

γ -ray high sensitivity tests of Collapse Models

Kristian Piscicchia^{1,2}, Massimiliano Bazzi², Mario Bragadireanu^{3,2}, Michael Cargnelli^{4,2}, Alberto Clozza², Luca De Paolis², Raffaele Del Grande^{5,2}, Carlo Guaraldo², Mihail Iliescu², Matthias Laubenstein⁶, Johann Marton^{4,2}, Marco Miliucci², Fabrizio Napolitano², Alessio Porcelli^{4,2}, Alessandro Scordo², Francesco Sgarmella², Hexi Shi⁴, Diana Laura Sirghi^{2,3}, Florin Sirghi^{2,3}, Oton Vazquez Doce², Johann Zmeskal^{4,2} and Catalina Curceanu^{2,3}

¹ Centro Ricerche Enrico Fermi – Museo Storico della Fisica e Centro Studi e Ricerche “Enrico Fermi”, Italy;

² Laboratori Nazionali di Frascati, INFN, Italy;

³ IFIN-HH, Institutul National pentru Fizica si Inginerie Nucleara Horia Hulubei, Romania;

⁴ Stefan-Meyer-Institute for subatomic physics, Austrian Academy of Science, Austria;

⁵ Excellence Cluster Universe, Technische Universität München, Germany;

⁶ Laboratori Nazionali del Gran Sasso, INFN, Italy.

Abstract. The article reviews our recent experimental results on the Continuous Spontaneous Localization (CSL) model and on the gravity related collapse model developed by Diósi and Penrose (DP). These models of dynamical reduction of the wave function consist in non-linear and stochastic modifications of the Schrödinger equation, which lead to a progressive breakdown of the superposition principle, as the size of the system increases. We performed a high sensitivity survey of the spontaneous radiation phenomenon, predicted by the collapse models, at the Gran Sasso underground National Laboratory of INFN in Italy. Our studies set the strongest bounds on the CSL parameters, in a broad region of the parameters space, and rule out the DP in its present formulation.

1. Dynamical collapse models and spontaneous radiation

Quantum Theory (QT) is the basis of our understanding of the physical world. Since its inception QT successfully described plenty of puzzling experimental phenomena, it was the cornerstone of the development of modern chemistry, of nuclear physics and of quantum field theory, just to give some examples, and presently fuels the growth of vanguard technologies. Despite its success and the outstanding precision of the experimental validations, QT still contains a conundrum in its grounding pillars. Why the superposition principle, characterizing the evolution of microscopic systems, does not carry over to macroscopic objects? Why in the act of measuring the deterministic dynamics is replaced by a probabilistic behaviour governed by the Born rule?

Models of dynamical reduction of the wave function represent phenomenological, and testable, concrete solutions to the problem (see e.g. [1, 2, 3, 4, 5, 6, 7, 8], for a review and references see also [9]). They consist in non-linear and stochastic modifications of the Schrödinger equation, which preserve the QT predictions in the microscopic regime, and go over to classical mechanics in the macroscopic limit, by breaking down the quantum linear evolution proportionally to the



growing size of the system.

Besides interferometric experiments (see e.g. [10, 11, 12, 13, 14]), collapse models can be also probed with indirect tests (see e.g. [15, 16, 17, 18, 19, 20, 21, 22, 23, 24, 25, 26, 27]). Common denominator of this second class of experiments is to exploit the random motion associated to the collapse mechanism, which allows to test the effect of the models predictions on macroscopic objects. Clear advantage is the magnification effect, which leads to the stronger constraints on the collapse models, this is the case of micrometer cantilever [16], gravitational wave detectors [28, 29] and X/ γ -ray measurements [25, 26, 27], the latter being the subject of this paper.

We will review in this paper our latest experimental results on the Continuous Spontaneous Localization (CSL) and on the Diósi-Penrose (DP) models. In the CSL model [4, 5, 6] the non-linear and stochastic terms are characterized by the interaction with a continuous set of independent noises, with zero average, Gaussian correlation in space and, in the simplest version, white correlation in time. The model is defined in terms of two phenomenological parameters, denoted by λ and r_C . λ has the dimensions of a rate and sets the strength of the collapse. r_C is a correlation length which determines the spatial resolution of the collapse, the collapse is weak if the superposition size is much smaller than r_C , while becomes effective for delocalizations which are much larger than r_C . Different theoretical considerations lead to alternative choices for the parameters: Ghirardi, Rimini and Weber [3] proposed $\lambda = 10^{-17}\text{s}^{-1}$ and $r_C = 10^{-7}\text{m}$, Adler [30] proposed $\lambda = 10^{-8\pm 2}\text{s}^{-1}$ for $r_C = 10^{-7}\text{m}$, and $\lambda = 10^{-6\pm 2}\text{s}^{-1}$ for $r_C = 10^{-6}\text{m}$.

Roger Penrose argued [7, 8] that when a system is found in a spatial quantum superposition, a corresponding superposition of two different space-times is generated. The superposition is unstable and decays in time. The more massive the system in the superposition, the larger the difference in the two space-times and the faster the wave-function collapse. The average collapse time τ would then be given by the expression $\tau \approx \hbar/E_g$, where \hbar is the reduced Planck's constant and E_g is the gravitational self-energy of the difference between two (stationary) mass distributions of the superposition. Lajos Diósi developed a dynamical theory of gravity-related wave function collapse [1, 2] which predicts the same form for the collapse time. Considered that the gravitational self-interaction energy diverges for point-like constituents, Diósi introduced [31] a minimum length R_0 , which limits the spatial resolution of the mass density. E_g is then a function of R_0 , the smaller R_0 the faster the collapse.

An unavoidable consequence of the dynamics of both the CSL and the gravity related collapse developed by Diósi, is that the non-linear interaction with the noise-filed induces a Brownian-like diffusion motion for the particles which, if charged, emits radiation. This phenomenon, which is not predicted in the context of QT, is usually called *spontaneous radiation*, and represents the observable which was investigated in our experimental surveys. The spontaneous radiation rate, due to the emission of protons in the atomic nuclei, was calculated in Refs. [27, 26] and is given by the following equations (left for the CSL model and right for the DP model):

$$\left. \frac{d\Gamma}{dE} \right|_t = N_{atoms} \cdot N_A^2 \cdot \frac{\hbar e^2}{4 \pi^2 \epsilon_0 c^3 m_0^2} \cdot \frac{\lambda}{r_C^2} \frac{1}{E} ; \quad \left. \frac{d\Gamma}{dE} \right|_t = N_{atoms} \cdot N_A^2 \cdot \frac{2}{3} \frac{G e^2}{\pi^{3/2} \epsilon_0 c^3} \cdot \frac{1}{R_0^3 E} . \quad (1)$$

N_{atoms} is the number of atoms in the system with atomic number N_A , c is the speed of light, ϵ_0 is the vacuum permittivity, m_0 is the nucleon mass, G is the universal gravitational constant, E and t are the energy and the time. Electrons are relativistic in the energy range which was considered in our analyses, hence their contribution to the spontaneous radiation emission can not be considered.

The paper is organized as follows: in Section 2 the experimental apparatus is described, in Section 3 is given a brief description of the statistical analysis and the constraints on the characteristic parameters of the CSL and DP models are summarized, while concluding remarks and the future developments of our studies are outlined in Section 4.

2. The experimental setup

The experimental apparatus was based on a coaxial p-type High Purity Germanium detector (HPGe) surrounded by multiple shielding layers: the inner shielding consisting of 5cm thick electrolytic copper, the external part of lead (30 cm from the bottom and 25 cm from the sides). Both the shielding and the cryogenic system were enclosed in an air tight steel housing, flushed with boil-off nitrogen, in order to suppress radon contamination (see Fig. 2 in Ref. [26] for a schematic representation of the setup, further details on the setup structure can be found in Ref. [26] and therein references). The experiment was operated in the extremely low background environment of the Gran Sasso underground National Laboratory of INFN in Italy.

The goal of the measurement was to disentangle a faint contribution of the spontaneous radiation emission process, to the measured spectrum, from environmental background. To this aim an accurate characterization of the whole apparatus was performed with a validated Monte Carlo (MC) code [32] based on the GEANT4 software library [33].

The measured spectrum (corresponding to an exposure of 124 kg · day) is shown in Fig. 1 of Ref. [27]). The energy range fulfills the theoretical requirements for the validity of the calculated rates (Eq. (1)). In ΔE the main contribution to the background was found to be originated by residual radionuclides, present in the materials of the setup, whose measured activities represented the inputs of the MC simulations. The magenta distribution in the same figure represents the simulated background, 88% of the measured spectrum can be described in terms of known emission processes.

The simulation also allowed to compute the efficiencies, as a function of the energy, for the detection of spontaneously emitted photons in each component of the setup. To this end 10^8 photons, with uniform spatial distribution, were generated in each material in steps of 200 keV (i.e. 15 points in the ΔE). The efficiency functions $\epsilon_i(E)$ (i labelling the material of the detector) were then estimated by means of polynomial fits of the corresponding distributions, for each component of the detector which gives an appreciable contribution. The results of this analysis are summarized in Fig. 2 and Table 1 of Ref. [27].

3. Summary of the data analyses and results

The strategy of the Bayesian statistical analysis was to perform a comparison of the theoretically predicted spontaneous emission rate, generated by each component of the apparatus and weighted by the experimental efficiency and acceptance, with the measured distribution, accounting for the estimated background.

Given the calculated efficiency functions, and the theoretical rate (Eq. (1)), the expected number of measured events, due to the spontaneous emission by protons belonging to the i -th material, during the acquisition time T is:

$$\int_{\Delta E} \frac{d\Gamma}{dE} \Big|_t T \epsilon_i(E) dE. \quad (2)$$

Summation over i yields the total expected signal contribution, which is a function of the phenomenological parameters (λ , r_C) or R_0 , depending on the selected collapse model. As an example the shape of the total expected spontaneous radiation signal, according to the CSL model, is shown in Fig. 1.

The measured counts were assumed to fluctuate according to a Poissonian distribution and the probability density functions for the expected number of counts were derived, from which the following constraints on the models parameters were calculated, corresponding to a probability of 0.95:

$$\frac{\lambda}{r_C^2} < 52 \text{ s}^{-1} \text{ m}^{-2} \quad ; \quad R_0 > 0.54 \cdot 10^{-10} \text{ m}, \quad (3)$$




Figure 1. Energy distribution of the expected spontaneous radiation signal, according to CSL. The area of the distribution is normalised to unity (n.u.) in the energy range $\Delta E = (1000-3800)$.

see Refs. [27, 26] for more details concerning the data analysis.

The first limit in Eq. (3) represents the stronger existing bound on the CSL model for values of the correlation length $r_C \leq 10^{-6}\text{m}$. The limit on R_0 (right side in Eq. (3)) is about three orders of magnitude stronger than previous bounds in the literature [29]. If R_0 is chosen as the size of the nucleus's wave function (as suggested by Penrose), our result is to be compared with the square-root of the mean square displacement of a nucleus in the lattice. For the Germanium crystal, cooled down at the liquid Nitrogen temperature, this would amount to an R_0 value of about $0.05 \cdot 10^{-10}\text{m}$, which is more than one order of magnitude less than the lower limit set by our experiment.

4. Conclusions and perspectives

We summarized the results of a dedicated measurement, performed at the Gran Sasso underground National Laboratory of INFN. We set the strongest bounds on the CSL phenomenological parameters in the region $r_C \leq 10^{-6}\text{m}$. Penrose's proposal for a gravity-related collapse of the wave function, in the present formulation, is ruled out. Our result indicates that the idea of gravity-related wave function collapse, which remains very appealing, will probably require a new approach. Indeed new theoretical developments are seeking for non-Markovian and/or dissipative versions of the collapse models, predicting a lower rate of spontaneous radiation depending on the photon frequency. Both Penrose and Diósi are also pursuing the idea of a radiation free gravity-related collapse.

This pushes our efforts through further refinements our experimental techniques and data analyses methods. We are presently expanding our sensitive energy region from the MeV to few keV, with experimental setups based on Broad Energy Germanium detectors and ultra-radio pure targets. We are investigating the application of Machine Learning algorithms to identify the faint signal of the dynamical collapse, towards a deeper understanding of the foundations of Quantum Mechanics.

Acknowledgments

This publication was made possible through the support of Grant 62099 from the John Templeton Foundation. The opinions expressed in this publication are those of the authors and do not necessarily reflect the views of the John Templeton Foundation. We acknowledge support from the Foundational Questions Institute and Fetzer Franklin Fund, a donor advised

fund of Silicon Valley Community Foundation (Grants No. FQXi-RFP-CPW-2008 and FQXi-MGB-2011), and from the H2020 FET TEQ (Grant No. 766900) and INFN (VIP). We thank the Austrian Science Foundation (FWF) which supports the VIP2 project with the grants P25529-N20, project P 30635-N36 and W1252-N27 (doctoral college particles and interactions). K. P. acknowledges support from the Centro Ricerche Enrico Fermi - Museo Storico della Fisica e Centro Studi e Ricerche “Enrico Fermi” (Open Problems in Quantum Mechanics project).

References

- [1] Diosi L 1987 *Physics letters A* **120** 377–381
- [2] Diósi L 1989 *Physical Review A* **40** 1165
- [3] Ghirardi G C, Rimini A and Weber T 1986 *Physical review D* **34** 470
- [4] Pearle P 1989 *Physical Review A* **39** 2277
- [5] Ghirardi G C, Pearle P and Rimini A 1990 *Physical Review A* **42** 78
- [6] Pearle P and Squires E 1994 *Physical Review Letters* **73** 1
- [7] Penrose R 1996 *Gen. Rel. Grav.* **28**: 581-600
- [8] Penrose R 2014 *Foundations of Physics* **44**, 557-575
- [9] Bassi A and Ghirardi G 2003 *Physics Reports* **379** 257–426
- [10] Kovachy T, Asenbaum P, Overstreet C, Donnelly C, Dickerson S, Sugarbaker A, Hogan J and Kasevich M 2015 *Nature* **528** 530–533
- [11] Eibenberger S, Gerlich S, Arndt M, Mayor M and Tüxen J 2013 *Physical Chemistry Chemical Physics* **15** 14696–14700
- [12] Toroš M and Bassi A 2018 *Journal of Physics A: Mathematical and Theoretical* **51** 115302
- [13] Lee K C, Sprague M R, Sussman B J, Nunn J, Langford N K, Jin X M, Champion T, Michelberger P, Reim K F, England D *et al.* 2011 *Science* **334** 1253–1256
- [14] Belli S, Bonsignori R, D’Auria G, Fant L, Martini M, Peirone S, Donadi S and Bassi A 2016 *Physical Review A* **94** 012108
- [15] Kovachy T, Hogan J M, Sugarbaker A, Dickerson S M, Donnelly C A, Overstreet C and Kasevich M A 2015 *Physical review letters* **114** 143004
- [16] Vinante A, Mezzena R, Falferi P, Carlesso M and Bassi A 2017 *Physical review letters* **119** 110401
- [17] Usenko O, Vinante A, Wijts G and Oosterkamp T 2011 *Applied Physics Letters* **98** 133105
- [18] Vinante A, Collaboration A *et al.* 2006 *Classical and Quantum Gravity* **23** S103
- [19] Abbott B P, Abbott R, Abbott T, Abernathy M, Acernese F, Ackley K, Adams C, Adams T, Addesso P, Adhikari R *et al.* 2016 *Physical review letters* **116** 131103
- [20] Abbott B P, Abbott R, Abbott T, Abernathy M, Acernese F, Ackley K, Adams C, Adams T, Addesso P, Adhikari R *et al.* 2016 *Physical review letters* **116** 061102
- [21] Armano M, Audley H, Auger G, Baird J, Bassan M, Binetruy P, Born M, Bortoluzzi D, Brandt N, Caleno M *et al.* 2016 *Physical review letters* **116** 231101
- [22] Armano M, Audley H, Baird J, Binetruy P, Born M, Bortoluzzi D, Castelli E, Cavalleri A, Cesarini A, Cruise A *et al.* 2018 *Physical review letters* **120** 061101
- [23] Adler S L and Vinante A 2018 *Physical Review A* **97** 052119
- [24] Bahrani M 2018 *Physical Review A* **97** 052118
- [25] Piscicchia K, Bassi A, Curceanu C, Grande R D, Donadi S, Hiesmayr B C and Pichler A 2017 *Entropy* **19** 319
- [26] Donadi S, Piscicchia K, Curceanu C, Diósi L, Laubenstein M and Bassi A 2021 *Nature Physics* **17** 74–78
- [27] Donadi S, Piscicchia K, Del Grande R, Curceanu C, Laubenstein M and Bassi A 2021 *The European Physical Journal C* **81** 1–10
- [28] Carlesso M, Bassi A, Falferi P and Vinante A 2016 *Physical Review D* **94** 124036
- [29] Helou B, Slagmolen B, McClelland D E and Chen Y 2017 *Physical Review D* **95** 084054
- [30] Adler S L 2007 *Journal of Physics A: Mathematical and Theoretical* **40** 2935
- [31] Diósi L 2007 *J. Phys. A* **40**, 2989-2995
- [32] Boswell M, Chan Y D, Detwiler J A, Finnerty P, Henning R, Gehman V M, Johnson R A, Jordan D V, Kazkaz K, Knapp M *et al.* 2011 *IEEE Transactions on Nuclear Science* **58** 1212–1220
- [33] Agostinelli S, Allison J, Amako K a, Apostolakis J, Araujo H, Arce P, Asai M, Axen D, Banerjee S, Barrand G *et al.* 2003 *Nuclear instruments and methods in physics research section A: Accelerators, Spectrometers, Detectors and Associated Equipment* **506** 250–303