D istributed Entanglem ent as a Probe for the Quantum Structure of Spacetim e

Pieter K ok¹, U lvi Yurtæver¹, Sam uel L. Braunstein², and Jonathan P. D ow ling¹

¹ Jet Propulsion Laboratory, California Institute of Technology, Quantum Computing Technologies Group,

M ail Stop 126-347, 4800 O ak G rove D rive, P asadena, C alifornia 91109

² Inform atics, Bangor University, Bangor LL57 1UT, UK

Simultaneity is a well-de ned notion in special relativity once a M inkowski metric structure is xed on the spacetime continuum (manifold) of events. In quantum gravity, however, the metric is not expected to be a xed, classical structure, but a uctuating quantum operator which may assume a coherent superposition of two classically-distinguishable values. A natural question to ask is what happens to the notion of simultaneity and synchronization when the metric is in a quantum superposition. Here we show that the resource of distributed entanglement of the same kind as used by Jozsa et al. [Phys.Rev.Lett. 85, 2010 (2000)] gives rise to an experimental probe that is sensitive to coherent quantum uctuations in the spacetime metric.

PACS numbers: 03.30.+ p, 03.65.-w, 01.70.+ w

For a given choice of a M inkow skim etric structure on the spacetime continuum, simultaneity is a uniquely dened notion in special relativity. A though there is an innite class of distinguishable but equivalent M inkow ski metrics on the spacetime manifold, the speci c metric that is to be used is a philosophical problem that seems to have no consequences for real experiments. In particular, it does not have any computational implications for classical physics [1 [6]. In quantum gravity, however, the metric is not expected to be a xed, classical structure, but a uctuating quantum operator. In particular, it is conceivable that the metric can be in a coherent superposition of two classically-distinguishable values. Experin entally, there exist well known protocols to construct the classical metric once a labeling of actual events as spacetim e points is carried out. O ne particular such protocol involves the synchronization of the clocks of two distant observers (A lice and B ob) at rest with respect to each other. Recently, clock synchronisation received renew ed interest with the added resource of shared entanglem ent between A lice and Bob [7]. A natural question to ask is what happens to the notion of simultaneity and synchronization when the metric is in a quantum superposition. Here we show that the resource of distributed entanglem ent of the same kind as used in [7] gives rise to an experimental probe that is sensitive to coherent quantum uctuations in the spacetime metric.

In special relativity, given a xed M inkow skim etric g on spacetim e R⁴, simultaneity is de ned as follows: let u be the four-vector of an inertial observer, A lice, and let P be an event along the world-line of A lice. Then A lice's surface of simultaneity at P is the set of all events Q such that the space-like vector (or geodesic) S joining P to Q is orthogonal to u : g u S = 0. This de nition is formulated entirely in terms of physically observable quantities, and, given a xed metric g , is in plemented in practice using the E instein synchronization protocol.

The protocol works as follows: suppose A lice and B ob

are separated by a (large) distance d. A lice sends a light signal to B ob, who uses a m irror to return the signal in – m ediately. A lice then m easures the tim e interval between the departure at t_1 and the arrival at t_3 of the signal: $(t_3 \quad t_2)$, and de nes the half-way time t_2 through this interval as

$$t_2 = t_2 + \frac{1}{2} (t_3 = t_2)$$
: (1)

By construction, the spacelike vector joining the event at time t_2 on A lice's worldline to the event of rejection t_2^0 in B ob's mirror is orthogonal to A lice's four velocity. In other words, t_2 and t_2^0 lie on a surface of simultaneity for A lice (and B ob), according to the above de nition. A lice now tells B ob that the time of rejection (which B ob recorded, e.g., by measuring the impulse on the mirror) was at t_2 on her clock. B ob can then adjust his clock so that his measured time at this event coincides with t_2 , and we have therefore obtained clock synchronisation in accordance with the above de nition.

Notice that this protocol depends crucially on the specicMinkowskimetricg that is xed from the outset (see Fig. 1). In general, there exists an in nite class of distinct M inkow skim etrics on the manifold R⁴: For any : R^4 ! R^4 , the metric g^0 di eom orphism (g) is an element in that class (where denotes the tensorial \pullback" m ap associated to the di eom erphism) distinct from g unless happens to be a transform ation in the Poincare group (i.e. a Lorentz transform ation combined with translations). W hich speci c m etric represents the realLorentz structure is an operational question that can in principle be answered by experiment; nevertheless, since physics is invariant under isom etries, these di erent M inkow skim etrics are in any case physically equivalent to each other [1{6].

So far, the discussion has been purely classical. In quantum mechanics A lice and Bob might share entanglement, and the spacetime metric is generally no longer a xed background structure, but is subject to quantum uctuations. In this paper, we will show how this extra resource of shared distributed entanglement can be used as an experim ental probethat is sensitive to coherent quantum uctuations in the spacetimemetric.



FIG.1. Einstein synchronization using the round-trip travel time of a light signal. The location of the re ection event t_2^0 on B ob's worldline which is de ned to be simultaneous with A lice's t_2 , depends entirely on the given M inkowski m etric g on spacetim e: a) the synchronization process for the "standard" m etric (only the light cones of g are shown), b) E instein synchronization with a di erent M inkowskim etric.

Consider our two observers, A lice and Bob, who initially are co-located and share a singlet state of two qubits whose computational basis states jDi and jLi correspond to nondegenerate (distinct) energy levels E₀ and E₁ (where we de new ithout loss of generality E₁ > E₀). The initial quantum state of the joint system is given by

$$ji = \frac{1}{\frac{p}{2}} (j \hat{p}_{i_{A}} j \hat{l}_{i_{B}} j \hat{l}_{i_{A}} j \hat{p}_{i_{B}}): \qquad (2)$$

Throughout this paper, the subscripts A and B A lice and B ob respectively. Suppose this entanglement is now distributed by letting A lice move a large distance d away from B ob. A fier the distribution, when B ob and A lice are at relative rest again, the state of the system can be written in the form

$$ji = \frac{1}{\frac{p}{2}} e^{i_{0}A} j Di_{A} e^{i_{1}B} j Li_{B}$$
$$e^{i_{1}A} j Li_{A} e^{i_{0}B} j Di_{B} ; \quad (3)$$

where $_{\rm A}$ and $_{\rm B}$ are the proper times that elapsed in A lice and Bob's frame during the entanglement transport, and ~ $_0$ and ~ $_1$ are the ground and excited state energies, respectively. Up to an overall phase, the state Eq.(3) can be rewritten as

$$ji = \frac{1}{\frac{p}{2}} \quad \mathcal{D}i_{A} \ jii_{B} \quad e^{i (B A)} \ jii_{A} \ \mathcal{D}i_{B} ; \quad (4)$$

where 1_{0} . When A lice and B ob are at relative rest (com oving: A = B), is a dark state since

its time evolution corresponds to multiplication by an overall phase factor.

A lice and B ob now execute the clock synchronization protocol introduced by Jozsa et al. [7]. First A lice m akes a m easurem ent on her qubit in the fj $\frac{1}{3}$ g basis:

$$j = i_{A} \qquad \frac{1}{P-2} (j = i_{A} + j = i_{A});$$

$$j = \frac{1}{2} (j = i_{A} - j = i_{A});$$

$$(5)$$

and communicates the result classically to B ob. A ssume that A lice obtains the result $j\!\!+\!i_A$. B ob then knows that his qubit is in the reduced state

$$j^{()}i_{B} = \frac{1}{p_{2}}$$
 $jli_{B} e^{j(B_{A})}Di_{B}$; (6)

obtained via the projection P_{j+i_A} from the state Eq.(4). This is the same protocolused in the clock synchronization application of [7], and the phase ($_B _A$) is the \P reskill" phase which makes this application difcult to implement in practice [8]. Here we are not interested in a synchronization protocol, how ever, and the important thing about the state Eq. (6) is that it is a pure state (though an unkown pure state) as Bob can verify experimentally.

Suppose now that the background spacetime on which the above protocol is in plan ented has a metric subject to quantum uctuations. Let us assume that the quantum state of the metric jui is in a coherent superposition of two macroscopically-distinguishable (orthogonal) states j_0 i and j_1 i given by

$$\dot{g}i = \dot{g}_0 i + \dot{g}_1 i;$$
 (7)

where and are complex numbers with $j \ j^2 + j \ j^2 = 1$. A ssume, furtherm one, that the proper time elapsed during A lice's trip to her naldestination di ers for the two metrics g_0 and g_1 by a (sm all) time interval . Under these assumptions, after entanglement distribution the total state of the singlet system plus the metric can be written in the form [compare Eq. (3)]

$$j;gi = \frac{1}{p-\frac{1}{2}} h j_{i_A} e^{i_{1}} j_{i_B} e^{i_{0}} e^{i_{0}} j_{g_0} i + e^{i_{0}} (a^{+}) j_{g_1} i_{g_1} i_{g_1}$$

(8)

From the point of view of A lice and B ob, the quantum state of the gravitational eld is inaccessible via any direct observation; therefore, their joint state is described

by tracing over the gravitational part of the wave function Eq.(8):

$$\begin{array}{rl} {}_{A\,B} &=& {\rm Tr}_{g} \left[j ; g i h ; g j \right] \\ &=& \displaystyle \frac{1}{2} \left[\left[{\rm Di}_{A} h {\rm D}_{A} \right]_{A} & {\rm Ji}_{B} h {\rm I}_{B} + {\rm Ji}_{A} h {\rm I}_{A} & {\rm Di}_{B} h {\rm D}_{B} \right] \\ && \displaystyle \overline{W} & {\rm Di}_{A} h {\rm I}_{A} & {\rm Ji}_{B} h {\rm D}_{B} & W & {\rm Ji}_{A} h {\rm D}_{A} & {\rm JD}_{B} h {\rm I}_{B} \end{array}$$

where W denotes the complex number

$$W e^{i(B_{A})}jj^{2} + e^{i}jj^{2}$$
: (10)

W hat will happen when B ob and A lice carry out the protocol described above [Eqs. (5-6)]? A lice performs the m easurement in her fj i g basis, and obtains a random string of outcomes f\+ ";\"g. She sends this bit string to B ob. In practice, thism eans that A lice tells B ob which of herenumerated singlet-halfs from a large ensemble are projected onto the j+ i_A state. Note that this calculation describes an experiment in which the various ensemples are obtained via repeated application of the entanglement distribution and measurement protocols described above, in each such application the metric being in the same coherent state described by Eq. (7).] The state $_{AB}$ in Eq. (9) then collapses to the density matrix

$$\begin{array}{rcl} & & & & P_{j+i_{A}} & ABP_{j+i_{A}} \\ & & & TrP_{j+i_{A}} & ABP_{j+i_{A}} \\ & & & = \frac{1}{2}j+i_{A}h+j_{A} \\ & & & & & \\ & & & & & \\ & & & & & \\ & & & & & \\ & & & & & & \\ & & & & & & \\ & & & & & & \\ & & & & & & \\ \end{array}$$

B ob's reduced state, therefore, is given by

$$B = \frac{1}{2} [\mathcal{D}i_{B} h \mathcal{D}_{B} + \mathcal{I}i_{B} h \mathcal{I}_{B}$$

$$W \mathcal{D}i_{B} h \mathcal{I}_{B} \quad \overline{W} \mathcal{I}i_{B} h \mathcal{D}_{B} : \qquad (12)$$

Contrast Eq.(12) with the pure state Eq.(6). The state Eq.(12) is pure if and only if

$$Tr^{2} = \frac{1}{2} (1 + j \sqrt{2}) = 1; \qquad (13)$$

which is possible if and only if $\frac{1}{2}$ j = 1. But

$$\mathbf{j}\mathbf{y} \mathbf{j} = 1$$
 $4\mathbf{j} \mathbf{j} \mathbf{j} \mathbf{j} \mathbf{sin}^2 - \frac{1}{2}$
 $1 \mathbf{j}^2 \mathbf{j} \mathbf{j}^2 \mathbf{j}^2 \mathbf{j} \mathbf{j} \mathbf{sin}^2 \mathbf{j} \mathbf{j} \mathbf{sin}^2 \mathbf{j} \mathbf{sin}^2 \mathbf{j} \mathbf{sin}^2 \mathbf{sin}^$

where the approximate equality assumes 1. In general, B ob's state at the end of the protocol is mixed, and if experiment can distinguish this \decoherence" effect from other sources of decoherence, it provides a possible probe for the quantum uctuations in the spacetime metric.

A sim ilar gravitational decoherence e ect could be produced by using a single clock qubit carried by A lice through the region with the uctuating metric. However, the advantages of using the singlet state as a probe are twofold: First, the singlet state is immune to phase decoherence e ects that interact with both qubits in the (9) me way; so it provides a more localized probe than a single qubit would. Second, the singlet state allows the nal measurement process to be performed in a region (B ob's location) arbitrarily distant from the region where the gravitational interaction takes place (A lice's worldline); thus there is no danger of the nal measurement process \collapsing" the state of the metric leading to a false negative result (a pure-state outcom e for B ob).

W hat are the prospects for this probe to be a realistic one? For Planck scale uctuations in the metric, for which 10⁴³ sec (the P lanck time), an observable effect will be present if 10⁴³Hz, which corresponds, not surprisingly, to energies ~ of the order of the rest energy corresponding to the Planck mass (roughly the mass of a grain of sand). This is a macroscopic amount of energy (di erence): the entangled state Eq. (2) would have to be a m acroscopic, \Schrodinger's cat" state and preserve its coherence over the large distance d. Since m any non-gravitational sources of decoherence would tend to destroy such states rather quickly, the prospects for a successful experim ent to probe for P lanck-scale geom etry uctuations are not good.

There are, how ever, recent intriguing suggestions that microscopic black holes could be produced in large hadron colliders currently under construction [11]. A ccording to these suggestions, string theory may present a new length scale much larger than the Planck length at which the gravitational interaction becomes a dom inant force, allowing much lower energy thresholds for black hole production. The black holes produced in future hadron colliders may be as light as 1 TeV in mass, correponding to a length scale on the order of 10 17 cm . This new mass-length scale involves the geometry of com pacti ed dimensions in string theory, but if these small black holes have gravitational signatures in the noncom pacti ed dim ensions that have length scales com parable to 10¹⁷ cm, or equivalently time scales of 10²⁷ sec, then our probe would be sensitive to such uctuations 10^{27} Hz, which corresponds to energies on provided the order of ~ 1TeV. This is a mesoscopic energy scale, and it is not inconceivable that entangled states of mesoscopic systems, like for example high photonnum ber path-entangled states [12,13], can be produced and maintained against non-gravitational decoherence just long enough for the protocolwed iscussed above to be practical. We believe this possibility is intriguing enough to deserve further study.

This work was carried out at the Jet P ropulsion Laboratory, C alifornia Institute of Technology, under a contract with the N ational A eronautics and Space A dm inistration. In addition, PK.would like to thank W illiam J.M unro for fruitful discussions, and the United States N ationalR essenth C ouncil for nancial support. Support was received from the O ce of N avalR essenth, A dvanced R essenth and D evelopment A ctivity, N ational Security A gency and the D effense A dvanced R essenth P rojects A gency.

PieterKok@jplnasa.gov

- H. Reichenbach, the Philosophy of Space and Time, Dover paperback (1957), rst published in German (1927).
- [2] B.Ellis and P.Bowman, Phil.Sci. 34, 116{136 (1967).
- [3] A.Grunbaum, Phil.Sci. 36, 5{43 (1969).
- [4] D.Malament, Noûs 11, 293 (300 (1977).
- [5] M L G. Redhead and T A. Debs, Am. J. Phys. 64, 384 392 (1996).

- [6] R.Anderson, I. Vetharaniam and G.E. Stedman, Phys. Rep. 295, 93(180 (1998).
- [7] R. Jozsa, D. S. Abram s, J.P. Dow ling and C.P.W illiam s, Phys. Rev. Lett. 85, 2010 (2013 (2000).
- [8] U.Yurtæverand J.P.D ow ling, Phys. Rev. A 65, 052317 (2002).
- [9] E A. Burt, C R. Ekstrom and T B. Swanson, A reply to \Quantum C lock Synchronization", quant-ph/0007030 (2000).
- [10] J.Preskill, Quantum clock synchronization and quantum error correction, quant-ph/0010098 (2000).
- [11] I. Antoniadis, N. ArkaniHamed, S. Dimopoulos, and G. Dvali, Phys. Lett. B 436, 257 (1998); S. Dimopoulos and G. Landsberg, Phys. Rev. Lett. 87, 161602 (2001); S. B. Giddings and S. Thomas, http://xxx.lanl.gov/abs/hep-th/0106219; G. Landsberg, Phys. Rev. Lett. 88, 181801 (2002); S. Dimopoulos and R. Emparan, Phys. Lett. B 526, 393 (2002).
- [12] H.Lee, P.Kok, N.J.Cerf, and J.P.Dow ling, Phys.Rev. A 65,030101 (2002).
- [13] P. Kok, H. Lee, and J.P. Dowling, Phys. Rev. A 65, 052104 (2002).