

Joint gravity survey using an absolute atom gravimeter and relative gravimeters

Li Chen-yang^{#, 1, 2, 3} Xu Ru-gang^{#, 4, 5, 6, 7} Chen Xi,^{1, 2, 3} Sun Hong-bo,⁴ Li Su-peng,^{1, 2, 3} Luo Yu,² Huang Ming-qi,² Di Xue-feng,^{1, 2, 3} Li Zhao-long,^{1, 2, 3} Xiao Wei-peng,⁴ Liang Xiao,⁴ Yang Xuan,³ Huang Xian-liang,^{4, 6} Yao Hua-jian,^{3, 5, 6} Huang Jin-shui,^{3, 5, 6} Chen Luo-kan,^{1, 2, 3} and Chen Shuai^{1, 2, 3}

¹*Hefei National Research Center for Physical Sciences at the Microscale and School of Physical Sciences, University of Science and Technology of China, Hefei 230026, China*

²*Shanghai Research Center for Quantum Science and CAS Center for Excellence in Quantum Information and Quantum Physics, University of Science and Technology of China, Shanghai 201315, China*

³*Hefei National Laboratory, University of Science and Technology of China, Hefei 230088, China*

⁴*Anhui Earthquake Agency, Hefei 230031, China*

⁵*School of Earth and Space Sciences, University of Science and Technology of China, Hefei 230026, China*

⁶*Mengcheng National Geophysical Observatory, University of Science and Technology of China, Mengcheng 233500, China*

⁷*Wuhan Gravitation and Solid Earth Tides, National Observation and Research Station, Wuhan 430071, China*

(*Electronic mail: shuai@ustc.edu.cn)

(*Electronic mail: lkchen@ustc.edu.cn)

(Dated: 2 April 2025)

Time-varying gravity field survey is one of the important methods for seismic risk assessment. To obtain accurate time-varying gravity data, it is essential to establish a gravity reference, which can be achieved using absolute gravimeters. Atom gravimeters, as a recently emerging type of absolute gravimeter, have not yet been practically validated for their reliability in mobile gravity surveys. To study and evaluate the operational status and performance metrics of the A-Grav atom gravimeter under complex field conditions, the University of Science and Technology of China, Hefei National Laboratory, and the Anhui Earthquake Agency conducted a joint observation experiment using an atom gravimeter (A-Grav) and relative gravimeters (CG-6) within the North China Seismic Gravity Monitoring Network. The experiment yielded the following results: 1) The standard deviations for mobile observations of the atom gravimeter is $2.1 \mu\text{Gal}$; 2) The mean differences in point values and segment differences between the atom gravimeter and the relative gravimeter at the same locations is $5.8 \pm 17.1 \mu\text{Gal}$ and $4.4 \pm 11.0 \mu\text{Gal}$, respectively, with point value differences of less than $2.0 \mu\text{Gal}$ compared to the FG5X absolute gravimeter at the same location; 3) The results of hybrid gravity adjustment based on absolute gravity control and the point value precision at each measurement point, with an average point value precision of $3.6 \mu\text{Gal}$. The results indicate that the A-Grav atom gravimeter has observation accuracy and precision comparable to the FG5X absolute gravimeter, demonstrating good stability and reliability in field mobile measurements, and can meet the requirements for seismic gravity monitoring. This work provides a technical reference for the practical application of atom gravimeters in control measurements and time-varying gravity monitoring for earthquakes.

I. INTRODUCTION

Seismic gravity measurement is a crucial method for earthquake monitoring and research¹⁻³. Its primary task is to monitor the Non-terrestrial interior changes in the gravity field over time in tectonically active regions, and to study the temporal, spatial, and intensity variations of the gravity field during the processes of earthquake preparation, occurrence, and adjustment, as well as their underlying causes. To this end, China has gradually established a seismic gravity monitoring network covering the entire mainland, consisting of 105 absolute gravity points, 4,000 relative gravity points, and 86 continuous gravity stations². Currently, a hybrid gravity measurement model combining absolute gravity observations and relative gravity surveys⁴ is employed to conduct repeated observations of the seismic gravity monitoring network. This methodology enables precise detection of gravitational field variations, thereby providing critical support for seismic haz-

ard assessment (including earthquake monitoring and prediction), geophysical research, and the safeguarding of national infrastructure systems. Significant achievements have been made in this field^{1, 5-13}.

High-precision absolute gravity observations play a significant role in monitoring changes in the gravity field:

1) Conducting quasi-synchronous absolute gravity observations and relative gravity surveys provides a control benchmark for relative gravity data, enabling the acquisition of reliable time-varying gravity field information. This serves as a foundation for research on earthquake and disaster prediction¹.

2) Long-term absolute gravity observations provide precise data for studying earthquakes and crustal deformation processes¹⁴⁻¹⁹.

During the past years, the absolute gravimeters used for seismic gravity measurements in China are the FG5 and A10 models, both developed and produced by the Micro-g LaCoste

from U.S., the nominal accuracy is $2.0 \mu\text{Gal}$ and $10.0 \mu\text{Gal}$, respectively. The FG5X is the latest model deriving from the FG5 series. However, given the annual observation tasks involving thousands of points in the seismic gravity monitoring network, the limited number of available absolute gravity instruments hinders the full utilization of data from mobile ground gravity surveys and continuous gravity station measurements³. Additionally, due to mechanical wear in traditional laser interferometers, their design life is limited, and instrument maintenance poses significant challenges²⁰.

In recent years, absolute gravimeters (AG) based on cold atom interferometry have rapidly developed. Their measurement sensitivity and accuracy^{21,22} are comparable to those of the classical optical interferometry absolute gravimeter FG5X. Complementing its high-performance capabilities, the AG has unique advantages such as faster measurement speeds, the ability to achieve long-term continuous measurements, no mechanical wear, and low maintenance costs^{22–26}. Given these characteristics, atom gravimeters are an attractive option for mobile absolute gravity measurements, provided they can be made compact and portable. However, there is a lack of reports that have quantitatively evaluated the accuracy of atom gravimeter in real field environments. If AG is to be truly useful in mobile absolute gravity measurement scenarios, its mobile gravity surveys reliability must be verified.

This work based on the North China Seismic Gravity Monitoring Network, designed and conducted relevant experiments. To verify the stability and observation accuracy of the A-Grav atom gravimeter in mobile environments, a hybrid gravity observation experiment was conducted in the field in conjunction with a relative gravimeter (CG-6), covering large spatial scales and significant gravity gradients. The results showed that the A-Grav atom gravimeter also exhibits good stability in such environments, with observation accuracy meeting the requirements for seismic gravity monitoring. Following the initial experiment, the Nanjing site was re-measured with an FG5X absolute gravimeter to fulfill the requirements of the Chinese Crustal Movement Observation Network measurement campaign. Capitalizing on this opportunity, a direct comparative analysis between the USTC-AG12 and FG5X instruments was conducted. The results revealed a discrepancy of less than $2.0 \mu\text{Gal}$ between the two instruments at the Nanjing site, thereby demonstrating the reliability of AG-based gravity measurements.

This experimental study demonstrates that atom gravimeters significantly outperform conventional campaign-based gravity surveys by establishing a denser network of absolute gravity reference stations, thereby improving measurement traceability. The findings establish a methodological framework for deploying AG in both static absolute gravity control networks and dynamic seismic gravity monitoring systems, offering pivotal insights to accelerate the technological maturation and field operationalization of quantum sensor-based gravimetry.

II. GRAVITY SURVEY

A. Overview of the Experiment

This work based on the North China Seismic Gravity Monitoring Network, designed and conducted an experiment to evaluate the performance of the A-Grav atom gravimeter under field conditions.

To further evaluate the stability, observation accuracy, and measurement precision of the A-Grav atom gravimeter in mobile field environments, a hybrid gravity observation experiment combining absolute gravity observations with relative gravity surveys and vertical gradient measurements was designed. This experiment was carried out in two phases.

The first phase of observations took place from September 30, 2022, to November 22, 2022, at three measurement points along the Jinzhai-Liyang seismic gravity line: Jinzhai, Anqing, and Jingxian. Quasi-synchronous absolute gravity observations, relative gravity surveys, and vertical gradient measurements were conducted at these points. After the observations, the noise components of the A-Grav atom gravimeter were optimized to improve its performance.

The second phase of observations was conducted from April 16, 2023, to April 23, 2023, at five gravity points: Huangshan, Hefei, Bengbu, Nanjing, and Huaibei. Simultaneous absolute gravity observations, relative gravity surveys, and vertical gradient measurements were carried out at these locations.

The equipment used in these experiments included one A-Grav atom gravimeter²² and two CG-6(241/245) relative gravimeters. Key instrument parameters are listed in Table I, and the distribution of measurement points and lines is shown in Figure 1.




FIG. 1: Gravity stations and lines of joint gravity survey experiment. The red points in the figure denote the survey stations from Phase I of the experiment, the blue points represent the measurement locations surveyed in Phase II, and the black points form the Jinzhai-Liyang gravimetric profile.

TABLE I: Nominal performance parameters of gravimeters

Model	Sensor Type	Range (mGal)	Resolution (μGal)	Absolute Zero Drift ($\mu\text{Gal}\cdot\text{d}^{-1}$)	Standard Deviation (μGal)
CG-6	Quartz Spring	8000	0.1	<200	5
A-Grav	Cold Atom	Global	1 μGal	/	<5

B. Experimental Observations

1. Relative Gravity Survey

The relative gravity survey was conducted using two CG-6(241/245) relative gravimeters in a synchronized manner. The survey employed a round-trip symmetric tandem observation mode, following the pattern $A \rightarrow B \rightarrow A$, to ensure high precision in the relative gravity measurements. Each survey line was closed within the shortest possible time on the same day to minimize errors caused by temporal variations in the gravity field.

The scale factor of an instrument is one of the critical factors affecting the accuracy of relative gravity measurements, directly influencing the accuracy of gravity difference measurements²⁷. To avoid introducing additional systematic errors due to the time-varying characteristics of the instrument scale factor²⁸ and to ensure the accuracy and reliability of the observation results, the two CG-6(241/245) relative gravimeters were calibrated before each phase of the experimental observations. The calibration results for both phases are shown in Appendix A 1 Table VII, with calibration accuracy better than 5×10^{-5} .

The vertical gravity gradient near the surface of the Earth is around $300 \mu\text{Gal}/\text{m}$, there are significant differences in gravity values at different heights, therefore, a relative gravimeter is needed to make precise measurements and provide a gradient reference for the absolute value obtained by the atom gravimeter. The vertical gravity gradient observation method and results are presented in Appendix A 2 and Table VIII. During this gravity surveys, the precision of the vertical gravity gradient segment differences was better than $\pm 5.0 \mu\text{Gal}$, and the precision of the vertical gravity gradients was better than $\pm 0.025 \mu\text{Gal} \cdot \text{cm}^{-1}$.

The measurement results for the 8 survey points using the relative gravimeter are shown in the table II.

2. Absolute Gravity Survey

During the hybrid gravity surveys, the absolute gravity measurements were performed synchronously with vertical gradient measurements and relative gravity surveys. After completing the vertical gradient measurements and relative gravity surveys at each measurement point, the atom absolute gravimeter was set up at the same location to conduct absolute gravity measurements.

Taking Nanjing as an example, there is a raw gravity data in figure 2 obtained by USTC-AG12. The red curve is the Earth




FIG. 2: Raw gravity data from Nanjing point during the phase II. The black points represent gravity values measured at Nanjing station, whose fluctuations demonstrate tidal-induced gravitational variations, while the red curve shows theoretical values calculated using the Earth solid tide model. Each black data point was acquired at approximately 6-second intervals. The gravity residuals are obtained by subtracting the theoretical values from the measured gravity values.

solid tide model, which is calculate by *Tsoft* software. The black points are the raw gravity value(all the values have been subtracted by their mean) measured by our atom gravimeter, and the residuals is subtracting the Earth solid tide, air-pressure and polar motion effect from the measured gravity. Similarly, the measurements at all other points in both phases of the experiment were processed using the same methodology. The observation duration ranging from 2.5 hours to 25.5 hours at each point with the sampling rate of 6 seconds.

The measurement data from the atom gravimeter is recorded every 30 minutes, with the average of the valid absolute gravity data for that period serving as the observation value for that group. The observed values, tidal theoretical model values, and residual sequence distributions for each measurement point are presented, as shown in Figure 3. We use the standard deviation of the residual sequence, averaged over 30 minutes, as the criterion for assessing the validity of the data. A standard deviation of less than $5.0 \mu\text{Gal}$ is considered acceptable, the standard deviation results for all 8 points meet the requirements.

At each location, Atom gravimeter needs to calibrate the systematic errors^{29,30} related to the location, primarily the calibration of the tilt and the Coriolis force effect. In addition, the influence of the vertical gravity gradient should also be

TABLE II: Phase I and II experiments result of relative gravity measurement.

Survey Segment	Observation Date (y-m-d)	CG-6#241(mGal)	CG-6#245(mGal)	Mean Difference(mGal)	Mutual Difference Precision (μ Gal)	Remarks
Jinzhai-Jinzhai	2022-11-15	0.2981	0.3027	0.3004	2.3	
Anqing-Anqing	2022-11-16	5.8793	5.8836	5.8815	2.2	Phase I observation
Jingxian-Jingxian	2022-11-19	0.2172	0.2096	0.2134	3.8	
Huangshan-Hefei	2023-4-17	197.8910	197.8900	197.8905	0.5	
Hefei-Bengbu	2023-4-18	76.3070	76.3038	76.3054	1.6	Phase II
Nanjing-Bengbu	2023-4-19	35.8415	35.8469	35.8442	2.7	observation
Bengbu-Huaibei	2023-4-20	81.2340	81.2310	81.2325	1.5	

considered. According to the vertical gradient results in Table VIII, the absolute gravity observation values at each measurement point are reduced to the height of the sensor of the relative gravity measurement instrument. Then, the reference datum is uniformly subtracted. Finally, the absolute gravity observation results at 8 measurement points are obtained, as shown in Table III.

III. EXPERIMENTAL RESULTS AND ANALYSIS

Gravity adjustment constitutes a cornerstone data processing methodology in geophysics and geodesy, primarily employed to perform systematic corrections on gravity measurement datasets³¹. This procedure serves three principal purposes: mitigating observational inaccuracies, enhancing data precision, and constructing a unified gravitational field model. At its core, this technique seeks to integrate discrete gravity observations into an internally consistent and coherent system with minimized residual errors through the application of sophisticated mathematical techniques. The indirect adjustment model was employed to process the hybrid gravity observation data. This model uses the segment difference between two adjacent stations as the adjustment element. The basic observation equations are:

$$\begin{aligned} v_{ij} &= \bar{g}_i - \bar{g}_j - \Delta g_{ij} \\ v_{ai} &= \bar{g}_{ai} - g_{ai} \end{aligned} \quad (1)$$

where \bar{g}_i , \bar{g}_j , and Δg_{ij} are the gravity estimates at points i and j and the segment difference after various corrections, respectively. v_{ij} is the adjustment element. \bar{g}_{ai} and v_{ai} are the estimate and residual of the absolute gravity observation g_{ai} at point i . The gravity values at the observation points can be solved according to the least squares criterion. This work uses a weak baseline adjustment based on the above model, employing relative gravity surveys controlled by absolute gravity. The absolute gravity observations are weighted with a precision of $5 \times 10^{-8} \text{ m} \cdot \text{s}^{-2}$, and the weights of the relative gravity survey data are determined iteratively during the calculation process.

Using the observation results of the absolute gravity points in Table III as the control benchmark, combined with the synchronous relative gravity survey data in Table II, the differences and precisions between the adjusted gravity values and

the observed gravity values at the Jinzhai, Anqing, and Jingxian points were obtained based on the above indirect adjustment model, as shown in Table IV. The adjustment results for the four survey segments of Huangshan-Hefei, Hefei-Bengbu, Nanjing-Bengbu, and Bengbu-Huaibei are shown in Table V.

Based on Table III, for Phase I observations, the maximum and minimum intergroup standard deviations were $3.5 \mu\text{Gal}$ and $2.3 \mu\text{Gal}$, respectively, with a mean of $2.7 \mu\text{Gal}$. For Phase II observations, the maximum and minimum intergroup standard deviations were $2.1 \mu\text{Gal}$ and $1.3 \mu\text{Gal}$, respectively, with a mean of $1.8 \mu\text{Gal}$. Both phases of observations were better than $5.0 \mu\text{Gal}$. Compared to Phase I, the intergroup standard deviation in Phase II significantly decreased by 30%, approximately $1.0 \mu\text{Gal}$. As shown in Figure 3, although the observation periods and duration of the A-Grav atom gravimeter varied at different measurement points, with the longest observation duration being 25.5 hours and the shortest being 2.5 hours, the observed values from the A-Grav atom gravimeter showed excellent consistency with the tidal values calculated by the tidal model during the observation period. The A-Grav atom gravimeter demonstrated good stability and adaptability in field mobile observations, with intergroup standard deviations better than $5.0 \mu\text{Gal}$. It was able to accurately extract and identify tidal variation signals, and its performance has been further improved through technical iterations.

Table IV shows the distribution of the differences between the adjusted gravity values at the measurement points in Jinzhai, Anqing, and Jingxian and the observed gravity values from the A-Grav atom gravimeter. The differences are the largest at the Jinzhai point, followed by the Jingxian point, and the smallest at the Anqing point, which are $16.7 \mu\text{Gal}$, $14.6 \mu\text{Gal}$, and $-13.9 \mu\text{Gal}$ respectively, with an average value of $(5.8 \pm 17.1) \mu\text{Gal}$. The point precision at the Jinzhai point is the highest, which is $7.6 \mu\text{Gal}$, followed by the Jingxian point with $10.0 \mu\text{Gal}$, and the Anqing point has the largest value of $11.5 \mu\text{Gal}$, and the average point precision values is $9.7 \mu\text{Gal}$. The difference in gravity values between the same points is less than $20 \mu\text{Gal}$, the measurements comply with the accuracy and precision specifications required for mobile gravity surveys.

As evidenced in Table V, for the CG-6(241/245) instruments, the maximum self-deviations are $4.0 \mu\text{Gal}$ and $17.0 \mu\text{Gal}$, the average self-deviations are $2.0 \mu\text{Gal}$ and $10.5 \mu\text{Gal}$, and the mutual differences are better than $5.0 \mu\text{Gal}$. Meanwhile, the average point precision at the




FIG. 3: Distribution of absolute gravity observation and theoretical tidal model, gravity residuals in phase I and phase II experiments. (a), (b), and (c) represent the observation points of Jinzhai, Anqing, and Jingxian respectively from a single phase of observation; (d), (e), (f), (g), and (h) represent the observation points of Hefei, Huangshan, Bengbu, Nanjing, and Huaibei respectively from the second phase of observation.

measurement points is $3.6 \mu\text{Gal}$ during the phase II, which is better than $5.0 \mu\text{Gal}$, meeting the precision requirements for seismic gravity observations. The calibration factors of CG-6(241/245) obtained from the adjusted calculation are 1.000776 ± 0.000034 and 1.000836 ± 0.000034 , which

are slightly different from the calibration factors of CG-6(241/245) in Table VII, which are 1.000751 ± 0.000044 and 1.000798 ± 0.000044 . The difference amplitudes are 2.5×10^{-5} and 3.8×10^{-5} , which are less than 5.0×10^{-5} . The calibration factor of the instrument directly affects the accuracy

TABLE III: Results of Phase I and II Experiments of Absolute Gravity Measurement

Point Name	Observation Time	Number of Observation Groups	Gravity Value at sensor height(mGal)	Standard Deviation between Groups(μ Gal)	Weather	Remarks
Jinzhai	2022 - 10 - 01/10 - 01 00:00 - 24:00	46	95.95384	3.5	Sunny	
Anqing	2022 - 11 - 17/11 - 18 19:00 - 08:00	25	53.58448	2.4	Light Rain	Phase I Observation
Jingxian	2022 - 11 - 21/11 - 22 20:00 - 07:00	21	50.39148	2.3	Light Rain	
Hefei	2023 - 04 - 16/04 - 17 16:40 - 09:00	32	144.03380	1.3	Sunny	
Huangshan	2023 - 04 - 18/04 - 18 01:00 - 09:00	15	-53.85640	1.9	Sunny	
Bengbu	2023 - 04 - 19/04 - 19 01:30 - 05:30	8	220.33270	1.6	Sunny	Phase II Observation
Nanjing	2023 - 04 - 20/04 - 21 12:00 - 11:00	45	184.48340	1.9	Sunny	
Huaibei	2023 - 04 - 22/04 - 23 22:00 - 24:00	51	301.58470	2.1	Sunny	

TABLE IV: The difference between the adjusted gravity value and the observed value at the measurement stations of Jinzhai, Anqing, and Jingxian in phase I experiment.

Station Name	Observation Date (y-m-d)	Adjusted Gravity Value (mGal)	Point Precision (μ Gal)	Adjusted Value Minus Observed Value (μ Gal)	Mean Difference and Precision (μ Gal)
Jinzhai	2022-7-14	95.9705	7.6	16.7	
Anqing	2022-7-14	53.5706	11.5	-13.9	5.8 ± 17.1
Jingxian	2022-8-5	50.4061	10.0	14.6	

TABLE V: Overall Adjustment Results of Gravity Data from the Phase II Experiment

Measurement Segment	CG - 6#241		CG - 6#245		Mean Segment Difference (mGal)	Scale Value and Its Precision (μ Gal)	
	Segment Difference (mGal)	Self - difference (μ Gal)	Segment Difference (mGal)	Self - difference (μ Gal)		CG - 6#241	CG - 6#245
Huangshan - Hefei	197.891	4	197.889	17	197.890	—	—
Hefei - Bengbu	76.304	0	76.301	4	76.303	1.000776 ± 0.0	$1.000836 \pm$
Nanjing - Bengbu	35.840	2	35.845	13	35.842	0.00034	0.000034
Bengbu - Huaibei	81.234	2	81.231	8	81.233	—	—

of the measured segment difference. According to the results of the relative gravity joint measurement in Table II, this paper gives the differences in the segment differences of the calibration factors of the CG-6(241/245) instruments in the four measurement segments of Huangshan-Hefei, Hefei-Bengbu, Nanjing-Bengbu, and Bengbu-Huaibei. The results show that the maximum influence in the Huangshan-Hefei measurement segment is 4.9μ Gal and 7.5μ Gal, and the influences in other measurement segments are less than 2.0μ Gal and 3.1μ Gal, with an average value of 2.4μ Gal and 3.7μ Gal. Table VI shows the differences in the segment differences of the same measurement segments between the absolute gravity observations and the relative gravity joint measurements for the segments of Huangshan-Hefei, Hefei-Bengbu, Bengbu-Nanjing, and Huaibei-Bengbu. As evidenced in Table II, it can be known that the segment differences of the four measurement segments are relatively large, with an average value of 97.8182 mGal. Among them, the segment difference of the Huangshan-Hefei measurement segment is the largest, which is 197.8905 mGal, and the segment difference of the Bengbu-Nanjing measurement segment is the smallest, which is 35.8442 mGal.

The differences in the segment differences of the same measurement segments are between 6.5μ Gal and -19.5μ Gal. Except that the difference in the Huaibei-Bengbu measurement segment is relatively large, which is -19.5μ Gal, the differences in the segment differences of other measurement

segments are all less than 6.5μ Gal, with an average value of $(4.4 \pm 11.0) \mu$ Gal, which is better than 10.0μ Gal. There is no obvious correlation between the segment differences and the differences in the segment differences.

The above results indicate that in the field mobile gravity observations, the observation results of the A-Grav atom gravimeter are in good agreement with the observation results of the commercial CG-6 relative gravimeter with a nominal observation accuracy of 10.0μ Gal. The atom gravimeter has good stability and observation accuracy in the field, and the observation results are reliable.

IV. THE COMPARISON OF ABSOLUTE GRAVIMETERS

The most direct way to validate the accuracy of atom gravimeters is through synchronous comparative observations with the currently best commercially available laser interferometry absolute gravimeter, the FG5X. During the experimental observation phase, absolute gravity observations were conducted at the Nanjing point, with the two absolute gravity observations separated by no more than 40 days. The real-time observation data of A-Grav is shown in Figure 2. Given the short interval between the two absolute gravity observations and the absence of significant seismic events or large-scale rainfall events in the Nanjing area during this period, the effects of seismic activity and local water load changes on grav-

TABLE VI: The difference between the gravity segment difference value and the observed value at the phase II experiment.

Measurement segment	gravity segment difference(mGal)	Observed gravity(mGal)	gravity difference(μ Gal)	Mean Difference and Precision(μ Gal)
Huangshan-Hefei	197.8905	197.8902	0.3	
Hefei-Bengbu	76.3054	76.2989	6.5	$4.4 \pm 11.0\mu$ Gal
Nanjing-Bengbu	35.8442	35.8493	-5.1	
Bengbu-Huaibei	81.2325	81.2520	-19.5	




FIG. 4: Long-term changes of absolute gravity observations at the Nanjing point. The geological structure of this point is relatively stable, and the gravity change does not exceed 10μ Gal within a decade. The blue dots are the measurement results of FG5X-259, and the red dots are the measurement results of atom gravimeter A-Grav, The difference between them is better than 2μ Gal.

ity variations can be ignored. Additionally, combined with the long-term absolute gravity observation results at the Nanjing point shown in Figure 4, this point is less affected by time-varying gravity fields and is stable over the long term, making the observation results at the Nanjing point suitable for studying the accuracy of atom gravimeters.

On May 30, 2023, the Hubei Earthquake Administration used the FG5X-259 absolute gravimeter to conduct 25 sets of observations at the Nanjing point, obtaining the absolute gravity value at a drop height of 130 cm, with an inter-group standard deviation of 1.4μ Gal. According to the vertical gradient of 2.5052μ Gal \cdot cm $^{-1}$ at the Nanjing point in Table VIII, the gravity value of the atom gravimeter at the Nanjing point in Table III was converted to the drop height of the FG5X-259 instrument.

Following gradient-based reduction to a unified reference plane, the normalized measurements from both instruments demonstrated a good consistency, the gravity value of $g_0 + 184.2253$ mGal differed by only 0.3μ Gal from the observation result of the FG5X-259 gravimeter, $g_0 + 184.2250$ mGal, where g_0 is a gravity value has been redacted in accordance with standard security protocols, this treatment will not affect the work of this paper. the difference falls well within the acceptable threshold for high-precision gravity surveys. This marginal difference not only validates the technical maturity of our quantum-based solution, but also conclusively proves that our atom gravimeter has reached parity with conventional

state-of-the-art devices in practical applications. Such comparable accuracy, achieved through fundamentally different operational principles, underscores our instrument's unique advantages in long-term stability, environmental adaptability, and potential for miniaturization.

V. CONCLUSION AND OUTLOOK

This work based on the North China Seismic Gravity Monitoring Network, combines the absolute gravimeter FG5X and the relative gravimeter CG-6 to investigate the working state of the A-Grav atom gravimeter in complex field environments through hybrid gravity measurements. The following conclusions are drawn:

1. Field hybrid gravity observation experiments show that during Phase I observations, the mean difference between the A-Grav and CG-6 observation point values is $5.8 \pm 17.1 \mu$ Gal. During Phase II observations, the mean precision of the measurement points is 3.6μ Gal, which is better than 5.0μ Gal, and the mean difference in segment differences is $4.4 \pm 11.0 \mu$ Gal. These results are in good agreement with the observations from the commercial CG-6 relative gravimeter, which has a nominal observation precision of 10.0μ Gal. This indicates that the A-Grav atom gravimeter provides reliable results in mobile measurements, demonstrating good stability, adaptability, and observation precision.
2. By comparing with the observation results from the absolute gravimeter FG5X, it is verified that the difference between the A-Grav atom gravimeter and the FG5X is less than 2.0μ Gal. This indicates that the A-Grav atom gravimeter has good accuracy and observation precision in mobile measurements, meeting the requirements for seismic gravity monitoring.

With the accumulation and enrichment of absolute gravity observation data, research on the relationship between absolute gravity changes and earthquakes has continued to develop. Wang Yong et al.¹⁵ revealed significant gravity decreases of 14.8μ Gal and 10.9μ Gal at the Lijiang and Eryuan points, respectively, within a radius of 150 km from the epicenter, based on multi-period repeat observations using FG5 and JILAG absolute gravimeters before and after the 1996 Lijiang Ms7.0 earthquake. Xing Lelin et al.¹⁷ discovered a significant upward gravity trend before the 2008 Wenchuan

Ms8.0 earthquake, based on multi-period re-measurement data from the Chengdu Reference Station FG5 absolute gravimeter near the epicenter from 2002 to 2008, with a long-term cumulative change exceeding $20 \mu\text{Gal}$ and an annual change of $5.3 \mu\text{Gal}$. Chen et al.¹¹ concluded that the Shigatse absolute gravity point, located 430 km west of the 2015 Nepal Mw7.8 earthquake, experienced a cumulative change exceeding $40 \mu\text{Gal}$, with an annual rate of $22.4 \mu\text{Gal}$, based on re-measurement data from four absolute gravity points on the Tibetan Plateau. Jia et al.¹³ revealed a synchronous upward gravity trend at four absolute gravity points within a radius of 350 km from the epicenter of the 2022 Menyuan Ms6.9 earthquake, based on multi-period re-measurement data from FG5 and A10 absolute gravimeters at four absolute gravity points on the southeastern edge of the Tibetan Plateau, with an annual change of $3.94 \mu\text{Gal}$ over the five years preceding the earthquake. These research results indicate that significant gravity field changes before strong earthquakes can be detected by the current high-precision commercial absolute gravimeter FG5X. The analysis results of hybrid gravity measurements show that atom gravimeters have observation accuracy and precision comparable to the FG5X absolute gravimeter, with intergroup standard deviations of long-term continuous observations better than $\pm 5.0 \mu\text{Gal}$. These characteristics indicate that atom gravimeters can detect and extract gravity field changes that meet the requirements of seismic gravity monitoring. Moreover, they can obtain the complete time-varying evolution process of the gravity field before and after strong earthquakes through long-term continuous observations. This will provide valuable basic data for studying the temporal, spatial, and intensity variation characteristics and causes of the gravity field during the processes of earthquake preparation, occurrence, and adjustment, and will provide foundational research results for earthquake and disaster prediction studies.

ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

We thank the Hubei Provincial Seismological Bureau for providing absolute gravity data from Nanjing station, and Dr. Li Zhong-ya for insightful discussions and exchanges. We wish to acknowledge the support of the Innovation Program for Quantum Science and Technology, China (Grant No. 2021ZD0300601), the Center for Ocean Mega-Science, Chinese Academy of Sciences, the Senior User Project of RV KEXUE (Grant No. KEXUE2020GZ03), the National Natural Science Foundation of China (Grant No. 12025406), Anhui Initiative in Quantum Information Technologies (Grant No. AHY120000), and the Shanghai Municipal Science and Technology Major Project (Grant No. 2019SHZDZX01).

DATA AVAILABILITY STATEMENT

The data that support the findings of this study are available from the corresponding authors upon reasonable request.

Appendix A: Calibration and Gradient Measurement of Relative Gravimeters

1. Instrument Calibration

Currently, short baseline calibration for relative gravimeters can be performed using two methods: based on gravity baseline fields or on measured data from the survey area. Both methods have been shown to yield equivalent results³². Phase I Observation: The scale factors of the instruments were calibrated using multi-period measured data from the North China Seismic Gravity Monitoring Network. Phase II Observation: The instruments were calibrated at the Jinzhai gravity short baseline field in the Dabie Mountains. The calibration results shows in Table VII.

2. Vertical Gravity Gradient Measurement

The vertical gradient measurements at the observation points were conducted using two CG-6(241/245) relative gravimeters in a low-high-low or high-low-high round-trip measurement mode. This approach was designed to reduce the gravity observations obtained by the A-Grav atom gravimeter at the height of its measurement sensor to the desired specific position, ensuring alignment with the reference plane of the relative gravity survey.

Given the actual height of the atom absolute gravimeter's measurement sensor, the vertical gradient observation platform was set to a uniform height of 102 cm during Phase I observations and 107 cm during Phase II observations. At each measurement point, no fewer than three qualified independent observations were made per instrument. In total, vertical gradient measurements were completed at 8 measurement points, as shown in Table VIII.

¹Li Hui. Dynamic gravity change in recent years in china continent. *Journal of Geodesy and Geodynamics*, 29(3):1–10, 2009.

²Shen Chongyang. Time-varying gravity field monitoring and strong earthquake prediction on the chinese mainland. *earthquake research in china. Earthquake Research in China*, 36(4):729–743, 2020.

³Guoqing Zhang Fang Liu Yunfeng Zhao Yiqing Zhu, Yong Zhang. Gravity variations preceding the large earthquakes in the qinghai-tibet plateau from 21st century. *Chinese Science Bulletin*, 65(7):622–632, 2020.

⁴Liu nian Yang Yuanxi, Guo chunxi and Qiu qixian. Datum and quality control for synthetic adjustment of absolute and relative gravity networks. *Engineering of Surveying and Mapping*, 10(2):5, 2001.

⁵Chen Yun-Tai, Gu Hao-Ding, and Lu Zao-Xun. Variations of gravity before and after the haicheng earthquake, 1975, and the tangshan earthquake, 1976. *Physics of the Earth and Planetary Interiors*, 18(4):330–338, 1979.

⁶LI RUIHAO and FU ZHAOZHU. Local gravity variations before and after the tangshan earthquake ($m = 7.8$) and the dilatation process. In P. VYSKOČIL, A.M. WASSEF, and R. GREEN, editors, *Recent Crustal Movements, 1982*, volume 20 of *Developments in Geotectonics*, pages 159–169. Elsevier, 1983.

⁷Shen Chongyang, Li Hui, Sun Wenke, Huang Jinshui, Sun Shaoan, Xuan Songbai, Tan Hongbo, and Liu Shaoming. Dynamic changes of gravity fields before and after the 2008 wenchuan earthquake (ms8.0). *Geodesy and Geodynamics*, 3(3):1–16, 2012.

⁸Yiqing Zhu, F. Benjamin Zhan, Jiangcun Zhou, Weifeng Liang, and Yunma Xu. Gravity measurements and their variations before the 2008 wenchuan earthquake. *Bulletin of the Seismological Society of America*, 100(5B):2815–2824, 11 2010.

TABLE VII: Instrument Calibration and Observation Data

Observation Date	Instrument Scale Value		Segment Difference (mGal)	Calibration Site
	CG-6#241	CG-6#245		
January 12, 2022	1.000465±0.000041	1.000529±0.000041	448.8793	Anhui Seismic Gravity Monitoring Network
April 12, 2023	1.000751±0.000044	1.000798±0.000044	225.1605	Dabie Mountain Jinzhai Gravity Baseline Field

TABLE VIII: Phase I and II experiments measurement result of vertical gradient on gravity stations

No.	Station	Instrument	Date (y-m-d)	Gradient Difference (μ Gal)	Vertical Gradient (μ Gal/cm)	Height (cm)
1	Hefei		2023-4-17	257.0208 ± 0.7026	2.4021 ± 0.0066	
2	Huangshan		2023-4-17	288.8732 ± 0.7342	2.6997 ± 0.0069	
3	Bengbu		2023-4-18	324.6523 ± 0.3039	3.0341 ± 0.0028	107
4	Nanjing		2023-4-19	268.0552 ± 0.5679	2.5052 ± 0.0053	
5	Huaibei	CG-6(241/245)	2023-4-20	245.1066 ± 0.8322	2.2907 ± 0.0078	
6	Jinzhai		2022-11-15	239.7360 ± 0.3091	2.3504 ± 0.0030	
7	Anqing		2022-11-16	291.3528 ± 0.2950	2.8564 ± 0.0029	102
8	Jingxian		2022-11-19	228.2385 ± 0.6351	2.2376 ± 0.0062	

- ⁹Sun heping Guo shusong Zhu yiqing, Wen xueze and Zhao yunfeng. Gravity changes before the lushan, sichuan, ms7.0 earthquake of 2013, 2013.
- ¹⁰ZHU Yi-Qing, LIANG Wei-Feng, ZHAO Yun-Feng, LIU Fang, WEI Shou-Chun, and XU Yun-Ma. Gravity changes before the jiuzhaigou, sichuan, <i>m</i>_s7.0 earthquake of 2017, 2017.
- ¹¹Shi Chen, Mian Liu, Lelin Xing, Weimin Xu, Wuxing Wang, Yiqing Zhu, and Hui Li. Gravity increase before the 2015 m 7.8 nepal earthquake. *Geophysical Research Letters*, 43(1):111–117, 2016.
- ¹²HU MinZhang, HAO HongTao, HAN YuFei, ZHAO YunFeng, LIU JinZhao, ZHENG Bing, ZHANG XinLin, ZHANG Yi, LI ZhongYa, WANG JiaPei, WANG Jian, YIN Peng, WU YunLong, WEI Jin, and WU GuiJu. Gravity flexural isostasy background of the 2021 madoi (qinghai) <i>m</i>_s7.4 earthquake and gravity change before the earthquake, 2021.
- ¹³Lulu Jia, Shi Chen, Linhai Wang, Longwei Xiang, Hongyan Lu, and Wen Shi. Gravity yearly transient change around the epicenter of 2022 ms 6.9 menyuan earthquake, china and seismotectonic implications. *Tectonophysics*, 846:229676, 2023.
- ¹⁴Yoshiyuki Tanaka, Shuhei Okubo, Morito Machida, Isao Kimura, and Toshihiro Kosuge. First detection of absolute gravity change caused by earthquake. *Geophysical Research Letters*, 28(15):2979–2981, 2001.
- ¹⁵Gravity change detected by repeated absolute gravity measurements in western yunnan and lhasa, china and its implication. *Chinese Journal of Geophysics*, 47(1):110–116, 2004.
- ¹⁶Wenke Sun, Qi Wang, Hui Li, Yong Wang, Shuhei Okubo, Desheng Shao, Dongzhi Liu, and Guangyu Fu. Gravity and gps measurements reveal mass loss beneath the tibetan plateau: Geodetic evidence of increasing crustal thickness. *Geophysical Research Letters*, 36(2), 2009.
- ¹⁷Xing Lelin, Li Hui, Xuan Songbai, Kang Kaixuan, and Liu Xiaoling. Long-term gravity changes in chinese mainland from grace and ground-based gravity measurements. *Geodesy and Geodynamics*, 2(3):61–70, 2011.
- ¹⁸Wei Qu, Zhong Lu, Qin Zhang, Ming Hao, Qingliang Wang, Feifei Qu, and Wu Zhu. Present-day crustal deformation characteristics of the southeastern tibetan plateau and surrounding areas by using gps analysis. *Journal of Asian Earth Sciences*, 163:22–31, 2018.
- ¹⁹Lin Hai Wang, Shi Chen, Jiancang Zhuang, Bei Zhang, Wen Shi, Jinling Yang, and Weimin Xu. Gravity field changes reveal deep mass transfer before and after the 2013 lushan earthquake. *Communications Earth & Environment*, 4(1):194, May 2023.
- ²⁰Hu Hua, Wu Kang, Shen Lei, Li Gang, and Wang Li-Jun. A new high precision absolute gravimeter. *Acta Physica Sinica*, 61(9):099101–099101, 2012.
- ²¹Hong-Tai Xie, Bin Chen, Jin-Bao Long, Chun Xue, Luo-Kan Chen, and Shuai Chen. Calibration of a compact absolute atomic gravimeter. *Chinese Physics B*, 29(9):093701, 2020.
- ²²Chen-Yang Li, Jin-Bao Long, Ming-Qi Huang, Bin Chen, Yu-Meng Yang, Xiao Jiang, Chuan-Fang Xiang, Zhao-Li Ma, De-Qiang He, Luo-Kan Chen, and Shuai Chen. Continuous gravity measurement with a portable atom gravimeter. *Phys. Rev. A*, 108:032811, Sep 2023.
- ²³Bing Cheng, Pei-Jun Chen, Yin Zhou, Kai-Nan Wang, Dong Zhu, Li Chu, Kan-Xing Weng, He-Lin Wang, Shu-Ping Peng, Xiao-Long Wang, Bin Wu, and Qiang Lin. Experiment on dynamic absolute gravity measurement based on cold atom gravimeter. *Acta Physica Sinica*, 71(2):026701–1–026701–11, 2022.
- ²⁴Vincent M noret, Pierre Vermeulen, Nicolas Le Moigne, Sylvain Bonvalot, Philippe Bouyer, Arnaud Landragin, and Bruno Desruelle. Gravity measurements below 10-9 g with a transportable absolute quantum gravimeter. *Scientific Reports*, 8(1):12300, Aug 2018.
- ²⁵Zhijie Fu, Bin Wu, Bing Cheng, Yin Zhou, Kanxing Weng, Dong Zhu, Zhaoying Wang, and Qiang Lin. A new type of compact gravimeter for long-term absolute gravity monitoring. *Metrologia*, 56(2):025001, feb 2019.
- ²⁶Xuejian Wu, Zachary Pagel, Bola S. Malek, Timothy H. Nguyen, Fei Zi, Daniel S. Scheirer, and Holger M ller. Gravity surveys using a mobile atom interferometer. *Science Advances*, 5(9):eaax0800, 2019.
- ²⁷HAO Hongtao, LI Hui, SUN Heping, ZHOU Jianguan, WANG Qinghua, and WEI Dongping. Application of zero drift correct and detection of scale parameters of cg-5 gravimeter. *Geomatics and Information Science of Wuhan University*, 41(9):1265–1271, 2016.
- ²⁸Sun Shaoan, Xiang Aimin, and Wu Weiri. Time-varying characteristics of lcr-g gravimeter parameters. *Journal of Geodesy and Geodynamics*, 22(2):101–105, 2002.
- ²⁹A Peters, K Y Chung, and S Chu. High-precision gravity measurements using atom interferometry. *Metrologia*, 38(1):25, feb 2001.

- ³⁰Hong-Tai Xie, Bin Chen, Jin-Bao Long, Chun Xue, Luo-Kan Chen, and Shuai Chen. Calibration of a compact absolute atomic gravimeter. *Chinese Physics B*, 29(9):093701, 2020.
- ³¹Chenway Hwang, Cheng-Gi Wang, and Li-Hua Lee. Adjustment of relative gravity measurements using weighted and datum-free constraints. *Computers and Geosciences*, 28(9):1005–1015, 2002.
- ³²LIANG Xiao SUN Hong-bo CHU Fei HUANG Xian-liang TAN Hong-bo WANG Jian XU Ru-gang, ZHANG Xin-lin. Analysis for synthetic adjustment of absolute and relative gravity of jinzhai gravity baseline in dabie mountain. *SEISMOLOGY AND GEOLOGY*, 45(5):1147–1169, 2023.
- ³³TAN Li-long, ZHANG Yan-tao, WANG Peng, CHEN Si, and ZHONG Shan. Measurement principle and development status of atomic interference gravimeter, 2020.
- ³⁴Hans Gerd Wenzel. The nanogal software : Earth tide data processing package eterna 3.30. 1996.
- ³⁵XD Chen and HP Sun. New method for pre-processing and analyzing tidal gravity observations. *Journal of Geodesy and Geodynamics (in Chinese)*, 22(3):83–87, 2002.
- ³⁶Xu Jian. Long-term observations of gravity tides from a superconducting gravimeter at wuhan. *Chinese Journal of Geophysics*, 2014.
- ³⁷V. Dehant, P. Defraigne, and J. M. Wahr. Tides for a convective earth. *Journal of Geophysical Research: Solid Earth*, 104(B1):1035–1058, 1999.