

New Folder Name Gravity Waves

---

revised

# GRAVITY WAVES FROM MINI-CREATION EVENTS

P. Das Gupta and J.V. Narlikar

Inter-University Centre for Astronomy and Astrophysics, Pune 411 007, INDIA

e-mail : jayant@iucaa.ernet.in

## Abstract

This paper examines the possibility of testing the hypothesis recently proposed by some authors that instead of the one-shot creation of the entire universe in a big bang, creation of matter takes place in finite bursts at random in a universe that is without a beginning and whose expansion on the large scale is as given by the steady state model. It is argued that if the creation events are anisotropic then they generate gravity waves. Calculations are given to show that a laser interferometric detector of the LIGO type would easily detect an event that generates  $\sim 100$  to  $1000 M_{\odot}$ . Further, the cosmological gravity wave background generated by the mini-creation events is compared with the limits set by the analysis of arrival time of pulses from millisecond pulsars. The existing data place severe constraints on the mass and anisotropies of the mini creation events.

## 1. INTRODUCTION

As a serious alternative to the standard hot big bang cosmology, Arp *et al* (1990) and subsequently Hoyle *et al* (1993) proposed a variation on the old steady state model of Bondi and Gold (1948) and Hoyle (1948), that combines some features of both these models. Instead of a single (and primordial) creation event that launched the big bang universe, the alternative envisages an endless chain of creation events randomly distributed in space and time. Each event creates a finite mass which may vary from event to event but the average rate of creation of matter per unit volume remains steady over the cosmological time scale  $H_0^{-1}$ ,  $H_0$  being the Hubble constant. We will call such an event a mini creation event (MCE). Hoyle *et al* (op.cit.) have suggested that MCEs may create masses of varying sizes ranging from the supercluster size mass  $\sim 10^{16} M_\odot$  to masses of the order of  $10 - 10^6 M_\odot$  within galaxies which manifest themselves as explosive phenomena.

The authors have claimed that the primordial single creation event of the big bang is observationally undetectable whereas the MCEs are more amenable to detection. It may well be possible to detect differences in the predictions of the two cosmologies through measurements of primordial abundances, the anisotropies of the microwave background, ages of stars and galaxies etc. We consider here two new methods which can in principle tell us whether MCEs are taking place, what mass limits are allowed and their frequencies. The methods are "new" in the sense that they deal with the gravity waves emerging from the MCEs rather than the more common and conventional electromagnetic waves; and they illustrate the potential role of gravity wave astronomy in the years to come.

Specifically we will calculate two measurable quantities. The first is the gravity wave amplitude generated by an MCE of mass  $M$  at a typical cosmological distance  $r$ . We will then compare it with the magnitudes which are detectable by laser interferometric detectors

available today and planned for the future. Next we will estimate the background spectrum of gravity waves produced by the existing population of MCEs and compare it with the limits set by the timing measurements of millisecond pulsars.

To begin with we will outline the mini-creation scenario of Arp et al (1990) with further details supplied by Hoyle et al (1993). Although no specific discussion has been given regarding the shapes of the MCEs, in order to establish their relevance to the gravity wave problems we make the (not unreasonable) assumption that they possess a small degree of anisotropy and discuss a simple model for anisotropic expansion of the local region around a typical MCE.

## 2. THE DYNAMICS OF A MINI-CREATION EVENT

### 2.1 Isotropic events

The equations determining the expansion of the steady state universe were given by Hoyle and Narlikar (1966a, b), and are summarized below.

The line element for the spacetime has the standard Robertson-Walker form :

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

where  $k = 0, 1, -1$  and  $S(t)$  is the scale factor for expansion.

The field equations are those of Einstein with a scalar field  $C$  which is linked to the creation phenomenon. For the above line element the field equations become

$$2 \frac{\ddot{S}}{S} + \frac{\dot{S}^2 + kc^2}{S^2} = -\frac{8\pi G\rho}{c^2} + 4\pi Gf\dot{C}^2, \quad (2)$$

$$3 \frac{\dot{S}^2 + kc^2}{S^2} = 8\pi G\rho - 4\pi Gf\dot{C}^2, \quad (3)$$

where  $f$  is the coupling constant of the  $C$ -field,  $G$  being the gravitational constant. The pressure  $p$  and density  $\rho$  have their standard interpretation in cosmology.

The steady state model dominated by dust-like matter is given by

$$k = 0, \quad \dot{C} = m, \quad S \propto \exp H_0 t, \quad p = 0, \quad \rho = fm^2 = \frac{3H_0^2}{4\pi G}, \quad (4)$$

where  $m$  is the mass of a typical created particle. For the radiation dominated model we have

$$\rho = \frac{3p}{c^2} = \frac{9H_0^2}{8\pi G}. \quad (5)$$

If we take  $m$  to be large compared to baryon mass and argue that a fraction  $\epsilon$  of the created energy  $mc^2$  goes into matter and the remaining fraction  $1 - \epsilon$  into radiation, we then get

$$\rho_{\text{matter}} = \epsilon fm^2, \quad \rho_{\text{radiation}} = \frac{3}{4}(1 - \epsilon)fm^2, \quad (6)$$

where

$$3H_0^2 = 2\pi G(1 + \epsilon)fm^2. \quad (7)$$

As discussed by Hoyle and Narlikar (1966b) the  $C$ -field works in two modes. The 'creative' mode drives the above steady state solution while the 'non-creative' mode leads to an adiabatic expansion with no injection of new energy. Hoyle and Narlikar had envisaged local region undergoing phase transitions with a switchover of the  $C$ -field from the creative to the non-creative mode. In such a locality the expansion is slowed down and is given by (for  $k = 0$ )

$$\frac{\dot{S}^2}{S^2} = \frac{8\pi G f m^2}{3} \left[ \epsilon \frac{S_0^3}{S^3} + \frac{3}{4} (1 - \epsilon) \frac{S_0^4}{S^4} - \frac{1}{2} \frac{S_0^6}{S^6} \right], \quad (8)$$

$$\dot{C} = m \frac{S_0^3}{S^3}. \quad (9)$$

We have set  $S_0$  as the value of  $S$  when the phase transition took place. Soon, with  $S \gg S_0$ , the first term on the right hand side dominates the expansion and we get

$$S = S_0 \left( \frac{t}{t_0} \right)^{2/3}, \quad t_0 = (6\pi G \epsilon f m^2)^{-1/2}. \quad (10)$$

These ideas of 1966 anticipated the inflationary model of Guth (1981) in which a GUT phase transition is responsible for a similar switchover of the universe from the de Sitter state to the Friedman state. Hoyle and Narlikar (op.cit.) had argued that our cosmological observations tend to be confined to the bubble expanding according to (10). In the later version of Arp et al (1990) the bubbles are identified with minicreation events. The creation process is on/off type with the universe accelerating (in the steady state fashion) when the activity is on and decelerating (in the Friedman way) when it is off.

These ideas have been worked out in greater detail recently by Hoyle et al (1993) in their 'quasi steady state cosmology'. We summarize the scenario here, highlighting the quantitative deductions that are relevant to this work.

In the quasi steady state cosmology creation occurs in varying mass units upto  $\sim 10^{15} - 10^{16} M_{\odot}$  at epochs interspersed with periods of very little creation. During the creative phases the universe is made to accelerate its expansion while in the dormant phases the expansion tends to slow down. We ourselves happen to lie in a dormant phase, with the last creative phase being as far back as  $z \sim 4$ . These values are related by Hoyle

et al also to the observed degree of isotropy of the microwave background and the relative transparency of the universe upto redshifts of this order.

In a typical minicreation event of mass  $M$ , the  $C$ -field causes outward motion starting from a density that is typical of a Schwarzschild sphere of radius  $2GM/c^2$ . Thus the initial density is given by

$$\rho_i \cong 2 \times 10^{16} \left( \frac{M_\odot}{M} \right)^2 g \text{ cm}^{-3}. \quad (11)$$

The created particles are Planck particles of mass

$$M_p = \left( \frac{3\hbar c}{4\pi G} \right)^{1/2},$$

which subsequently decay into baryons and photons leading to an equipartition of the energy density  $\rho_i c^2$  of matter with that of radiation  $aT_i^4$ . This equality gives an initial temperature

$$T_i \approx 7 \times 10^{12} \left( \frac{M_\odot}{M} \right)^{1/2} K. \quad (12)$$

As the system expands, the radiation is initially confined to the object by its high opacity. However, a stage is reached when the radiation escapes, leaving the expansion to be matter dominated. Hoyle *et al* estimate the density at this stage to be

$$\rho \simeq \left[ 3 \times 10^{-9} \left( \frac{M_\odot}{M} \right)^{2/3} \kappa^{-1} \right]^{6/5} g \text{ cm}^{-3} \quad (13)$$

where  $\kappa$  is the opacity, i.e., the mean absorption coefficient expressed in  $\text{cm}^3 \text{ g}^{-1}$ .

Several such MCEs overlap in the course of expansion. By requiring the overlap density  $\rho_{overlap}$  to be such that at that stage the neighbouring objects touch one another,

Hoyle et al estimate this density as  $\sim 10^{-27} g cm^{-3}$ . They argue that the present (closure) density of  $\sim 10^{-29} g cm^{-3}$  implies that the universe has expanded (with essentially no significant creation of matter) by a volume factor  $\sim 10^2$ . Setting this as  $(1+z)^3$ , the conclusion is that the overlap epoch was at redshift of  $\sim 4$ .

Thus from the escape value of density given by (13) to the overlap value the temperature of the radiation field declines as the cube root of density while thereafter it declines as the fourth root. Denoting by factor  $\beta$  the fall in density in the escape to overlap stage, Hoyle et al estimate the present radiation temperature as

$$T_0 = 2.6 \times 10^7 \left( \frac{M}{M_\odot} \right)^{1/6} \beta^{1/12} \rho_{\text{present}}^{1/3}. \quad (14)$$

Setting  $T_0 = 2.74 K$ ,  $\rho_{\text{present}} = 10^{-29} g cm^{-3}$  we get

$$\left( \frac{M}{M_\odot} \right) = 1.4 \times 10^{16} \beta^{1/2}. \quad (15)$$

Hoyle et al then show that from (13) and (15) a value of  $M$ , a little above  $10^{15} M_\odot$  gives a consistent solution, thereby relating the microwave background temperature to the size of a typical supercluster. Subsequently they also relate the picture to the synthesis of light nuclei. Creation can, however, take place on smaller scales also. We will therefore do our calculations for MCEs of arbitrary masses.

## 2.2 Anisotropic MCEs

Since we are interested in the possible emission of gravity waves from an MCE we have to depart from the above idealized spherically symmetric model. It is indeed more realistic to expect the MCEs to be anisotropic if they are to eventually become superclusters (which have generally flattened ellipsoidal shapes). Accordingly we will construct a toy model for



simulating an anisotropically expanding mass  $M$  created in an MCE.

It is convenient to describe the expansion through a Bianchi Type I model with line element given by

$$ds^2 = c^2 d\tau^2 - X^2(\tau)dx^2 - Y^2(\tau)dy^2 - Z^2(\tau)dz^2, \quad (16)$$

where  $(x, y, z)$  are the comoving coordinates and  $\tau$  the proper time of a typical dust particle partaking expansion. The Einstein field equations can be solved for a dust dominated system to yield the solution

$$\begin{aligned} X(\tau) &= S(\tau)\{F(\tau)\}^{2 \sin \alpha}, \quad Y(\tau) = S(\tau)\{F(\tau)\}^{2 \sin(\alpha + \frac{2\pi}{3})} \\ Z(\tau) &= S(\tau)\{F(\tau)\}^{2 \sin(\alpha + \frac{4\pi}{3})}, \quad F(\tau) = \frac{(GM)^{1/3} \tau^{2/3}}{S(\tau)}, \\ \{S(\tau)\}^3 &= X(\tau)Y(\tau)Z(\tau). \end{aligned} \quad (17)$$

The anisotropy of expansion comes through the parameter  $\alpha$ . The 'average' scale factor of expansion is given by  $S(\tau)$ , and it is related to the mass  $M$  by

$$S^3(\tau) = \frac{9}{2} GM\tau(\tau + \Sigma), \quad \Sigma = \text{constant} \quad (18)$$

The mass  $M$  and the density  $\rho$  are related by

$$M = \frac{4\pi}{3} \rho S^3. \quad (19)$$

The comoving coordinates  $(x, y, z)$  for the dust particles within the MCE have values lying in the range  $(-1, 1)$  so that at any time  $\tau$  during expansion the physical coordinates on the surface  $(x_s, y_s, z_s)$  satisfy the ellipsoidal equation

$$\frac{x_s^2}{X^2(\tau)} + \frac{y_s^2}{Y^2(\tau)} + \frac{z_s^2}{Z^2(\tau)} = 1. \quad (20)$$

Such an expanding object has a changing quadrupole moment. The quadrupole moment tensor has principal axes in the  $xyz$  directions. A straightforward calculation gives the three diagonal elements of the quadrupole moment tensor as

$$I_{xx} = \frac{1}{5}MX^2(\tau), \quad I_{yy} = \frac{1}{5}MY^2(\tau), \quad I_{zz} = \frac{1}{5}MZ^2(\tau) \quad (21)$$

We therefore expect that a typical MCE of the above kind will radiate gravitationally. We will estimate its effect in the following section. For this we will need the so called anisotropy parameter  $\eta$ . It is estimated as follows.

From (17) we have for  $\tau \gg \Sigma$

$$\frac{X(\tau)}{Y(\tau)} = \left(\frac{2}{9}\right)^{\frac{2}{3} \sin \alpha - \frac{2}{3} \sin \left(\alpha + \frac{2\pi}{3}\right)} \equiv \left(\frac{2}{9}\right)^{q_{xy}} \quad (22)$$

and similar ratios for  $Y(\tau)/Z(\tau)$ ,  $Z(\tau)/X(\tau)$  etc. For complete isotropy these ratios are all unity. In general, the exponents  $q_{xy}, q_{yz}, q_{zx}$  of  $(2/9)$  are non-zero and indicate departure from isotropy.

The anisotropy parameter  $\eta_{xy}$  is then defined by

$$\begin{aligned} \eta_{xy} &= \left(\frac{2}{9}\right)^{\frac{4}{3} \sin \alpha} - \left(\frac{2}{9}\right)^{\frac{4}{3} \sin \left(\alpha + \frac{2\pi}{3}\right)} \\ &= \left(\frac{2}{9}\right)^{\frac{4}{3} \sin \left(\alpha + \frac{2\pi}{3}\right)} \left( \left(\frac{2}{9}\right)^{2q_{xy}} - 1 \right) \end{aligned} \quad (23)$$

with similar expressions for  $\eta_{yz}$  and  $\eta_{zx}$ . The reason for this particular expression will become clear in the next section.

We first estimate  $q_{xy}$  etc. from the shapes of clusters, superclusters on the assumption that after the MCE ceases to expand it retains its shape (20) as galaxies form within it. We will return to this assumption in §4.2. For clusters of galaxies the mean axial ratio is  $\sim 0.5$  (Plionis, Barrow & Frenk 1991) while for superclusters it is  $\sim 0.14$  (Oort 1983). From (22) we estimate  $q_{xy} \sim 0.46$  for clusters and  $\sim 1.3$  for superclusters.

Since the  $\alpha$  parameter effectively varies between  $\left(-\frac{\pi}{6}, \frac{\pi}{2}\right)$  we find from (23) that

$$\begin{aligned} 0.098 &\lesssim |\eta_{xy}| \lesssim 2.04 && \text{for clusters} \\ 0.127 &\lesssim |\eta_{xy}| \lesssim 2.66 && \text{for superclusters.} \end{aligned} \tag{24}$$

Again,  $\eta_{xy} = 0$  corresponds to complete spherical symmetry. The implication of  $\eta$  will become clear in the next section when we discuss the actual magnitude of gravity wave amplitude due to an MCE.

### 3. GRAVITATIONAL RADIATION FROM AN MCE

#### 3.1 Amplitude of radiation

We now proceed with the anisotropic MCE discussed above as a typical source of gravity waves located at a cosmological distance. First we do a calculation for flat spacetime and subsequently make corrections to the results due to various causes. Typically the gravity wave amplitude is given by (e.g. Landau & Lifshitz 1941),

$$h_{ik}{}^{TT}(\mathbf{r}, \tau) = \frac{2G}{c^4} \frac{1}{r} \left[ \ddot{I}_{ik} \left( \tau - \frac{r}{c} \right) \right]^{TT} \tag{25}$$

where the superscript  $TT$  refers to the transverse traceless gauge. Here  $\mathbf{r}$  is the position vector of the observer from the source and  $\tau - \frac{r}{c}$  the retarded time when the effect from the source reaches the observer.

For simplicity, we choose the line of sight to coincide with the  $z$  axis of the ellipsoid

(20). (For a general orientation our final answer has to be multiplied by some projection factors.) In this case we have the only non-zero components of  $I_{ik}^{TT}$  as

$$I_{xx}^{TT} = I_{yy} = \frac{1}{5}M[X^2(\tau) - Y^2(\tau)] = -I_{yy}^{TT}. \quad (26)$$

Thus, we see that (22) is non-zero only if  $X \neq Y$ .

Substituting from (17) we get after a somewhat lengthy but straightforward manipulation for  $\tau \gg \Sigma$

$$\begin{aligned} \ddot{I}_{xx}^{TT} &\approx \frac{2}{5}M(GM)^{2/3}\tau^{-2/3} \left[ \left(\frac{2}{9}\right)^{(1/3)[1+4 \sin \alpha]} - \left(\frac{2}{9}\right)^{(1/3)[1+4 \sin (\alpha + \frac{2\pi}{3})]} \right] \\ &\approx \frac{2}{5} \left(\frac{2}{9}\right)^{1/3} M(GM)^{2/3}\tau^{-2/3}\eta_{xy} \end{aligned} \quad (27)$$

where  $\eta_{xy}$  is given by (23). And hence  $h$  from (25) is given by

$$h_{xx}^{TT}(\mathbf{r}, \tau) = \frac{4}{5} \left(\frac{2}{9}\right)^{1/3} (GM)^{5/3} \frac{1}{c^4 r} (\tau - \frac{r}{c})^{-2/3} \eta_{xy} \quad (28)$$

To set the above result in astronomical perspective we rewrite it as

$$h(\mathbf{r}, \tau) \cong 3.2 \times 10^{-20} \eta \left(\frac{10 \text{ kpc}}{r}\right) \left(\frac{M}{10M_{\odot}}\right)^{5/3} \left(\frac{\tau - \frac{r}{c}}{1 \text{ sec}}\right)^{-2/3}. \quad (29)$$

Henceforth we will drop the suffix  $xy$  on  $\eta$ .

### 3.2 Fourier transform of the amplitude

Since most of the detectors as well as probes of gravitational radiation are sensitive over a limited frequency band, it is useful to express (29) in the frequency space. We redefine the 'zero' of time  $\tau$  of the observer as the instant when the gravity wave first hits him so that for  $\tau > 0$

$$h(\mathbf{r}, \tau) = \frac{4}{3} \left( \frac{2}{9} \right)^{1/3} \frac{(GM)^{5/3}}{c^4 r} \tau^{-2/3} \eta. \quad (30)$$

The fourier transform of  $h(\mathbf{r}, \tau)$  is given by

$$\begin{aligned} \tilde{h}(\mathbf{r}, f) &= \int_{-\infty}^{\infty} h(\mathbf{r}, t) e^{-2\pi i f t} dt \\ &= \int_0^{\infty} \frac{4}{5} \left( \frac{2}{9} \right)^{1/3} \frac{(GM)^{5/3}}{c^4 r} \eta \tau^{-2/3} e^{-2\pi i f \tau} d\tau \\ &= \frac{4}{5} \left( \frac{2}{9} \right)^{1/3} \Gamma\left(\frac{1}{3}\right) \frac{\eta e^{-i\pi/6}}{(2\pi f)^{1/3}} \frac{(GM)^{5/3}}{c^4 r}. \end{aligned} \quad (31)$$

In numerical terms this becomes

$$|\tilde{h}| = 4.65 \times 10^{-20} \eta \left( \frac{10 \text{ kpc}}{r} \right) \left( \frac{M}{10 M_{\odot}} \right)^{5/3} \left( \frac{f}{1 \text{ Hz}} \right)^{-1/3}. \quad (32)$$

We will next put this result in perspective with regard to detection by gravity wave detectors from the currently available technology.

### 3.3 Detection by Laser Interferometers

For the LIGO type detectors that are essentially broad band detectors one uses the Wiener optimal filters  $q(t)$  defined by its Fourier transform (Thorne 1987, Schutz 1991),

$$\tilde{q}(f) = k \frac{\tilde{h}(f)}{S_h(f)}, \quad (33)$$

where  $S_h(f)$  is the spectral density of the noise in the detector and  $k$  is some arbitrary constant. When the filter matches the signal perfectly the cross correlation between the output of the detector and the filter leads to a signal to noise ratio

$$\frac{S}{N} = \left\{ 2 \int_0^{\infty} \frac{|\tilde{h}(f)|^2}{S_h(f)} df \right\}^{1/2}. \quad (34)$$

Assuming for simplicity that the detector is sensitive uniformly in the frequency band  $(f_1, f_2)$  and is blind outside it, we obtain

$$S_h(f) = \begin{cases} \sigma^2 & \text{for } f_1 < f < f_2, \\ \infty & \text{otherwise.} \end{cases} \quad (35)$$

Here  $\sigma$  is a constant related to the sensitivity of the detector. So, from (34) and (31) we obtain

$$\frac{S}{N} = \left( \frac{1}{9\pi} \right)^{1/3} \frac{4\sqrt{6}}{5} \Gamma\left(\frac{1}{3}\right) \frac{\eta(GM)^{5/3}}{\sigma c^4 r} \left( f_2^{1/3} - f_1^{1/3} \right)^{1/2} \quad (36)$$

To fix ideas, we take the LIGO sensitivity which, for the characteristic frequency range between  $\sim 100$  Hz to 300 Hz, is expected to be (Abramovici et al. 1992),

$$\sigma \sim 10^{-24} \text{ Hz}^{-1/2}. \quad (37)$$

Using these numbers we get

$$\frac{S}{N} \gtrsim 16.4\eta \left( \frac{M}{10M_{\odot}} \right)^{5/3} \left( \frac{100 \text{ Mpc}}{r} \right) \left( \frac{\sigma}{10^{-24} \text{ Hz}^{-1/2}} \right)^{-1} \left\{ \left( \frac{f_2}{300 \text{ Hz}} \right)^{1/3} - \left( \frac{f_1}{100 \text{ Hz}} \right)^{1/3} \right\}^{1/2}. \quad (38)$$

It is interesting that S/N is large enough for LIGO to detect an MCE of as low mass as  $10M_{\odot}$  situated within a distance of  $\sim 100$  Mpc from us provided it is anisotropic enough to have  $\eta \gtrsim 0.1$ .

Are there any upper limits on the masses of MCEs detectable by gravitational waves? Here, we have to be careful in using (28) to estimate the gravitational wave amplitude because it is based on the quadrupole radiation formula in which the background space-time geometry is taken to be flat, while the time coordinate  $\tau$  that appears in (28)-(30) corresponds to the proper time in the interior of a MCE. In particular, the time coordinate external to the MCE that is relevant for the observer is a function both of spatial and temporal coordinates describing the interior geometry, implying that the observed amplitude at an instant depends on the interior coordinates in a very complicated manner.

On the other hand, the expanding solution given in §2.2 describes an object with large scale coherence in its dynamical motion in the  $\tau$ -frame. The crucial question is, to what extent this coherence would manifest itself in the gravity waves from the object in the rest frame of an external detector (like the LIGO on Earth). An exact calculation is extremely difficult. However, to obtain an insight into the problem we make use of simple physical arguments.

The net gravitational wave amplitude from a MCE, in the linear approximation, can be thought of arising out of a superposition of gravitational waves from individual fluid elements of the MCE. If  $f$  is the frequency of interest, coherent superposition of amplitudes occurs only from within a region  $R$  of size less than  $\sim 0.5\lambda = 0.5c/f$ . After a time  $\tau$  of the birth of a MCE, the characteristic frequency  $f$  of the gravitational wave is  $\sim \dot{S}/S = 2/3\tau$ , so that from (18) one estimates the mass of the region  $R$  to be less than  $\sim 1.3 \times 10^4 f^{-1} M_{\odot}$ , where  $f$  is in units of Hz. Thus, for frequencies in the range  $\sim 10 - 100$  Hz, the upper limit to the mass lies in the range  $\sim 130 - 1300 M_{\odot}$ . One can safely use the expression in (38) for events having mass less than the above upper limit. For masses above the limit more exact and detailed calculations will be needed to compute the net observable

effect. However, for an event that releases  $\sim 100 M_{\odot}$  at a distance close to the limit of the observable universe ( $\sim 3000$  Mpc), the signal-to-noise ratio is about  $36\eta$ , well within the reach of a LIGO.

The crucial question, of course, is : how frequent are such events? For this we need to know the rate at which the MCEs occur over a given volume.

In the steady state model the average rate of creation of matter is given by  $3H_0\rho$  where  $H_0$  is Hubble's constant =  $100 h_0 \text{ km s}^{-1} \text{ Mpc}^{-1}$  and  $\rho$  the mean (smoothed out) density of matter. Assuming that the MCEs occur with a more or less uniform mass  $M$  per unit time, the rate of such events is

$$\mathfrak{R}(M) = \frac{3\rho H_0}{M} \cong 10^{-80} h_0 \left( \frac{\rho}{2 \times 10^{-29} \text{ gm cm}^{-3}} \right) \left( \frac{M}{10M_{\odot}} \right)^{-1} \text{ cm}^{-3} \text{ s}^{-1}. \quad (39)$$

The above rate implies that within a radius of  $\sim 100$  Mpc, one MCE of  $\sim 10M_{\odot}$  goes off every second. Similarly, a MCE with mass  $\sim 130 M_{\odot}$  going off anywhere within the horizon will be seen at a rate of  $\sim 570$  per second. On the other hand the rate for an MCE of the supercluster size occurring within  $\sim 3000$  Mpc is still quite low, viz  $\sim 1$  in  $10^4 - 10^5$  yrs. Hoyle *et al* (1993) have argued that creation events come in phases when the universe passes through a 'creative' mode. The isotropy constraints of the microwave background constrain the epoch of last such activity to redshifts of  $\gtrsim 4$ . Thus, major supercluster type MCEs would not be expected at smaller redshifts. In any case, destructive interference of gravitational wave amplitudes arising from points separated by a distance of  $\sim 0.5\lambda$  within the MCE, makes it difficult to estimate the intensity of gravitational radiation at  $f \sim 100$  Hz from such high mass events.

However, reduced creation in terms of smaller masses may be taking place sporadically even in the relatively recent epochs. Thus the rate of 570 per second computed for MCEs



of  $\sim 130 M_{\odot}$  is expected to be an overestimate. For example, if the present creation rate has fallen now to  $\sim 10^{-6}$  of the average value given by (39), the above rate would be reduced to  $5.7 \times 10^{-4}$  per second.

This calculation therefore tells us that the existence of MCEs of stellar mass range can be easily confirmed or disproved by a detector in the LIGO class. For the supercluster type MCEs both rarity of events as well as lack of quantitative estimates for the gravitational wave amplitude, make them uninteresting as far as LIGOs are concerned.

### 3.4 A few caveats

We reemphasize that these estimates are to be looked upon as crude 'first estimates' that need to be polished up with more accurate and detailed calculations. Such calculations should include the following issues :

- a) The Bianchi type-I solution discussed by us is singular at  $\tau = 0$  whereas a realistic MCE should start with a finite but very large density corresponding to a dense pocket of  $C$ -field. Thus we have not taken due note of the relationship of our isolated MCE solution to the overall cosmological boundary conditions.
- b) We have ignored the matching conditions across the finite boundary of the MCE which should tell us how to relate the time coordinate  $\tau$  within the MCE to the cosmological time  $t$ . Normally, we expect the observer (like ourselves) to observe a mixture of Doppler blue shift (for the approaching surface of the MCE) and the gravitational redshift of the MCE mass besides the usual cosmological redshift.
- c) The exact solution is further complicated by the fact that the gravity waves that arrive at the observer at a given time did not leave the different parts of the source at the same comoving time (This was already discussed in §3.3). Hence a more exact version

of our calculations of  $\ddot{X}, \ddot{Y}, \ddot{Z}$  etc. will have to include this non-synchronous departure effect.

d) We have used in (22) the flat spacetime formula for propagation of the gravity wave. One would expect redshift dependent factors to appear, reducing the intensity beyond the flat space distance effect.

We also make a brief comparison of the MCE with the standard sources of gravity waves in astrophysics, namely supernovae, coalescing binaries, etc. This will enable observers to distinguish between the possible sources in the event of a positive detection.

From a supernova as a source we expect powerful but transient bursts of gravity waves. Crude estimates (cf Misner et al. 1973, for example) indicate energy radiated at the rate of  $\sim 3 \times 10^{54} \text{ erg s}^{-1}$  with a characteristic frequency of  $\sim 3000 \text{ Hz}$  and lifetime of  $\sim 0.15$  or 300 periods. Such supernova explosions occur a few times per century per galaxy.

In the case of a MCE, since the characteristic gravitational wave frequency when the MCE is  $\tau$  seconds old is  $\sim 2/3\tau$ , one expects LIGO to see a burst of radiation lasting for a duration of  $\sim 0.007 - 0.07$  seconds, provided the lower frequency cut-off of the detector lies in the range 10 - 100 Hz. An MCE of  $\sim 100 M_{\odot}$  would thus be observed even at a distance of  $\sim 3000 \text{ Mpc}$ . Observations by the LIGO type detectors can therefore place limits on the creation rate allowable in the form of MCEs of this order of masses.

Typical stellar binaries have longer time scales ranging from  $\sim 10^9 - 10^{24}$  yrs. (Misner et al. op. cit.). For coalescing binaries the time scales can be much shorter, ranging from a few years to a few seconds. For example, in the case of a neutron star binary with mass of  $\sim 1.4 M_{\odot}$  for each of the compact objects the characteristic gravitational wave amplitude at the frequency of  $\sim 300 \text{ Hz}$  is about  $\sim 7 \times 10^{-19}$  if the binary is 10 kpc away. For such a binary, the gravitational wave amplitude lasts for  $\sim 2.5$  seconds corresponding to

frequencies larger than 100 Hz.

Therefore, energetically (and also, possibly, event rate-wise) both supernovae as well as coalescing binaries fall short of MCEs with mass less than  $\sim 100 - 1000 M_{\odot}$ , making the latter an interesting class of objects for LIGO-type detectors.

## 4. THE GRAVITY WAVE BACKGROUND GENERATED BY THE MCEs

### 4.2 Flux and Spectrum of an MCE

The energy radiated per unit time per unit area by an MCE of mass  $M$  and anisotropy parameter  $\eta$  is given by (cf Thorne 1987)

$$\mathcal{F} \cong \frac{c^3}{16\pi G} \left( \frac{\partial h}{\partial \tau} \right)^2, \quad (4)$$

where  $h$  is given by (30). In the frequency space, the energy crossing per unit area per unit frequency range is given by

$$\tilde{\mathcal{F}} \cong \frac{\pi c^3}{2G} f^2 |\tilde{h}(f)|^2 \quad (41)$$

The net energy radiated per unit frequency range is (41) multiplied by  $4\pi r^2$ . This quantity becomes, after substitution from (31)

$$\mathcal{E} \cong \frac{32\pi^2}{25} \left( \frac{1}{9\pi} \right)^{2/3} \left\{ \Gamma \left( \frac{1}{3} \right) \right\}^2 \cdot \frac{\eta^2}{c^5 G} \cdot (GM)^{10/3} f^{4/3}. \quad (42)$$

In numerical terms this is

$$\mathcal{E} = 1.57 \times 10^{46} \eta^2 \left( \frac{M}{10M_{\odot}} \right)^{10/3} \left( \frac{f}{1\text{Hz}} \right)^{4/3} \text{ erg Hz}^{-1} \quad (43)$$

Using these expressions within the framework of the steady state model we evaluate the spectrum of the energy density produced by all such MCEs together. We will take note of the expanding universe in computing the dimming and frequency shift of this radiation.

#### 4.2 The stochastic gravity wave background

To compute the background, consider the MCEs of mass  $M$  in the shell of inner and outer boundaries of redshifts  $z$  and  $z + dz$ . Denoting by  $V(z)dz$  the volume of this shell, the number of gravitons radiated in frequency range  $(f', f' + df')$  in time  $(\tau', \tau' + d\tau')$  is estimated as

$$dN = \frac{\mathcal{E}(f')df'}{hf'} \cdot \mathfrak{R}(M)V(z)dzd\tau'. \quad (44)$$

The corresponding frequency and time ranges at the terrestrial observer are  $df = df'/(1+z)$  and  $d\tau = d\tau'(1+z)$ . Hence the flux density of gravitational radiation received from the redshift shell  $(z, z + dz)$  is given by

$$F(M, f, z)dz = \frac{hf}{4\pi r^2 S_0^2} \cdot \frac{dN}{df dt}. \quad (45)$$

We first compute the background on the assumption that the MCEs are distributed uniformly in the steady state universe. We will subsequently discuss the modifications based on our being in a bubble that extends upto the redshift of  $z \sim 4$  as discussed in §2.1. The radial coordinate  $r$  is related to  $z$  in the steady state model by the relation

$$rS_0 = \frac{c}{H_0} z, \quad (46)$$

while  $V(z)$  becomes

$$V(z) = 4\pi \left( \frac{c}{H_0} \right)^3 \frac{z^2}{(1+z)^3}. \quad (47)$$

Using the above expressions we get

$$F(M, f, z) = \frac{c}{H_0} \frac{\mathcal{E}(f \cdot \overline{1+z})}{(1+z)^4} \mathfrak{R}(M). \quad (48)$$

Substituting for  $\mathcal{E}$  and  $\mathfrak{R}$  from (42) and (39) we get

$$F(M, f, z) = \frac{96\pi^2}{25} \left( \frac{1}{9\pi} \right)^{2/3} \left\{ \Gamma\left(\frac{1}{3}\right) \right\}^2 \eta^2 \frac{\rho(GM)^{7/3}}{c^4} f^{4/3} (1+z)^{-8/3}. \quad (49)$$

Integrating  $F$  with respect to  $z$  gives us the total stochastic gravity wave background in the observed frequency range  $(f, f + df)$ . We get the answer as a function of  $M$  as well as  $f$ :

$$F(M, f) = \frac{288\pi^2}{125} \left( \frac{1}{9\pi} \right)^{2/3} \Gamma\left(\frac{1}{3}\right)^2 \eta^2 \frac{\rho(GM)^{7/3}}{c^4} f^{4/3}. \quad (50)$$

The corresponding energy density of gravity wave background is therefore

$$\mathcal{E}_{GW} = \frac{1}{c} F(M, f) \equiv \Omega_{GW}(f) \rho_c c^2 f^{-1} \quad (51)$$

where  $\rho_c$  is the closure density  $3H_0^2/8\pi G$ .

Now, it is possible to set limits on  $\Omega_{GW}(f)$  by analysing residuals in the pulse arrival time measurements of pulsars (Detweiler 1979, Mashhoon 1982). We make use of (51) to express  $\Omega_{GW}$  as,

$$\Omega_{GW} = \frac{288\pi^2}{125c^7} \left( \frac{1}{9\pi} \right)^{2/3} \left( \Gamma\left(\frac{1}{3}\right) \right)^2 (GM)^{7/3} f^{7/3} \eta^2 \Omega_0. \quad (52)$$

where  $\Omega_0$  is the ratio of matter density to the closure density.

Stinebring *et al* (1990) quote an upper limit of  $4 \times 10^{-7}$  near  $f = 0.14 \text{ yr}^{-1}$  with 95% confidence. This value may be compared with the theoretical value given by (52). Evaluating (52) at  $f = 0.14 \text{ yr}^{-1}$  gives the inequality

$$\eta^2 \left( \frac{M}{M_\odot} \right)^{7/3} < 1.55 \times 10^{24},$$

i.e.,

$$M < 2.33 \times 10^{10} \eta^{-6/7} M_\odot. \quad (53)$$

These results are slightly modified if we take into account the possibility that we live in a part of spacetime where the creation process is relatively dormant. The quasi steady state cosmology requires that upto redshift of  $z \sim 4$  we are in a Friedman bubble with the Einstein de Sitter (flat  $k = 0$ ) model determining the expansion of the universe, with *no* creation of matter. The relations (45)–(49) therefore apply to  $z \gtrsim 4$  while for smaller redshifts we need to use the Einstein-de Sitter relations. The calculation is straightforward though somewhat tedious. The resulting expression for  $F(M, f)$  is that given by (50) with an additional factor  $(1 + z_c)^{-5/3}$  where  $z_c (\approx 4)$  is the redshift of the bubble boundary. The limit (53) is then changed to

$$M < 7.36 \times 10^{10} \eta^{-6/7} M_\odot. \quad (54)$$

MCEs with mass  $\lesssim 100 - 1000 M_\odot$  are in obvious agreement with the above observational constraint. For high mass events again one has to be cautious. As discussed in §3.3, the gravitational wave amplitude formula (28), on which the above analysis is

based , is valid only for MCEs of mass less than  $\sim 1.3 \times 10^4 (f/1 \text{ Hz})^{-1} M_{\odot}$ . For  $f \approx 0.14 \text{ yr}^{-1}$ , this translates into an upper limit of  $\sim 3 \times 10^{12} M_{\odot}$ . Therefore strictly speaking, the constraint (54) is applicable only to MCEs of mass not exceeding typical galactic masses. And it is clear from (54) that galactic size MCEs with  $\eta$  less than 0.1 are consistent with the currently available pulsar timing data. A naive extrapolation of (54) to supercluster size MCEs have following implications.

For MCEs with  $M \cong 10^{15} M_{\odot}$ , (54) will force  $\eta$  to values  $\lesssim 10^{-6}$ . That is, such MCEs should expand very isotropically. This, of course, does not tie up with the relatively large values of  $\eta$  given by (24). One has to argue, then, that the observed large values of  $\eta$  in the superclusters are not characteristic of the expansion anisotropies from which they formed. In that case, the observed flattening has to be a later phenomenon related to the astrophysical processes of condensation of galaxies and clusters in the superclusters. Or, a second line of defence involves the statement that the supercluster size MCEs are only a small fraction of the overall creation process which is confined more to smaller size masses. If, however, a more careful calculation shows that very massive MCEs do not act as coherent sources of gravity waves (as discussed earlier) then the expression (54) cannot be used to rule out supercluster type MCEs.

## 5. CONCLUSIONS

These calculations show that gravity waves can provide sharply focussed tests of the mini-creation event hypothesis. In terms of its magnitude an anisotropic MCE is the biggest source of gravity waves, far exceeding in its power as well as event rate than the more conventional sources like the supernova explosion and binary star systems.

We have shown that a LIGO-type laser interferometric detector should frequently detect mini-creation events generating mass less than  $\sim 1000 M_{\odot}$ . If matter is being created through mini bangs at the overall rate required by the quasi steady state cosmology proposed by Hoyle *et al* (1993), then the non-detection of any event would imply either that the creation process is occurring through larger and more infrequent MCEs or that the MCEs are highly isotropic failing which, the hypothesis of continuous creation is untenable.

The calculation of stochastic background of gravity waves created by the MCEs is also capable of being tested through the timing measurements of millisecond pulsars. We find that upto galactic size MCEs are consistent with the presently available pulsar residual analysis. Extrapolating these calculations to supercluster type MCEs seems to indicate that such MCEs should be highly isotropic in order to meet the pulsar timing constraint.

Our conclusions are based on an approximate calculation which suffices for low mass events. But a more exact (and technically much more difficult) calculation is necessary for MCEs of supercluster class.

Finally, this discussion demonstrates that the concept of cosmological creation of matter through mini bangs hypothesized by Arp *et al* (1990) is capable of being tested observationally with the existing technology.



## **Acknowledgements**

We wish to thank the referee of this paper for useful comments. One of us (P.D.G.) wishes to thank C.S.I.R., New Delhi for supporting this research work.

## REFERENCES

- Abramovici, A., et al., 1992, *Sci*, 256, 325
- Arp, H.C., Burbidge, G., Hoyle, F., Narlikar, J.V., Wickramasinghe, N.C., 1990, *Nat*, 346, 807
- Bondi, H., Gold, T., 1948, *MNRAS*, 108, 252
- Detweiler, S., 1979, *ApJ*, 234, 1100
- Guth, A.H., 1981, *Phys. Rev. D.*, 23, 347
- Hoyle, F., 1948, *MNRAS*, 108, 372
- Hoyle, F., Narlikar, J.V., 1966a, *Proc. Roy. Soc., A* 290, 143
- Hoyle, F., Narlikar, J.V., 1966b, *Proc. Roy. Soc., A* 290, 162
- Hoyle, F., Burbidge, G., Narlikar, J.V., 1993, *ApJ*, to appear.
- Landau, L.D., Lifshitz, E.M., 1941, *Teoriya Polya, Nauka : Moscow*
- Mashhoon, B., 1982, *MNRAS*, 199, 659
- Misner, C.W., Thorne, K.S., Wheeler, J.A., 1973, *Gravitation*, W.H. Freeman, New York, Chapter 36
- Oort, J.H., 1983, *ARA&A*, 21, 373
- Plionis, M., Barrow, J.D., Frenk, C.S., 1991, *MNRAS*, 249, 662
- Schutz, B.F., 1991, in Blair, D.G., ed, *The Detection of Gravitational Waves*, Cambridge University Press, Cambridge, p. 406
- Stinebring, D.R., Ryba, M.F., Taylor, J.H., Romani, R.W., 1990, *Phys. Rev. Lett.*, 65, 285

Thorne, K.S., 1987, in Hawking, S., Israel, W., eds, 300 years of gravitation,  
Cambridge University Press, Cambridge, p.330