



CHORUS

This is the accepted manuscript made available via CHORUS. The article has been published as:

Parametrized post-Einsteinian gravitational waveforms in various modified theories of gravity

Sharaban Tahura and Kent Yagi

Phys. Rev. D **98**, 084042 — Published 25 October 2018

DOI: [10.1103/PhysRevD.98.084042](https://doi.org/10.1103/PhysRevD.98.084042)

Parameterized Post-Einsteinian Gravitational Waveforms in Various Modified Theories of Gravity

Sharaban Tahura and Kent Yagi

Department of Physics, University of Virginia, Charlottesville, Virginia 22904, USA.

Despite the tremendous success of general relativity so far, modified theories of gravity have received increased attention lately, motivated from both theoretical and observational aspects. In particular, gravitational wave observations opened new possibilities for testing the viability of such theories in the dynamical and strong-field regime. One could test each modified theory of gravity against observed data one at a time, though perhaps a more efficient approach would be to first probe gravity in a theory-agnostic way and map such information to that on specific theories afterwards. One example of such model-independent tests of gravity with gravitational waves is the parameterized post-Einsteinian formalism, where one introduces generic parameters in the amplitude and phase that capture non-Einsteinian effects. In this paper, we derive gravitational waveforms from inspiraling compact binaries in various modified theories of gravity that violate at least one fundamental pillar in general relativity, such as the strong equivalence principle, Lorentz and parity invariance and commutativity of spacetime. We achieve this by first deriving relations between corrections to the waveform amplitude/phase and those to the frequency evolution and Kepler's third law, since the latter two have already been (or can easily be) derived in several example modified theories of gravity. In particular, such an analysis allows us to derive corrections to the waveform amplitude, which extends many of previous works that focused on deriving phase corrections only. Moreover, we derive modified gravitational waveforms in theories with varying gravitational constant. In particular, we extend the previous work by introducing two different gravitational constants (the conservative one entering in the binding energy and the dissipative one entering in the gravitational wave luminosity), and allowing masses of binary constituents to also vary with time. We also correct some errors in previous literature. Our results can be used to improve current analyses of testing general relativity with available gravitational wave data, as well as to achieve new projected constraints on various modified theories of gravity with future gravitational wave observations.

I. INTRODUCTION

General relativity (GR) is one of the cornerstones of modern physics, and so far the most successful theory of gravitation. Along with the elegant mathematical structure and solid conceptual foundation, GR has passed all the tests with high accuracy [1]. However, there are theoretical and observational motivations which lead to the demand of a modified theory of gravitation. Regarding the former, GR is a purely classical theory and incompatible with quantum mechanics. Strong gravitational fields at Planck scale where quantum effects cannot be ignored [2, 3], such as in the vicinity of black holes (BHs) and the very early universe, require a consistent theory of quantum gravity for their complete description. Regarding the latter, puzzling observations such as the accelerated expansion of the universe [4–11] and anomalous kinematics of galaxies [12–18] also suggest that one may need to go beyond GR to explain such cosmological phenomena if one does not wish to introduce dark energy or dark matter that are currently unknown.

Before gravitational waves (GWs) were directly detected by Advanced LIGO and Virgo, tests of gravity mainly focused on using solar system experiments and observations of radio pulsars and cosmology. Each of these cover different ranges of length scale and curvature strength. Solar system experiments constrain gravity in the weak-field and slow-motion environment. In terms

of relativistic equations of motion, such experiments give access mostly to first order corrections to Newtonian dynamics [1, 19]. Pulsar timing observations of neutron stars (NSs) offer us both weak-field and strong-field tests of gravity [20–29]. On one hand, binary components are widely separated and the relative motion of two stars in a binary is slow (and thus weak-field). On the other hand, binary pulsars consist of NSs which are compact and are strong-field sources of gravity. Cosmological observations constrain gravity in the weak field regime but at length scales which are many orders of magnitude larger compared to other tests [19, 30–33]. Cosmological tests of gravity include observations of cosmic microwave background radiation [34–38], studies of Big Bang Nucleosynthesis [39–45], weak gravitational lensing [46–50] and observations of galaxies [19]. Other tests include using the orbital motion of stars near the Galactic Center [51–53].

Up until now, six GW sources have been discovered (five of them being consistent with binary BH mergers [54–58] while the remaining one being consistent with a binary NS merger [59]), which opened completely new ways of testing GR. GWs provide the opportunity to probe gravity in the strong-field and highly dynamical regime. Binary BH merger events have been used to carry out a model-independent test of gravity by estimating the amount of residuals in the detected signals of GW150914 from the best-fit waveform [60]. GW150914 has also been used to perform a consistency test of GR between the inspiral and post-inspiral phases [60]. An

addition of Virgo allowed one to look for non-tensorial polarization modes of GWs [58]. Meanwhile, the arrival time difference between gravitons and photons in the binary NS merger event GW170817 can be used to constrain the deviation in the propagation speed of the former from the latter to one part in 10^{15} , to place bounds on the violation of Lorentz invariance and to carry out a new test of the equivalence principle via the Shapiro time delay [61]. Such a constraint on the propagation speed of GWs has led one to rule out many of modified theories of gravity that can explain the current accelerating expansion of our universe without introducing dark energy [62–69]. So far, no evidence has been found that indicates non-GR effects.

One can carry out yet another type of tests of GR by directly measuring or constraining non-GR parameters in the waveform. One can derive modifications to GR waveforms by choosing specific modified theories of gravity, though perhaps a more efficient approach is to perform the test in a model-independent way. A pioneering work along this line has been carried out in [70–72], where the authors treat each post-Newtonian (PN) term in the waveform independently and look for consistency among them. Based on this, a data analysis pipeline (TIGER) was developed [73, 74]. One drawback of such a formalism is that one can only treat PN terms in non-GR theories that are also present in GR, which means that one cannot capture e.g. scalar dipole radiation effect entering at a negative PN order that is absent in GR. To overcome this, Yunes and Pretorius [75] proposed a new framework called *parameterized post-Einsteinian* (PPE) formalism, where they introduced new parameters that can capture non-GR effects in waveforms in a generic way. The original work focused on tensorial polarizations for quasi-circular binaries and introduced only the leading PN non-GR corrections in Fourier domain. Such an analysis was later extended to include non-tensorial polarizations [76] and multiple PN correction terms [77], and for time domain waveforms [78], eccentric binaries [79] and a sudden turn on of non-GR effects [80, 81]. The LIGO Scientific Collaboration and Virgo Collaboration developed a generalized IMRPhenom model [61] that is similar to the PPE formalism [82]. Generic non-GR parameters in the waveform phase have been constrained in [56, 61, 82, 83] with the observed GW events.

In this paper, we derive PPE waveforms in various modified theories of gravity. Many of previous literature focused on deriving phase corrections since matched filtering is more sensitive to such phase corrections than to amplitude corrections. Having said this, there are situations where amplitude corrections are more useful to probe, such as amplitude birefringence in parity-violating theories of gravity [84–87] and testing GR with astrophysical stochastic GW backgrounds [88]. We first derive PPE amplitude and phase corrections in terms of generic modifications to the frequency evolution and Kepler’s third law that determine the waveform in Fourier domain. For our purpose, this formalism is more useful

than that in [76], which derives the amplitude and phase corrections in terms of generic modifications to the binding energy of a binary and the GW luminosity. We follow the original PPE framework and focus on deriving leading PN corrections in tensorial modes only [75, 89]. Non-tensorial GW modes also typically exist in theories beyond GR, though at least in scalar-tensor theories, the amplitude of a scalar polarization is of higher PN order than amplitude corrections to tensor modes [76, 90].

We also derive non-GR corrections in varying- G theories, considering a PPE formalism with variable gravitational constants. Although there is only one gravitational constant in GR, many modified theories allow more than one gravitational constants that appear in different sectors. We consider two different gravitational constants, one entering in the GW luminosity and the other in Kepler’s third law or the binding energy. We also promote the binary masses and the specific angular momentum to vary with time via the sensitivities [91], which closely follow testing variation in G with binary pulsars [28]. Our work extends the previous work of Ref. [92] where dissipative and conservative constants were taken to be the same and the masses of binary components were assumed to be constant. Furthermore, we correct the energy-balance law used in [92] for varying- G theories by taking into account the non-conservation of binding energy in the absence of gravitational radiation.

Non-GR corrections can enter in the gravitational waveform through activation of different theoretical mechanisms, which can be classified as generation mechanisms and propagation mechanisms [82]. Generation mechanisms take place close to the source (binary), while propagation mechanisms occur in the far-zone and accumulate over distance as the waves propagate. In this paper, we focus on the former¹. The PPE parameters in various modified theories of gravity are summarized in Tables I (phase corrections) and II (amplitude corrections). Some of the amplitude corrections were derived here for the first time. We also correct some errors in previous literature.

The rest of the paper is organized as follows: In Sec. II, we revisit the standard PPE formalism. In Sec. III, we derive the PPE parameters in some example theories following the formalism in Sec. II. In Sec. IV, we derive the PPE parameters in varying- G theories. We summarize our work and discuss possible future prospects in Sec. V. Appendix A discusses the original PPE formalism. In App. B, we derive the frequency evolution in varying- G theories from the energy-balance law. We use the geometric units $G = c = 1$ throughout this paper except for varying- G theories.

¹ PPE waveforms due to modifications in the propagation sector can be found in [82, 93, 94], which have been used for GW150914, GW151226 [82] and GW170104 [56] to constrain the mass of the graviton and Lorentz violation.

Theories	PPE Phase Parameters		Binary Type
	Magnitude (β)	Exp. (b)	
Scalar-Tensor [95, 96]	$-\frac{5}{7168}\eta^{2/5}(\alpha_1 - \alpha_2)^2$	-7	Any
EdGB [97]	$-\frac{5}{7168}\zeta_{\text{EdGB}}\frac{(m_1^2 s_2^{\text{EdGB}} - m_2^2 s_1^{\text{EdGB}})^2}{m^4 \eta^{18/5}}$	-7	Any
DCS [82, 98]	$\frac{1549225}{11812864}\eta^{-14/5}\zeta_{\text{dCS}}[-2\delta_m\chi_a\chi_s + (1 - \frac{16068\eta}{61969})\chi_a^2 + (1 - \frac{231808\eta}{61969})\chi_s^2]$	-1	BH/BH
Einstein-Æther [99]	$-\frac{5}{3584}\eta^{2/5}\frac{(s_1^{\text{EA}} - s_2^{\text{EA}})^2}{[(1-s_1^{\text{EA}})(1-s_2^{\text{EA}})]^{4/3}}\left[\frac{(c_{14}-2)w_0^3 - w_1^3}{c_{14}w_0^3w_1^3}\right]$	-7	Any
Khronometric [99]	$-\frac{5}{3584}\eta^{2/5}\frac{(s_1^{\text{kh}} - s_2^{\text{kh}})^2}{[(1-s_1^{\text{kh}})(1-s_2^{\text{kh}})]^{4/3}}\sqrt{\bar{\alpha}_{\text{kh}}}\left[\frac{(\bar{\beta}_{\text{kh}}-1)(2+\bar{\beta}_{\text{kh}}+3\bar{\lambda}_{\text{kh}})}{(\bar{\alpha}_{\text{kh}}-2)(\bar{\beta}_{\text{kh}}+\bar{\lambda}_{\text{kh}})}\right]^{3/2}$	-7	Any
Noncommutative [100]	$-\frac{75}{256}\eta^{-4/5}(2\eta - 1)\Lambda^2$	-1	BH/BH
Varying- G [92]	$-\frac{25}{851968}\eta_0^{3/5}\dot{G}_{\text{C},0}[\mathbf{11}\mathbf{m}_0 + \mathbf{3}(\mathbf{s}_{1,0} + \mathbf{s}_{2,0} - \delta_{\dot{G}})\mathbf{m}_0 - \mathbf{41}(\mathbf{m}_{1,0}\mathbf{s}_{1,0} + \mathbf{m}_{2,0}\mathbf{s}_{2,0})]$	-13	Any

TABLE I. PPE corrections to the GW phase $\delta\Psi \equiv \beta u^b$ in Fourier space in various modified theories of gravity, where β is the magnitude correction (second column) and b is the exponent correction (third column). $u \equiv (\pi G_C \mathcal{M} f)^{1/3}$, where \mathcal{M} and η are the chirp mass and the symmetric mass ratio of the binary respectively, and G_C is the conservative gravitational constant appearing in Kepler's third law. We adopt the unit $G_C \equiv 1$ in all theories except for the varying- G ones. The expressions in dynamical Chern-Simons (dCS) gravity and noncommutative gravity only apply to binary BHs, while those in other theories apply to any compact binaries (last column)^a. The mass, sensitivity, and scalar charge of the A th binary component are represented by m_A , s_A , and α_A respectively. ζ_{EdGB} and ζ_{dCS} are the dimensionless coupling constants in Einstein-dilaton Gauss-Bonnet (EdGB) and dCS gravity respectively. \bar{s}_A^{EdGB} are the spin-dependent factors of the scalar charges in EdGB gravity, given below Eq. (29) for BHs while 0 for ordinary stars. $\chi_{s,\alpha}$ are the symmetric and antisymmetric combinations of dimensionless spin parameters and δ_m is the fractional difference in masses relative to the total mass m . The amount of Lorentz violation in Einstein-Æther theory and khronometric gravity is controlled by (c_1, c_2, c_3, c_4) and $(\bar{\alpha}_{\text{kh}}, \bar{\beta}_{\text{kh}}, \bar{\lambda}_{\text{kh}})$ respectively. w_s is the propagation speed of the spin- s modes in Einstein-Æther theory given by Eqs. (36)-(38), and $c_{14} \equiv c_1 + c_4$. The representative parameter in noncommutative gravity is Λ . The subscript 0 in varying- G theories denotes that the quantity is measured at the time of coalescence t_0 , while a dot refers to a time derivative. $\delta_{\dot{G}}$ is the fractional difference between the rates at which conservative and dissipative gravitational constants change in time. The former is G_C as already explained while the dissipative gravitational constant is defined as the one that enters in the GW luminosity through Eq. (8). The boldface expression indicates that it has been derived here for the first time.

^a Practically speaking, if NSs are spinning much slower than BHs, one can use the dCS expression also for BH/NS binaries by setting one of the spins to zero.

II. PPE WAVEFORM

We begin by reviewing the PPE formalism. The original formalism (that we explain in detail in App. A) was developed by considering non-GR corrections to the binding energy E and GW luminosity \dot{E} [75, 76]. The former (latter) correspond to conservative (dissipative) corrections. Here, we take a slightly different approach and consider corrections to the GW frequency evolution \dot{f} and the Kepler's law $r(f)$, where r is the orbital separation while f is the GW frequency. This is because these two quantities directly determine the amplitude and phase corrections away from GR, and hence, the final expressions are simpler than the original ones. Moreover, non-GR corrections to \dot{f} and $r(f)$ have already been derived in previous literature for many modified theories of gravity.

PPE gravitational waveform for a compact binary in-

spiral in Fourier domain is given by [75]

$$\tilde{h}(f) = \tilde{h}_{\text{GR}}(1 + \alpha u^a)e^{i\delta\Psi}, \quad (1)$$

where \tilde{h}_{GR} is the gravitational waveform in GR. αu^a corresponds to the non-GR correction to the GW amplitude while $\delta\Psi$ is that to the GW phase with

$$u = (\pi \mathcal{M} f)^{\frac{1}{3}}. \quad (2)$$

$\mathcal{M} = (m_1 m_2)^{3/5} / (m_1 + m_2)^{1/5}$ is the chirp mass with component masses m_1 and m_2 . u is proportional to the relative velocity of the binary components. α represents the overall magnitude of the amplitude correction while a gives the velocity dependence of the correction term. In a similar manner, one can rewrite the phase correction as

$$\delta\Psi = \beta u^b. \quad (3)$$

α , β , a , and b are called the PPE parameters. When $(\alpha, \beta) \equiv (0, 0)$, Eq. (1) reduces to the waveform in GR.

Theories	PPE Amplitude Parameters	
	Magnitude (α)	Exponent (a)
Scalar-Tensor [76, 90, 101]	$-\frac{5}{192}\eta^{2/5}(\alpha_1 - \alpha_2)^2$	-2
EdGB	$-\frac{5}{192}\zeta_{\text{EdGB}}\frac{(m_1^2 s_2^{\text{EdGB}} - m_2^2 s_1^{\text{EdGB}})^2}{m^4 \eta^{18/5}}$	-2
DCS	$\frac{185627}{1107456}\eta^{-14/5}\zeta_{\text{dCS}}[-2\delta_m\chi_a\chi_s + (1 - \frac{53408\eta}{14279})\chi_a^2 + (1 - \frac{3708\eta}{14279})\chi_s^2]$	+4
Einstein-Æther [99]	$-\frac{5}{96}\eta^{2/5}\frac{(s_1^{\text{EA}} - s_2^{\text{EA}})^2}{[(1-s_1^{\text{EA}})(1-s_2^{\text{EA}})]^{4/3}}\left[\frac{(c_{14}-2)w_0^3 - w_1^3}{c_{14}w_0^3w_1^3}\right]$	-2
Khronometric [99]	$-\frac{5}{96}\eta^{2/5}\frac{(s_1^{\text{kh}} - s_2^{\text{kh}})^2}{[(1-s_1^{\text{kh}})(1-s_2^{\text{kh}})]^{4/3}}\sqrt{\bar{\alpha}_{\text{kh}}}\left[\frac{(\bar{\beta}_{\text{kh}}-1)(2+\bar{\beta}_{\text{kh}}+3\bar{\lambda}_{\text{kh}})}{(\bar{\alpha}_{\text{kh}}-2)(\bar{\beta}_{\text{kh}}+\bar{\lambda}_{\text{kh}})}\right]^{3/2}$	-2
Noncommutative	$-\frac{3}{8}\eta^{-4/5}(2\eta - 1)\Lambda^2$	+4
Varying- G [92]	$\frac{5}{512}\eta_0^{3/5}\dot{G}_{\text{C},0}[-7\mathbf{m}_0 + (s_{1,0} + s_{2,0} - \delta_G)\mathbf{m}_0 + 13(\mathbf{m}_{1,0}s_{1,0} + \mathbf{m}_{2,0}s_{2,0})]$	-8

TABLE II. PPE corrections to the GW amplitude $|\tilde{h}| = |\tilde{h}_{\text{GR}}|(1 + \alpha u^a)$ in Fourier space in various modified theories of gravity with the magnitude α (second column) and the exponent a (third column), and $|\tilde{h}_{\text{GR}}|$ representing the amplitude in GR. The meaning of other parameters are the same as in Table I. The expressions in boldface correspond to either those derived here for the first time or corrected expressions from previous literature.

One can count the PN order of non-GR corrections in the waveform as follows. A correction term is said to be of n PN relative to GR if the *relative* correction is proportional u^{2n} . Thus, the amplitude correction in Eq. (1) is of $a/2$ PN order. On the other hand, given that the leading GR phase is proportional to u^{-5} (see Eq. (A12)), the phase correction in Eq. (3) is of $(b + 5)/2$ PN order.

As we mentioned earlier, the PPE modifications in Eq. (1) enter through corrections to the orbital separation and the frequency evolution. We parameterize the former as

$$r = r_{\text{GR}}(1 + \gamma_r u^{c_r}), \quad (4)$$

where γ_r and c_r are non-GR parameters which show the deviation of the orbital separation r away from the GR contribution r_{GR} . To leading PN order, r_{GR} is simply given by the Newtonian Kepler's law as $r_{\text{GR}} = (m/\Omega^2)^{1/3}$. Here $m \equiv m_1 + m_2$ is the total mass of the binary while $\Omega \equiv \pi f$ is the orbital angular frequency. The above correction to the orbital separation arises purely from conservative corrections (namely corrections to the binding energy).

Similarly, we parameterize the GW frequency evolution with non-GR parameters γ_f and c_f as

$$\dot{f} = \dot{f}_{\text{GR}}\left(1 + \gamma_f u^{c_f}\right). \quad (5)$$

Here \dot{f}_{GR} is the frequency evolution in GR which, to leading PN order, is given by [102, 103]

$$\dot{f}_{\text{GR}} = \frac{96}{5}\pi^{8/3}\mathcal{M}^{5/3}f^{11/3} = \frac{96}{5\pi\mathcal{M}^2}u^{11}. \quad (6)$$

Unlike the correction to the orbital separation, the one to the frequency evolution originates corrections from both the conservative and dissipative sectors.

Below, we will derive how the PPE parameters (α, β, a, b) are given in terms of (γ_r, c_r) and (γ_f, c_f) . We will also show how the amplitude PPE parameters (α, a) can be related to the phase PPE ones (β, b) in certain cases. We will assume that non-GR corrections are always smaller than the GR contribution and keep only to leading order in such corrections at the leading PN order.

A. Amplitude Corrections

Let us first look at corrections to the waveform amplitude. Within the stationary phase approximation [104, 105], the waveform amplitude for the dominant quadrupolar radiation in Fourier domain is given by

$$\tilde{A}(f) = \frac{A(\bar{t})}{2\sqrt{\dot{f}}}. \quad (7)$$

Here A is the waveform amplitude in the time domain while $\bar{t}(f)$ represents time at the stationary point. $\mathcal{A}(\bar{t})$ can be obtained by using the quadrupole formula for the metric perturbation in the transverse-traceless gauge given by [106]

$$h^{ij}(t) \propto \frac{G}{D_L} \frac{d^2}{dt^2} Q^{ij}. \quad (8)$$

Here D_L is the source's luminosity distance and Q^{ij} is the source's quadrupole moment tensor.

For a quasi-circular compact binary, $\tilde{\mathcal{A}}$ in Eq. (7) then becomes

$$\tilde{\mathcal{A}}(f) \propto \frac{1}{\sqrt{f}} \frac{G}{D_L} \mu r^2 f^2 \propto \frac{r^2}{\sqrt{f}}, \quad (9)$$

where μ is the reduced mass of the binary. Substituting Eqs. (4) and (5) into Eq. (9) and keeping only to leading order in non-GR corrections, we find

$$\tilde{\mathcal{A}}(f) = \tilde{\mathcal{A}}_{\text{GR}} \left(1 + 2\gamma_r u^{c_r} - \frac{1}{2}\gamma_f u^{c_f} \right), \quad (10)$$

where $\tilde{\mathcal{A}}_{\text{GR}}$ is the amplitude of the Fourier waveform in GR. Notice that this expression is much simpler than that in the original formalism in Eq. (A7).

Let us now show the expressions for the PPE parameters α and a for three different cases using Eq. (10):

- *Dissipative-dominated Case*

When dissipative corrections dominate, we can neglect corrections to the binary separation ($\gamma_r = 0$) and Eq. (10) reduces to

$$\tilde{\mathcal{A}}(f) = \tilde{\mathcal{A}}_{\text{GR}} \left(1 - \frac{1}{2}\gamma_f u^{c_f} \right). \quad (11)$$

Comparing this with the PPE waveform in Eq. (1), we find

$$\alpha = -\frac{\gamma_f}{2}, \quad a = c_f. \quad (12)$$

- *Conservative-dominated Case*

When conservative corrections dominate, $c_r = c_f$ and there is an explicit relation between γ_r and γ_f . Though finding such a relation is quite involved and one needs to go back to the original PPE formalism as explained in App. A. Non-GR corrections to the GW amplitude in such a formalism is shown in Eq. (A14). Setting the dissipative correction to zero, one finds

$$\alpha = -\frac{\gamma_r}{a}(a^2 - 4a - 6), \quad a = c_r = c_f. \quad (13)$$

- *Comparable Dissipative and Conservative Case*

If dissipative and conservative corrections enter at the same PN order, we can set $c_r = c_f$ in Eq. (10). Since there is no generic relation between γ_r and γ_f in this case, one simply finds

$$\alpha = 2\gamma_r - \frac{\gamma_f}{2}, \quad a = c_r = c_f. \quad (14)$$

Example modified theories of gravity that we study in Secs. III and IV fall into either the first or third case.

B. Phase Corrections

Next, let us study corrections to the GW phase. The phase Ψ in Fourier domain is related to the frequency evolution as [107]

$$\frac{d^2\Psi}{d\Omega^2} = 2\frac{dt}{d\Omega}, \quad (15)$$

which can be rewritten as

$$\frac{d^2\Psi}{d\Omega^2} = \frac{2}{\pi f}. \quad (16)$$

Substituting Eq. (5) to the right hand side of the above equation and keeping only to leading non-GR correction, we find

$$\frac{d^2\Psi}{d\Omega^2} = \frac{2}{\pi f_{\text{GR}}}(1 - \gamma_f u^{c_f}). \quad (17)$$

Using further Eq. (6) to Eq. (17) gives

$$\frac{d^2\Psi}{d\Omega^2} = \frac{5}{48}\mathcal{M}^2 u^{-11}(1 - \gamma_f u^{c_f}). \quad (18)$$

We are now ready to derive Ψ and extract the PPE parameters β and b . Using $\Omega = \pi f$, we can integrate Eq. (18) twice to find

$$\Psi = \Psi_{\text{GR}} - \frac{15\gamma_f}{16(c_f - 8)(c_f - 5)} u^{c_f - 5} \quad (19)$$

for $c_f \neq 5$ and $c_f \neq 8$. Here we only keep to leading non-GR correction and Ψ_{GR} is the GR contribution given in Eq. (A12) to leading PN order. Similar to the amplitude case, the above expression is much simpler than that in the original formalism in Eq. (A11). Comparing this with Eqs. (1) and (3), we find

$$\beta = -\frac{15\gamma_f}{16(c_f - 8)(c_f - 5)}, \quad b = c_f - 5. \quad (20)$$

The above relation is valid for all three types of corrections considered for the GW amplitude case.

In App. A, we review $\delta\Psi$ derived in the original PPE formalism, where we show dissipative and conservative contributions explicitly. In particular, one can use Eq. (A15) to find β for all three cases separately.

C. Relations among ppE Parameters

Finally, we study relations among the PPE parameters. From Eqs. (12)–(14) and (20), one can easily see

$$b = a - 5, \quad (21)$$

which holds in all three cases considered previously. Let us consider such three cases in turn below to derive relations between α and β .

- *Dissipative-dominated Case*

When dissipative corrections dominate, we can use Eqs. (12) and (20) to find α in terms of β and a as

$$\alpha = \frac{8}{15}(a-8)(a-5)\beta. \quad (22)$$

- *Conservative-dominated Case*

When conservative corrections dominate, we can set the dissipative correction to vanish in Eq. (A15) to find

$$\beta = -\frac{15}{8} \frac{\gamma_r}{c_r} \frac{c_r^2 - 2c_r - 6}{(8 - c_r)(5 - c_r)}, \quad b = c_r - 5. \quad (23)$$

Using this equation together with Eq. (13), we find

$$\alpha = \frac{8}{15} \frac{(8-a)(5-a)(a^2 - 4a - 6)}{a^2 - 2a - 6} \beta. \quad (24)$$

- *Comparable Dissipative and Conservative Case*

When dissipative and conservative corrections enter at the same PN order, there is no explicit relation between α and β . This is because α depends both on γ_r and γ_f (see Eq. (14)) while β depends only on the latter (see Eq. (19)), and there is no relation between the former and the latter. Thus, one can rewrite γ_f in terms of β and substitute into Eq. (14) but cannot eliminate γ_r from the expression for α .

III. EXAMPLE THEORIES

In this section, we consider several modified theories of gravity where non-GR corrections arise from generation mechanisms. We briefly discuss each theory, describing differences from GR and its importance. We derive the PPE parameters for each theory following the formalism in Sec. II. Among the various example theories we present here, dissipative corrections dominate in scalar-tensor theories, EdGB gravity, Einstein-Æther theory, and khronometric gravity. On the other hand, dissipative and conservative corrections enter at the same PN order in dCS gravity, noncommutative gravity, and varying- G theories. We do not consider any theories where conservative corrections dominate dissipative ones, though such a situation can be realized for e.g. equal-mass and equal-spin binaries in dCS gravity, where the scalar quadrupolar radiation is suppressed and dominant corrections arise from the scalar dipole interaction and quadrupole moment corrections in the conservative sector.

A. Scalar-Tensor Theories

Scalar-tensor theories are one of the most well-established modified theories of gravity where at least

one scalar field is introduced through a non-minimal coupling to gravity [19, 108, 109]. Such theories arise naturally from the dimensional reduction of higher dimensional theories, such as Kaluza-Klein theory [110, 111] and string theories [112, 113]. Scalar-tensor theories have implications to cosmology as well since they are viable candidates for accelerating expansion of our universe [114–118], structure formation [119], inflation [30, 120, 121], and primordial nucleosynthesis [40, 41, 122, 123]. Such theories also offer simple ways to self-consistently model possible variations in Newton’s constant [30] (as we discuss in Sec. IV). One of the simplest scalar-tensor theories is Brans-Dicke (BD) theory, where a non-canonical scalar field is non-minimally coupled to the metric with an effective strength inversely proportional to the coupling parameter ω_{BD} [95, 124]. So far the most stringent bound on the theory has been placed by the Cassini-Huygens satellite mission via Shapiro time delay measurement, which gives $\omega_{\text{BD}} > 4 \times 10^4$ [125]. Another class of scalar-tensor theories that has been studied extensively is Damour-Esposito-Farèse (DEF) gravity (or sometimes called quasi Brans-Dicke theory), which has two coupling constants (α_0, β_0). This theory reduces to BD theory when β_0 is set to 0 and α_0 is directly related to ω_{BD} . This theory predicts nonperturbative spontaneous or dynamical scalarization phenomena for NSs [126, 127].

When scalarized NSs form compact binaries, these systems emit scalar dipole radiation that changes the orbital evolution from that in GR. Such an effect can be used to place bounds on scalar-tensor theories. For example, combining observational orbital decay results from multiple binary pulsars, the strongest upper bound on β_0 that controls the magnitude of scalarization in DEF gravity has been obtained as $\beta_0 \gtrsim -4.38$ at 90% confidence level [128]. More recently, observations of a hierarchical stellar triple system PSR J0337+1715 placed strong bounds on the Strong Equivalence Principle (SEP) violation parameter² as $|\Delta| \lesssim 2 \times 10^{-6}$ at 95% confidence level [129]. This bound stringently constrained the parameter space (α_0, β_0) of DEF gravity [126, 130–133].

Can BHs also possess scalar hair like NSs in scalar-tensor theories? BH no-hair theorem can be applied to many of scalar-tensor theories that prevents BHs to acquire scalar charges [134–138] including BD and DEF gravity, though exceptions exist, such as EdGB gravity [139–143] that we explain in more detail in the next subsection. On the other hand, if the scalar field cosmologically evolves as a function of time, BHs can acquire scalar charges, known as the BH miracle hair growth [144, 145] (see also [146, 147] for related works).

Let us now derive the PPE parameters in scalar tensor theories. Gravitational waveforms are modified from that in GR through the scalar dipole radiation. Using the or-

² SEP violation parameter is defined as $\Delta = m_G/m_I - 1$, where m_G and m_I are respectively the gravitational and inertial mass of a pulsar [129].

bit decay rate of compact binaries in scalar-tensor theories in [20, 28], one can read off the non-GR corrections to \dot{f} as

$$\gamma_{\dot{f}} = \frac{5}{96}\eta^{2/5}(\alpha_1 - \alpha_2)^2 \quad (25)$$

with $c_{\dot{f}} = -2$. Given that the leading correction to the waveform is the dissipative one in scalar-tensor theories, one can use Eq. (20) to derive the PPE phase correction as

$$\beta_{\text{ST}} = -\frac{5}{7168}\eta^{2/5}(\alpha_1 - \alpha_2)^2 \quad (26)$$

with $b = -7$. Here α_A represents the scalar charge of the A th binary component. Using further Eq. (22), one finds the amplitude correction as

$$\alpha_{\text{ST}} = -\frac{5}{192}\eta^{2/5}(\alpha_1 - \alpha_2)^2 \quad (27)$$

with $a = -2$. These corrections enter at -1 PN order relative to GR.

The scalar charges α_A depend on specific theories and compact objects. For example, in situations where the BH no-hair theorem [134–136] applies, $\alpha_A = 0$. On the other hand, if the scalar field is evolving cosmologically, BHs undergo *miracle hair growth* [144] and acquire scalar charges given by [145]

$$\alpha_A = 2m_A\dot{\phi}[1 + (1 - \chi_A^2)^{1/2}], \quad (28)$$

where $\dot{\phi}$ is the growth rate of the scalar field while m_A and χ_A are the mass and the magnitude of the dimensionless spin angular momentum of the A th body respectively. The PPE phase parameter β for binary BHs in such a situation was derived in [82]. Another well-studied example is Brans-Dicke theory, where one can replace $(\alpha_1 - \alpha_2)^2$ in Eqs. (26) and (27) as $2(s_1 - s_2)^2/(2 + \omega_{\text{BD}})$ [20]. Here s_A is the sensitivity of the A th body and roughly equals to its compactness (0.5 for BHs and ~ 0.2 for NSs). The PPE parameters in this theory has been found in [76]. Scalar charges and the PPE parameters in generic screened modified gravity have recently been derived in [101, 148].

The phase correction in Eq. (26) has been used to derive current and future projected bounds with GW interferometers. Regarding the former, GW150914 and GW151226 do not place any meaningful bounds on $\dot{\phi}$ [82]. On the other hand, by detecting GWs from BH-NS binaries, aLIGO and Virgo with their design sensitivities can place bounds that are stronger than the above binary pulsar bounds from dynamical scalarization for certain equations of state and NS mass range [81, 128, 149, 150]³. Einstein Telescope, a third generation ground-based detector, can yield constraints on BD theory from BH-NS

binaries that are 100 times stronger than the current bound [151]. Projected bounds with future space-borne interferometers, such as DECIGO, can be as large as four orders of magnitude stronger than current bounds [152], while those with LISA may not be as strong as the current bound [96, 153].

Up until now, we have focused on theories with a massless scalar field, but let us end this subsection by commenting on how the above expressions for the PPE parameters change if one considers a massive scalar field instead. In such a case, the scalar dipole radiation is present only when the mass of the scalar field m_s is smaller than the orbital angular frequency $\Omega = \pi f$. Then, if the Yukawa-type correction to the binding energy is subdominant, Eqs. (26) and (27) simply acquire an additional factor of $\Theta(\Omega - m_s/\hbar)$, where Θ is the Heaviside function. For example, the gravitational waveform phase in massive BD theory is derived in [154]. The situation is similar if massive pseudo-scalars are present, such as axions [155].

B. Einstein-dilaton Gauss-Bonnet Gravity

EdGB gravity is a well-known extension of GR, which emerges naturally in the framework of low-energy effective string theories and gives one of the simplest viable high-energy modifications to GR [156, 157]. It also arises as a special case of Horndeski gravity [19, 158], which is the most generic scalar-tensor theory with at most second-order derivatives in the field equations. One obtains the EdGB action by adding a quadratic-curvature term to the Einstein-Hilbert action, where the scalar field (dilaton) is non-minimally coupled to the Gauss-Bonnet term with a coupling constant $\bar{\alpha}_{\text{EdGB}}$ [159]⁴. A stringent upper bound on such a coupling constant has been placed using the orbital decay measurement of a BH low-mass X-ray binary (LMXB) as $\sqrt{|\bar{\alpha}_{\text{EdGB}}|} < 1.9 \times 10^5 \text{ cm}$ [160]. A similar upper bound has been placed from the existence of BHs [157]. Equation-of-state-dependent bounds from the maximum mass of NSs have also been derived in [161].

BHs in EdGB gravity are of particular interest since they are fundamentally different from their GR counterparts. Perturbative but analytic solutions are available for static [139, 141, 162, 163] and slowly rotating EdGB BHs [164–166] while numerical solutions have been found for static [159, 167, 168] and rotating [157, 169, 170] BHs. One of the important reasons for considering BHs in EdGB is that BHs acquire scalar monopole charges [97, 141, 171, 172] while ordinary stars such as NSs do not if the scalar field is coupled linearly to the Gauss-Bonnet term in the action [97, 173]. This means

³ One needs to multiply Eq. (26) by a step-like function to capture the effect of dynamical scalarization.

⁴ We use barred quantities for coupling constants so that one can easily distinguish them from the PPE parameters.

that binary pulsars are inefficient to constrain the theory, and one needs systems such as BH-LMXBs [160] or BH/pulsar binaries [173] to have better probes on the theory.

We now show the expressions of the PPE parameters for EdGB gravity. The scalar monopole charge of EdGB BHs generates scalar dipole radiation, which leads to an earlier coalescence of BH binaries compared to GR. Such scalar radiation modifies the GW phase with the PPE parameters given by [82, 97]

$$\beta_{\text{EdGB}} = -\frac{5}{7168}\zeta_{\text{EdGB}}\frac{(m_1^2\tilde{s}_2^{\text{EdGB}} - m_2^2\tilde{s}_1^{\text{EdGB}})^2}{m^4\eta^{18/5}} \quad (29)$$

and $b = -7$. Here, $\zeta_{\text{EdGB}} \equiv 16\pi\bar{\alpha}_{\text{EdGB}}^2/m^4$ is the dimensionless EdGB coupling parameter and $\tilde{s}_A^{\text{EdGB}}$ are the spin-dependent factors of the BH scalar charges given by $\tilde{s}_A^{\text{EdGB}} \equiv 2(\sqrt{1-\chi_A^2} - 1 + \chi_A^2)/\chi_A^2$ [171, 172]⁵. In EdGB gravity, the leading order correction to the phase enters through the correction of the GW energy flux, and hence the theory corresponds to a dissipative-dominated case. We can then use Eq. (22) to calculate the amplitude PPE parameters as

$$\alpha_{\text{EdGB}} = -\frac{5}{192}\zeta_{\text{EdGB}}\frac{(m_1^2\tilde{s}_2^{\text{EdGB}} - m_2^2\tilde{s}_1^{\text{EdGB}})^2}{m^4\eta^{18/5}} \quad (30)$$

and $a = -2$. These corrections enter at -1 PN order.

One can use the phase correction in Eq. (29) to derive bounds on EdGB gravity with current [82] and future [160] GW observations. Similar to the scalar-tensor theory case, current binary BH GW events do not allow us to place any meaningful bounds on the theory. Future second- and third-generation ground-based detectors and LISA can place bounds that are comparable to current bounds from LMXBs [160]. On the other hand, DECIGO has the potential to go beyond the current bounds by three orders of magnitude.

C. Dynamical Chern-Simons Gravity

dCS gravity is described by Einstein-Hilbert action with a dynamical (pseudo-)scalar field which is non-minimally coupled to the Pontryagin density with a coupling constant $\bar{\alpha}_{\text{dCS}}$ [174, 175]. Similar to EdGB gravity, dCS gravity arises as an effective field theory from the compactification of heterotic string theory [176, 177]. Such a theory is also important in the context of particle physics [174, 178–180], loop quantum gravity [181, 182], and inflationary cosmology [183]. Demanding that the critical length scale (below which higher curvature corrections beyond quadratic order cannot be neglected in the action) has to be smaller than the scale probed by tabletop experiments, one finds $\sqrt{|\bar{\alpha}_{\text{dCS}}|} < \mathcal{O}(10^8\text{km})$ [184].

Similar constraints have been placed from measurements of the frame-dragging effect by Gravity Probe B and LAGEOS satellites [185].

We now derive the expressions of the PPE parameters for dCS gravity. While BHs in EdGB gravity possess scalar monopole charges, BHs in dCS gravity possess scalar dipole charges which induce scalar quadrupolar emission [97]. On the other hand, scalar dipole charges induce a scalar interaction force between two BHs. Each BH also acquires a modification to the quadrupole moment away from the Kerr value. All of these modifications result in both dissipative and conservative corrections entering at the same order in gravitational waveforms. For spin-aligned binaries⁶, corrections to Kepler's law and frequency evolution in dCS gravity are given in [98] within the slow-rotation approximation for BHs, from which we can derive

$$\gamma_r = \frac{25}{256}\eta^{-9/5}\zeta_{\text{dCS}}\chi_1\chi_2 - \frac{201}{3584}\eta^{-14/5}\zeta_{\text{dCS}}\left(\frac{m_1^2}{m^2}\chi_2^2 + \frac{m_2^2}{m^2}\chi_1^2\right) \quad (31)$$

with $c_r = 4$, and

$$\gamma_f = \frac{38525}{39552}\eta^{-9/5}\zeta_{\text{dCS}}\chi_1\chi_2 - \frac{309845}{553728}\eta^{-14/5}\zeta_{\text{dCS}}\left(\frac{m_1^2}{m^2}\chi_2^2 + \frac{m_2^2}{m^2}\chi_1^2\right) \quad (32)$$

with $c_f = 4$. Here $\zeta_{\text{dCS}} = 16\pi\bar{\alpha}_{\text{dCS}}^2/m^4$ is the dimensionless coupling constant. Using Eqs. (31) and (32) in Eqs. (14) and (20) respectively, one finds

$$\alpha_{\text{dCS}} = \frac{185627}{1107456}\eta^{-14/5}\zeta_{\text{dCS}}[-2\delta_m\chi_a\chi_s + \left(1 - \frac{53408\eta}{14279}\right)\chi_a^2 + \left(1 - \frac{3708\eta}{14279}\right)\chi_s^2] \quad (33)$$

with $a = 4$, and

$$\beta_{\text{dCS}} = \frac{1549225}{11812864}\eta^{-14/5}\zeta_{\text{dCS}}[-2\delta_m\chi_a\chi_s + \left(1 - \frac{16068\eta}{61969}\right)\chi_a^2 + \left(1 - \frac{231808\eta}{61969}\right)\chi_s^2] \quad (34)$$

with $b = -1$. Here $\chi_{s,a} = (\chi_1 \pm \chi_2)/2$ are the symmetric and antisymmetric combinations of dimensionless spin parameters and $\delta_m = (m_1 - m_2)/m$ is the fractional difference in masses relative to the total mass. The above corrections enter at 2 PN order.

Can GW observations place stronger bounds on the theory? Current GW observations do not allow us to

⁵ $\tilde{s}_A^{\text{EdGB}}$ are zero for ordinary stars like NSs [97, 173].

⁶ See recent works [186, 187] for precession equations in dCS gravity.

put any meaningful bounds on dCS gravity [82] (see also [87]). However, future observations have potential to place bounds on the theory that are six to seven orders of magnitude stronger than current bounds [98]. Such stronger bounds can be realized due to relatively strong gravitational field and large spins that source the pseudo-scalar field. Measuring GWs from extreme mass ratio inspirals with LISA can also place bounds that are three orders of magnitude stronger than current bounds [188].

D. Einstein-Æther and Khronometric Theory

In this section, we study two example theories that break Lorentz invariance in the gravity sector, namely Einstein-Æther and khronometric theory. Lorentz-violating theories of gravity are candidates for low-energy descriptions of quantum gravity [189, 190]. Lorentz-violation in the gravity sector has not been as stringently constrained as that in the matter sector [191–193] and several mechanisms exist that prevents percolation of the latter to the former [193, 194].

Einstein-Æther theory is a vector-tensor theory of gravity, where along with the metric, a spacetime is endowed with a dynamical timelike unit vector (Æther) field [195, 196]. Such a vector field specifies a particular rest frame at each point in spacetime, and hence breaks the local Lorentz symmetry. The amount of Lorentz violation is controlled by four coupling parameters (c_1, c_2, c_3, c_4) . Einstein-Æther theory preserves diffeomorphism invariance and hence is a Lorentz-violating theory without abandoning the framework of GR [196]. Along with the spin-2 gravitational perturbation of GR, the theory predicts the existence of the spin-1 and spin-0 perturbations [197–199]. Such perturbation modes propagate at speeds that are functions of the coupling parameters c_i , and in general differ from the speed of light [198].

Khronometric theory is a variant of Einstein-Æther theory, where the Æther field is restricted to be hypersurface-orthogonal. Such a theory arises as a low-energy limit of Hořava gravity, a power-counting renormalizable quantum gravity model with only spatial diffeomorphism invariance [19, 190, 200–202]. The amount of Lorentz violation in the theory is controlled by three parameters, $(\bar{\alpha}_{\text{kh}}, \bar{\beta}_{\text{kh}}, \bar{\lambda}_{\text{kh}})$. Unlike Einstein-Æther theory, the spin-1 propagating modes are absent in khronometric theory.

Most of parameter space in Einstein-Æther and khronometric theory have been constrained stringently from current observations and theoretical requirements. Using the measurement of the arrival time difference between GWs and electromagnetic waves in GW170817, the difference in the propagation speed of GWs away from the speed of light has been constrained to be less than $\sim 10^{-15}$ [59, 61]. Such a bound can be mapped to bounds on Lorentz-violating gravity as $|c_1 + c_3| \lesssim 10^{-15}$ [203, 204]

and $|\bar{\beta}_{\text{kh}}| \lesssim 10^{-15}$ [205]⁷. Imposing further constraints from solar system experiments [207–209], Big Bang nucleosynthesis [210] and theoretical constraints such as the stability of propagating modes, positivity of their energy density [211] and the absence of gravitational Cherenkov radiation [212], allowed regions in the remaining parameter space have been derived for Einstein-Æther [204] and khronometric [205] theory. Binary pulsar bounds on these theories were studied in [213, 214] before the discovery of GW170817, within a parameter space that is different from the allowed regions in [204, 205].

Let us now derive the PPE parameters in Einstein-Æther and khronometric theories. Propagation of the scalar and vector modes is responsible for dipole radiation and loss of angular momentum in binary systems, which increase the amount of orbital decay rate. Regarding Einstein-Æther theory, the PPE phase correction is given by [99]

$$\beta_{\text{EA}} = -\frac{5}{3584}\eta^{2/5}\frac{(s_1^{\text{EA}} - s_2^{\text{EA}})^2}{[(1 - s_1^{\text{EA}})(1 - s_2^{\text{EA}})]^{4/3}} \times \frac{(c_{14} - 2)w_0^3 - w_1^3}{c_{14}w_0^3w_1^3} \quad (35)$$

with $b = -7$. Here w_s is the propagation speed of the spin- s modes in Einstein-Æther theory given by [196]

$$w_0^2 = \frac{(2 - c_{14})c_{123}}{(2 + 3c_2 + c_+)(1 - c_+)c_{14}}, \quad (36)$$

$$w_1^2 = \frac{2c_1 - c_+c_-}{2(1 - c_+)c_{14}}, \quad (37)$$

$$w_2^2 = \frac{1}{1 - c_+}, \quad (38)$$

with

$$c_{14} \equiv c_1 + c_4, \quad c_{\pm} \equiv c_1 \pm c_3, \quad c_{123} \equiv c_1 + c_2 + c_3. \quad (39)$$

s_A in Eq. (35) is the sensitivity of the A -th body and has been calculated only for NSs [213, 214]. Given that the leading order correction in Einstein-Æther theory arises from the dissipative sector [99], we can use Eq. (22) to find the PPE amplitude correction as⁸

$$\alpha_{\text{EA}} = -\frac{5}{96}\eta^{2/5}\frac{(s_1^{\text{EA}} - s_2^{\text{EA}})^2}{[(1 - s_1^{\text{EA}})(1 - s_2^{\text{EA}})]^{4/3}} \times \frac{(c_{14} - 2)w_0^3 - w_1^3}{c_{14}w_0^3w_1^3} \quad (40)$$

⁷ Such bounds are consistent with the prediction in [99] based on [206].

⁸ Eqs. (40) and (42) correct errors in [99].

with $a = -2$. Similar to Einstein-Æther theory, the PPE parameters in khronometric theory is given by [99]

$$\beta_{\text{kh}} = -\frac{5}{3584}\eta^{2/5}\frac{(s_1^{\text{kh}} - s_2^{\text{kh}})^2}{[(1 - s_1^{\text{kh}})(1 - s_2^{\text{kh}})]^{4/3}} \times \sqrt{\bar{\alpha}_{\text{kh}}}\left[\frac{(\bar{\beta}_{\text{kh}} - 1)(2 + \bar{\beta}_{\text{kh}} + 3\bar{\lambda}_{\text{kh}})}{(\bar{\alpha}_{\text{kh}} - 2)(\bar{\beta}_{\text{kh}} + \bar{\lambda}_{\text{kh}})}\right]^{3/2} \quad (41)$$

with $b = -7$, and

$$\alpha_{\text{kh}} = -\frac{5}{96}\eta^{2/5}\frac{(s_1^{\text{kh}} - s_2^{\text{kh}})^2}{[(1 - s_1^{\text{kh}})(1 - s_2^{\text{kh}})]^{4/3}} \times \sqrt{\bar{\alpha}_{\text{kh}}}\left[\frac{(\bar{\beta}_{\text{kh}} - 1)(2 + \bar{\beta}_{\text{kh}} + 3\bar{\lambda}_{\text{kh}})}{(\bar{\alpha}_{\text{kh}} - 2)(\bar{\beta}_{\text{kh}} + \bar{\lambda}_{\text{kh}})}\right]^{3/2} \quad (42)$$

with $a = -2$. These corrections enter at -1 PN order.

Above corrections to the gravitational waveform can be used to compute current and projected future bounds on the theories with GW observations, provided one knows what the sensitivities are for compact objects in binaries. Unfortunately, such sensitivities have not been calculated for BHs, and hence, one cannot derive bounds on the theories from recent binary BH merger events. Instead, Ref. [82] used the next-to-leading 0 PN correction that is independent of the sensitivities and derived bounds from GW150914 and GW151226, though such bounds are weaker than those from binary pulsar observations [213, 214]. On the other hand, Ref. [99] includes both the leading and next-to-leading corrections to the waveform and estimate projected future bounds with GWs from binary NSs. The authors found that bounds from second-generation ground-based detectors are less stringent than existing bounds even with their design sensitivities. However, third-generation ground-based ones and space-borne interferometers can place constraints that are comparable, and in some cases, two orders of magnitude stronger compared to the current bounds [99, 215].

E. Noncommutative Gravity

Although the concept of nontrivial commutation relations of spacetime coordinates is rather old [216, 217], the idea has revived recently with the development of noncommutative geometry [218–222], and the emergence of noncommutative structure of spacetime in a specific limit of string theory [223, 224]. Quantum field theories on noncommutative spacetime have been studied extensively as well [225–227]. In the simplest model of noncommutative gravity, spacetime coordinates are promoted to operators, which satisfy a canonical commutation relation:

$$[\hat{x}^\mu, \hat{x}^\nu] = i\theta^{\mu\nu}, \quad (43)$$

where $\theta^{\mu\nu}$ is a real constant antisymmetric tensor. In ordinary quantum mechanics, Planck's constant \hbar measures the quantum fuzziness of phase space coordinates.

In a similar manner, $\theta^{\mu\nu}$ introduces a new fundamental scale which measures the quantum fuzziness of spacetime coordinates [100].

In order to obtain stringent constraints on the scale of noncommutativity, low-energy experiments are advantageous over high-energy ones [228, 229]. Low-energy precision measurements such as clock-comparison experiments with nuclear-spin-polarized $^9\text{Be}^+$ ions [230] give a constraint on noncommutative scale as $1/\sqrt{\theta} \gtrsim 10$ TeV [228], where θ refers to the magnitude of the spatial-spatial components of $\theta^{\mu\nu}$ ⁹. A similar bound has been obtained from the measurement of the Lamb shift [231]. Another speculative bound is derived from the analysis of atomic experiments which is 10 orders of magnitude stronger [229, 232]. Study of inflationary observables using cosmic microwave background data from Planck gives the lower bound on the energy scale of noncommutativity as 19 TeV [233, 234].

Let us now review how the binary evolution is modified from that in GR in this theory. Several formulations of noncommutative gravity exist [235–240], though the first order noncommutative correction vanishes in all of them [241, 242] and the leading order correction enters at second order. On the other hand, first order corrections may arise from gravity-matter interactions [242, 243]. Thus one can neglect corrections to the pure gravity sector and focus on corrections to the matter sector (i.e., energy-momentum tensor) [100]. Making corrections to classical matter source and following an effective field theory approach, expressions of energy and GW luminosity for quasi-circular BH binaries have been derived in Ref. [100], which give the correction to the frequency evolution in Eq. (5) as

$$\gamma_f = \frac{5}{4}\eta^{-4/5}(2\eta - 1)\Lambda^2 \quad (44)$$

with $c_f = 4$ and $\Lambda^2 = \theta^{0i}\theta_{0i}/(l_p^2 t_p^2)$ with l_p and t_p representing the Planck length and time respectively. On the other hand, modified Kepler's law in Eq. (4) can be found as [100]

$$\gamma_r = \frac{1}{8}\eta^{-4/5}(2\eta - 1)\Lambda^2 \quad (45)$$

with $c_r = 4$.

We are now ready to derive the PPE parameters in noncommutative gravity. Given that the dissipative and conservative leading corrections enter at the same PN order, one can use Eqs. (44) and (45) in Eq. (14) to find the PPE amplitude correction as

$$\alpha_{\text{NC}} = -\frac{3}{8}\eta^{-4/5}(2\eta - 1)\Lambda^2 \quad (46)$$

⁹ The corresponding bound on the time-spatial components of $\theta^{\mu\nu}$ is roughly six orders magnitude weaker than that on the spatial-spatial components.

with $a = 4$. Similarly, substituting Eq. (44) into Eq. (20) gives the PPE phase correction as

$$\beta_{\text{NC}} = -\frac{75}{256}\eta^{-4/5}(2\eta - 1)\Lambda^2 \quad (47)$$

with $b = -1$. β_{NC} can also be read off from the phase correction derived in [100]. The above corrections enter at 2 PN order.

The above phase correction has already been used to derive bounds on noncommutative gravity from GW150914 as $\sqrt{\Lambda} \lesssim 3.5$ [100], which means that the energy scale of noncommutativity has been constrained to be the order of the Planck scale. Such a bound, so far, is the most stringent constraint on noncommutative scale and is 15 orders of magnitude stronger compared to the bounds coming from particle physics and low-energy precision measurements¹⁰.

IV. VARYING- G THEORIES

Many of the modified theories of gravity that violate the strong equivalence principle [1, 244, 245] predict that locally measured gravitational constant (G) may vary with time [246]. Since the gravitational self-energy of a body is a function of the gravitational constant, in a theory where G is time-dependent, masses of compact bodies are also time-dependent [91]. The rate at which the mass of an object varies with time is proportional to the rate of change of the gravitational coupling constant [91]. Such a variation of mass, together with the conservation of linear momentum, causes compact bodies to experience anomalous acceleration, which results in a time-evolution of the specific angular momentum [91]. Existing experiments that search for variations in G at present time (i.e., at very small redshift) include lunar laser ranging observations [247], pulsar timing observations [248, 249], radar observations of planets and spacecraft [250], and surface temperature observations of PSR J0437-4715 [251]. Another class of constraints on a long-term variation of G comes from Big Bang nucleosynthesis [252, 253] and helioseismology [254]. The most stringent bound on $|\dot{G}/G|$ is of the order $\lesssim 10^{-14} \text{ yr}^{-1}$ [255].

More than one gravitational constants can appear in different areas of a gravitational theory. Here we introduce two different kinds of gravitational constant, one that arises in the dissipative sector and another in the conservative sector. The constant which enters in the GW luminosity through Einstein equations, i.e. the constant in Eq. (8), is the one we refer to as dissipative gravitational constant (G_D), while that enters in Kepler's law or binding energy of the binary is what we refer as the

conservative one (G_C). These two constants are the same in GR, but they can be different in some modified theories of gravity. An example of such a theory is Brans-Dicke theory with a cosmologically evolving scalar field [256].

The PPE parameters for varying- G theories have previously been derived in [92] for $G_D = G_C$. Here, we improve the analysis by considering the two different types of gravitational constant and including variations in masses, which are inevitable for strongly self-gravitating objects when G varies [91]. We also correct small errors in [92]. We follow the analysis of [257] that derives gravitational waveforms from BH binary inspirals with varying mass effects from the specific angular momentum. We also present another derivation in App. B using the energy balance argument in [92].

The formalism presented in Sec. II assumes that G and the masses to be constant, and hence are not applicable to varying- G theories. Thus, we will derive the PPE parameters in varying- G theories by promoting the PPE formalism to admit time variation in the gravitational constants and masses as

$$m_A(t) \approx m_{A,0} + \dot{m}_{A,0}(t - t_0), \quad (48)$$

$$G_C(t) \approx G_{C,0} + \dot{G}_{C,0}(t - t_0), \quad (49)$$

$$G_D(t) \approx G_{D,0} + (1 + \delta_\epsilon)\dot{G}_{C,0}(t - t_0), \quad (50)$$

where t_0 is the time of coalescence. Here we assumed that spatial variations of G_C and G_D are small compared to variations in time. δ_ϵ gives the fractional difference between the rates at which G_C and G_D vary with time, and could be a function of parameters in a theory. The subscript 0 denotes that the quantity is measured at the time $t = t_0$. Other time variations to consider are those in the specific angular momentum j and the total mass m :

$$j(t) \approx j_0 + \dot{j}_0(t - t_0), \quad (51)$$

$$m(t) \approx m_0 + \dot{m}_0(t - t_0). \quad (52)$$

\dot{j}_0 and \dot{m}_0 can be written in terms of binary masses and sensitivities defined by

$$s_A = -\frac{G_C}{m_A} \frac{\delta m_A}{\delta G_C}, \quad (53)$$

as [91]

$$\dot{j}_0 = \frac{m_{1,0}s_{1,0} + m_{2,0}s_{2,0}}{m_{1,0} + m_{2,0}} \frac{\dot{G}_{C,0}}{G_{C,0}} j_0, \quad (54)$$

$$\dot{m}_0 = -\frac{m_{1,0}s_{1,0} + m_{2,0}s_{2,0}}{m_{1,0} + m_{2,0}} \frac{\dot{G}_{C,0}}{G_{C,0}} m_0, \quad (55)$$

respectively.

Next, we explain how the binary evolution is affected by the variation of the above parameters. First, GW emission makes the orbital separation r decay with the rate given by [258]

$$\dot{r}_{\text{GW}} = -\frac{64}{5} \frac{G_D G_C^2 \mu m^2}{r^3}. \quad (56)$$

¹⁰ Notice that the GW bound is on the time-spatial components of $\theta^{\mu\nu}$, while most of particle physics and low-energy precision experiments place bounds on its spatial-spatial components.

Second, time variation of the total mass, (conservative) gravitational constant and specific angular momentum changes r at a rate of

$$\dot{r}_G = - \left(\frac{\dot{G}_{C,0}}{G_C} + \frac{\dot{m}_0}{m} - 2 \frac{\dot{j}_0}{j} \right) r, \quad (57)$$

which is derived by taking a time derivative of the specific angular momentum $j \equiv \sqrt{G_C m r}$. Having the evolution of r at hand, one can derive the evolution of the orbital angular frequency using Kepler's third law as

$$\dot{\Omega} = \frac{1}{2\Omega r^3} \left(m \dot{G}_{C,0} + \dot{m}_0 G_C - 3m G_C \frac{\dot{r}}{r} \right). \quad (58)$$

Using the evolution of the binary separation $\dot{r} \equiv \dot{r}_{\text{GW}} + \dot{r}_G$ in Eq. (58), together with Eqs. (54) and (55), we can find the GW frequency evolution as

$$\begin{aligned} \dot{f} &= \frac{\dot{\Omega}}{\pi} \\ &= \frac{96}{5} \pi^{8/3} G_C^{2/3} G_D \mathcal{M}^{5/3} f^{11/3} \left\{ 1 \right. \\ &\quad \left. + \frac{5}{96} \frac{\dot{G}_{C,0} G_C}{G_D \eta} [2m - 5(m_{1,0} s_{1,0} + m_{2,0} s_{2,0})] x^{-4} \right\}, \end{aligned} \quad (59)$$

where $x \equiv (\pi G_C m f)^{2/3}$ is the squared velocity of the relative motion. Here we only considered the leading correction to the frequency evolution entering at -4 PN order. Using Eqs. (48)–(50) and (55) into Eq. (59), one finds

$$\dot{f} = \frac{96}{5} \pi^{8/3} f^{11/3} \eta_0 G_{C,0}^{2/3} G_{D,0} m_0^{5/3} \left\{ 1 \right.$$

$$\begin{aligned} \Psi(f) &= 2\pi f t(f) - \phi(f) - \frac{\pi}{4} \\ &= 2\pi f t_0 - \phi_0 - \frac{\pi}{4} + \frac{3}{128} u_0^{-5} \left\{ 1 - \frac{25}{19968} \frac{\dot{G}_{C,0}}{\eta_0} [11m_0 + 3(s_{1,0} + s_{2,0} - \delta_G)m_0 - 41(m_{1,0} s_{1,0} + m_{2,0} s_{2,0})] x_0^{-4} \right\}. \end{aligned} \quad (63)$$

From Eq. (63), one finds the PPE phase parameters as $b = -13$ and

$$\beta_G = - \frac{25}{851968} \dot{G}_{C,0} \eta_0^{3/5} [11m_0 + 3(s_{1,0} + s_{2,0} - \delta_G)m_0 - 41(m_{1,0} s_{1,0} + m_{2,0} s_{2,0})]. \quad (64)$$

Next, we derive the PPE amplitude parameters. Using Kepler's law to Eq. (9), one finds

$$\tilde{A}(f) \propto \frac{1}{\sqrt{\dot{f}}} \frac{G_D(t)}{D_L} \mu(t) r(t)^2 f^2$$

$$\begin{aligned} &- \frac{5 G_{C,0} \dot{G}_{C,0}}{768 \eta_0 G_{D,0}^2} [3(1 + \delta_G) G_{C,0} m_0 - (3s_{1,0} + 3s_{2,0} \\ &+ 14) G_{D,0} m_0 + 41(m_{1,0} s_{1,0} + m_{2,0} s_{2,0}) G_{D,0}] x_0^{-4} \}. \end{aligned} \quad (60)$$

Notice that $G_{C,0}$ and $G_{D,0}$ differ only by a constant quantity, and such a difference will enter in \dot{f} at 0 PN order which is much higher than the -4 PN corrections. We will thus ignore such 0 PN corrections and simply use $G_{D,0} = G_{C,0} \equiv G_0$ from now on.

Based on the above binary evolution, we now derive corrections to the GW phase. We integrate Eq. (60) to obtain time before coalescence $t(f) - t_0$ and the GW phase $\phi(f) \equiv \int 2\pi f dt = \int (2\pi f / \dot{f}) df$ as

$$\begin{aligned} t(f) &= t_0 - \frac{5}{256} G_0 \mathcal{M}_0 u_0^{-8} \left\{ 1 \right. \\ &\quad \left. - \frac{5}{1536} \frac{\dot{G}_{C,0}}{\eta_0} [11m_0 + 3(s_{1,0} + s_{2,0} - \delta_G)m_0 \right. \\ &\quad \left. - 41(m_{1,0} s_{1,0} + m_{2,0} s_{2,0})] x_0^{-4} \right\}, \end{aligned} \quad (61)$$

$$\begin{aligned} \phi(f) &= \phi_0 - \frac{1}{25} u_0^{-5} \left\{ 1 \right. \\ &\quad \left. - \frac{25}{9984} \frac{\dot{G}_{C,0}}{\eta_0} [11m_0 + 3(s_{1,0} + s_{2,0} - \delta_G)m_0 \right. \\ &\quad \left. - 41(m_{1,0} s_{1,0} + m_{2,0} s_{2,0})] x_0^{-4} \right\}, \end{aligned} \quad (62)$$

with $u_0 \equiv (\pi G_0 \mathcal{M}_0 f)^{1/3}$. The GW phase in the Fourier space is then given by

$$\propto \frac{1}{\sqrt{\dot{f}}} G_D(t) G_C(t)^{2/3} \mu(t) m(t)^{2/3}. \quad (65)$$

Using further Eqs. (48)–(50) in Eq. (65), we find the amplitude PPE parameters as $a = -8$ and

$$\begin{aligned} \alpha_G &= \frac{5}{512} \eta_0^{3/5} \dot{G}_{C,0} [-7m_0 + (s_{1,0} + s_{2,0} - \delta_G)m_0 \\ &\quad + 13(m_{1,0} s_{1,0} + m_{2,0} s_{2,0})]. \end{aligned} \quad (66)$$

Let us comment on how the above new PPE parameters in varying- G theories differ from those obtained previously in [92]. The latter considers $G_D = G_C$ (which

corresponds to $\delta_G = 0$) and $s_A = 0$ (which is only true for weakly-gravitating objects). However, the above expressions for the PPE parameters do not reduce to those in [92] under these limits. This is because Ref. [92] did not take into account the fact that the binding energy is not conserved in the absence of GW emission in varying- G theories. In App. B, we show that the correct application of the energy balance law does indeed lead to the same conclusion as in this section.

Eqs. (64) and (66) can be used to constrain varying- G theories with GW observations. Recent GW events (GW150914 and GW151226) place constraints on variation of G which are much weaker than the current constraints [82]. Projected GW bounds have been calculated in Ref. [92] (see [215] for an updated forecast of future GW bounds on \dot{G}) which gives $|\dot{G}_0/G_0| \lesssim 10^{-11} \text{ yr}^{-1}$, considering a single merger event. Although GW bounds are less stringent compared to the existing bounds [256], they are unique in the sense that they can provide constraints at intermediate redshifts, while the existing bounds are for very small and large redshifts [92]. Furthermore, GW constraints give \dot{G}_0/G_0 at the location of merger events, which means that a sufficient number of GW observations can be used to construct a 3D constraint map of \dot{G}_0/G_0 as a function of sky locations and redshifts [92].

V. CONCLUSIONS

We derived non-GR corrections to the GW phase and amplitude in various modified theories of gravity. We achieved this by revisiting the standard PPE formalism and considered generic corrections to the GW frequency evolution and Kepler's third law that have been derived in many non-GR theories. Such a formalism yields the expressions of the PPE parameters which are simpler compared to the original formalism [75, 76]. We derived the PPE amplitude parameters for the first time in EdGB, dCS and noncommutative gravity. We also corrected some errors in the expressions of the PPE amplitude parameters in Einstein-Æther and khronometric theories in previous literature [99].

We also considered the PPE formalism with variable gravitational constants by extending previous work [92] in a few different ways. One difference is that we introduced two different gravitational constants, one entering in the GW luminosity (dissipative G) and the other entering in the binding energy and Kepler's law (conservative G). We also included time variations of component masses in a binary in terms of the sensitivities following [91], which is a natural consequence in varying- G theories. We further introduced the effect of non-conservation of the binding energy in the energy balance law. Such an effect arises due to an anomalous acceleration caused by time variations in G or masses [91] that was not accounted for in the original work of [92]. Including all of these, we derived the PPE amplitude and phase

corrections to the gravitational waveform from compact binary inspirals.

The analytic expressions of the PPE corrections derived in this paper, especially those in the amplitude, can be used to improve analyses on testing GR with observed GW events and to derive new projected bounds with future observations, since most of previous literature only include phase corrections. For example, one can re-analyze the available GW data for testing GR including amplitude corrections with a Bayesian analysis [60]. One can also carry out a similar Fisher analysis as in [82] by including amplitude corrections and mapping bounds on generic parameters to those on fundamental pillars in GR. GW amplitude corrections are also crucial for testing strong-field gravity with astrophysical stochastic GW backgrounds [87, 88]. One could further improve the analysis presented in this paper by considering binaries with eccentric orbits [79] or including spin precession [78, 187]. We leave these possible avenues of extensions for future work.

ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

We would like to thank Nicolás Yunes for fruitful discussions. K.Y. would like to acknowledge networking support by the COST Action GWverse CA16104.

Appendix A: Original PPE Formalism

In this appendix, we review the original PPE formalism. In particular, we will show how the amplitude and phase corrections depend on conservative and dissipative corrections, where the former are corrections to the effective potential of a binary while the latter are those to the GW luminosity. We will mostly follow the analysis in [76].

First, let us introduce conservative corrections. We modify the reduced effective potential of a binary as

$$V_{\text{eff}} = \left(-\frac{m}{r} + \frac{L_z^2}{2\mu^2 r^2} \right) \left[1 + A \left(\frac{m}{r} \right)^p \right], \quad (\text{A1})$$

where L_z is the z -component of the angular momentum. A and p show the magnitude and exponent of the non-GR correction term respectively. Such a modification to the effective potential also modifies Kepler's law. Taking the radial derivative of V_{eff} in Eq. (A1) and equating it to zero gives modified Kepler's law as

$$\Omega^2 = \frac{m}{r^3} \left[1 + \frac{1}{2} A p \left(\frac{m}{r} \right)^p \right]. \quad (\text{A2})$$

The above equation further gives the orbital separation as

$$r = r_{\text{GR}} \left[1 + \frac{1}{6} A p \eta^{-\frac{2p}{5}} u^{2p} \right], \quad (\text{A3})$$

where to leading PN order, r_{GR} is given by Kepler's law as $r_{\text{GR}} = (m/\Omega^2)^{1/3}$. For a circular orbit, radial kinetic energy does not exist and the effective potential energy is same as the binding energy of the binary. Using Eq. (A3) in Eq. (A1) and keeping only to leading order in non-GR corrections, the binding energy becomes

$$E = -\frac{1}{2}\eta^{-2/5}u^2 \left[1 - \frac{1}{3}A(2p-5)\eta^{-\frac{2p}{5}}u^{2p} \right]. \quad (\text{A4})$$

Next, let us introduce dissipative corrections. Such corrections to the GW luminosity can be parameterized by

$$\dot{E} = \dot{E}_{\text{GR}} \left[1 + B \left(\frac{m}{r} \right)^q \right], \quad (\text{A5})$$

where \dot{E}_{GR} is the GR luminosity which is proportional to $v^2(m/r)^4$ with $v = r\Omega = (\pi mf)^{1/3}$ representing the relative velocity of binary components¹¹.

Let us now derive the amplitude corrections. First, using Eqs. (A4) and (A5) and applying the chain rule, the GW frequency evolution is given by

$$\begin{aligned} \dot{f} &= \frac{df}{dE} \frac{dE}{dt} \\ &= \dot{f}_{\text{GR}} \left[1 + B\eta^{-\frac{2q}{5}}u^{2q} + \frac{1}{3}A(2p^2 - 2p - 3)\eta^{-\frac{2p}{5}}u^{2p} \right], \end{aligned} \quad (\text{A6})$$

where \dot{f}_{GR} is given by Eq. (6). Next, using Eqs. (A3) and (A6) to Eq. (9) and keeping only to leading order in non-GR corrections, the GW amplitude in Fourier domain becomes

$$\tilde{A}(f) = \tilde{A}_{\text{GR}} \left[1 - \frac{B}{2}\eta^{-\frac{2q}{5}}u^{2q} - \frac{1}{6}A(2p^2 - 4p - 3)\eta^{-\frac{2p}{5}}u^{2p} \right]. \quad (\text{A7})$$

Next, we move onto deriving phase corrections. One can derive the GW phase in Fourier domain by integrating Eq. (18) twice. Equivalently, one can use the following expression

$$\Psi(f) = 2\pi ft(f) - \phi(f) - \frac{\pi}{4}, \quad (\text{A8})$$

where $t(f)$ gives the relation between time and frequency and can be obtained by integrating (A6) as

$$\begin{aligned} t(f) &= \int \frac{dt}{df} df \\ &= t_0 - \frac{5\mathcal{M}}{256u^8} \left[1 + \frac{4}{3}A \frac{(2p^2 - 2p - 3)}{(p-4)} \eta^{-\frac{2p}{5}}u^{2p} \right] \end{aligned}$$

$$+ \frac{4}{q-4} B \eta^{-\frac{2q}{5}} u^{2q} \Big], \quad (\text{A9})$$

with t_0 representing the time of coalescence and keeping only the Newtonian term and leading order non-GR corrections. On the other hand, $\phi(f)$ in Eq. (A8) corresponds to the GW phase in time domain and can be calculated from Eq. (A6) as

$$\begin{aligned} \phi(f) &= \int 2\pi f dt = \int \frac{2\pi f}{\dot{f}} df \\ &= \phi_0 - \frac{1}{16u^5} \left[1 + \frac{5}{3}A \frac{(2p^2 - 2p - 3)}{(2p-5)} \eta^{-\frac{2p}{5}}u^{2p} \right. \\ &\quad \left. + \frac{5}{2q-5} B \eta^{-\frac{2q}{5}}u^{2q} \right], \end{aligned} \quad (\text{A10})$$

with ϕ_0 representing the coalescence phase. Using Eqs. (A9) and (A10) into (A8) and writing $\Psi(f)$ as $\Psi_{\text{GR}}(f) + \delta\Psi(f)$, non-GR modifications to the phase can be found as

$$\begin{aligned} \delta\Psi(f) &= -\frac{5}{32}A \frac{2p^2 - 2p - 3}{(4-p)(5-2p)} \eta^{-\frac{2p}{5}}u^{2p-5} \\ &\quad - \frac{15}{32}B \frac{1}{(4-q)(5-2q)} \eta^{-\frac{2q}{5}}u^{2q-5}, \end{aligned} \quad (\text{A11})$$

with Ψ_{GR} to leading PN order is given by [103]

$$\Psi_{\text{GR}} = 2\pi ft_0 - \phi_0 - \frac{\pi}{4} + \frac{3}{128}u^{-5}. \quad (\text{A12})$$

We can easily rewrite the above expressions using γ_r and c_r . Comparing Eq. (A3) with Eq. (4), we find

$$A = \frac{12\gamma_r}{c_r} \eta^{\frac{c_r}{5}}, \quad p = \frac{c_r}{2}. \quad (\text{A13})$$

Using this, we can rewrite the GW amplitude in Eq. (A7) as

$$\tilde{A}(f) = \tilde{A}_{\text{GR}} \left[1 - \frac{B}{2}\eta^{-\frac{2q}{5}}u^{2q} - \frac{\gamma_r}{c_r}(c_r^2 - 4c_r - 6)u^{c_r} \right]. \quad (\text{A14})$$

Similarly, one can rewrite the correction to the GW phase in Eq. (A11) as

$$\begin{aligned} \delta\Psi(f) &= -\frac{15}{8} \frac{\gamma_r}{c_r} \frac{c_r^2 - 2c_r - 6}{(8-c_r)(5-c_r)} u^{c_r-5} \\ &\quad - \frac{15}{32}B \frac{1}{(4-q)(5-2q)} \eta^{-\frac{2q}{5}}u^{2q-5}. \end{aligned} \quad (\text{A15})$$

On the other hand, rewriting the above expressions further in terms of γ_f and c_f is not so trivial in general since corrections to the frequency evolution in Eq. (A6) involves two independent terms instead of one.

¹¹ If we assume \dot{E}_{GR} to be proportional to $r^4 \Omega^6$ which directly follows from the quadrupole formula without using Kepler's law, we will find slightly different expressions for \dot{f} and the waveform [76]

Appendix B: GW Frequency Evolution From Energy Balance Law in Varying- G Theories

In this appendix, we show an alternative approach to find \dot{f} in varying- G theories in Eq. (59) by correcting and applying the energy balance law used in Ref. [92]. We begin by considering the total energy of a binary given by $E = -(G_C \mu m)/2r$. In order to calculate the leading order correction to the frequency evolution due to the time-varying gravitational constants, we use Kepler's law to rewrite the binding energy as

$$E(f, G_C, m_1, m_2) = -\frac{1}{2}\mu(G_C m \Omega)^{2/3}, \quad (\text{B1})$$

where $\Omega = \pi f$ is the orbital angular frequency. Taking a time derivative of the above expression and using Eqs. (48)–(50) in Eq. (B1), the rate of change of the binding energy becomes

$$\frac{dE}{dt} = \frac{\pi^{2/3}}{6f^{1/3}G_C^{1/3}m^{4/3}} [-3fG_C m(\dot{m}_{1,0}m_2 + m_1\dot{m}_{2,0}) - 2m^3\eta(G_C\dot{f} + f\dot{G}_C) + m^2fG_C\eta\dot{m}]. \quad (\text{B2})$$

We can use the following energy balance argument to derive \dot{f} . In GR, the time variation in the binding energy is balanced with the GW luminosity \dot{E}_{GW} emitted from the system given by

$$\dot{E}_{\text{GW}} = \frac{1}{5}G_D \left\langle \ddot{Q}_{ij}\ddot{Q}_{ij} - \frac{1}{3}(\ddot{Q}_{kk})^2 \right\rangle = \frac{32}{5}r^4 G_D \mu^2 \Omega^6. \quad (\text{B3})$$

In varying- G theories, there is an additional contribution $\dot{E}_{\dot{G}}$ due to variations in G , masses, and the specific angular momentum. Namely, the binding energy is not conserved even in the absence of GW emission and the energy balance law is modified as

$$\frac{dE}{dt} = -\dot{E}_{\text{GW}} + \dot{E}_{\dot{G}}. \quad (\text{B4})$$

To estimate such an additional contribution, we rewrite the binding energy in terms of the specific angular momentum as

$$E(G_C, m_1, m_2, j) = -\frac{G_C^2 \mu m^2}{2j^2}. \quad (\text{B5})$$

Taking the time variation of this leads to

$$\dot{E}_{\dot{G}} = \frac{\partial E}{\partial j} \dot{j}_0 + \frac{\partial E}{\partial m_1} \dot{m}_{1,0} + \frac{\partial E}{\partial m_2} \dot{m}_{2,0} + \frac{\partial E}{\partial G_C} \dot{G}_{C,0}, \quad (\text{B6})$$

where \dot{j}_0 is given by Eq. (54) and originates purely from the variation of G_C (i.e. no GW emission).

We are now in a position to derive the frequency evolution. Using Eqs. (B3), (B5) and (B6) in Eq. (B4), one finds

$$\frac{dE}{dt} = -\frac{32}{5}\pi^{10/3}f^{10/3}\eta^2G_C^{4/3}G_Dm^{10/3} \left[1 + \frac{5G_C^2\eta^{3/5}m}{64G_D} \times \left(\frac{\dot{m}_0}{m} + \frac{\dot{m}_{1,0}}{m_1} + \frac{\dot{m}_{2,0}}{m_2} - 2\frac{\dot{j}_0}{j} + 2\frac{\dot{G}_{C,0}}{G_C} \right) u^{-8} \right], \quad (\text{B7})$$

where $u = (\pi G_C \mathcal{M} f)^{1/3}$. Substituting this further into Eq. (B2) and solving for \dot{f} , one finds the frequency evolution as

$$\dot{f} = \frac{96}{5}\pi^{8/3}G_C^{2/3}G_D\mathcal{M}^{5/3}f^{11/3} \left\{ 1 + \frac{5}{96}\frac{G_C}{G_D}\dot{G}_{C,0}\eta^{3/5}[2m - 5(m_{1,0}s_{1,0} + m_{2,0}s_{2,0})]u^{-8} \right\}, \quad (\text{B8})$$

in agreement with Eq. (59).

Along with the constancy of masses, the second term in Eq. (B4) was also missing in [92]. Consequently, our PPE parameters in Eqs. (64) and (66) do not agree with Ref. [92] even when we take the limit of no time variation in masses. Difference in $\beta_{\dot{G}}$ is smaller than 20% while $\alpha_{\dot{G}}$ differs by a factor of 7. Despite the discrepancy, we expect the projected bounds on \dot{G}_0/G_0 calculated in Ref. [92] to be qualitatively correct. This is because a matched filtering analysis is more sensitive to phase corrections than to amplitude ones, where the difference between our results and [92] is small.

-
- [1] C. M. Will, *Living Rev. Rel.* **17**, 4 (2014), [arXiv:1403.7377 \[gr-qc\]](#).
 - [2] R. J. Adler, *Am. J. Phys.* **78**, 925 (2010), [arXiv:1001.1205 \[gr-qc\]](#).
 - [3] Y. J. Ng, *Mod. Phys. Lett.* **A18**, 1073 (2003), [arXiv:gr-qc/0305019 \[gr-qc\]](#).
 - [4] L. Abbott, *Sci. Am.* **258**, 106 (1988), [Spektrum Wiss.7,92(1988)].
 - [5] E. J. Copeland, M. Sami, and S. Tsujikawa, *Int. J. Mod. Phys.* **D15**, 1753 (2006), [arXiv:hep-th/0603057 \[hep-th\]](#).
 - [6] S. Perlmutter *et al.* (Supernova Cosmology Project), *Astrophys. J.* **517**, 565 (1999), [arXiv:astro-ph/9812133 \[astro-ph\]](#).
 - [7] A. G. Riess *et al.* (Supernova Search Team), *Astron. J.* **116**, 1009 (1998), [arXiv:astro-ph/9805201 \[astro-ph\]](#).
 - [8] A. G. Riess *et al.* (Supernova Search Team), *Astrophys. J.* **607**, 665 (2004), [arXiv:astro-ph/0402512 \[astro-ph\]](#).
 - [9] S. Weinberg, *Rev. Mod. Phys.* **61**, 1 (1989).
 - [10] T. S. van Albada, J. N. Bahcall, K. Begeman, and

- R. Sancisi, *Astrophys. J.* **295**, 305 (1985).
- [11] D. H. Weinberg, M. J. Mortonson, D. J. Eisenstein, C. Hirata, A. G. Riess, and E. Rozo, *Physics Reports* **530**, 87 (2013), observational Probes of Cosmic Acceleration.
- [12] A. Bosma, *The Astronomical Journal*, **86**, 1791 (1981).
- [13] A. Bosma, *Astron. J.* **86**, 1825 (1981).
- [14] K. G. Begeman, A. H. Broeils, and R. H. Sanders, *Mon. Not. Roy. Astron. Soc.* **249**, 523 (1991).
- [15] V. C. Rubin and W. K. Ford, Jr., *Astrophys. J.* **159**, 379 (1970).
- [16] V. C. Rubin, N. Thonnard, and W. K. Ford, Jr., *Astrophys. J.* **238**, 471 (1980).
- [17] J. P. Ostriker and P. J. E. Peebles, *Astrophys. J.* **186**, 467 (1973).
- [18] J. P. Ostriker, *Ann. Rev. Astron. Astrophys.* **31**, 689 (1993).
- [19] E. Berti *et al.*, *Class. Quant. Grav.* **32**, 243001 (2015), arXiv:1501.07274 [gr-qc].
- [20] P. C. C. Freire, N. Wex, G. Esposito-Farese, J. P. W. Verbiest, M. Bailes, B. A. Jacoby, M. Kramer, I. H. Stairs, J. Antoniadis, and G. H. Janssen, *Mon. Not. Roy. Astron. Soc.* **423**, 3328 (2012), arXiv:1205.1450 [astro-ph.GA].
- [21] M. Kramer *et al.*, *Science* **314**, 97 (2006), arXiv:astro-ph/0609417 [astro-ph].
- [22] K. Liu, N. Wex, M. Kramer, J. M. Cordes, and T. J. W. Lazio, *Astrophys. J.* **747**, 1 (2012), arXiv:1112.2151 [astro-ph.HE].
- [23] S. M. Ransom *et al.*, *Nature* **505**, 520 (2014), arXiv:1401.0535 [astro-ph.SR].
- [24] I. H. Stairs, S. E. Thorsett, J. H. Taylor, and A. Wolszczan, *Astrophys. J.* **581**, 501 (2002), arXiv:astro-ph/0208357 [astro-ph].
- [25] I. H. Stairs, Z. Arzoumanian, F. Camilo, A. G. Lyne, D. J. Nice, J. H. Taylor, S. E. Thorsett, and A. Wolszczan, *Astrophys. J.* **505**, 352 (1998), arXiv:astro-ph/9712296 [astro-ph].
- [26] I. H. Stairs, *Living Rev. Rel.* **6**, 5 (2003), arXiv:astro-ph/0307536 [astro-ph].
- [27] J. H. Taylor, A. Wolszczan, T. Damour, and J. Weisberg, *Nature* **355**, 132 (1992).
- [28] N. Wex, (2014), arXiv:1402.5594 [gr-qc].
- [29] N. Yunes and X. Siemens, *Living Rev. Rel.* **16**, 9 (2013), arXiv:1304.3473 [gr-qc].
- [30] T. Clifton, P. G. Ferreira, A. Padilla, and C. Skordis, *Phys. Rept.* **513**, 1 (2012), arXiv:1106.2476 [astro-ph.CO].
- [31] B. Jain and J. Khoury, *Annals Phys.* **325**, 1479 (2010), arXiv:1004.3294 [astro-ph.CO].
- [32] A. Joyce, B. Jain, J. Khoury, and M. Trodden, *Phys. Rept.* **568**, 1 (2015), arXiv:1407.0059 [astro-ph.CO].
- [33] K. Koyama, *Rept. Prog. Phys.* **79**, 046902 (2016), arXiv:1504.04623 [astro-ph.CO].
- [34] S. J. Osborne, D. S. Y. Mak, S. E. Church, and E. Pierpaoli, *The Astrophysical Journal* **737**, 98 (2011).
- [35] P. A. R. Ade *et al.* (Planck), *Astron. Astrophys.* **594**, A13 (2016), arXiv:1502.01589 [astro-ph.CO].
- [36] V. Salvatelli, F. Piazza, and C. Marinoni, *JCAP* **1609**, 027 (2016), arXiv:1602.08283 [astro-ph.CO].
- [37] C. L. Bennett *et al.* (WMAP), *Astrophys. J. Suppl.* **208**, 20 (2013), arXiv:1212.5225 [astro-ph.CO].
- [38] G. Hinshaw *et al.* (WMAP), *Astrophys. J. Suppl.* **208**, 19 (2013), arXiv:1212.5226 [astro-ph.CO].
- [39] T. Clifton, J. D. Barrow, and R. J. Scherrer, *Phys. Rev.* **D71**, 123526 (2005), arXiv:astro-ph/0504418 [astro-ph].
- [40] A. Coc, K. A. Olive, J.-P. Uzan, and E. Vangioni, *Phys. Rev.* **D73**, 083525 (2006), arXiv:astro-ph/0601299 [astro-ph].
- [41] T. Damour and B. Pichon, *Phys. Rev.* **D59**, 123502 (1999), arXiv:astro-ph/9807176 [astro-ph].
- [42] E. Komatsu *et al.* (WMAP), *Astrophys. J. Suppl.* **192**, 18 (2011), arXiv:1001.4538 [astro-ph.CO].
- [43] G. J. Mathews, M. Kusakabe, and T. Kajino, *Int. J. Mod. Phys.* **E26**, 1741001 (2017), arXiv:1706.03138 [astro-ph.CO].
- [44] K. A. Olive, G. Steigman, and T. P. Walker, *Phys. Rept.* **333**, 389 (2000), arXiv:astro-ph/9905320 [astro-ph].
- [45] D. I. Santiago, D. Kalligas, and R. V. Wagoner, *Phys. Rev. D* **56**, 7627 (1997).
- [46] M. Bartelmann and P. Schneider, *Phys. Rept.* **340**, 291 (2001), arXiv:astro-ph/9912508 [astro-ph].
- [47] T. E. Collett, L. J. Oldham, R. J. Smith, M. W. Auger, K. B. Westfall, D. Bacon, R. C. Nichol, K. L. Masters, K. Koyama, and R. van den Bosch, *Science* **360**, 1342 (2018), arXiv:1806.08300 [astro-ph.CO].
- [48] D. Clowe, M. Bradač, A. H. Gonzalez, M. Markevitch, S. W. Randall, C. Jones, and D. Zaritsky, *Astrophys. J.* **648**, L109 (2006), arXiv:astro-ph/0608407 [astro-ph].
- [49] D. Huterer, *General Relativity and Gravitation* **42**, 2177 (2010).
- [50] A. Lewis and A. Challinor, *Phys. Rept.* **429**, 1 (2006), arXiv:astro-ph/0601594 [astro-ph].
- [51] A. M. Ghez, S. Salim, S. D. Hornstein, A. Tanner, M. Morris, E. E. Becklin, and G. Duchene, *Astrophys. J.* **620**, 744 (2005), arXiv:astro-ph/0306130 [astro-ph].
- [52] A. Hees *et al.*, *Phys. Rev. Lett.* **118**, 211101 (2017), arXiv:1705.07902 [astro-ph.GA].
- [53] R. Abuter *et al.* (GRAVITY), *Astron. Astrophys.* **615**, L15 (2018), arXiv:1807.09409 [astro-ph.GA].
- [54] B. P. Abbott *et al.* (Virgo, LIGO Scientific), *Phys. Rev. Lett.* **116**, 061102 (2016), arXiv:1602.03837 [gr-qc].
- [55] B. P. Abbott *et al.* (Virgo, LIGO Scientific), *Phys. Rev. Lett.* **116**, 241103 (2016), arXiv:1606.04855 [gr-qc].
- [56] B. P. Abbott *et al.* (VIRGO, LIGO Scientific), *Phys. Rev. Lett.* **118**, 221101 (2017), arXiv:1706.01812 [gr-qc].
- [57] B. P. Abbott *et al.* (Virgo, LIGO Scientific), *Astrophys. J.* **851**, L35 (2017), arXiv:1711.05578 [astro-ph.HE].
- [58] B. P. Abbott *et al.* (Virgo, LIGO Scientific), *Phys. Rev. Lett.* **119**, 141101 (2017), arXiv:1709.09660 [gr-qc].
- [59] B. P. Abbott *et al.* (Virgo, LIGO Scientific),

- tific), *Phys. Rev. Lett.* **119**, 161101 (2017), [arXiv:1710.05832 \[gr-qc\]](#).
- [60] B. P. Abbott *et al.* (Virgo, LIGO Scientific), *Phys. Rev. Lett.* **116**, 221101 (2016), [arXiv:1602.03841 \[gr-qc\]](#).
- [61] B. P. Abbott *et al.* (Virgo, Fermi-GBM, INTEGRAL, LIGO Scientific), *Astrophys. J.* **848**, L13 (2017), [arXiv:1710.05834 \[astro-ph.HE\]](#).
- [62] T. Baker, E. Bellini, P. G. Ferreira, M. Lagos, J. Noller, and I. Sawicki, *Phys. Rev. Lett.* **119**, 251301 (2017), [arXiv:1710.06394 \[astro-ph.CO\]](#).
- [63] P. Creminelli and F. Vernizzi, *Phys. Rev. Lett.* **119**, 251302 (2017), [arXiv:1710.05877 \[astro-ph.CO\]](#).
- [64] J. M. Ezquiaga and M. Zumalacarregui, *Phys. Rev. Lett.* **119**, 251304 (2017), [arXiv:1710.05901 \[astro-ph.CO\]](#).
- [65] R. A. Battye, F. Pace, and D. Trinh, *Phys. Rev.* **D98**, 023504 (2018), [arXiv:1802.09447 \[astro-ph.CO\]](#).
- [66] J. M. Ezquiaga and M. Zumalacarregui, (2018), [arXiv:1807.09241 \[astro-ph.CO\]](#).
- [67] J. Sakstein and B. Jain, *Phys. Rev. Lett.* **119**, 251303 (2017), [arXiv:1710.05893 \[astro-ph.CO\]](#).
- [68] L. Lombriser and N. A. Lima, *Phys. Lett.* **B765**, 382 (2017), [arXiv:1602.07670 \[astro-ph.CO\]](#).
- [69] L. Lombriser and A. Taylor, *JCAP* **1603**, 031 (2016), [arXiv:1509.08458 \[astro-ph.CO\]](#).
- [70] K. G. Arun, B. R. Iyer, M. S. S. Qusailah, and B. S. Sathyaprakash, *Class. Quant. Grav.* **23**, L37 (2006), [arXiv:gr-qc/0604018 \[gr-qc\]](#).
- [71] K. G. Arun, B. R. Iyer, M. S. S. Qusailah, and B. S. Sathyaprakash, *Phys. Rev.* **D74**, 024006 (2006), [arXiv:gr-qc/0604067 \[gr-qc\]](#).
- [72] C. K. Mishra, K. G. Arun, B. R. Iyer, and B. S. Sathyaprakash, *Phys. Rev.* **D82**, 064010 (2010), [arXiv:1005.0304 \[gr-qc\]](#).
- [73] M. Agathos, W. Del Pozzo, T. G. F. Li, C. Van Den Broeck, J. Veitch, and S. Vitale, *Phys. Rev.* **D89**, 082001 (2014), [arXiv:1311.0420 \[gr-qc\]](#).
- [74] J. Meidam, M. Agathos, C. Van Den Broeck, J. Veitch, and B. S. Sathyaprakash, *Phys. Rev.* **D90**, 064009 (2014), [arXiv:1406.3201 \[gr-qc\]](#).
- [75] N. Yunes and F. Pretorius, *Phys. Rev.* **D80**, 122003 (2009), [arXiv:0909.3328 \[gr-qc\]](#).
- [76] K. Chatziioannou, N. Yunes, and N. Cornish, *Phys. Rev.* **D86**, 022004 (2012), [Erratum: *Phys. Rev. D*95,no.12,129901(2017)], [arXiv:1204.2585 \[gr-qc\]](#).
- [77] L. Sampson, N. Cornish, and N. Yunes, *Phys. Rev.* **D87**, 102001 (2013), [arXiv:1303.1185 \[gr-qc\]](#).
- [78] C. Huwlyler, E. K. Porter, and P. Jetzer, *Proceedings, 10th International LISA Symposium: Gainesville, Florida, USA, May 18-23, 2014*, *J. Phys. Conf. Ser.* **610**, 012046 (2015), [arXiv:1410.6687 \[gr-qc\]](#).
- [79] N. Loutrel, N. Yunes, and F. Pretorius, *Phys. Rev.* **D90**, 104010 (2014), [arXiv:1404.0092 \[gr-qc\]](#).
- [80] L. Sampson, N. Cornish, and N. Yunes, *Phys. Rev.* **D89**, 064037 (2014), [arXiv:1311.4898 \[gr-qc\]](#).
- [81] L. Sampson, N. Yunes, N. Cornish, M. Ponce, E. Barausse, A. Klein, C. Palenzuela, and L. Lehner, *Phys. Rev.* **D90**, 124091 (2014), [arXiv:1407.7038 \[gr-qc\]](#).
- [82] N. Yunes, K. Yagi, and F. Pretorius, *Phys. Rev.* **D94**, 084002 (2016), [arXiv:1603.08955 \[gr-qc\]](#).
- [83] B. P. Abbott *et al.* (Virgo, LIGO Scientific), *Phys. Rev.* **X6**, 041015 (2016), [arXiv:1606.04856 \[gr-qc\]](#).
- [84] S. Alexander, L. S. Finn, and N. Yunes, *Phys. Rev.* **D78**, 066005 (2008), [arXiv:0712.2542 \[gr-qc\]](#).
- [85] N. Yunes and L. S. Finn, *Laser Interferometer Space Antenna. Proceedings, 7th international LISA Symposium, Barcelona, Spain, June 16-20, 2008*, *J. Phys. Conf. Ser.* **154**, 012041 (2009), [arXiv:0811.0181 \[gr-qc\]](#).
- [86] N. Yunes, R. O'Shaughnessy, B. J. Owen, and S. Alexander, *Phys. Rev.* **D82**, 064017 (2010), [arXiv:1005.3310 \[gr-qc\]](#).
- [87] K. Yagi and H. Yang, *Phys. Rev.* **D97**, 104018 (2018), [arXiv:1712.00682 \[gr-qc\]](#).
- [88] A. Maselli, S. Marassi, V. Ferrari, K. Kokkotas, and R. Schneider, *Phys. Rev. Lett.* **117**, 091102 (2016), [arXiv:1606.04996 \[gr-qc\]](#).
- [89] N. Cornish, L. Sampson, N. Yunes, and F. Pretorius, *Phys. Rev.* **D84**, 062003 (2011), [arXiv:1105.2088 \[gr-qc\]](#).
- [90] K. G. Arun, *Class. Quant. Grav.* **29**, 075011 (2012), [arXiv:1202.5911 \[gr-qc\]](#).
- [91] K. Nordtvedt, *Phys. Rev. Lett.* **65**, 953 (1990).
- [92] N. Yunes, F. Pretorius, and D. Spergel, *Phys. Rev.* **D81**, 064018 (2010), [arXiv:0912.2724 \[gr-qc\]](#).
- [93] S. Mirshekari, N. Yunes, and C. M. Will, *Phys. Rev.* **D85**, 024041 (2012), [arXiv:1110.2720 \[gr-qc\]](#).
- [94] A. Nishizawa, *Phys. Rev.* **D97**, 104037 (2018), [arXiv:1710.04825 \[gr-qc\]](#).
- [95] P. D. Scharre and C. M. Will, *Phys. Rev.* **D65**, 042002 (2002), [arXiv:gr-qc/0109044 \[gr-qc\]](#).
- [96] E. Berti, A. Buonanno, and C. M. Will, *Phys. Rev.* **D71**, 084025 (2005), [arXiv:gr-qc/0411129 \[gr-qc\]](#).
- [97] K. Yagi, L. C. Stein, N. Yunes, and T. Tanaka, *Phys. Rev.* **D85**, 064022 (2012), [Erratum: *Phys. Rev. D*93,no.2,029902(2016)], [arXiv:1110.5950 \[gr-qc\]](#).
- [98] K. Yagi, N. Yunes, and T. Tanaka, *Phys. Rev. Lett.* **109**, 251105 (2012), [Erratum: *Phys. Rev. Lett.*116,no.16,169902(2016)], [arXiv:1208.5102 \[gr-qc\]](#).
- [99] D. Hansen, N. Yunes, and K. Yagi, *Phys. Rev.* **D91**, 082003 (2015), [arXiv:1412.4132 \[gr-qc\]](#).
- [100] A. Kobakhidze, C. Lagger, and A. Manning, *Phys. Rev.* **D94**, 064033 (2016), [arXiv:1607.03776 \[gr-qc\]](#).
- [101] T. Liu, X. Zhang, W. Zhao, K. Lin, C. Zhang, S. Zhang, X. Zhao, T. Zhu, and A. Wang, (2018),

- arXiv:1806.05674 [gr-qc].
- [102] C. Cutler and É. E. Flanagan, *Phys. Rev. D* **49**, 2658 (1994), arXiv:gr-qc/9402014.
- [103] L. Blanchet, T. Damour, B. R. Iyer, C. M. Will, and A. Wiseman, *Phys. Rev. Lett.* **74**, 3515 (1995), arXiv:gr-qc/9501027 [gr-qc].
- [104] T. Damour, B. R. Iyer, and B. S. Sathyaprakash, *Phys. Rev. D* **62**, 084036 (2000).
- [105] N. Yunes, K. G. Arun, E. Berti, and C. M. Will, *Phys. Rev. D* **80**, 084001 (2009), [Erratum: *Phys. Rev. D* **89**, no.10, 109901 (2014)], arXiv:0906.0313 [gr-qc].
- [106] L. Blanchet, *Living Rev. Rel.* **5**, 3 (2002), arXiv:gr-qc/0202016 [gr-qc].
- [107] W. Tichy, E. E. Flanagan, and E. Poisson, *Phys. Rev. D* **61**, 104015 (2000), arXiv:gr-qc/9912075 [gr-qc].
- [108] T. Chiba, T. Harada, and K.-i. Nakao, *Prog. Theor. Phys. Suppl.* **128**, 335 (1997).
- [109] E. R. Harrison, *Phys. Rev. D* **6**, 2077 (1972).
- [110] Y. Fujii and K. Maeda, *The scalar-tensor theory of gravitation*, Cambridge Monographs on Mathematical Physics (Cambridge University Press, 2007).
- [111] J. M. Overduin and P. S. Wesson, *Phys. Rept.* **283**, 303 (1997), arXiv:gr-qc/9805018 [gr-qc].
- [112] J. Polchinski, *String theory. Vol. 1: An introduction to the bosonic string* (Cambridge University Press, Cambridge, UK, 1998).
- [113] J. Polchinski, *String theory. Vol. 2: Superstring theory and beyond* (Cambridge University Press, Cambridge, UK, 1998).
- [114] P. Brax, C. van de Bruck, A.-C. Davis, J. Khoury, and A. Weltman, *Phys. Rev. D* **70**, 123518 (2004), arXiv:astro-ph/0408415 [astro-ph].
- [115] K. Kainulainen and D. Sunhede, *Phys. Rev. D* **73**, 083510 (2006).
- [116] C. Baccigalupi, S. Matarrese, and F. Perrotta, *Phys. Rev. D* **62**, 123510 (2000).
- [117] A. Riazuelo and J.-P. Uzan, *Phys. Rev. D* **66**, 023525 (2002).
- [118] C. Schimd, J.-P. Uzan, and A. Riazuelo, *Phys. Rev. D* **71**, 083512 (2005), arXiv:astro-ph/0412120 [astro-ph].
- [119] P. Brax, C. van de Bruck, A.-C. Davis, and A. M. Green, *Phys. Lett. B* **633**, 441 (2006), arXiv:astro-ph/0509878 [astro-ph].
- [120] A. Burd and A. Coley, *Phys. Lett. B* **267**, 330 (1991).
- [121] J. D. Barrow and K.-i. Maeda, *Nucl. Phys. B* **341**, 294 (1990).
- [122] J. Larena, J.-M. Alimi, and A. Serna, *Astrophys. J.* **658**, 1 (2007), arXiv:astro-ph/0511693 [astro-ph].
- [123] D. F. Torres, *Phys. Lett. B* **359**, 249 (1995).
- [124] C. Brans and R. H. Dicke, *Phys. Rev.* **124**, 925 (1961).
- [125] B. Bertotti, L. Iess, and P. Tortora, *Nature* **425**, 374 (2003).
- [126] T. Damour and G. Esposito-Farèse, *Phys. Rev. Lett.* **70**, 2220 (1993).
- [127] E. Barausse, C. Palenzuela, M. Ponce, and L. Lehner, *Phys. Rev. D* **87**, 081506 (2013), arXiv:1212.5053 [gr-qc].
- [128] L. Shao, N. Sennett, A. Buonanno, M. Kramer, and N. Wex, *Phys. Rev. X* **7**, 041025 (2017), arXiv:1704.07561 [gr-qc].
- [129] A. M. Archibald, N. V. Gusinskaia, J. W. T. Hessels, A. T. Deller, D. L. Kaplan, D. R. Lorimer, R. S. Lynch, S. M. Ransom, and I. H. Stairs, (2018), 10.1038/s41586-018-0265-1, [Nature559,73(2018)], arXiv:1807.02059 [astro-ph.HE].
- [130] K. Nordtvedt, Jr., *Astrophys. J.* **161**, 1059 (1970).
- [131] P. G. Bergmann, *International Journal of Theoretical Physics* **1**, 25 (1968).
- [132] M. W. Horbatsch and C. P. Burgess, *JCAP* **1108**, 027 (2011), arXiv:1006.4411 [gr-qc].
- [133] R. V. Wagoner, *Phys. Rev. D* **1**, 3209 (1970).
- [134] S. W. Hawking, *Commun. Math. Phys.* **25**, 167 (1972).
- [135] J. D. Bekenstein, *Phys. Rev. D* **51**, R6608 (1995).
- [136] T. P. Sotiriou and V. Faraoni, *Phys. Rev. Lett.* **108**, 081103 (2012), arXiv:1109.6324 [gr-qc].
- [137] L. Hui and A. Nicolis, *Phys. Rev. Lett.* **110**, 241104 (2013), arXiv:1202.1296 [hep-th].
- [138] A. Maselli, H. O. Silva, M. Minamitsuji, and E. Berti, *Phys. Rev. D* **92**, 104049 (2015), arXiv:1508.03044 [gr-qc].
- [139] N. Yunes and L. C. Stein, *Phys. Rev. D* **83**, 104002 (2011), arXiv:1101.2921 [gr-qc].
- [140] T. P. Sotiriou and S.-Y. Zhou, *Phys. Rev. Lett.* **112**, 251102 (2014), arXiv:1312.3622 [gr-qc].
- [141] T. P. Sotiriou and S.-Y. Zhou, *Phys. Rev. D* **90**, 124063 (2014), arXiv:1408.1698 [gr-qc].
- [142] H. O. Silva, J. Sakstein, L. Gualtieri, T. P. Sotiriou, and E. Berti, *Phys. Rev. Lett.* **120**, 131104 (2018), arXiv:1711.02080 [gr-qc].
- [143] D. D. Doneva and S. S. Yazadjiev, *Phys. Rev. Lett.* **120**, 131103 (2018), arXiv:1711.01187 [gr-qc].
- [144] T. Jacobson, *Phys. Rev. Lett.* **83**, 2699 (1999), arXiv:astro-ph/9905303 [astro-ph].
- [145] M. W. Horbatsch and C. P. Burgess, *JCAP* **1205**, 010 (2012), arXiv:1111.4009 [gr-qc].
- [146] J. Healy, T. Bode, R. Haas, E. Pazos, P. Laguna, D. M. Shoemaker, and N. Yunes, *Class. Quant. Grav.* **29**, 232002 (2012), arXiv:1112.3928 [gr-qc].
- [147] E. Berti, V. Cardoso, L. Gualtieri, M. Horbatsch, and U. Sperhake, *Phys. Rev. D* **87**, 124020 (2013), arXiv:1304.2836 [gr-qc].
- [148] X. Zhang, T. Liu, and W. Zhao, *Phys. Rev. D* **95**, 104027 (2017), arXiv:1702.08752 [gr-qc].
- [149] M. Shibata, K. Taniguchi, H. Okawa, and A. Buonanno, *Phys. Rev. D* **89**, 084005 (2014), arXiv:1310.0627 [gr-qc].
- [150] K. Taniguchi, M. Shibata, and A. Buonanno, *Phys. Rev. D* **91**, 024033 (2015), arXiv:1410.0738 [gr-qc].
- [151] X. Zhang, J. Yu, T. Liu, W. Zhao, and A. Wang, *Phys. Rev. D* **95**, 124008 (2017), arXiv:1703.09853 [gr-qc].
- [152] K. Yagi and T. Tanaka, *Prog. Theor. Phys.* **123**, 1069 (2010),

- arXiv:0908.3283 [gr-qc].
- [153] K. Yagi and T. Tanaka, *Phys. Rev.* **D81**, 064008 (2010), [Erratum: *Phys. Rev.*D81,109902(2010)], arXiv:0906.4269 [gr-qc].
- [154] E. Berti, L. Gualtieri, M. Horbatsch, and J. Alsing, *Phys. Rev.* **D85**, 122005 (2012), arXiv:1204.4340 [gr-qc].
- [155] J. Huang, M. C. Johnson, L. Sagunski, M. Sakellariadou, and J. Zhang, (2018), arXiv:1807.02133 [hep-ph].
- [156] F. Moura and R. Schiappa, *Class. Quant. Grav.* **24**, 361 (2007), arXiv:hep-th/0605001 [hep-th].
- [157] P. Pani and V. Cardoso, *Phys. Rev.* **D79**, 084031 (2009), arXiv:0902.1569 [gr-qc].
- [158] H. Zhang, M. Zhou, C. Bambi, B. Kleihaus, J. Kunz, and E. Radu, *Phys. Rev.* **D95**, 104043 (2017), arXiv:1704.04426 [gr-qc].
- [159] P. Kanti, N. E. Mavromatos, J. Rizos, K. Tamvakis, and E. Winstanley, *Phys. Rev.* **D54**, 5049 (1996), arXiv:hep-th/9511071 [hep-th].
- [160] K. Yagi, *Phys. Rev.* **D86**, 081504 (2012), arXiv:1204.4524 [gr-qc].
- [161] P. Pani, E. Berti, V. Cardoso, and J. Read, *Phys. Rev.* **D84**, 104035 (2011), arXiv:1109.0928 [gr-qc].
- [162] S. Mignemi and N. R. Stewart, *Phys. Rev.* **D47**, 5259 (1993), arXiv:hep-th/9212146 [hep-th].
- [163] S. Mignemi, *Phys. Rev.* **D51**, 934 (1995), arXiv:hep-th/9303102 [hep-th].
- [164] P. Pani, C. F. B. Macedo, L. C. B. Crispino, and V. Cardoso, *Phys. Rev.* **D84**, 087501 (2011), arXiv:1109.3996 [gr-qc].
- [165] D. Ayzenberg and N. Yunes, *Phys. Rev.* **D90**, 044066 (2014), [Erratum: *Phys. Rev.*D91,no.6,069905(2015)], arXiv:1405.2133 [gr-qc].
- [166] A. Maselli, P. Pani, L. Gualtieri, and V. Ferrari, *Phys. Rev.* **D92**, 083014 (2015), arXiv:1507.00680 [gr-qc].
- [167] T. Torii, H. Yajima, and K-i. Maeda, *Phys. Rev.* **D55**, 739 (1997), arXiv:gr-qc/9606034 [gr-qc].
- [168] S. O. Alexeev and M. V. Pomazanov, *Phys. Rev.* **D55**, 2110 (1997), arXiv:hep-th/9605106 [hep-th].
- [169] B. Kleihaus, J. Kunz, and E. Radu, *Phys. Rev. Lett.* **106**, 151104 (2011), arXiv:1101.2868 [gr-qc].
- [170] B. Kleihaus, J. Kunz, and S. Mojica, *Phys. Rev.* **D90**, 061501 (2014), arXiv:1407.6884 [gr-qc].
- [171] E. Berti, K. Yagi, and N. Yunes, *Gen. Rel. Grav.* **50**, 46 (2018), arXiv:1801.03208 [gr-qc].
- [172] K. Prabhu and L. C. Stein, *Phys. Rev.* **D98**, 021503 (2018), arXiv:1805.02668 [gr-qc].
- [173] K. Yagi, L. C. Stein, and N. Yunes, *Phys. Rev.* **D93**, 024010 (2016), arXiv:1510.02152 [gr-qc].
- [174] S. Alexander and N. Yunes, *Phys. Rept.* **480**, 1 (2009), arXiv:0907.2562 [hep-th].
- [175] R. Jackiw and S. Y. Pi, *Phys. Rev.* **D68**, 104012 (2003), arXiv:gr-qc/0308071 [gr-qc].
- [176] M. B. Green and J. H. Schwarz, *Physics Letters B* **149**, 117 (1984).
- [177] R. McNees, L. C. Stein, and N. Yunes, *Class. Quant. Grav.* **33**, 235013 (2016), arXiv:1512.05453 [gr-qc].
- [178] T. Mariz, J. R. Nascimento, E. Passos, and R. F. Ribeiro, *Phys. Rev.* **D70**, 024014 (2004), arXiv:hep-th/0403205 [hep-th].
- [179] T. Mariz, J. Nascimento, A. Petrov, L. Santos, and A. da Silva, *Physics Letters B* **661**, 312 (2008).
- [180] M. Gomes, T. Mariz, J. R. Nascimento, E. Passos, A. Y. Petrov, and A. J. da Silva, *Phys. Rev. D* **78**, 025029 (2008).
- [181] S. Mercuri and V. Taveras, *Phys. Rev. D* **80**, 104007 (2009).
- [182] V. Taveras and N. Yunes, *Phys. Rev.* **D78**, 064070 (2008), arXiv:0807.2652 [gr-qc].
- [183] S. Weinberg, *Phys. Rev.* **D77**, 123541 (2008), arXiv:0804.4291 [hep-th].
- [184] K. Yagi, N. Yunes, and T. Tanaka, *Phys. Rev.* **D86**, 044037 (2012), [Erratum: *Phys. Rev.*D89,049902(2014)], arXiv:1206.6130 [gr-qc].
- [185] Y. Ali-Haïmoud and Y. Chen, *Phys. Rev.* **D84**, 124033 (2011), arXiv:1110.5329 [astro-ph.HE].
- [186] N. Loutrel, T. Tanaka, and N. Yunes, (2018), arXiv:1806.07425 [gr-qc].
- [187] N. Loutrel, T. Tanaka, and N. Yunes, (2018), arXiv:1806.07431 [gr-qc].
- [188] P. Canizares, J. R. Gair, and C. F. Sopuerta, *Phys. Rev.* **D86**, 044010 (2012), arXiv:1205.1253 [gr-qc].
- [189] D. Blas and E. Lim, *Int. J. Mod. Phys. D* **23**, 1443009 (2015), arXiv:1412.4828 [gr-qc].
- [190] P. Horava, *Phys. Rev.* **D79**, 084008 (2009), arXiv:0901.3775 [hep-th].
- [191] D. Mattingly, *Living Rev. Rel.* **8**, 5 (2005), arXiv:gr-qc/0502097 [gr-qc].
- [192] T. Jacobson, S. Liberati, and D. Mattingly, *Annals Phys.* **321**, 150 (2006), arXiv:astro-ph/0505267 [astro-ph].
- [193] S. Liberati, *Class. Quant. Grav.* **30**, 133001 (2013), arXiv:1304.5795 [gr-qc].
- [194] M. Pospelov and Y. Shang, *Phys. Rev.* **D85**, 105001 (2012), arXiv:1010.5249 [hep-th].
- [195] T. Jacobson and D. Mattingly, *Phys. Rev.* **D64**, 024028 (2001), arXiv:gr-qc/0007031 [gr-qc].
- [196] T. Jacobson, *Proceedings, Workshop on From quantum to emergent gravity: Theory and phenomenology (QG-Ph): Trieste, Italy, June 11-15, 2007*, PoS **QG-PH**, 020 (2007), arXiv:0801.1547 [gr-qc].
- [197] B. Z. Foster, *Phys. Rev.* **D73**, 104012 (2006), [Erratum: *Phys. Rev.*D75,129904(2007)], arXiv:gr-qc/0602004 [gr-qc].
- [198] T. Jacobson and D. Mattingly, *Phys. Rev.* **D70**, 024003 (2004), arXiv:gr-qc/0402005 [gr-qc].
- [199] B. Z. Foster, *Phys. Rev. D* **76**, 084033 (2007).

- [200] D. Blas, O. Pujolas, and S. Sibiryakov, *Phys. Rev. Lett.* **104**, 181302 (2010), [arXiv:0909.3525 \[hep-th\]](#).
- [201] T. Nishioka, *Class. Quant. Grav.* **26**, 242001 (2009), [arXiv:0905.0473 \[hep-th\]](#).
- [202] M. Visser, *Phys. Rev.* **D80**, 025011 (2009), [arXiv:0902.0590 \[hep-th\]](#).
- [203] Y. Gong, S. Hou, D. Liang, and E. Papanonopoulos, *Phys. Rev.* **D97**, 084040 (2018), [arXiv:1801.03382 \[gr-qc\]](#).
- [204] J. Oost, S. Mukohyama, and A. Wang, *Phys. Rev.* **D97**, 124023 (2018), [arXiv:1802.04303 \[gr-qc\]](#).
- [205] A. Emir Gumrukcuoglu, M. Saravani, and T. P. Sotiriou, *Phys. Rev.* **D97**, 024032 (2018), [arXiv:1711.08845 \[gr-qc\]](#).
- [206] A. Nishizawa and T. Nakamura, *Phys. Rev.* **D90**, 044048 (2014), [arXiv:1406.5544 \[gr-qc\]](#).
- [207] Q. G. Bailey and V. A. Kostelecky, *Phys. Rev.* **D74**, 045001 (2006), [arXiv:gr-qc/0603030 \[gr-qc\]](#).
- [208] B. Z. Foster and T. Jacobson, *Phys. Rev.* **D73**, 064015 (2006), [arXiv:gr-qc/0509083 \[gr-qc\]](#).
- [209] C. M. Will, *Living Rev. Rel.* **9**, 3 (2006), [arXiv:gr-qc/0510072 \[gr-qc\]](#).
- [210] B. Audren, D. Blas, J. Lesgourgues, and S. Sibiryakov, *JCAP* **1308**, 039 (2013), [arXiv:1305.0009 \[astro-ph.CO\]](#).
- [211] C. Eling, *Phys. Rev.* **D73**, 084026 (2006), [Erratum: *Phys. Rev.* **D80**, 129905(2009)], [arXiv:gr-qc/0507059 \[gr-qc\]](#).
- [212] J. W. Elliott, G. D. Moore, and H. Stoica, *JHEP* **08**, 066 (2005), [arXiv:hep-ph/0505211 \[hep-ph\]](#).
- [213] K. Yagi, D. Blas, E. Barausse, and N. Yunes, *Phys. Rev.* **D89**, 084067 (2014), [Erratum: *Phys. Rev.* **D90**, no.6, 069901(2014)], [arXiv:1311.7144 \[gr-qc\]](#).
- [214] K. Yagi, D. Blas, N. Yunes, and E. Barausse, *Phys. Rev. Lett.* **112**, 161101 (2014), [arXiv:1307.6219 \[gr-qc\]](#).
- [215] K. Chamberlain and N. Yunes, *Phys. Rev.* **D96**, 084039 (2017), [arXiv:1704.08268 \[gr-qc\]](#).
- [216] H. S. Snyder, *Phys. Rev.* **71**, 38 (1947).
- [217] H. S. Snyder, *Phys. Rev.* **72**, 68 (1947).
- [218] A. Connes, *Publications Mathématiques de l'Institut des Hautes Études Scientifiques* **62**, 41 (1985).
- [219] A. Connes, *Noncommutative Geometry* (Elsevier Science, 1995).
- [220] S. L. Woronowicz, *Publications of the Research Institute for Mathematical Sciences* **23**, 117 (1987).
- [221] G. Landi, *Lect. Notes Phys. Monogr.* **51**, 1 (1997), [arXiv:hep-th/9701078 \[hep-th\]](#).
- [222] S. L. Woronowicz, *Commun. Math. Phys.* **111**, 613 (1987).
- [223] E. Witten, *Nuclear Physics B* **268**, 253 (1986).
- [224] N. Seiberg and E. Witten, *JHEP* **09**, 032 (1999), [arXiv:hep-th/9908142 \[hep-th\]](#).
- [225] M. R. Douglas and N. A. Nekrasov, *Rev. Mod. Phys.* **73**, 977 (2001), [arXiv:hep-th/0106048 \[hep-th\]](#).
- [226] V. O. Rivelles, *Phys. Lett.* **B558**, 191 (2003), [arXiv:hep-th/0212262 \[hep-th\]](#).
- [227] R. J. Szabo, *Frontiers of Mathematical Physics: Summer Workshop on Particles, Fields and Strings Burnaby, Canada, July 16-27, 2001*, *Phys. Rept.* **378**, 207 (2003), [arXiv:hep-th/0109162 \[hep-th\]](#).
- [228] S. M. Carroll, J. A. Harvey, V. A. Kostelecky, C. D. Lane, and T. Okamoto, *Phys. Rev. Lett.* **87**, 141601 (2001), [arXiv:hep-th/0105082 \[hep-th\]](#).
- [229] I. Mocioiu, M. Pospelov, and R. Roiban, *Phys. Lett.* **B489**, 390 (2000), [arXiv:hep-ph/0005191 \[hep-ph\]](#).
- [230] J. D. Prestage, J. J. Bollinger, W. M. Itano, and D. J. Wineland, *Phys. Rev. Lett.* **54**, 2387 (1985).
- [231] M. Chaichian, M. M. Sheikh-Jabbari, and A. Tureanu, *Phys. Rev. Lett.* **86**, 2716 (2001).
- [232] C. J. Berglund, L. R. Hunter, D. Krause, Jr., E. O. Prigge, M. S. Ronfeldt, and S. K. Lamoreaux, *Phys. Rev. Lett.* **75**, 1879 (1995).
- [233] X. Calmet and C. Fritz, *Physics Letters B* **747**, 406 (2015).
- [234] J. P. K., P. Chingangbam, and S. Das, *Phys. Rev. D* **91**, 083503 (2015).
- [235] P. Aschieri, C. Blohmann, M. Dimitrijevic, F. Meyer, P. Schupp, and J. Wess, *Class. Quant. Grav.* **22**, 3511 (2005), [arXiv:hep-th/0504183 \[hep-th\]](#).
- [236] P. Aschieri, M. Dimitrijevic, F. Meyer, and J. Wess, *Class. Quant. Grav.* **23**, 1883 (2006), [arXiv:hep-th/0510059 \[hep-th\]](#).
- [237] X. Calmet and A. Kobakhidze, *Phys. Rev.* **D72**, 045010 (2005), [arXiv:hep-th/0506157 \[hep-th\]](#).
- [238] A. H. Chamseddine, *Phys. Lett.* **B504**, 33 (2001), [arXiv:hep-th/0009153 \[hep-th\]](#).
- [239] A. Kobakhidze, *Int. J. Mod. Phys. A* **23**, 2541 (2008), [arXiv:hep-th/0603132 \[hep-th\]](#).
- [240] R. J. Szabo, *Class. Quant. Grav.* **23**, R199 (2006), [arXiv:hep-th/0606233 \[hep-th\]](#).
- [241] X. Calmet and A. Kobakhidze, *Phys. Rev.* **D74**, 047702 (2006), [arXiv:hep-th/0605275 \[hep-th\]](#).
- [242] P. Mukherjee and A. Saha, *Phys. Rev.* **D74**, 027702 (2006), [arXiv:hep-th/0605287 \[hep-th\]](#).
- [243] A. Kobakhidze, *Phys. Rev.* **D79**, 047701 (2009), [arXiv:0712.0642 \[gr-qc\]](#).
- [244] E. Di Casola, S. Liberati, and S. Sonogo, *Am. J. Phys.* **83**, 39 (2015), [arXiv:1310.7426 \[gr-qc\]](#).
- [245] B. Bertotti and L. P. Grishchuk, *Classical and Quantum Gravity* **7**, 1733 (1990).
- [246] J.-P. Uzan, *Living Rev. Rel.* **14**, 2 (2011), [arXiv:1009.5514 \[astro-ph.CO\]](#).
- [247] J. G. Williams, S. G. Turyshev, and D. H. Boggs, *Phys. Rev. Lett.* **93**, 261101 (2004), [arXiv:gr-qc/0411113 \[gr-qc\]](#).
- [248] A. T. Deller, J. P. W. Verbiest, S. J. Tingay, and M. Bailes, *Astrophys. J.* **685**, L67 (2008), [arXiv:0808.1594 \[astro-ph\]](#).
- [249] V. M. Kaspi, J. H. Taylor, and M. F. Ryba, *Astrophys. J.* **428**, 713 (1994).
- [250] E. V. Pitjeva, *Astronomy Letters* **31**, 340 (2005).
- [251] P. Jofre, A. Reisenegger, and R. Fernandez, *Phys. Rev. Lett.* **97**, 131102 (2006),

- arXiv:astro-ph/0606708 [astro-ph].
- [252] C. Bambi, M. Giannotti, and F. L. Villante, *Phys. Rev. D* **71**, 123524 (2005), arXiv:astro-ph/0503502 [astro-ph].
- [253] C. J. Copi, A. N. Davis, and L. M. Krauss, *Phys. Rev. Lett.* **92**, 171301 (2004), arXiv:astro-ph/0311334 [astro-ph].
- [254] D. B. Guenther, L. M. Krauss, and P. Demarque, *The Astrophysical Journal* **498**, 871 (1998).
- [255] A. Genova, E. Mazarico, S. Goossens, F. G. Lemoine, G. A. Neumann, D. E. Smith, and M. T. Zuber, *Nature Communications* **9**, 289 (2018).
- [256] C. M. Will, *Living Reviews in Relativity* **9**, 3 (2006).
- [257] K. Yagi, N. Tanahashi, and T. Tanaka, *Phys. Rev. D* **83**, 084036 (2011), arXiv:1101.4997 [gr-qc].
- [258] C. Cutler and E. E. Flanagan, *Phys. Rev. D* **49**, 2658 (1994).