Approaching the motional ground state of a 10 kg object


1 LIGO, Massachusetts Institute of Technology, Cambridge, MA 02139, USA
2 LIGO Hanford Observatory, Richland, WA 99352, USA
3 Department of Mechanical Engineering, Massachusetts Institute of Technology, Cambridge, MA 02139*
4 OzGrav, University of Western Australia, Crawley, Western Australia 6009, Australia
5 OzGrav, University of Adelaide, Adelaide, South Australia 5005, Australia
6 OzGrav, Australian National University, Canberra, Australian Capital Territory 0200, Australia
7 University of Oregon, Eugene, OR 97403, USA
8 Syracuse University, Syracuse, NY 13244, USA
9 University of Toronto, Toronto, ON M5S 1A1, Canada
10 California State University Fullerton, Fullerton, CA 92831, USA
11 Ohio State University, Columbus, OH 43210, USA
12 Columbia University, New York, NY 10027, USA
13 Christchurch College, University of Oxford, Oxford OX2 6DG, UK
14 University of Minnesota, Minneapolis, MN 55455, USA
15 Stanford University, Stanford, CA 94305, USA
16 LIGO Hanford Observatory, Richland, WA 99352, USA
17 Lyon University, Lyon, F-69364, France
18 University of Science and Technology, Risa, MO 65409, USA
19 LIGO, Massachusetts Institute of Technology, Cambridge, MA 02139, USA
20 Max Planck Institute for Gravitational Physics (Albert Einstein Institute), D-30167 Hannover, Germany
21 Leibniz Universität Hannover, D-30167 Hannover, Germany
22 RESCUE, University of Tokyo, Tokyo, 113-0033, Japan.
23 University of Birmingham, Birmingham B15 2TT, UK
24 Université de les Illes Balears, IAC—IEEC, E-07122 Palma de Mallorca, Spain
25 University of Glasgow, Glasgow G12 8QQ, UK
26 Cardiff University, Cardiff CF24 3AA, UK
27 LIGO, Massachusetts Institute of Technology, Cambridge, MA 02139, USA
28 University of Florida, Gainesville, FL 32611, USA
29 The Pennsylvania State University, University Park, PA 16802, USA
The apparent classical behavior of tangibly massive objects is, according to conventional quantum mechanics, the symptom of decoherence. Thermal decoherence, caused by the interaction of a system with a thermal environment, is by far the most pervasive. For a mechanical oscillator of mass \( m \) and natural frequency \( \Omega_0 \), thermal decoherence induces motion characterized by spectral density \( S_x^{th} [\Omega_0] = (2n_{th} [\Omega_0] + 1) S_x^{zp} [\Omega_0] \), where \( n_{th} [\Omega_0] \approx k_B T / h \Omega_0 \) is the average thermal phonon occupation due to the environment (at temperature \( T \)) and \( S_x^{zp} [\Omega_0] = 8 x_{zp}^2 / \Gamma_0 [\Omega_0] \) is its motional zero-point fluctuation, \( x_{zp} = \sqrt{\hbar / (2 m \Omega_0)} \), concentrated in a frequency band of width \( \Gamma_0 [\Omega_0] \). Thermal fluctuations obscure signatures of decoherence that allegedly arise from modifications of quantum mechanics at large masses [1–4], and limit the sensitivity of mechanical transducers in metrology applications [5]. Techniques to probe both frontiers call for large mass mechanical objects prepared in pure quantum states.

Over the past decade, progressively larger objects all the way to nanomechanical oscillators have been prepared in their motional ground state [6–10]. A vast majority of these experiments rely on isolating the oscillator in an elastic or electromagnetic trap in the \( \gtrsim 100 \) kHz frequency range, embedded in a sideband-resolved electromagnetic cavity, typically in a cryogenic environment. These methods do not address a number of technical challenges unique to mechanical oscillators above the milli-/gram mass scale. For one, the large optical power required to trap massive oscillators introduces extraneous heating and other opto-mechanical nonlinearities. Meanwhile, the low resonant frequency of large suspended oscillators doubly compounds the problem of thermal decoherence by increasing the intrinsic thermal motion \( n_{th} \approx 1 / (\Omega_0) \) and precluding efficient cavity sideband cooling. Therefore a different route is needed to prepare large-mass oscillators in pure quantum states.

The Advanced LIGO gravitational-wave detectors offer a unique perspective on this problem. Advanced LIGO is a pair of Michelson interferometers, each with 4 km long Fabry–Pérot arm cavities formed by 40 kg mirrors that hang on fused silica fibers (Fig. 1). The differential motion of each pair of arm cavity mirrors forms a mechanical oscillator with a reduced mass of \( 20 \) kg; the differential motion of each such oscillator in either arm, sensed by the Michelson interferometer, forms a mechanical oscillator of effective mass \( m = 10 \) kg that is the object of our attention. The oscillator follows the pendulum-like motion of the suspended mirror at a frequency \( \Omega_0 \approx 2 \pi \times 0.43 \) Hz; gravitational stress dilution is expected to realize a quality factor of \( Q_0 \approx 10^9 \) [11]. Its displacement fluctuates due to the presence of \( n_{th} [\Omega_0] \approx 10^{13} \) phonons. The interferometer resonantly transduces the differential arm motion into optical power fluctuations at the anti-symmetric port, which is sensed by homodyne detection; during ordinary operation, these fluctuations encode the gravitational-wave signals. In this state, the homodyne photocurrent fluctuations bear the apparent displacement \( \delta x_{\text{obs}} = \delta x + \delta x_{\text{imp}} \); here \( \delta x \) is the physical motion of the differential arm, which contains the displacement of the oscillator, and \( \delta x_{\text{imp}} \) is the measurement imprecision. The imprecision noise, depicted in Fig. 1B, is \( 2 \times 10^{-20} \) m/\( \sqrt{\text{Hz}} \) around 100–200 Hz and is largely quantum shot noise — suppressed by \( \sim 3 \text{~dB} \) by injection of squeezed light [12], and shaped by the response of the signal recycling cavity — with a secondary contribution from mechanical dissipation in the mirror coatings [13]. This sensitivity is equivalent to \( n_{\text{imp}} \approx S_x^{zp} / 2 S_{\text{imp}} \approx 3.5 \times 10^{-13} \) phonons for a 10 kg oscillator at \( \sim 150 \) Hz—a record low number (Ref. [9] demonstrates \( n_{\text{imp}} \approx 10^{-7} \)) tantamount to resolv-
In order to take advantage of this precision, we actively stiffen the pendulum mode by synthesizing a force proportional to the observed displacement (i.e. $\propto \Omega_{fb}^2 \delta x_{obs}$) and in-phase with the motion $\delta x$, trapping the pendulum mode as an oscillator around $\Omega_0 \approx 2\pi \cdot 148$ Hz. Two additional sources of decoherence plague this scheme. First, such measurement precision comes at the expense of additional quantum back-action on the pendulum mode: radiation pressure shot noise from the 200 kW intracavity power and the anti-squeezed intracavity field produces motion $\chi_{imp}$ equivalent to about $n_{imp} \approx 1/2n_{th}$, for a viscously-damped oscillator [14].

To trap and damp the oscillator, we adjust the feedback control so that $\delta F_{fb} = \chi_{fb}^{-1} \delta x_{obs}$, with a feedback filter, $\chi_{fb}^{-1} \propto \Omega_{fb}^2 + i\Omega_{fb}$, between 100–200 Hz. This is implemented by careful shaping of the control loop that is otherwise used to stabilize the interferometer at its linear operating point. The feedback force is applied on the mirror electrostatically: gold electrodes on the reaction mass (Fig. 1A) are held at a 400 V bias, whose fringing field polarizes the dielectric test mass; control voltages added on interleaved electrodes produce a proportional force (extraneous force noise produces $\ll 1$ phonon of excess occupation on average, see Supplementary Information). The overall feedback gain is adjusted so that the system’s effective susceptibility takes the form, $\chi_{eff}[\Omega] \propto (-\Omega^2 + \Omega_{eff}^2 + i\Omega_{eff}[\Omega])^{-1}/m$, of that of an oscillator with frequency $\Omega_{eff} = \sqrt{\Omega_0^2 + \Omega_{fb}^2} \approx \Omega_{fb} \approx 2\pi \cdot 148$ Hz. Delays in the feedback loop limit the trap frequency and cause the oscillator to be intrinsically “cold-damped”. In particular, the phase response of the notch filters used to prevent excitation of the violin modes of the suspension (at 500 Hz and harmonics, featuring quality factors $\geq 10^9$) in conjunction with the feedback filter leaves the interferometer’s length control system with a phase margin of 1° for a trap frequency of 148 Hz. Physical delay in the loop also cold-damps the trapped oscillator to a quality factor of $\approx 50$ (Fig. 2B red trace; see SI for further details). The oscillator is damped further by modifying the imaginary part of the feedback filter. Fig. 2A shows the effective susceptibilities of the trapped and damped oscillator so realized. The largest damping rate, corresponding to
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The effective phonon occupation (n_eff) of the cooled oscillator can be defined through, M_{eff} (n_{eff} + \frac{1}{2}) = (\hbar^2 / (2m)) + mW_{eff}^2 \Omega_{eff}^2 x^2 / 2, where x (p) is the physical displace- 
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FIG. 2. Trapping and cooling of a 10 kg oscillator to 10 quanta. (A) Effective susceptibility of the oscillator for each setting 
of the damping filter, measured by exciting the feedback loop at each frequency and demodulating its response at the same 
frequency. The lines show fits to a model of the susceptibility of a damped harmonic oscillator with an additional delay, i.e. 
χeff(\Omega)e^{i\Omega\tau}; fits to the phase response produce τ = 0.9 ms. (B) Displacement spectrum of the oscillator as the damping is 
increased. Solid lines show fits to a model of the observed spectrum S_{obs}^x (see text for details) where the effective susceptibility 
is determined by the response measurements in panel (A), and only the frequency-dependent imprecision noise and force noise 
are variable. Inset shows the inferred average phonon occupation for each of the curves in the main panel, as a function of the 
damping quality factor; also shown is a model (black dashed) with model uncertainties (gray band). (The disagreement between 
the simple model and data — both the transfer functions and spectra — around 150–155 Hz arises from a coupling between the 
motion of the pendulum and the upper intermediate mass of the suspension [17].)
The preparation of massive objects progressively nearer their ground state opens the door for more sophisticated demonstrations and applications of macroscopic quantum phenomena and quantum metrology. The most intriguing possibility, however, harnesses the ready susceptibility of kg-scale masses to gravitational forces; with this work, it becomes possible to prepare them in near-quantum states. This hints at the tantalizing prospect of studying gravitational decoherence on massive quantum systems.

Note that the 100 Hz frequency band in which the oscillator is established is much larger than the expected decoherence rate of the trapped oscillator, \((n_{th}[\Omega_{\text{eff}}] + n_{ba} + n_{th}[\Omega_{\text{eff}}])\Gamma[\Omega_{\text{eff}}] \approx 2\pi \cdot 10\text{ Hz}\). We evaluate the integral using the physical displacement spectrum reconstructed from fits to the observed displacement. The minimum phonon occupation of the 10 kg oscillator, corresponding to the purple trace in Fig. 2B, is thus inferred to be 10.8 ± 0.8 phonons. Experiments with future gravitational-wave interferometers (“3G”) will achieve occupations below 1.

\[
n_{\text{eff}} \approx \int \frac{S_\nu[\Omega]}{2\nu^2} \frac{d\Omega}{2\pi}.
\]

FIG. 3. A selection of oscillator cooling experiments [9, 10, 14, 18–28]. The initial occupations mentioned are those of the relevant oscillator mode as defined by the natural trap frequency, at its ambient temperature. For atomic physics experiments, this is usually at room temperature in a harmonic electromagnetic trap; whereas for most solid-state mechanical oscillators, it is the harmonic mode defined by the Hookean restoring force of its elastic suspension, and typically at cryogenic temperatures (the exception is the recent work from Delić et al. [10] which demonstrated cavity-cooling of an electric dipole ground state).

control loop picks up again), which regulates both these problems. In this fashion, within 100–200 Hz, the trapped oscillator approximately satisfies the equipartition principle, and so an effective phonon occupation can be assigned using the physical displacement spectrum:

\[
n_{\text{eff}} \approx \int \frac{S_\nu[\Omega]}{2\nu^2} \frac{d\Omega}{2\pi}.
\]
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Appendix A: Model of measurement and feedback

The displacement of the oscillator ($\delta x$) responds to a sum of thermal, back-action, and feedback forces:

\[
\chi_0^{-1}\delta x = \delta F_{\text{th}} + \delta F_{\text{ba}} + F_b. \tag{A1}
\]

Here, the susceptibility of the oscillator $\chi_0^{-1}[\Omega] = m(-\Omega^2 + \Omega_0^2 + i\Omega \Gamma_0[\Omega])$ is well approximated by the test mass pendulum mode at frequency $\Omega_0 \approx 2\pi \cdot 0.43$ Hz, which is structurally damped, so that its damping rate is frequency dependent: $\Gamma_0[\Omega] = (\Omega_0/Q_0)(\Omega_0/\Omega)$, with a quality factor $Q_0 \approx 10^8$.

The thermal force ($\delta F_{\text{th}}$) is characterized by its spectral density,

\[
S_{\text{F}}^{\text{th}}[\Omega] = 4h \left( n_{\text{th}}[\Omega] + \frac{1}{2} \right) \Im \chi_0^{-1}[\Omega], \tag{A2}
\]

where $n_{\text{th}}[\Omega] \approx k_B T/(\hbar \Omega) \approx 9 \cdot 10^{-12} (\Omega_0/\Omega)$ is the average thermal phonon occupation. The back-action force ($\delta F_{\text{ba}}$), arising from radiation pressure quantum fluctuations, is characterized by

\[
S_{\text{F}}^{\text{ba}}[\Omega] = \frac{16\hbar F}{\lambda c} P_{\text{cav}} e^{2r_{\text{squeez}}}, \tag{A3}
\]

where $P_{\text{cav}} \approx 200$ kW is the mean arm cavity power at wavelength $\lambda = 1064$ nm, $F \approx 45$ is the effective finesse of the signal-recycled arm cavities, and $r_{\text{squeez}}$ quantifies the increase in quantum fluctuations of the intracavity optical amplitude due to antisqueezing due to the phase-squeezed vacuum injected at the interferometer’s dark port; here 10 log$_{10} e^{2r_{\text{squeez}}} = (8 \pm 1)$ dB [15]. The back-action force can be quantified in terms of an average phonon occupation $n_{\text{ba}}$ via $S_{\text{F}}^{\text{ba}} \equiv 4\hbar n_{\text{ba}} \Im \chi_0^{-1}[\Omega_0]$, which gives $n_{\text{ba}} \approx 1.0 \cdot 10^{12}$. 
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The feedback force \( F_{\text{fb}} \) is based on a linear estimate of the oscillator’s position,
\[
\delta x_{\text{est}} \equiv G(\delta x + \delta x_{\text{imp}}); \quad (A4)
\]
here, \( \delta x_{\text{imp}} \) is the displacement imprecision (due to sensing noise), and \( G \) is the sensing function of the interferometer. Such an estimate is obtained only when the interferometer is stabilized at its linear operating point, achieved by a feedback loop that forces the test mass (modeled by the actuation function \( A \)) based on a filtered (by \( D_0 \)) record of the error signal \( x_{\text{est}} \). We create an additional feedback path consisting of a digital filter \( D_T \) in series with \( D_0 \) to produce the trap, and a parallel path consisting of the digital filter \( D_C \) to cold-damp the trapped oscillator. The combined feedback force thus exerted is
\[
F_{\text{fb}} = A(D_0 D_T + D_C)\delta x_{\text{est}} + \delta F_{\text{fb}} \\
\equiv -\chi_0^{-1}(\delta x + \delta x_{\text{imp}}) + \delta F_{\text{fb}}; \quad (A5)
\]
here, \( \delta F_{\text{fb}} \) models extraneous force fluctuations due to the actuator. Solving for \( \delta x \) between Eqs. (A1) and (A5) gives the physical displacement fluctuations,
\[
\delta x = \chi_{\text{eff}} (\delta F_{\text{tot}} - \chi_0^{-1} \delta x_{\text{imp}}); \quad (A6)
\]
here, \( \chi_{\text{eff}} \equiv (\chi_0^{-1} + \chi_{\text{fb}}^{-1})^{-1} \) is the effective susceptibility of the oscillator, and \( \delta F_{\text{tot}} \equiv \delta F_{\text{th}} + \delta F_{\text{ba}} + \delta F_{\text{fb}} \) is the total force noise.

The oscillator can be trapped and cooled by synthesizing an effective susceptibility of the form,
\[
\chi_{\text{eff}}^{-1} = m(-\Omega^2 + \Omega_{\text{eff}}^2 + i\Omega_{\text{eff}}); \quad (A7)
\]
We are able to do this by careful design of the effective loop filter \( \chi_{\text{fb}}^{-1} \), which is switched on in a sequence that both traps the oscillator, and keeps the interferometer unconditionally stable.

What we observe is the apparent displacement \( \delta x_{\text{obs}} \) inferred using an estimate for the inverse sensing function \( G^{-1} \) (that forms part of LIGO’s calibration pipeline [30]). That is, \( \delta x_{\text{obs}} \equiv G^{-1}\delta x_{\text{est}} \approx \delta x + \delta x_{\text{imp}} \); amplitude uncertainty in this estimate is at the 2% level [17]. Using the known expression for the physical displacement in Eq. (A6), the apparent displacement is,
\[
\delta x_{\text{obs}} = \chi_{\text{eff}} (\delta F_{\text{tot}} + \chi_0^{-1} \delta x_{\text{imp}}). \quad (A8)
\]
This model produces the spectrum of the observed signal,
\[
S_{x_{\text{obs}}}[\Omega] = \frac{S_{x_{\text{imp}}}[\Omega]/m^2}{(\Omega_{\text{eff}}^2 - \Omega^2)^2 + (\Omega_{\text{eff}})^2} + \frac{\Omega_{\text{th}}^2}{(\Omega_{\text{eff}}^2 - \Omega^2)^2 + (\Omega_{\text{eff}})^2}S_{x_{\text{imp}}}[\Omega], \quad (A9)
\]
that is used to fit the data in Fig. 2B in the main text. However the apparent motion — since it contains correlations impressed by the feedback of imprecision — cannot be directly compared to the spectrum of a physical oscillator that is damped.

The spectrum of the physical motion of the oscillator (\( \delta x \) in Eq. (A6))
\[
S_x[\Omega] = \frac{S_{x_{\text{imp}}}[\Omega]/m^2}{(\Omega_{\text{eff}}^2 - \Omega^2)^2 + (\Omega_{\text{eff}})^2} + \frac{\Omega_{\text{th}}^2}{(\Omega_{\text{eff}}^2 - \Omega^2)^2 + (\Omega_{\text{eff}})^2}S_{x_{\text{imp}}}[\Omega], \quad (A10)
\]
can be directly compared against that of an oscillator trapped at frequency \( \Omega_{\text{eff}} \), and featuring a damped linewidth \( \Gamma_{\text{eff}} \). Writing \( x = x_{\text{ap}}(b + b^\dagger) \) for the position of such an oscillator, with zero-point motion \( x_{\text{ap}} = \sqrt{h/2m\Omega_{\text{eff}}} \) and creation operator \( b \), presumed to exist in a thermal state, we use the identities,
\[
\Var[x] = 2x_{\text{ap}}^2 \langle (b^\dagger b) + \frac{1}{2} \rangle, \quad (A11)
\Var[x] = \int S_x[\Omega] \frac{d\Omega}{2\pi}, \quad (A12)
\]
to assign an effective phonon number \( n_{\text{eff}} \equiv \langle b^\dagger b \rangle \):
\[
n_{\text{eff}} + \frac{1}{2} = \int S_x[\Omega] \frac{d\Omega}{2\pi}. \quad (A13)
\]
Here, the integral is understood to be evaluated in the frequency interval where the oscillator susceptibility is realized.

When the imprecision noise is white (i.e. \( S_{x_{\text{imp}}}[\Omega] \approx S_{x_{\text{imp}}}[\Omega_{\text{eff}}] \)), and the frequency-dependence of the structurally-damped thermal phonon number can be neglected (i.e. \( n_{\text{th}}[\Omega] \approx n_{\text{th}}[\Omega_{\text{eff}}] \)) — both inapplicable to the current experiment, but useful to develop intuition — the phonon occupation can be explicitly evaluated as,
\[
n_{\text{eff}} + \frac{1}{2} \approx \left( n_{\text{tot}}[\Omega_{\text{eff}}] + \left( \frac{\Omega_{\text{eff}}}{\Gamma_0[\Omega_{\text{eff}}]} \right)^2 n_{\text{imp}} + \frac{1}{2} \right) \frac{\Gamma_0[\Omega_{\text{eff}}]}{\Gamma_{\text{eff}}[\Omega_{\text{eff}}]} \left( n_{\text{imp}} + \frac{1}{2} \right) \left( \frac{\Gamma_0[\Omega_{\text{eff}}]}{\Gamma_{\text{eff}}[\Omega_{\text{eff}}]} \right), \quad (A14)
\]
where the factor in the parentheses in the first line is the total initial occupation, consisting of the sum of thermal and back-action quanta \( (n_{\text{tot}} = n_{\text{th}} + n_{\text{ba}}) \), and an additional contribution \( (\Omega_{\text{eff}}/\Gamma_0)^2 n_{\text{imp}} \) due to fluctuations in the trap from feedback of imprecision noise due to the active spring. Here, \( n_{\text{imp}} \equiv S_{\text{imp}}^x/\Omega_{\text{eff}}^2 \) is the phonon-equivalent imprecision (\( S_{\text{zp}}^x \Omega_{\text{eff}}^2 = 8\pi^2/\Gamma_0 \)) is the peak zero-point spectrum of the trapped oscillator).

1. Effect of actuator force noise

It has been documented that the electrostatic drive (ESD) that is used to actuate the test masses produces excess force noise that arises from a combination of charging effects and driver voltage noise [31]. In the context of feedback cooling the test mass, this force (termed \( \delta F_{\text{fb}} \) in Eq. (A6)) acts as an excess thermal force that heats the trapped oscillator, resulting in additional phonons \( n_{\text{fb}} \) that add to the thermal occupation. From Ref. [31], it can be inferred that

\[
\sqrt{S_F^b} \approx (4 \cdot 10^{-18} N/\sqrt{\text{Hz}}) \left( \frac{10 \text{ Hz}}{f} \right).
\]

(By comparison, the typical actuation strength used to keep the interferometer locked is \( \sim 10^{-6} N/\sqrt{\text{Hz}} \) at 10 Hz.) An extraneous phonon occupation \( n_{\text{fb},\text{ex}} \) can be associated with this force noise via,

\[
S_F^b \approx 4\hbar m \Gamma_0 \Omega_{\text{eff}} n_{\text{fb},\text{ex}}.
\]

Assuming the oscillator is trapped at \( \Omega_{\text{eff}} \approx 2\pi \cdot 148 \text{ Hz} \), the equivalent phonon occupation from excess ESD noise is, \( n_{\text{fb},\text{ex}} \lesssim 10^{-3} \).

2. Effect of filter delay

If the feedback is implemented with an overall delay \( \tau \) — for example arising from delays in the computation of the digital filter — the trapping and cooling filter is modified to

\[
\chi_{\text{fb}}^{-1} e^{i\Omega\tau} = m(\Omega_{\text{fb}}^2 + i\Omega \Gamma_{\text{fb}}) e^{i\Omega\tau} \\
\approx m[\Omega_{\text{fb}}^2(1 - \tau \Gamma_{\text{fb}}) + i\Omega(\Gamma_{\text{fb}} + \tau \Omega_{\text{fb}})],
\]

where in going to the second line, we assume that the delay is small compared to the characteristic frequency at which it occurs, i.e. \( \Omega \tau \ll 1 \). Thus, even in the absence of active damping (i.e. \( \Gamma_{\text{fb}} = 0 \)), delay in the loop manifests as damping \( \tau \Omega_{\text{fb}}^2 \). This serves to stabilize the trapped oscillator.

Delay in other parts of the loop manifest as an overall phase factor in the closed-loop gain, \( \chi_{\text{eff}} e^{i\Omega\tau} \). Fits to the phase response of the closed-loop gain in the main text resolve this overall phase shift at the level of \( \approx 0.9 \text{ ms} \), consistent with expected delays in the loop.

Appendix B: Data analysis

1. Uncertainty in transfer function fits

The standard deviation in the transfer function estimate \( \hat{G} \) derived from signals with coherence \( C \) over \( N \) averages is given by [32]

\[
\sigma_{\hat{G}} = \sqrt{\frac{1 - C}{2CN}} \hat{G}.
\]

Similarly, the coherence estimate \( \hat{C} \) has standard deviation

\[
\sigma_{\hat{C}} = \sqrt{\frac{2C}{N}} (1 - C).
\]

Even assuming a worst-case true coherence \( C \) within this range, most of the uncertainty in our data arises from the 1 s average duration and corresponding 1 Hz bin width.

We fit to a time-delayed resonator model,

\[
\chi_{\text{eff}} \sim \frac{1}{\Omega_0^2 - \Omega^2 + i\Omega_0 \Omega/Q} e^{i(\phi - \Omega t)},
\]

and propagate these uncertainties using orthogonal distance regression [33].