

Revealing self-gravity in a Stern-Gerlach Humpty-Dumpty experiment

Mohamed Hatifi*

*Aix Marseille Université, CNRS, Centrale-Marseille,
Institut Fresnel UMR 7249, Marseille, France*

Thomas Durt†

*Aix Marseille Université, CNRS, Centrale Marseille,
Institut Fresnel UMR 7249, Marseille, France*

(Dated: January 25, 2022)

Abstract

There is no consensus among today's physicists about how to describe properly the gravitational interaction in a quantum framework. Our proposal aims at bringing this question to the realm of experiment. We propose in this paper an experimental test aimed at revealing the existence of a non-linear self-interaction à la Schrodinger-Newton. In this test, a mesoscopic spin 1/2 microsphere is freely falling in a Humpty-Dumpty Stern-Gerlach interferometer. It is shown that self-gravity induces a measurable phase shift between the up and down spin components of the microsphere.

* hatifi.mohamed@gmail.com

† thomas.durt@centrale-marseille.fr

a. Introduction Properly quantizing gravity remains one of the most challenging problems of today's theoretical physics. Recently several experiments were proposed, aimed at testing manifestations of the gravitational interaction in the mesoscopic regime (through entanglement [1, 2], decoherence [3] and so on). It is worth mentioning however that there exists no unanimous agreement about how to quantize gravity even in the Newtonian limit [4]. Here we focus on a mean field formulation of Einstein's general relativity originally proposed by Møller [5] and Rosenfeld [6] in which space-time remains classical while the material source term in Einstein's equation is the average stress-energy tensor, averaged over quantum degrees of freedom. In the Newtonian limit, a self-gravitational interaction is thus likely to be present which can be expressed, for instance in the single particle case, through the (non-linear) Schrödinger-Newton equation [7, 8]

$$i\hbar\frac{\partial\Psi(t,\mathbf{x})}{\partial t} = -\frac{\hbar^2}{2m}\Delta\Psi(t,\mathbf{x}) + V_{ext}(\mathbf{x},t)\Psi(\mathbf{x},t) + \int d^3x' |\Psi(t,\mathbf{x}')|^2 V(|\mathbf{x}-\mathbf{x}'|)\Psi(t,\mathbf{x}),$$

where $V(d) = -Gm^2/d$ and $V_{ext}(\mathbf{x},t)$ represents the external potential. Replacing the mass m by the charge of the electron, Newton's constant G by the Coulomb constant, and self-attraction by self-repulsion, we obtain the Wigner-Poisson equation which has been successfully implemented in plasma physics or solid state physics in order to mimic repulsive Coulomb self-interaction between many electrons in the mean field (Hartree) regime. In the single particle case however the Wigner-Poisson equation is clearly not relevant and ruled out by facts, among others because if we would apply it to quantize electronic energy levels in the hydrogen atom it would drastically modify Bohr's spectrum, strongly contradicting accurate spectroscopic data accumulated since the 19th century by Rydberg and others [4, 9]. Now, gravity is known to differ from other fundamental interactions and it could be after all that the Schrödinger-Newton equation (and its many-particles generalisation) is relevant for modeling gravity in the quantum and mesoscopic regimes [10]. Here we propose an experimental test aimed at revealing the existence of a gravitational self-interaction *à la* Schrödinger-Newton. It is directly inspired by two recent proposals [1, 2] in which two massive spin 1/2 objects, initially prepared in a factorisable spin state, simultaneously move in parallel humpty-dumpty Stern-Gerlach interferometers. These proposals were conceived in such a way that the gravitational interaction ultimately induces some (in principle mea-

surable) spin entanglement between the two objects. It is worth mentioning here that in these proposals no gravitational self-interaction was supposed to be present from the beginning. In the present paper we propose on the contrary to test the existence of gravitational self-interaction at the quantum level in the Newtonian limit. This also explains why in our case one humpty-dumpty interferometer is sufficient, and not two as in the two aforementioned proposals [1, 2]. In our case we assume that a unique spin 1/2 mesoscopic particle interacts with itself due to self-gravity which leads as we will show to a dephasing between the spin up and spin down wave packets inside the Stern-Gerlach interferometer. This will lead after recombination to a rotation of the spin, which can in principle get revealed by spin tomography after completion of the Humpty-Dumpty experiment.

A. Humpty-Dumpty Stern Gerlach experiment as a test for the Schrodinger-Newton equation

1. Self-interaction of a homogeneous sphere.

We will consider here a humpty-dumpty experiment similar to the one considered in [1]: for instance a micro-diamond with an embedded NV center spin is released from an optical trap of frequency 1 Mhz, after which it falls freely and directly enters a Stern-Gerlach apparatus where it undergoes, at well-chosen times, a combination of judiciously chosen operations (as e.g. $\pi/2$ spin flips, swaps between electronic states and nuclear spin state) which are described with great detail in [1]. A difference with the proposal [1] is that we shall assume that we prepare the center of mass wave function in the ground state of the trap; the reason therefore is that all our computations are based on the assumption that the initial state is a gaussian state [9]. We shall discuss this assumption at the end of the paper. For a rigid and homogeneous sphere of radius R , one can approximate [9, 10] the self-gravitational potential in terms of $d = |\mathbf{x}_{\text{CM}} - \mathbf{x}'_{\text{CM}}|$, where $\mathbf{x}_{\text{CM}}$ represents the center of mass of the spherical object as:

$$V^{\text{eff}}(d) = \frac{Gm^2}{R} \left(-\frac{6}{5} + \frac{1}{2} \left(\frac{d}{R} \right)^2 - \frac{3}{16} \left(\frac{d}{R} \right)^3 + \frac{1}{160} \left(\frac{d}{R} \right)^5 \right) \quad (1)$$

if $d \leq 2R$ otherwise for larger distances (d larger than twice the radius R), one can integrate the internal contributions using Gauss's theorem:

$$V^{\text{eff}}(d) = -\frac{Gm^2}{d} \quad (d \geq 2R). \quad (2)$$

It follows that the center of mass wavefunction (CMWF) will be solution of:

$$\begin{aligned} i\hbar \frac{\partial \Psi(t, \mathbf{x}_{\text{CM}})}{\partial t} = & -\frac{\hbar^2}{2m} \Delta \Psi(t, \mathbf{x}_{\text{CM}}) + V_{\text{ext}}(\mathbf{x}_{\text{CM}}, t) \Psi(\mathbf{x}_{\text{CM}}, t) \\ & + \int d^3 \mathbf{x}'_{\text{CM}} |\Psi(t, \mathbf{x}'_{\text{CM}})|^2 V^{\text{eff}}(|\mathbf{x}_{\text{CM}} - \mathbf{x}'_{\text{CM}}|) \Psi(t, \mathbf{x}_{\text{CM}}), \end{aligned} \quad (3)$$

where $V^{\text{eff}}(|\mathbf{x}_{\text{CM}} - \mathbf{x}'_{\text{CM}}|)$ has been defined in equations (1,2). In particular in what follows we will consider the limit where the wave function of the center of mass $\Psi(t, \mathbf{x}_{\text{CM}})$ is peaked with a width small compared to the radius R . In that case the effective potential defined in (1) can be considered as quadratic (see also [11]):

$$V^{\text{eff}}(d) \sim \frac{Gm^2}{R} \left(-\frac{6}{5} + \frac{1}{2} \left(\frac{d}{R} \right)^2 \right) \quad (4)$$

hence when $d \leq 2R$ equation (3) takes the form

$$\begin{aligned} i\hbar \frac{\partial \Psi(t, \mathbf{x}_{\text{CM}})}{\partial t} = & -\frac{\hbar^2}{2m} \Delta \Psi(t, \mathbf{x}_{\text{CM}}) + V_{\text{ext}}(\mathbf{x}_{\text{CM}}, t) \Psi(\mathbf{x}_{\text{CM}}, t) \\ & + \left[\frac{m\omega_s^2}{2} (\mathbf{x}_{\text{CM}} - \langle \mathbf{x}_{\text{CM}} \rangle)^2 + \frac{m\omega_s^2}{2} \mathcal{Q}(t) - \frac{6}{5} \frac{Gm^2}{R} \right] \Psi(t, \mathbf{x}_{\text{CM}}), \end{aligned} \quad (5)$$

where $\mathcal{Q} = \langle \mathbf{x}_{\text{CM}}^2 \rangle - \langle \mathbf{x}_{\text{CM}} \rangle^2$ is the quantum spread in position : and where the pulsation of the (comoving) harmonic potential ω_s is equal to $\sqrt{\frac{Gm}{R^3}} = \sqrt{G\rho_{\text{sphere}}}$. It is worth noting here that, as is shown in the supplementary material, corrections due to the presence of the nuclei which render the mass distribution in the sphere inhomogeneous [9, 11] are negligible in the present context.

2. Temporal evolution

Even inside magnetic regions of the Stern-Gerlach device, equation (3) is in good approximation separable in Cartesian coordinates. This allows us to consider in what follows a description in the (freely falling) comoving frame in which we limit our study to the component of the CMWF along the quantization axis (Z) of the Stern-Gerlach interferometer (see figure 1). Nothing remarkable happens along the free fall axis X or along the third axis Y .




FIG. 1. Illustration of the Humpty-Dumpty Stern-Gerlach experiment [12]. We consider here a freely falling mesoscopic sphere (spin 1/2 NV center in a diamond nanocrystal) of radius $R = 1 \cdot 10^{-6}$ m and with a mass $m = 5.5 \cdot 10^{-15}$ Kg. The time-steps T_i are defined in the supplementary material.

After factoring out its x and y components, the CMWF can be expressed as a superposition of spin up and down along Z states $\Psi(z, t) = \sum_{i=\{+,-\}} \beta_i \psi_i(z, t) |i\rangle$ with $|\beta_+|^2 + |\beta_-|^2 = 1$. The reduced Hamiltonian then reads

$$\mathcal{H}_z = -\frac{\hbar^2}{2m} \frac{\partial^2}{\partial z^2} + \lambda \frac{g\mu_B}{2} (B_0 - B'_0 z) \otimes \sigma_z + \hat{V}^G(z, t) \quad (6)$$

where B_0 is the magnetic field and B'_0 is its gradient, μ_B is the Bohr magneton, $g \sim 2$ is the electronic g-factor and $\hat{V}^G$ the self-gravitational potential defined in (5). The parameter λ depends on the branch of the evolution (see figures 1 and 2) and is defined as follow:

$$\lambda = \begin{cases} 1 & \text{if } 0 \leq t \leq T_1 \text{ or } T_4 \leq t \leq T_5 \\ 0 & \text{if } T_2 \leq t \leq T_3 \\ -1 & \text{if } T_1 \leq t \leq T_2 \text{ or } T_3 \leq t \leq T_4 \end{cases} \quad (7)$$

The mass density obeys the Born rule:

$$m|\Psi(z, t)|^2 = m \sum_{i=\{+, -\}} |\beta_i|^2 |\psi_i(z, t)|^2. \quad (8)$$

hence the potential of self-interaction reads

$$Gm^2 \int dz' |\Psi(t, \mathbf{z}')|^2 V^{eff}(|\mathbf{z} - \mathbf{z}'|) = Gm^2 \sum_{i=\{+, -\}} |\beta_i|^2 \int dz' |\psi_i(t, \mathbf{z}')|^2 V^{eff}(|\mathbf{z} - \mathbf{z}'|) \quad (9)$$

Developing the Schrodinger-Newton potential (3) around $\langle z \rangle_+$ (resp. $\langle z \rangle_-$) we get

$$\widehat{V}_\pm^G(z, t) = \underbrace{|\beta_\pm|^2 \left[\frac{m}{2} \omega_s^2 (z - \langle z \rangle_\pm)^2 + \frac{m\omega_s^2}{2} \mathcal{Q}_\pm(t) - \frac{6}{5} \frac{Gm^2}{R} \right]}_{\text{Self-interaction } |\pm\rangle \rightarrow |\pm\rangle} + \underbrace{|\beta_\mp|^2 f_\mp(z, t)}_{\text{Self-interaction } |\mp\rangle \rightarrow |\pm\rangle}$$

where $\mathcal{Q}_\pm = \langle z^2 \rangle_\pm - \langle z \rangle_\pm^2$, and the function $f_\mp(z, t) = Gm^2 \int dz' |\psi_\mp(t, \mathbf{z}')|^2 V^{eff}(|\mathbf{z} - \mathbf{z}'|)$ and in which $V^{eff}(|\mathbf{z} - \mathbf{z}'|)$ interpolates, according to (1), between the harmonic potential when $d_\pm = |\langle z \rangle_+ - \langle z \rangle_-| \leq 2R$ and the Newtonian potential if $d_\pm \geq 2R$, as in (2). Strictly speaking, the evolution is not exactly gaussian when the up and down wave packets separate from each other but in the rest of the paper we shall approximate the evolution by a gaussian evolution. When $d_\pm = |\langle z \rangle_+ - \langle z \rangle_-| \leq 2R$ (which is satisfied when $0 \leq t \leq T_s = \left(\frac{4mR}{g\mu_B B_0} \right)^{1/2} \sim 0.034s$, and $T_5 - T_s \leq t \leq T_5$ see SM) we shall do as if there was no separation. This is justified because the separation time is very short and does not contribute much to the dephasing, and also because during the (short) separation process the Stern-Gerlach potential [13, 14] dominates the self-interaction. If $d_\pm \geq 2R$ we shall do as if the wave packets associated to the centers of mass of the spin components were Dirac peaks centered around their average positions. This is fully justified in the narrow wave packet regime where we operate. Then $f_\mp(z, t)$ takes the form of a Newton-like potential ($-\frac{Gm^2}{|z_\pm - \langle z_\mp \rangle|}$ as in (2)). Actually, in the interval $[T_s, T_5 - T_s]$, the Newton force between the up and down wave packets can be shown to be negligibly small: it is easy to check indeed that even if the spin up and down components would move side by side ($d_\pm \approx 2R$) during a time of the order of T_5 their Newtonian attraction is so weak that it would reduce the distance between the wave packets by a tiny fraction (10^{-6}) of their size R . Consequently,

we shall limit ourselves to the lowest order in the Taylor development of $-\frac{Gm^2}{|z_{\pm} - \langle z_{\mp} \rangle|}$ around $\langle z_{\pm} \rangle$ which means that we approximate $f_{\mp}$ through a classical Newton-like potential:

$$f_{\mp}(t) = -Gm^2 \frac{1}{|\langle z \rangle_+ - \langle z \rangle_-|} = -Gm^2 \frac{1}{d_{\pm}} \quad (10)$$

To conclude, each branch of the superposition is solution of the following non-linear Schrodinger equation:

$$i\hbar \frac{\partial \psi_{\pm}(z, t)}{\partial t} = \left[-\frac{\hbar^2}{2m} \frac{\partial^2}{\partial z^2} \pm \lambda \frac{g\mu_B}{2} (B_0 - B'_0 z) + \hat{V}_{\pm}^G(z, t) \right] \psi_{\pm}(z, t), \quad (11)$$

where in good approximation and most of the time $\hat{V}_{\pm}^G(z, t)$ is the sum of a quadratic self-interaction of each packet with itself (with weight $|\beta_i|^2$) with an effective Newtonian interaction towards the other wave packet (with weight $|\beta_{j,j \neq i}|^2$). In accordance with the previous discussion we impose

$$\hat{V}_{\pm}^G(z, t) = \nu_{\pm}^2 \left[\frac{m}{2} \omega_s^2 (z - \langle z \rangle_{\pm})^2 + \frac{m\omega_s^2}{2} \mathcal{Q}_{\pm}(t) - \frac{6}{5} \frac{Gm^2}{R} \right] - (1 - \nu_{\pm}^2) \frac{Gm^2}{d_{\pm}} \quad (12)$$

where

$$\nu_{\pm} = \begin{cases} 1 & \text{if } d_{\pm} = |\langle z \rangle_+ - \langle z \rangle_-| \leq 2R \\ |\beta_{\pm}| & \text{otherwise that is to say when } T_s \leq t \leq T_5 - T_s \text{ with } T_s = \left(\frac{4mR}{g\mu_B B'_0} \right)^{1/2} \sim 0.034s \end{cases} \quad (13)$$

Such an evolution being gaussian, gaussian wave packets remain so in good approximation during the temporal evolution, which seriously facilitates the numerical treatment.

3. Estimate of the phase

In order to estimate the phase, let us impose gaussian solutions of the form:

$$\psi_{\pm}(z, t) = \exp \left[-A_{\pm}(t) \frac{z^2}{2} + B_{\pm}(t)z + C_{\pm}(t) \right] \quad (14)$$

where $A_{\pm}(t)$, $B_{\pm}(t)$ and $C_{\pm}(t)$ are complex functions of time only. Their phases evolve (see SM) according to

$$\frac{d\text{Im}C_{\pm}(t)}{dt} = \frac{\hbar}{2m} [\text{Re}B_{\pm}^2 - \text{Im}B_{\pm}^2 - \text{Re}A_{\pm}] - \frac{V_{\pm}^G(t) \pm \lambda \frac{g\mu_B}{2} B_0}{\hbar} \quad (15)$$

The phase shift can be expressed in terms of the classical action $\mathcal{S}_{Cl}$:

$$\mathcal{S}_{Cl,\pm} = \int_0^{T_5} dt \left[\frac{\langle p \rangle_{\pm}^2}{2m} - V^{ext}(\langle z \rangle_{\pm}) \right] \quad (16)$$

where V^{ext} represents here the magnetic potential (self-gravitational potentials having been included in the quantum contributions); for more details of the derivation see supplementary material.

$$\text{Im}C_{\pm}(t) = \underbrace{-\frac{\langle z \rangle_{\pm} \langle p \rangle_{\pm}}{\hbar} + \frac{1}{\hbar} \mathcal{S}_{Cl}}_{\text{Classical contributions}} + \underbrace{\frac{\langle z \rangle_{\pm}^2}{2} \frac{1}{\hbar Q_{\pm}} \left[Q_{\pm} \mathcal{P}_{\pm} - \frac{\hbar^2}{4} \right]^{\frac{1}{2}} - \frac{1}{\hbar} \int_0^{T_5} dt \mathcal{F}_{Q,\pm}}_{\text{Quantum contributions}} \quad (17)$$

where we defined

$$\mathcal{F}_{Q,\pm} = \frac{\hbar^2}{4mQ_{\pm}} + \frac{m\omega_s^2}{2} Q_{\pm}(t) \nu_{\pm}^2 - \frac{6}{5} \frac{Gm^2}{R} \nu_{\pm}^2 - (1 - \nu_{\pm}^2) \frac{Gm^2}{d_{\pm}} \quad (18)$$

$$Q_{\pm} = \langle z^2 \rangle_{\pm} - \langle z \rangle_{\pm}^2 = \frac{1}{2\text{Re}A_{\pm}} \quad (19)$$

$$\mathcal{P}_{\pm} = \langle p^2 \rangle_{\pm} - \langle p \rangle_{\pm}^2 = \frac{\hbar^2}{2} \frac{|A_{\pm}|^2}{\text{Re}A_{\pm}} \quad (20)$$

The terms $-\frac{\langle z \rangle_{\pm} \langle p \rangle_{\pm}}{\hbar}$ and $\frac{\langle z \rangle_{\pm}^2}{2} \frac{1}{\hbar Q_{\pm}} \left[Q_{\pm} \mathcal{P}_{\pm} - \frac{\hbar^2}{4} \right]^{\frac{1}{2}}$ are irrelevant regarding the phase shift because they cancel out during the recombination process (in which $\langle z \rangle_{\pm} = 0$). Knowing $\langle z \rangle_{\pm}$, $\langle p \rangle_{\pm}$ and $A_{\pm}(t)$ allows us to solve this equation and to deduce the phase difference between the two quantum paths $|+\rangle$ and $|-\rangle$. Note that the expressions of $\langle z \rangle_{\pm}$ and $\langle p \rangle_{\pm}$ are easily found using Ehrenfest's theorem; we also derived an analytic expression of the function $A_{\pm}(t)$ (see supplementary material). In conclusion, up to an integration over time, all contributions to the phase shift are known in analytic form which considerably enhances the precision of the numerical simulations.




FIG. 2. We illustrate here the time evolution of $\langle z \rangle_{\pm}$ (left) and $\langle p \rangle_{\pm}$ (right), for the same nanosphere as in figure 1, with a field gradient $B'_0 = 10^6 \text{ T.m}^{-1}$.

4. Numerical simulations

Let us define the phase shift as

$$\Delta\varphi(t) = c_+(t) - c_-(t). \quad (21)$$

To estimate the phase shift, we used the same parameters as in [1]. We consider thus a mesoscopic mass $m = 5.5 \cdot 10^{-15} \text{ kg}$ with radius $R = 1 \cdot 10^{-6} \text{ m}$ and we used a field gradient $B'_0 = 10^6 \text{ T.m}^{-1}$. Moreover, we considered $|\beta_+| = 1/\sqrt{3}$ and an initial spread in position $\sqrt{\mathcal{Q}_0} = 10^{-9} \text{ m}$ (other initial spreads were also considered in the supplementary material). In figure 2 we plot the trajectories $\langle z \rangle_{\pm}$ and the momentum $\langle p \rangle_{\pm}$ of each wave packet whose expressions are found in the supplementary material. When the two wave packets ψ_L and ψ_R are recombined (using a magnetic field oriented in the opposite direction), the state becomes:

$$\Psi(z, t) = [\beta_+ |+\rangle + \beta_- e^{-i\Delta\varphi(T_5)} |-\rangle] \psi(z, t) \quad (22)$$

where T_5 is the total time of the experiment. In figure 3 we illustrate the phase shift $\Delta\varphi$ accumulated during this evolution in function of time. For $T_5 = 2 \text{ s}$ (and with $T_3 - T_2 = 1 \text{ s}$), which corresponds to the evolution of figure 2. Actually, if we have a strict equality $|\beta_+| = |\beta_-| = 1/\sqrt{2}$ we find at the end of the Humpty Dumpty experiment that the phase shift is zero, as it must due to symmetry. Because of symmetries, there is also no classical

contribution to the final value of the phase shift. Therefore we only plot the contributions made by the quantum term $\mathcal{F}_{Q,\pm}$ present in equation (17). Although this phase shift consists of several and non-trivial quantum contributions, we can estimate it as follows. If we naively only take account of the contribution $\frac{6}{5} \frac{Gm^2}{\hbar R} (T_5 - 2T_s) (|\beta_+|^2 - |\beta_-|^2)$ we expect to find, for $T_5 - 2T_s = 1.93$ s, a phase shift of the order of -15.59 which is almost the exact value $\Delta\varphi \sim -15.33$. Actually, in the regime of parameters that we considered it can be shown (see supplementary material) that in good approximation $A_+(t) = A_-(t) \sim A_0(t)$ where $A_0(t)$ corresponds to a freely evolving gaussian wave packet. This is so because either the pulsation of the (comoving) harmonic potential ω_s is very small or, when it is large due to nucleic contributions, it is large only during very short times. This also explains why no spin decoherence appears after recombination, because internal (spin) and external (spatial) degrees of freedom will not be entangled by then [15, 16].

5. Conclusions

In figure 4 we also plot the phase shift for different values of the radius R of the nanosphere, i.e. different values of the mass. Measuring this phase shift would, in principle, enable us to establish the existence of self-gravity *à la* Schrodinger-Newton. At this level, we may relax the original assumption according to which it was necessary to prepare the initial state in the ground state of the optical trap from which it is released before entering the S-G apparatus. The reason that we advocated for doing so was that we need a pure gaussian state to begin with. Retrospectively we see that, as it is the additive constant $\frac{6}{5} \frac{Gm^2}{\hbar R}$ in the self-interaction that mainly contributes to the dephasing, a similar dephasing is expected to occur even when the center of mass degrees of freedom are initially prepared in a thermal state. If there is no dephasing, this would mean that there is no gravitational self-interaction in nature; then, a double humpty dumpty experiment as already proposed in [1, 2] would make it possible to measure, if it exists, the entangling power of gravity. The double humpty-dumpty experiment is more difficult to realize than our proposal, not only because two interferometers must be realized in parallel. In order to minimize Casimir-Polders interaction, the authors of [1] must impose that the distance between the objects is de facto quite larger than their size (of the order of 100 times larger), so that free fall times of the order of at least 2.5 second are necessary (working in the same conditions) to see a

dephasing of the order of one radian.

When only one object is present as in our case, the Casimir-Polders force is equal to zero because there is no electro-magnetic self-interaction in nature as we explained at the beginning of this paper. All what is necessary in our case is to nullify the spatial overlap of the up and down wave packets. Our experimental proposal would thus still be feasible with quite less intense magnetic fields and/or quite shorter time of the experiment compared to those required for realizing the double humpty-dumpty proposals [1, 2]. For instance, if we impose that the up and down components fall side by side, at a distance $d_{\pm} = \frac{g\mu_B}{m} B'_0 \tilde{T}_1^2$ of the order of $2R = 2 \cdot 10^{-6}$ m, we may let act the magnets at the same intensity as before but with a time almost ten times shorter, $\tilde{T}_1 \sim T_1/10 = 0.025$ s; we may also diminish all the time intervals T_i and then the time of the experiment in the same ratio: $\tilde{T}_5 \sim 0.2$ s. After recombination the dephasing will be of the order of $\left[\left(-\frac{6}{5} \frac{Gm^2}{\hbar R} + \frac{Gm^2}{2R\hbar} \right) \cdot (\tilde{T}_5 - 2T_s) \cdot (|\beta_+|^2 - |\beta_-|^2) \right] \approx -1.1 + 0.4 = -0.7$. Compared to the double humpty dumpty experiment where comparable dephasings require a free fall of 2,5 s (thus a vertical distance larger than 30 m, only reachable in a free fall tower), our proposal requires a distance of $\frac{g\tilde{T}_5^2}{2} = 20$ cm which can be done on a lab. table.

Actually the most promising candidates for our proposal are nano-resonators, for which cooling of the center of mass degree of freedom and imbedding of NV centres have already been successfully demonstrated in the past [17, 18]. The dynamics is slightly different because of the presence of a confining harmonic trap ($V_2 x^2 = m\omega_{Trap}^2 x^2$) but for the rest our formalism can be integrally transposed, as it is, to tackle the problem. In any case, all these proposals constitute a breakthrough in the sense that they aim at measuring gravitational effects originating from delocalized objects in the mesoscopic regime. It is worth trying to realize them because they could provide the missing clues necessary for properly quantizing gravity.

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

The authors gratefully acknowledge funding and support from the John Templeton foundation (grant 60230, Non-Linearity and Quantum Mechanics: Limits of the No-Signaling Condition, 20162019). MH acknowledges support from Aix-Marseille University for an ATER contract in 2019-2020.




FIG. 3. Plot of the accumulated phase shift associated to the evolution of figure 2, with $T_3 - T_2 = 1$ s. We considered again a mesoscopic sphere of radius $R = 1 \cdot 10^{-6}$ m with a mass $m = 5,5 \cdot 10^{-15}$ kg so that $\omega_s = \sqrt{\frac{Gm}{R^3}} \sim 6 \cdot 10^{-4}$ Hz. Here we also used $|\beta_+| = \frac{1}{\sqrt{3}}$ and $|\beta_-| = \sqrt{\frac{2}{3}}$ and $\sqrt{Q_0} = 10^{-9}$ m.




FIG. 4. Plot of the accumulated phase shift in function of the radius R of the nanosphere. We chose the same magnetic fields and time-steps as before, and $|\beta_+| = \frac{1}{\sqrt{3}}$ and $|\beta_-| = \sqrt{\frac{2}{3}}$ and an initial spread $\sqrt{Q_0} = 10^{-9}$ m, as in figure 3.

-
- [1] S. Bose, A. Mazumdar, G. W. Morley, H. Ulbricht, M. Toroš, M. Paternostro, A. A. Geraci, P. F. Barker, M. Kim, and G. Milburn, Physical review letters **119**, 240401 (2017).
 - [2] C. Marletto and V. Vedral, Physical review letters **119**, 240402 (2017).
 - [3] B. Hu, in *Journal of Physics: Conference Series*, Vol. 504 (IOP Publishing, 2014) p. 012021.
 - [4] C. Anastopoulos and B. Hu, New Journal of Physics **16**, 085007 (2014).
 - [5] C. Moller, in *Colloq. Int. CNRS*, Vol. 91 (1959) pp. 15–29.
 - [6] L. Rosenfeld, Nuclear Physics **40**, 353 (1963).
 - [7] L. Disi, Physics Letters A **105**, 199 (1984).
 - [8] K. Jones, Australian Journal of Physics **48**, 1055 (1995).
 - [9] S. Colin, T. Durt, and R. Willox, Class. Quantum Grav. **31**, 245003 (2014).
 - [10] R. Penrose, Foundations of Physics **44**, 557 (2014).
 - [11] H. Yang, H. Miao, D.-S. Lee, B. Helou, and Y. Chen, Physical review letters **110**, 170401 (2013).
 - [12] M. O. Scully, B.-G. Englert, and J. Schwinger, Physical Review A **40**, 1775 (1989).
 - [13] B. C. Hsu, M. Berrondo, and J.-F. S. Van Huele, Physical Review A **83**, 012109 (2011).
 - [14] D. E. Platt, American Journal of Physics **60**, 306 (1992).
 - [15] B. Viaris de Lesegno, M. Boustimi, J. H. KARAM, F. Perales, and J. Reinhardt, in *Annales de la Fondation Louis de Broglie*, Vol. 26 (2001) pp. 571–586.
 - [16] B. J. Lawson Daku, *Effets transverses et temporels en interférométrie atomique Stern-Gerlach*, Ph.D. thesis, Paris 13 (1997).
 - [17] O. Arcizet, V. Jacques, A. Siria, P. Poncharal, P. Vincent, and S. Seidelin, Nature Physics **7**, 879 (2011).
 - [18] M. Yuan, V. Singh, Y. M. Blanter, and G. A. Steele, Nature communications **6**, 1 (2015).

I. SUPPLEMENTARY MATERIAL

A. Ehrenfest's theorem and self-gravity

In order to compute the phase shift associated to each wave packet, it appears to be useful to develop the potential $V(z, t)$ to the second order in z around the location of the peak of the gaussian wave packet. To see this, let us consider the Schrodinger equation

$$i\hbar \frac{\partial \Psi}{\partial t} = -\frac{\hbar^2}{2m} \frac{\partial^2 \Psi}{\partial z^2} + V(\langle z \rangle) + \frac{\partial V}{\partial z} \Big|_{\langle z \rangle} (z - \langle z \rangle) + \frac{1}{2} \frac{\partial^2 V}{\partial z^2} \Big|_{\langle z \rangle} (z - \langle z \rangle)^2 \quad (23)$$

Denoting $\frac{\partial^2 V}{\partial z^2} \Big|_{\langle z \rangle} = m\omega^2$, and identifying $V_0(t) + V_1(t)z + V_2(t)z^2$ with the expression of V above we get

$$V_0 = V(\langle z \rangle) - \frac{\partial V}{\partial z} \Big|_{\langle z \rangle} \langle z \rangle + \frac{m\omega^2}{2} \langle z \rangle^2 \quad (24)$$

$$V_1 = \frac{\partial V}{\partial z} \Big|_{\langle z \rangle} - m\omega^2 \langle z \rangle \quad (25)$$

$$V_2 = \frac{m\omega^2}{2} \quad (26)$$

Generally, a Schrodinger equation of the form

$$i\hbar \frac{\partial \psi_{\pm}(z, t)}{\partial t} = \left[-\frac{\hbar^2}{2m} \frac{\partial^2}{\partial z^2} + V_{0,\pm}(t) + V_{1,\pm}(t)z + V_{2,\pm}(t)z^2 \right] \psi_{\pm}(z, t) \quad (27)$$

can be solved using a gaussian wave function

$$\psi_{\pm}(z, t) = \exp \left[-A_{\pm}(t) \frac{z^2}{2} + B_{\pm}(t)z + C_{\pm}(t) \right] \quad (28)$$

where $A_{\pm}(t)$, $B_{\pm}(t)$ and $C_{\pm}(t)$ are complex functions of time. We then get after straightforward computations the following system of equations:

$$\begin{cases} i \frac{dA_{\pm}(t)}{dt} = \frac{\hbar}{m} A_{\pm}(t)^2 - 2 \frac{V_{2,\pm}(t)}{\hbar} \\ i \frac{dB_{\pm}(t)}{dt} = \frac{\hbar}{m} A_{\pm}(t) B_{\pm}(t) + \frac{V_{1,\pm}(t)}{\hbar} \\ i \frac{dC_{\pm}(t)}{dt} = \frac{\hbar}{2m} [A_{\pm}(t) - B_{\pm}(t)]^2 + \frac{V_{0,\pm}(t)}{\hbar}. \end{cases} \quad (29)$$

Here $V_{k,\pm}$, $k = 0, 1, 2$, is defined through (30) and (31):

$$\begin{aligned} \mathcal{H}_z &= -\frac{\hbar^2}{2m} \frac{\partial^2}{\partial z^2} + \lambda \frac{g\mu_B}{2} (B_0 - B'_0 z) \otimes \sigma_z + \widehat{V}_{\pm}^G(z, t) \\ \widehat{V}_{\pm}^G(z, t) &= \underbrace{\nu_{\pm}^2 \left[\frac{m}{2} \omega_s^2 (z - \langle z \rangle_{\pm})^2 + \frac{m\omega_s^2}{2} \mathcal{Q}_{\pm}(t) - \frac{6}{5} \frac{G m^2}{R} \right]}_{\text{Self-interaction } |\pm\rangle \rightarrow |\pm\rangle} - \underbrace{(1 - \nu_{\pm}^2) \frac{G m^2}{|\langle z \rangle_{+} - \langle z \rangle_{-}|}}_{\text{Self-interaction } |\mp\rangle \rightarrow |\pm\rangle} \end{aligned} \quad (30)$$

$$(31)$$

where

$$\nu_{\pm} = \begin{cases} 1 & \text{if } |\langle z \rangle_{+} - \langle z \rangle_{-}| \leq 2R \\ |\beta_{\pm}| & \text{otherwise.} \end{cases} \quad \text{and} \quad \lambda = \begin{cases} 1 & \text{if } 0 \leq t \leq T_1 \quad \text{or} \quad T_4 \leq t \leq T_5 \\ 0 & \text{if } T_2 \leq t \leq T_3 \\ -1 & \text{if } T_1 \leq t \leq T_2 \quad \text{or} \quad T_3 \leq t \leq T_4 \end{cases}$$

A gaussian packet of the form (28) is characterized by the following identities:

$$\langle z \rangle_{\pm} = \frac{\text{Re} B_{\pm}}{\text{Re} A_{\pm}} \quad \text{and} \quad \langle p \rangle_{\pm} = \hbar \left(\text{Im} B_{\pm} - \text{Im} A_{\pm} \frac{\text{Re} B_{\pm}}{\text{Re} A_{\pm}} \right) \quad (32)$$

And we also know from (29) that

$$\frac{d\text{Re} A_{\pm}}{dt} = 2 \frac{\hbar}{m} \text{Re} A_{\pm} \text{Im} A_{\pm}, \quad \frac{d\text{Im} A_{\pm}}{dt} = -\frac{\hbar}{m} (\text{Re} A_{\pm}^2 - \text{Im} A_{\pm}^2) + 2 \frac{V_{2,\pm}}{\hbar} \quad (33)$$

$$\frac{d\text{Re} B_{\pm}}{dt} = \frac{\hbar}{m} (\text{Re} A_{\pm} \text{Im} B_{\pm} + \text{Im} A_{\pm} \text{Re} B_{\pm}), \quad \frac{d\text{Im} B_{\pm}}{dt} = -\frac{\hbar}{m} (\text{Re} A_{\pm} \text{Re} B_{\pm} - \text{Im} A_{\pm} \text{Im} B_{\pm}) - \frac{V_{1,\pm}}{\hbar}$$

hence one can show the following identities

$$\frac{d\langle z \rangle_{\pm}}{dt} = \frac{1}{m} \langle p \rangle_{\pm} \quad \frac{d\langle p \rangle_{\pm}}{dt} = -(V_{1,\pm} + 2 V_{2,\pm} \langle z \rangle_{\pm}) \quad (34)$$

In particular, (31) imposes that $V_{1,\pm}^G = -m\omega_s^2\nu_{\pm}^2\langle z\rangle_{\pm}$ and $V_{2,\pm}^G = \frac{m\omega_s^2}{2}$. It follows that $V_{1,\pm}^G + 2V_{2,\pm}^G\langle z\rangle_{\pm} = 0$ so that

$$\frac{d\langle z\rangle_{\pm}}{dt} = \frac{1}{m}\langle p\rangle_{\pm} \quad \frac{d\langle p\rangle_{\pm}}{dt} = \pm\lambda\frac{g\mu_B}{2}B'_0 \quad (35)$$

Consequently, the trajectory center of mass is not affected by self-gravity [?]; it is only influenced by the magnetic forces. This allows us to know at all times the average values of the position and that of the momentum of the center of mass which obey the classical predictions (as we do now).

B. Time evolution

- $T_0 \longrightarrow T_1$

$$\langle p\rangle_{\pm} = \pm\frac{g\mu_B}{2}B'_0t \quad \text{and} \quad \langle z\rangle_{\pm} = \pm\frac{g\mu_B}{4m}B'_0t^2 \quad (36)$$

- $T_1 \longrightarrow T_2$

$$\langle p\rangle_{\pm} = \mp\frac{g\mu_B}{2}B'_0(t - 2T_1) \quad \text{and} \quad \langle z\rangle_{\pm} = \mp\frac{g\mu_B}{4m}B'_0(t^2 - 4T_1t + 2T_1^2) \quad (37)$$

- $T_2 \longrightarrow T_3$

$$\langle p\rangle_{\pm} = 0 \quad \text{and} \quad \langle z\rangle_{\pm} = \pm\frac{g\mu_B}{2m}B'_0T_1^2 \quad (38)$$

- $T_3 \longrightarrow T_4$

$$\langle p\rangle_{\pm} = \mp\frac{g\mu_B}{2}B'_0(t - T_3) \quad \text{and} \quad \langle z\rangle_{\pm} = \mp\frac{g\mu_B}{4m}B'_0[(t - T_3)^2 - 2T_1^2] \quad (39)$$

- $T_4 \longrightarrow T_5$

$$\langle p\rangle_{\pm} = \pm\frac{g\mu_B}{2}B'_0(t - T_5) \quad \text{and} \quad \langle z\rangle_{\pm} = \pm\frac{g\mu_B}{4m}B'_0(t - T_5)^2 \quad (40)$$

Note that in order to achieve the recombination we must require that

$$T_2 - T_1 = T_4 - T_3 = T_5 - T_4 = T_1 \quad (41)$$

In the numerical simulations we chose $T_1 = 0.25$ s.

C. Classical action and quantum contributions to the phase shifts

Let us now compute the phase shift associated to each wave packet. Imposing a gaussian solution (28) we find, making use of (29) that the phase $\mathcal{I}mC$ evolves in time according to

$$\frac{d\mathcal{I}mC}{dt} = \frac{\hbar}{2m} [(\mathcal{R}eB)^2 - (\mathcal{I}mB)^2 - \mathcal{R}eA] - \frac{V_0}{\hbar} \quad (42)$$

with

$$V_0 = V(\langle z \rangle) - \langle z \rangle \frac{\partial V}{\partial z} \Big|_{\langle z \rangle} + \frac{1}{2} \frac{\partial^2 V}{\partial z^2} \Big|_{\langle z \rangle} \langle z \rangle^2 \quad (43)$$

Noting that

$$\langle z \rangle = \frac{\mathcal{R}eB}{\mathcal{R}eA} \quad \text{and} \quad \langle p \rangle = \hbar (\mathcal{I}mB - \mathcal{I}mA \langle z \rangle) \quad (44)$$

one can show that

$$\begin{aligned} \frac{d\mathcal{I}mC}{dt} = & \frac{\hbar}{2m} \left[\langle z \rangle^2 [(\mathcal{R}eA)^2 - (\mathcal{I}mA)^2] - 2 \frac{\langle p \rangle \langle z \rangle}{\hbar} \mathcal{I}mA - \frac{\langle p \rangle^2}{\hbar^2} - \mathcal{R}eA \right] \\ & - \frac{1}{\hbar} \left[V(\langle z \rangle) - \langle z \rangle \frac{\partial V}{\partial z} \Big|_{\langle z \rangle} + \frac{1}{2} \frac{\partial^2 V}{\partial z^2} \Big|_{\langle z \rangle} \langle z \rangle^2 \right] \end{aligned} \quad (45)$$

Making use of Ehrenfest's theorem, we get, as already shown $\frac{d\langle p \rangle}{dt} = -\frac{\partial V}{\partial z} \Big|_{\langle z \rangle}$ and $\frac{d\langle z \rangle}{dt} = \frac{\langle p \rangle}{m}$, which allows us to write :

$$V_0 = V(\langle z \rangle) + \frac{d}{dt} (\langle z \rangle \langle p \rangle) - \frac{\langle p \rangle^2}{m} + \frac{1}{2} \frac{\partial^2 V}{\partial z^2} \Big|_{\langle z \rangle} \langle z \rangle^2 \quad (46)$$

hence we get

$$\begin{aligned} \frac{d\mathcal{I}mC}{dt} = & \frac{\hbar}{2m} \left[\langle z \rangle^2 [(\mathcal{R}eA)^2 - (\mathcal{I}mA)^2] - 2 \frac{\langle p \rangle \langle z \rangle}{\hbar} \mathcal{I}mA - \mathcal{R}eA \right] \\ & - \frac{1}{2\hbar} \frac{\partial^2 V}{\partial z^2} \Big|_{\langle z \rangle} \langle z \rangle^2 - \frac{1}{\hbar} \frac{d}{dt} (\langle z \rangle \langle p \rangle) + \frac{1}{\hbar} \left(\frac{\langle p \rangle^2}{2m} - V(\langle z \rangle) \right) \end{aligned} \quad (47)$$

Now using the imaginary part of A

$$\frac{d\mathcal{I}mA}{dt} = -\frac{\hbar}{m} ((\mathcal{R}eA)^2 - (\mathcal{I}mA)^2) + 2 \frac{V_2}{\hbar} \quad \text{with} \quad V_2 = \frac{1}{2} \frac{\partial^2 V}{\partial z^2} \Big|_{\langle z \rangle} \quad (48)$$

we have then

$$\begin{aligned} \frac{d\mathcal{I}mC}{dt} = & -\frac{\hbar}{2m} \mathcal{R}eA - \frac{\langle z \rangle^2}{2} \left[\frac{d\mathcal{I}mA}{dt} - \frac{1}{\hbar} \frac{\partial^2 V}{\partial z^2} \Big|_{\langle z \rangle} \right] - \frac{1}{m} \langle p \rangle \langle z \rangle \mathcal{I}mA \\ & - \frac{1}{2\hbar} \frac{\partial^2 V}{\partial z^2} \Big|_{\langle z \rangle} \langle z \rangle^2 - \frac{1}{\hbar} \frac{d}{dt} (\langle z \rangle \langle p \rangle) + \frac{1}{\hbar} \left(\frac{\langle p \rangle^2}{2m} - V(\langle z \rangle) \right) \end{aligned} \quad (49)$$

after some rearrangement we get

$$\frac{d\mathcal{I}mC}{dt} = -\frac{\hbar}{2m} \mathcal{R}eA - \frac{1}{2} \frac{d}{dt} [\langle z \rangle^2 \mathcal{I}mA] - \frac{1}{\hbar} \frac{d}{dt} (\langle z \rangle \langle p \rangle) + \frac{1}{\hbar} \left(\frac{\langle p \rangle^2}{2m} - V(\langle z \rangle) \right) \quad (50)$$

after integration we get

$$\mathcal{I}mC(t) = -\frac{1}{2} \langle z \rangle^2 \mathcal{I}mA - \frac{1}{\hbar} \langle z \rangle \langle p \rangle + \frac{1}{\hbar} \int dt \left(\frac{\langle p \rangle^2}{2m} - V(\langle z \rangle) - \frac{\hbar^2}{2m} \mathcal{R}eA \right) \quad (51)$$

thus using

$$\mathcal{I}mA = -\frac{1}{\hbar \mathcal{Q}} \left[\mathcal{Q} \mathcal{P} - \frac{\hbar^2}{4} \right]^{\frac{1}{2}} \quad (52)$$

we get

$$\mathcal{I}mC(t) = \frac{1}{2} \frac{\langle z \rangle^2}{\hbar \mathcal{Q}} \left[\mathcal{Q} \mathcal{P} - \frac{\hbar^2}{4} \right]^{\frac{1}{2}} - \frac{1}{\hbar} \langle z \rangle \langle p \rangle + \frac{1}{\hbar} \int dt \left(\frac{\langle p \rangle^2}{2m} - V(\langle z \rangle) - \frac{\hbar^2}{2m} \mathcal{R}eA \right) \quad (53)$$

with

$$\mathcal{Q} = \langle z^2 \rangle - \langle z \rangle^2 = \frac{1}{2\mathcal{R}eA} \quad \mathcal{P} = \langle p^2 \rangle - \langle p \rangle^2 = \frac{\hbar^2}{2} \frac{|A|^2}{\mathcal{R}eA} \quad (54)$$

The two first terms in (53) systematically disappear during the recombination process while the integral contains the classical action plus a quantum correction.

D. Classical action and quantum contributions to the phase shifts in the Humpty-Dumpty Stern Gerlach experiment

Coming back to the humpty-dumpty experiment, we have the following hamiltonian:

$$\mathcal{H}_z = -\frac{\hbar^2}{2m} \frac{\partial^2}{\partial z^2} + \lambda \frac{g\mu_B}{2} (B_0 - B'_0 z) \otimes \sigma_z + \hat{V}_{\pm}^G(z, t) \quad (55)$$

with

$$\hat{V}_{\pm}^G(z, t) = \underbrace{\nu_{\pm}^2 \left[\frac{m}{2} \omega_s^2 (z - \langle z \rangle_{\pm})^2 + \frac{m\omega_s^2}{2} \mathcal{Q}_{\pm}(t) - \frac{6}{5} \frac{G m^2}{R} \right]}_{\text{Self-interaction } |\pm\rangle \rightarrow |\pm\rangle} - \underbrace{(1 - \nu_{\pm}^2) \frac{G m^2}{|\langle z \rangle_{+} - \langle z \rangle_{-}|}}_{\text{Self-interaction } |\mp\rangle \rightarrow |\pm\rangle} \quad (56)$$

and with

$$\nu_{\pm} = \begin{cases} 1 & \text{if } |\langle z \rangle_{+} - \langle z \rangle_{-}| \leq 2R \\ |\beta_{\pm}| & \text{otherwise.} \end{cases} \quad \text{and} \quad \lambda = \begin{cases} 1 & \text{if } 0 \leq t \leq T_1 \quad \text{or} \quad T_4 \leq t \leq T_5 \\ 0 & \text{if } T_2 \leq t \leq T_3 \\ -1 & \text{if } T_1 \leq t \leq T_2 \quad \text{or} \quad T_3 \leq t \leq T_4 \end{cases}$$

Hence using the expressions of the phase shifts for the spin up and spin down packets derived in the (SM):

$$\mathcal{I}mC_{\pm}(t) = \underbrace{-\frac{\langle z \rangle_{\pm} \langle p \rangle_{\pm}}{\hbar} + \frac{1}{\hbar} \mathcal{S}_{Cl}}_{\text{Classical contributions}} + \underbrace{\frac{\langle z \rangle_{\pm}^2}{2} \frac{1}{\hbar Q_{\pm}} \left[Q_{\pm} \mathcal{P}_{\pm} - \frac{\hbar^2}{4} \right]^{\frac{1}{2}} - \frac{1}{\hbar} \int dt \mathcal{F}_{Q,\pm}}_{\text{Quantum contributions}} \quad (57)$$

where here

$$\mathcal{S}_{Cl,\pm} = \int dt \left[\frac{\langle p \rangle_{\pm}^2}{2m} - V^{ext}(\langle z \rangle_{\pm}) \right] \quad (58)$$

$$(59)$$

$$\mathcal{F}_{Q,\pm} = \frac{\hbar^2}{4mQ_{\pm}} + \frac{m\omega_s^2}{2} Q_{\pm}(t) \nu_{\pm}^2 - \frac{6}{5} \frac{G m^2}{R} \nu_{\pm}^2 - (1 - \nu_{\pm}^2) \frac{G m^2}{d} \quad (60)$$

with

$$Q_{\pm} = \langle z^2 \rangle_{\pm} - \langle z \rangle_{\pm}^2 = \frac{1}{2\mathcal{R}eA_{\pm}} \quad \mathcal{P}_{\pm} = \langle p^2 \rangle_{\pm} - \langle p \rangle_{\pm}^2 = \frac{\hbar^2}{2} \frac{|A_{\pm}|^2}{\mathcal{R}eA_{\pm}} \quad (61)$$

We redefined the classical action $\mathcal{S}_{Cl}$ through $\mathcal{S}_{Cl,\pm} = \int dt \left[\frac{\langle p \rangle_{\pm}^2}{2m} - V^{ext}(\langle z \rangle_{\pm}) \right]$, where V^{ext} represents here the magnetic potential and here the self-gravitational potentials have been included in the quantum contributions $\mathcal{F}_{Q,\pm}$.

E. Estimate of $A_{\pm}(t)$

Here the following equation for $A_{\pm}(t)$ is solved

$$i \frac{dA_{\pm}(t)}{dt} = \frac{\hbar}{m} A_{\pm}(t)^2 - 2 \frac{V_{2,\pm}(t)}{\hbar} \quad \text{where} \quad V_{2,\pm}(t) = \frac{m \omega_s^2}{2} \nu_{\pm} \quad (62)$$

with

$$\nu_{\pm} = \begin{cases} 1 & \text{if } |\langle z \rangle_+ - \langle z \rangle_-| \leq 2R \\ |\beta_{\pm}| & \text{otherwise.} \end{cases} \quad (63)$$

It is useful to use a set of dimensionless variables such that

$$X(t) = A_{\pm}(t) L^2 \quad \text{and} \quad s = \omega_s t \quad (64)$$

with

$$L^2 = \frac{\hbar}{m \omega_s} \quad (65)$$

Thus we get

$$i \frac{dX}{ds} = X^2 - \nu_{\pm}^2 \quad (66)$$

then

$$\frac{dX}{(X - \nu_{\pm})(X + \nu_{\pm})} = -i ds \quad (67)$$

which can be put in the form

$$\frac{dX}{2\nu_{\pm}} \left(\frac{1}{X - \nu_{\pm}} - \frac{1}{X + \nu_{\pm}} \right) = -i ds \quad (68)$$

after integration we get

$$\ln \left(\frac{X - \nu_{\pm}}{X + \nu_{\pm}} \frac{X_0 - \nu_{\pm}}{X_0 + \nu_{\pm}} \right) = -2i\nu_{\pm} s \quad (69)$$

with $X_0 = X(t=0)$ and $c_0 = \frac{X_0 - \nu_{\pm}}{X_0 + \nu_{\pm}}$. Finally it reads

$$\boxed{X(s) = \nu_{\pm} \frac{1 + c_0 e^{-2i\nu_{\pm} s}}{1 - c_0 e^{-2i\nu_{\pm} s}}} \quad \text{or} \quad \boxed{A_{\pm}(t) = \nu_{\pm} \frac{m \omega_s}{\hbar} \frac{1 + c_0 e^{-2i\nu_{\pm} \omega_s t}}{1 - c_0 e^{-2i\nu_{\pm} \omega_s t}}} \quad (70)$$

with

$$\nu_{\pm} = \begin{cases} 1 & \text{if } |\langle z \rangle_+ - \langle z \rangle_-| \leq 2R \\ |\beta_{\pm}| & \text{otherwise.} \end{cases} \quad (71)$$

Therefore, it is not necessary to solve the equations (29) for knowing $B_{\pm}(t)$, of which the

values can be derived directly from (44) and using the analytical expressions of $A_{\pm}(t)$, $\langle z \rangle_{\pm}$ and $\langle p \rangle_{\pm}$, the latter being obtained making use of Ehrenfest's theorem.

The real part of equation (70) can be rewritten in terms of the initial spread $\mathcal{Q}_0 = \langle \mathbf{z}(t_0)^2 \rangle - \langle \mathbf{z}(t_0) \rangle^2$ as

$$\frac{1}{\mathcal{R}e(A_{\pm}(t))} = 2 \mathcal{Q}_0 \cos^2(\nu_{\pm} \omega_s t) + \frac{\hbar^2 \sin^2(\nu_{\pm} \omega_s t)}{2m^2 \omega_s^2 \nu_{\pm}^2 \mathcal{Q}_0} \quad (72)$$

Hence since $\mathcal{Q}_{\pm}(t) = \frac{1}{2\mathcal{R}e(A_{\pm}(t))}$ we have :

$$\mathcal{Q}_{\pm}(t) = \mathcal{Q}_0 \cos^2(\nu_{\pm} \omega_s t) + \frac{\hbar^2 \sin^2(\nu_{\pm} \omega_s t)}{4m^2 \omega_s^2 \nu_{\pm}^2 \mathcal{Q}_0} \quad (73)$$

Note that the case of the free particle is recovered in the limit $\omega_s t \ll 1$ in which the equation above is expanded as

$$\mathcal{Q}_{\pm}(t) = \mathcal{Q}_0 + \mathcal{Q}_0 t^2 \left(\frac{\hbar^2}{4m^2 \mathcal{Q}_0^2} - \nu_{\pm}^2 \omega_s^2 \right) + \mathcal{O}((\omega_s t)^3) \quad (74)$$

which can be put into the form

$$\mathcal{Q}_{\pm}(t) = \underbrace{\mathcal{Q}_0 \left[1 + \frac{\hbar^2 t^2}{4m^2 \mathcal{Q}_0^2} \right]}_{\text{Quantum spread of the free particle}} - \underbrace{(\omega_s t)^2 \mathcal{Q}_0 \nu_{\pm}^2}_{\text{Contribution of self-gravity}} + \mathcal{O}((\omega_s t)^3) \quad (75)$$

F. Discussion: contributions of self-gravity to the spread and nuclear corrections.

In order to take account of nuclear corrections, we have to impose that ω_s is of the order of $\sqrt{G \left(\frac{10^{-12}}{10^{-10}} \right)^3 \rho_{\text{sphere}}} \approx 1$ Hz when the width of the wave function is smaller than the size of a nucleon (of the order of 10^{-12} m [11]), and equal to $\sqrt{\frac{Gm}{R^3}} = \sqrt{G \rho_{\text{sphere}}}$ otherwise [9].

Even if we take these corrections into account, the global contribution of self-gravity in (75) is actually negligible because either the pulsation of the (comoving) harmonic potential ω_s is very small or, when it is large due to nuclear contributions, it is large only during very short times.

Indeed it is easy to check that whenever the width of the wave function is larger than the size of a nucleon (of the order of 10^{-12} m [11]), so that $\sqrt{\frac{Gm}{R^3}} = \sqrt{G \rho_{\text{sphere}}} \approx 10^{-3}$ Hz then $(\omega_s t)^2 \approx 10^{-6}$ for falls of duration of the order of 1 s.

Otherwise, when for instance $\sqrt{\mathcal{Q}_0} \leq 10^{-12}$ m, the expansion of the free packet occurs so fast that the pulsation ω_s will get boosted by nucleic contributions during a negligibly

short time. For instance, if we impose that $\sqrt{\mathcal{Q}_0}$ belongs to the interval $(10^{-13}, 10^{-15})$ m, $\sqrt{\mathcal{Q}_0}$ will reach a width $\sqrt{\mathcal{Q}} \approx 10^{-12}$ m after a time of the order of $(m\mathcal{Q}_0/\hbar) \cdot 10^{-12}$ m that belongs to the interval $(10^{-5}, 10^{-9})$ s. Then $\omega_s t$ belongs to the interval $(10^{-5}, 10^{-9})$, which is very small compared to unity. This explains why the nucleic corrections are negligible being given the typical values of times, masses and so on considered by us in our proposal.

As has been confirmed by accurate numerical computations (see e.g. figure 5), the difference between $\mathcal{Q}_{\pm}(t)$ and their free counterpart $\mathcal{Q}_0 \left[1 + \frac{\hbar^2 t^2}{4m^2 \mathcal{Q}_0^2}\right]$ can thus consistently be neglected.

Indeed, in the limit $\omega_s t \ll 1$ considered above and using equation (75) we get that the difference in the width is given by

$$\mathcal{D}(t) = \sqrt{\mathcal{Q}_-(t)} - \sqrt{\mathcal{Q}_+(t)} = \frac{\sqrt{\mathcal{Q}_0}}{2} (1 - 2|\beta_-|^2) (\omega_s t)^2 + \mathcal{O}((\omega_s t)^3) \quad (76)$$

For example, in our simulations, when we considered $m = 5, 5 \cdot 10^{-15}$ kg, $\omega_s = \sqrt{\frac{Gm}{R^3}} \sim 6 \cdot 10^{-4}$ Hz, $|\beta_+| = \frac{1}{\sqrt{3}}$ and $|\beta_-| = \sqrt{\frac{2}{3}}$, we found for a time T_5 of the order of 3 s, $\mathcal{D}(T_5) \sim 5, 4 \cdot 10^{-17}$ m. The difference between the width $\mathcal{D}(T_5)$ is thus smaller than all the characteristic lengths considered in this study. Actually, the difference between $A_{\pm}(t)$ and $A(t)$, where $A(t)$ is the free counterpart of $A_{\pm}(t)$ (see also figure 5) can also be consistently neglected for similar reasons. All this explains why

$$\begin{aligned} \frac{1}{\hbar} \int dt \mathcal{F}_{Q,\pm} &= \frac{1}{\hbar} \int dt \left(\frac{\hbar^2}{4m\mathcal{Q}_{\pm}} + \frac{m\omega_s^2}{2} \mathcal{Q}_{\pm}(t) \nu_{\pm}^2 - \frac{6}{5} \frac{Gm^2}{R} \nu_{\pm}^2 - (1 - \nu_{\pm}^2) \frac{Gm^2}{d} \right) \\ &\approx \frac{1}{\hbar} \int dt \left(\frac{\hbar^2}{4m\mathcal{Q}} + \frac{m\omega_s^2}{2} \mathcal{Q}(t) \nu_{\pm}^2 - \frac{6}{5} \frac{Gm^2}{R} \nu_{\pm}^2 - (1 - \nu_{\pm}^2) \frac{Gm^2}{d} \right) \end{aligned} \quad (77)$$




FIG. 5. Here we plot the spread in position of the wave packets $|+\rangle$, $\sqrt{\mathcal{Q}_+} = \frac{1}{\sqrt{2\mathcal{R}eA_+}}$ with and without self-gravity. We considered $m = 5,5 \cdot 10^{-15}$ kg, $\omega_s = \sqrt{\frac{Gm}{R^3}} \sim 6 \cdot 10^{-4}$ Hz, $|\beta_+| = \frac{1}{\sqrt{3}}$ and $|\beta_-| = \sqrt{\frac{2}{3}}$ and $\sqrt{\mathcal{Q}_0} = 10^{-9}$ m.

G. Formal expressions of the integrals in the phase shift

We shall now consider the following integrals that appear in the total phase shift

$$I_{1,\pm}(t) = \int dt' \frac{\hbar}{4m\mathcal{Q}_{\pm}(t')} \quad \text{and} \quad I_{2,\pm}(t) = \int dt' \frac{m\omega_s^2}{2\hbar} \mathcal{Q}_{\pm}(t') \nu_{\pm}^2. \quad (78)$$

- It can be shown that

$$I_{1,\pm}(t) = \frac{1}{2} \tan^{-1} \left(\frac{\hbar \tan(\nu_{\pm} \omega_s t)}{2m\nu_{\pm} \mathcal{Q}_0 \omega_s} \right) \quad (79)$$

In the limit $\omega_s t \ll 1$ (this is the limit we considered in the main paper):

$$I_{1,\pm}(t) = \frac{\hbar t}{4m\mathcal{Q}_0} + \mathcal{O}((\omega_s t)^3). \quad (80)$$

In this limit, self gravity does not contribute in the phase shift since $I_{1,+}(t) - I_{1,-}(t) = 0 + \mathcal{O}((\omega_s t)^3)$.




FIG. 6. We illustrate here the functions (79) and (81) in the limit $\omega_s t \sim 1$ for different values of the initial spread $\sqrt{Q_0}$. We chose $m = 5, 5 \cdot 10^{-15}$ kg, $\omega_s = \sqrt{\frac{Gm}{R^3}} \sim 6 \cdot 10^{-4}$ Hz, $|\beta_+| = \frac{1}{\sqrt{3}}$ and $|\beta_-| = \sqrt{\frac{2}{3}}$

• Now let us consider the second contribution made by the function $I_{2,\pm}(t)$. It can be shown that after integration we get:

$$I_{2,\pm}(t) = \frac{1}{2} \frac{m\omega_s^2}{\hbar} \nu_{\pm}^2 \left[\frac{Q_0 t}{2} + \frac{\hbar^2 t}{8m^2 \omega_s^2 \nu_{\pm}^2 Q_0} + \left(\frac{Q_0}{4\nu_{\pm} \omega_s} - \frac{\hbar^2}{16m^2 \nu_{\pm}^3 \omega_s^3 Q_0} \right) \sin(2\nu_{\pm} \omega_s t) \right] \quad (81)$$

Here again, in the range of parameters (initial spreads, mass, typical times) considered by us, $\omega_s t \ll 1$ and $1 \ll \frac{\hbar^2 t^2}{4m^2 Q_0^2}$ excepted for very short times so that

$$I_{2,\pm}(t) \approx \frac{1}{2} \frac{m\omega_s^2}{\hbar} \nu_{\pm}^2 Q_0 \left[\frac{\hbar^2 t^3}{12m^2 Q_0^2} \right] \quad (82)$$

Hence if $|\beta_+| = \frac{1}{\sqrt{3}}$ and $|\beta_-| = \sqrt{\frac{2}{3}}$:

$$I_{2,+}(t) - I_{2,-}(t) \approx \frac{m\omega_s^2}{\hbar} Q_0 \left[\frac{\hbar^2 t^3}{72m^2 Q_0^2} \right] \quad (83)$$

which fits well the analytical function plotted in figure 8.

If in particular one is able to initially prepare the degrees of freedom associated to the center of mass (or at least their z component) in the ground state of the trap from which it is afterwards released, then $Q_0 = \hbar/(m \omega_{Trap})$, and the phase-shift

$$I_{2,+}(T_5) - I_{2,-}(T_5) \approx \frac{1}{72} \omega_{Trap} \omega_s^2 (T_5 - T_s)^3 \quad (84)$$

for T_5 sufficiently large.

For instance in equation (83), if we take $m = 5,5 \cdot 10^{-15}$ kg, $\sqrt{Q_0} = 10^{-13}$ m, we predict $\omega_{Trap} = 1.82$ Mhz and $\omega_s = 6,4 \cdot 10^{-4}$ Hz. Imposing $T_5 = 2$ s and $T_s = 0.034$ s, the contribution in the phase shift made by $I_{2,+}(T_5 - T_s) - I_{2,-}(T_5 - T_s)$ is predicted in this way to be of the order of 0.07039 which fits very well the exact final phase shift ≈ 0.07035 corresponding to figure 8.

In figure 6 we plot the functions $I_{1,+}(t) - I_{1,-}(t)$ and $I_{2,+}(t) - I_{2,-}(t)$ for different values of the initial spread.

H. Contributions in the phase shift : numerical simulations




FIG. 7. Plots of individual contributions of each term in the expression of the total phase shift. We chose $\sqrt{\mathcal{Q}_0} = 10^{-10}$ m, $m = 5, 5 \cdot 10^{-15}$ kg, $\omega_s = \sqrt{\frac{Gm}{R^3}} \sim 6 \cdot 10^{-4}$ Hz, $|\beta_+| = \frac{1}{\sqrt{3}}$ and $|\beta_-| = \sqrt{\frac{2}{3}}$.




FIG. 8. Plots of numerical simulations of the individual contributions of each term in the expression of the total phase shift. We chose $\sqrt{Q_0} = 10^{-13}$ m, $m = 5, 5 \cdot 10^{-15}$ kg, $\omega_s = \sqrt{\frac{Gm}{R^3}} \sim 6 \cdot 10^{-4}$ Hz, $|\beta_+| = \frac{1}{\sqrt{3}}$ and $|\beta_-| = \sqrt{\frac{2}{3}}$.