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We provide an observation method for gravitational waves using a pulsar timing array to extend the observational frequency range up to the rotational frequency of pulsars. For this purpose, we perform an analysis of a perturbed electromagnetic wave in perturbed spacetime from the field perspective. We apply the analysis to the received electromagnetic waves in a radio telescope, which partially composes the periodic electromagnetic pulse emitted by a pulsar. For simple observation, two frequency windows are considered. For each window, we propose gauge-invariant quantities and discuss their observations.

Introduction — A pulsar is a stably rotating compact star which periodically emits an electromagnetic pulse (EMP) periodically due to its magnetic axis being tilted to the rotation axis. Because the rotation of a pulsar is extremely stable, the period of the EMP generally remains roughly constant. However, when an EMP passes through a perturbed spacetime, its period will be changed, and the perturbation will contain information about gravitational waves (GWs).

In practice, GW observation by a single pulsar measurement is not possible because various noises are larger than the GW signal. Instead, the correlation between measurements from different pulsars can amplify a stochastic gravitational wave (SGW) signal by increasing the measurement time if the noises of the measurements are independent of each other. In this way, GW observation is being performed by pulsar timing array (PTA) [1-3]. The method of extracting a SGW signal from the correlation was proposed by Hellings and Downs [4].

Let us look at the analysis for the effect of GW on the EMP period. When we consider an electromagnetic wave (EMW) with a frequency much larger than that of a GW, we can introduce geometrical optics. By an approximation of geometrical optics, the propagation direction of EMW follows null geodesics [5]. On the other hand, the time interval between emission and arrival time of the EMW is perturbed by GWs. The time interval can be obtained as the solution of the perturbed null geodesic equation with appropriate boundary conditions. In this way, the effect of GWs on the EMP period is calculated quantitatively as in [6].

In addition, assuming that GW frequency is much smaller than the EMP frequency, the well-known Detweiler redshift [7] is obtained. Note that we distinguish between the frequency of EMP and EMW. The EMP frequency is defined from the periodic intensity of the EMWs which is quadratic to the electromagnetic field. Therefore, a periodic EMP can be composed of EMWs with relatively high frequencies. For example, a radio telescope with a GHz frequency band of EMW measures a periodic EMP in KHz.

In this paper, we determine an analysis of perturbed EMWs that applies to the observation of GWs with frequencies comparable to the EMP frequency of a pulsar. To do this, we first obtain a general solution of the vacuum Maxwell equation in the presence of GWs without using the geometric optical approximation. The general solution consists of a particular solution and a homogeneous solution. The particular solution is determined by GWs, and the homogeneous solution is determined to satisfy the appropriate boundary condition for the electromagnetic field. In [8], Montanari performed an analysis of EMWs with GWs by solving the Maxwell equation introducing the Fermi normal coordinate. Instead, we will give a covariant analysis without introducing a coordinate system.

For measurement of EMWs, we introduce spatial scalars of the electromagnetic field independent to the spatial frame in a given observer, e.g., \(E^2, B^2,\) and \(E \cdot B\). When the measurement is given in components that depend on a spatial frame, the analysis of its perturbation is challenging because we need the frame perturbation that reflects the structure of the device. In contrast, spatial scalars are given only by the electric field, the magnetic field, and the spatial metric.

Finally, we restrict frequencies of GWs to much less than that of EMWs to introduce the geometrical optics approximation. On the other hand, the frequency of a GW can be comparable to that of an EMP. With these GWs, we obtain the perturbed spatial scalars of a periodic EMP composed by high frequency EMWs. As an application, two frequency windows for spatial scalars are considered. For each window, we propose gauge-invariant quantities and discuss their observations.

In this paper, we introduce the geometrized unit \((c = 1, G = 1)\) for the spacetime, and the Gaussian unit \((\epsilon_0 = 1/4\pi, \mu_0 = 4\pi)\) for the electromagnetism. Indices represented by italic lowercase Latin letters starting from \(a\) are abstract indices, as in [9].

Ansatz — Perturbed metric \(g\) of a perturbation parameter \(\epsilon\) is represented by \(g_{ab} = g_{ab} + \epsilon h_{ab} + O(\epsilon^2)\), where \(g\) is the Minkowski background metric, and \(h\) is the first order metric perturbation. We impose gauge conditions on \(h\) as \(\nabla^b h_{ab} = 0, h^a_a = 0\), where \(\nabla\) is the...
Let us consider geodesic observers with 4-velocity vector field \( \dot{t} \) over perturbed spacetime given by \( \dot{n}^a = n^a + \epsilon \delta n^a + O ( \epsilon^2 ) \), where \( n^a = -g^{ab} \nabla_b t \) is the normal vector of globally inertial time coordinate \( t \) in Minkowski spacetime, and \( \delta n \) is the first order perturbation. Additionally imposing a gauge condition on \( h \) as \( h_{ab} \dot{n}^a = 0 \), geodesic observers satisfying \( \delta n^a = 0 \) are possible. We only consider these observers.

Metric perturbation \( h \) is superposed by monochromatic plane GW over all directions and all frequencies. It is given by \( h_{ab} = \int d^2 \kappa \int_{-\infty}^{\infty} \frac{d\omega_b}{2\pi} \tilde{h}_{ab} e^{iP} \) where \( \kappa \) is the spatial unit vector, \( d^2 \kappa \) is the solid angle element of 3-dimensional unit sphere, \( \omega_b \) is the frequency, \( \tilde{h} \) the amplitude of GW with \((\omega_b, \kappa)\), and \( P (t, \vec{x}) \equiv \omega_b (-t + \kappa \cdot \vec{x}) \) is the phase. Let \( \dot{h} \) be zero when \( \omega_b = 0 \). This corresponds to a gauge choice of \( h \). Vector \( k^a \equiv g^{ab} \tilde{h}_b \) is decomposed into \( k^a = \omega_b (n^a + \kappa^a) \).

We assume that the electromagnetic potential \( A \) has first order strength in \( \epsilon \), i.e., \( \epsilon A_a = \epsilon A_a + \epsilon^2 X_a + O ( \epsilon^3 ) \), where \( A \) is leading order value, and \( X \) is its next order perturbation. In the field strength, \( \epsilon F_{ab} = 2 \nabla_a A_b - \epsilon^2 Y_{ab} + O ( \epsilon^3 ) \), where \( F_{ab} = 2 \nabla_a A_b \), and \( Y_{ab} = 2 \nabla_a X_b \). Additionally, we assume no electromagnetic source. Then, its stress-energy having \( O (\epsilon^2) \) does not influence metric perturbation \( h \) by the perturbed Einstein equation.

We impose gauge conditions on \( A \) as \( \nabla^a A_a = 0 \) and \( A_{ab} n^a = 0 \). Then, the Maxwell equation in leading order becomes the wave equation \( \nabla^a \nabla_a A = 0 \). We consider a plane EMW propagating to spatial unit vector \( \lambda = A_a = \int_{-\infty}^{\infty} \frac{d\omega}{2\pi} A e^{iQ} \), where \( \omega \) is the frequency, \( A \) is the amplitude of EMW with \((\omega, \lambda)\), and \( Q (t, \vec{x}) \equiv \omega_b (-t + \lambda \cdot \vec{x}) \) is the phase. Let \( \dot{A} \) be zero when \( \omega_b = 0 \). This corresponds to a gauge choice of \( A \). Vector \( l^a = g^{ab} \nabla_b Q \) is decomposed into \( l^a = \omega_b (n^a + \lambda^a) \).

For measurement of an EMW, we introduce basic spatial scalars defined by \( \gamma I_1 = \gamma^{ab} E_a E_b \), \( \gamma I_2 = \gamma^{ab} B_a B_b \), \( \gamma I_3 = \gamma^{ab} E_a B_b \), where \( E_a = \nabla_a l^a \) is the electric field, \( B_a = \frac{1}{2} \varepsilon^{abc} B_{bc} \) is the magnetic field, \( \gamma \) is the spatial metric, and \( \varepsilon \) is the spatial Levi-Civita tensor. All spatial scalars that are composed only by electromagnetic quantities \( (E, B) \) and spacetime quantities \( (\gamma, \varepsilon) \) can be expressed by a combination of \( I_1 \), \( I_2 \), and \( I_3 \). For example, the magnitude of the Poynting vector is given by \( \frac{1}{4\pi} \sqrt{I_1^2 I_2^2 - I_3^2} \). The basic spatial scalars are expanded in \( \epsilon \) as \( \gamma I_i = \epsilon^2 I_i + \epsilon^3 \delta I_i + O ( \epsilon^4 ) \) for \( i \in \{1, 2, 3\} \).

**Perturbation of EMW** — The perturbation of electromagnetic potential \( X \) is determined by the perturbed Maxwell equation, i.e.,

\[
\nabla^a \nabla_a X = \int_V dV \left( 2i \tilde{C}_{ab} l^b \tilde{A}_c - \tilde{h}_{bc} l^b l^c \tilde{A}_a \right) e^{i(P + Q)} ,
\]

where \( \tilde{C}_{bc} = \frac{1}{4i} \left( k_b \tilde{h}_c + k_c \tilde{h}_b - k_a \tilde{h}_{bc} \right) \), and the integration over domain \( V \) is defined by

\[
\int_V dV \equiv \int_{\kappa \neq 0} d^2 \kappa \int_{-\infty}^{\infty} \frac{d\omega_a}{2\pi} \int_{-\infty}^{\infty} \frac{d\omega_b}{2\pi} ,
\]

excluding the case of \( \kappa^a = \lambda^a \) from \( V \), in which the right-hand side of Eq. (1) vanishes. The solution \( X \) consists of homogeneous solution \( X^P \) and particular solution \( X^h \). As shown in [10], the particular solution is obtained by

\[
X^a_p = \int_V dV \tilde{X}^p e^{i(P + Q)} ,
\]

where \( \tilde{X}^p \) is

\[
\tilde{X}^p = \frac{1}{k^d l_d} \left( -2i \tilde{C}_{ab} l^b \tilde{A}_c + \tilde{h}_{bc} l^b l^c \tilde{A}_a \right) .
\]

We define its field strength as

\[
Y_{ab}^p \equiv 2 \nabla_a X^p_b = \int_V dV \tilde{Y}^p_{ab} e^{i(P + Q)} ,
\]

where \( \tilde{Y}^p \) is

\[
\tilde{Y}^p \equiv 2i \left( k_{[a} + l_{[a} \right) \tilde{X}^p_{b]} ,
\]

The homogeneous solution \( X^h \) is required to accommodate a boundary condition. Because it is governed by the wave equation \( \nabla^b \nabla_b X^h_a = 0 \), it has form of

\[
X^h_a = \int_{\mu \geq 0} d^2 \mu \int_{\omega_b \neq 0} \frac{d\omega_b}{2\pi} \tilde{X}^h_a e^{iR} ,
\]

where \( \mu \) is the spatial unit vector, \( d^2 \mu \) is the solid angle element of 3-dimensional unit sphere, \( \omega_b \) is the frequency, \( \tilde{X}^h \) is the amplitude of \((\omega_b, \mu)\), and \( R (t, \vec{x}) \equiv \omega_b (-t + \mu \cdot \vec{x}) \) is the phase. We only consider waves propagating positively with respect to \( \lambda \) such that \( \mu^a \lambda_a \geq 0 \). Defining its field strength as \( Y_{ab}^h \equiv 2 \nabla_{[a} X^h_{b]} \), we impose the boundary condition such that the field strength perturbation \( Y_{ab} = Y_{ab}^p + Y_{ab}^h \) vanishes on the plane which is perpendicular to \( \lambda \) and located at the source of the EMW. Explicitly, \( Y_{ab} (t, \vec{x}) = 0 \) for all \( (t, \vec{x}) \) such that \( \lambda \cdot \vec{x} = -d \) where \( d \) is distance between the source plane and the origin. In conclusion, the solution that meets all conditions we imposed is given by

\[
Y_{ab}^h = - \int_V dV \tilde{Y}_{ab}^p e^{i(P + Q + \Delta)} ,
\]
where
\[
\Delta (\vec{x}) \equiv \left\{ \sqrt{\omega_c^2 + 2\omega_c \omega_n + (\omega_g k^a \lambda_a)^2} - \omega_c - \omega_g k^a \lambda_a \right\} (\lambda \cdot \vec{x} + d).
\] (9)

Collecting \( Y^p \) in Eq. (5) and \( Y^h \) in Eq. (8), we obtain the field strength perturbation \( Y \) as
\[
Y_{ab} = \int_V dV \tilde{Y}^p_{ab} e^{i(P + Q)} (1 - e^{i\Delta}).
\] (10)

Then, the perturbations of electric field and magnetic field are given by
\[
\delta E_a = Y_{ab} u^b,
\]
(11)
\[
\delta B_a = \frac{1}{2} \epsilon_{abc} Y_{bc} - \epsilon_{abc} h^d \rho_{dc}.
\] (12)

Finally, the perturbations of spatial scalars are obtained by
\[
\delta I_1 = 2g^{ab} \delta E_a E_b - h^{ab} E_a E_b,
\]
(13)
\[
\delta I_2 = 2g^{ab} \delta B_a B_b - h^{ab} B_a B_b,
\]
(14)
\[
\delta I_3 = g^{ab} \delta E_a B_b + g^{ab} \delta B_a E_b - h^{ab} E_a B_b.
\] (15)

**Application to PTA** — For GW observation, we consider the square of the electric field \( \delta I_1 \). For example, a static conducting wire can only be powered by an electric field. Using three conducting wires oriented in different directions, we can measure three components of the electric field. Eventually, \( \delta I_1 \) is constructed by these components.

An plane EMW propagating to \( \lambda \) from a rotating pulsar with frequency \( \omega_0 \) has an electric field satisfying the periodic condition,
\[
E_a (u + T) = E_a (u),
\] (16)
where \( u(t, \vec{x}) \equiv t - \lambda \cdot \vec{x} \) and \( T = 2\pi/\omega_0 \). Then, the electric field is decomposed into the Fourier series given by
\[
E_a (u) = \sum_{n=-\infty}^{\infty} \tilde{E}^{(n)}_a e^{-i n \omega_0 u},
\] (17)
where \( \tilde{E}^{(n)}_a \) are Fourier coefficients satisfying \( \tilde{E}^{(-n)} = \tilde{E}^{(n)*} \).

A radio telescope measures an amplified EMW using a parabolic mirror. Thus, received EMWs in the radio telescope have frequencies that are larger than the mirror’s inverse focal length. Frequency bands of existing radio telescopes extend from 100MHz to 100GHz [11]. However, the frequency of pulsar \( \omega_0 \) is at most \( \sim 1\text{KHz} \) [12]. Accordingly, we only consider the partial frequency range of EMW inside the radio telescope frequency band as
\[
E_a (u) = \sum_{|n|=n_1}^{n_2} \tilde{E}^{(n)}_a e^{-i n \omega_0 u},
\] (18)
where \( n_1 \) and \( n_2 \) are positive integers much larger than 1, and the summation with vertical bars are defined by
\[
\sum_{|n|=n_1}^{n_2} \equiv \sum_{n=n_1}^{n_2} + \sum_{n=-n_2}^{-n_1}.
\] (19)

To introduce the geometrical optics, we need the condition of \( \omega_c = n\omega_0 \gg \omega_g \). In our situation, it is already the case that \( n \gg 1 \). Therefore, GWs of frequencies comparable to \( \omega_0 \) are in the geometrical optics regime. Keeping the leading order \( O(\omega_c/\omega_g) \) and the next order \( O(1) \) in Eq. (9), we obtain
\[
\Delta (\vec{x}) \simeq \omega_g (1 - \kappa^a \lambda_a) (\lambda \cdot \vec{x} + d).
\] (20)

Note that \( \Delta \) does not depend on \( \omega_0 \) because the leading order vanishes. By substitution of Eq. (18) into Eq. (13), keeping the the leading order and the next order as well, we obtain
\[
\delta I_1 = - \int_{\kappa \neq \lambda} d^2 \kappa \int_{|\omega_0| = \omega_1} d\omega \sum_{|n|=n_1}^{n_2} \sum_{|m|=m_1}^{m_2} \tilde{E}^{(n)}_a \tilde{E}^{(m)*}_b \times \left\{ \frac{1}{\Theta} \left[ 1 + \frac{\omega_0}{\omega_g} \tilde{h}_{cd} \lambda^c \lambda^d P^{ab}_{(\lambda)} (1 - e^{i\Delta}) + \tilde{h}^{ab} e^{i\Delta} \right] \right\} e^{iP} e^{-i(n+m)\omega_0 u},
\] (21)
where \( (\omega_1, \omega_2) \) is the GW frequency range, \( \Theta \equiv 1 - \kappa^a \lambda_a \), and \( P^{ab}_{(\lambda)} \equiv g^{ab} + n^a n^b - \lambda^c \lambda^d \) is the projection orthogonal to \( n \) and \( \lambda \). The integral with vertical bars is defined by
\[
\int_{|\omega_0| = \omega_1} d\omega = \int_{\omega_1}^{\omega_2} d\omega + \int_{-\omega_1}^{-\omega_2} d\omega.
\] (22)

**Frequency Window I** — We set a frequency window of range \((0, \omega_0/2)\) for \( I_1 = I_1 + \delta I_1 + O (e^2) \). We also assume for simplicity that the GW frequency range is below \( \omega_0/2 \). Then, we obtain \( I_1 \) and \( \delta I_1 \) as
\[
I_1 = 2P^{ab} \sum_{|n|=n_1}^{n_2} \tilde{E}^{(n)}_a \tilde{E}^{(n)*}_b,
\] (23)
\[
\delta I_1 = -2 \int_{\kappa \neq \lambda} d^2 \kappa \int_{|\omega_0| = \omega_1} d\omega \sum_{|n|=n_1}^{n_2} \tilde{E}^{(n)}_a \tilde{E}^{(n)*}_b \times \left\{ \frac{1}{\Theta} \tilde{h}_{cd} \lambda^c \lambda^d P^{ab}_{(\lambda)} (1 - e^{i\Delta}) + \tilde{h}^{ab} e^{i\Delta} \right\} e^{iP}.
\] (24)

Note that \( \delta I_1 \) is gauge-invariant because \( I_1 \) is constant scalar. This statement is proved by the lemma in [13].

To give an understandable picture, we simplify the EMW as a monochromatic plane wave of \((\omega_n, \lambda)\) having the form of
\[
E_a = 2\Re \left\{ (\mathcal{E}_p P_a + i\mathcal{E}_s s_a) e^{i(Q + \delta_s)} \right\},
\]
where \( \delta_s \) is determined to make \( \mathcal{E}_p \) and \( \mathcal{E}_s \) real, and to make \( \{n, p, s, \lambda\} \) an orthonormal basis. The ellipticity of
the EMW polarization ellipse is defined by
\[ \tan \chi \equiv \frac{E_{(s)}}{E_{(p)}} \] (26)

Likewise, an amplitude of GW \( \tilde{h}_{ab} (\omega, \kappa) \) has the form of
\[ \tilde{h}_{ab} = (H_+ e_{ab}^+ + i H_\times e_{ab}^\times) e^{i \delta}, \] (27)
where \( \delta \) is determined to make \( H_+ \) and \( H_\times \) real and \( \{e^+, e^\times\} \) an orthonormal basis satisfying
\[ 0 = e_{ab}^A b^b, \] (28)
\[ 0 = e_{ab}^b b^b, \] (29)
\[ \delta^{AB} = e_{ab}^A e_{cd}^b a^c d^d, \] (30)
for \( A, B \in \{+, \times\} \). The set of all possible orthonormal bases orthogonal to \( \kappa \) is parameterized by \( \psi \) as
\[ e_{ab}^+ (\psi) = \cos (2 \psi) e_{ab}^0 (0) + \sin (2 \psi) e_{ab}^\times (0), \] (31)
\[ e_{ab}^\times (\psi) = -\sin (2 \psi) e_{ab}^0 (0) + \cos (2 \psi) e_{ab}^\times (0), \] (32)
where \( \{e^0 (0), e^\times (0)\} \) is a reference basis. We define \( \theta \) and \( \phi \) as the polar and azimuthal angle, respectively, of \( \kappa \) with respect to the spatial frame \( \{p, s, \lambda\} \) such that
\[ \kappa^a = \sin \theta \cos \phi a^a + \sin \theta \sin \phi a^s + \cos \theta a^\lambda. \]
Substituting Eqs. (25) and (27) into Eqs. (23) and (24), the amplitude of observation \( H (\omega, \kappa) \) and the complex detector tensor \( \tilde{D} (\omega, \kappa, \psi) \) are defined as
\[ \frac{\delta I_1}{I_1} = \int_{\kappa \neq \lambda} d^2 \kappa \int_{|\omega_\kappa| = \omega_1} \frac{d \omega_\kappa}{2 \pi} \tilde{H}_e i^p, \] (33)
\[ \tilde{H} = \tilde{h}_{ab} D_{ab}, \] (34)
\[ \tilde{D}^{ab} = -\left(\cos^2 \chi p^a p^b + \sin^2 \chi s^a s^b\right) \epsilon^{\Delta} - \frac{1}{\Theta} \lambda^a \lambda^b \right(1 - \epsilon^{\Delta}). \] (35)

We consider the complex pattern functions \( F^A \) for \( A \in \{+, \times\} \) from
\[ \tilde{H} = H_A \tilde{F}^A, \] (36)
where we used the Einstein summation convention for index \( A \). The strength of observation \( |\tilde{H}|^2 \) is given by
\[ |\tilde{H}|^2 = H_A H_B F^{AB}, \] (37)
where \( F^{AB} \equiv \Re \left(\tilde{F}^A \tilde{F}^{* B}\right) \). To see the angular dependency of the strength, we consider the angle average of \( |\tilde{H}|^2 \) over \( \Delta \) and \( \psi \) fixing \( H_A \) because they can be any values from different pulsar locations and GW sources. As a result, we found that
\[ \langle F^{AB} \rangle_{\psi, \Delta} = \frac{1}{2} \delta^{AB} \langle F \rangle_{\psi, \Delta}, \] (38)
where \( \langle \cdot \rangle_{\psi, \Delta} \) is the successive angle average over \( \psi \) and \( \Delta \), and \( F \equiv \delta^{AB} F_{AB} \) is the trace of \( F^{AB} \). Angular dependencies of \( \langle F \rangle_{\psi, \Delta} \) for different ellipticities \( \chi \) are depicted in Fig. 1. The sky average of the strength is given by
\[ \langle |\tilde{H}|^2 \rangle_{\text{sky}} = \frac{1}{2} \delta^{AB} H_A H_B \langle F \rangle_{\text{sky}}, \] (39)
\[ \langle F \rangle_{\text{sky}} = \frac{11}{6} \left(1 + \frac{3}{55} \cos (4 \chi) - \frac{10}{11} \cos \Delta\right), \] (40)
where \( \langle \cdot \rangle_{\text{sky}} \) is the successive angle average over \( \theta, \phi \), and \( \psi \).

We consider the observation of SGWs by the correlation between two observations from two different pulsars. Assuming that a SGW is stationary, Gaussian, isotropic, and evenly polarized, the correlation between two amplitudes in the SGW is given by
\[ \langle \tilde{h}_{ab} (\omega, \kappa) \tilde{h}_{cd} (\omega', \kappa') \rangle = 2 \pi \delta (\omega_\kappa - \omega_\kappa') S_h (\omega_\kappa) \times \frac{1}{4 \pi} \delta^2 (\kappa, \kappa') P^{(e)}_{abcd}, \] (41)
where \( \langle \cdot \rangle \) is the ensemble average, \( S_h (\omega_\kappa) \) is the power spectral density of the SGW, \( P^{(e)}_{abcd} \equiv \delta_{AB} e_{ab} (\psi) e_{cd}^B (\psi), \)
and $\delta^2 (\kappa, \kappa') \equiv \delta (\cos \theta - \cos \theta') \delta (\phi - \phi')$. Although we used the orthonormal basis $\{e^+ (\psi), e^- (\psi)\}$ that depends on $\psi$, $p^{(\kappa)}$ is independent of the choice of $\psi$. Then, the correlation between two observations is given by

$$\left\langle \frac{\delta l_1^*}{T_1} \frac{\delta l_1^*}{T_1} \right\rangle = \int_{|\omega_\delta| = \omega_1} d\omega_\delta S_h \int_{\kappa \neq \lambda, \lambda'} \frac{d^2 \kappa}{4 \pi} D^{*ab} D_{\lambda'\lambda} p_{\kappa}^{(c)} p_{\kappa'}^{(c)},$$

(42)

where quantities with prime are defined from a different pulsar. Assuming, $\omega_\delta^2 d \gg 1$, $\omega_\delta^2 d \gg 1$, and that distance between two pulsars is much larger than wave length of the SGW, it approximately reduces to

$$\left\langle \frac{\delta l_1^*}{T_1} \frac{\delta l_1^*}{T_1} \right\rangle \simeq C (\lambda, \lambda') \int_{|\omega_\delta| = \omega_1} d\omega_\delta S_h,$$

(43)

where $C (\lambda, \lambda')$ is given by

$$C (\lambda, \lambda') \equiv \int_{\kappa \neq \lambda, \lambda'} \frac{d^2 \kappa}{4 \pi} \Theta \Theta' \delta_{abcd} \lambda^a \lambda^b \lambda^c \lambda^d.$$  

(44)

Having $\cos \alpha \equiv \lambda^a X_a$, $C$ becomes

$$C (\alpha) = 1 + \frac{1}{3} \cos \alpha + 4 (1 + \cos \alpha) \ln \left(\frac{\sin \alpha}{2}\right),$$

(45)

which is identical to the Hellings-Downs curve up to factor 4.

**Frequency Window II** — We set a frequency window of range $(\omega_0/2, 3\omega_0/2)$ for $I_1$. We also assume that the GW frequency range is below to $\omega_0/2$. Then, we obtain $I_1$ and $\delta I_1$ as

$$I_1 = 4 \Re \left( P_{ab}^{\kappa} \sum_{n=1}^{n_2} \tilde{E}_{a}^{(n)} \tilde{E}_{b}^{(n+1)} e^{-i\omega_\delta u} \right),$$

(46)

$$\delta I_1 = -2 \Re \left[ \int_{\kappa \neq \lambda, \lambda'} \frac{d^2 \kappa}{4 \pi} \int_{|\omega_\delta| = \omega_1} d\omega_\delta \sum_{n=1}^{n_2} \tilde{E}_{a}^{(n)} \tilde{E}_{b}^{(n+1)} \right.$$

$$\times \left\{ \frac{1}{\Theta} \left[ 1 + \frac{\omega_0}{\omega_\delta} \right] \tilde{h}_{cd} \lambda^c \lambda^d P_{1}^{ab} (1 - e^{i\Delta}) + 2 \tilde{h}_{ab} e^{i\Delta} \right\}$$

$$\times e^{iP_{1} e^{-i\omega_\delta u}} \right].$$

(47)

Note that $\delta I_1$ is not gauge-invariant because $I_1$ is oscillating with frequency $\omega_\delta$.

To find a gauge-invariant quantity, we consider peak time $t_k$ of $I_1$ for integer $k$ satisfying

$$I_1' (t_k) = 0,$$

(48)

where prime is the derivative $n^a \nabla_a$ and $t_k = t_0 + kT$ because of the periodicity. The perturbation of the peak time is given by

$$\delta t_k = \frac{\delta (I_1') (t_k)}{I_1' (t_k)}$$

(49)

where $\delta (I_1')$ is easily obtained from the identity $\delta (I_1') = (\delta I_1')'$ because $\delta t^n = 0$. Then, quantity $\delta T_k = \delta t_{k+1} - \delta t_k$ is gauge-invariant because its background value is constant $T$. Because of its complexities, we think that $\delta T_k$ does not have many advantages compared to Eq. (24) in frequency window I. However, in limit $\omega_\delta \ll \omega_0$, it is simplified drastically and becomes

$$\delta T_k T = - \int_{\kappa \neq \lambda} d^2 \kappa \int_{|\omega_\delta| = \omega_1} d\omega_\delta \tilde{h}_{ab} \lambda^a \lambda^b$$

$$\times \left( 1 - e^{i\Delta} \right) e^{-i\omega_\delta (t_k - \kappa \cdot \vec{r})},$$

(50)

which is used in the current GW observation by PTA.

**Conclusions** — We have obtained the perturbation of a plane EMW with arbitrary GWs. In the analysis, we directly solved the vacuum Maxwell equation imposing the boundary condition on the plane perpendicular to the propagating direction of the EMW located at a pulsar. This result was applied to the received EMW in a radio telescope, which partially composes the periodic EMP emitted by the pulsar. In the process, we assumed the geometrical optics such that the frequency of the received EMW is much larger than those of the EMP and the GWs. Because we did not impose the smallness of the GW frequency compared to the EMP frequency, the observational frequency range of PTA is extended by our results.

For the observation of GW, we introduced two frequency windows. In frequency window I, we proposed a gauge-invariant quantity that being the square of the electric field, and showed its antenna patterns as being different from the ellipticity of EMW. The correlation between observations from two pulsars has an angular dependency identical to the one given by Hellings and Downs. In frequency window II, we proposed a gauge-invariant quantity that is the time interval between adjacent peaks. Due to its complexity, there is no advantage over the gauge-invariant quantity in frequency window I. However, when the GW frequency is much smaller than frequency of the pulsar, it is simplified considerably and becomes the formula used in the current GW observation by PTA.
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