

# On the possible wave-packet collapse without direct contact and experimental suggestions

Hongwei Xiong <sup>\*1,2</sup>

<sup>1</sup>*State Key Laboratory of Magnetic Resonance and Atomic and Molecular Physics,  
Wuhan Institute of Physics and Mathematics,  
Chinese Academy of Sciences, Wuhan 430071, P. R. China*

<sup>2</sup>*Center for Cold Atom Physics, Chinese Academy of Sciences, Wuhan 430071, China*

(Dated: February 6, 2020)

## Abstract

In this paper, the problem that “whether a particle could exist simultaneously in two disconnected and closed boxes” is considered theoretically. Based on the consideration of the wave-corpucle duality, we try to argue the possibility that there does not exist in principle a quantum state of a particle which is a coherent superposition of two wave packets in two disconnected boxes. For a coherent superposition of two wave packets in two initially connected boxes, based on this possibility, we predict a wave-packet collapse process by cutting two initially connected boxes with a shutter. This is an unusual predication because in this sort of wave-packet collapse process, there is no spatial contact between two spatially separated wave packets and the shutter. We propose several experimental suggestions to test this predication based on the idea of quantum interference.

PACS: 03.65.Ta; 03.65.Yz; 03.65.Ud

---

\* xionghongwei@wimp.ac.cn

## I. INTRODUCTION

Driven by the remarkable quantum manipulations such as the ability to control individual atoms and the realization of gaseous Bose-Einstein condensates [1] etc, a second quantum revolution is under way. It is quite possible that in the second quantum revolution, a lot of important techniques will have practical applications, such as quantum cryptography, and quantum-controlled chemistry *etc*. The advances in quantum manipulation also give us a golden opportunity to consider and test further the basic concepts of quantum mechanics, whose meaning has long been debated. A well-known example is the experimental test [2] of Bell's inequality [3]. A recent experimental realization [4] of high-fidelity photon-atom entanglement provides important step towards loophole-free test of Bell's inequality. Recently, an almost ideal realization of Wheeler's delayed-choice gedanken experiment is reported with a single-photon pulse [5]. Most recently, a previously untested correlation between two entangled photons was measured by Groblacher *et al* [6] to test an inequality proposed by Leggett based on a non-local realistic theories [7]. The combination of theoretical and experimental works has deepened largely our understanding of quantum world in the last decade. In the near future, we expect that experiments will provide more convincing tests about the unique concepts in quantum mechanics, such as nonlocality, wave-packet collapse and wave-corpuscle duality *etc* [8].

In this paper, we try to consider a basic problem that “whether a particle could exist simultaneously in two disconnected and closed boxes”. At first sight, it seems that this is a simple and trivial problem. After careful consideration, however, different physicists may have completely different answers. This difficult choice is quite interesting and natural because it reflects in an essential way the mystery of quantum mechanics. Based on a discussion about the wave-corpuscle duality, we try to argue here the possibility that a particle can not in principle exist simultaneously in two disconnected and closed boxes. If we agree with this simple point of view, one inevitably predicts a wave-packet collapse process without any contact between the wave packet and a “shutter” controlled in a gedanken experiment. In a sense, this predicts a new type of wave-packet collapse (or decoherence) induced by topological disconnectivity. For this seemingly simple, but subtle problem, we do not confine our consideration in philosophical discussion. Several experimental suggestions are proposed to test different answers based on the idea of quantum interference. Although an experimental

investigation of this problem may be quite challenging, fortunately, the remarkable advances of quantum manipulation makes this sort of experiment become promising in future. We believe this sort of experiment could deepen largely our understanding of quantum mechanics, especially about the meaning of wave-corpucle duality, nonlocality and wave-packet collapse.

## II. A GEDANKEN EXPERIMENT AND DISCUSSION

We first consider a gedanken experiment shown in Fig. 1. In Fig. 1(a), there are two connected boxes and a shutter. A particle with a coherently superposed quantum state  $|\Psi\rangle = \alpha |\Psi_1\rangle + \beta |\Psi_2\rangle$  is confined in the trapping potential  $V_1$  and  $V_2$ . The wave packets of the particle are assumed to be spatially separated, and there is no spatial contact between two wave packets and the boxes due to the trapping potential. The shutter is prepared specially so that it can be regarded as an infinitely high potential barrier with finite width. In this situation, the closing of the shutter in Fig. 1(b) makes two boxes become disconnected and closed, *i.e.* the tunneling current can be completely omitted. In the present work, we discuss the following problem:

*After two boxes become disconnected by closing the shutter (in the closing process, there is not any external perturbation on the particle and there is also no contact between the shutter and the wave packets of the particle), is there an essential change in the quantum state of the particle?*

For this seemingly simple problem, one may have completely different answers.

**Point of view I** — *There is no influence on the single-particle quantum state based on the Schrödinger equation.*

Before closing the shutter, the Schrödinger equation is

$$i\hbar \frac{\partial \Psi}{\partial t} = -\frac{\hbar^2}{2m} \nabla^2 \Psi + (V_1 + V_2) \Psi + V_{box} \Psi. \quad (1)$$

Here  $V_{box}$  is the potential due to the boxes, which gives the boundary condition for the quantum state, *i.e.* in the region out  $\Sigma$ ,  $\Psi(\mathbf{r}, t) = 0$ . After the shutter is closed, the Schrödinger equation becomes

$$i\hbar \frac{\partial \Psi}{\partial t} = -\frac{\hbar^2}{2m} \nabla^2 \Psi + (V_1 + V_2) \Psi + V_{box} \Psi + V_{shutter} \Psi. \quad (2)$$




FIG. 1: Schematic diagram of a gedanken experiment. In Fig. 1(a), the initial single-particle quantum state is two spatially-separated wave packets in two connected boxes (The overall region in two connected boxes is denoted by  $\Sigma$ ). After the closing of the shutter, two boxes (regions  $\Sigma_1$  and  $\Sigma_2$ ) become disconnected and closed. The shutter can be regarded as an infinitely high potential barrier with finite width. We consider in the present work the question that whether the closing of the shutter has an essential influence on the quantum state  $|\Psi\rangle = \alpha|\Psi_1\rangle + \beta|\Psi_2\rangle$ .

Here  $V_{shutter}$  is the potential barrier due to the shutter. It is an infinitely high potential barrier with finite width. Because the wave packets are confined in the trapping potential  $V_1$  and  $V_2$  ( $\Psi$  is zero at the location of the shutter), it is obvious that the last term  $V_{shutter}\Psi$  gives no contribution to the evolution of the quantum state. This leads to a result that there is no influence on the single-particle quantum state by the closing of the shutter. One should note that in these discussions, we only address the wave aspect of a particle. In the following discussions, we will also consider the role of the particle aspect of the single-particle quantum state.

**Point of view II** — *There is an essential influence on the single-particle quantum state based on the consideration of the wave-corpucle duality.*

The wave-corpucle duality tells us that the Schrödinger equation describes the wave

aspect of the quantum state, while there exists a statistical bond between the wave aspect and corpuscular aspect. The corpuscular aspect stresses the fact that as a whole the quantum state  $|\Psi\rangle$  describes a single particle. Based on the corpuscular aspect, we try to give here an argument that a single particle only exists in one of the disconnected boxes (in other words, there is no single-particle quantum state which is a coherent superposition of two wave packets existing in two disconnected and closed boxes).

We first assume that there is a quantum state  $|\Psi\rangle = \alpha |\Psi_1\rangle + \beta |\Psi_2\rangle$  for two disconnected boxes. In the left box, there is a detector, as shown in Fig. 1(b). After the detector worked, and if the detector records a particle, what the detector measures is a whole particle due to the corpuscular aspect. This means that the wave packet  $\beta |\Psi_2\rangle$  in the right box would disappear, and this wave packet would appear in the left box. It is analogous that, if the detector does not record a particle, the wave packet  $\alpha |\Psi_1\rangle$  would disappear in the left box, and appear in the right box. For two connected boxes, this wave-packet collapse can happen and in fact it is well-known that it can happen in a nonlocal way. For the present situation that the two boxes are disconnected and closed, the disconnectivity between two boxes means that the wave packet in one box can not disappear in one box and appear in another box if we assume that there is no extra hidden spatial dimension, or assume that the wave-packet collapse is a process in the ordinary three-dimensional space (rather than the so-called superspace). However, the measurement of the particle by the detector means that there must be a wave-packet collapse process due to the particle aspect of the single-particle quantum state. This leads to a paradox between the wave-packet collapse due to the measurement and particle aspect, and the inhibition of the wave-packet collapse due to the disconnectivity of two boxes. It is natural that an economic solution to this paradox is the suggestion that our initial assumption is invalid, *i.e.* it is tempting to assume a result that there does not exist in principle a quantum state which is a coherent superposition of two wave packets trapped respectively in two completely disconnected and closed boxes.

In getting the above result, we have assumed an inhibition of the nonlocal wave-packet collapse between two disconnected and closed boxes. One should note a subtle meaning of the nonlocality of the wave-packet collapse due to a measurement. Nonlocality has become a key element of quantum mechanics. For a connected region, the wave-packet collapse can happen nonlocally and unblockedly. For two disconnected boxes that a particle in one box can not be transferred to another box in any approach without the breaking of two boxes,

however, it is quite possible that even nonlocality can not transfer a wave packet from one box to another box. Up to my best knowledge, almost all the theoretical and experimental studies on the nonlocality of quantum mechanics are carried out for a fully connected region. In particular, on the experimental side, it seems that the role of disconnectivity on the nonlocality of quantum mechanics has never been studied carefully. At least, the previous experiments do not exclude the possibility of the inhibition of the wave-packet collapse between two disconnected boxes.

If we agree with the *point of view II* that a particle only exists in one of the two disconnected boxes, we inevitably get a result that the closing of the shutter would have an essential influence on the quantum state  $|\Psi\rangle = \alpha|\Psi_1\rangle + \beta|\Psi_2\rangle$ , even there is no spatial contact between the shutter and the wave packets of this quantum state. These analyses suggest the following process for the density matrix after closing the shutter:

$$\begin{aligned}\rho_i &= |\Psi\rangle\langle\Psi| \\ \implies \rho_f &= |\alpha|^2 |\Psi_1\rangle\langle\Psi_1| + |\beta|^2 |\Psi_2\rangle\langle\Psi_2|.\end{aligned}\tag{3}$$

Here  $\rho_i$  and  $\rho_f$  are respectively the density matrix before and after the closing of the shutter.

It is obvious that the probability of finding a particle in the left or right boxes is the same for the density matrix  $\rho_i$  and  $\rho_f$ . However, there is an essential difference between  $\rho_i$  and  $\rho_f$ , by noting that in the density matrix  $\rho_f$ , there is classical correlation between two boxes, rather than quantum correlation. In the density matrix  $\rho_i$ , there is no quantum coherence between  $|\Psi_1\rangle$  and  $|\Psi_2\rangle$ . For a particle described by the density matrix  $\rho_f$ , the particle only exists in one of the boxes with probability  $|\alpha|^2$  and  $|\beta|^2$ . If all the confining conditions (the boxes, the shutter and the trapping potential  $V_1$  and  $V_2$ ) are removed, there would be interference between  $|\Psi_1\rangle$  and  $|\Psi_2\rangle$  after sufficient expansion time for  $\rho_i$ , while there is no interference for  $\rho_f$ .

Generally speaking, the measurement for a quantum state consists of two elementary processes: (i) the wave-packet collapse (or decoherence) process; and (ii) a transformation of the collapsed quantum state to a classical signal we can understand. For the situation discussed in the present work, the closing of the shutter makes one box become two disconnected boxes. After the closing of the shutter, we prepare in fact two detectors whose resolution is the region of a box. Thus, the closing of the shutter leads to the wave-packet collapse of a particle, and complete the first component of a measurement process. The second part of

the measurement can be completed by switching on the detectors in two boxes, so that the interaction between the particle and the detectors gives classical signal we can understand. What we want to stress here is that even before the detectors in two boxes are switched on, it is highly possible that there is already a wave-packet collapse by the closing of the shutter. In a sense, the closing of the shutter plays a role of measurement process, although further information is needed to know which box the particle exists. This is a little like the detection of a particle by a detection screen. When the particle “hits” the detection screen, the measurement process is completed. However, we still need to “have a look at” the detection screen to know the location of the particle. Of course, if the closing of the shutter is regarded as a measurement process, because there is no spatial contact between the shutter and wave packets of the particle, it is different from the ordinary measurement process. In a sense, it is a sort of quantum measurement induced by topological disconnectivity.

### III. THE DEFINITION OF STRONG DISCONNECTIVITY AND WEAK DISCONNECTIVITY

In the *point of view II* about the wave-packet collapse process (3), it relies on two assumptions: wave-corpucle duality and wave-packet collapse being a process in the ordinary three-dimensional space. The *point of view II* is a natural result if we adopt the point of view that a particle can not exist simultaneously in several disconnected regions. We see that the definition of disconnected regions is necessary to consider further the problem we discussed in the present work, and in particular the future experiments.

There are two different situations for the disconnectivity as follows.

(i) For a particle existing in a region  $\Sigma_1$ , under any coherent quantum manipulation such as the manipulation of internal and external states, if the wave packet of the particle can not be transformed into another region  $\Sigma_2$ , two regions  $\Sigma_1$  and  $\Sigma_2$  is regarded as *strong disconnectivity*.

(ii) For a particle existing in a region  $\Sigma_1$ , there is a situation that, the manipulation of the spatial wave function alone can not transform the particle to another region  $\Sigma_1$ . Together with a manipulation of the internal state, however, one may transform coherently the wave packet to the region  $\Sigma_2$ . We call this situation as *weak disconnectivity*.

To make the definition of the weak disconnectivity more clearly, we give here an example




FIG. 2: An example of weak disconnectivity.

of weak disconnectivity. In Fig. 2, there are two coherently separated photon wave packets with vertical polarization and horizontal polarization. In the connection region, there are horizontal polarizer and vertical polarizer. The cavities  $\Sigma_1$  and  $\Sigma_2$  are disconnected in a sense, because the left (right) photon with vertical (horizontal) polarization can not transform into the right (left) cavity without the changes of the polarization direction. However, if the polarization of the photon is changed with some quantum manipulations, the wave packet can transform between two cavities. Thus, two cavities are weakly disconnected.

In my opinion, if the closing of a shutter leads to a strong disconnectivity, it is highly possible that there would be a wave-packet collapse for the coherently superposed quantum state. As for the situation of weak disconnectivity, frankly speaking, at least in my opinion, it is highly uncertain what will happen in an experiment. In fact, I believe only future experiments could tell us what will happen for both cases. In the following sections, I will try to give several experimental schemes to answer these problems in future experiments.



#### IV. EXPERIMENTAL SUGGESTIONS FOR STRONG DISCONNECTIVITY

In this section, I will try to give several experimental schemes about the situation of strong disconnectivity.

##### A. experimental suggestion I

We consider a double-split interference experiment shown in Fig. 3. The Young double-split experiment has been discussed widely for the complementarity between the corpuscular aspect and wave aspect. Various Young double-split experiments have verified the concept of the wave-corpuscular duality. The single-photon pulse is coherently spatially-separated after the photon passes the double splits. After the photon passes the double splits, the quantum state of the photon is confined in two optical fibers. For this sort of experiment, it is obvious that there is clear interference pattern in the detection screen when two shutters  $A$  and  $B$  are always open. In a real experiment, the connection between the double splits and the optical fiber may be realized by using a beam splitter to play the role of double splits. For this double-split experiment, the density matrix is

$$\rho_1 = |\Psi\rangle \langle\Psi|, \quad (4)$$

with  $|\Psi\rangle = (|\Psi_1\rangle + |\Psi_2\rangle)/\sqrt{2}$ . For a series of photon pulses with overall photon number  $N$ , the density distribution on the detection screen is then

$$\begin{aligned} n_1 &= \langle\mathbf{r}|\rho_1|\mathbf{r}\rangle \\ &= N \left[ \frac{1}{2} |\langle\mathbf{r}|\Psi_1\rangle|^2 + \frac{1}{2} |\langle\mathbf{r}|\Psi_2\rangle|^2 + \text{Re}(\langle\mathbf{r}|\Psi_1\rangle \langle\Psi_2|\mathbf{r}\rangle) \right]. \end{aligned} \quad (5)$$

The last term is the well-known interference term.

As a comparison, we consider another double-split experiment by considering the role of two mechanical shutters  $A$  and  $B$  along the optical fiber 1. The mechanical shutters are used so that one considers experimentally the situation of strong disconnectivity. During the propagation of the photon wave packet between two shutters in the optical fiber 1, two shutters close and then open simultaneously. After the two shutters are closed, the existence region of the quantum state  $|\Psi_1\rangle$  and the existence region of the quantum state  $|\Psi_2\rangle$  become completely disconnected. If the *point of view II* (the wave-packet collapse given by (3)) is




FIG. 3: Schematic diagram of the Young double-split experiment. If two shutters  $A$  and  $B$  along the optical fiber 1 are always open, there should be clear interference pattern on the detection screen shown by the dashed line. When two shutters are manipulated appropriately, *the point of view I* still predicts the interference pattern shown by the dashed line, while the *point of view II* gives the predication of no interference pattern shown by the solid line.

correct, the closing of the shutter makes the density matrix become

$$\rho_2 = \frac{1}{2} |\Psi_1\rangle \langle \Psi_1| + \frac{1}{2} |\Psi_2\rangle \langle \Psi_2|. \quad (6)$$

Before the possible single-photon pulse arrives at the shutter  $B$  along the optical fiber 1, two shutters open simultaneously. For every single-photon pulse, there is a manipulation of the closing and opening of two shutters during the propagation of the pulsed quantum state between two shutters. In this situation, for a series of photon pulses with overall photon number  $N$ , the density distribution on the detection screen is

$$n_2 = \langle \mathbf{r} | \rho_2 | \mathbf{r} \rangle = N \left[ \frac{1}{2} |\langle \mathbf{r} | \Psi_1 \rangle|^2 + \frac{1}{2} |\langle \mathbf{r} | \Psi_2 \rangle|^2 \right]. \quad (7)$$

We see that there is no interference pattern based on the *point of view II*. If the *point of view I* is correct, we expect that there is still clear interference pattern.




FIG. 4: Schematic diagram of an experimental suggestion for the situation of strong disconnectivity.

### B. experimental suggestion II

We now consider another experimental suggestion. In Fig. 4, a single photon pulse is split into two beams by the beam splitter denoted by BS1. Two coherently separated photon pulses propagate in optical fibers along different paths denoted by  $x$  and  $y$ . Two mirrors (denoted by  $M$ ) bring two beams together at a beam splitter denoted by BS2. The light path is devised so that two photon pulses arrive at BS2 simultaneously. The phase shifter controls the relative phase  $\phi$  when two pulses arrive at BS2. The role of BS2 is shown by the inset in this figure.

Without the shutters, after very simple derivation, the density matrix is

$$\rho_a = |\Psi\rangle \langle \Psi| \quad (8)$$

with  $|\Psi\rangle = \frac{1}{2}(e^{i\phi} - 1)|x\rangle + \frac{1}{2}(e^{i\phi} + 1)|y\rangle$ . For a series of photon pulses with overall photon number  $N$ , the average photon number recorded by the detectors  $D_x$  and  $D_y$  is respectively given by

$$N_x = N \langle x | \rho_a | x \rangle = \frac{N}{4} |e^{i\phi} - 1|^2, \quad (9)$$

and

$$N_y = N \langle y | \rho_a | y \rangle = \frac{N}{4} |e^{i\varphi} + 1|^2. \quad (10)$$

Because of the coherent interference of two split photon pulses,  $N_x$  and  $N_y$  display oscillating behavior with the relative phase  $\varphi$ .

Similar to the preceding experimental suggestion, during the propagation of the pulsed photon between two shutters, two mechanical shutters shown in Fig. 4 close and open simultaneously. Based on the *point of view II*, the density matrix is

$$\rho_b = \frac{1}{2} |\Psi_x\rangle \langle \Psi_x| + \frac{1}{2} |\Psi_y\rangle \langle \Psi_y| \quad (11)$$

with

$$|\Psi_x\rangle = \frac{e^{i\varphi}}{\sqrt{2}} (|x\rangle + |y\rangle), \quad (12)$$

and

$$|\Psi_y\rangle = \frac{1}{\sqrt{2}} (-|x\rangle + |y\rangle). \quad (13)$$

In this situation, we have

$$N_x = N \langle x | \rho_b | x \rangle = \frac{N}{2}, \quad (14)$$

and

$$N_y = N \langle y | \rho_b | y \rangle = \frac{N}{2}. \quad (15)$$

Because two pulses along the paths  $x$  and  $y$  become incoherent due to the manipulation of two shutters,  $N_x$  and  $N_y$  do not depend on the relative phase  $\varphi$ .

We see that there is obvious difference between the results based on the *point of view I* and *point of view II*. In particular, for  $\varphi = 0$ , the *point of view I* predicts that  $N_x = 0$ , while the *point of view II* predicts that  $N_x = N/2$ . For  $\varphi = 0$ , the *point of view II* can be verified or rejected by checking whether there is significant proportion of photons recorded by the detector  $D_x$ .

## V. EXPERIMENTAL SUGGESTION FOR WEAK DISCONNECTIVITY

We now turn to consider an experimental suggestion about the situation of weak disconnectivity. The experimental suggestions in the preceding section have a shortcoming that the response time of the mechanical shutter should be very short. If one use a single-photon pulse, the response time of the mechanical shutter should be smaller than  $L/c$  with  $L$  and

$c$  being the length of the optical fiber and light velocity. This is quite challenging for a mechanical shutter. For the situation of weak disconnectivity, however, the application of the Pockels cell can overcome the problem of response time.

Compared with Fig. 4, the path  $y$  in Fig. 5 has special design with two vertical polarizers and two Pockels cells (PC1 and PC2). The response time of the Pockels cell can be of the order of ns. The pulse from the single-photon source has vertical polarization. Assuming that the wave packet of the  $n$ th single photon along the path  $y$  arrives in succession the left polarizer, PC1, PC2 and the right polarizer with times  $t_{n0}$ ,  $t_{n1}$ ,  $t_{n2}$  and  $t_{n3}$ . We have  $t_{n1} - t_{n0} = L_1/c$ ,  $t_{n2} - t_{n1} = L_2/c$  and  $t_{n3} - t_{n2} = L_3/c$ . The Pockels cell has the role that once a voltage is applied on it, the polarization of the incident light will be rotated by  $90^\circ$ . The time sequence of the voltage for two Pockels cells is shown respectively by solid and dashed lines in the figure. After the time  $t_{n1}$ , the polarization of the wave packet of the photon along path  $y$  becomes horizontal. In this situation, we see that between the time interval  $\Delta t$  (shown by the dashed line), the interior and exterior regions of the box show a sort of weak disconnectivity. The merit of this experimental scheme lies in that due to the rapid response of the Pockels cell, it is more feasible than that of the strong disconnectivity shown in Fig. 4. It is obvious that whether there is interference phenomena recorded by the detectors  $D_x$  and  $D_y$  can tell us whether there is a wave-packet collapse due to weak disconnectivity.

## VI. SUMMARY AND DISCUSSION

In summary, I discuss here a gedanken experiment about the questions that “whether a particle can exist simultaneously in two disconnected boxes” and “whether there is a wave-packet collapse induced by topological disconnectivity”. For two different point of view discussed here, and at least for the situation of strong disconnectivity, I tend to a prediction of wave-packet collapse induced by topological disconnectivity based on the consideration of the wave-corpucle duality. Possibly feasible experimental suggestions are proposed to answer these questions.

Once a reliable experiment is done, I believe that the experimental results could deepen our understanding of quantum mechanics, no matter which point of view (*point of view I* or *point of view II*) is verified. If the *point of view I* is verified (in particular for the situation of




FIG. 5: (Color online) Schematic diagram of an experimental suggestion for the situation of weak disconnection.

strong disconnection), the concept of nonlocality of quantum mechanics can be extended to disconnected regions, and this means that the wave-packet collapse can be regarded as not only nonlocal, but also in a sense a process beyond the ordinary three-dimensional physical space. Before the final verification of the *point of view I*, I could not speak too much about the meaning of the wave-packet collapse beyond the ordinary three-dimensional space. If the *point of view II* is verified, it would establish a new decoherence without contact with the wave packet and without thermal source. It would also add new meaning about the concept of nonlocality of quantum mechanics. Note that this sort of decoherence is quite different from the environment-induced decoherence [9], because in environment-induced decoherence, there is contact between the wave packet and the environment (or thermal source). For example, in a beautiful decoherence experiment by using atomic interferometry [10], the spontaneously emitted photons play a role of contact between the spatially separated atomic wave packets and environment.

Our discussion in this paper is different from the delayed-choice experiments [11] in quantum interference suggested by Wheeler [12]. In the delayed-choice experiment, it considers

the question that whether the result is changed in quantum interference experiment if the decision for observation of the photon in one of the paths is made after the photon has passed a beam splitter. In the delayed-choice experiment, there is also no contact between the wave packet and the apparatus (a Pockels cell and a Glan polarizing prism in Ref. [11]). In our gedanken experiment, however, two shutters make two different regions become disconnected. In fact, after careful searching the relevant experiments, we find that almost all the quantum inference experiments do not address the situation of controllable connected and disconnected regions. In previous Young double-split experiments, splitting experiments by a beam splitter and atomic interferometer etc, the whole region is always connected.

Considering the great challenge of controllable disconnected regions in an experiment, I think that it is almost impossible to distinguish *point of view I* and *point of view II* by an accidental experiment, i.e. I believe that all previous experiments do not give us clear evidence to verify which point of view is more reasonable. Careful division of an experiment is needed to tell us which point of view is correct. The challenge of this sort of experiment can be given by a simple analysis. For a single photon pulse considered in Fig. 3 and Fig. 4, if the response time of two electromechanical shutters is microsecond (which can be achieved in the present technique), this requests that the length of the optical fiber should be larger than 300 m. This means that there is severe request on the quality of the optical fiber and experimental environment so that the random phase during the propagation of the photon pulse in the optical fiber is suppressed largely. One method to overcome this problem is the development of submicrosecond electromechanical shutters. Another method is the application of atomic interferometer [13] to investigate our problem. For this sort of experiment, two shutters and a cavity should be placed in the vacuum chamber. After the splitting of an atom, one of the wave packets passes the cavity, and the closing of two shutters can make the cavity become completely closed. For the shutters with response time of microsecond and the atoms with velocity of 10 m/s, the length of the cavity should be larger than  $10^{-5}$  m. Therefore, it is possible that our problem could be answered with the development of atom interferometers.

## Acknowledgments

This work is supported by NSFC 10634060 and NBRPC 2006CB921406. The author thanks very much the useful discussions with Dr. Hongping Liu, Prof. Baolong Lu and Prof. Biao Wu *et al.*

- 
- [1] M. H. Anderson, J. R. Ensher, M. R. Matthews, C. E. Wieman, and E. A. Cornell, *Science* **269**, 198 (1995); K. B. Davis, M.-O. Mewes, M. R. Andrews, N. J. van Druten, D. S. Durfee, D. M. Kurn, and W. Ketterle, *Phys. Rev. Lett.* **75**, 3969 (1995); C. C. Bradley, C. A. Sackett, J. J. Tollett, and R. G. Hulet, *Phys. Rev. Lett.* **75**, 1687 (1995).
  - [2] A. Aspect, J. Dalibard, and G. Roger, *Phys. Rev. Lett.* **49**, 1804 (1982).
  - [3] J. S. Bell, *Physics* (Long Island City, N.Y.) **1**, 195 (1964).
  - [4] J. Volz, M. Weber, D. Schlenk, W. Rosenfeld, J. Vrana, K. Saucke, C. Kurtsiefer, and H. Weinfurter, *Phys. Rev. Lett.* **96**, 030404 (2006).
  - [5] V. Jacques, E. Wu, F. Grosshans, F. Treussart, P. Grangier, A. Aspect, and J. F. Roch, *Science* **315**, 966 (2007).
  - [6] S. Groblacher, T. Paterek, R. Kaltenbaek, C. Brukner, M. Zukowski, M. Aspelmeyer, and A. Zeilinger, *Nature* **446**, 871 (2007).
  - [7] A. J. Leggett, *Found. Phys.* **33**, 1469 (2003).
  - [8] A. J. Leggett, *J. Phys.-Condens. Mat.* **14**, R415 (2002).
  - [9] W. H. Zurek, *Phys. Today* **44**, 36 (1991); W. H. Zurek, *Rev. Mod. Phys.* **75**, 715 (2003); M. Schlosshauer, *Rev. Mod. Phys.* **76**, 1267 (2004).
  - [10] D. A. Kokorowski, A. D. Cronin, T. D. Roberts, and D. E. Pritchard, *Phys. Rev. Lett.* **86**, 2191 (2001).
  - [11] T. Hellmuth, H. Walther, A. Zajonc, and W. Schleich, *Phys. Rev. A* **35**, 2532 (1987).
  - [12] J. A. Wheeler, in *Mathematical Foundations of Quantum Theory*, edited by A. R. Marlow (Academic, New York, 1978), p. 9; in *Some Strangeness in the Proportion*, edited by H. Woolf (Addison-Wesley, Reading, Mass., 1980), p. 341; in *Problems in the Foundations of Physics*, Proceedings of the International School of Physics “Enrico Fermi,” Course LXXII, Varenna, 1977, edited by T. di Francia (North-Holland, Amsterdam, 1979), p. 395; W. A. Miller and



J. A. Wheeler, in *Proceedings of the International Symposium on Foundations of Quantum Mechanics*, edited by S. Kamefuchi (Physics Society of Japan, Tokyo, 1983), p. 140.

- [13] *Atom Interferometry*, edited by P. R. Berman (Academic Press, San Diego, 1997), and references therein.