

Double Binary Pulsar Test of Dynamical Chern-Simons Modified Gravity

Nicolás Yunes¹ and David N. Spergel^{2,3}

¹*Department of Physics, Princeton University, Princeton, NJ 08544, USA.*

²*Princeton Center for Theoretical Science, Princeton University, Princeton, NJ 08544, USA.*

³*Department of Astrophysical Sciences, Princeton University, Princeton, NJ 08544, USA.*

Gravitational parity violation is inherent in string theory, one effective model of which is Chern-Simons modified gravity. This effective theory introduces a parity-violating modification to the Einstein equations, whose magnitude depends on derivatives of the Chern-Simons coupling. In the dynamical formulation, this coupling is an evolving field that is sourced by spacetime curvature. We here calculate the Chern-Simons modification to the orbital evolution of a binary system of spinning compact objects in the weak-field. The ratio of the Chern-Simons correction to perigee precession to the general relativistic prediction is found to scale quadratically with the semi-major axis and inversely with the square of the object's radius. Binary pulsar systems are ideal to test this theory, since perigee precession can be measured with sub-degree accuracies and the semi-major axis is millions of times larger than the stellar radius. We find that observations of perigee precession from the double binary pulsar PSR J0737 – 3039A/B dramatically constrain the Chern-Simons coupling, $M_{\text{CS}} := 1/|\dot{\theta}| > 50$ meV, approximately a hundred billion times better than Solar System tests.

Introduction. String theory is an intricate web of mathematically beautiful hypothesis that promises to unify all forces of nature. General Relativity (GR) is expected to be its low-energy limit with possible higher-order curvature corrections. To date, however, string theory remains intrinsically difficult to test experimentally, because these curvature-corrections are believed to be perturbatively Planck suppressed. Dynamical situations with large spacetime curvature could lead to non-linear couplings and enhance such curvature corrections to a constrainable realm.

One such curvature correction is the *parity-violating* Pontryagin density, which in addition to the Einstein-Hilbert term defines an effective theory: Chern-Simons (CS) modified gravity [1]. In four dimensions, this density is a topological term that does not contribute to the field equations, unless its coupling is non-constant or promoted to a scalar field [2]. From a string theoretical standpoint, the Pontryagin correction is inescapable, if one is to have a mathematically consistent theory that is anomaly-free [3]. From an experimental standpoint, the search for the breakage of fundamental symmetries can provide hints that can guide theorist toward the correct ultraviolet completion of GR.

The signature of CS modified gravity is the introduction of gravitational parity violation that leads to modifications of gravitational phenomena, such as frame-dragging [4, 5, 5, 6]. In GR, the gravitomagnetic sector of the metric couples to the spin and the orbital angular momentum of gravitating systems, leading to corrections in their orbital evolution, such as precession of the orbital plane. In CS modified gravity, the gradient of the coupling scalar selects a preferred direction in spacetime that corrects this precession. Thus, observations of gravitomagnetic precession can be used to test the validity of the effective theory [5, 6].

In the Solar System, this precession correction has al-

ready been studied for an externally prescribed (non-dynamical) CS coupling [2]. Through comparisons with the LAGEOS and the Gravity Probe B experiment, bounds have been placed on the time derivative of this field $\dot{\theta} \lesssim 10^3$ km or $M_{\text{CS}} := 1/\dot{\theta} \gtrsim 10^{-14}$ eV. From a theoretical standpoint, the effective mass scale for the CS term is uncertain. While it could be as large as the Planck scale, it is intriguing to explore the possibility that the scale is $\Lambda^{1/4} \sim 1$ meV.

The weakness of this bound can be qualitatively understood in terms of the ratio of the CS precession correction to the GR expectation. For any binary system, this ratio scales as $(\mathcal{R}_{\text{ext}}/\mathcal{R}_{\text{ind}})^2$, where \mathcal{R}_{ext} and \mathcal{R}_{ind} are the radius of curvature of the combined system and of either compact body respectively. For a binary system $\mathcal{R}_{\text{ext}} \sim a$, where a is the semi-major axis, and $\mathcal{R}_{\text{ind}} \sim R$, where R is the stellar radius. In the Solar System, $a = R_+ + h$, where h is the height to which satellites can be reliably placed in orbit, while $R = R_+$ is Earth's radius. Thus, the ratio $\mathcal{R}_{\text{ext}}/\mathcal{R}_{\text{ind}} - 1 \sim h/R_+ \ll 1$ and the CS effect is inherently small. For a binary pulsar, however, $\mathcal{R}_{\text{ext}}/\mathcal{R}_{\text{ind}} \sim \mathcal{O}(10^5)$, which thus enhances the CS effect by a factor of $\mathcal{O}(10^{10})$.

In this letter, we shall study the dynamical CS correction to gravitomagnetic precession. We shall first derive the perturbation equations in the dynamical theory and show that, under certain sensible conditions, the CS coupling must tend to a linearly time-dependent scalar. We shall then proceed by calculating the CS correction to the orbital evolution of a binary system of spinning bodies. The averaged rate of change of the perigee is found to be CS corrected, with a scaling of the form discussed above. Using the measurement of perigee precession from the double binary pulsar PSR J0737 – 3039A/B [7], we place a bound on the magnitude of the time derivative of the CS coupling: $\dot{\theta} \lesssim 4 \times 10^{-9}$ km or equivalently $M_{\text{CS}} \gtrsim 50$ meV, well above the dark energy scale. We

shall here employ the conventions in [8], with Greek letters ranging over spacetime indices, Latin letters over spatial indices only and $G = c = 1$.

Dynamical Chern-Simons Modified Gravity. Let us begin by summarizing the basic equations of CS modified gravity that are relevant to our calculation (see eg. [9] for a pedagogical review). We begin directly with the CS modified field equations, which take the form [1, 2]

$$G_{\mu\nu} + \frac{\alpha}{\kappa} C_{\mu\nu} = \frac{1}{2\kappa} \left(T_{\mu\nu}^{\text{mat}} + T_{\mu\nu}^{(\theta)} \right), \quad (1)$$

where $G_{\mu\nu}$ is the Einstein tensor, $\kappa = 1/(16\pi G)$ is the GR coupling constant, α is a coupling constant and the Cotton-like or C-tensor $C_{\mu\nu}$ is defined via

$$C_{\mu\nu} := \theta_{;\sigma} \epsilon^{\sigma}{}_{(\mu} \alpha^{\beta} R_{\nu)\beta;\alpha} + \theta_{;\sigma\tau} {}^*R^{\sigma}{}_{(\mu}{}^{\tau}{}_{\nu)}. \quad (2)$$

In Eq. (2), $R_{\mu\nu}$ and $R_{\mu\nu\alpha\beta}$ are the Ricci and Riemann tensors respectively, ${}^*R^{\alpha\beta\gamma\delta} = \epsilon^{\alpha\beta\mu\nu} R^{\gamma\delta}{}_{\mu\nu}/2$ is the dual of the latter, $\epsilon^{\alpha\beta\gamma\delta}$ is the four-dimensional Levi-Civita tensor, and the semi-colon stands for covariant differentiation. The stress-energy content of Eq. (1) is given by external matter fields $T_{\mu\nu}^{\text{mat}}$ plus the stress-energy $T_{\mu\nu}^{(\theta)}$ of the scalar field θ [see eg. Eq. (67) in [10]].

One of the main ingredients in CS modified gravity is the *CS coupling scalar* $\theta = \theta(x^\mu)$, which controls the strength of the correction. The units of this scalar are determined by the choice of coupling α , ie. if $[\alpha] = L^A$ for some real constant A , then $[\theta] = L^{-A}$. In the dynamical formalism, this coupling scalar satisfies its own equation of motion

$$\beta \theta_{;\gamma}{}^{;\gamma} = \beta \frac{dV}{d\theta} - \frac{\alpha}{4} {}^*R R, \quad (3)$$

where the Pontryagin density is ${}^*R R = {}^*R^{\alpha}{}_{\beta}{}^{\sigma\delta} R^{\beta}{}_{\alpha\sigma\delta}$ and β is another coupling constant that determines how $T_{\mu\nu}^{(\theta)}$ couples to the gravitational sector. In the limit of constant coupling scalar, the modified theory reduces identically to GR because the C-tensor vanishes. In the limit of linear coupling scalar, the modified theory reduces to a non-dynamical one, where Eq. (3) implies the Pontryagin constraint ${}^*R R = 0$. The modified theory was originally proposed in such way [1], with the canonical scalar $\theta = t/\mu$, for some positive constant μ .

Perturbation Theory. Consider the line element

$$ds_{\mathbb{S}}^2 = -(1+2\phi)dt^2 + 2w_i dt dx^i + (1-2\psi)\delta_{ij} dx^i dx^j, \quad (4)$$

where t, x^i are regular Cartesian coordinates, δ_{ij} is the Euclidean metric, (ψ, ϕ) and w_i are scalar and vectorial perturbation potentials respectively in the longitudinal gauge ($\partial_i w^i = 0$). These potentials shall be treated perturbatively, in a post-Newtonian sense, where the matter sources that generate them are assumed slowly-moving ($\epsilon := v^2/c^2 \ll 1$), weakly-gravitating and isolated.

Matter sources shall be described via a perfect fluid stress energy tensor, $T_{00} = \rho = \mathcal{O}(\epsilon^2)$, $T_{0i} = -\rho v_i =$

$\mathcal{O}(v^3)$ and $T_{ij} = \mathcal{O}(\epsilon^4)$, where ρ is density and v^i is the three-velocity of the fluid. The field equations then require that $\mathcal{O}(\phi) = \mathcal{O}(\psi) = \mathcal{O}(\epsilon^2)$, while $\mathcal{O}(|w^i|) = \mathcal{O}(\epsilon^{3/2})$, plus CS corrections. The stress-energy $T_{\mu\nu}^{(\theta)}$ shall be neglected, since it is always at least quadratic in the CS coupling, which will also be treated perturbatively.

The evolution equation for θ can be solved if we neglect back-reaction effects. The source of θ -waves is matter through the Pontryagin density:

$${}^*R R = -4\tilde{\epsilon}^{ijk} (\partial_j^l w_i) \partial_{kl} (\phi + \psi) + \mathcal{O}(\epsilon^6), \quad (5)$$

where $\epsilon^{ijk} := \epsilon^{0ijk}$ and $\tilde{\epsilon}^{ijk}$ is the Levi-Civita symbol. We shall implicitly impose a no-incoming wave boundary condition, since we assume matter, and thus, the potentials are isolated. To leading order in ϵ , the evolution equation becomes

$$\square_{\eta} \theta := (-\partial_t^2 + \nabla^2) \theta = 0, \quad (6)$$

where $\nabla^2 := \delta^{ij} \partial_{ij}$ and whose solution in the far field is

$$\theta = \theta_C \cos(\eta^{\mu\nu} k_{\mu} x_{\nu}) + \theta_S \sin(\eta^{\mu\nu} k_{\mu} x_{\nu}), \quad (7)$$

where $\theta_{C,S}$ are constants of integration and $k^{\sigma} = [\Omega, k^i]$ is a four-wavevector that determines the magnitude of the rate of change of θ , with dispersion relation $\Omega = \pm |k^i|$.

Let us first consider the scalar sector of the perturbed field equations. To $\mathcal{O}(\epsilon)$, the 00 components is not CS modified, leading to the usual relation $4\pi\rho = \nabla^2\psi$, which can be solved immediately for ψ as a function of ρ using Green function methods. The remaining equations are

$$\begin{aligned} \tilde{\epsilon}_i{}^{jk} [(\partial_j\theta) \partial_k \nabla^2 + (\partial_{jm}\theta) \partial_{mk}] (\psi + \phi) &= 0, \quad (8) \\ (\delta_{ij} \nabla^2 - \partial_{ij}) (\phi - \psi) &= -\frac{\alpha}{\kappa} (\partial_l\theta) \tilde{\epsilon}_{(i}{}^{kl} \partial_{j)m} (\psi + \phi), \quad (9) \end{aligned}$$

which can be solved by focusing on θ -deformed solutions: $\phi = \phi_{\text{GR}} + \chi_{\phi}$, where ϕ_{GR} is θ -independent and χ_{ϕ} is linear in $|\partial_{\mu}\theta|$. To zeroth-order, $\phi_{\text{GR}} = \psi_{\text{GR}}$, while to linear order the $0i$ becomes

$$\tilde{\epsilon}_i{}^{jk} [(\partial_j\theta) \partial_k \nabla^2 + (\partial_{jm}\theta) \partial_{mk}] \psi = 0, \quad (10)$$

which is a condition for θ that forces $\partial_i\theta \propto \partial_i\psi$, or with Eq. (7), $k_i \propto \partial_i\psi$. The ij equation then automatically forces $\chi = 0$ by requiring regularity of ϕ at spatial infinity. The scalar sector of the perturbed field equations remains unaffected in dynamical CS gravity, only forcing the wave three-vector of the CS scalar to be coaligned with the gradient of the gravitational potential.

Let us now consider the vectorial sector of the perturbed field equations, assuming the gauge condition holds and the scalar sector is satisfied. To $\mathcal{O}(\epsilon^{3/2})$, the 00 equation vanishes identically because the unperturbed vector potential $w_{\text{GR}}^i \propto \psi_{\text{GR}} v^i$. The ij equations, however, do not vanish, but reduce to

$$2(\partial_l\theta) \tilde{\epsilon}_{(i}{}^{lk} (\partial_{j)k}\psi) = \frac{1}{2} \tilde{\epsilon}_{(i}{}^{kl} \ddot{\theta} (\partial_{j)k} w_l), \quad (11)$$

which are not differential equations for ψ , since this potential has already been determined. Instead they pose additional differential constraints on θ that *cannot* be satisfied for a wave-like field. These equations over-constrain the theory, thus forcing $\ddot{\theta} = 0$ and $\partial_i \theta = 0$ independently, which leads to a CS coupling of canonical form $\theta = t/\mu$. With such a choice of θ , the 00 and ij equations are satisfied, while $0i$ equations can be solved to linear order in $\dot{\theta}$ via

$$w_k = -4 \int \frac{v_k \rho'}{|x-x'|} d^3 x' - \frac{2\alpha \dot{\theta}}{\kappa} \int d^3 r' \frac{(\vec{\nabla} \rho \times \vec{v})_k}{|x-x'|}. \quad (12)$$

where \times is the Euclidean cross product and we have neglected any time dependence in ψ .

The vectorial solution found here is similar to that found in [5, 6], except that here we consider generic density distributions. One can show that in the limit as $\rho \rightarrow m \delta^3(x^i)$, Eq. (12) reduces identically to Eq. (44) in [5], with the appropriate choice of α . Moreover, this potential is also similar to that found in [2], except that here we work to linear order in $\dot{\theta}$. One can also show that if ρv_i is replaced with the stress-energy component appropriate to a homogeneous rotating sphere, then this potential reduces to Eq. (B4) in [2] with the appropriate choice of α and to linear in $\dot{\theta}$.

The reduction of the dynamical CS theory to the non-dynamical, canonical one is forced by the requirement that the solution space be a θ -deformation of the GR one. The evolution of the CS field is controlled by two competing processes: the evolution equation for θ pushes toward wave-like solutions, while the linearized field equations with the GR requirement drive θ to non-wavelike solutions. The compromise that satisfies both competing processes is simply the canonical choice. If one relinquishes these requirements in the far far field, more general θ fields might be allowed, but these will source potentials that will generically disagree with Solar System tests. More general θ fields might be allowed in the strong field, where the constraints $\ddot{\theta} = 0 = \partial_i \theta$ cease to be valid, since perturbation theory breaks down.

Binary Pulsar Test. The lack of a CS correction to the scalar sector of the gravitational perturbations implies that most astrophysical processes are unaffected by this type of parity violation. For example, the equations of structure formation remain untouched because the Poisson equation is not CS corrected and the stress-energy tensor remains locally conserved. The vectorial sector of the metric, however, is CS modified in a normal direction relative to the GR prediction. For randomly oriented velocities, the average value of the CS correction in fact identically vanishes, but in many astrophysical scenarios, the velocity field is not randomly oriented. One such case is binary systems, where the CS correction leads to an anomalous frame-dragging effect.

Anomalous frame-dragging induces modifications on a variety of astrophysical processes, such as the formation

of accretion discs around protoplanetary systems and the evolution of neutron star spins. The CS correction, however, would be hard to detect in such processes because it scales inversely with the radius of curvature of the system, as one can see from Eq. (12). Galactic radii are on the kpc scale, which renders the ratio of the CS correction to the GR prediction on the $\mathcal{O}(10^{-17})$ if we saturate the Solar System $\dot{\theta}$ -constraint [2].

Although the CS correction is insignificant in the evolution of non-compact astrophysical sources, this is not the case for binary pulsars. In such systems, there are two important scales the CS correction could couple to: the radius of curvature of the system, which is proportional to the semi-major axis a ; and the radius of curvature of either component, which is proportional to the radius of either body R . As we shall see, the GR prediction for the precession of the perigee scales as a^{-3} , while the CS correction scales as $a^{-1}R^{-2}$, which implies that observed binary systems are preferred laboratories to test the modified theory since $a/R \sim \mathcal{O}(10^6)$.

Inspiring black hole binaries would be ideal sources to test CS modified gravity due to their compactness. Such systems do not radiate electromagnetically unless surrounded by an accretion disk, but gravitational wave observations with space-based or earth-based detectors could be used to test the modified theory [11, 12]. Such observations would be sensitive to the integrated history of the CS term, instead of its instantaneous value.

Let us then concentrate on binary systems of spinning neutron stars, whose orbital evolution we shall model through a geodesic study of a compact object in the background of a rotating, homogeneous sphere. Following [2], the stress-energy tensor of this sphere will be described by $T_{0i} = -j_i$, where the current $j_i = \rho_0 (\vec{\omega} \times \vec{r})_i \Theta(R-r)$, with ρ_0 some constant density, $\omega^i = [0, 0, \omega]$ the angular momentum vector in Cartesian coordinates, $r^i = [x, y, z]$ the distance from the center of the sphere to a field point and R the radius of the sphere. The total mass of this sphere is $M = 3\rho_0/(4\pi R^3)$, while its angular momentum $J^i = I\omega^i$, where $I = (2/5)MR^2$ is the moment of inertia

The motion of the compact body in this background is governed by the geodesic equations $\vec{a} = -4\vec{v} \times \vec{B}$, where we have neglected time-dependent scalar potentials and where \vec{a} and \vec{v} are the three-acceleration and three-velocity of the compact object. The gravitomagnetic field is $\vec{B} := \vec{\nabla} \times \vec{A}$, where the gravitomagnetic potential is $A_i := -4w_i$. Both the field and the potential have been computed for this stress-energy to arbitrary order in $\dot{\theta}$ [2], but we shall here work only to leading order, where the CS correction $\vec{B}_{\text{CS}} = \vec{B} - \vec{B}_{\text{GR}}$ is

$$\vec{B}_{\text{CS}} = \frac{c_0}{r} \cos[\xi(r)] \left[\vec{\mathcal{J}} - \tan \xi \left(\vec{\mathcal{J}} \times \hat{r} \right) - \left(\vec{\mathcal{J}} \cdot \hat{r} \right) \hat{r} \right], \quad (13)$$

with $\xi(r) = 2r\kappa/(\dot{\theta}\alpha)$, $c_0 = 15\alpha\dot{\theta}/(4\kappa R) \sin[\xi(R)]$, $\hat{r} = \vec{r}/r$, $\vec{\mathcal{J}} = \vec{J}/R^2$ and \cdot the Euclidean dot product. From the gravitomagnetic field, we can straightforwardly com-

pute the CS correction to the geodesic acceleration by taking the cross-product with the velocity vector.

One must be careful when expanding solutions in $\dot{\theta}$, since this quantity is in principle dimensional, and thus, corrections will arise as combinations of $\mathcal{O}(\dot{\theta}/R)$ and $\mathcal{O}(\dot{\theta}/a)$. For binary pulsars, $\dot{\theta}/a \sim 10^{-3} \ll 1$ if we saturate $\dot{\theta}$ with the current Solar System constraint, but $\dot{\theta}/R \sim 100 \gg 1$. Thus, in order for the linearized approximation to hold, one must verify at the end of the calculation that $\dot{\theta} \ll 10$ km, which we shall see is indeed the case. Moreover, because the argument of the oscillatory functions scales as $1/\dot{\theta}$, any spatial derivatives of w_i will be larger than w_i by one power of $\dot{\theta}$. When this fact is taken into account, the results for the gravitomagnetic field found in [5, 6] and [2] are in complete agreement.

We shall here parameterize the trajectory of the compact object in terms of equatorial coordinates. We shall thus define the triad $\hat{r} = [\cos u, \cos \iota \sin u, \sin \iota \sin u]$, $\hat{t} = [-\sin u, \cos \iota \cos u, \sin \iota \cos u]$ and $\hat{n} = [0, -\sin \iota, \cos \iota]$ to describe radial, transverse and normal directions relative to the comoving frame in the orbital plane. Here, ι is the inclination angle, w is the argument of perigee, $u = f + w$ with f the true anomaly and $\Omega = 0$ is the right ascension of the ascending node, chosen in this way so that the line of nodes is co-aligned with the \hat{x} vector [13, 14].

The perturbation equations for the variation of the Keplerian orbital elements is governed by the projection of the geodesic acceleration on this triad. To leading order in $\dot{\theta}$, however, only the radial projection $a_r := \vec{a} \cdot \hat{r}$ is CS modified leading to $a_r^{\text{CS}} := a_r - a_r^{\text{GR}}$:

$$a_r^{\text{CS}} = -4c_0 \dot{u} \mathcal{J} \{ \cos \iota \cos [\xi(r)] + \sin \iota \cos u \sin [\xi(r)] \}. \quad (14)$$

The precession of the perigee is given by the perturbation equation [see eg. Eqs. (33)-(38) in [14]], namely $\dot{w} = -a_r/(n a e) \cos f$, where $\vec{a}^{\text{CS}} \cdot \hat{t} = \mathcal{O}(\dot{\theta}^2) = \vec{a}^{\text{CS}} \cdot \hat{n}$, and thus $\dot{\Omega} = 0$, $n = \sqrt{M/a^3}$ is the unperturbed Keplerian mean motion and e is the eccentricity.

The average of the rate of change of w can be computed by integrating \dot{w} over one orbital period:

$$\langle \dot{w} \rangle := \int_0^T \frac{\dot{w}}{P} dt = \int_0^{2\pi} \dot{w} \frac{(1-e^2)^{3/2}}{2\pi(1+e \cos f)^2} df, \quad (15)$$

during which we shall assume the pericenter is approximately constant, so that $\dot{u} \sim \dot{f} = n(1+e \cos f)^2(1-e^2)^{-3/2}$, and the motion of the compact object can be described by a Keplerian ellipse, where $r = a(1-e^2)(1+e \cos f)^{-1}$. This last assumption is justified by the fact that in the weak field, the motion of test particles about any arbitrary background remains unchanged relative to the GR prediction [15]. Finally, the integrals in Eq. (15) shall be approximated with a small eccentricity expansion $e \ll 1$.

The averaged rate of change of the perigee can then be decomposed into a GR prediction plus a CS correction,

where the latter is given by

$$\langle \dot{w} \rangle_{\text{CS}} = \frac{15}{2a^2 e} \frac{J}{R^2} \frac{\dot{\theta}}{R} X \sin \left(\frac{2\kappa R}{\alpha \dot{\theta}} \right) \sin \left(\frac{2a\kappa}{\alpha \dot{\theta}} \right), \quad (16)$$

we have chosen $\alpha = \kappa$ so that $\dot{\theta}$ has units of length and the projected semi-major axis $X := a \sin \iota$. Note that the CS effect scales as e^{-1} because although \dot{w} scales as $\cos f$, so does a_r , and thus, the leading order term in e does not vanish upon integration unlike the GR case. The orbital orientation, however, is ill-defined for zero eccentricity, and thus, the limit $e \rightarrow 0$ is meaningless. The scaling in the precession of the perigee of Eq. (16) is consistent with other precession results studied in the Solar System [2]. As discussed in the introduction, the ratio of CS correction to the GR expectation scales as $a^2 \dot{\theta}/R^3$, since $\langle \dot{w} \rangle_{\text{GR}} \sim J/a^3$. In the Solar System, however, a/R is very close to unity, while for binary systems $a/R \sim \mathcal{O}(10^6)$.

Observations of the precession of the perigee in the double binary pulsar PSR J0737 – 3039A/B [7] can be used to test CS modified gravity. We shall treat pulsar A as the rotating homogeneous sphere, and pulsar B as the test body in orbit around the sphere, where the bodies are sufficiently separated that we can neglect tidal interactions. The relevant system parameters are [16] the mass $M_A = M \approx 1.34 M_\odot$, the projected semi-major axis $X \approx 1.41$ s, the eccentricity $e_b \approx 0.088$ and the inclination angle $\iota \approx 89(-76, +50)$ deg. From the projected semi-major axis we can deduce that $a_b \approx 4.24 \times 10^5$ km, where we used the nominal value for the inclination angle. Following [17], we assume that the moment of inertia of body A $I \approx 10^{38}$ kg m², which leads to a radius of $R_A \approx 9.69$ km and an angular momentum of $J_A \approx 2.8 \times 10^{40}$ kg m² s⁻¹. The overall uncertainty in the measurement of the periastron precession is approximately $\delta = 0.03$ degrees per year [17].

We can then constraint $\dot{\theta}$ by requiring graphically that $\langle \dot{w}_{\text{CS}} \rangle$ be less than δ , which leads to $\dot{\theta} \lesssim 4 \times 10^{-9}$ km, or simply $M_{\text{CS}} := \dot{\theta}^{-1} \gtrsim 50$ meV, which is 10^{11} times stronger than current Solar System constraints. We have checked that terms higher order in e or $\dot{\theta}$ do not significantly affect this bound, which is however affected by uncertainties in the semi-major axis. Even with the most pessimistic choice of a , the bound deteriorates only by a factor of twenty, still leading to a constraint 10^{10} times stronger than the Solar System one.

Acknowledgements. We wish to thank Joe Taylor, Juan Maldacena, Richard O’Shaughnessy and Frans Pretorius for useful discussions and comments. N. Y. acknowledges support from the NSF grant PHY-0745779, while D. S. acknowledges support from the NASA theory grant NNX08AH30G.

-
- [1] R. Jackiw and S. Y. Pi, Phys. Rev. **D68**, 104012 (2003), gr-qc/0308071.
- [2] T. L. Smith, A. L. Erickcek, R. R. Caldwell, and M. Kamionkowski, Phys. Rev. **D77**, 024015 (2008), 0708.0001.
- [3] J. Polchinski, *String theory. Vol. 2: Superstring theory and beyond* (Cambridge University Press, Cambridge, UK, 1998).
- [4] S. H. Alexander, M. E. Peskin, and M. M. Sheikh-Jabbari (2007), hep-ph/0701139.
- [5] S. Alexander and N. Yunes, Phys. Rev. Lett. **99**, 241101 (2007), hep-th/0703265.
- [6] S. Alexander and N. Yunes, Phys. Rev. **D75**, 124022 (2007), 0704.0299.
- [7] M. Burgay et al., Nature. **426**, 531 (2003), astro-ph/0312071.
- [8] C. W. Misner, K. Thorne, and J. A. Wheeler, *Gravitation* (W. H. Freeman & Co., San Francisco, 1973).
- [9] S. Alexander and N. Yunes, in progress (2007).
- [10] N. Yunes and C. F. Sopuerta, Phys. Rev. **D77**, 064007 (2008), 0712.1028.
- [11] S. Alexander, L. S. Finn, and N. Yunes, Phys. Rev. D **78**, 066005 (2008), 0712.2542.
- [12] S. Alexander, B. J. Owen, R. O'Shaughnessy, and N. Yunes, in progress (2008).
- [13] O. Montenbruck and E. Gill, *Satellite Orbits. Models, methods, applications*. (Springer, Germany, 2000).
- [14] L. Iorio and M. L. Ruggiero (2008), 0810.0199.
- [15] C. F. Sopuerta and N. Yunes, in progress (2008).
- [16] M. Kramer et al., Science **314**, 97 (2006), astro-ph/0609417.
- [17] L. Iorio (2008), 0808.0256.