Interference effects and modified Born rule in the presence of torsion
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The propagation of non-relativistic excitations in material media with topological defects can be modeled in terms of an external torsion field modifying the Schrödinger equation. We calculate the magnitude of corrections caused by this effect for an experimental setup at atomic scales using interference patterns. Finally, we demonstrate how this geometric, but effective, approach can indeed accommodate a probabilistic interpretation of the wave function although the perturbative theory is non-unitary.

I. INTRODUCTION

Generalizations of the space-time structure concerning the relationship between the metric and the affine connection have been pursued since after the proposal of general relativity [1]. In the last decades, the extra degrees of freedom of the connection, beyond the Levi-Civita one, have been used to produce cosmic inflation [2], explain dark matter [3] or model CPT violation [4, 5]. The skew-symmetric part of the connection, called torsion tensor, may play an important role in the description of space-time [6], being a useful tool for alternative theories of gravity [7–9], super-symmetry or quantum gravity [10]. There are many different models dealing with this field found in the literature along one of the following approaches (see Ref. [11] and references therein): (i) algebraic torsion, (ii) dynamical torsion or (iii) field dependent torsion. On the other hand, experimental tests of gravity have set very narrowed bounds on the possibility of a fundamental torsion field in the space-time. It means that if this field is necessary for describing the gravitational phenomenon, then the precision of the measurements must be considerably enhanced in order to detect its tiny contribution. That is the conclusion from experiments and simulations like LAGEOS, Gravity Probe B and BepiColombo [12–15].

At the quantum level, the influence of torsion can be mathematically accommodated assuming the principle of general covariance. From the physical viewpoint, spinning or spinless relativistic particles follow well-behaved equations of motion in the presence of torsion, while non-relativistic spinless particles cannot couple to this field in order that the theory be unitary and hermitian (for details, see full discussion provided by Ref. [16]). It is also known that in most theories with torsion, the coupling with non-relativistic spinless particles does not occur because it is produced by fermionic matter, thus being completely skew-symmetric. However, it has been proposed recently different sources for the torsion field avoiding the previous argument, as one can see in Ref. [8].

In between, at mesoscopic scales, one can find geometric models taken torsion into account to describe effectively topological defects [17–19] and transport properties [20] within material media. This is the line we shall follow here, considering a non-relativistic particle satisfying a modified Schrödinger equation in presence of an external torsion field. We shall see that such effective approach may shed some light to the role played by torsion in making the theory non-unitary, but with a quasi-probabilistic interpretation in virtue of a measurable distinction from the torsion-free case.

II. SCHRODINGER EQUATION IN GENERAL METRIC-AFFINE SPACETIMES

Following Ref. [16], the study of quantum mechanics in an arbitrary metric-affine space-time can be done introducing a non-holonomic map, so that

$$dx^a = e^a_\mu(x^\lambda)dx^\mu,$$ (1)

where $e^a_\mu = \partial x^a / \partial x^\mu$. Here Greek and lower Latin indexes run from 0 to 3, while capital Latin indexes vary from 1 to 3; exception for $i, j, k$ which also run from 1 to 3. The functions $x^\alpha(x^\lambda)$ should be multivalued in order to take into account curvature and torsion. Thus, the functions $e^a_\mu(x^\lambda)$ will be a multivalued tetrad basis, yielding the induced metric in the space spanned by $x^\lambda$:

$$g_{\mu\nu} = e^a_\mu e^b_\nu \eta_{ab}.$$ (2)

Defining the reciprocal basis as $e^\mu_a \equiv \eta_{ab} g^{\mu\nu} e^b_\nu$, both bases satisfy the identities $e^\lambda_a e^\mu_b = \delta^\lambda_b$ and $e^\lambda_a e^\nu_\mu = \delta^\nu_\mu$. Thence, from $e^a_\mu(x^\lambda)$ we construct the connection

$$\Gamma^\mu_{\lambda\kappa} = e^a_\mu \partial_\lambda e^\lambda_a,$$ (3)

from which we define the covariant derivative operator as $D_\mu \nu^a = \partial_\mu \nu^a + \Gamma^\nu_{\mu\lambda} \nu^\lambda$, where $\nu^a$ is an arbitrary vector.
field. This covariant derivative is such that the metricity condition holds, i.e., $D_{\mu}g_{\alpha\beta} = 0$. The torsion tensor $T^\lambda_{\mu\nu}$ in this case is

$$T^\lambda_{\mu\nu} = \frac{1}{2} (\Gamma^\lambda_{\mu\nu} - \Gamma^\lambda_{\nu\mu}) = \frac{1}{2} e_a^\lambda (\partial_\mu e_\nu^a - \partial_\nu e_\mu^a),$$

where the curvature tensor is defined from the connection as

$$R^\lambda_{\mu\nu\kappa} = e_a^\lambda (\partial_\mu \partial_\nu e_\kappa^a - \partial_\nu \partial_\mu e_\kappa^a) e_\kappa^a. \quad (5)$$

Note that for non-vanishing torsion and curvature, the Schwarz integrability condition should not be satisfied by the coordinates $x^\alpha(x^\lambda)$ and by the basis $e_\mu^a(x^\lambda)$, respectively. This is crucial to distinguish our multivalued basis from the usual vierbein, defined in theories of spinning particles in curved spacetimes, since the latter is single-valued and it does not carry torsional or curvature degrees of freedom [16].

In order to describe the quantum dynamics of a system in this general metric-affine space, we use the minimal coupling prescription to substitute the partial derivative for the covariant derivative. In this way, the Schrödinger equation becomes

$$i\hbar \frac{\partial}{\partial t} \Psi(x^\lambda) = -\frac{\hbar^2}{2m} D_\mu D^\mu \Psi(x^\lambda) + V(x^\lambda) \Psi(x^\lambda)$$

$$= \frac{\hbar^2}{2m} \left( \partial^\mu \partial_\mu + \Gamma^\mu_{\lambda \nu} \partial_\nu \right) \Psi(x^\lambda) + V(x^\lambda) \Psi(x^\lambda), \quad (6)$$

where being time an absolute quantity, only spatial torsion and curvature are presented. The connection term may be split into a symmetric part, which together with the Laplace operator will define the unitary Laplace-Beltrami operator, while the skew-symmetric term (torsion) is responsible for the non-unitary contribution to the Schrödinger equation. It should be noticed that this expression is the same one found by Kleinert through a path integral approach [16].

Finally, for the introduction of a time component in the torsion, we must transform the derivatives by the non-holomomical mapping $\partial_\alpha \rightarrow e_\alpha^a \partial_a$, which leads to

$$i\hbar e_0^\alpha \partial_\alpha \Psi = -\frac{\hbar^2}{2m} \left( g^{\mu\nu} \partial_\mu \partial_\nu + \Gamma^\mu_{\lambda \nu} \partial^\nu \right) \Psi$$

$$+ \frac{\hbar^2}{2m} \left[ e_0^\mu e_0^\nu \partial_\mu \partial_\nu + e_0^\mu (\partial_\mu e_0^\nu) \partial^\nu \right] \Psi + V \Psi. \quad (7)$$

Note that we recover the absolute time expression when $e_0^0 = 1$ and $e_0^a = e_0^\lambda = 0$. It is straightforward to see that Eq. (7) has an immediate correspondence to the Schrödinger equation written in a Newton-Cartan background [20].

### III. TORSION GENERATED BY A SCREW DISLOCATION

In this vein, we shall investigate the motion of non-relativistic particles in the particular case of a two-dimensional crystalline lattice with a screw dislocation in a given spatial direction. Usually, such defect in a medium is attributed to the removal of layers of atoms from the lattice. A partial description of this system, where the defect is modeled by torsion can be found in [16]. However, we shall demonstrate that it is possible to go further and bypass the complaints encountered in the full theory, as non-hermiticity and non-unitarity, assuming an effective description of the system where the conservation of probability can be neglected at a first glance.

In our case, we can map the distorted coordinates $x'^i = (x'^1, x'^2)$ of the atoms in the lattice to the undistorted ones $x^i = (x^1, x^2)$ through the parametrization

$$dx'^1 = dx^1, \quad dx'^2 = dx^2 + \varepsilon \partial_i \phi(x^i) dx^i, \quad (8)$$

with $\varepsilon = nd \ll 1$, where $n$ is the number of planes removed from the crystalline lattice and $d$ being the distance between two of them, so that terms of order $\varepsilon^2$ are negligible. Latin indexes shall assume the values 1 and 2 from now on. The function $\phi(x^i)$ is the multivalued function

$$\phi(x') = \arctan \left( \frac{x^2}{x^1} \right). \quad (9)$$

Such function is made unique by cutting the plane in a line from the origin to infinity, and demanding the function to go from $\pi$ to $-\pi$ when passing through it. So, being $C$ a small closed path encircling the origin, and $S$ the surface enclosed by it, we have:

$$\int_S d^2x (\partial_1 \partial_2 - \partial_2 \partial_1) \phi(x') = \oint_C dx^i \partial_i \phi(x^i) = 2\pi. \quad (10)$$

Further, our multivalued basis is given by

$$e_1^i = \delta_1^i, \quad e_2^i = \delta_2^i + \varepsilon \partial_i \phi(x^i), \quad (11)$$

and the induced metric reads

$$g = \left( \begin{array}{cc} 1 & \varepsilon \partial_i \phi(x^i) \\ \varepsilon \partial_i \phi(x^i) & 1 + 2\varepsilon \partial_2 \phi(x^i) \end{array} \right). \quad (12)$$

From this, we find the inverse tetrad basis

$$e_1^i = \delta_1^i - \delta_2^i \varepsilon \partial_1 \phi(x^i), \quad e_2^i = \delta_2^i [1 - \varepsilon \partial_1 \phi(x^i)]. \quad (13)$$

Since the derivative of $\phi(x^i)$ is a single-valued function, the curvature tensor is zero. The connection coefficients read

$$\Gamma^i_{jk} = e_A^i \partial_j e_A^k = e_2^i \delta_{jk} - \delta_2^i \varepsilon \partial_j \partial_k \phi(x^i), \quad (14)$$

and finally, the torsion tensor becomes

$$T^1_{ij} = 0, \quad T^2_{ij} = \frac{\varepsilon}{2\pi} (\partial_i \partial_j - \partial_j \partial_i) \phi(\vec{x}) = \epsilon_{ij} \delta(\vec{x}). \quad (15)$$
IV. CARRYING OUT THE TORSION IN THE SCHRODINGER EQUATION

From the results of the previous section, we are able to implement torsion effects in the Schrödinger equation through modifications in the Laplace operator due to the non-Riemannian connection. Thus, Eq. (6) for a free particle moving in this crystalline surface becomes

$$\frac{i\hbar}{\partial t} \Psi = -\frac{\hbar^2}{2m} \left( \partial_x \phi \partial_y + \left( \partial_x \zeta - T^2 \partial_x \right) \right) \Psi,$$

with $\Lambda = \varepsilon \partial_x \phi \partial_y$. Substituting $\Psi(x^i, t) = e^{-\frac{i}{\hbar} \int L \, dx} \delta(x^i) \partial_t \psi_0$, in the equation above and neglecting terms quadratic in $\varepsilon$, we find that

$$i\frac{\partial}{\partial t} \psi = -\frac{\hbar}{2m} \left( \partial_x \partial_y \psi - T^2 \partial_x \partial_t \psi - \frac{1}{2} \nu \partial_x \partial_y \Lambda \right).$$

Straightforward calculations show that the potential-like term vanishes, that is, $\partial_x \partial_y \Lambda = 0$. Then, we have

$$\frac{\partial}{\partial t} \psi_1 + \nabla^2 \psi_1 = -\delta(x^i) \partial_t \psi_0.$$

Integrating this equation over a small region $S$ enclosing the origin, we have

$$\int_S d^2 x \psi_1 + \int_{\partial S} \partial_x \partial_t \psi_1 = -\partial_1 \psi_0 \big|_{x^1 = 0}.$$  

(20)

Notice that we can approximate $\sqrt{f(x^i)} \approx 1$, because $\psi_1$ already contributes with a first order term in $\varepsilon$. Moreover, any arbitrary path that encloses the origin can be decomposed into a region that does not contain the origin and, for simplicity, a squared one of small side $\eta \ll 1$ surrounding the origin, as depicted in Fig. (1).

For the region that does not contain the origin, the right-hand side of Eq. (19) is zero, and $\psi$ behaves as the free particle wave function. Nonetheless, for the small squared region in the limit $\eta \to 0$, the first integral on the left-hand side of Eq. (20) can be neglected, while the second term remains:

$$\lim_{\eta \to 0} \left[ \int_{-\eta/2}^{\eta/2} d^2 x \partial_1 \left( \psi_u - \psi_d \right) + \int_{-\eta/2}^{\eta/2} d^2 x \partial_1 \left( \psi_r - \psi_l \right) \right] = -\partial_1 \psi_0 \big|_{x^1 = 0},$$

(21)

where $\psi_u, \psi_d$ evaluate the wave function along the horizontal lines and $\psi_r, \psi_l$ are the branches of the wave function along the vertical lines (see Fig. 1). From this, the only possibility for $\psi_1$ to be continuous at the origin is whether $\partial_1 \psi_0 \big|_{x^1 = 0} = 0$. Otherwise, the first order correction of the wave function has a discontinuity at least in one of its branches.

In what follows, we shall apply this technique to further analyze the consequences of a non-zero torsion field in the Schrödinger equation. In particular, as the effects of torsion are manifest only in closed paths, we shall consider interference phenomena through the double-slit experiment for both the cases of plane waves and wave packets.

FIG. 1: Oriented squared region of side $\eta$ enclosing the origin in the $(x^1, x^2)$-plane.

A. Plane wave solution

In an interference experiment, such as the double-slit, it is supposed an infinite plate placed at $x^1 = 0$ with two slits equidistant from the origin, without loss of generality. The state $\psi_0(x^i) = A e^{ik x^i}$ is prepared somewhere before the plate, where $x^1 < 0$ and $x^2 = 0$, then it is divided into two branches, which we shall call right-going $\psi_R(x^i)$ and left-going $\psi_L(x^i)$ wave, as it passes through the slits. Setting this apparatus in the lattice, we can put over the plate the semi-line generated by the screw dislocation as starting from the origin. As long as the wave functions pass through this dislocation and present a discontinuity, it does not matter which branch it is since the defect only accounts for closed paths. Here, we will choose the right-going wave to stay the same, $\psi_R = \psi_0$, while the left-going one is modified due to the effective torsion, according to

$$\lim_{x^1 \to 0^+} \psi_L(x^i, t) - \lim_{x^1 \to 0^-} \psi_L(x^i, t) = \varepsilon A B_L.\quad \text{(22)}$$

Then, from Eq. (21), we find that $B_L = -i k_1^2 k_2 / k^2$, where $k^2 = k_1^2 + k_2^2$. So, after crossing the defect (region $x^1 > 0$), the left-going wave is

$$\psi_L(x^i) = A(1 + \varepsilon B_L) e^{ik x^i} = A e^{ik x^1 - \theta} + O(\varepsilon^2),$$

(23)
with $\theta = \arctan(\varepsilon k_1^2 k_2/k^2)$.

From the usual definition of the probability density

$$P(x^1, t) \sqrt{g(x^1)}d^2 x = |\Psi(x^1, t)|^2 \sqrt{g(x^1)}d^2 x = e^{-\Delta(x^1)}|\psi(x^1, t)|^2 \sqrt{g(x^1)}d^2 x \approx |\psi(x^1, t)|^2 d^2 x,$$  

(24)

with $e^{-\Delta \sqrt{g(x^1)}} \approx (1 - \Delta)(1 + \Delta) \approx 1$ at first order in $\varepsilon$, one would expect to measure on the screen

$$|\psi|^2 = |\psi_R(x_{1(1)}^1) + \psi_L(x_{1(2)}^1)|^2$$

$$= 4A^2\cos^2 \left[ k_1(x_{1(2)}^1 - x_{1(1)}^1) - \frac{\theta}{2} \right],$$  

(25)

where $x_{1(1)}^1$ and $x_{1(2)}^1$ denote the distances from the slits on the right and on the left, respectively. It is easy see that $|\psi|^2$ would be the same if we have chosen the other way round as the discontinuous branch. Note that this is similar to the well-known electromagnetic Aharonov-Bohm effect, as it introduces a phase shift, although the shift here is proportional to the wave number $k_j$. Such detail is a motivation to analyze the case of wave packets which are quite sensitive to wave numbers.

### B. Wave packet solution

Now, let us consider the effect of the torsion field on a wave packet. The wave function of a packet produced at $x_i^0$ satisfying the homogeneous part of Eq. (18) is given by

$$\psi_0(x^i, t) = \frac{a}{(2\pi)^{\frac{3}{2}}} \int_{-\infty}^{+\infty} e^{-\frac{y^2}{2}}(\Delta x^i)^2 e^{i[k_1(\Delta x^i) - \omega t]}d^2 k,$$  

(26)

where $a$ measures the width of the packet, $\Delta x^i \equiv A^i - A_0^i$, for $A^i = x^i, k^i$ and $\omega \equiv h k^2/2m$. The integration of Eq. (26) yields

$$\psi_0(x^i, t) = \frac{2a}{\sqrt{2\pi}} \frac{e^{-\xi}}{a^4 + 4h^2 t^2/m^2} e^{i(k_1 - \xi/2)t}$$

$$\times \exp \left[ -\frac{(\Delta x^i - \frac{a^2 k_1}{m^2})^2}{a^2 + 2ih t/m} \right],$$  

(27)

with $\xi = h t k_0^2/(2m) + \arctan(2h t/(a^2 m))$. Still regarding the double-slit experiment, the modification due to torsion on the left-going wave will be just the superposition of the modification on each plane wave component, as follows

$$\psi_1(x^i, t) = -i \frac{a}{(2\pi)^{\frac{3}{2}}} \int_{-\infty}^{+\infty} \frac{k^1 k_2}{k} e^{-\frac{\xi}{2} \Delta x^i} e^{i(k_1 x^i - \omega t)}d^2 k$$

$$= -i B_L(\bar{x}, t) \psi_0(\bar{x}, t),$$  

(28)

with (see Appendix A)

$$B_L(x^1, t) = \frac{\alpha}{\pi} \int d^2 k \frac{k^1 k_2}{k} e^{-\alpha(k^1 - \beta_1)^2}$$

$$= \frac{\beta_2}{\alpha^2 \beta_0^2} \left[ (\beta^2 - 4 \beta_1^2) e^{-\alpha \beta^2 + \alpha \beta^2 - 1} + 2\alpha^2 \beta_1^4 \right],$$  

(29)

where we defined the auxiliary quantities

$$\alpha = \frac{1}{4} \left( a^2 + \frac{2h t}{m} \right), \quad \beta_j = \frac{1}{2\alpha} \left( a^2(k_j) + i x_j \right),$$  

(30)

and $\beta^2 \equiv \beta_1^2 + \beta_2^2$. Therefore, if the right-going and left-going waves travel through the paths $x_{1(1)}^1$ and $x_{1(2)}^1$ previously defined, the squared amplitude of the wave packet on the detection plate will be

$$|\Psi|^2 \sqrt{g}d^2 x \approx \frac{1}{4}|\psi_R(x_{1(1)}^1) + \psi_L(x_{1(2)}^1)|^2$$

$$= \frac{1}{4}|\psi_0(x_{1(1)}^1)|^2 + |\psi_0(x_{1(2)}^1)|^2$$

$$- \epsilon \left[ \frac{1}{2} \int \psi_0^*(x_{1(1)}^1) \psi_0(x_{1(2)}^1) B_L(x_{1(2)}^1) \right].$$  

(31)

For the sake of illustration, we compare the interference fringe pattern provided by Eq. (31) with the one obtained from the same setup but without torsion. The difference between them is depicted, where we clearly see the break of symmetry due to torsion and a tiny deviation in the size of the first peaks. In Fig. (2), the free parameters were chosen as follows: the slits are separated by 10 nm, their apertures are 0.1 nm each (which coincide with the wave packet width $a$), and the screen of detection is at 20 nm from the plane $x^1 = 0$. Also, $(k_1)_{0} = 50$nm$^{-1}$, $(k_2)_{0} = 0$ and the instant time as $t = m x^1/(k_1)_{0} h$, such that the peak of the packet in the $x^1$-direction is depicted. Thus, the displacement of

![FIG. 2: Interference fringes pattern of a double-slit experiment in the presence of a torsion field](https://example.com/fig2.png)
the first peaks are of the order $\Delta I_{MAX} \sim 10^{-2}$ mm, corresponding to a detectable deviation at the atomic scale of few angstroms. This first order approach breaks down at the valleys, where higher orders of perturbation in $\varepsilon$ are required in order to guarantee the positive-definiteness of the ordinate axis. Nevertheless, the existence of a shift in the interference pattern is preserved at the length scale just mentioned.

Nonetheless, the double-slit is one among many experiments that can probe interference effects at such scale, for instance, the detection of the Aharonov-Bohm shift using carbon nanotubes [22] or phase measurements in quantum dots [23]. Moreover, as the defect contributes solely for closed paths, experiments done with one slit closed at a time, in addition to the two slits, to single out the interference contribution could be useful [24, 25].

It should also be noticed that the assumption of taking the lattice as a continuous surface is fulfilled as long as the Compton wavelength $\lambda_c = h/mc$ is much greater than the lattice spacing. This is not a problem, since the mass of the particle does not change the interference pattern, but only the time scale of the experiment.

V. ATTEMPT TO SAVE THE PROBABILISTIC INTERPRETATION

Apart from the non-unitarity, the major drawback of Schrödinger equation in the presence of torsion corresponds to the violation of Born’s rule, which states: the only real physical information is given by the modulus squared of the wave function amplitude, that is, the normalized and conserved probability density defined all over the space. This kind of trouble also appears in effective open quantum systems, where non-hermitian Hamiltonians are well suited to treat dissipative localized systems embedded in an environment [26], for which the description is performed by postulating a certain spacetime symmetry instead of hermiticity\(^1\). Notwithstanding, the delta-like torsion investigated here does not change the energy levels, as one can see by the solutions given above. Therefore, it is not possible to interpret our quantum system in terms of dissipative processes. We, thus, propose a solution to this issue by appropriately redefining the probability distribution in a way that it can also be applied to other systems whose corrections affect only sets of measure zero.

In order to effectively see the non-unitary nature of the problem, we must calculate the continuity equation determining the flow of probability of the system. Using the modified Schrödinger equation (18), we find that
\[
\frac{\partial}{\partial t} \int |\psi|^2 \sqrt{\Delta} \, d^3x \approx \int \frac{\partial}{\partial t} |\psi|^2 \, d^3x = - \int \left[ \hat{\partial}_k j^k + \frac{\varepsilon h}{m} \delta(x^i) \text{Im}(\psi^\ast \partial_1 \psi) \right] \, d^3x ,
\]
with the usual definition of a free particle current density $j_k = (h/m) \text{Im}(\psi^\ast \partial_k \psi)$. Thus,
\[
\int \left( \frac{\partial}{\partial t} |\psi|^2 + \hat{\partial}_k j^k \right) \, d^3x = - \frac{\varepsilon h}{m} \text{Im}(\psi^\ast_0 \partial_1 \psi_0) \big|_{x=0}.
\]
On the left-hand side, we have the continuity equation in terms as the integrand, but the right-hand side is not zero whenever there is torsion $\varepsilon \neq 0$.

Now, the wave functions discussed before can be written down as
\[
\psi(x^i, t) = \begin{cases} 
\psi_0(x^i, t) & \text{if } x^i < 0 , \\
\psi_0(x^i, t) \left[ 1 - \frac{x^i}{2} B_L(x^i, t) \right] & \text{if } x^i > 0 ,
\end{cases}
\]
for which the modulus squared is trivial when $x^i < 0$ and for $x^i > 0$, to first order in $\varepsilon$, we have
\[
|\psi(x^i, t)|^2 \approx |\psi_0|^2 (1 + \varepsilon \text{Im} B_L) .
\]
For a Gaussian wave packet produced in the negative $x^i$-axis away from the defect, and initially normalized, the source term of Eq. (33) reads
\[
\text{Im}(\psi^\ast_0 \partial_1 \psi_0) \big|_{x=0} = \frac{2\pi^2}{\pi(a^4 + 4\varepsilon^2 m^2 x_0^2)} \exp \left[ -2\pi^2 \left( \frac{x_0^2 + \varepsilon^2 m^2 x_0^2}{a^4 + 4\varepsilon^2 m^2} \right)^2 \right] .
\]
This is always positive for the wave function given by Eqs. (27)-(28), ensuring a draining of probability in the defect. However, if we reflect the problem with respect to the $x^2$-axis, so that $k_0 < 0$ and $x_0 > 0$, the system gains probability from the dislocation.

Indeed, Eq. (33) poses some difficulties for the usual probabilistic interpretation of the wave function. One can imagine a very localized system to be detected in a region comprising it, so that the probability should be one. If there is a defect in this region, the detector could never click or could have a probability to click greater than one without any change in its energy.

It is possible to circumvent this issue by modifying the Born rule accordingly. In fact, if we extend the integration region to be large enough, we can discard the term $\hat{\partial}_k j^k$. By doing this, we realize that we can preserve a probabilistic interpretation by redefining the probability density function as
\[
\mathcal{P}(x^i, t) = \mathcal{P}(x^i, t) + \frac{\varepsilon h}{m} \delta(x^i) \int_{t_0}^t \text{Im}(\psi^\ast \partial_1 \psi) dt ,
\]
where $t_0$ is the instant of time that normalizes the new probability distribution as $\int_{t_0} \mathcal{P} dt \, d^3x = 1$, for an arbitrarily

\(^1\) In a more fundamental description, such problems can be circumvented by other formulations of the quantum theory, where the probabilistic interpretation is secondary, such as the De Broglie-Bohm theory [27, 28].
large integration region $\Omega$. This guarantees that somewhere in space the particle described by the wave function must be detected.

Ultimately, the expectation value of a given function of the spatial coordinates can now be defined as $\langle V(x',t) \rangle = \int \sqrt{\gamma} PV(x',t) d^2x$. Notice that actual departures from the usual Born rule shall emerge when assuming integration regions that comprise the location of the defect. However, the probability of locating the particle perfectly at the origin is not well-defined. This is not a limitation of this approach, since, for practical reasons, one shall always consider an extended region for integration. The expectation value of quantities that depend on momenta can be calculated through the Fourier transform of the wave function and those quantities whose dependence involves both momentum and spatial coordinate, it shall be done by a combination thereof.

VI. FINAL REMARKS

The aforementioned statements are not exclusive to the model of torsion developed here, but it can be applied to any quantum system driven by the Schrödinger equation with topological defects modeled by a localized torsion field. As long as the wave packet admits a region where the torsion is negligible, the interaction between them can be described in the same lines as a scattering process and this has been confirmed for both plane waves and wave packets.

The probabilistic interpretation can be adapted to this (effective/perturbative) situation, since the deviation from the torsion-free case is very small and such smallness can be experimentally measured. Furthermore, the redefinition of the probability distribution used to calculate the expected value of observables guarantee the control of such discrepancy along time.
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Appendix A: Calculating the torsion contribution $B_L(\vec{x},t)$

To solve the integral in Eq.(29) we first go to spherical coordinates in k-space, so that

$$B_L(\vec{x},t) = \frac{\alpha}{\pi} e^{-\alpha^2} \int_0^\infty dr r^2 e^{-\alpha r^2}$$

Further, using that [29]

$$\int_0^{2\pi} d\theta \cos^2 \theta \sin \theta e^{i\alpha \cos \theta + \beta \sin \theta}$$

$$= \frac{\partial^2}{\partial a^2} \frac{\partial}{\partial b} \int_0^{2\pi} d\theta e^{i\alpha \cos \theta + \beta \sin \theta} = 2\pi \frac{\partial^2}{\partial a^2} \frac{\partial}{\partial b} 0 \left(\sqrt{a^2 + b^2}\right)$$

$$= 2\pi b I_2 \left(\sqrt{a^2 + b^2}\right) + 2\pi a^2 I_3 \left(\sqrt{a^2 + b^2}\right), \quad (A2)$$

where $I_\nu(z)$ is the modified Bessel function of the first kind. Thence, back in eq. (A1)

$$B_L(\vec{x},t) = 2\alpha \beta_2 e^{-\alpha^2} \left[ \frac{1}{2\alpha^2\beta^2} \int_0^\infty dr re^{-\alpha r^2} I_2 \left(2\alpha r \sqrt{\beta^2}\right) \right.$$

$$\left. + \frac{\beta_2^2}{\beta^4} \int_0^\infty dr r^2 e^{-\alpha r^2} I_3 \left(2\alpha r \sqrt{\beta^2}\right) \right]. \quad (A3)$$

Using the series expansion of $I_\nu(z)$:

$$I_\nu(z) = \sum_{n=0}^\infty \frac{(z/2)^{\nu + 2n}}{\Gamma(n + 1)\Gamma(n + \nu + 1)} \quad (A4)$$

we can simplify this integral as follows:

$$\int_0^\infty dr r e^{-\alpha r^2} I_2 \left(2\alpha r \sqrt{\beta^2}\right)$$

$$= \sum_{n=0}^\infty \frac{(\alpha \sqrt{\beta^2})^{2+2n}}{\Gamma(n + 1)\Gamma(n + 3)} \int_0^\infty dr r^{3+2n} e^{-\alpha r^2}$$

$$= \frac{1}{2\alpha} \sum_{n=0}^\infty \frac{\Gamma(n + 2)}{\Gamma(n + 1)\Gamma(n + 3)} (\alpha^2 \sqrt{\beta^2})^{2+2n}$$

$$= \frac{1}{2\alpha^2\beta^2} \left[ 1 + (\alpha \beta^2 - 1)e^{\alpha \beta^2} \right] \quad (A5)$$

Furthermore

$$\int_0^\infty dr r^2 e^{-\alpha r^2} I_3 \left(2\alpha r \sqrt{\beta^2}\right)$$

$$= \sum_{n=0}^\infty \frac{(\alpha \sqrt{\beta^2})^{3+2n}}{\Gamma(n + 1)\Gamma(n + 4)} \int_0^\infty dr r^{5+2n} e^{-\alpha r^2}$$

$$= \frac{1}{2\alpha^2} \sum_{n=0}^\infty \frac{\Gamma(n + 3)}{\Gamma(n + 1)\Gamma(n + 4)} (\alpha^2 \sqrt{\beta^2})^{3+2n}$$

$$= \frac{1}{2\alpha^3(\beta^2)^{3/2}} \left[ -2 + (2 - 2\alpha \beta^2 + \alpha^2 \beta^4)e^{\alpha \beta^2} \right]. \quad (A6)$$


