## Constraining Lorentz violations with Gamma Ray Bursts

M ar a Rodr guez M art nez and T sviP iran

R acah Institute of Physics The Hebrew University 91904 Jerusalem, Israel.

#### Abstract

G am m a ray bursts are excellent candidates to constrain physical m odels which break the Lorentz sym m etry. W e consider deform ed dispersion relations which break boost invariance and lead to an energy-dependent speed of light. In these m odels, simultaneously em itted photons from cosm ological sources reach Earth with a spectral time delay that depends on the sym m etry breaking scale. We estimate the possible bounds which can be obtained by comparing the spectral time delays with the time resolution of available telescopes. We discuss the best strategy to reach the strongest bounds. We compute the probability of detecting bursts that im prove the current bounds. The results are encouraging, depending on the m odel, it is possible to build a detector that within several years will im prove the present lim its of 0.015 m  $_{pl}$ .

## 1 Introduction

One of the open questions of high energy physics is how to unify gravity with quantum physics. A lot of e ort has been devoted to develop a theory of quantum gravity. This theory is likely to require a drastic modi cation of our current understanding of the space-time. At present there are two form al mathematical approaches : loop quantum gravity and superstring theory. W hatever might be the right description of the space-time at very short scales, there are some likely physical manifestations. It has been suggested, for instance, that such a theory would break what we believe to be basic symmetries of nature. In [1, 2], it was shown that Einstein Lagrangian allows for large uctuations of the metric and the topology of the spacetime on scales of order of the P lanck length, creating a foam -like structure at these scales. It has been proposed that the propagation of particles in a foam y space-time is strongly a ected on short scales. The medium responds di erently depending on the energy of the particle, in analogy with the propagation through a conventional electrom agnetic plasm a [3, 4]. Thus space-time m ight exhibit a non-trivial dispersion relation in vacuum, violating therefore Lorentz invariance.

There are m any di erent ways of breaking Lorentz symmetry; a background tensor eld, like a magnetic eld, breaks the vacuum rotational invariance, for instance. However, it has been shown that there are 46 di erent ways in which the standard model Lagrangian can be modiled while remaining renormalizable, invariant under SU (3) SU (2) U (1) and rotationally and translationally invariant in a preferred fram e [5]. Among other elects, these terms cause the velocity of light to di er from the maximum attainable velocity of a particle, therefore changing the kinematics of particle decays. Modifying the dispersion relations of photons and electrons allows for new QED vertex interactions like photon splitting in vacuum, vacuum Cerenkov elect for electrons, photon decay, electron-positron annihilation to a single photon, etc. [6, 7].

In this work we consider only rotationally invariant deform ations of the photon dispersion relation which produce an energy-dependent speed of light. If this e ect is present in nature, it has to be absent below some energy scale,  $m_{pl}$ , (where  $m_{pl}$  is the P lanck energy and a dimensionless constant), high enough to have been undetected so far. Traditionally this energy is believed to be the Planck energy which, at rst, seems to make hopeless any experim ental attempt to test these models. However, in 1997 Am elino-Camelia et al. [8] suggested that such models can be explored by studying the propagation of photons emitted from a distance source like a gam m a ray burst (GRB) GRBs are short and intense pulses of soft gamma rays that arrive from cosm ological distances from random directions in the sky. The bursts last from a fraction of a second to several hundred seconds. Most GRBs are narrowly beam ed with typical energies around  $10^{51}$  ergs, making them comparable to supernovae (for a recent review see [9, 10]). Because of the large distances traveled by the photons, these bursts are valuable tools to explore energies far beyond the reach of any laboratory on Earth.

If one considers photons with energies much smaller than the symmetry breaking scale, it is possible to expand the dispersion relation in powers of

 $E = m_{pl}$ . The rst correction produces a tiny departure from the Lorentz invariant (LI) equations and we expect that the low energy lim it of the deformed dispersion relation can be written generically as:

$$E^{2} p^{2}c^{2}' E^{2} - \frac{E}{m_{pl}}^{!n};$$
 (1)

where = 1 takes into account the possibility of having either infralum inal or superlum inalm otion, the latter appearing in som em odels of quantum loop gravity [11, 12]. Photons simultaneously em itted from a GRB with di erent energies will travel at di erent speeds, and therefore will show on Earth a time delay. The goal of this paper is to explore these high energy Lorentz violation m odels by studying such time delays. We analyze the potential of detecting observational consequences of a modi ed dispersion relation like Eq. 1.

The paper is organized as follows; in section 2 we review cosm obgical photon propagation in the LI theory and show how these results are modied when a non LI term is introduced. We compute the travel time of cosm ological photons and, as a check, compare it with the travel time obtained in the New tonian approximation. In section 3 we turn to the observations and show how such models can be tested using GRB observations. We compare our method with previous works in section 5 and nally conclude in section 6.

## 2 Propagation of the photons

We consider rst the propagation of a particle in a FRW universe, described by the metric  $ds^2 = c^2 dt^2 + a(t)^2 dx^2$ . The Ham iltonian of a relativistic particle is

$$H = \frac{m^2 c^4 + \frac{p^2 c^2}{a^2}}{a^2};$$
 (2)

where p is the com oving m om entum and m the m ass. The H am iltonian depends explicitly on t through a (t), expressing the fact that the m om entum is redshifted due to the cosm ological expansion. The trajectory of the particle is

$$x(t;p) = \frac{z}{a^2} \frac{pc^2}{q} \frac{dt}{m^2 c^4 + \frac{p^2 c^2}{a^2}}$$
;  $p = constant$ : (3)

For a massless particle, like a photon, Eq. 3 becomes

$$a\underline{\mathbf{x}} = c$$
: (4)

Hence the speed of photons is an universal constant, c, which does not depend on the energy.

W hen Lorentz sym m etry is broken this result is modiled. As long as a theory of quantum gravity is not available, the high energy corrections to the H am iltonian de ned in Eq. 2 cannot be calculated. Here we will adopt a phenom enological approach, assuming that the H am iltonian at high energy is an unknown function of the momentum, which reduces at low energies to Eq. 2. At small energies compared to the sym metry breaking scale, E  $m_{\rm pl}$ , a series expansion is applicable. We will consider the rst order correction to the LI theory.

W e consider models which break boost invariance but keep rotational and translational invariance. Inspired by Eq. 2 we therefore postulate

$$H = m^{2}c^{4} + \frac{p^{2}c^{2}}{a^{2}} + \frac{pc}{m_{pl}a} ; n = 1;2; ...$$
(5)

Note that given Eq. 1 there is some arbitrariness in the choice of Eq. 5 concerning the a  $^{n}$  factor. We believe that this choice is physically the best motivated because any p dependence should be redshifted due to the cosm ic expansion.

W e de ne the parameter as the ratio between the energy of the photon and the P lanck energy,

$$(a;p) = \frac{pc}{m_{pl}a} :$$
(6)

1 2

From Eq. 5 we deduce the new trajectory of a particle

$$x (t;p) \quad ' \quad \frac{Z_{t}}{t_{i}} \frac{pc^{2}}{a^{2}} \frac{pc^{2}}{m^{2}c^{4} + \frac{p^{2}c^{2}}{a^{2}}} 41 + \frac{1}{2} \quad n \quad n \quad 0 \quad 1 + n + \frac{m^{2}c^{4}}{m^{2}c^{4} + \frac{p^{2}c^{2}}{a^{2}}} A \quad 5 \quad dt;$$

$$p = \text{constant}:$$

$$(7)$$

W e m ade a linear expansion with respect to n since Eq. 5 is only valid to linear order. The linear approximation used in equation 5 remains valid for

< 1. Notice that in the lim it when the symmetry breaking scale goes to in nity, ! 1, we recover Eq. 3 and the Lorentz symmetry is restored.

The main and striking di erence with respect to the LI theory is that the speed of a massless particle depends on its momentum

$$a\underline{x} = c(1 + \frac{1}{2}(1 + n) (a;p)^{n})$$
 (a)

#### 2.1 Time delay

Because of the energy dependence of the speed of light in Eq. 8, two photons em itted at the same time from the same source with momenta  $p_1$  and  $p_2$ , will reach Earth at times  $t_1$  and  $t_2$ . The comoving distance traveled by both photons is the same

$$x(t_1;p_1) = x(t_2;p_2);$$
 (9)  
 $t_2 = t_1 + t:$ 

Rewriting equation 7 in term s of the redshift and particularizing for photons, m = 0, one obtains

$$x(z;p) = \frac{c}{H_0} \int_0^{L_z} 1 + \frac{1+n}{2} \int_0^{\infty} (p)^n \int_0^n (1+z)^n \frac{dz}{(1+z)^3 + z}; (10)$$

where the cosm ological parameters  $H_0$ , m and are evaluated today [16] and we set  $a_0 = 1$ . Notice that

$$(a;p) = {}_{0}(p)(1+z); {}_{0}(p) (a_{0};p): (11)$$

When ! 1, Eq. 10 becomes the standard de nition of the cosm ological distance, as it should.

Expanding Eq. 9 for small t, we obtain the time delay between two photons with momenta  $p_1$  and  $p_2$ ,

$$t_{del}' \frac{1+n}{2H_0^{n}} = \frac{q}{\frac{m}{p}(1+z)^3 + m} \frac{z}{m} \frac{z}{q} \frac{(1+z)^n dz}{(1+z)^3 + m}; \quad (12)$$

where  $n = {n \atop 0} (p_2) {n \atop 0} (p_1)$ . Fig. 1 depicts the time delay as a function of the redshift and the momentum of the photon.



Figure 1: Curves of constant time delay as a tunction of the redshift of the source and the energy of the photon. In all the curves n = 1 and = 1.

#### 2.2 Newtonian approximation

It is instructive to compare the form er results with those obtained in the New tonian approximation. For small redshifts one can neglect the expansion of the universe and suppose that energy of the photons is constant. The delay between a low energy photon traveling at the standard speed of light c and the a high energy photon traveling at the modil ed speed of light v is

t 
$$\frac{d}{c} - \frac{d}{v}$$
; (13)

where v = dE = dp. In this approximation a linear relation between distance and redshift holds

d' 
$$\frac{C}{H_0} p \frac{Z}{m +}$$
: (14)

Hence the time delay is

t 
$$\frac{1+n}{2H_0} p = \frac{z}{m+1} = \frac{n}{0} = \frac{n}{1}$$
 (15)

C om paring Eq. 15 and Eq. 12 we verify that the N ew tonian analysis agrees to rst order with its relativistic counterpart, Eq. 12.

# 3 Observational Detection of Lorentz V iolation

To obtain an experim ental bound on the sym m etry breaking scale , we need to compare the delay produced by the modi ed speed of light, Eq. 8, with the time resolution of the observing telescope. For a successful detection of a Lorentz violation, the delay has to be larger than the time resolution of the telescope:

$$t_{del} > t_{res}$$
: (16)

#### 3.1 Telescope time resolution

The time resolution of a telescope depends on two factors. The rst is the intrinsic detector m inim al time resolution,  $t_{detector}$ , which is typically of order 10<sup>3</sup> 10<sup>4</sup> s. The second factor,  $t_{res}$ , is inversely proportional to the photon detection rate which, in turn, depends on the detector e ective area and on the lum inosity, spectrum and distance of the source,

$$t_{res}' \frac{b}{AP(E_1;E_2)}$$
: (17)

where P ( $E_1; E_2$ ) is the photon peak ux in the energy band ( $E_1; E_2$ ) and A is the detector e ective area. The factor b takes into account the m inim um num ber of photons needed to resolve a peak. If the noise of the detector is negligible, b is of order 5-10. In the following examples we consider an idealized detector with no noise and set b = 6.

The overall time resolution is given by

$$t_{res}^{\sim} = m ax (t_{res}; t_{detector}) :$$
(18)

The photon ux depends on the energy intervaland therefore it is sensitive to the spectrum of the burst. A good phenom enological t for the high energy GRB photon spectrum is

$$N(E) = R_1 E$$
; (19)

where E is the energy in the rest fram e of the burst<sup>1</sup>, and N (E) has units of photons keV  $^{1}$  s<sup>1</sup>. This t is valid for energies higher than E<sub>0</sub>, where E<sub>0</sub> is

 $<sup>^{1}</sup>$ The notation in this section is the following: E denotes energies in the rest fram e of the burst and E energies measured in the Earth fram e.

typically of order of a few hundred keV. In what follows, we will take  $E_0$  100 keV. For this spectrum the ux in the energy band ( $E_1$ ;  $E_2$ ) is

$$P (E_{1}; E_{2}) = \frac{1}{4 d(z)^{2}} \frac{R_{1}}{1+z} \sum_{E_{1}(1+z)}^{Z E_{2}(1+z)} E dE:$$
(20)

The factors (1 + z) in the lim its of the integral transform rest-fram e energies into E arth m easured energies, and there is an extra (1 + z) because of the cosm ological time dilation; d(z) is the cosm ological distance.

Let us introduce the (isotropic equivalent) peak lum inosity in the GRB rest frame is  $$\rm Z_{\ 1}$$ 

$$L_{peak} = R_1 \underset{E_0}{\overset{-1}{\underset{E_0}{}}} E E dE:$$
(21)

Combining Eq. 20 and Eq. 21 we obtain

$$t_{\rm res} = b \frac{4 d(z)^2}{A} - \frac{1}{2} \frac{(1+z)}{L_{\rm peak}} \frac{E_0^2}{E_1^1 E_2^1}; \qquad (22)$$

In the following sections we will also need to estimate the resolution from the photon energy ux P ( $E_1$ ; $E_2$ ) and from the luminosity of the bursts. Using

$$P(E_{1};E_{2}) = \frac{R_{1}}{4 d(z)^{2} (1+z)} \sum_{E_{1}(1+z)}^{2 E_{2}(1+z)} E E dE; \qquad (23)$$

the time resolution is obtained by combining Eq. 20, 22 and 23,

$$t_{res}' \frac{b}{AP(E_1;E_2)} \frac{1}{2} (1+z) \frac{E_2^2}{E_2^1} \frac{E_1^2}{E_1^1} :$$
 (24)

### 3.2 A bound on

C om paring Eq. 12 and 22 we nd that we can test symmetry breaking scales up to:

$$n < \frac{AH_0}{8 bc^2} - \frac{2}{1}E_0^2 L_{peak} = 1 \qquad \frac{E_2}{E_1}^{-1} = \frac{1}{E_1^{-1}} G_n(z);$$
 (25)

where all the redshift dependence is contained in the function  $G_n(z)$  (rem em – ber that  $L_{peak}$  is de ned in the rest fram e of the burst).



Figure 2:  $G_n(z)$  as a function of the redshift for = 2.5. For small redshifts  $G_n(z)$  has two branches, the upper one corresponds to  $t_{detector} = 10^4$  s and the lower one corresponds to  $t_{detector} = 10^3$  s.

For distant bursts, the limiting resolution is determined by the photon arrival rate and therefore  $t_{res} = t_{res}$ . In this case, the function  $G_n(z)$  is given by:

$$G_{n}(z) = (1+n) \frac{q}{p} \frac{(1+z)^{3} + \frac{z}{m}}{m} \frac{z}{m} \frac{z}{m} \frac{(1+z)^{n} dz}{(1+z)^{3} + \frac{z}{m}} \frac{z}{m} \frac{(1+z)^{n} dz}{(1+z)^{3} + \frac{z}{m}}$$

$$= \frac{q}{q} \frac{dz}{m} \frac{dz}{(1+z)^{3} + \frac{z}{m}} \frac{z}{(1+z)} \frac{(1+z)^{n} dz}{(1+z)^{n} + \frac{z}{m}} \frac{z}{(1+z)} \frac{(1+z)^{n} dz}{(1+z)^{n} + \frac{z}{m}}$$

$$= \frac{q}{q} \frac{dz}{m} \frac{dz}{(1+z)^{3} + \frac{z}{m}} \frac{z}{(1+z)} \frac{(1+z)^{n} dz}{(1+z)^{n} + \frac{z}{m}} \frac{(1+z)^{n} dz}{(1+z)^{n} + \frac{z}{m} + \frac{z}{m} \frac{z}{(1+z)^{n} + \frac{z}{m} + \frac{z}{m} + \frac{z}{m} \frac{z}{(1+z)^{n} + \frac{z}{m} + \frac{z}{m} + \frac{z}{m} \frac{z}{(1+z)^{n} + \frac{z}{m} + \frac{z}{m} \frac{z}{(1+z)^{n} + \frac{z}{m} + \frac{z}{m} \frac{z}{m} \frac{z}{(1+z)^{n} + \frac{z}{m} + \frac{z}{m} + \frac{z}{m} \frac{z}{m} \frac{z}{m} \frac{z}{(1+z)^{n} + \frac{z}{m} + \frac{z}{m} + \frac{z}{m} \frac{z}$$

On the other hand, for nearby bursts  $t_{res}^{res}$  is limited by the detector resolution. Fig. 2 depicts the behavior of  $G_n(z)$ . For small redshifts,  $G_n(z)$  increases from zero up to a maximum value where  $t_{detector} = t_{res}$ .  $G_n(z)$  is shown in this regime for  $t_{detector} = 10^4$  s (upper branch) and  $10^3$  s (lower branch). For higher redshifts,  $t_{res}^{res}$  is dominated by  $t_{res}$ . The function  $G_n(z)$  decreases then up to a minimum and nally increases again at high redshift (for n = 1 the growth begins at z > 5, which is too large to be experimentally interesting). As the limit on is proportional to  $G_n^{1=n}(z)$  the best limit is obtained at small redshifts, when  $t_{res} = t_{detector}$ .

This is a non intuitive result. One would expect that the best bound on is obtained from photons arriving from bursts at very high redshifts, which have signi cant larger delays than photons from nearby bursts. How ever the distance also dilutes the photons decreasing the time resolution. Moreover, due to the redshift of the energy, a xed energy band on Earth corresponds to an intrinsically higher energy band which is more scarce in photons. These two combined e ects overcome the improvement of the bound due to the larger delay. Thus, to obtain the tightest bound it is preferable to use low redshift bursts. As it can be seen in Fig. 2, low redshift means here z < 1 (but this depends, of course, on the intrinsic detector resolution). Note that we have not yet taken into account the possible attenuation of the interstellar medium. This result is merely based on geometric considerations.

Let us turn our attention to the in uence of the energy range in which we observe the burst. If we observe photons in the interval  $(E_1; E_2)$ , <sup>n</sup> satisfies

$$n > \frac{E_1}{m_{pl}}! n$$
; (27)

and the energy dependence in Eq. 25 is bounded by

$$E_{1}^{n+1} = 1 = \frac{E_{2}}{E_{1}}^{1} :$$
 (28)

The exponent n + 1 is positive for n > 1. The parameter can vary between 1:6 < < 5 [23] (the lower limit of 5 corresponds, how ever, to bursts which do not have a high energy tail and are consequently not interesting for our purposes). For typical bursts 2:5. For n = 2 and

2.5 the exponent n + 1 is positive and therefore the best bound is obtained by observing in the highest possible energy band. On the contrary, for n = 1 and 2.5 the exponent is negative and it is advantageous to use the low energy bands. Note that this analysis is based on the assumption that the spectrum is given by Eq. 19, which is valid for energies higher than  $E_0$ . We should therefore always observe at energies higher than  $E_0$ .

Like the discussion about the optim al redshift, this is another non intuitive result. Contrary to what would be naively expected, we have shown that the optim al energy range is not necessarily the highest one, but depends on the model of symmetry breaking and on the burst spectrum. These results apply only for a given detector with a xed collecting area. Observations in a higher energy band might be advantageous under dierent conditions, for instance, if they are made with a dierent telescope with a larger area. Finally, cosm ic attenuation sets an upper limit on the energy range. We discuss this issue in the section 3.3. From Eq. 28 is evident that the larger the ratio  $E_2=E_1$ , the better the bound (broadening the energy band increases the number of photons and consequently the telescope resolution); however, in order to avoid a large spread in the arrival times, the detected photons in each channel should have comparable energies.

The bound can be rew ritten as

$$_{n} > \frac{L_{peak}}{L} G_{n} (z)$$
 ; (29)

where

$$= \frac{{}^{"}}{8 \ bm_{pl}^{n}c^{2}} - \frac{2}{1}L \ E_{0}^{2} E_{1}^{n+1} \qquad 1 \qquad \frac{E_{2}}{E_{1}}^{1} \qquad : \qquad (30)$$

We have introduced the quantity L = 6:3 f<sup>†</sup> erg s<sup>1</sup>, which will be useful later on when dealing with lum inosity distributions. In Eq. 29 we have explicitly separated the redshift and burst lum inosity and included all the num erical values and telescope dependent quantities in the constant ,

$$1 \hat{\mathcal{C}}^{2\frac{1-n}{n}} = \frac{2^{!}}{1} \frac{2^{(1-n)}}{1} \frac{A}{2000 \text{ cm}^2} \frac{1}{M \text{ eV}} \frac{E_1}{M \text{ eV}} \frac{1+\frac{1}{n}}{1} \frac{E_2}{E_1} \frac{1}{E_1} \frac$$

We see again that for n = 1 and > 2 going to high energies does not improve the bound.

The order of magnitude of achievable bounds for typical bursts obtained in Eq. 29 is 10<sup>3</sup> for n = 1 and 3  $10^3$  for n = 2 (for = 2.5 in both cases). This is in agreement with actual limits found for specic bursts in the literature. Ellis et al. [13] used a wavelet analysis to look for correlations between redshift and spectral time lags between the arrival times of ares at dierent energies, and obtained the bounds of  $_1 > 5.6$   $10^6$  and  $_2 >$ 2.4  $10^3$  at a 95% of con ance level. Subsequently this result was in proved [14] by using a more complete data set of transient sources with a broad spread in redshifts to correct for intrinsic time delays (we discuss intrinsic delays in section 5). A dierent approach was adopted by Boggs et al. [17], who considered a single and extrem ely bright burst, GRB 011206. This burst yielded the bounds of  $_1 > 0.015$  and  $_2 > 4.5$   $10^2$  respectively.



Figure 3: Optical thickness of the intergalactic medium at 10 GeV

#### 3.3 Cosm ic attenuation

At energies of TeV and higher, the universe becomes opaque due to the interaction of the gamma ray photons with the background light to create electron-positron pairs, ! e e<sup>+</sup>. The cross section of this reaction is maximized when the product of the energies of both photons is  $(m_ec^2)^2$ . A photon of 10 TeV will interact with an infrared photon, for instance, creating an electron-positron pair.

For n = 1 we are concerned with lower energies, from a few hundreds keV to a few M eV.A these energies we can safely neglect attenuation. Fig 3 shows the optical thickness of the extragalactic medium at 10 G eV [20]. As it can be seen, attenuation only becomes important at high redshift, z > 3. C learly, it is safe to ignore this e ect at lower energies.

#### 3.4 A quantitative exam ple : G R B 050603A

For an observed burst on Earth, we can skip Eq. 25 which depends on quantities de ned in the rest fram e of the burst ( $L_{peak}$  and  $E_0$ ) and calculate the bound directly from the ux on Earth. The quantities usually measured are the energy ux P ( $E_1$ ; $E_2$ ) (in erg cm  $^2$  s $^1$ ) or the photon ux P ( $E_1$ ; $E_2$ ) (in photons cm  $^2$  s $^1$ ).

GRB 050603A is a very bright burst with measured redshift z = 2.821observed with two satellites : K onus-W ind (area 200 cm<sup>2</sup>) and Swift-BAT (area 5200 cm<sup>2</sup>). The time-integrated spectrum is well tted by a high

energy photon index = 2:15. K onus m easured a peak ux of 3:2  $1\overline{0}$  erg cm<sup>2</sup> s<sup>1</sup> in the (20 keV, 3 M eV) band. These values correspond to:

t <sub>res</sub> (	20 keV , 3 M eV )	5 10 s
n = 1	t <sub>del</sub> (20 keV)	9 10= s
n = 2	$t_{del}$ (20 keV )	$5  10^{2} = {}^{2} s$

For the same burst Swift detected a peak ux of 31.8 photons cm  $^2$  s $^1$  in the (15 keV, 350 keV) band. This im plies

t <sub>res</sub> (	15 keV , 350 keV )		4 150	S
n = 1	t <sub>del</sub> (15 keV)	7	10=	S
n = 2	$t_{del}$ (15 keV )	3	10 =	<sup>2</sup> s

If the time delays at these low energy bands were not contam inated with intrinsic spectral delays at the source, this burst could have led to the following limits:

	K onus	Swift		
n = 1	> 0:02	> 02		
n = 2	> 3 10³	> 9 103		

The time resolution used in this example, 4  $1^{\circ}$  s, is in fact below the limiting time resolution of Swiff, 0.1 m s. Swift resolution would have led to a slightly weaker bound,  $_1 > 0.07$ . Furthermore, we have considered here photons all the way down to 15 keV (Swiff) or 20 keV (K onus). Limiting the discussion to photons above 100 keV, for which Eq. 19 is accurate, would have reduced the limits further.

The numbers obtained here are clearly idealized and should serve only as an example of what can be achieved. In order to set an experimental bound, we need to observe the burst in two dimensional problem is posed by the observed the arrival time in each one. An additional problem is posed by the observed intrinsic delay in the emission times of the photons at the source [13, 24] which we discuss in section 5.



F igure 4: The lum inosity and the redshift needed to give a bound of  $_0 = 0.2$  for n = 1. H igher bounds are obtained above the curve.

## 4 Distribution of bursts

GRB 050603A could have given a very powerful bound on . But how likely would it be to detect a burst yielding such a bound or a higher one ? From the results of the previous sections, the more lum inous and closer the burst, the stronger the bound. In this section we estimate the probability of nding such a burst, given an empirical lum inosity and space distribution of bursts.

To improve a bound,  $_0$ , we need to detect a burst with a lum inosity and a redshift such that

$$^{n} \frac{L}{L} G_{n}(z) > {}_{0}^{n}$$
 : (32)

Eq. 32 de ne a region in the lum inosity and redshift space-phase (see Fig. 4). The probability for such a burst to happen is given by the integral of the probability of nding a burst over this region.

Let us introduce the local peak lum inosity function,  $_0$  (L), de ned as the fraction of GRBs with lum inosities in the interval logL and logL + d logL, can be approximated by [18]:

$$_{0}(L) = C_{0} \begin{pmatrix} (L=L)^{1} & L = {}_{1} < L < L \\ (L=L)^{2} & L < L < {}_{2}L \end{pmatrix} ;$$
 (33)

where co is a norm alization constant such that the integral over the lum inosity

function equals the unity.

There is a strong evidence that long GRBs follow the com oving star formation rate (SFR),  $R_{SFR}$  (z). Namely,  $R_{GRB}$  (z), the com oving GRB rate satis es  $R_{GRB}$  (z) /  $R_{SFR}$  (z). We employ the parametrization of Porcianiet al. [19] for the com oving SFR distribution. From it we write

$$R_{GRB}(z) = \frac{23 \exp(3.4z)}{\exp(3.4z) + 22} \frac{q}{(1+z)^3 + (1+z)^3 + (1+z)^{3=2}}$$
(34)

The lum inosity function at redshift z is therefore  $(z;L) = _0(L) R_{GRB}(z)$ . Guetta et al. [25] used the BATSE peak ux distribution, to estimate the parameters  $_0$ ,  $_1$  and  $_2$ . For long bursts they found two di erent ts:

	1	2	1	2	L (er	gs <sup>1</sup> )	<sub>0</sub> (Gpc <sup>3</sup> yr <sup>1</sup> )
I	-0.1	-2	30	50	63	19	0.18
II	-0.6	-3	30	50	1:6	19	0.16

Short GRBs, which constitute about one quarter of the observed bursts, do not follow the SFR [26, 27] and will not be discussed here.

The probability of detecting a burst which sets a bound  $> _0$  is

$$N(z > 0) = \int_{0}^{Z_{1}} \frac{R_{GRB}(z)}{1+z} \frac{dV(z)}{dz} dz \int_{0}^{Z_{1}} 0(L) d\log L;$$
(35)

where the factor  $(1 + z)^{1}$  accounts for the cosm obgical time dilation and V (z) is the comoving volume. The factor is dened as

$$= \max \frac{\int_{0}^{n} L}{\int_{0}^{n} G_{n}(z)}; L_{m in}; \qquad (36)$$

where  $L_{m in}$  is the minimal lum inosity for a burst to be detected

$$L_{m in} = 4 d(z)^{2} (1 + z) - \frac{1}{2E_{1}^{1} E_{2}^{2}} N_{m in}$$
 (37)

 $L_{m in}$  depends on the sensitivity of the telescope, N<sub>m in</sub>, which is the m inim al photon ux necessary to trigger the instrum ent. W e considered for n = 1 an idealized detector, D et. I, with an area of 5200 cm<sup>2</sup> m aking observations in the energy band (500 keV, 2 M eV).Forn = 2, we focused on the forthcom ing spatial observatory G LAST which will be launched in 2006. W e considered the energy band (100 M eV, 1 G eV) where G LAST is expected to have an e ective area of 8000 cm<sup>2</sup>.

Integrating num erically Eq. 35 we nd

	Det.I	G LA ST			
1	rate (bursts yr <sup>1</sup> )	<sub>2</sub> rate (bursts yr			
0.015	(7.4 - 6.9) 10	4:5 10 <sup>2</sup>	9.4 - 12.8		
0.05	(2.8-3.1) 10	7 10 <sup>2</sup>	1.9 -2.2		
0.1	(9.1 - 6.9) 10	10 11	(4.8-3.5) 10		
0.5	(2.1 - 1.3) 10	2:5 10 <sup>1</sup>	(5.0 - 2.4) 10		
1.0	(3.5 - 2.0) 10	5 10 <sup>1</sup>	(7.2 - 3.9) 10		

The values in the rst row correspond to the bounds obtained from GRB 021206 [17]. To estimate  $L_{m in}$ , we assumed that the ideal detector, Det. I, has a sensitivity of  $N_{m in}$  1 ph cm<sup>2</sup> s<sup>1</sup>, which is comparable to the sensitivities estimated by B and [28] for several detectors in similar energy bands. For GLAST, we took  $N_{m in}$  4 10 ph cm<sup>2</sup> s<sup>1</sup>, which roughly m eans that the detector is very quiet at these energies and a detection of 6 photons during the whole duration of the burst (3 m inutes) is enough to identify it.

F inally we took into account the partial sky coverage of any real telescope to compute the number of bursts observed per year. G LAST opening angle will be 2 stereoradian; we used a similar opening angle for our idealized detector.

## 5 Comparison with other works

GRB 021206

The idea of using GRBs to set experimental bounds on a possible violation of Lorentz symmetry was inst suggested by Amelino-Camelia et al. [8]. Later on, several groups made use of it to explore these limits [13, 17, 14]. The current best bounds have been obtained by Boggs et al. [17] who used a very bright burst, GRB 021206, to set a limit on the symmetry breaking scale. The data consisted of light curves in six energy bands spanning 0.2 - 17 M eV. The redshift of this burst is not known, but an approximated redshift of z ' 0:3 was estimated from the spectral and temporal properties of the burst (this method involves, however, a very high uncertainty which can be as high as a factor of 2).

The observed uence of GRB 021206 is 1:6  $1^{\circ}$  ergs cm<sup>2</sup> at the energy range of 25-100 kev [21]. This puts GRB 021206 as one of the most powerful bursts ever observed. GRB 021206 also shows a very atypical photon spectrum at the MeV range. Instead of decreasing with the energy following a power law with 2:5, it is almost at from 1 MeV up to 17 MeV, namely

0 (this in plies in particular that F increases with in these energies). This atness allows to resolve a fast are and to determ ine its peak time and uncertainty in several bands. The analysis of the dispersion of these peak times yields to the lower bounds  $_1 > 0.015$  and  $_2 > 5 = 10^{2}$  [17]. Applying our method on the energy band 15-350 keV using data from the GRB 050603A, we obtained a theoretical upper limit to the lower bounds of  $_1 > 0.2$  and  $_2 > 9 = 10^{3}$ . These numbers represent the best bounds that could be obtained if the time resolution of the detector was high enough ( $5 = 10^{5}$  s), the detector noise was negligible and we had at our disposal the light curves in at least two energy channels.

Our conclusions on the optim al redshift and energy band are based on a power law spectrum E with 2. They arise from comparing the time delay, which always increases with the energy, with the time resolution of the telescope. Com paring both energy dependencies, we found in section 32> 2 is better to observe at low energies. However if that for n = 1 and < 2, like in GRB 021206 in the MeV range, this conclusion does not hold and it is preferable to use the highest available energy band. In this case the GLAST Large A rea Telescope will be a very powerful tool. It is expected to be sensitive from 20 MeV to 300 GeV with a peak e ective area in the range 1-10 GeV of 8000 cm<sup>2</sup>. Observing with GLAST in energy bands below 10 GeV where cosm ic extinction is still negligible (see g. 3) can improve dram atically our current bounds. At present little is known about GRB em ission at energies higher than 50 M eV and therefore it is not possible to estimate how common are bursts with < 2. Taking advantage of atypical bursts to explore even higher energies is an exciting possibility to keep in mind, however at present it is di cult to design a strategy based only in these bursts.

A salready m entioned, our bound m ust be interpreted as a theoretical one, i.e. the highest bound that could be set, were the best conditions achieved. W e already commented on the necessity of observing in at least two energy channels and to take into account the real time resolution of the detector.

An additional serious problem is the intrinsic lack of simultaneity in the pulse emission in the keV regime [13, 24]. Soft emission has a time delay relative to high energy emission [22]. While the reason for this phenom enon is not understood, an anti-correlation between the spectral evolution timescale and the peak lum inosity has been found [15]. There are two di erent ways to deal with the intrinsic delay. The rst is to try to reduce it by choosing very lum inous bursts and observing in M eV or higher, where the delay, if still

exists, seem s to be sm aller. The second approach is based on the fact that the delays produced by a violation of Lorentz sym m etry increase with the redshift of the source, whereas intrinsic time delays are independent of the redshift of the source [14]. Thus, a system atic comparison of a delays in a group of bursts with known redshifts could enable us to distinguish between intrinsic and redshift dependent delays. Using a sample of 35 bursts with known redshifts, E llis et al. [14] established a lower limit of  $_1 > 7$  10 on the sym m etry breaking scale. These bounds are two orders of m agnitude lower than our theoretical limits. This di erence dem onstrates the importance that intrinsic time delays, noise and the real instrum ental resolution can have.

## 6 Conclusions

O ur goal was to explore the potential of GRBs to set bounds on Lorentz violation and to nd optim altechniques to do so. W em odi ed the dispersion relation of photons by adding an extra term proportional to the photon m om entum to the power n + 2. W e have shown that in m odels with n = 1 it is possible to explore energies which are close to the P lanck energy. W hen n = 2, the energies explored are sm aller, around  $10^7$  GeV. These bounds are idealized and they do not take into account experimental limitations or the intrinsic time-structure of the -ray em ission. They should serve as theoretical estimations of what can be achieved. The m ethodology we use here can be used to design future optim al experiments for observing this e ect (or setting bounds on it).

We have modelled the burst high energy emission with a power law spectrum E with 2. This ts well the time integrated emission of most of the bursts. We found two non intuitive results: (i) The optimal redshift to set the strongest bound is less than 1. (ii) Forn = 1, low energy, rather than high energy emission is preferred. Both results are counter-intuitive since the Lorentz violation delay increases with the distance and with the energy. However, distance or observations at high energies (where the ux is lower) dilute the photons reducing the temporal resolution achieved on Earth. It turns out that this is the dominant e ect.

In the models with n = 2, going to higher energies always improves the bounds. Here the situation will be remarkably changed when the spatial observatory GLAST will become operational.

W e have also investigated the probability of in proving the current exper-

in ental bounds, given a phenom enological lum inosity and space distribution of bursts. A swe are discussing idealized bounds, this probability should only be trusted up to an order of magnitude.

## A cknow ledgm ents

W e would like to thank Steven Boggs, D avid Palmer, Joel Primack, D avid Sm ith and Raquelde los Reyes Lopez. We especially thank M atthew K leban for many useful discussions and a critical reading of this manuscript. This research was supported by the EU-RTN \GRBs-Enigma and a Tool" and by the Schwarzm ann university chair (TP).

## References

- [1] J.A.W heeler, Annals Phys. 2, 604 (1957).
- [2] S.W . Hawking Nucl. Phys. B 144, 349 (1978)
- [3] I.T.D rum m ond and S.J.Hathrell, Phys. Rev. D 22, 343 (1980).
- [4] J. I. Latorre, P. Pascual and R. Tarrach Nucl. Phys. B 437 60 (1995) [arX iv hep-th/9408016].
- [5] S.R.Coleman and S.L.Glashow, Phys. Rev. D 59, 116008 (1999)
   [arXiv:hep-ph/9812418].
- [6] T. Jacobson, S. Liberati and D. Mattingly, Phys. Rev. D 67, 124011 (2003) [arX iv:hep-ph/0209264].
- [7] A.Kostelecky and M.Mewes Phys.Rev.D 66, 056005 (2002)
- [8] G. Am elino-Cam elia, J. R. Ellis, N. E. Mavrom atos, D. V. Nanopoulos and S. Sarkar, Nature 393, 763 (1998) [arXiv astro-ph/9712103].
- [9] T.Piran, Rev.M od.Phys. 76, 1143 (2004) [arXiv astro-ph/0405503].
- [10] B. Zhang and P. Meszaros, Int. J. Mod. Phys. A 19, 2385 (2004) [arX iv astro-ph/0311321].

- [11] R.Gambini and J.Pullin, Phys. Rev. D 59, 124021 (1999) [arXiv:grqc/9809038].
- [12] J.A lfaro, H.A.M orales-Tecotl and L.F.Urrutia, Phys. Rev. Lett. 84, 2318 (2000) [arX iv gr-qc/9909079].
- [13] J.R.Ellis, N.E.Mavromatos, D.V.Nanopoulos and A.S.Sakharov, Astron. Astrophys. 402, 409 (2003) [arXiv:astro-ph/0210124].
- [14] J. Ellis, N. E. Mavromatos, D. V. Nanopoulos, A. S. Sakharov and E.K.G. Sarkisyan, [astro-ph/0510172]
- [15] J.P.Norris, G.F.Marani and J.T.Bonnell, [arX ivastro-ph/9903233].
- [16] D.N. Spergel et al. [W MAP Collaboration], Astrophys. J. Suppl. 148, 175 (2003) [arX ivastro-ph/0302209].
- [17] S.E.Boggs, and C.B.W underer, K.Hurley and W.Coburn, Astrophys. J. 611, L77-L80 (2004) [astro-ph/0310307].
- [18] M. Schmidt, Astrophys. J. 523, L117–L120 (1999) [astro-ph/9908206].
- [19] C.Porciani and P.M adau, A strophys. J. 548, L522-L531 (2001) [astroph/0008294]
- [20] J.R.Primack, J.S.Bullock and R.S.Som erville, A IP Conf. Proc. 745,
   23 (2005) [arXiv:astro-ph/0502177].
- [21] K.Hurley et al, GCN Circ. 1727, 1728 (2002)
- [22] J.P.Norris, R.J.Nem iro, J.T.Bonnell, J.D.Scargle, C.Kouveliotou, W.S.Paciesas, C.A.Meegan and G.J.Fishman, Astrophys. J. 459, L393-L531 (1996).
- [23] D.Band, J.Matteson, L.Ford, B.Schaefer, D.Palmer, B.Teegarden, T.Cline, M.Briggs, W.Paciesas, G.Pendleton, G.Fishman, C.Kouveliotou, C.Meegan, R.Wilson and P.Lestrade, Astrophys. J. 413, L281-L292 (1993).
- [24] T. Piran, \Gamma Ray Bursts as Probes of Quantum Gravity", [arXivastro-ph/0407462].

- [25] D. Guetta, T. Piran and E. Waxman, Astrophys. J. 619, L412-L419 (2005) [arX ivastro-ph/0311488].
- [26] D.Guetta, and T.Piran, Astron. & Astrophys., 435, 421, (2005)
- [27] D. Guetta, and T. Piran, submitted to Astron. & Astrophys., astroph/0511239, (2006)
- [28] D.L.Band, Astrophys. J. 588, 945 (2003) [arX ivastro-ph/0212452].