Field-induced entanglement in spatially superposed objects

Akira Matsumura

Department of Physics, Kyushu University, Fukuoka, 819-0395, Japan

Abstract

We discuss the generation of field-induced entanglement between two objects each in a superposition of two trajectories. The objects have currents coupled to local quantum fields, and the currents are evaluated by using classical values associated with each trajectory of the objects. If the fields have only dynamical degrees of freedom and satisfy the microcausality condition, we show that the objects initially in a product state cannot be entangled when they are spacelike separated. This means that such quantum fields do not work as mediators to generate spacelike entanglement between the two superposed objects.
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I. INTRODUCTION

The full picture of quantum gravity [1–4], which unifies general relativity and quantum mechanics, is still unclear. This is attributed to the lack of theoretical and experimental approaches to connect gravitational and quantum phenomena. However, with the recent development of various quantum technologies [5–8], there have been attempts to clarify quantum natures of gravity (for example, see [9] and the references therein, or the recent works [12–30]). In such works, the Bose-Marletto-Vedral (BMV) proposal [10, 11], which focuses on gravity-induced entanglement, has been attracting attentions. In the proposal, the authors considered two objects each in a superposition of two trajectories and assumed the Newtonian potential between them. The gravitational interactions generate the entanglement between the two objects. They argued that the gravity-induced entanglement would verify quantum gravity. However, it is not clear about the quantum nature of dynamical degrees of freedom for the Einstein’s gravity (spin-2 gravitons). This is because the Newtonian potential is obtained only from the constraint conditions in the Einstein’s equation (the Poisson equation).

The interesting point in the BMV proposal is that two spatially superposed objects can be a probe to test quantum entanglement. This is analogous to entanglement harvesting protocols [31–39] by the Unruh-DeWitt detector. The Unruh-DeWitt detector is constructed
by a particle with internal degrees of freedom, which locally interacts with a quantum field. In this model, the source of entanglement is the quantum field. In particular, it is known that the spacelike entanglement of a vacuum state induces the entanglement between the two spatially separated detectors (for example, see [31]).

In this paper, we investigate how two superposed objects are capable to probe the entanglement of quantum fields. We assume that the fields have only dynamical degrees of freedom and any constraint equations are not imposed on the whole Hilbert space of the objects and the fields. We consider the superposed objects which do not interact each other and whose currents locally couple with the fields. By assigning classical values to the currents along the objects’ trajectory, we compute the time evolution of the reduced density operator of the objects. For the case where the objects are spatially separated, we find that they remain disentangled if the microcausality condition holds for the quantum fields. In other words, such quantum fields cannot be mediators to generate spacelike entanglement for the two superposed objects. Our analysis also presents possible extensions of the objects’ model to verify the spacelike entanglement of fields; object with the fluctuation of internal degrees of freedom, multi-objects or multi-trajectories model.

This paper is organized as follows. In Sec. II the BMV proposal to test quantum gravity and its theoretical approach are reviewed. In Sec. III we introduce the model with the interaction given in a bilinear form of fields and currents of two objects. We derive the solution of the Schrödinger equation. In Sec. IV we investigate the separability of the two objects by using the solution. We find the no-go result of generation of spacelike entanglement, and discuss its implications. In Sec. V the conclusion is devoted. We use the natural units $\hbar = c = 1$ in this paper.

II. BOSE-MARLETTI-VEDRAL PROPOSAL TO TEST QUANTUM GRAVITY

The experimental setting of two matter-wave interferometers to test quantum gravity was proposed, which is called the BMV proposal [10] [11]. In each interferometer, a single object is in a superposition of two trajectories. Fig.1 presents a rough configuration of trajectories of each object. We assume that the two objects interact with each other by the Newtonian
FIG. 1: A configuration of the trajectories of the objects A and B. For the BMV proposal, the entanglement is generated between the objects by the gravitational interaction.

The Hamiltonian of the objects is

$$\hat{H}_{BMV} = \hat{H}_A + \hat{H}_B + \hat{V}_{AB}, \quad \hat{V}_{AB} = -\frac{G m_A m_B}{|\hat{x}_A - \hat{x}_B|},$$

(1)

where $m_A$ and $m_B$ are the masses of the objects A and B, $\hat{x}_A$ and $\hat{x}_B$ are each position, and the Hamiltonian $\hat{H}_A$ and $\hat{H}_B$ determine each trajectory of the objects. Each of the two objects at $t = 0$ is in the spatially superposed state,

$$|\psi_{in}\rangle = \frac{1}{\sqrt{2}}(|\psi_R\rangle_A + |\psi_L\rangle_A) \otimes \frac{1}{\sqrt{2}}(|\psi_R\rangle_B + |\psi_L\rangle_B),$$

(2)

where $|\psi_R\rangle_A$ and $|\psi_L\rangle_A$ are the states with wave packets localized around positions $x = x_{AR}(0)$ and $x = x_{AL}(0)$ at $t = 0$, respectively. Also, $|\psi_R\rangle_B$ and $|\psi_L\rangle_B$ are defined in the same manner. When each wave packet is sufficiently separated, those states satisfy

$$A \langle \psi_R | \psi_L \rangle_A \approx 0 \quad \text{and} \quad B \langle \psi_R | \psi_L \rangle_B \approx 0.$$ 

The evolved state $|\psi(t_f)\rangle$ at $t = t_f$ is

$$|\psi(t_f)\rangle = e^{-it\hat{H}_{BMV}}|\psi_{in}\rangle$$

$$= e^{-it(\hat{H}_A + \hat{H}_B)T} \text{exp} \left[i \int_0^{t_f} dt \left( \frac{G m_A m_B}{|\hat{x}_A^I(t) - \hat{x}_B^I(t)|} \right) \right] |\psi_{in}\rangle$$

$$\approx \frac{1}{2} e^{-it(\hat{H}_A + \hat{H}_B)} \sum_{P,Q = R,L} e^{i\Phi_{PQ}} |\psi_P\rangle_A |\psi_Q\rangle_B,$$

(3)

where $T$ is the time-ordered product, and $\hat{x}_A^I(t) = e^{it(\hat{H}_A + \hat{H}_B)} \hat{x}_A e^{-it(\hat{H}_A + \hat{H}_B)}$ and $\hat{x}_B^I(t) = e^{it(\hat{H}_A + \hat{H}_B)} \hat{x}_B e^{-it(\hat{H}_A + \hat{H}_B)}$ are the position operators in the interaction picture. The phase shift,

$$\Phi_{PQ} = \int_0^{t_f} dt \frac{G m_A m_B}{|\hat{x}_{AP}(t) - \hat{x}_{BQ}(t)|},$$

(4)
is determined by the Newtonian potential between the two objects on the trajectories \( x = x_{A_P}(t) \) and \( x = x_{B_Q}(t) \) \((P, Q = R, L)\). In the expression (3), we omitted the symbol of the tensor product as \( |·\rangle_A \otimes |·\rangle_B = |·\rangle_A |·\rangle_B \). The approximation of the third line of Eq. (3) is
\[
\hat{x}_A^I(t)|\psi_P\rangle_A \approx x_{A_P}(t)|\psi_P\rangle_A, \quad \hat{x}_B^I(t)|\psi_Q\rangle_B \approx x_{B_Q}(t)|\psi_Q\rangle_B.
\] (5)
These equations are valid when each object is sufficiently localized, for example, when the size of each wave packet is larger than de Broglie wave length of each object \([40, 41]\). Choosing the masses, the distance between a pair of trajectories and the traveling time properly, we find that the state (3) is entangled. Hence the gravitational interaction can generate quantum entanglement. The key point in the BMV proposal is that the spatially superposed objects can probe quantum entanglement. In the following sections, we will discuss the detection of entanglement of dynamical fields by such objects.

### III. MODEL HAMILTONIAN FOR FIELDS AND OBJECTS

In this section, we introduce a model with a field-current bilinear interaction. In the Schrödinger picture, we consider the Hamiltonian of fields and two objects A and B as
\[
\hat{H} = \hat{H}_A + \hat{H}_B + \hat{H}_F + \hat{V}, \quad \hat{V} = \int d^3x \sum_k \left( \hat{j}_A^k(x) + \hat{j}_B^k(x) \right) \hat{\phi}_k(x),
\] (6)
where the Hamiltonians \( \hat{H}_A, \hat{H}_B \) and \( \hat{H}_F \) determine each dynamics of the objects A, B and the fields. \( \hat{j}_A^k \) and \( \hat{j}_B^k \) are current operators with respect to the objects A and B, and \( \hat{\phi}_k \) is the field operator. We assume that the fields have only dynamical degrees of freedom and there are no constraint equations on the whole Hilbert space. The field operators are represented on a physical Hilbert space \( \mathcal{H}_F \) without negative norm states. In gauge field theories, there are formalisms using an unphysical Hilbert space of fields with gauge degrees of freedom \([46]\). The fact that there are no negative norm states will be used to derive our result in the next section.

We note that the Hamiltonian (6) does not completely represent that in the linearized Einstein theory. At first glance, by choosing the currents \( \hat{j}_A^k, \hat{j}_B^k \) and the fields \( \hat{\phi}_k \) as the energy-momentum tensor \( \hat{T}^{\mu\nu} \) and the metric perturbation \( \hat{h}_{\mu\nu} \) properly, the local interaction \( \hat{V} \) seems to be that in the linearized Einstein theory. This is not correct since the fields and those Hilbert space \( \mathcal{H}_F \) are assumed not to have no gauge degrees of freedom and negative
objects A and B without total electric charges have the electric dipole moments \( \hat{d}_A \) and \( \hat{d}_B \). Let us consider that the interactions between the two objects in our model.

By assigning the field operator \( \hat{\phi}_k \) and the currents \( \hat{j}_A^k \) and \( \hat{j}_B^k \) to \( \hat{E}_k \), \( \hat{d}_A^k \delta^3(x - x_A) \) and \( \hat{d}_B^k \delta^3(x - x_B) \), our model describes the objects with the dipole coupling to the electric field at the positions \( x = x_A \) and \( x = x_B \). For the distant objects, the Coulomb potential between them is neglected, and the local coupling to an electric field \( \hat{E} \) can be dominant.

In \([35]\), a similar model with time-dependent couplings and spatially smearing functions was considered as the Unruh-DeWitt detector model.

We consider that each object at \( t = 0 \) is in a superposition of two localized states \(|j_R\rangle\) and \(|j_L\rangle\) with \( \langle j_P | j_{P'} \rangle \approx \delta_{P'P} \) (\( P, P' = R, L \)). The objects move on the trajectories given by the Hamiltonian \( \hat{H}_A \) and \( \hat{H}_B \) (see Fig. 1). We assume that the current operators

\[
\hat{j}_{kA}^k(t, x) = e^{i\hat{H}_A t} \hat{j}_{kA}^k(x) e^{-i\hat{H}_A t} \quad \text{and} \quad \hat{j}_{kB}^k(t, x) = e^{i\hat{H}_B t} \hat{j}_{kB}^k(x) e^{-i\hat{H}_B t}
\]

in the interaction picture defined with \( \hat{H}_0 = \hat{H}_A + \hat{H}_B + \hat{H}_F \) are approximated by the classical currents \([40, 41]\):

\[
\hat{j}_{kA}^k(t, x) |j_P\rangle_A \approx j_{kA}^k(t, x) \langle j_P| A, \quad \hat{j}_{kB}^k(t, x) |j_Q\rangle_B \approx j_{kB}^k(t, x) \langle j_Q| B, \tag{7}
\]

where \( j_{kA}^k(t, x) \) and \( j_{kB}^k(t, x) \) (\( P, Q = R, L \)) have nontrivial values only on the classical trajectories \( x = x_{A_P}(t) \) and \( x = x_{B_Q}(t) \), respectively. For example, if the objects have electric dipole moments and the fields are electric fields, the classical current \( j_{kA}^k(t, x) \) of the object A has the form \( j_{kA}^k(t, x) = d_{A}^k(t) \delta^3(x - x_{A_P}(t)) \) with the electric dipole \( d_{A}^k(t) \). The localized state \( |j_P\rangle_A = |\psi_P\rangle_A |d\rangle_A \), where \( |\psi_P\rangle_A \) is the state with a local wave packet and \( |d\rangle_A \) is the state of the electric dipole of the object A. For these states, the position and the electric dipole of the object A are assumed not to fluctuate; \( \hat{x}_{A}^l(t)|\psi_P\rangle_A \approx x_{A_P}(t)|\psi_P\rangle_A \) and \( \hat{d}_{A}^l(t)|d\rangle_A \approx d_{A}^l(t)|d\rangle_A \), where \( \hat{x}_{A}^l(t) = e^{i\hat{H}_A t} \hat{x}_{A} e^{-i\hat{H}_A t} \) and \( \hat{d}_{A}^l(t) = e^{i\hat{H}_A t} \hat{d}_{A} e^{-i\hat{H}_A t} \). The similar argument is made for the object B.

When the fields are in an state \( |\chi\rangle_F \) at \( t = 0 \), the state of the objects and the fields at
$t = 0$ is

$$
|\Psi_{\text{in}}\rangle = |\alpha\rangle_A |\beta\rangle_B |\chi\rangle_F, \quad |\alpha\rangle_A = \alpha_R |j_R\rangle_A + \alpha_L |j_L\rangle_A, \quad |\beta\rangle_B = \beta_R |j_R\rangle_B + \beta_L |j_L\rangle_B,
$$

where $|\alpha_R|^2 + |\alpha_L|^2 \approx 1$ and $|\beta_R|^2 + |\beta_L|^2 \approx 1$ holds since the state $|j_P\rangle$ satisfies $\langle j_P | j_P \rangle \approx \delta_{PP'}$. Note that the initial product state may be not valid if there are constraint equations on the objects and fields. The solution of the Schrödinger equation is

$$
|\Psi(t_f)\rangle = e^{-i \hat{H}_t f} |\Psi_{\text{in}}\rangle
$$

where $\hat{\phi}_k(t, x) = e^{i \hat{H}_0 t} \hat{\phi}_k(x) e^{-i \hat{H}_0 t}$. In the third line, we used the approximations [7] assigning the classical currents and define the unitary operator $\hat{U}_{PQ}$,

$$
\hat{U}_{PQ} = \text{T exp} \left[ -i \int_{0}^{t_f} dt \int d^3 x \sum_k (\hat{j}^k_A(t, x) + \hat{j}^k_B(t, x)) \hat{\phi}_{k}(t, x) \right] |\Psi_{\text{in}}\rangle
$$

In the next section, we examine the entanglement between the two objects A and B using the solution Eq. (9). We will show no generation of entanglement between the objects in spacelike regions. This argument follows by the microcausality of fields, which is independent of the dynamics of the fields.

IV. NO GENERATION OF SPACELIKE ENTANGLEMENT BETWEEN TWO OBJECTS

In this section, we investigate the generation of entanglement between the two objects. Before mentioning our result, we focus on two origins of the generation of entanglement.

First, it is important to consider whether the unitary evolution gives correlations between the objects or not. The Hamiltonian $\hat{H}_0 = \hat{H}_A + \hat{H}_B + \hat{H}_F$ yields independent dynamics of each system, which give no correlations. On the other hand, the unitary evolution $\hat{U}_{PQ}$ Eq.(10) given by the local interaction $\hat{V}$ leads to the following process: the object A locally excites the fields, and then the excitations propagate to the object B and alter the potential around it. This process gives effective interactions and induces correlations between the objects A and B.
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FIG. 2: A configuration of trajectories of each object, which is in spatially separated regions.

objects A and B. In fact, there are no such effects when the two objects are in spacelike separated regions (see Fig. 2). If the fields in spacelike regions commute each other (the microcausality condition, for example, see [45]), we have

\[
\int d^3x \sum_k j^k_{AP}(t, x) \hat{\phi}_k^1(t, x) \int d^3y \sum_\ell j^\ell_{BQ}(t', y) \hat{\phi}_\ell^1(t', y) = 0,
\]

where note that \( j^k_{AP}(t, x) \propto \delta^3(x - x_{AP}(t)) \) and \( j^\ell_{BQ}(t', y) \propto \delta^3(y - x_{BQ}(t')) \). Then the unitary operator \( \hat{U}_{PQ} \) is factorized into the local unitaries,

\[
\hat{U}_{PQ} = \hat{U}_{AP} \otimes \hat{U}_{BQ},
\]

where \( \hat{U}_{AP} \) and \( \hat{U}_{BQ} \) are

\[
\hat{U}_{AP} = T \exp \left[ -i \int_0^{t_f} dt \int d^3x \sum_k j^k_{AP}(t, x) \hat{\phi}_k^1(t, x) \right],
\]

\[
\hat{U}_{BQ} = T \exp \left[ -i \int_0^{t_f} dt' \int d^3y \sum_\ell j^\ell_{BQ}(t', y) \hat{\phi}_\ell^1(t', y) \right].
\]

The local unitaries \( \hat{U}_{AP} \) and \( \hat{U}_{BQ} \) act on the Hilbert spaces \( \mathcal{H}_{FA} \) and \( \mathcal{H}_{FB} \) of the fields for two spacelike regions, respectively (the total Hilbert space \( \mathcal{H}_F \) of the fields is described by \( \mathcal{H}_F = \mathcal{H}_{FA} \otimes \mathcal{H}_{FB} \)). There are no interactions induced by the fields for the factorized evolution in Eq. (12), which does not generate entanglement between the two objects.

Another important point is quantum entanglement of fields’ state. The previous work [31] showed that a pair of Unruh-DeWitt detectors, even if they are spacelike separated, becomes entangled due to the entanglement of the vacuum of a relativistic field. Also, there are many works about the generation of entanglement for spacelike separated detectors in the context
of entanglement harvesting protocol \[32-35\]. These works mean that the entanglement of the state \(|\chi_F\rangle\) of the fields can be a source of the entanglement of the objects.

However, in the following we find that the spacelike entanglement of fields cannot be detected by the two objects of interest. The definition of entanglement as follows: a given state is not entangled if the density operator \(\rho\) of a system has a separable form \[42-44\],

\[
\rho = \sum_i p_i \rho_i \otimes \sigma_i, \tag{15}
\]

where \(p_i\) is a probability, \(\rho_i\) and \(\sigma_i\) are density operators of the subsystems. A state which cannot be written in such form is called entangled. We show that the reduced density operator of the two objects is written in a separable form. Tracing out the fields from the evolved state (9), the reduced density operator of the objects in spacelike regions is

\[
\rho = \sum_{P,P'=R,L} \sum_{Q,Q'=R,L} \alpha_P \alpha_{P'} \beta_Q \beta_{Q'} \langle \chi | \hat{U}_{A_{P'}}^\dagger \hat{U}_{A_P} \otimes \hat{U}_{B_{Q'}}^\dagger \hat{U}_{B_Q} | \chi \rangle_F | j_P \rangle_A \langle j_{P'} | \otimes | j_Q \rangle_B \langle j_{Q'} |, \tag{16}
\]

where we used Eq. (12), and the evolution operator \(e^{-i\hat{H}_0 t}\) was ignored because the local unitary transformation does not change the entanglement of the objects. The unitary operator \(\hat{V}_{A_{P'}}^A \hat{U}_{A_P} = \hat{V}_{A_P} \hat{U}_{A_P}\) appearing in (16) satisfies

\[
\hat{V}_{RR} = \hat{V}_{LL} = \hat{I}_A, \quad \hat{V}_{LR} = \hat{V}_{RL} = (\hat{V}_{RL})^{-1}, \tag{17}
\]

and hence all of the unitaries \(\hat{V}_{RR}^A, \hat{V}_{RL}^A, \hat{V}_{LR}^A\) and \(\hat{V}_{LL}^A\) commute each other. This means that \(\hat{V}_{P'P}^A\) has the following spectral decomposition,

\[
\hat{V}_{P'P}^A = \int e^{i\theta_{P'P}(\lambda)} d\hat{\mu}_A(\lambda), \tag{18}
\]

where \(\hat{\mu}_A\) is an operator-valued measure on the Hilbert space \(\mathcal{H}_A\), which is a part of the fields’ Hilbert space \(\mathcal{H}_F\). The real phase \(\theta_{P'P}(\lambda)\) has the antisymmetric property \(\theta_{P'P}(\lambda) = -\theta_{PP}(\lambda)\), which reflects Eq. (17). As the number of trajectories for each object is two, the number of independent components of \(\theta_{P'P}(\lambda)\) is one. Hence the phase is always written as

\[
\theta_{P'P}(\lambda) = \theta_{RL}(\lambda)(n_P - n_{P'}), \tag{19}
\]

where \(n_R = 0\) and \(n_L = 1\). From the above facts, we find that the reduced density operator
\( \rho \) is separable, 

\[
\rho = \sum_{P,P'=R,L} \sum_{Q,Q'=R,L} \alpha_P \alpha_P' \beta_Q \beta_Q' \langle \chi | \hat{V}_{P,P}^A \otimes \hat{U}_{B,Q}^L | \chi \rangle_F \langle j_P \otimes | j_Q \rangle_B \langle j_Q' | \\
= \sum_{P,P'=R,L} \sum_{Q,Q'=R,L} \alpha_P \alpha_P' \beta_Q \beta_Q' \times \int e^{i \theta_{RL}(\lambda)(n_P - n_P')} \langle \chi | \hat{d} \hat{\mu}_A(\lambda) \otimes \hat{U}_{B,Q}^L \hat{U}_{B,Q}^L | j_P \otimes | j_Q \rangle_B \langle j_Q' | \\
= \int d\mu(\lambda) \langle j(\lambda) \rangle_A \langle j(\lambda) \rangle \otimes \sigma_B(\lambda),
\]

where we used Eqs. (18) and (19) and introduced the probability measure \( \mu \) with 

\[
d\mu(\lambda) = F(\chi | d\hat{\mu}_A(\lambda) | \chi)_F.
\]

The states \( | j(\lambda) \rangle_A \) and \( \sigma_B(\lambda) \) are

\[
| j(\lambda) \rangle_A = \sum_{P=R,L} \alpha_P e^{i \theta_{RL}(\lambda) n_P} | j_P \rangle_A,
\]

\[
\sigma_B(\alpha) = \frac{1}{d\mu(\lambda)} \sum_{Q,Q'=R,L} \beta_Q \beta_Q' \langle \chi | d\hat{\mu}_A(\lambda) \otimes \hat{U}_{B,Q}^L \hat{U}_{B,Q}^L | j_Q \rangle_B \langle j_Q' |.
\]

Here, we emphasize that the Hilbert space \( H_F \) of the fields has no negative norm states, which was mentioned below Eq. (6). The fact leads to the inequalities \( \mu(\lambda) \geq 0 \) and \( \sigma_B(\lambda) \geq 0 \). Hence \( \mu \) and \( \sigma_B(\lambda) \) are a probability measure and a density operator, respectively, and then the separability of the state holds. If gauge degrees of freedom are included in the fields, the Hilbert space \( H_F \) may have a negative norm state and the separability is not guaranteed.

The separability of the objects does not depend on the dynamics of fields and the details of classical trajectories. Also, the separability holds even for the case where the objects and the fields are initially in a product mixed state. Our result means that the fields do not play a role of quantum mediators to generate the spacelike entanglement between the two superposed objects.

We compare our result with the no-go theorems in [11, 47] on generation of entanglement. The theorem in [11] argued that two systems mediated by classical systems with only a single observable (this is the meaning of “classical” for that claim) have no entanglement. For our model, the mediators are the fields, which may have noncommutative observables, for example, the field operator and its conjugate. In this sense, the fields can be quantum systems in general. However, there are no generations of spacelike entanglement.

The no-go theorem in Ref. [47] elucidates our result. We can rewrite Eq. (9) for the
spacelike separated two objects as

$$|\Psi(t)\rangle = e^{-iH_0t} \sum_{P,Q=R,L} \alpha_P \beta_Q |j_P\rangle_A |j_Q\rangle_B \hat{U}_{ PQ} |\chi\rangle_F$$

$$= e^{-iH_0t} \sum_{P,Q=R,L} \alpha_P \beta_Q |j_P\rangle_A |j_Q\rangle_B \hat{U}_{ AP} \otimes \hat{U}_{ BQ} |\chi\rangle_F$$

$$= e^{-iH_0t} \left( \sum_{P=R,L} |j_P\rangle_A \langle j_P| \otimes \hat{I}_{FA} \otimes \hat{I}_{FB} \right) \otimes \left( \sum_{Q=R,L} |j_Q\rangle_B \langle j_Q| \otimes \hat{I}_{FB} \otimes \hat{I}_{FA} \right) |\Psi_{in}\rangle,$$

(23)

where we used Eq. (12), and $|\Psi_{in}\rangle$ is the initial state given in Eq. (8). In this formula, we find the controlled unitary $\hat{U}_{AF}$,

$$\hat{U}_{AF} = \sum_{P=R,L} |j_P\rangle_A \langle j_P| \otimes \hat{U}_{AP} \otimes \hat{I}_{FB}.$$  (24)

Exactly speaking, $\hat{U}_{AF}$ has inverse only when it acts on the subspace spanned by $|j_R\rangle_A$ and $|j_L\rangle_A$ of the Hilbert space $\mathcal{H}_A$. In Ref. [47], the authors showed that the unitary evolution $\hat{U} = (\hat{U}_{AS} \otimes \hat{I}_B)(\hat{I}_A \otimes \hat{U}_{BS})$ with the exponential of a Schmidt rank-1 operator $\hat{U}_{AS} = e^{-i\hat{m}_A \otimes \hat{X}_s}$ does not generate entanglement between the systems A and B. The systems A, B and S correspond to the objects A and B, and the fields F for our model. Note that the controlled unitary $\hat{U}_{AF}$ is rewritten as the form

$$\hat{U}_{AF} = \hat{U}_{AR} (|j_R\rangle_A \langle j_R| \otimes \hat{I}_{FA} \otimes \hat{I}_{FB} + |j_L\rangle_A \langle j_L| \otimes \hat{V}_{RL} \otimes \hat{I}_{FB} ) = \hat{U}_{AR} e^{-i\hat{m}_A \otimes \hat{X}_F} ,$$  (25)

where $\hat{V}_{RL} = \hat{U}_{AR}^\dagger \hat{U}_{AL}$, and the self-adjoint operator $\hat{X}_F$ satisfies $e^{-iX_F} = \hat{V}_{RL} \otimes \hat{I}_{FB}$, and $\hat{m}_A = 0 \times |j_R\rangle_A \langle j_R| + 1 \times |j_L\rangle_A \langle j_L|$. Since the entanglement between the two objects is invariant under the local unitary transformation $\hat{U}_{AR}$ for the fields, the controlled unitary $\hat{U}_{AF}$ plays the same role as the exponential of a Schmidt rank-1 operator. Thus, our no-go result for generation of spacelike entanglement is a consequence of the no-go theorem in [47]. Note that the no-go theorem can be applied under the approximation assigning classical currents (7) and for the localized states satisfying $\langle j_P|j_{P'}\rangle \approx \delta_{PP'}$. If these conditions do not hold, we need a further study on entanglement generation.

We comment on the extension of our model. It is well known that the spacelike entanglement of a field is extracted by the Unruh-DeWitt detectors [31]. Further, in Refs. [38, 39], the authors discussed an entanglement harvesting protocol by using the Unruh-DeWitt detectors with quantum superpositions of trajectories. The critical difference is that there
are no internal degrees of freedom (such as a spin or an energy level) which transit by the interaction with quantum fields. This means that the approximation (7) is violated and the objects’ state fluctuates. We expect that such degrees of freedom are necessary for an extraction of spacelike entanglement from fields. Also, it is worth considering a multipartite [29] or multi-trajectory [30] extended model of the BMV proposal, since our result is based on the fact that each of two objects is superposed in two classical trajectories. It is interesting to characterize the advantage of many objects or trajectories for the generation of spacelike entanglement of fields.

V. CONCLUSION

In the BMV proposal, it was demonstrated that the Newtonian gravity can generate entanglement in two spatially superposed objects. Since the Newtonian gravity corresponds to non-dynamical parts of the Einstein’s theory (scalar part), quantum natures of the other dynamical components (spin-2 gravitons) have not been investigated in detail. As an attempt to clarify the role of dynamical fields, we discussed how such objects probe the entanglement of quantum fields with only physical degrees of freedom. We considered a pair of objects in a spatially superposed state which locally couples with the fields by field-current bilinear interactions. From the entanglement analysis for the objects under the approximation using classical currents, we found that the objects in spacelike regions cannot be entangled. This result dose not depend on the dynamics of fields and the detail of the trajectories of two objects, which holds if the commutator of spacelike separated fields vanishes (microcausality). The limitation for entanglement generation characterizes the behavior of the fields as quantum mediators between the two superposed objects. In other words, such objects have no capacity to detect the spacelike entanglement of fields. We can imagine several extensions of the model of objects; objects with internal degrees of freedom fluctuated by quantum fields, multiple objects and object superposed in multiple trajectories. It is important to discuss how the extensions are effective for the detection of spacelike entanglement. We need further research on quantum objects which play a crucial role in probing quantum nature of fields.
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