KCL-PH-TH/2017-01, CERN-TH/2017-007

FRB 121102 Casts New Light on the Photon Mass

Luca Bonetti[a,b,c], **John Ellis**[d,e], **Nikolaos E. Mavromatos**[d,e], **Alexander S. Sakharov**[f,g,h], **Edward K. Sarkisyan-Grinbaum**[h,i], **Alessandro D.A.M. Spallicci**[a,b,c]

[a] *Observatoire des Sciences de l'Univers en région Centre, UMS 3116, Université d'Orléans 1A rue de la Férollerie, 45071 Orléans, France*

[b] *Pôle de Physique, Collegium Sciences et Techniques, Université d'Orléans Rue de Chartres, 45100 Orléans, France*

[c] *Laboratoire de Physique et Chimie de l'Environnement et de l'Espace, UMR 7328 Centre Nationale de la Recherche Scientifique LPC2E, Campus CNRS, 3A Avenue de la Recherche Scientifique, 45071 Orléans, France*

[d] *Theoretical Particle Physics and Cosmology Group, Physics Department King's College London, Strand, London WC2R 2LS, United Kingdom*

[e] *Theoretical Physics Department, CERN, CH-1211 Genève 23, Switzerland*

[f] *Department of Physics, New York University 4 Washington Place, New York, NY 10003, United States of America*

[g] *Physics Department, Manhattan College 4513 Manhattan College Parkway, Riverdale, NY 10471, United States of America*

[h] *Experimental Physics Department, CERN, CH-1211 Genève 23, Switzerland*

[i] *Department of Physics, The University of Texas at Arlington 502 Yates Street, Box 19059, Arlington, TX 76019, United States of America*

arXiv:1701.03097v2 [astro-ph.HE] 9 Mar 2017

Abstract

The photon mass, m_γ, can in principle be constrained using measurements of the dispersion measures (DMs) of fast radio bursts (FRBs), once the FRB redshifts are known. The DM of the repeating FRB 121102 is known to $< 1\%$, a host galaxy has now been identified with high confidence, and its redshift, z, has now been determined with high accuracy: $z = 0.19273(8)$. Taking into account the plasma contributions to the DM from the Intergalactic medium (IGM) and the Milky Way, we use the data on FRB 121102 to derive the constraint $m_\gamma \lesssim 2.2\times10^{-14}$ eV c^{-2} (3.9×10^{-50} kg). Since the plasma and photon mass contributions to DMs have different redshift dependences, they could in principle be distinguished by measurements of more FRB redshifts, enabling the sensitivity to m_γ to be improved.

The photon is generally expected to be massless, but a number of theorists have challenged this assumption, starting from de Broglie and nowadays considering models with massive photons for dark energy and dark matter. Examples of mechanisms for providing mass include Standard Model Extensions with supersymmetry and Lorentz invariance breaking [1] and Higgs mechanisms [2]. In view of these possibilities and its fundamental importance, it is important to constrain the magnitude of the photon mass as robustly as possible. The most robust limits available are those from laboratory experiments [3] - see [4, 5] for reviews - but these are much weaker than those derived from astrophysical observations. The Particle Data Group (PDG) [6] cites the upper limit $m_\gamma < 8.4 \times 10^{-19}$ eV c^{-2} ($= 1.5 \times 10^{-54}$ kg) [7] obtained by modelling the magnetic field of the solar system [7,8]. However, this limit relies on assumptions about the form of the magnetic field and does not discuss measurement accuracy and errors. Another limit ($m_\gamma < 4 \times 10^{-52}$ kg) has been derived from atmospheric radio waves has been reported in [9]. A more conservative approach was followed in an analysis of Cluster data [10], leading to an upper limit between 7.9×10^{-14} and 1.9×10^{-15} eV c^{-2} (1.4×10^{-49} and 3.4×10^{-51} kg). It is clearly desirable to explore more direct and robust astrophysical constraints on a possible photon mass.

This was the motivation for a study we made [11] (see also [12]) showing how data from fast radio bursts (FRBs) could be used to constrain m_γ. These have durations in the millisecond range, and their signals are known to arrive with a frequency-dependent dispersion in time of the $1/\nu^2$ form. This is the dependence expected from plasma effects, but a similar dispersion $\propto m_\gamma^2/\nu^2$ could also arise from a photon mass. The dispersions induced by plasma effects and m_γ both increase with distance (redshift z), but with different dependences on z. We note in this connection that the lower frequencies of FRB emissions give a distinct advantage over gamma-ray bursters and other sources of high-energy γ rays for constraining m_γ, since mass effects are suppressed for higher-energy photons [1]. Moreover, using FRB emissions to constrain m_γ is much more direct and involves fewer uncertainties than using the properties of astrophysical magnetic fields [2].

That said, although the large dispersion measures (DMs) and other arguments led to the general belief that FRBs occur at cosmological distances, until recently no FRB redshift had been measured. The first claim to measure a redshift was made for FRB

[1] In contrast, sources of high-energy photons are better suited for probing models of Lorentz violation [13].

[2] For an early consideration of possible astrophysical photon propagation delays, see [14]. For pioneering studies using astrophysical sources, see [15] (flare stars) and [16] (Crab nebula), and for an analogous subsequent study with greater sensitivity to the photon mass, see [17] (GRB 980703, $m_\gamma < 4.2 \times 10^{-47}$ kg). The most recent such studies are those in [18] (GRB 050416A, $m_\gamma < 1.1 \times 10^{-47}$ kg) and [19] (radio pulsars in the Magellanic clouds, $m_\gamma < 2 \times 10^{-48}$ kg). Our limit on m_γ is significantly stronger.

150418 [20], and this was the example we used in [11] to show how FRB measurements could in principle be used to constrain m_γ. However, the identification of the host galaxy of FRB 150418 has subsequently been challenged [21], and is now generally not accepted [22].

Our interest in the possibility of using FRBs to constrain m_γ has recently been revived, however, by the observation of repeated emissions from FRB 121102 [22]. These have permitted precise localisation of its host galaxy, which has made possible a precise determination of its redshift, $z = 0.19273(8)$ [23]. This redshift determination makes it possible, in turn, to use data on FRB 121102 to provide a robust constraint on m_γ, as we discuss in this paper.

The dispersion measure (DM) is related to the frequency-dependent time lag of an FRB by

$$\Delta t_{\rm DM} \; = \; 415 \left(\frac{\nu}{1\,{\rm GHz}}\right)^{-2} \; \frac{\rm DM}{10^5 \; {\rm pc \; cm^{-3}}} \; {\rm s} \, . \tag{1}$$

In the absence of a photon mass, the time-lag of an FRB is given by integrating the column density n_e of free electrons along the line of flight of its radio signal

$$\Delta t_{\rm DM} \; = \; \int \frac{dl}{c} \frac{\nu_p^2}{2\nu^2} \, , \tag{2}$$

where $\nu_p = (n_e e^2/\pi m_e)^{1/2} = 8.98{\cdot}10^3 n_e^{1/2}$ Hz. Several sources contribute to this integrated column density of free electrons, notably the Milky Way galaxy, the intergalactic medium (IGM) and the host galaxy. The contribution to the DM (1) of an FRB at redshift z from the IGM is given by the cosmological density fraction $\Omega_{\rm IGM}$ of ionized baryons [24, 25]:

$${\rm DM_{IGM}} \; = \; \frac{3cH_0\Omega_{\rm IGM}}{8\pi G m_p} H_e(z) \, , \tag{3}$$

where $H_0 = 67.8(9)$ km/s/Mpc [6] is the present Hubble expansion rate [3], G is the Newton constant, m_p is the proton mass, and the redshift-dependent factor

$$H_e(z) \; \equiv \; \int_0^z \frac{(1+z')dz'}{\sqrt{\Omega_\Lambda + (1+z')^3 \Omega_m}} \, , \tag{4}$$

where $\Omega_\Lambda = 0.692(12)$ and $\Omega_m = 0.308(12)$ [6]. For comparison, the difference in time lags between photons of energies $E_{1,2}$ due to a non-zero photon mass has the form:

$$\Delta t_{m_\gamma} = \frac{m_\gamma^2}{2H_0} \cdot \left(\frac{1}{E_1^2} - \frac{1}{E_2^2} \right) \cdot H_\gamma(z) \, , \tag{5}$$

[3] We discuss later the impact of assuming a broader range $H_0 = 70(4)$ km/s/Mpc [26].

where we use natural units $h = c = 1$, and [27, 28]

$$H_\gamma(z) \equiv \int_0^z \frac{dz'}{(1+z')^2\sqrt{\Omega_\Lambda + (1+z')^3\Omega_m}} \,. \tag{6}$$

As already commented, the time lags due to the IGM and a possible photon mass have different dependences (4, 6) on the redshift. The uncertainties in the cosmological parameters and the measurement of the redshift measurement of FRB 121102 are taken into account in our analysis, with the uncertainties in the former being much more important, as we see later.

The top (green) band in Fig. 1 shows the total DM $= 558.1 \pm 3.3$ pc cm^{-3} measured for FRB 121102 [22]. The most conservative approach to constraining m_γ would be to set to zero the other contributions, and assign this total DM to a possible photon mass. However, this is surely over conservative, and a reasonable approach is to subtract from the total DM the expected contribution from the Milky Way [22], DM$_{\rm MW}$, which is the sum of contributions from the disk [29]: DM$_{\rm NE2001} \simeq 188$ pc cm^{-3} and the halo: DM$_{\rm halo} \simeq 30$ pc cm^{-3} [23], to which we assign an overall uncertainty of 20%, namely 44 pc cm^{-3} [23], leaving the middle (blue) band in Fig. 1 that is centred at 340 pc cm^{-3}. From this we may also subtract the contribution from the IGM, which is estimated within the ΛCDM model to be $\simeq 200$ pc cm^{-3} [23–25]. To this is assigned an uncertainty of 85 pc cm^{-3} associated with inhomogeneities in the IGM [23, 30], which is much larger than the 1.2% variation associated with uncertainties in the cosmological parameters (shown as the narrow magenta band). The bottom (pink) band in Fig. 1, centred at 140 pc cm^{-3}, shows the effect of subtracting these contributions from the measured DM for FRB 121102.

After subtracting these contributions, we are left with a residual DM $= 140$ pc cm^{-3} with a total uncertainty of ± 96 pc cm^{-3}, shown as the outer pink band, where the error is calculated by combining in quadrature the uncertainties in the experimental measurement of the total DM, the uncertainty in DM$_{\rm MW}$, and the uncertainties in DM$_{\rm IGM}$ associated with the cosmological parameters H_0, Ω_Λ and Ω_m and possible inhomogeneities. One cannot exclude the possibility that all the residual DM of FRB 121102 is due to the host galaxy, which is estimated to lie within the range $55 \lesssim {\rm DM}_{\rm Host} \lesssim 225$ pc cm^{-3} [23]. However, in the absence of detailed information about the host galaxy, when constraining the photon mass we allow conservatively for the possibility that all the residual DM is due to $m_\gamma \neq 0$.

The curved band in Fig. 1 shows the possible contribution to the DM of FRB 121102 of a photon mass, as a function of m_γ: DM $= 10^5 m_\gamma^2 H_\gamma/(415 A^2 h_0)$, where H_γ is given in (6), $A = 1.05 \cdot 10^{-14}$ ev s$^{-1/2}$ and $h_0 \equiv H_0/100$km/s/Mpc. The width of this band is due to the uncertainties in the cosmological parameters H_0, Ω_Λ and Ω_m [6], and the




Figure 1: *Contributions to the dispersion measure (DM) budget for FRB 121102. The top (green) band represents the experimental measurement of the total DM* $= 558.1 \pm 3.3$ *pc cm*$^{-3}$*. The middle (blue) band shows the extragalactic contribution, as obtained by subtracting from the central value of the total DM the galactic contribution* $DM_{\rm MW} \equiv DM_{\rm NE2001} + DM_{\rm halo} = 218$ *pc cm*$^{-3}$ *[23], to which is assigned an estimated uncertainty of 20%. The bottom (pink) band is obtained by subtracting also the estimated contribution from the intergalactic medium (IGM):* $DM_{\rm IGM} \simeq 200$ *pc cm*$^{-3}$ *[23], which has an uncertainty of* 85 *pc cm*$^{-3}$ *associated with inhomogeneities in the IGM, and a smaller uncertainty associated with the cosmological parameters (indicated by the narrow magenta band). The outer pink band shows the total uncertainty in the residual DM after subtraction of* $DM_{\rm MW}$ *and* $DM_{\rm IGM}$*, with errors added in quadrature. The curved (black) band shows the possible contribution of a non-zero photon mass,* m_γ*, also including the uncertainties in cosmological parameters and the redshift of FRB 121102.*

uncertainty in the determination of the redshift of FRB 121102. Assuming that the photon mass contribution to the total DM of FRB 121102 lies within the range allowed for the residual DM, after subtraction of the Milky Way and IGM contributions and taking their uncertainties into account, we find $m_\gamma \lesssim 2.2 \times 10^{-14}$ eV c^{-2} (3.9×10^{-50} kg) [4]. This limit is similar to, though slightly weaker than, that obtained from similar considerations of FRB 150418 [11,12], whose redshift is now contested, as discussed earlier [21]. If FRB 150418 was indeed at a cosmological distance, using its DM value determined in [20] and the same values of $H_e(z)$ and $H_\gamma(z)$ as in the present analysis, we find that the inferred limits on m_γ would coincide if FRB 150418 had a redshift $z = 0.38$, instead of the value $z = 0.492$ reported in [20] and challenged in [21].

How could this constraint be improved in the future? Clearly it is desirable to reduce the uncertainties in the modelling of the Milky Way and IGM contributions. Also, the limit could be strengthened by a redshift measurement for an FRB at higher z, if the uncertainty in the IGM contribution can be controlled. Finally, as remarked in [11], comparing the DMs for FRBs with different redshifts could enable the IGM and m_γ contributions to be disentangled, in view of their different dependences (4, 6) on z.

A hitherto unexplored window at very low frequencies in the MHz-KHz region could be opened by a space mission consisting of a swarm of nanosatellites [31]. One possible configuration would be orbiting the Moon, where it would be sufficiently away from the ionosphere to avoid terrestrial interference, and would have stable conditions for calibration during observations. Such low frequencies would offer a sensitive probe of any delays due to a non-zero photon mass.

Acknowledgements

The research of J.E. and N.E.M. was supported partly by the STFC Grant ST/L000326/1. The work of A.S.S. was supported partly by the US National Science Foundation under Grants PHY-1505463 and PHY-1402964.

References

[1] L. Bonetti, L. R. dos Santos Filho, J. A. Helayël-Neto and A. D. A. M. Spallicci, *"Effective photon mass by super and Lorentz symmetry breaking"*, Phys. Lett. B **764** (2017) 203, doi:10.1016/j.physletb.2016.11.023, arXiv:1607.08786 [hep-ph].

[4] This limit would increase to $m_\gamma \lesssim 2.3 \times 10^{-14}$ eV c^{-2} (4.1×10^{-50} kg) if the more relaxed range $H_0 = 70(4)$ km/s/Mpc [26] were used for H_0. On the other hand, it would decrease to $m_\gamma \lesssim 1.8 \times 10^{-14}$ eV c^{-2} (3.2×10^{-50} kg) if the minimum estimate of $\mathrm{DM_{Host}}$ [23] was taken into account.

[2] E. Adelberger, G. Dvali, A. Gruzinov, *"Photon-mass bound destroyed by vortices"*, Phys. Rev. Lett. **98** (2007) 010402, doi:10.1103/PhysRevLett.98.010402, arXiv:hep-ph/0306245.

[3] E. R. Williams, J. E. Faller and H. A. Hill, *"New experimental test of Coulomb's law: A laboratory upper limit on the photon rest mass"*, Phys. Rev. Lett. **26**, 721 (1971), doi:10.1103/PhysRevLett.26.721.

[4] D. D. Lowenthal, *"Limits on the photon mass",* Phys. Rev. D **8**, 2349 (1973), doi:10.1103/PhysRevD.8.2349; L. C. Tu, J. Luo and G. T. Gillies, *"The mass of the photon",* Rept. Prog. Phys. **68**, 77 (2005), doi:10.1088/0034-4885/68/1/R02; L. B. Okun, *"Photon: History, mass, charge",* Acta Phys. Polon. B **37**, 565 (2006), `http://www.actaphys.uj.edu.pl/fulltext?series=Reg&Vol=37&page=565`, arXiv:hep-ph/0602036; G. Spavieri, J. Quintero, G. T. Gillies and M. Rodriguez, *"A survey of existing and proposed classical and quantum approaches to the photon mass",* Eur. Phys. J. D **61**, 531 (2011), doi:10.1140/epjd/e2011-10508-7.

[5] A. S. Goldhaber and M. M. Nieto, *"Photon and graviton mass limits"*, Rev. Mod. Phys. **82**, 939 (2010), doi:10.1103/RevModPhys.82.939, arXiv:0809.1003 [hep-ph].

[6] C. Patrignani *et al.* [Particle Data Group], *"Review of particle physics"*, Chin. Phys. C **40** (2016) 100001, doi:10.1088/1674-1137/40/10/100001

[7] D. D. Ryutov, *"The role of finite photon mass in magnetohydrodynamics of space plasmas"*, Plasma Phys. Control. Fusion **39**, A73 (1997), doi:10.1088/0741-3335/39/5A/008.

[8] D. D. Ryutov, *"Using plasma physics to weigh the photon"*, Plasma Phys. Control. Fusion **49**, B429 (2007), doi:10.1088/0741-3335/49/12B/S40.

[9] M. Füllekrug, *"Probing the speed of light with radio waves at extremely low radio frequencies"*, Phys. Rev. Lett., 93, 043901 (2004), doi: 10.1103/PhysRevLett.93.043901.

[10] A. Retinò, A. D. A. M. Spallicci and A. Vaivads, *"Solar wind test of the de Broglie-Proca's massive photon with Cluster multi-spacecraft data"*, Astropart. Phys. **82** (2016) 49, doi:10.1016/j.astropartphys.2016.05.006, arXiv:1302.6168 [hep-ph].

[11] L. Bonetti, J. Ellis, N. E. Mavromatos, A. S. Sakharov, E. K. Sarkisyan-Grinbaum and A. D. A. M. Spallicci, *"Photon mass limits from fast radio bursts"*, Phys. Lett. B **757** (2016) 548, doi:10.1016/j.physletb.2016.04.035, arXiv:1602.09135 [astro-ph.HE].

[12] X.-F. Wu, S.-B. Zhang, H. Gao, J.-J. Wei, Y.-C. Zou, W.-H. Lei, B. Zhang, Z.-G. Dai and P. Mészáros, *"Constraints on the photon mass with fast radio bursts"*, Astrophys. J. **822** (2016) L15, doi:10.3847/2041-8205/822/1/L15, arXiv:1602.07835 [astro-ph.HE].

[13] G. Amelino-Camelia, J. R. Ellis, N. E. Mavromatos, D. V. Nanopoulos and S. Sarkar, *"Tests of quantum gravity from observations of gamma-ray bursts",* Nature **393**, 763 (1998), doi:10.1038/31647, arXiv:astro-ph/9712103; see also J. R. Ellis, K. Farakos, N. E. Mavromatos, V. A. Mitsou and D. V. Nanopoulos, *"Astrophysical probes of the constancy of the velocity of light",* Astrophys. J. **535**, 139 (2000), doi:10.1086/308825, arXiv:astro-ph/9907340.

[14] L. de Broglie, *"La Mécanique Ondulatoire du Photon. Une Nouvelle Théorie de la Lumière"*, Hermann, Paris, 1940.

[15] B. Lovell, F. L. Whipple and L. H. Solomon, *"Relative velocity of light and radio wave in space",* Nature **202**, 157 (1964).

[16] B. Warner and R. E. Nather, *"Wavelength independence of the velocity of light in space",* Nature **222**, 157 (1969), doi:10.1038/222157b0.

[17] B. E. Schaefer, *"Severe limits on variations of the speed of light with frequency,"* Phys. Rev. Lett. **82** (1999) 4964 doi:10.1103/PhysRevLett.82.4964 [astro-ph/9810479].

[18] B. Zhang, Y.-T. Chai, Y.-C. Zou and X.-F. Wu, *"Constraining the mass of the photon with gamma-Ray bursts,"* JHEAp **11-12** (2016) 20 doi:10.1016/j.jheap.2016.07.001 arXiv:1607.03225 [astro-ph.HE].

[19] J.-J. Wei, E.-K. Zhang, S.-B. Zhang and X.-F. Wu, *"New Limits on the Photon Mass with Radio Pulsars in the Magellanic Clouds,"* Res. Astron. Astrophys. **17** (2017) 13 doi:10.1088/1674-4527/17/2/13 arXiv:1608.07675 [astro-ph.HE].

[20] E. F. Keane *et al.*, *"A fast radio burst host galaxy,"* Nature **530**, 453 (2016), doi:10.1038/nature17140, arXiv:1602.07477 [astro-ph.HE].

[21] P. K. G. Williams and E. Berger, *"No precise localization for FRB 150418: claimed radio transient is AGN variability"*, Astrophys. J. **821** (2016), L22, doi:10.3847/2041-8205/821/2/L22, arXiv:1602.08434 [astro-ph.CO]; H. K. Vedantham, V. Ravi, K. Mooley, D. Frail, G. Hallinan and S. R. Kulkarni, *"On associating fast radio bursts*

with afterglows", Astrophys. J. **824** (2016), L9, doi:10.3847/2041-8205/824/1/L9, arXiv:1603.04421 [astro-ph.HE].

[22] S. Chatterjee *et al.*, *"The direct localization of a fast radio burst and its host"*, Nature **541**, 58 (2017), doi:10.1038/nature20797, arXiv:1701.01098 [astro-ph.HE].

[23] S. P. Tendulkar *et al.*, *"The host galaxy and redshift of the repeating fast radio burst FRB 121102"*, Astrophys. J. **834**, L7 (2017), doi:10.3847/2041-8213/834/2/L7, arXiv:1701.01100 [astro-ph.HE].

[24] K. Ioka, *"Cosmic dispersion measure from gamma-ray burst afterglows: probing the reionization history and the burst environment"*, Astrophys. J. **598**, L79 (2003), doi:10.1086/380598, arXiv:astro-ph/0309200.

[25] S. Inoue, *"Probing the cosmic reionization history and local environment of gamma-ray bursts through radio dispersion",* Mon. Not. Roy. Astron. Soc. **348**, 999 (2004), doi:10.1111/j.1365-2966.2004.07359.x, arXiv:astro-ph/0309364.

[26] N. Jackson, *"The Hubble constant"*, Living Rev. Relativity, **18** (2015) 2, doi:10.1007/lrr-2015-2.

[27] J. R. Ellis, N. E. Mavromatos, D. V. Nanopoulos, A. S. Sakharov and E. K. G. Sarkisyan, *"Robust limits on Lorentz violation from gamma-ray bursts"*, Astropart. Phys. **25**, 402 (2006), doi:10.1016/j.astropartphys.2006.04.001, arXiv:astro-ph/0510172; *Erratum*, ibidem **29**, 158 (2008), doi:10.1016/j.astropartphys.2007.12.003, arXiv:0712.2781 [astro-ph].

[28] U. Jacob and T. Piran, *"Lorentz-violation-induced arrival delays of cosmological particles"*, J. Cosm. Astropart. Phys. **0801**, 031 (2008), doi:10.1088/1475-7516/2008/01/031, arXiv:0712.2170 [astro-ph].

[29] J. M. Cordes and T. J. W. Lazio, *"NE2001. 1. A new model for the galactic distribution of free electrons and its fluctuations"*, arXiv:astro-ph/0207156.

[30] M. McQuinn, *"Locating the "missing" baryons with extragalactic dispersion measure estimates"*, Astrophys. J. **780** (2014) L33, doi:10.1088/2041-8205/780/2/L33, arXiv:1309.4451 [astro-ph.CO].

[31] M. J. Bentum, L. Bonetti, A. D. A. M. Spallicci , *" Dispersion by pulsars, magnetars, fast radio bursts and massive electromagnetism at very low radio frequencies"*, Adv. Sp. Res., 59, 736 (2017), doi: 10.1016/j.asr.2016.10.0.018, arXiv:1607.08820 [astro-ph.IM].