

Remarks on Rydberg atom constraints on the cosmological constant

Stephen L. Adler*

Institute for Advanced Study, Einstein Drive, Princeton, NJ 08540, USA.

In an interesting paper, Kundu, Pradhan, and Rosenzweig have obtained a bound on the cosmological constant using high accuracy energy level measurements of Rydberg atoms. We show here that the effective potential they use can be derived from the geodesic equation for the atomic electron, and that this method shows that the energy shifts are computable from the leading cosmological constant contribution to the temporal component of the gravitational metric. To within a small factor, bounds of similar magnitude are obtained from the standard cosmological constant action, in which “dark energy” is taken as a vacuum energy, and from a novel cosmological constant action based on Weyl scaling invariance, in which dark energy is not a vacuum energy. So the Rydberg atom bound does not reveal whether or not the vacuum gravitates.

I. ELECTRON EFFECTIVE POTENTIAL FROM THE GEODESIC EQUATION

In their paper on Rydberg atom bounds on the cosmological constant [1], Kundu, Pradhan, and Rosenzweig use an effective potential for the electron inferred from an exponentially expanding de Sitter universe. Our aim in this paper is to show that the same potential can be obtained in a more general way from the geodesic equation for motion of the electron, which gives added insight into how bounds obtained from this potential vary between different models for the cosmological constant action.

Weinberg in his text “Gravitation and Cosmology” [2] gives the geodesic equation for a general spherical metric. For the line element

$$ds^2 = B(r)dt^2 - A(r)dr^2 - r^2d\Omega \quad , \quad (1)$$

Eq. (8.4.19) of [2] gives

$$\frac{A(r)}{B^2(r)} \left(\frac{dr}{dt} \right)^2 + \frac{J^2}{r^2} - \frac{1}{B(r)} = -E \quad , \quad (2)$$

where $E_{nr} = (1 - E)/2$ plays the role of the non-relativistic energy per unit mass. Comparing this

*Electronic address: adler@ias.edu

with the nonrelativistic energy formula

$$\frac{1}{2} \left(\frac{dr}{dt} \right)^2 + \frac{V_{eff}}{m_e} - E_{nr} = 0 \quad , \quad (3)$$

and doing algebraic rearrangement to eliminate $(dr/dt)^2$ we get a formula for V_{eff} ,

$$\frac{V_{eff}}{m_e} = \frac{B^2(r)}{2A(r)} \frac{J^2}{r^2} + \frac{B(r)}{2A(r)} [B(r) - 1] - E_{nr} \left[\frac{B^2(r)}{A(r)} - 1 \right] \quad . \quad (4)$$

Since $B(r)$ and $A(r)$ are unity up to small corrections of order the electrostatic and gravitational potentials and the cosmological constant, the cosmological constant contribution to the effective potential is given by

$$V_{eff} \simeq \frac{m_e}{2} [B(r)_{cosm} - 1] \quad . \quad (5)$$

As summarized in Adler [3], one can write for a central mass M in geometrized units,

$$\begin{aligned} A(r) &= 1 + 2M/r - C_A \Lambda r^2 + D_A \Lambda M r + \dots, \\ B(r) &= 1 - 2M/r - C_B \Lambda r^2 + D_B \Lambda M r + \dots, \end{aligned} \quad (6)$$

with the parameters given in Table I for a standard dark energy action and for a Weyl scaling invariant [4] dark energy action. So the general formula for the cosmological constant contribution

TABLE I: Parameters C_A , C_B , D_A , D_B for the spherically symmetric line element arising from the conventional and the Weyl scaling invariant dark energy actions.

dark energy type	Equations	C_A	C_B	D_A	D_B
conventional	(2),(6)	-1/3	1/3	4/3	0
Weyl scaling invariant	(1), (3)–(5)	1	1	-10	-14

to V_{eff} is

$$V_{eff} = -\frac{m_e C_B}{2} \Lambda r^2 \quad (7)$$

which for the standard dark energy action gives $V_{eff} = -(1/6)m_e \Lambda r^2$, in agreement with Eq. (7) of [1]. For a Weyl scaling invariant dark energy action, one instead gets $V_{eff} = -(1/2)m_e \Lambda r^2$ according to Table I. Thus qualitatively, there is no distinction between the potentials arising in the two cases, as well as for other models of dark energy that take the form of a gravitational action, which will each have a characteristic value of C_B .

One might ask what happens if the center for measuring \vec{r} is not taken as the center of the atom, but a displacement \vec{R} from the atomic center. Then r^2 in Eq. (7) is replaced by $\vec{R}^2 + 2\vec{R} \cdot \vec{r} + r^2$. The term \vec{R}^2 is a constant and does not contribute to energy level differences in Rydberg atoms, and the term $2\vec{R} \cdot \vec{r}$ will average to zero over any inversion invariant squared atomic wave function. So the calculation of energy differences is invariant with respect to the choice of \vec{R} .

II. PERTURBATION THEORY OF RYDBERG ATOMS

Given V_{eff} , the change in the energy level of a Rydberg atom can be calculated from first order perturbation theory,

$$\Delta E_{cosm} = \langle \Psi | V_{eff} | \Psi \rangle = -\frac{m_e C_B}{2} \Lambda \langle \Psi | r^2 | \Psi \rangle \simeq -\frac{m_e C_B}{2} \Lambda R^2 \quad , \quad (8)$$

where R is the radius of the Rydberg atom orbit. Thus, from an upper bound $|\Delta E_{cosm}| < U$ we get a bound on the cosmological constant

$$\Lambda < \frac{2U}{m_e C_B R^2} \quad . \quad (9)$$

If U is a bound on an energy level difference, R^2 in Eq. (9) will be an orbit radius-squared difference. In analogy with the formulas of Eqs. (12)-(15) of [1] this can be turned into a quantitative bound on Λ .

As Kundu et al. have noted, the energy scale of their bound is much smaller than the energy scale of the standard model, already implying very substantial cancellations if the cosmological constant is interpreted as a vacuum energy. But as shown above using a geodesic equation derivation, a very similar bound is obtained in a dark energy model [4] in which the cosmological constant does not arise as a vacuum energy. Thus, although the bounds set by Rydberg atoms are interesting, they do not reveal whether the gravitational vacuum gravitates. As long as C_B is of order unity, any dark energy action coupled to the gravitational metric gives a bound similar in magnitude to that given by the conventional cosmological constant action.

III. ACKNOWLEDGEMENT

I wish to thank Suman Kumar Kundu for calling my attention to [1] and for an informative email correspondence.

-
- [1] S. K. Kundo, A. Pradhan, and C. Rosenzweig, “Does the Vacuum Gravitare? Rydberg Atoms Say ‘Probably Not’ ”, arXiv:2208.14192v1.
 - [2] S. Weinberg, *Gravitation and Cosmology: Principles and Applications of the General Theory of Relativity*, John Wiley & Sons, New York (1972), Sec. 8.4.
 - [3] S. L. Adler, “Solar system relativity tests, formulas for light deflection by a central mass, and modification of the lens equation, for a Weyl scaling invariant dark energy”, arXiv:2204.09132.
 - [4] S. L. Adler, *Modern Physics Letters A* **36**, 2130027 (2021), arXiv:2111.12576.