

# Scientific value of the quantum tests of equivalence principle

Abhishek Majhi\* and Gopal Sardar†  
Indian Statistical Institute,  
Plot No. 203, Barrackpore, Trunk Road,  
Baranagar, Kolkata 700108, West Bengal, India

Determination of Planck constant involves the use of acceleration due to gravity of the earth ( $g$ ) that results in the force on a test mass. The equivalence between inertial mass and gravitational mass of a test object is assumed in the process of logically defining  $g$  from the relevant hypotheses of physics. Consequently, if Planck constant is used as input in any experiment (or in the associated theory that founds such an experiment) that is designed to test the equivalence between inertial and gravitational mass, then it is equivalent to establish a scientific truth by implicitly assuming it i.e. a tautology. There are several notable examples which plague the frontiers of current scientific research which claim to make quantum test of equivalence principle. We question the scientific value of such experiments.

## I. INTRODUCTION

An experiment is considered to have a scientific value when it verifies some hypothesis or theoretical prediction<sup>1</sup>. However, such an experiment can not depend on any input that explicitly or implicitly depends on the concerned hypothesis. If it does, then such an experiment verifies the truth by assuming it in the process. We consider this as a physical demonstration of a logical tautology. Such an experiment is devoid of any scientific value<sup>2</sup>. Here, we intend to discuss one such scenario, that involves a certain class of experiments which are designed to perform “quantum” tests of the equivalence principle [1–4], *where and henceforth, by “equivalence principle” we mean “equivalence between inertial mass and gravitational mass of an object”* [5]. These experiments inevitably involve the Planck constant (henceforth, to be denoted as “ $h$ ”) which justifies the word “quantum”. To be more particular, such experiments rely on atom interferometry where the De Broglie wavelength ( $\lambda$ ) of the respective matter wave, with momentum  $p$ , needs to be calculated from the formula  $\lambda = h/p$  and for this calculation  $h$  is considered as a given input – see refs. [1–4] and the relevant references there in.

We may express our concern in short as follows. Irrespective of the different measurement procedures to determine  $h$  employed till date, the corresponding theoretical analyses involve, either explicitly or implicitly, the use of  $g$ , where by the symbol “ $g$ ”, we denote “acceleration due to gravity of the earth”, or equivalently “gravitational field of the earth”. For example, as we shall discuss here, in case of the Kibble balance method,  $h$  is expressed in terms of  $g$ . On the other hand, in case of photo-electron emission method,  $g$  gets implicitly incorporated into the analyses through the processes by which “charge of an electron” is determined and used as an input. However,  $g$  can be *defined* from the axioms and hypotheses of physics, *if and only if the equivalence principle is assumed*. Therefore, the so called “quantum tests of equivalence principle” are attempts to physically demonstrate a logical tautology and are devoid of any scientific value.

To present our arguments, we begin with a discussion regarding the definition of  $g$ , especially with a focus on how the assumption of equivalence principle is necessary for such a definition. Then, we discuss in what way the theoretical analyses for the different procedures of determining  $h$  are founded on the assumption of the equivalence principle due to the involvement of  $g$  and also due to the use of only one concept of “mass” regardless of any distinction as “inertial” and “gravitational”. Finally, we conclude with a summary and some remarks regarding the status of this work in light of the new convention adopted by the science community in 2019[58]. .

---

\*Electronic address: [abhishek.majhi@gmail.com](mailto:abhishek.majhi@gmail.com)

†Electronic address: [gopalsardar.87@gmail.com](mailto:gopalsardar.87@gmail.com)

<sup>1</sup> The other scenario is when an experiment brings forth some newly observed phenomenon that is yet to be explained by theory.

<sup>2</sup> Nevertheless, such an experiment can have scientific value if it results in some hitherto unknown phenomenon that is not related to the concerned theory.

## II. INTERPRETATIONS OF THE SYMBOL “ $g$ ”

There are two kinds of interpretations that we generally associate with the symbol “ $g$ ”. One is the *operational* interpretation and the other is the *logical* interpretation.

We provide the operational interpretation of “ $g$ ” in terms of what we can measure<sup>3</sup> and it is the “acceleration of a freely falling object due to earth’s gravity” which we determine experimentally (e.g. by dropping objects). However, if we restrict ourselves to being *completely* operational, we can not ask questions like the following – “how do we interpret that the acceleration is *due to earth’s gravity*?” This is because, in order to have a reasonable answer to this question, we need to consider hypotheses, axioms, etc. of physics, namely Newton’s laws of gravity and motion, to provide the logical explanations corresponding to “earth’s gravity” through mathematical expressions. So, we need to be both operational (i.e. induce from experience) and logical (i.e. deduce from assumed truths i.e. axioms, hypotheses, etc.)<sup>4</sup> We discuss, in what follows, that the equivalence principle is a *necessary* proposition for the logical (deductive) definition of “ $g$ ”<sup>5</sup>.

### A. Definition of “ $g$ ” and the logical status of the equivalence principle

At first sight it may appear to be an utter stupidity to have a discussion regarding the definition of “ $g$ ” as it is “too trivial”. Nevertheless, keeping in mind that the discussion is regarding some logical issues, we believe that the definition must be put into formal terms, rather than in a colloquial language, so as to clear any doubts regarding any of the individual propositions involved in the process, irrespective of its apparent triviality[52]. Therefore, in order to avoid any misjudgment by the concerned reader regarding the definition of “ $g$ ”, we consider formal statements, regardless of its simplicity and familiarity in the science community. It is much like what Hadamard has done to clear the doubt regarding the statement of Huygens’ principle in section (33) of ref.[53]. He has considered “simple formulae and statements” in the form of propositions and has made a formal logical analysis in order to resolve doubts: “*But, however simple the preceding formulae and statements, they have, nevertheless, opened somewhat important and lengthy scientific discussions, of which we have now to speak and which refer to what is called Huygens’ Principle.*”

Apart from the above mentioned reasons, we adopt such a path based on formal logic so as to put an emphasis on the necessity of the assumption of equivalence principle, as a formal statement, for the deductive definition of “ $g$ ”. In what follows, the symbols “ $\wedge$ ,  $\iff$ ,  $:=$ ” denote “logical conjunction, logical equivalence (if and only if), defined as” respectively<sup>6</sup>.

- **Proposition A:** Newton’s laws of motion apply to *an object whose motion is to be studied as a whole*, called *test object*. Associated concept of “mass” is called inertial mass ( $m_I$ ). Acting force is given by

$$F = m_I a, \tag{1}$$

where  $a$  is the acceleration of the test object.

- **Proposition B:** *The test object obeys Newton’s law of gravitation*. Associated concept of “mass” is called gravitational mass ( $m_G$ ). Force of gravitation on the test object due to the earth is given by

$$F = G \frac{m_G M_{earth}}{r^2}. \tag{2}$$

<sup>3</sup> The “operational” viewpoint of any definition in physics was advocated by Mach [47]. We know that Einstein, who was highly influenced by Mach, took an “operational” approach to give meaning to “time” by stating our everyday experience of seeing the hands of a clock to mark the timing of an observed event like “arrival of the train at the station”[48]. The operational perspective was revisited in an elaborate fashion by Bridgman [49].

<sup>4</sup> We can not just stick to only one of the following stances – “a posteriori induction”, “a priori deduction”. One can consult ref.[50] for a discussion regarding such issues.

<sup>5</sup> Ref.[51, 52] contain some in depth discussion regarding such logical perspective of “definition”.

<sup>6</sup> In the context of writing down the propositions  $A$  and  $B$  citing ref.[44, 45] would have been relevant. However, those references do not contain the equations in the form that we use today. So, we have assumed that the reader is already acquainted with the Newton’s laws.

Here,  $G$  is a proportionality constant,  $M_{earth}$  is the gravitational mass<sup>7</sup> of the earth and  $r$  is the distance between the test object and the earth, considering them as two points (point-masses).

- **Proposition C:** Equivalence principle holds:

$$m_I = m_G, \quad (3)$$

where the meaning of the symbols “ $m_I$ ” and “ $m_G$ ” are explained by  $A$  and  $B$  respectively.

**Corollary:**  $G$  is a fundamental constant if and only if  $C$  is true for any type of material i.e.  $m_{I(type)} = m_{G(type)}$  for any type of material like iron, aluminium, copper, etc<sup>8</sup>.

- **Proposition D:** Concept of “gravitational field due to earth”, represented by the symbol “ $g$ ”, which is conceived through the observation of vertically falling objects towards the earth, is definable.
- **Proposition E:**  $g$  is definable *if and only if* Newton’s laws of motion, Newton’s law of gravitation and the equivalence principle hold simultaneously for the test object. Formally,  $((A \wedge B) \wedge C) \iff D$ .

**Corollary:**  $E$  implies the definition of  $g$ . Formally,

$$E \implies g := \frac{GM_{earth}}{r^2}. \quad (4)$$

- **Proposition F:** Considering  $g$  as input, experiments are modeled to determine  $h$ . We call such models as “ $g$ -experiments” i.e.

$$g\text{-experiments} : (g \wedge \dots). \quad (5)$$

The “dots” stand for propositions, other than  $D$ , which need to hold for the modeling. Such propositions can be both theoretical and experimental in nature. By “experimental propositions” we mean, the choices of appropriate physical conditions which are made by the experimenter in the laboratory.

Let us explicate the relevance of the above propositions and the nature of the logical structure of the same as follows:

- **Step 1:**  $A$  provides meaning to the symbol “ $m_I$ ”.  $B$  provides meaning to the symbol “ $m_G$ ”. Hence,  $C$  is *meaningless* without either of  $A$  and  $B$ . Consequently,  $C$  can neither be validated nor invalidated without  $A$  and  $B$  together. Also, validation or invalidation of  $C$  does not affect the validity of  $A$  or of  $B$ .
- **Step 2:**  $D$  is an assertion about the possibility of theoretically defining the concept of “gravitational field due to the earth”, represented by the symbol “ $g$ ”.  $E$  states the condition when such definition is possible by using  $A, B$  and  $C$ . Thus,  $E$  *implies* the definition of  $g$ . In other words, the definition of  $g$  is implied by all the propositions from  $A$  to  $E$ , albeit an one-sided implication.
- **Step 3:**  $F$  is the modeling of the  $g$ -experiments used to determine  $h$ . The meaning associated with the symbol “ $g$ ” is explained by Step 1 and Step 2.

---

<sup>7</sup> We have not gone into further distinction of active and passive gravitational mass, unlike in ref.[5].

<sup>8</sup> Here, we note the following. If  $m_{I(a)} \propto m_{G(a)}$ , then the proportionality constant  $\gamma_a$  can also depend on the material so that we can write  $m_{I(a)} = \gamma_a m_{G(a)}$ . In that case we should have  $G_a$  instead of  $G$  i.e. the proportionality constant in Newton’s law of gravitation would depend on the material that is used to perform the experiment for its determination. So, we must consider equality, and not proportionality, of  $m_{I(a)}$  and  $m_{G(a)}$  so as to consider  $G$  as fundamental constant. We believe, Eotvos et. al. have only meant “equal” when they write “proportional” in the sentence after the second equation in ref.[54]: “The proportionality of inertia and gravity is therefore synonymous with the fact that  $f$  is a constant quantity (gravitational constant)”. This is the English translation that we have obtained from the original German version with the help of Google translate.

Therefore, we can draw the following conclusion:

*Since  $C$  is necessary for the definition of  $g$ , then  $F$  is implied by  $C$  i.e. the validity of the equivalence principle goes in as a necessary assumption when  $g$  is used as an input to determine  $h$ . Hence, use of  $h$  to experimentally determine the validity of equivalence principle, is an attempt to physically demonstrate a logical tautology.*

### B. “Completely operational” or “logical contradiction”?

Although we have briefly argued just a bit earlier that we can not be completely operational, we would like to emphasize that point once again in light of the above logical analysis. One can certainly object to the conclusion (drawn in the earlier section) by arguing that, since  $g$  is only implied by the successive propositions ( $E \implies g$ ) and the reverse is not necessarily true (i.e. it is not an “if and only if” condition and rather a one-sided implication), then the tautology can be avoided. Instead of the above explained meaning of “ $g$ ”, a complete operational meaning can be assigned to “ $g$ ” as follows:

*The acceleration of a vertically falling object can be measured to have a value  $9.81 \text{ m/s}^2$  without referring to Newton’s law of gravitation. Then, this explains the meaning of “ $g$ ”, and provides its numerical value that has been used in the  $g$ -experiments. In this way, there is no necessity of  $B$  and hence,  $C, D, E$  become meaningless. Only  $A$  and the symbol “ $a$ ” suffice and the introduction of the symbol “ $g$ ” is altogether unnecessary. We can have just “ $a$ -experiments” to determine  $h$ .*

However, in such a way of reasoning, the operational arguer *denies* the knowledge of the Newtonian[44, 45] (as well as Einsteinian[46]) theory of gravity that explains the phenomenon of falling object and consequently, denies the knowledge of the concept of “gravitational mass”. So, if the arguer now claims to examine the validity of equivalence principle by using  $h$ , then he should *accept* the knowledge that he has already *denied*. Hence, the operational arguer runs into a logical contradiction, that is unacceptable.

At this point a diligent reader may be wondering whether our arguments imply that Eotvos et. al., in ref.[54], have made a logical contradiction. The answer is certainly negative. It is true that the authors have considered  $g$  in operational terms i.e. they used a directly measured value of  $g$  in their analyses. However, their motive has been to judge how close are  $g$  and  $a$  if we *do not assume the equivalence principle* (e.g. see Box 1.2 on page 16 of ref.[56]). Their case is different from the scenario where people consider the logical definition of  $g$  by assuming the validity of equivalence principle and use the value of  $g$  in operational terms if required to determine some quantity, which they use in turn to test the validity of equivalence principle. The issue will be more clear as we proceed and discuss what follows.

## III. PRINCIPLES BEHIND DETERMINATION OF $h$

Now, let us discuss how the assumption of the equivalence principle is involved either explicitly or implicitly in the determination of  $h$ . Broadly, there are two categories of such experiments: (i) the Kibble balance experiments e.g. see refs.[6, 7] and the relevant references therein<sup>9</sup> (ii) photo-electron emission experiments e.g. see refs.[12, 14] and the relevant references in ref.[14].

### A. Kibble balance experiments

In Kibble balance experiments [6, 7], a crucial step is the balancing between the gravitational force (due to earth) on a test mass ( $m$ )<sup>10</sup> and force generated by a current ( $I$ ) carrying coil perpendicularly placed in

<sup>9</sup> Since Joule balance technique is just an improvement of the Kibble balance and follows the same basic principle of balancing under gravity (see e.g. refs.[9–11]), we do not discuss it separately. Our views regarding the Kibble balance that concerns the equivalence principle as the founding premise of the theoretical analysis, also applies for the Joule balance.

<sup>10</sup> The test mass includes the tare mass.

a magnetic field. So, the relevant equation is[6]:

$$F = mg = BLI \quad (6)$$

where  $L$  is the length of the coil and  $B$  is the magnetic flux density. This is called the weighing phase.

The other phase, which is called the moving phase, is designed to measure  $BL$  from the voltage developed in the coil ( $V$ ) when it passes with constant velocity  $v$  through the magnetic field. The relevant equation is  $V = BLv$ , which is then used to eliminate  $BL$  from eq.(6), under the assumption that  $BL$  remains same in both phases, to obtain the Kibble equation:

$$mg = \frac{IV}{v} , \quad (7)$$

Going through some further theoretical manipulations, corresponding to the measurement process (details can be found in ref.[6], unnecessary for the present purpose), the expression for  $h$  comes out to be the following:

$$h = \gamma g v m \quad (8)$$

where  $\gamma$  is a parameter with physical dimension  $[T]^2$  (time squared) that depends on the properties of the materials used in the experiment<sup>11</sup>.

We note that in the theoretical analysis of the Kibble balance experiments, only *one* concept of “mass”, denoted by “ $m$ ”, has been used and no categorization like “inertial mass” and “gravitational mass” has been made. Furthermore,  $g$  appears explicitly in the expression for  $h$  i.e. in eq.(8). Therefore, the equivalence principle has been assumed.

## B. Photo-electron emission experiments

In photo-electron emission experiments, as was first done by Millikan [12], the theoretical analysis is founded upon the photoelectric equation rooted to Einstein’s work [13]:  $h\nu = \phi + E_{max}$ , where  $E_{max}$  is the maximum kinetic energy of photo-electron,  $\nu$  is the frequency of the incident light and  $\phi$  is the work function of the illuminated material.

It is found in such experiments that  $E_{max}$  is proportional to  $\nu$ .  $E_{max}$  is determined by measuring the stopping potential  $V$  from the equation  $E_{max} = eV$ , where  $e$  is the charge of an electron. Therefore, plotting  $V$  along  $y$ -axis and  $\nu$  along  $x$ -axis,  $h/e$  is obtained as the slope of the straight line. Hence, *the value of  $h$  is determined from this slope  $h/e$  by taking the value of  $e$  as input.*

This fact does not change even in modern day experiments which involve photo-emission spectroscopy techniques to increase the precision of such experiments e.g. see ref.[14] and the relevant references there in. So, it is worth understanding how  $e$  is determined (without using  $h$  as input<sup>12</sup>). We discuss the relevant methods in the following section.

<sup>11</sup> It is interesting to note, in passing, that the expression (8) of  $h$  is dependent on velocity of moving coil. Therefore, the following questions may arise: Is the determined value of  $h$  boost dependent? What happens to the measurement if it could be done for relativistic situations i.e. when  $v$  is comparable to  $c$ ? If such an expression of  $h$  is kept track of in theoretical physics, do all the, so called, Lorentz invariant expressions in quantum field theory remain “Lorentz invariant”? In the rest frame of the moving coil,  $h$  becomes zero. Does it mean “classical” or “quantum” depends on the boosted frame? Pauli-Lubanski pseudovector has mass and spin as the constituents of the two eigen-values which are obviously Lorentz (Poincare) invariant (e.g. see ref.[57]) and the unit of spin is  $h$ . Then, how can such a result be reconciled with expression (8) so that appearance of velocity does not appear to be counter intuitive?

<sup>12</sup> There are examples of experiments, where experimenters claim to determine  $e$  by using some value of  $h$  as input in the process, without any elaborate discussion regarding how such value of  $h$  is determined in the first place. For example, the experiments like those discussed in ref.[15, 16], which use the Single Electron Tunneling (SET) mechanism[17, 18], use  $h$  as input to determine  $e$ . We keep any discussion regarding such experiments out of the present context because our motive is to discuss the methods of determining  $h$  and not to assume its value as given.

### C. Principles behind determination of $e$ (without using $h$ as input)

There are broadly two methods of determining  $e$  without using  $h$  as input, which have been explored till date viz. oil-drop experiment and the x-ray spectroscopy method. While the former is explicitly dependent on the use of  $g$ , later is implicitly dependent on the use of  $g$  through the determination of Avogadro constant in the process. Therefore, both the procedures are based on the assumption of equivalence principle, which we shall discuss in what follows.

#### 1. Oil-drop experiment

The oil-drop experiment is due to Millikan [21, 22] and Fletcher [23]. The theoretical analysis behind the experiment can be traced back to ref.[21], where the first equation has been written in the following way: “*The relations between the apparent mass  $\mathbf{m}$  of a drop, the charge  $e_n$ , which it carries, its speed,  $v_1$  under gravity, and its speed  $v_2$  under the influence of an electrical field of strength  $E$ , are given by the simple equation*

$$\frac{v_1}{v_2} = \frac{\mathbf{m}g}{e_n E - \mathbf{m}g} \quad \text{or} \quad e_n = \frac{\mathbf{m}g}{E} \left( \frac{v_1 + v_2}{v_1} \right).'' \quad (9)$$

The following clarification has been provided in a footnote: “*The term ‘apparent mass’ has been used to denote the difference between the actual mass and the buoyancy of the air.*”. Therefore, only *one* concept of “mass” (called “actual mass”) has been used in such an analysis. No distinction such as “inertial mass” and “gravitational mass” has been made. Furthermore, the involvement of  $g$  in the analysis is explicitly manifest from the expression for  $e_n$ , where  $e_n$  stands for some integral multiple of  $e$ . Therefore, the equivalence principle has been assumed.

#### 2. X-ray spectroscopy method and the principles behind determination of Avogadro constant

The second method of determining  $e$  relies on the use of x-ray spectroscopy to study crystal lattices as grating e.g. see refs. [24, 25] and the relevant references therein. This method of determining  $e$  requires the use of Avogadro constant  $N_A$  as input [9]. And, the theoretical analyses, which underlie the experimental determination of  $N_A$  by various methods<sup>13</sup>, are invariably founded upon only *one* concept of “mass” along with explicit involvement of  $g$  [26–28], as we explain in what follows.

In ref.[26], the final expression for  $N_A$ , that appears in the section called “*Precise Determination of Avogadro’s Constant*”, explicitly depends on  $g$ :

$$2.303(RT/N_A) \log_{10}(n_0/n) = (4/3)\pi a^3 g(\Delta - \delta)\mathbf{h}. \quad (10)$$

The significance of the other symbols in the equation can be found in ref.[26] and the symbol “ $\mathbf{h}$ ” represent some length and *not* Planck constant. The above expression is rooted to the buoyancy related analysis that follow from the earlier sections of ref.[26]. Such analysis is based on only *one* concept of “mass” which becomes apparent from only *one* concept of “density”<sup>14</sup>. To mention,  $\Delta, \delta$  are the densities of the granular material and the inter-granular liquid, respectively, which have been used to perform the experiment. Further,  $g$  is explicitly manifest in eq.(10). Hence, the equivalence principle has been assumed in the process.

In ref.[27], the authors declare (in the second paragraph), the following: “*We have made, instead, readily available highly spherical steel artifacts as local and temporary ‘standards’ of density. Their masses were*

<sup>13</sup> Of course, by “various methods” we mean only those methods of measurements which use the value of neither  $h$  nor  $e$  as input to determine  $N_A$ .

<sup>14</sup> Since *density = mass/volume*, then the use of two different concepts of mass, namely, inertial mass and gravitational mass, would have led to two different notions of densities viz. inertial density=inertial mass/volume and gravitational density=gravitational mass/volume. Until now, we have not encountered such concepts in physics.

determined in terms of the U.S. National Standard (kilogram replica number 20) by well understood procedures.” This “well understood procedure”, described in ref.[30], is based on only *one* concept of “mass” and the use of  $g$ . Therefore, the equivalence principle has been assumed in the process.

In a nutshell, the determination of  $N_A$  depends on the measured value of the density ( $\rho$ ) of the associated crystal and  $\rho$  is measured through buoyancy related experiments[31–36]. Any such experiment is based on Archimedes’ principle [29] where  $g$  plays the role in defining “the weight of an object”. Also, due to the inputs of the mass measurements,  $g$  gets involved in the process as well[30]. This is because mass measurements are done through mass comparators which are just balancing instruments with a founding principle based on the use of  $g$  and only *one* concept of “mass” [37–39]. Importantly, such mass measurements using mass comparators are involved in any modern experiment<sup>15</sup> that intend to determine  $N_A$  e.g. the modern x-ray crystal density method discussed in refs.[40, 41] indeed relies on mass comparators for mass measurement of the silicon crystal which becomes clear from the relevant references therein and especially from refs.[42, 43].

Therefore, we can conclude from the above discussion that the determination of Avogadro constant ( $N_A$ ) is based on the assumption of the equivalence principle.

#### IV. CONCLUDING REMARKS

Let us conclude by providing a concise account of what we have discussed, followed by some crucial remarks regarding the status of this work in light of the new convention adopted in 2019[58]. While we define the symbol “ $g$ ” to bear the meaning “acceleration due to gravity of the earth”, we assume in course of such a definition that the equivalence principle (equivalence between inertial and gravitational mass) holds. Any measurement procedure of Planck constant ( $h$ ), that involves the use of  $g$ , either explicitly or implicitly, is therefore dependent on the assumption of equivalence principle. While the Kibble balance method explicitly involves the use of  $g$ , the photo-electron emission experiments implicitly involves the use of  $g$  through the measurement of the charge of an electron  $e$ . This is because the determination of  $e$  through oil-drop experiment explicitly depends on the use of  $g$  and the method of x-ray spectroscopy, to determine  $e$ , implicitly depends on  $g$  due to the determination of Avogadro constant ( $N_A$ ) by measuring the crystal density through buoyancy related experiments (which require “weight of an object” to be defined) and mass measurements through mass comparators (which is based on balancing mechanism involving  $g$  in principle). In view of these, we conclude that the modern day experiments which claim to make quantum tests of equivalence principle, are just attempts to physically demonstrate a logical tautology i.e. in such experiments one assumes the equivalence principle to test the equivalence principle.

Now, an apparently legitimate objection may be raised against this work, if one considers the new convention adopted by the scientific community in the year 2019 [58], in the following way:

**Objection:** *Since 2019 the Planck constant ( $h$ ) has been considered as a defining constant, in terms of which (and other defining constants), the kilogram – unit of mass – is defined. The distinction between “inertial” mass and “gravitational” mass does not enter such a definition.*

While such an objection may appear to be legitimate at first, however it is fallible to simple counter reasoning as we demonstrate in what follows. It is true that  $h$  has been being considered a defining constant since 2019 and it can be found to have been clearly stated in the Preface of ref.[58]. So, the respective value (in some system of units like SI system) is chosen to be exact and the base units like kilogram are defined in terms of  $h$  and other defining constants. However, such a definition of kilogram, as given in ref.[58], is *theoretical* and yet to be realized through experiment. In fact, this has been clearly mentioned, on page no. 131 of ref.[58], that:

*“The present definition fixes the numerical value of  $h$  exactly and the mass of the prototype has now to be determined by experiment.”*

That, the objection raised about the redundancy of the equivalence between inertial and gravitational mass is empty of any essence, can be understood if we pose the following question regarding the above promise that “the mass of the prototype has now to be determined by experiment”:

---

<sup>15</sup> We consider only those experiments which do not use  $h$  as input in the process of determining Avogadro constant. This is because we are investigating the methods by which  $h$  is determined.

*What type of mass of the prototype is going to be determined by experiment – inertial or gravitational?*

In this work we have discussed precisely this issue regarding mass determinations in general and we have pointed out that one always assumes the equivalence between inertial and gravitational mass while performing such mass measurements. However, such an assumption is not stated formally and rather kept unmentioned.

Further, we may point out that the chosen value of  $h$  has been determined through years of experimental research and then only it has been possible to reach a general consensus to consider an exact value, based on which the base units are defined in ref.[58]. What we have discussed in the article is that, all such procedures to determine the value of  $h$ , which have been performed over the years, are based on the assumption of the equivalence between inertial mass and gravitational mass, explicitly or implicitly. Now, if we consider the current convention of choosing  $h$  to be *exact*, then it is implied by such convention that inertial mass and gravitational mass are *exactly* equivalent. Therefore, according to the convention of 2019, the quantum tests of equivalence between inertial mass and gravitational mass [1–4], are physical demonstrations of a logical tautology.

*Acknowledgment:* The authors thank R. Radhakrishnan for pointing out ref.[53]. The work was accomplished while G. S. was visiting The Indian Statistical Institute, Kolkata. A. M. is supported by the Department of Science and Technology of India through the INSPIRE Faculty Fellowship, Grant no.- IFA18-PH208.

- 
- [1] G. Rosi, G. D’Amico, L. Cacciapuoti, F. Sorrentino, M. Prevedelli, M. Zych, C. Brukner and G. M. Tino, *Quantum test of the equivalence principle for atoms in coherent superposition of internal energy states*, Nature Communications , volume 8, Article number: 15529 (2017), [online link](#). 1, 8
  - [2] Magdalena Zych and Caslav Brukner, *Quantum formulation of the Einstein equivalence principle*, Nature Physics, volume 14, pages1027–1031(2018), [online link](#).
  - [3] Jason Williams, Sheng-wei Chiow, Nan Yu and Holger Mueller, *New Journal of Physics*, Volume 18, February (2016), [online link](#).
  - [4] Sven Herrmann, Hansjoerg Dittus, Claus Lammerzahl and (for the QUANTUS and PRIMUS teams), Testing the equivalence principle with atomic interferometry, [online link](#). 1, 8
  - [5] Herman Bondi, *Negative mass in general relativity*, Rev. Mod. Phys. 29, 423 (1957), [online link](#). 1, 3
  - [6] C. A. Sanchez, B. M. Wood, R. G. Green, J. O. Liard and D. Inglis, *A determination of Planck’s constant using the NRC watt balance*, Metrologia 51 (2014) S5–S14, [online link](#). 4, 5
  - [7] D. Haddad, F Seifert, L. S. Chao, A. Possolo, D. B. Newell, J. R. Pratt, C. J. Williams and S. Schlamminger, *Measurement of the Planck constant at the National Institute of Standards and Technology from 2015 to 2017*, Metrologia 54 (2017) 633–641, [online link](#), 4
  - [8] N. Feltin and F. Piquemal, *Determination of the elementary charge and the quantum metrological triangle experiment*, Eur. Phys. J. Special Topics 172, 267–296 (2009), [online link](#).
  - [9] Richard Steiner, *History and progress on accurate measurements of the Planck constant*, Rep. Prog. Phys. 76 (2013) 016101, [online link](#). 4, 6
  - [10] Z. Li, Z. Zhang, Q. He, B. Han, Y. Lu, J. Xu, S. Li, C. Li, G. Wang, T. Zeng, and Y. Bai , *The Improvement of Joule Balance NIM-1 and the Design of New Joule Balance NIM-2*, , [online link](#).
  - [11] Z. Li et al., *The Improvements of the NIM-2 Joule Balance*, in IEEE Transactions on Instrumentation and Measurement, vol. 68, no. 6, pp. 2208-2214 (2019), [online link](#). 4
  - [12] Robert Millikan, *A Direct Photoelectric Determination of Planck’s “h”*, Phys. Rev. 7, 355 (1916), [online link](#). 4, 5
  - [13] Albert Einstein, *On a Heuristic Point of View about the Creation and Conversion of Light*, Ann. Physik 17, 132 (1905), English translation by D. ter Haar in *The Old Quantum Theory*, Pergamon Press (1967), [online link](#). 5
  - [14] Jianwei Huang, Dingsong Wu, Yongqing Cai, Yu Xu, Cong Li, Qiang Gao, Lin Zhao, Guodong Liu, Zuyan Xu and X. J. Zhou, *High precision determination of the Planck constant by modern photoemission spectroscopy*, Review of Scientific Instruments 91, 045116 (2020), [online link](#). 4, 5
  - [15] B. Jeckelmann and F. Piquemal, *The Elementary Charge for the Definition and Realization of the Ampere*, Ann. Phys. (Berlin), 1800389 (2018), [online link](#). 5
  - [16] E. R. Williams, R. N. Ghosh and J. M. Martinis, *Measuring the Electron’s Charge and the Fine-Structure Constant by Counting Electrons on a Capacitor*, J. Res. Natl. Inst. Stand. Technol. 97, 299 (1992), [online link](#). 5
  - [17] T. A. Fulton and G. J. Dolan, *Observation of single-electron charging effects in small tunnel junctions*, Phys. Rev. Lett. 59, 109 (1987), [online link](#). 5
  - [18] D. V. Averin and K. K. Likharev, *Coulomb Blockade of Single-Electron Tunneling, and Coherent Oscillations in*



- Small Tunnel Junctions*, Journal of Low Temperature Physics, Vol. 62, Nos. 3/4 (1986), [online link](#). 5
- [19] S. Komiyama, O. Astafiev, V. Antonov, T. Kutsuwa and H. Hirai, *A single-photon detector in the far-infrared range*, Nature 403, 405–407 (2000), [online link](#).
- [20] L. Kouwenhoven, *One photon seen by one electron*, Nature volume 403, pages374–375(2000), [online link](#).
- [21] Robert Millikan, *The Isolation of an Ion, a Precision Measurement of its Charge, and the Correction of Stokes’s Law*, Phys. Rev. (Series I) 32, 349 (1911), [online link](#). 6
- [22] Robert Millikan, *On the elementary electrical charge and the avogadro constant*, Phys. Rev. 2, 109 (1913), [online link](#). 6
- [23] Harvey Fletcher, *My Work with Millikan on the Oil-drop Experiment*, Physics Today 35, 6, 43 (1982), [online link](#). 6
- [24] H. R. Robinson, *The charge of the electron*, Reports on Progress in Physics, Volume 2, Number 1 (1935), [online link](#). 6
- [25] H. R. Robinson, *The charge of the electron*, Reports on Progress in Physics, Volume 4, Number 1 (1937), [online link](#). 6
- [26] Jean Perrin, *Mouvement brownien et réalité moléculaire*, Annales de Chimie et de Physique. 8e Série. 18: 1–114 (1909), Extract in English, translation by Frederick Soddy, [online link](#). 6
- [27] R. D. Deslattes, A. Henins, H. A. Bowman, R. M. Schoonover, C. L. Carroll, I. L. Barnes, L. A. Machlan, L. J. Moore and W. R. Shields, *Determination of the Avogadro Constant*, Phys. Rev. Lett. 33, 463 (1974), [online link](#). 6
- [28] R. D. Deslattes, A. Henins, R. M. Schoonover, C. L. Carroll and H. A. Bowman, *Avogadro Constant - Corrections to an Earlier Report*, Phys. Rev. Lett. 36, 898 – Published 12 April 1976, [online link](#). 6
- [29] *On floating bodies* on page no. 253 in Archimedes, Heath T.L. (eds.), *The Works of Archimedes: Edited in Modern Notation with Introductory Chapters*, Cambridge University Press (2009). 7
- [30] P. O. Pontius, *Mass and Mass Values*, U. S. National Bureau of Standards Monograph No. 133 (U. S. GPO, Washington, D. C., 1974); [online link](#). 7
- [31] A. Picard and H. Fang, *Mass comparisons using air buoyancy artefacts*, Metrologia 41 (2004) 330–332, [online link](#). 7
- [32] K. Fujii, A. Waseda and N. Kuramoto, *Development of a silicon density standard and precision density measurements of solid materials by hydrostatic weighing*, Meas. Sci. Technol., vol. 12, pp. 2031–2038, (2001), [online link](#).
- [33] K. Fujii, *Present state of the solid and liquid density standards*, Metrologia, vol. 41, pp. S1-S15 (2004), [online link](#).
- [34] K. Fujii, *Precision density measurements of solid materials by hydrostatic weighing*, Meas. Sci. Technol. 17 (2006) 2551–2559, [online link](#).
- [35] A. Waseda and K. Fujii, *High precision density comparison measurement of silicon crystals by the pressure of flotation method*, Meas. Sci. Technol., vol. 12, pp. 2039–2045 (2001), [online link](#).
- [36] A. Waseda and K. Fujii, *Density comparison measurements of silicon crystals by a pressure- of-flotation method at NMIJ*, Metrologia, vol. 41, pp. S62–S67, (2004), [online link](#). 7
- [37] T. J. Quinn, C. C. Speake and R. S. Davis, *A 1 kg Mass Comparator Using Flexure-Strip Suspensions: Preliminary Results*, Metrologia 23, 87- 100 (1986/87), [online link](#). 7
- [38] T. J. Quinn, *The beam balance as an instrument for very precise weighing*, Meas. Sci. Technol. 3 (1992) 141-159, [online link](#).
- [39] A. Picard, *The BIPM flexure-strip balance FB-2*, Metrologia 41 (2004) 319–329, [online link](#). 7
- [40] Naoki Kuramoto, Shigeki Mizushima, Lulu Zhang, Kazuaki Fujita, Yasushi Azuma, Akira Kurokawa, Sho Okubo, Hajime Inaba and Kenichi Fujii, *Determination of the Avogadro constant by the XRCD method using a  $^{28}\text{Si}$ -enriched sphere*, Metrologia 54 (2017) 716–729, [online link](#). 7
- [41] P. Becker, H. Friedrich, K. Fujii, W. Giardini, G. Mana, A. Picard, H-J Pohl, H. Riemann and S. Valkiers, *The Avogadro constant determination via enriched silicon-28*, [online link](#). 7
- [42] A. Picard, *Primary mass calibration of silicon spheres*, Meas. Sci. Technol. 17, 2540–2544 (2006), [online link](#). 7
- [43] A. Picard, P. Barat, M. Borys, M. Firlus and S Mizushima, *State-of-the-art mass determination of  $^{28}\text{Si}$  spheres for the Avogadro project*, Metrologia 48 S112-S119 (2011), [online link](#). 7
- [44] Isaac Newton, *Principia, Volume I - The Motion of Bodies*, University of California Press (1966). [English translation by A. Motte, edited by F. Cajori]. 2, 4
- [45] Isaac Newton, *Principia, Volume II - The System of the World*, University of California Press (1966). [English translation by A. Motte, edited by F. Cajori]. 2, 4
- [46] Albert Einstein, *Relativity: The Special and the General Theory*, Forgotten Books (2010). 4
- [47] Ernst Mach, *The Science Of Mechanics - A Critical and Historical Account of its Development*, 4th Edition (2007). 2
- [48] A. Einstein, *On the electrodynamics of moving bodies*, on page no. 140 of *The Collected Papers of Albert Einstein*, Vol. 2, The Swiss Years Writings, 1900-1909, Princeton University Press (1989). 2
- [49] Percy Williams Bridgman, *The Logic of Modern Physics*, The Macmillan Company (1960). 2
- [50] Willard Quine, *Two dogmas of empiricism in From a logical point of view: 9 logico-philosophical essays*, Harvard

- University Press, Third Edition (1980). 2
- [51] Alfred Tarski, *The Concept of Truth in Formalized Languages in Logics, Semantics, Metamathematics - Papers from 1923 to 1938*, translated by J. H. Woodger, Second Edition, Hackett (1983). 2
- [52] Alfred Tarski, *Introduction to logic and to the methodology of the deductive sciences*, Oxford University Press (1994). 2
- [53] Jacques Hadamard, *Lectures on Cauchy's Problem in Linear Partial Differential Equations*, New Haven Yale University Press (1923). 2
- [54] R. v. Eötvös, D. Pekár, and E. Fekete, Ann. Phys. (Leipzig) 68 (1922) 11. 3, 4
- [55] J. O. Liard, C. A. Sanchez, B. M. Wood, A. D. Inglis and R. J. Silliker, *Metrologia*, 51, S32 (2014), [online link](#).
- [56] C. W. Misner, K. S. Thorne, J. A. Wheeler, *Gravitation*, Freeman (1973). 4
- [57] L. H. Ryder, *Quantum field theory*, Cambridge University Press (1996). 5
- [58] *BIPM: The International System of Units (SI)*, Brochure, 9th Edition (2019), [online link](#).  
1, 7, 8