



Seeing the quantum

The human eye is a surprisingly good photospY of the line between the quantum and c

Rebecca Holmes

I spent a lot of time in the dark in graduate school. Not just because I was learning we usually deal with one particle of light or *photon* at a time – but because my measurement tool. I was studying how humans perceive the smallest amounts of

every time.

I conducted these experiments in a closet-sized room on the eighth floor of the University of Illinois, working alongside my graduate advisor, Paul Kwiat, and psychologists equipped with special blackout curtains and a sealed door to achieve total darkness. For hours in that room, sitting in an uncomfortable chair with my head supported in a device with crosshairs, and waiting for tiny flashes delivered by the most precise light source I could find. My goal was to quantify <<https://www.sciencedirect.com/science/article/pii/S0037073200000000>> I (and other volunteer observers) perceived flashes of light from a few hundred

As individual particles of light, photons belong to the world of quantum mechanics, not the Universe we know. Physics professors tell students with a straight face that *(quantum superposition* <<https://aeon.co/videos/the-physics-revolution-that-still-shocks-us>> that a measurement on one photon can instantly affect another, far-away photon <<https://aeon.co/ideas/you-thought-quantum-mechanics-was-weird-but-we-accept-these-incredible-ideas-so-casually-because-we-usually-dont-have-to-invent-it>> we accept these incredible ideas so casually because we usually don't have to invent them. An electron can be in two places at once; a soccer ball cannot.

But photons are quantum particles that human beings can, in fact, directly perceive. We could force the quantum world to become visible, and we don't have to wait around for today's technology. The eye is a unique biological measurement device, and deep research where we truly don't know what we might find. Studying what we see in a quantum state could contribute to our understanding of the boundary between the quantum world and the observer might even participate in a test of the strangest consequences of quantum mechanics.

The human visual system works surprisingly well as a quantum detector. It's the eyeball to the brain, that turns light into the images we perceive. Humans are the primary types of living light detectors: rod cells and cone cells. These photoreceptors are in a light-sensitive layer at the back of the eyeball. The cone cells provide colour vision well. The rod cells see only in black-and-white, but they are tuned for night vision and can see about half an hour in darkness.

Rod cells are so sensitive that they can be activated by a single photon. One photon has a few electron-volts of energy. (Even a flying mosquito has tens of *billions* of electron-volts of energy.) A chain reaction and feedback loop inside the rod cell amplifies this tiny signal in the language of the neurons.

We know that rods are single-photon detectors because the electrical response was measured in the lab. What remained unknown until recently was whether these rods are single-photon detectors and cause an observer to see anything, or whether they're just noise. It was a difficult question to answer because the right tools didn't exist. The light from neon lights is a random stream of photons, like raindrops falling from the sky. The next photon will come, or exactly how many photons will arrive in any time interval. This fact makes it impossible to be sure that a human observer is really seeing just one or three instead.

There are now two possible experiments that could be in the realm of human perception

Over the past 75 years or so, researchers have come up with clever ways to try to solve this problem. But in the late 1980s, a new field called quantum optics developed a new source. This was a new kind of light that the world had never seen before, and it delivered exactly one photon at a time. Instead of a rainstorm, we now had an eyedropper.

Today there are many recipes for making single photons, including trapped atoms and diamond crystals. My favourite recipe, which I learned as a graduate student, is called *downconversion*. Step one: take a laser and shine it on a beta-barium borate crystal that sometimes spontaneously split apart into two daughter photons. The newborn photons travel to the other end of the crystal, making a Y shape. Step two: take one of these daughter photons to a detector, which ‘clicks’ whenever it detects a photon. Because the daughters are entangled, the detector announces that exactly one photon is now present on the other side of the Y, regardless of how far away it is.

There’s one more important trick to studying single-photon vision. Just sending a photon and asking: ‘Did you see it?’ is a flawed experimental design, because humans find it hard to answer objectively. We don’t like to say ‘yes’ unless we’re sure, but it’s hard to be sure a human visual system – which can produce phantom flashes even in total darkness – always reports truth. A better strategy is to ask the observer to choose between two alternatives. In our experiment, we send a photon to the left or the right side of the observer’s eye, and in each trial the observer can answer that question better than random guessing (which would be 50%). This way, we know they are seeing something. This is called a forced-choice experimental design.

In 2016, a Vienna-based research group led by the physicist Alipasha Vaziri from the University of Vienna used a similar experiment to [show](https://www.cell.com/cell/fulltext/S0092-9646(16)30092-0) that observers were able to respond to a forced choice with single photons better than random guessing. This is the strongest evidence so far that humans really can see just one photon. Using a single-photon source based on parametric downconversion, and a forced-choice experimental design, there are now two experiments that could bring quantum weirdness into the realm of human perception: a test using entangled photons known as a ‘Bell test’ of non-locality using a human observer.

Superposition is a uniquely quantum concept. Quantum particles such as photons are in a state where that a future measurement will find them in a particular location – so, before measurement, they can be in two (or more!) places at once. This idea applies not just to particles but also to properties such as polarisation, which refers to the orientation of the plane along which the light oscillates. Measurement seems to make particles ‘collapse’ to one outcome or another, but the exact nature of collapse happens.

The human visual system provides interesting new ways to investigate this problem. One goal is to determine whether humans perceive a difference between a photon in a specific location and a photon in a different definite location. Physicists have been interested in this question for years, and for the moment let’s consider the single-photon source described above, delivered to the observer’s eye.

right of an observer's eye.

First, we can deliver a photon in a superposition of the left and right positions – an observer to report which side they believe the photon appeared on. To quantify between a superposition state and a random guess of left or right, the experimental trials in which the photon really is just sent either to the left or the right.

Creating the superposition state is the easy part. We can split the photon into two positions using a polarising beam splitter, an optical component that both transmits and reflects polarisation. (Many surfaces do this – even ordinary window glass both transmits and reflects light both the outdoors and your own reflection. Beam splitters are engineered to do both of transmission and reflection.)

Standard quantum mechanics predicts that a superposition of left and right should behave the same as a photon that's randomly sent either to the left or to the right. Upon reaching the observer, the superposition will probably collapse to one side or the other so fast that it would be unmeasurable in a single experiment, so we don't know for sure. Any statistically significant difference in the number of photons sent to the left or right in a superposition trial would be unexpected – a violation of quantum mechanics as we know it. The observer could also be asked to record the results of a superposition state, compared with the random mixture. Again, according to standard quantum mechanics, we expect to see no difference – but if we did, it could point to new physics and a measurement problem.

If humans can see single photons, an observer can play a role in quantum realism

Human observers could also participate in a test of the other defining concept of quantum mechanics: Entangled particles share a quantum state, and behave as if they are joined together even when separated.

Bell tests, named for the Northern Irish physicist John S Bell, are a category of experiment that show that quantum entanglement violates some of our natural ideas about reality. In a Bell test, measurements on two particles show results that can't be explained by any theory that obeys the principles of local realism. First is locality: things that are far apart cannot have a signal travel between them (and the theory of relativity tells us that the speed of light is the maximum speed for any signal). Second is realism: things in the physical world have definite properties at all times, even if we don't measure them with anything else.

The concept of a Bell test is that two particles interact with each other and become entangled. Then, the particles are sent in two different directions – and we decide which ones to measure at random, so the results are unpredictable ahead of time. (This might sound like a bizarre conspiracy theory, but the experimental consequences of entanglement, it's important to rule out every alternative. The experiment is repeated many times with new pairs of particles to build up a statistical result. In the end, there is a limit on how much the results between two particles should be correlated if the

In dozens of Bell tests, the limit has been broken, proving that quantum mechanics is non-local or both.

Entangled photons are usually the particle of choice for Bell tests, and the local realism is made using electronic single-photon detectors. But if humans can see single photons at these detectors, playing a direct role in a test of local realism.

Conveniently, spontaneous parametric downconversion can also be used to produce a kind of experiment could use pairs of photons entangled in their polarisation. In one photon goes to the observer when a certain outcome of a certain type of position other measurements will be made by single-photon detectors, at least in a first experiment take note of how often that measurement outcome occurs, and the number they expect correlation calculation that measures whether or not local realism has been violated.

But the observer will likely only be lucky enough to notice their photon in a small fraction so they would never measure the true frequency of that measurement outcome. The experiment will be carefully designed to eliminate bias and help the observer be unbiased. The design is the secret ingredient again. We will randomly choose whether to send a photon to the side of the observer's eye, and at the same time send a second, non-entangled control photon with probability equal to the maximum expected frequency of the measurement outcome. In each trial, the observer will decide whether they saw anything on the left side or the right, left, right, or both. If the observer chooses the side with the entangled photon and chooses the control side, the outcome violates local realism.

Why do these experiments? Beyond the 'far out' factor, there are serious scientific questions. The question of how superposition states collapse to definite outcomes is still one of the great unsolved problems of quantum mechanics with a new, unique, ready-to-hand measurement apparatus that could out or provide evidence for certain theories. In particular, a class of theories called macrorealism propose an undiscovered physical process that always causes the superposition states of large systems to collapse very quickly. This would mean that large superpositions are actually indistinguishable from disturbances from interactions with the environment. The Nobel prizewinning physicist John Clauser at the University of Illinois has been pushing for experimental tests of such theories. In 2015, his experiments using the human visual system showed a clear divergence from standard quantum mechanics, providing evidence that something like macrorealism is at work.

Bell tests are also still an active area of research. In 2015, all the major Bell-test experiments that could have allowed local realism to persist, however unlikely – were finally proposed and carried out. In 2017, researchers led by David Kaiser of the Massachusetts Institute of Technology and the University of Vienna [performed <https://arxiv.org/abs/1808.05966>](https://arxiv.org/abs/1808.05966) a 'cosmic Bell test' using distant stars to trigger the measurement settings, in an attempt to prove that predetermined hidden variables (which could open a loophole for local realism to persist) would have to be non-local. An international collaboration called the BIG Bell Test used random choices from human participants to [decide <https://www.nature.com/articles/s41586-018-0085-3>](https://www.nature.com/articles/s41586-018-0085-3) the measurement settings in 2016. A Bell test with a human observer would be a fascinating addition to the field.

These days, I spend less time in blackened rooms than I once did. At Los Alamos, I work on ways to use single photons (detected by electronics, not the eye) to create orbits around the Earth. But when this next generation of experiments makes quantum optics retreat back into the dark and fire up my own single-photon detectors again.

Rebecca Holmes is a physicist and staff scientist at Los Alamos National Laboratory and writes in Physics World and Applied Optics, among others.

aeon.co²⁴ April, 2019