

What particles that never met "know" of one another?

Sofia Wechsler

Computer Engineering Center ¹⁾

Abstract

An experiment is proposed, similar to that performed by Sciarrino et al. Sciarrino's experiment was done with two identical photons in a down-conversion pair i.e. the photons met in the past. In the case examined here the particles are also identical, but originate in different and independent sources and the particles never meet. As long as one can tell what is the source of each of them, the joint wave function remains factorizable. A configuration is created, in which one cannot tell anymore which particle comes from which source. As a result, the joint wave function becomes non-factorizable, symmetrical (bosons) or antisymmetrical (fermions), i.e. the particles are no more independent. For comparison, entanglements are prepared by letting the particles meet in some way. In the case studied here the change from factorizable to non-factorizable occurs *at-a-distance*. It looks as if a particle "feels" across a space-like interval the presence of another particle identical with it, and the two "adjust" their joint state *at a distance*, i.e. symmetrical or antisymmetrical according to their particle type. These features may be observed by measuring the probabilities of detections in coincidence, which are different for fermions and bosons, and both different from not-identical particles.

1. Introduction

Experiments on entangled particles show nonlocal correlations between results of measurements. Despite distances between them, the particles behave as if they are "informed" on the type of test(s) and the result(s) of the other particle(s).

An experiment performed by Sciarrino et al.²⁾, hinted about another nonlocal phenomenon. Sciarrino et al. showed that the wave function of two identical photons is symmetrical with respect to the operation of exchange between the two particles, although they are spacely separated. But in his experiment the two photons originated in a down-conversion pair, i.e. they met in the past, so one can say that the wave function symmetry was "agreed upon" when the particles met.

The purpose of the present text is to avoid this possibility. A stronger case is proposed for test, when the two identical particles come from different sources and never meet before the measurement. As long as it is obvious from which source comes each particle, their joint wave function is factorizable – no entanglement. A configuration is

¹⁾ Nahariya, P.O.B. 2004, 22265, Israel

²⁾ F. Sciarrino, E. Lombardi, F. de Martini, "Delayed – Choice Entanglement – Swapping with Vacuum – One Photon Quantum States", quant-ph/0201019.

created in which, though keeping the particles distant from one another, it is no more discernable from which source came each one of them. The prediction made in this text is that the joint wave function will become non-factorizable, despite space-like interval between the particles and their never having met. This prediction, if confirmed, looks as if a particle "knows" that somewhere in the space there is a likeness of itself, and the two particles "arrange" joint their joint state *at a distance*, symmetrical for bosons and antisymmetrical for fermions.

This symmetry (antisymmetry) may be observed by means of probabilities of detections in coincidence, which are predicted to differ for each type of particles, and differ from non-identical particles.

For comparison, the joint wave function of the two electrons on the *s*-shell in an atom is also antisymmetrical, but in the atom the particles are close in space. Some authors even speak of an exchange interaction.³⁾

As another difference from the case proposed here, entanglements are obtained between particles that in the past, before being measured.⁴⁾ The remark in the section 2 is useful for avoiding confusion about some procedures of preparing entanglements.

2. An experiment with distant identical particles

Assume two sources of particles of a same energy, S_L and S_R , fig. 1. A Stern-Gerlach apparatus in front of each source selects particles with positive spin projection along the axis perpendicular to the page (for photons, the Stern-Gerlach apparatuses may be replaced by polarizers). The resulting beams, L and R, impinge on two beam-splitters, BS_L , respectively BS_R . From each beam-splitter an output branch goes to the region V, the other to the region E. On the branch B' is placed a phase shift φ .

We are interested in detections in coincidence, and the state of two particles is

$$(1) |\psi\rangle = \frac{1}{2}(|A\rangle - |A'\rangle)(|B\rangle - e^{i\varphi}|B'\rangle) = 2^{-1/2}\{|\psi_2\rangle - |\psi_{1,1}\rangle\}$$

where $|\psi_2\rangle$ describes particles detected both at BS_V or both at BS_E , and $|\psi_{1,1}\rangle$ describes particles detected one at BS_V one at BS_E

$$(2) |\psi_2\rangle = 2^{-1/2}(|A, B\rangle + e^{i\varphi}|A', B'\rangle).$$

³⁾ L. D. Landau and E.M. Lifschitz, "Quantum Mechanics, non-relativist theory", chapter IX, section 62, (1962).

⁴⁾ For instance, in Hardy's proposed experiment, P.R.L. vol. 68, no.20, the entanglement appears because one possible coupling between the particles is excluded by electron-positron annihilation. The singlet of photons is usually generated from down-conversion pairs, i.e. the particles also met in the past. Jian-Wei Pan et al., P.R.L. vol. 80, no. 18, claim that an entanglement is created between particles that never met, by performing a Bell-test on two particles, each from a different polarization singlet. The remaining particles are said to be in an entangled state. This is not an entanglement, see the remark in section 2.




Figure 1. An experiment with identical particles originating in different sources.

$$(3) |\psi_{1,1}\rangle = 2^{-1/2}(e^{i\varphi}|A, B'\rangle + |A', B\rangle).$$

Most of the analysis in continuation will be devoted to $|\psi_{1,1}\rangle$ which encapsulates the nonlocal features, as in every coupling of $|\psi_{1,1}\rangle$ one particle is in the region V, the other in the region E.

Remark: despite the appearance $|\psi_{1,1}\rangle$ is not an entanglement. A part of a wave function cannot be considered an entanglement, only the entire state may say if the particles are separable or not. If from the joint wave function one ignores some of the couplings, it is trivial that the remaining expression looks non-factorizable. Nothing happens to the state of particles in consequence of our decision to ignore part of the results.

However, in the case studied here the state $|\psi\rangle$ in its entirety describes not independent particles. $|\psi_{1,1}\rangle$ comprises the nonlocal part of it, see below.

The beam-splitters BS_V and BS_E produce the transformations

$$(4) |A\rangle \rightarrow 2^{-1/2}(|D_1\rangle + |D_2\rangle), \quad |B\rangle \rightarrow 2^{-1/2}(|D_1\rangle - |D_2\rangle),$$

which introduced in (2) and (3) give

$$(5) |\psi_2\rangle = \begin{cases} \frac{1}{2}\{(|2D_1\rangle - |2D_2\rangle) + e^{i\varphi}(|2D'_1\rangle - |2D'_2\rangle)\} & \text{bosons,} \\ 2^{-1/2}\{|D_2, D_1\rangle_{AS} + e^{i\varphi}|D'_2, D'_1\rangle_{AS}\} & \text{fermions,} \end{cases}$$

$$(6) |\psi_{1,1}\rangle = 8^{-1/2}\{e^{i\varphi}(|D_1, D'_1\rangle - |D_2, D'_2\rangle - |D_1, D'_2\rangle + |D_2, D'_1\rangle) \\ + (|D'_1, D_1\rangle - |D'_2, D_2\rangle + |D'_2, D_1\rangle - |D'_1, D_2\rangle)\},$$

with the definitions

$$(7) |p, q\rangle_{AS} = 2^{-1/2}(|p, q\rangle - |q, p\rangle), \quad |p, q\rangle_S = 2^{-1/2}(|p, q\rangle + |q, p\rangle),$$

and each expression of the form $|p, q\rangle$ in (6) and (7) is ordered, with p originating in the beam L , and q in the beam R . (5) was obtained by applying the procedure of symmetrization (antisymmetrization).⁵⁾

In what concerns the relationship between $|D_1, D'_1\rangle$ and $|D'_1, D_1\rangle$, and in general between a coupling on the 1st line of (6) and the coupling below, the exchange between the origins of the particles is equivalent with a rotation of the picture by 180°, which overlays the particle L on R , and vice-versa. It is considered that at such a rotation the wave function of a pair of bosons remains unchanged, while that of a pair of fermions changes sign. So, let's symmetrize (antisymmetrize) (6) too. One gets for bosons

$$(8) |\psi_{1,1}\rangle = 8^{-1/2}\{(e^{i\varphi} + 1)(|D_1, D'_1\rangle_S - |D_2, D'_2\rangle_S) - (e^{i\varphi} - 1)(|D_1, D'_2\rangle_S - |D_2, D'_1\rangle_S)\}$$

and for fermions

$$(9) |\psi_{1,1}\rangle = 8^{-1/2}\{(e^{i\varphi} - 1)(|D_1, D'_1\rangle_{AS} - |D_2, D'_2\rangle_{AS}) - (e^{i\varphi} + 1)(|D_1, D'_2\rangle_{AS} - |D_2, D'_1\rangle_{AS})\},$$

⁵⁾ The wave function of bosons (fermions) is predicted by the theory to be symmetrical (antisymmetrical). This behavior was widely confirmed for photons, see for instance, by C.K. Hong, Z.Y. Ou, L. Mandel, "Measurement of Subpicosecond Time Intervals between Two Photons by Interference", Phys. Rev. Lett. 59, 2044 (1987). For fermions the experiments are less abundant. I am not aware of experiments with two fermions impinging simultaneously on a beam-splitter. Partial results may be found in M. Iannuzzi et al., "Direct experimental evidence of free fermion antibunching", quant-ph/0509131; A. Aspect, D. Boiron, C. Westbrook, "Quantum atom optics with bosons and fermions", quant-ph/0803.2828 .

see the definitions (7). The probabilities of detections in coincidence between the regions V and E will be,

$$(10) \text{Prob}[D_i, D'_i] = \frac{1}{2}(1 + \cos \varphi), \quad \text{Prob}[D_i, D'_k] = \frac{1}{2}(1 - \cos \varphi),$$

for bosons, and

$$(11) \text{Prob}[D_i, D'_i] = \frac{1}{2}(1 - \cos \varphi), \quad \text{Prob}[D_i, D'_k] = \frac{1}{2}(1 + \cos \varphi),$$

for fermions, with $i, k = 1, 2$, and $i \neq k$.

No symmetrization or antisymmetrization is justified when the particles L and R are not identical. In this case $|D_1, D'_1\rangle$ and $|D'_1, D_1\rangle$ differ in their meaning, in the former at D_1 is detected a particle of type L, in the latter at D_1 is detected a particle of type R. It is easy to check that in this case the results in D_1, D'_1, D_2, D'_2 , remain uncorrelated.

3. Discussion

By examining both $|\psi_2\rangle$ and $|\psi_{1,1}\rangle$, expressions (5), (8), (9), one can see that the state $|\psi\rangle$ is not factorizable, neither for bosons nor for fermions. Then $|\psi\rangle$ represents an entanglement. Sciarrino obtained for photons the same results as in (10). But this is just a hint, not a confirmation of (10), since Sciarrino's experiment was different, with particles that met in the past. In the experiment proposed here the component $|\psi_2\rangle$ of the wave function also describes particles that meet, so, the symmetry (antisymmetry) of this component may be thought of as an "arrangement" between the particles when they meet. However, the main assumption to be verified is that the component $|\psi_{1,1}\rangle$, (8), (9), that describes particles that don't meet, is symmetrical (antisymmetrical). In this case an "agreement" may be made only *at a distance*.

It will be of help to examine a difference between the Hardy-type entanglement and that obtained here. Hardy's experiment starts with independent particles that annihilate when in a particular coupling, and because that coupling is modified, the wave function becomes non-factorizable. In the present case the state $|\psi\rangle$ also comprises a component with particles that meet, $|\psi_2\rangle$, but no entanglement follows from that. The entanglement is the result of the symmetry (antisymmetry) of the wave function which in turn is due to the non distinguishability of the particles.