Junction Conditions and local Spacetimes in General Relativity

Albert Huber*

Institut für theoretische Physik, Technische Universität Wien, Wiedner Hauptstr. 8-10, A-1040 Wien, AUSTRIA

Abstract

In the present work, a theoretical framework focussing on local geometric deformations is introduced in order to cope with the problem of how to join spacetimes with different geometries and physical properties. Within the said framework, it is shown that two Lorentzian manifolds can be matched in agreement with the well-known Darmois-Israel junction conditions by locally deforming the associated spacetime metrics in relation to each other. Based on the insight that metrics can be suitably matched in this way, it is concluded that the underlying geometric approach allows a characterization of local spacetimes in General Relativity or more general theories of gravity.

Key words: general relativity, local spacetimes, junction conditions

Introduction

The General Theory of Relativity, like most of its countless generalizations, is an apparently nonlinear theory of gravity. As such, it is a theory that comprises on the one hand a nonlinear geometric action principle and on the other hand associated nonlinear field equations, both of which are formulated with respect to the nonlinear mathematical framework of Lorentzian geometry.

It is for this reason, in particular, that Einstein's gravitational field equations do not permit a unique solution and that, accordingly, Einstein-Hilbert gravity does not allow for the characterization of a unique preferred geometry of spacetime.

Instead, the theory predicts the existence of a whole series of different exact solutions of the addressed field equations - many of which have been confirmed to be fully consistent with observation. In this vein, General Relativity not only allows for the co-existence, but also for the co-evolution of different types of gravitational fields.

^{*}ahuber@tph.itp.tuwien.ac.at

However, despite explaining a multitude of structural differences of gravitating physical systems existing in nature, this particular aspect of the theory also reveals especially challenging implications.

More precisely, from a purely phenomenological point of view, this aspect of the theory poses the unpleasant task of explaining how the physical behaviour of a given gravitational field changes under structural alterations of the matter source generating these fields, especially in the case where these fluctuations become so strong that they lead to a completely new type of gravitational field with a different geometric structure and inherently different physical properties, as for example in the extreme case of mergers of bodies in *N*-body systems.

From a purely theoretical point of view, in turn, this problem leads to the equally complicated question of how geometrically distinct spacetimes can be joined along a hypersurface separating the respective Lorentzian manifolds.

This matter, in particular, is known to be subject to local junction conditions which require - at least in consideration of the well-established Darmois-Israel formulation - the first and second fundamental forms of given spacetimes to match with each other across a space- or timelike boundary hypersurface [14, 28]. Following [11, 28, 32], this matching has to be given in such a way that the first fundamental forms of the corresponding geometric fields fit one another in a continuous way, whereas the second fundamental forms are allowed to be discontinuous across the hypersurface separating the given Lorentzian manifolds. The condition for this to be the case, however, is the existence of a concentrated, singular matter distribution - a so-called thin shell of matter that happens to form a joint boundary layer for both spacetimes.

Of course, similar junction conditions can also be formulated in the lightlike case [5, 32], where the situation is more sophisticated, but nevertheless manageable. In fact, both the null and the non-null formalisms can even be combined to one formalism known as the general thin shell formalism and associated junction conditions can be formulated, which have to be met regardless of the causal structure of the boundary hypersurface [32, 40, 41].

In view of the said phenomenological problem, the conditions mentioned are essential insofar as they provide the rules for identifying the geometries of the respective gravitational fields in such a way that a transition from one Lorentzian manifold to another becomes possible, thus laying the foundation for the treatment of dynamical quantities across a given boundary hypersurface.

Taking this into account, a typical task in treating spacetime models in General Relativity is to find an appropriate physical setting which allows for the joining of spacetime pairs with different geometries, or, in other words, for the fulfillment of the said junction conditions.

Although the corresponding method by no means presupposes the existence of symmetries of any kind, the respective equations have hitherto been solved only for spacetimes with a high degree of symmetry; that is to say, in the case of spacetimes with either spherical, cylindrical or plane symmetries. In more generic scenarios, such as in case of spacetimes with a lower degree of symmetry like stationary, axisymmetric or even non-stationary spacetimes, not many rigorous results are known to this day. A primary cause of this epistemological deficiency appears to be rooted in the problem of finding spacetime pairs that share locally (but not necessarily globally) compatible geometric structures. This is because the finding of such pairs with identical induced geometries is more of a requirement than a direct part of the thin shell formalism, and therefore has been performed almost exclusively for spacetimes with the mentioned symmetry properties.

An additional cause is the fact that the methods being used to cope with the Darmois-Israel conditions, in spite of leading to appropriate local discontinuities in the curvature of respective gravitational fields (at most 'delta-like'singularities), in many different cases, fail to deliver physically feasible predictions that could be in agreement with the dynamics of the continuous theory. The usual reason for this drawback is the fact that the corresponding methods lead to concentrated, singular gravitational source terms that often do not obey any of the relevant energy conditions, which clearly diminishes their phenomenological and physical relevance.

In conclusion, there appears to be a need for a more reliable geometric framework toward junction conditions which allows for a better selection of pairs of geometrically compatible metric fields and a better distinguishability of physical and non-physical gravitational source terms in spacetime gluing approaches.

In response to that fact, the aim of a major part of this work is to provide a simple geometric framework that endeavors to avoid the aforementioned technical and conceptual difficulties.

The key difference between this model and former approaches to the subject is the fact that, in the present case, the transition of one spacetime to the other is viewed as a dynamical deformation process. This idea is formally realized by considering a given deformed geometry in relation to an associated reference background geometry and showing that the effect of the deformation completely subsides if appropriate boundary conditions, which follow from the addressed junction conditions, are imposed.

Based on the fact that each spacetime metric is determinable relative to another metric by specifying a suitable deformation term, and that it is also possible to restrict oneself only to those deformations that have compact support (or go to zero in a suitable limit) in an embedded subregion of the Lorentzian manifold of an associated ambient spacetime, the respective geometric framework allows for a rigorous characterization of local spacetime geometries in agreement with the addressed junction conditions. This characterization of the bounded local spacetime geometries is based on considering pairs of exact solutions of the field equations of the theory and on imposing suitable boundary conditions on their metrics, which will be clarified by means of a few particular examples. Although these examples deal almost exclusively with specific types of spacetimes and specific types of deformations to be discussed in the third and final section of this work, it can be expected that the introduced framework can be applied to much more general physical settings that could provide more general local geometric fields that still have to be discovered.

1 Junction Conditions and Gluings of Spacetimes

In Einstein's General Theory of Relativity, the situation quite often occurs that two spacetime partitions $(\mathcal{M}^{\pm}, g^{\pm})$ with two associated Lorentzian manifolds $\mathcal{M}^{\pm} = \mathcal{M}^{\pm} \cup \partial \mathcal{M}^{\pm}$ are given, which are bounded by a hypersurface Σ that forms a part of the boundary of both spacetimes, so that $\Sigma \subset \partial \mathcal{M}^{\pm}$ applies. Given this situation, the question typically arises as to whether or not both spacetimes can be 'combined' into an ambient spacetime (\mathcal{M}, g) , whose manifold is the union of the manifolds of the individual parts such that $\mathcal{M} \equiv \mathcal{M}^+ \cup \mathcal{M}^-$.

A relatively straightforward method that allows one to deal with this question and thus solve the underlying geometric problem is the method of gluing spacetimes together across a boundary hypersurface $\Sigma \equiv \partial M^+ \cap \partial M^-$, using the so-called thin shell formalism [5, 11, 28, 32, 37, 40, 41].

According to this method, which has a rich history and important applications in General Relativity, it is usually assumed that an ambient spacetime (\mathcal{M}, g) with above-mentioned properties is given, i.e. a spacetime with Lorentzian manifold $M = M^+ \cup \Sigma \cup M^-$ and metric g_{ab} , which reduces to the metrics g_{ab}^{\pm} in M^{\pm} . As a basis for this, it is further assumed that there is a restricted C^2 -metric $g_{ab}^+ = g_{ab}|_{M^+}$ associated with the part (\mathcal{M}^+, g^+) and another C^2 -metric $g_{ab}^- = g_{ab}|_{M^-}$ associated with (\mathcal{M}^-, g^-) , respectively; parts, in relation to which the metric g_{ab} of the ambient spacetime (\mathcal{M}, g) can be decomposed in the form

$$g_{ab} = \theta g_{ab}^{+} + (1 - \theta) g_{ab}^{-}, \tag{1}$$

where θ is the Heavyside step function. This step function is usually assumed to take a value of one half for points lying on Σ , a value of one for points lying in M^+ and a value of zero for points lying in M^- . This makes sense as long as it is ensured that the ambient metric is continuous across the layer, which implies that (in appropriate coordinates) it must apply that

$$[g_{ab}] = 0, (2)$$

where $[g_{ab}] \equiv \lim_{\substack{x \xrightarrow{M^+} x_0}} g_{ab}^+(x) - \lim_{\substack{x \xrightarrow{M^-} x_0}} g_{ab}^-(x)$ applies for all $x_0 \in \Sigma$.

To provide a coordinate independent description in this context, it is only natural to use a formalism that is compatible with the intrinsic geometric structure of the boundary portion Σ . However, since such a description cannot be independent of the causal structure of Σ , it seems convenient to first closely pursue the most essential ideas of the so-called general (or mixed) thin shell formalism developed in [32], not least because said formalism, unlike previous approaches to the subject, allows the treatment of the current physical problem of joining pairs of spacetimes with different geometries without having to fix the geometric character of the boundary portion Σ . Rather, Σ can very well be null somewhere in spacetime and non-null elsewhere.

To enable such treatment of the problem, the formalism takes advantage of the fact that a pair of normal vector fields ζ^a_{\pm} exists on each side of the layer Σ such that ζ_{\pm}^{a} points toward M^{+} and ζ_{\pm}^{a} points outwards from M^{-} . In addition, the fact is exploited that - regardless of the causal structure of the boundary portion - bases of vector fields $\{E_{\rho}^{a}\}$ can be chosen in $T(\Sigma)$ with $\rho = 1, 2, 3$ as well as associated co-bases $\{e_{a}^{\rho}\}$ in $T^{*}(\Sigma)$ such that $e_{a}^{\rho}E_{\sigma}^{a} = \delta_{\sigma}^{\rho}$, $\zeta_{\pm}^{a}e_{a}^{\rho} = 0$ and $g_{ab}^{\pm}|_{\Sigma}E_{\rho}^{a}E_{\sigma}^{a} = g_{ab}^{\pm}|_{\Sigma}E_{\rho}^{a}E_{\sigma}^{a}$. Furthermore, it is observed that there is a pair of vector fields ξ_{\pm}^{\pm} , usually called rigging vector fields, and an associated pair of co-vector fields ξ_{\pm}^{a} such that $\xi_{a}^{\pm}\zeta_{\pm}^{a} = -1$ and $\xi_{\pm}^{\pm}E_{\rho}^{a} = 0$. The corresponding rigging vector fields are fixed in this context by demanding $g_{ab}|_{\Sigma}\xi_{\pm}^{a}E_{\rho}^{b} = g_{ab}|_{\Sigma}\xi_{-}^{a}E_{\rho}^{b} \equiv g_{ab}|_{\Sigma}\xi_{\pm}^{a}E_{\rho}^{b}$ and $g_{ab}|_{\Sigma}\xi_{\pm}^{a}\xi_{\pm}^{a} = g_{ab}|_{\Sigma}\xi_{-}^{a}\xi_{-}^{a}$, so that the two bases on the tangent spaces $\{\xi_{\pm}^{a}, E_{\rho}^{a}\} \equiv \{\xi^{a}, E_{\rho}^{a}\}$ are identified and the (\pm) can be dropped. The two one-forms ζ_{a}^{\pm} are automatically identified as well, so that $\{\zeta_{a}^{\pm}, e_{\alpha}^{a}\} \equiv \{\zeta_{a}, e_{a}^{a}\}$. Consequently, it then turns out to be possible to construct a projector of the type $o_{a}^{c} = \delta_{a}^{c} + \zeta^{c}\xi_{a}$ with the properties $o_{a}^{c}o_{b}^{a} = o_{b}^{c}$ and $o_{a}^{c}\xi^{a} = o_{a}^{c}\zeta_{c} = 0$, which can be used as a projector onto Σ .

With these definitions at hand, the difference (or jump) of any object from the + or the - sides of Σ can be specified. In particular, any (m, n)-tensor field with definite limits on Σ from M^{\pm} (regardless of whether it is discontinuous across Σ or not) can be split up in a +-part and a --part , so that

$$T^{a_1 a_2 \dots a_m}_{b_1 b_2 \dots b_n} = \theta T^{+a_1 a_2 \dots a_m}_{b_1 b_2 \dots b_n} + (1 - \theta) T^{-a_1 a_2 \dots a_m}_{b_1 b_2 \dots b_n}.$$
(3)

The covariant derivative of the same object then reads

$$\nabla_c T^{a_1 a_2 \dots a_m}_{\ b_1 b_2 \dots b_n} = \theta \nabla_c^+ T^{+a_1 a_2 \dots a_m}_{\ b_1 b_2 \dots b_n} + (1-\theta) \nabla_c^- T^{-a_1 a_2 \dots a_m}_{\ b_1 b_2 \dots b_n} + \delta_c [T^{a_1 a_2 \dots a_m}_{\ b_1 b_2 \dots b_n}],$$
(4)

where $[T^{a_1a_2...a_m}_{b_1b_2...b_n}] \equiv \lim_{\substack{x \xrightarrow{M^+}{\to} x_0}} T^{+a_1a_2...a_m}_{b_1b_2...b_n}(x) - \lim_{\substack{x \xrightarrow{M^-}{\to} x_0}} T^{-a_1a_2...a_m}_{b_1b_2...b_n}(x)$ applies for all $x_0 \in \Sigma$ and $\delta_c \equiv \zeta_c \delta$ is a vector-valued distribution constructed from Dirac's delta distribution $\delta = \delta(x)$.

The situation with the partial derivative of objects is similar, so that one comes to the conclusion that although the metric is continuous across Σ , its derivatives, and thus the corresponding connections, are allowed to be discontinuous. In fact, it is found in this context

$$[\partial_c g_{ab}] = 2 \cdot \zeta_c \gamma_{ab} \tag{5}$$

and therefore

$$[\Gamma^a_{bc}] = \gamma^a_b \zeta_c + \gamma^a_c \zeta_b - \gamma_{bc} \zeta^a.$$
(6)

The associated Riemann tensor then is of the form

$$R^a_{bcd} = \theta R^{+a}_{bcd} + (1-\theta) R^{-a}_{bcd} + \delta H^a_{bcd},\tag{7}$$

where δ is the Dirac delta distribution and H^a_{bcd} represents the singular part of the curvature tensor distribution, which is explicitly given by $H^a_{bcd} = \frac{1}{2} (\gamma^a_d \zeta_b \zeta_c - \gamma^a_c \zeta_b \zeta_d + \gamma_{bc} \zeta^a \zeta_d - \gamma_{bd} \zeta^a \zeta_c)$.

Given this definition, the said approach allows for a generalized formulation of Einstein's field equations in a distributional sense, which leads to a distributional Einstein tensor of the form

$$G_b^a = \theta G_b^{+a} + (1 - \theta) G_b^{-a} + \delta \cdot \rho_b^a, \qquad (8)$$

where $\rho_b^a = H_b^a - \frac{1}{2} \delta_b^a H$ (with $H \equiv g^{ab}|_{\Sigma} H_{ab}$) is a symmetric covariant tensor field defined only at points of the hypersurface Σ . The associated stress-energy tensor, on the other hand, has to possess the form

$$T_b^a = \theta T_b^{+a} + (1 - \theta) T_b^{-a} + \delta \cdot \tau_b^a.$$

$$\tag{9}$$

Of course, many more important expressions could be listed and many more intrinsic equations or general properties of the formalism could be formulated at this stage. However, the focus of attention shall now be shifted to the issue of how to specify within said formalism those special cases in which parts of Σ are either null or non-null, that is, either null or spacelike or timelike.

In the latter cases, where portions of the thin shell are allowed to be nonnull, the above general formalism traces back to the Darmois-Israel method, which is based on a 3 + 1-decomposition of spacetime. The geometric setting used in this method is essentially the same as that of the general formalism mentioned above, with the only exception being that it is additionally required a priori that the ambient spacetime (\mathcal{M}, g) admit a foliation in either spacelike or timelike hypersurfaces and a boundary portion Σ (with fixed causal structure) that can be embedded in said foliation of spacetime. This additional restriction of the geometry of spacetime allows the consideration of a congruence of curves generated by a normalized vector field n^a that is necessarily orthogonal to Σ and therefore fulfills $n_a n^a = \epsilon$ and $\nabla_{[c} n_{a]} = 0$ with $\epsilon = \pm 1$. This normal vector field (and its associated co-normal) can then be used to define the first and second fundamental forms $h_{ab} = g_{ab} + \epsilon n_a n_b$ and $K_{ab} = h_a^c h_b^d \nabla_{(c} n_{d)}$.

In order to find the corresponding shell equations and to guarantee that the spacetime partitions $(\mathcal{M}^{\pm}, g^{\pm})$ can be 'combined' to the ambient spacetime (\mathcal{M},q) in the given case, however, it must be ensured that the said pair of spacetimes exhibits spacelike or timelike foliations compatible to that of the ambient spacetime (\mathcal{M}, g) . Essentially, this means that pairs of either timelike or spacelike generating vector fields n_{\pm}^a with the properties $n_a^{\pm} n_{\pm}^a = \epsilon$ and $\nabla_{[c}^{\pm} n_{a]}^{\pm} = 0$ must exist, which can be appropriately identified across the shell in a manner similar to the general formalism. By definition, these vector fields have to be orthogonal to the respective first and second fundamental forms $h_{ab}^{\pm} = g_{ab}^{\pm} + \epsilon n_a^{\pm} n_b^{\pm}$ and $K_{ab}^{\pm} = h_a^{\pm c} h_b^{\pm d} \nabla_{(c}^{\pm} n_d^{\pm})$ on the shell Σ , where it must be assumed, in order to obtain well-defined distributional field equations, that the three-metrics of the spacetime partitions are, at least, continuous across Σ , so that $[h_{ab}] = 0$ is valid; although $[K_{ab}] = 0$ does not necessarily have to apply in this context. The corresponding shell equations then yield conditions for matching the Cauchy data $(h_{ab}^{\pm}, K_{ab}^{\pm})$ of the bounded spacetimes $(\mathcal{M}^{\pm}, g^{\pm})$ in such a way across Σ that they are consistent with the Cauchy data (h_{ab}, K_{ab}) of the ambient spacetime (\mathcal{M}, g) . These shell equations result directly from the general formalism discussed above if one sets $\xi_a \equiv \epsilon n_a$, $\zeta^a \equiv n^a$, $o^c_a \equiv h^c_a =$ $\delta^c_a + \epsilon n^c n_a$ and $\gamma_{ab} = \epsilon [K_{ab}]$ in relations (5-9), thus proving the fact that said formalism actually contains the Darmois-Israel framework as a special case.

Accordingly, in order to avoid the existence of ill-defined singular contributions to the field equations in this context, it must be required that the pairs of first and the second fundamental forms associated with pairs of spacetimes $(\mathcal{M}^{\pm}, g^{\pm})$ satisfy the junction conditions of Darmois and Israel

$$[h_{ab}] = 0 \tag{10}$$

and

$$[K_{ab}] = 8\pi\epsilon(\tau_{ab} - \frac{1}{2}h_{ab}\tau); \tag{11}$$

conditions which represent, in a quite generic way, geometrically necessary requirements for the identification of Lorentzian manifolds in all those geometric models which are based on a 3 + 1-decomposition of spacetime.

Note that the former condition (10) is sometimes called the preliminary junction condition, whereas the latter junction relation (11), which characterizes a singular and confined stress-energy tensor distribution located entirely in Σ , is sometimes called Lanczos-Israel relation. It is also worth noting that even though the given approach is formulated in a coordinate-independent manner, it still leads back to alternative formulations of junction conditions, for example those given by Lichnerowicz or O'Brian and Synge in case of the special choice of so-called admissible coordinates on both sides of the layer [28].

Furthermore, there is also the case that Σ is locally null; a case that seems to require a more deliberate approach than the traditional non-null description of the problem not least due to the fact that the first fundamental form is degenerate on a null hypersurface and the associated null normal is not only orthogonal but also tangential to it. Nevertheless, assuming the existence of two pairs of null congruences generated by a pair of lightlike vector fields l^a and k^a that are orthogonal to a spacelike two-slice $S \subset \Sigma$, it turns out that the general formalism is versatile enough to include said special case as well; giving rise to the same shell equations previously found in [5]. These equations can be obtained from expressions (5–9) if the choice $\xi_a \equiv l_a$, $\zeta^a \equiv k^a$ and $o_a^c = \delta_a^c + k^c l_a$ is made in this context and a covariant symmetric two-form $\mathcal{H}_{ab} = 2o_a^c o_b^d \nabla_{(c} l_{d)}$ is specified, which (in the continuous null limit of the Darmois-Israel framework) has the same jump discontinuity features as the extrinsic curvature across Σ . More precisely, while in the non-null case generically one has $\gamma_{bc} \equiv \epsilon[K_{bc}]$, in the lightlike case, where there is a different geometric setting, one has $\gamma_{ab} \equiv [\mathcal{H}_{ab}]$. With regard to this specific quantity, which shall be called Mars-Senovilla twoform from now on, the above series of junction relations turns into

$$\left[\mathcal{H}_{ab}\right] = 0\tag{12}$$

and therefore becomes, in contrast to the non-null case in which the right hand side is non-vanishing, a trivial set of relations; relations that guarantee that the Einstein tensor of the geometry contains no singular part proportional to Dirac's delta distribution (and thus no surface layer). However, as shown in [32], these junction relations can actually be relaxed in the given null case by requiring that the respective Mars-Senovilla two-forms meet the conditions

$$[\mathcal{H}_{ab}]k^b = [\mathcal{H}] = 0, \tag{13}$$

which also guarantee that the singular part of the curvature tensor distribution vanishes identically.

Anyhow, junction conditions do not necessarily have to be based on a 3 + 1-decomposition of spacetime; they also have been formulated in the 2 + 2-framework toward General Relativity or in space-time approaches that are based on a 1 + 1 + 2-decomposition of spacetime.

In particular, as shown by Penrose in [35], junction conditions can be formulated (in a coordinate dependent manner) which are based on a dual null foliation of spacetime in spacelike surfaces. These conditions form the basis of Penrose's now infamous cut-and-paste method, which provides the formal basis for the description of gravitational shock wave spacetimes in General Relativity and turns out to be closely related to the thin shell framework in specific applications.

Besides that, in order to characterize boundary portions that possess a 'corner' or a 'sharp edge', another set of junction relations has been formulated in the literature in the past [22]. For the purpose of formulating said conditions, a timelike generating vector field n^a and a spacelike one u^a associated with respective timelike and spacelike congruences have been considered, which yield spacelike and timelike foliations and thus a 1+1+2-decomposition of spacetime. Based on the existence of said foliations, the fact was exploited that the spacetime metric g_{ab} can be decomposed in the form $g_{ab} = -n_a n_b + h_{ab} = u_a u_b + \gamma_{ab}$ with $h_{ab} = q_{ab} + s_a s_b$ and $\gamma_{ab} = q_{ab} - v_a v_b$, respectively, where s^a and v^a are spacelike and timelike unit normals orthogonal to n^a and u^a and q_{ab} is the induced Riemannian metric on a spacelike two-slice $S \subset \Sigma$. Due to the fact that the given vector fields n^a and u^a are not assumed to be normalized with respect to each other in this context, it then typically turns out that one has to deal (in the case of a spacelike joint) with a non-vanishing edge 'angle' $\Theta = \cos^{-1}((n, u))$ in such approaches. This non-vanishing quantity has been shown to lead to jump discontinuities and therefore to an additional set of junction conditions given by

$$[\Theta]q_{ab} = \mathcal{T}_{ab},\tag{14}$$

where \mathcal{T}_{ab} is the stress-energy tensor restricted to S.

Taking into account this whole set of different conditions, the remainder of the present work will address the problem of joining different spacetimes from a slightly different point of view, namely by using metric deformations leading to pairs of geometrically compatible spacetimes. By restricting the support properties of the respective metric deformations, it is shown how this approach trivially allows for the introduction of the concept of local spacetime fields in relation to a fixed ambient geometry of spacetime.

2 Local Geometries and Deformations of Spacetime

In order to approach now the subject of joining different spacetime manifolds from a different point of view, two different spacetime partitions $(\mathcal{M}^{\pm}, g^{\pm})$ of an ambient spacetime (\mathcal{M}, g) shall once more be considered. These partitions, as before, shall be assumed to be bounded by a hypersurface Σ which forms a part of the boundary of both spacetimes such that $\Sigma \subset \partial M^{\pm}$ applies.

Without any further assumptions about the geometric structures of both of the spacetimes $(\mathcal{M}^{\pm}, g^{\pm})$, both fields are allowed to exhibit totally different geometric properties anywhere except for their boundary, where, by the introduced junction conditions, both spacetimes have to possess identical induced geometries.

To that end, in order to obtain a well-defined connected manifold $\mathcal{M} = \mathcal{M}^+ \cup \mathcal{M}^-$, it is necessary to pointwise identify said spacetime partitions along the boundary portion Σ . This can always be achieved by noticing that the metrics of the respective local spacetimes can be locally deformed with respect to each other in such a way that the associated induced metrics and their first derivatives coincide at Σ . This is possible not least because any given change of one spacetime geometry with respect to another can be characterized by a deformation of metrics, where deformation in this context means any backreaction that changes the geometric properties of a given spacetime metric with respect to an associated background metric and a given class or group of deformation fields that propagate geometrically consistent on that background.

To make this final statement precise, let g_{ab} be a fundamental metric field associated with the ambient spacetime (\mathcal{M}, g) with the manifold structure $\mathcal{M} = \mathcal{M}^+ \cup \mathcal{M}^-$. Considering the tensor deformations

$$g_{ab} = g_{ab}^{\pm} + e_{ab}^{\pm} \tag{15}$$

and

$$g^{ab} = g^{\pm ab} + f^{\pm ab},$$
 (16)

one can certainly make the assignments $g_{ab}^{\pm}(x^{\pm}) = g_{ab}^{\pm}(g(x))|_{x=x^{\pm}}$ and $g^{\pm ab}(x^{\pm}) = g^{\pm ab}(g(x))|_{x=x^{\pm}}$. The corresponding expressions $g_{ab}^{\pm} = g_{ab} - e_{ab}^{\pm}$ and $g^{\pm ab} = g^{ab} - f^{\pm ab}$ then yield globally well-defined tensor fields on \mathcal{M} , which, however, do not represent a metric and an inverse metric, respectively. This holds true unless it is required that the corresponding deformation fields e_{ab}^{\pm} and $f^{\pm ab}$ vanish somewhere in a local subregion of the ambient manifold \mathcal{M} , in which case the tensor fields g_{ab}^{\pm} locally coincide with the metric g_{ab} of the spacetime (\mathcal{M}, g) . However, this implies that, as long as the tensor fields e_{ab}^{\pm} and $f^{\pm ab}$ are defined in such a way that they vanish globally in $\mathcal{M}^{\pm} \subseteq \mathcal{M}$, which is certainly the case if said fields have compact supports lying in the complements $\mathcal{M} \setminus \mathcal{M}^{\pm}$ of the Lorentzian manifolds \mathcal{M}^{\pm} , the tensor fields g_{ab}^{\pm} represent well-defined metric fields, but only within the local regions \mathcal{M}^{\pm} . 'Outside' these regions, however, they are just tensor fields, so that it can be concluded that the pairs

 $(\mathcal{M}^{\pm}, g^{\pm})$ define pairs of *local spacetimes*, i.e. pairs of spacetimes whose metrics g_{ab}^{\pm} represent well-defined tensor fields on (\mathcal{M}, g) , which coincide locally with the 'correct' metric of the ambient spacetime (\mathcal{M}, g) . However, this is the case if and only if appropriate boundary conditions on the fields e_{ab}^{\pm} or $f^{\pm ab}$ are imposed; boundary conditions that have to ensure the spacetime partitions $(\mathcal{M}^{\pm}, g^{\pm})$ can pointwise be joined along Σ .

And although it can already be guessed that these boundary conditions will require that the fields e_{ab}^{\pm} and $f^{\pm ab}$ match exactly at Σ and have compact support in $\mathcal{M} \setminus \{\mathcal{M}^{\pm} \setminus \Sigma\}$, it may be worthwhile to carefully determine these conditions step by step with regard to the set of junction conditions discussed in the previous section.

To do so, it shall first be noted that the introduced splitting contains the distributional splitting $g_{ab} = \theta g_{ab}^+ + (1 - \theta) g_{ab}^-$ as a special case. This can easily be realized by taking into account that either the components of g_{ab}^+ or that of g_{ab}^- can always be added to and subtracted from the given expression in an appropriate chart, so that the information that there is another local metric field on (\mathcal{M}, g) now happens to be encoded in the structure of the introduced, a priori unknown deformation fields e_{ab}^{\pm} .

At first sight, such a revision definitely appears to be artificial. However, it shows that the geometric framework discussed so far is in full agreement with that of the previous section, so that it can be concluded that the junction conditions previously mentioned can be used as a template to impose boundary conditions on the local deformation fields e_{ab}^{\pm} and $f^{\pm ab}$. Actually, it even turns out in this regard that the geometric approach to be developed contains the thin shell formalism as a special case and therefore offers a broader range of methods for joining spacetimes in General Relativity. This is not least because said approach provides the advantage that the problem of joining a pair of local spacetimes $(\mathcal{M}^{\pm}, g^{\pm})$ with respect to a given ambient spacetime (\mathcal{M}, g) reduces to the problem of determining appropriate deformation fields (possibly of compact support) on (\mathcal{M}, g) . From a purely physical point of view, the presented framework thus includes a mechanism for generating local geometric structures within a spacetime, thus providing a natural approach to deal with specific ramifications that need to be addressed in dealing with the junction conditions described in the previous section.

In this context, however, it is important to note that neither e_{ab}^{\pm} nor $f^{\pm ab}$ are assumed to be small and that both pairs of objects define a whole class of tensor deformations which in principle can become arbitrarily large, so that for a given vector field w^a , which is causal with regard to one of the background metrics g_{ab}^{\pm} , there is no need for it to be causal with regard to the other background metric g_{ab}^{\mp} or the full metric g_{ab} in the complement $\mathcal{M} \setminus \mathcal{M}^{\pm}$ of \mathcal{M}^{\pm} . However, in the opposite case, the deformations may also become arbitrarily small, so that they become the subject of relativistic perturbation theory.

In any case, the given triple of metrics has to remain subject to the metrical consistency conditions

$$g_{ab}g^{bc} = \delta_a^{\ c},\tag{17}$$

which, since they are assumed to hold globally on (\mathcal{M}, q) , can be brought into the form

$$e_a^{\pm b} + f_a^{\pm b} + e_a^{\pm c} f_c^{\pm b} = 0.$$
(18)

This form of the relation can be deduced from the fact that the fundamental metric field g_{ab} of the ambient spacetime (\mathcal{M}, g) can be decomposed with respect to the metrics of the local spacetimes $(\mathcal{M}^{\pm}, g^{\pm})$ and vice versa, so that the tensor fields $e_a^{\pm b} := e_{ac}^{\pm} g^{\pm cb} = e_{ac}^{\pm} (g^{cb} - f^{\pm cb})$ and $f_a^{\pm b} := g_{ac}^{\pm} f^{\pm cb} = (g_{ab} - e_{ab}^{\pm}) f^{\pm cb}$ can be identified as tensor fields on the ambient spacetime.

If the given metrical consistency condition can be fulfilled, there holds in fact $g^{\pm bc} := (g^{\pm -1})^{bc}$, which allows one to determine the difference tensors $C_{bc}^{\pm a} = \frac{1}{2}(g^{\pm ad} + f^{\pm ad})(\nabla_b^{\pm}e_{dc}^{\pm} + \nabla_c^{\pm}e_{bd}^{\pm} - \nabla_d^{\pm}e_{bc}^{\pm})$ with regard to the unique Levi-Civita connection defined on (\mathcal{M}, g) . According to these unique fixings, the deformed Riemann tensors then take the well-known form

$$R^{a}_{bcd} = R^{\pm a}_{bcd} + E^{\pm a}_{bcd}, \tag{19}$$

where $E_{bcd}^{\pm a} = 2\nabla_{[c}^{\pm}C_{d]b}^{\pm a} + 2C_{e[c}^{\pm a}C_{d]b}^{\pm e}$. By contracting indices, one finds that the associated Ricci tensors are of the form

$$R_{bd} = R_{bd}^{\pm} + E_{bd}^{\pm}, \tag{20}$$

where, of course, $E_{bd}^{\pm} = 2\nabla_{[a}^{\pm}C_{d]b}^{\pm a} + 2C_{e[a}^{\pm a}C_{d]b}^{\pm e}$. By repeating that procedure, the associated Ricci scalars

$$R = R^{\pm} + g^{\pm bd} E^{\pm}_{bd} + f^{\pm bd} R^{\pm}_{bd} + f^{\pm bd} E^{\pm}_{bd}$$
(21)

can be obtained. However, as a direct consequence, Einstein's equations

$$G_{ab} = 8\pi T_{ab} \tag{22}$$

read

$$G_{ab}^{\pm} + \rho_{ab}^{\pm} = 8\pi T_{ab}, \tag{23}$$

after being decomposed with respect to the local metrics of $(\mathcal{M}^{\pm}, g^{\pm})$; at least provided that $\rho_{ab}^{\pm} = \psi_{ab}^{\pm} - \frac{1}{2}g_{ab}^{\pm}(f^{\pm cd}R_{cd}^{\pm} + f^{\pm cd}E_{cd}^{\pm}) - \frac{1}{2}e_{ab}^{\pm}(R^{\pm} + f^{\pm cd}R_{cd}^{\pm} + g^{\pm cd}E_{cd}^{\pm})$ with $\psi_{ab}^{\pm} = E_{ab}^{\pm} - \frac{1}{2}g_{ab}^{\pm}(g^{\pm cd}E_{cd}^{\pm})$ holds in the given context. If the given equations reduce to the restricted local Einstein equations $G_{ab}^{\pm} = Q_{ab}^{\pm} - Q_{ab}^{\pm}(g^{\pm cd}E_{cd}^{\pm})$

 $8\pi T_{ab}^{\pm}$ on $(\mathcal{M}^{\pm}, g^{\pm})$, it becomes clear that the remaining equations

$$\rho_{ab}^{\pm} = 8\pi \tau_{ab}^{\pm},\tag{24}$$

have to be determined independently in agreement with the introduced junction conditions, where, of course, $\tau_{ab}^{\pm} := T_{ab} - T_{ab}^{\pm}$ applies in the given context. In consideration of these facts and definitions, the problem of satisfying the

previously addressed junction conditions can be translated into the problem of selecting appropriate local deformation tensors and gradients of such on different local subregions of (\mathcal{M}, g) , whereas care has to be taken to ensure that the resulting curvature fields exhibit a decent physical interpretation at the end.

To ensure this, and thus to treat models of physical interest, it makes sense to focus exclusively on deformation fields according to which appropriate energy conditions are fulfilled on (\mathcal{M}, g) . To be more precise, it makes sense to assume that the corresponding stress-energy fields fulfill at least the weak energy condition [21] on (\mathcal{M}, g) and thus to require the positivity of energy of the considered matter fields.

By requiring this, it is ensured that the resulting confined stress-energy tensor is well-defined from a physical point of view. Moreover, it is ensured that the same conditions locally hold on $(\mathcal{M}^{\pm}, g^{\pm})$. If this is actually the case, one finds

$$T^{\pm}_{ab}v^a v^b \ge 0, \tag{25}$$

for all future directed timelike vectors v^a . As a further step one can then also try to fulfill stronger energy conditions, whose validity, however, cannot be guaranteed in every physical situation of interest.

To proceed, it may next be noted in this regard that important subclasses of the introduced class of metric deformations can be selected by requiring either

$$f^{\pm ab} = -e^{\pm ab} \tag{26}$$

or

$$e_{ab}^{\pm} = f^{\pm ab} = e^{\pm ab} = 0. \tag{27}$$

While metric deformations fulfilling the former conditions, containing the theory of metric perturbations as a special case, shall from now on be referred to as linear, deformations which globally fulfill the latter conditions, on the other hand, from now on shall be referred to as trivial deformations.

In case of trivial deformations, obviously no change of the geometric structure results. In case of linear deformations, on the other hand, the introduced system of equations considerably simplifies, as, for example, the metrical consistency condition reduces to

$$e_a^{\pm c} e_c^{\pm b} = 0. (28)$$

Additionally, the form of any of the introduced fields considerably simplifies due to the fact that now they can be built from one single field that is non-zero only in the complement of \mathcal{M}^{\pm} .

Coming back to the sought boundary conditions, the first junction condition of the Darmois-Israel framework, which requires

$$[h_{ab}] = 0 \tag{29}$$

to be met, is certainly satisfied if there holds

$$[e_{ab}] = [f^{ab}] = 0 \tag{30}$$

on Σ .

With that being said, a quite natural way of dealing with the addressed conditions is to seek local tensor fields e_{ab}^{\pm} and $f^{\pm cb}$ with the property that all their components possess compact support in $\mathcal{M} \setminus \{\mathcal{M}^{\pm} \setminus \Sigma\}$. This then implies that if one expands the fields in terms of the tetrad fields e_a^{μ} and E_{μ}^{a} with $\mu = 0, ..., 3$ of the ambient metric g_{ab} of (\mathcal{M}, g) , which yields in the most general case the expressions $e_{ab}^{\pm} = c_1^{\pm} e_{(a}^0 e_{b)}^0 + c_2^{\pm} e_{(a}^0 e_{b)}^1 + ...$ and $f^{\pm ab} = d_1^{\pm} E_0^{(a} E_0^{b)} + d_2^{\pm} E_0^{(a} E_1^{b)} + ...$, the imposed junction conditions automatically can be fulfilled if $supp c_i^{\pm}$, $supp d_i^{\pm} \equiv \mathcal{M} \setminus \{\mathcal{M}^{\pm} \setminus \Sigma\}$. Hence, the problem of fulfilling the addressed junction conditions, in the given context, reduces to the problem of finding appropriate local coefficients c_i^{\pm} and d_i^{\pm} which do possess the desired support properties and thus allow to join (\mathcal{M}^+, g^+) and (\mathcal{M}^-, g^-) across Σ .

And although these restrictions on the geometric structure of the deformation fields e_{ab}^{\pm} and $f^{\pm cb}$ are strong enough to meet either condition (12) or, in particular, conditions (10) and (11) in the case that parts of Σ are non-null or condition (13) in the case that other parts of Σ are null, it should be clear that in many cases of interest the addressed coefficients will not coincide with ordinary smooth functions, but will rather possess a distributional character that ought to be determined with the aid of the framework of Colombeau's theory of generalized functions [12, 13].

However, since this can lead to very serious ramifications in practice, it appears to be an interesting alternative idea to consider local coefficients c_i^{\pm} and d_i^{\pm} which vanish at Σ in a specific limit such that either $e_{ab}^+ \rightarrow e_{ab}^-$ as $c_i^+, d_i^+ \rightarrow c_i^-, d_i^-$ or even $e_{ab}^{\pm} \rightarrow 0$ as $c_i^{\pm}, d_i^{\pm} \rightarrow 0$. The main specificity of this approach is then that no longer the boundary conditions

$$[e_{ab}] = [f^{ab}] = 0, \ [C^a_{bc}] = 0 \tag{31}$$

hold, but rather the alternative conditions

$$[e_{ab}] = [f^{ab}] = 0, \ [C^a_{bc}] \neq 0 \tag{32}$$

are found to be valid, whereas the validity of the latter type of conditions may culuminate in a change of the structure of the field equations of the theory.

In this context, however, it proves to be of great relevance in which way the components of the local deformation tensors are specified in (\mathcal{M}, g) . In concrete terms, it proves to be relevant for the action principle of the theory, or, so to speak, for the structure of the Einstein-Hilbert action of spacetime. In the case that the ambient spacetime (\mathcal{M}, g) exhibits a boundary ∂M without edges or corners, this action is simply given by

$$S[g] = \int_{M} R\omega_g + \int_{\Sigma}^{\Sigma'} K\omega_h, \qquad (33)$$

where Σ and Σ' are spacelike hypersurfaces and $\omega_g \equiv \sqrt{-g}d^4x$ is the four-volume element and $\omega_h \equiv \sqrt{h}d^3x$ is the three-volume element of spacetime. If the same

boundary ∂M of the ambient spacetime, on the other hand, does indeed contain a sharp edge or corner, its action alternatively can be specified by Hayward's action [9, 22]

$$S[g] = \int_{M} R\omega_g + \int_{\Sigma}^{\Sigma'} K\omega_h + \int_{\mathcal{B}} \tilde{K}\omega_\gamma + \int_{\Omega}^{\Omega'} \sinh^{-1} \eta\omega_q, \qquad (34)$$

where $\omega_h \equiv \sqrt{h}d^3x$, $\omega_\gamma \equiv \sqrt{-\gamma}dtd^2x$ and $\omega_q \equiv \sqrt{q}d^2x$ are volume forms associated with the individual parts of the boundary ∂M of (\mathcal{M}, g) , which consists of two spacelike hypersurfaces Σ and Σ' and a timelike hypersurface \mathcal{B} , which intersects the spacelike hypersurfaces Σ and Σ' in Ω and Ω' . Here, the quantities K and \tilde{K} are extrinsic curvature scalars and $\eta := n_a u^a$ is a generally non-zero scalar parameter originating from the fact that the boundary normals n^a and u^a are usually non-orthogonal in the given case.

Introducing in this context a partitioning $\mathcal{M} = \mathcal{M}_1 \cup \mathcal{M}_2 \cup ... \cup \mathcal{M}_n$ of the Lorentzian manifold of (\mathcal{M}, g) , where each submanifold \mathcal{M}_i of \mathcal{M} is thought to be irreducible in the sense that it would not prove to be useful to decompose \mathcal{M} any further in this particular context, one obtains the *n*-tuple of deformation relations

$$g_{ab} = g_{ab}^1 + e_{ab}^1 = g_{ab}^2 + e_{ab}^2 = \dots = g_{ab}^n + e_{ab}^n$$
(35)

and

$$g^{ab} = g_1^{ab} + f_1^{ab} = g_2^{ab} + f_2^{ab} = \dots = g_n^{ab} + f_n^{ab},$$
(36)

which is given with respect to associated *n*-tuples of deformation fields e_{ab}^1 , e_{ab}^2 , ..., e_{ab}^n and f_1^{ab} , f_2^{ab} ,..., f_n^{ab} , which are chosen in such a way that relations (18) and either (31) or (32) turn out to be valid.

Assuming then that for the *i*-th partition $1 + e^i$ is the matrix representation of the object $\delta_b^a + e_b^{i\,a}$, one can use the relation $|X| = |e^{\ln X}| = e^{tr \ln X} =$ $1 + \sum_{m=1}^{\infty} \frac{(tr \ln X)^m}{m!}$ between the determinant and the trace of a matrix X in order to obtain the identity $\sqrt{-g} = (1 + \chi^i)\sqrt{-g^i}$, where $\chi^i = \sum_{m=1}^{\infty} \frac{(tr \ln(1+e^i))^m}{2^m m!}$ applies by definition. Moreover, using the fact that one can always decompose the lapse function N of the ambient spacetime with respect to the lapse function N^i of the *i*-th local background such that $N = N^i + e_{00}^i$, the result obtained implies that $\sqrt{h} = (1 + \chi^i) \frac{N^i}{N^i + e_{00}^i} \sqrt{h^i} = (1 + \chi^i) \frac{1}{1 + \frac{e_{00}^i}{N^i}} \sqrt{h^i} =: (1 + \chi^i)(1 + \psi^i)\sqrt{h^i}$, where $\psi^i = \sum_{n=1}^{\infty} \left(-\frac{e_{00}^i}{N^i}\right)^n$ holds by definition. In addition, the extrinsic curvature tensor K_{ab} of (\mathcal{M}, q) can be decomposed with respect to the *i*-th extrinsic curvature

 K_{ab} of (\mathcal{M}, g) can be decomposed with respect to the *i*-th extrinsic curvature tensor K_{ab}^i of the *i*-th local spacetime (\mathcal{M}_i, g^i) in the form $K_{ab} = K_{ab}^i + \kappa_{bd}^i$.

Consequently, in the case of a boundary ∂M without edges or corners, the corresponding action decomposes according to the rule

$$S[g] \equiv S[g^1] + \Sigma[g^1, e^1, f^1] = \ldots = S[g^n] + \Sigma[g^n, e^n, f^n]) =$$

$$= \frac{1}{n} \left\{ S[g^1] + \Sigma[g^1, e^1, f^1] + \dots + S[g^n] + \Sigma[g^n, e^n, f^n]) \right\},$$
(37)

where

$$S[g^i] = \int_{M_i} R_i \omega_{g^i} + \int_{\Sigma_i}^{\Sigma_i'} K_i \omega_{h^i}$$
(38)

and

$$\Sigma[g^{i}, e^{i}, f^{i}] = \int_{M_{i}} \chi^{i} R_{i} \omega_{g^{i}} + \int_{\Sigma_{i}}^{\Sigma_{i}'} (\chi^{i} + \psi^{i} + \chi^{i} \psi^{i}) K_{i} \omega_{h^{i}} + \int_{M_{i}} (1 + \chi^{i}) (g_{i}^{bd} E_{bd}^{i} + f_{i}^{bd} R_{bd}^{i} + f_{i}^{bd} E_{bd}^{i}) \omega_{g^{i}} + \int_{M_{i}}^{\Sigma_{i}'} (1 + \chi^{i}) (1 + \psi^{i}) (g_{i}^{bd} \kappa_{bd}^{i} + f_{i}^{bd} K_{bd}^{i} + f_{i}^{bd} \kappa_{bd}^{i}) \omega_{h^{i}} + \int_{\Sigma_{i}'}^{\Sigma_{i}'} (1 + \chi^{i}) (R_{i} + g_{i}^{bd} E_{bd}^{i} + f_{i}^{bd} R_{bd}^{i} + f_{i}^{bd} E_{bd}^{i}) \omega_{g^{i}} + \int_{M \setminus M_{i}} (1 + \chi^{i}) (R_{i} + g_{i}^{bd} \kappa_{bd}^{i} + f_{i}^{bd} K_{bd}^{i} + f_{i}^{bd} \kappa_{bd}^{i}) \omega_{g^{i}} + \int_{\Sigma \setminus \Sigma_{i}}^{\Sigma \setminus \Sigma_{i}'} (1 + \chi^{i}) (1 + \psi^{i}) (K_{i} + g_{i}^{bd} \kappa_{bd}^{i} + f_{i}^{bd} K_{bd}^{i} + f_{i}^{bd} \kappa_{bd}^{i}) \omega_{h^{i}}$$

$$(39)$$

applies for the *i*-th part of the action. Thus, it can be seen that the action of the ambient spacetime (\mathcal{M}, g) can be decomposed into a system of 'subactions' $S[g^i] + \Sigma[g^i, e^i, f^i]$, whose variation with respect to g_i^{ab} possibly leads to modifications of the 'standard' field equations obtained from a variation of $S[g^i]$ with respect to g_i^{ab} . However, this is possible only if the deformation fields e^i_{ab} and f_i^{ab} are not chosen to be of compact support in $\mathcal{M} \setminus \{\mathcal{M}_i \setminus \Sigma_i\}$.

A similar, but slightly more complicated decomposition relation is also obtained in the case of a boundary ∂M with edges or corners, which is consistent not least due to the fact that Hayward's action has been shown to be additive in a generalized sense [8]. The associated formalism therefore allows one to add up the Einstein-Hilbert actions of spacetimes with non-smooth boundaries and different topologies and causal structures.

Taking into account the ideas of how to join different spacetimes by means of local geometric deformations discussed above, it is found that the sufficient (though not strictly necessary) requirements for a given system of local spacetimes (\mathcal{M}_i, g^i) to transition consistently into a complete spacetime (\mathcal{M}, g) are given by the boundary conditions

$$[e_{ab}] \stackrel{\Sigma_i}{=} [f^{ab}] \stackrel{\Sigma_i}{=} 0, \ [C^a_{bc}] \stackrel{\Sigma_i}{=} 0 \tag{40}$$

in the case of local tensor fields e^i_{ab} and f^{ab}_i with compact support or by the alternative set of conditions

$$[e_{ab}] \stackrel{\Sigma_i}{=} [f^{ab}] \stackrel{\Sigma_i}{=} 0, \ [C^a_{bc}] \stackrel{\Sigma_i}{\neq} 0 \tag{41}$$

in the case of local tensor fields e_{ab}^i and f_i^{ab} that vanish in a certain limit at the different boundary intersection hypersurfaces Σ_i .

Thus, if the supports of the respective deformation fields are appropriately chosen, the geometry of each representative of the given collection of local geometric fields turns out to agree with the geometry of the complete spacetime on local scales, so that the Einstein-Hilbert action remains unmodified by these deformations. However, this no longer has to be true for the latter case of local tensor fields that vanish in the geometric limit in which each of the individual local metric fields coincides with that of the remaining ambient spacetime, since in this case the Einstein-Hilbert actions of the individual parts of the spacetime undergo modifications, which, however, need to be consistent with the geometric structure of (\mathcal{M}, g) . This point marks an important difference to alternative multi-metric theories of gravity treated in literature for which no such correspondence is required [15, 18, 20, 27].

Nevertheless, considering the fact that conditions (31) and (32) and the related sets of conditions (40) and (41) are based on very different physical assumptions and therefore generally treat different geometric models, it would be desirable to be able to relax these conditions in such a way that they can be unified to a single set of conditions, which comes closer to the requirements of the general thin shell formalism discussed in the previous section. In fact, this can easily be achieved by requiring instead of (31) and (32) the validity of the conditions

$$[\mathfrak{e}_{ab}] = [\mathfrak{f}^{ab}] = 0, \ [\mathfrak{C}^a_{bc}] = 0, \tag{42}$$

where the quantities $\mathfrak{e}_{ab} \equiv o_a^c o_b^d e_{cd}$, $\mathfrak{f}^{ab} \equiv o_a^c o_b^d f^{cd}$ and $\mathfrak{C}_{bc}^a \equiv o_d^a o_b^e o_c^f C_{ef}^d$ are given with respect to the projector $o_a^c = \delta_a^c + \zeta^c \xi_a$ introduced in the previous section, which allows one to project tensor fields onto the boundary portion shared by both spacetimes regardless of its concrete causal structure. Although much less strict than (31), these conditions are still stricter than condition (12). They are also stricter than the non-null conditions (11) and (12) and the null condition (13).

Anyway, after this has now been clarified, it remains to be discussed what advantages working with the deformation approach presented in this section has over working with the thin shell formalism presented in the previous section.

One of the main advantages of working with the deformation approach is that it is more general than the thin shell formalism and other closely related approaches to the subject, such as, in particular, Penrose's cut-and-paste method. Ultimately, both of these approaches occur as special cases of the geometric deformation framework.

In addition, the deformation approach allows for a more careful treatment of the subject in the sense that it allows the treatment of problems where both Penrose's method and the thin shell method lead to (or at least seem to lead to) distributionally ill-defined terms, which cannot be properly treated from a mathematical point of view. This shall be explained in greater detail in the next section using the concrete example of gravitational shock wave spacetimes in black hole backgrounds.

The deformation approach is also more versatile than the thin-shell formalism because it allows spacetime pairs to be smoothly glued together by introducing a suitable cut-off function, and also because it allows new solutions of the field equations to be constructed using transformations that leave the geometric character of the background metric unchanged, but lead to a new ambient spacetime or even classes of ambient spacetimes. Furthermore, the formalism mentioned includes the perturbative approach to general relativity as a special case. Not least for this reason, it allows one to weaken the formulated boundary conditions (31) and (32) or (42), which are designed to meet the previously discussed junction conditions, in a perturbative sense, so that they are no longer exact, but only approximately valid, i. e. up to higher orders in a fixed parameter or systems of parameters.

This will be explained in more detail in the next section using concrete geometric models. For the sake of simplicity, however, only a few very simple examples of local spacetimes are selected and discussed below, which can be easily obtained by suitable deformation of a (usually highly symmetric) background geometry.

3 Examples of local Geometries in Einstein-Hilbert Gravity

From a theoretical point of view, the key indicator for the existence of local spacetime geometries in General Relativity is the fact that there are several solutions to Einstein's equations describing a large number of different physical scenarios valid in different scale regimes of theory. This certainly applies not only to the theory of General Relativity, but also to any generalized theory of gravitation on which the validity of the said solutions and associated physical scenarios can be based.

The key phenomenological indicator for the existence of local spacetimes in nature, on the other hand, is the fact that the geometry of the universe varies considerably from comparatively small to large scales. To be more precise, it is the fact that among the many different local matter accumulations contained in the universe, ranging from stellar systems to large systems of galaxy clusters, many can be expected to possess gravitational fields with distinguished, manifestly non-identical local geometries that do not coincide with the geometry which, on large scales, is assigned to the universe itself; namely that of Friemann-LeMaitre-Robertson-Walker.

As a result, it appears to be reasonable not only to analyze the global geometric structure of the universe, but also its local structure, which is naturally connected to the co-evolution of systems possessing a finite magnitude, not remaining truly stationary or static for infinite periods of time. This, however, makes it necessary to specify the exact meaning of the concept of a local spacetime geometry.

In response to that fact, it has been argued so far that the concept of a local geometry can be introduced on the level of local tensor deformations of the metric field - allowing one to single out spatially and/or temporarily bounded systems within a given ambient spacetime.

While the theoretical implications of the specified geometric framework, in principle, could be discussed by a number of different choices for the local deformation fields, they shall, for the sake of clarity, now be discussed merely with regard to selected classes of fields and associated spacetime geometries.

The first class that shall be considered is generally referred to as the Gordon class, which is a class of spacetimes that can be obtained by applying a so-called generalized Gordon transformation to a given background metric [3, 19, 44]. This special class of metric deformations plays an important role in describing deflections of light or sound in bodies with different optical densities or acoustic properties in both Special and General Relativity. Given a background metric g_{ab} , the metric \bar{g}_{ab} lying in the Gordon class is characterized by the following decomposition relation

$$\bar{g}_{ab} = g_{ab} + f n_a n_b, \tag{43}$$

which holds under the assumptions that $n_a = g_{ab}n^b$ and $g_{ab}n^bn^b < 0$; although it is usually assumed in this context that $g_{ab}n^an^b = -1$ applies for the sake of simplicity. Although it seems to represent a comparatively simple class of spacetimes at first sight, the Gordon class is defined with respect to a deformation field fn_an_b , which belongs to the general class of nonlinear metric deformations. As a consequence, the background field equations are modified in a nonlinear way, which implies that the resulting corrections are generally not easy to determine.

The most well-known representative of this class of deformations is the socalled acoustic metric, which has the form

$$\bar{g}_{ab} = \eta_{ab} + (1 - \frac{1}{n})n_a n_b \tag{44}$$

with n being referred to as the so-called refractive index. This index describes how the speed of light or sound changes during the propagation through a medium¹. It is well-known that outside of the medium, the refractive index becomes one; a case which immediately implies $f|_{n=1} = 0$. Therefore, it is found that the function f entering the above deformation scheme must go to zero outside the optical or acoustical medium. Accordingly, the spacetime is locally Minkowskian and thus a pair of local spacetimes in the previously introduced sense is formed by this particular class of deformations. Of course, the same

 $^{^1\}mathrm{Note}$ that the speed of light as well as the speed of sound are set to one in both of these cases.

type of local spacetime can also be defined with respect to more general types of background fields g_{ab} and more general functions f as long as these functions go to zero outside a given matter field under consideration.

In this context, it is worth mentioning that the class of Gordon class metrics contains the class of conformal Gordon class metrics as a special case. The representatives of this closely related class are subject to the deformation relations

$$\bar{g}_{ab} = \Omega^2 (g_{ab} + f n_a n_b), \tag{45}$$

which have been studied perhaps most thoroughly so far in the theory of socalled acoustic black holes and in the context of analogue gravity; theories that aim to explain, among other things, the geometric structure of acoustic black holes as well as electromagnetic phenomena in linear media and the behavior of condensed matter models in General Relativity or even more general theories of gravity [4, 17, 23, 43, 44].

Inevitably, therefore, the corresponding geometric models should characterize local spacetimes in the sense presented above, but are usually not treated in this way in the literature. However, as it turns out, these models can always be used as a starting point for the construction of local spacetimes by requiring that the functions f entering either (43) or (45) have compact support within the medium under study, which represents a strong, but very reasonable physical restriction. A meaningful way to achieve this is to introduce a thin shell splitting of the form $f = \theta f_+ + (1 - \theta) f_-$ and to require that [f] = 0 hold on a hypersurface Σ , which represents the boundary of the medium. The resulting form of metric can then easily be brought into a form of type (1) by adding and subtracting either a term θg_{ab} in the case of a Gordon class metric or a term $\theta \Omega g_{ab}$ in the case of conformal Gordon class metric, which shows that the selected deformation scheme is compatible with the thin shell formalism discussed in section one of this work.

Consequently, the corresponding geometric approach also leads to meaningful results when it is required that either f_+ or f_- be zero in the present context. However, in such a case it is clear that the field equations will contain singular expressions in many cases of interest, which are given in terms of a delta function. And although these singular expressions are perfectly reasonable from a theoretical point of view, it may turn out to be useful to have smoothed approximations to the usual step function for some applications.

Such smooth approximations can be obtained by considering bounded, nonnegative continuous functions taking values between zero and one. Typical examples are functions such as bump functions or other smooth functions with similar support properties, which are often constructed from convolutions of smooth functions with mollifiers. To give a specific example in this context, the function

$$\chi(x) := \begin{cases} e^{-\frac{1}{x}} & x > 0\\ 0 & x \le 0 \end{cases}$$
(46)

shall be considered, which belongs to $C^{\infty}(\mathbb{R})$ and meets the conditions $0 \le \chi \le 1$ and $\chi(x) > 0$ if and only if x > 0. This function can be used to define the cut-off function

$$\psi(x) = \frac{\chi(x)}{\chi(x) - \chi(1 - x)},$$
(47)

which takes a value of zero for x < 0, a value of one for $x \ge 1$ and is strictly increasing in the interval [0, 1]. In turn, this cut-off function can be used to specify the quantities f = f(x) such as those occurring in (43) or (45) via making an ansatz of the form $f(x) = \psi(x)F(x)$, where F(x) is some a priori unspecified smooth function. In this way, a smooth analogon of the distributional splitting $f = \theta f_+ + (1 - \theta)f_-$ is obtained, which may be used to construct local geometric models in general relativity, which can specifically be designed to describe the interior fields of compact massive objects or (on a perturbative level) even collections of such.

To clarify this on the basis of a concrete geometric example, consider the class of general metric deformations given by the expression

$$\bar{g}_{ab} = g_{ab} + f n_a n_b + g s_a s_b, \tag{48}$$

which contains the Gordon class of metrics as a special case, where $n_a = g_{ab}n^b$, $s_a = g_{ab}s^b$ and $g_{ab}n^a n^b = -1$, $g_{ab}s^a s^b = 1$. This class of spacetimes gives rise to a classic example of a local spacetime, namely Schwarzschild's interior solution.

As is well known, the Schwarzschild metric, whose components can be read off the line element

$$ds^{2} = -\left(1 - \frac{2M}{r}\right)dt^{2} + \frac{dr^{2}}{1 - \frac{2M}{r}} + r^{2}d\Omega^{2},$$
(49)

describes not only the geometric structure of an eternal black hole, but also the exterior gravitational field of an extended non-rotating central body, which is often used to characterize (or at least approximate) the physics of compact massive objects such as stars. In the latter case, Schwarzschild's exterior solution globally describes a vacuum field that can be extended to Schwarzschild's interior solution; a solution which is characterized by the line element

$$d\bar{s}^{2} = -\left(\frac{3}{2}\sqrt{1-\frac{2M}{R}} - \frac{1}{2}\sqrt{1-\frac{2Mr^{2}}{R^{3}}}\right)^{2}dt^{2} + \frac{dr^{2}}{1-\frac{2Mr^{2}}{R^{3}}} + r^{2}d\Omega^{2}$$
(50)

in the specific region r < R, in which the body resides. As a result of this extension of the geometry, it turns out that the energy-momentum tensor of the geometry is no longer singular. Instead, it is given by a perfectly regular perfect fluid ansatz $T_b^a = \varepsilon n^a n_b + p h_b^a$, according to which $\varepsilon = const.$, $p(r, R) = \frac{3M}{4\pi R^3} \frac{\sqrt{1-\frac{2Mr^2}{R^3}} - \sqrt{1-\frac{2M}{R^3}}}{3\sqrt{1-\frac{2M}{R}} - \sqrt{1-\frac{2Mr^2}{R^3}}}$ and $h_b^a = \delta_b^a + n^a n_b$ applies by definition. For this reason, the geometry spacetime is non-singular too; at least as long as it is guaranteed that $R > \frac{9M}{4}$ applies in the given context. In such a case, the exterior field can actually be extended and the geometry splits into two different parts, which need to be connected across the r = R-hypersurface Σ .

Of course, this can be achieved by using the thin shell formalism discussed in section one of this work. To see this, one may use the fact that the interior Schwarzschild metric can be expressed as a deformation of the corresponding exterior metric and thus be re-written in the form (48), where

$$f(r,R) := f_0(r,R) = 1 - \left(\frac{3}{2}\sqrt{\frac{r(R-2M)}{R(r-2M)}} - \frac{1}{2}\sqrt{\frac{R^3r - 2Mr^3}{R^3(r-2M)}}\right)^2$$
(51)

and

$$g(r,R) := g_0(r,R) = \frac{2M(R^3 - r^3)}{R^3 r - 2Mr^3}$$
(52)

applies by definition.

This deformation can easily be extended to be in accordance with the thin shell formalism by making an ansatz of the form $f = \theta f_0$ and $g = \theta g_0$ for the corresponding deformation parameters. More precisely, by setting f(r, R) = $\theta(r - R)f_0(r, R)$ and $g(r, R) = \theta(r - R)g_0(r, R)$ and adding and subtracting a term θg_{ab} , where g_{ab} represents the exterior vacuum background metric, a splitting of the form (1) as well as an associated connected Lorentzian manifold consisting of two local subregions with different geometries is obtained, which are separated by a r = R = const.-hypersurface. It then turns out that not only conditions (10) and (11) are fulfilled in this context, but also condition (42). As a result, there is a smooth transition from the interior to the exterior geometry of spacetime, which is entirely compatible with the results of the first and second sections of this work. The compatibility of the thin-shell formalism with the deformation approach can therefore be demonstrated, as shown, using a known concrete example of a local spacetime geometry.

And although the present description of the subject is as meaningful as it is well-defined, there is also another approach to the subject from the perspective of geometric deformation theory, which should lead to interesting generalizations of Schwarzschild's classic model. This kind of approach to the subject is based on the idea of introducing a smooth cut-off function instead of a step function in order to establish a deformation relation of the form (48) and to ensure that conditions (10), (11) and (42) are all fulfilled simultaneously. Specifically, in this context, one may choose $f(r, R) = \psi(1 - \frac{r}{R})f_0(r, R)$ and g(r, R) = $\psi(1 - \frac{r}{R})g_0(r, R)$, where $\psi(1 - \frac{r}{R})$ shall be assumed to be of form (47) for convenience and thus given with respect to expression (46). In this way, it is guaranteed that $\psi(1 - \frac{r}{R}) = 0$ applies by definition for $r \geq R$ and $\psi(1 - \frac{r}{R}) = 1$ for r = 1, so that it becomes clear that the given smooth deformation of the metric has similar physical properties as the distributionally defined deformation.

However, as it turns out in this context, the given type of deformation leads to a completely different type of solution of Einstein's field equations, which generally will not match the classic model of the interior Schwarzschild geometry. This is because replacing the step function with a smooth cut-off function leads to new modified field equations of the form (23), the concrete form of which can be obtained by first solving the deformed field equations (24). In contrast to the thin-shell formalism, the deformation approach consequently leads to possibly quite interesting extensions of the original model; extensions that lead from a solution of Einstein's field equations for a non-rotating perfect fluid source to one for a non-rotating imperfect fluid source, which is more difficult to find and handle in practice.

It remains to be seen, however, whether interesting new solutions to the field equations can actually be obtained in this way. In any case, their existence does not appear to contradict the observational facts a priori, since realistic models for the gravitational fields of compact massive bodies in many cases make it necessary to treat imperfect central fluid sources.

Anyway, regardless of the question of the meaningfulness of the solutions mentioned, it turns out that the deformation approach is not only fully compatible with the thin-shell formalism, but even shows the treatability of problems that one would not a priori expect to be treatable using the said formalism. These problems revolve around the case where the components of the metrics in (1) are not smooth functions, but Schwartz distributions, which may even be proportional to the Dirac delta distribution. This has the immediate consequence that the deformed parts of the field equations cannot be sensibly set up, since they would contain mathematically ill-defined quantities; or at least it seems that way at first glance. However, by taking the deformation approach into account, it is found that said parts of the field equations are actually welldefined in certain cases.

This becomes apparent when considering another important class of local geometric deformations: a class commonly referred to as the generalized Kerr-Schild class. This class, whose representatives are metrics of the type

$$\bar{g}_{ab} = g_{ab} + f l_a l_b, \tag{53}$$

belongs to the class of linear metric deformations, where the corresponding metrics are given with respect to a lightlike geodesic co-vector field $l_a = g_{ab}l^b$ which has to fulfill the relations $g_{ab}l^a l^b = 0$, $(l\nabla) l^a = 0$ and $\bar{g}_{ab}l^a l^b = 0$, $(l\bar{\nabla})l^a = 0$. As such, it is a family of solutions that encompass a considerably large class of geometric models that are of interest to General Relativity, such as all stationary geometries that are in the Kerr-Newman family of spacetimes and, in addition, all dynamical radiation fluid spacetimes lying in the even more general Bonnor-Vaidya family. Moreover, it includes various models with cosmological horizons, like for instance Kottler alias Schwarzschild-de Sitter spacetime and its generalizations.

The main property of this class is the fact that the mixed Einstein tensor \bar{G}^a_b of the ambient metric \bar{g}_{ab} is linear in the profile function f, which simplifies the geometric structure of the deformed field equations. This structure simplifies even more if the geometric constraints

$$\bar{\nabla}_{[a}l_{b]} = \nabla_{[a}l_{b]} = 0, \ (l\bar{\nabla})f = (l\nabla)f = 0 \tag{54}$$

are met, since in such a case it turns out that both the Ricci with lowered and raised indices is linear in f. To see this, one may use the fact that there holds

 $C^b_{ab} = 0$ for the corresponding affine connection

$$C^{a}_{bc} = \frac{1}{2} \nabla_{b} (f l^{a} l_{c}) + \frac{1}{2} \nabla_{c} (f l^{a} l_{b}) - \frac{1}{2} \nabla^{a} (f l_{b} l_{c})$$
(55)

of the Kerr-Schild class, which relates the pair of covariant derivative operators $\bar{\nabla}_a$ associated with \bar{g}_{ab} and ∇_a and associated with g_{ab} . As a result, the deformed Ricci tensor with lowered indices reads

$$\ddot{R}_{ab} = R_{ab} + E_{ab},\tag{56}$$

where $E_{ab} = \nabla_c C^c_{ab} + C^c_{ad} C^d_{cb}$ applies.

To ensure that this object as well as the Einstein tensor of the geometry are linear in the profile function f, it must be ensured that the conditions

$$C^c_{ad}C^d_{cb} = 0 ag{57}$$

and

$$\nabla_c C^c_{ab} l^a = \nabla_c C^c_{ab} l^b = 0, \ \bar{R}^a_b l_a l^b = R^a_b l_a l^b = 0$$
(58)

are met, where the conditions (57) and (58) result from the consistency condition $\bar{R}_{ab} = \bar{g}_{ac} \bar{R}^c_{\ b}$. However, using the result

$$C^{c}_{ad}C^{d}_{cb} = \frac{1}{2} \left\{ [(l\nabla)f]^{2} + f^{2}\nabla^{[c}l^{d]}\nabla_{d}l_{c} + f^{2}\nabla_{[d}l_{c]}\nabla^{c}l^{d} \right\} l_{a}l_{b},$$
(59)

it immediately becomes clear that both the Ricci and the Einstein tensors with lowered indices are linear in the profile function if the conditions listed in (54) are met.

Based on these results, it is found that a splitting of the form $f = \theta f_+ + (1 - \theta) f_+$ θ f_{-} can even be meaningfully performed if it is assumed that the quantities $f_{\pm}(x)$ are themselves distributions as long as the products θf_{+} and $(1-\theta)f_{-}$ can be calculated meaningfully. Specifically, this is the case if the choice $f_{\pm} = F_{\pm}\delta$ is made in the present context, where $\delta(x)$ represents the Dirac delta distribution. Given this choice, it turns out that the distributional products $F_+\theta\delta$ and $F_{-}(1-\theta)\delta$ can be calculated in a distributional sense using classic methods from Colombeau theory, which yield the expressions $AF_+\delta$ and $F_-(1-A)\delta$; expressions that are associated in a distributional sense with $F_+\theta\delta$ and $F_-(1-\theta)\delta$, where A is a constant that has to be specified consistently on a case-by-case basis. This leads to an ansatz of the form $f = f_0 \delta$ for the function f appearing in (53), where $f_0 = AF_+ + F_-(1-A)$ is a smooth function that has to be determined by solving the field equations of the theory. In this context, however, it is worth noting that the validity of (57) and (58) is by no means obvious even in view of Colombeau's nonlinear theory of generalized functions, which is why the results obtained will be discussed in more detail elsewhere in the future.

Anyway, in order to deal with a specific physical example in this respect, consider now a class of Kerr-Schild geometries to which the methods discussed can be applied, namely the class of gravitational shock wave geometries in black hole and cosmological backgrounds. These geometries, which all were found by using Penrose's cut-and-paste alias scissors-and-paste procedure, characterize the fields of spherical shock waves caused by a massless particle moving at the speed of light along the corresponding event or cosmological horizons. The most famous representatives of this class are the geometries of Dray and 't Hooft [16], Sfetsos [42] and Lousto and Sanchez [29], which characterize the gravitational fields of spherical shock waves in Schwarzschild, Reissner-Nordström and Kottler alias Schwarzschild-de Sitter backgrounds.

Due to their similarity, all these approaches shall be discussed in a single effort in the following. The reason why this is possible is the following: Using the fact that the line element of any static spherically symmetric spacetime can be brought into the form

$$-2A^2 dU dV + r^2 (d\theta^2 + \sin^2 \theta d\phi^2), \tag{60}$$

where r = r(UV) and A = A(r(UV)) are implicit functions of U and V, the line elements of the Dray-'t Hooft, Sfetsos and Lousto-Sanchez shock wave fields can be written down as follows

$$ds^{2} = 2A^{2}f_{0}\delta dU^{2} - 2A^{2}dUdV + r^{2}(d\theta^{2} + \sin^{2}\theta d\phi^{2})$$
(61)

where $\delta = \delta(U)$ is Dirac's delta distribution. Thus, it can be concluded that the metrics

$$\tilde{g}_{ab} = g_{ab} + 2A^2 f_0 \delta l_a l_b, \tag{62}$$

corresponding to these line elements belong to the generalized Kerr-Schild classes of the Schwarzschild, Reissner-Nordström and Kottler backgrounds, where in each case one has $l_a = g_{ab}l^b = -dU_a$. Accordingly, given the fact that one can always choose $f_0 = f_0(\theta, \phi)$ in this context, it becomes clear that conditions (54) and thus conditions (57) and (58) can be met if it is required that $\partial_V A|_{U=0} = \partial_V r|_{U=0} = 0$. As a result, the Einstein tensor of the corresponding classes of geometries takes the form $G^a_b = (\Delta_{\mathbb{S}_2} - c)f_0l^a l_b$ and thus characterizes the geometric field of a null fluid source.

The validity of this result cannot be deduced from thin-shell formalism alone; it requires geometric deformation theory to make it possible. This can be concluded from the fact that in the past, on the basis of careless application of Penrose's method, which according to [16] gives the same results as the thinshell formalism (except for a single not particularly relevant term), the authors of the above-mentioned works came to the erroneous conclusion that despite the validity of $\partial_V A|_{U=0} = \partial_V r|_{U=0} = 0$, the field equations should contain nonlinear ill-defined 'delta-square' terms. As it turns out, however, the deformed field equations of the generalized Kerr-Schild class do not contain such terms after all, but lead to a single differential equation for the reduced profile function of the form

$$(\Delta_{\mathbb{S}_2} - c)f_0 = 2\pi b\delta,\tag{63}$$

where $\delta \equiv \delta(\cos \theta - 1)$ is Dirac's delta distribution and b and c are constants, whereas c is given by $c = 2r_{+}(\kappa - \Lambda r_{+})$ in the Schwarzschild-de Sitter case, $c = 2r_{+}\kappa$ in the Reissner-Nordström case and by c = 1 in the Schwarzschild case.

The resulting equation can be solved by expanding the reduced profile function on the left hand side and the delta function on the right hand side simultaneously in Legendre polynomials. Using here the fact that $\delta(x) = \sum_{l=0}^{\infty} (l + \frac{1}{2}) P_l(x)$, one obtains the solution

$$f_0(\theta) = -b \sum_{l=0}^{\infty} \frac{l + \frac{1}{2}}{l(l+1) + c} P_l(\cos\theta)$$
(64)

by solving the corresponding eigenvalue problem. As was shown in [42], however, it is quite possible to find another representation for the function f, which is fully consistent with the thin shell formalism discussed in section one of this work.

Other examples of Kerr-Schild deformed local spacetimes with deformation fields that have compact support in a single null hypersurface of the geometry are pp-wave spacetimes. The perhaps most well-known models in this regard are the spacetimes of Aichelburg and Sexl [1] and Lousto and Sanchez [29, 30, which have in common that they are specified by a Brinkmann form that contains a delta distribution and therefore has support only on a single lightlike hypersurface of spacetime. For that reason, they determine a local background geometry that coincides everywhere with that of a spherically symmetric black hole spacetime except for one single null hypersurface.

Other geometric models that allow the definition of a geometric background that is local in the sense previously introduced are members of the Bonnor-Vaidya family of spacetimes. In the general rotating case, the metric of this family can be read off the line element

$$d\bar{s}^{2} = -dv^{2} + 2(dv - a\sin^{2}\theta d\phi)dr + \Sigma d\theta^{2} + \frac{(r^{2} + a^{2})\sin^{2}\theta}{\Sigma}d\phi^{2} + \frac{2Mr - e^{2}}{\Sigma}(dv - a\sin^{2}\theta d\phi)^{2},$$
(65)

where $\Sigma = r^2 + a^2 \cos^2 \theta$ and M = M(v), e = e(v). The energy-momentum tensor of this geometry consists of a null fluid part and an additional part. It reads $T_{ab} = \varepsilon l_a l_b + 2\vartheta \left(l_{(a}k_{b)} + m_{(a}\bar{m}_{b)} \right) + 2\varsigma l_{(a}\bar{m}_{b)} + 2\bar{\varsigma} l_{(a}m_{b)}$, where $\varepsilon = -\frac{2r(r\dot{M} - e\dot{e}) + a^2 \sin\theta(r\ddot{M} - \dot{e}\dot{e} - e\ddot{e})}{8\pi\Sigma^2}$, $\vartheta = \frac{e^2}{8\pi\Sigma^2}$ and $\varsigma = \frac{-ia\sin\theta}{\sqrt{28}\pi\Sigma^2} \left\{ \Sigma \dot{M} - 2e\dot{e} \right\}$ with $\dot{M} := \frac{dM}{dv}$ and $\dot{e} := \frac{de}{dv}$. In the limit $a \to 0$, the metric of the geometry reduces to that of Bonnor-

Vaidya spacetime [7], which is given in spherical coordinates by the line element

$$d\bar{s}^2 = -(1 - \frac{2M}{r} + \frac{e^2}{r^2})dv^2 + 2dvdr + r^2d\Omega^2.$$
 (66)

In this case, the component ς of the energy-momentum tensor goes to zero, i.e. $\varsigma \to 0$ as $a \to 0$. Therefore, the energy-momentum tensor reduces to a null fluid part plus an electromagnetic part, i.e. $T_{ab} = -\frac{\dot{M} - \frac{cb}{r}}{4\pi r^2} l_a l_b - F_{ac} F_b^c + \frac{1}{4} \delta^a_{\ b} F^{cd} F_{cd}$, where $F_{bc} = 2\nabla_{[b} A_{c]}$ is the antisymmetric Faraday tensor satisfying the covariant Maxwell equations $\nabla_a F^a_{\ b} = j_b$ and $\nabla_{[a} F_{bc]} = 0$, constructed from the vector potential $A_b = \frac{e}{r^2} \delta^0_b$.

In the combined limits $a, e \to 0$, the metric reduces to that of Vaidya spacetime, whose associated metric can be read off the line element

$$d\bar{s}^{2} = -(1 - \frac{2M}{r})dv^{2} + 2dvdr + r^{2}d\Omega^{2}.$$
(67)

In this case, the component ς and ϑ of the energy-momentum tensor goes to zero as well, i.e. $\vartheta, \varsigma \to 0$ as $a, e \to 0$. Consequently, the energy-momentum tensor of the initially axially symmetric gravitational field reduces to that of a spherically symmetric one which is generated by a null fluid source, i.e. $T_{ab} = -\frac{\dot{M}}{4\pi r^2} l_a l_b$.

The most general form of the geometry, whose associated metric can be read off line element (65), can be interpreted as the field of an accreting charged rotating black hole. As a basis for this interpretation, one may split the mass and the charge functions into constant and non-constant parts such that M(v) = $M_0 + m(v)$ and $e(v) = e_0 + \mathfrak{e}(v)$, where $M_0 = const.$ and $e_0 = const.$ In this way, the metric of spacetime can be written in the form $\bar{g}_{ab} = g_{ab} + f l_a l_b$, where f = $\frac{m+2e_0\mathfrak{e}+\mathfrak{e}^2}{\Sigma}$, as can easily be concluded from the fact that $l_a = -dv_a + a\sin^2\theta d\phi_a$. In addition, one may focus on the case in which m(v) and $\mathfrak{e}(v)$ are functions of compact support or possibly re-introduce a cut-off function - possibly, but not necessarily given by (47) - and make an ansatz of the form $m(v) = \psi(\frac{v}{v_0})m_0(v)$ and $\mathfrak{e}(v) = \psi(\frac{v}{v_0})\mathfrak{e}_0(v)$, where $m_0(v)$ and $\mathfrak{e}_0(v)$ are generic functions in v (the only restriction on their structure is that $M(v) \ge 0$ at all times). In this way, it is guaranteed that $\psi(\frac{v}{v_0})$ takes a value of zero for v < 0, a value of one for $v \ge 1$ and is strictly increasing in the interval [0, 1], so that condition (42) is met and it can therefore be concluded that the metric of spacetime coincides locally with that of Kerr-Newman spacetime; a spacetime that describes the electrovac gravitational field of a stationary axially symmetric charged rotating black hole, which has, by necessity, a completely different physical interpretation from the metric of a rotating Bonnor-Vaidya spacetime. Specifically, if in this context it is required that $m(v) = \psi(\frac{v}{v_0})m_0$ and $\mathfrak{e}(v) = \psi(\frac{v}{v_0})\mathfrak{e}_0$ for constant m_0 and \mathfrak{e}_0 , it then occurs that an initially given Kerr-Newman geometry with 'degrees of freedom' (M_0, e_0, a) transitions smoothly into one with different parameters $(M_0 + m_0, e_0 + \mathfrak{e}_0, a)$, so that it can indeed be concluded that Bonnor-Vaidya spacetime characterizes the gravitational field of an accreting rotating black hole that accretes null radiation.

As a consequence, it is found that the Bonnor-Vaidya model can always be set up to predict the collapse of a null radiation field and its absorption by a charged rotating black hole, which could even result in the complete discharge of the black hole. However, this shows that the geometric deformation approach can be used to produce meaningful results in the present context - results which are in complete agreement with the famous black hole uniqueness theorems [10, 39, 38]. Of course, one could also try to make another choice for the component f in this regard, which is in better agreement with the thin shell formalism. In particular, one could choose $m(v) = \theta(v - v_0)m_0$ and $\mathfrak{e}(v) = \theta(v - v_0)\mathfrak{e}_0$ where $\theta(v - v_0)$ represents the Heaviside step function $\theta(v - v_0) := \begin{cases} \frac{1}{2} & v \frac{v - v_0 < 0}{v - v_0 > 0} \\ \frac{1}{2} & v \frac{v - v_0 < 0}{v - v_0 > 0} \end{cases}$ However, from a purely physical point of view, this would actually be a very poor choice, since the resulting geometry would describe the very unphysical case of a black hole that accretes material of mass m_0 and charge \mathfrak{e}_0 within an infinitesimally small instant of time. Consequently, it would probably be more sensible to stick to the above smooth description of the problem. Nevertheless, the given choice also provides a well-defined example of a local geometry in the previously introduced sense and the resulting geometric model reveals the

Sure enough, the results obtained so far can be generalized in many ways. A particular way is to perform a series of Kerr-Schild deformations of the Kerr-Newman geometry and then to impose the right boundary conditions on the system. In this context, one could follow for example the ideas of Wang and Wu [45], who generalized the form of the Vaidya solution in such a way that it includes a cosmological constant and a gravitational monopole term. Moreover, said solution was shown to contain Husain's solution [25] as a special case. As shown in [26], the given class of solutions can be generalized by applying the Newman-Janis algorithm to them, so that the resulting geomtries are contained in a more general class of rotating Bonnor-Vaidya-de Sitter monopole solutions.

structure of the gravitational field of a black hole that absorbs null radiation.

A different strategy would be to generalize the family of models characterized by line element (65) via simply performing a null rescaling of the form $l_a \rightarrow \lambda l_a$, $k_a \rightarrow \lambda^{-1} k_a$, which leaves the geometric structure of the background metric g_{ab} invariant, but changes the geometric structure of the metric \bar{g}_{ab} of the ambient spacetime $(\bar{\mathcal{M}}, \bar{g})$, giving thereby a more general class of solutions to Einstein's field equations with a metric of the form

$$\bar{g}_{ab} = g_{ab} + \lambda^2 f l_a l_b \tag{68}$$

The only condition that one may wish to impose in this context is that $(l\nabla)\lambda = 0$ and therefore $\lambda = \lambda(v, \theta, \phi)$ holds by definition, so that the resulting class of geometries still belongs to the generalized Kerr-Schild class of Kerr-Newman spacetime and the corresponding mixed field equations remain linear in f. But, of course, that restriction is not a must by any means.

Another possibility to construct a new class of models from the one given above is to use the fact that the null geodesic vector field can be extended to an associated null geodesic frame $(l^a, k^a, m^a, \bar{m}^a)$ and then to perform a null rotation of the form $k_a \to k_a, m_a \to m_a + \xi k_a, l_a \to l_a + \xi \bar{m}_a + \bar{\xi} m_a + |\xi|^2 k_a$, which again leaves the geometric structure of the background metric g_{ab} invariant, but changes the geometric structure of the metric \bar{g}_{ab} of the ambient spacetime $(\bar{\mathcal{M}}, \bar{g})$. In this way, once again a more general class of solutions to Einstein's field equations is obtained, whose metric is of the form

$$\bar{g}_{ab} = g_{ab} + f l_a l_b + 2f \xi l_{(a} \bar{m}_{b)} + 2f \xi l_{(a} m_{b)} + 2f |\xi|^2 \left(l_{(a} k_{b)} + m_{(a} \bar{m}_{b)} \right) + (69) + f \xi^2 \bar{m}_a \bar{m}_b + f \bar{\xi}^2 m_a m_b + 2f \xi |\xi|^2 k_{(a} \bar{m}_{b)} + 2f \bar{\xi} |\xi|^2 k_{(a} m_{b)} + f |\xi|^4 k_a k_b.$$

Consequently, by repeatedly applying a combination of null rescalings and null rotations, models of any complexity can be constructed. Therefore, it is generally to be expected that the development of much more general gravitational fields in Einstein-Hilbert gravity can be described in the given context, including models that allow one to model partial or even complete gravitational collapse of matter fields that is caused by the influence of a black hole. In general, however, one will not obtain generalized Kerr-Schild models this way, but rather other types of generic models.

To construct generalized Kerr-Schild models, one could instead consider superimposed generalized Kerr-Schild transforms, which are deformed metrics of the type

$$\bar{g}_{ab} = g_{ab} + \sum_{A=1}^{N} f_{(A)} l_a^{(A)} l_b^{(A)},$$
(70)

where each and every $l_a^{(A)} = a^{(A)}l_a + b^{(A)}k_a + c^{(A)}\bar{m}_a + \bar{c}^{(A)}m_a$ must meet the conditions $l_a^{(A)}l_{(A)}^a = 0$ and $(l_{(A)}\nabla)l_{(A)}^a = 0$. This type of deformation leads to a whole series of nested Kerr-Schild spacetimes, i.e.

$$\bar{g}_{ab} = g_{ab}^{(1)} + \sum_{A=2}^{N} f_{(A)} l_a^{(A)} l_b^{(A)} = g_{ab}^{(2)} + \sum_{A=3}^{N} f_{(A)} l_a^{(A)} l_b^{(A)} = \dots = g_{ab}^{(N-1)} + f_{(N)} l_a^{(N)} l_b^{(N)},$$
(71)

where $g_{ab}^{(1)} = g_{ab} + f_{(1)}l_a^{(1)}l_b^{(1)}, \ g_{ab}^{(2)} = g_{ab} + \sum_{A=1}^2 f_{(A)}l_a^{(A)}l_b^{(A)}, \ \dots, \ g_{ab}^{(N-1)} = 0$

 $g_{ab} + \sum_{A=1}^{N-1} f_{(A)} l_a^{(A)} l_b^{(A)}$ applies by definition. Therefore, it immediately becomes

clear that the given type of deformation belongs to the class of linear metric deformations introduced in the previous section, which are easier to handle than general metric deformations. As highlighted in several works on the subject [6, 31, 33, 34, 36], the corresponding metric deformations can be used to provide initial data for the construction of solutions to Einstein's equations that characterize multiple black holes in general relativity. However, as it must be stressed, these specific types of metric deformations in the non-numerical case have so far only been used to obtain very specific two-body systems consisting of a black hole and a point source located at its associated event horizon [2, 16, 24, 42]. Nevertheless, it can reasonably be expected that the underlying geometric approach is also suitable for the construction of other types of manybody systems with generic metrics that are in the same equivalence class as the metrics of the members of the Kerr-Newman family of spacetimes. In addition to the geometric models mentioned above, there may be many other classes of both exact and approximate metric deformations, which may lead to very physically interesting examples of local spacetimes.

Summary

In the present work, a specific approach to the construction of local spacetimes in General Relativity was presented. This approach is based on the idea of using local deformations of the metric to join spacetimes with different geometries and physical properties. The validity of this idea was made clear by demonstrating the feasibility of fulfilling suitable junction conditions, and further demonstrated by means of some concrete examples of background metrics that prove to be local in a sense specified in this work. On the basis of the results obtained, it can reasonably be expected that additional examples of local spacetimes can be found in the future, which may provide valuable extensions of already known geometric models in Einstein-Hillbert gravity or more general theories of gravity.

References

- Peter C Aichelburg and Roman Ulrich Sexl. On the gravitational field of a massless particle. *General Relativity and Gravitation*, 2(4):303–312, 1971.
- [2] Rodrigo Alonso and Nelson Zamorano. Generalized Kerr-Schild metric for a massless particle on the Reissner-Nordström horizon. *Physical Review D*, 35(6):1798, 1987.
- [3] Valentina Baccetti, Prado Martin-Moruno, and Matt Visser. Gordon and Kerr-Schild ansätze in massive and bimetric gravity. *Journal of High Energy Physics*, 2012(8):1–19, 2012.
- [4] Carlos Barcelo, Stefano Liberati, and Matt Visser. Analogue gravity from Bose-Einstein condensates. *Classical and Quantum Gravity*, 18(6):1137, 2001.
- [5] C Barrabes and W Israel. Thin shells in general relativity and cosmology: The lightlike limit. *Physical Review D*, 43(4):1129, 1991.
- [6] Erin Bonning, Pedro Marronetti, David Neilsen, and Richard Matzner. Physics and initial data for multiple black hole spacetimes. *Physical Review* D, 68(4):044019, 2003.
- [7] WB Bonnor and PC Vaidya. Spherically symmetric radiation of charge in Einstein-Maxwell theory. *General Relativity and Gravitation*, 1(2):127–130, 1970.
- [8] Dieter Brill and Geoff Hayward. Is the gravitational action additive? *Physical Review D*, 50(8):4914, 1994.

- [9] J David Brown and James W York Jr. Quasilocal energy and conserved charges derived from the gravitational action. *Physical Review D*, 47(4):1407, 1993.
- [10] Brandon Carter. Axisymmetric black hole has only two degrees of freedom. *Physical Review Letters*, 26(6):331, 1971.
- [11] CJ]S Clarke and Tevian Dray. Junction conditions for null hypersurfaces. Classical and Quantum Gravity, 4(2):265, 1987.
- [12] Jean François Colombeau. New generalized functions and multiplication of distributions. Elsevier, 2000.
- [13] Jean François Colombeau. *Elementary introduction to new generalized functions*. Elsevier, 2011.
- [14] Georges Darmois. Les équations de la gravitation einsteinienne. Mémorial des sciences mathématiques, 25:1–48, 1927.
- [15] Claudia de Rham. Massive Gravity. Living Rev. Rel, 17(7):1401–4173, 2014.
- [16] Tevian Dray and Gerard't Hooft. The gravitational shock wave of a massless particle. Nuclear physics B, 253:173–188, 1985.
- [17] Serena Fagnocchi, Stefano Finazzi, Stefano Liberati, Marton Kormos, and Andrea Trombettoni. Relativistic Bose-Einstein condensates: a new system for analogue models of gravity. New Journal of Physics, 12(9):095012, 2010.
- [18] Markus Fierz and Wolfgang Pauli. On relativistic wave equations for particles of arbitrary spin in an electromagnetic field. Proceedings of the Royal Society of London. Series A, Mathematical and Physical Sciences, pages 211–232, 1939.
- [19] Walter Gordon. Zur Lichtfortpflanzung nach der Relativitätstheorie. Annalen der Physik, 377(22):421–456, 1923.
- [20] S Fawad Hassan and Rachel A Rosen. Bimetric gravity from ghost-free massive gravity. Journal of High Energy Physics, 2012(2):1–12, 2012.
- [21] Stephen W Hawking and George Francis Rayner Ellis. *The large scale structure of space-time*, volume 1. Cambridge university press, 1973.
- [22] Geoff Hayward. Gravitational action for spacetimes with nonsmooth boundaries. *Physical Review D*, 47(8):3275, 1993.
- [23] Sabine Hossenfelder and Tobias Zingg. Analogue gravity models from conformal rescaling. *Classical and quantum gravity*, 34(16):165004, 2017.
- [24] Albert Huber. The gravitational Field of a massless Particle on the Horizon of a stationary Black Hole. arXiv:1911.02299.

- [25] Viqar Husain. Exact solutions for null fluid collapse. Physical Review D, 53(4):R1759, 1996.
- [26] Ng Ibohal. Rotating metrics admitting non-perfect fluids. General Relativity and Gravitation, 37(1):19–51, 2005.
- [27] Chris J Isham, Abdus Salam, and J Strathdee. Nonlinear realizations of space-time symmetries. Scalar and tensor gravity. Annals of Physics, 62(1):98–119, 1971.
- [28] Werner Israel. Singular hypersurfaces and thin shells in general relativity. Il Nuovo Cimento B Series 10, 44(1):1–14, 1966.
- [29] CO Lousto and N Sánchez. The ultrarelativistic limit of the Kerr-Newman geometry and particle scattering at the Planck scale. *Physics Letters B*, 232(4):462–466, 1989.
- [30] CO Lousto and N Sánchez. The curved shock wave space-time of ultrarelativistic charged particles and their scattering. *International Journal of Modern Physics A*, 5(05):915–938, 1990.
- [31] Pedro Marronetti and Richard A Matzner. Solving the initial value problem of two black holes. *Physical Review Letters*, 85(26):5500, 2000.
- [32] Marc Mars and Jose MM Senovilla. Geometry of general hypersurfaces in spacetime: junction conditions. *Classical and Quantum Gravity*, 10(9):1865, 1993.
- [33] Richard A Matzner, Mijan F Huq, and Deirdre Shoemaker. Initial data and coordinates for multiple black hole systems. *Physical Review D*, 59(2):024015, 1998.
- [34] Claudia Moreno, Darío Núñez, and Olivier Sarbach. Kerr-Schild-type initial data for black holes with angular momenta. *Classical and Quantum Gravity*, 19(23):6059, 2002.
- [35] R Penrose. General relativity, papers in honour of jl synge. Clarendon, Oxford, page 101, 1972.
- [36] István Rácz. A simple method of constructing binary black hole initial data. Astronomy Reports, 62(12):953–958, 2018.
- [37] Borja Reina, José MM Senovilla, and Raül Vera. Junction conditions in quadratic gravity: thin shells and double layers. *Classical and Quantum Gravity*, 33(10):105008, 2016.
- [38] David C Robinson. Uniqueness of the Kerr black hole. *Physical Review Letters*, 34(14):905, 1975.
- [39] DC Robinson. Classification of black holes with electromagnetic fields. *Physical Review D*, 10(2):458, 1974.

- [40] José MM Senovilla. Double layers in gravity theories. In Journal of Physics: Conference Series, volume 600, page 012004. IOP Publishing, 2015.
- [41] José MM Senovilla. Equations for general shells. Journal of High Energy Physics, 2018(11):134, 2018.
- [42] Konstadinos Sfetsos. On gravitational shock waves in curved spacetimes. Nuclear Physics B, 436(3):721–745, 1995.
- [43] William George Unruh. Experimental black-hole evaporation? Physical Review Letters, 46(21):1351, 1981.
- [44] Matt Visser and Carmen Molina-París. Acoustic geometry for general relativistic barotropic irrotational fluid flow. New Journal of Physics, 12(9):095014, 2010.
- [45] Anzhong Wang and Yumei Wu. Generalized Vaidya solutions. General Relativity and Gravitation, 31(1):107–114, 1999.