

On testing quantum gravity with interactive information sensing

Onur Hosten

Institute of Science and Technology Austria, 3400 Klosterneuburg, Austria

(Dated: June 15, 2021)

We show that the atom interferometric coherence revival test suggested in [arXiv:2101.11629 [quant-ph] (2021)] does not test the quantum nature of the gravitational field when the atoms are coupled to a mechanical oscillator prepared in a thermal state. Specifically we clarify that the same coherence revivals take place in a model where the atoms are coupled to a classical oscillator through a classical gravitational field. We further elucidate the quantum mechanical calculation, showing that entanglement is not the source of the revivals. The suggested test is thus only relevant for pure initial quantum states of the oscillator. In this regime, numerical estimates show that it is unfeasible to do a test of the proposed type.

Experimentally testing the quantum mechanical nature of the gravitational field has long been a subject of interest [1–4]. With recent advances in the quantum mechanical control of mesoscopic objects, the topic has been gaining renewed interest [5,6,15,7–14], building on the idea that if two quantum systems can be entangled through the gravitational interaction, the gravitational field ought to be able to transmit quantum information, and thus needs to be described by quantum mechanics [8,16–19]. The proposed tests typically require verifying that entanglement is formed between the involved systems by characterizing their correlations. In Ref. [20], an experiment is proposed to bypass this requirement and infer the presence of entanglement from only one of the sub-systems. This would in principle allow one to make the second system very massive while eliminating the need for good quantum control of it. In particular, the proposal aims to utilize the entanglement formed between an atom interferometer and a macroscopic mechanical oscillator. A periodic wavefunction collapse and revival is predicted for the atom interferometer. It is argued that this revival is only possible if the gravitational interaction forms an entangling channel. In this pedagogically oriented article, we will show that this not the case.

The core idea of the proposal is schematically illustrated in Fig.1. The wavefunction of an atom is first split into two parts. The resulting wavepackets are trapped (e.g, in the motional ground state of an external potential) and held near the mechanical oscillator. Through the gravitational interaction, the oscillator is pulled to opposite sides depending on the atomic wavepacket location, generating entanglement between




Figure 1. Schematic illustration of the ‘interactive information sensing’ protocol. (a) Trapped atomic wave packets gravitationally interact with a mechanical oscillator which is depicted as a pendulum. (b) Qualitative hold time dependence of atomic interference visibility for increasing (blue, orange, green in order) coupling between the systems. Visibility variations ΔV are exaggerated for illustrative purposes.

the two systems. The systems repeatedly become entangled and then again separable at the period of the mechanical oscillation. Therefore, depending on the exact instance the atomic wavepackets are released and subsequently interfered, the visibility of the interference fringes formed by the atoms are expected to show periodic collapses and revivals due to the varying level of entanglement with the mechanical oscillator. The measurement of the collapses and revivals form the basis of the proposed scheme.

As one would expect, the gravitational interaction between the atoms and the mechanical oscillator is quite weak, and thus it is not easy to generate an appreciable amount of entanglement. Concretely, if one assumes a ~ 10 -mg oscillator with a period of ~ 100 s (the longer the better) and consequently a 100-s superposition holding time, one obtains an interference visibility variation of $\Delta V \sim 10^{-24}$ for a mechanical oscillator initially prepared in its ground state. It is clearly not feasible to measure this. However, the authors of [20] notice that, the use of thermal states of the mechanical oscillator significantly improves the variations in the fringe visibility making it potentially feasible to observe it experimentally. In particular for a room temperature oscillator (mean thermal excitation number of $\bar{n} \sim 10^{15}$) one obtains $\Delta V \sim 10^{-10}$ (and $\Delta V \sim 10^{-5}$ for a boosted version of the protocol [20]). There might be a chance of observing such a visibility variation with an ambitious 100-s atom interferometer with $\sim 10^{11}$ atoms with carefully considered geometries, noise and systematic analyses as shown in [20].

The counterintuitive aspect is that, although the visibility variations improve for larger temperature initial thermal states, it fails to improve if the initial oscillator states are taken to be pure coherent states. It is

known that thermal states can be considered as mixtures of coherent states. This suggests that contrary to the theorem provided in [20], in the thermally excited limit, the visibility collapse and revival is perhaps not due to entanglement, but could admit a more mundane classical explanation. In the remainder of this article, we show that this interpretation is indeed the case. We first show this in the context of a semi-classical calculation, and then we do the full quantum mechanical calculation to show that entanglement is not responsible for the coherence revival in the thermal case.

Semi-classical calculation – Assume a classical harmonic oscillator with mass M and angular oscillation frequency ω whose position is given by $x_c(t)$. An atom of mass m is further assumed to be placed in an equal superposition of two locations $\pm d$ away from the equilibrium position of the oscillator (Fig. 1), tightly trapped in the motional ground states of the trapping potentials (corresponding to atomic states that we label $|+\rangle$ and $|-\rangle$). The gravitational potential energies for the two configurations are given by $E_{\pm} = \frac{-GMm}{|\pm d - x_c(t)|} \sim \frac{-GMm}{d} (1 \pm \frac{x_c(t)}{d})$, where G is Newton's constant. Dropping the first term which does not contain any dynamical variables, the Hamiltonian of an atom exposed to the external field generated by a classical oscillator is thus given by

$$H = -\hbar\chi x_c(t) \sigma_z \quad (1)$$

Here σ_z is a Pauli operator ($\sigma_z |\pm\rangle = \pm 1 |\pm\rangle$) and the coupling strength is defined by $\chi = \frac{1}{\hbar} \frac{GMm}{d^2}$. The atom starts in the initial state $|\psi_0\rangle = \frac{1}{\sqrt{2}}(|+\rangle + |-\rangle)$. The oscillator obeys classical equations of motion, and is initially assumed to be in thermal equilibrium with the environment. For the duration of the experiment, the oscillator is assumed to be decoupled well from its environment, so its position is simply given by $x_c(t) = x_0 \cos \omega t + \frac{1}{m\omega} p_0 \sin \omega t$. In a particular realization of the experiment, the random initial position x_0 and momentum p_0 of the oscillator are drawn from a classical thermal distribution at temperature T .

Under the unitary operator $U(t) = \exp[-\frac{i}{\hbar} \int_0^t dt' H(t')] = \exp[i\sigma_z \phi_{x_0, p_0}(t)]$ generated by the Hamiltonian, for the particular initial conditions x_0 and p_0 the atomic state evolves as

$$|\psi(t)\rangle_{x_0, p_0} = U(t) |\psi(0)\rangle = \frac{1}{\sqrt{2}} \left(e^{i\phi_{x_0, p_0}(t)} |+\rangle + e^{-i\phi_{x_0, p_0}(t)} |-\rangle \right) \quad (2)$$

Here $\phi_{x_0, p_0}(t) = \frac{\chi}{\omega} \left(x_0 \sin \omega t + \frac{1}{m\omega} p_0 (1 - \cos \omega t) \right)$. The corresponding density operator for this realization of the experiment is $\rho_{x_0, p_0}(t) = |\psi(t)\rangle \langle \psi(t)|_{x_0, p_0}$. Since the initial oscillator values are drawn from a thermal distribution, the overall state of the atom can be described by a mixture expressed with the density operator

$$\rho(t) = \int dx_0 dp_0 P(x_0, p_0) \rho_{x_0, p_0}(t) = \rho_{++} |+\rangle\langle +| + \rho_{--} |-\rangle\langle -| + \rho_{+-} |+\rangle\langle -| + \rho_{-+} |-\rangle\langle +| \quad (3)$$

$$\begin{aligned} \rho_{++} &= \rho_{--} = \frac{1}{2} \\ V(t) &= 2 |\rho_{+-}(t)| = \exp[-8(\frac{\lambda}{\omega})^2 (\sin \frac{\omega t}{2})^2 k_B T / m\omega^2] \end{aligned} \quad (4)$$

Here we defined the visibility $V(t)$ for a subsequent interference experiment, which is related to the coherences $\rho_{+-} = \rho_{-+}^*$. In evaluating $V(t)$ we used the probability density for a thermal distribution $P(x_0, p_0) = \frac{1}{2\pi\sigma_p\sigma_x} e^{-p_0^2/2\sigma_p^2 - x_0^2/2\sigma_x^2}$ with $\sigma_x = (k_B T / m\omega^2)^{1/2}$ and $\sigma_p = (mk_B T)^{1/2}$. In order to compare this result with that of [20], we define $\lambda = \frac{\chi}{\omega} x_{zp}$, where $x_{zp} = (\frac{\hbar}{2m\omega})^{1/2}$ is the zero point fluctuations of a quantum harmonic oscillator, and we note that in the highly excited limit $k_B T \gg \hbar\omega$, we have $\frac{k_B T}{\hbar\omega} \approx \bar{n}$ with \bar{n} being the mean thermal excitation number. We thus obtain

$$V(t) = \exp[-8\lambda^2 2\bar{n} \sin^2(\frac{\omega t}{2})] \quad (5)$$

The only difference between this equation and Eq. 12 of Ref. [20] is the presence of $2\bar{n}$ instead of $2\bar{n} + 1$. The +1 term is the true quantum contribution as we will see, and is irrelevant in comparison to the intended $\bar{n} \sim 10^{15}$. At half the oscillation period the visibility dips and returns to 1 at a full oscillation period, indicating that coherence revivals do take place in a purely semi-classical treatment, without any concept of entanglement.

Note that semi-classically including the possibility of the atom altering the oscillator motion does not change the discussion. For example in the simplest model, where the gravitational field is sourced by the expectation value of the matter density [7], there isn't even a force on the oscillator. We now turn to the full quantum mechanical calculation to see the story from that perspective.

Full quantum calculation – Here we include the oscillator in the analysis as a quantum object. With x and p as the position and momentum operators for the oscillator, the Hamiltonian in Eq. (1) becomes

$$\begin{aligned} H &= \frac{1}{2M} p^2 + \frac{1}{2} M \omega^2 x^2 - \hbar \chi x \sigma_z \\ &= \hbar \omega (a^\dagger a + \frac{1}{2}) - \hbar g (a^\dagger + a) \sigma_z \\ &\equiv \hbar \omega (a^\dagger - \frac{g}{\omega} \sigma_z) (a - \frac{g}{\omega} \sigma_z) \end{aligned} \quad (6)$$

Above, we defined the creation and annihilation operators through the relation $a = \frac{1}{2x_{zp}} (x + i \frac{1}{M\omega} p)$, introduced the scaled coupling constant $g = \chi x_{zp}$, and omitted constant energy terms in the third line. The time evolution of the composite system is then carried out with the unitary operator

$$U(t) = \exp[-i\omega(a^\dagger - \lambda\sigma_z)(a - \lambda\sigma_z)t] = D^\dagger(-\lambda\sigma_z)e^{-i\omega a^\dagger a t}D(-\lambda\sigma_z) \quad (7)$$

Here $\lambda = g / \omega$, and the second expression breaks the evolution operator into a convenient form with the aid of the displacement operator $D(\zeta) = \exp[\zeta a^\dagger - \zeta^\dagger a]$. Since we are interested in thermal states of the oscillator (which are mixed states), we use the density operator from the outset, taking the joint initial density operator to be a separable one $\rho(0) = \rho_A(0) \otimes \rho_o(0)$ with

$$\begin{aligned} \rho_A(0) &= \frac{1}{2}(I + \sigma_x) = \frac{1}{2}(|+\rangle\langle+| + |-\rangle\langle-|) \\ \rho_o(0) &= \int d^2\alpha \frac{\exp[-|\alpha|^2/\bar{n}]}{\pi\bar{n}} |\alpha\rangle\langle\alpha| \end{aligned} \quad (8)$$

The initial atomic state $\rho_A(0)$ is a pure state, whereas the initial oscillator state $\rho_o(0)$, expressed in the Sudharsan P-representation (in terms of coherent states $|\alpha\rangle$), is a mixed one¹. The state evolves as²

$$\begin{aligned} \rho(t) &= U(t)\rho(0)U^\dagger(t) \\ &= \int d^2\alpha \frac{\exp[-|\alpha|^2/\bar{n}]}{\pi\bar{n}} \frac{1}{2} \left(|+\rangle\langle+| \otimes |\alpha_+\rangle\langle\alpha_+| + |-\rangle\langle-| \otimes |\alpha_-\rangle\langle\alpha_-| \right. \\ &\quad \left. + e^{\alpha^* \delta^* - \alpha \delta} |+\rangle\langle-| \otimes |\alpha_+\rangle\langle\alpha_-| + e^{-\alpha^* \delta^* + \alpha \delta} |-\rangle\langle+| \otimes |\alpha_-\rangle\langle\alpha_+| \right) \end{aligned} \quad (9)$$

Here we defined $\alpha_\pm = \alpha e^{-i\omega t} \mp \delta$ and $\delta = \lambda(e^{-i\omega t} - 1)$. We are interested in the reduced density operator for the atom since the oscillator is not observed. Tracing over the oscillator we obtain³

$$\rho_A(t) = Tr_o[\rho(t)] = \rho_{A++} |+\rangle\langle+| + \rho_{A--} |-\rangle\langle-| + \rho_{A+-} |+\rangle\langle-| + \rho_{A-+} |-\rangle\langle+| \quad (10)$$

$$\begin{aligned} \rho_{A++} &= \rho_{A--} = \frac{1}{2} \\ \rho_{A+-} &= \rho_{A-+}^* = \frac{1}{2} \exp[-8\lambda^2(2\bar{n}+1)\sin^2(\frac{\omega t}{2})] \end{aligned} \quad (11)$$

This result again shows the collapse and revivals of the coherences, with the quantity $2\bar{n}+1$ making its appearance. To answer the pressing question whether or not the revivals are due to entanglement, we note that for small displacements $|\delta| \ll 1$, the coherent states $|\alpha_\pm\rangle$ can be re-expressed exactly as $|\alpha_\pm\rangle = e^{-\frac{1}{2}|\delta|^2} e^{\pm\frac{1}{2}(\alpha^* \delta^* - \alpha \delta)} |\alpha e^{-i\omega t}\rangle + (1 - e^{-|\delta|^2})^{1/2} |\alpha_{\pm\pm}\rangle$ by utilizing the non-orthogonal nature of coherent

¹ Note that $Tr[\rho_o(0)] = \frac{1}{2\bar{n}+1} \rightarrow 0$ as $\bar{n} \rightarrow \infty$ indicating a completely mixed state at high temperatures.

² In obtaining this result, we used the following helpful relations about coherent states and displacement operators: $\langle\beta|\alpha\rangle = e^{-\frac{1}{2}|\alpha-\beta|^2} e^{\frac{1}{2}(\beta^* \alpha - \beta \alpha^*)}$, $|\alpha\rangle = D(\alpha)|0\rangle$, $D^\dagger(\alpha) = D(-\alpha)$, and $D(\alpha)D(\beta) = e^{\frac{1}{2}(\alpha\beta^* - \alpha^* \beta)} D(\alpha + \beta)$.

³ For example, the calculation for an off-diagonal element goes as

$$\rho_{A+-} = \langle+|Tr_o[\rho(t)]|-\rangle = \frac{1}{2} \int d^2\alpha \frac{\exp[-|\alpha|^2/\bar{n}]}{\pi\bar{n}} e^{\alpha^* \delta^* - \alpha \delta} \langle\alpha_-|\alpha_+\rangle = \frac{1}{2} \int d^2\alpha \frac{\exp[-|\alpha|^2/\bar{n}]}{\pi\bar{n}} e^{-2|\delta|^2} e^{2(\alpha^* \delta^* - \alpha \delta)} = \frac{1}{2} e^{-8\lambda^2(2\bar{n}+1)\sin^2\frac{\omega t}{2}}$$

states. Here $|\alpha_{\pm}\rangle$ is some state that is orthogonal to $|\alpha e^{-i\omega t}\rangle$, whose form is not important. Rewriting Eq. (9) using the new expressions for $|\alpha_{\pm}\rangle$, we obtain the following exact expression which expresses the density operator as a sum of two terms

$$\rho(t) = e^{-|\delta|^2} \rho^{(0)}(t) + (1 - e^{-|\delta|^2}) \rho^{(1)}(t) \quad (12)$$

$$\begin{aligned} \rho^{(0)}(t) &= \int d^2\alpha \frac{\exp[-|\alpha|^2/\bar{n}]}{\pi\bar{n}} |\psi_{\alpha,\delta}(t)\rangle \langle \psi_{\alpha,\delta}(t)| \otimes |\alpha\rangle \langle \alpha| \\ |\psi_{\alpha,\delta}(t)\rangle &= \frac{1}{\sqrt{2}} \left(e^{(\alpha^* \delta^* - \alpha \delta)} |+\rangle + e^{-(\alpha^* \delta^* - \alpha \delta)} |-\rangle \right) \end{aligned} \quad (13)$$

Here $\rho^{(0)}(t)$ and $\rho^{(1)}(t)$ both have unit traces, and the exact form of $\rho^{(1)}(t)$ is not important. The important point is that the contribution of $\rho^{(1)}(t)$ to the overall density operator $\rho(t)$ is minute (since $\delta \ll 1$ and $e^{-|\delta|^2} \sim 1$ in our example), and can safely be ignored in the thermal case. Therefore, to an excellent approximation $\rho(t) \equiv \rho^{(0)}(t)$. In fact $\rho^{(0)}(t)$ is in the canonical form of a separable mixed state – a sum (or integral) over direct products of the density operators of the subsystems – and hence contains no entanglement. If we calculate the reduced density operator $\rho_A^{(0)}(t) = \text{Tr}_o[\rho^{(0)}(t)]$ for the atoms in this (excellent) approximation, we recover Eq. (5), the semi-classical result (with $\bar{n} \sim 10^{15}$)

$$V^{(0)}(t) = 2 |\rho_{A+-}^{(0)}| = \exp[-8\lambda^2(2\bar{n})\sin^2(\frac{\omega t}{2})] \quad (14)$$

In summary, when the initial state of the oscillator is in a thermal state, observing collapses and revivals in the atomic coherence does not inform us about the quantum nature of the force field mediating the interaction. The central theorem of Ref. [20] about the necessity of entanglement for coherence revival does not hold, since both the semi-classical and full quantum calculations here demonstrate the lack of entanglement, yet the presence of coherence revival when the oscillator is initially in a thermal state. The discrepancy appears to originate from the Markovian approximation used in the proof of [20]. In the semi-classical model we see that it is the exact position history of the oscillator that brings the revivals, and this would be lost in a Markovian decoherence model.

If we look at the pure state limit, e.g., at zero temperature ($\bar{n} = 0$), although $\rho(t)$ in Eq. (12) is still dominated by the $\rho^{(0)}(t)$ contribution, the leading contribution to visibility variations originates from the non-separable $\rho^{(1)}(t)$ term, relating to entanglement. Nevertheless, as already discussed, the visibility variations in this case are too small to be observed for the discussed setting.

References

- [1] C. M. DeWitt and D. Rickles, *The Role of Gravitation in Physics: Report from the 1957 Chapel Hill Conference*, Sources Max Planck Res. Libr. Hist. Dev. Knowledge; Sources 5, Ed. Open Access, Berlin (2011).
- [2] H. D. Zeh, *Feynman's Interpretation of Quantum Theory*, Eur. Phys. J. H **36**, 63 (2011).
- [3] D. N. Page and C. D. Geilker, *Indirect Evidence for Quantum Gravity*, Phys. Rev. Lett. **47**, 979 (1981).
- [4] R. Penrose, *On Gravity's Role in Quantum State Reduction*, Gen. Relativ. Gravit. **28**, 581 (1996).
- [5] N. H. Lindner and A. Peres, *Testing Quantum Superpositions of the Gravitational Field with Bose-Einstein Condensates*, Phys. Rev. A **71**, 024101 (2005).
- [6] S. Bose, A. Mazumdar, G. W. Morley, H. Ulbricht, M. Toroš, M. Paternostro, A. A. Geraci, P. F. Barker, M. S. Kim, and G. Milburn, *Spin Entanglement Witness for Quantum Gravity*, Phys. Rev. Lett. **119**, 240401 (2017).
- [7] D. Carney, P. C. E. Stamp, and J. M. Taylor, *Tabletop Experiments for Quantum Gravity: A User's Manual*, Class. Quantum Gravity **36**, 034001 (2019).
- [8] C. Marletto and V. Vedral, *Gravitationally Induced Entanglement between Two Massive Particles Is Sufficient Evidence of Quantum Effects in Gravity*, Phys. Rev. Lett. **119**, 240402 (2017).
- [9] D. Kafri, J. M. Taylor, and G. J. Milburn, *A Classical Channel Model for Gravitational Decoherence*, New J. Phys. **16**, 065020 (2014).
- [10] D. Kafri, G. J. Milburn, and J. M. Taylor, *Bounds on Quantum Communication via Newtonian Gravity*, New J. Phys. **17**, 015006 (2015).
- [11] H. Chevalier, A. J. Paige, and M. S. Kim, *Witnessing the Nonclassical Nature of Gravity in the Presence of Unknown Interactions*, Phys. Rev. A **102**, 022428 (2020).
- [12] R. Howl, V. Vedral, D. Naik, M. Christodoulou, C. Rovelli, and A. Iyer, *Non-Gaussianity as a Signature of a Quantum Theory of Gravity*, PRX Quantum **2**, 010325 (2021).
- [13] C. Anastopoulos and B. L. Hu, *Quantum Superposition of Two Gravitational Cat States*, Class. Quantum Gravity **37**, 235012 (2020).

- [14] A. Matsumura and K. Yamamoto, *Gravity-Induced Entanglement in Optomechanical Systems*, Phys. Rev. D **102**, 106021 (2020).
- [15] T. Krisnanda, G. Y. Tham, M. Paternostro, and T. Paterek, *Observable Quantum Entanglement Due to Gravity*, Npj Quantum Inf. **6**, 12 (2020).
- [16] R. J. Marshman, A. Mazumdar, and S. Bose, *Locality and Entanglement in Table-Top Testing of the Quantum Nature of Linearized Gravity*, Phys. Rev. A **101**, 052110 (2020).
- [17] A. Belenchia, R. M. Wald, F. Giacomini, E. Castro-Ruiz, Č. Brukner, and M. Aspelmeyer, *Quantum Superposition of Massive Objects and the Quantization of Gravity*, Phys. Rev. D **98**, 126009 (2018).
- [18] M. Christodoulou and C. Rovelli, *On the Possibility of Laboratory Evidence for Quantum Superposition of Geometries*, Phys. Lett. B **792**, 64 (2019).
- [19] T. D. Galley, F. Giacomini, and J. H. Selby, *A No-Go Theorem on the Nature of the Gravitational Field beyond Quantum Theory*, ArXiv:2012.01441 [Quant-Ph] (2020).
- [20] D. Carney, H. Müller, and J. M. Taylor, *Testing Quantum Gravity with Interactive Information Sensing*, ArXiv:2101.11629 [Quant-Ph] (2021).