

Desk Analysis: Do Existing Network Experiments Already Bound the Lag Term?

A companion note to “Causal Boundaries of Bell’s Inequality” (not part of the paper)

Gerd Graßhoff 
Humboldt-Universität zu Berlin
gerd.grasshoff@hu-berlin.de

ABSTRACT

Laidlaw’s field-ontology model predicts that the coherence of an entangled pair held at range r equals the short-range coherence at a later time, shifted by $\kappa\tau$ with $\tau = r/c$ and $\kappa = 1$. Before any new experiment is proposed we ask whether published long-baseline experiments with memory qubits already exclude this. They do not, with one conditional exception. The effect scales as τ/T_{coh} , and every published link protects its qubits with echo sequences that make T_{coh} hundreds of microseconds to milliseconds, which hides a lag of tens of microseconds. The one experiment with a short hold time and no protection, Hensen et al. (2015), bounds κ only once its coherence time is known, and that number is not in the main text. The analysis also yields a design rule: the test must be run with the coherence time deliberately reduced.

Table of contents

1 What is being tested	1
2 How large is the effect?	1
3 The three experiments	2
3.1 Hensen et al. 2015 (1.28 km)	2
3.2 Stolk et al. 2024 (10 km, Delft–The Hague)	2
3.3 van Leent et al. 2022 (400 m, fibre up to 33 km)	3
3.4 Not analysed	3
4 What the desk analysis says	3
5 Where to run it, and what it would cost	3
6 Verification status	4

1 What is being tested

Let $C_r(t)$ be the coherence of a Bell state held for a time t between two memory qubits r apart, and $\tau = r/c$ the vacuum light time. The hypothesis H1 of the paper is

$$C_r(t) = C_0(t + \kappa\tau), \quad \kappa = 1.$$

For an exponential decay $C_0(t) = e^{-2t/T_{\text{coh}}}$ the range factor is

$$R = \frac{C_r(t)}{C_0(t)} = e^{-2\kappa\tau/T_{\text{coh}}}.$$

Standard theory with uncorrelated local noise gives $R = 1$. This note asks what the published data say about R . All numbers below are read in the primary papers unless marked *derived* (computed here from read numbers) or *not read*.

2 How large is the effect?

Table 1 gives R for $\kappa = 1$. The geometric distances are those the papers give; $\tau = r/c$.

Table 1 Range factor $R = e^{-2\tau/T_{\text{coh}}}$ under H1 with $\kappa = 1$ (derived).

Geomet- ric r	τ	$T_{\text{coh}} = 5 \mu\text{s}$	$30 \mu\text{s}$	$100 \mu\text{s}$	$330 \mu\text{s}$	1 ms	5 ms
400 m	$1.33 \mu\text{s}$	0.59	0.92	0.97	0.992	0.997	0.9995
1.28 km	$4.27 \mu\text{s}$	0.18	0.75	0.92	0.975	0.991	0.998
10 km	$33.4 \mu\text{s}$	0.00	0.11	0.51	0.82	0.94	0.987

The message of the table is the design rule of this note: **the effect is visible only where T_{coh} is comparable to τ or shorter**. With echo protection at the millisecond scale, even a 10 km link changes the coherence by only a few percent.

3 The three experiments

3.1 Hensen et al. 2015 (1.28 km)

Read in the main text: the spins are 1280 m apart, which defines a $4.27 \mu\text{s}$ window; readout lasts $3.7 \mu\text{s}$; the entanglement fidelity to the ideal state, estimated from the two-photon interference visibility (0.90 ± 0.06) and the spin-photon correlations measured in the same setup, is 0.92 ± 0.03 ; combined with the readout fidelities this predicts $S = 2.30 \pm 0.07$; the Bell test gives $S = 2.42 \pm 0.20$; the collinear ZZ and XX runs during full operation are consistent with the estimated state.

Derived. The measured value exceeds the prediction: $S_{\text{meas}}/S_{\text{pred}} = 1.05 \pm 0.09$ (the two errors combined in quadrature). Any unmodelled multiplicative loss R_{tot} , which would include a range term and hold-time dephasing together, is therefore bounded from below. At two standard deviations, one-sided, $R_{\text{tot}} > 0.87$, so $2\kappa\tau/T_{\text{coh}} < 0.14$ and

$$\kappa < 0.0165 \left(T_{\text{coh}} / 1 \mu\text{s} \right).$$

Table 2 Bound on κ from Hensen et al. as a function of the unknown coherence time (derived).

$T_{\text{coh}} (\mu\text{s})$	5	13	30	60	100
bound on κ (2σ)	0.08	0.22	0.50	1.0	1.7

So Hensen’s data exclude $\kappa = 1$ at two standard deviations if the relevant coherence time was below about $60 \mu\text{s}$, and say nothing if it was longer. **The main text does not give the coherence time or the exact hold time between spin-photon entanglement and readout; these are in the supplement, which is not read here.** That is the single cheapest next step: read the supplement, or ask the authors.

Caveats: the prediction of $S = 2.30$ already uses readout and photon parameters that are themselves uncertain; the bound treats the ratio of two numbers with the errors as stated; and S carries only 245 trials.

3.2 Stolk et al. 2024 (10 km, Delft–The Hague)

Read: the nodes are 10 km apart, connected through a midpoint by 25 km of deployed fibre. In the fully heralded mode the qubits wait $162.5 \mu\text{s}$ or $135.4 \mu\text{s}$ under an echo pulse; the wait reduces the coherence by 1.3 (Delft) and 3.2 (The Hague) per cent; the delivered fidelity is 0.534(15) at a rate of 0.022 s^{-1} ; a model without free parameters describes the fidelity as a function of the acceptance window; the same devices were first validated in a single laboratory in Delft (fidelities above 0.6).

Derived. If the loss is exponential in the wait, the effective echo coherence is about 5 to 10 ms. With $\tau = 33.4 \mu\text{s}$ the H1 factor is $R \approx 0.987$ to 0.993 (Table 1), a 1 to 1.3 per cent effect. The fidelity 0.534(15) corresponds to a contrast $V = (4F - 1)/3 = 0.38 \pm 0.02$, a relative error of 5 per cent. A two-sigma bound is therefore $2\kappa\tau/T_{\text{coh}} \lesssim 0.11$, i.e. $\kappa \lesssim 8$ for $T_{\text{coh}} \approx 5 \text{ ms}$. This does not discriminate between $\kappa = 0$ and $\kappa = 1$.

The link is nevertheless the best available lever: it is a long baseline, it has a same-hardware short-range control (the Delft-only configuration), and the coherence protection is a programmable sequence. The section “Where to run it, and what it would cost” uses that.

■ 3.3 van Leent et al. 2022 (400 m, fibre up to 33 km)

Read: two ^{87}Rb atoms sit in buildings 400 m apart; the fibre link between them and a midpoint station is varied over 6, 11, 23 and 33 km. The lower bounds on the fidelity fall as 0.830(10), 0.799(11), 0.719(12), 0.622(15); at 33 km the states are analysed 171 and 178 μs after excitation, with $T_2 \approx 330 \mu\text{s}$. The authors state that decoherence of the atomic states dominates the loss in fidelity. In a control they delay the memory readout electronically by the corresponding communication times with short fibres; the fidelities show, within the measurement accuracy, no difference from the long-fibre configuration.

Derived. The geometric light time between the atoms is $\tau = 1.33 \mu\text{s}$, so $R = e^{-2\tau/T_2} \approx 0.992$: below the sensitivity of the data. The result that matters is the **delay control**. It confirms that the coherence is set by elapsed time and not by fibre length, at fixed geometric distance. That is what H0 and H1 both predict for the “spool” control of experiment E1 in the paper, and it shows that control is technically routine.

■ 3.4 Not analysed

Pompili et al. (2021) is a multi-node network over 3 m; $\tau \approx 10 \text{ ns}$, which is useless as a range lever. Photonic long-baseline tests (Ursin, Yin) store nothing: there is no hold time in which a memory decoheres, so they do not constrain $C_r(t)$ in the sense of H1.

■ 4 What the desk analysis says

1. **No published memory-qubit experiment excludes $\kappa = 1$.** Hensen et al. might, if the supplement gives a coherence time below about 60 μs .
2. **The effect needs a short coherence time.** All three experiments protect their qubits, which is what makes their coherence times long and R close to one.
3. **The test is therefore a change of operating point, not a new platform.** Run an existing long link with the echo sequence weakened or replaced by a tunable one, so that T_{coh} is a few hundred microseconds, and compare with the same hardware in one laboratory.

■ 5 Where to run it, and what it would cost

The Delft–The Hague link of Stolk et al. has $\tau = 33.4 \mu\text{s}$ and a same-hardware short-range control. With T_{coh} tuned to 300 μs , H1 predicts $R = 0.82$ per qubit pair. Table 3 gives the number of heralded events per Bell state that the sum rule of experiment E2 needs for a five-standard-deviation detection at the rate of 0.022 s^{-1} reported for the fully heralded mode. The three rows differ in the starting contrast of the delivered state.

Table 3 Events per Bell state for a 5σ detection of the H1 deficit in the sum-rule quantity Q , for a Stolk-type link (derived; script `revision/checks.py` function `e2_n` with a finite starting contrast, hold time $140\ \mu\text{s}$, $\tau = 33.4\ \mu\text{s}$). Illustrative: Gaussian dephasing, exponential decay, independent binomial readout, single-qubit shots assumed abundant.

Delivered fidelity	T_{coh}	events per Bell state	hours at $0.022\ \text{s}^{-1}$
ideal ($V = 1$)	$300\ \mu\text{s}$	2,300	29
ideal ($V = 1$)	1 ms	2,800	35
0.80 ($V = 0.73$), projected by the authors	$300\ \mu\text{s}$	4,500	57
0.80	1 ms	7,600	96
0.534 (measured, $V = 0.38$)	$300\ \mu\text{s}$	17,000	220
0.534	1 ms	36,000	460

At the measured fidelity the run would take several months per Bell state and per configuration, and so is not attractive. With the improvements the authors project (they state that replacing the NV centre by an SnV centre, quantum frequency conversion at all nodes and a known fix to the phase stabilisation would give fidelities above 80 per cent) it takes days to a few weeks. The estimate is only as good as its assumptions; the experimenter’s own noise budget should replace it.

6 Verification status

Item	Status
Hensen et al.: $4.27\ \mu\text{s}$ window, $3.7\ \mu\text{s}$ readout, $F = 0.92 \pm 0.03$, $S = 2.30 \pm 0.07$, $S = 2.42 \pm 0.20$, visibility 0.90 ± 0.06	read (arXiv:1508.05949, main text)
Hensen et al.: coherence time, hold time	not read (supplement)
Stolk et al.: 10 km, 25 km fibre, $162.5 / 135.4\ \mu\text{s}$, 1.3 / 3.2 %, 0.534(15), $0.022\ \text{s}^{-1}$, projected $> 80\ \%$	read (arXiv:2404.03723, main text)
van Leent et al.: 400 m, 6–33 km, fidelities, $T_2 \approx 330\ \mu\text{s}$, delay control	read (arXiv:2111.15526, main text)
R table, bounds on κ , cost table	derived here; not independently checked
Assignment of the 1.3 and 3.2 % losses to particular echo times in Stolk et al.	not resolved; both bracket the result

The bounds treat the reported errors as Gaussian and independent, which they are not exactly.