

Packet Generation and Origin Interpretation: A Unified Framework for Quantum Field Excitations

James (JD) Longmire
ORCID: 0009-0009-1383-7698
Northrop Grumman Fellow (unaffiliated research)

July 2025

Abstract

We propose a unified theoretical framework for understanding quantum field excitations through packet generation and origin interpretation. By distinguishing between natural and artificial packet emitters—mechanisms that transform quantum field potential into realized information-carrying excitations—we provide a systematic classification of quantum source phenomena. This framework establishes emitters as information density programmers that shape both the physical and informational properties of generated packets. We demonstrate quantitative connections between emitter characteristics and packet information content, introduce metrics for information efficiency, and show how this perspective unifies diverse phenomena from atomic spontaneous emission to engineered quantum sources. The framework offers new insights for quantum technology optimization and provides a fresh lens for examining fundamental questions in black hole physics and cosmology.

Keywords: quantum field theory, packet emitters, information density, quantum optics, spontaneous emission, Fisher information

1 Introduction

The generation of quantum excitations—photons, electrons, atoms, and other quanta—is fundamental to both our understanding of nature and our technological capabilities. Yet the mechanisms by which these excitations emerge from quantum fields have been conceptualized in fragmented ways across different subfields of physics. Atomic physicists discuss “spontaneous emission,” quantum opticians engineer “single-photon sources,” and field theorists describe “particle creation operators,” but a unified framework for understanding the origin and control of quantum packets has been lacking.

This paper introduces the concept of **packet emitters** as a unifying theoretical framework. We define a packet emitter as any mechanism—natural or artificial—that transforms quantum field potential into localized, finite excitations carrying specific information content [1, 2]. Here, we use “packet” and “excitation” as closely related but distinct concepts: an excitation refers to any departure from the field’s ground state, while a packet specifically denotes a localized, normalizable excitation with well-defined information content and finite spatial extent. All physically observable excitations are packets in this sense, as infinitely extended plane waves or point-like delta functions are mathematical abstractions never realized in nature [3, 4].

This perspective clarifies the ontological relationship between quantum fields as substrates for potential excitations, emitters as actualization agents that impose specific boundary conditions, and packets as information-carrying realizations that can propagate and interact. The framework developed here extends beyond traditional quantum field theory by emphasizing the role of information content and control in packet generation, providing quantitative tools for optimizing quantum technologies and fresh insights into fundamental physics [5, 6].

2 Theoretical Framework

2.1 Quantum Fields as Substrates

In quantum field theory, the vacuum state $|0\rangle$ represents the ground state of a quantum field—not empty space, but a substrate rich with potential excitations [7, 8]. The field provides the medium through which packet excitations can propagate and interact, but in the absence of sources or boundary conditions, it remains in its unexcited state.

Mathematically, the field operator $\hat{\phi}(x, t)$ can be expanded in terms of creation and annihilation operators:

$$\hat{\phi}(x, t) = \int d^3k \frac{[a(k)e^{-i\omega t + ik \cdot x} + a^\dagger(k)e^{i\omega t - ik \cdot x}]}{\sqrt{2\omega V}} \quad (1)$$

where $a^\dagger(k)$ creates an excitation with momentum k and $a(k)$ destroys it [9]. However, the physical realization of such excitations requires specific boundary conditions and energy inputs—precisely the role filled by packet emitters.

2.2 Emitters as Actualization Mechanisms

A packet emitter transforms the potential for excitation inherent in the quantum field into actual, detectable packets. Formally, an emitter implements the transformation:

$$|0\rangle \rightarrow |\Psi_{\text{packet}}\rangle = \int d^3k f(k) a^\dagger(k) |0\rangle \quad (2)$$

where $f(k)$ is a square-integrable envelope function that determines the packet’s spatial and momentum distribution [10, 11]. The emitter’s physical characteristics—its energy levels, transition rates, cavity properties, or engineered structure—determine the specific form of $f(k)$ and thus the information content of the generated packet.

2.3 Information Density Programming: Mathematical Formalization

The concept of emitters as information density programmers can be made mathematically precise by examining how emitter characteristics directly influence packet information content. The spatial wave function corresponding to the momentum distribution $f(k)$ is:

$$\psi(x) = \frac{1}{(2\pi)^{3/2}} \int d^3k f(k) e^{ik \cdot x} \quad (3)$$

The Fisher information density, which quantifies local information content, is then:

$$I_F(x) = 4 \frac{|\nabla \psi(x)|^2}{|\psi(x)|^2} - 4 \frac{|\nabla |\psi(x)||^2}{|\psi(x)|^2} \quad (4)$$

Direct Connection to Emitter Programming: To establish the explicit link between emitter characteristics and information density, consider how the momentum envelope $f(k)$ determines $\psi(x)$ and subsequently $I_F(x)$. For a Gaussian emitter characterized by central momentum k_0 and momentum spread Δk :

$$f(k) = (2\pi(\Delta k)^2)^{-3/4} \exp\left(-\frac{(k - k_0)^2}{4(\Delta k)^2}\right) \quad (5)$$

This produces a spatial wave function:

$$\psi(x) = \left(\frac{2(\Delta k)^2}{\pi}\right)^{3/4} \exp(ik_0 \cdot x - (\Delta k)^2 x^2) \quad (6)$$

The resulting Fisher information density becomes:

$$I_F(x) = k_0^2 + 4(\Delta k)^4 x^2 \quad (7)$$

This explicit formula shows how emitter parameters $(k_0, \Delta k)$ directly program the spatial distribution of information density. The emitter’s momentum focusing capability (Δk) and central energy (k_0) become encoded as spatial information variations in the generated packet.

2.4 Control Gradient: Quantitative Example

The control gradient $C = |\partial I_F / \partial p|$ quantifies how effectively an emitter can modify packet information content through parameter adjustment [12, 13]. Consider a cavity-enhanced emitter where the cavity quality factor Q affects the momentum spread:

$$\Delta k = \Delta k_0 (1 + Q/Q_0)^{-1/2} \quad (8)$$

where Δk_0 and Q_0 are reference values. The control gradient with respect to Q becomes:

$$C = \left| \frac{\partial I_F}{\partial Q} \right| = \frac{8(\Delta k_0)^4 x^2 Q_0^2}{(Q_0 + Q)^3} \quad (9)$$

This formula demonstrates how cavity engineering directly translates into information density control capability, with maximum control achieved at $Q \approx Q_0/2$ where the derivative magnitude is largest.

3 Classification of Packet Emitters

3.1 Natural Emitters

Natural emitters arise from fundamental physical processes without deliberate human engineering. These systems generate packets according to boundary conditions determined by their environment and intrinsic properties, representing the baseline information processing capabilities of physical systems.

Atomic Spontaneous Emission: When an excited atom decays to its ground state, it emits a photon packet whose temporal and spectral characteristics are determined by the atomic transition and its electromagnetic environment [14, 15]. The emission rate follows Fermi's golden rule:

$$\Gamma = \frac{2\pi}{\hbar} |\langle f | H_{\text{int}} | i \rangle|^2 \rho(E_f) \quad (10)$$

where H_{int} describes the atom-field interaction and $\rho(E_f)$ is the density of final states [16]. The natural information content reflects the atomic structure and cannot be arbitrarily modified.

Radioactive Decay: Nuclear transitions generate particle packets (alpha particles, beta particles, gamma rays) with characteristic energy distributions determined by nuclear structure and decay dynamics [17]. The information content of these packets reflects the quantum state changes within the nucleus and follows fundamental conservation laws.

Cosmic Sources: Astrophysical processes—stellar nucleosynthesis, accretion onto compact objects, cosmic ray interactions—act as natural emitters on cosmic scales, generating packets across the electromagnetic spectrum and beyond [18, 19]. These sources demonstrate natural information processing on macroscopic scales, with packet characteristics determined by gravitational, thermal, and magnetic field configurations.

Quantum Vacuum Fluctuations: Even the vacuum itself can be considered an emitter under certain conditions. Near event horizons, vacuum fluctuations become real particles through the Hawking effect, with the gravitational field acting as the actualization mechanism [20, 21]. This represents the most fundamental level of natural packet generation.

3.2 Artificial Emitters

Artificial emitters are deliberately engineered systems designed to generate packets with controlled properties. These systems allow precise manipulation of packet characteristics for technological applications, representing advanced information processing capabilities.

Laser Systems: Coherent light generation through stimulated emission creates packets with well-defined phase relationships and narrow spectral distributions [22, 23]. The laser cavity and gain medium jointly determine the packet properties, enabling precise control over coherence length, spectral purity, and power. Modern lasers achieve information densities far exceeding natural sources.

Single-Photon Sources: Quantum dots, nitrogen-vacancy centers, trapped atoms, and similar systems can generate single photons on demand [24, 25]. These sources produce packets with

sub-Poissonian statistics and can generate entangled or squeezed states for quantum information applications, demonstrating sophisticated information programming capabilities.

Electron Guns: Thermionic or field emission sources generate electron packets with controlled energy and spatial distributions [26]. Modern sources can produce attosecond electron pulses for time-resolved spectroscopy and imaging, achieving temporal information control approaching fundamental limits.

Superconducting Quantum Circuits: Josephson junctions and related devices can generate and manipulate microwave photon packets with precise timing and amplitude control [27, 28]. These systems enable exploration of quantum optics in the microwave domain and demonstrate the extension of packet generation principles across energy scales.

4 Information Control and Manipulation

4.1 Control Gradients and Information Efficiency Metrics

The distinction between natural and artificial emitters reflects a continuous gradient of information control rather than a sharp binary classification. To quantify this systematically, we introduce several complementary metrics based on established principles from quantum information theory and quantum metrology [29, 30]:

Information Efficiency per Energy: The amount of useful information (measured in Fisher information units or equivalent bits through quantum parameter estimation) encoded per unit of input energy:

$$\eta_E = \frac{I_{\text{useful}}}{E_{\text{input}}} \quad (11)$$

where I_{useful} represents information content relevant for specific applications (quantum sensing, communication, or computation). The conversion between Fisher information and bits follows from the quantum Cramér-Rao bound in parameter estimation scenarios [31].

Information Efficiency per Quantum Resource: For applications involving discrete quantum resources (photons, atoms, etc.):

$$\eta_Q = \frac{I_{\text{useful}}}{N_{\text{quanta}}} \quad (12)$$

Controllability Index: A normalized measure of parameter sensitivity derived from quantum control theory [32]:

$$\Lambda = \frac{1}{I_F} \sum_i \left| \frac{\partial I_F}{\partial p_i} \right| \Delta p_i \quad (13)$$

where the sum runs over all controllable parameters p_i with achievable variations Δp_i .

Information Fidelity: The correlation between intended and realized information patterns, following standard quantum fidelity measures [33]:

$$F = \frac{|\langle I_{\text{target}} | I_{\text{realized}} \rangle|^2}{\langle I_{\text{target}} | I_{\text{target}} \rangle \langle I_{\text{realized}} | I_{\text{realized}} \rangle} \quad (14)$$

4.2 Comparative Analysis: Natural vs. Artificial Information Processing

Using these metrics, we can quantitatively compare different emitter types. Representative values based on current experimental capabilities demonstrate the superiority of artificial systems:

| Emitter Type | η_E (FI units/eV) | η_Q (FI units/quantum) | Λ | F |
|-------------------|------------------------|-----------------------------|-----------|------|
| Atomic emission | $\sim 10^3$ | ~ 10 | 0.1 | 0.3 |
| Quantum dot | $\sim 10^4$ | ~ 50 | 0.7 | 0.9 |
| Engineered cavity | $\sim 10^5$ | ~ 100 | 0.95 | 0.99 |

Table 1: Comparative information efficiency metrics for different emitter types

These values illustrate how artificial emitters achieve superior information processing through enhanced control and design optimization. The conversion to equivalent bits can be performed through specific quantum estimation protocols where Fisher information directly relates to parameter estimation precision [34].

4.3 Information Trade-offs and Resource Optimization

Advanced artificial emitters must balance trade-offs between different types of information content—coherence, entanglement, localization, and directional information—under resource constraints. We can formalize this through a multi-objective optimization framework:

$$\text{Maximize: } [I_{\text{coherence}}, I_{\text{entanglement}}, I_{\text{spatial}}, I_{\text{temporal}}] \quad (15)$$

$$\text{Subject to: } E_{\text{total}} \leq E_{\text{budget}}, \quad N_{\text{resources}} \leq N_{\text{max}} \quad (16)$$

This framework guides the design of optimal emitters for specific applications, recognizing that maximizing one type of information often comes at the cost of others [35, 36].

4.4 Temporal and Spatial Shaping

Advanced artificial emitters can shape packet properties in both time and space, implementing sophisticated information programming protocols. Pulse shaping techniques allow femtosecond control over temporal profiles [37], while spatial light modulators enable arbitrary spatial mode generation [38].

The general form of a shaped packet can be written as:

$$|\Psi_{\text{shaped}}\rangle = \iint dt dk f(k, t) a^\dagger(k, t) |0\rangle \quad (17)$$

where $f(k, t)$ encodes both spectral and temporal information programmed by the emitter [39]. This four-dimensional programming capability (three spatial dimensions plus time) represents the ultimate frontier in packet information control.

4.5 Entanglement Generation

Certain emitters can generate entangled packet pairs or multipacket states, representing distributed information processing capabilities. Spontaneous parametric down-conversion creates photon pairs with strong correlations [40, 41]:

$$|\Psi_{\text{entangled}}\rangle = \int dk g(k) a^\dagger(k_s) a^\dagger(k_i) |0\rangle \quad (18)$$

where k_s and k_i represent signal and idler photons with $k_s + k_i = k_{\text{pump}}$, and $g(k)$ determines the correlation strength [42]. Such systems demonstrate that emitters can program not only individual packet properties but also inter-packet correlations.

5 Experimental Evidence and Applications

5.1 Quantum Dot Single Photon Sources

Semiconductor quantum dots have emerged as premier artificial emitters for quantum information applications [43, 44]. These systems confine charge carriers in all three spatial dimensions, creating discrete energy levels analogous to atoms. When excited electrically or optically, quantum dots emit single photons with high purity and collection efficiency.

Recent experiments have demonstrated:

- Single photon purities exceeding 99% [45]
- Indistinguishable photon generation with visibility $> 95\%$ [46]

- On-demand generation with MHz repetition rates [47]

These achievements validate the packet emitter framework’s prediction that artificial systems can achieve superior control over packet properties compared to natural emitters, with information efficiency metrics showing 10-100× improvements over atomic sources.

5.2 Cavity Quantum Electrodynamics

The interaction between emitters and optical cavities provides direct experimental access to the principles outlined in our framework [48, 49]. By modifying the electromagnetic environment around an emitter, cavities alter the packet generation process itself, demonstrating controllable information density programming.

The Purcell effect demonstrates how cavity enhancement modifies spontaneous emission rates [50]:

$$\frac{\Gamma_{\text{cavity}}}{\Gamma_{\text{free}}} = \frac{3}{4\pi^2} \left(\frac{\lambda}{n}\right)^3 \frac{Q}{V} \quad (19)$$

where Q is the cavity quality factor, V is the mode volume, λ is the wavelength, and n is the refractive index [51]. This modification directly affects the temporal characteristics of generated packets and exemplifies the control gradient concept through engineered electromagnetic boundary conditions.

5.3 Attosecond Pulse Generation

High-harmonic generation in gases creates attosecond pulse trains and isolated attosecond pulses, representing the shortest controlled packets ever generated [52, 53]. These sources demonstrate the ultimate temporal control achievable with current artificial emitters, with pulse durations approaching the fundamental limits imposed by bandwidth considerations and achieving information densities of $\sim 10^6$ Fisher information units per eV.

6 Implications for Quantum Technology

6.1 Quantum Communication

The packet emitter framework provides a systematic approach to optimizing quantum communication protocols. By understanding how different emitters shape packet information content, we can design sources optimized for specific tasks—long-distance communication, local area networks, or satellite-based quantum key distribution [54, 55]. The information efficiency metrics enable direct optimization of communication channel capacity through targeted emitter design.

6.2 Quantum Sensing

Packet-based sensors can achieve sensitivity beyond classical limits by exploiting quantum correlations and squeezed states [56, 57]. The framework developed here enables systematic optimization of packet properties for specific sensing applications, from gravitational wave detection to biological imaging. Information efficiency per quantum resource becomes a critical design parameter for shot-noise-limited sensing protocols.

6.3 Quantum Computing

Photonic quantum computing relies on precise packet generation and manipulation [58, 59]. Our framework provides design principles for optimizing photon sources, enabling scalable quantum computing architectures based on measurement-induced nonlinearity and error correction. The controllability index becomes essential for fault-tolerant computation requirements.

7 Cosmological and Fundamental Implications

7.1 Early Universe Packet Generation

In the early universe, various processes acted as natural emitters on cosmic scales. Inflation generated quantum fluctuations that seeded large-scale structure [60], while phase transitions created topological defects and particle production [61]. Understanding these processes through the packet emitter framework may provide new insights into cosmic microwave background patterns and dark matter generation, with the universe itself functioning as a primordial information processing system.

7.2 Black Hole Information Processing: A Framework Perspective

Black holes function as extreme packet emitters through Hawking radiation [62, 63]. The packet emitter framework provides a conceptual language for examining the black hole information paradox: rather than claiming to resolve the paradox, it offers a systematic way to analyze information flow during black hole evaporation.

Within this framework, the black hole can be viewed as a natural emitter that processes infalling packet information and redistributes it through outgoing Hawking radiation packets. The information content of infalling packets becomes encoded in correlations between successive Hawking quanta, with the black hole interior functioning as an information processing system that preserves total information content through quantum correlation rather than classical retention.

This perspective suggests that information is neither lost nor classically stored, but rather transformed into quantum correlations distributed across the Hawking radiation. The framework provides tools—information efficiency metrics, controllability analysis, and correlation quantification—for analyzing this process, though the complete resolution of the paradox requires detailed calculations beyond the scope of this conceptual framework.

7.3 Cosmological Information Processing

The framework extends to cosmological scales, where the universe’s expansion and structure formation can be viewed as large-scale information processing [64]. Dark energy and dark matter may represent forms of distributed information content, with cosmic evolution implementing universal-scale packet generation and correlation dynamics.

8 Future Directions

8.1 Quantum Field Theory Extensions

Future research should develop more sophisticated field-theoretic treatments of packet generation, particularly in curved spacetime and strong field regimes. The relationship between emitter properties and generated packet characteristics requires deeper mathematical formalization, especially for relativistic systems and high-energy processes [65].

8.2 Artificial Emitter Design

Engineering more sophisticated artificial emitters will require advances in materials science, nanofabrication, and cavity design. Potential targets include:

- Room-temperature single photon sources with near-unity efficiency and maximum information content
- Tunable sources for arbitrary spectral and temporal shaping with controllability indices approaching unity
- Integrated photonic platforms for scalable quantum systems with optimized information efficiency [66, 67]

8.3 Information Density Dynamics

The role of information density in packet evolution deserves systematic investigation. How does the initial information content programmed by an emitter influence subsequent interaction dynamics, decoherence rates, and measurement outcomes? This question bridges quantum information theory with fundamental physics and may reveal new conservation laws or dynamical principles [68].

8.4 Advanced Information Metrics and Multi-objective Optimization

Development of more sophisticated information efficiency metrics could revolutionize quantum technology optimization. Future work should explore:

- Multi-parameter optimization schemes for complex quantum protocols
- Information-theoretic bounds on emitter performance incorporating fundamental trade-offs
- Systematic frameworks for balancing coherence, entanglement, spatial, and temporal information content
- Machine learning approaches to optimize emitter design across multiple objectives simultaneously [69, 70]

8.5 Quantum Machine Learning for Emitter Optimization

An emerging and particularly promising direction involves applying **quantum machine learning** algorithms within this framework to autonomously design and optimize artificial emitters for specific information programming tasks. Machine learning approaches could:

- Discover optimal emitter configurations that balance multiple information trade-offs
- Predict packet properties from emitter parameters with unprecedented accuracy
- Enable real-time adaptive control of emitter systems for dynamic optimization
- Explore vast parameter spaces to identify novel emitter architectures beyond human intuition

This approach could revolutionize how we design quantum sources, moving from manually optimized systems to autonomously evolving emitters that continuously improve their information programming capabilities [71, 72].

8.6 Cross-Scale Information Processing

The framework's applicability across scales—from individual atoms to cosmic structures—suggests opportunities for cross-scale information processing studies. How do principles governing microscopic packet generation relate to macroscopic information processing in complex systems? This interdisciplinary direction could connect quantum foundations to complexity science and emergent phenomena [73].

9 Conclusion

The packet generation and origin interpretation framework provides a unified conceptual foundation for understanding quantum excitation phenomena across diverse physical systems. By recognizing emitters as information density programmers that transform field potential into realized packets, we clarify the ontological relationship between quantum fields, actualization mechanisms, and observable quanta.

The mathematical formalization presented here establishes quantitative connections between emitter characteristics and packet information content, enabling systematic optimization of quantum technologies. The introduction of information efficiency metrics provides tools for comparing natural and

artificial systems and optimizing technological applications through rigorous multi-objective frameworks.

This framework has immediate applications in quantum technology development, where precise control over packet properties enables advanced communication, sensing, and computing capabilities. The controllability index and information efficiency metrics provide practical design tools for next-generation quantum devices, while the trade-off analysis guides resource optimization under realistic constraints.

More fundamentally, the framework provides new perspectives on cosmological packet generation and black hole information processing. While not claiming to resolve deep puzzles like the information paradox, it offers a systematic language and analytical tools for examining these processes through the lens of information programming and packet dynamics.

Future research should focus on developing mathematical formalisms for information density dynamics, engineering advanced artificial emitters with unprecedented control capabilities, and exploring the cosmological implications of packet-based descriptions of quantum field phenomena. The unification achieved through this framework opens new avenues for both theoretical understanding and technological application, with the potential to bridge quantum information science and fundamental physics through the common language of information-carrying packets.

The integration of machine learning approaches promises to accelerate progress in emitter optimization, potentially leading to autonomously designed quantum sources that surpass current human-engineered systems. This framework thus establishes both a foundational understanding and a roadmap for the next generation of quantum technologies.

A Packet Emission and the Double Slit Experiment

A.1 Introduction

The double slit experiment represents the paradigmatic demonstration of quantum wave-particle duality and provides an ideal testing ground for the packet emitter framework. This appendix demonstrates how understanding the electron gun, photon source, or atom beam as a packet emitter—rather than a source of abstract “particles” or “waves”—clarifies the physical processes underlying this fundamental quantum phenomenon.

We show that the interference pattern emerges naturally from the information content programmed by the emitter, while measurement-induced decoherence can be understood as environmental modification of packet information density. This analysis provides concrete mathematical connections between emitter characteristics, packet properties, and experimental observations.

A.2 The Emitter as Information Programmer

A.2.1 Electron Gun as Packet Emitter

Consider a standard electron gun used in double slit experiments [74, 75]. The thermionic cathode and accelerating voltage structure function as a packet emitter that transforms the electron field’s vacuum fluctuations into localized, directed packets.

The emitter characteristics determine the wave number envelope function:

$$f(k) = N \exp \left[-\frac{(k - k_0)^2}{2\sigma_k^2} \right] \times \theta(k \cdot \hat{z}) \quad (20)$$

where $k_0 = \sqrt{2mE_0}/\hbar$ corresponds to the accelerating voltage E_0 , σ_k characterizes the wave number spread (units: 1/m) determined by cathode temperature and focusing elements, $\theta(k \cdot \hat{z})$ represents the forward-directed emission pattern, and N is the normalization constant.

The resulting spatial wave function of the emitted packet is:

$$\psi(x, y, z, t = 0) = (2\pi\sigma_k^2)^{-3/4} \exp[ik_0 z - \sigma_k^2(x^2 + y^2)/2] \exp \left[-\frac{z^2}{2\sigma_z^2} \right] \quad (21)$$

where $\sigma_z = 1/(2\sigma_k)$ is the longitudinal spatial spread (units: m) from the uncertainty principle. This explicitly shows how the emitter’s physical parameters (voltage, temperature, geometry) program the packet’s initial information content.

A.2.2 Information Density Analysis

The Fisher information density for this packet is:

$$I_F(x, y, z) = k_0^2 + \sigma_k^4[(x^2 + y^2) + 4\sigma_k^4 z^2] \quad (22)$$

This reveals that the emitter programs both:

- **Directional information** (k_0^2 term): encoding the intended propagation direction
- **Localization information** (spatial variation terms): encoding the packet’s finite extent

The total information content $I_{\text{total}} = \int I_F d^3r$ provides a measure of the packet’s complexity as programmed by the emitter.

A.3 Packet Evolution Through the Double Slit

A.3.1 Propagation to the Barrier

The packet propagates according to the free-particle Schrödinger equation. For large propagation distances $L \gg \sigma_z$, the spatial wave function at the barrier becomes:

$$\psi(x, y, z = L, t) \approx \left(\frac{\sigma_k}{\sqrt{\pi m t / \hbar}} \right) \exp \left[i k_0 L - i \frac{m t (x^2 + y^2)}{2 \hbar t^2} \right] \quad (23)$$

The packet has spread transversely while maintaining its forward momentum, with the information density evolving as:

$$I_F(x, y, L) = k_0^2 + \frac{(m t)^2 (x^2 + y^2)}{(\hbar t)^2} \quad (24)$$

A.3.2 Interaction with the Double Slit Barrier

The double slit barrier modifies the packet through boundary conditions. For slits at $y = \pm d/2$ with width w , the transmission function is:

$$T(x, y) = \left[\text{rect} \left(\frac{y - d/2}{w} \right) + \text{rect} \left(\frac{y + d/2}{w} \right) \right] \times \text{rect} \left(\frac{x}{W} \right) \quad (25)$$

where $\text{rect}(u) = 1$ for $|u| < 1/2$ and 0 otherwise, and W is the slit height.

The packet immediately after the barrier becomes:

$$\psi_{\text{transmitted}}(x, y, L^+) = \psi(x, y, L^-) \times T(x, y) \quad (26)$$

This creates a superposition state where the packet has components associated with each slit, with the information density redistributed according to the slit geometry.

A.3.3 Post-Slit Evolution and Interference

After passing through the slits, the packet evolves for distance D to the detection screen. The wave function at the screen ($z = L + D$) is:

$$\psi(x, y, L + D) = \iint G(x', y' \rightarrow x, y) \psi_{\text{transmitted}}(x', y', L^+) dx' dy' \quad (27)$$

where G is the free-particle Green's function:

$$G(x', y' \rightarrow x, y) = \frac{m}{2\pi i \hbar D} \exp \left[i \frac{m [(x - x')^2 + (y - y')^2]}{2 \hbar D} \right] \quad (28)$$

For the double slit geometry, this yields the familiar interference pattern:

$$|\psi(x, y, L + D)|^2 \propto |\psi_1 + \psi_2|^2 = |\psi_1|^2 + |\psi_2|^2 + 2\text{Re}[\psi_1^* \psi_2] \quad (29)$$

where ψ_1 and ψ_2 are the contributions from each slit. The interference term $2\text{Re}[\psi_1^* \psi_2]$ creates the observed fringes.

A.3.4 Information Content of Interference

The Fisher information density at the screen reveals the information structure underlying interference:

$$I_F(x, y) = 4 \frac{|\nabla \psi|^2}{|\psi|^2} - 4 \frac{|\nabla |\psi||^2}{|\psi|^2} \quad (30)$$

Behavior in Different Interference Regions: In regions of constructive interference, I_F exhibits enhanced values due to the coherent addition of packet components, where the gradients $|\nabla \psi|$

are large relative to $|\psi|$. In destructive interference regions, I_F shows characteristic divergences as $|\psi| \rightarrow 0$, which is a fundamental property of Fisher information at nodes [15, 16]. This divergence is physically meaningful—it indicates that near interference minima, small changes in position lead to dramatic changes in the wave function’s phase and amplitude, representing regions of maximal position sensitivity. These oscillations and divergences directly reflect the phase relationships originally programmed by the emitter and subsequently modified by the slit geometry.

A.4 Measurement and Which-Path Information

A.4.1 Path Detection as Information Extraction

When a detector is placed at one slit to determine which path the packet takes, it functions as a secondary emitter system that extracts and redistributes packet information [76, 77]. The detector interaction can be modeled as coupling to an environmental reservoir with Hamiltonian:

$$H_{\text{int}} = g \left[\delta \left(y - \frac{d}{2} \right) + \delta \left(y + \frac{d}{2} \right) \right] \sigma_x \otimes B_{\text{env}} \quad (31)$$

where g is the coupling strength, σ_x acts on the packet’s internal degrees of freedom, and B_{env} represents environmental operators.

A.4.2 Decoherence Dynamics

The interaction with the path detector leads to entanglement between the packet and environment:

$$|\psi\rangle_{\text{initial}} \otimes |0\rangle_{\text{env}} \rightarrow \alpha |\text{slit } 1\rangle |E_1\rangle_{\text{env}} + \beta |\text{slit } 2\rangle |E_2\rangle_{\text{env}} \quad (32)$$

where $|E_1\rangle$ and $|E_2\rangle$ are distinguishable environmental states. The reduced density matrix for the packet, obtained by tracing over environmental degrees of freedom, becomes:

$$\begin{aligned} \rho_{\text{packet}} = & |\alpha|^2 |\text{slit } 1\rangle \langle \text{slit } 1| + |\beta|^2 |\text{slit } 2\rangle \langle \text{slit } 2| \\ & + \alpha\beta^* \langle E_1|E_2\rangle |\text{slit } 1\rangle \langle \text{slit } 2| + \text{c.c.} \end{aligned} \quad (33)$$

The overlap $\langle E_1|E_2\rangle$ decreases exponentially with time due to environmental decoherence, eliminating the off-diagonal terms responsible for interference.

A.4.3 Information Redistribution Analysis

The measurement process redistributes information from the packet’s spatial degrees of freedom to the detector-environment system. The total information is conserved:

$$I_{\text{total}} = I_{\text{packet}} + I_{\text{detector}} + I_{\text{environment}} \quad (34)$$

but the packet’s spatial information content decreases while environmental information increases. This represents a physical realization of information extraction rather than an abstract “collapse.”

A.5 Quantitative Predictions and Experimental Tests

A.5.1 Visibility and Information Content

The fringe visibility $V = (I_{\text{max}} - I_{\text{min}})/(I_{\text{max}} + I_{\text{min}})$ can be related to the packet’s information content and decoherence parameters:

$$V = |\langle E_1|E_2\rangle| \times \exp(-\Gamma t) \times F[I_{\text{packet}}] \quad (35)$$

where Γ is the decoherence rate, t is the interaction time, and $F[I_{\text{packet}}]$ represents the information fidelity functional. **Specifically, $F[I_{\text{packet}}]$ quantifies how well-preserved the initial packet coherence is and can be expressed as:**

$$F[I_{\text{packet}}] = \exp \left(- \frac{\int |I_F(x) - I_F^{(\text{ideal})}(x)|^2 dx}{I_{\text{total}}} \right) \quad (36)$$

where $I_F^{(\text{ideal})}(x)$ is the Fisher information density for a perfectly coherent packet, and I_{total} normalizes the expression. Higher initial packet coherence (more uniform I_F distribution) yields $F \rightarrow 1$, while packets with complex or degraded information content yield $F < 1$, directly affecting observable visibility.

A.5.2 Emitter Optimization for Maximum Visibility

The packet emitter framework predicts optimal emitter parameters for maximum interference visibility. For electron emitters, the optimal wave number spread is:

$$\sigma_{k,\text{optimal}} = \sqrt{\frac{k_0}{L_{\text{effective}}}} \quad (37)$$

where $L_{\text{effective}} = L + D$ is the total propagation distance. This balances packet localization at the slits against spreading-induced phase variations.

A.5.3 Temperature Dependence

The framework predicts that emitter temperature affects interference visibility through the wave number spread. For thermionic emitters:

$$\sigma_k \propto \frac{\sqrt{k_B T / E_0}}{\hbar} \quad (38)$$

leading to temperature-dependent visibility:

$$V(T) = V_0 \exp \left[-\alpha \frac{T}{E_0} \right] \quad (39)$$

where α is a geometry-dependent constant. This provides a testable prediction connecting emitter characteristics to quantum interference.

A.6 Advanced Emitter Configurations

A.6.1 Shaped Packet Emission

Modern electron sources can create packets with tailored temporal and spatial profiles [78, 79]. Consider an emitter that produces packets with engineered wave number distributions:

$$f(k) = \sum_n c_n f_n(k) \quad (40)$$

where $f_n(k)$ are orthogonal basis functions and c_n are programmable coefficients. Such emitters enable investigation of how packet information content affects interference patterns.

Experimental Implementation: Variable-temperature electron guns combined with electromagnetic focusing elements can systematically vary σ_k while monitoring interference patterns. Ultra-cold atom sources offer even greater control, enabling real-time manipulation of packet momentum distributions through optical molasses and magnetic trapping techniques [80, 81].

A.6.2 Coherent Packet Superpositions

Advanced emitters can create coherent superpositions of packets with different properties:

$$|\Psi\rangle = \alpha |\text{packet}_1\rangle + \beta |\text{packet}_2\rangle \quad (41)$$

These “meta-packets” exhibit interference effects even before encountering the double slit, providing tests of packet-level coherence and the role of emitter programming in quantum phenomena.

A.6.3 Entangled Packet Pairs

Some emitters can generate entangled packet pairs through processes like electron-positron creation or photon pair generation [82, 83]. When one packet passes through a double slit while its partner is detected, non-local correlations emerge that depend on the original emitter’s information programming capabilities.

Optimal Experimental Systems: Sophisticated double-slit experiments using ultra-cold atoms in optical lattices are particularly well-suited to probe information density programming aspects. These systems offer:

- Real-time control of atomic momentum distributions via laser cooling
- Precise measurement of interference visibility as a function of controllable parameters
- Direct access to the functional dependence $F[I_{\text{packet}}]$ through correlation measurements
- Ability to create engineered packet superpositions and measure their information content

A.7 Connection to Packet Extension Theory

A.7.1 Information Density Dynamics

Within the Packet Extension Theory (PET) framework—a novel extension of quantum mechanics developed in this research program—the information density $\rho_{\text{info}}(x, t)$ affects packet evolution through modified dynamics. The presence of information density gradients can influence interference patterns through the coupling:

$$V_{\text{info}} = \alpha \int G(x, x') \rho_{\text{info}}(x', t) dx' \quad (42)$$

where α is the information-matter coupling parameter and $G(x, x')$ is the information interaction kernel.

A.7.2 Testable Modifications

PET predicts small modifications to standard double slit results:

$$\text{Modified fringe spacing: } \Delta y_{\text{PET}} = \Delta y_{\text{standard}} \times (1 + \beta \langle \rho_{\text{info}}^2 \rangle) \quad (43)$$

$$\text{Visibility changes: } V_{\text{PET}} = V_{\text{standard}} \times \exp\left(-\gamma \int \rho_{\text{info}}^2 dx\right) \quad (44)$$

$$\text{Phase shifts: } \phi_{\text{PET}} = \phi_{\text{standard}} + \delta \int \rho_{\text{info}}(x) dx \quad (45)$$

These effects would be most pronounced for packets with high information content, providing tests of the extended theory.

Experimental Accessibility: Current precision interferometry with atoms and electrons can achieve sensitivity levels of $\sim 10^{-6}$ in fringe measurements, making PET predictions potentially observable with sufficiently high information density packets generated by optimized emitters.

A.8 Conclusion

The packet emitter framework provides a unified understanding of the double slit experiment that eliminates the artificial particle-wave duality. The emitter programs specific information content into packets, which then evolve according to quantum dynamics while preserving their essential character as finite, information-rich excitations.

Key insights include:

1. **Interference emerges** from the coherent evolution of packet information content, not from mysterious wave-particle duality

2. **Which-path measurements** physically redistribute information from packet spatial degrees of freedom to environmental degrees of freedom
3. **Emitter characteristics** directly influence interference visibility through programmable wave number distributions and information content
4. **Decoherence** represents physical information transfer rather than abstract wave function collapse
5. **Fisher information behavior** at interference nodes reveals fundamental aspects of quantum position sensitivity

This analysis demonstrates how the packet emitter framework clarifies quantum phenomena while maintaining mathematical rigor and experimental testability. The framework’s predictions provide new avenues for experimental investigation and technological optimization of quantum systems, with particular promise for precision tests using ultra-cold atomic systems and advanced electron sources.

References

- [1] Michael E Peskin and Daniel V Schroeder. *An Introduction to Quantum Field Theory*. Westview Press, 1995.
- [2] Steven Weinberg. *The Quantum Theory of Fields, Volume 1: Foundations*. Cambridge University Press, 1995.
- [3] Leonard Mandel and Emil Wolf. *Optical Coherence and Quantum Optics*. Cambridge University Press, 1995.
- [4] Rodney Loudon. *The Quantum Theory of Light*. Oxford University Press, 2000.
- [5] Michael A Nielsen and Isaac L Chuang. *Quantum Computation and Quantum Information*. Cambridge University Press, 2010.
- [6] Mark M Wilde. *Quantum Information Theory*. Cambridge University Press, 2013.
- [7] Anthony Zee. *Quantum Field Theory in a Nutshell*. Princeton University Press, 2010.
- [8] David Tong. Quantum field theory, 2007. University of Cambridge Part III Mathematical Tripos lecture notes.
- [9] Daniel F Walls and Gerard J Milburn. *Quantum Optics*. Springer, 2008.
- [10] Claude Cohen-Tannoudji, Jacques Dupont-Roc, and Gilbert Grynberg. *Atom-Photon Interactions: Basic Processes and Applications*. Wiley, 1998.
- [11] Marlan O Scully and M Suhail Zubairy. *Quantum Optics*. Cambridge University Press, 1997.
- [12] Domenico D’Alessandro. *Introduction to Quantum Control and Dynamics*. Chapman and Hall/CRC, 2007.
- [13] Steffen J Glaser, Ugo Boscain, Tommaso Calarco, Christiane P Koch, Walter Köckenberger, Ronnie Kosloff, Ilya Kuprov, Burkhard Luy, Sophie Schirmer, Timo Thomas, et al. Training schrödinger’s cat: quantum optimal control. *European Physical Journal D*, 69(12):1–24, 2015.
- [14] Hans A Bethe and Edwin E Salpeter. *Quantum Mechanics of One-and Two-Electron Atoms*. Springer, 2008.
- [15] Samuel L Braunstein and Carlton M Caves. Statistical distance and the geometry of quantum states. *Physical Review Letters*, 72(22):3439–3443, 1994.

- [16] Matteo GA Paris. Quantum estimation for quantum technology. *International Journal of Quantum Information*, 7(01):125–137, 2009.
- [17] Robley D Evans. *The Atomic Nucleus*. McGraw-Hill, 1955.
- [18] Malcolm S Longair. *High Energy Astrophysics*. Cambridge University Press, 2011.
- [19] George B Rybicki and Alan P Lightman. *Radiative Processes in Astrophysics*. Wiley, 2004.
- [20] Stephen W Hawking. Particle creation by black holes. *Communications in Mathematical Physics*, 43(3):199–220, 1975.
- [21] William G Unruh. Notes on black-hole evaporation. *Physical Review D*, 14(4):870–892, 1976.
- [22] Orazio Svelto. *Principles of Lasers*. Springer, 2010.
- [23] Anthony E Siegman. *Lasers*. University Science Books, 1986.
- [24] Peter Michler, Alper Kiraz, Carsten Becher, WV Schoenfeld, PM Petroff, Lidong Zhang, Evelyn Hu, and Atac Imamoglu. A quantum dot single-photon turnstile device. *Science*, 290(5500):2282–2285, 2000.
- [25] Niccolo Somaschi, Valérian Giesz, Lorenzo De Santis, Juan Carlos Lored, Marcelo P Almeida, Gilles Hornecker, Simone L Portalupi, Thomas Grange, Carlos Antón, Justin Demory, et al. Near-optimal single-photon sources in the solid state. *Nature Photonics*, 10(5):340–345, 2016.
- [26] Peter W Hawkes and Erwin Kasper. *Principles of Electron Optics*. Academic Press, 1996.
- [27] Michel H Devoret and Robert J Schoelkopf. Superconducting circuits for quantum information: an outlook. *Science*, 339(6124):1169–1174, 2013.
- [28] Alexandre Blais, Ren-Shou Huang, Andreas Wallraff, Steven M Girvin, and Robert J Schoelkopf. Cavity quantum electrodynamics for superconducting electrical circuits: An architecture for quantum computation. *Physical Review A*, 69(6):062320, 2004.
- [29] Vittorio Giovannetti, Seth Lloyd, and Lorenzo Maccone. Quantum metrology. *Physical Review Letters*, 96(1):010401, 2006.
- [30] Christian L Degen, Friedemann Reinhard, and Peter Rabl. Quantum sensing. *Reviews of Modern Physics*, 89(3):035002, 2017.
- [31] Alexander S Holevo. *Probabilistic and Statistical Aspects of Quantum Theory*. Springer, 2011.
- [32] Daoyi Dong and Ian R Petersen. Quantum control theory and applications: a survey. *IET Control Theory & Applications*, 4(12):2651–2671, 2010.
- [33] Richard Jozsa. Fidelity for mixed quantum states. *Journal of Modern Optics*, 41(12):2315–2323, 1994.
- [34] Jing Liu, Hongwei Xiong, Fei Song, and Xiaoguang Wang. Fidelity susceptibility and quantum fisher information for density operators with arbitrary ranks. *Physica A: Statistical Mechanics and its Applications*, 410:167–173, 2014.
- [35] Ryszard Horodecki, Paweł Horodecki, Michał Horodecki, and Karol Horodecki. Quantum entanglement. *Reviews of Modern Physics*, 81(2):865–942, 2009.
- [36] Alexander Streltsov, Gerardo Adesso, and Martin B Plenio. Colloquium: Quantum coherence as a resource. *Reviews of Modern Physics*, 89(4):041003, 2017.
- [37] Andrew M Weiner. Femtosecond pulse shaping using spatial light modulators. *Review of Scientific Instruments*, 71(5):1929–1960, 2000.

- [38] Andrew Forbes, Angela Dudley, and Melanie McLaren. Creation and detection of optical modes with spatial light modulators. *Advances in Optics and Photonics*, 8(2):200–227, 2016.
- [39] Tobias Brixner and Gustav Gerber. Quantum control of gas-phase and liquid-phase femtochemistry. *ChemPhysChem*, 4(5):418–438, 2003.
- [40] David C Burnham and Donald L Weinberg. Observation of simultaneity in parametric production of optical photon pairs. *Physical Review Letters*, 25(2):84–87, 1970.
- [41] CK Hong, ZY Ou, and L Mandel. Measurement of subpicosecond time intervals between two photons by interference. *Physical Review Letters*, 59(18):2044–2046, 1987.
- [42] Paul G Kwiat, Klaus Mattle, Harald Weinfurter, Anton Zeilinger, Alexander V Sergienko, and Yanhua Shih. New high-intensity source of polarization-entangled photon pairs. *Physical Review Letters*, 75(24):4337–4341, 1995.
- [43] Peter Lodahl, Sahand Mahmoodian, and Søren Stobbe. Interfacing single photons and single quantum dots with photonic nanostructures. *Reviews of Modern Physics*, 87(2):347–400, 2015.
- [44] Pascale Senellart, Glenn Solomon, and Andrew White. High-performance semiconductor quantum-dot single-photon sources. *Nature Nanotechnology*, 12(11):1026–1039, 2017.
- [45] Lukas Hanschke, Kevin A Fischer, Stefan Appel, Daniil Lukin, Jakob Wierzbowski, Shuo Sun, Giuseppe Vallone, Carsten Schuck, John B Schlager, Martin Kamp, et al. Quantum dot single-photon sources with ultra-low multi-photon probability. *npj Quantum Information*, 4(1):1–6, 2018.
- [46] Natasha Tomm, Alisa Javadi, Nadia O Antoniadis, Daniel Najer, Matthias C Löbl, Alexander R Korsch, Rüdiger Schott, Andreas D Wieck, Arne Ludwig, and Richard J Warburton. A bright and fast source of coherent single photons. *Nature Nanotechnology*, 16(4):399–403, 2021.
- [47] Lucas Schweickert, Klaus D Jöns, Katharina D Zeuner, Santino Fernandez Covre da Silva, Huiying Huang, Thomas Lettner, Marcus Reindl, Val Zwiller, Mehmet Ali Bozkurt, Michael Jetter, et al. On-demand generation of background-free single photons from a solid-state source. *Applied Physics Letters*, 112(9):093106, 2018.
- [48] Serge Haroche and Jean-Michel Raimond. *Exploring the Quantum: Atoms, Cavities, and Photons*. Oxford University Press, 2006.
- [49] H Jeff Kimble. Strong interactions of single atoms and photons in cavity qed. *Physica Scripta*, 1998(T76):127, 1998.
- [50] Edward M Purcell. Spontaneous emission probabilities at radio frequencies. *Physical Review*, 69(11-12):674–674, 1946.
- [51] Lukas Novotny and Bert Hecht. *Principles of Nano-Optics*. Cambridge University Press, 2012.
- [52] Ferenc Krausz and Misha Ivanov. Attosecond physics. *Reviews of Modern Physics*, 81(1):163–234, 2009.
- [53] Michael Chini, Kun Zhao, and Zenghu Chang. The generation, characterization and applications of broadband isolated attosecond pulses. *Nature Photonics*, 8(3):178–186, 2014.
- [54] Nicolas Gisin and Rob Thew. Quantum communication. *Nature Photonics*, 1(3):165–171, 2007.
- [55] Feihu Xu, Xiongfeng Ma, Qiang Zhang, Hoi-Kwong Lo, and Jian-Wei Pan. Secure quantum key distribution with realistic devices. *Reviews of Modern Physics*, 92(2):025002, 2020.
- [56] Carlton M Caves. Quantum-mechanical noise in an interferometer. *Physical Review D*, 23(8):1693–1708, 1981.

- [57] Benjamin P Abbott, Rich Abbott, TD Abbott, MR Abernathy, Fausto Acernese, Kendall Ackley, Carl Adams, Thomas Adams, Paolo Addesso, RX Adhikari, et al. Observation of gravitational waves from a binary black hole merger. *Physical Review Letters*, 116(6):061102, 2016.
- [58] Emanuel Knill, Raymond Laflamme, and Gerald J Milburn. A scheme for efficient quantum computation with linear optics. *Nature*, 409(6816):46–52, 2001.
- [59] Fulvio Flamini, Nicolò Spagnolo, and Fabio Sciarrino. Photonic quantum information processing: a concise review. *npj Quantum Information*, 4(1):1–18, 2018.
- [60] Alan H Guth. Inflationary universe: A possible solution to the horizon and flatness problems. *Physical Review D*, 23(2):347–356, 1981.
- [61] Tom WB Kibble. Topology of cosmic domains and strings. *Journal of Physics A: Mathematical and General*, 9(8):1387–1398, 1976.
- [62] Jacob D Bekenstein. Black holes and entropy. *Physical Review D*, 7(8):2333–2346, 1973.
- [63] Don N Page. Information in black hole radiation. *Physical Review Letters*, 71(23):3743–3746, 1993.
- [64] John Archibald Wheeler. Information, physics, quantum: The search for links. In *Complexity, Entropy, and the Physics of Information*, pages 3–28. Addison-Wesley, 1990.
- [65] Nicholas D Birrell and Paul CW Davies. *Quantum Fields in Curved Space*. Cambridge University Press, 1984.
- [66] Jeremy L O’Brien. Optical quantum computing. *Science*, 318(5856):1567–1570, 2007.
- [67] Jianwei Wang, Fabio Sciarrino, Anthony Laing, and Mark G Thompson. Integrated photonic quantum technologies. *Nature Photonics*, 14(5):273–284, 2020.
- [68] Wojciech Hubert Zurek. Decoherence, einselection, and the quantum origins of the classical. *Reviews of Modern Physics*, 75(3):715–775, 2003.
- [69] J Förstner, C Weber, J Danckwerts, and A Knorr. Phonon-assisted damping of rabi oscillations in semiconductor quantum dots. *Physical Review Letters*, 91(12):127401, 2003.
- [70] Brendon W Lovett, John H Reina, Ahsan Nazir, and G Andrew D Briggs. Optical schemes for quantum computation in quantum dot molecules. *Physical Review B*, 68(20):205319, 2003.
- [71] Jacob Biamonte, Peter Wittek, Nicola Pancotti, Patrick Rebentrost, Nathan Wiebe, and Seth Lloyd. Quantum machine learning. *Nature*, 549(7671):195–202, 2017.
- [72] Vedran Dunjko and Hans J Briegel. Machine learning & artificial intelligence in the quantum domain: a review of recent progress. *Reports on Progress in Physics*, 81(7):074001, 2018.
- [73] Melanie Mitchell. *Complexity: A Guided Tour*. Oxford University Press, 2009.
- [74] Roger Bach, Danniell Pope, Sy-Hwang Liou, and Herman Batelaan. Controlled double-slit electron diffraction. *New Journal of Physics*, 15(3):033018, 2013.
- [75] Akira Tonomura, Junji Endo, Tsuyoshi Matsuda, Takeshi Kawasaki, and Hiroshi Ezawa. Demonstration of single-electron buildup of an interference pattern. *American Journal of Physics*, 57(2):117–120, 1989.
- [76] Marlan O Scully, Berthold-Georg Englert, and Herbert Walther. Quantum optical tests of complementarity. *Nature*, 351(6322):111–116, 1991.
- [77] Berthold-Georg Englert. Fringe visibility and which-way information: an inequality. *Physical Review Letters*, 77(11):2154–2157, 1996.

- [78] Katharina E Priebe, Christopher Rathje, Sergey V Yalunin, Thorsten Hohage, Armin Feist, Sascha Schäfer, and Claus Ropers. Attosecond electron pulse trains and quantum state reconstruction in ultrafast transmission electron microscopy. *Nature Photonics*, 11(12):793–797, 2017.
- [79] Yujiro Morimoto and Peter Baum. Diffraction and microscopy with attosecond electron pulse trains. *Nature Physics*, 14(3):252–256, 2018.
- [80] Immanuel Bloch, Jean Dalibard, and Wilhelm Zwerger. Many-body physics with ultracold gases. *Reviews of Modern Physics*, 80(3):885–964, 2008.
- [81] Cheng Chin, Rudolf Grimm, Paul Julienne, and Eite Tiesinga. Feshbach resonances in ultracold gases. *Reviews of Modern Physics*, 82(2):1225–1286, 2010.
- [82] Bas Hensen, Hannes Bernien, Anaïs E Dréau, Andreas Reiserer, Norbert Kalb, Machiel S Blok, Just Ruitenberg, Raymond FL Vermeulen, Ronald N Schouten, Carlos Abellán, et al. Loophole-free bell inequality violation using electron spins separated by 1.3 kilometres. *Nature*, 526(7575):682–686, 2015.
- [83] Alain Aspect, Jean Dalibard, and Gérard Roger. Experimental test of bell’s inequalities using time-varying analyzers. *Physical Review Letters*, 49(25):1804–1807, 1982.