Multilayer test masses to enhance the collapse noise
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Recently, a non-thermal excess noise, compatible with the theoretical prediction provided by collapse models, was measured in a millikelvin nanomechanical cantilever experiment [Vinante et al., Phys. Rev. Lett. 119, 110401 (2017)]. We propose a feasible implementation of the cantilever experiment able to probe such a noise. The proposed modification, completely within the grasp of current technology and readily implementable also in other type of mechanical non-interferometric experiments, consists in substituting the homogeneous test mass with one composed of different layers of different materials. This will enhance the action of a possible collapse noise above that given by standard noise sources.

I. INTRODUCTION

Technological development allows for novel and more refined tests of the foundations of quantum mechanics [1–3], which were wishful thinking up to a few decades ago. Among them, non-interferometric tests [4–18] of models of spontaneous wave function collapse [19, 20], which assume a progressive violation of the quantum superposition principle when moving from the micro to the macro scale, have given a strong boost to the search of the limits of validity of quantum theory. These limits, if present, would represent an intrinsic boundary to the scalability of quantum technologies.

Collapse models predict the existence of new effects, which tend to localize the wave function of massive systems in space. This is accomplished by coupling quantum systems nonlinearly to a noise field, which is characterized by two phenomenological constants: a collapse rate λ and a correlation length rC. Numerical value for these parameters were first given by Ghirardi, Rimini and Weber (GRW) [21]: λ = 10−16 s−1 and rC = 10−7 m. Later, Adler [22, 23] suggested stronger values for the collapse rate, namely λ = 10−8±2 s−1 for rC = 10−7 m, and λ = 10−6±2 s−1 for rC = 10−6 m.

The literature on experimental tests of collapse models is nowadays rather extensive. First came matter-wave interferometry—the most natural type of experiment—where larger and larger systems are prepared in delocalized states, and quantum interference is measured by standard interferometric techniques [24–29]. Due to the difficulty in handling massive delocalized states, such experiments so far do not place significant bounds on the collapse parameters.

To overcome this difficulty, non-interferometric experiments have been developed. They are based on an unavoidable side-effect of the collapse process: a diffusion of the system’s position, which can be traced via optomechanical techniques, being these very sensitive to small position displacements [30–32]. Among them, cold atoms [33], measurement of bulk temperature [12, 13] and detection of spontaneous X-ray emission give the strongest bound on λ for rC < 10−6 m [18], while force noise measurements on nanomechanical cantilevers [14, 15] and on gravitational wave detectors give the strongest bound for rC > 10−6 m [16, 17]. Recently an excess noise of unknown origin was measured in one such experiment [15]; the value of the noise is in principle compatible with Adler’s value for the collapse rate. These results call for a more refined experimental analysis of collapse models.

We propose a method to enhance and optimize the CSL effect in optomechanical setups, which can be readily applied to most experiments of this kind. In contrast with other previous proposals [34–37], the hereby described method takes the advantage of only existing technology, that was already used to set bounds on the CSL parameters. It consists in using a mechanical test mass composed of layers of two different materials, instead of an homogeneous one. For specific values of ratio between the layers thickness and rC, the CSL noise coherently correlates the collapses of the single layers and an amplification mechanism, which is fully discussed below, emerges. We will consider a specific application to the cantilever-based experiment described in Ref. [15]. The foreseen increase of the CSL effect is sufficient to test almost the entire interval of collapse rate proposed by Adler, and in particular to falsify the hypothesis that the excess noise observed in [15] may be due to CSL.

II. MODEL

The CSL master equation [19] is of the Lindblad type:

\[ \dot{\rho}(t) = -\frac{i}{\hbar}[\hat{H}, \rho(t)] + L[\rho(t)], \]

where \( \hat{H} \) describes the
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where

with \( \hat{\mu}(\mathbf{k}) \) the Fourier transform of the mass density of the system.

Eq. (3) describes a diffusive dynamics, quantified by the CSL-induced diffusion constants \( \eta_{ij} \), which can be best measured via optomechanical techniques [30–32]. In a typical experimental setup, the position of a mechanical resonator is accurately monitored and the force acting on it is determined; this is for instance the case of cantilever experiments [14, 15] or gravitational wave detectors [16, 17]. In such a setup, diffusion is conveniently quantified by the Density Noise Spectrum (DNS) of the resonator’s position, which under the effect of thermal fluctuations and the CSL diffusion takes the form [37]:

\[
S_z(\omega) = \frac{2M\gamma_m k_n T + S_{\text{CSL}}}{M^2[(\omega_0^2 - \omega^2)^2 + \gamma_m^2\omega^2]},
\]

where \( M \), \( \omega_0 \) and \( \gamma_m \) are respectively the mass, the resonance frequency and the damping of the resonator, and \( T \) is the temperature of the thermal noise (\( k_n \) is Boltzmann constant). CSL contributes to the DNS as a temper-

Eq. (5) shows that in order to increase the relative strength of the CSL effect with respect to the thermal noise, one has two options: one either minimizes the thermal force noise \( S_{\text{th}} = 2M\gamma_m k_n T \), which requires low temperatures and/or low damping regimes, or maximizes the CSL force noise, i.e. the diffusion constant \( \eta \).

Some of the strongest CSL bounds have been set by mechanical experiments, which were designed for ultralow thermal noise. For experiments with cantilevers, this is achieved by operating at millikelvin temperature, for macroscopic experiments such as gravitational wave detectors, the key ingredient is the operation at very low frequency, where the mechanical damping can be strongly reduced. Further decrease of temperatures and/or low damping requires demanding technological improvements.

Here, we are interested in the other option: to explore possible ways to enhance the CSL diffusion by optimizing the shape and the mass density distribution of the test mass. In a cantilever experiment, the damping constant \( \gamma_m \) is mainly defined by the cantilever stiffness and the value of the attached mass, independently of its shape. Thus, at fixed mass, the shape plays a role only in defining \( \eta \). Quantitative calculations (see Appendix A) show that the cuboidal geometry maximizes the CSL diffusion. Similar results can be obtained also for a cylindrical geometry, once the ratio between the basis length and the height of the system is properly chosen. For the sake of simplicity in the following analysis we will focus on the cuboidal geometry.

Preliminary heuristic considerations can be done by looking at the characteristic profile of the upper bounds inferred from non-interferometric experiments [14–17], c.f. light orange lines in Fig. 4. Such a profile can be understood by looking at Table I: for a single mass, the CSL effect (as well as the bound on \( \lambda \)) is strongest when \( r_c \sim L \), where \( L \) defines the mass dimension. Conversely, for \( r_c \ll L \) or \( r_c \gg L \) the effect is weakened by its incoherent or unfocused action respectively.

In the following, we will quantify such a profile for a system composed by \( N \) masses, modeled as harmonic oscillators. The action of the CSL noise on each mass

\[ \]

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>( N )</th>
<th>( r_c )</th>
<th>Disposition</th>
<th>CSL effect on center of mass</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>single mass</td>
<td>( r_c \ll L )</td>
<td>( r_c \ll d )</td>
<td>Incoherent action</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>( r_c \ll L )</td>
<td>( r_c \ll d )</td>
<td>Weak effect</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>( r_c \sim L )</td>
<td>Coherent action</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>( r_c \sim L )</td>
<td>Strong effect</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>( r_c \gg L )</td>
<td>Coherent unfocused action</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>( r_c \gg d )</td>
<td>Weak effect</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>two masses</td>
<td>( r_c \ll L )</td>
<td>( r_c \ll L )</td>
<td>Incoherent action</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>( r_c \ll L )</td>
<td>( r_c \ll L )</td>
<td>Weak effect</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>( r_c \gg L )</td>
<td>Coherent action</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>( r_c \gg L )</td>
<td>Strong effect</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>( r_c \gg d )</td>
<td>Coherent unfocused action</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>( r_c \gg d )</td>
<td>Weak effect</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

TABLE I: CSL effect as diffusion of the center of mass of the system for different values of \( r_c \). The red and green circles represent Gaussians of variance \( r_c^2 \), where the CSL noise acts coherently. For the single mass case, it depends on the ratio between \( r_c \) and the dimension \( L \) of the system, which is represented in blue. For the two mass case, it depends also on the relative distance \( d \).
can be described in terms of the Langevin equations [16]:
\[
\begin{align*}
\frac{d\mathbf{x}_\alpha}{dt} &= \frac{\mathbf{p}_\alpha}{m_\alpha}, \\
\frac{d\mathbf{p}_\alpha}{dt} &= -m_\alpha\omega_\alpha^2\mathbf{x}_\alpha - \gamma_\alpha\mathbf{p}_\alpha + \mathbf{\xi}_\alpha + \mathbf{F}_\alpha,
\end{align*}
\]
where \(\omega_\alpha\), \(\gamma_\alpha\) and \(m_\alpha\) are respectively the frequency, the damping constant and the mass of the \(\alpha\)-th mass. \(\mathbf{\xi}_\alpha\) and \(\mathbf{F}_\alpha\) are the surrounding environmental and the CSL stochastic forces, whose action leads to thermal and non-thermal diffusions, respectively.

The noises \(\mathbf{\xi}_\alpha\) are uncorrelated: \(\frac{1}{2}\langle\{\mathbf{\xi}_\alpha(t), \mathbf{\xi}_{\beta}(s)\}\rangle = 2m_\alpha\gamma_\alpha k_BT\delta_\alpha,\beta\delta(t-s)\) where \(t, s = x, y, z\). On the contrary, the correlations of the CSL forces depend on the distance between the masses. In the limit of validity of Eq. (3), the Fourier transform of \(\mathbf{F}_\alpha\) becomes [16]
\[
\tilde{\mathbf{F}}_\alpha = \frac{ih\sqrt{\lambda r_C^3}}{(4\pi)^{3/4}m_0} \int dz \mathbf{w}(z, \omega) \int dk \tilde{\mu}_\alpha(k) e^{-i\mathbf{k} \cdot \mathbf{z}} k, \tag{7}
\]
where \(\tilde{\mu}_\alpha(k)\) and \(\mathbf{w}(z, \omega)\) are respectively the Fourier transform of the density \(\mu_\alpha(x)\) of the \(\alpha\)-th mass and of a white noise. For the latter, it holds: \(\langle\mathbf{w}(z, \omega)\rangle = 0\) and \(\langle\mathbf{w}(z, \omega)\mathbf{w}(\tilde{z}, \Omega)\rangle = 2\pi\delta(\omega + \Omega)\delta^{(3)}(\mathbf{z} - \tilde{\mathbf{z}})\). Consequently, the correlations read:
\[
\frac{1}{2} \langle\{\tilde{F}_\alpha(\omega), \tilde{F}_\beta(\Omega)\}\rangle = \frac{2\hbar^2\lambda r_C^3\delta(\omega + \Omega)}{\sqrt{\pi}m_0^2} \int dk \tilde{\mu}_\alpha(k) \tilde{\mu}_\beta^*(k) e^{-i\mathbf{k} \cdot \mathbf{z}} k, \tag{8}
\]
which reduces to \(\frac{1}{2}\langle\{\tilde{F}_\alpha(\omega), \tilde{F}_\beta(\Omega)\}\rangle = 2\pi\hbar^2\delta(\omega + \Omega)\eta_{ij}\) for \(N = 1\), with \(\eta_{ij}\) defined in Eq. (4).

We are interested in the motion of the center of mass of the system, whose dynamical equation can be derived from Eq. (6):
\[
\begin{align*}
\frac{d\mathbf{x}_{cm}}{dt} &= \frac{\mathbf{p}_{cm}}{M}, \\
\frac{d\mathbf{p}_{cm}}{dt} &= -M\omega_0^2\mathbf{x}_{cm} - \gamma_m\mathbf{p}_{cm} + \mathbf{\xi}_{cm} + \mathbf{F}_{cm}, \tag{9}
\end{align*}
\]
where \(M = \sum_\alpha m_\alpha\), and we set \(\omega_\alpha = \omega_0\) and \(\gamma_\alpha = \gamma_m\). This is the case when the masses are clamped together and attached to a cantilever, thus they move together at the frequency \(\omega_0 = \sqrt{k/M}\) where \(k\) is the cantilever stiffness, while the damping \(\gamma_m\) will be typically determined by cantilever bending losses. We also defined \(\mathbf{\xi}_{cm} = \sum_\alpha \mathbf{\xi}_\alpha\) and \(\mathbf{F}_{cm} = \sum_\alpha \mathbf{F}_\alpha\). Such forces correspond to the thermal and non-thermal (CSL) contributions, whose form is \(\mathcal{S}_A = \int d\Omega\langle\{\tilde{A}(\omega), \tilde{A}(\Omega)\}\rangle/4\pi\), to the DNS, which was introduced in Eq. (5). By applying the single mass correlation rules for \(\mathbf{\xi}_\alpha\) and \(\mathbf{F}_\alpha\) previously outlined, we end up with:
\[
\begin{align*}
\mathcal{S}_A &= 2M\gamma_m k_BT, \\
\mathcal{S}_{\text{CSL}} &= \frac{\hbar^2\lambda r_C^3}{\pi^{3/2}m_0^2} \int dk \sum_{\alpha,\beta} (\tilde{\mu}_\alpha(k)\tilde{\mu}_\beta^*(k)) e^{-k^2r_C^2k_z^2}, \tag{10}
\end{align*}
\]
where we focused once again on the motion along the \(z\)-direction, which is assumed to be the direction of measurement. If \(N = 1\), these relations correspond to those entering Eq. (5).

We note that \(\mathcal{S}_A\) is given only by \(N\) contributions \((M = \sum_{\alpha=1}^N m_\alpha)\) as the noises \(\mathbf{\xi}_\alpha\) are independent. On the other hand, \(\mathcal{S}_{\text{CSL}}\) is a sum of \(N^2\) contributions: \(N\) contributions are due to the self-correlation of a single mass; \(N(N-1)\) are due to the cross-correlation terms. While the former are positive by definition, the latter do not have a definite sign, and depend on the distance \(d_{\alpha,\beta}\) between the \(\alpha\)-th and \(\beta\)-th mass. Indeed, by considering only two masses, if \(r_C \ll d_{\alpha,\beta}\), the forces acting on the two masses are uncorrelated, hence the corresponding cross-correlation term vanishes. If \(r_C \gtrsim d_{\alpha,\beta}\), the two forces contribute coherently to the center of mass diffusion: this is the situation that maximizes the CSL effect. If \(r_C \gg d_{\alpha,\beta}\), the main contribution to the integral in Eq. (10) comes from \(|k| < 1/d_{\alpha,\beta}\); the rest is suppressed due to the Gaussian weight and consequently the global CSL effect does not benefit from it. This analysis is summarized in Table I for two masses.

A first example of this analysis is reported in Fig. S5 of [14], where the mixed term diminishes the self-correlated contributions to \(\mathcal{S}_{\text{CSL}}\) for \(r_c \lesssim 10^{-6}\) m, a value for which both the noise acting on the cantilever and that acting on the sphere coherently contribute to the CSL diffusion of the center of mass of the system. For \(r_c \gtrsim 10^{-6}\) m the mixed contribution to \(\mathcal{S}_{\text{CSL}}\) is positive and for \(r_c \gg 10^{-6}\) m it goes to zero. We will now discuss a concrete application of the model discussed in the previous section. Let us consider a test mass consisting of a cuboidal of basis \(L \times L\) and height \(H\) made of \((2N_{lay} + 1)\) layers, which are parallel to the basis and orthogonal to the \(z\)-axes. These layers are made of two different materials, respectively \(N_{lay} + 1\) of material A (density \(\mu_A\)) of thickness \(a\) and \(N_{lay}\) of material B (density \(\mu_B\)) of thickness \(b\), alternatively disposed one on top of the other. In order to maximize the contribution to \(\eta\), we choose the layers labeled by A, whose number exceed the B layers by one, to be the heavier ones [cf. Fig. 1].

Thus, by carefully tuning the dimension \(L\) of the single
mass and the distance $d$ between the masses, one can explore different CSL parameter regions even though the value of $S_{\text{CSL}}$ does not change.

### III. Multilayer Approach

The test mass is supposed to be attached to a cantilever. Specifically, we take as a reference the experiment described in Ref. [15]. Here, the resonant frequency is $\omega_0/2\pi = 8174$ Hz, the spring constant $k = 0.40$ N/m and the test mass is a NdFeB sphere with density $\mu_s = 7430$ kg/m$^3$ and radius $R = 15.5 \mu$m. Under these conditions the measured residual force noiseacting on the cantilever after subtracting the thermal noise is $S_F = 2.0$ aN$^2$/Hz. This value corresponds to an excess noise of unknown origin, compatible with CSL. Here, we want to probe the values of $\lambda$ and $r_c$ that correspond to such a value.

While keeping all other experimental parameters fixed, we replace now the NdFeB sphere with a layered cuboid with the same mass, and variable geometry ($L$, $a$, $b$ and $N_{\text{lay}}$). By taking the same mass we keep also the same resonant frequency, so to guarantee a fair comparison with the experiment in Ref. [15]. We choose the densities of the two materials equal to $\mu_s = 16.0 \times 10^3$ kg/m$^3$ and $\mu_n = 2.2 \times 10^3$ kg/m$^3$, which correspond respectively to CoPt, a heavy ferromagnetic material required for the SQUID detection, and SiO$_2$. SiO$_2$ is one of the most common materials, it is easy to fabricate and comparatively light. CoPt is one of the heaviest ferromagnetic materials, and is chosen here to enable SQUID detection in absence of a magnetic sphere as in Ref. [15]. If the latter condition is not required, better choices for the heavy material are for instance Au and W, whose densities are almost the same $\mu_s = 19.41 \times 10^3$ kg/m$^3$. Given the measured value of the residual force noise, we compute the upper bounds on the CSL parameters for different values of the cuboid parameters. The Fourier transform of cuboidal mass density is given by

$$\tilde{\mu}(k) = \frac{4}{k_x k_y} \sin \left( \frac{k_x L}{2} \right) \sin \left( \frac{k_y L}{2} \right) \tilde{\mu}_z(k_z),$$  
(11)

where

$$\tilde{\mu}_z(k_z) = \frac{2e^{ik_z H} e^{ik_z b}}{k_z} \sin \left( \frac{k_z(a+b)}{2} \right) \left[ \mu_s \sin \left( \frac{k_z a}{2} \right) \sin \left( \frac{k_z(b+H)}{2} \right) + \mu_n \sin \left( \frac{k_z b}{2} \right) \sin \left( \frac{k_z(H-a)}{2} \right) \right],$$  
(12)

with $H = (N_{\text{lay}}+1)a + N_{\text{lay}}b$. In the particular case $a = b$, the latter expression reduces to

$$\tilde{\mu}_z(k_z) = \frac{\mu_s \sin \left( (N_{\text{lay}}+1)k_z a \right) + \mu_n \sin \left( N_{\text{lay}}k_z a \right)}{k_z \cos \left( \frac{k_z a}{2} \right) e^{-ik_z(H/2+a)}}.$$  
(13)

Combining Eq. (11) and Eq. (4), we obtain the CSL diffusion constant

$$\eta = \frac{16r_c^3 \lambda}{m_0^2 \sqrt{\pi}} \left[ 1 - e^{-\frac{k_z^2}{4r_c^2}} - \frac{L\sqrt{\pi}}{2r_c} \text{erf} \left( \frac{k_z}{2r_c} \right) \right]^2 \cdot \mathcal{I}_z,$$  
(14)

where

$$\mathcal{I}_z = \int dk_z e^{-\gamma^2 k_z^2} k_z^2 |\tilde{\mu}_z(k_z)|^2.$$  
(15)

The latter must be in general computed numerically. For the special case of $N_{\text{lay}} = 0$, we obtain the standard expression [31]

$$\mathcal{I}_z = \frac{2\sqrt{\pi} \mu_s^2}{r_c} \left( 1 - e^{-\frac{H^2}{4r_c^2}} \right),$$  
(16)

where here $H = a$.

We start our numerical analysis by noting that, once the value of the mass is fixed, $\eta$ depends on three parameters of the system: the basis side $L$ of the cuboid, the number of layers $(2N_{\text{lay}}+1)$ and the ratio between the thickness of the two materials $\epsilon = b/a$.

We take the value $r_c = 10^{-7}$ m as a reference, and by fixing $\epsilon = 1$ and $N_{\text{lay}} = 1, 1.6$ and 64, we compute the hypothetical bounds obtained by varying $L$. Fig. 2 compares the bounds from the uniform case (black line) with the ones obtained by using the multilayer approach (colored lines), with $N_{\text{lay}} = 1$ (blue lines), $N_{\text{lay}} = 16$ (orange lines) and $N_{\text{lay}} = 64$ (green lines). To underline the importance of the density difference between the two materials used, Fig. 2 shows the bounds obtained using $\mu_s =
multilayer approach for different values of $N_{lay}$ with $\epsilon = 1/4$ (continuous orange line), $\epsilon = 1$ (continuous blue line) and $\epsilon = 4$ (continuous green line). Again, we also studied the case of $\mu_b = 0$, whose data are reported with the corresponding dashed lines.

Fig. 3 shows that the best configuration is given by $N_{lay} = 61$ with $\epsilon = 1$ for $L = 18 \mu m$ and by $N_{lay} = 7$ with $\epsilon = 1$ for $L = 50 \mu m$. The corresponding values of $H$, $a$, and $b$ and the bound on $\lambda$ for $r_c = 10^{-7} m$ are reported in Table II. It is worthwhile to notice that, although the dimensions of the proposed test masses are well different, the value of $a$ (and equivalently $b$) is almost identical in the two configurations that maximize the bound on $\lambda$. The optimal value of $a \sim b$ is of the order of $r_c$, which is in agreement with the heuristic argument discussed in Table I.

As the last step of the analysis, we compute the hypothetical bounds in the CSL parameters space ($r_c$ vs $\lambda$) for the configurations reported in Table II. These are reported in Fig. 4 for different values of $N_{lay}$. It is clear that with the multilayer approach one can strongly improve the bound on $\lambda$ by one or two orders of magnitude, depending on the side length.

Since the CSL effect scales with the total mass of the mechanical oscillator, it is worth to extend the analysis to larger masses. Specifically, we consider $M_1 = 1.16 \times 10^{-9} kg$ and $M_2 = 2.32 \times 10^{-9} kg$, which are respectively 10 and 20 times larger than the mass previously considered. By keeping $L = 60 \mu m$ and $\epsilon = 1$, we chose $N_{lay}$ such that the second minimum in $\lambda$ appears near $r_c = 10^{-7} m$. This corresponds to having $a = b \approx 0.3 \mu m$ [cf. Tab. II] and taking $N_{lay} = 48$ ($H \approx 29 \mu m$) and $N_{lay} = 98$ ($H \approx 59 \mu m$) for the two cases respectively. We consider also the case with $N_{lay} = 12$ ($a \approx 1.2 \mu m$, $H \approx 29 \mu m$) and $N_{lay} = 25$ ($a \approx 0.6 \mu m$, $H \approx 29 \mu m$) respectively as a comparison. We note that also with this increased size, the test mass would still fit on the cantilever of Ref. [15]. Fig. 5 shows the corresponding bounds assuming that the value of the measured noise remains the same as in [15]. This is a stronger assumption with respect to the previous analysis, since also the resonant frequencies will change according to $\omega_i = \sqrt{k/M_i}$, which gives $\omega_1/(2\pi) = 2584$ Hz and $\omega_2/(2\pi) = 1828$ Hz respectively. With this assumption, the multilayer configuration for a mass equal to $M_2$ with 48 layers is able to test the CSL model almost down to $\lambda = 10^{-11} s^{-1}$. Thus, this method can provide bounds comparable with those from the X-ray measurements, which, contrary to
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**TABLE II:** Parameters of the test mass that maximize the bound on $\lambda$ from the analysis shown in Fig. 3.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>$L$ [$\mu m$]</th>
<th>$H$ [$\mu m$]</th>
<th>$N_{lay}$</th>
<th>$a = b$ [$\mu m$]</th>
<th>$\lambda$ [s$^{-1}$]</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>18</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>61</td>
<td>0.32</td>
<td>$3.1 \times 10^{-10}$</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>50</td>
<td>4.6</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>0.31</td>
<td>$2.9 \times 10^{-10}$</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

16.0 $\times 10^3$ kg/m$^3$ and $\mu_b = 2.2 \times 10^3$ kg/m$^3$ (continuous lines) and the extreme case with $\mu_b = 0$ is reported with the corresponding dashed lines.

As Fig. 2 shows, by using the multilayer approach, one can gain almost two orders of magnitude in bounding $\lambda$ with respect to the uniform case, c.f. $L \sim 20 \mu m$ and $N_{lay} = 64$. The choice of the range of possible values of $L$ is constrained by experimental considerations. The test mass should be accommodated on the cantilever, so $L$ is limited by the cantilever width. In the opposite high aspect ratio limit $H/L \gg 1$, the test mass becomes a thin pillar and it cannot be treated as a simple inertial mass anymore. A good compromise is a value of $L$ which is comparable with $H$, for instance we consider for the further analyses $L = 18 \mu m$. For a comparison, we consider also a bigger, but still worthwhile, value $L = 50 \mu m$.

As the second step of our numerical investigation, we fix the value of the side length $L$ to the values defined above and vary $N_{lay}$ and $\epsilon$. Fig. 3 compares the bound given by the uniform mass (black line) with those of the
cantilever experiments, are less robust against changes in the CSL noise [40, 41].

IV. DISCUSSION

The novel feature of a multilayer cuboidal resonator is the appearance of a second minimum in the curve defining the upper bound. According to Table I, while the main minimum corresponds to \( r_C \sim L, R \), the new minimum appears at \( r_C \sim a, b \) and it moves to smaller values of \( r_C \) as \( N_{\text{lay}} \) increases. The reason for this behavior is the following: For small \( r_C \), the single layer contributions add incoherently with the maximum effect when reaching \( r_C \sim a, b \). For \( r_C > a, b \) the cross-correlation between the layers interfere and the global diffusive action narrows until \( r_C \) is of the order of the dimension of the system, when again the whole mass contributes coherently to the diffusive dynamics. As Fig. 4 shows, there is not an advantage of using a multilayer strategy for \( r_C > a, b \).

The new hypothetical bounds are stronger than the bounds from the measured non-thermal excess noise reported in [15]. Moreover they partially cover the orange highlighted region, which is the portion of CSL parameter space which results by attributing such an excess noise to standard sources.

Notably, the potential improvement would cover almost completely Adler’s suggestion, \( \lambda = 10^{-8.5} \text{s}^{-1} \) at \( r_C = 10^{-7} \) m, using the value of the mass as in Ref. [15] [cf. Fig. 4]. So far, Adler’s values for the parameters have been ruled out only by two experiments. The first is the X-ray experiment [38], whose bound however may be evaded by a colored version of CSL [41, 42], with a frequency cutoff lower than 10^{11} Hz, which is realistic. The second is the measurement of the crystal phonon excitations at low temperatures, however again the bound does not hold for colored extensions of the CSL model, and for a cutoff of the order of 10^{11} Hz it vanishes [41]. In both cases, an exclusion by a purely mechanical experiment would be much more significant since the dominant frequencies are much smaller. This is the case for the multilayer method applied to a larger mass [cf. Fig. 5].

One should also note that, differently from previous experiments, where for each value of \( r_C \) one can at most infer a bound on \( \lambda \), the multilayer strategy enables the possibility of identifying the value for \( r_C \), if the presence of an excess noise were confirmed, by changing the geometry of the resonator.

Finally, we underline that the hereby proposed scheme to enhance the CSL action can be easily implemented also in other type of mechanical resonators, as for example the one considered in [16, 30–32, 35–37].
FIG. 5: Hypothetical upper bounds from multilayer method with a bigger test mass. The system here considered is a cuboid of basis side $L = 60 \mu m$. Red and blue lines correspond to $M_t = 1.16 \times 10^{-9} kg$ with $N_{2\omega} = 48$ and $N_{\omega} = 12$ respectively. Green and purple lines correspond to $M_t = 2.32 \times 10^{-9} kg$ with $N_{2\omega} = 98$ and $N_{\omega} = 25$ respectively. The other lines and the colored region refer to ranges of parameters of CSL, which are already excluded by other experimental data, as described in Fig. 4.
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Appendix A: CSL action on levitated systems

We compare the CSL contribution $S_{\text{CSL}} = \hbar^2 \eta$ to the density noise spectrum $S_x(\omega)$ for three different cases: a sphere of radius $R$, a cuboid of lengths $(L, L, H)$, and a cylinder of radius $L$ and height $H$ (moving along the symmetry axis), all made of SiO$_2$ with density $\mu = 2650$ kg/m$^3$. The corresponding CSL contributions can be computed analytically [31]

\[
\begin{align*}
\eta_{\text{sphere}} &= \frac{3\lambda m^2 r_c^2}{m_0 R^6} \left( R^2 - 2r_c^2 + e^{-\frac{R^2}{r_c}} (R^2 + 2r_c^2) \right), \\
\eta_{\text{cuboid}} &= \frac{32\lambda m^2 r_c^4}{L^4 H^2 m_0^2} \left( 1 - e^{-\frac{H^2}{4r_c}} \right) \cdot \left( 1 - e^{-\frac{L^2}{4r_c}} - \frac{L\sqrt{\pi}}{2r_c} \text{erf}(\frac{L}{2r_c}) \right)^2, \\
\eta_{\text{cylinder}} &= \frac{16m^2 r_c^2 \lambda}{H^2 m_0^2 L^2} \left( 1 - e^{-\frac{H^2}{4r_c}} \right) \cdot \left( 1 - e^{-\frac{L^2}{2r_c}} \left( I_0\left(\frac{L^2}{2r_c}\right) + I_1\left(\frac{L^2}{2r_c}\right) \right) \right).
\end{align*}
\]

In Fig. 6 we compare these contributions. As one can see, for small values of the mass, corresponding to a system whose spatial dimension is smaller than $r_c$, the CSL diffusion rate depends on the shape in a negligible way. Conversely, for larger masses, or equivalently when the dimensions of the system exceed $r_c$, the shape of the system plays a role. The most favorable case is given by the cuboidal geometry, as it can be concluded from Fig. 7, where the cuboidal geometry is compared to the cylindrical one for different values of the volume over basis area ratio. For $L \ll r_c$, there is no significant difference between the two geometries, as it is for the sphere. For $L \gg r_c$, the cuboidal geometry has a larger diffusion constant $\eta$, which leads to a stronger bound on $\lambda$. 

(A1)
FIG. 6: CSL contribution $S_{CSL} = \hbar^2 \eta$ to the DNS as a function of the mass of the system; the density has been set equal to $\mu = 2650 \text{kg/m}^3$. [Top axis: for a better comparison, we report the value of the radius of a sphere with given mass.] Left panel: spherical (red line) vs cuboidal (grey lines) geometry. Right panel: spherical (red line) vs cylindrical (blue lines) geometry. We considered three different aspect ratios for the cuboidal and for the cylindrical geometries: $L/H = 0.1$ (dotted lines), $L/H = 1$ (continuous lines) and $L/H = 10$ (dashed lines). For the CSL parameters, we take as reference Adler’s values: $\lambda = 10^{-8} \text{s}^{-1}$ and $r_C = 10^{-7} \text{m}$.

FIG. 7: Comparison of the CSL diffusion rate for a cylinder $\eta_{\text{cylinder}}$ and for a cuboid $\eta_{\text{cuboid}}$, whose ratio depends only on $L/r_C$. 