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## Introduction

- 1922, Friedmann's solution to Einstein's equations
- assumes isotropy and homogeneity of space
- solution includes gravitational singularity (gravitational and matter fields invariants diverge)
- commonly used in astrophysics and cosmology
- 1946, discovery by Lifshitz that isotropy is unstable in the evolution towards the singularity ${ }^{1}$
- In late 50-ties relativists (USSR, USA) started examination of models with homogeneous space
- Belinskii-Khalatnikov-Lifshitz (BKL) conjecture: GR implies the existence of generic solution that is singular ${ }^{2}$
- corresponds to non-zero measure subset of all initial data
- is stable against perturbation of initial data
- depends on arbitrary functions defined on space
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## General remarks

- BKL conjecture concerns both cosmological and astrophysical singularities
- low energy limits of bosonic sectors of superstring models are consistent with BKL scenario ${ }^{3}$
- Penrose-Hawking's singularity theorems (of 60-ties): possible existence of incomplete geodesics in spacetime; needn't imply that the invariants diverge; these theorems say nothing about the dynamics of gravitational field near singularities
- the existence of generic singularities in solutions to Einstein's equations
- signal the existence of the limit of validity of GR
- give support to observed black holes and big bang singularities
- hypothesis: quantization of GR may lead to the theory that is devoid of singularities so that it could be used to explain observational data
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## The BKL scenario

The dynamics that underlies the BKL conjecture, called the BKL scenario, is the following

$$
\begin{gather*}
\frac{d^{2} \ln a}{d \tau^{2}}=\frac{b}{a}-a^{2}, \quad \frac{d^{2} \ln b}{d \tau^{2}}=a^{2}-\frac{b}{a}+\frac{c}{b}, \quad \frac{d^{2} \ln c}{d \tau^{2}}=a^{2}-\frac{c}{b},  \tag{1}\\
\frac{d \ln a}{d \tau} \frac{d \ln b}{d \tau}+\frac{d \ln a}{d \tau} \frac{d \ln c}{d \tau}+\frac{d \ln b}{d \tau} \frac{d \ln c}{d \tau}=a^{2}+\frac{b}{a}+\frac{c}{b} . \tag{2}
\end{gather*}
$$

where $a=a(\tau), b=b(\tau), c=c(\tau)$ are directional scale factors.
Eqs. 1)-(2) define a highly nonlinear coupled system of equations.
These equations have been given to me by Vladimir Belinski (2010)
and ... I decided to quantize this dynamics to see if quantization may
resolve the generic cosmological singularity of general relativity.
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## Hamilton's dynamics underlying the BKL scenario

Making use of the reduced phase space technique ${ }^{4}$ enables rewriting the dynamics (1)-(2) in the form of the Hamiltonian system:

$$
\begin{align*}
d q_{1} / d t & =\partial H / \partial p_{1}=\left(p_{2}-p_{1}+t\right) / 2 F  \tag{3}\\
d q_{2} / d t & =\partial H / \partial p_{2}=\left(p_{1}-p_{2}+t / 2 F\right.  \tag{4}\\
d p_{1} / d t & =-\partial H / \partial q_{1}=\left(2 e^{2 q_{1}}-e^{q_{2}-q_{1}} / F\right.  \tag{5}\\
d p_{2} / d t & =-\partial H / \partial q_{2}=-1+e^{q_{2}-q_{1}} / F \tag{6}
\end{align*}
$$

where $H\left(q_{1}, q_{2} ; p_{1}, p_{2} ; t\right):=-q_{2}-\ln F\left(q_{1}, q_{2}, p_{1}, p_{2}, t\right)$, and where

$$
\begin{equation*}
F:=-e^{2 q_{1}}-e^{q_{2}-q_{1}}-\frac{1}{4}\left(p_{1}^{2}+p_{2}^{2}+t^{2}\right)+\frac{1}{2}\left(p_{1} p_{2}+p_{1} t+p_{2} t\right)>0 \tag{7}
\end{equation*}
$$
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Hamiltonian is not of polynomial-type so that canonical quantization cannot be applied.

[^9]
## Quantization of BKL scenario

How to quantize a non-polynomial Hamiltonian if canonical approach is useless?

Answer: try to use coherent states approach

- J. P. Gazeau and WP, J. Phys. A 37, 6977 (2004), "Asymptotic coherent states quantization of a particle in de Sitter space."
- A. Góźdź, WP, and G. Plewa, Eur. Phys. J. C (2019) 79:45, "Quantum Belinski-Khalatnikov-Lifshitz scenario."
- A. Góźdź, WP, and T. Schmitz, Eur. Phys. J. Plus, 2020, in press, "Dependence of the affine coherent states quantization on the parametrization of the affine group"
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## Quantum dynamics

## Making use of the coherent states quantization we have found the self-adjoint quantum Hamiltonian $\hat{H}$ corresponding to the classical one. Thus, the quantum evolution has been defined by the Schrödinger equation:

$$
\begin{equation*}
i \frac{\partial}{\partial t}|\psi(t)\rangle=\hat{H}(t)|\psi(t)\rangle \tag{8}
\end{equation*}
$$

where $|\psi\rangle \in L^{2}\left(\mathbb{R}_{+}, d \nu(x)\right)$, Hilbert space of our system, with $d \nu(x)=d x / x$, and where $\mathbb{R}_{+}:=\{x \in \mathbb{R} \mid x>0\}$.
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## Quantum dynamics near singularity

Near the gravitational singularity, the classical Hamiltonian simplifies so that the Schrödinger equation takes the form:

$$
\begin{equation*}
i \frac{\partial}{\partial t} \Psi\left(t, x_{1}, x_{2}\right)=\left(i \frac{\partial}{\partial x_{2}}-\frac{i}{2 x_{2}}-K\left(t, x_{1}, x_{2}\right)\right) \Psi\left(t, x_{1}, x_{2}\right) \tag{9}
\end{equation*}
$$

where
$K=\frac{1}{A_{\Phi_{1}} A_{\Phi_{2}}} \int_{0}^{\infty} \frac{d p_{1}}{p_{1}^{2}} \int_{0}^{\infty} \frac{d p_{2}}{p_{2}^{2}} \ln \left(F_{0}\left(t, \frac{p_{1}}{x_{1}}, \frac{p_{2}}{x_{2}}\right)\right)\left|\Phi_{1}\left(x_{1} / p_{1}\right)\right|^{2}\left|\Phi_{2}\left(x_{2} / p_{2}\right)\right|^{2}$
and where

$$
\begin{equation*}
F_{0}\left(t, p_{1}, p_{2}\right):=p_{1} p_{2}-\frac{1}{4}\left(t-p_{1}-p_{2}\right)^{2} \tag{10}
\end{equation*}
$$

## Resolution of singularity

The general solution to our Schrödinger equation (9) reads
$\Psi=\eta\left(x_{1}, x_{2}+t-t_{0}\right) \sqrt{\frac{x_{2}}{x_{2}+t-t_{0}}} \exp \left(i \int_{t_{0}}^{t} K\left(t^{\prime}, x_{1}, x_{2}+t-t^{\prime}\right) d t^{\prime}\right)$,
where $\eta\left(x_{1}, x_{2}\right):=\Psi\left(t_{0}, x_{1}, x_{2}\right)$ is the initial state.
One gets
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so that the probability amplitude is time independent, which implies that the quantum evolution is unitary.
One can show that it is continuous at $t=0$, which means that we are dealing with quantum bounce at $t=0$ (that marks the classical
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## Prospects: quantization of interior of black hole

- isotropic BH s, can be done
- quantum shell model (Minkowski+shell+Schwarzschild) ${ }^{5}$
- classical Oppenheimer-Snyder (FRW+Sch), classical Lemaître-Tolman-Bondi (LTB+Sch) ${ }^{6}$
- quantum FRW+Sch model ${ }^{7}$.
- quantum LTB+Sch model ${ }^{8}$
- anisotropic BHs, challenge
- Bianchi-type (inside) + Sch-like (outside), in progress
- BKL (inside) + Sch-like (outside), in progress
- radiation of GWs in cases of BIX and BKL, in progress

```
\({ }^{5}\) A. Góźdź, M. Kisielowski, and WP, in progress.
\({ }^{6}\) N. Kwidzinski, D. Malafarina, J. Ostrowski, WP, and T. Schmitz,
Phys. Rev. D 101, 104017 (2020).
\({ }^{7}\) WP and T. Schmitz, Phys. Rev. D 102, 046004 (2020)
\({ }^{8}\) A. Góźdź, A. Pȩdrak, J. Ostrowski, and WP, in progress.
```
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- BKL scenario concerns generic singularity of general relativity so that its resolution at quantum level strongly suggests that quantum gravity is free from singularities.
- It makes sense applying quantum gravity to address the issues of black holes singularities.
- quantum bounce, i.e. black to white hole transition, may lead to astrophysical small bang (analogy with cosmological Big Bang).
- quantum gravity may be used to get insight into the origin of numerous highly energetic explosions in distant galaxies and vice versa.
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