

Autocatalysis of Graviton Production via the Gertsenshtein Effect in the Yang-Mills Field

Andrea Palessandro ^{*1} and Tony Rothman ^{†2}

¹Deloitte Consulting, Artificial Intelligence and Data

²New York University, Department of Applied Physics (retired)

Abstract

As shown by Gertsenshtein in 1961, an external magnetic field can couple electromagnetic to gravitational waves, giving rise to oscillations between them. Viewed as a quantum process, the magnetic field has catalyzed the mixing of photon and graviton states, which results in a phenomenon closely analogous to neutrino oscillations. We show that the self-interaction terms of the Yang-Mills SU(2) field can take the place of the external magnetic field and autocatalyze the mixing of Yang-Mills bosons and gravitons. In the process, rotational symmetry is broken and the Yang-Mills boson acquires a mass, much as in the Higgs mechanism.

1 Introduction

In a previous paper [1], we presented a straightforward derivation of the Gertsenshtein effect based on unpublished notes of Freeman Dyson [2]. As originally discovered by Gertsenshtein [3], a large external magnetic field can catalyze the mixing of electromagnetic and gravitational waves, resulting in a phenomenon closely analogous to neutrino oscillations. Essentially, the external field couples the internal magnetic field of the electromagnetic wave to the spacetime curvature produced by the gravitational wave. The coupled system of equations for the electromagnetic and gravitational fields in a region where the electromagnetic field is the only energy source admits oscillatory solutions.

*apalessandro@deloitte.dk

†tonyrothman@gmail.com

Although the original Gertsenshtein mechanism is entirely classical, in quantum-mechanical language one can say that the external magnetic field has catalysed a resonant mixing between photon and graviton states. Such an interpretation, however, assumes that individual quanta of the gravitational field exist, a fact that has not, and may never be, experimentally established [4–6].

If it is meaningful to talk about gravitational quanta, then despite the extremely weak coupling between the graviton and photon states, the exceptionally strong magnetic fields of neutron stars $\sim 10^{14}$ G make them plausible graviton factories. Such fields, however, are at approximately the Schwinger limit, where one expects electron-positron pairs to be created from the vacuum [5,7]. Such pairs raise the local index of refraction, which in turn lowers the speed of light, destroying the presumed coherence between the electromagnetic and gravitational waves. Depending on the field strength, the effectiveness of the Gertsenshtein mechanism is diminished, if not quenched altogether. That outcome should be investigated more closely.

The ultimate drawback to the Gertsenshtein mechanism, however, is that it requires the imposition of an external magnetic field. In attempting to address this issue one notices that the original Yang-Mills SU(2) field, in contrast to the U(1) Maxwell field, contains self-interaction terms. Evidently, the YM field might itself provide the “external magnetic field” required by the Gertsenshtein mechanism and consequently autocatalyze the mixing of graviton and boson states.

Given the importance of the original SU(2) YM field in the development of modern non-abelian gauge theories, it seems reasonable to examine the Gertsenshtein effect in that scenario, which is the purpose of this paper. Via a simple choice of potentials, we show that one of the “magnetic field” components can be arranged to have a constant background value, providing the necessary catalysis for graviton-boson mixing. This field component breaks Lorentz (rotational) symmetry, in the process generating a mass term for the gauge boson even as it mixes with the gravitational field.

Our approach is step-for-step the same as the one we employed in [1] (henceforth PR) to

derive the Gertsentein effect for the Maxwell field, and we recommend that the reader follow it side-by-side with that paper. We write down the gravitational wave equation, as well as the YM wave equation and search for simultaneous, oscillatory solutions between gravitons and YM bosons. As mentioned above, we find that such solutions do exist for a simple choice of the potentials, establishing the autocatalysis of graviton production by the Gertsenshtein effect in the Yang-Mills field.

2 Yang-Mills and Gravitational Wave Equations

To write down the wave equation for the Yang-Mills field, we first assume that the YM equations in flat space go over to the curved-space equations with the usual minimal substitutions, comma \rightarrow semicolon and $\eta_{\mu\nu} \rightarrow g_{\mu\nu}$. Then, the YM field equations become [8, 9]:

$$\frac{1}{\sqrt{g}}(\sqrt{g}g^{\alpha\mu}g^{\beta\nu}F_{\mu\nu}^a)_{,\beta} + e\varepsilon^{abc}g^{\alpha\mu}g^{\beta\nu}A_\beta^bF_{\mu\nu}^c = 0. \quad (2.1)$$

Notice that the first term represents the ordinary Einstein-Maxwell equations, and is the only term required in deriving the electromagnetic Gertsenshtein effect. In the second term, e is the coupling constant (taken to be dimensionless), ε^{abc} is the antisymmetric permutation operator, and the A^a are the three YM potentials, which will be designated by Latin indices $a, b, c = 1\dots 3$. The position of these indices is unimportant, but all repeated indices are summed.¹ The YM field tensor is

$$F_{\mu\nu}^a = \partial_\mu A_\nu^a - \partial_\nu A_\mu^a + e\varepsilon^{abc}A_\mu^bA_\nu^c. \quad (2.2)$$

The energy-momentum tensor is the same as the ordinary electromagnetic energy-momentum tensor, except that one must trace over the internal indices:

$$4\pi T_{\mu\nu} = F_{\mu\alpha}^a F_{a\nu}^\alpha - \frac{1}{4}g_{\mu\nu}F_{\alpha\beta}^a F_a^{\alpha\beta}. \quad (2.3)$$

One can define “magnetic” and “electric” fields in exactly the same way as in the Maxwellian case, that is, $F_{ij}^a = \varepsilon_{ijk}B_k^a$ and $F_{i0}^a = E_i^a$. We follow this convention; however, it should

¹We use units in which $\hbar = c = 1$ and follow MTW [10] conventions throughout. In particular, the flat-space metric is taken to be $\eta_{\mu\nu} = (-1, 1, 1, 1)$. Greek indices = 0...3 are spacetime indices, while Latin indices are spatial indices = 1...3. Repeated indices are always summed.

be understood that these are not the Maxwellian electric and magnetic fields. With these designations, the stress tensor reads:

$$4\pi T_{ij} = -(E_i^a E_j^a + B_i^a B_j^a) + \frac{1}{2}\delta_{ij}(\mathbf{E}^a \cdot \mathbf{E}^a + \mathbf{B}^a \cdot \mathbf{B}^a). \quad (2.4)$$

Next, we assume that the full spacetime metric is a small perturbation of the Minkowski background, such that $g_{\mu\nu} = \eta_{\mu\nu} + h_{\mu\nu}$, with $h_{\mu\nu} \ll 1$, and we carry out our calculations in the Transverse Traceless (TT), or Lorentz, gauge. Apart from the definition of $T_{\mu\nu}$, the (linearized) gravitational wave equation retains its usual form:

$$\square h_{\mu\nu} = -\frac{16\pi}{m_p^2} T_{\mu\nu}, \quad (2.5)$$

with $\square \equiv \partial^\mu \partial_\mu$, and m_p is the Planck mass.

Then, working to first order in $h_{\mu\nu}$, (2.1) yields

$$\begin{aligned} & \eta^{\alpha\mu} \eta^{\beta\nu} F_{\mu\nu,\beta}^a - \eta^{\alpha\mu} h^{\beta\nu} F_{\mu\nu,\beta}^a - \eta^{\alpha\mu} h^{\beta\nu}{}_{,\beta} F_{\mu\nu}^a - \eta^{\beta\nu} h^{\alpha\mu} F_{\mu\nu,\beta}^a - \eta^{\beta\nu} h^{\alpha\mu}{}_{,\beta} F_{\mu\nu}^a \\ & + e\eta^{\alpha\mu} \eta^{\beta\nu} \varepsilon^{abc} A_\beta^b F_{\mu\nu}^c - e(\eta^{\beta\nu} h^{\alpha\mu} + \eta^{\alpha\mu} h^{\beta\nu}) \varepsilon^{abc} A_\beta^b F_{\mu\nu}^c = 0. \end{aligned} \quad (2.6)$$

In the Lorentz gauge $h^{\beta\nu}{}_{,\beta} \equiv 0$. Discarding terms $\sim hF$ as small but keeping terms $\sim \partial hF$ as potentially large leaves

$$\eta^{\alpha\mu} \eta^{\beta\nu} F_{\mu\nu,\beta}^a - \eta^{\beta\nu} h^{\alpha\mu}{}_{,\beta} F_{\mu\nu}^a + e\eta^{\alpha\mu} \eta^{\beta\nu} \varepsilon^{abc} A_\beta^b F_{\mu\nu}^c = 0. \quad (2.7)$$

For $\alpha = i$, (2.7) becomes

$$-\dot{E}_i^a + \varepsilon_{ijk} B_{k,j}^a + \dot{h}_{ij} E_j^a - h_{i,j,k} \varepsilon_{jkl} B_\ell^a - e\varepsilon^{abc} A_0^b E_i^c + e\varepsilon^{abc} \varepsilon_{ijk} A_j^b B_k^c = 0. \quad (2.8)$$

As in case of the Maxwell field, to transform this expression into a wave equation we take its curl to get:

$$\begin{aligned} & -\varepsilon_{ijk} \dot{E}_{k,j}^a + B_{j,ji}^a - B_{i,jj}^a + \varepsilon_{ijk} (\dot{h}_{kp} E_p^a)_{,j} \\ & -\varepsilon_{ipr} \varepsilon_{jkl} (h_{rj,k} B_\ell^a)_{,p} - e\varepsilon_{ijk} \varepsilon^{abc} (A_0^b E_k^c)_{,j} \\ & + e\varepsilon^{abc} [(A_i^b B_j^c)_{,j} - (A_j^b B_i^c)_{,j}] = 0. \end{aligned} \quad (2.9)$$

In contrast to the Maxwellian case, for the YM field we cannot automatically set $\nabla \cdot \mathbf{B} = \mathbf{0}$ or $\nabla \times \mathbf{E} = -\partial \mathbf{B} / \partial t$ because the homogeneous YM equations differ from the homogeneous

Maxwell equations. We will, however, attempt to eliminate the first and second terms above. The homogeneous YM equations (Bianchi identities) are

$$(\partial_\mu F_{\nu\sigma}^a + e\varepsilon^{abc}A_\mu^b F_{\nu\sigma}^c) + \text{cyclical permutations of } \mu\nu\sigma = 0, \quad (2.10)$$

where we work in the so-called adjoint representation. As in the Maxwellian case, all indices must be distinct. For $(\mu, \nu, \sigma) = (0, j, k)$, and upon multiplication by ε_{ijk} one finds

$$\dot{B}_i^a - \varepsilon_{ijk}E_{j,k}^a + e\varepsilon^{abc}A_0^b B_i^c + e\varepsilon_{ijk}\varepsilon^{abc}A_j^b E_k^c = 0. \quad (2.11)$$

The first two terms are the Maxwellian ones. For $(\mu, \nu, \sigma) = (i, j, k)$, and upon multiplication by ε_{ijk} , one has

$$B_{j,j}^a + e\varepsilon^{abc}A_j^b B_j^c = 0, \quad (2.12)$$

and so $\nabla \cdot \mathbf{B} \neq 0$. Taking the time derivative of (2.11) and the gradient of (2.12) to eliminate the first two terms in (2.9) yields

$$\begin{aligned} & \ddot{B}_i^a - B_{i,jj}^a + \varepsilon_{ijk}(\dot{h}_{kp}E_p^a)_{,j} - \varepsilon_{ipr}\varepsilon_{jkl}(h_{rj,k}B_\ell^a)_{,p} \\ & - e\varepsilon_{ijk}\varepsilon^{abc}(A_0^b E_k^c)_{,j} + e\varepsilon^{abc}(A_0^b B_i^c)_{,0} + e\varepsilon_{ijk}\varepsilon^{abc}(A_j^b E_k^c)_{,0} \\ & + e\varepsilon^{abc}[(A_i^b B_j^c)_{,j} - (A_j^b B_i^c)_{,j}] - e\varepsilon^{abc}(A_j^b B_j^c)_{,i} = 0. \end{aligned} \quad (2.13)$$

The first four terms are identical to those obtained in the Maxwellian case, as they must be. However, this is a nonlinear equation with multiple solutions and it is not immediately obvious that it admits wave solutions. Nevertheless, in the case of the YM field alone (without the gravitational interaction terms), it has been known for some time that it does [11–14].

3 Oscillatory Solution

We search for the simplest possible simultaneous solution of the gravitational and YM wave equations. As in PR, in the following we assume that the gravitational wave is propagating in the z -direction, $h_{\mu\nu}(z, t)$, with the two independent polarizations being $h_{11} = -h_{22}$, and $h_{12} = h_{21}$.

Note that if all the potentials A^b are the same, the coupling terms in (2.13) evidently disappear due to the symmetry of the permutation operator. For the choice of potentials

$$\begin{aligned} A^1 &= (0, f(z, t), 0, 0) \\ A^2 &= (0, 0, A, 0) \\ A^3 &= (0, 0, 0, A), \end{aligned} \tag{3.1}$$

where $A = \text{constant}$, one finds the electric and magnetic fields from (2.2) to be

$$E_1^1 = -\dot{f} \quad ; \quad B_1^1 = +eA^2 \quad ; \quad B_2^1 = +f' \quad ; \quad B_2^2 = +eAf \quad ; \quad B_3^3 = +eAf. \tag{3.2}$$

These potentials were chosen in order to make $B_1^1 = eA^2 = \text{constant}$. This field component thus acts as the ‘‘external’’ magnetic field of the electromagnetic case, while E_1^1 and B_2^1 act as the electric and magnetic fields of the electromagnetic wave, respectively.

With this choice of potentials, (2.13) gives for $a = 1, i = 2$:

$$\ddot{B}_2^1 - (B_2^1)'' + (\dot{h}_{11}E_1^1)' + (h'_{11}B_2^1)' - (h'_{12}B_1^1)' + eA[(B_3^3)' + (B_2^2)'] = 0. \tag{3.3}$$

The gravitational wave equation (2.5) for the h_{12} polarization is

$$-\ddot{h}_{12} + h''_{12} = \frac{4}{m_p^2}(E_1^a E_2^a + B_1^a B_2^a) = 4e\frac{A^2}{m_p^2}B_2^1. \tag{3.4}$$

Assuming that B_1^1 is much larger than the electromagnetic wave components E_1^1 and B_2^1 , and writing $B_2^1 = f' \equiv b$ and $h_{12} \equiv h$, one arrives at the coupled equations:

$$\ddot{b} - b'' + 2e^2A^2b = eA^2h'', \tag{3.5}$$

and

$$\ddot{h} - h'' = -4\frac{eA^2}{m_p^2}b. \tag{3.6}$$

The above are the final equations in PR except for the $2e^2A^2b$ term in (3.5) and that the background magnetic field B_0 is replaced by eA^2 . Note that the constant background magnetic field B_1^1 breaks Lorentz invariance by picking out a preferred direction in space, and generates a mass term for the boson field B_2^1 equal to $2eB_1^1$ in a manner analogous to the usual Higgs mechanism.

Given that the equations are essentially those as in PR (plus a mass term), we assume that both b and h can be decomposed into products of a rapidly varying function and a slowly varying function of the form

$$h = \mathcal{A}e^{i(k_r z - \omega_r t)} e^{-i\omega_s(z+t)} \quad ; \quad b = \mathcal{B}e^{i(k_r z - \omega_r t)} e^{-i\omega_s(z+t)}, \quad (3.7)$$

with $\omega_r \gg \omega_s$. The rapidly varying components define the field (or particle) energy ω_r and momentum k_r , while the slowly varying components describe the oscillation between boson and gravitational states with frequency ω_s .

In our units the massless case of PR corresponds to $k_r = \omega_r$. For the present massive case, we introduce the dispersion relation

$$\omega_r^2 = k_r^2 + m^2, \quad (3.8)$$

where $m^2 \equiv 2e^2 A^2$ as above. Plugging the ansatz (3.7) into (3.5) and using the dispersion relation yields

$$2\omega_s(\omega_r + k_r)\mathcal{B} = eA^2(k_r - \omega_s)^2\mathcal{A}, \quad (3.9)$$

which gives a simple relationship between the amplitudes:

$$\mathcal{A} = \frac{2}{eA^2} \frac{\omega_s(\omega_r + k_r)}{(k_r - \omega_s)^2} \mathcal{B}. \quad (3.10)$$

Now, plugging (3.7) into (3.6) and using (3.10) gives the condition

$$\frac{1}{eA^2} \frac{\omega_s(\omega_r + k_r)}{(k_r - \omega_s)^2} (e^2 A^2 + \omega_s(\omega_r + k_r)) = \frac{eA^2}{m_p^2}. \quad (3.11)$$

Solving for ω_s with $k_r - \omega_s \approx k_r$ yields finally

$$\omega_s = \frac{e^2 A^2}{2(k_r + \omega_r)} \left(\sqrt{1 + \frac{4k_r^2}{e^2 m_p^2}} - 1 \right), \quad (3.12)$$

where, contrary to the massless case, the mixing frequency ω_s now depends on ω_r .

In the high-energy limit $k_r \gg em_p$, (3.12) becomes

$$\omega_s \equiv \frac{1}{L} = \frac{eA^2}{2m_p}, \quad (3.13)$$

which is the electromagnetic result, given that there $B_0 = eA^2$.

Note that, since in our case the same mechanism gives rise to the boson mass *and* the catalyzing magnetic field, one cannot consistently take the massless limit without also letting the magnetic field go to zero. That is, the limit $A \rightarrow 0$ corresponds to both $m \rightarrow 0$ and $B_0 \rightarrow 0$. The mixing length in that limit becomes infinite, since there is no coupling between the YM bosons and gravitons.

The result (3.13) is valid if both conditions $\omega_r \gg \omega_s$ and $\omega_r \gg em_p$ are satisfied. When $A \sim m_p$, the two conditions coincide, meaning that setting $A \sim m_p$ above is equivalent to taking the high-energy limit.

One can prove this more simply by the identical procedure employed in PR. Assume that both b and h can be decomposed into products of a rapidly varying function and a slowly varying function of the form $f = f_r(z-t)f_s(z+t)$. In these units $f'_r = -\dot{f}_r$, but $f'_s = +\dot{f}_s$, and by assumption $\dot{f}_r \gg \dot{f}_s$.

Then, substituting $b = b_r(z-t)b_s(z+t)$ and $h = h_r(z-t)h_s(z+t)$ into (3.5) and (3.6) yields

$$-4b'_r b'_s + 2e^2 A^2 b_r b_s = eA^2 (h''_r h_s + 2h'_r h'_s + h_r h''_s), \quad (3.14)$$

and

$$h'_r h'_s = e \frac{A^2}{m_p^2} b_r b_s. \quad (3.15)$$

Now substituting (3.15) for the mass term in (3.14) gives

$$-4b'_r b'_s + 2em_p^2 h'_r h'_s = eA^2 (h''_r h_s + 2h'_r h'_s + h_r h''_s). \quad (3.16)$$

In the case $A = m_p$, the mass term identically cancels the second term on the right and only the last term in (3.16) need be dropped as small compared to the others (in fact a better approximation than the one used in PR).

Thus the equations can now be solved by inspection as in PR. Pick

$$b_r = \frac{a}{\sqrt{e}} h'_r \quad ; \quad h'_s = a\sqrt{e} b_s \quad ; \quad b'_s = -\frac{e^{3/2}}{4a} m_p^2 h_s, \quad (3.17)$$

with a an arbitrary constant.

Letting $a = 1/2$, the solution for the slowly varying functions is

$$h_s = \mathcal{A} \sin\left(\frac{z+t+\phi}{L}\right) \quad ; \quad b_s = \mathcal{A} \sqrt{em_p^2} \cos\left(\frac{z+t+\phi}{L}\right), \quad (3.18)$$

where the mixing length is now

$$L = \frac{2}{em_p}, \quad (3.19)$$

which is the same as (3.13) for $A = m_p$.

4 Conclusions

We have shown that a simple choice of YM potentials can produce a mixing between the YM and gravitational fields. If the gravitational field is quantized, the mixing gives rise at the quantum level to oscillations between YM bosons and gravitons.

The particular configuration of potentials we adopt breaks rotational symmetry by selecting a preferred direction in space, which corresponds to that of the constant background “magnetic” field B_1^1 . This in turn gives rise through self-interaction terms to a mass for the mixing boson proportional to $2eB_1^1$, and provides the required coupling between boson and graviton states.

Of course, there are an infinite number of choices of potentials, most of which will certainly not admit oscillatory solutions. We have also made several simplifying assumptions about the size of the field components and it would be desirable to relax these to solve the full set of equations, if necessary numerically. Nevertheless, we have given a “proof of concept” that if Yang-Mills fields exist in nature, they have the potential to autocatalyse the production of gravitons. It is also conceivable that, depending on what particles are produced from the vacuum at high field strength, the difficulties arising from a change in index of refraction are evaded.

In another paper we intend to investigate whether such a scenario can lead to the generation of a cosmological constant.

References

- [1] A. Palessandro and T. Rothman, “A Simple Derivation of the Gertsenshtein Effect” [arXiv:2301.02072 [gr-qc]].
- [2] F. J. Dyson, “Photon-Graviton Oscillations” (unpublished).
- [3] Gertsenshtein, M. E. ”Wave resonance of light and gravitational waves” Sov Phys JETP **14** (1962): 84-85.
- [4] T. Rothman and S. Boughn, “Can gravitons be detected?” Found. Phys. **36** (2006), 1801-1825.
- [5] F. J. Dyson, “Do gravitons exist?” Talk given at Boston University, November 8, 2005.
- [6] A. Palessandro and M. S. Sloth, “Gravitational Absorption Lines” Phys. Rev. D **101** (2020) no.4, 043504.
- [7] Ya. B. Zel’dovich, “Electromagnetic and gravitational waves in a stationary magnetic field,” *Zh. Eksp. Theor. Fiz.* **68** 1311-1315 (1973).
- [8] M. E. Peskin and D. V. Schroeder, “An Introduction to quantum field theory” Addison-Wesley, 1995, ISBN 978-0-201-50397-5.
- [9] C. Itzykson and J. B. Zuber, “Quantum Field Theory” McGraw-Hill, 1980, ISBN 978-0-486-44568-7.
- [10] C. W. Misner, K. S. Thorne and J. A. Wheeler, “Gravitation” W. H. Freeman, 1973, ISBN 978-0-7167-0344-0, 978-0-691-17779-3.
- [11] S. R. Coleman, “Nonabelian Plane Waves” Phys. Lett. B **70** (1977), 59-60 doi:10.1016/0370-2693(77)90344-6.
- [12] F. Melia and S. y. Lo, “Linear Plane Wave Solutions of the Yang-Mills Theory” Phys. Lett. B **77** (1978), 71-72.
- [13] E. Kovacs and S. y. Lo, “Selfdual Propagating Wave Solutions in Yang-Mills Gauge Theory” Phys. Rev. D **19** (1979), 3649-3652.
- [14] M. Basler and A. Hadicke, “On non-Abelian SU(2) plane waves” Phys. Lett. B **144** (1984), 83-86.