Open Science Framework DOI:10.31219/osf.io/***

# Dimensional analysis on differential manifolds [draft]

P.G.L. Porta Mana
<pgl@portamana.org>

13 December 2019; updated 11 January 2020

Some notes on dimensional analysis on differential manifolds, with an eye on general relativity and the Einstein equation.
*Note: Dear Reader & Peer, this manuscript is being peer-reviewed by you. Thank you.*

## 1 ***

'Dimensional analysis remains a controversial and somewhat obscure subject. We do not attempt a complete presentation here.'[1]

There seem to be insecurity and wrong ideas among some students and even researchers in relativity, regarding the dimensions of tensors, of tensor components, and of dimensional constants in equations. I've met, for example, with the statement that the components of a tensor should all have the same dimension; and with calculations of the dimensions of curvature tensors starting from coordinates with dimensions of length. That statement is wrong, and that procedure is unnecessary.

Several factors probably cause or contribute to such difficulties. Modern texts in Lorentzian and general relativity commonly use geometrized units. They say that to find the dimension of some constant in a tensorial equations it's sufficient to compare the dimensions of the tensors in the equation. But this is not so immediate, because some tensors don't have universally agreed dimensions – prime example the 4-metric tensor. Older texts often use coordinates with dimension of length. They even multiply a timelike coordinate or some tensorial components by $c$, thus giving the impression that coordinates should always be lengths and that the components of a tensor would all have the same dimension.[2].

In this note I want to clarify some misconceptions about dimensional analysis in differential manifolds, and to illustrate a simple way of reasoning to solve dimensional-analysis doubts and problems. This way

[1] Truesdell et al. 1960 Appendix § 7 footnote 4. [2] e.g. Tolman 1949 § 37 eq. (37.8); Landau et al. 1996 § 32 eq. (32.15).

of reasoning relies on the coordinate-free, *intrinsic* view of tensors and other differential-geometrical objects.

Let's start from more general facts about dimensional analysis on differential manifolds.

For dimensional analysis I use ISO conventions and notation. I sometimes use notation such as $\boldsymbol{A}_{\bullet}{}^{\bullet}$ to indicate that the tensor $\boldsymbol{A}$ is covariant in its first slot and contravariant in its second; I call this a 'co-contra-variant tensor'.

[check[3]]

## 2 Intrinsic view of differential-geometric objects: brief reminder

From the intrinsic point of view, a tensor is defined by its geometric properties. For example, a vector field $\boldsymbol{v} \equiv \boldsymbol{v}(\,\cdot\,)$ is an object that operates on functions defined on the manifold, yielding new functions, with the properties $\boldsymbol{v}(af + bg) = a\boldsymbol{v}(f) + b\boldsymbol{v}(g)$ and $\boldsymbol{v}(fg) = \boldsymbol{v}(f)g + f\boldsymbol{v}(g)$ for all functions $f$, $g$ and reals $a$, $b$. A covector field (1-form) $\boldsymbol{\omega}$ is an object that operates on vector fields, yielding functions ('duality'), with the property $\boldsymbol{\omega}(f\boldsymbol{u} + g\boldsymbol{v}) = f\boldsymbol{\omega}(\boldsymbol{u}) + g\boldsymbol{\omega}(\boldsymbol{v})$ for all vector fields $\boldsymbol{u}$, $\boldsymbol{v}$ and functions $f$, $g$. The sum of vector or covector fields, and their products by functions – let's call this 'linearity' – are defined in an obvious way. Tensors are constructed from these objects.

A system of coordinates $(x^i)$ is just a set of linearly independent functions. This set gives rise to a set of vectors fields $\left(\frac{\partial}{\partial x^i}\right)$ and to a set of covector fields $(\mathrm{d}x^i)$ by the obvious requirements that $\frac{\partial}{\partial x^i}(x^j) = \delta_i{}^j$ and $\mathrm{d}x^i\left(\frac{\partial}{\partial x^j}\right) = \delta^i{}_j$. These two sets can be used as bases to express all other vectors and covectors as linear combinations. A vector field $\boldsymbol{v}$ can thus be written as

$$\boldsymbol{v} \equiv \sum_i v^i \frac{\partial}{\partial x^i} \equiv v^i \frac{\partial}{\partial x^i}, \tag{1}$$

where the *functions* $v^i := \boldsymbol{v}(x^i)$ are its components with respect to the basis $\left(\frac{\partial}{\partial x^i}\right)$. Analogously for a covector field.

For the full presentation of the intrinsic view I recommend the excellent texts by Choquet-Bruhat et al. (1996), Boothby (2003), Abraham

[3] Aldersley 1977.

et al.[4], Bossavit (1991), Burke (1987; 1980 ch. 2), and more on the general-relativity side Misner et al. (1973 ch. 9), Gourgoulhon (2012 ch. 2), Penrose et al. (2003 ch. 4).

check[5]

## 3 Coordinates

From a physical point of view, a coordinate is just a function that associates a value of a physical quantity with every event in a region (the domain of the coordinate chart) of spacetime. Together with the other coordinates, such function allows us to uniquely identify every event within that region. Any physical quantity will do: the distance from something, the time elapsed since something, an angle, an energy density, the strength of a magnetic flux, a temperature, and so on. A coordinate can thus have any dimensions: length $\mathsf{L}$, time $\mathsf{T}$, angle $1$, energy density $\mathsf{E} \coloneqq \mathsf{M}\mathsf{L}^{-1}\mathsf{T}^{-2}$, magnetic flux $\Phi \coloneqq \mathsf{M}\mathsf{L}^{2}\mathsf{T}^{-2}\mathsf{I}^{-1}$, temperature $\Theta$, and so on.

The dimensions of the coordinates don't matter, as we'll now see.

## 4 Tensors

Consider a system of coordinates $(x^i)$ with dimensions $(\mathsf{X}_i)$, and the ensuing sets of covector fields (1-form) $\mathrm{d}x^i$ and of vector fields $\left(\frac{\partial}{\partial x^i}\right)$, bases for the cotangent and tangent spaces. Their tensor products are bases for the tangent spaces of higher tensor types.

The differential $\mathrm{d}x^i$ traditionally has the same dimension as $x^i$: $\dim(\mathrm{d}x^i) = \mathsf{X}_i$, and the operator (a vector) $\frac{\partial}{\partial x^i}$ traditionally has the inverse dimension: $\dim \frac{\partial}{\partial x^i} = {\mathsf{X}_i}^{-1}$. We'll see later that these conventions are self-consistent.

For our discussion let's take a concrete example: a contra-co-tensor field $\boldsymbol{A} \equiv \boldsymbol{A}^{\bullet}{}_{\bullet}$. The discussion generalizes to tensors of other types in an obvious way.

The tensor $\boldsymbol{A}$ can be expanded in terms of the basis vectors and covectors, as mentioned in § 2:

$$\boldsymbol{A} = A^i{}_j \, \frac{\partial}{\partial x^i} \otimes \mathrm{d}x^j \equiv A^0{}_0 \, \frac{\partial}{\partial x^0} \otimes \mathrm{d}x^0 + A^0{}_1 \, \frac{\partial}{\partial x^0} \otimes \mathrm{d}x^1 + \cdots . \tag{2}$$

[4] Abraham et al. 1988. [5] Fischer et al. 1972.

Each function

$$A^i{}_j \coloneqq \boldsymbol{A}\Bigl(\mathrm{d}x^i, \frac{\partial}{\partial x^j}\Bigr) \tag{3}$$

is a component of the tensor in this coordinate system.

To make dimensional sense, all terms in the sum (2) must have the same dimension. This is possible only if the generic component $A^i{}_j$ has dimension

$$\dim(A^i{}_j) = \mathsf{A}\,\mathsf{X}_i\,{\mathsf{X}_j}^{-1}, \tag{4}$$

where $\mathsf{A}$ is common to all components. Suppose for example that we're using coordinates with dimensions

$$\dim(x^0) = \Theta, \quad \dim(x^1) = \mathsf{L}, \quad \dim(x^2) = \mathsf{L}, \quad \dim(x^3) = \mathsf{ML^{-1}MT^{-2}}; \tag{5}$$

then the components of $\boldsymbol{A}$ have dimensions

$$\bigl(\dim(A^i{}_j)\bigr) = \mathsf{A} \times \begin{pmatrix} 1 & \mathsf{L}^{-1}\Theta & \mathsf{L}^{-1}\Theta & \mathsf{M^{-1}LT^2}\Theta \\ \mathsf{L}\Theta^{-1} & 1 & 1 & \mathsf{M^{-1}L^2T^2} \\ \mathsf{L}\Theta^{-1} & 1 & 1 & \mathsf{M^{-1}L^2T^2} \\ \mathsf{ML^{-1}T^{-2}}\Theta^{-1} & \mathsf{ML^{-2}T^{-2}} & \mathsf{ML^{-2}T^{-2}} & 1 \end{pmatrix}. \tag{6}$$

The dimension $\mathsf{A}$, which is also the dimension of the sum (2), is called the *absolute dimension*[6] of the tensor $\boldsymbol{A}$, and we write

$$\dim(\boldsymbol{A}) = \mathsf{A}. \tag{7}$$

This is the intrinsic dimension of the tensor, independent of any coordinate system. It reflects the physical or operational[7] meaning of the tensor. We'll see an example of what this mean in § 8.

Different coordinate systems lead to different dimensions of the *components* of $\boldsymbol{A}$, but its absolute dimension remains the same. Formula (4) for the dimensions of the components is consistent under changes of coordinates. For example, in new coordinates $(x'^k)$ with dimensions $(\mathsf{X}'_k)$, the new components of $\boldsymbol{A}$ are

$$A'^k{}_l = A^i{}_j \,\frac{\partial x'^k}{\partial x^i}\,\frac{\partial x^j}{\partial x'^l} \tag{8}$$

and a quick check shows that $\dim(A'^k{}_l) = \mathsf{A}\,\mathsf{X}'_k\,{\mathsf{X}'_l}^{-1}$, consistent with the general formula (4).

In the following I'll drop the adjective 'absolute' when it's clear from the context.

[6] Dorgelo et al. 1946; Schouten 1989 ch. VI. § A.2; Truesdell et al. 1960 §§ A.3–4.

[7] Bridgman 1958; see also Synge 1960a

## 5 Tensor operations

By the reasoning of the previous section, which simply applies standard dimensional considerations to the basis expansion (2), it's easy to find out the resultant absolute dimension of various operations and operators on tensors and tensor fields.

The tensor product of $\boldsymbol{A}^{\bullet}{}_{\bullet}$ and $\boldsymbol{B}_{\bullet\bullet}{}^{\bullet}$, for example, can be written as the sum

$$\boldsymbol{A} \otimes \boldsymbol{B} = A^{i}{}_{j}\, B_{kl}{}^{m}\, \frac{\partial}{\partial x^{i}} \otimes \mathrm{d}x^{j} \otimes \mathrm{d}x^{k} \otimes \mathrm{d}x^{l} \otimes \frac{\partial}{\partial x^{m}} \tag{9}$$

from which it follows that

$$\dim(A^{i}{}_{j}\, B_{kl}{}^{m}) = \mathsf{A}\,\mathsf{B}\; \mathsf{X}_{i}\, \mathsf{X}_{j}{}^{-1}\, \mathsf{X}_{k}{}^{-1}\, \mathsf{X}_{l}{}^{-1}\, \mathsf{X}_{m} \tag{10}$$

with $\mathsf{A} = \dim(\boldsymbol{A})$ and $\mathsf{B} = \dim(\boldsymbol{B})$. The absolute dimension of $\boldsymbol{A} \otimes \boldsymbol{B}$ is therefore $\mathsf{AB} \equiv \dim(\boldsymbol{A})\, \dim(\boldsymbol{B})$.

Here is then a summary of the dimensional results of the main differential-geometric operations and operators, except for the covariant derivative and related tensors, discussed more in depth in § 7 below. In brackets I give the section of Choquet-Bruhat et al. (1996) where they are defined.

- *Tensor multiplication* [III.B.5] multiplies dimensions:

$$\dim(\boldsymbol{A} \otimes \boldsymbol{B}) = \dim(\boldsymbol{A}) \dim(\boldsymbol{B}). \tag{11}$$

- The *contraction* [III.B.5] of the $i$th and $j$th slots (one covariant and one contravariant) of a tensor has the same dimension as the tensor:

$$\dim(\mathrm{tr}_{ij}\, \boldsymbol{A}) = \dim(\boldsymbol{A}). \tag{12}$$

Note that this only holds *without* raising or lowering indices.

- The *transposition* (swapping) of the $i$th and $j$th slots of a tensor has the same dimension as the tensor:

$$\dim(\boldsymbol{A}^{\top ij}) = \dim(\boldsymbol{A}). \tag{13}$$

- The *Lie bracket* [III.B.3] of two vectors has the product of their dimensions:

$$\dim([\boldsymbol{u}, \boldsymbol{v}]) = \dim(\boldsymbol{u}) \dim(\boldsymbol{v}). \tag{14}$$

• The *Lie derivative* [III.C.2] of a tensor with respect to a vector field has the product of the dimensions of the tensor and of the vector:

$$\dim(\mathrm{L}_v \boldsymbol{A}) = \dim(v)\dim(\boldsymbol{A}). \tag{15}$$

Regarding operations and operators on differential forms:

• The *exterior product* [IV.A.1] of two differential forms multiplies their dimensions:

$$\dim(\boldsymbol{\omega} \wedge \boldsymbol{\tau}) = \dim(\boldsymbol{\omega})\dim(\boldsymbol{\tau}). \tag{16}$$

• The *interior product* [IV.A.4] of a vector and a form multiplies their dimensions:

$$\dim(\mathrm{i}_v \boldsymbol{\omega}) = \dim(v)\dim(\boldsymbol{\omega}). \tag{17}$$

• The *exterior derivative* [IV.A.2] of a form has the same dimension of the form:

$$\dim(\mathrm{d}\boldsymbol{\omega}) = \dim(\boldsymbol{\omega}). \tag{18}$$

This can be proven using the identity $\mathrm{d}\,\mathrm{i}_v + \mathrm{i}_v\,\mathrm{d} = \mathrm{L}_v$ or similar identities[8] together with eqs (15) and (17).

• The *integral* [IV.B.1] of a form over a submanifold has the same dimension as the form:

$$\dim\Bigl(\int_c \boldsymbol{\omega}\Bigr) = \dim(\boldsymbol{\omega}). \tag{19}$$

The resultant absolute dimensions of other operators, for example the determinant[9], can be obtained by similar reasoning.

## 6 Curves and integral curves

Consider a curve into spacetime, $c\colon s \mapsto P(s)$, with the parameter $s$ having dimension $\dim(s) = \mathrm{S}$.

[8] Curtis et al. 1985 ch. 9 p. 180 Theorem 9.78; Abraham et al. 1988 § 6.4 Theorem 6.4.8.
[9] Abraham et al. 1988 § 6.2.

If we consider the manifold as a dimensionless quantity (see §*** for what I mean by this), then the dimension of the tangent or velocity vector $\dot{C}$ to the curve is

$$\dim(\dot{C}) = \mathrm{S}^{-1}, \tag{20}$$

owing to the definition[10]

$$\dot{C} \coloneqq \frac{\partial x^i[C(s)]}{\partial s} \frac{\partial}{\partial x^i}. \tag{21}$$

This has a quirky but interesting consequence. Given a vector field $\boldsymbol{v}$ we say that $C$ is an integral curve for it if

$$\boldsymbol{v} = \dot{C} \tag{22}$$

(or more precisely $\boldsymbol{v}_{C(s)} = \dot{C}_{C(s)}$ in usual differential-geometric notation[11]) at all events $C(s)$ in the image of the curve. From the point of view of dimensional analysis this definition can only be valid if $\boldsymbol{v}$ has dimension $\mathrm{S}^{-1}$. If $\boldsymbol{v}$ and $s^{-1}$ have different dimensions – a case which can happen for physical reasons – the condition (21) must be modified into $\boldsymbol{v} = k\dot{C}$, where $k$ is a possibly dimensionful constant. This is equivalent to considering an affine and dimensional reparameterization of $C$.

## 7 Connection, covariant derivative, curvature tensors

Consider an arbitrary connection[12] with covariant derivative $\nabla$. For the moment we don't assume the presence of any metric structure.

The covariant derivative of the product $f\boldsymbol{v}$ of a function and a vector satisfies[13]

$$\nabla(f\boldsymbol{v}) = \mathrm{d}f \otimes \boldsymbol{v} + f\nabla\boldsymbol{v}. \tag{23}$$

The first summand, from formulae (18) and (11), has dimension $\dim(f)\dim(\boldsymbol{v})$; for dimensional consistency this must also be the dimension of the second summand. Thus

$$\dim(\nabla\boldsymbol{v}) = \dim(\boldsymbol{v}). \tag{24}$$

It follows that the *directional* covariant derivative has dimension

$$\dim(\nabla_{\boldsymbol{u}}\boldsymbol{v}) = \dim(\boldsymbol{u})\dim(\boldsymbol{v}), \tag{25}$$

[10] Choquet-Bruhat et al. 1996 § III.B.1; Boothby 2003 § IV.(1.9). [11] Choquet-Bruhat et al. 1996 § III.B.1. [12] Choquet-Bruhat et al. 1996 § V.B. [13] Choquet-Bruhat et al. 1996 § V.B.1.

and by its derivation properties[14] we see that formula (24) extends from vectors to tensors of arbitrary type.

In the coordinate system $(x^i)$, the action of the covariant derivative is carried by the *connection coefficients* or Christoffel symbols $(\varGamma^i_{\ jk})$ defined by

$$\nabla \frac{\partial}{\partial x^k} = \varGamma^i_{\ jk}\ \mathrm{d}x^j \otimes \frac{\partial}{\partial x^i}. \tag{26}$$

From this equation and the previous ones it follows that these coefficients have dimensions

$$\dim(\varGamma^i_{\ jk}) = \mathsf{X}_i\, \mathsf{X}_j^{-1}\, \mathsf{X}_k^{-1}. \tag{27}$$

The *torsion* $\boldsymbol{\tau}^{\bullet}{}_{\bullet\bullet}$, *Riemann curvature* $\boldsymbol{R}^{\bullet}{}_{\bullet\bullet\bullet}$, and *Ricci curvature* $\boldsymbol{Ric}_{\bullet\bullet}$ tensors are defined by[15]

$$\boldsymbol{\tau}(\boldsymbol{u}, \boldsymbol{v}) \coloneqq \nabla_{\boldsymbol{u}}\boldsymbol{v} - \nabla_{\boldsymbol{v}}\boldsymbol{u} - [\boldsymbol{u}, \boldsymbol{v}], \tag{28}$$

$$\boldsymbol{R}(\boldsymbol{u}, \boldsymbol{v}; \boldsymbol{w}) \coloneqq \nabla_{\boldsymbol{u}}\nabla_{\boldsymbol{v}}\boldsymbol{w} - \nabla_{\boldsymbol{v}}\nabla_{\boldsymbol{u}}\boldsymbol{w} - \nabla_{[\boldsymbol{u},\boldsymbol{v}]}\boldsymbol{w}, \tag{29}$$

$$\boldsymbol{Ric}_{\bullet\bullet} \coloneqq \mathrm{tr}_{13}\, \boldsymbol{R}^{\bullet}{}_{\bullet\bullet\bullet}. \tag{30}$$

From these definitions and the results of § 5 we find the dimensional requirements

$$\dim(\boldsymbol{\tau}^{\bullet}{}_{\bullet\bullet}) \dim(\boldsymbol{u}) \dim(\boldsymbol{v}) = \dim(\boldsymbol{u}) \dim(\boldsymbol{v}), \tag{31}$$

$$\dim(\boldsymbol{R}^{\bullet}{}_{\bullet\bullet\bullet}) \dim(\boldsymbol{u}) \dim(\boldsymbol{v}) \dim(\boldsymbol{w}) = \dim(\boldsymbol{u}) \dim(\boldsymbol{v}) \dim(\boldsymbol{w}), \tag{32}$$

$$\dim(\boldsymbol{Ric}_{\bullet\bullet}) = \dim(\boldsymbol{R}^{\bullet}{}_{\bullet\bullet\bullet}), \tag{33}$$

which imply that *torsion, Riemann curvature, and Ricci curvature are dimensionless*:

$$\dim(\boldsymbol{\tau}^{\bullet}{}_{\bullet\bullet}) = \dim(\boldsymbol{R}^{\bullet}{}_{\bullet\bullet\bullet}) = \dim(\boldsymbol{Ric}_{\bullet\bullet}) = 1. \tag{34}$$

The exact contra- and co-variant type used above for these tensors is very important in these equations. If we raise any of their indices using a metric, their dimensions will generally change.

Misner et al. (1973 pp. 35, 407) say that 'curvature', the Riemann or Einstein tensors (for which see § 8 below), has dimension $\mathsf{L}^{-2}$, a statement seemingly at variance with the dimensionless results (34). But I believe that they refer to the *components* of those tensors, in specific coordinates of dimension $\mathsf{L}$, and using geometrized units. In such specific coordinates

[14] Choquet-Bruhat et al. 1996 § V.B.1 p. 303.

[15] Choquet-Bruhat et al. 1996 § V.B.1.

every *component* $R^{i}{}_{jkl}$ does indeed have dimension $\mathsf{L}^{-2}$, according to the general formula (4), if and only if the *absolute* dimension of $\boldsymbol{R}$ is unity, $\dim(\boldsymbol{R}) = 1$. So I believe that there's no real contradiction with that statement and the results (34). This possible misunderstanding shows that it's important to distinguish between absolute dimensions, which don't depend on any specific coordinate choice, and component dimensions, which do.

The formulae above are also valid if a metric is defined and the connection is compatible with it. The connection coefficients in this case are defined in terms of the metric tensor, but using the results of §*** it's easy to see that eqs (24), (25), (27), (34) still hold.

## 8 Metric tensor

Let's now consider a metric tensor $\boldsymbol{g}_{\bullet\bullet}$. What is its absolute dimension $\dim(\boldsymbol{g})$? There seem to be two or three choices in the literature; all three can be derived from an operational meaning of the metric.

Consider a (timelike) worldline $s \mapsto C(s)$, $s \in [a, b]$, between events $C(a)$ and $C(b)$. The metric tells us the *proper time* elapsed for an observer having that worldline, according to the formula

$$\vartriangle t = \int_a^b \mathrm{d}s \, \sqrt{\left|\boldsymbol{g}[\dot{C}(s), \dot{C}(s)]\right|}. \tag{35a}$$

From the results of § 5 this formula implies that $\mathsf{T} \equiv \dim(\vartriangle t) = \sqrt{\dim(\boldsymbol{g}_{\bullet\bullet})}$, (independently of the dimension of $s$) and therefore

$$\dim(\boldsymbol{g}_{\bullet\bullet}) = \mathsf{T}^2. \tag{36a}$$

Many authors[16] prefer to include a dimensional factor $1/c$ in front of the integral (35a):

$$\vartriangle t = \frac{1}{c} \int_a^b \mathrm{d}s \, \sqrt{\left|\boldsymbol{g}[\dot{C}(s), \dot{C}(s)]\right|}, \tag{35b}$$

thus obtaining

$$\dim(\boldsymbol{g}_{\bullet\bullet}) = \mathsf{L}^2. \tag{36b}$$

[16] e.g. Fock 1964 § V.62, eq. (62.02); Curtis et al. 1985 ch. 11 eq. (11.21); Rindler 1986 § 5.3 eq. (5.6); Hartle 2003 ch. 6 eq. (6.24).

The choice (36b) seems also supported by the traditional expression for the 'line element $ds^2$' as it appears in many works,

$$ds^2 = c^2 dt^2 - dx^2 - dy^2 - dz^2, \tag{37}$$

possibly with opposite signature[17]. If the coordinates $(t, x, y, z)$ have the dimensions suggested by their symbols, this formula has dimension $\mathsf{L}^2$, so that if we interpret '$ds^2$' as $\boldsymbol{g}$ we find $\dim(\boldsymbol{g}) = \mathsf{L}^2$. The line-element expression above often has an ambiguous differential-geometric meaning, however, because it may represent *the metric applied to some unspecified vector*, that is, $\boldsymbol{g}(\boldsymbol{v}, \boldsymbol{v})$, where $\boldsymbol{v}$ is left unspecified[18]. In this case we have

$$\mathsf{L}^2 = \dim(\boldsymbol{g}) \dim(\boldsymbol{v})^2 \tag{38}$$

and the dimension of $\boldsymbol{g}$ is ambiguous – possibly dimensionless if $\boldsymbol{v}$ has dimension of length, but we'll see in § 10 that a dimensionless $\boldsymbol{g}$ isn't quite compatible with the Einstein equation.

The standard choices for $\dim \boldsymbol{g}$ are thus $\mathsf{T}^2$ or $\mathsf{L}^2$. My favourite choice is the first, (36a), for reasons discussed by Synge and Bressan[19]. Synge gives a vivid summary:[20]

> We are now launched on the task of giving physical meaning to the Riemannian geometry [. . .]. It is indeed a Riemannian *chronometry* rather than *geometry*, and the word *geometry*, with its dangerous suggestion that we should go about measuring *lengths* with *yardsticks*, might well be abandoned altogether in the present connection

In fact, to measure the proper time $\triangle t$ defined above we only need to ensure that a clock has the worldline $C$, and then take the difference between its final and initial times. On the other hand, consider the case when the curve $C$ is *spacelike*. Its proper length is still defined by the integral (35a) (apart from a dimensional constant). Its measurement, however, is more involved than the timelike case. It requires dividing the curve into very short pieces, and having specially-chosen observers (they must be orthogonal to the piece) measure each piece. But the measurement of each piece actually relies on the measurement of *proper time*: each observer uses 'radar distance'[21], explained in appendix***. Even if rigid rods are used, their calibration still relies on a measurement

**17** for an exception, with dimension $\mathsf{T}^2$, see Kilmister 1973 ch. II p. 25. **18** cf. Misner et al. 1973 Box 3.2 D, p. 77. **19** Synge 1960b §§ III.2–4; Bressan 1978 §§ 15, 18. **20** Synge 1960b § III.3 pp. 108–109. **21** Landau et al. 1996 § 84.

of time – this is also reflected in the current definition of the standard metre[22].

The metric $\boldsymbol{g}$ can be considered as an operator mapping vectors to covectors, which we can compactly write as $\boldsymbol{\omega} = \boldsymbol{g}\boldsymbol{v}$, rather than $\boldsymbol{\omega} = \mathrm{tr}_{23}(\boldsymbol{g} \otimes \boldsymbol{v})$. The *inverse metric tensor* $\boldsymbol{g}^{-1\bullet\bullet}$ is then defined by the formula

$$\boldsymbol{g}^{-1}\boldsymbol{g} = \mathrm{id}^{\bullet}{}_{\bullet}, \qquad \boldsymbol{g}\boldsymbol{g}^{-1} = \mathrm{id}_{\bullet}{}^{\bullet}, \tag{39}$$

and obviously

$$\dim(\boldsymbol{g}^{-1}) = \dim(\boldsymbol{g})^{-1}. \tag{40}$$

The *metric volume element*[23] in spacetime is a 4-form $\boldsymbol{\gamma}$, equivalent to a completely antisymmetric tensor $\boldsymbol{\gamma}_{\bullet\bullet\bullet\bullet}$, such that $\boldsymbol{\gamma}(\boldsymbol{e}_0, \boldsymbol{e}_1, \boldsymbol{e}_2, \boldsymbol{e}_3) = 1$ for every set of positively-oriented orthonormal vector fields $(\boldsymbol{e}_k)$, that is, such that $\boldsymbol{g}(\boldsymbol{e}_k, \boldsymbol{e}_l) = \pm\delta_{kl}$ (remember that the orientation is not determined by the metric). It has only one non-zero coordinate component, given by the square root of the determinant of the (positively ordered) components $(g_{ij})$ of the metric:

$$\boldsymbol{\gamma} = \sqrt{|\det(g_{ij})|}\; \mathrm{d}x^0 \wedge \mathrm{d}x^1 \wedge \mathrm{d}x^2 \wedge \mathrm{d}x^3. \tag{41}$$

From this expression and the results of § 5 it can be shown that, in spacetime,

$$\dim(\boldsymbol{\gamma}) = \dim(\boldsymbol{g})^2 \equiv \begin{cases} \mathsf{T}^4 \\ \mathsf{L}^4 \end{cases} \quad \text{if } \dim(\boldsymbol{g}) \coloneqq \begin{cases} \mathsf{T}^2 \\ \mathsf{L}^2 \end{cases} . \tag{42}$$

(This is also the dimension of the *density* $|\boldsymbol{\gamma}|$, which, as opposed to the volume element, has the property that $|\boldsymbol{\gamma}|(\boldsymbol{e}_0, \boldsymbol{e}_1, \boldsymbol{e}_2, \boldsymbol{e}_3) = 1$ for all sets of orthonormal vector fields, not only positively-oriented ones.)

The operation of *raising or lowering an index* of a tensor represents a contraction of the tensor product of that tensor with the metric or the metric inverse, for example $\boldsymbol{A}_{\bullet\bullet} \equiv \mathrm{tr}_{13}\, \boldsymbol{A}^{\bullet}{}_{\bullet} \otimes \boldsymbol{g}_{\bullet\bullet}$ and similarly for tensors of other types. Therefore

$$\dim(\boldsymbol{A}_{\dots\bullet\dots}) = \dim(\boldsymbol{A}_{\dots}{}^{\bullet}{}_{\dots})\dim(\boldsymbol{g}), \quad \dim(\boldsymbol{A}_{\dots}{}^{\bullet}{}_{\dots}) = \dim(\boldsymbol{A}_{\dots\bullet\dots})\dim(\boldsymbol{g})^{-1}. \tag{43}$$

The formulae for the covariant derivative (24), connection coefficients (27), and curvature tensors (34) remain valid for a connection

[22] BIPM 1983 p. 98; Giacomo 1984 p. 25.
[23] Abraham et al. 1988 § 6.2.

compatible with the metric. In this case the connection coefficients can be obtained from the metric by the formulae[24]

$$\Gamma^{i}_{\ jk} = \frac{1}{2}\left(\frac{\partial}{\partial x^k} g_{jl} + \frac{\partial}{\partial x^j} g_{kl} - \frac{\partial}{\partial x^l} g_{jk}\right) g^{li}, \tag{44}$$

and it's easily verified that formula (27) still holds, and also (34) since the expression of the curvature tensors in terms of the connection coefficients is the same with or without a metric.

The *scalar curvature* $\rho$ and the *Einstein tensor* $\boldsymbol{G}_{\bullet}^{\ \bullet}$,

$$\rho = \operatorname{tr} \boldsymbol{Ric}_{\bullet}^{\ \bullet} \equiv \operatorname{tr}_{23}(\boldsymbol{Ric} \otimes \boldsymbol{g}^{-1}), \qquad \boldsymbol{G}_{\bullet}^{\ \bullet} := \boldsymbol{Ric}_{\bullet}^{\ \bullet} - \tfrac{1}{2}\rho \operatorname{id}_{\bullet}^{\ \bullet} \tag{45}$$

have therefore dimension

$$\dim(\rho) := \dim(\boldsymbol{G}_{\bullet}^{\ \bullet}) = \dim(\boldsymbol{g})^{-1} \equiv \begin{cases} \mathsf{T}^{-2} \\ \mathsf{L}^{-2} \end{cases} \text{if } \dim(\boldsymbol{g}) := \begin{cases} \mathsf{T}^{2} \\ \mathsf{L}^{2} \end{cases}. \tag{46}$$

## 9 Stress-energy-momentum tensor

To find the dimension of the stress-energy-momentum, which I'll call '4-stress', let's start with the analysis of the (3-)stress in Newtonian mechanics. The stress is the projection of the 4-stress on a spacelike tangent plane with respect to some observer. If we choose a coordinate system compatible with such observer and the spatial projection, then the components of the stress are also the spacelike components of the 4-stress, apart from dimensionless relativistic-correction factors.

In Newtonian mechanics the stress $\boldsymbol{\sigma}$ is an object that, integrated over the boundary of a body, gives the total surface force acting on the body (such integration requires a flat connection). This means that it must be represented by a 'force-valued' 2-form. Force, in turn, can be interpreted as an object that, integrated over a (spacelike) trajectory, gives an energy – the work done by the force along the trajectory. It's therefore a 1-form. Putting these two requirements together we obtain a covector-valued 2-form, equivalent to a tensor $\boldsymbol{\sigma}_{\bullet\bullet\bullet}$ antisymmetric in its last two indices. Integrated over a surface, and then over a trajectory, it yields an energy.

[24] Choquet-Bruhat et al. 1996 § V.B.2.

From § 5, integration of a form does not change the dimension of the form. Therefore

$$\dim(\boldsymbol{\sigma}_{\bullet\,\bullet\bullet}) = \mathsf{E} \equiv \mathsf{M}\mathsf{L}^2\mathsf{T}^{-2}. \tag{47}$$

In most texts the stress-energy-momentum, which I'll call '4-stress', is represented by a tensor of order 2,

$$\boldsymbol{T}_{\bullet}{}^{\bullet\bullet} = T_i{}^j \, \mathrm{d}x^i \otimes \frac{\partial}{\partial x^j}. \tag{48}$$

To find its dimension let's examine its spatial part only

The most fitting geometrical nature of the stress-energy-momentum, from a kinematic and dynamical point of view, is still shrouded by mystery. In most relativity texts it is represented by a tensor of order 2, but there are indications that it could be more properly represented by a covector-valued 3-form (equivalent to a tensor $\boldsymbol{T}_{\bullet\,\bullet\bullet\bullet}$ antisymmetric in the last three slots), or by a 3-vector-valued 3-form (equivalent to a tensor $\boldsymbol{T}^{\bullet\bullet\bullet}{}_{\bullet\bullet\bullet}$ antisymmetric in the first three and last three slots). See for example the discussion about '${}^*\boldsymbol{T}$' by Misner et al. (1973 ch. 15), the works by Segev (2002; 1986; 1999; 2000a,b), the discussion by Burke (1987 § 41).

What are the absolute dimensions of the co-contra-variant stress-energy-momentum tensor $\boldsymbol{T}_{\bullet}{}^{\bullet}$? We must look for an operational meaning here too. I'll try to sketch an informal argument that reflects my point of view. The argument can be made more rigorous but that would take too long to do here.

The dynamics equation $\nabla \cdot \boldsymbol{T} = 0$ holds in general-relativistic (thermo)mechanics, and also in Newtonian (thermo)mechanics when no body forces and no body heating are present. In Newtonian mechanics it's the formal combination of the balances of momentum density and energy density – which incidentally have the same dimensions $[\mathrm{M}\,\mathrm{L}^{-1}\,\mathrm{T}^{-3}]$, energy/(volume × time).

The divergence of the stress-energy-momentum gives us a 4-force density, just like the 3-divergence of the stress gives us a force density. Please check Misner &al (1973), chap. 14, for a very interesting discussion of these matters, and also Eckart (1940) and Burke (1980, 1987).

Further, the 4-force is an object that, integrated over a path, gives us an energy density (cf Milne 1951 chap. IV, and Burke again). The integral of a force in Newtonian mechanics is the work done by the force. In general-relativistic mechanics, the timelike component of the 4-force additionally gives us the increase in energy owing to heating (Eckart 1940).

So $\nabla\cdot\boldsymbol{T} \equiv T_i{}^j{}_{;j}\,\mathrm{d}x^i$ has the dimensions of energy density, $[\mathrm{M\,L^{-1}T^{-2}}]$. The *co-contra-variant* stress-energy-momentum $\boldsymbol{T}_{\boldsymbol{\cdot}}{}^{\boldsymbol{\cdot}}$ has therefore the same dimensions. But the *co-co-variant* tensor, obtained by contraction with the metric, $\boldsymbol{T}_{\boldsymbol{\cdot\cdot}} \equiv \boldsymbol{T}\cdot\boldsymbol{g}$, has dimensions of energy density times squared time: $[\mathrm{M\,L^{-1}}]$, a mass over length.

## 10 Einstein equation

[25,26]

***

In fact the metric tells us the *proper time* $\triangle t$ elapsed along any (timelike) worldline $s \mapsto C(s)$, $s \in [a,b]$, between events $C(a)$ and $C(b)$, by the formula

We can use the metric to measure the "length" of (timelike or spacelike) paths in spacetime. The "length" of a path $c(s)$ with $s \in [a,b]$ is

$$\int_a^b \mathrm{d}s\ \sqrt{\left|g_{ij}[c(s)]\ \dot{c}^i(s)\,\dot{c}^j(s)\right|}.$$

We see that this "length" has dimensions $[\mathrm{Z}^{1/2}]$ and not unexpectedly it doesn't depend on the dimensions of the curve parameter $s$.

If the path is timelike, this "length" can be measured by a clock having that path as worldline – it's its proper time. Thus, for me $[\mathrm{Z}^{1/2}] = [\mathrm{T}]$, a time, and therefore the absolute dimensions of the metric tensor are time squared:

$$\dim(\boldsymbol{g}) = [\mathrm{T}^2].$$

I believe that these dimensions also make sense for spacelike paths: in this case we would have to measure the "length" by dividing it in very small pieces and using radar coordinates on each piece. So we're measuring the "length" by checking clocks, to see how long it takes for the light to bounce back: time [T], again.

By our usual argument it's possible to see that the Riemann curvature tensor $\boldsymbol{R}^{\boldsymbol{\cdot}}{}_{\boldsymbol{\cdot\cdot\cdot}}$, the Ricci tensor $\boldsymbol{R}_{\boldsymbol{\cdot\cdot}}$, and the Einstein tensor $\boldsymbol{G}_{\boldsymbol{\cdot\cdot}}$ are adimensional – [1] – and the scalar curvature has dimensions $[\mathrm{T}^{-2}]$. Note that the Riemann and Ricci tensors (with the contra/co-variant type

[25] Rindler 1986 § 3.5 p. 65. [26] Fock 1964 § 2, p. 10.

specified above) do not require a metric for their definition, but an affine connection. They are adimensional no matter what dimensions we give the metric. By construction the (fully co-variant) Einstein tensor is always adimensional, too.

An important operation done with the metric:

- "lowering an index" of a tensor multiplies its dimensions by $[\mathrm{T}^2]$, and "rising an index" multiplies them by $[\mathrm{T}^{-2}]$ (if you agree with my discussion above).

[27,28,29,30,31]

Einstein's constant $\kappa$ therefore relates a dimensionless quantity and a mass over length:

$$\boldsymbol{G}_{\cdot\cdot} = \kappa \boldsymbol{T}_{\cdot\cdot}\;.$$

Its dimension must be $[\mathrm{M}^{-1}\,\mathrm{L}]$, and it's easily seen that these are the dimensions of $G/c^2$. So I'm one of those people (like Fock 1964 p. 199) who define

$$\kappa = 8\pi G/c^2.$$

[32]

** References **

- Burke (1980): *Spacetime, Geometry, Cosmology* (University Science Books) - Burke (1987): *Applied Differential Geometry* (Cambridge) - [Eckart (1940)]: *The thermodynamics of irreversible processes. III. Relativistic theory of the simple fluid*, Phys. Rev. 58, 919. - Fock (1964): *The Theory of Space, Time and Gravitation* (Pergamon) - Misner, Thorne, Wheeler (1973): *Gravitation* (Freeman) - Schouten (1989): *Tensor Analysis for Physicists* (Dover, 2nd ed.)

I first present my favourite choice, which is very close to the points of view of Synge and Bressan[33], and then the other, probably the most common. I also discuss a possible misinterpretation of traditional expressions for the 'length element $ds^2$', with consequences for the dimension of the metric tensor.

Quoting Synge[34]: 'We are now launched on the task of giving physical meaning to the Riemannian geometry [...]. It is indeed a Riemannian

---

[27] Fock 1964 § V.62, eq. (62.02). [28] Curtis et al. 1985 ch. 11 eq. (11.21). [29] Cook 2004 eqs (1) or (9). [30] Hartle 2003 ch. 6 eq. (6.24). [31] Kilmister 1973 ch. II p. 25. [32] Whitney 1968a,b. [33] Synge 1960b §§ III.2–4; Bressan 1978 §§ 15, 18. [34] Synge 1960b § III.3 pp. 108–109.

*chronometry* rather than *geometry*, and the word *geometry*, with its dangerous suggestion that we should go about measuring *lengths* with *yardsticks*, might well be abandoned altogether in the present connection'.

# Bibliography


('de *X*' is listed under D, 'van *X*' under V, and so on, regardless of national conventions.)

Abraham, R., Marsden, J. E., Ratiu, T. (1988): *Manifolds, Tensor Analysis, and Applications*, 2nd ed. (Springer, New York). First publ. 1983.

Aldersley, S. J. (1977): *Dimensional analysis in relativistic gravitational theories*. Phys. Rev. D **15**$^{2}$, 370–376.

bipm (Bureau international des poids et mesures), ed. (1983): *17$^{e}$ conférence générale des poids et mesures (cgpm)*. (bipm, Sèvres). https://www.bipm.org/en/worldwide-metrology/cgpm/resolutions.html#comptes-rendus.

Boothby, W. M. (2003): *An Introduction to Differentiable Manifolds and Riemannian Geometry*, rev. 2nd ed. (Academic Press, Orlando, USA). First publ. 1975.

Bossavit, A. (1991): *Differential Geometry: for the student of numerical methods in Electromagnetism*. https://www.researchgate.net/publication/200018385_Differential_Geometry_for_the_student_of_numerical_methods_in_Electromagnetism.

Bressan, A. (1978): *Relativistic Theories of Materials*. (Springer, Berlin).

Bridgman, P. W. (1958): *The Logic of Modern Physics*, eight printing. (Macmillan, New York). First publ. 1927.

Burke, W. L. (1980): *Spacetime, Geometry, Cosmology*. (University Science Books, Mill Valley, USA).

— (1987): *Applied Differential Geometry*, reprint. (Cambridge University Press, Cambridge). First publ. 1985.

Choquet-Bruhat, Y., DeWitt-Morette, C., Dillard-Bleick, M. (1996): *Analysis, Manifolds and Physics. Part I: Basics*, rev. ed. (Elsevier, Amsterdam). First publ. 1977.

Cook, R. J. (2004): *Physical time and physical space in general relativity*. Am. J. Phys. **72**$^{2}$, 214–219.

Curtis, W. D., Miller, F. R. (1985): *Differential Manifolds and Theoretical Physics*. (Academic Press, Orlando, USA).

Dorgelo, H. B., Schouten, J. A. (1946): *On unities and dimensions. I*. Verh. Kon. Akad. Wetensch. Amsterdam **49**$^{2,3,4}$, 123–131, 282–291, 393–403.

Fischer, A. E., Marsden, J. E. (1972): *The Einstein equations of evolution – a geometric approach*. J. Math. Phys. **13**$^{4}$, 546–568.

Flügge, S., ed. (1960): *Handbuch der Physik: Band III/1: Prinzipien der klassischen Mechanik und Feldtheorie [Encyclopedia of Physics: Vol. III/1: Principles of Classical Mechanics and Field Theory]*. (Springer, Berlin).

Fock [Fok], V. A. (1964): *The Theory of Space, Time and Gravitation*, second revised ed. (Pergamon, Oxford). Transl. by N. Kemmer. First publ. in Russian 1955.

Giacomo, P. (1984): *News from the bipm*. Metrologia **20**$^{1}$, 25–30.

Gourgoulhon, É. (2012): *3+1 Formalism in General Relativity: Bases of Numerical Relativity*. (Springer, Heidelberg). First publ. 2007 as arXiv:gr-qc/0703035.

Hartle, J. B. (2003): *Gravity: An Introduction to Einstein's General Relativity*. (Addison-Wesley, San Francisco).

Kilmister, C. W. (1973): *General Theory of Relativity*. (Pergamon, Oxford).

Landau, L. D., Lifshitz [Lifšic], E. M. (1996): *The Classical Theory of Fields*, corr. repr. of the 4th English ed. (Butterworth-Heinemann, Oxford). Transl. from the 1987 seventh Russian edition by Morton Hamermesh. First publ. 1939.

Misner, C. W., Thorne, K. S., Wheeler, J. A. (1973): *Gravitation*, repr. (W. H. Freeman and Company, New York). https://archive.org/details/Gravitation_201803.

Penrose, R., Rindler, W. (2003): *Spinors and Space-Time. Vol. 1: Two-spinor calculus and relativistic fields*, corr. repr. (Cambridge University Press, Cambridge). First publ. 1984.

Rindler, W. (1986): *Essential Relativity: Special, General, and Cosmological*, rev. second ed. (Springer, New York). First publ. 1969.

Schouten, J. A. (1989): *Tensor Analysis for Physicists*, corr. second ed. (Dover, New York). First publ. 1951.

Segev, R. (1986): *Forces and the existence of stresses in invariant continuum mechanics*. J. Math. Phys. **27**[1], 163–170. http://www.bgu.ac.il/~rsegev/Papers/JMP86S.pdf.

— (2000a): *The geometry of Cauchy's fluxes*. Arch. Rational Mech. Anal. **154**[3], 183–198. http://www.bgu.ac.il/~rsegev/Papers/TheGeometryofCauchyFluxes.pdf.

— (2000b): *Notes on stresses for manifolds*. Rend. Sem. Mat. Univ. Pol. Torino **58**[2], 199–206.

— (2002): *Metric-independent analysis of the stress-energy tensor*. J. Math. Phys. **43**[6], 3220–3231. http://www.bgu.ac.il/~rsegev/Papers/MetricIndependent.pdf.

Segev, R., Rodnay, G. (1999): *Cauchy's theorem on manifolds*. J. Elasticity **56**[2], 129–144. http://www.bgu.ac.il/~rsegev/Papers/CauchyTheoremonManifolds.pdf. See also erratum **segev2001**.

Synge, J. L. (1960a): *Classical Dynamics*. In: Flügge (1960), I–VII, 1–225, 859–902.

— (1960b): *Relativity: The General Theory*. (North-Holland, Amsterdam).

Tolman, R. C. (1949): *Relativity, Thermodynamics and Cosmology*. (Oxford University Press). First publ. 1934.

Truesdell III, C. A., Toupin, R. A. (1960): *The Classical Field Theories*. In: Flügge (1960), I–VII, 226–902. With an appendix on invariants by Jerald LaVerne Ericksen.

Whitney, H. (1968a): *The mathematics of physical quantities. Part I: Mathematical models for measurement*. Am. Math. Monthly **75**[2], 115–138. See also Whitney (1968b).

— (1968b): *The mathematics of physical quantities. Part II: Quantity structures and dimensional analysis*. Am. Math. Monthly **75**[3], 227–256. See also Whitney (1968a).