An independent test on the local position invariance of gravity with the triple pulsar PSR J0337 + 1715
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Abstract
We design a direct test of the local position invariance (LPI) in post-Newtonian gravity, using the timing observation of the triple pulsar, PSR J0337 + 1715. The test takes advantage of the large gravitational acceleration exerted by the outer white dwarf to the inner neutron star—white dwarf binary. Using machine-precision three-body simulations and dedicated Markov-chain Monte Carlo (MCMC) techniques with various sampling strategies and noise realizations, we estimate that the Whitehead’s parameter could have already been limited to $|\xi| \lesssim 0.4$ (95% CL), with the published timing data spanning from January 2012 to May 2013. The constraint is still orders of magnitude looser than the best limit, yet it is able to independently falsify Whitehead’s gravity theory where $\xi = 1$. In addition, the new test is immune to extra assumptions and involves full dynamics of a three-body system with a strongly self-gravitating neutron star.
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1. Introduction

PSR J0337 + 1715, a millisecond pulsar (MSP) with a spin period $P \simeq 2.73$ ms, was discovered in a large-scale pulsar survey conducted with the Robert C Byrd Green Bank telescope (GBT) [1]. It is in a hierarchical triple system consisting of a neutron star (NS) with a gravitational mass $m_{\text{NS}} \simeq 1.44 \, M_\odot$, and two white dwarfs (WDs) with masses $m_{\text{WD},I} \simeq 0.20 \, M_\odot$ and
The NS and the lighter WD are gravitationally bound as an inner binary with $P_{B,I} \approx 1.63$ d that are, as a whole hierarchically bound to the outer WD with $P_{B,O} \approx 327$ d. Two orbits are very circular with $e_I \approx 6.9 \times 10^{-4}$ for the inner binary, and $e_O \approx 3.5 \times 10^{-2}$ for the outer orbit. Two orbital planes are remarkably coplanar with an inclination $\lesssim 0.01^\circ$ due to the three-body dynamics in the formation of the system [2]. The apsides of two orbits are aligned with a difference $\lesssim 2^\circ$ due to the secular effects of the three-body interaction [1]. The 3-dimensional spatial trajectory of the inner binary for a time span slightly shorter than $P_{B,O}$ is illustrated in figure 1.

The triple pulsar is identified immediately as a superb celestial laboratory to test the strong equivalence principle (SEP) by investigating the difference in the inertia and gravitational masses of the pulsar [1]. Later on such a test is extended to probe the equivalence between the passive and active gravitational masses as well, that will represent the first test of Newton’s third law with compact objects [3, 4]. Indeed, SEP is the founding principle of general relativity (GR) that deserves the strictest examination from every angle, to establish its precision as well as to look for new physics beyond GR. Will [5, 6] summarized the equivalence principles in gravity theories in a hierarchical way, from the weak equivalence principle (WEP) to the Einstein equivalence principle (EEP), and then to SEP, where the last one can be decomposed into three parts,

- the universality of free fall (UFF),
- the local Lorentz invariance (LLI),
- the local position invariance (LPI),

for non-self-gravitating bodies as well as for self-gravitating bodies. SEP describes the general rules for the outcome of gravitational experiments. It is indeed lying to the heart of GR, and actually, there are arguments that among the viable gravity theories, GR is the only one that respects SEP in its entirety [6]. Therefore, probing the building blocks of SEP probes the deepest foundational principle of GR [7].

The tests in the equivalence of different masses pertains to tests of UFF [1, 3]. In this paper we will study the possibility of using PSR J0337 + 1715 to test the LPI in gravity, which is another important ingredient of SEP. The motivation of the study is similar to the tests of UFF. The outer WD provides a substantial gravitational environment for the inner binary that is valuable to study UFF and LPI in gravity theories [7–10]. In post-Newtonian gravity, the tests of UFF and LPI with self-gravitating bodies were done with the Sun–Earth–Moon system [11], and with the Milky Way—binary-pulsar systems [12, 13]. These studies would benefit greatly if the third body were exerting a larger gravitational effect on the other two bodies. The triple system precisely provides an ideal realization of this requirement in Nature. In addition, there is a strongly self-gravitating body involved (namely, the NS), some strong-field aspects could be studied, which is nearly impossible with weakly self-gravitating bodies alone (e.g. in the lunar laser ranging experiments [11]). Moreover, compared with tests using the Milky Way—binary-pulsar systems, the triple system probes a dynamical regime where the third body (namely the outer WD) does react to the gravitational dynamics. Although the limit on LPI violation that could have been provided by the triple pulsar is found to be orders of magnitude looser than the best limit from solitary pulsars [6, 19], we still feel it worthy as an independent limit and it has various extra merits compared with previous studies (see discussions in section 4).

---

1 In this paper, ‘PSR J0337 + 1715’, ‘the triple pulsar’, and ‘the neutron star’ are used to refer to the pulsar, while ‘the triple system’ and ‘the pulsar system’ are used to refer to the three-body system.
The paper is organized as follows. In the next section, we present some theoretical details for the orbital dynamics of PSR J0337 +1715 in presence of LPI violation, in the parameterized post-Newtonian (PPN) gravity. Then in section 3 we simulate various mock time-of-arrival (TOA) data closely following the real observation in [1] (see table 1) with a machine-precision N-body integrator. Dedicated parameter estimation using Markov-chain Monte Carlo (MCMC) techniques that take account of full correlations (of 17 parameters) is performed on these mock TOAs, and from MCMC chains we conservatively estimate the precision of the test. Section 4 discusses the relevance of the results, and makes some comparisons with limits obtained elsewhere.

2. Triple pulsar system with LPI violation

PPN formalism is the most popular framework in experimental gravity for testing alternative gravity theories. In PPN gravity theories are parametrized with ten generic PPN parameters that represent different physical properties of gravitation and take different values in different theories [5, 14, 15]. There also exists a generic framework called the standard-model
Table 1. Parameters for the spindown of the pulsar and the orbits of the triple system. Values in the second column are from [1], while those in the third column are from the parameter estimation on the mock dataset ‘TOA.3’ while allowing a nonzero Whitehead parameter in the MCMC runs. Parenthesized numbers represent the 1-$\sigma$ uncertainty in the last digits quoted.

| Parameter | Observation | Simulation |
|-----------|-------------|------------|
| **SPINDOWN PARAMETERS** | | |
| Pulsar spin frequency, $f_0$ | 365.953 363 096(11) Hz | 365.953 363 095 999(3) Hz |
| Spin frequency derivative, $\dot{f}$ | $-2.3658(12) \times 10^{-15}$ Hz s$^{-1}$ | $-2.3658(1) \times 10^{-15}$ Hz s$^{-1}$ |
| **INNER KEPLERIAN PARAMETERS FOR PULSAR ORBIT** | | |
| Semimajor axis projected along line of sight, $a \sin i_1$ | 1.217 528 44(4) ls | 1.217 528 44(2) ls |
| Orbital period, $P_{b,1}$ | 1.629 401 788(5) d | 1.629 401 789(3) d |
| Eccentricity parameter, $e_{1,1} \equiv (e \sin \omega)_1$ | $6.8567(2) \times 10^{-4}$ | $6.8566(2) \times 10^{-4}$ |
| Eccentricity parameter, $e_{2,1} \equiv (e \cos \omega)_1$ | $-9.171(2) \times 10^{-5}$ | $-9.169(2) \times 10^{-5}$ |
| Time of ascending node, $T_{asc,1}$ | MJD 55 920.407 717 436(17) | MJD 55 920.407 717 44(1) |
| **OUTER KEPLERIAN PARAMETERS FOR CENTER OF MASS OF INNER BINARY** | | |
| Semimajor axis projected along line of sight, $a \sin i_\Omega$ | 74.672 7101(8) ls | 74.672 711(2) ls |
| Orbital period, $P_{b,\Omega}$ | 327.257 541(7) d | 327.257 55(2) d |
| Eccentricity parameter, $e_{1,\Omega} \equiv (e \sin \omega)_\Omega$ | $3.518 6282(9) \times 10^{-2}$ | $3.518 6282(8) \times 10^{-2}$ |
| Eccentricity parameter, $e_{2,\Omega} \equiv (e \cos \omega)_\Omega$ | $-3.462 131(11) \times 10^{-3}$ | $-3.462 12(3) \times 10^{-3}$ |
| Time of ascending node, $T_{asc,\Omega}$ | MJD 56 233 935 815(7) | MJD 56 233 935 82(2) |
| **INTERACTION PARAMETERS** | | |
| Semimajor axis projected in plane of sky, $a \cos i_1$ | 1.4900(5) ls | 1.4900(3) ls |
| Semimajor axis projected in plane of sky, $a \cos i_\Omega$ | 91.42(4) ls | 91.42(2) ls |
| Ratio of inner companion mass to pulsar mass, $q_i \equiv m_{WD,1}/m_{NS}$ | 0.137 37(4) | 0.137 38(3) |
| Difference in longitudes of ascending nodes, $\delta \Omega$ | $2.7(6) \times 10^{-3}$ deg | $2.6(2) \times 10^{-3}$ deg |

extension (SME) [30, 31] which, using an effective field theory, casts the possible deviations from GR into new operators that can host anisotropic terms as well. Due to the large number of coefficients in SME, here we will focus on the LPI-violating PPN parameter, $\xi$. It is also called the Whitehead’s parameter because of its first appearance in Whitehead’s parameter-free gravity theory [16–18]. In GR, $\xi = 0$, and in Whitehead’s gravity theory $\xi = 1$. The original Whitehead’s gravity theory [16] was disproved by many experiments by now [6, 17, 19] (see [18] for an excellent review), but due to the importance of the SEP it does not hurt to have another independent test with distinct merits.

In the PPN formalism, one has an extra LPI-violating term in the $N$-body Lagrangian [5, 19],

$$L_\xi = -\frac{\xi G^2}{c^2} \sum_{ij} \frac{m_i m_j}{r_{ij}} r_{ij} \left[ \sum_k m_k \left( \frac{r_{jk}}{r_k} - \frac{r_{ik}}{r_k} \right) \right],$$

(1)
where \( r_{ij} \equiv r_i - r_j \), \( r_{ij} \equiv |r_{ij}| \), and the summation excludes terms that make any denominator vanish. In the Hamiltonian formalism, for a triple system like PSR J0337+1715 where finite-size effects are subdominant, \( L_\xi \) corresponds to an extra term in the interaction potential,

\[
V_\xi = \frac{G^2}{2} \sum_{i \neq j} \frac{m_i m_j}{r_{ij}} \left( \frac{r_{01} \cdot r_{12}}{r_{01} r_{12}} + \frac{r_{01} \cdot r_{12}}{r_{12} r_{20}} + \frac{r_{01} \cdot r_{20}}{r_{01} r_{12}} + \frac{r_{12} \cdot r_{20}}{r_{12} r_{20}} \right),
\]

where in our case we use subscripts, 0, 1, 2, refer to the NS, the inner WD, and the outer WD, respectively. Due to the hierarchical structure for the triple system that we are considering, we have \( r_{01} \ll r_{12} \sim r_{20} \). Therefore, the first and the third terms in the parentheses contribute prominently to \( V_\xi \). Nevertheless, we include all contributions in equation (2) in our numerical study below.

In figure 2, we plot the Newtonian potential, \( V_{\text{Newt}} \equiv \sum_{i \neq j} -\frac{G m_i m_j}{2 r_{ij}} \), and the Whitehead potential, \( V_{\text{Whit}} \equiv V_\xi (\xi = 1) \), in the unit of total Newtonian orbital energy, \( E_{\text{tot}}^{\text{Newt}} \equiv V_{\text{Newt}} + \sum_i \frac{1}{2} m_i v_i^2 \) for the triple system. The total Newtonian orbital energy \( E_{\text{tot}}^{\text{Newt}} \simeq -8.3 \times 10^{46} \text{ erg} \) is conserved if the gravitational dissipation is ignored. According to the virial theorem, one has \( \langle V_{\text{Newt}} \rangle = 2 \langle E_{\text{tot}}^{\text{Newt}} \rangle \) for Newtonian gravity, where \( \langle \cdot \rangle \) denotes
an average over time. As expected, \( V_{\text{Newt}} \) oscillates with a short timescale, \( P_{b,I} \), and the oscillation is modulated with a large timescale, \( P_{b,O} \). In contrast, \( V_{\text{Whit}} \) oscillates around its average value, \( \langle V_{\text{Whit}} \rangle \approx -2.0 \times 10^{39} \text{ erg} \), with a short timescale, \( \frac{1}{2} P_{b,I} \). A faster oscillation for \( V_{\text{Whit}} \) can be understood based on the facts that, the dominant contribution to \( V_{\text{Newt}} \) comes from \( -Gm_0 m_1 r_{01} \propto \frac{1}{r_{01}} \), while the dominant contributions to \( V_{\text{Whit}} \) come from the first and the third terms in the parentheses in equation (2), both behaving as \( \propto \frac{1}{r_{01}^2} \). There is less long-term modulation for \( V_{\text{Whit}} \), compared with that of \( V_{\text{Newt}} \), at the timescale of the outer orbit (see panels (a) and (c) in figure 2). The relative smallness in the modulation of \( V_{\text{Whit}} \) is understood that \( V_{\text{Whit}} \) is at the first post-Newtonian order which receives a smaller contribution from a wider orbit, by roughly a factor of \( \frac{V_{O}^2/c^2}{V_{I}^2/c^2} = \frac{V_{O}^2}{V_{I}^2} \approx 0.03 \) relative to the Newtonian order, where \( V_{I} \) and \( V_{O} \) are the characteristic relative velocities of the inner and the outer orbits.

3. Mock simulation and parameter estimation

The timing data presented in [1] include radio observations with the GBT, the Arecibo telescope, and the Westerbork synthesis radio telescope (WSRT), spanning from MJD 55930.9 to 56436.5 (\( \sim 1.4 \) yr, or \( \sim 4 \times 10^7 \) s). Within such a duration, the inner and outer orbits revolve \( \sim 300 \) and \( \sim 1.5 \) cycles, respectively, while the pulsar spins \( \sim 16 \) billion cycles. The timing solution in [1] (see the second column in table 1) is derived with \( N_{\text{TOA}}^{(0)} = 26,280 \) TOAs and results in a weighted root mean squared residual \( \sigma_{\text{TOA}}^{(0)} = 1.34 \) \( \mu \)s.

Since the TOA data are not publicly available, we simulate mock TOAs closely following the observational characteristics, as was done in [3]. It is well known that there is no general analytical solution for the three-body problem in gravity given by algebraic expressions and integrals [20, 21]. To produce mock TOAs, we resort to a machine-precision \( N \)-body numerical integrator developed by Rein and his collaborators, which is implemented in the rebound package\(^2\) [22]. Specifically, we use a 15th-order integrator basing on the Galab–Radau quadrature, ias15, that uses adaptive time stepping, and keeps systematic errors well below machine precision over \( 10^9 \) orbits [23]. Such a precision meets the requirement posed by the accurate pulsar timing data [3].

For all simulations, we use the parameters of \( \text{PSR J0337} + 1715 \) reported in [1] (see table 1). Initial conditions for the system are worked out for MJD 55920.0 which is the reference epoch for all parameters. The LPI-violating modification in equation (3) is augmented to the ias15 integrator [23]. We evolve the system in 3-dimensional space for a longer time than the observational span and cut data keeping the part that corresponds to the real observation. A spindown model for the pulsar is adopted with \( f(t) = f_0 + \dot{f}t \) where \( t \) is the coordinate time. The Römer delay is obtained by projecting the 3-dimensional orbit of the pulsar onto

\[ \delta a_\zeta = -\frac{1}{m_i} \nabla V_\zeta (r_{0}, r_{1}, r_{2}) , \quad (3) \]

in addition to the acceleration in the LPI-invariant gravity theory. In equation (3), \( \nabla^i \) is the gradient operator for body \( i \) with its coordinate vector \( r_i \); no summation is assumed for the body index \( i \) in equation (3). The explicit expressions of \( \delta a_\zeta \) are tedious yet not inspiring, therefore, we do not give them here.
the line of sight to the Earth [24]. Relativistic delays, e.g. the Einstein delay and the Shapiro delay, are ignored, due to the fact that they are not observable in PSR J0337 + 1715 yet [1]. An exception is the transverse Doppler delay due to the cross term of the velocities of two orbits, which is approximated for PSR J0337 + 1715 as \( R(t) \approx \frac{1}{c} x_1(t) \cdot v_0(t) \), where \( x_1(t) \) and \( v_0(t) \) are respectively the position vector of the inner orbit and the velocity vector of the outer orbit. It was shown in [3] that indeed it is a reasonable approximation. The end product of one integration is TOAs in the form of \( N(t) \) with \( N \) the counting number of pulses.

As mentioned before, \( N_{\text{TOA}}^{(0)} = 26280 \) TOAs were collected with \( \sigma_{\text{TOA}}^{(0)} = 1.34 \mu s \). Due to the computational cost in MCMC runs (see below), in our mock simulations we rescale it by a factor of 9 to \( N_{\text{TOA}} = \frac{N_{\text{TOA}}^{(0)}}{9} = 2920 \) and \( \sigma_{\text{TOA}} = \frac{\sigma_{\text{TOA}}^{(0)}}{\sqrt{9}} \approx 0.447 \mu s \). Such a rescaling is reasonable because on average it still keeps about 10 TOAs per inner orbit.

Two strategies are used to sample TOAs [3].

- **uniform sampling**: \( N_{\text{TOA}} = 2920 \) TOAs are generated uniformly in time;
- **step sampling**: \( N_{\text{TOA}} = 2920 \) TOAs are generated with fake observing blocks once per week within which TOAs are separated by 10 s.

We consider the **step sampling** method more closely resembles the real observation, however, the sensitivities to LPI violation from two methods are extremely consistent (see below). In total, we simulate five noise realizations for each method, named as \( 'k' \) with \( k \in \{0, 1, 2, 3, 4\} \) for **uniform sampling** and \( k \in \{5, 6, 7, 8, 9\} \) for **step sampling**. Noises in TOAs are generated according to a Gaussian random number generator \( \mathcal{N}(0, \sigma_{\text{TOA}}^2) \), and they are added to the ‘noiseless’ TOAs to obtain mock TOAs. For different set of mock TOAs, the noise generation is independent to each other.

Mock TOAs are generated with the Whitehead’s parameter \( \xi = 0 \), with noises \( \sigma_{\text{TOA}} \approx 0.447 \mu s \) added homogeneously in the uncorrelated Gaussian form. We want to estimate the extent of these TOAs in constraining \( \xi \). To achieve this task, following [1, 3], MCMC runs are set up to estimate 17 parameters, \( \theta \equiv \theta_{\text{spin}} \cap \theta_{\text{orbit}} \cap \theta_\xi \), simultaneously in the model. Parameters in \( \theta \) include 2 spindown parameters in \( \theta_{\text{spin}} \), 14 orbital parameters in \( \theta_{\text{orbit}} \) (see table 1 for definition of symbols), and 1 LPI-violating parameter in \( \theta_\xi \).

\[
\theta_{\text{spin}} \equiv \left\{ f_0; f_1 \right\},
\]

\[
\theta_{\text{orbit}} \equiv \left\{ (a \sin i)_1; P_{b,1}; \epsilon_{1,1}; \epsilon_{2,1}; T_{\text{asc,1}}; (a \sin i)_0; P_{b,0}; \epsilon_{1,0}; \epsilon_{2,0}; T_{\text{asc,0}}; (a \cos i)_1; (a \cos i)_0; q_1; \delta \Omega \right\},
\]

\[
\theta_\xi \equiv \left\{ \xi \right\}.
\]

The **Python** package of an affine-invariant MCMC ensemble sampler [25, 26], **emcee**\(^3\), is used to sample the 17-dimensional \( \theta \)-space. This algorithm has better performance over traditional MCMC sampling methods (e.g. the traditional Metropolis–Hasting method), as measured by the smaller autocorrelation time and fewer hand-tuning input parameters. It transforms the sampling of the parameter space by an affine transformation such that the internal algorithm samples an isotropic density, and the efficiency is not limited by possibly large covariances among parameters [25, 26]. We use uniform priors for all parameters in \( \theta \), and choose good starting values to reduce computational cost. Convergence tests are performed in post-processing to ensure that the starting values do not influence our parameter

\(^3\)http://dan.iel.fm/emcee
estimation. The ranges of parameters are not limited, thus in principle they can take any values as long as they have support from the likelihood. For each mock TOA dataset, noiseless template TOAs are generated on the fly at every MCMC step according to \( \theta \) that is sampled by the kernel. These noiseless template TOAs are compared with the noisy mock TOAs, namely \( \text{TOA}_k \) with \( k \in \{0, 1, \ldots, 9\} \). The kernel proceeds the sampling of \( \theta \) based on the difference between template TOAs and mock TOAs, characterized by \( \chi^2(\theta) \). With this setting, the posterior is directly proportional to \( e^{-\chi^2(\theta)/2} \).

In total, we have 10 MCMC runs for two sampling methods each with five different noise realizations. With emcee, 44 walkers are adopted for each run, and 44 chains for each set of mock TOAs are accumulated as the end product of MCMC runs for post-processing. There are about 300,000 posterior samples for each mock dataset, and the first half of them are discarded as the burn-in phase [27]. The Gelman–Rubin statistic is used to assess the convergence of different chains [28], which tells that the runs have forgotten the starting values and are in equilibrium.

As was already demonstrated in [3], if the template TOAs use GR dynamics, the mock TOAs can reproduce the observational uncertainties of all orbital parameters in \( \theta_{\text{orbit}} \) within a factor of two for 13 parameters and a factor of three for the remaining one, while they underestimate the uncertainties of \( \theta_{\text{spin}} \). In the current case, the recovering template is a LPI-violating template with one extra degree of freedom, therefore, we expect to produce larger uncertainties, at least for some variables that are strongly correlated with \( \xi \). This is indeed the case, as shown in figure 3 for the dataset \( \text{TOA}_3 \) as an example. We see that \( \xi \) strongly correlates with orbital parameters that pertain to the outer orbit with correlation coefficients \( \rho = 0.98–0.99 \), while it has relatively smaller correlations with the other parameters. The correlation with the parameters of the outer orbit makes the (marginalized) uncertainties of these parameters (see the third column of table 1) larger than what was reported in [1] where the recovering template is LPI-invariant. The reason for large correlation, we suspect, is that the observational span only covers about 1.5 cycles for the outer orbit, which makes parameter estimation for these elements rather uncertain. Worthy to mention that, in figure 3 the parameter estimation recovers the injected parameters very well, as marked with stars. The parameter-estimation chains with other mock datasets, \( \text{TOA}_k \) \( (k \neq 3) \), have similar results.

In figure 4, the marginalized 1-dimensional posterior densities of \( \xi \) for all 10 runs are given by normalized histograms. We can see that though with different sampling strategies and different noise realizations, the posteriors on \( \xi \) are rather consistent, in terms of their means and variances. In real data, unlike the cases in our mock datasets where several noise realizations are simulated, only one noise realization is working and we only have one dataset. To make a conservative estimate on the expected constraint on \( \xi \) from PSR J0337 + 1715, we stack the posterior samples in each sampling method, and it is shown with black histograms in figure 4. From the stacked posterior densities, we obtain a conservative sensitivity of PSR J0337 + 1715 in probing the LPI of gravity,

\[
|\xi| \lesssim 0.4, \quad \text{(95\% CL)}
\]

for both sampling methods.

---

4 Ideally it will be rather rewarding to study the parameter-estimation problem here with longer mock datasets, say, with \( \geq 6 \) outer orbits, to investigate the reduction in the correlations between \( \xi \) and the outer orbital parameters, and the improvement in constraining \( \xi \). However, currently we are limited by the speed of the three-body integration and the high dimensionality of the parameter space, thus a high computational cost in the MCMC runs. We hope the code can be speeded up in the future, and address this important question.
Discussion

Besides the generic value of $\xi$ in the PPN framework [5, 6], and the specific example of Whitehead’s gravity theory ($\xi = 1$) [16], a class of theories called ‘quasilinear’ theories of gravity could have a nonzero $\xi$ [17]. In these theories, the PPN parameter $\beta$, that measures the nonlinearity in the superposition law for gravity, equals to $\xi$; therefore the limit on $\xi$ can be cast as a limit on $\beta$ as well in these theories. Furthermore, as noted in [19], the constraint on $\xi$ might also limit parameters in the anisotropic PPN framework of [29], and in the gravity sector of SME [30–34]. If the code can be speeded up significantly thus the computational cost can be reduced significantly in the future, similar analysis with multiple non-GR parameters will also be possible (for example, in the SME framework).

Compared with previous observational constraints on the Whitehead’s parameter [17, 19, 35–37], the expected constraint in equation (7) is worse than the current best limit from solitary...
pulsars [19] by orders of magnitude\(^5\). Nevertheless, it has its own virtue. Firstly, it is a totally independent limit yet it is able to rule out the Whitehead’s gravity theory [16] alone, that adds to the ‘multiple deaths’ [18] of that theory. Secondly, previous limits generally involve extra assumptions, for example, the alignment of the Solar spin with the angular orbital momentum of the Solar system five billion years ago [19, 36] or the statistical assumptions of unknown angles in the cases of binary pulsars [37] and solitary pulsars [19]. The test proposed here is immune to extra assumptions. Thirdly, compared with the limits from gravimeters on Earth [17, 35] and the lunar laser ranging experiment [11], here we have a strongly self-gravitating body involved. For some gravity theories, for example the scalar-tensor gravity [38, 44], strong fields will amplify deviations from GR nonperturbatively. Even in the case of a perturbative expansion in the compactness \(C\), \(\xi\) might have a linear dependence on \(C\), as in the case of the Nordtvedt parameter [5, 39]. If strong fields are relevant, then the limit in equation (7) could have a large relative merit over weak-field ones due to the large compactness of the NS, \(C_{\text{NS}} \approx 0.1\). Fourthly, compared with experiments that use the Milky Way—binary-pulsar systems, here it is a dynamical three-body system where the third body (the outer WD) reacts to the gravitational dynamics. Although it is not clear yet but we suspect that this might have a standing for some specific gravity theories.

The estimation in equation (7) is obtained with mock data simulated closely following the real observation for a time span about 1.4 yr. In reality, new observations have accumulated more data with probably better qualities. Up to the time of writing, about 6 outer orbits are covered, compared with \(~1.5\) orbits used in the simulation. This will vastly break parameter degeneracy and reduce the strong correlations (\(\rho = 0.98–0.99\)) seen in figure 3 with the elements of the outer orbit. Thus these new data are expected to give an even tighter limit than that by a naive rescaling. In future, new radio telescopes like the Five-hundred-meter Aperture Spherical Telescope (FAST) [40] and the Square Kilometre Array (SKA) [41, 42] will provide better sensitivities in obtaining TOAs for the triple system. Moreover, although triple pulsars

\(^5\)If the limit on \(\xi\) is converted to a limit on the anisotropy of the gravitational constant \([5, 19]\), it is worse than the current best limit from solitary pulsars [19] by the same orders of magnitude.
are rare, there is a chance of hosting about 100 such systems in the Milky Way [1], and the SKA is going to discover almost all of them [43]. If an even tighter triple system is discovered, a better test of LPI in gravity could be conducted.

Lastly, we want to stress that, although our mock TOAs are able to reproduce major features of the observation in [1], they are nevertheless simplified compared with the complications in real data, e.g. the heteroscedasticity in TOAs from different telescopes (the GBT, the Arecibo telescope, and the WSRT), the removal of (probably time-dependent) interstellar dispersion, the irregular jumps between different observing sessions, and so on. Also, there will be correlations of parameters with the parallax and the proper motion of PSR J0337 + 1715, which could be resolved with the Very Long Baseline Array (VLBA) [1]. We are not expecting that simulated mock data to cover all these observational facts. Nevertheless, we believe that the simulations have include major features of the triple system. An analysis with the real data could settle the result firmly. We hope the analysis done here will simulate observers to analyze the real data to test LPI.
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