

Boundary Conditions

Under infinitesimal coordinate transformation $x^\mu \rightarrow \bar{x}^\mu = x^\mu + \epsilon^\mu(x)$ where

$$\epsilon^0 = T, \quad \epsilon^i = \tilde{\nabla}^i L + L^i, \quad \tilde{\nabla}^i L_i = 0,$$

it follows that h_{0i} transforms as

$$\bar{h}_{0i} = h_{0i} - (\tilde{\nabla}_i \dot{L} + L_i) + \partial_i T \quad (1)$$

which evaluates to

$$\tilde{\nabla}_i \bar{B} + \bar{B}_i = \tilde{\nabla}_i B + B_i - \tilde{\nabla}_i \dot{L} - \dot{L}_i + \tilde{\nabla}_i T. \quad (2)$$

or

$$\tilde{\nabla}_i \bar{B} + \bar{B}_i = \tilde{\nabla}_i (B - \dot{L} + T) + B_i. \quad (3)$$

Since an arbitrary gradient of a scalar such as $\tilde{\nabla}_i T$ could in fact be transverse, we cannot immediately separate scalars to scalars and vectors to vectors. If we take the divergence, we arrive at

$$\tilde{\nabla}_a \tilde{\nabla}^a \bar{B} = \tilde{\nabla}_a \tilde{\nabla}^a (B - \dot{L} + T), \quad (4)$$

in which we may define \bar{B} as

$$\begin{aligned} \bar{B} &= \int d^3 y \, D^3(\mathbf{x} - \mathbf{y}) \tilde{\nabla}_a^y \tilde{\nabla}^a (B - \dot{L} + T) \\ &= \int d^3 y \, \tilde{\nabla}_a^y \tilde{\nabla}^a \left[D^3(\mathbf{x} - \mathbf{y}) (B - \dot{L} + T) \right] - \int d^3 y \, \tilde{\nabla}_a^y \tilde{\nabla}^a D^3(\mathbf{x} - \mathbf{y}) (B - \dot{L} + T) \\ &= B - \dot{L} + T + \int dS_a \, \tilde{\nabla}_y^a \left[D^3(\mathbf{x} - \mathbf{y}) (B - \dot{L} + T) \right] \\ &= B - \dot{L} + T + \chi. \end{aligned} \quad (5)$$

The surface term takes the form

$$\chi = \int dS_a \, \tilde{\nabla}_y^a D^3(\mathbf{x} - \mathbf{y}) (B - \dot{L} + T) + \int dS_a \, D^3(\mathbf{x} - \mathbf{y}) \tilde{\nabla}_y^a (B - \dot{L} + T). \quad (6)$$

The discussion in Jackson Electrodynamics pg. 39 suggests that a given Green's function $D(\mathbf{x}, \mathbf{y})$, may be defined up to an arbitrary function $F(\mathbf{x}, \mathbf{y})$ which satisfies $\nabla^2 F(\mathbf{x}, \mathbf{y}) = 0$. It is then suggested that the freedom in $F(\mathbf{x}, \mathbf{y})$ may be used to formulate the solution for \bar{B} in terms of either Dirichlet or Neumann boundary conditions by finding an $F(\mathbf{x}, \mathbf{y})$ such that

$$D(\mathbf{x}, \mathbf{y}) = 0 \quad \text{for } \mathbf{x} \text{ on } S, \quad \text{or} \quad \tilde{\nabla}_a D(\mathbf{x}, \mathbf{y}) = 0 \quad \text{for } \mathbf{x} \text{ on } S. \quad (7)$$

Let us assume we were able to find an $F(\mathbf{x}, \mathbf{y})$ that allows for Dirichlet boundary conditions, i.e.

$$D(\mathbf{x}, \mathbf{y}) = 0 \quad \text{for } \mathbf{x} \text{ on } S, \quad (8)$$

then in order to arrive at the desired equation of

$$\bar{B} = B - \dot{L} + T \quad (9)$$

we must require that

$$B - \dot{L} + T = 0 \quad \text{for } \mathbf{x} \text{ on } S, \quad (10)$$

with S being the asymptotic boundary surface at infinity. Imposing such a boundary condition would seem to allow better constraints when expanding the perturbation functions in momentum space viz.

$$B(t, x) = \int d^3k e^{ikx} \tilde{B}(t, k). \quad (11)$$

For example, an equation such as

$$\tilde{\nabla}_a \tilde{\nabla}^a (B - E) = 0, \quad (12)$$

leads to

$$\int d^3k e^{ikx} k^2 [-\tilde{B}(t, k) + \tilde{E}(t, k)] = 0. \quad (13)$$

Without boundary conditions, either $\tilde{B}(t, k) = \tilde{E}(t, k)$ or $\tilde{B}(t, k) = \tilde{E}(t, k) + \delta(k)$ (or perhaps $k^n \delta(k)$ for $n > -2$). However, the requirement that $B(t, x)$ and $E(t, x)$ vanish at spatial infinity excludes the possible $\delta(k)$ solutions and thus yields $\tilde{B}(t, k) = \tilde{E}(t, k)$ and consequently $B(t, x) = E(t, x)$.

As an aside, we take the Laplacian of the boundary term χ , which evaluates to

$$\begin{aligned} \tilde{\nabla}_b^x \tilde{\nabla}_x^b \chi &= \int dS_a \tilde{\nabla}_y^a \delta^3(\mathbf{x} - \mathbf{y}) (B - \dot{L} + T) + \int dS_a \delta^3(\mathbf{x} - \mathbf{y}) \tilde{\nabla}_y^a (B - \dot{L} + T) \\ &= -\tilde{\nabla}_x^a \int dS_a \delta^3(\mathbf{x} - \mathbf{y}) (B - \dot{L} + T) + \int dS_a \delta^3(\mathbf{x} - \mathbf{y}) \tilde{\nabla}_y^a (B - \dot{L} + T) \end{aligned} \quad (14)$$

The quantity $\nabla^2 \chi$ is only supported asymptotically, but even if \mathbf{x} is evaluated at a point on the infinite surface, the two surface terms will mutually cancel. Therefore, for all \mathbf{x} such a χ obeys

$$\tilde{\nabla}_a \tilde{\nabla}^a \chi = 0. \quad (15)$$

Introduce the scalar propagator $D(x - x')$, which obeys

$$\partial_\nu \partial^\nu D(x - x') = \delta(x - x'). \quad (16)$$

Take the mathematical identity

$$\phi(x') \partial_\nu \partial^\nu D(x - x') = D(x - x') \partial_\nu \partial^\nu \phi(x') + \partial_\nu [\phi(x') \partial^\nu D(x - x') - D(x - x') \partial^\nu \phi(x')], \quad (17)$$

where here $\partial_\nu = \frac{\partial}{\partial x'^\nu}$. Now integrate over a region S ,

$$\begin{aligned} \int d^4x' \phi(x') \partial_\nu \partial^\nu D(x - x') &= \int d^4x' D(x - x') \partial_\nu \partial^\nu \phi(x') + \int dS_\nu [\phi(x') \partial^\nu D(x - x') - D(x - x') \partial^\nu \phi(x')] \\ \phi(x) &= \int d^4x' D(x - x') \partial_\nu \partial^\nu \phi(x') + \int dS_\nu [\phi(x') \partial^\nu D(x - x') - D(x - x') \partial^\nu \phi(x')]. \end{aligned} \quad (18)$$

Thus we have separated ϕ into two parts

$$\phi(x) = \int d^4x' D(x - x') \partial_\nu \partial^\nu \phi(x') + \int dS_\nu [\phi(x') \partial^\nu D(x - x') - D(x - x') \partial^\nu \phi(x')]. \quad (19)$$

$$\phi = \phi^L + \phi^T \quad (20)$$

where

$$\phi^L = \int d^3x' D(x-x') \nabla_a \nabla^a \phi(x'), \quad \phi^T = \int dS_a [\phi(x') \nabla^a D(x-x') - D(x-x') \nabla^a \phi(x')]. \quad (21)$$

Taking the Laplacian

$$\nabla_a \nabla^a \phi^L = \nabla_a \nabla^a \phi, \quad \nabla_a \nabla^a \phi^T = \int dS_a [\phi(x') \nabla^a \delta(x-x') - \delta(x-x') \nabla^a \phi(x')]. \quad (22)$$

We see that $\nabla_a \nabla^a \phi^L = 0$ only if $\nabla_a \nabla^a \phi = 0$, but this then entails by definition of ϕ^L that $\phi^L = 0$. Therefore, only a completely transverse $\nabla_a \nabla^a \phi$ entails $\nabla_a \nabla^a \phi^L = 0$.