

Gravitational contributions to the electron g -factor

Andrew G. Cohen*

Institute for Advanced Study, Hong Kong University of Science and Technology, Hong Kong

David B. Kaplan[†]

Institute for Nuclear Theory, Box 351550, University of Washington, Seattle, WA 98195-1550

In a previous paper, the authors with Ann Nelson proposed that the UV and IR applicability of effective quantum field theories should be constrained by requiring that strong gravitational effects are nowhere encountered in a theory's domain of validity [Phys. Rev. Lett. 82, 4971 (1999)]. The constraint was proposed to delineate the boundary beyond which conventional quantum field theory, viewed as an effective theory excluding quantum gravitational effects, might be expected to break down. In this Letter we revisit this idea and show that quantum gravitational effects could lead to a deviation of size $(\alpha/2\pi)\sqrt{m_e/M_p}$ from the Standard Model calculation for the electron magnetic moment. This is the same size as QED and hadronic uncertainties in the theory of a_e , and a little more than one order of magnitude smaller than both the dominant uncertainty in its Standard Model value arising from the accuracy with which α is measured, as well as the experimental uncertainty in measurement of a_e .

Effective field theory is a technique to exclude high energy single-particle states from a theory's Hilbert space and construct a Hamiltonian that accurately describes the physics of the remaining low energy states. Hermiticity within this restricted space ensures that these low energy states do not evolve out of the restricted Hilbert space with time. This requires not only modifying interactions between light degrees of freedom to account for the virtual effects of the excluded particles, but also restricting the allowed particle density; otherwise, an initial state with many widely separated low energy particles could evolve to a denser state with sufficient energy to produce the excluded heavy particles. An example of such an effective theory is a lattice version of QCD with lattice spacing a providing a UV cutoff $\Lambda \sim \pi/a$ on the energy of single-particle states. This lattice theory also limits the energy density of multi-particle states to $\lesssim O(\Lambda^4)$: for fermions the density is restricted by the Pauli principle that allows at most two particles per lattice site, while photons and gluons are represented by compact link variables with similarly bounded energy density¹. Viewed as an effective field theory for the Standard Model with $\Lambda = O(1 \text{ GeV})$ there are no states on the lattice which in the full theory would evolve into propagating W bosons, while the effects of virtual W bosons are accounted for by irrelevant operators suppressed by powers of M_W .

It is conventional to treat quantum gravity similarly as a short distance phenomenon that can be incorporated into effective theories applicable at energies below the Planck Mass, M_p , by imposing a cutoff $\Lambda \ll M_p$, with small residual effects accounted for by irrelevant oper-

ators suppressed by powers of M_p . Weak gravitational effects are included by allowing a classical background metric with mild curvature. However, when formulated in infinite volume, such an effective theory unavoidably allows low energy particles to collapse into what would be a black hole in General Relativity, even with an arbitrarily low UV cutoff. In the full theory including gravity this would cause the formation of a spacetime singularity (or some quantum smoothed version of one) hidden behind a horizon; this black hole would emit Hawking radiation and shrink until the spacetime curvature at the horizon reaches the Planck scale, where quantum gravitational effects become important. This superficially looks like many low energy particles in lattice QCD being allowed to converge to create propagating W bosons, which is avoided by limiting the local energy density; in the gravitational case, however, there is no local constraint that can avoid black hole creation (which can occur at arbitrarily low energy density), nor black hole evaporation (which can occur by the emission of low energy particles). While this discussion treats black holes semiclassically, presumably black hole events can also arise from quantum fluctuations in such a theory. Therefore a quantum field theory attempting to relegate the effects of quantum gravity to irrelevant operators suppressed by powers of the Planck mass cannot be fully consistent. While perhaps it is possible to make rigorous sense of a quantum field theory that treats quantum gravity as a short distance phenomenon, it must be recognized that it does not behave like a conventional healthy effective field theory: a theory that excludes quantum gravity with corrections parametrized by Newton's constant is very different than one that excludes quantum W bosons with corrections parametrized by Fermi's constant.

Nevertheless, there is no denying that quantum field theories where gravitational effects are parameterized by inverse powers of M_p seem to work just fine. Ref. [2]

¹ In a lattice Hamiltonian approach one would have to bound the magnitude of the electric field, such as by using compact variables for the electric field as in Ref. [1].

(CKN) argued that such a theory makes sense provided it is formulated in finite volume, providing an IR cutoff, with a particular constraint between the UV and IR cutoffs. That work then analyzed whether one could experimentally tell the difference between such a modified effective theory and the conventional one. CKN concluded that there were important differences between the conventional and IR-modified theories, with the size of gravitational effects at an energy scale E scaling with a lower power of E/M_p than expected from M_p -suppressed irrelevant operators. Unfortunately, detection of these exotic effects seemed out of reach of (then) current and future experiments. Recently, however, it was pointed out that part of the CKN analysis included an error in estimating certain IR effects [3]. In this Letter we reanalyze the CKN theory taking into account this correction. Our conclusion is that gravitational corrections to the electron ($g-2$) scale as $\sqrt{m_e/M_p}$ instead of $(m_e/M_p)^{2/3}$ as stated in Ref. [2], and the deviation from the Standard Model is tantalizingly close to the current experimental and theoretical errors in the experimental determinations of ($g-2$) and α . Notably these effects may be within reach of experiments in the foreseeable future.

As we have argued, in a world with gravity it is not possible to exclude gravitational effects in an effective theory in infinite volume by means of local constraints on the fields. The CKN starting point was to discard the notion that an effective theory can be used with a given UV cutoff in an arbitrarily large volume. By requiring that the theory not evolve states into black holes CKN arrived at a simple constraint between the cutoff Λ and size L of such a theory:

$$\Lambda^2 L \lesssim M_p. \quad (1)$$

This constraint relating UV and IR cutoffs implies that the usual procedure of sending both Λ and L to infinity is not possible, and consequently unavoidable uncertainties in perturbative quantum field theoretic calculations remain even at arbitrarily small coupling. As discussed in [2], this bound is more stringent than one might argue based on simple holographic considerations.

While this argument makes no presumptions regarding the cosmological constant problem, intriguingly the Standard Model with IR cutoff L set to the current horizon size has a UV cutoff from eq. (1) of $\Lambda \sim 10^{-3}$ eV and a resulting vacuum energy consistent with the observed cosmological acceleration. There have been various cosmological models proposed exploiting a UV/IR constraint to explain the dark energy, such as Ref. [4], but while they are intriguing, it would be more compelling to find evidence for the UV/IR constraint in terrestrial experiments. Since the most accurate tests of quantum field theory are the ($g-2$) of the electron and muon, it makes sense to consider what happens to the calculation

of these at one loop ².

The conventional 1-loop result for $a \equiv (g-2)/2$ for a lepton of mass m is

$$a(L, \Lambda) = \frac{4\alpha m^2}{\pi} \int_0^1 dx \int_0^{(1-x)} dy (x+y)(1-x-y) \times \int_0^\infty dk \frac{k^3}{(k^2 + \Delta)^3}, \quad (2)$$

with $\Delta = m^2(x+y)^2$. Although the k integral is finite, the CKN prescription evaluates it with an IR cutoff $k_{\min} = 2\pi/L$ and a UV cutoff $k_{\max} = \Lambda$. The result is

$$a(L, \Lambda) = \left(\frac{\alpha}{2\pi}\right) \left(1 - \frac{\pi^2}{mL} - \frac{m^2}{3\Lambda^2} + \dots\right), \quad (3)$$

where the first term is Schwinger's classic result, and we have kept only the leading³ dependence on L and Λ . The UV/IR constraint in eq. (1) restricts us to a 1-parameter set of effective theories: choosing a large UV cutoff to minimize the sensitivity to UV physics necessitates taking a low IR cutoff which increases sensitivity to large extended states. Our best strategy to reduce sensitivity to strong gravitational effects is to minimize the combined UV and IR corrections in the above result. Minimization is achieved by choosing cutoffs

$$\Lambda \sim m \left(\frac{M_p}{m}\right)^{1/4}, \quad L \sim \frac{1}{m} \left(\frac{M_p}{m}\right)^{1/2}. \quad (4)$$

For $m = m_e$, this results in $\Lambda \simeq 200$ GeV and $L \simeq 6$ cm, and yields the minimum deviation from the Schwinger one-loop result:

$$a - \frac{\alpha}{2\pi} \sim \frac{\alpha}{2\pi} \sqrt{\frac{m}{M_p}} = \begin{cases} 10^{-14} & m = m_e \\ 10^{-13} & m = m_\mu \end{cases}. \quad (5)$$

We emphasize that we are not pretending to compute corrections to a_e from quantum gravity—but only the intrinsic uncertainty to the calculation in an effective theory that excludes gravity.

These deviations from the conventional result are experimentally interesting for the electron. Current experimental and theoretical values for a_e are quoted in Ref. [11–13] as

$$a_e^{\text{th}}(\text{Rb}) = 1\,159\,652\,180.252\,(95)(11)(12) \times 10^{-12}, \\ a_e^{\text{th}}(\text{Cs}) = 1\,159\,652\,181.606\,(229)(11)(12) \times 10^{-12},$$

² We note that there have been other suggestions in recent years for terrestrial experiments to find novel gravitational effects arising from an IR/UV correspondence, although they do not appear to be related to what we discuss here [5–9].

³ Ref. [2] erred in finding a leading L dependence of $1/L^2$ instead of $1/L$; however, it should be noted that that reference advocates a different interpretation to the UV/IR constraint eq. (1) and predicts a negligible effect on ($g-2$). The $1/L$ behavior was noted in [10].

where the two values depend on whether one uses the measurement of α from atomic experiments using Rb [14] or Cs [12] respectively. The three errors quoted are due to uncertainties in the measurement of α , numerical evaluation of tenth order QED, and hadronic contributions respectively ⁴.

Currently the best experimental measurement of a_e is given by [15]

$$a_e^{\text{expt}} = 1\,159\,652\,180.73 (28) \times 10^{-12}. \quad (6)$$

We see that the hadronic and QED uncertainties in the theoretical value are at the 10^{-14} level, roughly the same size as the deviation we find in eq. (5), while the experimental uncertainties in α and a_e are about one order of magnitude larger. Therefore, while observing the $(\alpha/2\pi)\sqrt{m_e/M_p}$ discrepancy would require significant progress in both experiment and theory, such progress is entirely possible. The same cannot be said for the muon, given that current experimental and theoretical uncertainties in a_μ are at the 10^{-10} level [16], three orders of magnitude larger than the expected $(\alpha/2\pi)\sqrt{m_\mu/M_p}$ deviation.

Our truncation of the Hilbert space through simultaneous UV and IR cutoffs on (Euclidean) momenta is admittedly crude but has the virtues of respecting manifest Lorentz invariance and allowing for a simple power counting. It should be noted that Banks and Draper in Ref. [3] reinterpret the bound eq. (1) in terms of a scale-dependent modification in the density of states and arrive at a much smaller (and unmeasurable) deviation for $(g-2)$ than we obtain in eq. (5). If such an approach can be made precise it would be most welcome, but we do not currently know how to implement a scale-dependent depletion of states that shares the above virtues.

This work is dedicated to the memory of Ann Nelson. We thank Tom Banks, Howard Georgi, Martin Hoferichter, and Dam Son for useful communications. This research was supported in part by DOE Grant No. DE-FG02-00ER41132, and by Grant No AoE/P-404/18-3 of the Research Grants Council of Hong Kong S.A.R.

* acohen@ust.hk

† dbkaplan@uw.edu

[1] David B. Kaplan and Jesse R. Stryker. Gauss’s law, duality, and the Hamiltonian formulation of U(1) lattice gauge theory. *Phys. Rev. D*, 102(9):094515, 2020.

- [2] Andrew G. Cohen, David B. Kaplan, and Ann E. Nelson. Effective field theory, black holes, and the cosmological constant. *Phys. Rev. Lett.*, 82:4971–4974, 1999.
- [3] Tom Banks and Patrick Draper. Remarks on the Cohen-Kaplan-Nelson bound. *Phys. Rev. D*, 101(12):126010, 2020.
- [4] Miao Li. A model of holographic dark energy. *Physics Letters B*, 603(1-2):1–5, 2004.
- [5] Aaron Chou, Henry Glass, H Richard Gustafson, Craig Hogan, Brittany L Kamai, Ohkyung Kwon, Robert Lanza, Lee McCuller, Stephan S Meyer, Jonathan Richardson, et al. The holometer: an instrument to probe planckian quantum geometry. *Classical and Quantum Gravity*, 34(6):065005, 2017.
- [6] Aaron Chou, Henry Glass, H Richard Gustafson, Craig J Hogan, Brittany L Kamai, Ohkyung Kwon, Robert Lanza, Lee McCuller, Stephan S Meyer, Jonathan W Richardson, et al. Interferometric constraints on quantum geometrical shear noise correlations. *Classical and Quantum Gravity*, 34(16):165005, 2017.
- [7] Erik P. Verlinde and Kathryn M. Zurek. Observational signatures of quantum gravity in interferometers, 2019.
- [8] Erik Verlinde and Kathryn M. Zurek. Spacetime fluctuations in ads/cft. *Journal of High Energy Physics*, 2020(4), Apr 2020.
- [9] Kathryn M. Zurek. On vacuum fluctuations in quantum gravity and interferometer arm fluctuations, 2020.
- [10] Zohreh Davoudi and Martin J Savage. Finite-volume electromagnetic corrections to the masses of mesons, baryons, and nuclei. *Physical Review D*, 90(5):054503, 2014.
- [11] Léo Morel, Zhibin Yao, Pierre Cladé, and Saïda Guellati-Khélifa. Determination of the fine-structure constant with an accuracy of 81 parts per trillion. *Nature*, 588(7836):61–65, 2020.
- [12] Richard H Parker, Chenghui Yu, Weicheng Zhong, Brian Estey, and Holger Müller. Measurement of the fine-structure constant as a test of the standard model. *Science*, 360(6385):191–195, 2018.
- [13] Tatsuaki Aoyama, Toichiro Kinoshita, and Makiko Nio. Theory of the anomalous magnetic moment of the electron. *Atoms*, 7(1):28, 2019.
- [14] Rym Bouchendira, Pierre Cladé, Saïda Guellati-Khélifa, Fran çois Nez, and Fran çois Biraben. New determination of the fine structure constant and test of the quantum electrodynamics. *Phys. Rev. Lett.*, 106:080801, Feb 2011.
- [15] D. Hanneke, S. Fogwell, and G. Gabrielse. New measurement of the electron magnetic moment and the fine structure constant. *Phys. Rev. Lett.*, 100:120801, Mar 2008.
- [16] T. Aoyama et al. The anomalous magnetic moment of the muon in the Standard Model. *Phys. Rept.*, 887:1–166, 2020.

⁴ The theoretical extraction of α from atomic experiments also incurs uncertainties $\delta\alpha/\alpha$ from the truncation of the Hilbert space, at the level one part in $\alpha/2\pi\sqrt{m_e/M_p} \sim 10^{-14}$. However, this is

much smaller than the current quoted error of one part in 10^{-10} . The enhanced sensitivity of $(g-2)$ to gravitational effects stems from the fact that leading contributions to it are radiative corrections.