

Do heavy Monopoles hide from us ?

Huner Fanchiotti and C.A. García Canal

*IFLP(CONICET) and Department of Physics, University of La Plata
C.C. 67 1900, La Plata, Argentina*

and

Vicente Vento

*Departamento de Física Teórica and Instituto de Física Corpuscular
Universidad de Valencia - Consejo Superior de Investigaciones Científicas
46100 Burjassot (València), Spain,
Email: vicente.vento@uv.es*

Abstract

Dirac showed that the existence of one magnetic pole in the universe could offer an explanation of the discrete nature of the electric charge. Magnetic poles appear naturally in most grand unified theories. Their discovery would be of greatest importance for particle physics and cosmology. The intense experimental search carried thus far has not met with success. In order to understand this lack of success we studied monopolium a monopole anti-monopole bound state with properties very different from monopoles in which monopoles could be hiding. In here, we propose another mechanism, namely that magnetic poles bind deeply with some neutral states hiding in this way some of the properties of the free monopoles. We study different scenarios of these systems and analyze their detectability. In particular, one scenario is very interesting because it leads to a light state, an analog of an electron with magnetic instead of electric charge, which we call magnetron.

Pacs: 14.80.Hv, 95.30.Cq, 98.70.-f, 98.80.-k

Keywords: monopoles, electrodynamics, cosmology.

1 Introduction

The theoretical justification for the existence of classical magnetic poles, hereafter called monopoles, is that they add symmetry to Maxwell's equations and explain charge quantization [1]. Dirac showed that the mere existence of a monopole in the universe could offer an explanation of the discrete nature of the electric charge. His analysis leads to the so called Dirac Quantization Condition (DQC), which in natural units reads,

$$eg = \frac{N}{2}, \quad N = 1, 2, \dots, \quad (1)$$

where e is the electron charge and g the monopole charge [1, 2]. Note that if quarks were asymptotic states the minimum monopole charge would be three times larger.

The origin of monopoles, and therefore their properties, is diverse. In Dirac's formulation monopoles are assumed to exist as point-like particles and quantum mechanical consistency conditions lead to Eq.(1), establishing the value of their magnetic charge. However, their mass, M_m , is a parameter of the theory, limited only by classical reasonings to be $M_m > 2 \text{ GeV}$ [3]. In non-Abelian gauge theories monopoles arise as topologically stable solutions through spontaneous breaking via the Kibble mechanism [4–6]. They are allowed by most Grand Unified Theories (GUTs), have finite size and come out extremely massive $M_m > 10^{16} \text{ GeV}$ [7].

The discovery of monopoles would be of greatest importance not only for particle physics but for cosmology as well. Therefore monopoles and their experimental detection have been a subject of much study since many believe in Dirac's statement [1, 2]

"...one would be surprised if Nature had made no use of it [the monopole]."

At present, despite intense experimental search, there is no evidence of their existence [3, 8–16]. This state of affairs has led us to investigate a possible mechanism by which monopoles could exist hiding in a monopole-antimonopole bound state, monopolum [17, 18].

Here we analyze a different scenario. At some early stage in the expansion of the Universe, monopoles were created together with some neutral particles, which we endow with a magnetic moment and here we study their binding to monopoles. The resulting particles, named hideons, are characterized by a magnetic charge and a magnetic moment. We next model the dynamics of such systems.

2 Dynamics of the Hideon

We study the coupling of a monopole, which we consider spin 0, and a neutral spin 1/2 particle with magnetic moment. Assuming non relativistic motion the bound state equation becomes

$$-\frac{1}{2m} \left(\nabla^2 - \vec{\mu} \cdot \vec{B} \right) \Psi = E\Psi \quad (2)$$

where $m = \frac{M_n M_m}{M_n + M_m}$ being M_n and M_m the corresponding masses of the neutral and the monopole, $\vec{\mu} = g_a \frac{e}{2M_n} \vec{S}$, where g_a is the anomalous gyromagnetic ratio, and the magnetic field created by the monopole is $\vec{B} = \frac{g\vec{r}}{r^3}$, where g is the monopole magnetic charge. The corresponding bound state equation becomes

$$-\frac{1}{2m} \left(\nabla^2 - \frac{g_a}{4M_n} \frac{\vec{S} \cdot \hat{r}}{r^2} \right) \Psi = E\Psi \quad (3)$$

where we have used the Dirac quantization condition $eg = \frac{1}{2}$.

The operator $\vec{S} \cdot \hat{r}$ requires a very difficult diagonalization as can be seen easily from the equation

$$\vec{S} \cdot \hat{r} = 2\sqrt{\frac{2\pi}{3}} \left(S_+ Y_{-1}^1(\theta, \varphi) + S_z Y_0^1(\theta, \varphi) - S_- Y_{+1}^1(\theta, \varphi) \right), \quad (4)$$

where $S_{\pm} = S_x \pm iS_y$ and $Y_m^l(\theta, \varphi)$ are the spherical harmonics. Recalling now the property of the spherical harmonics

$$Y_{m_1}^1(\theta, \varphi)Y_{m_2}^L(\theta, \varphi) = \sum_{L=|l-1|}^{l+1} \sum_{m=-L}^L (1l00/L0)(1lm_1m_2/Lm)Y_m^L(\theta, \varphi), \quad (5)$$

where $(l_1l_2m_1m_2/lm)$ represent Clebsch-Gordan coefficients, we see that the angular-spin structure of the exact wave function is very complicated. We did not find an exact solution. To simplify the calculation we will try as a variational ansatz a polarized wave function,

$$\Psi(r, \theta, \varphi)\chi_{\frac{1}{2}+\frac{1}{2}} \quad (6)$$

where $\chi_{\frac{1}{2}+\frac{1}{2}}$ is the corresponding spinor with projection about the an axis $+\frac{1}{2}$.

Then

$$\begin{aligned} & \langle \Psi(r, \theta, \varphi)\chi_{\frac{1}{2}+\frac{1}{2}} | -S_-Y_{+1}^1 + S_zY_0^1 + S_+Y_{-1}^1 | \Psi(r, \theta, \varphi)\chi_{\frac{1}{2}+\frac{1}{2}} \rangle \\ & = \langle \Psi(r, \theta, \varphi)\chi_{\frac{1}{2}+\frac{1}{2}} | S_zY_0^1 | \Psi(r, \theta, \varphi)\chi_{\frac{1}{2}+\frac{1}{2}} \rangle . \end{aligned} \quad (7)$$

With this ansatz we are assuming that the neutral particle approaches the monopole polarized in a certain direction. One could introduce a density matrix instead to avoid polarizing the neutral but this would only complicate the calculation and introduce more parameters, without changing the wishful results.

Thus from the point of view of the variational principle with a wave function of the above structure, Eq. (6), the hamiltonian of our problem turns out to be for the ground state in spherical coordinates after eliminating the φ dependence

$$H = -\frac{1}{2m} \left(\frac{\partial^2}{\partial r^2} + \frac{2}{r} \frac{\partial}{\partial r} + \frac{1}{r^2} \frac{\cos \theta}{\sin \theta} \frac{\partial}{\partial \theta} + \frac{1}{r^2} \frac{\partial^2}{\partial \theta^2} \right) - \frac{g_a}{4M_n} \frac{\cos \theta}{r^2}. \quad (8)$$

where we take for the discussion g_a positive. For a negative gyromagnetic ratio we should take the spinor polarization in the opposite direction. From now on we shall use $\gamma = \frac{g_a}{8M_n}$ in the equations always positive recalling that the spin polarization is associated with the sign of the gyromagnetic ratio. The spherical coordinates are defined to have the polarization axis at $\theta = 0$.

The effective magnetic moment-monopole potential is singular since it falls at short distances like $1/r^2$. In order to avoid the singularity we add a cutoff to the potential in line with the work of Schiff and Goebels [19, 20] leading to,

$$V(r, \theta) = -\gamma \frac{\cos \theta (1 - e^{-\frac{r}{r_c}})}{r^2} \quad (9)$$

where r_c is the cutoff radius is a parameter whose possible values we shall discuss later on. With this exponential factor the behavior of the potential as $r \rightarrow 0$ becomes $V(r, z) \rightarrow -\gamma \frac{z}{r^2 r_c}$, which is non singular. The hamiltonian becomes

$$H = -\frac{1}{2m} \left(\frac{\partial^2}{\partial r^2} + \frac{2}{r} \frac{\partial}{\partial r} + \frac{1}{r^2} \frac{\cos \theta}{\sin \theta} \frac{\partial}{\partial \theta} + \frac{1}{r^2} \frac{\partial^2}{\partial \theta^2} \right) - \gamma \frac{\cos \theta (1 - e^{-\frac{r}{r_c}})}{r^2}. \quad (10)$$

Following the structure of our ansatz, Eq. (6), we propose the following variational ansatz

$$r < r_c \quad \Psi_{<}(r, \theta) = (\alpha + \beta \cos \theta) \frac{e^{-kr}}{r_c}, \quad (11)$$

$$r > r_c \quad \Psi_{>}(r, \theta) = (\alpha + \beta \cos \theta) \frac{e^{-kr}}{r}, \quad (12)$$

where α and β are the parameters to be determined and $k = \sqrt{2m|E|}$.

The coulombic behavior of the potential at short distances inspires the radial behavior of Eq.(11) , while the long range interaction inspires the radial behavior of Eq.(12) [21]. The ansatz wave function is continuous, but it has no continuous derivative. In order to obtain the mass of the hideon we will calculate the expectation value of the hamiltonian and determine the values of α and β by minimization. The corresponding result will lead to an upper value for the binding energy.

The normalization of the wave function establishes a relation between α and β given by

$$\frac{|\beta|^2 + 3|\alpha|^2}{3} = \frac{2k^3 r_c^2}{1 - e^{-2kr_c}(1 + 2kr_c)}. \quad (13)$$

The expectation value of the hamiltonian becomes

$$\begin{aligned} 2m \langle H \rangle &= \frac{|\beta|^2 + 3|\alpha|^2}{3} \frac{1 - e^{-2kr_c}(1 + 2kr_c - 2k^2 r_c^2)}{2kr_c^2} + \frac{2|\beta|^2}{3} \frac{1 - e^{-2kr_c}}{kr_c^2} \\ &\quad - \frac{|\beta|^2 + 3|\alpha|^2}{3} k e^{-2kr_c} + \frac{4|\beta|^2}{3} \left(\frac{e^{-2kr_c}}{r_c} - 2k\Gamma(0, 2kr_c) \right) \\ &\quad - \frac{2m(\alpha^* \beta + \alpha \beta^*) \gamma}{3r_c^2} \left(\frac{e^{-2kr_c}}{k} - \frac{e^{-2kr_c-1}}{k + \frac{1}{2r_c}} \right) \\ &\quad - \frac{4m(\alpha^* \beta + \alpha \beta^*) \gamma}{3} \left(\frac{e^{-2kr_c}}{r_c} - 2k\Gamma(0, 2kr_c) - \frac{e^{-2kr_c-1}}{r_c} + (2k + \frac{1}{r_c})\Gamma(0, 2kr_c + 1) \right) \end{aligned} \quad (14)$$

Where Γ is the incomplete gamma function.

We use from now on the reduced mass of the system m as our energy scale, thus $\alpha^2 = \tilde{\alpha}^2 m$, $\beta^2 = \tilde{\beta}^2 m$, $\gamma = \frac{\tilde{\gamma}}{m}$, $k = \tilde{k}m$, $r_c = \frac{\tilde{r}_c}{m}$, $E = \tilde{E}m = -\frac{k^2}{2m} = -\frac{\tilde{k}^2}{2}m$. With these substitutions the dimensions in the equations disappear since all energies are measured in m units and distances in $\frac{1}{m}$ units. Assuming $\tilde{\alpha}$ and $\tilde{\beta}$ real and omitting the tildes from now on the equation that determines the energy becomes

$$\begin{aligned} -k^2 &= \frac{\beta^2 + 3\alpha^2}{3} \frac{1 - e^{-2kr_c}(1 + 2kr_c - 2k^2 r_c^2)}{2kr_c^2} + \frac{2\beta^2}{3} \frac{1 - e^{-2kr_c}}{kr_c^2} \\ &\quad - \frac{\beta^2 + 3\alpha^2}{3} k e^{-2kr_c} + \frac{4\beta^2}{3} \left(\frac{e^{-2kr_c}}{r_c} - 2k\Gamma(0, 2kr_c) \right) \\ &\quad - \frac{4\alpha\beta\gamma}{3r_c^2} \left(\frac{e^{-2kr_c}}{k} - \frac{e^{-2kr_c-1}}{k + \frac{1}{2r_c}} \right) \\ &\quad - \frac{8\alpha\beta\gamma}{3} \left(\frac{e^{-2kr_c}}{r_c} - 2k\Gamma(0, 2kr_c) - \frac{e^{-2kr_c+1}}{r_c} + (2k + \frac{1}{r_c})\Gamma(0, 2kr_c + 1) \right) \end{aligned} \quad (15)$$

subject to the condition

$$\frac{\beta^2 + 3\alpha^2}{3} = \frac{2k^3 r_c^2}{1 - e^{-2kr_c}(1 + 2kr_c)}. \quad (16)$$

These dimensionless equations are functions of kr_c , therefore the energy as a function of r_c will correspond to $kr_c = \text{constant}$. Thus our next job is to calculate the corresponding constant for different values of the potential characterized by γ .

3 Hideon structure

The physical parameters in our calculations are γ and r_c . Let us discuss their possible values. We foresee two scenarios: i) light neutral scenario $M_m \gg M_n \rightarrow m = M_n$; ii) heavy neutral scenario $M_n \sim M_m = M \rightarrow m = \frac{M}{2}$. The third possibility $M_n \gg M_m$ we do not contemplate because the magnetic moment is extremely small. In the first scenario $\gamma = \frac{g_a}{8m} \rightarrow \tilde{\gamma} = \frac{g_a}{8}$, while in the second $\gamma = \frac{g_a}{16m} \rightarrow \tilde{\gamma} = \frac{g_a}{16}$. The value of r_c becomes quite important, since the smaller r_c the larger will be the contribution of the magnetic moment interaction. Let us treat r_c as a parameter in units of $\frac{1}{m}$, $r_c = \frac{\tilde{r}_c}{m}$, with \tilde{r}_c a dimensionless number. Thus the scale of values we are going to investigate are $\tilde{\gamma} < 1$ which implies for the heavy neutral case $g_a < 16$ and for the light case $g_a < 8$, and in both cases we limit the value of $\tilde{r}_c < 1$, which implies sizes smaller than $\frac{1}{m}$. It must be recalled that m is the reduced mass




Figure 1: We show the value of the binding energy of the system as a function of α . Beyond 1.026 the energy equation Eq.(15) has no solution.

which in the light neutral case is the light neutral mass much smaller than the monopole mass, and in the heavy neutral case is large of the order of the monopole mass, and therefore the size of the system in this scenario will be very small.

Once we have fixed the magnitude of these two dimensionless parameters we proceed to calculate the energy using Eqs.(15) and (16) varying α looking for minima. In Fig. 1 we show the minimization procedure for $\gamma = 1$ and $r_c = 0.5$. As seen in the figure, for certain values of α , $\alpha > 1.026$, Eq. (15) ceases to be satisfied. We take the minimum value as our best value recalling that it is an upper limit of the true binding energy.

In Fig. 2 we show the binding energy as a function of r_c for two values of γ , 0.5 and 1. We note that the binding energy depends crucially on the cut-off radius r_c . Note that the hamiltonian without a cut-off is unbounded below. In the case of the $\frac{1}{r^2}$ potential the elimination of the the cut-off has lead, to obtain physical results, to a sort of *renormalitaion* process which requires some experimental input [21–23]. Since in our case we have no experimental information we take the cut-off r_c as physical by assuming that the monopoles have a finite size. For our variational wave function the relation between the energy and the cut-off radius is very simple $kr_c = constant$ as discussed before. In the figure we show a few numerical points which we have used to calculate the constant and the final curves for $\gamma = 1$ with $kr_c = 0.352$ and for $\gamma = 0.5$ with $kr_c = 0.234$. The *renormalization* process, discussed in refs. [21–23], which would eliminate the r_c dependence requires the knowledge of a hideon observable.

In Fig. 3 we show the value of Er_c^2 for different values of γ . The corresponding relation can be approximated by

$$Er_c^2 \sim -0.06251\gamma^{1.21239}. \quad (17)$$

We note that for any value of γ the binding energy can become large for small r_c . This implies that small monopoles produce very large binding energies and therefore might lead to light hideons as we shall discuss.

Given the fact that $kr_c = constant$ for every potential strengths, the observables determined from the wave function are functions of only kr_c and therefore their value will be constant for these observables for different values of r_c . For example the mean square radius comes out to be in units of $1/m$

$$r_{ms}^2 = \langle \psi | r^2 | \psi \rangle = \frac{3 - e^{-2kr}(3 + 6kr_c + 5k^2r_c^2 + 2k^3r_c^3)}{(1 - e^{-2kr_c}(1 + 2kr_c))k^2r_c^2}. \quad (18)$$

We plot the corresponding values in Fig. 4 for different values of γ .




Figure 2: We show the value of the binding energy of the system as a function of r_c . The inset shows the behavior for large r_c . The curves represent $kr_c = \text{constant}$. The dotted line corresponds to $\gamma = 1$ and $kr_c = 0.352$ and the dashed line to $\gamma = 0.5$ and $kr_c = 0.234$.

4 Hideon properties and detectability

In order to study the properties of the hideon states let us recall the two scenarios mentioned above:

- i) heavy monopole and light neutral $M_m \gg M_n \rightarrow M_n \sim m$.
- ii) heavy monopoles and heavy neutral $M_m \sim M_n \rightarrow M_m \sim 2m$.

i) In the first case the binding energy is small for conventional values of r_c and γ , since the outcome is in units of the reduced mass m , which is basically the mass of the light fermion. The hideon then behaves as a heavy fermion with magnetic charge, magnetic moment, and large mass $\sim M_m$. As an example, one such very light fermion could be the neutron. In this case the hideon will appear as a heavy particle with a large magnetic charge and a measurable magnetic moment. If the neutral is a heavy particle then the magnetic moment will be small $\mu \sim \frac{1}{M_n}$.

ii) In the second case by an appropriate choice of parameters, the binding energy can be made large, namely for large γ and/or small r_c . For example, one can achieve a zero mass hideon, i.e. binding energy of $-4m$, by choosing $g_a \sim 4 - 6$, that is $\gamma \sim 0.25 - 0.4$, and $r_c \sim 0.05 - 0.07$, as can be seen from Fig. 3. Note that the γ associated with a neutron is 0.24. Therefore very light hideons might exist. These hideons are light particles with a huge magnetic charge and small magnetic moment, which behave as a magnetic electron, therefore we call them *magnetrons*. In the case the binding energy is small, i.e. smaller values of γ and larger r_c , these hideons behave as in i) with the difference that their magnetic moment will be very small since $\mu \sim \frac{1}{M_n}$.

Let us show some numerical examples. Assume a GUT monopole, $M_m \sim 10^{16}$ GeV, with a GUT neutral leading to a $\gamma = 0.25$, which corresponds to a magnetic moment of $\sim 10^{-19}$ Bohr magnetons, $r_{ms} \sim 10^{-16}$ fm, and binding energy, $Er_c^2 \sim -0.01$ which for large $r_c \sim 1$ leads to a binding energy of $\sim -10^{14}$ GeV. Thus the mass of the hideon is a GUT mass $\sim 2 \cdot 10^{16}$ GeV. Given the large magnetic charge, a binding energy much smaller than its mass, and the small magnetic moment the heavy hideon would appear experimentally as a GUT monopole since the magnetic moment effect would be small in the detectors.

Let us assume now a low mass monopole, $M_m \sim 10^3$ GeV, with a similar mass neutral leading to $\gamma = 0.25$, which corresponds to a magnetic moment of $\sim 10^{-5}$ Bohr magnetons, $r_{ms} \sim 10^{-3}$ fm, and binding energy, $Er_c^2 \sim -0.01$ which for large $r_c \sim 1$ leads to a binding energy of -10 GeV. Thus the mass of the hideon is low $\sim 2 \cdot 10^3$ GeV. Given the large magnetic charge, the small binding energy and the small magnetic moment this hideon will appear experimentally as a monopole, unless it breaks up in the detector, since the binding energy is relatively small for high energy collisions. Detection will be then




Figure 3: We show the relation between the potential strength γ , the binding energy E and the cut-off radius r_c . Note that for each gamma we obtain an equation $Er_c^2 = \text{constant}$.

notably different, since in the final state one has a monopole and a neutral. The neutral will be most probably undetected given the small magnetic moment, but it will carry momentum and energy. This will show up as a monopole with an irregular trajectory, signaling the previous existence of a hideon. In a Moedal type detector [14] one would get probably in the detector two imprints, a highly ionising one from the monopole, and less ionizing one from the neutral. Trajectory reconstruction might determine the bound state nature of the initial state.

In case i) if the neutral is very light, i.e. a neutron, the result would be similar to that described above except that the magnetic moment would be measurable.

Let us now turn to the light hideon scenario which is characterized by the existence of a new particle since given the huge binding energy the constituents are almost confined. This new particle, the magnetron, behaves like a magnetic electron, with a very large magnetic charge and a small magnetic moment. Thus it behaves as a light fermionic monopole.

Let us assume a constituent GUT monopole, $M_m \sim 10^{16}$ GeV, with a GUT neutral leading to $\gamma = 0.5$, which corresponds to a magnetic moment of $\sim 10^{-19}$ Bohr magnetons, $r_{ms} \sim 10^{-16} fm$, and binding energy, $Er_c^2 \sim -0.02$ which for small $r_c \sim 0.11$ leads to $\sim -2 \cdot 10^{16}$ GeV. Thus the mass of the magnetron can be very small by the proper choice of γ and r_c . This magnetron will manifest itself like a light monopole since the magnetic moment effect is small. Given its massive constituents it cannot be produced in accelerators.

Let us assume a low mass monopole, $m \sim 10^3$ GeV, with a similar mass neutral leading to $\gamma = 0.5$, which corresponds to a magnetic moment of $\sim 10^{-5}$ Bohr magnetons, $r_{ms} \sim 10^{-3} fm$, and binding energy, $Er_c^2 \sim -0.02$ which for small $r_c \sim 0.11$ leads to $\sim -2 \cdot 10^3$ GeV. Thus the mass of the magnetron can be very small by the proper choice of γ and r_c . This hideon will manifest itself like a very light fermionic monopole since the magnetic moment effect is small. However, it can kinematically be produced in accelerators and in the presence of very strong magnetic fields the magnetic moment might show up.

5 Conclusions

Monopoles have been a subject of much study and experimental search since Dirac showed their quantum mechanical properties [2]. The lack of success in their experimental search moved physicist to hide them in an almost magnetically neutral bound state: monopolium [17, 18]. Certain experimental analysis have transformed their lack of detection into mass limits at the TeV range [11, 13, 16]. GUT theories put their mass limits at the GUT scale [5–7]. In here we have studied a mechanism whose virtue is to hide monopoles into bound states which keep the monopole charge but change its kinematical and electromagnetic properties by adding a magnetic moment. Basically we transform a bosonic monopole




Figure 4: We show the relation between the potential strength γ , the mean square radius r_{ms} . Note that for each gamma we obtain an equation the same radius. Thus different states lead to the same r_{ms} since kr_c is constant.

into a fermionic monopole and in one particular scenario it can be very light. To detect this bound state one has to take into account its mass, which might be very small, its large magnetic charge but also its small magnetic moment.

Two scenarios arise from our study. One scenario in which the particles in the bound state are lightly bound and therefore the hideons are very massive. These states have a large magnetic charge and a small magnetic moment, thus from the point of view of detection they are similar to monopoles, except if the bound state can be broken on detection, in which case one would have a two particle final state kinematics. If the small magnetic moment will change its astrophysical behavior is still a matter of study.

The second scenario, characterized by a large binding energy, leads to light states with magnetic charge and magnetic moments, i.e. fermions with charge and magnetic moment, which we called magnetron. In this case the magnetic charge is very large while the magnetic moment is small. These light states would be easier to detect due to its small mass and in the case of TeV constituents it would be possible to produce them at colliders.

Acknowledgments

HF and CAGC were partially supported by ANPCyT, Argentina. VV was supported by GVA PROMETEO/2021/083.

References

- [1] P.A.M. Dirac, Proc. Roy. Soc. **A133** (1931) 60, Phys. Rev. **74** (1940) 817.
- [2] P. A. M. Dirac, Phys. Rev. **74** (1948) 817. doi:10.1103/PhysRev.74.817
- [3] N. Craigie, G. Giacomelli, W. Nahern and Q. Shafi, *Theory and detection of magnetic monopoles in gauge theories*, World Scientific, Singapore 1986.
- [4] T.W.B. Kibble, J. Phys. **A 9** (1976) 1387, Phys. Rep. **67** (1980) 183; A. Vilenkin, Phys. Rep. **121** (1985) 263.
- [5] G. 't Hooft, Nucl. Phys. B **79** (1974) 276.
- [6] A. M. Polyakov, JETP Lett. **20** (1974) 194 [Pisma Zh. Eksp. Teor. Fiz. **20** (1974) 430].

- [7] J.P. Preskill, Phys. Rev. Lett. **43** (1979) 1365.
- [8] G. Giacomelli and L. Patrizzii, hep-ex/0506014.
- [9] K. A. Milton, hep-ex/0602040.
- [10] Review of Particle Physics, S. Eidelman et al. Phys. Lett. **B592** 2004 1.
- [11] A. Abulencia *et al.* [CDF Collaboration], Phys. Rev. Lett. **96** (2006) 201801 [hep-ex/0509015].
- [12] G. Aad *et al.* [ATLAS Collaboration], Phys. Rev. Lett. **109** (2012) 261803 [arXiv:1207.6411 [hep-ex]].
- [13] G. Aad *et al.* [ATLAS Collaboration], Phys. Rev. D **93** (2016) no.5, 052009 doi:10.1103/PhysRevD.93.052009 [arXiv:1509.08059 [hep-ex]].
- [14] B. Acharya *et al.* [MoEDAL Collaboration], JHEP **1608** (2016) 067 doi:10.1007/JHEP08(2016)067 [arXiv:1604.06645 [hep-ex]].
- [15] B. Acharya *et al.* [MoEDAL Collaboration], Phys. Rev. Lett. **118** (2017) no.6, 061801 doi:10.1103/PhysRevLett.118.061801 [arXiv:1611.06817 [hep-ex]].
- [16] B. Acharya *et al.* [MoEDAL], Nature **602** (2022) no.7895, 63-67 doi:10.1038/s41586-021-04298-1 [arXiv:2106.11933 [hep-ex]].
- [17] V. Vento, Int. J. Mod. Phys. A **23** (2008) 4023 doi:10.1142/S0217751X08041669 [arXiv:0709.0470 [astro-ph]].
- [18] L. N. Epele, H. Fanchiotti, C. A. Garcia Canal and V. Vento, Eur. Phys. J. C **56** (2008) 87 doi:10.1140/epjc/s10052-008-0628-0 [hep-ph/0701133].
- [19] L. I. Schiff, Phys. Rev. **160** (1967) no.5, 1257-1262 doi:10.1103/physrev.160.1257
- [20] C.J. Goebel, Quanta, Essays in Theoretical Physics, eds. P.G.O. Freund, C.J. Goebel and Y. Nambu (Chicago, 1970).
- [21] S. R. Beane, P.F. Bedaque, L. Childress, A. Kryjevski, A., J. McGuire, J. and U. van Kolck, Phys. Rev. A **64** 042103.
- [22] K. M. Case, Phys. Rev. **80** (1950), 797-806 doi:10.1103/PhysRev.80.797
- [23] D. Bouaziz and T. Birkandan, Annals Phys. **387** (2017), 62-74 doi:10.1016/j.aop.2017.10.004 [arXiv:1711.04158 [quant-ph]].