

A Remark on the Kerr Metric

Keiko Hirose and Giiti Iwata

Department of Physics, Faculty of Science
Ochanomizu University, Tokyo
(Received, Sept. 10, 1977)

Schiffer et al.¹⁾ have simplified the derivation of the Kerr metric²⁾ by assuming a degenerate metric

$$g_{\alpha\beta} = \eta_{\alpha\beta} - 2ml_{\alpha}l_{\beta}$$

$\eta_{\alpha\beta}$ being the Lorentz metric and l_{α} being a null vector with respect to the Lorentz metric, and by demanding that $g_{\alpha\beta}$ satisfy the Einstein free field equations for any value of m . This demand splits the field equations into 3 sets of equations according to the order in m , so that the solution of the field equations becomes easy.

We remark here that the demand is unnecessary. Without the demand, the Einstein field equations yield 3 sets of equations.

Generalizing the Einstein free field equations a little, we set up the field equations with the cosmological term

$$R_{\mu\nu} - \Lambda g_{\mu\nu} = 0 \quad (1)$$

which reduce to the free field equations discussed by Schiffer et al. when $\Lambda=0$. We list here basic relations

$$\left. \begin{aligned} g_{\alpha\beta} &= \eta_{\alpha\beta} - Ml_{\alpha}l_{\beta}, & g^{\alpha\beta} &= \eta^{\alpha\beta} + Ml^{\alpha}l^{\beta}, & M &= 2m \\ R_{\mu\nu} &= -\partial_{\alpha}\Gamma_{\mu\nu}^{\alpha} + \Gamma_{\beta\mu}^{\alpha}\Gamma_{\alpha\nu}^{\beta}. \end{aligned} \right\} \quad (2)$$

The relations

$$v^{\alpha} = l^{\beta}\partial_{\beta}l^{\alpha}, \quad v^{\alpha}l_{\alpha} = 0, \quad l^{\alpha}l_{\alpha} = 0 \quad (3)$$

remain intact, while we have

$$\begin{aligned} \Gamma_{\mu\nu}^{\alpha} &= \frac{1}{2}g^{\alpha\beta}(\partial_{\mu}g_{\nu\beta} + \partial_{\nu}g_{\mu\beta} - \partial_{\beta}g_{\mu\nu}) \\ &= -\frac{1}{2}M(\partial_{\mu}l_{\nu}l^{\alpha} + \partial_{\nu}l_{\mu}l^{\alpha} - \partial^{\alpha}l_{\mu}l_{\nu}) + \frac{1}{2}M^2l^{\alpha}(v_{\mu}l_{\nu} + v_{\nu}l_{\mu}) \end{aligned} \quad (4)$$

and

$$l^{\nu}\Gamma_{\mu\nu}^{\alpha} = -M/2 \cdot (v_{\mu}l^{\alpha} + v^{\alpha}l_{\mu}). \quad (5)$$

Therefore we have, by virtue of the relations (3), (4) and (5),

$$\begin{aligned} l^{\mu}l^{\nu}R_{\mu\nu} &= -l^{\mu}l^{\nu}\partial_{\alpha}\Gamma_{\mu\nu}^{\alpha} = -M/2 \cdot l^{\mu}l^{\nu}\partial_{\alpha}\{\partial_{\mu}l_{\nu}l^{\alpha} + \partial_{\nu}l_{\mu}l^{\alpha} - \partial^{\alpha}l_{\mu}l_{\nu}\} \\ &= -M/2 \cdot l^{\mu}l^{\nu}\partial_{\alpha}\{l^{\alpha}(\partial_{\mu}l_{\nu} + \partial_{\nu}l_{\mu})\} \end{aligned}$$

$$\begin{aligned}
&= M/2 \cdot \partial_\alpha l^\mu l^\nu \cdot l^\alpha (\partial_\mu l_\nu + \partial_\nu l_\mu) \\
&= M v^\nu v_\nu.
\end{aligned} \tag{6}$$

Because of the field equations (1), we have

$$v^\nu v_\nu = 0 \quad \text{or} \quad v^\nu = -A l^\nu. \tag{7}$$

If we use this relation, we have

$$R_{\mu\nu} = M K_{\mu\nu} - M^2 S l_\mu l_\nu \tag{8}$$

$$\begin{aligned}
K_{\mu\nu} &= \frac{1}{2} \cdot \partial_\alpha (\partial_\mu l_\nu l^\alpha + \partial_\nu l_\mu l^\alpha - \partial^\alpha l_\mu l_\nu) \\
&= -\frac{1}{2} \cdot \{ \partial_\mu (A + L) l_\nu + \partial_\nu (A + L) l_\mu + \partial_\alpha \partial^\alpha l_\mu l_\nu \}
\end{aligned} \tag{9}$$

$$S = \frac{1}{2} \cdot \{ A^2 - 2 \partial_\alpha A l^\alpha + \partial_\alpha l^\beta \cdot \partial^\alpha l_\beta - \partial_\alpha l^\beta \cdot \partial_\beta l^\alpha \}. \tag{10}$$

Hence we have

$$R_{\mu\nu} l^\nu = M K_{\mu\nu} l^\nu = M S l_\mu$$

while the field equations (1) give

$$R_{\mu\nu} l^\nu = A l_\mu.$$

Therefore we have

$$M S = A. \tag{11}$$

Using this relation in (8), we have

$$R_{\mu\nu} = M K_{\mu\nu} - M A l_\mu l_\nu$$

while the field equations (1) give

$$R_{\mu\nu} = A g_{\mu\nu} = A (\eta_{\mu\nu} - M l_\mu l_\nu).$$

Therefore we have

$$M K_{\mu\nu} = A \eta_{\mu\nu}. \tag{12}$$

In short the field equations (1) reduce to (7), (11) and (12).

If A vanishes, (11) and (12) reduce to

$$S = 0$$

$$K_{\mu\nu} = 0$$

respectively. In other words, the $R_{\mu\nu}$ (8) vanish in each order in m . It is to be noted that the relation (7) is valid when the cosmological term is present.

References

- 1) M.M. Schiffer, R.J. Alder, J. Mark and C. Sheffield: J. Math. Phys. 14 (1973) 52.
- 2) R.P. Kerr: Phys. Rev. Letters, 11 (1963) 237.