A distance functional between cosmological Celestial Spheres

XXV SIGRAV Conference on General Relativity and Gravitation Sep 4 – 8, 2023 Trieste

Speaker: Francesca Familiari Work in collaboration with Mauro Carfora



University of Pavia

The picture provided by the ACDM model and by the FLRW spacetime, is quite successful in providing a rather accurate physical and geometrical representation of the universe at present era and over spatial scales ranging from $\approx 100 h^{-1}$ Mpc to the visual horizon of our past light cone.

However extending the validity of the FLRW solutions (even in their perturbatuve form) over scales $\leq 100 h^{-1}$ Mpc is quite problematic

(f)

Standard model

As we probe spatial regions in the range $\leq 100h^{-1}$ Mpc, the actual distribution of matter becomes extremely anisotropic with a high density contrast.

Gravitational clustering gives rise to a complex network of structures, characterized by the presence of a foam like web of voids and galaxy filaments often extending well into the $100h^{-1}$ Mpc range

At this scales we may have non-perturbative correction terms due to the coupling between gravitationally bound structures and the emergent spacetime geometry.



...this leads to the question

What is the role of these pre-homogeneity regions ?



We would like to be able to quantify the effect of the prehomogeneity region on the overall dynamics of the Universe

The general Idea is to consider the point of view of two different observers: the Friedmaniann observer and the Physical observer.

How much do they differ from each other?

...we need to adress this problem in the context of spacetime geometry Friedmaniann 4 Celestial sphere Physical Celestial sphere



Friedmanian past light-cone

Physical past light-cone

We want to compare the two Celestial Spheres

These Celestial spheres are Riemaniann surfaces (a round 2-sphere for FLRW; a bumpy surface in the physical case) , so from the matematical point of view we are comparing Metric Surfaces: the best way to do that is by using the harmonic map theory, adopted usually in image visualization problems.

Friedmaniann 4 Celestial sphere





Contains informations about the difference between the two Celestial-Spheres which arise for two main reasons:

- The respective Hubble flows are different from each other.
- On scale <L₀ local inhomogeneities couple with the geometry (no longer RW) which influence the motion
 of the observer (peculiar velocities affect the choice of the three referece anchors determining ζ)

 ζ is a Lorentz transformation Represented as an element of $\zeta \in PSL(2,\mathbb{C})$

The group of conformal trasformation between Celestial Spheres



In the simplest case, when both the celestial spheres are spheres, the map induce a conformal diffeomorfism between the two

All the difference between the two 2-spheres can be encoded in a conformal factor: Φ

Taking advantage of this conformal transformation we can define...



The Comparison Functional:

 $E_{\widehat{\mathbb{CS}}_{\widehat{z}}, \mathbb{CS}_{z}}[\zeta_{(\widehat{z})}] := \int_{\widehat{\mathbb{CS}}_{\widehat{z}}} (\Phi(y) - 1)^{2} d\mu_{\hat{h}_{(\widehat{z})}}(y).$

Conformal factor

FLRW Celestial Spheres

area element on $\widehat{\mathbb{CS}}_{\hat{z}}$

At a given redshift \hat{z} compares the FLRW celestial sphere and the Physical celestial sphere

FLRW Celestial Spheres Physical Celestial Spheres



A really crucial property of the comparison functional is its relation with the area distance:

 $E_{\widehat{\mathbb{CS}}_{\widehat{z}}, \ \mathbb{CS}_{z}}[\zeta_{(\widehat{z})}] = \int_{\widehat{\mathbb{CS}}_{\widehat{z}}} \left[D(\zeta_{(\widehat{z})}(y)) - \widehat{D}_{\widehat{z}}(y) \right]^{2} d\mu_{\mathbb{S}^{2}_{z}}(y)$

FLRW area distance Physical area distance

solid angle

measure

E > 0

This equation tell us that the comparison functional describes the *mean square fluctuations*, at the chosen redshift \hat{z} , of the physical area distance with respect to the Friedmaniann area distance.

The comparison functional can be written in terms of measurable quantities so, in principle:.

FLRW Celestial Sphere Physical Celestial Sphere

It is measurable!

This suggest us that we can address the issue of finding the optimal functional: the one that minimize the fluctuations between the physical area distance and the Friedmaniann area distance.

We minimize the Comparison Functional over all the possible peculiar velocities fluctuations around the map ζ :

$d_{\widehat{z}}\left[\widehat{\mathbb{C}\,\mathbb{S}}_{\widehat{z}},\ \mathbb{C}\,\mathbb{S}_{z}\right]\ :=\ \inf_{\zeta_{(\widehat{z})}\ \in\ \mathrm{PSL}(2,\mathbb{C})}\ E_{\widehat{\mathbb{C}\,\mathbb{S}}_{\widehat{z}},\ \mathbb{C}\,\mathbb{S}_{z}}[\zeta_{(\widehat{z})}]$

defining the Distance Functional

It has a number of properties:

- It is scale dependent (\hat{z})
- It is a functional distance between the two Celestial Spheres



The scale-dependent distance functional has **memory** of the inhomogeneous region probed by our past light cone also when the information reaching us comes from large \hat{z} sources.

For single sources this memory is manifest from lensing events etc... However $d_{\hat{z}}$ organizes these local memories in a unique global functional.

We can associate to this memory field a corresponding red-shift dependent positive contribution to the FLRW cosmological constant $\widehat{\Lambda}$ given by:



to whatever degree one accepts the role of (area) distance fluctuations in precision cosmology, one has to grant this expression an equal degree of acceptance. Weak lensing, and galaxy surveys, delivering accurate measurements of our celestial sphere, will allow us to understand to what extent $\hat{\Lambda}_{\hat{S}}$ contributes to the FLRW cosmological constant.

(late-epoch) inhomogeneous Universe





(early-epoch) homogeneous Universe

Standard model