Gravitationally induced entanglement between two quantum walkers
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Quantum walk is a synonym for multi-path interference and spread of particle in superposition of position space. We study the effects of a quantum mechanical interaction modeled to mimic quantum mechanical gravitational interaction between the two states of the walkers. The study has been carried out to investigate the entanglement generation between the two quantum walkers that do not otherwise interact. We see that the states do in fact get entangled more and more as the quantum walks unfold. We investigate the dependence of this entanglement generation on the coin parameter of the walks. With the introduction of noise into the dynamics, we also show the sensitivity of entanglement entropy between the two walkers on the noise introduced in one of the walks.

One of the most elusive quests in theoretical physics for almost a century now has been the understanding of the quantum nature of gravity. Some of the most promising theories of our age that are attempting to answer this question work at length scales that are far beyond our experimental limits. For this reason there has been an interest to look for the signature of quantum gravity both, at the cosmological scales and as well as in tabletop experimental setups. The later approaches attempt to probe the plank scale length \([1, 2]\) and as well as the quantum nature of gravity itself by exploiting the phenomena of quantum interference and quantum entanglement. In this regards a revived interest propose experiments using quantum interference to answer if gravitational attraction between two masses is quantum mechanical\([3, 4]\). The basic set-up for both the papers consists of two massive particles each prepared in a superposition of two position states. The particles then evolve under the mutual gravitational interaction. The claim is that if we see entanglement generation between the particles, we must conclude that the interaction between the two particles, which in this case was only gravitational, must be quantum mechanical in nature because a classical interaction cannot generate entanglement. Further, the model of gravitational interaction between the two objects in superposition of two positions requires that the gravitational attraction itself be in a superposition of two different values. This argument in fact finds its roots in the interaction between Feynman and colleagues including Bondi, Bergmann, Wheeler and others at the 1957 Chapel Hill Conference \([5]\). While discussing whether gravity at all should be quantized, Feynman proposes an experiment in which a little ball of diameter 1 cm is prepared in quantum superposition of two states. This ball is then used to move another object gravitationally which should (according to Feynman) carry the information of the quantum amplitudes (which can be checked by performing interference experiments on the second ball). The argument is that if one can prove that the information of the quantum amplitudes can travel across a gravitational channel, the channel must be quantum mechanical; unless, of course, quantum mechanics fails at mass ranges where gravity starts getting significant. The proposals in \([3]\) and \([4]\) improve on this thought experiment to find a witness (entanglement) for the quantum mechanical nature of gravity using an interference set-up.

In this letter we generalize the given model of gravitational attraction to a system of two particles performing quantum walks. The discrete-time quantum walks, version studied in this work provide a more controlled way of handling interferences, engineer any arbitrary configuration of state in superposition of position space \([6]\) and model effect of noise in the dynamics. They have also been used to simulate various quantum systems including Dirac fields (see eg. \([7–11]\)). So, studying them under the action of a “quantum gravitation” model can give us interesting insights into the effects of such interactions in quantum systems and help us to probe further investigations towards quantum nature of gravity.

Quantum walks: In a classical random walks a particle hops over the different lattice points based on the result of a coin toss. In the same spirit, a quantum mechanical particle performs a quantum walk by hopping onto the different lattice sites based on the result of a quantum coin toss (which is the rotation in the space of internal degrees of freedom of the particle). The difference arises in fact that unlike a classical coin that can exist exclusively in one or the other state, a quantum particle can exist in a superposition of two or more states. As a result, the hopping, which is conditional on the result of the coin toss, takes place in the superposition of two different lattice sites \([11]\). Thus the quantum property of superposition gives rise to the various constructive and destructive interferences in the quantum walk which gives it a probability distribution that has properties drastically different from its classical counterpart. We can demonstrate these properties with the following example:

Let us consider a quantum particle with an internal state \(|↑\rangle\) at a localized initial position, the origin \(|x = 0\rangle ≡ |0\rangle\). We represent this combined state by \(|0\rangle ⊗ |↑\rangle\), indicating that the state lives in the direct product Hilbert space of the spin (the coin space) and position Hilbert space, \(\mathcal{H}_c\).
and \( H_0 \), respectively. Here we take our position states to be orthonormal. Orthogonality of the position states stems from the assumption that at each site the wave function has a spread of \( \delta x \) which is much smaller than the lattice spacing \( a \). So, the overlap of two different position states vanishes: \( \langle x | y \rangle = \delta_{x,y} \).

The first step of the walk is to perform a rotation in the spin space (or a coin space), just like a coin toss, using a unitary operator, let us say a Hadamard operator \( H_2 = \frac{1}{\sqrt{2}} \begin{bmatrix} 1 & 1 \\ 1 & -1 \end{bmatrix} \). This operation is represented as follows:

\[
(I \otimes H_2) \cdot (|0\rangle \otimes |\uparrow\rangle) = \frac{|0\rangle|\uparrow\rangle + |0\rangle|\downarrow\rangle}{\sqrt{2}},
\]

where \( I \) represents the identity operation on the position space. The coin operation is followed by the shift operation, to effect a change of the state in position space, conditioned on the spin state. Let us suppose we shift to the right by one position for \(|\downarrow\rangle\) states and to the left for \(|\uparrow\rangle\). This operation, for any state at position \( x \) is represented by:

\[
S = \sum_{x} (|x-1\rangle \otimes |\uparrow\rangle + |x+1\rangle \otimes |\downarrow\rangle).
\]  

So a quantum walk operator for \( T \) step of walk can be represented as \( W^T = (S \cdot (I \otimes H_2))^T \). Fig. 1a shows the probability distribution after \( T = 100 \) on the walker with initial state \( |0\rangle|\uparrow\rangle \). We can see that the final distribution of a state depends on the kind of coin that is used and also on the initial state. For example, Fig. 1b shows the distribution after 100 steps of walk for state \( |0\rangle(|\uparrow\rangle + \sqrt{1/2} \cdot |\downarrow\rangle) \) with Hadamard coin. A general form of coin operation we will use in this work in place of Hadamard operation \( H_2 \) is,

\[
C(\theta) = \begin{bmatrix} \cos(\theta) & \sin(\theta) \\ -\sin(\theta) & \cos(\theta) \end{bmatrix}.
\]

Apart from the discrete time walks discussed here, quantum walks can also be defined for continuous time [12]. In addition, one can construct different forms of quantum walks by defining different combination of the coin and shift operators. One such example is the split-step quantum walk [13] that has been shown to model the Dirac cellular automaton [14] and so is useful for quantum algorithms.

**Quantum walks under mutual gravity:** Our aim in this paper is to generalize the model of gravitational attraction proposed by Bose et al. [3] and Martelto et al. [4] to quantum walks. To achieve this we consider a simplified system of two massive particles with two internal states in a 2-dimensional discrete space, each performing discrete time quantum walks in 1-dimensional space parallel to each other (see Fig. 2). We assume that the states of the particle are are initially separable and start at the same time. After every step of the walk, the state evolves into a superposition of components at different positions. State of the first particle \( \psi \) with two dimensional coin space, \((|\uparrow\rangle \text{ and } |\downarrow\rangle)\) has the following general form after \( t \) steps of walk, starting from the position \( i = 0 \):

\[
\psi(t) = \sum_{i=-t}^{t} |i\rangle \otimes (p_i^t(t)|\uparrow\rangle + q_i^t(t)|\downarrow\rangle).
\]

Here \( i \) are the lattice indices on which the walk is being performed. \(|p_i^t|^2\) (\(|q_i^t|^2\)) is the probability of spin state \(|\uparrow\rangle\) (\(|\downarrow\rangle\)) at \( i \).

State of the second particle \( \phi \) at position \( j = 0 \) which starts a quantum walk parallel to forst particle at time \( t = 0 \) (see Fig. 2) has the following form at time \( t \),

\[
\phi(t) = \sum_{j=-t}^{t} |j\rangle \otimes (s_j^t(t)|\uparrow\rangle + q_j^t(t)|\downarrow\rangle).
\]

At time \( t = 0 \) the composite state is \(|\psi\phi\rangle\). If there are no quantum mechanical interactions between these states, the state of the system as a whole remains a product state. \( \Psi(t) = \psi(t) \otimes \phi(t) \).

**FIG. 1:** Probability distribution of the state after 100 steps of one dimensional quantum walk starting at the origin for the initial state (a) \(|\uparrow\rangle\) and (b) \((|\uparrow\rangle + \sqrt{1/2} \cdot |\downarrow\rangle)\). The coin used is two dimensional Hadamard. Only the even positions are plotted, as the odd positions after even steps of the walk have zero probability.

**FIG. 2:** Two quantum walks on a plane, each restricted to a one dimensional walk parallel to each other. Now suppose we introduce an interaction between the
two walks that treats each component of the product state separately. Then every component will evolve with respect to a different Hamiltonian. If this interaction is gravitational interaction in the weak filed limit, the component \(|i_A,j_B\rangle\) will evolve under the Hamiltonian
\[
\langle \hat{H}_{ij} \rangle = -\frac{Gm_Am_B}{|\langle \hat{r}_{ij} \rangle|} \tag{6}
\]
where \(\langle \hat{r}_{ij} \rangle\) is the distance between lattice site \(i_A\) and \(j_B\) averaged over the spatial quantum fluctuations of the respective particles around these sites [16]. The measure of distances in these walks will depend on the kind of lattice we work on. But if we take the parallel distance between the two walks to be much greater than the lattice lattice we work on. But if we take the parallel distance between the two walks to be much greater than the lattice spacing as well as the region in which each walk spreads, it is safe to take the distance measure to be the Euclidean distance between the two sites. Furthermore, we assume that the walk is being performed on the lattice of spacetime, with lattice spacing between the sites of the walk being a multiple of the plank length, i.e.
\[
|r(i_A) - r(i_A + 1)| = N_d p. \tag{7}
\]
So, the Euclidean distance between the site \(r(i_A)\) and \(r(j_B)\) is given by:
\[
|\langle \hat{r}_{ij} \rangle| = N_d p \sqrt{L^2 + |i_A - j_B|^2} \equiv N_d p d_{ij}. \tag{8}
\]
Similarly, the time taken between the two successive steps of the walk can be taken as a multiple of the plank time, \(\delta t = N_t p\). With this in mind, the component \(|i_A,j_B\rangle\) in walk of \(t\) steps evolves under the Hamiltonian given by Eq. (6) for time:
\[
\Delta t_{ij} = N_t t_p \min(t - i, t - j) - |\langle \hat{r}_{ij} \rangle|/c. \tag{9}
\]
The \(-|\langle \hat{r}_{ij} \rangle|/c\) term ensures the locality of the gravitational interaction as it is the time taken for the carrier of interaction to travel the distance between the two lattice sites at the speed of light.

As a result, the two state system at time \(t\) takes the following form due to the gravitational interaction:
\[
|\Psi_G(t)\rangle = \sum_{i,j=-t}^{t} e^{-ig_{ij}(t)} \left( |i_A\rangle \otimes (p_{i}^{u}|\uparrow\rangle + p_{i}^{d}|\downarrow\rangle) \right) \otimes (|j_B\rangle \otimes (q_{j}^{u}|\uparrow\rangle + q_{j}^{d}|\downarrow\rangle) \right). \tag{10}
\]

Where \(g_{ij}(t)\) is the phase acquired due to the gravitational potential between the site \(i\) of state \(A\) and \(j\) of state \(B\). It is given by:
\[
g_{ij}(t) = -\frac{Gm_1 m_2 \Delta t_{ij}}{\hbar |\langle \hat{r}_{ij} \rangle|} \tag{11}
\]
where we have used the fact: \(l_p/t_p = c\) and \(\sqrt{\hbar/G} = m_p\) being the plank mass. We see that there is a constant phase term which can be dropped since entanglement is depends only on the relative phases of the components.

Since it is known that a discrete quantum walk with coin operation of the form Eq.(3) with parameter \(\theta\) models the Dirac equation [14, 15] of a particle mass \(m = m_p \sin \theta\) in continuum limit, we use this expression while evaluating the phase to put in the mass of the quantum walkers. For a component \(|i_A,j_B\rangle\), suppose \(|j| > |i|\), then the associated phase will be given by:
\[
g_{ij}(t) = -\frac{N_d m_p m_B(t - j)}{N_d m_p^2 d_{ij}} = -\frac{N_d \sin(\theta_A) \sin(\theta_B)(t - j)}{d_{ij}} . \tag{12}
\]

Quantum-ness: Before we begin to analyze the effects of the particular model of interaction presented here and draw conclusions on the quantum-ness of the interaction, we need to make it clear of what it means to be a quantum field. Our argument rely on the fact that local operation (interaction) and classical communications cannot increase entanglement (the LOCC principle). And the fact that all our physical theories are inherently local means that entanglement generation cannot be possible without “something” being exchanged between the two states as argued by the authors of [17], wherein they suggest that it is the off-shell graviton that is exchanged between the two masses. However, if we believe in the LOCC principle and if we have an interaction that is local and yet is generating entanglement, the only conclusion we can draw is that the proposed interaction has quantum properties. We could however be more explicit in our proof of quantum-ness by showing that the model of interaction can be generated by a quantum field configuration that can be written in terms of amplitudes. But proving entanglement generation by a local theory, we believe, is sufficient for our purposes.

The remaining part of this work will focus on the simulation of quantum walks under given gravitational interactions. In order to make the computations unambiguous and less dependent on machine errors, we make the following two adjustments to the phase factor in Eq. (12):

(1) We take \(N_t = N_d\) which essentially means that at each step the hopping speed of the particle is \(c\). This
does not mean that the particle as a whole is moving at the speed of light, its velocity is determined by the group velocity of the wave function which is bounded above by \( c \) times the cosine of \( \theta \) \cite{18}. (2) We use large values of \( \theta \) (\( \sim \pi/4 \)) which means that we are simulating walks with very large masses (\( \sim m_P \)). We do this because we run these simulations for very small number of steps. One can in principle see measurable entanglement for masses \( \sim 10^{-14}kg \) (for which superpositions have been observed \cite{19}) if the walks are performed for very large number of steps.

**Entanglement Entropy:** Entanglement entropy between two subsystems A and B is a von Neumann entropy of the density matrix reduced with respect to one of the systems. If we trace out the spin and position space of the state A from the density matrix \( \rho = \langle \Psi_G | \Psi_G \rangle \), we get the reduced density matrix \( \rho_B \), the entanglement entropy is then calculated as:

\[
EE = - \sum_i \lambda_i \ln(\lambda_i),
\]

where \( \lambda_i \) are the eigenvalues of \( \rho_B \). This reduced density matrix takes the following form:

\[
\rho_B = \sum_{j,k} \sum_i P_i e^{-i(g_{ij} - g_{ji})} |j_B\rangle \langle k_B| \otimes |s^B_j\rangle \langle s^B_k|,
\]

where \( P_i \) is the probability of the state A at site \( i \). We can see this matrix as a perturbation to the pure density matrix \( \rho^0_B = \sum_{j,k} |j\rangle \langle k| \otimes |s^B_j\rangle \langle s^B_k| \), so that \( \rho_B \) is a Hadamard product of the matrix \( K_{ij} = \sum_j P_i e^{-i(g_{ij} - g_{ji})} \) with \( \rho^0_B \), \( \rho_B = K \otimes \rho^0_B \). The change in eigen-spectrum due to a perturbation \( \rho \to \rho + \delta \rho \) is given by,

\[
\delta \lambda_i = \lambda_i + X_i^T \delta \rho X_i,
\]

where \( X_i \) are the corresponding eigenvectors. Given that \( \rho^0_B \) has one non-zero eigenvalue \( \lambda_1 = 1 \) with eigenvector \( X_1 = \sum_j |j\rangle |s^B_j\rangle \), the leading contribution the new eigenvalue is given by:

\[
\delta \lambda'_1 = \sum_{j,k,l} Q_{ij} Q_{kj} P_l e^{-i(g_{ji} - g_{lj})}.
\]

\( \{Q_i\} \) are the probability distribution of the state B and \( \{P_i\} \) are probability distribution of state A. A few more steps of calculation, under the approximation that \( L \gg t \), will show that the first order correction to the eigenvalue vanishes and the second order correction, which is a function of the second moment of the distributions of the two states provides the leading order contribution.

\[
\begin{align*}
\delta^{(2)} \lambda'_1 &\propto \sin^2(\theta_A) \sin^2(\theta_B) \sum_{t>1,j} Q_i Q_j P_t (t-l)^2 \\
&+ \sum_{t<i,j} Q_i Q_j P_t (t-i) (t-j) + \sum_{i>j>t} Q_i Q_j P_t (t-i) (t-l) \\
&+ \sum_{t>i,j} Q_i Q_j P_t (t-l) (t-j).
\end{align*}
\]

(17)

We measure the entanglement entropy for the state \(|\Psi_G\rangle\) given by Eq. (10). Based on the simulations run for different mass pairs of quantum walkers, we obtain EE between the two walkers as shown in the Fig. 3. \( \theta = \sin^{-1}(m/m_p) \) is the coin parameter (or the mass parameter). As the states evolve in the walk, EE between the two states typically increases quadratically with each time step. In addition, EE after a time \( T \) is typically higher for higher \( \theta \) values, till about \( \theta \sim \pi/3 \). This behavior is expected from Eq. (17), as the second moment is a decreasing function of \( \theta \) and \( \sin(\theta) \) increases in this range (see supplementary material for more discussions). Furthermore, EE is independent of the initial spin state of the walks, which also is an expected behavior as the even moments of a DTQW does not depend on the initial spin state \cite{20}.

![Entanglement Entropy](image)

**FIG. 3:** Entanglement entropy between two parallel 1D quantum walks under gravity for different mass pairs. Numbers in the bracket represent the mass parameters of the two states, \((\theta_A, \theta_B)\) where \( \theta = \sin^{-1}(m/m_p) \). The initial spin states of the two walkers are \((a) |\uparrow\rangle \) and \((b) |\downarrow\rangle \), however we note that the initial spin states have no effect on EE.

**Negativity:** Calculating the entanglement between the spatial degrees of freedom of the total system by summing up over the spin degrees of freedom of the product state \(|\Psi_G\rangle\). The density matrix \( \rho^T \) and can be calculated by tracing out the spins of the subsystem B,

\[
\rho_B^T = \langle \uparrow_B | \langle |\Psi_G\rangle \langle \Psi_G | | \uparrow_B \rangle + \langle \downarrow_B | \langle |\Psi_G\rangle \langle \Psi_G | | \downarrow_B \rangle \tag{18}
\]

followed by tracing out the spins of the subsystem A:

\[
\rho^T = \langle \uparrow_A | \rho_B^T | \uparrow_A \rangle + \langle \downarrow_A | \rho_B^T | \downarrow_A \rangle \tag{19}
\]
After we trace out the spins degrees of freedom, entanglement entropy may need not be the right measure of entanglement, as the resultant state may be a mixed state. Hence we resort to negativity as the measure of entanglement in the spatial degrees of freedom. For a density matrix \( \rho \), the negativity is the sum of the eigenvalues of its partial transpose, \( \mathcal{N}(\rho) = \sum_i \frac{|\lambda_i - \lambda_i^\Gamma|}{2} \), where \( \lambda_i \) are the eigenvalues of the partial transposed matrix \( \rho^\Gamma \). Unlike some other measures of entanglement, negativity does not converge to entanglement entropy for pure states [21] and is an entanglement monotone for \( 2 \times 2 \) and \( 2 \times 3 \) systems. However a positive value for negativity is a sufficient condition to establish entanglement in system [22, 23].

![FIG. 4: Negativity between two parallel 1-D quantum walks under Newtonian gravity, for different mass pairs. Numbers in the brackets are the mass parameters \( (\theta = \sin^{-1}(m/m_p)) \) of the two states. The initial spin states of the two walks are: (a) |↑⟩ and (b) |↓⟩.](image)

Negativity for three different mass pairs, parametrized by \( (\theta_A, \theta_B) \), is plotted in Fig. 4 and Fig. 5 for the full system and after tracing out the spin degree of freedom. We see that negativity is independent of the initial spin state of the walks and increases linearly with the number of steps. Furthermore, just like the case of entanglement entropy, negativity for higher mass pairs is higher compared to the lower mass pairs after the same time steps. We see that the value of negativity after tracing out the spin degree of freedom follow the same trend as as the original state \( |\Psi_G\rangle \). However, entanglement for different pairs of initial states do not exactly overlap. This hints at the possibility that the negativity of a spin traced system also depend on the odd moments of the probability distributions.

**Noise:** Introduction of noise, like a simple bit flip (\( \sigma_x \) gate) or a phase flip (\( \sigma_z \) gate), introduced with a probability \( p \) into a system reduces the effects of quantum interferences in the dynamics of the system [24, 25]. The “two quantum walks” system separated by a large distance, that has been introduced in this work, has no interference among the walks themselves. But we have argued that there is a quantum mechanical channel between the two walks that is responsible for the gravitational interaction and as well as the entanglement generation between the two particles. Fig. 6 shows the effect of the noise, applied on one of the walkers state, on the negativity between the two walkers. The reduction in entanglement is the indication of the fact that the local interactions between the “carrier” of the gravitational interaction and the walk is a quantum mechanical interaction, proving that the carrier is a quantum mechanical state.

![FIG. 6: Effect of Noise: Black solid line shows negativity between two parallel 1-D quantum walks under Newtonian gravity with mass parameters \( (\theta = \sin^{-1}(m/m_p)) \) \( \pi/4 \) and \( \pi/6 \) with initial spin states \( |\uparrow\rangle \) and \( |\downarrow\rangle \) respectively. Red dashed line and blue dotted line shows negativity for the same setup, with a bit-flip and phase flip noise respectively introduced on the first state (with initial spin \( |\uparrow\rangle \)) with probability \( p= 0.02 \).](image)

**Concluding remarks:** We have investigated the effects of a particular model of gravitational interactions on the discrete quantum walks. We saw that the two
walks get entangled with time if the interaction between them is mediated by a gravitational field that can treat each component of the superposition separately. This interaction obeys locality and since LOCC interactions cannot generate or increase entanglement, our results suggests a quantum carrier of gravitational interaction. The increase in entanglement with time shows the importance of states expansion in position space with superposition. Introduction of noise in one of the walks results in a reduction of entanglement which further strengthens the argument that the interaction between the walk and the gravitational channel is indeed quantum mechanical.

Although we have used high values of mass parameters (\( \sim m_p \)) for which superposition has not been seen in a lab, this study stands as a proof of concept for the entanglement generation in quantum walks due to quantum gravity. For smaller masses (\( \sim 10^{-14} kg \)) but for much larger number of steps, the entanglement might be detectable in a lab. In addition to this, we have the freedom to extend the study to higher dimensional walks, which although will require more computational resources, but can generate entanglement at much faster rate.

We acknowledge the fact that one does not know if gravitational interaction does indeed remain Newtonian at the scales we are studying them. Newton’s law of gravity has been tested reliably only at the scales of solar system. At higher scales general relativity takes over and there is no reason to believe that it should hold at microscopic scales too [26]. However, a deeper question still remains unanswered, which is: what is the nature of gravitational interaction for states in a superposition of positions [16]? Gravity could still be quantum mechanical and Newtonian but act in way that is different from our assumption in this paper.

**Supplementary introduction**

**Variation of entanglement with respect to the coin parameters:** As discussed in the main text, the analytical solution for the correction to the eigenvalue (Eq. (16)) suggest that the entanglement should initially increase with \( \theta \) due to the \( \sin(\theta)^2 \) term until the point when the term that is a function of second moments of the distributions takes over. Fig. 7a shows how the second moment varies with the coin parameter for a given walk and Fig. 7b shows the variation of the product of \( \sin(\theta) \) with the second moment. In Fig. 8 and Fig. 9 we show the variation of entanglement entropy and negativity respectively with respect to the coin parameters \( \theta_1 \) and \( \theta_2 \). We see that the entanglement increases till about \( \theta \sim \pi/3 \) and decreases after that.

**FIG. 7:** (a) shows the variation of the second moment about the mean of the probability distribution after 15 steps of the walk with the coin parameter. (b) shows the effect of the \( \sin(\theta)^2 \) factor multiplying the second moment.

**FIG. 8:** Variation of entanglement entropy with the \( \theta \) parameters after 15 steps of the walk. Initial spin states are \( |\uparrow\rangle \) and \( |\downarrow\rangle \). All the figures are the same graph from different orientations.
FIG. 9: Variation of negativity with the θ parameters after 15 steps of the walk. Initial spin states are $|↑\rangle$ and $|↓\rangle$. All the figures are the same graph from different orientations.