Note on the "size" of Schroedinger cats*

Anthony J. Leggett[1]

[1]*Department of Physics, University of Illinois at Urbana-Champaign, Urbana, IL 61801, USA*

PACS numbers:

arXiv:1603.03992v1 [quant-ph] 13 Mar 2016

In ref. [1] Korsbakken et al.define a number which they propose as a measure of the degree of "macro/mesoscopic distinctness" of two states which may be involved in a quantum superposition. Crudely speaking,this number (which they call ΔN_{tot}; for brevity I will refer to it as W) is the minimum number of single particles which one needs to shift to orthogonal states in order to go from one state to the other.More technically, in a basis k in which the single-particle occupation numbers n_k are diagonal, we have

$$W = \sum_k |\Delta n_k| \tag{1}$$

where Δn_k is the difference in $\langle n_k \rangle$ in the two states compared. They then evaluate W for those experiments on flux qubits in the existing literature which have been interpreted as evidence for "macroscopic quantum coherence", and find that the maximum value which has been obtained to date is only of order 5000. They comment that "[this number is] well short of anything that could reasonably be considered meso-or macroscopic".

While I agree with Korsbakken et al.'s evaluation of W for the flux qubit experiments, the purpose of this note is to point out that for at least one type of situation where I think most people would agree that the two states in question are "macro-(not meso-!)scopically distinct" the value of W is actually _smaller_ than in those experiments. However, examination of the the example used suggests strongly that the use of the value of W as a measure of "macroscopic distinctness" is rather unnatural,and suggests a different figure of merit, which I evaluate for the flux qubit case.

Let us provisionally define two different states of a physical system as "macroscopically distinct" if they can be resolved by the unaided human senses over a "reasonable" period,say for definiteness one second;and further more define two states as "mesoscopically distinct" if they can be similarly resolved under some magnification X^{-1}. (The reader is invited to pause at this point and decide,before reading further,whether he/she agrees with the first definition, and to choose a value of X in the second definition). Now, the minimum spatial difference which can be resolved by the unaided human eye is about 1.5 microns [2]. Let us err on the side of conservatism and thus consider a particle, say for definiteness of LiF, of diameter 5 microns,traversing its own diameter over a period of a second; then according to the above definition this state of the particle is macroscopically distinct from its rest state.(Similarly, the two corresponding states of a particle of diameter $5X$ microns are "mesoscopically" distinct.)

Now let us make an approximate evaluation of the number W for this pair of states.It is convenient to introduce quite generically (also for the flux- qubit case) a characteristic velocity v_0 such that the contribution of each kind of particle to W can be written in the form $N(v/v_0)$ where N is the total number of such particle involved. Thus, for the flux-qubit case, which involves only electrons, N is of order 10^9-10^{10} and v_0 is,apart from a factor of order unity,the electron Fermi velocity [1].

The LiF particle considered contains about $8 * 10^{14}$ electrons and about 2.2 times that number of nucleons. Consider first the electrons. Since in the rest state they occupy only Bloch-wave states in filled bands, and the only difference in the moving state is that the bands are shifted, it is clear that the value of v_0 is simply of order h/ma, where a is the linear dimension of the cubic unit cell; thus v_0 is about $3*10^8$ cm/sec (which is comparable, not surprisingly, to the Fermi velocity of a typical metal).

Before assessing the effect of the nucleons, let us consider one possible objection to the above line of argument: It may be argued that the only way in which we can in fact tell the two states of the particle apart is because we actually discriminate not the two velocities but the two positions occupied after one second, for which W (or even the contribution to it from the electrons) is definitely of order N. Even supposing that this argument is psychophysically correct, the problem is that in view of the different nature of the geometry there is no corresponding number one can define for the flux qubit, so the point seems moot.

In considering the nucleons, it is at first sight tempting to take v_0 to be of the order of the root-mean-square atomic velocity, which is about three orders of magnitude smaller than the electron Fermi velocity; this would give a contribution to W several orders of magnitude greater than that of the electrons. However-and this is the crucial point-if we take the definition given by Korsbakken et al. seriously, we should actually take v_0 to be of the order of the rms velocity of the individual _nucleons_ within

*This note was originally written (but not widely circulated) in April 2009,in response to a preprint version of ref. [1].This slightly expanded version is posted now because of its relevance to ref. [4].

the nucleus! Since the latter is about one order of magnitude larger than the electron Fermi velocity, and the number of nucleons is only about twice that of the electrons, the nucleon contribution to W is only about 0.2 of the electronic one.

Putting these results together, we see that the value of W for the two macroscopically distinct states of our LiF particle is approximately $1.2*8*10^{14}*(5*10^{-4}/3*10^{8})$, i.e.around 1600-_smaller_ than that for "best" flux qubit! It is amusing that by reducing the size to the "minimum visible" value of 1.5 microns we can actually get a value of W which is smaller than 3.

Of course,the reader's first and entirely natural reaction to this surprising result will no doubt be that I have "cheated" by not treating the motion of the individual nucleons in terms of that of the composite nuclei. But my point is that the "cheating" is also implicit in the calculation carried out in ref. [1]: If one wishes, perhaps reasonably, to argue that when a particular type of particle is bound into a composite then the quantity W should be evaluated in terms of the Δn_k of the composite, then one must be prepared to treat the flux-qubit case in terms of the _center-of-mass_ coordinates of the Cooper pairs, which are, after all, perfectly good "composites". (One can bolster this point by a thought-experiment in which we sweep the system across the "BCS-BEC crossover"; at the BEC end it is clear that it is the COM degree of freedom of the _molecules_ which is relevant, and current theory and experiment suggests no discontinuity in the crossover).

Before proceeding, I should note that in p.3,col.2.para.2 of their extended discussion in ref.[3] Korsbakken et al. also briefly refer to the Cooper pairs and conclude that "looking at Cooper-pair modes rather than single-electron modes does not change the effective cat size". However, the quantity they consider (the $\Delta N_{k,-k}$ of their eqn.(6)) bears no relation to anything that could reasonably be called the COM wave function of the pairs, and would give a very small cat size even in the BEC limit; I therefore believe that it is irrelevant to the present discussion.

Suppose,first,that the external flux is half a flux quantum ("symmetric" case), so that the (classically degenerate) many-body states which are superposed correspond to center-of-mass (kinematic) angular momentum $1/2*\hbar$ and $-1/2*\hbar$ respectively and the corresponding COM wave functions are mutually orthogonal. Then if one takes the reasonable point of view that the fraction of all the electrons which are "bound into Cooper pairs" is N_p/N where $N_p \approx N*(\Delta/\epsilon_F)$ is the single macroscopic eignvalue of the reduced 2-particle density matrix, then the resultant value of W (call it W_{CP}) is of order 10^6-10^7. Since the corresponding number for the LiF particle (i.e.that obtained by treating the basic constituents as electrons and nuclei) is about 10^5, we see that the states superposed in the flux qubit should still count as macroscopically distinct.

The "asymmetric" case, which is realized in the experiment reported in ref. [4], is trickier, since while the _many-body_ wave functions of the two states whose superposition is confirmed [5] are of course mutually orthogonal to a very high degree of accuracy, the corresponding Cooper-pair COM wave functions are not. In this case the most natural extension of the definition of W_{CP} would seem to be simply N_p times $(1-K)$ where K is the overlap of the two COM wave functions (this would seem to correspond most closely to the definition of W for the _single-particle_ case in ref. [1]). However, it is clear that a more quantitative discussion is desirable.

I am grateful to Birgitta Whaley for sending me a copy of ref.[1] before publication, to Frances Wang for information on human visual acuity and to Markus Aspelmeyer for helpful discussions. I also thank Mao-chuang Yeh for pointing out a numerical error in the original version, and for useful comments.

[1] J.Korsbakken, F.K.Wilhelm and K.B.Whaley, Physics Scripta T137, 014022 (2009)
[2] R-X.Wang,private communication.
[3] J.Korsbakken,F.K.Wilhelm and K.B.Whaley,Europhysics Letters 89,30003 (2010)
[4] G.Knee et al.,submitted to Nature
[5] In the sense that a macrorealistic account is excluded.