

# Quantum effects on Lagrangian points and displaced periodic orbits in the Earth-Moon system

Enrico Battista\*

*Dipartimento di Fisica, Complesso Universitario di Monte S. Angelo,  
Via Cintia Edificio 6, 80126 Napoli, Italy  
Istituto Nazionale di Fisica Nucleare, Sezione di Napoli,  
Complesso Universitario di Monte S. Angelo,  
Via Cintia Edificio 6, 80126 Napoli, Italy*

Donato Agnello†

*Istituto Nazionale di Fisica Nucleare,  
Laboratori Nazionali di Frascati, 00044 Frascati, Italy*

Gaetano Esposito‡

*Istituto Nazionale di Fisica Nucleare, Sezione di Napoli,  
Complesso Universitario di Monte S. Angelo,  
Via Cintia Edificio 6, 80126 Napoli, Italy*

Juana María Ojeda§

*Department of Mechanical and Aerospace Engineering,  
University of Strathclyde, Glasgow, G1 1XJ, United Kingdom*

(Dated: October 8, 2018)

# Abstract

Recent work in the literature has shown that the one-loop long distance quantum corrections to the Newtonian potential imply tiny but observable effects in the restricted three-body problem of celestial mechanics, i.e., at the Lagrangian libration points of stable equilibrium the planetoid is not exactly at equal distance from the two bodies of large mass, but the Newtonian values of its coordinates are changed by a few millimeters in the Earth-Moon system. First, we assess such a theoretical calculation by exploiting the full theory of the quintic equation, i.e., its reduction to Bring-Jerrard form and the resulting expression of roots in terms of generalized hypergeometric functions. By performing the numerical analysis of the exact formulas for the roots, we confirm and slightly improve the theoretical evaluation of quantum corrected coordinates of Lagrangian libration points of stable equilibrium. Second, we prove in detail that also for collinear Lagrangian points the quantum corrections are of the same order of magnitude in the Earth-Moon system. Third, we discuss the prospects to measure, with the help of laser ranging, the above departure from the equilateral triangle picture, which is a challenging task. On the other hand, a modern version of the planetoid is the solar sail, and much progress has been made, in recent years, on the displaced periodic orbits of solar sails at all libration points, both stable and unstable. The present paper investigates therefore, eventually, a restricted three-body problem involving Earth, Moon and a solar sail. By taking into account the one-loop quantum corrections to the Newtonian potential, displaced periodic orbits of the solar sail at libration points are again found to exist.

PACS numbers: 04.60.Ds, 95.10.Ce

---

\*E-mail: ebattista@na.infn.it

†E-mail: simone.dellagnello@lnf.infn.it

‡E-mail: gesposit@na.infn.it

§E-mail: jules.simo@strath.ac.uk

## I. INTRODUCTION

From the point of view of modern theoretical physics the logical need for a quantum theory of gravity is suggested by the Einstein equations themselves which tell us that gravity couples to  $T_{\mu\nu}$  the energy-momentum tensor of matter and also in a de Sitter invariant way by virtue of the tensor equations

$$R_{\mu\nu} - \frac{1}{2}g_{\mu\nu}R = \frac{8\pi G}{c^4}T_{\mu\nu}.$$

When Einstein arrived at these equations although he had already understood that the classical Maxwell theory of electromagnetic phenomena is not valid in all circumstances the only known forms of  $T_{\mu\nu}$  were classical e.g. the energy-momentum tensor of a relativistic fluid or even just the case of vacuum Einstein equations for which  $T_{\mu\nu}$  vanishes. In due course it was realized that matter fields are quantum fields in the first place e.g. a massive Dirac field or spinor electrodynamics where the quantum fields are operator valued distributions for which a regularization and renormalization procedure is necessary and even fruitful. However the mere replacement of  $T_{\mu\nu}$  by its regularized and renormalized form  $\langle T_{\mu\nu} \rangle$  on the right hand side of Eq. (1) leads to a hybrid scheme because the classical Einstein tensor  $R_{\mu\nu} - \frac{1}{2}g_{\mu\nu}R$  is affected by the coupling to  $\langle T_{\mu\nu} \rangle$ . The question then arises whether the appropriate full quantum theory of gravity should have a different theoretical nature or should involve instead other structures e.g. strings, or loops, or twistors, and at least respectable approaches have been developed so far in the literature of a few such theories truly physical predictions should be checked against observations. For example applications of the covariant theory lead to detailed predictions for the cross sections of various scattering processes, but such phenomena if any occur at energy scales inaccessible to observations and also the effects of Planck scale physics on cosmology e.g. the cosmic microwave background radiation and its anisotropy spectrum are not yet easily accessible to observations although cosmology offers possibly the best chances for testing quantum gravity.

Recently inspired by the work of others on effective theories of gravity where it is shown that the leading one-loop long distance quantum corrections to the Newtonian potential are entirely ruled by the Einstein-Hilbert part of the full action functionals so we of us have assumed that such a theoretical analysis can be applied to the

long distances and macroscopic bodies occurring in celestial mechanics. More precisely the Newtonian potential between two bodies of masses  $m_A$  and  $m_B$  receives quantum corrections leading to

$$V_Q(r) \simeq -\frac{Gm_A m_B}{r} \left( 1 + \frac{k_1}{r} + \frac{k_2}{r^2} \right) + O(G^2),$$

where

$$k_1 \equiv \kappa_1 \frac{G m_A m_B}{c^2},$$

$$k_2 \equiv \kappa_2 \frac{G \hbar}{c^3} \simeq \kappa_2 l_P^2.$$

Equation (1) implies that  $\forall \varepsilon > 0$  there exists an  $r_0$  value of  $r$  such that

$$\left| V_Q(r) + \frac{Gm_A m_B}{r} \left( 1 + \frac{k_1}{r} + \frac{k_2}{r^2} \right) \right| < \varepsilon, \quad \forall r > r_0.$$

This feature will play an important role in our concluding remarks in section 5.

We also stress that the dimensionless parameter  $\kappa_1$  depends on the dimensionless parameter  $\kappa_2$ . In other words  $k_1$  is a post Newtonian term which only depends on classical physical constants but its weight expressed by the real number  $\kappa_1$  is affected by the calculational procedure leading to the fully quantum term  $k_2$  where the real number  $\kappa_2$  weighs the Planck length squared. More precisely the perturbative expansion involves only integer powers of Newton's constant  $G$

$$V_Q(r) \sim -\frac{Gm_A m_B}{r} \left( \sum_{p=1}^{\infty} f_p(r) G^p \right) \sim -\frac{Gm_A m_B}{r} \left( \sum_{n=1}^{\infty} \frac{k_n}{r^n} \right),$$

where upon denoting by  $L_A$  and  $L_B$  the gravitational radii  $L_A \equiv \frac{Gm_A}{c^2}$ ,  $L_B \equiv \frac{Gm_B}{c^2}$  one has the coefficients  $k_n \simeq k_n L_A L_B l_P^{-2}$ . At one-loop level to near order in  $G$  where

$$f_1(r) \simeq \kappa_1 \frac{m_A m_B}{c^2} \frac{1}{r} + \kappa_2 \frac{\hbar}{c^3 r^2},$$

we can only have the contribution  $\frac{(L_A+L_B)}{r}$  with weight equal to the real number  $\kappa_1$  and the contribution on  $\frac{(l_P)^2}{r^2}$  with weight equal to the real number  $\kappa_2$ . Although the term  $\frac{(l_P)^2}{r^2}$  is overwhelmed by the term  $\frac{(L_A+L_B)}{r}$  the two are next to each other intertwined because  $\kappa_1$  is not a free real parameter but depends on  $\kappa_2$  both  $\kappa_1$  and  $\kappa_2$  result from one-loop diagrams. Thus the one-loop long distance quantum correction is the whole term

$$f_1(r) G \simeq \frac{k_1}{r} + \frac{k_2}{r^2} \simeq \kappa_1 \frac{L_A L_B}{r} + \kappa_2 \frac{l_P^2}{r^2},$$

where  $\kappa_1$  takes a certain value because there exists a nonvanishing value of  $\kappa_2$  the authors of Ref. [23] found the numerical values

$$\kappa_1 \simeq 0.0001, \quad \kappa_2 \simeq \frac{1}{\pi}.$$

The work in Ref. [23] considered the application of Eqs. (1) and (2) to the circular restricted three-body problem of celestial mechanics in which two bodies  $A$  and  $B$  of masses  $\alpha$  and  $\beta$  respectively with  $\alpha > \beta$  move in such a way that the orbit of  $B$  relative to  $A$  is circular and hence both  $A$  and  $B$  move along circular orbits around the center of mass  $C$  which moves in a straight line or is at rest while a third body the planetoid  $P$  of mass  $m$  much smaller than  $\alpha$  and  $\beta$  is subject to the gravitational attraction and one wants to evaluate the motion of the planetoid. On taking rotating axes<sup>1</sup> with center of mass  $C$  as origin distance  $AB$  denoted by  $l$  and angular velocity  $\omega$  given by

$$\omega \simeq \sqrt{\frac{G(\alpha + \beta)}{l^3}},$$

one has with the notation in Fig. 1 that the quantum corrected effective potential for the circular restricted three-body problem is given by  $GU$  where

$$U \simeq -\frac{\alpha + \beta}{l^3} x^2 - y^2 - \frac{\alpha}{r} \left( \frac{k_1}{r} - \frac{k_2}{r^2} \right) - \frac{\beta}{s} \left( \frac{k_3}{s} - \frac{k_2}{s^2} \right),$$

where  $r$  and  $s$  are the distances  $AP$  and  $BP$  respectively while here

$$k_1 \equiv \kappa_1 \frac{G m}{c^2} \alpha, \quad k_3 \equiv \kappa_3 \frac{G m}{c^2} \beta, \quad \kappa_1 \simeq \kappa_3 \simeq 0.$$

The equilibrium points are found by studying the gradient of  $U$  and evaluating its zeros. There exist indeed five zeros of  $\text{grad}U$ , three of the which correspond to coorbital points  $L_1, L_2, L_3$  of unstable equilibrium while the remaining two describe configurations of stable equilibrium at the points denoted by  $L_4, L_5$ . The simple but nontrivial definitions [23] was that even though the quantum corrections in the above quantities *the analysis of stable equilibrium to, near order in perturbations might lead to testable departures from Newtonian theory, being related to the gradient of  $U$  and to the second derivatives of  $U$  evaluated at the zeros of  $\text{grad}U$*  the quantum corrected Lagrange points  $L_4$  and  $L_5$  have coordinates  $(x_+, l, y_+, l)$  and  $(x_-, l, y_-, l)$  respectively where

$$x_{\pm} l \simeq \frac{r^2 l - s^2 l \pm b^2 - a^2}{a - b},$$

<sup>1</sup> To be self-consistent, some minor repetition of the text in Ref. [23] is unavoidable.




FIG. 1: The figure shows the two bodies of large mass,  $A$  and  $B$ , the center of mass  $C$ , and the planetoid at  $P$ .

$$y_{\pm} l \simeq \pm \sqrt{r^2 l^2 - x^2 l^2 - ax l^2 - a^2},$$

where  $r l \equiv \frac{1}{w(l)}$ ,  $s l \equiv \frac{1}{u(l)}$  and  $w l$  and  $u l$  being the roots of an algebraic equation of fifth degree (see Sec II). Interestingly  $r l \neq s l$  and hence to the equilibrium points of Newtonian celestial mechanics there correspond points no longer exactly at vertices of an equilateral triangle. For the Earth-Moon satellite system the work of [1] has found

$$x_Q - x_C \approx 0.0001, \quad |y_Q| - |y_C| \approx 0.0001,$$

where  $x_Q$  resp.  $x_C$  is the quantum corrected resp. classical value of  $x l$  and the same for  $y_Q$  and  $y_C$  obtained from [1] by the values  $n$  are well accessible to the modern astrometric techniques [2].

On the other hand such progress has been made along the years on modern models of planets and the related periodic orbits at the Lagrange points  $L_1, L_2, L_3, L_4, L_5$  to, near order in the variational equations for Newtonian theory. In particular a modern version of planets as solar sails which is propelled by reflecting solar photons and therefore can transform the momentum of photons into a propulsive force. Solar sailing technology appears as a promising for advanced spacecraft propulsion which can enable exciting new space science missions on concepts such as solar system exploration and deep space observation. Although solar sailing has been considered as a practical means of spacecraft propulsion only relatively recently the fundamental ideas had been already developed towards the end of the previous century.

Solar sails can also be used for highly nonKeplerian orbits such as closed orbits displaced high above the equatorial plane. Solar sails are especially suited for such nonKeplerian orbits since they can apply a propulsive force continuously. This allows to consider some exciting and unique trajectories. In such trajectories a sail can be used as a communication satellite for high altitudes. For example the orbital plane of the sail can be displaced above the orbital plane of the Earth so that the sail can stay fixed above the Earth at some distance if the orbital periods are equal. Orbits around the collinear points of the Earth-Moon system are also of great interest because the unique positions are advantageous for several important applications in space mission design.

Over the last few decades several authors have tried to determine more accurate approximations of such equilibrium points. Such quasi-Halo orbits were first studied in refs. Halo orbits near the collinear libration points in the Earth-Moon system are of great interest in particular around the  $L_1$  and  $L_2$  points because of the unique positions. However a linear analysis shows that the collinear libration points  $L_1, L_2$  and  $L_3$  are of the type saddle-center-center leading to an instability in the vicinity whereas the equatorial equilibrium points  $L_4$  and  $L_5$  are stable in that they are of the type center-center-center. Although the libration points  $L_4$  and  $L_5$  are naturally stable and require a small acceleration the disadvantage is the longer communication path length from the lunar pole to the sail. If the orbital altitude vs. distance from Earth a spacecraft orbit near the  $L_2$  point can be used to provide communications between the equatorial regions of the Earth and the polar regions of the Moon. The establishment of a bridge for radio communications is crucial for forthcoming space missions which plan to use the lunar poles. Displaced nonKeplerian

orbits near the Earth-Moon libration points have been investigated in refs.

This brief outline shows therefore that the analysis of libration points does not belong just to the history of celestial mechanics but plays a crucial role in modern investigations of space mission design.

Section II studies in detail the algebraic equation of fifth degree for the evaluation of noncoplanar libration points  $L_4$  and  $L_5$  by first passing to dimensionless units and then exploiting the rich algebraic theory of quintic equations and their roots. Section III derives and solves the algebraic equation of  $n$ th degree for the evaluation of quantum corrections to coplanar Lagrangian points  $L_1, L_2, L_3$ . Section I outlines the prospects to measure the quantum-corrected coordinates obtained in Sec. II with the help of laser ranging. Section IV evaluates displaced periodic orbits at the quantum-corrected Lagrange points  $L_4$  and  $L_5$  and a detailed comparison with the results of Newtonian celestial mechanics is also made. Concluding remarks and open problems are presented in Sec. V while the Appendices describe relevant background material on the theory of algebraic equations.

## II. ALGEBRAIC EQUATIONS OF FIFTH DEGREE FOR $w(l)$ AND $u(l)$

In Ref. [1] it has been shown that the  $\text{grad}U \rightarrow 0$  condition at noncoplanar libration points leads to the algebraic equations of fifth degree

$$\begin{aligned} w^5 - \zeta_4 w^4 - \zeta_3 w^3 - \zeta_0 &= 0, \\ u^5 - \zeta_4 u^4 - \zeta_3 u^3 - \zeta_0 &= 0, \end{aligned}$$

where

$$\begin{aligned} \zeta_4 &\rightarrow -\frac{\kappa_1 G m}{\kappa_2} \frac{\alpha}{c^2 l_P^2}, \quad \zeta_3 \rightarrow \frac{\alpha}{\kappa_2 l_P^2}, \quad \zeta_0 \rightarrow -\frac{\alpha}{\kappa_2 l_P^2 l^3}, \\ \zeta_4 &\rightarrow -\frac{\kappa_1 G m}{\kappa_2} \frac{\beta}{c^2 l_P^2}, \quad \zeta_3 \rightarrow \zeta_3, \quad \zeta_0 \rightarrow \zeta_0. \end{aligned}$$

such for  $u$  as for  $w$  that it is enough to focus on Eq. (1) where to exploit the algebraic theory of quintic equations we pass to dimensionless units by defining

$$w \rightarrow \frac{\gamma}{r} \equiv \frac{\gamma}{l_P},$$

where  $\gamma$  is a real number to be determined. The quintic equation obeyed by  $\gamma$  is therefore

$$\gamma^5 - \rho_4 \gamma^4 - \rho_3 \gamma^3 - \rho_0 = 0,$$

where  $\rho_4, \rho_3, \rho_0$  are additional dimensions and read as

$$\rho_4 \equiv \zeta_4 l_P \rightsquigarrow -\frac{\kappa_1}{\kappa_2} \frac{G}{c^2} \frac{m}{l_P} \frac{\alpha}{l_P},$$

$$\rho_3 \equiv \zeta_3 l_P^2 \rightsquigarrow \frac{1}{\kappa_2},$$

$$\rho_0 \equiv \zeta_0 l_P^5 \rightsquigarrow -\frac{1}{\kappa_2} \left(\frac{l_P}{l}\right)^3 \rightsquigarrow -\rho_3 \left(\frac{l_P}{l}\right)^3.$$

At this stage we can export the results of Appendix A by virtue of which Eq. (10) can be brought into the Brng Jerrard form of quintic equations

$$\gamma^5 + d_1 \gamma + d_0 = 0.$$

Since we are going to need the roots of the quintic up to the ninth or tenth decimal digit the for-  
of the quintic will turn out to be very useful because it leads to exact formulas for the roots which are then evaluated numerically which is possibly better than solving numerically the quintic from the beginning. Here, we have proved that this equation can be solved in terms of elliptic functions but we use the even more manageable formulas for the roots displayed in Ref. [10]. For this purpose the crucial role is played by the number

$$\sigma \equiv \frac{-d_0^4}{-d_1^5}.$$

We can further simplify Eq. (11) by rescaling  $\gamma$  according to

$$\gamma \rightsquigarrow \chi \gamma.$$

The quintic for  $\gamma$  is then

$$\gamma^5 + \frac{d_1}{\chi^4} \gamma + \frac{d_0}{\chi^5} = 0.$$

One can choose  $\chi$  in such a way that

$$-\frac{d_1}{\chi^4} \rightsquigarrow \Rightarrow \chi \rightsquigarrow \chi d_1 \rightsquigarrow -d_1^{\frac{1}{4}},$$

and the corresponding  $\sigma$  of (12) reads as

$$\sigma \rightsquigarrow \left( -\frac{d_0}{\chi d_1^{\frac{5}{4}}} \right)^4 \rightsquigarrow \sigma.$$

If  $|\sigma| < 1$  which is the case that holds in the Earth-Moon system by virtue of the numerical results for  $d_0$  and  $d_1$  obtained from the algorithm of Appendix A then the analysis of Ref.

shows that the five roots of the quintic here written as  $\gamma^5 - \gamma - \beta$  are obtained from the parameter

$$\beta \equiv -\frac{d_0}{\chi d_1^5}$$

occurring in  $\sigma$  and from hypergeometric functions of order according to

$$\begin{pmatrix} \gamma_1 \\ \gamma_2 \\ \gamma_3 \\ \gamma_4 \end{pmatrix} \rightarrow \begin{pmatrix} -\frac{\tilde{\beta}}{4} & \frac{5}{32}\beta^2 & -\frac{5}{32}\beta^3 \\ -\frac{\tilde{\beta}}{4} & \frac{5}{32}\beta^2 & \frac{5}{32}\beta^3 \\ -\frac{\tilde{\beta}}{4} & -\frac{5}{32}\beta^2 & -\frac{5}{32}\beta^3 \\ \frac{\tilde{\beta}}{4} & -\frac{5}{32}\beta^2 & \frac{5}{32}\beta^3 \end{pmatrix} \begin{pmatrix} F_0(\sigma) \\ F_1(\sigma) \\ F_2(\sigma) \\ F_3(\sigma) \end{pmatrix},$$

$$\gamma_5 \rightarrow -\beta F_1(\sigma),$$

where having defined the higher hypergeometric function

$$F(a_1, a_2, \dots, a_{n-2}, a_{n-1}; b_1, b_2, \dots, b_{n-2}, \sigma) \equiv \sum_{s=0}^{\infty} C_s \sigma^s,$$

with the coefficients evaluated according to the rules

$$C_0 \equiv 1, \quad C_s \equiv \frac{a_1, s \quad a_2, s \quad \dots \quad a_{n-2}, s \quad a_{n-1}, s}{s \quad b_1, s \quad \dots \quad b_{n-3}, s \quad b_{n-2}, s},$$

$$\lambda, \mu \equiv \lambda_1 \lambda_2 \dots \lambda_{\mu-1},$$

one has

$$F_0(\sigma) \equiv F\left(-\frac{1}{20}, \frac{3}{20}, \frac{7}{20}, \frac{11}{20}; \frac{1}{4}, \frac{1}{2}, \frac{3}{4}, \sigma\right),$$

$$F_1(\sigma) \equiv F\left(\frac{1}{5}, \frac{2}{5}, \frac{3}{5}, \frac{4}{5}; \frac{1}{2}, \frac{3}{4}, \frac{5}{4}, \sigma\right),$$

$$F_2(\sigma) \equiv F\left(\frac{9}{20}, \frac{13}{20}, \frac{17}{20}, \frac{21}{20}; \frac{3}{4}, \frac{5}{4}, \frac{3}{2}, \sigma\right),$$

$$F_3(\sigma) \equiv F\left(\frac{7}{10}, \frac{9}{10}, \frac{11}{10}, \frac{13}{10}; \frac{5}{4}, \frac{3}{2}, \frac{7}{4}, \sigma\right).$$

This representation of the roots  $\gamma_i$  is discovered by pointing out that Eqs. (10) and (11) suggest considering such roots as functions of  $\sigma$ . By taking derivatives of Eq.

with respect to  $\sigma$  up to the fourth order one can then prove that all  $\gamma_i$  are particular integrals of the fourth order ordinary differential equation

$$\left[ \sigma^3 \frac{d}{d\sigma} - \frac{d^4}{d\sigma^4} - \sigma^2 (A_1 \sigma - B_1) \frac{d^3}{d\sigma^3} - \sigma (A_2 \sigma - B_2) \frac{d^2}{d\sigma^2} - (A_3 \sigma - B_3) \frac{d}{d\sigma} - C \right] \gamma = 0, \quad (10)$$

where  $A_1, A_2, A_3, B_1, B_2, B_3, C$  are constants. The roots  $\gamma_i$  undergo a peculiar variation when  $\beta$  describes an arbitrary curve in its plane. The critical points turn out to be

$$\beta_1 = -C, \beta_2 = C, \beta_3 = C, \beta_4 = -C, C \equiv \frac{B_3}{A_3}.$$

The group of the linear differential equation (10) has in this case the property that the root  $\gamma_k$  is changed into  $\gamma_5$  for all  $k = 1, 2, 3, 4$  when  $\beta$  describes a self-closed contour about the critical point  $\beta_k$ .

Eventually the roots  $\gamma_i$  of Eq. (10) are given by

$$\gamma_i = \chi \frac{d}{d\sigma} \gamma_i, \quad \forall i = 1, 2, 3, 4.$$

At this stage we have to invert the cubic transformation (A) to find the five roots of the ordinary differential equation (10) since in this equation the number of sign differences between consecutive nonvanishing coefficients is three. We now from Descartes's sign rule that it has only one positive root. We find for its numerical value from the definition (1) that it is clear that only positive values of  $\gamma$  are physically admissible.

$$\gamma_+ = \frac{1}{2} \left( \frac{B_3}{A_3} + \sqrt{\left( \frac{B_3}{A_3} \right)^2 - 4 \frac{B_2}{A_2}} \right). \quad (11)$$

This value is not affected by the planetoid mass  $m$  since  $m$  is much smaller than  $\alpha$ . As far as the unphysical roots<sup>2</sup> are concerned, two of the roots are real and negative, i.e.

$$\gamma_- = -\frac{1}{2} \left( \frac{B_3}{A_3} + \sqrt{\left( \frac{B_3}{A_3} \right)^2 - 4 \frac{B_2}{A_2}} \right) \quad \text{or} \quad -\frac{1}{2} \left( \frac{B_3}{A_3} - \sqrt{\left( \frac{B_3}{A_3} \right)^2 - 4 \frac{B_2}{A_2}} \right), \quad (12)$$

and two of the roots are complex conjugate, i.e.

$$\gamma_C = -\frac{1}{2} \left( \frac{B_3}{A_3} - \sqrt{\left( \frac{B_3}{A_3} \right)^2 - 4 \frac{B_2}{A_2}} \right) \pm i \sqrt{4 \frac{B_2}{A_2} - \left( \frac{B_3}{A_3} \right)^2}. \quad (13)$$

Finally by repeating the whole analysis for

$$u = \frac{r}{s} \equiv \frac{r}{l_P},$$

<sup>2</sup> We do not need many decimal digits for unphysical roots.



one-loop, long distance quantum corrections to the Newtonian potential. On the side of the applications, the importance is further strengthened since satellites e.g. the Jason Microwave Anisotropy Probe have been sent so far to the points  $L_1, L_2$  and  $L_3$  of some approximate three body configurations in the solar system.

beginning by recalling from Ref. [1] that the gradient of the effective potential in the restricted three body problem has components

$$\begin{aligned}\frac{\partial U}{\partial x} &\rightarrow \frac{\alpha - \beta}{l^3}x - \frac{\alpha x}{r^3} \left( \frac{k_1}{r} - \frac{k_2}{r^2} \right) - \frac{\beta x}{s^3} \left( \frac{k_3}{s} - \frac{k_2}{s^2} \right) \\ &\quad - \frac{\alpha \beta l}{\alpha - \beta} \left[ \frac{1}{s^3} \left( \frac{k_3}{s} - \frac{k_2}{s^2} \right) - \frac{1}{r^3} \left( \frac{k_1}{r} - \frac{k_2}{r^2} \right) \right], \\ \frac{\partial U}{\partial y} &\rightarrow y \left[ \frac{\alpha - \beta}{l^3} - \frac{\alpha}{r^3} \left( \frac{k_1}{r} - \frac{k_2}{r^2} \right) - \frac{\beta}{s^3} \left( \frac{k_3}{s} - \frac{k_2}{s^2} \right) \right].\end{aligned}$$

When the orbitation points are close near the coordinate  $y$  vanishes which ensures the vanishing of  $\frac{\partial U}{\partial y}$  as well. On the other hand from the geometry of the problem as shown in Fig. 1 one has

$$y^2 \rightarrow r^2 - x^2 - ax - a^2.$$

The vanishing of  $y$  implies therefore that  $x$  obeys the algebraic equation

$$x^2 - ax - a^2 - r^2 \rightarrow 0,$$

which is solved by the two roots

$$x \rightarrow \varepsilon r - a \rightarrow \varepsilon r - \frac{\beta l}{\alpha - \beta}, \quad \varepsilon \rightarrow \pm 1.$$

Furthermore the geometry of the problem yields also

$$x \rightarrow \frac{r^2 - s^2}{l} - \frac{\alpha - \beta}{\alpha - \beta} l,$$

which implies by comparison with Eq. (10)

$$s^2 \rightarrow (r - \varepsilon l)^2 \Rightarrow s \rightarrow \pm (r - \varepsilon l),$$

where both signs should be considered since  $r - \varepsilon l$  may be negative. Note now that the insertion of (11) into Eq. (9) yields

$$\frac{\partial U}{\partial x} \rightarrow \frac{\beta}{s^3} \left( \frac{k_3}{s} - \frac{k_2}{s^2} \right) (l - \varepsilon r) - \frac{\alpha \varepsilon}{r^2} \left( \frac{k_1}{r} - \frac{k_2}{r^2} \right) - \frac{\alpha - \beta}{l^3} \left( \varepsilon r - \frac{\beta l}{\alpha - \beta} \right) \rightarrow 0.$$

Moreover we consider first the solution  $s \ll r - \varepsilon l$  in Eq. (15) which turns Eq. (14) into the form

$$\frac{\beta}{r - \varepsilon l^2} = \frac{k_3 \beta}{r - \varepsilon l^3} = \frac{k_2 \beta}{r - \varepsilon l^4} = \frac{\alpha}{r^2} = \frac{k_1 \alpha}{r^3} = \frac{k_2 \alpha}{r^4} = \frac{\alpha}{l^3} = \frac{\beta r}{l^2} = \frac{\beta \varepsilon}{l^2} \ll 1.$$

Since for all of the equations to be solved for  $r \ll \overline{AP}$  suggests putting both sides by  $r - \varepsilon l^4 r^4$  which assures to hear that we end up by studying a non algebraic equation. Moreover it is now convenient to adopt dimensionless units. For this purpose we point out that the length parameters  $k_1$  and  $k_3$  in the potential (1) are a linear combination of the gravitational radii  $L_\alpha, L_\beta$  of primaries and  $L_m$  of planetoid according to the relations

$$\begin{aligned} L_\alpha &\equiv \frac{G\alpha}{c^2}, \quad L_\beta \equiv \frac{G\beta}{c^2}, \quad L_m \equiv \frac{Gm}{c^2}, \\ l_\alpha &\ll L_\alpha = L_m, \quad l_\beta \ll L_\beta = L_m, \\ k_1 &\ll \kappa_1 l_\alpha, \quad k_3 \ll \kappa_3 l_\beta \ll \kappa_1 l_\beta, \end{aligned}$$

while  $k_2 \ll \kappa_2 l_P^2$  from Eq. (15). Furthermore all lengths involved are a fraction of the distance  $l$  along the primaries and hence we set

$$\psi \equiv \frac{r}{l}, \quad \rho \equiv \frac{\beta}{\alpha}, \quad \rho_\alpha \equiv \frac{l_\alpha}{l}, \quad \rho_\beta \equiv \frac{l_\beta}{l}, \quad \rho_P \equiv \frac{l_P}{l}.$$

In light of (16) we find the following dimensionless form of the non c result from Eq. (14)

$$\sum_{n=0}^9 A_n \psi^n \ll 1,$$

where

$$\begin{aligned} A_0 &\equiv -\rho^{-1} \kappa_2 \rho_P^2, \\ A_1 &\equiv -\rho^{-1} \left[ \kappa_1 \rho_\alpha - \varepsilon \kappa_2 \rho_P^2 \right], \\ A_2 &\equiv -\rho^{-1} \left[ -\varepsilon \kappa_1 \rho_\alpha - \kappa_2 \rho_P^2 \right], \\ A_3 &\equiv \rho^{-1} \left[ \varepsilon - \kappa_1 \rho_\alpha - \varepsilon \kappa_2 \rho_P^2 \right], \\ A_4 &\equiv -\rho^{-1} \left[ \varepsilon \rho - \kappa_1 \rho_\alpha - \rho_\beta \rho \varepsilon - \rho \kappa_2 \rho_P^2 \right], \\ A_5 &\equiv \rho^{-1} \left[ \varepsilon - \varepsilon \rho - \kappa_1 \rho_\alpha - \rho_\beta \rho \right], \\ A_6 &\equiv -\rho^{-1} \left[ \varepsilon - \varepsilon - \rho \right], \end{aligned}$$

$$\begin{aligned} A_7 &\equiv \frac{\rho^{-1}}{\rho}, \\ A_8 &\equiv -\frac{\rho^{-1}}{\rho\varepsilon}, \\ A_9 &\equiv 0. \end{aligned}$$

If we take instead the root  $s_{-} = r - \varepsilon l$  in Eq. (10) and insert it into Eq. (11) we find with analogous procedure the non c equation

$$\sum_{n=0}^9 B_n \psi^n_{-},$$

where

$$\begin{aligned} B_k &\equiv A_k \text{ f } k_{-}, \dots, \dots, \\ B_4 &\equiv \frac{\rho^{-1}}{\rho} \left[ -\frac{\varepsilon}{\rho} - \frac{\kappa_1 \varepsilon}{\rho_\alpha} - \frac{\rho_\beta \rho}{\rho} - \frac{\kappa_2}{\rho_P^2} \right], \\ B_5 &\equiv \frac{\rho^{-1}}{\rho} \left[ \frac{\varepsilon}{\rho} - \frac{\varepsilon}{\rho} - \frac{\kappa_1}{\rho_\alpha} - \frac{\rho_\beta \rho}{\rho} \right], \\ B_6 &\equiv -\frac{\rho^{-1}}{\rho} \left[ \frac{\varepsilon}{\rho} - \frac{\varepsilon}{\rho} \right]. \end{aligned}$$

In Newtonian theory the co-linear Lagrangian points  $L_1, L_2, L_3$  are ruled instead by a quant c equation as so ear by setting  $k_{1,-}, k_{2,-}, k_{3,-}$  in Eq. (10) and ut py ng the result ng equation by  $r - \varepsilon l^2 r^2$ . By virtue of the two choices of s gn in Eq. (10) one gets f  $s_{-} = r - \varepsilon l$  the quant c

$$\begin{aligned} \sum_{n=0}^5 C_n \psi^n_{-} &= \psi^5 - \frac{\rho}{\rho} \varepsilon \psi^4 - \frac{\rho}{\rho} \psi^3 - \frac{\varepsilon \rho}{\rho} \psi^2 \\ &\quad - \frac{\varepsilon}{\rho} \psi - \frac{\varepsilon}{\rho}, \end{aligned}$$

while  $s_{+} = r + \varepsilon l$  leads to the quant c

$$\begin{aligned} \sum_{n=0}^5 D_n \psi^n_{+} &= \psi^5 - \frac{\rho}{\rho} \varepsilon \psi^4 - \frac{\rho}{\rho} \psi^3 - \frac{-\varepsilon \rho}{\rho} \psi^2 \\ &\quad - \frac{\varepsilon}{\rho} \psi - \frac{\varepsilon}{\rho}. \end{aligned}$$

In this case the coefficients are related by

$$\begin{aligned} C_k &\equiv D_k \text{ f } k_{-}, \dots, \dots, \\ C_{2,-} &= \frac{\rho^{-1}}{\rho} D_{2,+}, \end{aligned}$$

$$C_{2,+} = -\rho^{-1} - \rho \not\leq D_{2,-} = -\rho^{-1} - \rho.$$

In light of Eqs. (10) and (11) we find the values of  $r$  distance from the planetoid to the primary in Newtonian theory given by

$$\begin{aligned} r_1 &= \sqrt[8]{\frac{1}{2} \left( \frac{1}{\mu} - \frac{1}{\mu^2} \right)}, \\ r_2 &= \sqrt[8]{\frac{1}{2} \left( \frac{1}{\mu} + \frac{1}{\mu^2} \right)}, \\ r_3 &= \sqrt[8]{\frac{1}{2} \left( \frac{1}{\mu} - \frac{1}{\mu^2} \right)}, \end{aligned}$$

where for the corresponding roots of the noncubic equations (10) and (11) we find

$$\begin{aligned} R_1 &= \sqrt[8]{\frac{1}{2} \left( \frac{1}{\mu} - \frac{1}{\mu^2} \right)}, \\ R_2 &= \sqrt[8]{\frac{1}{2} \left( \frac{1}{\mu} + \frac{1}{\mu^2} \right)}, \\ R_3 &= \sqrt[8]{\frac{1}{2} \left( \frac{1}{\mu} - \frac{1}{\mu^2} \right)}. \end{aligned}$$

By virtue of these values we find

$$\begin{aligned} R_1 - r_1 &= \frac{1}{8} \mu^{-1/8}, \\ R_2 - r_2 &= \frac{1}{8} \mu^{-1/8}, \\ R_3 - r_3 &= \frac{1}{8} \mu^{-1/8}. \end{aligned}$$

Interestingly the order of magnitude of quantum corrections to the location of  $L_1, L_2, L_3$  in the Earth-Moon system coincides with the order of magnitude of quantum corrections to  $L_4, L_5$  that we have found in Eq. (12). This may not have any practical consequence since  $L_1, L_2, L_3$  are points of unstable equilibrium, but the detailed analysis performed in this section adds evidence in favour of our evaluation of quantum corrections to a Lagrangian points in the Earth-Moon system being able to predict effects of order half a centimeter.

The small perturbations of such a scheme may result from the Sun. If one then considers a restricted four-body problem where the Earth and Moon move in circular orbits around their center of mass which in turn moves in a circular orbit about the Sun<sup>3</sup> one finds that  $L_4$  and  $L_5$  are no longer points of stable equilibrium. However, one can evaluate the pulse required to induce stability at  $L_4$  i.e. to force the planetoid to stay precisely at  $L_4$  such a pulse turns out to be  $10^{-10}$  s, i.e.  $10^{-10}$  s, as shown in Ref. [10].

<sup>3</sup> The Sun's effect on the planetoid is much larger than the Sun's effect on the Moon.

#### IV. TINY DEPARTURE FROM THE EQUILATERAL TRIANGLE PICTURE: PROSPECTS TO MEASURE THE EFFECT WITH LASER RANGING

The quantum gravity effect described in our paper can be studied with the technique of the Lunar Laser ranging hereafter LLR and a laser ranged test mass equipped with Cube Corner retro reflectors CCs to be designed ad hoc for this purpose. LLR is performed by the International Laser ranging service ILRS<sup>4</sup> which recently celebrated the 40th anniversary of the first successful LLR measurement which occurred at the Goddard Geophysical and Astronomical Observatory GGAO on October

<sup>4</sup> Detecting this tiny departure from classical gravity is a challenging task which requires precise positioning in space at the Lagrangian points  $L_4$  and  $L_5$  in absolute terms that is with respect to an appropriately chosen coordinate reference system. One potential choice is the International Terrestrial reference system ITRS<sup>5</sup> which is established with several geodesy techniques including LLR. The latter provides almost uniquely the retrograde motion of the Earth's center of mass geocenter and origin of the ITRS as well as together with Very Long Baseline Interferometry VLBI the absolute scale of length in space in Earth Orbit. Given its similarity with LLR another option for the coordinate frame is the solar system Barycenter B. In fact the distance of  $L_4$  and  $L_5$  from the ground laser stations of the ILRS is very close to the distance to the Laser retroreflector array LAs of deployed by the Apollo and Lunar Reconnaissance Orbiter which over the past years were used for some among the best precision tests of General relativity see refs

The Barycenter is particularly apt for the purpose since it is used for General relativity tests carried out with LLR data analysis by means of the orbit software package Planetary Ephemeris Program PEP since the eighties and until nowadays PEP has been developed by the Harvard-Smithsonian Center for Astrophysics I I Shapiro et al currently maintained by J. F. Chandler. A review of LLR data taking and analysis can be found in ref

A laser ranging test mass  $L_{tm}$  can be designed with a dedicated effort by exploiting the experience of LLR data taking and analysis described above and especially by taking advantage of existing capabilities for detailed pre-launch characterization of any kind of

---

<sup>4</sup> See <http://ilrs.gsfc.nasa.gov> for a description of satellite/lunar laser ranging. See also <http://ilrs.gsfc.nasa.gov/ilrw19/>.

$L_4$ s and/or test class for solar system exploration, some of the Key Performance Indicators (KPIs) that must be taken into account to design an appropriate  $L_{tm}$  for the signature of new physics described in this paper are as follows

Adequate laser return signal, radar optical cross section from the Lagrangian points  $L_4, L_5$

Acceptable rejection of the unavoidable nongravitational perturbations (NGPs) at  $L_4, L_5$  which *any* chosen test class and/or test spacecraft will experience whose complexity scales with the complexity of the structure of the test class and/or test spacecraft itself

Optimization/minimization of the value of the surface to mass ratio.  $M$  has a critical KPI since all NGPs related to the sun radiation pressure and thermal effects are proportional to  $M$  (see for example [1]). Compared to other test spacecrafts and/or test classes an  $L_{tm}$  has the advantage of the simplicity of geometric shape (for example spherical) and mechanical structure (to date Apollo Lunar Module are demonstrating a lifetime of at least 10 years)

Very low durability of the test class to prolonged measurements since  $L_{tm}$  are passive and maintenance free this KPI favors  $L_{tm}$  over other types of any active test classes and/or spacecrafts

The above KPIs can be characterized at the dedicated laboratory described by [1] (see also <http://www.infn.it/esperimenti/etrusco>). From the experimental point of view of laser ranging investigations arguments reported in this section for  $L_4$  and  $L_5$  apply identically to  $L_3$  (they do not apply to  $L_2$  since such a position is not visible from IL stations). The distance of  $L_1$  from Earth is shorter than for  $L_3, L_4$  and  $L_5$  which would make the laser return signal from an  $LR_{tm}$  in  $L_1$  higher than from  $L_3, L_4, L_5$  by a purely geometric factor equal to the fourth power of the ratio of the distances of  $L_3$  and  $L_1$  from any given IL station (see for example [1]). Given the relative proximity of  $L_1$  to the Moon gravitational effects on an  $LR_{tm}$  in  $L_1$  related to the nonpointlike structure of the Moon felt in  $L_1$  should be evaluated to determine the relevance of any conclusions of the previous section. This influence is expected to be negligible for an  $LR_{tm}$  in  $L_3, L_4$  and  $L_5$  since they are much more distant from the Moon than  $L_1$ .

## V. DISPLACED PERIODIC ORBITS FOR A SOLAR SAIL IN THE EARTH-MOON SYSTEM

Displaced periodic orbits describe the dynamics of the planetoid *e.g.* a solar sail in the neighborhood of the libration points which have been studied in detail in the quantum corrected case [1] and in Newtonian theory [2]. The appropriate tools of classical mechanics are the variational equations for which we refer the reader to refs. [3, 4]. In the simplest possible case the components  $x, y, z$  of the position vector of the sail (see Fig. 1) at each libration point change by the infinitesimal amount  $\xi, \eta, \zeta$  respectively and by retaining only first order terms in  $\xi, \eta, \zeta$  in the equations of motion one finds the following linear variational equations of motion for the libration points  $L_4, L_5$  describing stable equilibrium

$$\begin{aligned}\ddot{\xi} - \eta \left( U_{xx}^0 \xi + U_{xy}^0 \eta \right) &= a_\xi, \\ \ddot{\eta} - \xi \left( U_{xy}^0 \xi + U_{yy}^0 \eta \right) &= a_\eta, \\ \ddot{\zeta} - U_{zz}^0 \zeta &= a_\zeta,\end{aligned}$$

where the auxiliary variables  $a_\xi, a_\eta, a_\zeta$  describe the solar sail acceleration and  $U_{xx}^0, U_{yy}^0, U_{zz}^0, U_{xy}^0$  are the partial derivatives of the gravitational potential evaluated at  $L_4$  or  $L_5$ . Note that following ref. [5] we are here using units where the sum of the masses of the primaries is set to 1 as well as the distance and the Newton constant

Following ref. [6] assume now that a solution of the linearized equations of motion is periodic of the form

$$\begin{aligned}\xi(t) &= A_\xi \cos \omega_\star t + B_\xi \sin \omega_\star t, \\ \eta(t) &= A_\eta \cos \omega_\star t + B_\eta \sin \omega_\star t,\end{aligned}$$

where  $A_\xi, A_\eta, B_\xi$  and  $B_\eta$  are parameters to be determined and  $\omega_\star$  is the angular rate of the sun in the corotating frame in a dimensionless synodic coordinate system.

By substituting Eqs. (1) in the differential equations (2) we obtain the following linear system in  $A_\xi, A_\eta, B_\xi$  and  $B_\eta$

$$\begin{aligned}-\omega_\star^2 - U_{xx}^0 B_\xi - \omega_\star A_\eta - U_{xy}^0 B_\eta &= 0, \\ -U_{xy}^0 A_\xi - \omega_\star B_\xi - \omega_\star^2 - U_{yy}^0 A_\eta &= 0,\end{aligned}$$




FIG. 2: Schematic geometry of the Earth-Moon restricted three-body problem when the planetoid is a solar sail.

$$\begin{aligned}
 & -\omega_{\star}^2 U_{xx}^0 A_{\xi} - U_{xy}^0 A_{\eta} - \omega_{\star} B_{\eta} \rightharpoonup a_0 \cos^3 \varphi, \\
 & -\omega_{\star} A_{\xi} - U_{xy}^0 B_{\xi} - \omega_{\star}^2 U_{yy}^0 B_{\eta} \rightharpoonup -a_0 \cos^3 \varphi.
 \end{aligned}$$

h s , near syste can be solved to find the coefficients  $A_{\xi}, B_{\xi}, A_{\eta}, B_{\eta}$  here arranged in the four rows of a column vector  $\mathbf{P}$  while  $\mathbf{b}$  is the column vector whose four rows are the right hand sides of (10) and (11) respectively. Let  $A$  be the  $4 \times 4$  matrix

$$A \rightharpoonup \begin{pmatrix} A_1 & B_1 \\ C_1 & D_1 \end{pmatrix},$$

where the  $4 \times 4$  submatrices of  $A$  are

$$\begin{aligned}
 A_1 \rightharpoonup & \begin{pmatrix} -\omega_{\star}^2 - U_{xx}^0 & \\ -U_{xy}^0 & \omega_{\star} \end{pmatrix}, \\
 B_1 \rightharpoonup & \begin{pmatrix} \omega_{\star} & -U_{xy}^0 \\ -\omega_{\star}^2 - U_{yy}^0 & \end{pmatrix}, \\
 C_1 \rightharpoonup & \begin{pmatrix} -\omega_{\star}^2 - U_{xx}^0 & \\ -\omega_{\star} & -U_{xy}^0 \end{pmatrix},
 \end{aligned}$$




FIG. 3: Time evolution of  $\xi$  for  $L_4$  in the Newtonian case.

$$D_1 \rightarrow \begin{pmatrix} -U_{xy}^0 & -\omega_\star \\ -\omega_\star^2 & -U_{yy}^0 \end{pmatrix}.$$

with this matrix notation the solution of our linear system reads as ,

$$P^i \rightarrow A^{-1}{}^i{}_j b^j \forall i = 1, 2, 3.$$

The coefficients  $A_\xi, A_\eta, B_\xi$  and  $B_\eta$  are amplitudes that characterize the displaced periodic orbit

Last the out of plane motion Eq. (15) is decoupled from the in plane motion hence the solution of Eq. (15) is given by ,

$$\zeta(t) \rightarrow \theta(t) a_0 \cos^2 \varphi \sin \varphi |U_{zz}^0|^{-1} \cos \omega_\zeta t \left[ \zeta(t) \rightarrow -a_0 \cos^2 \varphi \sin \varphi |U_{zz}^0|^{-1} \right],$$

where  $\theta$  is a step function

$$\theta(t) \rightarrow 1 \text{ if } t > 0, \theta(t) \rightarrow 0 \text{ if } t < 0.$$

thus the required surface acceleration for a fixed distance can be given by ,

$$a_0 \rightarrow \frac{\zeta(t) |U_{zz}^0|}{\cos^2 \varphi \sin \varphi}.$$

In Newtonian theory the findings for displaced periodic orbits are well summarized in Figs. 3 and 4.

On considering the quantum corrections evaluated in detail in Sec. II and setting furthermore the angle  $\varphi \rightarrow \frac{\pi}{4}$  while  $\zeta(t) \rightarrow \omega_\star$  and  $a_0 \rightarrow 10^{-4}$  we arrive at the plots displayed in Figs. 5 and 6. The starting value of  $\zeta$  has been taken to be increased gradually to reach




FIG. 4: Time evolution of  $\eta$  for  $L_4$  in the Newtonian case.




FIG. 5: Periodic orbits at linear order around the Lagrangian point  $L_4$  in Newtonian theory.

Our calculations of interest because it shows that even our quantum corrected potential allows for periodic solutions in the neighborhood of uniform circular motion. The precise characterization of regions of stability and instability, of such dispersed periodic orbits is a fascinating problem for the years to come.




FIG. 6: Time evolution of  $\xi$  for  $L_4$  in the quantum-corrected model.




FIG. 7: Time evolution of  $\eta$  for  $L_4$  in the quantum-corrected model.




FIG. 8: Periodic orbits at linear order around the Lagrangian point  $L_4$ . We have used the quantum corrected coordinates obtained at the end of Sec. II. The periodic orbit is elliptic as in the Newtonian case displayed in Fig. 5.

## VI. CONCLUDING REMARKS AND OPEN PROBLEMS

It is not appropriate to begin our concluding remarks by stressing two conceptual aspects which are as follows

In the course of an orbit of a celestial body around another celestial body the mutual separation may change by a nonnegligible amount. This would be leading to a test of one-loop long distance quantum corrections to the Newtonian potential by investigating the orbits, because we do not have a formula for  $V(r)$  which is equally good at all points. By contrast, the evaluation of stable equilibrium points to first order in perturbations provides a definite prediction on the coordinates of such a point

which can be hopefully measured with the techniques outlined in Sec. III. In other words, coordinates of Lagrangian libration points  $L_4$  and  $L_5$  and displaced periodic orbits around unperturbed circular motion provide a valuable test of effective field theories of quantum gravity, whereas the orbits of celestial bodies are best studied within the framework of relativistic celestial mechanics.

At the risk of repeating ourselves, the technique of Refs. [1, 2] provides corrections to the Newtonian potential and hence the unperturbed dynamics of the Newtonian celestial mechanics of the Earth-Moon satellite system, which may provide a good example of circular restricted three-body problem. The quantum-corrected potential becomes  $V = -\frac{GMm}{r} \left( 1 + \frac{k_1}{r} + \frac{k_2}{r^2} \right)$  where  $k_1$  appears on dimensional grounds purely classical but includes a numerical coefficient  $\kappa_1$  which depends on the value taken by the coefficient  $\kappa_2$  that multiplies  $l_P^2/r^2$ .

$$\kappa_1 \simeq \kappa_1 \kappa_2, \quad k_2 \simeq \kappa_2 l_P^2.$$

Thus, we do not compute corrections to relativistic celestial mechanics of Ref. [1] but on the other hand, we need the advanced tools of relativistic celestial mechanics to test the tiny effect predicted in Eq. (1). We should mention at this stage the important work of Ref. [3] where the authors obtain a triangular solution to the general relativistic three-body problem for general masses and find that the post-Newtonian configuration for three non-relativistic masses is not always equilateral. When the technique is applied to the Earth-Moon system, we find using our Eq. (1) a correction to the  $x$ -coordinate of  $L_4$  of order  $10^{-10}$  m.

and a correction to the  $y$ -coordinate of  $L_4$  of order  $10^{-10}$  m. The former agrees with our orders of magnitude while the latter being less than a millimeter is very hardly detectable.

Our original contribution consists of the detailed calculation of the roots of the quantum equation in Sec. II, which is an original application of techniques previously developed by Athanassopoulos, second, the derivation and solution of the non-linear equation in Sec. III for quantum corrections to co-orbiting Lagrangian points and third, the application of the roots in Sec. II to the evaluation of displaced periodic orbits of solar sails in the Earth-Moon system when the one-loop long-distance quantum corrections to the Newtonian potential are taken into account. The use of dimensionless variables for the quantum equation and the exponent of exact formulas for its roots were of crucial importance to double-check the numerical predictions of Refs. [1, 2]. Interestingly, we have found that

a refined analysis, the ours confirms the orders of magnitude obtained in [eq. \(1\)](#) whereas the sign of  $|y_Q| - |y_C|$  gets reversed with respect to [eq. \(1\)](#) and its expected theoretical value turns out to be smaller by 10 per cent. Furthermore, dressed periodic orbits have been evaluated in [sec. II](#) with the quantum corrected coordinates displayed in [Eq. \(10\)](#) when the condition for the existence of dressed orbits is affected by terms resulting from a solar sail model. We have found that even when the quantum corrected potential is adopted the dressed periodic orbits are of elliptical shape (see [Fig. 1](#)) as in the Newtonian theory. The solar sail model is an interesting possibility considered over the last few decades but is not necessarily better than alternative models of planetary. For example, the large structure and optical nature of solar sails can create a considerable challenge. If the structure and mass distribution of the sails is complicated one has to resort to suitable approximations. Furthermore, the characterization of regions of stability or instability of dressed periodic orbits of solar sails is a theoretical problem whose solution might have far reaching consequences for designing space missions.

Last but not least, the laser ranging techniques outlined in [sec. II](#) appear as a promising tool for testing the predictions at the end of [sec. II](#). The years to come will hopefully tell us whether a laser ranging test class can be designed upon consideration of the four key performance indicators stated at the end of [sec. I](#). At that stage the task will be able to actually send a satellite at  $L_4$  and keep it there despite the perturbations caused by the Sun, which has never been accomplished to the best of our knowledge. The resulting low energy test of quantum gravity in the solar system would reward the considerable effort necessary to achieve this.

## Acknowledgments

E. B. and G. E. are indebted to John Donoghue for enlightening correspondence and to Massimo Cerdonio and Alberto Vecchiato for conversations. G. E. is grateful to the Dipartimento di Fisica of Federico II University Naples for hospitality and support.

## Appendix A: Bring-Jerrard form of quintic equations

Let us start from the general quintic equation

$$X^5 + a_4X^4 + a_3X^3 + a_2X^2 + a_1X + a_0 = 0. \quad \text{A}$$

Denote the roots of Eq. A by  $X_i, i = 1, \dots, 5$  and let

$$S_n = S_n(X_k) \equiv \sum_{k=1}^5 X_k^n \quad \text{A}$$

be the sum of the  $n$ th powers of such roots. By virtue of the Newton power sum formula a general representation of  $S_n$  is

$$S_n = -na_{5-n} - \sum_{j=1}^{n-1} S_{n-j}a_{5-j}, \quad \text{A}$$

with the understanding that  $a_j = 0$  for  $j < 0$ . For the lowest values of  $n$  Eq. A yields  $S_1(X_k) = -a_4$ ,  $S_2(X_k) = a_4^2 - a_3$ ,  $S_3(X_k) = a_4^3 - a_3a_4 - a_2$

$$S_4(X_k) = a_4^4 - a_3a_4^2 - a_2a_4 - a_3^2 - a_1, \quad \text{A}$$

$$S_5(X_k) = a_4^5 - \left[ a_3a_4^3 - a_2a_4^2 - a_3^2a_4 - a_1a_4 - a_0 - a_2a_3 \right]. \quad \text{A}$$

A systematic way to proceed involves two steps: the first a quadratic schrodinger transformation

$$Y_k = X_k^2 + \mu X_k + \nu \quad \text{A}$$

between the roots  $X_k$  of Eq. A and the roots  $Y_k$  of the principal quintic

$$X^5 + c_2X^2 + c_1X + c_0 = 0, \quad \text{A}$$

suggested by the evaluation of  $S_1(Y_k), \dots, S_5(Y_k)$  to obtain through radicals  $\mu, \nu, c_0, c_1, c_2$  and eventually a quartic schrodinger transformation

$$Z_k = Y_k^4 + u_1Y_k^3 + u_2Y_k^2 + u_3Y_k + u_4, \quad \text{A}$$

between the roots  $Y_k$  of Eq. A and the roots  $Z_k$  of the Bring-Jerrard form of the quintic. This procedure is conceptually clear although rather lengthy (see Appendix B and the footnote of inverting A) and then A to find  $X_k = X_k(Y_j, Z_l)$  leads to

candidate roots, which is not very helpful if one is interested in the numerical values of such roots as indeed we are. One might instead stick to our Eq. (1) and then try to exploit the Brianchon theorem according to which the roots of any quintic can be re-expressed through generalized hypergeometric functions, i.e. the ones defined in our Sec. II. However, when there are three or more nonvanishing coefficients as in Eq. (1) the Brianchon theorem leads to too many (for numerical purposes) hypergeometric functions in the general expansion of roots. Furthermore, the set of (near) particular differential equations obeyed by the roots when viewed as functions of all coefficients does not lead easily to the compact form

At this stage having appreciated the need for a truly accessible Brianchon-Jerrard form of the quintic and rather than feeling despair we point out that since in our original quintic (1) two coefficients vanish, i.e.  $a_2 = a_1 = 0$ , it is more convenient to use what is now usually called in the generic case (1) the Cayley-Schroeder transformation between the roots  $X_k$  of Eq. (A) and the roots  $Y_k$  of Eq.

$$Y_k = X_k^3 - \lambda_1 X_k^2 - \lambda_2 X_k - \lambda_3. \quad (\text{A})$$

By virtue of Eqs. (1) and (A) we find

$$S_1 Y_k = S_2 Y_k = S_3 Y_k = 0, \quad (\text{A})$$

$$S_4 Y_k = d_1, \quad S_5 Y_k = d_0. \quad (\text{A})$$

On assuming the cubic relation (A) Eqs. (A) become a nonlinear algebraic system leading to the numerical evaluation of  $\lambda_1, \lambda_2, \lambda_3$ . More precisely from  $S_1 Y_k = 0$  we find

$$\lambda_3 - \lambda_2 S_1 X_k - \lambda_1 S_2 X_k - S_3 X_k^3 = 0, \quad (\text{A})$$

while from  $S_2 Y_k = 0$  we obtain

$$\begin{aligned} & \lambda_3^2 - \lambda_2 \lambda_3 S_1 X_k - \lambda_2^2 - \lambda_1 \lambda_3 S_2 X_k - \lambda_1 \lambda_2 - \lambda_3 S_3 X_k \\ & - \lambda_1^2 - \lambda_2 S_4 X_k - \lambda_1 S_5 X_k - S_6 X_k^3 = 0. \end{aligned} \quad (\text{A})$$

Last, from the vanishing of  $S_3 Y_k$  we get

$$\begin{aligned} & \lambda_3^3 - \lambda_2 \lambda_3^2 S_1 X_k - \lambda_2^2 \lambda_3 S_2 X_k - \lambda_2^3 S_3 X_k \\ & - \lambda_1^2 \lambda_3 S_4 X_k - \lambda_1^2 \lambda_2 - \lambda_1 \lambda_3 S_5 X_k - \lambda_1^3 - \lambda_3 - \lambda_1 \lambda_2 S_6 X_k \\ & - \lambda_1^2 - \lambda_2 S_7 X_k - \lambda_1 S_8 X_k - S_9 X_k^3 = 0. \end{aligned} \quad (\text{A})$$

the system A cannot be solved by radicals because if one expresses for example  $\lambda_1$  as a near function of  $\lambda_2$  and  $\lambda_3$  from Eq A and one solves the resulting quadratic equation for  $\lambda_2 \rightleftharpoons \lambda_2 - \lambda_3$  or  $\lambda_3 \rightleftharpoons \lambda_3 - \lambda_2$  from Eq A one discovers that Eq A is not a polynomial in  $\lambda_3$  respectively  $\lambda_2$ . Nevertheless *for numerical purposes* the system A can be solved and has been solved from us in the Earth-Moon system. Last from Eq A we find the coefficients  $d_1$  and  $d_0$  in the Bring-Jerrard form of the quintic according to the formulas

$$d_1 \rightleftharpoons -S_4 - Y_k \sum_{i=0}^{12} b_{1i} S_i X_k, \quad \text{A}$$

$$d_0 \rightleftharpoons -S_5 - Y_k \sum_{i=0}^{15} b_{0i} S_i X_k, \quad \text{A}$$

We have evaluated all  $b_{1i}$  and  $b_{0i}$  coefficients by applying patiently the Schrnhaus transformation A and the definition A and therefore sets of possible values for  $\lambda_1, \lambda_2, \lambda_3$  see tables I and II which lead always to the same values of  $d_1$  and  $d_0$  thus is a crucial consistency check.

$$d_1(w) \rightleftharpoons \dots -176 \dots -186, \quad d_1(u) \rightleftharpoons \dots -176 - \dots -188, \quad \text{A}$$

$$d_0(w) \rightleftharpoons \dots -220 - \dots -230, \quad d_0(u) \rightleftharpoons - \dots -220 \dots -232, \quad \text{A}$$

where  $w$  and  $u$  are the variables defined in Eqs and respectively. Eventually the roots  $X_k$  of our quintic have been obtained by solving Eq A for  $X_k \rightleftharpoons X_k - Y_k$  with the help of the solution algorithm for the cubic equation. This means that we first re-express A in the form

$$h(X_k) \equiv X_k^3 - \kappa_2 X_k^2 - \kappa_1 X_k - \kappa_0 \rightleftharpoons, \quad \text{A}$$

where  $\kappa_2 \equiv \lambda_1, \kappa_1 \equiv \lambda_2, \kappa_0 \equiv \lambda_3 - Y_k$  we then define the new variable

$$V_k \equiv X_k - \frac{\kappa_2}{3} \rightleftharpoons X_k - \frac{\lambda_1}{3}, \quad \text{A}$$

in terms of which Eq A is adapted into its canonical form

$$V_k^3 - pV_k - q \rightleftharpoons, \quad p \equiv h' \left( -\frac{\kappa_2}{3} \right), \quad q \equiv h \left( -\frac{\kappa_2}{3} \right). \quad \text{A}$$

As shown in Ref. of the discriminant

$$\delta \equiv -\frac{q^2}{p^3} \quad \text{A}$$

s such that  $|\delta| < 1$  or if  $\delta \rightarrow 0$ , the three roots of Eq. A can be expressed through the Gauss hypergeometric function for

$$V_{k=1} = \sqrt{-p} \left[ - {}_3F_1 \left( - , - , - ; -\delta \right) - \sqrt{\frac{\delta}{-p}} F \left( - , - , - ; -\delta \right) \right] \quad \text{A}$$

$$V_{k=3} = -\sqrt{-\frac{p\delta}{3}} F \left( - , - , - ; -\delta \right). \quad \text{A}$$

As seen from A, A, A, our methodology eventually calculate roots and by inserting into the original quintic we have found the effective roots at the end of Sec. II

TABLE I: The six triplets of values of  $\lambda_3$ ,  $\lambda_2$  and  $\lambda_1$  for the  $1/r$ -equation (2.1).

| $n$ th triplet | $\lambda_3$                                     | $\lambda_2$                     | $\lambda_1$                                    |
|----------------|-------------------------------------------------|---------------------------------|------------------------------------------------|
| n=1            | $-4.98 \times 10^{45} - 3.10 \times 10^{-55} i$ | $0.26 + 1.59 \times 10^{-11} i$ | $4.21 \times 10^{32} + 3.78 \times 10^{-44} i$ |
| n=2            | $-4.98 \times 10^{45} + 3.10 \times 10^{-55} i$ | $0.26 - 1.59 \times 10^{-11} i$ | $4.21 \times 10^{32} - 3.78 \times 10^{-44} i$ |
| n=3            | $2.49 \times 10^{-45} + 4.32 \times 10^{-45} i$ | $0.26 + 2.57 \times 10^{-11} i$ | $4.21 \times 10^{32} + 6.11 \times 10^{-44} i$ |
| n=4            | $2.49 \times 10^{-45} - 4.32 \times 10^{-45} i$ | $0.26 - 2.57 \times 10^{-11} i$ | $4.21 \times 10^{32} - 6.11 \times 10^{-44} i$ |
| n=5            | $2.49 \times 10^{-45} + 4.32 \times 10^{-45} i$ | $0.26 + 9.82 \times 10^{-12} i$ | $4.21 \times 10^{32} + 2.34 \times 10^{-44} i$ |
| n=6            | $2.49 \times 10^{-45} - 4.32 \times 10^{-45} i$ | $0.26 - 9.82 \times 10^{-12} i$ | $4.21 \times 10^{32} - 2.34 \times 10^{-44} i$ |

TABLE II: The six triplets of values of  $\lambda_3$ ,  $\lambda_2$  and  $\lambda_1$  for the  $1/s$ -equation (2.2).

| $n$ th triplet | $\lambda_3$                                     | $\lambda_2$                     | $\lambda_1$                                    |
|----------------|-------------------------------------------------|---------------------------------|------------------------------------------------|
| n=1            | $-4.98 \times 10^{45} - 3.82 \times 10^{-57} i$ | $0.26 + 1.96 \times 10^{-13} i$ | $5.17 \times 10^{30} + 3.78 \times 10^{-44} i$ |
| n=2            | $-4.98 \times 10^{45} + 3.82 \times 10^{-57} i$ | $0.26 - 1.96 \times 10^{-13} i$ | $5.17 \times 10^{30} - 3.78 \times 10^{-44} i$ |
| n=3            | $2.49 \times 10^{-45} + 4.32 \times 10^{-45} i$ | $0.26 + 3.16 \times 10^{-13} i$ | $5.17 \times 10^{30} + 6.11 \times 10^{-44} i$ |
| n=4            | $2.49 \times 10^{-45} - 4.32 \times 10^{-45} i$ | $0.26 - 3.16 \times 10^{-13} i$ | $5.17 \times 10^{30} - 6.11 \times 10^{-44} i$ |
| n=5            | $2.49 \times 10^{-45} + 4.32 \times 10^{-45} i$ | $0.26 + 1.21 \times 10^{-13} i$ | $5.17 \times 10^{30} + 2.34 \times 10^{-44} i$ |
| n=6            | $2.49 \times 10^{-45} - 4.32 \times 10^{-45} i$ | $0.26 - 1.21 \times 10^{-13} i$ | $5.17 \times 10^{30} - 2.34 \times 10^{-44} i$ |

Yet another valuable solution algorithm is available in the method of [1] which expresses the roots of the quintic A through two infinite series in the Jacobian  $\theta$  and the theta series for which fast convergence is obtained but the need to evaluate the roots

with a large number of decimadigits, a test problem at least as far as we can see to deal with such series. Further variable work on the quintic can be found in [14].

## Appendix B: Alternative route to the quintic

We here find it useful to give details about the alternative to the procedure used in Appendix A. For that purpose, we shall assume that the roots  $X_k$  of Eq. A are related to the roots  $Y_k$  of the principal quintic A by the quadratic transformation A. The power sums for the principal quintic for are indeed

$$S_1(Y_k) = S_2(Y_k) = S_3(Y_k) = c_2, S_4(Y_k) = c_1, S_5(Y_k) = c_0. \quad B$$

On the other hand, we can evaluate  $S_1(Y_k)$  and  $S_2(Y_k)$  by using the quadratic transformation A and exploiting the identities

$$S_1(Y_k) = S_2(X_k) = \mu S_1(X_k) = \nu, \quad B$$

$$S_2(Y_k) = S_4(X_k) = \mu S_3(X_k) = \mu^2 = \nu S_2(X_k) = \mu\nu S_1(X_k) = \nu^2, \quad B$$

obtaining therefore the following equations for  $\mu$  and  $\nu$

$$\mu a_4 = \nu = a_3 - a_4^2, \quad B$$

$$\mu^2 a_3 = \nu^2 = \mu(a_2 - a_3 a_4) = a_1 - a_2 a_4 - a_3^2, \quad B$$

where in the course of arriving at Eq. B we have re-expressed repeatedly  $a_4^2$  from Eq. B. This system's quadratic with respect to  $\mu$  and  $\nu$  and hence leads to two sets of coefficients. For the case studied in Eq. they reduce to here  $a_3 = \rho_3, a_4 = \rho_4$

$$\mu_{\pm} = \frac{a_4(a_3 - a_4^2 \pm \sqrt{a_3^3 - a_3 a_4^2})}{a_3 - a_4^2}, \quad B$$

$$\nu_{\pm} = \frac{\mu_{\pm}}{a_4} = a_3 - a_4^2. \quad B$$

There is complete freedom to choose either of these. After finding  $\mu$  and  $\nu$  in such a way, one can use the Eqs. B to obtain  $c_0, c_1, c_2$ . One finds explicitly in general

$$\begin{aligned} c_0 &= -\nu^5 - \mu\nu^4 S_1(X_k) - \mu^2\nu^3 = \nu^4 S_2(X_k) - (\mu^3\nu^2 + \mu\nu^3) S_3(X_k) \\ &= (\mu^4\nu + \mu^2\nu^2 + \nu^3) S_4(X_k) - \left(\frac{\mu^5}{\nu} + \mu^3\nu + \mu\nu^2\right) S_5(X_k) \\ &= \mu^4 + \mu^2\nu + \nu^2 S_6(X_k) - \mu^3 + \mu\nu S_7(X_k) - \mu^2 - \nu S_8(X_k) \\ &= \mu S_9(X_k) = -S_{10}(X_k), \end{aligned} \quad B$$

$$\begin{aligned}
c_1 &\rightarrow -\nu^4 - \mu\nu^3 S_1 X_k - \left( -\mu^2\nu^2 \quad \nu^3 \right) S_2 X_k \\
&- \mu^3\nu \quad \mu\nu^2 S_3 X_k - \left( \frac{\mu^2}{\nu} \quad \mu^2\nu \quad -\nu^2 \right) S_4 X_k - \mu^3 \quad \mu\nu S_5 X_k \\
&- \left( -\mu^2 \quad \nu \right) S_6 X_k - \mu S_7 X_k - S_8 X_k, \tag{B}
\end{aligned}$$

$$\begin{aligned}
c_2 &\rightarrow -\nu^3 - \mu\nu^2 S_1 X_k - \mu^2\nu \quad \nu^2 S_2 X_k - \frac{\mu}{\nu} \mu^2 \quad \nu S_3 X_k \\
&- \mu^2 \quad \nu S_4 X_k - \mu S_5 X_k - S_6 X_k. \tag{B}
\end{aligned}$$

he re-ova from a general quant c of the three terms in  $X^4, X^3$  and  $X^2$  brings t to the Br ng Jerrard form here re wr tten for conven ence as

$$X^5 - d_1 X - d_0 \rightarrow. \tag{B}$$

By virtue of the Newton form as A the power sums for the quant c B are

$$S_1 Z_k \rightarrow S_2 Z_k \rightarrow S_3 Z_k \rightarrow, S_4 Z_k \rightarrow -d_1, S_5 Z_k \rightarrow -d_0. \tag{B}$$

Assu ng now follow ng Br ng that the roots  $Z_k$  of Eq B are related by the quart c transform at on A to the roots  $Y_k$  of the princ pal quant c A we can substitute Eq A into Eq B h s leads to a syste of ve equations w th s x un nown variables More precise y from the equation

$$S_1 Z_k \rightarrow u_4 - c_1 - u_1 c_2 \rightarrow, \tag{B}$$

one nds

$$u_4 \rightarrow -c_1 - c_2 u_1. \tag{B}$$

he second equation

$$\begin{aligned}
S_2 Z_k \rightarrow &- u_1 u_2 c_0 - u_2^2 c_1 - c_1^2 - c_0 c_2 - u_1 c_1 c_2 \\
&\left[ -u_1^2 \quad u_2 \right] c_2^2 - u_3 c_0 - u_1 c_1 - u_2 c_2 \rightarrow, \tag{B}
\end{aligned}$$

obtained from the dent tes

$$\begin{aligned}
S_2 Z_k \rightarrow &S_8 Y_k - u_1 S_7 Y_k - u_1^2 - u_2 S_6 Y_k - u_1 u_2 - u_3 S_5 Y_k \\
&- u_2^2 - u_4 - u_1 u_3 S_4 Y_k - u_2 u_3 - u_1 u_4 S_3 Y_k - u_4^2, \tag{B}
\end{aligned}$$

$$S_6 Y_k = c_2^2, S_7 Y_k = c_1 c_2, S_8 Y_k = c_0 c_2 - c_1^2, \quad \text{B}$$

relates  $u_2$  and  $u_3$  the clever idea of the Br\"ugger-Jerrard method is choosing  $u_2$  in such a way that the coefficient of  $u_3$  in Eq. B vanishes. By inspection one finds immediately

$$u_2 = -\frac{c_0}{c_2} - \frac{c_1}{c_2} u_1. \quad \text{B}$$

thus Eq. B now depends only on  $u_1$  and is a quadratic equation

$$\left[ \begin{array}{ccc} c_2^4 - c_1^3 & c_0 c_1 c_2 & \\ c_1 c_2^2 - c_0 c_2^3 - c_0^2 c_1 & & \end{array} \right] u_1^2 + \left[ \begin{array}{ccc} c_1 c_2^3 - c_0 c_1^2 & c_0^2 c_2 & \end{array} \right] u_1 = 0. \quad \text{B}$$

Lastly by setting the sum of the cubes of A to zero by virtue of B a cubic equation for  $u_3$  is obtained by virtue of the identity

$$S_3 Z_k = u_4^3 - \sum_{l=2}^{12} b_l S_l Y_k, \quad \text{B}$$

where recall that we already know  $S_1 Y_k \dots S_8 Y_k$

$$b_2 = u_2 u_4^2, \quad \text{B}$$

$$b_3 = u_3^3 - u_1 u_4^2 - u_2 u_3 u_4, \quad \text{B}$$

$$b_4 = u_2^2 u_4 - u_4^2 - u_2 u_3^2 - u_1 u_3 u_4, \quad \text{B}$$

$$b_5 = u_2^2 u_3 - u_1 u_3^2 - u_4 u_3 - u_1 u_2, \quad \text{B}$$

$$b_6 = u_2^3 - u_1^2 u_4 - u_3^2 - u_2 u_4 - u_1 u_3, \quad \text{B}$$

$$b_7 = u_1^2 u_3 - u_2^2 u_1 - u_1 u_4 - u_2 u_3, \quad \text{B}$$

$$b_8 = u_4 - u_1^2 u_2 - u_2^2 - u_1 u_3, \quad \text{B}$$

$$b_9 = u_1^3 - u_3 - u_1 u_2, \quad \text{B}$$

$$b_{10} = u_2 - u_1^2, \quad \text{B}$$

$$b_{11} = u_1, \quad \text{B}$$

$$b_{12} = 0, \quad \text{B}$$

$$S_9 Y_k = c_0 c_1 - c_2^3, \quad \text{B}$$

$$S_{10} Y_k = c_0^2 - c_1 c_2^2, \quad \text{B}$$

$$S_{11} Y_k = c_0 c_2^2 - c_1^2 c_2, \quad \text{B}$$

$$S_{12} Y_k = c_0 c_1 c_2 - c_1^3 - c_2^4. \quad \text{B}$$

Another adequate quantites for reduction to the Bragg-Jerrard form can be therefore found in terms of radii. Of course, once the irreducible quintic B-solved in terms of hypergeometric functions as outlined in sec. II, one has to invert the Schwarzian Bragg quartic transformation (A) to obtain the solutions of the principal quintic (A) and eventually of the original quintic (A) as well.

$$X_k = X_k Y_j Z_l. \quad \text{B}$$

thus one obtains in general twenty candidates for the solutions and only numerical testing can tell which ones are correct.

- 
- [1] A. Einstein, *Annalen Phys.* **49**, 769 (1916).
  - [2] Y. Choquet-Bruhat, *General Relativity and the Einstein Equations* (Oxford University Press, Oxford, 2009).
  - [3] A. S. Wightman, *Fortschr. Phys.* **44**, 173 (1996).
  - [4] J. Polchinski, *String Theory* (Cambridge University Press, Cambridge, 1998).
  - [5] C. Rovelli, *Quantum Gravity* (Cambridge University Press, Cambridge, 2004).
  - [6] R. Penrose and M. A. H. MacCallum, *Phys. Rep.* **6 C**, 241 (1973).
  - [7] G. Esposito, *An Introduction to Quantum Gravity*, UNESCO Encyclopedia (UNESCO, Paris, France, 2011).
  - [8] B. S. DeWitt, *Phys. Rev.* **162**, 1239 (1967).
  - [9] C. Kiefer and M. Kramer, *Phys. Rev. Lett.* **108**, 021301 (2012).
  - [10] D. Bini, G. Esposito, K. Kiefer, M. Kramer, and F. Pessina, *Phys. Rev. D* **87**, 104008 (2013).
  - [11] D. Bini and G. Esposito, *Phys. Rev. D* **89**, 084032 (2014).
  - [12] A. Yu. Kamenshchik, A. Tronconi, and G. Venturi, *Phys. Lett. B* **726**, 518 (2013).
  - [13] A. Yu. Kamenshchik, A. Tronconi, and G. Venturi, *Phys. Lett. B* **734**, 72 (2014).
  - [14] A. Ashoorioon, P. S. Bhupal Dev, and A. Mazumdar, *Mod. Phys. Lett. A* **29**, 1450163 (2014);  
L. Krauss and F. Wilczek, *Phys. Rev. D* **89**, 047501 (2014).
  - [15] J. F. Donoghue, *Phys. Rev. Lett.* **72**, 2996 (1994).

- [16] J. F. Donoghue, Phys. Rev. D **50**, 3874 (1994).
- [17] J. F. Donoghue, arXiv:gr-qc/9405057.
- [18] I. J. Muzinich and S. Vokos, Phys. Rev. D **52**, 3472 (1995).
- [19] H. W. Hamber and S. Liu, Phys. Lett. B **357**, 51 (1995).
- [20] A. A. Akhundov, S. Bellucci, and A. Shiekh, Phys. Lett. B **395**, 16 (1997).
- [21] I. B. Khriplovich and G. G. Kirilin, Sov. Phys. JETP **95**, 981 (2002).
- [22] N. E. J. Bjerrum-Bohr, J. F. Donoghue, and B. R. Holstein, Phys. Rev. D **67**, 084033 (2003).
- [23] E. Battista and G. Esposito, Phys. Rev. D **89**, 084030 (2014).
- [24] E. Battista and G. Esposito, Phys. Rev. D **90**, 084010 (2014).
- [25] H. Poincaré, Acta Mathematica **13**, 1 (1890); Bull. Astronomique **8**, 12 (1891).
- [26] H. Poincaré, *Les Methodes Nouvelles de la Mecanique Celeste* (Gauthier-Villars, Paris, 1892),  
reprinted as *New Methods of Celestial Mechanics*, edited by D. L. Goroff (American Institute  
of Physics, College Park, 1993).
- [27] L. A. Pars, *A Treatise on Analytical Dynamics* (Heinemann, London, 1965).
- [28] E. V. Pitjeva, in *Relativity in Fundamental Astronomy, Proceedings IAU Symposium No. 261*,  
Eds. S. A. Klioner, P. K. Seidelman, and M. H. Soffel, 2009.
- [29] J. Simo and C. R. McInnes, in *59th International Astronomical Congress, Glasgow, Scotland*,  
2008.
- [30] J. Simo and C. R. McInnes, Comm. Nonlinear Sci. Numer. Simulat. **14**, 4191 (2009).
- [31] J. Simo and C. R. McInnes, J. of Guidance, Control, and Dynamics **32**, 1666 (2009).
- [32] J. Simo and C. R. McInnes, J. of Guidance, Control, and Dynamics **33**, 259 (2010).
- [33] J. Simo and C. R. McInnes, Acta Astronautica **96**, 106 (2014).
- [34] C. R. McInnes, *Solar Sailing: Technology, Dynamics and Mission Applications* (Springer  
Praxis, London, 1999).
- [35] T. Waters and C. R. McInnes, J. of Guidance, Control, and Dynamics **30**, 687 (2007).
- [36] V. Szebehely, *Theory of Orbits: the Restricted Problem of Three Bodies* (Academic Press, New  
York, 1967).
- [37] A. E. Roy, *Orbital Motion* (Institute of Physics Publishing, Philadelphia, 2005).
- [38] F. O. Vonbun, NASA report TN-D-4468 (1968).
- [39] R. Thurman and P. Worfolk, Technical report GC95, Geometry Center, University of Min-  
nesota (1996).

- [40] G. Gomez, J. Libre, R. Martinez, and C. Simo, *Dynamics and Mission Design Near Libration Points*, Vol. I, II (World Scientific, Singapore, 2001).
- [41] G. Gomez, A. Jorba, J. Masdemont, and C. Simo, *Dynamics and Mission Design Near Libration Points*, Vol. III, IV (World Scientific, Singapore, 2001).
- [42] R. W. Farquhar and A. A. Kamel, *Cel. Mech.* **7**, 458 (1973).
- [43] R. W. Farquhar, NASA technical report (1971).
- [44] J. V. Breakwell and J. V. Brown, *Cel. Mech.* **20**, 389 (1979).
- [45] D. L. Richardson, *J. Guidance and Control* **3**, 543 (1980).
- [46] K. C. Howell, *Cel. Mech.* **32**, 53 (1984).
- [47] K. C. Howell and B. G. Marchand, *Dyn. Systems: An Int. J.* **20**, 149 (2005).
- [48] C. McInnes, *J. of Spacecraft and Rocket* **30**, 782 (1993).
- [49] E. S. Bring, *Quart. J. Math.* **6** (1864).
- [50] G. B. Jerrard, *An Essay on the Resolution of Equations* (Taylor and Francis, New York, 1859).
- [51] C. Hermite, *Comptes Rendus Acad. Sci. Paris* **46**, 508 (1858).
- [52] R. Birkeland, in *International Congress of Mathematicians* (1924).
- [53] B. D. Tapley and J. M. Lewallen, *AIAA J.* **2**, 728 (1964).
- [54] Z. Altamimi, X. Collilieux, J. Legrand et al., *J. Geophys. Res.* **112**, B09401 (2007).
- [55] M. R. Pearlman, J. J. Degnan, and J. M. Bosworth, *Adv. Space Res.* **30**, 135 (2002).
- [56] P. L. Bender et al., *Science* **182**, 229 (1973).
- [57] J. G. Williams, S. G. Turyshev, and D. H. Boggs, *Phys. Rev. Lett.* **93**, 261101 (2004).
- [58] I. I. Shapiro, R. D. Reasenberg, J. F. Chandler, and R. W. Babcock, *Phys. Rev. Lett.* **61**, 2643 (1988).
- [59] S. Dell’Agnello et al., *Nucl. Instr. Methods Phys. Res. A* **692**, 275 (2012).
- [60] M. Martini, S. Dell’Agnello et al., *Planet Space Sci.* **74**, 276 (2012).
- [61] R. March, G. Bellettini, R. Tauraso, and S. Dell’Agnello, *Phys. Rev. D* **83**, 104008 (2011).
- [62] R. March, G. Bellettini, R. Tauraso, and S. Dell’Agnello, *Gen. Relativ. Gravit.* **43**, 3099 (2011).
- [63] S. Dell’Agnello et al., *J. Adv. Space Res.* **47**, 822 (2011).
- [64] S. Dell’Agnello et al., in *ESA Proc. Int. Conf. on Space Optics* (Tenerife, Spain, Oct. 2014).
- [65] D. Currie, S. Dell’Agnello, G. O. Delle Monache, B. Behr, and J. G. Williams, *Nucl. Phys. B Proc. Suppl.* **243**, 218 (2013).

- [66] S. Dell’Agnello et al., *Exp. Astron.* **32**, 19 (2011).
- [67] D. Vokrouhlicky, *Icarus* **126**, 293 (1997).
- [68] G. Huang and X. Wu, *Phys. Rev. D* **89**, 124034 (2014).
- [69] K. Yamada and H. Asada, *Phys. Rev. D* **86**, 124029 (2012).
- [70] T. Levi Civita, *Opere Matematiche, Vol. II* (Zanichelli, Bologna, 1956).
- [71] E. Tschirnhaus, *ACM SIGSAM Bulletin* **37**, N. 143, 1 (2003).
- [72] V. S. Adamchik and D. J. Jeffrey, *ACM SIGSAM Bulletin* **37**, N. 3, 90 (2003).
- [73] R. Birkeland, *Comptes Rendus Acad. Sciences Paris* **171**, 1370 (1920).
- [74] B. Sturmfels, *Discrete Math.* **210**, 171 (2000).
- [75] R. B. King and E. R. Canfield, *J. Math. Phys.* **32**, 823 (1991).
- [76] R. Drociuk, [arXiv:math/0207058](https://arxiv.org/abs/math/0207058) [math.GM].