

Gravitomagnetic effects in Palatini $f(R)$ theories of gravity

Lorenzo Iorio

INFN-Sezione di Pisa. Permanent address for correspondence: Viale Unità di Italia 68,
70125, Bari (BA), Italy. E-mail: lorenzo.iorio@libero.it

and

Matteo Luca Ruggiero

Dipartimento di Fisica del Politecnico di Torino and INFN-Sezione di Torino, Corso Duca
degli Abruzzi 24, 10129, Torino (TO), Italy. E-mail: matteo.ruggiero@polito.it

Received _____; accepted _____

ABSTRACT

We explicitly worked out the orbital effects induced on the trajectory of a test particle by the the weak-field approximation of the Kerr-de Sitter metric, which is a solution of vacuum $f(R)$ field equations, in the Palatini formalism. It results that the node, the pericentre and the mean anomaly undergo secular precessions proportional to k , which is a measure of the non linearity of the theory. We used such theoretical predictions and the latest observational determinations of the non-standard precessions of the perihelia of the inner planets of the Solar System to put a bound on k getting $k \leq 10^{-29} \text{ m}^{-2}$. The node rate of the LAGEOS Earth's satellite yields $k \leq 10^{-26} \text{ m}^{-2}$. The periastron precession of the double pulsar PSR J0737-3039A/B allows to obtain $k \leq 3 \times 10^{-21} \text{ m}^{-2}$.

Subject headings: Classical general relativity–Approximation methods; equations of motion–Experimental tests of gravitational theories–Orbit determination and improvement

1. Introduction

The General Theory of Relativity (GTR) has passed with excellent results many observational tests, as Solar System and binary pulsars observations show (Ni 2005; Will 2006; Turyshev 2008). As a matter of fact, the current values of the PPN parameters are in agreement with GTR predictions.

However, some observations seem to question the general relativistic model of gravitational interaction on larger scales. On the one hand, the data coming from the galactic rotation curves of spiral galaxies (Binney and Tremaine 1987) cannot be explained on the basis of Newtonian gravity or GTR: the existence of *dark matter* is postulated to reconcile the theoretical model with observations; furthermore, dark matter can explain the mass discrepancy in galactic clusters (Clowe et al. 2006). On the other hand, a lot of observations, such as the light curves of the type Ia supernovæ and the cosmic microwave background (CMB) experiments (Riess et al. 1998; Perlmutter et al. 1999; Bennet et al. 2003), firmly state that our Universe is now undergoing a phase of accelerated expansion. Actually, the present acceleration of the Universe cannot be explained, within GTR, unless the existence of a cosmic fluid having exotic properties is postulate, i.e. the so called *dark energy*.

Among the theories that have been proposed to face these problems, going beyond GTR, $f(R)$ theories of gravity (Sotiriou and Faraoni 2008) received much attention in recent years. In these theories the gravitational lagrangian depends on an arbitrary function f of the scalar curvature R ; they are also referred to as “extended theories of gravity”, since they naturally generalize, on a geometric ground, GTR: namely, when $f(R) = R$ the action reduces to the usual Einstein-Hilbert action, and Einstein’s theory is obtained. Extended theories of gravity can be studied in different formalisms (see Capozziello and Francaviglia (2007) and references therein): in order to obtain the field equations in the *metric formalism*

the action is varied with respect to metric tensor only; in the *Palatini formalism* the action is varied with respect to the metric and the affine connection, which are supposed to be independent from one another. In general, the two approaches are not equivalent. Actually, $f(R)$ provide cosmologically viable models able to reproduce both the inflation phase and the accelerated expansion (see Amarzguioui et al. (2006), Nojiri and Odintsov (2007) and references therein); furthermore, they have been used to reproduce the rotation curves of galaxies without need for dark matter (Capozziello et al. 2007; Frigerio Martins and Salucci 2007). However, because of the excellent agreement of GTR with Solar System tests and binary pulsars observations, every theory that aims at explaining galaxies dynamics and the accelerated expansion of the Universe should reproduce GTR at the Solar System scale, i.e. in a suitable weak field limit. In other words, also for $f(R)$ theories the constraint holds to have correct Newtonian and post-Newtonian limits. This issue has been lively debated in the recent literature; for a comprehensive review we refer to Sotiriou and Faraoni (2008) who discussed this problem in detail.

In this paper we are concerned with some peculiar post-Newtonian effects, i.e. the so called gravito-magnetic (GM) effects in $f(R)$ theories of gravity. GM effects are due to the rotation of the sources of the gravitational field: this gives raise to the presence of off-diagonal terms in the metric tensor, which are responsible for a variety of effects concerning orbiting test particles, precessing gyroscopes, moving clocks and atoms and propagating electromagnetic waves (Mashhoon et al. 2001; Ruggiero and Tartaglia 2002; Schäfer 2004; Mashhoon 2007). They are expected in GTR, but are generally very small and, hence, very difficult to detect (Iorio 2007a). In recent years, there have been some attempts to measure the Lense-Thirring effect (Lense and Thirring 1918) with the LAGEOS and LAGEOS II laser-ranged satellites in the gravitational field of the Earth (Ciufolini and Pavlis 2004); the evaluation of the realistic accuracy reached in such a test and other topics related to it are still matter of debate (Iorio 2006a, 2007b). For

other attempts to measure the Lense-Thirring effect in other Solar System scenarios with natural and artificial satellites, see (Iorio 2007a). In April 2004 the Gravity Probe B spacecraft (Everitt et al. 2001) was launched to accurately measure the gravito-magnetic (and geodetic) precession of an orbiting gyroscope (Pugh 1959; Schiff 1960) in the terrestrial space environment: the final results are going to be published. We focus on the GM effects in Palatini $f(R)$ gravity (GM effects and other Post-Newtonian effects were obtained in metric $f(R)$ gravity by Clifton (2008); the GM precession of an orbiting gyroscope was investigated by Ruggiero (2008)): in particular we work out the GM effects in the weak-field and slow-motion approximation on the orbit of a test particle, working out explicitly the perturbations of the Keplerian orbital elements; furthermore, by using the EPM2004 (Pitjeva 2005a) and EPM2006 (Pitjeva 2008) ephemerides, we put constraints on the parameter k , which is a measure of the non linearity of the theory.

The paper is organized as follows: in Section 2 we briefly review the field equations of Palatini $f(R)$ gravity, while in Section 3 we work out the GM effects and their impact on the orbit of a test particle. Section 4 is devoted to the discussion and the conclusions.

2. Vacuum field equations of Palatini $f(R)$ gravity

The equations of motion of $f(R)$ extended theories of gravity can be obtained starting from the action:

$$A = A_{\text{grav}} + A_{\text{mat}} = \int [\sqrt{g}f(R) + 2\chi L_{\text{mat}}(\psi, \nabla\psi)] d^4x. \quad (1)$$

The gravitational part of the Lagrangian is represented by a function $f(R)$ of the scalar curvature R . The total Lagrangian contains also a first order matter part L_{mat} functionally depending on matter fields Ψ , together with their first derivatives, equipped with a gravitational coupling constant $\chi = \frac{8\pi G}{c^4}$. In the Palatini formalism the metric g and the

affine connection Γ are supposed to be independent, so that the scalar curvature R has to be intended as $R \equiv R(g, \Gamma) = g^{\alpha\beta} R_{\alpha\beta}(\Gamma)$, where $R_{\mu\nu}(\Gamma)$ is the Ricci-like tensor of the connection Γ . By independent variations with respect to the metric g and the connection Γ , we obtain the following equations of motion:

$$f'(R)R_{(\mu\nu)}(\Gamma) - \frac{1}{2}f(R)g_{\mu\nu} = \chi T_{\mu\nu}, \quad (2)$$

$$\nabla_{\alpha}^{\Gamma}[\sqrt{g}f'(R)g^{\mu\nu}] = 0, \quad (3)$$

where $f'(R) = df(R)/dR$, $T_{\mu\nu}$ is the matter source stress-energy tensor and ∇^{Γ} means covariant derivative with respect to the connection Γ (Capozziello and Francaviglia 2007; Sotiriou and Faraoni 2008). Eq. (2) can be supplemented by the scalar-valued equation obtained by taking the contraction of eq. (2) with the metric tensor:

$$f'(R)R - 2f(R) = \chi T, \quad (4)$$

where T is the trace of the energy-momentum tensor. Eq. (4) is an algebraic equation for the scalar curvature R : it is called the *structural equation* and it controls the solutions of eq. (2). We are interested into solutions of the field equation in vacuum, in particular outside a rotating source of matter: thus, the field equations become

$$f'(R)R_{(\mu\nu)}(\Gamma) - \frac{1}{2}f(R)g_{\mu\nu} = 0, \quad (5)$$

$$\nabla_{\alpha}^{\Gamma}[\sqrt{g}f'(R)g^{\mu\nu}] = 0, \quad (6)$$

and they are, again, supplemented by the scalar equation

$$f'(R)R - 2f(R) = 0. \quad (7)$$

For a given function f , the trace equation of eq. (7) is an algebraic equation for R which admits constant solutions $R = c_i$. Then, it is possible to show that, under suitable conditions (Ferraris et al. 1993; Allemandi et al. 2005), eq. (5)-eq. (6) reduce to

$$R_{\mu\nu}(g) = kg_{\mu\nu}, \quad (8)$$

with $k = c_i/4$, which are identical to GTR equations with a cosmological constant Λ : in practice, it is $\Lambda = k$ in our notation. Indeed, we may say that k is a measure of the non-linearity of the theory (if $f(R) = R$, eq. (7) has only the solution $R = 0 \rightarrow k = 0$).

Accordingly, the vacuum solutions of GTR with a cosmological constant can be used in Palatini $f(R)$ gravity: the role of the $f(R)$ function is determining the solutions of the structural equation¹. In particular, the Kerr-de Sitter solution, which describes a rotating black-hole in a space-time with a cosmological constant (Demianski 1973; Carter 1973; Kerr et al. 2003; Kraniotis 2004, 2005, 2007), can be used to investigate GM effects in extended theories of gravity.

The Kerr-de Sitter metric in the standard Boyer-Lindquist coordinates $x^\mu = (t, \rho, \theta, \phi)$ has the form²

$$\begin{aligned}
 ds^2 = & \left\{ 1 - \frac{2GM\rho}{c^2\Sigma} - \frac{k}{3} \left[\rho^2 + \left(\frac{J}{Mc} \right)^2 \sin^2\theta \right] \right\} c^2 dt^2 + \\
 & + 2 \left(\frac{J}{Mc} \right) \left\{ \frac{2GM\rho}{c^2\Sigma} + \frac{k}{3} \left[\rho^2 + \left(\frac{J}{Mc} \right)^2 \right] \right\} \sin^2\theta c dt d\phi + \frac{\Sigma}{\Delta} d\rho^2 + \frac{\Sigma}{\chi} d\theta^2 + \\
 & + \left\{ \frac{2GM\rho}{c^2\Sigma} \left(\frac{J}{Mc} \right)^2 \sin^2\theta + \left[1 + \frac{k}{3} \left(\frac{J}{Mc} \right)^2 \right] \left[\rho^2 + \left(\frac{J}{Mc} \right)^2 \right] \right\} \sin^2\theta d\phi^2 , \quad (9)
 \end{aligned}$$

¹It is useful to point out that, for a given function f function, in vacuum case the solutions of the field equations of Palatini $f(R)$ gravity are a subset of the solutions of the field equations of metric $f(R)$ gravity (see e.g. (Magnano 1995)) of eq. (7). Thus, every solution of eq. (8) is also a solution of the field equations of metric $f(R)$ gravity *with constant scalar curvature* R

²The space-time metric has signature $(1, -1, -1, -1)$, greek indices run from 0 to 3, and latin ones run from 1 to 3, boldface letters like \boldsymbol{r} refers to three-vectors.

where

$$\Sigma = \rho^2 + \left(\frac{J}{Mc}\right)^2 \cos^2 \theta \quad , \quad \chi = 1 + \frac{k}{3} \left(\frac{J}{Mc}\right)^2 \cos^2 \theta \quad , \quad (10)$$

$$\Delta = \rho^2 - 2\frac{GM\rho}{c^2} + \left(\frac{J}{Mc}\right)^2 - \frac{k}{3}\rho^2 \left[\rho^2 + \left(\frac{J}{Mc}\right)^2 \right] \quad . \quad (11)$$

The mass of the source is M , while J is its angular momentum (which is perpendicular to the $\theta = \pi/2$ plane). When $k = 0$ the Kerr-de Sitter metric given by eq. (9) reduces to the Kerr metric. Other limiting cases can be checked: for instance, when $J = 0$, we obtain the Schwarzschild-de Sitter solution, and when $M = J = 0$ we have the de Sitter space-time.

3. Gravito-magnetic field in Palatini $f(R)$ gravity

In order to study GM effects a weak field approximation eq. (9) is sufficient; furthermore, it is useful to introduce the isotropic radial coordinate r denotes the defined as

$$r = \rho \left(1 - \frac{GM}{c^2\rho} - \frac{k\rho^2}{12} \right) \quad , \quad (12)$$

where ρ is the standard Boyer-Lindquist radial coordinate. Then, up to linear terms in $\frac{GM}{c^2r}$, $\frac{GJ}{c^3r^2}$, kr^2 , $\frac{kJr}{cM}$, the metric is

$$\begin{aligned} ds^2 = & \left(1 - \frac{2GM}{c^2r} - \frac{k}{3}r^2 \right) c^2 dt^2 - \left(1 + \frac{2GM}{c^2r} - \frac{k}{6}r^2 \right) (dr^2 + r^2 d\theta^2 + r^2 \sin^2 \theta d\phi^2) + \\ & + 2\frac{J}{Mc} \left(\frac{2GM}{c^2r} + \frac{k}{3}r^2 + \frac{5}{6}\frac{GM}{c^2}kr \right) \sin^2 \theta d\phi c dt. \end{aligned} \quad (13)$$

In particular, it turns out that the off-diagonal, i.e. gravito-magnetic, components g_{0i} , $i = 1, 2, 3$ of the metric tensor of the weak-field approximation of the Kerr-de Sitter

space-time are, in cartesian coordinates

$$g_{01} = \frac{J}{Mc} \left(\frac{2GM}{c^2 r^3} + \frac{k}{3} + \frac{5GMk}{6c^2 r^2} \right) y, \quad (14)$$

$$g_{02} = -\frac{J}{Mc} \left(\frac{2GM}{c^2 r^3} + \frac{k}{3} + \frac{5GMk}{6c^2 r^2} \right) x \quad (15)$$

$$g_{03} = 0; \quad (16)$$

In the weak-field and slow-motion linear approximation the spatial components of the geodesic equations of motions yielding gravito-magnetic accelerations are (Foster and Nightingale 1995)

$$\frac{d^2 x^i}{dt^2} = c \delta^{ik} (\partial_j h_{0k} - \partial_k h_{0j}) \frac{dx^j}{dt}, \quad i = 1, 2, 3 \quad (17)$$

where $h_{0l} = g_{0l} - \eta_{0l} = g_{0l}$, $l = 1, 2, 3$. It can be straightforwardly showed that the terms not containing k yield the usual Lense-Thirring acceleration in cartesian coordinates (Soffel 1989). The components of the acceleration containing k in cartesian coordinates are

$$A_x = \frac{2GJk}{3c^2} \left\{ - \left[\frac{c^2}{GM} + \frac{5}{4} \left(\frac{x^2 + y^2 + 2z^2}{r^3} \right) \right] \dot{y} + \left(\frac{5yz}{4r^3} \right) \dot{z} \right\}, \quad (18)$$

$$A_y = \frac{2GJk}{3c^2} \left\{ \left[\frac{c^2}{GM} + \frac{5}{4} \left(\frac{x^2 + y^2 + 2z^2}{r^3} \right) \right] \dot{x} - \left(\frac{5yz}{4r^3} \right) \dot{z} \right\}, \quad (19)$$

$$A_z = \frac{5GJk}{6c^2} \left[\frac{z(xy - yx)}{r^3} \right]. \quad (20)$$

which can be cast into the vectorial form (Mashhoon 2007)

$$\mathbf{A} = -2 \frac{\mathbf{v}}{c} \times \mathbf{B}, \quad (21)$$

where the gravito-magnetic field \mathbf{B} is

$$\mathbf{B} = \frac{Jkc}{3M} \hat{\mathbf{J}} + \frac{5GJk}{12c} \frac{[\hat{\mathbf{J}} + (\hat{\mathbf{J}} \cdot \hat{\mathbf{r}}) \hat{\mathbf{r}}]}{r}, \quad (22)$$

with \mathbf{J} directed along the z axis of an inertial frame centered in the central mass. We notice that the gravito-magnetic field consists of two contributions, the first one that is

everywhere constant and parallel to \mathbf{J} , the second one whose position and directions are position-dependent.

Furthermore, by defining the gravito-magnetic potential \mathcal{A} as (Mashhoon 2007)

$$\mathcal{A} = kr^2 \left(\frac{c^2 r}{6GM} + \frac{5}{12} \right) \frac{G \mathbf{J} \times \mathbf{r}}{c r^3} \quad (23)$$

and recalling that

$$\nabla \times (\mathbf{A} \times \mathbf{B}) = (\mathbf{B} \cdot \nabla) \mathbf{A} - (\mathbf{A} \cdot \nabla) \mathbf{B} + \mathbf{A} \nabla \cdot \mathbf{B} - \mathbf{B} \nabla \cdot \mathbf{A}, \quad (24)$$

$$\nabla \cdot \mathbf{r} = 3, \quad \nabla \frac{1}{r} = -\frac{\hat{\mathbf{r}}}{r^2}, \quad (25)$$

it is possible to express the gravito-magnetic field \mathcal{B} in terms of \mathcal{A} as (Mashhoon 2007)

$$\mathcal{B} = \nabla \times \mathcal{A}. \quad (26)$$

In order to calculate the impact of eq. (21) on the orbit of a test particle, let us project it onto the radial ($\hat{\mathbf{r}}$), transverse ($\hat{\mathbf{t}}$) and normal ($\hat{\mathbf{n}}$) directions of the co-moving frame picked out by the three unit vectors³ (Montenbruck and Gill 2000)

$$\hat{\mathbf{r}} = \cos u \hat{\mathbf{x}} + \cos i \sin u \hat{\mathbf{y}} + \sin i \sin u \hat{\mathbf{z}}, \quad (27)$$

$$\hat{\mathbf{t}} = -\sin u \hat{\mathbf{x}} + \cos i \cos u \hat{\mathbf{y}} + \sin i \cos u \hat{\mathbf{z}} \quad (28)$$

$$\hat{\mathbf{n}} = -\sin i \hat{\mathbf{y}} + \cos i \hat{\mathbf{z}}, \quad (29)$$

where i is the inclination of the orbital plane to the equator of the central mass and $u = \omega + f$ is the argument of latitude defined as the sum of the argument of the pericentre ω , which fixes the position of the pericentre with respect to the line of the nodes, and the

³Here we have chosen the x axis coincident with the line of the nodes, i.e. $\Omega = 0$.

true anomaly f which reckons the position of the test particle from the pericentre. Thus,

$$A_r = \mathbf{A} \cdot \hat{\mathbf{r}} = -\frac{GJk}{6c^2} \left(5 + 4\frac{c^2 r}{GM} \right) \cos i \dot{u}, \quad (30)$$

$$A_t = \mathbf{A} \cdot \hat{\mathbf{t}} = 0, \quad (31)$$

$$A_n = \mathbf{A} \cdot \hat{\mathbf{n}} = \frac{GJk}{3c^2} \left(5 + 2\frac{c^2 r}{GM} \right) \sin i \sin u \dot{u}; \quad (32)$$

they must be inserted into the right-hand-side of the Gauss equations (Bertotti et al. 2003) of the variations of the Keplerian orbital elements

$$\frac{da}{dt} = \frac{2}{n\sqrt{1-e^2}} \left[eA_r \sin f + A_t \left(\frac{p}{r} \right) \right], \quad (33)$$

$$\frac{de}{dt} = \frac{\sqrt{1-e^2}}{na} \left\{ A_r \sin f + A_t \left[\cos f + \frac{1}{e} \left(1 - \frac{r}{a} \right) \right] \right\}, \quad (34)$$

$$\frac{di}{dt} = \frac{1}{na\sqrt{1-e^2}} A_n \left(\frac{r}{a} \right) \cos u, \quad (35)$$

$$\frac{d\Omega}{dt} = \frac{1}{na \sin i \sqrt{1-e^2}} A_n \left(\frac{r}{a} \right) \sin u, \quad (36)$$

$$\frac{d\omega}{dt} = \frac{\sqrt{1-e^2}}{nae} \left[-A_r \cos f + A_t \left(1 + \frac{r}{p} \right) \sin f \right] - \cos i \frac{d\Omega}{dt}, \quad (37)$$

$$\frac{d\mathcal{M}}{dt} = n - \frac{2}{na} A_r \left(\frac{r}{a} \right) - \sqrt{1-e^2} \left(\frac{d\omega}{dt} + \cos i \frac{d\Omega}{dt} \right), \quad (38)$$

where a , e , Ω and \mathcal{M} are the semi-major axis, the eccentricity, the longitude of the ascending node and the mean anomaly of the orbit of the test particle, respectively, $p = a(1-e^2)$ is the semi-latus rectum and $n = \sqrt{GM/a^3}$ is the un-perturbed Keplerian mean motion. By evaluating them onto the un-perturbed Keplerian ellipse

$$r = \frac{a(1-e^2)}{1+e \cos f} \quad (39)$$

and averaging⁴ them over one orbital period P_b of the test particle by means of

$$\frac{dt}{P_b} = \frac{(1-e^2)^{3/2}}{2\pi(1+e \cos f)^2} df, \quad (40)$$

⁴We used $\dot{u} = \dot{f}$ because over one orbital revolution the pericentre ω can be assumed constant.

it is possible to obtain the secular effects induced by eq. (21)

$$\langle \dot{a} \rangle = 0, \quad (41)$$

$$\langle \dot{e} \rangle = 0, \quad (42)$$

$$\langle \dot{i} \rangle = 0, \quad (43)$$

$$\langle \dot{\Omega} \rangle = \frac{Jk}{3} \left(\frac{1}{M} + \frac{5G}{2c^2a} \right), \quad (44)$$

$$\langle \dot{\omega} \rangle = -\frac{Jk \cos i}{3} \left(\frac{2}{M} + \frac{5G}{2c^2a} \right), \quad (45)$$

$$\langle \dot{\mathcal{M}} \rangle = n + \frac{5Jk \cos i}{3} \left(\frac{1}{M} + \frac{G}{c^2a} \right). \quad (46)$$

In the calculation we have neglected terms of order $\mathcal{O}(e^2)$.

The correction ΔP_b to the orbital period P_b due to eq. (21) can be calculated using the mean longitude

$$\lambda = \mathcal{M} + \omega + \cos i \Omega. \quad (47)$$

For small eccentricities eq. (36)-eq. (38) yield

$$\frac{d\lambda}{dt} \approx n - \frac{2}{na} A_r \left(\frac{r}{a} \right). \quad (48)$$

By using eq. (30) it is possible to obtain, for $e \rightarrow 0$,

$$P_b \approx \frac{2\pi}{n} \left[1 - \frac{GJk}{3c^2na} \left(\frac{4c^2a}{GM} + 5 \right) \cos i \right], \quad (49)$$

so that

$$\Delta P_b = -\frac{2\pi Jka^2}{3c^2M} \left(\frac{4c^2a}{GM} + 5 \right) \cos i. \quad (50)$$

We will, now, put constraints on k from the corrections to the standard Newtonian/Einsteinian precessions of the longitudes of the perihelia $\varpi = \omega + \cos i \Omega$ of the inner planets of the Solar System, quoted in Table 1, estimated by E.V. Pitjeva by fitting more than 400000 observations of various kinds with the EPM2004 (Pitjeva 2005a,b)

and EPM2006 (Pitjeva 2008) ephemerides. No gravito-magnetic terms of any kind were included in the dynamical force models used, so that, in principle, they account for the effects investigated by us. For the spin angular momentum of the Sun we will use the value $J_{\odot} = (190.0 \pm 1.5) \times 10^{39} \text{ kg m}^2 \text{ s}^{-1}$ determined from helioseismology (Pijpers 1998, 2003), i.e. independently of the planetary dynamics which we want to test. From

$$\langle \dot{\varpi} \rangle = -\frac{Jk \cos i}{3M}, \quad (51)$$

and Table 1 it is possible to obtain

$$k \leq 1 \times 10^{-29} \text{ m}^{-2}. \quad (52)$$

In the case of the laser-ranged LAGEOS satellite (Smith and Dunn 1980), orbiting at about 6000 km above the Earth’s surface, by assuming $J_{\oplus} = 5.85 \times 10^{33} \text{ kg m}^2 \text{ s}^{-1}$ (McCarthy and Petit 2004) and an uncertainty of the order of 1 cm or less (Lucchesi 2007) in reconstructing its orbit, which translates into an uncertainty in the nodal rate of $\delta\dot{\Omega} \sim 0.1$ milliarcseconds per year, the bound which can be obtained from eq. (44) is $k \leq 4 \times 10^{-26} \text{ m}^{-2}$.

Concerning the double pulsar system PSR J0737-3039A/B (Burgay et al. 2003), by assuming for the moment of inertia of A the value $I \approx 10^{38} \text{ kg m}^2$ (Lorimer and Kramer 2005), since its rotational period is 22 ms (Kramer et al. 2006) its angular momentum can be evaluated as $J_A = 2.8 \times 10^{40} \text{ kg m}^2 \text{ s}^{-1}$. The overall uncertainty (including also the mismodelling in the usual 1PN term) in the periastron precession amounts to 0.03 deg yr⁻¹ (Iorio 2009), so that eq. (45) and the system’s parameters (Kramer et al. 2006) yield $k \leq 3 \times 10^{-21} \text{ m}^{-2}$.

Such bounds are not competitive with the ones which can be obtained from the Schwarzschild-de Sitter non-gravitomagnetic precession (Iorio 2006b; Sereno and Jetzer 2006; Jetzer and Sereno 2006; Ruggiero and Iorio 2007).

4. Discussion and Conclusions

We explicitly worked out the effects induced on the orbit of a test particle by the weak-field approximation of the Kerr-de Sitter metric, which is a solution of vacuum $f(R)$ field equations, in the Palatini formalism. It turns out that the semi-major axis, the eccentricity and the inclination do not experience secular, i.e. averaged over one orbital period, changes; instead, the longitude of the ascending node, the argument of pericentre and the mean anomaly undergo secular precessions. Interestingly, all such effects consist of two kinds of contributions. The first type is given by terms proportional to GMc^{-2} , which vanish in the limits $c \rightarrow \infty$, $G \rightarrow 0$, $M \rightarrow 0$. Instead, the second kind consists of terms proportional to Jk/M , which are independent of the speed of light c , the constant of gravitation G and the source's mass M , so that they do not vanish in the limits for $c \rightarrow \infty$, $G \rightarrow 0$ and $M \rightarrow 0$. Concerning the dependence on the orbital geometry, both kinds of effects depend on the inclination and vanish for polar orbits; while the $\mathcal{O}(c^{-2})$ terms depend also on the size of the orbit through the semi-major axis, it is not so for the $\mathcal{O}(Jk/M)$ ones which are, indeed, independent of it. Then, we compared our predictions to the latest observational determinations of the corrections to the standard Newtonian/Einsteinian precessions of the perihelia of the inner planets of the Solar System obtaining the constrain $k \leq 10^{-29} \text{ m}^{-2}$. The node of the terrestrial LAGEOS satellite yields $k \leq 10^{-26} \text{ m}^{-2}$, while the bound from the periastron of the double pulsar system PSR J0737-3039A/B is $k \leq 3 \times 10^{-21} \text{ m}^{-2}$.

Table 1: Inner planets. First row: estimated perihelion extra-precessions in $10^{-4}'' \text{ cy}^{-1}$ ($'' \text{ cy}^{-1} \rightarrow$ arcseconds per century), from Table 3 of (Pitjeva 2005b) (apart from Venus). The quoted errors, in $10^{-4}'' \text{ cy}^{-1}$, are not the formal ones but are realistic. The formal errors are quoted in square brackets (E.V. Pitjeva, personal communication to L.I., November 2005). The units are $10^{-4}'' \text{ cy}^{-1}$. Second row: semi-major axes, in Astronomical Units (AU). Their formal errors are in Table IV of (Pitjeva 2005a), in m. Third row: eccentricities. Fourth row: orbital periods in years. The result for Venus have been recently obtained by including the Magellan radiometric data (E.V. Pitjeva, personal communication to L.I., June 2008).

	Mercury	Venus	Earth	Mars
$\langle \Delta \dot{\varpi} \rangle$ ($10^{-4}'' \text{ cy}^{-1}$)	$-36 \pm 50[42]$	$-4 \pm 5[1]$	$-2 \pm 4[1]$	$1 \pm 5[1]$
a (AU)	0.387	0.723	1.000	1.523
e	0.2056	0.0067	0.0167	0.0934
P (yr)	0.24	0.61	1.00	1.88

REFERENCES

- Allemandi, G., Francaviglia, M., Ruggiero, M.L., and Tartaglia, A., 2005. *Gen. Relativ. Gravit.* **37**, 1891.
- Amarzguioui, M., Elgaroy, O., Mota, D.F., and Multamaki, T, 2006. *Astron. Astrophys.* **454**, 707.
- Bennet, C.L., et al., 2003. *Astrophys. J. Suppl.* **148**, 1.
- Burgay, M., et al., 2003. *Nature* **426**, 531.
- Bertotti, B., Farinella, P., and Vokrouhlický, D., 2003. *Physics of the Solar System*. (Dordrecht: Kluwer). p. 313.
- Binney, J., and Tremaine, S., 1987. *Galactic Dynamics*. (Princeton: Princeton University Press).
- Capozziello, S., and Francaviglia, M., 2007. arXiv:0706.1146 [astro-ph].
- Capozziello, S., Cardone, V.F., and Troisi, A., 2007a. *Mon. Not. Roy. Astron. Soc.* **375**, 1423.
- Carter, B., 1973. In: DeWitt, B.S., and DeWitt, C. (eds.) *Black Holes (Les Houches 1972)*. (London: Gordon and Breach).
- Ciufolini, I., and Pavlis, E.C., 2004. *Nature* **431**, 958.
- Clifton, T., 2008. *Phys. Rev. D* **77**, 024041.
- Clowe, D., et al., 2006. *Astrophys. J.* **648**, L109.
- Demianski, M., 1973. *Acta Astronomica* **23**, 197.

- Everitt, C.W.F., et al., 2001. In: Lämmerzahl, C., Everitt, C.W.F., and Hehl, F.W. (eds.) *Gyros, Clocks, Interferometers...: Testing Relativistic Gravity in Space*. (Berlin: Springer). pp. 52-82. Most recent information about GP-B see the web site <http://einstein.stanford.edu>.
- Ferraris, M., Francaviglia, M., and Volovich, I., 1993. *Nuovo Cim. B* **108**, 1313.
- Foster, J., and Nightingale, J.D., 1995. *A Short Course in General Relativity. Second Edition*. (New York: Springer). p. 91.
- Frigerio Martins, C., and Salucci, P., 2007. *Mon. Not. Roy. Astron. Soc.* **381**, 1103.
- Iorio, L., 2006a. *J. Geodesy* **80**, 128.
- Iorio, L., 2006b. *Int. J. Mod. Phys. D* **15**, 473.
- Iorio, L. (ed.), 2007a. *The Measurement of Gravitomagnetism: A Challenging Enterprise*. (Hauppauge: NOVA).
- Iorio, L., 2007b. *Planet. Space Sci.* **55**, 503.
- Iorio, L., 2009. *New Astron.* **14**, 40.
- Jetzer, Ph., and Sereno, M., 2006. *Phys. Rev. D* **73**, 044015.
- Kerr, A.W., Hauck, J.C., and Mashhoon B., 2003. *Class. Quantum Grav.* **20**, 2727.
- Kramer, M., et al., 2006. *Science* **314**, 97.
- Kraniotis, G.V., 2004. *Class. Quantum Grav.* **21**, 4743.
- Kraniotis, G.V., 2005. *Class. Quantum Grav.* **22**, 4391.
- Kraniotis, G.V., 2007. *Class. Quantum Grav.* **24**, 1775.

- Lense, J., and Thirring, H., 1918. *Phys. Z.* **19**, 156.
- Lorimer, D. and Kramer, M., 2005. *Handbook of Pulsar Astronomy*. (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press). p. 58.
- Lucchesi, D.M., 2007. *Adv. Space Res.* **39**, 1559.
- Magnano, G., 1995. [arXiv:gr-qc/9511027].
- Mashhoon, B., Gronwald, F., and Lichtenegger, H.I.M., 2001. In: Lämmerzahl, C., Everitt, C.W.F., and Hehl, F.W. (eds.) *Gyros, Clocks, Interferometers...: Testing Relativistic Gravity in Space*. (Berlin: Springer). pp. 83-108.
- Mashhoon, B., 2007. In: Iorio, L., (ed.) *The Measurement of Gravitomagnetism: A Challenging Enterprise*. (Hauppauge: NOVA). pp. 29-39.
- McCarthy, D.D., and Petit, G., 2004. *IERS Conventions (2003)* (Frankfurt am Main: Verlag des Bundesamtes für Kartographie und Geodäsie). p. 106.
- Montenbruck, O., and Gill, E., 2000. *Satellite Orbits*. (Berlin: Springer). p. 27.
- Ni, W.-T., 2005. *Int. J. Mod. Phys. D* **14**, 901.
- Nojiri, S., Odintsov, S.D., 2007. arXiv:0710.1738 [astro-ph].
- Perlmutter, S., et al., 1999. *Astrophys. J.* **517**, 565.
- Pijpers, F.P., 1998. *Mon. Not. R. Astron. Soc.* **297**, L76.
- Pijpers, F.P., 2003. *Astron. Astrophys.* **402**, 683.
- Pitjeva, E.V., 2005a. *Sol. Syst. Res.* **39**, 176.
- Pitjeva, E.V., 2005b. *Astron. Lett.* **31**, 340.

- Pitjeva, E.V., 2008. In: Jin, W.J., Platais, I., and Perryman, M.A.C. (eds.) *A Giant Step: from Milli- to Micro-arcsecond Astrometry Proceedings IAU Symposium No. 248, 2007*. (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press). pp. 20-22.
- Pugh, G. E., 1959. *WSEG Research Memorandum No. 11*
- Riess, A.G., et al., 1998. *Astron. J.* **116**, 1009.
- Ruggiero, M.L., and Tartaglia, A., 2002. *Il Nuovo Cimento B* **117**, 743.
- Ruggiero, M.L., and Iorio, L., 2007. *J. Cosmol. Astropart. Phys.* **1**, 10.
- Ruggiero, M.L., 2008. arXiv:0809.3358 [gr-qc].
- Schäfer, G., 2004. *Gen. Relativ. Gravit.* **36**, 2223.
- Schiff, L., 1960. *Phys. Rev. Lett.* **4**, 215.
- Sereno, M., and Jetzer, Ph., 2006. *Phys. Rev. D* **73**, 063004.
- Smith, D.E., and Dunn, P.J., 1980. *J. Geophys. Res. Lett.* **7** 437.
- Soffel, M., 1989. *Relativity in Astrometry, Celestial Mechanics and Geodesy*. (Berlin: Springer). p. 95.
- Sotiriou, T., and Faraoni, V., 2008. arXiv:0805.1726 [gr-qc].
- Turyshv, S.G., 2008. *Annu. Rev. Nucl. Part. Sci* **58**, 207.
- Will, C.M., 2006. *Living Rev. Relativity*, **9** <http://www.livingreviews.org/lrr-2006-3>.