate $\partial_0 \xi_3$, $\partial_0 \xi_2$, $\partial_0 \xi_1$ and $\partial_0 \xi_0$ respectively. Then, substitute $\partial_3 \xi_3$ as given by (14), to find

$$\partial_3 \partial_3 \xi_0 + \sin \theta \cos \theta \partial_2 \xi_0 + r (1 - \kappa r^2) \sin^2 \theta \partial_1 \xi_0 + U r^2 \sin^2 \theta \xi_0 = 0 . \quad (51)$$

Again recalling that $U = \kappa$ in the present case, insertion of (50) in (51) yields

$$\begin{aligned} & r \sin \theta [\partial_3 \partial_3 \tau_3 (\phi) + \tau_3 (\phi)] + r \cos \theta [\partial_3 \partial_3 \tau_4 (\phi)] \\ & + \sqrt{1 - \kappa r^2} [\partial_3 \partial_3 \tau_5 (\phi) \theta + \sin \theta \cos \theta \tau_5 (\phi) + \partial_3 \partial_3 \tau_6 (\phi)] = 0 . \end{aligned}$$

In view of the independence of the coefficients $r \sin \theta$, $r \cos \theta$ and $\sqrt{1 - \kappa r^2}$, we arrive at the system

$$\partial_3 \partial_3 \tau_3 (\phi) + \tau_3 (\phi) = 0 , \quad \partial_3 \partial_3 \tau_4 (\phi) = 0 , \quad \text{and} \quad \partial_3 \partial_3 \tau_5 (\phi) \theta + \sin \theta \cos \theta \tau_5 (\phi) + \partial_3 \partial_3 \tau_6 (\phi) = 0 . \quad (52)$$

From the first two equations in (52),

$$\tau_3 (\phi) = \tau_7 \sin \phi + \tau_8 \cos \phi , \quad \text{and} \quad \tau_4 (\phi) = \tau_9 \phi + \tau_{10} . \quad (53)$$

The third equation imposes

$$\tau_5 (\phi) = 0 , \quad \text{and} \quad \partial_3 \partial_3 \tau_6 (\phi) = 0 , \quad (54)$$

thanks to the independence of the functions that appear multiplying $\partial_3 \partial_3 \tau_5(\phi)$, $\tau_5(\phi)$ and $\partial_3 \partial_3 \tau_6(\phi)$. From the last result,

$$\tau_6(\phi) = \tau_{11} \phi + \tau_{12} . \quad (55)$$

Substituting (53-55) in (50) we determine the ϕ -dependence of ξ_0 :

$$\xi_0 = r [(\tau_7 \sin \phi + \tau_8 \cos \phi) \sin \theta + (\tau_9 \phi + \tau_{10}) \cos \theta] + \sqrt{1 - \kappa r^2} [\tau_{11} \phi + \tau_{12}] . \quad (56)$$

The periodicity condition $\xi_0(r, \theta, 0) = \xi_0(r, \theta, 2\pi)$ on the azimuthal coordinate gives $\tau_9 = \tau_{11} = 0$ which, in (56), leads to

$$\xi_0 = r [(\tau_7 \sin \phi + \tau_8 \cos \phi) \sin \theta + \tau_{10} \cos \theta] + \sqrt{1 - \kappa r^2} \tau_{12} .$$

Renaming the constants $\tau_7 = C_2$; $\tau_8 = C_1$; $\tau_{10} = C_3$; $\tau_{12} = C_0$, we arrive at the final form:

$$\xi_0 = C_0 \sqrt{1 - \kappa r^2} + r [(C_2 \sin \phi + C_1 \cos \phi) \sin \theta + C_3 \cos \theta] ; \quad (57)$$

The other covariant Killing components are found by analogous operations and are:

$$\begin{aligned} \xi_1 = & a^2 H \frac{r}{\sqrt{1 - \kappa r^2}} C_0 + \left[\frac{(1 - \kappa^2)}{2} \left(\frac{1}{H} + a^2 H r^2 \right) - \kappa a^2 H \right] [(C_2 \sin \phi + C_1 \cos \phi) \sin \theta + C_3 \cos \theta] \\ & + a^2 \frac{1}{\sqrt{1 - \kappa r^2}} [(K_1 \cos \phi + K_2 \sin \phi) \sin \theta + K_3 \cos \theta] ; \end{aligned} \quad (58)$$

$$\begin{aligned} \xi_2 = & \left[\frac{(1 - \kappa^2)}{2} \left(\frac{1}{H} - a^2 H r^2 \right) - \kappa a^2 H \right] r [(C_2 \sin \phi + C_1 \cos \phi) \cos \theta - C_3 \sin \theta] \\ & + a^2 r \sqrt{1 - \kappa r^2} [(K_1 \cos \phi + K_2 \sin \phi) \cos \theta - K_3 \sin \theta] + a^2 r^2 (L_1 \sin \phi - L_2 \cos \phi) ; \end{aligned} \quad (59)$$

$$\begin{aligned} \xi_3 = & \left[\frac{(1 - \kappa^2)}{2} \left(\frac{1}{H} - a^2 H r^2 \right) - \kappa a^2 H \right] r (C_2 \cos \phi - C_1 \sin \phi) \sin \theta \\ & + a^2 r \sqrt{1 - \kappa r^2} (K_2 \cos \phi - K_1 \sin \phi) \sin \theta \\ & + a^2 r^2 [\sin \theta \cos \theta (L_1 \cos \phi + L_2 \sin \phi) - \sin^2 \theta L_3] . \end{aligned} \quad (60)$$

Each Killing vector field $\xi^{(P)}$ will be obtained by choosing a convenient, simple value (such as ± 1) for one of the constants while putting all the other = 0. In particular, that we have complete freedom in the choice of overall signs. Of course, linear combinations of such fields will also be solutions. Case $\dot{U} = 0$ contributes the whole of Eq.(57) and the terms in C_α of Eqs.(58, 59, 60). Indeed, case $\dot{U} \neq 0$ corresponds to $C_0 = C_1 = C_2 = C_3 = 0$, vindicating the statement of Section 2: four of the Killing vector fields vanish completely.

Let us go back to the FRW Killing fields (4). Two steps are necessary to arrive at their most convenient form: **(i)** Find the contravariant components, by applying to the components (57–60) the inverse metric

$$(g^{\mu\nu}) = \text{diag} \left(1, -\frac{(1 - \kappa r^2)}{a^2}, -\frac{1}{a^2 r^2}, -\frac{1}{a^2 r^2 \sin^2 \theta} \right) ;$$

and **(ii)** Simpler, more recognizable expressions obtain if we change from the above basis $\{\partial_t, \partial_r, \partial_\theta, \partial_\phi\}$ to basis $\{\partial_x, \partial_y, \partial_z\}$, related to cartesian variables on the space-section, $x = r \sin \theta \cos \phi$, $y = r \sin \theta \sin \phi$; $z = r \cos \theta$. It will be also convenient to introduce the space-section dilation generator $D = r \partial_r = x \partial_x + y \partial_y + z \partial_z$. After this change, go back to notation $x^1 = x$, $x^2 = y$, $x^3 = z$. The result are the operators (22).

B The generalized Robertson transformation

The simultaneous use of de Sitter static line element (2) and the standard form (1) of the FRW interval has led to very interesting results [17, 20]. We give now explicit expressions for the transformations relating them.

The simple Robertson transformations [3, 2]

$$\bar{r} = r \left(A e^{t/L} \right), \quad (61)$$

$$\bar{t} = t - \frac{L}{2} \ln \left[1 - \frac{r^2}{L^2} \left(A e^{t/L} \right)^2 \right], \quad (62)$$

convert the de Sitter static line element into the form

$$ds^2 = dt^2 - \left(A e^{t/L} \right) \left[dr^2 + r^2 d\theta^2 + r^2 \sin^2 \theta d\phi^2 \right], \quad (63)$$

exactly the FRW interval for the particular value $\kappa = 0$ with $a(t) = A e^{ct/L}$, the paradigmatic inflationary solution. Our aim is to extend these transformations so as to include cases $\kappa = \pm 1$. We look for a transformation

$$\begin{aligned} \bar{r} &= r f(t), \\ \bar{t} &= g(t) + h(t, r), \end{aligned} \quad (64)$$

in terms of functions $f(t)$, $g(t)$ and $h(t, r)$ to be determined. Inserting these expressions in the static interval (2) and imposing equality with the FRW interval leads to a system of partial differential equations,

$$\left[1 - \frac{(rf)^2}{L^2} \right] \left(\dot{g} + \dot{h} \right)^2 - \frac{1}{\left[1 - \frac{(rf)^2}{L^2} \right]} r^2 \dot{f}^2 = 1, \quad (65)$$

$$\left[1 - \frac{(rf)^2}{L^2} \right] 2h' \left(\dot{g} + \dot{h} \right) - \frac{1}{\left[1 - \frac{(rf)^2}{L^2} \right]} 2r f \dot{f} = 0, \quad (66)$$

$$\frac{1}{\left[1 - \frac{(rf)^2}{L^2} \right]} f^2 - \left[1 - \frac{(rf)^2}{L^2} \right] h'^2 = \frac{f^2(t)}{1 - \kappa r^2}, \quad (67)$$

$$f^2(t) = a^2(t), \quad (68)$$

where the dots and primes indicate derivations with respect to t and r , respectively. Eliminating the factor $(\dot{g} + \dot{h})$ from the first two equations, it is possible to determine h'^2 in terms of f and f' . Substituting the result into Eq.(67) leads to

$$\dot{f}^2 = \frac{1}{L^2} f^2 - \kappa, \quad (69)$$

which is, in view of Eq.(68), just the Friedmann equation $\dot{a}^2 = \frac{1}{L^2} a^2 - \kappa$ for the de Sitter case with $\kappa = 0, \pm 1$ – see Ref. [9], for example. This is a curious fact, since the Friedmann equations come from the gravitational field dynamics — dictated by Einstein's equations — and the FRW interval, while relation (69) rises solely as a coordinate transformation effect. Its solution is, of course, just Eq.(20):

$$f(t) = A \cosh \frac{t}{L} + \sqrt{A^2 - \kappa L^2} \sinh \frac{t}{L}. \quad (70)$$

The next step is to isolate h' in Eq.(67), and integrate directly, thereby fixing the radial dependence of $h(t, r)$. It is safer to solve for each value of κ separately and afterwards gather the results in a single formula, which is

$$h(t, r) = L \ln \left[\frac{\sqrt{\left(\frac{t}{L}\right)^2 - \kappa} + \frac{t}{L} \sqrt{1 - \kappa r^2}}{\sqrt{1 - \frac{(rf)^2}{L^2}}} \right] + z(t). \quad (71)$$

For the time being, $z(t)$ is arbitrary and \bar{t} is determined up to a function of t , say, $\bar{g}(t) \equiv g(t) + z(t)$. The function $\bar{g}(t)$ will be fixed as soon as we evaluate $\dot{h}(t, r)$. The derivatives of Eq.(71) with respect to t and r , once inserted into Eq.(66), give:

$$\frac{d\bar{g}}{dt} = 0, \quad \text{i.e.,} \quad \bar{g} = g + z = \text{constant} \equiv T. \quad (72)$$

Using Eqs.(70), (71) and (72), Eqs. (64) can be rewritten as

$$\bar{r}(t, r) = ra(t); \quad (73)$$

$$\bar{t}(t, r) = T + L \ln \left[\frac{\sqrt{\left[\frac{a(t)}{L}\right]^2 - \kappa + \frac{a(t)}{L}} \sqrt{1 - \kappa r^2}}{\sqrt{1 - \left[\frac{ra(t)}{L}\right]^2}} \right]. \quad (74)$$

Constant T can be fixed by requiring that these expressions remain non-singular in the limit $L \rightarrow \infty$. This strong requirement comes from two facts: (i) we will study the Inönü -Wigner contraction of the dS symmetry operators into Poincaré generators in both static and comoving coordinates, comparing the results afterwards via (73,74), which, therefore, must hold; (ii) the dS static line element (2) reduces mildly to Minkowski interval in spherical coordinates,

$$ds^2 = d\bar{t}^2 - d\bar{r}^2 - \bar{r}^2 (d\theta^2 + \sin^2 \theta d\phi^2), \quad (75)$$

in limit $L \rightarrow \infty$. If we substitute the dS scale factor (20) in FRW line element (1), what we obtain is the dS interval in comoving coordinates. This form of ds^2 must also reduce to Minkowski interval (75) after taking $L \rightarrow \infty$ and restoring the dimension of length to the (dimensionless) radial comoving coordinate r . To restore the dimension of r means to convert (t, r) into (\bar{t}, \bar{r}) through (73,74) with $L \rightarrow \infty$.

Let us proceed case by case.

- For $\kappa = 0$, $a(t) = Ae^{t/L}$ and (74) is:

$$\bar{t} = T + L \ln \frac{2A}{L} + t - \frac{1}{2}L \ln \left[1 - \frac{r^2}{L^2} (Ae^{t/L})^2 \right] \quad (\kappa = 0). \quad (76)$$

Notice that in the limit $L \rightarrow \infty$ the second term diverges. In order to avoid this singularity, we fix

$$T = -L \ln \frac{2A}{L} \quad (\kappa = 0). \quad (77)$$

This choice is specially convenient, as (76) turns to be exactly the traditional Robertson transformation law (62).

- In the case $\kappa = -1$, if $L \gg 1$,

$$\begin{aligned} \bar{r} &= ra(t), \quad a(t) = (A + t), \\ \bar{t} &= T + a(t) \sqrt{1 + r^2} \quad (L \gg 1, \kappa = -1). \end{aligned} \quad (78)$$

These are exactly the expressions for the coordinate transformation law from Minkowski (barred) coordinates to FRW coordinates. This statement is verified, for example, by repeating the procedures of this section for line elements (75) and (1): start with an ansatz just like (64), then substitute it in (75) to find, after comparison with (1), equations analogous to (65-68), which, by direct integration, lead to (78). This leads to the conclusion that we may take

$$T = 0 \quad (\kappa = -1) \quad (79)$$

without loss of generality. Of course, one might prefer to take another value for T in this case, e.g., $T = -L \ln \left(1 + \frac{2A}{L}\right)$. The only constraint is to avoid functional forms of T that diverge in the limit $L \rightarrow \infty$.

- If $\kappa = +1$ and $L \gg 1$, Eqs.(73,74) reduce to:

$$\begin{aligned}\bar{r} &= r a(t) , \quad a(t) = (A + i t) , \\ \bar{t} &= T + L \ln i - i a(t) \sqrt{1 - \bar{r}^2} \quad (L \gg 1, \kappa = +1) .\end{aligned}\tag{80}$$

The divergence of the second term is prevented by the choice

$$T = -L \ln i \quad (\kappa = +1) .\tag{81}$$

The complex factors turning up are artifacts of the coordinate system (see the comments below Eq.(44), item 3). They reflect our forceful requirement of equality between the FRW line element

$$ds^2 = dt^2 - a^2(t) \left[\frac{dr^2}{1 - r^2} + r^2 (d\theta^2 + \sin^2 \theta d\phi^2) \right] .\tag{82}$$

and the Minkowski interval. Minkowski space is flat, non-compact, while the space section of the line element above is a sphere.

In conclusion, we use the definitions

$$T = L \ln \tau(\kappa) ; \quad \tau(\kappa) = \begin{cases} \frac{L}{2A} , & \kappa = 0 \\ 1 , & \kappa = -1 \\ \frac{1}{i} , & \kappa = +1 \end{cases}\tag{83}$$

and the identity (obvious for the dS solution)

$$\sqrt{\left[\frac{a(t)}{L}\right]^2 - \kappa} = a(t) H(t)\tag{84}$$

to write the final unified form of the generalized transformation as Eq. (34) of the main text.

Notice that what was done in this section differs from the results found in the literature. It does not coincide with the treatments presented, for example, in [21], [22], [23] and [24], but implements in all details the transformation mentioned in [20]. Reference [21] exhibits interval (82) – up to a signature convention and the definition $r = \sin \chi$. However, the expansion parameter it is taken to be $a(t) = L \cosh \frac{t}{L}$, which would correspond to arbitrarily fixing $A = L$ in our solution (20). This would imply that the scale factor is always greater than the dS horizon L . Besides, no transformation between dS static coordinates and comoving ones is given, but only transformations from embedding (5-dimensional) variables to comoving coordinates. Choice $A = L$ is made also in ref. [25], which presents an extensive study of dS geometry in various coordinate systems, including the transformation between the static and the three FRW sections of dS space-time. Nevertheless, those are not exactly the generalized Robertson transformations; not only because of the choice for the value of A , but also in view of the fact that they do not have an appropriate limit when $L \rightarrow \infty$.

References

- [1] J. V. Narlikar, *Introduction to Cosmology* (Cambridge University Press, Cambridge, 1993).
- [2] S. Weinberg, *Gravitation and Cosmology* (J. Wiley, New York, 1972).
- [3] R C Tolman, *Relativity, Thermodynamics and Cosmology* (Dover, New York, 1987).
- [4] F. Gürsey in *Group Theoretical Concepts and Methods in Elementary Particle Physics*, ed. by F. Gürsey, Istanbul Summer School of Theoretical Physics (Gordon and Breach, New York, 1962).

- [5] R. Gilmore, *Lie Groups, Lie Algebras, and Some of Their Applications* (Wiley, New York, 1974).
- [6] L. P. Eisenhart, *Riemannian Geometry* (Princeton University Press, Princeton, 1949).
- [7] E. İnönü in *Group Theoretical Concepts and Methods in Elementary Particle Physics*, ed. by F. Gürsey (ed.), Istanbul Summer School of Theoretical Physics (Gordon and Breach, New York, 1962).
- [8] P. Coles and G. F. R. Ellis, *Is the universe open or closed?* (Cambridge University Press, Cambridge, 1997).
- [9] R. Aldrovandi, R. R. Cuzinatto and L. G. Medeiros, *Analytic solutions for the Λ -FRW model*, Foundations of Physics **36** (2006) 1736-1752; gr-qc/0508073.
- [10] B. Doubrovine, S. Novikov and A. Fomenko, *Géométrie Contemporaine*, 3 vols. (MIR, Moscow, 1979).
- [11] R. Aldrovandi and J. G. Pereira, *An Introduction to Geometrical Physics* (World Scientific, Singapore, 1995).
- [12] Kobayashi S and Nomizu K 1963 *Foundations of Differential Geometry*, vol.1 (New York: Interscience)
- [13] L. D. Landau and E. M. Lifschitz, *The Classical Theory of Fields* (Pergamon Press, Oxford, 1975).
- [14] J. Garecki, *An interesting property of the isotropic and homogeneous cosmological models*, General Relativity and Gravitation **27** (1995) 55.
- [15] See, for example, H. Bacry and J. M. Lévy-Leblond, *Possible kinematics*, Journal of Mathematical Physics **9** (1968) 1605-1614.
- [16] See, for example, R. Aldrovandi, J. P. Beltrán Almeida and J. G. Pereira, *Time-Varying Cosmological Term and the Emergence of a FRW Universe*, Gravitation and Cosmology **11** (2005) 277-283; gr-qc/0312017.
- [17] I. G. Dymnikova, *Inflationary universes from the point of view of general relativity*, Soviet Physics — JETP **63** (1986) 1111.
- [18] R. Aldrovandi, R. R. Cuzinatto and L. G. Medeiros, *Interacting Constituents in Cosmology*, gr-qc/0705.1369v2 (2007).
- [19] R. Aldrovandi, *Gauge theories, and beyond* in T. W. Barret and D. M. Grimes (eds.), *Advanced Electromagnetism: Foundations, Theory and Applications*, World Scientific, Singapore, 1995, ps. 3-51; *Extended Gauge Theories*, Journal of Mathematical Physics **32** (1991) 2503-512; and *Breeding Curvature from Extended Gauge Covariance*, Physics Letters **A155** (1991) 459-63.
- [20] É. B. Gliner, *The vacuum-like state of a medium and Friedman cosmology*, Soviet Physics — DOKLADY **15** (1970) 559.
- [21] S. Hawking and G. Ellis, *The Large Scale Structure of Space and Time* (Cambridge Monographs on Mathematical Physics, New York, 1995).
- [22] E. A. Lord, *Geometry of the De-Sitter universe*, International Journal of Theoretical Physics **9** (1974) 117-127.
- [23] Y. Kim, C. Young Oh and N. Park, *Classical geometry of De Sitter Spacetime: an introductory review*, hep-th/0212326.

- [24] V. Mukhanov, *Physical Foundations of Cosmology* (Cambridge University Press, New York, 2005).
- [25] E. Eriksen and Ø. Grøn, *The de Sitter universe models*, Journal of Modern Physics **D 4** (1995) 115-159.