

The kilogram: inertial or gravitational mass?

G Mana^{1,2} and S Schlamminger³

¹INRIM – Istituto Nazionale di Ricerca Metrologica, Torino, Italy

²UNITO – Università di Torino, Dipartimento di Fisica, Torino, Italy

³NIST – National Institute of Standard and Technology, 100 Bureau Drive,
Gaithersburg, MD 20899, USA

E-mail: stephan.schlamminger@nist.gov

Abstract. With the redefinition of the international system of units, the value of the Planck constant was fixed, similarly to the values of the unperturbed ground state hyperfine transition frequency of the ^{133}Cs atom, speed of light in vacuum. Therefore, differently from the past, the kilogram is now explicitly defined as the unit of the inertial mass. This short communication outlines the conceptual consequences of the new definition and of its practical implementations.

Submitted to: *Metrologia*

1. Introduction

A never-conceived constant links inertial to gravitational mass of all matter and energy. The first mass determines the force required to accelerate an object by a given rate, $m_i = F/a$; the second is the charge in Newton's law of universal gravitation, $F = Gm_g M_g / r^2$ and plays a role similar to the charge in Coulomb's law.

Since Newton's unification of the Earth and celestial mechanics, the equivalence principle states that they are the same quantity. It implies the universality of free fall: in a gravitational field, locally, all bodies fall with the same acceleration, independently of their composition. Consequently, the said constant has to be dimensionless and was set equal to one.

In 1901, the 3rd Conférence Générale des Poids et Mesures declared that the unit of mass *is equal to the mass of the international prototype of the kilogram*, a Pt-Ir artefact. This definition, consistent with the equivalence principle, did not distinguish between the inertial and gravitational masses. However, disseminating the kilogram by balances, we compared gravitational masses. In this sense, the quantity that was traced back to the Pt-Ir prototype was the gravitational mass.

The 2019 redefinition of the international system of units changed this state of the affairs [1]. The unit of mass is now traced back to the stipulated values of the unperturbed ground state hyperfine transition frequency of the ^{133}Cs atom, speed of light in vacuum, and Planck constant, ν_{Cs} , h , and c , respectively. Therefore, the mass defect between the two hyperfine ground-state levels of the ^{133}Cs atom is exactly $\Delta m_{\text{Cs}} = h\nu_{\text{Cs}}/c^2$. Since the roots of Δm_{Cs} are the Einstein and Planck equations $E = mc^2$ and $E = h\nu$, which are derived from special relativity and quantum mechanics and are, hence, not gravitational in nature, the kilogram is now the unit of the inertial mass.

The object of this short communication is to examine how the equivalence principle underlies the practical realizations of the kilogram via counting atoms and the Kibble balance.

2. Atom count

We conceptually describe how the atom counting method can be used to realize an inertial mass

standard. The first realisation step is recoiling ^{133}Cs or ^{87}Rb atoms by photons in an atom interferometer to measure the ratios between their inertial masses and the Planck constant [2, 3]. Alternatively, one can derive the m_e/h ratio (where m_e is the inertial mass of the electron) from the measured value of the Rydberg constant via hydrogen spectroscopy. These mass ratios fix the absolute scale of atomic (inertial) masses via relative mass spectrometry by Penning traps.

In the second step, the kilogram is realised by atom counting. To bring the count into practice, a ^{28}Si monocrystal is shaped as a quasi-perfect ball; the number N_{Si} of atoms in it is obtained from the measurement of the ball volume V and lattice parameter a_0 according to $8V/a_0^3$, where $a_0^3/8$ is the atom volume and 8 is the number of atoms in the cubic unit cell.

Making reference, for instance, to the m_e/h quotient, the measurement equation is

$$\frac{m_i(^{28}\text{Si ball})}{h} = \frac{8V}{a_0^3} \frac{M(^{28}\text{Si})}{M(e)} \frac{m(e)}{h}, \quad (1)$$

where $m_i(^{28}\text{Si ball})$ is the ball's inertial mass and $M(-)$ indicates the molar mass [4]. Since Si crystals are never perfect, mono-isotopic, and pure, (1) is corrected for the isotope abundances, impurities, and point defects (vacancies and interstitials). Also, the ball surface is characterised to correct for the oxide layer, adsorbed or absorbed water, and contaminants. In principle, one should take the mass defect associated with the binding energy of the atoms into account, but this correction is negligible at the present level of accuracy.

3. Kibble balance

Tracing mass measurements back to the Planck constant by a Kibble balance does not exactly imply the realisation of an inertial mass. Conceptually, a Kibble balance compares the power $m_g(\text{K})gv$ generated by a gravitational mass $m_g(\text{K})$ falling with constant velocity v in a locally uniform gravitational field g , with the power $\mathcal{E}I$ dissipated by magnet-coil brake that would keep the mass motion uniform (\mathcal{E} and I are the electromotive force and eddy current).

In practice, the balance's measurement-equation,

$$m_g(\text{K})gv = \mathcal{E}I, \quad (2)$$

is assembled in two steps. Firstly, one measures the current I necessary to hold up the mass in the brake's

magnetic field. Next, it is measured the electromotive force \mathcal{E} at the ends of the brake coil when the mass moves with constant velocity v . The tie to the Planck constant is provided by $I = V/R_K$ and \mathcal{E} , which are measured in terms of the Josephson and von Klitzing constants [5].

The local gravitational field is determined by tracking a free-falling body, a corner-cube mirror, with a laser interferometer. Therefore, ideally,

$$g = \frac{m_i(\text{ff})}{m_g(\text{ff})} a = \frac{m_i(\text{ff})}{m_g(\text{ff})} \frac{2z}{t^2}, \quad (3)$$

where z and t are the fall height and duration. The $m_i(\text{ff})/m_g(\text{ff})$ factor, where $m_i(\text{ff})$ and $m_g(\text{ff})$ are the inertial and gravitational masses of the free-falling body, is necessary because, if we do not assume the equivalence principle, the tracking result is the kinematical acceleration $a = 2z/t^2$.

Alternatives to the widely used classical gravimeter are measurements using atom or neutron interferometry and Bloch's oscillations of cold atoms (ca) in an optical lattice, which employ freely falling neutrons or atoms [6–8]. A decade ago there was substantial debate, whether these techniques measure g or $g \times m_g(\text{ca})/m_i(\text{ca})$, see [9–11]. The authors believe that the phase shifts measured in these techniques are proportional to $g \times m_g(\text{ca})/m_i(\text{ca})$.

Since the balance's measurement equation requires the strength of the gravitational field, by putting (2) and (3) together, the mass determination of a ^{28}Si ball via the Kibble balance delivers the quantity

$$\frac{m_g(^{28}\text{Si ball})m_i(\text{ff})}{m_g(\text{ff})} = \frac{\mathcal{E}I}{av}. \quad (4)$$

Since the free-falling body and ^{28}Si ball have different compositions, (4) shows that the atom count and Kibble balance measure different quantities.

4. Conclusions

Contrary to the past, when balances disseminated gravitational masses, the kilogram is now the unit of inertial mass. However, only the atom count determines the inertial mass of the kilogram realisation without assuming the equivalence principle.

From (1) and (4), the agreement – within their associated uncertainties – between the mass determinations of the same ^{28}Si ball via the Kibble balance and atom count [12] means

$$m_i(^{28}\text{Si ball}) = \frac{m_g(^{28}\text{Si ball})m_i(\text{ff})}{m_g(\text{ff})}. \quad (5)$$

Therefore, for instance, $m_i(\text{ff}) = m_g(\text{ff})$ and $m_i(^{28}\text{Si ball}) = m_g(^{28}\text{Si ball})$. So, in effect the agreement between the Kibble balance and atom count tests the equivalence principle.

The sensitivity, approaching 10 $\mu\text{g}/\text{kg}$ at the best [12], is certainly not competitive against that of null tests [13, 14], whose relative sensitivities reach 10^{-13} . Two facts, however, are worth consideration. Firstly, (4) compares the absolute determinations of the inertial and gravitational mass of a 1 kg body. Secondly, unlike Eötvös-like-type experiments, electromagnetic and gravitational accelerations are compared here.

Acknowledgments

G M received support from the Ministero dell'Istruzione, dell'Università e della Ricerca.

References

- [1] Wiersma D S and Mana G 2021 *Rendiconti Lincei. Scienze Fisiche e Naturali* **32** 655–663
- [2] Cladé P, Biraben F, Julien L, Nez F and Guellati-Khelifa S 2016 *Metrologia* **53** A75–A82
- [3] Yu C, Zhong W, Estey B, Kwan J, Parker R H and Müller H 2019 *Annalen der Physik* **531** 1800346
- [4] Massa E, Sasso C P and Mana G 2020 *MAPAN* **35** 511–519
- [5] Schlamminger S and Haddad D 2019 *Comptes Rendus Physique* **20** 55–63
- [6] Colella R, Overhauser A W and Werner S A 1975 *Phys. Rev. Lett.* **34**(23) 1472–1474
- [7] Kasevich M and Chu S 1992 *Applied Physics B* **54** 321–332
- [8] Cladé P, Guellati-Khelifa S, Schwob C, Nez F, Julien L and Biraben F 2005 *Europhysics Letters (EPL)* **71** 730–736
- [9] Biraben F, Cadoret M, Cladé P, Genevès G, Gournay P, Guellati-Khelifa S, Julien L, Juncar P, de Mirandes E and Nez F 2006 *Metrologia* **43** L47–L50
- [10] Müller H, Peters A and Chu S 2010 *Nature* **463** 926–929
- [11] Wolf P, Blanchet L, Bordé C J, Reynaud S, Salomon C and Cohen-Tannoudji C 2011 *Classical and Quantum Gravity* **28** 145017
- [12] Davidson S and Stock M 2021 *Metrologia* **58** 033002
- [13] Adelberger E, Gundlach J, Heckel B, Hoedl S and Schlamminger S 2009 *Progress in Particle and Nuclear Physics* **62** 102–134
- [14] Wagner T A, Schlamminger S, Gundlach J H and Adelberger E G 2012 *Classical and Quantum Gravity* **29** 184002