

What happens once an accelerating observer has detected a Rindler particle?

Angel Garcia-Chung^{1,2*}, Benito A. Juárez-Aubry^{3†}
and Daniel Sudarsky^{3‡}

¹Departamento de Física, Universidad Autónoma Metropolitana - Iztapalapa,
San Rafael Atlixco 186, Ciudad de México 09340, México.

²Universidad Panamericana,
Tecoyotitla 366. Col. Ex Hacienda Guadalupe Chimalistac, C.P. 01050 Ciudad de
México, México

³Departamento de Gravitación y Teoría de Campos, Instituto de Ciencias Nucleares,
Universidad Nacional Autónoma de México, A. Postal 70-543, Mexico City 045010,
Mexico

May 6, 2021

Abstract

In a seminal paper, Unruh and Wald found that the detection of a right Rindler particle by a linearly uniformly accelerated detector coupled to a free field in the Minkowski vacuum leads to the creation of a Minkowski particle from the inertial viewpoint. In this paper, we revisit the framework studied by Unruh and Wald, but now consider in addition what happens once the particle has been measured somewhere in the right Rindler wedge. We find that the such measurement induces changes to the expectation value of the stress-energy tensor in the left Rindler wedge, and opens the possibility for designing superluminal communication protocols between two spacelike separated observers confined to the right and left Rindler wedges respectively. We discuss the possible ways of avoiding such measurement-induced, faster-than-light signalling protocols, but it seems to us that the question remains open.

1 Introduction

In 1984 Unruh and Wald wrote a very influential paper [1] in which they studied what happens when a linearly uniformly accelerated observer detects a Rindler particle: From the point of view of an inertial observer in Minkowski spacetime, the absorption of a Rindler particle – modelled as a two-level detector excitation – corresponds to the emission of a Minkowski particle. [1] has become a standard reference in the literature of quantum field theory (QFT), and has helped clarify several conceptual issues arising in curved spacetimes, remarkably doing so in the context of a problem in flat spacetime involving accelerated observers. The paper not

*alechung@xanum.uam.mx

†benito.juarez@correo.nucleares.unam.mx

‡sudarsky@nucleares.unam.mx

only illustrated the relativity of the notions of particle, detection and emission, but clarified the fact that working in terms of quantum fields (and taking particles to have an operational meaning) is fully consistent with the basic ideas underlying the equivalence principle.

Furthermore, [1] has served as the starting ground for further developments. For example, the study of *bremssstrahlung* as seen from the point of view of accelerated observers [2, 3], the analysis of the decay of accelerated protons, and the remarkable finding that such behavior approaches that of accelerated neutrons, as the mass scale characterizing that acceleration – i.e., the corresponding Unruh temperature $T = k_B a / (2\pi)$ – increases and disappears exponentially as that quantity grows beyond the value of the proton-neutron mass gap [4, 5]. More generally, the Unruh effect [6] continues to be of great interest in theoretical physics, see e.g. [7] for a study of the problem as return to equilibrium, [8] for the characterisation of thermalisation time scales for Unruh-DeWitt detectors, [9] in the context of entanglement harvesting. The intimate relationship between the Unruh effect and black holes in equilibrium, which indeed originally motivated Unruh’s work [6], is by now well-established [10, Chap. 5], and can be seen very explicitly in two-dimensional situations [11]. [12, 13] include thorough discussions of the Unruh effect, including applications and structural properties.

In any case, it might seem quite surprising that there is anything else to be said by revisiting the situation analyzed in the seminal work of Unruh and Wald [1]. However, we have several motivations for doing so. In order to state our motivations, let us describe more precisely what has been achieved in [1], so we can thereafter state what the new insights of this work are with respect to what has been previously discussed.

1.1 Brief recount of [1]

The setting of [1], as is well known, considers a Klein-Gordon field in Minkowski spacetime initially in the Minkowski vacuum, interacting with a detector that undergoes constant proper acceleration with value a . The worldline of the detector is naturally described in Rindler coordinates, which can be used to cover Minkowski spacetime with four non-overlapping charts as follows. The Minkowski boost generator $b^a = a(x \partial_t^a + t \partial_x^a)$ defines a bifurcate Killing horizon at the origin of the Minkowski coordinates and divides the spacetime into four regions: Region I, where $|t| < x$ is the right Rindler wedge. Region II, where $|t| < -x$ is the left Rindler wedge. Region III and IV are defined by $|x| < t$ and $|x| < -t$ respectively. For the Unruh effect, one is mainly interested in regions I and II. In particular, the motion of a uniformly accelerated detector follows a boost orbit in the right Rindler wedge.

The Rindler wedge I is best described with Rindler coordinates (τ, ξ, y, z) in which the flat Minkowski line element takes the form.

$$ds^2 = e^{2a\xi}(d\tau^2 - d\xi^2) - dy^2 - dz^2. \quad (1)$$

Similarly, in the Rindler wedge II the line element takes an identical form with the replacements $\tau \leftrightarrow \tilde{\tau}$ and $\xi \leftrightarrow \tilde{\xi}$. Similar coordinates can be used for the future and past wedges but we shall not need to make use of those in the present context. For convenience and in order to connect with the typical language used in discussions about possible faster than light signaling, we will refer by Alice to an observer in Rindler wedge I, thinking of one moving with the detector along the world-line $\xi = 0$ and by Bob, to any observer whose world-line lies entirely on the Rindler wedge II, often also undergoing constant proper acceleration.

As is well known one might produce various quantum field theory constructions in any spacetime, which are in general not unitarily equivalent. In particular, in Minkowski spacetime there are two quantisation procedures that are natural, given the symmetries of the problem. The textbook construction is based on the notion of positive energy associated with the usual time translation isometry of Minkowski spacetime, and leads to a Fock space based on the

so-called Minkowski vacuum. In a uniformly accelerated frame, the natural quantisation is based on the positive-energy notion associated with the boost isometries generated by b^a in the Rindler wedges I (and II), where the corresponding Killing field is timelike, leading to a Fock space based on the so-called right (and left) Fulling-Rindler vacuum [14].

From the Fulling-Rindler viewpoint, the Minkowski vacuum corresponds to an entangled state involving all possible number of particles in each of the Rindler wedges I and II. Moreover, the reduced density operator representing the state in each one of the Rindler wedges is a thermal density operator at the positive Unruh temperature. Thus, a linearly uniformly accelerated observer in, say, the right Rindler wedge will perceive the Minkowski vacuum as a thermal state, importantly, at the Unruh temperature. (We give more details below in sec. 3.)

In this setting, there are three central questions that are addressed in [1]. The first one is to analyse the unitary evolution of the joint field-detector system when the field is initially in the Minkowski vacuum state and the two-level detector, initially switched off and prepared in the ground state, follows a linearly uniformly accelerated trajectory in the right Rindler wedge. This is done using perturbation theory in the interaction picture. The second question is to see what the updated state of the field is assuming the detector has detected a Rindler particle after some interaction time has elapsed, namely a one-particle state in the Minkowski folium, and to obtain the updated stress-energy tensor. It is found that, since the updated field state is a one-particle state, the energy of the field has increased upon detection. The third question that is addressed in [1] is whether detecting Rindler particles can be used as a mechanism for extracting an unbounded amount of energy from the field or to send a superluminal signal from the right to the left Rindler wedges. In both cases, the analysis leads to a negative answer.

1.2 Motivations or *why revisit* [1]?

On the one hand, we wish to revisit each one of the main questions addressed in [1]. On the other hand, additional motivations for the considerations of this article are provided by the recent works [15, 16] on the implications of certain simple *gedankenexperiments* about the quantum or classical nature of gravitation itself, the recent increase in attention of certain groups on experimental implications of plausible paths for the resolution of the measurement problem[17], the whole semi-classical gravity program[18] and recent works involving one of us on the fate of energy conservation in some of the most promising approaches to deal with that shortcoming in quantum theory [20].

For the first question the motivation might seem *a priori* somewhat academic. It is the following: In [1] the calculation of the field-detector evolution is carried out by exploiting an analogy with the situation of the evolution of a detector interacting with a field in a thermal state that describes a *proper mixture* [21], i.e., such that the actual state of the system is pure, but there is a degree of ignorance as to what the state of the system actually is, which is encoded in weights accounting for a probability distribution of the possible (pure) states of the system. This results in a mixed state description of a pure state due to ignorance. On the other hand, the most natural description for the Minkowski vacuum from the point of view of an accelerated observer is that of a thermal state as an *improper mixture* [21] (see footnote 2 for more details), as the left Rindler wedge degrees of freedom must be traced out, yielding a reduced mixed state.

In this work, we address this by working directly in the Fulling-Rindler representation and describing the Minkowski vacuum in the left and right Rindler wedges in a doubled Fock space from the start. In this way, there are no interpretative ambiguities as to what the physical picture of the system is. Naturally, since the difference between the proper and improper mixtures plays no mathematical rôle, the result obtained here is consistent with the one obtained with Unruh and Wald.

We proceed to address the second central question of [1] and obtain the renormalised stress-energy tensor for the field once a Rindler particle has been detected. The upshot of working directly in double Fock space is that we can obtain an explicit expression for the stress-energy tensor in the left Rindler wedge, adding to the result displayed in [1] for the right Rindler wedge, as we show in sec. 4. Here we must emphasise that, while Unruh and Wald present an argument for the conservation *on average* of the energy of the system for successive measurements, which prevents the indefinite extraction of energy from the field by means of detectors, the energy is *not conserved* for a single measurement.

This allows us to revisit the third question addressed in [1], that of the possibility of sending faster-than-light signals from the right Rindler wedge to the left Rindler wedge. As Unruh and Wald correctly point out in their discussion of Sec. IV in [1], the presence of a detector (switched on or otherwise) in the right Rindler wedge has no influence on the left Rindler wedge. Their argument is based on the Heisenberg-picture observation that the effects of the detector can only affect the causal future of the coupling region between the detector and the field. In fact, this observation does not even depend on the details of the detector or the field observables, see e.g. [22] for a precise statement in some generality. The limitation of that argument is that it does not take into account the non-unitary measurement of the detector, which is typically described as a projection in the out-state in the interaction picture.

So, indeed, as long as the detector has not been excited¹, there cannot be superluminal effects in the left Rindler wedge. Once a detection of a particle has taken place, the state of the field must be updated, and this does have an effect on the left Rindler wedge for the state update rule in QFT (and in quantum mechanics) is a non-local operation. The situation is aggravated by the fact that there is no preferred choice of reference frame in which the state “collapse” should take place. Indeed, can one think of that occurring in the past null cone of the event where the detector is excited or in any other arbitrary Cauchy surface including this spacetime point? While this is a highly non-trivial issue, some general arguments indicate that the state collapse cannot be taken to occur, say, along the future null cone of the region associated to the measurement event, for otherwise space-like correlations, as those occurring in, say, an EPR-B setting could not be accounted for, which is unacceptable and inconsistent with experiments.

It seems therefore that the measurement will have some effect in at least some region inside the left Rindler wedge, and that the expectation value of the stress-energy tensor could change in this region. We must then reassess the question of whether any superluminal signal can be sent from the right Rindler wedge and read out in the left Rindler wedge, say, by some precision experiment that could detect a change in the stress-energy tensor of the field detected through gravitational effects.

In any case, it is clear that it is the actualisation of the excitation (often identified with the “act of measurement”), and which is poorly understood in quantum theory, what seems to potentially give rise to faster-than-light signaling. Thus, it seems to us that this issue is in connection with the so-called measurement problem of quantum theory, which we shall very briefly discuss in the next section.

Before doing so, it is worthwhile emphasising that any kind of superluminal signaling, if taken together with the equivalence of inertial frames, would have very dramatic and quite disturbing consequences, even if such signaling protocol were not completely reliable, as long as the receiver can be sufficiently sure that the signal they read was emitted by the expected sender.

¹We will not need to get here into whether this actual change in the detector is to be considered to be the result of a measurement taken to be associated with an actual read out somewhere in the right Rindler wedge by an observer as in the Copenhagen interpretation, or as a result of something else as in other approaches to quantum theory.

To illustrate this consider A and B two spacelike-separated events. Alice, an observer at A, might take the decision to send a signal to Bob at event B using a communication protocol that has, say, a reliability of 0.1% success, in the sense that after deciding to send the signal, the probability that Bob receives it, is just one in a thousand. We note that there is an inertial reference frame in which event B is earlier than A (according to the standard Minkowski time coordinate in that reference frame). The equivalence of inertial frames then ensures that Bob can send a signal with reliability 0.1% to an event C, which is spacelike-separated from B, but that lies in the actual temporal past of A.

Let us say also that C is an event through which Charly's worldline passes, and that his world line is arranged to pass later on, through a designated event lying "just to the past" of A, and assume that in the remote past Alice and Carlos had agreed that Alice will send a signal only when in a specific roulette in certain Casino, the number 25 comes out, in say, the first run of the hour. Evidently Charly can take advantage of that, by simply placing a huge bet on 25 any time he receives a signal from Alice, and do nothing when he does not. They might have to repeat the procedure a million times or more (due to the low reliability of the signaling process) but eventually they will come out millionaires.

Examples of this kind seem extremely problematic, and thus, we take the position that there must be something at play in physical laws, which prevents anything like this taking place. We will consider in the remainder of the paper a simple situation in which what exactly would play that role seems to be rather unclear.

1.3 Organisation of the paper

After this introduction, for completeness Sec. 2 gives a brief account of the measurement problem in quantum theory, although the details of that section have no effect in the practical calculations that we present here. Sec. 3 includes some preliminary material, including the textbook and Fulling-Rindler quantisations of a field in Minkowski spacetime, and how the Minkowski state can be formally seen as a thermal state when restricted to, say, the right Rindler wedge. In Sec. 4 we describe the evolution of the field-detector system using a left and right doubled Fock space representation for the field, and we obtain the stress-energy tensor after a Rindler particle has been measured. Our results agree with those of Unruh and Wald in the right Rindler wedge [1], but we also obtain results valid on the left Rindler wedge. We then discuss the non-conservation of energy upon measurements in Sec. 5 in a simplified setting, for the sake of clarity. The possibility of faster than light signalling, its implications and potential avoidances appear in Sec. 6. Discussions and conclusions appear in Sec. 7.

2 Brief recount of the so-called measurement problem in quantum theory

As we have mentioned in the introduction, the actual measurement of a Rindler particle by a particle detector brings some difficulties that need to be resolved, and which seem to be linked more generally to the "fuzziness" of the description of the *act of measurement* in quantum theory. It seems to us that the conceptual difficulties collectively known as the *measurement problem* afflict not only "textbook" quantum theory conceptually, but also the way quantum theory is actually used by the working physicist, here exemplified by an apparently innocuous example.

Despite being overlooked in many practical applications in physics, the literature on the measurement problem is quite large, and the positions taken in the face of it varied. We do not intend to discuss them in detail. It suffices for us to mention that the paths to overcome

the measurement problem have been classified by Maudlin [17] as follows: It is internally inconsistent to hold simultaneously the following three propositions about a quantum theory:

- (i) The description of a physical system as provided by the quantum state or wave function is complete.
- (ii) The evolution of the quantum state is always dictated by the Schrödinger equation (or its relativistic generalisations).
- (iii) Individual experiments produce definite (even if often unpredictable) results.

Thus, one must negate at least one of (i)-(iii) above. Negating (i) leads down, in general, the path of the so-called *hidden variable theories*, of which the de Broglie-Bohm theory is the best known example [23]. Negating (ii) implies that the collapse or reduction of the wave function plays a central rôle, as in the Copenhagen textbook interpretation, as well as in so-called *spontaneous collapse* or *dynamical state reduction* theories, such as GRW, CSL, Penrose-Diósi, etc [24, 25, 26, 27, 28, 29, 30]. The negation of (iii) leads to *many-worlds-* or *many-minds-*type interpretations [31, 32].

We should stress in regard to (ii) that a central difference between the Copenhagen interpretation, as axiomatised by von Neumann, and interpretations based on spontaneous collapse is the rôle played by “observers” or “measuring devices”. In the latter theories observers are treated in a unified way and obey the same evolution equation as the *observed systems* of interest, with the drawback that there is still no fundamentally-derived theory of spontaneous collapse. In the Copenhagen interpretation, observers are interpreted as *external* to the theory, resulting in a lack of clarity regarding what the ontology of quantum theory really is. An interesting viewpoint, which is rather popular, is the claim that decoherence clarifies the situation for the Copenhagen interpretation, but this view has been refuted on a number of occasions, e.g. in [33, 34, 35]. A discussion on the subject could deserve a paper in its own right and, as we mentioned, it is not our purpose to go into details. We point the reader to works such as [17] for more elaborate versions of the various positions vis-à-vis the interpretations of quantum theory as well as the criticism offered by their detractors.

Fortunately, for computational purposes, such interpretative issues do not play a central role – at least as far as the specific analysis of the situation at hand is concerned. We can simply follow the authors of [1] in taking the viewpoint that the detector will end up – after some time has elapsed – in a detector energy eigenstate, that is either excited or unexcited, and computationally we overlook the details of how this comes to happen. Afterwards, we can analyze what happens once a Rindler particle has been detected.

3 Preliminaries

We briefly recall here the quantisation of the Klein-Gordon theory in Minkowski and Rindler spacetimes, and how the Minkowski vacuum can be seen formally as a thermal state when restricted to one of the Rindler wedges, and particularly to the right Rindler wedge. This observation is at the heart of the Unruh effect.

3.1 Quantisation in Minkowski spacetime

We consider first the quantisation a real Klein-Gordon field, Φ , in Minkowski spacetime, $(\mathbb{R}^4, \eta_{ab})$, with the line element given by:

$$ds^2 = dt^2 - dx^2 - dy^2 - dz^2, \tag{2}$$

obeying the field equation

$$(\square + m^2)\Phi = (\partial_t^2 - \Delta + m^2)\Phi = 0, \quad (3)$$

where Δ is the Laplacian operator in \mathbb{R}^3 and m is the mass of the scalar field. Given (say, Schwartz) initial data at $\Phi|_{t=0} = f$ and $\partial_t\Phi|_{t=0} = g$, the classical solutions to the Klein-Gordon equation take the form

$$\Phi(t, \vec{x}) = \frac{1}{(2\pi)^{3/2}} \int_{\mathbb{R}^3} d^3k e^{i\vec{k}\cdot\vec{x}} \left(\cos(\omega_{\vec{k}}t) \mathcal{F}[f](\vec{k}) + \frac{\sin(\omega_{\vec{k}}t)}{\omega_{\vec{k}}} \mathcal{F}[g](\vec{x}) \right), \quad (4)$$

where $\omega_{\vec{k}} := \sqrt{\vec{k}^2 + m^2}$ and $\mathcal{F}[\cdot]$ is the Fourier transform operator, and form a vector space, S . In order to quantise, we complexify the solution space to $S^{\mathbb{C}}$, whereby solutions now take the form

$$\Phi(t, \vec{x}) = \int d^3\vec{k} \left[b(\vec{k}) f_{\vec{k}}(t, \vec{x}) + \overline{b(\vec{k})} \overline{f_{\vec{k}}}(t, \vec{x}) \right], \quad (5)$$

with the coefficients $b(\vec{k})$ related to the Fourier transforms of initial data, and where the modes take the form

$$f_{\vec{k}}(t, \vec{x}) = \frac{e^{-i(\omega(\vec{k})t - \vec{k}\cdot\vec{x})}}{[2(2\pi)^3\omega_{\vec{k}}]^{1/2}}. \quad (6)$$

The solution space can be equipped with the pairing

$$\langle \phi_1 | \phi_2 \rangle := i \int_{\mathbb{R}^3} d^3x \left[\overline{\phi_1}(\partial_t \phi_2) - (\partial_t \overline{\phi_1}) \phi_2 \right], \quad (7)$$

and indeed the modes $f_{\vec{k}}$ are Dirac-orthonormal with respect to this pairing, i.e.,

$$\langle f_{\vec{k}} | f_{\vec{k}'} \rangle = -\langle \overline{f_{\vec{k}}} | \overline{f_{\vec{k}'}} \rangle = \delta(\vec{k} - \vec{k}'), \quad \langle f_{\vec{k}} | \overline{f_{\vec{k}'}} \rangle = 0. \quad (8)$$

The one-particle Hilbert space of the theory is the positive-frequency projection of the complexified solutions with respect to ∂_t^a , completed with respect to the norm defined by the pairing (7), which is an inner product in the positive-frequency subspace. We denote it by $\mathcal{H} := KS^{\mathbb{C}}$, where the K map denotes the projection. The bosonic Fock space is defined as usual,

$$\mathcal{F} := \mathbb{C} \oplus_{n=1}^{\infty} \mathcal{H}^{\otimes_s n}. \quad (9)$$

Creation and annihilation operators act in the usual way on Fock space vectors and satisfy the canonical commutation relations (CCR). Namely, for $u, v \in \mathcal{H}$, $[\widehat{b}(\overline{u}), \widehat{b}^*(v)] = \langle u | v \rangle \mathbb{1}$ and $[\widehat{b}(\overline{u}), \widehat{b}^*(\overline{v})] = [\widehat{b}^*(u), \widehat{b}^*(v)] = 0$. Importantly, the annihilation operator annihilates the Minkowski vacuum, $|\Omega_M\rangle$, i.e.,

$$\widehat{b}(\overline{u})|\Omega_M\rangle = 0. \quad (10)$$

The field observables are self-adjoint operator-valued distributions on \mathcal{F} . Denoting by $E : C_0^\infty(\mathbb{R}^4) \rightarrow C^\infty(\mathbb{R}^4)$ the causal propagator of the Klein-Gordon operator, we have that for $f \in C_0^\infty(\mathbb{R}^4)$

$$\widehat{\Phi}(f) := i\widehat{b}(\overline{KEf}) - i\widehat{b}^*(KEf), \quad (11)$$

where $K : S_I^{\mathbb{C}} \rightarrow \mathcal{H}$ is the positive-frequency projection map with respect to a usual time translation Killing field in Minkowski spacetime. The distributional kernel of the field observable can be written in the usual way as

$$\widehat{\Phi}(t, \vec{x}) = \int_{\mathbb{R}^3} d^3k \left(f_{\vec{k}}(t, \vec{x}) \widehat{b}_{\vec{k}} + \overline{f_{\vec{k}}}(t, \vec{x}) \widehat{b}_{\vec{k}}^* \right), \quad (12)$$

where the formal sharp-momentum annihilation and creation operators are $\widehat{b}_{\vec{k}} := \widehat{b}(\overline{f_{\vec{k}}})$ and $\widehat{b}_{\vec{k}}^* := \widehat{b}^*(f_{\vec{k}})$ respectively.

3.2 Quantisation in Rindler spacetime

As we have mentioned above, the boost generators $b^a = a(x\partial_t^a + t\partial_x^a)$ define a bifurcate Killing horizon at the origin of the coordinates of Minkowski spacetime and divide the spacetime into four regions: Region I, where $|t| < x$ is the right Rindler wedge. Region II, where $|t| < -x$ is the left Rindler wedge. Region III and IV are defined by $|x| < t$ and $|x| < -t$ respectively. Each of these regions can be seen as a globally hyperbolic spacetime in its own right, but we will be interested in regions I and II.

In the right Rindler wedge, b^a is everywhere timelike and defines a natural notion of time. Viewing region I as a globally hyperbolic spacetime in its own right, the quantisation of a Klein-Gordon field can be carried out analogously to the previous section, based now on the notion of positive frequency with respect to boosts. Let us denote by R the region I described above. The right Rindler spacetime is (R, η) . It is natural to cover the spacetime with Rindler coordinates

$$t = \frac{1}{a}e^{a\xi} \sinh(a\tau), \quad x = \frac{1}{a}e^{a\xi} \cosh(a\tau), \quad (13)$$

whereby the line element takes the form

$$ds^2 = e^{2a\xi} (d\tau^2 - d\xi^2) - dy^2 - dz^2. \quad (14)$$

The Klein-Gordon equation (3) written in these coordinates takes the form

$$\frac{\partial^2}{\partial \tau^2} \Phi(\tau, \xi, y, z) = \frac{\partial^2}{\partial \xi^2} \Phi(\tau, \xi, y, z) + e^{2a\xi} \left(\frac{\partial^2}{\partial y^2} \Phi(\tau, \xi, y, z) + \frac{\partial^2}{\partial z^2} \Phi(\tau, \xi, y, z) - m^2 \Phi(\tau, \xi, y, z) \right). \quad (15)$$

The solutions to eq. (15) have been first studied in [14]. For our purposes, we quote the complexified solutions to (15), which form a vector space $S_I^{\mathbb{C}}$ and take the general form

$$\Phi(\tau, \xi, y, z) = \int d\vec{\kappa} [a_I(\vec{\kappa})v_{I\vec{\kappa}}(\tau, \xi, y, z) + \overline{a_I(\vec{\kappa})}\overline{v_{I\vec{\kappa}}}(\tau, \xi, y, z)], \quad (16)$$

where $\vec{\kappa}$ denotes the tuple $(\omega, \kappa_y, \kappa_z)$, (here $\omega > 0$) and the right Rindler modes are

$$v_I(\vec{\kappa}; \tau, \xi, y, z) = \sqrt{\frac{\sinh(\frac{\pi\omega}{a})}{4\pi^4 a}} K_{i\omega/a} \left[\frac{\sqrt{\kappa_y^2 + \kappa_z^2 + m^2}}{a} e^{a\xi} \right] e^{-i\omega\tau + i(y\kappa_y + z\kappa_z)}. \quad (17)$$

where K_ν is the modified Bessel function of second kind or MacDonald's function of order ν . The Rindler modes are Dirac orthonormal with respect to the pairing

$$\langle \phi_1 | \phi_2 \rangle_I := i \int_{\mathbb{R}^3} d\text{vol}_\Sigma n^a [\overline{\phi_1}(\nabla_a \phi_2) - (\nabla_a \overline{\phi_1})\phi_2], \quad (18)$$

where Σ is a constant τ Cauchy surface in the right Rindler spacetime with normal n^a . This means that

$$\langle v_I(\vec{\kappa}_1) | v_I(\vec{\kappa}_2) \rangle_I = -\langle \overline{v_I(\vec{\kappa}_1)} | \overline{v_I(\vec{\kappa}_2)} \rangle_I = \delta(\vec{\kappa}_1 - \vec{\kappa}_2), \quad \langle v_I(\vec{\kappa}_1) | \overline{v_I(\vec{\kappa}_2)} \rangle_I = 0. \quad (19)$$

The one-particle Hilbert space of the theory in the right Rindler spacetime, \mathcal{H}_I , is defined by the projection to positive-frequency solutions with respect to b^a , completed with respect to the norm induced by the inner product (18). The bosonic Fock space of the theory is constructed as usual

$$\mathcal{F}_I := \mathbb{C} \oplus_{n=1}^{\infty} \mathcal{H}_I^{\otimes n}. \quad (20)$$

Creation and annihilation operators act in the usual way on Fock space vectors and satisfy the canonical commutation relations (CCR). Namely, for $u, v \in \mathbb{H}_I$, $[\widehat{a}_I(\overline{u}), \widehat{a}_I^*(v)] = \langle u|v \rangle_I \mathbb{1}$ and $[\widehat{a}_I(\overline{u}), \widehat{a}_I^*(\overline{v})] = [\widehat{a}_I^*(u), \widehat{a}_I^*(v)] = 0$. Importantly, the annihilation operator do not annihilate the Minkowski vacuum, but rather the Fulling-Rindler vacuum, $|\Omega_I\rangle$, i.e.

$$\widehat{a}_I(\overline{u})|\Omega_I\rangle = 0. \quad (21)$$

The field observables are self-adjoint operator-valued distributions on \mathcal{F}_I . For $f \in C_0^\infty(R)$,

$$\widehat{\Phi}(f) := i\widehat{a}_I(\overline{K_I E f}) - i\widehat{a}_I^*(K_I E f), \quad (22)$$

where $K_I : S_I^{\mathbb{C}} \rightarrow \mathcal{H}_I$ is the positive-frequency projection map with respect to b^a . The distributional kernel of the field observable can be written in the usual way as

$$\widehat{\Phi}(\tau, \xi, y, z) = \int_{\mathbb{R}^+ \times \mathbb{R}^2} d^3\kappa \left(v_{I\vec{\kappa}}(\tau, \xi, y, z) \widehat{a}_{I\vec{\kappa}} + \overline{v_{I\vec{\kappa}}}(t, \xi, y, z) \widehat{a}_{I\vec{\kappa}}^* \right), \quad (23)$$

where the formal sharp-momentum annihilation and creation operators are $\widehat{a}_{I\vec{\kappa}} := \widehat{a}(\overline{v_{I\vec{\kappa}}})$ and $\widehat{a}_{I\vec{\kappa}}^* := \widehat{a}^*(v_{I\vec{\kappa}})$ respectively.

A similar construction can be carried out in the left Rindler wedge with the construction based on a left Fulling-Rindler vacuum $|\Omega_{II}\rangle \in \mathcal{F}_{II} := \oplus_n \mathcal{H}_{II}^{\otimes n}$ and the field $\widehat{\Phi}$ can be represented in terms of left annihilation and creation operators.

3.3 The Minkowski vacuum as a thermal state

An argument to see that the Minkowski vacuum is a thermal state when restricted to a Rindler wedge relies on the observation [1, 6, 12, 14] that the linear combinations

$$F_{1\vec{\kappa}} = (1 - e^{-2\pi\omega a})^{-1/2} (v_{I\vec{\kappa}} + e^{-\pi\omega/a} + \overline{v_{II\vec{\kappa}}}), \quad (24a)$$

$$F_{2\vec{\kappa}} = (1 - e^{-2\pi\omega a})^{-1/2} (v_{II\vec{\kappa}} + e^{-\pi\omega/a} + \overline{v_{I\vec{\kappa}}}) \quad (24b)$$

are positive-frequency modes with respect to $\partial_{t_2}^a$, and can be seen formally as elements of the one-particle Hilbert space \mathcal{H} . Hence, formally $\widehat{A}_M(F_{1\vec{\kappa}})|\Omega_M\rangle = \widehat{A}_M(F_{2\vec{\kappa}})|\Omega_M\rangle = 0$. It follows that the Minkowski vacuum admits the formal representation [1, eq. (2.21)]

$$|\Omega_M\rangle = \prod_j \left(\sqrt{1 - e^{-2\pi\omega_j/a}} \sum_{n_j} \left(e^{-\pi\omega_j/a} \right)^{n_j} |n_{jI}\rangle \otimes |n_{jII}\rangle \right). \quad (25)$$

Where the index j runs over the complete set of Rindler modes which here are understood as discrete sharply-peaked wave packets concentrated around $\vec{\kappa}_j := (\omega_j, \kappa_{y_j}, \kappa_{z_j})$ and $|n_{jI}\rangle$ and $|n_{jII}\rangle$ denote an n -Rindler particle state in the regions I and II respectively.

A representation of the field acting on the doubled Fock space $\mathcal{F} \otimes \mathcal{F}$ is the following,

$$\begin{aligned} \widehat{\Phi}(\tau, \xi, y, z) &= \int_{\mathbb{R}^+ \times \mathbb{R}^2} d^3\kappa \left[\left(\widehat{A}_{I\vec{\kappa}} v_{I\vec{\kappa}}(\tau, \xi, y, z) + \widehat{A}_{I\vec{\kappa}}^* \overline{v_{I\vec{\kappa}}}(\tau, \xi, y, z) \right) \Theta_I \otimes \mathbb{1}_{II} + \right. \\ &\quad \left. + \mathbb{1}_I \otimes \left(\widehat{A}_{II\vec{\kappa}} v_{II\vec{\kappa}}(\tilde{\tau}, \tilde{\xi}, y, z) + \widehat{A}_{II\vec{\kappa}}^* \overline{v_{II\vec{\kappa}}}(\tilde{\tau}, \tilde{\xi}, y, z) \right) \Theta_{II} \right], \quad (26) \end{aligned}$$

where $\tilde{\tau}$ and $\tilde{\xi}$ are left Rindler coordinates and Θ_I and Θ_{II} are Heaviside distributions equal to unity in the right and left Rindler wedges respectively and vanishing elsewhere.

Taking a partial trace over, say, the left Rindler modes in eq. (25) yields a thermal state in the right Rindler wedge.

4 What happens once an accelerating observer has detected a Rindler particle

Here we will offer a brief review of the central aspects of the discussion in [1] which will serve as the basis for our analysis, but we will also point to certain aspects in which we will depart from it. For instance, consider the discussion in section IV of [1], in which the authors argue that measuring a particle in the right Rindler wedge does not open a path to sending a superluminal signal to an observer in the left Rindler wedge. The argument of [1] is of course mathematically correct, but it relies on the unitary part of the dynamics of standard quantum theory. Hence, it does not consider the more problematic aspect of quantum theory, namely the reduction or collapse of the quantum state that takes place when a measurement is involved. This aspect however will be an essential component of the present discussion, and a central question we are interested in considering is – as the title implies – what has happened once a detector has actually been excited by one of the particles present in the thermal bath characterising Minkowski state, as perceived by the accelerated observers. That detection in fact represents a non-unitary, non-local and non-deterministic change in the state of the field-detector system is the aspect we want to focus on. Once such aspect is added into the picture, the questions regarding causality and faster-than-light communication must be reassessed.

In order to start the exploration of such issues we will evaluate the change in the expectation value of the stress-energy tensor on the second Rindler wedge (i.e., that which does not contain the detector) in the collapsed state of the field corresponding to the situation “*after*” the actual excitation of the detector. We have used the word *after* in *italics* in recognition of the rather problematic fact that for any event A in the first Rindler wedge and any event B in the second Rindler wedge, the time ordering is not well defined, i.e., it will depend on the choice of inertial reference frame within which one chooses to describe the situation.

We will leave the discussion of the implications concerning the delicate issue of faster-than-light communication for later and, for the moment, we shall focus in the next sections on the direct mathematical calculation of the change in the expectation value of the stress-energy tensor, considering the post-collapse state in the two Rindler wedges.

Consider as in [1] a particle detector coupled to a Klein-Gordon field in Minkowski spacetime following a linearly uniformly accelerated trajectory with acceleration a in the right Rindler wedge. In other words, the particle detector follows the integral curve generated by the boost b^a . While currently the Unruh-DeWitt detector [36, 37, 8] is the most prominent detector model used in studies about the relativistic quantum information and QFT in curved spacetime literature, we shall model our detector as Unruh and Wald have in [1] to stay closer to their original treatment.

The detector is treated as a two-level system with Hilbert space \mathbb{C}^2 spanned by energy eigenstates $|\uparrow\rangle$ and $|\downarrow\rangle$. The detector Hamiltonian is $\hat{H}_D := \Omega \hat{A}^* \hat{A}$, where \hat{A} and \hat{A}^* are raising and lowering operators, and $\Omega > 0$ is the energy of the excited state, i.e., $\hat{H}_D |\uparrow\rangle = \Omega |\uparrow\rangle$ and $\hat{H}_D |\downarrow\rangle = 0$.

The coupled detector-field theory is described by the interaction Hamiltonian

$$\hat{H} = \hat{H}_D \otimes \mathbb{1} + \mathbb{1}_D \otimes \hat{H}_\Phi + \hat{H}_I, \quad (27)$$

where \hat{H}_Φ is the Klein-Gordon Hamiltonian and the interaction Hamiltonian is defined by

$$\hat{H}_I(\tau) = \epsilon(\tau) \int_{\Sigma} e^{2a\xi} d\xi dy dz \left[\psi(\xi, y, z) \hat{A}(\tau) + \bar{\psi}(\xi, y, z) \hat{A}^*(\tau) \right] \hat{\Phi}(\tau, \xi, y, z), \quad (28)$$

where $\psi \in C_0^\infty(\Sigma)$ defines the profile of the spatial extension of the detector and $\epsilon \in C_0^\infty(M)$ is a switching function that controls the interaction between the detector and the Klein-Gordon

field along the linearly uniformly accelerated trajectory of the detector. We shall assume that the interaction between the detector and the field is weaker than any other scale in the problem and that it takes place for sufficiently long times.

We consider that the state of the system is prepared initially (before the switch-on of ϵ) as the tensor product

$$|s_{-\infty}\rangle = |\downarrow\rangle \otimes |\Omega_M\rangle. \quad (29)$$

In the interaction picture, the late-time state of the system (after the switch-off of ϵ) is given by

$$\begin{aligned} |s_\infty\rangle &= T\left(e^{-i\int_{\mathbb{R}} d\tau \hat{H}_I}\right) |s_{-\infty}\rangle, \\ &= |s_{-\infty}\rangle + \left[-i\int_{\mathbb{R}} d\tau \hat{H}_I + O(\epsilon^2)\right] |s_{-\infty}\rangle, \end{aligned} \quad (30)$$

where in the second line we have used the assumption that the coupling is weak. To first order in perturbation theory, the late-time state of the system is

$$|s_\infty\rangle = |\downarrow\rangle \otimes |\Omega_M\rangle - i|\uparrow\rangle \otimes \int_{\mathbb{R}^+ \times \mathbb{R}^2} d\omega d^2\kappa \widetilde{\Gamma}_-(\vec{\kappa}) \hat{A}_I(\omega, \vec{\kappa}_\perp) |\Omega_M\rangle, \quad (31)$$

where the function $\widetilde{\Gamma}_-$ is related to $\gamma := \overline{\Gamma}_-$ as defined in [1] by a spectral transformation (with respect to the operator defining the eigenvalue problem in eq. (15)), and is given by

$$\begin{aligned} \widetilde{\Gamma}_-(\vec{\kappa}) &= \int_{\mathbb{R}} d\tau' \epsilon(\tau') e^{i(\Omega-\omega)\tau'} \int d\xi dy dz \psi(\xi, y, z) v_{I\vec{\kappa}}(0, \xi, y, z) e^{2a\xi} e^{i\vec{\kappa}_\perp \cdot \vec{x}_\perp}, \\ &= \mathcal{F}[\epsilon](\Omega - \omega) \int d\xi dy dz \psi(\xi, y, z) v_{I\vec{\kappa}}(0, \xi, y, z) e^{2a\xi} e^{i\vec{\kappa}_\perp \cdot \vec{x}_\perp}, \end{aligned} \quad (32)$$

where $\mathcal{F}[\epsilon]$ is the Fourier transform of the switching function of the detector. In [1] it is assumed that $\epsilon(\tau)$ vanishes for $|\tau| \gg T$ and is roughly constant for $|\tau| < T$, where T is a sufficiently long time during which the detector is switched on. We make the same assumption here. This implies that the Fourier transform, $\mathcal{F}[\epsilon]$, will be highly concentrated near $\Omega - \omega = 0$. In the formal limit $\epsilon \rightarrow 1$ this is a Dirac delta. Assuming that the coupled system is switched on for sufficiently long time, we make the approximation $F[\epsilon](\omega) = \epsilon_0 \delta(\Omega - \omega)$. The physical interpretation of the approximation is to disregard the switching effects of the detector on the field. With this approximation, the function $\widetilde{\Gamma}_-$ can now be written as

$$\widetilde{\Gamma}_-(\vec{\kappa}) = \delta(\Omega - \omega) \chi(\vec{\kappa}_\perp), \quad (33)$$

where we have defined

$$\chi(\vec{\kappa}_\perp) = \epsilon_0 \int_{\mathbb{R}^2} d\xi dy dz \overline{\Psi}(\xi, y, z) v_{I\vec{\kappa}}(0, \xi, y, z) e^{2a\xi} e^{i\vec{\kappa}_\perp \cdot \vec{x}_\perp}. \quad (34)$$

Consequently, in this approximation only the mode with energy concentrated around $\omega_j = \Omega$ of the initial state of the field $|\Omega_M\rangle$ appearing in the second term of (31) will be excited, i.e.,

$$|s_\infty\rangle = |\downarrow\rangle \otimes |\Omega_M\rangle - i|\uparrow\rangle \otimes \left[\prod_j \left(N_j \sum_{n_j} \left(e^{-\pi\omega_j/a} \right)^{n_j} |r_{n_j I}\rangle \otimes |n_{j II}\rangle \right) \right]. \quad (35)$$

where the state $|r_{n_j I}\rangle$ is given as

$$|r_{n_j I}\rangle = \begin{cases} \chi(\vec{\kappa}_\perp j) \sqrt{n_j} |(n-1)_{jI}\rangle & \text{for } j = \{\Omega, \vec{\kappa}_\perp\}, \\ |n_{jI}\rangle & \text{for } j \neq \{\Omega, \vec{\kappa}_\perp\}. \end{cases} \quad (36)$$

We now examine the situation in which a Rindler particle has been actually detected. The rules of quantum theory postulate that the state of the field is updated to

$$|f_M\rangle = -i \left[\prod_j \left(\tilde{N}_j \sum_{n_j} \left(e^{-\pi\omega_j/a} \right)^{n_j} |r_{n_j I}\rangle \otimes |n_{jII}\rangle \right) \right], \quad (37)$$

where the factor \tilde{N}_j , defined as

$$\tilde{N}_j := \begin{cases} \frac{2 \sinh(\pi\omega_j/a)}{|\chi(\vec{\kappa}_\perp j)|} & \text{for } j = \{\Omega, \vec{\kappa}_\perp\}, \\ \sqrt{1 - e^{-2\pi\omega_j/a}} & \text{for } j \neq \{\Omega, \vec{\kappa}_\perp\}, \end{cases}$$

guarantees the normalisation of the state.

Let us now compute the expectation value of the stress-energy tensor in the state $|f_M\rangle$ given in (37). Note that the central difference with the calculation in [1] is that we do not treat the state of the system as an improper² thermal mixture in the right Rindler wedge, but rather as a state defined in the right and left Rindler wedges, which allows us to obtain the renormalised expectation value of the stress energy tensor for points in the right and left Rindler wedges.

The classical stress-energy tensor of a Klein-Gordon field is

$$t_{\mu\nu}[\phi](x) = (\nabla_\mu \phi) (\nabla_\nu \phi) - \frac{1}{2} g_{\mu\nu} [(\nabla_\sigma \phi) (\nabla^\sigma \phi) + m^2 \phi^2]. \quad (38)$$

Using a point-splitting regularisation we can subtract the expectation value of the stress-energy tensor in the Minkowski vacuum from the expectation value of the stress-energy tensor in the state $|f_M\rangle$ and obtain the renormalised stress-energy tensor in the updated state.

In the Rindler wedge I , the expectation value of the stress-energy tensor is consistent with the one obtained in eq. (4.3) of [1], namely

$$\begin{aligned} \langle f_M | \hat{T}_{\mu\nu}^{\text{ren}}(x) | f_M \rangle_I &= \lim_{y \rightarrow x} \left[\langle f_M | \hat{T}_{\mu\nu}(x, y) | f_M \rangle - \langle \Omega_M | \hat{T}_{\mu\nu}(x, y) | \Omega_M \rangle \right], \\ &= \frac{e^{-2\pi\Omega/a}}{(1 - e^{-2\pi\Omega/a})} t_{\mu\nu}[v_{I\{\Omega, \kappa_\perp\}}](x). \end{aligned} \quad (39)$$

²We use here the terminology introduced by d’Espagnat [21] to clarify that the same mathematical object, a density matrix, can be used to represent two very different physical situations: 1) The case in which one is interested in an ensemble of identical quantum systems, each one of which is in one pure and definite quantum state among a list possible such states $\{|i\rangle\}$ and where the fraction of such states in the ensemble is given by a certain classical distribution function $f(i)$, and 2) the case in which a system of interest S is a subsystem of a larger system $S + E$ with the latter in a given pure quantum state, but with our interest focused just on S which can therefore be characterised in terms of the reduced density matrix obtained after tracing over the DOF of E . For the first case one reserves the name “proper mixture” and says the density matrix represents such proper mixture, and for the second case one reserves the name improper mixture and equally indicates the density matrix, is to be understood as representing the “proper mixture”. We note that another situation one might want to consider, is one in which one is dealing with a single quantum system S which is in a pure state, which however is not completely known, and for which one has information about the classical probability $p(i)$ of the system being in each one of the quantum states. For such situation one can often use the characterisation provided by case 1) by considering a corresponding imaginary ensemble, in which the fraction is arranged to match the given probability i.e $f(i) = p(i)$. That situation one also talks by extension about a improper mixture, even though the state of the system is pure, and the “improperness” is just a result of our ignorance. Finally, as is usual a density matrix is characterised as thermal if its representation in the energy basis has the standard thermal weights. Thus a thermal density matrix can be proper or improper.

In the Rindler wedge II , we obtain that

$$\langle f_M | \widehat{T}_{\mu\nu}^{\text{ren}}(x) | f_M \rangle_{II} = \frac{1}{(1-e^{-2\pi\Omega/a})} t_{\mu\nu}[v_{II\{\Omega,\kappa_{\perp}\}}](x). \quad (40)$$

The central point of the section is that a measurement that occurs in the right Rindler wedge has non-trivial effects on the causally-disconnected left Rindler wedge, as shown explicitly in eq. (40).³

5 Energetic considerations

In this section we revisit some of the energetic considerations discussed in [1] but focusing on the various possible *individual outcomes* of the “detection attempts”, rather than on the ensemble averages of detector measurement outcomes, which are the quantities considered in most of the discussion of said reference.

Following [1] and to simplify the discussion we will consider the case of (ensembles of) harmonic oscillators, and entangled pairs of harmonic oscillators instead of quantum fields. There is no loss of conceptual clarity in doing so, but the treatment is mathematically less involved.

Consider a harmonic oscillator with energy eigenstates $\{|n\rangle\}$ with renormalised energies $n\epsilon$ (i.e., we removed the zero point or ground state energy for simplicity of analysis), and a detector with two states $|\downarrow\rangle$ and $|\uparrow\rangle$ with energy levels 0 and ϵ respectively. Let us assume that the initial state of the combined system is:

$$|\Psi\rangle = N \left(|0\rangle \otimes |\downarrow\rangle + \frac{1}{\sqrt{\alpha}} |n\rangle \otimes |\uparrow\rangle \right), \quad (41)$$

with $N^2 = 1/(1 + \alpha^{-1})$. The expectation value of the energy is $\langle E \rangle_{\Psi} = \frac{n\epsilon}{1+\alpha}$.

If an observer finds the detector in the unexcited state $|\downarrow\rangle$, the value of the energy becomes $\langle E \rangle_{\text{unex}} = 0$, and the probability for this is $P_{\text{unex}} = N^2$. On the other hand if they find the detector in the excited state, the energy becomes $\langle E \rangle_{\text{ex}} = n\epsilon$ and the probability for this is $P_{\text{ex}} = N^2/\alpha$. The average result is of course $\langle E \rangle = \frac{n\epsilon}{1+\alpha}$, which is the same as $\langle E \rangle_{\Psi}$. We note however that in each specific case (i.e., for each specific outcome of the observation) the actual value of the energy differs from $\langle E \rangle_{\Psi}$, the expectation value of the initial state of the combined system. This is of course not surprising, given that the state $|\Psi\rangle$ is not an eigenstate of the total energy operator.

As has been argued in [20], the relevant issue regarding energy conservation is not its conservation “on average”, but its conservation on each single individual instance of any experiment. In this sense the possibility of preparing a state such as $|\Psi\rangle$ and to make the observations described above already set serious doubts about the general validity of anything like a law of “energy conservation” in the quantum setting.

5.1 Proper mixture

Consider now the case of a system in thermal equilibrium at temperature T . We take the system in question once again to be a simple harmonic oscillator. This corresponds, as is

³Note that the normalization factor in (17) plays a crucial rôle when considering the limit $\Omega \rightarrow 0$ for the RHS of the eqs. (39) and (40). These limits are given by the functions $\frac{t_{\mu\nu}[K_0](x)}{4\pi^4 a}$ and $\frac{t_{\mu\nu}[K_0](y)}{4\pi^4 a}$ respectively, where $x \in \text{Region I}$ and $y \in \text{Region II}$ and K_0 is the corresponding MacDonald function. In the limit when $\Omega \rightarrow \infty$, both RHS terms tend to zero as a result of the same normalization factor.

traditionally treated on statistical mechanic textbooks, to an ensemble (a canonical ensemble) of identical particles and might be described by the proper mixture:

$$\rho = N \sum_{n=0}^{\infty} e^{-\beta n \epsilon} |n\rangle \langle n|, \quad (42)$$

where $N = 1 - e^{-\beta \epsilon}$ is a normalisation constant ensuring $\text{Tr} \rho = 1$. The mean energy is then $\langle E \rangle_T = \frac{\epsilon e^{-\beta \epsilon}}{1 - e^{-\beta \epsilon}}$. Let us now consider a two level detector (as in the previous discussion) initially in the un-excited state (and vanishing energy) and make it interact with our thermal ensemble (for this purpose we in fact consider an ensemble of identical detectors). The initial situation will thus be described by the density matrix:

$$\rho \otimes |\downarrow\rangle \langle \downarrow| = \left[\left(1 - e^{-\beta \epsilon} \right) \sum_{n=0}^{\infty} e^{-\beta n \epsilon} |n\rangle \langle n| \right] \otimes |\downarrow\rangle \langle \downarrow|. \quad (43)$$

After letting the system interact for a suitably long time we will find a result analogous to that encountered in the equation (3.25) of [1]. That is:

$$\rho_{\text{late}} = N_{\text{late}} \sum_{n=0}^{\infty} e^{-\beta n \epsilon} \left[|n\rangle \otimes |\downarrow\rangle - i\gamma \sqrt{n} |n-1\rangle \otimes |\uparrow\rangle + \dots \right] \left[\langle n| \otimes \langle \downarrow| + i\gamma \sqrt{n} \langle n-1| \otimes \langle \uparrow| + \dots \right] \quad (44)$$

where γ is a small parameter representing the strength and time duration of the interaction and N_{late} is a normalisation constant ensuring $\text{Tr} \rho_{\text{late}} = 1$.

5.2 Improper mixture

Consider now the situation in which we are informed that the detector is excited. To do this we simply compute a partial trace after applying the corresponding projector $|\uparrow\rangle \langle \uparrow|$. The resulting density matrix up, to first order in the expansion is

$$\rho_{\text{post}} = N_{\text{post}} \sum_{n=1}^{\infty} e^{-\beta n \epsilon} n |n-1\rangle \langle n-1|, \quad (45)$$

where $N_{\text{post}} = \left(\frac{e^{-\beta \epsilon}}{(1 - e^{-\beta \epsilon})^2} \right)^{-1}$ is still another normalisation constant ensuring $\text{Tr} \rho_{\text{post}} = 1$.

We note that the absence of the first term ought be considered to be the result of both the measurement of the excitation level of the excited detector and the post selection within the ensemble in which the elements containing the un-excited detector state were removed. In other words, we have that in going from eq. 44 to eq. 45 actually modifies the set of systems composing the ensemble itself.

The next observation is that the resulting ensemble, represented by the density matrix 45 is not longer thermal, which in turn implies that the expectation value of the energy

$$\text{Tr}(\hat{H} \rho_{\text{post}}) = N_{\text{post}} \sum_{m=0}^{\infty} e^{-\beta(m+1)\epsilon} (m+1)m\epsilon = \frac{2\epsilon e^{-\beta \epsilon}}{(1 - e^{-\beta \epsilon})}. \quad (46)$$

differs slightly from that of a truly thermal ensemble ($\langle E \rangle_T = \frac{\epsilon e^{-\beta \epsilon}}{1 - e^{-\beta \epsilon}}$). We note again that even after adding the energy of excitation of the detector ϵ the expectation value of the energy has changed as the result of the measurement (and post-selection).

Finally let us consider the case of a single pair of entangled harmonic oscillators with ‘‘thermal weights’’. That is the case of a pure state, which upon consideration of the reduced density matrices for each oscillator would result in thermal density matrix, but of course one of an improper nature. Let us add a detector arranged to interact just with the harmonic oscillator (II) and which is initially prepared in the unexcited state, so the state of the complete system is:

$$|\Psi\rangle_{\text{initial}}^{(T)} = A_{\text{initial}} \sum_{n=0}^{\infty} e^{-\beta n \epsilon} |n\rangle^{(I)} \otimes |n\rangle^{(II)} \otimes |\downarrow\rangle, \quad (47)$$

where $A_{\text{initial}} = \sqrt{1 - e^{-2\beta\epsilon}}$. After letting the system interact for a suitably long time, the state of the system will be :

$$|\Psi\rangle_{\text{late}}^{(T)} = A_{\text{late}} \sum_{n=0}^{\infty} e^{-\beta n \epsilon} |n\rangle^{(I)} \otimes \left[|n\rangle^{(II)} \otimes |\downarrow\rangle - i\gamma\sqrt{n}|n-1\rangle^{(II)} \otimes |\uparrow\rangle + \dots \right]. \quad (48)$$

If we project on the subspace corresponding to the excited detector (ignoring the irrelevant factor i and ensuring that the final state is normalised) we find:

$$|\Psi\rangle_{\text{pos-tsel}}^{(T)} = A_{\text{post-sel}} \sum_{n=0}^{\infty} e^{-\beta n \epsilon} |n\rangle^{(I)} \otimes \left[\sqrt{n}|n-1\rangle^{(II)} + \dots \right], \quad (49)$$

where in this case $A_{\text{post-sel}} \approx \left(\frac{e^{-2\beta\epsilon}}{(1-e^{-2\beta\epsilon})^2} \right)^{-1/2}$.

Now the expectation values of the energy of the harmonic oscillator I is $\langle E \rangle_I = \frac{\epsilon(1+e^{-2\beta\epsilon})}{(1-e^{-2\beta\epsilon})}$, which is different from that of a purely thermal state, while the expectation value of the harmonic oscillator II is $\langle E \rangle_{II} = \frac{2\epsilon e^{-2\beta\epsilon}}{(1-e^{-2\beta\epsilon})}$. Note that if we add the energy of the excited detector, ϵ , we have that $\langle E \rangle_{II} + \epsilon = \langle E \rangle_I$. On the other hand the expectation energies of both cases have definitely changed as a result of the ‘‘projection’’.

At this point we might find nothing seriously puzzling because we have been dealing with systems that are not initially in energy eigen-states. The change in the case of the harmonic oscillator II in the above example, is of course a bit puzzling due to the fact that this oscillator has not been made to directly interact with a detector to bring about the ‘‘projection’’, however this is nothing more than the usual change occurring as a result of quantum entanglement with a second system which has been subjected to a measurement.

The situation considered in Sec. 4 is, however a bit more troublesome as it seems to have the potential for a serious violation of our fundamental ideas about relativity, in particular, the potential to offer a path for superluminal communication.

6 Faster than light signaling?

It is widely agreed that our world contains non-local features. This is reflected for instance in the violations of Bell’s inequalities[38], which have been experimentally confirmed by now in several experiments [39, 40, 41, 42, 43]. While even simpler theoretical settings, such as the GHZ construction [44] (which have not been experimentally realised due to technical difficulties) are expected to provide further and even more transparent evidence for non-locality. See for instance the discussion about the GHZ scheme in [53].

Nevertheless, there are a number of arguments and general widespread conviction that such non-locality cannot be exploited to communicate superluminally. Indeed, the non-locality present in the situation examined by Bell does not allow for superluminal communication. Faster-than-light communication would force us to revise the very foundations of special relativity – and of physics as a whole.

In any case, ‘‘textbook’’ quantum mechanics and its alternatives seeking to resolve the measurement problem do not seem to offer paths that allow for faster-than-light communication.⁴

The change that we have noted in the expectation value of the stress-energy tensor in the left Rindler wedge (region II) due to measurements in the right Rindler wedge (region I) – if detectable – however seem to provide a path for superluminal communication, which we describe in the following *gedankenexperiment*:

⁴See however the setting considered by Valentini[45] within the context of de Broglie-Bohm theory in a out-of-equilibrium context, which is argued might be prevalent in the very early universe.

Gedankenexperiment: Suppose a linearly uniformly accelerated observer in the right Rindler wedge, say Alice, is equipped with a highly-efficient detector for which it is highly probable to detect a Rindler particle and non-detection is negligible. This enables Alice to change the expectation value of the stress-energy tensor in the left Rindler wedge by turning her detector on or to decide not to do it by not switching on her detector. A causally-disconnected observer, say Bob, in the left Rindler wedge that can probe, either the state of the field or more specifically, the expectation value of stress-energy tensor (for example by probing the gravitational field with a torsion balance), would then be able to infer whether Alice has or has not turned on her detector in the right Rindler wedge. This seems to be a path for achieving superluminal communication between Alice and Bob.

At this point, one might raise objections regarding the “efficiency” of the above communication protocol. After all, Alice might decide to turn on her detector, but she has no way to ensure that the detector gets excited. One then might consider increasing the efficiency of the detector by increasing the strength of the interaction, however when so doing one must recall that this would also increase the probability of the detector emitting a particle after being excited thus returning the situation regarding the field and the expectation value of the stress-energy tensor to the previous condition. One might also consider the possibility of increasing the number of detectors in Alice’s hands, and having her turn then them all on or not as a means to signaling to Bob. This might increase the effectiveness of the protocol, but it is unclear how exactly the unavoidable interaction among the various detectors might modify the analysis.

In any event it seems that, even if not highly effective, the possibility of Alice signaling to Bob in a superluminal way should be considered problematic in view of the implications that would have for our understanding of the world.

Thus, it seems imperative to consider the caveats that might provide a path to avoid such a problematic communication protocol. We will offer and briefly discuss what we think are a serious set of options to be considered:

- (i) *Strong enough departures from semiclassical gravity, at least in region II:*
- (ii) *Existence of effects that are indistinguishable from observations of the change in the stress-energy in region II:*
- (iii) *A fundamental undetectability of the change of the state in region II, and in particular that of expectation value of the stress-energy tensor in said region:*

Before we start let us make some observations regarding semiclassical gravity. Semiclassical gravity is a formalism in which the gravitational field is taken as dynamical but treated in classical terms as the metric of a spacetime (M, g_{ab}) in general relativity, while the matter is treated in the language of quantum fields on such spacetime. The metric is taken to satisfy the semiclassical version of Einstein’s field equations

$$G_{ab}(x) = 8\pi G \langle T_{ab}^{\text{ren}}(x) \rangle, \quad (50)$$

with $\langle T_{ab}^{\text{ren}} \rangle$, the renormalised expectation value of the matter’s quantum stress-energy tensor in the quantum state, while the quantum matter obeys the dynamics of QFT.

At this point we should mention a delicate issue that appears once one considers any deviation from the pure unitary evolution of states (which might be represented, say, using the Heisenberg picture as is often done in QFT). The point is that once something like state reduction is considered (be it in the Copenhagen approach or in any of the spontaneous collapse theories[54, 55, 56, 57, 58, 59, 60, 61, 62, 63, 64, 65]), one has the ambiguity of which state

should be used in computing the right-hand side of eq. (50) should be employed. In other words, it seems natural that if we are interested in the value of the left-hand side of eq. (50) at a point x , the right-hand side should be computed using a state associated with a Cauchy surface that passes through x , but of course there are infinite such surfaces and the proposal to consider eq. 50 even as an approximation must be completed with a detailed prescription in this regard in order to at least have a well-defined proposal [66, 67, 68, 69, 70]. We will turn back to this point in the discussion section.

A serious issue that arises in situations involving measurements, as discussed in [19, 20], is the question of conservation laws, and in particular that of the stress-energy tensor, and are quite delicate in quantum theory in general. As noted in [20], the question becomes essentially intractable in a vaguely-defined scheme as the one offered by the Copenhagen interpretation. On the other hand, and as extensively discussed in [20], when considering the promising options to address the conceptual problems of quantum theory, namely: spontaneous collapse theories, non-local hidden variable theories, or even many-world-type interpretations, there seems to be no reasonable path to maintain energy momentum conservation in the context of semiclassical gravity.

It is worth noting that there are at least two points of view regarding semiclassical gravity. The first one, considers that it must be the effective limit of a fundamental quantum gravity theory. The second viewpoint is that quantum gravity is not a necessity and that semiclassical gravity can play a fundamental rôle in its own right. The first viewpoint would seem to be the only reasonable if one were to accept the conclusions of Eppley and Hannah [46], which have however been criticised in [47, 48, 49], or the arguments in Page and Geilker [50], which as discussed in [20] we do not take it to be conclusive either (see also [51]). We will not enter any further into this discussion here, and instead, point the interested reader to the above mentioned works and the references therein.

In any case, whether or not semiclassical gravity, if one is interested to consider the theory in its own right or just as an approximation to full quantum gravity, we must recall that it is applied to problems in black hole physics, cosmology, and so on. That is, its basically standard practice consider that semiclassical gravity represents at least an effective description of the gravity-matter interface, which might be valid as long as scales of curvature and matter densities are well below the Planck scale. Motivated by the considerations in [20] we will add the assumption that there is an underlying theory of quantum gravity, from which some appropriate notion of real or effective state reduction emerges on whose precise nature we remain agnostic. The thought that it must be discarded already by considerations involving such a simple situation as the excitation of an accelerated detector seem rather disturbing.

Let us now briefly discuss the options (i)-(iii) considered above.

(i) This possibility must be further specified regarding what is meant by the words “strong enough” to address the issue. As noted, it seems rather unlikely that arbitrarily large departures of semiclassical gravity will be associated with such simple and rather common situation. The question thus requires consideration of the means by which Bob might detect the corresponding change in the spacetime metric in region II. As is clear that a modification R_{ab} might be in principle measured by the study of the geodesic deviation equation and in particular the expansion of the congruence of geodesics in that region. It seems the question will have to be connected at least to some fundamental limitation on the validity of the notion of test point particles following geodesics of the underlying metric. There are of course some limitations on that arising from simple quantum considerations about the description of free point particles which negate the notion of well defined trajectories. Moreover as discussed in [52], the standard quantum mechanical minimal delocalisation of a quantum particle (characterised for instance by its Compton wavelength) implies such particle ought not to be considered as point like and

as is well known in general, even at the classical level extended objects fail to follow geodesics.

(ii) Here we must consider the existence of other effects that might not be effectively distinguished from the changes resulting from the collapse. Those might be intrinsically associated with the gravitational effects of either the measuring devices that Bob would be introducing in order to detect the changes in the space time metric in region II. They also might be associated with mere existence of (and the non-vanishing stress-energy tensor) corresponding to Alice and her detectors, whose own gravitational effects we have been neglecting so far, although classically these effects will in principle propagate causally and not affect region II, it is likely that deviations from Minkowski spacetime reflect on the *non-local* state of the field from a semiclassical-gravity viewpoint in such a way that the quantum state of the field cannot be in principle the Minkowski vacuum state to begin with. Moreover, the stress-energy of Alice and her apparatus must be considered in the constraints of the theory, and the spacetime will have a non-vanishing ADM mass, reflected in the asymptotic behaviour in all spacetime directions.

Another possibility is to consider that the model used for Alice’s detector, although standard in the literature, is a local model (in Region I) of the detector. Treating Alice’s detector as a quantum field yields a detector model with support in both Regions I and II. In the Heisenberg picture we know that the existence of a field-like detector for Alice will only affect the dynamics in the causal future of the coupling region between Alice’s detector (or probe) and the quantum field considered as a system. This can also be formalised in the algebraic QFT language [22]. However, as emphasised in [22], a local and covariant measurement scheme is only able to describe the *probe-system measurement chain* under the assumption that somewhere, someone knows how to measure something. Thus, it seems that the issue of sending a faster-than-light signal by the “act of measurement” cannot be resolved by simply changing the detector model. Sorkin has pointed out in his “impossible measurements” protocol [71] that the existence of spatially extended detectors, would make faster than light signaling almost unavoidable. See however [72, 73].

(iii) This possibility could result from a variety of reasons. For instance, it might be that the appropriate versions of semiclassical gravity that will hold are such that the expectation value of the stress-energy tensor at any point, is taken on states associated with hypersurfaces which would not incorporate the change in the state resulting from a collapse or a measurement on region I. One such option would require to take the expectation value of the stress-energy tensor appearing at the right-hand side of Einstein’s semiclassical equation in x to be computed using the state corresponding to the something like the hypersurface $J^-(x)$, and that, at the same time, the detailed theory characterising the measurement (i.e., something like the spontaneous collapse theories considered in [28, 29, 30]), is such, that the state associated with $J^-(x)$ is unaffected. A scheme of that kind would ensure that the measurement of Alice would have no consequences from semiclassical gravity for spacelike-separated events. The issue is however quite delicate one as illustrated by the discussions in [66], the pursuit of which lies outside the scope of the present work.

An argument in favour of the impossibility of detecting the signal is the following. One can assume that stress-energy conservation must hold *on average*, i.e., for successive measurements, which prevents one from extracting arbitrarily large amounts of energy from the quantum field by detector measurements, as argued in [1]. Thus, an arbitrarily-efficient detector must produce arbitrarily-small changes for the stress-energy tensor when it detects a Rindler particle. The issue now becomes whether there exists an “engineering window” where the efficiency of the detector and the amplitude of the signal can be compensated, such that a faster-than-light signal is measurable by Bob and that such signal can be sent with sufficient certainty by Alice. On this point, it follows from the inequality $\Delta E \Delta T \geq \hbar$ that to detect such a small signal Bob requires a large amount of time. On the other hand, in principle, Bob has an infinite

time to measure an arbitrarily small signal, for he can orbit along a Killing vector boost orbit in the left Rindler wedge, and one could argue that such engineering window can always be found. However, any physical signal sent by Alice must decay as it approaches \mathcal{I}^+ . Thus, it is possible that the signal becomes weaker as Bob's proper time elapses, hence rendering the signal "effectively undetectable". Note, however that as discussed in the introduction, such arguments must be considered with care, because, in principle, even a very unreliable communication protocol which allows faster than light communications would be quite problematic. We think these ideas deserve much deeper exploration.

7 Final remarks

We have revisited the issue of detection of a Rindler particle by an accelerator detector confined to the right Rindler wedge, focusing attention on the implications of the reduction of the state associated with the actual detection or what is often referred to as the measurement part of the process. We have noted that the concomitant modification of the state of the quantum field, imply changes in the (expectation value of the renormalised) stress-energy tensor in both Rindler wedges.

Concerning the right Rindler wedge, it is interesting that the resulting state and stress-energy tensor expectation values become non-thermal which is, in a sense, easy to understand as result of the disruption brought by the interaction with the detector. Of course, one expects that in the long run further interaction between the field and detector or among the field modes themselves will bring the system to a new state of thermal equilibrium.

Concerning the left Rindler wedge, however, the change in the stress-energy tensor expectation value is more problematic, as it seems to open a possibility for faster than light communication. We have noted some of what we see as the most natural possibilities to avoid such conclusion, but further studies of these issues are required in order to get to more definite and solid conclusions.

For the moment, we can only stress that the fuzzy act of measuring in quantum theory can bring about complications even in apparently innocuous circumstances, such as in the context of the detection of a Rindler particle in Minkowski spacetime. It is our hope to draw the attention of the community to these delicate issues that afflict our understanding of quantum theory in general and of QFT in particular. It seems to us that attempting to experimentally realise the proposed *gedankenexperiment* in this paper should aid in clarifying this situation.

Acknowledgements

We are gladly thank Prof. George Matsas for his careful reading of a previous version of this work and his very useful comments. A.G.-C. acknowledges Academia de Matemáticas and Colegio de Física, UP, for the support and enthusiasm. B.A.J-A. is supported by a CONACYT postdoctoral fellowship. D.S. acknowledges partial financial support from PAPIIT-UNAM, Mexico (Grant No.IG100120); the Foundational Questions Institute (Grant No. FQXi-MGB-1928); the Fetzer Franklin Fund, a donor advised by the Silicon Valley Community Foundation. B.A.J.-A. and D.S. acknowledge the support of CONACYT grant FORDECYT-PRONACES no. 140630. This article has been prepared as a contribution to the Topical Collection "Acceleration and Radiation: Classical and Quantum, Electromagnetic and Gravitational" of the Journal Symmetry, edited by Prof. Stephen A. Fulling.

References

- [1] W. G. Unruh and R. M. Wald, “What happens when an accelerating observer detects a Rindler particle”, *Phys. Rev. D* **29** (1984), 1047-1056 doi:10.1103/PhysRevD.29.1047
- [2] A. Higuchi, G. E. A. Matsas and D. Sudarsky, “Bremsstrahlung and Fulling-Davies-Unruh thermal bath”, *Phys. Rev. D* **46** (1992), 3450-3457 doi:10.1103/PhysRevD.46.3450
- [3] A. Higuchi, G. E. A. Matsas and D. Sudarsky, “Bremsstrahlung and zero energy Rindler photons”, *Phys. Rev. D* **45** (1992), R3308-R3311 doi:10.1103/PhysRevD.45.R3308
- [4] Decay of accelerated protons and the existence of the Fulling-Davies-Unruh effect D. A. T. Vanzella, G. E. A. Matsas *Phys.Rev.Lett.* **87** (2001) 151301 • e-Print: gr-qc/0104030 [gr-qc]
- [5] Decay of protons and neutrons induced by acceleration George E.A. Matsas Daniel A.T. Vanzella *Phys.Rev.D* **59** (1999) 094004 • e-Print: gr-qc/9901008 [gr-qc]
- [6] W. G. Unruh, “Notes on black hole evaporation”, *Phys. Rev. D* **14** (1976), 870 doi:10.1103/PhysRevD.14.870
- [7] S. De Bievre and M. Merkli, “The Unruh effect revisited”, *Class. Quant. Grav.* **23** (2006), 6525-6542 doi:10.1088/0264-9381/23/22/026 [arXiv:math-ph/0604023 [math-ph]].
- [8] C. J. Fewster, B. A. Juárez-Aubry and J. Louko, “Waiting for Unruh”, *Class. Quant. Grav.* **33** (2016) no.16, 165003 doi:10.1088/0264-9381/33/16/165003 [arXiv:1605.01316 [gr-qc]].
- [9] G. Salton, R. B. Mann and N. C. Menicucci, “Acceleration-assisted entanglement harvesting and rangefinding”, *New J. Phys.* **17** (2015) no.3, 035001 doi:10.1088/1367-2630/17/3/035001 [arXiv:1408.1395 [quant-ph]].
- [10] R. M. Wald, *Quantum Field Theory in Curved Space-Time and Black Hole Thermodynamics* (University of Chicago Press, 1994).
- [11] B. A. Juárez-Aubry and J. Louko, “Onset and decay of the 1 + 1 Hawking-Unruh effect: what the derivative-coupling detector saw”, *Class. Quant. Grav.* **31** (2014) no.24, 245007 doi:10.1088/0264-9381/31/24/245007 [arXiv:1406.2574 [gr-qc]].
- [12] L. C. B. Crispino, A. Higuchi and G. E. A. Matsas, “The Unruh effect and its applications”, *Rev. Mod. Phys.* **80** (2008), 787-838 doi:10.1103/RevModPhys.80.787 [arXiv:0710.5373 [gr-qc]].
- [13] B. L. Hu, S. Y. Lin and J. Louko, “Relativistic Quantum Information in Detectors-Field Interactions”, *Class. Quant. Grav.* **29** (2012), 224005 doi:10.1088/0264-9381/29/22/224005 [arXiv:1205.1328 [quant-ph]].
- [14] S. A. Fulling, “Nonuniqueness of canonical field quantization in Riemannian space-time”, *Phys. Rev. D* **7** (1973), 2850-2862. doi:10.1103/PhysRevD.7.2850
- [15] A. Belenchia, R. M. Wald, F. Giacomini, E. Castro-Ruiz, Č. Brukner and M. Aspelmeyer, “Information Content of the Gravitational Field of a Quantum Superposition”, *Int. J. Mod. Phys. D* **28** (2019) no.14, 1943001 doi:10.1142/S0218271819430016 [arXiv:1905.04496 [quant-ph]].
- [16] R. M. Wald, “Quantum superposition of massive bodies”, *Int. J. Mod. Phys. D* **29** (2020) no.11, 2041003 doi:10.1142/S0218271820410035

- [17] T. Maudlin, “Three measurement problems”, *Topoi* 14 (1995).
- [18] L. H. Ford, Spacetime in Semiclassical Gravity, in *100 Years of Relativity - Space-time Structure: Einstein and Beyond*, edited by A. Ashtekar, (World Scientific, Singapore 2005) [arXiv:gr-qc/0504096]
- [19] B. A. Juárez-Aubry, B. S. Kay and D. Sudarsky, “Generally covariant dynamical reduction models and the Hadamard condition”, *Phys. Rev. D* **97** (2018) no.2, 025010 doi:10.1103/PhysRevD.97.025010 [arXiv:1708.09371 [gr-qc]].
- [20] T. Maudlin, E. Okon and D. Sudarsky, “ On the status of conservation laws in physics: Implications for semiclassical gravity”, *Studies in History and Philosophy of Science Part B: Studies in History and Philosophy of Modern Physics* **69**, 67-81 (2020).
- [21] B. D’Espagnat, *Conceptual Foundations Of Quantum Mechanics* (CRC Press, 1999).
- [22] C. J. Fewster and R. Verch, “Quantum fields and local measurements”, *Commun. Math. Phys.* **378** (2020) no.2, 851-889 doi:10.1007/s00220-020-03800-6 [arXiv:1810.06512 [math-ph]].
- [23] D. Bohm, “A suggested interpretation of quantum theory in terms of “hidden” variables”, *Physics Reviews* **85** (1952) 166–193.
- [24] G. C. Ghirardi, A. Rimini and T. Weber, “Unified dynamics for microscopic and macroscopic systems”, *Phys. Rev. D* **34** (1986) 470–491.
- [25] P. Pearle, “Combining stochastic dynamical state vector reduction with spontaneous localization”, *Phys. Rev. A* **39** (1989) 2277–2289.
- [26] R. Penrose, *The emperor’s new mind: Concerning computers, minds, and the laws of physics* (Oxford University Press, 1999).
- [27] A. Bassi, K. Lochan, S. Satin, T. Singh and H. Ulbricht, “Models of wave-function collapse, underlying theories, and experimental tests”, *Reviews of Modern Physics* **85** (2013) 471.
- [28] D. J. Bedingham, “Relativistic state reduction dynamics”, *Foundations of Physics* **41** (2011) 686.
- [29] D. J. Bedingham, D. Dürr, G. C. Ghirardi, S. Goldstein, R. Tumulka and N. Zanghì, “Matter density and relativistic models of wave function collapse”, *Journal of Statistical Physics* **154** (2014) 623–631.
- [30] R. Tumulka, “A relativistic version of the Ghirardi-Rimini-Weber model”, *Journal of Statistical Physics* **125** (2006) 821.
- [31] H. Everett, “Relative state formulation of quantum mechanics”, *Reviews of Modern Physics*, **29** (1957) 3.
- [32] D. Wallace, “The emergent multiverse: Quantum theory according to the everett interpretation” (Oxford University Press, 2014).
- [33] S. L. Adler, “Why decoherence has not solved the measurement problem: A Response to P. W. Anderson”, *Stud. Hist. Phil. Sci. B* **34** (2003), 135-142 doi:10.1016/S1355-2198(02)00086-2 [arXiv:quant-ph/0112095 [quant-ph]].

- [34] G. Bacciagaluppi, “The Role of Decoherence in Quantum Mechanics”, The Stanford Encyclopedia of Philosophy (Fall 2020 Edition), edited by Edward N. Zalta.
- [35] E. Okon and D. Sudarsky, “Less Decoherence and More Coherence in Quantum Gravity, Inflationary Cosmology and Elsewhere”, *Found. Phys.* **46** (2016) no.7, 852-879 doi:10.1007/s10701-016-0007-x [arXiv:1512.05298 [quant-ph]].
- [36] B. S. DeWitt, “Quantum gravity: the new synthesis”, in *General Relativity: an Einstein centenary survey*, edited by S. W. Hawking and W. Israel (Cambridge University Press, Cambridge, 1979) 680.
- [37] J. Louko and A. Satz, “Transition rate of the Unruh-DeWitt detector in curved spacetime”, *Class. Quant. Grav.* **25** (2008), 055012 doi:10.1088/0264-9381/25/5/055012 [arXiv:0710.5671 [gr-qc]].
- [38] Bell, J. (1964). On the Einstein-Podolsky-Rosen paradox. *Physics*, 1:195–200. Bell, J. (1990). La nouvelle cuisine. In *Between Science and Technology*. Elsevier Science Publishers.
- [39] A. Aspect, J. Dalibard and G. Roger, “Experimental test of Bell’s inequalities using time varying analyzers”, *Phys. Rev. Lett.* **49** (1982), 1804-1807 doi:10.1103/PhysRevLett.49.1804
- [40] A. Aspect, P. Grangier and G. Roger, “Experimental Tests of Realistic Local Theories via Bell’s Theorem”, *Phys. Rev. Lett.* **47** (1981), 460-6443 doi:10.1103/PhysRevLett.47.460
- [41] M. Giustina *et al.*, “Significant-loophole-free test of Bell’s theorem with entangled photons” *Phys. Rev. Lett.* **115**, (2015) 250401
- [42] J. Handsteiner *et al.* “Cosmic Bell Test: Measurement Settings from Milky Way Stars”, *Phys. Rev. Lett.* **118** (2017) no.6, 060401 doi:10.1103/PhysRevLett.118.060401 [arXiv:1611.06985 [quant-ph]].
- [43] B. Hensen *et al.*. “Loophole-free Bell inequality violation using electron spins separated by 1.3 kilometres”, *Nature*, **526** (2015) 575:682–686.
- [44] D. Greenberger; M. Horne; A. Shimony; A. Zeilinger (1990). ”Bell’s theorem without inequalities”. *Am. J. Phys.* 58 (12): 1131.
- [45] Valentini, A. (1991). Signal-locality, uncertainty, and the subquantum H-theorem. I. *Physics Letters A*, 156(5–11).
- [46] K. Eppley and E. Hannah, “The necessity of quantizing the gravitational field”, *Found. Phys.* **7**, 51-68 (1977).
- [47] Huggett, N., and Callender, C. (2001). Why quantize gravity (or any other field for that matter)? *Philosophy of Science*, 68(3), S382–S394.
- [48] Mattingly, J. (2006). Why Epply and Hannah’s thought experiment fails. *Physics Reviews D*, 73, 064025.
- [49] Mattingly, J. (2005). Is quantum gravity necessary? In Kox, A. J., & Eisenstaedt, J. (Eds.), *The universe of general relativity* (pp. 325–338). Birkhäuser.
- [50] Don N. Page, G.D. Geilker, “Indirect Evidence for Quantum Gravity”, *Phys. Rev. Lett.* **47** 979 (1981).

- [51] Carlip, S. (2008). Is quantum gravity necessary? *Classical and Quantum Gravity*, **25**, 154010.
- [52] “Extracting Geometry from Quantum Spacetime: Obstacles down the road” Bondar Y., Chryssomalakos C. , and Sudarsky D., *Foundations of Physics*, **1**, (2018); arXiv:1706.08221 [gr-qc].
- [53] T. Maudlin *Quantum nonlocality and reality* (Blackwell Publishing, 1994).
- [54] P. Pearle, “Towards explaining why events occur”, *Int. J. Theor. Phys* **18** (1979) 489
- [55] G.Ghirardi, A.Rimini, T.Weber, “A model for a unified quantum description of macroscopic and microscopic systems,” in *Quantum Probability and Applications* edited by A. L. Accardi, (Springer, 1985) pp. 223
- [56] G. C. Ghirardi, A. Rimini and T. Weber, “A Unified Dynamics for microscopic and macroscopic Systems”, *Phys. Rev. D* **34** (1986), 470 doi:10.1103/PhysRevD.34.470
- [57] P. M. Pearle, “Combining Stochastic Dynamical State Vector Reduction With Spontaneous Localization”, *Phys. Rev. A* **39** (1989), 2277-2289 doi:10.1103/PhysRevA.39.2277
- [58] G. C. Ghirardi, P. M. Pearle and A. Rimini, “Markov Processes in Hilbert Space and Continuous Spontaneous Localization of Systems of Identical Particles”, *Phys. Rev. A* **42** (1990), 78-79 doi:10.1103/PhysRevA.42.78
- [59] L. Diosi, “Gravitation and Quantum Mechanical Localization of Macro-Objects”, *Phys. Lett. A* **105** (1984) 199–202
- [60] R. Penrose, “On Gravity’s Role in Quantum State Reduction”, *Gen. Rel. Gravit.* **28** (1996) 581–600
- [61] A. Bassi and G. C. Ghirardi, “Dynamical reduction models”, *Phys. Rept.* **379** (2003), 257 doi:10.1016/S0370-1573(03)00103-0 [arXiv:quant-ph/0302164 [quant-ph]].
- [62] D. J. Bedingham, “Relativistic state reduction dynamics”, *Found. Phys.* **41** (2011), 686-704 doi:10.1007/s10701-010-9510-7 [arXiv:1003.2774 [quant-ph]].
- [63] D. J. Bedingham, “Relativistic state reduction model”, *J. Phys.: Conf. Ser.* **306** (2011) 012034
- [64] R. Tumulka, “A relativistic version of the Ghirardi-Rimini-Weber model”, *J. Stat. Phys.* **125**, (2006) 821
- [65] P. Pearle, “Relativistic dynamical collapse model”, *Phys. Rev. D* **91** (2015) 105012 [arXiv:1412.6723 [quant-ph]].
- [66] Y. Aharonov and D. Z. Albert, “Is the usual notion of time evolution adequate for quantum-mechanical systems? II. Relativistic considerations”, *Phys. Rev. D* **29** (1984) 228
- [67] D. Z. Albert, “Physics and Narrative” in *After Physics* (Harvard University Press, 2015)
- [68] W. C. Myrvold, “On peaceful coexistence: is the collapse postulate incompatible with relativity?” *Stud. Hist. Philos. Mod. Phys.* **33** (2002) 435

- [69] D. Z. Albert and R. Galchen, “A quantum threat to special relativity” *Sci.Am.* **300** (2009) 32
- [70] W. C. Myrvold, “Quantum Mechanics and Narratability” *Found Phys.* **46** (2016) 759.
- [71] R. D. Sorkin, in *Directions in General Relativity: Volume 2: Proceedings of the 1993 International Symposium, Maryland: Papers in Honor of Dieter Brill, Vol. 1* (Cambridge University Press, 1993) p. 293.
- [72] H. Bostelmann, C. J. Fewster and M. H. Rued, “Impossible measurements require impossible apparatus”, *Phys. Rev. D* **103** (2021) no.2, 025017 doi:10.1103/PhysRevD.103.025017 [arXiv:2003.04660 [quant-ph]].
- [73] C. J. Fewster and B. A. Juárez-Aubry (in preparation, 2021).