

# $(\Lambda)$ -BMS symmetries in the Carroll and Galilei limits

Tomasz Trzeźniewski\*

Institute of Theoretical Physics,  
University of Wrocław, Poland

September 18, 2024

---

\*Borowiec, Kowalski-Glikman & T. T., arXiv:2312.17245 [hep-th]

# Outline:

- 1 Introduction
- 2 Symmetry algebras and their interrelations
  - Kinematical algebras – example of 2+1 dimensions
  - $(\Lambda)$ BMS<sub>3</sub> algebras and their subalgebras
- 3 Carrollian and Galilean contractions of the  $(\Lambda)$ BMS algebras
  - Contractions of  $(\Lambda)$ BMS<sub>3</sub>
  - BMS<sub>4</sub> and its contractions
- 4 Conclusions and prospects

# Outline:

- 1 Introduction
- 2 Symmetry algebras and their interrelations
  - Kinematical algebras – example of 2+1 dimensions
  - $(\Lambda)$ -BMS<sub>3</sub> algebras and their subalgebras
- 3 Carrollian and Galilean contractions of the  $(\Lambda)$ -BMS algebras
  - Contractions of  $(\Lambda)$ -BMS<sub>3</sub>
  - BMS<sub>4</sub> and its contractions
- 4 Conclusions and prospects

# Outline:

- 1 Introduction
- 2 Symmetry algebras and their interrelations
  - Kinematical algebras – example of 2+1 dimensions
  - $(\Lambda)$ -BMS<sub>3</sub> algebras and their subalgebras
- 3 Carrollian and Galilean contractions of the  $(\Lambda)$ -BMS algebras
  - Contractions of  $(\Lambda)$ -BMS<sub>3</sub>
  - BMS<sub>4</sub> and its contractions
- 4 Conclusions and prospects

# Outline:

- 1 Introduction
- 2 Symmetry algebras and their interrelations
  - Kinematical algebras – example of 2+1 dimensions
  - $(\Lambda)$ -BMS<sub>3</sub> algebras and their subalgebras
- 3 Carrollian and Galilean contractions of the  $(\Lambda)$ -BMS algebras
  - Contractions of  $(\Lambda)$ -BMS<sub>3</sub>
  - BMS<sub>4</sub> and its contractions
- 4 Conclusions and prospects

# Non-Lorentzian kinematics and gravity

## Carrollian structures:

- Associated with the Carroll (“ultrarelativistic”) limit  $c \rightarrow 0$ 
  - Ultralocality – trivial dynamics of free particles
  - Two Carroll limits of GR: “electric” and “magnetic”
  - Strong-gravity expansion, BKL conjecture, asymptotic silence<sup>a</sup>
- Null hypersurfaces of Lorentzian geometries
  - Black-hole horizons; plane gravitational waves
  - BMS group  $\cong$  a conformal extension of Carroll group

<sup>a</sup>Mielczarek & T. T., PRD **96**, 024012 (2017)

## Galilean structures:

- Associated with the Galilei (“nonrelativistic”) limit  $c \rightarrow \infty$ 
  - Weak-gravity expansion, gravitational waves
  - GR in this regime is extended to non-zero torsion
- Null reductions of Lorentzian geometries

# Asymptotic (BMS) symmetries

## Their variants and manifestations:

- standard BMS algebra was originally discovered at null infinity of asymptotically flat spacetimes
- relaxed boundary conditions lead to an extension of the algebra
- tweaking the conditions allows it to arise also at spatial infinity
- BMS can be generalized to the case of  $\Lambda \neq 0$  (algebroid in 4d!)
- applications – memory effects, soft theorems, holography...

## Their Carrollian and Galilean contraction limits:

- recently derived for the standard BMS algebra<sup>a</sup>
- obtained either algebraically or out of asymptotic conditions
- **our aim** was to investigate the (Barnich-Troessaert) BMS algebra

<sup>a</sup>A. Pérez, JHEP **12**, 173 (2021); O. Fuentealba et al., PRD **106**, 104047 (2022)

# The origin of BMS algebra – example of 4d

Let us consider a **spacetime metric** (in retarded time  $u$  and spherical coordinates  $r, x^2 = \varphi, x^3 = \theta$ )

$$ds^2 = e^{2\beta} \frac{V}{r} du^2 - 2e^{2\beta} dudr + g_{AB}(U^A du - dx^A)(U^B du - dx^B), \quad (1)$$

where  $\beta$ ,  $V$ ,  $U^A$  and  $g_{AB}$  are arbitrary functions of the coordinates. Then, we assume the **asymptotic flatness at null infinity**, i.e. that

$$\beta = O(r^{-2}), \quad U^A = O(r^{-2}), \quad V/r = \dots + O(r^{-1}), \quad (2)$$

and  $g_{AB}$  is conformally spherical up to  $O(r)$ . These conditions are **preserved by Killing vectors**. If we allow the latter to be well defined only locally, they can be expanded on the sphere ( $z, \bar{z} \in \mathbb{C}$ ) via

$$L_n = -z^{n+1} \partial_z, \quad \bar{L}_n = -\bar{z}^{n+1} \partial_{\bar{z}}, \quad T_{nm} = z^n \bar{z}^m, \quad n, m \in \mathbb{Z}, \quad (3)$$

which generate (**Barnich-Troessaert**) BMS algebra<sup>a</sup> (**see later**).

<sup>a</sup>G. Barnich, C. Troessaert, PRL **105**, 111103 (2010)



# Lorentz, Carroll and Galilei (in 3d)

The brackets of **Poincaré** and **(anti)-de Sitter** algebras in (2+1)d can be written in a unified fashion (with  $\Lambda = 0$ ,  $\Lambda < 0$  or  $\Lambda > 0$ ):

$$\begin{aligned}
 [J, K_a] &= \epsilon_a^b K_b, & [K_1, K_2] &= -J, & [J, P_a] &= \epsilon_a^b P_b, & [J, P_0] &= 0, \\
 [K_a, P_b] &= \delta_{ab} P_0, & [K_a, P_0] &= P_a, & [P_1, P_2] &= \Lambda J, & [P_0, P_a] &= -\Lambda K_a.
 \end{aligned} \quad (4)$$

Denoting  $R := J$ ,  $\mathcal{T}_a := P_a$  and rescaling  $Q_a := c K_a$ ,  $\mathcal{T}_0 := c P_0$ , we take the limit  $c \rightarrow 0$  to obtain **Carroll / (anti)-de Sitter-Carroll** algebra:

$$\begin{aligned}
 [R, Q_a] &= \epsilon_a^b Q_b, & [Q_1, Q_2] &= 0, & [R, \mathcal{T}_a] &= \epsilon_a^b \mathcal{T}_b, & [R, \mathcal{T}_0] &= 0, \\
 [Q_a, \mathcal{T}_b] &= \delta_{ab} \mathcal{T}_0, & [Q_a, \mathcal{T}_0] &= 0, & [\mathcal{T}_1, \mathcal{T}_2] &= \Lambda R, & [\mathcal{T}_a, \mathcal{T}_0] &= \Lambda Q_a.
 \end{aligned} \quad (5)$$

If we denote  $R := J$ ,  $\mathcal{T}_0 := P_0$  and rescale  $Q_a := c^{-1} K_a$ ,  $\mathcal{T}_a := c^{-1} P_a$ , the limit  $c \rightarrow \infty$  leads to **Galilei / (anti)-de Sitter-Galilei** algebra:

$$\begin{aligned}
 [R, Q_a] &= \epsilon_a^b Q_b, & [Q_1, Q_2] &= 0, & [R, \mathcal{T}_a] &= \epsilon_a^b \mathcal{T}_b, & [R, \mathcal{T}_0] &= 0, \\
 [Q_a, \mathcal{T}_b] &= 0, & [Q_a, \mathcal{T}_0] &= \mathcal{T}_a, & [\mathcal{T}_1, \mathcal{T}_2] &= 0, & [\mathcal{T}_a, \mathcal{T}_0] &= \Lambda Q_a
 \end{aligned} \quad (6)$$

(for  $\Lambda \neq 0$ , also known as the “**expanding/oscillating Newton-Hooke**”).

# Carroll and Galilei not from contractions

At the abstract level, Poincaré algebra is related by the isomorphism

$$K_a \mapsto |\Lambda|^{-1/2} \mathcal{T}_a, \quad P_a \mapsto -|\Lambda|^{1/2} Q_a, \quad J \mapsto R, \quad P_0 \mapsto \mathcal{T}_0 \quad (7)$$

with anti-de Sitter-Carroll algebra, hence called the “para-Poincaré”. Similarly, (inhomogeneous) Euclidean algebra:

$$\begin{aligned} [J, K_a] &= \epsilon_a^b K_b, & [K_1, K_2] &= J, & [J, P_a] &= \epsilon_a^b P_b, & [J, P_3] &= 0, \\ [K_a, P_b] &= -\delta_{ab} P_3, & [K_a, P_3] &= P_a, & [P_1, P_2] &= 0, & [P_3, P_a] &= 0 \end{aligned} \quad (8)$$

describes different kinematics but is related by the isomorphism

$$K_a \mapsto \Lambda^{-1/2} \mathcal{T}_a, \quad P_a \mapsto \Lambda^{1/2} Q_a, \quad J \mapsto R, \quad P_3 \mapsto \mathcal{T}_0 \quad (9)$$

with de Sitter-Carroll algebra, hence called the “para-Euclidean”.

Both isomorphisms extend to  $d > 2 + 1$ . Other generic features are that Carroll algebra is a subalgebra of Poincaré one dimension higher, while Galilei algebra is a quotient subalgebra of the latter.

# Real forms of a complex algebra – $\mathfrak{o}(4; \mathbb{C})$

The algebra  $\mathfrak{o}(4; \mathbb{C}) \cong \mathfrak{o}(3; \mathbb{C}) \oplus \mathfrak{o}(3; \mathbb{C})$  in Cartan-Weyl basis becomes:

$$\begin{aligned} [H, E_{\pm}] &= \pm E_{\pm}, & [E_+, E_-] &= 2H, \\ [\bar{H}, \bar{E}_{\pm}] &= \pm \bar{E}_{\pm}, & [\bar{E}_+, \bar{E}_-] &= 2\bar{H}. \end{aligned} \quad (10)$$

A **real form** of a complex Lie algebra  $\mathfrak{g}$  is the pair  $(\mathfrak{g}, *)$ , where  $*$  is an **antilinear conjugation**. There exist 7 **real forms of  $\mathfrak{o}(4; \mathbb{C})$** , including:

- $\mathfrak{so}(3, 1)$ , with  $H^* = -\bar{H}$ ,  $E_{\pm}^* = -\bar{E}_{\pm}$ ,  $\bar{H}^* = -H$ ,  $\bar{E}_{\pm}^* = -E_{\pm}$ ,
- $\mathfrak{sl}(2; \mathbb{R}) \oplus \bar{\mathfrak{sl}}(2; \mathbb{R})$ , with  
 $H^* = -H$ ,  $E_{\pm}^* = -E_{\pm}$ ,  $\bar{H}^* = -\bar{H}$ ,  $\bar{E}_{\pm}^* = -\bar{E}_{\pm}$ ,
- $\mathfrak{su}(1, 1) \oplus \bar{\mathfrak{su}}(1, 1)$ , with  
 $H^* = H$ ,  $E_{\pm}^* = -E_{\mp}$ ,  $\bar{H}^* = \bar{H}$ ,  $\bar{E}_{\pm}^* = -\bar{E}_{\mp}$ ,
- $\mathfrak{su}(1, 1) \oplus \mathfrak{su}(1, 1)$ , with  
 $H^* = H$ ,  $E_{\pm}^* = -E_{\mp}$ ,  $\bar{H}^* = -\bar{H}$ ,  $\bar{E}_{\pm}^* = -\bar{E}_{\pm}$ .

$\mathfrak{so}(3, 1)$  is the **(2+1)d de Sitter (or (3+1)d Lorentz)** algebra, while the other three are isomorphic to **(2+1)d anti-de Sitter** algebra  $\mathfrak{so}(2, 2)$ .

# BMS algebra for (2+1)d spacetime

In terms of the generators of **superrotations**  $l_n$  and **supertranslations**  $T_n$ , BMS algebra in 2+1 dims (BMS<sub>3</sub>) is given by:

$$[l_n, l_m] = (n - m) l_{n+m}, \quad [l_n, T_m] = (n - m) T_{n+m}, \quad (11)$$

where  $n, m \in \mathbb{Z}$  and  $T_n$  are commutative. This **complex algebra** has four **real forms**, inherited from  $\mathfrak{o}(3, \mathbb{C})$ :

- type  $\mathfrak{sl}(2, \mathbb{R})$ , with  $l_n^* = -l_n$ ,  $T_n^* = -T_n$ ,
- type  $\mathfrak{su}(1, 1)$ , with  $l_n^* = l_{-n}$ ,  $T_n^* = T_{-n}$ ,
- type  $\mathfrak{so}(2, 1)$ , with  $l_n^* = (-1)^{n+1} l_n$ ,  $T_n^* = (-1)^{n+1} T_n$ ,
- type  $\mathfrak{su}(1, 1) | \mathfrak{su}(2)$ , with  $l_n^* = (-1)^n l_{-n}$ ,  $T_n^* = (-1)^n T_{-n}$ .

**The latter two cases will be skipped here.**

Types  $\mathfrak{sl}(2, \mathbb{R})$  and  $\mathfrak{su}(1, 1)$  are **isomorphic**. However, the distinction **can still matter**, cf. quantum-group deformations of  $\mathfrak{o}(4; \mathbb{C})^a$ .

<sup>a</sup>Kowalski-Glikman, Lukierski & T. T., JHEP **09**, 096 (2020)  
T. T., JHEP **02**, 200 (2024)

# Asymptotic (anti-)de Sitter symmetries

BMS<sub>3</sub> can be generalized to the (complex) algebra  $\Lambda$ -BMS<sub>3</sub>:

$$\begin{aligned} [I_n, I_m] &= (n - m) I_{n+m}, & [I_n, T_m] &= (n - m) T_{n+m}, \\ [T_n, T_m] &= -\Lambda (n - m) I_{n+m}. \end{aligned} \quad (12)$$

where  $n, m \in \mathbb{Z}$  and  $\Lambda$ -BMS<sub>3</sub> is recovered for  $\Lambda \rightarrow 0$ . If we change the basis to  $L_n/\bar{L}_n := \frac{1}{2} \left( I_n \pm \frac{1}{\sqrt{-\Lambda}} T_n \right)$ , so that the brackets (12) become

$$[L_n, L_m] = (n - m) L_{n+m}, \quad [\bar{L}_n, \bar{L}_m] = (n - m) \bar{L}_{n+m}, \quad (13)$$

the real forms of  $\Lambda$ -BMS<sub>3</sub>, inherited from  $\mathfrak{o}(4, \mathbb{C})$ , are as follows:

- type  $\mathfrak{sl}(2, \mathbb{R}) \oplus \mathfrak{sl}(2, \mathbb{R})$ , with  $L_n^* = -L_n$ ,  $\bar{L}_n^* = -\bar{L}_n$ ,  $\Lambda < 0$ ,
- type  $\mathfrak{su}(1, 1) \oplus \mathfrak{su}(1, 1)$ , with  $L_n^* = L_{-n}$ ,  $\bar{L}_n^* = \bar{L}_{-n}$ ,  $\Lambda < 0$ ,
- type  $\mathfrak{sl}(2, \mathbb{R}) \oplus \mathfrak{su}(1, 1)$ , with  $L_n^* = -L_n$ ,  $\bar{L}_n^* = \bar{L}_{-n}$ ,  $\Lambda < 0$ ,
- type  $\mathfrak{so}(3, 1)_a$ , with  $L_n^* = -\bar{L}_n$ ,  $\Lambda > 0$ ,
- type  $\mathfrak{so}(3, 1)_b$ , with  $L_n^* = \bar{L}_{-n}$ ,  $\Lambda > 0$ .

# Embedding kinematical algebras into $(\Lambda)$ -BMS<sub>3</sub>

$(\Lambda)$ -BMS<sub>3</sub> contains a family of subalgebras  $\text{span}\{I_0, I_{\pm n}, T_0, T_{\pm n}\}$ , for  $n \in \mathbb{N}$ , isomorphic to  $\mathfrak{o}(4; \mathbb{C})$  or inhomogeneous  $\mathfrak{o}(3; \mathbb{C})$ , respectively.

If we impose the  $(\Lambda)$ -BMS<sub>3</sub> real form of type:  $\mathfrak{su}(1, 1)$ ,  $\mathfrak{su}(1, 1) \oplus \mathfrak{su}(1, 1)$  or  $\mathfrak{so}(3, 1)_b$ , it allows to define embeddings of Poincaré algebra  $\mathfrak{iso}(2, 1)$  into BMS<sub>3</sub> or (a)dS algebra ( $\mathfrak{so}(2, 2)$ )  $\mathfrak{so}(3, 1)$  into  $\Lambda$ -BMS<sub>3</sub>:

$$\begin{aligned} J &= i I_0, & K_{1(n)} &= \frac{1}{2} (I_n - I_{-n}), & K_{2(n)} &= -\frac{i}{2} (I_n + I_{-n}), \\ P_0 &= i T_0, & P_{1(n)} &= \frac{i}{2} (T_n + T_{-n}), & P_{2(n)} &= \frac{1}{2} (T_n - T_{-n}), \end{aligned} \quad (14)$$

so that the generators are anti-Hermitian. Similarly, in the case of the  $(\Lambda)$ -BMS<sub>3</sub> real form of type:  $\mathfrak{sl}(2, \mathbb{R})$ ,  $\mathfrak{sl}(2, \mathbb{R}) \oplus \mathfrak{sl}(2, \mathbb{R})$  or  $\mathfrak{so}(3, 1)_a$ , there exists an alternative family of embeddings:

$$\begin{aligned} J_{(n)} &= \frac{1}{2} (I_n + I_{-n}), & K_{1(n)} &= \frac{1}{2} (I_n - I_{-n}), & K_2 &= -I_0, \\ P_{0(n)} &= \frac{1}{2} (T_n + T_{-n}), & P_{2(n)} &= \frac{1}{2} (T_n - T_{-n}), & P_1 &= T_0. \end{aligned} \quad (15)$$

# Extending the contractions to $BMS_3$

The assumption: a **given contraction of  $BMS_3$**  should turn its Poincaré subalgebras into **Carroll/Galilei subalgebras of the contracted  $BMS_3$** . This can be consistently implemented for the  $\mathfrak{su}(1, 1)$ -type real form. The case of type  $\mathfrak{sl}(2, \mathbb{R})$  – **wait for a discussion of  $BMS_4$** .

In particular, rescaling  $\forall n \neq 0 : l_n \mapsto c l_n = \tilde{l}_n, T_0 \mapsto c T_0 = \tilde{T}_0$  and taking the limit  $c \rightarrow 0$ , we obtain the **Carroll- $BMS_3$  algebra**:

$$\begin{aligned} [\tilde{l}_n, \tilde{l}_m] &= 0, & [l_0, \tilde{l}_n] &= -n \tilde{l}_n, & [l_0, T_n] &= -n T_n, \\ [l_0, \tilde{T}_0] &= 0, & [\tilde{l}_n, \tilde{T}_0] &= 0, & [\tilde{l}_n, T_m] &= 2\delta_{m,-n} n \tilde{T}_0. \end{aligned} \quad (16)$$

Similarly, rescaling  $\forall n \neq 0 : l_n \mapsto c^{-1} l_n = \hat{l}_n, T_n \mapsto c^{-1} T_n = \hat{T}_n$  and taking the limit  $c \rightarrow \infty$  leads to the **Galilei- $BMS_3$  algebra**:

$$\begin{aligned} [\hat{l}_n, \hat{l}_m] &= 0, & [l_0, \hat{l}_n] &= -n \hat{l}_n, & [l_0, \hat{T}_n] &= -n \hat{T}_n, \\ [l_0, T_0] &= 0, & [\hat{l}_n, T_0] &= n \hat{T}_n, & [\hat{l}_n, \hat{T}_m] &= 0. \end{aligned} \quad (17)$$

# Applying the same approach to $\Lambda$ -BMS<sub>3</sub>

In the Carrollian case, it leads to the brackets of Carroll-BMS<sub>3</sub> and

$$[T_n, \tilde{T}_0] = -\Lambda n \tilde{l}_n, \quad [T_n, T_{-n}] = -2\Lambda n l_0, \quad [T_n, T_m] \rightarrow \infty, \quad (18)$$

which means that the **contraction limit does not exist!**

In the Galilean case, we obtain **Galilei- $\Lambda$ -BMS<sub>3</sub> algebra**, which differs from Galilei-BMS<sub>3</sub> by the additional non-zero bracket:

$$[\hat{T}_n, T_0] = -\Lambda n \hat{l}_n. \quad (19)$$

The interpretation of contractions again depends on a real form.

Moreover, **extending the isomorphism** (7) of Poincaré and adS-Carroll algebras to BMS<sub>3</sub> and **(the alleged) Carroll- $\Lambda$ -BMS<sub>3</sub>**, we recover (18) (without the divergence) but miss one bracket of Carroll-BMS<sub>3</sub>. This may be compared with the (3+1)d case<sup>a</sup>

---

<sup>a</sup>A. Pérez, JHEP **09**, 044 (2022)



# BMS algebra for (3+1)d spacetime

The Barnich-Troessaert (**extended**) BMS algebra in 3+1 dims, or  $BMS_4$ , has the brackets

$$\begin{aligned}
 [L_n, L_m] &= (n - m) L_{n+m}, & [L_k, T_{nm}] &= \left(\frac{k+1}{2} - n\right) T_{n+k,m}, \\
 [\bar{L}_n, \bar{L}_m] &= (n - m) \bar{L}_{n+m}, & [\bar{L}_k, T_{nm}] &= \left(\frac{k+1}{2} - m\right) T_{n,m+k}, \\
 [L_n, \bar{L}_m] &= 0, & [T_{nm}, T_{n'm'}] &= 0
 \end{aligned} \tag{20}$$

for the generators of **superrotations**  $L_n, \bar{L}_n$  and **supertranslations**  $T_{nm}$ , where  $n, m \in \mathbb{Z}$ . Its subalgebra  $\text{span}\{L_n, \bar{L}_n; n \in \mathbb{Z}\} \cong \Lambda\text{-BMS}_3$  and hence one can define the following **real forms of  $BMS_4$** :

- type  $\mathfrak{sl}(2, \mathbb{R}) \oplus \mathfrak{sl}(2, \mathbb{R})$ , i.e.  $L_n^* = -L_n, \bar{L}_n^* = -\bar{L}_n, T_{nm}^* = -T_{nm}$ ,
- type  $\mathfrak{su}(1, 1) \oplus \mathfrak{su}(1, 1)$ , i.e.  $L_n^* = L_{-n}, \bar{L}_n^* = \bar{L}_{-n}, T_{nm}^* = -T_{1-n, 1-m}$ ,
- type  $\mathfrak{so}(3, 1)_a$ , i.e.  $L_n^* = -\bar{L}_n, T_{nm}^* = T_{mn}$ ,
- type  $\mathfrak{so}(3, 1)_b$ , i.e.  $L_n^* = \bar{L}_{-n}, T_{nm}^* = T_{1-m, 1-n}$ .

The latter two (with **Lorentzian-like superrotations**) are of interest here.

# Embedding Poincaré algebra into BMS<sub>4</sub>

If we consider the **real form of type  $\mathfrak{so}(3, 1)_a$** , the basis

$$\begin{aligned} R_n &:= L_n + \bar{L}_n, & \bar{R}_n &:= -i(L_n - \bar{L}_n), \\ S_{nm} &:= i\frac{1}{2}(T_{nm} + T_{mn}), & A_{nm} &:= \frac{1}{2}(T_{nm} - T_{mn}) \end{aligned} \quad (21)$$

is anti-Hermitian and allows to define a **family of embeddings** of Poincaré algebra  $\mathfrak{iso}(3, 1)$  into BMS<sub>4</sub> for  $n \in 2\mathbb{N} - 1$ :

$$\begin{aligned} J_1^{(n)} &= \frac{1}{2}(\bar{R}_{-n} - \bar{R}_n), & J_2^{(n)} &= \frac{1}{2}(R_n + R_{-n}), & J_3 &= -\bar{R}_0, \\ K_1^{(n)} &= \frac{1}{2}(R_n - R_{-n}), & K_2^{(n)} &= \frac{1}{2}(\bar{R}_n + \bar{R}_{-n}), & K_3 &= R_0, \\ P_{0/3}^{(n)} &= \frac{1}{2}(S_{qq} \pm S_{pp}), & P_1^{(n)} &= S_{pq}, & P_2^{(n)} &= A_{pq}, \end{aligned} \quad (22)$$

where  $p = \frac{1+n}{2}$ ,  $q = \frac{1-n}{2}$ . Therefore, the embeddings **do not cover the whole BMS<sub>4</sub>** and do not provide a framework for the contractions.

Our work on the **real form of type  $\mathfrak{so}(3, 1)_b$**  is not yet complete.

Using the analogy of structures of BMS<sub>4</sub> and  $\text{iso}(3, 1)$ 

We define the **quasi-Carrollian contraction** as rescaling  $\bar{R}_n \mapsto c \bar{R}_n$ ,  $A_{pq} \mapsto c A_{pq}$ ,  $\forall n, p, q \in \mathbb{Z}$  and taking the limit  $c \rightarrow 0$ , which gives:

$$\begin{aligned} [R_n, R_m] &= (n - m) R_{n+m}, & [R_n, \bar{R}_m] &= (n - m) \bar{R}_{n+m}, \\ [R_n, S_{pq}] &= \left(\frac{1}{2}(n + 1) - p\right) S_{p+n, q} + \left(\frac{1}{2}(n + 1) - q\right) S_{p, q+n}, \\ [R_n, A_{pq}] &= \left(\frac{1}{2}(n + 1) - p\right) A_{p+n, q} + \left(\frac{1}{2}(n + 1) - q\right) A_{p, q+n}, \\ [\bar{R}_n, S_{pq}] &= \left(\frac{1}{2}(n + 1) - p\right) A_{p+n, q} - \left(\frac{1}{2}(n + 1) - q\right) A_{p, q+n}. \end{aligned} \quad (23)$$

The **quasi-Galilean contraction** consists in rescaling  $\bar{R}_n \mapsto c^{-1} \bar{R}_n$ ,  $S_{pq} \mapsto c^{-1} S_{pq}$ ,  $\forall n, p, q \in \mathbb{Z}$  and taking the limit  $c \rightarrow \infty$ , which gives:

$$\begin{aligned} [R_n, R_m] &= (n - m) R_{n+m}, & [R_n, \bar{R}_m] &= (n - m) \bar{R}_{n+m}, \\ [R_n, S_{pq}] &= \left(\frac{1}{2}(n + 1) - p\right) S_{p+n, q} + \left(\frac{1}{2}(n + 1) - q\right) S_{p, q+n}, \\ [R_n, A_{pq}] &= \left(\frac{1}{2}(n + 1) - p\right) A_{p+n, q} + \left(\frac{1}{2}(n + 1) - q\right) A_{p, q+n}, \\ [\bar{R}_n, A_{pq}] &= -\left(\frac{1}{2}(n + 1) - p\right) S_{p+n, q} + \left(\frac{1}{2}(n + 1) - q\right) S_{p, q+n}. \end{aligned} \quad (24)$$

# Interpretation of the new type of contractions

In terms of the lightcone basis of Poincaré subalgebras:

$$\begin{aligned}
 M_{\pm 1}^{(n)} &= \frac{1}{\sqrt{2}} (\pm J_2^{(n)} - K_1^{(n)}), & M_{\pm 2}^{(n)} &= \frac{1}{\sqrt{2}} (\mp J_1^{(n)} - K_2^{(n)}), \\
 P_{\pm}^{(n)} &= \frac{1}{\sqrt{2}} (P_0^{(n)} \pm P_3^{(n)}), & &
 \end{aligned}
 \tag{25}$$

the **quasi-Carrollian contraction** involves rescaling of the generators of spatial translations  $P_2^{(n)}$ , while **quasi-Galilean** – the generators of null and spatial translations  $P_{\pm}^{(n)}$ ,  $P_1^{(n)}$ , as well as they both involve rescaling of the generators of null rotations  $M_{\pm 2}^{(n)}$  and rotations  $J_3$ .

The contractions of  **$(\Lambda)$ -BMS<sub>3</sub> for the alternative real forms** (type  $\mathfrak{sl}(2, \mathbb{R})$ ,  $\mathfrak{sl}(2, \mathbb{R}) \oplus \mathfrak{sl}(2, \mathbb{R})$  or  $\mathfrak{so}(3, 1)_a$ ) have exactly **the same meaning** of quasi-Carrollian/Galilean but lead to the Carroll/Galilei contraction limits.

# Conclusions and prospects

## Summary:

- $BMS_3$  and  $\Lambda$ - $BMS_3$  can be covered by (overlapping) subalgebras isomorphic to 3D Poincaré or (anti-)de Sitter, respectively
- we define the Carrollian/Galilean contraction of  $(\Lambda)$ - $BMS_3$  by demanding that all such subalgebras become Carrollian/Galilean
- the interpretation changes for certain real forms of  $(\Lambda)$ - $BMS_3$
- Carroll- $\Lambda$ - $BMS_3$  turns out to not exist, at least in the expected way
- (extended)  $BMS_4$  is a more tricky case, the work still in progress

## Some future directions:

- a more detailed comparison with results for the standard BMS
- what asymptotic conditions lead to our contraction limits of BMS?
- applying the contractions to quantum-group BMS deformations<sup>a</sup>

<sup>a</sup>A. Borowiec et al., JHEP **02**, 084 (2021); JHEP **11**, 103 (2021)