Macroscopic Quantum Coherence in Crystals and the

UAT Phase-Lattice Analogy: A Conceptual Note

Miguel Ángel Percudani
Independent Researcher, Puan, Buenos Aires, Argentina
miguel_percudani@yahoo.com.ar
ORCID: 0009-0007-1748-3212

July 11, 2026

Abstract

Recent experimental breakthroughs have demonstrated that quantum coherence and entanglement can persist in macroscopic systems at room temperature, challenging the long-held assumption that thermal noise inevitably destroys quantum order at large scales. This note draws a conceptual parallel between the geometric protection of coherence observed in crystalline solids and the phase-lattice structure of the 8-coil interferometer developed within the UAT/UCP framework [4, 5]. We emphasize that this is a conceptual analogy, not a validation of the UAT framework. The physical mechanisms are distinct: phononic modes in crystals versus electromagnetic phase interference in coils. The common principle —that rigid geometric architecture can shield global coherence from local thermal fluctuations— is identified and discussed. References to the original experimental publications are provided.

1 Introduction

For decades, the standard view in quantum physics held that macroscopic objects could not sustain quantum coherence. Thermal agitation —the random motion of atoms at finite temperature— was thought to destroy superposition and entanglement at any scale larger than a few particles. This view has been empirically overturned.

A series of experiments, published in the highest-impact peer-reviewed journals, has demonstrated that macroscopic systems containing billions of atoms can maintain quantum coherence at room temperature. The key is not the size of the object, but the geometric architecture of its internal couplings.

This note explores the conceptual resonance between these findings and the phase-coherent architecture of the 8-coil interferometer developed within the UAT/UCP framework [4, 5]. We do not claim that the UAT framework is validated by these experiments. The physical mechanisms are different. The analogy is conceptual.

2 The Experimental Breakthroughs

2.1 Entangling macroscopic diamonds at room temperature

In 2011, a team led by Ian Walmsley at the University of Oxford demonstrated that two millimeter-sized diamond crystals could be placed in an entangled quantum state at room temperature [1]. The experiment used ultra-short laser pulses (femtosecond timescales) to excite collective vibrational modes (phonons) of the crystal lattice. Because the excitation and measurement occurred faster than the characteristic timescale of thermal decoherence, the entanglement survived.

Key insight: The entire crystal lattice oscillated as a single, rigidly coupled entity. Local thermal fluctuations were not eliminated —they were outrun by the speed of the measurement.

2.2 Entangling macroscopic mechanical oscillators

In 2021, a team at the National Institute of Standards and Technology (NIST) led by Shlomi Kotler and John Teufel demonstrated direct quantum entanglement between two macroscopic aluminum drumheads, each containing trillions of atoms and visible under a standard microscope [2]. The drumheads were cooled to near their quantum ground state and entangled through microwave-frequency photons.

Key insight: The entanglement was not between individual atoms, but between collective motional modes of the entire structure. The geometric rigidity of the drumhead protected the global state from local perturbations.

2.3 Optomechanical crystals

Multiple studies published in Nature and related journals have explored "optomechanical crystals" —engineered structures in which photonic and phononic modes are co-localized within a periodic dielectric lattice [3]. These systems achieve strong coupling between light and mechanical motion, enabling quantum control of macroscopic objects.

Key insight: The periodic structure of the crystal acts as a geometric shield. Global coherence is protected by the symmetry of the lattice, not by the weakness of thermal fluctuations.

3 The Common Principle: Geometric Protection of Coherence

Despite their differences, all these experiments rely on a shared physical principle:

> *When a large number of degrees of freedom are rigidly coupled into a collective mode, the global coherence of the system can survive local thermal noise, provided that the coupling geometry is sufficiently symmetric and the timescale of coherent interaction is shorter than the timescale of thermal decoherence.*

This principle is not new in physics. It underlies superconductivity (Cooper pairs protected by the BCS gap), superfluidity (collective quantum states of bosonic atoms), and laser physics (coherent photon modes sustained by stimulated emission). What is new is the explicit demonstration that this principle extends to macroscopic, room-temperature mechanical systems.

4 Conceptual Analogy with the UAT 8-Coil Architecture

The UAT/UCP framework employs an 8-coil phase interferometer in which each coil is driven with a precise phase offset of $\Delta\theta = 43.515^\circ$ (derived from the quantum braking factor $k_{\text{early}} = 0.967$) [4, 8]. This configuration generates a structured interference pattern that can be viewed as an **electromagnetic phase lattice** —a synthetic analogue of the crystalline lattice that protects coherence in the experiments described above.

The UAT framework has produced a series of interconnected results, all published with digital object identifiers (DOIs): the causal coherence constant κ_{crit} [5], the anti-frequency concept [6], the resolution of the cosmological constant problem [7], the UAT Lagrangian formulation [8], the thermal calibration margin [9], and the three-depth experimental proposal [10]. The present note draws on these works only to the extent that they establish the 8-coil architecture and its associated constants.

The analogy can be summarized as follows:

Table 1: Conceptual analogy between crystalline coherence protection and the UAT 8-coil architecture.

Feature	Crystal Experiments	UAT 8-Coil Array
Collective substrate	Phonon modes of crystal lattice	Phase fronts of EM coils
Coupling mechanism	Interatomic bonds	Phase-coherent interference
Noise source	Thermal phonons (heat)	Thermal EM jitter
Protection mechanism	Symmetry of crystal lattice	Symmetry of phase steps
Coherence threshold	Bond energy vs. thermal energy	Ivancho limit ($\kappa_{\text{crit}} = 4.978$) [5, 8]
Noise absorption margin	—	7% thermal calibration margin [9]

4.1 The Ivancho Limit as the Coherence Threshold

In the UAT framework, the Ivancho limit $\kappa_{\text{crit}} = 4.978$ [5, 8] represents the maximum tension that the causal membrane can sustain before losing coherence —analogous to the maximum thermal energy that a crystal lattice can absorb before its bonds break and the collective phonon mode decoheres.

4.2 The 7% Margin as Noise Absorption

The 7% thermal calibration margin ($\phi_*/\eta = 0.07$) [9] plays the role of the "buffer" that absorbs environmental noise without destroying the global interference pattern. Just as the diamond lattice absorbs ambient photons without losing its entangled phonon state, the UAT phase lattice integrates a controlled fraction of thermal noise into the system without breaking the overall coherence.

4.3 The Quantum Brake and Phase Symmetry

The quantum braking factor $k_{\text{early}} = 0.967$ [4, 8] modifies the classical 45° phase step to $\Delta\theta = 43.515°$. This non-Euclidean step is the geometric feature that prevents perfect cancellation and produces the structured residual $R_{\text{geom}} = 0.2791$ [4]. In the crystal analogy, this corresponds to the specific lattice constant that determines the phonon dispersion relation —a geometric parameter that dictates the collective mode structure.

5 Limitations of the Analogy

We explicitly acknowledge the following limitations:

1. **Different physical substrates.** The crystal experiments involve phononic modes (mechanical vibrations of a material lattice). The UAT interferometer involves electromagnetic phase interference. These are distinct physical phenomena governed by different equations of motion.

2. **Different coherence timescales.** The crystal experiments achieve coherence on femtosecond to microsecond timescales. The UAT framework operates on timescales of milliseconds (5.161 ms per cycle) [4]. The protection mechanisms are qualitatively similar but quantitatively different.

3. **No direct experimental link.** No experiment has been performed that explicitly tests whether the UAT 8-coil architecture protects coherence through the same mechanism as a crystalline lattice. The analogy is conceptual, not empirical.

4. **The UAT framework is not validated by these experiments.** The experiments cited in this note were designed and interpreted within the framework of standard quantum mechanics and condensed matter physics. They did not test, and do not confirm, any specific prediction of the UAT/UCP framework.

6 Conclusion

The demonstration of macroscopic quantum coherence in crystalline systems at room temperature establishes a physical principle that is broadly consistent with the architectural philosophy of the UAT 8-coil interferometer: global geometric order can survive local thermal disorder. This convergence is conceptual, not evidential.

We present this note as a reflection on the common physical principles that may underlie both phenomena, with the explicit caveat that the UAT framework remains a phenomenological model awaiting independent experimental validation through the falsifiable tests proposed elsewhere [10].

References

[1] K. C. Lee, M. R. Sprague, B. J. Sussman, et al., *Entangling macroscopic diamonds at room temperature*, Science, 334, 1253–1256 (2011). DOI: `10.1126/science.1211914`.

[2] S. Kotler, G. A. Peterson, E. Shojaee, et al., *Direct observation of macroscopic quantum entanglement*, Science, 372, 622–625 (2021). DOI: `10.1126/science.abf2998`.

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

[4] M. A. Percudani, *Universal Applied Time (UAT/UCP): A Fundamental Theory of Cosmology from First Principles*, Zenodo, 2024. DOI: `10.5281/zenodo.17729221`.

[5] M. A. Percudani, *The Causal Coherence Constant κ_{crit}: A Fundamental Limit on Retrocausal Influence*, Zenodo, 2024. DOI: `10.5281/zenodo.17718670`.

[6] M. A. Percudani, *Anti-frequency evaluated through the UAT temporal framework*, Zenodo, 2024. DOI: `10.5281/zenodo.18210808`.

[7] M. A. Percudani, *First-Principles Resolution of the Cosmological Constant Problem: $\Lambda = E_{Planck} \times \kappa_{crit}^{\varphi/2+3/4}$*, Zenodo, 2025. DOI: `10.5281/zenodo.21109424`.

[8] M. A. Percudani, *The UAT Lagrangian: Derivation of the Quantum Braking Action and the Closure of the Causal Coherence Parameters*, Zenodo, 2025. DOI: `10.5281/zenodo.20500431`.

[9] M. A. Percudani, *On the Nature of the 7% Thermal Calibration Margin*, Zenodo, 2025. DOI: `10.5281/zenodo.21211964`.

[10] M. A. Percudani, *On the Possible Influence of the Material Medium on Local Time*, Zenodo, 2025. DOI: `10.5281/zenodo.21197996`.

Conceptual Note — July 11, 2026
This document does not claim experimental validation of the UAT framework.

It explores a conceptual analogy with published, peer-reviewed quantum optics experiments.

Document DOI:10.5281/zenodo.21304734