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Abstract

We compare and contrast two different metric-based formulations of nonlinear cosmological perturbation theory: the MW2009 approach in Malik and Wands (2009 Phys. Rep. 475 1) following Bardeen and the recent approach of the paper KN2010 (Nakamura 2010 Adv. Astron. 2010 576273). We present each formulation separately. In the MW2009 approach, one considers the gauge transformations of perturbative quantities, choosing a gauge by requiring that certain quantities vanish, rendering all other variables gauge invariant. In the KN2010 formalism, one decomposes the metric tensor into a gauge variant and gauge invariant part from the outset. We compare the two approaches in both the longitudinal and uniform curvature gauges. In the longitudinal gauge, we find that Nakamura’s gauge invariant variables correspond exactly to those in the longitudinal gauge (i.e. for scalar perturbations to the Bardeen potentials), and in the uniform curvature gauge we obtain the usual relationship between gauge invariant variables in the flat and longitudinal gauge. Thus, we show that these two approaches are equivalent.

PACS numbers: 98.80.−k, 98.80.Jk

1. Introduction

Many problems in physics and applied mathematics can be described by nonlinear systems of evolution equations. These are notoriously difficult to solve exactly because of the nonlinearity. An example of such a theory is general relativity. Einstein’s equations are nonlinear and can only be solved exactly in a small number of useful cases. To go beyond these solutions
perturbative methods are used. Given a solution to the equations in the form of a metric \( g^{(0)}_{\mu\nu} \), we assume that we can approximate a neighbouring, more general, solution \( g_{\mu\nu} \) using a power series. Thus, we express the more general solution in the form

\[
g_{\mu\nu} = g^{(0)}_{\mu\nu} + g^{(1)}_{\mu\nu} + \frac{1}{2} g^{(2)}_{\mu\nu} + \cdots.
\]  

(1.1)

The metric \( g^{(0)}_{\mu\nu} \) is called the background and the remaining terms are perturbations of the background. The first-order part is

\[
g_{\mu\nu} = g^{(0)}_{\mu\nu} \approx g^{(1)}_{\mu\nu},
\]  

(1.2)

where the remaining terms are assumed to be negligible compared to \( g^{(1)}_{\mu\nu} \) and they are neglected at first order. In a similar way, the higher-order perturbations can be identified, so at second order we have

\[
g_{\mu\nu} = g^{(0)}_{\mu\nu} - g^{(1)}_{\mu\nu} \approx g^{(2)}_{\mu\nu},
\]  

(1.3)

and so on. This can be described simply if we introduce an infinitesimal parameter \( \epsilon \ll 1 \) for the perturbation and assume that the series can be written as

\[
g_{\mu\nu} = g^{(0)}_{\mu\nu} + \epsilon g^{(1)}_{\mu\nu} + \frac{1}{2} \epsilon^2 g^{(2)}_{\mu\nu} + \cdots,
\]  

(1.4)

where the quantities with bars have absolute magnitudes less than 1. In this format, the orders correspond to the powers of \( \epsilon \). In practice it is often a nuisance to introduce the parameter \( \epsilon \) so we will use the form (1.1) if there is no confusion.

Having set up the approximation (1.1), we have to substitute it into the Einstein equations

\[
G_{\mu\nu} + \Lambda g_{\mu\nu} = T_{\mu\nu},
\]  

(1.5)

to obtain solutions of the required order of approximation. This is more complicated than might be expected. Perturbations of the metric imply perturbations of the energy–momentum tensor and vice versa but more significantly, calculation of the connection coefficients and the Ricci tensor involves raising and lowering indices and so introduces more terms and potentially couples terms of different orders. At zeroth and first order, this is not a problem but at higher orders it makes calculations much more complicated. Even at second order, there are ‘proper’ second-order terms, for example \( \bar{g}^{(2)}_{\mu\nu} \), and terms quadratic in the first-order quantities, for example \( \bar{g}^{(1)}_{\mu\nu} \).

In addition to the complexity of the system of equations, the split of the metric and matter variables into a background and perturbations introduces spurious coordinate artefacts or gauge modes as described in detail in numerous reviews [1–5]. We only give a brief explanation, here.

As we are interested in cosmology, we will assume that the real universe is described by a perturbed Friedmann–Robertson–Walker (FRW) metric and that the background, or unperturbed spacetime, is described by an exact FRW metric. So we have in effect two spacetimes—one ‘physical’ and one ‘licititious’. We label points in the background by coordinates \( \{x^\mu\} \) and a one-to-one-map between points in the background and points in the physical spacetime maps these coordinates from the background to the physical spacetime. We refer to this one-to-one-map as a gauge choice. A change in the map is called a gauge transformation and this may be carried out in a number of ways, see for instance the recent reviews [4–6]. A perturbation of some quantity is the difference between the value at a point in the physical spacetime and the value at the point in the background with the same coordinates. Clearly such a perturbation depends on the above gauge choice.

It is important to note that a gauge transformation is different to a coordinate transformation which changes the labels on points in the physical and background spacetimes together, and so
it does not change the gauge. A simple example of a gauge transformation is an implementation of a coordinate change in the physical spacetime but not in the background. This changes the correspondence between the points in the two spacetimes, so it is a gauge transformation. It is easy to see that a scalar, e.g. the energy density $\rho$, which is (at least) time dependent, will not be invariant under such a transformation. Furthermore, if a gauge is chosen to simplify the metric on the physical spacetime and some residual gauge freedom remains, then spurious gauge mode solutions may appear. For these reasons, gauge invariant formulations of perturbations and other special gauge fixing forms have been sought. These fall into two broad classes, (1) those following the general pattern of Bardeen [7, 1–5] and (2) those following the covariant form developed by Ellis and Bruni [8–11].

At first order in the perturbations, the approaches in class (1) above differ largely due to different splits of the spatial part of the metric, and notation and sign conventions. At second order, things are more complicated and there are at least two different approaches. Relating the approach used by Malik and Wands [4] and the Nakamura approach [5] (hereafter referred to as MW2009 and KN2010, respectively) is the aim of this paper. We aim at highlighting similarities and differences of the two subclasses of approaches following Bardeen and try to keep the mathematical background discussions to a minimum, referring the interested reader to the reviews listed above and the original literature cited therein. However, in order to introduce some of the quantities and concepts used later on, we briefly review here the formulation of perturbation theory in a more rigorous sense.

In relativistic perturbation theory, we consider two distinct spacetimes: the ‘background’ spacetime denoted $\mathcal{M}_0$ and the ‘physical’ spacetime denoted $\mathcal{M}$, following Stewart [26]. The physical manifold is nature itself, and we want to describe the properties of this spacetime through the perturbations. On the other hand, the background spacetime is a mere reference spacetime on which to calculate perturbations. We then introduce a point identification map $\mathcal{X} : \mathcal{M}_0 \rightarrow \mathcal{M}$ relating points on the unperturbed manifold to points on the perturbed manifold. By virtue of the pullback of this point identification map (denoted $\mathcal{X}^*$), we may treat a tensor field on the physical spacetime $T$ as a tensor field on the background spacetime $\mathcal{X}^*T$, which we will often denote, equivalently, as $\mathcal{X}T$. The choice of map $\mathcal{X}$, the gauge choice, is not unique; if we choose another different map, $\mathcal{Y}$, the pulled-back variables are then different representations of the tensor $T$. These two gauge choices induce a diffeomorphism $\Phi : \mathcal{M}_0 \rightarrow \mathcal{M}_0$, defined as $\Phi := \mathcal{X}^{-1} \circ \mathcal{Y}$.

We conclude this introduction by presenting some essential equations from the reviews [6, 4], in the notation which is used in the standard literature (e.g. references [1–3]). As in the case of the metric tensor (equation (1.1)) above, we assume that any tensorial quantity $T$ can be expanded into a power series by

$$T = T_0 + \delta T,$$

where the subscripts denote the order of the perturbation. The change in a perturbed quantity (to a certain order) induced by a gauge transformation is given by the exponential map, once the generating vector of the gauge transformation, $\xi^\mu$, has been specified. The exponential map is

$$\Phi^\ast T \equiv \tilde{T} = e^{\xi^\mu \mathcal{L}_\xi} T,$$
Expanding to second order gives

\[ \tilde{T}_1 = T_1 + \xi_1 T_0, \]
\[ \tilde{T}_2 = T_2 + \xi_2 T_0 + \xi_1^2 T_0 + 2 \xi_1 T_1, \]  \hspace{1cm} (1.8)

where \( \xi^\mu \) is the vector field generating the transformation and is expanded order-by-order as

\[ \xi^\mu = \epsilon \xi_1^\mu + \frac{1}{2} \epsilon^2 \xi_2^\mu + O(\epsilon^3). \]

The exponential map can also be applied to the coordinates \( x^\mu \) to obtain the following relationship between coordinates at two points \( p \) and \( q \):

\[ x^\mu (q) = e^{\xi^\mu} (p) \cdot x^\mu (p). \]  \hspace{1cm} (1.9)

Expanding to second order gives

\[ x^\mu (q) = x^\mu (p) + \epsilon \xi_1^\mu (p) + \frac{1}{2} \epsilon^2 (\xi_1^\mu (p) \xi_1^\nu (p) + \xi_2^\mu (p)). \]  \hspace{1cm} (1.10)

Note that this coordinate relationship is not required to perform calculations in the active approach\(^4\), but will be useful for later discussion.

On the other hand, when evaluating the gauge transformation rule, a different point of view is adopted in the formulation in KN2010, where the change in a perturbed quantity induced by a gauge transformation \( \Phi \) is represented in the general form of the Taylor expansion of \( \Phi^* \):

\[ T(q) = (\Phi^* T)(p) = T(p) + \epsilon \xi_1 T|_p + \frac{1}{2} \epsilon^2 (\xi_1^2 + \xi_2) T|_p + O(\epsilon^3). \]  \hspace{1cm} (1.11)

As shown by Bruni and coworkers [12–16], the Taylor expansion of the pull-back of the tensor field is always given in the form of equation (1.6), even if \( \Phi^* \) is not an exponential map. In this sense, the Taylor expansion (1.11) represents the perturbative expansion of a wider class of diffeomorphisms than exponential maps. Through this general formula (1.11) and the perturbative expansion (1.6) of the variable \( T \), we can reach the same order-by-order gauge transformation rules as equation (1.8).

Although the gauge transformation rules at each order appear to have the same form in the two different formulations [4, 5], we should point out that the approaches to obtain the transformations are conceptually different. As mentioned above, the Taylor expansion (1.11) is valid for a wider class of diffeomorphisms beyond the exponential map. Although we may regard equation (1.11) as that of an exponential map through a special choice of \( \xi_2 \) (e.g. [12]), there is no guarantee that this is true for any choice of \( \xi_2 \). However, it seems that when working to a particular order in perturbation theory, one can always use an exponential map that generates the specified gauge transformation to that order. Therefore, while conceptually the gauge transformation rules used by the different formulations are not the same, this is only a philosophical issue and, in practice, the two are equivalent.

In this paper, we discuss the equivalence of these two formulations in MW2009 and KN2010, through clarifying the correspondence of the variables. Having introduced the basics, we now go on to tackle the main topic of this paper, namely, obtaining the relationship between the second-order metric perturbation in MW2009 and that in KN2010. It should be noted that the two formulations use very different notations. Rather than try and enforce a common notation between the two, we present each in its conventional notation, relating them to one another at the end. Further, we discuss two different gauge fixings. One is the Poisson gauge (longitudinal gauge) choice and the other is the flat gauge choice. In MW2009, they showed that these two gauge fixings are complete gauge fixing, while there is no explicit gauge fixing in the formulation in KN2010. We clarify the correspondence between the variables in MW2009 and KN2010 through these two gauge fixings.

We also have to emphasize that although this paper is not a complete survey of the many different formulations of second-order cosmological perturbation theory, the correspondence

\(^4\) We consider the active approach to gauge transformations in this paper, where the transformation of the perturbed quantities is evaluated at the same coordinate point, as opposed to the passive approach where the transformation of the perturbed quantities is taken at the same physical point.
which is clarified here is a useful check of the equivalence of different formulations and will hopefully lead to a consensus in the community.

This paper is organized as follows. In the next section, we describe first-order perturbations, first in the MW2009 approach and then in the KN2010 approach. In section 3, we review second-order perturbation theory, again starting with the MW2009 approach and then the KN2010 approach. In section 4, we compare the two approaches, in both the longitudinal (or Poisson) gauge and the uniform curvature gauge. Finally, we summarize our results in section 5.

If not otherwise stated we use conformal time, $\eta$, related to coordinate time $t$ by $dt = a d\eta$, where $a(\eta)$ is the scale factor, see equation (2.1), throughout. Derivatives with respect to conformal time are denoted by a prime, and the Hubble parameter is defined, in terms of conformal time, as $H = a'/a$. Greek indices, $\mu, \nu, \lambda$, run from 0,...,3, and lowercase Latin indices, $i, j, k$, run from 1,...,3. We also make use of abstract indices $a, b, c$, in parts.

2. First-order cosmological perturbations

The background spacetime $\mathcal{M}_0$ considered in cosmological perturbation theory is a homogeneous, isotropic Friedmann–Robertson–Walker universe foliated by three-dimensional hypersurfaces $\Sigma(\eta)$, parametrized by conformal time $\eta$. In this paper, we restrict ourselves to considering flat spatial hypersurfaces, and the line element for this spacetime is
d\bar{s}^2 = a^2(\eta)[-d\eta^2 + \delta_{ij} dx^i dx^j],

(2.1)

where $a = a(\eta)$ is the scale factor and $\delta_{ij}$ is the metric on the flat space. The full spacetime metric is then expanded, as in equation (1.6), as

g_{\mu\nu} = g_{\mu\nu}^{(0)} + \delta g_{\mu\nu}^{(1)} + \frac{1}{2}\delta g_{\mu\nu}^{(2)} + \cdots

in the notation of MW2009. Alternatively, one can represent the background spacetime metric as
g_{ab} = a^2(\eta)[- (d\eta)_a (d\eta)_b + \delta_{ij} (dx^i)_a (dx^j)_b],

(2.2)

in the abstract index notation with the full spacetime metric then being expanded as
g_{ab} = g_{ab}^{(0)} + \epsilon h_{ab} + \frac{1}{2}\epsilon^2 I_{ab} + O(\epsilon^3).

(2.3)

Equations (2.2) and (2.3) are the abstract index notation in KN2010.

The metric components at each order in perturbation theory can then be expanded into scalar, vector and tensor components, according to their transformation behaviour on spatial hypersurfaces.

2.1. MW2009 formulation

At linear, or first, order in perturbation theory, the general scalar, vector and tensor perturbations to the flat ($K = 0$) FRW background spacetime can be expressed in the line element
d\bar{s}^2 = a^2(\eta)[- (1 + 2\phi) d\eta^2 + 2B_{ij} dx^i d\eta + (\delta_{ij} + 2C_{ij}) dx^i dx^j].

(2.4)

The perturbations of the spatial components of the metric can then be further decomposed as

$B_{ij} = B_{1,ij} - S_{1,ij},$

(2.5)

$C_{ij} = -\psi_1 \delta_{ij} + E_{1,ij} + F_{1,1,ij} + \frac{1}{2} h_{1,ij},$

(2.6)
where \( \phi_1, B_1, \psi_1 \) and \( E_1 \) are scalar metric perturbations, \( S_{ij} \) and \( F_{ij} \) are divergence-free vector perturbations, and \( h_{ij} \) is a transverse, traceless tensor perturbation. In the notation of KN2010, this is then

\[
    h_{\eta \eta} = -2a^2 \phi_1, 
\]

\[
    h_{\eta i} = a^2 B_{1i} = a^2 D_i B_1 + a^2 S_{1i}, 
\]

\[
    h_{ij} = 2a^2 C_{1ij} = 2a^2 (-\psi_1 \delta_{ij} + D_i D_j E_1 + D_i (F_{1j}) + \frac{1}{2} h_{1ij}), 
\]

where \( D_i \) is formally the covariant derivative associated with the spatial metric \( \delta_{ij} \) and, in practice for this work, it reduces to a partial derivative denoted by a comma. Consistently perturbing the spacetime will naturally invoke perturbations to its matter content as well. In the following, however, we will only use the energy density.

Before studying the transformation behaviour of perturbations at first order, we split the generating vector \( \xi^\mu_1 \) into a scalar temporal part \( \alpha_1 \) and a spatial scalar and divergence-free vector part, respectively \( \beta_1 \) and \( \gamma_1^i \), as

\[
    \xi^\mu_1 = (\alpha_1, \beta_1, \gamma_1^i + \gamma_1^i). 
\]

We can then consider transformations of different types of perturbation independently, since they decouple at linear order. For example, equation (1.8) implies that the energy density perturbation transforms, at first order, as

\[
    \tilde{\delta} \rho_1 = \delta \rho_1 + \rho_0' \alpha_1, 
\]

where we have used the fact that the Lie derivative, when acting on a scalar function, is just \( \xi^\mu (\partial / \partial x^\mu) \). The transformation behaviour of the metric tensor, noting that the Lie derivative for a type \((0,2)\) tensor is given by

\[
    \tilde{\delta} g_{\mu \nu} = \delta g_{\mu \nu} + g_{\mu \lambda} \xi^\lambda_{, \nu} + g_{\nu \lambda} \xi^\lambda_{, \mu}, 
\]

is

\[
    \tilde{\delta} g^{(1)}_{\mu \nu} = \delta g^{(1)}_{\mu \nu} + g^{(0)}_{\mu \lambda} \xi^\lambda_{1, \nu} + g^{(0)}_{\nu \lambda} \xi^\lambda_{1, \mu}. 
\]

We can obtain the transformation behaviour of each particular metric function by extracting it, in turn, from the above general expression using the method outlined in e.g. MW2009. As mentioned above, we do not focus on details here but instead quote the results. The scalar metric perturbations transform as

\[
    \tilde{\phi}_1 = \phi_1 + H \alpha_1 + \alpha'_1, 
\]

\[
    \tilde{\psi}_1 = \psi_1 - H \alpha_1, 
\]

\[
    \tilde{B}_1 = B_1 - \alpha_1 + \beta'_1, 
\]

\[
    \tilde{E}_1 = E_1 + \beta_1, 
\]

the vector metric perturbations as

\[
    \tilde{S}_{1i} = S_{1i} - \gamma'_1, 
\]

\[
    \tilde{F}_{1i} = F_{1i} + \gamma'_1, 
\]

and the tensor perturbation, \( h_{1ij} \), is gauge invariant. Finally, the scalar shear, which is defined as \( \sigma_1 = E_{1i} - B_1 \), transforms as

\[
    \tilde{\sigma}_1 = \sigma_1 + \alpha_1, 
\]

which will be useful later when we come to define gauges in section 4.
2.2. KN2010 formulation

An alternative approach within perturbation theory was presented in KN2010 [5], where the procedure proposed by KN in 2003 [17] is used to construct gauge invariant variables. Evaluating equation (1.11) to first-order perturbation, the gauge transformation rule of the first-order metric perturbation $h_{ab}$ is given by

$$\gamma h_{ab} - \chi h_{ab} =: \xi_b g_{ab}. \quad (2.21)$$

We decompose the linear metric perturbation, $h_{ab}$, as

$$h_{ab} =: \mathcal{H}_{ab} + \xi_b g_{ab}, \quad (2.22)$$

where $\mathcal{H}_{ab}$ and $\xi_b g_{ab}$ are the gauge invariant and variant parts of the first-order metric perturbations [17], respectively, and $X^a$ is defined in equation (2.45) below. That is, under a gauge transformation, these are transformed as

$$\gamma \mathcal{H}_{ab} - \chi \mathcal{H}_{ab} = 0, \quad \gamma X^a - \chi X^a = \xi^a_{(1)}. \quad (2.23)$$

We note that the decomposition in equation (2.22) is an assumption; however, for perturbations to a FRW spacetime, it can be shown to be correct [5].

To proceed, we consider the scalar–vector–tensor decomposition of the components $h_{ij}$ of $h_{ab}$ as

$$h_{ij} = D_i h_{(V)L} + h_{(V)i}, \quad (2.24)$$

$$h_{ij} = a^2 \{ h_{(L)ij} + (D_i D_j - \frac{1}{2} \delta_{ij} \Delta) h_{(T)L} + 2 D_i h_{(TV)j} + h_{(TT)ij} \} \quad (2.25)$$

where $\Delta := D_i D_i$. Further, $h_{(V)i}$, $h_{(TV)j}$ and $h_{(TT)ij}$ satisfy the properties

$$D^i h_{(V)i} = 0, \quad D^i h_{(TV)j} = 0, \quad h_{(T)v} := \delta^i h_{(TV)ij} = 0, \quad (2.26)$$

The generator of the gauge transformation, $\xi^a$, is also decomposed as

$$\xi_a = \xi_a (\partial_t)_a + (D_t \xi_{(L)} + \xi_{(T)v})(dx^i)_a, \quad D^i \xi_{(T)v} = 0. \quad (2.27)$$

Using equation (2.21), we can then obtain gauge transformation rules for the components of $h_{ab}$:

$$\gamma h_{\eta \eta} - \chi h_{\eta \eta} = 2(\partial_t - H) \xi_\eta, \quad (2.28)$$

$$\gamma h_{(V)L} - \chi h_{(V)L} = \xi_\eta + (\partial_t - 2H) \xi_{(L)}, \quad (2.29)$$

$$\gamma h_{(V)i} - \chi h_{(V)i} = (\partial_t - 2H) \xi_{(TV)i}, \quad (2.30)$$

$$a^2 \gamma h_{(L)} - a^2 \chi h_{(L)} = -2H \xi_\eta + \frac{1}{2} \Delta \xi_{(L)}, \quad (2.31)$$

$$a^2 \gamma h_{(TL)} - a^2 \chi h_{(TL)} = 2 \xi_{(L)}, \quad (2.32)$$

$$a^2 \gamma h_{(TV)i} - a^2 \chi h_{(TV)i} = \xi_{(TV)i}, \quad (2.33)$$

$$a^2 \gamma h_{(TT)ij} - a^2 \chi h_{(TT)ij} = 0. \quad (2.34)$$

We then inspect these gauge transformation rules and define gauge invariant variables. Firstly, equation (2.34) shows that the transverse-traceless part $h_{(TT)ij}$ is itself gauge invariant, as expected. We denote this as

$$h^{(1)}_{ij} := h_{(TT)ij}. \quad (2.35)$$
Secondly, the gauge transformation rules (2.30) and (2.33) give the transverse vector mode \(^{(1)}v_i\) defined as [1]

\[
a^2 \left( \frac{(1)}{v_i} \right) := h_{(V)i} - a^2 \delta_{ij} h_{(TV)j}.
\] (2.36)

In addition to the vector and tensor modes, there are two scalar modes in the first-order metric perturbation, \(h_{ab}\). To see this, we first consider the gauge transformation rules (2.29) and (2.32). From these transformation rules, the variable \(X_\eta\) defined by

\[
X_\eta := h_{(V)L} - \frac{1}{2} a^2 \partial_\eta h_{(TL)}
\] (2.37)

transforms as

\[
\partial_\eta X_\eta = \xi_\eta.
\] (2.38)

Using this definition of \(X_\eta\), and inspecting the gauge transformation rule (2.28), we can show that the variable \(\Phi\) defined as

\[
-2a^2 \left( \frac{(1)}{\Phi} \right) := h_{\eta\eta} - 2(\partial_\eta - H)X_\eta
\] (2.39)

is gauge invariant. Furthermore, from gauge transformation rules (2.31), (2.32) and (2.38), the variable \(\Psi\) defined by

\[
-2a^2 \left( \frac{(1)}{\Psi} \right) := a^2 \left( h_{(L)} - \frac{1}{2} \Delta h_{(TL)} \right) + 2HX_\eta
\] (2.40)

is gauge invariant. The set of variables \(\{ \Phi, \Psi, v_i, \chi_{ij} \}\) is a complete set of gauge invariant variables.

We can now write the original metric perturbation, \(h_{ab}\), in terms of these gauge invariant variables as

\[
h_{\eta\eta} = -2a^2 \left( \frac{(1)}{\Phi} \right) + 2(\partial_\eta - H)X_\eta,
\] (2.41)

\[
h_{\eta i} = a^2 \left( \frac{(1)}{v_i} \right) + a^2 \delta_{ij} h_{(TV)j} + D_i h_{(VL)},
\] (2.42)

\[
h_{ij} = -2a^2 \left( \frac{(1)}{\chi_{ij}} \right) + a^2 \delta_{ij} + a^2 D_i D_j h_{(TL)} - 2HX_\eta \delta_{ij} + 2a^2 D_{(i} h_{(TV)j)}.
\] (2.43)

From the gauge invariance of the variables \(\chi_{ij}, v_i, \Phi\) and \(\Psi\), we may read off the gauge invariant part of \(h_{ab}\) as

\[
\mathcal{H}_{ab} = a^2 \left\{ -2 \left( \frac{(1)}{\Phi} \right) (d\eta)_a (d\eta)_b + 2 v_j (d\eta)_a (dx^j)_b + \left( -2 \left( \frac{(1)}{\Psi} \right) \delta_{ij} + \chi_{ij} (dx^i)_a (dx^j)_b \right) \right\}.
\] (2.44)

The remaining gauge-dependent parts in equations (2.41)–(2.43) should then be given in the form \(\mathcal{L}_X g_{ab}\) for some vector field \(X_a\). In fact, such a vector field is

\[
X_a := X_\eta (d\eta)_a + a^2 (h_{(TV)i} + \frac{1}{2} D_i h_{(TL)}) (dx^i)_a,
\] (2.45)

where \(X_\eta\) is defined in equation (2.37). One can also check that this vector field \(X_a\) satisfies equation (2.23).

Thus, it has been shown that decomposition (2.22) for the first-order metric perturbation is correct for cosmological perturbations. We should note that in order to accomplish equation (2.22), we have assumed the existence of Green’s function \(\Delta^{-1}\), and that the perturbative modes which belong to the kernel of the operator \(\Delta\) have been neglected. However, we ignore
both of these issues in this paper, pointing the diligent reader to, for example, [18, 19] for more information.

Finally, the correspondence between the variables for linear perturbations for the KN2010 approach presented in this section and those for the MW2009 approach presented in section 2.1 is

\[
\begin{align*}
\hat{h}_{00} &\approx -2a^2 \phi_1, \quad h_{(L)L} \approx a^2 B_1, \quad h_{(L)} \approx -a^2 S_{ij}, \\
\hat{h}_{0L} &\approx -2\psi_1 + \frac{2}{3} \Delta E_1, \quad h_{(TL)L} \approx 2E_1, \quad h_{(TV)L} \approx F_1, \quad h_{(TT)L} \approx h_{lij}.
\end{align*}
\]  

(2.46)

\[\xi_0 \approx -a^2 \alpha_1, \quad \xi_{(L)} \approx a^2 \beta_1, \quad \xi_{(TV)} \approx a^2 \gamma_{ij}.\]

Note that at first order there is no difference between the two formalisms, as can be seen from equation (2.46).

3. Second-order cosmological perturbations

Having reviewed linear cosmological perturbation theory in both the MW2009 approach and that in KN2010 above, in this section, we review the formalisms at second order.

3.1. MW2009 formulation

In order to consider cosmological perturbation theory to second order we do not truncate the perturbative expansion after the first term in equation (1.1). The metric tensor then has the component forms

\[\delta g^{(2)}_{\mu\nu} = -2a^2 (\eta) \phi_2,\]  

(3.1)

\[\delta g^{(2)}_{00} = a^2 (\eta)(B_2 - S_2),\]  

(3.2)

\[\delta g^{(2)}_{ij} = a^2 (\eta)(-2\psi_2 \delta_{ij} + 2E_{2,ij} + 2F_{3(i,j)} + h_{2ij}),\]  

(3.3)

where the quantities here are analogous to their first-order counterparts. At second order, we split the generating vector \(\xi^\mu_2\), as at first order, as

\[\xi^\mu_2 = (\alpha_2, \beta_{2}^{i} + \gamma_{2}^{i}).\]  

(3.4)

Then, using equation (1.8), we find that the second-order energy density perturbation transforms as

\[\tilde{\rho}_2 = \delta \rho_2 + \rho_0 \alpha_2 + \alpha_1 (\rho_0^T \alpha_1 + \rho_0 \alpha_1' + 2\delta \rho_1') + (2\delta \rho_1 + \rho_0 \alpha_1) \lambda (\beta_1^{i} + \gamma_1^{i}),\]  

(3.5)

where we note that while at linear order different types of perturbations (scalar, vector and tensor) decouple, this is no longer true at higher order. This is a crucial qualitative difference between first- and second-order perturbation theory and can lead to the generation of, for example, second-order gravitational waves [20, 14, 21] or vector modes and vorticity [20, 14, 22]. At second order, the metric tensor transforms as

\[
\tilde{\delta g}^{(2)}_{\mu\nu} = \delta g^{(0)}_{\mu\nu} + g^{(0)}_{\lambda\mu} \xi^\lambda_1 + g^{(0)}_{\lambda\nu} \xi^\lambda_1 + 2 \left[ \delta g^{(1)}_{\lambda\mu,\lambda} \xi^\lambda_1 + \delta g^{(1)}_{\lambda\nu,\lambda} \xi^\lambda_1 + \delta g^{(1)}_{\lambda\mu,\nu} \xi^\lambda_1 \right] + g^{(0)}_{\mu\lambda} \xi^\lambda_1 + g^{(0)}_{\nu\lambda} \xi^\lambda_1 + 2 \left[ \delta g^{(0)}_{\mu\lambda,\nu} \xi^\lambda_1 + \delta g^{(0)}_{\mu\lambda,\nu} \xi^\lambda_1 \right] + g^{(0)}_{\mu\lambda,\nu} \xi^\lambda_1 + g^{(0)}_{\nu\lambda,\mu} \xi^\lambda_1 + g^{(0)}_{\mu\lambda,\nu} \xi^\lambda_1 \]  

(3.6)
From this we can extract, as at first order, the transformation behaviour of the metric perturbations. Again we refer to MW2009 [4] for the details and only quote the results in this section. One finds that the scalar metric functions transform as

\[ \widetilde{\phi_2} = \phi_2 + H\alpha_2 + \alpha_2^i + \alpha_2^i [\alpha_1^i + 5H\alpha_1^i + (H' + 2H^2)\alpha_1 + 4H\phi_1 + 2\phi_1^i] \]

\[ + 2\alpha_1^i (\alpha_1^i + 2\phi_1) + \xi_{1i} (\alpha_1 + 2\phi_1)^i_k + \xi_{1i} [\alpha_1^k - 2B_{1k} - \xi_1^k]. \] (3.7)

\[ \widetilde{\psi_2} = \psi_2 - H\alpha_2 - \frac{1}{2}\partial^i \phi_1^i + \frac{1}{2} \nabla^{\alpha'} \gamma^{ij}. \] (3.8)

\[ \widetilde{E_2} = E_2 + \beta_2 + \frac{3}{4} \nabla^{\alpha'} \gamma^{ij} - \frac{1}{2} \nabla^{\alpha'} \gamma^{ij}_{\alpha'}. \] (3.9)

\[ \tilde{B}_2 = B_2 - \alpha_2 + \beta_2 + \nabla^{\alpha'} \gamma^{B^2}_{\alpha'}. \] (3.10)

where \( \chi_{ij} \) and \( \chi_{Bi} \) are defined as

\[ \chi_{B_i} \equiv 2\left[ (2HB_1 + B_1')\alpha_1 + B_1\xi_1^i - 2\phi_1\alpha_1 + B_1\xi_1^i + B_1\phi_1 + 2C_{1b} \right] \]

\[ + 4H\alpha_1 (\xi_1^i - \alpha_1^i) + \alpha_1^i (\xi_1^i - 3\alpha_1) + \alpha_1 (\xi_1^i - \alpha_1^i) \]

\[ + \xi_1^i \left[ (\xi_1^i - \alpha_1, \alpha_1) - \alpha_1, \xi_1^i \right]. \] (3.11)

We furthermore find that the second-order metric tensor perturbations transform as

\[ \tilde{S}_{2i} = S_{2i} - \gamma_{2i} - \chi_{B_i} + \nabla^{\alpha'} \gamma^{k}_{\alpha'} \]

\[ \tilde{F}_{2i} = F_{2i} + \gamma_{2i} + \nabla^{\alpha'} \gamma^{k}_{\alpha'} - \nabla^{\alpha'} \nabla^{\alpha'} \gamma^{k}_{lij}. \] (3.12)

and the tensor perturbation as

\[ \tilde{h}_{2ij} = h_{2ij} + \chi_{ij} + \frac{1}{2} \left( \nabla^{\alpha'} \gamma^{kl}_{\alpha'} \chi_{ij} \right) \delta_{ij} + \frac{1}{2} \nabla^l \nabla^{\alpha'} \gamma^{k}_{lij} \]

\[ + \frac{1}{2} \nabla^{\alpha'} \nabla^{\alpha'} \gamma^{k}_{ij} - \nabla^{\alpha'} \nabla^{\alpha'} \chi^{k}_{lij}. \] (3.15)

Note that the second order tensor perturbation, \( h_{2ij} \), changes under a gauge transformation [6, 14], unlike the first order tensor perturbation, \( h_{1ij} \). However, we show that expression (3.15) is itself gauge invariant as discussed at the end of the next section. Hence, using equation (3.15), we can construct gauge invariant tensor perturbations at second order.

### 3.2. KN2010 formulation

We now consider the construction of the gauge invariant variables for second-order metric perturbation \( \gamma_{ab} \) in KN2010 [5]. As we have confirmed the decomposition of the first-order metric perturbation, \( h_{ab} \), into the gauge invariant \( H_{ab} \) and gauge variant parts \( X_a \), we can now also find gauge invariant variables for higher order perturbations [17]. Using equation (1.8), the gauge transformation rule for \( \gamma_{ab} \) is

\[ \gamma'_{ab} = \gamma_{ab} + 2\xi_{ab} h_{ab} + (\xi_{ab}^2 + \xi_{ab}^k) g_{ab}. \] (3.16)

Through the first order gauge variant variable \( X_a \), we first define the tensor field \( \tilde{h}_{ab} \) as

\[ \chi h_{ab} := \chi_{ab} - 2\xi_{ab} h_{ab} + \xi_{ab}^2 + \xi_{ab}^k g_{ab}. \] (3.17)
so that it transforms as \( \chi \hat{L}_{ab} - \chi L_{ab} = \mathcal{L}_{ab} \), where \( \sigma' := \xi^a + [\xi_1, \chi X]^a \). Since \( \sigma' \) is an arbitrary vector field on \( \mathcal{M}_0 \), this gauge transformation rule is the same as that for the first order metric perturbation, \( h_{ab} \) (2.21). Using a similar procedure to that with which we decomposed \( h_{ab} \), the variable \( \hat{L}_{ab} \) is then \( \hat{L}_{ab} = : L_{ab} + \xi Y_{ab} \). Thus, the decomposition of the second order metric perturbation, \( L_{ab} \), is

\[
L_{ab} = L_{ab} + 2\xi X h_{ab} + (\xi Y - \xi_X^2) g_{ab},
\]

where \( \mathcal{L}_{ab} \) and \( Y^a \) are the gauge invariant and variant parts of the second order metric perturbations, i.e.

\[
\chi \mathcal{L}_{ab} - \chi L_{ab} = 0, \quad \chi Y^a - \chi X^a = \xi^a_{(1)} + [\xi(1), \chi X]^a.
\]

We may then choose the components of the gauge invariant variables \( \mathcal{L}_{ab} \) in equation (3.18) as

\[
\mathcal{L}_{ab} = a^2 \left\{ -2 \Phi (d\eta)_a (d\eta)_b + 2 \nu_i (d\eta)_a (dx^i)_b + \left( -2 \Psi \delta_{ij} + \chi_{ij} \right) (dx^i)_a (dx^j)_b \right\},
\]

where \( \nu_i \) and \( \chi_{ij} \) satisfy the equations

\[
D^2 v^i = 0, \quad D^2 \chi_{ij} = 0.
\]

The gauge invariant variables \( \Phi \) and \( \Psi \) are the second-order scalar perturbations and \( \nu_i \) and \( \chi_{ij} \) are the second-order vector and tensor modes of the metric perturbations, respectively. Furthermore, using \( X^a \) and \( Y^a \), the gauge invariant variables for an arbitrary tensor field \( Q \) can then be defined as

\[
(1) Q := (1) Q - \xi X Q_0, \quad (2) Q := (2) Q - 2\xi X (1) Q - (\xi Y - \xi_X^2) Q_0.
\]

Thus, from equations (3.22) and (3.23), we can see that any variable can be decomposed into a gauge invariant and gauge variant part as

\[
(1) Q = (1) Q + \xi_X Q_0, \quad (2) Q = (2) Q + 2\xi_X (1) Q + (\xi Y - \xi_X^2) Q_0.
\]

These decomposition formulae are valid for the perturbations of an arbitrary tensor field without knowing the detailed information of the background metric \( g_{ab}^{(0)} \). As a corollary, any equation for the perturbations (e.g. the Einstein equations or the equations of motion for the matter fields) is automatically given in a gauge invariant form [23, 24] due to the lower-order equations.

Since we know that any of these equations must be gauge invariant, we only need to study the gauge invariant parts of equation (3.18) and not treat the components of \( L_{ab} \) directly: that is, we must only study \( \mathcal{L}_{ab} \). However, the choice of the gauge invariant part at both first order, \( \mathcal{H}_{ab} \), and second order, \( \mathcal{L}_{ab} \), is not unique. This can be seen as follows: through the components of \( \mathcal{H}_{ab} \), we can construct a gauge invariant vector field, for example, \( Z_a := -a \Phi (d\eta)_a + a^i \nu_i (dx^i)_a \). Using this, we may write

\[
h_{ab} = \mathcal{H}_{ab} + \xi Z_{ab} - \xi Z_{ab} + \xi \chi g_{ab} = : \mathcal{K}_{ab} + \xi \chi g_{ab}.
\]
where we have defined $K_{ab} := \mathcal{H}_{ab} + \xi_Z g_{ab}$ and $\tilde{X}^a := X^a - Z^a$. Thus there are, in principle, infinitely many choices of $\mathcal{H}_{ab}$, which correspond to the infinitely many choices of the gauge fixing. As mentioned in a previous paper [5], the situation at second order is more complicated; we simply note here that there exist infinitely many choices of $L_{ab}$. Because of this, it is evident that relating the variables in the MW2009 approach to those in the KN2010 approach is more difficult. However, the procedure is the same as at first order: compare the components of $l_{ab}$ through equation (3.18) with equation (3.1).

4. Comparison of different formulations

Having now summarized cosmological perturbations from both the MW2009 approach, and that in KN2010, we move to the main point of this paper: linking the two approaches and showing the equivalence between them.

4.1. First order

In this section, we present the comparison between the two approaches at linear order. As shown in equations (2.46), at linear order, the correspondence between metric perturbation variables in the MW2009 and KN2010 approach is quite clear. Here we discuss the correspondence of the approaches themselves by choosing two popular gauges: the longitudinal (or Poisson) gauge and the uniform curvature gauge.

4.1.1. Longitudinal (Poisson) gauge. The longitudinal gauge is defined in perturbation theory by choosing hypersurfaces of constant shear ($\tilde{\sigma}_1^\ell = 0$). Thus, in the longitudinal gauge, the scalar gauge function $\alpha_1^\ell$ is given by

$$\alpha_1^\ell = -\sigma_1 = B_1 - E_1',$$

(4.1)

and this gauge is fully specified (for scalars) by requiring separately that $\tilde{E}_1^\ell = 0$ (which implies that $B_1 = 0$) and is a natural choice. Hence,

$$\beta_1^\ell = -E_1.$$ (4.2)

The remaining two scalar metric perturbations, $\phi_1$ and $\psi_1$, are then given as

$$\tilde{\phi}_1^\ell = \phi_1 + H(B_1 - E_1') + (B_1 - E_1')',$$

(4.3)

$$\tilde{\psi}_1^\ell = \psi_1 - H(B_1 - E_1').$$ (4.4)

These are the two gauge invariant Bardeen potentials $\Phi$ and $\Psi$ [1] and, in fact, these two variables coincide with $(\Phi_1^{(1)})$ and $(\Psi_1^{(1)})$ as defined in KN2010 [5].

By including vector perturbations (an extension of the longitudinal gauge generally called the Poisson gauge) we must also fix the vector gauge function $\gamma_1^{\ell}$ using the condition $S_1^{\ell} = 0$ which, from equation (2.18), gives

$$\gamma_1^{\ell} = \int S_1^\ell \, d\eta + C_1^{\ell}(x'),$$

(4.5)

where $C_1^{\ell}(x')$ is an arbitrary constant 3-vector which depends upon the choice of spatial coordinates on an initial hypersurface.

5 In Bardeen’s notation, these gauge invariant perturbations are given as $\Phi = \Phi_A Q^{(0)}$ and $\Psi = -\Phi_B Q^{(0)}$. 
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We have thus specified the gauge generating vector $\xi^\mu$ through equations (4.1), (4.2) and (4.5). In this gauge, the remaining components of the linear-order metric perturbation are completely given in the form (2.44). Therefore, this gauge fixing corresponds to the choice of the gauge variant part $X^\mu$ in equation (2.22) so that
\[ X^\mu = \mathcal{P} X^\mu = 0, \tag{4.6} \]
where $\mathcal{P}$ denotes the Poisson (longitudinal) gauge choice. In other words, the gauge invariant variables used in the KN2010 approach [5] correspond to the variables associated with the longitudinal gauge.

4.1.2. Uniform curvature (spatially flat) gauge. An alternative gauge choice is the uniform curvature, or spatially flat gauge. This amounts to choosing a spatial hypersurface on which the metric is unperturbed by scalar or vector perturbations, which requires $\tilde{\psi}_1^{\text{flat}} = \tilde{E}_1^{\text{flat}} = 0$ and $\tilde{F}_1^{\text{flat}} = 0$. This gives the gauge transformation
\[ \alpha_{1\text{flat}}^i = \frac{\psi_1}{H}, \quad \beta_{1\text{flat}} = -E_1, \quad \gamma_{1\text{flat}}^i = -F_1^i. \tag{4.7} \]
The remaining scalar metric perturbations are then
\[ \tilde{\phi}_{1\text{flat}} = \phi_1 + \psi_1 + \left( \frac{\psi_1}{H} \right)', \tag{4.8} \]
\[ \tilde{B}_{1\text{flat}}^i = B_1 - E_1^i - \frac{\psi_1}{H}, \tag{4.9} \]
which are gauge invariant. Thus, in the uniform curvature gauge, the metric perturbations as expressed in equations (2.7), (2.8) and (2.9) are
\[ \tilde{h}_{1\text{flat},\eta\eta}^{(1)} = -2a^2 \tilde{\phi}_{1\text{flat}}, \tag{4.10} \]
\[ \tilde{h}_{1\text{flat},\eta} = 2a^2 (\tilde{B}_{1\text{flat},i} - \tilde{S}_{1\text{flat}}), \tag{4.11} \]
\[ \tilde{h}_{1\text{flat},ij} = a^2 h_{1ij}. \tag{4.12} \]
Now, we compare this with the KN2010 formalism, in which the gauge choice is regarded as a choice of the gauge variant part $X_\alpha = \mathcal{F} X_\alpha$, where $\mathcal{F}$ denotes the flat gauge choice. From equations (2.22), (2.44) and equations (4.10)–(4.12), we obtain
\[ -2a^2 \Phi^{(1)} + 2\partial_\eta(x X_\eta) - 2H(x X_\eta) = -2a^2 \tilde{\phi}_{1\text{flat}}, \tag{4.13} \]
\[ a^2 \tilde{\psi}_{1i} + D_i(x X_\eta) + \partial_\eta(x X_i) - 2H(x X_i) = 2a^2 (\tilde{B}_{1\text{flat},i} - \tilde{S}_{1\text{flat}}), \tag{4.14} \]
\[ -2a^2 \tilde{\psi}^i \delta_{ij} + a^2 \tilde{X}^{ij}_{1} + D_i(x X_j) + D_j(x X_i) - 2H \delta_{ij} (x X_\eta) = a^2 h_{1ij}. \tag{4.15} \]
Since the transverse traceless part of both sides of equation (4.15) should coincide with one another, we may identify
\[ \tilde{X}^{ij}_{1} = h_{1ij}. \tag{4.16} \]
Further, the trace and the longitudinal part of equation (4.15) are given by
\[ -a^2 \tilde{\psi} + \frac{1}{2} D^i (x X_i) - H(x X_\eta) = 0, \tag{4.17} \]
\[ D_i(x X_i) + D_j(x X_j) = 0. \tag{4.18} \]
from which we can choose
\[ x_X = 0. \] (4.19)
Further, equation (4.17) yields
\[ x_X = -\frac{a^2}{H} \Psi. \] (4.20)
Then, identifying the divergenceless part of both sides of equation (4.14) with one another gives
\[ \tilde{S}_{1\text{flat}} = -\frac{1}{\nu} \xi. \] (4.21)
Finally, the scalar parts of equations (4.14) and (4.13) yield
\[ \tilde{\phi}_{2\text{flat}} = \Phi + \left(1 - \frac{\partial HH}{H^2}\right) \Psi + \frac{1}{H} \partial_\eta \Psi. \] (4.23)
As expected, this is simply the relationship between the scalar metric perturbations in the uniform curvature gauge and the Bardeen potentials, the scalar metric perturbations in the longitudinal gauge. In other words, this is equivalent to making a gauge transformation from the Poisson gauge to the flat gauge.

4.2. Second order

4.2.1. Longitudinal (Poisson) gauge. In order to extend the Poisson gauge to second order, we continue as at first order. First, we require that
\[ \tilde{E}_{2\ell} = 0, \]
which fixes the scalar part of the spatial gauge as
\[ \beta_{2\ell} = -E_2 - \frac{1}{4} \nabla^{-2} \chi_{ij} + \frac{1}{2} \nabla^{-2} \chi^k. \] (4.24)
Then, requiring that \( \tilde{B}_{2\ell} = 0 \) sets \( \alpha_{2\ell} \) through equation (3.10) and requiring that the vector \( S_{2\ell} = 0 \) can be used to fix the vector part of the spatial gauge transformation, up to a constant of integration as at linear order. The second-order analogues of the gauge invariant Bardeen potentials \( \Phi \) and \( \Psi \) are then given as
\[ \tilde{\phi}_{2\ell} = \phi_2 + H\alpha_{2\ell} + \alpha_{2\ell}' + \alpha_{4\ell} \left[ \alpha_{2\ell}'' + 5H\alpha_{2\ell}' + (H' + 2H^2)\alpha_{2\ell} + 4H\phi_1 + 2\phi_1' \right] + 2\alpha_{2\ell} \left[ \alpha_{2\ell}' + 2\phi_1 \right] + \xi_{1\ell} \left[ \alpha_{2\ell}' + H\alpha_{2\ell} + 2\phi_1 \right] + \xi_{1\ell}' \left[ \alpha_{2\ell}' - 2B_{1\ell} - \xi_{1\ell}' \right] \]
\[ \tilde{\psi}_{2\ell} = \psi_2 - H\alpha_{2\ell} - \frac{1}{2} \chi_{ij} + \frac{1}{4} \nabla^{-2} \chi_{ij}, \] (4.25)
where \( \chi_{ij} \) denotes the quadratic first-order terms in equation (3.12) using the longitudinal gauge transformation components \( \alpha_{2\ell} \) and \( \xi_{1\ell}' \).

To summarize, the second-order metric perturbation has the components
\[ \tilde{l}_{(g)\eta\eta} = -2a^2 \tilde{\phi}_{2\ell}, \] (4.26)
\[ \tilde{l}_{(g)\eta} = -a^2 \tilde{S}_{2\ell}, \] (4.27)
\[ \tilde{l}_{(g)\eta} = a^2 (\eta)(-2\tilde{\psi}_{2}\delta_{ij} + \tilde{\eta}_{2ij}). \] (4.28)
As at first order, the choice of the Poisson gauge in the MW2009 approach corresponds to the choice
\[ Y^a = \rho Y^a = 0 \] (4.29)
in the KN2010 approach. Thus, we again confirmed that the gauge invariant variables used in the KN2010 approach [5] correspond to the variables associated with the longitudinal gauge, with the correspondence between the variables of the MW2009 formulation and the KN2010 formulation as

\[
\begin{align*}
(2) & \quad \Phi \leftrightarrow \tilde{\phi}_{2l}, \\
(2) & \quad \eta_i \leftrightarrow \tilde{S}_{2l}, \\
(2) & \quad \Psi \leftrightarrow \tilde{\psi}_2, \\
(2) & \quad \chi_{ij} \leftrightarrow \tilde{h}_{2ij}.
\end{align*}
\] (4.30)

4.2.2. Uniform curvature (spatially flat) gauge. At second order, the gauge condition \( \tilde{\psi}_2 = 0 \) gives, using equation (3.8),

\[
\alpha_{2\text{flat}} = \frac{\psi_2}{H} + \frac{1}{4H} \left[ \nabla^2 - 2\psi_{1\text{flat},ij} - \psi \right],
\] (4.31)

where we get \( \chi_{\text{flat},ij} \) from equation (3.12) using the first-order gauge generators given above, as

\[
\chi_{\text{flat},ij} = 2 \left[ \psi_1 \left( \psi_1' + 2\psi_1 \right) + \psi_1, k \xi_{1\text{flat}}^k \right] \delta_{ij} + \frac{4}{H} \psi_1 \left( C_{1ij} + 2HC_{1ij} \right)
+ 4C_{1ij, k} \xi_{1\text{flat}}^k + (4C_{1ij} + \xi_{1\text{flat}, j}^j) \xi_{1\text{flat}, i}^i + (4C_{1ij} + \xi_{1\text{flat}, j}^j) \xi_{1\text{flat}, i}^i
+ \frac{1}{H} \left[ \psi_{1, i} \left( 2B_{1ij} + \xi_{1\text{flat}, i}^j \right) \right] + \psi_{1, j} \left( 2B_{1ij} + \xi_{1\text{flat}, i}^j \right) - \frac{2}{H^2} \psi_{1, i} \psi_{1, j}
+ \frac{2}{H^2} \psi_1 \left( \xi_{1\text{flat}, i}^j + 4H \xi_{1\text{flat}, i}^j \right) + 2\xi_{1\text{flat}, i}^j + 2\xi_{1\text{flat}, j}^j - \xi_{1\text{flat}, i}^j - \xi_{1\text{flat}, j}^j.
\] (4.32)

where we define

\[
\xi_{1\text{flat}} = -(E_{1, i} + F_{1i}).
\] (4.33)

Finally, the gauge conditions \( \tilde{E}_{2\text{flat}} = 0 \) and \( \tilde{F}_{1\text{flat}} = 0 \) enable us to specify the gauge functions \( \beta_{2\text{flat}} \) and \( \gamma_{2\text{flat}} \) completely. Thus, in the uniform curvature gauge, the metric perturbation has the components

\[
\tilde{l}_{(\text{flat}, \eta \eta)} = -2\alpha^2 \tilde{\phi}_{2\text{flat}},
\] (4.34)

\[
\tilde{l}_{(\text{flat}, \eta i)} = \alpha^2 (\eta) (B_{2\text{flat}, i} - S_{2\text{flat}}),
\] (4.35)

\[
\tilde{l}_{(\text{flat}, i j)} = \alpha^2 (\eta) \tilde{h}_{2\text{flat}, i j}.
\] (4.36)

On the other hand, according to decomposition (3.18), the second-order metric perturbation \( l_{ab} \) in the flat gauge is given by

\[
x_{ab} := l_{ab} + 2x_{\eta X} x_{ab} + \left( x_{\eta Y} - x_{\eta X}^2 \right) g_{ab}.
\] (4.37)

Here, the components of \( x_{\eta X} \) are given by equations (4.19) and (4.20), and the components of \( x_{\eta X} \) are given by equations (4.10)–(4.12) with relations (4.16), (4.21), (4.22) and (4.23). Tiedious calculations show that the components of the terms

\[
x_{\eta X} := 2x_{\eta X} x_{ab} - \xi_{\eta X} g_{ab}
\] (4.38)

in equation (4.37) are

\[
x_{\eta X} := \frac{2\alpha^2}{H^2} \left( -4H \Phi \psi + 2H \Phi \psi^2 + 2H \Phi \partial_\eta \psi^2 - 2H \psi \partial_\eta \Phi \right)
\] (4.39)
\[ \tau_{\mu} := \frac{\alpha^2}{H^2} \left[ 8 \delta_{\eta} H (\Psi D_i (\Psi) - 3H (\Psi \delta_\eta D_i (\Psi)) - 5H \delta_\eta (\Psi) D_i (\Psi) - 4H^2 (\Psi D_i (\Psi) \right. \\
\left. - 8H^2 (\Psi D_i (\Psi) + 8H^3 (\Psi \nu_i) + 4H^2 (\Psi \delta_\eta (\Psi) \nu_i) - 4H \delta_\eta (\Psi) \nu_i + 4H^2 \delta_\eta (\Psi) \nu_j \right] \right]. \tag{4.40} \]

\[ \tau_{ij} := \frac{2\alpha^2}{H^2} \left( \begin{array}{c}
-3D_i (\Psi) \nu_j - 2H^2 \delta_i (\Psi) \right) \right. \\
+ 2HD_i (\Psi \nu_j) + 2HD_i (\Psi \nu_i) + H (\Psi \delta_\eta (\Psi) \nu_i) + 2H^2 (\Psi \nu_i) \right]. \tag{4.41} \]

Together with equations (4.34)–(4.36), we obtain the components of equation (4.37) as follows:

\[ -2a^2 \Phi \eta = -2a^2 (\Psi + 2\delta_\eta \tau \nu_\eta - 2H^2 \tau \nu_\eta + \tau \nu_{\eta \eta}, \tag{4.42} \]

\[ \alpha^2 (\eta) \nabla_{\eta} \tau = \alpha^2 (\nu_\eta + \eta \tau \nu_\eta + D_i \tau \nu_\eta - 2H \tau \nu_i + \tau \nu_{\eta} \tau, \tag{4.43} \]

\[ \alpha^2 (\eta) \nabla \tau = -2a^2 (\Psi \delta_i + a^2 \delta_i + D_i \tau \nu_i + D_j \tau \nu_j - 2H \delta_i \tau \nu_\eta + \tau \nu_{ij}, \tag{4.44} \]

The trace part of equation (4.44) is given by

\[ 0 = -6a^2 (\Psi + 2D^2 \tau \nu_\kappa - 6H \tau \nu_\eta + \delta^i \tau \nu_{ij} \tag{4.45} \]

and the traceless part is

\[ \alpha^2 (\eta) \nabla_{\eta} \tau = \alpha^2 \nabla_{\nu} \tau + D_i \tau \nu_i + D_j \tau \nu_j - \frac{2}{3} \delta_i \tau \nu_\kappa + \tau \nu_{ij} - \frac{1}{3} \delta_i \delta_{\nu j} \tau \nu_{\kappa l}, \tag{4.46} \]

where \( \nu_{ij} \) is decomposed as

\[ \nu_{ij} := D_i \nu_{\nu j} + \nu_{\nu ij}, \quad D^j \nu_{\nu ij} = 0, \tag{4.47} \]

Equation (4.46) is then

\[ \alpha^2 (\eta) \nabla \tau = \alpha^2 \nabla + 2(D_i \nu_i + D_j \nu_j + \frac{2}{3} \delta_i \delta_\nu j \tau \nu_{kl}, \tag{4.48} \]

where we have used the fact that \( D_i \) is the covariant derivative associated with the flat metric. Taking the divergence of equation (4.48), we obtain

\[ \frac{1}{3} D_i \Delta \tau \nu_i + \Delta \tau \nu_{ij} + D^l \left( \tau \nu_{ij} - \frac{1}{3} \delta_i \delta_{\nu j} \tau \nu_{kl} \right) = 0, \tag{4.49} \]

and further taking the divergence of equation (4.49) gives

\[ \nu_{ij} = -\frac{1}{2} \Delta^{-1} D^l \left( \tau \nu_{ij} - \frac{1}{3} \delta_i \delta_{\nu j} \tau \nu_{kl} \right). \tag{4.50} \]

Substituting equation (4.50) into equation (4.49), we obtain

\[ \nu_{ij} = \Delta^{-1} \left[ \frac{1}{2} D_i \Delta^{-1} D^l \nu_j - \frac{1}{2} \delta_{ij} \tau \nu_{mk} \right] \tag{4.51} \]

and hence we have

\[ \nu_{ij} = \Delta^{-1} \left[ \frac{1}{2} D_i \Delta^{-1} D^l \nu_j - \frac{1}{2} \delta_{ij} \tau \nu_{mk} \right] \tag{4.52} \]

Since

\[ D^l \nu_i = \frac{1}{2} \Delta^{-1} D^l \nu_{ij} - \frac{1}{2} \delta_{ij} \tau \nu_{mk}, \tag{4.53} \]
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\[ h_{2\flat abij} = X_{ij} + \frac{1}{2\alpha^2} \left( \Delta^{-1} \left( D_i D_j \Delta^{-1} D^k D^l - 4\delta_{ij} D_k D^l + \delta_{ij} D^d D^d \right) + 2\delta_{ij} \delta_{kl} \right) \times \left[ \phi \Xi_{kl} - \frac{1}{3} \delta_{kl} \delta_{mn} \phi \Xi_{mn} \right]. \]  

(4.54)

On the other hand, the trace part of equation (4.45) gives

\[ \phi Y_{\eta} = - \frac{a^2}{H} \left( \frac{\partial^2}{\Psi \Delta^{-1} D^d D^d - \delta_{ij} D^d D^d} \left[ \phi \Xi_{kl} - \frac{1}{3} \delta_{kl} \delta_{mn} \phi \Xi_{mn} \right] \right) + \frac{1}{6H} \delta^{ij} \phi \Xi_{ij}. \]  

(4.55)

Taking the divergence of equation (4.43) and substituting equations (4.52), (4.53) and (4.55), we obtain

\[ \bar{B}_{2\flat} = - \frac{1}{H} \left( \frac{\partial^2}{\Psi \Delta^{-1} D^d D^d - \delta_{ij} D^d D^d} \left[ \phi \Xi_{kl} - \frac{1}{3} \delta_{kl} \delta_{mn} \phi \Xi_{mn} \right] \right) + \frac{1}{6\alpha^2 H} \delta^{ij} \phi \Xi_{ij} + \frac{1}{\alpha^2} \Delta^{-1} D^d \phi \Xi_{kn}. \]  

(4.56)

and substituting equation (4.56) into equation (4.43) gives

\[ \bar{S}_{2\flat} = - \frac{1}{\alpha^2} \left( \frac{\partial^2}{\Delta^{-1} D^d D^d - \delta_{ij} D^d D^d} \left[ \phi \Xi_{kl} - \frac{1}{3} \delta_{kl} \delta_{mn} \phi \Xi_{mn} \right] \right) - \frac{1}{\alpha^2} \left[ \phi \Xi_{kn} - D_l \Delta^{-1} D^d \phi \Xi_{kn} \right]. \]  

(4.57)

Finally, through equation (4.42), we obtain

\[ \bar{\phi}_{2\flat} = \Phi + \frac{1}{\alpha^2} \left( \frac{\partial^2}{\Delta^{-1} D^d D^d - \delta_{ij} D^d D^d} \phi \Xi_{kl} - \frac{1}{3} \delta_{kl} \delta_{mn} \phi \Xi_{mn} \right) + \frac{1}{6\alpha^2} \delta^{ij} \phi \Xi_{ij} - \frac{1}{2\alpha^2} \phi \Xi_{kn}. \]  

(4.58)

As at linear order, equations (4.54), (4.56), (4.57) and (4.58) give the relationship between the variables in the uniform curvature gauge and the Poisson gauge.

Before concluding this section, we note the non-uniqueness of the gauge invariant variables defined in equations (2.22) and (3.18) as discussed at the end of section 3.2. In this section, we regard the choice of gauge as the specification of the vector fields \( X^a \) and \( Y^a \), which are the gauge invariant part of the first- and second-order metric perturbations, respectively. On the other hand, we may also regard gauge fixing as the specification of the gauge invariant parts \( H_{ab} \) and \( \bar{\phi}_{ab} \) of the metric perturbations in the sense discussed at the end of section 3.2. Actually, we may use \( \phi X_a \), whose components are given by equations (4.19) and (4.20), as the vector field \( \bar{Z}_a \) in equation (3.26), since the components of \( \phi X_a \) are specified by the gauge invariant variables. In this case, the first-order metric perturbation \( h_{ab} \) is decomposed into the gauge invariant part \( \tilde{K}_{ab} \) and the gauge variant part \( \tilde{X}^a \) as equation (3.26), where \( K_{ab} \) and \( \tilde{X}^a \) are given by

\[ K_{ab} = H_{ab} + \xi_{\phi X} \xi_{ab}, \quad \tilde{X}^a = X^a - \phi X^a. \]  

(4.59)

Further components of \( K_{ab} = \phi_{ab} \) are given by equations (4.10)–(4.12). \( K_{ab} \) is regarded as the realization of the gauge invariant variables for the first-order metric perturbation associated with the flat gauge.

Furthermore, in the case of the second-order metric perturbation \( I_{ab} \), we define

\[ J_{ab} := L_{ab} + 2\xi_{\phi X} \phi_{ab} + (\xi_{\phi Y} - L_{\phi Y}^2) g_{ab} \]  

(4.60)
and equation (4.37) is given by
\[ l_{ab} = J_{ab} + 2\xi^X_{ab} + \left(\xi_Y - \xi^X - [X, \tilde{X}]\right)g_{ab}. \] (4.61)

Then, choosing
\[ \tilde{Y}^a = Y^a - \xi^X - [X, \tilde{X}]^a, \] (4.62)
the second-order metric perturbation \( l_{ab} \) is given by
\[ l_{ab} = J_{ab} + 2\xi^X_{ab} + \left(\xi_Y - \xi^X\right)g_{ab}. \] (4.63)

The tensor \( J_{ab} \) is clearly gauge invariant and \( \tilde{Y}^a \) satisfy the gauge transformation rule
\[ \lambda \tilde{Y}^a - \lambda \tilde{X}^a = \xi^a_{(2)} + \left[\xi(1), \lambda \tilde{X}\right]^a \] (4.64)
under the transformation \( \Phi = X^{-1} \circ Y \), i.e. \( \tilde{Y}^a \) satisfy property (3.19) of the gauge variant part of the second-order metric perturbation. The components of the gauge invariant part \( J_{ab} \) are given by equations (4.34)–(4.36) and so \( J_{ab} \) is regarded as the realization of the gauge invariant variables for the second-order metric perturbation associated with the flat gauge.

At the end of section 3.1, we noted that the second-order tensor perturbation is gauge dependent. Therefore, the expression for the gauge invariant second-order tensor perturbation will differ depending on the choice of gauge. This is due to the fact that in perturbation theory beyond linear order, in which mode couplings occur due to the nonlinearity of the system, the notion of the transverse-traceless part of the metric perturbation cannot be identified uniquely with the gravitational waves. As shown for the second-order case in section 3.1, the gauge invariant higher-order transverse-traceless perturbation has contributions from the second-order tensor perturbation and other first-order metric potentials. In other words, we might say that the second-order gravitational waves are also generated from the first-order gravitational potentials as discussed in the literature [21].

5. Summary and discussions

In this paper, we have compared and contrasted two different approaches to metric-based cosmological perturbation theory and have derived the relationship between the standard approach in the manner of Bardeen [1], which was discussed in MW2009 [4], and the formalism studied in KN2010 [5]. We started by introducing the basics of relativistic perturbation theory, and then presented first- and second-order cosmological perturbation theory in the MW2009 and KN2010 approach, respectively. Finally, in section 4, we compared the two formalisms directly for both the longitudinal or Poisson gauge and the uniform curvature gauge.

Both approaches recognize the spurious gauge artefacts present in perturbation theory, and adopt different techniques in order to remove them. In the MW2009 approach, one perturbs the metric tensor and then inspects the gauge transformations of the metric perturbations, using these to eliminate the gauge freedom and hence construct gauge invariant variables. The KN2010 approach splits the perturbation to the metric into a gauge invariant and gauge variant part, and then writes all equations in terms of these gauge invariant variables. In the MW2009 approach, the gauge choice is made by specifying the gauge generating vector, \( \xi^\mu \). On the other hand, in the KN2010 approach, the gauge is defined through the gauge variant vector \( X^a \) (or, at second order, \( Y^a \)). We showed that the gauge invariant variables that are used in KN2010 are equivalent to the usual gauge invariant variables of the Poisson gauge (so that the Poisson gauge is specified through \( X^a = 0 = Y^a \)). When relating the KN2010 formalism to the MW2009 approach in the uniform curvature gauge, we simply obtain the usual relationship
between the gauge invariant variables in the Poisson gauge and those in the uniform curvature gauge. Thus, we have shown that the two approaches are equivalent. Note that the ingredients of this paper are kinematical, and we have not invoked the field equations, so the results found here can be generalized to alternative metric theories of gravity.

While this result is not necessarily surprising, since both the approaches are based upon metric cosmological perturbation theory, showing this equivalence is a good consistency check for the KN2010 approach. Furthermore, there may be certain problems for which it could be advantageous to use one approach over the other. Having shown this equivalence and having a working knowledge of both theories may enable one to more easily solve the problem in hand.
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