General structure of the solutions of the Hamiltonian constraints of gravity

30 August 2007

1. Introduction

This paper is devoted to the search of the general of the solutions of the Hamiltonian constraints of gravity. The canonical description of General Relativity is an old problem [1], which goes on acquiring a renewed and increasing interest as the starting point point for the establishment of a quantum theory of gravity [2, 3, 4], which is probably one of the most ambitious programs of modern physics. It is an attempt whose final success seems to be still far away.

The idea to extend the methods of quantum filed theories to the case of gravity (perturbative approach) came up against a number of difficulties, the most evident one being the non renormalizability, so that it can be considered almost an abandoned field, nowadays.

This is not the case with the non perturbative approach which, on the contrary, maintain a considerable appeal. A direct application of the Gauss-Codazzi theorem, allows to split the four dimensional spacetime into a 3+1 space and time (ADM formalism [5, 6]), which provides us with a very useful tool to understand General Relativity in terms of our direct experience of space and time, *i. e.* three dimensional slices evolving with a parametric time variable. The final result is a canonical theory with a singular Hamiltonian consisting in a linear combination of first class constraints. From this point of view, the program of General Relativity essentially reduces to solve the constraints. This is, precisely, the object of this paper. From the work of these pioneers, this problem lives a revival with the introduction of gauge theories of gravity[7, 8, 9, 10], which are on the basis of the most recent proposals by Ashtekar and coworkers. They reach a canonical formalism of gravity, close to standard gauge theories, where the fundamental dynamical variables are given by the canonically conjugate pair (e_{ia}, A_{ia}). Here e_{ia} are the SO(3) triads and A_{ia}, the corresponding gauge connections. In the following, latin letters a, b, ... of the beginning of the alphabet are assigned to the coordinates defined in the three dimensional slices resulting form a suitable foliation of the space-time, while i, j, ... of the middle of the alphabet are internal SO(3) indices running from 1 to 3.

There have been some attempts to formally solve the constraints [11, 12, 13], thoroughly discussed in a previous reference [14]. The present work has a double aim. On the one hand, to emphasize the close relationship existent between the Ashtekar structure of the constraints and the usual ADM one. Using a suitable choice of the dynamical degrees of freedom, we get, on the other hand, a general form of the solutions which allows us to classify them in terms of simple and general mathematical conditions. As we will see, these imply several restrictions on the three-dimensional metric.

With the purpose to offer a complete and unified version of our approach, we include, in a first section, a brief review of reference [14], adding besides the analysis of some important properties which reveal useful to construct a general framework.

2. Hamiltonian constraints of General Relativity

The Hamiltonian constraints of General relativity, as derived in the literature [15, 16, 17], are the weakly vanishing expressions

$$\nabla_a E^a_i \approx 0, \tag{1}$$

$$E^b_i F^i_{ab} \approx 0, \tag{2}$$

$$\epsilon_i{}^{jk} E^a_j E^b_k F^i_{ab} \approx 0, \tag{3}$$

describing SO(3) Gauss law, vector and scalar constraints, respectively. For simplicity, we have chosen here the Barbero-Immirzi para meter $\beta = i$, as long as at the classical level the Einstein's field equations have the same dynamical contents for any value of β. $E^a_i = e e^a_i$ are the densitized triads and $F^i_{ab} = 2\partial_{[a} A^i_{b]} + \epsilon^i_{jk} A^j_a A^k_b$, $\nabla_a E^a_i = \partial_a E^a_i + \epsilon_{ij}{}^k A^j_a E^a_k$ being the local SO(3) covariant derivative.

Paying attention to the connections, which are the fundamental dynamical variables, we have considered in the previous paper [14] an approach which offers an alternative writing of the constraints (1)-(3) closer to the ordinary geometrical ADM language. To do that, we redefine the SO(3) connections as

$$A^i_a = \Gamma^i_a + k^i_a,$$

where Γ^i_a is the part of the connection compatible with the metric and k^i_a is its intrinsic part, which plays the role of the extrinsic curvature of the three dimensional slices.

With these elements and after a little algebra (the reader is referred to [14, 18, 19] for the details), one gets, in coordinate language, the three equivalent expressions for the constraints (1)-(3)

$$k_{[ab]} \approx 0, \qquad \text{Gauss law} \tag{4}$$

$$D_a(k^a_b - \delta^a_b \operatorname{Tr} k) \approx 0, \qquad \text{Vector constraint} \tag{5}$$

$$R^{(3)} - \operatorname{Tr}(k^2) + (\operatorname{Tr} k)^2 \approx 0, \qquad \text{Scalar constraint,} \tag{6}$$

where $R^{(3)}$ is the scalar curvature defined in the three dimensional space and the covariant derivatives are the ordinary Christoffel ones.

It must be emphasized that (1)-(3) and (4)-(6) are different versions of the same dynamical contents. Three gauges (SO(3), coordinates and reparametrizations) can be arbitrarily chosen to get the final result. The problem simplifies drastically after fixing the reparametrization gauge by imposing the usual condition $\operatorname{Tr}(k) = 0$. The problem reduces then to solve

$$D_a k^a_b \approx 0, \tag{7}$$

$$R^{(3)} - \operatorname{Tr}(k^2) \approx 0, \tag{8}$$

where k_{ab} is a traceless symmetric matrix.

It is very easy to verify that the vector constraint (7) transforms covariantly with respect to the rescaling of g_{ab} and k^a_b, namely

$$g_{ab} \rightarrow \varphi \tilde{g}_{ab},$$
$$k^a_b \rightarrow \varphi^{-3/2} \tilde{k}^a_b$$

what implies

$$D_a k^a_b = \varphi^{-3/2} \tilde{D}_a \tilde{k}^a_b.$$

Furthermore, the vector constraint always admits an identical solution depending only on the metric tensor. In fact, the Cotton-York tensor C^a_b, defined as

$$C^{ab} = \eta^{acd} D_c \left[R^b_d - \frac{1}{4}\, \delta^b_d R \right], \tag{9}$$

is symmetric, traceless and identically conserved $D_a C^a_b \equiv 0$, as required by the vector constraint (7).

Consequently, we can establish the general form of k^a_b as the sum of two terms

$$k^a_b = k(0)^a_b + \alpha C^a_b, \tag{10}$$

where $k(0)^a_b$ stands for any solution of (7) and α is an arbitrary constant.

As far as one looks primarily for solutions for k in eq. (7) which are functionals of any arbitrary metric, they must be expressible in terms of the metric tensor and its derivatives up to third order. The reason is that the first derivatives of the invariant $\mathrm{Tr}(k^2)$, implicitly present in (7), leads though the scalar constraint to a derived scalar curvature R^3, which includes up to second order derivatives of the metric.

Being, on the other hand, the cancellation of the Cotton-York tensor the necessary and sufficient condition for a manifold to be conformally flat, the presence of C^a_b allows us to distinguish, from the very beginning, conformally flat metrics as a very outstanding case, as we will see in the following.

3. The choice of the dynamical variables

A non negligible part of the problems arising in gravity theories is related with the search of a suitable set of dynamical variables. In this section, we consider a parametrization of k^a_b that reveals specially useful to deal with the analysis of the possible solutions. For this purpose, we recover the triads formalism to write down k^a_b as

$$k^a_b = e^a_i k_{ij} e_{jb},$$

where k_{ij} is an ordinary traceless, symmetric SO(3) matrix. Being symmetric, it can be diagonalized with the help of an orthogonal matrix, what enables us to deal easily with its spectral representation.

$$k_{ij} = u_i x u_j + v_i y v_j + w_i z w_j,$$

where x, y, z are the three eigenvalues verifying $x + y + z = 0$ (traceless condition) and u, v and w are the corresponding eigenvectors. In this way, the five degrees of freedom of k^a_b arrange as two scalar eigenvalues plus the three independent parameters associated with the eigenvectors, which are isomorphic to an SO(3) transformation. The last property will be important in what follows. With these assumptions, the final form of k^a_b reads

$$k^a_b = \hat{e}^a_1\, x\, \hat{e}_{1\,b} + \hat{e}^a_2\, y\, \hat{e}_{2\,b} + \hat{e}^a_3\, z\, \hat{e}_{3\,b}, \tag{11}$$

where $\hat{a}^a_1 = e^a_i u_i$, $\hat{a}^a_2 = e^a_i v_i$ and $\hat{a}^a_3 = e^a_i w_i$.

We impose now reality conditions on the eigenvalues, which become constrained to the real roots of the cubic canonical equation. This restricts the discriminant to be zero or negative. A very convenient parametrization for both cases is the following

$$\begin{aligned} x &= \lambda \cos\omega, \\ y &= -\frac{\lambda}{2}(\cos\omega - \sqrt{3}\,\sin\omega) \\ z &= -\frac{\lambda}{2}(\cos\omega + \sqrt{3}\,\sin\omega) \end{aligned} \tag{12}$$

where $\sin\omega = 0$ and $\sin\omega \neq 0$ correspond to null and negative discriminant, respectively.

Now, we have the essential elements to attempt a classification of the possible solutions, paying mainly attention to the vector constraint. Anyway, it is worth to notice that for conformally flat metrics, (12) is enough to formally deduce the value of λ. In fact, taking $\mathrm{Tr}(k^2)$ directly from (12) one immediately gets $\mathrm{Tr}(k^2) = 3\lambda^2/2$. Therefore, taking into account the scalar constraint, λ is given by $3\lambda^2/2 = R^{(3)}$.

4. Classifying the solutions

Since there are many and very different solutions of the constraints, a way must be found to classify them in a general scheme. For this purpose, we rewrite (1) in a more compact notation as

$$k^a_b = \rho_{ij} \hat{e}^a_i \hat{e}_{jb}, \tag{13}$$

where ρ_{ij} is the diagonal matrix of the eigenvalues. The vector constraint becomes then

$$D_a(k^a_b) = D_a(\rho_{ij}\hat{e}^a_i\hat{e}_{jb}) = \hat{e}^a_i\hat{e}_{jb}\partial_a\rho_{ij} + \rho_{ij}\hat{e}^a_i D_a\hat{e}_{jb} + \rho_{ij}\hat{e}_{jb}D_a\hat{e}^a_i = 0,$$

which, after multiplication by $\hat{e}^b_k$ gives

$$\hat{e}^a_i\partial_a\rho_{ik} - \rho_{ij}\hat{\gamma}_{ikj} + \rho_{ik}\hat{\gamma}_{jij} = 0, \tag{14}$$

where the symbols of anholonomy $\hat{\gamma}_{ijk}$ are given as

$$\hat{\gamma}_{ijk} \equiv -\hat{e}^b_j\hat{e}^a_k D_a\hat{e}_{ib} = \hat{e}_{ib}\hat{e}^a_k D_a\hat{e}^b_j$$

and verify

$$\hat{\gamma}_{ijk} + \hat{\gamma}_{jik} = 0, \qquad \text{and} \qquad \hat{\gamma}_{kjk} = D_a\hat{e}^a_j.$$

Note that the covariant derivative are here the Christoffel ones acting on the coordinate indices.

Desde aquí hasta la sección "The choice of the coordinates" el texto del fax estaba borroso. Quizá haya errores de trascripción.

It is convenient for the later discussion to develop eq. (14), which leads to

$$\hat{e}^a_1\partial_a\rho_1 + \hat{\gamma}_{212}(\rho_1 - \rho_2) + \hat{\gamma}_{313}(\rho_1 - \rho_3) = 0, \tag{15}$$
$$\hat{e}^a_2\partial_a\rho_2 + \hat{\gamma}_{121}(\rho_2 - \rho_1) + \hat{\gamma}_{323}(\rho_2 - \rho_3) = 0, \tag{16}$$
$$\hat{e}^a_3\partial_a\rho_3 + \hat{\gamma}_{131}(\rho_3 - \rho_1) + \hat{\gamma}_{232}(\rho_3 - \rho_2) = 0. \tag{17}$$

Notice that the triads $\hat{e}^a_i$ are defined in terms of the matrix elements of k^a_b and that the SU(3) gauge has been fixed in (15)-(17) by imposing $\hat{e}^a_1$, $\hat{e}^a_2$, $\hat{e}^a_3$ to be the eigenvectors of k^a_b with respect to the metric tensor.

The values of the dynamical variables λ and ω in the parametrization (12) provide us with a well defined mathematical criterion to classify all the real solutions. As will be seen, four different classes can be recognized. A first class, which we call A, corresponds to $\omega = 0$. This is precisely the case where the discriminant of the secular equation cancels. Starting from (15)-(17) a bit of algebra leads to the following system.

$$\hat{e}_1^a \partial_a \mu + \frac{3}{2}\mu(\hat{\gamma}_{212} + \hat{\gamma}_{313}) = 0, \tag{18}$$
$$\hat{e}_2^a \partial_a \mu + 3\mu\hat{\gamma}_{121} = 0, \tag{19}$$
$$\hat{e}_3^a \partial_a \mu + 3\mu\hat{\gamma}_{131} = 0, \tag{20}$$

where $\mu = \lambda \cos\omega$ to simplify the notation.

The second class, which we call B, corresponds to $\cos\omega = 0$. In this case k^a_b is a singular matrix (*i. e.* $\det(k) = 0$), verifying the equations

$$\nu(\hat{\gamma}_{212} - \hat{\gamma}_{313}) = 0, \tag{21}$$
$$\hat{e}_2^a \partial_a \nu + \nu\hat{\gamma}_{121} = 0, \tag{22}$$
$$\hat{e}_3^a \partial_a \nu - \nu\hat{\gamma}_{131} = 0, \tag{23}$$

where $\nu = \sqrt{3/4}\,\lambda \sin\omega$.

The third class C is the general case, sometimes called the irreducible one, in which the characteristic equation can be written as ??

$$\hat{e}_1^a \partial_a \mu + \frac{\mu}{2}(3-\delta)\hat{\gamma}_{212} + \frac{\mu}{2}(3+\delta)\hat{\gamma}_{313} = 0, \tag{24}$$
$$\hat{e}_2^a \partial_a [\mu(1-\delta)] + \mu(3-\delta)\hat{\gamma}_{121} + 2\mu\delta\hat{\gamma}_{323} = 0, \tag{25}$$
$$\hat{e}_3^a \partial_a [\mu(1+\delta)] + \mu(3+\delta)\hat{\gamma}_{131} + 2\mu\delta\hat{\gamma}_{232} = 0, \tag{26}$$

with $\delta = \sqrt{3}\,\tan\omega$.

Finally a fourth class D occurs when we take directly $k(0)^a_b = 0$ in (??). Therefore, all the solutions in this class depend only on the metric tensor. In this case, the distinction between spaces that are conformally flat and those which are not acquires a specially relevant role, which will be analyzed in the following.

5. The choice of the coordinates

Once characterized the different classes of solutions, we can use 3-diff to choose coordinates. According to the Gauss theorem, this can be done by fixing the values of the elements of the metric tensor and diagonalizing it. Although other choices are clearly possible, most of the known relevant solutions (?) can be written in diagonal form, which on the other hand greatly simplifies the calculations. We start, therefore, by writing the metric tensor in the form

$$g_{ab} = \begin{pmatrix} a & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & b & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & c \end{pmatrix}. \tag{27}$$

We introduce now a "natural" triad associated with this form and constructed with the three vectors $e_{1a} = (a, 0, 0)$, $e_{2a} = (0, b, 0)$ and $e_{3a} = (0, 0, c)$, which are an orthogonal basis with respect to g_{ab}. Any other basis can differ from this one only by the application of an orthogonal matrix (?), so that we can write

$$\hat{e}_{ia} = O_{ij}\, e_{ja}, \tag{28}$$

which expresses the relation between the eigenvalues of k^a_b and our triad e_{ia}. Equation (16) allows thus to parametrize all the arbitrariness of k^a_b simply in terms of a rotation matrix. Inserting (28) in (18)-(26), it is easy to find the final form of the vector constraint in each class. Once a metric is adopted in this way, the presence of O_{ij} describes all the generality of the theory.

As a first simple approach, let us consider the case $O_{ij} = \delta_{ij}$. A bit of algebra suffices then to find the expression of the vector constraint in the four classes. In the case of the class A, it adopts the very simple integrable form

$$\partial_1 \log[(\hat{b}\hat{c})^{3/4}] = 0, \tag{29}$$
$$\partial_2 \log[(\hat{a})^{3/2}] = 0, \tag{30}$$
$$\partial_3 \log[(\hat{a})^{3/2}] = 0, \tag{31}$$

where $\hat{a} = \lambda\, a^{3/2}$, $\hat{b} = \lambda\, b^{3/2}$ and $\hat{c} = \lambda\, c^{3/2}$. As is seen, this implies some restrictions on the fundamental structure of the matrix elements of the metric tensor, $\hat{a}$ being a function of only the first coordinate and $\hat{b}$ and $\hat{c}$ such that their product is of the form $\hat{b}\hat{c} = f(x_2, x_3)$, f being an arbitrary function.

The solutions in class B can be expressed also in directly integrable form, namely

$$\partial_1 \log[\sqrt{c/b}] = 0, \tag{32}$$
$$\partial_2 \log[\lambda\, c\sqrt{a}] = 0, \tag{33}$$
$$\partial_3 \log[\lambda\, b\sqrt{a}] = 0, \tag{34}$$

so that the quotient c/b is independent of the first coordinate while $\lambda\, c\sqrt{a}$ and $\lambda\, b\sqrt{a}$ do not depend on the second and third coordinates, respectively. It must be stressed that that, in spite of the simplicity of these properties, solutions of this class play a very relevant dynamical role.

The study of the third class C leads us to the more complex system

$$\begin{aligned}
\partial_1 \log[\mu(bc)^{3/4}] - \delta\, \partial_1 \log[(b/c)^{1/4}] &= 0, && (35)\\
\partial_2 \log[\mu(1-\delta)a^{3/2}] + \frac{\delta}{1-\delta}\, \partial_2 \log[\frac{a}{c}] &= 0, && (36)\\
\partial_3 \log[\mu(1+\delta)a^{3/2}] - \frac{\delta}{1+\delta}\, \partial_3 \log[\frac{a}{b}] &= 0. && (37)
\end{aligned}$$

It is clear that this system is, by no means, so easy to solve as are the previous ones. Nevertheless we will see in next section that it is not difficult to handle in some particular cases. For instance, assuming that $b \neq c$, δ can be obtained from the first equation so that, after substitution in the other two, two conditions can be deduced which involve the elements of the metric tensor and their first derivatives.

6. The search for the solutions

In order to find the solutions, we must handle a problem parametrized in terms of eight degrees of freedom. Two of them are the eigenvalues of k_b^a although, as emphasized before, one is formally found in our scheme by the condition $R = 3\lambda^2/2$. After fixing the gauge, we have three more which correspond to the independent elements of the metric tensor (??). Finally, the remaining three are parametrized by the defining elements of an orthogonal matrix, the Eulerian angles for instance. We will obtain in such a way the four degrees of freedom of pure gravity by solving the scalar end the vector constraints.

From the mathematical point of view, different possibilities are open. Nevertheless, it seems convenient to remain close to our experience of the world, so that the best approach is probably to use geometry as a primary input. We will consider, therefore, in this section several interesting cases in order to test our treatment in geometrical language.

No doubt, isotropic spaces are obvious candidates for that. Moreover, as will be seen later, they allow us to propose an interesting slight modification of our approach. An isotropic space is described by a diagonal metric tensor that can be written in spherical coordinates as

$$g_{11} = 1/\varphi(r), \quad g_{22} = r^2, \quad g_{33} = r^2 \sin^2\theta,$$

$\varphi(r)$ being a function depending only on the "radius"r.

It is easy to see that the scalar curvature adopts the form

$$R = \frac{2}{r^2}\, \partial_r \{r[(\varphi(r) - 1]\}. \tag{38}$$

Thanks to our parametrization, we can thus write immediately the scalar constraint as

$$\frac{3}{2}\,\lambda^2 = \frac{2}{r^2}\, \partial_r \{r[\varphi(r) - 1]\}, \tag{39}$$

which expresses a differential relation between φ and λ. At the same time, this defines λ as a function depending only on r, a property that highly simplifies the calculation, as will be seen. As explained in last section, we may start by choosing the matrix $O_{ij} = \delta_{ij}$, obtaining in this way simple relations enabling to construct solutions of Einstein's equations. For isotropic spaces, a simple calculation shows that the vector constraint can be written as the system

$$\begin{aligned} \partial_r(r^3\lambda\cos\omega) = 0, \quad (a) \\ \lambda\left[\partial_\theta\cos\omega - \frac{\sqrt{3}}{\sin^2\theta}\,\partial_\theta(\sin\omega\sin^2\theta)\right] = 0, \quad (b) \\ \lambda\,\partial_\varphi(\cos\omega + \sqrt{3}\sin\omega) = 0, \quad (c) \end{aligned} \tag{40}$$

In the case of $\sin\omega = 0$ (??) (Class A), (40) a reduces to

$$\partial(r^3\lambda) = 0, \quad \text{so that} \quad \lambda = 2k_0/r^3.$$

From this and the scalar constraint (**??**), it follows

$$\partial_r\left\{r[\phi(r) - 1] + \frac{k_0^2}{r}\right\} = 0,$$

what leads to the solution

$$\varphi = 1 - \frac{2m}{r} - \frac{k_0^2}{r^4}.$$

It is straightforward to check that the conditions (??) are clearly satisfied. In the class C, both $\sin\omega$ and $\cos\omega$ are different from zero, so that we write (40-a) and (40-b) in the form

$$\partial_\omega = \cot\omega\,\partial_r\,\log(r^3\lambda), \qquad \partial_\theta\omega = \frac{-2\sqrt{3}\cot\theta}{1+\sqrt{3}\cot\omega}.$$

The integrability condition $\partial_\theta\partial_r\omega = \partial_r\partial_\theta\omega = 0$ leads to $\tan\omega = -2\sqrt{3}$, from which some algebra shows that it appears, curiously, the condition on the coordinates $\cos\theta = 0$. The same happens in class B (Explain!).

Finally the class D occurs when $\lambda = 0$. Since the Cotton-York tensor C^a_b cancels for isotropic metrics, only the scalar constraint remains, and it is

$$R = \frac{2}{r^2}\,\partial_r\{r[\varphi(r) - 1]\} = 0,$$

what gives the Schwarzshild solution

$$\varphi = 1 - \frac{2m}{r}.$$

This function describes a static situation since $k^a_b = 0$ in this case.

The condition $\cos\theta = 0$ in classes B and C requires a comment. One can verify that it is not a property related with isotropy, but rather a consequence of the choice of the matrix O_{ij} as a Kronecker δ_{ij}, what puts in evidence the relevance of the role of the matrix O_{ij} in the construction of the different solutions. To understand this, one can take O_{ij} as a rotation with Eulerian angles such that $\cos\alpha = 0$, $\sin\phi = \cos\phi = 1/\sqrt{2}$ and arbitrary value of the third angle, i. e,

$$O = \begin{pmatrix} \sin\beta & -\cos\beta & 0 \\ \cos\beta/\sqrt{2} & \sin\beta/\sqrt{2} & 1/\sqrt{2} \\ -\cos\beta/\sqrt{2} & -\sin\beta/\sqrt{2} & 1/\sqrt{2} \end{pmatrix}. \qquad (41)$$

What definition of angles?

The result, not detailed here for simplicity, is that the third angle β is independent on φ, what does not pose any restriction on the coordinates.

Isotropic spaces have a property suitable to be used in a slightly different approach, due to the fact that the Ricci tensor becomes itself diagonal in these spaces. This suggests to parametrize the solution of the vector constraint in the alternative form

$$k^a_b = \eta^{acd} D_c M_{db},$$

where the tensor M_{db} must be symmetric to account for the property of k^a_b of being traceless. Moreover, it is easy to show that M_{db} and the Ricci tensor R_{ab} commute, otherwise k^a_b would not be divergenceless. Finally, the symmetry of k^{ab} requires that

$$D_a[M^a_b - \delta^a_b \, \mathrm{Tr}(M)] = 0,$$

as is easy to see, just cancelling its antisymmetric part. From this, it is very easy to obtain again the arbitrariness related to the presence of the Cotton-York tensor. In fact, if we take simply

$$M^a_b - \delta^a_b \mathrm{Tr}(M) = G^a_b,$$

G^a_b being the Einstein's tensor, it turns out that

$$M^a_b = R^a_b - \frac{1}{4} \, \delta^a_b R$$

is an identical solution. In this way one can work with a symmetric matrix M_{ab} that can be simultaneously diagonalized with the Ricci tensor, a property very useful in some cases.

To end this section, we include a brief example of the inverse problem or, in other words, to start from a well known solution reconstructing from it the different elements of the problem. The example is a stationary metric with axial symmetry and Papapetrou's structure, given in four dimensions as

$$g_{\alpha\beta} = \begin{pmatrix} g_{00} & 0 & 0 & g_{03} \\ 0 & g_{11} = a & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & g_{22} = b & 0 \\ g_{03} & 0 & 0 & g_{33} = c \end{pmatrix} \tag{42}$$

the components of which are functions depending only on r and θ. The extrinsic curvature is in this case

$$k_{ab} = \frac{1}{\sqrt{-g_{00}}} \, \Gamma^0_{ab} = \begin{pmatrix} 0 & 0 & \alpha_1 \\ 0 & 0 & \alpha_2 \\ \alpha_1 & \alpha_2 & 0 \end{pmatrix}.$$

Solving now the eigenvalues (secular?) equation with respect to the three-dimensional restriction of the metric

$$k_{ab}\hat{e}_i^b = \rho_i g_{ab}\hat{e}_i^b,$$

we obtain the eigenvalues

$$\rho_1 = 0, \qquad \rho_2 = -\rho_3 = \frac{\rho}{\sqrt{abc}} = \frac{\sqrt{b\alpha_1^2 + a\alpha_2^2}}{\sqrt{abc}}.$$

The corresponding eigenvectors can be easily deduced. They are

$$\begin{aligned} \hat{e}_1^a &= \left(\frac{\alpha_2}{\rho}, -\frac{\alpha_1}{\rho}, 0\right), \\ \hat{e}_2^a &= \left(\sqrt{\frac{b}{2a}}\,\frac{\alpha_1}{\rho}, \sqrt{\frac{a}{2b}}\,\frac{\alpha_2}{\rho}, \frac{1}{\sqrt{2c}}\right), \quad \hat{e}_3^a = \left(-\sqrt{\frac{b}{2a}}\,\frac{\alpha_1}{\rho}, -\sqrt{\frac{a}{2b}}\,\frac{\alpha_2}{\rho}, \frac{1}{\sqrt{2c}}\right) \end{aligned}$$

The matrix O_{ij} relating them with the "natural" triad $\tilde{e}_1^a = (1/\sqrt{a}, 0, 0)$, $\tilde{e}_2^a = (0, 1/\sqrt{b}, 0)$, $\tilde{e}_3^a = (0, 0, 1/\sqrt{c})$, is

$$O = \begin{pmatrix} \frac{\sqrt{a}\,\alpha_2}{\rho} & -\frac{\sqrt{b}\,\alpha_1}{\rho} & 0 \\ \sqrt{\frac{b}{2}}\,\frac{\alpha_1}{\rho} & \sqrt{\frac{a}{2}}\,\frac{\alpha_2}{\rho} & \frac{1}{\sqrt{2}} \\ -\sqrt{\frac{b}{2}}\,\frac{\alpha_1}{\rho} & -\sqrt{\frac{a}{2}}\,\frac{\alpha_2}{\rho} & \frac{1}{\sqrt{2}} \end{pmatrix}, \tag{43}$$

in which one recognizes eq. (**??**) if $\sin\beta = \sqrt{a}\,\alpha_2/\rho$ and $-\cos\beta = -\sqrt{b}\,\alpha_1/\rho$ minus signs?. It is therefore a typical B-class solution.

7. Concluding remarks

The essential purpose of this paper is to establish a general framework for the study of the solutions of Einstein's equations in the case of pure gravity. A framework which, at the same time, will give a classification based on simple and well defined mathematical grounds. In the framework here presented and as a consequence of the parametrization employed, the scalar constraint is directly solved *ab initio*. No entiendo frase. From the mathematical point of view, this scheme constitutes a "natural" starting point to study systematically the dynamical content of the different classes of solutions. The work on all these aspects is actually in progress.

Referencias

[1] abdc

[2] Arnowit, R., Deser, S., Misner, C. W.: Phys. Rev. **117**, 1595 (1960)

[3] Arnowit, R., Deser, S., Misner, C. W.: "The dynamics of general relativity" in *Gravitation: an introduction to current research*, Wiley, New York (1962), pp. 227-265

[4] De Witt, B. S.: Phys. Rev. **160**, 1113 (1967)

[5] De Witt, B. S.: Phys. Rev. Lett **13**, 114

[6] Misner, C. W., and Thorne, K. S., and Wheeler, J. A.: *Gravitation* (Freeman, St. Francisco, (1973)

[7] Hehl, F. W., Von Der Hayde, P., Kerlick, G. D., Nester, J. M.: Rev. Mod. Phys. **48**, 393 (1976)

[8] Gonwald, F., Hehl, F. W.: "On gauge aspects of Gravity", in Proceedings of 14th School of Cosmology and Gravitation, Erice (Italy) 1995

[9] Hehl, F. W., Mc Crea, J. D., Mielke, E. W., Neeman, Y.: Phys. Rept. **258**, 1 (1995)

[10] Tresguerres, R., Mielke, E. W.: Phys. Rev. D **62** 04404 (2000)

[11] Capovilla, R., Jacobson, T., Dell, J.: Phys. Rev. Lett. **63**, 2325 (1989)

[12] Barbero, J. F., Class. Quant. Grav.: **12**, L5 (1995)

[13] Capovilla, R., Jacobson, T., Dell, J.: Clas. Quant. Grav. **8**, 59 (1991)

[14] Tiemblo, A., Tresguerres, R.: Gen. Relativ. Gravit. **38**, 1839 (2006).

[15] Barbero, J. F.: Phys. Rev D **51**, 5507 (1995).

[16] Immirzi, G.: Nucl. Phys. Proc. Suppl. **57**, 65 (1997)

[17] Samuel, J.: Class. Quant. Grav. **17** L141 (2000)

[18] Ortin. T.: *Gravity and strings* (Cambridge, 2004)

[19] Blagojevic, M.: *Gravitation and gauge symmetries* (IOP Publishing Co., Bristol, 2002)