

Effects of gravity in extra dimensions in atomic phenomena

V. A. Dzuba, V. V. Flambaum, P. Munro-Laylim

School of Physics, University of New South Wales, Sydney 2052, Australia

We use the difference between theory and experiment for energy intervals in simple atomic systems (hydrogen, muonium, positronium and deuteron) to find limits on the size of extra space dimensions in the Arkani-Hamed - Dimopoulos - Dvali model for gravitation potential on short distances. As an additional experimental fact we use absence of the small size gravitational bound states of elementary particles. We demonstrate that the perturbation theory approach does not work and more reliable results are obtained by solving the Dirac equations for an electron in Coulomb and gravitational fields. These results probe smaller distances than distance between nuclei in molecules and the limits are significantly stronger than the limits on the size of extra dimensions obtained using spectra of hydrogen molecules.

I. INTRODUCTION

Observations indicate that our universe has three non-compact spatial dimensions, with all forces and particles operating inside these dimensions. However, there are popular theoretical models with extra spatial dimensions such as string theories - see e.g. [1]. These models have been motivated by search for theory unifying all interactions and producing finite results which do not require hiding infinities using the renormalisation procedures.

In this paper, we examine the Arkani-Hamed - Dimopoulos - Dvali (ADD) model [2] which aimed at solving the hierarchy problem by proposing that gravity can propagate through n extra spatial compact dimensions as well as the regular three non-compact dimensions. Ordinary Newtonian gravitational interaction between elementary particles is many orders of magnitude smaller than other interactions. In ADD model the observed Newton gravitational law in our three dimensions will be significantly strengthened at distance smaller than the size of extra dimensions R . The Newtonian gravitational potential will change from $1/r$ to a more singular $1/r^{n+1}$ dependence at distances smaller than the size of the extra dimensions, R . This may be easily explained by the Gauss integrated flux formula for the gravitational force since size of the "surface" in $(2+n)D$ is proportional to r^{2+n} [2] (see also the Randall-Sundrum multi-dimensional models [3, 4] which have similar small-distance gravity). Search for macroscopic effects has not found any deviation from Newton law. Gravity force has been observed to obey the inverse-square law down to the μm scale [5], see also Refs. [6–10]. Smaller distances may be probed in atomic phenomena. Several papers [11–15] have attempted to calculate this effect of extra dimensions on spectra of simple atomic systems and placed constraints on R through first order perturbation theory. The problem is that the results strongly depend on an unknown (and practically arbitrary) cut-off parameter which has to be introduced to obtain finite energy shift produced by the gravitational potential g/r^{n+1} for $n > 1$. Another problem is that perturbation theory is not applicable if the cut-off parameter is too small and the gravitational potential near the cut-off exceeds the

Coulomb potential. These problems have been solved in Ref. [16] where the authors studied effects of potential g/r^{n+1} between nuclei in H_2 , D_2 and HD^+ molecules. Since nuclei in molecules are separated by distance exceeding Bohr radius a_B , there is no need in cut-off parameter here. However, the effects of the potential g/r^{n+1} are much bigger for subatomic distances which give the main contribution to the energy shift in atoms.

In this paper we want to solve the cut-off problem using absence of small size bound states between two elementary particles which could be produced by the singular potential g/r^{n+1} if the cut-off parameter is too small. Indeed, the highly singular nature of the ADD gravitational potential introduces a fall-to-centre problem, where must exist some new physics mechanism that cuts off the gravitational potential below some cut-off radius r_c . To solve the cut-off problem empirically, we will use simultaneously two experimental facts: absence of the collapsed gravitational bound states of elementary particles and difference between the measured and calculated (using QED) transition energy. In this way we can get conservative limits on the size of extra dimensions by excluding the area of unknown physics at distances smaller than the electroweak scale.

II. OVERVIEW OF THE ADD MODEL

The ADD model was first proposed in Ref. [2] and introduced n extra spatial compactified dimensions of size R . There is also a change to the Planck mass, where a higher dimensional Planck mass M is defined with respect to R and replaces the observed three-dimensional Planck mass M_{Pl} ,

$$\left(\frac{cM_{Pl}}{\hbar}\right)^2 = R^n \left(\frac{cM}{\hbar}\right)^{n+2}. \quad (1)$$

This means that Gauss's Law can be applied to the gravitational potential for two masses m_1 and m_2 sepa-

rated by distance r :

$$V(r) = -\frac{Gm_1m_2}{r} \text{ for } r \gg R, \\ -\frac{Gm_1m_2R^n}{r^{n+1}} = -\frac{\hbar^{n+1}}{c^{n-1}M^{n+2}} \frac{m_1m_2}{r^{n+1}} \text{ for } r \ll R, \quad (2)$$

where $G = 6.674^{-11} \text{ m}^3 \text{ kg}^{-1} \text{ s}^{-2}$ is the regular gravitational constant. The long-range component of the potential matches the regular Newtonian gravitational potential that is known to be accurate from μm scales to astronomical scales. However, the short-range component has a more singular form, therefore this is the region where gravitational potential can become significantly stronger with extra dimensions.

For atomic calculations it is convenient to present relation between Plank mass M for $4+n$ dimensions and radius of extra dimensions R in the following form:

$$Mc^2 = (1.22 \cdot 10^{19})^{\frac{2}{n+2}} 10^{-\frac{6n}{n+2}} \left(\frac{3.73a_B}{R}\right)^{\frac{n}{n+2}} \text{ GeV}. \quad (3)$$

We introduce the dimensionless variable S to describe the ratio of the three-dimensional gravitational and Coulomb potential

$$S \equiv \frac{Gm_1m_2}{e^2} = \frac{m_1m_2}{\alpha M_{Pl}^2}, \quad (4)$$

and therefore the short-range ADD potential can be written as

$$V(r) = -\frac{\hbar c \alpha S R^n}{r^{n+1}}. \quad (5)$$

We can also consider the gravity-Coulomb boundary

$$\frac{\hbar c \alpha S R^n}{r_{gc}^{n+1}} = \frac{e^2}{r_{gc}}, \quad (6)$$

which provides the cut-off radius $r_{gc} = S^{1/n} R$ for the applicability of the perturbation theory for $n > 2$. Indeed, for $n > 2$ the matrix elements of $V(r) = g/r^{n+1}$ are dominated by the small distance integral near the cut off radius r_c , $\int_b d^3r/r^{n+1} \sim 1/r_c^{n-2}$. We can present the correction to energy as

$$\delta E = \langle \psi | H | \psi \rangle - \langle \psi_0 | H_0 | \psi_0 \rangle = \\ \langle \psi_0 | H - H_0 | \psi_0 \rangle + \langle \psi | H | \psi \rangle - \langle \psi_0 | H | \psi_0 \rangle,$$

where $H - H_0 = V(r)$ is the gravitational potential. Since in the area $r < r_{gc}$ the correction to the wave function is not small, i.e. condition $\psi - \psi_0 \ll \psi_0$ is violated for $r_{gc} > r_c$, the first order perturbation theory result is incorrect even if δE is small.

One may say that distance r_{gc} may be associated with the scale where all interactions have a comparable strength.

III. THE PERTURBATION APPROACH

As mentioned, we expect that perturbation theory for the potential $V(r) = g/r^{n+1}$ is applicable for $n < 2$ and not applicable for $n > 2$. For intermediate case $n = 2$ the perturbation theory may provide an estimate with a logarithmic accuracy. To make a link to ADD theory, we should find estimates for the size of extra dimensions R_n , which determines area of highly singular gravitational potential, $V(r) = g/r^{n+1}$ for $r < R_n$. We will do these first estimates using experimental data from muonium, postonium and hydrogen spectra and perturbation theory.

For $n = 1$, we use the known expectation values of $1/r^2$ potentials for s -waves [17] and obtain the energy shift produced by potential Eq. (5):

$$\delta E_1 = \frac{2\hbar c \alpha S R Z^2}{n_p^3 a^2}, \quad (7)$$

where a is the reduced atomic Bohr radius, Z is the nuclear charge (in units of proton electric charge e), and n_p is the principal quantum number.

For $n = 2$ and $n \geq 3$, we estimate leading terms enhanced by the small cut off parameter r_c in the first order perturbation energy shift:

$$\delta E_2 = \frac{4\hbar c \alpha S R^2 Z^3}{n_p^3 a^3} \ln\left(\frac{a}{r_c}\right), \quad (8)$$

$$\delta E_{n \geq 3} = \frac{4\hbar c \alpha S R^n Z^3}{(n-2)n_p^3 a^3 r_c^{n-2}}. \quad (9)$$

We consider two different choices for the cut-off parameter r_c . Firstly, we consider the point r_{gc} where the gravitational and Coulomb potentials are equal. This choice corresponds to the boundary of applicability of the perturbation theory. Defining the variable $\lambda \equiv \frac{1}{n_i^3} - \frac{1}{n_j^3}$ as the inverse cubed principal quantum number difference of the two energy states, we determine the size for any extra dimensions R_n for a given energy shift from gravity for a transition $n_i \rightarrow n_j$, assuming cut-off radius $r_c = r_{gc} = S^{1/n} R$ from equality of the gravitational and Coulomb potentials:

$$R_1 = \frac{a^2 \delta E}{2\hbar c \alpha S Z^2 \lambda}, \quad (10)$$

$$R_2 = \sqrt{\frac{a^3 \delta E}{4\hbar c \alpha S Z^3 \lambda \ln(a/S^{1/n} R_2)}}, \quad (11)$$

$$R_{n \geq 3} = \sqrt{\frac{a^3 (n-2) \delta E}{4\hbar c \alpha S^{2/n} Z^3 \lambda}}. \quad (12)$$

Note for $n = 2$, R_2 must be obtained using iterations; all other R_n can be trivially calculated. To have inputs

for δE , we consider the maximal energy shift between experimental and theoretical energy levels in simple systems. The systems were chosen due to their small deviation between theoretical and experimental results, which is presented in Table I. Spectroscopy results for hydrogen are new, while muonium and positronium measurements are older; see Ref. [18, 19] for recent reviews in muonium and positronium spectroscopy. Significant improvements for muonium and positronium $1s - 2s$ spectroscopy are expected in the near future [20, 21].

In our calculations, we use the S values for each system: $S_{ee} = 2.4 \times 10^{-43}$ for positronium and $S_{e\mu} = 4.9 \times 10^{-41}$ for muonium. For hydrogen stable gravitational bound states could be formed between electron and point-like quark. However, when we calculate the gravitational energy shift, the total proton mass density defines the strength of the gravitational potential. For $n > 2$ the quark-electron potential $V(r) = g/r^{n+1}$ with a cut-off r_c , which is very small on atomic scale, is practically equivalent to the contact potential $V(r) = C\delta(r)$, where $C = \int V(r)d^3r$. For a finite size proton or nucleus this approximation gives potential proportional to the mass density $m\rho(r)$, where $\int \rho(r)d^3r = 1$. In light atoms, s-wave electron wave function tends to constant at $r \rightarrow 0$ and finite size of the nucleus has no effect, i.e. we may take $V(r) = C\delta(r)$ for $n > 2$.

For $n = 1$ the effect of the potential $V(r) = g/r^2$ is not sensitive to both the cut-off radius and nuclear size. For $n = 2$ there is only very weak logarithmic sensitivity to these parameters. Thus we may conclude that formulas presented above may be used to estimate energy shift for hydrogen atom with $S_{ep} = 4.4 \times 10^{-40}$. Use of the proton mass (instead of the quark mass) for the estimate of the cut-off parameter, overestimates r_c and makes the limits on R weaker but more reliable.

A smaller value of the cut-off distance r_c comes from the condition of absence of the gravitational bound states of elementary particles (since they have not been observed experimentally). The estimate follows from the equality of the relativistic kinetic energy $\hbar c/r$ and gravitational energy Eq. (2) for weakly bound states. It leads to

$$(r_c/R)^n \sim m_1 m_2 / M_{Pl}^2, \quad (13)$$

which gives

$$r_c \sim \alpha r_{gc}. \quad (14)$$

TABLE I: Input parameters for simple systems. All systems have atomic charge $Z = 1$ and reduced Bohr radius a_B (with the exception of positronium with $2a_B$).

| System | $\Delta E = E_{exp} - E_{thr}$ | Max. ΔE (eV) | Ref. |
|--------------|--------------------------------|-----------------------|---------|
| H $1s - 2s$ | -0.9(5.4) kHz | 2.2×10^{-11} | [22] |
| H $1s - 3s$ | 1.2(4.1) kHz | 2.2×10^{-11} | [23] |
| Mu $1s - 2s$ | 5.6(9.9) MHz | 6.4×10^{-8} | [24] |
| Ps $1s - 2s$ | -5.78(3.5) MHz | 1.3×10^{-8} | [25–27] |

This choice leads to stronger constraints on the size of extra dimensions (see Table IV). Note that we still use the non-relativistic expression for gravitation interaction (2). The estimation of the role of the relativistic effects is presented in the Appendix. Relativistic corrections increase gravitational interaction and make constraint on the radius of extra dimensions R stronger.

A. Deuteron Binding Energy

Wave function of the deuteron may be found using the short range character of the strong interaction and relatively small binding energy of the deuteron. Outside the interaction range, we use solution to the Schrodinger equation for zero potential. Within the interaction range $r_0 = 1.2$ fm, wave function has a constant value for s orbital.

$$\psi(r) = \begin{cases} \frac{B e^{-\kappa r}}{r_0} & \text{for } r > r_0, \\ \frac{B J(0)}{r_0} & \text{for } r < r_0, \end{cases} \quad (15)$$

where the normalisation constant B is given by $4\pi B^2 = 2\kappa$ for $\kappa = \sqrt{2m|E|} = 4.56 \times 10^7$ eV (reduced mass $m = m_p/2$ and binding energy $|E| = 2.22$ MeV). The Jastrow factor, $J(0) = 0.4$ [28], is included to account for the nucleon repulsion at short distance. For $n = 1$ we obtain

$$\delta E_1 = -\frac{2\kappa R_1 \alpha S_{pn}}{r_0}, \quad (16)$$

where $S_{pn} = 0.81 \cdot 10^{-36}$, $\alpha S_{pn} = 0.59 \cdot 10^{-38}$. Following Ref. [29] we take difference between experimental [30] and theoretical [31] results as $E_{exp} - E_{thr} = -13.7$ eV. This gives $R_1 < 3 \cdot 10^{16}$ m.

For $n > 1$ the quark-quark potential $V(r) = -g/r^{n+1}$ with a cut-off r_c , which is very small on nuclear scale, may be approximated by the contact potential $V(r) = -C\delta(r)$, where $C = -\int V(r)d^3r$. This contact interaction is similar to the weak interaction mediated by Z-boson. From the results of the weak effects calculation we know that finite size of the nucleons produces suppression of the effects described by the Jastrow factor $J(0)$ [28]. After accounting for this factor we may assume that nucleons are point-like particles with interaction $V(r) = -C\delta(r)$.

Using wave function in Eq. (15) we obtain the following estimate for the energy shift in the case of $n > 1$:

$$\delta E_n = \langle \psi | -C_n \delta(\mathbf{r}) | \psi \rangle = -\frac{C_n \kappa J(0)^2}{2\pi r_0^2} = -C_n 0.8 \cdot 10^{36} \frac{eV}{m^2}, \quad (17)$$

where for $n = 2$

$$C_2 = 4\pi \alpha S_{pn} R_2^2 \ln \frac{r_0}{r_c}, \quad (18)$$

for $n > 2$

$$C_n = \frac{4\pi \alpha S_{pn} R_n^2}{(n-2)} \left(\frac{R_n}{r_c} \right)^{n-2}. \quad (19)$$

TABLE II: Parameters of extra dimensions obtained from the deuteron data. n is the number of extra dimensions, R is the size of extra dimensions, r_c is the cut-off parameter, M is Planck mass for extra dimensions (3). Numbers in square brackets mean powers of ten.

| n | R [m] | r_c [m] | M [GeV] |
|-----|------------|--------------|--------------|
| 2 | 5.1 | 4.5[-19] | 22 |
| 3 | 4.8[-06] | 9.6[-19] | 25 |
| 4 | 3.8[-09] | 1.1[-18] | 32 |
| 5 | 5.2[-11] | 1.2[-18] | 38 |
| 6 | 3.0[-12] | 1.3[-18] | 43 |
| 7 | 4.0[-13] | 1.4[-18] | 47 |

We can estimate the cut-off radius r_c from the condition of the absence of the small size gravitational bound states Eq. (13). Note that gravitational bound state may exist for two quarks while all quarks contribute to the deuteron binding energy. To have a conservative estimate of the limits on R and M , we use a constituent quark mass $m_q = 300$ MeV in Eq. (13) (mass $m_q \sim 5$ MeV would give smaller r_c , bigger energy shifts and stronger limits). Using $E_{\text{exp}} - E_{\text{thr}} = -13.7$ eV we obtain estimates for R_n and M_n presented in Table II. Formally, these estimates look like the strongest constrains among two-body systems. However, deuteron is a system with the strong interaction and these constrains are probably less reliable than the constrains from hydrogen, muonium and positronium.

IV. NUMERICAL CALCULATIONS

We performed the numerical calculations of the energy shifts caused by gravitation potential in order to find limits on the size of extra dimensions R . We do this in two ways. First, we use perturbation theory (PT) approach described in previous section. Second, we solve Dirac equations for the $1s$, $2s$, $3s$ states of hydrogen, muonium and positronium. The energy shift is found as a difference of energies calculated in the Coulomb potential and in the potential with added gravitational contribution. The size of extra dimensions R is used in this approach as a fitting parameter to fit input energy shifts from Table I (we call these shifts "experimental" shifts and use notation ΔE_{expt} for them). The calculations with Dirac equations are done to check whether PT really works. Note that small value of the correction to the energy does not necessary mean that PT is applicable. The correction is small because it comes from a very small region in the vicinity of the cut-off radius. However, in this region the change of the potential is not small leading to large change in the wave function and breaking of PT.

We perform the calculations using two ways of defining the cut-off parameter r_c ($V_g(r) = V_g(r_c)$ for $r < r_c$).

Using $r_c = r_{gc}$ (see Eq. (6)) leads to conservative estimates of the size of extra dimensions which are in agreement with the perturbation theory calculations. Corresponding results are presented in Table III. In another approach we use much smaller value of r_c which we find from the condition of the absence of the small size gravitational bound states of elementary particles. In practice this means that the wave function, found from solving the Dirac equation, does not oscillate at small distances. We found that in all cases $r_c = r_{gca}/100$, where $r_{gca} = S^{1/n} R_a$, in excellent agreement with an estimate $r_c \sim \alpha r_{gc}$ from Eqs. (13,14). The results are presented in Table IV.

In Tables III and IV we present energy shifts and corresponding values of r_c , R and M obtained in several different ways. ΔE_a is calculated using formulae (7,8,9) but with the radius of extra dimensions found from the fitting of the energy shift ΔE_D obtained by solving the Dirac equations. $\Delta E_{\text{PT}0} = \langle \psi_{1s}^{(0)} | V | \psi_{ns}^{(0)} \rangle$, where $\psi^{(0)}$ are unperturbed wave functions.

To avoid a misunderstanding, we should note that we used slightly different method of cut-off in the analytical approach and in the numerical solution of the Dirac equation. $\Delta E_{\text{PT}0} = \Delta E_a$ if integration for $\Delta E_{\text{PT}0}$ is done from r_c to infinity, as in the analytical approach. We did such calculations as a test and found good agreement between the two. However, in the tables we present values of $\Delta E_{\text{PT}0}$ and ΔE_{PT} found by integrating from zero to infinity. This is done to make meaningful comparison with the energy shift obtained from solving the Dirac equations. The same gravitation potential is used to calculate $\Delta E_{\text{PT}0}$, ΔE_{PT} and ΔE_D in the Dirac equations. If $\Delta E_{\text{PT}0} = \Delta E_{\text{PT}} = \Delta E_{\text{expt}}$ (we have $\Delta E_D = \Delta E_{\text{expt}}$) then one could say that PT works. We see that this is the case only for $r_c = r_{gca}$ (Table III).

The values of R_a and r_{gca} are given by Eqs. (10,11,12) and (6). The values of R_D and r_{gc} are found from solving the Dirac equations. We believe that the results obtained with the use of Dirac equations are more reliable. The Planck mass for extra dimensions M was found using the Dirac equations value of R (R_D).

V. CONCLUSION

In the present paper we investigated possibilities to probe ADD gravitational potential Eq. (2) at sub-atomic distances. This potential does not include relativistic corrections. However, as it is demonstrated in Appendix, relativistic corrections increase gravitational interaction and lead to much stronger constrains. Therefore, our estimates of the limits on the size of extra dimensions, based on the potential Eq. (2), are conservative. By imposing the condition that there are no gravitational bound states between stable elementary particles (which have not been observed), we cut-off area of unknown physics at distances smaller than the electroweak scale. Constrains on the size of extra dimensions R and Planck

TABLE III: Parameters of extra dimensions obtained from comparing experimental and theoretical energy shifts. Experimental shifts ΔE_{expt} are taken from Table I. Parameter n is the number of extra dimensions; ΔE_a is the energy shift given by Eqs. (7,8,9); $\Delta E_{\text{PT0}} = \langle \psi_{1s}^{(0)} | V | \psi_{ns}^{(0)} \rangle$, where $\psi^{(0)}$ are unperturbed wave functions; $\Delta E_{\text{PT}} = \langle \psi_{1s} | V | \psi_{ns} \rangle$, where ψ are wave functions obtained by solving Dirac equations including Coulomb and gravitation potentials. Energy shifts ΔE_D , obtained using Dirac equations, are fitted to ΔE_{expt} by varying size of extra dimensions R , i.e. $\Delta E_D = \Delta E_{\text{expt}}$. The values of R_a are given by Eqs. (10,11,12), R_D is chosen to fit experimental energy shift by solving Dirac equations; $r_{gca} = S^{1/n} R_a$, $r_{gc} = S^{1/n} R_D$. M is Planck mass for extra dimensions (3). The calculation were done at the cut-off parameter $r_c = r_{gc}$. Numbers in square brackets mean powers of ten.

| n | ΔE_a [eV] | ΔE_{PT0} [eV] | ΔE_{PT} [eV] | R_a [m] | r_{gca} [m] | R_D [m] | r_{gc} [m] | M [GeV] |
|---|----------------------|---------------------------------|--------------------------------|--------------|------------------|--------------|-----------------|--------------|
| Hydrogen, $1s - 2s$, $\Delta E_D = \Delta E_{\text{expt}} = 2.23 \times 10^{-11}$ eV | | | | | | | | |
| 1 | 2.23[-11] | 2.23[-11] | 2.23[-11] | 5.63[+16] | 2.48[-23] | 5.63[+16] | 2.48[-23] | 80.5 |
| 2 | 2.41[-11] | 2.27[-11] | 2.27[-11] | 3.06[+02] | 6.42[-18] | 3.18[+02] | 6.68[-18] | 2.75 |
| 3 | 1.69[-11] | 2.26[-11] | 2.26[-11] | 3.37[-04] | 2.56[-17] | 2.93[-04] | 2.23[-17] | 2.15 |
| 4 | 1.29[-11] | 2.15[-11] | 2.15[-11] | 2.50[-07] | 3.62[-17] | 1.90[-07] | 2.75[-17] | 2.36 |
| 5 | 1.09[-11] | 2.19[-11] | 2.19[-11] | 3.30[-09] | 4.44[-17] | 2.31[-09] | 3.11[-17] | 2.54 |
| 6 | 9.44[-12] | 2.20[-11] | 2.20[-11] | 1.86[-10] | 5.13[-17] | 1.21[-10] | 3.33[-17] | 2.70 |
| 7 | 8.04[-12] | 2.14[-11] | 2.14[-11] | 2.40[-11] | 5.73[-17] | 1.44[-11] | 3.44[-17] | 2.88 |
| Hydrogen, $1s - 3s$, $\Delta E_D = \Delta E_{\text{expt}} = 2.19 \times 10^{-11}$ eV | | | | | | | | |
| 1 | 2.22[-11] | 2.22[-11] | 2.22[-11] | 5.53[+16] | 2.44[-23] | 5.08[+16] | 2.24[-23] | 83.3 |
| 2 | 2.41[-11] | 2.27[-11] | 2.27[-11] | 3.03[+02] | 6.36[-18] | 3.03[+02] | 6.36[-18] | 2.82 |
| 3 | 1.62[-11] | 2.16[-11] | 2.16[-11] | 3.34[-04] | 2.54[-17] | 2.74[-04] | 2.08[-17] | 2.24 |
| 4 | 1.32[-11] | 2.20[-11] | 2.20[-11] | 2.48[-07] | 3.59[-17] | 1.83[-07] | 2.66[-17] | 2.42 |
| 5 | 1.12[-11] | 2.23[-11] | 2.23[-11] | 3.27[-09] | 4.40[-17] | 2.22[-09] | 2.99[-17] | 2.61 |
| 6 | 9.58[-12] | 2.24[-11] | 2.24[-11] | 1.84[-10] | 5.08[-17] | 1.16[-10] | 3.20[-17] | 2.79 |
| 7 | 8.54[-12] | 2.28[-11] | 2.28[-11] | 2.38[-11] | 5.68[-17] | 1.42[-11] | 3.38[-17] | 2.92 |
| Muonium, $\Delta E_D = \Delta E_{\text{expt}} = 6.41 \times 10^{-8}$ eV | | | | | | | | |
| 1 | 6.41[-08] | 6.41[-08] | 6.41[-08] | 1.43[+21] | 7.12[-20] | 1.43[+21] | 7.12[-20] | 2.74 |
| 2 | 7.04[-08] | 6.48[-08] | 6.48[-08] | 5.67[+04] | 4.00[-16] | 5.95[+04] | 4.20[-16] | 0.201 |
| 3 | 4.74[-08] | 6.32[-08] | 6.32[-08] | 3.73[-02] | 1.37[-15] | 3.21[-02] | 1.18[-15] | 0.128 |
| 4 | 3.90[-08] | 6.50[-08] | 6.50[-08] | 2.31[-05] | 1.94[-15] | 1.80[-05] | 1.51[-15] | 0.114 |
| 5 | 3.32[-08] | 6.65[-08] | 6.65[-08] | 2.73[-07] | 2.38[-15] | 1.97[-07] | 1.71[-15] | 0.106 |
| 6 | 2.71[-08] | 6.32[-08] | 6.32[-08] | 1.43[-08] | 2.75[-15] | 9.31[-09] | 1.78[-15] | 0.104 |
| 7 | 2.54[-08] | 6.78[-08] | 6.79[-08] | 1.76[-09] | 3.07[-15] | 1.11[-09] | 1.93[-15] | 0.098 |
| Ps, $1s - 2s$, $\Delta E_D = \Delta E_{\text{expt}} = 1.34 \times 10^{-8}$ eV | | | | | | | | |
| 1 | 1.34[-8] | 1.34[-8] | 1.34[-8] | 2.49[+23] | 5.97[-20] | 2.49[+23] | 5.97[-20] | 4.9[-1] |
| 2 | 1.50[-8] | 1.26[-8] | 1.26[-8] | 1.04[+06] | 5.08[-16] | 1.10[+06] | 5.39[-16] | 4.7[-2] |
| 3 | 9.71[-9] | 9.71[-9] | 9.71[-9] | 2.86[-01] | 1.78[-15] | 2.43[-01] | 1.51[-15] | 3.8[-2] |
| 4 | 7.97[-9] | 7.97[-9] | 7.97[-9] | 1.14[-04] | 2.51[-15] | 8.75[-05] | 1.94[-15] | 4.0[-2] |
| 5 | 6.58[-9] | 6.59[-9] | 6.59[-9] | 1.03[-06] | 3.08[-15] | 7.20[-07] | 2.16[-15] | 4.2[-2] |
| 6 | 5.68[-9] | 5.68[-9] | 5.68[-9] | 4.51[-08] | 3.56[-15] | 2.93[-08] | 2.31[-15] | 4.4[-2] |
| 7 | 5.16[-9] | 5.17[-9] | 5.17[-9] | 4.87[-09] | 3.97[-15] | 3.02[-09] | 2.46[-15] | 4.5[-2] |

mass M , obtained using the difference between the experimental and calculated value of the deuteron binding energy, have been presented in the Table II. However, deuteron is a system with the strong interaction and these constrains are probably less reliable than the constrains from hydrogen, muonium and positronium presented in the Table IV. The perturbation theory is not applicable if the main contribution to the energy shift comes from the area where the gravitational potential exceeds

the Coulomb potential. Therefore, we obtain the energy shift using solution of the Dirac equation including both Coulomb and gravitational potential. Corresponding limit on the size of extra dimensions is denoted by R_D .

TABLE IV: The same as Table III but the calculations were done at the smaller values of the cut-off parameter $r_c = r_{gca}/100$, chosen from the condition of the absence of the gravitational bound states of elementary particles.

| n | ΔE_a [eV] | ΔE_{PT0} [eV] | ΔE_{PT} [eV] | R_a [m] | r_c [m] | R_D [m] | M [GeV] |
|---|----------------------|--------------------------|-------------------------|--------------|--------------|--------------|--------------|
| Hydrogen, $1s - 2s$, $\Delta E_D = \Delta E_{\text{expt}} = 2.23 \times 10^{-11}$ eV | | | | | | | |
| 2 | 1.01[-12] | 9.49[-13] | 1.26[-08] | 3.06[+02] | 6.42[-20] | 5.73[+01] | 6.5 |
| 3 | 7.58[-13] | 7.59[-13] | 8.41[-10] | 3.37[-04] | 2.56[-19] | 2.35[-05] | 9.8 |
| 4 | 7.85[-13] | 7.86[-13] | 3.23[-10] | 2.50[-07] | 3.62[-19] | 1.08[-08] | 16 |
| 5 | 8.04[-13] | 8.05[-13] | 1.96[-10] | 3.30[-09] | 4.44[-19] | 1.07[-10] | 23 |
| 6 | 8.17[-13] | 8.17[-13] | 1.36[-10] | 1.86[-10] | 5.13[-19] | 4.97[-12] | 30 |
| 7 | 8.25[-13] | 8.26[-13] | 9.73[-11] | 2.40[-11] | 5.73[-19] | 5.59[-13] | 36 |
| Hydrogen, $1s - 3s$, $\Delta E_D = \Delta E_{\text{expt}} = 2.19 \times 10^{-11}$ eV | | | | | | | |
| 2 | 1.10[-12] | 1.03[-12] | 1.33[-08] | 3.03[+02] | 6.36[-20] | 5.69[+01] | 6.5 |
| 3 | 8.18[-13] | 8.19[-13] | 7.21[-10] | 3.34[-04] | 2.54[-19] | 2.33[-05] | 9.8 |
| 4 | 8.48[-13] | 8.49[-13] | 3.49[-10] | 2.48[-07] | 3.59[-19] | 1.07[-08] | 16 |
| 5 | 8.61[-13] | 8.62[-13] | 1.09[-10] | 3.27[-09] | 4.40[-19] | 1.06[-10] | 23 |
| 6 | 8.74[-13] | 8.75[-13] | 7.92[-11] | 1.84[-10] | 5.08[-19] | 4.91[-12] | 30 |
| 7 | 8.85[-13] | 8.86[-13] | 7.33[-11] | 2.38[-11] | 5.68[-19] | 5.53[-13] | 36 |
| Muonium, $\Delta E_D = \Delta E_{\text{expt}} = 6.41 \times 10^{-8}$ eV | | | | | | | |
| 2 | 2.84[-09] | 2.62[-09] | 2.24[-05] | 5.67[+04] | 4.00[-18] | 1.01[+04] | 0.49 |
| 3 | 2.17[-09] | 2.17[-09] | 1.55[-06] | 3.73[-02] | 1.37[-17] | 2.60[-03] | 0.58 |
| 4 | 2.25[-09] | 2.25[-09] | 9.50[-07] | 2.31[-05] | 1.94[-17] | 1.00[-06] | 0.78 |
| 5 | 2.32[-09] | 2.33[-09] | 1.60[-06] | 2.73[-07] | 2.38[-17] | 8.89[-09] | 0.97 |
| 6 | 2.35[-09] | 2.35[-09] | 4.77[-07] | 1.43[-08] | 2.75[-17] | 3.83[-10] | 1.14 |
| 7 | 2.37[-09] | 2.37[-09] | 2.82[-07] | 1.76[-09] | 3.07[-17] | 4.09[-11] | 1.28 |
| Ps, $1s - 2s$, $\Delta E_D = \Delta E_{\text{expt}} = 1.34 \times 10^{-8}$ eV | | | | | | | |
| 2 | 5.89[-10] | 5.21[-10] | 6.02[-06] | 1.04[+06] | 5.08[-18] | 1.85[+05] | 0.11 |
| 3 | 4.55[-10] | 4.55[-10] | 3.27[-07] | 2.86[-01] | 1.78[-17] | 1.99[-02] | 0.17 |
| 4 | 4.72[-10] | 4.73[-10] | 2.00[-07] | 1.14[-04] | 2.51[-17] | 4.92[-06] | 0.27 |
| 5 | 4.81[-10] | 4.82[-10] | 7.83[-08] | 1.03[-06] | 3.08[-17] | 3.34[-08] | 0.38 |
| 6 | 4.91[-10] | 4.92[-10] | 8.26[-08] | 4.51[-08] | 3.56[-17] | 1.21[-09] | 0.48 |
| 7 | 4.93[-10] | 4.94[-10] | 4.12[-08] | 4.87[-09] | 3.97[-17] | 1.13[-10] | 0.58 |

Acknowledgements

This work was supported by the Australian Research Council Grants No. DP190100974 and DP200100150.

VI. APPENDIX: RELATIVISTIC ESTIMATES

As known, all types of energy contribute to the gravitational potential. For example, kinetic energy of nearly massless quarks ($m_u \approx 3$ MeV, $m_d \approx 5$ MeV) give significant contribution to the nucleon mass. Kinetic energy of ultra-relativistic particle may be estimated as $E_k = pc \sim \hbar c/r$, so mass m in the gravitational potential should be replaced by \hbar/cr , and corresponding gravitational interaction energy of two particles is

$$U \sim -\frac{G}{r} \left(\frac{\hbar}{cr} \right)^2 \left(\frac{R_n}{r} \right)^n \quad (20)$$

For weakly bound states kinetic energy and potential energy compensate each other, $E_k = |U|$, and this equality defines the cut-off radius excluding formation of the bound states, $r_c = \hbar/M_n c$, where M_n is the Plank mass for extra n dimensions -see Eq. (1). Note that one can find similar estimates in Ref. [32].

Perturbation theory gives the following estimate for the energy shift produced by the potential Eq. (20) with the cut-off $r_c = \hbar/M_n c$ (in natural units $\hbar = c = 1$):

$$\delta E \sim \frac{4\pi\psi(0)^2}{nM_n^2} \quad (21)$$

For hydrogen $\delta E < 2.2 \cdot 10^{-11} \text{eV}$ and we obtain the limit $M_n > 100 \text{ GeV} / n^{1/2}$, which is much stronger than the limit obtain using the non-relativistic gravitational potential. For deuterium the limit is even stronger, $M_n > 170 \text{ GeV} / n^{1/2}$.

Thus, we conclude that use of the non-relativistic gravitational potential underestimates the energy shift δE

and gives conservative limits on the Plank mass M_n and radius of extra dimensions R_n .

-
- [1] E. Witten, Nuclear Physics B **443**, 85 (1995), URL [https://doi.org/10.1016/0550-3213\(95\)00158-0](https://doi.org/10.1016/0550-3213(95)00158-0).
- [2] N. Arkani-Hamed, S. Dimopoulos, and G. Dvali, Physics Letters B **429**, 263–272 (1998), ISSN 0370-2693, URL [http://dx.doi.org/10.1016/S0370-2693\(98\)00466-3](http://dx.doi.org/10.1016/S0370-2693(98)00466-3).
- [3] L. Randall and R. Sundrum, Phys. Rev. Lett. **83**, 3370 (1999), URL <https://link.aps.org/doi/10.1103/PhysRevLett.83.3370>.
- [4] L. Randall and R. Sundrum, Phys. Rev. Lett. **83**, 4690 (1999), URL <https://link.aps.org/doi/10.1103/PhysRevLett.83.4690>.
- [5] W.-H. Tan, A.-B. Du, W.-C. Dong, S.-Q. Yang, C.-G. Shao, S.-G. Guan, Q.-L. Wang, B.-F. Zhan, P.-S. Luo, L.-C. Tu, et al., Phys. Rev. Lett. **124**, 051301 (2020), URL <https://link.aps.org/doi/10.1103/PhysRevLett.124.051301>.
- [6] D. J. Kapner, T. S. Cook, E. G. Adelberger, J. H. Gundlach, B. R. Heckel, C. D. Hoyle, and H. E. Swanson, Phys. Rev. Lett. **98**, 021101 (2007).
- [7] E. G. Adelberger, B. R. Heckel, S. Hoedl, C. D. Hoyle, D. J. Kapner, and A. Upadhye, Phys. Rev. Lett. **98**, 131104 (2007).
- [8] Y.-J. Chen, W. K. Tham, D. E. Krause, D. Lopez, E. Fischbach, and R. S. Decca, Phys. Rev. Lett. **116**, 221102 (2016).
- [9] G. Vasilakis, J. M. Brown, T. W. Kornack, and M. V. Romalis, Phys. Rev. Lett. **103**, 261801 (2009).
- [10] W. A. Terrano, E. G. Adelberger, J. G. Lee, and B. R. Heckel, Phys. Rev. Lett. **115**, 201801 (2015).
- [11] L. Feng and L. Hong-Ya, Chinese Physics Letters **23**, 2903 (2006), URL <https://doi.org/10.1088/0256-307x/23/11/006>.
- [12] F. Luo and H. Liu, Int. J. Theor. Phys. **46**, 606 (2007), gr-qc/0602093.
- [13] F. Dahia and A. S. Lemos, Phys. Rev. D **94**, 084033 (2016), URL <https://link.aps.org/doi/10.1103/PhysRevD.94.084033>.
- [14] L. Zhi-Gang, N. Wei-Tou, and A. P. Patón, Chinese Physics B **17**, 70 (2008), URL <https://doi.org/10.1088/1674-1056/17/1/013>.
- [15] L.-B. Wang and W.-T. Ni, Modern Physics Letters A **28**, 1350094 (2013), ISSN 1793-6632, URL <http://dx.doi.org/10.1142/S0217732313500946>.
- [16] E. J. Salumbides, A. N. Schellekens, B. Gato-Rivera, and W. Ubachs, New Journal of Physics **17**, 033015 (2015), URL <https://doi.org/10.1088/1367-2630/17/3/033015>.
- [17] H. A. Bethe and E. E. Salpeter, *Quantum mechanics of one- and two-electron atoms* (Springer Berlin, 2014).
- [18] Y. V. Stadnik, *Searching for ultralight scalar dark matter with muonium and muonic atoms* (2022), URL <https://arxiv.org/abs/2206.10808>.
- [19] G. Adkins, D. Cassidy, and J. Pérez-Ríos, Physics Reports **975**, 1 (2022), ISSN 0370-1573, precision spectroscopy of positronium: testing bound-state QED theory and the search for physics beyond the Standard Model, URL <https://www.sciencedirect.com/science/article/pii/S03701573>
- [20] P. Crivelli, Hyperfine Interactions **239** (2018), ISSN 1572-9540, URL <http://dx.doi.org/10.1007/s10751-018-1525-z>.
- [21] M. Heiss, G. Wichmann, A. Rubbia, and P. Crivelli, *The positronium hyperfine structure: Progress towards a direct measurement of the $2^3S_1 \rightarrow 2^1S_0$ transition in vacuum* (2018), URL <https://arxiv.org/abs/1805.05886>.
- [22] M. Ahmadi, B. Alves, C. Baker, and et al., Nature **557**, 71 (2018).
- [23] H. Fleurbaey, Theses, Université Pierre et Marie Curie (UPMC) (2017), URL <https://tel.archives-ouvertes.fr/tel-01633631>.
- [24] V. Meyer, S. N. Bagayev, P. E. G. Baird, P. Bakule, M. G. Boshier, A. Breitrück, S. L. Cornish, S. Dyckov, G. H. Eaton, A. Grossmann, et al., Physical Review Letters **84**, 1136 (2000), ISSN 1079-7114, URL <http://dx.doi.org/10.1103/PhysRevLett.84.1136>.
- [25] A. Czarnecki, K. Melnikov, and A. Yelkhovsky, Phys. Rev. A **59**, 4316 (1999), URL <https://link.aps.org/doi/10.1103/PhysRevA.59.4316>.
- [26] A. V. Manohar and I. W. Stewart, Phys. Rev. Lett. **85**, 2248 (2000), URL <https://link.aps.org/doi/10.1103/PhysRevLett.85.2248>.
- [27] M. S. Fee, A. P. Mills, S. Chu, E. D. Shaw, K. Danzmann, R. J. Chichester, and D. M. Zuckerman, Phys. Rev. Lett. **70**, 1397 (1993), URL <https://link.aps.org/doi/10.1103/PhysRevLett.70.1397>.
- [28] V. F. Dmitriev, V. V. Flambaum, O. P. Sushkov, and V. B. Telitsin, Physics Letters B **125**, 1 (1983).
- [29] Y. V. Stadnik, Phys. Rev. Lett. **120**, 223202 (2018), URL <https://link.aps.org/doi/10.1103/PhysRevLett.120.223202>.
- [30] E. Kessler, Jr, M. Dewey, R. Deslattes, A. Henins, H. Börner, M. Jentschel, C. Doll, and H. Lehmann, Physics Letters A **255**, 221 (1999), ISSN 0375-9601, URL <https://www.sciencedirect.com/science/article/pii/S03759601>
- [31] A. Ekström, G. R. Jansen, K. A. Wendt, G. Hagen, T. Papenbrock, B. D. Carlsson, C. Forssén, M. Hjorth-Jensen, P. Navrátil, and W. Nazarewicz, Phys. Rev. C **91**, 051301(R) (2015), URL <https://link.aps.org/doi/10.1103/PhysRevC.91.051301>.
- [32] U. Guenther, A. Kuklov, and A. Zhuk, *Comment on stability of atoms and nuclei in multidimensional tev scale gravity* (2000), URL <https://arxiv.org/abs/hep-ph/0012246>.