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#### Abstract

A frequently confused point in studies of symmetry violation is the distinction between observer and particle transformations. In this work, we consider a model in which a coefficient in the Standard-Model Extension leads to violations of rotation invariance in Newton's second law. The model highlights the distinction between observer and particle transformations.


## 1. Introduction

The Standard-Model Extension (SME) provides a general field-theoretic framework for studying Lorentz violation, ${ }^{1}$ including rotation-invariance violation. To highlight the basic ideas of Lorentz-symmetry breaking, we consider rotation-invariance violation in Newton's second law: ${ }^{2}$

$$
\begin{equation*}
F_{j}=m_{j k} a_{k} . \tag{1}
\end{equation*}
$$

Here $m_{j k}$ is a symmetric direction-dependent inertial mass (we consider conventional gravitational mass). This yields a valid and more general form that Newton himself could have chosen.

Our effective inertial mass can be generated as a low-energy limit of the SME: ${ }^{3}$

$$
\begin{equation*}
m_{j k}=m\left(\delta_{j k}+2 c_{j k}\right) . \tag{2}
\end{equation*}
$$

Here $c_{j k}$ is a coefficient for Lorentz violation found in the fermion sector, taken as symmetric. It is depicted with background diamonds in Fig. 1. A similar construction can also be found associated with other SME coefficients for Lorentz violation. ${ }^{4}$

Using a block on an inclined plane, we show that observer rotation invariance holds, while a particle rotation changes the experiment's outcome, violating Lorentz symmetry.

## 2. Block on an inclined plane

Examine a block on an inclined plane devoid of friction. The $x$-axis points down the plane while the $y$-axis is perpendicular to the surface as shown in the left-hand diagram of Fig. 1. Let the block's effective inertial mass be diagonal:

$$
m_{j k}=m\left(\begin{array}{ccc}
1+2 c_{x x} & 0 & 0  \tag{3}\\
0 & 1+2 c_{y y} & 0 \\
0 & 0 & 1+2 c_{z z}
\end{array}\right)
$$

Solving for the particle's acceleration under the constraint $a_{y}=0$ yields

$$
\begin{equation*}
a_{x}=a_{R}=\left(1-2 c_{x x}\right) g \sin \theta+O\left(c^{2}\right) \tag{4}
\end{equation*}
$$

where $a_{R}$ is the acceleration down the ramp. The only difference here from the conventional problem is the presence of $c_{x x}$. Qualitatively, the motion is down the plane with constant acceleration, as in the absence of Lorentz violation.

## 3. Observer-rotation invariance remains

Perform an observer rotation on the original experiment; that is, consider the same problem in new coordinates as shown in the left-hand diagram of Fig. 1. Here,

$$
m_{j^{\prime} k^{\prime}}=m\left(\begin{array}{ccc}
1+2 c_{x^{\prime} x^{\prime}} & 2 c_{x^{\prime} y^{\prime}} & 0  \tag{5}\\
2 c_{x^{\prime} y^{\prime}} & 1+2 c_{y^{\prime} y^{\prime}} & 0 \\
0 & 0 & 1+2 c_{z^{\prime} z^{\prime}}
\end{array}\right)
$$

is the mass in the new coordinates obtained via $m^{\prime}=R m R^{T}, R$ being a rotation matrix. Components are related by, for example,

$$
\begin{equation*}
c_{x^{\prime} x^{\prime}}=c_{x x} \cos ^{2} \theta+c_{y y} \sin ^{2} \theta \tag{6}
\end{equation*}
$$

Again solving, we find up to $O\left(c^{2}\right)$ the components

$$
\begin{align*}
& a_{x^{\prime}}=\left(1-2 c_{x^{\prime} x^{\prime}} \cos ^{2} \theta-2 c_{y^{\prime} y^{\prime}} \sin ^{2} \theta+4 c_{x^{\prime} y^{\prime}} \sin \theta \cos \theta\right) g \sin \theta \cos \theta \\
& a_{y^{\prime}}=-\left(1-2 c_{x^{\prime} x^{\prime}} \cos ^{2} \theta-2 c_{y^{\prime} y^{\prime}} \sin ^{2} \theta+4 c_{x^{\prime} y^{\prime}} \sin \theta \cos \theta\right) g \sin ^{2} \theta \tag{7}
\end{align*}
$$

However, the acceleration is again along the ramp with the magnitude found in Eq. (4), which is obtained from $a_{x^{\prime}}$ and $a_{y^{\prime}}$ by $a_{R}=\sqrt{a_{x^{\prime}}^{2}+a_{y^{\prime}}^{2}}$ and a substitution for $c_{j^{\prime} k^{\prime}}$ in terms of $c_{j k}$. Hence, both observers agree on the outcome of the experiment.


Fig. 1. Diagrams.

## 4. Particle-rotation invariance is violated

A particle rotation of the original system leaves the mass matrix as in Eq. (1), but alters the direction of the gravitational field relative to the background as shown in the right-hand diagram of Fig. 1. This produces an observably different acceleration. Solving for the motion of the particle subject to the constraint yields

$$
\begin{align*}
& a_{y}=-\left(1-2 c_{x x}-2 c_{y y}\right) g \sin ^{2} \theta+O\left(c^{2}\right) \\
& a_{x}=\left(1-2 c_{x x}-2 c_{y y}\right) g \sin \theta \cos \theta+O\left(c^{2}\right) \tag{8}
\end{align*}
$$

Here the component along the ramp is

$$
\begin{equation*}
a_{R}=\left(1-2 c_{x x}-2 c_{y y}\right) g \sin \theta+O\left(c^{2}\right) \tag{9}
\end{equation*}
$$

which is different from the first cases, revealing observable Lorentz violation.
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