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Viewing two astronomical sources at large enough distance and angular separation can assure, by light-travel-time arguments, the acausality of their emitted photons. Using these photons to set apparatus parameters in a laboratory-based quantum-mechanical experiment could ensure those settings are independent too, allowing a decisive, loophole-free test of Bell’s inequality. Quasars are a natural choice for the task, yet at ultimate extent it involves their simultaneous flux measurement towards opposite directions on the sky, which is untried. Observational limits are formulated leaving independence intact in this case, provided the isotropy of causal quasar-pair flux-differences is preserved overall, but a consequence could be correlation among repeat samples at lesser separations. Analysis of one useful dataset from the Gemini twin telescopes is presented, using over 14 years of archival images, serendipitously sampling thousands of quasars up to 180° apart. These reject a null result of no correlation with 97.7% confidence, and are instead consistent with the expected bias: a mean residual 3σ signal of 0.21 magnitudes peaked at 65° ± 3° separation. Possible confirmatory observations are pointed to along with improved experimental protocol: an Earth-wide test.

I. INTRODUCTION

That quantum mechanics (QM) must be incomplete, allowing “spooky” outcomes requiring either superluminal signals or hidden variables was famously contended by Einstein, Podolsky and and Rosen [1]. Bell showed how correlations in a QM experiment could allow tests against such unsensed influences [2]. Modern experiments routinely find QM is correct, having tightly and simultaneously restricted necessary conditions on measurements (e.g. [3] and references therein) but not excluded a final possibility, by closing the so-called “freedom-of-choice” loophole, eliminating experimenter interaction. One promising route is to set experimental parameters via photons from astronomical sources [4, 5], requiring that interference between two settings had been orchestrated between distant sources and the Earth-based observer. Proof-of-concept QM tests using stars within the Milky Way have already been achieved [6, 7] forcing “collusion” in the outcome back hundreds of years. And a recent observational development was the extension to quasars [8–10]: the combination of high redshift with large angular separation on the sky can place these entirely outside each others’ light cone; for separations of 180° this occurs when both sources have z ≥ 3.65. The independence of settings triggered by those photons is unspoiled by their communication, and absent correlated errors corrupting the signals prior to detection, forces any unexplained coincidence to be the result of unexpected synchronization between sources. Otherwise, the foundations of QM would indeed be in question.

The quasar-based QM experiment performed by Rauch et al. follows the methodology of Clauser [11] where an entangled pair of photons emitted from a central source are split between two optical arms and their polarizations are detected at receivers. While those entangled photons are in flight, a switching mechanism at each receiver (also co-located with a telescope) selects randomly between two polarization measurements at pre-fixed relative angles, chosen to test the maximum potentially observable difference from QM. In these first test runs that switch was set by the colour of the most recently detected quasar photon, using bright pairs viewed separately via two 4-m class telescopes from Observatorio del Roque de los Muchachos on La Palma. One quasar pair was separated by 73° on the sky, having z = 0.27 and 3.91, with another pair 84° apart at z = 0.96 and 3.91. Their fluxes were sufficient to allow large sampling losses: a relative polarization measurement was retained only if both quasar photons arrived within the microseconds while the entangled photons were in flight, during runs lasting 12 and 17 minutes. Detailed analysis showed that neither the colours of the two quasars nor background noise against which they were detected (notably sky brightness) were correlated beyond measurement error, upholding QM against collusion between polarization settings.

Can a QM experiment utilizing antipodal, and truly acausal, quasar pairs be performed? The primary hurdle to one as described above is that such sightlines are effectively impossible from a single location on the Earth. A spaceborne mission with sufficient field of regard might do so, possibly even via direct photon-counting of γ-rays or X-rays. It is notable, however, that despite decades of optical variability studies (e.g. [12]) and extensive reverberation mapping having established the characteristic sizes of AGN disks on the order of light days across [13], no monitoring campaign simultaneously viewing such sources outside each others’ horizon is so far reported in the literature, at any wavelength. The difficulty from the ground is, of course, hindrance by the Earth. Radio telescopes do not gain a benefit in this regard, as dish elevations are well above the local horizon, regardless of Sun position. From the nightside, optical/near-infrared observatories are further restricted in workable separa-
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tions, hemmed below about two airmasses. That incurs at least twice the zenith extinction for each, even under photometric skies, with similarly degraded seeing. Darkness reaches only \( \sim 21 \text{ mag arcsec}^{-2} \) in the visible, which is relevant for two far-separated quasars, both typically fainter. What must be overcome is colour-discrimination of those, viewed independently and simultaneously from opposite hemispheres. This is undemonstrated, which although not obviating previous QM experiments, does set a bar to an irrefutable ground-based one.

Observational aspects of fair switching can be investigated without an actual QM experiment taking place, so free from practical issues of communication between sites and its internal apparatus. That is previously unexplored at quasar-separation angles greater than 90°, justifying the effort, as those photon fluxes would signal the switch settings in practice, and when their relative photometry is ill constrained these choices may be subject to a hidden connection. Tolerances on that correlation while still closing all loopholes are up to one in four external-source switching photons before being spoiled, although possibly as little as 14% \cite{14}. These are readily testable photometric limits, and a method of sensing average flux differences will be described here, for conditions where point-source photometry has sufficient sampling and sensitivity to reach the zeropoints of two identical instruments, within just a few percent error.

And at least one useful dataset to probe is already available at Gemini: on Maunakea in Hawaii (19.82°N, 155.47°W, 4213 m) and on Cerro Pachon in Chile (30.24°S, 70.74°W, 2722 m), that when each viewing a target near zenith, places those 95.5° apart on the sky. These 8-m class telescopes have operated near-identical optical imagers continuously for more than 15 years, and a public archive eases aggregation of many serendipitous observations. Although such data do not, in themselves, constitute a QM experiment, they may provide a baseline in devising a future one: at over 10600 km apart, no collision is possible on timescales less than this distance divided by the speed of light or \( l/c \approx 0.04 \) seconds, which in the restframe at \( z = 4 \) corresponds to 0.2 seconds.

The next section describes how the observational geometry of an experiment allowing simultaneous photometry of widely-separated quasar pairs restricts their best relative signal-to-noise ratio, and so possibly hides an underlying synchronization. This follows from recognizing in that situation a symmetry, in reflection about the mean flux difference, while satisfying both acausality (minimally, just for each antipodal pair with sufficient redshift) and cosmic isotropy (globally, among all sources). These dual requirements lead to a potential form of correlated fluxes with angular separation: suppressed below detection at large angles, and so still retaining the possibility of a true loophole-free test, if counterbalanced by residual peaks, especially a prominent one at 64.6°. In an attempt to rule this situation out a “virtual test” is suggested with sources chosen in a randomized way to avoid bias and sky conditions sampled sufficiently to remove their influence. Following that, the available Gemini dataset is described, which consists of \( g, r, i, z \) photometry for thousands of quasars with redshifts \( 0.1 < z < 6 \), sensitive down to 23 mag. The final sample comprises roughly 2 million observational pairs, which in their aggregate (0.25-magnitude 1-σ uncertainty within 6-degree-wide sampling bins) is sufficient to show a difference in brightness relative to object separation as expected, reaching a peak signal consistent with the model and against a null hypothesis of flat. Although this suggests a previously unseen connection between those quasar fluxes, it is not in conflict with either causality or previous QM results. Follow-up targets of interest are provided. Discussion concludes on the prospects of an Earth-wide test in the era of 30-m telescopes, and reaching sources with the necessary photometric accuracy to exclude both any intrinsic correlation and local noise sources in closing the last observational loophole.

II. QUANTIFYING QUASAR INDEPENDENCE

The intent is to quantify a lack of randomness in external source fluxes relative to local noise at the receiver telescopes, not details internal to the apparatus, and so a basic description of a QM experiment is sufficient to illustrate how this can be connected to angle-setting independence. Generically, quantum theory demands that entangled photon pairs must be found in opposite polarization states; if one is found with horizontal polarization, the state of its entangled twin will always be found vertical. (In the original theoretic treatment, these were the spin states of entangled electrons: up or down.) Importantly, any real experiment cannot measure both states in one direction simultaneously, as this requires a setting change. For example, polarimetry necessitates a discriminator, such as a polarizer or the rotation of a waveplate. A choice must be made as to which polarization angle (or arm) to sample. Detecting the state of one entangled photon instantly collapses the wavefunction of both subject to shared uncertainty, with a probability density \( q \) which depends on the angle \( \theta \) between waveplate settings. Those states must be anti-correlated when co-incident (there are exactly two possibilities) and preservation of equal average probabilities of both states implies no net correlation, and so a functional form for normalized correlation of \( -\cos \theta \). But when the experimenter’s ability to freely choose settings avoids making them implicit in the outcome, this takes on the form \cite{22}:

\[
p(\theta) = |\cos 2\theta - \cos \theta| + \cos \theta,
\]

which exceeds unity at all lesser angles. Detecting unequal or “excess” correlation, above equality and beyond what truly random sampling predicts, would reveal a fundamental fault in QM.
FIG. 1: Probability of correlated switching photons by source separation, with $D$ passing a detection threshold during the imagined full-sky QM experiment described in the text (thin black curve: $R = 0$, thick black curve: $R = 0.637$) and, for comparison, an ensemble of 10000 randomly-selected Gaussian residuals (grey points) all preserving less than 50% correlation (dashed line) on average, when antipodal (thick grey curve); thresholds of 75% (dot-dashed) and 25% (dotted).

A. Potential Correlations Across the Sky

In an experiment with fair switching there is no synchronization between external sources and no influence on results. Their fluxes are random, with zero median flux difference: any red or blue photon (within some suitably defined passbands) from one source corresponds just as likely as not with receiving the opposite from the other. This is connected to the probability of a measurable difference in the results, as given by the trace distance

$$P = \frac{1}{2} \left[ 1 + \frac{D(p, q)}{2} \right],$$

as that should then be 50:50, which occurs for $D = 0$. But synchronization is possible for causally-connected sources, influencing the outcome. When external flux-differences are zero for only 1 or less of every 4 photons (so nonzero for every 3 or more) this happens most of the time. And beyond that a correlation $M$ is reached at which point an effect on the difference cannot be hidden, before being necessarily spoiled by full mimicry of QM, at 100%. In that extreme case there exists two perfectly synchronized sources, and Alice and Bob at the two receiver telescopes could each select one of those. (Excluding two telescopes pointed to the same source.) For antipodal sources up until both have $z \geq 3.65$ they need not have any knowledge of the other’s settings at all, i.e. $\theta$, only equatorial position angles $\rho$ and $\delta$ of a pair member. Alice points to the source predicting all future photons to arrive at Bob’s telescope, which in the absence of measurement error will always set his polarizer angle to correspond to her results, and vice versa.

Perhaps nature does provide such special sources, correlated in just the way needed to mimic QM. But cosmic isotropy can be appealed to as a restriction, as no preferred direction on the sky should be found. If so, one could contrive a metric exploiting separations more likely than not to provide its correlated pair. Isotropy requires

$$P = \frac{1}{2} \left[ \frac{D(\phi)}{2} \right],$$

for convenience tallying each $\delta$ in polar coordinates about the azimuthal angle $\rho$, where $\phi$ is the projected great-circle angular distance between any two sources, integrated over the surface of a sphere. Imagine it has form

$$D(\phi) = 3(\sqrt{M^2 + p^2 - q^2} - R),$$

that is, $p = p(\phi)$ and similar for $q$, regardless of $\theta$, at constant $M$ and $R$. In this discussion only the likelihood of matching results (either correlated or anticorrelated) is important, not the sense, for the reason that when both telescopes receive synchronized photons those simultaneously set the polarizer angles to pre-defined settings, so more often than not, the experimenters’ results must correspond too. And here $M^2$ has to be greater than 0.5625 ($M = 3/4$) for $D$ to remain real; adopting $M^2 = 3/4$, this is restricted to $1 - M \approx 0.134$ or just over 86% (rather than perfect correlation). Now consider a simple geometric average of the lower and upper possible limits (with a distinction from the median to be determined) for $R = 0$; shown in Figure 1 as a thin black curve. A measurement threshold that 1 in 4 photons conspire sets the allowed range for any detectable instance:

$$D_0 = (|D| - \overline{|D|})/2.$$  

Relative to this, it cannot be less than $-2\overline{|D|}$ (25%) nor above an upper limit $|D| + \overline{|D|}$, defining an envelope of allowed correlations. Therefore, if equation 4 is correct, results might be corrupted for 25% of the trials, but correlations are then limited for any two sources and one can look for repeated occurrences of correlated fluxes across the sky in the form of $P$ against the sample average

$$\overline{P}(\phi) = \frac{1}{2} + \frac{D_0}{2},$$

where $D(\phi) < \overline{|D|}$, counterbalanced above the mean by

$$\overline{P}(\phi) = \frac{1}{2} + 2D_0 - \frac{3}{4}\overline{|D|},$$

for $D(\phi) \geq \overline{|D|}$, with a global maximum at $\phi = 64.6^\circ$ (and notably different from that of $p$, at $60^\circ$). Put a simpler way: the effect of $R$ is to raise two distinctive “bumps” in $\overline{P}(\phi)$. Illustrating how averaging over all conceivably detectable correlations does not alter this form, Figure 1 shows the results of 10000 realizations of randomly selecting from a Gaussian distribution of unity width centered on $R = 0.5$; the average of those is indicated by a thick grey curve. Finally, it is noted that this differs from the median by the small increment $|D_0|/4 \approx 0.019$, which has here been subtracted.
Three key features of this potential source correlation appear relevant to an Earth-wide experiment: First, finding flux correlations seemingly sufficient to trigger a QM-mimicking result (just over 25% more likely than neutral) for sources separated by angles near its peak at 65° would not be in conflict with previous experiments, which utilized quasars closer to 82° separation, where expected influence passes below the limit of corruption (less than 14% biased). Second, despite preserving isotropy over the sky it is distinctly bimodal and asymmetric about 90° in separation, not merely sinusoidal, crossing the median at over 99° and mean at 103°. This distinct form is required to preserve an average of neutral correlation of an ensemble across the whole sky: net correlation (after subtraction of the mean) is counterbalanced at larger angles. Past a distinctive “kink” at 120° they can undergo a further inflection, for angles between 140° and 160°, and so remain correlated up to angles impossible to reach from any single site. And third: in this form, median correlation is indeed suppressed below 50% at 180°, which serves to confirm the applicability of an Earth-wide test using antipodal sources, where those can be (minimally) acausal - as required for a true loophole-free test.

B. Angular Dependence of Noise

In a true loophole-free QM test the switching photons effectively operate the apparatus, automating setting changes photon-by-photon between settings by predefined selection criteria. Any criterion can only ever be a relative flux measurement over some suitably defined passband and time period. So an issue would arise if the colour of sensed switching photons at the telescope were dominated by local noise. Either the sources or switching mechanisms could retain hidden correlation. Admittedly, unless strong, that may not predict the colour of the next photon to arrive, so not exploitable to mimic QM behaviour. But even if weak, experimental results are immediately connected through the form of $P$ to the allowable relative noise between telescopes. That correlation will be unavoidable from the ground, as seeing, sky background and extinction are well known to depend on airmass, and will inject some cosine dependence on errors with viewing angle $\phi$, which to be successful must be excluded against that of the source fluxes.

Consider identical instruments at two sites with a geographic separation of 90 degrees, that is, two sources viewed simultaneously at zenith are at right angles. (This is essentially the case for Gemini North and South: 95.5 degrees apart.) Under clear skies, atmospheric extinction increases linearly with airmass, inversely with zenith distance ($1/Z$), so to a target under an airmass of 2, the difference between it and another $\phi$ degrees away, is at its extreme

$$E(\phi) = \left| 2 - \frac{\sqrt{2}}{\cos(\phi/2)} \right|,$$

FIG. 2: Model differences in seeing (blue), sky brightness (red), and extinction (yellow) between two positions on the sky up to 180° apart, viewed from two different sites, here plotted for Gemini. Instantaneous lower limits (thin black curves) and upper limits (dot-dashed) are indicated, giving those means of coincident observations and long-term medians (dashed lines) for combining views from each single site. Below is the long-term expected difference in flux of two quasars selected at random from a brightness distribution of width 1.0 mag, if their fluxes were correlated as per probability $P$, and reaching a mean of $S/N = 3$ (thick grey curve) against their averaged instrumental errors (green).

where $\alpha$ is half the median extinction in magnitudes. A similar relationship can be found in sky brightness,

$$B = \beta E,$$

and image quality

$$C = \gamma E \gamma,$$

where $\beta$ is in units of mag arcsec$^{-2}$, and $\gamma$ is in arcseconds. The functional form of $E$ has a zenith distance more like a standard expression [13], which is
The width of the quasar-brightness distribution in the optical is roughly $\omega = 1.0$ magnitude, and photometric accuracy limited by zeropoint knowledge to typically 2%, thus $S/N \leq 150$. Relative measurements of a given angle should still be dominated by their shared photometric uncertainty until sufficient samples beat that down below twice the zeropoint error, which for 0.25 mag occurs at $n = 10$. For reference, 10 Gemini FoVs (5 arcmin across) spans roughly one degree. Averaged over the sky, a detection minimum, at $S/N = 3$, is shown in Figure 2. The form of this curve suggests a further constraint: the peak at 64.6° is distinctly distinct from 60° and the inflection at $\phi = 120^\circ$ is 23.4 degrees across (minima to minima), not critically spanned by less than three samples; two per side would be optimal bins about 6 degrees wide.

A proportional relationship between sampling and detectable signal is made more clear by extending this result to a long-term average. For many samples the instrumental errors average out over the sky, that is, $E_z = E = 1$, which implies that (sampled over all angles) it slowly grows over $S/N = 3$ again by $n = 4000$ (reaching $S/N = 3.33$ at $n = 10000$) with photometric uncertainty fixed at 0.25 mag. This suggests that to achieve similar constraints either a single pair with minimum observational noise or a larger, noisier (but binned) sample across the full sky may present comparable ways to detect the influence of $P$. It is the latter method which is adopted here: obtaining good relative photometry of an unbiased quasar sample over many years, and looking for a relative dependence with angular separation.

### III. Sample

Archival Gemini Multi-Object Spectrograph (GMOS) images were searched for all instances of a known quasar falling into the field, starting from the beginning of regular GMOS operations to the beginning of 2016, spanning 14.5 years. A difficulty with a direct search is that the file header information will include a target name selected by the observer, which may not necessarily correspond to any catalog. Also, this would exclude cases where an object happened to fall on the detector during the observation of another, defined target. So instead the Million Quasars Catalog (MILLIQUAS), Version 4.8 of 22 June 2016 was cross-correlated with the full Canadian Astronomy Data Center (CADC) archive of science frames obtained with GMOS North and South. The MILLIQUAS is a compendium of published catalogs, primarily the Sloan Digital Sky Survey (SDSS) providing a redshift plus optical magnitudes (Blue: B, V or g; and Red: r or i) for each object. No restriction on type was made, including gravitational lenses, but the likelihood of misidentifications is considered small.

The GMOS field of view (FoV) is approximately $5 \times 5$ arcmin$^2$, with 0.075 arcsec pixels. Using the Common Archive Observation Model (CAOM) Table Access Protocol (TAP) web service and custom Python
scripts, a search inside a 5 arcmin radius for each object was conducted, which produced 28374 cases where an $0.1 < z < 6$ object was within a GMOS g, r, i, or z field, through the full range of right ascension, and between $-79^\circ$ and $+82^\circ$ declination; deleting those corrupted or otherwise unusable yielding 20514 objects (g: 4691, r: 6709, i: 6776, z: 2338), and a typical exposure time of 150 seconds. Gemini grades each science frame by clear-sky-fraction bins from CC20 (best 20%-ile) to CCAny (all conditions). This represents 11483 unique (although potentially repeated) objects having a mean redshift of 1.48, no noticeable dependence on sky position, and obtained under all conditions under which the telescopes were operational.

Finally, a selection was made to ensure good data quality in each observation. Every object frame was searched for a comparison star from the Fourth U.S. Naval Observatory CCD Astrograph Survey (UCAC4) to serve as a photometric calibration, with published SDSS r magnitude. There were 16774 frames that had such a suitable, unsaturated star. This also provided each an image quality criterion; image Point-Spread Function (PSF) Full-Width-at-Half Maximum (FWHM) was extracted for each star. The FWHM of the object (also confirmed to be unsaturated) was checked against this; in just a few cases where it occurred, the smaller of the two was taken. A lower FWHM limit of 0.20 arcsec was applied to ensure that only real images were obtained, without artifacts, and so it reflects seeing conditions. After this, only 9317 objects remained after culling to cloud-cover conditions better than CC80, or usable, with less than 2 magnitudes of extinction.

IV. PHOTOMETRY

Synthetic aperture photometry was carried out on the full sample, both objects and comparison stars, using a 4 arcsec diameter aperture throughout. Roughly 20 arcsec$^2$ postage stamps sections were downloaded from the database. The positional accuracy of the frames was found by inspection to not always be better than 2 arcseconds. During the FWHM measuring step, a centroiding algorithm located the central pixel position and then sub-pixel shifted the aperture prior to obtaining the flux. Median sky backgrounds for each frame were subtracted after applying the appropriate detector gains and filter zeropoints, as published on the Gemini webpages. The detectors, and their configurations at the focal plane changed at certain times, either 4 or 6 chips across the FoV with separate amplifiers and gaps between them, and each detector has a slightly different amplifier response. On average these are 28.11, 28.31, 28.16 and 27.17 mag in g, r, i and z, which fluctuated over that time with deviations of 0.12, 0.02, 0.12 and 0.22 mag respectively.

All resultant photometry was corrected for atmospheric extinction using the calibration stars, where each of those was relative to its UCAC4 r magnitude and a mean filter correction; results are shown in Figure 3. This was calculated using the 237 observations with complete photometry in MILLIQUAS catalogued B, V, r and i magnitudes, which allows the calculation of a mean sample colour shift to B, V, r, and i of 0.84, 0.49, 0.34, and 0.19 mag: g was interpolated as 0.66 mag and z extrapolated to 0.18 mag. Of these, 124 were cases of objects included in the UCAC4 catalog, all brighter than 17.5 mag. Correcting stellar colours so that the average sky background difference across the full sample is zero in r yields corrections of 0.50, 0.00, -0.27, and -0.22 mag in g, r, i, and z filters respectively; although less of a concern in r and i data, the mean values of the resultant sample in all four filters are very close to neutral. The objects were also shifted by the same mean filter correction to r and uniformly taken as a differential from their catalog.

FIG. 3: Differences between observed and catalog magnitudes for objects (black) and comparisons (yellow) in the four filters studied. The relative colours of those against MILLIQUAS Blue (light blue) and UCAC4 i (red) are also shown; comparison colours (dashed green) are neutral, as are the objects (dashed black). Those last have been limited to magnitude cutoffs (vertical dotted lines), serving to avoid a sample colour bias; if perfectly Gaussian each would be zero.
FIG. 4: Histograms of sky background (red curve), object (black), and comparison star (yellow) magnitudes, normalized to peak occurrences. Observed magnitudes are comparable to catalog MILLIQUAS Blue (blue curve) and Red (thin black) values as are comparisons and catalog UCAC4 r (thin yellow).

magnitudes. In this way, all photometry is relative to the sample average of $r = 20.0$ mag; photometry is sky-background-limited, with some down to the expected $5\sigma$ point-source limit of 23 mag: see Figure 4. A lower object cutoff at 21.5 mag excludes those fainter than the mean sky surface brightness, avoiding a colour bias.

The weak influence from sky brightness is illustrated in Figure 5. Only mild angle and sky-brightness restrictions were employed, with a uniform upper cutoff of 17.5 mag arcsec$^{-2}$. To meet this, objects must have been at least 30 degrees from the Sun or Moon, during phases less than 80% full (see Figure 4). This agrees well with expectations from the linear model, seen in Figure 6. Linear least-squares fits to extinction (comparison magnitudes), sky brightness and seeing (image quality) are shown in green (medians: dashed), giving $\alpha = 0.25$ mag, $\beta = 0.40$ mag arcsec$^{-2}$, and $\gamma = 0.38$ arcsec.

V. ANALYSIS AND RESULTS

Correlated observations were based on the sky position and UTC time recorded in each frame header. An Interactive Data Language (IDL) code was written to perform this step, with the following prescription. For each observation, all earlier ones were searched to find exposure duration overlapped by some fraction with the current one. A positive fraction means that there is some overlap. Perfect overlap, or perfect coincidence, would be a fraction of unity, and all less - down to zero - indicates that for equal fluxes this fraction of photons in the exposure would overlap with those taken in the other: over 50% is considered “coincident.” A negative fraction means that there is no overlap in the exposure durations, however, it is still useful in characterizing the temporal aspects of the sample. Observations were considered “correlated” if they fell within a given temporal window. For example, an initial check was to find if another observation occurred during the same observational “day” at the combined Gemini telescopes, which varies during the year, but is about 11 hours plus the timezone difference, or 17 hours. The largest possible window was to look back 14.5 years, to the beginning of records.

Some fully coincident observations did occur, that is, object pairs with fractional overlap of unity (310 times). One such case with multiple repeated observations is shown in Figure 7 for quasars SDSS J141624.14+134656.6 and SDSS J141632.99+135001.5, observed with GMOS-North 26 times together over the course of a month (the MJD observation times are indicated), when those two happened to fall inside the same frame. In most cases, the comparison star was the same (UCAC4 520-056039) and so there is no difference in measured sky background (red circle), extinction (yellow) ...
FIG. 6: All object magnitudes obtained (filled black circles) by airmass, with the UCAC4 r-band magnitudes for comparison stars in each field (yellow) and their background sky brightnesses (red); sample limits have been applied (horizontal dotted lines). Above: image quality estimates for each frame (blue); data are spurious below a cutoff at 0.20 arcsec (horizontal dotted line). Medians and linear-least-square fits are shown for comparison (green).

FIG. 7: Differences in object, seeing, sky background and extinction for two particular quasars falling inside the same frame, spanning one month. These coincident observations demonstrate the good data quality and photometric accuracy obtained for the sample.

FIG. 8: Differences in seeing, sky background and extinction occurring over a single day; a nightly window starting at twilight at Cerro Pachon and lasting approximately 17 hours. Data are averaged in 1-degree-wide bins, with 1-σ error bars. low) or seeing (blue dots). Those differ, however, in the few cases where a different calibration star was found (automatically) for the other. Spanning these observations, the uniformity of the photometry is remarkably stable. It is evident that photometry of quasars near the mean sample brightness (catalog magnitudes of 19.7 mag and 19.8 mag) was carried out over multiple observations over month-long timescales accurate to 0.10 mag, which is considered the limit of significant measurable differences for the rest of the sample.

Several repeat, correlated observations having brightness differences larger than the significance limit are provided in Table 1, ordered by the span of observations. Only those with at least 10 occurrences are retained; uncertainties reported are standard deviations. These are especially correlated; the most in the study. They were observed from both North and South, and through the full range of catalog brightness. There are notably cases of bright (up to 17.5 mag) quasars, although none is reported in the literature as a known variable. For example, 3C 186.0 (z = 1.07) is a well-studied radio-loud source with a prominent jet [16]: observed 11 times beyond the significance limit, on average 0.40 mag less than its catalog Red magnitude (and even brighter than its SDSS r magnitude of 17.88). The largest discrepancies from the catalog are over a magnitude, occurring in fainter objects, as expected. Monitoring of targets might reveal intrinsic, intra-day brightness fluctuations. There was, however,
across the sample (green curve). Ideally, the test sample distribution, it is fair, with no average redshift difference two sites necessarily results in density variation of this separation. Although the visibility of objects from the ground, and extinction values - for those cases that had expectations of intra-day variation in seeing, sky back-

are some outliers, for instance, occasions of particularly North or South; not both), are shown in Figure 8. There so, those observations with one object in the FoV (either

no case of significant object difference between the two telescopes obtained during a single-day window. Even so, those observations with one object in the FoV (either North or South; not both), are shown in Figure 8. There are some outliers, for instance, occasions of particularly good seeing at low elevation. But it can be seen how expectations of intra-day variation in seeing, sky background, and extinction values - for those cases that had a comparison star suffering less than 2 magnitudes of ex-

Full cross correlation of the entire catalog indicates no evident bias in sample selection. Figure 8 shows the ratio of redshifts of any two objects as a function of angular separation. Although the visibility of objects from the two sites necessarily results in density variation of this distribution, it is fair, with no average redshift difference across the sample (green curve). Ideally, the test sample would include only $z \geq 3.65$ objects $180^\circ$ apart, but with just 274 such observations taken instead across the full sky, there was not a sufficient sample to provide a meaningful comparison of just those. No observation of truly acausal pairs was obtained.

The most interesting result for the full cross-correlated sample is that there is significant object correlation at all, even if that does not directly impact a true loophole-free test. Results are shown in Figure 8. Only cases where objects were within 2 magnitudes of each other and hav-

mag were retained. These are displayed as the relative differences in the objects, averaged in 1-degree-wide bins (grey) and 6-degree-wide bins (black). The error bars are their 1-$\sigma$ standard deviations. The results of just the coincident pairs are shown in light blue, that is, those cases where two objects fell inside the FoV. Above are the differences of comparison stars; for reference, differences in seeing (blue) sky brightness (red), and the catalog magnitudes (green) are overplotted. These are all relatively flat (the standard deviation in comparison magnitude differences is 0.024 mag), which makes the comparison to equation 13 (thick black curve) remarkable, in agreement at all angles and strongly against flatness (dashed), for the deviation expected, at $S/N = 3$. It should be emphasized that this is not a fit, and all parameters were specified in Section I by the sample conditions. But analysis of the cumulative distribution functions do confirm a good match: the Anderson-Darling (AD) test statistic is under 0.004, and it rejects the null-hypothesis of flat-

TABLE 1: Multiple Significant Object Differences Ordered by Span of Samples
FIG. 9: Ratios of redshifts between objects ordered by separation angle, for all cross-correlated observations (grey points) and those above significance level (black). Averages are in six-degree-wide bins (green) close to an expected perfect median of unity.

FIG. 10: Object (top) and comparison-star differences (bottom) per angular degree (light grey) and, for objects, averaged in 6-degree-wide bins (dark grey) within 68%-confidence error bars, relative to the overall mean. Light-blue filled circles indicate the coincident cases only. Bottom panel: binned results for comparison stars (yellow); the standard deviation of cross-correlated differences is 0.024 magnitudes. Compared to the significance limit (dotted) the differences in catalog magnitudes are flatter (green), as are sky brightness (red) and image quality (blue). Top panel: signal is consistent with correlation as predicted by equation 13 (thick black curve); open black circles show averages over two optimal angular bins, falling within twice the zeropoint error of that curve (thin black curves) and thus reaching the sensitivity limits of the photometry; for comparison, the average of 10000 fair model trials (thin grey curve) and $5 \times$ the threshold-limits for residual correlation (dot-dashed) are also shown.

FIG. 11: Top panel: normalized occurrences of differences between objects (black) and comparisons (yellow). Bottom panel: the same for significant differences only, as a function of delay time between correlated occurrences in days. The green line is the result when the order of data is randomized. Perhaps less so, but still consistent with the data. The distribution of these differences is displayed as well in Figure 11. In the top panel a vertical dotted line shows the limit of 0.10 magnitudes; a thin black curve is a Gaussian of width 0.25 magnitudes, consistent with purely photometric error; a dashed line is the expected difference for a uniform sample of width 1.25 magnitudes. This is intuitively the limit one would expect, if the sample was randomly drawn from the same distribution, 1.00 magnitudes wide. Note the four or five instances near differences of about 0.50 magnitudes that are above this line, so occurring slightly more often than one would expect from a randomly drawn sample.

With reversed seasons between North and South hemispheres, one would expect some seasonal dependence on when objects were observed, and so although they may
be selected on the chance they appear in either telescope FoV this selection will not be uniform over the year. The bottom panel averages in 6-month-long bins those cases which were beyond the significance limit from the sample (black). The thin black curve shows the result if half the sample were selected, decaying geometrically back towards the beginning of the window. The yellow circles are the comparisons for the full sample, the green line is the same except sample times have been randomized across the entire 14.5 years. Note that this resampling has no effect on the results displayed in Figure \[10\] those are absolute values, so the order in which the differences were taken is not relevant, and those have already been cross correlated for the full sample. It is interesting that there appear to be some periods when it was more probable than random that there would be significant differences between two objects. The long timescales of those suggests that conducting an experiment avoiding such a bias may require repeat samples spanning years.

**VI. SUMMARY AND FUTURE DIRECTIONS**

A clean QM experiment employing antipodal quasars requires that the measured fluxes of objects at both far-separated telescopes are above the local noise, and found uncorrelated. If not, this could hide synchronization; a potential case has been described, generated by averaging over all experimental geometries allowed by an Earth-wide test. Fair, random sampling across the sky might sense this signal, if not photon-by-photon, at least on the timescale of minutes. By mining the full GMOS-North and GMOS-South archive, approximately 30,000 broadband g, r, i and z quasar images were found, with many repeated; the vast majority of which are merely serendipitous: targeting an unrelated object in the field. Photometry of each frame, which includes a stellar calibration for uniform data-quality selection, allows a careful analysis of the impact of source colour, variable sky conditions and airmass (sky background, extinction, and image quality) without explicit target or observer bias. Almost 10000 sufficiently deep observations for Gemini GMOS North and South, complete with a nearby unsaturated UCAC4 star, allowed photometry with a global zeropoint uncertainty of about 2% over a sample spanning 14.5 years. A “virtual test” was performed on those data, comprising roughly 2 million observational pairs, which in their aggregate have 0.25-magnitude 1-σ uncertainty within 6-degree-wide bins. This is sufficient to show a lack of flatness in relative object flux-differences with angular separation as predicted. A residual connection between sources is admittedly a surprising result, but not ruled out: the mean separation and redshift of those sources are less than could cause a conflict with causality, nor does it obviate previous QM tests. And others have recently considered the possibility of finding primordial correlations at even far-earlier epochs, for example, in the Cosmic Background Radiation [17].

Although the Gemini sample covers the full sky and range of possible angular separations between objects, there were not sufficient \( z \geq 3.65 \) sources to provide a meaningful comparison restricted to those. A potentially confusing factor may be shifting bandpasses with redshift, and correcting to a common colour; a better technique may be spectroscopic, focussed on bright emission lines. There was also limited information on how those individual sources (or the calibration stars) may have varied during this time. A subset of the data with significant differences is one output of this work, and provides a baseline from which to compare. Repeat observations of these at higher photometric precision would seem to provide a check on either real, intrinsic correlation between those source fluxes or false, spurious correlation due to unidentified source-selection or instrumental effects. Those were controlled here by the telescopes and instruments being essentially identical, and blind selection from a prior independent catalog, but a wealth of archival sources of photometry from other telescopes could be added together to improve on this result too; multiple cross-calibration may actually serve to reduce zeropoint errors. Future facilities combined with long-term monitoring, such the Large Synoptic Survey Telescope, will make false correlation via these potential error modes much easier to rule out.

The current dataset provides only a small number of truly coincident observations (yielding just those cases where two quasars were in the same GMOS FoV) yet that is the goal of this endeavour. Note that fair, unbiased switching in an Earth-wide QM experiment would depend on simultaneous control of local noise sources, however the discriminators are set. No such apparatus was implemented here, nor is a new experimental protocol suggested apart from this key improvement: employing widely-separated optical observatories can avoid the apparent bias seen in the data, which is impossible for the constricted angular separations available to any single site. An attractive aspect of Gemini is that these are at two premier sites over 10600 km apart, with a combined view stretching a full 180° across the sky. Ultimately, the coming era of 30-metre telescopes in both hemispheres is anticipated, with a \( d^2 \) aperture-diameter advantage of about \( (30/8)^2 = 14 \), plus a smaller PSF (and sky-background error) with adaptive optics increasing that to \( d^4 \sim 200 \), bringing exposure times for \( z \approx 4 \) quasars down to a second, not minutes. Thus, low-noise, truly-synchronous photometry could sample timescales (in the quasar restframe) shorter than the round-trip light travel time between telescopes, and so unambiguously exclude any collusion between measurements due to local noise. As neither the emission processes at either external source nor switching-decision at either telescope could have influenced the other, the results would have to be pre-determined before the photons left the quasars. In short, the experimental outcome would imply a “cosmic conspiracy” dating back nearly 90% of the look-back time for the visible Universe.
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