

Detection of Axions by Interferometry

H. Tam, and Q. Yang¹

¹*University of Florida, Gainesville, FL 32611*

(Dated: June 15, 2022)

We propose an interferometry experiment for the detection of axions. As in ordinary photon-regeneration (“shining-light-through-the-wall”) experiments, a laser beam traverses a region permeated by a magnetic field, where photons are converted to axions via the Primakoff process, resulting in a slight power loss and an additional phase shift. The beam is then combined with a reference beam that originates from the same source, and the detection of a change in the laser intensity would signal the presence of axions (or possibly other particles that couple to the photon in an analogous way). Because only one stage of conversion is needed, the signal is of $\mathcal{O}(g_{a\gamma\gamma}^2)$, as opposed to $\mathcal{O}(g_{a\gamma\gamma}^4)$ for photon-regeneration experiments, where $g_{a\gamma\gamma}$ is the coupling between the axion and two photons. This improvement is partially nullified by the presence of shot noise, which can however be reduced by the use of squeezed light. Because our experiment applies in principle to any particle that has a two-photon vertex, we also extend our analysis to axion-like particles (ALPs) and gravitons.

I. INTRODUCTION

One of the enigmas in modern cosmology is the identity of the dark matter, which constitutes 23% of the energy density of the current universe. Baryonic matter that we are familiar with, on the other hand, accounts for a mere 4% of the cosmic inventory. The dark matter made its debut in cosmology in 1933 as an explanation for the velocity dispersion of galaxies in the Coma galaxy cluster, and its existence has ever since been confirmed by a large number of observations, including the measurement of galactic rotation curves, primordial light element abundances, the dynamics of galaxy clusters, gravitational lensing data, and the anisotropies in the cosmic microwave background. In particular, from the observation of the hierarchical formation of structure and the dynamics of the Bullet Cluster, we can further infer that dark matter must be cold and collisionless, and interact primarily via the gravitational interaction. Since none of the known particles in the Standard Model possesses such properties, it seems necessary to turn to new physics for suitable dark matter candidates. Currently, the leading candidates are the axion, weakly-interacting massive particles (WIMPs), and sterile neutrinos. Despite intensive ongoing effort to search for dark matter particles in the laboratory, however, none of the proposed candidates has been observed. In this paper, we focus on the axion, and propose a new experimental method for its detection.

The axion originally arises as a pseudo Goldstone boson of the Peccei-Quinn (PQ) symmetry introduced to explain the absence of CP violation in the strong interaction [1–4]. The properties of the axion are essentially characterized by one parameter – the energy scale at which the PQ symmetry is spontaneously broken, f_a , as the axion mass and couplings are both inversely proportional to f_a . In the very first axion model, f_a is taken to be the electroweak scale, but this possibility was quickly ruled out by particle and nuclear experiments. Subsequent models (KSVZ and DFSZ) relax this assumption, and f_a could be much larger than originally

thought [5–8]. Using limits from astrophysics (as stellar emission of axions would heat up stars and accelerate their evolution [9–12]) and cosmology (avoiding overclosing the universe [13–17]), the value of f_a can be constrained to $10^9 < f_a < 10^{12}$ GeV, which implies that $10^{-6} < m_a < 10^{-3}$ eV. These constraints in parameter space have additionally been refined by a host of other observations, such as supernova dimming, axion-induced Bremsstrahlung by cosmic rays, distortion to polarizations of gamma ray bursts, photon-photon elastic scattering, axion-induced nuclear moments in cold molecules, etc. (For details, see, for example, [18–22].) In this mass range, cold axions have the right properties and cosmological abundance to be a substantial fraction of dark matter [13–17].

While astrophysical observations and cosmological considerations provide useful constraints on the parameter space, whether axions really exist can only be settled if they are actually detected in the laboratory. Initially, the likelihood of detecting such weakly interacting particles was deemed unlikely, since a very large f_a implies that axions couple very weakly to ordinary matter (hence are given the name “invisible axions”). However, it was pointed out that we can potentially catch glimpses of the elusive particle by exploiting its coupling to two photons, which is given in the Lagrangian by [23, 24]

$$\mathcal{L}_{a\gamma\gamma} = \frac{1}{4} \frac{g_\gamma \alpha}{\pi f_a} a \epsilon_{\mu\nu\rho\sigma} F^{\mu\nu} F^{\rho\sigma} = \frac{g_{a\gamma\gamma}}{4} a F \tilde{F}, \quad (1)$$

where g_γ is a model-dependent coefficient of order unity, α the fine structure constant, a the axion field, f_a the axion decay constant, $F_{\mu\nu}$ the electromagnetic field strength tensor, and $g_{a\gamma\gamma} \equiv g_\gamma \alpha / \pi f_a$. Through this coupling, the axion and photon can therefore mix with each other in a background magnetic field. It is essentially this principle that underlies the theoretical basis of all existing axion detection experiments. The ADMX experiment, for example, is a realization of the axion haloscope introduced in [23], in which axions in the halo are induced to convert in a cavity to microwave photons that are then

picked up by an antenna. The CERN Axion Solar Telescope and the Tokyo Helioscope, on the other hand, are a realization of the helioscope introduced in [23] and aim to detect axions originating from the Sun, by converting them into X-rays in a strong magnetic field. The photon-axion mixing can also manifest itself in the birefringence and dichroism in the vacuum, resulting in rotation and elliptization of the polarization of light in the presence of a magnetic field. Such signal is actively being sought, as in the PVLAS experiment.

Another type of experiment that makes use of this mixing is photon-regeneration (or so-called “shining-light-through-the-wall”) experiments, in which a small fraction of the photons in a laser beam traverses a region permeated by a magnetic field, where it is converted to axions. Because of their weak coupling to ordinary matter, the axions then travel essentially unimpeded through a wall, on the other side of which is an identical arrangement of magnets, where some of the axions are induced to convert back to photons, which can be detected. The primary advantage of photon-regeneration experiments is their greater control over experimental conditions, since the laser beam is prepared in the laboratory, so they do not have to rely on extraterrestrial axion sources. The major drawback is that their signal is very weak ($\propto g_{a\gamma\gamma}^4$), since two stages of conversion are required.

In this paper, we propose a new experimental method based on interferometry to detect axions. A laser beam is split into two beams of equal intensity. One of them acts as a reference beam, while the other would traverse a region permeated by a magnetic field to induce conversion into axions, just as in the first half of photon-regeneration experiments. However, instead of having a second stage behind a wall where axions are converted back to photons, the beam is recombined with the reference beam. If photon-axion conversion has occurred, the beam emerging from the conversion region would have a slightly reduced amplitude and a phase shift relative to the reference beam. This leads to a change in the combined intensity, which can then be measured by a detector. Because only one stage of conversion is needed, the signal intensity is proportional to only $g_{a\gamma\gamma}^2$, instead of $g_{a\gamma\gamma}^4$ for the photon-regeneration experiment.

In order to avoid having the signal being overwhelmed by the background, the two beams are arranged to traverse paths of different lengths, such that they would be out of phase by π at the detector when the magnetic field is switched off. Thus, without any conversion the two beams would interfere destructively at the detector, and the detection of a flash of light would signal the occurrence of axion production. Unfortunately, at the dark fringe the signal is reduced to a second-order effect ($\mathcal{O}(g_{a\gamma\gamma}^4)$), nullifying exactly the gain that we have over photon-regeneration experiments. However, this can be remedied by modulating the amplitude of the laser by using a Pockels cell. The presence of the two sidebands in addition to the carrier gives rise to a component in the power output that is of $\mathcal{O}(g_{a\gamma\gamma}^2)$, which can then be

isolated and detected by the use of a mixer.

In principle our proposed experiment is capable of detecting any particle with a two-photon vertex. While our major focus is on the QCD axion, we extend our discussion to ALPs and gravitons, both of which have similar couplings to photons. ALPs are spin-0 particles that are found generically in string theory [25], and couple to two photons as axions do. The primary difference is that there is no relationship between their mass and couplings; hence their parameter space is a lot less constrained in comparison. For pseudoscalar (scalar) ALPs, the coupling to photons is via a $aF\tilde{F}$ ($aF_{\mu\nu}F^{\mu\nu}$) term in the Lagrangian, so they can be produced by photons whose polarization is parallel (perpendicular) to the background magnetic field [26]. Throughout this paper, results on axions can thus be trivially extended to ALPs (in particular, m_a and $g_{a\gamma\gamma}$ can be interpreted as respectively the mass and coefficient of the coupling of ALPs to two photons).

Gravitons also couple to two photons via the $h_{\mu\nu}T^{\mu\nu}$ coupling in linearized general relativity, where $T^{\mu\nu}$ is the energy-momentum tensor which receives a contribution from the electromagnetic field. This is known in the literature as the Gertsenshtein Effect [27, 28]. As we will see, the coupling between them is of $\mathcal{O}(G)$, where G is Newton’s constant. With current technologies, it is expected that our proposed experiment is not yet sensitive enough to detect gravitons.

We also point out that in recent years there has been a proliferation of hypothesized particles, many of which couple to two photons as axions do, so they could also potentially be discovered in our proposed experiment. Some examples include chameleons, massive hidden photons, and light minicharged particles [30–34]. In particular, using results in [30], it is straightforward to generalize our analysis to the detection of minicharged particles.

This paper is structured as follows. In Section II, we review the physical principles underlying the proposed experiment, for axions, ALPs, and gravitons. In particular, we calculate the phase shift and amplitude reduction of the laser photons when they convert into these particles in a background magnetic field. In Section III, we describe in detail the experimental design, and discuss how amplitude modulation can boost the signal intensity to $\mathcal{O}(g_{a\gamma\gamma}^2)$ even within a dark fringe. This is then followed by discussions and conclusions in Section IV, in which we examine the implications of the presence of shot noise; possible ways to enhance the sensitivity of the experiment; and methods to help infer the identity of the particle that the laser photons have converted into.

II. THEORETICAL BACKGROUND

In an external magnetic field, a photon can convert into any particle with a two-photon vertex. In general, this has two consequences. First, there is a decrease in the amplitude of the photon, as the newly created par-

ticles carry away energy. Second, if the new particle is massive, a phase shift is introduced. If the conversion rates for different polarizations are different, the conversion would result in birefringence (ellipticity) and dichroism (rotation of polarization). We review in this section the theory behind these two effects.

A. Axions, scalar ALPs, and pseudoscalar ALPs

1. Power loss via the Primakoff Effect

Photon-axion mixing in a magnetic field is based on the $aF\tilde{F}$ coupling (1), where one of the photon legs is a virtual photon in the magnetic field. If the polarization of the photon is parallel to the magnetic field, the probability of conversion η can be obtained from the cross section of this process, which was first done in [23, 24] and is given by

$$\eta_{\gamma \rightarrow a} = \frac{1}{4v_a} (g_{a\gamma\gamma} BL)^2 \left(\frac{2}{qL} \sin\left(\frac{qL}{2}\right) \right)^2, \quad (2)$$

where v_a is the velocity of the axion, B the magnetic field, L the length of the conversion region, and q the momentum transfer. Since $m_a \ll \omega_\gamma$, the frequency of the laser beam photons, $v_a \approx 1$. For $L \approx 10\text{m}$, this also implies that $qL \approx 10^{-5} \ll 1$, so (2) can be approximated by

$$\eta_{\gamma \rightarrow a} \approx \frac{1}{4} (g_{a\gamma\gamma} BL)^2. \quad (3)$$

If we use $B \approx 10\text{T}$, $L \approx 10\text{m}$, and $f_a^{-1} \approx 10^{-12} \text{ GeV}^{-1}$, the probability of photon-axion conversion is of $\mathcal{O}(10^{-26})$ to $\mathcal{O}(10^{-25})$.

After the conversion, the amplitude A of the photon is reduced to $A - \delta A$, where

$$\delta A_{\gamma \rightarrow a} = \frac{A\eta_{\gamma \rightarrow a}}{2} \approx \frac{g_{a\gamma\gamma}^2 B^2 L^2 A}{8}. \quad (4)$$

We note that the discussion here is applicable to pseudoscalar ALPs, since they couple to the photon in exactly the same way. If the photon polarization is instead perpendicular to the magnetic field, the analysis is also valid for scalar ALPs, as they couple to photons via $aFF \sim \vec{B} \cdot \vec{B}$ instead.

2. Phase lag due to mixing

When a photon enters a region permeated by a magnetic field, the dispersion relation for the component orthogonal with respect to the magnetic field remains $\omega^2 = k^2$. However, if axion production occurs, that of

the parallel component is modified, and is given by [26]

$$\omega^2 = k^2 + \frac{1}{2} \left(m_a^2 + g_{a\gamma\gamma}^2 B^2 \pm \sqrt{(m_a^2 + g_{a\gamma\gamma}^2 B^2)^2 + 4g_{a\gamma\gamma}^2 k^2 B^2} \right). \quad (5)$$

For $B \approx 10\text{T}$ and $g_{a\gamma\gamma} \approx 10^{-12} \text{ GeV}^{-1}$, the value of $g_{a\gamma\gamma}^2 B^2$ is much less than m_a^2 . Under these assumptions, the additional phase acquired $\delta\theta$ (relative to photons that have travelled a distance L but in the absence of a magnetic field) is then approximately

$$\delta\theta_{\gamma \rightarrow a} \approx \frac{g_{a\gamma\gamma}^2 B^2 m_a^2 L^3}{48k}. \quad (6)$$

Obviously, the effect of the phase shift is negligible in comparison with $\delta A/A$.

Again, the present analysis on additional phase acquisition applies entirely to pseudoscalar ALPs. To generalize to scalar ALPs, all we need to do is to interchanging the parallel and orthogonal components of the photon relative to the magnetic field. This is expected, as $aF\tilde{F} \sim \vec{E} \cdot \vec{B}$ and $aFF \sim \vec{B} \cdot \vec{B}$, and $\vec{E}_\gamma \perp \vec{B}_\gamma$.

Even without conversion to axions, the vacuum in the presence of a magnetic field is by itself birefringent, due to loop corrections in QED (the Heisenberg-Euler term: $\frac{\alpha^2}{90m_e^4} [(F_{\mu\nu}F^{\mu\nu})^2 + \frac{7}{4}(F_{\mu\nu}\tilde{F}^{\mu\nu})^2]$). It is straightforward to show that, for a magnetic field strength below approximately 10^4T , this vacuum effect is subdominant compared to that due to amplitude reduction and phase shift caused by the mixing (for photons with frequency in the optical range and an axion mass of $\mathcal{O}(10^{-6}\text{eV})$). Hence we will ignore it in our present discussion.

In passing, we also point out that we can also use the modified dispersion (5) to calculate the reduction in the amplitude of the photon, from which we can calculate the power loss obtained in (3).

B. Gravitons

1. Power loss via graviton production

Since the graviton has a two-photon vertex, it can also be created by a photon in an external magnetic field. However, as we will see, photon-graviton conversion is qualitatively different from that between photon and axion. When photons convert into gravitons, their amplitude is reduced, but this is not accompanied by a phase shift, since the graviton, being massless, moves at the speed of light. The photon components parallel and perpendicular to the magnetic field convert at equal rates to the two polarization (+ and \times) of the graviton. As we will discuss, this qualitative difference can in principle tell us whether gravitons or axions are being produced in the conversion region; for example, we could alternate between modulating the amplitude and phase

of the laser beam, which would reveal information about amplitude reduction and phase shift respectively. We stress that this suggestion is essentially theoretical in nature, as we do not expect our proposed experiment to have the required sensitivity to detect gravitons. Since $G/g_{a\gamma\gamma}^2 \approx 10^{-6}$, they couple much more weakly to photons than QCD axions do.

In linearized general relativity, the interaction between the graviton and photon is given by

$$S_{h\gamma} = \frac{1}{2} \int d^4x h_{\mu\nu} T_{(\gamma)}^{\mu\nu}, \quad (7)$$

where $h_{\mu\nu} = g_{\mu\nu} - \eta_{\mu\nu}$ is a small perturbation to the metric, and $T_{(\gamma)}^{\mu\nu}$ is the energy-momentum tensor of the photon, given by

$$T_{\mu\nu}^{(\gamma)} = F_{\mu\rho} F^{\rho\nu} - \frac{1}{4} \eta_{\mu\nu} F_{\alpha\beta} F^{\alpha\beta}. \quad (8)$$

Without loss of generality, we assume that the graviton and photon propagates along the z axis. In the transverse-traceless gauge, the $+$ and \times modes of the graviton have respectively the polarization tensors $\epsilon_{11} = -\epsilon_{22} = 1$ and $\epsilon_{12} = \epsilon_{21} = 1$ (while all other components vanish). From (7), we see that the graviton-photon coupling $\propto \Sigma_{\alpha} \epsilon_{ij}^{\alpha} (E_i E_j + B_i B_j)$ [28], where E_i and B_i are respectively the electric and magnetic fields, $i = 1, 2$ and $\alpha = +, \times$. Hence, the $+$ (\times) mode couples only E_{\perp} (E_{\parallel}) polarizations, where \perp and \parallel are defined with respect to the plane containing the wave vector of the photon and the external magnetic field.

For simplicity we consider the case where the external magnetic field is perpendicular to the direction of propagation of the photon (and graviton). From the form of the action or the linearized Einstein's equations ($\partial^2 h_{\mu\nu} = -16\pi G T_{\mu\nu}$), we can then compute the conversion probability of photons into gravitons:

$$\eta_{\gamma \rightarrow h} = 4\pi G B^2 L^2, \quad (9)$$

which is valid for both the $+$ and \times modes. As expected, (9) has essentially the same dependence on the magnetic field and length of the conversion region as (3) ($\propto B^2 L^2$). However, since the Peccei-Quinn scale f_a is far less than the Planck scale M_{Planck} , graviton production has a much lower probability than that of axion production. For realistic values of B and L that we used above, the probability is of $\mathcal{O}(10^{-33})$. So it appears that our proposed experiment is not capable of finding the graviton, given existing technologies.

The reduction in photon amplitude corresponding to (9) is

$$\delta A_{\gamma \rightarrow h} = \frac{A \eta_{\gamma \rightarrow h}}{2} = 2\pi G B^2 L^2 A. \quad (10)$$

2. (The absence of) phase lag due to graviton production

Unlike the conversion into axions, photon-graviton mixing does not produce a phase lag between the two




FIG. 1: Schematic diagram of our proposed experiment. A laser beam, whose amplitude is modulated by a Pockels cell, is split into two beams of equal intensity (B_1 and B_2). The beam B_2 (vertical) traverses a region permeated by a magnetic field, where photons convert to axions (and other particles with a two-photon vertex). It is then recombined at the detector with the beam B_1 (horizontal), which acts as a reference. The two arms are different in length, so that the two beams are out of phase by π in the absence of a magnetic field. A change in intensity registered by the detector would signal the occurrence of a conversion. To extract the component of the overall signal that is proportional to $g_{a\gamma\gamma}^2$, we mix the output with the oscillator voltage that drives the Pockels cell.

photon polarizations, so unlike (6),

$$\delta\theta_{\gamma \rightarrow h} = 0. \quad (11)$$

This is understandable because the graviton is massless, and therefore moves at the speed of light. In addition, because both parallel and perpendicular polarizations decay into the \times and $+$ graviton modes with equal probabilities, birefringence and dichroism do not develop. As mentioned, this qualitative difference between axion- and graviton-photon mixing in a magnetic field can potentially be utilized to differentiate these particles experimentally. We also point out that QED birefringence and loop corrections give rise to a slight difference in the production rate of the two graviton polarizations, though they are negligible and therefore ignored here [29].

III. DESIGN OF EXPERIMENT

In our proposed experiment, a laser beam first enters a Pockels cell (with a polarizer behind) to modulate its amplitude (the purpose of the modulation will be explained below). Subsequently, it is divided by a beamsplitter into two beams (which we label B_1 and B_2 in Figure 1) with equal intensity. B_2 is essentially the laser beam used

in the first half of the “shining-light-through-the-wall” experiment: it passes through a region permeated by a constant magnetic field, where a small fraction of the photons are converted into axions which carry energy away from the beam, according to (3). For simplicity, we will consider here that the carrier of the modulated beam (both B_1 and B_2) is linearly polarized in the direction of the magnetic field, so our analysis in the previous section applies (For the detection of scalar ALPs, the polarization should be perpendicular to the magnetic field instead). The two beams are then recombined at the detector, and in the presence of a conversion, the slight amplitude reduction and phase shift would lead to interference, which can be detected.

The length of the path traversed by beam B_1 is by design slightly different from that by B_2 , so that at the detector the two beams would be out of phase by π if the magnetic field has been absent. Operationally, this can be achieved by adjusting one of the path lengths until destructive interference is observed at the detector when the magnetic field is turned off. Hence, in the absence of the sidebands, the two beams would interfere destructively at the detector. The purpose for this arrangement is to reduce the background, thereby enhancing the signal-to-noise ratio and minimizing shot noise.

Let the path lengths of the two arms be L_1 and L_2 (corresponding to beams B_1 and B_2), and that the state of the laser after passing through the Pockels cell be described by

$$\vec{E}_{in} = \vec{E}_0(1 + \beta \sin \omega_m t)e^{i\omega t}, \quad (12)$$

where β is a constant, \vec{E}_0 the initial electric field at $t = 0$, and ω is the frequency of the laser. The amplitude is modulated at a frequency ω_m . This can be recast as

$$\vec{E}_{in} = \vec{E}_0 \left(e^{i\omega t} + \frac{\beta}{2i} e^{i(\omega+\omega_m)t} - \frac{\beta}{2i} e^{i(\omega-\omega_m)t} \right), \quad (13)$$

where the first term is referred to as the “carrier”, and the latter two as “sidebands”.

For simplicity, we ignore the contribution of the additional phase in the present analysis, since it is negligible in comparison to that of δA , as we see in (4) and (6) for axions and (10) and (11) for gravitons. In this case, the state of the carrier after recombination at the detector is given by

$$\vec{E}_{carrier} = -\frac{\vec{E}_0}{2} e^{i(\omega t + 2kL)} \times \left[2i \sin k\Delta L - \frac{\delta A}{A} e^{-ik\Delta L} \right], \quad (14)$$

where $k = \omega/c$ is the wavenumber of the laser photons, $A = |\vec{E}_0|$, $\Delta L = L_x - L_y$ is the length difference between the two arms, and $L = (L_x + L_y)/2$ is the average. As mentioned, we will choose $k\Delta L = \pi$, so that the detector operates at a dark fringe, in order to eliminate the

background signal. This leads to

$$\vec{E}_{carrier} = e^{i(\omega t + 2kL)} \frac{\delta A}{2A} \vec{E}_0. \quad (15)$$

Note that without the aid of the sidebands, this would be the entire signal. While the background is eliminated, the intensity ($\sim \vec{E}^2$) is of $\mathcal{O}(g_{a\gamma\gamma}^4)$ (for axions). This loss in sensitivity, as we will see, can be recovered by using the sidebands.

Meanwhile, the sidebands (second and third terms of (13)) are described by

$$\vec{E}_{\pm} = \vec{E}_0 \beta e^{i(\omega t + 2kL)} e^{\pm i(\omega_m t + 2\omega_m L/c)} \times \left[\sin \frac{\omega_m \Delta L}{c} \mp i \frac{\delta A}{2A} e^{\mp i\omega_m \Delta L/c} \right], \quad (16)$$

where the subscripts $+$ and $-$ denote respectively to the sideband components of frequency $\omega + \omega_m$ and $\omega - \omega_m$.

If we set $\omega_m \approx \pi c/2\Delta L$, the total electric field at the detector is obtained by adding that of the carrier and sidebands:

$$\vec{E} = \vec{E}_0 e^{i(\omega t + 2kL)} \left(\frac{\delta A}{2A} + \beta \left(2 - \frac{\delta A}{A} \right) \cos \left[\omega_m t + \frac{2\omega_m L}{c} \right] \right). \quad (17)$$

Note that this particular value of ω_m is chosen to maximize the signal. Since $\omega_m \rightarrow n\omega_m$ and $k\Delta L \rightarrow n\pi$ (for n an odd integer) are equally valid choices, the experimenter has much freedom in choosing a suitable value for ω_m that is experimentally feasible.

Hence, the power P that falls on the detector is

$$P = P_{in} \left\{ \frac{(\delta A/A)^2}{4} + \frac{\beta^2(4 - 4(\delta A/A) + (\delta A/A)^2)}{2} + (\delta A/A)\beta(2 - (\delta A/A)) \cos \left[\omega_m \left(t + \frac{2L}{c} \right) \right] + \frac{\beta^2(4 - 4(\frac{\delta A}{A}) + (\frac{\delta A}{A})^2)}{2} \cos \left[2\omega_m \left(t + \frac{2L}{c} \right) \right] \right\} \quad (18)$$

Thus the power has a dc component (first line), and two ac components with frequencies ω_m and $2\omega_m$. If we multiply this with the oscillator voltage that drives the Pockels cell (plus an appropriate phase shift) via a mixer, we can extract the component of frequency ω_m . Neglecting the second-order contributions, the time-averaged output power of the mixer is given by

$$P_{out} = \frac{1}{T} \int_T 2P_{in}\beta\mathcal{G} \left(\frac{\delta A}{A} \right) \cos^2(\omega_m t) \quad (19)$$

$$= \frac{P_{in}\beta\mathcal{G}\delta A}{A} \quad (20)$$

where \mathcal{G} is the gain of the detector and T is taken to be sufficiently long to ensure that the time-averaging is accurate. Hence, the output signal is proportional to $g_{a\gamma\gamma}^2$ for axions and G for gravitons.

For conversion into gravitons, the size of our signal is of $\mathcal{O}(G)$, which is much lower than that due to axions ($4\pi G \ll g_{a\gamma\gamma}^2$). With further signal reduction due to shot noise, our proposed experiment clearly does not yet have the sensitivity to detect the graviton with current technologies.

In this analysis we choose to modulate the amplitude, rather than the phase, of the photons because the reduction in amplitude has comparatively a much larger effect. In principle, we could instead modulate the phase, in which case the change in intensity registered by the detector would be primarily a consequence of the phase shift instead of the amplitude reduction. The corresponding analysis is highly analogous and will not be repeated here. The major difference is that the coefficients for the sidebands in (13), $\beta/2i$, are replaced approximately by $J_1(\beta)$, the first-order Bessel function of the first kind (higher harmonics now are also present, but are negligible). Since $J_1(\beta)$ are real, our earlier analysis would work if $\delta A/A$ is replaced by $i\delta\theta$, which is purely imaginary. This can be implemented by manipulating polarizers adjacent to the Pockels cell. Thus by switching between phase and amplitude modulation, we can infer information on both the amplitude reduction and phase shift. This is one conceivable way that can help us identify the particles that the photons have converted into.

IV. DISCUSSIONS AND CONCLUSIONS

Now is an exciting time for particle physics. In the high-energy frontier, the LHC has finally begun operation, providing us with unprecedented access to physics at the TeV scale. In the low-energy frontier, a large number of experiments worldwide (e.g. ADMX, CAST, PVLAS, GammeV, CARRACK, etc.) are currently actively searching for new physics at the sub-eV scale, with a particular focus on discovering light scalars, most notably the QCD axion, and also ALPs, hidden photons, and chameleons, among other exotic particles. For a good summary of existing and future experiments, the reader is referred to [35].

The exploration of new physics at the low-energy frontier is a well-motivated enterprise. After all, more than thirty years have passed and the axion remains the most attractive solution to the strong CP problem. Even more remarkably, unbeknownst originally to the pioneers in axion physics, the properties of their new creation turn out to match precisely with those of dark matter (for a summary of evidence that favors axionic dark matter, see [36]). With the realization that axion-like-particles exist abundantly in string theory [25], there are thus ample reasons to believe that new physics might lurk at the sub-eV scale, waiting to be discovered.

In this paper, we propose a new method of axion detection based on interferometry. A laser source is split into two beams, where one is exposed to a magnetic field permeating a confined region, within which photon-axion

conversion occurs. This results in a phase shift and reduction in amplitude, which can be made manifest if the beam is then recombined and made to interfere with the other, which acts as a reference. Because only one stage of conversion is needed, the signal goes as $g_{a\gamma\gamma}^2$, which is quite an improvement over that of existing “shining-light-through-the-wall” experiments. The key to the improvement is the realization that it is not necessary to convert the axions back to photons for detection; interference with a reference beam can reveal just as much.

In order to avoid the signal being overwhelmed by the background, it is necessary to have the detector operate at a dark fringe. Unfortunately this also reduces the signal to a second-order effect ($\mathcal{O}(g_{a\gamma\gamma}^4)$). This reduction can be nullified by modulating the photon amplitude, and mixing the output signal with the oscillator voltage that drives the Pockels cell.

Despite the improvement in signal size, the use of interferometers is inevitably accompanied by the presence of shot noise, which is a manifestation of the granular nature of the photons in the laser beam. Strictly speaking, the approximation that the laser beam is a continuous wave is only true in the limit that the number of photons N goes to infinity. The number of photons in a laser beam arriving at a detector is described approximately by the Poisson distribution. From the Heisenberg’s uncertainty principle for energy and time, we can demonstrate that the phase θ and number operators are conjugate variables ($\sigma_N\sigma_\theta = 1$). This implies that fluctuations in photon number necessarily translate to fluctuations in the phase of the laser, limiting the resolution of the interferometer.

For a laser beam consisting of N incoming photons, we expect the shot noise in our setup to have roughly a magnitude of \sqrt{N} due to Poisson statistics. The signal-to-noise ratio is thus reduced to $g_{a\gamma\gamma}^2 N/\sqrt{N}$. In the case of a non-detection, this allows us to constrain the axion-photon coupling to $g_{a\gamma\gamma} < N^{-1/4}$, which is exactly what can be achieved by conventional photon-regeneration experiments. (In their case, the signal is much smaller, of $\mathcal{O}(g_{a\gamma\gamma}^4 N)$, since two conversions are needed. A non-detection would then lead to the constraint $g_{a\gamma\gamma}^4 N < 1$.)

One possible way to reduce shot noise is by the use of squeezed light. The idea is that we could reduce the uncertainty in an operator by enhancing that of its conjugate operator, so that the Heisenberg uncertainty principle is still satisfied. In our proposed experiment, light squeezing can be straightforwardly implemented with standard optical techniques, and it is not difficult to acquire a further gain of ten in sensitivity.

To further boost the sensitivity, we can adopt the proposals by [37–39] of including a Fabry-Perot cavity in the conversion region. While the resultant enhancement in sensitivity would be less than that in photon-regeneration (which requires two cavities), our setup has the advantage that it does not require sophisticated feedback loops to ensure the alignment of the cavities, so it would be easier to have a longer integration time. According to [38, 39], a gain of $10^{1.25-1.5}$ can be achieved.

Finally we point out that while we have as our principal aim the detection of axions, our design is theoretically applicable to any particle with a two photon vertex, so that mixing in the presence of an external magnetic field is permitted. Some notable examples include scalar and pseudoscalar ALPs, mini-charged particles, and gravitons, among other possibilities. Given all these possibilities, it is important to identify what the photons have converted into. We suggest two methods that can help shed light on this issue. First, we could repeat the experiment by modulating the phase instead of the amplitude of the laser, as this would reveal information about the phase shift as well. Secondly, scalar and pseudoscalar ALPs can be distinguished by modifying the polarization of the laser. Conversion can only occur if the polarization is parallel (perpendicular) to the external magnetic field for pseudoscalar (scalar) ALPs.

Even with the incorporation of squeezed light and Fabry-Perot cavities, the sensitivity of our experiment

(which is already approximately two orders of magnitude more sensitive than conventional photon-regeneration experiments) still falls short for the detection of gravitons. This is expected, in light of the feebleness of gravity. It is hoped that future improvements in the technology of light squeezing and the advent of more powerful lasers might some day help bridge the gap in sensitivity required. If achievable, our experiment might serve as an excellent complement to existing gravitational wave detectors, such as LIGO.

V. ACKNOWLEDGEMENT

We thank Guido Mueller, Pierre Sikivie, and David Tanner for useful conversations. This work was supported in part by the U.S. Department of Energy under contract DE-FG02-97ER41029.

-
- [1] R. D. Peccei, H. R. Quinn, Phys. Rev. Lett. **38**, 1440-1443 (1977).
 - [2] R. D. Peccei, H. R. Quinn, Phys. Rev. **D16**, 1791-1797 (1977).
 - [3] S. Weinberg, Phys. Rev. Lett. **40**, 223-226 (1978).
 - [4] F. Wilczek, Phys. Rev. Lett. **40**, 279-282 (1978).
 - [5] J. E. Kim, Phys. Rev. Lett. **43**, 103 (1979).
 - [6] M. A. Shifman, A. I. Vainshtein, V. I. Zakharov, Nucl. Phys. **B166**, 493 (1980).
 - [7] A. R. Zhitnitsky, Sov. J. Nucl. Phys. **31**, 260 (1980)
 - [8] M. Dine, W. Fischler, M. Srednicki, Phys. Lett. **B104**, 199 (1981).
 - [9] D. A. Dicus, E. W. Kolb, V. L. Teplitz, R. V. Wagoner, Phys. Rev. **D18**, 1829 (1978).
 - [10] D. A. Dicus, E. W. Kolb, V. L. Teplitz, R. V. Wagoner, Phys. Rev. **D22**, 839 (1980).
 - [11] G. G. Raffelt, D. S. P. Dearborn, Phys. Rev. **D36**, 2211 (1987).
 - [12] D. S. P. Dearborn, D. N. Schramm, G. Steigman, Phys. Rev. Lett. **56**, 26 (1986).
 - [13] J. Ipser, P. Sikivie, Phys. Rev. Lett. **50**, 925 (1983).
 - [14] J. Preskill, M. B. Wise, F. Wilczek, Phys. Lett. **B120**, 127-132 (1983)
 - [15] L. F. Abbott, P. Sikivie, Phys. Lett. **B120**, 133-136 (1983).
 - [16] M. Dine, W. Fischler, Phys. Lett. **B120**, 137-141 (1983).
 - [17] P. Sikivie, Lect. Notes Phys. **741**, 19-50 (2008). [astro-ph/0610440].
 - [18] F. Moulin, D. Bernard, I. F. Amiranoff, Z. Phys. **C72**, 607-611 (1996).
 - [19] A. Mirizzi, G. G. Raffelt, P. D. Serpico, Phys. Rev. **D72**, 023501 (2005). [astro-ph/0506078].
 - [20] D. Espriu and A. Renau, arXiv:1010.3580 [hep-ph].
 - [21] P. W. Graham and S. Rajendran, arXiv:1101.2691 [hep-ph].
 - [22] O. Mena, S. Razzaque, F. Villaescusa-Navarro, JCAP **1102**, 030 (2011). [arXiv:1101.1903 [astro-ph.HE]]
 - [23] P. Sikivie, Phys. Rev. Lett. **51**, 1415 (1983).
 - [24] P. Sikivie, Phys. Rev. **D32**, 2988 (1985).
 - [25] P. Svrcek, E. Witten, JHEP **0606**, 051 (2006). [hep-th/0605206].
 - [26] L. Maiani, R. Petronzio, E. Zavattini, Phys. Lett. **B175**, 359 (1986).
 - [27] M. E. Gertsenshtein, Sov. Phys. JETP, **64**, 84 (1962).
 - [28] G. Raffelt, L. Stodolsky, Phys. Rev. **D37**, 1237 (1988).
 - [29] M. Ahlers, J. Jaeckel, A. Ringwald, Phys. Rev. **D79**, 075017 (2009). [arXiv:0812.3150 [hep-ph]].
 - [30] H. Gies, J. Jaeckel and A. Ringwald, Phys. Rev. Lett. **97**, 140402 (2006) [arXiv:hep-ph/0607118].
 - [31] M. Ahlers, H. Gies, J. Jaeckel and A. Ringwald, Phys. Rev. D **75**, 035011 (2007) [arXiv:hep-ph/0612098].
 - [32] B. Holdom, Phys. Lett. B **166**, 196 (1986).
 - [33] S. A. Abel and B. W. Schofield, Nucl. Phys. B **685**, 150 (2004) [arXiv:hep-th/0311051].
 - [34] B. Batell and T. Gherghetta, Phys. Rev. D **73**, 045016 (2006) [arXiv:hep-ph/0512356].
 - [35] J. Jaeckel and A. Ringwald, Ann. Rev. Nucl. Part. Sci. **60**, 405 (2010) [arXiv:1002.0329 [hep-ph]].
 - [36] P. Sikivie, arXiv:1012.1553 [astro-ph.CO].
 - [37] F. Hoogeveen and T. Ziegenhagen, Nucl. Phys. B **358**, 3 (1991).
 - [38] P. Sikivie, D. B. Tanner and K. van Bibber, Phys. Rev. Lett. **98**, 172002 (2007) [arXiv:hep-ph/0701198].
 - [39] G. Mueller, P. Sikivie, D. B. Tanner and K. van Bibber, Phys. Rev. D **80**, 072004 (2009) [arXiv:0907.5387 [hep-ph]].