

Quantum Gravity Signature in a Thermodynamic Observable

Thomas Strasser,¹ Marios Christodoulou,¹ Richard Howl,² and Časlav Brukner^{1,3}

¹*Institute for Quantum Optics and Quantum Information (IQOQI) Vienna, Austrian Academy of Sciences, Boltzmannngasse 3, A-1090 Vienna, Austria*

²*Department of Physics, Royal Holloway, University of London, Egham, Surrey, TW20 0EX, United Kingdom*

³*Vienna Center for Quantum Science and Technology (VCQ), Faculty of Physics, University of Vienna, Boltzmannngasse 5, A-1090 Vienna, Austria*

Proposed experiments for obtaining empirical evidence for a quantum description of gravity in a table-top setting focus on detecting quantum information signatures, such as entanglement or non-Gaussianity production, in gravitationally interacting quantum systems. Here, we explore an alternative approach where the quantization of gravity could be inferred through measurements of macroscopic, thermodynamical quantities, without the need for addressability of individual quantum systems. To demonstrate the idea, we take as a case study a gravitationally self-interacting Bose gas, and consider its heat capacity. We find a clear-cut distinction between the predictions of a classical gravitational interaction and a quantum gravitational interaction in the heat capacity of the Bose gas.

Proposals for table-top tests of quantum gravity typically involve preparing a sufficiently massive system in a quantum state and then analysing its quantum information properties to evidence non-classicality of states of its gravitational field [1–3]. Examples include seeking entanglement between two massive systems prepared in Schrödinger cat states [1, 2], and detecting quantum non-Gaussianity in a squeezed Bose-Einstein condensate [3]. This general methodology presents a substantial technical challenge due to the need for preparing and isolating the system from the environment and detecting such highly non-classical quantum states.

Here, we explore whether an alternative approach might be possible. Inspired by ideas of verifying entanglement via macroscopic thermodynamic quantities, such as magnetic susceptibility and heat capacity [4–8], we consider whether a quantum gravitational effect could be detected through thermodynamic observables, thereby avoiding the need for coherent control or the application of quantum operations and measurements.

As a case study, we consider the self-gravitation contributions to the heat capacity of a Bose-Einstein condensate (BEC). Assuming a classical linearized gravitational field in the spirit of ‘semi-classical gravity’ [9, 10], we find that the energy spectrum and the heat capacity remain unaffected by self-gravity. Intuitively, this is due to the interaction being ‘averaged’ over the state of the BEC, which results in the energy spectrum simply being offset by a constant, and has no effect on the heat capacity as it only depends on the spacing of the energy eigenvalues. In contrast, in linearized quantum gravity, correlations are induced between the atoms that cause a non-trivial modification of the energy spectrum, resulting in a dependence of the heat capacity on Newton’s constant. Moreover, since the gravitational field cannot be shielded, the self-gravity contribution to the energies and the heat capacity is not restricted to the neighbouring atoms as in the case of the electromagnetic interaction, but extends to all atoms in the sample. The measurement of heat capacity or internal energy can, therefore, provide a clear-cut criterion for distinguishing semiclassical gravity and linearized quantum gravity.

Setup — The grand-canonical Hamiltonian of a Bose gas

with two-body electromagnetic interactions reads

$$\hat{K} = \int d^3\mathbf{r} \hat{\Psi}^\dagger(\mathbf{r}) \left(-\frac{\hbar^2 \nabla^2}{2m} - \mu \right) \hat{\Psi}(\mathbf{r}) + \hat{H}_I^{EM}, \quad (1)$$

where μ denotes the chemical potential, $\hat{\Psi}^\dagger(\mathbf{r})$ is the non-relativistic quantum field of the Bose gas, the first term represents the kinetic energy of the gas, and \hat{H}_I^{EM} is due to the electromagnetic interactions:

$$\hat{H}_I^{EM} = \frac{1}{2} \int d^3\mathbf{r}' d^3\mathbf{r} \hat{\Psi}^\dagger(\mathbf{r}) \hat{\Psi}^\dagger(\mathbf{r}') V_I(\mathbf{r} - \mathbf{r}') \hat{\Psi}(\mathbf{r}') \hat{\Psi}(\mathbf{r}), \quad (2)$$

with $V_I(\mathbf{r} - \mathbf{r}')$ the two-body electromagnetic potential. For simplicity, we consider a Bose gas trapped in a box of length L with periodic boundary conditions for the field, see for instance [11].

For a dilute Bose gas made up of neutral atoms, the electromagnetic interactions fall off significantly faster than $1/r$. It is, therefore, a good approximation to treat the electromagnetic self-interaction as a contact interaction $V_I(\mathbf{r}) = g^{EM} \delta^{(3)}(\mathbf{r})$, where $g^{EM} = 4\pi\hbar^2 a_s/m$, with m the particle mass and a_s the s-wave scattering length. This is the typical treatment found in textbooks.¹ However, since gravity cannot be shielded, to study the gravitational self-interaction of the Bose gas it is crucial to keep explicit the long-range nature of gravity.

We will study two different types of gravity self-interaction terms. These correspond to a linearized quantized metric perturbation and to a classical gravitational field. In the non-relativistic limit of linearized quantum gravity (meaning zeroth order in the speed of light, but G and \hbar are relevant), the interaction term due to gravity is of the form (2) with $V_I(\mathbf{r}) = -Gm^2/|\mathbf{r}|$,

$$\hat{H}_I^{QG} = -\frac{1}{2} Gm^2 \int d^3\mathbf{r}' \int d^3\mathbf{r} \hat{\Psi}^\dagger(\mathbf{r}) \hat{\Psi}^\dagger(\mathbf{r}') \frac{1}{|\mathbf{r} - \mathbf{r}'|} \hat{\Psi}(\mathbf{r}') \hat{\Psi}(\mathbf{r}). \quad (3)$$

¹ For BECs with non-contact electromagnetic interactions, such as electromagnetically charged BECs, see e.g., [12, 13].

Considering a classical metric perturbation in the spirit of ‘semiclassical gravity’ [14], the interaction Hamiltonian is of the form

$$\hat{H}_I^{CG} = -Gm^2 \int d^3\mathbf{r}' \int d^3\mathbf{r} \frac{\langle \hat{\Psi}^\dagger(\mathbf{r}') \hat{\Psi}(\mathbf{r}') \rangle}{|\mathbf{r} - \mathbf{r}'|} \hat{\Psi}^\dagger(\mathbf{r}) \hat{\Psi}(\mathbf{r}), \quad (4)$$

where the expectation value is taken over the quantum state of the Bose gas. The reason the two cases of self gravitation will give very different contributions to the heat capacity is that \hat{H}_I^{CG} is of *quadratic* order in the annihilation and creation operators, while \hat{H}_I^{QG} is of *quartic* order.

Bogolyubov method applied to long range interaction — The Bogolyubov method is the standard method to analyse a homogeneous, isotropic gaseous BEC with contact electromagnetic interactions [11]. We adapt and apply this method to a $1/r$ (long range) interaction term, with the aim to arrive at a diagonalized Hamiltonian from which the heat capacity can be obtained. The Bogolyubov method consists principally of three major steps: 1) The Bogolyubov approximation, 2) A Fourier transform to momentum space, and 3) A linear symplectic transformation (Bogolyubov transformation) that diagonalizes the Hamiltonian. Finally, we use the gapless condition to determine the chemical potential [15].

Bogolyubov approximation — The first step is to split the field operator as $\hat{\Psi}(\mathbf{r}) = \hat{\phi}(\mathbf{r}) + \hat{\psi}(\mathbf{r})$, where $\hat{\phi}(\mathbf{r})$ and $\hat{\psi}(\mathbf{r})$ are respectively for the condensate and excited states. The Bogolyubov approximation is then that the field operator $\hat{\phi}(\mathbf{r})$ is traded for a classical variable ϕ using the substitution $\hat{\phi}(\mathbf{r}) = \sqrt{n}$, where $n := N/\mathcal{V}$ is the number density of the Bose gas, with N the total number of atoms of the Bose gas and $\mathcal{V} = L^3$ is the volume of the box.² Then, $\hat{\psi}(\mathbf{r})$ acts on the excitations, while $\phi(\mathbf{r})$ is for the ground state. We take the definition of a BEC to be the macroscopic occupation of the ground state, i.e. $n \gg 1$. Inserting the above decomposition into the full grand-canonical Hamiltonian \hat{K} , only terms with two or more $\hat{\phi}(\mathbf{r}) = \sqrt{n}$ are kept since $n \gg 1$. All other terms are taken negligible. An explicit derivation is provided in Appendices 2 and 3.

Fourier transform — Next, we Fourier expand the excitation fields as $\hat{\psi}(\mathbf{r}) = \frac{1}{\sqrt{\mathcal{V}}} \sum_{\mathbf{k}} e^{i\mathbf{k}\cdot\mathbf{r}} \hat{a}_{\mathbf{k}}$, where $\hat{a}_{\mathbf{k}}$ is the annihilation operator for mode \mathbf{k} . Similarly, the interactions are expanded as $V_I(\mathbf{r}) = \frac{1}{\mathcal{V}} \sum_{\mathbf{k}} V_{\mathbf{k}} e^{i\mathbf{k}\cdot\mathbf{r}}$, where $V_{\mathbf{k}} = \int_{\mathcal{V}} d^3\mathbf{r} V_I(\mathbf{r}) e^{-i\mathbf{k}\cdot\mathbf{r}}$, with $\mathbf{k} = 2\pi\mathbf{n}_{\mathbf{k}}/L$, $\mathbf{n}_{\mathbf{k}} = (n_x, n_y, n_z)$, and n_x, n_y, n_z integers ranging from $-\infty$ to $+\infty$.

For the electromagnetic interactions, which are modelled as contact interactions $V_I(\mathbf{r}) = g^{EM} \delta^{(3)}(\mathbf{r})$, we simply have $V_{\mathbf{k}} = g^{EM}$ for all momenta \mathbf{k} . For the long-range gravitational

interaction, we must calculate

$$\begin{aligned} V_{\mathbf{k}}^G &= \int d^3\mathbf{r} \frac{-Gm^2}{|\mathbf{r}|} e^{-i\mathbf{k}\cdot\mathbf{r}} \\ &= \int_{-\frac{L}{2}}^{\frac{L}{2}} dx \int_{-\frac{L}{2}}^{\frac{L}{2}} dy \int_{-\frac{L}{2}}^{\frac{L}{2}} dz \frac{-Gm^2 e^{-2\pi i(n_x x + n_y y + n_z z)/L}}{\sqrt{x^2 + y^2 + z^2}}. \end{aligned} \quad (5)$$

This is well approximated by $V_{\mathbf{k}}^G = g_{\mathbf{k}}^G$ where

$$g_{\mathbf{k}}^G = \begin{cases} g_0^G & k = 0 \\ -4\pi Gm^2/k^2 & k > 0, \end{cases} \quad (7)$$

with $g_0^G \approx L^3 V_{cube}$, and $V_{cube} = -2.38Gm^2/L$ the gravitational potential of a cube of side L at its centre. A derivation is given in Appendix 1.

Inserting the above steps into the quantized gravity interaction Hamiltonian (3), we obtain

$$\hat{H}_I^{QG} = \frac{1}{2}n \left(N g_0^G + \sum_{\mathbf{k} \neq 0} g_{\mathbf{k}}^G \hat{A}_{\mathbf{k}} \right), \quad (8)$$

with $\hat{A}_{\mathbf{k}} = 2\hat{a}_{\mathbf{k}}^\dagger \hat{a}_{\mathbf{k}} + \hat{a}_{\mathbf{k}}^\dagger \hat{a}_{-\mathbf{k}}^\dagger + \hat{a}_{\mathbf{k}} \hat{a}_{-\mathbf{k}}$. Compare this to the electromagnetic interaction Hamiltonian, which in the same approximation reads

$$\hat{H}_I^{EM} = \frac{1}{2}n g^{EM} \left(N + \sum_{\mathbf{k} \neq 0} \hat{A}_{\mathbf{k}} \right). \quad (9)$$

The difference between the long-range nature of the quantum gravitational case (8) and the short-range nature of the (also quantum) electromagnetic case (9) is manifested in the second term (excitations) of the above expressions: in the gravity case we have a k dependent coupling while in the electromagnetic case we have a constant coupling.

Finally, in sharp contrast to the quantum gravity case, for classical gravity we find that the chemical potential is updated to $\mu \rightarrow \mu - n g_0^G$ and the interaction Hamiltonian (4) can be written as just

$$\hat{H}_I^{CG} = n_T N_T g_0^G, \quad (10)$$

where $N_T := \sum_{\mathbf{k} \neq 0} \langle \hat{a}_{\mathbf{k}}^\dagger \hat{a}_{\mathbf{k}} \rangle$ is the number of non-condensed atoms and $n_T := N_T/\mathcal{V}$ is their density. That is, the interaction Hamiltonian is simply a constant term. The radically different behaviour of the interaction between the classical and quantum gravity cases we consider is what allows us to discern the two cases. In particular, as we will see in a moment, the difference can be read from the energy spectrum and heat capacity.

Bogolyubov transformation — We next apply a linear symplectic transformation on phase space to diagonalize the canonical Hamiltonians: $\hat{b}_{\mathbf{k}} = u_{\mathbf{k}} \hat{a}_{\mathbf{k}} + v_{-\mathbf{k}}^* \hat{a}_{-\mathbf{k}}^\dagger$, and $\hat{b}_{\mathbf{k}}^\dagger = u_{\mathbf{k}}^* \hat{a}_{\mathbf{k}}^\dagger + v_{-\mathbf{k}} \hat{a}_{-\mathbf{k}}$, where $|u_{\mathbf{k}}|^2 - |v_{-\mathbf{k}}|^2 = 1$. For the quantum gravity case (8), this results in the grand-canonical Hamiltonian

$$\hat{K}^{QG} = E_0^{QG} + \sum_{\mathbf{k} \neq 0} \epsilon_{\mathbf{k}}^{QG} \hat{b}_{\mathbf{k}}^\dagger \hat{b}_{\mathbf{k}}, \quad (11)$$

² We leave implied the identity operator, an abuse of notation used throughout the letter.

with excitation energies

$$\epsilon_k^{QG} = \sqrt{\left(\frac{\hbar^2 k^2}{2m} - \mu + n(2g^{EM} + g_k^0 + g_k^G)\right)^2 - \left(n(g^{EM} + g_k^G)\right)^2} \quad (12)$$

and ground state energy

$$E_0^{QG} = E_0 + \frac{1}{2}nNg_0^G + \frac{1}{2}\sum_{k \neq 0} \left[\epsilon_k^G - ng_k^G \right], \quad (13)$$

with

$$E_0 = \frac{1}{2}nNg^{EM} + \frac{1}{2}\sum_{k \neq 0} \left[\mu - \frac{\hbar^2 k^2}{2m} - 2ng^{EM} - ng_0^G \right]. \quad (14)$$

For the classical gravity case (4), we find

$$\hat{K}^{CG} = E_0^{CG} + \sum_{k \neq 0} \epsilon_k^{CG} \hat{b}_k^\dagger \hat{b}_k, \quad (15)$$

where

$$\epsilon_k^{CG} = \sqrt{\left(\frac{\hbar^2 k^2}{2m} - \mu + 2ng^{EM} + ng_0^G\right)^2 - (ng^{EM})^2}, \quad (16)$$

and

$$E_0^{CG} = E_0 + n_T N_T g_0^G + \frac{1}{2}\sum_{k \neq 0} \epsilon_k^{CG}. \quad (17)$$

Energy spectrum — In order to obtain the final form of the energy spectrum, we apply the condition that the excitations must be gapless:

$$\lim_{k \rightarrow 0} \epsilon_k^{QG} = 0 \quad \text{and} \quad \lim_{k \rightarrow 0} \epsilon_k^{CG} = 0. \quad (18)$$

This is typically considered a necessary step in order to have a BEC according to the Nambu-Goldstone theorem [16, 17], and allows one to infer the chemical potential μ [15]. Assuming that the electromagnetic interactions are repulsive $g^{EM} > 0$, for the classical gravity interaction Hamiltonian (4) we obtain $\mu = n(g^{EM} + g_0^G)$, leaving us with

$$\epsilon_k^{CG} = \hbar k \sqrt{\frac{\hbar^2 k^2}{4m^2} + \frac{ng^{EM}}{m}}. \quad (19)$$

This result is just the standard excitation energies for a Bose gas with electromagnetic interactions in the approximation of the Bogolyubov method [11].

For the quantum gravity interaction Hamiltonian (8) and assuming again $g^{EM} > 0$, the situation is more subtle. We will discuss separately the case when the electromagnetic coupling is larger than the gravitational coupling and vice versa. With $g^{EM} > |g_0^G|$, we find $\mu = n(g^{EM} + g_0^G)$ and obtain

$$\epsilon_k^{QG} = \hbar k \sqrt{\frac{\hbar^2 k^2}{4m^2} + \frac{ng^{EM}}{m} + \frac{ng_k^G}{m}}. \quad (20)$$

Whereas, if $g^{EM} < |g_0^G|$ then $\mu = 3n(g^{EM} + g_0^G)$, in which case we obtain

$$\epsilon_k^{QG} = \sqrt{\left(\frac{\hbar^2 k^2}{2m} - 2n(g^{EM} + g_0^G)\right)\left(\frac{\hbar^2 k^2}{2m} - 2n(g_0^G - g_k^G)\right)}. \quad (21)$$

Note that the expression under the root never becomes negative. This is because g^G is always negative and $|g_0^G| > g^{EM}$ and $|g_0^G| > |g_k^G|$.

Some comments are in order. In (20), there will be phononic-like excitations when $\hbar k \ll mc_s$ and $n_0 g_k^G/m \ll c_s^2$, where we define $c_s^2 = n_0 g^{EM}/m$. In contrast, in (21), it is never possible to obtain phononic excitations given the form of g_k^G in (7). This means that if gravity becomes greater than the electromagnetic interactions, instead of phonons (type-A Nambu-Goldstone bosons)³, one should see the emergence of type-B Nambu-Goldstone bosons sourced by the quadratic dispersion relation. Additionally, the fact that quantum gravity produces Type-B NGBs also presents a clear-cut criterion to tell it apart from EM-sourced-dispersion, as the latter only ever produces Type-A NGBs (phonons).

Heat capacity — The heat capacity can be evaluated as $c_V = \partial E / \partial T$, where $E = \langle \hat{K}^G \rangle + \mu N$ is the internal energy, with \hat{K}^G being \hat{K}^{QG} or \hat{K}^{CG} . Given that $\langle b_k^\dagger b_k \rangle = \int dk 1/(\exp(\beta \epsilon_k) - 1)$, the specific heat capacity c_V is then

$$c_V = \frac{1}{k_B T^2} \sum_{k \neq 0} \frac{\epsilon_k^2 e^{\beta \epsilon_k}}{(e^{\beta \epsilon_k} - 1)^2}, \quad (22)$$

where $\beta := 1/(k_B T)$ and ϵ_k is ϵ_k^{QG} for quantum gravity and ϵ_k^{CG} for classical gravity, assuming sufficiently low temperatures. Since the form of (22) is the same for both quantum and classical gravity, any difference comes entirely from the respective ϵ_k calculated above. In fact, since ϵ_k^{CG} is the same as that for a non-self-gravitating BEC with electromagnetic interactions, the heat capacity of a BEC is unaffected by a classical gravity interaction of the form (4). Therefore, we see that the heat capacity, a macroscopic thermodynamical observable, will in principle cleanly distinguish between the two cases we consider: In the classical gravity case, the heat capacity will be unaffected and will be the same as if we had neglected the self-gravitational interaction, which is not the case for the quantum gravitational self-interaction. This is due to the spacing of the energy eigenvalues being only affected by quantum gravity: they follow (20) or (21) rather than (19).

Size of the effect — We now consider what sort of experimental parameters could be required to evidence quantum gravity through measurements of the heat capacity. Since any differences come through the energy eigenvalues, as discussed above, we first discuss how measurements of just these eigenvalues could also be used to distinguish quantum and classical

³ See Appendix 4 for more detail.

gravity. For example, we could consider a 0.1% deviation from the standard values ϵ_k^{CG} as the minimum threshold for a measurable result and evidence of quantum gravity. That is, we can consider what experimental parameters are required for $\Delta\epsilon_k/\epsilon_k^{CG} \times 100\% \geq 0.1\%$, where $\Delta\epsilon_k := |\epsilon_k^{QG} - \epsilon_k^{CG}|$. For now, we assume that the electromagnetic interactions can be set negligible compared to quantum gravity using Feshbach resonances, and return to this later. Then, from (21), if we ignore g_k^G for simplicity, the condition for the energy eigenvalues to be distinguishable is satisfied when

$$100 n g_0^G \gtrsim 0.1 \hbar^2 k^2 / (4m^2) \quad (23)$$

$$\implies NL \gtrsim \pi^2 \hbar^2 |\mathbf{n}_k|^2 / (2380 Gm^3). \quad (24)$$

Taking a ^{174}Yb Bose gas, this sets the approximate condition $NL \gtrsim 2.9 \times 10^{14} |\mathbf{n}_k|^2 \text{ m}^{-3}$. Clearly, it is preferable to measure the $|\mathbf{n}_k| = 1$ mode. Then, an approximate 0.1% deviation would require, for example, $N \approx 10^{15}$ and $L \approx 1$ cm. This is above what has been achieved in experiments - with $N = 10^9$ Hydrogen atoms being the greatest [18], with the condensate being 0.5 cm in length and $15 \mu\text{m}$ in diameter; and 10^8 Sodium atoms [19] in a BEC with axial and radial sizes of 1 mm and $20 \mu\text{m}$. It also requires a relatively high density compared to typical experiments, resulting in a theoretical half-life of around 1 ms due to three-body decay, where the rate of change in density is $dn(t)/dt = -Ln^3(t)$, with L the rate coefficient, which is of order $10^{-41} \text{ m}^6 \text{ s}^{-1}$ for ^{174}Yb [20].

Now we consider what experimental parameters might be required to distinguish quantum and classical gravity in measurements of the *thermodynamic* quantity c_V . We again consider a 0.1% deviation in these values as evidence of quantum gravity, i.e. $100\% \times \Delta c_V / c_V^{CG} \geq 0.1\%$, where $\Delta c_V := |c_V^{QG} - c_V^{CG}|$, with c_V^{QG} and c_V^{CG} defined in (22) for the respective energy eigenvalues. In this case, similar but slightly more demanding parameters are found to be required than in the measurement of the lowest energy mode, with for example $N \approx 10^{16}$, $L \approx 1$ cm and a temperature $T \approx 0.01$ pK providing a 0.1% deviation from a standard (classical gravity) heat capacity of $c_V^{CG}/k_B \approx 3.164$. Again this is very much pushing current experiments, with a temperature of order 10 pK the smallest observed so far in a Bose gas [21]. However, although the required numbers appear slightly more demanding, it may be experimentally preferable to measure the heat capacity, a macroscopic thermodynamic quantity, rather than attempting to single out only the first quasiparticle mode and measure its energy.

We now discuss the electromagnetic self-interaction contributions to the above measurements. Being long-range, the gravitational interaction scales very differently to the electromagnetic one: since the latter is assumed to be a contact potential, g^{EM} is independent of L , whereas g^G scales with L^2 from (7). This difference makes it possible to distinguish the two cases by measuring the functional dependence of the heat capacity on L . Specifically, a spatially large condensate is preferable (with the number of atoms making no difference). Taking a ^{174}Yb BEC with $L \approx 1$ cm, results in $g^{EM}/g_0^G \approx 10^{11}$. However, another aspect of BECs can be utilised: Feshbach resonances such that an appropriate magnetic (or optical in

the case of Strontium) field applied to a BEC can reduce the strength of the electromagnetic interactions. The challenge would be to use a precise enough magnetic field such that fluctuations in its field strength are minimal [3].

Conclusions — We have studied how the gravitational self-interaction of a BEC affects its heat capacity in the approximation of the Bogolyubov method. We find that this thermodynamic quantity is unaffected when the gravitational interaction is classical in the spirit of Schrödinger-Newton theory - see (4). In contrast, if the gravitational interaction is quantized, a gravitational term that is momentum-dependent enters the excitation energies - see (20) and (21) - which also modifies the heat capacity. The two cases of classical and quantum gravity can thus be distinguished in principle by measuring these modifications. This is our main result.

In practice, observing these modifications would require substantial improvements in the state-of-the-art of current BEC experiments. For example, while further studies are needed to assess the full feasibility of our idea, our estimates suggest that a gain of at least ~ 7 orders of the number of atoms in the condensate are required. However, we note that proposals based on measurements of quantum-information quantities, such as entanglement, also require large gains compared to the state-of-the-art. For example, the Bose et al. proposal [1], requires Schrödinger cat-like states of matter that are around 8 orders greater in mass than the current record for such states [22], and gravitationally-induced entanglement with cold atom interferometers requires similar levels of atom numbers when the interferometers are not quantum squeezed [23]. In contrast to such proposals, the proposal considered here does not necessitate coherent control or the application of quantum operations and measurements.

Since high numbers of atoms are needed to detect the quantum gravity signal, it is possible that denser macroscopic quantum systems, such as liquid Helium, could be more suited to our proposed test. This is further supported by the straightforward application of our derived condition $NL \approx 10^{14}$ for quantum gravity to have a significant effect in a BEC - when applied to liquid helium, this condition is easily satisfied [24], highlighting its potential as a promising platform for such investigations. Extending our analysis to a superfluid may be non-trivial since the microscopic description of a superfluid is still being debated [25] and there are no known Feshbach resonances. We note that neutron stars have also been proposed as systems that may undergo Bose-Einstein condensation [26], raising the intriguing possibility that gravitational wave or electromagnetic signals emitted by such astronomical objects could provide insights into properties like heat capacity and, in turn, potentially offer evidence of quantum gravity.

The approach explored here focuses on providing evidence for quantum gravity through measurements of macroscopic, thermodynamical observables. Interestingly, there is a conceptual link to methods that rely on quantum-information principles for demonstrating the quantum nature of gravity: In the Bogolyubov approximation, the quantum gravity Hamiltonian (8) contains off diagonal terms $\hat{a}_k \hat{a}_{-k} + h.c.$, which will generate entanglement in the atomic modes, whereas no such terms exist in the classical gravity Hamiltonian (10). This suggests

a connection to previous considerations of how heat capacity can be used to evidence entanglement [27]. Investigating further these connections may reveal whether measuring the change in the heat capacity could rule out forms of classical gravity beyond semi-classical gravity, such as those based on stochasticity [28].

Acknowledgements

We acknowledge support from the ID# 61466 and ID# 62312 grants from the John Templeton Foundation, as part

of the “Quantum Information Structure of Spacetime (QISS)” project (qiss.fr). This research was funded in whole or in part by the Austrian Science Fund (FWF)[10.55776/F71] and [10.55776/COE1]. For open access purposes, the author has applied a CC BY public copyright license to any author accepted manuscript version arising from this submission. RH also acknowledges the John Templeton Foundation grant ID# 62420.

-
- [1] 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).
- [2] 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), [arXiv:1707.06036 \[quant-ph\]](https://arxiv.org/abs/1707.06036).
- [3] 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), [arXiv:2004.01189 \[quant-ph\]](https://arxiv.org/abs/2004.01189).
- [4] M. Wiesniak, V. Vedral, and C. Brukner, Magnetic susceptibility as a macroscopic entanglement witness, *New Journal of Physics* **7**, 258–258 (2005).
- [5] C. Brukner and V. Vedral, *Macroscopic thermodynamical witnesses of quantum entanglement* (2004), [arXiv:quant-ph/0406040 \[quant-ph\]](https://arxiv.org/abs/quant-ph/0406040).
- [6] C. Brukner, V. Vedral, and A. Zeilinger, Crucial role of quantum entanglement in bulk properties of solids, *Physical Review A* **73**, 10.1103/physreva.73.012110 (2006).
- [7] M. Wiesniak, V. Vedral, and C. Brukner, Heat capacity as an indicator of entanglement, *Physical Review B* **78**, 10.1103/physrevb.78.064108 (2008).
- [8] H. Singh, T. Chakraborty, D. Das, H. S. Jeevan, Y. Tokiwa, P. Gegenwart, and C. Mitra, Experimental quantification of entanglement through heat capacity, *New Journal of Physics* **15**, 113001 (2013).
- [9] L. Rosenfeld, On quantization of fields, *Nuclear Physics* **40**, 353 (1963).
- [10] C. Møller, Les théories relativistes de la gravitation, *Colloques Internationaux CNRS* **91**, 15 (1962).
- [11] L. Pitaevskii and S. Stringari, *Bose-Einstein Condensation and Superfluidity*, International series of monographs on physics (Oxford University Press, New York, 2016).
- [12] M. Ghabour and A. Pelster, Bogoliubov theory of dipolar Bose gas in a weak random potential, *Phys. Rev. A* **90**, 063636 (2014), [arXiv:1410.3070 \[cond-mat.quant-gas\]](https://arxiv.org/abs/1410.3070).
- [13] I. Lukin, A. Sotnikov, and Y. Slyusarenko, Aspects of bose-einstein condensation in a charged boson system over the dielectric surface, *Physics Letters A* **417**, 127695 (2021).
- [14] L. Diósi, Gravitation and quantum-mechanical localization of macro-objects, *Physics Letters A* **105**, 199 (1984), [arXiv:1412.0201 \[quant-ph\]](https://arxiv.org/abs/1412.0201).
- [15] V. I. Yukalov and H. Kleinert, Gapless Hartree-Fock-Bogoliubov approximation for Bose gases, *pra* **73**, 063612 (2006), [arXiv:cond-mat/0606484 \[cond-mat.stat-mech\]](https://arxiv.org/abs/cond-mat/0606484).
- [16] Y. Nambu, Axial Vector Current Conservation in Weak Interactions, *Phys. Rev. Lett.* **4**, 380 (1960).
- [17] J. Goldstone, Field theories with « Superconductor » solutions, *Il Nuovo Cimento* **19**, 154 (1961).
- [18] D. G. Fried, T. C. Killian, L. Willmann, D. Landhuis, S. C. Moss, D. Kleppner, and T. J. Greytak, Bose-Einstein Condensation of Atomic Hydrogen, *Phys. Rev. Lett.* **81**, 3811 (1998).
- [19] K. M. R. van der Stam, E. D. van Ooijen, R. Meppelink, J. M. Vogels, and P. van der Straten, Large atom number Bose-Einstein condensate of sodium, *Review of Scientific Instruments* **78**, 013102 (2007).
- [20] T. Fukuhara, S. Sugawa, Y. Takasu, and Y. Takahashi, All-optical formation of quantum degenerate mixtures, *Phys. Rev. A* **79**, 021601 (2009).
- [21] C. Deppner, W. Herr, M. Cornelius, P. Stromberger, T. Sternke, C. Grzeschik, A. Grote, J. Rudolph, S. Herrmann, M. Krutzik, A. Wenzlawski, R. Corgier, E. Charron, D. Guéry-Odelin, N. Gaaloul, C. Lämmerzahl, A. Peters, P. Windpassinger, and E. M. Rasel, Collective-mode enhanced matter-wave optics, *Phys. Rev. Lett.* **127**, 100401 (2021).
- [22] Y. Y. Fein, P. Geyer, P. Zwick, F. Kiařka, S. Pedalino, M. Mayor, S. Gerlich, and M. Arndt, Quantum superposition of molecules beyond 25 kda, *Nature Physics* **15**, 1242 (2019).
- [23] R. Howl, N. Cooper, and L. Hackermüller, *Gravitationally-induced entanglement in cold atoms* (2023), [arXiv:2304.00734 \[quant-ph\]](https://arxiv.org/abs/2304.00734).
- [24] Y. Sato and R. E. Packard, Superfluid helium quantum interference devices: physics and applications, *Reports on Progress in Physics* **75**, 016401 (2011).
- [25] P. Nozières and D. Pines, *Theory of quantum liquids: Superfluid bose liquids, volume II* (CRC Press, 1990).
- [26] B. Haskell and A. Sedrakian, Superfluidity and superconductivity in neutron stars, *The Physics and Astrophysics of Neutron Stars*, 401 (2018).
- [27] M. Wiesniak, V. Vedral and C. Brukner, Heat capacity as an indicator of entanglement, *Phys. Rev. B* **78**, 064108 (2008).
- [28] S. Donadi and A. Bassi, Seven nonstandard models coupling quantum matter and gravity, *AVS Quantum Science* **4**, 025601 (2022), https://pubs.aip.org/avs/aqs/article-pdf/doi/10.1116/5.0089318/16493740/025601_1_online.pdf.
- [29] O. Ciftja, Concise presentation of the coulomb electrostatic potential of a uniformly charged cube, *Journal of Electrostatics* **76**, 127 (2015).
- [30] D. A. W. Hutchinson, K. Burnett, R. J. Dodd, S. A. Morgan, M. Rusch, E. Zaremba, N. P. Proukakis, M. Edwards, and C. W.

- Clark, Gapless mean-field theory of bose-einstein condensates, [Journal of Physics B: Atomic, Molecular and Optical Physics](#) **33**, 3825 (2000).
- [31] E. H. Lieb, R. Seiringer, and J. Yngvason, Bose-einstein condensation and spontaneous symmetry breaking1, [Reports on Mathematical Physics](#) **59**, 389 (2007).
- [32] H. Watanabe, Counting Rules of Nambu-Goldstone Modes, [Annual Review of Condensed Matter Physics](#) **11**, 169 (2020), [arXiv:1904.00569 \[cond-mat.other\]](#).
- [33] T. Brauner, Effective Field Theory for Spontaneously Broken Symmetry, [arXiv e-prints](#) , [arXiv:2404.14518 \(2024\)](#), [arXiv:2404.14518 \[hep-th\]](#).
- [34] H. Nielsen and S. Chadha, On how to count goldstone bosons, [Nuclear Physics B](#) **105**, 445 (1976).

APPENDIX

1. Fourier series of gravitational potential of a cube

Here, we analyse the Fourier series of the gravitational potential of a boxed Bose gas. Specifically, we consider the approximation (7) from the expression (5):

$$V_{\mathbf{k}}^G = \int_{-\frac{L}{2}}^{\frac{L}{2}} dx \int_{-\frac{L}{2}}^{\frac{L}{2}} dy \int_{-\frac{L}{2}}^{\frac{L}{2}} dz \frac{-Gm^2 e^{-i(k_x x + k_y y + k_z z)}}{\sqrt{x^2 + y^2 + z^2}}, \quad (25)$$

where $k_x := 2\pi n_x/L$, $k_y := 2\pi n_y/L$ and $k_z := 2\pi n_z/L$.

First, following [29] for deriving the Coulomb potential of a cube, we use the identity:

$$\int_0^\infty dt e^{-at^2} = \frac{\sqrt{\pi}}{2} \frac{1}{\sqrt{a}}, \quad (26)$$

$$\implies \frac{1}{\sqrt{x^2 + y^2 + z^2}} = \frac{2}{\sqrt{\pi}} \int_0^\infty dt e^{-(x^2 + y^2 + z^2)t^2} \quad (27)$$

We can then write:

$$V_{\mathbf{k}}^G = \frac{-2Gm^2}{\sqrt{\pi}} \int_0^\infty dt \int_{-L/2}^{L/2} dx \int_{-L/2}^{L/2} dy \int_{-L/2}^{L/2} dz e^{-i(k_x x + k_y y + k_z z)} e^{-(x^2 + y^2 + z^2)t^2} \quad (28)$$

$$= \frac{-2Gm^2}{\sqrt{\pi}} \int_0^\infty dt \int_{-L/2}^{L/2} dx e^{-ik_x x - x^2 t^2} \int_{-L/2}^{L/2} dy e^{-ik_y y - y^2 t^2} \int_{-L/2}^{L/2} dz e^{-ik_z z - z^2 t^2} \quad (29)$$

Integrating over x , y and z , we obtain:

$$V_{\mathbf{k}}^G = -2\pi Gm^2 \int_0^\infty dt \frac{e^{-k^2/(4t^2)}}{t^3} \operatorname{Re}[\operatorname{erf}(Lt/2 + ik_x/(2t))] \operatorname{Re}[\operatorname{erf}(Lt/2 + ik_y/(2t))] \operatorname{Re}[\operatorname{erf}(Lt/2 + ik_z/(2t))], \quad (30)$$

where $k^2 := k_x^2 + k_y^2 + k_z^2$. We now change variables to $v = 1/(Lt)$ so that:

$$V_{\mathbf{k}}^G = -2\pi Gm^2 L^2 \int_0^\infty dv v e^{-\pi^2 v^2 n_k^2} \operatorname{Re}[\operatorname{erf}(1/(2v) + i\pi n_x v)] \operatorname{Re}[\operatorname{erf}(1/(2v) + i\pi n_y v)] \operatorname{Re}[\operatorname{erf}(1/(2v) + i\pi n_z v)] \quad (31)$$

$$:= -2\pi Gm^2 L^2 \int_0^\infty dv f(v) \quad (32)$$

where $n_k^2 := n_x^2 + n_y^2 + n_z^2$. Since n_x, n_y and n_z are integers, for all n_x, n_y and $n_z \neq 0$, $f(v)$ is completely dominated by the term $v e^{-\pi^2 v^2 n_k^2}$. We can thus approximate $f(v)$ by just $f(v) \approx v e^{-\pi^2 v^2 n_k^2}$.⁴ Integrating this approximation, we obtain

$$V_{\mathbf{k} \neq 0}^G \approx -2\pi Gm^2 L^2 \frac{1}{2\pi^2 n_k^2} \equiv -\frac{4\pi Gm^2}{k^2}, \quad (33)$$

which is what we would obtain for a sphere with volume L^3 . Numerically, we find that this solution is indeed a very good approximation to (25) when $\mathbf{k} \neq 0$.

All that remains is to find (25) when $\mathbf{k} = 0$. Setting $\mathbf{k} = 0$ in (30), we need to calculate:

$$V_0^G = -2\pi Gm^2 \int_0^\infty dt \frac{1}{t^3} \operatorname{erf}^3(Lt/2) \quad (34)$$

$$= \frac{-\pi Gm^2 L^2}{2} \int_0^\infty dw \frac{1}{w^3} \operatorname{erf}^3(w). \quad (35)$$

⁴ A slightly better approximation can be obtained by expanding

$\operatorname{Re}[\operatorname{erf}(1/(2v) + i\pi n_x v)] \operatorname{Re}[\operatorname{erf}(1/(2v) + i\pi n_y v)] \operatorname{Re}[\operatorname{erf}(1/(2v) + i\pi n_z v)]$ to first order in v .

Integrating by parts twice (first with $u = \operatorname{erf}^3 w$ and second with $u = \operatorname{erf}^2 w$), and using the identity:

$$\int_0^\infty e^{-px^2} \operatorname{erf}(ax) \operatorname{erf}(bx) = \frac{1}{\pi p} \arctan\left(\frac{ab}{\sqrt{p(a^2 + b^2 + p)}}\right), \quad (36)$$

we find (see also [29]):

$$V_0^G = -\frac{\pi G m^2 L^2}{2} \left[\frac{12}{\pi} \operatorname{arcsinh}\left(\frac{1}{\sqrt{2}}\right) - 1 \right] \approx -2.38 G m^2 L^2. \quad (37)$$

2. Bogolyubov method for quantum gravity

Here we detail how the diagonalized grand canonical Hamiltonian for quantum gravity (11) is derived from the original non-diagonalized version (1) in the Bogolyubov method.

We start with \hat{H}_I^{QG} as given in (3):

$$\hat{H}_I^{QG} = \frac{1}{2} \int d^3 \mathbf{r}' \int d^3 \mathbf{r} \hat{\Psi}^\dagger(\mathbf{r}) \hat{\Psi}^\dagger(\mathbf{r}') V_I(\mathbf{r} - \mathbf{r}') \hat{\Psi}(\mathbf{r}') \hat{\Psi}(\mathbf{r}), \quad (38)$$

where $V_I(\mathbf{r} - \mathbf{r}') = -\frac{Gm^2}{|\mathbf{r} - \mathbf{r}'|}$.

As in the main text, we assume a Bose gas in a box of sides L and with periodic boundary conditions. The field operator $\hat{\Psi}(\mathbf{r})$ can then be written as:

$$\hat{\Psi}(\mathbf{r}) = \frac{1}{\sqrt{\mathcal{V}}} \sum_{\mathbf{k}} e^{i\mathbf{k} \cdot \mathbf{r}} \hat{a}_{\mathbf{k}} \quad (39)$$

$$\equiv \frac{1}{\sqrt{\mathcal{V}}} \hat{a}_0 + \frac{1}{\sqrt{\mathcal{V}}} \sum_{\mathbf{k} \neq 0} e^{i\mathbf{k} \cdot \mathbf{r}} \hat{a}_{\mathbf{k}}, \quad (40)$$

where $\mathbf{k} = 2\pi \mathbf{n}_k / L$, $\mathbf{n}_k = (n_x, n_y, n_z)$, and n_x, n_y, n_z integers ranging from $-\infty$ to $+\infty$.

We also likewise expand the potential $V_I(\mathbf{r} - \mathbf{r}')$ as:

$$V_I(\mathbf{r} - \mathbf{r}') = \frac{1}{\mathcal{V}} \sum_{\mathbf{k}} V_{\mathbf{k}}^G e^{i\mathbf{k} \cdot (\mathbf{r} - \mathbf{r}')}. \quad (41)$$

Plugging (41) and (40) into (38), we would obtain an expansion of \hat{H}_I^{QG} with terms consisting of no \hat{a}_0 operators, one \hat{a}_0 operator, two \hat{a}_0 operators, three \hat{a}_0 operators and four. Since we will later apply the Bogolyubov approximation, where we replace \hat{a}_0 with $\sqrt{N_0}$ and take $\sqrt{N_0} \gg 1$, we ignore terms with zero and one \hat{a}_0 operator. The terms with three \hat{a}_0 operators can also be shown to vanish: Integrating over \mathbf{r} and \mathbf{r}' such terms would yield a Kronecker delta that sets $\mathbf{k} = 0$, which is not possible - see, for example, [30] for more detail.

This leaves us with:

$$\hat{H}_I^{QG} = \frac{1}{\mathcal{V}^3} \sum_{\mathbf{q}} V_{\mathbf{q}}^G \frac{1}{2} \int d^3 \mathbf{r} \int d^3 \mathbf{r}' e^{i\mathbf{q} \cdot (\mathbf{r} - \mathbf{r}')} \left[\hat{a}_0^\dagger \hat{a}_0^\dagger \hat{a}_0 \hat{a}_0 + \sum_{\mathbf{k}, \mathbf{k}'} \left[\hat{a}_0 \hat{a}_0 e^{-i(\mathbf{k} \cdot \mathbf{r}' + \mathbf{k}' \cdot \mathbf{r})} \hat{a}_{\mathbf{k}}^\dagger \hat{a}_{\mathbf{k}'}^\dagger + \hat{a}_0^\dagger \hat{a}_0^\dagger e^{i(\mathbf{k} \cdot \mathbf{r}' + \mathbf{k}' \cdot \mathbf{r})} \hat{a}_{\mathbf{k}} \hat{a}_{\mathbf{k}'} \right. \right. \quad (42)$$

$$\left. \left. + \hat{a}_0^\dagger \hat{a}_0 \left(e^{i(\mathbf{k}' - \mathbf{k}) \cdot \mathbf{r}} + e^{i(\mathbf{k}' - \mathbf{k}) \cdot \mathbf{r}'} + e^{i(\mathbf{k}' \cdot \mathbf{r}' - \mathbf{k} \cdot \mathbf{r})} + e^{i(\mathbf{k}' \cdot \mathbf{r} - \mathbf{k} \cdot \mathbf{r}')} \right) \hat{a}_{\mathbf{k}}^\dagger \hat{a}_{\mathbf{k}'} \right] \right]. \quad (43)$$

Integrating over \mathbf{r} and \mathbf{r}' picks up Kronecker deltas, for example:

$$\int_{-\frac{L}{2}}^{\frac{L}{2}} \int_{-\frac{L}{2}}^{\frac{L}{2}} \int_{-\frac{L}{2}}^{\frac{L}{2}} d^3 \mathbf{r} e^{i\mathbf{r} \cdot (\mathbf{q} + \mathbf{k} - \mathbf{k}')} = \int_{-\frac{L}{2}}^{\frac{L}{2}} \int_{-\frac{L}{2}}^{\frac{L}{2}} \int_{-\frac{L}{2}}^{\frac{L}{2}} dx dy dz e^{ix(q_x + k_x - k'_x)} e^{iy(q_y + k_y - k'_y)} e^{iz(q_z + k_z - k'_z)} = \mathcal{V} \delta_{\mathbf{q}, \mathbf{k} - \mathbf{k}'}. \quad (44)$$

We thus obtain

$$\hat{H}_I^{QG} = \frac{1}{2\mathcal{V}} \left[V_0^G \hat{a}_0^\dagger \hat{a}_0^\dagger \hat{a}_0 \hat{a}_0 + \sum_{\mathbf{k}} \left[V_{\mathbf{k}}^G \left(\hat{a}_0 \hat{a}_0 \hat{a}_{\mathbf{k}}^\dagger \hat{a}_{-\mathbf{k}}^\dagger + \hat{a}_0^\dagger \hat{a}_0^\dagger \hat{a}_{\mathbf{k}} \hat{a}_{-\mathbf{k}} \right) + \hat{a}_0^\dagger \hat{a}_0 \left(2V_0^G + V_{\mathbf{k}}^G + V_{-\mathbf{k}}^G \right) \hat{a}_{\mathbf{k}}^\dagger \hat{a}_{\mathbf{k}} \right] \right]. \quad (45)$$

We now apply the Bogolyubov approximation and replace \hat{a}_0 with \sqrt{N} , such that@

$$\hat{H}_I^{QG} = \frac{V_0^G N^2}{2\mathcal{V}} + \frac{N}{2\mathcal{V}} \sum_{\mathbf{k} \neq 0} \left(2(V_0^G + V_{\mathbf{k}}^G) \hat{a}_{\mathbf{k}}^\dagger \hat{a}_{\mathbf{k}} + V_{\mathbf{k}}^G \left(\hat{a}_{\mathbf{k}}^\dagger \hat{a}_{-\mathbf{k}}^\dagger + \hat{a}_{\mathbf{k}} \hat{a}_{-\mathbf{k}} \right) \right), \quad (46)$$

where, from (5), we have used $V_{-\mathbf{k}}^G = V_{\mathbf{k}}^G$. Replacing $V_{\mathbf{k}}^G$ with $g_{\mathbf{k}}^{QG}$, the above results in (8).

The above method can also be applied to the grand canonical Hamiltonian (1) containing the kinetic term and electromagnetic interactions [11], resulting in:

$$\hat{K}^{QG} = \frac{1}{2} \left(g^{EM} + g_0^{QG} \right) nN + \sum_{\mathbf{k}} \left(\frac{\hbar^2 k^2}{2m} - \mu \right) \hat{a}_{\mathbf{k}}^\dagger \hat{a}_{\mathbf{k}} \quad (47)$$

$$+ \frac{1}{2} n \sum_{\mathbf{k} \neq 0} \left(\left(4g^{EM} + 2(g_0^{QG} + g_{\mathbf{k}}^{QG}) \right) \hat{a}_{\mathbf{k}}^\dagger \hat{a}_{\mathbf{k}} + \left(g^{EM} + g_{\mathbf{k}}^{QG} \right) \left(\hat{a}_{\mathbf{k}}^\dagger \hat{a}_{-\mathbf{k}}^\dagger + \hat{a}_{\mathbf{k}} \hat{a}_{-\mathbf{k}} \right) \right), \quad (48)$$

where, for simplicity, we have ignored the electromagnetic term $m (g^{EM} n)^2 / (2k^2)$ that is often implemented due to going beyond the Born approximation since this term only contributes to the ground state energy, which does not contribute to the internal energy or heat capacity [11].

We now diagonalize \hat{K}^{QG} with the Bogolyubov transformation:

$$\hat{a}_{\mathbf{k}} = u_{\mathbf{k}} \hat{b}_{\mathbf{k}} - v_{-\mathbf{k}}^* \hat{b}_{-\mathbf{k}}^\dagger, \quad (49)$$

$$\hat{a}_{\mathbf{k}}^\dagger = u_{\mathbf{k}}^* \hat{b}_{\mathbf{k}}^\dagger - v_{-\mathbf{k}} \hat{b}_{-\mathbf{k}}, \quad (50)$$

where:

$$u_{\mathbf{k}} := \sqrt{\frac{\hbar^2 k^2 / (2m) - \mu + n \left(2g^{EM} + g_{\mathbf{k}}^{QG} + g_0^{QG} \right)}{2\epsilon_{\mathbf{k}}^{QG}}} + \frac{1}{2}, \quad (51)$$

$$v_{\mathbf{k}} := \sqrt{\frac{\hbar^2 k^2 / (2m) - \mu + n \left(2g^{EM} + g_{\mathbf{k}}^{QG} + g_0^{QG} \right)}{2\epsilon_{\mathbf{k}}^{QG}}} - \frac{1}{2}, \quad (52)$$

$$\epsilon_{\mathbf{k}}^{QG} = \sqrt{\left(\frac{\hbar^2 k^2}{2m} - \mu + n \left(2g^{EM} + g_0^{QG} + g_{\mathbf{k}}^{QG} \right) \right)^2 - \left(n \left(g^{EM} + g_{\mathbf{k}}^{QG} \right) \right)^2}, \quad (53)$$

to end up with (11):

$$\hat{K}^{QG} = E_0^{QG} + \sum_{\mathbf{k} \neq 0} \epsilon_{\mathbf{k}}^{QG} \hat{b}_{\mathbf{k}}^\dagger \hat{b}_{\mathbf{k}}, \quad (54)$$

where E_0^{QG} is defined in the main text - see (13).

3. Bogolyubov method for classical gravity

Here we detail how the diagonalized grand canonical Hamiltonian for classical gravity (15) is derived from the original non-diagonalized version (1) in the Bogolyubov method.

We start with \hat{H}_I^{CG} as given in (4):

$$\hat{H}_I^{CG} = \int d^3 \mathbf{r}' \int d^3 \mathbf{r} V_I(\mathbf{r} - \mathbf{r}') \langle \hat{\Psi}^\dagger(\mathbf{r}') \hat{\Psi}(\mathbf{r}') \rangle \hat{\Psi}^\dagger(\mathbf{r}) \hat{\Psi}(\mathbf{r}). \quad (55)$$

where $V_I(\mathbf{r} - \mathbf{r}') = -\frac{Gm^2}{|\mathbf{r} - \mathbf{r}'|}$.

As in with quantum gravity, we plug in

$$\hat{\Psi}(\mathbf{r}) = \frac{1}{\sqrt{\mathcal{V}}} \hat{a}_0 + \frac{1}{\sqrt{\mathcal{V}}} \sum_{\mathbf{k} \neq 0} e^{i\mathbf{k} \cdot \mathbf{r}} \hat{a}_{\mathbf{k}}, \quad (56)$$

$$V_I(\mathbf{r} - \mathbf{r}') = \frac{1}{\mathcal{V}} \sum_{\mathbf{k}} V_{\mathbf{k}} e^{i\mathbf{k} \cdot (\mathbf{r} - \mathbf{r}')}, \quad (57)$$

such that:

$$\hat{H}_I^{CG} = \frac{1}{\mathcal{V}^3} \sum_q V_q \int d^3\mathbf{r}' \int d^3\mathbf{r} e^{i\mathbf{q}\cdot(\mathbf{r}-\mathbf{r}')} \left[\left(\langle \hat{a}_0^\dagger \hat{a}_0 \rangle + \sum_{\mathbf{k}, \mathbf{k}' \neq 0} e^{i(\mathbf{k}-\mathbf{k}')\cdot\mathbf{r}'} \langle \hat{a}_{\mathbf{k}'}^\dagger \hat{a}_{\mathbf{k}} \rangle \right) \left(\hat{a}_0^\dagger + \sum_{\mathbf{k}' \neq 0} e^{-i\mathbf{k}'\cdot\mathbf{r}} \hat{a}_{\mathbf{k}'}^\dagger \right) \left(\hat{a}_0 + \sum_{\mathbf{k} \neq 0} e^{i\mathbf{k}\cdot\mathbf{r}} \hat{a}_{\mathbf{k}} \right) \right], \quad (58)$$

where we have used $\langle \hat{\psi}(\mathbf{r}) \rangle = 0$, with the average taken over the quantum state of the entire Bose gas.

As in the quantum gravity case, the terms with three \hat{a}_0 operators vanish since they do not conserve momentum and, since we will use the Bogolyubov approximation, we can ignore terms with no or just one \hat{a}_0 operator. This then leaves us with:

$$\hat{H}_I^{CG} = \frac{1}{\mathcal{V}^3} \sum_q V_q \int d^3\mathbf{r}' \int d^3\mathbf{r} e^{i\mathbf{q}\cdot(\mathbf{r}-\mathbf{r}')} \left[\langle \hat{a}_0^\dagger \hat{a}_0 \rangle \hat{a}_0^\dagger \hat{a}_0 + \langle \hat{a}_0^\dagger \hat{a}_0 \rangle \sum_{\mathbf{k}, \mathbf{k}' \neq 0} e^{i(\mathbf{k}-\mathbf{k}')\cdot\mathbf{r}} \hat{a}_{\mathbf{k}'}^\dagger \hat{a}_{\mathbf{k}} + \hat{a}_0^\dagger \hat{a}_0 \sum_{\mathbf{k}, \mathbf{k}' \neq 0} e^{i(\mathbf{k}-\mathbf{k}')\cdot\mathbf{r}'} \langle \hat{a}_{\mathbf{k}'}^\dagger \hat{a}_{\mathbf{k}} \rangle \right]. \quad (59)$$

Integrating over \mathbf{r} and \mathbf{r}' then provides

$$\hat{H}_I^{CG} = \frac{V_0}{\mathcal{V}} \left(\langle \hat{a}_0^\dagger \hat{a}_0 \rangle \hat{a}_0^\dagger \hat{a}_0 + \langle \hat{a}_0^\dagger \hat{a}_0 \rangle \sum_{\mathbf{k} \neq 0} \hat{a}_{\mathbf{k}}^\dagger \hat{a}_{\mathbf{k}} + \hat{a}_0^\dagger \hat{a}_0 \sum_{\mathbf{k} \neq 0} \langle \hat{a}_{\mathbf{k}}^\dagger \hat{a}_{\mathbf{k}} \rangle \right). \quad (60)$$

We now apply the Bogolyubov approximation and set $\hat{a}_0 \approx \sqrt{N}$. This then leaves us with:

$$\hat{H}_I^{CG} = \frac{V_0}{\mathcal{V}} \left(N^2 + N \sum_{\mathbf{k} \neq 0} \hat{a}_{\mathbf{k}}^\dagger \hat{a}_{\mathbf{k}} + N \sum_{\mathbf{k} \neq 0} \langle \hat{a}_{\mathbf{k}}^\dagger \hat{a}_{\mathbf{k}} \rangle \right) \quad (61)$$

$$= \frac{V_0}{\mathcal{V}} N_T^2 + V_0 n \sum_{\mathbf{k}} \hat{a}_{\mathbf{k}}^\dagger \hat{a}_{\mathbf{k}}, \quad (62)$$

with N_T the total number of non-condensed atoms. Since the last term in (62) just contributes to the chemical potential term in the grand-canonical Hamiltonian (1), we are free to write

$$\hat{H}_I^{CG} = \frac{V_0}{\mathcal{V}} N_T^2 \quad (63)$$

and update μ as $\mu \rightarrow \mu - V_0 n$. Replacing V_0 with g_0^G then results in (10).

Since the classical gravity interaction Hamiltonian only affects the ground state energy, we only need the usual Bogolyubov transformation that is used to diagonalize a BEC with electromagnetic interactions [11], which is as (51)-(53) with g_k^G set to zero.

4. Phonons and interactions

The Nambu-Goldstone theorem connects the breaking of a global internal symmetry of a system to the onset of vector-bosons of either odd or even power in the momentum variable \mathbf{k} , and in that sense it holds for a wide variety of fields from high-energy to condensed matter physics.

A discussion of the connection between Bose-Einstein condensation and the breaking of the $U(1)$ -symmetry of the system at the second order phase transition can be found, for instance, in [31]. Today, the categorization is often given as Type-A and Type-B, as for instance in [32], where counting rules for NGBs are discussed. For a very recent and extensive pedagogical derivation of both the *Nambu-Goldstone Theorem* as well as the classification of Nambu-Goldstone-bosons, see [33].

The quadratic dispersion relation for a quantized gravity picture corresponds to what has been categorized first in [34] as *Type-II Nambu-Goldstone bosons* (NGBs).

When going beyond the contact approximation of the electromagnetic interactions, it is likely that phonons (Type-I NGBs) no longer necessarily emerge at low momenta in a homogeneous, isotropic BEC. However, the observation of phonons in experiments evidences that the contact approximation must be a very good approximation for the electromagnetic interactions.