



$$I(J^{PC}) = 0,1(1^{- -})$$

γ MASS

Results prior to 2008 are critiqued in GOLDHABER 10.

The following conversions are useful: $1 \text{ eV} = 1.783 \times 10^{-33} \text{ g} = 1.957 \times 10^{-6} m_e$; $\lambda_C = 1.973 \times 10^{-7} \text{ m}$.

VALUE (eV)	CL%	DOCUMENT ID	TECN	COMMENT
< 1	× 10⁻¹⁸	¹ RYUTOV	07	MHD of solar wind
● ● ● We do not use the following data for averages, fits, limits, etc. ● ● ●				
< 1	× 10 ⁻²⁶	² ACCIOLY	10	Anomalous mag. mom.
< 1.4	× 10 ⁻⁷	³ ADELBERGER	07A	Galactic field existence if Higgs mass
< 2	× 10 ⁻¹⁶	ACCIOLY	04	Dispersion of GHz radio waves by sun
< 7	× 10 ⁻¹⁹	FULLEKRUG	04	Speed of 5-50 Hz radiation in atmosphere
< 1	× 10 ⁻¹⁷	⁴ LUO	03	Modulation torsion balance
< 6	× 10 ⁻¹⁷	⁵ LAKES	98	Torque on toroid balance
< 9	× 10 ⁻¹⁶	⁶ RYUTOV	97	MHD of solar wind
<(4.73 ± 0.45) × 10 ⁻¹²	90	⁷ FISCHBACH	94	Earth magnetic field
<(9.0 ± 8.1) × 10 ⁻¹⁰		⁸ CHERNIKOV	92	SQID Ampere-law null test
< 3	× 10 ⁻²⁷	⁹ RYAN	85	Coulomb-law null test
< 6	× 10 ⁻¹⁶	¹⁰ CHIBISOV	76	Galactic magnetic field
< 7.3	× 10 ⁻¹⁶	DAVIS	75	Jupiter magnetic field
< 6	× 10 ⁻¹⁷	HOLLWEG	74	Alfven waves
< 1	× 10 ⁻¹⁴	¹¹ FRANKEN	71	Low freq. res. cir.
< 2.3	× 10 ⁻¹⁵	WILLIAMS	71	CNTR Tests Gauss law
< 6	× 10 ⁻¹⁵	GOLDHABER	68	Satellite data
< 6	× 10 ⁻¹⁵	¹¹ PATEL	65	Satellite data
< 6	× 10 ⁻¹⁵	GINTSBURG	64	Satellite data

¹ RYUTOV 07 extends the method of RYUTOV 97 to the radius of Pluto's orbit.
² ACCIOLY 10 limits come from possible alterations of anomalous magnetic moment of electron and gravitational deflection of electromagnetic radiation. Reported limits are not "claimed" by the authors and in any case are not competitive.
³ When trying to measure m one must distinguish between measurements performed on large and small scales. If the photon acquires mass by the Higgs mechanism, the large-scale behavior of the photon might be effectively Maxwellian. If, on the other hand, one postulates the Proca regime for all scales, the very existence of the galactic field implies $m < 10^{-26} \text{ eV}$, as correctly calculated by YAMAGUCHI 59 and CHIBISOV 76.
⁴ LUO 03 determine a limit on $\mu^2 A < 1.1 \times 10^{-11} \text{ T m/m}^2$ (with μ^{-1} =characteristic length for photon mass; A =ambient vector potential) — similar to the LAKES 98 technique. Unlike LAKES 98 who used static, the authors used dynamic torsion balance. Assuming A to be 10^{12} T m , they obtain $\mu < 1.2 \times 10^{-51} \text{ g}$, equivalent to $6.7 \times 10^{-19} \text{ eV}$. The rotating modified Cavendish balance removes dependence on the direction of A . GOLDHABER 03 argue that because plasma current effects are neglected, the LUO 03 limit does not provide the best available limit on $\mu^2 A$ nor a reliable limit at all on μ . The reason is that the A associated with cluster magnetic fields could become arbitrarily

small in plasma voids, whose existence would be compatible with present knowledge. LUO 03B reply that fields of distant clusters are not accurately mapped, but assert that a zero A is unlikely given what we know about the magnetic field in our galaxy.

- 5 LAKES 98 reports limits on torque on a toroid Cavendish balance, obtaining a limit on $\mu^2 A < 2 \times 10^{-9} \text{ Tm/m}^2$ via the Maxwell-Proca equations, where μ^{-1} is the characteristic length associated with the photon mass and A is the ambient vector potential in the Lorentz gauge. Assuming $A \approx 1 \times 10^{12} \text{ Tm}$ due to cluster fields he obtains $\mu^{-1} > 2 \times 10^{10} \text{ m}$, corresponding to $\mu < 1 \times 10^{-17} \text{ eV}$. A more conservative limit, using $A \approx (1 \mu\text{G}) \times (600 \text{ pc})$ based on the galactic field, is $\mu^{-1} > 1 \times 10^9 \text{ m}$ or $\mu < 2 \times 10^{-16} \text{ eV}$.
- 6 RYUTOV 97 uses a magnetohydrodynamics argument concerning survival of the Sun's field to the radius of the Earth's orbit. "To reconcile observations to theory, one has to reduce [the photon mass] by approximately an order of magnitude compared with" DAVIS 75.
- 7 FISCHBACH 94 report $< 8 \times 10^{-16}$ with unknown CL. We report Bayesian CL used elsewhere in these Listings and described in the Statistics section.
- 8 CHERNIKOV 92 measures the photon mass at 1.24 K, following a theoretical suggestion that electromagnetic gauge invariance might break down at some low critical temperature. See the erratum for a correction, included here, to the published result.
- 9 RYAN 85 measures the photon mass at 1.36 K (see the footnote to CHERNIKOV 92).
- 10 CHIBISOV 76 depends in critical way on assumptions such as applicability of virial theorem. Some of the arguments given only in unpublished references.
- 11 See criticism questioning the validity of these results in GOLDHABER 71, PARK 71 and KROLL 71. See also review GOLDHABER 71B.

γ CHARGE

OKUN 06 has argued that schemes in which all photons are charged are inconsistent. He says that if a neutral photon is also admitted to avoid this problem, then other problems emerge, such as those connected with the emission and absorption of charged photons by charged particles. He concludes that in the absence of a self-consistent phenomenological basis, interpretation of experimental data is at best difficult.

<u>VALUE (e)</u>	<u>CHARGE</u>	<u>DOCUMENT ID</u>	<u>TECN</u>	<u>COMMENT</u>
$<1 \times 10^{-46}$	mixed	12 ALTSCHUL	07B VLBI	Aharonov-Bohm effect
$<1 \times 10^{-35}$	single	13 CAPRINI	05 CMB	Isotropy constraint
● ● ● We do not use the following data for averages, fits, limits, etc. ● ● ●				
$<1 \times 10^{-32}$	single	12 ALTSCHUL	07B VLBI	Aharonov-Bohm effect
$<3 \times 10^{-33}$	mixed	14 KOBYCHEV	05 VLBI	Smear as function of $B \cdot E_\gamma$
$<4 \times 10^{-31}$	single	14 KOBYCHEV	05 VLBI	Deflection as function of $B \cdot E_\gamma$
$<8.5 \times 10^{-17}$		15 SEMERTZIDIS	03	Laser light deflection in B-field
$<3 \times 10^{-28}$	single	16 SIVARAM	95 CMB	For $\Omega_M = 0.3, h^2 = 0.5$
$<5 \times 10^{-30}$		17 RAFFELT	94 TOF	Pulsar $f_1 - f_2$
$<2 \times 10^{-28}$		18 COCCONI	92	VLBA radio telescope resolution
$<2 \times 10^{-32}$		COCCONI	88 TOF	Pulsar $f_1 - f_2$ TOF

- 12 ALTSCHUL 07B looks for Aharonov-Bohm phase shift in addition to geometric phase shift in radio interference fringes (VSOP mission).
- 13 CAPRINI 05 uses isotropy of the cosmic microwave background to place stringent limits on possible charge asymmetry of the Universe. Charge limits are set on the photon, neutrino, and dark matter particles. Valid if charge asymmetries produced by different particles are not anticorrelated.
- 14 KOBYCHEV 05 considers a variety of observable effects of photon charge for extragalactic compact radio sources. Best limits if source observed through a foreground cluster of galaxies.
- 15 SEMERTZIDIS 03 reports the first laboratory limit on the photon charge in the last 30 years. Straightforward improvements in the apparatus could attain a sensitivity of 10^{-20} e.
- 16 SIVARAM 95 requires that CMB photon charge density not overwhelm gravity. Result scales as $\Omega_M h^2$.
- 17 RAFFELT 94 notes that COCCONI 88 neglects the fact that the time delay due to dispersion by free electrons in the interstellar medium has the same photon energy dependence as that due to bending of a charged photon in the magnetic field. His limit is based on the assumption that the entire observed dispersion is due to photon charge. It is a factor of 200 less stringent than the COCCONI 88 limit.
- 18 See COCCONI 92 for less stringent limits in other frequency ranges. Also see RAFFELT 94 note.

γ REFERENCES

ACCIOLY	10	PR D82 065026	A. Accioly, J. Helayel-Neto, E. Scatena	(LABEX+)
GOLDHABER	10	RMP 82 939	A.F. Goldhaber, M.M. Nieto	(STON, LANL)
ADELBERGER	07A	PRL 98 010402	E. Adelberger, G. Dvali, A. Gruzinov	(WASH, NYU)
ALTSCHUL	07B	PRL 98 261801	B. Altschul	(IND)
		Also ASP 29 290	B. Altschul	(SCUC)
RYUTOV	07	PPCF 49 B429	D.D. Ryutov	(LLNL)
OKUN	06	APP B37 565	L.B. Okun	(ITEP)
CAPRINI	05	JCAP 0502 006	C. Caprini, P.G. Ferreira	(GEVA, OXFTP)
KOBYCHEV	05	AL 31 147	V.V. Kobychhev, S.B. Popov	(KIEV, PADO)
ACCIOLY	04	PR D69 107501	A. Accioly, R. Paszko	
FULLEKRUG	04	PRL 93 043901	M. Fullekrug	
GOLDHABER	03	PRL 91 149101	A.S. Goldhaber, M.M. Nieto	
LUO	03	PRL 90 081801	J. Luo <i>et al.</i>	
LUO	03B	PRL 91 149102	J. Luo <i>et al.</i>	
SEMERTZIDIS	03	PR D67 017701	Y.K. Semertzidis, G.T. Danby, D.M. Lazarus	
LAKES	98	PRL 80 1826	R. Lakes	(WISC)
RYUTOV	97	PPCF 39 A73	D.D. Ryutov	(LLNL)
SIVARAM	95	AJP 63 473	C. Sivaram	(BANG)
FISCHBACH	94	PRL 73 514	E. Fischbach <i>et al.</i>	(PURD, JHU+)
RAFFELT	94	PR D50 7729	G. Raffelt	(MPIM)
CHEJNIKOV	92	PRL 68 3383	M.A. Chernikov <i>et al.</i>	(ETH)
		Also PRL 69 2999 (erratum)	M.A. Chernikov <i>et al.</i>	(ETH)
COCCONI	92	AJP 60 750	G. Cocconi	(CERN)
COCCONI	88	PL B206 705	G. Cocconi	(CERN)
RYAN	85	PR D32 802	J.J. Ryan, F. Accetta, R.H. Austin	(PRIN)
CHIBISOV	76	SPU 19 624	G.V. Chibisov	(LEBD)
		Translated from UFN 119 551.		
DAVIS	75	PRL 35 1402	L. Davis, A.S. Goldhaber, M.M. Nieto	(CIT, STON+)
HOLLWEG	74	PRL 32 961	J.V. Hollweg	(NCAR)
FRANKEN	71	PRL 26 115	P.A. Franken, G.W. Ampulski	(MICH)
GOLDHABER	71	PRL 26 1390	A.S. Goldhaber, M.M. Nieto	(STON, BOHR, UCSB)
GOLDHABER	71B	RMP 43 277	A.S. Goldhaber, M.M. Nieto	(STON, BOHR, UCSB)
KROLL	71	PRL 26 1395	N.M. Kroll	(SLAC)
PARK	71	PRL 26 1393	D. Park, E.R. Williams	(WILC)
WILLIAMS	71	PRL 26 721	E.R. Williams, J.E. Faller, H.A. Hill	(WESL)
GOLDHABER	68	PRL 21 567	A.S. Goldhaber, M.M. Nieto	(STON)
PATEL	65	PL 14 105	V.L. Patel	(DUKE)
GINTSBURG	64	Sov. Astr. AJ7 536	M.A. Gintsburg	(ASCI)
YAMAGUCHI	59	PTPS 11 37	Y. Yamaguchi	
