



MeV scale quantum entanglement Applications in imaging and fundamental tests

Prof Dan Watts (University of York)

Dr Nick Zachariou, Dr Jamie Brown, Dr Julien Bordes, Dr Mikhail Bashkanov, Dr Ruth Newton, Dawid Grabowski, Laura Stephenson Prof Karla Evans, Cameron Kyle-Davidson (Al imaging group, Psychology) Prof Kenji Shimazoe, Mizuki Uenomachi (University of Tokyo) Prof Steve Archibald, John Wright (King's College London) Prof Harry Tsoumpas (Groningen PET research centre)







UNIVERSITY of

Talk outline

 \circ Photonic QE at the MeV scale (positron annihilation γ)

- MeVQE decoherence a paradigm shift in understanding
- York/Tokyo large acceptance AI-QEPET & AI-QESPECT prototype
- Measurements plans at York and KCL







Entanglement in positron annihilation

Positron annihilation
$$e^- + e^+ \rightarrow 2\gamma$$

Annihilation at rest (L=0)

 γ polarisations perpendicular (conservation of momentum)

1 entangled combination of directions (-,+) and polns. (H,V) also conserves parity. A Bell state

$$|\psi\rangle = \frac{1}{\sqrt{2}} (|H\rangle_{|V\rangle_{+}} - |H\rangle_{+}|V\rangle_{-})$$



e.g. Yang, Amer Phys Soc 77 242 (1950) Bohm and Aharonov, PRC 108 1070 (1957))

Entanglement in double Compton scattering

CS depends on γ polarization (pol. Klein Nishina prop sin² Φ)

$$|\psi\rangle = \frac{1}{\sqrt{2}} (|H\rangle_{-}|V\rangle_{+} - |V\rangle_{+}|H\rangle_{-})$$

Incorporate polarised KN

$$\frac{d^2\sigma}{d\Omega_1 d\Omega_2} = \frac{r_0^4}{16} \left(K_a(\theta_1 \theta_2) - K_b(\theta_1 \theta_2) \cos(2\Delta \phi) \right)$$

Entanglement -> *magnitude* of $cos(2\Delta\phi)$ modulation









e.g. Snyder et. al. , Phys Rev 73 440 (1947) Pryce and Ward, Nature 160 435 (1947) Bohm and Aharonov, PRC 108 1070 (1957) Hiesmayr et al, Sci Rep 2019 9(1):8166 Caradonna et. al., JPC 3, 105005 (2019) Duarte EPJ H 37 311 (2012) - historical overview

Comparison of entangled GEANT4 and experimental data

G4 simulation of detector apparatus



Analysed with same code and cuts as the experimental data

Agreement with entangled prediction

Clear disagreement with standard G4

Unpolarised ~flat -> uniform acceptance

Watts, Bordes, Brown, Cherlin, Newton et al. 2021 Nat. Comms. 12:2646



Also see previous tests in more limited kinematics – summarized In Caradonna et. al., JPC 3, 105005 (2019)





 $\Delta \phi$ from inter-crystal Compton scatter

Arrays 512 3x3x20mm LYSO crystals

PETSYS ASIC DAQ system

First Triple Compton Measurements



(Received 8 December 2023; revised 21 March 2024; accepted 27 June 2024; published 25 September 2024)

AI-QEPET : Doing better with the scatter

Early results training AI on simulated QE-PET data Multilayer Perceptron with 10 layers and ReLU Activations throughout.

Use of QE-PET significantly improves reconstruction of both the annihilation site and the scatter site 😀

Uses the ~80% of "scatter" events discarded in current PET Enhanced contrast, lower dose – screening PET?

Next steps

- -> Expand training data Stats, phantoms
- -> Optimise algorithm/network
- -> Anatomical information for free?
- -> Attenuation correction for free no CT?
- -> Movement corrections?



"Missing" acceptance leaves uncertainties ...



Larger acceptance -> Environment sensing in PET/SPECT, tests

3γ PET – relative yield sensitive to oxygen concentrations.
e.g. Radiation Physics and Chemistry 203 (2023) 110610
Hypoxic (low oxygen) tumours less sensitive to radiotherapy – influence treatment pathways?
Fundamental tests – QE in genuine tripartite system, CP/CPT violation e.g Hiesmayer, Sci. Reports 15349 (2017)



Cascade gamma – sensitive to pH of environment

Nat Comms vol5, Article number: 24 (2022)



Main clinical aims:

Measure the "missing piece" for understanding QE decoherence in PET

Polarisation correlations and QE unexplored for both 3γ and cascade- γ – crucial to deeper understanding

Analyse large acceptance PET and SPECT data for clinical images using AI-QE trained algorithms

York/Tokyo: Large acceptance 2 γ , 3 γ PET/SPECT system





York – 0.2 GBq ²²Na source KCL PET centre – ¹⁸F and ¹¹¹I with controlled pH, $p(O_2)$

Summary

Photonic QE at the MeV scale – we are learning new things !

AI-QEPET shows promise in early studies

Next generation large acceptance data to be obtained soon

UK leadership in MeVQE (seeded by QTFP) -> new collaborations e.g. Japan, UK, Netherlands

And a whole host of new competitors...

Other ongoing/completed work: QE of decay photons from decay of neutral pi meson Measurement of entanglement witness in rotating frames up to 100g and gravitational fields Distance tests Consistency of entanglement witness in different positron annihilating media



Backup slides



TCS data – $\Delta \phi$ distributions

 $\Delta \phi$ distributions for different intermediate CS angles

Event mixing to remove detector acceptance

Fit with:

 $Acos(2\Delta \phi) + B$

"Enhancement" (R) is:

 $\mathsf{R} = (\mathsf{B}\text{-}\mathsf{A}) / (\mathsf{B}\text{+}\mathsf{A})$

Measure of correlation between the γ







Scatter reconstruction in pixelated arrays



DMatrix ASIC - reads out energy of triggered pixel, and energy deposited in nearest neighbours Neighbours added if anode timing matches

2.97% FWHM at 511 keV (for double hits)

Assume highest energy site of first CS – improvements possible





Random backgrounds

Image slice from $\Delta \Phi$ around max (min) amplitude



Subtract slices using weight derived from G4 simulation Isolate true events!



But Assumes QE lost after first DCS ->TCS stated as a clear next step

Different weighting: Spatially resolved determination of scatter profile

A different slice ..







First measurements of EW in a gravitational field (and distance tests)





Ratio inclined/horizontal



UNIVERSITY of York

Measuring linear polarization at the MeV scale

Uses the process of Compton scattering. $\gamma + e \rightarrow \gamma' + e'$

Single polarized γ -> polarized Klein-Nishina formula

$$I = \frac{e^4}{r^2 m^2 c^4} I_0 \frac{\sin^2 \phi}{[1 + \alpha (1 - \cos \theta)]^3}$$



MeVQE – entanglement in accelerating frame

Single measurement of consistency of entanglement in (uniformally) accelerated frame obtained for optical photons (in 2017)

Entanglement witness measured from 30mg up to 30g

Centrifuge constructed at York to achieve measurement up to 100g

New energy range (6 orders of magnitude higher)

No theory of quantum gravity -> sets limits





Figure 5 | Summary of experimental data. All data acquired during the experiments shown as the g-value versus lower bound on Bell-state fidelity $(P_{P-}^{th}(\hat{\rho}_{exp}))$, for g-values ranging from 3 mg to up to 30 g. The error bars shown in the graphs are calculated considering Poissonian statistics, as well as systematical errors for DA measurements due to temperature fluctuations. No deviation from the total average (96.45% represented as horizontal dashed line) for more than the estimated errors is visible.

Aside: Modes of positron annihilation

Positrons quickly thermalise (~1ps) -> annihilation dominantly at rest

¹S₀ (S=0, m_s=0) "para-positronium" dominant. τ =0.125 ns -> 2 γ decay dominates, each 0.511 MeV (4 γ suppressed by 10⁻⁶)

 ${}^{3}S_{1}$ "ortho-positronium" state (τ =142ns in free space) decays to 3γ – its relative contribution, lifetime shows medium dependence, sensitivity to environment e.g. oxygen concentration. (Ortho can annihilate with another electron in pickup reaction -> 2γ)

We plan study of 3γ Ortho decays in future work

QE between all 3, 2 of 3 ,..-> additional info?



PHYSICAL REVIEW A 85, 042111 (2012)

Time correlation of two γ rays resulting from positronium annihilation

Haruo Saito^{*} and Kengo Shibuya Institute of Physics, Graduate School of Arts and Sciences, University of Tokyo, 3-8-1, Komaba, Meguro-ku, Tokyo, 153-8902, Japan (Received 14 February 2012; published 16 April 2012)

MeVQE: Applications in PET medical imaging ?

Widely used imaging tool to study cellular and molecular processes in vivo

Biologically active molecule labelled with positron emitter (e.g. glucose)

-> Functional info about disease/ therapy response

Usually complemented by anatomical information from other modalities (CT/MRI)

Scatter/True = 0.2 to 2 (brain/abdomen imaging respectively) Random/true = 0.2 to 1

Images have to be processed to remove scatter – involves full MC simulation of the patient

The implicit quantum entanglement of the photons has been overlooked !!



True coincidence One annihilation Straight path photons in opposite directions



Scatter coincidence

- One annihilation
- Photons scatter
- Measured line of response places annihilation reaction along artefactual projection



Random coincidence

- More than one annihilation.
- Photons from different annihilations are detected simultaneously
 Artefactual line of response
- Artefactual line of response calculated

