Seven Pines 2014

The Gravity-Quantum Interface An experimental outlook

Markus Aspelmeyer

Vienna Center for Quantum Science and Technology (VCQ) Faculty of Physics University of Vienna, Austria



- The predictions of quantum theory and of general relativity, our current theory of gravity, are extremely well confirmed by experiment.
- There are few table-top experiments to date that probe the interface between quantum physics and gravity. In all these experiments, Earth's gravity acts as a constant classical background field. Loosely speaking, the quantum system is used as a "test particle" in an external gravitational field.
- The current accuracy of optical atomic clocks in combination with techniques from atom interferometry should already allow to perform experiments on "superposition of clocks". I am confident that this will happen soon.
- On the other hand, the last decade has seen large progress in controlling the quantum regime of massive micro-mechanical oscillators. These systems may lead the way to a new class of gravitational quantum physics experiments, in which the quantum system itself, e.g. the center of mass degree of freedom of a massive sphere, serves as a gravitational source mass.
- These developments will lead to:
 - Tests of semiclassical gravity models
 - Observation of dephasing through superposition of clocks
 - Generation of quantum entanglement through gravity
 - Observation of decoherence through quantum gravity

Example from quantum theory: validity of the quantum superposition principle for

- orbital angular momentum states of photons up to a few hundred quantum numbers (1)
- μ A-level current states carrying up to 10⁶ electrons (2,3)
- collective spin degrees of freedom of 10¹² Rubidium atoms (4).
- macromolecules (up to 10⁴ amu) (5,6)
- acoustic vibrational degrees of freedoms of mechanical resonators (up to 10¹¹ amu) (7,8)

Examples from GR:

- dynamics of binary pulsars (9), CMB analysis (BICEP2) (10) \rightarrow
- satellite tests of the Lense-Thirring effect (11,12).
- tests of the weak equivalence principle to an accuracy of _ better than10⁻¹³ (13)
- measurements of Newton's constant G to 10⁻⁴ (14).
- atomic clocks for gravitational redshift to 10⁻⁶ (15).

- \rightarrow strong relativistic fields and gravitational radiation
- → solar-system scale experiments in the weak relativistic regime
 - → earth-based high-precision tests of gravity

Vienna Center for Quantum Science and Technology





Nature 406, 43 (2000)

Quantum superposition of distinct macroscopic states

Jonathan R. Friedman, Vijay Patel, W. Chen, S. K. Tolpygo & J. E. Lukens

Department of Physics and Astronomy, The State University of New York, Stony Brook, New York 11794-3800, USA

Science 290, 773 (2000) Quantum Superposition of Macroscopic Persistent-Current States

Caspar H. van der Wal,^{1*} A. C. J. ter Haar,¹ F. K. Wilhelm,¹ R. N. Schouten,¹ C. J. P. M. Harmans,¹ T. P. Orlando,² Seth Lloyd,³ J. E. Mooij^{1,2}

2-mode spin squeezing of 10¹² Rb atoms







10⁶ Cooper pairs (µA)



Nature 413, 400 (2001) Experimental long-lived entanglement of two macroscopic objects

Brian Julsgaard, Alexander Kozhekin & Eugene S. Polzik

Institute of Physics and Astronomy, University of Aarhus, 8000 Aarhus, Denmark









Arndt group (Vienna): S. Gerlich, S. Eibenberger et al., Nature Communications 2, 263 (2011



Micromechanics, 2×10¹³ atoms **m ~ 10⁻¹² kg** = 7×10¹⁴ AMU Δ**x ~ 10⁻¹⁶ m** (~10⁻¹⁰x its diameter)

Quantum ground state and single-phonon control of a mechanical resonator

A. D. O'Connell¹, M. Hofheinz¹, M. Ansmann¹, Radoslaw C. Bialczak¹, M. Lenander¹, Erik Lucero¹, M. Neeley¹, D. Sank¹, H. Wang¹, M. Weides¹, J. Wenner¹, John M. Martinis¹ & A. N. Cleland¹



VOLUME 85, NUMBER 14

PHYSICAL REVIEW LETTERS

2 October 2000

Measurement of Newton's Constant Using a Torsion Balance with Angular Acceleration Feedback

Jens H. Gundlach and Stephen M. Merkowitz

Department of Physics, Nuclear Physics Laboratory, University of Washington, Seattle, Washington 98195 (Received 5 June 2000)

We measured Newton's gravitational constant *G* using a new torsion balance method. Our technique greatly reduces several sources of uncertainty compared to previous measurements: (1) It is insensitive to anelastic torsion fiber properties; (2) a flat plate pendulum minimizes the sensitivity due to the pendulum density distribution; (3) continuous attractor rotation reduces background noise. We obtain $G = (6.674215 \pm 0.000092) \times 10^{-11} \text{ m}^3 \text{ kg}^{-1} \text{ s}^{-2}$; the Earth's mass is, therefore, $M_{\oplus} = (5.972245 \pm 0.000082) \times 10^{24} \text{ kg}$ and the Sun's mass is $M_{\odot} = (1.988435 \pm 0.000027) \times 10^{30} \text{ kg}$.

Source mass: 8kg spheres





Frequency shift due to 33 cm lift in Earth's gravitational field



Optical Clocks and Relativity C. W. Chou, *et al. Science* **329**, 1630 (2010); DOI: 10.1126/science.1192720

Optical Clocks and Relativity

C. W. Chou,* D. B. Hume, T. Rosenband, D. J. Wineland

Observers in relative motion or at different gravitational potentials measure disparate clock rates. These predictions of relativity have previously been observed with atomic clocks at high velocities and with large changes in elevation. We observed time dilation from relative speeds of less than 10 meters per second by comparing two optical atomic clocks connected by a 75-meter length of optical fiber. We can now also detect time dilation due to a change in height near Earth's surface of less than 1 meter. This technique may be extended to the field of geodesy, with applications in geophysics and hydrology as well as in space-based tests of fundamental physics.

"There are few table-top experiments to date that probe the interface between quantum physics and gravity*. In all these experiments, Earth's gravity acts as a constant classical background field. Loosely speaking, the quantum system is used as a "test particle" in an external gravitational field."



The most prominent examples are

- the wonderful "COW" experiment of Colella, Overhauser and Werner (Aharonov-Bohm type relative phase shift between two spatially separated arms of a neutron interferometer) (16)
- the **atomic fountain experiments** pioneered by Kasevich and Chu (17) (phase shift is generated by interaction between light and atoms accelerated in Earth's gravitational field); allows to measure gravitational gradients with an accuracy better than $\Delta g/g = 10^{-9}$
- experiments with quantum states of ultra-cold neutrons that are bound in the gravitational field of the Earth (18); their energy spectrum can be probed experimentally and is for example sensitive to deviations of Newton's 1/r² law at very short distances (19).
- matter waves in free fall as has been shown recently with 10⁴ atoms (20) and macromolecules (21).

^{*} I am explicitly neglecting all GR tests that are "motivated" by quantum gravity such as searches for the fifth force, 1/r2 deviations, violations of UFF, EEP, etc. They fall in the category of "indirect" tests.

"There are few table-top experiments to date that probe the interface between quantum physics and gravity. In all these experiments, Earth's gravity acts as a constant classical background field. Loosely speaking, the quantum system is used as a "test particle" in an external gravitational field."



Vienna Center for Quantum Science and Technology

Volume 34, Number 23

PHYSICAL REVIEW LETTERS

9 June 1975

Observation of Gravitationally Induced Quantum Interference*

R. Colella and A. W. Overhauser Department of Physics, Purdue University, West Lafayette, Indiana 47907

and

S. A. Werner Scientific Research Staff, Ford Motor Company, Dearborn, Michigan 48121 (Received 14 April 1975)

We have used a neutron interferometer to observe the quantum-mechanical phase shift of neutrons caused by their interaction with Earth's gravitational field. Aharonov-Bohm type phase shift

grandational polantial (on Earth: \$ = g h)



FIG. 1. Schematic diagram of the neutron interferometer and ³He detectors used in this experiment.



"There are few table-top experiments to date that probe the interface between quantum physics and gravity. In all these experiments, Earth's gravity acts as a constant classical background field. Loosely speaking, the quantum system is used as a "test particle" in an external gravitational field."



Science and Technology

NATURE VOL 400 26 AUGUST 1999

Measurement of gravitational acceleration by dropping atoms

Achim Peters, Keng Yeow Chung & Steven Chu

Physics Department, Stanford University, Stanford, California 94305-4060, USA



Figure 2 Typical Doppler-sensitive interferometer fringe for T = 160 ms. Shown are the 588,638th and 588,639th fringes. Each of the 40 data points represents a single launch of the atoms, spaced 1.3 s apart and taken over a period of 1 min. One full fringe corresponds to ~2 × 10⁶g. Performing a least-squares fit determines local gravity to approximately $3 \times 10^{-9}g$.



 $\oint U ds = 0$

 \rightarrow Phase shift due to atom-laser interaction with accelerated atoms "There are few table-top experiments to date that probe the interface between guantum physics and gravity. In all these experiments, Earth's gravity acts as a constant classical background field. Loosely speaking, the quantum system is used as a "test particle" in an external gravitational field."



H. Müntinga,¹ H. Ahlers,² M. Krutzik,³ A. Wenzlawski,⁴ S. Arnold,⁵ D. Becker,² K. Bongs,⁶ H. Dittus,⁷ H. Duncker,⁴ N. Gaaloul,² C. Gherasim,⁸ E. Giese,⁵ C. Grzeschik,³ T. W. Hänsch,⁹ O. Hellmig,⁴ W. Herr,² S. Herrmann,¹ E. Kajari,^{5,10} S. Kleinert,⁵ C. Lämmerzahl,¹ W. Lewoczko-Adamczyk,³ J. Malcolm,⁶ N. Meyer,⁶ R. Nolte,⁸ A. Peters,^{3,11} M. Popp,² J. Reichel,¹² A. Roura,⁵ J. Rudolph,² M. Schiemangk,^{3,11} M. Schneider,⁸ S. T. Seidel,² K. Sengstock,⁴ V. Tamma,⁵ T. Valenzuela,⁶ A. Vogel,⁴ R. Walser,⁸ T. Wendrich,² P. Windpassinger,⁴ W. Zeller,⁵ T. van Zoest,⁷ W. Ertmer,² W. P. Schleich,⁵ and E. M. Rasel^{2,*}



Fig. 1. Cuts through the ZARM drop tower facility in Bremen (A) and the capsule (B) containing the heart of the BEC experiment (C). The capsule is released from the top of the tower (D) and is recaptured after a free fall of 4.7 s through an evacuated stainless steel tube at the bottom of the tower by a 8-m-deep pool of polystyrene balls (E). In the process of recapturing the capsule, the experiment has to survive decelerations up to 500 m/s² (about 50 times the local gravitational acceleration). The facility permits up to three drops per day. The capsule contains all of the components necessary to prepare and observe a BEC, such as the laser systems for cooling the atoms, the ultrahigh-vacuum chamber with the atom chip, the current drivers and power supplies, a charge-coupled device (CCD) camera, and a control computer. The vacuum chamber is surrounded by two magnetic shields and allows us to include an atom interferometer in future experiments. Moreover, the catapult underneath the movable polystyrene pool offers the possibility of extending the time of free fall to 9 s.





Science and Technology



(a)

FIG. 2 (color). Mach-Zehnder interferometry of a BEC in microgravity as realized in the ZARM drop tower in Bremen (a) where absorption imaging (b) brings out the interference fringes (c). The preparatory experimental sequence (a) includes capturing cold atoms in a magneto-optical trap (MOT), loading an Ioffe-Pritchard trap, creating a BEC, and applying the DKC followed by the adiabatic rapid passage (ARP). The remaining time before the capture of the capsule at the bottom of the tower is used for AI and imaging of the atoms. The AMZI below the atom chip [top plane of (b)] is formed by scattering the BEC off moving Bragg gratings generated by two counterpropagating laser beams (red arrows directed along the y axis), resulting in two pairs of interfering BECs. A resonant laser beam propagating along the x axis projects the shadow of the BEC onto a CCD camera. Typical interference patterns and the corresponding column densities (c) are shown for T_{ex} of 180 and 260 ms with corresponding fringe spacing of 75 and 107 µm.

"The current accuracy of optical atomic clocks in combination with techniques from atom interferometry should already allow to perform experiments on "superposition of clocks". I am confident that this will happen soon."

qubit in a gravitational field

$$|\mathbf{g}
angle + |\mathbf{e}
angle
ightarrow |g
angle + exp\left\{-rac{i}{\hbar}rac{(E_g - E_e)}{c^2}ght
ight\}|e
angle$$

i.e. the qubit rotates on the Bloch sphere at a frequency $\omega_g = \frac{\Delta E}{\hbar c^2} g h$



Quantum interferometric visibility as a witness of general relativistic proper time

Magdalena Zych¹, Fabio Costa¹, Igor Pikovski¹ & Časlav Brukner^{1,2}

If the qubit is placed in a spatial superposition of two vertical heights (in Earth's gravitational field) separated by Δh the qubits will evolve differently:

Dephasing will occur at a frequency $\Delta \omega_g = \frac{\Delta E}{\hbar c^2} g \Delta h$

Complete dephasing (orthogonal qubit states) will occur

after a time $T_{\pi} = \frac{\pi}{\Delta \omega_g} = \frac{\pi \hbar c^2}{\Delta E g \Delta h}$

Complete re-phasing will occur after a time $2T_{\pi}$

Example:

 Δ h=20m (Kasevich drop tower, Stanford), Δ E=2eV (optical qubit, e.g. 4S-3D transition in Ca-2+) → Tπ = 500 ms (compatible with achievable coherence times)



"The current accuracy of optical atomic clocks in combination with techniques from atom interferometry should already allow to perform experiments on "superposition of clocks". I am confident that this will happen soon."

qubit in a gravitational field

$$|\mathbf{g}\rangle + |\mathbf{e}\rangle \rightarrow |g\rangle + exp\left\{-\frac{i}{\hbar}\frac{(E_g - E_e)}{c^2}ght\right\}|e\rangle$$

i.e. the qubit rotates on the Bloch sphere at a frequency $\omega_g = \frac{\Delta E}{\hbar c^2} g h$



If the qubit is placed in a spatial superposition of two vertical heights (in Earth's gravitational field) separated by Δh the qubits will evolve differently:

Dephasing will occur at a frequency $\Delta \omega_g = \frac{\Delta E}{\hbar c^2} g \Delta h$

Alternative: Entangle 2 qubits that are spatially separated by Δh

 $\mid g\rangle_{h1} \mid e\rangle_{h2} + \mid e\rangle_{h1} \mid g\rangle_{h2} \longrightarrow \mid g\rangle_{h1} \mid e\rangle_{h2} + exp\left\{-\frac{i}{\hbar}\frac{(E_g - E_e)}{c^2}g\Delta ht\right\} \mid e\rangle_{h1} \mid g\rangle_{h2}$

\rightarrow singlet-triplet oscillation at frequency $\Delta \omega_g$

Feasible with present day technology:

- Entanglement between states of separated atoms has been demonstrated (e.g. Weinfurter group (22))
- Large ∆h through optical fibers





Nature 464, 697-703 (2010)

Quantum ground state and single-phonon control of a mechanical resonator

A. D. O'Connell¹, M. Hofheinz¹, M. Ansmann¹, Radoslaw C. Bialczak¹, M. Lenander¹, Erik Lucero¹, M. Neeley¹, D. Sank¹, H. Wang¹, M. Weides¹, J. Wenner¹, John M. Martinis¹ & A. N. Cleland¹





Nature 475, 359-363 (2011)

Sideband cooling of micromechanical motion to the quantum ground state

J. D. Teufel¹, T. Donner^{2,3}, Dale Li¹, J. W. Harlow^{2,3}, M. S. Allman^{1,3}, K. Cicak¹, A. J. Sirois^{1,3}, J. D. Whittaker^{1,3}, K. W. Lehnert^{2,3} & R. W. Simmonds¹

Nature 478, 89-92 (2011)

Laser cooling of a nanomechanical oscillator into its quantum ground state

Jasper Chan¹, T. P. Mayer Alegre¹[†], Amir H. Safavi-Naeini¹, Jeff T. Hill¹, Alex Krause¹, Simon Gröblacher^{1,2}, Markus Aspelmeyer² & Oskar Painter¹





Advantage: large mass (>> 10¹⁰ atoms)

Disadvantage of current approaches: small coherence time (mainly limited by mechanical losses*)

For example, if we prepare the center of mass state of a micron-scale mechanical oscillator of 1 MHz resonance frequency and comprising 10¹³ atoms in a coherent spatial superposition of 1 nm separation, a quality factor of Q=10⁷ at an environment temperature of 20 mK will decohere the superposition on a timescale of one picosecond.

$$\gamma_{n}\left(\frac{\Delta x}{\lambda_{A3}(\tau)}\right)^{2} = \frac{2m\mu_{n}k_{i}T(\Delta x)^{2}}{t^{2}} = \frac{k_{i}T}{tQ}\left(\frac{\Delta x}{x_{eP}}\right)^{2} = \Gamma_{Acc}$$

* Note to Philip: in current approaches, mechanical losses are modelled by x-x coupling to a bosonic (non-Markovian) heat bath, hence there is loss-induced decoherence.



Advantage: large mass (>> 10¹⁰ atoms); quantum control is achievable through optical cavities, superconducting circuits, etc.

Disadvantage of current approaches: small coherence time (mainly limited by internal mechanical losses)

Solution: Levitation of masses

- → Optical or magnetic traps are essentially loss-free → long coherence times
- → Quantum state control through coupling to optical cavities or superconducting circuits
- → Free-fall dynamics

Theory see e.g. (23-26)



Trapped Particle

For example, a sphere with 10¹¹ atoms that is prepared in its quantum ground state of motion in a 100kHz frequency optical trap can achieve coherent wavepacket expansion times of **seconds** at an environment temperature of 20 K and a background pressure of 10⁻¹¹ mbar (26).

Solution: Levitation of masses

- → Optical or magnetic traps are essentially loss-free
- → Quantum state control through coupling to optical cavities or superconducting circuits
- → Free-fall dynamics



- Mechanical resonators can be used as measurement devices of external driving forces, with sensitivity limited by the oscillator thermal noise (essentially the product of temperature, mass, ω/Q and detection bandwidth).
- Levitated masses can achieve Q-factors well beyond 10¹⁰ → for a sphere of 500 µm trapped at a frequency of 100 Hz the force noise can be suppressed below 5×10⁻¹⁹ N for integration times shorter than 100 seconds.
- This corresponds to the gravitational force due to a sphere of same size at a distance of 1.5 mm. In other words, it becomes possible to detect **gravitational forces between sub-mm masses**.
- Such experiments provide a top-down approach for future experiments at the interface between quantum physics and gravity: the lowest masses above which gravitational coupling can be observed will be a benchmark for future quantum experiments. In the most optimistic scenario, the combination of force sensitivity and coherence time will eventually enable the quantum regime of gravitational source masses.

Optically trapped nanospheres as mechanical resonators







Vienna Center for Quantum Science and Technology

"These developments will lead to:

- Tests of semiclassical gravity models
- Observation of dephasing through superposition of clocks
- Generation of quantum entanglement
 through gravity
- Observation of decoherence through quantum gravity?"

Classical gravity: localization of macro-objects

How to incorporate a Newtonian gravity field into quantum framework?

e.g. add gravitational selfinteraction (Diosi, Penrose)

$$i\hbar\partial_t\Psi(t,\vec{x}) = \left(-\frac{\hbar^2}{2m}\Delta - Gm^2\int\frac{|\Psi(t,\vec{y})|^2}{\|\vec{x} - \vec{y}\|}\,d^3y\right)\Psi(t,\vec{x})$$

Schrödinger-Newton equation (Diosi 1984)



Figure 4: Collapsing wave packet for $m = 7 \times 10^9$ u. Plotted is the radial probability density $\rho = 4\pi r^2 |\psi|^2$ against r at three different times.

Giulini & Großardt (27), Colin, Durt & Willox (28) and references therein

ightarrow gravitational inhibition of dispersion

- ightarrow gravitationally bound states
- → modified ground state (Gross-Pitaevskii)

m = 10^{10} amu, $\sigma(0) = 500$ nm \rightarrow collapse time t~30,000 sec





Science and Technology

An ultimate experiment? Entanglement by gravity...



universität

wien

FEYNMAN: "Therefore, there must be an amplitude for the gravitational field, provided that the amplification necessary to reach a mass which can produce a gravitational field big enough to serve as a link in the chain does not destroy the possibility of keeping quantum mechanics all the way. There is a *bare* possibility (which I shouldn't mention!) that quantum mechanics fails and becomes classical again when the amplification gets far enough, because of some minimum amplification which you can get across such a chain. But aside from that possibility, if you believe in quantum mechanics up to any level then you have to believe in gravitational quantization in order to describe this experiment." Chapel Hill Conference 1957 (29)

For an initial superposition (Ball 1) of size Δr (distance between center of mass states), separation between the two balls on the order of their diameter and preparation of Ball 2 in a wavepacket of size Δx_0 , the "entanglement rate" (decoherence rate) is (M: mass, ρ : density) $\Gamma_{ent} = \left(\frac{GM}{\hbar}\right) \Delta r \rho \Delta x_0$

An ultimate experiment? Entanglement by gravity...



FEYNMAN: "Therefore, there must be an amplitude for the gravitational field, provided that the amplification necessary to reach a mass which can produce a gravitational field big enough to serve as a link in the chain does not destroy the possibility of keeping quantum mechanics all the way. There is a *bare* possibility (which I shouldn't mention!) that quantum mechanics fails and becomes classical again when the amplification gets far enough, because of some minimum amplification which you can get across such a chain. But aside from that possibility, if you believe in quantum mechanics up to any level then you have to believe in gravitational quantization in order to describe this experiment."

Chapel Hill Conference 1957 (29)

Example: For 2 lead spheres of diameter 500 μ m, an initial superposition size for sphere 1 of $\Delta r = 5 \times 10^{-7}$ m and preparation of sphere 2 in a motional ground state (100 Hz trap frequency) with $\Delta x_0 = 10^{-15}$ m, we obtain $\Gamma_{ent} = 1.5$ Hz, i.e. gravitational entanglement is established on a second time scale.

$$\Gamma_{ent} = \left(\frac{GM}{\hbar}\right) \Delta r \rho \Delta x_0$$

universität

PRL 111, 021302 (2013)

Effective Field Theory Approach to Gravitationally Induced Decoherence

M. P. Blencowe*

Department of Physics and Astronomy, Dartmouth College, Hanover, New Hampshire 03755, USA (Received 27 November 2012; revised manuscript received 10 April 2013; published 12 July 2013)

Adopting the viewpoint that the standard perturbative quantization of general relativity provides an effective description of quantum gravity that is valid at ordinary energies, we show that gravity as an environment induces the rapid decoherence of stationary matter superposition states when the energy differences in the superposition exceed the Planck energy scale.

See also current (different) approaches by Philip Stamp, Bill Unruh, ...

$$\Gamma_{\text{decohere}} = \frac{k_B T}{\hbar} \left(\frac{E - \tilde{E}}{E_P}\right)^2$$

for superposition of different energy eigenstates

For a matter system comprising an Avogadro's number of atoms ~1 gram in a quantum superposition where all of the atoms are either in their ground state or all in their excited state, then we have $\Gamma_{\text{decohere}} \sim 10^2 \text{ sec}^{-1}$. For a system with mass ~1 kg in such a superposition state, the gravitationally induced decoherence rate is $\Gamma_{\text{decohere}} \sim 10^8 \text{ sec}^{-1}$.

→ This is "really, really hard". I do not have an obvious idea how to achieve this. Maybe magnetic particles are a way to go... Levitation would certainly help to significantly suppress other decoherence sources (blackbody localization)

Summary and Outlook



- Levitated massive oscillators coupled to optical cavities or superconducting circuits open a new avenue to quantum experiments with a unique combination of large mass and long coherence times
- Such experiments will enable a new class of gravitational quantum physics experiments, in which quantum systems will eventually serve as a source mass
- In **20 years from now** we (as in "we as scientific community") will have
 - eliminated the idea of semiclassical gravity models through unambiguous experiments;
 - **eliminated** (in passing) the idea of ad-hoc **"collapse" models** (GRWP, Penrose), essentially through the same experiments;
 - found a new key experiment whose outcome has led the way to a almost working quantum theory of gravity.
- Table-top experiments will have played a vital role in this development.

Acknowledgements:

I want to thank all my coworkers and collaborators for making this area of research so exciting and worth while pusrsuing.

I want to thank Philip Stamp for giving this presentation for me. Not being able to make it to this Seven Pines Symposium is already a great punishment by itself. But now Philip is given all the opportunity of making fun of me without me being there to enjoy it

I want to thank Lee for his constant support of fundamental questions through these wonderful Seven Pines Symposia.

> Picture on the right: Almost like Seven Pines -Aspelmeyer group retreat in Dienten, Austria





(1) Fickler et al., Science **338**, 640 (2012). (2) Friedman et al., Nature **406**, 43 (2000). (3) van der Wal et al., Science **290**, 773 (2000). (4) Julsgaard et al., Nature **413**, 400 (2001). (5) Arndt et al., Nature **401**, 680 (1999). (6) Gerlich et al., Nat. Commun. 2, 263 (2011). (7) O'Connell et al., Nature **464**, 697 (2010). (8) Palomaki et al., Science **342**, 710 (2013). (9) Taylor and McCulloch, Ann. N. Y. Acad. Sci. 336, 442 (1980). (10) BICEP2 collaboration, arXiv:1403.3985v2 (2014). (11) I. Ciufolini and E. C. Pavlis, Nature **431**, 958 (2004). (12) Everitt et al., Phys. Rev. Lett. **106**, 221101 (2011). (13) E. Adelberger, Class. Quantum Gravity 2397, (2001). (14) J. Gundlach and S. Merkowitz, Phys. Rev. Lett. 85, 2869 (2000). (15) Chou et al., Science **329**, 1630 (2010). (16) R. Colella, A. Overhauser, and S. Werner, Phys. Rev. Lett. 34, 1472 (1975). (17) M. Kasevich and S. Chu, Phys. Rev. Lett. 67, 181 (1991). (18) Nesvizhevsky et al., Nature **415**, 297 (2002). (19) Jenke et al., Phys. Rev. Lett. 112, 151105 (2014). (20) Müntinga et al., Phys. Rev. Lett. 110, 093602 (2013). (21) Juffmann et al., Nat. Nanotechnol. 7, 297 (2012). (22) Hofmann et al. Science **337**, 72 (2012) (23) O. Romero-Isart et al., New J. Phys. **12**, 033015 (2010). (24) D. E. Chang et al., Proc. Natl. Acad. Sci. U. S. A. 107, 1005 (2010). (25) O. Romero-Isart et al., Phys. Rev. Lett. 109, 1 (2012). (26) Romero-Isart et al., Phys. Rev. Lett. **107**, 1 (2011). (27) D. Giulini and A. Großardt, Class. Quantum Gravity 28, 195026 (2011). (28) S. Colin, T. Durt, and R. Willox, arXiv Prepr. arXiv1402.5653 3 (2014). (29) Role Gravit. Physics. Rep. from 1957 Chapel Hill Conf., edited by C. M. DeWitt and D. Rickles (Max Planck Research Library for the History and Development of Knowledge, 2011).



