

A general solution in the Newtonian limit of $f(R)$ - gravity

S. Capozziello^{*◇}, A. Stabile^{†◇‡}, A. Troisi^{‡◇}

[◇] *Dipartimento di Scienze Fisiche and INFN, Sez. di Napoli,
Università di Napoli "Federico II", Compl. Univ. di Monte S. Angelo,
Edificio G, Via Cinthia, I-80126 - Napoli, Italy and*

[‡] *Dipartimento di Ingegneria Meccanica, Università di Salerno,
via Ponte don Melillo, I- 84084 - Fisciano (SA), Italy.*

(Dated: October 27, 2018)

We show that any analytic $f(R)$ -gravity model, in the metric approach, presents a weak field limit where the standard Newtonian potential is corrected by a Yukawa-like term. This general result has never been pointed out but often derived for some particular theories. This means that only $f(R) = R$ allows to recover the standard Newton potential while this is not the case for other relativistic theories of gravity. Some considerations on the physical consequences of such a general solution are addressed.

PACS numbers: 04.25.-g; 04.25.Nx; 04.40.Nr

Keywords: alternative theories of gravity; post-newtonian limit; perturbation theory

$f(R)$ -gravity can be considered a reliable mechanism to explain the cosmic acceleration by extending the geometric sector of field equations [1, 2, 3, 4, 5, 6, 7, 8, 9, 10, 11, 12, 13, 14, 15]. There are several physical and mathematical motivations to enlarge General Relativity (GR) by these theories. For comprehensive reviews, see [16, 17, 18].

Besides, dealing with such extended gravity models at astrophysical scales, one faces the emergence of corrected gravitational potentials with respect to the Newton one coming out from GR. This result is well known since a long time [19, 20] but recently it has been pursued to carry out the possibility to explain the flatness of spiral galaxies rotation curves and the potential of galaxy clusters without adding huge amounts of dark matter [21, 22, 23].

Other issues as, for example, the observed Pioneer anomaly problem [24, 25] can be framed into the same approach [26] and then, apart the cosmological dynamics, a systematic analysis of such theories urges at short scales.

In this letter, we discuss the Newtonian limit of analytic $f(R)$ -gravity models deriving a general solution for the gravitational potential.

The discussion about the short scale behavior of higher order gravity has been quite vivacious in the last years since GR shows its best predictions just at the Solar System level. As matter of fact, measurements coming from weak field limit tests like the bending of light, the perihelion shift of planets and the frame dragging experiments represent inescapable tests for any theory of gravity. Actually, in our opinion, there are sufficient theoretical predictions to state that higher order theories of gravity can be compatible with Newtonian and post-Newtonian prescriptions [28] since the standard Solar System tests can be evaded by several classes of them [27].

Nevertheless, up to now, the discussion on the weak field limit of $f(R)$ -theories is far to be definitive and there are several papers claiming for opposite results [29, 30, 31, 32, 33, 34, 35, 36], or stating that no progress has been reached in the last forty years due to several misconceptions in the various theories of gravity [37, 38].

In particular, people approached the weak limit issue following different schemes and developing different parameterizations which, in some cases, turn out to be not necessarily correct.

The present analysis is based on the metric approach, developed in the Jordan frame, assuming that the observations are performed in it, without resorting to any conformal transformation (see also [40]). This point of view is adopted in order to avoid dangerous variable changes which could compromise the correct physical interpretation of the results. As we will see below, a general gravitational potential, with a Yukawa correction, can be achieved in the Newtonian limit of any analytic $f(R)$ -gravity model. From a phenomenological point of view, this correction allows to consider as viable this kind of models even at small distances, provided that the Yukawa correction turns out to be insignificant in this approximation as in the so called "chameleon mechanism" [39]. From the point of view of the post-Newtonian corrections, such a solution implies a redefinition of the coupling constants in order to fulfill the experimental prescriptions.

As matter of fact, if one evaluates what the corrections are to the Newtonian potential coming from a modified gravity model in a post-Newtonian regime, it is necessary to take into account corrections both at the second order and at the fourth order in the perturbation expansion of the metric. Furthermore, this analysis turns out to be coherent

* e-mail address: capozziello@na.infn.it

† e-mail address: stabile@sa.infn.it

‡ e-mail address: antrois@gmail.com

only if a small r regime is adopted. In this limit, in fact, the potential can be retained reasonably Newtonian-like in relation with experimental results.

Let us start from a general fourth order gravity action :

$$\mathcal{A} = \int d^4x \sqrt{-g} \left[f(R) + \mathcal{X} \mathcal{L}_m \right], \quad (1)$$

where $f(R)$ is an analytic function of Ricci scalar, g is the determinant of the metric $g_{\mu\nu}$, $\mathcal{X} = \frac{16\pi G}{c^4}$ is the coupling constant and \mathcal{L}_m describes the standard fluid-matter Lagrangian. It is well known that such an action is the straight-forward generalization of the Hilbert-Einstein action of GR obtained for $f(R) = R$. Since we are considering the metric approach, field equations are obtained by varying (1) with respect to the metric :

$$f' R_{\mu\nu} - \frac{1}{2} f g_{\mu\nu} - f'_{;\mu\nu} + g_{\mu\nu} \square f' = \frac{\mathcal{X}}{2} T_{\mu\nu}, \quad (2)$$

and the trace is

$$3\square f' + f' R - 2f = \frac{\mathcal{X}}{2} T. \quad (3)$$

$T_{\mu\nu} = \frac{-2}{\sqrt{-g}} \frac{\delta(\sqrt{-g} \mathcal{L}_m)}{\delta g^{\mu\nu}}$ is the energy momentum tensor of matter (T is its trace), $f' = \frac{df(R)}{dR}$ and $\square = ;_{\sigma} ;^{\sigma}$ is the d'Alembert operator.

Actually, as discussed in [40], we deal with the Newtonian and the post-Newtonian limit of $f(R)$ - gravity adopting the spherical symmetry. The solution of field equations can be obtained considering the metric :

$$ds^2 = g_{\sigma\tau} dx^{\sigma} dx^{\tau} = g_{00}(x^0, r) dx^{0^2} + g_{rr}(x^0, r) dr^2 - r^2 d\Omega \quad (4)$$

where $x^0 = ct$ and $d\Omega$ is the angular element.

In order to develop the Newtonian limit, let us consider the perturbed metric with respect to a Minkowskian background $g_{\mu\nu} = \eta_{\mu\nu} + h_{\mu\nu}$. The metric entries can be developed as:

$$\begin{cases} g_{tt}(t, r) \simeq 1 + g_{tt}^{(2)}(t, r) + g_{tt}^{(4)}(t, r) \\ g_{rr}(t, r) \simeq -1 + g_{rr}^{(2)}(t, r) \\ g_{\theta\theta}(t, r) = -r^2 \\ g_{\phi\phi}(t, r) = -r^2 \sin^2 \theta \end{cases}, \quad (5)$$

where we are assuming $c = 1$, $x^0 = ct \rightarrow t$ and applying the formalism developed in [40].

Since we want to obtain the most general result, we does not provide any specific form for the $f(R)$ -Lagrangian. We assume, however, analytic Taylor expandable $f(R)$ functions with respect to a certain value $R = R_0$:

$$f(R) = \sum_n \frac{f^n(R_0)}{n!} (R - R_0)^n \simeq f_0 + f_1 R + f_2 R^2 + f_3 R^3 + \dots \quad (6)$$

In order to obtain the post-Newtonian approximation, one has to insert expansions (5) and (6) into field equations (2) - (3) and expand the system up to the orders $O(0)$, $O(2)$ e $O(4)$. This approach provides general results and specific (analytic) theories are selected by the coefficients f_i in Eq.(6). It is worth noting that, at the order $O(0)$, the field equations give the condition $f_0 = 0$ and then the solutions at further orders do not depend on this parameter as we will show below. If we now consider the $O(2)$ - order approximation, the equations system (2) in vacuum, results to be

$$\begin{cases} f_1 r R^{(2)} - 2f_1 g_{tt,r}^{(2)} + 8f_2 R_{,r}^{(2)} - f_1 r g_{tt,rr}^{(2)} + 4f_2 r R^{(2)} = 0 \\ f_1 r R^{(2)} - 2f_1 g_{rr,r}^{(2)} + 8f_2 R_{,r}^{(2)} - f_1 r g_{tt,rr}^{(2)} = 0 \\ 2f_1 g_{rr}^{(2)} - r[f_1 r R^{(2)} - f_1 g_{tt,r}^{(2)} - f_1 g_{rr,r}^{(2)} + 4f_2 R_{,r}^{(2)} + 4f_2 r R_{,rr}^{(2)}] = 0 \\ f_1 r R^{(2)} + 6f_2 [2R_{,r}^{(2)} + r R_{,rr}^{(2)}] = 0 \\ 2g_{rr}^{(2)} + r[2g_{tt,r}^{(2)} - r R^{(2)} + 2g_{rr,r}^{(2)} + r g_{tt,rr}^{(2)}] = 0 \end{cases} \quad (7)$$

It is evident that the trace equation (the fourth in the system (7)), provides a differential equation with respect to the Ricci scalar which allows to solve exactly the system (7) at $O(2)$ - order. Finally, one gets the general solution :

$$\begin{cases} g_{tt}^{(2)} = \delta_0 - \frac{Y}{f_1 r} - \frac{\delta_1(t)e^{-r\sqrt{-\xi}}}{3\xi r} + \frac{\delta_2(t)e^{r\sqrt{-\xi}}}{6(-\xi)^{3/2}r} \\ g_{rr}^{(2)} = -\frac{Y}{f_1 r} + \frac{\delta_1(t)[r\sqrt{-\xi}+1]e^{-r\sqrt{-\xi}}}{3\xi r} - \frac{\delta_2(t)[\xi r + \sqrt{-\xi}]e^{r\sqrt{-\xi}}}{6\xi^2 r} \\ R^{(2)} = \frac{\delta_1(t)e^{-r\sqrt{-\xi}}}{r} - \frac{\delta_2(t)\sqrt{-\xi}e^{r\sqrt{-\xi}}}{2\xi r} \end{cases} \quad (8)$$

where $\xi \doteq \frac{f_1}{6f_2}$, f_1 and f_2 are the expansion coefficients obtained by Taylor developing the analytic $f(R)$ Lagrangian and Y is an arbitrary integration constant. When we consider the limit $f \rightarrow R$, in the case of a point-like source of mass M , we recover the standard Schwarzschild solution with $Y = 2GM$. Let us notice that the integration constant δ_0 is dimensionless, while the two arbitrary functions of time $\delta_1(t)$ and $\delta_2(t)$ have respectively the dimensions of $length^{-1}$ and $length^{-2}$; ξ has the dimension $length^{-2}$. The functions of time $\delta_i(t)$ ($i = 1, 2$) are completely arbitrary since the differential equation system (7) contains only spatial derivatives and can be settled to constant values. Besides, the integration constant δ_0 can be set to zero since it represents an unessential additive quantity for the potential.

We can now write the general solution of the problem considering the previous expression (8). In order to match at infinity the Minkowskian prescription for the metric, we can discard the Yukawa growing mode in (8) and then we have :

$$\begin{cases} ds^2 = \left[1 - \frac{2GM}{f_1 r} - \frac{\delta_1(t)e^{-r\sqrt{-\xi}}}{3\xi r} \right] dt^2 - \left[1 + \frac{2GM}{f_1 r} - \frac{\delta_1(t)(r\sqrt{-\xi}+1)e^{-r\sqrt{-\xi}}}{3\xi r} \right] dr^2 - r^2 d\Omega \\ R = \frac{\delta_1(t)e^{-r\sqrt{-\xi}}}{r} \end{cases} \quad (9)$$

At this point, one can provide the solution in term of the gravitational potential. The first of (8) gives the second order solution in term of the metric expansion (see the definition (5)). This term coincides with the gravitational potential at the Newton order. In particular, since $g_{tt} = 1 + 2\Phi_{grav} = 1 + g_{tt}^{(2)}$, the general gravitational potential of $f(R)$ -gravity, analytic in the Ricci scalar R , is

$$\Phi_{grav} = - \left(\frac{GM}{f_1 r} + \frac{\delta_1(t)e^{-r\sqrt{-\xi}}}{6\xi r} \right). \quad (10)$$

This general result means that the standard Newton potential is achieved only in the particular case $f(R) = R$ while it is not so for generic analytic $f(R)$ models. Eq.(10) deserves some comments. The parameters $f_{1,2}$ and the function δ_1 represent the deviations with respect the standard Newton potential. To test such theories of gravity inside the Solar System, we need to compare such quantities with respect to the current experiments, or, in other words, Solar System constraints should be evaded fixing such parameters. On the other hand, such parameters could acquire non-trivial values (e.g. $f_1 \neq 1$, $\delta_1(t) \neq 0$, $\xi \neq 1$) at scales different from the Solar System ones.

In conclusions, we have derived the Newtonian limit for analytic $f(R)$ -gravity models. The approach which we have developed can be adopted also to calculate correctly the post-Newtonian parameters of such theories without any redefinition of the degrees of freedom by some scalar field. This last step could be misleading in the weak field limit. In the approach presented here, we do not need any change from the Jordan to the Einstein frame [41, 42].

Apart the possible shortcomings related to non-correct changes of variables, any $f(R)$ theory can be rewritten as a scalar-tensor one or an ideal fluid, as shown in [43, 44, 45]. In those papers, it has been demonstrated that such different representations give rise to physically non-equivalent theories and then also the Newtonian and post-Newtonian approximations have to be handled very carefully since the results could not be equivalent. In fact, the further geometric degrees of freedom of $f(R)$ gravity (with respect to GR), namely the scalar field and/or the further ideal fluid, have weak field behaviors strictly depending on the adopted gauge which could not be equivalent or difficult to compare. In order to circumvent these possible sources of shortcomings, one should states the frame (Jordan or Einstein) at the very beginning and then remain in such a frame along all the calculations up to the final results. Adopting this procedure, arbitrary limits and non-compatible results should be avoided.

As we have seen, the solution relative to the g_{tt} metric component gives the gravitational potential corrected by Yukawa-like terms, combined with the Newtonian potential. In relation to the sign of the coefficients entering g_{tt} , one can obtain real or complex solutions with different physical meanings. This degeneracy could be removed once standard matter is introduced into dynamics [39]. On the other hand, the growing Yukawa mode can be neglected as soon as the correct asymptotic Minkowskian limit is required. Such considerations acquire an important meaning as soon as $f(R)$ gravity is considered from the viewpoints of stability and Cauchy problem. It is possible to show that the correct Newtonian limit of the theory is strictly related to the stability of the ground state solution [46, 47, 48, 49] and this fact determines the range of viable parameters in the potential (10).

-
- [1] S. Capozziello, *Int. J. Mod. Phys. D* **11**, 483, (2002).
 - [2] S. Capozziello, S. Carloni, A. Troisi, *Rec. Res. Develop. Astron. Astrophys.* **1**, 625 (2003), arXiv:astro-ph/0303041.
 - [3] S. Capozziello, V.F. Cardone, S. Carloni, A. Troisi, *Int. J. Mod. Phys. D*, **12**, 1969 (2003).
 - [4] S. M. Carroll, V. Duvvuri, M. Trodden and M. S. Turner, *Phys. Rev. D* **70**, 043528 (2004).
 - [5] S. Nojiri, S.D. Odintsov, *Phys. Lett. B* **576**, 5, (2003).
 - [6] S. Nojiri, S.D. Odintsov, *Phys. Rev. D* **68**, 12352, (2003).
 - [7] S. Capozziello, V. F. Cardone and A. Troisi, *Phys. Rev. D* **71**, 043503 (2005).
 - [8] S. Carloni, P.K.S. Dunsby, S. Capozziello, A. Troisi, *Class. Quant. Grav.* **22**, 4839 (2005).
 - [9] D.N. Vollick, *Phys. Rev. D* **68**, 063510, (2003).
 - [10] X.H. Meng, P. Wang, *Class. Quant. Grav.*, **20**, 4949, (2003).
 - [11] E.E. Flanagan, *Phys. Rev. Lett.* **92**, 071101, (2004).
 - [12] E.E. Flanagan, *Class. Quant. Grav.*, **21**, 417, (2004).
 - [13] X.H. Meng, P. Wang, *Class. Quant. Grav.*, **21**, 951, (2004).
 - [14] G. Allemandi, A. Borowiec, M. Francaviglia, *Phys. Rev. D* **70**, 103503 (2004).
 - [15] S. Capozziello, V.F. Cardone, M. Francaviglia, *Gen. Rel. Grav.* **38**, 711 (2006).
 - [16] S. Capozziello and M. Francaviglia, *Gen. Rel. Grav.* **40**, 357 (2008).
 - [17] S.Nojiri and S.D. Odintsov, *Int. J. Meth. Mod. Phys.* **4**, 115 (2007).
 - [18] M. Farhoudi, *Gen. Relativ. Grav.* **38**, 1261 (2006).
 - [19] K.S. Stelle, *Gen. Rev. Grav.* **9**, 343, (1978).
 - [20] I. Quandt and H. J. Schmidt, *Astron. Nachr.* **312**, 97 (1991).
 - [21] S. Capozziello, V.F. Cardone, A. Troisi, *JCAP* **0608**, 001 (2006).
 - [22] S. Capozziello, V.F. Cardone, A. Troisi, *Mon. Not. Roy. Astron. Soc.* **375**, 1423 (2007).
 - [23] S. Capozziello, E. De Filippis, V. Salzano, arXiv:0809.1882 [astro-ph] (2008) to appear in MNRAS.
 - [24] J.D. Anderson et al. *Phys. Rev. Lett.* **81**, 2858 (1998).
 - [25] J.D. Anderson et al. *Phys. Rev. D* **65**, 082004 (2002).
 - [26] O. Bertolami, C.G. Böhmer, T. Harko, and F.S.N. Lobo, *Phys. Rev. D* **70**, 043528 (2007).
 - [27] W. Hu and I. Sawicki, *Phys. Rev. D* **76** 064004 (2007).
 - [28] S. Capozziello, A. Troisi, *Phys. Rev. D* **72**, 044022, (2005);
 - [29] T. P. Sotiriou, *Gen. Rel. Grav.* **38**, 1407 (2006).
 - [30] G. Allemandi, M. Francaviglia, M. L. Ruggiero and A. Tartaglia, *Gen. Rel. Grav.* **37**, 1891 (2005).
 - [31] S. Nojiri and S.D. Odintsov, *Phys. Lett. B*, **657**, 238 (2007).
 - [32] T. Chiba, *Phys. Lett. B* **575**, 1 (2005).
 - [33] T. Clifton and J.D. Barrow, *Phys. Rev. D* **72**, 103005 (2005).
 - [34] V. Faraoni, *Phys.Rev. D* **74** 023529 (2006).
 - [35] A.L. Erickcek, T.L. Smith, M. Kamionkowski, *Phys.Rev. D* **74** 121501 (2006).
 - [36] T. Chiba, A.L. Erickcek, T.L. Smith, *Phys.Rev. D* **75** 124014 (2007).

- [37] T. P. Sotiriou, V. Faraoni, S. Liberati, *Int. J. Mod. Phys. D*, **17** 399 (2008).
- [38] T. Multamäki, I. Vilja, *Phys. Rev. D* **74**, 064022 (2006).
- [39] S. Capozziello and S. Tsujikawa, *Phys. Rev. D* **77**, 107501 (2008).
- [40] S. Capozziello, A. Stabile, A. Troisi, *Phys. Rev. D* **76**, 104019 (2007).
- [41] S. Capozziello, A. Stabile, A. Troisi, *Mod. Phys. Lett. A* **21**, 2291 (2006).
- [42] T. P. Sotiriou, *Class. Quant. Grav.* **23**, 5117 (2006).
- [43] S. Nojiri and S.D. Odintsov, *Phys. Rev. D* **74**, 086005 (2006).
- [44] S. Capozziello, S. Nojiri and S.D. Odintsov, *Phys. Lett. B* **634**, 93 (2006).
- [45] S. Capozziello, S. Nojiri, S.D. Odintsov, and A. Troisi *Phys. Lett. B* **639**, 135 (2006).
- [46] N. Lanahan-Tremblay and V. Faraoni, *Class. Quant. Grav.* **24**, 5667 (2007).
- [47] V. Faraoni and N. Lanahan-Tremblay, *Phys. Rev. D* **78**, 064017 (2008).
- [48] L. Sokolowski, arXiv: 0810.2554 [gr-qc] (2008).
- [49] N. Straumann, arXiv: 0809.5148 [gr-qc] (2008).