On the two-slit interference experiment with electrons: the predictions of Copenhagen and Bohm-de Broglie quantum mechanics
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The Bohm-de Broglie quantum mechanics has made possible to calculate the trajectories of electrons in a typical double-slit experiment [C. Philippidis et al., Il Nuovo Cimento, 52 B, 15-28 (1979)]. The trajectories do not correspond to an uniform movement but to an accelerated one. The acceleration is caused by the quantum potential. From the quantum theoretical point of view, there is a probability for the electron to emit photons, with a certain emission power, during its movement from the slits to the screen. According to the Copenhagen interpretation we found that the emission power is strictly zero because the electron moves as a free particle after it leaves the slit and before reach the screen. Then, there is no emission of photons. On the other hand, in the case of the BdB interpretation, we obtain a general formula for the emission power, from which we can make two predictions: one is for the case of an ensemble, that is, a statistical prediction that coincides, as it was to hope, with the prediction of the interpretation of Copenhagen: zero emission. The other is for the case of an individual event, that is, an electron that follows a trajectory, and this concept exists in the BdB interpretation, and the result, for a concrete real experiment, is a very tiny but not a zero value. We give an idea of the type of spectrum that could be found. This effect, if measured, would constitute an indirect test in favor of the existence of Bohmian trajectories. Therefore, far from contradicting Copenhagen’s interpretation, BdB’s interpretation, besides reproducing their same results, also says something about the sub-quantum world so, instead of looking directly for the trajectories of the electrons we can try to measure their emitted radiation.

PACS numbers: 03.65.-w Quantum mechanics; 03.65.Ta Foundations of quantum mechanics; 03.70.+k Theory of quantized fields

I. INTRODUCTION

In Feynman, Leighton and Sands ’s words [1] the interference experiment with electrons “...has in it the heart of quantum mechanics. In reality, it contains the only mystery.” The formation of the interference pattern has been demonstrated in several experiments, among them Jönsson (1961)[2], Tonomura et. al (1989)[3]. At the same time the theoretical explanation indicated that “The electrons arrive in lumps, like particles, and the probability of arrival of these lumps is distributed like the distribution of intensity of a wave. It is in this sense that an electron behaves sometimes like a particle and sometimes like a wave.” [1], or ”In quantum mechanics there is not such concept as the path of a particle.”[4]. On the other hand the trajectories of the electrons in an typical two-slit interference experiment were computed and plotted in the framework of the BdB approach to quantum mechanics [5]. This is a version of quantum mechanics that reproduces all the experimental results explained by usual quantum mechanics [6][7].

In this work we analyze a known experiment and show that, although the two interpretations make equal predictions for expectation values, there is an additional prediction of the BdB interpretation for individual events. We will comment on the consequences of its possible verification.

This experiment is the typical interference experiment of electrons for which we will show that the usual interpretation predicts that they do not radiate on their way to the screen. On the other hand we will show that the interpretation of BdB predicts that electrons, being accelerated, radiate with a very small power, on its way to the screen. We emphasize that this is a prediction about individual events. However, the possible detection of this radiation would be an indirect and strong experimental support in favor of Bohmian trajectories.

When the present work was ready to be submitted to be considered for publication, we learned of a very inter-
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esting preprint by Pisin Chen, more than twenty years ago in which a proposal similar to ours had already been discussed [8]. In that preprint an analytical model of the quantum potential of the experiment of the two slits with electrons was used and a numerical study was also carried out. It was concluded, like us in the present work, that the electrons must emit radiation. We can say that this preprint and the present work, in a certain way, complement each other since, in our section III, we make a graphic study in scale, somewhat handmade and in Chen’s work more general methods were used. However, in addition to the fact that Chen’s prediction is mainly in the visible range, a range different from that predicted in the present work, namely radio waves [1], the same author in a more recent preprint concludes that this radiation does not really exist [9]. Therefore, we think that our proposal is of additional interest since, using different methods, we affirm that the BdB view of quantum mechanics is saying that this radiation should exist.

This letter is organized as follows: In section II we present the typical experiment and we made the calculations following usual quantum mechanics using an elementary pedestrian approach to quantum electrodynamics. In section III we make the computations according to the BdB approach giving first an exact formula for the emission power by electrons and then an estimate for its value in the case of two real experimental possibilities. In section IV we say two words about polarization of the emitted radiation and Section V is for discussion and conclusions. A certain calculation was put in the appendix, in order not to separate the reader from the main line of reasoning.

II. ELEMENTARY COMPUTATION OF THE EMISSION POWER OF PHOTONS BY AN ACCELERATED ELECTRON, ACCORDING TO THE COPENHAGEN INTERPRETATION

Let’s consider an usual two-slit experiment given by an electron source $S_1$, two slits $A$ and $B$ and a screen $S_2$.

We adopt a co-ordinate system with origin at $O$ as indicated in the Fig. 1 with the centers of the slits having co-ordinates $(O, Y)$ and $(O, -Y)$. (same convention that as [5]). After go through and coming out the slits an electron becomes free, i.e. the potential acting on it is zero.

In the experiment presented by Jönsson in [2] which is the same later studied in [5], the kinetic energy of a typical electron is 45 keV. This represents approximately 9% of its rest mass, 511 keV, and this mean a non-relativistic case [6]. Then the Hamiltonian operator of the electron is given by

$$H_e = \frac{p^2}{2m}$$  (1)

If we consider that a photon can be emitted, these are characterized by the potential vector $A(r)$ and then the Hamiltonian of the total electron + photon system is

$$H = \frac{1}{2m}(p - \frac{e}{c}A)^2 + \frac{1}{8\pi} \int dx^3(E^2 + B^2)$$  (2)

that can be written as

$$H = H_e + H_{rad} + H_I$$  (3)

where

$$H_I = -\frac{e}{mc}p \cdot A + \frac{e^2}{2mc^2}A^2$$  (4)

$$H_{rad} = \frac{1}{8\pi} \int dx^3(E^2 + B^2)$$  (5)

The term $H_I$ will be treated as a perturbation. The Hamiltonian without perturbation

$$H = H_e + H_{rad}$$  (6)

has as eigenvectors

$$|e + \text{radiation}⟩ = |p⟩ |n_kσ⟩_{rad}.$$  (7)

The interaction hamiltonian $H_I$ induce transitions between this states, and the transition probability per unit time is given by the Fermi ‘Golden Rule” as:

1. However, we note that the width of the slits used in Chen’s work is different.
2. In this section we follow the lines and notation of [10] Ch. 3. but keep in mind that here we have an electron instead of an atom.
\[
\frac{\text{prob}}{\text{time}} = \frac{2\pi}{\hbar} |M_{fi}|^2 \delta(E_f - E_i) \tag{8}
\]

where

\[
|M_{fi}| = \langle f | H_I | i \rangle + \sum \frac{\langle f | H_I | n \rangle \langle n | H_I | i \rangle}{E_i - E_f + i\eta} + \langle f | H_I | n \rangle \langle n | H_I | m \rangle \langle m | H_I | i \rangle \frac{E_i - E_n + i\eta}{(E_i - E_m + i\eta)} + \ldots \tag{9}
\]

Now we write \(H_I\) as

\[
H_I = H' + H'', \tag{10}
\]

where

\[
H' = -\frac{e}{mc} \mathbf{p} \cdot \mathbf{A} \tag{11}
\]

\[
H'' = \frac{e^2}{2mc^2} \mathbf{A}^2 \tag{12}
\]

and substituting the expansion in normal modes for \(\mathbf{A}\) we obtain:

\[
A(x, t) = \sum_{k, \sigma} \sqrt{\frac{2\pi\hbar c^2}{\Omega\omega_k}} \mathbf{u}_{k\sigma} \left[ a_{k\sigma}(t) e^{ikr} + a_{k\sigma}^+(t) e^{-ikr} \right]
\]

being

\[
a_{k\sigma}(t) = a_{k\sigma}(0) e^{-i\omega_k t} \tag{13}
\]

\[
a_{k\sigma}^+(t) = a_{k\sigma}^+(0) e^{i\omega_k t} \tag{14}
\]

the destruction and creation operators, and \(\Omega \equiv \text{volume of the box where the electromagnetic field is quantized}\)

To the first order in the perturbation we see that \(H'\) induce transitions in which the number of photons changes in one unity (i.e \(\pm 1\)), since one and only one creation or destruction operator appear in each term of it. In the same way we see that \(H''\) induces changes in which two photons are emitted or two are absorbed or one is emitted and another is absorbed.

Let’s consider the electron with initial state \(|p\rangle\) and final state \(|p_b\rangle\). We are going to analyze the emission of one photon with wave vector \(\mathbf{k}\) and polarization \(\sigma\). We write for the initial and final states:

\[
|i\rangle = |p\rangle |...n_{k\sigma}...\rangle_{\text{rad}} \tag{15}
\]

\[
|f\rangle = |p_b\rangle |...n_{k\sigma} + 1...\rangle_{\text{rad}} \tag{16}
\]

Transitions between these states can only be induced by \(H'\) in the first order contribution to \(M_{fi}\).

We have

\[
\langle f | H' | i \rangle = -\frac{e}{mc} \sqrt{\frac{2\pi\hbar c^2}{\Omega\omega_k}} \langle p_b | \mathbf{p} \cdot \mathbf{u}_{k\sigma} e^{-i\mathbf{k} \cdot \mathbf{r}} | p \rangle \sqrt{n_k + 1} \tag{17}
\]

then, from eq. [8]
The experiment which means emission of photons which are of very low energy, i.e. have a very long wavelength compared with the characteristic dimension of the experiment.

Now it is a reasonable approximation to say that the emission of a photon is necessary to sum over all the possible values of \( k \) and \( \sigma \) that the emitted photon can have. In summing over the polarizations we choose \( \mathbf{u}_{k1} \) and \( \mathbf{u}_{k2} \) as in Eq. \(#1\), then

\[
\sum_{\sigma=1,2} |\langle p_b | \mathbf{p} \cdot \mathbf{u}_{k\sigma} e^{-i k \mathbf{r}} | p_a \rangle|^2 = |\langle p_b | \mathbf{p} e^{-i k \mathbf{r}} | p_a \rangle|^2 \sin^2 \theta
\]

(19)

Now it is a reasonable approximation to say that the emitted photon is of very low energy, i.e. it have a very long wavelength compared with the characteristic dimensions of the experiment which means \( \exp(-i k \mathbf{r}) \sim 1 \). Substituting in \(#18\), taking into account that in summing on all the possible states the probability in the numerator becomes 1 and using the prescription

\[
\sum_k \rightarrow \frac{\Omega}{(2\pi)^3} \int d^3k,
\]

(20)

for \( \Omega \rightarrow \infty \) (the volume of the box going to infinity) we obtain:

\[
\left( \frac{1}{\tau} \right)_{a \rightarrow b} = \frac{e^2}{2m^2 \pi} \int d^3k \frac{1}{\omega_k} |\langle p_b | \mathbf{p} | p_a \rangle|^2 \sin^2 \theta \delta(E_b - E_a + \hbar \omega_k)
\]

(21)

Now we use spherical coordinates in the \( k \)-space with the \( z \)-axis in the \( \langle p_b | \mathbf{p} | p_a \rangle \) direction, then:

\[
d^3k = k^2 dk \sin \theta d\theta d\phi
\]

(22)

and using \( k = \frac{\omega_k}{c} \), we have

\[
d^3k = \frac{\omega_k^2}{c^3} d\omega_k \sin \theta d\theta d\phi
\]

(23)

which substituting in \(#21\) and integrating, allow us to write:

\[
\left( \frac{1}{\tau} \right)_{a \rightarrow b} = \frac{4e^2}{3m^2 c^3 \hbar \omega_{ab}} |\langle p_b | \mathbf{p} | p_a \rangle|^2
\]

(24)

were \( \omega_{ab} = \frac{(E_a - E_b)}{\hbar} \) is the frequency of the emitted photon.

Using that \( \mathbf{p} = m \mathbf{\dot{r}} \) (non relativistic case) we can re-write the bracket in \(#24\) in the following form:

\[
|\langle p_b | \mathbf{p} | p_a \rangle| = \frac{i m}{\hbar \omega_{ab}} |\langle p_b | \mathbf{r} \rangle| |\langle p_a | \mathbf{r} \rangle|
\]

(25)

that substituted in \(#24\) gives

\[
\left( \frac{1}{\tau} \right)_{a \rightarrow b} = \frac{4e^2}{3m^3 c^3 \hbar \omega_{ab}} |\langle p_b | \mathbf{r} \rangle| |\langle p_a | \mathbf{r} \rangle|^2,
\]

(26)

where we used that \( \omega_{ab} = -\omega_{ba} \).

Being the energy of the emitted photon equal to \( \hbar \omega_{ba} \), we have for the energy radiated per unit time (emission power)

\[
\left( \frac{dE}{dt} \right)_{a \rightarrow b} = \frac{4e^2}{3m^3 c^3} |\langle p_b | \mathbf{r} \rangle| |\langle p_a | \mathbf{r} \rangle|^2
\]

(27)

that we write as

\[
\left( \frac{dE}{dt} \right)_{a \rightarrow b} = \frac{4e^2}{3m^3 c^3} |\langle p_b | \mathbf{r} \rangle| |\langle p_a | \mathbf{r} \rangle|^2.
\]

(28)

We see a great resemblance to the Larmor’s formula for an accelerated electron of Classical electrodynamics.

We can write the last equation using the ”fine structure constant”: \( \alpha = \frac{e^2}{c \hbar} \) as

\[
\left( \frac{dE}{dt} \right)_{a \rightarrow b} = \frac{4 \alpha \hbar}{3 c^3} |\langle p_b | \mathbf{r} \rangle| |\langle p_a | \mathbf{r} \rangle|^2
\]

(29)

Now we analyze the electron considered in our problem, which once abandoned the slits experiences no potential before striking the screen (i.e. \( V(r) = 0 \) for \( x_{\text{slit}} < x < x_{\text{screen}} \)). This mean that its hamiltonian is that of a free particle, Eq. \(#1\), and then \( \mathbf{\dot{r}} \) vanish:

\[3\] See appendix A.
\[ \dot{r} = i \frac{\hbar}{\hbar} [H_e, r] = i \frac{\hbar}{\hbar} [H_e, p] = 0. \]  

(30)

Then, equation (29) gives:

\[
\left( \frac{dE}{dt} \right)_{a \to b} = 0 ,
\]

(31)

i.e. a null value, which means the energy emitted per unit time is zero and we have no photon emitted. This is the answer that gives the Copenhagen Interpretation of QM. The electrons goes from the slits to the screen without emission of photons in most of its travel, with a possible exception in two points which are the final point in the screen and the initial passing through the slits, point where the potential is not vanishing. Note that, following the founders Bohr, Heisenberg, Landau and others, we have not talked about "'trajectory'" in our deduction.

We followed an elementary computation in Q.E.D., i.e. we have not made use of the 2nd quantization formalism but, as it is well known, the answer to the problem must be the same with the only price to pay being the lost of manifestly covariant equations.

### III. PHOTON EMISSION IN THE BOHM-DE BROGLIE APPROACH

Before we begin to consider our problem we would like to note a suggestive result of the BdB theory: in the ground state of the hydrogen atom the electron is not accelerated, so there is no emission and the state is stationary (see reference [6]). It would be interesting to study another situation in which the electron is accelerated.

The two-slit interference experiment with electrons was studied in the framework of the BdB quantum mechanics in [5] where the bohmian trajectories were first calculated (Fig. 3). An interesting discussion of this experiment at the light of BdB quantum mechanics is given in [6]. The trajectory of an electron is affected by the quantum potential which is depicted in Fig. 4. The plot of the quantum potential shows, after the high spikes in the central region near the slits, a set of troughs and plateaus. An electron emerging for one slit can be first repelled by the central spikes and then moves practically uniformly (with a small component of velocity in the y-direction) until it encounters one of the troughs in Q. One can have an idea of the variation of Q in the y axis by plotting the cross section which is depicted at about 18 cm from the plane of the slits: we see a series of "'potential wells" (or valleys) corresponding to the troughs (Fig. 4). The electron "'fall'" in the potential well where is first accelerated with a strong force \(-\frac{\partial Q}{\partial y}\) and then decelerated (the quantum potential for this experiment depends only on y, see [5], [6]). From the quantum theoretical point of view we can say that there exist a certain probability for the accelerated electron emit a photon.

---

4 In a sense we verified the Feynman’s quote […] the electron cannot emit a photon and make a transition to a different electron state while traveling along a vacuum [11].
that the electron follows trajectories. To do that we are going to re-write the bracket:

$$\langle p_b | \vec{r} | p_a \rangle$$

by introducing two identities and, furthermore, simplifying notation by writing $|a\rangle$ instead of $|p_a\rangle$. By the way, remember that $|p\rangle$ are eigenstates of energy as well as being of the moment. We have:

$$\langle b | \vec{r} | a \rangle = \int dr |b\rangle \langle r | \vec{r} | d\rangle \langle r | \vec{r} | r' \rangle \langle r' | a \rangle$$

$$= \int dr \int dr' \langle b | r \rangle \langle r | \vec{r} | d\rangle \langle r | \vec{r} | r' \rangle \langle r' | a \rangle$$

Note that the acceleration operator $\vec{r}$ can be written in the $|r\rangle$ representation as proportional to a delta function, i.e.: $\langle r | \vec{r} | r' \rangle = \delta(r - r')$. To see that consider the quantum dynamical equation in Heisenberg picture, which is in general

$$m\ddot{r} = -\frac{\partial V(r)}{\partial r}$$

or

$$\ddot{r} = \frac{F(r)}{m}$$

where the force operator $F(r)$ was defined as $F(r) \equiv -\frac{\partial V(r)}{\partial r}$.

Then

$$\langle r | \vec{r} | r' \rangle = \frac{1}{m} \langle r | F(r) | r' \rangle$$

We see that $\ddot{r} \equiv \frac{F(r)}{m}$ is the eigenvalue of acceleration operator. Note that operators $\vec{r}$ and $r$ commute. It is easy to show that the local expectation value (LEV or the beable) associated with the operator acceleration, in the BdB theory, coincides with the eigenvalue of operator acceleration $\ddot{r}$. Substituting (39) in (33) we obtain:

$$\langle b | r \rangle \langle r | \vec{r} | a \rangle = \int dr \langle b | r \rangle \int d\delta(r - r') \langle r' | a \rangle$$

The quantity $\ddot{r}$, which is not an operator but a beable, can be obtained from the dynamical equation of BdB theory which, it is good to remember, comes directly from the real part of Schrödinger equation after take the spatial derivative (the gradient). This equation reads as follows:

$$\frac{d}{dt} (m\ddot{r}) = -\nabla (V + Q)|_{r = r(t)}$$

where $Q$ stands for the quantum potential.

In the experiment analyzed here we have $V = 0$ for the electron along the trajectory from the slits to the screen (excluding this extremal points).

Then

$$\frac{d}{dt} (m\ddot{r}) = -\nabla Q)|_{r = r(t)}$$

$\ddot{r} = -\frac{\nabla Q}{m}$

---

5 For an heuristic deduction see Appendix B

6 See appendix C for the computation. The LEV is a characteristic of the particle, not of the statistical ensemble, see, for example, chapter 3.5.

7 In order not to overload the writing, from now on we implicitly understand that the gradient is evaluated in the instantaneous position of the electron $r = r(t)$.
and substituting in (41) gives:

\[ \langle b | \hat{p} | a \rangle = \int dr \langle b | r \rangle \left( -\frac{\nabla Q}{m} \right) \langle r | a \rangle \]  

(45)

Finally, using (45) in (29) it is obtained

\[ \left( \frac{dE}{dt} \right)_{a \rightarrow b} = \frac{4}{3} \alpha \hbar \left( \nabla Q \right)^2 \int dr \langle b | r \rangle \left| \nabla Q \langle r | a \rangle \right|^2 . \]  

(46)

This is the general answer that BdB approach gives for the emission power in a double slit experiment with electrons.

It is noteworthy that we could also have considered the BdB interpretation of the electromagnetic field. In this sense, it is possible to show that in such a case the formula (46) is maintained. However, it may be of interest to give an ontological description of the radiation emission process studied, considering instead of Fock states, i.e. states as (16) (which are equivalent to plane waves), non-stationary states. These are given by packets or superpositions of Fock states with a certain function of weight, which allow to describe in a more realistic way the process. In this case, the weight function will appear included in the formula of the emission power. Bohm, in his 2nd article on "hidden variables" of 1952, developed the causal interpretation of the electromagnetic field and studied, in particular, the photoelectric and Compton processes from that point of view using non-stationary states (7). A valuable report on the BdB interpretation of the electromagnetic field can be found in (12).

In order to continue the analysis with data from a concrete and real experiment we can make a reasonable approximation: we accept that the gradient is constant or, in other words, we approximate the curvilinear walls of each well, shown in the Fig. 5, by straight walls, as it is shown in Fig. 6

\[ \nabla Q(r) = \text{constant} = \frac{\Delta Q}{\Delta r} \]  

(47)

Then we can take it out of the integral in (46):

\[ \left( \frac{dE}{dt} \right)_{a \rightarrow b} = \frac{4}{3} \alpha \hbar \left( \nabla Q \right)^2 \left| \int dr \langle b | r \rangle \left| \nabla Q \langle r | a \rangle \right|^2 \right| \]  

or

\[ \left( \frac{dE}{dt} \right)_{a \rightarrow b} = \frac{4}{3} \alpha \hbar \left( \nabla Q \right)^2 \left| \langle b | a \rangle \right|^2 \]  

(49)

For the square of scalar product \( | \langle b | a \rangle |^2 \), for a reasonable assumption for the initial and final states of the electron, it is possible to show that it is practically equal to one. For example, making the realistic assumption of gaussians states

\[ \langle r | a \rangle = \left( \frac{2}{\pi d^2} \right)^{\frac{3}{2}} e^{i \frac{\mathbf{p}_a \cdot \mathbf{r} - \mathbf{p}_b \cdot \mathbf{r}}{2 \hbar}} \]  

(50)

\[ \langle b | r \rangle = \left( \frac{2}{\pi d^2} \right)^{\frac{3}{2}} e^{-i \frac{\mathbf{p}_a \cdot \mathbf{r} - \mathbf{p}_b \cdot \mathbf{r}}{2 \hbar}} \]  

(51)

we have

\[ | \langle b | a \rangle |^2 = e^{i (\mathbf{p}_a - \mathbf{p}_b)^2 \cdot \frac{\Delta r}{2 \hbar}} \]  

(52)

which, adopting the values:

\( d = \text{classical electron radius} = 2.818 \times 10^{-13} \text{cm} \)
\( mc^2 = 0.511 \times 10^6 \text{eV} \)
\( p_a - p_b = m \cdot 476554 \text{cm/s for the valley 1 gives} \)
\( e^{i (\mathbf{p}_a - \mathbf{p}_b)^2 \cdot \frac{\Delta r}{2 \hbar}} = e^{3.359 \times 10^{-15}} \approx 1 \)

and so on, analogously for the other valleys.

So, the equation (49) reduces very approximately to

\[ \left( \frac{dE}{dt} \right)_{a \rightarrow b} = \frac{4}{3} \alpha \hbar \left( \nabla Q \right)^2 . \]  

(53)

Note that, using (44), this equation can be written as

\[ \left( \frac{dE}{dt} \right)_{a \rightarrow b} = \frac{4}{3} \alpha \hbar \left( \mathbf{r} \right)^2 . \]  

(54)

It is possible estimate an approximate absolute value for the gradient \( | \nabla Q \| \approx \left( \frac{\Delta Q}{\Delta y} \right) \) graphically from Fig. 5 when the electron enters each well (recall here Q depends on coordinate y: \( Q = Q(y) \)). The maximum absolute value of Q is, for the Jönsson experiment, approximately equal to \( 10^{-4} \text{eV} \). From this we roughly estimate that for the 2nd well (counting from the symmetry center between the slits) we have a variation of \( \frac{7}{16} \times 10^{-4} \text{eV} \) along a distance of \( \frac{1}{10} \times 10^{-4} \text{cm} \). Then:

\[ \nabla Q \approx \frac{\Delta Q}{\Delta y} \approx \frac{7}{16} \times 10^{-4} \text{eV} \approx 3.06 \text{eV/cm} \]  

(55)

Substituting (55) in (53) and using the standard values:

\( \hbar \approx 0.65 \times 10^{-15} \text{eV.s} \)
\( mc^2 \approx 0.511 \times 10^6 \text{eV} \)
\( e \approx 3 \times 10^1 \frac{\text{cm}}{s} \)
\( \alpha \approx \frac{1}{137} \)

we obtain for the mean emission power:
\[ P_2 \equiv \left( \frac{\Delta E}{\Delta t} \right) \cong 3.27 \times 10^{-26} W. \]  

(56)

In the same way, for the 3rd well we have approximately \( \Delta Q \cong \frac{350 \times 10^{-4} eV}{176 \times 10^{-4} \text{cm}} = 0.93 \frac{eV}{\text{cm}} \) and the mean emission results in

\[ P_3 \cong 3.02 \times 10^{-27} W. \]  

(57)

For the 4th well we obtain \( \Delta Q \cong 0.8 \frac{eV}{\text{cm}} \) and the emission power is

\[ P_4 \cong 2.23 \times 10^{-27} W. \]  

(58)

Still for the first well, by extrapolating below the abscissa axis, we can obtain \( \Delta Q \cong 9.66 \frac{eV}{\text{cm}} \) and for the emission power

\[ P_1 \cong 3.25 \times 10^{-25} W. \]  

(59)

It is possible to have a crude idea for the frequency of some of the photons emitted. For that we estimate the time the electron takes to cross the well (this is the collision time, call it \( \tau \)). We consider that the movement during the passage through the valley in the \( y \) axis occurs approximately with constant average accelerations (in the first half of the valley accelerated and in the second half decelerated) which can be obtained graphically. Furthermore we make another simplification which is to consider each valley as symmetrical along its central vertical axis.

Using for the initial \( y \)-velocity, in the border of the valley, the value from the experiment performed by Jönsson, \( v_y = 1.5 \times 10^4 \frac{\text{cm}}{s} \) we found approximately for the 2nd valley (or well) acceleration:

\[ |a_2| \cong \frac{3.06 \ eV}{m_e \ \text{cm}} = 5.99 \times 10^{-6} \ \frac{eV}{\text{cm}} = 5.39 \times 10^{15} \ \frac{\text{cm}}{s^2} \]  

(60)

collision time:

\[ \tau_2 \cong 7.01 \times 10^{-11} s. \]  

(61)

Accepting that during this time a photon is emitted, by using the mean emission power given by Eq. (56) we have for the energy of the photon:

\[ E_2 = P_2 \tau_2 = 3.27 \times 10^{-26} W \times 7.01 \times 10^{-11} s = 2.29 \times 10^{-36} J. \]  

(62)

To this photon must correspond a frequency

\[ \nu_2 = \frac{E_2}{\hbar} = \frac{2.29 \times 10^{-36} J}{6.63 \times 10^{-34} J \cdot s} = 3.45 \times 10^{-3} \text{ Hz}. \]  

(63)

For the photons emitted as an electron cross the 3rd valley we found the collision time \( \tau_3 \cong 1.02 \times 10^{-10} s \) and a frequency \( \nu_3 \) approximately equal to:

\[ \nu_3 \cong 4.66 \times 10^{-4} \text{ Hz}. \]  

(64)

In the same way we obtain the collision time and a frequency for the 4th and still for the 1st valley:

8 Strictly we call collision time to the time during which the electron "feels" the potential. That occurs in two stages, first acceleration and then deceleration, each lasting \( \tau \). In each of these lapses there is a change in the velocity of absolute value \( |\Delta v| \). This is the characteristic time that will define the frequency of cutoff of the spectrum, see below.
\[ \tau_4 \cong 1.09 \times 10^{-10} s, \quad (65) \]

\[ \nu_4 \cong 3.6 \times 10^{-4} Hz, \quad (66) \]

\[ \tau_1 \cong 2.8 \times 10^{-11} s, \quad (67) \]

\[ \nu_1 \cong 1.37 \times 10^{-2} Hz. \quad (68) \]

where \( \omega \) is the angular frequency, i.e. \( \omega = 2\pi \nu \) and \( \tau \) is the collision time.

The collision time \( \tau \) is the time the electron undergoes the acceleration in each potential well (estimated before) and \( \frac{1}{\tau} \) is, according to Eq. (69), the maximum angular frequency. For \( \omega \geq \frac{1}{\tau} \) the energy irradiated per unit of frequency interval (i.e. the frequency spectrum) fall rapidly to zero. This spectrum will have a cutoff at that frequency and higher frequency photons will practically not be emitted [13]. Then the spectrum will be something like a step function with the cutoff in \( \frac{1}{\tau} \), as in Fig. 7 (see too [14] Fig. 15.1).

The "height of the step", call it \( I(0) \), i.e. the intensity at zero frequency, can be obtained by re-writing Eq. (54) in a finite form as

\[ \delta E \delta t = \frac{4 \alpha \hbar}{3 c^2} (\Delta \nu)^2 \quad (70) \]

and being the frequencies of the photons tending to zero we can write \( \delta \nu \equiv \frac{1}{\tau} \), and we have in that limit:

\[ I(0) \equiv \frac{dE}{d\nu} = \frac{4 \alpha \hbar}{3 m c^2} (\Delta \nu)^2, \quad (71) \]

or equivalently

\[ I(0) \equiv \frac{dE}{d\nu} = \frac{4 \alpha \hbar}{3 m^2 c^2} (\nabla Q)^2 \tau^2 \quad (72) \]

which represents the energy irradiated per unit of frequency at very low frequencies.

So for each valley there is a spectrum as in Fig 7, each one of them with a cutoff angular frequency \( \omega_{ci} \equiv \frac{1}{\tau_i} \) (wavelength \( \lambda_{ci} \)) and "height of the step" \( I(0)_i \) (i = 1, 2, 3, 4) as indicated in the table I.

The spectrum should be given by a succession of step-type spectra (Fig 7), one for each valley of the quantum potential that is crossed by the electron, and each one with its cutoff frequency given above and with its corre-
sponding "height" (Eq.72).

\[ S = 2 \times \text{slit area} = 2 \times 0.3 \times 10^{-4} \text{cm} \times 50 \times 10^{-4} \text{cm} = 3 \times 10^{-7} \text{cm}^2, \]

and the total current \( I_J \) (where \( J \) stands for Jönsson) is

\[ I_J = j.S = 1.87245 \times 10^{17} \frac{e^-}{s.cm^2} \times 3 \times 10^{-7} \text{cm}^2 \]
\[ \approx 5.6 \times 10^{10} \frac{e^-}{s} \]  \( (74) \)

On the other hand we can write \([56]\) as

\[ P_2 = 3.27 \times 10^{-26} W = 3.27 \times 10^{-26} V \frac{C}{s}, \]

so, using \([73]\) we can write

\[ P_2 = 3.27 \times 10^{-26} V \times 6.24 \times 10^{18} \frac{e^-}{s} \]
\[ = 2.04 \times 10^{-10} V \times 10^2 \frac{e^-}{s} \]  \( (76) \)

and then

\[ P_2 = 2.04 \times 10^{-10} V \times I_T . \]  \( (77) \)

i.e the power is proportional to the current so, for the experiment with current \( I_J \), we can write

\[ P_{2J} = 2.04 \times 10^{-10} V \times I_J = 2.04 \times 10^{-10} V \times 5.6 \times 10^{10} \frac{e^-}{s} \]
\[ = 1.83 \times 10^{-18} W = 1.83 \times 10^{-11} \text{erg} \frac{s}{s}. \]  \( (78) \)

In the same way, from Eq.\([59]\), it can be obtained for the 1st valley:

\[ P_{1J} \approx 1.82 \times 10^{-17} W = 1.82 \times 10^{-10} \frac{\text{erg}}{s}, \]  \( (79) \)

And so on for the others wells, see table I. In this way in the case of a current as Jönsson’s experiment it is obtained an emission power several orders of magnitude greater than that obtained before for a current as Tonomura’s experiment and therefore, the emitted radiation will have a greater probability of being detected in an experiment like the one described. The radiation emitted by the electron reaches the screen before it and, if it is not too attenuated, we think it could be detected by an appropriate antenna after passing through it.

To have a brief idea of how difficult it could be to measure powers as small as those obtained we can compare,
for example, with the flux power of the cosmic microwave background radiation (CMBR): the average flux power arises from the Stefan-Boltzmann law for the temperature $T = 2.73K$ resulting in $3.15 \times 10^{-6} W/m^2$. In our case, using the value for the first valley $P_{1,1}$ and considering that the emission of radiation occurs predominantly along the valleys towards the screen, the radiation will strike on a small surface determined by the separation of the fringes (say 7000 Å [3]) and the height of the screen, say 10 times the separation of the fringes. This gives a flow of $1.85 \times 10^{-6} W/m^2$ which is comparable to the CMBR flux. For the radiation coming from the other valleys the flux power is even less.

IV. ANGULAR DISTRIBUTION WITH A DEFINITE STATE OF POLARIZATION

We can say something in relation to the angular distribution of the emitted radiation and its polarization. The key in this experiment is that the acceleration imparted by the quantum potential to the electron has only a component in the $\vec{v}_y$ direction. Therefore, making use of the results presented in [13] it is possible to see that for the angular spectral distribution, $I_\perp$ will survive only the contribution due to this polarization direction, i.e $I_\perp$, see Eq. (15.10) of that reference (remember that they are also valid from the quantum point of view). We will leave for a next article the details of this issue.

V. DISCUSSION AND CONCLUSION

It has been demonstrated from the usual quantum mechanics (interpretation of Copenhagen), that in the two slits experiment of interference with electrons they do not emit radiation in their way from the slits to the screen. On the other hand, for an individual event using the quantum mechanics in the view of Bohm-de Broglie, we have shown that these electrons must emit radiation. The reason for this emission is that the quantum potential accelerates the electrons. For realistic experimental parameters compatible with experiments already carried out, we have shown that the emission spectrum is a succession of step functions, each of them characterized by a cutoff frequency and a certain intensity. They are radio waves with wavelengths that go approximately from cm onwards, of very low power, but probably detectable. If this were the case, we would have indirect experimental evidence of the existence of the trajectories of these electrons. Note that Chen’s prediction [8] indicates electromagnetic waves in the visible range (using slits of another thickness) although in truth, as we observed earlier, the same author has completely refuted his own prediction [9].

Could these two different predictions, Copenhagen and BdB, be made, in some way, compatible? Let’s see: we know that if the following three conditions are satisfied ([7]):

1. $\psi$ satisfies the Schroedinger’s equation.
2. $p = \nabla S$.
3. $\rho = |\psi|^2$.

where $\rho$ is the probability density of the ensemble of particles, then all statistical predictions of the BdB interpretation coincide with the predictions of Copenhagen quantum mechanics (and these are all statistical predictions).

In fact, in the problem studied in the present work we have not made the assumption 3 because we have not needed it for our deduction: the prediction in this case has been about an individual event (the accelerated electron). This is the reason why there is no contradiction between the two predictions, that of Copenhagen and that of BdB. The latter is a prediction about the subquantum world, which simply does not exist for the interpretation of Copenhagen. The first is a statistical prediction, like any prediction of the Copenhagen quantum mechanics.

Now, as we said, the two interpretations must coincide in their statistical predictions. Indeed, that can be seen if we consider the case of an ensemble of electrons with probability density equal to the square of the wave function $\rho = |\psi|^2$ in the BdB interpretation: if we take the expectation value in our result Eq. [53], we obtain:

$$\langle \frac{dE}{dt} \rangle = \frac{4}{3} \frac{\alpha h}{m^2 c^2} \langle \nabla Q^2 \rangle = 0$$

because, if $\rho \to 0$ for $r \to \infty$, we have :

$$\langle \nabla Q \rangle = 0$$

(see [6] Chapter 3.8.3).

So we verify that, for a statistical prediction, the same value is obtained in both interpretations, that is, zero emission.

Until now, as far as we know, it has not been proven that Bohmian trajectories cannot be measured. They have not been measured either. We affirm that an indirect proof of its existence is the radiation emitted by the electron in the experiment of two slits, in case of being detected.
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9 An interesting discussion on the measurement of observables in the BdB theory, for the cases of individual measurements and for cases of statistical measurements, is found in [15].
VII. APPENDIX

A. Computation of equation (25)

\[ \dot{r} = \frac{i}{\hbar} [H, r] = \frac{i}{\hbar} [H_c + H_{rad}, r] = \frac{i}{\hbar} [H_c, r] - \frac{i}{\hbar} [H_{rad}, r] \]

(82)

then

\[ \langle p_b | \dot{r} | p_a \rangle = m \langle p_b | \dot{r} | p_a \rangle = \frac{i}{\hbar} \left( \langle p_b | H_c - rH_{rad} | p_a \rangle \right) \]

(83)

\[ m \langle p_b | H_c | p_a \rangle \frac{i}{\hbar} = m \langle p_b | H_{rad} | p_a \rangle \frac{i}{\hbar} = \frac{i}{\hbar} \left( \langle p_b | E_b - E_a | p_a \rangle - \langle p_b | r | p_a \rangle E_a \right) \]

\[ = \frac{i}{\hbar} \omega_{ba} \langle p_b | r | p_a \rangle \]

(84)

it means that

\[ \langle p_b | p | p_a \rangle = m \langle p_b | \dot{r} | p_a \rangle = \frac{i}{\hbar} \omega_{ba} \langle p_b | r | p_a \rangle \]

(85)

Now in the same way we can compute \( \langle p_b | \dot{r} | p_a \rangle \) and obtain:

\[ \langle p_b | \dot{r} | p_a \rangle = i \omega_{ba} \langle p_b | r | p_a \rangle \]

(86)

and using (85) we have

\[ \langle p_b | \dot{r} | p_a \rangle = -\omega^2_{ba} \langle p_b | r | p_a \rangle \]

(87)

that together (84) allow us write (25).

B. Showing heuristically the plausibility of (54)

It is possible to "re-obtain" equation Eq. (54) by following the elementary considerations given by Thirring in page 7: an electron which follows an accelerated movement must emit radiation according to classical electrodynamics. But from the quantum theoretical point of view we can only say that there exist a certain probability for the accelerated electron emit a photon.\(^\text{10}\)

\(^{10}\) We consider the single emission of a photon because it is much more likely than multiple emissions, see [16].

If the electron changes its velocity \( v \) in \( \Delta v \) during the time interval \( \Delta t \), the photon emission probability \( w \) is given in essence by the Larmor emission formula by

\[ w \sim \alpha (\Delta v)^2 \]

(88)

where \( \alpha \) is fine structure constant.

The energy emitted by this electron is, on the average, equal to the product of probability by the energy of the emitted photon

\[ \Delta E \sim \alpha (\Delta v)^2 \frac{\hbar}{\Delta t} \]

(89)

where the frequency of the photon is of the order \( \frac{1}{\Delta t} \).

Then, for the emitted power we have

\[ \frac{\Delta E}{\Delta t} \sim \alpha \hbar \left( \frac{\Delta v}{\Delta t} \right)^2 \]

(90)

or, in infinitesimal form:

\[ \frac{dE}{dt} \sim \alpha \hbar \left( \frac{dv}{dt} \right)^2 \]

(91)

which is in essence Eq. (54) or equivalently Eq. (53), except for numerical constants.

C. The local expectation value of acceleration

The definition of the local expectation value (LEV), \( A(x, t) \), associated to an operator \( A \), given in [6] is:

\[ A(x, t) = \Re \left( \frac{\langle \psi | r \rangle \int d^3r' \langle r | \dot{r} | r' \rangle \langle r' | \psi \rangle}{\langle \psi | r \rangle \langle r | \psi \rangle} \right). \]

(92)

For the LEV of the operator acceleration \( \dot{r} \), call it \( a(x, t) \), we have:

\[ a(x, t) = \Re \left( \frac{\langle \psi | r \rangle \int d^3r' \langle r | \ddot{r} | r' \rangle \langle r' | \psi \rangle}{\langle \psi | r \rangle \langle r | \psi \rangle} \right) \]

(93)

and using that \( \langle r | \ddot{r} | r' \rangle = i \delta(r - r') \) (see Eq. 39)

\[ a(x, t) = \frac{\langle \psi | r \rangle \int d^3r' i \delta(r - r') \langle r' | \psi \rangle}{\langle \psi | r \rangle \langle r | \psi \rangle} \]

(94)

\[ a(x, t) = \frac{\langle \psi | r \rangle \dot{r} \langle r | \psi \rangle}{\langle \psi | r \rangle \langle r | \psi \rangle} = \dot{r} \]

(95)

i.e the LEV of \( \dot{r} \) is its eigenvalue \( \dot{r} \). QED