

A First Look at “Continuous Spin” Gravity – Time Delay Signatures

Shayarneel Kundu,^{a,b} Philip Schuster,^a and Natalia Toro^a

^a*SLAC National Accelerator Laboratory, 2575 Sand Hill Road, Menlo Park, CA 94025, USA*

^b*Department of Physics, Stanford University, Stanford, CA, 94305, USA*

E-mail: skundu4@stanford.edu, schuster@slac.stanford.edu,
ntoro@slac.stanford.edu

ABSTRACT: We consider the possibility that gravity is mediated by “continuous spin” particles, i.e. massless particles whose invariant spin scale ρ_g is non-zero. In this case, the primary helicity-2 modes of gravitational radiation on a Minkowski background mix with a tower of integer-helicity partner modes under boosts, with ρ_g controlling the degree of mixing. We develop a formalism for coupling spinless matter to continuous spin gravity at linearized level. Using this formalism, we calculate the time delay signatures induced by gravitational waves in an idealized laser interferometer detector. The fractional deviation from general relativity predictions is $O(\rho_g/\omega)$ for gravitational wave frequencies $\omega > \rho_g$, and the effects of waves with $\omega \lesssim \rho_g$ are damped. The precision and low frequency ranges of gravitational wave detectors suggest potential sensitivity to spin scales at or below $\sim 10^{-14}$ eV at ground-based laser interferometers and $\sim 10^{-24}$ eV at pulsar timing arrays, motivating further analysis of observable signatures.

Contents

1	Introduction	1
2	Gravitational Waves and Worldline Formalism	2
2.1	Gravitational Waves	3
2.2	Worldline Formalism	4
2.3	Computing the Strain	6
3	CSP Gravitational Waves	8
3.1	Results for Continuous Spin Gauge Theories	8
3.2	Linearized GR Modes in η -space	11
3.3	Gravity at $\rho_g \neq 0$ at leading order in G_N	12
3.4	Matter Trajectories in a $\rho_g \neq 0$ Gravitational Wave Background, and the Strain	13
4	Future Directions	16
A	GW Gauge Terms	17
A.1	Gauge Terms in Linearized GR	17
A.2	Equations of Motion and Boundary Conditions with Gauge Terms	17
B	Photon Geodesics	18
B.1	GW Background	18
B.2	CSP GW Background	19
C	CSP - Identities and EoM	20
C.1	4-Vector Contraction Identities	20
C.2	CSP EoM	20

1 Introduction

The deep infrared structure of the Universe appears to be governed by the exchange of massless particles obeying an underlying Lorentz symmetry. The mathematical classification of such particles was pioneered by Wigner in the 1930's [1], where it was shown that massless particles fall into one of two connected classes: those with helicity states that are Lorentz invariant as usually assumed, or those where their helicity states mix under Lorentz boosts – the so-called “continuous-spin particle” (CSP) case. The latter case corresponds to a non-vanishing spin Casimir, $W^2 = -\rho^2$, where the spin-scale ρ is a characteristic invariant for any particle species, which carries units of momentum.

The classic theorems of Weinberg and Witten [2–5] showed that particles that can consistently mediate long-range interactions necessarily have helicity $h \leq 2$ when $\rho = 0$, but did not address the general case $\rho \neq 0$. In [6–9], two of the authors generalized these results to non-zero spin-scale, where it was shown that interacting CSP theories could potentially exist, and in all cases only the helicity modes $h \leq 2$ would remain interacting in the $\rho \rightarrow 0$ limit. These results suggest that the known gauge theories of the Standard Model and General Relativity could just be approximate limits of a more complete class of theories with small but non-zero spin scale. A concrete step towards realizing this idea was given in [10], which used a hybrid worldline formalism to describe interactions of a matter particle with a field of non-zero ρ , whose high-energy and $\rho \rightarrow 0$ limits are dominated by either scalar-like interactions of the $h = 0$ mode or gauge-boson-like interactions of the $h = \pm 1$ modes. In [11] this approach was extended to path integrals and used to compute on-shell scattering amplitudes for scalar QED where the photon has $\rho_\gamma \neq 0$. In this paper, we extend the logic of [10] to describe the linearized coupling to matter of a graviton with $\rho_g \neq 0$, and use it to compute the response of an idealized gravitational wave detector.

Our analysis will be confined to leading order in G_N , where we can ignore the effects of self-interactions. Indeed, the lack of a complete formalism for describing self-interactions of CSP’s has limited progress on generalizing Yang-Mills and General Relativity to their $\rho \neq 0$ counterparts. But nonetheless, we can learn a great deal even at leading order. The most developed formalism for studying interactions between on-shell CSP’s and familiar matter is that of [10], where the CSP degrees of freedom are treated with fields and the matter degrees of freedom are described using worldlines. We will use this formalism in what follows, but we note with interest that recent progress formulating CSP interactions with on-shell spinor-helicity techniques has been presented in [12] and could offer an alternative path forward.

In section 2, we cast the standard computation of time-delay in linearized General Relativity in the worldline formalism. In section 3, we summarize the CSP field theory formalism needed to generalize this approach to $\rho_g \neq 0$, and we compute the ρ_g -dependent corrections to gravitational time-delay. In section 4, we outline related computations needed to make direct contact with the study of gravitational radiation in ongoing and future experiments. We note that a range of other authors has considered various aspects of CSP physics over the last decade, including descriptions of free theories [9, 13–41], supersymmetric generalizations [15, 42–46], CSP’s in AdS/dS spaces [47–52], field-theoretic aspects of interactions [53–60], and thermodynamics with CSP’s [61].

2 Gravitational Waves and Worldline Formalism

Gravitational time delay is the foundation of gravitational wave detection at experiments like LIGO [62] and a standard textbook observable (see e.g. [63]). To make contact with the description of other interactions with $\rho_g \neq 0$, it is useful to first recast the computation of time delay and strain in terms of a linearized helicity-2 field with Fierz-Pauli action in flat Minkowski space, coupled to a current sourced by the worldlines of “mirror” and “laser” particles.

We start by discussing linearized gravitational waves in section 2.1, to establish notation. We introduce the matter worldlines and their coupling to gravitational waves in section 2.2, and compute the strain in section 2.3.

2.1 Gravitational Waves

Working with the mostly negative metric, $\mathbf{g}_{\mu\nu} = \text{diag}(+, -, -, -)$, we start with the Einstein-Hilbert action,

$$S = \int d^4x \sqrt{-g} \left(\frac{1}{2\kappa} R + \mathcal{L}_m \right), \quad (2.1)$$

where $\kappa = 8\pi G_N$. Considering perturbations about the flat Minkowski metric $g_{\mu\nu} = \mathbf{g}_{\mu\nu} + h_{\mu\nu}$, and keeping terms to $\mathcal{O}(|h_{\mu\nu}|^2)$, we obtain the Fierz-Pauli action,

$$S_{\text{FP}} = \frac{1}{2\kappa} \int d^4x \left(\frac{1}{2} \partial_\rho h_{\mu\nu} \partial^\rho h^{\mu\nu} - \partial_\rho h_{\mu\nu} \partial^\nu h^{\rho\mu} - \frac{1}{2} \partial_\mu h \partial^\mu h + \partial_\nu h^{\mu\nu} \partial_\mu h \right), \quad (2.2)$$

where h is the trace of the metric, and indices are raised and lowered with Minkowski metric, $\mathbf{g}_{\mu\nu}$. This action is invariant under the gauge transformation,

$$h_{\mu\nu} \rightarrow h_{\mu\nu} + \partial_\mu \chi_\nu + \partial_\nu \chi_\mu, \quad (2.3)$$

which is just linearized diffeomorphism invariance inherited from the full non-linear theory. For a more detailed review of linearized GR, the reader is referred to [63–65]. For radiation problems, a convenient gauge choice is the de-Donder gauge,

$$\partial^\mu \left(h_{\mu\nu} - \frac{1}{2} h \mathbf{g}_{\mu\nu} \right) = 0, \quad (2.4)$$

where the equation of motion reduces to

$$\square \left(h_{\mu\nu} - \frac{1}{2} h \mathbf{g}_{\mu\nu} \right) = 0. \quad (2.5)$$

Defining the trace-reversed metric, $\bar{h}_{\mu\nu} = h_{\mu\nu} - (1/2)h\mathbf{g}_{\mu\nu}$, the de-Donder gauge condition and equation of motion simplify to

$$\partial^\mu \bar{h}_{\mu\nu} = 0 \quad \text{and} \quad \square \bar{h}_{\mu\nu} = 0 \quad (2.6)$$

respectively. This covariant gauge-fixing admits a residual freedom under (2.3) with $\partial\dot{\chi} = 0$. This residual freedom can be used to render the polarization tensors spatially transverse ($\partial_i h_{ij} = 0$) and traceless ($h^i_i = 0$). On-shell, this is the transverse-traceless (TT) gauge, which is commonly used in the gravitational wave literature. Fixing the gravitational wave to be propagating along the z -axis, with 4-vector $k_\mu = (\omega, 0, 0, \omega)$, a basis of polarization tensors is

$$H_{\mu\nu}^{(+)} = \begin{pmatrix} 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & -1 & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & 1 & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 \end{pmatrix} \quad H_{\mu\nu}^{(\times)} = \begin{pmatrix} 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & -1 & 0 \\ 0 & -1 & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 \end{pmatrix} \quad (2.7)$$

We will focus on monochromatic solutions to the wave equation (2.6) propagating along the z axis, given in general by

$$h_{\mu\nu}(z) = \sum_{a=+, \times} h_a H_{\mu\nu}^{(a)} \cos(k \cdot z + \phi^{(a)}), \quad (2.8)$$

from which more general solutions can be built as superpositions. We will further set the phases $\phi^{(+)}$ and $\phi^{(\times)}$ to zero for simplicity in the computation that follows. These solutions have been expressed in the detector (rest) frame. Gauge transformations that preserve the covariant deDonder gauge condition (2.6) but not the spatial transverse condition $\partial_i h_{ij} = 0$ are equivalent to rigid Lorentz transformations of the observer's reference frame; independence of observables under these transformations is an important consistency check on computations, and is discussed further in Appendix A.

Using the polarization tensors defined in (2.7), we see that each one can be interpreted as spacetime stretching and shrinking in orthogonal directions. Gravitational wave observatories such as LIGO exploit this relative stretching and shrinking to observe a measurable “time-delay” signature. An idealized LIGO-like detector has two arms that are oriented 90° apart, and the difference in proper lengths between the arms is measured with light bouncing off mirrors at each end of the arm. The strain is defined as

$$g = \frac{\delta L}{L}, \quad (2.9)$$

where $\delta L = L_{\text{GW}} - L_{\text{M}}$, L is the proper length between the detector arms, and the subscripts GW and M refer to making the measurement in the presence of gravitational waves and in flat Minkowski spacetime respectively. The strain can also be expressed as

$$g = \frac{\delta L}{L} = \frac{\delta T}{T}, \quad (2.10)$$

where $\delta T = T_{\text{GW}} - T_{\text{M}}$, and T refers to the (detector frame) time elapsed for a photon to complete one round trip between two mirrors. This is an easier observable to compute in our idealized model. For simplicity, we focus on computing the time delay along one arm of a detector of known length, though in realistic experiments what is observed is the difference in time delay between two arms.

2.2 Worldline Formalism

In this calculation, we treat the photon as a massless scalar, and the mirrors as massive scalars. The action for a relativistic free scalar particle in Minkowski ($\mathbf{g}_{\mu\nu}$) spacetime with some arbitrary mass m is

$$S_{\text{free}} = \frac{1}{2} \int d\tau \left[\frac{\dot{\gamma}^\mu(\tau) \dot{\gamma}^\nu(\tau)}{e(\tau)} \mathbf{g}_{\mu\nu} + e(\tau) m^2 \right] \quad (2.11)$$

Here, $\gamma(\tau)$ is the worldline (geodesic) of the particle, τ parameterizes the worldline time, $\dot{\gamma} = \partial_\tau \gamma$, and $e(\tau)$ is the einbein. The einbein encodes invariance under re-parametrizations of the worldline time parameter τ , and the equation of motion for the einbein provides a constraint equation that puts the particle on the mass-shell.

The interaction term is

$$S_{\text{int}} = \int d^4x h_{\mu\nu}(x) T^{\mu\nu}(x), \quad T^{\mu\nu}(x) = \frac{1}{2} \int d\tau \frac{\dot{\gamma}^\mu(\tau) \dot{\gamma}^\nu(\tau)}{e(\tau)} \delta^{(4)}(x - \gamma(\tau)), \quad (2.12)$$

where the rank-2 matter current is identified with the energy-momentum tensor (EMT). This EMT is not conserved: $\partial_\mu T^{\mu\nu} \propto \ddot{\gamma}^\nu(\tau)$. This non-conservation is well known and physical — only the total EMT, including the energy-momentum of all particles and/or fields driving the acceleration of γ^μ , is conserved. For more details, the reader is referred to [64, 66].

Using the plane wave solution in (2.8), and integrating out the delta function in the interaction term (2.12), we obtain the action for γ^μ in a GW background at leading order in G_N ,

$$S = \frac{1}{2} \int d\tau \left[\frac{\dot{\gamma}^\mu \dot{\gamma}^\nu}{e} \left(\mathbf{g}_{\mu\nu} + h_a H_{\mu\nu}^{(a)} \cos(k \cdot \gamma) \right) + em^2 \right]. \quad (2.13)$$

The repeated index a sums over the two polarization states $+$ and \times , and the τ -dependence of γ and $\dot{\gamma}$ is suppressed. The resulting equation of motion (which we also refer to as the geodesic equation) is

$$-\frac{\dot{\gamma}^\rho \dot{\gamma}^\sigma}{e} k_\mu h_a H_{\rho\sigma}^{(a)} \sin(k \cdot \gamma) = 2\partial_\tau \left[\frac{\dot{\gamma}^\nu}{e} \left(\mathbf{g}_{\mu\nu} + h_a H_{\mu\nu}^{(a)} \cos(k \cdot \gamma) \right) \right]. \quad (2.14)$$

Varying the action with respect to the einbein gives the constraint

$$\dot{\gamma}^\mu \dot{\gamma}^\nu \left(\mathbf{g}_{\mu\nu} + h_a H_{\mu\nu}^{(a)} \cos(k \cdot \gamma) \right) = e^2 m^2. \quad (2.15)$$

Fixing the einbein to any non-zero constant, $e = \alpha \neq 0$, results in an α -independent equation of motion (EOM) (2.14), while the constraint equation (2.15) scales uniformly with α .

To solve the EOM and einbein constraint to linear order in h , it is convenient to expand the solution in h as

$$\gamma_\mu(\tau) = \gamma_\mu^{(0)}(\tau) + h_a \gamma_\mu^{(a)}(\tau), \quad (2.16)$$

and plug these into the EOM (2.14) and the einbein constraint (2.15), and expand the resulting equations in h . The zeroth-order equations are simply the Minkowski EOM and mass-shell constraint for $\gamma^{(0)}$. The first-order equations can be solved for $\gamma^{(a)}$ in terms of $\gamma^{(0)}$ and the background field. Explicitly, the zeroth order and linear EOMs are

$$\ddot{\gamma}_\mu^{(0)} = 0 \quad \text{and} \quad \ddot{\gamma}_\mu^{(a)} = A_\mu^{(a)} \sin(k \cdot \dot{\gamma}^{(0)}) \quad (2.17)$$

where we have introduced the coefficient function

$$A_\mu^{(a)} = \left(k \cdot \dot{\gamma}^{(0)} \right) \dot{\gamma}^{(0)\nu} H_{\mu\nu}^{(a)} - \frac{\dot{\gamma}^{(0)\rho} \dot{\gamma}^{(0)\sigma}}{2} k_\mu H_{\rho\sigma}^{(a)}, \quad (2.18)$$

and dropped terms proportional to $\ddot{\gamma}^{(0)}$ which vanish by the zeroth-order EOM. Note that the coefficient function $A^{(a)}$ is τ -independent because it only depends on the worldline

through $\dot{\gamma}^{(0)}$, which is τ -independent by the zeroth-order EOM. The general solutions to these EOMs are

$$\gamma_\mu^{(0)}(\tau) = b_\mu^{(0)} + c_\mu^{(0)}\tau, \quad \gamma_\mu^{(a)}(\tau) = b_\mu^{(a)} + c_\mu^{(a)}\tau + \frac{A_\mu^{(a)}}{(k \cdot \dot{\gamma}^{(0)})^2} \sin(k \cdot \gamma^{(0)}), \quad (2.19)$$

where $b_\mu^{(0)}$, $c_\mu^{(0)}$, $b_\mu^{(a)}$, and $c_\mu^{(a)}$ are constants of integration that must be fixed by boundary conditions. For each particle considered in a background with a GW polarizations, the combination of boundary conditions and einbein constraints must fix $2(a+1)$ undetermined four-vectors or $8(a+1)$ real numbers. Note that $c_\mu^{(0)}$ can be interpreted as the 4-momentum in Minkowski space. For a massless particle the resulting geodesics match [67], if one uses $c_\mu^{(0)} = \Omega(1, v_x, v_y, v_z)$.

Similar to the equation of motion, the einbein constraint can also be expanded order by order:

$$\left(\dot{\gamma}^{(0)}\right)^2 = e^2 m^2 \quad (2.20)$$

$$2\left(\dot{\gamma}^{(0)} \cdot \dot{\gamma}^{(a)}\right) + \dot{\gamma}^{(0)\mu} \dot{\gamma}^{(0)\nu} H_{\mu\nu}^{(a)} \cos(k \cdot \gamma^{(0)}) = 0 \quad (2.21)$$

The zeroth order term is, as noted earlier, the mass-shell condition in Minkowski space, and the linear order term is an additional constraint when matching boundary conditions.

2.3 Computing the Strain

The strain is computed in the following toy model where we consider a photon reflected between two mirrors, as can be seen in figure 1. The mirrors are considered to be inertial point masses separated along the x -axis, and the gravitational wave is propagating along the z -axis. In this configuration, only the $+$ polarization state contributes to the signal, so we restrict our attention to it. In the counting above, we therefore have $a = 1$ and a total of four 4-vectors (16 real constants) to fix for each body's trajectory.

The first mirror, $\mathcal{M}_1(\tau_1)$ is placed at the origin of a coordinate system, and the second mirror, $\mathcal{M}_2(\tau_2)$, is placed at $(L, 0, 0)$. These placements specify $b_i^{(0)}$ and their independence of the gravitational wave background specifies $b_i^{(+)} = 0$. Both mirrors are taken to be at rest, fixing $c_i^{(0)} = c_i^{(+)} = 0$. We can fix $b_0^{(0)} = 0$, and $b_0^{(+)} = 0$ by translating the worldline time parameter τ for each mirror. Then, for given constant einbein e ($e(\tau) = 1/m$ is canonical for a mirror of mass m), the einbein constraints (2.20) and (2.21) fix $c_0^{(0)}$ and $c_0^{(+)}$, respectively. With all boundary conditions thus fixed, the mirror geodesics are

$$\mathcal{M}_1^\mu(\tau_1) = (\tau_1, 0, 0, 0) \quad \mathcal{M}_2^\mu(\tau_2) = (\tau_2, L, 0, 0). \quad (2.22)$$

This is the proper time frame for each of the mirrors, and we can compute the time elapsed between events on a mirror by computing the difference in the time coordinate of the mirror between the two events. We note that the setting of boundary conditions becomes more subtle in the presence of gauge terms as considered in Appendix A, which induce oscillatory motion of the mirrors. We can still impose boundary conditions on the mirror's




Figure 1. The dotted lines correspond to the mirror geodesics, and the red lines correspond to the photon geodesics. The blobs correspond to when the photon intersects a mirror. The point A corresponds to the emission of the photon from the first mirror, the point B corresponds to the reflection of the photon at the second mirror, and point C corresponds to the photon hitting the first mirror.

time-averaged position and velocity in this case. Although each geodesic acquires gauge-dependent corrections, these cancel out of the final time delay computed below, as expected.

We turn now to the boundary conditions for the photon, which are fixed by matching to the mirrors. The emitted photon $\gamma_e(\tau_e)$ leaves $\mathcal{M}_1(\tau_1)$ and is reflected by $\mathcal{M}_2(\tau_2)$. The matching conditions are $\mathcal{M}_1^\mu(\tau_1 = 0) = \gamma_e^\mu(\tau_e = 0)$ (point A in figure 1), and $\mathcal{M}_2^\mu(\tau_2 = \tau_{2,i}) = \gamma_e^\mu(\tau_e = \tau_*)$ (point B in figure 1). More explicitly,

$$\begin{array}{ll} \text{At } \mathcal{O}(h_+^0) & \text{At } \mathcal{O}(h_+^1) \\ \text{At } \mathcal{M}_1 & \gamma_{e\mu}^{(0)}(0) = (0, 0, 0, 0) & \gamma_{e\mu}^{(+)}(0) = (0, 0, 0, 0) \end{array} \quad (2.23)$$

$$\text{At } \mathcal{M}_2 \quad \gamma_{e\mu}^{(0)}(\tau_*) = (\beta_e^{(0)}, L, 0, 0) \quad \gamma_{e\mu}^{(+)}(\tau_*) = (\beta_e^{(+)}, 0, 0, 0) \quad (2.24)$$

Here we have expanded $\tau_{2,i} = \beta_e^{(0)} + h_+ \beta_e^{(+)}$. The conditions in (2.23) fix $b_\mu^{(0)}$, and $b_\mu^{(+)}$, and those in (2.24) fix $c_\mu^{(0)}$, and $c_\mu^{(+)}$. The value of $\beta_e^{(0)}$, and $\beta_e^{(+)}$ are determined using the einbein constraint (2.15). The zeroth order constraint, (2.20) fixes $\beta_e^{(0)} = L/\tau_*$. To determine $\beta_e^{(+)}$, we integrate the linear order einbein constraint (2.21) over the path of the photon from $\tau = 0$ to τ_* ,

$$\dot{\gamma}_e^{(0)} \cdot \gamma_e^{(+)}(\tau_*) = -\frac{\dot{\gamma}_e^{(0)\mu} \dot{\gamma}_e^{(0)\nu} H_{\mu\nu}^{(a)}}{2 \left(k \cdot \dot{\gamma}_e^{(0)} \right)} \sin \left(k \cdot \gamma_e^{(0)}(\tau_*) \right). \quad (2.25)$$

In computing the integral, we have used that $\gamma^{(0)}(\tau)$ is a linear function of τ . From (2.24), $\gamma_{e,0}^{(+)}(\tau_*) = \beta_e^{(+)}$, and we can use the integrated linear einbein constraint to extract its value

$$\beta_e^{(+)} = \frac{\sin(L\omega)}{2\omega}. \quad (2.26)$$

Similarly, the reflected photon trajectory $\gamma_r(\tau_r)$ satisfies $\mathcal{M}_2^\mu(\tau_2 = \tau_{2,i}) = \gamma_r^\mu(\tau_r = 0)$ (point B in figure 1), and $\mathcal{M}_1^\mu(\tau_1 = \tau_{1,i}) = \gamma_r^\mu(\tau_e = \tau_\bullet)$ (point C in figure 1). An analogous treatment of boundary conditions for the reflected photon determines that

$$\tau_{1,i} = 2L + \frac{\sin(2L\omega)}{2\omega}. \quad (2.27)$$

Considering the geodesics of \mathcal{M}_1 in (2.22), we see that $\tau_{1,i}$ is the value of the time geodesic when the photon hits it after being reflected – this is the total time in the detector frame for the photon to complete one round trip in the presence of the GW background. The time-delay or δT , is found by subtracting $2L$, the time the photon would have taken to complete the trip in the absence of the GW perturbation. The strain is found by dividing this by the total path length.

$$g_{\text{GW}} = \frac{\delta T_{\text{GW}}}{T} = h_+ \frac{\sin(2L\omega)}{4L\omega}. \quad (2.28)$$

This closely matches the result in chapter 9 of [63]. Note that, because the mirrors were at rest, we needed only the einbein constraint to derive the time delay — not the full geodesic equations of motion. Nonetheless, for completeness, we list $\gamma_e(\tau_e)$, and $\gamma_r(\tau_r)$ with all boundary conditions matched in appendix B.

3 CSP Gravitational Waves

In this section, we generalize the approach of section 2 to compute the strain for a GW-CSP background. We start by introducing the η -space formalism of [6–11], which will allow us to generalize the scalar matter worldline interactions with a rank-2 tensor field (as in linearized GR) to the case of a CSP field. In section 3.1 we summarize key results from [10] on CSP gauge theory and η -space integration that we will use directly in this work. For context and derivations, we refer the reader to Sections II and III and Appendix A of [10]. In section 3.2 we recast to η -space the $\rho_g = 0$ interaction term used in section 2. We then generalize this interaction, at leading order in G_N , to non-zero ρ_g in section 3.3, and extend the calculation of strain from section 2 to non-zero ρ_g in section 3.4,

3.1 Results for Continuous Spin Gauge Theories

A gauge field theory for CSPs was developed in [9] and subsequently coupled to matter particles in [10]. This theory is based on a (bosonic) CSP field $\Psi(\eta^\mu, x^\mu)$, where x^μ is the usual space-time coordinate and the dependence of Ψ on the new four-vector coordinate η^μ encodes the particle’s spin (with substantial gauge redundancy). Because we are dealing here with the response of matter particles to an on-shell CSP background, we will need only

four key results: the mode expansion of the CSP field, its coupling to a current, evaluation of certain integrals over η , and the embedding of on-shell (linearized) gravitational waves and the stress-energy tensor in the η -space action with $\rho = 0$. In the interest of brevity, we state the relevant results with minimal commentary, referring the reader to specific sections of [10] for elaboration and context.

Field Mode Expansion: Up to gauge terms, a general solution to the CSP equation of motion can be decomposed as

$$\Psi(\eta, x) = \int \frac{d^3\mathbf{k}}{(2\pi)^3} \frac{1}{2|\mathbf{k}|} \sum_h \left(a_h(\mathbf{k}) \psi_{h,\mathbf{k}} e^{-i\mathbf{k}\cdot x} + \text{c.c.} \right) \Big|_{k^0=|\mathbf{k}|} \quad (3.1)$$

with

$$\psi_{h,\mathbf{k}} = e^{-i\rho_g \eta \cdot q} \times \begin{cases} (i\eta \cdot \epsilon^+)^h & h \geq 0 \\ (-i\eta \cdot \epsilon^-)^{-h} & h \leq 0 \end{cases} \quad (3.2)$$

(see (2.30) and (2.31) of [10]). This decomposition is given in terms of a set of null ‘‘frame’’ vectors ϵ^\pm, q for given momentum k satisfying $\epsilon^- = \epsilon^{+*}$, $k \cdot q = 1$, and $\epsilon_+ \cdot \epsilon_- = -2$ with all other inner products vanishing. As with the choice of polarization vectors in more familiar gauge theories, expansions using different choices of ϵ^\pm and q are related by a gauge + little group transformation. For a wave propagating along the z -axis, $k_\mu = (\omega, 0, 0, \omega)$, a convenient choice is $\epsilon_\mu^\pm = (0, 1, \pm i, 0)$ and $q_\mu = (1/2\omega, 0, 0, -1/2\omega)$, for which the modes $\psi_{h,\mathbf{k}}$ are eigenmodes of the usual helicity operator $\mathbf{J} \cdot \hat{\mathbf{k}}$ with eigenvalue h . In the next subsection, we will relate the previously considered $H^{(+)}$ and $H^{(\times)}$ modes to real superpositions of the $h = \pm 2$ modes with $\rho_g = 0$.

CSP Field Coupling to Currents: A general linear CSP coupling to an external current can be written as

$$S_{\text{int}} = \int [d^4\eta] d^4x \delta'(\eta^2 + 1) J(\eta, x) \Psi(\eta, x), \quad (3.3)$$

where $J(\eta, x)$ must respect the continuity condition

$$\delta(\eta^2 + 1)(\partial_x \cdot \partial_\eta + \rho_g) J(\eta, x) = 0 \quad (3.4)$$

in order to ensure gauge invariance (see (3.17) and (3.23) of [10]). In the above, $[d^4\eta]$ is a regulated measure discussed briefly below and in depth in Appendix A of [10], which satisfies the usual integration-by-parts and δ -function identities; $\delta'(a) = \frac{d}{da} \delta(a)$; and ∂_x and ∂_η denote $\partial/\partial x$ and $\partial/\partial \eta$, respectively.

We also refer the reader to Section III of [10] for a pedagogical overview of currents sourced by spinless particles that give rise to scalar- and vector-like interactions with CSP fields (those dominated at energies $\gg \rho_g$ by the helicity 0 or ± 1 modes of the CSP), which we generalize here to the tensor-like case (dominated by helicity 2).

We also note here an important convention difference from [10] to the present work. The analysis of [10] used canonically normalized (mass-dimension 1) fields $\Psi(\eta, x)$ and currents $J(\eta, x)$ of mass-dimension 3. To mimic more closely the conventions of linearized

GR, we will work from here forward with fields and currents that have been scaled by $\sqrt{\kappa}$ and $1/\sqrt{\kappa}$ respectively (where $\kappa = 8\pi G_N$), so that Ψ is dimensionless and currents have mass-dimension 4.

Integration over η : Integrals $\int d^4\eta \delta'(\eta^2 + 1) f(\eta)$ are naively divergent; loosely speaking, the notation $[d^4\eta]$ signifies normalizing by this divergent factor — a procedure that can be made rigorous using generating function arguments or by analytic continuation of η^0 , which renders the surface of integration $\eta^2 + 1 = 0$ compact. Both approaches are discussed in Appendix B of [10]. All integrals used here are of the form

$$\int [d^4\eta] \delta'(\eta^2 + 1) \eta^{\mu_1} \dots \eta^{\mu_n} e^{i\eta \cdot V} \quad (3.5)$$

with $n = 0$ or 2 , or its $V \rightarrow 0$ limit with $n = 0, 2$, or 4 . All such integrals follow from repeated differentiation with respect to V of (A18) from [10],

$$\int [d^4\eta] \delta'(\eta^2 + 1) e^{i\eta \cdot V} = J_0(\sqrt{-V^2}). \quad (3.6)$$

For example,

$$\int [d^4\eta] \delta'(\eta^2 + 1) \eta^\mu \eta^\nu e^{i\eta \cdot V} = -\frac{\partial}{\partial V_\mu} \frac{\partial}{\partial V_\nu} J_0(\sqrt{-V^2}) \quad (3.7)$$

$$= -\mathbf{g}^{\mu\nu} \frac{J_1(\sqrt{-V^2})}{\sqrt{-V^2}} + V^\mu V^\nu \frac{J_2(\sqrt{-V^2})}{V^2} \quad (3.8)$$

and from the $V \rightarrow 0$ limits of (3.6) and (3.8),

$$\int [d^4\eta] \delta'(\eta^2 + 1) = 1, \quad (3.9)$$

$$\int [d^4\eta] \eta^\mu \eta^\nu \delta'(\eta^2 + 1) = -\frac{1}{2} \mathbf{g}^{\mu\nu}. \quad (3.10)$$

Taking two more derivatives and then the $V \rightarrow 0$ limit we obtain

$$\int [d^4\eta] \delta'(\eta^2 + 1) \eta^\mu \eta^\nu \eta^\rho \eta^\sigma = \frac{1}{8} (\mathbf{g}^{\mu\nu} \mathbf{g}^{\rho\sigma} + \mathbf{g}^{\mu\rho} \mathbf{g}^{\nu\sigma} + \mathbf{g}^{\mu\sigma} \mathbf{g}^{\nu\rho}). \quad (3.11)$$

Extracting the Graviton Mode at $\rho_g = 0$: When $\rho_g = 0$, the free action of [10] can be decomposed into a sum of familiar actions for rank- h tensor fields encoding helicities $\pm h$ (Section IIB of [10]), and the interaction (3.3) likewise decomposes into a sum of couplings between helicity- h modes and conserved rank- h tensor currents (Eqs. (3.18)-(3.21) and Appendix B1 of [10]). We need only two results from this general machinery: First, on-shell $h = \pm 2$ graviton modes are embedded in Ψ as

$$\Psi(\eta, x) = 2\eta^\mu \eta^\nu h_{\mu\nu} \quad (3.12)$$

(eq. (2.8) of [10] with trace terms omitted since they vanish on-shell).

Second, a current of the form

$$J(\eta, x) = (\eta^\mu \eta^\nu + \frac{1}{2} \mathbf{g}^{\mu\nu}) T_{\mu\nu} \quad (3.13)$$

sources the graviton field exclusively — this is eq. (3.19) of [10] up to the κ -rescaling noted above.

3.2 Linearized GR Modes in η -space

Using the results above, we now make contact between the formulation of linearized GR coupled to worldlines in Sec. 2 and the η -space formalism of [9, 10] with $\rho = 0$.

Mode Expansion for $\rho_g = 0$: In the $\rho_g \rightarrow 0$ limit, the $h = \pm 2$ modes from (3.2) are monomials quadratic in η ,

$$\psi_{\pm 2, \mathbf{k}} = (i\eta \cdot \epsilon^\pm)^2. \quad (3.14)$$

Note that the polarization tensors defined in (2.7) can be written as

$$H_{\mu\nu}^{(+)} = \frac{-(\epsilon_\nu^+ \epsilon_\nu^+ + \epsilon_\mu^- \epsilon_\mu^-)}{2}, \quad H_{\mu\nu}^{(\times)} = \frac{i(\epsilon_\nu^+ \epsilon_\nu^+ - \epsilon_\mu^- \epsilon_\mu^-)}{2},$$

so that

$$\psi_{+2, \mathbf{k}} + \psi_{-2, \mathbf{k}} = (2\eta^\mu \eta^\nu) H_{\mu\nu}^{(+)}, \quad -i(\psi_{+2, \mathbf{k}} - \psi_{-2, \mathbf{k}}) = (2\eta^\mu \eta^\nu) H_{\mu\nu}^{(\times)}. \quad (3.15)$$

Thus, taking mode amplitudes $a_2(\mathbf{k}) = a_{-2}(\mathbf{k}) = (2\pi)^3 2|\mathbf{k}| h_+ \delta^{(3)}(\mathbf{k} - \omega \hat{z})$ and similarly for $-\mathbf{k}$ to obtain a real solution gives

$$\Psi(\eta, x) = (2\eta^\mu \eta^\nu) h_+ \cos(k \cdot x) H_{\mu\nu}^{(+)}. \quad (3.16)$$

This is the η -space form of the field that corresponds to the GW background of section 2, with the $(2\eta^\mu \eta^\nu)$ factor as expected from (3.12).

Worldline Current at $\rho_g = 0$: Following (3.13), the gravitational current at $\rho_g = 0$ is

$$J(\eta, x) = \left(\eta^\mu \eta^\nu + \frac{1}{2} \mathbf{g}^{\mu\nu} \right) T_{\mu\nu}.$$

The continuity condition (3.4) on this ansatz reduces to $\delta(\eta^2 + 1) \eta^\mu \partial^\nu T_{\mu\nu} = 0$, which is equivalent to the usual conservation law $\partial_\nu T_{\mu\nu} = 0$. Using the definition of $T_{\mu\nu}$ from (2.12), we have

$$J(\eta, x) = \int d\tau (2\eta^\mu \eta^\nu + \mathbf{g}^{\mu\nu}) \frac{\dot{\gamma}_\mu(\tau) \dot{\gamma}_\nu(\tau)}{4} \delta^{(4)}(x_\alpha - \gamma_\alpha(\tau)) \quad (3.17)$$

Interaction Term: We can now combine (3.17) and (3.16) to derive a matter action in the presence of a gravitational wave background. We have

$$S_{\text{int}} = \frac{h_+}{2} \int d\tau [d^4 \eta] \delta'(\eta^2 + 1) \frac{d^4 l}{(2\pi)^4} d^4 x \left((i\eta \cdot \epsilon^+)^2 + (i\eta \cdot \epsilon^-)^2 \right) \times (2(\eta \cdot \dot{\gamma})^2 + \dot{\gamma}^2) \cos(k \cdot x) e^{-il(x-\gamma)} \quad (3.18)$$

Integrating over l , x , and η , using (3.10) and (3.11) for the latter, we find

$$S_{\text{int}} = \frac{h_+}{2} \int d\tau \frac{-(\epsilon_\nu^+ \epsilon_\nu^+ + \epsilon_\mu^- \epsilon_\mu^-)}{2} \frac{\dot{\gamma}^\mu \dot{\gamma}^\nu}{e} \cos(k \cdot \gamma) = \frac{h_+}{2} \int d\tau H_{\mu\nu}^{(+)} \frac{\dot{\gamma}^\mu \dot{\gamma}^\nu}{e} \cos(k \cdot \gamma) \quad (3.19)$$

This matches (2.12), with the delta function integrated out and the $+$ polarization of the gravitational wave substituted into the action.

3.3 Gravity at $\rho_g \neq 0$ at leading order in G_N

Now, we express the linearized in gravity CSP field, and the matter current with CSP interactions in η -space. For the rest of this paper, we will drop the g subscript in ρ_g .

Current: The current is determined by the ρ -dependent continuity condition. It is easier to work in momentum space,

$$J(\eta, x) = \int \frac{d^4 l}{(2\pi)^4} d\tau e^{-il \cdot (x-\gamma)} j(\eta, l, \dot{\gamma}) \quad (3.20)$$

where the continuity condition (3.4) becomes

$$e^{il \cdot \gamma} \delta(\eta^2 + 1) (-il \cdot \partial_\eta + \rho) j(\eta, l, \dot{\gamma}) = 0 + \partial_\tau(\dots). \quad (3.21)$$

Note that the continuity condition on $j(\eta, l, \dot{\gamma})$ need only be satisfied up to a total τ derivative. We also impose the boundary condition that in the $\rho \rightarrow 0$ limit, we recover (3.17), the EMT. As discussed in [10], this is one of the three types of $\rho \rightarrow 0$ limits that currents can obey in general, the other two corresponding to a vector-like interactions and the other scalar-like. A solution that matches this boundary condition and satisfies the continuity condition (3.21) is

$$j(\eta, l, \dot{\gamma}) = - \left(\frac{l \cdot \dot{\gamma}}{\rho} \right)^2 \left(\exp \left(-i\rho \frac{\eta \cdot \dot{\gamma}}{l \cdot \dot{\gamma}} \right) - 1 + i\rho \frac{\eta \cdot \dot{\gamma}}{l \cdot \dot{\gamma}} \right) + \frac{\dot{\gamma}^2}{2} \exp \left(-i\rho \frac{\eta \cdot \dot{\gamma}}{l \cdot \dot{\gamma}} \right) \quad (3.22)$$

The exponential pieces satisfy (3.21) exactly, with no total τ -derivative correction. The subtraction terms constant and linear in η do not, but can be expressed via integration by parts in terms of total τ derivatives (which are allowed by the continuity condition), and terms that depend on $\ddot{\gamma}$. The latter are precise counterparts to the non-conserved terms in the matter EMT in GR, and are higher order in G_N . We note that other solutions to (3.21) exist (e.g. forms with different structures in the exponential) but all solutions with the same $\rho \rightarrow 0$ limiting behavior will yield the same results for on-shell observables (like the strain) as this solution. This is demonstrated in [10], and is absolutely crucial to allowing unambiguous predictions of the ρ -dependent physics.

Tensor-Like CSP: Starting from the mode expansion in (3.1), keeping the ρ dependent pieces, and using the amplitudes defined in (3.16) to do the integral over the Fourier modes, we obtain,

$$\Psi_+(\eta, x) = h_+ \left((i\eta \cdot \epsilon^+)^2 + (i\eta \cdot \epsilon^-)^2 \right) \left(e^{-i\rho\eta \cdot q} e^{-ik \cdot x} + e^{i\rho\eta \cdot q} e^{ik \cdot x} \right). \quad (3.23)$$

Interaction Term: The interaction term is constructed by using the the ρ -dependent current (3.22), and the CSP mode expansion (3.23),

$$S_{\text{int}} = h_+ \int d\tau [d^4 \eta] \delta'(\eta^2 + 1) \frac{d^4 l}{(2\pi)^4} d^4 x \left((i\eta \cdot \epsilon^+)^2 + (i\eta \cdot \epsilon^-)^2 \right) \left(\frac{\dot{\gamma}^2}{2} - \left(\frac{l \cdot \dot{\gamma}}{\rho} \right)^2 \right) \\ \times \left(e^{-i\rho\eta \cdot q} e^{-ik \cdot x} + e^{i\rho\eta \cdot q} e^{ik \cdot x} \right) e^{-i\rho \frac{\eta \cdot \dot{\gamma}}{l \cdot \dot{\gamma}}} e^{-il(x-\gamma)}. \quad (3.24)$$

In this expression, we have dropped the subtraction terms in (3.23), as they do not contribute to the equations of motion. Gauge terms can also be added, and like in the GR case, they do change the equations of motion, but they do not affect the strain or other gauge invariant observables. To simplify η -integrals, we define

$$V^\mu = \rho \left(q^\mu - \frac{\dot{\gamma}^\mu}{k \cdot \dot{\gamma}} \right) \quad (3.25)$$

Using the above definition in (3.24), and doing the integral over the Fourier modes, space-time, and η , we obtain,

$$\begin{aligned} S_{\text{int}} = 2h_+ \int \frac{d\tau}{e} \left(\frac{\dot{\gamma}^2}{2} - \left(\frac{k \cdot \dot{\gamma}}{\rho} \right)^2 \right) J_2 \left(\sqrt{-V^2} \right) \cos(k \cdot \gamma) \\ \times \left(\left(\frac{\epsilon^+ \cdot V}{|\epsilon^+ \cdot V|} \right)^2 + \left(\frac{\epsilon^- \cdot V}{|\epsilon^- \cdot V|} \right)^2 \right) \end{aligned} \quad (3.26)$$

Using the identities from appendix C.1, and defining $\zeta = \epsilon^+ \cdot \dot{\gamma}$, and $\bar{\zeta} = \epsilon^- \cdot \dot{\gamma}$, the above interaction term simplifies to

$$S_{\text{int}} = 2h_+ \int \frac{d\tau}{e} \left(\frac{\dot{\gamma}^2}{2} - \left(\frac{k \cdot \dot{\gamma}}{\rho} \right)^2 \right) \left(\frac{\zeta^2 + \bar{\zeta}^2}{\zeta \bar{\zeta}} \right) J_2 \left(\left(\frac{\rho}{k \cdot \dot{\gamma}} \right) \sqrt{\zeta \bar{\zeta}} \right) \cos(k \cdot \gamma) \quad (3.27)$$

Note that in the $\rho \rightarrow 0$ limit,

$$\begin{aligned} & 2h_+ \int \frac{d\tau}{e} \left(\frac{\dot{\gamma}^2}{2} - \left(\frac{k \cdot \dot{\gamma}}{\rho} \right)^2 \right) \left(\frac{\zeta^2 + \bar{\zeta}^2}{\zeta \bar{\zeta}} \right) \frac{1}{8} \left(\left(\frac{\rho}{k \cdot \dot{\gamma}} \right) \sqrt{\zeta \bar{\zeta}} \right)^2 \cos(k \cdot \gamma) \\ &= -\frac{h_+}{4} \int \frac{d\tau}{e} (\zeta^2 + \bar{\zeta}^2) \cos(k \cdot \gamma) \\ &= \frac{h_+}{2} \int d\tau \frac{\dot{\gamma}^\mu \dot{\gamma}^\nu}{e} H_{\mu\nu}^{(+)} \cos(k \cdot \gamma), \end{aligned} \quad (3.28)$$

and we nicely recover (3.19) (and therefore, (2.12)) for the GR interaction term in a GW background.

3.4 Matter Trajectories in a $\rho_g \neq 0$ Gravitational Wave Background, and the Strain

In this subsection, we compute the equation of motion with the interaction term (3.27). We then match boundary conditions on the geodesics that satisfy the equation of motion, to extract the strain signature.

Equation of Motion: The Lagrangian for a background CSP field interacting with matter in the worldline formalism is

$$L = \frac{\dot{\gamma}^2}{2e} + \frac{2h_+}{e} \left(\frac{\dot{\gamma}^2}{2} - \left(\frac{k \cdot \dot{\gamma}}{\rho} \right)^2 \right) \left(\frac{\zeta^2 + \bar{\zeta}^2}{\zeta \bar{\zeta}} \right) J_2 \left(\left(\frac{\rho}{k \cdot \dot{\gamma}} \right) \sqrt{\zeta \bar{\zeta}} \right) \cos(k \cdot \gamma) + em^2. \quad (3.29)$$

Once again, we expand the worldline γ in h using (2.16), to obtain zeroth and linear-order equations of motion

$$\ddot{\gamma}_\mu^{(0)} = 0 \quad \text{and} \quad \ddot{\gamma}_\mu^{(+)} = A_\mu^{(+)} \sin(k \cdot \gamma^{(0)}). \quad (3.30)$$

These are identical to (2.14), except that the coefficient function $A_\mu^{(+)}$, given in Appendix C.2, is now deformed by ρ . However, as in the GW case, the coefficient function is τ -independent.

The solution to the zeroth and linear order equation of motion are

$$\gamma_\mu^{(0)}(\tau) = b_\mu^{(0)} + c_\mu^{(0)}\tau, \quad \text{and} \quad \gamma_\mu^{(+)}(\tau) = b_\mu^{(+)} + c_\mu^{(+)}\tau + \frac{A_\mu^{(+)}}{(k \cdot \dot{\gamma}^{(0)})^2} \sin(k \cdot \gamma^{(0)}). \quad (3.31)$$

The constants of integration are the same as in (2.19), so the boundary condition matching procedure is no different that what we did in section 2.3.

The einbein constraint in the presence of the background CSP field is

$$\frac{\dot{\gamma}^2}{2} + 2h_+ \left(\frac{\dot{\gamma}^2}{2} - \left(\frac{k \cdot \dot{\gamma}}{\rho} \right)^2 \right) \left(\frac{\zeta^2 + \bar{\zeta}^2}{\zeta \bar{\zeta}} \right) J_2 \left(\left(\frac{\rho}{k \cdot \dot{\gamma}} \right) \sqrt{\zeta \bar{\zeta}} \right) \cos(k \cdot \gamma) = e^2 m^2 \quad (3.32)$$

Expanding this constraint, we get the mass-shell condition from the zeroth order constraint, as noted in (2.20). The constraint linear in h_+ is

$$\begin{aligned} (\dot{\gamma}^{(0)} \cdot \dot{\gamma}^{(+)}) &= -2h_+ \left(\frac{(\dot{\gamma}^{(0)})^2}{2} - \left(\frac{k \cdot \dot{\gamma}^{(0)}}{\rho} \right)^2 \right) \left(\frac{\epsilon^+ \cdot \dot{\gamma}^{(0)}}{\epsilon^- \cdot \dot{\gamma}^{(0)}} + \frac{\epsilon^- \cdot \dot{\gamma}^{(0)}}{\epsilon^+ \cdot \dot{\gamma}^{(0)}} \right) \\ &\quad \times J_2 \left(\left(\frac{\rho}{k \cdot \dot{\gamma}^{(0)}} \right) \sqrt{(\epsilon^+ \cdot \dot{\gamma}^{(0)}) (\epsilon^- \cdot \dot{\gamma}^{(0)})} \right) \cos(k \cdot \gamma^{(0)}) \end{aligned} \quad (3.33)$$

Strain: For the mirror geodesics, we once again pick $e(\tau) = 1/m$. The zeroth order geodesics are fixed using the same arguments as in section 2.3. Using these, we find that the ρ deformed $A_\mu^{(+)}$ is vanishing for the mirrors, since the argument of the Bessel function is vanishing. Furthermore, the linear order geodesic constraint also reduces to $\dot{\gamma}^{(0)} \cdot \dot{\gamma}^{(+)} = 0$ for the same reason. Therefore, in the presence of CSP's, the mirror geodesics are still the same as in (2.22).

For the emitted photon $\gamma_e(\tau_e)$, the boundary conditions that we match are exactly the same as in (2.23), and (2.24). Using the zeroth order einbein constraint for the CSP case we again get that $\beta_e^{(0)} = L$. Like we did for the GW case, $\beta_e^{(+)}$ can be extracted by integrating the linear order einbein constraint over the path of the photon.

$$\dot{\gamma}_e^{(0)} \cdot \dot{\gamma}_e^{(+)}(\tau_*) = \frac{4h_+}{\rho^2} \left(k \cdot \dot{\gamma}_e^{(0)} \right) J_2 \left(\frac{\rho}{\omega} \right) \sin(k \cdot \gamma^{(0)}(\tau_*)) \quad (3.34)$$

Where once again, we have utilized that $\gamma_\mu^{(0)}$ is a linear function of τ . Using the values of the coefficients from (2.23), and (2.24), we have

$$\beta_e^{(+)} = 4h_+ \sin(L\omega) \left(\frac{\omega}{\rho^2} \right) J_2 \left(\frac{\rho}{\omega} \right) \quad (3.35)$$

The constants for the reflected photon $\gamma_r(\tau_r)$ are determined in a similar fashion. An analogous implementation of the integrated linear order einbein constraint fixes

$$\tau_{1,i} = 2L + 4h_+ \sin(2L\omega) \left(\frac{\omega}{\rho^2} \right) J_2 \left(\frac{\rho}{\omega} \right). \quad (3.36)$$

Noting that $\tau_{1,i}$ is the detector frame time taken for a photon to complete a round trip. We can now read off the time-delay by subtracting $2L$, and therefore the strain in the presence of a background CSP field,

$$g_{\text{CSP}} = \frac{\delta T_{\text{CSP}}}{T} = h_+ \left(\frac{2\omega}{L\rho^2} \right) \sin(2L\omega) J_2 \left(\frac{\rho}{\omega} \right). \quad (3.37)$$

As a check, we consider the $\rho/\omega \ll 1$ limit, where the strain becomes,

$$\frac{\delta T_{\rho \ll \omega}}{T} = h_+ \frac{\sin(2L\omega)}{4L\omega} \left(1 - \frac{1}{12} \left(\frac{\rho}{\omega} \right)^2 \right). \quad (3.38)$$

Clearly, setting $\rho = 0$ recovers (2.28).




Figure 2. The ratio of the gravitational strain for the CSP case ($\rho \neq 0$) to the gravitational strain in GR for as a function of ρ/ω . At $\omega \gg \rho$, we see that the strain approaches the usual strain in GR. At $\omega \ll \rho$, the strain is suppressed and vanishes in the $\omega \rightarrow 0$ (or $\rho \rightarrow \infty$) limit. The sign of the strain has no physical significance (an ordinary $\rho = 0$ gravitational wave with a phase of π also produces a negative strain). The intercepts with zero are more physical: they correspond to values of ρ/ω for which the detector is completely unaffected by helicity-2 waves transverse to it. Note, however, that these “sensitivity zeros” will occur at different values of ω for waves impinging on the detector obliquely (in general, the argument of J_2 in (3.32) depends on the angle of $\hat{\gamma}^{(0)}$ relative to k , and (3.34) assumes a right angle).

We can see (see figure 2) that the observed strain relative to GR is suppressed as the graviton spin-scale is increased, and in the $\rho \rightarrow \infty$ limit, the signal vanishes. The qualitative reduction in signal for nonzero ρ can be understood as follows: The normal GW time delay

comes from an interaction term that is purely quadrupolar. The CSP GW solution (3.1) is also spatially quadrupole about the z -axis in the lab frame — however, from the perspective of an observer boosted in the x or y direction, the $e^{\pm i\rho\eta\cdot q}$ factors induce mixing with both higher and lower multipoles with a strength controlled by ρ/ω . Our idealized gravitational wave detector with two arms at right angles, perpendicular to the wave, is not sensitive to generic multipoles. Therefore, the mode mixing seen by boosted objects (including the null geodesics in our toy interferometer) has the effect of suppressing a quadrupole GW signal. Of course, analogous effects at the gravitational wave source will also generate ρ -suppressed waves in the “partner” polarization modes with helicities $h \neq \pm 2$. The nearest-neighbor helicities ± 1 and ± 3 can also contribute to the detected signal at the same $O(\rho^2)$ level as the depletion in (3.38). We defer consideration of this effect to future work, but note that for (semi)non-relativistic sources such as binary systems at an early stage of inspiral, we expect this effect to be $O(\rho v/\omega)^2$, and therefore parametrically smaller than the $O(\rho/\omega)^2$ suppression in the helicity-2 signal discussed here.

4 Future Directions

In this paper, we computed the gravitational time delay for an idealized photon interferometer setup for the case where the graviton is a CSP particle. We demonstrated that for the η -space interaction currents used in our analysis, the appropriate GR results are recovered in the $\rho \rightarrow 0$ limit. At non-zero ρ , the time delay signature differs significantly only for frequencies $\omega \lesssim \rho$, and in particular is suppressed relative to the predictions of GR. These results represent the first predictions computed for gravity when the graviton spin-scale ρ is non-zero, and we expect these results to be useful for measuring and/or constraining the graviton spin scale ρ in ongoing and future GW experiments.

For this calculation, we used two simplifications. The first is that we treat the photon as a scalar. While this is sufficient for our analysis here, the CSP coupling to photon (or matter) spin degrees of freedom would be interesting to investigate. Secondly, we used a monochromatic background wave composed only of $h = \pm 2$ modes, which ignores $O(\rho)$ corrections to the originating GW production mechanism. In principle, the underlying production process could create partner $h \neq \pm 2$ modes of the graviton at $O(\rho/\omega)$, which is also the leading order at which the strain is affected in this calculation (see (3.38)). Computing and understanding the production of these partner modes in astrophysical sources is both tractable with the present formalism and would be very interesting to study. To compute a realistic waveform in sources, including non-linear effects, a more complete theory of interacting CSP’s is required, which is presently a pressing direction of ongoing work.

Even with the present limitations to the linear regime, it would be interesting to compute waveforms for binary mergers, and use them to predict signals for LIGO [62]. Given that the largest departures from GR occur at lower frequencies, $\omega < \rho$, one might expect future experiments such as LISA [68–71], the Einstein Telescope [72–74], and Cosmic Explorer [75–77], to be more sensitive to CSP gravity, as these experiments will focus on lower frequencies than LIGO.

One can also look for CSP signatures in the stochastic gravitational wave background, which are measured using Pulsar Timing Array's (PTA's) [78, 79]. The recent data releases from PTA groups around the world [80–90] demonstrate an angular correlation that is suggestive of the Hellings-Downs predictions consistent with GR, but with significant error bars. Computing the size of non-quadrupole signatures due to a CSP gravitational wave background could potentially open another avenue for measures or constraining the gravitational spin-scale ρ .

Acknowledgments

We thank Shoaib Akhtar, Kevin Zhou, Gowri Sunderesan, and Aidan Reilly for general discussions and feedback. The authors are supported by the U.S. Department of Energy under contract number DE-AC02-76SF00515.

A GW Gauge Terms

A.1 Gauge Terms in Linearized GR

The Fierz-Pauli action, (2.2), has the gauge symmetry (linearized diffeomorphism invariance) as noted in (2.3). In Fourier space, the gauge symmetry implies that

$$\epsilon'_{\mu\nu} = \epsilon_{\mu\nu} + k_\mu \chi_\nu + k_\nu \chi_\mu \quad (\text{A.1})$$

where $k_\mu = (\omega, 0, 0, \omega)$ is the 4-vector for a wave propagating along the z -axis (as we fixed for our GW), and χ_μ is some arbitrary 4-vector. Combining the above expression with (2.4) gives us only two possible polarization states as defined in (2.7), up to some overall undetermined constant. For more details on the how this is done, the reader is referred to [91]. The gauge terms are

$$h_{\mu\nu}^{\text{gauge}}(z) = \sum_{i=1,2,3} H_{\mu\nu}^{(i)} h_i \cos(k \cdot z + \phi^{(i)}) \quad (\text{A.2})$$

Where $\phi^{(i)}$, and h_i are arbitrary phases and amplitudes, respectively, associated with each gauge term. For consistency, the gauge terms are monochromatic, with amplitudes comparable to h_+ , and h_\times . We also define $H_{\mu\nu}^{(i)}$, which are "polarization" tensors for the gauge terms.

$$H^{(1)} = \begin{pmatrix} 1 & 0 & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & 0 & -1 \end{pmatrix} \quad H^{(2)} = \frac{1}{2} \begin{pmatrix} 0 & -1 & 0 & 0 \\ -1 & 0 & 0 & 1 \\ 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & 1 & 0 & 0 \end{pmatrix} \quad H^{(3)} = \frac{1}{2} \begin{pmatrix} 0 & 0 & -1 & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 \\ -1 & 0 & 0 & 1 \\ 0 & 0 & 1 & 0 \end{pmatrix} \quad (\text{A.3})$$

A.2 Equations of Motion and Boundary Conditions with Gauge Terms

When considering the gauge terms (A.2), and (A.3) along with the usual polarization states (2.7), the equation of motion, einbein constraint, and the geodesics have the same form as in (2.14), (2.15) and (2.19) respectively, with the sum also including the gauge terms.

The photon geodesic in the presence of gauge terms has a total of $2(5 + 1) = 12$ undetermined 4-vector coefficients (here, following the parameter-counting below (2.19), we have $a = 5$ accounting for terms linear in the 3 gauge “polarizations” as well as the 2 physical ones). These are fixed by matching with the mirrors as was done in 2.3 - term by term for each perturbation parameter.

In section 2.3, the mirror geodesics were fixed by leveraging the fact that we were free to choose the detector rest frame. Including the gauge terms is a departure from the detector rest frame, as we pick up sinusoidal terms proportional to the gauge terms in the geodesics. This motivates us to define the boundary condition as a time average.

$$\langle \mathcal{M}_{1i} \rangle = \lim_{\tau' \rightarrow \infty} \frac{1}{\tau'} \int_0^{\tau'} d\tau_1 \mathcal{M}_{1i}(\tau_1) = L_{1i}. \quad (\text{A.4})$$

Here $\mathcal{M}_{1i}(\tau_1 = 0) = L_{1i}$ is the initial position of the mirror before the passage of the gravitational wave. This averaging kills the sinusoidal terms in the geodesics, but keeps the gauge terms. This tells us that the seemingly ad-hoc choice that we made to choose the detector rest frame is justified. The survival of the gauge terms should not be surprising – the observed geodesics are frame dependent.

The time delay, however, is not dependent on the gauge terms. While the einbein constraint (2.15) picks up gauge terms, when the full calculation is done, to leading order in the perturbative expansion, the time delay is independent of the gauge terms. This serves as a check on the calculation. This analysis can be extended to the CSP case, where the gauge terms can be taken from equation 2.24 of [10]), and in that case too, the answer is independent of the gauge terms.

B Photon Geodesics

B.1 GW Background

Here we list the photon geodesics for the GW case. These are the photons corresponding to $\gamma_e(\tau_e)$, and $\gamma_r(\tau_r)$ as shown in 1, with boundary conditions, and the einbein constraint imposed. We start with the emitted photon, with the time geodesic $t_{(e)}(\tau_e)$, and the 3-vector of spatial geodesics $\vec{\gamma}_{(e)}(\tau_e)$.

$$t_{(e)}(\tau_e) = L \left(\frac{\tau_e}{\tau_*} \right) + h_+ \left(g_e(0, \tau_e) + \frac{\sin \left(L\omega \left(\frac{\tau_e}{\tau_*} \right) \right)}{2\omega} \right) \quad (\text{B.1})$$

$$\vec{\gamma}_{(e)}(\tau_e) = L \left(\frac{\tau_e}{\tau_*} \right) (1, 0, 0) + h_+ g_e(0, \tau_e) \left(1, 0, \frac{1}{2} \right) \quad (\text{B.2})$$

$$\text{where } -g_e(0, \tau_e) = \left[\frac{\sin(L\omega)}{\omega} \left(\frac{\tau_e}{\tau_*} \right) - \frac{\sin \left(L\omega \left(\frac{\tau_e}{\tau_*} \right) \right)}{\omega} \right]$$

Since $g_e(0, 0) = g_e(0, \tau_*) = 0$, and $\vec{\gamma}_{(e)}(0) = (0, 0, 0)$, and $\tau = \tau_*$, $\vec{\gamma}_{(e)}(\tau_*) = (L, 0, 0)$, which matches the spatial coordinates of \mathcal{M}_1 , and \mathcal{M}_2 respectively. As claimed earlier, the value of τ_* does not matter – it scales how the affine parameter for the photon, τ_e , behaves.

Next, we consider the photons on the return trip, $\gamma_{(r)}(\tau_r)$

$$t_{(r)}(\tau_r) = L \left(1 + \frac{\tau_r}{\tau_\bullet} \right) + h_+ \left(g_r(\tau_r) + \frac{\sin \left(L\omega \left(1 + \frac{\tau_r}{\tau_f} \right) \right)}{2\omega} \right) \quad (\text{B.3})$$

$$\vec{\gamma}_{(r)}(\tau_r) = L \left(1 - \frac{\tau_r}{\tau_\bullet} \right) (1, 0, 0) + h_+ g_r(\tau_r) \left(1, 0, \frac{1}{2} \right) \quad (\text{B.4})$$

$$\text{where } -g_r(0, \tau_r) = \left[\frac{\sin(L\omega)}{\omega} - \left(\frac{\tau_r}{\tau_\bullet} \right) \left(\frac{\sin(L\omega)}{\omega} - \frac{\sin(2L\omega)}{\omega} \right) - \frac{\sin \left(L\omega \left(1 + \frac{\tau_r}{\tau_\bullet} \right) \right)}{\omega} \right]$$

Again, $g_r(0, 0) = g_r(0, \tau_\bullet) = 0$, so the spatial geodesics match the respective mirror geodesics. The time delay is proportional to the h_+ term that survives at $\tau_r = \tau_\bullet$, and this matches the value calculated using the einbein constraint in (2.28).

B.2 CSP GW Background

Here, we list the t and x geodesics for a CSP background. For the emitted photon, we have $t_{(e)}(\tau_e)$, and $x_{(e)}(\tau_e)$.

$$t_{(e)}(\tau_e) = L \left(\frac{\tau_e}{\tau_*} \right) + 2h_+ \left(2 \left(\frac{\omega}{\rho^2} \right) J_2 \left(\frac{\rho}{\omega} \right) \sin \left(L\omega \left(\frac{\tau_e}{\tau_*} \right) \right) + g_e(\rho, \tau_e) \right) \quad (\text{B.5})$$

$$x_{(e)}(\tau_e) = L \left(\frac{\tau_e}{\tau_*} \right) + 2h_+ g_e(\rho, \tau_e) \quad (\text{B.6})$$

$$\text{where } -g_e(\rho, \tau_e) = g_e(0, \tau_e) \left(\left(\frac{\omega}{\rho} \right) \left(J_1 \left(\frac{\rho}{\omega} \right) - J_3 \left(\frac{\rho}{\omega} \right) \right) + 2J_2 \left(\frac{\rho}{\omega} \right) \right)$$

On taking the $\rho \rightarrow 0$ limit, these recover (B.1), and (B.2). Given that the τ_e behavior of $g_e(\rho, \tau_e)$ is essentially $g_e(0, \tau_e)$, the x geodesic of the photons agrees with the respective mirror.

For the return trip, the geodesics are $t_{(r)}(\tau_r)$, and $x_{(r)}(\tau_r)$.

$$t_{(r)}(\tau_r) = L \left(1 + \frac{\tau_r}{\tau_\bullet} \right) + 2h_+ \left(2 \left(\frac{\omega}{\rho^2} \right) J_2 \left(\frac{\rho}{\omega} \right) \sin \left(L\omega \left(1 + \frac{\tau_r}{\tau_\bullet} \right) \right) + g_r(\rho, \tau_r) \right) \quad (\text{B.7})$$

$$x_{(r)}(\tau_r) = L \left(1 - \frac{\tau_r}{\tau_\bullet} \right) + 2h_+ g_r(\rho, \tau_r) \quad (\text{B.8})$$

$$\text{where } -g_r(\rho, \tau_r) = g_r(0, \tau_r) \left(\left(\frac{\omega}{\rho} \right) \left(J_1 \left(\frac{\rho}{\omega} \right) - J_3 \left(\frac{\rho}{\omega} \right) \right) + 2J_2 \left(\frac{\rho}{\omega} \right) \right)$$

Again, in the $\rho \rightarrow 0$ limit, these recover (B.3), and (B.4). It is easy to check that this matches the respective mirror geodesics. The time delay can be read off from the term proportional to h_+ that is non-vanishing at $\tau_r = \tau_\bullet$, and this agrees with (3.37).

C CSP - Identities and EoM

C.1 4-Vector Contraction Identities

Consider the CSP interaction term,

$$S_{\text{int}} = h_+ \int \frac{d\tau}{e} \left(\dot{\gamma}^2 - 2 \left(\frac{k \cdot \dot{\gamma}}{\rho} \right)^2 \right) \left(\left(\frac{\epsilon^+ \cdot V}{|\epsilon^+ \cdot V|} \right)^2 + \left(\frac{\epsilon^- \cdot V}{|\epsilon^- \cdot V|} \right)^2 \right) J_2 \left(\sqrt{-V^2} \right) \cos(k \cdot \gamma) \quad (\text{C.1})$$

The contraction of V^μ (defined in (3.25)) with ϵ_μ^\pm are

$$\epsilon^\pm \cdot V = -\rho \frac{\epsilon^\pm \cdot \dot{\gamma}}{k \cdot \dot{\gamma}}, \quad |\epsilon^\pm \cdot V| = \left(\frac{\rho}{k \cdot \dot{\gamma}} \right) \sqrt{(\epsilon^- \cdot \dot{\gamma})(\epsilon^+ \cdot \dot{\gamma})} \quad (\text{C.2})$$

This simplifies the second term in (C.1).

$$\left(\frac{\epsilon^+ \cdot V}{|\epsilon^+ \cdot V|} \right)^2 + \left(\frac{\epsilon^- \cdot V}{|\epsilon^- \cdot V|} \right)^2 = \frac{\epsilon^+ \cdot \dot{\gamma}}{\epsilon^- \cdot \dot{\gamma}} + \frac{\epsilon^- \cdot \dot{\gamma}}{\epsilon^+ \cdot \dot{\gamma}} \quad (\text{C.3})$$

Lastly, recalling that the $\mathbf{g}_{\mu\nu} = (q_\mu k_\nu + q_\nu k_\mu) - (1/2) (\epsilon_+^\mu \epsilon_-^\nu + \epsilon_+^\nu \epsilon_-^\mu)$, allows us to express $\dot{\gamma}^2 = 2(q \cdot \dot{\gamma})(k \cdot \dot{\gamma}) - (\epsilon^{(+)} \cdot \dot{\gamma})(\epsilon^{(-)} \cdot \dot{\gamma})$. The argument of the Bessel function is

$$\sqrt{-V^2} = \sqrt{-\left(\frac{\rho}{k \cdot \dot{\gamma}} \right)^2 \left(\dot{\gamma}^2 - 2(q \cdot \dot{\gamma})(k \cdot \dot{\gamma}) \right)} = \left(\frac{\rho}{k \cdot \dot{\gamma}} \right) \sqrt{(\epsilon^+ \cdot \dot{\gamma})(\epsilon^- \cdot \dot{\gamma})} \quad (\text{C.4})$$

This simplifies the integrand of the interaction term

$$\frac{h_+}{e} \left(\dot{\gamma}^2 - 2 \left(\frac{k \cdot \dot{\gamma}}{\rho} \right)^2 \right) \left(\frac{\epsilon^+ \cdot \dot{\gamma}}{\epsilon^- \cdot \dot{\gamma}} + \frac{\epsilon^- \cdot \dot{\gamma}}{\epsilon^+ \cdot \dot{\gamma}} \right) J_2 \left(\left(\frac{\rho}{k \cdot \dot{\gamma}} \right) \sqrt{(\epsilon^+ \cdot \dot{\gamma})(\epsilon^- \cdot \dot{\gamma})} \right) \cos(k \cdot \gamma) \quad (\text{C.5})$$

C.2 CSP EoM

The CSP EoM can be found in (3.30). Recalling the definitions of $\zeta = \epsilon^+ \cdot \dot{\gamma}$, and $\bar{\zeta} = \epsilon^- \cdot \dot{\gamma}$, we further define $\zeta^{(0)} = \epsilon^+ \cdot \dot{\gamma}^{(0)}$, and $\bar{\zeta}^{(0)} = \epsilon^- \cdot \dot{\gamma}^{(0)}$. Using this, we express the ρ deformed $A_\mu^{(+)}$ function in (3.30).

$$\begin{aligned} & 2h_+ \sin(k \cdot \gamma^{(0)}) \left[-\left(k \cdot \dot{\gamma}^{(0)} \right) \left\{ \left(\dot{\gamma}_\mu^{(0)} - \frac{2(k \cdot \dot{\gamma}^{(0)}) k_\mu}{\rho^2} \right) \left(\frac{\zeta^{(0)}}{\bar{\zeta}^{(0)}} + \frac{\bar{\zeta}^{(0)}}{\zeta^{(0)}} \right) \right. \right. \\ & + \left. \left(\frac{(\dot{\gamma}^{(0)})^2}{2} - \frac{(k \cdot \dot{\gamma}^{(0)})^2}{\rho^2} \right) \left(\frac{\epsilon_\mu^+}{\bar{\zeta}^{(0)}} - \frac{\zeta^{(0)} \epsilon_\mu^-}{(\bar{\zeta}^{(0)})^2} + \frac{\epsilon_\mu^-}{\zeta^{(0)}} - \frac{\bar{\zeta}^{(0)} \epsilon_\mu^+}{(\zeta^{(0)})^2} \right) \right. \\ & + \left. \frac{k_\mu}{(k \cdot \dot{\gamma}^{(0)})} \left(\frac{(\dot{\gamma}^{(0)})^2}{2} - \frac{(k \cdot \dot{\gamma}^{(0)})^2}{\rho^2} \right) \left(\frac{\zeta^{(0)}}{\bar{\zeta}^{(0)}} + \frac{\bar{\zeta}^{(0)}}{\zeta^{(0)}} \right) \right\} J_2 \left(\frac{\rho}{k \cdot \dot{\gamma}^{(0)}} \sqrt{\zeta^{(0)} \bar{\zeta}^{(0)}} \right) \\ & - \frac{1}{2} \left(\frac{(\dot{\gamma}^{(0)})^2}{2} - \frac{(k \cdot \dot{\gamma}^{(0)})^2}{\rho^2} \right) \left(\frac{\epsilon^+ \cdot \dot{\gamma}^{(0)}}{\epsilon^- \cdot \dot{\gamma}^{(0)}} + \frac{\epsilon^- \cdot \dot{\gamma}^{(0)}}{\epsilon^+ \cdot \dot{\gamma}^{(0)}} \right) \left(J_1 \left(\frac{\rho}{k \cdot \dot{\gamma}^{(0)}} \sqrt{\zeta^{(0)} \bar{\zeta}^{(0)}} \right) \right. \\ & \left. \left. - J_3 \left(\frac{\rho}{k \cdot \dot{\gamma}^{(0)}} \sqrt{\zeta^{(0)} \bar{\zeta}^{(0)}} \right) \right) \left(-\frac{\rho k_\mu}{k \cdot \dot{\gamma}^{(0)}} \sqrt{\zeta^{(0)} \bar{\zeta}^{(0)}} + \frac{1}{2} \sqrt{\frac{\zeta^{(0)}}{\bar{\zeta}^{(0)}}} \epsilon_\mu^- + \frac{1}{2} \sqrt{\frac{\bar{\zeta}^{(0)}}{\zeta^{(0)}}} \epsilon_\mu^+ \right) \right] \quad (\text{C.6}) \end{aligned}$$

For massive particles, the argument of the Bessel functions are vanishing since $\zeta^{(0)} = \bar{\zeta}^{(0)} = 0$, and this sets $A_\mu^{(+)} = 0$.

For photons, there are simplifications for our set up. Since the photons are constrained to move along the x -axis, $\zeta^{(0)} = \bar{\zeta}^{(0)}$. The orthogonality of the photon to the background GW gives a constraint $-\vec{k} \cdot \vec{\gamma} = 0$. From this, we get that $k \cdot \dot{\gamma}^{(0)} = \omega \sqrt{\zeta^{(0)} \bar{\zeta}^{(0)}}$. Lastly, photons are massless, so $(\dot{\gamma}^{(0)})^2 = 0$. This gives us the ρ deformed $A_\mu^{(+)}$ for photons.

$$2h_+ \sin(k \cdot \gamma^{(0)}) \left[-2(k \cdot \dot{\gamma}^{(0)}) \left\{ \left(\dot{\gamma}_\mu^{(0)} - \frac{2(k \cdot \dot{\gamma}^{(0)}) k_\mu}{\rho^2} \right) - \frac{k_\mu}{\rho^2} (k \cdot \dot{\gamma}^{(0)}) \right\} J_2\left(\frac{\rho}{\omega}\right) + \left(\frac{k \cdot \dot{\gamma}^{(0)}}{\rho}\right)^2 \left(-\frac{\rho}{\omega} k_\mu + \frac{\epsilon_\mu^-}{2} + \frac{\epsilon_\mu^+}{2} \right) \left(J_1\left(\frac{\rho}{\omega}\right) - J_3\left(\frac{\rho}{\omega}\right) \right) \right] \quad (\text{C.7})$$

References

- [1] Eugene P. Wigner. On Unitary Representations of the Inhomogeneous Lorentz Group. *Annals Math.*, 40:149–204, 1939. doi: 10.2307/1968551.
- [2] Steven Weinberg. Feynman Rules for Any Spin. 2. Massless Particles. *Phys. Rev.*, 134: B882–B896, 1964. doi: 10.1103/PhysRev.134.B882.
- [3] Steven Weinberg. Photons and Gravitons in S -Matrix Theory: Derivation of Charge Conservation and Equality of Gravitational and Inertial Mass. *Phys. Rev.*, 135:B1049–B1056, 1964. doi: 10.1103/PhysRev.135.B1049.
- [4] Steven Weinberg. Photons and gravitons in perturbation theory: Derivation of Maxwell’s and Einstein’s equations. *Phys. Rev.*, 138:B988–B1002, 1965. doi: 10.1103/PhysRev.138.B988.
- [5] Steven Weinberg and Edward Witten. Limits on Massless Particles. *Phys. Lett. B*, 96:59–62, 1980. doi: 10.1016/0370-2693(80)90212-9.
- [6] Philip Schuster and Natalia Toro. On the Theory of Continuous-Spin Particles: Wavefunctions and Soft-Factor Scattering Amplitudes. *JHEP*, 09:104, 2013. doi: 10.1007/JHEP09(2013)104.
- [7] Philip Schuster and Natalia Toro. On the Theory of Continuous-Spin Particles: Helicity Correspondence in Radiation and Forces. *JHEP*, 09:105, 2013. doi: 10.1007/JHEP09(2013)105.
- [8] Philip Schuster and Natalia Toro. A Gauge Field Theory of Continuous-Spin Particles. *JHEP*, 10:061, 2013. doi: 10.1007/JHEP10(2013)061.
- [9] Philip Schuster and Natalia Toro. Continuous-spin particle field theory with helicity correspondence. *Phys. Rev. D*, 91:025023, 2015. doi: 10.1103/PhysRevD.91.025023.
- [10] Philip Schuster, Natalia Toro, and Kevin Zhou. Interactions of Particles with ”Continuous Spin” Fields. *JHEP*, 04:010, 2023. doi: 10.1007/JHEP04(2023)010.
- [11] Philip Schuster and Natalia Toro. Quantum electrodynamics mediated by a photon with continuous spin. *Phys. Rev. D*, 109(9):096008, 2024. doi: 10.1103/PhysRevD.109.096008.
- [12] Brando Bellazzini, Stefano De Angelis, and Marcello Romano. Continuous-Spin Particles, On Shell. 6 2024.

- [13] I. L. Buchbinder, S. Fedoruk, A. P. Isaev, and V. A. Krykhtin. Towards Lagrangian construction for infinite half-integer spin field. *Nucl. Phys. B*, 958:115114, 2020. doi: 10.1016/j.nuclphysb.2020.115114.
- [14] Ā. Burdík, V. K. Pandey, and A. Reshetnyak. BRST–BFV and BRST–BV descriptions for bosonic fields with continuous spin on $R^{1,d-1}$. *Int. J. Mod. Phys. A*, 35(26):2050154, 2020. doi: 10.1142/S0217751X20501547.
- [15] I. L. Buchbinder, S. James Gates, and K. Koutrolikos. Superfield continuous spin equations of motion. *Phys. Lett. B*, 793:445–450, 2019. doi: 10.1016/j.physletb.2019.05.015.
- [16] Konstantin Alkalaev, Alexander Chekmenev, and Maxim Grigoriev. Unified formulation for helicity and continuous spin fermionic fields. *JHEP*, 11:050, 2018. doi: 10.1007/JHEP11(2018)050.
- [17] Victor O. Rivelles. A Gauge Field Theory for Continuous Spin Tachyons. 7 2018.
- [18] I. L. Buchbinder, V. A. Krykhtin, and H. Takata. BRST approach to Lagrangian construction for bosonic continuous spin field. *Phys. Lett. B*, 785:315–319, 2018. doi: 10.1016/j.physletb.2018.07.070.
- [19] Konstantin B. Alkalaev and Maxim A. Grigoriev. Continuous spin fields of mixed-symmetry type. *JHEP*, 03:030, 2018. doi: 10.1007/JHEP03(2018)030.
- [20] M. V. Khabarov and Yu. M. Zinoviev. Infinite (continuous) spin fields in the frame-like formalism. *Nucl. Phys. B*, 928:182–216, 2018. doi: 10.1016/j.nuclphysb.2018.01.016.
- [21] Xavier Bekaert and Evgeny D. Skvortsov. Elementary particles with continuous spin. *Int. J. Mod. Phys. A*, 32(23n24):1730019, 2017. doi: 10.1142/S0217751X17300198.
- [22] Mojtaba Najafizadeh. Modified Wigner equations and continuous spin gauge field. *Phys. Rev. D*, 97(6):065009, 2018. doi: 10.1103/PhysRevD.97.065009.
- [23] Yu. M. Zinoviev. Infinite spin fields in $d = 3$ and beyond. *Universe*, 3(3):63, 2017. doi: 10.3390/universe3030063.
- [24] R. R. Metsaev. BRST-BV approach to continuous-spin field. *Phys. Lett. B*, 781:568–573, 2018. doi: 10.1016/j.physletb.2018.04.038.
- [25] Victor O. Rivelles. Remarks on a Gauge Theory for Continuous Spin Particles. *Eur. Phys. J. C*, 77(7):433, 2017. doi: 10.1140/epjc/s10052-017-4927-1.
- [26] X. Bekaert, M. Najafizadeh, and M. R. Setare. A gauge field theory of fermionic Continuous-Spin Particles. *Phys. Lett. B*, 760:320–323, 2016. doi: 10.1016/j.physletb.2016.07.005.
- [27] Victor O. Rivelles. Gauge Theory Formulations for Continuous and Higher Spin Fields. *Phys. Rev. D*, 91(12):125035, 2015. doi: 10.1103/PhysRevD.91.125035.
- [28] Anamaria Font, Fernando Quevedo, and Stefan Theisen. A comment on continuous spin representations of the Poincare group and perturbative string theory. *Fortsch. Phys.*, 62: 975–980, 2014. doi: 10.1002/prop.201400067.
- [29] Xavier Bekaert, Nicolas Boulanger, and Per Sundell. How higher-spin gravity surpasses the spin two barrier: no-go theorems versus yes-go examples. *Rev. Mod. Phys.*, 84:987–1009, 2012. doi: 10.1103/RevModPhys.84.987.
- [30] X. Bekaert and J. Mourad. The Continuous spin limit of higher spin field equations. *JHEP*, 01:115, 2006. doi: 10.1088/1126-6708/2006/01/115.

- [31] Abu M. Khan and Pierre Ramond. Continuous spin representations from group contraction. *J. Math. Phys.*, 46:053515, 2005. doi: 10.1063/1.1897663. [Erratum: *J.Math.Phys.* 46, 079901 (2005)].
- [32] Arkady Yu. Segal. Point particle in general background fields versus gauge theories of traceless symmetric tensors. *Int. J. Mod. Phys. A*, 18:4999–5021, 2003. doi: 10.1142/S0217751X03015830.
- [33] Bernard de Wit and Daniel Z. Freedman. Systematics of Higher Spin Gauge Fields. *Phys. Rev. D*, 21:358, 1980. doi: 10.1103/PhysRevD.21.358.
- [34] J. Fang and C. Fronsdal. Massless Fields with Half Integral Spin. *Phys. Rev. D*, 18:3630, 1978. doi: 10.1103/PhysRevD.18.3630.
- [35] Christian Fronsdal. Massless Fields with Integer Spin. *Phys. Rev. D*, 18:3624, 1978. doi: 10.1103/PhysRevD.18.3624.
- [36] K. Hirata. Quantization of Massless Fields with Continuous Spin. *Prog. Theor. Phys.*, 58: 652–666, 1977. doi: 10.1143/PTP.58.652.
- [37] L. F. Abbott. Massless Particles with Continuous Spin Indices. *Phys. Rev. D*, 13:2291, 1976. doi: 10.1103/PhysRevD.13.2291.
- [38] L. P. S. Singh and C. R. Hagen. Lagrangian formulation for arbitrary spin. 1. The boson case. *Phys. Rev. D*, 9:898–909, 1974. doi: 10.1103/PhysRevD.9.898.
- [39] L. P. S. Singh and C. R. Hagen. Lagrangian formulation for arbitrary spin. 2. The fermion case. *Phys. Rev. D*, 9:910–920, 1974. doi: 10.1103/PhysRevD.9.910.
- [40] A. Chakrabarti. Remarks on lightlike continuous spin and spacelike representations of the poincare group. *J. Math. Phys.*, 12:1813–1822, 1971. doi: 10.1063/1.1665809.
- [41] J. Yngvason. Zero-mass infinite spin representations of the poincare group and quantum field theory. *Commun. Math. Phys.*, 18:195–203, 1970. doi: 10.1007/BF01649432.
- [42] I. L. Buchbinder, S. A. Fedoruk, A. P. Isaev, and V. A. Krykhtin. On the off-shell superfield Lagrangian formulation of 4D, N=1 supersymmetric infinite spin theory. *Phys. Lett. B*, 829: 137139, 2022. doi: 10.1016/j.physletb.2022.137139.
- [43] Mojtaba Najafizadeh. Off-shell supersymmetric continuous spin gauge theory. *JHEP*, 02:038, 2022. doi: 10.1007/JHEP02(2022)038.
- [44] Mojtaba Najafizadeh. Supersymmetric Continuous Spin Gauge Theory. *JHEP*, 03:027, 2020. doi: 10.1007/JHEP03(2020)027.
- [45] I. L. Buchbinder, A. P. Isaev, and S. A. Fedoruk. Massless Infinite Spin (Super)particles and Fields. *Proc. Steklov Inst. Math.*, 309(1):46–56, 2020. doi: 10.1134/S0081543820030049.
- [46] I. L. Buchbinder, M. V. Khabarov, T. V. Snegirev, and Yu. M. Zinoviev. Lagrangian formulation for the infinite spin $N=1$ supermultiplets in $d=4$. *Nucl. Phys. B*, 946:114717, 2019. doi: 10.1016/j.nuclphysb.2019.114717.
- [47] R. R. Metsaev. Mixed-symmetry continuous-spin fields in flat and AdS spaces. *Phys. Lett. B*, 820:136497, 2021. doi: 10.1016/j.physletb.2021.136497.
- [48] R. R. Metsaev. Light-cone continuous-spin field in AdS space. *Phys. Lett. B*, 793:134–140, 2019. doi: 10.1016/j.physletb.2019.04.041.
- [49] R. R. Metsaev. Fermionic continuous spin gauge field in (A)dS space. *Phys. Lett. B*, 773: 135–141, 2017. doi: 10.1016/j.physletb.2017.08.020.

- [50] R. R. Metsaev. Continuous spin gauge field in (A)dS space. *Phys. Lett. B*, 767:458–464, 2017. doi: 10.1016/j.physletb.2017.02.027.
- [51] I. L. Buchbinder, S. A. Fedoruk, A. P. Isaev, and V. A. Krykhtin. BRST construction for infinite spin field on AdS_4 . *Eur. Phys. J. Plus*, 139(7):621, 2024. doi: 10.1140/epjp/s13360-024-05430-6.
- [52] R. R. Metsaev. Continuous-spin mixed-symmetry fields in AdS(5). *J. Phys. A*, 51(21): 215401, 2018. doi: 10.1088/1751-8121/aabceda.
- [53] R. R. Metsaev. Cubic interaction vertices for massive/massless continuous-spin fields and arbitrary spin fields. *JHEP*, 12:055, 2018. doi: 10.1007/JHEP12(2018)055.
- [54] Xavier Bekaert, Jihad Mourad, and Mojtaba Najafizadeh. Continuous-spin field propagator and interaction with matter. *JHEP*, 11:113, 2017. doi: 10.1007/JHEP11(2017)113.
- [55] R. R. Metsaev. Cubic interaction vertices for continuous-spin fields and arbitrary spin massive fields. *JHEP*, 11:197, 2017. doi: 10.1007/JHEP11(2017)197.
- [56] Xavier Bekaert, Nicolas Boulanger, and Serge Leclercq. Strong obstruction of the Berends-Burgers-van Dam spin-3 vertex. *J. Phys. A*, 43:185401, 2010. doi: 10.1088/1751-8113/43/18/185401.
- [57] Frits A. Berends, G. J. H. Burgers, and H. van Dam. Explicit construction of conserved currents for massless fields of arbitrary spin. *Nucl. Phys. B*, 271:429–441, 1986. doi: 10.1016/S0550-3213(86)80019-0.
- [58] Frits A. Berends, G. J. H. Burgers, and H. van Dam. On the Theoretical Problems in Constructing Interactions Involving Higher Spin Massless Particles. *Nucl. Phys. B*, 260: 295–322, 1985. doi: 10.1016/0550-3213(85)90074-4.
- [59] G. J. Iverson and G. Mack. Quantum fields and interactions of massless particles - the continuous spin case. *Annals Phys.*, 64:211–253, 1971. doi: 10.1016/0003-4916(71)90284-3.
- [60] G. J. Iverson and G. Mack. Theory of weak interactions with *continuous-spin* neutrinos. *Phys. Rev. D*, 2:2326–2333, 1970. doi: 10.1103/PhysRevD.2.2326.
- [61] Philip Schuster, Gowri Sundaresan, and Natalia Toro. On the Thermodynamics of Continuous Spin photons. 6 2024.
- [62] B. P. Abbott et al. Observation of Gravitational Waves from a Binary Black Hole Merger. *Phys. Rev. Lett.*, 116(6):061102, 2016. doi: 10.1103/PhysRevLett.116.061102.
- [63] Michele Maggiore. *Gravitational Waves. Vol. 1: Theory and Experiments*. Oxford University Press, 2007. ISBN 978-0-19-171766-6, 978-0-19-852074-0. doi: 10.1093/acprof:oso/9780198570745.001.0001.
- [64] Charles W. Misner, K. S. Thorne, and J. A. Wheeler. *Gravitation*. W. H. Freeman, San Francisco, 1973. ISBN 978-0-7167-0344-0, 978-0-691-17779-3.
- [65] Sean M. Carroll. *Spacetime and Geometry: An Introduction to General Relativity*. Cambridge University Press, 7 2019. ISBN 978-0-8053-8732-2, 978-1-108-48839-6, 978-1-108-77555-7. doi: 10.1017/9781108770385.
- [66] Tomas Ortin. *Gravity and Strings*. Cambridge Monographs on Mathematical Physics. Cambridge University Press, 2nd ed. edition, 7 2015. ISBN 978-0-521-76813-9, 978-0-521-76813-9, 978-1-316-23579-9. doi: 10.1017/CBO9781139019750.

- [67] L. P. Grishchuk. Particle drift in the field of a gravitational wave. *Zh. Eksp. Teor. Fiz.*, 66: 833–837, 1974.
- [68] Nicola Bartolo et al. Probing anisotropies of the Stochastic Gravitational Wave Background with LISA. *JCAP*, 11:009, 2022. doi: 10.1088/1475-7516/2022/11/009.
- [69] Enis Belgacem et al. Testing modified gravity at cosmological distances with LISA standard sirens. *JCAP*, 07:024, 2019. doi: 10.1088/1475-7516/2019/07/024.
- [70] K. G. Arun et al. New horizons for fundamental physics with LISA. *Living Rev. Rel.*, 25(1): 4, 2022. doi: 10.1007/s41114-022-00036-9.
- [71] Pau Amaro-Seoane et al. Laser Interferometer Space Antenna. 2 2017.
- [72] B. S. Sathyaprakash, B. F. Schutz, and C. Van Den Broeck. Cosmography with the Einstein Telescope. *Class. Quant. Grav.*, 27:215006, 2010. doi: 10.1088/0264-9381/27/21/215006.
- [73] M. Punturo et al. The Einstein Telescope: A third-generation gravitational wave observatory. *Class. Quant. Grav.*, 27:194002, 2010. doi: 10.1088/0264-9381/27/19/194002.
- [74] B. Sathyaprakash et al. Scientific Objectives of Einstein Telescope. *Class. Quant. Grav.*, 29: 124013, 2012. doi: 10.1088/0264-9381/29/12/124013. [Erratum: *Class.Quant.Grav.* 30, 079501 (2013)].
- [75] David Reitze et al. Cosmic Explorer: The U.S. Contribution to Gravitational-Wave Astronomy beyond LIGO. *Bull. Am. Astron. Soc.*, 51(7):035, 2019.
- [76] Matthew Evans et al. A Horizon Study for Cosmic Explorer: Science, Observatories, and Community. 9 2021.
- [77] Charlie T. Mpeha, Giuseppe Congedo, and Andy Taylor. Future prospects on testing extensions to Λ CDM through the weak lensing of gravitational waves. *Phys. Rev. D*, 107(10): 103518, 2023. doi: 10.1103/PhysRevD.107.103518.
- [78] Steven L. Detweiler. Pulsar timing measurements and the search for gravitational waves. *Astrophys. J.*, 234:1100–1104, 1979. doi: 10.1086/157593.
- [79] Mikhail V. Sazhin. Opportunities for detecting ultralong gravitational waves. *Sov. Astron.*, 22:36–38, 1978.
- [80] Gabriella Agazie et al. The NANOGrav 15 yr Data Set: Evidence for a Gravitational-wave Background. *Astrophys. J. Lett.*, 951(1):L8, 2023. doi: 10.3847/2041-8213/acdac6.
- [81] Gabriella Agazie et al. The NANOGrav 15 yr Data Set: Observations and Timing of 68 Millisecond Pulsars. *Astrophys. J. Lett.*, 951(1):L9, 2023. doi: 10.3847/2041-8213/acda9a.
- [82] J. Antoniadis et al. The second data release from the European Pulsar Timing Array - I. The dataset and timing analysis. *Astron. Astrophys.*, 678:A48, 2023. doi: 10.1051/0004-6361/202346841.
- [83] J. Antoniadis et al. The second data release from the European Pulsar Timing Array - V. Search for continuous gravitational wave signals. *Astron. Astrophys.*, 690:A118, 2024. doi: 10.1051/0004-6361/202348568.
- [84] J. Antoniadis et al. The second data release from the European Pulsar Timing Array - IV. Implications for massive black holes, dark matter, and the early Universe. *Astron. Astrophys.*, 685:A94, 2024. doi: 10.1051/0004-6361/202347433.

- [85] J. Antoniadis et al. The second data release from the European Pulsar Timing Array - III. Search for gravitational wave signals. *Astron. Astrophys.*, 678:A50, 2023. doi: 10.1051/0004-6361/202346844.
- [86] J. Antoniadis et al. The second data release from the European Pulsar Timing Array - II. Customised pulsar noise models for spatially correlated gravitational waves. *Astron. Astrophys.*, 678:A49, 2023. doi: 10.1051/0004-6361/202346842.
- [87] Daniel J. Reardon et al. Search for an Isotropic Gravitational-wave Background with the Parkes Pulsar Timing Array. *Astrophys. J. Lett.*, 951(1):L6, 2023. doi: 10.3847/2041-8213/acdd02.
- [88] Daniel J. Reardon et al. The Gravitational-wave Background Null Hypothesis: Characterizing Noise in Millisecond Pulsar Arrival Times with the Parkes Pulsar Timing Array. *Astrophys. J. Lett.*, 951(1):L7, 2023. doi: 10.3847/2041-8213/acdd03.
- [89] Andrew Zic et al. The Parkes Pulsar Timing Array third data release. *Publ. Astron. Soc. Austral.*, 40:e049, 2023. doi: 10.1017/pasa.2023.36.
- [90] Heng Xu et al. Searching for the Nano-Hertz Stochastic Gravitational Wave Background with the Chinese Pulsar Timing Array Data Release I. *Res. Astron. Astrophys.*, 23(7): 075024, 2023. doi: 10.1088/1674-4527/acdfa5.
- [91] R. P. Feynman. *Feynman lectures on gravitation*. 1996. ISBN 978-0-429-50285-9. doi: 10.1201/9780429502859.