

## Comment on “Limit on the Electron Electric Dipole Moment in Gadolinium-Iron Garnet”

Tomislav Ivezić

Ruder Bošković Institute, P.O.B. 180, 10002 Zagreb, Croatia  
ivezic@irb.hr

PACS number(s): 32.10.Dk, 11.30.Er, 14.60.Cd, 75.80.+q

In [1], a solid-state electron electric dipole moment (EDM) experiment is described in which a sample (GdIG) electric polarization appears when the sample is magnetized. The voltage is induced across a GdIG sample by the alignment of the sample’s magnetic dipole moments (MDMs) in an applied magnetic field  $\mathbf{H}$ . All solid-state electron EDM experiments rely on the fact that the electron EDM  $\mathbf{d}$  is collinear with its MDM  $\mathbf{m}$ , because they are both supposed to be proportional to the spin  $\mathbf{S}$ ; it is supposed that  $\mathbf{S}$  is the only available 3-vector in the rest frame of the particle. Thus, the interaction of the EDMs and  $\mathbf{H}$  is only indirect through the alignment of MDMs, i.e., the three-dimensional (3D) spins, in the field  $\mathbf{H}$ .

Recently, [2], the Uhlenbeck-Goudsmit hypothesis is generalized in a Lorentz covariant manner using 4D geometric quantities; the dipole moment tensor  $D^{ab}$  is proportional to the spin four-tensor  $S^{ab}$ ,  $D^{ab} = g_S S^{ab}$ , Eq. (9) in [2]. The dipole moment vectors  $d^a$  and  $m^a$  are derived from  $D^{ab}$  and the velocity vector of the particle  $u^a$ , Eq. (2) in [2]. Similarly, the usual 4D spin  $S^a$ , and a new one, the intrinsic angular momentum, spin  $Z^a$ , are derived from  $S^{ab}$  and  $u^a$ , Eq. (8) in [2]. Then, Eq. (10) in [2] is obtained as  $m^a = cg_S S^a$ ,  $d^a = g_S Z^a$ . Accordingly, the intrinsic MDM  $m^a$  is determined by  $S^a$ , whereas the intrinsic EDM  $d^a$  is determined by the new spin vector  $Z^a$  and not, as usual, by the spin  $\mathbf{S}$ . Both spins,  $S^a$  and  $Z^a$ , are equally good physical quantities.

Instead of an indirect interaction between the applied  $\mathbf{H}$  and an EDM  $\mathbf{d}$  through the alignment of 3D spins by the interaction  $-m(\mathbf{S}/S) \cdot \mathbf{B}$ , we propose a direct, Lorentz covariant, interaction between  $B^a$  and an EDM  $d^a$ .

Inserting the decomposition of  $F^{ab}$  (in terms of  $E^a$ ,  $B^a$  and the velocity vector  $v^a$  of the observers who measure fields), Eq. (1) in [2], and that one of  $D^{ab}$ , Eq. (2) in [2], into the interaction term  $(1/2)F_{ab}D^{ba}$ , one finds Eq. (3) in [2] (it is first reported in [3]). When it is taken that the laboratory frame is the  $e_0$ -frame (the frame in which the observers who measure  $E^a$  and  $B^a$  are at rest, with the standard basis  $\{e_\mu\}$  in it), then  $E^0 = B^0 = 0$ , and *only* three spatial components  $E^i$  and  $B^i$  will remain. Similarly, *only* in the particle’s rest frame, with the standard basis in it,  $d^0 = m^0 = 0$  and *only*  $d^i$  and  $m^i$  will remain. Hence, it is not possible that, e.g., in the laboratory frame, *both*, the fields and the dipole moments have *only* three spatial components, i.e., as for the usual 3-vectors. (In all EDM experiments the interaction is described in terms of the 3-vectors as  $\mathbf{E} \cdot \mathbf{d}$  and  $\mathbf{B} \cdot \mathbf{m}$ .)

In the laboratory frame as the  $e_0$ -frame, one can neglect the contributions to  $L_{int}$ , Eq. (3) in [2], from the terms with  $d^0$  and  $m^0$ ; they are  $u^2/c^2$  of the usual terms  $E_i d^i$  or  $B_i m^i$ . Then, what remains is

$$L_{int} = -((E_i d^i) + (B_i m^i)) - (1/c^2)\varepsilon^{0ijk}(E_i m_k - c^2 B_i d_k)u_j. \quad (1)$$

With the usual 3-vectors, it would correspond to Eq. (26) in [2]. But, as stated in [2]: “... what is essential for the number of components of a vector field is the number of variables on which that vector field depends, i.e., the dimension of its domain. Thus, strictly speaking, the time-dependent  $\mathbf{E}(\mathbf{r},t)$  and  $\mathbf{B}(\mathbf{r},t)$  cannot be the 3-vectors, since they are defined on the spacetime.” Furthermore, as noticed in [2]: “... neither the direction of  $\mathbf{d}$  nor the direction of the spin  $\mathbf{S}$  have a well-defined meaning in the 4D spacetime. The only Lorentz-invariant condition on the directions of  $d^a$  and  $S^a$  in the 4D spacetime is  $d^a u_a = S^a u_a = 0$ . This condition does not say that  $\mathbf{d}$  has to be parallel to the spin  $\mathbf{S}$ .” Obviously, the same remark holds if  $\mathbf{d}$  is replaced by  $\mathbf{m}$  and  $d^a$  by  $m^a$ . The results from [2] indicate that the basic points of the interpretation of measurements of EDM in [1], i.e., both  $\mathbf{m}$  and  $\mathbf{d}$  are parallel to  $\mathbf{S}$ , are meaningless in the manifestly covariant formulation from [2]. This means that the usual formulation with 3-vectors  $\mathbf{E}$ ,  $\mathbf{B}$ ,  $\mathbf{S}$ , etc. **IS NOT** relativistically correct formulation.

It is seen from Eq. (1) that the interaction between  $B^a$  and a MDM  $m^a$  is contained in the term  $-B_i m^i$  and that one between  $B^a$  and an EDM  $d^a$  is contained in the term  $\varepsilon^{0ijk} B_i d_k u_j$ , which is  $u^a$ -dependent.

In conclusion, according to Eq. (1), a voltage induced across the solid is not caused by the alignment of MDMs in an applied field  $\mathbf{H}$  than by the polarization of the sample due to the interaction  $\varepsilon^{0ijk} B_i d_k u_j$ . That voltage can give some information about  $d^a$ , because that term contains the EDM  $d^a$ .

## References

- [1] B. J. Heidenreich *et al.*, Phys. Rev. Lett. **95**, 253004 (2005).
- [2] T. Ivezić, Phys. Scr. **81**, 025001 (2010).
- [3] T. Ivezić, Phys. Rev. Lett. **98**, 108901 (2007).