The accelerated expansion of the Universe suggests that most of the energy in the Universe is “dark” [1]. One potential explanation is that Einstein gravity receives $O(1)$ corrections from new degrees of freedom. However, the measured success of the weak field limit of GR within the Solar System requires that these corrections be screened in that regime. Two suitably screened fields are the chameleon [2] and the symmetron [3], which couple both to themselves and to matter. Although these theories cannot drive accelerated expansion without vacuum energy [4], they remain interesting as a way to hide modifications to Einstein gravity.

We proposed [5] that such forces might be detected by using atom interferometry to measure the attraction of an atom in ultrahigh vacuum toward a macroscopic test mass. This is an ideal technique because atoms are sufficiently small that they are unscreened probes of the fifth force. Our proposal was pursued by Hamilton et al. [6–8]. Here we report an independent atom interferometry measurement, using a significantly different experimental method, which achieves very similar sensitivity and confirms that a large part of the parameter space is now excluded.

Figure 1 illustrates the principle of the experiment. The walls of the stainless steel vacuum chamber are at $\pm Z$, where their high density drives the chameleon or symmetron field $\phi$ to a low value. Inside the empty chamber $\phi$ rises to a maximum, $\phi_{bg}$, illustrated by the red curve.

A metal ball placed in the vacuum at position 1 forces a dip in $\phi_{bg}$ (dashed blue line), creating a gradient of $\phi$ near the ball. An atom at the center of the chamber is accelerated by this gradient toward the ball, with acceleration $a_\phi$. We use atom interferometry to measure the component of $a_\phi$ along the axis marked $\pm Z$. When the ball is moved to position 2 (dotted blue line), this component of $a_\phi$ reverses, and we look for the change of acceleration.

Atom interferometry with stimulated Raman transitions [9,10] is a sensitive technique for detecting small accelerations. It is well established as the basis for ultrasensitive gravimeters [11], gyroscopes [12], magnetometers [13], and accelerometers [14] and for applications in metrology [15,16], tests of general relativity [17], and gravitational wave detection [18–20].

Figure 2 illustrates our experiment, in which counterpropagating laser beams along the $z$ axis, differing in frequency by 6.8 GHz, drive the clock transition in rubidium-87 atoms through a Raman process. At time $t = 0$ a $\pi/2$
The resonance frequency is Doppler shifted by the atom’s velocity component \( v_{||} \) along the Raman beams. With a detuning of \( \Delta f = -72 \text{ kHz} \) and a pulse length of 4.5 \( \mu \text{s} \), atoms in the velocity range \( v_{||} = 30 \pm 23 \text{ mm/s} \) are driven to the state \( |F = 1, M_F = 0\rangle \), after which we remove the remaining \( F = 2 \) atoms using resonant light pressure.

This state-selected, velocity-selected group of \( N_0 \approx 10^6 \) atoms is then subjected to three interferometer pulses, spaced by time intervals \( T = 16 \text{ ms} \) and having pulse areas of \( \pi/2, \pi, \) and \( \pi/2 \), respectively [9]. After the third pulse, the fraction of atoms in state \( |F = 2, M_F = 0\rangle \) is

\[
P = \frac{1}{2} \left( 1 - \eta \cos (\varphi + \varphi_0) \right),
\]

where

\[
\varphi = \frac{2\pi (f_1 + f_2)}{c} T^2 \mathbf{n} \cdot \mathbf{a},
\]

and \( \mathbf{n} \cdot \mathbf{a} \) is the acceleration of the atoms relative to the mirror, projected onto the mirror normal \( \mathbf{n} \). The fringe visibility \( \eta \) depends on the inhomogeneous width of the Raman transition, which depends on the range of velocities selected. The angle \( \varphi_0 \) in Eq. (1) is a phase shift applied to the last Raman pulse, which we switch between 0 and \( \pi \) on alternate shots of the experiment. The difference in \( P \) for these two phases is \( \Delta P = \eta \cos \varphi \). Each interferometer sequence ends with a measurement of \( P \) using laser-induced fluorescence. Measurements alternate between \( \varphi_0 = 0 \) and \( \pi \) to determine \( \Delta P \), and hence \( \varphi \).

In total, \( \mathbf{n} \cdot \mathbf{a} \) in Eq. (2) comprises three parts:

\[
\mathbf{n} \cdot \mathbf{a} = \mathbf{n} \cdot (\mathbf{a}_{\text{ball}} + \mathbf{g} + \mathbf{a}_{\text{noise}}).
\]

The term \( \mathbf{a}_{\text{ball}} \) includes the Newtonian attraction and the anomalous acceleration \( \mathbf{a}_s \) towards the ball. The second term represents the ambient gravitational field. The last term is the acceleration noise of the mirror, due mainly to acoustic vibrations. In order to distinguish the first term from the other two, we mount a navigation grade FLEX accelerometer (Honeywell, QA750) on the back of the mirror, and plot the \( \Delta P \) fringes against the voltage \( V_M \) registered by that accelerometer, as shown in Fig. 3(a). The phase of the fringe pattern only senses changes in \( \mathbf{n} \cdot \mathbf{a}_{\text{ball}} \), because the atomic and FLEX accelerometers both experience the same \( \mathbf{n} \cdot (\mathbf{g} + \mathbf{a}_{\text{noise}}) \) [23,24], whereas the FLEX accelerometer, being far from the ball, does not register \( \mathbf{n} \cdot \mathbf{a}_{\text{ball}} \). Zero offset in the FLEX accelerometer is avoided by alternating the position of the source mass between positions 1 and 2, flipping the sign of \( \mathbf{n} \cdot \mathbf{a}_{\text{ball}} \) [25].

The data points in Fig. 3(a) show a typical 12-h set of fringes in \( \Delta P \) obtained by tilting the experiment to scan \( \mathbf{n} \cdot \mathbf{g} \), and hence \( \varphi \). The total change of angle from one end of Fig. 3 to the other is \( \sim 350 \mu \text{rad} \). The red(blue) points are measured with
the ball in position 1(2). We fit these to \( \eta \cos(\alpha V_M + \theta_{1(2)}) \),
where \( \alpha \) converts FLEX voltage to interferometer phase, and \( \theta_{1(2)} \) is the phase offset due to \( \mathbf{n} \cdot \mathbf{a}_{\text{ball}} \).

Figure 3(b) plots 36 values of \( \mathbf{n} \cdot \mathbf{a}_{\text{ball}} \) derived from our measurements of \( \theta_1 - \theta_2 \) in November 2017, which average to \(-42 \pm 133 \text{ nm/s}^2\). Taking the force to be toward the center of the ball (at 48.8° to the mirror normal \( \mathbf{n} \)), we find a repulsive acceleration \( \mathbf{a}_{\text{ball}} = -64 \pm 201 \text{ nm/s}^2 \). This includes contributions from the Newtonian attraction and potentially magnetic and electric field gradients, summarized in Table I.

With a center-to-center spacing of 26.8 mm, as close as possible without scattering Raman light, the Newtonian acceleration is 7.2 nm/s\(^2\). Movement of the atoms through a small magnetic field gradient produces a false acceleration towards the ball of \(+6 \pm 5 \text{ nm/s}^2\) [26] due to the Zeeman shift of the clock transition. The electric analog of this is negligible because the Stark shift of the clock transition involves the very small tensor polarizability. Instead, an electric field gradient can produce a real acceleration of the atoms through their scalar polarizability. The ball was grounded to the chamber, but may have been electrically charged because aluminium naturally grows a surface layer of alumina \(\sim 4 \text{ nm} \) thick and can support a potential difference of up to \(\sim 1 \text{ V} \) before breaking down. Assuming that the surface is indeed charged to \(\leq 1 \text{ V} \), this effect contributes \(\leq 1.5 \text{ nm/s}^2 \). Ultimately, we determine

\[
\mathbf{a}_\phi = -77 \pm 201 \text{ nm/s}^2,
\]

where the uncertainty is almost entirely due to statistical noise. We conclude with 90% confidence that \(\mathbf{a}_\phi < +183 \text{ nm/s}^2\).

Key experimental differences between this work and that of Ref. [8] are our interferometry used freely propagating laser light, not light in a cavity; we measured the force horizontally, not against a large background due to gravity (requiring a chirped interferometer); we used a spherical, aluminum test mass not a cylindrical, tungsten one; we used Rb instead of Cs atoms. For chameleon and symmetron models, these differences in the source and test bodies change where in the parameter space the fifth force is screened. More generally, these differences may be significant if the force is sensitive, for example, to the density of the source or to the nuclear composition of the masses.

This bound on \(\mathbf{a}_\phi\) places an upper limit on the strength of screened fifth forces. The general action is (with the mostly plus metric signature)

\[
S_\phi = \int d^4x \sqrt{-g} \left( -\frac{1}{2} (\partial \phi)^2 - V(\phi) - A(\phi) \rho_m \right),
\]

where \(\rho_m\) is the density of nonrelativistic matter. The equation of motion for \(\phi\) is

\[
\vec{\nabla}^2 \phi = \frac{dV}{d\phi} + \frac{dA}{d\phi} \rho_m .
\]
The acceleration of a small, freely falling extended object due to $\phi$ is \[ \ddot{a}_\phi = \lambda_a \frac{dA}{d\phi} \ddot{\varphi}(\vec{x}). \tag{7} \]

The screening factor $\lambda_a$ varies between 0 for large and dense (screened) objects and 1 for small and light (unscreened) objects.

The prototypical chameleon field has a self-interaction potential $V(\phi) = \Lambda^2 / \phi$ and matter coupling $A(\phi) = \phi / M$ and the screening factor for a spherical object of radius $R_{\text{obj}}$ and density $\rho_{\text{obj}}$ is approximately $\lambda_{a,\text{cham}} \approx \min \left[ \left( 3M\rho_{\text{env}} \right)/\left( \rho_{\text{obj}} R_{\text{obj}}^2 \right), 1 \right]$, where $\rho_{\text{env}}$ is the ambient field value.

We solve Eq. (6), where $\rho_m$ includes the source mass, vacuum chamber gas, and walls. A general solution is unknown; however, it may be solved exactly for an infinite plate. It may also be solved numerically.

The distance $x = 0.775$ cm from the atoms to the surface of the sphere is less than half the radius of the sphere, so we approximate the sphere as an infinite plate \[ \text{[28,29]. The plate is assumed to be sufficiently dense that } \phi \approx 0 \text{ at the surface. We include a geometrical fitting factor } \xi, \text{ which is determined numerically.} \]

The chameleon field is approximated as \[ \phi_{\text{cham}} = \xi_{\text{cham}} \left( 9\Lambda^3 / 2 \right)^{1/3} x^{2/3}. \tag{8} \]

We determine $\xi_{\text{cham}}$ by solving Eq. (6) on a 3-dimensional grid \[ \text{[7,8], with } \phi = 0 \text{ at the surfaces of the vacuum chamber and sphere, and negligible gas density. When these approximations are not appropriate (for chameleon parameter } M \lesssim 10^{-10} M_{\text{Pl}} \text{ and } M \gtrsim 10^{-0.5} M_{\text{Pl}} \text{ with } M_{\text{Pl}} \text{ the reduced Planck mass), we use an analysis identical to that of } [5,6]. \]

Comparing our numerical results with Eq. (8), we find $\xi_{\text{cham}} = 1.11$ for $10^{-5} \text{ eV} < \Lambda < 10^3 \text{ eV}$. This insensitivity of $\xi_{\text{cham}}$ to $\Lambda$ is guaranteed by the vacuum scaling symmetry $\phi \to a\phi, \Lambda \to a^{3/5}\Lambda$. Equation (7) may now be used to compute the chameleon force on a rubidium-87 nucleus. The constraints are plotted in Fig. 4(a).

The symmetron has a potential $V(\phi) = -\frac{1}{2} \mu^2 \phi^2 + (\lambda/4)\phi^4$ and coupling $A(\phi) = \phi^2 / 2M^2$, and the screening factor for a spherical object is \[ \lambda_{a,\text{symm}} \approx \min \left[ \left( M^2 / \rho_{\text{obj}} R_{\text{obj}}^2 \right), 1 \right]. \]

When the ambient matter density $\rho_m$ is small, the field reaches $\phi \approx \mu / \sqrt{\lambda}$ at the minimum of its effective potential $V_{\text{eff}} = V + Ap$. If $\rho_m > \mu^2 M^2$, the minimum of the effective potential is $\phi = 0$. The scalar force Eq. (7) is proportional to the local field value, so large ambient matter densities shut off the scalar force.

The experiment tests the window $10^{-2} \text{ meV} < \mu < 10^{-1} \text{ meV}$. The upper bound is due to the force becoming short ranged, while at the lower bound it is so long ranged that $\phi = 0$ everywhere inside the vacuum chamber \[ \text{[29]. The approximate solution to the symmetron field near the atoms is a product of a fitting factor } \xi_{\text{symm}} \text{ and the 1D solution } [29,40,41] \]

\[ \phi_{\text{symm}} = \xi_{\text{symm}} \left( \mu / \sqrt{\lambda} \right) \tanh(\mu x / \sqrt{2}). \tag{9} \]

The symmetron equation of motion in vacuum also admits a scaling symmetry $\phi \to a\phi, \lambda \to (1/a^2)\lambda$, which guarantees that $\xi_{\text{symm}}$ is independent of $\lambda$. A similar argument does not apply for $\mu$. We have numerically solved the equation of motion for $10^{-2} \text{ meV} < \mu < 300 \text{ meV}, and
found that $1 < \xi_{\text{symm}} < 1.5$. We conservatively set $\xi_{\text{symm}} = 1$. Our constraints, illustrated in Fig. 4(b), cover a similar but slightly wider range of $\mu$ than those of [8].

There exist strong bounds from bouncing neutrons but, under standard assumptions about screening, those results [Fig. 4(b) of [39]] constrain a different window of $\mu$. The two experimental methods are therefore complementary. Recently Refs. [33,34] have reported the detection of a signal, at $6\sim 7\sigma$, consistent with screened fifth forces on Mpc scales. Those studies use a somewhat schematic screening model that, when interpreted as a chameleon model, corresponds to a similar but slightly wider range of $\xi_{\text{symm}}$, consistent with screened fifth forces on $\mu < 10^{-26}\text{meV}$, many orders of magnitude away from the range, presented in Fig. 4, that is accessible in the laboratory.

In conclusion, we have measured the acceleration of $^{87}\text{Rb}$ atoms toward a test mass in a high-vacuum environment. We find no evidence for screened fifth forces, which now seem to be ruled out by two independent tests over a wide range of the parameter space of prototypical chameleon and symmetron models. There remains a key region of parameter space accessible to chameleon models with $\Lambda \sim \Lambda_{\text{DE}}$, and much unconstrained parameter space for the symmetron model. We believe that this gap can be closed by an upgrade, in progress, to our experiment that will lower the noise floor to the quantum projection limit.
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