

### Numerical investigation of screened scalar-tensortheories in space-based experiments

Hugo Lévy, Joël Bergé, Jean-Philippe UzanWorkshop TUG 2023, LPENS, Paris

Based on arχiv 2209.07226 & 2310.03769



# Outline

I. Introduction to scalar-tensor theories with screening mechanisms

II. Solving nonlinear Klein-Gordon equation on unbounded domains – femtoscope code

III. Can we test scalar-tensor models with space geodesy techniques?

2

# Scalar-Tensor theories



#### 1. The dark sector [1]

- $\bullet$ Dark Matter
- $\bullet$ Dark Energy
- $\bullet$ + inflation paradigm



 $\bullet$  Discovery of the Higgs boson in 2012

2. A 'true' scalar field exists in nature



#### 3. More fundamental theories

- $\bullet$  String theory as an effective 4dimensional theory [1]
- •f(R)-theories  $\equiv$  scalar-tensor [2]



# Main motivations for introducing a scalar field in the gravitational sector

[1] A. Joyce et al, arXiv:1407.0059

[2] J. Velásquez and L. Castañeda, arXiv:1808.05615

### Laboratory Tests



#### Length scales

### Solar System Tests | Astrophysical Tests

Atom interferometry [3]



Eöt-Wash torsion pendulum [4]





MICROSCOPE [6]

© Y. Gominet/IMCCE/Nasa

Galaxy rotation curves [7]

#### Cluster lensing [8]

Scalar radiation in BNS [9]

#### Laboratory Tests

Atom interferometry [3]



Casimir effect [

#### Length scales

Solar System Tests | Astrophysical Tests

Eöt-Wash torsion

pendulum [4]



MICROSCOPE [6]

© Y. Gominet/IMCCE/Nasa

Galaxy rotation

Scalar radiation in BNS [9]

Cluster lensing [8]

### Scalar fields playing hide-and-seek



#### Take-home messages:

- Different mechanisms to 'screen' scalar fields from local tests of gravity (i.e. recover GR at Solar System scales)  $\bullet$
- •At the equation level, screening ≡ non-linearity

[2] A. Joyce et al, Beyond the Cosmological Standard Model, arXiv:1407.0059

### Scalar fields playing hide-and-seek



#### Take-home messages:

- Different mechanisms to 'screen' scalar fields from local tests of gravity (i.e. recover GR at Solar System scales)  $\bullet$
- •At the equation level, screening ≡ non-linearity

[2] A. Joyce et al, Beyond the Cosmological Standard Model, arXiv:1407.0059

### Numerical considerations arxiv:2209.07226

### Chameleon field equation

Field equation (in the Newtonian limit)  $5<sup>th</sup>$  force

$$
\Box \phi = \frac{\beta}{M_{Pl}} \rho - n \frac{\Lambda^{n+4}}{\phi^{n+1}}
$$

Free parameters:  $\beta$ , n,  $\Lambda$ Mass distribution:  $\rho=\rho(\pmb{x},t)$ Unknown:  $\phi=\phi(x,t)$ 

Point-mass follows geodesics of the Jordan frame metric  $\neq$  Einstein frame geodesics

$$
\vec{F}_{\phi} = -m \frac{\beta}{M_{Pl}} \nabla \phi
$$

## Chameleon field equation

Field equation (in the Newtonian limit)  $5<sup>th</sup>$  force

$$
\Box \phi = \frac{\beta}{M_{Pl}} \rho - n \frac{\Lambda^{n+4}}{\phi^{n+1}}
$$

Free parameters:  $\beta$ , n,  $\Lambda$ Mass distribution:  $\rho = \rho(\pmb{x},t)$ Unknown:  $\phi = \phi(\pmb{x},t)$ 

Point-mass follows geodesics of the Jordan frame metric  $\neq$  Einstein frame geodesics

$$
\vec{F}_{\phi} = -m \frac{\beta}{M_{Pl}} \nabla \phi
$$

pendulum [4]





[2] A. Upadhye, Dark energy fifth forces in torsion pendulum experiments, arXiv:1209.0211

### Chameleon field equation



$$
\vec{F}_{\phi} = -m \frac{\beta}{M_{Pl}} \nabla \phi
$$







 $\Omega$ 

Not possible to mesh a domain of infinite spatial extent...



### Let's compactify\* space !

\*(i.e. apply a global coordinate transform that will map the whole plane to a bounded domain)

Not possible to mesh a domain of infinite spatial extent…

 $Q_2$ 

$$
\mathcal{T} : \mathbb{R}^2 \to \mathbb{R}^2
$$

$$
= (x, y) \mapsto \frac{R_{\text{cut}}}{1 + ||\mathbf{x}||}(x, y)
$$

For instance

 $\mathbf X$ 

9





 $\overline{0}$ 









### One idea among (many) others!Caveat: Applying such coordinate transforms leads to unbounded coefficients in the resulting PDE(weight regularisation technique arχiv:2209.07226 )

Inspired by Grosch and Orszag (1977)Zenginoglu (2011) Chernogorova et al. (2016)Boulmezaoud (2005)



### Study Scripts (from femtoscope import ...)

- $\bullet$  Custom nonlinear solver with line-search
- $\bullet$  Implementation of 3 techniques to handle asymptotic boundary conditions
- $\bullet$  1D, 2D and 3D Finite Element Method



Third-party Python librairies meshio sfer Gmsh

· Poisson Class

 $($  + analytical  $\mathcal{C}$  semi-analytical solutions available)

 $\bullet$  Chameleon *Class* 

 $(+$  few analytical approximations)



### Application to space geodesy $\ast$ arχiv:2310.03769

#### All computations are performed with



\*space geodesy: Space geodesy is a scientific discipline that involves precise measurements and analysis of the Earth's shape, gravitational field, and the dynamic behavior of its surface using satellite-based technologies.

- A satellite in orbit is subject to both Newtonian attraction and fifth force
- Strong **impact of the local landform** on the scalar field in the screened regime
- $\bullet$  Mountain $\mathbf{n} \equiv$  deviation from spherical symmetry + analogy with the 'lightning-rod effect' in chameleon and symmetron models [10]
- $\bullet$  Can <sup>a</sup> satellite flying over <sup>a</sup> mountain distinguish between Newtonian gravity and chameleon gravity?

# Motivations

 $\bullet$ 

 $\bullet$ 

[10] K. Jones-Smith and F. Ferrer, Detecting Chameleon Dark Energy via an Electrostatic Analogy, Phys. Rev. Lett. 108, 221101 – Published 29 May 2012



#### Credit: NASA/JPL-Caltech



#### Credit: NASA/JPL-Caltech

 $\mathbf{v}$ 

![](_page_26_Picture_3.jpeg)

#### Credit: NASA/JPL-Caltech

![](_page_27_Picture_1.jpeg)

### Laser Ranging Interferometry: precision of few tenths of microns

#### That's  $\sim$  10<sup>-10</sup> km!!!

![](_page_28_Picture_0.jpeg)

### $t=t_0$

 $\blacktriangledown$ 

 $\bullet$ 

 $\bullet$ 

# $\int d(t_0)$

 $\bullet$ 

 $\bullet$ 

 $\bullet$ 

### $t=t_0$

 $\bigstar$ 

![](_page_30_Picture_0.jpeg)

 $\bullet$ 

 $\bullet$ 

 $\bullet$ 

### $t=t_1$

 $\bigstar$ 

![](_page_31_Picture_0.jpeg)

### $t=t_2$

 $\bigstar$ 

# $d(t_2) < d(t_1)$

![](_page_32_Figure_0.jpeg)

![](_page_33_Figure_0.jpeg)

### Interpreting the measurement in the framework of Newtonian gravity gives us a gravity map

![](_page_34_Picture_1.jpeg)

![](_page_34_Picture_2.jpeg)

![](_page_34_Figure_3.jpeg)

60

![](_page_35_Picture_0.jpeg)

![](_page_35_Figure_1.jpeg)

![](_page_35_Picture_2.jpeg)

#### Passage of the satellites above the mountain

ATTERNATIVE

![](_page_36_Figure_1.jpeg)

![](_page_36_Picture_2.jpeg)

#### $+3.267 \times 10^{5}$

 $230$ 

 $34$ 

32

30

28

Inter-satellite dist

![](_page_36_Figure_4.jpeg)

![](_page_37_Picture_0.jpeg)

#### The anomaly is well within the range of GRACE-FO precision!

 $\mathcal{O}(1cm) \gg \mathcal{O}(10^{-5}cm)$ 

![](_page_38_Figure_2.jpeg)

Is it possible to absorb the chameleon anomaly in• a small uncertainty in the satellite's initial state vector  $\delta_x$ ?  $\bullet$  $\bullet$ • a slight variation in the {Earth + Mountain} density  $\delta_{\rho}$ **)** (in the framework of Newtonian gravity) $\sqrt{17}$ 

### Sources of degeneracy

- 
- 

### $sat(10) - A_0$ <sub>1</sub> T  $O_\chi$

 $0$ L $\theta$ 

#### **Questions**

### Sources of degeneracy

### $0$ L $\theta$

### Questions

a slight variation in the {Earth + Mountain} density  $\delta_0$ ?  $\sqrt{17}$ 

 Is it possible to absorb the chameleon anomaly in•

- 
- $\bullet$ (in the framework of Newtonian gravity)

### $sat(10) = A_0L + U_x$

### Modified Gravity(Newtonian + chameleon accelerations)

### Newtonian Gravitywith extra point-mass

VS

![](_page_41_Figure_3.jpeg)

#### Modified Gravity(Newtonian + chameleon accelerations)

#### Point of mass  $m_*$  at coordinate  $Z_*$

### Newtonian Gravitywith extra point-mass

VS

 $\mathbf{Z}$ 

![](_page_43_Figure_0.jpeg)

## How to lift the degeneracy?

![](_page_44_Figure_1.jpeg)

1

![](_page_44_Picture_2.jpeg)

### Idea:

### Perform the experiment at different altitudes

![](_page_44_Picture_5.jpeg)

19

# How to lift the degeneracy?

![](_page_45_Figure_1.jpeg)

![](_page_45_Picture_2.jpeg)

![](_page_46_Figure_0.jpeg)

H Lévy et al, arχiv 2310.03769

### Tensions come in…

![](_page_47_Figure_1.jpeg)

### The **greater the tension**, the **tighter** the potential constraints on the modified gravity model at stake

# Conclusion

![](_page_49_Picture_1.jpeg)

- $\bullet$ • *femtoscope*: solve semi-linear elliptic PDE using the Finite Element Method on unbounded domains (general purpose code)
- $\bullet$ Application to scalar-tensor theories of gravity:

Linear Poisson equation

![](_page_50_Picture_5.jpeg)

#### Nonlinear Klein-Gordon equation

![](_page_50_Picture_10.jpeg)

![](_page_50_Picture_11.jpeg)

Gravitational Acceleration

![](_page_50_Picture_8.jpeg)

- $\bullet$ Application to space geodesy: focus on the GRACE-FO configuration
- Can we detect / put constraints on the chameleon model in this context? $\bullet$

With little to nouncertainties

With uncertainties

Competitive constraints can be derived

Satellite state vector

• In comparison, lab experiments offer a more controlled environment

Mass distribution inside the Earth

•

 Dramatically improve our knowledge of the Earth density (unlikely)

• Use  $\neq$  altitudes (taking advantage of the fact that  $a_{\phi} \ll 1/r^2$ )

•

#### hugo.levy@onera.fr

- $\bullet$ Application to space geodesy: focus on the GRACE-FO configuration
- Can we detect / put constraints on the chameleon model in this context? $\bullet$

With little to nouncertainties

With uncertainties

Competitive constraints can be derived

Satellite state vector

![](_page_52_Picture_13.jpeg)

• In comparison, lab experiments offer a more controlled environment

Mass distribution inside the Earth

•

 Dramatically improve our knowledge of the Earth density (unlikely)

• Use  $\neq$  altitudes (taking advantage of the fact that  $a_{\phi} \ll 1/r^2$ )

•

hugo.levy@onera.fr

Thanks for your attention!

![](_page_53_Picture_127.jpeg)

s, Vol. 568, 22 March 2015, p. 1-98  $\emph{ries and f(R)-gravity: From the action to} \rm{120}$ v. D, August 2016 Phys. Rev. D, November 2012

ts with parallel-plate configuration, Phys. Rev. D,

U. Vikram et al, Astrophysical tests of modes of allegeration curves in dwarf galaxies, Phys. Rev.

a. B. M. Wilcox et al. Simulation tests of the galaxy constraints on the constraints on the constraints on the A. 1306.6113 [astro-ph.CO], June 2013 Electrostatic Analogy, Phys. Rev. Lett. 108,

## References

# Backup Slides

![](_page_54_Picture_1.jpeg)

# E<br>  $\frac{1}{\sum_{\substack{0 \text{odd } \\ \text{even } \\ \text{odd } \\ \text{odd } \\ \text{odd } \\ \text{odd } \\ \text{even } \\$

![](_page_55_Picture_2.jpeg)

![](_page_56_Figure_1.jpeg)

#### FEM Recipe

1. Multiply Eq. (1) by a test function  $\nu$ 

2. Integrate over  $\Omega$ 

3. Perform an integration by parts

 $(1)$ 

![](_page_57_Figure_1.jpeg)

Find  $u \in V \coloneqq H_0^1(\Omega) \quad \forall v \in V, \underbrace{\int_{\Omega} \nabla u \cdot \nabla v \, dx}_{a(u,v)} = \underbrace{\int_{\Omega} f v \, dx}_{l(v)}$ 

![](_page_58_Figure_1.jpeg)

Find  $u \in V \coloneqq H_0^1(\Omega) \quad \forall v \in V, \int_{\Omega} \nabla v$ 

4. Look for  $u$  in a finite-dimensional subspace  $V^h$ (e.g. space of piecewise polynomial functions)

$$
\mathbf{u} \cdot \nabla v \, \mathrm{d}x = \int_{\Omega} f v \, \mathrm{d}x
$$

### The landscape of basis functions

![](_page_59_Picture_1.jpeg)

![](_page_60_Figure_1.jpeg)

Find  $u \in V := H_0^1(\Omega) \quad \forall v \in V, \int_{\Omega} \nabla u \cdot \nabla v \,dx = \int_{\Omega} f v \,dx$ 

Find  $u_h \in V_h \subset V$   $\forall i \in [1, N]$   $a(u_h, v_i) = l(v_i)$ 

Solve  $AU = L$ 

 $\left\{\begin{array}{rcl} A_{ij} & = & a(v_j, v_i) \ I_{ii} & = & I(v_i) \end{array}\right.$ 

 $a(u,v)$ 

continuous

### Idea n°2

### Measuring gravitational redshift using clocks [under investigation]

![](_page_61_Picture_2.jpeg)

### How to lift the degeneracy?

![](_page_61_Picture_4.jpeg)

### Chameleon constraints from MICROSCOPE

![](_page_62_Figure_1.jpeg)

M. Pernot-Borràs et al. (2019)

### **Chameleon constraints from MICROSCOPE**

#### MICROSCOPE can do:

- weak equivalence principle [state of the art]
- generic long-range Yukawa  $5^{\text{th}}$ -force [state of the art]
- $\bullet$  light dilaton [competitive]
- Lorentz invariance [state of the art]

#### MICROSCOPE cannot do:

- generic short-range Yukawa  $5^{\text{th}}$ -force [not competitive]
- chameleon  $5^{\text{th}}$ -force [not competitive]

MICROSCOPE was not designed for testing shortranged modified gravity theories. Recent work challenges the claim on the ability of space experiments to detect chameleon-sourced violations of the WEP sourced by the Earth  $[2, 3]$ .

# Convergence Analysis (FEM)

### Implemented techniques

• Compactification :  $\Omega \rightarrow \tilde{\Omega}$  (global coordinate transform) + BC applied at the boundary of the compactified domain.

• "Connected": domain splitting  $\overline{\Omega}$  $\overline{\Omega}=\overline{\Omega}_{int}$  $\sum_{t=0}^{t}$ and Kelvin inversion  $\Omega_{ext} \rightarrow \tilde{\Omega}_{ext}$  + identification of the boundary DOFs  $\partial\Omega_{int}$  $_{t}\equiv\partial\widetilde{\Omega}_{ext}$ .

• "ping-pong": domain splitting  $\overline{\Omega}$  $\overline{\Omega}=\overline{\Omega}_{int}$  $_{t}$  ∪  $\overline{\Omega}_{ext}$ and Kelvin inversion  $\Omega_{ext} \rightarrow \tilde{\Omega}_{ext}$  + iterative method with DtN / NtD transmission conditions<br>at the boundary

![](_page_64_Figure_1.jpeg)

- 
- 
- at the boundary

# Convergence Analysis (FEM)

![](_page_65_Figure_1.jpeg)

# Building blocks of Scalar-Tensor theories

### Metric Tensor $|g_{\mu\nu}|$

Einstein-Hilbert action in General Relativity

$$
S_{EH} = \frac{M_{Pl}^2}{2} \int d^4x \sqrt{-g} R + \int d^4x \sqrt{-g} L_m(g_{\mu\nu}, \psi_m^{(i)})
$$

# Building blocks of Scalar-Tensor theories

![](_page_67_Figure_1.jpeg)

![](_page_67_Figure_2.jpeg)

#### Scalar Field $\bm{D}$

 $\int$  $\boldsymbol{d}$ 4  $\bm{\chi}$  $-\tilde{g}$  $\boldsymbol{L}$  $m$   $(\, \Omega^{2}$  $\frac{2}{\sqrt{2}}$  $\phi)$  $\left(g_{\mu\nu},\psi_{m}^{\vee}\right)$ (  $\boldsymbol{l}$  $\left( i\right)$ 

$$
S = \int d^4x \sqrt{-g} \left[ \frac{M_{Pl}^2}{2} R - \frac{1}{2} g^{\mu\nu} \partial_\mu \phi \partial_\nu \phi - V(\phi) \right] +
$$

![](_page_68_Picture_0.jpeg)

#### Modified Gravity geodesics $\partial \ln \Omega$  $\frac{2}{\pi} \perp^{\mu \rho} \partial_{\mu} \phi$  $u^\mu \nabla_\mu u^\rho =$  $\partial \phi$

#### General Relativity geodesics

$$
\frac{\mathrm{d}^2 x^{\sigma}}{\mathrm{d}s^2} + \Gamma^{\sigma}_{\mu\nu} \frac{\mathrm{d}x^{\mu}}{\mathrm{d}s} \frac{\mathrm{d}x^{\nu}}{\mathrm{d}s} = 0
$$

![](_page_69_Picture_0.jpeg)

#### Modified Gravity geodesics $\partial \ln \Omega$  $\frac{2}{\pi} \pm \mu \rho \partial_{\mu} \phi$  $u^\mu \nabla_\mu u^\rho = \partial \phi$

#### General Relativity geodesics

$$
\frac{\mathrm{d}^2 x^{\sigma}}{\mathrm{ds}^2} + \Gamma^{\sigma}_{\mu\nu} \frac{\mathrm{d} x^{\mu}}{\mathrm{ds}} \frac{\mathrm{d} x^{\nu}}{\mathrm{ds}} = 0
$$

Derivation can be found in M. Pernot-Borràs 2020, PhD thesis