

MASSACHUSETTS INSTITUTE OF TECHNOLOGY  
Physics Department

Physics 8.286: The Early Universe  
Prof. Alan Guth

December 2, 2005

**PROBLEM SET 6**

**DUE DATE:** Tuesday, December 13, 2005

**READING ASSIGNMENT:** Barbara Ryden, *Introduction to Cosmology*, the 2-page Epilogue. Steven Weinberg, *The First Three Minutes*, “Afterward: Cosmology Since 1977.” This reading will be included on Quiz 3. Except for the reading, the material on this problem set will not be included on Quiz 3.

**PROBLEM 1: THE HORIZON PROBLEM** (*8 points*)

The success of the big bang predictions for the abundances of the light elements suggests that the universe was already in thermal equilibrium at one second after the big bang. At this time, the region which later evolves to become the observed universe was many horizon distances across. Try to estimate how many. You may assume that the universe is flat.

**PROBLEM 2: THE FLATNESS PROBLEM** (*7 points*)

Suppose that today  $\Omega_0 = 0.1$ . It then follows that at  $10^{-37}$  second after the big bang (about the time of the grand unified theory phase transition),  $\Omega$  must have been extraordinarily close to one. Writing  $\Omega = 1 - \delta$ , estimate the value of  $\delta$  at  $t = 10^{-37}$  sec (using the standard cosmological model).

**PROBLEM 3: GRAND UNIFIED THEORIES AND MAGNETIC MONOPOLE PRODUCTION** (*8 points*)

When grand unified theories are combined with standard (i.e., non-inflationary) cosmology, one is led to the conclusion that far too many magnetic monopoles are produced. This conclusion is based on an estimate of  $n_M/n_\gamma$ , the ratio of the number density of magnetic monopoles to the number density of photons. The estimated value of  $n_M/n_\gamma$  is proportional to a power of the critical temperature  $T_c$  of the grand unified theory phase transition. State the power, and explain why. You may assume that the annihilation of monopoles after the grand unified phase transition is unimportant.

**PROBLEM 4: EXPONENTIAL EXPANSION OF THE INFLATION-ARY UNIVERSE** (*7 points*)

Recall that the evolution of a Robertson-Walker universe is described by the equation

$$\left(\frac{\dot{R}}{R}\right)^2 = \frac{8\pi}{3}G\rho - \frac{kc^2}{R^2}.$$

Suppose that the mass density  $\rho$  is given by the constant mass density  $\rho_f$  of the false vacuum. For the case  $k = 0$ , the solution is given simply by

$$R(t) = \text{const } e^{\chi t},$$

where

$$\chi = \sqrt{\frac{8\pi}{3}G\rho_f}$$

and *const* is an arbitrary constant. Find the solution to this equation for an arbitrary value of  $k$ . Be sure to consider both possibilities for the sign of  $k$ . You may find the following integrals useful:

$$\int \frac{dx}{\sqrt{1+x^2}} = \sinh^{-1} x$$

$$\int \frac{dx}{\sqrt{1-x^2}} = \sin^{-1} x .$$

$$\int \frac{dx}{\sqrt{x^2-1}} = \cosh^{-1} x .$$

Show that for large times one has

$$R(t) \propto e^{\chi t}$$

for all choices of  $k$ .

**PROBLEM 5: A ZERO MASS DENSITY UNIVERSE— GENERAL RELATIVITY DESCRIPTION**

*(This problem is not required, but can be done for 10 points extra credit.)*

In this problem and the next we will explore the connections between special relativity and the standard cosmological model which we have been discussing. Although we have not studied general relativity in detail, the description of the cosmological model that we have been using is precisely that of general relativity. In the limit of zero mass density the effects of gravity will become negligible, and

the formulas must then be compatible with the special relativity which we discussed at the beginning of the course. The goal of these two problems is to see exactly how this happens.

These two problems will emphasize the notion that a coordinate system is nothing more than an arbitrary system of designating points in spacetime. A physical object might therefore look very different in two different coordinate systems, but the answer to any well-defined physical question must turn out the same regardless of which coordinate system is used in the calculation.

From the general relativity point of view, the model universe is described by the Robertson-Walker spacetime metric:

$$ds_{\text{ST}}^2 = -c^2 dt^2 + R^2(t) \left\{ \frac{dr^2}{1 - kr^2} + r^2 (d\theta^2 + \sin^2 \theta d\phi^2) \right\} .$$

I have included the subscript “ST” to remind us that this formula gives the full spacetime metric, as opposed to the purely spatial metric which we discussed earlier. This formula describes the analogue of the “invariant interval” of special relativity, measured between the spacetime points  $(t, r, \theta, \phi)$  and  $(t + dt, r + dr, \theta + d\theta, \phi + d\phi)$ .

The evolution of the model universe is governed by the general relation

$$\left( \frac{\dot{R}}{R} \right)^2 = \frac{8\pi}{3} G\rho - \frac{kc^2}{R^2} ,$$

except in this case the mass density term is to be set equal to zero.

- (a) Since the mass density is zero, it is certainly less than the critical mass density, so the universe is open. We can then choose  $k = -1$ . Derive an explicit expression for the scale factor  $R(t)$ .
- (b) Suppose that a light pulse is emitted by a comoving source at time  $t_e$ , and is received by a comoving observer at time  $t_o$ . Find the Doppler shift ratio  $z$ .
- (c) Consider a light pulse that leaves the origin at time  $t_e$ . In an infinitesimal time interval  $dt$  the pulse will travel a physical distance  $ds = cdt$ . Since the pulse is traveling in the radial direction (i.e., with  $d\theta = d\phi = 0$ ), one has

$$cdt = R(t) \frac{dr}{\sqrt{1 - kr^2}} .$$

Note that this is a slight generalization of Eq. (3.8), which applies for the case of a Euclidean geometry ( $k = 0$ ). Derive a formula for the trajectory  $r(t)$  of the light pulse. You may find the following integral useful:

$$\int \frac{dr}{\sqrt{1 + r^2}} = \sinh^{-1} r .$$

- (d) Use these results to express the redshift  $z$  in terms of the coordinate  $r$  of the observer. If you have done it right, your answer will be independent of  $t_e$ . (In the special relativity description that will follow, it will be obvious why the redshift must be independent of  $t_e$ . Can you see the reason now?)

**PROBLEM 6: A ZERO MASS DENSITY UNIVERSE— SPECIAL RELATIVITY DESCRIPTION**

*(This problem is also not required, but can be done for 10 points extra credit.)*

In this problem we will describe the same model universe as in the previous problem, but we will use the standard formulation of special relativity. We will therefore use an inertial coordinate system, rather than the comoving system of the previous problem. Please note, however, that in the usual case in which gravity is significant, there is no inertial coordinate system. Only when gravity is absent does such a coordinate system exist.

To distinguish the two systems, we will use primes to denote the inertial coordinates:  $(t', x', y', z')$ . Since the problem is spherically symmetric, we will also introduce “polar inertial coordinates”  $(r', \theta', \phi')$  which are related to the Cartesian inertial coordinates by the usual relations:

$$\begin{aligned}x' &= r' \sin \theta' \cos \phi' \\y' &= r' \sin \theta' \sin \phi' \\z' &= r' \cos \theta' .\end{aligned}$$

In terms of these polar inertial coordinates, the invariant spacetime interval of special relativity can be written as

$$ds_{\text{ST}}^2 = -c^2 dt'^2 + dr'^2 + r'^2 (d\theta'^2 + \sin^2 \theta' d\phi'^2) .$$

For purposes of discussion we will introduce a set of comoving observers which travel along with the matter in the universe, following the Hubble expansion pattern. (Although the matter has a negligible mass density, I will assume that enough of it exists to define a velocity at any point in space.) These trajectories must all meet at some spacetime point corresponding to the instant of the big bang, and we will take that spacetime point to be the origin of the coordinate system. Since there are no forces acting in this model universe, the comoving observers travel on lines of constant velocity (all emanating from the origin). The model universe is then confined to the future light-cone of the origin.

- (a) The cosmic time variable  $t$  used in the previous problem can be defined as the time measured on the clocks of the comoving observers, starting at the instant of the big bang. Using this definition and your knowledge of special relativity, find the value of the cosmic time  $t$  for given values of the inertial coordinates— i.e., find  $t(t', r')$ . [Hint: first find the velocity of a comoving observer who starts at the origin and reaches the spacetime point  $(t', r', \theta', \phi')$ . Note that the rotational symmetry makes  $\theta'$  and  $\phi'$  irrelevant, so one can examine motion along a single axis.]

- (b) Let us assume that angular coordinates have the same meaning in the two coordinate systems, so that  $\theta = \theta'$  and  $\phi = \phi'$ . We will verify in part (d) below that this assumption is correct. Using this assumption, find the value of the comoving radial coordinate  $r$  in terms of the inertial coordinates— i.e., find  $r(t', r')$ . [Hint: consider an infinitesimal line segment which extends in the  $\theta$ -direction, with constant values of  $t$ ,  $r$ , and  $\phi$ . Use the fact that this line segment must have the same physical length, regardless of which coordinate system is used to describe it.] Draw a graph of the  $t'$ - $r'$  plane, and sketch in lines of constant  $t$  and lines of constant  $r$ .
- (c) Show that the radial coordinate  $r$  of the comoving system is related to the magnitude of the velocity in the inertial system by

$$r = \frac{v/c}{\sqrt{1 - v^2/c^2}} .$$

Suppose that a light pulse is emitted at the spatial origin ( $r' = 0$ ,  $t' = \text{anything}$ ) and is received by another comoving observer who is traveling at speed  $v$ . With what redshift  $z$  is the pulse received? Express  $z$  as a function of  $r$ , and compare your answer to part (d) of the previous problem.

- (d) In this part we will show that the metric of the comoving coordinate system can be derived from the metric of special relativity, a fact which completely establishes the consistency of the two descriptions. To do this, first write out the equations of transformation in the form:

$$t' = ?$$

$$r' = ?$$

$$\theta' = ?$$

$$\phi' = ? ,$$

where the question marks denote expressions in  $t$ ,  $r$ ,  $\theta$ , and  $\phi$ . Now consider an infinitesimal spacetime line segment described in the comoving system by its two endpoints:  $(t, r, \theta, \phi)$  and  $(t + dt, r + dr, \theta + d\theta, \phi + d\phi)$ . Calculating to first order in the infinitesimal quantities, find the separation between the coordinates of the two endpoints in the inertial coordinate system— i.e., find  $dt'$ ,  $dr'$ ,  $d\theta'$ , and  $d\phi'$ . Now insert these expressions into the special relativity expression for the invariant interval  $ds_{ST}^2$ , and if you have made no mistakes you will recover the Robertson-Walker metric used in the previous problem.

## DISCUSSION OF THE ZERO MASS DENSITY UNIVERSE:

The two problems above demonstrate how the general relativistic description of cosmology can reduce to special relativity when gravity is unimportant, but it provides a misleading picture of the big-bang singularity which I would like to clear up.

First, let me point out that the mass density of the universe increases as one looks backward in time. If the mass density parameter  $\Omega \equiv \rho/\rho_c$  for our universe has a value of 0.2, at the low end of the empirically allowed range, then the universe today can be approximately modeled by the zero mass density universe. However, provided that  $\Omega$  is greater than zero today, the zero mass density model cannot be taken as a valid model for the early history of the universe.

In the zero mass density model, the big-bang “singularity” is a single spacetime point which is in fact not singular at all. In the comoving description the scale factor  $R(t)$  equals zero at this time, but in the inertial system one sees that the spacetime metric is really just the usual smooth metric of special relativity, expressed in a peculiar set of coordinates. In this model it is unnatural to think of  $t = 0$  as really defining the beginning of anything, since the the future light-cone of the origin connects smoothly to the rest of the spacetime.

In the standard model of the universe with a nonzero mass density, the behavior of the singularity is very different. First of all, it really is singular— one can mathematically prove that there is no coordinate system in which the singularity disappears. Thus, the spacetime cannot be joined smoothly onto anything that may have happened earlier.

The differences between the singularities in the two models can also be seen by looking at the horizon distance. We learned in Lecture Notes 5 that light can travel only a finite distance from the time of the big bang to some arbitrary time  $t$ , and that this “horizon distance” is given by

$$\ell_p(t) = R(t) \int_0^t \frac{c}{R(t')} dt' .$$

For the scale factor of the zero mass density universe as found in the problem, one can see that this distance is infinite for any  $t$ — for the zero mass density model there is **no** horizon. For a radiation-dominated model, however, there is a finite horizon distance given by  $2ct$ .

Finally, in the zero mass density model the big bang occurs at a single point in spacetime, but for a nonzero mass density model it seems better to think of the big bang as occurring everywhere at once. In terms of the Robertson-Walker coordinates, the singularity occurs at  $t = 0$ , for all values of  $r$ ,  $\theta$ , and  $\phi$ . There is a subtle issue, however, because with  $R(t = 0) = 0$ , all of these points have

zero distance from each other. Mathematically the locus  $t = 0$  in a nonzero mass density model is too singular to even be considered part of the space, which consists of all values of  $t > 0$ . Thus, the question of whether the singularity is a single point is not well defined. For any  $t > 0$  the issue is of course clear— the space is homogeneous and infinite (for the case of the open universe). If one wishes to ignore the mathematical subtleties and call the singularity at  $t = 0$  a single point, then one certainly must remember that the singularity makes it a very unusual point. Objects emanating from this “point” can achieve an infinite separation in an arbitrarily short length of time.

**Total points for Problem Set 6: 30, plus up to 20 points extra credit.)**