

Recent Results in Conformal Killing Gravity (CKG)

Alan Barnes

Aston University, Birmingham UK
(retired)
Alan.Barnes45678@gmail.com

24 July 2024
Coimbra, EREP2024

What is CKG?

- A 3rd order metric theory of gravitation due to Harada (2023) with field equations (HFEs): $\tilde{G}_{(ab;c)} = \tilde{T}_{(ab;c)}$
where $\tilde{G}_{ab} \equiv G_{ab} - \frac{1}{6}Gg_{ab}$ and $\tilde{T}_{ab} \equiv T_{ab} - \frac{1}{6}Tg_{ab}$.

What is CKG?

- A 3rd order metric theory of gravitation due to Harada (2023) with field equations (HFEs): $\tilde{G}_{(ab;c)} = \tilde{T}_{(ab;c)}$
where $\tilde{G}_{ab} \equiv G_{ab} - \frac{1}{6}Gg_{ab}$ and $\tilde{T}_{ab} \equiv T_{ab} - \frac{1}{6}Tg_{ab}$.
- Any solution in General Relativity (with or without Λ) is a solution in CKG.

What is CKG?

- A 3rd order metric theory of gravitation due to Harada (2023) with field equations (HFEs): $\tilde{G}_{(ab;c)} = \tilde{T}_{(ab;c)}$
where $\tilde{G}_{ab} \equiv G_{ab} - \frac{1}{6}Gg_{ab}$ and $\tilde{T}_{ab} \equiv T_{ab} - \frac{1}{6}Tg_{ab}$.
- Any solution in General Relativity (with or without Λ) is a solution in CKG.
- Note $T_{ab} = \tilde{T}_{ab} + 1/2\tilde{T}g_{ab}$.

What is CKG?

- A 3rd order metric theory of gravitation due to Harada (2023) with field equations (HFEs): $\tilde{G}_{(ab;c)} = \tilde{T}_{(ab;c)}$
where $\tilde{G}_{ab} \equiv G_{ab} - \frac{1}{6}Gg_{ab}$ and $\tilde{T}_{ab} \equiv T_{ab} - \frac{1}{6}Tg_{ab}$.
- Any solution in General Relativity (with or without Λ) is a solution in CKG.
- Note $T_{ab} = \tilde{T}_{ab} + 1/2\tilde{T}g_{ab}$.
- Contracting the HFEs implies $T^a_{b;a} = 0$.

What is CKG?

- A 3rd order metric theory of gravitation due to Harada (2023) with field equations (HFEs): $\tilde{G}_{(ab;c)} = \tilde{T}_{(ab;c)}$
where $\tilde{G}_{ab} \equiv G_{ab} - \frac{1}{6}Gg_{ab}$ and $\tilde{T}_{ab} \equiv T_{ab} - \frac{1}{6}Tg_{ab}$.
- Any solution in General Relativity (with or without Λ) is a solution in CKG.
- Note $T_{ab} = \tilde{T}_{ab} + 1/2\tilde{T}g_{ab}$.
- Contracting the HFEs implies $T^a_{b;a} = 0$.
- Mantica & Molinari's alternative form of HFEs:

$$G_{ab} = T_{ab} + C_{ab}$$

where C_{ab} is a **conformal Killing tensor**. Hence the name **conformal Killing gravity**.

What is CKG?

- A 3rd order metric theory of gravitation due to Harada (2023) with field equations (HFEs): $\tilde{G}_{(ab;c)} = \tilde{T}_{(ab;c)}$
where $\tilde{G}_{ab} \equiv G_{ab} - \frac{1}{6}Gg_{ab}$ and $\tilde{T}_{ab} \equiv T_{ab} - \frac{1}{6}Tg_{ab}$.
- Any solution in General Relativity (with or without Λ) is a solution in CKG.
- Note $T_{ab} = \tilde{T}_{ab} + 1/2\tilde{T}g_{ab}$.
- Contracting the HFEs implies $T^a_{b;a} = 0$.
- Mantica & Molinari's alternative form of HFEs:

$$G_{ab} = T_{ab} + C_{ab}$$

where C_{ab} is a **conformal Killing tensor**. Hence the name **conformal Killing gravity**.

- Actually $K_{ab} \equiv \tilde{G}_{ab} - \tilde{T}_{ab}$ is a **Killing tensor** and $C_{ab} = K_{ab} + \frac{1}{2}Kg_{ab}$.

Yet another theory – why study CKG?

- Harada considered the evolution of the scale factor $a(t)$ of the Friedmann-Robertson-Walker-Lemaître (FRWL) metric:

$$ds^2 = dt^2 - a^2(t) \left(\frac{dr^2}{1 - kr^2} + r^2 d\theta^2 + r^2 \sin^2 \theta d\phi^2 \right).$$

- He obtained a third order ODE which has the first integral:

$$2 \left(\frac{\dot{a}}{a} \right)^2 - \frac{\ddot{a}}{a} + \frac{2k}{a^2} = \frac{4\pi G}{3} (5\rho + 3p) + \frac{\Lambda}{3}.$$

Yet another theory – why study CKG?

- Harada considered the evolution of the scale factor $a(t)$ of the Friedmann-Robertson-Walker-Lemaître (FRWL) metric:

$$ds^2 = dt^2 - a^2(t) \left(\frac{dr^2}{1 - kr^2} + r^2 d\theta^2 + r^2 \sin^2 \theta d\phi^2 \right).$$

- He obtained a third order ODE which has the first integral:

$$2 \left(\frac{\dot{a}}{a} \right)^2 - \frac{\ddot{a}}{a} + \frac{2k}{a^2} = \frac{4\pi G}{3} (5\rho + 3p) + \frac{\Lambda}{3}.$$

- He showed that even in the case of a matter-dominated universe ($p = 0$) with $\Lambda = 0$ there could be a transition from deceleration to accelerating expansion.
- Thus removing the need to assume the existence of dark energy.

Static black hole solutions

- Harada(2023) obtained a metric for a static spherically symmetric vacuum field in CKG:

$$ds^2 = e^{a(r)} dt^2 - (e^{-a(r)} dr^2 + r^2(d\theta^2 + \sin^2 \theta d\phi^2)) \quad (1)$$

where $e^{a(r)} = 1 - \frac{2m}{r} - \frac{1}{3}\Lambda r^2 - \frac{1}{5}\lambda r^4$ where m , Λ and λ are integration constants. **Generalised Schwarzschild-Kottler solution.**

Static black hole solutions

- Harada(2023) obtained a metric for a static spherically symmetric vacuum field in CKG:

$$ds^2 = e^{a(r)}dt^2 - (e^{-a(r)}dr^2 + r^2(d\theta^2 + \sin^2\theta d\phi^2)) \quad (1)$$

where $e^{a(r)} = 1 - \frac{2m}{r} - \frac{1}{3}\Lambda r^2 - \frac{1}{5}\lambda r^4$ where m , Λ and λ are integration constants. **Generalised Schwarzschild-Kottler solution.**

- Tarsico et al.(2023) obtained a generalised Reissner-Nordström solution of the form(1) where now

$$e^{a(r)} = 1 - \frac{2m}{r} + \frac{q^2}{r^2} - \frac{1}{3}\Lambda r^2 - \frac{1}{5}\lambda r^4/5$$

Static black hole solutions

- Harada(2023) obtained a metric for a static spherically symmetric vacuum field in CKG:

$$ds^2 = e^{a(r)}dt^2 - (e^{-a(r)}dr^2 + r^2(d\theta^2 + \sin^2\theta d\phi^2)) \quad (1)$$

where $e^{a(r)} = 1 - \frac{2m}{r} - \frac{1}{3}\Lambda r^2 - \frac{1}{5}\lambda r^4$ where m , Λ and λ are integration constants. **Generalised Schwarzschild-Kottler solution.**

- Tarsico et al.(2023) obtained a generalised Reissner-Nordström solution of the form(1) where now

$$e^{a(r)} = 1 - \frac{2m}{r} + \frac{q^2}{r^2} - \frac{1}{3}\Lambda r^2 - \frac{1}{5}\lambda r^4/5$$

- However (1) is not the most general form for a spherically symmetric static metric which is

$$ds^2 = e^{a(r)}dt^2 - (e^{b(r)}dr^2 + r^2(d\theta^2 + \sin^2\theta d\phi^2)). \quad (2)$$

The general case

- The HFEs for the metric(2) with $T_{ab} = 0$ lead to 2 ODEs of third order for $a(r)$ and $b(r)$. However, writing $b = 2f - a$ one may deduce a 2nd order ODE $rf'' - 2rf'^2 - f' = 0$. Hence $e^b = e^{-a}/(c + dr^2)$ where c and d are constants.

The general case

- The HFEs for the metric(2) with $T_{ab} = 0$ lead to 2 ODEs of third order for $a(r)$ and $b(r)$. However, writing $b = 2f - a$ one may deduce a 2nd order ODE $rf'' - 2rf'^2 - f' = 0$. Hence $e^b = e^{-a}/(c + dr^2)$ where c and d are constants.
- Eliminating b the remaining field equation may be linearised by writing $y = e^a$ to yield

$$(c + dr^2)r^3y''' - (2c - dr^2)r^2y'' - (2c + dr^2)ry' + 8cy = 8. \quad (3)$$

The general case

- The HFEs for the metric(2) with $T_{ab} = 0$ lead to 2 ODEs of third order for $a(r)$ and $b(r)$. However, writing $b = 2f - a$ one may deduce a 2nd order ODE $rf'' - 2rf'^2 - f' = 0$. Hence $e^b = e^{-a}/(c + dr^2)$ where c and d are constants.
- Eliminating b the remaining field equation may be linearised by writing $y = e^a$ to yield

$$(c + dr^2)r^3y''' - (2c - dr^2)r^2y'' - (2c + dr^2)ry' + 8cy = 8. \quad (3)$$

For the electrovac case the only difference is an extra term $-24q^2/r^2$ on the rhs of the preceding equation.

The general case

- The HFEs for the metric(2) with $T_{ab} = 0$ lead to 2 ODEs of third order for $a(r)$ and $b(r)$. However, writing $b = 2f - a$ one may deduce a 2nd order ODE $rf'' - 2rf'^2 - f' = 0$. Hence $e^b = e^{-a}/(c + dr^2)$ where c and d are constants.
- Eliminating b the remaining field equation may be linearised by writing $y = e^a$ to yield

$$(c + dr^2)r^3y''' - (2c - dr^2)r^2y'' - (2c + dr^2)ry' + 8cy = 8. \quad (3)$$

For the electrovac case the only difference is an extra term $-24q^2/r^2$ on the rhs of the preceding equation.

- If $d = 0$, c may be set to 1 by a rescaling of the t -coordinate. Similarly if $c = 0$, d may be set to 1. In either case the ODE becomes homogeneous and easy to solve.

The general case

- The HFEs for the metric(2) with $T_{ab} = 0$ lead to 2 ODEs of third order for $a(r)$ and $b(r)$. However, writing $b = 2f - a$ one may deduce a 2nd order ODE $rf'' - 2rf'^2 - f' = 0$. Hence $e^b = e^{-a}/(c + dr^2)$ where c and d are constants.
- Eliminating b the remaining field equation may be linearised by writing $y = e^a$ to yield

$$(c + dr^2)r^3y''' - (2c - dr^2)r^2y'' - (2c + dr^2)ry' + 8cy = 8. \quad (3)$$

For the electrovac case the only difference is an extra term $-24q^2/r^2$ on the rhs of the preceding equation.

- If $d = 0$, c may be set to 1 by a rescaling of the t -coordinate. Similarly if $c = 0$, d may be set to 1. In either case the ODE becomes homogeneous and easy to solve. Otherwise we may set $c = \pm 1$. For Lorentzian signature $c + dr^2 > 0$.

- For $d = 0$ generalised Schwarzschild-Kottler and Reissner-Nordström solutions are obtained.

- For $d = 0$ generalised Schwarzschild-Kottler and Reissner-Nordström solutions are obtained.
- For $c = 0$ there are strange vacuum & electrovac solutions (Barnes 2023):

$$y = e^a = \lambda - \Lambda r^2/3 + m \log r - 1/(2r^2) + q^2/(4r^4), \quad e^b = e^{-a}/r^2.$$

- Physical Interpretation ???!!!

The solutions 2

- For $c > 0$ and $d \neq 0$, Barnes(2023) obtained solutions involving power series with radius of convergence $1/\sqrt{|d|}$.

$$y = e^a = 1 + (1 + 2dr^2)q^2/r^2 - 2mp_1(r)/r - \lambda p_2(r)r^4/5 - \Lambda r^2/3$$

$$p_1(r) = 1 + dr^2/2 - d^2r^4 \dots$$

$$p_2(r) = 1 - 4dr^2/7 + 8d^2r^4/21 \dots$$

$$e^b = e^{-a}/(1 + dr^2).$$

The solutions 2

- For $c > 0$ and $d \neq 0$, Barnes(2023) obtained solutions involving power series with radius of convergence $1/\sqrt{|d|}$.

$$y = e^a = 1 + (1 + 2dr^2)q^2/r^2 - 2mp_1(r)/r - \lambda p_2(r)r^4/5 - \Lambda r^2/3$$

$$p_1(r) = 1 + dr^2/2 - d^2r^4 \dots$$

$$p_2(r) = 1 - 4dr^2/7 + 8d^2r^4/21 \dots$$

$$e^b = e^{-a}/(1 + dr^2).$$

- If $d = 0$ $c > 0$, the power series disappear and we get the solutions of Harada and Tarsico et al.

The solutions 2

- For $c > 0$ and $d \neq 0$, Barnes(2023) obtained solutions involving power series with radius of convergence $1/\sqrt{|d|}$.
$$y = e^a = 1 + (1 + 2dr^2)q^2/r^2 - 2mp_1(r)/r - \lambda p_2(r)r^4/5 - \Lambda r^2/3$$
$$p_1(r) = 1 + dr^2/2 - d^2r^4 \dots$$
$$p_2(r) = 1 - 4dr^2/7 + 8d^2r^4/21 \dots$$
$$e^b = e^{-a}/(1 + dr^2).$$
- If $d = 0$ $c > 0$, the power series disappear and we get the solutions of Harada and Tarsico et al.
- When any of d , Λ or λ are non-zero, the solution is not asymptotically flat.

The solutions 2

- For $c > 0$ and $d \neq 0$, Barnes(2023) obtained solutions involving power series with radius of convergence $1/\sqrt{|d|}$.
$$y = e^a = 1 + (1 + 2dr^2)q^2/r^2 - 2mp_1(r)/r - \lambda p_2(r)r^4/5 - \Lambda r^2/3$$
$$p_1(r) = 1 + dr^2/2 - d^2r^4 \dots$$
$$p_2(r) = 1 - 4dr^2/7 + 8d^2r^4/21 \dots$$
$$e^b = e^{-a}/(1 + dr^2).$$
- If $d = 0$ $c > 0$, the power series disappear and we get the solutions of Harada and Tarsico et al.
- When any of d , Λ or λ are non-zero, the solution is not asymptotically flat.
- When $m = \lambda = 0$, the power series disappear. We have type D 'cosmological' solutions.

The solutions 2

- For $c > 0$ and $d \neq 0$, Barnes(2023) obtained solutions involving power series with radius of convergence $1/\sqrt{|d|}$.
$$y = e^a = 1 + (1 + 2dr^2)q^2/r^2 - 2mp_1(r)/r - \lambda p_2(r)r^4/5 - \Lambda r^2/3$$
$$p_1(r) = 1 + dr^2/2 - d^2r^4 \dots$$
$$p_2(r) = 1 - 4dr^2/7 + 8d^2r^4/21 \dots$$
$$e^b = e^{-a}/(1 + dr^2).$$
- If $d = 0$ $c > 0$, the power series disappear and we get the solutions of Harada and Tarsico et al.
- When any of d , Λ or λ are non-zero, the solution is not asymptotically flat.
- When $m = \lambda = 0$, the power series disappear. We have type D 'cosmological' solutions.
- If, in addition, $q = \Lambda = 0$ we have the static Einstein Universe which is a vacuum solution in CKG!

The solutions 3

- Clément and Nouicer(2024) found the solutions of the ODE(3) in terms of inverse trig. and hyperbolic functions for the cases $c > 0$ and $d \neq 0$ and also $c < 0$ and $d > 0$.

The solutions 3

- Clément and Nouicer(2024) found the solutions of the ODE(3) in terms of inverse trig. and hyperbolic functions for the cases $c > 0$ and $d \neq 0$ and also $c < 0$ and $d > 0$.
- The investigation of the singularity and asymptotic structure of the fields is so far incomplete – needs Kruskal-type coordinates and Penrose conformal diagrams!

The solutions 3

- Clément and Nouicer(2024) found the solutions of the ODE(3) in terms of inverse trig. and hyperbolic functions for the cases $c > 0$ and $d \neq 0$ and also $c < 0$ and $d > 0$.
- The investigation of the singularity and asymptotic structure of the fields is so far incomplete – needs Kruskal-type coordinates and Penrose conformal diagrams!
- Clément and Nouicer also obtained non-static vacuum FRWL solutions. Thus providing counter-examples to Birkhoff's theorem in CKG.

The solutions 3

- Clément and Nouicer(2024) found the solutions of the ODE(3) in terms of inverse trig. and hyperbolic functions for the cases $c > 0$ and $d \neq 0$ and also $c < 0$ and $d > 0$.
- The investigation of the singularity and asymptotic structure of the fields is so far incomplete – needs Kruskal-type coordinates and Penrose conformal diagrams!
- Clément and Nouicer also obtained non-static vacuum FRWL solutions. Thus providing counter-examples to Birkhoff's theorem in CKG.
- In these the scale factor a satisfies $\dot{a}^2 - \alpha a^4 - \frac{\Lambda}{3} a^2 + k$. The solutions in general involve Jacobi elliptic functions, but are elementary if $\alpha = 0$ or $\frac{\Lambda^2}{9} + 4k\alpha = 0$.

The solutions 3

- Clément and Nouicer(2024) found the solutions of the ODE(3) in terms of inverse trig. and hyperbolic functions for the cases $c > 0$ and $d \neq 0$ and also $c < 0$ and $d > 0$.
- The investigation of the singularity and asymptotic structure of the fields is so far incomplete – needs Kruskal-type coordinates and Penrose conformal diagrams!
- Clément and Nouicer also obtained non-static vacuum FRWL solutions. Thus providing counter-examples to Birkhoff's theorem in CKG.
- In these the scale factor a satisfies $\dot{a}^2 - \alpha a^4 - \frac{\Lambda}{3} a^2 + k$. The solutions in general involve Jacobi elliptic functions, but are elementary if $\alpha = 0$ or $\frac{\Lambda^2}{9} + 4k\alpha = 0$.
- **Open question:** does CKG admit spherically symmetric matter distributions emitting gravitational waves?

- Defining pp-waves as fields which admit a **covariantly constant null bivector**: $W_{ab;c} = 0$ where $W_{ab} = p_{[a}k_{b]}$ with $p_a p^a = -1$ and $k_a k^a = 0$, it follows that $k_{a;b} = 0$ and the metric may be written as

$$ds^2 = 2dudv + 2H(u, x, y)du^2 - dx^2 - dy^2.$$

- Defining pp-waves as fields which admit a **covariantly constant null bivector**: $W_{ab;c} = 0$ where $W_{ab} = p_{[a}k_{b]}$ with $p_a p^a = -1$ and $k_a k^a = 0$, it follows that $k_{a;b} = 0$ and the metric may be written as

$$ds^2 = 2dudv + 2H(u, x, y)du^2 - dx^2 - dy^2.$$

- The Ricci tensor is zero or $R_{ab} = \lambda k_a k_b$ and the Petrov type is N or 0.

- Defining pp-waves as fields which admit a **covariantly constant null bivector**: $W_{ab;c} = 0$ where $W_{ab} = p_{[a}k_{b]}$ with $p_a p^a = -1$ and $k_a k^a = 0$, it follows that $k_{a;b} = 0$ and the metric may be written as

$$ds^2 = 2dudv + 2H(u, x, y)du^2 - dx^2 - dy^2.$$

- The Ricci tensor is zero or $R_{ab} = \lambda k_a k_b$ and the Petrov type is N or 0.
- The above definition is stronger than the assumption of a constant null vector k^a alone.

- Defining pp-waves as fields which admit a **covariantly constant null bivector**: $W_{ab;c} = 0$ where $W_{ab} = p_{[a}k_{b]}$ with $p_a p^a = -1$ and $k_a k^a = 0$, it follows that $k_{a;b} = 0$ and the metric may be written as

$$ds^2 = 2dudv + 2H(u, x, y)du^2 - dx^2 - dy^2.$$

- The Ricci tensor is zero or $R_{ab} = \lambda k_a k_b$ and the Petrov type is N or 0.
- The above definition is stronger than the assumption of a constant null vector k^a alone.
- The CKG solutions differ from the GR ones only by a term $+c(x^2 + y^2)$ added to H where c is an arbitrary constant leading to an extra constant circularly polarized mode in addition to those in GR.

- Defining pp-waves as fields which admit a **covariantly constant null bivector**: $W_{ab;c} = 0$ where $W_{ab} = p_{[a}k_{b]}$ with $p_a p^a = -1$ and $k_a k^a = 0$, it follows that $k_{a;b} = 0$ and the metric may be written as

$$ds^2 = 2dudv + 2H(u, x, y)du^2 - dx^2 - dy^2.$$

- The Ricci tensor is zero or $R_{ab} = \lambda k_a k_b$ and the Petrov type is N or 0.
- The above definition is stronger than the assumption of a constant null vector k^a alone.
- The CKG solutions differ from the GR ones only by a term $+c(x^2 + y^2)$ added to H where c is an arbitrary constant leading to an extra constant circularly polarized mode in addition to those in GR.
- if $H = c(x^2 + y^2)$ the metric is a non-flat vacuum conformally flat field in CKG.

- If \tilde{T}_{ab} & \tilde{T}'_{ab} are trace-modified em tensors whose difference K_{ab} is a Killing tensor, the metric is the same whether T_{ab} or T'_{ab} is the source.

- If \tilde{T}_{ab} & \tilde{T}'_{ab} are trace-modified em tensors whose difference K_{ab} is a Killing tensor, the metric is the same whether T_{ab} or T'_{ab} is the source.
- Thus **different matter sources may produce the same metric**. The metric does not uniquely determine the energy-momentum tensor.

- If \tilde{T}_{ab} & \tilde{T}'_{ab} are trace-modified em tensors whose difference K_{ab} is a Killing tensor, the metric is the same whether T_{ab} or T'_{ab} is the source.
- Thus **different matter sources may produce the same metric**. The metric does not uniquely determine the energy-momentum tensor.
- Thus, if \tilde{T}_{ab} & \tilde{T}'_{ab} differ by the Killing tensor $\lambda g_{ab}/3$, (λ constant) then T_{ab} & T'_{ab} differ by a dark energy term λg_{ab} . Hence **dark energy does not gravitate in CKG**.

Multiple Matter Sources 2

- If a metric admits symmetries generated by Killing vectors $\xi_I^a, I = 1 \dots N$, then $K_{ab} = k g_{ab} + \sum_{I=1}^N \sum_{J=1}^N k_{IJ} \xi_{I(a} \xi_{J|b)}$, where k and the k_{IJ} are constants, is a Killing tensor.

Multiple Matter Sources 2

- If a metric admits symmetries generated by Killing vectors $\xi_I^a, I = 1 \dots N$, then $K_{ab} = k g_{ab} + \sum_{I=1}^N \sum_{J=1}^N k_{IJ} \xi_{I(a} \xi_{J|b)}$, where k and the k_{IJ} are constants, is a Killing tensor.
- If there are N Killing vectors, there are $1 + (N + 1)N/2$ possible terms in K_{ab} that may contribute to the matter source \tilde{T}_{ab} .

Multiple Matter Sources 2

- If a metric admits symmetries generated by Killing vectors $\xi_I^a, I = 1 \dots N$, then $K_{ab} = kg_{ab} + \sum_{I=1}^N \sum_{J=1}^N k_{IJ} \xi_{I(a} \xi_{J|b)}$, where k and the k_{IJ} are constants, is a Killing tensor.
- If there are N Killing vectors, there are $1 + (N + 1)N/2$ possible terms in K_{ab} that may contribute to the matter source \tilde{T}_{ab} .
- All known exact solutions in CKG admit Killing vectors:
Static spherically symmetric 4KVs, pp-waves at least 1KV
plane waves at least 5KVs, FRWL metrics 6KVs
Einstein Universe 7KVs, Minkowski, de Sitter & ADS 10 KVs.
Thus there are a plethora of possible sources in these cases.

Multiple Matter Sources 2

- If a metric admits symmetries generated by Killing vectors $\xi_I^a, I = 1 \dots N$, then $K_{ab} = kg_{ab} + \sum_{I=1}^N \sum_{J=1}^N k_{IJ} \xi_{I(a} \xi_{J|b)}$, where k and the k_{IJ} are constants, is a Killing tensor.
- If there are N Killing vectors, there are $1 + (N + 1)N/2$ possible terms in K_{ab} that may contribute to the matter source \tilde{T}_{ab} .
- All known exact solutions in CKG admit Killing vectors:
Static spherically symmetric 4KVs, pp-waves at least 1KV
plane waves at least 5KVs, FRWL metrics 6KVs
Einstein Universe 7KVs, Minkowski, de Sitter & ADS 10 KVs.
Thus there are a plethora of possible sources in these cases.
- Even with no symmetries there is the ubiquitous dark energy ambiguity.

Conclusions

- All static spherically symmetric vacuum & electrovac metrics in CKG are known.
- pp-waves metrics are known and are very similar to those in GR.

Conclusions

- All static spherically symmetric vacuum & electrovac metrics in CKG are known.
- pp-waves metrics are known and are very similar to those in GR.
- Birkhoff's theorem is not valid in CKG. There are time-dependent vacuum FRWL metrics.

Conclusions

- All static spherically symmetric vacuum & electrovac metrics in CKG are known.
- pp-waves metrics are known and are very similar to those in GR.
- Birkhoff's theorem is not valid in CKG. There are time-dependent vacuum FRWL metrics.
- Dark energy does not gravitate in CKG.

Conclusions

- All static spherically symmetric vacuum & electrovac metrics in CKG are known.
- pp-waves metrics are known and are very similar to those in GR.
- Birkhoff's theorem is not valid in CKG. There are time-dependent vacuum FRWL metrics.
- Dark energy does not gravitate in CKG.
- Many solutions have multiple possible matter sources.

Conclusions

- All static spherically symmetric vacuum & electrovac metrics in CKG are known.
- pp-waves metrics are known and are very similar to those in GR.
- Birkhoff's theorem is not valid in CKG. There are time-dependent vacuum FRWL metrics.
- Dark energy does not gravitate in CKG.
- Many solutions have multiple possible matter sources.
- Minkowski, de Sitter and ADS are all **vacuum** solutions; equally they may be regarded as having an arbitrary dark energy source $T_{ab} = \lambda g_{ab}$ (λ is **unrelated** to Λ in de Sitter & ADS metrics).

Conclusions

- All static spherically symmetric vacuum & electrovac metrics in CKG are known.
- pp-waves metrics are known and are very similar to those in GR.
- Birkhoff's theorem is not valid in CKG. There are time-dependent vacuum FRWL metrics.
- Dark energy does not gravitate in CKG.
- Many solutions have multiple possible matter sources.
- Minkowski, de Sitter and ADS are all **vacuum** solutions; equally they may be regarded as having an arbitrary dark energy source $T_{ab} = \lambda g_{ab}$ (λ is **unrelated** to Λ in de Sitter & ADS metrics).
- **Do the last 4 points make CKG somewhat unphysical?**

Conclusions

- All static spherically symmetric vacuum & electrovac metrics in CKG are known.
- pp-waves metrics are known and are very similar to those in GR.
- Birkhoff's theorem is not valid in CKG. There are time-dependent vacuum FRWL metrics.
- Dark energy does not gravitate in CKG.
- Many solutions have multiple possible matter sources.
- Minkowski, de Sitter and ADS are all **vacuum** solutions; equally they may be regarded as having an arbitrary dark energy source $T_{ab} = \lambda g_{ab}$ (λ is **unrelated** to Λ in de Sitter & ADS metrics).
- **Do the last 4 points make CKG somewhat unphysical?**
- **Thank you for listening if you have been! Questions?**

- Harada J (2023) Phys. Rev. D **108**, 044031 arXiv:2308.07634
- Harada J (2023) Phys. Rev. D **108**, 104037 arXiv:2308.02115
- Mantica J C & Molinari L G (2023) Phys. Rev. D **108**, 124029 arXiv:2308.06803 [gr-qc]
- Tarciso Junior, J S S et al. (2023) arXiv:2310.19508 [gr-qc]
- Barnes A (2023) arXiv:2309.05336 & arXiv:2311.09171 [gr-qc]
- Barnes A (2024) Class. Quantum Grav. **41**, 155007
- Clément G and Nouicer K (2024) arXiv:2404.00328 [gr-qc]
- Barnes A (2024) arXiv:2404.09310 [gr-qc]