

AD-A183 057

THE EXPERIMENTAL AND ANALYTICAL DEVELOPMENT OF A  
SENSITIVE SUPERCONDUCTIN. (U) STANFORD UNIV CA DEPT OF  
PHYSICS W H FAIRBANK 30 OCT 85 AFOSR-TR-87-0924


1/1


UNCLASSIFIED

AFOSR-85-0021

F/G 14/2

NL





MICROCOPY RESOLUTION TEST CHART  
NATIONAL BUREAU OF STANDARDS-1963-A

Unclassified

(2)

SECURITY CLASSIFICATION OF THIS PAGE

REPORT DOCUMENT

AD-A183 057

1a. REPORT SECURITY CLASSIFICATION  
Unclassified

2a. SECURITY CLASSIFICATION AUTHORITY

2b. DECLASSIFICATION/DOWNGRADING SCHEDULE

4. PERFORMING ORGANIZATION REPORT NUMBER(S)

3. DISTRIBUTION/AVAILABILITY OF REPORT

Approved for public release,  
distribution unlimited

6a. NAME OF PERFORMING ORGANIZATION

Stanford University

6b. OFFICE SYMBOL  
(If applicable)

7a. NAME OF MONITORING ORGANIZATION

AFOSR

6c. ADDRESS (City, State and ZIP Code)

Department of Physics  
Stanford University  
Stanford, CA 94305

7b. ADDRESS (City, State and ZIP Code)

Building 410  
Bolling AFB, Washington D.C. 20332-64488a. NAME OF FUNDING/SPONSORING  
ORGANIZATION

AFOSR

8b. OFFICE SYMBOL  
(If applicable)

NP

9. PROCUREMENT INSTRUMENT IDENTIFICATION NUMBER

AFOSR-85-0021

8c. ADDRESS (City, State and ZIP Code)

Bldg 410  
Bolling AFB, Washington D.C. 20332-6448

10. SOURCE OF FUNDING NOS.

PROGRAM  
ELEMENT NO.  
61102FPROJECT  
NO.  
2301TASK  
NO.  
A8WORK UNIT  
NO.

11. TITLE (Include Security Classification) "THE EXPERIMENTAL AND ANALYTICAL DEVELOPMENT OF A SENSITIVE SUPER-CONDUCTING ACCELEROMETER AND GRAVITY GRADIOMETER"

12. PERSONAL AUTHOR(S)

Dr. William M. Fairbank

13a. TYPE OF REPORT

FINAL

13b. TIME COVERED

FROM 84/11/01 TO 85/10/30

14. DATE OF REPORT (Yr., Mo., Day)

15. PAGE COUNT

59

16. SUPPLEMENTARY NOTATION

17. COSATI CODES

FIELD

GROUP

SUB. GR.

18. SUBJECT TERMS (Continue on reverse if necessary and identify by block number)

Superconducting Accelerometer, Gravity Gradiometer,  
Experiment, Theory

19. ABSTRACT (Continue on reverse if necessary and identify by block number)

A previously developed gravity gradiometer was further developed to become a very sensitive gravitational gradiometer. A passive subtraction of the thermal sensitivity can be accomplished at low frequencies. This subtraction can be extended to higher frequencies by coupling the temperature sensing coil more tightly in temperature to the gradient sensing coil. This could be accomplished by mounting the temperature sensing coil to the inside surface of the gradient sensing coil form.

20. DISTRIBUTION/AVAILABILITY OF ABSTRACT

UNCLASSIFIED/UNLIMITED ☒ SAME AS RPT. ☒ DTIC USERS ☒

21. ABSTRACT SECURITY CLASSIFICATION

UNCLASSIFIED

22a. NAME OF RESPONSIBLE INDIVIDUAL

ROBERT J. BARKER

22b. TELEPHONE NUMBER  
(Include Area Code)

202/767-5011

22c. OFFICE SYMBOL

NP

87 7 28 412

Department of Physics  
Stanford University  
Stanford, CA 94305

FINAL REPORT

**AFOSR-TR- 87-0924**

to the

**AIR FORCE OFFICE OF SCIENTIFIC RESEARCH**

for

**THE EXPERIMENTAL AND ANALYTICAL DEVELOPMENT OF A SENSITIVE  
SUPERCONDUCTING ACCELEROMETER AND GRAVITY GRADIOMETER**

**Air Force Contract # AFOSR 85-0021**


**November 1, 1984 - October 30, 1985**

**Principal Investigator:  
William M. Fairbank  
Professor of Physics**

## FORWARD

Under previous support from the AFOSR, we developed a superconducting accelerometer and gravity gradiometer with the ultimate objective of measuring the inverse square law of gravity. This accelerometer is described in the final report to the AFOSR for Contract # 80-0067. The present report covers a grant of \$30,000 to further develop this instrument as a very sensitive gravitational gradiometer. During the past year we worked to improve this gradiometer, and the result of this work is described in the enclosed paper. The work was done primarily by Joel Parke, a visiting graduate student from the University of Maryland, together with his professor, H. J. Paik, who was on sabbatical leave from the University of Maryland.

|                    |                                     |
|--------------------|-------------------------------------|
| Accession For      |                                     |
| NTIS CRA&I         | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> |
| DTIC TAB           | <input type="checkbox"/>            |
| Unannounced        | <input type="checkbox"/>            |
| Justification      |                                     |
| By                 |                                     |
| Distribution /     |                                     |
| Availability Codes |                                     |
| Dist               | Avail and for Special               |
| A-1                |                                     |



We have demonstrated that a passive subtraction of the thermal sensitivity can be accomplished at low frequencies. This subtraction can be extended to higher frequencies by coupling the temperature sensing coil more tightly in temperature to the gradient sensing coil. This could be accomplished by mounting the temperature sensing coil to the inside surface of the gradient sensing coil form. This would minimize the thermal time constant between the gradient coil and the temperature coil. It is believed that such a geometry would allow cancellation at frequencies below 0.1 Hz. This combined with conventional temperature stabilization of the inner vacuum can would allow the inverse square law test to be carried out.

**Noise in Superconducting Gravity Gradiometers**

**W. M. Fairbank and E. R. Mapoles  
Department of Physics  
Stanford University, Stanford, CA 94305**

**D. DeBra  
Department of Aeronautics and Astronautics  
Stanford University, Stanford, CA 94305**

**and**

**H. J. Paik, J. W. Parke  
Department of Physics and Astronomy  
University of Maryland, College Park, MD 20742**

## I. Introduction

In 1974 Long<sup>1</sup> pointed out that existing experimental data allows large violations of the inverse square law of gravity at distances less than  $10^3$  km. Since Long's initial article appeared in Nature, there has been a great deal of interest in a possible violation of the inverse square law of gravity. Such a possibility is extremely exciting, and may open a door into an area of physics that we have been previously unable to examine.

A recent reanalysis<sup>2</sup> of the Eötvös experiment suggests the existence of a force coupling to Baryon number. The existence of such a force would alter the measurement of the force between two bodies so that the law of gravity would be effectively violated. Any such violation is weaker than the already weak gravitational force, and must compete with a great deal of environmental disturbances of equal or greater strength. Thus, any experiment, designed to detect such a violation, must be extremely sensitive to the forces applied to it and extremely insensitive to environmental changes. These two contradictory requirements have caused experimentalists to attempt to improve the experimental environment and control disturbances.

Recent experiments, using superconducting gravity gradiometers<sup>3,4,5,6</sup> operating at liquid helium temperatures, take advantage of improvements in detection sensitivity and the improved experimental conditions that exist at liquid helium temperatures.

Improvements in detection sensitivity and scale factor stability arise through the unique properties of superconductivity. Superconductivity provides an extremely sensitive superconducting current-to-voltage amplifier, the SQUID. Scale factors are controlled by persistent currents stored in superconducting loops which are absolutely stable.

The experimental conditions that exist at 4 K are vastly superior to those that exist at room temperature. The thermal and mechanical properties of materials are much more stable. The Brownian motion due to the thermal phonon background is also greatly reduced.

Despite these advantages and improvements, superconducting gradiometers still suffer from environmental disturbances. Three main types of disturbances are important. Temperature fluctuations disturb scale factors, change the penetration depth of niobium, and cause mechanical parts to contract and expand. Seismic noise partially couples to the differential modes of the gradiometer. Rotation of the gradiometer introduces centrifugal forces that must be separated from the true gravitational, or at least noninertial, forces acting on the gradiometer. Lastly, magnetic fields can be picked up by the sensing loops in the gradiometer and amplified by the SQUID, introducing additional fictitious signals.

All present superconducting gravity gradiometers suffer from these same noise sources. During 1984 and 1985, we were able to study these noise sources in the Stanford Gravity Gradiometer<sup>4</sup>.

At the start of this work, excess noise in the low frequency regime was thought to be due to excess thermal sensitivity in the superconducting readout circuitry. In order to treat and study this effect, a second superconducting readout circuit sensitive only to changes in temperature was added to the gradiometer and coupled to the readout circuit.

By coupling both the gradient sensing coil and the temperature sensing coil to the output SQUID, a passive subtraction of the thermal sensitivity can be accomplished at low frequencies. At the same time, by storing current in only one of the sensing loops, thermal or gravity gradient effects can be independently examined.

The temperature sensing circuit is coupled directly to the gravity gradient sensing circuit through a second transformer. This change in the readout circuit made it necessary to recalibrate the instrument. The analysis for the gradient sensing circuit has been previously done by Mapoles<sup>4</sup> in his thesis. An extension of this analysis, including thermal effects, is presented in Section II.

During the study of the thermal sensitivity of the gradiometer, it was determined that two primary sources of excess noise exist in the gradiometer below 0.2 Hz. These are the large thermal drift in the readout circuit, and the motion of flux trapped in the gradiometer and the surrounding shields.

## II. The Basic Gradiometer

The Stanford Gradiometer<sup>4</sup> utilizes a displacement differencing method to detect gravitational gradients. The gradient sensing coil is rigidly attached to one of the proof masses, and measures the distance to the second proof mass. By measuring the relative motion of the two proof masses directly, a partial common mode balance exists before any of the tuning circuits are activated. It is this feature that is the basis of the displacement differencing design.

The gradiometer is shown schematically in Figure 1. All parts are cylindrically symmetric. Each of the two proof masses is supported by two mechanical springs. These mechanical springs are folded cantilevers cut into circular disks of niobium and confine the two proof masses to move along a single axis with a high degree of mechanical compliance.

When a gravitational gradient is applied along the sensitive axis of the gradiometer, the two proof masses move relative to each other. This motion modulates the inductance of the gradient sensing coil which in turn is coupled to the SQUID amplifier which amplifies this small change in current. The gradient sensing coil is mounted on the face of  $m_1$  on a 0.25 cm thick coil form of Macor machinable ceramic. The sensing coil is wound in a single layer on the surface of this coil form. It consists of 400 turns of 0.089 mm diameter niobium wire.

Since the Meissner effect will not allow the magnetic field from the gradient sensing coil to penetrate the second proof mass  $m_2$ , the inductance of the gradient sensing coil may be written as

$$(1) \quad L_G = \Lambda_G d_G + \Lambda_G (x_2 - x_1) \quad ,$$

where  $\Lambda_G$  is the change in inductance/meter given by  $\mu_0 n_G^2 \Lambda_G$ ,  $n_G =$

the number of turns/meter,  $\Lambda_G$  = the area of the 6.9 cm diameter sensing coil, and  $d_G$  = the effective initial separation of the coil from the proof mass  $m_2$ .  $x_1$  and  $x_2$  represent displacements of  $m_1$  and  $m_2$ , respectively.

In addition to this modulation of the gradient sensing coil inductance by the relative motion of  $m_1$  and  $m_2$ , any change in temperature will cause a change in the effective spacing,  $d_G$ . This can be represented by a temperature dependent term  $\Lambda_{GT}(T-T_0)$  so that  $L_G$  is completely described by

$$(2) \quad L_G = \Lambda_G d_G + \Lambda_G (x_2 - x_1) + \Lambda_{GT} (T - T_0) ,$$

where  $\Lambda_{GT}$  gives the change in inductance/Kelvin, and will be calculated in Section V.

The temperature sensing coil  $L_T$  was wound as two solenoidal coils on the outside of the cylindrical casing of the gradiometer. Each coil has a diameter of 11.43 cm, a width of 2.17 cm, and consists of 240 turns of 0.089 mm niobium wire. These coils are held in place by a thin layer of Stycast epoxy, and shielded by a second superconducting niobium shield. Any change in temperature will cause a change in the effective spacing of the coil to the niobium casing. The inductance of the temperature sensing coil can be written as

$$(3) \quad L_T = \Lambda_T d_T + \Lambda_{TT} (T - T_0) ,$$

where  $\Lambda_{TT}$  is the change in inductance/Kelvin,  $d_T$  is the effective initial separation, and  $\Lambda_T$  is the inductance/meter given by  $2\mu_0 n_T^2 A_T$ , where  $n_T$  = the number of turns/meter of 0.089 mm diameter niobium wire, and  $A_T$  = the area of one of the temperature sensing coils.  $\Lambda_{TT}$  will be calculated in Section V.

These sensing coils, for gradient and temperature, are coupled together using two impedance matching transformers, and

connected to the rf SQUID<sup>7</sup> as shown in Figure 2. The final output current containing both gradient and thermal terms is amplified by the SQUID.

The degree of coupling from the gradient sensing is proportional to the magnitude of  $I_{G0}$ . Similarly, the coupling from the temperature sensing coil is controlled by  $I_{T0}$ . To see this quantitatively, it is necessary to write three flux conservation equations, one for each of the loops in Figure 2. These are

$$(4) \quad (L_2 + L_G)(I_{G0} + i_G) + M_{23}i = (\Lambda_G d_G + L_2)I_{G0} ,$$

$$(5) \quad (L_3 + L_G + L_S)i + M_{23}(I_{G0} + i_G) + M_{45}(I_{T0} + i_T) = M_{23}I_{G0} + M_{45}I_{T0} ,$$

$$(6) \quad (L_T + L_4)(I_{T0} + i_T) + M_{45}i = (\Lambda_T d_T + L_4)I_{T0} ,$$

where the self-inductances  $L_i$  and mutual inductances  $M_{ij}$  are defined in Figure 2, and  $i_G$  and  $i_T$  represent signal currents for gradient and temperature. Substituting Eqs. (2) and (3) into Eqs. (4), (5) and (6), linearizing the equations, and solving for the output current  $i$ , we obtain

$$(7) \quad i = \frac{M_{23}I_{G0}\Lambda_G(x_2 - x_1)}{(\Lambda_G d_G + L_2)(L_3 + L_S + L'_T) - M_{23}^2} + \left\{ \frac{M_{23}I_{G0}\Lambda_{GT}}{(\Lambda_G d_G + L_2)(L_3 + L_S + L'_T) - M_{23}^2} + \frac{M_{45}I_{T0}\Lambda_{TT}}{(\Lambda_T d_T + L_4)(L_3 + L_S + L'_G) - M_{45}^2} \right\} (T - T_0) ,$$

where  $L'_G$  = the effective inductance of the gradient sensing coil,

$L_G$ , as seen through the transformer ( $L_2, L_3$ ) by the SQUID, which is given by

$$(8) \quad L'_G = L_3 - \frac{M_{23}^2}{(L_2 + \Lambda_G d_G)} ,$$

and  $L'_T$  = the effective inductance of the temperature sensing coil  $L_T$ , as seen through the transformer ( $L_4, L_5$ ) by the SQUID, which is given by

$$(9) \quad L'_T = L_5 - \frac{M_{45}^2}{(L_4 + \Lambda_T d_T)} .$$

In examining the output current  $i$ , a natural separation of the two signals, gradient and thermal, can be seen. If we concentrate on the mechanical motion of the gradiometer, we may simplify Eq. (7). Ignoring thermal effects, we have

$$(10) \quad i = \frac{M_{23} I_{G0} \Lambda_G (x_2 - x_1)}{(\Lambda_G d_G + L_2)(L_3 + L_5 + L'_T) - M_{23}^2} .$$

A gravitational gradient  $\Gamma$  applied to the gradiometer causes a displacement of the two proof masses which is controlled by the stiffness of the differential spring constant  $m\omega_p^2$ . Thus

$$(11) \quad |x_2 - x_1| = \frac{b}{\omega_p^2} \Gamma ,$$

where  $\omega_p$  is the differential resonance frequency, and  $b$  is the baseline between the two accelerometers.

Thus, when a gradient  $\Gamma$  is applied to the gradiometer, an output current  $i_\Gamma$  is produced:

$$(12) \quad i_{\Gamma} = \left\{ \frac{b}{\omega_D^2} \right\} \left\{ \frac{M_{23} I_{G0} \Lambda_G}{(\Lambda_G d_G + L_2)(L_3 + L_S + L_T') - M_{23}^2} \right\} \Gamma .$$

The SQUID amplifies this small current and produces an output voltage given by

$$(13) \quad v_{\Gamma} = R i_{\Gamma} ,$$

where  $R = 2 \times 10^5 \Omega$ .

Equation (12) shows only part of the dependence of  $i_{\Gamma}$  on  $I_{G0}$ . As expected, the differential resonance frequency  $\omega_D$  is dependent on the coupling between the mechanical system and the sensing circuitry.

A natural measure of this coupling can be given by

$$(14) \quad \beta = \frac{\omega_D^2 - \omega_0^2}{\omega_D^2} ,$$

where  $\omega_0$  is the resonance frequency of the differential mode when the stored current  $I_{G0}$  is zero.

In order to calculate the degree of coupling,  $\beta$ , and understand the way in which the sensing current affects the differential resonance frequency, we must look at the reaction forces on the proof masses  $m_1$  and  $m_2$  due to the magnetic pressure from the gradient sensing coil. This force is given by

$$(15) \quad F_{21} = \frac{B^2}{2\mu_0} \Lambda_G = \frac{1}{2} \Lambda_G I_G^2 \approx \frac{1}{2} \Lambda_G I_{G0}^2 + \Lambda_G i_G I_{G0} ,$$

where  $i_G$  may be calculated by solving Eqs. (4), (5), and (6). We have

$$(16) \quad i_G = \frac{-I_{G0} \Lambda_G (x_2 - x_1)}{(L_2 + \Lambda_G d_G) - M_{23}^2 / (L_3 + L_B + L_T)} ,$$

where we have ignored second order terms, and terms dependent on  $(T - T_0)$ .

Substituting Eq. (16) into Eq. (15), we obtain the force,  $F_{21}$ , of the gradient sensing coil on  $m_2$ :

$$(17) \quad F_{21} = F_0 - k_E (x_2 - x_1) ,$$

where

$$(18a) \quad F_0 = \frac{1}{2} \Lambda_G I_{G0}^2 ,$$

$$(18b) \quad k_E = \frac{\Lambda_G^2 I_{G0}}{(L_2 + \Lambda_G d_G) - M_{23}^2 / (L_3 + L_B + L_T)} .$$

We can begin to see the dependence of  $\omega_p$  on the degree of coupling from the gradient sensing coil. The electrical circuit supplies a DC force which tends to separate the two proof masses, and an additional spring constant  $k_E$  which adds to the mechanical spring constant. Newton's equations of motion for  $m_1$  and  $m_2$  give for the two modes of the gradiometer

$$(19a) \quad \frac{d^2}{dt^2} (x_2 - x_1) = - \frac{(k + 2k_E)}{m} (x_2 - x_1) ,$$

$$(19b) \quad \frac{d^2}{dt^2} (x_2 + x_1) = - \frac{k}{M} \left(1 + \frac{2m}{M}\right) (x_2 + x_1) ,$$

where  $M$  = the mass of the gradiometer casing,  $k$  is the mechanical spring constant from the folded cantilever springs supporting each of the proof masses, and  $m = m_1 = m_2$ .

The differential and common mode frequency can be seen from

Eqs. (19) to be

$$(20a) \quad \omega_p^2 = \omega_0^2 + \frac{2k_E}{m} ,$$

$$(20b) \quad \omega_c^2 = \omega_0^2 \left( 1 + \frac{2m}{M} \right) .$$

To complete the analysis, a dependence of  $k_E$  on  $I_{G0}$  must be included. This dependence arises through the change in the equilibrium spacing of the gradient sensing coil,  $d_G$ , as the magnetic pressure on proof masses  $m_1$  and  $m_2$  increases.

In the Stanford gradiometer, unless the sensing current,  $I_{G0}$ , was greater than 4.0 A, the sensing coil and the proof mass  $m_2$  touch. Thus for  $I_{G0} > I_{GF} = 4.0$  A, the gradient sensing coil equilibrium spacing,  $d_G$ , is given by

$$(21) \quad d_G = d_0 + \frac{\Lambda_G (I_{G0}^2 - I_{GF}^2)}{k} ,$$

where  $d_0$  = the effective spacing of the gradient sensing coil when  $I_{G0} = I_{GF}$ .

Combining Eq. (21) with Eqs. (18) and (20), we may solve for the complete dependence of  $\omega_p^2$  on  $I_{G0}^2$ :

$$(22) \quad \omega_p^2 = \omega_0^2 + \frac{2 \Lambda_G^2 I_{G0}^2}{m \left\{ \Lambda_G d_0 + L_2 + \frac{\Lambda_G^2 (I_{G0}^2 - I_{GF}^2)}{k} - \frac{M_{23}^2}{(L_3 + L_S + L_T')} \right\}} .$$

By setting

$$(23a) \quad L_0 = \left\{ \Lambda_G d_0 + L_2 - \frac{M_{23}}{(L_3 + L_8 + L'_1)} \right\} ,$$

$$(23b) \quad \gamma = \frac{\Lambda_G^2}{m L_0 (2\pi)^2} ,$$

Eq. (22) may be written as

$$(24) \quad \omega_p^2 = \omega_0^2 + \frac{(2\pi)^2 2 \gamma I_{G0}^2}{\left\{ 1 + \frac{\gamma (I_{G0}^2 - I_{GF}^2)}{f_0^2} \right\}} .$$

The dependence of  $\omega_p^2$  on  $I_{G0}^2$  can now be seen clearly. Initially, while  $I_{G0}^2$  is still small, it is constant at  $\omega_0^2$ . As  $I_{G0}^2$  increases,  $\omega_p^2$  climbs to a constant value of  $3\omega_0^2$  for large  $I_{G0}^2$ . This implies that the range of coupling,  $\beta$ , is 0 to 2/3.

A plot of the experimental data  $f_0^2$  versus  $I_{G0}^2$  and a fit to Eq. (24) is shown in Figure 3. The numerical fit gives

$$(25a) \quad f_{0,exp} = 68.9 \text{ Hz} ,$$

$$(25b) \quad \gamma_{exp} = 31.4 \text{ Hz}^2/\text{A}^2 .$$

From the geometry of the cantilever springs as given by Mapoles<sup>4</sup> and using the classical formula for a bent beam, we have

$$(26) \quad f_0^2 = \frac{3}{4} \frac{E \omega h^3}{m \ell^2} \frac{1}{(2\pi)^2} ,$$

where  $m = 1.07 \text{ kg}$  is the mass of each proof mass,  $\omega = 9.55 \times 10^{-3} \text{ m}$  is the width of each cantilever,  $h = 7.1 \times 10^{-4} \text{ m}$  is the

thickness of each cantilever,  $l = 1.115 \times 10^{-2} \text{ m}$  is the length of each cantilever, and  $E = 126.5 \times 10^9 \text{ N/m}$  is the Young's modulus of niobium at 4.2 K. Equation (26) gives

$$(27) \quad f_{0, \text{thy}} = 74.4 \text{ Hz} .$$

This is in fair agreement with  $f_{0, \text{exp}}$ . A further check can be obtained by calculating  $f_0$  from the  $f_c$  in Eq. (20b). Using  $f_{c, \text{exp}} = 76.9 \text{ Hz}$ , and  $M = 6.69 \text{ kg}$ , we obtain

$$(28) \quad f_0 = 69.2 \text{ Hz} .$$

This is in good agreement with  $f_{0, \text{exp}}$ .

In the previous work with the gradiometer, a  $f_0$  of 60 Hz, and a  $I_{\text{GF}} = 3.0 \text{ A}$  is reported by Mapoles.<sup>4</sup> The shift in  $f_0$  and in  $I_{\text{GF}}$  can possibly be accounted for if a shift in the equilibrium position of the springs occurred.

$\gamma$  may be computed from Eq. (23b) by using  $\Lambda_G = 0.79 \text{ H/m}$ ,  $m = 1.07 \text{ kg}$ ,  $d_0 = 250 \text{ } \mu\text{m}$ ,  $L_2 = 186 \text{ } \mu\text{H}$ ,  $M_{23} = 22 \text{ } \mu\text{H}$ ,  $L_3 = 4.9 \text{ } \mu\text{H}$ ,  $L_S = 2 \text{ } \mu\text{H} + 0.6 \text{ } \mu\text{H}$  (stray inductance), and  $L'_T = 0.7 \text{ } \mu\text{H}$ . This value of  $L'_T$  is computed by substituting  $L_6 = 0.8 \text{ } \mu\text{H}$ ,  $M_{45} = 4.4 \text{ } \mu\text{H}$ ,  $d_T = 19 \text{ } \mu\text{m}$ ,  $\Lambda_T = 2.48 \text{ H/m}$ , and  $L_4 = 43 \text{ } \mu\text{H}$  into Eq. (9). This results in a theoretical value for  $\gamma$ :

$$(29) \quad \gamma_{\text{thy}} = 45 \text{ Hz}^2/\text{A}^2 .$$

Experimentally, we found a smaller number,  $\gamma_{\text{Exp}} = 31.4 \text{ Hz}^2/\text{A}^2$ , as given in Eq. (25b).

Now that we have a clear understanding of the mode structure of the gradiometer and the superconducting readout circuitry, we are in a position to examine the intrinsic noise of the gradiometer.

## II. SQUID Amplifier Noise and Brownian Motion

If the gradiometer is operated in a perfectly quiet environment, i.e., with no seismic noise, no background magnetic field, and no thermal drift, then the theoretical performance of the gradiometer is limited by the SQUID amplifier noise and the noise force coming from the phonon background at 4.2 K.

The SQUID amplifier noise is specified as the equivalent input noise energy in J/Hz at the SQUID input sensing coil  $L_S$ :

$$(30) \quad \frac{1}{2} L_S i_{N,S}^2 df = E_{N,S} df ,$$

where  $E_{N,S} = 5 \times 10^{-29}$  J/Hz.

This effective noise current at the input to the SQUID amplifier is equivalent to a gradient noise,  $\Gamma_{N,S}$ , acting on the gradiometer. To see this clearly, we may rewrite Eq. (12) using Eqs. (14), (18), and (20):

$$(31) \quad i_{\Gamma}^2 = \frac{\Gamma^2 b^2 M_{23}^2 \beta^2 m^2}{4 I_{G0}^2 (L_3 + L_S + L_T')^2 \Lambda_G^2} ,$$

where  $\beta$  is the amplifier coupling as defined in Eq. (14). By substituting  $i_{N,S}^2$  in place of  $i_{\Gamma}^2$ , we may solve for the effective gradient noise due to the SQUID amplifier noise:.

$$(32) \quad \Gamma_{N,S}^2 df = \frac{8 \Lambda_G^2 I_{G0}^2 (L_3 + L_S + L_T')^2 E_{N,S}}{m^2 b^2 M_{23}^2 \beta^2 L_S} df .$$

The effective gradient noise due to the phonon background at 4.2 K may be computed from the noise force given by the Nyquist theorem:

$$(33) \quad F_{N,T}^2 df = \frac{4 k_B T \omega_D}{Q} df .$$

This is equivalent to a gradient noise of

$$(34) \quad \Gamma_{N,T}^2 df = \frac{8k_B T \omega_D}{b^2 m Q} df .$$

These two sources of gradient noise give a lower bound on the performance of the gradiometer:

$$(35) \quad \Gamma_{N,G}^2 df \geq \frac{8\Lambda_G^2 I_{G0}^2 (L_3 + L_S + L_T) E_{N,S}^2}{m^2 b^2 M_{23}^2 \beta^2 L_S} df + \frac{8k_B T \omega_D}{b^2 m Q} df .$$

In general, it is necessary to minimize this sum as a function of  $I_{G0}$ . However, in this case, the amplifier noise is dominant. The Brownian motion noise may be computed by using  $T = 4.2$  K,  $f_D = 84$  Hz,  $m = 1.07$  kg,  $b = 3.2$  cm,  $k_B = 1.381 \times 10^{-23}$  J/K,  $Q = 5 \times 10^4$ :

$$(36) \quad \Gamma_{N,T} = 0.068 \text{ E/Hz}^{1/2} ,$$

where  $1 \text{ E} = 1 \text{ Eötvös unit} = 10^{-9} \text{ s}^{-2}$  is a unit of gravity gradient. This will be much less than  $\Gamma_{N,S}$ , and we may minimize  $\Gamma_{N,S}$  by itself. This is equivalent to minimizing

$$(37) \quad \frac{I_{G0}}{\beta} .$$

This is a minimum when

$$(38) \quad I_{G0}^2 = \frac{f_0^2}{3\gamma} - \frac{I_{GF}^2}{3} .$$

Using  $f_{0,exp} = 68.8$  Hz and  $\gamma_{exp} = 31.4 \text{ Hz}^2/\text{A}^2$ , we have  $I_{G0,opt} = 6.71$  A or equivalently, using Eq. (24), we find

$$(39) \quad \omega_D^2 = \frac{3}{2} \omega_0^2 \quad \text{or} \quad \beta_{opt} = 1/3 .$$

Substituting the optimum current into  $\Gamma_{N,S}$  gives

$$(40) \quad \Gamma_{N,S}^2 df = \frac{72\Lambda_G^2 \left( \frac{f_0^2}{3\gamma} - \frac{I_{GF}^2}{3} \right) (L_3 + L_S + L_T')^2 E_{N,S}}{m^2 b^2 M_{23}^2 L_S} df .$$

Substituting  $\gamma_{exp} = 31.4 \text{ Hz}^2/\text{A}^2$ ,  $f_{0,exp} = 68.9 \text{ Hz}$ ,  $L_3 = 4.9 \text{ } \mu\text{H}$ ,  $L_S = 2 \text{ } \mu\text{H}$ ,  $m = 1.07 \text{ kg}$ ,  $b = 3.2 \text{ cm}$ ,  $M_{23} = 22 \text{ } \mu\text{H}$ ,  $I_{GF} = 4.0 \text{ A}$ ,  $E_{N,S} = 5 \times 10^{-29} \text{ J/Hz}$ , and  $\Lambda_G = 0.79 \text{ H/m}$ , we obtain

$$(41) \quad \Gamma_{N,G} \geq 2.2 \text{ E/Hz}^{1/2} .$$

We may also calculate the scale factor from Eq. (31):

$$(42) \quad \frac{1_\Gamma}{\Gamma} = \frac{b M_{23} \beta m}{2I_{opt} (L_3 + L_S + L_T') \Lambda_G} .$$

Using Eq. (13) and substituting in numerical factors, we find

$$(43) \quad \frac{V_\Gamma}{\Gamma} = 0.62 \text{ } \mu\text{V/E} .$$

$\Gamma_{N,G}$  is the basic noise of the gradiometer and any additional noise is due to thermal, seismic, or magnetic noise in the experimental environment.

For the original Stanford Gradiometer, with a different transformer, Mapoles<sup>4</sup> reported previously that  $\gamma = 70 \text{ Hz}^2/\text{A}^2$ ,  $I_{Go,opt} = 4.2 \text{ A}$ , and

$$(44) \quad \frac{V_\Gamma}{\Gamma} = 1.2 \text{ } \mu\text{V/E} \quad \text{or} \quad \Gamma_{N,G} = 1.14 \text{ E/Hz}^{1/2} .$$

This decrease of the gradient-to-voltage scale factor is partially due to the smaller coupling of the new transformer used in the present work. However, it does not seem that the factor of 2

decrease can be accounted for entirely by this. The most likely parameter that has changed over 4 years is the coil spacing  $d_c$ . Apparently,  $d_c$  has increased from approximately 55  $\mu\text{m}$  to 250  $\mu\text{m}$ . This change may be due to a dust particle, or a partial failure of the epoxy bond that holds the gradient sensing coil to the Macor coil form. Without disassembly, it is impossible to completely determine the cause.

### III. Gradiometer Performance

Theoretically, (ignoring environmental noise), the output of the gradiometer should be white noise at the level of  $1.4 \mu\text{V}/\text{Hz}^{1/2}$  from 0.01 Hz to the peaks due to the resonance of the gradiometer in the common and differential mode. After storing a current close to the optimum,  $I_{G0} = 6.69 \text{ A}$ , in the gradiometer sensing coil and balancing the common mode acceleration out of the differential mode, we obtained the data shown in Figures 4, 5, and 6.

The quietest region occurs just below 1 Hz with a noise of approximately  $36 \text{ E}/\text{Hz}^{1/2}$ . This is sixteen times the noise floor due to the amplifier noise alone, and it must have been caused by environmental noise. What is even worse is the climb in noise level below 0.1 Hz since this region is where the inverse square law experiment is to be performed. In the region where one may see the signal from the  $3.24 \times 10^3 \text{ kg}$  steel cylindrical shell, as it is raised and lowered over the experiment, the noise is approximately  $250 \text{ E}/\text{Hz}^{1/2}$ . This level is unacceptably high, and must be due to environmental noise, either large thermal drift or the movement of flux trapped in the cryostat. The various peaks seen in the data are caused by resonances in the vibration isolation used to remove seismic noise from the gradiometer.

#### IV. Thermal Noise in the Gradiometer

The basic sensitivity of the gradiometer to changes in temperature is shown in Eq. (7). If we concentrate on changes in the output current due to a change in temperature, it appears that we can simplify Eq. (7) to read

$$(45) \quad i = (T - T_0) \left\{ \frac{M_{23} I_{G0} \Lambda_{GT}}{(\Lambda_G d_G + L_2)(L_3 + L_S + L'_T) - M_{23}^2} + \frac{M_{45} I_{T0} \Lambda_{TT}}{(\Lambda_T d_T + L_4)(L_5 + L_S + L'_G) - M_{45}^2} \right\} .$$

This is not correct, it is important to realize that the proof masses are free to move in response to any change in the gradiometer sensing current  $I_{G0} + i_G$ . A change in the gradiometer sensing current produces a force

$$(46) \quad F_{21} \approx \Lambda_G i_G I_{G0}$$

which attempts to separate the proof masses a distance

$$(47) \quad x_2 - x_1 = \frac{\Lambda_G i_G I_{G0}}{k_m} .$$

Substituting Eq. (47) into Eqs. (4), (5), and (6), linearizing the equations, and solving for the current  $i$ , we obtain

$$(48) \quad i = (T - T_0) \left\{ (1-\beta) \frac{M_{23} I_{G0} \Lambda_{GT}}{(\Lambda_G d_G + L_2)(L_3 + L_S + L'_T) - M_{23}^2} + \frac{M_{45} I_{T0} \Lambda_{TT}}{(\Lambda_T d_T + L_4)(L_5 + L_S + L'_G) - M_{45}^2} \right\}.$$

where  $L'_G$  is the effective inductance of the gradient sensing coil, when the proof masses are allowed to move, as seen through the transformer  $(L_2, L_3)$  by the SQUID.  $L'_G$  is given by

$$(49) \quad L'_G = L_3 - \frac{M_{23}^2}{L_2 + \Lambda_G d_G} \frac{k}{k + k_E} \frac{[(L_4 + \Lambda_T d_T)(L_5 + L_S + L'_G) - M_{45}^2]}{[(L_4 + \Lambda_T d_T)(L_5 + L_S + L_3) - M_{45}^2]}.$$

In writing Eq. (48), we have assumed that the temperature of the gradiometer is the same everywhere. This should certainly be true at a low enough frequency. However, we will see that this is not true above approximately 0.01 Hz. A more accurate assumption is that each sensing coil has its own temperature; i.e.,

$$(50) \quad i = \left\{ (1-\beta) \frac{M_{23} I_{G0} \Lambda_{GT} (T_G - T_0)}{(\Lambda_G d_G + L_2)(L_3 + L_S + L'_T) - M_{23}^2} + \frac{M_{45} I_{T0} \Lambda_{TT} (T_T - T_0)}{(\Lambda_T d_T + L_4)(L_5 + L_S + L'_G) - M_{45}^2} \right\}$$

where  $T_G$  and  $T_T$  are the temperatures of the gradient sensing coil and the temperature sensing coil, respectively.

In examining Eq. (48), it seems clear that the thermal

sensitivity of the gradiometer may be "dropped out" by a correct adjustment of the temperature sensing current,  $I_{T0}$ , as a function of  $I_{G0}$ . However, Eq. (50) shows that this cancellation will occur only at sufficiently low frequencies where  $T_C \approx T_T$ . At higher frequencies, a complicated thermal structure will be seen.

At the start of this work, it was felt that the difference in temperature throughout the gradiometer should be negligible below a frequency of approximately 0.1 Hz. We have seen in the experiment, however, that the relevant time scale is on the order of 100 s. Below 0.01 Hz, Eq. (48) starts to approximate the thermal situation in the gradiometer reasonably well.

Indeed, the time scales for thermal heat pulses to move within the gradiometer are on the order of 10 s; however, the phase shift is still apparent at 100 s. This is because thermal systems are first order in nature.

The gradiometer can be broken up into several isolated thermal pieces. Heat first reaches the outside casing (at  $T_C$  with a heat capacity  $C_C$ ), then passes to the bulk of the gradiometer (at  $T_B$  with heat capacity  $C_B$ ). From the bulk of the gradiometer, heat moves slowly through the thin niobium springs to the two proof masses  $m_1$  and  $m_2$  (at  $T_M$  with heat capacity  $C_M$ ), and finally heat moves slowly through the Macor coil form to the gradient sensing coil (at  $T_H$  with heat capacity  $C_G$ ). This is schematically represented in Figure 7.

The thermal equations of "motion" can be written as

$$(51a) \quad \frac{dT_C}{dt} = \frac{P(t)}{C_C} - \frac{(T_C - T_B)}{\tau_{CB}},$$

$$(51b) \quad \frac{dT_B}{dt} = - \frac{(T_B - T_C)}{\tau_{CB}} \frac{C_C}{C_B} - \frac{(T_B - T_M)}{\tau_{BM}} \frac{C_M}{C_B},$$

$$(51c) \quad \frac{dT_M}{dt} = - \frac{(T_M - T_B)}{\tau_{BM}} ,$$

$$(51d) \quad \frac{dT_G}{dt} = - \frac{(T_G - T_M)}{\tau_{MG}} ,$$

where  $P(t)$  is heat applied to the outside casing and  $\tau_{ij}$  is the time constant for heat transfer from the  $i$ -th part to the  $j$ -th part.

Using this model, and applying a heat impulse to the outside casing through a heater coil, we obtained the parameters given in Table 1. Typical data and fit to the model are shown in Figures 8 and 9.

A partial verification of these parameters may be obtained by examining  $C_C/C_B$  and  $C_M/C_B$  with an exchange gas pressure approximately  $10^{-3} \mu$ .

Since heat capacity is proportional to mass,

$$(52) \quad \frac{C_M}{C_B + C_C} = \frac{m_1 + m_2}{m_C + m_B} = \frac{1.07 \text{ kg} + 1.07 \text{ kg}}{6.69 \text{ Kg}} = 0.32 .$$

Similarly from Table 1,

$$(53) \quad \frac{C_M}{C_B + C_C} = \frac{C_M/C_B}{1 + C_C/C_B} = 0.35 .$$

These numbers are in good agreement.

Using the thermal model of the gradiometer and looking at the steady state response, we may compute the transfer function:

$$(54) \quad \frac{T_C - T_G}{T_C} .$$

This transfer function will tell us the degree of balance between the temperature at the outside case and the temperature at the gradient sensing coil. Setting  $P(t)/C_c = A e^{st}$  and solving for the steady state response, we obtain

$$(55) \quad \frac{T_C - T_G}{T_C} (s) = \frac{s \{ C_B \tau_{BM} \tau_{CB} \tau_{MG} s^2 + s [ \tau_{CB} \tau_{MG} (C_M + C_B) + \tau_{BM} (\tau_{MG} C_C + \tau_{CB} C_B) ] + C_C (\tau_{BM} + \tau_{MG}) + (C_M + C_B) \tau_{CB} \} }{(s \tau_{MG} + 1) \{ C_B \tau_{BM} \tau_{CB} s^2 + [ \tau_{CB} (C_M + C_B) + \tau_{BM} C_C ] s + C_C \} } .$$

This transfer function is plotted in Figure 10 for the data with approximately  $10^{-3} \mu$  exchange gas. It is clear from the plot that the temperature of the outside casing and the temperature of the gradient sensing coil are very different above 0.01 Hz and no temperature balance is possible above this point.

With a little thought, it also becomes clear that the temperature of the gradient sensing coil fluctuates much less than the temperature of the case. At high frequencies, say above 0.2 Hz, all of the thermal noise reaching the case should be much suppressed when it reaches the gradient sensing coil. Quantitatively, if we examine the transfer function

$$(56) \quad \frac{T_G}{T_C}(s) = \frac{1}{\left\{ s^3 \tau_{BH} \tau_{CB} \tau_{HG} \frac{C_B}{C_C} + s^2 \left[ \tau_{CB} \frac{C_B}{C_C} (\tau_{BH} + \tau_{HG}) + \frac{C_B}{C_C} \frac{C_H}{C_B} \tau_{CB} \tau_{HG} + \tau_{BH} \tau_{HG} \right] + s \left[ \tau_{BH} + \tau_{HG} + \tau_{CB} \left( \frac{C_H}{C_B} \frac{C_B}{C_C} + \frac{C_B}{C_C} \right) \right] + 1 \right\}}$$

it is clear that the gradiometer sensing coil is well filtered by this third order low-pass function. Substituting in the parameters from Table 1 for an exchange gas pressure of approximately  $10^{-3} \mu$ , we obtain

$$(57) \quad \frac{T_G}{T_C} = \frac{1}{-jf^3(19s)^3 - f^2(46s)^2 + jf(91s) + 1},$$

where we have set  $s = 2\pi jf$ . At a frequency of 0.01 Hz, the difference between  $T_G$  and  $T_C$  is only 1.6 db. However, at 0.1 Hz,  $T_G$  fluctuations are suppressed by 26 db. This increases to 39 db at 0.2 Hz. Clearly, thermal fluctuations should make no contribution to environmental noise in the gradiometer above 0.2 Hz. This is our first indication that the excess noise in the gradiometer may be due to another source.

By storing currents,  $I_{T0} = 4.02$  A and  $I_{G0} = 0$  A, in the gradiometer, we can magnify thermal noise and suppress inertial disturbances. This data is plotted in Figure 11.

Comparing this with our previous data in Figure 5, we see that our excess noise above 0.2 Hz must be related to inertial disturbances. This comparison is shown more clearly in Figure 12.

Below 0.2 Hz, the excess noise may be due to the movement of magnetic flux trapped in the shields surrounding the gradiometer,

or due to fluctuations in temperature. Inertial disturbances should be somewhat suppressed below 0.2 Hz since, in this region, seismic disturbances drop in amplitude and there are no resonance peaks in the gradiometer suspension structure. This drop in amplitude, which is measured with a room temperature accelerometer constructed at the University of Maryland, is shown in Figure 13. At worst, the seismic noise should provide a flat background, and yet we observe a sharp increase as  $f$  becomes zero.

If we examine the output of the gradiometer without any current stored in the readout circuitry, we obtained the data in Figure 14. We observe a large amount of excess noise. This noise cannot be caused by temperature changes in the gradiometer, as the amount of residual current trapped in the gradiometer is very small. Typical data for the gradiometer output voltage, with no current stored, is plotted as a function of time, is shown in Figure 15. Flux movement is shown clearly in Figure 15.

The type of step function, as shown in Figure 15, will produce noise with a  $1/f^2$  characteristic when it is spectrally decomposed. This noise will contribute to the excess noise in the gradiometer below 0.2 Hz. By comparing the data in Figures 14 and 11, we conclude that, while the movement of flux is important, it is not the major source of noise below 0.2 Hz. Adding a  $\mu$ -metal shield to the dewar would eliminate the low frequency noise due to the movement of trapped flux, but excess thermal noise would still be present. The flux noise is, however, very important in any experiment in which the signal frequency lies above 0.1 Hz.

Mapoles<sup>4</sup> previously reported a thermal sensitivity of the gradiometer,  $dV/dT$ , equal to  $31.6 \times (I_{G0}/1 \text{ A}) \text{ V/K}$ . This is an extraordinary sensitivity to temperature changes. If the gradiometer has 6.69 A stored in the gradient sensing coil, it is necessary to stabilize the temperature to better than  $6.6 \text{ nK/Hz}^{1/2}$ , over the region of experimental interest, in order to

limit the contribution of thermal noise to the total noise so that the SQUID amplifier noise dominates.

By adding the readout circuit sensitive only to changes in temperature, it was hoped that a passive subtraction of temperature changes could be attained for frequencies below 0.1 Hz. We found that this subtraction did not occur until approximately 1 mHz. At this frequency, we did observe much improvement in the thermal sensitivity of the gradiometer.

## V. Thermal Sensitivity in the Gradiometer

During the original work on the Stanford Gradiometer, the only candidate for the mechanism that produces the high thermal sensitivity of gradiometer,  $dV/dT$ , was the change in the penetration depth of niobium as a function of temperature. This effect was 10 times too small, and the actual mechanism was unknown. Whatever the mechanism, it was thought that it should decrease as the temperature was lowered below 4.2 K. Mapoles constructed a cold plate in order to cool the gradiometer. This did not, however, improve the thermal performance.

We now know that three major mechanisms affect the thermal sensitivity of the gradiometer. These are, the change in penetration depth of niobium, the thermal expansion of Stycast epoxy at cryogenic temperatures, and the change in Young's modulus of niobium below the superconducting transition point.

For the first effect, Mapoles<sup>4</sup> reports that

$$(58) \quad \frac{d\lambda(T)}{dT} = \frac{2\lambda_0}{T_c} \left(\frac{T}{T_c}\right)^3 \left[ 1 - \left(\frac{T}{T_c}\right)^4 \right]^{-3/2},$$

where  $\lambda_0 = 440 \text{ \AA}$  and  $T_c = 9.2 \text{ K}$  for niobium. At 4.5 K,

$$(59) \quad \frac{d\lambda(T)}{dT} = 1.22 \times 10^{-9} \text{ m/K}.$$

It is difficult to determine the thermal expansion coefficient of Stycast epoxy at 4.5 K, but an estimate may be obtained from Serafini and Koenig<sup>5</sup> of

$$(60) \quad \frac{1}{L} \frac{dL}{dT} \approx 1.5 \times 10^{-5} / \text{K}.$$

The change in Young's modulus of niobium as reported by Kramer and Bauer<sup>9</sup> is dependent on the degree of stress in the sample, the degree of chemical purity, and the frequency at which it is measured. A rough estimate of this appears to be

$$(61a) \quad \frac{1}{Y} \frac{dY}{dT} = 25 \times 10^{-6} /K \text{ at } 4.5 \text{ K} ,$$

$$(61b) \quad \frac{1}{Y} \frac{dY}{dT} = 50 \times 10^{-6} /K \text{ at } 3 \text{ K and below} .$$

These three effects can be used to compute the expected change in self-inductance of the gradient sensing coil and the temperature sensing coil.

The temperature sensing coil is shown schematically in Figure 16. The thickness of the layer of epoxy bonding the niobium wire to the niobium casing of the gradiometer is approximately 130  $\mu\text{m}$ . If we assume that the wire moves half the distance that the epoxy expands or contracts, then the change in the coil spacing may be computed as

$$(62) \quad \left[ \frac{d \, d_T}{dT} \right]_{\text{epoxy}} = 65 \, \mu\text{m} \times \frac{1}{L} \frac{dL}{dT} = 0.98 \times 10^{-9} \text{ m/K} .$$

The change in the penetration depth of niobium contributes twice, once at the surface of the wire and again at the surface of the casing. There arises, however, a factor of one half which cancels this. The penetration depth is defined as the mean distance over which the magnetic field  $B$  penetrates a superconductor. If  $B_0$  is the field strength at the surface and  $B(x)$  is the field strength inside the superconductor, then

$$(63) \quad B(x) = B_0 e^{-x/\lambda(T)} .$$

The amount of magnetic energy that penetrates the inside of the superconductor per unit area is equal to

$$(64) \quad \int_0^{\infty} \frac{B(x)^2}{2\mu_0} dx = \int_0^{\infty} \frac{1}{2\mu_0} B_0^2 e^{-2x/\lambda(T)} dx = \frac{B_0^2}{2\mu_0} \frac{\lambda(T)}{2} .$$

The resulting change in self-inductance effectively modifies  $d_T$  as

$$(65) \quad \left[ \frac{d d_T}{dT} \right]_{\text{penetration}} = 2 \times \frac{1}{2} \times \frac{d\lambda(T)}{dT} = 1.2 \times 10^{-9} \text{ m/K} .$$

The change in  $d_T$  due to penetration depth changes and thermal expansion add together to give

$$(66) \quad \left[ \frac{d d_T}{dT} \right]_{\text{total}} = 2.2 \times 10^{-9} \text{ m/K} .$$

$\Lambda_{TT}$  can now be computed by setting

$$(67) \quad \Lambda_{TT} = \Lambda_T \times \left[ \frac{d d_T}{dT} \right]_{\text{total}} = 2.49 \text{ H/m} \times 2.2 \times 10^{-9} \text{ m/K} = 5.5 \text{ nH/K} .$$

The gradient sensing coil is shown schematically in Figure 17. The sensing coil is held to the Macor coil form by a thin layer of Stycast epoxy approximately 125  $\mu\text{m}$  thick. This Macor coil form is held to the proof mass  $m_2$  by a second layer of Stycast epoxy approximately 25  $\mu\text{m}$  thick.

Because the thermal expansion of the epoxy moves the sensing coil and the coil form towards the proof mass  $m_1$ , the equilibrium spacing  $d_g$  is reduced. As previously, we assume that the niobium sensing coil moves half as much as the expansion of the epoxy bonding it to the coil form. To this is added the expansion of the thin layer bonding the coil form to the proof mass  $m_2$ . The expansion of epoxy gives,

$$(68) \quad \left( \frac{d d_g}{dT} \right)_{\text{epoxy}} = -(65 \mu\text{m} + 25 \mu\text{m}) \times \frac{1}{L} \frac{dL}{dT} = -1.4 \times 10^{-9} \text{ m/K} .$$

The change in  $d_g$  due to penetration depth changes is identical to the change in  $d_r$ ,

$$(69) \quad \left( \frac{d d_g}{dT} \right)_{\text{penetration}} = 2 \times \frac{1}{2} \times \frac{d\lambda(T)}{dT} = +1.2 \times 10^{-9} \text{ m/K} .$$

At this point, we immediately notice that Eqs. (64) and (65) almost cancel each other. Thus, without a third mechanism to provide additional thermal sensitivity, there is no hope of explaining the large thermal sensitivity of the gradiometer.

This third mechanism is provided by the niobium springs that support the proof masses. Because the Young's modulus changes as a function of temperature, the equilibrium spacing  $d_g$  fluctuates with temperature.

The sensitivity of the gradiometer output to this change is directly proportional to how much the springs are loaded. To see this clearly, we may compute the equilibrium spacing of the two proof masses. The magnetic force causing the masses to separate is

$$(70) \quad \frac{B^2}{2\mu_0} \Lambda_G = \frac{1}{2} \Lambda_G I_{G0}^2 .$$

This defines the equilibrium stretch  $d_{ST}$ . Setting the restoring force equal to the magnetic force, we obtain

$$(71) \quad k_N \frac{d_{ST}}{2} = \frac{1}{2} \Lambda_G I_{G0}^2 ,$$

where the factor of 2 enters because both proof masses move. Solving for  $d_{ST}$ , we find

$$(72) \quad d_{ST} = \frac{\Lambda_G I_{G0}^2}{k} .$$

The mechanical spring constant  $k$  is directly proportional to the Young's modulus of niobium. Differentiating  $d_G$  with respect to temperature, using Eq. (25) and setting  $k = m\omega_0^2$ , we find

$$(73) \quad \left[ \frac{d d_{ST}}{dT} \right]_{spring} = - \frac{\Lambda_G I_{G0}^2}{m\omega_0^2} \frac{1}{Y} \frac{dY}{dT} = \left[ \frac{d d_G}{dT} \right]_{spring} .$$

Setting  $\Lambda_G = 0.79$  H/m,  $m = 1.07$  kg,  $f_{0,exp} = 68.9$  Hz,  $I_{G0,opt} = 6.69$  A, and using Eqs. (61), we obtain:

$$(74a) \quad \left[ \frac{d d_G}{dT} \right]_{spring} = - 4.4 \times 10^{-9} \text{ m/K at } 4.5 \text{ K} ,$$

$$(74b) \quad \left[ \frac{d d_G}{dT} \right]_{spring} = - 8.8 \times 10^{-9} \text{ m/K at } 3 \text{ K and below} .$$

In contrast to the change in penetration depth, this effect is much larger at 3 K than at 4.5 K.

Equations (68), (69), and (74) combine to give

$$(75a) \quad \left[ \frac{d d_G}{dT} \right]_{\text{total}} = - 4.6 \times 10^{-9} \text{ m/K at 4.5 K} ,$$

$$(75b) \quad \left[ \frac{d d_G}{dT} \right]_{\text{total}} = - 9.0 \times 10^{-9} \text{ m/K at 3 K and below} .$$

$\Lambda_{GT}$  can now be computed by setting

$$(76) \quad \Lambda_{GT} = \Lambda_G \times \left[ \frac{d d_G}{dT} \right]_{\text{total}} ,$$

substituting in Eqs. (75) and setting  $\Lambda_G = 0.79 \text{ H/m}$ , we obtain

$$(77a) \quad \Lambda_{GT} = - 3.6 \text{ nH/K at 4.5 K} ,$$

$$(77b) \quad \Lambda_{GT} = - 7.1 \text{ nH/K at 3 K and below.}$$

$di/dT$  for the gradiometer may now be computed. Differentiating Eq. (48) with respect to the gradient sensing coil temperature and the temperature sensing coil temperature, we obtain

$$(78a) \quad \frac{1}{I_{G0}} \frac{di}{dT_G} = (1-\beta) \frac{M_{23} \Lambda_{GT}}{(\Lambda_G d_G + L_2)(L_3 + L_S + L_T') - M_{23}^2} ,$$

$$(78b) \quad \frac{1}{I_{T0}} \frac{di}{dT_T} = \frac{M_{45} \Lambda_{TT}}{(\Lambda_T d_T + L_4)(L_5 + L_3 + L_6'') - M_{45}^2}$$

By Substituting, Eqs. (67) and (77), and other numerical parameters into these equations, we obtain

$$(79a) \quad \frac{1}{I_{G0}} \frac{di}{dT_G} = 2.0 \times 10^{-5} /K \text{ at } 4.5 K ,$$

$$(79b) \quad \frac{1}{I_{G0}} \frac{di}{dT_G} = 4.0 \times 10^{-5} /K \text{ at } 3 K \text{ and below ,}$$

$$(80) \quad \frac{1}{I_{T0}} \frac{di}{dT_T} = 3.7 \times 10^{-5} /K \text{ at } 4.5 K .$$

Using Eq. (13), we can calculate the corresponding change in output voltage:

$$(81a) \quad \left[ \frac{dv}{dT_G} \right]_{thy} = R \frac{1}{I_{G0}} \frac{di}{dT_G} = 4.0 \text{ V/K at } 4.5 K ,$$

$$(81b) \quad \left[ \frac{dv}{dT_G} \right]_{thy} = R \frac{1}{I_{G0}} \frac{di}{dT_G} = 8.0 \text{ V/K at } 3 K ,$$

$$(82) \quad \left[ \frac{dV}{dT} \right]_{thy} = R \frac{1}{I_{T0}} \frac{dI}{dT} = 7.4 \text{ V/K at } 4.5 \text{ K} .$$

Experimentally, we found

$$(83a) \quad \left[ \frac{dV}{dT_G} \right]_{exp} = 30.0 \text{ V/K at } 4.5 \text{ K} ,$$

$$(84) \quad \left[ \frac{dV}{dT_T} \right]_{exp} = 17.5 \text{ V/K at } 4.5 \text{ K} .$$

Mapoles measured previously

$$(83b) \quad \left[ \frac{dV}{dT_G} \right]_{exp} = 43.6 \text{ V/K at } 2.4 \text{ K} .$$

Comparing Eqs. (84) and (82), we find that the experimental value is twice as large as the theoretical value, and our rough estimate for the expansion of stycast epoxy at 4.5K must be too small by a factor of two.

Comparing Eqs. (83) and (81) we find that the experimental value is much larger than the theoretical value. The change in Young's modulus, as reported by Kramer and Bauer<sup>9</sup>, is strongly dependent on the chemical purity and the degree of stress in the sample. It is also dependent on the frequency at which it is

measured. Kramer and Bauer<sup>9</sup> report  $dY/dT$  for 80 kHz and 240 kHz. The value at 240 kHz is approximately half as large as that at 80 kHz. Perhaps it is reasonable to suspect that  $dY/dT$  is 2 to 3 times larger at 70 Hz. If we substitute

$$(85) \quad \frac{1}{Y} \frac{dY}{dT} = 75 \times 10^{-6} /K \text{ at } 4.5 \text{ K} ,$$

and use a thermal expansion coefficient for stycast epoxy that is twice as large, i.e. ,

$$(86) \quad \frac{1}{L} \frac{dL}{dT} = 3.0 \times 10^{-5} /K ,$$

we obtain:

$$(87) \quad \left[ \frac{dV}{dT_g} \right]_{thy} = 12.7 \text{ V/K at } 4.5 \text{ K}.$$

This is still too small.

Experimentally,  $dV/dT_g$  increases below 3.0 K. This is evidence that our understanding of the thermal properties of the gradiometer is basically correct.

## VI. Conclusion

At the start of this work, excess noise in the low frequency regime was thought to be due to excess sensitivity to thermal drift in the gradient sensing circuit. We have confirmed this for frequencies below 0.2 Hz. At higher frequencies, we have shown that there should be no contribution from thermal drift.

Previously the large sensitivity of the gradiometer to thermal drift was not understood. We now understand that this is primarily due to change in Young's modulus of niobium with temperature.

In addition to the noise generated by the thermal drift at low frequencies, we have also found that the motion of flux trapped in the lead shield surrounding the gradiometer leads to noise with a  $1/f^\alpha$  characteristic. The addition of a  $\mu$ -metal shield to the cryostat would remove this.

We have demonstrated that a passive subtraction of the thermal sensitivity can be accomplished at low frequencies. This subtraction can be extended to higher frequencies by coupling the temperature sensing coil more tightly thermally to the gradient sensing coil. This could be accomplished by mounting the temperature sensing coil to the inside surface of the gradient sensing coil form. This would minimize the thermal time constant between the gradient coil and the temperature coil. It is believed that such a geometry would allow cancellation at frequencies below 0.1 Hz. This combined with conventional temperature stabilization of the inner vacuum can would allow the inverse square law test to be carried out.

Another way of reducing the temperature sensitivity of the Stanford Gradiometer is using a current-differencing scheme employed in the gradiometer developed at the University of Maryland<sup>6</sup>. In this device, the displacements of the two proof masses are sensed by two

separate sensing coils, each mounted on the same side of the respective proof mass. A temperature change now produces effects which look like a common acceleration and are therefore rejected by the common mode balance of the two sensing loops.

### **Acknowledgement**

**We wish to acknowledge the valuable contributions by Dr. Mike McAshan.**

## REFERENCES

1. D. R. Long, *Nature* 260, 417 (1976).
2. E. Fishbach, D. Sudarsky, A. Szafer, C. Talmadge, and S. H. Aronson, *Phys. Rev. Lett.* 56, 3 (1986).
3. H. A. Chan, Ph.D. thesis, University of Maryland, College Park, Maryland (1982), unpublished.
4. E. R. Mapoles, Ph.D. thesis, Stanford University, Stanford, California (1981), unpublished.
5. H. J. Paik, *J. Astronaut. Sci.* 29, 1 (1981).
6. H. A. Chan, H. J. Paik, M. V. Moody and J. W. Parke, *IEEE Trans. Magnetics*, MAG-21, 411 (1985).
7. Model 330 RF SQUID system, Biomagnetic Technologies, Inc., San Diego, California.
8. Serafini and Koenig in *Cryogenic Properties of Polymers*.
9. E. J. Kramer and C. L. Bauer, *Phy. Rev.*, 163, 407, (1967).

Table 1.

| Pressure              | $C_C/C_B$ | $C_H/C_B$ | $\tau_{BH}$ | $\tau_{CB}$ | $\tau_{HC}$ |
|-----------------------|-----------|-----------|-------------|-------------|-------------|
| $\approx 10^{-3} \mu$ | 0.73      | 0.60      | 8.3 s       | 0.46 s      | 5.24 s      |
| 20 $\mu$              | 0.87      | 0.98      | 1.1 s       | 0.13 s      | 1.37 s      |
| 100 $\mu$             | 0.47      | 1.5       | 0.99 s      | 0.43 s      | 0.69 s      |

Figure 1. Gradiometer




Figure 2 Readout Circuitry





Figure 3  $f_{D,exp}^2$  vs  $I_{60}^2$



-40 dBV

Figure 4

4/25/85 8:00  
grad cond = 2.439

no exchange gas


$I_D = 6.66 \text{ amp}$

$I_0 = 4.66 \text{ amp}$

$I_A = 0.00$

$I_T = 0.00$

0.1 Hz high pass on Room




2400 Hz

120 dBV

255 Hz

Figure 5

-400dBV



no exchange gas

$I_D = 6.69 \text{ amp}$

$I_B = 4.66 \text{ amp}$

$I_A = 0.00$

$I_T = 0.00$

$f = 2.5/55 \quad 9.30$

$0.03 \text{ He high pass filter}$

2 averages

grad cond  $\approx 2.600$

06

24


-120dBV

10201

24

Figure 6

-40 dBV



-120 dBV

24.4 dBV

24.4 Hz

24.4 Hz

24.4 dBV

24.4 dBV

24.4 Hz

24.4 Hz

24.4 dBV

24.4 dBV

24.4 Hz

24.4 Hz

24.4 dBV

24.4 dBV

24.4 Hz

24.4 Hz

24.4 dBV

24.4 dBV

24.4 Hz

24.4 Hz

24.4 dBV

24.4 dBV

24.4 Hz

24.4 Hz

24.4 dBV

24.4 dBV

24.4 Hz

24.4 Hz

24.4 dBV

24.4 dBV

24.4 Hz

24.4 Hz

24.4 dBV

24.4 dBV

24.4 Hz

24.4 Hz

24.4 dBV

24.4 dBV

24.4 Hz

24.4 Hz

24.4 dBV

24.4 dBV

24.4 Hz

24.4 Hz

24.4 dBV

24.4 dBV

24.4 Hz

24.4 Hz

24.4 dBV

24.4 dBV

24.4 Hz

24.4 Hz

24.4 dBV

24.4 dBV

24.4 Hz

24.4 Hz

24.4 dBV

24.4 dBV

24.4 Hz

24.4 Hz

24.4 dBV

24.4 dBV

24.4 Hz

24.4 Hz

24.4 dBV

24.4 dBV

24.4 Hz

24.4 Hz

24.4 dBV

24.4 dBV

24.4 Hz

24.4 Hz

24.4 dBV

24.4 dBV

24.4 Hz

24.4 Hz

24.4 dBV

24.4 dBV

24.4 Hz

24.4 Hz

24.4 dBV

24.4 dBV

24.4 Hz

24.4 Hz

24.4 dBV

24.4 dBV

24.4 Hz

24.4 Hz

24.4 dBV

24.4 dBV

24.4 Hz

24.4 Hz

24.4 dBV

24.4 dBV

24.4 Hz

24.4 Hz

24.4 dBV

24.4 dBV

24.4 Hz

24.4 Hz

24.4 dBV

24.4 dBV

24.4 Hz

24.4 Hz

24.4 dBV

24.4 dBV

24.4 Hz

24.4 Hz

24.4 dBV

24.4 dBV

24.4 Hz

24.4 Hz

24.4 dBV

24.4 dBV

24.4 Hz

24.4 Hz

24.4 dBV

24.4 dBV

24.4 Hz

24.4 Hz

24.4 dBV

24.4 dBV

24.4 Hz

24.4 Hz

24.4 dBV

24.4 dBV

24.4 Hz

24.4 Hz

24.4 dBV

24.4 dBV

24.4 Hz

24.4 Hz

24.4 dBV

24.4 dBV

24.4 Hz

24.4 Hz

24.4 dBV

24.4 dBV

24.4 Hz

24.4 Hz

24.4 dBV

24.4 dBV

24.4 Hz

24.4 Hz

24.4 dBV

24.4 dBV

24.4 Hz

24.4 Hz

24.4 dBV

24.4 dBV

24.4 Hz

24.4 Hz

24.4 dBV

24.4 dBV

24.4 Hz

24.4 Hz

24.4 dBV

24.4 dBV

24.4 Hz

24.4 Hz

24.4 dBV

24.4 dBV

24.4 Hz

24.4 Hz

24.4 dBV

24.4 dBV

24.4 Hz

24.4 Hz

24.4 dBV

24.4 dBV

24.4 Hz

24.4 Hz

24.4 dBV

24.4 dBV

24.4 Hz

24.4 Hz

24.4 dBV

24.4 dBV

24.4 Hz

24.4 Hz

24.4 dBV

24.4 dBV

24.4 Hz

24.4 Hz

24.4 dBV

24.4 dBV

24.4 Hz

24.4 Hz

24.4 dBV

24.4 dBV

24.4 Hz

24.4 Hz

24.4 dBV

24.4 dBV

24.4 Hz

24.4 Hz

24.4 dBV

24.4 dBV

24.4 Hz

24.4 Hz

24.4 dBV

24.4 dBV

24.4 Hz

24.4 Hz

24.4 dBV

24.4 dBV

24.4 Hz

24.4 Hz

24.4 dBV

24.4 dBV

24.4 Hz

24.4 Hz

24.4 dBV

24.4 dBV

24.4 Hz

24.4 Hz

24.4 dBV

24.4 dBV

24.4 Hz

24.4 Hz

24.4 dBV

24.4 dBV

24.4 Hz

24.4 Hz

24.4 dBV

24.4 dBV

24.4 Hz

24.4 Hz

24.4 dBV

24.4 dBV

24.4 Hz

24.4 Hz

24.4 dBV

24.4 dBV

24.4 Hz

24.4 Hz

24.4 dBV

24.4 dBV

24.4 Hz

24.4 Hz

24.4 dBV

24.4 dBV

24.4 Hz

24.4 Hz

24.4 dBV

24.4 dBV

24.4 Hz

24.4 Hz

24.4 dBV

24.4 dBV

24.4 Hz

24.4 Hz

24.4 dBV

24.4 dBV

24.4 Hz

24.4 Hz

24.4 dBV

24.4 dBV

24.4 Hz

24.4 Hz

24.4 dBV

24.4 dBV

24.4 Hz

24.4 Hz

24.4 dBV

24.4 dBV

24.4 Hz

24.4 Hz

24.4 dBV

24.4 dBV

24.4 Hz

24.4 Hz

24.4 dBV

24.4 dBV

24.4 Hz

24.4 Hz

24.4 dBV

24.4 dBV




Figure 7 Thermal Model

100  $\mu$  exchange gr  
 $I_D = 4.50$   $I_0 = 4.50$

0.640



0 - 0.0256

Figure 8 Gradient Sensing Circuit Impulse Response 256

$C23 = 1.432$   
 $C43 = 1.087$   
 $\tau_{AU4} = 0.753$   
 $\tau_{AU2} = 3.747$

$t_{stop}$   
 $\downarrow$  fit

$\uparrow$  data  
 $\uparrow$  fit

Figure 9 Temperature Sensing Circuit Impulse Response

Figure 10.1  $\frac{T_c - T_d}{T_d} - 10$  amplitude and phase

$\frac{T_c - T_d}{T_c}$  theory

amp

phase

13.4

41.00.0

-50dB

-90°


0.014

Figure 11 temperature sensitive

APR 08 - 5028V

5/31

$I_T = 4.02 \text{ amp}$   
 $I_0 = I_A = I_B = 0.00$   
 60  $\mu$  exchange gear



0.596

0.392

107.320V/10H3

310V/1H3

93V/1H3

22V/1H3

11.6V/1H3

30V/1H3

3AV/1H3

0

1.0

Figure 12





Figure 13 Seismic Activity of  
the Ground.



output voltage vs. time

Figure 11.10



1-5ms

$\Delta V \approx 64 \mu V \approx 3 \times 10^{-3} V$

100  
200




Figure 16 Temperature Sensing Coil




Figure 17 gradient sensing coil

END

9-87

Dtic