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In a recent Comment, Decca et al. [Phys. Rev. A 79, 026101 (2009)] discussed the origin of the anomalies recently reported by us in Phys. Rev. A 78, 036102(R) (2008). Here we restate our view corroborated by their considerations that quantitative geometrical and electrostatic characterizations of the conducting surfaces (a topic not discussed explicitly in the literature until very recently) are critical for the assessment of precision and accuracy of the demonstration of the Casimir force and for deriving meaningful limits on the existence of Yukavian components possibly superimposed to the Newtonian gravitational interaction.
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I. INTRODUCTION

In the last decade, various efforts have been focused on demonstrating the Casimir force and exploring hypothetical short-range forces of gravitational origin [1]. Limits to the existence of these forces—or their tentative discovery—in the micrometer range rely on the control at the highest level of accuracy of the Casimir force and the related systematic effects [2,3].

In this context, we have investigated the celebrated sphere-plane geometry in a range of parameters for which the hypothetical Yukavian contribution of gravitational origin should be optimally detected [4]. This implies exploiting a combination of spheres with large radius of curvature, such as the ones already used in [5], and small separation gaps between the sphere and the planar surface similar to the ones explored in [6–8] with spheres having an order of 100 μm radius of curvature. Notice that large radius of curvature and relatively large distances as in [5] are not adequately sensitive to Yukavian forces with small interaction range. Conversely, microspheres at small distances as used in [6–8] have small sensitivity to the amplitude of Yukawa forces due to the smaller expected signal arising from the reduced effective surfaces of interaction. In this respect, limits to the Yukawa force based on a formal mapping between an ideal parallel-plate geometry and the sphere-plane configuration actually used in the experimental setup as in [9] are invalid, as the proximity force approximation (PFA)—typically used for forces acting between surfaces [10]—does not hold for forces of volumetric character such as the gravitational force or its theoretical short-range relatives.

In [4], we reported two anomalies in the electrostatic calibration of our apparatus after discussing and ruling out some systematic effects. This has triggered the interest of the authors of [11] who have added two interesting points: first attempting to explain our first anomaly in terms of a systematic deviation from the ideal single-curvature pattern for the spherical surface and second presenting a distance-independent contact potential in one of their experimental setups. We welcome these different insights and would like to discuss here their implications in the general context of both accurate demonstrations of the Casimir force and precision experiments on Yukawan gravitational forces, as in the following.

II. DEVIATION FROM IDEAL SPHERICAL GEOMETRY

Among the possible reasons for the first anomaly we have briefly discussed in [4], a couple of possibilities arise from geometrical effects, namely, the validity of the PFA approximation in our case and a surface obtained by convolving various spheres with different radii of curvature having in common the point of minimum distance from the plate. The authors of [11] provide a further example of a deviation from geometry that certainly, for an appropriate choice of the additional parameters added to the model, may mimic any desired power-law exponent for the scaling of the electrostatic curvature coefficient $k_{el}$ upon the distance. In particular, we concur that a softer dependence is obtainable by guessing higher curvatures around the point of minimum distance. In general, it is indeed intuitive that, for instance, harder scaling with the distance is obtained in regions at lower curvature—in the extreme case of a flat surface (i.e., infinite radius of curvature) one expects a scaling of $k_{el}$ with distance through an exponent $-3$—and conversely exponent softer than the expected $-2$ should be associated with even sharper regions.

However, this interpretation in terms of a modified geometry is hard to reconcile with the measurement of the capacitance versus distance that better follows the behavior expected for a surface with a single radius of curvature, as shown in Fig. 1. The electrostatic curvature coefficient $k_{el}$ is related to the second spatial derivative of the capacitance $C$ and the effective mass $m_{eff}$ as

$$k_{el} = \frac{C''}{8\pi^2 m_{eff}}.$$  

The model considered in [11] implies a capacitance for the modified sphere-plane configuration expressed by the formula

---
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FIG. 1. (Color online) Capacitance versus applied piezoelectric (PZT) voltage data (black circles) and its best fit under the two hypotheses of ideal spherical geometry and modified geometry as in [11]. The modified geometry fit (blue dashed line) is based on Eq. (3), with the distance $d=\beta(V_{\text{PZT}}-V_{\text{PZT}})$, where $\beta=(87 \pm 2)$ mm/V is the PZT actuation coefficient. The best fit with the constraint of $A_2$ terms equal to zero yields $A^\text{id}=222.96 \pm 0.04$ pF, $A_3^\text{id}=-(346.2 \pm 1)$ pF/m, and $V_0^\text{id}=68.43 \pm 0.05$ V, with a reduced $\chi^2=77.4$. The ideal geometry fit (red continuous line) is based on Eq. (4) and the resulting parameters are $A_1^\text{id}=193.9 \pm 0.2$ pF, $A_3^\text{id}=-(1.757 \pm 0.002)$ pF, and $V_0^\text{id}=69.31 \pm 0.02$ V, with a reduced $\chi^2=2.9$. The coefficient $A_3^\text{id}$ is in agreement within one standard deviation with the less accurate theoretical expectation of $-2\pi \varepsilon_0 R=-(1.72 \pm 0.02)$ pF. If the $A_2$ terms are not constrained to zero in both fits, one gets $A^\text{id}=223.8 \pm 1.5$ pF, $A_3^\text{id}=-(359524 \pm 13000)$ pF/m, $A^\text{mod}=(433 \pm 135)$ pF, and $V_0^\text{id}=68.59 \pm 0.45$ V, with a reduced $\chi^2=13.6$, and $A_1^\text{id}=193.9 \pm 0.2$ pF, $A_3^\text{id}=-(29000 \pm 2800)$ pF/m, $A_3^\text{id}=-(1.705 \pm 0.005)$ pF, and $V_0^\text{id}=69.25 \pm 0.02$ V, with a reduced $\chi^2=2.6$. 

$$C^*_{\text{id}}=C^\text{id}+A_2^\text{id}d+A_3^\text{id}d^3.$$ (3)

For the ideal sphere-plane capacitance, we obtain instead

$$C_{\text{id}}=A_1^\text{id}+A_2^\text{id}d+A_3^\text{id}d^3 \ln(R/d),$$ (4)

with $A_2^\text{id}=-2\pi \varepsilon_0 R$. The linear terms $A_2^\text{id}$ and $A_3^\text{id}$ may represent the effect of a constant electric field, to which our ac capacitance meter should not be sensitive (see comment below). We have fitted our capacitance data with both Eqs. (3) and (4), supposing that $A_3^\text{id}=A_3^\text{mod}=0$. Fitting with the modified geometry [Eq. (3)] yields a best fit with a reduced $\chi^2$ that is significantly larger than that of the ideal geometry [Eq. (4)], as detailed in the caption of Fig. 1. Moreover, by using the parameters provided in [11] ($R_{AB}=1.6$ mm, $R_{CD}=30$ Å, $h=8$ mm), we find that the best fit with Eq. (2) gives a discrepancy of about 20% in the expected coefficient for the distance dependence, while the discrepancy is 2.1% using the ideal sphere-plane formula, quite close to the nominal relative error of the radius of curvature of the sphere $R=(30.9 \pm 0.15)$ mm. This suggests that the capacitance data are better explained by using an idealized geometry rather than the sophisticated geometry proposed in [11] that, moreover, should have been evidenced by the dedicated atomic force microscopy (AFM) imaging of the sphere that we performed after the runs. Notice that in our setup the capacitance is measured dynamically by using an ac bridge, while $k_{\text{id}}$ is measured by looking at the frequency shift related to the gradient of spatial dependent but static force. By supposing that static or slowly changing charges—not affecting the dynamical measurement of the capacitance—are present on the two surfaces, an ideal capacitance and an anomalous scaling of $k_{\text{id}}$ are mutually consistent.

III. DISTANCE DEPENDENCE OF THE CONTACT POTENTIAL

With regard to the observation of the dependence on distance of the contact potential we have reported in [4], the authors of [11] show previously unpublished data, in Fig. 3, for their experiment located in Indiana. In this plot no systematic trend of $V_0$ is observable in the entire explored range of distances. However, an issue arises if the same data—provided to us by R. Decca—are plotted including the error bars for $V_0$ at one standard deviation, as appearing in Fig. 2. The contact potential is not constant within the error bars, showing scatter over several standard deviations, and perhaps a weak sinusoidal component. By fitting the data with a constant value, one gets a reduced $\chi^2=7.2$ (resulting from an absolute $\chi^2=3603$ and 499 degrees of freedom for the 500 data points); therefore the hypothesis of constant contact potential is highly unlikely, and the use of a constant compensating external potential will generate large residuals and related systematic errors. One may argue that the error bars associated to the contact potential have been underestimated. In fact, if the error bars are increased by a factor of $\sqrt{72}$, the reduced $\chi^2$ approaches values of order unity, making the constant contact potential hypothesis realistic. But doing so increases the average error bar to $0.35$ mV, with the relative average error in each determination of $V_0$ increasing from the initial 0.85% to 2.29%. This will invalidate, once propagated through the electrostatic calibration analysis, the precision of 0.2% quoted in [11], and is at variance with the relative error of 0.85% resulting from the standard deviation of 0.13 mV of $V_0=15.29$ mV quoted in the same paper. In other words, this is an example of data already collected requiring a reanalysis of the precision and accuracy, as we have commented in the conclusions of [4].

It is worth pointing out that the plot presented in Fig. 3 of [11] should not be considered representative of the overall
Recently outlined in investigations on its time variability—also started recently—will be necessary. We also remark on the fact that the precision of the measurement has been assessed by comparing the data with the expected Casimir force. This generates a manifestly model-dependent experimental precision in contradiction with the concept that this quantity is merely a figure of merit of the reproducibility of the measurements. Also, the model for patch potentials in assumes some specific form for the two-dimensional Fourier spectrum of patches and crucially depends on the range of spatial wavelengths contributing to it. Using this phenomenological model and a spectral range arbitrarily chosen based on the size of the grains in the material, in it is concluded that the effects of patches have been investigated in detail in and in and found negligible in those experiments. On the contrary, we believe that the model in does not necessarily describe any realistic experiment (as indeed argued in itself) and that a detailed investigation of patch effects in Casimir experiments would require in situ measurements, using, for instance, Kelvin probe techniques. A third example of model-dependent experimental claim in the same spirit is the evaluation of the limits to Yukawian forces based on a formal mapping of the sphere-plane configuration to the parallel plane case via PFA already mentioned in Sec. I. All these methodological issues will also require further in depth analysis, both on the data collected so far, and via a third generation of experiments capitalizing on the current discussions.

In conclusion, we believe that the message in our contribution is reinforced by the discussion presented in: a very detailed geometrical and electrical characterization of the sphere-plane setup is necessary prior to assessing the precision and accuracy of the Casimir force measurements. Characterizations of this nature require dedicated efforts, as, for instance, initiated in, where systematic measurements have been carried out to study the dependence of the forces upon the shape and roughness of the microspheres or using apparatus with unprecedented levels of stability. It is also crucial to declare all the relevant parameters in the entire explored range of distances as first stressed in, including their possible time variability, and also quoting the percentage of rejection of samples or data runs.
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U. Mohideen (private communication). We were unable to obtain data from Fig. 4 of [15] for an independent analysis. Various attempts to reconstruct the data by scanning that figure were not felt by us as reliable enough to avoid the risk, due to the considerable overlap among many points, of introducing artifacts and biases in their analysis.


