

Particle Physics with Gravitational Wave Detector Technology

Christoph Englert,^{1,*} Stefan Hild,^{1,†} and Michael Spannowsky^{2,‡}

¹*SUPA, School of Physics and Astronomy, University of Glasgow, Glasgow G12 8QQ, UK*

²*Institute for Particle Physics Phenomenology, Department of Physics,
Durham University, Durham DH1 3LE, UK*

Gravitational wave detector technology provides high-precision measurement apparatuses that, if combined with a modulated particle source, have the potential to measure and constrain particle interactions in a novel way, by measuring the pressure caused by scattering particle beams off the mirror material. Such a measurement does not rely on tagging a final state. This strategy has the potential to allow us to explore novel ways to constrain the presence of new interactions beyond the Standard Model of Particle Physics and provide additional constraints to poorly understood cross sections in the non-perturbative regime of QCD and Nuclear Physics, which are limiting factors of dark matter and neutrino physics searches. Beyond high-energy physics, if technically feasible, the proposed method to measure nucleon-nucleon interactions can lead to practical applications in material and medical sciences.

INTRODUCTION

The direct detection of gravitational waves [1–4] marks the beginning of a new era of Astronomy, Cosmology and Astrophysics that will exhaust the opportunities introduced by high precision interferometry techniques developed for gravitational wave detectors such as LIGO. The precision with which measurements can be performed opens up the prospects of better understanding early Universe phenomena such as baryogenesis [5], exotic physics on cosmological scales [6–8], test the nature of gravity [9–11] and constrain aspects of the cosmological standard model [12–14] through their gravitational signals.

Most of the implications of gravitational wave observations evolve around the semi-classical features of gravity as well as its potential modifications, and connecting these novel insights to our established microscopic picture of particle interactions might seem a bridge too far. However, the high precision that is offered by gravitational wave detectors and their underlying working principles could offer new opportunities for particle physics as new sensitive probes of particle interactions. Especially in the low energy limit of Quantum Chromodynamics, hadronic cross sections are plagued by big theoretical as well as experimental uncertainties, that feed into a series of searches for beyond the Standard Model interactions. For instance, hadronic and nuclear interactions are key limiting factors for searches for new effects in the neutrino sector [15], where additional information could be used to gain a more fine-grained picture of multi-nucleon interaction and nucleon correlation [16].

Using the sensitivity of gravitational wave detectors' mirrors to smallest forces, a gravitational wave detector, or smaller interferometer providing a similar force sensitivity, but without the need to build kilometre-scale arms, can in principle be turned into a particle physics detector through measuring the pressure caused by scattering of a (modulated) beam off the material. Such a


measurement can be, but does not have to be correlated with observation of transmission. Inclusive scattering cross sections can therefore be measured without relying on final state particle information if a certain material is sufficiently well-understood.

After discussing the sensitivity provided by gravitational wave detector technology, we calculate the expected pressures in a range of simplified scenarios that allow us to correlate pressure and total scattering cross section most straightforwardly. Considering realistic estimates of beam conditions of sources of highest intensity, we argue on theoretical grounds that the expected sensitivity is high enough to access strong interaction cross sections in a completely novel way.


ACHIEVABLE FORCE SENSITIVITY USING GRAVITATIONAL WAVE DETECTOR TECHNOLOGIES

Gravitational Wave Detectors such as LIGO, GEO 600 or VIRGO [17–19] have established high-precision measurements of differential displacement of end mirrors of their orthogonal arms, reaching sensitivities in the range of 10^{-19} m/ $\sqrt{\text{Hz}}$ for frequencies roughly covering the audio-band. Employing similar technology as large-scale laser-interferometric GW detectors, one can conceive meter-scale experiments* which can provide a similar displacement sensitivity in the kHz range. In the following we will use the example of the Glasgow ERC speedmeter interferometer [20] to show what range of forces applied to one of mirrors of the interferometer

*Note that the kilometre-scale arm length for real GW detectors is required to increase its response to spacetime fluctuations. However, for simple force measurement the achievable sensitivity will be to first order independent of the length of the laser interferometer.



(a) Target displacement sensitivity.



(b) Target force sensitivity.

FIG. 1: Sensitivity of the Glasgow ERC speedmeter experiment. The resonances with decreased sensitivity are related to the violin modes of the mirror suspension fibres.

can be measured. We chose that experiment because of its small scale in terms of cost (about 1 million \$) and space (footprint of about 4×2 m), which makes it conceivable to consider to set up a copy of experiment close to beamline of a particle accelerator.

Figure 1(a) shows the design sensitivity of the Glasgow ERC speedmeter, expressed as the linear spectral density of differential displacements of its interferometer mirrors. Each of the arm cavity resonators of the laser interferometer features a mirror of mass, $m = 1$ g, with a diameter of 10 mm, suspended from a multi-stage pendulum. In the following sections we assume that a particle beam, fully modulated at a frequency f is focussed down to less than 10 mm in diameter and impinges onto one of the interferometer mirrors. We also assume that apart from this one probing mirror, no other component of the laser interferometer is influenced by the modulated particle beam or the apparatus creating it. Then we can simply compute the linear spectral density of the force sensitivity of the ERC speedmeter for forces applied to one of its 1 gram mirrors:

$$F(f) = X_{sens}(f)mf^2, \quad (1)$$

where X_{sens} is the equivalent displacement spectral density shown in Fig. 1(a). The resulting spectral density of the force sensitivity, given in units of Newton per square root of Hz, is displayed in Fig. 1(b). For a particle beam modulation frequency of 1 kHz a force of 2×10^{-16} N exerted onto the mirror would be measured with a signal to noise ratio of 1 for a measurement of duration 1 second. This sensitivity is limited by noise processes inherent to the Glasgow ERC speedmeter such as Brownian fluctuations of the molecules in the mirror coating and mirror suspension fibres [21] or quantum noise, a

combination of sensing and back-action noise of the photons in the interferometer [22]. However, obviously the achievable signal to noise ratio can easily be increased by lengthening the measurement duration. Similarly, integration over longer durations allows the observation of forces smaller than the level shown Fig. 1(a). In the following sections we will conservatively focus on the sensitivity achievable with a measuring duration t of 1 second. However, we point out that the sensitivity improves with $\sqrt{\text{time}}$, i.e. for $t = 100$ s the sensitivity improves by a factor of 10 and for one week of data-taking it improves by a factor of ~ 777 .




FIG. 2: Schematic layout of the proposed experimental setup. Red lines indicate the laser beams of reading out the differential length of the two triangular arm cavities. One of the cavity end mirrors is used as the target of a modulated particle beam indicated by the blue arrow.




FIG. 3: Scattering in the toy models discussed in this work. The scalar (S) and vectorial mediators (V) carry momentum transfer $t = (p_1 - p_3)^2 = (p_2 - p_4)^2$ with four momenta $p_1^2, p_3^2 = m^2$ and $p_2^2, p_4^2 = M_n^2$ in the elastic case. The interaction vertices are generated by the interactions quoted in Eq. (3).

PRESSURE FROM SCATTERING

Macroscopic pressure can be related to scattering through the momentum transfer between incident beam and target material per unit area and unit of time. In the microscopic picture these effects are related to $2 \rightarrow 2$ scattering processes with differential cross section $d\sigma$. Choosing the beam axis in z direction the pressure is evaluated by weighting the momentum transfer in z direction with the corresponding field theoretic probability for a simplified geometry (see e.g. [23])

$$P \simeq \mathcal{F}\mathcal{T} \int_{-1}^1 d\alpha \frac{d\sigma}{d\alpha} p_z (1 - \alpha). \quad (2)$$

p_z is the z -component of the incident particle's momentum that is reduced by a factor $\alpha \in [-1, 1]$ by scattering off the target material. \mathcal{F} denotes the flux of incoming particles per unit area and time and \mathcal{T} is the optical thickness measured in number per unit area. The flux can be controlled in the experimental setting while \mathcal{T} is a material-dependent quantity.

In particle and nuclear physics-based collider experiments such as the Large Hadron Collider, total (or exclusive) cross sections are also inferred from an underlying differential cross section

$$\sigma = \int_{-1}^1 d\alpha \frac{d\sigma}{d\alpha}. \quad (3)$$

We can therefore correlate event count measurements of scattering processes at colliders with pressure constraints for a given theory model that underpins $d\sigma$. As the flux can be controlled experimentally, the implications are two-fold: if we have a good understanding of the scattering cross section, the material-dependent parameter \mathcal{T} can be inferred. If \mathcal{T} is sufficiently known, Eq. (2) provides a complementary constraint on our modelling of $d\sigma$. A more detailed modelling of the beam-absorber interaction can be achieved using GEANT [24]. We discuss potential practical applications of this measurement below.

We will consider elastic scattering in the following $p_1(m) + p_2(M_n) \rightarrow p_3(m) + p_4(M_n)$, with m denoting the mass of the incident particle and M_n the target mass (we will comment on inelastic scattering below). We focus on t -channel mediators, $t = (p_1 - p_3)^2 < 0$ of the scattering and consider scalar and vectorial toy-interactions with different Lorentz structures

$$\mathcal{L} = \sum_i \bar{\Psi}_i (c_1 S + c_2 \gamma^\mu V_\mu) \Psi_i \quad (4)$$

to highlight complementarity of the pressure measurement for a given cross section value (see Fig. 3). We denote the mediator masses with $m_{S,V}$, respectively. The sum runs over our mass choices $i = m, M_n$. The effective couplings c_i and masses are model-dependent and can have momentum transfer-dependencies. For instance, search strategies for dark matter in the context of simplified models do typically neglect any momentum dependencies in first instance (e.g. [25]).

Equation (2) (including the momentum transfer of the scattering) can be obtained from the amplitude \mathcal{M} for fixed target kinematics via (see e.g. [26])

$$\frac{d\sigma}{d\alpha} = \frac{1}{64\pi s} \frac{1}{|\mathbf{p}_{1,\text{cm}}|^2} |\mathcal{M}|^2 \frac{dt}{d\alpha}, \quad (5)$$

with $s = (p_1 + p_2)^2$ and

$$p_{1,\text{cm}} = \frac{p_{1,\text{lab}} M_n}{\sqrt{s}} \quad (6)$$

in the lab frame where M_n is at rest and m has three-momentum $p_{1,\text{lab}}$.

Current as well as projections of future beam facilities suggest that fluxes in the range of 10^{-1} to 1 ampere are controllable in the beam energy range of ~ 1 GeV [27]. For the purpose of this work we therefore (conservatively) assume

$$\mathcal{F} = \frac{10^{12}}{\text{cm}^2 \text{ s}} \quad (7)$$

while the optical thickness of the material is of the order of

$$\mathcal{T} = \frac{N_{\text{tot}}}{A} = \frac{d\rho N_A}{m_A} \simeq \frac{1.3 \cdot 10^{22}}{\text{cm}^2}, \quad (8)$$

where the constants used describe the absorbers properties: N_{tot} its total number of molecules, A is the absorber area, ρ its material density and d its depth. We assumed an absorber of cylindrical shape with $d = 0.5$ cm and a total weight of 1 g. m_A is the absorber's material molecular mass of $m_A \simeq 60$ g/mol, assuming Silicon dioxide SiO_2 , and N_A is Avogadro's constant. We assume the beam to be focussed to 10^{-3} m radius to compute the pressure that can be compared to the intensity curve of Fig. 1.




FIG. 4: Representative total cross section sensitivity contours for the different interactions as defined in Eq. (4) and incident beam energy of $E(m) = 10$ GeV that can be obtained from a sensitivity of 10^{-15} N/ $\sqrt{\text{Hz}}$ at a frequency of ~ 3 kHz (cf. Fig. 1(b)).

To estimate if gravitational wave detector technology can provide additional insights, beyond previous proton collision experiments, we consider the interaction of an incident beam with $E_{\text{beam}} = 0.979$ GeV, with a flux of Eq. (7) and an absorber as specified in Eq. (8). Assuming a scalar interaction of Eq. (4), i.e. $c_2 = 0$ off a single proton inside the core, and a sensitivity of 10^{-15} N/ $\sqrt{\text{Hz}}$ at 3 kHz, we find a sensitivity to a cross section of about 3 mb within our approximations. This is well beyond the precision of early proton proton experiments [26]. As the force can be measured precisely in these setups, decreasing uncertainties in cross section measurements becomes

feasible.[†]

A given sensitivity threshold of the detector setup (Fig. 1(b)) amounts to an upper limit of $|c_i|$ for given masses of the exchange particles through Eqs. (2) and (5). This limit can be interpreted as an upper total cross section limit, see Eq. (3). This is shown in Fig. 4, where we plot the upper cross section limits in the simplified model for our chosen benchmark sensitivity and a range of masses. The cross sections that the pressure measurement is sensitive to shows a significant model-dependence in particular because the pressure measurement high-

[†]Proton-proton cross sections are well exceeded by proton-nucleus cross sections that are $\gtrsim 100$ mb [28–30] over a broad range of centre-of-mass energies.




FIG. 5: Different sensitivity thresholds for measured elastic scattering cross sections in the presence of new inelastic interactions that cannot be probed at colliders. The red lines correspond to a signal hypothesis based on a particular collider cross section measurement. It can be related to the characteristic force that provides an estimate of the beam intensity at which a signal should be detected with the mirror. If a signal is observed at lower intensity, the relative cross section deviation is in one-to-one correspondence with the decreased intensity. This can then be interpreted either as a decreased uncertainty given the model or a force contribution from new scattering processes. We adopt the toy model described above and focus on scattering $m = 1$ GeV, $M_n = 10$ GeV with a beam energy of $E \simeq 3$ GeV.

lights the forward and backward scattering kinematics. Therefore, depending on the specific scenario as well as the different correlation that is under scrutiny, we can see that the setup discussed in this work could be capable of constraining a range of underlying models.

The force measurement can also be used to constrain the presence of new interactions or disentangle different contributions through their energy-dependence by varying the beam energy or intensity. In Fig. 5 we demonstrate how additional untagged processes (here assumed to be inelastic scattering $m + M_n \rightarrow 0 + M_n$) can be constrained through a force measurement.

SUMMARY

The progress of gravitational wave detector technology has allowed us to enter an unparalleled regime of precision displacement measurements. It is this progress that lies at the heart of the direct discovery of gravitational waves. A key question that has been left unaddressed relates to the extent to which this progress can create opportunities for other areas of physics, possibly beyond the realm of semi-classical approximations. We have addressed this question in this note, demonstrating that the combination of sensitivity to smallest displacements when paired with modulated particle beams of highest intensity can provide a new avenue to mea-

surements of strong interaction cross sections as found in proton-proton or proton-nucleon experiments. As such reactions are typical backgrounds to different searches for new physics phenomena, the additional information of pressure measurements that highlights forward or backward scattering (typically inaccessible at collider experiments) can provide a so far unconsidered handle in sharpening our understanding of physics at the relevant energy scales. Within our approximations we highlight the example of proton proton scattering that can be probed at the 3 mb level at low energy, well beyond the precision of earlier measurements. Possible improvements include measuring at different intensities and longer times.

Furthermore, by adding additional material between mirror and incident beam at known expected sensitivity intensities, the setup could in be used to provide insides into material's absorption and transmission properties, but also provide complementary measurements of nucleon cross sections that are important for, e.g. dark matter searches. Therefore, if experimentally feasible, the techniques discussed in this work have applications not only in particle and nuclear physics, but also in the field of material sciences or medical applications, e.g. in nuclear therapy where a precise determination of absorption and transmission coefficients of nuclei in biological material is of vital importance for the outcome of the procedure. We reserve a more realistic treatment of the interactions and physics cases for future work [31].

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

We thank Lucian Harland-Lang and Teppei Katori for helpful discussions.

C.E. is supported by the IPPP Associateship scheme and by the UK Science and Technology Facilities Council (STFC) under grant ST/P000746/1. S.H. is supported by the STFC Grant (CG2016-2020) Ref: ST/N005422/1 and the European Research Council (ERC-2012-StG: 307245).

* Electronic address: christoph.englert@glasgow.ac.uk

† Electronic address: stefan.hild@glasgow.ac.uk

‡ Electronic address: michael.spannowsky@durham.ac.uk

- [1] B. P. Abbott et al. (Virgo, LIGO Scientific), Phys. Rev. Lett. **116**, 061102 (2016), 1602.03837.
- [2] B. P. Abbott et al. (Virgo, LIGO Scientific), Phys. Rev. Lett. **116**, 241103 (2016), 1606.04855.
- [3] B. P. Abbott et al. (Virgo, LIGO Scientific), Phys. Rev. Lett. **119**, 141101 (2017), 1709.09660.
- [4] B. P. Abbott et al. (Virgo, LIGO Scientific), Phys. Rev. Lett. **119**, 161101 (2017), 1710.05832.
- [5] C. Grojean and G. Servant, Phys. Rev. **D75**, 043507 (2007), hep-ph/0607107.
- [6] C. Caprini et al., JCAP **1604**, 001 (2016), 1512.06239.

- [7] J. Jaeckel, V. V. Khoze, and M. Spannowsky, *Phys. Rev. D* **94**, 103519 (2016), 1602.03901.
- [8] P. Schwaller, *Phys. Rev. Lett.* **115**, 181101 (2015), 1504.07263.
- [9] V. Cardoso, E. Franzin, and P. Pani, *Phys. Rev. Lett.* **116**, 171101 (2016), [Erratum: *Phys. Rev. Lett.* **117**, no. 8, 089902 (2016)], 1602.07309.
- [10] J. Abedi, H. Dykaar, and N. Afshordi (2016), 1612.00266.
- [11] T. Baker, E. Bellini, P. G. Ferreira, M. Lagos, J. Noller, and I. Sawicki (2017), 1710.06394.
- [12] B. F. Schutz, *Nature* **323**, 310 (1986).
- [13] D. E. Holz and S. A. Hughes, *Astrophys. J.* **629**, 15 (2005), astro-ph/0504616.
- [14] P. Creminelli and F. Vernizzi (2017), 1710.05877.
- [15] T. Katori and M. Martini (2016), 1611.07770.
- [16] C. Ciofi degli Atti and H. Morita (2017), 1708.05168.
- [17] T. L. S. Collaboration, J. Aasi, B. P. Abbott, R. Abbott, T. Abbott, M. R. Abernathy, K. Ackley, C. Adams, T. Adams, P. Addesso, et al., *Classical and Quantum Gravity* **32**, 074001 (2015), URL <http://stacks.iop.org/0264-9381/32/i=7/a=074001>.
- [18] H. Luck et al., *J. Phys. Conf. Ser.* **228**, 012012 (2010), 1004.0339.
- [19] T. Accadia et al. (VIRGO), *JINST* **7**, P03012 (2012).
- [20] C. Gräf, B. W. Barr, A. S. Bell, F. Campbell, A. V. Cumming, S. L. Danilishin, N. A. Gordon, G. D. Hammond, J. Hennig, E. A. Houston, et al., *Classical and Quantum Gravity* **31**, 215009 (2014), URL <http://stacks.iop.org/0264-9381/31/i=21/a=215009>.
- [21] M. Pitkin, S. Reid, S. Rowan, and J. Hough, *Living Reviews in Relativity* **14**, 5 (2011), ISSN 1433-8351, URL <https://doi.org/10.12942/lrr-2011-5>.
- [22] S. L. Danilishin and F. Y. Khalili, *Living Reviews in Relativity* **15**, 5 (2012), ISSN 1433-8351, URL <https://doi.org/10.12942/lrr-2012-5>.
- [23] S. L. Adler, *Phys. Rev.* **D11**, 1155 (1975).
- [24] S. Agostinelli et al. (GEANT4), *Nucl. Instrum. Meth.* **A506**, 250 (2003).
- [25] A. DiFranzo, K. I. Nagao, A. Rajaraman, and T. M. P. Tait, *JHEP* **11**, 014 (2013), [Erratum: *JHEP* **01**, 162 (2014)], 1308.2679.
- [26] C. Patrignani et al. (Particle Data Group), *Chin. Phys.* **C40**, 100001 (2016).
- [27] V. Shiltsev, S. Henderson, P. Hurh, I. Kourbanis, and V. Lebedev, in *Proceedings, 2013 Community Summer Study on the Future of U.S. Particle Physics: Snowmass on the Mississippi (CSS2013): Minneapolis, MN, USA, July 29-August 6, 2013* (2013), 1305.6917, URL <http://inspirehep.net/record/1236065/files/arXiv:1305.6917.pdf>.
- [28] L. Ray, *Phys. Rev.* **C20**, 1857 (1979).
- [29] R. F. Carlson, *Atom. Data Nucl. Data Tabl.* **63**, 93 (1996).
- [30] V. Guzey and M. Strikman, *Phys. Lett.* **B633**, 245 (2006), [*Phys. Lett.* **B663**, 456 (2008)], hep-ph/0505088.
- [31] C. Englert, S. Hild, and M. Spannowsky, in preparation (2018).