

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. Theoretically and differently from the past, the kilogram is now explicitly defined as the unit of inertial mass. Experimentally, the kilogram is realized by atom count or the Kibble balance. We show that only the former method measures the inertial mass without assuming the universality of free fall. Therefore, the agreement between the two measures can be interpreted as a test of the equivalence principle.

Submitted to: *Metrologia*

1. Introduction

A constant that is never made explicit links inertial to gravitational mass of all matter and energy. The inertial mass, m_i , determines the force required to accelerate an object by a given rate, $m_i = F/a$. The gravitational mass, m_g , determines the force in Newton's law of universal gravitation, $F = Gm_gM_g/r^2$ 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. Accepting this principle, the constant linking the gravitational and inertial masses must be dimensionless and can be conveniently 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, ν_{Cs} speed of light in vacuum, c , and Planck constant, h . Therefore, the mass defect between the two hyperfine ground-state levels of the ^{133}Cs atom is exactly $\Delta m_{\text{Cs}} = h\nu_{\text{Cs}}/c^2$. The roots of Δm_{Cs} are the Einstein and Planck equations $E = mc^2$ and $E = h\nu$. In special relativity, the equality of energy and the inertial (rest) mass follows from the conservation law for the energy-momentum tensor [2], where gravity plays no role. Hence, Δm_{Cs} relates the inertial masses of the ^{133}Cs atom before and after the transition and 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 [3, 4]. Alternatively, one can derive the m_e/h ratio from the measured value of the Rydberg constant via hydrogen spectroscopy. It comes into the Rydberg from the kinetic term of the hydrogen-atom Hamiltonian; therefore, m_e stands for the inertial mass of the electron. 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 determine the count in 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 $M(X)$ indicates the X's molar mass [5]. 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, $m_g(\text{K})gv = \mathcal{E}I$, (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, the electromotive force \mathcal{E} is measured at the ends of the brake coil when the mass moves with constant velocity v . The tie to the Planck constant is provided by $\mathcal{E} = nf/K_J$, which is measured in terms of the Josephson constant $K_J = 2e/h$, where n is an integer, e is the elementary charge, and f is a frequency [6].

The local gravitational field is determined by tracking a free-falling body, a corner-cube mirror, with a laser interferometer. Let's assume that $m_i(\text{ff})$ and $m_g(\text{ff})$ are the inertial and gravitational masses of the free falling body. It is

$$m_g(\text{ff})g = m_i(\text{ff})a, \quad (3)$$

where a is the kinematic acceleration observed by measuring the traveled distance, $z(t) = z_0 + v_0t + at^2/2$. A curve fitting procedure yields a , and g is obtained as

$$g = \frac{m_i(\text{ff})}{m_g(\text{ff})}a. \quad (4)$$

Alternatives to the widely used classical gravimeters are measurements using atom or neutron interferometry and Bloch's oscillations of cold atoms in an optical lattice, which employ freely falling neutrons or atoms [7–9].

A careful analysis of neutron interferometers by Littrell and coworkers [10] shows that the difference of the quantum-mechanical phase accumulated by neutrons travelling the interferometer, $\Delta\Phi$, scales like $gm_g(n)$. However, this phase difference is measured as a fraction of the de Broglie wavelength, $\lambda = h/p$, with $p = m_i(n)v$ and v the neutrons' velocity. Thus,

$$\Delta\Phi \propto \frac{m_g(n)}{m_i(n)}g \quad (5)$$

Similar reasoning can be applied to atom interferometers and Bloch's oscillations in an optical lattice. The only difference is that the observable is not the de Broglie wavelength but the velocity and momentum changes of the free-falling atoms as probed by photon absorption [9, 11, 12]. This process is kinematical and, hence, only sensitive to the inertial mass m_i .

Eventually, regardless of whether the probe mass is a macroscopic body, a neutron, or an atom, the measured value of g is essentially given by (4). Therefore, by using (4) for g , we can rewrite (2) as

$$m_g(\text{K})\frac{m_i(\text{ff})}{m_g(\text{ff})} = \frac{\mathcal{E}I}{av}, \quad (6)$$

This equation shows that, if the free-falling body has not had the same composition of the weighed mass and the equivalence principle is not assumed true, 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.

Let us suppose that the mass of the same ^{28}Si ball is measured by both counting the atoms and the Kibble balance and that the mass values are found in agreement. The first key comparison of the kilogram realizations based on the fixed numerical value of the Planck constant [13, 14] is an embodiment of the supposed experiment, albeit in more than one step. The outcome is that the result of (1) is equal to the result of (6). Therefore,

$$m_i(^{28}\text{Si ball}) = m_g(^{28}\text{Si ball})\frac{m_i(\text{ff})}{m_g(\text{ff})}. \quad (7)$$

The conclusion is that if the mass values obtained from the Kibble balance and counting atoms agree, the ratios of inertial and gravitational masses of the ^{28}Si ball and free-falling body are the same, which is a test of the equivalence principle.

The sensitivity, approaching $10 \mu\text{g}/\text{kg}$ at the best [14], is certainly not competitive against that of null tests [15, 16], whose relative sensitivities reach 10^{-13} .

To make Eq. (7) competitive, five orders of magnitude improvement of the kilogram realisations would be needed. Two facts, however, are worth consideration. Firstly, in contrast to null tests, (7) compares the absolute determinations of the inertial and gravitational mass of a 1 kg body. Secondly, unlike Eötvös-like experiments, which compare gravitational and inertial accelerations, 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] Ohanian H C 2012 *American Journal of Physics* **80** 1067–1072
- [3] Cladé P, Biraben F, Julien L, Nez F and Guellati-Khelifa S 2016 *Metrologia* **53** A75–A82
- [4] Yu C, Zhong W, Estey B, Kwan J, Parker R H and Müller H 2019 *Annalen der Physik* **531** 1800346

- [5] Massa E, Sasso C P and Mana G 2020 MAPAN **35** 511–519
- [6] Schlamminger S and Haddad D 2019 Comptes Rendus Physique **20** 55–63
- [7] Colella R, Overhauser A W and Werner S A 1975 Phys. Rev. Lett. **34**(23) 1472–1474
- [8] Kasevich M and Chu S 1992 Applied Physics B **54** 321–332
- [9] Cladé P, Guellati-Khélifa S, Schwob C, Nez F, Julien L and Biraben F 2005 Europhysics Letters (EPL) **71** 730–736
- [10] Littrell K C, Allman B E and Werner S A 1997 Phys. Rev. A **56**(3) 1767–1780
- [11] Stuhler J, Fattori M, Petelski T and Tino G M 2003 Journal of Optics B: Quantum and Semiclassical Optics **5** S75–S81
- [12] Wolf P, Blanchet L, Bordé C J, Reynaud S, Salomon C and Cohen-Tannoudji C 2011 Classical and Quantum Gravity **28** 145017
- [13] Stock M, Conceição P, Fang H, Bielsa F, Kiss A, Nielsen L, Kim D, Kim M, Lee K C, Lee S, Seo M, Woo B C, Li Z, Wang J, Bai Y, Xu J, Wu D, Lu Y, Zhang Z, He Q, Haddad D, Schlamminger S, Newell D, Mulhern E, Abbott P, Kubarych Z, Kuramoto N, Mizushima S, Zhang L, Fujita K, Davidson S, Green R G, Liard J O, Murnaghan N F, Sanchez C A, Wood B M, Bettin H, Borys M, Mecke M, Nicolaus A, Peter A, Müller M, Scholz F and Schofeld A 2020 Metrologia **57** 07030
- [14] Davidson S and Stock M 2021 Metrologia **58** 033002
- [15] Adelberger E, Gundlach J, Heckel B, Hoedl S and Schlamminger S 2009 Progress in Particle and Nuclear Physics **62** 102–134
- [16] Wagner T A, Schlamminger S, Gundlach J H and Adelberger E G 2012 Classical and Quantum Gravity **29** 184002