

The Coupling of Linearized Gravity to Non-Relativistic Test Particles: Dynamics in the General Laboratory Frame

A. D. Speliotopoulos* and Raymond Y. Chiao†

Department of Physics, University of California, Berkeley, CA 94720-7300

(Dated: February 11, 2003)

The coupling of gravity to matter is explored in the linearized gravity limit. The usual derivation of gravity-matter couplings within the quantum-field-theoretic framework is reviewed. A number of inconsistencies between this derivation of the couplings and the known results of tidal effects on test particles from classical general relativity are pointed out. As a step towards resolving these inconsistencies, the dynamics of non-relativistic test particles in the linearized gravity limit are studied, and a General Laboratory Frame fixed on the worldline of an observer is constructed to make contact with experiment. The Hamiltonian dynamics for the particle is derived in this frame. For stationary metrics this Hamiltonian reduces to the usual Hamiltonian for non-relativistic particles undergoing geodesic motion. In the presence of long-wavelength gravitational waves (GWs), on the other hand, it reduces to the Hamiltonian for a non-relativistic particle undergoing geodesic *deviation* motion. Arbitrary GWs couple to the test particle through a vector potential-like field N_a that induces a local velocity field on the system. This N_a is the result of the tidal forces that the GW induces in the system. As with the vector potential of electromagnetism, effective electric and magnetic fields obeying Maxwell's equations can be constructed from N_a . These electric and magnetic fields are directly related to the electric and magnetic parts of the Weyl tensor. An Aharonov-Bohm-type experiment measure the interference of quantum test particles follows using N_a .

PACS numbers: 04.20.Cv, 04.25.-g, 04.30.Nk

I. INTRODUCTION

At first glance it would seem that the Hamiltonian dynamics of non-relativistic, classical test particles in the linearized gravity limit have been thoroughly studied, and are well understood. Indeed, in this limit gravitational waves (GW) are often treated as simply a spin-2 gauge field propagating in flat Minkowski spacetime [1], and the coupling of GWs to matter would seem to follow naturally. This determination would be premature, however. It would serve only to obfuscate the underlying physics of the system, and would overlook certain surprising links between gravitational waves, vector potentials, and gauge symmetries.

Much of our current understanding of the coupling of matter to gravity comes from attempts at constructing quantum gravity (QG) [1, 2, 3, 4], and from the theory of quantum fields in curved spacetime (QFCS) [5, 6]. Once the Lagrangians for various elementary particles—both gauge, and non-gauge—were determined in flat Minkowski spacetime, their extension to curved spacetimes were a natural next step. Once this was accomplished, detailed expressions for the interaction of gravity with these particles were then read off.

To make this extension of the flat spacetime Lagrangians to curved spacetimes, a number of seemingly natural assumptions are typically made with the expecta-

tion that the experience and intuition gained from constructing QFTs in flat spacetime will have served as a useful guide in constructing the QFTs in curved spacetimes. Thus, flat spacetime Lagrangians for bosonic fields are promoted to curved spacetimes by replacing the Minkowski metric with the metric for a curved spacetime, the partial derivative with the covariant derivative, and the Lorentz-invariant integration measure with a general-coordinate-transformation-invariant integration measure. Extension of fermionic fields, such as spin-1/2 and -3/2 fermions, follow in much the same way once a tetrad frame is chosen. The Hilbert action from classical general relativity (GR) is used for the gravity component of the theory, and the metric for the spacetime $g_{\mu\nu}$ is identified with the gravitational field's degree of freedom. A classical background metric $g_{\mu\nu}^0$ for the spacetime is chosen—in [1] it was flat Minkowski spacetime, and in [2, 3, 4] it was either an asymptotically flat spacetime or a spacetime with finite spatial extent—and the propagating component of the gravitational field is extracted from the theory by considering fluctuations $h_{\mu\nu}$ about $g_{\mu\nu}^0$ combined with a suitable gauge (coordinate) choice. These fluctuations—which are gravitational waves (GWs) in GR and gravitons in QG—are then expanded about $g_{\mu\nu}^0$ so that $h_{\mu\nu} = g_{\mu\nu} - g_{\mu\nu}^0$ are small compared to $g_{\mu\nu}^0$; they are treated as simply another spin-2 non-Abelian gauge field propagating in a background spacetime. By also expanding the metric terms about $g_{\mu\nu}^0$ in the Lagrangians for the matter fields, one obtains terms that couple GWs or gravitons with matter. Thus it would seem that these interaction terms are fixed by the field's corresponding flat spacetime Lagrangians

*Electronic address: adspelio@uclink.berkeley.edu

†Electronic address: chiao@physics.berkeley.edu;
URL: physics.berkeley.edu/research/chiao/

along with the accepted prescription for promoting them to curved spacetimes.

We currently do not have a quantum theory of gravity, of course. Neither the quantum field theory (QFT) defined in [1, 2, 3, 4] nor its extension to supergravity, which encompasses supersymmetry, are renormalizable. However, it is generally believed that the classical limit of a quantum theory of gravity would have, to lowest order, Lagrangians of the form constructed in [1, 2, 3, 4]. Indeed, this is the underlying premise of QFCS where the matter components of the theory are quantized, and the gravity component of the theory is treated as a fixed, classical background field. It is also believed that in the weak gravity limit QG makes sense at the tree-level (without the inclusion of loop diagrams). It is these underlying beliefs concerning what the classical limit of QG *should* look like, and how these Lagrangians are constructed that are important for our purposes, not whether or not a consistent theory of QG exists. Moreover, we shall always take care to use examples in the weak gravity limit where the tree-level description of QG is expected to make sense for doing calculations.

As natural, and as straightforward, as the above prescription is for determining the coupling of matter to gravity, it nevertheless makes a number of implicit assumptions. When one tries to reconcile these assumptions with classical GR, a number of troubling questions come immediately to the fore.

The first implicit assumption is that measuring apparatuses do not play a role in the theory. That is, when calculating the various effects caused by the interaction of gravity with matter—such as, say, the scattering cross-section of GWs—one does not have to explicitly include the measuring apparatus. This assumption is certainly true for all the other forces of nature; one can always choose the measuring apparatus to be electrically neutral when measuring electromagnetic (EM) phenomenon, and the confinement of quarks ensures that the apparatus can be made “color neutral” as well. The existence of opposite or canceling “charges” for the EM, weak, and strong forces thus ensures that one can, in principle, make the measuring apparatus transparent to these forces. This is *not* true for gravity, however: one cannot screen out gravity. Why, then, should we not include the measuring apparatus explicitly in the construction of QG or of QFCS?

One may argue that the scattering processes considered in quantum gravity occurs at very short length-scales—the Planck length—and the presence of any measuring apparatus will have negligibly small effect. However, we would expect from the correspondence principle that classical gravity results could be obtained—in some limit—from the quantum theory; indeed, the construction of QG [1, 2, 3, 4] makes explicit use of the classical theory. And in classical GR it is well-known that the inclusion of measuring apparatus—along with the observer—is crucial to understanding the dynamics of certain general relativistic systems involving tidal forces.

Consider, for example, an isolated observer and a classical test particle initially at rest some distance away from him. While both the observer and the particle do not move spatially with respect to one another, they are both physical objects that move along their respective geodesics. If a GW now passes through the system, tidal forces will of course shift the position and the velocity of the particle. These tidal forces will *also* shift the position and the velocity of the observer; the observer cannot be isolated from the *tidal* effects of the GW. Thus, the observer cannot measure the motion of the particle independent of his own motion; he can only measure the *relative* motion of the particle with respect to himself. For GWs in the long-wavelength limit, the particle appears to the observer to undergo geodesic *deviation* motion (eq. 35.12 of [7]), and not geodesic motion as one might first expect. Indeed, a simple derivation of the geodesic deviation equation in this limit is to take the geodesic equation for the observer, subtract from it the geodesic equation of the particle, and expand the result in the distance separating the two geodesics.

Based on this simple example we would expect that any physically measurable response of matter to the scattering of GWs calculated by using either QG or QFCS should include the effect of the GW on the observer. By extension, we would expect that to be consistent with classical GR, the construction of QG or QFCS should explicitly include the observer (and his measurement apparatus) from the very beginning.

It may also be argued that, as with the other forces, explicit inclusion of an observer would be formally correct, but not required; the lack of its inclusion would not materially affect any calculation. However, this argument would also be in conflict with general relativity. There are indications that calculation of the physical responses of quantum systems to GWs may be significantly different when the observer is explicitly included.

Consider once again the simple system described above. When the geodesic deviation equations of motion are solved, one finds that the observed *tidal* response of the test particle to the passage of the long-wavelength GW is proportional to the distance separating the observer from the test particle; as long as the long-wavelength approximation holds, the further away the particle is from the observer, the larger its response to the GW. This ubiquitous response of classical matter to the passage of a GW is exploited in various GW detectors such as the Weber bar and LIGO: the larger the detector, the larger its response to the passage of a GW. The characteristic size L of the detector—which is an *extensive* quantity—*does* play a role in how the system responds to the GW by introducing another length-scale to the system.

What if we now use either QG or QFCS to calculate the response of a Weber bar or some other material object with a characteristic size L ? Will its response to a GW (or graviton) depend on L to lowest order as we would expect from classical GR?

Consider, for example, a material with a characteristic size L which, at some level of approximation, can be described microscopically with a complex scalar field Ψ in flat spacetime. Using the above quantum-field-theoretic prescription, to lowest order the coupling between a GW propagating in Minkowski spacetime with Ψ is $\sim h_{\mu\nu}\partial^\mu\Psi^\dagger\partial^\nu\Psi$. In this example $h_{\mu\nu}$ could either be treated as a classical field within the QFCS formalism, or a quantum field within QG. Since any GW passing through an Earth-bound system is expected to be very weak, we would expect perturbation theory to work extremely well in this case.

A schematic of the Feynman diagram for this interaction vertex is shown in FIG. 1a. Details about the vertex and the difficulties in fixing the gauge of $h_{\mu\nu}$ are not directly relevant to our arguments and are suppressed. What is relevant is that the coupling constant for the interaction $\sim G^{1/2}$, where G is Newton's constant, and that the vertex depends on the polarization tensor $\epsilon_{\mu\nu}$ for the GW. The direction of time for the frame—the observer's frame—in which calculations using this diagram is explicitly drawn in. As usual, the *location* of this observer with respect to where the interaction occurs does not matter.

As natural and as straightforward as the diagram in FIG. 1a may seem to be, in many-body physics calculations of the response properties of materials using interaction vertices such as shown in FIG. 1a will result in *intensive* quantities that do not explicitly depend on the size of the system; indeed, at the end of any calculation the volume of the “bounding box” is taken to infinity. It is therefore difficult to see how any calculations of the response of matter to the passage of GWs, within the current framework of QG and QFCS, can depend on such an extensive quantity L , and yet such a dependence is expected from classical GR due to the tidal nature of GWs.

How would the calculation of the response function of extended material objects to GWs be changed if the measuring apparatus (observer) is included in the constructing QG or QFCS? Explicit inclusion of the measuring apparatus in the formulation of these theories has not been done yet. However, by straightforwardly extrapolating the results of our analysis in this paper to field theory, we can gain some measure of knowledge as to how the coupling of GW to the scalar field *may* be modified with this inclusion.

As we shall see, the coupling of GWs (of arbitrary wavelength) to a test particle takes the form of a vector-current coupling $N_a p^a$ (a is the spatial index and runs from 1-3) where p_a is the particle's momentum (see eq. (37)). This N_a is due to the *tidal* nature of the forces the GW induces on the test particle. For planar GWs in the transverse-traceless (TT) gauge, $N_a = \dot{h}_{ab}X^b/2$ where X^b is the position of the particle as measured from the center of mass of the observer's experimental apparatus. (Strange though the form of N_a may be, the equations of motion of a classical test particle that

are derived using N_a does agree with eq. 35.12 of [7] in the long-wavelength limit.) We would thus expect that, for the scalar field, the coupling will be $N_a j^a$ where $j_a = (\partial_a\Psi^\dagger\Psi - \Psi^\dagger\partial_a\Psi)/(2mi)$ is the usual non-relativistic current. After taking the Fourier transform of N_a , we once again get a Feynman diagram for this interaction vertex, which is shown in FIG. 1b. Once again, many of the details of the vertex—including the detail effects of the finite size of the system—are left out for clarity. We note, however, that because of the presence of X^a in N_a , the location of the observer with respect to where the GW interacts with matter now *does* matter; this is represented schematically by including the distance from the time axis of the observer's worldline to the Feynman vertex in FIG. 1b. The characteristic size of the system L now explicitly appears and modifies the strength of the vertex: $G^{1/2} \rightarrow G^{1/2}L$. Calculations of the responses of matter to the GW using the $N_a j^a$ will automatically depend on the size of the system in agreement with what we would expect from classical GR due to tidal effects.

The second implicit assumption made in [1] and [2, 3, 4] is that one can always find a global time axis—and thereby construct a global coordinate system—in the curved spacetime. This is certainly possible for flat Minkowski spacetime, which is often used as the background spacetime. It is also possible for the asymptotically flat manifold that DeWitt considers in [2]. However, we know from classical GR that it is not possible to find a coordinate system with a global time axis in general.

The Minkowski spacetime and asymptotically flat spacetimes—along with the various black hole spacetimes—are *stationary* spacetimes. In these spacetimes one can always choose a frame where the metric does not depend explicitly on the time coordinate. Consequently, one can always construct a *global* timelike Killing vector, which can be used by all observers in the spacetime as their time axis (except, perhaps, at the event horizon or at the essential singularity). This Killing vector can then be used to construct what DeWitt termed the preferred frame, or as Hawking and Ellis termed it, a special frame [8] that all observers in that spacetime can agree to use.

Timelike Killing vectors—and global frames—do not exist in general, however. More importantly, they do not exist in the presence of a GW. Instead, each observer must choose his own local time axis, the one that is most convenient for him, and construct his own local coordinate system from this time axis. Consequently, one can only measure the *relative* motion between observers. This is the underlying physical reason why, in the example given above, one ends up with the geodesic *deviation* equation of motion from [7] in the long-wavelength limit for GWs.

Although the above point is made very elegantly in the beginning of Chapter 4 of [8] for classical GR, it is relevant on the quantum level as well. As pointed out in both Chapter 3 of [5] and Chapter 3 of [6], the construction of Fock spaces for quantum fields in a curved spacetime is frame dependent; different choices of coordinates result




Fig. 1a




Fig. 1b

FIG. 1: Sketches of the Feynman diagrams for the lowest order graviton-scalar field interaction. Fig. 1a shows the standard Feynman diagram with vertex strength $G^{1/2}$ and polarization vector ϵ where we have suppressed the indices for clarity. Fig. 1b shows schematically the same Feynman diagram when the observer is explicitly included. The location and distance X_a from the observer to the interaction is relevant, and the coupling strength changes to $G^{1/2}L$, where L is the typical size of the system. This would then be consistent with the tidal nature of the interaction of GWs on matter expected from classical GR.

in unitarily *inequivalent* Hilbert spaces. Thus, only for such spacetimes as the stationary and De Sitter spacetimes (considered also by DeWitt in [2]) where there is a preferred frame will it be possible that all observers can agree on what constitutes a particle state. It does not exist in general (see, however, page of [6] for a discussion of the relevance of the concept of particles in general spacetimes).

Traditionally, there is an almost linear progression of approximations that we usually associated with GR. A schematic of this hierarchy of approximations is sketched in FIG. 2a. Within full GR we can make the linearized gravity approximation, which is thought to be inclusive of both the PPN (stationary) and the GW (non-stationary) limits. We can, with further restrictions, then pass over to either the PPN limit or the GW limit within this linearized approximation. Based on the arguments above and the results of our analysis in this paper, we find the separation between the PPN and GW limits to occur at a much higher level; the dynamics of particles in stationary spacetimes are drastically different from those in non-stationary spacetimes. This conclusion is consistent with [8], [5] and [6], all of whom note differences between dynamical theories in stationary versus non-stationary spacetimes. Thus, instead of the standard formulation consisting of the linear sequence of approximations in Fig. 2a, we should, as shown in FIG. 2b, instead separate the dynamics in stationary versus non-stationary spacetimes from the start.

As dissimilar as the two above implicit assumptions may appear to be on the surface, they are intimately connected. The experimental measurement of any physical quantity requires an operational choice of origin and local orthogonal (tetrad) coordinate system. As any measurement is done through a physical apparatus, this mathematical choice of coordinate systems is fixed on a real physical object. The inclusion of the observer in the theory is thus equivalent to a choice of local coordinates; a choice of local coordinates must be equivalent to the inclusion of the physical observer.

Although we have pointed out in the above a number of inconsistencies between results from classical GR on the one hand, and QG and QFCS on the other, the goal of this paper is *not* to present a different formulation of either QG or QFCS; we leave that task to future research. We will instead address the issues raised by the two assumptions in the above by focusing on the dynamics of a much simpler system: the non-relativistic, classical test particle in weak gravity. As simple as this system may be, especially when compared to the counterexamples we have listed above, many of the issues that we have raised above appear here as well. Fundamentally, what is at issue here is the appropriate choice of coordinates; this is an inherent aspect of classical GR, and is not due to any subtlety in the quantum theory.

An analysis based on the dynamics of classical test particles has the added advantage of having limiting cases that have either been experimentally verified, or are in the process of being verified. In one limit, the Eötvös experiment, the advancement of the perihelion of Mercury, and the gravitational red shift are all calculable within the usual dynamics of test particles in stationary spacetimes based on the geodesic equation. In the other limit, the response of LIGO to the passage of GWs is calculable within the dynamics of test particles based on the geodesic deviation equation [7]. The result of the anal-




FIG. 2a




FIG. 2b

FIG. 2: Fig. 2a is a schematic of the hierarchy of approximations that we usually associate with GR. Fig. 2b is the modified hierarchy based on the results of this paper. Notice the explicit separation between stationary and non-stationary spacetimes.

ysis in this paper *must* agree with these two limits; this serves as a stringent test of the validity of the approach we have taken, and the coordinate system we have constructed. It is hoped that with a correct coordinate system at hand—albeit for a non-relativistic system—many of the questions we raised in the above can then be answered for quantum field theories in a curved spacetimes.

In the literature most analyses of the dynamics of test particles in curved spacetime are done in the same vein as the construction of QG and QFT in curved spacetimes: They are a direct generalization of the usual techniques for deriving Hamiltonians from Lagrangians for particles in flat spacetimes. One starts with the usual geodesic action for the test particle moving in an arbitrary curved spacetime with a given metric $g_{\mu\nu}$. Time reparametrization invariance of the action is broken either by choosing an explicit time coordinate, or by introducing a mass-shell constraint (by hand or through a Lagrange multiplier). Choosing x^μ as the general coordinate, the canonical momentum p_μ is calculated from the Lagrangian. The Hamiltonian H_{SF} (SF for “standard formalism”) is then constructed from this p_μ and the Lagrangian in the usual way. An analysis similar to this was followed by DeWitt

in his 1957 paper [9], albeit in much more detail, and in 1966 he applied the non-relativistic limit of H_{SF} for charged test particles to the analysis of the behavior of superconductors in the Earth’s Lense-Thirring field [10].

It would seem that all we would have to do is to take the non-relativistic limit of H_{SF} . However, the form of H_{SF} is dramatically different from the Hamiltonian derived in [11] based on the geodesic deviation equations of motion. As with the case of QG and QFCS the same troubling questions come to the fore at this point: Where is the observer? What are physical quantities such as the position \vec{x} , and velocity \vec{v} of the particle measured with respect to? What frame has been implicitly chosen by this analysis? Is this frame physical? We know from the observer—test-particle example given above that these are not fatuous questions. Rather, they directly address the underlying physics.

It is certainly true that in some specific cases—such as the presence of a weak GW in the system—one can treat the time-varying part of the metric as a perturbation of one of the known stationary metrics; this time-varying piece would then be reflected as a perturbation on the Killing vector. One could then use the usual coordinate

system for these spacetimes—augmented by the inclusion of the observer and his coordinate system—and calculate H_{SF} in the usual way. However, doing so will not elucidate the underlying physics.

The approach we shall take in studying the dynamics of non-relativistic test particles in the linearized gravity limit will be to construct a general coordinate system that builds in the essential physics from the very beginning. Since relative measurements between the observer and the particle always make physical sense, they are used as the foundation of our construction; the special case of stationary metrics will naturally be included. Specifically, we follow the considerations of [12] and [13]: Every physical particle travels along a worldline $\Gamma_c(\tau)$ with tangent vector c^μ (which does not need to be a geodesic) in the spacetime manifold \mathbb{M} . Every measurement of the physical properties of the test particle by an observer must be done using an experimental apparatus. The observer—along with his apparatus—must propagate along his own worldline $\Gamma_u(\tau)$ with tangent vector u^μ . Consequently, every physical measurement of the particle is done relative to the motion of an observer. In particular, in measuring the position of the particle, one measures the distance *separating* $\Gamma_c(\tau)$ and $\Gamma_u(\tau)$; in measuring the 4-velocity of the particle one measures of the *relative* velocity of the particle with respect to the observer [7].

Implementation of the above considerations proceeds quite naturally. As the observer prepares to take measurements on the test particle, he first chooses a local orthonormal coordinate system. In curved spacetimes, this involves the construction of a local tetrad frame [12]. Naturally, this coordinate system will be fixed to, say, the center-of-mass of his experimental apparatus, and will thus propagate in time along the worldline $\Gamma_u(\tau)$ as well. The observer uses the coordinate time of the physical apparatus to measure time, which, because he will not be moving relative to the apparatus, is also his proper time. Thus the time axis of the coordinate system he has chosen will always lie tangentially to $\Gamma_u(\tau)$. The position—which can be of finite extent—of the test particle is measured with respect to an origin fixed on the apparatus, and is the shortest distance between this origin and the particle. However, because the apparatus travel along its worldline, the origin of the coordinate system will also travel along a worldline in \mathbb{M} . Later, when the rate of change of the position of the particle is measured at two successive times, the *relative* 4-velocity of the particle with respect to the apparatus will naturally be obtained. In other words, the observer constructs his usual laboratory frame that extends across his experimental apparatus, but now incorporating the non-trivial local curvature of \mathbb{M} . We call this frame the General Laboratory Frame (GLF).

Local coordinate systems fixed to an observer have been constructed before. The Fermi-Normal (FNC) coordinates were constructed in the 1920's by Fermi [14], and the Fermi-Walker (FWC) coordinates were constructed

in [12]. While an observer can use either set of coordinates, both make assumptions and approximations that drastically limit their usefulness. The FNC—a direct implementation of the equivalence principle—are constructed so that the Levi-Civita connection $\Gamma_{\mu\nu}^\alpha$ vanishes identically along the worldline of the observer; only when one moves off the worldline does the curvature dependent terms begin to appear [15]. For the FWC, the restrictions on $\Gamma_{\mu\nu}^\alpha$ are somewhat relaxed, but certain components of $\Gamma_{\mu\nu}^\alpha$ —such as $\Gamma_{\hat{0}\hat{b}}^{\hat{a}}$ where \hat{a}, \hat{b} are spatial indices—still vanish along the worldline. Once again, when one moves off the worldline curvature terms appear in the form of the Riemann tensor and its derivatives. In both, one effectively makes a derivative expansion in the Riemann tensor [16, 17, 18, 19].

In both FNC and FWC coordinate systems choices for the value of $\Gamma_{\mu\nu}^\alpha$ —a gauge choice—have been made, and in both systems such gauge choices are inconsistent with the usual TT gauge for GWs. While it is possible to study the interaction of GWs with test particles in these coordinate systems (see [20, 21, 22] for FNC and [23] for FWC), doing so is cumbersome. For example, it has only recently been established that the TT gauge for GWs is compatible with the FNC [24] only in the long wavelength limit; the two are incompatible when the wavelength is smaller than the size of the experimental apparatus. In our construction of the GLF, no restrictions on $\Gamma_{\mu\nu}^\alpha$ are made within the linearized gravity approximation. Thus, when we consider the case of GWs interacting with non-relativistic particles, the TT gauge—or any other gauge—can be directly taken. Moreover, we do not make any restrictions on how rapidly the Riemann tensor varies, and are not restricted to only the long-wavelength limit. This enables us to study the effects of arbitrary GWs on the motion of non-relativistic test particles in large systems.

It is here in our study of test particle dynamics that we obtain our most surprising result: Even though the underlying GW is a spin-2 tensor field, in the weak gravity, slow velocity limit, the GW acts on the particle through a local velocity field N_a . This velocity field—which depends on the spin-connection—couples to the test particle as though it was a vector potential for a spin-1 *vector* field (see also [25] for the additional terms that the spin-connection introduces in fermionic condensed matter systems and their implications), and its origin is the tidal nature of the forces that the GW induces on the test particle. It has the same properties as a vector potential: Like the vector potential for the EM-field A_a , N_a is a transverse field satisfying the wave equation. It is a frame-dependent field with the local Galilean group as its gauge group. Effective “electric” and “magnetic” fields can be constructed from N_a in the usual way, and they obey Maxwell-like equations because they are directly related to the electric and magnetic parts of the Weyl tensor, and thus to components of the Riemann tensor. The equations of motion for the non-relativistic particle have the form of a Lorentz force with the mass of

the particle playing the role of the charge. As required, they reduce to the usual geodesic deviation equations [7] in the long-wavelength limit.

The rest of this paper is organized as follows. In Section 2 we construct explicitly the GLF and its coordinates using a tetrad frame fixed to the worldline of the observer. The velocity of a test particle in the GLF is derived in the non-relativistic limit. In Section 3 we use these velocities to construct the action, and then the Hamiltonian for the test particle in the GLF. We show that for stationary \mathbb{M} this Hamiltonian reduces to DeWitt's Hamiltonian, and for long-wavelength TT GWs propagating in a flat background it reduces to the Hamiltonian [11] derived from the geodesic equation. In Section 4, we study the properties of the velocity field N_a introduced in Section 3 for arbitrary GWs, and construct effective electric and magnetic fields from it. These fields are shown to obey Maxwell's equations, and they are used to derive the equations of motion for a test particle. An Aharonov-Bohm-type interference effect for quantum test particles is shown to follow from the effective vector potential N_a can be found in Section 5 along with other concluding remarks. In Appendix A we present a very brief review of the tetrad and linearized gravity formalisms. In Appendix B, we derive the nonintegrable phase factor $\exp\{i(m/\hbar) \oint N_A dX^A\}$ for an Aharonov-Bohm-type interference effect.

II. CONSTRUCTION OF THE GLF

We begin with a word on notation. As usual, $g_{\mu\nu}(x)$ is the metric on the curved spacetime manifold \mathbb{M} with a signature $(-1, 1, 1, 1)$. Greek indices run from 0 to 3, and they denote the coordinates x^μ for a general coordinate system on \mathbb{M} . We will, however, be working primarily in one specific tetrad frame, and we will use capital Roman letters running from 0 to 3 for the spacetime indices in the frame. (A summary of well-known results for linearized gravity and tetrad frames is given in the Appendix A.) We reserve lower case Roman letters running from 1 to 3 for spatial indices in the tetrad frame, and hatted lower case Roman letters for spatial indices in the general coordinate frame. A worldline with a timelike tangent vector u^μ parameterized by τ is denoted as $\Gamma_u(\tau)$; it need not be a geodesic. Spacelike geodesics, with tangent vectors χ^μ and parameterized by its arclength s , are denoted by $\gamma_\chi(s)$, while null geodesics with tangent vectors π^μ and parameterized by its arclength σ are denoted by $\gamma_\pi(\sigma)$.

The construction of the GLF for the observer—being the specialization of the general tetrad frame to one that is fixed onto the worldline of the observer—is fairly standard. However, it must be done without knowing the specific form of the underlying metric of \mathbb{M} . Indeed, measurements from GW detectors will ultimately *determine* what the local metric is at any given time by observing the effect that a GW has on matter as it passes through it. We are aided in this task by three observations. First

and foremost, we note that the observer does not need a coordinate system that is non-singular over *all* of \mathbb{M} ; such a coordinate system is known not to exist in general. All that is needed is a coordinate system that is nonsingular within the region of \mathbb{M} that the observer can make experimental measurements. Second, we are working in the linearized gravity limit. This assures that we do not have to concern ourselves with coordinate singularities, and we can take curvature effects as perturbations on the flat spacetime metric. Finally, we are primarily interested in the effect of linearized gravity on *non-relativistic* test particles; incorporation of causality effects in this limit simplifies the construction of the GLF dramatically.

Let us consider an observer \mathcal{O} with worldline $\Gamma_u(\tau)$. To perform experimental measurements at some time τ_0 , \mathcal{O} constructs a local orthogonal coordinate system centered on his experimental apparatus by choosing a tetrad frame $\{e_A^\mu(\tau_0)\}$, a set of orthogonal unit vectors such that $\eta_{AB} = e_A^\mu(\tau_0) g_{\mu\nu}|_{\Gamma_u(\tau_0)} e_B^\nu(\tau_0)$, where η_{AB} is the usual Minkowski metric and $g_{\mu\nu}|_{\Gamma_u(\tau_0)} = e_{A\mu}(\tau_0) \eta^{AB} e_{B\nu}(\tau_0)$ is the metric for \mathbb{M} at $\Gamma_u(\tau_0)$. We use the pre-subscript o (for “observer”) on e_0^μ to emphasize that at this point the frame only exists on $\Gamma_u(\tau)$. Unlike the general tetrad frame, we require that $u^\mu(\tau_0) = e_0^\mu(\tau_0)$; the time axis of the frame at τ_0 lines up with the worldline of the observer. As usual, tetrad indices are raised and lowered by η_{AB} , and general coordinate indices are raised and lowered by $g_{\mu\nu}$.

For the coordinate system at subsequent times we have to transport e_A^μ along $\Gamma_u(\tau)$, but this must be done in such a way that e_0^μ always points along u^μ . If $\Gamma_u(\tau)$ were a geodesic, we would only need to parallel transport e_A^μ along $\Gamma_u(\tau)$. However, because we are interested in non-geodesic worldlines—say for an observer on the Earth—we must instead use Fermi-Walker transport. This is a generalization of parallel transport that subtracts out the non-geodesic motion of $\Gamma_u(\tau)$ from the transport of e_A^μ . For any vector v^μ and a tangent vector χ^μ to some worldline Γ , the Fermi-Walker transport of v^μ along Γ is

$$\frac{D^F v^\mu}{d\tau} = \frac{Dv^\mu}{d\tau} - \left(v_\nu \frac{D\chi^\nu}{d\tau} \right) \chi^\mu + (v_\nu \chi^\nu) \frac{D\chi^\mu}{d\tau}, \quad (1)$$

where as usual parallel transport along Γ is

$$\frac{Dv^\mu}{d\tau} = \frac{\partial v^\mu}{\partial \tau} + \Gamma_{\alpha\beta}^\mu \chi^\alpha \chi^\beta, \quad (2)$$

and $\Gamma_{\alpha\beta}^\mu$ is the connection on \mathbb{M} .

By Fermi-Walker transporting $e_A^\mu(\tau)$ along $\Gamma_u(\tau)$, we find at each time $\tau > \tau_0$,

$$\frac{D^F e_0^\mu(\tau)}{d\tau} \equiv 0. \quad (3)$$

Not surprisingly $e_0^\mu(\tau)$ automatically undergoes Fermi-Walker transport. The spatial tetrads, on the other hand, do not, and are solutions of the linear PDE's

$$0 = \frac{D e_a^\mu(\tau)}{d\tau} - \left(e_a^\nu(\tau) \frac{D e_{0\nu}(\tau)}{d\tau} \right) e_0^\mu(\tau), \quad (4)$$




FIG. 3: Parallel transport of e_A^μ off $\Gamma_u(\tau)$ and along a space-like geodesic $\gamma_\chi^\tau(s)$.

with the appropriate initial condition at $\tau = \tau_0$.

To extend $\{e_A^\mu(\tau)\}$ off $\Gamma_u(\tau)$ we once again Fermi-Walker transport e_A^μ , but now in directions perpendicular to $\Gamma_u(\tau)$. At any fixed time τ , let $\gamma_\chi^\tau(s)$ be a space-like geodesic such that $u^\mu \chi_\mu = 0$ and $\gamma_\chi^\tau(0) = \Gamma_u(\tau)$ (see FIG. 3). We include the superscript τ on $\gamma_\chi^\tau(s)$ to denote the implicit dependence of $\gamma_\chi^\tau(s)$ on τ . For geodesics Fermi-Walker transport is equivalent to parallel transport, and $e_A^\mu(\tau, s)$ are solutions of

$$0 = \frac{D e_A^\mu(\tau, s)}{\partial s} \quad (5)$$

along χ^μ with the initial condition $e_A^\mu(\tau, 0) = e_A^\mu(\tau)$ for each time τ . It is straightforward to show from eq. (5) that $e_A^\mu(\tau, s) e_{B\mu}(\tau, s) = \eta_{AB}$. Consequently, we can now consider e_A^μ as a vector field on \mathbb{M} such that

$$g_{\mu\nu} = e_A^\mu e_{A\nu}, \quad \text{and} \quad \eta_{AB} = e_A^\mu e_{B\mu}. \quad (6)$$

While the above defines a set of orthonormal vectors for the observer, we still have to construct explicit coordinates for this frame. As mentioned in the Introduction, observer-based coordinates have been constructed before [14], [12], although they were not explicitly constructed in a tetrad frame. Even though the FNC and FWC are constructed using a series of approximations that make them unsuitable for our purposes, a number of the fundamental concepts used in their construction nevertheless carry over to our construction. In particular, Synge [12] introduces the notion of the world function to construct both of them (see also [13]). This *extended* object is a scalar function that measures the length-squared between two points connected by a geodesic on \mathbb{M} that are separated by a *finite* distance. It serves as a two-point correlation

function that measures the net effect of the differences in local curvature between the two points. Moreover, because the world function is length—and thus a scalar invariant—it is expandable in terms of the Riemann tensor and its derivatives, thereby avoiding many coordinate-dependent artifacts.

Useful though the world function may be, with the construction of the tetrad frame above in hand we have a more direct method of constructing coordinates. (This method is similar to the approach followed in [19] for the FNC.) It nevertheless makes use of an extended object between two points on \mathbb{M} . Like Synge we explicitly introduce a test particle \mathcal{P} with worldline $\Gamma_c(\tau)$ that is close enough to $\Gamma_u(\tau)$ for its physical properties to be measured by \mathcal{O} 's experimental apparatus. We ask what its coordinates are in \mathcal{O} 's frame. To be consistent with \mathcal{O} 's experimental measurements, we parameterize $\Gamma_c(\tau)$ by the proper time of \mathcal{O} , not \mathcal{P} . Then let $X^A(\tau)$ be the position of \mathcal{P} at any time τ in the observer's frame. $X^A(x) : x^\mu \rightarrow X^A$ can also be considered as a coordinate transformation from the general coordinates x^μ to the tetrad frame at any time τ ,

$$\eta_{AB} dX^A dX^B = \frac{\partial X^A}{\partial x^\mu} \frac{\partial X^B}{\partial x^\nu} dx^\mu dx^\nu, \quad (7)$$

so that from eq. (6),

$$\frac{\partial X^A}{\partial x^\mu} = e_A^\mu, \quad \text{or} \quad \frac{\partial x^\mu}{\partial X^A} = e_A^\mu. \quad (8)$$

Solutions of eqs. (8) are clearly path dependent. For spatial components X_a , we consider again the spacelike geodesic $\gamma_\chi^\tau(s)$, but now connecting $\Gamma_u(\tau)$ to $\Gamma_c(\tau)$ such that $\gamma_\chi^\tau(0) = \Gamma_u(\tau)$ and $\gamma_\chi^\tau(s_1) = \Gamma_c(\tau)$. (See FIG. 4.) By integrating eq. (8) along this geodesic, we obtain the spatial coordinates of the test particle

$$X_a(\tau) = \int_{\gamma_\chi^\tau(0)}^{\gamma_\chi^\tau(s_1)} e_{a\mu}(\tau, s) \chi^\mu(\tau, s) ds \equiv \int_{\gamma_\chi^\tau(s)} e_a, \quad (9)$$

as a straightforward extension of the tetrad framework to coordinates. In the above we have made use of the differential form $e_A = e_{A\mu} dx^\mu$, which will greatly simplify our analysis later (see Appendix A). Like the world function, $X_a(\tau)$ is an extended function of two points—one on the worldline of \mathcal{O} and the other on the worldline of \mathcal{P} . Indeed, it is straightforward to see that the spatial coordinates in the FWC are an approximation of eq. (9) by taking χ^μ as constant equal to its value on $\gamma_\chi^\tau(0)$; the remaining integral is proportional to the world function. We emphasize, however, (the index a notwithstanding) that X_a is the integral of a differential form, and is a scalar function on \mathbb{M} (see Appendix A).

The construction of the time component of the test particle $X_0(\tau)$ is more complicated because of causality. As Synge pointed out in his derivation of the FWC, using *spacelike* geodesics $\gamma_\chi^\tau(s)$ in eq. (9) is somewhat artificial. No physical measurements ever take place along spacelike




FIG. 4: A sketch of the worldlines $\Gamma_u(\tau)$ and $\Gamma_c(\tau)$ with the spacelike $\gamma_\chi^\tau(s)$ and null $\gamma_\pi(\sigma)$ geodesics used to construct X^A shown. The end points of both geodesics are fixed onto specific points on $\Gamma_u(\tau)$ and $\Gamma_c(\tau)$. The simultaneity in time along $\gamma_\chi^\tau(s)$ is an approximation that only holds in the linearized gravity and non-relativistic limits.

geodesics. Strictly speaking, we should have instead used null vectors—corresponding to optical measurements—in the above. However, this would have resulted in a set of optical coordinates, and since we are primarily interested in the motion of a non-relativistic test particle, would have been needlessly complicated. Instead, we note that in the non-relativistic limit the forward lightcone of the observer opens up, and the observer’s null geodesic is well approximated by a spacelike geodesic in this limit. We would thus expect the above construction of X_a to be valid in the non-relativistic limit. The same argument cannot be made for the coordinate time X_0 of \mathcal{P} , however; causality still has to be taken into account. Consequently, we first construct X_0 using null geodesics, and then take the appropriate non-relativistic limit.

FIG. 4 shows explicitly the null geodesic and spatial geodesics that we use in this construction. At a time $\tau' < \tau$, let $\gamma_\pi(\sigma)$ be a null geodesic that connects \mathcal{O} at time τ' to \mathcal{P} at time τ : $\gamma_\pi(0) = \Gamma_u(\tau')$ and $\gamma_\pi(\sigma_1) = \Gamma_c(\tau)$. We define

$$X_0(\tau) = \int_{\gamma_\pi(0)}^{\gamma_\pi(\sigma_1)} e_{0\mu}(\tau(\sigma), s(\sigma)) \pi^\mu(\sigma) d\sigma - \left(- \int_{\tau'}^{\tau} e_{0\mu}(\tilde{\tau}, 0) u^\mu(\tilde{\tau}) d\tilde{\tau} \right). \quad (10)$$

The first term in eq. (10) is the time it takes an optical signal to reach \mathcal{P} . The second term is the amount of time that passes for the *observer* for the optical signal to reach

\mathcal{P} . Since ${}_o e_{0\mu} = u^\mu$,

$$X_0(\tau) = -(\tau - \tau') + \int_{\gamma_\pi(\sigma)} e_0. \quad (11)$$

Note that because $u^\mu \chi_\mu = 0$, unlike X_a we cannot simply replace π^μ by χ^μ in the non-relativistic limit; the second term in eq. (11) would vanish automatically. This limit has to be taken much more carefully [34].

The position of the test particle was arbitrary and could have been placed at any point near $\Gamma_u(\tau)$. Thus the GLF is a combination of a tetrad frame $\{e_A^\mu\}$ fixed to the worldline of the observer together with the coordinates (τ, X^a) . It is important to note that X^a measures the *relative* separation between the worldlines of \mathcal{O} and of \mathcal{P} . For “small” X^a [35], and for $\Gamma_u(\tau)$ and $\Gamma_c(\tau)$ geodesics, X^a is simply the geodesic deviation between \mathcal{O} and \mathcal{P} . We have also chosen, as the most physical, to use the proper time of the observer as our time coordinate; eq. (11) gives the dependence of the test particle’s coordinate time on τ . As we usually use the frame where the observer is at rest in the GLF, τ coincides with the coordinate time of \mathcal{O} . We shall simply use τ as the time variable for \mathcal{O} to avoid introducing additional notation.

In what follows, the final expressions of all physical quantities measured in the GLF will be expressed in terms of (τ, X^a) , the coordinates that \mathcal{O} measures in the GLF. In the frame, $u^A \equiv e^A_\mu u^\mu = \delta_0^A$, and u^A points along the time direction for the observer, while $\chi^A(\tau, s) \equiv e^A_\mu \chi^\mu(\tau, s)$ is a scalar function in the GLF such that

$$\frac{\partial \chi^A}{\partial s} = \frac{D\chi^\mu}{ds} e^A_\mu + \chi^\mu \frac{De^A_\mu}{ds} = 0. \quad (12)$$

The first term vanishes because $\gamma_\chi^\tau(s)$ is a geodesic, and the second term vanishes from the construction of e^A_μ in eq. (5). Thus in the GLF $\chi^A = \chi^A(\tau)$ only. In addition, since $0 = \chi_\mu u^\mu = \chi_A \delta_0^A$, $\chi^0 = 0$ and χ^A is a unit spatial vector pointing directly at the test particle at any time τ [36]. As a final point, although $\partial_a \equiv \partial/\partial X^a = e_a^\mu \partial_\mu$, to avoid confusion we shall always write $\partial/\partial\tau$ instead of ∂_0 , which is reserved for $\partial/\partial X^0$.

We now turn our attention to finding the 4-velocity of a test particle as measured in the GLF. To do so we refer to FIG. 5, which shows the position of both the observer and the particle at two subsequent times τ and $\tau + \delta\tau$. Note that both the observer and the observed are moving: \mathcal{O} along its worldline $\Gamma_u(\tau)$ and \mathcal{P} along its worldline $\Gamma_c(\tau)$. Thus, \mathcal{O} measures the relative 4-velocity between \mathcal{P} and himself. Beginning with the spatial coordinates, we take

$$\begin{aligned} \frac{dX_a}{d\tau} &\equiv \lim_{\delta\tau \rightarrow 0} \frac{X_a(\tau + \delta\tau) - X_a(\tau)}{\delta\tau}, \\ &= \lim_{\delta\tau \rightarrow 0} \frac{1}{\delta\tau} \left\{ \int_{\gamma_\chi^{\tau+\delta\tau}(s)} e_a - \int_{\gamma_\chi^\tau(s)} e_a \right\}, \end{aligned} \quad (13)$$

where $\gamma_\chi^{\tau+\delta\tau}(s)$ and $\gamma_\chi^\tau(s)$ are spacelike geodesics from \mathcal{O} to \mathcal{P} at $\tau + \delta\tau$ and τ (see Fig. 3). Adding and subtracting




FIG. 5: The location of \mathcal{O} and \mathcal{P} at two subsequent times, and the spacelike geodesics used in constructing X_a as they propagate along their worldlines. Notice also the vector ξ^μ as it varies along $\gamma_\chi^\tau(s)$. The closed rectangular region D used in eq. (14) is shown.

integrals along the worldlines of \mathcal{O} and \mathcal{P} ,

$$\begin{aligned} \frac{dX_a}{d\tau} &= -\lim_{\delta\tau \rightarrow 0} \frac{1}{\delta\tau} \left\{ \int_{\partial D} e_a + \int_\tau^{\tau+\delta\tau} e_{a\mu}(\tilde{\tau}, 0) u^\mu(\tilde{\tau}) d\tilde{\tau} \right. \\ &\quad \left. - \int_\tau^{\tau+\delta\tau} e_{a\mu}(\tilde{\tau}, s_1) c^\mu(\tilde{\tau}) d\tilde{\tau} \right\}, \\ &= c_a(\tau, X^a) - \lim_{\delta\tau \rightarrow 0} \frac{1}{\delta\tau} \int_D de_a, \end{aligned} \quad (14)$$

where $c_A = e_{A\mu}(\tau, X^a) c^\mu(\tau)$ is the 4-velocity of the test particle in the GLF. D is the closed region bounded by $\gamma_\chi^\tau(s)$, $\gamma_\chi^{\tau+\delta\tau}(s)$, and the worldlines $\Gamma_u(\tau)$ and $\Gamma_c(\tau)$ between τ and $\tau + \delta\tau$.

We parameterize the region D by the 1-forms $dl_1^\mu = \chi^\mu ds$ and $dl_2^\mu = \xi^\mu d\tau$ where

$$\xi^\mu \equiv \frac{D\chi^\mu}{\partial\tau}, \quad (15)$$

is a function of (τ, s) . Because $\chi_\mu \chi^\mu = 1$, $\xi_\mu \chi^\mu = 0$, and dl_1^μ and dl_2^μ are linearly independent. From eq. (A3), $de_a = e^B \wedge \omega_{aB}$ where $\omega_{aB} = e_a{}^\nu \nabla_\mu e_{B\nu} dx^\mu$ is the Ricci coefficient 1-form. Then,

$$\int_D de_a = - \int_\tau^{\tau+\delta\tau} \int_0^{s_1} (e^B{}_\mu \omega_{\nu a B} - e^B{}_\nu \omega_{\mu a B}) \xi^\mu \chi^\nu d\tilde{\tau} ds. \quad (16)$$

The limit $\delta\tau \rightarrow 0$ is now trivial to take, leaving only a path integral along $\gamma_\chi^\tau(s)$. Then

$$\begin{aligned} c_a &= \frac{dX_a}{d\tau} + \int_0^{X_a} \{\omega_{Bac} - \omega_{caB}\} \xi^B d\tilde{X}^c, \\ &= \frac{dX_a}{d\tau} + \int_0^{X_a} \{\langle \xi, \omega_{ac} \rangle e^c - \langle \xi, e^B \rangle \omega_{aB}\}, \end{aligned} \quad (17)$$

where we have now expressed the path integral in GLF coordinates by using $dX^c = e^c{}_\mu \chi^\mu d\tilde{\tau}$, and $\xi^A \equiv e^A{}_\mu \xi^\mu$. As usual, $\langle \xi, \omega_{ac} \rangle = \xi^\mu \omega_{\mu ab}$.

To determine ξ , we note that ξ^μ measures the deviation in the geodesic $\gamma_\chi^{\tau+\delta\tau}(s)$ from $\gamma_\chi^\tau(s)$ at any time τ along s , and is thus the solution of the geodesic deviation (or Jacobi) equation in s [12]. In the GLF,

$$0 = \frac{\partial^2 \xi^A}{\partial s^2} + \tilde{R}^A{}_B \xi^B \quad (18)$$

where $\xi^A \equiv e^A{}_\mu \xi^\mu$ and $\tilde{R}^A{}_B \equiv R^A{}_{CBD} \chi^C \chi^D$ (see Appendix A). Note that χ^A is independent of s and only fixes a direction in the above.

From FIG. 5 we see that ξ^A interpolates between the tangent vector to the worldline of \mathcal{O} and the tangent vector to the worldline of \mathcal{P} . Since $\xi^A \chi_A = \xi^\mu \chi_\mu = 0$, the precise boundary conditions are: $\lim_{s \rightarrow 0^+} \xi^A(\tau, s) = \delta_0^A$ and $\lim_{s \rightarrow s_1^-} \xi^A(\tau, s) = (\delta_B^A - \chi^A \chi_B) c^B$. However, ξ^A appears in eq. (16) because of the 2-form $dl_1^\mu \wedge dl_2^\mu$, and dl_2^μ lies parallel to χ^μ . This automatically projects-out any component of ξ^A parallel to χ^A . Consequently, we can without loss of generality replace the second boundary condition by the much simpler condition $\lim_{s \rightarrow s_1^-} \xi^A(\tau, s) = c^A$. Eq. (18) can then be solved iteratively, and

$$\begin{aligned} \xi^A(\tau, s) &= \frac{1}{s_1} \{s c^A(\tau) + (s_1 - s) \delta_0^A\} + \\ &\quad \int_0^{s_1} \tilde{R}^A{}_B(\tau, s') \xi^B(\tau, s') G(s, s') ds', \end{aligned} \quad (19)$$

where $G(s, s')$ is the Green's function

$$G(s, s') = \frac{s}{s_1} (s_1 - s') \theta(s' - s) + \frac{s'}{s_1} (s_1 - s) \theta(s - s'), \quad (20)$$

with $\theta(x)$ the Heaviside function.

For c_0 we proceed the same way. Using now the diagram in FIG. 6,

$$c_0 = \frac{dX_0}{d\tau} + \lim_{\delta\tau \rightarrow 0} \frac{1}{\delta\tau} \int_{D'} e^a \wedge \omega_{0a}. \quad (21)$$

To parameterize D' , we again take $dl_1^\mu = \pi^\mu d\sigma$, but now $dl_2^\mu = \zeta^\mu d\tilde{\tau}$ where, in the GLF,

$$\zeta^A(\tau, \sigma) = \delta_0^A + \{c^A(\tau) - \delta_0^A\} \frac{\sigma}{s_1}. \quad (22)$$

Clearly, ζ^A and π^A are linearly independent. Unlike the spatial components of the 4-velocity, we *cannot* use $e^A{}_\mu D\pi^\mu / \partial\tau$ to parameterize D' , because it is either a null-vector or a spacelike vector. Like ξ^A , ζ^A interpolates between the tangent vector at $\Gamma_u(\tau')$ and the tangent vector at $\Gamma_c(\tau)$. It does *not*, however, include the corrections due to non-vanishing curvature that eq. (18) does. Because we will be working in the linearized gravity limit, such correction terms are of the order h_{AB} times




FIG. 6: The null geodesics used in constructing X_0 at two subsequent times as \mathcal{O} and \mathcal{P} propagate along their worldlines. The closed region D' used in eq. (21) is shown.

the particle velocity, and can be neglected to lowest order. We therefore get

$$c_0 = \frac{dX_0}{d\tau} + \int_{\gamma_\pi(\sigma)} \{ \langle \zeta, \omega_{0A} \rangle e^A - \langle \zeta, e^A \rangle \omega_{0A} \}. \quad (23)$$

Eqs. (17) and (23) in principle determine the components of the 4-velocity c^A of the test particle in the GLF. However, because both ξ^A and ζ^A themselves depend c^A , these equations form a set of coupled integral equations in c^A . While these equations can be solved for iteratively using eq. (19) and eq. (22), we are primarily interested in the behavior of non-relativistic test particles in the linearized gravity limit. In fact, much of our construction of the coordinates for the GLF is only valid for the non-relativistic test particle. We thus keep only terms linear in $h_{\mu\nu}$ where $g_{\mu\nu} = \eta_{\mu\nu} + h_{\mu\nu}$ (see Appendix A), and we approximate $c^0 \approx 1$ and keep only terms linear in $c^A - \delta_0^A$. Since both the spatial velocity and the curvature effects are small, we also neglect cross terms of $O((c^A - \delta_0^A)h_{AB})$. Thus, we can neglect curvature corrections in eq. (19) altogether, and can take $\xi^A \approx \delta_0^A$ since ξ^A always appears in the combination $\xi\omega$. Using a similar argument, we take $\zeta^A \approx \delta_0^A$ as well. (This is the underlying reason we did not have to be concerned with curvature corrections to ζ^A in eq. (22).) With these approximations,

$$c_A = \frac{dX_A}{d\tau} + \int_0^{X^a} \{ \omega_{0Ab} - \omega_{bA0} \} d\tilde{X}^b. \quad (24)$$

III. THE HAMILTONIAN

The action for a test particle with mass m and charge q in general coordinates is:

$$I = -m \int \sqrt{-c_\mu c^\mu} d\tau + q \int A_\mu c^\mu d\tau. \quad (25)$$

Because eq. (25) is time reparameterization invariant, we are free to choose the proper time τ of \mathcal{O} as our parameterization. In the rest frame of \mathcal{O} , this is just \mathcal{O} 's coordinate time. In the GLF this Lagrangian becomes

$$\begin{aligned} \mathcal{L} = & -m \sqrt{(c^0)^2 - (c^a)^2} + q A_0 c^0 + q A_a c^a, \\ \approx & -m + \frac{1}{2} m \left(\frac{dX^a}{d\tau} + \int_0^{X^a} \{ \omega_0^a{}_b - \omega_b^a{}_0 \} d\tilde{X}^b \right)^2 \\ & - m \int_0^{X^a} \omega_{00b} d\tilde{X}^b + q A_0 \left(1 + \int_0^{X^a} \omega_{00b} d\tilde{X}^b \right) \\ & + q A_a \left(\frac{dX^a}{d\tau} + \int_0^{X^a} \{ \omega_0^a{}_b - \omega_b^a{}_0 \} d\tilde{X}^b \right), \end{aligned} \quad (26)$$

where $A_B \equiv e_B^\mu A_\mu$ is the vector potential in the GLF. In the above we have used the non-relativistic—including taking $dX^0/d\tau \approx 1$ —and the linearized gravity limits. The momentum canonical to X^a is then:

$$\begin{aligned} p_a & \equiv \frac{\delta \mathcal{L}}{\delta (dX^a/d\tau)} \\ & = m \frac{dX_a}{d\tau} + m \int_0^{X^a} \{ \omega_{0ab} - \omega_{ba0} \} d\tilde{X}^b + q A_a, \end{aligned} \quad (27)$$

so that in general

$$\begin{aligned} H = & \frac{1}{2m} (p_a - q A_a)^2 - p_a \int_0^{X^a} \{ \omega_0^a{}_b - \omega_b^a{}_0 \} d\tilde{X}^b \\ & - q A_0 \left(1 + \int_0^{X^a} \omega_{00b} d\tilde{X}^b \right) + m \int_0^{X^a} \omega_{00b} d\tilde{X}^b. \end{aligned} \quad (28)$$

We now consider two special cases.

A. Stationary Metrics

For stationary metrics there is always a frame where $g_{\mu\nu}$ is independent of time. In this frame,

$$\omega_{00b} = \frac{1}{2} \partial_b h_{00}, \quad \omega_{0ab} - \omega_{ba0} = \frac{1}{2} \partial_b h_{a0}, \quad (29)$$

where we have used eq. (A9). Then,

$$\begin{aligned} c_0 & = \frac{dX_0}{d\tau} + \frac{1}{2} \{ h_{00}(\tau, X^a) - h_{00}(\tau, 0) \}, \\ c_a & = \frac{dX_a}{d\tau} + \frac{1}{2} \{ h_{a0}(\tau, X^a) - h_{a0}(\tau, 0) \}, \end{aligned} \quad (30)$$

while

$$H = \frac{1}{2m}(p_a - qA_a)^2 - \frac{1}{2}p_a \{h_0^a(\tau, X^a) - h_0^a(\tau, 0)\} + \frac{1}{2}m \{h_{00}(\tau, X^a) - h_{00}(\tau, 0)\} - qA_0 \{1 + h_{00}(\tau, X^a) - h_{00}(\tau, 0)\}. \quad (31)$$

To compare this with DeWitt's results [9], [10], we first remember that we are working in the (orthogonal) GLF, while DeWitt is working in the general coordinate frame. To transform the above back to the general coordinate frame, we use eq. (A8) in

$$p_a = \left(\delta_a^\mu - \frac{1}{2}h_a^\mu \right) p_\mu \approx p_{\hat{a}} - \frac{m}{2}h_{\hat{a}\hat{0}}, \quad (32)$$

where we follow DeWitt and neglect terms of $O(ph)$. For clarity, we use a hat to distinguish between indices in the GLF and DeWitt's frame. Like DeWitt we neglect terms $O(Ah)$ also, and find

$$H = \frac{1}{2m} \left(p_{\hat{a}} - mh_{\hat{a}\hat{0}}(\tau, X^{\hat{a}}) - \frac{m}{2}h_{\hat{a}\hat{0}}(\tau, 0) - qA_{\hat{a}} \right)^2 + \frac{m}{2} \{h_{\hat{0}\hat{0}}(\tau, X^{\hat{a}}) - h_{\hat{0}\hat{0}}(\tau, 0)\} + qA_{\hat{0}}. \quad (33)$$

This agrees with DeWitt's result up to a constant shift in velocity and in energy. This shift is needed because DeWitt's coordinates are fixed to the origin of the mass generating the gravitational field (for example, on the center of the Earth if we are dealing with tidal forces generated by its rotation), while our origin is fixed on the observer (on the surface of the Earth, say).

B. For Gravitational Waves

For GWs we work in the usual TT gauge. $\omega_{00b} = 0$ now while

$$\omega_{0ab} - \omega_{ba0} = -\frac{1}{2} \frac{\partial h_{ab}}{\partial \tau}. \quad (34)$$

Then

$$\begin{aligned} c_0 &= \frac{dX_0}{d\tau} \\ c_a &= \frac{dX_a}{d\tau} - N_a(X^a), \end{aligned} \quad (35)$$

where

$$N_a(X^a) = \int_0^{X^a} \omega_{a0}. \quad (36)$$

Then,

$$H = \frac{1}{2m}(p_a - qA_a)^2 + p_a N^a - qA_0. \quad (37)$$

Now, in the long-wavelength limit, $N_a = X^b(\partial h_{ab}/\partial \tau)/2$. Thus, for neutral particles eq. (37) agrees with the Hamiltonian derived in [11] from the geodesic deviation equation. In that paper one of us (ADS) also postulated the existence of a minimal coupling with the EM-field which was of the form $\sim (p_a + N_a - qA_a)^2$ using the notation of this paper. This was based on the usual arguments for minimal coupling, and was valid within the framework and approximations of that paper. This direct coupling between N_a and A_a does not appear in this more general analysis.

IV. PROPERTIES OF N_a

If we expand out the kinetic part of the Hamiltonian eq. (37), we see that for small A_a both A_a and N_a couple to the test particle in the same way. Surprisingly, this similarity between N_a and A_a goes much deeper. Like A_a , N_a —which has units of velocity—is transverse and satisfies the wave equation in GLF. Like A_a , N_a is a gauge dependent object, the gauge symmetry in this case being the choice of local Lorentz frames, and the gauge group being the Galilee group (since we are dealing with non-relativistic test particles). As with N_a , we can construct from N_a effective “electric” and “magnetic” fields that obey Maxwell's equations. These fields have direct physical meaning, and they turn out to be proportional to the integrals of the electric and magnetic parts of the Weyl tensor.

Consider first

$$\begin{aligned} \frac{\partial N_a}{\partial \tau} &= \lim_{\delta\tau \rightarrow 0} \frac{1}{\delta\tau} \{N_a(\tau + \delta\tau, X^a) - N_a(\tau, X^a)\}, \\ &= \omega_{Ba0}(\tau, X^a)c^B(\tau) - \omega_{Ba0}(\tau, 0)\delta_0^B - \lim_{\delta\tau \rightarrow 0} \frac{1}{\delta\tau} \int_D d\mathbf{w}_{a0}, \end{aligned} \quad (38)$$

where we have used the same arguments as in Section 2. Once again, because we are in the non-relativistic limit, the domain D' in FIG. 6 is well approximated by the domain D in FIG. 5. Using eq. (A4) and the usual parameterization of D ,

$$\begin{aligned} \frac{\partial N_a}{\partial \tau} &= -\frac{1}{2} \lim_{\delta\tau \rightarrow 0} \frac{1}{\delta\tau} \int_D R_{BCa0} d\mathbf{l}_1^B \wedge d\mathbf{l}_2^C, \\ &= -\int_0^{X^a} R_{b0a0} d\tilde{X}^b. \end{aligned} \quad (39)$$

since $c^A \approx \delta_0^A$ and $\omega_{0a0} = 0$ for GWs in the TT gauge. Similarly,

$$\begin{aligned} \frac{\partial^2 N_a}{\partial \tau^2} &= \lim_{\delta\tau \rightarrow 0} \frac{1}{\delta\tau} \int_D \partial_C R_{B0a0} d\mathbf{l}_1^C \wedge d\mathbf{l}_2^B, \\ &= -\int_0^{X^a} \partial_0 R_{b0a0} d\tilde{X}^b, \end{aligned} \quad (40)$$

since $R_{00b0} = 0$.




FIG. 7: A sketch of the two spacelike geodesics $\gamma_\chi^\tau(s)$ and $\gamma_{\delta\chi}^\tau(s)$ for X^a and $X^a + \delta X^b$ respectively used in calculating spatial derivatives. The addition of $\gamma_{\delta\chi}^\tau(s)$ linking the two points defines the closed triangular region Δ used in eq.(41).

For the spatial derivatives, we refer to FIG. 7 and now consider the three spacelike geodesics bounding the closed surface Δ : $\gamma_\chi^\tau(s)$ connecting the origin to X^a , $\gamma_{\delta\chi}^\tau(s)$ connecting the origin to $X^a + \delta X^b$ for δX^b small, and $\gamma_{\delta\chi}^\tau(s)$ connecting X^a to $X^a + \delta X^b$. Then,

$$\begin{aligned} \frac{\partial N_a}{\partial X^b} &= \lim_{\delta X^b \rightarrow 0} \frac{1}{\delta X^b} \{N_a(\tau, X^a + \delta X^b) - N_a(\tau, X^a)\}, \\ &= \lim_{\delta X^b \rightarrow 0} \frac{1}{\delta X^b} \left(\int_{\gamma_{\delta\chi}^\tau(s)} \omega_{a0} - \int_{\Delta} d\omega_{a0} \right), \end{aligned} \quad (41)$$

where we have once again added and subtracted an integral—along $\gamma_{\chi\Delta}^\tau(s)$ —and used Stoke's Theorem on the closed boundary $\partial\Delta$ of Δ . Parameterizing Δ by $dl_1^\mu = \chi^\mu ds$ and $dl_2^\mu = \chi'^\mu ds'$, then

$$\partial_b N_a = \omega_{ba0} - \int_0^{X^a} R_{cba0} d\tilde{X}^c. \quad (42)$$

This equation shows explicitly the difference between taking spatial derivatives in flat spacetime versus taking derivatives in curved space. In flat spacetimes the gradient of N_a would simply be ω_{ba0} . In curved space, on the other hand, we have to take into account the differences in curvature between X^a and $X^a + \delta X^b$, and that introduces the additional curvature term. Proceed-

ing similarly,

$$\begin{aligned} \partial_b \partial_c N_a &= \partial_c \omega_{ba0} - R_{cba0}(\tau, X^a) + \\ &\quad \lim_{\delta X^c \rightarrow 0} \frac{1}{\delta X^c} \int_{\Delta} \partial_e R_{dba0} dl_1^e \wedge dl_2^d, \\ &= \partial_c \omega_{ba0} - R_{cba0}(\tau, 0) - \int_0^{X^a} \partial_c R_{eba0} d\tilde{X}^e. \end{aligned} \quad (43)$$

From eq. (42),

$$\partial^a N_a = \omega^a{}_{a0} + \int_0^{X^a} R_{a0} d\tilde{X}^a. \quad (44)$$

For GWs in the TT gauge $\omega^a{}_{a0} = (\partial h_a^a / \partial \tau) / 2 = 0$ and $R_{a0} = -\square h_{a0} / 2 = 0$, where \square is the d'Alembertian operator. N_a is thus transverse: $\partial^a N_a = 0$. Next, from eqs. (43) and (40),

$$\square N_a = - \int_0^{X^a} \frac{\partial R_{ab}}{\partial \tau} d\tilde{X}^b. \quad (45)$$

But this also vanishes since $R_{ab} = 0$. Thus, like the vector potential for EM, N_a is a transverse vector field obeying the wave equation $\square N_a = 0$.

Next, to construct the effective “electric” and “magnetic” fields from N_a , we consider the current 1-form (see [26])

$$N = N_B dX^B = dX^B \left(\int_0^{X^a} \omega_{B0} \right), \quad (46)$$

which, because $N_0 = 0$, is the 1-form corresponding to N_a . We next define the co-exterior derivative as $\delta = -*d*$ where $** = -1$ is the Hodge Star operator on the GLF where the metric is η_{AB} . The transverse condition is simply $\delta N = 0$. We can also define an effective field strength $\mathfrak{F} = dN$ with effective electric and magnetic fields

$$\begin{aligned} \mathfrak{E}_a &\equiv \mathfrak{F}_{a0} = -\frac{\partial N_a}{\partial \tau}, \\ \mathfrak{B}^a &\equiv \frac{1}{2} \epsilon^{abc} \mathfrak{F}_{bc} = \epsilon^{abc} \partial_b N_c. \end{aligned} \quad (47)$$

Using the same methods as above, we see that

$$\begin{aligned} \frac{\partial \mathfrak{E}_a}{\partial \tau} &= \int_0^{X^a} \frac{\partial R_{b0a0}}{\partial \tau} d\tilde{X}^b, \\ \partial_b \mathfrak{E}_a &= R_{b0a0}(\tau, 0) + \int_0^{X^a} \partial_b R_{c0a0} d\tilde{X}^c, \\ \frac{\partial \mathfrak{B}^a}{\partial \tau} &= - \int_0^{X^a} \epsilon^{abc} \frac{\partial R_{ebc0}}{\partial \tau} d\tilde{X}^e, \\ \partial_b \mathfrak{B}^a &= -\epsilon^{afc} R_{bfc0}(\tau, 0) - \int_0^{X^a} \epsilon^{afc} \partial_b R_{efc0} d\tilde{X}^e, \end{aligned} \quad (48)$$

Now, it is clear that by definition \mathfrak{F} is an exact 2-form, and the identity $d\mathfrak{F} = 0$ should hold if \mathfrak{F} has been defined consistently. To verify this, we first consider

$$\partial^a \mathfrak{B}_a = -\epsilon^{afc} R_{afc0}(\tau, 0) - \int_0^{X^a} \epsilon^{afc} \partial_a R_{efc0} d\tilde{X}^e = 0, \quad (49)$$

which vanishes identically using the 1st (eq. (A5)) and 2nd Bianchi Identities (eq. (A6)). Similarly,

$$\frac{\partial \mathfrak{B}^a}{\partial \tau} - \epsilon^{abc} \partial_b \mathfrak{E}_c = \epsilon^{abc} \int_0^{X^a} d\tilde{X}^e \left(-\frac{\partial R_{ebc0}}{\partial \tau} + \partial_b R_{e0c0} \right), \quad (50)$$

also vanishes for the same reason. Thus $d\mathfrak{F} \equiv 0$, which holds as a direct consequence of the Bianchi Identities for the Riemann tensor.

For the other part of Maxwell's equations, $\delta\mathfrak{F} = 0$, we consider

$$\partial^a \mathfrak{E}_a = -R_{00}(\tau, 0) + \int_0^{X^a} \partial^a R_{c0a0} d\tilde{X}^c. \quad (51)$$

From eq. (A6),

$$0 = \partial^A R_{C00A} + \partial_c R_{00} - \frac{\partial R_{0C}}{\partial \tau}. \quad (52)$$

Once again, $R_{AB} = 0 \implies \partial^a \mathfrak{E}_a = 0$. Finally, we consider,

$$\epsilon^{abc} \partial_b \mathfrak{B}_c + \frac{\partial \mathfrak{E}^a}{\partial \tau} = - \int_0^{X^a} \frac{\partial R^a{}_b}{\partial \tau} d\tilde{X}^b = 0, \quad (53)$$

using eq. (A6) and $R_{ab} = 0$ once again. Consequently $\delta\mathfrak{F} = 0$ and $d\mathfrak{F} = 0$, and \mathfrak{E}_a and \mathfrak{B}^a satisfy Maxwell's equations. Notice also that like EM waves, $\delta\mathfrak{F} = 0$ only in the absence of sources [37].

The surprising connection between \mathfrak{E}_a and \mathfrak{B}^a , and Maxwell's equations can be understood by looking at the electric and magnetic parts of the Weyl tensor C_{ABCD} . For GWs propagating in a flat background, $C_{ABCD} = R_{ABCD}$ and the Riemann tensor can be separated into two parts [13]: The electric part,

$$E_{ab} \equiv -C_{0a0b} = -R_{0a0b}, \quad (54)$$

and the magnetic part,

$$H_b^a = \frac{1}{2} \epsilon^{0aef} C_{ef0b} = -\frac{1}{2} \epsilon^{aef} R_{efb0}. \quad (55)$$

Clearly

$$\mathfrak{E}_a = - \int_0^{X^a} E_{ab} d\tilde{X}^b, \quad \mathfrak{B}^a = - \int_0^{X^a} H_b^a d\tilde{X}^b. \quad (56)$$

\mathfrak{E}_a and \mathfrak{B}^a are simply path integrals of E_{ab} and H_{ab} ; they obey Maxwell's equations because E_{ab} and H_b^a obey tensor Maxwell-like equations [13].

If N_a functions as an effective vector potential for the GW, what, then, is the corresponding gauge group?

Notice that although we have chosen a specific coordinate system—and thus broken general coordinate invariance—we still have a residual invariance left over. To see this, let us do *local* Lorentz transformation $L_A^{\tilde{A}}$ on e_a^μ such that $\eta_{AB} = L_A^{\tilde{A}} L_{B\tilde{A}}$ while $e_A^\mu = L_A^{\tilde{A}} e_{\tilde{A}}^\mu$. This leaves $g_{\mu\nu} = e_{A\mu} e^A_\nu = e_{\tilde{A}\mu} e^{\tilde{A}}_\nu$ invariant, and we see that local Lorentz invariance is still left over. Now, it is straightforward to show that under a local Lorentz transformation $\omega_{CAB} \rightarrow \omega_{\tilde{C}\tilde{A}\tilde{B}} + L_{\tilde{B}}^D \partial_{\tilde{C}} L_{D\tilde{A}}$; ω_{CAB} transforms anomalously under a local Lorentz transformation. Consequently,

$$N_a \rightarrow N_{\tilde{a}} + \int_0^{X^a} L^D_{\tilde{0}} \partial_{\tilde{c}} L_{D\tilde{a}} d\tilde{X}^{\tilde{c}}. \quad (57)$$

Because we are working in the non-relativistic limit, the gauge group for N_a is the local Galilee Group. Indeed, for a pure boost in the non-relativistic limit, $L_{A\tilde{A}} \approx \delta_{A\tilde{A}} - v_a K_{A\tilde{A}}^a$ where $K_{A\tilde{A}}^a$ is the generator of boosts. Then,

$$N_a \rightarrow N_{\tilde{a}} - \int_0^{X^a} dv_{\tilde{a}} = N_{\tilde{a}} - \{v_{\tilde{a}}(\tau, X^a) - v_{\tilde{a}}(\tau, 0)\}, \quad (58)$$

and N_a changes by a local velocity field.

Finally, we calculate the equations of motion for the test particle in a GW. Eq. (26) for GWs is

$$\mathcal{L} = \frac{m}{2} \left(\frac{dX^a}{d\tau} - N^a \right)^2 + qA_0 + qA_a \left(\frac{dX^a}{d\tau} - N^a \right), \quad (59)$$

from which we get

$$m \frac{d^2 X^a}{d\tau^2} = -m \left\{ \mathfrak{E}^a + \epsilon^{abc} \frac{dX_b}{d\tau} \mathfrak{B}_c \right\} + q \left\{ E^a + \epsilon^{abc} \frac{dX_b}{d\tau} B_c \right\}, \quad (60)$$

after using eq. (47); like DeWitt we drop terms $O(Ah)$. In Section 2 we stated that we would neglect terms of order $(c^A - \delta_0^A)h_{ab}$, and yet eq. (60) contains just such a term. It is, however, straightforward, though tedious, to repeat the calculation for eq. (60) keeping the next higher order velocity-connection terms. After doing so we still obtain the above to lowest order.

Let us suppose that GW can be approximated as a plane wave with wave-vector k_a . Notice that the integral in eq. (26) is always over the plane perpendicular to k_a , yet h_{ab} is a only function of the spatial coordinates parallel to k_a . Consequently, $N_a = \omega_{ba0} X^b$, $\mathfrak{E}_a = R_{b0a0} X^b$ and $\mathfrak{B}^a = \epsilon^{abc} R_{bce0} X^e / 2$. Thus, for planar GWs,

$$m \frac{d^2 X_a}{d\tau^2} = -m \left\{ R_{b0a0} X^b + \frac{dX^b}{d\tau} X^c R_{abc0} \right\} + q \left\{ E_a + \epsilon_{abc} \frac{dX^b}{d\tau} B_c \right\}. \quad (61)$$

As expected, in the low velocity limit where the \mathfrak{B}^a term can be neglected this is just the geodesic deviation equation for a charged test particle. Note also that eq. (61)

holds for general GWs in the long-wavelength limit as well, and that it agrees with the equation of motion for a charged test particle interacting with a GW found in [7].

V. CONCLUDING REMARKS

In eqs. (26) and (28) we can clearly see the natural separation that occurs in the dynamics of test particles in two extremes. In the one extreme the metric for \mathbb{M} can be approximated as being stationary. Matter moving with a characteristic velocity v much smaller than the speed of light such that $v/c \ll 1$ make up the dominant contribution to the stress-energy tensor in these space-times; thus to a very good approximation the presence of GWs can be neglected. In this extreme our Hamiltonian reduces to DeWitt's Hamiltonian, and the straightforward approach to the derivation of H_{SF} described in the Introduction works. In the other extreme, all the curvature effects are due to GWs, and the characteristic velocity for the metric is the speed of light. In this extreme, our Hamiltonian reduces to ADS' Hamiltonian [11] for geodesic deviation motion in the presence of GE's in the long-wavelength limit, and the equations of motion reduce to the usual geodesic deviation equations in [7].

Let us be very clear. The dynamics of non-relativistic, classical test particles in stationary spacetimes that we have derived in the GLF are the same as the dynamics for these particles derived using standard methods. Thus, such classical tests of GR as the perihelion of Mercury and the gravitational redshift will follow through in the GLF as well. By extension, because QFCS's are usually formulated in stationary spacetimes, we would expect such analysis as the evaporation of black holes and black hole thermodynamics to hold as well. It is when we consider non-stationary spacetimes—such as those where GWs play a dominant role in determining the physics—that we must take care to explicitly include the observer in the analysis.

What is most surprising about our results is the form that the coupling of general GWs to the test particle takes in the GLF. The tidal nature of the force that a GW induces on a test particle introduces an effective velocity field N_a to the system that couples *vectorially*, under the Lorentz Group, to the particle, even though the GW itself is a *rank-2* tensor. This N_a —being a path integral—is in general a non-local function of the Ricci coefficients, although for planar GWs it reduces to the product of the Ricci coefficient and the position of the test particle. (A vector coupling of GWs to matter was proposed by RYC in [27] based on a generalization of the PPN formalism.) Thus the motion of the test particle is determined by the cumulative effects of the GW along the distance between the observer's worldline and the test particle's. Like the vector potential for EM, N_a is a transverse-field satisfying the wave equation, and like EM, effective electric \mathfrak{E} and magnetic \mathfrak{B} fields can also be constructed from N_a that obey equations that have the same form as Maxwell's

equations. Thus, N_a functions as a vector potential for \mathfrak{E} and \mathfrak{B} with its gauge group being the local Galilee Group. Indeed, the equations of motion for the test particle in the presence of arbitrary GWs has the form of the Lorentz Force with the mass m of the particle playing the role of the “charge”.

Surprising though this vector coupling may be at first glance, after further study we see that there are deep connections between N_a and the tetrad formulation of General Relativity. \mathfrak{E} and \mathfrak{B} are proportional to the path integrals of the electric E_{ab} and magnetic H_{ab} parts of the Weyl tensor respectively, and it is precisely the Weyl tensor that contains GW excitations. It is also known that E_{ab} and H_{ab} obey tensor Maxwell's equations for GWs propagating on a flat, source-free background, and the fact that \mathfrak{E} and \mathfrak{B} satisfy Maxwell's equations is simply the reflection that E_{ab} and H_{ab} do. In fact, the identity $d\mathfrak{F} = 0$ holds precisely because of the 1st and 2nd Bianchi conditions for the Riemann tensor, while $\delta\mathfrak{F} = 0$ only holds because we are in a source-free region for GWs. As for N_a itself, it is precisely “half” of the loop integral of the real part of Ashtekar's connection in the loop variable formulation of quantum gravity. Indeed, Ashtekar's loop integrals can be thought of as quantum corrections to the “classical” N_a .

While most of our focus has been on classical dynamics, we end this paper by looking at a gedanken experiment that probes the essential difference between the classical and quantum dynamics of non-relativistic test particles in the linearized gravity limit.

Extension of eq. (37) to quantum mechanics is straightforward. For non-relativistic, neutral particles with wavefunction ψ ,

$$i\hbar \frac{\partial \psi}{\partial t} = -\frac{\hbar^2}{2m} \nabla^2 \psi - i\hbar N_a \partial^a \psi. \quad (62)$$

Notice that the interaction term $N_a \partial^a \psi$ has the same form as the coupling of an EM vector potential A_B (expressed in GLF coordinates) to a charge particle. In the EM case, the solution of equations of this form leads, on the quantum level, to the Aharonov-Bohm effect, which is expressible through Yang's nonintegrable phase factor (Wilson loop) [29] $\lambda_{EM} = \exp\{i(e/\hbar) \oint A_B dX^B\}$. In direct analogy, eq. (62) suggests that like the EM case, a *time-dependent* Aharonov-Bohm interference experiment such as those described in [28] or [30] can be done, but now with GWs. We would expect this to lead to a corresponding phase factor for gravity $\lambda_{GR} = \exp\{i(m/\hbar) \oint N_a dX^A\}$. While actually performing this experiment would be unrealistic at this time, the corresponding gedanken experiment does illustrate both the essential difference between the classical and quantum systems, and the importance of this gravitational phase factor.

Consider the gedanken Aharonov-Bohm-type experiment shown in FIG. 8 using a Gaussian GW packet with a width l_{GW} at some time t_1 . FIG. 8a shows the space-time diagram for the particle and the GW used in the

interferometry experiment with a time-slice drawn in at t_1 . A schematic of the corresponding physical apparatus at this time-slice is shown in FIG. 8b. We require that the GW also be an unipolar wave-packet so that at all times the amplitude of the \mathfrak{E} and \mathfrak{B} for the packet is non-negative. The interfering particle is taken to be a Gaussian wave packet as well, but with width l_p at any time t . After being emitted at the source, the particle at event p_1 passes through the first beam splitter shown in FIG. 8b, and there is a finite probability it will propagate either along Γ^1 or along Γ^2 until it is recombined at event p_2 . As usual, the combined path $\Gamma = \Gamma^1 \cup \Gamma^2$ encircles the GW beam.

The Bonse-Hart interferometer of a type shown in FIG. 8b is a concrete example of an interferometer that could be used in this experiment; in this case the interfering particle could be neutrons. The gray oval patch at the center of the interferometer represents the time slice at t_1 shown in FIG. 8a of the Gaussian (more generally, Laguerre-Gaussian) beam waist. Most importantly, we choose the size of the interferometer such that $R \gg l_{GW} + l_p$ where R is the distance from the center of the GW beam in FIG. 8b to each arm of the interferometer. Thus, on a classical level the GW and the neutron worldlines do not intersect. On a quantum mechanical level, the amplitude of the neutron's wavefunction is exponentially small where the amplitude of the GW is large, and the amplitude of the GW is exponentially small where the amplitude of the wavefunction is large.

Although the wavefunction of the neutrons satisfy eq. (62), because they are Gaussian wave packets we can make a WKB-like approximation by taking $\psi \approx e^{i\Theta}$. For h_{ab} with small spatial variations along the worldlines, eq. (62) reduces to

$$0 = \frac{\partial \Theta}{\partial t} + N_a \partial^a \Theta, \quad (63)$$

where we have neglected terms $\mathcal{O}(|\nabla \Theta|^2)$ since N_a is small. The solution of eq. (63) in the linearized gravity limit for the particle propagating along worldline Γ^1 is

$$\Theta_{\Gamma^1} = \frac{m}{\hbar} \int_{\Gamma^1} N_A dX^A, \quad (64)$$

from eq. (B5) of Appendix B. Similarly, if the particle had travel the worldline Γ^2 ,

$$\Theta_{\Gamma^2} = \frac{m}{\hbar} \int_{\Gamma^2} N_A dX^A. \quad (65)$$

The phase factor

$$\exp\{i\delta\Theta\} \equiv \exp\{\Theta_{\Gamma^1} - \Theta_{\Gamma^2}\} = \exp\left\{i\frac{m}{\hbar} \int_{\Gamma} \mathbf{N}\right\}, \quad (66)$$

is a measure of the phase difference between the particle propagating along Γ^1 versus propagating along Γ^2 , and

we have also used the current 1-form formalism eq. (46) in the above. Eq. (66) is simply the λ_{GR} that we predicted above. Next, since Γ is a closed loop, by Stokes theorem,

$$\exp\{i\delta\Theta\} = \exp\left\{i\frac{m}{\hbar} \int_{\mathcal{D}} \mathfrak{F}\right\}, \quad (67)$$

where \mathcal{D} is the surface bound by Γ and we have used $\mathfrak{F} = \mathbf{dN}$. Because the boundary of \mathcal{D} is made-up of time-like curves, from eqs. (47), (54) and (56) the dominant contribution to the surface integral in eq. (67) comes from $R_{0a,0b}$. As expected, the phase factor depends on the Riemann tensor and is independent of coordinate choice even though eq. (62) is dependent on the gauge-dependent field N_a .

We note also the underlying topological nature of Fig. 8a. If a path Γ is chosen that does not encircle the GW beam, $\delta\Theta = 0$; if it does, $\delta\Theta \neq 0$. Γ cannot be shrunk to zero without cutting through the GW beam, and thus altering the topology of the Γ -GW beam system. Moreover, each time one goes around Γ , the phase difference $\delta\Theta$ changes by an integral multiple of the same factor; $\delta\Theta$ is thus proportional to the linking number of Γ around the GW beam. That $\delta\Theta$ is related to the linking number is not unexpected since N_a is related to Ashtekar's loop variables. Nonetheless, it does point out the possibility of doing experiments such as [31] that directly measures the linking number of Γ , and thus the underlying topological nature of this Aharonov-Bohm-type effect.

APPENDIX A: REVIEW OF LINEARIZED GRAVITY AND TETRAD FORMALISMS

In this appendix, we present a brief review some of the properties of general tetrad frames, differential forms, and linearized gravity. The review is not exhaustive and the reader is referred to [32] or [13] for a more complete presentation.

A tetrad is a local coordinate system formed by a set of four orthonormal vectors $\{e_A^\mu\}$ such that $e_A^\mu e_{B\mu} = \eta_{AB}$ and $e_A^\mu e_{A\nu} = g_{\mu\nu}$. These $\{e_A^\mu\}$ do not have to be tied to any observer's worldline as we have done in the above, and the results presented here are valid in general.

Since e_A^ν is a unit vector, the covariant derivative $\nabla_\mu e_{B\nu}$ can only be a rotation or boost of e_B^ν . This "rotation matrix" is the Ricci coefficients:

$$\omega_{CAB} = e_C^\mu e_A^\nu \nabla_\mu e_{B\nu}, \quad (A1)$$

with $\omega_{\mu AB} = -\omega_{\mu BA}$. It is straightforward to show that




FIG. 8a




FIG. 8b

FIG. 8: FIG. 8a is a sketch of spacetime diagram showing the passage of the unipolar, Gaussian GW (shown in gray) and the worldlines of two particles beams, along the two paths Γ^1 and Γ^2 (i. e. the two dominant Feynman paths), of the interferometer encircling it. Events p_1 and p_2 correspond to the splitting and recombining of the initial and final beam splitters shown in FIG. 8a. FIG. 8b shows a schematic of a possible experimental set-up (a Bonse-Hart interferometer) at the given time slice t_1 shown in FIG. 8a. The GW beam passes through the center of the Bonse-Hart interferometer, and the gray oval shows the cross-section of the Gaussian beam waist which forms at the center of the plane of the interferometer.

in a tetrad frame,

$$R_{ABCD} = e_A^\mu \partial_\mu \omega_{BCD} - e_B^\mu \partial_\mu \omega_{ACD} - \left\{ \omega_{AFC} \omega_B^F{}_D - \omega_{BFC} \omega_A^F{}_D + \omega_{AFB} \omega_C^F{}_D - \omega_{BFA} \omega_C^F{}_D \right\}. \quad (\text{A2})$$

We emphasize that objects with capital Roman indices in the tetrad frame—such as ω_{CAB} —are *scalars*. They only take the partial derivative, and not the covariant derivative.

Given a tetrad frame, it is natural to work with differential forms, which we shall denote by symbols in boldface. As 1-forms we have $e_A \equiv e_{A\mu} dx^\mu$ and $\omega_{AB} = \omega_{\mu AB} dx^\mu$, and as 2-forms we have $R_{AB} \equiv R_{\mu\nu AB} dx^\mu dx^\nu / 2$. As usual, d is the exterior derivative. Eq. (A1) becomes

$$de_A = e^B \wedge \omega_{AB}, \quad (\text{A3})$$

where \wedge is the wedge product; ω_{AB} 's role as a “rotation” or boost matrix is now manifest. Eq. (A2) is then

$$R_A{}^B = d\omega_A{}^B + \omega_A{}^C \wedge \omega_C{}^B. \quad (\text{A4})$$

Taking the exterior derivative of eq. (A3), we get the 1st Bianchi Identity,

$$0 = e_b \wedge R_A{}^B, \quad (\text{A5})$$

and the exterior derivative of eq.(A5) gives the 2nd Bianchi Identity

$$dR_A{}^B = R_A{}^C \wedge \omega_C{}^B - \omega_A{}^C R_C{}^B. \quad (\text{A6})$$

In the case of linearized gravity, $g_{\mu\nu} = \eta_{\mu\nu} + h_{\mu\nu}$ where $h_{\mu\nu}$ is “small”, and we are only concerned with terms linear in $h_{\mu\nu}$. Then $g^{\mu\nu} = \eta^{\mu\nu} - h^{\mu\nu}$ where on the left hand side we use $\eta_{\mu\nu}$ to raise and lower indices. In this limit:

$$\begin{aligned} \Gamma_{\mu\nu}^\alpha &= \frac{1}{2} (\partial_\mu h_\nu^\alpha + \partial_\nu h_\mu^\alpha - \partial^\alpha h_{\mu\nu}), \\ R^\mu{}_{\nu\alpha\beta} &= \frac{1}{2} \left\{ \partial_\nu (\partial_\alpha h_\beta^\mu - \partial_\beta h_\alpha^\mu) + \partial^\mu (\partial_\beta h_{\nu\alpha} - \partial_\alpha h_{\nu\beta}) \right\}, \\ R_{\mu\nu} &= -\frac{1}{2} \square h_{\mu\nu} + \frac{1}{2} \partial_\mu \partial^\alpha h_{\alpha\nu} + \frac{1}{2} \partial_\nu \partial^\alpha h_{\alpha\mu} - \frac{1}{2} \partial_\mu \partial_\nu h^\alpha{}_\alpha, \\ R &= -\square h^\mu{}_\mu + \partial_\mu \partial_\nu h^{\mu\nu}. \end{aligned} \quad (\text{A7})$$

For GWs in the TT gauge, $h^\mu{}_\mu = 0$, $\partial^\mu h_{\mu\nu} = 0$, $h_{0\mu} = 0$, $R = 0$, $R_{0\mu} = 0$, and the equation of motion for GWs is $R_{\hat{a}\hat{b}} = -\square h_{\hat{a}\hat{b}}/2 = 0$.

To construct the tetrad frame for linearized gravity, we first note that in flat spacetime the tetrad frame is

trivial: $\{\delta_A^\mu\}$. The presence of small $h_{\mu\nu}$ rotates these vectors and

$$e_A^\mu = \left(\delta_\nu^\mu - \frac{1}{2} h_\nu^\mu \right) \delta_A^\nu, \quad \text{and} \quad e^A_\mu = \left(\delta_\mu^\nu + \frac{1}{2} h_\mu^\nu \right) \delta_\nu^A. \quad (\text{A8})$$

Note that this choice is *not* unique. As remarked in Section 4, given any tetrad frame, we can always do a *local* Lorentz transformation that will still preserve the orthonormality of $\{e_A^\mu\}$. The choice we have made for $\{e_A^\mu\}$ for the GLF, and used in the construction in Section 1, corresponds to an observer at rest in his frame.

Using eq. (A1) and the Levi-Civita connection in eq. (A7), we find that

$$\omega_{CAB} = -\frac{1}{2} (\partial_A h_{BC} - \partial_B h_{AC}), \quad (\text{A9})$$

while $R_{ABCD} = \partial_A \omega_{BCD} - \partial_B \omega_{ACD}$ in the linearized gravity limit. Also in this limit, the equations for the Ricci tensor and scalar in eq. (A7) have the same form in the tetrad frame, with the replacement of Greek indices with capital Roman indices.

APPENDIX B: PHASE FACTOR SOLUTION

In this Appendix we derive an explicit solution of eq. (63).

Eq. (63) is a quasi-linear partial differential equation [33] whose method of solution is well known. Both t and X^a are considered functions of a parameter τ . Then $\Theta = \Theta(t(\tau), X^a(\tau))$, and defines a constant surface in (t, X^a) space. Consequently,

$$0 = \frac{dt}{d\tau} \frac{\partial \Theta}{\partial t} + \frac{dX^a}{d\tau} \partial_a \Theta. \quad (\text{B1})$$

For eq. (B1) to be a solution of eq. (63),

$$\frac{\partial t}{\partial \tau} = 1, \quad \frac{dX^a}{d\tau} = N^a, \quad (\text{B2})$$

and the quasi-linear partial differential equation reduces to the solution of a set of ordinary differential equations. Although eq. (B2) can be solved using standard methods once an initial condition is given, the underlying physics become much clearer if we consider instead the following function

$$\Theta_{\tilde{T}}(t(T), X^a(T)) = \frac{m}{\hbar} \int_{\tilde{T}} N_A(t(\tau), X^a(\tau)) dX^A, \quad (\text{B3})$$

where the integral is from a fixed point $(t(0), X^a(0))$ to the point $(t(T), X^a(T))$ along \tilde{T} . The pre-factor m/\hbar is included so that $\Theta_{\tilde{T}}$ is unitless. We choose \tilde{T} such that its tangent vector is given by eq. (B2), and we parameterize it by $\tau \in [0, T]$. \tilde{T} starts at the point $(t(0), X^a(0))$, which is also used as the initial condition for eq. (B2). Clearly,

$$\frac{d\Theta_{\tilde{T}}(t, X^a)}{d\tau} = \frac{m}{\hbar} N_A \frac{dX^A}{d\tau} = \frac{m}{\hbar} N_a N^a \approx 0, \quad (\text{B4})$$

in the linearized gravity limit, while the left-hand-side vanishes identically from eq. (B1). Thus, $\Theta_{\tilde{T}}(t, X^a)$ is a solution of eq. (63). It is not unique, however.

The spatial component of the tangent vector to \tilde{T} lies along N_a , and for plane waves, N_a is perpendicular to the direction of propagation. Thus, for the Gaussian beam in FIG. 8a, \tilde{T} will tend to wrap azimuthally around the beam. We can, of course, go around this beam in a clockwise or counter-clockwise direction, and we denote a clockwise path by \tilde{T}^- and a counter-clockwise path by \tilde{T}^+ . To \tilde{T}^- there is then the corresponding function $\Theta_{\tilde{T}^-}$, and to \tilde{T}^+ there is the corresponding function $\Theta_{\tilde{T}^+}$.

Consider now the functions

$$\begin{aligned} \Theta_{\Gamma^1}(t(T), X^a(T)) &= \frac{m}{\hbar} \int_{\Gamma^1} \mathbf{N}, \\ \Theta_{\Gamma^2}(t(T), X^a(T)) &= \frac{m}{\hbar} \int_{\Gamma^2} \mathbf{N}, \end{aligned} \quad (\text{B5})$$

and we restrict ourselves to those \tilde{T}^\pm that lie on the surface of the beam meaning that \tilde{T}^\pm do not come closer than l_{GW} to the center of the beam of GWs. Because N_a is exponentially small outside of the Gaussian beam, $\Theta_{\Gamma^1} \approx \Theta_{\tilde{T}^+}$ and $\Theta_{\Gamma^2} \approx \Theta_{\tilde{T}^-}$. Thus, eq. (B5) are solutions of eq. (63).

ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

ADS and RYC were supported by a grant from the Office of Naval Research. We thank John Garrison and Jon Magne Leinass for many clarifying and insightful discussions. We also thank William Unruh for reading a very early draft of this paper, and Robert Herrlich for editing the final draft.

-
- [1] R. P. Feynman, *Acta Phys. Polon.* **24**, 697 (1963).
 - [2] B. S. DeWitt, *Phys. Rev.* **160**, 1113 (1967).
 - [3] B. S. DeWitt, *Phys. Rev.* **162**, 1195 (1967).
 - [4] B. S. DeWitt, *Phys. Rev.* **162**, 1239 (1967).
 - [5] N. D. Birrell and P. C. W. Davies, *Quantum Fields in*

Curved Space (Cambridge University Press, Cambridge, 1982).

- [6] R. Wald, *Quantum Field Theory in Curved Spacetimes and Black Hole Dynamics* (The University of Chicago Press, Chicago, 1994).

- [7] C. W. Misner, K. S. Thorne, and J. A. Wheeler, *Gravitation* (W. H. Freeman and Company, San Francisco, 1973), Chapters 1, 35.
- [8] S. W. Hawking and G. F. R. Ellis, *The Large Scale Structure of Space-time* (Cambridge University Press, Cambridge, 1973), Chapter 4.
- [9] B. S. DeWitt, Rev. Mod. Phys. **29**, 337 (1957).
- [10] B. S. DeWitt, Phys. Rev. Lett. **16**, 1092 (1966).
- [11] A. D. Speliotopoulos, Phys. Rev. **D51**, 1701 (1995).
- [12] J. L. Synge, *Relativity: The General Theory* (North-Holland Publishing Co., Amsterdam, 1960), Chapter 2.
- [13] F. de Felice and C. J. S. Clarke, *Relativity on Curved Manifolds* (Cambridge University Press, Cambridge, 1990), Chapter 9.
- [14] E. Fermi, Atti. Acad. Naz. Lincei Rend. Cl. Sci. Fiz. Mat. Nat. **31**, 21, 51 (1922).
- [15] F. R. Manasse and C. W. Misner, J. Math. Phys. **4**, 735 (1963).
- [16] B. Mashhoon, Astrophys. J. **197**, 705 (1975).
- [17] B. Mashhoon, Astrophys. J. **216**, 591 (1977).
- [18] W.-Q. Li and W.-T. Wi, J. Math. Phys. **20**, 1925 (1979).
- [19] A. I. Nesterov, Class. Quan. Geom. **16**, 465 (1999).
- [20] P. L. Fortini and C. Gualdi, Nuovo Cimento **B71**, 37 (1982).
- [21] L. Baroni, in *Proceedings of the 4th Marcel Grossman Meeting on General Relativity*, edited by R. Ruffini (Elsevier Science Publications, Amsterdam, 1986).
- [22] G. Flores and M. Orlandini, Nuovo Cimento **B91**, 236 (1986).
- [23] C. Chicone and B. Mashhoon, *The Generalized Jacobi Equation*, gr-qc/0203073 v2 (2002).
- [24] V. Faraoni, Nuovo Cimento **B107**, 631 (1992).
- [25] R. Y. Chiao, gr-qc/0211078v4, to appear in *Science and Ultimate Reality: Quantum Theory, Cosmology and Complexity*, J. D. Barrows, P. C. W. Davies, and C. L. Harper, Jr., (Cambridge University Press, Cambridge, 2003).
- [26] G. de Rham, *Differentiable Manifolds: Forms, Currents, Harmonic Forms* (Springer-Verlag, New York, 1984).
- [27] R. Y. Chiao *Superconductors as transducers and antennas for gravitational and electromagnetic radiation*, gr-qc/0204012 v2 (2002).
- [28] L. Stodolsky, Gen. Rel. Grav. **11**, 391 (1979).
- [29] T. T. Wu and C. N. Yang, Phys. Rev. **D12**, 3845 (1975).
- [30] J. Anandan, Phys. Rev. **15**, 1448 (1977).
- [31] A. Tonomura, Phys. Script. **T76**, 16 (1998).
- [32] R. Wald, *General Relativity* (The University of Chicago Press, Chicago, 1984), Chapter 3.
- [33] D. Zwillinger, *Handbook of Differential Equations* (Academic Press, New York, 1998).
- [34] In Fermi-Walker coordinates $X^0 = \tau$.
- [35] Meaning that $|X^a|$ is small in comparison to the scale in which the Riemann tensor varies.
- [36] Note that this only holds because we are dealing with non-relativistic particles. If the particle was relativistic, then we would have to go back and use null-geodesics in constructing X_a .
- [37] The equations of motion for GWs would be changed in the presences of sources.