

New results at 3PN via an effective field theory of gravity

Rafael A. Porto

Department of Physics, Carnegie Mellon University, Pittsburgh, PA 15213

NRGR, an Effective Field Theory approach to gravity, has emerged as a powerful tool to systematically compute higher order corrections in the Post-Newtonian expansion. Here we discuss in somewhat more detail the recently reported new results for the spin-spin gravitational potential at third Post-Newtonian order.

A new approach, coined NRGR, has been recently introduced as a new technique to systematically calculate within the Post-Newtonian expansion via an effective field theory approach.¹⁻³ The purpose of this contribution is to elaborate upon the new results recently reported⁴ for the spin-spin potential. Further details will appear in a forthcoming publication.

The extension of NRGR to include spin effects³ can be achieved by adding rotational degrees of freedom (e_I^μ) in the worldline action. The generalized angular velocity is given by $\Omega^{\mu\nu} = e^{\nu J} \frac{De_I^\mu}{d\lambda}$, and the spin $S_{\mu\nu}$ is introduced as the conjugate momentum. The form of the world-line action is then fixed by reparameterization invariance,

$$S = - \sum_q \left(\int p_q^\mu u_\mu^q d\lambda_q + \int \frac{1}{2} S_q^{\mu\nu} \Omega_{\mu\nu}^q d\lambda_q \right), \quad (1)$$

where λ_q is the proper length for the q 'th worldline. The Papapetrou equations follow from (1).³ Higher dimensional terms describing finite size effects have been left out although its inclusion is straightforward.^{1,3,4} In order to account for the correct number of degrees of freedom a so called spin supplementarity conditions (SSC) is added to the equations of motion (EOM). The most convenient choices are the covariant, $S^{\mu\nu} p_\nu = 0$, and Newton-Wigner (NW), $S^{\mu\nu} p_\nu = m S^{\mu 0}$, SSC. Notice that the latter is not covariant, however it can be shown to have the advantage that the algebra reduces to a canonical structure (up to subleading corrections) after Dirac brackets are imposed.⁵ The leading order spin-spin and spin-orbit effects were shown to follow from the potentials within the NW SSC.³ The 3PN spin-spin potential, V_{3pn}^{ss} , was recently obtained,⁴ so that the spin-spin part of the EOM followed by means of the traditional Hamilton-Lagrange approach. As we shall see this is a correct statement up to 4PN where curvature effects in the algebra start to play a role.

The spin-gravity coupling in (1) can be rewritten by introducing the spin coefficients, ω_μ^{ab} , as

$$S_{spin} \sim -\frac{1}{2} \int S_{Lab} \omega_\mu^{ab} u^\mu d\lambda, \quad (2)$$

with S_L^{ab} the spin tensor in a local Lorentzian frame defined by the vierbein e_μ^a . In this basis the co-rotating frame is given by $e_\mu^J = \Lambda_a^J(\tau) e_\mu^a$ with Λ a Lorentz boost. By further expanding (2) in the weak gravity limit one obtains the Feynman rules.^{3,4} Let us emphasize here that the spin tensor appearing in the vertex rules is the one defined in the local frame, where the NW SSC was chosen^a. Before imposing the SSC one can show that the algebra for the phase space variables (x^μ, p^ν, S_L^{ab}) is given by

$$\{x^\mu, \mathcal{P}_\alpha\} = \delta_\alpha^\mu, \quad \{x^\mu, p_\alpha\} = \delta_\alpha^\mu \quad (3)$$

$$\{\mathcal{P}^\alpha, \mathcal{P}^\beta\} = 0, \quad \{x^\mu, x^\nu\} = 0, \quad \{p^\alpha, p^\beta\} = \frac{1}{2} R^{\alpha\beta}{}_{ab} S_L^{ab}, \quad (4)$$

$$\{x^\mu, S_L^{ab}\} = 0, \quad \{p^\alpha, S_L^{ab}\} = 0, \quad \{\mathcal{P}^\alpha, S_L^{ab}\} = 0 \quad (5)$$

$$\{S_L^{ab}, S_L^{cd}\} = \eta^{ac} S_L^{bd} + \eta^{bd} S_L^{ac} - \eta^{ad} S_L^{bc} - \eta^{bc} S_L^{ad}, \quad (6)$$

where p^μ is related to the canonical momentum by $\mathcal{P}^\mu = p^\mu - \frac{1}{2} \omega_{ab}^\mu S_L^{ab}$. After the SSC is enforced a Dirac structure emerges. In flat space-time the NW SSC will preserve the canonical structure in the reduced space (x^i, p^i, S_L^i) , with $S_L^i = \epsilon^{ijk} S_L^{jk}$ the spin three vector. In a curved background however, the algebra turns out to be

$$\{x^i, \mathcal{P}_j\} = \delta_j^i + \dots \quad (7)$$

$$\{x^i, x^j\} = 0 + \dots \quad (8)$$

$$\{\mathcal{P}^i, \mathcal{P}^j\} = 0 + \dots \quad (9)$$

$$\{x^i, S_L^j\} = 0 + \dots \quad (10)$$

$$\{\mathcal{P}^j, S_L^i\} = 0 + \dots \quad (11)$$

$$\{S_L^i, S_L^j\} = \epsilon^{ijk} S_L^k, \quad (12)$$

with the ellipses representing a series of ‘‘curvature×spin’’ terms^b. In principle we should worry about these curvature effects, however we will show by standard power counting, its effects in the spin-spin EOM are subleading and the canonical procedure is accurate up to 4PN. The reason is somehow intuitive. To get a correction coming from the algebra to the $\vec{S}_1 \cdot \vec{S}_2$ piece of the EOM for particle 1, one needs to consider the \vec{S}_2 part of the spin-orbit Hamiltonian. The latter scales as v^3 relatively to the Newtonian term. We know on the other hand that the spin-orbit EOM does

^aOne could chose to expand the action in terms of $S^{\mu\nu}$. However, to obtain the EOM from the potentials one would need to account for a more complicated spin algebra.

^bFor example, in the electromagnetic case,⁵ similar to ours after the identification $A_\mu \sim \omega_\mu^{ab} S_{ab}$, the Dirac structure (in the covariant SSC) turns out to be a very cumbersome expression.

not receive any corrections at leading order (1.5PN). This is a not trivial statement given the fact that it could be modified by a non trivial commutator with the leading order Hamiltonian. Therefore, “algebra corrections” should start at 2.5PN. To get a correction to the spin-spin EOM we would then need to hook up a 1.5PN spin-orbit Hamiltonian with a 2.5PN algebra term, effectively a 4PN correction. Let us consider for instance the commutator $\{x^i, x^j\}$ as an example. This commutator in the NW SSC will receive corrections scaling as (schematically) $\sim R x^2 \frac{S}{m^2} + \dots$, with R the Riemann tensor. On the other hand, in the covariant SSC, this bracket is modified⁵ to $\{x^i, x^j\} = \frac{S^{ji}}{m^2}$, whose net effect in the EOM is a 1.5PN term, necessary indeed to prove the equivalence for different SSCs.³ The new term has now an extra factor scaling as $\partial^2 h_{00} x^2$ at leading order ($R \sim \partial^2 h_{00}$). In the weak gravity approximation, $h_{00} \sim v^2$, so that the algebra-correction effectively starts at 2.5PN as we had foreseen^c.

Let us add a few words on the NW SSC in a curved background and the spin choice. The NW condition implies (for each particle)

$$m S_L^{a0} = S_L^{ab} p_b \rightarrow S_{L(pn)}^{i0} = \frac{1}{2} v^j S_{L(pn)}^{ij} + O(v^4) \quad (13)$$

where S_{pn}^{ij} is the spin tensor in the original PN frame ($S_L^{ab} = e_\mu^a e_\nu^b S_{pn}^{\mu\nu}$), and v^i the three coordinate velocity^d. One can also relate both spin tensors (we removed the pn label for simplicity),

$$S_{1L}^{ij} = S_1^{ij} + S_1^{ik} h_k^j - S_1^{jk} h_k^i + \dots \sim S_1^{ij} + 4 \frac{G_N m_2}{r} S_1^{ij} + \dots \quad (14)$$

and then transform the EOM in terms of S^i , and hence to the covariant SSC.

As we said above spin-spin subleading effects can be computed regardless of algebra corrections up to 4PN. This is however not true for subleading spin-orbit effects at 2.5PN,^{6,7} where these corrections start to contribute. We will thus finish this short contribution with yet another approach which will naturally overcome these difficulties in a more natural fashion.

Going back to the covariant SSC it is easy to show, from Papapetrou equations,

$$p^\alpha = m u^\alpha - \frac{1}{2m} R_{\beta\nu\rho\sigma} S^{\alpha\beta} S^{\rho\sigma} u^\nu. \quad (15)$$

Notice that $p \cdot u = m$ *on shell* (once the SSC is obeyed). One can thus show that the action (1) is equivalent to the following Routhian,

$$\mathcal{R} = - \sum_q \left(\int m_q \sqrt{u_q^2} d\lambda_q + \int \frac{1}{2} S_{Lq}^{ab} \omega_{ab\mu} u_q^\mu - \frac{1}{2m_q} R_{deab}(x_q) S_{Lq}^{cd} S_{Lq}^{ab} u_q^c u_q^d d\lambda_q \right). \quad (16)$$

^cOther corrections could go as $R \frac{S^2}{m^2} \frac{S}{m^2}$ and can be shown to be subleading.

^dDepending on the frame choice the $O(v^4)$ piece will change, however, the leading order condition stays the same regardless of the choice.

There is an extra piece, $S_L^{ab}S_{Lab}$, not shown. This term does not affect the spin EOM since it is a Casimir operator. However, it enters in the worldline evolution in the form of a spin dependent mass. The EOM are,

$$\frac{\delta\mathcal{R}}{\delta x^\mu} = 0, \quad \frac{dS_L^{ab}}{d\tau} = \{S_L^{ab}, \mathcal{R}\}, \quad (17)$$

which can be shown to reproduce eq. (15) and Papapetrou equations on shell, e.g. on the constraint surface $S_L^{ab}p_b = 0^e$. To obtain Post-Newtonian corrections one calculates \mathcal{R} perturbatively. Notice that, had we imposed the SSC in (16) one would get rid of the Riemann term and end up in an approach equivalent to what we discussed before. We will proceed in a different way and we will impose the SSC condition after the EOM for (x^i, S_L^{ij}) are obtained from (17), while keeping the power counting rules for spin as before,³ e.g. $S_L^{0k} \sim v^i S_L^{ik}$. The advantage of this approach is that one does not have to worry about complicated algebraic structures. The price to pay is the need of a spin tensor rather than a vector. As an example let us compute the leading order spin-orbit contribution to the spin EOM^f. The spin-orbit potential is given by (we dropped L for simplicity)

$$V_{1.5pn}^{so} = \frac{G_N m_2}{r^2} n^j \left(S_1^{j0} + S_1^{jk} (v_1^k - 2v_2^k) \right) + 1 \leftrightarrow 2, \quad (18)$$

with $n^j = (x_1 - x_2)^j$. The relevant piece of the algebra is the commutator

$$\{S^i, S^{j0}\} = \epsilon^{ijk} S^{0k} = v^i S^j - v^j S^i + \dots, \quad (19)$$

which follows from (6) in the covariant SSC. Using (17) one gets,

$$\frac{d\vec{S}_1}{dt} = 2 \left(1 + \frac{m_2}{m_1} \right) \frac{\mu G_N}{r^2} (\vec{n} \times \vec{v}) \times \vec{S}_1 - \frac{m_2 G_N}{r^2} (\vec{S}_1 \times \vec{n}) \times \vec{v}_1 \quad (20)$$

with μ the reduced mass and \vec{v} the relative velocity. This agrees with the known result after the shift,³

$$\vec{S}_1 \rightarrow \left(1 - \frac{1}{2} \vec{v}_1^2 \right) \vec{S}_1 + \frac{1}{2} \vec{v}_1 (\vec{v}_1 \cdot \vec{S}_1). \quad (21)$$

Details and higher order computations will appear in a forthcoming paper. We would like to thank Gerhard Schäfer for helpful discussions and bringing to our attention the subtleties of the algebraic approach. We thank Ira Rothstein for helpful comments and collaboration. This work was supported by DOE contracts DOE-ER-40682-143 and DEAC02-6CH03000.

^eA similar Routhian was advocated in Ref.⁸ with $S_L^{ab}u_b$ as SSC. A Routhian was also shown to be very convenient in Ref.⁹

^fThe leading spin-spin EOM does not include S^{a0} and thus follows the exact same steps.

References

1. W. Goldberger and I. Rothstein, Phys. Rev. D 73, 104029 (2006)
2. W. Goldberger and I. Rothstein, Phys. Rev. D 73, 104030 (2006)
3. R. A. Porto, Phys.Rev. D 73, 104031 (2006)
4. R. A. Porto and I. Rothstein, Phys.Rev.Lett. 97, 021101 (2006)
5. A. Hanson and T. Regge, Ann. Phys. (N.Y.) 87, 498 (1974).
6. H. Tagoshi and A. Ohashi and B. Owen, Phys. Rev. D 63, 044006 (2001).
7. G. Faye, L. Blanchet and A. Buonanno, Phys.Rev. D 74 104033 (2006).
8. K. Yee and M. Bander, Phys. Rev. D 48 2797 (1993).
9. P. Jaranowski and G. Schäfer, Phys. Rev. D 57 7274 (1998).