Gravitational Decoherence as a Fundamental Limit on Massive Quantum Technologies

Quantum-Geometric Correspondence

Marc Sperzel*

Independent Researcher
MSci Physics, King's College London

June 16, 2026

Abstract

The Diósi-Penrose hypothesis predicts that gravity decoheres spatial superpositions at the irreducible rate $\Gamma_{\text{grav}} = GM^2/(\hbar d)$, for superposed mass M and separation d. We evaluate this gravitational decoherence floor across quantum computing platforms. Conventional qubits (superconducting, trapped ion, photonic) have gravitational decoherence times of 10^{16} s or longer and are unaffected; emerging massive technologies—optomechanical oscillators and electromechanical resonators—reach the regime where gravitational decoherence can become the dominant coherence-limiting mechanism. For a levitated nanosphere of mass 10^{-12} kg (nanogram scale) in a 10 μm superposition, $\tau_{\text{grav}} \approx 16$ μs. Three signatures distinguish gravitational from environmental decoherence: M^2 scaling of the rate, material independence at fixed mass and separation, and temperature independence below a critical threshold. The G^1 (Diósi-Penrose) and G^2 (perturbative) predictions differ by $\sim 3 \times 10^{34}$ for microgram masses at mm separation (scaling as $(M_P/M)^2(d/\ell_P)$), a stark discriminant. If the hypothesis holds, optomechanical quantum systems are a concrete testing ground for gravitational decoherence within the coming decade.

1 Introduction

Environmental decoherence—electromagnetic noise, thermal fluctuations, material defects—limits coherence times and is reducible by isolation; gravity may impose a floor that isolation cannot remove. The Diósi-Penrose hypothesis [1, 2] predicts that a mass M in spatial superposition with separation d decoheres at rate

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

with G Newton's constant and $\hbar$ the reduced Planck constant. The rate is first order in G ("G^1 scaling"); perturbative quantum field theory for graviton-mediated decoherence instead gives rates $\propto G^2$ [3, 4], many orders of magnitude smaller for laboratory masses.

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

If Eq. (1) is correct it sets a fundamental coherence limit: no massive-component quantum technology maintains superposition indefinitely, regardless of isolation. The limit is negligible for current platforms but grows as the field moves toward larger masses—optomechanical and electromechanical devices in particular.

Building on the framework and signatures of Ref. [18], this paper evaluates the gravitational decoherence floor for all major quantum computing platforms. We locate the mass-separation regime where gravitational decoherence transitions from negligible to dominant, give the discriminants that separate it from environmental backgrounds, and derive the implications for scaling massive quantum technologies.

2 The Gravitational Decoherence Floor

2.1 Decoherence rate and scaling

Definition 2.1 (Diósi-Penrose decoherence floor)**.** For a point mass M in spatial superposition with separation d, the gravitational decoherence rate and time are

$$\Gamma_{\text{grav}} = \frac{GM^2}{\hbar d}, \qquad \tau_{\text{grav}} = \frac{\hbar d}{GM^2}. \tag{2}$$

Equation (2) fixes four scaling properties:

- **Quadratic mass dependence**: $\tau_{\text{grav}} \propto M^{-2}$; doubling M quarters the coherence time.
- **Linear separation dependence**: $\tau_{\text{grav}} \propto d$; the gravitational potential difference decreases with d for point masses at fixed center-of-mass distance.
- **Temperature independence**: Γ_{grav} carries no T, unlike thermal decoherence.
- **Material independence**: Γ_{grav} depends only on M and d, not on composition, crystal structure, or surface properties.

Evaluating the constants in Eq. (2),

$$\tau_{\text{grav}} = 1.58 \times 10^{-24} \frac{d\,[\text{m}]}{(M\,[\text{kg}])^2} \text{ seconds.} \tag{3}$$

2.2 Extended mass distributions

For an extended object the rate generalizes to the Diósi integral over the mass-density difference $\delta\rho = \rho_L - \rho_R$ between superposition branches [1, 18]. A rigid body displaced by $d \gg R$ (R the object radius) reduces to Eq. (2), with finite-size corrections

$$\tau_{\text{grav}}^{-1} \to \tau_{\text{grav}}^{-1}\left(1 + \tfrac{6}{5}R^2/d^2 + \cdots\right), \tag{4}$$

negligible for the parameter regimes below.

2.3 G^1 versus G^2 scaling

The rate (2) scales as G^1; its theoretical status and physical motivation are set out in Ref. [18]. Perturbative quantum field theory, treating gravitons as a bath and computing the rate via the

Lindblad master equation, gives instead [3, 4]

$$\Gamma_{G^2} \sim \frac{G^2 M^4}{\hbar^2 c^5} f(d) \qquad \text{(up to a geometric factor)}, \tag{5}$$

where $f(d)$ encodes the superposition geometry and carries the dimensions required to give Γ_{G^2} units of inverse time. The two timescales ratio as

$$\frac{\tau_{G^2}}{\tau_{G^1}} = \frac{\tau_{\text{grav}}}{\tau_{G^2}^{-1}} \sim \left(\frac{M_P}{M}\right)^2 \frac{d}{\ell_P}, \tag{6}$$

with Planck mass $M_P = \sqrt{\hbar c/G} \approx 2.18 \times 10^{-8}$ kg and Planck length $\ell_P = \sqrt{\hbar G/c^3} \approx 1.62 \times 10^{-35}$ m. At microgram mass ($M = 1$ μg) and millimeter separation ($d = 1$ mm) the ratio is $\sim 3 \times 10^{34}$, scaling as $M^{-2}d$. The separation makes the two predictions distinguishable in principle, once gravitational decoherence is isolated from environmental backgrounds.

The G^1 and G^2 predictions for gravitational decoherence differ by a factor $\sim 3 \times 10^{34}$ for microgram-scale masses at mm separation (scaling as $(M_P/M)^2(d/\ell_P)$). An experiment sensitive to decoherence at the G^1 level would either confirm the Diósi-Penrose hypothesis or rule it out decisively in favor of the perturbative G^2 rate.

3 Platform Analysis

For each major quantum computing platform, the gravitational decoherence time $\tau_{\text{grav}} = \hbar d/(GM^2)$ follows from the effective superposed mass M and spatial separation d of the degrees of freedom encoding quantum information.

3.1 Conventional platforms

Superconducting qubits. Transmon and fluxonium qubits encode information in collective charge or flux states of a Josephson junction circuit. The effective superposed mass is that of the delocalized Cooper pairs, $M \sim 10^{-23}$ kg, with spatial separation $d \sim 1$ μm set by the junction geometry. This gives $\tau_{\text{grav}} \sim 10^{16}$ s—of order the age of the universe, hence irrelevant for any experiment. Gravitational decoherence is entirely negligible.

Trapped ions. Individual ions (e.g., $^{171}\text{Yb}^+$, mass $\sim 3 \times 10^{-25}$ kg) are confined in Paul traps with motional superpositions of order $d \sim 10$ μm. The resulting $\tau_{\text{grav}} \sim 10^{21}$ s is even more remote from measurability.

Neutral atoms. Cold atoms ($M \sim 10^{-25}$ kg) in optical lattices or tweezers achieve superposition separations $d \sim 1$ μm, yielding $\tau_{\text{grav}} \sim 10^{20}$ s. Gravitational decoherence plays no role.

Photonic qubits. Single photons have effective gravitational mass $M = E/c^2 \sim 10^{-36}$ kg for optical frequencies. Even with meter-scale path separations, $\tau_{\text{grav}} \sim 10^{48}$ s. This is the most gravitationally robust platform.

Nitrogen-vacancy centers. NV centers in diamond encode spin qubits with negligible spatial delocalization of mass ($M \sim 10^{-26}$ kg, $d \sim 1$ nm), giving $\tau_{\text{grav}} \sim 10^{19}$ s.

3.2 Massive quantum platforms

Optomechanical oscillators. Levitated dielectric nanospheres [5, 6] are the most promising platform for gravitational decoherence tests. Current experiments achieve:

- Masses: $M = 10^{-18}$ to 10^{-12} kg (silica, silicon, diamond spheres)
- Superposition separations: $d = 1$ nm to 10 μm (proposed)
- Coherence times: $T_2 \sim 1$ ms to 1 s (projected)

For a nanogram (10^{-12} kg) nanosphere in a 10 μm superposition:

$$\tau_{\text{grav}} = \frac{1.055 \times 10^{-34} \times 10^{-5}}{6.674 \times 10^{-11} \times 10^{-24}} = \frac{1.055 \times 10^{-39}}{6.674 \times 10^{-35}} = 15.8\ \mu\text{s}. \tag{7}$$

This is comparable to current coherence times in state-of-the-art cryogenically levitated systems.

Electromechanical resonators. Piezoelectric nanobeams and membrane resonators coupled to superconducting circuits [7, 8] achieve:

- Masses: $M = 10^{-16}$ to 10^{-13} kg
- Phonon number state separations: $d \sim 10$ nm to 1 μm
- Coherence times: $T_2 \sim 10$ μs to 1 ms

For a 10^{-14} kg resonator with $d = 1$ μm phonon separation:

$$\tau_{\text{grav}} = \frac{1.055 \times 10^{-34} \times 10^{-6}}{6.674 \times 10^{-11} \times 10^{-28}} = \frac{1.055 \times 10^{-40}}{6.674 \times 10^{-39}} = 15.8\ \text{ms}. \tag{8}$$

For larger resonators ($M = 10^{-13}$ kg, $d = 100$ nm):

$$\tau_{\text{grav}} = \frac{1.055 \times 10^{-34} \times 10^{-7}}{6.674 \times 10^{-11} \times 10^{-26}} = \frac{1.055 \times 10^{-41}}{6.674 \times 10^{-37}} = 15.8\ \mu\text{s}. \tag{9}$$

This is comparable to current coherence times in state-of-the-art electromechanical systems.

3.3 Summary

Table 1 collects the gravitational decoherence time for each platform.

The division is sharp: conventional qubit platforms have $\tau_{\text{grav}} \geq 10^{16}$ s, far beyond any experimental timescale, whereas massive optomechanical and electromechanical systems reach the regime where τ_{grav} is comparable to or shorter than achievable environmental coherence times.

4 Experimental Signatures

Isolating the gravitational contribution from environmental backgrounds is the central experimental challenge. Ref. [18] identified four qualitative signatures of the Diósi-Penrose mechanism: M^{-2} mass scaling, temperature independence, material independence, and linear separation scaling. The three most directly testable in optomechanical and electromechanical systems follow, each as a quantitative contrast of the gravitational and environmental scaling laws.

Table 1. *Gravitational decoherence times for quantum computing platforms. The effective mass M and superposition separation d represent typical or projected operating parameters. Platforms are ordered by decreasing τ_{grav}.*

Platform	M [kg]	d [m]	τ_{grav} [s]	**Testable?**
Photonic	10^{-36}	1	1.6×10^{48}	No
Trapped ion	10^{-25}	10^{-5}	1.6×10^{21}	No
Neutral atom	10^{-25}	10^{-6}	1.6×10^{20}	No
NV center	10^{-26}	10^{-9}	1.6×10^{19}	No
Superconducting	10^{-23}	10^{-6}	1.6×10^{16}	No
Optomech. (small)	10^{-15}	10^{-6}	1.6	Future
Electromech. (small)†	10^{-14}	10^{-6}	1.6×10^{-2}	Marginal
Electromech. (large)‡	10^{-13}	10^{-7}	1.6×10^{-5}	**Yes**
Optomech. (medium)*	10^{-12}	10^{-5}	1.6×10^{-5}	**Yes**
Optomech. (large)	10^{-9}	10^{-4}	1.6×10^{-10}	**Yes**

† Parameters for the worked electromechanical example in Sec. 3 ($M = 10^{-14}$ kg, $d = 1$ μm, $\tau_{\text{grav}} = 15.8$ ms). ‡ Parameters for the larger electromechanical example ($M = 10^{-13}$ kg, $d = 100$ nm, $\tau_{\text{grav}} = 15.8$ μs). * Parameters for the worked optomechanical example ($M = 10^{-12}$ kg, $d = 10$ μm, $\tau_{\text{grav}} = 15.8$ μs).

4.1 M^2 scaling of the decoherence rate

The gravitational rate scales as $\Gamma_{\text{grav}} \propto M^2/d$; the environmental mechanisms scale differently with mass:

- **Blackbody radiation**: $\Gamma_{\text{BB}} \propto R^6 T^9 d^2/(c^6 \hbar^4)$, where R is the particle radius. For a sphere of uniform density, $R \propto M^{1/3}$, so $\Gamma_{\text{BB}} \propto M^2 d^2 T^9$.
- **Gas collisions**: $\Gamma_{\text{gas}} \propto P R^2 d^2/(\hbar k_B T)$, where P is the residual gas pressure. This gives $\Gamma_{\text{gas}} \propto M^{2/3} d^2$.
- **Photon scattering**: $\Gamma_{\text{scat}} \propto I R^6 d^2/(\hbar c^4)$, giving $\Gamma_{\text{scat}} \propto M^2 d^2$ for fixed trapping intensity I.

Blackbody and photon scattering share the M^2 dependence with gravity but scale as d^2, not d^{-1}. Measuring the rate against d at fixed M separates the gravitational ($\Gamma \propto d^{-1}$) from the environmental ($\Gamma \propto d^2$) contribution.

Vary the superposition separation d at fixed mass M. Gravitational decoherence predicts $\Gamma \propto 1/d$; all environmental mechanisms predict $\Gamma \propto d^2$. The opposite dependence on separation provides an unambiguous discriminant.

4.2 Material independence

Gravitational decoherence depends only on M and d; the environmental mechanisms depend on material properties:

- Blackbody: depends on dielectric constant $\epsilon(\omega)$
- Gas scattering: depends on surface cross-section and accommodation coefficient
- Photon scattering: depends on polarizability $\alpha(\omega)$

The test: prepare identical mass superpositions (M, d fixed) from different materials—silica, silicon, and diamond nanospheres, or resonators of differing composition. Gravity predicts identical rates; environmental decoherence produces material-dependent rates.

4.3 Temperature independence

The gravitational rate Γ_{grav} carries no temperature; thermal environmental sources scale strongly with T:

- Blackbody: $\Gamma_{\text{BB}} \propto T^9$ (dominant at $T > 10$ K)
- Gas collisions: $\Gamma_{\text{gas}} \propto P/\sqrt{T}$
- Phonon emission: $\Gamma_{\text{ph}} \propto e^{-\Delta/k_B T}$ (activated process)

Lowering T suppresses the environmental contributions while the gravitational one holds constant. Below the critical temperature T_c fixed by $\Gamma_{\text{env}}(T_c) = \Gamma_{\text{grav}}$, gravity dominates and the total rate plateaus:

$$\Gamma_{\text{total}}(T) = \Gamma_{\text{grav}} + \Gamma_{\text{env}}(T) \xrightarrow{T \ll T_c} \Gamma_{\text{grav}}. \tag{10}$$

A temperature-independent decoherence plateau is therefore strong evidence for a gravitational origin.

5 Implications for Quantum Technology Scaling

5.1 Fundamental coherence limit

Under the Diósi-Penrose rate the coherence time of any massive quantum system is bounded by

$$T_2 \leq \tau_{\text{grav}} = \frac{\hbar d}{GM^2}. \tag{11}$$

Quantum error correction requires a per-gate error rate $\epsilon < \epsilon_{\text{th}}$, with threshold $\epsilon_{\text{th}} \sim 10^{-2}$ to 10^{-4} depending on the code [12]. The gravitational error contribution is

$$\epsilon_{\text{grav}} = \frac{t_{\text{gate}}}{\tau_{\text{grav}}} = \frac{GM^2 t_{\text{gate}}}{\hbar d}, \tag{12}$$

with t_{gate} the gate duration. Below-threshold operation requires

$$\frac{M^2}{d} < \frac{\hbar \epsilon_{\text{th}}}{G\, t_{\text{gate}}}, \tag{13}$$

which at $\epsilon_{\text{th}} = 10^{-3}$ and $t_{\text{gate}} = 1$ μs reads

$$\frac{M^2}{d} < 1.58 \times 10^{-21} \ \frac{\text{kg}^2}{\text{m}}. \tag{14}$$

Table 2 gives the resulting maximum superposed mass for useful quantum computation across separations.

Table 2. *Maximum superposed mass for quantum error correction below threshold ($\epsilon_{th} = 10^{-3}$, $t_{gate} = 1\ \mu s$), assuming the Diósi-Penrose decoherence rate.*

Separation d	$M_{\max}$	Physical system
1 μm	4.0×10^{-14} kg	Nanomechanical resonator
10 μm	1.3×10^{-13} kg	Levitated nanoparticle
100 μm	4.0×10^{-13} kg	Optomechanical cavity
1 mm	1.3×10^{-12} kg	Large levitated sphere

These limits exceed conventional-qubit masses but constrain proposed massive quantum processors built from optomechanical or electromechanical elements.

5.2 Crossover mass

Setting $\tau_{\text{grav}} = \tau_{\text{env}}$ defines the crossover mass at which gravitational and environmental decoherence balance,

$$M_c = \sqrt{\frac{\hbar d}{G\tau_{\text{env}}}}. \tag{15}$$

For $d = 10\ \mu$m and $\tau_{\text{env}} = 1$ s,

$$M_c = \sqrt{\frac{1.055 \times 10^{-34} \times 10^{-5}}{6.674 \times 10^{-11}}} = 4.0 \times 10^{-15} \text{ kg} \approx 4 \text{ femtograms}. \tag{16}$$

Above M_c gravity dominates the environment, placing the crossover within the regime of levitated nanoparticle experiments.

5.3 Self-limiting testability

Gravitational decoherence limits the very superpositions needed to test it: testing requires coherent superpositions of massive objects, yet the more massive the object, the faster gravity decoheres it. The window is bounded on both sides:

- **Lower bound**: $M > M_c$ so that $\tau_{\text{grav}} < \tau_{\text{env}}$ (gravitational signal detectable above environmental noise)
- **Upper bound**: $\tau_{\text{grav}} > t_{\text{prep}}$, where t_{prep} is the time required to prepare the superposition

For typical state preparation times $t_{\text{prep}} \sim 1$ ms and $d = 10\ \mu$m, the accessible mass range is

$$M_c \sim 10^{-15} \text{ kg} \ < \ M \ < \ \sqrt{\frac{\hbar d}{G\, t_{\text{prep}}}} \approx 1.3 \times 10^{-13} \text{ kg}, \tag{17}$$

with upper bound $\sqrt{(1.055 \times 10^{-34} \times 10^{-5})/(6.674 \times 10^{-11} \times 10^{-3})} \approx 1.3 \times 10^{-13}$ kg. This roughly two-decade window (10^{-15} to 10^{-13} kg) is the "gravitational decoherence testing zone" for optomechanical experiments.

6 Discussion

6.1 Relation to existing proposals

Matter-wave interferometry proposals for gravitational decoherence [6, 13, 14] are complemented here by quantum computing platforms, where decoherence is routinely measured in device characterization and the high-precision infrastructure already exists and is improving.

The MAQRO space mission [15] targets collapse models including Diósi-Penrose in micro-gravity with nanospheres of mass $\sim 10^{-17}$ to 10^{-14} kg. The M^2 scaling of the gravitational rate implies that ground-based optomechanical systems with heavier masses ($\sim 10^{-12}$ kg) can reach comparable or superior sensitivity.

6.2 Comparison with collapse model bounds

Current bounds on the collapse-rate parameter λ from optomechanical [16] and underground X-ray emission [17] measurements constrain the Continuous Spontaneous Localization (CSL) model. The Diósi-Penrose model is tighter: its single parameter, Newton's constant G, is fixed and its overall coefficient is $O(1)$ (natural value 1), with no tunable collapse rate.

6.3 Status of G^1 scaling

The Diósi-Penrose rate (Eq. (1)) follows in linearized gravity, within a controlled approximation, from imposing the Wheeler-DeWitt constraint on the Feynman-Vernon influence functional [18]. The product initial state $|\psi\rangle \otimes |0\rangle$ violates the constraint; the physical entangled state decoheres through coherent-state overlap at G^1 rather than the noise-kernel mechanism at G^2 [3, 4]. Each scaling is correct for its own initial condition. Whether nature enforces the Wheeler-DeWitt constraint on the initial state is experimentally decidable.

If the G^2 rate is correct, gravitational decoherence is negligible for all foreseeable quantum technologies ($\tau_{\text{grav}} > 10^{35}$ times longer). The experiments proposed here would then set upper bounds on non-perturbative gravitational effects.

6.4 Recommended experimental program

The analysis points to a phased experimental program:

1. **Near-term (1–5 years)**: Precision decoherence measurements on electromechanical resonators ($M \sim 10^{-13}$ kg). Demonstrate material-independence tests using different resonator compositions.

2. **Medium-term (5–10 years)**: Levitated nanosphere experiments with masses 10^{-15} to 10^{-12} kg. Systematic d-dependence and M-dependence measurements to test scaling predictions.

3. **Long-term (10–15 years)**: Space-based optomechanical experiments for extended coherence in microgravity. Definitive G^1 vs G^2 discrimination.

7 Conclusions

The Diósi-Penrose hypothesis, if correct, imposes a fundamental coherence limit on massive quantum technologies. Conventional platforms (superconducting, trapped ion, photonic, NV center) are unaffected—their gravitational decoherence times exceed 10^{16} s—while emerging optomechanical and electromechanical platforms operate where gravitational decoherence can become the dominant coherence-limiting mechanism.

Three signatures identify gravitational decoherence: inverse separation dependence ($\Gamma \propto 1/d$, against d^2 for environmental mechanisms), material independence at fixed mass and separation, and temperature independence below a critical threshold. The G^1 versus G^2 rates differ by $\sim 3 \times 10^{34}$ for microgram masses at mm separation (order-of-magnitude; $\propto (M_P/M)^2(d/\ell_P)$).

The "gravitational decoherence testing zone" spans $\sim 10^{-15}$ to $\sim 10^{-13}$ kg (for $d = 10$ μm, $t_{\text{prep}} \sim 1$ ms), coinciding with the parameter space of next-generation optomechanical experiments. Massive quantum technologies are thus a concrete testing ground for gravitational decoherence, complementing dedicated interferometric proposals.

A Numerical Estimates

Numerical estimates of the gravitational decoherence time across the relevant masses and separations follow.

A.1 Reference values

With $G = 6.674 \times 10^{-11}$ $\text{m}^3/(\text{kg}\cdot\text{s}^2)$ and $\hbar = 1.055 \times 10^{-34}$ J·s:

Table 3. *Gravitational decoherence times for representative mass-separation combinations.*

Mass M	Separation d	τ_{grav}	Physical context
10^{-25} kg	10 μm	1.6×10^{21} s	Single atom
10^{-20} kg	1 nm	1.6×10^{7} s	Large molecule
10^{-18} kg	10 nm	1.6×10^{4} s	Virus-size particle
10^{-16} kg	100 nm	16 s	Small nanoparticle
10^{-15} kg	1 μm	1.6 s	Nanosphere
10^{-14} kg	1 μm	16 ms	Large nanoparticle
10^{-13} kg	1 μm	160 μs	Electromechanical
10^{-13} kg	100 nm	16 μs	Phonon state
10^{-12} kg	10 μm	16 μs	Levitated sphere
10^{-12} kg	1 μm	1.6 μs	Trapped microsphere
10^{-9} kg	100 μm	0.16 ns	Milligram crystal
10^{-6} kg	1 mm	1.6 fs	Microgram mass

A.2 Crossover masses

The crossover mass $M_c = \sqrt{\hbar d/(G\tau_{\text{env}})}$, at which gravitational and environmental rates are equal:

In every case the crossover mass lies in the femtogram-to-nanogram range (10^{-17} to 10^{-12} kg), within the operating regime of optomechanical experiments.

Table 4. *Crossover masses for various environmental coherence times and superposition separations.*

τ_{env}	$d = 100$ nm	$d = 1$ μm	$d = 10$ μm
10 μs	1.3×10^{-13} kg	4.0×10^{-13} kg	1.3×10^{-12} kg
1 ms	1.3×10^{-14} kg	4.0×10^{-14} kg	1.3×10^{-13} kg
1 s	4.0×10^{-16} kg	1.3×10^{-15} kg	4.0×10^{-15} kg
100 s	4.0×10^{-17} kg	1.3×10^{-16} kg	4.0×10^{-16} kg

References

[1] L. Diósi, "A universal master equation for the gravitational violation of quantum mechanics," Phys. Lett. A **120**, 377 (1987). doi:10.1016/0375-9601(87)90681-5.

[2] R. Penrose, "On gravity's role in quantum state reduction," Gen. Relativ. Gravit. **28**, 581 (1996). doi:10.1007/BF02105068.

[3] C. Anastopoulos and B. L. Hu, "A master equation for gravitational decoherence: probing the textures of spacetime," Class. Quant. Grav. **30**, 165007 (2013). doi:10.1088/0264-9381/30/16/165007.

[4] M. P. Blencowe, "Effective field theory approach to gravitationally induced decoherence," Phys. Rev. Lett. **111**, 021302 (2013). doi:10.1103/PhysRevLett.111.021302.

[5] M. Aspelmeyer, T. J. Kippenberg, and F. Marquardt, "Cavity optomechanics," Rev. Mod. Phys. **86**, 1391 (2014). doi:10.1103/RevModPhys.86.1391.

[6] O. Romero-Isart, A. C. Pflanzer, F. Blaser, R. Kaltenbaek, N. Kiesel, M. Aspelmeyer, and J. I. Cirac, "Large quantum superpositions and interference of massive nanometer-sized objects," Phys. Rev. Lett. **107**, 020405 (2011). doi:10.1103/PhysRevLett.107.020405.

[7] A. D. O'Connell *et al.*, "Quantum ground state and single-phonon control of a mechanical resonator," Nature **464**, 697 (2010). doi:10.1038/nature08967.

[8] Y. Chu, P. Kharel, W. H. Renninger, L. D. Burkhart, L. Frunzio, P. T. Rakich, and R. J. Schoelkopf, "Quantum acoustics with superconducting qubits," Science **358**, 199 (2017). doi:10.1126/science.aao1511.

[9] M. H. Devoret and R. J. Schoelkopf, "Superconducting circuits for quantum information: an outlook," Science **339**, 1169 (2013). doi:10.1126/science.1231930.

[10] C. D. Bruzewicz, J. Chiaverini, R. McConnell, and J. M. Sage, "Trapped-ion quantum computing: progress and challenges," Appl. Phys. Rev. **6**, 021314 (2019). doi:10.1063/1.5088164.

[11] M. Kjaergaard *et al.*, "Superconducting qubits: current state of play," Annu. Rev. Cond. Matt. Phys. **11**, 369 (2020). doi:10.1146/annurev-conmatphys-031119-050605.

[12] A. G. Fowler, M. Mariantoni, J. M. Martinis, and A. N. Cleland, "Surface codes: towards practical large-scale quantum computation," Phys. Rev. A **86**, 032324 (2012). doi:10.1103/PhysRevA.86.032324.

[13] W. Marshall, C. Simon, R. Penrose, and D. Bouwmeester, "Towards quantum superpositions of a mirror," Phys. Rev. Lett. **91**, 130401 (2003). doi:10.1103/PhysRevLett.91.130401.

[14] I. Pikovski, M. R. Vanner, M. Aspelmeyer, M. S. Kim, and Č. Brukner, "Probing Planck-scale physics with quantum optics," Nature Phys. **8**, 393 (2012). doi:10.1038/nphys2262.

[15] R. Kaltenbaek *et al.*, "Macroscopic quantum resonators (MAQRO)," Exp. Astron. **34**, 123 (2012). doi:10.1007/s10686-012-9292-3.

[16] A. Vinante *et al.*, "Improved noninterferometric test of collapse models using ultracold cantilevers," Phys. Rev. Lett. **119**, 110401 (2017). doi:10.1103/PhysRevLett.119.110401.

[17] S. Donadi *et al.*, "Underground test of gravity-related wave function collapse," Nature Phys. **17**, 74 (2021). doi:10.1038/s41567-020-1008-4.

[18] M. Sperzel, "The Quantum-Geometric Correspondence: Axioms, Gravitational Decoherence, and the Wheeler–DeWitt Rate," (2026), Quantum-Geometric Correspondence, canonical core paper.