

CLARIFICATION ON THEORETICAL PREDICTIONS FOR GENERAL RELATIVISTIC EFFECTS IN FROZEN SPIN STORAGE RINGS

András László, Zoltán Zimborás
*Wigner Research Centre for Physics,
 P.O.Box 49, H-1525 Budapest, Hungary
 laszlo.andras@wigner.hu
 zimboras.zoltan@wigner.hu*

Electromagnetic moments of particles carry important information on their internal structure, as well as on the structure of the effective Lagrangian describing their underlying field theory. One of the cleanest observable of such kind is the electric dipole moment (EDM), since Standard Model estimates would imply very small, much less than 10^{-30} ecm value for that quantity, whereas several Beyond Standard Model (BSM) theories happen to predict of the order of 10^{-28} ecm EDM for elementary or hadronic particles. So far, precision EDM upper bounds are mainly available for neutrons via cold neutron experiments, and indirect measurements for electrons. Therefore, in the recent year there has been a growing interest for direct measurement of EDM for charged particles, such as electrons, protons, muons or light nuclei. Such measurements become possible in relativistic storage rings, called *frozen spin storage rings*. Many environmental factors give systematic backgrounds to the EDM signal, including General Relativity (GR), due to the gravitational field of the Earth. It turns out that, depending of the experimental scenario, the GR effect can be well above the planned EDM sensitivity. Therefore, it is both of concern as a source of systematics, as well as it can serve as a spin-off experiment for an independent test of GR. There are a handful of theoretical papers quantifying the GR systematics, delivering slightly different results. The aim of this paper is to clarify these claims, eventually try to reconcile these predictions, and to deduce their experimental implications. The closing section of the paper quantifies the field imperfection systematic error cancellation in the case of a so-called *doubly-frozen spin storage ring* setting, in the idealized axial symmetric limit.

Keywords: general relativity; frozen spin; EDM; electric dipole moment

1. Introduction

In the recent years, a significant interest built up for studying the electric dipole moment (EDM) of charged elementary or hadronic particles (electrons, muons, protons, or light nuclei). The reason for that is the following fact: the Standard Model (SM) predicts rather low, way smaller than 10^{-30} ecm EDM, whereas several most prominent Beyond Standard Model (BSM) theories predict EDMs of the order of 10^{-28} ecm. As such, setting experimental upper bounds to EDM can serve as one of the most sensitive SM/BSM discriminator. So far, stringent EDM upper bounds were obtained for neutrons via ultracold neutron experiments, as well as indirect measurements for electrons were also obtained for bound electrons in large Z atoms.¹ For unbound charged particles, the measurement becomes obviously difficult, since their EDM cannot be simply be determined via putting them into a homogeneous electrostatic field and observing the transition between the parallel and antiparallel spin state to the electric field. Therefore, the technically rather challenging idea of *frozen spin storage ring* emerged in the early 2000s (see reviews e.g. in^{2,3}).

In a typical idealized storage ring, particles are confined to a circular orbit using a homogeneous magnetic bending field. In such a situation, however, the spin of the particles precesses around the bending axis, proportionally to their magnetic moment anomaly, $a := \frac{g-2}{2}$. In a frozen spin storage ring, an additional, beam-radial electrostatic bending field is superimposed, such that the circular motion is satisfied, and the magnetic precession of the spin vector is stalled. This is illustrated in Figure 1. In such condition, if the particle had an electric dipole moment, it would cause a spin precession around the instantaneous beam-radial axis.

The concept of frozen spin ring setting is suggested by the special relativistic equation of motion of point particles with spin, which are the Newton and the Thomas-Bargmann-Michel-Telegdi (TBMT) equations:

$$\begin{aligned} \frac{d\vec{\beta}}{dt_{\text{lab}}} &= \frac{q}{m\gamma} \left(\vec{E}/c - (\vec{\beta} \cdot \vec{E}/c) \vec{\beta} + \vec{\beta} \times \vec{B} \right), \\ \frac{d\vec{S}_{\text{lab,corot.}}}{dt_{\text{lab}}} &= -\frac{q}{m}. \end{aligned}$$

In a frozen spin ring, magnetic precession is compensated by an electric field:
spin is always tangential to orbit




Fig. 1. (Color online) Illustration of the concept of a frozen spin storage ring. The basic idea is that two kind of bending fields are used, a magnetic one and an electrostatic one, in such combination that both the circular motion is satisfied, as well as the magnetic precession of the spin vector is stalled. The transverse dispersion of the beam is kept under control by additional, electrostatic quadrupole beam focusing optics. For particles with $a > 0$, it is possible to construct such rings with electrostatic-only bending fields, at the magic momentum, $|\beta\gamma| = \frac{1}{\sqrt{a}}$, where $\beta\gamma$ denotes momentum-over-mass.

$$\left(\underbrace{a \vec{B}}_{\text{magnetic term}} + \underbrace{\left(\frac{1}{(\beta\gamma)^2} - a \right) \vec{\beta} \times \vec{E}/c}_{\text{electric term}} + \underbrace{\frac{1}{2} \eta (\vec{E}/c + \vec{\beta} \times \vec{B})}_{\text{EDM term}} \right) \times \vec{S}_{\text{lab,corot.}} \quad (1)$$

zero at
"magic momentum"

Here, c is the speed of light, m is the mass, q is the charge of the particle, s is its spin, μ is its magnetic dipole moment, d is its electric dipole moment (EDM), $g := \frac{2m\mu}{qs}$ is its scaled magnetic moment, $a := \frac{g-2}{2}$ is its magnetic moment anomaly, $\eta := \frac{2mc d}{qs}$ is its "g" for the EDM. The fields \vec{B} , \vec{E} are understood in the laboratory frame, as well as the time t_{lab} , the velocity vector $\vec{\beta}$, and the spin vector \vec{S}_{lab} . The vector $\vec{S}_{\text{lab,corot.}}$ denotes the projections of the latter onto the tangent, normal and binormal directions, i.e. its components in the corotating (Fernet–Serret) coordinates. The frozen spin condition is said to be satisfied whenever $\frac{d\vec{S}_{\text{lab,corot.}}}{dt_{\text{lab}}} = 0$ holds, assuming $\eta = 0$. It is seen that for particles with $a > 0$ one may set $|\beta\gamma| = \frac{1}{\sqrt{a}}$, which is also called the "magic momentum", and under such condition the electrostatic term does not contribute. At magic momentum, the frozen spin condition is satisfied whenever $\vec{B} = 0$. More generally, at any momentum-over-mass $\beta\gamma$, the idealized planar circular motion together with the frozen

spin condition is satisfied whenever

$$\begin{aligned} E_H \cdot L &= -\text{sign}(a) \frac{m c^2}{q} \frac{(a \beta \gamma)^2 \sqrt{a^2 + (a \beta \gamma)^2}}{a^2 (1 + a)}, \\ B_V \cdot L &= \frac{m c}{q} \frac{(a \beta \gamma)(a - (a \beta \gamma)^2)}{a^2 (1 + a)} \end{aligned} \quad (2)$$

holds, where L is the bending radius, B_V is the homogeneous vertical magnetic bending field, and E_H is the horizontal (beam-radial) electrostatic bending field, both sampled at the beam trajectory.

The experimental proposals for EDM rings⁴ aim to reach an EDM sensitivity of the order of 10^{-29} ecm, which would be equivalent (in a typical realistic setting) to an instrumental sensitivity for about 10^{-9} rad/s for the rate of spin precession around the instantaneous beam-radial axis. Technically, this is measured by initially longitudinally polarized beams, and this small precession rate is detected via the rate of vertical polarization buildup. This small signal adds up coherently with each full revolution, and therefore can be accumulated. In the foreseen experimental setting, the signal integration time is of the order of an hour.

2. General Relativistic (GR) effects

In the years of early 2000s it was suggested¹⁰ that in storage ring experiments, Earth's gravitational field might cause a systematic effect on the spin precession. In manifestly covariant General Relativistic (GR) formalism, the Newton plus TBMT equations^{5–8} read as:

$$\begin{aligned} u^a \nabla_a u^b &= -\frac{q}{m} g^{ab} F_{ac} u^c, \\ D_u^F w^b &= -\frac{\mu}{s} (g^{ab} F_{ac} - u^b u^d F_{dc} - g^{ab} F_{ad} u^d u^e g_{ec}) w^c, \\ &+ \frac{d}{s} (g^{ab} \mathcal{F}_{ac} - u^b u^d \mathcal{F}_{dc} - g^{ab} \mathcal{F}_{ad} u^d u^e g_{ec}) w^c. \end{aligned} \quad (3)$$

Here, u^a is the four velocity vector field along the particle worldline, whereas w^a denotes the spin direction vector, the symbol F_{bc} denotes the electromagnetic field strength tensor of the total guiding fields, \mathcal{F}_{bc} denotes the Hodge dual of the electromagnetic field strength tensor, g_{ab} denotes the spacetime metric tensor field as usual, ∇_a denotes the spacetime covariant derivation compatible with the metric, and $D_u^F w^b$ denotes the *Fermi–Walker derivative* of w^b along the worldline described by u^a , and it is defined as $D_u^F w^b := u^a \nabla_a w^b + g_{ed} w^e u^b u^a \nabla_a u^d - g_{cd} w^c u^d u^a \nabla_a u^b$. The Fermi–Walker

derivative is a minimally modified version of the spacetime covariant derivation ∇_a , preserving angles determined by the spacetime metric g_{ab} . As such, it can be interpreted as parallel transport of rigid frames along a prescribed timelike trajectory described by u^a . The rationale behind this equation of motion is that it preserves the orthogonality relation $g_{ab}u^aw^b = 0$ of the four-velocity vector and the spin direction vector, which algebraic relation derives from the quantum mechanical origin of the spin vector (Pauli–Lyubanski vector). The pertinent algebraic constraint already causes a spin precession in special relativity, i.e. over Minkowski spacetime, whenever the trajectory described by u^a is accelerating, i.e. $u^a\nabla_a u^b \neq 0$. That is called Thomas precession. For non-accelerating (geodesic) trajectories, the Fermi–Walker derivation falls back to ordinary covariant derivation, and Thomas precession is not present. Over general relativistic spacetimes, the precession caused by a Schwarzschild background is called the de Sitter precession or geodetic effect, and on a Kerr background it is called Lense–Thirring effect (also experimentally confirmed by the Gravity Probe B satellite experiment).

3. Quantitative predictions of GR effects in EDM rings

We now enumerate the available literature on the predictions for the GR systematics in a frozen spin ring EDM observable.

The work presented in¹⁰ seems to be the first one which suggests that in storage ring experiments, GR might have a contribution to the spin dynamics. In that work, a perturbative weak field approximation in terms of $\frac{r_S}{R}$ was used (R standing for the Earth’s radius, and r_S standing for the Earth’s Schwarzschild radius), worked out in laboratory frame formalism, i.e. in a non-manifestly covariant formalism. There was no concrete prediction stated, yet, for a frozen spin EDM ring.

The first concrete quantitative prediction for a frozen spin storage ring setting was presented in,¹¹ but solely electrostatic-only (magic momentum) ring was considered. The authors determine that the total GR systematics in an electrostatic-only (magic momentum) frozen spin ring is

$$\Omega_{GR}\Big|_{\text{magic momentum}} = -\sqrt{a}g/c, \quad (4)$$

where $g := \frac{r_S c^2}{2R^2}$ is the gravitational acceleration at the surface of the Earth. The result was obtained with a manifestly covariant formalism, in the weak field approximation, i.e. with a perturbative calculation in $\frac{r_S}{R}$. Since $g/c \approx 33 \text{ nrad/s}$, this should be a significant background for an EDM

experiment at the design sensitivity of 10^{-9} rad/s. One should recall that such an electric-only ring is only possible for particles with $a > 0$ and at $|\beta\gamma| = \frac{1}{\sqrt{a}}$, i.e. such a setting cannot exist for the experimentally very relevant deuteron or helium-3 nucleus⁹ beams.

The work^{12,13} presents the first concrete prediction for a mixed magnetic and electrostatic frozen spin storage ring, with an electrostatic or magnetostatic or combined focusing. The importance of this result is given by the above mentioned fact: such experimental setting can exist for all particle types and at any momenta, only the condition Eq.(2) needs to be satisfied (which is the frozen spin condition for an ideal planar circular ring). The pertinent work used a perturbative approach in lab frame formalism, i.e. not a manifestly covariant formalism. The prediction given by the authors for GR systematics in a frozen spin ring is

$$\Omega_{GR} = \beta (1 - a(2\gamma^2 - 1))/\gamma g/c \quad (5)$$

for the most important case of the electrostatic focusing (we only consider this case in this paper, for brevity).

The paper¹⁴ also discusses GR effect in storage rings, and draws a similar conclusion to.¹⁰ It does not give, however, a concrete prediction for an EDM ring. Similarly to,¹⁰ it uses perturbative approach in lab frame formalism, i.e. not in manifestly covariant formalism.

In the paper¹⁵ again a quantitative prediction is derived for the GR systematics. For a mixed magnetic and electrostatic EDM ring, with electrostatic focusing, the prediction

$$\Omega_{GR} = -a \beta \gamma g/c \quad (6)$$

is derived. That paper intends to make a comprehensive, spacetime geometrical modeling of the idealized experimental setting over curved background. For cross-checking purposes, in that paper manifestly covariant formalism was used, and an exact solution was derived, without intermediary weak field perturbation approach in terms of $\frac{r_S}{R}$. As such, this prediction should be compared to that of¹² (or to¹¹ at the magic momentum setting).

4. Discussion

It is seen that the quantitative predictions in the literature^{11,12,15} all agree for the electrostatic-only (magic momentum) ring case, and the according prediction for GR systematics is Eq.(4).

From the experimental point of view, however, it is important to consider non-magic momentum rings as well. Apparently, for this general case,

the predictions of¹² and¹⁵ (i.e. Eq.(5) and Eq.(6)) differ, up to a factor of 2 – 8 in the experimentally relevant $\beta\gamma$ and a settings. The aim of the present paper is to identify and understand the source of this difference in the predictions. The relevance of these investigations is given by the fact that for the experimentally most relevant particle type (deuteron) one has $a \approx -0.142$, for which Eq.(5) predicts a measurable effect well above the planned experimental sensitivity ≈ 1 nrad/s, whereas Eq.(6) would predict an effect below or just around the sensitivity, i.e. it foresees practically no observable effect. For protons, away from the magic momentum, the predictions also differ up to factor of 2 in the extreme case. This comparison is visualized in Figure 2.




Fig. 2. (Color online) Comparison of predictions¹² (Eq.(5)) and¹⁵ (Eq.(6)) for the GR systematics Ω_{GR} in the EDM observable, for the case of the experimentally very relevant deuteron beam ($a \approx -0.142$, left panels) and proton beam ($a \approx 1.79$, right panels). At the “magic momentum” (only possible for particles with $a > 0$), all the predictions agree.

The main complication for the quantitative calculation of Ω_{GR} comes from the fact, that in general relativity, there is no model for a homogeneous gravitational field, which is valid globally. Therefore, one cannot just take e.g. a Minkowski limit of Eq.(3), and apply a homogeneous acceleration field, like one would be able to do in nonrelativistic mechanics. One therefore cannot avoid to put the equations of motion Eq.(3) on a Schwarzschild spacetime, and do the calculation in GR. Detailed analysis of the perturbative lab-frame formalism (i.e. non-manifestly covariant) calculation¹² shows that in their calculation an implicit assumption was made, namely that the magnetic bending axis is Earth-radial. One should recall that Schwarzschild metric is modeling the round Earth and not an infinitely large Earth (which would stand for a homogeneous field), and in a perturbative approach in fact one needs to take care about *two* small parameters: $\frac{r_S}{R}$ and $\frac{L}{R}$, the

symbol L as before standing for the storage ring radius. In an experimental situation at the surface of the Earth with a storage ring of bending radius $L \approx 10$ m, one has that $\frac{r_s}{R} \approx 1.41 \cdot 10^{-9}$ and $\frac{L}{R} \approx 1.57 \cdot 10^{-6}$. As such, if one wishes to keep track of the gravitational modification effects (perturbatively scaling with $\frac{r_s}{R}$), one cannot just disregard the effect coming from the curvature of the Earth (perturbatively scaling with $\frac{L}{R}$): one cannot simply approximately equate the Earth-radial direction with the “vertical” direction (being the ring axis direction). To model the magnetic bending fields correctly, one actually needs to calculate the asymptotically homogeneous magnetic field over Schwarzschild spacetime (Eq.(53) and Figure 3 in¹⁵). To model the electrostatic bending field, which is the electric field of an infinite homogeneously charged wire, one needs to calculate that field over Schwarzschild (Eq.(59) and Figure 4 in¹⁵). Quite naturally, the beam needs to be balanced against the Earth’s gravitational drag. In the real experimental setting, as a consequence of the gravitational drag, the beam sinks into the electrostatic quadrupole focusing field, as depicted in Figure 3. Therefore, at the nominal equilibrium trajectory, an Earth-radial electrostatic field will balance the gravitational drag (Eq.(55) and Figure 3 in¹⁵).




Fig. 3. (Color online) Illustration of the GR modification effect of the guiding fields in a frozen spin ring. The magnetic bending field (B_V) is the asymptotically homogeneous field over Schwarzschild, the electric bending field (E_H) is the field of an infinite charged wire, and the focusing quadrupoles exert an Earth-radial (E_R) field to balance gravitational drag, at the position of the nominal planar circular closed orbit. The precise formulae for these over Schwarzschild is described in.¹⁵

In the model, the amplitudes of the above three guiding fields B_V , E_H , E_R are uniquely determined by the condition that the stationary planar circular motion holds, and that the horizontal component of the spin vector is frozen. If, on the contrary, one assumes an Earth-radial magnetic bending field, see Figure 4, then one can also satisfy the above condition, but at the

limit of $r_S \rightarrow 0$ the spin will still precess around the instantaneous beam axis due to the conical shape of the magnetic bending field (since the limit $r_S \rightarrow 0$ does not imply $L \rightarrow 0$).




Fig. 4. (Color online) If the magnetic bending field is not vertical, but e.g. Earth-radial, then a small beam-radial B_H component will be present besides B_V . The component B_H will first of all induce a small vertical Lorentz force which is superimposed onto the gravitational drag, and keeps equilibrium with the force of the quadrupole focusing optics. Furthermore, the small beam-radial component B_H acts with a direct torque on the spin, which is a large effect.

Indeed, concrete calculation shows using the non-perturbative manifestly covariant formalism of,¹⁵ that if the magnetic bending field at the nominal beamline is fixed to be Earth-radial direction, and a stationary closed planar circular nominal beam orbit as well as a frozen horizontal spin condition is assumed, then the spin precession rate around the instantaneous beam axis becomes:

$$\delta\Omega = \underbrace{\frac{c}{R} \beta \frac{a \beta^2 \gamma^2 - 1}{\gamma}}_{\text{from Earth-radial conicality of bending fields}} + \underbrace{\frac{1 - a(2\gamma^2 - 1)}{\gamma} \beta c \frac{r_S}{2R^2}}_{\text{first order GR correction, PRD94(2016)044019}} + O(r_S^2). \quad (7)$$

Consequently, one can read off from Eq.(7), that the result of¹² or Eq.(5) is indeed correct as the first order GR correction, but for an Earth-radial magnetic bending field assumption. From the experimental point of view, it is important to note, that in such setting, even when GR is neglected ($r_S \rightarrow 0$), there is a rather large residual systematic contribution to the EDM observable, as seen from Eq.(7). This is simply because of the conical shape imperfection of the magnetic bending field due to the Earth-radiality assumption, which will not vanish in the Minkowski limit. As such, the GR correction quantified in¹² rather applies to a special case of a so-called *Koop spin wheel*¹⁷ experiment. (Koop spin wheel is a modified version of a frozen spin setting, when bending and focusing fields are adjusted such that the planar circular motion is satisfied, and the horizontal spin is frozen, but the spin vector is allowed to precess slowly around the instantaneous

beam-radial axis with a controllable rate. In this case, the EDM or GR signal adds to the spin roll coherently.)

The above claim can be explicitly shown of course by lengthy but rather straightforward calculations of directly solving Eq.(3) over Schwarzschild, similarly as done in.¹⁵ It can, however, be justified by somewhat simpler means as well. For instance an intermediary result of¹² is that in a magnetic-electric frozen spin ring with electrostatic focusing, the amplitude of the Earth-radial electric field exerted by the focusing quadrupoles is $q E_R = m \frac{2\gamma^2-1}{\gamma} g$ at equilibrium. This formula, at a first glance is quite striking, as it contradicts the naive expectation $m \gamma g$ from equivalence principle. In fact, with a vertical magnetic bending field and corresponding electrostatic bending field one can assess that in that situation rather $q E_R = m \gamma g$ holds. We show this below, explicitly.

For the calculations, let us use Schwarzschild coordinates t, r, ϑ, φ in a standard Schwarzschild spacetime, and let us use $c = 1$ units for the remaining of the paper. An idealized planar circular closed stationary beam orbit on the surface of the Earth is an $r = \text{const}$ and $\vartheta = \text{const}$ worldline. The corresponding constants will be denoted by R and Θ . One can set $L := R \sin \Theta$ for the beam bending radius, so then one has $\frac{L}{R} = \sin \Theta$ by definition. Such a world line has four-acceleration vector

$$u^a \nabla_a u^b = \underbrace{\frac{du^b}{d\tau}}_{=0} + u^a u^c \Gamma_{ac}^b = \begin{pmatrix} 0 \\ -\beta^2 \gamma^2 \frac{1}{R} \left(1 - \frac{r_S}{R}\right) + \gamma^2 \frac{r_S}{2R^2} \\ -\beta^2 \gamma^2 \frac{1}{L} \frac{1}{R} \sqrt{1 - \frac{L^2}{R^2}} \\ 0 \end{pmatrix}. \quad (8)$$

From this, as also pointed out in,^{12,13} one may obtain that the GR correction to the Earth-radial projection of the four-acceleration vector is:

$$-g_{ab} \hat{r}^a (u^c \nabla_c u^b) = \underbrace{-\gamma^2 \frac{\beta^2 L}{R}}_{\substack{\text{constant part} \\ \text{(Earth-radial projection of} \\ \text{centrifugal four-acceleration} \\ \text{in Minkowski limit)}}} + \underbrace{(2\gamma^2 - 1) \frac{r_S}{2R^2}}_{\text{first order GR correction}} + O(r_S^2). \quad (9)$$

The constant part is just the Earth-radial projection of the centrifugal four-acceleration vector in the Minkowski limit, and the first order term in r_S is the first order GR correction. One would naively draw the conclusion from this, that the necessary Earth-radial electrostatic force needed to compensate for the gravitational drag is $q E_R = m \frac{2\gamma^2-1}{\gamma} g$, as also concluded e.g.

in.¹² This formula is apparently not in accordance with a naive application of the equivalence principle, which would dictate $q E_R = m \gamma g$. One should note, however, that not only the four-acceleration in the Newton equation gets a GR correction, but also the four-force expression of the electromagnetic forces. With vertical magnetic bending axis, as discussed and used in,¹⁵ the vector of four-force over mass is:

$$-\frac{q}{m} g^{bc} F_{cd} u^d = -\frac{q}{m} \begin{pmatrix} 0 \\ \frac{(B_V \beta \gamma - E_H \gamma) \frac{L}{R} (1 - \frac{r_S}{R})}{\sqrt{1 - \frac{r_S}{R} \frac{L^2}{R^2}}} - E_R \gamma \sqrt{1 - \frac{r_S}{R}} \\ \frac{1}{R} \frac{(B_V \beta \gamma - E_H \gamma) \sqrt{1 - \frac{L^2}{R^2}}}{\sqrt{1 - \frac{r_S}{R} \frac{L^2}{R^2}}} \\ 0 \end{pmatrix} \quad (10)$$

which needs to be equal to Eq.(8) for the four-Newton equation to be satisfied. Apparently, this equation is triangular and therefore may be solved exactly. One infers:

$$q E_R = \underbrace{0}_{\substack{\text{zero constant offset} \\ \text{in Minkowski limit}}} + \underbrace{m \gamma \frac{r_S}{2R^2}}_{\substack{\text{first order GR correction,} \\ \text{as in CQG35(2018)175003}}} + O(r_S^2) \quad (11)$$

as expected from naive application of the equivalence principle. If one, however, assumes an Earth-radial magnetic bending field (its amplitude denoted by B), then the expression for the vector of four-force over mass vector is:

$$-\frac{q}{m} g^{bc} F_{cd} u^d = -\frac{q}{m} \begin{pmatrix} 0 \\ -E_R \gamma \sqrt{1 - \frac{r_S}{R}} \\ \frac{1}{R} (B \beta \gamma - E_H \gamma) \\ 0 \end{pmatrix} \quad (12)$$

in this case. The four-Newton equation is satisfied whenever this equals to Eq.(8). That also can be solved exactly, since it is a triangular equation, and one infers:

$$q E_R = \underbrace{-m \gamma \frac{\beta^2}{L} \frac{L}{R}}_{\substack{\text{a constant offset} \\ \text{in Minkowski limit} \\ \text{from Earth-radial bending axis}}} + \underbrace{m \frac{2\gamma^2 - 1}{\gamma} \frac{r_S}{2R^2}}_{\substack{\text{first order GR correction,} \\ \text{as in PRD94(2016)044019}}} + O(r_S^2) \quad (13)$$

where one can recognize that there is a constant offset due to the Earth-radial projection of the bending forces in Minkowski limit (see also the

illustration Figure 4), and the GR correction is just as claimed in.¹² According to the non-perturbative and manifestly covariant calculation, this should be understood to be in pair with Eq.(7).

One can also reconcile the results of¹² and¹⁵ via allowing for four types of guiding fields: B_V , E_H , E_R as previously, and an additional beam-radial magnetic field component B_H at the nominal stationary planar circular beam line. Assuming that the planar circular motion is satisfied, as well as the horizontal spin component is frozen, then as a function of the freely specifiable parameters $\beta\gamma$ and B_H , the field amplitudes B_V , E_H and E_R are uniquely determined, moreover one gets a precession rate¹⁶

$$\delta\Omega = \underbrace{-\frac{q(1+a)}{m}\frac{1}{\gamma^2}B_H}_{\text{magnetic field conicality imperfection term}} + \underbrace{-a\beta\gamma\frac{r_S}{2R^2}}_{\text{first order GR term}} + O(r_S^2) \quad (14)$$

around the instantaneous beam-radial axis (this would give a coherently accumulating background to the EDM signal). We derived this formula again with the same non-perturbative manifestly covariant formalism as used in.¹⁵ The magnetic field conicality shape imperfection term (the first term) in this equation can also be derived, of course, without considering GR, namely from the Minkowski limit Newton + TBMT equations in the lab frame, i.e. merely from Eq.(1). Knowing this result, one can recover the GR correction of,¹² i.e. Eq.(5), or more precisely Eq.(7). Namely, a fixed Earth-radial magnetic bending field would imply a conical field shape imperfection characterized by $\frac{B_H}{B_V} = \tan(\Theta)\sqrt{1-\frac{r_S}{R}}$. Plugging this identity into Eq.(14), one recovers Eq.(7), using the Newton equation and the frozen horizontal spin condition. One can thus conclude that the quantitative difference between the prediction of¹² and¹⁵ can be well understood.

5. Systematic error reduction using doubly-frozen spin ring

The above discussed apparent discrepancy also highlights a rather important experimental fact, well-known by the EDM experimental community. Namely, it follows from the first term of Eq.(14), that a conical magnetic bending field shape imperfection (i.e. a small stray beam-radial magnetic field component) gives substantial contribution to the EDM observable. An EDM (or GR) experiment sensitive down to $\delta\Omega \approx 1 \text{ nrad/s}$ can be only constructed if this coherently accumulating field shape imperfection term can be controlled or cancelled. Controlling that contribution seems to be beyond experimental reach, since pushing down that term in a realistic setting would require suppressing $|B_H|$ below $\approx 10^{-16}$ Tesla. A more promising

approach would be a recent idea by R. Talman,¹⁸ called *doubly-frozen spin storage ring*. The basic idea is that for certain particle type pairs (such as helion3 and proton beam pairs), it is possible to reach the frozen horizontal spin condition, i.e. Eq.(2), simultaneously in the same storage ring. Their spins will roll around the instantaneous beam-radial axis with rates \mathfrak{K}_1 and \mathfrak{K}_2 , which both contain contributions from the conical magnetic field imperfection and from GR as dictated by Eq.(14), and eventually from EDM. The idea is to use an optimal weighted difference $\mathfrak{K} := \mathfrak{K}_1 - W \cdot \mathfrak{K}_2$ of the observables \mathfrak{K}_1 and \mathfrak{K}_2 of the two beams, such that the magnetic field conicality imperfection term, i.e. the contribution of the first term of Eq.(14), cancels. The optimal weighting factor W is determined below.

An idealized planar circular doubly-frozen spin storage ring¹⁸ assumes that beams of two particle species are stored in the same storage ring fields both in frozen horizontal spin condition. A cross section of such a setting is illustrated in Figure 5. The parameters of “beam_{*i*}” will be $\frac{m_i}{q_i}$ for mass-over-charge, a_i for magnetic moment anomaly, $\beta_i \gamma_i$ for momentum-over-mass, and L_i for bending radius ($i = 1, 2$ stands for the two beams). The idealized planar circular orbit of the two beams are not assumed to exactly coincide, that is why two possibly slightly different bending radii $L_{1,2}$ were assumed. The magnetic bending field is assumed to be (locally) homogeneous vertical, whereas the electrostatic bending field is assumed to be (locally) cylindrical, and therefore

$$\begin{aligned} B_{V1} &= B_{V2} &= B_V &= \text{const}, \\ L_1 E_{H1} &= L_2 E_{H2} &= L E_H &= \text{const} \end{aligned} \quad (15)$$

when sampled at the nominal planar circular orbit of the two beams. The tiny magnetic field conicality imperfection term (beam-radial component) is cylindrical, and needs to (locally) satisfy vacuum Maxwell equations, and therefore

$$L_1 B_{H1} = L_2 B_{H2} = L B_H = \text{const} \quad (16)$$

holds (where B_H is the amplitude of the idealized cylindrical stray fields, the main source of systematic errors in \mathfrak{K}). The amplitudes E_{V1} and E_{V2} exerted by the focusing quadrupoles are determined by the condition that the nominal orbits do not drift, i.e. the total electromagnetic and gravitational fields yield stationary orbits “beam₁” and “beam₂”. The above model takes into account all the possible instrumental imperfections which respect an idealized exact axial symmetry of the storage ring and beams. Therefore it provides an analytic means to quantify the most important systematic

error contributions, which need to be dealt with, prior to investigation of further instrumental imperfection effects via detailed beamline simulations.




Fig. 5. (Color online) Illustration of the cross-section of an idealized doubly-frozen storage ring, proposed by R. Talman,¹⁸ with all the possible axially symmetric imperfections taken into account. Beams of two particle species are injected into the same storage ring fields, both under closed planar circular motion and frozen horizontal spin condition (their orbits might be possibly slightly displaced in terms of their bending radii). As such, the field imperfections felt by the two beams can be canceled to the first order, by combining their vertical polarization buildup rates \mathfrak{A}_1 and \mathfrak{A}_2 .

Given the identities for the fields Eq.(15) and Eq.(16), and that one would like to have the planar circular motion and frozen horizontal spin condition Eq.(2) is also required to hold, and the vertical forces are required to be also equilibrated, for both beams Eq.(14) will be satisfied. For the two beams, one gets

$$\begin{aligned}\mathfrak{A}_1 &= -\frac{q_1(1+a_1)}{m_1} \frac{1}{\gamma_1^2} B_{H1} + (-a_1 \beta_1 \gamma_1 g/c) \\ \mathfrak{A}_2 &= -\frac{q_2(1+a_2)}{m_2} \frac{1}{\gamma_2^2} B_{H1} \frac{L_1}{L_2} + (-a_2 \beta_2 \gamma_2 g/c)\end{aligned}\quad (17)$$

for the polarization buildup signal by the magnetic field conicality imperfection $B_{H1,2}$, and from the first order GR correction. From this equation, one can deduce the optimal weighting factor

$$W = \left(\frac{q_1(1+a_1)}{m_1} / \frac{q_2(1+a_2)}{m_2} \right) \frac{\gamma_2^2 L_2}{\gamma_1^2 L_1} \quad (18)$$

which is needed to be determined very accurately, in order to cancel the magnetic field conicality imperfection term from the combined signal.

Introduce the notation $A := \frac{m}{q} \frac{G}{1+G}$. Moreover, assume that the particle pair properties A_1/A_2 , G_1/G_2 , G_2 , L_1/L_2 can be accurately measured. As a function of these parameters, the nominal closed planar circular orbits “beam_{1,2}” and their $(\beta\gamma)_{1,2}$ satisfying the frozen horizontal spin condition is uniquely determined, as illustrated in Figure 5. Under that condition,

the correction factor W , given by Eq.(18) is also uniquely determined as a function of the above parameters, by a closed formula.

One can consider e.g. a set of particle species

$$\{\text{triton, helion3, proton, deuteron, } e^+, e^-, \text{C13 ion, F19 ion, } \mu^+, \mu^-\}$$

for a doubly-frozen spin ring setting within the same ring ($\frac{L_1}{L_2} \approx 1$). Using a Maple code one can numerically solve for the kinematic parameters of doubly-frozen spin configurations. Taking into account practical constraints, such as a reasonable bending radius $L \approx 8$ m and a feasible electrostatic bending field $|E_H| \leq 8$ MV/m, it turns out that only the helion3–proton beam pairs are practically realistic.

For the pertinent helion3–proton doubly-frozen spin ring, the GR signals happen to combine constructively in the optimal weighted difference $\delta\Omega = \delta\Omega_1 - W \cdot \delta\Omega_2$, and it is of the order of -30 nrad/s. It turns out that in order to cancel the magnetic field conicality imperfection in such setting, down to a factor of 10 signal-to-background ratio for the GR signal to be well detectable, the weighting factor W needs to be known to such accuracy that $|\delta W \cdot B_H| \leq 10^{-17}$ Tesla holds. The correction factor W and its derivatives as a function of the particle parameters A_1/A_2 , G_1/G_2 , G_2 and the radial displacement parameter L_1/L_2 at the helion3–proton setting is of the order of 1. It is not unrealistic to measure the particle parameters A_1/A_2 , G_1/G_2 , G_2 down to 10^{-10} relative accuracy. Moreover, with recent beam instrumentation technology, one can expect a measurement on the radial displacement L_1/L_2 down to a 10^{-7} relative accuracy. This means that the optimal weighting factor W can be determined up to a systematic error of $|\delta W| \approx 10^{-7}$. By means of the above error estimates, one would need to suppress the beam-radial stray field down to $|B_H| \approx 10^{-10}$ Tesla for the GR signal (or an EDM signal) to be visible in a doubly-frozen spin ring setting.

6. Concluding remarks

In this paper, a comparison of theoretical predictions^{11,12,15} on GR systematics in frozen spin storage rings (EDM rings)^{2,3} was presented. All theoretical predictions agree for magic momentum (that setting is only possible for beam particles with positive magnetic moment anomaly). The predictions¹² and¹⁵ differ substantially for negative magnetic moment particles (e.g. the experimentally rather important deuterons), or away from the magic momentum for positive magnetic moment particles. The difference is of the order of a factor of 2 – 8. In this paper we showed that the pertinent

difference comes from the assumption on the shape of the magnetic bending field. In¹² an implicit assumption of an Earth-radial magnetic bending field was made, whereas in¹⁵ the magnetic bending field was assumed to be asymptotically homogeneous (“vertical” instead of Earth-radial). It was shown that, keeping in mind these assumptions, both results describe correct first order GR contributions to the EDM observable. The frozen spin storage ring experimental situation, however, is rather modeled by the assumptions of,¹⁵ whereas the assumptions of¹² rather fits to a special case of a so-called Koop spin wheel setting¹⁷ (i.e. when the spin rolls with a finite frequency, even without GR or EDM being present).

A further conclusion of the paper is that the conical shape imperfection of the magnetic bending field can be compensated to a first order by using the doubly-frozen spin storage ring setting proposed by Talman.¹⁸ For instance for a helion3–proton doubly-frozen spin ring the GR systematics add constructively. If the radial displacements of the two beams can be measured down to 10^{-7} relative accuracy, one still needs to suppress the beam-radial component of the stray magnetic fields down to 10^{-10} Tesla, which is a significant experimental challenge.

Acknowledgments

This work was supported in part by the Hungarian Scientific Research Fund (NKFIH 123842-123959).

References

1. K. Kirch, P. Schmidt-Wellenburg: *Search for electric dipole moments*; EPJWC **234** (2020) 01007 [[arXiv:2003.00717](#)].
2. Y. Semetzidis: *Storage ring EDM experiments*; EPJWC **118** (2016) 01032.
3. R. Talman: *The Electric Dipole Moment Challenge*; Morgan and Claypool Publishers (2017).
4. F. Abusaif et al (CPEDM collaboration): *Feasibility study for a storage ring to search for electric dipole moments of charged particles*; experimental proposal (2018) [[arXiv:1812.08535](#)].
5. M. Conte, R. Jagannathan, S. A. Khan, M. Pusterla: *Beam optics of the Dirac particle with anomalous magnetic moment*; Particle Accelerators **56** (1996) 99.
6. J. D. Jackson: *Classical Electrodynamics*; Wiley (1999).
7. S. Hawking, G. F. R. Ellis: *Large Scale Structure of Spacetime*; Cambridge University Press (1973).
8. R. M. Wald: *General Relativity*; Chicago University Press (1984).
9. N. J. Stone: Atomic Data and Nuclear Data Tables **90** (2005) 75.

10. A. J. Silenko, O. V. Terayev: *Equivalence principle and experimental tests of gravitational spin effects*; Phys. Rev. **D76** (2007) 061101 [[arXiv:gr-qc/0612103](#)].
11. Y. Orlov, E. Flanagan, Y. Semertzidis: *Spin rotation by Earth's gravitational field in a "frozen-spin" ring*; Phys. Lett. **A376** (2012) 2822.
12. Y. N. Obukov, A. J. Silenko, O. V. Terayev: *Manifestations of the rotation and gravity of the Earth in high-energy physics experiments*; Phys. Rev. **D94** (2016) 044019 [[arXiv:1608.03808](#)].
13. Y. N. Obukov, A. J. Silenko, O. V. Terayev: *Manifestations of the rotation and gravity of the Earth in spin physics experiments*; Int. J. Mod. Phys. **A31** (2016) 1645030.
14. A. Kobach: *Gravitational effects on measurements of the muon dipole moments*; Nucl. Phys. **B911** (2016) 206 [[arXiv:1603.00127](#)].
15. A. László, Z. Zimborás: *Quantification of GR effects in muon $g-2$, EDM and other spin precession experiments*; Class. Quant. Grav. **35** (2018) 175003 [[arXiv:1803.01395](#)].
16. A. László: *General relativity experiment with frozen spin rings*; PoS **SPIN2018** (2019) 182 [[arXiv:1901.06217](#)].
17. S. R. Mane: *Spin wheel*; Note (2015) [[arXiv:1509.01167](#)].
18. R. Talman: *A doubly-magic storage ring EDM measurement method*; Note (2015) [[arXiv:1812.05949](#)].