Proposal for a loophole-free test of macroscopic realism
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We propose a rigorous, alternative, test of macrorealism that exploits the contextuality of two-time correlation functions to escape the so-called “clumsiness loophole” that plagues any Leggett-Garg inequality. The non-contextuality of two-time correlation functions is proven to be an unequivocal criterion to guarantee that measurements are being carried out in the ideally-weak measurement regime. In this regime, time-correlation functions are shown to distinctively unravel either the expectation value of two-time Heisenberg operators for non-macrorealistic systems or the product of expectation values of two independent events for macrorealistic systems. Then, by comparing the outcome of two different experimental setups, viz., one in which ideally-weak measurements are performed subsequently and another one in which measurements are performed independently, it is possible to unambiguously distinguish between macrorealistic and non-macrorealistic systems.

PACS numbers: Valid PACS appear here

Ever since the birth of quantum theory more than a century ago theoretical works have deepened our understanding of its conceptual and mathematical structure. Any list of highlights in this respect should definitely include Bell’s [1] and Leggett-Garg [2] inequalities to disprove local [3,4] and macroscopic realism [5,6] respectively. In contrast to the violation of local realism which has been proven for several systems [7,9], an inarguable violation of macroscopic realism has remain elusive to date [10,11]. The reason is that whilst special relativity can be used to close the “communication loophole” in a Bell test of local realism [12,15], no such defence exists for a Leggett-Garg test of macrorealism.

Macroscopic realism does not assert that it is impossible to affect a physical system by measurement, and therefore, Leggett-Garg tests can only be a proof that the system is either (i) non-macrorealistic or (ii) macrorealistic but subjected to a measurement technique that happens to disturb the system. This problem is known as the “clumsiness loophole” [10], and can always be exploited to refute the implications of a measured Leggett-Garg inequality violation. While a number of works have addressed this problem by making the explanation of Leggett-Garg inequalities violations in terms of experimental clumsiness so contrived as to be doubtful [13,16], whether or not a loophole-free Leggett-Garg protocol can be constructed remains an open question [11].

It is the purpose of this Letter to propose a rigorous loophole-free test of macrorealism that is based on proving the existence of an experimental criterion that allows to guarantee that a macrorealistic system is not being disturbed by the measurement process. Our test relies on the notion of contextuality introduced by Bell [1], Kochen and Specker [17], which is known to yield observable effects at the level of time-correlation functions [18,20]. Measuring an observable A at time t and correlating the outcome, yA(t), with the measured value of B, yB(τ), at a later time τ ≥ t, provides, at least in principle, an unequivocal way of representing the dynamics of classical systems in terms of correlation functions, i.e., yA(τ) ↔ system dynamics. In quantum mechanics, however, the unavoidable backaction of the measurement process [21,22] precludes such a clear-cut connection. Even using the best technological means, different measurement schemes, {σ}, lead to different correlation functions, i.e., yA(τ) ↔ system+apparatus dynamics.

We here provide a sufficient condition under which the sequential measurement of A and B yields ⟨yA yB⟩σ = ⟨yA yB⟩ independently of the experimental resolution. This will be proven to be a critical result, as the non-contextuality of two-time correlation functions is a condicio sine qua non to lay down an unambiguous test of macrorealism. More specifically, we will show that witnessing the non-contextuality of time-correlation functions is equivalent to ensure that the measurement of A is being performed in the ideally-weak measurement regime: the regime where two-time correlation functions distinctively unravel the expectation value of two-time Heisenberg operators for non-macrorealistic systems and the product of the expectation values of two independent events for macrorealistic systems. Relying on these findings, we conceive an alternative (to Leggett-Garg) test of macrorealism that is based on equating the outcome of two different experimental setups, viz., one in which A and B are measured subsequently in the ideally-weak regime, and another one in which A and B are measured independently.

We follow a generalized von Neumann measurement process [23,24], where the expectation value of a property A, associated to the operator A = ∑i a_i |a_i⟩⟨a_i|
(with $a_i$ and $|a_i\rangle$ being the corresponding eigen-values and -states), of a quantum system $|\psi(t)\rangle$ is determined by repeatedly reading-out the pointer position of the meter over a large (infinite) ensemble of identically prepared experiments:

$$\langle y_A(t) \rangle = \int_{-\infty}^{\infty} dy_A y_A P(y_A),$$

(1)

where $P(y_A)$ is the probability of finding a value $y_A$ of the pointer position at time $t$. According to Born’s rule, $P(y_A)$ can be expressed in terms of the system degrees of freedom as $P(y_A) = |\psi_A(t)|^2$, where

$$|\psi_A(t)\rangle = \sum_i \Omega_{y_A-a_i} c_i |a_i\rangle$$

(2)

is the state of the system right after measuring $y_A$ at time $t$ [25]. In Eq. (2) we have defined the coefficients $c_i = \langle a_i|\psi(t)\rangle$, and the displaced (by an amount $a_i$) wavepacket of the pointer, $\Omega_{y_A-a_i}$, with $\lambda$ being a macroscopic parameter with units of $[L][A]^{-1}$ that hereafter we assume to be $\lambda = 1$ [26].

In order to ensure that Eq. (1) always yields the correct expectation value $\langle y_A(t) \rangle = \langle \hat{A} \rangle$, it is enough to make the pointer wavepacket to be well normalized and obeying $\int y_A|\Omega_{y_A-a_i}|^2 dy_A = a_i$. In this way, while projective and weak measurements, defined respectively as $\Omega_{y_A-a_i} = \delta(y_A-a_i)$ and $\Omega_{y_A-a_i} \neq \delta(y_A-a_i)$, typically provide very different outcome distributions $P(y_A)$, they still yield the same exact expectation value [24, 27, 28].

A second, subsequent, measurement of a property $B$, associated to the operator $\hat{B} = \sum_i b_i |b_i\rangle \langle b_i| \ (\text{with } b_i \text{ and } |b_i\rangle \text{ being the corresponding eigen-values and -states})$ can be easily accommodated into the above scheme by simply reading-out the pointer position of a second measuring apparatus at time $\tau \geq t$. The two-time autocorrelation function $\langle y_A(t) y_B(\tau) \rangle$ can be then evaluated as:

$$\langle y_A(t) y_B(\tau) \rangle = \int_{-\infty}^{\infty} \int_{-\infty}^{\infty} dy_A dy_B y_A y_B P(y_A, y_B),$$

(3)

where $P(y_A, y_B)$ is the joint probability of reading-out the values $y_A$ and $y_B$ at times $t$ and $\tau$ respectively. Using Born’s rule, this probability can be written as $P(y_A, y_B) = |\psi_{A,B}(\tau)|^2$, where

$$|\psi_{A,B}(\tau)\rangle = \sum_{i,j} \Omega_{y_A-a_i} \Omega_{y_B-b_j} c_i c_j |b_j\rangle$$

(4)

is the state of the system right after the two-time measurement process [29]. In Eq. (4) we have defined $c_{i,j} = \langle b_j|\hat{U}_\tau|a_i\rangle$, and $\hat{U}_\tau = \exp(iH\tau/\hbar)$ describes the unitary evolution of the system between the two measurements.

Without the loss of generality, we can now restrict the meter wavepackets to be well represented by a gaussian Krauss operator [30, 31]:

$$\Omega_{y-a_j} = \mathcal{A} \exp \left[ -\frac{(y-a_j)^2}{4\sigma^2} \right],$$

(5)

where $\mathcal{A}$ is a normalization constant. In this way the dependence of Eq. (5) on the measuring apparatuses can be effectively characterized by the coupling-strength parameters $\sigma = \sigma_{A/B}$ and then Eq. (3) reads [32]:

$$\langle y_A(t) y_B(\tau) \rangle = \frac{1}{2} \sum_{i,j} a_i \mathcal{E}_{j,i} B_{j,i}(\tau) + c.c.,$$

(6)

where $B_{j,i}(\tau) = \langle a_j|\hat{B}(\tau)|a_i\rangle$ are the matrix elements of the Heisenberg operator $\hat{B}(\tau) = \hat{U}_\tau^\dagger \hat{B} \hat{U}_\tau$, and we have defined $\mathcal{E}_{j,i} = c_i^* \exp \left[ -\frac{(a_j-a_i)^2}{4\sigma^2} \right]$. The expectation value in Eq. (6) now bears a subscript $\sigma$ that reinforces the idea that this result depends on the measurement scheme. This is, two-time expectation values are contextual [19].

The result in Eq. (6) can now be generalized to systems made of $N$ interacting particles. For that, we consider a general (non-separable) state $|\psi(t)\rangle = \sum_{i_1,..,i_N} c_{i_1,..,i_N} |a_{i_1,..,i_N}\rangle$, where $c_{i_1,..,i_N} = \langle a_{i_1,..,i_N}|\psi(t)\rangle$. We define also the many-body (center-of-mass) operator $\hat{A} = \sum_{\xi=1}^{N} \hat{I} \otimes \cdots \hat{A}_\xi \otimes \cdots \otimes \hat{I}/N$, where the index $\xi$ only denotes the degree of freedom that the single-particle operator, $\hat{A}_\xi$, acts on. Then, the analogous of Eq. (6) for a many-body system reads [33]:

$$\langle y_A(t) y_B(\tau) \rangle = \frac{1}{2N} \sum_{\xi=1}^{N} \sum_{i_1,..,i_N} \sum_{j_1,..,j_N} a_{\xi i_1,..,i_N} \mathcal{E}_{i_1,..,i_N,j_1,..,j_N} B_{j_1,..,j_N} + c.c.,$$

(7)

where we have defined the matrix elements:

$$B_{i_1,..,i_N} = \langle a_{i_1,..,i_N}|\hat{B}(\tau)|a_{i_1,..,i_N}\rangle,$$

(8a)

$$\mathcal{E}_{i_1,..,i_N,j_1,..,j_N} = c_{i_1,..,i_N}^* \exp \left[ -\frac{\sum_{\nu=1}^{N} (a_{\nu i_\nu} - a_{\nu j_\nu})^2}{4\sigma^2_\sigma N^2} \right] c_{j_1,..,j_N}.\tag{8b}$$

Eq. (7) trivially reduces to Eq. (6) for $N = 1$. For $N \neq 1$, the result in Eq. (7) allows the backaction of the measurement of $A$ to induce entanglement among parties that do not necessarily interact with each other [34, 55].

At this point we want to address the question of whether there exist a specific measurement regime where the result in Eq. (7) becomes non-contextual, viz., $\langle y_A y_B \rangle_{\sigma} \approx \langle y_A y_B \rangle_{\sigma}$, for $\sigma = \sigma_A$. For that, we define the effective dimension of the system, $d_{\text{eff}}$, as a measure of the average width of the relevant spectrum of the system with respect to $A$, i.e: $d_{\text{eff}} := \sum_{\nu=1}^{N} \max(\Delta A_{\nu})/N$, where $\max(\Delta A_{\nu})$ is the maximum distance between the occupied upper and lower bounds of the spectrum of $A_{\nu}$. Then, a simple inspection of the matrix elements in Eq. (8b) shows that for any experimental resolution $\sigma_A$ fulfilling the condition

$$d_{\text{eff}} \ll \sigma_A,$$

(9)

one will always measure [36]:

$$\langle y_A(t) y_B(\tau) \rangle = \langle \psi(t)|\hat{A}(t)\hat{B}(\tau)|\psi(t)\rangle + c.c.$$ (10)
The condition in Eq. (9) defines what we call the ideally-weak measurement regime: viz., the regime where, independently of \( \sigma_A \), one always measure the same expectation value in Eq. (10). Note that this is the case even if the joint probability distribution of measuring \( y_A(t) \) and \( y_B(\tau) \), \( P(y_B, y_A)_{\sigma_A} \), keeps the dependence on \( \sigma_A \).

The above result adds to previous findings \cite{18,20,36,37} by showing that, while quantum backaction is needed for correlation functions to be contextual, viz., \( \langle y_A y_B \rangle_{\sigma} \Rightarrow P(y_B, y_A)_{\sigma} \), the contrary is not true for a general class of experiments, viz., \( P(y_B, y_A)_{\sigma} \Rightarrow \langle y_A y_B \rangle_{\sigma} \). Note also that time-correlation functions, as written in Eq. (10), play a fundamental role in many theoretical approaches, including fluctuation-dissipation theorems \cite{38}, the Kubo formula \cite{39}, optical coherence \cite{40}, or full counting statistics \cite{41}, to name a few. In this respect, the condition in Eq. (9) can also be regarded as a sufficient condition for the correct evaluation of “standard” theoretical correlation functions \cite{42}.

The non-contextuality of two-time correlation functions under the fulfillment of Eq. (9) can be now exploited to put forth a criterion to discern whether or not an experiment is being carried out in the ideally-weak measurement regime. Specifically, by checking that

\[
\frac{d \langle y_A y_B \rangle_{\sigma_A}}{d \sigma_A} \approx 0
\]

is fulfilled for a reasonable number of \( \sigma_A \) (within the experimental error bar), an experimentalist can assert that he/she is making the best one can do to minimize the backaction of the measurement of \( A \).

Making sure that one is operating in the ideally-weak measurement regime, however, does not guarantee that the measurement of \( A \) is non-invasive. This can be appreciated by rewriting the final state of the system in Eq. (11) using a first order Taylor expansion of \( \Omega y_A - a \) and \( \Omega y_B - b \), around \( y_A \) and \( y_B \) in the limit of \( \sigma_A / B \to \infty \): \cite{18}

\[
|\psi_{A,B}\rangle = \Omega_{y_B} \Omega_{y_A} \left(1 - \frac{y_A}{\sigma_A} \right) \hat{B} \left( |\psi(\tau)\rangle - \frac{y_B}{\sigma_B} |\tilde{\psi}(\tau)\rangle \right),
\]

where we have defined \( |\psi(\tau)\rangle = \hat{U}_{\tau} |\psi(\tau)\rangle \) and \( |\tilde{\psi}(\tau)\rangle = \hat{U}_{\tau} |\psi(\tau)\rangle \). Expression (12) tells us that the state of the system right after two ideally-weak measurements can be written as a superposition of two states, and that only the first one, i.e., \( \Omega_{y_B} \Omega_{y_A} \left(1 - \frac{y_A}{\sigma_A} \right) \hat{B} |\psi(\tau)\rangle \), contains information about the system having evolved freely from \( t \) to \( \tau \). Generally, the second term in Eq. (12) is not proportional to \( \hat{B} \hat{U}_{\tau} |\psi(\tau)\rangle \) and hence it represents the non-negligible backaction of the first measurement on the subsequent evolution of the system.

Only when the state of the system \( |\psi(\tau)\rangle \) can be approximated by an eigenstate of the operator \( \hat{A} \), i.e., \( \hat{A} |\psi(\tau)\rangle \approx \langle \hat{A} \rangle |\psi(\tau)\rangle \), the backaction of the first measurement is evaded, and hence the system is said to be macrorealistic as it fulfills macrorealism per-se and noninvasive measurability \cite{2}. In these circumstances Eq. (10) reduces to:

\[
\langle y_A(t) y_B(\tau) \rangle = \langle y_A(t) \rangle \langle y_B(\tau) \rangle,
\]

which is the result for two independent events, i.e., \( P(y_B, y_A) = P(y_A) P(y_B) \).

At this point, we can already propose an experimental test of macrorealism that follows two main steps:

(S1) make sure that the measurement of \( A \) at time \( t \) is carried out in the ideally-weak measurement regime. This can be ensured by checking the criterion defined in Eq. (11).

(S2) perform two different experiments to evaluate first \( \langle y_A(t) y_B(\tau) \rangle \) ensuring that (S1) is satisfied and second to evaluate \( \langle y_A(t) \rangle \langle y_B(\tau) \rangle \). Then compare the results. The system is non-macrorealistic if they differ and macrorealistic otherwise.

Note that the above protocol only assesses macrorealism at a given time \( t \) and with respect to the observable \( A \). In a genuine test of macrorealism the validity of Eq. (13) should be proven for any pair of observables \( A \) and \( B \) and times \( t \) and \( \tau \). That is, one should repeat steps (S1) and (S2) for many different scenarios. Unfortunately, this is a prohibitive experimental task, and hence it is a common practice to associate macrorealism only with a given observable of interest \cite{4,44,46}. Yet, examples of genuine macrorealism, for which Eq. (13) is valid for any pair of observables and times, far from being atypical, can be common for large systems made of weakly-interacting particles. Consider, for instance, a separable system \( |\psi(t)\rangle = |\psi_1(t)\rangle \otimes \ldots \otimes |\psi_N(t)\rangle \) where \( |\psi_i(t)\rangle \) are identical single-particle states. To determine whether the state \( |\psi(t)\rangle \) is an eigenstate of the operator \( \hat{A} \), i.e., \( \hat{A} |\psi(t)\rangle \approx \langle \hat{A} \rangle |\psi(t)\rangle \) with \( \langle \hat{A} \rangle = \sum_{\xi} \langle \psi_\xi(t) | \hat{A} |\psi_\xi(t)\rangle / N \), we check the soundness of the following identity: \( \langle \hat{A}^2 - \langle \hat{A} \rangle^2 \rangle = 0 \). By writing \( \hat{A}^2 = \frac{1}{N^2} \sum_{\xi} \left( \hat{A}_\xi \hat{A}_\xi + \sum_{\nu \neq \xi} \hat{A}_\xi \hat{A}_\nu \right) \), it is easy to realize that the expectation value \( \langle \hat{A}^2(t) | \hat{A}^2 \rangle |\psi(t)\rangle \) reads: \( \langle \hat{A}^2(t) \rangle = \frac{1}{N^2} \sum_{\xi=1}^N \left( \hat{A}_\xi^2(t) + \sum_{\nu \neq \xi} \hat{A}_\xi(t) \hat{A}_\nu(t) \right) \). Therefore, in the limit \( N \to \infty \) we get \( \langle \hat{A}^2 \rangle = \langle \hat{A} \rangle^2 \), so we conclude that \( \hat{A} |\psi(t)\rangle \approx \langle \hat{A} \rangle |\psi(t)\rangle \), even if, individually, \( |\psi_\xi(t)\rangle \) are not eigenstates of \( \hat{A}_\xi \). Also, in this limit one can arguably speak of macroscopic (rather than microscopic) realism \cite{14}.

To illustrate the proposed test of macrorealism in (S1) and (S2), we consider a simple numerical experiment. We will evaluate the auto-correlation function of the center-of-mass position operator, \( \hat{X} = \sum_{\xi} \hat{X}_\xi / N \), for a number \( N \) of uncoupled one-dimensional double-well oscillators (see the top panel of Fig. 1). Hereafter we use atomic units, \( \hbar = m = 1 \), and define the single-particle Hamiltonian of the oscillators to be \( \hat{H} = P^2 / 2 + \omega_0^2 \hat{X}^2 / 2 + \).
Figure 1: Top panel: schematic picture of the double-well oscillator. The potential energy curve is plotted in solid black line. The initial state of the system (area in green) is taken to be the ground state of the system. Two main frequencies are related respectively with the inter-well and intra-well dynamics. The relevant upper and lower bounds of the spectrum of the Fourier transform of the autocorrelation function in Eq. (10) are shown respectively in dashed red and blue lines. In between these two regimes, an infinite number of dynamics can be inferred depending on the value of \( \sigma_X \) (in black solid lines).

To conclude whether a single oscillator is macrorealistic, we first need to ensure that the measurement of \( A \) at time \( t = 0 \) is carried out in the ideally-weak measurement regime (S1), and then compare the expectation values \( \langle y(0)y(\tau) \rangle \) and \( \langle y(0) \rangle \langle y(\tau) \rangle \) (S2). To address (S1) and (S2) in a compact way we use the quantity

\[
\Delta(\sigma_X, N) = \frac{d\langle y_X(0)y_X(\tau) \rangle}{d\sigma_X} - \Delta_{QC}
\]

where \( \Delta_{QC} = \langle y_X(0)y_X(\tau) \rangle - \langle y_X(0) \rangle \langle y_X(\tau) \rangle \). Then, whenever \( \Delta(\sigma_X, N) \) becomes constant, Eq. (11) is fulfilled, and whether the system is macrorealistic or not can be checked by simply assessing \( \Delta(\sigma_X, N) \) in the asymptotic region. That is, the system is macrorealistic if \( \Delta(\sigma_X, N) \) vanishes in the asymptotic region and non-macrorealistic otherwise.

In Fig. 2 we plot the quantity \( \Delta(\sigma_X, N) \) as a function of \( \sigma_X \) and the number \( N \) of oscillators. For a single oscillator, \( \Delta(\sigma_X, 1) \) asymptotically converges to a non-zero value, which indicates that our system is non-macrorealistic. For a large enough number of oscillators, however, the dynamics of \( \hat{X} \) becomes independent of \( \sigma_X \) which is a clear signature of macrorealism as defined in Eq. (13). In general, the \( N \) oscillators become entangled right after the first measurement process and this allows a smooth transition (exponential decay with \( N \)) between the non-macrorealistic and macrorealistic results.

Conclusion. — Due to contextuality, any account of quantum dynamics (in its broadest sense) is ambiguous unless it goes along with a proper discussion of the system-meter interaction. Under the assumption of a generalized Von Neumann measurement scheme, in this Letter we have proven an exception to the above statement by providing a sufficient condition for the non-contextuality of two-time correlation functions. For non-macrorealistic systems the condition in Eq. (9) (or equivalently Eq. (11)) allows to unequivocally write two-time correlation functions in terms of two-time Heisenberg operators (see Eq. (10)). For macrorealistic systems the same condition leads to the result in Eq. (13). Based on these findings we have proposed an alternative test of macrorealism that escapes the “clumsiness loophole” commonly found in any Leggett-Garg inequality.

In Eq. (14), we have established a connection between general time-correlation functions as written in Eq. (7) and time-correlation functions of systems consisting of

cosh^{-2} \alpha \hat{X}, \) where \( \hat{P} \) is the momentum operator, and the natural frequency of the underlying harmonic oscillator is \( \omega_0 = 4.3 \times 10^{-3} \text{a.u.} \) The characteristic width of the barrier between the two wells is set to \( \alpha = 5 \times 10^{-2} \text{a.u.} \) We choose \( t = 0 \) such that the only relevant time in the discussion is \( \tau \). Furthermore, we consider that the oscillators are all initially prepared in the ground state. Then, by taking the non-interacting limit of Eq. (7), we find (for arbitrary initial conditions see [17]):

\[
\langle A(t)B(\tau) \rangle_\sigma = \frac{1}{2N} \sum_{i,j} e^{\frac{\pi}{2} B_{j,i}(a_i + (N-1)(A(t)))} + c.c.
\]

which in the limit of \( N \to \infty \) reduces to Eq. (13) [18].

The dynamics of a single oscillator for different values of \( \sigma_X \) is shown in Fig. 1. For a projective measurement, i.e., \( \sigma_X \to 0 \), the dynamics presents a central resonance peak at \( \omega_0 \) (in dashed red line). This is due to the strong perturbation (quench) induced by the projective measurement at \( t = 0 \), which leads to a subsequent dynamics characterized by a large amplitude (over-the-barrier) oscillation. Contrarily, in the limit \( \sigma_X \to \infty \) the measurement produces a smaller perturbation to the initial state and yields an ensuing dynamics confined within the two wells with a larger characteristic frequency \( \omega = 1.28 \omega_0 \) (in dashed blue line). In between these two regimes, an infinite number of dynamics can be inferred depending on the value of \( \sigma_X \) (in black solid lines).
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dation of non-interacting particles. We have seen


\[ A(\psi(t)) \approx \langle A \rangle |\psi(t)\rangle \]


give a number \( N \) of non-interacting particles. We have seen

for a large enough number of “weakly-interacting” particles, \( A(\psi(t)) \approx \langle A \rangle |\psi(t)\rangle \) for any observable \( A \), which is a clear-cut signature of genuine macrorealism. This finding is in accordance with previous works [19], and suggests that a large number of weakly-interacting particles could be sufficient for a natural quantum to classical transition to occur. Whether or not more general, interacting, systems can lead to macrorealism remains an open question.
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