Cavity optomechanics\textsuperscript{8,9} allows the characterization of a vibration mode, its cooling and quantum manipulation using electromagnetic fields. Regarding nanomechanical\textsuperscript{12-13} as well as electronic properties\textsuperscript{14,15}, single wall carbon nanotubes provide a prototypical experimental system. At cryogenic temperatures, as high quality factor vibrational resonators, they display strong interaction between motion and single-electron tunneling\textsuperscript{6,7}. However, small vibrational deflection and length have made their optomechanical coupling to microwave fields, as used in solid state cavity quantum electrodynamics or quantum information experiments, so far impossible. Here, we demonstrate large optomechanical coupling of a suspended carbon nanotube quantum dot and a microwave cavity, amplified by several orders of magnitude via the inherent nonlinearity of Coulomb blockade. From an optomechanically induced transparency (OMIT) experiment\textsuperscript{8}, we obtain an outstanding single photon coupling of up to \( g_0 = 2\pi \cdot 88\) Hz. This indicates that normal mode splitting and full optomechanical control of the carbon nanotube vibration in the quantum limit\textsuperscript{9} is reachable in the near future. A unique experimental system becomes accessible, where the nanomechanically active part directly incorporates a quantum-confined electron system\textsuperscript{17}. Mechanical manipulation and characterization via the microwave field is complemented by the manifold physics of single electron devices. Applications of mechanical systems in the quantum limit range from ultraprecise sensors to quantum information processing\textsuperscript{11-13} and signal processing in a wide frequency range. Further, based on our work, a carbon nanotube can become a “switchboard” for quantum states, potentially allowing quantum information transfer between spin, charge, vibration quantum, or cavity photon.

The technically challenging integration of suspended carbon nanotubes into complex quantum devices has recently made significant advances\textsuperscript{14-18}, as has also the integration of nanotube quantum dots into coplanar microwave cavities\textsuperscript{19,20}. Our device, depicted in Figure 1a, combines a half-wavelength coplanar microwave cavity with a suspended carbon nanotube quantum dot. Near the coupling capacitor, the center conductor of the niobium-based cavity is connected to a thin gate electrode, buried between source and drain contacts of the carbon nanotube, see the sketch of Figure 1b. At the cavity center, i.e., the location of the voltage node of its fundamental mode, a bias connection allows additional application of a dc voltage \( V_g \) to the gate. The device is mounted at the base temperature stage \(( T \approx 10\) mK\) of a dilution refrigerator; for details see the Methods section and Extended Data Figure 7.

At cryogenic temperatures, electronic transport through the carbon nanotube is dominated by Coulomb blockade, with the typical behaviour of a small band gap nanotube\textsuperscript{4}. Near the electronic band gap, sharp Coulomb oscillations of conductance can be resolved; a detailed measurement is shown in Figure 1c. A well-known method to detect the transversal vibration resonance of a suspended nanotube quantum dot is to apply a rf signal and measure the time-averaged dc current\textsuperscript{5,22,23}. On resonance, the oscillating geometric capacitance, effectively broadening the Coulomb oscillations, leads to an easily recognizable change in current. This was used to identify the transversal vibration resonances of the device; Figure 1d plots the resonance frequencies over a wide gate voltage range. Two coupled vibration modes are observed, one of which clearly displays electrostatic softening\textsuperscript{24,25}. At low gate voltages, \(|V_g| \leq 1.5\) V, where subsequent experiments are carried out, the resonance frequency is given by \( \omega_n \approx 2\pi \cdot 502.5\) MHz, with typical quality factors around or exceeding \( Q_m \sim 10^4\).

The combined suspended nanotube – cavity device forms a dispersively coupled optomechanical system\textsuperscript{1}. The cavity has a resonance frequency of \( \omega_c = \omega_{c,0} = 2\pi \cdot 5.74\) GHz with a decay rate of \( \kappa_c = 2\pi \cdot 13\) MHz, dominated by internal losses. Nevertheless, due to the large mechanical resonance frequency \( \omega_m \) of the carbon nanotube, the coupled system is far in the resolved sideband regime \( \omega_m \gg \kappa_c \), the most promising parameter region for a large number of optomechanical protocols including ground state cooling and quantum control.

To probe for optomechanical coupling, we perform an optomechanically induced transparency (OMIT) experiment\textsuperscript{8}, cf. Figures 2a and 2b: a strong, red-detuned drive field \((\omega_d \simeq \omega_c - \omega_m)\) pumps the microwave cavity; the transmission of a weak, superimposed probe signal \( \omega_p \) near \( \omega_c \) is detected. A distinct, sharp OMIT absorption feature within the transmission resonance of the cavity becomes visible in the measurements of Figures 2c-e. It occurs due to destructive interference of the probe field with optomechanically upconverted photons of the drive field, when the two-photon resonance condition \( \omega_m - \omega_d = \omega_m \) is fulfilled\textsuperscript{8}, and shifts in frequency as expected when \( \omega_d \) is detuned from the precise red sideband condition, see Figures 2d,e. Fitting the OMIT feature allows to extract the optomechanical coupling parameter \( g = \sqrt{n_C} (\partial \omega_c / \partial x)_{x_{zpf}} \), describing the cavity detuning per displacement of the mechanical harmonic oscillator\textsuperscript{18,26}, see the Methods section for details. With a driven cavity photon occupation of \( n_c = 67500 \), one obtains a single-photon coupling rate of up to \( g_0 = g / \sqrt{n_C} = 2\pi \cdot 88\) Hz.

This value of \( g_0 \) strongly exceeds expectations from the device geometry\textsuperscript{26}. For a mechanical oscillator dispersively coupled to a coplanar waveguide resonator, the coupling is given by \( g_0 = (\Delta \omega_c / 2C_c) (\partial C_c / \partial x)_{x_{zpf}} \), where \( C_c \) is the total capacitance of the cavity, \( x \) is the mechanical displacement, and \( x_{zpf} \) the mechanical zero-point fluctuation length scale. Assuming a metallic wire over a metallic plane and inserting device
parameters, the coupling calculated from the change in geometric gate capacitance $C_g(x)$ becomes $\partial C_g/\partial x \sim 10^{-12} \ \text{F/m}$. This leads to $g_0 = 2\pi \cdot 2.9 \ \text{mHz}$, four orders of magnitude smaller than the measured $g_0$. To explain this discrepancy, we need to focus on the properties of the carbon nanotube as a quantum dot, with a strongly varying quantum capacitance $C_{CNT}(x)$ as the displacement-dependent component of $C_g$ dominating $g_0$.

Figure 2f depicts OMIT measurements for similar parameters as in Figures 2c-e, however, we now keep the drive frequency $\omega_d$ constant and vary the gate voltage $V_g$ across a Coulomb oscillation of conductance. The mechanical resonance frequency $\omega_m$ shifts to lower frequencies in the vicinity of the charge degeneracy point. This electrostatic softening is a well-known characteristic of suspended carbon nanotube quantum dots. More interestingly, the resulting gate-dependent coupling $g(V_g)$ (along with $g_0(V_g)$) is plotted in Figure 2g. It is maximal at the edges of the finite conductance peak, whereas at its center and on the outer edges, the coupling vanishes; the enhancement of $g_0$ is intrinsically related to Coulomb blockade.

Figure 3 explores the nature of this enhanced coupling mechanism. We assume a full separation of time scales $\omega_m \ll \omega_k \ll \Gamma$, where $\Gamma$ describes the tunnel rates of the quantum dot. We can then define a generalized gate capacitance or quantum capacitance $C_{CNT} = e \partial \langle N \rangle / \partial V_g$, where $\langle N \rangle(V_g)$ is the number of charge carriers (here holes) on the quantum dot averaged over the tunneling events. In a quantum dot, each Coulomb oscillation corresponds to the addition of one electron or hole on the quantum dot. The charge occupation $\langle N \rangle(V_g)$ resembles a step function, with the sharpness of the step given for zero bias voltage by lifetime and temperature broadening. This is plotted in Figure 3a, for the limit of $k_BT \ll \Gamma$. The generalized capacitance $C_{CNT}(V_g)$ becomes a Lorentzian, as plotted in Figure 3b.

Any motion $\delta x$ modulates the geometric capacitance $C_g(x)$. It thus shifts the position of the Coulomb oscillations in gate voltage, acting equivalent to an effective modulation of the gate voltage $\delta V_g$. With this, the optomechanical coupling $g$, scaling with $|\partial C_{CNT}/\partial x|$, becomes proportional to the derivative $\partial C_{CNT}/\partial V_g$ and thus the second derivative of $\langle N \rangle(V_g)$, as is illustrated in Figure 3c. The resulting three key situations are sketched in Figures 3d-f: away from the conductance peak, the charge on the nanotube is constant, and only geometric capacitances change, see Figure 3d. On the flank of the conductance resonance, a small change $\delta x \propto \delta C_g(x)$ strongly modulates $C_{CNT}$, see Figure 3e. At the center of the conductance resonance, the charge adapts to $x$, but the derivative $\partial C_{CNT}/\partial V_g$ and with it $g \propto |\partial C_{CNT}/\partial x|$ is approximately zero.

The detailed derivation and the full expressions and values for Figure 3 can be found in the Methods section and in Extended Data Table 1. We obtain an enhancement of the optomechanical coupling by a factor of $\sim 10^4$, with the broadening $\Gamma$ of the Coulomb oscillation as dominating parameter. The experimental gate voltage dependence $g_0(V_g)$ is qualitatively reproduced very well. To obtain the quantitative agreement of Figure 3c, we have introduced a scaling prefactor as free fit parameter, resulting in $g_0^{\exp} / g_0^{\text{th}} = 1.11$. Given the uncertainties of input parameters, this is an excellent agreement;
FIG. 2. Optomechanically induced transparency (OMIT) in the Coulomb blockade regime: a, Frequency scheme and b, detection setup of an OMIT measurement. A drive signal at \(\omega_d = \omega_c - \omega_m\) pumps the microwave cavity; the cavity transmission near the cavity resonance \(\omega_c\) is characterized using a superimposed weak probe signal \(\omega_p\). Device parameters: \(\omega_c = 2\pi \cdot 5.74\,\text{GHz}, \kappa_c = 2\pi \cdot 13\,\text{MHz}, \omega_m \approx 2\pi \cdot 502.5\,\text{MHz}\), \(\kappa_m = 5\,\text{MHz}\).

- c, d, e, Probe signal transmission \(|S_{21}(\omega_p)|^2\) for three different choices of \(\omega_d\), at \(\omega_d = \omega_c - \omega_m\) (c) and slightly detuned (d, e). The gate voltage \(V_g = -1.1855\,\text{V}\) is fixed on the flank of a sharp Coulomb oscillation of conductance; \(V_m = 0\). f, Probe signal transmission as in c, d, e, now for fixed \(\omega_d = 2\pi \cdot 5.23989\,\text{GHz}\) and varied gate voltage \(V_g\) across a Coulomb oscillation. The depth of the OMIT feature allows evaluation of \(g(V_g)\). g, Optomechanical coupling \(g(V_g)\) (left axis) and corresponding single photon coupling \(g_0(V_g) = g(V_g)/\sqrt{n_c}\) (right axis), extracted from the data of f; \(n_c = 67500\). Error bars indicate the standard error of the fit result.

see the Methods section for a discussion of error sources.

In literature, many approaches have been pursued to enhance optomechanical coupling\(^{12,13,27–34}\). Resonant coupling with \(\omega_m = \omega_c\), has been demonstrated successfully for a carbon nanotube quantum dot\(^{27}\), but does not provide access to the wide set of experimental protocols developed for the usual case of dispersive coupling and the “good cavity limit” \(\omega_m \gg \kappa_c\). The mechanism presented here is most closely related to those where a superconducting charge qubit was coherently introduced between mechanical resonator and cavity\(^{12}\). However, the impact of single electron tunneling and shot noise on the optomechanical system shall require careful analysis.

Given the sizeable coupling in the good cavity limit \(\kappa_c \ll \omega_m\), many experimental techniques for future experiments are at hand. First steps are demonstrated in Figure 4 in a two-tone spectroscopy experiment: a mechanical drive signal \(\omega_d\) is applied simultaneously to a cavity pump signal at \(\omega_d = \omega_c - \omega_m\); the plotted cavity output power at \(\omega_c\) clearly shows the optomechanical upconversion (Anti-Stokes scattering) at mechanical resonance \(\omega_m = \omega_m\). In Figure 4a, the dc bias across the nanotube is set to zero, and the antenna drive kept at a minimum. In Figure 4b, both antenna drive and bias voltage have been increased. A background signal independent of device parameters emerges; at the same time, the upconverted signal displays a phase shift and destructive interference with the background for parts of the gate voltage range, meriting further measurements and analysis.

Future improvements of the optomechanical coupling via drive power and device geometry and of the detection sensitivity via the output amplifier chain shall allow detection of the thermal motion of the carbon nanotube and subsequently motion amplitude calibration. With this, a wide range of physical phenomena becomes experimentally accessible, ranging from side-band cooling of the vibration mode and potentially its quantum control\(^{35}\) all the way to real-time observation of its interaction with single electron tunneling phenomena\(^{36}\).
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**FIG. 3.** Coulomb blockade enhanced optomechanical coupling mechanism: Solid lines correspond to the model of a Lorentz-broadened quantum dot level at $k_B T \ll \Gamma$.

- **a.** Time-averaged charge occupation $\langle N \rangle (V_g)$ of the quantum dot (note that we are in the hole conduction regime).
- **b.** Conductance $dI/dV_s (V_g)$ (left axis) and generalized capacitance $C_{CNT} = e \partial \langle N \rangle / \partial V_g$ (right axis).
- **c.** Coulomb-blockade enhanced optomechanical coupling $g(V_g)$ (left axis) and single photon coupling $g_0(V_g)$ (right axis). The data points are identical to Fig. 2g; the calculation result has been scaled with 1.11 to fit the data.
- **d-f.** Schemata for the situations corresponding to the dashed lines in a-c, see the text.
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\[ \omega_\pi \approx \frac{c}{\omega} \times 1 \times 10 \times 5 \times 2 \]

The plots show the power output of the cavity at the upconverted frequency \( \omega_c \), with the nanotube acting as a nonlinear element. Drive power \( P_a = 20 \text{dBm} (n_c \approx 2.1 \times 10^3) \), measurement bandwidth 5Hz. \( \textbf{a} \), Antenna generator power \( P_a = -55 \text{dBm}, \text{bias } V_{sd} = 0; \textbf{b} \), antenna generator power \( P_a = -30 \text{dBm}, \text{bias } V_{sd} = 0.5 \text{mV}. \)


**METHODS**

**Coplanar resonator fabrication** Fabrication starts with a substrate of 500 μm compensation doped silicon, covered by 500 nm thermally grown SiO2 and 100 nm niobium. The niobium layer is structured to form the coplanar $λ/2$ resonator geometry (1) (see Extended Data Figure 5) using optical lithography and reactive ion etching with argon and sulphur hexafluoride SF6. In this step also the bond pads (2) (3) (5) and the outer dc leads are defined, though the dc leads are not connected to the nanotube deposition area and the resonator center line yet. Next, using electron beam lithography and thermal deposition of gold, the 100 nm wide and 50 nm thick gate finger (8) is created near the coupling capacitors of the resonator, reaching under the area where a carbon nanotube will be deposited. This gate finger is then covered with about 200 nm of poly-methyl methacrylate (PMMA) electron beam resist, which is locally cross-linked via electron beam overexposure. The subsequent step uses the same techniques as for the gate finger to connect the gate dc lead with the centre of the resonator, and to create the source, drain, and cutting electrodes for the nanotube (6) using 200 nm gold. As final step, areas to either side of the transfer electrodes are etched 10 μm deep into the substrate (7), to allow the nanotube transfer fork (see below) to pass below the resonator plane.

**Carbon nanotube growth and deposition** Our carbon nanotube growth and deposition process is based on techniques developed by several research groups over the past years; a more detailed description can be found in Ref. 18. As growth substrate, we use a commercial, macroscopic quartz tuning fork, where the metallization has been chemically removed. Namely 1 nm cobalt is sputter-deposited onto the fork tips. Subsequently, the quartz fork is inserted into a tube oven and exposed to a gas flow of 10 sccm CH4 and 20 sccm H2 at 960°C for 30 min. The cobalt clusters on the tips surfaces then act as catalyst seeds for the nanotube growth.

A typical growth result is shown in the scanning electron micrograph of Extended Data Figure 6a, where long and clean carbon nanotubes cross the fork tines and the gap between them. Here, for better visibility of the nanotubes, the entire fork has been coated with cobalt, not only its tips.

Subsequently, the fork is mounted on a manual positioning system and lowered towards the sample holder circuit board with the bonded resonator chip, see Extended Data Figure 6b. Monitoring the current between the contact electrodes allows us to detect when a nanotube touches them. Then, between each of the outer two electrode pairs, a voltage is subsequently ramped up to cut the macromolecule with a high current. After cutting, the fork is retracted, with a nanotube segment remaining between the central source and drain electrodes.

**Measurement setup** Extended Data Figure 7a sketches the measurement setup integrating both dc and GHz access into our Oxford Instruments Kelvinox 400HA dilution refrigerator; the arrangement of the room temperature equipment in the figure corresponds to the optomechanically induced transparency (OMIT) measurement shown in Figure 2. The probe signal, generated by a Rohde & Schwarz (R&S) ZVA 24 vector network analyzer, is injected into the coupled port, the drive signal, generated by a R&S SMB100A microwave source, into the direct port of a directional coupler at room temperature. UT85 semirigid cables, using superconducting NbTi from the 1K stage on, and with thermally anchored attenuators inserted at every temperature stage, convey the combined signal to the device at dilution refrigerator base temperature.

Our chip is mounted on a custom-made printed circuit board “sandwich”, with two Mini-SMP connectors for the GHz signals and a Micro-D connector for up to 24 dc wires, see Extended Data Figure 7b. A cryogenic circulator, mounted at the mixing chamber stage, with a terminated third port, guides the transmitted output signal towards the cryostat output and blocks noise from higher temperature stages. The signal is amplified by 30 dB each along a chain of amplifiers: a cryogenic low-noise HEMT amplifier Caltech CITCRYO 1-12 at the 1K-pot stage, and two microwave amplifiers at room temperature. Subsequently, it is detected by the vector network analyzer.

Extended Data Figure 8, extending Figures 1b and 2b, combines a simplified sketch of the device and a circuit model to clarify device function and nomenclature.

**Vibration mode precharacterization** In order to precharacterize the vibration modes of our carbon nanotube device, following Refs. 6, 22, 23, and 40 we use an antenna to irradiate an amplitude-modulated MHz signal onto the device and measure the current response through the device using a lock-in amplifier. The result is plotted in Extended Data Fig. 9; two gate-dependent vibration modes are clearly visible, which display an avoided crossing at $V_g \approx \pm 8 \text{ V}$. A trace-wise extraction of the response maxima leads to the plot of Figure 1d.

Even though the contact separation of our device is $L = 1 \mu$m, we do not observe any vibration modes at lower frequency. In combination with the very weak gate voltage dependence of the resonance frequencies, this indicates that high mechanical tension has been imprinted on the carbon nanotube during device fabrication.

**Cavity photon number calibration** Since the center conductor of the coplanar microwave cavity also acts as dc gate of the carbon nanotube quantum dot, we use the cavity-induced broadening of Coulomb oscillations for calibration of the voltage amplitude in the cavity and thereby the average photon number. Modeling the microwave cavity classically, it applies a sinusoidal ac gate voltage on top of the dc voltage. In a dc measurement, this leads to broadening of a Coulomb oscillation $I(V_g)$ as follows:

$$I_{\text{d}r\text{e}n}(V_g, P_{\text{cav}}) = \frac{2 \pi}{2 \pi} \int_0^\infty \left( I(V_g + V_g^{\text{ac}})(P_{\text{cav}}) \sin(\varphi) \right) d\varphi$$

where $V_g^{\text{ac}}(P_{\text{cav}})$ is the so-far unknown dependence of the ac voltage amplitude on the drive power. Note that both voltages $V_g$ and $V_g^{\text{ac}}$ are applied via the same gate electrode and thus act on the quantum dot with the same geometric lever arm.

The function $I(V_g)$ is extracted for the lowest power generator power, $I(V_g) := I_{\text{d}r\text{e}n}(V_g, -10 \text{ dB})$, and Equation 1 is used to obtain $V_g^{\text{ac}}(P_{\text{cav}})$ by fitting $I_{\text{d}r\text{e}n}(V_g, P_{\text{cav}})$, Equation 1, for each power setting $P_{\text{cav}}$ at the generator. The result is shown in Extended Data Figure 10b (left axis).

For obtaining the number of photons in the cavity $n_c$, we calculate the total capacitance of our coplanar waveguide based on conformal mapping techniques. This results in $C_{\text{CPW}} = 1.75 \text{ pF}$. The energy stored in the cavity is then given by

$$E = \frac{1}{2} C_{\text{CPW}} \left( \frac{V_g^{\text{ac}}}{\sqrt{2}} \right)^2 = n_c \hbar \omega_0,$$

where the factor $1/\sqrt{2}$ reflects the non-homogeneous voltage distribution along the cavity. The resulting cavity photon number $n_c$ is given by the right axis of Extended Data Figure 10b, and depends, as expected, linearly on the drive power. For a generator output power of $P = 25 \text{ dBm}$, we obtain $n_c = 67501$.

**Optomechanical coupling** A key parameter of a dispersively coupled optomechanical system is the single-photon optomechanical coupling $g_0$, given by the shift in cavity frequency when the mechanical resonator is displaced on its characteristic zero point fluctuation length scale $\xi_{\text{opt}}$.

$$g_0 = \frac{\partial \omega_m}{\partial x_{\text{opt}}} = x_{\text{opt}}.$$
In experiments, it typically enters via

\[ g = g_0 \sqrt{\kappa_c}, \]  

(4)

where \( g \) is the optomechanical coupling scaling with the number of cavity photons \( n_c \).

To derive \( g_0 \) for our coplanar waveguide cavity, we start with the electronic cavity parameters. The cavity can be modeled as a lumped element resonator with total capacitance \( C_c \), approximated as a sum of three terms,

\[ C_c = \frac{C_{\text{CPW}}}{2} + 2C_k + C_p(x). \]  

(5)

The capacitance \( C_{\text{CPW}} \) of the coplanar waveguide forming the cavity to its ground plane can be calculated analytically from the waveguide geometry, using conformal mapping techniques\(^{41,42}\). For our device we obtain \( C_{\text{CPW}} = 1.75 \text{pF} \); the factor 1/2 stems from the transformation between distributed and lumped element model\(^{42}\). \( C_k \) describes the coupling of input (drive) and output line to the cavity; it can be estimated by finite element modelling, is typically in the range of \( nF \), and in any case small for an undercoupled cavity. The last and by far smallest term, \( C_p(x) \), is the deflection-dependent capacitance between the suspended carbon nanotube and the cavity gate finger; thus, to a good approximation

\[ C_c \approx \frac{C_{\text{CPW}}}{2}. \]  

(6)

With \( \omega_0 = 1/\sqrt{LC_c} \), the optomechanical single-photon coupling strength \( g_0 \) from Equation 3 is then given by\(^{1,27}\)

\[ g_0 = \frac{\omega_0}{2C_c} \left. \frac{\partial C_c}{\partial x} \right|_{x=\text{x}_{\text{opt}}}. \]  

(7)

**Extracting the coupling constant from OMIT** Since we measure transmission through our \( \lambda/2 \) cavity, from an input port to an output port, we need to take both input and output coupling separately into account. We define the loss rate of the GHz cavity \( \kappa_c \) by

\[ \kappa_c = \kappa_0 + \kappa_{\text{in}} + \kappa_{\text{out}}, \]  

(8)

where \( \kappa_{\text{in}} \) describes the input port and \( \kappa_{\text{out}} \) the output port coupling, and \( \kappa_0 \) is the intrinsic loss. Following Ref. 8, in an OMIT experiment, with \( \kappa_{\text{in}} \) as amplitude of the probe signal at \( \omega_p \), with a cavity drive signal at the red-detuned mechanical side band \( \omega_d = \omega_0 - \omega_m \), and with \( \Delta = \omega_0 - (\omega_0 + \omega_m) \), the intracavity probe field amplitude is given by

\[ A(\Delta, g) = \frac{1}{-i\Delta + \kappa_0/2 + \frac{g^2}{-i\Delta + \kappa_0/2}} \sqrt{K_{\text{in}}}, \]  

(9)

leading to a signal transmitted through the cavity

\[ s_{\text{out}}(\Delta) = \sqrt{K_{\text{out}}} A(\Delta, g). \]  

(10)

With \( K_{\text{in}} \approx 2\pi \cdot 50 \text{kHz} \ll 2\pi \cdot 13 \text{MHz} = \kappa_0 \) and \( \Delta \ll \kappa_0 \), we simplify the fit procedure, normalizing the maximum cavity transmission in absence of an OMIT “dip” to 1 and thus fitting it with

\[ |p|^2 (\Delta, g) = \left| \frac{A(\Delta, g)}{A(0, 0)} \right|^2 = \frac{\kappa_0}{(-i\Delta + \kappa_0/2 + \frac{g^2}{-i\Delta + \kappa_0/2})^2}. \]  

(11)

where \( \kappa_0 \), \( \omega_m \), and \( g \) are treated as free parameters.

Extended Data Figure 11 illustrates this procedure at an example data set, showing both a raw data trace and a normalized power transmission with the fit of Equation 11.

When the cavity drive frequency \( \omega_d \) deviates from the motional sideband condition, as is the case in Figures 2d,e, Equation 9 needs to be modified to describe a wider frequency range. Then we obtain with \( \Delta' = \omega_k - \omega_0 \)

\[ A'(\Delta', g) = \frac{1}{(-i\Delta' + \kappa_0/2 + \frac{g^2}{-i\Delta' + \kappa_0/2})} \sqrt{K_{\text{in}}} \]  

(12)

see Ref. 8 for the derivation.

Additionally, since \( \Delta < \kappa_0 \) does not hold anymore, we need to take into account the cavity resonance shape. For a \( \lambda/2 \)-resonator, as the one used here, intrinsically a Lorentzian line shape is expected. The measured signal can, however, deviate, e.g., due to crosstalk on the sample around the actual resonator, leading to a Fano resonance. This crosstalk can be be introduced in the calculation by adding an additional complex term \( e^{i\theta r} \), leading to

\[ A_{\text{Fano}}(\Delta, g) = \left( e^{i\theta r} + \frac{1}{(-i\Delta' + \kappa_0/2 + \frac{g^2}{-i\Delta' + \kappa_0/2})} \right) \sqrt{K_{\text{in}}} \]  

(13)

Equation 13 provides no obvious normalization condition, since the complex shift leads to a transmission maximum that is not necessarily at the cavity resonance frequency. To allow for comparison with Equation 11, we normalize to 1 by dividing through the maximally transmitted signal \( |A_{\text{Fano}}(\Delta_{\text{max}}, 0)| \), leading to the normalized Fano signal

\[ |p|^2_{\text{Fano}} = \frac{|A_{\text{Fano}}(\Delta, g)|^2}{|A_{\text{Fano}}(\Delta_{\text{max}}, 0)|^2}. \]  

(14)

Note that for the fitting of Equation 14, actually two steps were performed. In the first one, the data points excluding the OMIT “dip” and its close surrounding were used to obtain the cavity parameters for \( g = 0 \). In the next step, these parameters were used to fit the entire data set with only the mechanical parameters left free.

**Modeling the geometric optomechanical coupling** Comparing our system with previous microwave optomechanical devices, see, e.g., Ref. 26, we can model the carbon nanotube as metallic and conductive, neglecting Coulomb blockade effects. The only part of the total cavity capacitance \( C_c \) which depends on the nanotube deflection is then the geometrical capacitance \( C_g(x) \) between gate finger and nanotube, thus

\[ \frac{\partial C_c}{\partial x} = \frac{\partial C_g}{\partial x}. \]  

(15)

We can approximate \( C_g(x) \) using the relation for a long conductive rod above an infinite conductive plane,

\[ C_g(x) = \frac{2\pi \varepsilon_0 \varepsilon_r \ell}{\cosh^{-1}(\frac{d-\ell}{\ell})}. \]  

(16)

where \( d \) is the distance between nanotube and gate at equilibrium, \( x \) is the deflection, \( r \) the nanotube radius, and \( \ell \) the nanotube length. Our device has 250 nm vacuum and 200 nm cross-linked PMMA (with a typical dielectric constant of \( \varepsilon_r^{\text{PMMA}} \approx 3 \))\(^{44}\) between nanotube and gate; we approximate \( d = 450 \text{nm} \) and \( \varepsilon_r = 2 \). Since we do not know the diameter of our carbon nanotube, we assume a typical value of \( r = 2 \text{nm} \).

From dc Coulomb blockade measurements, we obtain a gate capacitance \( C_g^{\text{MB}} = 2.6 \text{aF} \); we identify this with the capacitance at zero deflection \( C_g(0) \), resulting in an effective electronic length of the system \( \ell_{\text{eff}} = 140 \text{nm} \), significantly smaller than the geometric length \( \ell = 1000 \text{nm} \) taken from the contact electrode distance. This indicates that our electrostatically induced potential well only takes up part of the nanotube length, the remaining parts represent barriers and/or leads.
From the abovementioned identification of $C^\text{CB}_g = C_g(0)$ we obtain
\[
\frac{\partial C_g}{\partial x}|_{x=0} = 0.95 \text{ pF/m}
\] (17)
and
\[
g_0 = 2\pi \cdot 2.9 \text{ mHz}
\] (18)
A summary of the device constants as input parameters and the predicted or measured optomechanical properties is given in Extended Data Table 1, where it is also compared with other optomechanical systems from literature.

Coulomb-blockade enhancement of the optomechanical coupling So far, the nanomechanical system has been approximated as metallic, and only geometric capacitances have been taken into account. We now demonstrate that the dispersive optomechanical coupling can be drastically enhanced when the quantum dot behavior of the nanotube and the resulting variation of its quantum capacitance is additionally considered. See also Refs. 27 and 45, where a nanotube is coupled resonantly, i.e., with $\omega_0 \approx \omega_m$, for a model based on similar principles.

We here assume that a full separation of time scales is possible, with $\omega_m \ll \omega_0 \ll \Gamma$, where $\Gamma$ characterizes the electronic tunnel processes of the quantum dot and corresponds to the lifetime broadening of its states. A generalized capacitance of the nanotube $C_{\text{CNT}}$ is given by
\[
C_{\text{CNT}} = \epsilon \frac{\partial \langle N \rangle}{\partial V_g},
\] (19)
where $\langle N \rangle$ is the number of charge carriers on the quantum dot, averaged over single electron tunneling processes at rates faster than both the mechanical frequency $\omega_m$ and the cavity frequency $\omega_0$. Here, $V_g$ is the static, externally applied gate voltage.

To calculate $g_0$, we require $\partial C_{\text{CNT}}/\partial x$, and we now assume that $C_{\text{CNT}}$ (instead of $C_g$) is its deflection-dependent part, i.e.,
\[
\frac{\partial C_z}{\partial x} = \frac{\partial C_{\text{CNT}}}{\partial x}.
\] (20)
Any change in the mechanically modulated geometric capacitance $\partial C_g$ leads to a change of the gate voltage where Coulomb blockade oscillations reach maximum conductance; one can thus translate $\partial C_g$ into an effective gate voltage modulation $\partial V_g$ via
\[
C_g \partial V_g^{\text{eff}} = V_g \partial C_g,
\] (21)
where $C_g$ is the static, geometric capacitance at zero deflection. With this we implicitly assume that a variation of the effective gate voltage $\partial V_g^{\text{eff}}$ acts on the system in the same way as a variation of the actual gate voltage $\partial V_g$. We now expand
\[
\frac{\partial C_{\text{CNT}}}{\partial x} = \frac{\partial C_{\text{CNT}}}{\partial V_g^{\text{eff}}} \frac{\partial V_g^{\text{eff}}}{\partial x} = \frac{\partial C_{\text{CNT}}}{\partial V_g^{\text{eff}}} \frac{V_g \partial C_g}{C_g \partial x}
\] (22)
Inserting Eq. (19) and using our definition of the effective gate voltage $\partial V_g^{\text{eff}}$, we can now simplify and obtain
\[
\frac{\partial C_{\text{CNT}}}{\partial x} = \epsilon \frac{\partial \langle N \rangle}{\partial V_g^2} \frac{V_g \partial C_g}{C_g \partial x}.
\] (23)

In an intuitive picture, the cavity probes the first derivative of the charge $\langle N \rangle$; an optomechanical interaction results precisely when that derivative changes over a mechanical modulation cycle, i.e., when the second derivative of $\langle N \rangle$ is non-zero.

What remains is to insert an expression for $\langle N \rangle (V_g)$. Given our above requirements of large single electron tunneling rates, the limit $\hbar \Gamma \gg k_B T$ of a lifetime-broadened single electron tunneling (SET) conductance peak at zero temperature is appropriate. Then, the time-averaged number of charge carriers on the quantum dot $\langle N \rangle (V_g)$, near a SET peak centered at $V_{g0}$, can be modelled as the integral over the quantum dot density of states below the Fermi energy,
\[
\langle N \rangle (V_g) = N_0 + \int \frac{1}{2\pi} \frac{\hbar \Gamma}{(\frac{\hbar}{2})^2 + e\alpha (V'_g - V_{g0})^2} \mathrm{d}V'_g
\] (24)
Here, $N_0$ is an offset number of charge carriers, and $\alpha$ is the gate lever arm.

In the fit of Figure 3, the free parameters were the broadening $\Gamma$, the Coulomb oscillation position $V_{g0}$, and an additionally introduced scaling prefactor $\alpha$, resulting in $V_{g0} = -1.18841 \text{ V}$, $\hbar \Gamma = 0.688 \text{ meV}$, and $a = 1.11 = \frac{\rho_\text{exp}}{\rho_0}$. Error sources In the following we discuss potential errors introduced by approximations entering our calculation.

- The length of the vibrating nanotube segment is assumed to be equal to the contact electrode separation, $\ell = 1 \mu\text{m}$. It can be larger in case the nanotube is not aligned perpendicular to the electrodes.
- Since we do not know the radius of the specific carbon nanotube in the device, we assume a typical value $r = 2 \text{ nm}$.
- The space between nanotube and gate electrode consists of 250nm vacuum and 200nm cross-linked PMMA. We simplify this as a single material with relative dielectric constant $\varepsilon_r = 2$ and thickness $d = 450 \text{ nm}$.
- We approximate the nanotube-gate capacitance as that of a thin, long rod above an infinite conductive plane, while the width of the gate electrode, below the nanotube and perpendicular to it, is also only approximately 100nm.
- The effective mass of the carbon nanotube vibrational resonator is assumed to be half its total mass, $m = \frac{(2\pi r \ell \rho \text{ graphene})}{2}$.

Data availability The datasets generated during and/or analysed during this study are available from the corresponding author on reasonable request.
FIG. 5. **The combined coplanar waveguide resonator – carbon nanotube device:** a, Optical microscope overview image, including the superconducting coplanar resonator (1) (length ~ 1 cm), the bond pads (2) to couple a GHz signal into and out of the cavity, the dc bond pads (3) leading to the transfer areas (4), and the dc bondpad (5) leading to the center conductor of the cavity. b, Detail zoom of the carbon nanotube deposition area with the transfer electrodes (6) in between the deep etched areas (7), the gate finger (8) connected to the cavity, and 0.5 µm thin, meandering gold lines (9) as rf blocks, connecting the dc electrodes to the bondpads shown in a.

FIG. 6. **Nanotube growth and transfer:** a, Scanning electron micrograph of carbon nanotubes grown over and between the tines of a commercial quartz tuning fork. For better visibility of the nanotubes, here the entire fork has been covered with cobalt catalyst, not only the fork tips. b, Optical microscope view during nanotube transfer. A near-transparent growth quartz fork is lowered onto an electrode chip (here without a coplanar resonator, for testing purposes), while monitoring the resistance between the target electrodes.
FIG. 7. Cryogenic measurement setup: a, Schematic measurement setup, at the example of an optomechanically induced transparency (OMIT) measurement. b, Top view of the sample holder with dc and GHz access to the chip. The dc lines, with 12 vias at upper and lower edge of the PCB each, lead to a connector on the bottom side.

FIG. 8. Models of the optomechanical device: a, Schematic drawing and b, corresponding circuit. The carbon nanotube, marked in brown in the model, is capacitively \( (C_g) \) coupled to a coplanar waveguide resonator \( (R_{CPW}, L_{CPW}, C_{CPW}) \), marked in gray in the model. A microwave signal can be coupled in and out of the cavity via coupling capacitors \( (C_k) \). To tune the electrostatic potential, an additional dc gate voltage \( V_g \) can be applied to the cavity center conductor.
FIG. 9. **Vibration mode precharacterization:** Absolute value of the lock-in signal $|dI/dP_a|$ measured while an amplitude-modulated rf signal is irradiated onto the device, as function of signal frequency $\omega_a/2\pi$ and applied gate voltage $V_g$. Tracewise extraction of the peak positions leads to the data plotted in the main manuscript, Fig. 1(D).

FIG. 10. **Cavity photon number calibration:** a, Current across a Coulomb blockade oscillation, as a function of gate voltage $V_g$ and off-resonant, red sideband ($\omega_d = 2\pi \cdot 5.2399\text{GHz}$) cavity drive power $P_{\text{cav}}$ (as set at the signal generator). For increasing drive power, the current peak broadens. b, Extracted squared ac gate voltage amplitude $(V_{acg}^2)$ (left axis) and cavity photon number $n_c$ (right axis), as function of applied generator drive power $P_{\text{cav}}$. 
FIG. 11. OMIT data evaluation: a. Raw power transmission data $|S_{21}|^2$ of an OMIT experiment with $\Delta \ll \kappa$. b. The same data after normalization, see text; the solid line is a fit according to Equation 11.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>“Optical” cavity</th>
<th>Resonance frequency</th>
<th>Line width</th>
<th>Quality factor</th>
<th>Capacitance</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>$\omega_c$</td>
<td>$\kappa_c$</td>
<td>$Q_c$</td>
<td>$C_c$</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>$2\pi \cdot 5.7398\text{GHz}$</td>
<td>$2\pi \cdot 13\text{MHz}$</td>
<td>437</td>
<td>875 fF</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>$2\pi \cdot 5.9\text{GHz}$</td>
<td>$2\pi \cdot 242\text{kHz}$</td>
<td>[2.4 $\cdot 10^4$]</td>
<td>415 fF</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>$2\pi \cdot 4.9\text{GHz}$</td>
<td>$2\pi \cdot 490\text{kHz}$</td>
<td>10$^4$</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Mechanical resonator</td>
<td>Resonance frequency</td>
<td>Line width</td>
<td>Quality factor</td>
<td>Effective electronic length</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>$\omega_m$</td>
<td>$\kappa_m$</td>
<td>$Q_m$</td>
<td>$\ell_{\text{eff}}$</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>$2\pi \cdot 502.5\text{MHz}$</td>
<td>$2\pi \cdot 50\text{kHz}$</td>
<td>$10^4$</td>
<td>143 nm</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>$2\pi \cdot 36\text{MHz}$</td>
<td>$2\pi \cdot 228\text{Hz}$</td>
<td>[5.8]</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>$2\pi \cdot 240\text{kHz}$</td>
<td>[2$\pi \cdot 10^4$]</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>~10$^4$</td>
<td>1.6 $\cdot 10^5$</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>~1.6 $\cdot 10^5$</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1.6 $\cdot 10^5$</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Coupling</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>$\sqrt{\hbar/2m\omega_m}$</td>
<td>$x_{\text{zpf}}$</td>
<td>1.9 pm</td>
<td>29 fm</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>$d$</td>
<td>450 nm</td>
<td>150 nm</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>$\varepsilon_r$</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>$C_g$ (for optimal $V_{\text{gate}}$)</td>
<td>2.6 aF</td>
<td>578 aF</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>$\partial C_g/\partial x$</td>
<td>0.95 pF/m</td>
<td>170 pF/m</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Optomechanical parameters</td>
<td>(for optimal $V_{\text{gate}}$)</td>
<td>$\omega_m / \kappa_m$</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>149</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>$g_0$</td>
<td>2$\pi \cdot 2.9\text{MHz}$</td>
<td>2$\pi \cdot 0.83\text{Hz}$</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>$g_0$</td>
<td>2$\pi \cdot 88\text{Hz}$</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>$g_0 / \sqrt{\hbar}$</td>
<td>2$\pi \cdot 22.9\text{kHz}$</td>
<td>[2$\pi \cdot 216\text{Hz}$]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>$g_0 / \sqrt{\hbar}$</td>
<td>2$\pi \cdot 47\text{Hz}$</td>
<td>[2$\pi \cdot 26.5\text{Hz}$]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>$\Gamma_{\text{opt}} / \kappa_m$</td>
<td>3.2 $\cdot 10^{-3}$</td>
<td>[3.4 $\cdot 10^{-3}$]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>$Q_{\text{opt}} / \kappa_m$</td>
<td>3.4 $\cdot 10^{-22}$ W</td>
<td>[1.2 $\cdot 10^{-25}$ W]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>$\omega$</td>
<td>6.8 $\cdot 10^{-6}$</td>
<td>[3.1 $\cdot 10^{-7}$]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>$G$</td>
<td>2$\pi \cdot 161\text{Hz}$</td>
<td>[2$\pi \cdot 12\text{mHz}$]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>$C$</td>
<td>3.2 $\cdot 10^{-3}$</td>
<td>[1.2 $\cdot 10^{-4}$]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>$\ell_{\text{eff}}$</td>
<td>60 nm</td>
<td>110 nm</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>$\ell$</td>
<td>2 nm</td>
<td>4 μm</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>$\ell_{\text{eff}}$</td>
<td>143 nm</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>$r$</td>
<td>2 nm</td>
<td>4 μm</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>$m$</td>
<td>4.8 $\cdot 10^{-21}$ kg</td>
<td>2 $\cdot 10^{-15}$ kg</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**TABLE I. Overview of the parameters of the optomechanical system:** The nomenclature of Ref. 1 is used. The geometric values for the carbon nanotube quantum dot are calculated based on the device geometry and dc measurement results; the Coulomb blockade enhanced values are based on the OMIT measurement evaluation, as are the derived parameters in the lowermost table block. Values for a graphene drum from Ref. 46 and for an aluminum beam from Ref. 26 are given for comparison; parameters in brackets have been calculated based on the data in these publications.