

Some comments on the nature of initial data in spherical collapse

T. P. Singh

Theoretical Astrophysics Group
Tata Institute of Fundamental Research
Homi Bhabha Road, Mumbai 400005, India

January 30, 2018

Abstract

Various authors have shown the occurrence of naked singularities and black holes in the spherical gravitational collapse of inhomogeneous dust. In a recent preprint, Antia has criticised a statement in a paper by Jhingan, Joshi and Singh on dust collapse. We show that his criticism is invalid. Antia shows that in Eulerian coordinates a series expansion for the density of a collapsing Newtonian fluid can have only even powers. However, he has overlooked the fact that Jhingan et al. have actually used Lagrangian (comoving) coordinates, and not Eulerian coordinates. As we show, in Lagrangian coordinates there is no restriction that the density have only even powers and hence his criticism is invalid. We also point out that an earlier claim by Antia on the instability of strong naked singularities in dust collapse is not supported by any concrete analysis, and is hence incorrect.

A proof or disproof of the cosmic censorship hypothesis is generally regarded as one of the most important unsolved problems in classical general relativity. Recent studies of models of gravitational collapse exhibit examples of formation of both black-holes and naked singularities, depending on the initial data (for a recent review see, e.g. [1]). Hence the validity of the censorship hypothesis remains an open problem. In particular, various authors

have shown the occurrence of naked singularities in spherical dust collapse [2]. It turns out that initial data consisting of only smooth and even functions can result in a weak naked singularity, whereas if the initial data is allowed to be more general a strong naked singularity can result [3]. Jhingan et al. [4] discussed the structure of the apparent horizon in dust collapse; this gives physical insight as to why some initial conditions can lead to a naked singularity. In this paper the authors also stated that density functions having odd powers are physically admissible. To clarify this issue, a comparison was made with the case of the Lane-Emden equation for a polytrope in Newtonian stellar theory. As is well-known, this equation describes hydrostatic equilibrium, and it is easily shown from this equation that a series expansion of the density around the center can have only even powers. Jhingan et al. pointed out that when the Lane-Emden equation is replaced by the acceleration equation describing collapse, there is no longer any restriction that the density function be even. (It should be noted however, that this comparison is in no way central to the main theme of the paper of Jhingan et al. which is entirely concerned with dust models, and is no more than a side remark concerning the possibilities when pressures are included.)

In a recent preprint, Antia [5] has claimed that this last argument of Jhingan et al. is incorrect, and that even in the case of a collapsing fluid, as described by the Newtonian theory, a series expansion for the density has only even powers. Further, the series expansion for the velocity can have only odd powers. This is shown by considering a general expansion in the coupled Euler and continuity equations, written in Eulerian coordinates. According to Antia, Jhingan et al. did not consider the continuity equation, and hence arrived at an incorrect conclusion.

The aim of our paper is to point out the error in Antia's reasoning. While Antia's demonstration holds in Eulerian coordinates, it does not hold in Lagrangian (i.e. comoving) coordinates, as we show below. Since the discussion of Jhingan et al. is entirely in comoving coordinates, their conclusion is hence not affected by Antia's argument, and continues to be valid. Antia misses the point that the form of functions describing physical quantities such as density etc. is coordinate dependent and as such changes with the adoption of coordinates. His statement that we have not included the continuity equation is completely wrong and misleading. Our analysis of dust collapse obviously includes the continuity equation. Moreover, as we show, our specific argument regarding the Lane-Emden equation is unchanged by including the continu-

ity equation, and hence in fact this argument does not require the use of the continuity equation.

In order to clarify this point, we start by writing the continuity equation and Euler equation in the Lagrangian coordinates (t, r) , (see, for instance, [6]):

$$\dot{\rho} + \rho \frac{\dot{R}'}{R'} + 2\rho \frac{\dot{R}}{R} = 0 \quad (1)$$

$$\rho \ddot{R} = -\rho \frac{Gm(r)}{R^2} - \frac{p'}{R'} \quad (2)$$

In these equations, dot stands for the convective time derivative, and prime stands for a derivative w.r.t. the comoving coordinate r . The distance of a fluid element r from the origin is given by $R(t, r)$. The mass $m(t, r)$ is given by

$$m(t, r) = 4\pi \int_0^r \rho R^2 R' dr \quad (3)$$

We assume that the pressure obeys an equation of state $p = p(\rho)$. In order to check whether Antia's claim holds in Lagrangian coordinates, we expand the density $\rho(t, r)$ and the distance $R(t, r)$ as a series in the Lagrangian coordinate r , at an arbitrary time t .

$$\rho = \rho_0(t) + \rho_1(t)r + \rho_2(t)r^2 + \rho_3(t)r^3 + \dots \quad (4)$$

$$R(t, r) = a_0(t)r + a_1(t)r^2 + a_2(t)r^3 + \dots \quad (5)$$

Using these expansions in the Euler equation (2), putting $p' = (dp/d\rho)\rho'$, and assuming the center to be at rest, the terms at order r^0 imply that $\rho_1 = 0$. (A binomial expansion for $1/R$ and $1/R'$ has been used). At order r , the continuity equation (1) gives $\dot{a}_1/a_1 = \dot{a}_0/a_0$. Since in general a_0 and a_1 will be non-zero, and are evolving functions of time, we see that there is no constraint on the series expansion of the velocity \dot{R} . In general, there will be odd as well as even powers - this is unlike in Antia's consideration given in Eulerian coordinates. Similarly, since \ddot{a}_0 and \ddot{a}_1 will in general be non-zero, it does not follow from the Euler equation that $\rho_3 = 0$, again unlike what Antia finds. Neither will the higher odd derivatives vanish. Thus there is no constraint on the density expansion that it must have only even powers. One could now write the density as a function of the physical distance. Since

there is no constraint in comoving coordinates, there will be no constraint when the density is written in terms of the physical distance. The result given by Antia for Eulerian coordinates is a peculiarity of that particular coordinate system.

Hence the statement made by Jhingan et al. regarding the series expansion of the density in comoving coordinates is correct. Antia's criticism is invalid because he considers expansions in Eulerian coordinates, which are not the coordinates used by Jhingan et al. It is worthwhile to repeat that the above discussion for a Newtonian fluid with pressure is in any case rather academic from the point of view of Jhingan et al., who are actually considering relativistic dust. On the other hand, Antia tries to create an impression that our conclusions on dust collapse are incorrect because we have not used the continuity equation. This is entirely wrong and misleading. It also demonstrates the irrelevance of the issue raised by him. Further, it is important to note that for some collapsing systems with pressure, strong naked singularities actually arise from smooth initial data [7]. Other examples of strong naked singularities are also known [8]. In our opinion, these issues could easily have been resolved by dialogue, but the existence of a criticism in the archives compels us to reply.

Unfortunately, the preprint by Antia contains a few incorrect statements which can confuse the reader. Hence we comment on them below.

(i) Antia writes: "It may be noted that in all these calculations the singularity is naked only when it just forms. Irrespective of initial conditions, gravitational collapse ultimately results in a formation of event horizon and hence black holes appear to be the only stable end product of such a collapse". This statement is incorrect because although the naked singularity is only a point in the comoving coordinates, it is actually a null line in the Penrose diagram. Furthermore, an asymptotic observer could receive a family of null rays emerging from the singularity, for an infinite period of his time. Besides, since the Cauchy horizon could lie outside the event horizon in the Penrose diagram, the formation of an event horizon in such a case could certainly not be guaranteed.

(ii) Antia criticises an illustration given by Jhingan et al. to show that the absence of apparent horizon until singularity formation does not imply the singularity is naked. His criticism is that this illustration uses a density profile which is non-generic in the space of initial data. This criticism is completely unfounded. The density profile used by Jhingan et al. forms a one parameter

family of solutions, and even in the possible case of its being non-generic in a certain sense, it is perfectly reasonable to use it to demonstrate a conceptual issue.

(iii) The statements in the last paragraph of Antia's preprint regarding strength of the singularity do not appear to have any clear meaning at all. The strength of the naked singularity does not have anything to do with how the starting epoch is labelled, as is to be expected, since curvature strength is an invariant quantity.

We would also like to use this opportunity to comment on an earlier paper by Antia [9] where he claims to have shown that strong curvature naked singularities in dust collapse are unstable. Unfortunately, the paper does not give any proof to establish the claimed instability. Hence, we regard the issue of stability of these strong naked singularities as open. Besides, Antia's paper deals with marginally bound collapse, without explicitly stating so. Hence it is in major error in claiming the conclusions to be generally valid for any values of the velocity function; while that is clearly not what he has shown. Also, the paper incorrectly states that if the initial density were to increase outwards, the collapse ends in a black-hole. Actually, in this case the collapse leads to a shell-crossing (as opposed to shell-focussing) naked singularity, to begin with, and a discussion of further evolution needs to take into account possible extendibility beyond the shell-crossing singularity. We will point out the errors in his paper and discuss these issues elsewhere.

In summary, the objections raised by Antia to our work on dust collapse are invalid and/or incorrect.

References

- [1] T. P. Singh, in *Classical and quantum aspects of gravitation and cosmology* Eds. G. Date and B. R. Iyer (1996), Institute of Mathematical Sciences Report 117; gr-qc/9606016.
- [2] D. Christodoulou, Commun. Math. Phys. 93 (1984) 2239; R. P. A. C. Newman, Class. Quantum Grav. 3 (1986) 527; I. H. Dwivedi and P. S. Joshi, Class. Quantum Grav. 9 (1992) L69; P. S. Joshi and I. H. Dwivedi, Phys. Rev. D47 (1993) 5357; B. Waugh and K. Lake, Phys. Rev. D38

- (1988) 1315; V. Gorini, G. Grillo and M. Pelizza, Phys. Lett. A135 (1989) 154; G. Grillo, Class. Quantum Grav. 8 (1991) 739.
- [3] T. P. Singh and P. S. Joshi, Class. Quantum Grav. 13 (1996) 559.
 - [4] S. Jhingan, P. S. Joshi and T. P. Singh, Class. Quantum Grav. 13 (1996) 3057.
 - [5] H. M. Antia (1997) gr-qc/9701023.
 - [6] M. A. Podurets, Soviet Astronomy - AJ 8 (1964) 19.
 - [7] A. Ori and T. Piran, Phys. Rev. D42 (1990) 1068.
 - [8] I. H. Dwivedi and P. S. Joshi, Class. Quantum Grav. 6 (1989) 1599; 8 (1991) 1339; P. S. Joshi and I. H. Dwivedi, Gen. Rel. Gravn. 24 (1992) 129.
 - [9] H. M. Antia, Phys. Rev. D53 (1996) 3472.