Signature of Noncommutative geometry on resonant detectors of Gravitational Wave

Current Developments in Quantum Field Theory and Gravity-2016

SNBNCBS, Salt Lake

A. Saha,

Department of Physics, West Bengal State University, Barasat

. – p.1/7

Spatial Noncommutative structure

• Gedanken experiments with a sharp spatial localization of events have predicted uncertainty in the coordinates at the quantum level. PLB 331 39 (1994); PLB 339 301 (1994)

Spatial Noncommutative structure

- Gedanken experiments with a sharp spatial localization of events have predicted uncertainty in the coordinates at the quantum level. PLB 331 39 (1994); PLB 339 301 (1994)
- Quantization of the continuous phase-space of CM → QM, variables follow the Hisenberg algebra
 [x_i, p_j] = iħδ_{ij}, [x_i, x_j] = 0, [p_i, p_j] = 0.
 ⇒ simulteneous determination of the same components of position variable and its conjugate momenta is restricted.

Spatial Noncommutative structure

- Gedanken experiments with a sharp spatial localization of events have predicted uncertainty in the coordinates at the quantum level. PLB 331 39 (1994); PLB 339 301 (1994)
- Quantization of the continuous phase-space of CM → QM, variables follow the Hisenberg algebra
 [x_i, p_j] = iħδ_{ij}, [x_i, x_j] = 0, [p_i, p_j] = 0.
 ⇒ simulteneous determination of the same components of position variable and its conjugate momenta is restricted.
- Likewise, quantization of the space ⇒ Restriction on the simulteneous determination of different components of space coordinates ⇒ the NC Heisenberg algebra
 [x̂_i, p̂_j] = iħδ_{ij}, [x̂_i, x̂_j] = iθ_{ij}, [p̂_i, p̂_j] = iθ̄_{ij}.
 θ, θ̄ = constant antisymmetric tensor
 ⇒ noncommutative (NC) space.

• NCFT: Action with NC fields and star product; $\hat{f} \star \hat{g} = \hat{f}\hat{g} + \frac{i}{2}\theta_{\mu\nu}\partial_{\mu}f\partial_{\nu}g + O[\theta^2]$

- NCFT: Action with NC fields and star product; $\hat{f} \star \hat{g} = \hat{f}\hat{g} + \frac{i}{2}\theta_{\mu\nu}\partial_{\mu}f\partial_{\nu}g + O[\theta^2]$
- In presence of the gauge fields SW map relates $\hat{f} = f + \theta f^1 (f, A_\mu) + O[\theta^2]$

- NCFT: Action with NC fields and star product; $\hat{f} \star \hat{g} = \hat{f}\hat{g} + \frac{i}{2}\theta_{\mu\nu}\partial_{\mu}f\partial_{\nu}g + O[\theta^2]$
- In presence of the gauge fields SW map relates $\hat{f} = f + \theta f^1 (f, A_\mu) + O[\theta^2]$
- Commutative equivalent description.

- NCFT: Action with NC fields and star product; $\hat{f} \star \hat{g} = \hat{f}\hat{g} + \frac{i}{2}\theta_{\mu\nu}\partial_{\mu}f\partial_{\nu}g + O[\theta^2]$
- In presence of the gauge fields SW map relates $\hat{f} = f + \theta f^1 (f, A_\mu) + O[\theta^2]$
- Commutative equivalent description.
- NC electrodynamics: first order; NC gravity: second order

- NCFT: Action with NC fields and star product; $\hat{f} \star \hat{g} = \hat{f}\hat{g} + \frac{i}{2}\theta_{\mu\nu}\partial_{\mu}f\partial_{\nu}g + O[\theta^2]$
- In presence of the gauge fields SW map relates $\hat{f} = f + \theta f^1 (f, A_\mu) + O[\theta^2]$
- Commutative equivalent description.
- NC electrodynamics: first order; NC gravity: second order
- NCQM: Classical Hamiltonian → canonical variables change to NC Heisenberg operators.

- NCFT: Action with NC fields and star product; $\hat{f} \star \hat{g} = \hat{f}\hat{g} + \frac{i}{2}\theta_{\mu\nu}\partial_{\mu}f\partial_{\nu}g + O[\theta^2]$
- In presence of the gauge fields SW map relates $\hat{f} = f + \theta f^1 (f, A_\mu) + O[\theta^2]$
- Commutative equivalent description.
- NC electrodynamics: first order; NC gravity: second order
- NCQM: Classical Hamiltonian → canonical variables change to NC Heisenberg operators.
- This NC phase-space algebra \rightarrow Standard Heisenberg algebra spanned by the operators \hat{X}_i and \hat{P}_j of the ordinary QM through the transformation equations $\hat{x}_i = \hat{X}_i - \frac{1}{2\hbar} \theta \epsilon_{ij} \hat{P}_j$, $\hat{p}_i = \hat{P}_i + \frac{1}{2\hbar} \bar{\theta} \epsilon_{ij} \hat{X}_j$

• Theoretical modeling of various experiments in a NC space help set up upper bounds on NC parameter.

- Theoretical modeling of various experiments in a NC space help set up upper bounds on NC parameter.
- NC length scale √θ ~ 10⁻²⁰m (Clock-comparison experiment) [PRL87, 141601, 2001].

- Theoretical modeling of various experiments in a NC space help set up upper bounds on NC parameter.
- NC length scale √θ ~ 10⁻²⁰m (Clock-comparison experiment) [PRL87, 141601, 2001].
- NC will show up in xperiments where a length-scale $\sim 10^{-20}$ m is effectively probed.

- Theoretical modeling of various experiments in a NC space help set up upper bounds on NC parameter.
- NC length scale √θ ~ 10⁻²⁰m (Clock-comparison experiment) [PRL87, 141601, 2001].
- NC will show up in xperiments where a length-scale $\sim 10^{-20}$ m is effectively probed.
- Best Bet: NCQM modelling of GW detection set ups.

- Theoretical modeling of various experiments in a NC space help set up upper bounds on NC parameter.
- NC length scale √θ ~ 10⁻²⁰m (Clock-comparison experiment) [PRL87, 141601, 2001].
- NC will show up in xperiments where a length-scale $\sim 10^{-20}$ m is effectively probed.
- Best Bet: NCQM modelling of GW detection set ups.
- Successful detection of GW in aLIGO, an interferometric detector. (but justifying a QM modeling is tricky.)

- Theoretical modeling of various experiments in a NC space help set up upper bounds on NC parameter.
- NC length scale √θ ~ 10⁻²⁰m (Clock-comparison experiment) [PRL87, 141601, 2001].
- NC will show up in xperiments where a length-scale $\sim 10^{-20}$ m is effectively probed.
- Best Bet: NCQM modelling of GW detection set ups.
- Successful detection of GW in aLIGO, an interferometric detector. (but justifying a QM modeling is tricky.)
- Instead, we modelled the Resonant bar detectors of GW(still trying to achieve the needed sensitivity limit for successful detection) quantum mechanically in NC space.

• Typical cylindrical Aluminium bar with $L \sim 3 \text{ m}$, $r = 30 \text{ cm}, M = 2 \times 10^3 \text{ Kg}$.

- Typical cylindrical Aluminium bar with $L \sim 3 \text{ m}$, $r = 30 \text{ cm}, M = 2 \times 10^3 \text{ Kg}.$
- Set into forced elastic oscillation by incoming GW ⇒
 Oscillation is converted into electrical signal ⇒ Amplified and recorded. (when oscillator resonates with GW).

- Typical cylindrical Aluminium bar with $L \sim 3 \text{ m}$, $r = 30 \text{ cm}, M = 2 \times 10^3 \text{ Kg}.$
- Set into forced elastic oscillation by incoming GW ⇒
 Oscillation is converted into electrical signal ⇒ Amplified and recorded. (when oscillator resonates with GW).
- The frequency of the fundamental mode of elastic oscillation is a few KHz (respond to GW in the KHz range.)

- Typical cylindrical Aluminium bar with $L \sim 3 \text{ m}$, $r = 30 \text{ cm}, M = 2 \times 10^3 \text{ Kg}.$
- Set into forced elastic oscillation by incoming GW ⇒
 Oscillation is converted into electrical signal ⇒ Amplified and recorded. (when oscillator resonates with GW).
- The frequency of the fundamental mode of elastic oscillation is a few KHz (respond to GW in the KHz range.)
- The fundamental mode of elastic oscillation driven by the force of the passing GW is identical to a forced harmonic oscillator.

- Typical cylindrical Aluminium bar with $L \sim 3 \text{ m}$, $r = 30 \text{ cm}, M = 2 \times 10^3 \text{ Kg}.$
- Set into forced elastic oscillation by incoming GW ⇒
 Oscillation is converted into electrical signal ⇒ Amplified and recorded. (when oscillator resonates with GW).
- The frequency of the fundamental mode of elastic oscillation is a few KHz (respond to GW in the KHz range.)
- The fundamental mode of elastic oscillation driven by the force of the passing GW is identical to a forced harmonic oscillator.
- SO we model a NCQM Harmonic oscillator interacting with GW.

Our results imply that due to noncommutativity the harmonic oscillator resonates to a periodic GW not at its intrinsic frequency *∞*, but at two frequencies evenly spaced around it, *∞* ± Λ_θ = *∞*′.

- Our results imply that due to noncommutativity the harmonic oscillator resonates to a periodic GW not at its intrinsic frequency *∞*, but at two frequencies evenly spaced around it, *∞* ± Λ_θ = *∞*'.
- The shift in frequency is $\Lambda_{\theta} = \frac{m \varpi^2 \theta}{2\hbar}$.

- Our results imply that due to noncommutativity the harmonic oscillator resonates to a periodic GW not at its intrinsic frequency ∞, but at two frequencies evenly spaced around it, ∞ ± Λ_θ = ∞'.
- The shift in frequency is $\Lambda_{\theta} = \frac{m \varpi^2 \theta}{2\hbar}$.
- The same bar-detector resonating to two evenly placed frequencies, centering the intrinsic frequency of the bar can be a potential evidance of NC space.

- Our results imply that due to noncommutativity the harmonic oscillator resonates to a periodic GW not at its intrinsic frequency ∞, but at two frequencies evenly spaced around it, ∞ ± Λ_θ = ∞'.
- The shift in frequency is $\Lambda_{\theta} = \frac{m \varpi^2 \theta}{2\hbar}$.
- The same bar-detector resonating to two evenly placed frequencies, centering the intrinsic frequency of the bar can be a potential evidance of NC space.
- In such a scenario, since the intrinsic frequency *π* is known, and resonance frequencies *π'* would be observed, one can ontain Λ_θ.

Publications

- 1. AS, SG, PLB 681 96, 2009
- 2. AS, SG, SS, PRD 83 025004, 2011
- 3. SG, AS, MPLA 35 1250192, 2012
- 4. SG, AS, SS, MPLA 35 1350161, 2013
- 5. SG, AS, SS, GRG 47 6, 65 (2015)
- 6. SG, AS, SS, GRG 47 3, 28 (2015)
- 7. AS, SG, CQG 33 205006 (2016)
- 8. SG, AS, SS, PRD 97 044015 (2018).