

Quantum gravity corrections to the spontaneous excitation of an accelerated atom interacting with a quantum scalar field

Zhi Wang*

School of Mathematics and Statistics,

Guizhou University of Finance and Economics, Guiyang 550025, China

Abstract

The Generalized Uncertainty Principle (GUP) extends the Heisenberg Uncertainty Principle (HUP) by suggesting a minimum observable scale that includes the effects of quantum gravity, which is supposed to potentially result in observable effects far below the Planck energy scale, providing us the opportunity to explore the theory of quantum gravity through physical processes at low energy scale. In present work, we study the corrections induced by the GUP to the spontaneous radiation properties of a two-level atom interacting with a real massless scalar quantum field based on the DDC formalism. The GUP alters the correlation function of the scalar field, consequently affecting the radiative properties of atoms. We compute the rate of change in the mean atomic energy for an atom undergoing inertial motion, uniform acceleration, and uniform circular motion. We show that the GUP can enhance the spontaneous emission rate of an excited state atom in inertial motion; however, it does not alter the stability of the ground-state atom in vacuum. For an atom in uniformly accelerated and uniformly circular motion, the GUP can change both its spontaneous emission and spontaneous excitation rates, and the proper acceleration a can significantly amplify the effect of the GUP on the spontaneous transition rates of the atom.

* E-mail address: zwangphys@163.com

I. INTRODUCTION

Over the past several decades, the reconciliation of quantum physics with general relativity stands as one of the paramount challenges in fundamental physics. A favored strategy for this unification is quantization of gravity, but the theory of the quantized gravitational field would be non-renormalizable. As of now, none of the proposals for quantum gravity have been experimentally validated. A complete and consistent theory of quantum gravity is still on the way. While a complete description of quantum gravity remains elusive, several consistent features have emerged in all viable contenders for such a theory. One such feature is the presence of a minimum length scale at the Planck scale [1, 2].

The string theory suggests that all of the different elementary particles stem from vibrating strings. The string is the smallest scale existing in perturbative string theory, thus it is not possible to probe a scale smaller than its own length [3–6]. Gedanken experiments argue that the energy needed to investigate any space region below the Planck length exceeds the energy necessary to generate a miniature black hole within that same space region [7–9]. The presence of a minimum length is also a dynamic occurrence resulting from the constraint imposed by Planck length arising from the quantum fluctuations of the background gravitational field [10, 11]. In the Doubly Special Relativity (DSR), the existence of both the minimal length and maximal momentum is required [12–15].

However, the concept of a minimum length contradicts the Heisenberg Uncertainty Principle (HUP), which suggests that spatial resolution can be infinitely sharpened with a sufficiently energetic probe. To reconcile the concept of a minimum length with quantum mechanics, it is necessary to revise the Heisenberg Uncertainty Principle into the Generalized Uncertainty Principle (GUP). The introduction of this concept has garnered significant attention in recent decades, leading to a proliferation of literature exploring the modifications of GUP on a wide range of quantum mechanical aspects and systems [16–51]. The potential experimental tests have also been proposed considering microscopic [52] or macroscopic harmonic oscillators [53], or using quantum optomechanics [54–57]. In addition, the corrections to the Casimir effect based on several GUP proposals implying a minimal length were studied in Ref. [58, 59]. The non-trivial modifications to the Unruh effect have been discussed in the context of GUPs [60–64].

Spontaneous emission, as one of the most important effects in the interaction of atom

with radiation, has always been a subject of interest for many years. Previous studies have shown that this process can be attributed to vacuum fluctuations [65, 66], radiation reaction [67, 68], or a combination of both [69–72]. Milonni proposed that the differentiation between the impacts of vacuum fluctuations and radiation reaction on spontaneous emission relies on the ordering of atomic and field operators, a choice that can be somewhat arbitrary [70–72]. Significant progress has been made by Dalibard, Dupont-Roc, and Cohen-Tannoudji (DDC), who argued in Refs. [73, 74] that adopting a symmetric ordering between atomic and field operators is crucial to guarantee the Hermiticity of both vacuum fluctuations and radiation reaction contributions. This step enables these components to possess distinct physical interpretations [73, 74]. Using the DDC prescription, one can demonstrate that for ground-state atoms, the effects of vacuum fluctuations and radiation reaction on the rate of change of the mean excitation energy cancel out precisely. This cancellation prevents any transitions from the ground state, thereby maintaining the atom’s stability. However, for any initial excited state, the rate of change of atomic energy receives equal contributions from vacuum fluctuations and radiation reaction.

Subsequently, Audretsch and Müller [75] have extended the formalism of DDC to analyze the contributions of vacuum fluctuations and radiation reaction on the spontaneous excitation rate of a two-level atom undergoing acceleration and interacting with a scalar field in the Minkowski spacetime. Their results indicate that the balance between vacuum fluctuations and radiation reaction is altered when an atom is accelerated, implying that transitions to excited states for ground-state atoms can occur even in a vacuum. These results not only align with the Unruh effect, but also offer a compelling interpretation, as the spontaneous excitation of accelerated atoms can be viewed as the fundamental physical process underlying the Unruh effect. In recent decades, the DDC formalism has been extensively utilized to study the spontaneous radiative characteristics of atoms in various scenarios [76–89].

Considering the modification of various quantum phenomena induced by the GUP is universal, it is reasonable to expect that the GUP could also influence the spontaneous radiation properties of atoms. In this paper, we intend to study the effect of the GUP on the spontaneous radiative processes of a two-level atom based on the DDC formalism. The atom is initially set in an energy eigenstate, while the field remains in the vacuum state. Where three motion states of atom are considered, namely, uniform motion, uniformly accelerated motion and uniform circular motion. As a preliminary discussion, the two-level

atom is considered to have a weak coupling with a bath of fluctuating real massless scalar quantum field. The paper is organized as follows. In the next Section, the GUP proposal we adopted in present work and the Green's functions in position space are brief reviewed. In Section III, the model of an atom coupled to the scalar quantum field and the DDC formalism are introduced. In Section IV, we calculate the modification of the GUP on the spontaneous emission of an inertial atom. We generalize the discussion to the cases of a uniformly accelerating atom and a uniformly circulating atom in Section V and VI. The summary is given in last Section.

II. THE GUP PROPOSAL AND GREEN'S FUNCTIONS IN POSITION SPACE

The GUPs that implying a minimum measurable length have been extensively studied in the past few decades, the pioneering works can be found in [7, 8, 16]. In the present work, we focus on the GUP model proposed by Kempf et al. [16], which has the form as

$$\Delta X \Delta P \geq \frac{\hbar}{2}(1 + \beta \Delta P^2), \quad (1)$$

where β is the GUP parameter defined as $\beta = \beta_0/(M_{\text{Pl}}c)^2 = \beta_0 l_{\text{Pl}}^2/\hbar^2$ with β_0 being a dimensionless parameter expected to be of order unity, and the Planck energy $M_{\text{Pl}}c^2 \simeq 10^{19}\text{GeV}$, $l_{\text{Pl}} \simeq 10^{-35}$ m is the fundamental Planck scale. At energies significantly below the Planck energy, the β correction of the GUP becomes insignificant, leading to the recovery of HUP.

It is clear that the uncertainty relation (1) corresponds to a minimum position uncertainty $\Delta x_{\text{min}} \simeq l_{\text{Pl}}\sqrt{\beta_0}$. For the mirror-symmetric states, it is straightforward to derive the uncertainty relation (1) by use of the following commutator:

$$[X, P] = i\hbar(1 + \beta P^2). \quad (2)$$

For the three-dimensional scenario, the general form of the above expression, retaining rotational isotropy, is provided by

$$[X_i, P_j] = i(\delta_{ij} + \beta P^2 \delta_{ij} + \beta' P_i P_j). \quad (3)$$

In the GUP model, the position and momentum operators still adhere to a Lie algebra structure. Therefore, the position commutator fixed by Eq. (3) and the Jacobi identity

reads

$$[X_i, X_j] = i\hbar \frac{2\beta - \beta' + (2\beta + \beta')\beta P^2}{1 + \beta P^2} (P_j X_i - P_i X_j). \quad (4)$$

As frequently done in the literature [43, 45], we will consider the case $\beta' = 2\beta$. By opting for this choice, the spatial geometric structure remains commutative up to $o(\beta, \beta')$, and then we have $[X_i, P_j] = i\hbar (\delta_{ij} + \beta P^2 \delta_{ij} + 2\beta P_i P_j)$, the implementation of this algebra up to the linear order in β can be achieved straightforwardly utilizing the standard position and momentum operators that satisfy $[x_i, p_j] = i\hbar \delta_{ij}$,

$$X_i = x_i, \quad P_i = p_i (1 + \beta \mathbf{p}^2). \quad (5)$$

In the classical limit, the Eq. (5) admits simple physical interpretation that because of quantum-gravitational fluctuations in the background metric, the momentum \mathbf{p} acquires the increment $\beta \mathbf{p}^2 \mathbf{p}$, leading to a modified dispersion relation [29, 30]

$$E^2 = \mathbf{p}^2 + m^2 + 2\beta \mathbf{p}^4. \quad (6)$$

It is clearly seen that the above dispersion relation related to the GUP explicitly violate Lorentz invariance. And the velocities of photons vary with energy due to the GUP, resulting in the possibility of superluminal photon propagation. Although superluminality sounds quite unphysical, because of the photons traveling at the speed of light c in vacuum in the view of Special Relativity. One can make a reasonable assumption that the principle of relativity is no longer applicable near or above the Planck scale E_{Pl} [1]. In addition, it was shown that the photons can be subluminal or superluminal depending on the path they follow in the gravitational field as well as on the position of the observer [90]. In the limit $\beta \rightarrow 0$, the standard dispersion relation with no quantum gravity correction is recovered.

The dispersion relation (6) leads to the GUP-modified propagator of the scalar quantum field in position space as

$$G(x, x') = \int \frac{d^4 p}{(2\pi)^4} \frac{e^{-i[p_0(t-t') - \mathbf{p} \cdot (\mathbf{x} - \mathbf{x}')]}}{p_0^2 - \mathbf{p}^2 (1 + 2\beta \mathbf{p}^2) - m^2}, \quad (7)$$

the p_0 integral is performed by use of a contour integral, and the poles occur at $p_0^2 = \mathbf{p}^2 (1 + 2\beta \mathbf{p}^2) + m^2$, with the contour selection relevant to the two-point functions in the standard approach [91]. Then the positive frequency Wightman function modified by the GUP in the massless limit can be obtained as [92]

$$D^+(x, x') = -\frac{1}{4\pi^2} \frac{1}{(\Delta t - i\varepsilon)^2 - |\Delta \mathbf{x}|^2} \left(1 - \frac{2\beta}{(\Delta t - i\varepsilon)^2 - |\Delta \mathbf{x}|^2} \right), \quad (8)$$

where the spacetime points are $x = (t, \mathbf{x})$ and an infinitesimally small positive parameter ε is introduced to characterize the singularities of the function.

III. ATOM-FIELD INTERACTION AND THE DDC FORMALISM

The system under consideration consists of a two-level atom weakly interacting with a quantum field, here we take the field as a real massless scalar quantum field. The total Hamiltonian governing the evolution of this system with respect to the atom's proper time τ can be expressed as

$$H(\tau) = H_A(\tau) + H_F(\tau) + H_I(\tau), \quad (9)$$

where $H_A(\tau) = \omega_0 R_3(\tau)$ is Hamiltonian of the two-level atom, in which ω_0 is the energy level spacing of the atom, and $R_3 = \frac{1}{2}(|+\rangle\langle+| - |-\rangle\langle-|)$. $H_F(\tau)$ is the Hamiltonian of the scalar field, whose expression is given by

$$H_F(\tau) = \int d\mu_j \omega_j a_j^\dagger a_j \frac{dt}{d\tau}, \quad (10)$$

where t and τ denote the coordinate time and the proper time, respectively. The atom and field can be coupled by an analogy of electric dipole interaction $H_I(\tau) = \mu R_2(\tau) \phi(x(\tau))$ [75], with μ being a small coupling constant, $R_2 = \frac{i}{2}(R_- - R_+)$, where $R_- = |-\rangle\langle+|$ and $R_+ = |+\rangle\langle-|$ are the atomic raising and lowering operators, respectively. The coupling is effective only along the trajectory, $x(\tau)$, of the atom. $\phi(x)$ is the scalar field operator in the spacetime.

Beginning with the aforementioned Hamiltonian, one can derive the Heisenberg equations of motion for the dynamical variables associated with both the atom and the field. To figure out the contribution of vacuum fluctuations and that of radiation reaction on the rate of change of atomic observables, we will discuss the two physical mechanisms, separately. To this end, we can split the solution of the field ϕ into a “free” part ϕ^f which persists even in the absence of interaction between the atom and the field, and a “source” part ϕ^s which is induced by the interaction, i.e., $\phi(x) = \phi^f(x) + \phi^s(x)$. Then we can follow the DDC formalism [73, 74], divide the impacts of vacuum fluctuations and radiation reaction on the evolution of the atomic observable. Let's write out the Heisenberg equation for the atomic

Hamiltonian

$$\frac{dH_A(\tau)}{d\tau} = i\mu\omega_0 [R_2(\tau), R_3(\tau)] \phi(x(\tau)), \quad (11)$$

by partitioning the field operator into the free component and the source component, and adopting a symmetric operator ordering between the variables related to the atom and the field, we derive the rate of change of atomic energy

$$\frac{dH_A(\tau)}{d\tau} = \left(\frac{dH_A(\tau)}{d\tau} \right)_{vf} + \left(\frac{dH_A(\tau)}{d\tau} \right)_{rr}, \quad (12)$$

with

$$\left(\frac{dH_A(\tau)}{d\tau} \right)_{vf} = \frac{1}{2} i\mu\omega_0 \{ \phi^f(x(\tau)), [R_2(\tau), R_3(\tau)] \}, \quad (13)$$

$$\left(\frac{dH_A(\tau)}{d\tau} \right)_{rr} = \frac{1}{2} i\mu\omega_0 \{ \phi^s(x(\tau)), [R_2(\tau), R_3(\tau)] \}. \quad (14)$$

We assume that the atom is initially prepared in the state $|b\rangle$ and the field is in the vacuum state $|0\rangle$. By averaging the two equations above over the system's state $|0, b\rangle$, simplifying, we can determine the impacts of vacuum fluctuations and radiation reaction on the average rate of change of atomic energy

$$\left\langle \frac{dH_A(\tau)}{d\tau} \right\rangle_{vf} = 2i\mu^2 \int_{\tau_0}^{\tau} d\tau' C^F(x(\tau), x(\tau')) \frac{d}{d\tau} \chi_b^A(\tau, \tau'), \quad (15)$$

$$\left\langle \frac{dH_A(\tau)}{d\tau} \right\rangle_{rr} = 2i\mu^2 \int_{\tau_0}^{\tau} d\tau' \chi^F(x(\tau), x(\tau')) \frac{d}{d\tau} C_b^A(\tau, \tau'), \quad (16)$$

where $C_b^A(\tau, \tau')$ and $\chi_b^A(\tau, \tau')$ are two statistical functions, called the symmetric correlation function and the linear susceptibility of the atom in the state $|b\rangle$, which are explicitly given by

$$C_b^A(\tau, \tau') = \frac{1}{2} \left\langle b \left| \left\{ R_2^f(\tau), R_2^f(\tau') \right\} \right| b \right\rangle = \frac{1}{2} \sum_d |\langle b | R_2(0) | d \rangle|^2 (e^{i\omega_{bd}\Delta\tau} + e^{-i\omega_{bd}\Delta\tau}), \quad (17)$$

$$\chi_b^A(\tau, \tau') = \frac{1}{2} \left\langle b \left| \left[R_2^f(\tau), R_2^f(\tau') \right] \right| b \right\rangle = \frac{1}{2} \sum_d |\langle b | R_2(0) | d \rangle|^2 (e^{i\omega_{bd}\Delta\tau} - e^{-i\omega_{bd}\Delta\tau}), \quad (18)$$

where $\omega_{bd} = \omega_b - \omega_d$ and $\Delta\tau = \tau - \tau'$, the sum spreads over a complete set of atomic stationary states.

The functions $C^F(x(\tau), x(\tau'))$ and $\chi^F(x(\tau), x(\tau'))$ represent the symmetric correlation function and linear susceptibility of the scalar field in the vacuum state $|0\rangle$, respectively,

expressed as

$$\begin{aligned} C^F(x(\tau), x(\tau')) &= \frac{1}{2} \langle 0 | \{ \phi^f(x(\tau)), \phi^f(x(\tau')) \} | 0 \rangle, \\ \chi^F(x(\tau), x(\tau')) &= \frac{1}{2} \langle 0 | [\phi^f(x(\tau)), \phi^f(x(\tau'))] | 0 \rangle. \end{aligned} \quad (19)$$

Plugging the positive frequency Wightman function (8), the statistical functions modified by the GUP of the field can be written as

$$\begin{aligned} C^F(x, x') &= -\frac{1}{8\pi^2} \left(\frac{1}{(\Delta t - i\varepsilon)^2 - |\Delta \mathbf{x}|^2} + \frac{1}{(\Delta t + i\varepsilon)^2 - |\Delta \mathbf{x}|^2} \right) + \\ &\quad \frac{\beta}{4\pi^2} \left(\frac{1}{((\Delta t - i\varepsilon)^2 - |\Delta \mathbf{x}|^2)^2} + \frac{1}{((\Delta t + i\varepsilon)^2 - |\Delta \mathbf{x}|^2)^2} \right), \end{aligned} \quad (20)$$

$$\begin{aligned} \chi^F(x, x') &= -\frac{1}{8\pi^2} \left(\frac{1}{(\Delta t - i\varepsilon)^2 - |\Delta \mathbf{x}|^2} - \frac{1}{(\Delta t + i\varepsilon)^2 - |\Delta \mathbf{x}|^2} \right) + \\ &\quad \frac{\beta}{4\pi^2} \left(\frac{1}{((\Delta t - i\varepsilon)^2 - |\Delta \mathbf{x}|^2)^2} - \frac{1}{((\Delta t + i\varepsilon)^2 - |\Delta \mathbf{x}|^2)^2} \right), \end{aligned} \quad (21)$$

where $\Delta t = t(\tau) - t(\tau')$, $\Delta \mathbf{x} = \mathbf{x}(\tau) - \mathbf{x}(\tau')$.

IV. THE UNIFORMLY MOVING ATOM

In this section, we employ the DDC formalism given in above section to study the effect of GUP on the spontaneous emission of an inertial atom. This will provide a basis for the discussion of the GUP-modified contributions of vacuum fluctuations and radiation reaction in the more general cases of an accelerated atom in the following sections. Considering an inertial atom moving in the x -direction with a constant velocity \mathbf{v} , we have

$$t(\tau) = \gamma\tau, \quad \mathbf{x}(\tau) = \mathbf{x}_0 + \mathbf{v}\gamma\tau, \quad (22)$$

where the Lorentz factor $\gamma = (1 - \mathbf{v}^2)^{-1/2}$. The statistical functions of the field can be easily obtained from the general forms Eqs. (20) and (21) as

$$\begin{aligned} C^F(x, x') &= -\frac{1}{8\pi^2} \left(\frac{1}{(\Delta\tau - i\varepsilon)^2} + \frac{1}{(\Delta\tau + i\varepsilon)^2} \right) + \\ &\quad \frac{\beta}{4\pi^2} \left(\frac{1}{(\Delta\tau - i\varepsilon)^4} + \frac{1}{(\Delta\tau + i\varepsilon)^4} \right), \end{aligned} \quad (23)$$

$$\begin{aligned} \chi^F(x, x') &= -\frac{1}{8\pi^2} \left(\frac{1}{(\Delta\tau - i\varepsilon)^2} - \frac{1}{(\Delta\tau + i\varepsilon)^2} \right) + \\ &\quad \frac{\beta}{4\pi^2} \left(\frac{1}{(\Delta\tau - i\varepsilon)^4} - \frac{1}{(\Delta\tau + i\varepsilon)^4} \right), \end{aligned} \quad (24)$$

where $\Delta\tau = \tau - \tau'$. Then by using the statistical functions, we can evaluate the contributions of vacuum fluctuations with the subscript ‘ vf ’ and radiation reaction with the subscript ‘ rr ’ to the average rate of change of atomic excitation energy $\langle H_A(\tau) \rangle$,

$$\begin{aligned} \left\langle \frac{dH_A(\tau)}{d\tau} \right\rangle_{vf} &= \frac{\mu^2}{8\pi^2} \sum_d \omega_{bd} \left| \langle b | R_2^f(0) | d \rangle \right|^2 \int_{-\infty}^{+\infty} d\Delta\tau \left(\frac{1}{(\Delta\tau - i\varepsilon)^2} + \frac{1}{(\Delta\tau + i\varepsilon)^2} \right) e^{i\omega_{bd}\Delta\tau} \\ &\quad - \frac{\beta\mu^2}{4\pi^2} \sum_d \omega_{bd} \left| \langle b | R_2^f(0) | d \rangle \right|^2 \int_{-\infty}^{+\infty} d\Delta\tau \left(\frac{1}{(\Delta\tau - i\varepsilon)^4} + \frac{1}{(\Delta\tau + i\varepsilon)^4} \right) e^{i\omega_{bd}\Delta\tau}, \end{aligned} \quad (25)$$

$$\begin{aligned} \left\langle \frac{dH_A(\tau)}{d\tau} \right\rangle_{rr} &= \frac{\mu^2}{8\pi^2} \sum_d \omega_{bd} \left| \langle b | R_2^f(0) | d \rangle \right|^2 \int_{-\infty}^{+\infty} d\Delta\tau \left(\frac{1}{(\Delta\tau - i\varepsilon)^2} - \frac{1}{(\Delta\tau + i\varepsilon)^2} \right) e^{i\omega_{bd}\Delta\tau} \\ &\quad - \frac{\beta\mu^2}{4\pi^2} \sum_d \omega_{bd} \left| \langle b | R_2^f(0) | d \rangle \right|^2 \int_{-\infty}^{+\infty} d\Delta\tau \left(\frac{1}{(\Delta\tau - i\varepsilon)^4} - \frac{1}{(\Delta\tau + i\varepsilon)^4} \right) e^{i\omega_{bd}\Delta\tau}, \end{aligned} \quad (26)$$

we have extended the integration range to infinity for a significant duration, and after some calculations, we deduce the contribution of vacuum fluctuations to the rate of change of atomic excitation energy

$$\begin{aligned} \left\langle \frac{dH_A(\tau)}{d\tau} \right\rangle_{vf} &= -\frac{\mu^2}{4\pi} \left[\sum_{\omega_b > \omega_d} \omega_{bd}^2 \left| \langle b | R_2^f(0) | d \rangle \right|^2 - \sum_{\omega_b < \omega_d} \omega_{bd}^2 \left| \langle b | R_2^f(0) | d \rangle \right|^2 \right] \\ &\quad - \frac{\beta\mu^2}{12\pi} \left[\sum_{\omega_b > \omega_d} \omega_{bd}^4 \left| \langle b | R_2^f(0) | d \rangle \right|^2 - \sum_{\omega_b < \omega_d} \omega_{bd}^4 \left| \langle b | R_2^f(0) | d \rangle \right|^2 \right], \end{aligned} \quad (27)$$

and for that of radiation reaction

$$\begin{aligned} \left\langle \frac{dH_A(\tau)}{d\tau} \right\rangle_{rr} &= -\frac{\mu^2}{4\pi} \left[\sum_{\omega_b > \omega_d} \omega_{bd}^2 \left| \langle b | R_2^f(0) | d \rangle \right|^2 + \sum_{\omega_b < \omega_d} \omega_{bd}^2 \left| \langle b | R_2^f(0) | d \rangle \right|^2 \right] \\ &\quad - \frac{\beta\mu^2}{12\pi} \left[\sum_{\omega_b > \omega_d} \omega_{bd}^4 \left| \langle b | R_2^f(0) | d \rangle \right|^2 + \sum_{\omega_b < \omega_d} \omega_{bd}^4 \left| \langle b | R_2^f(0) | d \rangle \right|^2 \right]. \end{aligned} \quad (28)$$

It is shown from Eqs. (27) and (28) that the corrections induced by the GUP are represented by β -dependent terms in the above results. And the effect of GUP only change both the contributions of vacuum fluctuations and radiation reaction to the rate of change of atomic energy quantitatively but not qualitatively since the GUP parameter $\beta > 0$. As $\beta \rightarrow 0$, our results reduce to those of the Minkowski spacetime with no quantum gravity correction [75]. In addition, for a given atom, the radiation rate is always enhanced as compared with the case without GUP.

From the Eq. (27), we see that for an atom initially in the excited state $|b\rangle = |+\rangle$, one has $|d\rangle = |-\rangle$, thus only the terms with $\omega_b > \omega_d$ contributes, in which situation $\left\langle \frac{dH_A(\tau)}{d\tau} \right\rangle_{vf} < 0$, this means that vacuum fluctuations tend to de-excite the atom in the excited state. While for an atom initially in the ground state $|b\rangle = |-\rangle$, only the terms with $\omega_b < \omega_d$ survives and then $\left\langle \frac{dH_A(\tau)}{d\tau} \right\rangle_{vf} > 0$, which means that vacuum fluctuations tend to excite the atoms in the ground state. Note that if only contributions of vacuum fluctuations are considered, both spontaneous excitation and deexcitation would occur equally, no matter whether or not the effect of GUP is taken into account. This results in the well-known issue of spontaneous absorption for a ground-state atom in vacuum.

On the other hand, Eq. (28) shows that the radiation reaction always makes the atom to lose energy since $\left\langle \frac{dH_A(\tau)}{d\tau} \right\rangle_{rr} < 0$ for both the ground or excited state atom, independent of whether the effect of GUP is considered or not. Which leads to a problem of the instability of atoms. This can be contrasted with radiation reaction in classical theory, which produces a similar effect leading to the instability of classical atoms. By adding the contributions of vacuum fluctuations and radiation reaction, the total rate of change of the atomic excitation energy can be obtained as

$$\begin{aligned} \left\langle \frac{dH_A(\tau)}{d\tau} \right\rangle_{tot} &= \left\langle \frac{dH_A(\tau)}{d\tau} \right\rangle_{vf} + \left\langle \frac{dH_A(\tau)}{d\tau} \right\rangle_{rr} \\ &= -\frac{\mu^2}{2\pi} \sum_{\omega_b > \omega_d} \omega_{bd}^2 |\langle b | R_2^f(0) | d \rangle|^2 - \frac{\beta\mu^2}{6\pi} \sum_{\omega_b > \omega_d} \omega_{bd}^4 |\langle b | R_2^f(0) | d \rangle|^2. \end{aligned} \quad (29)$$

It is interesting to see that for an atom in the ground state ($\omega_b < \omega_d$), the contributions of vacuum fluctuations and radiation reaction exactly cancel, in spite of with or without GUP introduced, since each term in $\left\langle \frac{dH_A(\tau)}{d\tau} \right\rangle_{vf}$ is exactly canceled by the corresponding term in $\left\langle \frac{dH_A(\tau)}{d\tau} \right\rangle_{rr}$. Hence, the GUP conspires to alter the influence of vacuum fluctuations and radiation reaction such that the delicate balance between the vacuum fluctuations and radiation reaction shown in Ref. [75] in the absence of GUP remains. Thus the effect of GUP does not alter the stability of ground-state inertial atoms in vacuum. While for the excited state atom $|b\rangle = |+\rangle$, the effect of GUP can change the spontaneous emission rate of the atom, specifically, the second term of Eq. (29) proportional to $\beta\omega_{bd}^4$ is the correction of the radiation rate induced by the GUP.

V. THE UNIFORMLY ACCELERATED ATOM

Next we generalize the discussion in above section to the case of a uniformly accelerating atom. We will study the effect of GUP on the spontaneous excitation for the atom in interaction with a massless scalar quantum field. Assuming the atom is being accelerated along the z direction with a proper acceleration a . The trajectory of the atom can be described by

$$t(\tau) = \frac{1}{a} \sinh a\tau, \quad z(\tau) = \frac{1}{a} \cosh a\tau, \quad x(\tau) = y(\tau) = 0. \quad (30)$$

Inserting the trajectory into the general expressions of the GUP-modified symmetric correlation function (20) and linear susceptibility function (21) of the scalar field, and after some calculations, we obtain

$$C^F(x(\tau), x(\tau')) = -\frac{a^2}{32\pi^2} \left[\frac{1}{\sinh^2\left(\frac{a}{2}(\tau - \tau') - ia\epsilon\right)} + \frac{1}{\sinh^2\left(\frac{a}{2}(\tau - \tau') + ia\epsilon\right)} \right] \\ + \frac{\beta a^4}{64\pi^2} \left[\frac{1}{\sinh^4\left(\frac{a}{2}(\tau - \tau') - ia\epsilon\right)} + \frac{1}{\sinh^4\left(\frac{a}{2}(\tau - \tau') + ia\epsilon\right)} \right], \quad (31)$$

$$\chi^F(x(\tau), x(\tau')) = -\frac{a^2}{32\pi^2} \left[\frac{1}{\sinh^2\left(\frac{a}{2}(\tau - \tau') - ia\epsilon\right)} - \frac{1}{\sinh^2\left(\frac{a}{2}(\tau - \tau') + ia\epsilon\right)} \right] \\ + \frac{\beta a^4}{64\pi^2} \left[\frac{1}{\sinh^4\left(\frac{a}{2}(\tau - \tau') - ia\epsilon\right)} - \frac{1}{\sinh^4\left(\frac{a}{2}(\tau - \tau') + ia\epsilon\right)} \right]. \quad (32)$$

After some calculations, we arrive at

$$C^F(x(\tau), x(\tau')) = -\left(\frac{1}{8\pi^2} + \frac{\beta a^2}{24\pi^2}\right) \sum_{k=-\infty}^{\infty} \left[\frac{1}{\left(\Delta\tau + \frac{2\pi i}{a}k - 2i\epsilon\right)^2} + \frac{1}{\left(\Delta\tau + \frac{2\pi i}{a}k + 2i\epsilon\right)^2} \right] \\ + \frac{\beta}{4\pi^2} \sum_{k=-\infty}^{\infty} \left[\frac{1}{\left(\Delta\tau + \frac{2\pi i}{a}k - 2i\epsilon\right)^4} + \frac{1}{\left(\Delta\tau + \frac{2\pi i}{a}k + 2i\epsilon\right)^4} \right], \quad (33)$$

$$\chi^F(x(\tau), x(\tau')) = -\left(\frac{1}{8\pi^2} + \frac{\beta a^2}{24\pi^2}\right) \sum_{k=-\infty}^{\infty} \left[\frac{1}{\left(\Delta\tau + \frac{2\pi i}{a}k - 2i\epsilon\right)^2} - \frac{1}{\left(\Delta\tau + \frac{2\pi i}{a}k + 2i\epsilon\right)^2} \right] \\ + \frac{\beta}{4\pi^2} \sum_{k=-\infty}^{\infty} \left[\frac{1}{\left(\Delta\tau + \frac{2\pi i}{a}k - 2i\epsilon\right)^4} - \frac{1}{\left(\Delta\tau + \frac{2\pi i}{a}k + 2i\epsilon\right)^4} \right]. \quad (34)$$

Substituting the symmetric correlation function of the field (33) and the antisymmetric statistical function of the atom (18) into Eq. (15), we obtain the contribution of vacuum

fluctuations to the average rate of change of the atomic excitation energy as

$$\begin{aligned}
\left\langle \frac{dH_A(\tau)}{d\tau} \right\rangle_{vf} &= \frac{\mu^2}{8\pi^2} \left(1 + \frac{\beta a^2}{3} \right) \sum_d \omega_{bd} |\langle b | R_2^f(0) | d \rangle|^2 \\
&\times \sum_{k=-\infty}^{\infty} \int_{-\infty}^{\infty} d\Delta\tau \left[\frac{1}{(\Delta\tau + \frac{2\pi i}{a}k - 2i\epsilon)^2} + \frac{1}{(\Delta\tau + \frac{2\pi i}{a}k + 2i\epsilon)^2} \right] e^{i\omega_{bd}\Delta\tau} \\
&- \frac{\beta\mu^2}{4\pi^2} \sum_d \omega_{bd} |\langle b | R_2^f(0) | d \rangle|^2 \\
&\times \sum_{k=-\infty}^{\infty} \int_{-\infty}^{\infty} d\Delta\tau \sum_{k=-\infty}^{\infty} \left[\frac{1}{(\Delta\tau + \frac{2\pi i}{a}k - 2i\epsilon)^4} + \frac{1}{(\Delta\tau + \frac{2\pi i}{a}k + 2i\epsilon)^4} \right] e^{i\omega_{bd}\Delta\tau}.
\end{aligned} \tag{35}$$

Similarly, inserting the linear susceptibility function of the field (34) and the symmetric statistical function of the atom (17) into Eq. (16), we get the contribution of radiation reaction to the average rate of change of the atomic excitation energy

$$\begin{aligned}
\left\langle \frac{dH_A(\tau)}{d\tau} \right\rangle_{rr} &= \frac{\mu^2}{8\pi^2} \left(1 + \frac{\beta a^2}{3} \right) \sum_d \omega_{bd} |\langle b | R_2^f(0) | d \rangle|^2 \\
&\times \sum_{k=-\infty}^{\infty} \int_{-\infty}^{\infty} d\Delta\tau \left[\frac{1}{(\Delta\tau + \frac{2\pi i}{a}k - 2i\epsilon)^2} - \frac{1}{(\Delta\tau + \frac{2\pi i}{a}k + 2i\epsilon)^2} \right] e^{i\omega_{bd}\Delta\tau} \\
&- \frac{\beta\mu^2}{4\pi^2} \sum_d \omega_{bd} |\langle b | R_2^f(0) | d \rangle|^2 \\
&\times \sum_{k=-\infty}^{\infty} \int_{-\infty}^{\infty} d\Delta\tau \sum_{k=-\infty}^{\infty} \left[\frac{1}{(\Delta\tau + \frac{2\pi i}{a}k - 2i\epsilon)^4} - \frac{1}{(\Delta\tau + \frac{2\pi i}{a}k + 2i\epsilon)^4} \right] e^{i\omega_{bd}\Delta\tau},
\end{aligned} \tag{36}$$

where we have also assumed the time interval $\Delta\tau$ to be infinitely large. The integrals can be evaluated by use of the residue theorem, leading to a geometric series for the k summation. The analytical expression for the rate of change of atomic excitation energy caused by vacuum fluctuation is

$$\begin{aligned}
\left\langle \frac{dH_A(\tau)}{d\tau} \right\rangle_{vf} &= -\frac{\mu^2}{4\pi} \left(1 + \frac{\beta a^2}{3} \right) \left[\sum_{\omega_b > \omega_d} \omega_{bd}^2 |\langle b | R_2^f(0) | d \rangle|^2 \left(1 + \frac{2}{e^{2\pi\omega_{bd}/a} - 1} \right) \right. \\
&- \sum_{\omega_b < \omega_d} \omega_{bd}^2 |\langle b | R_2^f(0) | d \rangle|^2 \left. \left(1 + \frac{2}{e^{2\pi|\omega_{bd}|/a} - 1} \right) \right] \\
&- \frac{\beta\mu^2}{12\pi} \left[\sum_{\omega_b > \omega_d} \omega_{bd}^4 |\langle b | R_2^f(0) | d \rangle|^2 \left(1 + \frac{2}{e^{2\pi\omega_{bd}/a} - 1} \right) \right. \\
&- \sum_{\omega_b < \omega_d} \omega_{bd}^4 |\langle b | R_2^f(0) | d \rangle|^2 \left. \left(1 + \frac{2}{e^{2\pi|\omega_{bd}|/a} - 1} \right) \right].
\end{aligned} \tag{37}$$

From this result, we see that similar to the case of inertial atom, the vacuum fluctuation contributes to the average rate of change of the atomic energy in both ground state and excited state, which tend to excite the atoms in the ground state and de-excite the atoms in the excited state with the same amplitude, even though the effect of GUP is taken into account. By comparing this result with that of inertial atom, we find that the contribution of vacuum fluctuation to the average energy change rate of uniformly accelerated atom has the thermal radiation terms related to the atomic acceleration. The β -dependent terms gives the modification induced by the GUP, this corrections change the rate of change of atomic energy significantly, however, the thermal character is still retained. When $\beta \rightarrow 0$, we recover the result obtained in Ref. [75] for a uniformly accelerated atom in the usual Minkowski spacetime without the GUP.

Similarly, we have for the contribution of radiation reaction

$$\begin{aligned} \left\langle \frac{dH_A(\tau)}{d\tau} \right\rangle_{rr} = & -\frac{\mu^2}{4\pi} \left(1 + \frac{\beta a^2}{3} \right) \left[\sum_{\omega_b > \omega_d} \omega_{bd}^2 \left| \langle b | R_2^f(0) | d \rangle \right|^2 + \sum_{\omega_b < \omega_d} \omega_{bd}^2 \left| \langle b | R_2^f(0) | d \rangle \right|^2 \right] \\ & - \frac{\beta \mu^2}{12\pi} \left[\sum_{\omega_b > \omega_d} \omega_{bd}^4 \left| \langle b | R_2^f(0) | d \rangle \right|^2 + \sum_{\omega_b < \omega_d} \omega_{bd}^4 \left| \langle b | R_2^f(0) | d \rangle \right|^2 \right]. \end{aligned} \quad (38)$$

Comparing the Eqs. (28) with (38), we observe that when the effect of GUP is taken into consideration, the contribution of radiation reaction for a uniformly accelerated atom is obviously different with the case of the inertial atom, in which the Eq. (38) contains the a -dependent terms. This is in contrast to the case of that in Minkowski space without GUP considered, where the contribution of radiation reaction is not changed for a uniformly accelerated atom compared with the inertial one. It suggests that, due to the effect of GUP, a uniformly accelerated atom on the trajectory (30) would be subject to a radiation reaction force relying on the acceleration a .

Adding up the two contributions of vacuum fluctuations and radiation reaction, the total

rate of change of the atomic excitation energy can be found as

$$\begin{aligned}
\left\langle \frac{dH_A(\tau)}{d\tau} \right\rangle_{tot} &= \left\langle \frac{dH_A(\tau)}{d\tau} \right\rangle_{vf} + \left\langle \frac{dH_A(\tau)}{d\tau} \right\rangle_{rr} \\
&= -\frac{\mu^2}{2\pi} \left(1 + \frac{\beta a^2}{3}\right) \left[\sum_{\omega_b > \omega_d} \omega_{bd}^2 \left| \langle b | R_2^f(0) | d \rangle \right|^2 \left(1 + \frac{1}{e^{2\pi\omega_{bd}/a} - 1}\right) \right. \\
&\quad \left. - \sum_{\omega_b < \omega_d} \omega_{bd}^2 \left| \langle b | R_2^f(0) | d \rangle \right|^2 \frac{1}{e^{2\pi|\omega_{bd}|/a} - 1} \right] \\
&\quad - \frac{\beta\mu^2}{6\pi} \left[\sum_{\omega_b > \omega_d} \omega_{bd}^4 \left| \langle b | R_2^f(0) | d \rangle \right|^2 \left(1 + \frac{1}{e^{2\pi\omega_{bd}/a} - 1}\right) \right. \\
&\quad \left. - \sum_{\omega_b < \omega_d} \omega_{bd}^4 \left| \langle b | R_2^f(0) | d \rangle \right|^2 \frac{1}{e^{2\pi|\omega_{bd}|/a} - 1} \right]. \tag{39}
\end{aligned}$$

We note that the distinct feature with the presence of the GUP is that the total rate of change of the atomic energy now depends on not only GUP parameter β but also the proper acceleration a of the atom. The terms proportional to βa^2 suggest that the acceleration a can amplify the effect of GUP. We see that for the atom initially prepared in the excited state, only the terms with $\omega_b > \omega_d$ contributes. The spontaneous emission is modified by the appearance of the thermal term as compared to an inertial atom, and although the GUP corrections significantly alter the transition rate of the atom, the thermal character is still retained. However, for the atom initially prepared in the ground state, the delicate balance between the vacuum fluctuations and radiation reaction is broken due to the uniformly accelerated motion as opposed to the inertial atom, in spite of both contributions of the vacuum fluctuations and radiation reaction are modified by the GUP. There are positive contributions from the $\omega_b < \omega_d$ terms, suggest that transition of ground-state atom to excited state is allowed to occur even in the vacuum, which is known as spontaneous excitation. It is also shown that the effect of the GUP can always increase the transition rate and makes it as a function of β , however, the Unruh temperature seems not changed by the GUP. When the GUP parameter $\beta \rightarrow 0$, the spontaneous emission and excitation rates of an accelerated atom will reduce to the results without the quantum gravitational corrections.

VI. THE ATOM IN CIRCULAR MOTION

In this section, by use of the formalism presented in the preceding section, we turn to study the effect of GUP on the spontaneous processes of a uniformly circulating atom of

which the trajectory is described by

$$x(\tau) = (\gamma\tau, R \cos(\gamma\Omega\tau), R \sin(\gamma\Omega\tau), \dots), \quad (40)$$

where R is the radius of the orbit, Ω is the angular velocity in the preferred Lorentz frame. and $\gamma = (1 - v^2)^{-1/2}$ is the Lorentz factor with $v = R\Omega$. The proper acceleration $a = R\Omega^2\gamma^2$.

Inserting the (40) into Eqs. (20) and (21), in the ultrarelativistic limit $\gamma \gg 1$, we obtain the GUP-modified symmetric correlation function and the linear susceptibility of the field along the atomic trajectory as

$$C^F(x, x') = -\frac{1}{8\pi^2} \left[\frac{1}{(\Delta\tau - i\varepsilon)^2 (1 + \frac{a^2}{12}\Delta\tau^2)} + \frac{1}{(\Delta\tau + i\varepsilon)^2 (1 + \frac{a^2}{12}\Delta\tau^2)} \right] \\ + \frac{\beta}{4\pi^2} \left[\frac{1}{(\Delta\tau - i\varepsilon)^4 (1 + \frac{a^2}{12}\Delta\tau^2)^2} + \frac{1}{(\Delta\tau + i\varepsilon)^4 (1 + \frac{a^2}{12}\Delta\tau^2)^2} \right], \quad (41)$$

$$\chi^F(x, x') = -\frac{1}{8\pi^2} \left[\frac{1}{(\Delta\tau - i\varepsilon)^2 (1 + \frac{a^2}{12}\Delta\tau^2)} - \frac{1}{(\Delta\tau + i\varepsilon)^2 (1 + \frac{a^2}{12}\Delta\tau^2)} \right] \\ + \frac{\beta}{4\pi^2} \left[\frac{1}{(\Delta\tau - i\varepsilon)^4 (1 + \frac{a^2}{12}\Delta\tau^2)^2} - \frac{1}{(\Delta\tau + i\varepsilon)^4 (1 + \frac{a^2}{12}\Delta\tau^2)^2} \right]. \quad (42)$$

Following similar steps as in the previous analysis, we can get the contributions of vacuum fluctuations to the average rate of change of the atomic energy as

$$\left\langle \frac{dH_A(\tau)}{d\tau} \right\rangle_{vf} = -\frac{\mu^2}{4\pi} \left[\sum_{\omega_b > \omega_d} \omega_{bd} \left| \langle b | R_2^f(0) | d \rangle \right|^2 \left(\omega_{bd} + \frac{a}{2\sqrt{3}} e^{-2\sqrt{3}\omega_{bd}/a} \right) \right. \\ \left. - \sum_{\omega_b < \omega_d} \omega_{bd} \left| \langle b | R_2^f(0) | d \rangle \right|^2 \left(\omega_{bd} - \frac{a}{2\sqrt{3}} e^{2\sqrt{3}\omega_{bd}/a} \right) \right] \\ - \frac{\beta\mu^2}{4\pi} \left\{ \sum_{\omega_b > \omega_d} \omega_{bd} \left| \langle b | R_2^f(0) | d \rangle \right|^2 \left[\frac{1}{3}\omega_{bd} (a^2 + \omega_{bd}^2) + \left(\frac{5a^3}{24\sqrt{3}} + \frac{a^2\omega_{bd}}{12} \right) e^{-2\sqrt{3}\omega_{bd}/a} \right] \right. \\ \left. - \sum_{\omega_b < \omega_d} \omega_{bd} \left| \langle b | R_2^f(0) | d \rangle \right|^2 \left[\frac{1}{3}\omega_{bd} (a^2 + \omega_{bd}^2) - \left(\frac{5a^3}{24\sqrt{3}} - \frac{a^2\omega_{bd}}{12} \right) e^{2\sqrt{3}\omega_{bd}/a} \right] \right\}, \quad (43)$$

and the contribution of the radiation reaction reads

$$\left\langle \frac{dH_A(\tau)}{d\tau} \right\rangle_{rr} = -\frac{\mu^2}{4\pi} \left[\sum_{\omega_b > \omega_d} \omega_{bd}^2 \left| \langle b | R_2^f(0) | d \rangle \right|^2 + \sum_{\omega_b < \omega_d} \omega_{bd}^2 \left| \langle b | R_2^f(0) | d \rangle \right|^2 \right] \\ - \frac{\beta\mu^2}{12\pi} \left[\sum_{\omega_b > \omega_d} \omega_{bd}^2 (a^2 + \omega_{bd}^2) \left| \langle b | R_2^f(0) | d \rangle \right|^2 + \sum_{\omega_b < \omega_d} \omega_{bd}^2 (a^2 + \omega_{bd}^2) \left| \langle b | R_2^f(0) | d \rangle \right|^2 \right]. \quad (44)$$

Obviously, the contributions of vacuum fluctuations and radiation reaction are both dependent on the GUP parameter β and the acceleration a of the atom. In the limit $\beta \rightarrow 0$, the results will reduce to the cases without the GUP corrections. The total rate of change of the atomic excitation energy can be found by adding the contributions of vacuum fluctuations and radiation reaction:

$$\begin{aligned}
\left\langle \frac{dH_A(\tau)}{d\tau} \right\rangle_{tot} &= -\frac{\mu^2}{4\pi} \left[\sum_{\omega_b > \omega_d} \omega_{bd} \left| \langle b | R_2^f(0) | d \rangle \right|^2 \left(2\omega_{bd} + \frac{a}{2\sqrt{3}} e^{-2\sqrt{3}\omega_{bd}/a} \right) \right. \\
&\quad \left. + \sum_{\omega_b < \omega_d} \omega_{bd} \left| \langle b | R_2^f(0) | d \rangle \right|^2 \frac{a}{2\sqrt{3}} e^{2\sqrt{3}\omega_{bd}/a} \right] \\
&\quad - \frac{\beta\mu^2}{2\pi} \left\{ \sum_{\omega_b > \omega_d} \omega_{bd} \left| \langle b | R_2^f(0) | d \rangle \right|^2 \left[\frac{\omega_{bd}}{3} (a^2 + \omega_{bd}^2) + \left(\frac{5a^3}{48\sqrt{3}} + \frac{a^2\omega_{bd}}{24} \right) e^{-2\sqrt{3}\omega_{bd}/a} \right] \right. \\
&\quad \left. + \sum_{\omega_b < \omega_d} \omega_{bd} \left| \langle b | R_2^f(0) | d \rangle \right|^2 \left(\frac{5a^3}{48\sqrt{3}} - \frac{a^2\omega_{bd}}{24} \right) e^{2\sqrt{3}\omega_{bd}/a} \right\}.
\end{aligned} \tag{45}$$

Once again, we see the corrections to the spontaneous transition rates of the uniformly circulating atom induced by the GUP are characterized by parameter β . Note that the spontaneous excitation ($\omega_b < \omega_d$) is possible as well as spontaneous deexcitation ($\omega_b > \omega_d$), and considering $\beta > 0$, the effect of GUP can significantly increase both the spontaneous emission and excitation rates of the atom. To be specific, different from the inertial case, the equilibrium between vacuum fluctuations and radiation reaction that exists for an inertial atom is disrupted, thus the ground-state atom in uniformly circulating motion can be spontaneously excited and the transition rate for this process rely on both the acceleration a and the GUP parameter β . We also observe that the GUP-modified terms contains the terms proportional to βa^3 , indicating that the uniform circular motion of atom can amplify the GUP effect more than the case of linear accelerated motion.

Compared with the case of a linearly accelerated atom, the contribution of radiation reaction to the rate of change of the mean atomic energy is obviously different with that of the uniformly circulating atom due to the GUP effect. Moreover, in contrast to the case of linear acceleration, the terms associated with the Planckian factor $\frac{1}{e^{2\pi\omega_{bd}/a}-1}$ in the contribution from vacuum fluctuations in Eq. (43) are substituted with terms that exhibit a non-Planckian exponential dependence. This indicates that the radiation perceived by an observer in uniform circular motion is no longer thermal in nature. In the limit $\beta \rightarrow 0$, the

result of that in Minkowski spacetime with no GUP correction is recovered as expected.

VII. SUMMARY

We have studied the effect of the GUP on the spontaneous emission and spontaneous excitation of a two-level atom in interaction with a real massless scalar quantum field, and discussed both the contributions of vacuum fluctuations and radiation reaction to the variation of the mean energy of a state of a two-level atom for inertial motion, uniform acceleration and uniform circular motion based on DDC formalism.

In the case of an inertial atom, our results show that the effect of GUP only change both the contributions of vacuum fluctuations and radiation reaction to the rate of change of atomic energy quantitatively but not qualitatively considering the positive GUP parameter. For an atom in the ground state, the contributions of vacuum fluctuations and radiation reaction exactly cancel, in spite of with or without GUP introduced. Thus the effect of GUP does not alter the stability of ground-state inertial atom in vacuum. For the excited state atom, the effect of GUP can enhance the spontaneous emission rate of the atom by adding a correction term proportional to $\beta\omega_{bd}^4$.

In the case of a uniformly accelerated atom, we show that the total rate of change of the atomic energy depends on both GUP parameter β and the proper acceleration a of the atom, and the acceleration a can amplify the effect of GUP. For the atom initially prepared in the excited state, the spontaneous emission is modified by the appearance of the thermal term as compared to an inertial atom, and although the GUP corrections significantly alter the transition rate of the atom, the thermal character is still retained. For the atom initially prepared in the ground state, the transition from ground state to excited state known as spontaneous excitation is allowed to occur even in the vacuum, and the effect of the GUP can always increase the transition rate and makes it as a function of β .

In the case of a uniformly circulating atom, in the ultrarelativistic limit $\gamma \gg 1$, we observe the effect of GUP can significantly increase both the spontaneous emission and excitation rates of the atom. The uniformly circulating atom in the ground state can be spontaneously excited and the probability for this process is dependent on both the acceleration a and the GUP parameter β . It is also shown that the GUP-modified terms contains the terms proportional to βa^3 , indicating that the uniform circular motion of atom can amplify the

GUP effect more than the case of linear accelerated motion. Thus it might provide a potentially way to allow us to probe the effect of GUP experimentally, if possible, and further deepen our understanding of quantum gravity and the nature of spacetime.

ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

The work is supported by Guizhou Provincial Science and Technology Projects (ZK[2022]029).

-
- [1] S. Hossenfelder, Minimal Length Scale Scenarios for Quantum Gravity, *Living Rev. Relativity* 16, 2 (2013).
 - [2] A. N. Tawfik and A. M. Diab, A review of the generalized uncertainty principle, *Rep. Prog. Phys.* 78, 126001 (2015).
 - [3] D. Amati, M. Ciafaloni, and G. Veneziano, Superstring Collisions at Planckian Energies, *Phys. Lett. B* 197 (1987) 81.
 - [4] D. Amati, M. Ciafaloni, G. Veneziano, Can spacetime be probed below the string size? *Phys. Lett. B* 216, 41 (1989).
 - [5] D. J. Gross, P. F. Mende, String theory beyond the Planck scale, *Nucl. Phys. B* 303, 407 (1988).
 - [6] K. Konishi, G. Paffuti, P. Provero, Minimum physical length and the generalized uncertainty principle in string theory, *Phys. Lett. B* 234, 276 (1990).
 - [7] M. Maggiore, A generalized uncertainty principle in quantum gravity, *Phys. Lett. B* 304, 65 (1993).
 - [8] M. Maggiore, The Algebraic structure of the generalized uncertainty principle, *Phys. Lett. B* 319 (1993) 83–86
 - [9] M. Park, The generalized uncertainty principle in (A) dS space and the modification of Hawking temperature from the minimal length, *Phys. Lett. B* 659, 698 (2008).
 - [10] K. Nozari and T. Azizi, Some aspects of gravitational quantum mechanics, *Gen. Rel. Grav.* 38, 735 (2006).
 - [11] K. Nozari, Some aspects of Planck scale quantum optics, *Phys. Lett. B* 629, 41 (2005).

- [12] G. Amelino-Camelia, Testable scenario for relativity with minimum length, *Phys. Lett. B* 510, 255 (2001).
- [13] J. Magueijo and L. Smolin, Lorentz invariance with an invariant energy scale, *Phys. Rev. Lett.* 88, 190403 (2002).
- [14] J. Magueijo and L. Smolin, String theories with deformed energy-momentum relations, and a possible nontachyonic bosonic string, *Phys. Rev. D* 71, 026010 (2005).
- [15] J. L. Cortes and J. Gamboa, Quantum uncertainty in doubly special relativity, *Phys. Rev. D* 71, 065015 (2005).
- [16] A. Kempf, G. Mangano, R.B. Mann, Hilbert space representation of the minimal length uncertainty relation, *Phys. Rev. D* 52, 1108 (1995).
- [17] A Kempf, On quantum field theory with nonzero minimal uncertainties in positions and momenta, *J. Math. Phys.* 38, 1347–1372 (1997).
- [18] A. F. Ali, S. Das, and E. C. Vagenas, Proposal for testing quantum gravity in the lab, *Phys. Rev. D* 84, 044013 (2011).
- [19] P. Pedram, A higher order GUP with minimal length uncertainty and maximal momentum, *Phys. Lett. B* 714, 317 (2012).
- [20] L. N. Chang, D. Minic, N. Okamura, T. Takeuchi, Exact solution of the harmonic oscillator in arbitrary dimensions with minimal length uncertainty relations, *Phys. Rev. D* 65.125027 (2002).
- [21] W. S. Chung, H. Hassanabadi, A new higher order GUP one dimensional quantum system, *Eur. Phys. J. C* 79, 213 (2019).
- [22] S. Benczik, L. N. Chang, D. Minic, T. Takeuchi, Hydrogen-atom spectrum under a minimal-length hypothesis, *Phys. Rev. A* 72, 012104 (2005).
- [23] S. Haouat, Schrödinger equation and resonant scattering in the presence of a minimal length, *Phys. Lett. B* 729, 33 (2014).
- [24] S. Das, R. B. Mann, Planck scale effects on some low energy quantum phenomena, *Phys. Lett. B* 704, 596 (2011).
- [25] C. Villalpando, S. K. Modak, Minimal length effect on the broadening of free wave packets and its physical implications, *Phys. Rev. D* 100, 024054 (2019).
- [26] P. Bosso, S. Das, R. B. Mann, Planck scale corrections to the harmonic oscillator, coherent, and squeezed states, *Phys. Rev. D* 96, 066008 (2017).

- [27] J. Y. Bang, M. S. Berger, Quantum mechanics and the generalized uncertainty principle, *Phys. Rev. D* 74, 125012 (2006).
- [28] P. Pedram, K. Nozari, S. H. Taheri, The effects of minimal length and maximal momentum on the transition rate of ultra cold neutrons in gravitational field, *JHEP* 03, 093 (2011).
- [29] D. Mania, M. Maziashvili, Corrections to the black body radiation due to minimum-length deformed quantum mechanics, *Phys. Lett. B* 705, 521 (2011).
- [30] M. S. Berger and M. Maziashvili, Free particle wave function in light of the minimum-length deformed quantum mechanics and some of its phenomenological implications, *Phys. Rev. D* 84, 044043 (2011).
- [31] B. Vakili and M. A. Gorji, Thermostatistics with minimal length uncertainty relation, *J. Stat. Mech.* P10013 (2012).
- [32] A. Awad, A. F. Ali, Minimal length, Friedmann equations and maximum density, *JHEP* 06, 093 (2014).
- [33] X. Guo, P. Wang, H. Yang, The classical limit of minimal length uncertainty relation revisit with the Hamilton-Jacobi method, *JCAP* 05, 062 (2016).
- [34] L. B. Castro, A. E. Obispo, Generalized relativistic harmonic oscillator in minimal length quantum mechanics, *J. Phys. A Math. Theor.* 50, 285202 (2017).
- [35] M. I. Samar, V. M. Tkachuk, Exactly solvable problems in the momentum space with a minimum uncertainty in position uncertainty in position, *J. Math. Phys.* 57, 042102 (2016).
- [36] I. Prasetyo, I. H. Belfaqih, A. B. Wahidin, A. Suroso, A. Sulaksono, Minimal length, nuclear matter, and neutron stars, *Eur. Phys. J. C* 82, 884 (2022).
- [37] P. Bosso, G. G. Luciano, Generalized uncertainty principle from the harmonic oscillator to a QFT toy mode, *Eur. Phys. J. C* 81, 982 (2021).
- [38] T. L. Antonacci Oakes, R. O. Francisco, J. C. Fabris, J. A. Nogueira, Ground state of the hydrogen atom via Dirac equation in a minimal-length scenario, *Eur. Phys. J. C* 73, 2495 (2013).
- [39] F. J. Twagirayezu, Generalized uncertainty principle corrections on atomic excitation, *Annals of Physics* 422, 168294 (2020).
- [40] R. C. S. Bernardo, J. P. H. Esguerra, Energy levels of one-dimensional systems satisfying the minimal length uncertainty relation, *Annals of Physics* 373, 521 (2016).
- [41] F. Scardigli, R. Casadio, Generalized uncertainty principle, extra dimensions and holography,

- Class. Quantum Gravity 20, 3915 (2003).
- [42] A. Camacho, Time Evolution of a Quantum Particle and a Generalized Uncertainty Principle, Rel. Grav.Cosmol. 1, 89 (2004).
 - [43] S. Das, E.C. Vagenas, Universality of quantum gravity corrections, Phys. Rev. Lett. 101, 221301 (2008).
 - [44] K. Nozari, P. Pedram, Minimal length and bouncing-particle spectrum, Europhys. Lett. 92, 50013 (2010).
 - [45] L. Petrucciello and F. Illuminati, Quantum gravitational decoherence from fluctuating minimal length and deformation parameter at the Planck scale, Nature Commun. 12, 4449 (2021).
 - [46] M. Fadel, M. Maggiore, Revisiting the algebraic structure of the generalized uncertainty principle, Phys. Rev. D 105, 106017 (2022).
 - [47] P. Bosso, L. Petrucciello, F. Wagner, F. Illuminati, Spin operator, Bell nonlocality and Tsirelson bound in quantum-gravity induced minimal-length quantum mechanics, Communications Physics 6, 114 (2023).
 - [48] A. H. Gomes, On the algebraic approach to GUP in anisotropic space, Class. Quantum Grav. 40, 065005 (2023).
 - [49] A. F. Ali, I. Elmashad, J. Mureika, Universality of minimal length, Phys. Lett. B 831, 137182 (2022).
 - [50] R. Casadio, W. Feng, I. Kuntz, F. Scardigli, Minimum length (scale) in quantum field theory, generalized uncertainty principle and the non-renormalisability of gravity, Phys. Lett. B 838, 137722 (2023).
 - [51] D. Artigas, K. Martineau, J. Mielczarek, Squeezing of light from Planck-scale physics, Phys. Rev. D 109, 024028 (2024).
 - [52] M. Bawaj et al., Probing deformed commutators with macroscopic harmonic oscillators, Nat. Commun. 6, 7503 (2015).
 - [53] F. Marin et al., Gravitational bar detectors set limits to Planck-scale physics on macroscopic variables, Nat. Phys. 9, 71 (2013).
 - [54] I. Pikovski, M. R. Vanner, M. Aspelmeyer, M. S. Kim, and Č. Brukner, Probing Planck-scale physics with quantum optics, Nat. Phys. 8, 393 (2012).
 - [55] P. Bosso, S. Das, I. Pikovski, and M. Vanner, Amplified transduction of Planck-scale effects using quantum optics, Phys. Rev. A 96, 023849 (2017).

- [56] S. P. Kumar, M. B. Plenio, Quantum-optical tests of Planck-scale physics, *Phys. Rev. A* 97, 063855 (2018).
- [57] S. Sen, S. Bhattacharyya, S. Gangopadhyay, Probing the generalized uncertainty principle through quantum noises in optomechanical systems, *Class. Quantum Grav.* 39, 075020 (2022).
- [58] U. Harbach, S. Hossenfelder, The Casimir effect in the presence of a minimal length, *Phys. Lett. B* 632 (2006) 379-383.
- [59] A. M. Frassino, O. Panella, Casimir effect in minimal length theories based on a generalized uncertainty principle, *Phys. Rev. D* 85, 045030 (2012).
- [60] P. Nicolini, M. Rinaldi, A minimal length versus the Unruh effect, *Phys. Lett. B* 695, 303 (2011).
- [61] B. R. Majhi, E. C. Vagenas, Modified dispersion relation, photon's velocity, and Unruh effect, *Phys. Lett. B* 725, 477 (2013).
- [62] V. Husain, J. Louko, Low energy Lorentz violation from modified dispersion at high energies, *Phys. Rev. Lett.* 116, 061301 (2016).
- [63] Y. Gim, H. Um, W. Kim, Unruh effect of nonlocal field theories with a minimal length, *Phys. Lett. B* 784, 206 (2018).
- [64] F Scardigli, M Blasone, G Luciano, R Casadio, Modified Unruh effect from generalized uncertainty principle, *Eur. Phys. J. C* 78,728 (2018).
- [65] T. A. Welton, Some observable effects of the quantum-mechanical fluctuations of the electromagnetic field, *Phys. Rev.* 74 1157 (1948).
- [66] G. Compagno, R. Passante and F. Persico, The role of the cloud of virtual photons in the shift of the ground state energy of a hydrogen atom, *Phys. Lett. A* 98 253 (1983).
- [67] J. R. Ackerhalt, P. L. Knight and J. H. Eberly, Radiation reaction and radiative frequency shifts, *Phys. Rev. Lett.* 30 456 (1973).
- [68] J. R. Ackerhalt and J. H. Eberly, Quantum electrodynamics and radiation reaction: nonrelativistic atomic frequency shifts and lifetimes, *Phys. Rev. D* 10 3350 (1974).
- [69] I. R. Senitzky, Radiation-reaction and vacuum-field effects in Heisenberg-picture quantum electrodynamics, *Phys. Rev. Lett.* 31 955 (1973).
- [70] P. W. Milonni, J. R. Ackerhalt and W. A. Smith, Interpretation of radiative corrections in spontaneous emission, *Phys. Rev. Lett.* 31 958 (1973).
- [71] P. W. Milonni and W. A. Smith, Radiation reaction and vacuum fluctuations in spontaneous

- emission, *Phys. Rev. A* 11 814 (1975).
- [72] P. W. Milonni, Semiclassical and quantum-electrodynamical approaches in nonrelativistic radiation theory, *Phys. Rep.* 25 1 (1976).
- [73] J. Dalibard, J. Dupont-Roc, and C. Cohen-Tannodji, Vacuum fluctuations and radiation reaction: identification of their respective contributions, *J. Phys. (Paris)* 43, 1617 (1982).
- [74] J. Dalibard, J. Dupont-Roc, and C. Cohen-Tannodji, Dynamics of a small system coupled to a reservoir: reservoir fluctuations and self-reaction, *J. Phys. (Paris)* 45, 637 (1984).
- [75] J. Audretsch and R. Müller, Spontaneous excitation of an accelerated atom: The Contributions of vacuum fluctuations and radiation reaction, *Phys. Rev. A* 50 1755 (1994).
- [76] H. Yu and S. Lu, Spontaneous excitation of an accelerated atom in a spacetime with a reflecting plane boundary, *Phys. Rev. D* 72 064022 (2005).
- [77] Z. Zhu and H. Yu, Fulling–Davies–Unruh effect and spontaneous excitation of an accelerated atom interacting with a quantum scalar field, *Phys. Lett. B* 645 459 (2007).
- [78] Z. Zhu, H. Yu and S. Lu, Spontaneous excitation of an accelerated hydrogen atom coupled with electromagnetic vacuum fluctuations, *Phys. Rev. D* 73 107501 (2006).
- [79] H. Yu and Z. Zhu, Spontaneous absorption of an accelerated hydrogen atom near a conducting plane in vacuum, *Phys. Rev. D* 74 044032 (2006).
- [80] Y. Jin, J. Hu and H. Yu, Spontaneous excitation of a circularly accelerated atom coupled to electromagnetic vacuum fluctuations, *Ann. Phys.* 344 97 (2014).
- [81] W. Zhou and H. Yu, Interaction of Hawking radiation with static atoms outside a Schwarzschild black hole, *JHEP* 4, 024 (2007).
- [82] Z. Zhu and H. Yu, Thermal nature of de Sitter spacetime and spontaneous excitation of atoms, *JHEP* 2, 033 (2008).
- [83] W. Zhou and H. Yu, Spontaneous excitation of a static multilevel atom coupled with electromagnetic vacuum fluctuations in Schwarzschild spacetime, *Class. Quantum Grav.* 29 085003 (2012).
- [84] G. Menezes, N. F. Svaiter, Radiative processes of uniformly accelerated entangled atoms, *Phys. Rev. A* 93, 052117 (2016).
- [85] H. Cai, Z. Wang, Z. Ren, Radiative properties of a static two-level atom in a cosmic dispiration spacetime, *Class. Quantum Grav.* 35, 155016 (2018).
- [86] S. Cheng, J. Hu, H. Yu, Spontaneous excitation of an accelerated atom coupled with quantum

- fluctuations of spacetime, *Phys. Rev. D* 100, 025010 (2019).
- [87] G. Menezes, Spontaneous excitation of an atom in a Kerr spacetime, *Phys. Rev. D* 95, 065015 (2017).
- [88] G. Picanço, N. F. Svaiter, C.A.D. Zarro, Radiative processes of entangled detectors in rotating frames, *JHEP* 08, 025 (2020).
- [89] S. Barman, B. R. Majhi, Radiative process of two entangled uniformly accelerated atoms in a thermal bath: a possible case of anti-Unruh event, *JHEP* 03, 245 (2021).
- [90] D. Lust, M. Petropoulos, Comment on superluminality in general relativity, *Class. Quant. Grav.* 29, 085013 (2012).
- [91] N. D. Birrell and P. C. W. Davies, *Quantum Fields in Curved Space*, Cambridge University Press (1984).
- [92] P. C. W. Davies and P. Tee, Accelerated particle detectors with modified dispersion relations, *Phys. Rev. D* 108, 045009 (2023).