

The Berry phase from the entanglement of future and past light cones: detecting the timelike Unruh effect

James Q. Quach,^{1,*} Timothy C. Ralph,² and William J. Munro^{3,4}

¹*Institute for Photonics and Advanced Sensing and School of Physical Sciences,
The University of Adelaide, South Australia 5005, Australia*

²*Centre for Quantum Computation and Communication Technology,*

School of Mathematics and Physics, University of Queensland, Brisbane, Queensland 4072, Australia.

³*NTT Basic Research Laboratories & NTT Research Center for Theoretical Quantum Physics,
NTT Corporation, 3-1 Morinosato-Wakamiya, Atsugi-shi, Kanagawa 243-0198, Japan*

⁴*National Institute of Informatics, 2-1-2 Hitotsubashi, Chiyoda-ku, Tokyo 101-8430, Japan*

The Unruh effect can not only arise out of the entanglement between modes of left and right Rindler wedges, but also between modes of future and past light cones. We explore the geometric phase resulting from this timelike entanglement between the future and past, showing that it can be captured in a simple Λ -system. This provides an alternative paradigm to the Unruh-deWitt detector. The Unruh effect has not been experimentally verified because the accelerations needed to excite a response from Unruh-deWitt detectors are prohibitively large. We demonstrate that a stationary but time-dependent Λ -system detects the timelike Unruh effect with current technology.

The Unruh effect is the intriguing idea that an accelerating observer will view the quantum vacuum as a thermal state [1]. It arises as a consequence of the theory of relativity applied to quantum mechanics: quantum states are dependent on the spacetime path of the observer. The temperature measured by an accelerating observer however is exceedingly small, requiring a proper acceleration on the order of 10^{20} ms^{-2} for a temperature of 1 K [2]. Detection of the Unruh effect typically relies on the response of photon detectors. In its most basic form, this is represented by the Unruh-DeWitt detector, which is simply a two-level point monopole [3]. The Unruh-DeWitt detector has served as the foundational probe detector of relativistic quantum [4–15] and gravitational fields [16–21]. As such a detector requires energy transfer to excite its response function, it is insensitive to ultraweak fields where excitation events are rare. It is also insensitive to fields in a noisy environments, as its response function is indifferent to noise and signal. This has restricted progress in the detection of the Unruh effect. To make progress in the detection of ultraweak fields or fields in noisy environments, requires a conceptual shift in the fundamental detector paradigm. Here we introduce a probe detector model which does not require energy exchange with the field in which it is measuring. Our detector is a simple Λ -system with degenerate ground states. The measured field is not probed by an excitation response, but through a geometric or Berry phase response.

Previous works have proposed interferometry setups to detect the geometric phase (GP) that result from accelerating atoms [22, 23]. In these proposals, the atom in one of the arms of the interferometer is accelerated, whilst in the other arm the atom travels inertially. This setup however is impractical as it is difficult to slow down the accelerating atom to precisely match the speed of the inertial atom, in order to eliminate which-path informa-




FIG. 1. A spacetime diagram separated into four quadrants: the left and right Rindler wedges, and the future and past light cones. The vacuum state can be written as an entangled state between the Rindler wedges, or between the light cones. For an observer in one of these quadrants (e.g. the future), tracing out the unobserved modes (e.g. in the past) leads to the (timelike) Unruh effect. The solid lines represents future and past spacetime trajectories at constant τ and $\bar{\tau}$.

tion. This is particularly challenging given that the required acceleration to detect the Unruh effect is on the order of 10^{17} m/s^2 . That in itself is problematic, as such large acceleration is likely to change the structure of the atom or ionize it. Here we propose an alternative and more practical stationary Λ -system to measure the Unruh effect by making use of the entanglement between modes in the future and past lightcones.

A uniformly accelerating observer is most conveniently described as a stationary observer in Rindler coordinates [24]. Here the Unruh effect arises as the result of spacelike entanglement between particles in the left and

right Rindler wedges [1] (Fig. 1). Specifically, the vacuum state can be written as an entangled state between two sets of modes spanning the left and right Rindler wedges. As an accelerating observer is confined to just one of these wedges, tracing out the unobserved modes leads to the prediction that such an observer will see a thermalised vacuum. Recently, it has been shown that in theory one could write down the vacuum state similarly as entangled states between modes spanning the future and past light cones [25]. If an observer or detector is confined to a spacetime trajectory in one of these cones, tracing out the unobserved modes again will lead to a thermal vacuum states. Here we determine the GP for an observer on one of these trajectories. We demonstrate that the GP can be used to measure the timelike Unruh effect with current technology.

Λ -detector. The Λ -detector is a three-level Λ -system with two ground states as illustrated in Fig. 2. The ground states ($|g_1\rangle, |g_2\rangle$) only couple to the excited state ($|e\rangle$), with transition frequency ω . For simplicity we take the ground states to be degenerate. The Hamiltonian of the Λ -detector interacting with an electromagnetic field in the detector's proper time τ is $H(\tau) = H_0 + H_I(\tau)$, where $H_0 = \hbar\omega|e\rangle\langle e|$ gives the λ -system's free energy. The interaction Hamiltonian is given by $H_I(\tau) = -\mathbf{q}\mathbf{r} \cdot \mathbf{E}[x(\tau)]|e\rangle(\langle g_1| + \langle g_2|) + h.c.$, where $h.c.$ represents the Hermitian conjugate. $\mathbf{q}\mathbf{r}$ is the electric dipole moment and $\mathbf{E}[x(\tau)] = -\partial\mathbf{A}[x(\tau)]/\partial\tau$ is the electric field with \mathbf{A} the magnetic vector potential. Defining the states $|\pm\rangle \equiv (|g_1\rangle \pm |g_2\rangle)/\sqrt{2}$, with corresponding annihilation operators $\sigma_{\pm} \equiv |e\rangle\langle\pm|$, the interaction Hamiltonian can be re-written as

$$H_I(\tau) = -e\mathbf{r} \cdot \mathbf{E}[x(\tau)](\sigma_+ + \sigma_+^\dagger). \quad (1)$$

From this equation, it is clear that $|-\rangle$ is not only an eigenstate, but also a dark state which does not interact with the electric field. Representing the bright eigenstates subspace as $|p_1\rangle$ and $|p_2\rangle$, we write down the bright component as

$$|\psi_b(\tau)\rangle = \frac{\sqrt{p_1(\tau)}|p_1(\tau)\rangle + \sqrt{p_2(\tau)}|p_2(\tau)\rangle}{\sqrt{|p_1(\tau)| + |p_2(\tau)|}}, \quad (2)$$

where

$$|p_i(\tau)\rangle = e^{i\alpha_e(\tau)}\sqrt{p_{i,e}(\tau)}|e\rangle + e^{i\alpha_g(\tau)}\sqrt{p_{i,+}(\tau)}|+\rangle, \quad (3)$$

with dynamical phases (DPs) $\alpha(\tau)$. The total system then evolves as

$$|\psi(\tau)\rangle = e^{i[\beta(\tau) + \alpha_b(\tau) + \phi]}\sqrt{p_1(\tau) + p_2(\tau)}|\psi_b(\tau)\rangle + e^{i\alpha_g(\tau)}\sqrt{p_-}|-\rangle, \quad (4)$$

where $|p_1(\tau)| + |p_2(\tau)| + |p_-| = 1$. In Eq. (4), we make the important observation that only the bright component can pick up a GP $\beta(\tau)$, due to its cyclic interaction




FIG. 2. (a) A three-level Λ -system with two degenerate ground states ($|g_1\rangle, |g_2\rangle$) which couple to the excited state ($|e\rangle$), with time-dependent transition frequency ω . (b) The Λ -configuration can be represented in an L-configuration in the $|\pm\rangle \equiv (|g_1\rangle \pm |g_2\rangle)/\sqrt{2}$ basis. Here $|-\rangle$ is a dark state that does not couple to the other states of the system $\{|+\rangle, |e\rangle\}$ or the environment. As the $|+\rangle$ does couple to the environment, a relative GP can arise in the system. This GP is used to detect the thermal state of the environment.

with the electric field [22]. Both components also pick-up DPs. We make a further observation that the GP is path-independent in the associated parameter space, and therefore is insensitive to noise [26, 27]. In contrast, the DP is path-dependent, and sensitive to noise. Phase $\phi = \Delta E\Delta t$ is an initial phase shift that can be tuned by lifting the energy degeneracy of $|+\rangle$ and $|-\rangle$ (ΔE) for a short period of time (Δt). This can be achieved via a Stark shift of one of the transition frequencies, for example.

The GP $\beta(\tau)$, can be experimentally determined by monitoring the ground state population $|g_1\rangle$ (or $|g_2\rangle$),

$$P_1(\tau) = |\langle g_1|\psi(\tau)\rangle|^2 = \frac{|p_-|}{2} + \frac{|p_+(\tau)|}{2} + \sqrt{p_-(\tau)}|\cos[\beta(\tau) + \alpha_b(\tau) + \phi]|, \quad (5)$$

where $\sqrt{p_+(\tau)} = \sum_{i,j}^2 \sqrt{p_i(\tau)p_{i,+}(\tau)}$. To eliminate $\alpha_b(\tau)$ one may take measurements at integer multiples of the quasi-cycle $\tau_c = 2\pi/\omega$, since $\alpha_b(\tau) \approx \omega\tau$. Alternatively, one may change the transition frequency as $\omega \bmod 2\pi/\tau = 0$, for a measurement at each τ .

Response function in future-past coordinates. We have explained how the GP can be experimentally measured in a Λ -system. Now we explain the theoretical predictions for the GP resulting from the timelike Unruh effect. The future-past (FP) coordinates in the future $(\tau, \zeta)_{\text{FP}}$ and past light-cones $(\bar{\tau}, \bar{\zeta})_{\text{FP}}$, transform the usual Minkowski coordinate $(t, z)_{\text{M}}$ as [25]

$$\begin{aligned} t &= a^{-1}e^{a\tau} \cosh(a\zeta), & z &= ca^{-1}e^{a\tau} \sinh(a\zeta), \\ t &= -a^{-1}e^{a\bar{\tau}} \cosh(a\bar{\zeta}), & z &= -ca^{-1}e^{a\bar{\tau}} \sinh(a\bar{\zeta}), \end{aligned} \quad (6)$$

where $a > 0$ is a real number in units of s^{-1} , while c is the speed of light.

For an observer on the world line $(\tau, 0)_{\text{FP}}$, the Schrodinger equation in FP coordinates is $i\hbar\partial\psi(\tau)/\partial\tau =$

$[H_0 + H_I(\tau)]\psi(\tau)$. In Minkowski coordinates, this corresponds to

$$i\hbar \frac{\partial \psi(t)}{\partial t} = \left[\frac{H_0}{at} + H_I(t) \right] \psi(t), \quad (7)$$

where we have used $\partial t / \partial \tau = e^{a\tau} = at$ and $\mathbf{E}(t) = e^{a\tau} \mathbf{E}(\tau)$. This tells us that a Λ -detector with energy gap scaled with $1/at$ corresponds to a Λ -detector on the $(\tau, 0)_{\text{FP}}$ world line.

As the dark states do not couple to the environment, only the bright states will contribute to the response function. The bright state $|\psi_b\rangle$ is a two level system in the $\{|e\rangle, |+\rangle\}$ basis. The Green's function for this two-level system is

$$G^+(x, x') = \frac{q^2}{\hbar^2} \sum_{i,j=1}^3 \langle e|r_i(t)|+\rangle \langle +|r_j(t')|e\rangle \langle 0|E_i(x)E_j(x')|0\rangle, \quad (8)$$

with $r_{i,j}(t) = r_0/at$ and

$$\langle 0|E_i(x)E_j(x')|0\rangle = \frac{\hbar c}{4\pi^2 \epsilon_0} (\partial_0 \partial'_0 \delta_{ij} - \partial_i \partial'_j) \frac{1}{|\mathbf{x} - \mathbf{x}'|^2 - (ct - ct' - i\epsilon)^2}, \quad (9)$$

where ∂' denotes differentiation with respect to x' and regularisation parameter $\epsilon \rightarrow 0^+$ [28]. Applying the future coordinates in Eq.(6) with $r_{i,j}(\tau) = r_0 e^{-a\tau}$, the Green's function for a detector on the $(\tau, 0)_{\text{FP}}$ world line is

$$G^+(\tau, \tau') = \frac{q^2 |\langle e|r_0|+\rangle|^2}{16\pi^2 \epsilon_0 \hbar c^7} \frac{a^4 e^{-a(\tau+\tau')}}{\cosh^4[\frac{a}{2}(\tau - \tau' - i\epsilon)]}. \quad (10)$$

Noting that the detector transition frequency (ω_{FP}) is constant relative to FP time τ , we write down the Fourier transform of the Green's function (response function) as

$$\begin{aligned} \mathcal{G}(\omega_{\text{FP}}) &= \int_{-\infty}^{\infty} d\tau d\tau' e^{-i\omega_{\text{FP}}(\tau-\tau')} e^{a(\tau+\tau')} G^+(\tau, \tau') \\ &= \Gamma(\omega_{\text{FP}}) \left(1 + \frac{a^2}{\omega_{\text{FP}}^2} \right) \left(1 + \text{csch} \frac{\pi\omega_{\text{FP}}}{a} \right) \end{aligned} \quad (11)$$

where $\Gamma(\omega_{\text{FP}}) = \frac{\omega_{\text{FP}}^3 q^2 |\langle e|r_0|+\rangle|^2}{6\pi\epsilon_0 \hbar c^3}$ is the spontaneous emission rate. The Lamb shift is negligible. This Green's function is similar to the uniformly accelerating (a') case [23], except a replaces a'/c . As such, the thermal response corresponds to temperature $T = \hbar a / 2\pi k_{\text{B}}$, where k_{B} is the Boltzmann constant. Note the $e^{a(\tau+\tau')}$ factor in Eq. (11) arises from transformation $dt dt' = e^{a(\tau+\tau')} d\tau d\tau'$.

Geometric phase. Now that we have the Green's function for a particle on the $(\tau, 0)_{\text{FP}}$ worldline, we can use it to find the eigenstates required to calculate the resulting GP. The evolution of $\rho_b = |\psi_b\rangle\langle\psi_b|$ is given by the Lindblad master equation

$$\dot{\rho}_b(\tau) = -i\omega_{\text{FP}}[\sigma_3, \rho_b(\tau)] + \mathcal{G}(\omega_{\text{FP}})\mathcal{L}[\sigma_+] - \mathcal{G}(-\omega_{\text{FP}})\mathcal{L}[\sigma_+^\dagger], \quad (12)$$

where $\mathcal{L}[O] = O\rho O^\dagger - \frac{1}{2}\{O^\dagger O, \rho\}$. For initial state $\rho_b(0) = |\psi_b(0)\rangle\langle\psi_b(0)|$ with $|\psi_b(0)\rangle = \cos\frac{\theta}{2}|e\rangle + \sin\frac{\theta}{2}|+\rangle$, the solution to Eq. (12) is

$$\rho_b(\tau) = e^{-\Delta_+\tau} \begin{pmatrix} f(\tau) & \frac{1}{2}e^{-i\omega_{\text{FP}}\tau} \sin\theta \\ \frac{1}{2}e^{i\omega_{\text{FP}}\tau} \sin\theta & e^{\Delta_+\tau} - f(\tau) \end{pmatrix}, \quad (13)$$

where $f(\tau) = e^{-\Delta_+\tau} \cos^2\frac{\theta}{2} - (\frac{\Delta_-}{\Delta_+} - 1) \sinh\Delta_+\tau$, with $\Delta_\pm = \frac{1}{2}[\mathcal{G}(\omega_{\text{FP}}) \pm \mathcal{G}(-\omega_{\text{FP}})]$.

The GP for a mixed state under a non-unitary quasi-cyclic path $\tau_c = 2\pi/\omega_{\text{FP}}$ is [29]

$$\beta = \arg \sum_{i=1}^N \sqrt{p_i(0)p_i(\tau_P)} \langle p_i(0)|p_i(\tau_P)\rangle e^{-\int_0^{\tau_c} \langle p_i(\tau)|\dot{p}_i(\tau)\rangle d\tau}. \quad (14)$$

Hence, by diagonalising Eq. (13) we can get the GP. The eigenvalues of $\rho_b(\tau)$ are

$$p_1(\tau) = \frac{1}{2}[1 + \eta(\tau)], \quad (15)$$

$$p_2(\tau) = \frac{1}{2}[1 - \eta(\tau)], \quad (16)$$

where $\eta(\tau) = \sqrt{\delta^2 + e^{-2\Delta_+\tau} \sin^2\theta}$ with $\delta = e^{-2\Delta_+\tau} \cos\theta + \frac{\Delta_-}{\Delta_+}(e^{2\Delta_+\tau} - 1)$. The corresponding eigenstates are

$$|p_1(\tau)\rangle = \sin\frac{\lambda(\tau)}{2}|e\rangle + e^{i\omega_{\text{FP}}\tau} \cos\frac{\lambda(\tau)}{2}|+\rangle \quad (17)$$

$$|p_2(\tau)\rangle = \cos\frac{\lambda(\tau)}{2}|e\rangle - e^{i\omega_{\text{FP}}\tau} \sin\frac{\lambda(\tau)}{2}|+\rangle \quad (18)$$

where

$$\tan\frac{\lambda(\tau)}{2} = \sqrt{\frac{\eta(\tau) + \delta(\tau)}{\eta(\tau) - \delta(\tau)}}. \quad (19)$$

As $p_2(0) = 0$, only the eigenstate corresponding to $p_1(\tau)$ will contribute to β : applying Eq. (15) and (18) to (14), the GP is

$$\beta(a) = \omega_{\text{FP}} \int_0^{\tau_P} \cos^2\frac{\lambda(\tau)}{2} d\tau. \quad (20)$$

To first order in $\Gamma(\omega_{\text{FP}})/\omega_{\text{FP}}$,

$$\begin{aligned} \beta(a) &= \pi(\cos\theta - 1) - \frac{\pi^2 \Gamma \sin^2\theta}{2\omega_{\text{FP}}^2} \left(\frac{a^2}{\omega_{\text{FP}}^2} + 1 \right) \\ &\quad \times \left(\cos\theta + 2 \coth\frac{\pi\omega_{\text{FP}}}{a} \right) \text{csch}\frac{\pi\omega_{\text{FP}}}{a}. \end{aligned} \quad (21)$$

For $\theta = 0$ and π , which corresponds to $|\psi_b(0)\rangle = |e\rangle$ and $|+\rangle$ respectively, $\Delta\beta(a) \equiv \beta(a) - \beta(0) = 0$. The GP is maximised near $\theta = \pi/2$. Fig. (3) plots $\Delta\beta(a)$ for an initial detector state corresponding to $\theta = \pi/2$.

Sensitivity. We compare the sensitivity of the Λ -detector to that of a corresponding Unruh-Dewitt detector. The GP of the Λ -detector is determined by




FIG. 3. $\Delta\beta$ (normalised to $\Gamma/\omega_{\text{FP}}$) as a function of a/ω_{FP} , after one quasi-cycle ($\tau_c = 2\pi/\omega_{\text{FP}}$).

measuring the groundstate population P_1 (or P_2). As we are only interested in the component of the population attributed to the Unruh effect, we define $\delta P_1(\tau) \equiv P_1(a, \tau) - P_1(0, \tau)$. We choose initial populations to maximise $|\delta P_1(\tau_c)|$: we find that this occurs when the dark state population is $p_- \approx 0.2$. In Fig. 4 we plot the shift in groundstate population due to the Unruh effect, $\Delta P_1(\tau) = \delta P_1(\tau) - \delta P_1(0)$. We see that over one quasi-cycle $O[\Delta P_1] = 10^{-3}$. In comparison, the sensitivity of the Unruh-Dewitt detector is measured by its probability of excitation. As the Unruh-Dewitt detector is a two-level system, and noting that the Λ -system reduces to a two-level system if we do not populate the uncoupled dark state, this probability can be calculated as

$$P_e(\tau) = |\langle e|\psi(\tau)\rangle|^2 = |p_e(\tau)|, \quad (22)$$

where $\sqrt{p_e(\tau)} = \sum_{i,j}^2 \sqrt{p_i(\tau)p_{i,e}(\tau)}$, with initial condition $p_- = 0$ set with $\theta = \pi/2$. Under the same conditions as that of the Λ -detector, $O[P_e]$ never exceeds 10^{-6} , meaning that the Λ -detector is three orders of magnitude more sensitive than the Unruh-Dewitt detector. Moreover, such small signals in the Unruh-DeWitt detector may not be discernable from noise; whereas in the Λ -detector, the GP is insensitive to noise.

Implementation and feasibility. Λ -systems are ubiquitous in the selection rules of atoms and molecules, and can be manufactured in artificial-atoms [30]. Recent work with nitrogen-vacancy (NV) centres has been used to characterise the GP in a Λ -system [31]. However, the range over which the energy gap can be tuned in atoms may be too restrictive. Instead, we propose to implement the three-level system with two superconducting qubits in a resonator. Representing the basis set of the two qubit system as $\{|00\rangle, |01\rangle, |10\rangle, |11\rangle\}$, we get the following mapping in the fast-cavity limit: $|e\rangle \rightarrow |01\rangle + |10\rangle$, $|-\rangle \rightarrow |01\rangle - |10\rangle$, $|+\rangle \rightarrow |00\rangle$. As we operate near the ground state, $|11\rangle$ can be ignored. Implementating such a system with gap tunable flux qubits, one may vary the energy gap from 1 to 10 GHz [32–34].




FIG. 4. Shift in the groundstate population probability due to the Unruh effect, over one quasi-cycle. Parameters: $a/\omega_{\text{FP}} = 1$, $\Gamma/\omega_{\text{FP}} = 10^{-4}$.

As a feasibility case-study we consider a two flux-qubit implementation with $\omega_M^i = 1.6 \times 10^9 \text{ s}^{-1}$. One quasi-cyclic evolution in FP time τ_c corresponds to

$$t_c = \frac{\omega_{\text{FP}}}{a\omega_M^i} (e^{a/\omega_{\text{FP}}} - 1), \quad (23)$$

where ω_M is a frequency in Minkowski time t . For $a = \omega_{\text{FP}}$, $O[t_c] = 1 \text{ ns}$. Over this time, the final frequency is $\omega_M^f = \omega_M^i e^{-a/\omega_{\text{FP}}} \approx 5.9 \times 10^8 \text{ s}^{-1}$. Under these operating time scales and frequencies, which are well within current technology ranges [35–37], the detector would be detecting an Unruh temperature of 0.6 K.

Conclusion. We have shown how the Λ -system can be used to detect the timelike Unruh effect that arises out of the entanglement between future and past light cones, with practical operating parameters. This opens the way for experimental verification of the Unruh effect with current technology. More generally, the Λ -system described here is also a general framework for the detection of ultra-low temperatures. Instead of scaling the energy gap to elicit a thermal response from the vacuum, the GP of a time-independent Λ -system can detect ambient temperatures, offering a new platform for robust and hypersensitive thermometry.

Acknowledgements. We thank Jay Olson for some useful discussions. JQQ acknowledges financial support for this work from the Ramsay fellowship.

* quach.james@gmail.com

- [1] W. G. Unruh, “Notes on black-hole evaporation,” *Phys. Rev. D* **14**, 870–892 (1976).
- [2] P. C. W. Davies, “Scalar production in schwarzschild and rindler metrics,” *Journal of Physics A: Mathematical and General* **8**, 609–616 (1975).
- [3] W. G. Unruh and R. M. Wald, “What happens when an

- accelerating observer detects a rindler particle,” Phys. Rev. D **29**, 1047–1056 (1984).
- [4] P. C. W. Davies and A. C. Ottewill, “Detection of negative energy: 4-dimensional examples,” Phys. Rev. D **65**, 104014 (2002).
- [5] S. Schlicht, “Considerations on the unruh effect: causality and regularization,” Classical and Quantum Gravity **21**, 4647–4660 (2004).
- [6] J. Louko and A. Satz, “How often does the unruh–DeWitt detector click? regularization by a spatial profile,” Classical and Quantum Gravity **23**, 6321–6343 (2006).
- [7] S.-Y. Lin and B. L. Hu, “Backreaction and the unruh effect: New insights from exact solutions of uniformly accelerated detectors,” Phys. Rev. D **76**, 064008 (2007).
- [8] E. G. Brown, E. Martín-Martínez, N. C. Menicucci, and R. B. Mann, “Detectors for probing relativistic quantum physics beyond perturbation theory,” Phys. Rev. D **87**, 084062 (2013).
- [9] D. C.M. Ostapchuk, S.-Y. Lin, R. B. Mann, and B.L. Hu, “Entanglement dynamics between inertial and non-uniformly accelerated detectors,” Journal of High Energy Physics **2012**, 72 (2012).
- [10] G. Salton, R. B. Mann, and N. C. Menicucci, “Acceleration-assisted entanglement harvesting and ranging,” New Journal of Physics **17**, 035001 (2015).
- [11] S. Kukita and Y. Nambu, “Entanglement dynamics in de sitter spacetime,” Classical and Quantum Gravity **34**, 235010 (2017).
- [12] E. Martín-Martínez and N. C. Menicucci, “Entanglement in curved spacetimes and cosmology,” Classical and Quantum Gravity **31**, 214001 (2014).
- [13] Y. Nambu, “Entanglement structure in expanding universes,” Entropy **15**, 1847–1874 (2013).
- [14] G. V. Steeg and N. C. Menicucci, “Entangling power of an expanding universe,” Phys. Rev. D **79**, 044027 (2009).
- [15] B. L. Hu, S.-Y. Lin, and J. Louko, “Relativistic quantum information in detectors–field interactions,” Classical and Quantum Gravity **29**, 224005 (2012).
- [16] J. Louko and A. Satz, “Transition rate of the unruh–DeWitt detector in curved spacetime,” Classical and Quantum Gravity **25**, 055012 (2008).
- [17] L. Hodgkinson and J. Louko, “How often does the unruh-dewitt detector click beyond four dimensions?” Journal of Mathematical Physics **53**, 082301 (2012).
- [18] L. Hodgkinson, J. Louko, and A. C. Ottewill, “Static detectors and circular-geodesic detectors on the schwarzschild black hole,” Phys. Rev. D **89**, 104002 (2014).
- [19] K. K. Ng, L. Hodgkinson, J. Louko, R. B. Mann, and E. Martín-Martínez, “Unruh-dewitt detector response along static and circular-geodesic trajectories for schwarzschild–anti-de sitter black holes,” Phys. Rev. D **90**, 064003 (2014).
- [20] N. D. Birrell and P.C.W. Davies, *Quantum fields in curved space*, 7 (Cambridge university press, 1984).
- [21] P. Langlois, “Causal particle detectors and topology,” Annals of Physics **321**, 2027 – 2070 (2006).
- [22] E. Martín-Martínez, I. Fuentes, and R. B. Mann, “Using berry’s phase to detect the unruh effect at lower accelerations,” Phys. Rev. Lett. **107**, 131301 (2011).
- [23] J. Hu and H. Yu, “Geometric phase for an accelerated two-level atom and the unruh effect,” Phys. Rev. A **85**, 032105 (2012).
- [24] W. Rindler, “Hyperbolic motion in curved space time,” Phys. Rev. **119**, 2082–2089 (1960).
- [25] S. J. Olson and T. C. Ralph, “Entanglement between the future and the past in the quantum vacuum,” Phys. Rev. Lett. **106**, 110404 (2011).
- [26] Erik Sjöqvist, “A new phase in quantum computation,” Physics **1**, 35 (2008).
- [27] S. Berger, M. Pechal, A. A. Abdumalikov, C. Eichler, L. Steffen, A. Fedorov, A. Wallraff, and S. Filipp, “Exploring the effect of noise on the berry phase,” Phys. Rev. A **87**, 060303 (2013).
- [28] Zhiying Zhu, Hongwei Yu, and Shizhuan Lu, “Spontaneous excitation of an accelerated hydrogen atom coupled with electromagnetic vacuum fluctuations,” Phys. Rev. D **73**, 107501 (2006).
- [29] D. M. Tong, E. Sjöqvist, L. C. Kwek, and C. H. Oh, “Kinematic approach to the mixed state geometric phase in nonunitary evolution,” Phys. Rev. Lett. **93**, 080405 (2004).
- [30] I. Buluta, S. Ashhab, and F. Nori, “Natural and artificial atoms for quantum computation,” Reports on Progress in Physics **74**, 104401 (2011).
- [31] C. G. Yale, F. J. Heremans, B. B. Zhou, A. Auer, G. Burkard, and D. D. Awschalom, “Optical manipulation of the berry phase in a solid-state spin qubit,” Nature photonics **10**, 184–189 (2016).
- [32] Xiaobo Zhu, Alexander Kemp, Shiro Saito, and Kouichi Semba, “Coherent operation of a gap-tunable flux qubit,” Applied Physics Letters **97**, 102503 (2010).
- [33] A. Fedorov, A. K. Feofanov, P. Macha, P. Forn-Díaz, C. J. P. M. Harmans, and J. E. Mooij, “Strong coupling of a quantum oscillator to a flux qubit at its symmetry point,” Phys. Rev. Lett. **105**, 060503 (2010).
- [34] Hiraku Toida, Takuya Ohrai, Yuichiro Matsuzaki, Kosuke Kakuyanagi, and Shiro Saito, “Control of the transition frequency of a superconducting flux qubit by longitudinal coupling to the photon number degree of freedom in a resonator,” Phys. Rev. B **102**, 094502 (2020).
- [35] T. D. Ladd, F. Jelezko, R. Laflamme, Y. Nakamura, C. Monroe, and J. L. O’Brien, “Quantum computers,” nature **464**, 45–53 (2010).
- [36] J. M. Raimond, M. Brune, and S. Haroche, “Manipulating quantum entanglement with atoms and photons in a cavity,” Rev. Mod. Phys. **73**, 565–582 (2001).
- [37] Marlan O. Scully, Vitaly V. Kocharovskiy, Alexey Belyanin, Edward Fry, and Federico Capasso, “Enhancing acceleration radiation from ground-state atoms via cavity quantum electrodynamics,” Phys. Rev. Lett. **91**, 243004 (2003).