

Gravitational radiation in Infinite Derivative Gravity and Effective Quantum Gravity

James Edholm¹

¹*Lancaster University, Lancaster, LA1 4YW*

The Hulse-Taylor binary provides possibly the best test of GR to date. We find the modified quadrupole formula for Infinite Derivative Gravity (IDG). We extend the backreaction formula for propagation of gravitational waves, found previously for Effective Quantum Gravity (EQG) for a flat background and extend this calculation to a de Sitter background for both EQG and IDG. We put tighter constraints on EQG using new LIGO data. We also find the power emitted by a binary system within the IDG framework for both circular and elliptical orbits and use the example of the Hulse-Taylor binary. IDG predicts a slightly lower power than GR, which is exactly the observed result. We also find a lower bound on our mass scale of $M > 4.0$ keV, which is 10^6 larger than the previous result.

General Relativity (GR) has been spectacularly successful in experimental tests, notably in the recent detection of gravitational waves [1]. One of the most renowned tests is the Hulse-Taylor binary. The way the orbital period of these two stars changes over time depends on the gravitational radiation emitted. This matches the GR prediction to within 0.2% [2].

However, GR breaks down at short distances where it produces singularities. The first attempts to modify gravity by altering the action failed because they generated ghosts, which are excitations with negative kinetic energy [3]. Infinite Derivative Gravity (IDG) [4–34] avoids this fate while also allowing us the possibility to not produce singularities.

IDG has the action [6]

$$\mathcal{L} = \frac{\sqrt{-g}}{2} \left[M_P^2 R + R F_1(\square) R + R_{\mu\nu} F_2(\square) R^{\mu\nu} + C_{\mu\nu\rho\lambda} F_3(\square) C^{\mu\nu\rho\lambda} \right], \quad (1)$$

where M_P is the Planck mass, R is the Ricci scalar, $R_{\mu\nu}$ is the Ricci tensor and $C_{\mu\nu\rho\lambda}$ is the Weyl tensor. Each $F_i(\square)$ is an infinite series of the d'Alembertian operator $\square = g^{\mu\nu} \nabla_\mu \nabla_\nu$ i.e. $F_i(\square) = \sum_{n=0}^{\infty} f_{i_n} \square^n / M^{2n}$, where the f_{i_n} s are dimensionless coefficients and M is the mass scale of the theory, which dictates the length scales below which the additional terms come into play.

The propagator Π_{IDG} around a flat background in terms of the spin projection operators is modified as fol-

lows [6]

$$\Pi_{\text{IDG}} = \frac{P^2}{a(k^2)} + \frac{P_s^0}{a(k^2) - 3c(k^2)} \stackrel{a=c}{=} \frac{\Pi_{\text{GR}}}{a(k^2)} \quad (2)$$

where a and c (given in (4)) are combinations of the $F_i(\square)$ s from (1). In the second equality we have taken the simplest choice $a(k^2) = c(k^2)$, giving a clear path back to GR in the limit $a(k^2) \rightarrow 1$.

The simplest way to show that there are no ghosts is to show that there are no poles in the propagator, which means there can be no zeroes in $a(k^2)$. Any function with no zeroes can be written in the form of the exponential of an entire function, so we choose $a(k^2) = c(k^2) = \exp[\gamma(k^2/M^2)]$, where γ is an entire function.

Any entire function can be written as a polynomial $\gamma(k^2) = c_0 + c_1 k^2 + c_2 k^4 + \dots$, so a priori we have an infinite number of coefficients to choose. However, it was shown that only the first few orders will affect the predictions of the theory, as terms higher than order ~ 10 can be described by a rectangle function with a single unknown parameter [35].

The quadrupole formula tells us the perturbation to a flat metric caused by a source with quadrupole moment I_{ij} . Here we use the equations of motion to find the modified quadrupole formula for IDG.

I. MODIFIED QUADRUPOLE FORMULA

The IDG equations of motion for a perturbation $h_{\mu\nu}$ around a flat background $\eta_{\mu\nu}$ are given by [6]

$$-\kappa T_{\mu\nu} = \frac{1}{2} \left[a(\square) (\square h_{\mu\nu} - \partial_\sigma (\partial_\mu h_\nu^\sigma + \partial_\nu h_\mu^\sigma)) + c(\square) (\partial_\mu \partial_\nu h + \eta_{\mu\nu} \partial_\sigma \partial_\tau h^{\sigma\tau} - \eta_{\mu\nu} \square h) + f(\square) \partial_\mu \partial_\nu \partial_\sigma \partial_\tau h^{\sigma\tau} \right], \quad (3)$$

where

$$\begin{aligned} a(\square) &= 1 + M_P^{-2} (F_2(\square) + 2F_3(\square)) \square, \\ c(\square) &= 1 - M_P^{-2} \left(4F_1(\square) - F_2(\square) + \frac{2}{3} F_3(\square) \right) \square, \\ f(\square) &= M_P^{-2} \left(4F_1(\square) + 2F_2(\square) + \frac{4}{3} F_3(\square) \right), \end{aligned} \quad (4)$$

and it should be noted that as $a(\square) = c(\square)$, then $f(\square)\square = a(\square) - c(\square) = 0$. If we take the de Donder gauge $\partial_\mu h^{\mu\nu} = \frac{1}{2} \partial^\nu h$ and assume $a(\square) = c(\square)$, then

$$-2\kappa T_{\mu\nu} = a(\square) \square \bar{h}_{\mu\nu}, \quad (5)$$

where we have defined $\bar{h}_{\mu\nu} \equiv h_{\mu\nu} - \frac{1}{2}g_{\mu\nu}h$. Note that in the limit $a \rightarrow 1$, we return to the GR result. If we invert $a(\square)$, then

$$\square \bar{h}_{\mu\nu} = -2\kappa \frac{T_{\mu\nu}}{a(\square)}. \quad (6)$$

Following the usual GR method [36], we assume the source is far away, composed of non-relativistic matter and isolated. The Fourier transform of $h_{\mu\nu}$ with respect to time is

$$\tilde{\bar{h}}_{\mu\nu} = 4G \frac{e^{ikr}}{r} \int d^3y \frac{\tilde{T}_{\mu\nu}(k, y)}{a(k^2)}. \quad (7)$$

When we insert the definition of the quadrupole moment, $I_{ij} = \int d^3y T_{\mu\nu}(y)$,

$$\tilde{\bar{h}}_{ij} = -2Gk^2 \frac{e^{ikr}}{r} \frac{1}{a(k^2)} \tilde{I}_{ij}(k), \quad (8)$$

which means that

$$\bar{h}_{ij} = \frac{-2G}{\sqrt{2\pi}} \frac{1}{r} \frac{d^2}{dt^2} \int dk e^{-ik(t-r)} \frac{1}{a(k^2)} \tilde{I}_{ij}(k). \quad (9)$$

Now writing out the full expression for \tilde{I}_{ij} and defining the retarded time $t_r = t - r$

$$\bar{h}_{ij} = \frac{-G}{\pi} \frac{1}{r} \frac{d^2}{dt^2} \int dk dt' \frac{e^{ik(t_r - t'_r)}}{a(k^2)} I_{ij}(t'_r). \quad (10)$$

II. SIMPLEST CHOICE OF $a(\square)$

We choose $a(k^2)$ to avoid ghosts, by ensuring there are no poles in the propagator. If we choose $a(k^2) = e^{k^2/M^2}$ then

$$\bar{h}_{ij} = \frac{-G}{\pi} \frac{1}{r} \frac{d^2}{dt^2} \int dk dt' \frac{e^{ik(t_r - t'_r)}}{e^{k^2/M^2}} I_{ij}(t'_r). \quad (11)$$

Using the general formula for the inverse Fourier transform of a Gaussian,

$$\int_{-\infty}^{\infty} e^{-k^2/a} e^{-ikx} dk = \sqrt{\pi a} e^{-ax^2/4}, \quad (12)$$

we find

$$\bar{h}_{ij} = \frac{-G}{r} \frac{M}{\sqrt{\pi}} \frac{d^2}{dt^2} \int dt'_r e^{-M^2(t_r - t'_r)^2/4} I_{ij}(t'_r). \quad (13)$$

This is the modified quadrupole formula for the simplest case of IDG. We now need to specify I_{ij} . For example, when we look at the radiation emitted by a binary system of stars of mass M_s in a circular orbit, the 11 component of I_{ij} is

$$I_{11}(t) = M_s R^2 (1 + \cos(2\omega t)), \quad (14)$$

where R is the distance between the stars and ω is their angular velocity. Therefore

$$\bar{h}_{11} = \frac{4GM_s^2 R^2}{r} \left(1 + e^{-\frac{4\omega^2}{M^2}} \cos(2\omega t_r)\right), \quad (15)$$

Comparing to the GR case, we see that this matches the GR prediction at large M , but at small M there is a reduction in the magnitude of the oscillating term compared to GR.

III. BACKREACTION EQUATION

There is a second order effect where gravity couples to itself and produces a backreaction. In [37], the backreaction was found for Effective Quantum Gravity (EQG). EQG has a similar action to IDG (the $F_i(\square)$ in (1) are replaced by $a + b \log(\square/\mu^2)$ where μ is a mass scale [38].

In this section we generalise the result of [37] and also extend it to a de Sitter background. Using the Gauss-Bonnet identity and a similar expression for the higher-order terms (only valid in the weak field limit) we can focus on (1) without the Weyl term.

Around a dS background, the curvatures to linear order in the perturbation are

$$\begin{aligned} r_\nu^\mu &= \nabla_\lambda \nabla^{(\mu} h_\nu^{\lambda)} - \frac{1}{2} \square h_\nu^\mu - \frac{1}{2} \nabla_\nu \partial^\mu h - 3H^2 h_\nu^\mu, \\ r &= -(\square + 3H^2)h + \nabla_\tau \nabla^\sigma h_\sigma^\tau, \end{aligned} \quad (16)$$

where the background curvature is $\bar{R} = 12H^2$ and H is the Hubble constant. The curvatures to quadratic order are

$$\begin{aligned} r_{\mu\nu}^{(2)} &= \frac{1}{4} \left(h^{\alpha\beta} \nabla_\mu \nabla_\nu h_{\alpha\beta} - 2h_{\alpha(\nu} (\square - 4H^2) h_{\mu)}^\alpha \right) \\ r^{(2)} &= -\frac{1}{4} h_{\mu\nu} (\square - 8H^2) h^{\mu\nu}. \end{aligned} \quad (17)$$

Far away from the source, we use the gauge $\nabla^\mu h_\mu^\nu = 0$ and $h = 0$, so that the linearised curvatures become

$$\begin{aligned} r_\nu^\mu &= \nabla_\lambda \nabla^{(\mu} h_\nu^{\lambda)} - \frac{1}{2} \square h_\nu^\mu - \frac{\bar{R}}{4} h_\nu^\mu, \\ r &= 0. \end{aligned} \quad (18)$$

We can simplify the equations of motion further by noting that

$$\nabla_\lambda \nabla^\mu h_\nu^\lambda = \frac{\bar{R}}{3} h_\nu^\mu - \frac{\bar{R}}{12} \delta_\nu^\mu h. \quad (19)$$

The linear vacuum equations of motion around a dS background in this gauge [39, 40] are then

$$(\square - 2H^2)^2 F_2(\square) h_\nu^\mu = -(1 + 24M_P^2 H^2 f_{1_0}) (\square - 2H^2) h_\nu^\mu, \quad (20)$$

where f_{1_0} is the zeroeth order coefficient of $F_1(\square)$. Using (18), the second order equations of motion are

$$t_\nu^{\mu IDG} = \frac{1}{2} \langle h_\sigma^\mu F_2(\square) (\square - 2H^2)^2 h_\nu^\sigma \rangle - \frac{1}{8} \delta_\nu^\mu \langle h_\sigma^\tau F_2(\square) (\square - 2H^2)^2 h_\tau^\sigma \rangle, \quad (21)$$

which upon inserting (20) becomes

$$t_\nu^{\mu IDG} = (1 + 24M_P^{-2} H^2 f_{1_0}) \left[-\frac{1}{2} \langle h_\sigma^\mu (\square - 2H^2) h_\nu^\sigma \rangle + \frac{1}{8} \delta_\nu^\mu \langle h_\sigma^\tau (\square - 2H^2) h_\tau^\sigma \rangle \right], \quad (22)$$

where f_{1_0} corresponds to b_1 in the EQG formalism and $\langle X \rangle$ represents the spacetime average of X .

So the energy density $\rho = t_{00}$ is given by

$$\rho_{dS}^{IDG} = (1 + 24M_P^{-2} H^2 f_{1_0}) \rho_\eta^{IDG} + H^2 \langle h_{0\sigma} h_0^\sigma \rangle + \frac{1}{4} H^2 \langle h_\sigma^\tau h_\tau^\sigma \rangle. \quad (23)$$

For a plane wave solution

$$h_{\mu\nu} = \epsilon_{\mu\nu} \cos(\omega t - kz), \quad (24)$$

we find

$$\rho_{dS}^{IDG} = \frac{1}{4} M_P^2 \left\{ \omega^2 \epsilon^2 + 2(4\epsilon_0^\alpha \epsilon_{0\alpha} + \epsilon^2) \left[8H^2 + (1 + 24M_P^{-2} H^2 f_{1_0}) \right] (\omega^2 - k^2) \right\}. \quad (25)$$

Note that because $H_0^2 M_P^{-2} \approx 10^{-119}$, f_{1_0} would have to be of the order of 10^{115} for the de Sitter background in the present day to have a noticeable impact and we can generally use the Minkowski background as a good approximation. In the EQG notation, f_{1_0} is replaced by b_1 which already has the constraint $b_1 < 10^{61}$ so we can ignore this extra term.

For a classical wave, $\omega^2 = k^2$ so the term on the second line disappears. This is the case for IDG when we assume there are no poles. On the other hand, EQG has complex poles, so for EQG or IDG with a single pole there can be damping [41–44] and therefore $\omega^2 \neq k^2$.

[37] used LIGO constraints on the density parameter Ω_0 as well as the constraint on the mass of the pole $m > 5 \times 10^{13}$ GeV to constrain ϵ , the amplitude of the massive mode as $\epsilon < 1.4 \times 10^{-33}$. Since then, LIGO has found more stringent constraints of $\Omega_0 < 5.58 \times 10^{-8}$ [45]. Following the same method as [37], we divide by the critical density $\rho_c = \frac{3H_0^2}{8\pi G}$ to find

$$\Omega_0 = \frac{1}{12} (\epsilon_0^\alpha \epsilon_{0\alpha} + \epsilon^2) \frac{m^2}{H_0^2} < 5.58 \times 10^{-8} \quad (26)$$

which we use to find a stronger constraint of

$$\epsilon < 8.0 \times 10^{-34}. \quad (27)$$

This cuts the allowed parameter space in half and makes it less likely that the detector referred to in [37] would be able to detect this mode.

IV. POWER EMITTED

We can use the backreaction equation to find the power radiated to infinity by a system, which is given by [36]

$$P = \int_{S_\infty^2} t_{0\mu} n^\mu r^2 d\Omega, \quad (28)$$

where the integral is taken over a two-sphere at spatial infinity S_∞^2 and n^μ is the spacelike normal vector to the two-sphere. In polar coordinates, $n^\mu = (0, 1, 0, 0)$. We are therefore interested in the t_{0r} component.

In the limit $H \rightarrow 0$ and including the usual GR term, (22) becomes

$$t_{\mu\nu} = \frac{1}{64\pi G} \left[2 \langle \partial_\mu h_{\alpha\beta}^{TT} \partial_\nu h_{TT}^{\alpha\beta} \rangle + 4 \langle h_{\sigma(\mu}^{TT} \square_\eta h_{\nu)}^{TT\sigma} \rangle - \eta_{\mu\nu} \langle h_{\sigma\tau}^{TT} \square_\eta h_{TT}^{\sigma\tau} \rangle \right]. \quad (29)$$

Note that $h_{0\nu}^{TT} = \eta_{0r} = 0$, which means we can discard the second and third terms in the square bracket.

Because \bar{h}_{ij}^{TT} is traceless,

$$h_{ij}^{TT} = \bar{h}_{ij}^{TT} = \frac{-G}{r} \frac{M}{\sqrt{\pi}} \frac{d^2}{dt^2} \int_{-\infty}^{\infty} dt'_r e^{-M^2(t_r - t'_r)^2} I_{ij}^{TT}(t'_r). \quad (30)$$

Note that if we call the integral in (30) $\hat{I}_{ij}(t_r)$, then

$$\partial_0 h_{ij}^{TT} = \frac{-G}{r} \frac{M}{\sqrt{\pi}} \frac{d^3}{dt^3} \hat{I}_{ij}(t_r), \quad (31)$$

and

$$\begin{aligned} \partial_r h_{ij}^{TT} &= \frac{G}{r} \frac{M}{\sqrt{\pi}} \frac{d^3}{dt^3} \hat{I}_{ij}(t_r) + \frac{G}{r^2} \frac{M}{\sqrt{\pi}} \frac{d^2}{dt^2} \hat{I}_{ij}(t_r) \\ &\approx \frac{G}{r} \frac{M}{\sqrt{\pi}} \frac{d^3}{dt^3} \hat{I}_{ij}(t_r), \end{aligned} \quad (32)$$

as we are looking at the $r \rightarrow \infty$ limit.

Therefore the remaining term becomes

$$\begin{aligned} t_{0\mu} n^\mu &= \frac{1}{32\pi G} \delta_r^\mu \delta_t^\nu \partial_\mu h_{\alpha\beta} \partial_\nu h^{\alpha\beta} \\ &= \frac{-GM^2}{32\pi^2 r^2} \frac{d^3}{dt^3} \left(\hat{I}_{ij}(t_r) \right) \frac{d^3}{dt^3} \left(\hat{I}^{ij}(t_r) \right). \end{aligned} \quad (33)$$

Note that this is the same as the GR expression, but with \hat{I}_{ij} instead of I_{ij} . If we convert to the reduced quadrupole moment \hat{J}_{ij} , using $J_{ij} = I_{ij} - \delta_{ij}\delta^{kl}I_{kl}$ [36], we find

$$t_{0\mu}n^\mu = \frac{-GM^2}{32\pi^2r^2} \left\langle \frac{d^3\hat{J}_{ij}}{dt^3} \frac{d^3\hat{J}^{ij}}{dt^3} - 2 \frac{d^3\hat{J}_i^j}{dt^3} \frac{d^3\hat{J}^{ik}}{dt^3} n_j n_k + \frac{1}{2} \frac{d^3\hat{J}^{ij}}{dt^3} \frac{d^3\hat{J}^{kl}}{dt^3} n_i n_j n_k n_l \right\rangle \quad (34)$$

We can then use the identities [36]

$$\int d\Omega = 4\pi, \quad \int n_i n_j d\Omega = \frac{4\pi}{3} \delta_{ij},$$

$$\int n_i n_j n_k n_l d\Omega = \frac{4\pi}{15} (\delta_{ij}\delta_{kl} + \delta_{ik}\delta_{jl} + \delta_{il}\delta_{jk}), \quad (35)$$

to see that the power emitted by a system is

$$P = -\frac{G}{5} \left\langle \frac{d^3\hat{J}_{ij}}{dt^3} \frac{d^3\hat{J}^{ij}}{dt^3} \right\rangle, \quad (36)$$

where

$$\hat{J}_{ij} = \int_{-\infty}^{\infty} dt'_r e^{-M^2(t_r - t'_r)^2} J_{ij}(t'_r). \quad (37)$$

This result can then be applied to any system for which we know the reduced quadrupole moment. We will now apply it to binary systems in both circular and elliptical orbits.

A. Circular orbits

For a binary system of two stars in a circular orbit, the reduced quadrupole moment J_{ij} in polar coordinates is given by

$$\frac{M_s R^2}{3} \begin{pmatrix} (1 + 3 \cos(2\omega t)) & 3 \sin(2\omega t) & 0 \\ 3 \sin(2\omega t) & (1 - 3 \cos(2\omega t)) & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & -2 \end{pmatrix}, \quad (38)$$

where M_s is the mass of each of the stars, R is the distance between them, and ω is the angular velocity. Our power is then (again in the limit $r \rightarrow \infty$)

$$P = -\frac{G}{5} \left\langle (g^{rr})^2 \left(\frac{d^3\hat{J}_{rr}}{dt^3} \right)^2 + (g^{\theta\theta})^2 \left(\frac{d^3\hat{J}_{\theta\theta}}{dt^3} \right)^2 \right\rangle$$

$$\approx -\frac{GR^2 M_s^4}{45} \left\langle \left(\frac{d^3}{dt^3} \int dt'_r \frac{(1 + 3 \cos(2\omega t'_r))}{e^{M^2(t_r - t'_r)^2}} \right)^2 \right\rangle. \quad (39)$$

This gives

$$P = -\frac{256}{5} R^2 M_s^4 \omega^6 e^{-2\omega^2/M^2} \langle \sin^2(2\omega t_r) \rangle, \quad (40)$$

and using $\langle \sin^2(x) \rangle \equiv \frac{1}{2}$,

$$P = -\frac{128}{5} GR^2 M_s^4 \omega^6 e^{-2\omega^2/M^2}. \quad (41)$$

This is the GR result with an extra factor of $e^{-2\omega^2/M^2}$. This gives a reduction in the amount of radiation emitted from a binary system of stars in a circular orbit. Note that this factor tends to 1 in the GR limit $M \rightarrow \infty$.




FIG. 1. We plot the enhancement factor $f^{\text{IDG}}(e)$ given by (A3) against the eccentricity e as well as the enhancement factor for the GR term $f^{\text{GR}}(e)$, where the total power is $P_{\text{GR}}^{\text{circ}} f^{\text{GR}}(e) + P_{\text{IDG}}^{\text{circ}} f^{\text{IDG}}(e)$. This factor describes how the power emitted changes with respect to the eccentricity. The extra IDG term will show up most strongly at around $e = 0.6$, which coincidentally is the value for the Hulse-Taylor binary.

B. Generalisation to elliptical orbits

The power radiated by a binary system with a circular orbit is of limited applicability because (as shown in Fig. 1), in GR the power emitted is highly dependent on the eccentricity of the orbit [46], i.e. $P_{\text{GR}} = P_{\text{GR}}^{\text{circ}} f^{\text{GR}}(e)$, where $f^{\text{GR}}(e)$ is an enhancement factor that can be as large as 10^3 . The circular orbit is therefore unlikely to be an accurate approximation.

For an elliptical orbit, the relevant components of the reduced quadrupole moment are [46]

$$J_{xx} = \mu d^2 \left(\cos^2(\psi) - \frac{1}{3} \right)$$

$$J_{yy} = \mu d^2 \left(\sin^2(\psi) - \frac{1}{3} \right), \quad (42)$$

where μ is the reduced mass $m_1 m_2 / (m_1 + m_2)$ and the distance between the two bodies is given by

$$d = \frac{a(1 - e^2)}{1 + e \cos(\omega t)}, \quad (43)$$

where e is the eccentricity of the orbit and a is the semi-major axis [46]. The change in angular position over time is

$$\dot{\psi} = \frac{[G(m_1 + m_2)a(1 - e^2)]^{1/2}}{d^2}. \quad (44)$$

For the xx component, we need to calculate

$$\hat{J}_{xx} = \mu a^2 (1 - e^2)^2 \int_{-\infty}^{\infty} dt'_r e^{-M^2(t_r - t'_r)^2} \frac{\cos^2(\psi(t'_r)) - \frac{1}{3}}{(1 + e \cos(\psi(t'_r)))^2}. \quad (45)$$

This is a very difficult integration to do. However, if we make the change of coordinates $z = M(t_r - t'_r)$, we

can use a Taylor expansion in $\frac{1}{M}$ if it is small and the identities

$$\int_{-\infty}^{\infty} e^{-z^2} dz = \sqrt{\pi}, \quad \int_{-\infty}^{\infty} e^{-z^2} z dz = 0$$

$$\int_{-\infty}^{\infty} e^{-z^2} z^2 dz = -\frac{\sqrt{\pi}}{2}, \quad (46)$$

to see that we can write

$$P \approx P_{\text{GR}} + P_{\text{IDG}} = P_{\text{GR}}^{\text{circ}} f^{\text{GR}}(e) + P_{\text{IDG}}^{\text{circ}} f^{\text{IDG}}(e), \quad (47)$$

where the IDG power for an elliptical orbit is the power for a circular orbit multiplied by an enhancement factor $f(e)$ which depends on the eccentricity.

$$P_{\text{IDG}} = P_{\text{IDG}}^{\text{circ}} f^{\text{IDG}}(e) = \frac{256}{5} \frac{\omega^8}{M^2} G R^2 M_s^4 f^{\text{IDG}}(e), \quad (48)$$

$f^{\text{IDG}}(e)$ is a polynomial of 22nd order and so is given in the appendix. $f^{\text{IDG}}(e)$ is plotted in Fig 1 with a comparison to the enhancement factor for GR, $f^{\text{GR}}(e)$.

The Hulse-Taylor binary has a period of 7.5 hours and ellipticity of 0.617. The radiation emitted from the Hulse-Taylor binary is 0.998 ± 0.002 of the GR prediction [2], which leads to the constraint on our mass scale M^1

$$M > 2.3 \times 10^{-24} M_P = 4.0 \text{ keV}. \quad (49)$$

This improves by a factor of 10^6 our previous constraint of $M > 0.004 \text{ eV}$ [15] from laboratory tests of gravity at short distances [47]. In length terms, we have gone from the micrometre scale down to the picometre scale.

Interestingly, the eccentricity of the Hulse-Taylor binary is almost exactly the right level for IDG to show up most strongly. The observed value is indeed slightly lower than the GR prediction - this is exactly what IDG would predict and taking the mass scale to be 6 keV gives precisely the observed value.

V. CONCLUSION

We found the modified quadrupole formula for IDG, telling us how the metric changes for a given stress-energy tensor. We generalised the backreaction formula already found for Effective Quantum Gravity (EQG) to a de Sitter background (for both EQG and IDG) and used updated LIGO results to find tighter constraints on EQG.

Finally, we found the power emitted by a binary system, for both circular and elliptical orbits and used the example of the Hulse-Taylor binary.

We predicted a lower radiation loss than GR, which is exactly what observations found. We were also able to dramatically improve our constraints on IDG.

VI. ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

We would like to thank David Burton, Iberê Kuntz and Sonali Mohapatra for their help in preparing this paper.

Appendix A: Elliptical orbits

Using our change of coordinates, the integral (45) becomes

$$\hat{J}_{xx} = -\frac{\mu}{M} \int_{-\infty}^{\infty} dz e^{-z^2} \frac{\cos^2(\psi(t_r - \frac{z}{M})) - \frac{1}{3}}{(1 + e \cos(\psi(t_r - \frac{z}{M})))^{\frac{5}{2}}} \quad (\text{A1})$$

We can use a Taylor expansion in $\frac{1}{M}$ to write this as the GR expression J_{xx} (the zeroeth order) plus the first order expression (which disappears as the integrand is odd) and finally the second order correction as

$$\hat{J}_{xx} \approx J_{xx} - \frac{\sqrt{\pi}\mu}{24M^2(1 + e \cos(\psi))^4} \left\{ \psi'^2 \right.$$

$$\cdot \left(4(e^2 - 3) \cos(2\psi) - 8e^2 - 19e \cos(\psi) \right.$$

$$\left. \left. + 3e \cos(3\psi) \right) - 2\psi'' \sin(\psi) \right.$$

$$\left. \cdot (2(e^2 + 3) \cos(\psi) + e(3 \cos(2\psi) + 5)) \right\} \quad (\text{A2})$$

We perform a similar calculation for \hat{J}_{yy} to find that the full enhancement factor for the IDG term $f^{\text{IDG}}(e)$ is given by

$$f^{\text{IDG}}(e)$$

$$= 1 - \frac{120467e}{167802} + \frac{5284978e^2}{251703} - \frac{12620113e^3}{2013624} + \frac{585660427e^4}{4027248}$$

$$- \frac{14387669e^5}{1006812} + \frac{21671843e^6}{55934} - \frac{321579275e^7}{4027248}$$

$$+ \frac{1822163101e^8}{4027248} - \frac{4929137503e^9}{32217984} + \frac{18026523359e^{10}}{64435968}$$

$$- \frac{52454025521e^{11}}{515487744} + \frac{101348994923e^{12}}{1030975488} - \frac{14433473687e^{13}}{515487744}$$

$$+ \frac{37007732585e^{14}}{2061950976} - \frac{2233524965e^{15}}{687316992} + \frac{12090157079e^{16}}{8247803904}$$

$$- \frac{2100312263e^{17}}{16495607808} + \frac{170855795e^{18}}{3665690624} - \frac{26969647e^{19}}{32991215616}$$

$$+ \frac{10580267e^{20}}{21994143744} - \frac{11e^{21}}{64435968} + \frac{595e^{22}}{515487744} \quad (\text{A3})$$

¹ M can a priori take any value up to the Planck mass M_P , which still gives us a huge allowed range, but this should improve as we get more results from gravitational wave observations. Tighter

constraints on the mass scale can be found if we assume IDG is responsible for inflation [29, 31, 32].

-
- [1] B. P. Abbott et al. Observation of Gravitational Waves from a Binary Black Hole Merger. *Phys. Rev. Lett.*, 116(6):061102, 2016.
- [2] Joel M. Weisberg and Yuping Huang. Relativistic Measurements from Timing the Binary Pulsar PSR B1913+16. *Astrophys. J.*, 829(1):55, 2016.
- [3] K. S. Stelle. Renormalization of higher-derivative quantum gravity. *Phys. Rev. D*, 16:953–969, Aug 1977.
- [4] Arkady A. Tseytlin. On singularities of spherically symmetric backgrounds in string theory. *Phys. Lett.*, B363:223–229, 1995.
- [5] Tirthabir Biswas, Anupam Mazumdar, and Warren Siegel. Bouncing universes in string-inspired gravity. *JCAP*, 0603:009, 2006.
- [6] Tirthabir Biswas, Erik Gerwick, Tomi Koivisto, and Anupam Mazumdar. Towards singularity and ghost free theories of gravity. *Phys. Rev. Lett.*, 108:031101, 2012.
- [7] Tirthabir Biswas, Alexey S. Koshelev, and Anupam Mazumdar. Gravitational theories with stable (anti-)de Sitter backgrounds. *Fundam. Theor. Phys.*, 183:97–114, 2016.
- [8] W. Siegel. Stringy gravity at short distances. 2003.
- [9] Luca Buoninfante. Ghost and singularity free theories of gravity. 2016.
- [10] Spyridon Talaganis, Tirthabir Biswas, and Anupam Mazumdar. Towards understanding the ultraviolet behavior of quantum loops in infinite-derivative theories of gravity. *Class. Quant. Grav.*, 32(21):215017, 2015.
- [11] Leonardo Modesto. Super-renormalizable Quantum Gravity. *Phys. Rev.*, D86:044005, 2012.
- [12] Leonardo Modesto. Super-renormalizable Multidimensional Quantum Gravity. 2012.
- [13] Leonardo Modesto and Leslaw Rachwal. Super-renormalizable and finite gravitational theories. *Nucl. Phys.*, B889:228–248, 2014.
- [14] Leonardo Modesto and Leslaw Rachwal. Finite Conformal Quantum Gravity and Nonsingular Spacetimes. 2016.
- [15] James Edholm, Alexey S. Koshelev, and Anupam Mazumdar. Behavior of the Newtonian potential for ghost-free gravity and singularity-free gravity. *Phys. Rev.*, D94(10):104033, 2016.
- [16] James Edholm and Aindri Conroy. Newtonian Potential and Geodesic Completeness in Infinite Derivative Gravity. *Phys. Rev.*, D96(4):044012, 2017.
- [17] Aindri Conroy, Tomi Koivisto, Anupam Mazumdar, and Ali Teimouri. Generalized quadratic curvature, non-local infrared modifications of gravity and Newtonian potentials. *Class. Quant. Grav.*, 32(1):015024, 2015.
- [18] Alan S. Cornell, Gerhard Harmsen, Gaetano Lambiase, and Anupam Mazumdar. Rotating metric in nonsingular infinite derivative theories of gravity. *Phys. Rev.*, D97(10):104006, 2018.
- [19] Tirthabir Biswas, Aindri Conroy, Alexey S. Koshelev, and Anupam Mazumdar. Generalized ghost-free quadratic curvature gravity. *Class. Quant. Grav.*, 31:015022, 2014. [Erratum: *Class. Quant. Grav.* 31,159501(2014)].
- [20] Gianluca Calcagni, Leonardo Modesto, and Piero Nicolini. Super-accelerating bouncing cosmology in asymptotically-free non-local gravity. *Eur. Phys. J.*, C74(8):2999, 2014.
- [21] Tirthabir Biswas, Tomi Koivisto, and Anupam Mazumdar. Towards a resolution of the cosmological singularity in non-local higher derivative theories of gravity. *JCAP*, 1011:008, 2010.
- [22] Tirthabir Biswas, Alexey S. Koshelev, Anupam Mazumdar, and Sergey Yu. Vernov. Stable bounce and inflation in non-local higher derivative cosmology. *JCAP*, 1208:024, 2012.
- [23] Alexey S. Koshelev and Sergey Yu. Vernov. On bouncing solutions in non-local gravity. *Phys. Part. Nucl.*, 43:666–668, 2012.
- [24] Alexey S. Koshelev. Stable analytic bounce in non-local Einstein-Gauss-Bonnet cosmology. *Class. Quant. Grav.*, 30:155001, 2013.
- [25] Tirthabir Biswas, Alexey S. Koshelev, and Anupam Mazumdar. Consistent higher derivative gravitational theories with stable de Sitter and anti de Sitter backgrounds. *Phys. Rev.*, D95(4):043533, 2017.
- [26] Aindri Conroy, Anupam Mazumdar, and Ali Teimouri. Wald Entropy for Ghost-Free, Infinite Derivative Theories of Gravity. *Phys. Rev. Lett.*, 114(20):201101, 2015. [Erratum: *Phys. Rev. Lett.* 120,no.3,039901(2018)].
- [27] Leonardo Modesto, John W. Moffat, and Piero Nicolini. Black holes in an ultraviolet complete quantum gravity. *Phys. Lett.*, B695:397–400, 2011.
- [28] Valeri P. Frolov and Andrei Zelnikov. Radiation from an emitter in the ghost free scalar theory. *Phys. Rev.*, D93(10):105048, 2016.
- [29] James Edholm. UV completion of the Starobinsky model, tensor-to-scalar ratio, and constraints on nonlocality. *Phys. Rev.*, D95(4):044004, 2017.
- [30] Fabio Briscese, Antonino Marcian, Leonardo Modesto, and Emmanuel N. Saridakis. Inflation in (Super-)renormalizable Gravity. *Phys. Rev.*, D87(8):083507, 2013.
- [31] Alexey S. Koshelev, Leonardo Modesto, Leslaw Rachwal, and Alexei A. Starobinsky. Occurrence of exact R^2 inflation in non-local UV-complete gravity. *JHEP*, 11:067, 2016.
- [32] Ben Craps, Tim De Jonckheere, and Alexey S. Koshelev. Cosmological perturbations in non-local higher-derivative gravity. *JCAP*, 1411(11):022, 2014.
- [33] Spyridon Talaganis. Towards UV Finiteness of Infinite Derivative Theories of Gravity and Field Theories. 2017.
- [34] Aindri Conroy, Alexey S. Koshelev, and Anupam Mazumdar. Geodesic completeness and homogeneity condition for cosmic inflation. *Phys. Rev.*, D90(12):123525, 2014.
- [35] James Edholm. Revealing Infinite Derivative Gravity’s true potential: The weak-field limit around de Sitter backgrounds. *Phys. Rev.*, D97(6):064011, 2018.
- [36] Sean M. Carroll. *Spacetime and geometry: An introduction to general relativity*. 2004.
- [37] Iberê Kuntz. Quantum Corrections to the Gravitational Backreaction. *Eur. Phys. J.*, C78(1):3, 2018.
- [38] John F. Donoghue. The effective field theory treatment of quantum gravity. *AIP Conf. Proc.*, 1483:73–94, 2012.
- [39] Aindri Conroy. *Infinite Derivative Gravity: A Ghost and Singularity-free Theory*. PhD thesis, Lancaster U., 2017.

- [40] James Edholm and Aindriu Conroy. Criteria for resolving the cosmological singularity in Infinite Derivative Gravity around expanding backgrounds. *Phys. Rev.*, D96(12):124040, 2017.
- [41] Xavier Calmet, Iberê Kuntz, and Sonali Mohapatra. Gravitational Waves in Effective Quantum Gravity. *Eur. Phys. J.*, C76(8):425, 2016.
- [42] Xavier Calmet. The Lightest of Black Holes. *Mod. Phys. Lett.*, A29(38):1450204, 2014.
- [43] X. Calmet, R. Casadio, A. Yu. Kamenshchik, and O. V. Teryaev. Graviton propagator, renormalization scale and black-hole like states. *Phys. Lett.*, B774:332–337, 2017.
- [44] Xavier Calmet and Iber Kuntz. Higgs Starobinsky Inflation. *Eur. Phys. J.*, C76(5):289, 2016.
- [45] Benjamin P. Abbott et al. A Search for Tensor, Vector, and Scalar Polarizations in the Stochastic Gravitational-Wave Background. *Phys. Rev. Lett.*, 120(20):201102, 2018.
- [46] P. C. Peters and J. Mathews. Gravitational radiation from point masses in a Keplerian orbit. *Phys. Rev.*, 131:435–439, 1963.
- [47] D. J. Kapner, T. S. Cook, E. G. Adelberger, J. H. Gundlach, Blayne R. Heckel, C. D. Hoyle, and H. E. Swanson. Tests of the gravitational inverse-square law below the dark-energy length scale. *Phys. Rev. Lett.*, 98:021101, 2007.