

Equivalence of Active and Passive Gravitational Mass Tested with Lunar Laser Ranging

Vishwa Vijay Singh^{*1}, Jürgen Müller¹, Liliane Biskupek¹, Eva Hackmann², and Claus Lämmerzahl²

¹Institute of Geodesy (IFE), Leibniz University Hannover, Schneiderberg 50, 30167 Hannover, Germany

²Center of Applied Space Technology and Microgravity (ZARM), University of Bremen, Am Fallturm, 28359 Bremen, Germany

20th December, 2022

Abstract

Lunar Laser Ranging (LLR) measures the distance between observatories on Earth and retro-reflectors on Moon since 1969. In this paper, we study the possible violation of the equality of passive and active gravitational mass (m_a/m_p), for Aluminium (Al) and Iron (Fe), using LLR data. Our new limit of $3.9 \cdot 10^{-14}$ is about 100 times better than that of Bartlett and Van Buren [1986] reflecting the benefit of the many years of LLR data.

Keywords— lunar laser ranging; active and passive mass; relativity

1 Introduction

In a non-relativistic framework each body has three masses: the inertial mass, the passive gravitational mass (weight) reacting on a given gravitational field, and the active gravitational mass creating a gravitational field. In standard physics all three masses are assumed to be the same. However, if they are different [Bondi, 1957] then for any two gravitationally bound bodies A and B the equations of motion read

$$m_{iA}\ddot{\mathbf{x}}_A = m_{pA}Gm_{aB}\frac{\mathbf{x}_B - \mathbf{x}_A}{|\mathbf{x}_B - \mathbf{x}_A|^3} \quad (1)$$

$$m_{iB}\ddot{\mathbf{x}}_B = m_{pB}Gm_{aA}\frac{\mathbf{x}_A - \mathbf{x}_B}{|\mathbf{x}_A - \mathbf{x}_B|^3}, \quad (2)$$

where m_{iA} , m_{aA} , m_{pA} are the inertial, active and passive gravitational mass of body A , respectively. We define relative and center of mass coordinates according to

$$\mathbf{x} = \mathbf{x}_B - \mathbf{x}_A \quad (3)$$

$$\mathbf{X} = \frac{m_{iA}}{M_i}\mathbf{x}_A + \frac{m_{iB}}{M_i}\mathbf{x}_B \quad (4)$$

with the total inertial mass $M_i = m_{iA} + m_{iB}$. While the relative coordinate evolves according to the Kepler problem

$$\ddot{\mathbf{x}} = -G\alpha\frac{\mathbf{x}}{x^3}, \quad \alpha = \frac{m_{pA}}{m_{iA}}m_{aB} + \frac{m_{pB}}{m_{iB}}m_{aA} \quad (5)$$

the center of mass coordinate shows a self acceleration

$$\ddot{\mathbf{X}} = G\frac{m_{pA}m_{pB}}{M_i}S_{A,B}\frac{\mathbf{x}}{x^3} \quad (6)$$

where

$$S_{A,B} = \frac{m_{aB}}{m_{pB}} - \frac{m_{aA}}{m_{pA}} \quad (7)$$

describes the difference of the ratio of active and passive masses of the two bodies. \mathbf{x} describes the vector between the two bodies. It is interesting that the relative motion decouples from the center of mass motion so that for the determination of the latter any relative motion can be taken. Accordingly, in the case of binary systems this is given by the solutions of equation (5), in our case it is the vector between two components of the Moon (see below). This leads to a change in the Earth-Moon distance what can be very precisely measured using LLR. In fact, many aspects of gravity have been tested with LLR with the best precision [Müller et al., 1996; Hofmann and Müller, 2018].

From the space mission MICROSCOPE the equality of inertial and passive gravitational mass has been confirmed at the level of 10^{-15} in the Eötvös coefficient [Touboul et al., 2022]. From laboratory experiments the equality of active and passive gravitational mass has been shown at the level of 10^{-5} [Kreuzer, 1968]. Later, Bartlett and Van Buren [1986] used Lunar Laser Ranging (LLR) to improve this estimate to the level $\leq 4 \cdot 10^{-12}$. This limit has further been used to determine other limits, such as on the parameterized post-Newtonian (PPN) parameter ζ_3 [Will, 2014]. Here we will report on a further improvement on the limit by two more orders of magnitude using a longer and improved set of LLR data.

Bartlett and Van Buren [1986] considered the self force $F_s = M_i\ddot{\mathbf{X}} = S_{A,B}Gm_{pA}m_{pB}/r_{AB}^2$ between the different parts of the Moon (with the simplifying assumption that the mantle has the same composition as maria, i.e. Iron (Fe) rich basalt, and the crust has the same composition as the highlands, i.e. Aluminium (Al) rich anorthosite). The effect of this force in the tangential direction with respect to the Earth will lead to an increase in the angular velocity of the Moon. Using Kepler's law, stating that $\omega^2 r^3$ stays constant, and the change in energy per lunar sidereal month, they express the relation between the self force and the angular velocity of the Moon as,

$$\frac{\Delta\omega}{\omega} = 6\pi\frac{F_t}{F_{EM}}, \quad (8)$$

*Corresponding author:

Vishwa Vijay Singh, email: singh@ife.uni-hannover.de

where F_{EM} is the gravitational force between Earth and Moon, $F_t = F_s \sin \delta_{c.m.,c.f.}$ is the tangential part of the self force using the offset angle $\delta_{c.m.,c.f.}$ between the directions of the center of mass (c.m.) and the centre of figure (c.f.) of the Moon.

Bartlett and Van Buren [1986] use the offset between the c.m. and c.f. of the Moon, as given by Bills and Ferrari [1977], of 1.98 ± 0.06 km in the direction $14.00 \pm 1.00^\circ$ to the east of the vector pointing to the Earth. They also assume a two component Moon, with the mantle having a density of 3.35 g/cm³ and the crust having a density of 2.90 g/cm³. Using these assumptions, they show a ratio between F_s and F_{EM} of

$$\frac{F_s}{F_{EM}} \approx 5S_{A,B}, \quad (9)$$

and give $S_{Al,Fe} = S_{A,B}/0.08$.

For the uncertainty of the value of the tidal acceleration in the orbital mean longitude of the Moon, $\dot{\omega}$, Bartlett and Van Buren [1986] considered two values of $\dot{\omega}$, -25.30 ± 1.20 arcsec/century² [Dickey et al., 1983] and -25.50 ± 1 arcsec/century² [Christodoulidis et al., 1988]. Using the maximum difference between these values of about 2 arcsec/century², together with equations (8) and (9), they derived an upper limit on the coefficient $S_{Al,Fe}$ of $4 \cdot 10^{-12}$.

In the present study we use the latest results from Lunar Laser Ranging (LLR) to determine a new limit on the coefficient $S_{Al,Fe}$ by using the current value of $\Delta\omega$. For the study, the ephemeris calculation model is primarily based on the DE430 model [Folkner et al., 2014] with only a few minor changes. We consider fourteen solar system bodies (Sun, Moon, eight planets, Ceres, Pallas, and Vesta) for our ephemeris calculation, and use their initial positions at J2000 from the DE430 ephemeris. The initial position and orientation of the Moon (for orientation, mantle and core of the Moon) is fitted to LLR data along with other parameters such as station and reflector coordinates, spherical harmonic coefficients of the Moon, etc. A full list of the parameters fitted in a standard calculation can be found in Singh et al. [2021]. For this study, 30172 normal points (NPs) in the time span April 1970 - April 2022 were used, obtained thanks to the continuous efforts of various personnel at the different observatories (see Acknowledgements).

2 Determination of the Lunar Angular Acceleration

The effect on the lunar orbit of the degree 2 tides on Earth is modelled as a tidal bulge (see Fig. 1). This tidal bulge can be modelled, in a simplified way, as one angle defining a geometric rotation [Williams et al., 1978]. It used one Love number defined for degree 2. An expanded model has a more complex definition, involving three Love numbers for each frequency of degree 2, and five tidal time delays (three orbital and two rotational) which define the time-delayed position of the tide generating bodies [Folkner et al., 2014; Williams and Boggs, 2016]. In this study, we use both methods to obtain a value of $\dot{\omega}$ and its uncertainty, and compare them to -25.82 ± 0.03 arcsec/century² [Folkner et al., 2014].




Figure 1: Geocentric change of position of the tide generating body due to time delay [Hofmann, 2017].

For the calculation based on the one angle defining a geometric rotation [Williams et al., 1978], we used an initial value of $k_2\delta = 0.01220$. For the calculation of the ephemeris, all aspects (initial values of solar system bodies, constants, acceleration models, etc.), except the calculation of the effect on the lunar orbit of the degree 2 Earth tides, are based on the DE430 ephemeris [Folkner et al., 2014]. All standard parameters except the two rotational components of degree 2 time delays (which were not used in the calculation) were estimated using a Gauss-Markov model (GMM). We obtained a value of $k_2\delta = 0.01312 \pm 1.17 \cdot 10^{-6}$. Using $\dot{\omega} = -1961 k_2\delta$ [Williams and Boggs, 2016], we get $\dot{\omega} = -25.73 \pm 0.0023$ arcsec/century². This solution is later referred to as ‘k2d’.

For a second solution, later referred to as ‘LUNAR’, we added the effect of degree 2 Earth tides in the LLR analysis based on Folkner et al. [2014]. We created four different cases. For three of these cases, along with other standard parameters, the individual values of the three orbital time delays were adjusted. For the fourth case, the three orbital tidal time delay values were kept fixed, and the two rotational tidal time delay values were adjusted along with all other standard parameters. We obtain four sets of values of the five tidal time delays from these variations, which are converted [Williams, 2022; personal communication] to determine four values of $\dot{\omega}$: -25.7898 , -25.7759 , -25.7635 , and -25.7649 arcsec/century². The uncertainty of $\dot{\omega}$, taken as the range of the four individual cases, is then obtained as ± 0.0263 arcsec/century².

3 Discussion

Different values of $\Delta\omega/\omega$ can be obtained from the different values of the uncertainty mentioned in section 2. We use the values of all constants and apply the same assumptions as that used by Bartlett and Van Buren [1986] to recalculate a limit on the violation of the equality of passive and active gravitational mass for Al and Fe. This is done to be able to assess the contribution of the many years of LLR data in establishing the limit. The assumptions, such as the 14° offset angle between the c.m. and the c.f. of the Moon, an onion-skin lunar interior, $\dot{G} = 0$, etc., are critical to the results. Any change compared to these assumptions would affect the results as well. The updated $\Delta\omega/\omega$ values are given in Table 1, along with the limit on the coefficient $S_{Al,Fe}$ for both solutions (see equations (8) and (9)).

Table 1: Limit on the violation of the equality of passive and active gravitational mass for Al and Fe from the value of $\Delta\omega/\omega$ obtained based on our k2d and LUNAR solutions.

Solution	$\Delta\omega/\omega$ [month ⁻¹]	$S_{\text{Al,Fe}}$
k2d	$1.2 \cdot 10^{-15}$	$6.9 \cdot 10^{-16}$
LUNAR	$1.4 \cdot 10^{-14}$	$7.7 \cdot 10^{-15}$

Bartlett and Van Buren [1986] gave the value of $S_{\text{Al,Fe}}$ as $7 \cdot 10^{-13}$, and worsen it around five times to report a realistic limit of $4 \cdot 10^{-12}$, to reflect the limitations in the knowledge of the interior and the surface of the Moon, and to reflect the assumptions in their calculations. Taking the worse of the two values of $S_{\text{Al,Fe}}$ mentioned in Table 1, and using a scaling factor of five, our new limit on the violation of the equality of passive and active mass for Al and Fe gives $3.9 \cdot 10^{-14}$. If, however, the limit were taken from the k2d solution, it would, after using a scaling factor of five, give $3.4 \cdot 10^{-15}$.

Following Will [2014], based on the limit value of $S_{\text{Al,Fe}}$, the limit value for ζ_3 would also improve by about two orders of magnitude, assuming the same difference in binding energy between the atomic nuclei of Al and Fe. As mentioned in section 1, the value of $S_{\text{Al,Fe}}$ is determined when differentiating between the crust and the mantle of the Moon. In reality, the lunar core will also add to the self force, and affect the value of $S_{\text{Al,Fe}}$. For this study, to keep the assumptions the same as those used by Bartlett and Van Buren [1986], this effect was not considered. Furthermore, if considering a more recent value of the c.m.-c.f. offset from Smith et al. [2017], the value of $S_{\text{Al,Fe}}$ would become even smaller by a factor of 0.3, i.e. $2.5 \cdot 10^{-14}$. As mentioned earlier, such minor error sources are well captured by up-scaling the estimated error by a factor of five.

4 Conclusions

We determine a new limit on the violation of the equality of passive and active gravitational mass for Al and Fe following the procedure of Bartlett and Van Buren [1986]. Our result benefits from the many years of very good LLR data. We used different versions of our LLR analysis software to obtain two final solutions, both providing the value of $\Delta\omega/\omega$. Using the model of Bartlett and Van Buren [1986], we convert the value of $\Delta\omega/\omega$ to obtain the coefficient $S_{\text{Al,Fe}}$. If Al and Fe were to attract each other with the same force, the coefficient $S_{\text{Al,Fe}}$ would be zero, otherwise this perturbation would affect the lunar orbit. We obtained two values for the limit of the ratio of active to passive mass for Al and Fe. Using the worse of the two values, we determine a new limit of $3.9 \cdot 10^{-14}$ on the possible violation of the equality of active and passive mass.

Acknowledgements

Current LLR data are collected, archived, and distributed under the auspices of the International Laser Ranging Service (ILRS)

[Pearlman et al., 2019]. We acknowledge with thanks that the processed LLR data, since 1969, has been obtained under the efforts of the personnel at the Observatoire de la Côte d’Azur in France, the LURE Observatory in Maui, Hawaii, the McDonald Observatory in Texas, the Apache Point Observatory in New Mexico, the Matera Laser Ranging observatory in Italy, and the Wettzell Laser Ranging System in Germany. This research was funded by the Deutsche Forschungsgemeinschaft (DFG, German Research Foundation) under Germany’s Excellence Strategy EXC 2123 QuantumFrontiers, Project-ID 390837967. We also thank James G. Williams, California Institute of Technology for an extensive discussion on the effect of the degree 2 tides. Without his help, this publication would not have been possible.

Author contributions

All authors contributed to the development of this study and provided ideas to its content. The first draft of the manuscript was written by VVS, and all authors commented on previous versions of the manuscript. All authors read and approved the final manuscript.

References

- D. F. Bartlett and D. Van Buren. Equivalence of active and passive gravitational mass using the moon. *Phys. Rev. Lett.*, 57:21–24, Jul 1986. doi: 10.1103/PhysRevLett.57.21.
- B. G. Bills and A. J. Ferrari. A harmonic analysis of lunar topography. *Icarus*, 31(2):244–259, 1977. ISSN 0019-1035. doi: 10.1016/0019-1035(77)90036-7.
- H. Bondi. Negative mass in general relativity. *Rev. Mod. Phys.*, 29:423–428, Jul 1957. doi: 10.1103/RevModPhys.29.423.
- D. C. Christodoulidis, D. E. Smith, R. G. Williamson, and S. M. Klosko. Observed tidal braking in the earth/moon/sun system. *Journal of Geophysical Research: Solid Earth*, 93(B6): 6216–6236, 1988. doi: 10.1029/JB093iB06p06216.
- J. O. Dickey, J. G. Williams, X. X. Newhall, and C. F. Yoder. Geophysical applications of lunar laser ranging. In *Proceedings of the International Union of Geodesy and Geophysics, Hamburg*, pages 509–521. (Ohio State Univ. Press, Columbus, 1984), 1983.
- W. Folkner, J. Williams, D. Boggs, R. Park, and P. Kuchynka. The Planetary and Lunar Ephemerides DE430 and DE431. *Interplanet. Netw. Prog. Rep.*, 196, 01 2014.
- F. Hofmann. *Lunar Laser Ranging – verbesserte Modellierung der Mondynamik und Schätzung relativistischer Parameter*. PhD thesis, Leibniz University Hannover, 2017. Deutsche Geodätische Kommission bei der Bayerischen Akademie der Wissenschaften, Reihe C, Nr. 797.
- F. Hofmann and J. Müller. Relativistic tests with lunar laser ranging. *Classical and Quantum Gravity*, 35, 02 2018. doi: 10.1088/1361-6382/aa8f7a.

- L. B. Kreuzer. Experimental measurement of the equivalence of active and passive gravitational mass. *Phys. Rev.*, 169: 1007–1012, May 1968. doi: 10.1103/PhysRev.169.1007.
- J. Müller, K. Nordtvedt, and D. Vokrouhlicky. Improved constraint on the alpha-1 PPN parameter from lunar motion. *Phys. Rev. D*, 54:R5927–R5930, 1996. doi: 10.1103/PhysRevD.54.R5927.
- M. R. Pearlman, C. E. Noll, E. C. Pavlis, F. G. Lemoine, L. Combrink, J. J. Degnan, G. Kirchner, and U. Schreiber. The ILRS: approaching 20 years and planning for the future. *Journal of Geodesy*, 93(11):2161–2180, Nov. 2019. doi: 10.1007/s00190-019-01241-1.
- V. V. Singh, L. Biskupek, J. Müller, and M. Zhang. Impact of non-tidal station loading in LLR. *Advances in Space Research*, 67(12):3925–3941, 2021. ISSN 0273-1177. doi: 10.1016/j.asr.2021.03.018.
- D. Smith, M. Zuber, G. Neumann, E. Mazarico, F. Lemoine, J. Head, P. Lucey, O. Aharonson, M. Robinson, X. Sun, M. Torrence, M. Barker, J. Oberst, T. Duxbury, D. Mao, O. Barnouin, K. Jha, D. Rowlands, S. Goossens, and T. McClanahan. Summary of the results from the lunar orbiter laser altimeter after seven years in lunar orbit. *Icarus*, 283: 70–91, 02 2017. doi: 10.1016/j.icarus.2016.06.006.
- P. Touboul et al. MICROSCOPE Mission: Final Results of the Test of the Equivalence Principle. *Phys. Rev. Lett.*, 129(12): 121102, 2022. doi: 10.1103/PhysRevLett.129.121102.
- C. Will. The confrontation between general relativity and experiment. *Living Reviews in Relativity*, 17, 01 2014. doi: 10.12942/lrr-2014-4.
- J. Williams and D. Boggs. Secular tidal changes in lunar orbit and earth rotation. *Celestial Mechanics and Dynamical Astronomy*, 126, 11 2016. doi: 10.1007/s10569-016-9702-3.
- J. G. Williams, W. S. Sinclair, and C. F. Yoder. Tidal acceleration of the moon. *Geophysical Research Letters*, 5(11): 943–946, 1978. doi: 10.1029/GL005i011p00943.