Gravity induced entanglement of multiple massive particles with large spin

Kai Li ^{1,2},* Yi Ling ^{1,2},[†] and Zhangping Yu ^{1,2‡}

¹Institute of High Energy Physics, Chinese Academy of Sciences, Beijing 100049, China

² School of Physics, University of Chinese Academy of Sciences, Beijing 100049, China

Abstract

We investigate the generation rate of the quantum entanglement in a system composed of multiple massive particles with large spin, where the mass of a single particle can be split into multiple trajectories by a generalized Stern-Gerlach interferometer. Taking the coherent spin states (CSS) as the initial state and considering the gravitational interaction due to Newtonian potential, we compute the generation rate of the entanglement for different configurations of the setup. Explicitly, the optimal polar angles of the spin are found numerically for systems with three and four particles, respectively. We conclude that the amount of the entanglement increases with the number of particles as well as the spin, and the configuration of the prism with a particle at the center generates the best rate of the entanglement.

^{*} lik@ihep.ac.cn

 $^{^\}dagger$ lingy@ihep.ac.cn

[‡] yuzp@ihep.ac.cn

I. INTRODUCTION

One of the most fundamental problems in modern physics is to diagnose whether the nature of gravity is quantum or classical. Without doubt, the answer would provide significant implications for our understanding of the structure of spacetime and the universe. Unfortunately, the direct detection of quantum effects of gravity remains a formidable challenge due to the extreme weakness of the gravitational interaction relative to other fundamental forces. The naive estimation indicates that the energy level sensitive to the quantum effects of gravity is far beyond the current capability of experiments. Nevertheless, recently a novel strategy based on quantum entanglement has been proposed to experimentally test whether gravity acts as a quantum entity at low energy level [1, 2]. The key idea is to consider two massive particles in the superposition states of position, which can be generated by two Stern-Gerlach (SG) devices. Suppose initially the system starts in a product state, and during the evolution, these two particles interact with each other solely through gravitational interaction. If quantum entanglement is generated in the final state through this interaction, then gravity, as the exclusive medium between the two particles, must be quantum, as Local Operations and Classical Communication (LOCC) [3] cannot generate entanglement from product states. This approach is referred to as "quantum gravity-induced entanglement of masses (QGEM)". Subsequently, this strategy has been employed to investigate relevant problems, including testing the discreteness of time [4], seeking evidence for quantum superposition of geometries [5], testing gravity-induced reduction of quantum states [6], probing massless and massive gravitons [7], and validating the weak equivalence principle [8]. Additional relevant work on this topic can be found in the literature [9–14]. Furthermore, inspired by this strategy, alternative strategies have been proposed for testing the nature of gravity at low energy level, such as the exploration by BEC [6], non-Gaussianity [15], spacetime diffusion [16], and LOCC but without entanglement [17].

The main challenge in implementing this scheme experimentally is to sustain massive particles in a position superposition for long enough to generate detectable entanglement. Preparing the superposition state for a large massive particle is inherently difficult. Moreover, the gravitational effects from both the environment and the particles themselves can lead to decoherence [18–22]. Given the difficulty of extending the lifetime of superposition states, another feasible approach is to increase the generation rate of entanglement such that the entanglement becomes large enough to be detected within the lifetime of the particles in superposition states. With this success then one may further relax the requirement on the particle mass and thus make the experiment more feasible. To this end, numerous attempts have been made to enhance the generation rate of entanglement. In Ref.[23], it is found that the entanglement entropy could be increased if the relative position of the particles is rearranged from a linear configuration to a parallel configuration. The setup of multiple particles with different configurations has been explored in Refs.[24] and [25]. Furthermore, it is proposed in Ref.[26] to add a classical macroscopic particle as a mediator to enhance gravitational interaction, while in Ref.[27] it is proposed to apply a Casimir shield to reduce the spacing between particles. Other improvements on the measurement can be found in Refs.[28–33].

Increasing the number of particles N is an effective way to enhance the generation rate of entanglement. It is found in Ref. [25] that the prism configuration with a particle at the center achieves the fastest rate of entanglement generation. Furthermore, utilizing the configuration with seven particles requires only half of the time to reach the same amount of entanglement as the configuration with three particles. Recently, an alternative way has been proposed to enhance the entanglement by considering particles with large spins [34]. In the original QGEM configuration, spin 1/2 particles are considered. Since the maximal entanglement is limited by the dimension of the Hilbert space, the amount of entanglement entropy is bounded by $\ln 2$. However, if particles with spin j are employed, the upper bound of entanglement increases to $\ln(2j+1)$. The entanglement of two particles with large spin has been investigated in Ref. [34], indicating that large spins can significantly enhance both the entanglement generation rate and the maximal value of entanglement. Inspired by the above work, we intend to investigate the rate of entanglement generation in the case of multiple particles with large spins. We will consider the system consisting of multiple particles with large spin, and figure out all the possible configurations for the setup, and then compute the generation rate of the entanglement for different configurations. Explicitly, the optimal polar angles of the spin are found numerically for the systems with three and four particles, respectively. By the above analysis we find that the amount of the entanglement increases with the number of particles as well as the spin, and the configuration of the prism with a particle at the center generates the best rate of the entanglement.

The paper is organized as follows. The general setup for multiple massive particles with

large spin is presented in the next section, with details on the evolution of the system driven by the gravitational potential. The generation rate of entanglement for the system with three particles is investigated in Section three. We numerically compute the entanglement entropy for the system up to j = 5 and figure out the optimal polar angles of the spin. It turns out that the rate of entanglement generation is significantly improved in comparison with the system with two particles. In Section four we numerically compute the entanglement entropy for the system with four particles up to j = 2, and the rules for obtaining the optimal polar angles of the spin are obtained. Our conclusions and discussions are given in the last Section.

II. THE GENERAL SETUP FOR MULTIPLE MASSIVE PARTICLES WITH LARGE SPIN

In this section, we present the general setup for multiple massive particles with large spin. We begin by introducing the superposition state for a particle with spin j, which may be intuitively described by 2j + 1 semiclassical trajectories generated by the Generalized Stern-Gerlach (CSG) interferometer, as proposed in [34]. Then we consider a system consisting of multiple particles, each with 2j + 1 semiclassical trajectories, interacting with one another through Newtonian potential. We outline the logic line for the computation of entanglement entropy between one specified particle with the other particles in this system, which serves as the basis for witnessing gravity-induced entanglement in QGEM experiment.

The generalized Stern-Gerlach interferometer, which splits the mass with spin j into 2j+1 trajectories, was firstly explored in Ref.[34]. The protocol of the process can be described as follows:

(1) Initial State Preparation: The initial state is prepared as a tensor product of spin state and position state: $|\psi(t=0)\rangle = |\psi_S\rangle \otimes |\psi_x\rangle = \left(\sum_{m=-j}^{j} c_m |m\rangle\right) \otimes |0\rangle$, where $|\psi_S\rangle$ is a specific spin state, and c_m are the coefficients in the Dicke basis $\{|j,m\rangle\}$ with $m \in [-j,j]$, and $|\psi_x\rangle = |0\rangle$ represents the position ground state. The specific spin state $|\psi_S\rangle$ can be created by applying secondary magnetic fields to the spin ground state $|m = -j\rangle$. Three families of spin states are discussed in Ref.[34]: Coherent Spin States (CSS), a superposition of CSS, and Squeezed Spin States (SSS). It was found that there was no significant difference between using the last two families of spin states and using the first one; thus, for simplicity,

we utilize Coherent Spin States (CSS) in this paper. A CSS is defined as the state resulting from an arbitrary rotation of the spin ground state $|-j\rangle$, and for the CSS state with a specific direction,

$$|\psi_{CSS}\rangle = |\phi,\theta\rangle := \mathcal{N}e^{\mu J_{-}} |-j\rangle$$
$$= \mathcal{N}\sum_{m=-j}^{j} \mu^{j+m} \sqrt{\frac{2j!}{(j+m)!(j-m)!}},$$
(1)

where $\mathcal{N} = (1 - |\mu|^2)^{-j}$ is the normalization factor with $\mu = e^{i\phi} \tan \theta/2$, and ϕ , θ are understood as the phase in the *xy*-plane and the azimuth angle with respect to the *z*-axis, respectively.

(2) Splitting Process: The splitting process is described by a Hamiltonian

$$H = \hbar \omega_M a^{\dagger} a - \hbar g J_z \left(a + a^{\dagger} \right), \tag{2}$$

where ω_M is the frequency of the quantum harmonic oscillator in which the mass is trapped, and the coupling constant g between spin and position for the mass M is given by

$$g = \tilde{g}\mu_B \sqrt{\frac{1}{2\hbar M\omega_M}} \left(\partial_x B\right),\tag{3}$$

where μ_B is the Bohr magneton and \tilde{g} is the Lande g-factor. The derivation of the time evolution can be found in Appendix B of Ref.[34], and the the quantum state at time t is given by

$$|\psi(t)\rangle = \sum_{m=-j}^{j} c_m e^{i\frac{g^2}{\omega_M^2}m^2(\omega_M t - \sin(\omega_M t))} |m\rangle \otimes |\alpha_m(t)\rangle, \qquad (4)$$

where the position coherent state is given by

$$\alpha_m(t) = m \frac{g}{\omega_M} \left(1 - e^{-i\omega_M t} \right).$$
(5)

The maximal displacement between adjacent trajectories is achieved when $t_s = \pi/\omega_M$, and the splitting

$$\Delta x := \langle x_{m+1}(t_s) \rangle - \langle x_m(t_s) \rangle = 2\sqrt{\frac{2\hbar}{M\omega_M}} \frac{g}{\omega_M}$$
(6)

is independent of m, where $\langle x_m(t_s) \rangle = \langle \alpha_m(t_s) | X | \alpha_m(t_s) \rangle$ is the position of the *m*-th trajectory. At the time t_s , the state is given by

$$|\psi(t_s)\rangle = \sum_{m=-j}^{j} c_m e^{i\pi \frac{g^2}{\omega_M^2} m^2} |m\rangle \otimes |\alpha_m = m\Delta x\rangle.$$
(7)

(3) Recombination and Measurements: After the interaction, 2j + 1 trajectories can be recombined through the inverse process of splitting, and the final state is given by

$$|\psi\left(2t_{s}\right)\rangle = \left(\sum_{m=-j}^{j} c_{m} e^{i2\pi \frac{g^{2}}{\omega_{M}^{2}}m^{2}} |m\rangle\right) \otimes |0\rangle.$$
(8)

The spatial degrees of freedom and spin degrees of freedom of the final state are separated after recombination, allowing for general spin measurements to be performed on the spin component embedded in the mass.

Next we consider a system composed of N massive particles with identical spin j interacting via gravity due to Newtonian potential, each of which splits into 2j + 1 trajectories. The initial state of the system is given by $|\Psi(t_s)\rangle = \prod_{i=1}^N \otimes |\psi_i(t_s)\rangle$, where

$$|\psi_i(t_s)\rangle = \sum_{m=-j}^{j} c_m(\phi_i, \theta_i) e^{i\pi \frac{g^2}{\omega_M^2} m^2} |m\rangle \otimes |x_i(m)\rangle.$$
(9)

 $x_i(m)$ is the position of the *i*-th particle along the *m*-th trajectory, and its specific value depends on the configuration of arranging N particles. In this paper, we will consider several different configurations. Note that each particle is created by splitting an initial state $|\psi_i(t=0)\rangle = |\psi_{CSS}\rangle \otimes |(x_0)_i\rangle$, but the orientation of the CSS can be different. However, it can be seen from Eq.(1) that ϕ_i only contributes an overall phase factor, which does not affect the calculation of entanglement entropy. Therefore, without loss of generality, we set $\phi_i = 0$, for $i = 1, \ldots, N$.

The evolution of the system is described by the Hamiltonian

$$\hat{H} = \sum_{1 \le k < l \le N} \hat{V}_{kl},\tag{10}$$

where \hat{V}_{kl} is the gravitational potential between the k-th particle and the l-th particle, and

$$\left(\hat{V}_{kl}\right)_{m,n} = -\frac{GM^2}{R\left(x_k(m), x_l(n)\right)},\tag{11}$$

where $R(x_k(m), x_l(n))$ is the distance between the k-th particle along the m-th trajectory and the l-th particle along the n-th trajectory, with $m, n \in [-j, j]$. For various configurations under consideration, we present the specific expressions for $R(x_k(m), x_l(n))$ in Appendix A. It is straightforward to obtain the state of the system after t seconds of interaction:

$$|\Psi(t_s+t)\rangle = e^{-i\hat{H}t} |\Psi(t_s)\rangle$$

=
$$\sum_{m_1,\dots,m_N=-j}^{j} \left[\left(\prod_{i=1}^{N} c_{m_i}(\theta_i) \right) e^{i\pi \frac{g^2}{\omega_M^2} \left(\sum_{i=1}^{N} m_i^2 \right) - i\phi_{m_1\dots m_N} t} \prod_{i=1}^{N} \left(|m_i\rangle \otimes |x_i(m_i)\rangle \right) \right],$$
 (12)

where the phase ϕ is determined by the Newtonian potential as

$$\phi_{m_1...m_N} = -\sum_{1 \le k < l \le N} \frac{Gm^2}{R(x_k(m_i), x_l(m_j))}.$$
(13)

After the recombination process, the final state is given by

$$|\Psi(2t_s+t)\rangle = \left[\sum_{m_1,\dots,m_N=-j}^{j} \left(\prod_{i=1}^{N} c_{m_i}(\theta_i)\right) e^{i\pi \frac{g^2}{\omega_M^2} \left(\sum_{i=1}^{N} m_i^2\right) - i\phi_{m_1\dots m_N} t} \prod_{i=1}^{N} |m_i\rangle\right]$$
$$\otimes \prod_{i=1}^{N} |(x_0)_i\rangle.$$
(14)

Since the spatial degrees of freedom and spin degrees of freedom are separated, we only need to consider the entanglement between the spins of the particles when calculating the entanglement entropy.

Once the final state is obtained, the entanglement between particle i and the other particles can be measured by von Neumann entropy:

$$S_i = S(\rho_i) = -\operatorname{Tr}\left(\rho_i \ln \rho_i\right) = -\sum_j \lambda_j \ln \lambda_j,\tag{15}$$

where $\rho_i = \text{Tr}_{1,\dots,\hat{i},\dots,N}(\rho)$ is the reduced density matrix of the particle *i*, and λ_j are the eigenvalues of ρ_i .

III. THE GRAVITY INDUCED ENTANGLEMENT IN THE SYSTEM WITH THREE PARTICLES WITH LARGE SPIN

In this section we investigate the generation rate of entanglement for the system composed of three massive particles with spin j. Due to the symmetry, the distinct configurations of arranging these three large-spin particles are illustrated in Figure (1), which include the



FIG. 1: The allowable configurations for the system consisting of three particles with large spins.

Linear, Polygon, Star, Prism, and Parallel configurations[25]. In the case of j = 1/2, it is found in [25] that both the Parallel and Prism configurations exhibit the fastest entanglement generation rates compared to other configurations shown in Fig. (1). Here we extend the study for large spin.

For an N-particle system, there are N parameters θ_i , where i = 1, ..., N. We need to optimize the polar angles θ_i , as these have a more significant effect on the entanglement generation. Given the complexity of the problem, an analytical approach is challenging; thus, we employ a numerical grid search method to figure out the optimal values of θ_i that maximize the entanglement entropy.

To compare with the results in previous work on two-particle system of large spins [34], we adopt the experimental configuration proposed in [1], with the following specification for parameters: interaction time $\tau = 2 \text{ s}$, particle mass $M_i \approx 10^{-14} \text{ kg}$, and spatial separation $\Delta x \approx 250 \,\mu\text{m}$. Additionally, the effects of Casimir screening [27] are incorporated, which reduces the separation between particles to $\Delta s = 50 \,\mu\text{m}$.

Setup	S(t = 2s)	θ_A	θ_B	$ heta_C$	Rules
Linear $(j=2)$	0.540	$2.31/\sim$	0.83/2.31	$\sim /0.83$	0 + 0
Linear $(j=5)$	0.538	$2.61/\sim$	0.53/2.61	$\sim /0.53$	$\theta_A + \theta_B = \pi$
Polygon $(j=2)$	0.566	~/0.83	0.83/2.31	$2.31/\sim$	or
Polygon $(j=5)$	0.563	$\sim /0.53$	0.53/2.61	$2.61/\sim$	$\theta_B + \theta_C = \pi$
Star $(j=2)$	0.653	0.83	0.83	0.83	0 0 0
Star $(j=5)$	0.655	0.53	0.53	0.53	$\theta_A = \theta_B = \theta_C$
$\boxed{\text{Prism/Parallel } (j=2)}$	1.367	1.97/1.17	1.57	1.17/1.97	$\theta_B = \frac{\pi}{2}$
$\boxed{\text{Prism/Parallel } (j=5)}$	1.647	1.80/1.34	1.57	1.34/1.80	$\theta_A + \theta_C = \pi$

TABLE I: The optimal angles for the maximal entropy with N = 3

The numerical results for the optimal values of θ_i are summarized in Table (I). For clarity, we present the results for j = 2 and j = 5 here, while the detailed data for other values of jare provided in Appendix B. The symbol "~" in the table indicates that the corresponding angle can take any value in the range $[0, \pi]$. The von Neumann entropy, S_2 , is evaluated at the time t = 2 s. From this table, we observe that the maximal entropy increases with the spin indeed, thus the larger spin is beneficial to the entanglement generation. Moreover, given the spin j, the maximal entropy for the system with three particles is greater than that for the system with two particles at the same evolution time [34], thus adding more particles is also beneficial to the entanglement generation.

From Table (I), we notice that the pattern of the optimal θ_i for the Linear and Polygon configurations is quite similar. In both cases, the maximal entanglement entropy appears when $\theta_A + \theta_B = \pi$ or $\theta_B + \theta_C = \pi$, and the remaining angle, θ_C or θ_A , has a relatively small effect on the result. For the Star configuration, the maximum of entropy is achieved when $\theta_A = \theta_B = \theta_C$. As the value of j increases, the optimal θ_i gradually decreases. Furthermore, for the three-particle case, we find that the optimal θ_i and the maximal entropy are identical for both the Parallel and Prism configurations. The optimal θ_i for these configurations satisfies $\theta_A + \theta_C = \pi$ and $\theta_B = \pi/2$. Notably, the Prism/Parallel configuration achieves the largest entanglement entropy among all the configurations considered. This conclusion is the same as that found in the case of j = 1/2, but the amount of entanglement entropy has been greatly enhanced with the increase of spin j.

Next, to explicitly demonstrate the change of the entanglement entropy with the angles θ_i , we perform a contour plot for the entanglement entropy on (θ_A, θ_C) plane for different configurations in Fig. (2), where θ_B is fixed to be the value presented in Table (I). From this figure, it is evident that given the spin j, the Prism/Parallel configuration yields the largest entanglement entropy. On the other hand, for a given configuration, one finds that the region with relatively large entropy becomes narrow with the increase of spin j, while simultaneously the maximum of entropy becomes larger indeed. This indicates that larger spins enhance the entanglement capability of the system, thereby improving its ability to generate and sustain quantum entanglement.



FIG. 2: The contour plot for the entanglement entropy over (θ_A, θ_C) plane for different configurations with three particles at t = 2s. The specific configuration is labeled on the top of each subfigure.

Next we examine the effect of θ_B on the entanglement entropy for the Prism/Parallel configuration, as illustrated in Fig. (3). It is evident that given the spin j, when θ_B deviates



FIG. 3: The contour plot for the entanglement entropy over (θ_A, θ_C) plane for different values of θ_B in the *Prism/Parallel* configuration with three particles at t = 2s.

from $\pi/2$, the entropy decreases rapidly. Specifically, when $\theta_B = 0$ or $\theta_B = \pi$, particle B is no longer entangled with the other two particles. On the other hand, as the spin *j* increases, the reduction of entropy becomes less pronounced. In addition, we notice that there exists a symmetry between the cases of θ_B and $\pi - \theta_B$, demonstrating the inherent symmetry of the system with respect to θ_B .

Now we turn to discuss the time evolution of the entanglement entropy for different configurations and different spins. The results are presented in Fig. (4), while the complete period is illustrated in Appendix B. Fig. (4a) presents the evolution of the entanglement entropy for five distinct configurations with spin j = 2 (dashed lines) and j = 5 (solid lines), while Fig. (4b) compares the evolution of entropy for the system with two particles and the system with three particles. As observed in Fig. (4a), for a given spin, the *Prism/Parallel* configuration consistently exhibits the highest entanglement entropy among all the configurations analyzed. Fig. (4b) further highlights that the entanglement entropy of the system with two particles (represented by the dashed baby blue curve) is notably lower than that of the system with three particles with the same spin (depicted by the solid blue curve). This indicates that increasing the number of particles significantly enhances the entanglement entropy.



FIG. 4: The evolution of the entanglement entropy for various configurations and spins.

IV. THE GRAVITY INDUCED ENTANGLEMENT IN THE SYSTEM WITH FOUR PARTICLES WITH LARGE SPIN

In this section, we focus on the system with four particles with large spin (N = 4). Unlike the previous section, we restrict our analysis to the *Parallel* and *Prism* configurations for four particles, as these configurations exhibit the highest efficiency of entanglement generation. For the *Prism* configuration with N = 4, there are two possible configurations, as discussed in [25]. Now extending to particles with large spin, we illustrate the configurations in Fig. (5), corresponding to *Parallel*, *Prism with center*, and *Prism*, respectively.

Similar to the case of three particles, we perform a numerical scan over four parameters θ_i to figure out the optimal combination that maximizes the entanglement entropy. Since the computational resources will increase exponentially with the number of particles, in this section we only analyze the cases with spin up to j = 2. The detailed results and corresponding rules are summarized in Table (II). From this table, one notices that for smaller spin values, such as j = 1/2 and j = 1, the optimal value for all θ_i is $\pi/2$. As a matter of fact, this rule also holds for all configurations with three particles, except for the *Star* configuration, as shown in Appendix B.

For j = 2, the *Parallel* and *Prism* configurations follow the same rules, namely $\theta_A + \theta_C = \pi$ and $\theta_B = \theta_D = \pi/2$. Additionally, we show that θ_B , θ_C , and θ_D in the *Prism with center* configuration exhibit cyclic symmetry. To express this symmetry concisely, we adopt the



FIG. 5: Three typical configurations for the system consisting of four particles with large spins.

notation "(,)" to denote the symmetry of permutation.

Setup	$S(t=2\mathbf{s})$	θ_A	θ_B	θ_C	θ_D	Rules
Parallel $(j=1/2)$	0.683	1.57	1.57	1.57	1.57	
Prism $(j=1/2)$	0.692	1.57	1.57	1.57	1.57	
Prism with center $(j=1/2)$	0.689	1.57	1.57	1.57	1.57	$0 - 0 - 0 - 0 - \pi$
Parallel $(j=1)$	1.036	1.57	1.57	1.57	1.57	$\sigma_A = \sigma_B = \sigma_C = \sigma_D = \frac{1}{2}$
Prism $(j=1)$	1.038	1.57	1.57	1.57	1.57	
Prism with center $(j=1)$	1.039	1.57	1.57	1.57	1.57	
Parallel $(j=2)$	1.377	1.15/1.99	1.57	1.99/1.15	1.57	$\theta_A + \theta_C = \pi$
Prism $(j=2)$	1.387	1.11/2.03	1.57	2.03/1.11	1.57	$\theta_B = \theta_D = \frac{\pi}{2}$
						$\theta_A = \frac{\pi}{2}$
Prism with center $(j=2)$	1.399	1.57	(1.03, 1.57, 2.11)			$\theta_B + \theta_C + \theta_D = \frac{3\pi}{2}$
						$\theta_i = \frac{\pi}{2}, \ (i = B \text{ or } C \text{ or } D)$

TABLE II: The optimal angles for the maximal entropy with N = 4

It is also worth emphasizing that for j = 2, the values of θ_A and θ_C in the *Parallel* and *Prism* configurations with four particles are slightly different, whereas they are identical for the case of three particles, as presented in Table (I).

Next, we focus on the *Prism with center* configuration and examine the behavior of the



FIG. 6: The contour plot for the entanglement entropy over (θ_C, θ_D) plane for the *Prism with center* configuration with four particles with j = 2 at t = 2s.

entanglement entropy on (θ_C, θ_D) plane with fixed angles θ_A and θ_B , as illustrated in Fig. (6). It is evident that when θ_A deviates from $\pi/2$, the entropy decreases significantly. For instance, in the middle column of Fig. (6), where θ_A varies from $\pi/4$, to $\pi/2$, and then to $3\pi/4$, the color transitions from blue to purple and then back to blue, demonstrating a marked decline in entropy as θ_A departs from $\pi/2$. Furthermore, when $\theta_A = \theta_B =$ $\pi/2$, variations in θ_C and θ_D have a negligible effect on the entropy. This indicates that the remaining angles play a minor role in altering the entanglement entropy under these conditions. Additionally, with θ_A fixed, changes in θ_B exert only a minor influence on the entropy, as evident in any row of Fig. (6). In addition, the results for the cases (θ_A, θ_B) and $(\pi - \theta_A, \pi - \theta_B)$ exhibit a strong symmetry. This symmetry arises naturally from the geometric symmetry of the *Prism with center* configuration.

Finally, we are concerned with the time evolution of the entanglement entropy for different configurations of the system with four particles, as shown in Fig. (7), while the complete period is illustrated in Appendix B. From Fig. (7a), it is evident that given the same spin j, the *Prism with center* configuration achieves the largest entanglement entropy among all the configurations. Moreover, as the spin increases, the maximum entropy attained by this configuration also increases.

Fig. (7b) reveals that even for large spin values, increasing the number of particles leads to an increase in both the maximum entanglement entropy and the entropy generation rate. Notably, the increment in maximum entropy from N = 2 to N = 3 is larger than that from N = 3 to N = 4, although the entropy generation rate continues to increase consistently across all cases.



particles

FIG. 7: Time evolution of the entanglement entropy for various configurations and particle numbers.

V. CONCLUSION AND DISCUSSION

In this paper we have investigated the gravity induced entanglement entropy in a system with multiple massive particles with large spin, which could be viewed as an improvement of the work in [25, 34]. Specifically, we have computed the entanglement entropy for the

system with three and four particles, respectively, and figured out the optimal angles for the maximal entropy for all the allowable configurations with symmetry up to spin j = 5 for N = 3 and j = 2 for N = 4. The results have revealed that with the increase of the particle number and their spins, both the amount of the entanglement entropy and its generation rate may be greatly improved. Specifically, the entanglement entropy for j = 2 reported in the original work [34] reaches its maximum value at approximately $t \approx 2.3$ s. In contrast, in our work, the entanglement entropy for j = 2 achieves the same maximum value at $t \approx 1.6$ s for the Prism/Parallel setup with N = 3, and at $t \approx 1.2$ s for the Prism with center setup with N = 4. Notably, the time $t \approx 1.2$ s required in the latter configuration is nearly half of the $t \approx 2.3$ s reported in [34]. This demonstrates the increased efficiency of the *Prism with center* setup, particularly for higher particle numbers, in reaching the maximal entanglement entropy within a significantly shorter time frame. Alternatively, if the decoherence-preserving time remains to be fixed at 2.3 seconds, the requirement for the mass of the matter wave could be relaxed from 10^{-14} kg to a smaller value. This relaxation would significantly simplify the experimental implementation, making the setup more feasible under current technological constraints. In particular, the configuration of the prism with a particle at the center would provide the best efficiency for the entropy generation and this conclusion is the same as that obtained in [25] for particles with half spin. In contrast to the work in [25], here we have found that the increase of particle spin is beneficial to the generation of the entanglement entropy. On the other hand, in comparison with the work in [34], we have found that the increase of the number of particles is also beneficial to the generation of entanglement entropy.

Decoherence is a critical factor that must be carefully considered in QGEM experiments. On one hand, Ref.[24, 25] suggests that setups with a greater number of particles are more resilient to decoherence. On the other hand, following the analysis on decoherence in [34], while the dependency on the superposition distance in the long-wavelength limit leads to easier decoherence for larger spins, at shorter wavelengths, a larger superposition does not impact decoherence. It is relatively straightforward to eliminate long-wavelength interference caused by black-body noise in experiments, whereas mitigating short-wavelength interference presents a greater experimental challenge. Therefore, we believe that our setup exhibits greater resilience to decoherence.

The experimental realization of the superposition states involving massive particles re-

mains a significant challenge in contemporary physics. This difficulty arises primarily due to the intricate requirements for isolating such systems from environmental interactions and ensuring precise control over their quantum states. Furthermore, addressing and mitigating the effects of decoherence, which can rapidly degrade the coherence of quantum superpositions, demands further investigation and the development of advanced techniques. Achieving robust superposition states for massive particles will require substantial efforts in both experimental innovation and theoretical advancements.

ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

We are very grateful to Pan Li for the collaboration at the early stage of this work, and to Wen-bin Pan for helpful discussions. This work is supported in part by the Innovative Projects of Science and Technology (E2545BU210) at IHEP, and the Natural Science Foundation of China (Grant Nos. 12035016, 12275275). It is also supported by Beijing Natural Science Foundation (Grant No. 1222031).

Appendix A: Distance of different configurations

In this appendix we present the expressions for $R(x_k(m), x_l(n))$ in various configurations. Without loss of generality, we assume $1 \le k < l \le N$, where N is the number of particles. For prism with center configuration, the particle at the center is regarded as the 0-th particle. Note that m and n take values from -j to j, so the m-th (or n-th) trajectory actually refers to the (m + j)-th (or (n + j)-th) trajectory.

$$R^{(\text{Linear})}(x_k(m), x_l(n)) = (l-k)(\Delta s + 2j\Delta x) + (n-m)\Delta x,$$
(A1)

$$R^{(\text{Parallel})}(x_k(m), x_l(n)) = \sqrt{[(l-k)\Delta s]^2 + [(n-m)\Delta x]^2},$$
(A2)

$$R^{(\text{Prism})}(x_k(m), x_l(n)) = \sqrt{\left[\Delta s \frac{\sin\left((l-k)\frac{\pi}{N}\right)}{\sin\frac{\pi}{N}}\right]^2} + \left[(n-m)\Delta x\right]^2, \tag{A3}$$

$$R^{(\text{Prism with center})}(x_0(m), x_l(n)) = \sqrt{(\Delta s)^2 + \left[(n-m)\Delta x\right]^2},\tag{A4}$$

$$R^{(\text{Prism with center})}(x_k(m), x_l(n)) = \sqrt{\left[2\Delta s \sin\frac{\pi}{N} \frac{\sin\left((l-k)\frac{\pi}{N}\right)}{\sin\frac{\pi}{n}}\right]^2 + \left[(n-m)\Delta x\right]^2}, \quad (A5)$$

$$R^{(\text{Star})}(x_k(m), x_l(n)) = \sqrt{a^2 + b^2 - 2ab\cos\left((l-k)\frac{2\pi}{N}\right)},$$
(A6)

$$R^{(\text{Polygon})}(x_k(m), x_l(n)) = 2L \sin\left[(l-k)\frac{\pi}{N} + (n-m)\theta\right],$$
(A7)

where $a = \frac{\Delta s}{2\sin(\pi/N)} + (m+j)\Delta x$, $b = \frac{\Delta s}{2\sin(\pi/N)} + (n+j)\Delta x$, $L = \sqrt{\frac{\Delta s^2 + 2\Delta s(2j\Delta x)\cos(\pi/N) + (2j\Delta x)^2}{4\sin^2(\pi/N)}}$, and $\theta = \arcsin(j\Delta x/L)$.

Appendix B: Detailed data

The optimal angles for three particles (N = 3) with additional j values are summarized in Table (III). From the table, it can be observed that for the *Linear* and *Polygon* configurations, the rules vary with different spin j. In contrast, for the *Star* and *Prism/Parallel* configurations, the rules remain unchanged.

Furthermore, the complete periods of the evolution process for two, three, and four particles are presented in Fig. (8) and Fig. (9). From these plots, it is observed that for $j = \frac{1}{2}$, the period is approximately 3s regardless of the number of particles. Similarly, for $j > \frac{1}{2}$, the period is approximately 6s, independent of both the particle number and the value of

Setup	S(t=2s)	θ_A	θ_B	$ heta_C$	Rules
Linear $(j=1/2)$	0.638	1.57	1.57	1.57	
Polygon $(j=1/2)$	0.638	1.57	1.57	1.57	
Star $(j=1/2)$	0.640	1.57	1.57	1.57	$\theta_A = \theta_B = \theta_C = \frac{\pi}{2}$
$\begin{tabular}{lllllllllllllllllllllllllllllllllll$	0.673	1.57	1.57	1.57	
Prism/Parallel (j=1)	1.034	1.57	1.57	1.57	
Linear $(j=1)$	0.802	1.15/1.99	1.57	1.99/1.15	$\theta_B = \frac{\pi}{2}$
Polygon $(j=1)$	0.843	1.15/1.99	1.57	1.99/1.15	$\theta_A + \theta_C = \pi$
Linear $(j=3/2)$	0.588	0.95/2.19	1.16/1.98	2.19/0.95	
Polygon $(j=3/2)$	0.615	0.95/2.19	1.16/1.98	2.19/0.95	$\theta_A + \theta_C = \pi$
Star $(j=1)$	0.649	1.15	1.15	1.15	
Star $(j=3/2)$	0.652	0.95	0.95	0.95	$\theta_A = \theta_B = \theta_C$
Star $(j=5)$	0.655	0.53	0.53	0.53	
$\boxed{\text{Prism/Parallel } (j=3/2)}$	1.237	1.89/1.25	1.57	1.25/1.89	ο π
Prism/Parallel (j=3)	1.515	1.90/1.24	1.57	1.24/1.90	$\theta_B = \frac{\pi}{2}$
Prism/Parallel (j=4)	1.598	1.85/1.29	1.57	1.29/1.85	$\theta_A + \theta_C = \pi$

TABLE III: The optimal angles for the maximal entropy with ${\cal N}=3$ for other j values

the spin.



le evolution of different configurations

(b) The evolution of different spins and particles

FIG. 8: Time evolution for longer time of the von Neumann entanglement entropy with three particles for various configurations and spins.



(a) The evolution for different configurations



FIG. 9: Time evolution of the von Neumann entanglement entropy for longer time for various configurations and particle numbers.

- S. Bose, A. Mazumdar, G. W. Morley, H. Ulbricht, M. Toroš, M. Paternostro, A. Geraci, P. Barker, M. S. Kim, and G. Milburn, Spin Entanglement Witness for Quantum Gravity, Phys. Rev. Lett. **119**, 240401 (2017), arXiv:1707.06050 [quant-ph].
- [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].

- M. B. Plenio and S. S. Virmani, An Introduction to Entanglement Theory, Quant. Inf. Comput. 7, 001 (2007), arXiv:quant-ph/0504163.
- [4] M. Christodoulou and C. Rovelli, On the possibility of experimental detection of the discreteness of time, Front. in Phys. 8, 207 (2020), arXiv:1812.01542 [gr-qc].
- [5] M. Christodoulou and C. Rovelli, On the possibility of laboratory evidence for quantum superposition of geometries, Phys. Lett. B 792, 64 (2019), arXiv:1808.05842 [gr-qc].
- [6] R. Howl, R. Penrose, and I. Fuentes, Exploring the unification of quantum theory and general relativity with a Bose–Einstein condensate, New J. Phys. 21, 043047 (2019), arXiv:1812.04630 [quant-ph].
- [7] S. G. Elahi and A. Mazumdar, Probing massless and massive gravitons via entanglement in a warped extra dimension, Phys. Rev. D 108, 035018 (2023), arXiv:2303.07371 [gr-qc].
- [8] S. Bose, A. Mazumdar, M. Schut, and M. Toroš, Entanglement Witness for the Weak Equivalence Principle, Entropy 25, 448 (2023), arXiv:2203.11628 [gr-qc].
- [9] A. Belenchia, R. M. Wald, F. Giacomini, E. Castro-Ruiz, v. Brukner, and M. Aspelmeyer, Quantum Superposition of Massive Objects and the Quantization of Gravity, Phys. Rev. D 98, 126009 (2018), arXiv:1807.07015 [quant-ph].
- [10] D. Carney, P. C. E. Stamp, and J. M. Taylor, Tabletop experiments for quantum gravity: a user's manual, Class. Quant. Grav. 36, 034001 (2019), arXiv:1807.11494 [quant-ph].
- [11] R. J. Marshman, A. Mazumdar, and S. Bose, Locality and entanglement in table-top testing of the quantum nature of linearized gravity, Phys. Rev. A 101, 052110 (2020), arXiv:1907.01568 [quant-ph].
- [12] F. Hanif, D. Das, J. Halliwell, D. Home, A. Mazumdar, H. Ulbricht, and S. Bose, Testing Whether Gravity Acts as a Quantum Entity When Measured, Phys. Rev. Lett. 133, 180201 (2024), arXiv:2307.08133 [gr-qc].
- [13] P. Ghosal, A. Ghosal, and S. Bandyopadhyay, Distribution of quantum gravity induced entanglement in many-body systems, J. Phys. A 57, 445302 (2024), arXiv:2311.08291 [quant-ph].
- [14] D. L. Danielson, G. Satishchandran, and R. M. Wald, Gravitationally mediated entanglement: Newtonian field versus gravitons, Phys. Rev. D 105, 086001 (2022), arXiv:2112.10798 [quantph].
- [15] 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].

- [16] J. Oppenheim, C. Sparaciari, B. Šoda, and Z. Weller-Davies, Gravitationally induced decoherence vs space-time diffusion: testing the quantum nature of gravity, Nature Commun. 14, 7910 (2023), arXiv:2203.01982 [quant-ph].
- [17] L. Lami, J. S. Pedernales, and M. B. Plenio, Testing the Quantumness of Gravity without Entanglement, Phys. Rev. X 14, 021022 (2024), arXiv:2302.03075 [quant-ph].
- [18] D. L. Danielson, G. Satishchandran, and R. M. Wald, Black holes decohere quantum superpositions, Int. J. Mod. Phys. D 31, 2241003 (2022), arXiv:2205.06279 [hep-th].
- [19] D. L. Danielson, G. Satishchandran, and R. M. Wald, Killing horizons decohere quantum superpositions, Phys. Rev. D 108, 025007 (2023), arXiv:2301.00026 [hep-th].
- [20] D. L. Danielson, G. Satishchandran, and R. M. Wald, Local Description of Decoherence of Quantum Superpositions by Black Holes and Other Bodies, (2024), arXiv:2407.02567 [hep-th].
- [21] D. Miki, A. Matsumura, and K. Yamamoto, Entanglement and decoherence of massive particles due to gravity, Phys. Rev. D 103, 026017 (2021), arXiv:2010.05159 [gr-qc].
- [22] D. Moustos and C. Anastopoulos, Gravity-mediated decoherence, Phys. Rev. D 110, 024022 (2024), arXiv:2402.11663 [gr-qc].
- [23] H. C. Nguyen and F. Bernards, Entanglement dynamics of two mesoscopic objects with gravitational interaction, (2019), arXiv:1906.11184 [quant-ph].
- [24] M. Schut, J. Tilly, R. J. Marshman, S. Bose, and A. Mazumdar, Improving resilience of quantum-gravity-induced entanglement of masses to decoherence using three superpositions, Phys. Rev. A 105, 032411 (2022), arXiv:2110.14695 [quant-ph].
- [25] P. Li, Y. Ling, and Z. Yu, Generation rate of quantum gravity induced entanglement with multiple massive particles, Phys. Rev. D 107, 064054 (2023), arXiv:2210.17259 [gr-qc].
- [26] J. S. Pedernales, K. Streltsov, and M. B. Plenio, Enhancing Gravitational Interaction between Quantum Systems by a Massive Mediator, Phys. Rev. Lett. **128**, 110401 (2022), arXiv:2104.14524 [quant-ph].
- [27] T. W. van de Kamp, R. J. Marshman, S. Bose, and A. Mazumdar, Quantum Gravity Witness via Entanglement of Masses: Casimir Screening, Phys. Rev. A 102, 062807 (2020), arXiv:2006.06931 [quant-ph].
- [28] L. Braccini, A. Serafini, and S. Bose, Exponential Expansion of Massive Schrödinger Cats for Sensing and Entanglement, (2024), arXiv:2408.11930 [quant-ph].

- [29] R. Zhou, Q. Xiang, and A. Mazumdar, Spin-Dependent Force and Inverted Harmonic Potential for Rapid Creation of Macroscopic Quantum Superpositions, (2024), arXiv:2408.11909 [quantph].
- [30] T. B. Lantaño, L. Petruzziello, S. F. Huelga, and M. B. Plenio, Low-Energy Test of Quantum Gravity via Angular Momentum Entanglement, (2024), arXiv:2409.01364 [quant-ph].
- [31] R. J. Marshman, S. Bose, A. Geraci, and A. Mazumdar, Entanglement of magnetically levitated massive Schrödinger cat states by induced dipole interaction, Phys. Rev. A 109, L030401 (2024), arXiv:2304.14638 [quant-ph].
- [32] M. Schut, A. Grinin, A. Dana, S. Bose, A. Geraci, and A. Mazumdar, Relaxation of experimental parameters in a quantum-gravity-induced entanglement of masses protocol using electromagnetic screening, Phys. Rev. Res. 5, 043170 (2023), arXiv:2307.07536 [quant-ph].
- [33] M. Schut, A. Geraci, S. Bose, and A. Mazumdar, Micrometer-size spatial superpositions for the QGEM protocol via screening and trapping, Phys. Rev. Res. 6, 013199 (2024), arXiv:2307.15743 [quant-ph].
- [34] L. Braccini, M. Schut, A. Serafini, A. Mazumdar, and S. Bose, Large Spin Stern-Gerlach Interferometry for Gravitational Entanglement, (2023), arXiv:2312.05170 [quant-ph].