

Bianchi Cosmologies in a Thurston-Based Theory of Gravity

Quentin Vigneron^{*1,2} and Hamed Barzegar^{†2}

¹*Institute of Astronomy, Faculty of Physics, Astronomy and Informatics, Nicolaus Copernicus University, Grudziądzka 5, Toruń, 87-100 Poland*

²*ENS de Lyon, CRAL UMR5574, Université Claude Bernard Lyon 1, CNRS, Lyon 69007, France*

(December 9, 2025)

Abstract

The strong interplay between Bianchi–Kantowski–Sachs (BKS) spacetimes and Thurston geometries motivates the exploration of the role of topology in our understanding of gravity. As such, we study non-tilted BKS solutions of a theory of gravity that explicitly depends on Thurston geometries. We show that shear-free solutions with perfect fluid, as well as static vacuum solutions, exist for all topologies. Moreover, we prove that, aside from non-rotationally-symmetric Bianchi II models, all BKS metrics isotropize in the presence of a positive cosmological constant, and that recollapse is never possible when the weak energy condition is satisfied. This contrasts with General Relativity (GR), where these two properties fail for Bianchi IX and KS metrics. No additional parameters compared to GR are required for these results. We discuss, in particular, how this framework might allow for simple inflationary models in any topology.

^{*}quentin.vigneron@ens-lyon.fr

[†]hamed.barzegar@ens-lyon.fr

Contents

1	Introduction	3
1.1	Notations, definitions, and conventions	5
2	Maximal and minimal geometries with their metrics	6
2.1	Maximal geometries	6
2.2	Minimal geometries	8
2.3	Minimal metrics as left-invariant metrics on Bianchi groups	10
2.4	Isometry groups of minimal metrics	11
2.5	Ricci tensors of the maximal metrics	12
3	Topo-GR	14
3.1	Field equations	14
3.2	Reference Ricci tensor	14
3.3	Discussions	16
4	3+1-decomposition in topo-GR	17
4.1	Induced reference spatial Ricci tensor and reference tilt	18
4.2	3+1-equations of topo-GR	19
4.3	3+1-equations for homogeneous solutions	21
4.4	General results for LSH solutions	21
5	Systems of equations in all models	24
5.1	Relation between the physical metric and the reference curvature	24
5.2	Orthonormal approach for spacetime Bianchi metrics	26
5.3	\mathbb{E}^3 -geometry	28
5.4	\mathbb{S}^3 -geometry	30
5.5	\mathbb{H}^3 -geometry	31
5.6	$\mathbb{R} \times \mathbb{H}^2$ -geometry	32
5.7	Nil-geometry	33
5.8	Sol-geometry	36
5.9	$\widetilde{\text{SL}}(2, \mathbb{R})$ -geometry	38
5.10	$\mathbb{R} \times \mathbb{S}^2$ -geometry	39
5.11	General results revisited	40
6	To what extent is the result for the Nil-geometry peculiar?	41
7	Conclusion	43
A	Some properties of locally homogeneous quantities	44
A.1	\mathbb{H}^3 -geometry	44
A.2	$\mathbb{R} \times \mathbb{H}^2$ -geometry	45
A.3	Nil-geometry	46
A.4	Sol-geometry	47
A.5	$\widetilde{\text{SL}}(2, \mathbb{R})$ -geometry	48
A.6	$\mathbb{R} \times \mathbb{S}^2$ -geometry	50
	References	51

1 Introduction

Locally spatially homogeneous (LSH) spacetimes are interesting classes of solutions to theories of gravity because of their rich structures and, to some extent, their usefulness in describing the Universe as a whole (cf., e.g., [1–3]) or local structures in it (see, e.g., [4, 5]). In fact, the first of such solutions (i.e., vacuum Bianchi type I solution) is almost as old as the birth of the General Relativity (GR) by the work of Kasner [6], which was not motivated by group theoretical considerations. However, Bianchi models (as the major class of LSH spacetimes) based on Bianchi’s classification in his seminal work [7–9], were introduced first in the famous solution by Gödel in 1949 that he gave as a present on the occasion of the 70th birthday of Einstein (see, e.g., [10]). Gödel’s groundbreaking work included Bianchi types III and VIII (cf. [9, 11, 12]), and was followed by the presentation of his results (though without proof) on Bianchi type IX in 1950 [13, 14].¹ Nevertheless, it was Taub (1951) who systematically used Bianchi’s classification for LSH spacetimes, i.e., where the spatial sections admit simply transitive 3-dimensional isometry group [15]—as Gödel investigated homogeneous spacetimes—which was revived later by Heckmann and Schücking in the late 1950’s [16]. Finally, Kantowski and Sachs (1966) investigated LSH spacetimes with no simply transitive subgroup, known as Kantowski–Sachs solutions [17], thereby completing the classification of LSH cosmological spacetimes.² Since then, LSH cosmological models have attracted a lot of interest, for example analysis of: the dynamics towards the singularity, in particular the mixmaster universe and the BKL conjecture [18, 19] (see [20] and references therein for recent developments on this topic), the vacuum regime (e.g., [21, 22]), the late time dynamics and the question of the isotropization of anisotropic initial conditions (e.g., [3, 23–26]), the dependence on the matter content (e.g., [3, 26–33]) and its tilt (e.g., [34, 35]), and the description of first order perturbations (e.g., [36–42]). Additionally, the full classification of closed 3-manifolds (cf. [43–46]) raised the question of determining how spatial topology constrains LSH cosmological models, and in particular how it constrains the spatial geometry (e.g., [47–50]), the matter content (e.g., [50, 51]) and their dynamics (e.g., [49–55]). A strong focus has also been made on considering modified gravity theories in the context of LSH cosmological models (e.g., [56, 57]). They may offer a better framework than GR with regards to, e.g., resolving cosmological singularities [58] or for constructing inflation [59]. Last but not least, Bianchi models serve as minisuperspace models in quantum gravity approaches: they reduce the infinite-dimensional superspace of all 3-geometries to a finite number of degrees of freedom, making quantization tractable (cf., e.g., [48, 60–63]).

From an observational point of view, Bianchi cosmologies offer a crucial framework for testing the fundamental assumption of isotropy in the standard cosmological model that assumes GR. While early analysis using the WMAP data had a preference for a Bianchi VII_h

¹Gödel remained actively engaged with ongoing developments in Bianchi cosmology until the final years of his life; see [9] and [10] for a summary of his remarkable role in GR and relativistic cosmology.

²Although Bianchi already considered this case in [7, §9] (see [8, Section 9] for the English translation), he “curiously” omitted the discussion of 3-geometries that possess a higher degree of symmetry but lack a simply transitive 3-dimensional subgroup when summarizing the complete classification in [7, §38] ([8, Section 38]); see also [9]. Hence, this justifies referring to LSH solutions as simply Bianchi cosmologies, a designation used in the title of our paper.

model exhibiting global vorticity and shear [64], the inclusion of dark energy [65] and the later Planck observations [66, 67] found no evidence for a significant anisotropic component. This placed stringent limits on such models, and at the same time on the topology of the Universe.³ These findings are in agreement with the standard cosmological model in which inflation plays a fundamental role in driving any initial global anisotropy to zero at late times. This result finds its root in Wald’s theorem [25], stating that negative curvature models become isotropic asymptotically during inflation. While most LSH models fulfill that condition, Bianchi IX (S^3 topologies) and Kantowski–Sachs models ($\mathbb{R} \times S^2$ topologies) do not, and therefore require additional fine-tuning on their initial conditions to explain the late-time isotropy and avoid an early recollapse (cf., e.g., [77–81]). In the absence of a physical mechanism excluding these topologies for our Universe, having a non-fine-tuned mechanism that prevents their recollapse and in the same time leads to their isotropization is needed. This motivates, in particular, the study of anisotropic models in modified gravity theories (see, e.g., [82, 83]).

Thus, there is a strong interplay between LSH models and spatial topology, with motivations ranging from early universe physics to late time isotropization, and in this context, modified gravity theories can offer new perspectives. The goal of this paper is to study this interplay within a recently proposed *parameter-free* modified gravity theory [84]. In this framework, named *topo-GR*, a reference (topological) spacetime Ricci curvature ${}^4\overline{\text{Ric}}$ depending on the spatial topology is added to the Einstein equation. This direct link between the field equation of topo-GR and topology naturally suggests strong departures with GR regarding LSH solutions. Indeed, already for homogeneous-isotropic metrics—hence restricting the spatial topology to be Euclidean, spherical or hyperbolic—it was shown in [85] that the expansion of homogeneous-isotropic models in topo-GR does not depend on the spatial curvature parameter, hence contrasting with GR. This result found a first application in [59] where it was shown that it allows for a canonical quantization of inflation and a Bunch–Davies prescription in spherical and hyperbolic topologies, something not possible in GR.

Our goal is to provide the systems of equations of LSH solutions in topo-GR with non-tilted perfect fluids in each of the (Thurston) families of topologies. We do not aim at providing a full dynamical analysis of these equations. Rather we will present specific solutions, such as static vacuum solutions and shear-free anisotropic solutions. Furthermore, we will show that, except for a subcase of Bianchi II metrics, no recollapse is possible and late time isotropization is ensured by a positive cosmological constant, hence generalizing the result of Wald [25] for topo-GR to the S^3 and $\mathbb{R} \times S^2$ topologies.

The paper is organized as follows. Before proceeding to Section 2 that reviews the Thurston classification and its correspondence to Bianchi and Kantowski–Sachs metrics, we begin by establishing the notations, definitions, and conventions used throughout this paper in Section 1.1. Section 3 recalls the fundamentals of topo-GR and introduces its field equations. Section 4 derives the 3 + 1 equations of topo-GR and their homogeneous version for a generic LSH solution. In particular, we derive a Wald-like theorem for isotropization in

³These analyses were however not exhaustive in different topological degrees of freedom that can be considered [68]. In this regard, a more exhaustive analysis on how much the Planck data constrains topology is currently being conducted by the COMPACT collaboration [69–76].

the presence of a cosmological constant. Sections 5 computes the precise field equations for each type of LSH solutions. Finally, Section 6 discusses a peculiar result for Nil-topologies, and Section 7 concludes our study.

1.1 Notations, definitions, and conventions

Throughout this paper, we will use the following notations. We consider a spacetime 4-manifold (\mathcal{M}, g) where $\mathcal{M} \cong \mathbb{R} \times \Sigma$ with Σ a closed Riemannian 3-manifold. Bold letters are used to represent tensors in a coordinate-free notation. Indices running from 0 to 3 will be represented by Greek letters and those running from 1 to 3 by Roman letters. Local coordinate functions are denoted by $(x^\mu) = (t, x^i) \equiv (t, \mathbf{x})$. We occasionally use the musical symbols \sharp and \flat —for the *musical isomorphism*—to denote the metric-dual 1-form and metric-dual vector of a given vector and 1-form, respectively, for a given metric. Angle brackets represent the (projected) symmetric tracefree part of a given tensor \mathbf{A} with components A_{ij} on a Riemannian 3-manifold (Σ, \mathbf{h}) , i.e., $A_{\langle ij \rangle} := A_{(ij)} - h_{ij} h^{kl} A_{kl}/3$. For a metric \mathbf{h} we denote by $\nabla[\mathbf{h}]$ and $\mathbf{Ric}[\mathbf{h}]$ its Levi-Civita connection and Ricci tensor, respectively, denoted by ∇ and \mathbf{Ric} , whenever no ambiguity arises. The corresponding objects associated with the metric $\bar{\mathbf{h}}$ will be designated by $\bar{\nabla}$ and $\bar{\mathbf{Ric}}$. To distinguish spacetime objects from spatial ones we occasionally use an upper-left index 4 (e.g., ${}^4\nabla$). The semidirect product is denoted by \rtimes . For the ease of reference, we summarize all the groups used in this work in Table 6. Finally, we set the speed of light at $c = 1$.

A foliation will be called an *\mathbf{n} -foliation* whenever the 1-form \mathbf{n} is orthogonal to the corresponding foliation of \mathcal{M} , and it is called a *Σ -foliation* if the leaves of the foliation of \mathcal{M} are diffeomorphic to a hypersurface Σ .

For any manifold Σ , there is a unique universal covering space denoted by $\tilde{\Sigma}$. Any geometric quantity defined on Σ can be lifted to a geometric quantity on $\tilde{\Sigma}$, but the reverse does not hold necessarily. In this work, unless an ambiguity is possible, we will denote equivalently the quantity defined on Σ and the one lifted on $\tilde{\Sigma}$.

Given a manifold Σ and a tensor field \mathbf{F} on Σ , we define

$$\text{Sym}(\Sigma, \mathbf{F}) := \{\phi \in \text{Diff}(\Sigma) \mid \phi^* \mathbf{F} = \mathbf{F}\}, \quad \mathfrak{sym}(\Sigma, \mathbf{F}) := \{\xi \in \mathfrak{X}(\Sigma) \mid \mathcal{L}_\xi \mathbf{F} = 0\}, \quad (1.1)$$

where $\mathfrak{X}(\Sigma)$ is the set of all vector fields on Σ . Given a torsion-free connection ∇ on Σ , we define

$$\mathfrak{sym}(\Sigma, \nabla) := \{\xi \in \mathfrak{X}(\Sigma) \mid (\mathcal{L}_\xi \nabla)^\mu{}_{\alpha\beta} = \nabla_\alpha \nabla_\beta \xi^\mu + \text{Riem}[\nabla]^\mu{}_{\beta\alpha\gamma} \xi^\gamma = 0\}. \quad (1.2)$$

For a tensor field \mathbf{F} , we say that a (local) vector field ξ is a (local) *\mathbf{F} -colineation* if $\mathcal{L}_\xi \mathbf{F} = 0$. If \mathbf{F} is a metric tensor, we will instead say that ξ is a *Killing vector field*.

Finally, for a (semi-)Riemannian manifold (Σ, \mathbf{h}) , we define

$$\begin{aligned} \text{Isom}(\Sigma, \mathbf{h}) &:= \text{Sym}(\Sigma, \mathbf{h}), & \text{isom}(\Sigma, \mathbf{h}) &:= \mathfrak{sym}(\Sigma, \mathbf{h}), \\ \text{Aff}(\Sigma, \mathbf{h}) &:= \text{Sym}(\Sigma, \nabla[\mathbf{h}]), & \text{aff}(\Sigma, \mathbf{h}) &:= \mathfrak{sym}(\Sigma, \nabla[\mathbf{h}]), \\ \text{Ric}(\Sigma, \mathbf{h}) &:= \text{Sym}(\Sigma, \mathbf{Ric}[\mathbf{h}]), & \text{ric}(\Sigma, \mathbf{h}) &:= \mathfrak{sym}(\Sigma, \mathbf{Ric}[\mathbf{h}]), \end{aligned} \quad (1.3)$$

for which the following inclusions hold (cf. [86])⁴

$$\text{Isom}(\Sigma, \mathbf{h}) \subseteq \text{Aff}(\Sigma, \mathbf{h}) \subseteq \text{Ric}(\Sigma, \mathbf{h}), \quad \text{isom}(\Sigma, \mathbf{h}) \subseteq \text{aff}(\Sigma, \mathbf{h}) \subseteq \text{ric}(\Sigma, \mathbf{h}). \quad (1.4)$$

Table 1: Thurston geometries and their correspondence to Bianchi–Kantowski–Sachs metrics (based on [47–50, 52, 53]): (i) G_{\max} is the group of the maximal geometry; (ii) G_{\min} is the group of a minimal subgeometry of (X, G_{\max}) ; (iii) $\text{Isom}(\tilde{\Sigma}, \mathbf{h}_{G_{\min}})_{\text{general}}$ is the local isometry group of a *general* minimal metric \mathbf{h} defined on a closed manifold Σ .

Geometry	G_{\max}	$\text{Isom}(\tilde{\Sigma}, \mathbf{h}_{G_{\min}})_{\text{general}}$	G_{\min}
\mathbb{E}^3	$\text{IO}(3)$	$\begin{cases} G_{\max} \\ \text{B}_{\text{VII}_0} \rtimes \text{D}_2 \end{cases}$	$\begin{cases} \text{B}_{\text{I}} = \mathbb{R}^3 \\ \text{B}_{\text{VII}_0} \end{cases}$
\mathbb{S}^3	$\text{O}(4)$	$\text{SU}(2) \rtimes \text{D}_2$	$\text{B}_{\text{IX}} = \text{SU}(2)$
\mathbb{H}^3	$\text{O}_+(1, 3)$	G_{\max}	$\begin{cases} \text{B}_{\text{V}} \\ \text{B}_{\text{VII}_{h>0}} \end{cases}$
$\mathbb{R} \times \mathbb{H}^2$	$\text{O}_+(2, 1) \times \text{IO}(1)$	G_{\max}	B_{III}
Nil	$\text{Nil} \rtimes \text{O}(2)$	G_{\max}	$\text{B}_{\text{II}} = \text{Nil}$
Sol	$\text{Sol} \rtimes \text{D}_4$	$\text{Sol} \rtimes \text{D}_2$	$\text{B}_{\text{VI}_0} = \text{Sol}$
$\widetilde{\text{SL}}(2, \mathbb{R})$	$\widetilde{\text{SL}}(2, \mathbb{R}) \rtimes \text{O}(2)$	$\begin{cases} \widetilde{\text{SL}}(2, \mathbb{R}) \rtimes \text{D}_2 \\ G_{\max} \end{cases}$	$\begin{cases} \text{B}_{\text{VIII}} = \widetilde{\text{SL}}(2, \mathbb{R}) \\ \text{B}_{\text{III}} \end{cases}$
$\mathbb{R} \times \mathbb{S}^2$	$\text{O}(3) \times \text{IO}(1)$	G_{\max}	G_{\max}

2 Maximal and minimal geometries with their metrics

2.1 Maximal geometries

In this section, we briefly introduce the Thurston classification, and refer the reader for more technical details to, e.g., [43, 48–50, 53, 87, 88].

A *geometry* is defined by a pair (X, G) , where X is a manifold and G is a group acting transitively on X such that the point stabilizer (isotropy subgroup) is compact. These properties guarantee the existence of a complete G -invariant Riemannian metric on X .⁵ A geometry (X, G') is a *subgeometry* of (X, G) if G' is a subgroup of G . We call a geometry

⁴While $\text{Isom}(\Sigma, \mathbf{h})$ and $\text{Aff}(\Sigma, \mathbf{h})$ are always (finite dimensional) Lie groups, $\text{Ric}(\Sigma, \mathbf{h})$ can be infinite dimensional.

⁵In this sense, a geometry is an equivalence class of homogeneous Riemannian manifolds.

minimal if it does not have a proper subgeometry, and denote it by (X, G_{\min}) . We call a geometry *maximal* if it is not a proper subgeometry of any geometry, and denote it by (X, G_{\max}) . For such maximal geometries, no larger group includes G as a proper subgroup while maintaining the transitive action and compact stabilizer condition. Such maximal geometries are often termed *Thurston*; indeed, they were classified by Thurston which we summarize in the following theorem.⁶

Theorem 2.1 (Thurston, 1982 [43, 87]). *The eight maximal, simply connected 3-dimensional geometries (X, G_{\max}) admitting compact quotient manifolds are as follows:*

- (i) *the \mathbb{E}^3 -geometry (or Euclidean geometry): $X = \mathbb{R}^3$ and $G_{\max} = \text{IO}(3) =: G_{\mathbb{E}^3}$,*
- (ii) *the \mathbb{S}^3 -geometry (or spherical geometry): $X = \mathbb{S}^3$ and $G_{\max} = \text{O}(4) =: G_{\mathbb{S}^3}$,*
- (iii) *the \mathbb{H}^3 -geometry (or hyperbolic geometry): $X = \mathbb{R}^3$ and $G_{\max} = \text{O}_+(3, 1) =: G_{\mathbb{H}^3}$,*
- (iv) *the $\mathbb{R} \times \mathbb{S}^2$ -geometry: $X = \mathbb{R} \times \mathbb{S}^2$ and $G_{\max} = \text{O}(3) \times \text{IO}(1) =: G_{\mathbb{R} \times \mathbb{S}^2}$,*
- (v) *the $\mathbb{R} \times \mathbb{H}^2$ -geometry: $X = \mathbb{R}^3$ and $G_{\max} = \text{O}_+(2, 1) \times \text{IO}(1) =: G_{\mathbb{R} \times \mathbb{H}^2}$,*
- (vi) *the Nil-geometry: $X = \mathbb{R}^3$ and $G_{\max} = \text{Nil} \rtimes \text{O}(2) =: G_{\text{Nil}}$,*
- (vii) *the Sol-geometry: $X = \mathbb{R}^3$ and $G_{\max} = \text{Sol} \rtimes \text{D}_4 =: G_{\text{Sol}}$,*
- (viii) *The $\widetilde{\text{SL}}(2, \mathbb{R})$ -geometry: $X = \mathbb{R}^3$ and $G_{\max} = \widetilde{\text{SL}}(2, \mathbb{R}) \rtimes \text{O}(2) =: G_{\widetilde{\text{SL}}(2, \mathbb{R})}$.*

A given group G_{\max} defines a family (or class) of 3-dimensional topological spaces. For this reason we will sometimes refer to “the class of topology” of a closed 3-manifold. A precise topological space within each class is characterized by a discrete subgroup Γ of G_{\max} .

Definition 2.2 (Geometric manifold). *A manifold Σ is a geometric 3-manifold if it is a closed 3-manifold and $\Sigma = \tilde{\Sigma}/\Gamma$ where Γ is a discrete subgroup of one of the maximal geometries, and $\tilde{\Sigma}$ is the universal covering space of Σ . Equivalently, we say that Σ is modeled on a Thurston geometry.*

Theorem 2.3 (Thurston–Hamilton–Perelman, 2003 [43–45, 90]). *Every closed 3-manifold is a connected sum of geometric 3-manifolds.*

Remark 2.4. Theorem 2.3 states that the knowledge of every geometric 3-manifold, and equivalently the knowledge of every discrete subgroup Γ (acting freely on X) of the maximal geometries is sufficient to construct every closed 3-manifold. However, geometric 3-manifolds are the only closed 3-manifolds admitting locally homogeneous Riemannian metrics. Otherwise, when a non-trivial connected sum is considered, no such metric can be

⁶The classification of maximal Lorentzian geometries admitting compact quotients has also been done, see, e.g., [89]. There are four maximal Lorentzian geometries on top of the ones that are also maximal Riemannian geometries. These additional geometries do not have compact point stabilizer. Moreover, a maximal Lorentzian metric is not necessarily complete, contrary to Riemannian maximal metrics.

defined (the only exception is $\mathbb{RP}^3 \# \mathbb{RP}^3$ which can be modeled on $\mathbb{R} \times \mathbb{S}^2$, see [88, 91]). For this reason, in this paper, we will only consider manifolds modeled on a maximal geometry. Moreover, we will not be interested in the precise topology, given by the discrete subgroup $\Gamma \subset G_{\max}$, but rather we will be interested only in the maximal geometry on which the manifold is modeled.

Definition 2.5 (Maximal metric). *Given a closed 3-manifold Σ modeled on a (X, G_{\max}) geometry, a Riemannian metric \mathbf{h} on Σ is said to be maximal, or Thurston, if the isometry group of its lift on $\tilde{\Sigma}$ is G_{\max} , i.e., $\text{Isom}(\tilde{\Sigma}, \mathbf{h}) = G_{\max}$.*

Since G_{\max} acts transitively on $\tilde{\Sigma}$, maximal metrics are locally homogeneous metrics on Σ .

2.2 Minimal geometries

Locally homogeneous metrics that are not necessarily maximal are defined to be locally invariant by a minimal geometry. It was shown in [47, 48, 53], summarized in the following theorem, that, apart from the $\mathbb{R} \times \mathbb{S}^2$ -geometry, all the minimal subgeometries of the maximal geometries are described by simply transitive 3-dimensional groups G_3 , referred to as the *Bianchi groups*.⁷ They are classified from I to IX ([7, 8]), and we denote them by B_I to B_{IX} .

Theorem 2.6 ([47, 48, 53]). *The minimal subgeometries of the eight maximal geometries are for*

- (i) *the \mathbb{E}^3 -geometry: $G_{\min} = B_I$ and $G_{\min} = B_{VII_0}$,*
- (ii) *the \mathbb{S}^3 -geometry: $G_{\min} = B_{IX}$,*
- (iii) *the \mathbb{H}^3 -geometry: $G_{\min} = B_V$ and $G_{\min} = B_{VII_{h>0}}$,*
- (iv) *the $\mathbb{R} \times \mathbb{S}^2$ -geometry: $G_{\min} = G_{\max}$,*
- (v) *the $\mathbb{R} \times \mathbb{H}^2$ -geometry: $G_{\min} = B_{III}$,*
- (vi) *the Nil-geometry: $G_{\min} = B_{II}$,*
- (vii) *the Sol-geometry: $G_{\min} = B_{VI_0}$,*
- (viii) *the $\widetilde{\text{SL}}(2, \mathbb{R})$ -geometry: $G_{\min} = B_{VIII}$ and $G_{\min} = B_{III}$.*

⁷The classification of minimal geometries made by Kodama in [49, Table 1] and [50, Table 1] is not coherent between these two papers, and differ from Theorem 2.6. While no precise definition of “minimal geometry” is given in these papers, the reason for the difference is likely because the author referred to minimal geometries as “the minimal groups admitting compact quotient with a discrete subgroup $\Gamma \subset G_{\min}$.” Here, we do not require the existence of a $\Gamma \subset G_{\min}$ such that $\Sigma = \tilde{\Sigma}/\Gamma$. Hence, we follow the definition in [48, 53].

Table 2: Classification of Bianchi groups with respect to Milnor bases. Note that we do not consider here that these bases are orthonormal with respect to a given metric. That is why the values of the structure constants (for a given sign) are totally free, i.e, not constrained by compactness considerations.

Maximal geometry	Bianchi group	n_1	n_2	n_3	a
\mathbb{E}^3	$\begin{cases} B_I \\ B_{VII_0} \end{cases}$	0	$\begin{cases} 0 \\ + \end{cases}$	$\begin{cases} 0 \\ + \end{cases}$	0
\mathbb{S}^3	B_{IX}	+	+	+	0
\mathbb{H}^3	$\begin{cases} B_V \\ B_{VII_{h>0}} \end{cases}$	0	$\begin{cases} 0 \\ + \end{cases}$	$\begin{cases} 0 \\ \frac{a^2}{h n_2} > 0 \end{cases}$	+
$\mathbb{R} \times \mathbb{H}^2$	B_{III}	0	+	$-\frac{a^2}{n_2} < 0$	+
Nil	B_{II}	+	0	0	0
Sol	B_{VI_0}	0	+	−	0
$\widetilde{\text{SL}}(2, \mathbb{R})$	B_{VIII} (and B_{III})	−	+	+	0

While $B_{VI_{h \neq -1,0}}$ and B_{IV} groups define minimal geometries, they are not subgeometries of any maximal geometry. For this reason, no metric defined on a closed manifold can be locally invariant by these groups. Hence, for the rest of the paper, we will not consider these groups.

Remark 2.7. For the \mathbb{H}^3 and $\mathbb{R} \times \mathbb{H}^2$ geometries, the discrete subgroups $\Gamma \subset G_{\max}$ used to construct closed manifolds can never be subsets of the minimal groups. In this sense, B_V , $B_{VII_{h>0}}$, and B_{III} cannot be compactified [60]. However, some metrics locally invariant by these minimal groups can still be defined on closed manifolds, but their isometry group will necessarily be bigger than G_{\min} . This is discussed in Section 2.4.

Definition 2.8 (Minimal metric). *Given a closed geometric 3-manifold Σ , a Riemannian metric \mathbf{h} on Σ is said to be minimal, or Bianchi–Kantowski–Sachs (BKS), if its (local) isometry group $\text{Isom}(\tilde{\Sigma}, \mathbf{h})$ includes (one of) the minimal group G_{\min} of the maximal geometry on which Σ is modeled.*

Definition 2.8 implies that any maximal metric is also minimal, but the reverse is not necessarily true. In Section 2.4, we detail which minimal metrics are necessary maximal. This is summarized in the third column of Table 1.

2.3 Minimal metrics as left-invariant metrics on Bianchi groups

When the minimal group G_{\min} is a Bianchi group G_3 , it acts simply transitively on X . Thus, X can be identified with the group itself, and a minimal metric is a *left invariant* metric on G_3 . A Killing vector field from the Bianchi group, denoted by ξ , is therefore a generator of the left-translation and the metric has constant components in a left-invariant basis, denoted by $\{e_i\}_{i \in \{1,2,3\}}$. The *commutation coefficients* $C_{ij}^k \xi_k := [\xi_i, \xi_j]$ of a basis $\{\xi_i\}_{i \in \{1,2,3\}}$ uniquely determine the Bianchi group. They can always be written in the form

$$C_{ij}^k = \epsilon_{ij\ell} n^{\ell k} + 2\delta_{[i}^k a_{j]}, \quad (2.1)$$

where n^{ij} is a symmetric matrix, and such that $n^{ij}a_j = 0$ due to the Jacobi identities on C_{ij}^k .⁸ We can always choose a basis $\{\xi_i\}$ such that (cf., e.g., [2, 3, 92])

$$(n^{ij}) = \text{diag}(n_1, n_2, n_3), \quad (a_i) = (a, 0, 0); \quad a n_1 = 0, \quad a \geq 0. \quad (2.2)$$

The signs of n_i , a and $h := a^2/(n_2 n_3)$ determine the G_3 group, as presented in Table 2.

The (reciprocal) algebra of any left-invariant basis $\{e_i\}$ on X , i.e., $[\xi_i, e_j] = 0 \forall i, j \in \{1, 2, 3\}$, is isomorphic to the algebra \mathfrak{g}_3 [92]. Moreover, denoting by $\{e^i\}$ the dual to the left-invariant basis, the Maurer–Cartan equation reads

$$de^i = -\frac{1}{2} C_{jk}^i e^j \wedge e^k. \quad (2.3)$$

Therefore, we can always choose a left-invariant basis whose commutation coefficients correspond to (2.2). Such a basis is called a *Milnor basis* [93]. We can always choose a Milnor basis that diagonalizes any left-invariant Riemannian metric h [92]. Two choices of such a Milnor basis will be of interest for this paper:

- (i) the basis is *orthonormal* with respect to h , i.e., $h(e_i, e_j) = \delta_{ij}$. In general, no freedom is left on the basis to choose the values of the constants n_i and a , unless some n_i are degenerate. When considered in a spacetime context, this approach is called the *orthonormal approach*, which we detail in Section 5.2.
- (ii) the constants n_i and a are either 1, -1 , or 0, and the metric is diagonal. We call this Milnor basis *unit*. Depending on the Bianchi group, some rescaling freedom of the basis vectors can remain, enabling us to choose some of the diagonal components of the metric.

Since all maximal metrics are Bianchi metrics, except for the $\mathbb{R} \times \mathbb{S}^2$ -geometry, these metrics can be expressed in an orthonormal Milnor basis with a specific choice of structure constants. We provide them in the second column of Table 3. We also provide their maximal Ricci tensor, calculated from the following formula (cf., e.g., [92, Equation (3.7b)])

$$R_{ij} = 2n_{ik} n^k_j - n^k_k n_{ij} - 2\epsilon^{k\ell}_{(i} n_{j)k} a_\ell - \delta_{ij} \left[2a_k a^k + n_{k\ell} n^{k\ell} - \frac{1}{2} (n^c_c)^2 \right], \quad (2.4)$$

where indices are raised and lowered by the metric h .

⁸ n^{ij} and a_i define a symmetric $(2,0)$ -tensor density of weight 1 and a 1-form field globally on the group, respectively. However, a_i can never descend to a global quantity on a compact manifold.

2.4 Isometry groups of minimal metrics

2.4.1 Spatial isometry group

While a minimal metric is defined such that it is G_{\min} -invariant, this does not imply that its isometry group corresponds to G_{\min} ; indeed, additional discrete isometries (discrete isotropies) are always present in the form of the dihedral group of order 4, denoted by D_2 (see, e.g., [49, 50]). These isometries represent, in general, rotations of angle π around the left-invariant basis vectors (for the Bianchi cases).⁹ However, for some geometries, a minimal metric always has additional *continuous* symmetries (continuous isotropies) such that the metric is actually maximal (see, e.g. [94]). This is the case for the \mathbb{E}^3 (for a B_I -invariant metric), \mathbb{H}^3 , $\mathbb{R} \times \mathbb{H}^2$, Nil and $\mathbb{R} \times \mathbb{S}^2$ -geometries. In this sense, a B_I , a B_{II} , a B_{III} (on a closed manifold), a B_V , a $B_{VII_{h>0}}$ (on a closed manifold), and a KS metric are all maximal metrics. For the other geometries, a general minimal metric has only three continuous symmetries described by the (minimal) Bianchi group. This is summarized in the third column of Table 1, where $\text{Isom}(\tilde{\Sigma}, \mathbf{h}_{G_{\min}})_{\text{general}}$ corresponds to the local isometry group of a *general* G_{\min} -invariant metric \mathbf{h} defined on a closed manifold Σ .

Furthermore, as presented in Tables 1 and 2, some geometries (\mathbb{E}^3 , \mathbb{H}^3 and $\widetilde{\text{SL}}(2, \mathbb{R})$) admit several minimal geometries.

For \mathbb{E}^3 , a minimal metric can be described either by a B_I or B_{VII_0} metric. In the former case it is always a maximal metric, while in the latter case it can be non-maximal. In this sense B_I metrics are subcases of B_{VII_0} metrics and they are equivalent when the latter is characterised by $n_2 = n_3$ in an orthonormal Milnor basis. However, this inclusion does not hold when a spacetime metric is considered (cf. [92], see also Sections 2.4.2 and 5.3 below).

For \mathbb{H}^3 , a minimal metric can be described either by a B_V or $B_{VII_{h>0}}$ metric, which differ in general. However, when we demand that the metric descend to a globally defined metric on a closed manifold (as we do in this paper), then both metrics are maximal metrics, and differ only by an homothety due to Mostow rigidity theorem [95].

For $\widetilde{\text{SL}}(2, \mathbb{R})$, a minimal metric can be described either by a B_{III} or B_{VIII} metric. The B_{VIII} metric can be fully general, however, for the B_{III} metric $n_2 \neq a$ is required in an orthonormal Milnor basis. For $n_2 = a$, the metric is instead defined on the $\mathbb{R} \times \mathbb{H}^2$ -geometry. Interestingly, choosing $n_2 \neq a$ or $n_2 = a$ does not change the dimension of $\text{Isom}(\tilde{\Sigma}, \mathbf{h})$, which is always 4. However, the isometry group itself changes. In the former case it is $G_{\widetilde{\text{SL}}(2, \mathbb{R})}$ and in the latter case it is $G_{\mathbb{R} \times \mathbb{H}^2}$. Bianchi III metrics are therefore always maximal $\mathbb{R} \times \mathbb{H}^2$ or $\widetilde{\text{SL}}(2, \mathbb{R})$ -metrics. Consequently, in the $\widetilde{\text{SL}}(2, \mathbb{R})$ case, they are subcases of B_{VIII} metrics (we provide in Appendix A.5.2 their correspondence). However, contrary to the Euclidean case, this property also holds at the spacetime level (as shown in [92]). This means that, when studying minimal metrics on the $\widetilde{\text{SL}}(2, \mathbb{R})$ -geometry, one needs only to consider B_{VIII} metrics.

Remark 2.9. Depending on the fundamental group $\pi_1(\Sigma)$, additional continuous symmetries

⁹The dihedral group of order 8, denoted by D_4 , present in the maximal group of the Sol-geometry, completes D_2 by rotations of angle $\pi/2$ around the basis vectors. We direct the reader to the works of Kodama [49, 50] for a detailed analysis of these discrete symmetries and their representations of the Bianchi groups.

can be forced, even imposing a general minimal metric to be maximal. In this paper, we will not consider the dependence of the isometry group on the topology, and we direct the reader to the works by Kodama [49, 50] for a detailed analysis of this dependence.

2.4.2 Spacetime isometry group

While some Bianchi metrics always have continuous isotropies, as shown in the previous section, these symmetries are not necessarily symmetries of the spacetime metric \mathbf{g} . In other words, the spacetime metric does not necessarily inherit the isometry group of the spatial metric, but, in general, only the minimal group (cf. [96]). For an isometry of the spatial minimal metric to be an isometry of the spacetime metric, a necessary and sufficient condition is that the shear tensor $\boldsymbol{\sigma}$ (see Section 4.2 for the definition) is invariant by this isometry. Whether or not the shear tensor shares some isotropies with the metric depends on the constraint equations, the matter content and the fundamental group $\pi_1(\Sigma)$ (see, e.g., [49, 50, 54]). Thus, there is an important distinction to make between the fact that some Bianchi metrics always have more than three continuous symmetries, and the notion of *locally rotationally symmetric* (LRS) metrics used in the literature on Bianchi spacetimes (see, e.g., [92]); LRS is a property of the set $(\mathbf{h}, \boldsymbol{\sigma})$ and not the spatial metric \mathbf{h} alone.

Remark 2.10. There always exists a subgroup of $\text{Sym}(\tilde{\Sigma}, \boldsymbol{\sigma})$ that is isomorphic to $\text{Isom}(\tilde{\Sigma}, \mathbf{h})$, but this does not necessarily imply $\text{Sym}(\tilde{\Sigma}, \mathbf{h}) \subseteq \text{Sym}(\tilde{\Sigma}, \boldsymbol{\sigma})$. This is the case if the Killing vector generating the infinitesimal isotropy of the metric rotates with time. A simple example is that of B_I metric of the form $h_{ij}dx^i dx^j = A_1(t)dx^2 + A_2(t)dy^2 + A_3(t)dz^2$. Its shear tensor is $\sigma_{ij}dx^i dx^j = \partial_t A_1 dx^2 + \partial_t A_2 dy^2 + \partial_t A_3 dz^2$. The vector $\boldsymbol{\xi}_4 = A_2(t)y\partial_x - A_1(t)x\partial_y$ is a (time-dependent) Killing vector of isotropy for the metric. However, only its time derivative is a shear collineation. Thus, both \mathbf{h} and $\boldsymbol{\sigma}$ have a continuous isotropy, but the associated collineation is different. $\boldsymbol{\xi}_4$ is a shear collineation if and only if $A_2(t) = A_1(t)$, in which case we say that the set $(\mathbf{h}, \boldsymbol{\sigma})$ is locally isotropic (LRS) around the z -axis. A similar example can be built for the Nil (B_{II}) metric.

2.5 Ricci tensors of the maximal metrics

The Ricci tensor of maximal metrics is a building block of the topo-GR theory, as we will present in Section 3 below. In this section, we summarize some properties of this tensor.

Up to isometries, a maximal geometry can sometimes define a family of maximal metrics on the universal covering space $\tilde{\Sigma} = X$, rather than a single metric. For maximal metrics described as Bianchi metrics, this family can be characterized by the structure constants n_i and a of an orthonormal Milnor basis. In Table 3, we provide the maximal metrics in terms of choice of n_i and a for each maximal geometry. For the \mathbb{E}^3 -geometry, the maximal metric is unique. For the geometries $\{\mathbb{S}^3, \mathbb{H}^3, \mathbb{R} \times \mathbb{H}^2, \text{Nil}, \text{Sol}, \mathbb{R} \times \mathbb{S}^2\}$ there is a one-parameter family of maximal metrics. For the $\widetilde{\text{SL}}(2, \mathbb{R})$ -geometry, there is a two-parameter family of maximal metrics. However, while for the geometries other than $\widetilde{\text{SL}}(2, \mathbb{R})$ the parameter freedom on the Ricci tensors does not change their symmetry group, for $\widetilde{\text{SL}}(2, \mathbb{R})$ it does. As shown in Appendix A.5, when $n_1 \neq 2n_2$, **Ric** has four continuous symmetries (the same as those of its metric), but when $n_1 = -2n_2$, **Ric** has six continuous symmetries (of

Table 3: Maximal metrics and their maximal Ricci tensors, *expressed in an orthonormal Milnor basis*, apart from the $\mathbb{R} \times \mathbb{S}^2$ -geometry where we directly use coordinates.

Maximal geometry	An orthonormal Milnor basis of a maximal metric	Ric
\mathbb{E}^3	$n_1 = n_2 = n_3 = a = 0$	$\mathbf{0}$
\mathbb{S}^3	$n_1 = n_2 = n_3 > 0, \quad a = 0$	$\frac{n_1^2}{2} \text{diag}(1, 1, 1)$
\mathbb{H}^3	$n_1 = n_2 = n_3 = 0, \quad a > 0$	$-2a^2 \text{diag}(1, 1, 1)$
$\mathbb{R} \times \mathbb{H}^2$	$n_1 = 0, \quad n_2 = -n_3 = a > 0$	$-2a^2 \begin{pmatrix} -2 & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & -1 & 1 \\ 0 & 1 & -1 \end{pmatrix}$
Nil	$n_1 > 0, \quad n_2 = n_3 = a = 0$	$\frac{n_1^2}{2} \text{diag}(1, -1, -1)$
Sol	$n_1 = 0, \quad n_2 = -n_3 > 0, \quad a = 0$	$-2n_2^2 \text{diag}(1, 0, 0)$
$\widetilde{\text{SL}}(2, \mathbb{R})$	$n_1 < 0, \quad n_2 = n_3 > 0, \quad a = 0$	(Maximal iff $n_1 = -2n_2$) $2n_2^2 \text{diag}(1, -2, -2)$
$\mathbb{R} \times \mathbb{S}^2$	$A^2 (dx^2 + \sin^2 x dy^2) + dz^2$	$dx^2 + \sin^2 x dy^2$

course the metric still has only four of them). Therefore, for the $\widetilde{\text{SL}}(2, \mathbb{R})$ -geometry, there is a subset of maximal metrics that maximizes the symmetry group of the Ricci tensor.¹⁰ When constructing topo-GR, this is that maximal Ricci tensor which we will consider. We provide the Ricci tensors of the maximal metrics in the third column of Table 3.

Note that while it seems that the Ricci tensors for some geometries are not unique due to the presence of a structure constant, this is not the case. That structure constant, which always appears as a conformal factor, can be absorbed by a change of left-invariant basis, from the orthonormal basis of the maximal metric to a unit Milnor basis (i.e., in which the structure constants are 1, -1 or 0). One can do so by a transformation proportional to the identity, e.g., for \mathbb{S}^3 by $e_i \mapsto e_i/n_1$. No free parameter is left in the commutation coefficients of the basis, nor in the components of the Ricci tensors. Consequently, while a maximal geometry can define, up to isometries, a family of maximal metrics on X , it always defines a *unique* maximal Ricci tensor. As will be detailed in Section 3.2, this uniqueness is the reason why topo-GR can be seen as a parameter-free modification of GR.

Finally, for topo-GR, the following property will also be of use: for all the Ricci tensors listed in Table 3, any vector field in their kernel is a collineation, i.e.,

$$\mathcal{L}_v \mathbf{Ric} = 0; \quad \forall v \in \ker(\mathbf{Ric}). \quad (2.5)$$

¹⁰Interestingly, this tensor can also be obtained from a non-maximal B_{VIII} metric, as shown in Appendix A.5.

3 Topo-GR

3.1 Field equations

The theory developed in [84] features two geometric structures on a 4-manifold \mathcal{M} :

- (i) a (physical) Lorentzian metric \mathbf{g} , with its Levi-Civita connection ${}^4\nabla$, its Riemann tensor ${}^4\mathbf{Riem}$ and its Ricci tensor ${}^4\mathbf{Ric}$.
- (ii) a *reference* (or background) torsion-free connection ${}^4\overline{\nabla}$, with its Riemann tensor ${}^4\overline{\mathbf{Riem}}$ and its Ricci tensor ${}^4\overline{\mathbf{Ric}}$. This second connection is non-dynamical and is fixed solely by topological considerations (detailed below), independently of the metric \mathbf{g} or the matter content. Notably, ${}^4\overline{\nabla}$ is *a priori* not assumed to arise from any underlying additional Lorentzian metric.

The presence of the additional connection ${}^4\overline{\nabla}$ places this theory under the broad family of modified gravity theories known as *Metric Affine Gravity* (cf., e.g., [97]). But, while in these theories the connection ${}^4\overline{\nabla}$ is often considered flat, leading to *General Teleparallel Gravity* (cf., e.g., [98]), a central idea in the approach of [84] is that ${}^4\overline{\mathbf{Riem}}$ depends on the topology of \mathcal{M} . This is detailed in Section 3.2 below.

The Lagrangian of topo-GR is given by

$$S := \int_{\mathcal{M}} \sqrt{-g} \left[\frac{1}{2\kappa} ({}^4R_{\mu\nu} - {}^4\bar{R}_{\mu\nu}) g^{\mu\nu} + \mathcal{L}_m \right] d^4x. \quad (3.1)$$

Assuming that the matter Lagrangian does not depend on ${}^4\overline{\nabla}$, and with $\delta {}^4\bar{R}_{\mu\nu} = 0$, i.e., ${}^4\overline{\nabla}$ is a background/non-dynamical connection, we obtain from this Lagrangian the following field equations

$${}^4R_{\alpha\beta} - {}^4\bar{R}_{\alpha\beta} = \kappa \left(T_{\alpha\beta} - \frac{T}{2} g_{\alpha\beta} \right) + \Lambda g_{\alpha\beta}, \quad (3.2)$$

$${}^4\nabla^\mu {}^4\bar{R}_{\mu\alpha} = \frac{1}{2} {}^4\nabla_\alpha (g^{\mu\nu} {}^4\bar{R}_{\mu\nu}), \quad (3.3)$$

where $\kappa := 8\pi G$.

The action (3.1) corresponds to a modified Hilbert action that can be obtained with the procedure ${}^4R_{\mu\nu} \rightarrow {}^4R_{\mu\nu} - {}^4\bar{R}_{\mu\nu}$ from the Hilbert action. The same applies for the field equation (3.2). The second field equation (3.3) corresponds to the conservation of the term ${}^4\bar{R}_{\mu\nu} - g_{\mu\nu} g^{\alpha\beta} {}^4\bar{R}_{\alpha\beta}/2$. Very importantly, the two field equations depend on the reference connection *only* via its Ricci curvature ${}^4\overline{\mathbf{Ric}}$.

3.2 Reference Ricci tensor

A fundamental aspect of topo-GR is the presence of a *reference* Ricci tensor ${}^4\overline{\mathbf{Ric}}$. In this section, we first provide its definition, and then consider its consequence.

We assume the 4-manifold \mathcal{M} to be of the form $\mathcal{M} \cong \mathbb{R} \times \Sigma$ with Σ being a closed geometric 3-manifold. Then, we define ${}^4\overline{\mathbf{Ric}}$ by the following two conditions:

- (i) it is the Ricci tensor of a *reference* connection ${}^4\overline{\nabla}$ that is complete and torsion-free, and is characterized using the *external Whitney sum* of a connection $\overline{\nabla}_{\mathbb{R}}$ on \mathbb{R} and a connection $\overline{\nabla}_{\Sigma}$ on Σ , i.e.,

$${}^4\overline{\nabla} = \overline{\nabla}_{\mathbb{R}} \boxplus \overline{\nabla}_{\Sigma}, \quad (3.4)$$

- (ii) $\mathbf{Ric}[\overline{\nabla}_{\Sigma}]$ is the maximal Ricci tensor arising from a maximal Riemannian metric on Σ (cf. Table 3).

The external Whitney sum of the two tangent bundles $T\mathbb{R}$ and $T\Sigma$ is $T\mathbb{R} \boxplus T\Sigma := \text{pr}_1^*(T\mathbb{R}) \oplus \text{pr}_2^*(T\Sigma)$ with the Whitney sum of the connections as $\overline{\nabla}_{\mathbb{R}} \boxplus \overline{\nabla}_{\Sigma} := \text{pr}_1^*(\overline{\nabla}_{\mathbb{R}}) \oplus \text{pr}_2^*(\overline{\nabla}_{\Sigma})$ where $\text{pr}_1 : \mathbb{R} \times \Sigma \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ and $\text{pr}_2 : \mathbb{R} \times \Sigma \rightarrow \Sigma$ (see, e.g., [99, Chapter I] for more details on the external Whitney sum). Hence, ${}^4\overline{\nabla}$ given in (3.4) acts on a given smooth vector field $\mathbf{Y} = (\mathbf{Y}_{\mathbb{R}}, \mathbf{Y}_{\Sigma})$ along an arbitrary smooth vector field $\mathbf{X} = (\mathbf{X}_{\mathbb{R}}, \mathbf{X}_{\Sigma})$ as ${}^4\overline{\nabla}_{\mathbf{X}}\mathbf{Y} = \overline{\nabla}_{\mathbf{X}_{\mathbb{R}}}\mathbf{Y}_{\mathbb{R}} + \overline{\nabla}_{\mathbf{X}_{\Sigma}}\mathbf{Y}_{\Sigma}$. As a result, we have $\mathbf{Riem}[{}^4\overline{\nabla}] = \mathbf{Riem}[\overline{\nabla}_{\mathbb{R}}] \boxplus \mathbf{Riem}[\overline{\nabla}_{\Sigma}] = \text{pr}_1^*(\mathbf{Riem}[\overline{\nabla}_{\mathbb{R}}]) \oplus \text{pr}_2^*(\mathbf{Riem}[\overline{\nabla}_{\Sigma}])$, and in particular

$$\mathbf{Ric}[{}^4\overline{\nabla}] = \text{pr}_1^*(\mathbf{Ric}[\overline{\nabla}_{\mathbb{R}}]) \oplus \text{pr}_2^*(\mathbf{Ric}[\overline{\nabla}_{\Sigma}]), \quad (3.5)$$

which acts as $\mathbf{Ric}[{}^4\overline{\nabla}](\mathbf{X}, \mathbf{Y}) = \mathbf{Ric}[\overline{\nabla}_{\mathbb{R}}](\mathbf{X}_{\mathbb{R}}, \mathbf{Y}_{\mathbb{R}}) + \mathbf{Ric}[\overline{\nabla}_{\Sigma}](\mathbf{X}_{\Sigma}, \mathbf{Y}_{\Sigma})$. Since \mathbb{R} is 1-dimensional we have $\mathbf{Riem}[\overline{\nabla}_{\mathbb{R}}] = \mathbf{0}$, and $\mathbf{Riem}[{}^4\overline{\nabla}]$ is given entirely by $\mathbf{Riem}[\overline{\nabla}_{\Sigma}]$. For this reason we will drop the subscript Σ for the connection on Σ , and use the following notations for the curvature tensors ${}^4\overline{\mathbf{Riem}} := \mathbf{Riem}[{}^4\overline{\nabla}]$, ${}^4\overline{\mathbf{Ric}} := \mathbf{Ric}[{}^4\overline{\nabla}]$, $\overline{\mathbf{Riem}} := \mathbf{Riem}[\overline{\nabla}_{\Sigma}]$ and $\overline{\mathbf{Ric}} := \mathbf{Ric}[\overline{\nabla}_{\Sigma}]$.

Therefore, by (ii), $\overline{\mathbf{Ric}}$ is uniquely defined by the universal covering space of Σ . In this sense $\overline{\mathbf{Ric}}$, and therefore ${}^4\overline{\mathbf{Ric}}$, depend on the (spatial) topology. A direct consequence of this definition is that for Euclidean topologies for which $\tilde{\Sigma} = \mathbb{E}^3$ and $\overline{\mathbf{Ric}} = \mathbf{0}$, hence ${}^4\overline{\mathbf{Ric}} = \mathbf{0}$, topo-GR and GR are equivalent. Therefore, the two theories only differ in non-Euclidean topologies.

From the definition (3.4), there exists a (reference) Σ -foliation, an adapted vector basis $\{\bar{\mathbf{e}}_0, \mathbf{e}_i\}$ and dual 1-form basis $\{\bar{\mathbf{e}}^0, \mathbf{e}^i\}$, i.e., with $\bar{\mathbf{e}}^0$ orthogonal to the foliation and \mathbf{e}_i tangent to the foliation, such that the components of the reference Riemann tensor are purely spatial, i.e.,

$${}^4\bar{R}^{\alpha}_{\beta\mu\nu} = \delta^{\alpha}_i \delta^j_{\beta} \delta^k_{\mu} \delta^{\ell}_{\nu} \bar{R}^i_{jkl}. \quad (3.6)$$

In this same basis, the reference Ricci tensor has the form

$${}^4\bar{R}_{\mu\nu} = \begin{pmatrix} 0 & 0 \\ 0 & \bar{R}_{ij} \end{pmatrix}. \quad (3.7)$$

Furthermore, the Whitney sum (3.5) implies that $\bar{\mathbf{e}}_0$ is a collineation for ${}^4\overline{\mathbf{Riem}}$, i.e.,

$$\mathcal{L}_{\bar{\mathbf{e}}_0} {}^4\overline{\mathbf{Riem}} = \mathbf{0} \quad \Rightarrow \quad \mathcal{L}_{\bar{\mathbf{e}}_0} {}^4\overline{\mathbf{Ric}} = \mathbf{0}. \quad (3.8)$$

Relation (3.7) implies that $\bar{\mathbf{e}}_0 \in \ker({}^4\overline{\mathbf{Ric}})$ and that $\ker({}^4\overline{\mathbf{Ric}}) = \{\bar{\mathbf{e}}_0\} \oplus \ker(\overline{\mathbf{Ric}})$. Therefore, from properties (2.5) and (3.8) we have

$$\mathcal{L}_{\mathbf{u}} {}^4\overline{\mathbf{Ric}} = \mathbf{0}; \quad \forall \mathbf{u} \in \ker({}^4\overline{\mathbf{Ric}}). \quad (3.9)$$

Since only the reference Ricci curvature is present in the field equations (3.2) and (3.3), then only equations (3.7) and (3.9) are relevant for topo-GR. They will be especially important when deriving the 3+1-equations of the theory.

3.3 Discussions

Before diving into the 3+1-decomposition of topo-GR, we provide in this section some interpretations and discussions of the topo-GR framework presented so far.

3.3.1 Motivations for topo-GR and the form of the reference Ricci tensor

The initial motivation for topo-GR is to have a theory that admits a Newtonian limit in any topology, see [84]. We detail in this paper the motivations for this requirement, especially a few conditions are listed for a modified gravity theory and the additional term present in the Einstein equation to admit this limit. In particular, the new term should not depend on the matter content, but it has to depend explicitly on the spatial topology in a form similar to (3.7). Taking this term to be a (reference) Ricci tensor of the form (3.7) is the simplest solution we found, essentially because it does not explicitly introduce new parameters. On top of admitting a Newtonian limit in any topology, it was showed in [59] that topo-GR allows for the construction of a simple curved inflation model, something not possible in GR, thus providing a second—here model-dependent—motivation for the theory.

3.3.2 Interpretation of the field equation

From the field equation (3.2), in the absence of matter, the spacetime is not Ricci-flat as in GR, but rather we have ${}^4\mathbf{Ric} = {}^4\overline{\mathbf{Ric}}$ which is non-zero for non-Euclidean types of topologies. Therefore, the role of matter is not to directly curve spacetime as in GR, but only to induce a deviation from the “topological curvature” ${}^4\overline{\mathbf{Ric}}$. This was rendered in [59, Figure 1].

3.3.3 No reference foliation

By definition, ${}^4\overline{\nabla}$ and ${}^4\overline{\mathbf{Riem}}$ define a reference foliation, or a set of reference foliations, which can be reconstructed from a 1-form \mathbf{n} satisfying $n_\alpha {}^4\overline{R}^\alpha{}_{\beta\mu\nu} = 0$. However, the information on this foliation is lost when only the reference Ricci tensor ${}^4\overline{\mathbf{Ric}}$ is considered, since no preferred 1-form can be constructed from ${}^4\overline{\mathbf{Ric}}$ alone, i.e., the kernel of ${}^4\overline{\mathbf{Ric}}$ only involves vectors and not 1-forms. Consequently, the field equations of topo-GR, which only feature the reference Ricci curvature, and not the reference Riemann curvature, do *not* involve a reference foliation. As shown in Section 4.1, the consequence is that in a 3+1-decomposition, ${}^4\overline{\mathbf{Ric}}$ always induces the same spatial reference Ricci tensor regardless of the choice of foliation.

But while no preferred foliation is defined, the set $\ker({}^4\overline{\mathbf{Ric}})$ defines a *reference* subset of the set of vector fields on \mathcal{M} . The dimension of that subset depends on the type of spatial topology as we have $\dim[\ker({}^4\overline{\mathbf{Ric}})] = 1 + \dim[\ker(\overline{\mathbf{Ric}})]$, from (3.7). When Σ is modeled on one of $\{\mathbb{S}^3, \mathbb{H}^3, \text{Nil}, \widetilde{\text{SL}}(2, \mathbb{R})\}$ -geometries, we have $\dim[\ker({}^4\overline{\mathbf{Ric}})] = 1$ and

a unique (up to a factor) reference vector field is defined on \mathcal{M} . While for the \mathbb{E}^3 -geometry, we have ${}^4\overline{\text{Ric}} = \mathbf{0}$ and no reference vector fields are defined on \mathcal{M} , leading exactly to GR. Consider the spacetime metric \mathbf{g} of the theory, one can construct the set of 1-forms dual to $\ker({}^4\overline{\text{Ric}})$, which is 1-dimensional for $\{\mathbb{S}^3, \mathbb{H}^3, \text{Nil}, \widetilde{\text{SL}}(2, \mathbb{R})\}$ -geometries. But these 1-forms do not necessarily fulfill the Frobenius condition needed for them to define a foliation. Therefore, even in the case $\ker({}^4\overline{\text{Ric}})$ is 1-dimensional, in general, no preferred foliation can be constructed in topo-GR.

3.3.4 Reference curvature for general manifolds \mathcal{M}

The definition of $\overline{\text{Ric}}$ assumes that Σ is a geometric 3-manifold. This is the case for the present paper, and for most cosmological models. However, if Σ is not a geometric 3-manifold (e.g., a connected sum), then no maximal metric can be defined on it. In this situation, the definition given in Section 3.2 for $\overline{\text{Ric}}$ does not hold. This happens in particular for asymptotically flat spacetimes, for which spatial sections are infinite. In this situation, we define ${}^4\overline{\text{Ric}}$ to be zero, and therefore, we define topo-GR to be equivalent to GR. In this sense, the Schwarzschild metric is an exact vacuum solution of topo-GR.

For more general asymptotic conditions or when Σ is closed but not modeled on a Thurston geometry, we do not yet have a definition for ${}^4\overline{\text{Ric}}$. A possibility, that would include the current definition, would be to define ${}^4\overline{\text{Ric}}$ as being the Ricci tensor of a (locally) maximally symmetric Riemannian metric on Σ , given a choice of boundary conditions (i.e., choice of closed spatial manifold Σ or choice of asymptotic conditions). For closed non-geometric manifolds, this metric would not be locally homogeneous. However, we are not yet sure if this is a well-defined definition, leading to a unique Ricci tensor, as it does for closed geometric manifolds.

3.3.5 A metric behind ${}^4\overline{\text{Ric}}$

From the definition given in Section 3.2, the reference connection and its curvature tensors can be obtained from a metric of the form

$$\bar{\mathbf{g}} = \bar{\mathbf{g}}_{\mathbb{R}} \boxplus \bar{\mathbf{h}}_{\Sigma} := \text{pr}_1^*(\mathbf{g}_{\mathbb{R}}) \oplus \text{pr}_2^*(\bar{\mathbf{h}}_{\Sigma}), \quad (3.10)$$

where $\bar{\mathbf{g}}_{\mathbb{R}}$ and $\bar{\mathbf{h}}_{\Sigma}$ are, respectively, any metric on \mathbb{R} and a maximal metric on Σ . As a consequence, there is a coordinate system in which

$$\bar{g}_{\mu\nu} = \begin{pmatrix} \pm 1 & 0 \\ 0 & \bar{h}_{ij} \end{pmatrix}, \quad (3.11)$$

where \bar{h}_{ij} is time-independent. However, the field equations do not depend explicitly on this metric, which is why topo-GR is rather a “bi-connection” theory than a bi-metric theory.

4 3+1-decomposition in topo-GR

In this section, we derive for the first time the 3+1 equations of topo-GR. We provide their homogeneous form in Section 4.3, which we will use to compute the homogeneous systems

of equations of topo-GR in each Thurston geometry in Section 5. Additionally, we derive general results regarding LSH solutions in Section 4.4.

4.1 Induced reference spatial Ricci tensor and reference tilt

The orthogonal complement of $\ker({}^4\overline{\mathbf{Ric}})$, denoted by $\ker({}^4\overline{\mathbf{Ric}})^\perp$, is defined as

$$\ker({}^4\overline{\mathbf{Ric}})^\perp := \{\mathbf{n} \in T^*\mathcal{M} \mid \mathbf{n}(\mathbf{u}) = 0; \forall \mathbf{u} \in \ker({}^4\overline{\mathbf{Ric}})\}. \quad (4.1)$$

Proposition 4.1. *For any Σ -foliation of \mathcal{M} and a normal 1-form $\mathbf{n} \notin \ker({}^4\overline{\mathbf{Ric}})^\perp$, the spatial components of ${}^4\overline{\mathbf{Ric}}$ in a basis adapted to the foliation always induces the maximal Ricci tensor $\overline{\mathbf{Ric}}$ of a maximal metric of Σ .*

Proof. The proof proceeds in three steps: we show that (i) for a given \mathbf{n} -foliation of \mathcal{M} the spatial components of ${}^4\overline{\mathbf{Ric}}$ in any adapted basis induce the same tensor on the leaves of the foliation, (ii) this induced tensor does not depend on the choice of foliation, as long as it is a Σ -foliation (i.e., whose leaves are diffeomorphic to Σ , see Section 1.1) and is never “tangent” to the kernel of ${}^4\overline{\mathbf{Ric}}$, (iii) this unique induced tensor is the maximal Ricci tensor of a maximal metric on Σ , hence finishing the proof.

For (i), it suffices to consider two bases $\{\mathbf{e}^0 = \mathbf{n}, \mathbf{e}^i\}$ and $\{\hat{\mathbf{e}}^0 = \mathbf{n}, \hat{\mathbf{e}}^i\}$ adapted to the same \mathbf{n} -foliation that are related to each other by $\mathbf{e}^\mu = \Lambda^\mu_\nu \hat{\mathbf{e}}^\nu$. This directly implies ${}^4\bar{R}_{ij} = \Lambda_i^k \Lambda_j^\ell {}^4\hat{R}_{k\ell}$, showing that the spatial components of ${}^4\overline{\mathbf{Ric}}$ in two different adapted bases are related by a spatial diffeomorphism. Thus, given an \mathbf{n} -foliation, the spatial components of ${}^4\overline{\mathbf{Ric}}$ in an adapted basis induce a unique spatial tensor on that foliation, which we denote by ${}^{\mathbf{n}}\overline{\mathbf{Ric}}$.¹¹

For (ii), we consider two different Σ -foliations defined by two 1-forms \mathbf{e}^0 and $\hat{\mathbf{e}}^0$, respectively. Assuming that $\mathbf{e}^0, \hat{\mathbf{e}}^0 \notin \ker({}^4\overline{\mathbf{Ric}})^\perp$ ensures that at any point $x \in \mathcal{M}$ there exists a vector in the kernel of ${}^4\overline{\mathbf{Ric}}$ that is not tangent to these foliations (we say that the foliations are not tangent to the kernel). In turn, this ensures that there exist two adapted bases $\{\mathbf{e}^0, \mathbf{e}^i\}$ and $\{\hat{\mathbf{e}}^0, \hat{\mathbf{e}}^i\}$, again related by $\mathbf{e}^\mu = \Lambda^\mu_\nu \hat{\mathbf{e}}^\nu$, such that the spatial components of ${}^4\overline{\mathbf{Ric}}$ in these bases satisfy the same transformation behavior as before. Therefore, the components of the two induced tensors ${}^{\mathbf{e}^0}\overline{\mathbf{Ric}}$ and ${}^{\hat{\mathbf{e}}^0}\overline{\mathbf{Ric}}$ are related by ${}^{\mathbf{e}^0}\bar{R}_{ij} = \Lambda_i^k \Lambda_j^\ell {}^{\hat{\mathbf{e}}^0}\bar{R}_{k\ell}$. Since the leaves of the \mathbf{e}^0 -foliation and the $\hat{\mathbf{e}}^0$ -foliation are diffeomorphic (as we assumed that they are Σ -foliations), this implies that ${}^{\mathbf{e}^0}\overline{\mathbf{Ric}}$ and ${}^{\hat{\mathbf{e}}^0}\overline{\mathbf{Ric}}$ are diffeomorphic as tensors defined on Σ .

For (iii), the definition (3.7) of ${}^4\overline{\mathbf{Ric}}$ ensures that there exists a Σ -foliation not tangent to the kernel and such that the induced spatial reference curvature on that foliation is the maximal curvature arising from a maximal metric on Σ , which we denoted by $\overline{\mathbf{Ric}}$, as defined in Table 3. By uniqueness showed in (ii), this concludes the proof. \square

Definition 4.2. *Consider a spacetime $(\mathcal{M}, \mathbf{g})$ and a spacelike Σ -foliation with a unit normal 1-form $\mathbf{n} \notin \ker({}^4\overline{\mathbf{Ric}})^\perp$. The reference tilt $\bar{\beta}$ is the unique vector $\bar{\beta}$ fulfilling*

¹¹The fact that the spatial components induce a unique spatial tensor in any adapted basis is true for any covariant tensor, but this does not hold for contravariant tensors [100].

- (i) $\mathbf{n}(\bar{\beta}) = 0$ (i.e., $\bar{\beta}$ is spatial),
- (ii) $\mathbf{n}^\sharp + N^{-1}\bar{\beta} \in \ker({}^4\overline{\mathbf{Ric}})$ (i.e., $\bar{\beta}$ measures the tilt of \mathbf{n}^\sharp with respect to $\ker({}^4\overline{\mathbf{Ric}})$),
- (iii) $\bar{\beta}^\flat \in \ker({}^4\overline{\mathbf{Ric}})^\perp$ (i.e., ensures uniqueness of $\bar{\beta}$ when $\dim[\ker({}^4\overline{\mathbf{Ric}})] > 1$),

where N is the lapse of the foliation.

To summarize this section, given any Σ -foliation with orthogonal 1-form fulfilling $\mathbf{n} \notin \ker({}^4\overline{\mathbf{Ric}})^\perp$, the reference Ricci tensor ${}^4\overline{\mathbf{Ric}}$ induces the same reference spatial (maximal) Ricci tensor $\overline{\mathbf{Ric}}$ on Σ regardless of the choice of foliation. And given a Lorentzian metric with respect to which \mathbf{n} is timelike, then ${}^4\overline{\mathbf{Ric}}$ induces a reference tilt $\bar{\beta}$ on that foliation in the direction of non-zero reference spatial Ricci curvature. That tilt depends on the choice of foliation and Lorentzian metric, which is not the case for the induced spatial reference Ricci tensor $\overline{\mathbf{Ric}}$.

4.2 3+1-equations of topo-GR

We consider a timelike Σ -foliation with unit 1-form $\mathbf{n} \notin \ker({}^4\overline{\mathbf{Ric}})^\perp$. We denote by N the lapse of the foliation, and $\mathbf{h} := \mathbf{g} + \mathbf{n} \otimes \mathbf{n}$ the induced spatial metric with the Levi-Civita connection ∇ and associated Riemann and Ricci tensors \mathbf{Riem} and \mathbf{Ric} , respectively, and the scalar curvature $R := \text{tr}_{\mathbf{h}} \mathbf{Ric}$. We introduce the expansion tensor $\Theta := \mathcal{L}_{\mathbf{n}^\sharp} \mathbf{h} / 2$ of the foliation, its trace $\theta := \text{tr}_{\mathbf{h}} \Theta$, and its traceless part, i.e., the shear tensor $\sigma := \Theta - \theta \mathbf{h} / 3$.

Moreover, we introduce the 3+1-variables of the matter energy-momentum tensor with respect to \mathbf{n}^\sharp as ρ for the density, p for the pressure, \mathbf{q} for the momentum and $\boldsymbol{\pi}$ for the anisotropic stress as follows (cf., e.g., [100, Section 5.1.2])

$$\rho := n^\mu n^\nu T_{\mu\nu}, \quad p := \frac{1}{3} h^{\mu\nu} T_{\mu\nu}, \quad q_\alpha := -h^\mu{}_\alpha n^\nu T_{\mu\nu}, \quad \pi_{\mu\nu} := h^\alpha{}_\mu h^\beta{}_\nu T_{\alpha\beta} - p h_{\mu\nu}. \quad (4.2)$$

The 3+1-projection of the reference curvature can be written as functions of the reference tilt $\bar{\beta}$ and the reference spatial curvature $\overline{\mathbf{Ric}}$ as follows

$$n^\mu n^\nu {}^4\bar{R}_{\mu\nu} = \frac{1}{N^2} \bar{\beta}^i \bar{\beta}^j \bar{R}_{ij}, \quad (4.3)$$

$$h^\mu{}_i n^\nu {}^4\bar{R}_{\mu\nu} = -\frac{1}{N} \bar{\beta}^j \bar{R}_{ji}, \quad (4.4)$$

$$h^\mu{}_i h^\nu{}_j {}^4\bar{R}_{\mu\nu} = \bar{R}_{ij}. \quad (4.5)$$

The effective fluid variables in the spirit of (4.2) with respect to the \mathbf{n} -foliation and induced

by the presence of ${}^4\overline{\mathbf{Ric}}$ in equation (3.2) are

$$\kappa \bar{\rho} = \frac{1}{2} \left(\bar{R} + \frac{1}{N^2} \bar{\beta}^i \bar{\beta}^j \bar{R}_{ij} \right), \quad (4.6)$$

$$\kappa \bar{p} = \frac{1}{6} \left(-\bar{R} + \frac{3}{N^2} \bar{\beta}^i \bar{\beta}^j \bar{R}_{ij} \right), \quad (4.7)$$

$$\kappa \bar{q}_i = \frac{1}{N} \bar{\beta}^j \bar{R}_{ij}, \quad (4.8)$$

$$\kappa \bar{\pi}_{ij} = \bar{R}_{ij} - \frac{1}{3} \bar{R} h_{ij}, \quad (4.9)$$

where $\bar{R} := \text{tr}_h \overline{\mathbf{Ric}}$.

Then, choosing a coordinate system adapted to the foliation, the 3 + 1-decomposition of the first field equation (3.2) of topo-GR gives

$$2\kappa\rho + 2\Lambda = \frac{2}{3}\theta^2 - \left(\sigma_{ij}\sigma^{ij} + \frac{1}{N^2} \bar{\beta}^i \bar{\beta}^j \bar{R}_{ij} \right) + R - \bar{R}, \quad (4.10)$$

$$\kappa q_i = \frac{2}{3} \nabla_i \theta - \nabla^j \sigma_{ij} - \frac{1}{N} \bar{\beta}^j \bar{R}_{ij}, \quad (4.11)$$

$$\frac{1}{N} (\partial_t - \mathcal{L}_\beta) \theta = -\frac{1}{3} \theta^2 - \sigma_{ij} \sigma^{ij} - \frac{1}{N^2} \bar{\beta}^i \bar{\beta}^j \bar{R}_{ij} + \frac{1}{N} \Delta N - \frac{\kappa}{2} (\rho + 3p) + \Lambda, \quad (4.12)$$

$$\frac{1}{N} (\partial_t - \mathcal{L}_\beta) \sigma^i_j = -\theta \sigma^i_j - h^{ik} \left(R_{\langle kj \rangle} - \bar{R}_{\langle kj \rangle} - \frac{1}{N} \nabla_{\langle k} \nabla_{j \rangle} N \right) + \kappa \pi^i_j. \quad (4.13)$$

The space part of the second field equation (3.3) leads to

$$\begin{aligned} (\partial_t - \mathcal{L}_\beta) \left(\bar{\beta}^j \bar{R}_{ij} \right) &= [(\partial_t - \mathcal{L}_\beta) \ln N - \theta N] \bar{\beta}^j \bar{R}_{ij} - \frac{1}{2} \nabla_i \left(\bar{\beta}^j \bar{\beta}^k \bar{R}_{jk} \right) \\ &\quad - N^2 \left[\nabla^j \left(\bar{R}_{ij} - \frac{1}{2} \bar{R} h_{ij} \right) + \bar{R}_{ij} \nabla^j \ln N \right]. \end{aligned} \quad (4.14)$$

We also need to consider (3.9) which implies $\mathcal{L}_{\mathbf{n}^\sharp + N^{-1} \bar{\beta}} {}^4\overline{\mathbf{Ric}} = 0$ due to Definition 4.2. Only the spatial part of this equation gives an independent equation, which is

$$(\partial_t - \mathcal{L}_{\beta - \bar{\beta}}) \bar{R}_{ij} = 0. \quad (4.15)$$

Note that the projection of (3.3) along \mathbf{n}^\sharp results in (4.14) and (4.15).

The system of equations (4.10)-(4.15) along with the definition of Θ correspond to the 3+1-equations of topo-GR. Compared to GR, two additional variables are present: the reference spatial curvature $\overline{\mathbf{Ric}}$ and the reference tilt $\bar{\beta}$. The former is fully fixed by its definition as being the maximal Ricci tensor of a maximal metric on Σ (defined in Section 2.5 and in Table 3), and by the staticity (along the kernel of ${}^4\overline{\mathbf{Ric}}$) imposed by (4.15). The dynamics of the latter is determined by (4.14).

By using (4.15), equation (4.14) can be replaced by

$$\begin{aligned} \bar{R}_{ij} \left[\left(\partial_t - \mathcal{L}_\beta - \bar{\beta}^k \nabla_k \right) \bar{\beta}^j - [(\partial_t - \mathcal{L}_\beta) \ln N - \theta N] \bar{\beta}^j + N^2 \nabla^j \ln N \right] \\ = - \left(N^2 h^{jk} - \bar{\beta}^j \bar{\beta}^k \right) \left(\nabla_j \bar{R}_{ki} - \frac{1}{2} \nabla_i \bar{R}_{jk} \right). \end{aligned} \quad (4.16)$$

We also obtain the following equation by contracting (4.14) with $\bar{\beta}$ and using the trace of (4.15)

$$\begin{aligned} \frac{1}{2}(\partial_t - \mathcal{L}_\beta) \left(\bar{\beta}^i \bar{\beta}^j \bar{R}_{ij} \right) &= [(\partial_t - \mathcal{L}_\beta) \ln N - \theta N] \bar{\beta}^i \bar{\beta}^j \bar{R}_{ij} \\ &\quad - N^2 \bar{\beta}^i \left[\nabla^j (\bar{R}_{ij} - \tfrac{1}{2} \bar{R} h_{ij}) + \bar{R}_{ij} \nabla^j \ln N \right]. \end{aligned} \quad (4.17)$$

This equation determines the evolution of the term $\overline{\mathbf{Ric}}(\bar{\beta}, \bar{\beta}) = \bar{\beta}^i \bar{\beta}^j \bar{R}_{ij}$ present in the Hamilton constraint (4.10) and the Raychaudhuri equation (4.12).

4.3 3+1-equations for homogeneous solutions

For a spatially homogeneous solution of the topo-GR field equations, the lapse is constrained to be $N = 1$ and any scalar is spatially constant. Furthermore, since Σ is closed, any divergence of a locally homogeneous spatial vector field vanishes. We define the expansion rate $H := \theta/3$, and include Λ in the energy-momentum tensor. From the system (4.10)-(4.15), we obtain the following system of equations

$$1 = \Omega_\sigma + \Omega_{\bar{\beta}} + \Omega_{R-\bar{R}} + \Omega_\rho, \quad (4.18)$$

$$\kappa q_i = -\nabla^j \sigma_{ij} - \bar{\beta}^j \bar{R}_{ij}, \quad (4.19)$$

$$\partial_t H = -(1+q)H^2, \quad (4.20)$$

$$(\partial_t - \mathcal{L}_\beta) \sigma^i_j = -3H \sigma^i_j - h^{ik} (R_{\langle kj \rangle} - \bar{R}_{\langle kj \rangle}) + \kappa \pi^i_j, \quad (4.21)$$

$$(\partial_t - \mathcal{L}_{\beta-\bar{\beta}}) \bar{R}_{ij} = 0, \quad (4.22)$$

$$(\partial_t - \mathcal{L}_\beta) \left(\bar{\beta}^j \bar{R}_{ij} \right) = -3H \bar{\beta}^j \bar{R}_{ij} - \nabla^j \bar{R}_{ij}, \quad (4.23)$$

where

$$\begin{aligned} \Omega_\rho &:= \frac{\kappa \rho}{3H^2}, \quad \Omega_{R-\bar{R}} := -\frac{R - \bar{R}}{6H^2}, \quad q := 2(\Omega_\sigma + \Omega_{\bar{\beta}}) + \tfrac{1}{2}(3w+1)\Omega_\rho, \\ \Omega_\sigma &:= \frac{\sigma_{ij}\sigma^{ij}}{6H^2}, \quad \Omega_{\bar{\beta}} := \frac{\bar{\beta}^i \bar{\beta}^j \bar{R}_{ij}}{6H^2}, \quad w := \frac{p}{\rho}. \end{aligned} \quad (4.24)$$

Moreover, equations (4.21) and (4.23) lead to

$$\frac{1}{2} \partial_t (\sigma_{ij} \sigma^{ij}) = -3H \sigma_{ij} \sigma^{ij} - \sigma^{ij} (R_{ij} - \bar{R}_{ij}) + \kappa \sigma^{ij} \pi_{ij}, \quad (4.25)$$

$$\frac{1}{2} \partial_t \left(\bar{\beta}^i \bar{\beta}^j \bar{R}_{ij} \right) = -3H \bar{\beta}^i \bar{\beta}^j \bar{R}_{ij} - \bar{\beta}^i \nabla^j \bar{R}_{ij}. \quad (4.26)$$

When $\text{div}_h \overline{\mathbf{Ric}} = 0$, (4.26) implies $\Omega_{\bar{\beta}} \propto 1/a^6$, with $\dot{a}/a := H$, which yields that $\Omega_{\bar{\beta}}$ has a contribution similar to the shear parameter of Bianchi type I models in GR.

4.4 General results for LSH solutions

We present in this section some results for LSH solutions of topo-GR that are independent of choosing a precise model, i.e., a precise Thurston geometry on which the spatial manifold is modeled.

4.4.1 Isotropization of LSH solutions

We can derive a theorem similar to Wald's theorem [25] for isotropization of LSH solutions in GR in the presence of a positive cosmological constant.

Theorem 4.3. *Consider an LSH solution of topo-GR with*

- (i) *a positive cosmological constant*
- (ii) *matter satisfying the dominant and strong energy conditions,*
- (iii) *no reference tilt,*
- (iv) $R - \bar{R} \leq 0$.

If $H > 0$ initially at time t_0 , then $H > 0$ for all time $t \geq t_0$, and $\sigma \xrightarrow{t \rightarrow \infty} \mathbf{0}$. Additionally, for non-tilted perfect fluids, we have $\mathbf{Ric} - \overline{\mathbf{Ric}} \xrightarrow{t \rightarrow \infty} \mathbf{0}$.

Proof. Assuming $\bar{\beta} = \mathbf{0}$, the Hamilton constraint (4.18) and the Raychaudhuri equation (4.20) differ from those of GR only by the presence of \bar{R} . The proof is therefore very similar to that of Wald [25]. In [25], the necessary condition for obtaining $\sigma \xrightarrow{t \rightarrow \infty} \mathbf{0}$ was $H^2 \geq \Lambda/3$. From the Hamiltonian constraint of GR, this is ensured when $R \leq 0$. In topo-GR, $H^2 \geq \Lambda/3$ is ensured by the Hamilton constraint (4.18) when $R - \bar{R} \leq 0$. For non-tilted perfect fluids, we have $\pi = \mathbf{0}$, and $\mathbf{Ric} - \overline{\mathbf{Ric}} \xrightarrow{t \rightarrow \infty} \mathbf{0}$ follows directly from equation (4.21) and $\sigma \xrightarrow{t \rightarrow \infty} \mathbf{0}$. \square

Remark 4.4. In GR, the fourth condition in Theorem 4.3 is replaced by $R \leq 0$. This is why for LSH solutions modeled on \mathbb{S}^3 (i.e., Bianchi IX solutions) or $\mathbb{R} \times \mathbb{S}^2$ (i.e., Kantowski–Sachs solution), a positive cosmological constant do not ensure isotropization of the solution asymptotically. In topo-GR, isotropization is ensured if $R - \bar{R} \leq 0$. As will be shown in Section 5, this will be fulfilled by B_{IX} and Kantowski–Sachs metrics. However, surprisingly, for B_{II} solutions, the condition is not ensured, unless the LRS condition is assumed (Section 5.7).

4.4.2 Shear-free LHS solutions

In topo-GR, shear-free ($\sigma = \mathbf{0}$), non-tilted perfect fluids ($\mathbf{q} = \mathbf{0} = \pi$) solutions exist for all types of topologies. Indeed, for such solutions (4.19) and (4.21) imply $\mathbf{Ric} = \overline{\mathbf{Ric}}$ and $\bar{\beta} = 0$, and the field equations become

$$\partial_t H = -(1 + q)H^2, \quad \Omega_\rho = 1, \quad q = \frac{1}{2}(3w + 1). \quad (4.27)$$

The shear-free condition implies that the time dependence of the spatial metric \mathbf{h} in an *Eulerian basis*, i.e., $\partial_t = \mathbf{n}^\sharp$, is solely given by a scale factor. In turn, this implies that \mathbf{Ric} is time independent in the Eulerian basis, automatically fulfilling (4.22). The spacetime metric has the form

$$\mathbf{g} = -\mathbf{d}t \otimes \mathbf{d}t + a^2(t) h_{ij}(\mathbf{x}) \mathbf{d}x^i \otimes \mathbf{d}x^j. \quad (4.28)$$

The condition $\mathbf{Ric} = \overline{\mathbf{Ric}}$ forces \mathbf{h} to be a maximal metric, unless Σ is modeled on the $\widetilde{\text{SL}}(2, \mathbb{R})$ -geometry. In that case, \mathbf{h} can have no continuous isotropies, and therefore is not necessarily maximal. This is detailed in Appendix A.5. The field equations (4.27) for the scale factor are equal to that of a flat-FLRW model in GR.

The existence of shear-free, non-tilted perfect fluids solutions for all models in topo-GR contrasts with GR for which this type of solutions only exists for Euclidean, spherical, or hyperbolic topologies. In these cases, the solutions are isotropic, as for topo-GR, but the Hamilton constraint in GR still features the curvature parameter. Shear-free solutions in other topologies in GR require the presence of a fluid anisotropic stress [101] due to the anisotropic Ricci curvature sourcing the shear. Generally, in these GR models, the anisotropic stress is just *ad-hoc*, chosen to be equal to the anisotropic part of the Ricci tensor, but without a physical model of matter giving rise to that stress (see, e.g., [102] for a proposition of such a physical model). In particular, when perturbations of the shear-free LSH metric are considered, the anisotropic stress remains a pure background quantity [39–42]. Additionally, to get the shear-free solution in GR, the standard approach is to assume that the ad-hoc matter is solely characterized by the anisotropic stress (equal to the anisotropic Ricci curvature), only modifying the evolution equation for the shear, but not the other 3+1-equations. In topo-GR, the effective density associated to ${}^4\overline{\mathbf{Ric}}$ modifies the Hamilton constraint. As a result, the evolution equations for expansion of shear-free solutions in topo-GR do not feature the scalar curvature (as can be seen in (4.27) above), while they do so in GR. The direct consequence is that the evolution of the scale factor of shear-free solutions in topo-GR is equivalent to that of flat-FLRW solutions of GR for any BKS type, while in GR it depends on the model, and can feature a bounce or a recollapse.

As a subcase of these solutions, we can consider $\rho = 0 = p$, leading to (shear-free) static-vacuum solutions, for which the metric is given by

$$\mathbf{g} = -\mathbf{d}t \otimes \mathbf{d}t + h_{ij}(\mathbf{x})\mathbf{d}x^i \otimes \mathbf{d}x^j, \quad (4.29)$$

where, again, \mathbf{h} is maximal, except for the $\widetilde{\text{SL}}(2, \mathbb{R})$ -geometry (Appendix A.5). The existence of SH static-vacuum solutions for any topology contrasts strongly with GR, for which this kind of solutions is only possible for Euclidean topologies with the Minkowski metric.

One interesting consequence of the existence of these static solutions is for inflation. In [59] it was showed that it allows for a well defined Bunch–Davies vacuum for spherical and hyperbolic topologies. This is because in the large-Hubble-radius limit, the perturbation equations become wave equations on a static background (with the Mukhanov–Sasaki equation in particular), hence allowing for canonical quantization. In GR, this is not possible exactly because LHS static-vacuum solutions do not exist for spherical and hyperbolic topologies (see, e.g., [103] and references therein). Only after additional (fine-tuned) assumptions on the curvature scale, canonical quantization becomes possible in the large-Hubble-radius limit. In this sense, the existence of static-vacuum solutions in topo-GR makes the construction of inflation and the choice of initial conditions simpler and more natural than in GR. As discussed in [59], this result can be viewed as an additional (model-dependent) motivation for the topo-GR theory.

In this context, the fact that in topo-GR static-vacuum solutions exist for all types of topologies suggests that canonical quantization of the inflaton should be feasible in the

same way demonstrated in [59]. If this is true, this would again contrast with GR, for which anisotropic topologies (i.e., different from Euclidean, spherical or hyperbolic) also suffer from the same limitations as spherical and hyperbolic topologies when it comes to quantizing the inflaton [39, 40].

5 Systems of equations in all models

While in Section 4.3 we provided the general form of the 3+1-equations for LSH solutions, this system can be either simplified or put in a different form (e.g., with the orthonormal approach) when a specific type of topology is considered. Thus, the aim of this section is to compute the system of equations of LSH solutions for each Thurston families of topologies. The method we will use is detailed in Section 5.1. The systems of equations will be expressed using the orthonormal approach (cf. [92]) detailed in Section 5.2. The systems for each geometry are provided in Section 5.3 to Section 5.10. Finally, in Section 5.11, we revisit for each model the general results obtained in Section 4.4.

5.1 Relation between the physical metric and the reference curvature

For all models, a prerequisite to be able to compute the field equations is to relate the spatial reference Ricci curvature $\overline{\mathbf{Ric}}$ with the spatial metric \mathbf{h} . More precisely, given a basis in which \mathbf{h} is known (e.g., an orthonormal basis), we need to determine the components of $\overline{\mathbf{Ric}}$, using, in particular, its definition as maximal Ricci tensor. The goal of this section is to present the procedure we will follow to tackle this problem. In this section, the maximal and minimal groups G_{\max} and G_{\min} are defined as abstract groups, provided in Table 1, not belonging to the diffeomorphism group of $\tilde{\Sigma}$.

By definition, $\overline{\mathbf{Ric}}$ is constructed from a maximal Riemannian metric, and therefore there exists a transitive subgroup $\overline{G}_{\max} \subseteq \text{Sym}(\tilde{\Sigma}, \overline{\mathbf{Ric}})$ such that $\overline{G}_{\max} \cong G_{\max}$, where G_{\max} is one of the maximal groups. Additionally, there exists a transitive subgroup $\overline{G}_{\min} \subseteq \overline{G}_{\max}$ such that $\overline{G}_{\min} \cong G_{\min}$, where G_{\min} is one of the minimal groups compatible with G_{\max} .

Remark 5.1. There might exist other subgroups $\overline{G}'_{\max} \subseteq \text{Sym}(\tilde{\Sigma}, \overline{\mathbf{Ric}})$ and $\overline{G}'_{\min} \subseteq \overline{G}'_{\max}$ such that $\overline{G}'_{\max} \cong G_{\max}$ and $\overline{G}'_{\min} \cong G_{\min}$, but with $\overline{G}'_{\max} \neq \overline{G}_{\max}$ and $\overline{G}'_{\min} \neq \overline{G}_{\min}$. The groups \overline{G}'_{\max} and \overline{G}_{\max} induce two different families of maximal metrics $\{\overline{\mathbf{h}}'\}$ and $\{\overline{\mathbf{h}}\}$ on $\tilde{\Sigma}$, both yielding the same Ricci tensor $\overline{\mathbf{Ric}}$. For example, in the case of the $\widetilde{\text{SL}}(2, \mathbb{R})$ -geometry, we have $\text{Sym}(\tilde{\Sigma}, \overline{\mathbf{Ric}})_0 \cong \widetilde{\text{SL}}(2, \mathbb{R}) \times \widetilde{\text{SL}}(2, \mathbb{R})$ (where the subscript $_0$ refers to the connected components to the identity of the group), and there are two families of maximal metrics giving the same Ricci tensor, left and right B_{VIII} -invariant metrics, respectively. The important point of this remark is that for any subgroups \overline{G}_{\max} and \overline{G}_{\min} with the above properties, we can always define a maximal metric $\overline{\mathbf{h}}$ such that $\overline{\mathbf{Ric}} = \mathbf{Ric}[\overline{\mathbf{h}}]$ and for which $\text{Isom}(\tilde{\Sigma}, \overline{\mathbf{h}}) = \overline{G}_{\max}$ and $\overline{G}_{\min} \subseteq \text{Isom}(\tilde{\Sigma}, \overline{\mathbf{h}})$.

The physical metric \mathbf{h} is defined to be a minimal metric. Therefore, there exists a transitive subgroup $\hat{G}_{\min} \subseteq \text{Isom}(\tilde{\Sigma}, \mathbf{h})$ such that $\hat{G}_{\min} \cong G_{\min}$. Thus, by definition, both

$\overline{\mathbf{Ric}}$ and \mathbf{h} are invariant by a transitive subgroup of diffeomorphisms (of $\tilde{\Sigma}$) isomorphic to a minimal group, denoted by \overline{G}_{\min} and \hat{G}_{\min} , respectively, and for a given choice of Thurston geometry we have $\overline{G}_{\min} \cong \hat{G}_{\min}$. However, since \overline{G}_{\min} and \hat{G}_{\min} are isomorphic as subsets of $\text{Diff}(\tilde{\Sigma})$, in general, they are equal only up to a diffeomorphism. A direct consequence, taking the example of Bianchi groups, is that, in general, a left invariant basis for \hat{G}_{\min} is not necessarily a left invariant basis for \overline{G}_{\min} , and vice versa. Therefore, in a basis where the components of \mathbf{h} are spatially constants, the components of $\overline{\mathbf{Ric}}$ are not necessarily spatially constants, even though the two tensors are locally homogeneous. Therefore, without additional constraints on the relation between the symmetries of $\overline{\mathbf{Ric}}$ and \mathbf{h} , a full diffeomorphism freedom remains between the components of these two tensors in a given basis. As presented just below, those constraints come from the field equations.

We assume now that the transitive subgroup $\hat{G}_{\min} \subset \text{Diff}(\tilde{\Sigma})$ making the spatial metric locally homogeneous also makes the energy-momentum tensor locally homogeneous, i.e., $\hat{G}_{\min} \subseteq \text{Sym}(\tilde{\Sigma}, \rho, p, \mathbf{q}, \boldsymbol{\pi})$. This is the standard assumptions for LSH models in cosmology. Then, from the properties $\hat{G}_{\min} \subseteq \text{Sym}(\tilde{\Sigma}, \boldsymbol{\sigma})$ and $\hat{G}_{\text{BKS}} \subseteq \text{Sym}(\tilde{\Sigma}, \mathcal{L}_{\mathbf{n}^\#} \boldsymbol{\sigma})$ (see Section 2.4), the equations (4.18) and (4.26) directly imply $\hat{G}_{\min} \subseteq \text{Sym}(\tilde{\Sigma}, \overline{\mathbf{Ric}})$, leading to

$$\hat{G}_{\min} = \overline{G}_{\min}. \quad (5.1)$$

Therefore, from the remark 5.1, we can consider a maximal metric $\bar{\mathbf{h}}$ such that $\overline{\mathbf{Ric}} = \mathbf{Ric}[\bar{\mathbf{h}}]$ which is invariant by the group \hat{G}_{\min} . We shall show in Sections 5.3 to 5.10 that, except for the Nil-geometry, this property is sufficient to fully determine the components of $\overline{\mathbf{Ric}}$ as functions of those of \mathbf{h} . Note that *a priori* $\text{Isom}(\tilde{\Sigma}, \mathbf{h}) \subseteq \text{Isom}(\tilde{\Sigma}, \bar{\mathbf{h}})$ does not hold and therefore $\text{Isom}(\tilde{\Sigma}, \mathbf{h}) \subseteq \text{Sym}(\tilde{\Sigma}, \overline{\mathbf{Ric}})$ does not hold either. Hence, as for the shear tensor (see Section 2.4), in models where the spatial metric has more continuous symmetries than that described by \hat{G}_{\min} , those symmetries are not necessarily symmetries of the reference Ricci tensor. We discuss this in Section 6.

Now, as mentioned in the beginning of this section, the goal is to determine the components of $\overline{\mathbf{Ric}}$ with respect to those of \mathbf{h} . For Bianchi metrics, this amounts to answering the following question.

Question 5.2. *What is the expression of $\overline{\mathbf{Ric}}$ in an orthonormal Milnor basis for \mathbf{h} ?*

To answer Question 5.2, a three-step program will be followed:

- (i) We consider a left-invariant basis $\{\bar{\mathbf{e}}_i\}$, in which the components of $\overline{\mathbf{Ric}}$, denoted by $\bar{R}_{\bar{i}\bar{j}}$, are known, and a unit Milnor basis in which $\bar{R}_{\bar{i}\bar{j}}$ do not feature free parameters. As explained in Section 2.5, these components can easily be obtained from the third column of Table 3 with a rescaling of the basis vectors.
- (ii) We determine the general transformation matrix Λ , with components $\Lambda_i^{\bar{i}}$, between the basis $\{\bar{\mathbf{e}}_i\}$ and a second Milnor basis $\{\mathbf{e}_i\}$ defined to be orthonormal with respect to \mathbf{h} , i.e.,

$$\mathbf{e}_i = \Lambda_i^{\bar{i}} \bar{\mathbf{e}}_{\bar{i}}. \quad (5.2)$$

Due to (5.1), Λ is space-independent. We will decompose this matrix into an automorphism A of the Lie algebra of $\{\bar{\mathbf{e}}_i\}$, and a diagonal transformation H . (Note that this decomposition will not be unique in general.)

(iii) Using Λ , we compute the components of $\overline{\mathbf{Ric}}$ in the orthonormal basis $\{\mathbf{e}_i\}$. We denote them by \bar{R}_{ij} . We thus have

$$\bar{R}_{ij} = \Lambda_i^{\bar{i}} \Lambda_j^{\bar{j}} \bar{R}_{\bar{i}\bar{j}}. \quad (5.3)$$

Once this program is fulfilled, the field equations in the orthonormal basis can be computed, using the orthonormal approach detailed in the next section.

For the $\mathbb{R} \times \mathbb{S}^2$ -geometry, no $G_{\mathbb{R} \times \mathbb{S}^2}$ -invariant basis can be defined. For this geometry we will directly use a canonical coordinate system to determine the components of $\overline{\mathbf{Ric}}$ and \mathbf{h} , and to express the field equations.

5.2 Orthonormal approach for spacetime Bianchi metrics

In Sections 5.3 to 5.10, we derive and discuss the field equations for SH solutions of topo-GR for each Thurston geometry. To express the systems of equations for the type A Bianchi models, i.e., for \mathbb{E}^3 , \mathbb{S}^3 , \mathbb{Sol} , \mathbb{Nil} , and $\widetilde{\mathbb{SL}}(2, \mathbb{R})$ geometries, we will consider the orthonormal approach which we describe in this section.

In the orthonormal approach introduced in [92], the components of tensor fields are expressed with respect to an orthonormal spacetime basis $\{\mathbf{e}_0, \mathbf{e}_i\}$ having the following properties:

- (i) the basis is adapted to the foliation of homogeneity, i.e., $\mathbf{e}_0 = \mathbf{n}^\#$ and $\mathbf{n}(\mathbf{e}_i) = 0$,
- (ii) the spatial vector basis $\{\mathbf{e}_i\}$ is an orthonormal Milnor basis for the spatial metric \mathbf{h} with the algebra (2.2),
- (iii) the spatial vector basis $\{\mathbf{e}_i\}$ is time dependent, i.e., $[\mathbf{e}_0, \mathbf{e}_i] \neq 0$. The time dependence is decomposed in expansion, with the expansion tensor Θ , and rotation, with the *Fermi rotation coefficients* (i.e., rotation of the triads with respect to a Fermi-propagated frame) defined as $\Omega^k := \epsilon^{kij} \mathbf{h}(\mathbf{e}_i, [\mathbf{e}_0, \mathbf{e}_j]) / 2$.¹² This leads to the relation

$$[\mathbf{e}_0, \mathbf{e}_i] = (-\Theta_i^k + \epsilon_{i\ell}^k \Omega^\ell) \mathbf{e}_k. \quad (5.4)$$

Note that in this basis the spatial indices can be raised and lowered arbitrarily as the spatial metric components are the identity.

Further, we introduce the usual Wainwright–Hsu variables σ_+ and σ_- defined from the diagonal components of the shear as (cf. [104])

$$\sigma_+ := \frac{1}{2}(\sigma_{22} + \sigma_{33}), \quad \sigma_- := \frac{1}{2\sqrt{3}}(\sigma_{22} - \sigma_{33}). \quad (5.5)$$

The Jacobi identities for the basis $\{\mathbf{e}_0, \mathbf{e}_i\}$ imply a direct relation between the off-diagonal components of the shear and the Fermi rotation coefficients

$$\begin{aligned} (n_1 + n_2)\sigma_{12} &= (n_2 - n_1)\Omega_3, \\ (n_2 + n_3)\sigma_{23} &= (n_3 - n_2)\Omega_1, \\ (n_3 + n_1)\sigma_{31} &= (n_1 - n_3)\Omega_2, \end{aligned} \quad (5.6)$$

¹²While Θ is an intrinsic property of the foliation of homogeneity, Ω is a property of the orthonormal basis, and therefore is not necessarily defined globally on Σ .

and provides the evolution equations for

$$\begin{aligned}\dot{n}_1 &= -n_1 (H + 4\sigma_+), \\ \dot{n}_2 &= -n_2 \left(H - 2\sigma_+ - 2\sqrt{3}\sigma_- \right), \\ \dot{n}_3 &= -n_3 \left(H - 2\sigma_+ + 2\sqrt{3}\sigma_- \right),\end{aligned}\tag{5.7}$$

where the over dot will denote the time derivative from now on. Therefore, the set of variables coming from the metric and the orthonormal basis are in general

$$\{H, n_1, n_2, n_3, \sigma_+, \sigma_-, \Omega_1, \Omega_2, \Omega_3\}.\tag{5.8}$$

To this set one should add the fluid variables

$$\{\rho, p, q_1, q_2, \pi_+ := \frac{1}{2}(\pi_{22} + \pi_{33}), \pi_- := \frac{1}{2\sqrt{3}}(\pi_{22} - \pi_{33}), \pi_{12}, \pi_{23}, \pi_{31}\},\tag{5.9}$$

and, in topo-GR, one should add the reference Ricci curvature and reference tilt variables

$$\{\bar{R}_{11}, \bar{R}_{22}, \bar{R}_{33}, \bar{R}_{12}, \bar{R}_{23}, \bar{R}_{31}, \bar{\beta}_1, \bar{\beta}_2, \bar{\beta}_3\}.\tag{5.10}$$

Using the expression of the Einstein equation with respect to these variables (cf., e.g., [3, 92]), the momentum constraint (4.19) and the evolution equation (4.21) for the shear become, respectively,

$$\epsilon_{ijk} n^{j\ell} \sigma_\ell^k = \kappa q_i + \bar{\beta}^j \bar{R}_{ji},\tag{5.11}$$

$$\dot{\sigma}_{ij} = -3H\sigma_{ij} + 2\epsilon_{k\ell(i}\Omega^k\sigma_{j)}^\ell - (R_{\langle ij\rangle} - \bar{R}_{\langle ij\rangle}) + \kappa\pi_{ij}.\tag{5.12}$$

Additionally, equations (4.22) and (4.23) present in topo-GR become, respectively,

$$\partial_t \left(\bar{\beta}^j \bar{R}_{ji} \right) = -4H\bar{\beta}^j \bar{R}_{ji} - \bar{\beta}^j \bar{R}_{jk} \sigma_i^k + \epsilon_{ij}^k \Omega^j \bar{\beta}^\ell \bar{R}_{\ell k} + \epsilon_{ijk} n^{j\ell} \bar{R}_\ell^k,\tag{5.13}$$

$$\dot{\bar{R}}_{ij} = -2H\bar{R}_{ij} - 2\bar{R}_{k(i}\sigma_{j)}^k + 2\epsilon_{k\ell(i}\left(\Omega^k\delta^{\ell m} - \bar{\beta}^k n^{\ell m}\right)\bar{R}_{j)m}.\tag{5.14}$$

The fluid variables (5.9) depend on the equation of state, which, in general, is not constrained by the choice of Bianchi metric. However, the reference curvature variables (5.10) highly depend on the choice of Bianchi metric through their dependence on the Thurston geometry on which Σ is modeled. In particular, we will show in the next sections that the off-diagonal components of $\overline{\mathbf{Ric}}$ are always zero for Bianchi type A (apart from Nil-geometries, i.e., Bianchi II models) and that the diagonal components are uniquely expressed as functions of n_1, n_2 , and n_3 (see Table 4). Therefore, for these models the only new dynamical variable coming from the reference Ricci curvature ${}^4\overline{\mathbf{Ric}}$ will be $\bar{\beta}$. We will show that for the \mathbb{E}^3 (for Bianchi I), \mathbb{H}^3 , $\mathbb{R} \times \mathbb{H}^2$, $\mathbb{R} \times \mathbb{S}^2$ geometries, the general solution imposes $\mathbf{q} = \mathbf{0} = \bar{\beta}$. For the other models, we will rather assume that relation, and we let the study of models with $\mathbf{q} \neq \mathbf{0} \neq \bar{\beta}$ for a future work.

Remark 5.3. The orthonormal approach is more often considered with variables normalized by the Hubble rate H , especially for a dynamical analysis of the equations. However, since we will discuss $H = 0$ solutions (see Section 5.11), we will consider the non-normalized variables.

Table 4: Spatial reference Ricci curvature given, for Bianchi metrics, in the orthonormal Milnor basis of the physical metric \mathbf{h} , and, for KS metrics, in canonical coordinates.

Maximal geometry	$\overline{\mathbf{Ric}}$	$\text{tr}_{\mathbf{h}}(\mathbf{Ric} - \overline{\mathbf{Ric}})$
\mathbb{E}^3	$\mathbf{0} = \mathbf{Ric}$	0
\mathbb{S}^3	$\frac{1}{2} \begin{pmatrix} n_2 n_3 & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & n_3 n_1 & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & n_1 n_2 \end{pmatrix}$	≤ 0
\mathbb{H}^3	$\begin{pmatrix} -2a^2 & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & -2a^2 & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & -2a^2 \end{pmatrix} = \mathbf{Ric}$	0
$\mathbb{R} \times \mathbb{H}^2$	$\begin{pmatrix} -4a^2 & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & -2a^2 & 2a^2 \\ 0 & 2a^2 & -2a^2 \end{pmatrix} = \mathbf{Ric}$	0
for $\text{div}_{\mathbf{h}} \overline{\mathbf{Ric}} = \mathbf{0}$		
Nil	$\frac{n_1^2}{2} \begin{pmatrix} r_2 r_3 & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & -r_2 & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & -r_3 \end{pmatrix},$ with $r_2, r_3 > 0$	$\leq 0; \quad r_2 = r_3$ indefinite; $r_2 \neq r_3$
Sol	$\begin{pmatrix} 2n_2 n_3 & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & 0 \end{pmatrix}$	≤ 0
$\widetilde{\text{SL}}(2, \mathbb{R})$	$2 \begin{pmatrix} n_2 n_3 & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & n_3 n_1 & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & n_1 n_2 \end{pmatrix}$	≤ 0
$\mathbb{R} \times \mathbb{S}^2$	$\text{diag}(1, \sin^2 x, 0) = \mathbf{Ric}$	0

In situations where the shear is transverse, i.e., $\text{div}_{\mathbf{h}} \boldsymbol{\sigma} = \mathbf{0}$, the shear is diagonal and $\Omega^i = 0$ [92], unless there are degeneracies in values of n_i . In that situation, off-diagonal components of σ_{ij} can still be non-zero, but they can be chosen to vanish using a spatial rotation freedom of the orthonormal Milnor basis $\{\mathbf{e}_i\}$. This also holds for setting Ω^i to zero [92]. Therefore, when the shear is transverse, the set of dynamical variables coming from the metric and the orthonormal basis reduces to

$$\{H, n_1, n_2, n_3, \sigma_+, \sigma_-\}. \quad (5.15)$$

In topo-GR, this situation holds when $\mathbf{q} = \mathbf{0} = \bar{\boldsymbol{\beta}}$, since $\text{div}_{\mathbf{h}} \boldsymbol{\sigma} = \mathbf{0}$ is imposed by the momentum constraint (4.19).

Let us emphasize an important point: because $\overline{\mathbf{Ric}}$ depends on the Thurston geometry on which Σ is modeled, and therefore depends on the Bianchi model, then, contrary to GR, the systems of equations as functions of the structure constants n_1, n_2 , and n_3 will not be the same among different Bianchi models in topo-GR.

5.3 \mathbb{E}^3 -geometry

For \mathbb{E}^3 -geometric manifolds, we have $\overline{\mathbf{Ric}} = 0$ by definition. Therefore, GR and topo-GR are equivalent for this type of topologies. Two different minimal metrics can be considered

on this geometry: B_I and B_{VII_0} metrics. For the sake of generality, we recall the systems of equations for both metrics.

The B_I metric does *not* allow for a tilt. The orthonormal Milnor basis is characterized by $n_1 = n_2 = n_3 = a = 0$, and the field equations are

$$1 = \Omega_\rho + \Omega_\sigma, \quad (5.16a)$$

$$\dot{H} = -(1+q)H^2, \quad (5.16b)$$

$$\dot{\sigma}_+ = -3H\sigma_+, \quad (5.16c)$$

$$\dot{\sigma}_- = -3H\sigma_-, \quad (5.16d)$$

where the cosmological parameters have the form

$$H^2\Omega_\sigma = \sigma_+^2 + \sigma_-^2, \quad H^2\Omega_{R-\bar{R}} = 0. \quad (5.17)$$

The shear parameter always evolves as $H^2\Omega_\sigma \propto 1/a^6$.

For the B_{VII_0} metric tilt is generally allowed, and the curvature is non-zero. The orthonormal Milnor basis is characterized by $n_1 = 0 = a$ and $n_2, n_3 > 0$. For non-tilted perfect fluids, the field equations are

$$1 = \Omega_\rho + \Omega_{R-\bar{R}} + \Omega_\sigma, \quad (5.18a)$$

$$\dot{H} = -(1+q)H^2, \quad (5.18b)$$

$$\dot{n}_2 = -n_2 \left(H - 2\sigma_+ - 2\sqrt{3}\sigma_- \right), \quad (5.18c)$$

$$\dot{n}_3 = -n_3 \left(H - 2\sigma_+ + 2\sqrt{3}\sigma_- \right), \quad (5.18d)$$

$$\dot{\sigma}_+ = -3H\sigma_+ - \frac{1}{6}(n_2 - n_3)^2, \quad (5.18e)$$

$$\dot{\sigma}_- = -3H\sigma_- + \frac{1}{2\sqrt{3}}(n_3^2 - n_2^2), \quad (5.18f)$$

where the cosmological parameters have the form

$$H^2\Omega_\sigma = \sigma_+^2 + \sigma_-^2, \quad H^2\Omega_{R-\bar{R}} = -\frac{1}{2}(n_2 - n_3)^2 \leq 0. \quad (5.19)$$

Remark 5.4. In the literature, Bianchi VII_0 models are often said to be “more general” than Bianchi I models (e.g., [64–66, 105–107]). This interpretation of generality is in the sense that Bianchi VII_0 models feature more parameters than Bianchi I models (c.f., e.g., [108]). However, this does not mean that the former includes the latter. Indeed, for a (spatial) B_{VII_0} metric to be a (spatial) B_I metric, one needs $n_2 = n_3$. However, the consequence for the spacetime metric is that $\sigma_- = 0$ (as can be seen from (5.18) above), enforcing the LRS. The LRS for B_I metrics is not a generic feature, but a subset of the set of solutions. Therefore, when considering a minimal metric on the \mathbb{E}^3 -geometry for constructing a cosmological model, two complementary and inequivalent choices are possible.

5.4 \mathbb{S}^3 -geometry

5.4.1 Reference curvature in the orthonormal basis

As shown in Section 2.5, for \mathbb{S}^3 -geometric manifolds, there exists a unit Milnor basis $\{\bar{\mathbf{e}}_i\}$ with algebra

$$(\bar{n}^{ij}) = \text{diag}(1, 1, 1), \quad \bar{a}_i = 0, \quad (5.20)$$

such that the maximal Ricci tensor is

$$\overline{\mathbf{Ric}} = \frac{1}{2} (\bar{\mathbf{e}}^1 \otimes \bar{\mathbf{e}}^1 + \bar{\mathbf{e}}^2 \otimes \bar{\mathbf{e}}^2 + \bar{\mathbf{e}}^3 \otimes \bar{\mathbf{e}}^3). \quad (5.21)$$

The (minimal) physical metric \mathbf{h} is a B_{IX} metric and its orthonormal Milnor basis $\{\mathbf{e}_i\}$ is characterized by

$$(n^{ij}) = \text{diag}(n_1, n_2, n_3), \quad a_i = 0, \quad (5.22)$$

where $n_i > 0$ for $i \in \{1, 2, 3\}$.

The (constant) transformation matrix Λ , with components defined in (5.2), is given by

$$\Lambda = \begin{pmatrix} \sqrt{n_2 n_3} & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & \sqrt{n_3 n_1} & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & \sqrt{n_1 n_2} \end{pmatrix} A, \quad (5.23)$$

where $A \in O(3)$ is an automorphism of the Lie algebra (5.20). This implies that the components of the reference Ricci tensor in the orthonormal basis $\{\mathbf{e}_i\}$ are

$$\overline{\mathbf{Ric}} = \frac{1}{2} (n_2 n_3 \mathbf{e}^1 \otimes \mathbf{e}^1 + n_3 n_1 \mathbf{e}^2 \otimes \mathbf{e}^2 + n_1 n_2 \mathbf{e}^3 \otimes \mathbf{e}^3). \quad (5.24)$$

The reason why $\overline{\mathbf{Ric}}$ is solely expressed as a function of n_i in the basis $\{\mathbf{e}_i\}$ is because its components (5.21) in the basis $\{\bar{\mathbf{e}}_i\}$ are invariant under the automorphisms of the Lie algebra (5.20), corresponding to 3-dimensional rotations.

Using relation (2.4) to express \mathbf{Ric} in the orthonormal basis and equation (5.24), we get

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbf{Ric} - \overline{\mathbf{Ric}} &= \frac{1}{2} (n_1^2 - n_2^2 - n_3^2 + n_2 n_3) \mathbf{e}^1 \otimes \mathbf{e}^1 \\ &\quad + \frac{1}{2} (n_2^2 - n_3^2 - n_1^2 + n_3 n_1) \mathbf{e}^2 \otimes \mathbf{e}^2 \\ &\quad + \frac{1}{2} (n_3^2 - n_1^2 - n_2^2 + n_1 n_2) \mathbf{e}^3 \otimes \mathbf{e}^3 \\ &= \mathbf{0}; \quad \text{iff } n_1 = n_2 = n_3. \end{aligned} \quad (5.25)$$

Consequently, we have

$$\begin{aligned} R - \bar{R} &= -\frac{1}{2} (n_1^2 + n_2^2 + n_3^2 - n_1 n_2 - n_1 n_3 - n_2 n_3) \\ &\leq 0, \quad \forall n_i > 0, \\ &= 0; \quad \text{iff } n_1 = n_2 = n_3. \end{aligned} \quad (5.26)$$

Therefore, in general $\mathbf{Ric} \neq \overline{\mathbf{Ric}}$, and the equality holds *if and only if* the Bianchi metric \mathbf{h} is isotropic, hence maximal.

5.4.2 Field equations

For Bianchi IX models $\text{div}_{\mathbf{h}} \boldsymbol{\sigma} \neq \mathbf{0}$, in general. This implies, through the momentum constraint (4.19), that a general LSH solution includes a fluid tilt \mathbf{q} , as well as a reference tilt $\bar{\boldsymbol{\beta}}$ for topo-GR. As mentioned before, we assume $\mathbf{q} = \mathbf{0} = \bar{\boldsymbol{\beta}}$ in the present work. Then, the momentum constraint (4.19) imposes $\text{div}_{\mathbf{h}} \boldsymbol{\sigma} = \mathbf{0}$.

Using the orthonormal approach variables (5.15) and the expression of $\overline{\mathbf{Ric}}$ in the orthonormal basis (5.24), the field equations of LSH solutions of topo-GR for non-tilted perfect fluid and non-tilted reference Ricci curvature, on a \mathbb{S}^3 -geometric manifold read

$$1 = \Omega_{\sigma} + \Omega_{R-\bar{R}} + \Omega_{\rho}, \quad (5.27a)$$

$$\dot{H} = -(1 + q)H^2, \quad (5.27b)$$

$$\dot{n}_1 = -n_1(H + 4\sigma_+), \quad (5.27c)$$

$$\dot{n}_2 = -n_2(H - 2\sigma_+ - 2\sqrt{3}\sigma_-), \quad (5.27d)$$

$$\dot{n}_3 = -n_3(H - 2\sigma_+ + 2\sqrt{3}\sigma_-), \quad (5.27e)$$

$$\dot{\sigma}_+ = -3H\sigma_+ + \frac{1}{12}(4n_1^2 - 2n_2^2 - 2n_3^2 + 2n_2n_3 - n_1n_2 - n_1n_3), \quad (5.27f)$$

$$\dot{\sigma}_- = -3H\sigma_- - \frac{1}{4\sqrt{3}}(n_3 - n_2)(n_1 - 2n_2 - 2n_3), \quad (5.27g)$$

where the cosmological parameters have the form

$$\begin{aligned} H^2\Omega_{\sigma} &= \sigma_+^2 + \sigma_-^2, \\ H^2\Omega_{R-\bar{R}} &= \frac{1}{12}(n_1^2 + n_2^2 + n_3^2 - n_1n_2 - n_1n_3 - n_2n_3) \geq 0. \end{aligned} \quad (5.28)$$

As for Bianchi IX models in GR, if the metric is shear-free ($\sigma_- = \sigma_+ = 0$) and isotropic ($n_1 = n_2 = n_3$) at a given time, in topo-GR it remains so for all times too.

5.5 \mathbb{H}^3 -geometry

Due to Mostow rigidity theorem [95], on a closed manifold modeled on the \mathbb{H}^3 -geometry, all locally homogeneous metrics are homothetic to a maximal metric, i.e., they differ by a constant conformal factor, up to diffeomorphisms.¹³ Additionally, if there exists a transitive subgroup $\hat{G}_3 \subset \text{Isom}(\tilde{\Sigma}, \mathbf{h})$ such that $\hat{G}_3 \subset \text{Isom}(\tilde{\Sigma}, \bar{\mathbf{h}})$ (\hat{G}_3 is either the B_V or the $B_{VII_{h>0}}$ group), then the two metrics are exactly homothetic (i.e., the diffeomorphism freedom disappears). This is the situation between the reference metric defining $\overline{\mathbf{Ric}}$ and the physical metric \mathbf{h} . Therefore, $\bar{\mathbf{h}} = \alpha\mathbf{h}$ with $\alpha > 0$. Consequently, we have $\overline{\mathbf{Ric}} = \mathbf{Ric}$. Moreover, as shown in Appendix A.1, any locally B_V or $B_{VII_{h>0}}$ -invariant vector field is zero and any locally B_V or $B_{VII_{h>0}}$ -invariant symmetric $(0, 2)$ -tensor is homothetic to the metric.

¹³The maximal metric is both a B_V and a $B_{VII_{h>0}}$ invariant metric as $B_V \subset G_{\mathbb{H}^3}$ and $B_{VII_0} \subset G_{\mathbb{H}^3}$. For $B_{VII_{h>0}}$, the orthonormal basis, characterized in general by $n_1 = 0$, $n_2 > 0$, $a > 0$, $n_3 = a^2/(h n_2) > 0$, is restricted by $n_2 = a/\sqrt{h}$ due to compactness.

Therefore, we always have $\bar{\beta} = \mathbf{0}$, $\sigma = \mathbf{0}$, $\mathbf{q} = \mathbf{0}$, and $\pi = \mathbf{0}$, implying $\Omega_\sigma = 0 = \Omega_{R-\bar{R}}$, and the general field equations are

$$1 = \Omega_\sigma + \Omega_\rho, \quad \dot{H} = -(1+q)H^2. \quad (5.29)$$

These are the general field equations for an LSH solution on a closed hyperbolic topology in topo-GR. As for GR, no tilt is allowed and they correspond to the hyperbolic homogeneous and isotropic solution of the theory, derived in [85]. The only difference to GR is that the scalar curvature is not anymore present in the Friedmann equation.

5.6 $\mathbb{R} \times \mathbb{H}^2$ -geometry

5.6.1 Reference curvature in the orthonormal basis

As shown in Section 2.5, for $\mathbb{R} \times \mathbb{H}^2$ -geometric manifolds, there exists a unit Milnor basis $\{\bar{e}_i\}$ with algebra

$$(\bar{n}^{ij}) = \text{diag}(0, 1, -1), \quad \bar{a}_i = (1, 0, 0), \quad (5.30)$$

such that the maximal Ricci tensor is

$$\overline{\mathbf{Ric}} = -4\bar{e}^1 \otimes \bar{e}^1 - 2(\bar{e}^2 - \bar{e}^3) \otimes (\bar{e}^2 - \bar{e}^3). \quad (5.31)$$

The (minimal) physical metric \mathbf{h} is a B_{III} metric and its orthonormal Milnor basis $\{e_i\}$ is characterized by

$$(n^{ij}) = \text{diag}(0, a, -a), \quad (a_i) = (a, 0, 0), \quad (5.32)$$

where $a > 0$. As detailed in Section 2.4, compactness imposes $n_2 = a$ for B_{III} metrics.

The (constant) transformation matrix Λ , with components defined in (5.2), is given by

$$\Lambda = \begin{pmatrix} a & c_1 & c_2 \\ 0 & c_4 & c_3 \\ 0 & c_3 & c_4 \end{pmatrix}, \quad (5.33)$$

where $c_i \in \mathbb{R}$ for $i = 1, 2, 3, 4$ with $(c_4)^2 \neq (c_3)^2$. This implies that the components of the Ricci tensor $\overline{\mathbf{Ric}}$ in the orthonormal basis $\{e_i\}$ are

$$(\bar{R}_{ij}) = \begin{pmatrix} -4a^2 - 2r^2 & -2rs & 2rs \\ -2rs & -2s^2 & 2s^2 \\ 2rs & 2s^2 & -2s^2 \end{pmatrix}, \quad (5.34)$$

where $r := c_1 - c_2$ and $s := c_4 - c_3 \neq 0$.

As shown in Appendix A.2, a locally homogeneous symmetric $(0, 2)$ -tensor on $\mathbb{R} \times \mathbb{H}^2$ -geometric manifolds is restricted by the form (A.2) in a basis with algebra (5.32). This restriction imposes $r = 0$ and $s^2 = a^2$, leading to

$$\overline{\mathbf{Ric}} = -a^2 [4\bar{e}^1 \otimes \bar{e}^1 + 2(\bar{e}^2 - \bar{e}^3) \otimes (\bar{e}^2 - \bar{e}^3)]. \quad (5.35)$$

Consequently, we have $\overline{\mathbf{Ric}} = \mathbf{Ric}$.

5.6.2 Field equations

As shown in Appendix A.2, any locally homogeneous vector field is in the kernel of the Ricci tensor. Therefore, we always have $\overline{\mathbf{Ric}}(\boldsymbol{\beta}, \cdot) = \mathbf{0}$. Additionally, any locally homogeneous symmetric $(0, 2)$ -tensor field is transverse, implying $\text{div}_{\mathbf{h}} \boldsymbol{\sigma} = \mathbf{0}$. Along with the momentum constraint (4.19), this imposes $\mathbf{q} = \mathbf{0}$. Therefore, as for GR, LSH solutions on $\mathbb{R} \times \mathbb{H}^2$ -geometric manifolds do not allow for tilted fluids. No reference tilt is allowed either. Furthermore, the shear is restricted to the form (A.2) in the orthonormal basis $\{\mathbf{e}_i\}$ and therefore depends only on one variable. The consequence is that the physical metric can be written in the simple form (resembling that of Kantowski–Sachs by replacing $\sin^2 x$ by $\sinh^2 x$, representing the hyperbolic fibers)

$$\mathbf{h} = A^2(t) (\mathbf{d}x \otimes \mathbf{d}x + \sinh^2 x \mathbf{d}y \otimes \mathbf{d}y) + B^2(t) \mathbf{d}z \otimes \mathbf{d}z, \quad (5.36)$$

implying that the (reference) Ricci curvature have the form

$$\overline{\mathbf{Ric}} = \mathbf{Ric} = -(\mathbf{d}x \otimes \mathbf{d}x + \sinh^2 x \mathbf{d}y \otimes \mathbf{d}y). \quad (5.37)$$

Then, the field equations of a general LSH solution of topo-GR with perfect fluid on a geometric manifold modeled on $\mathbb{R} \times \mathbb{H}^2$ are

$$1 = \Omega_\sigma + \Omega_\rho, \quad (5.38a)$$

$$\dot{H} = -(1 + q)H^2, \quad (5.38b)$$

$$\dot{\sigma}^i_j = -3H\sigma^i_j, \quad (5.38c)$$

with

$$H = 4\frac{\dot{A}}{A} + 2\frac{\dot{B}}{B}, \quad (\sigma^i_j) = \frac{2}{3} \left(\frac{\dot{A}}{A} - \frac{\dot{B}}{B} \right) \text{diag}(1, 1, -2), \quad H^2\Omega_\sigma = \frac{4}{9} \left(\frac{\dot{A}}{A} - \frac{\dot{B}}{B} \right)^2. \quad (5.39)$$

In particular, we have $\Omega_{R-\bar{R}} = 0$. These equations are similar to those in GR, with the difference that the spatial curvature is not present anymore. As a consequence, the shear parameter always evolves as $H^2\Omega_\sigma \propto 1/a^6$, similar to B_I metrics.

5.7 Nil-geometry

5.7.1 Reference curvature in the orthonormal basis

As shown in Section 2.5, for Nil-geometric manifolds, there exists a unit Milnor basis $\{\bar{\mathbf{e}}_i\}$ with algebra

$$(\bar{n}^{ij}) = \text{diag}(1, 0, 0), \quad \bar{a}_i = 0, \quad (5.40)$$

such that the maximal Ricci tensor is

$$\overline{\mathbf{Ric}} = \frac{1}{2} (\bar{\mathbf{e}}^1 \otimes \bar{\mathbf{e}}^1 - \bar{\mathbf{e}}^2 \otimes \bar{\mathbf{e}}^2 - \bar{\mathbf{e}}^3 \otimes \bar{\mathbf{e}}^3). \quad (5.41)$$

This tensor is a Lorentzian metric, and we can compute its Ricci tensor, leading to $\mathbf{Ric}[\mathbf{Ric}[\bar{\mathbf{h}}]] \propto \bar{\mathbf{h}}$. This implies that $\text{Isom}(\tilde{\Sigma}, \bar{\mathbf{h}}) = \text{Aff}(\tilde{\Sigma}, \bar{\mathbf{h}}) = \text{Ric}(\tilde{\Sigma}, \bar{\mathbf{h}}) \cong G_{\text{Nil}}$.

The (minimal) physical metric \mathbf{h} is a B_{II} metric and its orthonormal Milnor basis $\{\mathbf{e}_i\}$ is characterized by

$$(n^{ij}) = \text{diag}(n_1, 0, 0), \quad a_i = 0, \quad (5.42)$$

with $n_1 > 0$. The basis $\{\mathbf{e}_i\}$ is unique up to a rotation around \mathbf{e}_1 .

The transformation matrix Λ between $\{\bar{\mathbf{e}}_i\}$ and $\{\mathbf{e}_i\}$ can be put in the form

$$\Lambda = \begin{pmatrix} n_1 & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & n_1 & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & n_1 \end{pmatrix} \begin{pmatrix} a_2 a_3 - c_3 d_3 & 0 & 0 \\ d_1 & a_2 & c_3 \\ d_2 & d_3 & a_3 \end{pmatrix}, \quad (5.43)$$

where $a_2, a_3, c_3, d_3, d_1, d_2 \in \mathbb{R}$, with $a_2 a_3 - c_3 d_3 \neq 0$. The second matrix in (5.43) is an automorphism of the Lie algebra (5.40). Unfortunately, compared to the other Bianchi type A models, the components of the reference Ricci tensor (5.41) are not invariant under the automorphisms of the unit Milnor basis. The consequence is that the components of $\overline{\mathbf{Ric}}$ in the orthonormal basis $\{\mathbf{e}_i\}$ depend on 6 free-parameters (a_2, a_3, c_3, d_3, d_1 and d_2), and not solely on the commutation coefficient n_1 of the orthonormal basis. This is a very odd result, as it is different from all the other models. We discuss this in more details in Section 6 below.

To reduce the degrees of freedom, we can use at this stage the field equation (4.14) along with $\bar{\beta} = \mathbf{0}$ (which we impose), resulting in $\text{div}_{\mathbf{h}} \overline{\mathbf{Ric}} = \mathbf{0}$. This imposes $d_1 = 0 = d_2$. Then using the rotation freedom around \mathbf{e}_1 in the definition of the orthonormal basis, we can further set $\bar{R}_{23} = 0 = \bar{R}_{32}$ by taking $d_3 = -a_3 c_3 / a_2$, which leads to

$$\overline{\mathbf{Ric}} = \frac{n_1^2}{2} (r_2 r_3 \bar{\mathbf{e}}^1 \otimes \bar{\mathbf{e}}^1 - r_2 \bar{\mathbf{e}}^2 \otimes \bar{\mathbf{e}}^2 - r_3 \bar{\mathbf{e}}^3 \otimes \bar{\mathbf{e}}^3), \quad (5.44)$$

where $r_2 := a_2^2 + c_3^2 > 0$ and $r_3 := (a_3/a_2)^2 (a_2^2 + c_3^2) > 0$ are free parameters. Then we get

$$\mathbf{Ric} - \overline{\mathbf{Ric}} = \frac{n_1^2}{2} [(1 - r_2 r_3) \bar{\mathbf{e}}^1 \otimes \bar{\mathbf{e}}^1 - (1 - r_2) \bar{\mathbf{e}}^2 \otimes \bar{\mathbf{e}}^2 - (1 - r_3) \bar{\mathbf{e}}^3 \otimes \bar{\mathbf{e}}^3], \quad (5.45)$$

and

$$\text{tr}_{\mathbf{h}} (\mathbf{Ric} - \overline{\mathbf{Ric}}) = -\frac{n_1^2}{2} (r_2 - 1) (r_3 - 1). \quad (5.46)$$

Remark 5.5. Since \mathbf{h} is maximal, we have $\text{Isom}(\tilde{\Sigma}, \mathbf{h}) \cong G_{\text{Nil}}$. However, for $r_2 \neq r_3$, we only have $\text{Isom}(\tilde{\Sigma}, \mathbf{h}) \cong \text{Sym}(\tilde{\Sigma}, \overline{\mathbf{Ric}})$, and $\text{Isom}(\tilde{\Sigma}, \mathbf{h}) = \text{Sym}(\tilde{\Sigma}, \overline{\mathbf{Ric}})$ holds if and only if $r_2 = r_3$ (see Proposition A.3 in Appendix A.3). Additionally, $\mathbf{Ric} = \overline{\mathbf{Ric}}$ if and only if $r_2 = r_3 = 1$. Therefore, the Nil-geometry is the only geometry in which, when \mathbf{h} is maximal, $\text{Isom}(\tilde{\Sigma}, \mathbf{h}) \subseteq \text{Sym}(\tilde{\Sigma}, \overline{\mathbf{Ric}})$ and $\mathbf{Ric} = \overline{\mathbf{Ric}}$ are not guaranteed. We discuss this in Section 6.

5.7.2 Field equations: general case

Using the momentum constraint (4.11) with the assumption $\mathbf{q} = \mathbf{0} = \bar{\boldsymbol{\beta}}$, we get $\Omega^2 = 0 = \Omega^3$. However, Ω^1 is not zero in general. And since we already used the freedom of rotation around \mathbf{e}_1 in the orthonormal basis to set $\bar{R}_{23} = 0$, there is no more freedom left to set $\Omega^1 = 0$ nor $\sigma_{23} = 0$. The field equation (4.22), written in the orthonormal basis, leads to

$$\sigma_{23} = \frac{r_2 - r_3}{r_2 + r_3} \Omega^1. \quad (5.47)$$

Therefore, the set of dynamical variables are

$$\{H, n_1, \sigma_+, \sigma_-, \sigma_{23}, r_1, r_2, \rho, p\}. \quad (5.48)$$

The field equations are

$$1 = \Omega_\sigma + \Omega_{R-\bar{R}} + \Omega_\rho, \quad (5.49a)$$

$$\dot{H} = -(1 + q)H^2, \quad (5.49b)$$

$$\dot{n}_1 = -n_1(H + 4\sigma_+), \quad (5.49c)$$

$$\dot{\sigma}_+ = -3H\sigma_+ - \frac{n_1^2}{12}(2r_2r_3 + r_2 + r_3 - 4), \quad (5.49d)$$

$$(r_2 - r_3)\dot{\sigma}_- = -3H(r_2 - r_3)\sigma_- - \frac{n_1^2}{4\sqrt{3}}(r_2 - r_3)^2 + \frac{2}{\sqrt{3}}(r_2 + r_3)\sigma_{23}^2, \quad (5.49e)$$

$$(r_2 - r_3)\dot{\sigma}_{23} = -3H(r_2 - r_3)\sigma_{23} + 2\sqrt{3}(r_2 + r_3)\sigma_{23}\sigma_-, \quad (5.49f)$$

$$\dot{r}_2 = 2r_2(3\sigma_+ - \sqrt{3}\sigma_-), \quad (5.49g)$$

$$\dot{r}_3 = 2r_3(3\sigma_+ + \sqrt{3}\sigma_-), \quad (5.49h)$$

where by definition $r_2, r_3 > 0$, and where the cosmological parameters have the form

$$H^2\Omega_\sigma = \sigma_+^2 + \sigma_-^2 + \frac{\sigma_{23}^2}{9}, \quad H^2\Omega_{R-\bar{R}} = \frac{n_1^2}{12}(r_2 - 1)(r_3 - 1). \quad (5.50)$$

Equations (5.49g) and (5.49h) arise from the evolution equation (5.14) for the reference curvature. The Nil-geometry is the only model in which that equation is not redundant with the evolution equations for the structure constant n_i , coming from the Jacobi identities. The reason for this is that the expression (5.44) of $\bar{\mathbf{Ric}}$ in the orthonormal basis features additional parameters in addition to n_1 .

5.7.3 Field equations: LRS case

A Bianchi II spacetime is LRS when $\text{Isom}(\tilde{\Sigma}, \mathbf{h}) \subseteq \text{Sym}(\tilde{\Sigma}, \boldsymbol{\sigma})$, i.e., the fourth Killing vector of the metric is a shear collineation. As shown in Appendix A.3 with Proposition A.3, this happens if and only if there exists an orthonormal basis with Lie algebra (5.42) for which $\sigma_- = \sigma_{12} = \sigma_{13} = \sigma_{23} = 0$.¹⁴ In that case, the field equation (5.49e) and the relation (5.47) imply $r_2 = r_3$.

¹⁴For this reason, LRS Bianchi II spacetimes are necessarily non-tilted (see, e.g., [49, 50]).

As shown in Remark 5.5, if we assume $\text{Isom}(\tilde{\Sigma}, \mathbf{h}) \subseteq \text{Sym}(\tilde{\Sigma}, \overline{\mathbf{Ric}})$, we get $r_2 = r_3$. Then, from (5.47) it follows that $\sigma_{23} = 0$, and the field equations (5.49g) and (5.49h) impose $\sigma_- = 0$. Therefore, LRS is equivalent as assuming $\text{Isom}(\tilde{\Sigma}, \mathbf{h}) \subseteq \text{Sym}(\tilde{\Sigma}, \overline{\mathbf{Ric}})$.

For an LRS Bianchi II spacetime, the system of equations is

$$1 = \Omega_\sigma + \Omega_{R-\bar{R}} + \Omega_\rho, \quad (5.51a)$$

$$\dot{H} = -(1+q)H^2, \quad (5.51b)$$

$$\dot{n}_1 = -n_1(H + 4\sigma_+), \quad (5.51c)$$

$$\dot{\sigma}_+ = -3H\sigma_+ - \frac{n_1^2}{6}(r_2 + 2)(r_2 - 1), \quad (5.51d)$$

$$\dot{r}_2 = 6r_2\sigma_+, \quad (5.51e)$$

where, by definition, $r_2 > 0$, and the cosmological parameters have the form

$$H^2\Omega_\sigma = \sigma_+^2, \quad H^2\Omega_{R-\bar{R}} = \frac{n_1^2}{12}(r_2 - 1)^2 \geq 0. \quad (5.52)$$

Remark 5.6. As shown in [49, 50], some Nil-topologies can impose the LRS condition. This is the case for the topological spaces named $T^3(n)/Z_{k=3,4,5}$ in these papers.

5.8 Sol-geometry

5.8.1 Reference curvature in the orthonormal basis

As shown in Section 2.5, for Sol-geometric manifolds, there exists a unit Milnor basis $\{\bar{e}_i\}$ with algebra

$$(\bar{n}^{ij}) = \text{diag}(0, 1, -1), \quad \bar{a}_i = 0, \quad (5.53)$$

such that the maximal Ricci tensor is

$$\overline{\mathbf{Ric}} = -2\bar{e}^1 \otimes \bar{e}^1. \quad (5.54)$$

The (minimal) physical metric \mathbf{h} is a B_{VI_0} metric and its orthonormal Milnor basis $\{e_i\}$ is characterized by

$$(n^{ij}) = \text{diag}(0, n_2, n_3), \quad a_i = 0; \quad \text{where } n_2 > 0 \text{ and } n_3 < 0. \quad (5.55)$$

When $n_2 \neq -n_3$, we have $\text{Isom}(\tilde{\Sigma}, \bar{\mathbf{h}}) = \text{Sol} \rtimes D_2$ and the metric is maximal if and only if $n_2 = -n_3$. This means that a (minimal) B_{VI_0} metric and a maximal Sol metric have the same number of continuous symmetries, and their isometry group differ only by discrete symmetries. However, $\overline{\mathbf{Ric}}$ has more continuous symmetries than \mathbf{Ric} for $n_2 \neq -n_3$, as $\dim(\text{Sym}(\tilde{\Sigma}, \mathbf{Ric})) = 3$ for $n_2 \neq n_3$ while $\dim(\text{Sym}(\tilde{\Sigma}, \overline{\mathbf{Ric}})) = \infty$ (see Appendix A.4).

The (constant) transformation matrix Λ between $\{\bar{e}_i\}$ and $\{e_i\}$, with components defined in (5.2), can be put in the form

$$\Lambda = \begin{pmatrix} \sqrt{-n_2 n_3} & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & \sqrt{-n_3} & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & \sqrt{n_2} \end{pmatrix} \begin{pmatrix} s & c_1 & c_2 \\ 0 & c_4 & c_3 \\ 0 & s c_3 & s c_4 \end{pmatrix}, \quad (5.56)$$

where $c_i \in \mathbb{R}$ for $i = 1, 2, 3, 4$, and $s = \pm 1$ with $(c_4)^2 \neq (c_3)^2$. The second matrix in (5.56) is an automorphism of the Lie algebra (5.53). Because the components of $\overline{\mathbf{Ric}}$ in the $\{\bar{\mathbf{e}}_i\}$ basis in (5.54) are invariant by this automorphism, in the orthonormal basis $\{\mathbf{e}_i\}$ we get

$$\overline{\mathbf{Ric}} = 2 n_2 n_3 \mathbf{e}^1 \otimes \mathbf{e}^1. \quad (5.57)$$

Consequently, we have

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbf{Ric} - \overline{\mathbf{Ric}} &= -\frac{1}{2} (n_2 + n_3)^2 \mathbf{e}^1 \otimes \mathbf{e}^1 + \frac{1}{2} (n_2^2 - n_3^2) \mathbf{e}^2 \otimes \mathbf{e}^2 + \frac{1}{2} (n_2^2 - n_3^2) \mathbf{e}^3 \otimes \mathbf{e}^3 \\ &= \mathbf{0}; \quad \text{iff } n_2 = -n_3, \end{aligned} \quad (5.58)$$

leading to

$$\begin{aligned} \text{tr}_{\mathbf{h}} (\mathbf{Ric} - \overline{\mathbf{Ric}}) &= -\frac{1}{2} (n_2 + n_3)^2 \\ &\leq 0; \quad \forall n_2 > 0 \text{ and } n_3 < 0 \\ &= 0; \quad \text{iff } n_2 = -n_3. \end{aligned} \quad (5.59)$$

Therefore, in general $\mathbf{Ric} \neq \overline{\mathbf{Ric}}$, and the equality holds if and only if \mathbf{h} is maximal.

5.8.2 Field equations

Similar to the Bianchi IX case, tilt is generally allowed in Bianchi VI₀ models. Therefore, the assumption $\mathbf{q} = \mathbf{0} = \bar{\boldsymbol{\beta}}$ we take in this paper is a restriction in this model.

Using the orthonormal approach variables (5.15) and the expression of $\overline{\mathbf{Ric}}$ in the orthonormal basis (5.57), the field equations of LSH solutions of topo-GR for non-tilted perfect fluid and non-tilted reference Ricci curvature, on a Sol-geometric manifold read

$$1 = \Omega_\sigma + \Omega_{R-\bar{R}} + \Omega_\rho, \quad (5.60a)$$

$$\dot{H} = -(1 + q)H^2, \quad (5.60b)$$

$$\dot{n}_2 = -n_2 \left(H - 2\sigma_+ - 2\sqrt{3}\sigma_- \right), \quad (5.60c)$$

$$\dot{n}_3 = -n_3 \left(H - 2\sigma_+ + 2\sqrt{3}\sigma_- \right), \quad (5.60d)$$

$$\dot{\sigma}_+ = -3H\sigma_+ - \frac{1}{6} (n_2 + n_3)^2, \quad (5.60e)$$

$$\dot{\sigma}_- = -3H\sigma_- - \frac{1}{2\sqrt{3}} (n_2^2 - n_3^2). \quad (5.60f)$$

The cosmological parameters take the form

$$H^2 \Omega_\sigma = \sigma_+^2 + \sigma_-^2, \quad H^2 \Omega_{R-\bar{R}} = \frac{1}{12} (n_2 + n_3)^2 \geq 0. \quad (5.61)$$

5.9 $\widetilde{\text{SL}}(2, \mathbb{R})$ -geometry

5.9.1 Reference curvature in the orthonormal basis

As shown in Section 2.5, for $\widetilde{\text{SL}}(2, \mathbb{R})$ -geometric manifolds, there exists a unit Milnor basis $\{\bar{\mathbf{e}}_i\}$ with algebra

$$(\bar{n}^{ij}) = \text{diag}(-1, 1, 1), \quad \bar{a}_i = 0, \quad (5.62)$$

such that the maximal Ricci tensor is

$$\overline{\mathbf{Ric}} = 2 (\bar{\mathbf{e}}^1 \otimes \bar{\mathbf{e}}^1 - \bar{\mathbf{e}}^2 \otimes \bar{\mathbf{e}}^2 - \bar{\mathbf{e}}^3 \otimes \bar{\mathbf{e}}^3). \quad (5.63)$$

The (minimal) physical metric \mathbf{h} is a B_{VIII} metric (Bianchi III models on $\widetilde{\text{SL}}(2, \mathbb{R})$ are subcases of Bianchi VIII models, see Section 2.4) and its orthonormal Milnor basis $\{\mathbf{e}_i\}$ is characterized by

$$(n^{ij}) = \text{diag}(n_1, n_2, n_3), \quad a_i = 0; \quad n_2, n_3 > 0 \text{ and } n_1 < 0. \quad (5.64)$$

The metric is maximal if and only if $n_2 = n_3$.

The (constant) transformation matrix Λ between $\{\bar{\mathbf{e}}_i\}$ and $\{\mathbf{e}_i\}$ can be put in the form

$$\Lambda = \begin{pmatrix} \sqrt{n_2 n_3} & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & \sqrt{-n_3 n_1} & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & \sqrt{-n_1 n_2} \end{pmatrix} A, \quad (5.65)$$

where A is an automorphism of the Lie algebra (5.65). The components (5.63) of the reference Ricci tensor are invariant under this automorphism. Therefore, in the orthonormal basis it reads

$$\overline{\mathbf{Ric}} = 2 (n_2 n_3 \mathbf{e}^1 \otimes \mathbf{e}^1 + n_3 n_1 \mathbf{e}^2 \otimes \mathbf{e}^2 + n_1 n_2 \mathbf{e}^3 \otimes \mathbf{e}^3). \quad (5.66)$$

Consequently, we have

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbf{Ric} - \overline{\mathbf{Ric}} &= \frac{(n_1 + n_2 + n_3)}{2} [(n_1 - n_2 - n_3) \mathbf{e}^1 \otimes \mathbf{e}^1 + (n_2 - n_3 - n_1) \mathbf{e}^2 \otimes \mathbf{e}^2 \\ &\quad + (n_3 - n_1 - n_2) \mathbf{e}^3 \otimes \mathbf{e}^3] \\ &= \mathbf{0}; \quad \text{iff } n_1 + n_2 + n_3 = 0, \end{aligned} \quad (5.67)$$

leading to

$$\begin{aligned} \text{tr}_{\mathbf{h}} (\mathbf{Ric} - \overline{\mathbf{Ric}}) &= -\frac{1}{2} (n_1 + n_2 + n_3)^2 \\ &\leq 0, \\ &= 0; \quad \text{iff } n_1 + n_2 + n_3 = 0. \end{aligned} \quad (5.68)$$

Therefore, in general $\mathbf{Ric} \neq \overline{\mathbf{Ric}}$. However, even if \mathbf{h} is maximal the equality does not necessarily hold, and reversely \mathbf{h} does not need to be maximal for the equality to hold. This is the only geometry for which this happens.

5.9.2 Field equations

Similar to the Bianchi IX case, tilt is generally allowed in Bianchi VIII models. Therefore, the assumption $\mathbf{q} = \mathbf{0} = \bar{\beta}$ we take in this paper is a restriction in this model.

Using the orthonormal approach variables (5.15) and the expression of $\bar{\mathbf{Ric}}$ in the orthonormal basis (5.66), the field equations of LSH solutions of topo-GR for non-tilted perfect fluid and non-tilted reference Ricci curvature on a $\widetilde{\text{SL}}(2, \mathbb{R})$ -geometric manifold read

$$1 = \Omega_\sigma + \Omega_{R-\bar{R}} + \Omega_\rho, \quad (5.69a)$$

$$\dot{H} = -(1 + q)H^2, \quad (5.69b)$$

$$\dot{n}_1 = -n_1(H + 4\sigma_+), \quad (5.69c)$$

$$\dot{n}_2 = -n_2(H - 2\sigma_+ - 2\sqrt{3}\sigma_-), \quad (5.69d)$$

$$\dot{n}_3 = -n_3(H - 2\sigma_+ + 2\sqrt{3}\sigma_-), \quad (5.69e)$$

$$\dot{\sigma}_+ = -3H\sigma_+ + \frac{1}{6}(n_1 + n_2 + n_3)(2n_1 - n_2 - n_3), \quad (5.69f)$$

$$\dot{\sigma}_- = -3H\sigma_- + \frac{1}{2\sqrt{3}}(n_1 + n_2 + n_3)(n_3 - n_2). \quad (5.69g)$$

The cosmological parameters take the form

$$H^2\Omega_\sigma = \sigma_+^2 + \sigma_-^2, \quad H^2\Omega_{R-\bar{R}} = \frac{1}{12}(n_1 + n_2 + n_3)^2 \geq 0. \quad (5.70)$$

5.10 $\mathbb{R} \times \mathbb{S}^2$ -geometry

5.10.1 Reference curvature in canonical coordinates

As shown in Section 2.5, for $\mathbb{R} \times \mathbb{S}^2$ -geometric manifolds, there exists a coordinate system $\{\bar{x}, \bar{y}, \bar{z}\}$ such that the maximal Ricci tensor is

$$\mathbf{Ric} = d\bar{x} \otimes d\bar{x} + \sin^2 \bar{x} d\bar{y} \otimes d\bar{y}. \quad (5.71)$$

The (minimal) physical metric \mathbf{h} is a Kantowski–Sachs metric and there exists a coordinate system $\{x, y, z\}$ such that

$$\mathbf{h} = A_1(dx \otimes dx + \sin^2 x dy \otimes dy) + A_2 dz \otimes dz, \quad (5.72)$$

where $A_1, A_2 > 0$.

In general, $\{\bar{x}, \bar{y}, \bar{z}\}$ and $\{x, y, z\}$ can be different coordinate systems. However, because an isometry of the physical metric is necessarily a symmetry of $\bar{\mathbf{Ric}}$ as implied by the condition (5.1) (the minimal group for $\mathbb{R} \times \mathbb{S}^2$ -geometries corresponds to the maximal group and is therefore the isometry group of \mathbf{h}), then the two coordinate systems must coincide (see Appendix A.6). Consequently, we have $\mathbf{Ric} = \bar{\mathbf{Ric}}$.

A similar proof for the $\mathbb{R} \times \mathbb{H}^2$ -geometry could have been conducted.

5.10.2 Field equations

Similar to what was presented in Section 5.6.2 for the $\mathbb{R} \times \mathbb{H}^2$ -geometry, using the properties derived in Appendix A.6 and the momentum constraint (4.19), we obtain $\bar{\mathbf{Ric}}(\bar{\beta}, \cdot) = \mathbf{0}$, $\text{div}_h \sigma = \mathbf{0}$, and $\mathbf{q} = \mathbf{0}$. Therefore, as for GR, LSH solutions on $\mathbb{R} \times \mathbb{S}^2$ -geometric manifolds do not allow for tilted fluids. No reference tilt is allowed either. As a result, the field equations are equivalent to the ones for $\mathbb{R} \times \mathbb{H}^2$ -geometric manifolds, corresponding to (5.38). Therefore, LSH solutions on $\mathbb{R} \times \mathbb{H}^2$ and $\mathbb{R} \times \mathbb{S}^2$ -geometric manifolds are dynamically equivalent and only differ by their spatial geometry.

5.11 General results revisited

In Section 4.4, we derived general results for LSH solutions without specifying the precise model. We discussed, in particular, shear-free and static vacuum solutions, and conditions for late-time isotropization. The computation of the field equations for (non-tilted) perfect fluids in Section 5.3 to Section 5.10 for each model allows us to refine these results. Notably, for some models, these equations allowed us to determine the generic behavior of the shear parameter Ω_σ , the sign of the modified curvature parameter $\Omega_{R-\bar{R}}$ and whether or not tilt is allowed. We summarize this in Table 5. Additionally, these field equations allowed us to obtain a sufficient condition for an LSH solution of topo-GR to be static and vacuum:

Proposition 5.7. *Consider an LSH solution of topo-GR with a non-tilted perfect fluid fulfilling the weak energy condition. For all geometries apart from the non-LRS Bianchi II models in the Nil-geometry, if $H = 0$ at a given time t_0 , then $H = 0$, $\sigma = \mathbf{0}$, $\mathbf{Ric} = \bar{\mathbf{Ric}}$, and $\rho = 0$ hold for all time t , and the solution is a static vacuum solution.*

This result shows that bounces and recollapses are *not* possible in topo-GR for non-tilted perfect fluids with weak energy condition for all geometries except for the non-LRS Bianchi II model in the Nil-geometry.

The isotropization Theorem 4.3 requires $R - \bar{R} \leq 0$ to hold. As shown in Section 5.3 to Section 5.10, and summarized in Table 4, this is the case for all geometries apart from the non-LRS Nil-geometry, leading the following proposition.

Proposition 5.8. *Consider an LSH solution of topo-GR with a positive cosmological constant, matter satisfying the dominant and strong energy conditions, and $H > 0$ at an initial time t_0 . Then for all geometries apart from the non-LRS Bianchi II models in the Nil-geometry, we have $\sigma \xrightarrow{t \rightarrow \infty} \mathbf{0}$. Moreover, for non-tilted perfect fluids, we have $\mathbf{Ric} - \bar{\mathbf{Ric}} \xrightarrow{t \rightarrow \infty} \mathbf{0}$.*

Therefore, unless we consider a non-LRS Bianchi II model, regardless of the initial conditions, a sufficiently long phase of inflation guaranties, within topo-GR, that the Universe becomes shear-free at late-times. This holds in particular for the two geometries that allow for positive scalar curvature for the class of LSH solutions, i.e., \mathbb{S}^3 and $\mathbb{R} \times \mathbb{S}^2$ -geometries, hence contrasting with GR. However, this isotropization is not ensured for non-LRS Bianchi II models. We discuss this result in Section 6.

Table 5: Ω -parameters and tilt of LSH solutions of topo-GR. A “?” refers to a more complex dynamical behavior of the quantity, which we intend to study in future works.

Maximal geometry	Minimal metric	$H^2\Omega_\sigma$	$H^2\Omega_{R-\bar{R}}$	Allows tilt?
\mathbb{E}^3	$\begin{cases} \text{B}_\text{I} \\ \text{B}_{\text{VII}_0} \end{cases}$	$\begin{cases} \propto 1/a^6 \\ ? \end{cases}$	$\begin{cases} 0 \\ \geq 0 \end{cases}$	$\begin{cases} \text{No} \\ \text{Yes} \end{cases}$
\mathbb{S}^3	B_{IX}	?	≥ 0	Yes
\mathbb{H}^3	B_V (or $\text{B}_{\text{VII}_{h>0}}$)	0	0	No
$\mathbb{R} \times \mathbb{H}^2$	B_{III}	$\propto 1/a^6$	0	No
Sol	B_{VI_0}	?	≥ 0	Yes
Nil	B_{II}	?	$\begin{cases} \text{LRS} : \geq 0 \\ \text{non-LRS} : \text{indefinite} \end{cases}$	$\begin{cases} \text{LRS} : \text{No} \\ \text{non-LRS} : \text{Yes} \end{cases}$
$\widetilde{\text{SL}}(2, \mathbb{R})$	B_{VIII} (or B_{III})	?	≥ 0	Yes
$\mathbb{R} \times \mathbb{S}^2$	KS	$\propto 1/a^6$	0	No

Note that for geometries where $R \leq 0$ for which Wald’s theorem holds in GR, due to the unknown sign of \bar{R} , it was *a priori* not guaranteed that $R - \bar{R} \leq 0$ would still hold for these geometries. In this sense, it is quite remarkable that Wald’s theorem is still valid in topo-GR for almost all cases.

6 To what extent is the result for the Nil-geometry peculiar?

Because $\text{tr}_{\mathbf{h}}(\mathbf{Ric} - \overline{\mathbf{Ric}}) \leq 0$ fails for a general LSH solution on the Nil-geometry, the isotropization theorem does not apply for that geometry, unless the LRS condition is assumed. This is a very peculiar and unexpected result. Indeed, the Nil-geometry is, algebraically speaking, one of the simplest geometry, and, in GR, LSH solutions on this geometry (i.e., Bianchi II solutions) are, dynamically speaking, the second simplest LSH solutions after the Bianchi I solutions. In particular, Wald’s theorem holds for Bianchi II solutions in GR. In this sense, we did not expect any fundamental difference for the Bianchi II solutions between the two theories. Moreover, four purely geometric properties make LSH solutions of topo-GR on the Nil-geometry even more peculiar:

- (i) for all geometries apart from the non-LRS Nil-geometry, when the metric \mathbf{h} has more local isometries than that imposed by the minimal group, these isometries are always symmetries of $\overline{\mathbf{Ric}}$, i.e., $\text{Isom}(\tilde{\Sigma}, \mathbf{h}) \subseteq \text{Sym}(\tilde{\Sigma}, \overline{\mathbf{Ric}})$ always holds. For the

Nil-geometry, this is not the case, as the fourth Killing vector field of the metric is not necessarily a collineation vector field for $\overline{\mathbf{Ric}}$, unless $r_2 = r_3$ in (5.44).

- (ii) for all geometries except for the Nil-geometry, when \mathbf{Ric} is maximal, then $\mathbf{Ric} = \overline{\mathbf{Ric}}$. For the $\{\mathbb{E}^3, \mathbb{H}^3, \mathbb{R} \times \mathbb{H}^2, \mathbb{R} \times \mathbb{S}^2\}$ -geometries this is trivially obtained. For the $\{\mathbb{S}^3, \mathbb{S}^2 \times \mathbb{I}, \widetilde{\mathrm{SL}}(2, \mathbb{R})\}$ -geometries, maximality of \mathbf{Ric} is achieved when $n_1 = n_2 = n_3$, $n_2 = -n_3$ and $n_1 + n_2 + n_3 = 0$, respectively, and relations (5.25), (5.58) and (5.67) imply $\mathbf{Ric} = \overline{\mathbf{Ric}}$. But, the Nil-geometry is the only geometry where this property does not hold, as \mathbf{Ric} is always maximal but $\mathbf{Ric} \neq \overline{\mathbf{Ric}}$ by relation (5.45), in general.
- (iii) for all geometries other than the Nil-geometry, given a basis in which \mathbf{h} is known, the components of $\overline{\mathbf{Ric}}$ are fully expressed as functions of the components of \mathbf{h} and the commutation coefficients of the basis. Taking the example of the orthonormal Milnor basis for Bianchi metrics, then $\overline{\mathbf{Ric}}$ is uniquely expressed for each model as a function of n_i and a . However, for the Nil-geometry, two additional parameters are present, i.e., r_2 and r_3 .
- (iv) the Nil-geometry is the only geometry where the absence of reference tilt $\bar{\beta}$ is needed to get $\mathrm{div}_{\mathbf{h}} \overline{\mathbf{Ric}} = \mathbf{0}$ via (4.23). Additionally, it is the only geometry for which the evolution equation (4.22) for $\overline{\mathbf{Ric}}$ provides equations independent of the other 3+1-equations.

We were unable to identify a definite explanation for the mentioned peculiarity of the Nil-geometry. We hoped to find a “hidden” geometric or topological condition that would impose either $\mathrm{Isom}(\tilde{\Sigma}, \mathbf{h}) \subseteq \mathrm{Sym}(\tilde{\Sigma}, \overline{\mathbf{Ric}})$ or directly $\mathbf{Ric} = \overline{\mathbf{Ric}}$. When the topology is $T^3(n)/\mathbb{Z}_{k=3,4,5}$ (see [49, 50] for the notation and the proof) LRS is imposed, and therefore $\mathrm{Isom}(\tilde{\Sigma}, \mathbf{h}) \subseteq \mathrm{Sym}(\tilde{\Sigma}, \overline{\mathbf{Ric}})$ (as shown in Section 5.7.3). But for the other closed manifolds modeled on Nil, no such constraint arises, and the peculiarities listed above remain.

We believe that these peculiarities, and especially the first one in the list above, suggest that the definition of ${}^4\overline{\mathbf{Ric}}$ should be slightly changed such that either $\mathrm{Isom}(\tilde{\Sigma}, \mathbf{h}) \subseteq \mathrm{Sym}(\tilde{\Sigma}, \overline{\mathbf{Ric}})$ always holds, or perhaps the stronger condition “ \mathbf{Ric} is maximal $\Rightarrow \mathbf{Ric} = \overline{\mathbf{Ric}}$ ” always holds. That is, we would eliminate by definition (part of, or all of) the diffeomorphism freedom that might remain between \mathbf{Ric} and $\overline{\mathbf{Ric}}$ when both are maximal. Ideally, this redefinition should imply $\mathrm{Isom}(\tilde{\Sigma}, \mathbf{h}) \subseteq \mathrm{Sym}(\tilde{\Sigma}, \overline{\mathbf{Ric}})$ prior to considering the field equation. We recall that in Section 5.1, we had to use the field equations to show that the Killing vectors related to the $\hat{G}_{\min} \subseteq \mathrm{Isom}(\tilde{\Sigma}, \mathbf{h})$ of the spatial metric are collineations of $\overline{\mathbf{Ric}}$, leading to (5.1).

Imposing $\mathrm{Isom}(\tilde{\Sigma}, \mathbf{h}) \subseteq \mathrm{Sym}(\tilde{\Sigma}, \overline{\mathbf{Ric}})$ is, however, foliation dependent, as it features explicitly the spatial metric \mathbf{h} . We would rather want this property to hold regardless of the chosen foliation. Therefore, the “redefinition” of ${}^4\overline{\mathbf{Ric}}$ would be made such that, as a consequence, the following property would hold.

Property 6.1. *For all Σ -foliations, spacelike with respect to \mathbf{g} , $\mathrm{Isom}(\tilde{\Sigma}, \mathbf{h}) \subseteq \mathrm{Sym}(\tilde{\Sigma}, \overline{\mathbf{Ric}})$ holds, where \mathbf{h} and $\overline{\mathbf{Ric}}$ are, respectively, the spatial metric induced by \mathbf{g} on the foliation and the spatial reference Ricci tensor induced by ${}^4\overline{\mathbf{Ric}}$ on the foliation.*

Adding Property 6.1 to the definition of topo-GR would be very artificial. Ideally, we would want that the way ${}^4\overline{\mathbf{Ric}}$ is constructed would encompass both the above property, and the current definition (3.4) in terms of external Whitney sum. Even more ideally, we would like this definition not to depend on the spacetime manifold being topologically $\mathbb{R} \times \Sigma$ as assumed in the paper (see the discussion in Section 3.3.4). However, we have not yet found a natural and compact way of doing that.

Finally, let us clarify an important point here: the result for Nil and the discussion we just made do *not* mean that the theory is currently ill-defined. Indeed, the system of equations (5.49) for Nil is closed, and more generally, the 3+1-system derived in Section 4.2 is closed. Rather, the results for non-LRS Bianchi II models on the Nil-geometry contradict the understanding and interpretation we have had so far of the theory, namely that the solutions of the theory are qualitatively the same regardless of which topology is chosen. With this respect, if one wants the topo-GR theory to fully comply with this line of interpretation, one might want Property 6.1 to result from the definition of the theory.

7 Conclusion

In this work, we have determined the systems of equations for locally spatially homogeneous (LSH) solutions, admitting a Bianchi–Kantowski–Sachs (BKS) metric, of a topology dependent modified gravity theory, *topo-GR*. We focused on non-tilted LSH solutions for closed 3-manifolds, hence using the correspondence between the Thurston classification and BKS metrics. Except for the Nil-geometry, all models feature the same number of free-parameters as in general relativity (GR). Our four main results are:

- (i) All BKS models admit shear-free exact solutions for perfect fluids with a dynamics equivalent to that of a flat FLRW metric in GR. This contrasts with GR, for which for maximal geometries other than $\{\mathbb{E}^3, \mathbb{S}^3, \mathbb{H}^3\}$, shear-free solutions are only possible if the matter has a non-vanishing anisotropic stress (cf., e.g., [109]).
- (ii) All BKS models admit a static vacuum solution. The spacetime metric features no lapse and the induced spatial metric is static and corresponds to the maximal metric (apart from the $\widetilde{\mathbb{SL}}(2, \mathbb{R})$ -geometry where it can be minimal) related to the spatial topology. In contrast, static vacuum LSH solutions in GR are only possible for the \mathbb{E}^3 -geometry, with the Minkowski metric.
- (iii) For all BKS models, apart from the non-locally rotationally symmetric (non-LRS) Bianchi II model, recollapse is *never* possible when the weak energy condition is fulfilled. In contrast, Bianchi IX solutions (\mathbb{S}^3 -geometry) and Kantowski-Sachs solutions ($\mathbb{R} \times \mathbb{S}^2$ -geometry) can recollapse in GR (cf., e.g., [78]).
- (iv) For all BKS models, apart from the non-LRS Bianchi II model, a Wald-like theorem [25] holds: a positive cosmological constant ensures isotropization at late times. This differs from GR for which LSH solutions on the \mathbb{S}^3 and $\mathbb{R} \times \mathbb{S}^2$ geometries do not isotropize without fine-tuning on the value of the initial spatial curvature.

With respect to the recollapse and the isotropization problems, these results show that topo-GR behaves better than GR without introducing additional parameters, with the only exception of the non-LRS Bianchi II model. We discussed in Section 6 why this latter result is peculiar.

In direct continuation of this work, there are two main perspectives: dynamical analysis and tilted models. Indeed, while we provided some exact solutions for each model, we did not conduct an in-depth analysis of the systems of equations. In this regard, studying the dynamics towards the initial singularity and the presence or absence of chaos will be one of the main follow-ups. Further, while for the $\{\mathbb{E}^3$ (with Bianchi I), \mathbb{H}^3 , $\mathbb{R} \times \mathbb{S}^2$, $\mathbb{R} \times \mathbb{H}^2\}$ -geometries generic solutions do not feature tilt, for the other geometries, we imposed a vanishing tilt. Generalizing this work to tilted models for the $\{\mathbb{S}^3, \text{Nil}, \text{Sol}, \widetilde{\text{SL}}(2, \mathbb{R})\}$ -geometries would be therefore another main follow-up.

Finally, as discussed in Section 4.4.2, the existence of static vacuum solutions in any topology could be beneficial for quantizing inflation and defining a Bunch–Davies vacuum in any topology, as was shown in [59] for \mathbb{S}^3 and \mathbb{H}^3 types of topologies. Alongside this potential benefit for inflation, shear-free solutions in topo-GR also suggest the possibility to extend the Λ CDM model to any Thurston geometry without adding any parameter (other than the spatial curvature already present in the Λ CDM model) and without changing the background dynamics. In this sense, topo-GR would offer a way to define a universal cosmological model, formally equivalent for any spatial topology.

Acknowledgements

The authors are grateful to Abdelghani Zeghib and Áron Szabó for very insightful discussions. QV is supported by the Polish National Science Centre under Grant No. SONATINA 2022/44/C/ST9/00078. HB was funded by the Austrian Science Fund (FWF) [Grant DOI: 10.55776/J4803]. For open access purposes, the authors have applied a CC BY public copyright license to any author-accepted manuscript version arising from this submission.

A Some properties of locally homogeneous quantities

A.1 \mathbb{H}^3 -geometry

Proposition A.1. *Consider a closed manifold Σ modeled on the \mathbb{H}^3 -geometry. Then,*

- (i) *there are no non-trivial vector fields that are locally invariant by the B_V or B_{VII_0} groups,*
- (ii) *all symmetric (0,2)-tensor fields locally invariant by the B_V or B_{VII_0} groups are homothetic.*

Proof. We first consider the B_V group. Let \mathbf{h} , \mathbf{v} , and \mathbf{A} be, respectively, a Riemannian metric, a vector field and a symmetric (0,2)-tensor on Σ all (locally) left-invariant by the B_V group. The metric \mathbf{h} is any arbitrary left-invariant metric introduced for the proof. Then,

Table 6: List of groups

Group	Description
D_{2n}	Dihedral group of rank n
$O(n)$	Orthogonal group of dimension n
$O_+(n, m)$	Positive orientation preserving component of the indefinite orthogonal group of dimension n (positive) and m (negative)
$IO(n)$	Euclidean group of dimension n
Nil	Heisenberg group
Sol	Sol group
$\widetilde{SL}(2, \mathbb{R})$	Universal cover of the $SL(2, \mathbb{R})$ group
G_\blacklozenge	Maximal group associated to the \blacklozenge -geometry
B_\blacklozenge	Bianchi \blacklozenge group

by compactness, $\text{div}_{\mathbf{h}} \mathbf{v} = 0$. Additionally, regardless of the metric, there always exists an orthonormal Milnor basis $\{\mathbf{e}_i\}$ such that $n^{ij} = 0$ and $(a_i) = (a, 0, 0)$. Computing $\text{div}_{\mathbf{h}} \mathbf{v}$ in that basis yields $v^1 = 0$. Then computing $\nabla_{\mathbf{v}} \mathbf{v}$ in that basis yields $(a(v^2)^2 + a(v^3)^2, 0, 0)$. Since the first component needs to be zero, we get $v^2 = v^3 = 0$. Therefore, any left-invariant vector field is zero. Consequently, both $\nabla^i A_{ij}$ and $\nabla^j (A_{jk} A^{ki})$ are zero. Computing these quantities in the Milnor basis directly yields $\mathbf{A} \propto \mathbf{h}$. Therefore, all left-invariant symmetric (0,2)-tensor are homothetic to a left-invariant metric.

We now consider the B_{VII_0} group. An orthonormal Milnor basis is characterized by $(n^{ij}) = \text{diag}(0, n_2, a^2/(h n_2))$ and $(a_i) = (a, 0, 0)$ with $n_2 > 0$. Because any locally homogeneous metric on a closed hyperbolic manifold is isotropic [95], then $\mathbf{Ric} \propto \mathbf{h}$, which leads to $n_2 = a/\sqrt{h}$. Then, conducting the same calculation as for the Bianchi V group leads to $\mathbf{v} = 0$ and $\mathbf{A} \propto \mathbf{h}$. \square

A.2 $\mathbb{R} \times \mathbb{H}^2$ -geometry

Proposition A.2. *Let Σ be a closed manifold modeled on the $\mathbb{R} \times \mathbb{H}^2$ -geometry. Let \mathbf{v} and \mathbf{A} be, respectively, a vector field and a symmetric (0,2)-tensor on Σ , both locally invariant by a B_{III} group. Then, there exists (locally) a Milnor basis $\{\mathbf{e}_i\}$ with $(n^{ij}) = \text{diag}(0, a, -a)$ and $(a_i) = (a, 0, 0)$, such that*

$$\mathbf{v} = (0, b, b), \quad (\text{A.1})$$

where b is a constant, and

$$\mathbf{A} = b_1 \boldsymbol{\delta} + \begin{pmatrix} -2b_2 & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & b_2 & 3b_2 \\ 0 & 3b_2 & b_2 \end{pmatrix}, \quad (\text{A.2})$$

where $\boldsymbol{\delta}$ is the Kronecker delta tensor, and b_1 and b_2 are constants.

Table 7: Generators of left-translations $\{\xi_i\}$, left-invariant vector basis $\{e_i\}$ and its dual basis $\{e^i\}$ for the Bianchi models considered in this appendix and elsewhere. These quantities are used in local coordinates, resulting from the Maurer–Cartan equation (2.3). $\{\xi_i\}$ and $\{e_i\}$ are chosen such that their algebra are those given in Table 2 with unit structure constants.

Bianchi groups	ξ_i	e_i	e^i
B_{II}	∂_x	$-\partial_x$	$-\mathbf{d}x + \frac{z}{2}\mathbf{d}y - \frac{y}{2}\mathbf{d}z$
	$-\frac{z}{2}\partial_x + \partial_y$	$\frac{z}{2}\partial_x + \partial_y$	$\mathbf{d}y$
	$\frac{y}{2}\partial_x + \partial_z$	$-\frac{y}{2}\partial_x + \partial_z$	$\mathbf{d}z$
B_{VI_0}	$\partial_x + z\partial_y + y\partial_z$	∂_x	$\mathbf{d}x$
	$\sinh x \partial_y + \cosh x \partial_z$	$\sinh x \partial_y + \cosh x \partial_z$	$-\sinh x \mathbf{d}y + \cosh x \mathbf{d}z$
	$-\cosh x \partial_y - \sinh x \partial_z$	$-\cosh x \partial_y - \sinh x \partial_z$	$-\cosh x \mathbf{d}y + \sinh x \mathbf{d}z$
B_{VIII}	$\frac{\cosh z}{\cosh y}\partial_x + \sinh z \partial_y$	$-\partial_x$	$-\mathbf{d}x + \sinh y \mathbf{d}z$
	$-\tanh y \cosh z \partial_z$		
	$\frac{\sinh z}{\cosh y}\partial_x + \cosh z \partial_y$	$\cos x \tanh y \partial_x + \sin x \partial_y$	$\sin x \mathbf{d}y + \cos x \cosh y \mathbf{d}z$
	$-\tanh y \sinh z \partial_z$	$+\frac{\cos x}{\cosh y}\partial_z$	
	$-\partial_z$	$-\sin x \tanh y \partial_x + \cos x \partial_y$ $-\frac{\sin x}{\cosh y}\partial_z$	$\cos x \mathbf{d}y - \sin x \cosh y \mathbf{d}z$

Proof. Let \mathbf{h} , \mathbf{v} and \mathbf{A} be, respectively, a Riemannian metric, a vector field, and a symmetric (0,2)-tensor on Σ , all (locally) left-invariant by B_{III} . The metric \mathbf{h} is any arbitrary left-invariant metric introduced for the proof. Then, there exists an orthonormal Milnor basis $\{e_i\}$ such that $(n^{ij}) = \text{diag}(0, a, -a)$ and $(a_i) = (a, 0, 0)$, where compactness imposed $n_2 = a$ (see Section 2.4). Then, following a similar method to the proof of Proposition A.1, we obtain (A.1) and (A.2). Note that \mathbf{v} is an eigenvector of the Ricci tensor of \mathbf{h} with eigenvalue zero. \square

A.3 Nil-geometry

For any B_{II} Riemannian metric, there exists a unit Milnor basis with algebra given in Table 2 and such that

$$\mathbf{h} = A_1 e^1 \otimes e^1 + e^2 \otimes e^2 + e^3 \otimes e^3, \quad (\text{A.3})$$

where $\mathbb{R} \ni A_1 > 0$. Any such metric is maximal, i.e., $\text{Isom}(\tilde{\Sigma}, \mathbf{h}) \cong G_{\text{Nil}}$ with $\dim(G_{\text{Nil}}) = 4$, hence, admitting a fourth Killing vector

$$\xi_4 := z \partial_y - y \partial_z. \quad (\text{A.4})$$

Proposition A.3. Let \mathbf{h} and \mathbf{A} be, respectively, a Riemannian metric and a symmetric $(0,2)$ -tensor, both left-invariant by the B_{II} group. If $\text{Isom}(\tilde{\Sigma}, \mathbf{h}) \subseteq \text{Isom}(\tilde{\Sigma}, \mathbf{A})$, then

$$\mathbf{A} = A_{11}\mathbf{e}^1 \otimes \mathbf{e}^1 + A_{22}(\mathbf{e}^2 \otimes \mathbf{e}^2 + \mathbf{e}^3 \otimes \mathbf{e}^3),$$

where $A_{11}, A_{22} \in \mathbb{R}$, in the unit Milnor basis for which the metric has the form (A.3).

Proof. A direct computation of $\mathcal{L}_{\xi_4}\mathbf{A} = 0$ for a symmetric tensor $\mathbf{A} = A_{ij}\mathbf{e}^i \otimes \mathbf{e}^j$ with A_{ij} being constants, using the coordinate expressions for the dual basis $\{\mathbf{e}^i\}$ in Table 7, leads to the result. \square

Remark A.4. While all B_{II} Riemannian metrics can be put into the single form (A.3), there are three different ways of defining a B_{II} Lorentzian metric (see, e.g., [110]). Interestingly, a Lorentzian metric \mathbf{h} for which the center is a null vector field, i.e., $[\xi_3, \xi_i] = 0$ for $i = 2, 3$ and $\mathbf{h}(\xi_3, \xi_3) = 0$, is Ricci flat. Riemannian B_{II} metrics cannot be flat.

A.4 Sol -geometry

For any B_{VI_0} metric \mathbf{h} , there always exists a unit Milnor basis $\{\mathbf{e}_i\}$ such that

$$\mathbf{h} = A_1\mathbf{e}^1 \otimes \mathbf{e}^1 + A_2\mathbf{e}^2 \otimes \mathbf{e}^2 + A_3\mathbf{e}^3 \otimes \mathbf{e}^3, \quad (\text{A.5})$$

where $A_i > 0$ for $i = 1, 2, 3$.¹⁵ The maximal metrics are those with $A_2 = A_3$.

Proposition A.5. Let \mathbf{h} be a B_{VI_0} metric, then

$$\begin{aligned} \text{aff}(\mathbb{R}^3, \mathbf{h}) &= \text{span}\{\xi_1, \xi_2, \xi_3\}; \quad \forall A_i > 0, \\ \text{ric}(\mathbb{R}^3, \mathbf{h}) &= \begin{cases} \text{span}\{\xi_1, \xi_2, \xi_3\}; & A_2 \neq A_3, \\ \{\mathbf{v} \in \mathfrak{X}(\mathbb{R}^3) \mid \mathbf{v} = v^1\partial_x + v^2(x, y, z)\partial_y + v^3(x, y, z)\partial_z\}; & A_2 = A_3, \end{cases} \end{aligned}$$

where $\{\xi_1, \xi_2, \xi_3\}$ and A_i are defined in Table 7 and (A.5), respectively, and where v^1 is a constant, and $v^2(x, y, z)$ and $v^3(x, y, z)$ are arbitrary functions.

Remark A.6. The metric always has 3 linearly independent affine collineations. If the metric is minimal, i.e., $A_2 \neq A_3$ there are only 3 linearly independent Ricci collineations as well. However, when the metric is maximal, i.e., $A_2 = A_3$, the set of Ricci collineations is infinite dimensional. The infinite dimensional part lies in the kernel of the Ricci tensor.

Proof. The Ricci tensor of (A.5) is

$$\begin{aligned} \text{Ric}[\mathbf{h}] &= -\frac{(A_2 + A_3)^2}{2A_2A_3}\mathbf{e}^1 \otimes \mathbf{e}^1 + \frac{(A_2 - A_3)(A_2 + A_3)}{2A_3A_1}\mathbf{e}^2 \otimes \mathbf{e}^2 \\ &\quad - \frac{(A_2 - A_3)(A_2 + A_3)}{2A_1A_2}\mathbf{e}^3 \otimes \mathbf{e}^3. \end{aligned} \quad (\text{A.6})$$

¹⁵The automorphism $\{\mathbf{e}_1, \mathbf{e}_2, \mathbf{e}_3\} \rightarrow \{\mathbf{e}_1, \alpha\mathbf{e}_2, \alpha\mathbf{e}_3\}$, which keeps the algebra of the basis, allows us to further choose the value of either A_2 or A_3 .

For $A_2 \neq A_3$, the Ricci tensor is always non-degenerate, and therefore it is a (semi-Riemannian) metric. Its Ricci tensor is therefore well-defined and given by

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbf{Ric}[\mathbf{Ric}[\mathbf{h}]] &= \frac{(A_2 - A_3)^2}{2A_2A_3} \mathbf{e}^1 \otimes \mathbf{e}^1 + \frac{(A_2 - A_3)^2}{2A_3A_1} \mathbf{e}^2 \otimes \mathbf{e}^2 \\ &\quad + \frac{(A_2 - A_3)^2}{2A_1A_2} \mathbf{e}^3 \otimes \mathbf{e}^3. \end{aligned} \quad (\text{A.7})$$

For $A_2 \neq A_3$, this tensor is always non-degenerate with positive eigenvalues, and therefore it is a Riemannian B_{VI_0} metric. Therefore, $\mathfrak{sym}(\mathbb{R}^3, \mathbf{Ric}[\mathbf{Ric}[\mathbf{h}]]) = \mathfrak{ric}(\mathbb{R}^3, \mathbf{Ric}[\mathbf{h}]) = \text{span}\{\boldsymbol{\xi}_1, \boldsymbol{\xi}_2, \boldsymbol{\xi}_3\}$. By the inclusion

$$\mathfrak{sym}(\mathbb{R}^3, \mathbf{h}) \subseteq \mathfrak{aff}(\mathbb{R}^3, \mathbf{h}) \subseteq \mathfrak{ric}(\mathbb{R}^3, \mathbf{h}) \subseteq \mathfrak{sym}(\mathbb{R}^3, \mathbf{Ric}[\mathbf{Ric}[\mathbf{h}]]) ,$$

this implies

$$\mathfrak{aff}(\mathbb{R}^3, \mathbf{h}) = \mathfrak{ric}(\mathbb{R}^3, \mathbf{h}) = \text{span}\{\boldsymbol{\xi}_1, \boldsymbol{\xi}_2, \boldsymbol{\xi}_3\} . \quad (\text{A.8})$$

Assuming $A_2 = A_3$, we find

$$\mathbf{Ric}[\mathbf{h}] = -2\mathbf{e}^1 \otimes \mathbf{e}^1. \quad (\text{A.9})$$

Let $\mathbf{v} = v^1(x, y, z)\boldsymbol{\partial}_x + v^2(x, y, z)\boldsymbol{\partial}_y + v^3(x, y, z)\boldsymbol{\partial}_z$ be a vector field such that $\mathcal{L}_{\mathbf{v}}\mathbf{Ric}[\mathbf{h}] = 0$. This leads to $\partial_i v^1 = 0$ for $i \in \{x, y, z\}$, i.e.,

$$\mathbf{v} = v^1\boldsymbol{\partial}_x + v^2(x, y, z)\boldsymbol{\partial}_y + v^3(x, y, z)\boldsymbol{\partial}_z. \quad (\text{A.10})$$

Finally, because an affine collineation vector field is always a Ricci collineation, it must have this form. Then, by solving $\mathcal{L}_{\mathbf{v}}\boldsymbol{\nabla}[\mathbf{h}] = 0$ with $A_2 = A_3$ for (A.10) being the affine collineation, it directly follows that the only solutions are the vectors $\{\boldsymbol{\xi}_1, \boldsymbol{\xi}_2, \boldsymbol{\xi}_3\}$. \square

A.5 $\widetilde{\text{SL}}(2, \mathbb{R})$ -geometry

A.5.1 Maximal Ricci tensor

For any B_{VIII} metric \mathbf{h} , there always exists a unit Milnor basis $\{\mathbf{e}_i\}$ such that

$$\mathbf{h} = A_1\mathbf{e}^1 \otimes \mathbf{e}^1 + A_2\mathbf{e}^2 \otimes \mathbf{e}^2 + A_3\mathbf{e}^3 \otimes \mathbf{e}^3, \quad (\text{A.11})$$

where $A_i > 0$ for $i = 1, 2, 3$. The Ricci tensor in this basis reads

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbf{Ric}[\mathbf{h}] &= \frac{(A_1 + A_2 - A_3)(A_1 - A_2 + A_3)}{2A_2A_3} \mathbf{e}^1 \otimes \mathbf{e}^1 \\ &\quad + \frac{(A_1 - A_2 + A_3)(A_1 + A_2 + A_3)}{2A_3A_1} \mathbf{e}^2 \otimes \mathbf{e}^2 \\ &\quad + \frac{A_3^2 - (A_1 + A_2)^2}{2A_1A_2} \mathbf{e}^3 \otimes \mathbf{e}^3. \end{aligned} \quad (\text{A.12})$$

The metric \mathbf{h} has an additional continuous symmetry if and only if $A_2 = A_3$, in which case the additional Killing vector is given by

$$\boldsymbol{\xi}_4 = -\boldsymbol{\partial}_x = \mathbf{e}_1, \quad (\text{A.13})$$

and the metric is maximal.

Proposition A.7. *The maximal number of linearly independent Ricci collineations of a maximal metric on $\widetilde{\text{SL}}(2, \mathbb{R})$ -geometric manifolds is 6 and is achieved if and only if $A_1 = 2A_2$. In this case, the Ricci tensor is left and right invariant under $\widetilde{\text{SL}}(2, \mathbb{R})$, and its collineations are*

$$\xi_1, \xi_2, \xi_3, e_1, e_2, e_3, \quad (\text{A.14})$$

with $\text{Sym}(\tilde{\Sigma}, \mathbf{Ric})_0 = \widetilde{\text{SL}}(2, \mathbb{R}) \times \widetilde{\text{SL}}(2, \mathbb{R})$.

Remark A.8. From (A.12), we can see that a minimal metric with $A_1 = A_2 + A_3$ (equivalently with $n_1 + n_2 + n_3 = 0$ in an orthonormal Milnor basis) produces the same Ricci tensor as a maximal metric (i.e., $A_2 = A_3$, equivalently $n_2 = n_3$ in an orthonormal Milnor basis) with $A_1 = 2A_2$ (equivalently with $n_1 + 2n_2 = 0$ in an orthonormal Milnor basis).

Proof. The Ricci tensor of a maximal $\widetilde{\text{SL}}(2, \mathbb{R})$ -metric is

$$\mathbf{Ric}[\mathbf{h}] = \left(\frac{A_1}{2A_2} \right)^2 \mathbf{e}^1 \otimes \mathbf{e}^1 + \frac{A_1(A_1 + 2A_2)}{2A_2A_1} \mathbf{e}^2 \otimes \mathbf{e}^2 + \frac{(A_2)^2 - (A_1 + A_2)^2}{2A_1A_2} \mathbf{e}^3 \otimes \mathbf{e}^3. \quad (\text{A.15})$$

This tensor is always non-degenerate for any value of $A_1 > 0$ and $A_2 > 0$, with always two negative eigenvalues and one positive eigenvalue. Therefore, $\mathbf{Ric}[\mathbf{h}]$ is a Lorentzian metric and for this reason its maximum number of collineations is 6. This is achieved if and only if $\mathbf{Ric}[\mathbf{h}]$ is an Einstein metric, i.e., $\mathbf{Ric}[\mathbf{Ric}[\mathbf{h}]] \propto \mathbf{Ric}[\mathbf{h}]$. Solving the latter equation yields

$$\mathbf{Ric}[\mathbf{Ric}[\mathbf{h}]] = \frac{1}{4} \mathbf{Ric}[\mathbf{h}], \quad \text{iff } A_1 = 2A_2. \quad (\text{A.16})$$

This shows that for $A_1 = 2A_2$, a maximal $\widetilde{\text{SL}}(2, \mathbb{R})$ -metric has 6 linearly independent Ricci collineations. If $A_1 \neq 2A_2$, then $\mathbf{Ric}[\mathbf{h}]$ is not an Einstein metric and the maximum number of Ricci collineations of \mathbf{h} is 4. This is because, on a 3-manifold, the isometry group of a metric cannot be 5-dimensional (cf., e.g., [3, Section 1.2]).

Finally, a direct computation of $\mathcal{L}_{e_i} \mathbf{Ric}$ for all left-invariant vector basis (given in Table 7), shows that all e_i are collineations of \mathbf{Ric} , and therefore \mathbf{Ric} is right-invariant, implying $\text{Sym}(\tilde{\Sigma}, \mathbf{Ric})_0 = \widetilde{\text{SL}}(2, \mathbb{R}) \times \widetilde{\text{SL}}(2, \mathbb{R})$ (where the subscript $_0$ means the connected component of the identity). Interestingly, this implies that \mathbf{Ric} is the Killing form of $\widetilde{\text{SL}}(2, \mathbb{R})$ (e.g. [11]). \square

A.5.2 Bianchi VIII metrics as Bianchi III metrics

If a metric \mathbf{h} is at the same time a B_{VIII} and a B_{III} metric, then it can be represented in two different orthonormal Milnor bases having the algebra of the former group and the latter group, respectively, hence non-isomorphic algebras. In the Bianchi VIII representation, $n_2^{\text{VIII}} = n_3^{\text{VIII}}$ is imposed by the presence of a fourth Killing vector additional to the three coming from the B_{VIII} group. In the Bianchi III representation, $n_2^{\text{III}} \neq a^{\text{III}}$ is imposed, otherwise the B_{III} metric is a $G_{\mathbb{R} \times \mathbb{H}^2}$ metric. Since these are two different representations of the same metric, one can relate n_1^{VIII} and n_2^{VIII} to n_2^{III} and a^{III} . To do so, it is sufficient

to calculate the Ricci scalar $\text{tr}_{\mathbf{h}} \mathbf{Ric}$ and the Ricci square $R_{ij}R^{ij}$. Since these are invariant quantities, they must agree in both bases. One finds

$$n_1^{\text{VIII}} = \frac{|(a^{\text{III}})^2 - (n_2^{\text{III}})^2|}{n_2^{\text{III}}}, \quad n_2^{\text{VIII}} = \frac{4 (a^{\text{III}})^2 n_2^{\text{III}}}{|(a^{\text{III}})^2 - (n_2^{\text{III}})^2|}, \quad \forall n_2^{\text{III}} \neq a^{\text{III}}. \quad (\text{A.17})$$

A.6 $\mathbb{R} \times \mathbb{S}^2$ -geometry

On $\mathbb{R} \times \mathbb{S}^2$, the generators of $G_{\mathbb{R} \times \mathbb{S}^2}$ -invariance are the vector fields

$$\begin{aligned} \xi_1 &= \cos y \, \partial_x - \cot x \sin y \, \partial_y, & \xi_2 &= \sin y \, \partial_x + \cot x \cos y \, \partial_y, \\ \xi_3 &= \partial_y, & \xi_4 &= \partial_z, \end{aligned} \quad (\text{A.18})$$

with

$$[\xi_1, \xi_2] = -\xi_3, \quad [\xi_1, \xi_3] = \xi_2, \quad [\xi_2, \xi_3] = -\xi_1, \quad (\text{A.19})$$

and ξ_4 commutes with all the other vector fields.

A general $G_{\mathbb{R} \times \mathbb{S}^2}$ -invariant (Kantowski–Sachs) metric \mathbf{h} has the form

$$\mathbf{h} = A_1 (\mathbf{d}x \otimes \mathbf{d}x + \sin^2 x \, \mathbf{d}y \otimes \mathbf{d}y) + A_2 \mathbf{d}z \otimes \mathbf{d}z. \quad (\text{A.20})$$

By a direct computation with the Lie derivative along the vector fields (A.18), one can prove the following proposition.

Proposition A.9. *Let Σ be a closed manifold modeled on the $\mathbb{R} \times \mathbb{S}^2$ -geometry. Let \mathbf{v} , \mathbf{n} and \mathbf{A} be, respectively, a vector field, a 1-form and a symmetric $(0, 2)$ -tensor on Σ , all locally $G_{\mathbb{R} \times \mathbb{S}^2}$ -invariant. Then*

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbf{v} &= c_1 \, \partial_z, \\ \mathbf{n} &= c_2 \, \mathbf{d}z, \\ \mathbf{A} &= c_3 (\mathbf{d}x \otimes \mathbf{d}x + \sin^2 x \, \mathbf{d}y \otimes \mathbf{d}y) + c_4 \mathbf{d}z \otimes \mathbf{d}z, \end{aligned}$$

where c_i for $i = 1, \dots, 4$ are constants.

A direct consequence of this proposition is

Corollary A.10. *Given a locally $G_{\mathbb{R} \times \mathbb{S}^2}$ -invariant metric \mathbf{h} on an $\mathbb{R} \times \mathbb{S}^2$ -geometric manifold Σ , any symmetric $(0, 2)$ -tensor \mathbf{A} such that $\text{Isom}(\tilde{\Sigma}, \mathbf{h}) \subseteq \text{Sym}(\tilde{\Sigma}, \mathbf{A})$, is a transverse tensor field, i.e., $\text{div}_{\mathbf{h}} \mathbf{A} = 0$.*

References

- [1] Ryan Jr., M. P. and Shepley, L. C. *Homogeneous relativistic cosmologies*. Princeton Series in Physics. Princeton University Press, Princeton, NJ, 1975, pp. xv+320.
- [2] Kramer, D. et al. *Exact solutions of Einstein's field equations*. Ed. by Schmutzer, E. Cambridge Monographs on Mathematical Physics. Cambridge University Press, Cambridge-New York, 1980, p. 425.
- [3] Wainwright, J. and Ellis, G. F. R., eds. *Dynamical Systems in Cosmology*. Cambridge University Press, Cambridge, 1997, pp. xiv, 343.
- [4] Giani, L., Piattella, O. F., and Kamenshchik, A. Y. “[Bianchi IX gravitational collapse of matter inhomogeneities](#)”. *JCAP* **03.03** (2022), p. 028. arXiv: [2112.01869 \[gr-qc\]](#).
- [5] Malkiewicz, P., Ostrowski, J. J., and Delgado Gaspar, I. “[Relativistic modeling of cosmological structures with Bianchi IX spacetimes](#)”. *Phys. Rev. D* **109.8** (2024), p. 083525. arXiv: [2401.05810 \[gr-qc\]](#).
- [6] Kasner, E. “[Geometrical theorems on Einstein's cosmological equations](#)”. *Am. J. Math.* **43** (1921), pp. 217–221.
- [7] Bianchi, L. “Sugli spazi a tre dimensioni che ammettono un gruppo continuo di movimenti”. *Memorie di Matematica e di Fisica della Società Italiana delle Scienze*. Third Series **XI** (1898). Reprinted in: *Opere*, Rome, Edizione Cremonese, 1952, Vol. 9, pp. 17–109, pp. 267–352.
- [8] Bianchi, L. “[On the Three-Dimensional Spaces Which Admit a Continuous Group of Motions](#)”. *Gen. Rel. Grav.* **33.12** (2001), pp. 2171–2253.
- [9] Jantzen, R. “[Editor's Note: On the Three-Dimensional Spaces Which Admit a Continuous Group of Motions by Luigi Bianchi](#)”. *Gen. Rel. Grav.* **33.12** (2001), pp. 2157–2170.
- [10] Rindler, W. “[Gödel, Einstein, Mach, Gamow, and Lanczos: Gödel's remarkable excursion into cosmology](#)”. *Am. J. Phys.* **77.6** (2009), pp. 498–510.
- [11] Ozsváth, I. “[Dust-Filled Universes of Class II and Class IIF](#)”. *J. Math. Phys.* **11.9** (1970), pp. 2871–2883.
- [12] Jantzen, R. T. “[Generalized quaternions and spacetime symmetries](#)”. *J. Math. Phys.* **23** (1982), pp. 1741–1746.
- [13] Gödel, K. “Rotating universes in general relativity theory”. *Proceedings of the International Congress of Mathematicians, Cambridge, Mass., 1950, vol. 1*. Amer. Math. Soc., Providence, RI, 1952, pp. 175–181.
- [14] Gödel, K. “[Rotating universes in general relativity theory](#)”. *Gen. Rel. Grav.* **32.7** (2000), pp. 1419–1427.
- [15] Taub, A. H. “[Empty space-times admitting a three parameter group of motions](#)”. *Annals Math.* **53** (1951), pp. 472–490.

- [16] Heckmann, O. and Schücking, E. “Relativistic Cosmology”. *Gravitation: An Introduction to Current Research*. Ed. by Witten, L. Wiley, New York, 1962.
- [17] Kantowski, R. and Sachs, R. K. “Some Spatially Homogeneous Anisotropic Relativistic Cosmological Models”. *J. Math. Phys.* **7**.3 (1966), pp. 443–446.
- [18] Misner, C. W. “Mixmaster Universe”. *Phys. Rev. Lett.* **22**.20 (1969), pp. 1071–1074.
- [19] Belinskij, V. A., Khalatnikov, I. M., and Lifshits, E. M. “Oscillatory approach to a singular point in the relativistic cosmology.” *Adv. Phys.* **19** (1970), pp. 525–573.
- [20] Ringström, H. “Cosmology, the big bang and the BKL conjecture”. *Comptes Rendus. Mécanique* **353** (2025), pp. 53–78.
- [21] Ringström, H. *On the Topology and Future Stability of the Universe*. Oxford Mathematical Monographs. Oxford University Press, Oxford, 2013, pp. xiv+718.
- [22] Ringström, H. “The Cauchy Problem in General Relativity”. *Acta Phys. Polon. B* **44**.12 (2013), pp. 2621–2641.
- [23] Collins, C. B. and Hawking, S. W. “Why is the Universe Isotropic?” *ApJ* **180** (1973), pp. 317–334.
- [24] Barrow, J. “Light elements and the isotropy of the Universe”. *MNRAS* **175** (1976), pp. 359–370.
- [25] Wald, R. M. “Asymptotic behavior of homogeneous cosmological models in the presence of a positive cosmological constant”. *Phys. Rev. D* **28** (8 1983), pp. 2118–2120.
- [26] Coley, A. A. *Dynamical Systems and Cosmology*. 1st ed. Vol. 291. Astrophysics and Space Science Library. Springer Dordrecht, 2003, pp. VIII+195.
- [27] Maccallum, M. A. H., Stewart, J. M., and Schmidt, B. G. “Anisotropic stresses in homogeneous cosmologies”. *Commun. Math. Phys.* **17** (1970), pp. 343–347.
- [28] Coley, A. and Goliath, M. “Closed cosmologies with a perfect fluid and a scalar field”. *Phys. Rev. D* **62**.4, 043526 (2000), p. 043526. arXiv: [gr-qc/0004060 \[gr-qc\]](#).
- [29] Rendall, A. D. *Partial Differential Equations in General Relativity*. Vol. 16. Oxford Graduate Texts in Mathematics. Oxford University Press, Oxford, 2008, pp. xvi+279.
- [30] Calogero, S. and Heinzle, J. M. “Bianchi cosmologies with anisotropic matter: Locally rotationally symmetric models”. *Phys. D: Nonlinear Phenom.* **240**.7 (2011), pp. 636–669. arXiv: [0911.0667 \[gr-qc\]](#).
- [31] Fardagas, C. R., Leon, G., and Saridakis, E. N. “Dynamical analysis of anisotropic scalar-field cosmologies for a wide range of potentials”. *Class. Quantum Grav.* **31**.7, 075018 (2014), p. 075018. arXiv: [1308.1658 \[gr-qc\]](#).
- [32] Barzegar, H. “Future attractors of Bianchi types II and V cosmologies with massless Vlasov matter”. *Class. Quantum Grav.* **38**.6, 065019 (2021), p. 065019. arXiv: [2012.14306 \[gr-qc\]](#).
- [33] Normann, B. D. et al. “Bianchi cosmologies with p -form gauge fields”. *Class. Quantum Grav.* **35**.9 (2018), p. 095004. arXiv: [1712.08752 \[gr-qc\]](#).

- [34] King, A. R. and Ellis, G. F. R. “[Tilted homogeneous cosmological models](#)”. *Commun. Math. Phys.* **31.3** (1973), pp. 209–242.
- [35] Goliath, M. and Ellis, G. F. R. “[Homogeneous cosmologies with a cosmological constant](#)”. *Phys. Rev. D* **60.2**, 023502 (1999), p. 023502. arXiv: [gr-qc/9811068 \[gr-qc\]](#).
- [36] Tanimoto, M. “[Linear perturbations of spatially locally homogeneous spacetimes](#)”. *arXiv e-prints* (2003). arXiv: [gr-qc/0306087 \[gr-qc\]](#).
- [37] Tanimoto, M., Moncrief, V., and Yasuno, K. “[Perturbations of spatially closed Bianchi III spacetimes](#)”. *Class. Quantum Grav.* **20.9** (2003), pp. 1879–1927. arXiv: [gr-qc/0210078 \[gr-qc\]](#).
- [38] Pereira, T. S., Pitrou, C., and Uzan, J.-P. “[Theory of cosmological perturbations in an anisotropic universe](#)”. *J. Cosmology Astropart. Phys.* **2007.9**, 006 (2007), p. 006. arXiv: [0707.0736 \[astro-ph\]](#).
- [39] Pereira, T. S., Carneiro, S., and Mena Marugan, G. A. “[Inflationary perturbations in anisotropic, shear-free universes](#)”. *J. Cosmology Astropart. Phys.* **2012.5**, 040 (2012), p. 040. arXiv: [1203.2072 \[astro-ph.CO\]](#).
- [40] Pereira, T. and Pitrou, C. “[Isotropization of the universe during inflation](#)”. *Comptes Rendus Physique* **16.10** (2015), pp. 1027–1037. arXiv: [1509.09166 \[astro-ph.CO\]](#).
- [41] Pereira, T. S. and Pabon, D. T. “[Extending the \$\Lambda\$ CDM model through shear-free anisotropies](#)”. *Modern Phys. Lett. A* **31.21**, 1640009 (2016), p. 1640009. arXiv: [1603.04291 \[gr-qc\]](#).
- [42] Franco, F. O. and Pereira, T. S. “[Tensor perturbations in anisotropically curved cosmologies](#)”. *J. Cosmology Astropart. Phys.* **2017.11**, 022 (2017), p. 022. arXiv: [1709.00007 \[gr-qc\]](#).
- [43] Thurston, W. P. “Three dimensional manifolds, Kleinian groups and hyperbolic geometry”. *Bull. Amer. Math. Soc.* **6.3** (1982), pp. 357–381.
- [44] Perelman, G. “The entropy formula for the Ricci flow and its geometric applications”. *arXiv e-prints* (2002). arXiv: [math/0211159 \[math.DG\]](#).
- [45] Perelman, G. “Ricci flow with surgery on three-manifolds”. *arXiv e-prints* (2003). arXiv: [math/0303109 \[math.DG\]](#).
- [46] Perelman, G. “Finite extinction time for the solutions to the Ricci flow on certain three-manifolds”. *arXiv e-prints* (2003). arXiv: [math/0307245 \[math.DG\]](#).
- [47] Fagundes, H. V. “[Relativistic cosmologies with closed, locally homogeneous spatial sections](#)”. *Phys. Rev. Lett.* **54.11** (1985), pp. 1200–1202.
- [48] Koike, T., Tanimoto, M., and Hosoya, A. “[Compact homogeneous universes.](#)” *J. Math. Phys.* **35.9** (1994), pp. 4855–4888. arXiv: [gr-qc/9405052 \[gr-qc\]](#).
- [49] Kodama, H. “[Canonical Structure of Locally Homogeneous Systems on Compact Closed 3-Manifolds of Types \$E^3\$, Nil and Sol](#)”. *Prog. Theor. Phys.* **99.2** (1998), pp. 173–236. arXiv: [gr-qc/9705066 \[gr-qc\]](#).

- [50] Kodama, H. “Phase Space of Compact Bianchi Models with Fluid”. *Prog. Theor. Phys.* **107.2** (2002), pp. 305–362. arXiv: [gr-qc/0109064 \[gr-qc\]](#).
- [51] Barrow, J. D., Kodama, H., and Ahluwalia, D. V. “All Universes Great and Small”. *Int. J. Mod. Phys. A* **10.6** (2001), pp. 785–790. arXiv: [gr-qc/0105049 \[gr-qc\]](#).
- [52] Fujiwara, Y., Ishihara, H., and Kodama, H. “Comments on closed Bianchi models”. *Class. Quantum Grav.* **10.5** (1993), pp. 859–867. arXiv: [gr-qc/9301019 \[gr-qc\]](#).
- [53] Tanimoto, M., Koike, T., and Hosoya, A. “Dynamics of compact homogeneous universes”. *J. Math. Phys.* **38.1** (1997), pp. 350–368. arXiv: [gr-qc/9604056 \[gr-qc\]](#).
- [54] Barrow, J. D. and Kodama, H. “The isotropy of compact universes”. *Class. Quantum Grav.* **18.9** (2001), pp. 1753–1766. arXiv: [gr-qc/0012075 \[astro-ph\]](#).
- [55] Smith, A. F., Copi, C. J., and Starkman, G. D. “Cosmological constraints on anisotropic Thurston geometries”. *J. Cosmology Astropart. Phys.* **01** (2025), p. 005. arXiv: [2409.03008 \[astro-ph.CO\]](#).
- [56] Mimoso, J. P. and Wands, D. “Anisotropic scalar-tensor cosmologies”. *Phys. Rev. D* **52.10** (1995), pp. 5612–5627. arXiv: [gr-qc/9501039 \[gr-qc\]](#).
- [57] Goheer, N., Leach, J. A., and Dunsby, P. K. S. “Dynamical systems analysis of anisotropic cosmologies in R^n -gravity”. *Class. Quantum Grav.* **24.22** (2007), pp. 5689–5708. arXiv: [0710.0814 \[gr-qc\]](#).
- [58] de Cesare, M. and Wilson-Ewing, E. “A generalized Kasner transition for bouncing Bianchi I models in modified gravity theories”. *J. Cosmology Astropart. Phys.* **2019.12**, 039 (2019), p. 039. arXiv: [1910.03616 \[gr-qc\]](#).
- [59] Vigneron, Q. and Larena, J. “A natural model for curved inflation”. *Class. Quantum Grav.* **41.22**, 22LT01 (2024), 22LT01. arXiv: [2405.04450 \[gr-qc\]](#).
- [60] Ashtekar, A. and Samuel, J. “Bianchi cosmologies: the role of spatial topology”. *Class. Quantum Grav.* **8.12** (1991), p. 2191.
- [61] Ashtekar, A., Tate, R. S., and Ugla, C. “Minisuperspaces: Symmetries and quantization”. *Directions in General Relativity: An International Symposium in Honor of the 60th Birthdays of Dieter Brill and Charles Misner*. 1992. arXiv: [gr-qc/9302026](#).
- [62] Barbero G., J. F. and Villasenor, E. J. S. “Quantization of Midisuperspace Models”. *Living Rev. Rel.* **13** (2010), p. 6. arXiv: [1010.1637 \[gr-qc\]](#).
- [63] Geiller, M., Livine, E. R., and Sartini, F. “Dynamical symmetries of homogeneous minisuperspace models”. *Phys. Rev. D* **106.6** (2022), p. 064013. arXiv: [2205.02615 \[gr-qc\]](#).
- [64] Jaffe, T. R. et al. “Bianchi Type VII_h Models and the WMAP 3-year Data”. *Astron. Astrophys.* **460** (2006), p. 393. arXiv: [astro-ph/0606046](#).
- [65] Jaffe, T. R. et al. “On the Viability of Bianchi Type VII_h Models with Dark Energy”. *ApJ* **644** (2006), pp. 701–708. arXiv: [astro-ph/0512433](#).
- [66] Ade, P. A. R. et al. “Planck 2013 results. XXVI. Background geometry and topology of the Universe”. *Astron. Astrophys.* **571** (2014), A26. arXiv: [1303.5086 \[astro-ph.CO\]](#).

- [67] Ade, P. A. R. et al. “Planck 2015 results - XVIII. Background geometry and topology of the Universe”. *Astron. Astrophys.* **594** (2016), A18. arXiv: [1502.01593 \[astro-ph.CO\]](#).
- [68] Akrami, Y. et al. “Promise of Future Searches for Cosmic Topology”. *Phys. Rev. Lett.* **132**.17, 171501 (2024), p. 171501. arXiv: [2210.11426 \[astro-ph.CO\]](#).
- [69] Petersen, P. et al. “Cosmic topology. Part I. Limits on orientable Euclidean manifolds from circle searches”. *J. Cosmology Astropart. Phys.* **2023**.1, 030 (2023), p. 030. arXiv: [2211.02603 \[astro-ph.CO\]](#).
- [70] Mihaylov, D. P. et al. “Erratum: Cosmic topology. Part I. Limits on orientable Euclidean manifolds from circle searches”. *J. Cosmology Astropart. Phys.* **2024**.4, E01 (2024), E01.
- [71] Eskilt, J. R. et al. “Cosmic topology. Part IIa. Eigenmodes, correlation matrices, and detectability of orientable Euclidean manifolds”. *J. Cosmology Astropart. Phys.* **2024**.3, 036 (2024), p. 036. arXiv: [2306.17112 \[astro-ph.CO\]](#).
- [72] Tamosiunas, A. et al. “Cosmic topology. Part IVa. Classification of manifolds using machine learning: a case study with small toroidal universes”. *J. Cosmology Astropart. Phys.* **2024**.9, 057 (2024), p. 057. arXiv: [2404.01236 \[astro-ph.CO\]](#).
- [73] Samandar, A. et al. “Cosmic topology. Part IIIa. Microwave background parity violation without parity-violating microphysics”. *J. Cosmology Astropart. Phys.* **2024**.11, 020 (2024), p. 020. arXiv: [2407.09400 \[astro-ph.CO\]](#).
- [74] Saha, S. et al. “Cosmic topology. Part Ic. Limits on lens spaces from circle searches”. *J. Cosmology Astropart. Phys.* **2025**.1, 004 (2025), p. 004. arXiv: [2409.02226 \[astro-ph.CO\]](#).
- [75] Samandar, A. et al. “Cosmic topology. Part IIIb. Eigenmodes and correlation matrices of spin-2 perturbations in orientable Euclidean manifolds”. *J. Cosmology Astropart. Phys.* **2025**.8, 015 (2025), p. 015. arXiv: [2503.08671 \[astro-ph.CO\]](#).
- [76] Copi, C. J. et al. “Cosmic topology. Part IIb. Eigenmodes, correlation matrices, and detectability of non-orientable Euclidean manifolds”. *arXiv e-prints* (2025). arXiv: [2510.05030 \[astro-ph.CO\]](#).
- [77] Barrow, J. D. “Cosmic no-hair theorems and inflation”. *Phys. Lett. B* **187**.1-2 (1987), pp. 12–16.
- [78] Barrow, J. D. “The premature recollapse problem in closed inflationary universes”. *Nucl. Phys. B* **296**.3 (1988), pp. 697–709.
- [79] Götz, G. “On the cosmological “no-hair” conjecture”. *Phys. Lett. A* **128**.3-4 (1988), pp. 129–132.
- [80] Ponce de León, J. “Can ever-expanding closed universes with Λ_0 enter an inflationary era?” *Phys. Lett. A* **129**.7 (1988), pp. 367–371.
- [81] Moniz, P. V. “Kantowski-Sachs universes and the cosmic no-hair conjecture”. *Phys. Rev. D* **47**.10 (1993), pp. 4315–4321.

- [82] Cervantes-Cota, J. L. and Chauvet, P. A. “Can induced gravity isotropize Bianchi type I, V, or IX universes?” *Phys. Rev. D* **59**.4, 043501 (1999), p. 043501. arXiv: [gr-qc/9810064](#) [[gr-qc](#)].
- [83] Miritzis, J. “The recollapse problem of closed Friedmann-Robertson-Walker models in higher-order gravity theories”. *J. Math. Phys.* **46**.8, 082502 (2005), p. 082502. arXiv: [gr-qc/0505139](#) [[gr-qc](#)].
- [84] Vigneron, Q. “Non-Relativistic Regime and Topology: Topological Term in the Einstein Equation”. *Found. Phys.* **54**.1, 15 (2024), p. 15. arXiv: [2204.13980](#) [[gr-qc](#)].
- [85] Vigneron, Q. and Poulin, V. “Is expansion blind to the spatial curvature?” *Phys. Rev. D* **108**.10, 103518 (2023), p. 103518. arXiv: [2212.00675](#) [[gr-qc](#)].
- [86] Katzin, G. H., Levine, J., and Davis, W. R. “Curvature Collineations: A Fundamental Symmetry Property of the Space-Times of General Relativity Defined by the Vanishing Lie Derivative of the Riemann Curvature Tensor”. *J. Math. Phys.* **10**.4 (1969), pp. 617–629.
- [87] Thurston, W. P. *Three-dimensional geometry and topology. Vol. 1*. Ed. by Levy, S. Vol. 35. Princeton Mathematical Series. Princeton University Press, Princeton, NJ, 1997, pp. x+311.
- [88] Scott, P. “The geometries of 3-manifolds”. *Bull. London Math. Soc.* **15**.5 (1983), pp. 401–487.
- [89] Dumitrescu, S. and Zeghib, A. “Géométries Lorentziennes de dimension 3 : classification et complétude”. *Geom. Dedicata* **149**.1 (2010), pp. 243–273. arXiv: [math/0703846](#) [[math.DG](#)].
- [90] Hamilton, R. S. “Three-manifolds with positive Ricci curvature”. *J. Differential Geometry* **17**.2 (1982), pp. 255–306.
- [91] Tollefson, J. L. “The compact 3-manifolds covered by $S^2 \times R^1$ ”. *Proc. Amer. Math. Soc.* **45** (1974), pp. 461–462.
- [92] Ellis, G. F. R. and MacCallum, M. A. H. “A class of homogeneous cosmological models”. *Commun. Math. Phys.* **12**.2 (1969), pp. 108–141.
- [93] Milnor, J. “Curvatures of Left Invariant Metrics on Lie Groups”. *Adv. Math.* **21** (1976), pp. 293–329.
- [94] Papadopoulos, G. O. and Grammenos, T. “Locally homogeneous spaces, induced Killing vector fields and applications to Bianchi prototypes”. *J. Math. Phys.* **53**.7 (2012), pp. 072502–072502. arXiv: [1106.3897](#) [[math.DG](#)].
- [95] Mostow, G. D. “Quasi-conformal mappings in n -space and the rigidity of hyperbolic space forms”. en. *Publications Mathématiques de l’IHÉS* **34** (1968), pp. 53–104.
- [96] Szafron, D. A. “Intrinsic isometry groups in general relativity”. *J. Math. Phys.* **22**.3 (1981), pp. 543–548.
- [97] Hehl, F. W. et al. “Metric-affine gauge theory of gravity: field equations, Noether identities, world spinors, and breaking of dilation invariance”. *Phys. Rep.* **258**.1 (1995), pp. 1–171. arXiv: [gr-qc/9402012](#) [[gr-qc](#)].

- [98] Beltrán Jiménez, J. et al. “General teleparallel quadratic gravity”. *Phys. Lett. B* **805**, 135422 (2020), p. 135422. arXiv: [1909.09045 \[gr-qc\]](#).
- [99] Karoubi, M. *K-Theory*. Springer Berlin, Heidelberg, 1978, pp. XVIII, 316.
- [100]ourgoulhon, E. *3+1 Formalism in General Relativity: Bases of Numerical Relativity*. Vol. 846. Lecture Notes in Physics. Springer-Verlag Berlin Heidelberg, 2012.
- [101] Mimoso, J. P. and Crawford, P. “Shear-free anisotropic cosmological models”. *Class. Quantum Grav.* **10.2** (1993), pp. 315–326.
- [102] Koivisto, T. S. et al. “Possibility of anisotropic curvature in cosmology”. *Phys. Rev. D* **83.2**, 023509 (2011), p. 023509. arXiv: [1006.3321 \[astro-ph.CO\]](#).
- [103] Handley, W. “Primordial power spectra for curved inflating universes”. *Phys. Rev. D* **100.12**, 123517 (2019), p. 123517. arXiv: [1907.08524 \[astro-ph.CO\]](#).
- [104] Wainwright, J. and Hsu, L. “A dynamical systems approach to Bianchi cosmologies: orthogonal models of class A”. *Class. Quantum Grav.* **6.10** (1989), pp. 1409–1431.
- [105] Barrow, J. D., Juszkiewicz, R., and Sonoda, D. H. “Universal rotation - How large can it be?” *MNRAS* **213** (1985), pp. 917–943.
- [106] Pontzen, A. and Challinor, A. “Bianchi Model CMB Polarization and its Implications for CMB Anomalies”. *MNRAS* **380** (2007), pp. 1387–1398. arXiv: [0706.2075 \[astro-ph\]](#).
- [107] Saadeh, D. et al. “How isotropic is the Universe?” *Phys. Rev. Lett.* **117.13** (2016), p. 131302. arXiv: [1605.07178 \[astro-ph.CO\]](#).
- [108] Hervik, S. et al. “The futures of Bianchi type VII₀ cosmologies with vorticity”. *Class. Quantum Grav.* **23.3** (2006), pp. 845–866. arXiv: [gr-qc/0509032 \[gr-qc\]](#).
- [109] Mimoso, J. P. and Crawford, P. “Shear-free anisotropic cosmological models”. *Class. Quantum Grav.* **10.2** (1993), p. 315.
- [110] Rahmani, S. “Métriques de lorentz sur les groupes de lie unimodulaires, de dimension trois”. *J. Geom. Phys.* **9.3** (1992), pp. 295–302.
- [111] Olea, B. “Canonical variation of a Lorentzian metric”. *J. Math. Anal. Appl.* **419.1** (2014), pp. 156–171. arXiv: [1509.00793 \[math.DG\]](#).