

# Checking the variability of the gravitational constant with binary pulsars

G. S. Bisnovatyi-Kogan

## Abstract

The most precise measurements are done at present by timing of radio pulsars in binary systems with two neutron stars. The timing measurements of the Taylor-Hulse pulsar B1913+16 gave the most precise results on testing of general relativity (GR), finding implicit proof of existence of gravitational waves. We show that available results of existing measurements, obtained to the year 1993, in combination with the results of the Mariner 10 in (1992), give the boundaries for the variation of the gravitational constant  $G=G$  inside the limits  $(-0.6 \pm 2) \cdot 10^{12} \text{ year}^{-1}$ .

**Keywords:** pulsars, gravitation

Since 1937 [15],[6], and up to present times [18],[7] the possibility of variation of fundamental physical constants arise interest among physicists. While theories exist where these constants may vary [21],[19],[13], [2], it is evident that only from experiments, or better to say from the astrophysical observations, we may obtain a realistic answer. The spectral observations of distant quasars have been used for estimation of upper limits for the variations of the fine structure constant, electron and proton masses [19].

Variations of the gravitational constant  $G$  have been measured by different methods [18], among which are investigations of stellar and planetary orbits. The measurements on the Viking Lander ranging data gave the limits [8] for the variation of the gravitational constant in the form

$$G=G \pm (2 \div 4) \cdot 10^{12} \text{ yr}^{-1}; \quad (1)$$

and the combination of Mariner 10 and Mercury and Venus ranging gave [1]

$$G=G \pm (0 \div 2) \cdot 10^{12} \text{ yr}^{-1}; \quad (2)$$

Lunar Laser Ranging experiments are lasting for many years, and improve the estimations of  $G=G$  from  $G=G \pm 6 \cdot 10^{12} \text{ yr}^{-1}$  in [5] the year 1994, up to

---

Institute of Space Research (IKI), Moscow, Russia, Profsoyuznaya 84/32, Moscow 117810, Russia, gkogan@mx.ki.rssi.ru

$$\dot{G} = (-0.4 \pm 0.9) \cdot 10^{12} \text{yr}^{-1}; \quad (3)$$

in [20] the year 2004.

Recycled pulsars give now the best available timing precision. Especially important results may be obtained from timing measurements of the pulsars in close binaries consisting of two neutron stars. These measurements had been already used for checking general relativity [16] (PSR B1913+16), and [12],[10] (PSR J0737-3039). From the long time observations of the the pulsar PSR B1913+16 changes in the binary period had been measured, and explaining these changes by emission of gravitational waves, it was found [17], that "Einstein's theory passes this extraordinary stringent test with a fractional accuracy better than 0.4% ". Similar accuracy was obtained from only one year observations of the close binary consisting of two pulsars PSR J0737-3039A and B [12] [10]. Farther observations of this system should considerably improve the precision, in comparison with the one reached by PSR B1913+16.

The restrictions on the gravitational theory, and checking of its validity is possible because timing permits to measure several quantities what gives an overlapping information. With the two masses as the only free parameters, the measurement of three or more post-keplerian parameters over-constrains the system, and thereby provides a test ground for theories of gravity. In a theory that describes a binary system correctly, the post-keplerian parameters produce theory-dependent lines in a mass-mass diagram that all intersect in a single point [3],[10]. Measurements of 5 relativistic parameters together with independent determination of the mass ratio, due to presence of the second pulsar, are available in PSR J0737-3039, in comparison with only 3 parameters in the PSR B1913+16.

The variation of fundamental constant could be incorporated in the general procedure of the timing data development. With 6 measurable quantities at present (and possibility to increase this number in future [10]) variability of several fundamental constant can be investigated.

Nevertheless, even without any complicated calculations strong restrictions can be obtained to the variation of the gravitational constant using only the measurements of the variations of the binary period. Change of  $G$  has the most evident influence on the orbital motion, because only emission of the gravitational waves compete here with the variation of  $G$ . Influence of  $G$  variation of the pulsar period changes, star contraction at increasing gravity, or star expansion at its decreasing, accompanying by corresponding period changes at constant angular momentum, are strongly contaminated with the intrinsic changes of the rotational period, due to losses of the rotational energy and angular momentum. A theoretical description of these losses is rather poor [14]. If we accept the correctness of general relativity inside the observed accuracy, than we can use the residuals (error box) of the measurements of decay of the binary period  $\dot{P}_b$  for the estimation of variations of  $G$ . Such estimations have been done first

in [4], and later in [9], using timing data from [16] with the result

$$\dot{G} = G = (4 \pm 5) \times 10^{12} \text{yr}^{-1}; \quad (4)$$

Here we make slightly more careful analysis of the data in [16], and combine it with Mariner 10 data, to decrease the error box for  $\dot{G} = G$ , in comparison with [9]. In absence of gravitational waves, and  $G$  variations on the binary period may be considered separately in linear approximation due to smallness of both effects. The orbital angular momentum is conserved during slow  $G$  variations, as an adiabatic invariant, so only total energy of the system is changing due to change of the gravitational constant. In newtonian approximation the total energy  $E$  and orbital angular momentum  $M$  of the binary in the mass center system are written as

$$(a) \ E = \frac{m_1 v_a^2}{2} - \frac{G m_1 m_2}{a}; \quad (b) \ M = m_1 a v_a; \quad (5)$$

Here  $m_1, m_2$  are masses, considered as points,  $m = \frac{m_1 m_2}{m_1 + m_2}$ ,  $v_a$  is the azimuthal velocity at apogee, where radial velocity is zero. The parameters of the binary orbit, such as large semi-axis  $a$ , eccentricity  $e$ , and orbital period  $P_b$ , are uniquely determined by the conserved values  $E < 0$  and  $M$  as [11]

$$(c) \ a = \frac{G m_1 m_2}{2 \mathcal{E}^2}; \quad (d) \ P_b = \frac{2\pi}{G m_1 m_2} \sqrt{\frac{M^3}{\mathcal{E}}}; \quad (f) \ e = 1 - \frac{2 \mathcal{E} M^2}{G^2 m_1^2 m_2^2}; \quad (6)$$

Slow variation of  $G$  imply the variation of  $P_b$ ,  $a$ ,  $v_a$ ,  $E$  and  $e$ , which are connected by relations following from variations of corresponding relations in (5), (6)

$$(b) \ \frac{v_a}{v_a} = \frac{a}{a}; \quad (c) \ \frac{\mathcal{E}}{\mathcal{E}} = \frac{G}{G} - \frac{a}{a};$$

$$(a) \ \mathcal{E} = m v_a^2 - \frac{G m_1 m_2}{a} = \frac{a}{a} + \frac{G m_1 m_2}{a} \frac{G}{G}; \quad (7)$$

$$(d) \ \frac{P_b}{P_b} = \frac{G}{G} - \frac{3}{2} \frac{\mathcal{E}}{\mathcal{E}}; \quad (f) \ \frac{e}{e} = \frac{M^2}{G^2 m_1^2 m_2^2} \frac{\mathcal{E}}{e^2} - \frac{G}{G} - \frac{\mathcal{E}}{\mathcal{E}}; \quad (8)$$

It follows from (7)

$$\frac{a}{a} = \frac{G}{G}; \quad \frac{v_a}{v_a} = \frac{G}{G}; \quad \frac{\mathcal{E}}{\mathcal{E}} = 2 \frac{G}{G}; \quad (9)$$

what, using (8), gives

Table 1: Error budget for the orbital period derivative, in comparison with the general relativistic prediction, from [16].

|                                 | Parameter                             | ( $10^{-12}$ ) |
|---------------------------------|---------------------------------------|----------------|
| Observed value                  | $P_b^{\text{obs}}$                    | -2.4225 0.0056 |
| Galactic contribution           | $P_b^{\text{gal}}$                    | -0.0124 0.0064 |
| Intrinsic orbital period decay  | $P_b^{\text{obs}} - P_b^{\text{gal}}$ | -2.4101 0.0085 |
| General relativistic prediction | $P_b^{\text{GR}}$                     | -2.4025 0.0001 |

$$\frac{P_b}{P_b} = -2 \frac{\dot{G}}{G}; \quad \frac{\dot{G}}{G} = -\frac{1}{2} \frac{\dot{P}_b}{P_b}; \quad \frac{\dot{e}}{e} = 0; \quad e = \text{const:} \quad (10)$$

The first relation of (10) was derived in [4] in a more complicated way. So, from measurements of changes of the orbital period we may estimate variations of the gravitational constant, after account of gravitational wave reaction. For the pulsar PSR B1913+16 the error budget for the orbital period derivative, in comparison with the general relativistic prediction, is given in Table 1, from [16].

It follows, that the observed values coincide with GR prediction within the error bar

$$(P_b^{\text{obs}} - P_b^{\text{gal}}) - P_b^{\text{GR}} = 1.0032 \pm 0.0035:$$

Supposing that all deviations from GR are connected with  $\dot{G}$  variation, we obtain the upper limit for these variation as follows

$$\frac{\dot{G}}{G} = (-4.3 \pm 4.9) \cdot 10^{12} \text{ yr}^{-1}: \quad (11)$$

To obtain this result we have assumed correctness of GR prediction (last line in the Table 1), used the difference between the observed (third line in Table 1) and theoretical values ( $\pm 0.0076 \cdot 10^{12}$ ) for the result, and the combined (theoretical + experimental) error ( $\pm 0.0086 \cdot 10^{12}$ ) for the error box. To transform the nondimensional value of  $\dot{P}_b$  into prediction for  $\frac{\dot{G}}{G}$  in (11), we should multiply the result and the error by  $\frac{1}{2P_b} = 565.4 \text{ yr}^{-1}$ , where  $P_b = 0.323 \text{ days} = 8.84 \cdot 10^{-4} \text{ years}$ . So, more accurate estimations (11) slightly improve the values (4), obtained in [9]. This improvement narrows on 40% the boundary in the negative region (most important from the theoretical point of view [21, [13], [2]), from  $-1 \cdot 10^{12}$  to  $-0.6 \cdot 10^{12}$ .

Combination of two results (11) and (2) permits to narrow the range of  $\dot{G}$  variations, which is now may be situated in the limits

$$\dot{G} = G \text{ is within the interval } (-0.6; 2) \cdot 10^{12} \text{ yr}^{-1}:$$

These limits are slightly shifted from predictions of superstring theories [21]  $G = G_0 (1 \pm 10^{11} \text{ yr}^{-1})$ ; and permit for  $G$  to remain constant. They are independent on the influence of tidal interaction between Earth and Moon. Regrettably, the data of measurements of  $P_b$  in PSR B1913+16 since 1993, as well as the refined data on the PSR J0737-3039 are not available, and the published [10] errors in measurement of  $P_b$  in the last case are still considerably larger than that for PSR B1913+16 in 1993. Farther observations of both pulsars could improve the precision in the estimation of  $G$  variations.

### Acknowledgement

Author is grateful to Dr. Marco Merenna and the Physics Department of the University La Sapienza, for hospitality during the work on this paper.

### References

- [1] J. D. Anderson, J. W. Armstrong, J. K. Campbell, et al. *Space Science Reviews* 60 (1992) 591.
- [2] K. A. Bronnikov, V. N. Melnikov and M. Novello, *Grav. & Cosmol. Suppl.* II (2002) 18.
- [3] T. Damour, N. Deruelle, *Ann. Inst. H. Poincaré (Physique Théorique)* 44 (1986) 263.
- [4] T. Damour, G. W. Gibbons, J. H. Taylor, *Physical Review Letters* 61 (1988) 1151.
- [5] J. O. Dickey, P. L. Bender, J. E. Faller, et al., *Science* 265 (1994) 482.
- [6] P. A. M. Dirac, *Nature* 139, (1937) 323.
- [7] H. Fritzsch, *Lecture Notes in Physics* 648 (2004) 107.
- [8] R. W. Hellings et al., *Phys. Rev. Lett.* 51 (1983) 1609.
- [9] V. M. Kaspi, J. H. Taylor, M. F. Ryba, *Astrophysical Journal* 428 (1994) 713.
- [10] M. Kramer, D. R. Lorimer, A. G. Lyne et al. *astro-ph/0503386*.
- [11] L. D. Landau and E. M. Lifshits, *Mechanics*, Moscow, Nauka, 1988.
- [12] A. G. Lyne, M. Burgay, M. Kramer et al., *Science* 303 (2004) 1153.
- [13] V. N. Melnikov, *International Journal of Modern Physics A* 17 (2002) 4325.
- [14] C. Michel, *Theory of neutron star magnetospheres*. University of Chicago Press, 1991.

- [15] E.M ilne, P roc. Roy. Soc. A 158, (1937) 324.
- [16] J.H .Taylor, C lassical and Q uantum G ravity 10 (1993) 167.
- [17] J.H .Taylor, Rev M od. Phys. 66 (1994) 711.
- [18] J.Ph.U zan, Reviews of M odern Physics, 75 (2003) 403.
- [19] D .A .Varshalovich, A .Y .Potekhin, Space Science Rev. 74 (1995) 259.
- [20] J.G .W illiam s, S.G .Turyshch, D .H .Boggs, Physical Review Letters, 93 (2004) 261101.
- [21] Y .S.W u, Z.W ang, Phys.Rev.Lett. 57 (1986) 1978.