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We analyze families of particle detector models that linearly couple to different kinds of fermionic and bosonic fields. We also study the response of these detectors to particle and anti-particle excitations of the field. We propose a simple linear complex scalar particle detector model that captures the fundamental features of fermionic field detectors similarly to how the Unruh-DeWitt model captures the features of the light matter interaction. We also discuss why we do not need to limit ourselves to quadratic models commonly employed in past literature. Namely, we study in detail the subtleties related to the fermionic nature of the detector and the mechanisms that restore $U(1)$ symmetry in these linear complex models.

I. INTRODUCTION

Although quantum field theory (QFT) has been formulated over one hundred years ago, many interesting fundamental aspects of the theory are not yet fully understood. Among them, a very important foundational gap in QFT is the lack of a consistent measurement framework \cite{1,2}. One possible approach to the elusive measurement problem in QFT is the use of particle detectors \cite{3,4}. These are localized nonrelativistic quantum systems that couple locally to a quantum field. First introduced by Unruh in \cite{5} and refined by DeWitt \cite{6}, they have been extensively used in a plethora of scenarios from tools to probe the Unruh effect and Hawking radiation \cite{7,12} to the proposal of protocols in relativistic quantum information: for example, for quantum and classical communication \cite{13,14} and the study of the field entanglement structure both in flat and curved space-times \cite{15,21}.

Furthermore, particle detector models go beyond theoretical idealizations. They have been proven to be very good approximations to experimentally accessible systems. For instance, the interactions of atoms with the electromagnetic field can be very well described by particle detector models \cite{19,22,25}. In these setups, the role of the (approximately non-relativistic) localized quantum system is played by the atom that couples to the electromagnetic quantum field. Moreover, it has been shown that simple scalar models in which two-level systems couple to real massless scalar fields are already able to reproduce most of the features of the light-matter interaction \cite{25} with even more accuracy than the typical Jaynes-Cummings or Rabi models used in quantum optics \cite{26}.

The usefulness of particle detectors to closely model real experiments is not limited to the light-matter interaction. Indeed, a new kind of particle detector that modelled the detection of neutrino field excitations has been proposed \cite{27}. There, the detector would be associated with a fermionic degree of freedom which models nucleons and electron/positron states within the nucleus of an atom. The proposed model was able to recover the well-known results of neutrino oscillations and provided a platform to extend particle detector models to neutrino fields where fermionic fields are probed by means of a linear interaction with a localized system.

The fermionic particle detector in \cite{27} was applied to a specific process in the emission and detection of neutrinos. Nevertheless, a more detailed study of the model and its response to general field states in different space-times has not yet been carried out.

On the other hand, knowing that the interaction of atoms with light can be captured by a simpler model, where a scalar field is considered, one may then wonder whether the fermionic particle detector could be well approximated by a simpler scalar theory. The natural candidate is the replacement of the fermionic field by a complex scalar field. Although a complex quantum field theory does not contain spin degrees of freedom, it has a nontrivial antiparticle content, so that there is room to explore which results of the fermionic detectors can carry to this simplified model.

The goals of this paper are: 1) study the effect of linearly coupling detectors to non-Hermitian fields extending and generalizing the results of \cite{27} to different kinds of fermionic and bosonic fields; 2) study in what ways simple linear detector models for complex scalar fields can capture the features of spinor field particle detectors; and 3) characterize the role that field statistics (fermionic vs bosonic) plays in the phenomena of particle detection.

This paper is organized as follows: In Section II we review a simple model for the interactions of atoms with a quantum electromagnetic field and its relation to the Unruh-DeWitt detector model, that couples a probe to a scalar field. In Section III we review the fermionic particle detector model and compute the transition probability of the detector for different field states. In Section IV we introduce the complex scalar particle detector model and compare the main features of the model with the fermionic case. Conclusions can be found in Section V.
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II. THE LIGHT-MATTER INTERACTION AND THE UDW MODEL

As we discussed in the introduction, it is well established that particle detectors provide good models for the light-matter interaction. The extent to which the Unruh-DeWitt (UDW) model is a good approximation for the light-matter dynamics has been extensively discussed in past literature \[19, 22–25\]. In this section we review the sense in which the interaction of atoms with light can be regarded as a particle detector model and to show the cases where it can be well approximated by an Unruh-DeWitt detector interacting with a massless scalar field. In Subsection II A we review the dipole approximation for the interaction of atoms with an external electromagnetic field. In Subsection II B we review the UDW model and in Subsection II C we present a generalized particle detector model that couples to a real quantum vector field and reduces to the light-matter interaction in a particular case.

A. A Simple Model for the Light-Matter Interaction

The Schrödinger description for a single electron hydrogen atom consists of a wavefunction description, whose time evolution is prescribed by the quantization of the following classical Coulomb Hamiltonian,

\[
H_0 = \frac{p^2}{2m} - \frac{e^2}{r},
\]

where the first term on the right hand side is the kinetic term, while the second term is the Coulomb potential due to the central charge in the nucleus, with \(e\) being the charge of the electron. We consider the mass of the nucleus to be much larger than the electron so that the dynamics of the centre of mass is neglected and that the reduced mass of the electron is approximately \(m \approx m_e\). The eigenvalues of \(H_0\) are discrete and, for the Hydrogen atom, are given by \(E_n = E_1/n^2\), where \(E_1 \approx -13.6\text{eV}\). The associated eigenfunctions will be denoted by \(\psi_n(x) = (x/n)\), where \(n\) is a multi-index that contains the quantum numbers associated with the eigenstates.

The interaction of the hydrogen atom with an external electromagnetic field can be approached in many different ways. We refer the reader to [25] for further detail. For our purposes, we will follow a similar approach as that of [19], where the dipole approximation is employed, and one obtains the following gauge invariant interaction Hamiltonian for an inertial hydrogen atom:

\[
\hat{H}_I(t) = e \int d^3x \, \hat{d}(t, x) \cdot \hat{E}(t, x),
\]

where we assume our observables to be in the interaction picture, that is, we ‘incorporate’ in them the evolution with respect to the free Hamiltonian \(\hat{H}_0\). The operator \(\hat{d}(t, x)\) is usually called the dipole operator and it can be written in terms of the eigenfunctions of \(\hat{H}_0\) as

\[
\hat{d}(t, x) = \sum_{nm} \Lambda_{nm}(x) e^{-i\Omega_{nm} t} |n\rangle |m\rangle,
\]

where the smearing vector is defined as

\[
\Lambda_{nm}(x) = \psi^*_m(x) \psi_n(x),
\]

and we denote the energy gap between the states \(n\) and \(m\) by \(\Omega_{nm} = E_n - E_m\).

Notice that at this stage, after quantizing the electromagnetic field, we are left with a localized nonrelativistic quantum system coupled to a quantum field. This is the defining characteristic of a particle detector model. Nevertheless, the model can be further simplified if one considers energy transitions between only two energy levels (see, e.g., [19, 25]), say \(E_g\) and \(E_e\). In this case, if we denote \(\Lambda(x) = \Lambda_{eg}(x)\) and \(\Omega = \Omega_{eg}\), the dipole operator can be further recast as

\[
\hat{d}(t, x) = \Lambda(x) e^{-i\Omega \hat{\sigma}^-} + \Lambda^*(x) e^{i\Omega \hat{\sigma}^+},
\]

where we have denoted \(\hat{\sigma}^+ = |g\rangle \langle e|\) and \(\hat{\sigma}^- = |e\rangle \langle g|\).

With this simple model, one can already grasp some of the fundamental features of the interaction of a hydrogen atom with a quantum external electromagnetic field. Noting that the atom is comoving with the field quantization frame, the electric field can be expanded in terms of plane-wave modes according to

\[
\hat{E}(x) = i \sum_{s=1}^2 \int \frac{d^3k}{(2\pi)^3} \sqrt{\frac{k}{2}} \left( \hat{a}_k^s e^{-ikx} - \hat{a}^s_k e^{ikx} \right) \epsilon(k, s),
\]

where the \(s = 1, 2\) index labels two independent polarizations of the field associated with the vectors \(\epsilon(k, s)\) for each mode. The \(\hat{a}_k^s\) operators denote the annihilation operators of the field and satisfy the canonical commutation relations with the creation operators \(\hat{a}^s_k\),

\[
[\hat{a}_k^s, \hat{a}^{s'}_{k'}] = \delta_{ss'} \delta^{(3)}(k-k').
\]

Using the expansion for the electromagnetic field above, it is straightforward to compute the first order transition probability for an atom that starts in a given ground state to end in an excited state. These computations have been thoroughly studied in the literature, in e.g. [19].
B. The UDW Model

As we discussed in the introduction, the first model of particle detector as we know them today was introduced by Unruh in [5], where a quantum particle was used to probe a QFT. The model was later simplified by DeWitt in [2], where he proposed a two-level system that couples to a scalar quantum field. This model has become known as the Unruh-DeWitt detector model and has been employed in a plethora of scenarios in quantum optics and quantum field theory in flat and curved spacetimes. Schematically, a UDW detector is a two-level quantum system whose internal degree of freedom is localized along a timelike curve $z(\tau)$ in an $n+1$ dimensional spacetime, where we assume $\tau$ to be the proper time parameter of the curve. The detector’s free evolution is governed by the free Hamiltonian

$$\hat{H}_D = \Omega \sigma^+ \sigma^-,$$

that generates time evolution with respect to the proper time of the curve. We denote the states of the two-level system by $|g\rangle$ and $|e\rangle$ such that $\hat{H}_D |g\rangle = 0$ and $\hat{H}_D |e\rangle = \Omega |e\rangle$.

We recall that in the simplest version of this model, the detector is assumed to interact with a free real scalar quantum field $\hat{\phi}(x)$. Given an orthonormal basis of solutions to the Klein-Gordon equation, $\{u_k(x), u_k^*(x)\}$, the free field can be written as

$$\hat{\phi}(x) = \int d^n k \left( u_k(x) \hat{a}_k + u_k^*(x) \hat{a}_k^\dagger \right),$$

where $\hat{a}_k$ and $\hat{a}_k$ are the creation and annihilation operators that satisfy the canonical commutation relations

$$[\hat{a}_{k'}, \hat{a}^\dagger_k] = \delta^{(3)}(k - k').$$

This mode expansion then defines a field Hilbert space representation associated with the choice of modes from Eq. (9). It is tradition to associate $u_k(x)$ with the positive frequency modes and $u_k^*(x)$ with the negative frequency ones due to their signature with respect to the Klein-Gordon inner product.

Indeed, the interaction of a typical UDW detector with the quantum field is linear in the field amplitude and can be put in a covariant way by means of a spacetime smearing function $\Lambda(x)$, which is supported around the trajectory $z(\tau)$ (See [28, 29]). The smearing function then controls both the spatial and temporal profile of the interaction. The interaction between the field and detector can be described in terms of a Hamiltonian density

$$\hat{h}_I(x) = \lambda \hat{\phi}(x) \hat{\phi}(x),$$

where $\hat{\phi}(x)$ is the monopole moment of the detector, given in terms of the ladder operators by $\hat{\phi}(x) = e^{-i\Omega x^\mu \partial_\mu} + e^{i\Omega x^\mu \partial_\mu}$. Notice that although the proper time of the curve is just defined along $z(\tau)$, it is possible to define $\tau$ locally around the curve by means of Fermi normal coordinates, as was done in, e.g., [28, 29].

With this, the time evolution operator associated with the quantum system composed of the detector and quantum field can be written as

$$\hat{U} = \exp \left(-i \int dV \hat{h}_I(x) \right),$$

where we assume the time ordering to happen with respect to the detector’s proper time, although it has been shown in [29] that in the cases we will be interested any notion of time ordering would be equivalent. Namely, we will only be looking the excitation probability when the detector starts in the ground state $|g\rangle$ to leading order in perturbation theory.

Regarding the field, following [30], we will assume that its initial state is a general one-particle wavepacket $|\varphi\rangle$, given by

$$|\varphi\rangle = \int d^n k f(k) \hat{a}_k^\dagger |0\rangle,$$

where $|0\rangle$ denotes the vacuum of the quantum field (according to the mode decomposition (9)) and $f(k)$ gives the momentum distribution of the one-particle excitation. The condition that the state above is normalized imposes that $f$ has unit $L^2$ norm.

The detector excitation probability amplitude for an arbitrary final state of the field $|\text{out}\rangle$ is given, to leading order, by

$$A_{g\rightarrow\text{e}}(\text{out}) = \langle e, \text{out}| \hat{U} |g, \varphi\rangle$$

$$= -i \lambda \int dV A(x) e^{i\Omega \tau} \langle \text{out} | \hat{\phi}(x) | \varphi \rangle + O(\lambda^2).$$

To obtain the transition probability of the detector, we must sum over all possible field final states. The probability then reads

$$p_{g\rightarrow\text{e}} = \sum_{\text{out}} |A_{g\rightarrow\text{e}}(\text{out})|^2$$

$$= \int dV dV' A(x') A(x) e^{i\Omega (\tau' - \tau)} \langle \varphi | \hat{\phi}(x') \hat{\phi}(x) | \varphi \rangle.$$

It is then enough to compute the two-point function of the field in the state $|\varphi\rangle$. This computation can be found
in full detail in Appendix A. In the end, we find that the transition probability can be written in the following form:

\[ p_{g \to e} = \lambda^2 \int dV' V' \Lambda(x') \Lambda(x) e^{i \Omega(t-t')} \times (W_0(x', x) + F(x') F^*(x) + F^*(x') F(x)), \]

where we have defined

\[ F(x) = \int d^nk f(k) u_k(x), \]
\[ W_0(x', x) = \int d^nk u_k(x') u_k^*(x). \]

\( W_0(x', x) \) is the vacuum Wightman function. Indeed, as we see from Eq. (16), it is possible to identify the vacuum contribution to the excitation probability, and separate it from the one-particle content contribution, associated with the \( F(x') F^*(x) \) and \( F^*(x') F(x) \) terms. Note that the \( F^*(x') F(x) \) term is usually referred to as the counter-rotating term [30, 31], this is because in the transition probability these terms are proportional to \( e^{i \Omega t} u_k^*(x) \) (counter-rotating term) whereas the term \( F(x') F^*(x) \) is proportional to \( e^{i \Omega t} u_k(x) \) (co-rotating phase). In other words, the counter-rotating terms can be associated with the coupling of the positive phase terms of the detector with the negative frequency modes of the field. It can be shown that there is a variety of scenarios where the counter-rotating terms vanish [30, 31], and the overall contribution of the co-rotating term tends to be larger. As a matter of fact, in Appendix B we show that the counter-rotating contribution from the wavepacket terms is always smaller than the vacuum contribution of the field.

So far we have considered a general field expansion. For the remaining of the section we will consider a typical plane-wave mode expansion for a Minkowski spacetime:

\[ u_k(x) = \frac{1}{(2\pi)^{\frac{D}{2}}} \frac{e^{i k \cdot x}}{\sqrt{2\omega_k}}, \]

where we represent the event \( x \equiv (t, x) \) in an inertial coordinate system and \( k \equiv (\omega_k, k) \) with \( \omega_k = \sqrt{k^2 + m^2} \). As a first exercise we will compute the response of an inertial detector in flat spacetime when the field is prepared in a one-particle wavepacket. That is, we assume the initial state of the field to be given by Eq. (13) where the \( \delta_k^\dagger \) is a plane wave creation operator, and we prescribe the shape of the wavepacket in momentum space by a Gaussian centered at \( k_0 \) and localized around it with a spectral width \( \sigma \):

\[ f(k) = \frac{1}{(\pi \sigma^2)^{\frac{D}{2}}} e^{-\frac{\sqrt{k^2 + m^2}}{2\sigma^2}}. \]

This choice ensures that \(|f|^2 = 1\), and therefore the particle state \(|\varphi\rangle\) from Eq. (13) is normalized. These calculations are analogous to those performed in [30] for the linear model, although we allow the field to be massive.

We assume the detector’s trajectory to be \( z(t) = (t, 0) \), so that it is comoving with the field quantization frame \((t, x)\). We consider the detector to be pointlike. This corresponds to the following choice of spacetime smearing function:

\[ \Lambda(x) = \chi(t) \delta^{(3)}(x), \]

where \( \chi(t) \) is a switching function and where we assumed the detector to be centered at the origin, which also corresponds to the center of the wavepacket of the state \(|\varphi\rangle\) in position space. We will consider that the detector couples to the field for a very long time. The detector long-time response is computed through the so-called adiabatic limit. Namely, consider \( \chi(t) \equiv \chi(t/T) \) to be a one parametric family of switching functions where \( T \) is the timescale governing the duration of the interaction (e.g., \( \chi(t) = e^{-t^2/T^2} \)). Assume \( \chi(t) \) to be such that its Fourier transform of decays faster than any polynomial. We then take the \( T \to \infty \) limit. The adiabatic limit yields the physical behaviour of a detector switched on for long times preventing spurious UV divergences, as discussed, e.g., in [30] [32] [33].

Under the long time limit assumption, both the vacuum contribution and the counter-rotating contribution vanish (see, e.g., [30], and Appendix A). That is, out of the three terms in Eq. (16), only the co-rotating term \( F(x') F^*(x) \) survives. We also see that, as expected, in the adiabatic long-time limit the excitation probability is only non-zero in the case where the detector gap is larger than the mass of the particle, i.e., \( \Omega > m \). In this case, the probability can be written as

\[ p_{g \to e} = \frac{2 \lambda^2 \Omega^2 (\Omega^2 - m^2)^{\frac{n-2}{2}} e^{-\frac{k_0^2 \omega_k^2 + m^2}{\sigma^4}}}{\pi^{\frac{D}{2}} \sigma^{4-n} |k_0|^{n-2}} \times I_{\frac{D}{2}-2} \left( \frac{k_0 \sqrt{\Omega^2 - m^2}}{\sigma^2} \right)^2 \Theta(\Omega - m), \]

where \( I_n \) is the modified Bessel function of the first kind [34] and \( \Theta \) denotes the Heaviside step function. This result is a slight generalization of what was obtained in [30], where a massless field was considered. The details regarding the resonance of the detector with the field have been thoroughly discussed in [30], where it was shown that localizing the momentum state sharply around \( k_0 \) does not necessarily increase the probability of detection, and the behaviour depends explicitly on the spacetime dimension. In fact, for \( n \geq 3 \), we have \( p_{g \to e} \to 0 \) as \( \sigma \to 0 \) even though the energy of the wavepacket does not vanish in the monochromatic limit \( \sigma \to 0 \). The reasoning behind it lies in the fact that localizing the one-particle state in momentum space delocalizes it in position space. With this, the energy density of the particle at the location of the detector vanishes in the limit of \( \sigma \to 0 \). Nevertheless, as \( \sigma \) decreases, we have a resonance effect when the detector energy gap satisfies \( \Omega = \omega_0 = \sqrt{|k_0|^2 + m^2} \).
In particular, for future comparisons, it is worth pointing out that Eq. (21) for the case of \( n = 3 \) yields 

\[
p_{g\rightarrow e} = \frac{4\lambda^2\sigma}{\sqrt{\pi}|k_0|^2} \kappa |_{k_0}^2 \frac{\sinh^2 \left( \frac{|k_0|^2 \sqrt{\lambda^2 - m^2}}{\sigma^2} \right) \Theta(\Omega - m)}{\sqrt{\Omega^2 - m^2}}.
\]  

(22)

We plot this function for different values of \( m \) and \( \sigma \) in Figs. 1(a) and 1(b). Notice that as \( \sigma \) decreases, the more localized the particle state is in momentum space and the more delocalized the particle is in position space. This makes the excitation probability decrease as \( \sigma \) decreases due to the fact that the detector only probes the field along a (tightly localized) timelike trajectory. This effect has been studied in detail in [30] in the massless case.

The effect of the field’s mass on the probability can be seen in Fig. 1(c): as the mass of the field increases the resonant peak becomes sharper around the frequency \( \Omega = \omega_0 = \sqrt{|k_0|^2 + m^2} \). Furthermore, the peak of the probability distribution can be found by setting \( \Omega = \omega_0 \) in Eq. (22) and is found to be

\[
p_{g\rightarrow e} = \frac{4\lambda^2\sigma}{\sqrt{\pi}|k_0|^2} e^{-\frac{2|k_0|^2}{\sigma^2}} \sinh^2 \left( \frac{|k_0|^2 \sqrt{\lambda^2 - m^2}}{\sigma^2} \right) \sqrt{|k_0|^2 + m^2}.
\]  

(23)

This implies that for a fixed field state, the peak of the excitation probability grows with the mass of the field. In particular, for \( m \gg |k_0| \), we obtain a linear growth with the mass of the field.

C. A particle detector probing a real vector quantum field

We will now show that the scalar light-matter interaction model presented in Subsection 2B captures the right resonant behaviour obtained through a more realistic vector coupling as described in 2A. Let us consider a vector coupling of the form (2) modeling an atomic system dipolarly coupled to the (vector) electromagnetic field in arbitrary spacetime. In general, a free massless real quantum vector field in three space dimensions has two polarizations and can be written as

\[
\hat{E}_\mu(x) = \sum_{s=1,2} \int d^3p \left( \hat{u}_{p,s}(x) \hat{a}_{p,s} + \hat{u}^*_{p,s}(x) \hat{a}^\dagger_{p,s} \right) \epsilon_{\mu}(p, s),
\]

(24)

where \( s = 1, 2 \) labels the polarizations of the field and \( \epsilon_{\mu}(p, s) \) are the polarization four-vectors.

In this context, the particle detector model is still described by a two-level system moving along a trajectory \( z(\tau) \) whose time evolution is dictated by the Hamiltonian in Eq. (8). Since it couples to a vector field, the detector must have a vector degree of freedom. To add this to the model, we promote the spacetime smearing function to a vector field \( \Lambda_\mu(x) \) supported locally around the trajectory \( z(\tau) \). The interaction Hamiltonian weight is then prescribed as

\[
\hat{H}_I(x) = \lambda(\Lambda_\mu(x) e^{i\Omega_\tau \hat{\sigma}^+} + \Lambda_\mu^*(x) e^{-i\Omega_\tau \hat{\sigma}^-}) \hat{E}_\mu(x).
\]

(25)

This interaction can be seen in two ways: as a generalization of Eq. (2) to curved spacetimes or as a generalization of Eq. (11) to a vector interaction.

To study the response of the detector to a one-particle Fock wavepacket with arbitrary polarization, let us consider that the field \( \hat{E}_\mu \) starts out in the following state

\[
|\varphi\rangle = \sum_{s=1,2} \int d^3k f_s(k) |k, s\rangle,
\]

(26)

while the detector starts in its ground state, \( |g\rangle \). The normalization of the state is achieved by demanding that the two polarization momentum distributions satisfy \( \|f_1\|^2 + \|f_2\|^2 = 1 \). Proceeding in analogy to what was done in the previous subsection, we find that the probability that the detector ends up in an excited state

\[
|\Phi\rangle = \sum_{s=1,2} \int d^3k f_s(k) |k, s\rangle.
\]
after the interaction is given by
\begin{equation}
\rho_{g\rightarrow e} = \lambda^2 \int dVdV' \Lambda^*_\mu(x')^* \Lambda_\mu(x) e^{i\Omega(t'-t)} \times (W_0^{\mu}(x',x) + F^\nu(x') F_{\mu\nu}(x) + F_{\nu}(x') F^\mu(x)),
\end{equation}
where we defined
\begin{equation}
F^\mu(x) = \sum_{s=1,2} \int d^3k f_s(k) e^{i\nu(s)} u_{k,s}(x),
\end{equation}
and
\begin{equation}
W_0^{\mu}(x',x) = \sum_{s=1,2} \int d^3k e^{i\nu(s)} u_{k,s}(x') u_{k,s}(x).
\end{equation}
Here, \( W_0^{\mu}(x',x) \) is the two-point vacuum Wightman tensor of the vector field in the chosen quantization scheme. The details of this computation can be found in Appendix B. Notice that we again find a vacuum contribution to the excitation probability and two terms that come form the state’s ‘particle content’.

One can apply the techniques above to treat the interaction of a two-level atom with light that was discussed in Subsection 11C. Employing inertial coordinates in flat spacetimes we obtain the following mode expansion for the electric field considering a quantization inertial frame \((t,x)\)
\begin{equation}
\hat{E}^\mu(x) = \frac{1}{\sqrt{2}} \sum_{\sigma = 1}^2 \int \frac{d^3k}{(2\pi)^3} \sqrt{\frac{k}{2}} \left( \hat{a}_{k,s}^\dagger e^{-ikx} - \hat{a}_{k,s} e^{ikx} \right) e^{i\nu(s)},
\end{equation}
where the polarization vectors satisfy \( k_{\mu} e^{\nu(s)}(k,s) = 0 \), due to the divergenceless condition of the electric field, \( \nabla_{\mu} E^\mu = 0 \). For a fixed \( k \), the polarization four-vectors also form a basis the (spacelike) orthogonal space to \( k \) and \( \partial_t \). Thus, they satisfy the completeness relation
\begin{equation}
\sum_{s=1}^2 \epsilon_{\mu}(k,s) \epsilon_{\nu}(k,s) = \eta_{\mu\nu} - \frac{k_{\mu} k_{\nu}}{|k|^2}.
\end{equation}

With these tools, it is possible to compute the excitation probability for an atom coupled to the field, through a coupling of the form of Eq. (25). This translates into choosing a spacetime smearing vector field \( \Lambda_\mu(x) \) in equation (4) with \( n = g \) and \( m = e \). We are interested in comparing the response of the more realistic vector model (see, e.g., [19, 25]) to those of the scalar UDW model in Subsection 11B for a pointlike detector interacting in the long time regime. In this simplified case, we will choose a spacetime smearing vector that is a Dirac delta supported along the worldline of the detector. In other words, we assume the detector’s trajectory to be \( z(t) = (t,0) \). That is, we have that
\begin{equation}
\Lambda_\mu(x) = \chi(t) \delta(x) X_\mu,
\end{equation}
where \( \chi(t) \) is a switching function that will be used to compute the long-time limit adiabatically and \( X_\mu \) is a constant spacelike vector capturing the vector nature of the detector. \( X_\mu \) basically tells us the polarization of the electromagnetic field that the detector couples to. In essence, the detector is treated as an ideal dipole.

We will also make a further choice for the field state \(|\varphi\rangle = (0|\hat{E}^\nu(x')\hat{E}^\mu(x)|0)\) by specifying its polarization and momentum distribution:
\begin{align}
f_1(k) &= \frac{\alpha_1}{(\pi\sigma^2)^2} e^{-\frac{|k-k_0|^2}{2\sigma^2}}, \\
f_2(k) &= \frac{\alpha_2}{(\pi\sigma^2)^2} e^{-\frac{|k-k_0|^2}{2\sigma^2}},
\end{align}
where the normalization condition for the state \(|\varphi\rangle\) implies that \( |\alpha_1|^2 + |\alpha_2|^2 = 1 \). We perform the computations associated with this model in Appendix B where we find the general excitation probability for the detector as a function of the average momentum of the wavepacket \( k_0 \). In the case where \( k_0 \) is parallel to the dipole four-vector \( X \) and only the polarization \( s = 1 \) has components in the direction of \( X \), we obtain the following excitation probability,
\begin{equation}
\rho_{g\rightarrow e} = \frac{\lambda^2|\alpha_1|^2 \sigma^2 \Omega^3}{4\sqrt{\pi} |k_0|^2} e^{-\frac{|k_0|^2 + \Omega^2}{2\sigma^2}} I_1 \left( \frac{\Omega |k_0|}{\sigma^2} \right)^2,
\end{equation}
where the coupling constant for a Hydrogen-like atom is \( \lambda = e \). In the case where \( k_0 \) is perpendicular to the polarization vector we have the following result for the excitation probability:
\begin{equation}
\rho_{g\rightarrow e} = \frac{|\alpha_1|^2 \lambda^2 \Omega^5}{16\pi \sigma^2} e^{-\frac{|k_0|^2 + \Omega^2}{2\sigma^2}} \times \left( I_1 \left( \frac{\Omega |k_0|}{2\sigma^2} \right)^2 + I_0 \left( \frac{\Omega |k_0|}{2\sigma^2} \right)^2 \right)^2.
\end{equation}

In Fig. 2 we plot the excitation probability for different values of the relative angle \( \theta \) between \( X \) and \( k_0 \). We
then see that the maximum contribution for the excitation of the detector happens when $\mathbf{k}_0$ is orthogonal to the polarization vector, as expected, because in this case the electric field is the most parallel to the detector’s dipole, thus maximizing the value of the interaction term $\mathbf{d} \cdot \mathbf{E}$. These results are also similar to the ones obtained in the massless scalar field. Specifically, we also see the delocalization effect that makes the probability vanish in the monochromatic limit $\sigma \to 0$. Moreover, in Fig. 5 we also see the same kind of resonance effect as seen in Fig. 1(b), where the peak of the probability distribution is centered at $\Omega = |\mathbf{k}_0|$.

III. THE FERMIONIC PARTICLE DETECTOR

Fermionic UDW detectors have been successfully employed in QFT in curved spacetimes for a long time. For example, the fermionic UDW detector proposed in \[9, 27\] has been shown to capture the phenomenology of the Unruh effect for fermion fields. In all these models the coupling of the internal degree of freedom of the detector with the fermion field was, in nature, quadratic, mimicking the coupling of the electromagnetic field to charged fermions, which is also quadratic. However, having quadratic particle detector for fermionic fields makes it difficult to establish a direct comparison between the scalar UDW models (which are mostly linear) and the fermionic ones (which are mostly quadratic). If one is to observe different phenomenology in the response of boson versus fermion detectors, would the difference come from the quadratic nature of the coupling? Or would it be due to the statistics of the field? This has been partially studied in the past comparing the quadratic UDW boson model to the fermionic detector, showing that the answers to this questions are not trivial \[9, 35\]. More over, the quadratic fermion UDW detector model was proposed because in order to respect U(1) symmetry, if the detector is U(1) invariant it has to couple to a boson \[9\]. This already makes it very difficult to see distinctions coming from particle vs anti-particle phenomenology as we will discuss later on.

On the other hand, in the recent paper \[27\] another kind of fermionic particle detector model was introduced with the aim to probe neutrino fields. In that model, the detector would itself be regarded as a fermionic system, and the ground and excited states were thought of as associated with different states of nucleons in the nucleus of an atom. The goal of this section is to review and generalize the model introduced in \[27\], and explicitly compute the transition probability for a fermionic detector interacting with a spin 1/2 field. In particular, we will study in depth its response to a one-particle Fock wavepacket.

A. The Fermi Interaction

Before generalizing to particle detectors for arbitrary fermion fields, in this subsection we present the technical details of the detector model introduced in \[27\]. The motivation for this model comes from the decay of nucleons via the weak interaction. This process is very well described by the four-Fermi theory. In this formalism, the proton, neutron, electron and neutrino are treated as fermionic fields that interact according to the following Lagrangian density,

$$\mathcal{L}_{4F} = -\frac{G_F}{\sqrt{2}} \left( \bar{\nu}_e \gamma^\mu (1 - \gamma^5) e \right) \left( \bar{n} \gamma_\mu (1 - \gamma^5) p \right) + \text{H.c.},$$

(36)

where $p, n, e$ and $\nu_e$ are the fermionic quantum fields associated with the proton, neutron, electron and electron neutrino, respectively. $\gamma^5$ denotes the gamma matrices, with $\gamma^5 = i \gamma^0 \gamma^1 \gamma^2 \gamma^3$ and $G_F = 1.16 \times 10^{-5}$ GeV$^{-2}$ is the Fermi constant. It is important to remark that the weak interaction only couples to the left-handed fields, which justifies the projector on this subspace, $P_L = (1 - \gamma^5)$, in the Lagrangian above.

In \[27, 36\] it has been argued that a limiting case of the theory in Eq. (36) can be obtained by treating the neutron-proton part of the system as a two-level system associated with the states $|n\rangle$ for the neutron and $|p\rangle$ for the proton. This simplified two-level system is then defined around the nucleus’ trajectory and is smeared by a four-current $j_\mu (x)$. The procedure of applying this simplification to Eq. (36) amounts to the following replacement

$$\bar{n} \gamma_\mu (1 - \gamma^5) p \rightarrow j_\mu (x) e^{i\Delta M \tau} |n\rangle\langle p|,$$

(37)

where $\Delta M$ denotes the mass difference between the neutron and proton and $\tau$ is the proper time of the trajectory of the nucleus.

The next step towards obtaining fermionic detector model is to reduce the electron field to a two-level system smeared by a spinor field. Namely, we want to approximate the electron field by only considering one electron state to be part of the detector description. We will denote such state by $|1\rangle_e$ and assume that the excitation is such that—to a good approximation—it behaves as an energy eigenstate, i.e., its time evolution is given by $e^{-i\Omega_e \tau} |1\rangle_e$, where $\Omega_e = \sqrt{\langle \mathbf{k}_e \rangle^2 + m^2}$ is the average energy of the electron involved in the process. Effectively, this means that we can write the electron field in Eq. (36) as

$$(1 - \gamma^5) \dot{e} \rightarrow u(x) e^{-i\Omega_e \tau} \hat{a}_e,$$

(38)

where $\hat{a}_e$ is the annihilation operator associated with the state $|1\rangle_e$, that is, $\hat{a}_e |0\rangle_e = |1\rangle_e$ and $u(x)$ is the left-handed projection of the spinor field associated with the spatial profile of the state. In this approximation, the quantum degree of freedom of the electron field can be
associated with the states $|0\rangle_e$ and $|1\rangle_e$, related to the absence of the electron (vacuum of the field) and its presence, respectively. Notice that the reduction in Eq. (38) should not be thought of as an approximation. Rather, it represents the particular choice of process that gives rise to the physical system that will be able to characterize as a simple two-level fermionic detector model.

To probe the neutrino field, we can focus on the $\beta$-decay, where a neutron can decay into a proton, electron and anti-neutrino,

$$n \rightarrow p + e^- + \bar{\nu}_e. \quad (39)$$

Particularizing to this process allows one to obtain the appropriate smearing field $u(x)$ and also the state $|1\rangle_e$ associated with the electron field. In flat spacetimes and according to the usual mode decomposition for spinor fields, one can write the $\hat{\imath}(x)$ as

$$\hat{\imath}(x) = \sum_{s=1}^{2} \int \frac{d^3 k}{(2\pi)^3} \left(u_s(k)e^{i\mathbf{k}\cdot\mathbf{x}}\hat{a}_{k,s} + v_s(k)e^{-i\mathbf{k}\cdot\mathbf{x}}\hat{a}_k^\dagger,s,\right), \quad (40)$$

where $u_s(k)e^{i\mathbf{k}\cdot\mathbf{x}}$ and $v_s(k)e^{-i\mathbf{k}\cdot\mathbf{x}}$ are a basis of solutions to Dirac’s equation and $\hat{a}_{k,s}$ and $\hat{a}_{k,s}^\dagger$ are the creation operators associated with particles and anti-particles, respectively. We simplify the electron’s description by only taking into account the energy weight in terms of the SU(2) ladder operators $\sigma^- = |e\rangle\langle e|$, and $\sigma^+ = |e\rangle\langle e|$:

$$\hat{h}_f(x) = \frac{G_F}{\sqrt{2}} \left( e^{i\Omega \tau} \hat{\rho}_\tau f(x)u(x)\sigma^+ + e^{-i\Omega \tau} \hat{\mu} \bar{\nu}_e(x)\sigma^- \right). \quad (43)$$

As one can easily see, after these reductions we can write the model in a way that resembles the standard UDW-like models presented before, but in this case one must provide both a spacetime-smearing four-current associated with the nucleons and a spacetime-smearing spinor field associated with the emitted/absorbed electron. It is also important to comment that the nucleus is much more localized than any other relevant lengthscale of the problem, and it is then natural to consider the spatial profile of the hadronic current to be pointlike.

Further evidence that, albeit simple, the model captures the fundamental features of the physical system modelled is that it has been shown to reproduce the results of neutrino oscillations \cite{27}. Namely, the $\beta$-decay of the neutron, i.e.,

$$n \rightarrow p + e^- + \bar{\nu}_e, \quad (44)$$

is described by the deexcitation of the detector system. The energy spectrum of the emitted electron defines the spatial profile of the $u(x)$ field. Similarly, the localization of the neutron/proton system defines the shape of the hadronic current $j^\mu(x)$. In this model, the emission of an anti-neutrino would then be associated with the deexcitation of the detector, while the absorption of an anti-neutrino will be associated with its excitation. The deexcitation of this detector model can also happen due to the stimulated neutron decay via the absorption of a neutrino,

$$n + \nu_e \rightarrow p + e^- \quad (45)$$

but this process would require the state of the neutrino field to contain a one-particle excitation to begin with. We will study these situations in a more general setup in the next subsection, where we will generalize this model to curved spacetimes and compute the excitation probability for one-particle field states.
B. A particle detector probing a spin $1/2$ field

A general free massive spin $1/2$ quantum field in a $(3 + 1)$ dimensional spacetime can be expanded as

$$\hat{\psi}(x) = \sum_{s=1}^{2} \int d^3p \left( u_{p,s}(x) \hat{a}_{p,s} + v_{p,s}(x) \hat{b}_{p,s}^{\dagger} \right),$$

(46)

where the spinors $u_{p,s}(x)$ and $v_{p,s}(x)$ constitute a basis of solutions to Dirac’s equation in the given spacetime. Here $s$ labels the spin of the solutions, while $\hat{a}_{p,s}$ are the annihilation operators associated with particles and $\hat{b}_{p,s}^{\dagger}$ are the creation operators associated with antiparticles.

We choose a normalization for $u_{p,s}(x)$ and $v_{p,s}(x)$ such that the creation and annihilation operators satisfy the anti-commutation relations

$$\{\hat{a}_{p, s}, \hat{a}_{p', s'}^{\dagger}\} = \delta^{(3)}(p - p'), \quad \{\hat{b}_{p, s}, \hat{b}_{p', s'}^{\dagger}\} = \delta^{(3)}(p - p'),$$

$$\{\hat{a}_{p, s}, \hat{a}_{p', s'}\} = 0, \quad \{\hat{b}_{p, s}, \hat{b}_{p', s'}\} = 0, \quad \{\hat{a}_{p, s}^{\dagger}, \hat{a}_{p', s'}^{\dagger}\} = 0, \quad \{\hat{b}_{p, s}^{\dagger}, \hat{b}_{p', s'}^{\dagger}\} = 0.$$

(47)

According to the discussion of the previous subsection, a detector model that couples to a fermionic field linearly must itself have a fermionic degree of freedom in order to preserve the symmetries of the theory. We then include this fermionic degree of freedom in the spacetime smearing function of the detector, regarding $\Lambda(x)$ as a classical fermionic field with support centered around the detector’s worldline. Once again, the detector will be described by a two-level quantum system governed by the (internal) free Hamiltonian from Eq. [§].

The interaction Hamiltonian weight for the field-detector system within this model can be written as a straightforward generalization of Eq. (45):

$$\hat{h}_{I}(x) = \lambda \left( e^{i\Omega_{\tau}} \hat{\bar{\psi}}(x) \hat{\sigma}^{+} \hat{\psi}(x) \Lambda(x) + e^{-i\Omega_{\tau}} \hat{\bar{\sigma}}^{-} \Lambda(x) \hat{\sigma}^{+} \hat{\bar{\psi}}(x) \hat{\psi}(x) \right).$$

(48)

Allowing $\Lambda(x)$ to transform as a spinor field makes the Hamiltonian above invariant under $U(1)$ transformations, as well as any local Lorentz transformation in the spinor bundle. By comparison with the previous section, we assume $\lambda$ to have units of $[E]^{-2}$ and $\Lambda(x)$ to have units of a spin $1/2$ field, that is, $[E]^{1/2}$. An arbitrary one-particle state for the fermionic field in this theory can be written in terms of four functions, $f_{1}, f_{2}, g_{1}, g_{2}$ defined in momentum space and associated with the two different spin polarizations of the field and to particle and anti-particle content respectively. The one-particle Fock state is explicitly given by

$$|\varphi\rangle = \sum_{s=1}^{2} \int d^3k (f_{s}(k) |k, s\rangle + g_{s}^{\dagger}(k) |\bar{k}, s\rangle),$$

(49)

where we denote $|k, s\rangle = \hat{a}_{k, s}^{\dagger} |0\rangle$ and $|\bar{k}, s\rangle = \hat{b}_{k, s}^{\dagger} |0\rangle$. In order for this state to be normalized, we then get the following condition on the $L^{2}$ norm of the functions $f_{s}$ and $g_{s}$,

$$\sum_{s=1}^{2} \left( \|f_{s}\|_{2}^{2} + \|g_{s}\|_{2}^{2} \right) = 1.$$  

(50)

The transition probability for a linear fermion detector when interacting with a general one-particle state of the form (49) is computed in detail in Appendix C. It reads

$$p_{g \to e} = \lambda^{2} \int dVdV' e^{-i\Omega(\tau - \tau')} \bar{\Lambda}(x)f(x) \left( W_{0}(x, x') + G(x)G(x') - F(x')F(x) \right) f(x')\Lambda(x'),$$

(51)

where we have defined the spinors $F(x)$ and $G(x)$ and the (particle sector) two-point vacuum Wightman tensor $W_{0}$ as

$$F(x) = \sum_{s=1}^{2} \int d^{3}k f_{s}(k) u_{k, s}(x),$$

$$G(x) = \sum_{s=1}^{2} \int d^{3}k g_{s}(k) u_{k, s}(x),$$

$$W_{0}(x, x') = \langle 0 | \hat{\psi}(x)\hat{\bar{\psi}}(x') | 0 \rangle = \sum_{s=1}^{2} \int d^{3}p u_{p, s}(x)\bar{u}_{p, s}(x').$$

(52)

As we have seen in the previous sections, the vacuum Wightman term corresponds to the vacuum excitation probability of the detector, while the $F(x)$ and $G(x)$ functions correspond to the particle and anti-particle content contributions, respectively. At this stage, it is possible to see a major difference between the previous (bosonic) cases and the fermionic spin $1/2$ field. Namely, we see that the particles contribute negatively to the excitation probability. This effect can be understood by looking at the physical system that the detector models. Indeed, the excitation of the detector is associated with the term $\hat{a}^{\dagger}(\tau)\hat{\bar{\psi}}(x)\hat{\sigma}^{+}\hat{\sigma}^{-}\Lambda(x)$ in the Hamiltonian. This term can be associated with annihilation of a $\psi$ anti-particle or the creation of a $\psi$ particle. In this sense, it is understandable that the more anti-particle content the state has, the higher the excitation probability of the detector, while the more particles, the less likely the detector will be to get excited.

On the other hand, the deexcitation of the detector has the opposite behaviour: the roles of the functions $G(x)$
and \( F(x) \) are swapped in Eq. (51) and the particle sector vacuum Wightman is swapped with the anti-particle sector Wightman tensor, \( \mathcal{W}_0 \),

\[
\mathcal{W}_0(x,x') = (0|\hat{\psi}(x')\hat{\psi}(x')|0) = \sum_{s=1}^{2} \int d^3 p \, v_{p,s}(x') \bar{v}_{p,s}(x).
\]

(53)

These changes are associated with the fact that the part of the interaction Hamiltonian corresponding to the de-excitation is the term \( \hat{\sigma}^{-} (\tau) \Lambda(x) f(x) \psi(x) \), related to the emission of a \( \psi \) anti-particle, or the absorption of a \( \psi \) particle.

Another interesting aspect of this detector model can be seen when one considers the vacuum excitation and deexcitation probabilities. In these cases we have that the excitation and deexcitation probabilities will be given by

\[
p_{g\rightarrow e} = \int dV dV' e^{-i\Omega(\tau-\tau')} \tilde{\Lambda}(x) f(x) \langle 0 | \psi(x) \bar{\psi}(x') | 0 \rangle \bar{\Lambda}(x'),
\]

(54)

\[
p_{e\rightarrow g} = \int dV dV' e^{i\Omega(\tau-\tau')} \langle 0 | \bar{\psi}(x') \Lambda(x) \Lambda(x') f(x) | 0 \rangle \psi(x).
\]

(55)

From the expressions above, it is clear that unlike what happens in the scalar case, the excitation probability of the detector, is not related to the deexcitation probability simply by a level inversion \( \Omega \rightarrow -\Omega \). This happens because the effect of changing the sign of the energy gap in the Hamiltonian from Eq. (48) is not only to swap the roles played by \( \hat{\sigma}^{+} \) and \( \hat{\sigma}^{-} \). The swap \( \Omega \rightarrow -\Omega \) would also change whether the excitation would be associated with the absorption of a fermionic particle or antiparticle. Mathematically, this can be traced back to the fact that both \( \hat{\sigma}^{+} \) and \( \hat{\sigma}^{-} \) can couple to either the field \( \bar{\psi} \) or its conjugate \( \bar{\psi} \).

To finish this Section, we consider an example of fermionic particle detection in flat spacetime, with a pointlike inertial detector. We assume the initial state of the field to be the one-particle Fock wavepacket \( |\varphi\rangle \), given in Eq. (49) with the following choices of momentum distribution for each spin polarization,

\[
f_1(k) = \frac{\alpha_1}{(\pi \sigma^2)^{\frac{3}{2}}} e^{-\frac{|k-k_0|^2}{2\sigma^2}}, \quad f_2(k) = \frac{\alpha_2}{(\pi \sigma^2)^{\frac{3}{2}}} e^{-\frac{|k-k_0|^2}{2\sigma^2}},
\]

\[\alpha_1^2 + \alpha_2^2 = 1.\]

Here \( \alpha_1^2 + \alpha_2^2 + |\beta_1|^2 + |\beta_2|^2 = 1 \). These coefficients control the particle/anti-particle content in each spin polarization.

We then pick the following hadronic current \( j^{\mu}(x) \) and spinor smearing field \( \Lambda(x) \) for the detector:

\[
j^{\mu}(x) = \delta^{(3)}(x) u^{\mu}, \quad \Lambda(x) = \Delta^2 \chi(t) \left( \begin{array}{c} A_1 \\
B_1 \\
B_2 \end{array} \right),
\]

(60)

where \( u^{\mu} \) is the detector’s four-velocity, \( \Delta \) is a constant with units of energy, \( \chi(t) \) is a switching function and the spinor field \( \Lambda \) is written in the Dirac basis and, without loss of generality, it is chosen to be spatially independent, since any position dependence would be washed out by the Dirac delta factor in \( j^{\mu}(x) \). We will also assume that the basis chosen for the spinors is such that
the $z$ component of spin is aligned with the mean momentum in the distribution (the peak of the Gaussian spectrum, $k_0$). The constant $\Delta$ takes into account the fact that the components of the spinor $\Lambda$ chosen above must have units of $[E]^{3/2}$ due to the spin 1/2 nature of the field. $\Delta$ is then associated with a scale of energy for the interaction. For example, in the case of a detector probing the neutrino field, we would have $\Delta \approx m_e$, as was discussed in Subsection III A. The normalization condition for the spinor $(A_1, A_2, B_1, B_2)$ imposes that $|A_1|^2 + |A_2|^2 + |B_1|^2 + |B_2|^2 = 1$.

In Appendix C, we compute in full detail the long time excitation probability for the detector in the adiabatic limit when it responds to the wavepacket in Eq. (49). In the long time regime, the probability is zero if $\Omega \leq m$. Under the condition that $\Omega > m$, we obtain the following result:

$$p_{g-e} = \frac{4\lambda^2 \sigma^{3/2} \Omega^3 (\Omega + m)}{k_0^2} \frac{|\gamma^+ (\Omega, m, k_0, \sigma)|^2}{\sinh^2 \left( \frac{k_0 \sqrt{\Omega^2 - m^2}}{m} \right)} \times \Theta(\Omega - m),$$

(61)

where $\gamma^+$ is an adimensional function given by

$$\gamma^+ (\Omega, m, k_0, \sigma) = \beta_1 B_1^* + \beta_2 B_2^*$$

$$+ (\beta_1 A_1^* - \beta_2 A_2^*) \sqrt{\frac{\Omega - m}{\Omega + m}} f \left( \frac{k_0 \sqrt{\Omega^2 - m^2}}{m} \right),$$

(62)

and $f(u) = \coth(u) - 1/u$ is the pole-removed hyperbolic cotangent function and satisfies $0 \leq f(u) \leq 1$ for $u \geq 0$. Given the normalization for the spinor $\Lambda$ and for the state $|\psi\rangle$, we see that $|\gamma^+|^2$ is bounded by 1. Also notice that in the adiabatic long time limit, only the anti-particle portion of the state $|\psi\rangle$ contributes to the probability. That is, the particle content of $|\psi\rangle$ does not influence the excitation of this detector in this regime for the choice of process that motivates our detector, as discussed in Subsection III A.

Notice that the dependence of $\gamma^+$ on $\Omega, m, k_0$ and $\sigma$ only appears in the term in the second line of Eq. (62). This term contributes the most near the monochromatic limit $\sigma \ll |k_0|$, where $f \to 1$. Conversely, when $\sigma \gg |k_0|$, we have $f \to 0$ and this term can be neglected, simplifying the expression for $\gamma^+$. This term could also be neglected if we were to consider the mass of the fermionic field to be large with respect to $|k_0|$, due to the prefactor $[(\Omega - m)/\Omega + m]^{3/2}$. However, assuming $m$ to be large would go against our physical motivation that uses neutrino fields, known to have extremely low mass and to be extremely relativistic. That is, in general all terms in $\gamma^+$ contribute, but we always have $|\gamma^+|^2 \leq 1$.

Notice the similarity between Eq. (61) for the fermionic field and Eq. (22) for the massive real scalar case in three spatial dimensions. However, if we compare the two expressions we see four major differences between the two models:

1. In the fermionic case we have a dimensionful coupling constant (which, in the detector model inspired by the four-fermion interaction discussed in Subsection III A, would be given by $G_F/\sqrt{2}$).

2. The probability from Eq. (61) crucially depends on the relative orientation between the spin polarizations of the detector spinor smearing and the wavepacket. This is the spinor analogue to the dependence on orientation between dipole and polarization of the wavepacket for the case of the vector field detector.

3. The contribution to the excitation probability for the fermionic detector comes from the antiparticle content of the field, being completely blind to the particle content of the state. This has no analogue in the detector models for real fields we have seen so far. This is not as surprising when one remembers that famous particle physics maxim that says particles of a real field are their own anti-particles.

4. Unlike the models for probing real fields, the vacuum excitation and deexcitation probabilities are not connected by the $\Omega \to -\Omega$ exchange. This is due to the fact that the detector operator $\sigma^-$ couples with the field in (18), while $\sigma^+$ couples to its conjugate. As explained above this is because of the particular process we are using to build the fermionic detector.

5. Finally, unlike the scalar case, the numerator of Eq. (61) is mass dependent.

However, it is arguably unfair to compare the fermionic detector model to other models where the detector couples to real fields. In order to establish a fair comparison where differences are truly rooted in the fermionic nature of the field as opposed to bosonic, we would need to compare the fermionic model with that of a complex bosonic field detector.

IV. A DETECTOR MODEL FOR A COMPLEX SCALAR FIELD

In order to truly understand the differences between fermionic and bosonic detector models, and compare the response of detectors coupled linearly to these two kinds of fields, we first need to build a linear bosonic detector model where we have distinct particle and anti-particle sectors. In this section we propose and study a particle detector model that couples linearly to a complex scalar field. We will focus on two different relevant comparisons: 1) We will build a particle detector model that couples linearly to a complex scalar field and compare it with the fermionic detector developed in Sec. III 2) We will
compare the cases of a (true bosonic) complex scalar field, with a Grassmann scalar field.\footnote{A Grassmann scalar field is a spin-0 field where the complex algebra is anti-commutative instead of commutative (effectively behaving as spin-0 fermions that satisfy Fermi-Dirac statistics).}

In general, a free complex scalar quantum field in an \(n + 1\) dimensional spacetime can be expanded in terms of a basis of solutions to the classical equations of motion according to

\[
\hat{\psi}(x) = \int d^n p \left( u_p(x) \hat{a}_p + u_p^*(x) \hat{b}_p \right), \tag{63}
\]

\[
\hat{\psi}^+(x) = \int d^n p \left( u_p^*(x) \hat{a}_p^\dagger + u_p(x) \hat{b}_p^\dagger \right), \tag{64}
\]

where \(\{u_p(x), u_p^*(x)\}\) is a basis of solutions to Klein-Gordon’s equations, \(\hat{a}_p\) are the annihilation operators associated with particles and \(\hat{b}_p\) are the ones associated with the annihilation of anti-particles. At this stage we could impose commutation relations for the creation and annihilation operators and have a regular complex scalar field. However, in order to generalize the model to consider Grassmann fields as well, we will impose arbitrary sign commutation relations

\[
[\hat{a}_p, \hat{a}_p^\dagger]_\pm = \delta^{(3)}(p - p'), \quad [\hat{b}_p, \hat{b}_p^\dagger]_\pm = \delta^{(3)}(p - p'),
\]

\[
[\hat{a}_p, \hat{a}_p^\dagger]_\pm = [\hat{b}_p, \hat{b}_p^\dagger]_\pm = 0, \tag{65}
\]

so that ‘+’ denotes anti-commutation and ‘−’ commutation. This general approach allows us to distinguish results that depend on the fact that the field has anti-particle content from the features that depend on whether it satisfies Bose-Einstein or Fermi-Dirac statistics.

To build the interaction of the detector with the field, we proceed along the lines of what was done in Section III. We propose a particle detector model that has a complex degree of freedom that will be encompassed in the detector’s smearing function. This means that the detector will also change under \(U(1)\) transformations, and the interaction of the detector and the field will remain invariant under \(U(1)\). Similarly to the other detector models studied in this manuscript, we will assume the detector to be described by a two-level system whose internal quantum degree of freedom is supported along a trajectory \(z(\tau)\). The detector’s free Hamiltonian will then be given by Eq. (8). The interaction with the field will then be described by the Hamiltonian weight

\[
\hat{h}_I(x) = \lambda \left( \Lambda(x)e^{i\Omega \tau} \hat{\sigma}^+ \hat{\psi}^+(x) + \Lambda^*(x)e^{-i\Omega \tau} \hat{\sigma}^- \hat{\psi}(x) \right), \tag{66}
\]

where \(\Lambda(x)\) is a complex smearing function that regulates the coupling of the detector with the field and transforms under \(U(1)\) so that the interaction Hamiltonian is \(U(1)\)-invariant, as expected in order to preserve the symmetries of the field theory.

We will consider a general one-particle state with arbitrary particle and anti-particle content:

\[
|\varphi\rangle = \int d^n k \left( f(k) |k\rangle + g^*(k) |\bar{k}\rangle \right), \tag{67}
\]

where \(f(k)\) and \(g(k)\) are the momentum distributions of the particle and anti-particle components, respectively. Normalization of the state \(|\varphi\rangle\) implies that the \(L^2\) norm of \(f\) and \(g\) satisfy \(\|f\|^2 + \|g\|^2 = 1\).

We can then compute the transition probability for the detector to go from the ground to the excited state using similar techniques to what was performed in the previous sections

\[
p_{e \to g} = \lambda^2 \int dV dV' \Lambda^*(x') \Lambda(x) e^{i\Omega(\tau' - \tau)} \langle \varphi|\hat{\psi}^+(x')\hat{\psi}(x)|\varphi\rangle. \tag{68}
\]

Notice that in this case, the excitation probability and the deexcitation probability have a similar interpretation to that of the fermionic model in Section III: the excitation of the detector is associated with either the absorption of a \(\psi\) anti-particle or emission of a \(\bar{\psi}\) particle. Conversely, the probability of deexcitation \(p_{e \to g}\) will be associated with the absorption of particles or emission of anti-particles. It is explicitly given by

\[
p_{e \to g} = \lambda^2 \int dV dV' \Lambda^*(x') \Lambda(x) e^{i\Omega(\tau' - \tau)} \langle \varphi|\hat{\psi}^+(x')\hat{\psi}(x)|\varphi\rangle. \tag{69}
\]

The general excitation probability from Eq. (68) can be computed by plugging in the value for the Wightman function of the state \(|\varphi\rangle\). In Appendix D we perform the explicit computations and find

\[
p_{g \to e} = \lambda^2 \int dV dV' \Lambda^*(x') \Lambda(x) e^{i\Omega(\tau' - \tau)} \times \left( W_0(x', x') + G^*(x') G(x) \equiv F(x') F^*(x) \right), \tag{70}
\]

where the \(\bar{\tau}\) is associated with anti-commutation (Grassmann scalar case) and commutation (complex bosonic scalar) relations respectively. We also defined

\[
F(x) = \int d^n k f(k) u_k(x), \quad G(x) = \int d^n k g(k) u_k(x), \tag{71}
\]

\[
W_0(x', x) = \langle 0|\hat{\psi}^+(x')\hat{\psi}(x)|0\rangle = \int d^n p u_p(x') u_p^*(x). \]

Here we see that whether our field has Fermi-Dirac or Bose-Einstein statistics will make the excitation probability depend on the particle or antiparticle content in a different way. If the bosonic commutation relations are chosen, then both the particle and antiparticle content increase the excitation probability. On the other hand, for our choice of model, if we choose anti-commutation
relations for $\hat{\psi}$, the particle content decreases the overall excitation probability. This is analogous to the feature seen in the neutrino particle detector model, where the particle content of the neutrino field would inhibit the process of excitation of the proton. It is then possible to use this physically motivated asymmetric response to distinguish particle and anti-particle excitations.

Before going into the explicit example for a pointlike detector, let us compare the vacuum excitation and de-excitation probabilities in this general case. Notice that, for a complex scalar field, the vacuum Wightman function satisfies

$$\langle 0 | \hat{\psi}(x') \hat{\psi}^\dagger(x) | 0 \rangle = \langle 0 | \hat{\psi}^\dagger(x') \hat{\psi}(x) | 0 \rangle = \int d^n k u_k(x) u^*_k(x').$$

(72)

This implies that both the vacuum excitation and spontaneous emission probabilities for this detector model coincide with the scalar ones. In turn, this means that this complex scalar model (regardless of statistics) preserves the $\Omega \rightarrow -\Omega$ symmetry between the vacuum excitation probability and the spontaneous decay probability. Keep in mind that this symmetry is broken in the fermionic particle detector from Section [11] even in the vacuum. However, Eq. (72) is not satisfied by a general field state $|\varphi\rangle$, that is, $(\varphi | \hat{\psi}(x') \hat{\psi}^\dagger(x) | \varphi\rangle \neq \langle \varphi | \hat{\psi}^\dagger(x') \hat{\psi}(x) | \varphi\rangle$. This in turn means that besides the very special case of the vacuum, the complex scalar detector (regardless of statistics) does not have the symmetry $\Omega \rightarrow -\Omega$ connecting excitation and de-excitation processes, analogous to what we had for the spinor detector.

We can now reduce this general setup to a specific example that can be solved analytically. We consider a pointlike detector undergoing an inertial trajectory in Minkowski spacetime. We also assume the interaction between the detector and field to be switched on for arbitrary long times in order to clean up any finite-time switching effects. We assume the field to start in a general one-particle/antiparticle state given by Eq. (67), where we center the distribution around momentum $k_0$ by choosing

$$f(k) = \frac{\alpha}{(\pi \sigma^2)^{3/2}} e^{-\frac{(k-k_0)^2}{2\sigma^2}},$$

(73)

$$g(k) = \frac{\beta}{(\pi \sigma^2)^{3/2}} e^{-\frac{(k-k_0)^2}{2\sigma^2}},$$

(74)

where the normalization condition on $|\varphi\rangle$ implies that $|\alpha|^2 + |\beta|^2 = 1$ and the localization in momentum space is given by the parameter $\sigma$. In this case, it is easy to see that the excitation probability of the detector (Eq. (70)) will be the same that we had for a scalar field, but with a factor of $|\beta|^2$, because for the choice of interaction in (66), only the anti-particle content is associated with the co-rotating term. The probability reads

$$p_{g\rightarrow e} = \frac{2\lambda^2 |\beta|^2 \Omega (\Omega^2 - m^2)^{3/2}}{\pi^{1/2} \sigma^{1/2} |k_0|^{3/2} \sqrt{\lambda}} e^{-\frac{|k_0|^2 + \Omega^2 - m^2}{\sigma^2}} \times \int \frac{d\tau}{\sqrt{\lambda}} \left( \frac{|k_0| \sqrt{\Omega^2 - m^2}}{\sigma^2} \right)^2 \Theta(\Omega - m).$$

(75)

In particular, in the case of three spatial dimensions this probability is

$$p_{g\rightarrow e} = \frac{4\lambda^2 |\beta|^2 \sigma \Omega}{\sqrt{\pi} |k_0|^2} e^{-\frac{|k_0|^2 + \sigma^2}{\sigma^2}} \times \sinh^2 \left( \frac{|k_0| \sqrt{\Omega^2 - m^2}}{\sigma^2} \right) \Theta(\Omega - m).$$

(76)

Notice that the results of Eqs. (75) and (76) are very similar to the scalar case. This is particular to the adiabatic (long time) limit taken, where the overall behaviour of the response of all the models studied here is very similar. Nevertheless, the excitation probability of the detector depends only on the anti-particle content. In fact, if the field state contains only particles, the excitation probability vanishes in this case, same as for the fermionic detector in Section [11].

Furthermore, looking at Eq. (72) and comparing it with Eq. (51), we see that the use of a Grassmann scalar field (anti-commutation of the creation and annihilation operators) allows us to treat this model as a scalar simplification of the spinor field detector, much in the same way that the Unruh-DeWitt model reproduces the fundamental features of the light-matter interaction when the exchange of angular momentum is not relevant [19]. The only two fundamental features that are not captured by this scalar model when compared to the fermionic one are: 1) The fact that the vacuum excitation and deexcitation are symmetric over the exchange $\Omega \rightarrow -\Omega$, while the fermionic one is not. And 2) The spin polarization of the states are not grasped by the scalar model, as one would expect.

V. CONCLUSIONS

We have systematically compared four different particle detector models that couple linearly to fields of different spin (scalar, vector, spinor), paying special attention to the role that particle and anti-particle sectors play in these models. In all cases we have studied the response of the detectors when the field is in a general one-particle Fock wavepacket with respect to an arbitrary mode expansion. From this general setup we have seen that particle detector models that couple linearly to complex fields (in a similar way to the neutrino detector proposed in [27]) can distinguish the particle and anti-particle content of the field state. In fact, the complex

---

4 Notice that this is a consequence of the fact that linear fermion detectors have to be fermionic themselves.
field detector models studied here can be tuned to be sensitive to the absorption of particles or anti-particles.

Moreover, we have studied the behaviour of the complex scalar model detector we proposed when the field satisfies either Bose-Einstein or Fermi-Dirac statistics (Grassmann scalar field). We showed that the linear scalar complex model with fermionic commutation relations yields a good approximation to the fermionic particle detector model. This is completely analogous to the way in which the real scalar UDW model can be used to approximately model the light-matter interaction (see, e.g. [23, 25]).

In summary, this work introduces and studies a new simple particle detector model for probing complex scalar fields that can, in principle, approximate experiments sensitive to the absorption of particles or anti-particles. Field detector models studied here can be tuned to be well as his Ontario Early Researcher Award.
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Appendix A: The Real Scalar Field Detecting a Particle

In this appendix we provide the details for the excitation probability for a UDW detector probing a one-particle state in a real scalar field theory, first for a detector undergoing general trajectories in a general globally hyperbolic curved spacetime and then we specialize to the case of an inertial detector in flat spacetimes under the long time limit as in Eq. (16). Upon choosing a quantization scheme, the quantized version of a real scalar field in curved spacetimes can be expanded in terms of creation and annihilation operators according to Eq. (9). The interaction between a two-level particle detector and the quantum field is prescribed in terms of the interaction Hamiltonian density from Eq. (16) as in [23, 24]. We consider the initial state of the field to be the pure state $|\varphi\rangle$ from Eq. (13) given in terms of the momentum spectral profile function $f(k)$. Normalization of the state implies $|f|^2 = 1$. The probability for the detector to transition from ground to excited state is given in Eq. (15). It is then enough to calculate the two-point function for the field in the one-particle state $|\varphi\rangle$. In order to proceed, let us first state the following preliminary results,

$$\langle 0 | \hat{a}_k \hat{a}_p^\dagger \hat{a}_p \hat{a}_k^\dagger | 0 \rangle = \langle 0 | \hat{a}_k \hat{a}_p^\dagger | 0 \rangle \delta(p - k) = \delta(p' - k') \delta(p - k). \quad (A1)$$

$$\langle 0 | \hat{a}_k \hat{a}_p \hat{a}_p^\dagger \hat{a}_k \hat{a}_p | 0 \rangle = \langle 0 | \hat{a}_k \hat{a}_p \hat{a}_p | p, k \rangle = \delta(p - p') \delta(k - k') + \delta(k - p') \delta(k' - p). \quad (A2)$$

With these, we obtain

$$\langle \varphi | \hat{\phi}(x') \hat{\phi}(x) | \varphi \rangle = \int d^n k d^n k' d^n p d^n p' f^*(k') f(k) \langle 0 | \hat{a}_{k'} \left( u_{p'}(x') \hat{a}_{p'} + u_{p'}(x') \hat{a}_{p'}^\dagger \right) \left( u_{p}(x) \hat{a}_p + u_{p}(x) \hat{a}_p^\dagger \right) | 0 \rangle \frac{\delta(p - k) \delta(k - k') \delta(p - p')}{\Lambda^2}$$

$$= \int d^n k d^n k' d^n p d^n p' f^*(k') f(k) \left( u_{p'}(x') u_{p}(x) \langle 0 | \hat{a}_{k'} \hat{a}_{p'} \hat{a}_p^\dagger \hat{a}_{k} | 0 \rangle + u_{p'}(x') u_{p}(x) \langle 0 | \hat{a}_{k'} \hat{a}_{p'} \hat{a}_p \hat{a}_{k}^\dagger | 0 \rangle \right) \times \left( u_{p'}(x') u_{p}(x) \delta(p - p') \delta(k - k') + \delta(k - p') \delta(k' - p) \right) + u_{p'}(x') u_{p}(x) \delta(p' - k') \delta(p - k))$$

$$= \int d^n k d^n k' f^*(k') f(k) \left( \int d^n p u_{p'}(x') u_{p}(x) \delta(k - k') + u_{p}(x') u_{k'}(x) + u_{k'}(x') u_{k}(x) \right). \quad (A3)$$

Thus, the transition probability can be cast as

$$\frac{p_{y \rightarrow e}}{\Lambda^2} = \int dV dV' \Lambda(x) \Lambda(x') e^{i\Omega(\tau - \tau')} \int d^n k d^n k' f^*(k') f(k) \left( \int d^n p u_{p'}(x') u_{p}(x) \delta(k - k') + u_{k'}(x') u_{k}(x) + u_{k}(x') u_{k}(x) \right)$$

$$= \int dV dV' \int d^n p \Lambda(x) \Lambda(x') e^{i\Omega(\tau - \tau')} u_{p}(x') u_{p}(x) \quad (A4)$$
Now we notice that the time integrals can be recast as Dirac deltas, according to
\[
\delta^{(n)}(x - z(\tau)) \frac{u^0(\tau)}{u^0(\tau) \sqrt{-g}},
\]
where we used the fact that the vacuum contribution yield zero in the 'particle' contribution

\[
p_{g\to e} = \lambda^2 \int dVdV' \Delta(x)\Delta(x') e^{i\Omega(\tau - \tau')} (W(x', x) + F(x')F^*(x) + F^*(x')F(x)).
\]

(A5)

The case of pointlike detectors with a switching function \(\chi(\tau)\) can then be obtained by using the following spacetime smearing function

\[
\Lambda(x) = \chi(\tau) \frac{\delta^{(n)}(x - z(\tau))}{u^0(\tau) \sqrt{-g}},
\]

where \(u(\tau)\) denotes the four-velocity of the detector’s trajectory and the above expression can be used in any coordinate system \(x = (t, x)\). The excitation probability for a point-like detector then reads

\[
p_{g\to e} = \lambda^2 \int d\tau d\tau' \chi(\tau)\chi(\tau') e^{i\Omega(\tau - \tau')} (W(\tau', \tau) + F(\tau')F^*(\tau) + F^*(\tau')F(\tau)).
\]

(A7)

1. A Simple Example

Consider now an inertial pointlike detector in Minkowski spacetime such that its interaction is switched on indefinitely. In this case we use the mode expansion from Eq. (18) for \(\phi(x)\) in an inertial coordinate system. We will work with the one-particle state from Eq. (13), with the choice of momentum profile function \(f(k)\) from Eq. (19). In this setup, the \(F(x)\) function from Eq. (17) takes the shape

\[
F(x) = \frac{1}{(2\pi)^n} \int d^n k e^{-ik\cdot x} \frac{e^{ik\cdot x}}{\sqrt{2\omega_k}}.
\]

(A8)

We will work with a massive scalar field interacting with the quantum field in the infinitely long time, so that \(\omega_k = \sqrt{k^2 + m^2}\) and \(\chi(\tau) = \chi(t) = 1\) (understood as taking the adiabatic limit). Under these assumptions the excitation probability for an inertial detector located at the origin can be written as

\[
p_{g\to e} = \frac{\lambda^2}{2\pi^n} \int dt dt' e^{i\Omega(t-t')} \left( \int d^n k \frac{e^{-i\Omega k(t-t')}}{2\omega_k} \right.
\]

\[
+ \frac{1}{(2\pi)^n} \int d^n k e^{-i\Omega k(t-t')} \left( \int d^n k e^{-i\Omega k(t-t')} \right.
\]

\[
+ \frac{1}{(2\pi)^n} \int d^n k e^{-i\Omega k(t-t')} \left( \int d^n k e^{-i\Omega k(t-t')} \right).
\]

(A9)

Now we notice that the time integrals can be recast as Dirac deltas, according to

\[
\int dt e^{i(\Omega \pm \omega_k)t} = 2\pi \delta(\Omega \pm \omega_k) = 2\pi \delta(\Omega \pm \sqrt{k^2 + m^2}) = 2\pi \frac{\sqrt{k^2 + m^2}}{|k|} \left( \delta \left( |k| - \sqrt{\Omega^2 - m^2} \right) + (\delta \left( |k| + \sqrt{\Omega^2 - m^2} \right) \right).
\]

(A10)

where we used the fact that \(|k|\) is always positive.

With these results we see that the terms above that combine time exponents of the form \((\Omega + \omega_k)t\) vanish, because the argument of the delta will never yield zero. Note the technicality that the vacuum contribution yield zero in the
adiabatic limit (i.e., the long time limit is thought of as the limit of a sequence of smooth enough switching functions of larger and larger support [32, 33]). That is, the vacuum contribution and counter-rotating term do not contribute in the infinitely long time. We are left with:

\[
p_{g\rightarrow e} = \frac{1}{(2\pi)^n (\pi \sigma^2)^\frac{d}{2}} \left(2\pi \int d^nk e^{-\frac{|k-k_0|^2}{2\sigma^2}} \delta \left(\Omega - \sqrt{k^2 + m^2}\right)\right) \left(2\pi \int d^n{k'} e^{-\frac{|k'-k_0|^2}{2\sigma^2}} \delta \left(\Omega - \sqrt{k'^2 + m'^2}\right)\right).
\]

\[
= \frac{(2\pi)^2 \lambda^2}{(2\pi)^n (\pi \sigma^2)^\frac{d}{2}} \left|\int d|k|d|\Omega_{n-1}| |k|^{n-1} e^{-\frac{|k-k_0|^2}{2\sigma^2}} \delta \left(|k| - \sqrt{\Omega^2 - m^2}\right)(k^2 + m^2)^\frac{d}{2}\right|^2
\]

\[
= \frac{(2\pi)^2 \lambda^2 e^{-\frac{|k_0|^2}{\sigma^2}}}{(2\pi)^n (\pi \sigma^2)^\frac{d}{2}} \frac{\Omega(\Omega^2 - m^2)^{n-2}}{\sigma^{4+n}|k_0|^{n-2}} \text{I}_{\frac{n-2}{2}} \left(\frac{|k_0|\sqrt{\Omega^2 - m^2}}{\sigma^2}\right)^2 4\pi^n \text{I}_{\frac{n-2}{2}} \left(\frac{|k_0|\sqrt{\Omega^2 - m^2}}{\sigma^2}\right)^2.
\]

Notice that this result recovers the one obtained in [30] once one sets the mass to zero. Notice that our computations assumed the detector gap $\Omega$ to be larger than the mass of the field, otherwise the excitation probability in this limit would yield zero. This is compatible with the known fact that in order for a particle detector to absorb a particle, it must have a gap larger than its mass.

Appendix B: The Real Vector Field Detecting a Particle

In this appendix we provide the details for the excitation probability when a detector probes a one-particle excitation of a real massless vector field, carried out in Eq. (27). We assume to have a quantized real vector field with two polarizations expanded in terms of creation and annihilation operators as in Eq. (24). The interaction of the field with a two-level system that undergoes a trajectory $z(\tau)$ is prescribed in terms of the interaction Hamiltonian density from Eq. (25) and we consider the initial pure state for the field, $|\varphi\rangle$, given by Eq. (26), where we have $\|f_1\|^2 + \|f_2\|^2 = 1$ due to the normalization of the state. The probability for the detector to transition from the ground to excited state is given by

\[
p_{g\rightarrow e} = \lambda^2 \int dVdV' \Lambda^*_\mu(x')\Lambda^*_\mu(x)e^{i\Omega(\tau'-\tau)} \langle \varphi | \hat{E}^\nu(x') \hat{E}^\mu(x) | \varphi \rangle,
\]

and it can be obtained in an analogous way to what was done in the real scalar case. It is then enough to compute the two-point function of the state $|\varphi\rangle$. In order to compute it, let us first state the following preliminary results,

\[
\langle \varphi | \hat{E}^\nu(x') \hat{E}^\mu(x) | \varphi \rangle = \sum_{s,s',l,l'} \int d^3kd^3k'd^3pd^3p' f_{\nu,m}(k') f_l(k) \\
\times \langle 0 | \hat{a}_{k',l'} \left(u_{p,s}(x')\hat{a}_{p',s'} + u_{p',s'}^*(x')\hat{a}_{p,s}^\dagger\right) \epsilon^{\nu}(p', s')e^{i\nu}(p, s) (u_{p,ss}(x)\hat{a}_{p,s} + u_{p,ss}^*(x)\hat{a}_{p,s}^\dagger) \hat{a}_{k,l} | 0 \rangle.
\]

(B1)

(B2)
\[
\begin{align*}
&= \sum_{ss'll'} \int d^3k d^3k' d^3p d^3p' f^\nu(p') f_i(k) e^\nu(p', s') e^\mu(p, s) \\
&\quad \left( up', s'(x') \langle 0 | \hat{a}_{k', l'} \hat{a}_{p', s'} + u^*_p(p', s') \langle 0 | \hat{a}_{k', l'} \hat{a}_{p', s'} \right) \left( up_{p, s}(x) \hat{a}_{p, s} \hat{a}_{p, s}^\dagger | 0 \rangle + u^*_p(p, s) \langle 0 | \hat{a}_{p, s} \hat{a}_{p, s}^\dagger | 0 \rangle \right) \\
&= \sum_{ss'll'} \int d^3k d^3k' d^3p d^3p' f^\nu(p') f_i(k) e^\nu(p', s') e^\mu(p, s) \\
&\quad \left( up', s'(x') u_{p, s}(x) \langle 0 | \hat{a}_{k', l'} \hat{a}_{p', s'} \hat{a}_{p, s} \hat{a}_{k, l} | 0 \rangle + u^*_p(p', s') \langle 0 | \hat{a}_{k', l'} \hat{a}_{p', s'} \hat{a}_{p, s} \hat{a}_{k, l} | 0 \rangle \right) \\
&= \sum_{ss'll'} \int d^4k d^4k' \left( \epsilon^\nu(k', s') e^\mu(k, s) f^\nu(k') f_s(k) u^\mu_{k', s'}(x) u_{k, s}(x) \\
&\quad + f^\nu_s(k) f_s(k) e^\nu(k', s') e^\mu(k', s') u^\mu_{k', s'}(x) u_{k', s'}(x') \right) + f^\nu_s(k) f_s(k') e^\nu(k', s') e^\mu(k, s) u^\mu_{k', s'}(x) u_{k, s}(x)) \quad \text{(B3)}
\end{align*}
\]

Therefore the transition probability can be cast as a sum of three terms:

\[
p_{g \rightarrow e} = \lambda^2 \int dVdV' \Lambda_+^\nu(x') \Lambda^\mu(x) e^{i\Omega(\tau - \tau')} \langle \varphi | \hat{E}^\nu(x') \hat{E}^\mu(x) | \varphi \rangle \\
= \lambda^2 \sum_{ss'} \int dVdV' \int d^3k d^3k' \Lambda_+^\nu(x') \Lambda^\mu(x) e^{i\Omega(\tau - \tau')} \epsilon^\nu(k', s') e^\mu(k, s) f^\nu_s(k') f_s(k) u^\mu_{k', s'}(x') u_{k, s}(x) \\
+ \lambda^2 \sum_{ss'} \int dVdV' \int d^3k d^3k' \Lambda_+^\nu(x') \Lambda^\mu(x) e^{i\Omega(\tau - \tau')} f^\nu_s(k) f_s(k) e^\nu(k', s') e^\mu(k', s') u^\mu_{k', s'}(x') u_{k', s'}(x') \\
+ \lambda^2 \sum_{ss'} \int dVdV' \int d^3k d^3k' \Lambda_+^\nu(x') \Lambda^\mu(x) e^{i\Omega(\tau - \tau')} f^\nu_s(k') f_s(k') e^\nu(k', s') e^\mu(k', s') u^\mu_{k', s'}(x') u_{k', s'}(x') \quad \text{(B4)}
\]

By using the functions defined in Eq. (28), we can recast the excitation probability as

\[
p_{g \rightarrow e} = \lambda^2 \int dVdV' \Lambda_+^\nu(x') \Lambda^\mu(x) e^{i\Omega(\tau - \tau')} (W^\nu_\mu(x', x) + F^\nu(x') F^\mu(x) + F^\nu(x') F^\mu(x)) \\
= p_{g \rightarrow e}^{\text{acc}} + p_{g \rightarrow e}^{\text{particle}}. \quad \text{(B5)}
\]

For the case of pointlike detectors, we must prescribe a switching function that takes into account the vector-like character of the coupling, that is \( \chi^\mu(\tau) \). This is the most general choice for switching function. For simplicity it is somewhat common to simplify the switching, by assuming that \( \chi^\mu(\tau) = \chi(\tau) X^\mu(\tau) \), where \( \chi(\tau) \) is a scalar switching function and \( X^\mu(\tau) \) is a vector field whose components are constant in a frame adapted to the detector’s trajectory.

The transition probability can then be obtained by considering the following spacetime smearing vector field

\[
\Lambda^\mu(x) = \chi^\mu(\tau) \frac{\delta^{(3)}(x - z(\tau))}{a^0(\tau) \sqrt{-g}}, \quad \text{(B6)}
\]
where \( u(\tau) \) is the four-velocity of the trajectory. The probability for a pointlike detector can then be written as

\[
p_{g \rightarrow e} = \lambda^2 \int d\tau' d\tau' \chi^*_\nu(\tau') \chi_\mu(\tau) e^{i\Omega(\tau' - \tau)} (W^{\nu\mu}(\tau', \tau) + F^{\nu'}(\tau') F^{\mu*}_{\nu'}(\tau) + F^{\mu*}(\tau') F^{\nu'}(\tau)) .
\]

(7)

1. Probing the Electromagnetic Field

The electromagnetic field seen by a given inertial observer in Minkowski spacetime can be written as

\[
\dot{E}^\mu(x) = i \sum_{s=1}^2 \int \frac{d^3k}{(2\pi)^3} \sqrt{\frac{k}{2}} \left( \hat{a}_{k,s} e^{-ik \cdot x} - \hat{a}_{k,s}^\dagger e^{ik \cdot x} \right) e^\mu(k, s).
\]

(8)

To proceed with the computations, we must choose polarization vectors \( e^\mu(k, s) \), with \( s = 1, 2 \), that are orthogonal to the spacelike portion of \( k^\mu \). We parametrize these according to

\[
k = |k| (\sin \theta \cos \phi \, e_x + \sin \theta \sin \phi \, e_y + \cos \theta e_z),
\]

\[
e(k, 1) = \cos \theta \cos \phi \, e_x + \cos \theta \sin \phi \, e_y - \sin \theta e_z, \quad \text{and} \quad e(k, 2) = -\sin \phi \, e_x + \cos \phi \, e_y.
\]

(9)

The effective basis of solutions to the K.G. equation in this case is given by

\[
u_{k,s}(x) = -i \sqrt{\frac{|k|}{2 (2\pi)^3}} e^{ik \cdot x},
\]

(10)

which is independent of the spin \( s \).

Under the assumptions of an inertial pointlike detector (Eq. 31) probing the one particle state defined by the momentum spectral functions in Eqs. 32 and 33, and choosing coordinates such that the dipole moment of the detector can be written as \( X = e_z \), we obtain:

\[
p_{g \rightarrow e} = \lambda^2 \int dt' dt e^{i\Omega(t - t')} \left( \int \frac{d^3k}{(2\pi)^3} \sin^2 \theta \frac{|k|}{2} e^{i|k|\Omega(t-t')} \right)
\]

(11)

\[
+ |\alpha_1|^2 \int d^3k d^3k' \left( \frac{e^{-i(k-k')^2}}{\pi \sigma^2} \right)^2 \left( \frac{e^{-i|k|\Omega t}}{\pi \sigma^2} \right)^2 \left( \frac{e^{-i|k'|\Omega (t-t')}}{\pi \sigma^2} \right)^2 \left( \frac{e^{-i|k'|\Omega (t-t')}}{\pi \sigma^2} \right)^2 .
\]

\[
+ |\alpha_1|^2 \int d^3k d^3k' \left( \frac{e^{-i(k-k')^2}}{\pi \sigma^2} \right)^2 \left( \frac{e^{-i|k|\Omega t}}{\pi \sigma^2} \right)^2 \left( \frac{e^{-i|k'|\Omega (t-t')}}{\pi \sigma^2} \right)^2 \left( \frac{e^{-i|k'|\Omega (t-t')}}{\pi \sigma^2} \right)^2 .
\]

\[
\left( \frac{e^{-i|k'|\Omega (t-t')}}{\pi \sigma^2} \right)^2 \left( \frac{e^{-i|k'|\Omega (t-t')}}{\pi \sigma^2} \right)^2 .
\]

Using the fact that

\[
\int dt \, e^{i(\Omega \pm |k|)t} = 2\pi \delta(\Omega \pm |k|),
\]

(12)

we can set the first two terms to zero in the adiabatic long-time limit, while the last term yields:

\[
p_{g \rightarrow e} = \lambda^2 \left( \frac{|\alpha_1|^2}{2(\pi \sigma^2)^2} \right)^2 \int d\theta d\phi \, \sin^2 \theta \, e^{i(\Omega \pm |k|)t} (\Omega(\sigma \sin \theta \cos \phi + k_{0y} \sin \theta \sin \phi + k_{0z} \cos \theta))^2 .
\]

(13)

The integral over \( \phi \) can be solved in terms of the modified Bessel function of the first kind,

\[
\int d\phi \, e^{i(\Omega \pm |k|)t} (\Omega(\sigma \sin \theta \cos \phi + k_{0y} \sin \theta \sin \phi + k_{0z} \cos \theta))^2 = 2\pi \frac{\Omega \sigma \pm k_{0z}}{\sigma^2} \frac{\sin \theta}{\sin \phi} \frac{\sin \phi + k_{0z}}{\sin \phi + k_{0z} \cos \phi} .
\]

(14)
The result of the integral over \( \theta \) yields a closed-form expression for the excitation probability for a general \( k_0 \),

\[
p_{g \rightarrow e} = \frac{\Omega^3 e^{-k_0^2 + \Omega^2}}{16\sqrt{\pi} |k_0|^2 \sigma^2} \left( 2I_0 \left( \frac{|k_0| \Omega \sin^2 \left( \frac{\theta}{2} \right)}{\sigma^2} \right) \cos^2 \left( \frac{\theta}{2} \right) \right) \left[ I_1 \left( \frac{|k_0| \Omega \cos^2 \left( \frac{\theta}{2} \right)}{\sigma^2} \right) \right] \frac{\sigma^2 \cos \theta}{2} - 2I_0 \left( \frac{|k_0| \Omega \cos^2 \left( \frac{\theta}{2} \right)}{\sigma^2} \right) \frac{\sigma^2 \cos^2 \left( \frac{\theta}{2} \right)}{2} \cos \theta \right] \right)^2,
\]
where \( \theta \) denotes the relative angle between \( k_0 \) and \( X \). In the particular cases where the polarization vector is a) parallel, and b) orthogonal to the center of the momentum distribution of the one-particle state we obtain the following simplified results:

\[
p_{g \rightarrow e} = |\alpha|^2 \lambda^2 e^{-\frac{|k-k_0|^2}{2\sigma^2}} \sigma^2 \Omega^2 I_1 \left( \frac{\Omega |k_0|}{2\sigma^2} \right)^2, \quad (B16)
\]
and

\[
p_{\bar{g} \rightarrow e} = |\alpha|^2 \lambda^2 e^{-\frac{|k-k_0|^2}{2\sigma^2}} \left( I_1 \left( \frac{\Omega |k_0|}{2\sigma^2} \right)^2 + I_0 \left( \frac{|\Omega |k_0|}{2\sigma^2} \right)^2 \right)^2, \quad (B17)
\]
respectively. Notice that in this case the coupling constant has dimensions of inverse energy and is given by \( \lambda = e/m \), as discussed in Subsection III A

### Appendix C: The Spinor Field Detecting a Particle

In this appendix we compute the transition probabilities associated with the fermionic particle detector presented in Section III A spin 1/2 fermionic field in curved spacetimes can be expanded in terms of a basis of solutions to Dirac’s equation according to Eq. (46). We consider the interaction of such field with a two-level system that undergoes a trajectory \( z(\tau) \) with free Hamiltonian given by Eq. (48). The interaction between the detector and the field is prescribed in terms of the interaction Hamiltonian weight (48), where we remark that now the spacetime smearing function is a spinor field.

We consider the initial pure state for the field \( |\varphi\rangle \) given by Eq. (49). The probability amplitude for the detector to transition from the ground to excited state while the filed transitions from \( |\varphi\rangle \) to an arbitrary state \( |\psi\rangle \) at first order in \( \lambda \) can then be obtained by

\[
\langle e, \text{out} | \hat{U}_I | g, \psi \rangle = \lambda \int \text{d}V e^{i\Omega \tau} \langle \text{out} | \hat{U}(x) \hat{\psi}(x) \lambda(\varphi) | \varphi \rangle + \mathcal{O}(\lambda^2).
\]

(C1)

The transition probability regardless of the final state of the field will then be given by

\[
p_{g \rightarrow e} = \lambda^2 \int \text{d}V dV' e^{i\Omega (\varphi' - \tau)} \langle \varphi | \hat{A}(x) \hat{\psi}(x) \hat{\psi}(x') \lambda(\varphi') | \varphi' \rangle.
\]

(C2)

Let us then calculate the contracted two-point function above,

\[
\langle \varphi | \hat{A}(x) \hat{\psi}(x) \hat{\psi}(x') \lambda(\varphi') | \varphi \rangle
\]

\[
= \sum_{s, s', r, r'=1} \int d^3k d^3k' d^3p d^3p' \times \langle 0 | \hat{A}(x) \hat{f}_{s,r}(k') + \hat{b}_{k',r}^\dagger \hat{g}_{r'}(k') \rangle \left( u_{p,s}(x) \hat{a}_{p,s} + v_{p,s}(x) \hat{b}_{p,s}^\dagger \right) \times \left( u_{p',s'}(x') \hat{a}_{p',s'}^\dagger + \hat{b}_{p',s'} \hat{g}_{r'}(k') \right) \langle f_{s'}(k) \hat{a}_{k,r} + g_{r'}(k) \hat{b}_{k,r}^\dagger \rangle \langle \varphi' | \lambda(\varphi') \rangle | 0 \rangle
\]

\[
= \sum_{s, s', r, r'=1} \int d^3k d^3k' d^3p d^3p' \quad (C3)
\]
\[ x \mathcal{A}(x) f(x) \left( g_{\tau r}(k') \bar{v}_{\tau r}(x') g_{\tau r}(k) \langle 0 | \hat{a}_{\tau r} \hat{a}_{\tau r}^\dagger \hat{b}_{k,r} \hat{b}_{k,r}^\dagger | 0 \rangle + g_{\tau r}(k') \bar{v}_{\tau r}(x') g_{\tau r}(k) \langle 0 | \hat{b}_{\tau r} \hat{a}_{\tau r} \hat{b}_{\tau r}^\dagger \hat{b}_{k,r}^\dagger | 0 \rangle + f_{\tau r}^*(k') \bar{v}_{\tau r}(x') f_{\tau r}(k) \langle 0 | \hat{a}_{\tau r} \hat{a}_{\tau r}^\dagger \hat{b}_{k,r} \hat{b}_{k,r}^\dagger | 0 \rangle \right) f(x') \Lambda(x') \]

It is then enough to compute the following matrix elements:

\[ \langle 0 | \hat{a}_{\tau r} \hat{a}_{\tau r}^\dagger \hat{b}_{k,r} \hat{b}_{k,r}^\dagger | 0 \rangle = \delta_{\tau s} \delta_{\tau r} \delta(p - p') \delta(k - k') - \delta_{\tau r} \delta_{\tau s} \delta(p - k) \delta(k - p') \]

\[ \langle 0 | \hat{b}_{\tau r} \hat{a}_{\tau r} \hat{b}_{\tau r}^\dagger \hat{b}_{k,r}^\dagger | 0 \rangle = \delta_{\tau r} \delta_{\tau s} \delta(p' - k) \delta(p - k') \]

We can now calculate the contraction of the detector smearing functions with the two-point function:

\[ \langle \varphi | \mathcal{A}(x) f(x) \hat{\psi}(x') \hat{\psi}(x') f(x') \Lambda(x') | \varphi \rangle \]

\[ = \sum_{s,s',r,r'=1} \int d^3k d^3k' d^3p d^3p' \]

\[ \times \mathcal{A}(x) f(x) \left( g_{\tau r}(k') \bar{v}_{\tau r}(x') g_{\tau r}(k) \delta_{\tau s} \delta_{\tau r} \delta(p - k) \delta(p - k') + g_{\tau r}(k') \bar{v}_{\tau r}(x') g_{\tau r}(k) \delta_{\tau r} \delta_{\tau s} \delta(p - k) \delta(k - p') + f_{\tau r}^*(k') \bar{v}_{\tau r}(x') f_{\tau r}(k) \delta_{\tau r} \delta_{\tau s} \delta(p' - k) \delta(p - k') - f_{\tau r}^*(k') \bar{v}_{\tau r}(x') f_{\tau r}(k) \delta_{\tau s} \delta_{\tau r} \delta(p - k' - p) \right) f(x') \Lambda(x') \]

\[ = \mathcal{A}(x) f(x) \left( \sum_{r=1}^2 (\|g_r\|^2 + \|f_r\|^2) W_0(x, x') + G(x') \tilde{G}(x') - F(x') \tilde{F}(x') \right) f(x') \Lambda(x') \]

\[ = \mathcal{A}(x) f(x) \left( W_0(x, x') + G(x') \tilde{G}(x') - F(x') \tilde{F}(x') \right) f(x') \Lambda(x') \]

where we have used the spinors \( F(x) \) and \( G(x) \) and the matrix Wightman function of the vacuum that were defined in Eq. (52). The final excitation probability of the detector will then be given at leading order by

\[ p_{g \rightarrow e} = \lambda^2 \int dV dV' e^{-i\Omega(\tau - \tau')} \mathcal{A}(x) f(x) \left( W_0(x, x') + G(x') \tilde{G}(x') - F(x') \tilde{F}(x') \right) f(x') \Lambda(x') \]

The case of pointlike detectors with a switching function \( \chi(\tau) \) can be obtained by considering the following four-current density

\[ j^\mu(x) = \frac{\delta^{(3)}(x - z(\tau))}{u^\mu(\tau) \sqrt{-g}} u^\mu(\tau), \]

where \( u(\tau) \) is the four-velocity of the trajectory. Notice that the Dirac delta in the current above washes out all position dependence in the smearing spinor field \( \mathcal{A}(x) \), so that it only depends on the proper time of the trajectory. We can then write it as \( \mathcal{A}(x) = \chi(\tau). \) With these, the (leading order) excitation probability for a pointlike fermionic detector can then be written as

\[ p_{g \rightarrow e} = \lambda^2 \int d\tau d\tau' e^{i\Omega(\tau - \tau')} \tilde{\chi}(\tau) \tilde{\psi}(\tau) \left( W_0(\tau, \tau') + G(\tau') \tilde{G}(\tau') - F(\tau') \tilde{F}(\tau') \right) \tilde{\psi}(\tau) \chi(\tau'). \]
We now compute the deexcitation probability of the detector. In this case, we obtain the following probability amplitude for the field to go from the state $|\varphi\rangle$ to an arbitrary final state:

$$
\langle g, \text{out} | \hat{U}_{\text{f}} | e, \psi \rangle \approx \lambda \int dV e^{-i\Omega r} \langle \text{out} | \bar{\Lambda}(x) f(x) \tilde{\psi}(x) | \varphi \rangle .
$$

(C9)

The deexcitation probability will then be given by the sum over all possible final states of the field,

$$
p_{g\rightarrow e} = \lambda^2 \int dV dV' e^{-i\Omega (r-r')} \langle \varphi | \tilde{\psi}(x') \Lambda(x') \bar{\Lambda}(x) f(x) \tilde{\psi}(x) | \varphi \rangle .
$$

(C10)

Let us then calculate the sandwiched two-point function that shows up above,

$$
\langle \varphi | \tilde{\psi}(x') \Lambda(x') \bar{\Lambda}(x) f(x) \tilde{\psi}(x) | \varphi \rangle = \sum_{s,s',r,r'} \int d^3k d^3k' d^3p d^3p' \times \left( \langle 0 | \hat{a}_{k',r'} f_{r'}(k') + \hat{b}_{k',r'} g_{r'}(k') \rangle \left( \hat{a}_{p',s'}(x') \hat{a}_{p',s'}^\dagger + \hat{b}_{p',s'}(x') \hat{b}_{p',s'}^\dagger \right) f(x') \Lambda(x') \times \bar{\Lambda}(x) f(x) \left( u_{p,s}(x) \hat{a}_{p,s} + v_{p,s}(x) \hat{b}_{p,s} \right) (f_{r}(k) \hat{a}_{k,r} + g_{r}(k) \hat{b}_{k,r}) |0\rangle \right)
$$

(C11)

It is then enough to calculate the following matrix elements:

$$
\langle 0 | \hat{a}_{k',r'} \hat{a}_{p',s'} \hat{a}_{p,s} \hat{b}_{k,r} |0\rangle = \delta_{s,s'} \delta_{r,r'} \delta(k - k') - \delta_{s,s'} \delta_{r',r} \delta(p' - p) \delta(k' - k)
$$

$$
\langle 0 | \hat{b}_{k',r'} \hat{b}_{p',s'} \hat{b}_{p,s} \hat{a}_{k,r} |0\rangle = \delta_{s,s'} \delta_{r,r'} \delta(p - p') \delta(k - k')
$$

$$
\langle 0 | \hat{a}_{k',r'} \hat{a}_{p',s'} \hat{b}_{p,s} \hat{a}_{k,r} |0\rangle = \delta_{s,s'} \delta_{r,r'} \delta(p - k) \delta(k' - p')
$$

We now compute the contraction of the two-point function with the detector's spinor smearing function:

$$
\langle \varphi | \tilde{\psi}(x') \Lambda(x') \bar{\Lambda}(x) f(x) \tilde{\psi}(x) | \varphi \rangle
$$

(C13)
\[
\times \left( f^*_s(k') f_s(k) u_{k,s}(x) \bar{\nu}_{k',s'}(x') + f^*_s(k') f_s(k) \left( \int d^3p \, v_{p,s}(x) \bar{v}_{p,s}(x') \right) \delta(k - k')
\]
\[
+ g^*_s(k') g_s(k) \left( \int d^3p v_{p,s}(x) \bar{v}_{p,s}(x') \right) \delta(k - k') - g^*_s(k') g_s(k) v_{k',s'}(x) \bar{v}_{k,s}(x') \right) f(x') \Lambda(x')
\]
\[
= \bar{\Lambda}(x) f(x) \left( F(x) \bar{F}(x') - G(x') \bar{G}(x) + \sum_{s=1}^{2} (\|f_s\|^2 + \|g_s\|^2) \bar{W}_0(x,x') \right) f(x') \Lambda(x').
\]

where we have defined the spinors \( F(x) \) and \( G(x) \) as in Eq. (52) and the Wightman matrix \( \bar{W}_0(x,x') \) as in (53). With these, the deexcitation probability of the detector (at leading order) can be written as

\[
p_{e\to g} = \lambda^2 \int dVdV' e^{-i\Omega(x-x')} \bar{\Lambda}(x) f(x) \left( F(x) \bar{F}(x') - G(x') \bar{G}(x) + \bar{W}_0(x,x') \right) f(x') \Lambda(x'). \tag{C14}
\]

The reduction to the pointlike case is analogous to Eq. (C8).

1. A Particular case: vacuum excitation of an inertial detector in flat spacetime

We now consider a inertial pointlike detector in Minkowski spacetime. We will consider a fermionic field quantized in some inertial quantization frame \((t, x)\). In the usual plane wave basis the mode solutions are given by

\[
u_{p,1}(x) = \frac{1}{\lambda^2} \sqrt{\frac{\omega_p + m}{2\omega_p}} \begin{pmatrix} 1 \\ 0 \\ \frac{p_z}{\sqrt{p_z^2 + m^2}} \\ \frac{p_z}{p_z + i p_y} \sqrt{\frac{p_z^2 + m^2}{p_z^2 + p_y^2}} \end{pmatrix} e^{ip_\gamma x}, \quad \nu_{p,2}(x) = \frac{1}{\lambda^2} \sqrt{\frac{\omega_p + m}{2\omega_p}} \begin{pmatrix} 1 \\ 0 \\ \frac{p_z}{\sqrt{p_z^2 + m^2}} \\ \frac{p_z}{p_z + i p_y} \sqrt{\frac{p_z^2 + m^2}{p_z^2 + p_y^2}} \end{pmatrix} e^{-ip_\gamma x}. \tag{C15}
\]

To provide the description of the fermionic particle detector, we must specify the current \( j^\mu(x) \) and the spinor \( \Lambda(x) \). We particularize to to the choices in Eq. (60). Finally we fix the the field state to be \( |\phi\rangle \) given in Eq. (49) with the Gaussian choices of momentum distribution functions of Eq. (59).

Same as before, in the long time adiabatic limit only the co-rotating term contributes. It is then enough to compute the \( G(x) \) spinor. We split it in terms of its spin components, \( G_1(x) \) and \( G_2(x) \). By choosing the Dirac basis associated with the frame such that the \( z \) component is aligned with the \( p_0 \) vector, we have

\[
G_1(t) = \frac{2\pi}{(2\pi)^{3/2}} \int \frac{d|p|d\theta |p|^2 \sin \theta}{\sqrt{\frac{\omega_p + m}{2\omega_p}}} \sqrt{\frac{\omega_p + m}{2\omega_p}} \begin{pmatrix} |p| \cos \theta \\ \omega_p + m \\ 0 \\ 0 \end{pmatrix} e^{i\Omega_p t} \beta_1 \frac{\beta_1}{(\pi \sigma^2)^{3/4}} e^{-\frac{|p|^2 + |p_0|^2}{2\sigma^2}} e^{-\frac{|p|^2 + |p_0|^2}{\sigma^2}} \tag{C17}
\]

and

\[
G_2(t) = \frac{2\pi}{(2\pi)^{3/2}} \int \frac{d|p|d\theta |p|^2 \sin \theta}{\sqrt{\frac{\omega_p + m}{2\omega_p}}} \sqrt{\frac{\omega_p + m}{2\omega_p}} \begin{pmatrix} |p| \cos \theta \\ \omega_p + m \\ 0 \\ 0 \end{pmatrix} e^{i\Omega_p t} \beta_2 \frac{\beta_2}{(\pi \sigma^2)^{3/4}} e^{-\frac{|p|^2 + |p_0|^2}{2\sigma^2}} e^{-\frac{|p|^2 + |p_0|^2}{\sigma^2}} \tag{C18}
\]
where we have defined \( \Sigma \) and obtained the following expression for the excitation probability of the fermionic detector, the interaction of such field with a two-level system that undergoes a trajectory and antiparticles according to Eq. (63), where we assume the creation and annihilation operators to satisfy canonical interaction Hamiltonian weight of Eq. (66). Notice that now the spacetime smearing function is a complex scalar and is assumed to be given by Eq. (8). The interaction between the detector and field is prescribed in terms of the

\[
\int d\tau \Lambda(t) \Lambda(t') G_s(t') = \sum_{n=1}^{2} \int d\tau \tau \Lambda(t) \Lambda(t') \Lambda(t') G_s(t')
\]

(C19)

All that is left is to compute

\[
\int d\tau e^{-i\Omega t} \Lambda(t) G_s(t) = \frac{1}{2\pi} \int \frac{d\Omega}{2\pi} \left( \frac{1}{\Omega^2 - \beta^2} \right) \frac{1}{\Omega + m} \left( \frac{2\pi}{\Omega} \right) \delta \left( \Omega - \Omega^2 - m^2 \right)
\]

(C20)

where we have defined \( \Sigma_m = \sqrt{\Omega^2 - m^2} \) and used the following representation of the Dirac delta function

\[
\int d\tau e^{i(\Omega \pm \omega_p)\tau} = 2\pi \delta (\Omega \pm \omega_p) = 2\pi \frac{p^2 + m^2}{|p|} \delta \left( |p| - \sqrt{\Omega^2 - m^2} \right) = \frac{2\pi \Omega}{\Omega^2 - m^2} \delta \left( |p| - \sqrt{\Omega^2 - m^2} \right).
\]

An analogous expression holds for the term involving the time integral of the contraction of \( G_s(t) \) and \( \Lambda \). We then obtain the following expression for the excitation probability of the fermionic detector,

\[
p_{g\rightarrow e} = \frac{4\lambda^2 \sigma \Omega (\Omega + m)}{\sqrt{|p_0|^2}} e^{-\frac{|p_0|^2 + \Sigma_m^2}{\sigma^2}} \left| \beta_1 B_1^* \sinh \left( \frac{|p_0|\Sigma_m}{\sigma^2} \right) \right| + \Sigma_m \left( \frac{\sigma^2}{|p_0| \Sigma_m} \right) \sinh \left( \frac{|p_0|\Sigma_m}{\sigma^2} \right)
\]

(C23)

Finally, we factor out the \( \sinh \) term and obtain the expression

\[
p_{g\rightarrow e} = \frac{4\lambda^2 \sigma \Omega (\Omega + m)}{\sqrt{|p_0|^2}} e^{-\frac{|p_0|^2 + \Sigma_m^2}{\sigma^2}} \left| \beta_1 B_1^* + \beta_2 B_2^* + (\beta_1 A_1^* - \beta_2 A_2^*) \right| \Sigma_m \left( \frac{\sigma^2}{|p_0| \Sigma_m} \right) \cos \left( \frac{|p_0|\Sigma_m}{\sigma^2} \right)
\]

Appendix D: The Complex Scalar Field Detecting a Particle

In this section we compute the excitation probability for the complex scalar field particle detector model proposed in Section IV. A complex scalar field can be expanded in terms of creation and annihilation operators of particles and antiparticles according to Eq. (63), where we assume the creation and annihilation operators to satisfy canonical commutation relations (or anti-commutation in the case of the Grassmann scalar), given by Eq. (65). We consider the interaction of such field with a two-level system that undergoes a trajectory \( z(t) \) and whose free Hamiltonian is assumed to be given by Eq. (56). The interaction between the detector and field is prescribed in terms of the interaction Hamiltonian weight of Eq. (66). Notice that now the spacetime smearing function is a complex scalar function that transforms properly according to \( U(1) \) transformations.

Consider an initial pure state for the field \( |\varphi\rangle \) given by Eq. (67). The probability amplitude for the detector to transition from the ground to excited state can then be computed by

\[
\langle e, \text{out} | \hat{U}_1 | g, \psi \rangle \approx \lambda \int dV A(x) e^{i\Delta x} \langle \text{out} | \hat{\psi}^\dagger(x) | \varphi \rangle.
\]

(D1)
The probability itself will then be given by

$$p_{g \rightarrow e} = \lambda^{2} \int dV dV' \Lambda^*(x') \Lambda(x) e^{i \Omega(\tau - \tau')} \langle \varphi | \hat{\psi}(x') \hat{\psi}^\dagger(x) | \varphi \rangle.$$  \hspace{1cm} (D2)

To evaluate it we need to calculate the two-point function of the field in the state $| \varphi \rangle$. In order to do so, we advance the following preliminary results:

$$\langle 0 | \hat{a}_{k'} \hat{a}_{p'} \hat{a}^\dagger_{k} \hat{a}^\dagger_{p} | 0 \rangle = \langle 0 | \hat{a}_{k'} \hat{a}_{p'} | p, k \rangle = \delta(p - p') \delta(k - k') \mp \delta(k - p') \delta(k' - p),$$

$$\langle 0 | \hat{b}_{k'} \hat{b}_{p'} \hat{b}^\dagger_{k} \hat{b}^\dagger_{p} | 0 \rangle = \langle 0 | \hat{b}_{k'} \hat{b}_{p'} | p - k \rangle = \delta(p' - k') \delta(p - k),$$

$$\langle 0 | \hat{b}_{k'} \hat{a}_{p'} \hat{a}^\dagger_{k} \hat{b}^\dagger_{p} | 0 \rangle = \delta(p' - p) \delta(k' - k).$$  \hspace{1cm} (D3)

With these,

$$\langle \varphi | \hat{\psi}(x') \hat{\psi}^\dagger(x) | \varphi \rangle$$

$$= \int d^{n} k d^{n} k' d^{n} p d^{n} p' \times \langle 0 | (f^*(k') \hat{a}_{k'} + g(k') \hat{b}_{k'}) \left( u_{p'}(x') \hat{a}_{p'} + u_{p'}^*(x') \hat{b}^\dagger_{p'} \right) \left( f_{k} \hat{a}^\dagger_{k} + g^*(k) \hat{b}^\dagger_{k} \right) | 0 \rangle$$

$$= \int d^{n} k d^{n} k' d^{n} p d^{n} p' \left( g^*(k) u_{p'}(x') g^*(k') \delta(k - p) \delta(k' - p') + f(k) u^*_{p'}(x') f^*(k') \delta(p - p') \delta(k - k') \right.$$

$$\mp f(k) u^*_{p'}(x') f^*(k') \delta(k - p') \delta(k - p)$$

$$\left. + g^*(k) u^*_{p'}(x') g(k') \delta(k' - p) \delta(p - p') \right)$$

$$= \int d^{n} p \left( g^*(k) u_{k}(x) u^*_{p'}(x') g(p) + f(k) u^*_{p'}(x') f^*(k) \right.$$

$$\mp f(k) u^*_{p'}(x') f^*(k') + g^*(k) u^*_{p'}(x') g(k') \right)$$

$$= G^*(x') G(x) + \|g\|^2 W_0(x', x) + \|f\|^2 W_0(x', x) \mp F(x') F^*(x),$$

where we have used the definitions form the Equations \[71\] and the signs are given by the choices of commutation/anticommutation made in Eq. \[65\].

Therefore, using that $| \varphi \rangle$ is a normalized state, we obtain $\|f\|^2 + \|g\|^2 = 1$ and the transition probability can be cast as

$$p_{g \rightarrow e} = \lambda^{2} \int dV dV' \Lambda^*(x') \Lambda(x) e^{i \Omega(\tau - \tau')} \left( G^*(x') G(x) + W_0(x', x) \mp F(x') F^*(x) \right).$$  \hspace{1cm} (D5)

The case of a pointlike detector with a complex switching function $\chi(\tau)$ can then be obtained by using the following complex spacetime smearing function

$$\Lambda(x) = \frac{\delta^{(n)}(x - z(\tau))}{u^0(\tau) \sqrt{-g}},$$  \hspace{1cm} (D6)
where \( u(\tau) \) denotes the four-velocity of the detector’s trajectory and the above expression can be used in any coordinate system \((t, x)\). The excitation probability for a point-like detector then reads

\[
p_{g\rightarrow e} = \lambda \int d\tau d\tau' |(\tau')\chi(\tau)e^{i\Omega(\tau-\tau')} (G^*(\tau')G(\tau) + W(\tau', \tau) + U(\tau)' F(\tau) F^*(\tau))|.
\]

(Appendix E: Proof that the probabilities for fermionic fields are always positive)

In this Appendix we show that the transition probability for particle detectors linearly coupled to fields that satisfy Fermi-Dirac statistics is always positive. Although there are first principle arguments for the probabilities in Eqs. [51] and [70] to be positive numbers, when looking at the expressions themselves, it might not be entirely clear whether the result is positive for any field state. In this appendix we will focus in the case of complex scalar detectors, but the arguments naturally carry to the fermionic case.

Equation [70] shows the excitation probability of the linear complex detector interacting with a one-particle state. The contribution due to the antiparticle content is easily seen to be positive, while the particle content contributes negatively. For our argument, it is then enough to consider the case where the field state contains only particle content, that is, \( g(k) = 0 \). The probability then reads

\[
p_{g\rightarrow e} = \lambda^2 \int d\tau d\tau' |(\tau')\chi(\tau)e^{i\Omega(\tau-\tau')} (W(\tau', x) - F^*(\tau') F(\tau))|,
\]

where \( F(x) \) is defined in Eq. [71]. Using the expression for \( F \) and for the Wightman function, it is possible to rewrite the excitation probability in terms of an integral over momentum space \( k \). In order to simplify notation, we define

\[
U(k) = \int d\tau \Lambda^*(\tau)e^{-i\Omega\tau} u_k(x).
\]

With this, we can write the excitation probability as

\[
p_{g\rightarrow e} = \int d^n k U^*(k) U(k) - \int d^n k f(k) U(k) \int d^n k' f^*(k') U^*(k') = U \cdot U - (U \cdot f^*) (f^* \cdot U),
\]

where \( \cdot \) denotes the \( L^2 \) inner product in momentum space. Then the Cauchy-Schwarz inequality can be used to show that the probability above is indeed always positive. We have

\[
|U \cdot f^*|^2 \leq (U \cdot U)(f^* \cdot f^*) = (U \cdot U),
\]

where we have used the fact that \( f \) is normalized with respect to this inner product and therefore so is \( f^* \). It is then easy to see that the particle content contributes less than the vacuum contribution to the excitation probability and decreases the likelihood for the excitation of the detector to occur.
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