arXiv:quant-ph/0305020v1 5 May 2003

Reply to: Comment on "Bohmian prediction about a two double-slit experiment and its disagreement with SQM"

O. Akhavan *and M. Golshani †

Department of Physics, Sharif University of Technology, P.O. Box 11365–9161, Tehran, Iran
Institute for Studies in Theoretical Physics and Mathematics, P.O. Box 19395–5531, Tehran, Iran

Abstract

In a recent paper, Struyve *et al.* [Struyve W, De Baere W, De Neve J and De Weirdt S 2003 *J. Phys. A* **36** 1525] attempted to show that the thought experiment proposed in [Golshani M and Akhavan O 2001 *J. Phys. A* **34** 5259] cannot distinguish between standard and Bohmian quantum mechanics. Here, we want to show that, in spite of their objection, our conclusion still holds out.

PACS number(s): 03.65.Bz

Recently, a thought experiment was proposed in [1] to show that the standard quantum mechanics (SQM) can present incompatible predictions as compared with Bohmian quantum mechanics (BQM) at the individual level of particles. But, this proposal was diligently criticized by Struyve *et al.* [2] by resorting to the quantum equilibrium hypothesis (QEH). It seems useful, before any discussion on the raised objection, to outline the proposed experiment.

Consider an original type of EPR source [3] which emits a pair of identical non-relativistic particles labelled by 1 and 2 with vanishing total momentum. The source is placed at the origin of the $x-y$ coordinate system which is taken to be the geometrical center of two identical double-slit screen in parallel to the y-axis. The slits are labelled by A and B as well as A' and B' on the right and left screens, respectively. They have the coordinates $(\pm d, \pm Y)$ with the half-width of each slit being σ_0. For simplicity, let us suppose that there is just one pair of particles in the system at any moment. Thus, the general wave function of the system describing the two entangled particles emerging from the slits can be written as

$$\begin{aligned}\psi(x_1,y_1;x_2,y_2;t) &= N[\psi_A(x_1,y_1,t)\psi_{B'}(x_2,y_2,t) \pm \psi_A(x_2,y_2,t)\psi_{B'}(x_1,y_1,t) \\ &\quad +\psi_B(x_1,y_1,t)\psi_{A'}(x_2,y_2,t) \pm \psi_B(x_2,y_2,t)\psi_{A'}(x_1,y_1,t)] \qquad (1)\end{aligned}$$

where N is a renormalization constant and the upper (lower) sign refers to bosonic (fermionic) property of the two-particle system. Furthermore, it is assumed that the slits produce Gaussian wave functions in the form

$$\begin{aligned}\psi_{A,B}(x,y,t) &= (2\pi\sigma_t^2)^{-1/4} exp[-(\pm y - Y - \hbar k_y t/m)^2/4\sigma_0\sigma_t] \\ &\quad \times exp[i(k_x(x-d-\hbar k_x t/2m) + k_y(\pm y - Y - \hbar k_y t/2m)] \qquad (2)\end{aligned}$$

where the index $A(B)$ is related to the upper (lower) sign, and

$$\sigma_t = \sigma_0(1 + \frac{i\hbar t}{2m\sigma_0^2}). \qquad (3)$$

Notice that, the form of $\psi_{A',B'}$ is the same as $\psi_{A,B}$ with the parameter d being replaced by $-d$ in Eq. (2). A joint detection of the two particles is simultaneously done on two screens placed at $\pm(D+d)$,

*E-mail: akhavan@mehr.sharif.edu
†E-mail: golshani@ihcs.ac.ir

perpendicular to the x-axis. It is well known that, based on SQM, the probability of the joint detection of a pair, at positions $y_1 = Q_1$ and $y_2 = Q_2$ on the two screens, is

$$P_{12}(Q_1, Q_2, t_0) = \int_{Q_1}^{Q_1+\triangle Q} \int_{Q_2}^{Q_2+\triangle Q} |\psi(y_1, y_2, t_0)|^2 dy_1 dy_2 \tag{4}$$

where $t_0 = mD/\hbar k_x$ and $\triangle Q$ is the size of position detectors. On the other hand, according to BQM, one can show that [1]

$$y(t) = y(0)\sqrt{1 + (\hbar t/2m\sigma_0^2)^2} \tag{5}$$

where $y(t) = (y_1(t) + y_2(t))/2$ is center of mass position of the two particles in the y-direction at time t. Now, if we can adjust $y(0) = 0$, then BQM predicts that each pair of particles must be observed symmetrically with respect to the x-axis on the screens. In addition, it predicts that detection of the two particles at one side of the x-axis on the screens is impossible. But, according to SQM, the probability of asymmetrical joint detection of the two particles or finding them on one side of the x-axis can be non-zero, contrary to BQM's prediction. It can easily be seen that, the difference between the two theories is rooted in the position entanglement condition $y(0) = 0$. In fact, Struyve *et al.* [2] believe that by considering QEH, this initial entangled condition is not realizable in BQM. Thus, in the following, the discussion is mainly concentrated on this issue.

Let us begin with some more detailed description of the experiment. Suppose that before the arrival of the two particles on the slits, the entangled wave function describing them is given by

$$\begin{aligned} \psi_0(x_1, y_1; x_2, y_2) &= \chi(x_1, x_2)\hbar \int_{-\infty}^{+\infty} exp[ik_y(y_1 - y_2)]dk_y \\ &= 2\pi\hbar\chi(x_1, x_2)\delta(y_1 - y_2) \end{aligned} \tag{6}$$

where $\chi(x_1, x_2)$ is the x-component of the wave function that could have a form similar to the y-component. However, its form is not important for the present work. The wave function (6) is just the one represented in [3], and it shows that the two particles have vanishing total momentum in the y-direction, and their y-component of the center of mass is exactly located on the x-axis. This is not inconsistent with Heisenberg's uncertainty principle, because

$$[p_{y_1} + p_{y_2}, y_1 - y_2] = 0. \tag{7}$$

Furthermore, the considered source is not necessarily a point source, and the two entangled particles are uniformly distributed in the y-direction.

We have seen that, the wave function (6) implies that there are initial position and momentum entanglements for the pair in the y-direction. Now, it is interesting to know what can happen to these entanglements when the two particles emerge from the slits. We assumed that the slits produce the Gaussian wave functions represented by Eq. (2). Thus, when the particles pass through the slits, the transformation

$$\psi_0(x_1, y_1; x_2, y_2) \longrightarrow \psi(x_1, y_1; x_2, y_2) \tag{8}$$

occurs to the wave function describing the system. Now, there is a question as to whether the position entanglement property of the two particles is kept after this transformation. To answer this question, one can first examine the effect of the total momentum operator on the wave function of the system, $\psi(x_1, y_1; x_2, y_2; t)$, which yields

$$\begin{aligned} (p_{y_1} + p_{y_2})\psi(x_1, y_1; x_2, y_2; t) &= -i\hbar(\frac{\partial}{\partial y_1} + \frac{\partial}{\partial y_2})\psi(x_1, y_1; x_2, y_2; t) \\ &= i\hbar(\frac{y_1(t) + y_2(t)}{2\sigma_0\sigma_t})\psi(x_1, y_1; x_2, y_2; t) \end{aligned} \tag{9}$$

where we see that the wave function is an eigenfunction of the total momentum operator. Now, if we can assume that the total momentum of the particles is remained zero at all times (an assumption about

which we shall elaborate later on), then it can be concluded that the center of mass of the two particles in the y-direction is always located on the x-axis. In other words, a momentum entanglement in the form $p_1 + p_2 = 0$ leads to the position entanglement in this experiment. However, Born's probability principle, i.e. $P = |\psi|^2$, which is a basic rule in SQM, shows that the probability of asymmetrical joint detection of the two particles can be non-zero on the screens. Thus, there is no position entanglement and consequently no momentum entanglement between the two particles. This compels us to believe that, according to SQM, the momentum entanglement of the two particles must be erased during their passage through the slits, and the center of mass position has to be distributed according to $|\psi|^2$.

In BQM, however, Born's probability principle is not so important as a primary rule and all particles follow well-defined tracks determined by the wave function $\psi(\mathbf{x}, t)$, using the guidance condition

$$\dot{\mathbf{x}}_i(\mathbf{x}, t) = \frac{\hbar}{m_i} Im(\frac{\nabla_i \psi(\mathbf{x}, t)}{\psi(\mathbf{x}, t)}) \tag{10}$$

with the unitary time development governed by Schrödinger's equation. Now, let us review the previous details, but this time in BQM frame. Based on our supposed EPR source, there are momentum and position entanglements between the two particles before they were arrived on the slits. Then, the wave function of the emerging particles from the slits suffers a transformation represented by Eq. (8). It is not necessary to know in details how this transformation acts, but what is important is that the two double-slit screens are considered to be completely identical. Thus, we expect that the two particles in the slits undergo the same transformation(s), and so the momentum entanglement, i.e. $p_1 + p_2 = 0$, must be still valid in BQM which is a deterministic theory, contrary to SQM. Then, according to Eq. (9), the validity of the momentum entanglement immediately leads to the position entanglement

$$y(t) = \frac{1}{2}(y_1(t) + y_2(t)) = 0. \tag{11}$$

We would like to point out that this entanglement is obtained by using the quantum wave function of the system. Therefore, the claim that the supposed position entanglement can not be understood by using the assumed wave function for the system is not correct. By the way, if we accepted that the momentum entanglement is not kept and consequently $y(0)$ obeys QEH, then deterministic property of BQM, which is a main property of this theory, must be withdrawn. However, it is well known that Bohm [4] put QEH only as a subsidiary constraint to ensure the consistency of the motion of an ensemble of particles with SQM's results. Thus, although in this experiment, the center of mass position of the two entangled particles turns out to be a constant in BQM frame, the position of each particle is consistent with QEH so that the final interference pattern is identical to what is predicted by SQM. Therefore, Bohm's aim concerning QEH is still satisfied and deterministic property of BQM is left intact. In addition, superluminal signals resulting from nonlocal conditions between our distant entangled particles are precisely masked by considering QEH for the distribution of each entangled particle.

So far, contrary to the belief of Struyve *et al.* [2] concerning QEH, we have shown that in BQM frame, the center of mass position of the two entangled particles can be considered to be a constant, without any distribution. So, this novel property provides a way to make a discrepancy between SQM and BQM, even for an ensemble of entangled particles. For instance, suppose that we only consider those pairs one of which arrives at the upper half of the right screen. Thus, BQM predicts that only detectors located on the lower half of the left screen become ON and the other ones are always OFF. In fact, we obtain two identical interference pattern at the upper half of the right screen and the lower half of the left screen. Instead, SQM is either silent or predicts a diluted interference pattern at the left screen. Therefore, concerning to the validity of the initial constraint $y(0) = 0$ in BQM, selecting of some pairs to obtain a desired pattern, which is called selective detection in [1], can be applied to evaluate the two theories, at the ensemble level of pairs.

In conclusion, the reason for the existence of these differences between SQM and BQM in this thought experiment is that, in BQM as a deterministic theory, the position and momentum entanglements are kept at the slits, while in SQM, due to its probabilistic interpretation, we must inevitably accept that the entanglements of the two particles are erased when the two particles pass through the slits. Meantime, the saved position entanglement in BQM, i.e. $y(0) = 0$, which is a result of the deterministic property of the theory is not inconsistent with QEH, because we are still able to reproduce SQM's prediction

for an ensemble of such particles, just as QEH requires. Therefore, our proposed experiment is still a suitable candidate to distinguish between the standard and Bohmian quantum mechanics. Furthermore, it is worthy to note that, based on a recent work on Bohmian trajectories for photons [5], the first effort for the realization of this type of experiment was performed by Brida *et al.* [6] very recently, using correlated photons produced in type I parametric down conversion. This can stimulate more serious and interesting discussions on the possible incompatibilities between SQM and BQM, both theoretically and experimentally.

References

[1] Golshani M and Akhavan O 2001 *J. Phys. A* **34** 5259, quant-ph/0103101
Note: the main text given after Eq. (26) to end of Eq. (27) was inadvertently repeated and should be omitted.

[2] Struyve W, De Baere W, De Neve J and De Weirdt S 2003 *J. Phys. A* **36** 1525

[3] Einstein A, Podolsky B and Rosen N 1935 *Phys. Rev.* **47** 777

[4] Bohm D 1952 *Phys. Rev.* **85** 166
Bohm D 1952 *Phys. Rev.* **85** 180

[5] Ghose P, Majumdar A S, Guha S and Sau J 2001 *Phys. Lett. A* **290** 205, quant-ph/0102071

[6] Brida G, Cagliero E, Falzetta G, Genovese M, Gramegna M and Novero C 2002 quant-ph/0206196