Cosm ic m icrow ave background constraints on the strong equivalence principle

V.Boucher, 1 J.M.Gerard, 1 P.Vandergheynst, 2 and Y.W iaux 2 ,

¹ Institut de Physique Theorique, Universite catholique de Louvain, B-1348 Louvain-la-Neuve, Belgium

²Signal Processing Institute, Swiss Federal Institute of Technology, CH-1015 Lausanne, Switzerland

(D ated: July 2004)

W e study the e ect of a violation of the strong equivalence principle (SEP) on the cosm ic m icrow ave background (CMB). Such a violation would modify the weight of baryons in the prim ordial gravitational potentials and hence their im pact in the establishm ent of the photon-baryon plasm a acoustic oscillations before recom bination. This cosm ological N ordtvedt e ect alters the odd peaks height of the CMB tem perature anisotropy power spectrum. A gravitational baryonic m ass density of the universe m ay already be inferred at the rst peak scale from the analysis of W M A P data. Experimental constraints on a primordial SEP violation are derived from a comparison with the universe's inertial baryonic m ass density measured either in a full analysis of the CMB, or in the fram ework of the standard big bang nucleosynthesis (BBN).

PACS num bers: 98.80 Es, 04.80 Cc, 98.70 Vc, 98.80 Ft

I. IN TRODUCTION

The recent results of the cosm icm icrow ave background (CMB) experiments, together with other cosm ological tests, provide us today with a coherent picture of the structure and evolution of the universe. The corresponding canonical paradigm postulates a spatially at universe which has undergone a period of in ation in its early ages. The present large scale structure of the universe essentially originates from primordial quantum energy density uctuations around a hom ogeneous and isotropic background. These perturbations also left their in print on the cosm ic background radiation which decoupled from the rest of the universe som e 380:000 years after the big bang. A coording to this cosm ologicalm odel, the universe is led in with about seventy percent of dark energy, twenty-vepercent of cold dark matter, vepercent of ordinary (baryonic) matter and a relic background of radiations. The recent one-year W M A P results led to an already precise determ ination of the corresponding cosmological parameters [1, 2]. However, in this context full credit may not be given to this analysis before the theoretical hypotheses on which the canonical paradigm is based are tested, notably through a thorough analysis of the CMB. M any questions m ay in fact be raised. The in ationary scenario and the structure of the initial conditions for energy density perturbations have been extensively analyzed (see for example [3, 4] for general considerations). Lately, the wellestablished cosm ological principle, postulating global hom ogeneity and isotropy of the universe, has also been challenged [4, 5, 6]. But, perhapsmost fundam entally, one should question the theory of gravitation on which cosm ology is developed, namely general relativity.

A ny explicit theory of gravitation beyond general relativity introduces di erent e ects which modify the char-

acteristics of the CMB temperature anisotropy power spectrum. In particular the location and height of acoustic peaks should be altered proportionally to the strength of auxiliary gravitational couplings. This analysis has already been performed for pure Brans-Dicke theories [7] as well as generalized versions [8, 9, 10], leading to constraints on a possible scalar coupling. However these bounds do not take into account possible e ects induced by the violation of the strong equivalence principle (SEP). This principle, essential feature of the theory of general relativity, notably postulates the constancy of the new tonian gravitational coupling G in space and time. It distinguishes E instein's theory from otherm etric theories of gravitation. Any SEP test therefore challenges general relativity in its most fundamental structure. The purpose of this article is to study the in uence of a possible SEP violation on the CMB tem perature power spectrum. In order to single out the generic e ect of such a SEP violation on the CMB, our approach naively conserves Einstein's equations for the gravitational eld. Hence, under the hypothesis of the cosm ological principle, the Friedmann-Lema^tre background and perturbed cosmological evolution remains unchanged. In this way, we avoid the introduction of multiple e ects which could unnecessarily com plicate the conceptual analysis. The SEP violation is simply introduced through the break down of energy-m om entum conservation for com pact bodies. The breaking term in the corresponding covariant equations depends on the gradient of the gravitational coupling G with respect to spacetime coordinates.

In section II we introduce the SEP and its violation. Section III is devoted to the analysis of the e ect of a SEP violation on the CM B tem perature power spectrum. The SEP violation a ects the weight of baryons in the prim ordial gravitational potentials and hence their in pact in the establishment of acoustic oscillations of the plasm a before the last scattering of photons. The odd peaks height enhancement of the CM B tem perature power spectrum depends indeed on a gravitational baryonic m ass density of the universe, not on its inertial baryonic m ass density.

E lectronic address: yves.w iaux@ep .ch

W e also discuss the characteristic amplitude of this e ect and the uniqueness of its signature relatively to the variation of the canonical cosm obgical param eters. In section IV we derive experim ental constraints on the SEP violation. A gravitational baryonic m ass density of the universe is inferred at the rst peak scale from W M AP data. The constraints on the SEP violation are obtained from the m easurement of the inertial baryonic m ass density, either in a full analysis of the CM B tem perature power spectrum, or through the independent determ ination of light element abundances in the fram ework of standard BBN. W e discuss the proposed constraints, and nally conclude.

This article pursues the work done in [11], on the ground of both theory and data analysis.

II. SEP V IO LATION

The equivalence principle is an important fundament of any theory of gravitation. It is how ever im plem ented at dierent levels in dierent theories. The Einstein equivalence principle postulates the universality of free fall of test-bodies at one given point of a gravitational eld (called weak equivalence principle), as well as the independence of the result of any non-gravitational experiment in a freely falling frame relative to the velocity of free fall and relative to where and when in the universe it is performed. A metric theory of gravitation postulates the geodesic motion of test-bodies, as well as the agreem ent of the results of any non-gravitational experiment performed in free fall with the laws of special relativity. By de nition, all metric theories of gravitation therefore respect the Einstein equivalence principle. Technically, a theory of gravitation respects this principle if the Lagrange density for matter only depends on the matter elds and the spacetime metric, but not on possible auxiliary gravitational elds which directly couple to the metric. This structure implies indeed the general covariant conservation equations T $_{\rm p}$ = 0 for the energy-momentum tensor T , from which readily follows geodesic motion. On the other hand, nongravitational interactions are coupled to the metric eld through the connexion, and therefore reduce to their special-relativistic structure in free fall. Both postulates of the Einstein equivalence principle are therefore ensured.

The strong equivalence principle extends the universality of free fall to compact bodies. By compact body, one means a body with a non-negligible amount of internal gravitational binding energy. It also extends to gravitational experiments the independence of the result of any experiment in free fall relative to the velocity of free fall and relative to where and when in the universe it is performed. The mere existence of an auxiliary eld of gravitation coupled to the metric eld violates this principle. The reason for this holds in the fact that it is not possible to cancel the e ect of auxiliary (typically scalar or vector) elds by a local coordinate transform ation, like it is for the tensor metric eld. A uxiliary couplings will inevitably modify the result of gravitational experiments (and notably the structure of compact bodies) performed in a freely falling frame, therefore violating the SEP. The gravitational coupling G itself will depend on the spacetime point through a dependence in the auxiliary elds, which implies by denition to a SEP violation. A side from the Nordstrom scalar theory, only general relativity incorporates the equivalence principle at the level of the SEP [12, 13]. Testing the SEP violation is therefore a way of discriminating general relativity from other metric theories of gravitation such as extended B rans-D icke or vector-tensor theories of gravitation.

If the new tonian gravitational coupling is a function of the position x in spacetime, G ! G (x), the mass m of a compact body also depends on the position through its internal gravitational binding energy. An elective action for the geodesic motion of gom pact bodies may therefore be de ned as: $S_{m at} = c m (x) ds$. Energy-momentum conservation is therefore broken through the introduction of a source term in the general covariant conservation as our mathem atical in plementation of a possible SEP violation:

$$T_{p} = G' \frac{\partial T}{\partial G} ; \qquad (1)$$

where T is the trace of the energy-momentum tensor. The dependence of the new tonian gravitational coupling on the spatial position x is parametrized through the relation G $(\mathbf{x}) = G_0 (1 + {}_{q}V (\mathbf{x})=c^2)$, where V (\mathbf{x}) stands for the gravitational potential at the point considered, G₀ is the background value of the new tonian gravitational coupling in the absence of this potential, and $_{\alpha}$ is the parameter which de nes the amplitude of the SEP violation. One may also de ne the compactness s of a body as the sensitivity of its mass relative to G. It is equivalently given by the ratio of its internal gravitational binding energy E_q to its total mass energy: $s = d \ln m = d \ln G = \frac{1}{2} g = m c^2$. The acceleration a of a body in a gravitational eld now explicitly depends on its proper sensitivity s. This establishes the SEP violation through the so-called Nordtvedt e ect [14, 15]. From the de nition (1) indeed, we get in the non-relativistic (called quasi-new tonian) approximation: a = g(1) $_{q}s)$, where $\tilde{r} V (x)$. In other words, the SEP violation induces a = a reduction (for $_{q} > 0$) or increase (for $_{q} < 0$) of the gravitational mass m q of a body relative to its inertial massm, proportionally to its own compactness:

$$m_{g} = m (1_{g}s) :$$
 (2)

From the experim entalpoint of view, tests of the weak equivalence principle date back to New ton and its pendulum experiments. First tests of the SEP have been introduced several decades ago with the Lunar Laser R anging experiment (see [16] for an extended review and references). This test still gives the best constraint on the parameter $_{q}$ today¹:

 g^{0} 1 10³; (3)

with involved compactnesses of order 10¹⁰ [16, 17]. A better constraint may be inferred in the fram ework of peculiar scalar-tensor theories of gravitation though. Indeed, the SEP violation actually introduces a new charge of gravitation beyond the mass, in terms of the compactness s. This new charge not only modi es the motion of compact bodies (Nordtvedt e ect) but a ects the dynam ical structure of the corresponding theory, inducing potentially dom inant dipole gravitational radiations associated with auxiliary elds of gravitation (scalar or vector). The analysis of the orbital period decrease rate of asymmetric binary pulsars is an extremely good probe of dipole radiations. The recent and unique m easurement of the orbital decrease in such a binary, the neutron star - white dwarf PSR J1141 6545 [18, 19] gives a tight constraint on a scalar gravitational coupling. In pure Brans-Dicke theories (BD), the corresponding bound on the SEP violation inferred from [12, 18] reads: 0(BD) 10^{4} (see also [20]). 2:7

III. SEP AND CM B

Qualitative analysis

In the primordial universe the photon gas is rather tightly coupled to electrons through Compton scattering. The electrons are them selves linked to protons through the C oulom b interaction. W e m ay then consider a photon-baryon plasm a in evolution in gravitational potentials. These gravitational potentials are essentially produced by the dom inant cold dark matter component of the universe. About 380:000 years after the big bang, the tem perature of the expanding universe had decreased too much to longer maintain hydrogen dissociation. The cosm ic m icrowave background radiation observed today corresponds to a snapshot of this photon gas which decoupled from the rest of the universe at the time of last scattering. The anisotropy distribution on the sky today is determ ined by the multiple physical phenom ena which governed the evolution of the plasm a before recombination, and therefore contains all the inform ation on the structure and evolution of the universe (de ned in terms of cosm ological parameters). The plasm a underwent oscillations, responsible for relative tem perature uctuations in the associated black-body spectrum . In the corresponding angular power spectrum, this oscillation process translates into a series of acoustic peaks at scales smaller than the horizon size at last scattering. O dd peaks correspond to scales which had reached m axim um compression (rarefaction) at the time of last scattering in potential wells (hills). Even peaks correspond to m axim um rarefaction (compression) in potential wells (hills). The general shape of this spectrum therefore exhibits a Sachs-W olfe plateau at scales beyond the horizon size at last scattering, follow ed by the acoustic peak series under the horizon size. Notice that, up to now, the standard CMB analysis has been based on the study of the precise characteristics of the tem perature anisotropy angular power spectrum. The cosm ological param eters are determ ined through a best t of the theoretical cosm ologicalm odels with experim ental data (see notably [1, 2] for the W M AP analysis).

The oscillations of the plasm a are electrom agnetic acoustic oscillations of the photon gas. However, the action of gravity is introduced through a purely new tonian coupling of the baryonic content of the plasm a to the dark m atter potentials. The e ect of this coupling is to shift the zero point (equilibrium) of the oscillations tow and m ore compressed states in potential wells, and rare ed states in potential hills. Consequently, the height of odd peaks relative to even peaks is enhanced proportionally to the total baryon weight in the dark m atter potentials [21, 22, 23, 24, 25].

If the SEP is violated through a spatial dependence of the new tonian gravitational coupling (N ordtvedt e ect), gravitationalm assess di er from inertialm asses. The tem – perature power spectrum peaks height therefore bears the imprint of a possible SEP violation as it essentially originates from a gravitational interaction and therefore depends on a gravitational baryonic m ass density:

$$(_{b})_{g} = _{b} (1 _{g}S_{b}) ;$$
 (4)

rather than on the inertial baryonicm ass density $_{\rm b}$. The compactness $s_{\rm b}$ must be associated with a baryon-region seen as a compact body at the relevant cosm ological scale.

Plasm a evolution equations and SEP violation

The purpose of this subsection is to derive more technically the main result of the last subsection. The evolution equations for the photon-baryon plasma in the tight coupling limit are derived from the generalized covariant energy-momentum tensor equations (1).

The tight coupling limit amounts to consider an in nite C ompton interaction rate which implies the equality of the mean photon and baryon velocities: $\mathbf{v} = \mathbf{v}_{b}$. In this standard approximation, the photon-baryon gas may be entirely described as a uid with the energymomentum tensor $T = (+P=c^2)u u Pg$. The equation of state relating pressure and density reads: $P = c^2$, with = 0 for matter and = 1=3 for radiation. Restricting ourselves to a at universe, in the new tonian gauge, with conform altime and com obile coordinates \mathbf{x} , we may write the perturbed spacetime m etric as $g_{00}(\mathbf{x};) = a^2()(1+2(\mathbf{x};)=c^2), g_{01}(\mathbf{x};) = 0$,

 $^{^1}$ Q uantities m easured at the present epoch are indexed by the superscript $^{\rm 0}$.

and $g_{ij}(\mathbf{x};) = {}_{ij}a^2()(1+2(\mathbf{x};)=c^2)$. The factor a() stands for the scale factor of the expanding universe norm alized to its present size ($a^0 = 1$). The scalar perturbations ($\mathbf{x};$) and ($\mathbf{x};$) m ay been seen as new tonian potentials.

From the equations (1) we readily obtain the continuity and Euler equations for the uid under consideration. In the Fourier space, to rst order in the relative density perturbations $(\tilde{\kappa};)$, com obile velocity $v(\tilde{\kappa};)$, and gravitational potentials $(\tilde{\kappa};)$ and $(\tilde{\kappa};)$, these equations read respectively:

$$- = (1 +) \quad i\mathbb{R} \quad \mathbf{v} + \frac{3}{c^2} \quad 1 \quad 3\frac{c_s^2}{c^2} \quad s\frac{G}{G} \quad (5)$$
$$\mathbf{v} = \frac{a}{a} \quad 1 \quad 3\frac{c_s^2}{c^2} \quad \mathbf{v} \quad i\mathbb{K} \quad c_s^2 \frac{1}{1 + c_s^2} + 1 \quad 1 \quad 3\frac{c_s^2}{c^2} \quad \frac{gs}{1 + c_s^2} \quad (6)$$

I

D otted variables here stand for their derivative with respect to the conform altime. The sound speed in the uid c_s and the compactness s characterizing a given uid volume are background space-independent quantities. The s-terms represent the explicit modi cation due to SEP violation of the canonical [23, 24, 25] evolution equations for a single component uid.

In order to nd the evolution equations for the photons, we just apply this set of equations to a photon uid with $\mathbf{v} = \mathbf{v} \ \hat{\mathbf{k}}$, taking into account the presence of baryons in the sound speed and the compactness. The sound speed reads $c_{\rm s}^2 = d\mathbf{P} = d(\mathbf{t} + \mathbf{b}) = c^2 = 3(\mathbf{l} + \mathbf{R})$, where \mathbf{b} and are respectively the background inertial baryonic m ass density and photon density of the universe, and $\mathbf{R} = 3 \ \mathbf{b} = 4$ is the canonical norm alization of the baryonic m ass density by the photon density. The photon gravitational binding energy is negligible and the

uid com pactness reduces to the baryonic component s_b , which is studied in the next subsection. The uid density and velocity m ay be expressed in terms of the monopole and dipole moments $_0(\mathcal{K};)$ and $_1(\mathcal{K};)$ of the photon relative temperature distribution: $(\mathcal{K};) = 4_0(\mathcal{K};)$ and $v(\mathcal{K};) = 3i_1(\mathcal{K};)$. In this context, the plasm a evolution equations for X $(\mathcal{K};) = _0(\mathcal{K};) + (\mathcal{K};)=c^2$ and $_1(\mathcal{K};)$ read:

$$X + \frac{R}{1+R}X + k^{2}c_{s}^{2}X = k^{2}c_{s}^{2} \frac{1}{c^{2}}$$

$$\frac{1}{c^{2}}(1+R(1-gs_{b})) \quad (7)$$

$$k_{1} = -0 \frac{-}{c^{2}}$$
 : (8)

W e do not consider here the term with tem poral dependence of the new tonian coupling, though it would be worth analyzing its e ect. Only the spatial dependence of G is considered by analogy with the N ordtvedt e ect. The rst equation sets the dynam ics for dam ped oscillations for $_0$ with a forcing term (right-hand side). We clearly identify that the e ect of baryons in this forcing term depends indeed on the gravitational baryonic mass density

$$R_{g}(s_{b}; g) = R(1 gs_{b});$$
 (9)

function of the compactness $s_{\rm b},$ rather than on the inertial baryonic m ass density.

Notice that in the lim it of constant new tonian potentials² = , = , with R = R , equation (7) reduces, for the e ective tem perature perturbation Y = $_{0}$ + = c^{2} , to Y + $k^{2}c_{s}^{2}Y$ = $k^{2}c_{s}^{2}R_{q}$ (s_b; _q) = c^{2} . The forcing term clearly reduces to the (quasi-)new tonian interaction between the baryons and the surrounding constant potentials. In the further approximations $s_b = s_b$ and g = q discussed in the following, the interaction term is constant. We therefore recover the exact lim it in which a constant zero-point shift of the acoustic oscillations originates the odd peaks height enhancem ent of the tem perature power spectrum. But the acceleration of baryons is now a function of the compactness of the baryon-region considered. Equation (9) is therefore the m athem atical expression of the cosm ological N ordtvedt e ect discussed in the form er qualitative analysis.

C om pactness of baryon-regions

Under the hypothesis of the cosm ological principle, we live in a globally homogeneous and isotropic universe. As suggested in our qualitative analysis, let us consider a hom ogeneous spherical baryon-region of radius L and total m ass M b. Its com pactness calculated, in the spirit of the quasi-new tonian approach introduced in section II, as the ratio of the internal gravitational binding energy over the total mass energy reads: $s_b =$ $3GM_b=5Lc^2 = 4 G_bL^2=5c^2$. The mean baryon density scales as $_{b}(a) = _{b}^{0}a^{3}$. At each instant in the course of the universe expansion, the maximum size of the radius L is set by the event horizon: L_1 () = ca . This hypothesis is natural as the event horizon de nes at each mom ent the maxim aldistance through which particles may have interacted gravitationally since the prim ordial ages of the universe (after in ation), and therefore the maxim alsize of a body. In m atter and radiation universes, the Friedmann-Lema^tre equations (in the considered limit where Einstein equations are preserved) determine the evolution of the scale factor with time as $= 0 = a^{1-2}$ and $= {}^{0} = a$, respectively.

The compactness of a baryon-region therefore grows linearly with the scale factor in a radiation era, while it is constant in a matter era. Recombination takes place

 $^{^2}$ Q uantities m easured at recombination are indexed by the superscript $% 10^{-2}$.

after the matter-radiation equilibrium, inside the matter era. For the sake of the analogy with the N ordtvedt e ect on compact bodies in a gravitational eld, we consider in the following a constant compactness over the course of the universe evolution until recombination. It is evaluated at its value in the matter era, say at last scattering ($s_b = s_b$). The low baryon density turns out to be largely compensated by the considered cosm ological scales to give a non-negligible contribution to the compactness. In terms of physical quantities (the Hubble constant, the age of the universe and the relative baryon density), we get a compactness

$$s_{b}^{1} = \frac{27}{10} H^{0} t^{0}^{2} {}_{b}' 0:1 ;$$
 (10)

for the maximal radius L_1 . This compactness is the sensitivity to be considered at the scale of the wavelength $_1$ associated with the rst acoustic peak. The sensitivity of the baryonic body relevant for the subsequent acoustic peaks ($_n$) scales like n $^2\,$ since the compactness s_b of the baryon-region considered is proportional to the square of its radius L:

$$s_{\rm b}^{\rm n}$$
 ' 0:1n² : (11)

Let us now brie y comment on the implications of these results.

Amplitude of the SEP violation e ect

The value s_b^1 ' 0:1 in (10) in plies that a SEP violation parameter of order unity at the time of recombination, $_g$ ' 1, would a ect the rst peak height by 10% (see equation (9)). In present CM B analyses, the cosm ological parameter $_bh^2$ identifying the baryon content of the universe is essentially extracted from the measurement of the relative height between the rst and second peaks of the temperature angular power spectrum. In this regard, it measures the gravitational, rather than inertial, baryonic mass density of the universe. The recent one-year W MAP analysis gives this parameter with a precision of 4%. Consequently, the present CM B data will already allow us to derive interesting constraints on a possible SEP violation.

Uniqueness of the SEP violation signature

The peculiar n² scaling of the baryon-regions compactness s_b^n in (11) ensures the orthogonality of the SEP violation signature relative to the e ect other cosm ological parameters on the CMB temperature angular power spectrum. The signature of the SEP violation may indeed be disentangled from the e ect of other parameters through the corresponding n² scaling of the odd peaks height. The measurement of the SEP violation parameter $_g$ at recombination is therefore in principle possible, simultaneously to the determination of the canonical

[21, 26] cosm ological parameters. The Planck satellite is designed to achieve a better sensitivity in the tem – perature anisotropies measurement, as well as a better resolution on the sky, than the present W MAP mission. This mission will notably give access to the whole series of acoustic peaks in the tem perature anisotropies angular power spectrum [3], therefore allowing an unambiguous analysis of a possible SEP violation.

IV. EXPERIMENTAL CONSTRAINTS

In this section, we establish experimental constraints on the SEP violation parameter $_g$ at recombination, and discuss their signing cance in comparison with existing bounds at our epoch and theoretical predictions at the exit of the radiation era.

A precise analysis of a possible SEP violation must be perform ed through a best t of our m odi ed theory (1) and experim ental data, taking into account the substitution (9) in the plasm a evolution equations before recom bination. Here, we determ ine bounds on a possible SEP violation by the analysis of the one-year W MAP experin ental error bars on the observables of interest. This simple approach nds its justication in the fact that our m odi ed theory assum es the cosm ologicalN ordtvedt e ect to be the only perturbation to the cosm ic background anisotropy spectrum relatively to the canonical paradigm based on general relativity. In a rst approach, one can determ ine the gravitational and inertial baryonic mass densities of the universe at recombination from their specic (orthogonal) signatures on the CMB power spectrum characteristics. A second generic approach consists in determining the gravitational baryonic mass density through the analysis of the CMB, using as a prior the m easurement of the inertial baryonic mass density by independent observations. In that respect, we will consider here the determ ination of the inertial baryon icm ass density through the m easurem ent of light elem ent abundances in the fram ework of standard BBN.

CMB-CMB constraint

The baryon content of the universe a ects the CM B tem perature power spectrum in di erent ways. The major e ect is a dependence of the odd peaks height due to the weight of baryons in the surrounding gravitational potentials. We already know that this e ect is actually a function of a gravitational baryonic m ass density R_g . It bears the in print of a possible SEP violation in temms of the already discussed n² scaling. This unique signature adds to the canonical odd peaks height enhancement related to the inertial baryonic m ass density R (equation (9)). But any increase of the baryon density also naturally induces a decrease of the sound speed for the propagation of the acoustic oscillations in the prim ordial plasm a, therefore a ecting the peaks location, rather

than their height. Increasing the baryon density also decreases the di usion length, de ned as the scale below which inhom ogeneities are dam ped because of the nite C om pton interaction rate. These last two e ects are related to electrom agnetic (rather than gravitational) phenom ena and are consequently independent of the SEP violation. They only depend on the inertial baryonic m ass density R .

A salready mentioned, the forthcom ing Planck mission will probe all these signatures. At present how ever, the tem perature power spectrum characteristics are known with precision only up to the second peak through the one-year W M A P data. It is therefore rather di cult to disentangle a SEP violation from variations of other cosmological parameters, notably from R . However, assum ing that all param eters, other than R $_{\alpha}$ and R $\,$, are xed to their accepted value, we may infer a constraint on . On the one hand, we consider the one-year W MAP value of the cosm ological parameter ${}_{\rm b}{\rm h}^2$ as a measure of the relative height between the rst and second peaks [1], hence originating from the gravitational baryonic mass density R_q (s¹_b; ,), at last scattering, and at a scale corresponding to the maximum oscillation wavelength. On the other hand how ever, the specic analysis of the rst peak position gives the inertial baryonic mass density R , through the dependence of the peaks location in the sound speed in the prim ordial plasm a. A simple analysis

of the one-year W MAPext (i.e. W MAP extended to the CBI and ACBAR experiments [1, 2]) error bars on these two observables gives the bound: $j_g s_b^1 j = 0.06$. From the estimated value (10) for s_b^1 , we readily obtain the following constraint on the SEP violation in terms of $_g$:

CMB-BBN constraint

The standard BBN model may also infer the inertial baryonic content of the universe from the determ ination of light element (D, ³H e, ⁴H e, ⁷L i) abundances. These abundances are studied in low -m etallicity systems in such a way that they still signi cantly reject primordial quantities. In this context, the baryon content of the universe is usually quoted in terms of $_{\rm b}h^2$, rather than R . Notice that BBN is also a ected in the fram ework of a speci calternative theory of gravitation [8, 27, 28]. How ever it is independent of the SEP violation considered here.

The prim ordial ⁴H e abundance is determ ined to better accuracy than in the case of other light elements [29, 30, 31]. However, it is rather insensitive to the baryon content. The measurement of ⁴H e abundance therefore has to be extremely precise if one wants to obtain a small uncertainty on $_{\rm b}h^2$ or R . The most recent estimate, obtained in the analysis of dwarf irregular and compact blue galaxies gives, for the ⁴H e mass fraction: Y_p = 0.2421 0.0021 [29]. In the framework of the standard BBN theory, the corresponding baryon

content is $_{b}h^{2} = 12^{+3}_{2}$ 10³ or R = $0.334^{+0.084}_{0.056}$. The baryon density inferred from the primordial lithium -tohydrogen abundance ratio ⁷L i=H lies around the same values [32, 33, 34]. The one-year W M A Pext value, still understood as a measurem ent of the relative height of the rst two peaks of the CMB tem perature power spectrum, gives a signi cantly higher value for R_{a} : $bh^{2} =$ (22 1) 10³ [2], or $R_{a} = 0.613$ 0.028. The confrontation of these numbers would, in our approach based on (9), suggest a rather high negative value for the param eter $_{\alpha}$. In other words, assuming that the ⁴H e and ⁷Li analyses really re ect the baryon content of the universe, the gravitational interaction heavily violates the SEP, at least at the epoch of last scattering, if the whole discrepancy is accounted for by this e ect. This would be the rst experim ental evidence that general relativity is not the correct theory of gravitation. However, large system atic uncertainties a ect the ⁴H e and ⁷Li abundance estimation. These may be related to observation or due to the lack of understanding of the complex physics in the evolution of these abundances [29, 34, 35]. Errors and incompletenesses in the standard BBN schemem ay also lead to deviations [36, 37, 38]. M any e orts are m ade to reduce these system atic errors.

The deuterium abundance is extremely sensitive to the prim ordial baryon content. M oreover it m ay have been produced in signi cant quantities only during the BBN. Its measurement in quasar absorption line systems is therefore an extrem ely good probe of the baryon content of our universe [39, 40, 41, 42]. The most recent estim ate of the prim ordial deuterium -to-hydrogen abundance ratio D = H based on a recent analysis toward ve quasars gives $D = H = 2:78^{+0:44}_{0:38}$ 10^{5} [39]. This value corresponds to a weighted average of the results obtained for each quasar independently. The corresponding value for the baryon content, in the fram ework of the standard BBN theory, reads $_{b}h^{2}$ = (21:4 2) 10³, or $R^{(BBND)} = 0.596$ 0.056. Combined with the oneyear W M A Pext value given here above, this measure gives the following constraint on a possible SEP viola-0:08. This bound, once translated tion: 0:14 _q Sb⊥ into a constraint on the parameter $_{q}$, leads to:

$$g^{(BBND)} = 0:3 1:$$
 (13)

The determ ination of the primordial ³H e abundance is more di cult as its destruction and production in stars are not well understood. However a recent upper limit on ³H e=H leads to a prediction for the baryon content of the universe in complete agreement with deuterium measurements [43]. Remains to be noticed that the dispersion of the values obtained for the deuterium abundance from di erent quasar absorption lines is bigger than expected from individual measurement errors. This dispersion could be real but the hypothesis of underestimated systematic errors in the measurements is favored [39, 40, 44]. More data would be needed to con m the measurements and limit systematics. However, in the fram ework of light element abundance measurements, deuterium analysis remains the most reliable evaluation of the universe's baryon content thanks to its high sensitivity to the baryon content and the relative absence of deuterium production after BBN. In this context, the discrepancy between the baryon content inferred from D and from ⁴H e or ⁷Li analyses should be resolved by a better assessment of the system atics a ecting the measurements of the last two elements abundances.

New physical scenarios beyond the standard BBN are also considered for solving this apparent tension. Leaving aside the present discrepancies am ong the BBN m easurements, several proposals have recently been m ade for reconciling BBN and CMB measurements. The new physical e ects invoked notably consider the modi cation of the number of relativistic particle species, variations of the strength of gravity in the early universe, or its dependence on the nature of interacting particles [45, 46, 47, 48, 49, 50]. Our last constraint on $_{\rm g}$ m ay be understood as an alternative solution in this direction.

D iscussion

F irst we emphasize that accurate constraints on a primordial SEP violation should be determined by a best t of our m odi ed theory with experim ental data. H ow ever, the num erical com patibility of the two independent bounds obtained, (12) and (13), supports our results. A lso notice that in the fram ework of a speci c alternative to general relativity the SEP violation is not the only new e ect. The introduction of auxiliary gravitational elds a ects the structure of gravitation itself and notably leaves signatures in the CMB as well as in the BBN. This will inevitably modify our bounds. In such a fram ework, the corresponding bounds on $_{\rm q}$ could also be run backward or forward over cosm ological tim escales for com parison, either with theoretical predictions on initial conditions $\begin{pmatrix} i \\ a \end{pmatrix}$, or with present experimental constraints (⁰_a).

On the one hand, string theories naturally lead to an e ective scalar-tensor gravity with a running of the param eter $_{\rm g}$ from an initial value $_{\rm g}^{\rm i}$ of order unity. This initial am plitude of violation is essentially preserved during the radiation era since the param eter $_{\rm g}$ depends on the auxiliary scalar eld(s) of gravitation, which is(are) frozen during that period. A large SEP violation at recombination should therefore be expected in that context. The order of m agnitude of our bounds on $_{\rm g}$ are still com patible with such a sm ooth running of that value until recombination time. Im proved m easurem ents could how ever rapidly reveal new physics beyond general relativity. O n the other hand, the experim ental constraints at our epoch ($\frac{0}{g}$ 1 10³) require a strong decrease of g between recombination and today. An attractorm echanism has been advocated for a particular class of scalar-tensor theories, according to which the scalar coupling of gravitation, and consequently the parameter g, vanish at late times, to recover general relativity [51]. In this scenario our bounds on the SEP are naturally compatible with the present experimental limits.

V. CONCLUSION

The SEP is an essential feature of the theory of general relativity, distinguishing it from any other (experin entally viable) metric theory of gravitation. A violation of the SEP introduces a cosm ological Nordtvedt e ect in the establishm ent of the acoustic oscillations im printed in the CMB tem perature power spectrum. The corresponding peaks height therefore m easures a gravitational baryonic mass density of the universe. The modi ed theory considered here introduces this e ect as the only signature beyond general relativity, orthogonal to the variation of other cosm ological parameters. In this fram ework we derived constraints on a possible SEP violation, testing in this way E instein's theory of gravitation, through two independent m easurem ents of the inertial baryonic mass density of the universe. The CMB tem perature power spectrum peaks location and the light element abundances in standard BBN respectively lead to $j_q^{(CMB)}j_{(CMB)} =$ 0:3 1.

M ore accurate bounds should be determ ined through a best t of our m odi ed theory with the experimental data. We also emphasized that, in speci c alternatives to general relativity, the cosm ological N ordtvedt e ect is not the only new e ect and the corresponding bounds will in principle be a ected. Finally, our approach also o ers a possibility of understanding apparent discrepancies between CMB and BBN baryon density measurements in term s of new physics.

A cknow ledgm ents

The authors w ish to thank A.K osow sky, P.J.E.Peebles and N. Sugiyam a for interesting comments and discussions. The work of V.B. and J.M.G. was supported by the Belgian Science Policy through the Interuniversity A ttraction Pole P5/27.Y.W. also acknow ledges support of the european H arm onic A nalysis and Statistics for Signal and Im age Processing research network.

- [1] L.Page et al., A strophys.J.Suppl.Ser.148,233 (2003).
- [2] D.N.Spergeletal, Astrophys.J.Suppl.148,175 (2003).
- [3] F.R.Bouchet, Preprint astro-ph/0401108 (2004).
- [4] P. Coles, P. Dinnen, J. Earl, and D. W right, Preprint

astro-ph/0310252 (2003).

- [5] F.K.Hansen, A.J.Banday, and K.M.Gorski, Preprint astro-ph/0404206 (2004).
- [6] A. Hajian and T. Souradeep, A strophys. J. Lett. 597, L5 (2003).
- [7] X. Chen and M. Kam ionkowski, Phys. Rev D 60, 104036 (1999).
- [8] R.Catena, N.Formengo, A.Masiero, M.Pietroni, and F. Rosati, Preprint astro-ph/0403614 (2004).
- [9] R. Nagata, T. Chiba, and N. Sugiyam a, Phys. Rev. D 69, 083512 (2004).
- [10] R. Nagata, T. Chiba, and N. Sugiyam a, Phys. Rev. D 66, 103510 (2002).
- [11] V. Boucher, J.-M. Gerard, P. Vandergheynst, and Y. Wiaux, Preprint astro-ph/0407508 (2004).
- [12] J.-M. Gerard and Y. W iaux, Phys. Rev. D 66, 024040 (2002).
- [13] T. Damour and G. Esposito-Farese, Class. Quantum Grav. 9, 2093 (1992).
- [14] K.Nordtvedt, Phys.Rev.169, 1014 (1968).
- [15] K.Nordtvedt, Phys.Rev.169, 1017 (1968).
- [16] C.M.W ill, Living Rev.Rel.4, 4 (2001).
- [17] J.G.W illiam s, S.G. Turyshev, and T.W. Murphy Jr., Int. J.M od. Phys. D 13, 567 (2004).
- [18] M. Bailes, S. M. Ord, H. S. Knight, and A. W. Hotan, A strophys. J. Lett. 595, L49 (2003).
- [19] V.M.Kaspietal, Astrophys. J. 543, 321 (2000).
- [20] G. Esposito-Farese, Preprint gr-qc/0402007 (2004).
- [21] W. Hu, M. Fukugita, M. Zaldarriaga, and M. Tegmark, A strophys. J. 549, 669 (2001).
- [22] W .Hu and M .W hite, A strophys. J 471, 30 (1996).
- [23] W .Hu and N.Sugiyam a, Phys.Rev.D 51, 2599 (1995).
- [24] W .Hu and N. Sugiyam a, A strophys. J. 444, 489 (1995).
- [25] W. Hu, PhD. Thesis, UC Berkeley, Preprint astroph/9508126 (1995).
- [26] A. Kosowsky, M. M ilosavljevic, and R. Jim enez, Phys. Rev.D 66,063007 (2002).
- [27] S. M. Carroll and M. Kaplinghat, Phys. Rev. D 65, 063507 (2002).
- [28] T. Dam our and B. Pichon, Phys. Rev. D 59, 123502 (1999).

- [29] Y. I. Izotov and T. X. Thuan, A strophys. J. 602, 200 (2004).
- [30] V. Luridiana, A. Peimbert, M. Peimbert, and M. Cervino, Astrophys. J. 592, 846 (2003).
- [31] B.D. Fields and K.A.O live, A strophys. J. 506, 177 (1998).
- [32] A.Ford et al, Astron. Astrophys. 393, 617 (2002).
- [33] P.Bonifacio et al., A stron. A strophys. 390, 91 (2002).
- [34] S.G.Ryan, T.C.Beers, K.A.Olive, B.D.Fields, and J.E.Norris, Astrophys.J.Lett. 530, L57 (2000).
- [35] R.H.Cyburt, B.D.Fields, and K.A.Olive, Phys.Lett. B 567, 227 (2003).
- [36] R.H.Cyburt, Preprint astro-ph/0401091 (2004).
- [37] A. Coc, E. Vangiono-Flam, P. Descouvem ont, A. Adahchour, and C. Angulo, A strophys. J. 600, 544 (2004).
- [38] A. Cuoco et al., Preprint astro-ph/0307213 (2004).
- [39] D. K irkm an, D. Tytler, N. Suzuki, J. M. O'M eara, and D. Lubin, A strophys. J. Suppl. Ser. 149, 1 (2003).
- [40] J.M. O'M eara et al., A strophys. J. 552, 718 (2001).
- [41] S. D'O dorico, M. Dessauges-Zavadsky, and P. Molaro, A stron. A strophys. 368, L21 (2001).
- [42] M. Pettini and D. V. Bowen, Astrophys. J. 560, 41 (2001).
- [43] T.M. Bania, R.T.Rood, and D.S.Balser, Nature 415, 54 (2002).
- [44] N.H.M.Crighton, J.K.Webb, R.F.Carswell, and K. M.Lanzetta, Mon.Not.R.Astron.Soc. 345, 243 (2003).
- [45] V.Barger, J.P.Kneller, H.-S.Lee, D.Marfatia, and G. Steigman, Phys.Lett.B 566, 8 (2003).
- [46] C.J.Copi, A.N.Davis, and L.M.K rauss, Phys. Rev. Lett. 92, 171301 (2004).
- [47] J.P.K neller and G.Steigm an, Phys. Rev. D 67, 063501 (2003).
- [48] E.M asso and F.R ota, P reprint astro-ph/0406660 (2004).
- [49] J. D. Barrow and R. J. Scherrer, Preprint astroph/0406088 (2004).
- [50] K. Ichikawa, M. Kawasaki, and F. Takahashi, Preprint astro-ph/0402522 (2004).
- [51] T.D am our and K.N ordtvedt, Phys. Rev. Lett. 70, 2217 (1993).