

# Should we necessarily treat masses as localized when analysing tests of quantum gravity?

Adrian Kent<sup>1,2</sup>

<sup>1</sup>*Centre for Quantum Information and Foundations, DAMTP, Centre for Mathematical Sciences, University of Cambridge, Wilberforce Road, Cambridge CB3 0WA, UK*

<sup>2</sup>*Perimeter Institute for Theoretical Physics, 31 Caroline Street North, Waterloo, ON N2L 2Y5, Canada.*

(Dated: June 3, 2024)

Recently proposed “table-top tests of quantum gravity” involve creating, separating and recombining superpositions of masses at non-relativistic speeds. The general expectation is that these generate superpositions of gravitational fields via the Newtonian potential. Analyses suggest that negligible gravitational radiation is generated if the interference experiments involve sufficiently small accelerations. One way of thinking about this is that matter and the static gravitational field are temporarily entangled and then disentangled. Another is that the static gravitational field degrees of freedom are dependent on the matter and do not belong to a separate Hilbert space, and that there is always negligible entanglement between matter and dynamical gravitational degrees of freedom.

In this last picture, localized masses effectively become infinitely extended objects, inseparable from their Newtonian potentials. While this picture appears hard to extend to a fully relativistic theory of non-quantum gravity, it has significant implications for analyses of how or whether BMV and other non-relativistic experiments might test the quantum nature of gravity. If the masses in a BMV experiment are regarded as occupying overlapping regions (or indeed all of space), explaining how they become entangled does not require that their gravitational interaction involves quantum information exchange. On this view, while the experiments test gravity in a regime where quantum theory is needed to describe all the relevant matter degrees of freedom, they do not necessarily test its quantum nature. It might be argued that no plausible explanation other than quantum gravity could be consistent both with these experiments and with special and general relativity. But any such argument relies on further theoretical assumptions, and so is weaker than claiming direct evidence for quantum gravitational interactions from the experiments alone.

## I. INTRODUCTION

Proposals by Bose et al. [1] and Marletto-Vedral [2] (BMV) for experiments that could entangle two mesoscopic particles gravitationally have attracted a great deal of interest, along with further proposals (e.g. [3]) for “table-top tests of quantum gravity”. Refined versions of BMV experiments, in which entanglement is tested by Bell experiments rather than by entanglement witnesses, have been proposed [4] to exclude the possibility that the appearance of entanglement is explained by local hidden variables. Table-top tests are very strongly motivated whether or not they could definitively confirm quantum gravity, since they would certainly distinguish the predictions of non-relativistic quantum mechanics with Newtonian potentials from some interesting alternatives, including gravitationally-induced collapse models [5–12] and related ideas [13] and the possibility that a semi-classical gravity theory holds in the relevant regime [14]. However, discussion continues over how robustly any of the proposed experiments test the quantum nature of gravity (e.g. [12, 15–20]). All the table-top experiments considered to date probe non-relativistic quantum gravity: the masses move slowly, and the predictions do not involve  $c$ . This is a previously little-explored regime. Many physicists’ initial reaction is that one cannot get new evidence for quantum gravity from predictions derived from the Schrödinger equation with New-

tonian potentials. Yet the prediction that entanglement is generated between separated subsystems, when the only significant interaction is gravitational, does appear at first sight to require a quantumly mediated force. It is a basic result of quantum information theory that local operations on and classical communication between separate quantum subsystems cannot generate entanglement. This is usually framed in a non-relativistic setting, and so apparently applicable to BMV and related experiments. Yet, even prior to considering loopholes, some feel a lingering unease that arguments for strong conclusions about quantum gravity are ultimately based on no more than standard undergraduate quantum mechanics.

This paper explores and tries to formalize one version of this unease. Its starting point is that arguments that gravity can be shown to be quantum by analysing only experiments in the non-relativistic regime need themselves to be consistently non-relativistic. If we use only non-relativistic dynamical equations to make predictions and inferences about the underlying physics, we should also consider alternative explanations that may not be evidently consistent with relativity. One reason for this is logical clarity: if in fact we also need to appeal to relativistic theory or experiment in order to argue that gravity must be quantum, we should make this part of the argument explicit. Also, importantly, such arguments (e.g. [21]) sometimes turn out to be incorrect [22–24] and so deserve careful scrutiny. A lack of evident consis-

tency with special or general relativity might possibly be due to a failure of theoretical imagination.

## II. NON-RELATIVISTIC CHARGE AND MASS INTERFEROMETRY

Consider a particle of charge  $q$  in an interferometry experiment with two paths  $\mathbf{x}_L(\mathbf{t}), \mathbf{x}_R(\mathbf{t})$  that both involve small acceleration. Suppose that the interference component occupies time  $T$ , i.e.,  $\mathbf{x}_L(\mathbf{t}) = \mathbf{x}_R(\mathbf{t})$  for  $t \leq 0$  and  $t \geq T$ , while  $\mathbf{x}_L(\mathbf{t}) \neq \mathbf{x}_R(\mathbf{t})$  for  $0 < t < T$ . In a non-relativistic treatment (effectively taking  $c = \infty$ ) its electrostatic field at position  $\mathbf{x}_0$  is

$$\mathbf{E}(\mathbf{x}) = \frac{q}{4\pi\epsilon_0} \frac{\mathbf{x} - \mathbf{x}_0}{|\mathbf{x} - \mathbf{x}_0|^3}. \quad (1)$$

During the interval  $(0, T)$ , the particle's position superposition is associated with a superposition of electrostatic fields. After time  $T$  the paths recombine, and there is again a single electrostatic field. This non-relativistic discussion conceals important subtleties and does not adequately explain why particle interference is possible in a relativistic world. However, it is at least consistent with the possibility of interference: it implies that, after time  $T$ , no measurement of the electrostatic field can give any path information. It is in line with the discussion given by Christodoulou and Rovelli [25] for the analogous case of non-relativistic BMV mass interferometry.

A more satisfactory discussion of charge and mass interferometry and relativistic causality was given by Mari et al. [26]. However, we will not discuss their analysis of relativistic causality here, but rather focus on one point in their illuminating commentary. As they note, although the charged particle creates a superposition of electrostatic fields, there is a sense in which one can treat it as never entangled with the quantum electromagnetic field. The momentum space Maxwell equation

$$\mathbf{k}^2 \hat{V}(\mathbf{k}) = \hat{\rho}(\mathbf{k}) \quad (2)$$

gives

$$\hat{\mathbf{E}}(\mathbf{k}, t) = \frac{-i\mathbf{k}}{\mathbf{k}^2} \hat{\rho}(\mathbf{k}) - \frac{\partial}{\partial t} \hat{\mathbf{A}}(\mathbf{k}). \quad (3)$$

In Coulomb gauge,  $\mathbf{k} \cdot \hat{\mathbf{A}}(\mathbf{k}) = 0$  and so the longitudinal component of  $\mathbf{E}$  is determined by  $\hat{\rho}$  and acts on the same Hilbert space. The vacuum expectation value of the quasistatic electric field is thus determined by that of the charge density operator.

As Mari et al. put it, “the longitudinal component of the electric field is not a dynamical propagating degree of freedom, since it [...] is completely determined by [external charges], so there is no Hilbert space associated to it. The Hilbert space of the field contains only the degrees of freedom associated to the electromagnetic radiation.” In this picture, the matter degrees of freedom can be

in a product state with the field vacuum, despite generating a quasistatic electric field. This picture is gauge-dependent, and the Coulomb gauge is not Lorentz invariant. But this is not an immediate issue when considering BMV-type experiments in the non-relativistic ( $c \rightarrow \infty$ ) limit and the issue of whether they give evidence for non-relativistic quantum interactions.

This picture may be counter-intuitive: it seems to suggest that the electromagnetic field may be in the same vacuum state whether the particle is localized at  $\mathbf{x}$ ,  $\mathbf{x}'$  or not present at all. In this way of thinking, there is nothing at a general point  $\mathbf{y} \neq \mathbf{x}, \mathbf{x}'$ . Yet there *is* an electrostatic field, whose effect is measurable in finite time, for example, as Mari et al. discuss, by its action on a charge initially trapped in an oscillator near  $\mathbf{y}$ . One way of reconciling these conflicting intuitions is to think of the particle as an extended object of which the electrostatic field is an essential component: its centre-of-mass wave function and charge density may be localized around  $\mathbf{x}$ , but the field is not.

According to this picture, a BMV experiment involving Coulomb forces can generate entanglement between two particles without non-local interactions because the particles – understood as extended objects – always overlap, although their charge densities do not. We do not need to appeal to quantum information exchange to explain the generated entanglement. In fact, of course, we have overwhelming evidence for QED and in particular that electromagnetic forces *are* mediated by photons. We can give a version of this picture based on QED, via the unrigorous but still quite compelling intuition that we can think of the particle as dressed by an extended cloud of virtual electrons, positrons and photons. But, importantly, the picture is motivated without appealing to an underlying quantum field theory.

Turning now to non-relativistic gravitational BMV experiments, we need to keep in mind that their aim is to give evidence for (or against) the quantum nature of gravity, so we should not require all possible explanations for the predicted entanglement generation to assume that gravity is quantized. We can construct an explanation without assuming a direct analogue of (3) and of the underlying theory, QED. We can simply adopt the analogous picture of a mass  $m$  particle as an object described by non-relativistic quantum mechanics, which has localized centre-of-mass wave function and mass density, but which has a long-range extension associated with its Newtonian gravitational field

$$-Gm \left( \frac{\mathbf{x} - \mathbf{x}_0}{|\mathbf{x} - \mathbf{x}_0|^3} \right) \quad (4)$$

This would explain the generation of BMV entanglement as arising from local interactions between overlapping quantum systems.

A related issue, raised by Hanif et al. [27], is whether decohering a mass interferometer by measuring the path-dependent gravitational field would constitute evidence for the quantum nature of gravity. In this picture, it

constitutes evidence for the extended nature of a massive particle, but not that there is an independent quantum gravitational field associated with a separate Hilbert space. In principle, one could imagine hybrid theories in which matter is extended in this way, while other gravitational degrees of freedom are classical (or more generally, not quantum).

### III. RELATIVISTIC CONSIDERATIONS

Considering charges and masses as extended objects, as above, is an intrinsically non-relativistic theoretical explanation. For example, it allows instantaneous action at arbitrary distances. This is justified in analysing BMV and other non-relativistic interferometry experiments, when comparing standard analyses that do the same. Relativistic corrections in these experiments are negligible, because all the relevant speeds and distance/time ratios are small compared to  $c$ . In a world in which we had quantum mechanics but not relativity, charge and mass interferometry, including BMV experiments, would not *per se* give compelling evidence that the electromagnetic and gravitational fields have independent degrees of freedom described quantumly, with independent Hilbert spaces, or that they are mediated by the exchange of quantum particles.

Of course, classical electromagnetism is a relativistically invariant theory, and we have compelling evidence for relativistic QED. We also have compelling evidence for general relativity. So our non-relativistic theoretical explanations are wrong. They do, however, pose questions for the interpretation of BMV experiments: Could they be extended to relativistically covariant explanations consistent with all present experimental data? Or to explanations that are not covariant but give covariant predictions consistent with all present experimental data? Or to explanations that are at least consistent with all present experimental data? And in each case, can we prove that the answers are negative, if indeed they are?

It is worth noting that we can, at least, correct our picture to allow for the finite speed of propagation of Coulomb or Newtonian potentials. For example, in the Newtonian case, consider a slow-moving (i.e. non-relativistic) particle has trajectory  $x(t)$  in the laboratory rest frame. We take the associated potential at point  $y$  and time  $t'$  to be

$$\Phi(y, t') = \frac{-Gm}{|y - x(t_0)|}, \quad (5)$$

where  $t_0$  is determined by the constraint  $t_0 < t'$  and

$$\frac{|y - x(t_0)|}{|t' - t_0|} = c. \quad (6)$$

In the case of electromagnetism, trying to develop this project towards a fully relativistic model, or to show that it cannot be so developed, seems unmotivated. The totality of evidence for QED is compelling evidence that the electromagnetic force is quantum. BMV experiments to test entanglement generation via Coulomb forces are technologically interesting but not expected to give new fundamental insights. In some sense, QED *does* relativistically extend our model, but it does so in a way that replaces potentials by quantum field excitations.

The case of gravity, however, is presently less clear. Most theorists strongly believe that making our model consistent with quantum theory (for matter) means replacing it by a quantum theory of gravity. But the purported point of BMV-type experiments is to replace this strong belief by conclusive experimental evidence. Most theorists (including us) also strongly believe that making the classical limit of our model consistent with large-scale observational data necessitates effectively replacing it by general relativity. But if so, the case that entanglement generation in BMV experiments implies the quantum nature of gravity needs to go beyond non-relativistic analyses and make explicit relativistic assumptions and/or arguments from other data.

### IV. ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

I acknowledge financial support from the UK Quantum Communications Hub grant no. EP/T001011/1. This work was supported in part by Perimeter Institute for Theoretical Physics. Research at Perimeter Institute is supported by the Government of Canada through the Department of Innovation, Science and Economic Development and by the Province of Ontario through the Ministry of Research, Innovation and Science. I am very grateful to Carlo Rovelli for many invaluable comments and insights.

---

[1] Sougato Bose, Anupam Mazumdar, Gavin W. Morley, Hendrik Ulbricht, Marko Toroš, Mauro Paternostro, Andrew A. Geraci, Peter F. Barker, M. S. Kim, and Gerard Milburn. Spin entanglement witness for quantum gravity. *Physical Review Letters*, 119, 2017.

[2] Chiara Marletto and Vlatko Vedral. Gravitationally induced entanglement between two massive particles is sufficient evidence of quantum effects in gravity. *Physical Review Letters*, 119, 2017.

[3] Richard Howl, Vlatko Vedral, Devang Naik, Marios Christodoulou, Carlo Rovelli, and Aditya Iyer. Non-

- gaussianity as a signature of a quantum theory of gravity. *PRX Quantum*, 2, 2021.
- [4] Adrian Kent and Damián Pitalúa-García. Testing the nonclassicality of spacetime: What can we learn from Bell–Bose et al. –Marletto–Vedral experiments? *Physical Review D*, 104, 2021.
- [5] F. Karolyhazy. Gravitation and quantum mechanics of macroscopic objects. *Nuovo Cimento A (1965-1970)*, 42:390–402, 1966.
- [6] L. Diósi. Gravitation and quantum-mechanical localization of macro-objects. *Phys. Lett. A*, 105(4-5):199–202, 1984.
- [7] L. Diósi. A universal master equation for the gravitational violation of quantum mechanics. *Phys. Lett. A*, 120:377–381, 1987.
- [8] L. Diósi. Models for universal reduction of macroscopic quantum fluctuations. *Phys. Rev. A*, 40:1165–1174, 1989.
- [9] R. Penrose. On gravity’s role in quantum state reduction. *Gen. Relat. Gravit.*, 28:581–600, 1996.
- [10] Roger Penrose. Quantum computation, entanglement and state reduction. *Phil. Trans. R. Soc. A*, 356(1743):1927–1939, 1998.
- [11] Roger Penrose. On the gravitization of quantum mechanics 1: Quantum state reduction. *Found. Phys.*, 44(5):557–575, 2014.
- [12] Richard Howl, Roger Penrose, and Ivette Fuentes. Exploring the unification of quantum theory and general relativity with a Bose–Einstein condensate. *New J. Phys.*, 21(4):043047, apr 2019.
- [13] Jonathan Oppenheim. A postquantum theory of classical gravity? *Physical Review X*, 13(4):041040, 2023.
- [14] Adrian Kent. Quantum state readout, collapses, probes, and signals. *Physical Review D*, 103, 2021.
- [15] Michael J W Hall and Marcel Reginatto. On two recent proposals for witnessing nonclassical gravity. *J. Phys. A: Math. Theor.*, 51(8):085303, jan 2018.
- [16] Chiara Marletto and Vlatko Vedral. Witnessing nonclassicality beyond quantum theory. *Phys. Rev. D*, 102:086012, Oct 2020.
- [17] Simon A Haine. Searching for signatures of quantum gravity in quantum gases. *New J. Phys.*, 23(3):033020, mar 2021.
- [18] Richard Howl, Vlatko Vedral, Devang Naik, Marios Christodoulou, Carlo Rovelli, and Aditya Iyer. Non-gaussianity as a signature of a quantum theory of gravity. *PRX Quantum*, 2:010325, Feb 2021.
- [19] Daniel Carney, Holger Müller, and Jacob M. Taylor. Using an atom interferometer to infer gravitational entanglement generation. *PRX Quantum*, 2:030330, Aug 2021.
- [20] Eduardo Martín-Martínez and T Rick Perche. What gravity mediated entanglement can really tell us about quantum gravity. *Physical Review D*, 108(10):L101702, 2023.
- [21] Kenneth Eppley and Eric Hannah. The necessity of quantizing the gravitational field. *Foundations of Physics*, 7, 1977.
- [22] James Mattingly. Why Eppley and Hannah’s thought experiment fails. *Phys. Rev. D*, 73:064025, Mar 2006.
- [23] Mark Albers, Claus Kiefer, and Marcel Reginatto. Measurement analysis and quantum gravity. *Phys. Rev. D*, 78:064051, Sep 2008.
- [24] Adrian Kent. Simple refutation of the Eppley–Hannah argument. *Class. Quantum Grav.*, 35(24):245008, nov 2018.
- [25] Marios Christodoulou and Carlo Rovelli. On the possibility of laboratory evidence for quantum superposition of geometries. *Physics Letters, Section B: Nuclear, Elementary Particle and High-Energy Physics*, 792, 2019.
- [26] Andrea Mari, Giacomo De Palma, and Vittorio Giovannetti. Experiments testing macroscopic quantum superpositions must be slow. *Scientific reports*, 6(1):22777, 2016.
- [27] Farhan Hanif, Debarshi Das, Jonathan Halliwell, Dipankar Home, Anupam Mazumdar, Hendrik Ulbricht, and Sougato Bose. Testing whether gravity acts as a quantum entity when measured. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2307.08133*, 2023.