

Zooming in on discrete space

Daniel A. Turolla Vanzella*

*Instituto de Física de São Carlos, Universidade de São Paulo,
Caixa Postal 369, CEP 13560-970, São Carlos, SP, Brazil and
Institute for Quantum Optics and Quantum Information (IQOQI),
Austrian Academy of Sciences, Boltzmannngasse 3, A-1090 Vienna, Austria*[†]

(Dated: May 28, 2024)

Although we lack complete understanding of quantum aspects of gravitation, it is usually agreed, using general arguments, that a final quantum gravity theory will endow space and time with some (fundamental or effective) notion of discreteness. This granular character is supposed to lie on space and time scales of $l_P \sim 10^{-33}$ cm and $\tau_P \sim 10^{-42}$ s, respectively—the Planck scale—, far beyond any hope of direct assessment. Here, by modeling displacements of particles on a discrete underlying space as Poisson processes, we speculate on the possibility of amplifying the effects of space discreteness (if existent) by *several* orders of magnitude, using the statistical variance of correlated displacements of particles/systems with very different masses. Although still out of reach by current technology, the analysis presented here suggests that it may be possible to see hints of space(time) discreteness at larger scales than one would usually expect.

The comprehension that the most basic concepts of space and time are fundamentally dynamical—ultimately giving rise to the phenomenon of gravity, as ruled, e.g., by General Relativity—is certainly one of the most striking paradigm shifts in Physics. Possibly, it is also at the heart of the difficulty in formulating a gravity theory which fully encompasses the quantum principles which seem to rule all other fundamental aspects of Nature. Although a complete quantum gravity theory continues elusive after a search of more than a century, there are some features which are generally believed that will be true in such a theory. One of them is the (fundamental or effective) discreteness of space and time at the Planck scale— $l_P \sim 10^{-33}$ cm and $\tau_P \sim 10^{-43}$ s, respectively. Unfortunately, directly assessing such diminutive scales through standard Particle Physics experiments—which would involve particle processes with energies of order 10^{19} GeV (the Planck energy), some 15 orders of magnitude beyond LHC’s energy scale—seems a hopeless task. A (loose) parallel can perhaps be drawn with the “atomistic theory” at the end of the 19th century, when the physical reality of the hypothetical entities called *atoms* and *molecules*, which were so useful for stoichiometric calculations in Chemistry, was beyond direct verification due to their (alleged) tiny dimensions. Notwithstanding, the *statistical* properties of (the existence of) a large number of these invisible entities were directly linked, by Einstein, to the *observed* phenomenon of the Brownian motion [1]—hence, giving observational support to the reality of those invisible entities. Could statistics come to our help, again, regarding the existence of a discrete spatial scale? Here, we try to argue that this may indeed be possible. (We use natural units, in which $c = \hbar = 1$.)

In order to illustrate the general idea, consider a one-dimensional space discretized in cells, each with size l_P . An “object” which possesses only one spatial degree of freedom on this space cannot be localized to a precision better than l_P —regardless how many cells its extension occupies¹. Therefore, if this object is “forced” to undergo a certain spatial displacement d (e.g., by some “physical law”—we ask the reader to bear with us for now), it does not seem too far-fetched that this process might be treated as a *Poisson process* for the discrete variable $d_N := Nl_P$ ($N \in \mathbb{N}$), with average $\langle d_N \rangle = d$. This constitutes the first basic assumption underlying our investigation.²

The assumption above means that if the process of “forcing” the same object to undergo the same spatial translation d is repeated a large number of times, there should exist an *inevitable statistical variance* in the determination of d_N , associated to a standard deviation $\Delta d_N = d/\sqrt{N} = \sqrt{l_P d}$. This is certainly a natural consequence of describing position as a discrete variable on an underlying discrete space. And the standard-deviation expression can be used to illustrate well the difficulty in *observing* this statistical effect of space discreteness if l_P is exceedingly small. For in order to detect such an effect, one should be able to *measure* the variable d to an experimental precision Δd better than Δd_N (i.e., $\Delta d < \Delta d_N$). For instance: given an experimental *accuracy* $a := \Delta d/d$ (i.e., relative precision) with which d can be measured in an experiment, $\Delta d < \Delta d_N$ implies $N < 1/a^2$, which, in

[†]While on a sabbatical leave.

¹ By definition, having only one spatial degree of freedom means that the entire configuration of the “object” can be characterized by a single parameter, even though this configuration may occupy several spatial cells.

² The analysis and conclusions presented here could be adapted to processes following statistical distributions other than Poissonian.

turn, leads to $d < l_P/a^2$ and $\Delta d < l_P/a$. Therefore, even with extremely accurate displacement measurements, say $a \sim 10^{-10}$ m, one would have to measure displacements of order 10^{-15} m (the size of a proton) to a precision better than 10^{-25} m in order to be sensitive to this statistical variance—recalling that $l_P \approx 10^{-33}$ cm. If instead of fixing the accuracy we give the precision Δd to which an experiment can determine d , say $\Delta d \sim 10^{-12}$ m (the Compton wavelength of an electron), then the condition $\Delta d < \Delta d_N$ implies that one should be able to measure, to that precision, displacements $d > \Delta d^2/l_P \sim 10^{11}$ m (the radius of Venus’s orbit). These figures illustrate very clearly why statistical effects of space discreteness would have passed unnoticed even if our basic assumption (of modeling displacements as Poisson processes) is true.³

In fact, things can be even worse than discussed above—i.e., the statistical effect we are interested in can be even more elusive. This is because we only considered “objects” with one spatial degree of freedom on a given direction. Adding spatial degrees of freedom (f) to the analysis above can have two effects. On the positive—and practical—side, it allows us to consider “objects” with arbitrary masses m , beyond the ones of the known elementary particles. And even for elementary particles, the assumption of one or few spatial degrees of freedom ($f \sim 1$) is not in general realistic, due to the supposedly continuous nature of their quantum-mechanical wave functions. Nonetheless, $f \sim 1$ is possible to be attained for specific quantum states—e.g., ground states in confining potentials. So, as an idealization, we shall consider, here, that it is *possible* to have $f \sim 1$ for “objects” up to a certain mass/energy scale μ —which we simply call “particles”—above which f may increase with m (e.g., with a power-law dependence such as $f = (m/\mu)^\alpha$, $\alpha > 0$ and $m > \mu$).

On the other hand, the negative effect (for observational purposes) of adding spatial degrees of freedom is that it makes the measurement conditions more stringent. This is because, typically, $f > 1$ improves the precision to which, *in principle*, the object can be localized “on average” on a discrete grid—for instance, its center of mass, which is the spatial degree of freedom which is associated to the whole mass m . This makes the *effective* discreteness scale for the whole mass m , l_{eff} , even smaller than the Planck length if $f \gg 1$, which, in turn, makes the “effective number of cells” $N_{\text{eff}} = d/l_{\text{eff}}$, for a given displacement d , even larger—thus suppressing statistical fluctuations. For concreteness sake, we model $l_{\text{eff}} = l_P/f^\beta$, with $\beta > 0$. We leave our expressions in terms of l_{eff} , which is *the* quantity on which our discus-

sion depends. But we ask the reader to bear in mind this conjectured dependence of l_{eff} on f and of this latter on m —which leads to $l_{\text{eff}} = (\mu/m)^{\alpha\beta}l_P$ for $m > \mu$ (while $l_{\text{eff}} = l_P$ for $m \leq \mu$). When illustrating numerical values, we consider the case $f \propto m$ (i.e., $\alpha = 1$) and $l_{\text{eff}} \propto 1/\sqrt{f}$ (i.e., $\beta = 1/2$) for $m > \mu$, which seem reasonable as a toy model (the latter due to the assumption of statistical independence of the spatial variances associated to each degree of freedom).

Thus, repeating the same analysis performed earlier for one degree of freedom but now for $f > 1$ degrees of freedom—with the additional constraint that, in order to be unambiguously *measurable*, in principle, the statistical deviation Δd_N should be considerably larger than l_P^4 and $\lambda_C = 1/m$ (the Compton wavelength of the object with mass m)—, the condition that space discreteness should lead to an (in principle) observable statistical variance in displacement measurements (i.e., $l_P, \lambda_C \ll \Delta d < \Delta d_N = \sqrt{l_{\text{eff}}d}$) imposes

$$d \gg \begin{cases} \lambda_C^2/l_{\text{eff}} & , m \leq m_P \\ l_P^2/l_{\text{eff}} & , m > m_P \end{cases} \quad (1)$$

and, consequently,

$$\frac{\Delta d}{d} \ll \begin{cases} l_{\text{eff}}/\lambda_C & , m \leq m_P \\ l_{\text{eff}}/l_P & , m > m_P \end{cases}, \quad (2)$$

where $m_P := 1/l_P \approx 10^{19}$ GeV is the Planck mass.

Just for the sake of illustrating how $f > 1$ makes the task of detecting statistical variance coming from discrete space more difficult, we plot, in Fig. 1(a), the right-hand side (r.h.s.) of Ineq. (1) (for different values of $\mu < m_P$) assuming the dependence $l_{\text{eff}} = (\mu/m)^{\alpha\beta}l_P$ conjectured above, with $\alpha = 1$ and $\beta = 1/2$. The curves represent (for different values of μ) the (underestimated) lower bounds on the displacement d of an object with mass m for which statistical variance due to space discreteness would *in principle* be measurable. In Fig. 1(b), we plot the corresponding worst-accuracy bounds [the r.h.s. of Ineq. (2)] for measurements of d to be sensitive to statistical variance. (Recall that “better accuracy” means smaller values on the vertical axis.) We see that, regardless the (fixed) value of μ (and for $0 < \alpha\beta < 1$), objects with mass $m \sim m_P \approx 10^{19}$ GeV are the ones which, in principle, would require *less accuracy* in their

³ Note that the requirement is to measure a *displacement* d to a precision Δd . This is *not* the same as measuring a *distance* d between two objects to that same precision—the latter being limited only by the two-object’s uncorrelated, individual uncertainties, independent of the distance between them.

⁴ The reader may well question why we impose $\Delta d_N \gg l_P$ instead of $\Delta d_N \gg l_{\text{eff}}$. We may justify this by pointing out that the fact that l_{eff} is the effective discrete spatial scale for purposes of inferring statistical properties of displacements of the object, this does not necessarily mean that our “displacement measuring device” is not bound by the fundamental scale l_P . And in any case, the condition $\Delta d_N \gg l_P$ is stronger than $\Delta d_N \gg l_{\text{eff}}$, in the sense that by imposing the former we also guarantee the latter.




FIG. 1: (a) The curves represent the r.h.s. of Ineq. (1) assuming $l_{\text{eff}} = l_P(\mu/m)^{\alpha\beta}$ (with $\alpha = 1$ and $\beta = 1/2$), for different values of μ . These are the lower-bound values of displacement d for which statistical variance due to space discreteness is *in principle* measurable (i.e., $\Delta d_N \gg \lambda_C, l_P$). The gray region represents distances smaller than λ_C or l_P . (b) The curves represent the r.h.s. of Ineq. (2), again assuming $l_{\text{eff}} = l_P(\mu/m)^{\alpha\beta}$ (with $\alpha = 1$ and $\beta = 1/2$), for different values of μ . These are the worst-accuracy bounds needed to observe statistical variance in measurements of spatial displacements of a mass m due to space discreteness. (Recall that better accuracy means lower values in the vertical axis.) (c) The curves represent the lower-bound values of displacement d for which statistical variance due to space discreteness can in principle be measured to a precision $\Delta d \approx 10^{-15}$ m (assuming $l_{\text{eff}} = l_P(\mu/m)^{\alpha\beta}$, with $\alpha = 1$ and $\beta = 1/2$). The gray region represents distances smaller than λ_C or l_P . (d) The corresponding worst-accuracy bounds needed in the displacement measurements of Fig. 1(c).

displacement measurements to still be sensitive to variance due to space discreteness. But this is simply because these are the objects whose best-possible localization scale ($\sim \lambda_C \sim l_P$) is the closest to the (effective) discreteness scale ($\sim l_{\text{eff}}$). Obviously, this is completely useless for any practical purposes, since the *absolute precision* (Δd) needed to be indulged by this “low accuracy” is close the Planck scale itself.

In Fig. 1(c), instead of privileging accuracy, we plot the minimum displacement necessary if the *absolute precision* is limited by, e.g., $\Delta d \approx 10^{-15}$ m. We see that, in this case, observing statistical variance due to space discreteness would involve measuring, to a precision comparable to the size of an atomic nucleus, “identical” displacements varying from a few hundred kilometers (for masses

$m \sim \mu$) up to the distance to the Oort Cloud ($\sim 10^{15}$ m, for $\mu \sim 1$ GeV and $m \sim m_P$), beyond the limits of our Solar System. This ludicrous situation is well reflected in the worst-accuracy bounds needed in these cases, plotted in Fig. 1(d).

So far, all we have done, using quantitative arguments based on our simple model, is corroborating the common wisdom that effects of an hypothetical granular nature of space at scales $l_P \sim 10^{-33}$ cm are well beyond any hope of direct observation. With this resigned view, we ask the reader to consider the following idealized situation.

A particle with mass m and an “object” (i.e., possibly having $f \gg 1$) with mass $M \gg m$ are initially at rest w.r.t. each other, constituting an *isolated* system. Let $|i\rangle = |0\rangle_m |0\rangle_M$ be the initial state of the system,




FIG. 2: Pictorial representation of displacements d and D due to interaction between the particle with mass m and the “object” with mass M . Conservation of the mass dipole moment of an isolated system leads to $md + MD = 0$.

where $|0\rangle_m$ and $|0\rangle_M$ represent the initial (uncorrelated) peaked position states of the particle and the object, respectively; let σ_m and σ_M be the corresponding spatial uncertainties (in principle, limited by $\sigma_m > 1/m, l_P$ and $\sigma_M > 1/M, l_{eff}$). Now, suppose interaction takes place between them, in such a way that the state of the particle is displaced by a certain distance d —characterized by the final state $|d\rangle_m$. Conservation of total momentum of an isolated system imposes that its center of mass (or, equivalently, its mass dipole moment) cannot change in the initial, inertial rest frame. Therefore, the final position state $|d\rangle_m$ of the particle *must* be correlated to a final position state $|D\rangle_M$ of the object, with $md + MD = 0$, so that the final state of the system is described by $|f\rangle = |d\rangle_m |D\rangle_M$ (see Fig. 2). In principle, there is no reason for the uncertainty in the position of the center of mass of the system to increase appreciably during this process; i.e., the *inherent* uncertainties of the final states $|d\rangle_m$ and $|D\rangle_M$ in each realization of the experiment can, in principle, be the same as the ones of the initial states $|0\rangle_m$ and $|0\rangle_M$, respectively.

Consider, now, repeating this same *identical* process a large number of times. If d (and D) were a continuous variable, the statistical variance in the position/displacement measurements of the particle should reflect *only* the uncertainty σ_m associated to $|d\rangle_m$. However, if we take into consideration that the spatial displacements should be described by the discrete variables d_N and $D_{N'}$, with $md_N + MD_{N'} = 0$ for *each* run (see Fig. 3), we end up with two *coupled* Poisson processes for which the standard deviations Δd and ΔD are tied together by

$$m\Delta d = M\Delta D \Leftrightarrow \frac{\Delta d}{|\langle d_N \rangle|} = \frac{\Delta D}{|\langle D_{N'} \rangle|}. \quad (3)$$

As a consequence, the *accuracy* to which the displacements d and D can be determined is *limited* by the one which is most affected by statistical variance. From Fig. 1(b), we see that statistical variance should be most




FIG. 3: Pictorial representation showing several processes “identical” to the one represented in Fig. 2. The statistical variance of the discrete variable $D_{N'}$ is transferred, amplified, to the variable d_N due to the constraint $md_N + MD_{N'} = 0$.

important, in principle, for masses around the Planck mass m_P —as previously explained, due to the fact that these are the masses whose best-possible localization scale is the closest to the discreteness scale l_{eff} .⁵ So, by choosing $M \approx m_P$, the statistical variance in the determination of D “contaminates” the determination of (or gets transferred to) d via Eq. (3), which leads to

$$\begin{aligned} \Delta d &= \frac{\Delta D}{|\langle D_{N'} \rangle|} |d| = \frac{|d|}{\sqrt{N'}} = \sqrt{\frac{l_{eff}(M)}{|D|}} |d| \\ &= \sqrt{\frac{M l_{eff}(M) |d|}{m}}, \end{aligned} \quad (4)$$

where, to be clear, $l_{eff}(M)$ stands for the effective scale of space discreteness for the object with mass M (taking into account its $f(M)$ spatial degrees of freedom). If we want this “contamination” arising from space discreteness to be in principle measurable for the particle with mass $m \ll M \approx m_P$, we need to impose $\Delta d \gg 1/m, \sigma_m$ (in addition to $\Delta D \gg l_P$; see previous footnote). Assuming, just to make comparisons simpler, that σ_m can be made of the same order as $\lambda_C = 1/m$, this leads to

$$d \gg \begin{cases} (m_P/M)[l_P/l_{eff}(M)]\lambda_C & , M < m_P \\ (M/m_P)[l_P/l_{eff}(M)]\lambda_C & , M \geq m_P \end{cases} . \quad (5)$$

⁵ If we relax the condition $\Delta D \gg l_P$ used to obtain Fig. 1(b) and consider the weaker one, $\Delta D \gg l_{eff}$ —which seems justifiable, here, since we are not assessing *directly* the displacement D (see previous footnote)—then the higher the mass M , the worse the accuracy $\Delta D/D$ —*provided* f does *not* grow linearly or faster with M —and the easier it would be to observe effects of statistical variance on D . However, the hypothesis that f does not grow linearly or faster with M (i.e., $\alpha < 1$) does impose a nontrivial condition which is likely to be false or experimentally untenable for large enough masses. Therefore, we stick to the stronger condition $\Delta D \gg l_P$.

The result above is to be compared with Ineq. (1). The conclusion is: while independent displacements d of a particle with mass $m < m_P$ must satisfy $d \gg \lambda_C^2/l_{\text{eff}}(m)$ for statistical variance due to space discreteness to be *in principle* observable ($\Delta d_N \gg \lambda_C$), they only need to satisfy the *weaker* condition $d \gg [l_P/l_{\text{eff}}(M)] \lambda_C$ if they are coupled, through mass-dipole-moment conservation, to the displacements D of an object with mass $M \approx m_P$. For the sake of illustration, in Fig. 4 we plot the r.h.s. of Ineq. (5)—under the same assumptions used to plot Fig. 1, namely $l_{\text{eff}}(M) = l_P/[f(M)]^\beta$ and $f(M) = \max\{1, (M/\mu)^\alpha\}$, with $\alpha = 1$ and $\beta = 1/2$ —for $m = m_e$ (the mass of the electron) and different values of μ . We see that instead of having to measure displacements of order 10^{11} m (Venus’s orbital radius) for an electron with a precision comparable to its Compton wavelength, now we “only” need to measure displacements of about 1 cm to that same precision (in case $\mu = 1$ GeV) if this displacement is due to interaction with a Planck-mass object—thus turning an astronomically difficult problem into a down-to-Earth (though still difficult) task, literally.

In conclusion, here we have explored the idea that spatial discreteness alone should naturally lead to statistical variance of the spatial displacement of an object. The question we investigated, in this scenario, was: can this statistical variance be observed and, hence, provide a signature of the existence of a minimal length scale? We have shown that although this is a hopeless task for independent displacements (see Fig. 1), interaction between particles with different masses, modeled as *coupled* Poisson processes, can *amplify*, by several orders of magnitude, statistical variance across the very different mass scales. Our analysis here should be seen as a mere “proof of concept.” Obviously, several experimentally-relevant issues and subtleties were neglected here, as, e.g., the experimental conditions under which the particle’s and object’s states would satisfy the *key condition*

$$\frac{M l_{\text{eff}}(M)}{m l_{\text{eff}}(m)} \gg 1$$

—which is necessary for Ineq. (5) to represent a significantly less stringent condition than Ineq. (1)—not to mention the obvious requirement that Δd given by Ineq. (4) should not be buried under σ_m ($\Delta d \gg \sigma_m$). In fact, distinguishing Δd coming from Eq. (4) from σ_m coming from the spread of the wave function associated to $|d\rangle_m$ seems a delicate experimental task. Another (over)simplification considered here regards the final state $|f\rangle = |d\rangle_m |D\rangle_M$ of the system. Since the idea is to amplify tiny statistical variances of already tiny and possibly directly-unobservable displacements D , it seems much more reasonable to consider final states of the *entangled* form

$$|f\rangle = \int_{\mathbb{R}} dD f(D) |d(D)\rangle_m |D\rangle_M, \quad (6)$$

with $d(D) = -MD/m$ and $f(D)$ a complex function, satisfying $\int dD |f(D)|^2 = 1$, which depends on the details of the experiment. Although this does not invalidate the core idea that measurements of d can exhibit an inevitable (and measurable) statistical variance coming from the effects of space discreteness on the variable D , it certainly modifies the details of the analysis.⁶ Moreover, considering the perspective that, in the not-so-distant future, very sensitive experiments will likely be able to generate entanglement of position states of mesoscopic massive particles—e.g., through Coulomb or gravitational [2] interaction—it is interesting to consider cases where

$$|f\rangle \approx \frac{1}{\sqrt{2}} (|\ell\rangle_m |R\rangle_M + |r\rangle_m |L\rangle_M),$$

with $|\ell\rangle_m$, $|r\rangle_m$ and $|L\rangle_M$, $|R\rangle_M$ being peaked position states of the masses m and M , respectively. Although the main goal of these planned experiments is observing electromagnetically- and gravity-induced position entanglement between particles, it would be interesting to analyze how close they would be, in terms of sensitivity, to seeing hints of an underlying discrete space, in the sense discussed here.

Acknowledgments

This work was developed while on a sabbatical leave at the Institute for Quantum Optics and Quantum Information (IQOQI-Vienna) of the Austrian Academy of Sciences. The author acknowledges partial financial support from the São Paulo State Research Foundation (FAPESP) under grant no. 2023/04827-9. The author thanks the IQOQI, the University of Vienna, and Časlav Brukner and his group for the stimulating environment and their hospitality. The author also thanks Gerard Higgins for inspiring conversations about state-of-the-art quantum experiments and Jeremy Butterfield for valuable suggestions on the text.

* Electronic address: vanzella@ifsc.usp.br

- [1] A. Einstein, *Über die von der molekularkinetischen Theorie der Wärme geforderte Bewegung von in ruhenden Flüssigkeiten suspendierten Teilchen*. Ann. der Phys. **17**, 549 (1905). Reproduced in *Investigations on the Theory of the Brownian Movement* (Dover, New York, 1956).
 [2] C. Marletto and V. Vedral, *Gravitationally Induced Entanglement between Two Massive Particles is Sufficient Evi-*

⁶ The object’s displacement D would play the role of a *nonlocal* hidden variable for the state of the mass m .




FIG. 4: The curves represent the r.h.s. of Ineq. (5) (assuming $l_{eff} = l_P(\mu/M)^{\alpha\beta}$, with $\alpha = 1$ and $\beta = 1/2$). They correspond to the lower-bound values of displacement of an electron-mass particle in order to statistical variance, due to an underlying discrete space, to be *in principle* observable when the displacement is due to interaction with an “object” with mass M . (The gray area marks the region where $d < \lambda_C = 1/m_e$.)

idence of Quantum Effects in Gravity. Phys. Rev. Lett.
119, 240402 (2017).