

A stellar constraint on Eddington-inspired Born-Infeld gravity from cataclysmic variable binaries

PRITAM BANERJEE,¹ DEBOJYOTI GARAIN,¹ SUVANKAR PAUL,² RAJIBUL SHAIKH,¹ AND TAPOBRATA SARKAR¹

¹*Department of Physics, Indian Institute of Technology, Kanpur 208016, India*

²*ICFAI University, Agartala, Tripura 799210, India*

ABSTRACT

Eddington-inspired Born-Infeld gravity is an important modification of Einstein’s general relativity, which can give rise to non-singular cosmologies at the classical level, and avoid the end-stage singularity in a gravitational collapse process. In the Newtonian limit, this theory gives rise to a modified Poisson’s equation, as a consequence of which stellar observables acquire model dependent corrections, compared to the ones computed in the low energy limit of general relativity. This can in turn be used to establish astrophysical constraints on the theory. Here, we obtain such a constraint using observational data from cataclysmic variable binaries. In particular, we consider the tidal disruption limit of the secondary star by a white dwarf primary. The Roche lobe filling condition of this secondary star is used to compute stellar observables in the modified gravity theory in a numerical scheme. These are then contrasted with the values obtained by using available data on these objects, via a Monte Carlo error progression method. This way, we are able to constrain the theory within 5σ confidence level.

1. INTRODUCTION

In spite of the unprecedented success of Einstein’s general relativity (GR), modifications thereof are important, and have been the focus of intense research over the last few decades. On one hand, issues related to the observed cosmic acceleration and the cosmological constant indicate that such modifications are possibly necessary. From a more fundamental point of view however, theories beyond GR might be essential, due to the biggest *pathology* of GR itself, namely the existence of mathematical singularities, such as the big bang. In GR, the process of matter collapsing under its own gravity often leads to unavoidable singularities, indicating the limitation of the theory itself. Although it is commonly believed that quantum effects might smoothen these, a consistent theory of quantum gravity has been elusive. An alternative then is to construct a singularity-free classical theory of gravity itself. One can envisage such a theory in lines with the celebrated works of Born (1933), Born (1934), Born and Infeld (1933), who constructed a viable theory of electromagnetism free of the divergences associated with the more conventional Maxwell form.

One such theory that has been the focus of attention in the recent past is the Eddington inspired Born-Infeld (EiBI) theory of gravity, put forward by Banados and Ferreira (2010) (BF), building upon the work of Deser and Gibbons (1998), Vollick (2004, 2005). Briefly put, BF used an alternative to the Einstein-Hilbert action of GR, proposed by Eddington, where the gauge connection is considered as a fundamental field as opposed to the metric tensor (Eddington (1924), Schrodinger (1950)). In Eddington’s formalism, the gravitational Lagrangian, apart from pre-factors is taken to be $\sqrt{|\det R_{\mu\nu}|}$, with $R_{\mu\nu}$ being the Ricci tensor. Variation of this action with the affine connection being considered as a dynamical variable (dubbed as the Palatini formalism) leads to Einstein’s equation in the presence of a cosmological constant, which is otherwise obtained from a variation of the more conventional Einstein-Hilbert Lagrangian proportional to $\sqrt{|\det g_{\mu\nu}|}(R - 2\Lambda)$. Here, $R = g^{\mu\nu}R_{\mu\nu}$ is the Ricci scalar, Λ is the cosmological constant, and the metric $g_{\mu\nu}$ is the dynamical variable. BF considered a Born-Infeld type of “square root” action, with a minimal coupling of gravity with matter fields, with a Lagrangian proportional to $\sqrt{|\det[g_{\mu\nu} + \epsilon R_{(\mu\nu)}]|} - \lambda\sqrt{|\det g_{\mu\nu}|}$, apart from the matter contribution, and one considers the symmetric part of the Ricci tensor in the Lagrangian, denoted by the braces. Here, $1/\epsilon$ is the Born-Infeld mass $M_{BI} \ll M_{Pl}$, the Planck mass, and λ is a dimensionless non-zero parameter, related to the cosmological constant, with asymptotically flat solutions corresponding to $\lambda = 1$. BF showed that this theory led to singularity-free cosmology. Shortly afterwards, Pani, Cardoso and Delsate (2011) showed

that EiBI gravity is indeed capable of avoiding singularities that arise due to a collapse process, see also [Delsate and Steinhoff \(2012\)](#).

In the non-relativistic limit, EiBI gravity gives rise to a modified Poisson's equation, with the modification of the low energy limit of Einstein gravity being characterised by a coupling term that is non-zero only in the presence of matter. Since the Poisson's equation is used as a basic input in many of stellar observables, it is then natural that EiBI theories can thus be tested by stellar physics. Indeed, there has been a variety of works in the recent past in this direction. [Casanelas et. al. \(2012\)](#) proposed tests for the theory using solar constraints. [Avelino \(2012 a\)](#) studied such constraints using cosmological and astrophysical scenarios. [Avelino \(2012 b\)](#) obtained bounds on EiBI theories by demanding that electromagnetic forces dominate gravitational ones in nuclear reaction. More recently, [Banerjee, Shankar and Singh \(2017\)](#) have put constraints on the theory from an analysis of white dwarfs. [Beltran Jimenez et. al. \(2017\)](#) studied gravitational waves in non-singular EiBI cosmological models. A recent comprehensive review of EiBI gravity and related phenomenological tests appear in the work of [Beltran Jimenez et. al. \(2018\)](#).

The starting point of phenomenological studies of EiBI gravity in astrophysical scenarios is the modified Poisson's equation that the theory yields in the Newtonian limit. With the speed of light denoted by c and the gravitational constant by G , expanding the field equations up to first order in ϵ , one obtains ([Banados and Ferreira \(2010\)](#), [Beltran Jimenez et. al. \(2018\)](#)),

$$\nabla^2\phi = \frac{8\pi G}{2c^4}\rho + \frac{8\pi G\epsilon}{4c^4}\nabla^2\rho, \quad (1)$$

where $\epsilon = 1/M_{BI}$. In units $c = G = 1$, we will write this equation as

$$\nabla^2\phi = 4\pi\rho + \frac{\kappa_g}{4}\nabla^2\rho, \quad (2)$$

with $\kappa_g = 8\pi\epsilon$. Observables in stellar physics, in which the Poisson's equation is a crucial input, therefore gets modified in EiBI gravity, and observational data can be used to constrain κ_g . In this paper, we will use data from tidal forces in cataclysmic variable (CV) binary systems (for a comprehensive introduction to CV systems, see [Warner \(1995\)](#)) to put such a constraint. As we will discuss in details in the next section, the fact that the donor star in such a binary fills up its Roche lobe provides us with a way to compute all the observables (like critical mass, radius, etc.) and Eq. (2) then implies that these are dependent on the EiBI parameter. Then, using catalogued data on these binaries allows us to put bounds on κ_g . We are able to provide 5σ bounds on this parameter.

Importantly, an attractive feature of Eq. (2) is that the modification to the Poisson's equation does not require us to assume spherical symmetry. This is in contrast with many other known theories where such modifications take place. For example, in the beyond-Horndeski class of modified gravity theories (for a recent review, see [Kobayashi \(2019\)](#)), only the radial part of the modified pressure balance equation is known, and it is imperative in such examples to assume spherical symmetry of stellar objects. This assumption has to be carefully dealt with, in CV systems where the stellar structure is more complicated due to effects of tidal forces as well as rotations, as discussed by [Banerjee et. al. \(2021\)](#). EiBI theories on the other hand provide a much neater picture where one can work explicitly in Cartesian coordinates.

In this paper, we will be interested in studying EiBI gravity in the context of low mass main sequence stars that are well described by a polytropic equation of state that relates the pressure to the density, and is of the form $P = \kappa\rho^{1+\frac{1}{n}}$, with κ being the polytropic constant and n the polytropic index. These are the secondaries in CV binary systems with a white dwarf primary, and we will focus on stars of mass $\sim 0.4M_\odot$. For such low mass stars, the polytropic index $n = 1.5$ is a good approximation (see, e.g., [Rappaport and Joss \(1982\)](#), [Renoize et al. \(2002\)](#)), a fact that is also borne out by the observation these stars have a rotation time period of less than 6 hours. Here we use the observational data on CV binaries, with the underlying theory being EiBI gravity. This latter fact is inbuilt in our analysis which uses the modified Poisson's equation, Eq.(2), and via this, stellar observables are numerically obtained as a functions of κ_g , thus offering ready comparison with data, which allows us to constrain the possible values of κ_g . In the next section 2, we will briefly elaborate on the numerical recipe that we use. Section 3, we discuss the methodology of constraining the EiBI parameter κ_g followed by section 4 which contains our main results. The paper ends with a summary of the results in section 5.

2. NUMERICAL PROCEDURE

We will now discuss the procedure to constrain the EiBI parameter using a set of observed data points and comparing it with that obtained numerically. Our numerical procedure involves solving the modified Poisson equation and the

Euler equation for hydrostatic equilibrium inside a polytropic star. We find the star's deformed shape under the influence of tidal forces, such that the star is maximally deformed and fills its Roche lobe. Under a stronger tidal field, the star will be tidally disintegrated. Thus, the Roche lobe filling condition gives the critical mass that the star must have, so that it is not tidally disrupted. This is a condition that we can use as a source of information to find the masses and radii of the secondary stars in a CV system. Comparing them with the observed data allows us to constrain the EiBI parameter. This will be the approach that we will follow in this paper. Thus we can consider a polytropic fluid star in flat spacetime throughout its complete trajectory. The effect of the background curvature now comes in the form of an additional force field, namely the tidal field. To begin with, we numerically create a polytropic star which remains in hydrostatic equilibrium under the influence of a tidal field. The tidal field is calculated in a locally flat Fermi-Normal (FN) frame (Manasse and Misner (1963)). The FN frame is particularly useful, as its local flatness allows us to deal with fluid equations in the Newtonian limit, and the local inhomogeneity of gravity is already incorporated in the tidal field.

In the FN frame, the tidal potential can be written as Ishii, Shibata and Mino (2005):

$$\phi_{\text{tidal}} = \frac{1}{2}C_{ij}x^ix^j + \frac{1}{6}C_{ijk}x^ix^jx^k + \frac{1}{24}[C_{ijkl} + 4C_{(ij}C_{kl)} - 4B_{(kl|n|}B_{ij)n}]x^ix^jx^kx^l + O(x^5) \quad (3)$$

Here, the FN coordinates are denoted by $x^i = \{x^0, x^1, x^2, x^3\}$ and the coefficients are given in terms of the rank 4 Riemann curvature tensor as given by

$$C_{ij} = R_{0i0j}, \quad C_{ijk} = R_{0(i0|j;k)}, \quad C_{ijkl} = R_{0(i0|j;k;l)}, \quad B_{ijk} = R_{k(ij)0}, \quad (4)$$

where, covariant derivatives are indicated by the symbol ‘;’ and i, j, k, \dots run from 1 to 3. The tensorial notation $R_{0(i0|j;k;l)}$ denotes a summation over all the possible permutations of i, j, k, l with m fixed at its position, divided by the total number of such permutations. In the presence of the tidal force field, the deformation is obtained by numerically solving the Euler equation in the FN frame,

$$\rho \frac{\partial v_i}{\partial \tau} + \rho v^j \frac{\partial v_i}{\partial x^j} = -\frac{\partial P}{\partial x^i} - \rho \frac{\partial(\phi + \phi_{\text{tidal}})}{\partial x^i} + \rho \left[v^j \left(\frac{\partial A_j}{\partial x^i} - \frac{\partial A_i}{\partial x^j} \right) - \frac{\partial A_i}{\partial \tau} \right]. \quad (5)$$

Here, as discussed before, $P = \kappa \rho^{1+(1/n)}$ is the pressure inside the fluid body of the star. The last term on the right hand side comes from gravitomagnetic forces where $A_i = \frac{2}{3}B_{ijk}x^jx^k$ is the corresponding vector potential. v^i is the velocity field of a fluid element, and ϕ_{tidal} is the tidal potential as experienced by the star inside the FN frame. The self-gravity of the star is calculated from the modified Poisson equation of Eq. (2).

For non-zero κ_g , the second term in Eq.(2) quantifies the difference in the self-gravity of the star, as compared to GR. It is important to note that κ_g is expressed in SI units as $m^5 kg^{-1} s^{-2} = [[G]][[R^2]]$, where G is the gravitational constant and R is a length that is usually related to the size of the star. This implies that κ_g will have a higher value as one considers a star of a larger radius, to remain significant in Eq.(2) and hence any bound on κ_g will be dependent on the particular star that one considers. A better procedure is then to define the dimensionless quantity $\bar{\kappa}_g = \kappa_g/(GR^2)$ which does not depend on the size of the star and therefore can be constrained using any astrophysical object. Here, the only input in our analysis is the polytropic equation of state, and hence the bound that we obtain on the EiBI parameter is universal for all low mass main sequence stars.

We solve Eq.(2) and Eq.(5) to find the central density, mass and the volume equivalent radius of the deformed star. The star is corotating in the FN frame with velocity (Ishii, Shibata and Mino (2005), Banerjee et. al. (2021))

$$v^i = \Omega [-\{x^3 - x_c \sin(\Omega\tau)\}, 0, \{x^1 - x_c \cos(\Omega\tau)\}] \quad (6)$$

where Ω is the corotational frequency, and x_c is a constant that arises as the rotational axis deviates from the x^2 axis due to the star's deformation. It is convenient to convert these equations into dimensionless form since we do not know the amount of deformation beforehand. Firstly, we rewrite the equations in coordinate \tilde{x}^i which is defined as the coordinate of the star such that the star has no rotation in the tilde frame and the tilde frame rotates in the FN frame with angular frequency Ω along the x^2 axis. Such a choice allows us to remove the τ dependent parts from the above equations. Moreover, we need to write ϕ_{tidal} and ϕ_{mag} in terms of the tilde coordinates. Next, we convert the coordinates into dimensionless form $\tilde{x}^i = pq^i$, where p is a constant to be found iteratively as it converges

to a prescribed precision and q^i is the dimensionless coordinate. Now, Eqs.(2) and (5) can be written using the dimensionless coordinates as,

$$\frac{\Omega^2}{2} p^2 [(q^1 - q_g)^2 + (q^3)^2] = \kappa(n+1)\rho^{1+1/n} + \phi + \phi_{\text{tidal}} + \phi_{\text{mag}} + C \quad (7)$$

$$\frac{1}{p^2} \nabla_q^2 \phi = 4\pi\rho + \frac{\kappa_g}{4p^2} \nabla_q^2 \rho \quad (8)$$

where, $\nabla_q^2 \equiv p^2 \nabla^2$ is the dimensionless Laplacian, and in Eq.(7) we have used the polytropic equation. As discussed earlier, in units of $c = G = 1$, κ_g has the dimension of length squared whereas p has the dimension of length, i.e., $[\kappa_g] = [p^2]$. Therefore, the right hand side of Eq.(8) is well defined in dimensionless form. Now, to solve Eqs.(7) and (8), we need to fix the boundary conditions in order to find the constants C, p and q_g . These are obtained by fixing the surface of the deformed star at $(q_s, 0, 0)$ where the density is zero. Also, we provide the central density $\rho = \rho_c$ and $\partial\rho/\partial q^1 = 0$ at the center of the star which is assumed to be the origin of the tilde coordinates. Although the origin may not coincide with the center of the star in the deformed shape, the error is negligible. We solve Eq.(7) and (8) together to find the solution in hydrostatic equilibrium. An initial density distribution, along with an initial p is used in Eq.(8) to obtain ϕ which is then used in Eq.(7) to find the updated value of p . The updated p is used in Eq.(8) and the iteration continues until p converges to a desired precision. This procedure is performed for different central density ρ_c until the Roche lobe filling condition is satisfied. At this critical condition, $\partial\rho/\partial q^1$ at the surface of the star at $(q_s, 0, 0)$ becomes smoothly zero (for more details on the numerical procedure, see [Banerjee et al. \(2019\)](#)).

To perform the numerical procedure, we still need to specify the polytropic constant κ , polytropic index n , and the EiBI gravity parameter κ_g . As was discussed earlier, the polytropic index is set to $n = 1.5$ in our case, whereas, κ_g is varied to put a constraint on it by comparing the numerical results with the observational data. On the other hand, κ can be found by equating the volume equivalent radius at the Roche limit, obtained numerically in GR ($\kappa_g = 0$), with the observed radius. The same κ is thereafter used to find the critical mass and radius due to other non-zero κ_g values. Such an assumption is motivated by the fact that the polytropic constant is determined entirely by stellar hydrodynamics, and thus should remain unchanged for different EiBI parameters. For example, in case of white dwarfs (WDs), κ is obtained by equating electron degeneracy pressure with the carbon atom density. In our case, we use the Roche lobe filling condition to find κ for which GR is chosen as a reference. Such a procedure is essential when no other ways are known to find the polytropic constant beforehand. However, many other possible values of κ appear because we can use any other radius within the observed range to match the numerical result in GR. We will show in the next section how the best possible choice of the observed radius is made.

3. METHODOLOGY

As discussed previously, we compare the numerical data with observational data of a set of cataclysmic variable systems which are binary systems with a Roche lobe filling secondary star orbiting a WD primary. When a star fills its Roche lobe, it is at its critical mass below which it overfills the Roche lobe. The disrupted material is accreted by the primary. This Roche lobe filling condition can therefore be used to find the stellar parameters. We utilize this Roche fill condition to find the unknown polytropic constant κ for which the star's numerical size matches with the observed one.

A set of 13 CV systems is used in this paper. The orbital distances between the primary and the secondary stars in these CVs are large enough to safely neglect the rotation of the primary while calculating the tidal field around the secondary. It allows us to model the gravitational field of the primary as a Schwarzschild geometry. However, the radius of the secondary is about ~ 0.1 times the orbital distance, which is significantly large to generate asymmetry in the deformed shape of the secondary. Hence, we take up to the fourth order term in the tidal potential. Also, it is safe to assume that the secondary moves in a circular orbit since the type of the orbit does not make any significant difference in the tidal field when the orbital distance is large. Thus the observed orbital parameters of these CV systems can be used to compare with the numerical data for constraining the EiBI gravity parameter. As already mentioned, the polytropic index of the secondary star is taken to be $n = 1.5$. The secondary stars in these CVs fall in the main sequence category and have small masses $\sim 0.4M_\odot$ as can be interpreted from their orbital period less than 6 hours. These stars are known to have highly convective cores and can be accurately represented by a polytropic index $n = 1.5$.

We find the Mass of the primary (M_1), mass (M_2) and radius (R_2) of the secondary and the orbital distance (a) using Monte Carlo error progression method from a set of observed input parameters such as orbital period (P) and inclination angle (i), mass ratio (q), binary phases at mid ingress and mid egress ($\Delta\phi_{1/2}$), radial velocities of the primary and the secondary (K_1 and K_2) and the rotational velocity ($v\sin i$) of the secondary star. A detailed description of the procedure can be found in [Smith et al. \(1998\)](#) [Thoroughgood et al. \(2005\)](#) [Horne, Welsh and Wade \(1993\)](#). A list of the input parameters are shown in Table 1 and the output parameters M_1 , M_2 , a and R_2 , obtained from Monte Carlo error progression, are given in Table 2.

We use the observed M_1 and a to find the tidal field in FN frame of the secondary. Next, we numerically calculate the critical mass (M_2^{crit}) and volume equivalent radius (R_2^{crit}) of the star at Roche limit in the presence of various nonzero values of κ_g . It is found that both M_2^{crit} and R_2^{crit} increase as κ_g is increased. Hence, we get a range of critical mass and radius of the secondary from the numerical analysis, which is then compared with the observed ranges. In the next section, we analyze the results and find a constraint on the EiBI parameter.

4. CONSTRAINING THE EIBI GRAVITY PARAMETER




Figure 1. Variation of $\chi^2/\text{d.o.f}$ with $\bar{\kappa}_g$ for different values of κ which are again obtained for different choices of $R_{2,i}$ such that $R_{2,i}^{crit} = R_{2,i}$ in GR. The plot in red is for $R_{2,i} = R_{2,i}^{mean} + \sigma_{R,i}$, in green is for $R_{2,i} = R_{2,i}^{mean} - \sigma_{R,i}$ and in blue is for $R_{2,i} = R_{2,i}^{mean} + (\sigma_{R,i}/4)$. The dashed curve in black denotes the positions of the minimum points of each individual plots. The blue curve having the lowest minimum, is the best choice to constrain $\bar{\kappa}_g$.




Figure 2. Constrained ranges of $\bar{\kappa}_g$ are shown along with their σ levels.

As the EiBI parameter κ_g has a dimension of length squared (in units of $G = c = 1$), it is evident that the constraint depends on the size of the secondary star R_2 . However, we can avoid this limitation by constraining the dimensionless parameter $\bar{\kappa}_g = \kappa_g/(GR_2^2)$ with any astrophysical object, including the CV secondaries. To numerically find the secondary star's critical mass and radius, we need to calculate the polytropic constant κ . The procedure is as follows:

We choose a value of radius R_2 of the secondary star from its observed range. Now, we perform the numerical procedure keeping $\kappa_g = 0$ (i.e., in GR). We can numerically find the volume equivalent radius R_2^{crit} of the star at the Roche limit if any value of the polytropic constant κ is given. However, the desired value of κ is found when R_2^{crit} becomes equal to R_2 . The same κ is then used to numerically calculate the critical masses and radii of the secondary for other non-zero values of the EiBI gravity parameter κ_g . Thus a set of M_2^{crit} and R_2^{crit} is obtained numerically for various values of $\bar{\kappa}_g = \kappa_g/(GR_2^{crit})^2$. A similar numerical procedure is performed for all the CVs.

Now we define a quantity χ^2 as

$$\chi^2 = \sum_{i=1}^N \frac{(M_{2,i}^{mean} - M_{2,i}^{crit})^2}{\sigma_{M,i}^2} + \frac{(R_{2,i}^{mean} - R_{2,i}^{crit})^2}{\sigma_{R,i}^2}, \quad (9)$$

where, $M_{2,i}^{mean}$, $\sigma_{M,i}$ and $R_{2,i}^{mean}$, $\sigma_{R,i}$ are the observed mean and standard deviation of mass and radius of the secondary star of the i th CV system respectively. On the other hand, $M_{2,i}^{crit}$ and $R_{2,i}^{crit}$ are the numerically calculated critical mass and volume equivalent radius of the Roche lobe filling secondary of the i th CV system respectively. Here, the total number of systems are taken to be $N = 13$. We calculate χ^2 for various values of $\bar{\kappa}_g$ using the 13 sets of M_2^{crit} and R_2^{crit} already obtained numerically. Now, to constrain $\bar{\kappa}_g$ with confidence levels, we need to know the degrees of freedom (d.o.f) of the chi-square test. In our case, d.o.f = $2N - 2 = 24$. Finally, we find a constraint on $\bar{\kappa}_g$ using the $\chi^2/\text{d.o.f}$ vs. $\bar{\kappa}_g$ plot.

However, this constraint is obtained for choosing a particular set of polytropic constants using a particular set of secondary radii from the CV systems. If we take any other set of secondary radii within the observed ranges, another set of polytropic constants as well as a different constraint on $\bar{\kappa}_g$ is found. The best possible constraint on $\bar{\kappa}_g$ is obtained only if the best set of secondary radii is chosen which is done using the chi-square analysis as well. We take different sets of secondary stars' radii as $R_{2,i} = R_{2,i}^{mean} + \epsilon\sigma_{R,i}$, where $-1 \leq \epsilon \leq 1$. Hence, we find different constraints on $\bar{\kappa}_g$ for different choices of $R_{2,i}$. The best choice of $R_{2,i}$ is the one for which the minimum of $\chi^2/\text{d.o.f}$ vs $\bar{\kappa}_g$ plot has the lowest value. Fig. 1 shows three plots between $\chi^2/\text{d.o.f}$ and $\bar{\kappa}_g$ for three different sets of $R_{2,i}$. First one is for $R_{2,i} = R_{2,i}^{mean} + \sigma_{R,i}$ (denoted by red) meaning the maximum values of $R_{2,i}$, another is for $R_{2,i} = R_{2,i}^{mean} - \sigma_{R,i}$ (green) indicating the minimum values of $R_{2,i}$ and the third one stands for $R_{2,i} = R_{2,i}^{mean} + (\sigma_{R,i}/4)$ (blue) for which the $\chi^2/\text{d.o.f}$ vs $\bar{\kappa}_g$ plot has the lowest minimum. Therefore, $R_{2,i} = R_{2,i}^{mean} + (\sigma_{R,i}/4)$ is the best choice for calculating the desired set of κ for each of the CV secondaries and therefore constraining $\bar{\kappa}_g$. In Fig. 2, we show the confidence levels to which $\bar{\kappa}_g$ is constrained. We find $\bar{\kappa}_g$ to be $0.005 \leq \bar{\kappa}_g \leq 0.352$ within 1σ and $-0.315 \leq \bar{\kappa}_g \leq 0.597$ within 5σ confidence level.

In Fig. 3, we show the M_2 , R_2 ranges generated by Monte Carlo using the observed parameters as compared to numerically obtained M_2^{crit} and R_2^{crit} which are obtained using the best choice of κ . Numerical data are denoted by black lines which are obtained for various values of $\bar{\kappa}_g$ within its 5σ limit. As already mentioned, both the critical mass and radius increase with $\bar{\kappa}_g$. It can be seen that numerical results tend towards nonzero positive values of $\bar{\kappa}_g$ to match the observed parameters as also evident from the χ^2 analysis.

There are two important issues that we will discuss at this stage. First, we note that Banerjee et. al. (2021) discussed constraining modified gravity theories of the beyond-Horndeski class. An important difference between the method followed there as compared to the present paper is as follows. In Banerjee et. al. (2021), the polytropic constant is not kept fixed while varying the modified gravity parameter. As a result, numerical mass values are influenced by both the polytropic constant as well as the modified gravity parameter. For each value of this parameter, the polytropic constant is freely adjusted until the volume equivalent radius matches the observed radius. While this procedure is correct in its own merit, it suppresses the modified gravity parameter's effects somewhat, and makes it difficult to constrain. A better procedure is to consider the modifications coming solely from the modified gravity parameter. However, eliminating the effects of the polytropic constant requires its value to be known either by some other physical equations (like that in the case of WDs) or by a statistical best choice method. In the case of the CV secondaries, we do not have any other information to find their polytropic constant beforehand. Therefore, here we have resorted to the best choice of the polytropic constant statistically, and we keep it fixed for all values of the modified parameter.




Figure 3. In this figure, M_2 and R_2 ranges of the 13 CV secondaries as obtained from Monte Carlo error progression method using the observed parameters given in Table 1 are shown in green dots. These are compared with the numerical values (shown in black lines) generated using different values of $\bar{\kappa}_g$ within its 5σ limits. Higher mass and radius appear due to higher values of $\bar{\kappa}_g$.

Secondly, we note from Fig. 3 that for a few CV systems such as OY Car, Z Cha and DV Uma, the numerical data do not fall onto the Monte Carlo generated distributions. Such tension in the data appears from the fact that R_2 is obtained using $\Delta\phi_{1/2}$ which is independent of mass M_2 . On the other hand, M_2^{crit} is numerically dependent on R_2 since it is matched with the volume equivalent radius of the secondary. Therefore, observed mass ranges can possibly deviate from the numerical data. We, however, note that both M_2^{crit} and R_2^{crit} individually fall within the observed ranges of M_2 and R_2 respectively while extending both sides of the observed mean values. That is why, we do not categorize these CVs as outliers.

5. SUMMARY

Modifications to GR are becoming increasingly popular of late, as it is by now commonly believed that such theories might be essential to understand the nature of gravity at cosmological scales. Apart from this, a significant unresolved issue is the inevitable singularity at the end of a gravitational collapse process as predicted by GR. EiBI theories of gravity are very attractive in this sense, as they give rise to non-singular cosmologies as well as predict non-singular collapse processes in the realm of classical gravity, i.e., without invoking quantum effects. Although the main effects of such modified theories of gravity are expected to set in at strong gravity scales, nonetheless they often leave their

imprint at low energy scales, in this case by a modification of the Poisson's equation in the Newtonian limit. This allows us to constrain EiBI theories via stellar structure tests, and put bounds on the parameter that determines the deviation from GR.

To this end, in this paper, we have studied EiBI theories of gravity in the context of CV binaries, and constrained the theory using available data. A total of 13 systems were chosen, with the secondary star orbiting a white dwarf primary and filling its Roche lobe, and being well described by an $n = 1.5$ polytropic equation of state. The Roche lobe filling condition was used to compute stellar observables numerically and comparing these with data, we have obtained a constraint on the EiBI parameter $\bar{\kappa}_g$ appearing in Eq.(2) which gives, within 5σ confidence level, $-0.315 \leq \bar{\kappa}_g \leq 0.597$. It is useful to compare this with existing results on stellar bounds of the EiBI parameter in the literature, obtained by different methods. [Casanellas et. al. \(2012\)](#) obtained the bound $-0.016 < \kappa_g/(GR_\odot^2) < 0.013$ from solar physics constraints, and [Avelino \(2012 a\)](#) obtained an upper bound $\bar{\kappa}_g < 4/\pi$ from the fact that the effective Jeans length in EiBI theories should be less than the solar radius. On the other hand, taking a typical white dwarf radius $\sim 10^6\text{m}$, the results of [Banerjee, Shankar and Singh \(2017\)](#) who constrained EiBI gravity using the mass-radius relation of white dwarfs give, $-0.239 < \bar{\kappa}_g < 0.728$ at 5σ confidence level.

The only assumption that we have made to simplify the analysis is that of a polytropic equation of state inside stellar matter. As we have discussed, this is an excellent approximation for low mass CV secondaries considered here, which are fully convective. Nonetheless, it might be interesting to relax this assumption and consider a model with a core-envelope structure. Recently, [Chowdhury and Sarkar \(2021\)](#) have explored such a model in the context of beyond-Horndeski class of models and studied how modified gravity affects stellar radius and luminosity in such models. It will be interesting to understand these issues in the context of EiBI gravity, and we expect to report on this in the near future.

APPENDIX

In this appendix, we list the observed binary parameters in Table (1) and the stellar parameters obtained using Monte Carlo error progression in Table (2). These have appeared in [Banerjee et. al. \(2021\)](#) and are included here for completeness.

Table 1. List of observed binary parameters used for calculating M_1 , a , M_2 and R_2

Name	Observed binary parameters							
	P	i	q	$\Delta\phi_{1/2}$	K_1	K_2	$v \sin i$	M_2
	(hr)	(degree)			(km s ⁻¹)	(km s ⁻¹)	(km s ⁻¹)	(M_\odot)
V4140 Sgr ^a	1.467	80.2 ± 0.5	0.125 ± 0.015	0.0378 ± 0.0005	56 ± 7	-	-	-
V2051 Oph ^b	1.5	83.3 ± 1.4	0.19 ± 0.03	0.0662 ± 0.0002	91 ± 12	-	-	-
OY Car ^c	1.51	83.3 ± 0.2	0.102 ± 0.003	0.051 ± 0.004	-	470 ± 2.7	-	-
Ex Hya ^d	1.638	77 ± 1	-	0.017 ± 0.002	69 ± 9	356 ± 4	-	-
HT Cas ^e	1.77	81 ± 1	-	0.0493 ± 0.0007	58 ± 11	389 ± 4	-	-
IY Uma ^f	1.77	86 ± 1	0.125 ± 0.008	0.0637 ± 0.0001	-	383 ± 6	-	-
Z Cha ^g	1.79	81.78 ± 0.13	0.150 ± 0.004	0.0534 ± 0.0009	-	430 ± 16	-	-
DV Uma ^h	2.06	84.24 ± 0.07	0.151 ± 0.001	0.063604	-	-	-	0.15 ± 0.02
IP Peg ⁱ	3.797	81.8 ± 0.9	0.45 ± 0.04	0.0863	-	298 ± 8	-	-
UU Aqr ^j	3.93	78 ± 2	-	0.051 ± 0.002	121 ± 7	327 ± 31	-	-
Gy Cnc ^k	4.211	77 ± 0.9	-	0.060 ± 0.005	115 ± 7	283 ± 17	-	-
Ex Dra ^l	5.04	85 ⁺³ ₋₂	0.72 ± 0.06	0.1085 ± 0.0006	-	210 ± 14	140 ± 10	-
V347 Pup ^m	5.566	87 ± 3	-	0.115 ± 0.005	-	198 ± 5	130 ± 5	-

^a Borges and Baptista (2005) Mukai et al. (1988) Baptista et al. (1989), ^b Baptista et al. (1998), ^c Wood et al. (1989) Copperwheat et al. (2012) Littlefair et al. (2008), ^d Hellier et al. (1987) Gilliland (1982) Breysacher and Vogt (1980) Smith et al. (1993) Vande Putte et al. (2003) Hellier (1996) Ishida et al. (1994), ^e Horne et al. (1991), ^f Steeghs et al. (2003) Patterson, Kemp et al. (2000) Rolfe et al. (2002), ^g Wade and Horne (1988) Wood et al. (1986) Cook and Warner (1984), ^h Feline et al. (2004) Patterson, Vanmunster et al. (2000) Mukai et al. (1990) Henry et al. (1999), ⁱ Martin et al. (1989) Smak (2002) Marsh (1988) Wood and Crawford (1986), ^j Diaz and Steiner (1991) Vande Putte et al. (2003) Baptista et al. (1994), ^k Thorstensen (2000), ^l Billington et al. (1996) Baptista et al. (2000) Fiedler et al. (1997), ^m Thoroughgood et al. (2005) Buckley et al. (1990) Still et al. (1998)

Table 2. List of M_1 , a , M_2 and R_2 as obtained from Monte Carlo error progression method using the observed binary parameters given in Table 1.

Name	$M_1(M_\odot)$	$a(R_\odot)$	$R_2(R_\odot)$	$M_2(M_\odot)$
V4140 Sgr	0.9 ± 0.5	0.63 ± 0.11	0.13 ± 0.02	0.10 ± 0.05
V2051 Oph	1.2 ± 0.9	0.726 ± 0.14	0.17 ± 0.04	0.22 ± 0.11
OY Car	1.2 ± 0.3	1.48 ± 0.11	0.39 ± 0.05	0.085 ± 0.003
Ex Hya	0.49 ± 0.03	0.589 ± 0.014	0.136 ± 0.011	0.095 ± 0.017
HT Cas	0.62 ± 0.04	0.661 ± 0.018	0.144 ± 0.009	0.09 ± 0.02
IY Uma	0.55 ± 0.03	0.630 ± 0.011	0.133 ± 0.004	0.068 ± 0.006
Z Cha	0.84 ± 0.09	0.7 ± 0.3	0.161 ± 0.006	0.125 ± 0.014
DV Uma	1.00 ± 0.13	0.86 ± 0.04	0.190 ± 0.010	0.15 ± 0.02
IP Peg	0.94 ± 0.09	1.37 ± 0.05	0.41 ± 0.02	0.42 ± 0.07
UU Aqr	0.834 ± 0.015	0.649 ± 0.004	0.127 ± 0.0017	0.44 ± 0.07
Gy Cnc	0.88 ± 0.13	1.42 ± 0.07	0.41 ± 0.03	0.36 ± 0.05
Ex Dra	0.69 ± 0.10	1.58 ± 0.08	0.54 ± 0.03	0.52 ± 0.09
V347 Pup	0.63 ± 0.08	1.66 ± 0.10	0.60 ± 0.02	0.53 ± 0.13

REFERENCES

- A. S. Eddington, 1924, *The Mathematical Theory of Relativity*, Cambridge University Press, Cambridge, United Kingdom.
- Avelino, P. P., 2012, JCAP **1211**, 022.
- Avelino, P. P., 2012, Phys. Rev. D **85**, 104053.
- Banados, M., and Ferreira, P. G., 2010, Phys. Rev. Lett. **105** 011101, Erratum: Phys. Rev. Lett. **113**, 119901 (2014).
- Banerjee P., Paul S., Shaikh R. and Sarkar T., 2019, Phys. Lett. B, **795**, 29.
- Banerjee, P., Garain, D., Paul, S., et. al., 2021, Astrophys. J. **910**, 23.
- Banerjee, S., Shankar, S., and Singh, T. P., 2017, JCAP **1710**, 004.
- Baptista R., Catalan M. S. and Costa L., 2000, Mon. Not. R. Astron. Soc., **316**, 529.
- Baptista R., Catalan M. S., Horne K. and Zilli D., 1998, Mon. Not. R. Astron. Soc., **300**, 233.
- Baptista R., Jablonski F. J. and Steiner J. E., 1989, Mon. Not. R. Astron. Soc., **241**, 631.
- Baptista R., Steiner J. E. and Ciesninski D., 1994, Astrophys. J., **433**, 332.
- Beltran Jimenez, J., Heisenberg, L., Olmo, G. J., and Rubiera-Garcia, D., 2017, JCAP **1710**, 029, Erratum: [JCAP **1808**, E01 (2018)].
- Beltran Jimenez, J., Heisenberg, L., Olmo, G. J., and Rubiera-Garcia, D., 2018, Phys. Rept. **727**, 1.
- Billington I., Marsh T. R. and Dhillon V. S., 1996, Mon. Not. R. Astron. Soc., **278**, 673.
- Borges B. W. and Baptista R., 2005, Astron. Astrophys., **437**, 235.
- Born, M., 1933, Nature **132** 282.
- Born, M., 1934, Proc. R. Soc. Lond. **A143** 410.
- Born, M., and Infeld, L., 1933, Proc. R. Soc. Lond. **A144** 425.
- Breysacher J. and Vogt N., 1980, Astron. Astrophys., **87**, 349.
- Buckley D. A. H., Sullivan D. J., Remillard R. A., Tuohy I. R., Clark M., 1990, Astrophys. J., **355**, 617.
- Casanellas, J., Pani, P., Lopes, I., and Cardoso, V., 2012, Astrophys. J. **745**, 15.
- Chowdhury, S., and Sarkar, T., JCAP (to appear) arXiv: 2008.12264 [gr-qc].
- Cook M. C. and Warner B., 1984, Mon. Not. R. Astron. Soc., **207**, 705.

- Copperwheat C. N., Marsh T. R., Parsons S. G. et al., 2012, *Mon. Not. R. Astron. Soc.*, **421**, 149.
- Delsate, T., and Steinhoff, J., 2012, *Phys. Rev. Lett.* **109**, 021101.
- Deser, S., and Gibbons, G. W., 1998, *Class. Quant. Grav.* **15** L35.
- Diaz N. P. and Steiner J. E., 1991, *Astron. J.*, **102**, 1417.
- E. Schrodinger, *Space-time Structure*, Cambridge University Press, Cambridge, United Kingdom.
- Feline W. J., Dhillon V. S., Marsh T. R. and Brinkworth C. S., 2004, *Mon. Not. R. Astron. Soc.*, **355**, 1.
- Fiedler H., Barwig H. and Mantel K. H., 1997, *Astron. Astrophys.*, **327**, 173.
- Gilliland R. L., 1982, *Astrophys. J.*, **258**, 576.
- Hellier C., 1996, in A. Evans, J. H. Wood eds, *Cataclysmic Variables and Related Objects*. Kluwer Academic Publishers, Netherlands, p. 143.
- Hellier C., Mason K. O. and Rosen S. R., 1987, *Mon. Not. R. Astron. Soc.*, **228**, 463.
- Henry T. J. et al., 1999, *Astrophys. J.*, **512**, 864.
- Horne K., Welsh W. F., Wade R. A., 1993, *Astrophys. J.*, **410**, 357.
- Horne K., Wood J. H. and Stiening R. F., 1991, *Astrophys. J.*, **378**, 271.
- Ishida M., Mukai K. and Osborne J. P., 1994, *Publ. Astron. Soc. Jap.*, **46**, L81.
- Ishii M., Shibata M. and Mino Y., 2005, *Phys. Rev. D*, **71**, 044017.
- Jain R. K., Kouvaris C., Nielsen N. G., 2016, *Phys. Rev. Lett.* **116**, 151103.
- Kobayashi T., 2019, *Rept. Prog. Phys.* **82**, no. 8, 086901.
- Littlefair S. P., Dhillon V. S., Marsh T. R. et al., 2008, *Mon. Not. R. Astron. Soc.*, **388**, 1582
- Manasse F. K. and Misner C. W., 1963, *J. Math. Phys.*, **4**, 735.
- Marsh T. R., 1988, *Mon. Not. R. Astron. Soc.*, **231**, 1117.
- Martin J. S., Friend M. T., Smith R. C. and Jones D. H. P., 1989, *Mon. Not. R. Astron. Soc.*, **240**, 519.
- Mukai K. et al., 1990, *Mon. Not. R. Astron. Soc.*, **245**, 385.
- Mukai K., Corbet R. H. D. and Smale A. P., 1988, *Mon. Not. R. Astron. Soc.*, **234**, 291.
- Pani, P., Cardoso, V., and Delsate, T., 2011, *Phys. Rev. Lett.* **107**, 031101.
- Pani, P., Delsate, T., and Cardoso, V., 2012, *Phys. Rev. D* **85**, 084020.
- Patterson J., Kemp J., Jensen L. et al., 2000, *Publ. Astron. Soc. pac.*, **112**, 1567.
- Patterson J., Vanmunster T., Skillman D. R. et al., 2000, *Publ. Astron. Soc. Pac.*, **112**, 1584.
- Rappaport S. and Joss P. C., 1982, *Astrophys. J.*, **254**, 616.
- Renvoize V., Baraffe I., Kolb U. and Ritter H., 2002, *Astron. Astrophys.*, **389**, 485.
- Rolfe D. J., Abbott T. M. C. and Haswell C. A., 2002, *Mon. Not. R. Astron. Soc.*, **334**, 699.
- Smak J. I., 2002, *Acta Astronomica*, **52**, 189.
- Smith D. A., Dhillon V. S. and Marsh T. R., 1998, *Mon. Not. R. Astron. Soc.*, **296**, 465.
- Smith R. C., Cameron A. C., Tucknott D. S., 1993, in O. Regev, G. Shaviv eds, *Cataclysmic Variables and Related Physics*. IOP Publ., Bristol, p. 70.
- Steehgs D., Perryman M. A., Reynolds A. et al., 2003, *Mon. Not. R. Astron. Soc.*, **339**, 810.
- Still M. D., Buckle D. A. H. and Garlick M. A., 1998, *Mon. Not. R. Astron. Soc.*, **299**, 545.
- Thoroughgood T. D., Dhillon V. S., Steeghs D. et al., 2005, *Mon. Not. R. Astron. Soc.*, **357**, 881.
- Thorstensen J. R., 2000, *Publ. Astron. Soc. pac.*, **112**, 1269.
- Vande Putte D., Smith R. C., Hawkins N. A., Martin J. S., 2003, *Mon. Not. R. Astron. Soc.*, **342**, 151.
- Vollick, D. N., 2004, *Phys. Rev.* **D69** 064030.
- Vollick, D. N., 2005, *Phys. Rev.* **D72** 084026.
- Wade R. A. and Horne K., 1988, *Astrophys. J.*, **324**, 411.
- Warner B., 1995, *Cataclysmic Variable Stars*, Cambridge University Press.
- Wood J. and Crawford C. S., 1986, *Mon. Not. R. Astron. Soc.*, **222**, 645.
- Wood J. H., Horne K., Berrinan G. and Wade R. A., 1989, *Astrophys. J.*, **341**, 974.
- Wood J., Horne K., Berriman G. et al., 1986, *Mon. Not. R. Astron. Soc.*, **219**, 629.