

# Stringent limits on the existence of Planck time from stellar interferometry

Richard Lieu and Lloyd W. Hillman

Department of Physics, University of Alabama, Huntsville, AL 35899, U.S.A.

## Abstract

We present a method of directly testing whether time is ‘grainy’ on scales of  $\leq t_P = (\hbar G/c^5)^{1/2} \approx 5.4 \times 10^{-44}$  s, the Planck time. If the phenomenon exists, the energy and momentum of a photon (quantities which are independently measurable) will be subject to ultimate uncertainties of the form  $\delta E/E \approx \delta p/p \approx (E/E_P)^\alpha$ , where  $E_P = h/t_P$  and  $\alpha \sim 1$ , because surpassing these will lead to ‘super-clocks’ and ‘super-rulers’. A well-known consequence is random perturbation of the photon dispersion equation by a correction term which to lowest order modifies the equation to the form  $p^2 = E^2[1 \pm a_o(E/E_P)^\alpha]$ , where  $a_o \sim 1$  and  $c = 1$ . As a result, the two wave velocities will fluctuate by different amounts, so that after propagating a sufficiently large distance the phase of the radiation will no longer be well-defined, however sharp it might have been when emitted by the source. Since, at optical frequencies, the technique of stellar interferometry readily ascertains whether light from an astronomical object at various distances retains its phase information upon arrival, it is shown here that such observations place stringent limits on the graininess of time. Currently the furthest star from which interference fringes were seen, S Ser, is at  $\sim 1$  kpc, implying that all models with  $\alpha \leq \frac{13}{15}$  are to be rejected, including scenarios based upon random-walk ( $\alpha = 1/2$ ) and the holographic principle of Wheeler and Hawking ( $\alpha = 2/3$ ). The decisive step, of course, is to test the presence or not of the first order term  $E/E_P$  itself (i.e.  $\alpha = 1$ ); for this one must await the imminent observations of extra-galactic sources at  $> 1$  Mpc by the Very Large Telescope Interferometer (here-and-after the VLTI). Based upon the S Ser result, nonetheless, it is already possible to conclude that there is no first order departure from exactness in time over intervals  $\approx 4.2 \times 10^{-40}$  s ( $\approx 10^4$  times longer than the Planck time).

arXiv:astro-ph/0211402v1 18 Nov 2002

It is widely believed that time ceases to be exact at intervals  $\leq t_P$ , where quantum fluctuations in the vacuum metric tensor renders General Relativity an inadequate theory. Both  $t_P$  and its corresponding distance scale  $l_P = ct_P$ , the Planck length, play a vital role in almost all of the many theoretical models (including superstrings) that attempt to explain how the universe was born, and how it evolved during infancy (see e.g, Silk 2000 and references therein). Unfortunately we lack experimental evidence for the existence or not of  $t_P$ . Although the recent efforts in using data from gravitational wave interferometry and the observation of ultra-high energy (UHE) quanta carry potential (Amelino-Camelia 2001, Ng et al 2001, Lieu 2002), they are still some way from delivering a verdict. Here we wish to describe how an entirely different yet well established technique has hitherto been overlooked: not only would it enable direct tests for Planck scale fluctuations (and revealing the detailed properties of any such effects), but also the measurements performed to date could already be used to eliminate prominent theories.

Owing to the variety of proposed models we begin by describing the common feature that define the phenomenon being searched: if a time  $t$  is so small that  $t \rightarrow t_P$  even the best clock ever made will only be able to determine it with an uncertainty  $\delta t \geq t$ . To express this mathematically we may write the intrinsic standard deviation of time as  $\sigma_t/t = f(t_P/t)$ , where  $f \ll 1$  for  $t \gg t_P$  and  $f \geq 1$  for  $t \leq t_P$ . Over the range  $t \gg t_P$  the (hitherto unknown) function  $f$  can be expanded as follows:

$$f(x) = x^\alpha(a_0 + a_1x + a_2x^2 + \dots) \approx a_0x^\alpha \text{ for } x \ll 1, \text{ where } x = \frac{t_P}{t} \text{ and } a_0 \sim 1, \quad (1)$$

and  $\alpha$  is an index which in principle can assume any positive value. Since for the rest of this paper we shall be concerned only with times  $t \gg t_P$  we may take an approximate form of Equ. (1) as:

$$\frac{\sigma_t}{t} \approx \left(\frac{t_P}{t}\right)^\alpha \quad (2)$$

Our appreciation of how Equ. (2) may affect measurements of  $(E, \mathbf{p})$  arises from the realization that if frequencies  $\nu > \nu_P = 1/t_P$  can be determined accurately such a calibration will lead to a ‘superclock’ that keeps time to within  $\delta t < t_P$ . Thus it should be possible to demonstrate that as  $\nu \rightarrow \nu_P$ ,  $\delta\nu/\nu \rightarrow 1$ . In fact, for the case of  $\sigma_t \approx t_P$  (i.e. Equ. (2) with  $\alpha = 1$ ) the following Equ. was shown by Lieu (2002) to be an immediate consequence:

$$\frac{\sigma_\nu}{\nu} \approx \frac{\nu}{\nu_P}, \text{ or } \frac{\sigma_E}{E} \approx \frac{E}{E_P}, \quad (3)$$

where  $E = h\nu$  and  $E_P = h\nu_P = h/t_P \approx 8.1 \times 10^{28}$  eV. Further, for any value of  $\alpha$  it can be proved (see Ng & van Dam 2000) that Eq. (2) leads to:

$$\frac{\sigma_\nu}{\nu} \approx \left(\frac{\nu}{\nu_P}\right)^\alpha, \text{ or } \frac{\sigma_E}{E} \approx \left(\frac{E}{E_P}\right)^\alpha. \quad (4)$$

The same reasoning also applies to the intrinsic uncertainty in data on the momentum  $\mathbf{p}$  (note however for measurements directly taken by an observer  $\delta E$  and  $\delta\mathbf{p}$ , like  $\delta t$  and  $\delta\mathbf{r}$ ,

are uncorrelated errors), for if any component of  $\mathbf{p}$  could be known to high accuracy even in the limit of large  $p$  we would be able to surpass the Planck length limitation in distance determination for that direction. Thus a similar equation may then be formulated as:

$$\frac{\sigma_p}{p} \approx \left( \frac{E}{E_P} \right)^\alpha \quad (5)$$

where  $p$  is the magnitude of  $\mathbf{p}$  and the right side is identical to the previous equation because  $E \approx p$  for photons. Note indeed that Eqs. (4) and (5) hold good for ultra-relativistic particles as well.

About the value of  $\alpha$ , the straightforward choice is  $\alpha = 1$ , which by Equ. (2) implies  $\sigma_t \approx t_P$ , i.e. the most precise clock has uncertainty  $\sim t_P$ . Indeed,  $\alpha = 1$  is just the first order term in a power series expansion of quantum loop gravity. However, the quantum nature of time at scales  $\leq t_P$  may be manifested in other (more contrived) ways. In particular, for random walk models of space-time, where each step has size  $t_P$ ,  $\alpha = 1/2$  (Amelino-Camelia 2000). On the other hand, it was shown (Ng 2002) that as a consequence of the holographic principle (which states that the maximum degrees of freedom allowed within a region of space is given by the volume of the region in Planck units, see Wheeler 1982, Bekenstein 1973, Hawking 1975, 't Hooft 1993, Susskind 1995)  $\sigma_t$  takes the form  $\sigma_t/t = (t_P/t)^{\frac{2}{3}}$ , leading to  $\alpha = 2/3$  in Eqs. (3) and (4). Such an undertaking also has the desirable property (Ng 2002) that it readily implies a finite lifetime  $\tau$  for black holes, viz.,  $\tau \sim G^2 m^3 / \hbar c^4$ , in agreement with the earlier calculations of Hawking. Although the choice of  $\alpha$  is not unique, the fact that it appears as an exponent means different values can lead to wildly varying predictions. Specifically, even by taking  $E = 10^{20}$  eV (i.e. the highest energy particles known, where Planck scale effects are still only  $\sim (E/E_P)^\alpha \approx 10^{-9\alpha}$  in significance), an increment of  $\alpha$  by 0.5 would demand a detection sensitivity 4.5 orders of magnitude higher. The situation gets much worse as  $E$  becomes lower. Thus if an experiment fails to offer confirmation at a given  $\alpha$ , one can always raise the value of  $\alpha$ , and the search may never end. Fortunately, however, it turns out that all of the three scenarios  $\alpha = 1/2, 2/3$ , and 1 may now be observationally clinched.

How do Eqs. (4) and (5) modify our perception of the photon dispersion relation? By writing the relation as:

$$E^2 - p^2 = 0 \quad (6)$$

the answer becomes clear - one simply needs to calculate the uncertainty in  $E^2 - p^2$  due to the intrinsic fluctuations in the measurements of  $E$  and  $\mathbf{p}$ , viz.  $\delta(E^2 - p^2) = 2E\delta E - 2p\delta p$ , bearing in mind that  $\delta E$  and  $\delta p$  are independent variations, as already discussed. This allows us to obtain the standard deviation

$$\sigma_{E^2 - p^2} = 2\sqrt{2}E^2 \left( \frac{E}{E_P} \right)^\alpha \quad (7)$$

Thus, typically a photon will go off-shell, with Eq. (6) replaced by:

$$E^2 - p^2 \approx \pm 2\sqrt{2}E^2 \left( \frac{E}{E_P} \right)^\alpha \quad (8)$$

In the case of a positive fluctuation on the right hand term of Eq. (6) by unit  $\sigma$ , the phase and group velocities of propagation will read, for  $E/E_P \ll 1$ , as:

$$v_p = \frac{E}{p} \approx 1 + \sqrt{2} \left( \frac{E}{E_P} \right)^\alpha; \quad v_g = \frac{dE}{dp} \approx 1 + \sqrt{2}(1 + \alpha) \left( \frac{E}{E_P} \right)^\alpha \quad (9)$$

The results differ from that of a particle - here  $E^2 - p^2$  is a function of  $E$  and not a constant, so that both  $v_p$  and  $v_g$  are  $> 1$ , i.e. greater than the speed of light  $v = 1$ . On the other hand, if the right side of Eq. (6) fluctuates negatively the two wave velocities will read like:

$$v_p = \frac{E}{p} \approx 1 - \sqrt{2} \left( \frac{E}{E_P} \right)^\alpha; \quad v_g = \frac{dE}{dp} \approx 1 - \sqrt{2}(1 + \alpha) \left( \frac{E}{E_P} \right)^\alpha \quad (10)$$

and will both be  $< 1$ .

Is it possible to force a re-interpretation of Equ. (8) in another (more conventional) way, viz., for a particular off-shell mode  $E^2 - p^2$  typically assumes a *constant* value different from zero by about the unit  $\sigma$  of Equ. (7)? The point, however, is that even in this (very artificial) approach, whereby the photon is regarded as a particle of non-vanishing but fixed  $m^2$ , the quantities  $v_p = E/p$  and  $v_g = dE/dp = p/E$  will still disagree with each other randomly by an amount  $\sim (E/E_P)^\alpha$ , so that the chief outcome of Equis. (9) and (10) is robust.

But is such an effect observable? Although an obvious approach is to employ the highest energy radiation, so as to maximize  $E/E_P$ , such quanta are difficult to detect. More familiar types of radiation, e.g. optical light at  $E \approx 1$  eV ( $\lambda \approx 1.24\mu m$ ), have much smaller values of  $E/E_P$ , yet the advantage is that we can measure their properties with great accuracy. Specifically we consider the phase behavior of 1 eV light received from a celestial optical source located at a distance  $L$  away. During the propagation time  $\Delta t = L/v_g$ , the phase has advanced from its initial value  $\phi$  (which we assume to be well-defined) by an amount:

$$\Delta\phi = 2\pi \frac{v_p \Delta t}{\lambda} = 2\pi \frac{v_p L}{v_g \lambda}$$

According to Equis. (9) and (10),  $\Delta\phi$  should then randomly fluctuate in the following manner:

$$\Delta\phi = 2\pi \frac{L}{\lambda} \left[ 1 \pm \sqrt{2}\alpha \left( \frac{E}{E_P} \right)^\alpha \right] \quad (11)$$

In the limit when

$$\sqrt{2}\alpha \left( \frac{E}{E_P} \right)^\alpha \frac{L}{\lambda} \geq 1; \quad \text{or} \quad \frac{\sqrt{2}\alpha}{h} E^{1+\alpha} E_P^{-\alpha} L \geq 1 \quad (12)$$

the phase of the wave will have appreciable probability of assuming any value between 0 and  $2\pi$  upon arrival, irrespective of how sharp the initial phase at the source may be.

From the preceding paragraph, a way towards directly testing whether time remains exact at the Planck scale has become apparent. In stellar interferometry (see e.g. Baldwin & Haniff 2002 for a review) two light rays from an astronomical source travel along different paths to reach two reflectors (within a terrestrial telescope) which subsequently coverge them to form interference fringes. By Equ. (11), however, we see that if the time quantum exists the phase of light from a sufficiently distant source will appear random - when  $L$  is large enough to satisfy Equ. (12) the fringes will disappear. In fact, the value of  $L$  at which Equ. (12) holds may readily be calculated for the case of  $\alpha = 2/3$  and  $\alpha = 1$ , with the results:

$$L \geq 2.47 \times 10^{15} (E/1 \text{ eV})^{-\frac{5}{3}} \text{ cm } (\alpha = \frac{2}{3}); \quad L \geq 7.07 \times 10^{24} (E/1 \text{ eV})^{-2} \text{ cm } (\alpha = 1). \quad (13)$$

These distances correspond respectively to 165 AU (or  $8 \times 10^{-4}$  pc) and 2.3 Mpc.

It is interesting to note that interference effects were clearly seen at  $\lambda = 2.2 \mu\text{m}$  ( $E \approx 0.56 \text{ eV}$ ) light from the star S Ser at 1.012 kpc, using the Infra-red Optical Telescope Array, which enabled a radius determination of the star (van Belle, Thompson, & Creech-Eakman 2002). When comparing with Equ. (13) one realizes that this finding has already excluded the possibility of  $\alpha = 2/3$ , because for such a case  $\Delta\phi$  should carry uncertainties  $\gg 2\pi$ , and the two light rays would not have interfered. Thus the presence of fringe patterns from S Ser implies an absence of the second (correction) term on the right side of Equ. (11) for all  $\alpha \leq \frac{13}{15}$ . In another manner of expression, the S Ser observation has set an upper limit on the effects of Planck scale fluctuations at the level of  $(E/E_P)^{\frac{13}{15}} = 5.42 \times 10^{-26}$  (or  $\approx 2$  parts in  $10^{25}$ ), while the genuine first order correction term is at the level  $\sim E/E_P = 6.96 \times 10^{-30}$ ; the ratio of the two numbers gives, in units of  $t_P$ , the smallest interval over which we currently know that time must remain to first order a precise quantity. This interval is  $\approx 7.8 \times 10^3 t_P$ , or  $4.2 \times 10^{-40}$  s.

Obviously, the milestone point is not yet reached until we can clinch the  $E/E_P$  ( $\alpha = 1$ ) term itself. From Equ. (13) we see that this crucially await the observation of extragalactic objects, which can be done in the foreseeable future by the VLTI of the European Southern Observatory, as it carries an assembly of four 8m mirrors to provide sensitivity for such measurements on sources like M87 and 3C273 at 1-2.5  $\mu\text{m}$  wavelengths (Richichi et al 2002).

RL is grateful to Jonathan Mittaz, Sir Ian Axford, and Lord James McKenzie of the Hebrides and Outer Isles for discussions.

## References

- Amelino-Camelia, G., 2000, Towards quantum gravity, Proc. of the XXXV International Winter School on Theor. Phys., Polanica, Poland, Ed. Jerzy Kowalski- Glikman. Lecture Notes in Phys., 541, 1, Berlin: Springer-Verlag.
- Amelino-Camelia, G., 2001, Nature, 410, 1065.
- Baldwin, J.E., & Haniff, C.A., 2002, Phil. Trans. A360, 969.

- Bekenstein, J.D., 1973, Phys. Rev. D., 7, 2333.
- Hawking, S., 1975, Comm. Math. Phys., 43, 199.
- t'Hooft, G., 1993, in *Salamfestschrift*, p. 284, Ed. A Ali et al (World Scientific, Singapore).
- Lieu, R., 2002, ApJ, 568, L67.
- Ng, Y. -J., & van Dam, H., 2000, Found. Phys., 30, 795.
- Ng, Y. -J., Lee, D. -S., Oh, M.C., & van Dam, H., 2001, Phys. Lett, B507, 236.
- Ng, Y. -J., 2002, Int. J. Mod. Phys., D., in press (to appear in Dec. special issue), gr-qc/0201022.
- Richichi, A., Bloecker, T., Foy, R., Fraix-Burnet, D., Lopez, B., Malbet, F., Stee, P., von der Luehe, O.,
- Weigelt, G., 2000, Proc. SPIE, 4006, 80.
- Silk, J., 2001, The Big Bang, 3rd ed., W.H. Freeman & Co.
- Susskind, L., 1995, J. Math. Phys (N.Y.), 36, 6377.
- van Belle, G.T., Thompson, R.R., Creech-Eakman, M.J., 2002, AJ, 124, 1706.
- Wheeler, J., 1982, Int. J. Theor. Phys., 21, 557.