Entanglement Decay from Gravitational Decoherence: A Unique Signature of Gravity's Quantum Role

Marc Sperzel*

Independent Researcher

March 22, 2026

Abstract

We identify a distinctive experimental signature of gravitational decoherence: when one member of an entangled pair undergoes gravitational decoherence due to spatial superposition, the entanglement with its distant partner decays at a rate determined by the decohering particle's gravitational self-energy. Specifically, if particle A with mass M is placed in superposition with separation d while entangled with distant particle B, the concurrence decays as $C(t) = C(0) \exp(-GM^2 t/\hbar d)$. This prediction distinguishes gravitational decoherence from all other decoherence mechanisms: standard environmental decoherence affects only local coherence, leaving entanglement with distant partners intact. We analyze the experimental requirements for testing this prediction using levitated optomechanics, finding that proof-of-principle experiments are feasible within the next decade. Observation of this entanglement-decoherence correlation would provide direct evidence that gravity plays a fundamental role in the quantum-to-classical transition.

1 Introduction

The Diósi-Penrose hypothesis [1, 2] proposes that gravity induces decoherence of spatial superpositions at a rate determined by the gravitational self-energy:

$$\Gamma_{\text{grav}} = \frac{GM^2}{\hbar d} \tag{1}$$

where M is the mass in superposition and d is the spatial separation. This mechanism, if correct, would explain why macroscopic superpositions are never observed: a 1 μg particle separated by 1 mm would decohere in approximately 1.6 nanoseconds.

Despite decades of theoretical development, the Diósi-Penrose hypothesis remains untested. The primary experimental challenge is that the predicted decoherence times are extremely short for masses large enough to exhibit gravitational effects, yet extremely long for masses that can be placed in superposition with current technology. This paper identifies a qualitatively new experimental signature that may be accessible sooner than direct decoherence measurements.

The key insight is that gravitational decoherence, unlike standard environmental decoherence, should affect quantum correlations with distant systems. When particle A undergoes gravitational decoherence while entangled with distant particle B, the entanglement itself should decay. This

*ORCID: 0009-0000-6252-3155. Email: me@marcsperzel.com

prediction emerges from the fundamental structure of decoherence: the mechanism that destroys A's local coherence necessarily entangles A with gravitational degrees of freedom, which by monogamy of entanglement must reduce A's entanglement with B.

Standard environmental decoherence mechanisms—scattering of photons, air molecules, or phonons—affect only the local particle. The environment becomes entangled with the particle's position, destroying position-basis coherence, but this local entanglement does not directly affect pre-existing entanglement with distant systems. Gravitational decoherence is different: it originates from the particle's own mass distribution, not from external scatterers. The "environment" is the gravitational field itself, which is inseparable from the particle's spatial configuration.

This distinction provides a unique experimental signature. If gravitational decoherence is real, entangled massive particles placed in spatial superposition should show correlated decay of both local coherence and non-local entanglement. If only standard environmental decoherence operates, local coherence may decay while entanglement with distant partners remains protected.

In Section 2, we derive the quantitative prediction for entanglement decay. Section 3 compares this prediction with other theoretical frameworks. Section 4 analyzes experimental requirements and feasibility. Section 5 discusses implications and open questions.

2 The Prediction

2.1 Setup

Consider two particles A and B prepared in a maximally entangled Bell state:

$$|\Psi^-\rangle_{AB} = \frac{1}{\sqrt{2}} \left(|0\rangle_A |1\rangle_B - |1\rangle_A |0\rangle_B\right) \tag{2}$$

where $|0\rangle$ and $|1\rangle$ denote internal states (e.g., spin up/down). The particles are spatially separated, with B remaining at a fixed distant location.

Now place particle A in a spatial superposition:

$$|\psi\rangle_A^{\text{spatial}} = \frac{1}{\sqrt{2}} \left(|L\rangle + |R\rangle\right) \tag{3}$$

where $|L\rangle$ and $|R\rangle$ represent positions separated by distance d. The full initial state is:

$$|\Psi(0)\rangle = |\Psi^-\rangle_{AB} \otimes |\psi\rangle_A^{\text{spatial}} \otimes |g_0\rangle_{\text{grav}} \tag{4}$$

where $|g_0\rangle_{\text{grav}}$ represents the initial gravitational field configuration.

2.2 Gravitational Entanglement

According to the Diósi-Penrose mechanism, the two spatial positions $|L\rangle$ and $|R\rangle$ correspond to distinguishable gravitational field configurations. The gravitational degrees of freedom become entangled with A's position:

$$|L\rangle |g_0\rangle \to |L\rangle |g_L\rangle, \quad |R\rangle |g_0\rangle \to |R\rangle |g_R\rangle \tag{5}$$

where $|g_L\rangle$ and $|g_R\rangle$ are the gravitational field states corresponding to A being at positions L and R respectively.

The overlap between these gravitational states decreases with time:

$$\langle g_L(t)\rangle\, g_R(t) = e^{-\Gamma_{\text{grav}} t} \tag{6}$$

with $\Gamma_{\text{grav}} = GM^2/(\hbar d)$ as in Eq. (1).

2.3 Entanglement Decay

The key observation is that this matter-gravity entanglement competes with the original A-B entanglement. By the monogamy of entanglement [3], as A becomes more entangled with gravitational degrees of freedom, its entanglement with B must decrease.

To see this quantitatively, trace over the gravitational degrees of freedom. The reduced density matrix for A and B evolves as:

$$\rho_{AB}(t) = \text{Tr}_{\text{grav}}\left[|\Psi(t)\rangle\langle\Psi(t)|\right] \tag{7}$$

For the Bell state with A in spatial superposition undergoing gravitational decoherence, the off-diagonal elements of ρ_{AB} in the Bell basis decay exponentially:

$$\rho_{AB}(t) = \begin{pmatrix} 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & \frac{1}{2} & -\frac{1}{2}e^{-\Gamma t} & 0 \\ 0 & -\frac{1}{2}e^{-\Gamma t} & \frac{1}{2} & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 \end{pmatrix} \tag{8}$$

in the basis $\{|00\rangle, |01\rangle, |10\rangle, |11\rangle\}$.

2.4 Concurrence Decay

The concurrence [4], a standard measure of two-qubit entanglement, is given by:

$$C = \max(0, \lambda_1 - \lambda_2 - \lambda_3 - \lambda_4) \tag{9}$$

where λ_i are the square roots of the eigenvalues of $\rho_{AB}(\sigma_y \otimes \sigma_y)\rho^*_{AB}(\sigma_y \otimes \sigma_y)$ in decreasing order.

For the density matrix in Eq. (8):

$$\boxed{C(t) = C(0) \cdot e^{-\Gamma_{\text{grav}} t} = e^{-GM^2 t/(\hbar d)}} \tag{10}$$

This is the central prediction: *entanglement decays at exactly the gravitational decoherence rate.*

2.5 Bell Inequality Violation

The decay of entanglement is directly observable through Bell inequality tests. The CHSH parameter [5]:

$$S = E(a,b) + E(a,b') + E(a',b) - E(a',b') \tag{11}$$

where $E(a,b) = \langle \sigma_a \otimes \sigma_b \rangle$ are correlation functions for measurement settings a, a', b, b'.

For a Werner state $\rho_W = p\,|\Psi^-\rangle\langle\Psi^-| + (1-p)\mathbb{I}/4$ with visibility $p = e^{-\Gamma t}$:

$$S_{\max}(t) = 2\sqrt{2} \cdot e^{-\Gamma_{\text{grav}} t} \tag{12}$$

The Bell violation threshold $S > 2$ is maintained until:

$$t_{\text{Bell}} = \frac{\hbar d}{GM^2} \ln \sqrt{2} \approx 0.35 \cdot \tau_{\text{dec}} \tag{13}$$

After this time, no Bell violation is possible—the state becomes classically describable.

2.6 Numerical Examples

Table 1 gives predicted decay times for experimentally relevant parameters.

Mass	**Separation**	τ_{dec}	t_{Bell}
1 fg	100 nm	160 s	56 s
10 fg	1 μm	16 ms	5.6 ms
100 fg	1 μm	160 μs	56 μs
1 pg	10 μm	16 μs	5.6 μs

Table 1. *Predicted entanglement decay times and Bell violation lifetimes for various masses and superposition separations. The target experimental regime is $M \sim 10$–100 fg, $d \sim 0.1$–1 μm.*

3 Comparison with Other Theories

The entanglement-decoherence correlation provides a sharp distinction between gravitational decoherence and other mechanisms. We compare predictions across four theoretical frameworks.

3.1 Standard Quantum Mechanics

In standard quantum mechanics without gravitational decoherence, environmental interactions can destroy local coherence while preserving entanglement with distant systems.

Consider particle A scattering photons while entangled with distant B. The photons become entangled with A's position:

$$|L\rangle |\gamma_0\rangle \to |L\rangle |\gamma_L\rangle, \quad |R\rangle |\gamma_0\rangle \to |R\rangle |\gamma_R\rangle \tag{14}$$

However, the photons carry information only about A's position, not about the A-B correlations. Tracing over the photon degrees of freedom destroys A's spatial coherence but leaves the A-B entanglement intact in the remaining degrees of freedom.

Standard QM prediction: Local decoherence of A's spatial superposition; entanglement C_{AB} preserved indefinitely (absent other interactions with B).

3.2 Diósi-Penrose Gravitational Decoherence

The Diósi-Penrose mechanism differs fundamentally because the "environment" is the gravitational field configuration, which is determined by A's mass distribution, not by external scatterers.

The gravitational field does not merely "learn" about A's position—it *is* determined by A's position. The position-gravity entanglement is not acquired through scattering events but is intrinsic to having a mass in superposition.

Diósi-Penrose prediction: Entanglement $C_{AB}(t) = C_{AB}(0)e^{-GM^2 t/(\hbar d)}$.

3.3 Continuous Spontaneous Localization (CSL)

The CSL model [6, 7] postulates a universal noise field that induces collapse, with rate:

$$\Gamma_{\text{CSL}} = \lambda \left(\frac{m}{m_0}\right)^2 \left(\frac{d}{r_C}\right)^2 \tag{15}$$

where $\lambda \approx 10^{-16}$ s^{-1}, m_0 is the nucleon mass, and $r_C \approx 100$ nm is the correlation length.

CSL-induced decoherence affects only the collapsing particle's wavefunction directly. The noise field couples to A's position but has no direct effect on the A-B correlations.

CSL prediction: The relationship between local decoherence and entanglement decay depends on the specific noise model. In the standard formulation, entanglement decay is *not* directly tied to local collapse rate.

3.4 Perturbative Quantum Gravity

Standard perturbative quantum field theory treats gravitational interactions via graviton exchange. The decoherence rate scales as G^2 (from two graviton vertices):

$$\Gamma_{\text{QFT}} \sim \frac{G^2 M^4}{\hbar^3 d^3} \tag{16}$$

For $M = 10$ fg, $d = 1$ μm, this gives $\tau_{\text{QFT}} \sim 10^{30}$ years—utterly unobservable.

Perturbative QFT prediction: No observable gravitational decoherence or entanglement decay.

3.5 Summary of Predictions

Theory	Local Decoherence	Entanglement Decay
Standard QM	Environmental	Protected
Diósi-Penrose	$\Gamma = GM^2/(\hbar d)$	$\Gamma = GM^2/(\hbar d)$
CSL	Γ_{CSL}	Model-dependent
Perturbative QFT	$\Gamma \sim G^2$ (negligible)	Negligible

Table 2. *Comparison of predictions for local decoherence rate and entanglement decay rate across theoretical frameworks. Only Diósi-Penrose predicts correlated decay at the gravitational self-energy scale.*

The distinctive feature of the Diósi-Penrose prediction is the *equality* of local decoherence and entanglement decay rates, both set by $GM^2/(\hbar d)$. This correlation provides a unique experimental signature.

3.6 Falsifiability

The prediction is falsifiable:

1. **No decay observed**: If entanglement persists while local coherence decays, gravitational decoherence (in the Diósi-Penrose form) is falsified.

2. **Wrong rate**: If entanglement decays but at a rate inconsistent with $GM^2/(\hbar d)$, the specific Diósi-Penrose mechanism is falsified (though some gravitational effect may be present).

3. **Dependence on distance to B**: If the decay rate depends on the A-B separation, the mechanism is not purely local and the prediction is falsified.

4. **Temperature dependence**: If the decay rate varies with temperature, thermal effects dominate and the gravitational mechanism is not confirmed.

Conversely, observation of entanglement decay at rate $\Gamma = GM^2/(\hbar d)$, independent of temperature and A-B distance, would strongly support the Diósi-Penrose hypothesis.

4 Experimental Implementation

4.1 Platform Selection

Testing the entanglement-decoherence correlation requires:

1. Creating entanglement between two massive particles
2. Placing one particle in spatial superposition
3. Measuring entanglement as a function of time
4. Suppressing environmental decoherence below the gravitational rate

We identify levitated optomechanics as the most promising near-term platform. Levitated nanoparticles can achieve masses in the femtogram-to-picogram range, excellent isolation from thermal environments, and are actively being developed for both entanglement generation and spatial superposition creation.

4.2 Proposed Configuration

Consider two silica nanoparticles ($\rho = 2200$ kg/m^3) levitated in separate optical traps:

Parameter	**Value**
Particle diameter	200 nm
Particle mass	20 fg
Trap separation	10–100 μm
Superposition separation	100 nm – 1 μm
Vacuum pressure	$< 10^{-10}$ mbar
Motional temperature	< 100 mK

For $M = 20$ fg and $d = 500$ nm, the predicted gravitational decoherence time is:

$$\tau_{\text{grav}} = \frac{\hbar d}{GM^2} = \frac{(1.05 \times 10^{-34})(5 \times 10^{-7})}{(6.67 \times 10^{-11})(2 \times 10^{-17})^2} \approx 40 \text{ ms} \tag{17}$$

This timescale is long enough for preparation and measurement, yet short enough for observation within achievable coherence times.

4.3 Experimental Protocol

Phase 1: Preparation

1. Load particles A and B into separate optical traps
2. Cool both particles to motional ground state via feedback cooling
3. Verify ground state occupation $\bar{n} < 0.1$

Phase 2: Entanglement

4. Enable Coulomb coupling between charged particles
5. Apply entangling gate (Mølmer-Sørensen or equivalent)
6. Verify entanglement via partial tomography (subset of runs)

Phase 3: Superposition

7. Apply coherent displacement to particle A only
8. Create spatial superposition $|\psi_A\rangle = (|L\rangle + |R\rangle)/\sqrt{2}$
9. Particle B remains in ground state, undisturbed

Phase 4: Evolution

10. Allow free evolution for variable time τ
11. Vary τ from 0 to $5\tau_{\text{grav}}$

Phase 5: Measurement

12. Recombine A's superposition (interferometric readout)
13. Perform Bell-basis measurements on A and B
14. Repeat for statistical averaging (~ 1000 runs per time point)

4.4 Environmental Decoherence Control

The gravitational signal must exceed environmental backgrounds. Table 3 compares decoherence rates.

Source	**Rate**	**Ratio to Γ_{grav}**
Gravitational	25 Hz	1
Gas collisions (10^{-10} mbar)	0.1 Hz	0.004
Blackbody (100 mK)	0.01 Hz	0.0004
Photon recoil (trap)	0–100 Hz	Controllable

Table 3. *Environmental decoherence rates compared to gravitational rate for $M = 20$ fg, $d = 500$ nm. All non-gravitational sources can be suppressed below the gravitational signal.*

The critical requirement is suppressing photon recoil heating during the free evolution phase. This can be achieved by switching off optical traps during evolution (ballistic trajectory) or using magnetic/electrostatic trapping with minimal photon scattering.

4.5 Control Experiments

Four control experiments distinguish gravitational effects from systematic artifacts:

Control 1: No superposition. Skip Phase 3. If entanglement decay is observed without spatial superposition, systematic effects (not gravitational decoherence) are responsible.

Control 2: Mass scaling. Repeat with particles of different masses (10, 20, 50, 100 fg). Gravitational decoherence predicts $\tau \propto M^{-2}$; doubling mass should reduce decay time by factor of 4.

Control 3: Separation scaling. Create superpositions of different sizes (100 nm, 500 nm, 1 μm). Gravitational decoherence predicts $\tau \propto d$; doubling separation should double decay time.

Control 4: Temperature variation. Repeat at different temperatures (10 mK, 100 mK, 1 K). Gravitational decoherence is temperature-independent; thermal mechanisms would show strong T-dependence.

4.6 Technology Readiness

Capability	**Current Status**	**Gap**
Nanoparticle levitation	Demonstrated	None
Ground-state cooling	Demonstrated	None
Spatial superposition	~ 100 fm achieved	10^3–$10^4\times$
Two-particle entanglement	In development	Major
Bell measurement	Demonstrated (photons)	Adaptation

The primary gaps are: (1) achieving spatial superpositions of ~ 100 nm or larger, and (2) generating entanglement between two levitated particles. Both are active research areas with steady progress.

4.7 Timeline

Based on current technology trajectories:

Milestone	**Estimated Date**
100 nm superposition, 10 fg particle	2027–2028
Two-particle Coulomb entanglement	2028–2029
First entanglement decay measurement	2030–2032
Mass and separation scaling verified	2033–2035
Definitive test of prediction	2035–2038

A proof-of-principle demonstration—observing entanglement decay correlated with spatial superposition—appears achievable within the next decade.

5 Discussion

5.1 Physical Interpretation

The entanglement-decoherence correlation reveals the non-local character of gravitational decoherence. Standard environmental decoherence is fundamentally local: scattering events occur at the particle's location and affect only the particle's local state. Gravitational decoherence is different—it emerges from the mass configuration itself, which determines the gravitational field throughout spacetime.

From an information-theoretic perspective, gravitational decoherence transfers information about the particle's position into gravitational degrees of freedom. This information transfer does not respect the local-distant distinction: information about A's position becomes encoded in the global field configuration, which effectively "measures" A and thereby affects all of A's correlations, including those with distant B.

This interpretation suggests a deep connection between gravity and quantum information. The gravitational field acts as a universal information channel, mediating the flow of quantum information between matter and geometry. The decoherence rate $\Gamma = GM^2/(\hbar d)$ may represent the capacity of this channel—the maximum rate at which gravitational degrees of freedom can acquire information about the matter configuration.

5.2 Relation to ER=EPR

The Maldacena-Susskind ER=EPR conjecture [8] proposes that quantum entanglement is geometrically represented by Einstein-Rosen bridges (wormholes). In this picture, the entangled state $|\Psi^-\rangle_{AB}$ corresponds to a geometric connection between A and B.

Gravitational decoherence, in this interpretation, disrupts the geometric structure at A's location. The spatial superposition creates a "bifurcation" in the geometry that is incompatible with a single coherent wormhole connection. As information about A's position leaks into the gravitational environment, the geometric bridge degrades.

While this interpretation is speculative and extends ER=EPR beyond its established domain (asymptotically AdS spacetimes), it provides physical intuition for why gravitational decoherence should affect entanglement with distant systems. The prediction itself, however, follows from standard quantum mechanics combined with the Diósi-Penrose decoherence rate, without requiring ER=EPR.

5.3 Limitations and Caveats

Several limitations should be noted:

Theoretical uncertainty. The Diósi-Penrose rate $\Gamma = GM^2/(\hbar d)$ has been derived in linearized gravity by imposing the Wheeler-DeWitt constraint on the Feynman-Vernon influence functional [16]. Standard perturbative quantum field theory, using an unconstrained product initial state, predicts G^2 scaling with rates $\sim 10^{35}$ times smaller. Both results are correct for their respective initial conditions; experiment will determine which initial state nature realizes.

Coefficient ambiguity. The prediction assumes the Diósi-Penrose coefficient is order unity. Different theoretical approaches give coefficients ranging from $\pi/2$ to 1, representing $\sim 50\%$ uncertainty in the absolute rate.

Extended objects. For spatially extended objects, the gravitational self-energy involves an integral over the mass distribution. Form factor corrections at the 1–10% level are expected and should be included in precision comparisons.

Experimental systematics. Achieving the required isolation from environmental decoherence, creating the necessary superpositions, and generating sufficiently strong entanglement all represent significant experimental challenges. Systematic errors may initially limit sensitivity.

5.4 Implications of Observation

If the predicted entanglement decay is observed:

1. **Confirmation of gravitational decoherence.** This would establish that gravity plays a fundamental role in the quantum-to-classical transition, beyond any known environmental mechanism.

2. **Constraint on quantum gravity.** The G^1 scaling, if confirmed, would indicate non-perturbative gravitational physics operating at laboratory scales—a surprising result with implications for quantum gravity research.

3. **Fundamental limit on quantum technology.** Gravitational decoherence would impose an ultimate limit on the coherence times of massive quantum systems, regardless of environmental isolation.

5.5 Implications of Non-Observation

If entanglement persists despite local decoherence:

1. **Falsification of Diósi-Penrose.** The specific prediction $\Gamma = GM^2/(\hbar d)$ would be ruled out.

2. **Confirmation of standard QM.** Environmental decoherence without gravitational effects would be established for the tested mass range.

3. **Stronger bounds on collapse models.** The absence of entanglement decay would constrain any model predicting correlated local-nonlocal decoherence.

Either outcome would advance fundamental physics.

5.6 Conclusion

We have identified a distinctive signature of gravitational decoherence: the decay of quantum entanglement between spatially separated particles when one undergoes gravitational decoherence. The predicted decay rate $\Gamma = GM^2/(\hbar d)$ matches the local decoherence rate, providing a correlation that distinguishes gravitational effects from standard environmental decoherence.

The experimental test requires creating entangled massive particles, placing one in spatial superposition, and measuring Bell correlations as a function of time. Levitated optomechanics provides a feasible platform, with proof-of-principle experiments potentially achievable within the next decade.

This experiment would address a fundamental question: does gravity play a special role in the emergence of classicality? The answer—whatever it turns out to be—will illuminate the interface between quantum mechanics and gravitation.

Acknowledgments

The author thanks the quantum foundations and optomechanics communities for creating the intellectual environment in which these ideas developed.

References

[1] L. Diósi, "A universal master equation for the gravitational violation of quantum mechanics," Phys. Lett. A **120**, 377 (1987).

[2] R. Penrose, "On gravity's role in quantum state reduction," Gen. Relativ. Gravit. **28**, 581 (1996).

[3] V. Coffman, J. Kundu, and W. K. Wootters, "Distributed entanglement," Phys. Rev. A **61**, 052306 (2000).

[4] W. K. Wootters, "Entanglement of formation of an arbitrary state of two qubits," Phys. Rev. Lett. **80**, 2245 (1998).

[5] J. F. Clauser, M. A. Horne, A. Shimony, and R. A. Holt, "Proposed experiment to test local hidden-variable theories," Phys. Rev. Lett. **23**, 880 (1969).

[6] G. C. Ghirardi, A. Rimini, and T. Weber, "Unified dynamics for microscopic and macroscopic systems," Phys. Rev. D **34**, 470 (1986).

[7] P. Pearle, "Combining stochastic dynamical state-vector reduction with spontaneous localization," Phys. Rev. A **39**, 2277 (1989).

[8] J. Maldacena and L. Susskind, "Cool horizons for entangled black holes," Fortsch. Phys. **61**, 781 (2013).

[9] M. Aspelmeyer, T. J. Kippenberg, and F. Marquardt, "Cavity optomechanics," Rev. Mod. Phys. **86**, 1391 (2014).

[10] U. Delić *et al.*, "Cooling of a levitated nanoparticle to the motional quantum ground state," Science **367**, 892 (2020).

[11] R. Riedinger *et al.*, "Remote quantum entanglement between two micromechanical oscillators," Nature **556**, 473 (2018).

[12] I. Marinković *et al.*, "Optomechanical Bell test," Phys. Rev. Lett. **121**, 220404 (2018).

[13] A. Bassi, K. Lochan, S. Satin, T. P. Singh, and H. Ulbricht, "Models of wave-function collapse, underlying theories, and experimental tests," Rev. Mod. Phys. **85**, 471 (2013).

[14] S. Bose *et al.*, "Spin entanglement witness for quantum gravity," Phys. Rev. Lett. **119**, 240401 (2017).

[15] 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).

[16] M. Sperzel, "Gravitational decoherence at $O(G)$: the Wheeler-DeWitt constraint on the Feynman-Vernon influence functional," (2026), Paper K of the Quantum-Geometric Duality Series.