First evidence of the general relativistic gravitomagnetic field of the Sun and new constraints on a Yukawa-like fifth force

L. Iorio Viale Unità di Italia 68, 70125 Bari, Italy tel./fax 0039 080 5443144 e-mail: lorenzo.iorio@libero.it

Abstract

The post-Newtonian general relativistic gravitomagnetic Lense-Thirring precessions of the perihelia of the inner planets of the Solar System amount to $< 10^{-3}$ arcseconds per century. Up to now they were always retained too small to be detected. Recent improvements in the planetary ephemerides determination yield the first observational evidence of such a tiny effect. Indeed, extra-corrections to the known perihelion advances of -0.0036 ± 0.0050 , -0.0002 ± 0.0004 and 0.0001 ± 0.0005 arcseconds per century were recently determined by E.V. Pitjeva for Mercury, the Earth and Mars, respectively. They were based on the EPM2004 ephemerides and a set of more than 317 000 observations of various kinds. The predicted relativistic Lense-Thirring precessions for these planets are -0.0020, -0.0001 and -3×10^{-5} arcseconds per century, respectively and are compatible with the measured perihelia corrections, although the experimental errors are still large. The data from the forthcoming BepiColombo mission to Mercury will improve our knowledge of the orbital motion of this planet and, consequently, the precision of the measurement of the Lense-Thirring effect. As a by-product of the present analysis, it is also possible to constrain the strength of a Yukawa-like fifth force to a $10^{-12} - 10^{-13}$ level at scales of about one Astronomical Unit (10^{11} m) .

1 Introduction

1.1 The Lense-Thirring effect

The post-Newtonian Lense-Thirring (LT in the following) effect (Lense and Thirring 1918, Soffel 1989, Ciufolini and Wheeler 1995) is one of the few predictions of the Einsteinian General Theory of Relativity (GTR) for which a direct and undisputable test is not yet available. According to Einstein, the action of the gravitational potential U of a given distribution of mass-energy is described by the metric coefficients $g_{\mu\nu}$, $\mu, \nu = 0, 1, 2, 3$, of the space-time metric tensor. They are determined, in principle, by solving the fully non-linear field equations of GTR for the considered mass-energy content. These equations can be linearized in the weak-field $(U/c^2 << 1)$, where c is the speed of light in vacuum) and slowmotion (v/c << 1) approximation (Mashhoon 2001; Ruggiero and Tartaglia 2002), valid throughout the Solar System, and look like the equations of the linear Maxwellian electromagnetism. Among other things, a noncentral, Lorentz-like force

$$\boldsymbol{F}_{\rm LT} = -2m\left(\frac{\boldsymbol{v}}{c}\right) \times \boldsymbol{B}_g \tag{1}$$

acts on a moving test particle of mass m. It is induced by the post-Newtonian component B_g of the gravitational field in which the particle moves with velocity v. B_g is related to the mass currents of the massenergy distribution of the source and comes from the off-diagonal components g_{0i} , i = 1, 2, 3 of the metric tensor. Thanks to such an analogy, the ensemble of the gravitational effects induced by mass displacements is also named gravitomagnetism. For a central rotating body of mass M and proper angular momentum L the gravitomagnetic field is

$$\boldsymbol{B}_g = \frac{G[3\boldsymbol{r}(\boldsymbol{r}\cdot\boldsymbol{L}) - r^2\boldsymbol{L}]}{cr^5}.$$
(2)

One of the consequences of eq. (1) and eq. (2) is a gravitational spinorbit coupling. Indeed, if we consider the orbital motion of a particle in the gravitational field of a central spinning mass, it turns out that the orbital angular momentum ℓ of the particle undergoes the LT precession, so that the longitude of the ascending node Ω and the argument of pericentre ω of the orbit of the test particle are affected by tiny secular rates $\dot{\Omega}_{\rm LT}$, $\dot{\omega}_{\rm LT}$ (Lense and Thirring 1918, Soffel 1989, Ashby and Allison 1993, Iorio 2001a)

$$\dot{\Omega}_{\rm LT} = \frac{2GL}{c^2 a^3 (1-\epsilon^2)^{\frac{3}{2}}}, \ \dot{\omega}_{\rm LT} = -\frac{6GL\cos i}{c^2 a^3 (1-\epsilon^2)^{\frac{3}{2}}},\tag{3}$$

where a, ϵ and i are the semimajor axis, the eccentricity and the inclination, respectively, of the orbit and G is the Newtonian gravitational constant. Note that in their original paper Lense and Thirring (1918) used the longitude of pericentre ϖ .

The gravitomagnetic force may have strong consequences in many astrophysical and astronomical scenarios involving, e.g., accreting disks around black holes (Stella et al. 2003), gravitational lensing and time delay (Sereno 2003; 2005a; 2005b). Unfortunately, in these contexts the knowledge of the various competing effects is rather poor and makes very difficult to reliably extract the genuine gravitomagnetic signal from the noisy background. E.g., attempts to measure the LT effect around black holes are often confounded by the complexities of the dynamics of the hot gas in their accretion disks. On the contrary, in the solar and terrestrial space environments the LT effect is weaker but the various sources of systematic errors are relatively well known and we have the possibility of using various artificial and natural orbiters both to improve our knowledge of such biases and to design suitable observables circumventing these problems, at least to a certain extent.

1.2 The performed and ongoing tests

Up to now, all the performed and ongoing tests of gravitomagnetism were performed in the weak-field and slow-motion arena of the Earth gravitational field.

In April 2004 the GP-B mission (Everitt et al. 2001) was launched. Its aim is the measurement of another gravitomagnetic effect, i.e. the precession of the spins (Schiff 1960) of four superconducting gyroscopes carried onboard with a claimed accuracy of 1% or better.

Recently, a test of the LT effect on the orbit of a test particle was performed by Ciufolini and Pavlis (2004). They analyzed the data of the laserranged LAGEOS and LAGEOS II satellites in the gravitational field of the Earth by using an observable explicitly proposed by Iorio and Morea (2004). The total accuracy claimed by Ciufolini and Pavlis is 5-10% at 1-3 sigma, respectively, but such estimate is controversial (Iorio 2005a; 2005b) for various reasons. The total error may be as large as 19-24% at 1 sigma level.

Finally, it must be noted that, according to Nordtvedt (2003), the multidecade analysis of the Moon'orbit by means of the Lunar Laser Ranging (LLR) technique yields a comprehensive test of the various parts of order $\mathcal{O}(c^{-2})$ of the post-Newtonian equation of motion. The existence of the LT signature as predicted by GTR would, then, be indirectly inferred from the high accuracy of the lunar orbital reconstruction. Also the radial motion of the LAGEOS satellite would yield another indirect confirmation of the existence of the LT effect (Nordtvedt 1988).

2 The solar gravitomagnetic field

The action of the solar gravitomagnetic field on the Mercury's longitude of perihelion was calculated for the first time by de Sitter (1916) who, by as-

Table 1: Gravitomagnetic secular precessions of the longitudes of perihelion ϖ of Mercury, Venus, Earth and Mars in " cy⁻¹. The value (190.0 ± 1.5) × 10³⁹ kg m² s⁻¹ (Pijpers 1998; 2003) has been adopted for the solar proper angular momentum L_{\odot} .

3.6			3.6
Mercury	Venus	Earth	Mars
-0.0020	-0.0003	-0.0001	-3×10^{-5}

suming an homogenous and uniformly rotating Sun, found a secular advance of -0.01 arcseconds per century (" cy⁻¹ in the following). This value is also quoted by Soffel (1989). Instead, recent determinations of the Sun's proper angular momentum $L_{\odot} = (190.0 \pm 1.5) \times 10^{39}$ kg m² s⁻¹ from helioseismology (Pijpers 1998; 2003), accurate to 0.8%, yield a precessional effect one order of magnitude smaller for Mercury (Ciufolini and Wheeler 1995; Iorio 2005c). See Table 1 for the gravitomagnetic precessions of the four inner planets. As can be seen, they are of the order of $10^{-3} - 10^{-5}$ " cy⁻¹.

So far, the LT effect on the orbits of the Sun's planets was believed to be too small to be detected (Soffel 1989). Iorio (2005c) preliminarily investigated the possibility of measuring such tiny effects in view of recent important developments in the planetary ephemerides generation. It is important to note that the currently available estimate of L_{\odot} is accurate enough to allow, in principle, a genuine test of GTR. Moreover, it was determined in a relativity-free fashion from astrophysical techniques which do not rely on the dynamics of planets in the gravitational field of the Sun. Thus, there is no any a priori 'memory' effect of GTR itself in the adopted value of L_{\odot} .

3 Compatibility of the determined extra-precessions of planetary perihelia with the LT effect

3.1 The Keplerian orbital elements

The Keplerian orbital elements like ϖ are not directly observable quantities like right ascensions, declinations, ranges and range-rates in optical observations, radiometric measurements and meridian transits: they can only be computed from such measurements. In this sense, speaking of an "observed" time series of a certain Keplerian element means that it has been computed from the machinery of the data reduction of the real observations. Keeping this in mind, it is possible, in principle, to extract the LT signal from the planetary motions by taking the difference between two suitably computed time-series of the Keplerian elements in such a way that it contains the post-Newtonian gravitomagnetic force. Such ephemerides, which must share the same initial conditions, differ in the fact that one is based on the processing of the real data, which are presumed to be contain also the LT signal, and the other one is, instead, the result of a purely numerical propagation. The dynamical force models with which the data are processed and the numerical ephemeris is propagated do not contain the gravitomagnetic force itself: only the general relativistic gravitoelectric Schwarzschild terms must be present. Moreover, the astronomical parameters entering the perturbations which can mimic the LT signature must not be fitted in the data reduction process: they must be kept fixed to some reference values, preferably obtained in a relativity-independent way so to avoid 'imprinting' effects. Thus, in the resulting "residual" time series $\Delta \varpi_{obs}(t)$, the LT effect should be entirely present.

3.2 The EPM2004 ephemerides

An analogous procedure was, in fact, recently implemented with the Ephemerides of Planets and the Moon EPM2004 (Pitjeva 2005a; 2005b). They are based on a data set of more than 317 000 observations (1913-2003) including radiometric measurements of planets and spacecraft, astrometric CCD observations of the outer planets and their satellites, and meridian and photographic observations. Such ephemerides were constructed by the simultaneous numerical integration of the equations of motion for all planets, the Sun, the Moon, 301 largest asteroids, rotations of the Earth and the Moon, including the perturbations from the solar quadrupolar mass moment J_2^{\odot} and asteroid ring that lies in the ecliptic plane and consists of the remaining smaller asteroids. In regard to the post-Newtonian dynamics, only the gravitoelectric terms, in the harmonic gauge, were included (Newhall et al. 1983).

3.3 The measured extra-precessions of the planetary perihelia and the Lense-Thirring effect

As a preliminary outlook on the measurability of the Lense-Thirring perihelion precessions, let us make the following considerations. The magnitude of the gravitomagnetic shift of the Mercury's perihelion over a 90-years time span like that covered by the EPM2004 data amounts to 0.0018 ". The accuracy in determining the secular motion of Mercury's perihelion can be inferred from the results for the components of the eccentricity vector reported in Table 4 by Pitjeva (2005b). Indeed, the formal standard deviations

Table 2: Observed extra-precessions $\Delta \dot{\varpi}_{\rm obs}$ of the longitudes of perihelia of the inner planets, in " cy⁻¹, by using EPM2004 with $\beta = \gamma = 1$, $J_2^{\odot} = 2 \times 10^{-7}$. The gravitomagnetic force was not included in the adopted dynamical force models. Data taken from Table 3 of (Pitjeva 2005a).

Mercury	Venus	Earth	Mars
-0.0036 ± 0.0050	0.53 ± 0.30	-0.0002 ± 0.0004	0.0001 ± 0.0005

of $k = e \cos \varpi$ and $h = e \sin \varpi$ are 0.123 and 0.099 milliarcseconds, respectively. Thus, the error in measuring ϖ is about 0.0007 ".

The EPM2004 ephemerides were used to determine corrections $\Delta \dot{\varpi}_{obs}$ to the secular precessions of the longitudes of perihelia of the inner planets as fitted parameters of a particular solution. In Table 3 by Pitjeva (2005a). part of which is reproduced in Table 2, it is possible to find their values obtained by comparing the model observations computed using the constructed ephemerides with actual observations. Note that in determining such extra-precessions the PPN parameters (Will 1993) γ and β and the solar even zonal harmonic coefficient J_2^{\odot} were not fitted. They were held fixed to their GTR values, i.e. $\gamma = \beta = 1$, and to $J_2^{\odot} = 2 \times 10^{-7}$. Note also that the unit values of β and γ were measured in a variety of approaches which are independent of the gravitomagentic force itself. Although the original purpose¹ of the determination of such corrections was not the measurement of the LT effect, the results of Table 3 by Pitjeva (2005a) can be used to take first steps towards an observational corroboration of the existence of the solar gravitomagnetic force. Indeed, by comparing Table 1 and Table 2 of this paper it turns out that the predictions of GTR for the LT effect are compatible with the small determined corrections to the secular motions of the planetary perihelia for² Mercury $(-0.0086'' \text{ cy}^{-1} < -0.0020''$ $cy^{-1} < 0.0014$ " cy^{-1}), the Earth (-0.0006" $cy^{-1} < -0.0001$ " $cy^{-1} < 0.0002$

¹The goal by Pitjeva (2005a) was to make a test of the quality of the previously obtained general solution in which certain values of β , γ and J_2 , were used. If the construction of the ephemerides was satisfactory, very small residual effects due to such parameters should have been found. She writes: "At present, as a test, we can determine [...] the corrections to the motions of the planetary perihelia, which allows us to judge whether the values of β , γ , and J_2 used to construct the ephemerides are valid.". The smallness of the extraperihelion precessions found in her particular solution is interpreted by Pitjeva as follows: "Table 3 shows that the parameters $\beta = 1$, $\gamma = 1$, and $J_2 = 2 \times 10^{-7}$ used to construct the EPM2004 ephemerides are in excellent agreement with the observations."

 $^{^{2}}$ In the case of Venus the discrepancy between the predicted and the measured values is slightly larger than the measurement error. For such a planet the perihelion is not a good observable because of the small eccentricity of its orbit (0.0066).

Table 3: Comparison between the predicted values (P) of the LT precessions of the perihelia of Mercury, the Earth and Mars (Table 1) and the measured values (M) of the extra-precessions of their perihelia (Table 2). Their differences are smaller than the errors (Table 2).

Planet	P-M (" cy^{-1})	Error (" cy^{-1}
Mercury	0.0016	0.0050
Earth	0.0001	0.0004
Mars	-0.0001	0.0005

" cy⁻¹) and Mars (-0.0004 " cy⁻¹< -3 × 10⁻⁵ " cy⁻¹< 0.0006 " cy⁻¹). The discrepancies between the predicted and the determined values are 0.0016 " cy⁻¹ for Mercury, 0.0001 " cy⁻¹ for the Earth and -0.0001 for Mars: they are smaller than the measurement uncertainties, as can be inferred from Table 3. Note also that the uncertainties in the predicted values of the LT precessions induced by the error in L_{\odot} (Pijpers 1998; 2003) amount to 1×10^{-5} " cy⁻¹ for Mercury, 7×10^{-7} " cy⁻¹ for the Earth and 2×10^{-7} " cy⁻¹ for Mars: they are far smaller than the experimental errors, so that a genuine comparison with the measured precessions make sense. Figure 1 summarizes the obtained results.

A way to improve the robustness and reliability of such a test would be to vary the adopted values for the solar oblateness within the currently accepted ranges and investigate the changes in the fitted values of the extraprecessions. Moreover, it would also be important to produce an analogous set of solutions with β , γ and J_2^{\odot} fixed in which the extra-precessions of the nodes are determined.

3.4 Some possible systematic errors due to other competing errors

In order to check our conclusion that the gravitomagentic LT effect is the main responsible for the observed secular corrections to the planetary perihelia $\Delta \dot{\varpi}_{obs}$ let us focus on Mercury and on the known perturbations which could induce a secular extra-perihelion advance due to their mismodelling.

The major sources of the secular advances of the perihelia are the Schwarzschild part of the space-time metric and the quadrupolar mass moment J_2^{\odot} of the Sun. Their nominal effects on the longitudes of perihelion of the inner planets are quoted in Table 4 and Table 5 of this paper. In view of their large size with respect to the LT effect, one could legitimately ask if the measured extra-precessions are due to the systematic errors in such competing secu-



Figure 1: The horizontal dash-dotted lines represent the predicted values of the LT secular precessions of the perihelia of Mercury, Venus, the Earth and Mars according to GTR. The vertical solid lines represent the values of the additional secular precessions of Mercury, Venus, the Earth and Mars determined by Pitjeva (2005a) along with their error bars. The predictions of the LT effect by GTR are compatible with them for Mercury, the Earth and Mars.

Table 4: Nominal values of the secular gravitoelectric precessions of the longitudes of perihelion ϖ of Mercury, Venus, Earth and Mars in " cy⁻¹. Their mismodelled amplitudes are fixed by the uncertainties in γ and β which are of the order of 0.01% (Pitjeva 2005a).

Mercury	Venus	Earth	Mars	
42.98	8.62	3.84	1.35	

Table 5: Nominal values of the classical secular precessions of the longitudes of perihelion ϖ of Mercury, Venus, Earth and Mars, in " cy⁻¹, induced by the solar quadrupolar mass moment J_2^{\odot} . The value $J_2^{\odot} = 2 \times 10^{-7}$ used in (Pitjeva 2005a) has been adopted. Their mismodelled amplitudes are fixed by the uncertainty in J_2^{\odot} which is of the order of ~ 10%.

Mercury	Venus	Earth	Mars
0.0248	0.0025	0.0008	0.0002

lar rates. An analytical calculation shows that it should not be the case. Indeed, a 2×10^{-4} mismodelling in the combination of γ and β in front of the gravitoelectric precessions yields a bias of +0.0086 " cy⁻¹ for Mercury. In regard to J_2^{\odot} , only values derived from astrophysical techniques should be considered for our purposes; the most recent determinations of the solar oblateness yield values close to 2.2×10^{-7} (Pijpers 1998; Mecheri et al. 2004) with discrepancies between the various best estimates of the same order of magnitude of their errors, i.e. $\sim 10^{-9}$. Thus, by assuming an uncertainty of ~ 10% in the adopted value by Pitjeva (2×10^{-7}) , the resulting bias amounts to +0.0025'' cy⁻¹ for Mercury. By linearly adding such effects³, a total mismodelled precession of +0.0110 " cy⁻¹ would occur for Mercury. It is one order of magnitude larger than the upper bound of the experimental range which is +0.0014'' cy⁻¹; recall that the best estimate for the measured extra-perihelion advance is -0.0036 " cy⁻¹. Moreover, the discrepancy between such a possible systematic bias and the measured value $(0.0146 \text{ " cy}^{-1})$ is almost 3 times larger than the observational error (0.0050 ") cv^{-1}).

As already noted, the dynamical force models adopted in EPM2004 also include the action of the major asteroids and of the ecliptic ring which accounts for the other minor bodies. Indeed, it has recently pointed out that their impact limits the accuracy of the inner planets' ephemerides over time-scales of a few decades (Standish and Fienga 2002) in view of the relatively high uncertainty in their masses (Krasinsky et al. 2002; Pitjeva 2005b) Recently, Fienga and Simon (2005) have shown that also Mercury's orbit is affected to a detectable level by secular perturbations due to the most important asteroids. It may happen that the mismodelled part of such secular precessions could explain the observed $\Delta \dot{\varpi}_{obs}^{Mercury}$. From Table 3 by Fienga and Simon (2005) the nominal amplitude of the secular perturbations on $\varpi^{Mercury}$ due to 295 major asteroids can be calculated. It turns out to

³The fitted values of the parameters β, γ and J_2^{\odot} are strongly correlated.

be 0.0004 " cy⁻¹; even assuming a conservative $\sim 10\%$ uncertainty (Pitjeva 2005b), it is clear that the asteroids are not the cause of the observed extraperihelion shift of Mercury.

In regard to other possible sources of extra-secular precessions of the planetary perihelia outside the scheme of the Newton-Einstein gravity, recently it has been shown by Lue and Starkman (2003) that the multidimensional braneworld scenario by Dvali, Gabadadze and Porrati (2000) predicts also a secular perihelion shift in addition to certain cosmological features. By postulating that the current cosmic acceleration is entirely caused by the late-time self-acceleration, constraints from Type 1A Supernovæ data yield a value of ~ 0.0005 " cy⁻¹ for the braneworld planetary precessions. Also this effect is too small to accommodate the observed additional perihelion advance of Mercury.

3.5 Constraints on a Yukawa-like fifth force

The differences between the measured extra-precessions and the predicted LT rates of Table 3 of this paper can also be used to strongly constrain, at planetary length-scales $10^{10} - 10^{11}$ m, departures from the inverse-square-law phenomenologically parameterized in terms of the magnitude $|\alpha|$ of the strength of a Yukawa-like fifth force (Adelberger et al. 2003). Indeed, a potential

$$U_{\text{Yukawa}} = -\frac{GM}{r} \left(1 + \alpha e^{-\frac{r}{\lambda}} \right), \tag{4}$$

where λ is the range of such a hypothesized force, can produce a secular perihelion advance over scales λ comparable to *a* (Lucchesi 2003)

$$\dot{\varpi}_{\text{Yukawa}} \propto \frac{\alpha n}{e}.$$
 (5)

By using the data in the left column of Table 3 it is possible to constrain α to $10^{-12} - 10^{-13}$ level at $r \sim \lambda \sim 1$ A.U. The most recently published constraints in the planetary range are at $10^{-9} - 10^{-10}$ level (Bertolami and Paramos 2005; Reynaud and Jaekel 2005).

4 Discussion and conclusions

In this paper we analyzed the corrections to the secular advances of the perihelia of the inner planets of the Solar System recently determined by E.V. Pitjeva. She used the EPM2004 ephemerides with a wide range of observational data spanning almost one century; in a particular solution, she

solved for the secular motions of the perihelia by keeping fixed the PPN parameters β and γ and the solar quadrupole mass moment J_2^{\odot} and neglecting the gravitomagnetic force in the dynamical force models. It turns out that the post-Newtonian LT secular precessions predicted by GTR are compatible with the measured extra-precessions for Mercury, the Earth and Mars, although the observational errors are still large. If confirmed by further, more extensive and robust data analysis by determining, e.g., the extra-precessions of the nodes as well, it would be the first observational evidence of the solar gravitomagnetic field. The data expected from the forthcoming BepiColombo mission to Mercury will further improve the accuracy in determining the orbital motion of this planet and, consequently, the precision of the LT tests. A by-product of the present analysis is represented by new, strong constraints $(10^{-12} - 10^{-13})$ on the strength of a Yukawa-like fifth force at scales of about one Astronomical Unit.

Acknowledgements

I gratefully thank E.V. Pitjeva for helpful clarifications about her measured extra-precessions, J.-F. Pascual-Sánchez, O. Bertolami and G. Melki for useful comments and references.

References

- Adelberger, E.G., Heckel, B.R., and Nelson, A.E., Tests of the gravitational inverse-square law, Ann. Rev. Nucl. Part. Sci., 53, 77–121, 2003.
- [2] Ashby, N., and Allison, T., Canonical planetary equations for velocity-dependent forces, and the Lense-Thirring precession. *Celest. Mech. Dyn. Astron.*, 57, 537–585, 1993.
- [3] Bertolami, O., and Paramos, J., Astrophysical Constraints on Scalar Fields Models, *Phys. Rev. D*, **71**, 023521, 2005.
- [4] Ciufolini, I., and Wheeler, J.A., Gravitation and Inertia, (Princeton University Press, Princeton), 1995.
- [5] de Sitter, W., On Einstein's theory of gravitation and its astronomical consequences, Mon. Not. Roy. Astron. Soc. 76, 699–728, 1916.

- [6] Dvali, G., Gabadadze, G., and Porrati, M., 4D Gravity on a Brane in 5D Minkowski Space, *Phys. Lett. B*, 485 208–214, 2000.
- [7] Everitt, C.W.F., et al., Gravity Probe B: Countdown to Launch. In: Lämmerzahl C., Everitt, C.W.F., Hehl, F.W. (eds.) Gyros, Clocks, Interferometers...: Testing Relativistic Gravity in Space, (Springer, Berlin), 2001. pp. 52-82.
- [8] Fienga, A., and Simon, J.-L., Analytical and numerical studies of asteroid perturbations on solar system planet dynamics, Astron. Astrophys., 429, 361-367, 2005.
- [9] Iorio, L., An alternative derivation of the Lense-Thirring drag on the orbit of a test body, *Nuovo Cimento B*, **116**, 777-789, 2001.
- [10] Iorio, L., and Morea, A., The impact of the new Earth gravity models on the measurement of the Lense-Thirring effect, *Gen. Rel. Grav.*, 36,1321–1333, 2004.
- [11] Iorio, L., On the reliability of the so far performed tests for measuring the Lense-Thirring effect with the LAGEOS satellites, *New Astron.*, **10**, 603-615, 2005a.
- [12] Iorio, L., The impact of the new Earth gravity models on the measurement of the Lense-Thirring effect with a new satellite, New Astron., 10, 616-635, 2005b.
- [13] Iorio, L., Is it possible to measure the Lense-Thirring effect on the orbits of the planets in the gravitational field of the Sun?, Astron. Astrophys., 431, 385-389, 2005c.
- [14] Krasinsky, G.A., Pitjeva, E.V., Vasiljev, M.V., and Yagudina, E.I., Hidden Mass in the Asteroid Belt, *Icarus*, **158**, 98-105, 2002.
- [15] Lense, J., and H. Thirring, Über den Einfluss der Eigenrotation der Zentralkörper auf die Bewegung der Planeten und Monde nach der Einsteinschen Gravitationstheorie, *Phys. Z.*, **19**, 156-163, 1918, translated and discussed by Mashhoon, B., F. W. Hehl, and D. S. Theiss, On the Gravitational Effects of Rotating Masses: The Thirring-Lense Papers, *Gen. Rel. Grav.*, **16**, 711-750, 1984. Reprinted in: Ruffini, R.J., and Sigismondi, C. (eds.), *Nonlinear Gravitodynamics*, (World Scientific, Singapore), 2003. pp. 349–388.

- [16] Lucchesi, D.M., LAGEOS II perigee shift and Schwarzschild gravitoelectric field, *Phys. Lett. A*, **318**, 234–240, 2003.
- [17] Lue, A., and Starkman, G., Gravitational Leakage into Extra Dimensions Probing Dark Energy Using Local Gravity, *Phys. Rev. D*, 67, 064002, 2003.
- [18] Mashhoon, B., Gronwald, F., and Lichtenegger, H., Gravitomagnetism and the Clock Effect. In: Lämmerzahl C, Everitt, C.W.F., and Hehl, F.W. (eds.), *Gyros, Clocks, Interferometers...: Testing Relativistic Gravity in Space*, (Springer, Berlin), 2001. pp. 83-108.
- [19] Mecheri, R., Abdelatif, T., Irbah, A., Provost, J., and Berthomieu, G., New values of gravitational moments J2 and J4 deduced from helioseismology, *Sol. Phys.*, **222**, 191-197, 2004.
- [20] Newhall, X.X., Standish, E.M., and Williams, J.G., DE 102-A numerically integrated ephemeris of the moon and planets spanning forty-four centuries, *Astron. Astrophys.*, **125**, 150-167, 1983.
- [21] Nordtevdt, K., Gravitomagnetic interaction and laser ranging to Earth satellites, Phys. Rev. Lett., 61, 2647–2649, 1988.
- [22] Nordtvedt, K., Some considerations on the varieties of frame dragging, in: Ruffini, R.J., and Sigismondi, C. (eds.), Nonlinear Gravitodynamics. The Lense-Thirring Effect, (World Scientific, Singapore), 2003. pp. 35–45
- [23] Pijpers, F.P., Helioseismic determination of the solar gravitational quadruople moment, Mon. Not. Roy. Astron. Soc., 297, L76-L80, 1998.
- [24] Pijpers, F.P., Astroseismic determination of stellar angular momentum, Astron. and Astrophys., 402, 683-692, 2003.
- [25] Pitjeva, E.V., Relativistic Effects and Solar Oblateness from Radar Observations of Planets and Spacecraft, Astron. Lett., 31, 340-349, 2005a.
- [26] Pitjeva, E.V., High-Precision Ephemrides of Planets-EPM and Determinations of Some Astronomical Constants, Sol. Sys. Res., 39, 176-186, 2005b.

- [27] Reynaud, S., and Jaekel, M.-T., Testing the Newton Law at Long Distances, Int. J. of Mod. Phys. A, 20, 2294–2303, 2005.
- [28] Ruggiero, M.L., and Tartaglia, A., Gravitomagnetic Effects, Nuovo Cimento B, 117, 743-767, 2002.
- [29] Schiff, L., On Experimental Tests of the General Theory of Relativity, Am. J. Phys. 28, 340-343, 1960.
- [30] Sereno, M., Gravitational lensing by stars with angular momentum, Mon. Not. Roy. Astron. Soc., 344, 942-950, 2003.
- [31] Sereno, M., Detecting gravitomagnetism with rotation of polarization by a gravitational lens, *Mon. Not. Roy. Astron. Soc.*, **356**, 381-385, 2005a.
- [32] Sereno, M., On gravitomagnetic time-delay by extended lenses, Mon. Not. Roy. Astron. Soc., 357, 1205-1210, 2005b.
- [33] Soffel, M.H., Relativity in Astrometry, Celestial Mechanics and Geodesy, (Springer, Berlin), 1989.
- [34] Standish, E.M, and Fienga, A., Accuracy limit of modern ephemerides imposed by the uncertainties in asteroid masses, *As*tron. Astrophys., **384**, 322-328, 2002.
- [35] Stella, L. Cui, W., Chen, W., Zhang, S.N., Van Der Klis, M., Karas, V., Semerák, O., De Felice, F., Dovčiak, M., Casini, H., Montemayor, R., Morsink, S.M., Silbergleit, A.S., Wagoner, R.V., Khanna, R., Markovic, D., and Lamb, F.K., Section E: Probing the Gravitomagnetic Lense-Thirring effect with Neutron Stars and Black Holes, in: Ruffini, R.J., and Sigismondi, C. (eds.), *Nonlinear Gravitodynamics. The Lense-Thirring Effect*, (World Scientific, Singapore), 2003. pp. 235–345.
- [36] Will, C M., Theory and Experiment in Gravitational Physics, 2nd edition, (Cambridge University Press, Cambridge), 1993.