

# Information Constraints on Quantum Measurements

## I. Dynamics and Information Patterns

S.N.Mayburov

Lebedev Inst. of Physics

Leninsky Prospect 53, Moscow, Russia, 117924

E-mail : mayburov@sci.lebedev.ru

### Abstract

The information transfer between the measured object  $S$  and the information-processing system  $O$  is studied. As the model example, the measurement of dichotomic  $S$  observable  $\Lambda$  is considered for two  $S$  ensembles; first one includes the pure states which are the superposition of  $\Lambda$  eigenstates  $|\lambda_{1,2}\rangle$ , other one is the probabilistic mixture of these states. It is shown that the information constraints induced by Heisenberg commutation relations block the transfer of information about the purity of  $S$  state, for the studied ensembles it is characterized by the expectation value of  $\Lambda'$  observable conjugated to  $\Lambda$ . Due to these restrictions,  $O$  can't discriminate the pure and mixed  $S$  ensembles with the same  $\bar{\Lambda}$ . It is demonstrated that these information losses result in the appearance of stochasticity in the measurement of  $S$  pure state, so that in the individual events  $O$  would detect the random 'pointer' values  $O_{1,2}$ , which correspond to the outcomes for  $O$  measurement of incoming  $|\lambda_{1,2}\rangle$ . The influence of  $O$  decoherence by its environment is studied, it's shown that the account of its effects doesn't change these results principally.

## 1 Introduction

Quantum mechanics (QM) after more than 90 years of its development achieved the tremendous success in the description of nature. However, its foundations are still disputed extensively and seems to contain some unsettled questions [1, 2, 3]. The most famous and oldest of them is the State collapse or Quantum measurement problem [4, 5, 6]. In our paper this problem will be considered mainly within the framework

of information theory [7, 8]. Really, the measurement of parameters characterizing an arbitrary system  $S$  includes the transfer of information from  $S$  to the information system  $O$  (Observer) which processes and memorizes it. Correspondingly, in information theory any measuring system (MS) can be described as the information channel which transfers the information about  $S$  state to  $O$  [7, 8].

Plainly, if some restrictions on the information transfer via such channel exist, such losses can influence the content of signals perceived by  $O$  after the measurement. It was shown earlier that such constraints, which induced formally by Heisenberg commutation relations, influence essentially the functioning of typical information channels [11, 13]. However, until now the influence of this effect on the outcome of quantum measurements wasn't analyzed at the proper mathematical level. In our previous papers for the simple MS model it was shown that such restrictions result in the loss of information characterizing the rate of  $S$  state purity, so it becomes impossible for  $O$  to discriminate the pure and mixed ensembles of incoming  $S$  states. It was demonstrated that for individual events such information losses result in the unavoidable stochasticity of the measurement outcomes for  $S$  pure states [9, 10].

The information-theoretical approach of system self-description or 'measurement from inside' is applied to the description of information acquisition by  $O$  in quantum measurements [6, 8]. In Schroedinger QM framework, it realized by means of the formalism of restrictive maps in MS Hilbert space [5, 6]. Here we develop our formalism and discuss its main features in detail. In particular, the influence of  $O$  decoherence by its environment will be considered briefly for simple MS model. As the result, we shall argue that such approach allows to construct the consistent measurement theory, in which the stochasticity appears without exploit of axiomatic reduction of quantum states in Schroedinger QM scheme. Below such formalism without reduction axiom is called linear QM formalism.

It's acknowledged now that Operator algebra called also Algebraic QM is the most deep and universal theory, which in the same mathematical setting describes successfully classical physics, QM and QFT [4]. However,  $C^*$ -algebra formalism exploited in it is complicated and abstract which makes the discussion of QM fundamental aspects in its framework rather difficult. Because of it, in this paper Schrödinger QM formalism is used for the description of information transfer in quantum measurements. We plan to reconsider these problems in  $C^*$ -algebra formalism in forcoming paper, some results on it can be found in [9]. It was proposed earlier in general philosophical and logical setting that the incompleteness of  $O$  information can be the possible reason of wave function collapse, but no consistent proof of this hypothesis or model calculations weren't published ([5, 6] and refs. therein). It's worth to notice beforehand that even if  $O$  is taken to be the human brain, in our approach the observer's consciousness doesn't play any role and will not be referred to at all. We assume that the brain obeys the standard QM laws; some aspects of this problem will be discussed in conclusion. However, for the illustrative purposes some terms characteristic for conscious analysis of signals will be used in the description of our theory.

## 2 Models of Quantum Measurements

Here our measurement model will be described and some aspects of QM measurements theory will be reviewed. We shall also formulate the main ideas of our approach in semi-qualitative form, the corresponding detailed formalism is presented in the next section. Our analysis will be concentrated on the study of individual quantum measurements, so it's worth to remind the properties of individual quantum states. We shall consider here only such states, which can be prepared 'event by event' by the experimentalist in the ideal scheme of state preparation. For the finite-dimensional system  $S$  they are the pure states (rays) in  $S$  Hilbert space  $\mathcal{H}_S$  [1]. Only such state can't be decomposed as the probabilistic mixture of two or more other individual states. For the statistical or ensemble quantum states such restriction is absent, their effects are described by the density matrix  $\rho$ , i.e. the positive trace one operator on  $\mathcal{H}_S$ . In case when the procedure of such ensemble preparation is well-defined, its statistical states admits the objective decomposition into the individual states in form of gemenge [1]. The quantum observables, which will be considered here, are the linear, self-adjoint (PV) operators on  $\mathcal{H}$ ; POV generalization of QM observables is unimportant for our approach and will not be used here.

It's worth to remind also how the individual measurements are characterized in information theory. In this case the amount of information transferred from  $S$  to  $O$  is practically unimportant, and their analysis is concentrated on the distinctions between the individual signals. In the simplest case the signal  $\Theta_O$  induced by the measured state of  $S$  and detected by  $O$  in event  $n$  is described by the array of real parameters called the information pattern (IP)  $J(n) = \{e^1, \dots, e^l\}$  [16]. The difference between two individual measured  $S$  states for  $O$  is reflected by the difference of their IPs, their complete set called IP space.  $J(n)$  is the set of subjective  $O$  parameters, in general their relation with  $S, O$  dynamical parameters isn't straightforward and unambiguous, in particular,  $J(n)$  can be their stochastic function [8]. It supposed that the corresponding sequence of logical operations stipulates  $O$  recognition of  $S$  signals described by  $J(n)$ . Usually, it is admitted implicitly that  $O$  physical structure permits to perform such operations, but for quantum  $O$  models studied here this is the additional assumption. Of course, if such simple description of  $O$  quantum signals by IPs will turn out to be incomplete, it can be changed to more complicated one. In particular, for quantum objects  $S$  and  $O$  some of IP parameters, in principle, can be uncertain, yet as will be shown, this possibility is unimportant for the studied problem.

### 2.1 Microscopic MS Model

The quantum measurements are theoretically studied by means of specific microscopic models; despite the significant simplifications in comparison with the practical devices, such models successfully reproduce some their important features [1, 15]. In this approach the elementary system  $S$  during its measurement interacts with the model detector  $D$ , which is the quantum object with a few (usually one) degrees of freedom (DF). In our model MS consists of  $S$ , detector  $D$  and the information

gaining and utilizing system (IGUS)  $O$ , which processes and stores the incoming  $D$  signals. In general,  $O$  can be supposedly treated as the quantum object, and so MS is described by the quantum state  $\rho(t)$  in arbitrary reference frame (RF). It will be argued that the effects of MS decoherence by the environment [15] aren't principal for our theory, so they will be considered in the final part of our paper.  $S$  is taken to be the particle with the spin  $\frac{1}{2}$  and the measurement of its projection  $S_z$  will be studied. Its  $u, d$  eigenstates denoted  $|s_{1,2}\rangle$ , so that the measured  $S$  pure state is:

$$\psi_s = a_1|s_1\rangle + a_2|s_2\rangle \quad (1)$$

For the comparison the measurement of incoming  $u, d$  'test' mixed ensemble with the same  $\bar{S}_z$  will be studied also. Such  $S$  ensemble is described by the gemenge  $W^s = \{|s_i\rangle, P_i\}$ , where  $P_i = |a_i|^2$  are the probabilities of  $|s_i\rangle$  in this ensemble [1], its density matrix denoted  $\rho_{mix}^s$ . Normally, the detector amplifies  $S$  amplitude to the level accessible for  $O$  processing, here for the simplicity it just doubles it.  $D$  states are also described by Dirac vector  $|D\rangle$  in two-dimensional Hilbert space  $\mathcal{H}_D$ . Its basis is constituted by  $|D_{1,2}\rangle$  eigenstates of  $Q$  'pointer' observable; the auxiliary observables are denoted  $Q_{x,y}$ . The initial  $D$  state is:

$$|D_0\rangle = \frac{1}{\sqrt{2}}(|D_1\rangle + |D_2\rangle)$$

It is supposed that  $S, D$  interaction starts at  $t_0$  and finishes effectively at some  $t_1 = t_0 + \tau$ . For Zurek  $S, D$  hamiltonian  $H_{S,D}$  with the parameters tuned optimally for given  $\tau$  the measurement of  $S$  eigenstate  $|s_{1,2}\rangle$  induces the final product state:

$$\Psi_C^{1,2} = |s_{1,2}\rangle|D_{1,2}\rangle \quad (2)$$

in which  $D$  'pointer' observable  $Q$  has the eigenvalues  $q_{1,2}$ . From the linearity of Schrödinger evolution it follows that for arbitrary  $\psi_s$  such  $S, D$  interaction will result in  $S, D$  entangled final state [15]:

$$\Psi_{S,D} = \sum_{i=1}^2 a_i |s_i\rangle |D_i\rangle \quad (3)$$

If  $a_{1,2} \neq 0$ , then  $D$  separate state  $\Delta_D$  also can be formally defined, however, due to  $S, D$  entanglement,  $D$  and  $S$  properties can't be completely factorized. It admitted usually that  $\Delta_D$  coincides with  $D$  reduced state, i.e. the partial trace over 'external' DFs, which for  $\Psi_{S,D}$  is equal to:

$$R_D^e = \sum_{i=1}^2 |a_i|^2 |D_i\rangle \langle D_i| \quad (4)$$

in terms of density matrixes. This expression is rather obvious for  $D$  statistical state, but for the individual state such definition seems to be controversial, first of all, because  $R_D^e$  isn't the pure state in  $\mathcal{H}_D$ . This formal difficulty, in fact, is unimportant, because in all calculations  $\Psi_{S,D}$  can be used in place of  $\Delta_D$ . The proper ansatz

for the separate states will be discussed below, until then it will be no need to use it.  $D$ ,  $O$  interaction and the resulting  $O$  information acquisition will be considered in detail in the next section, for the moment it will be enough to suppose that its performance corresponds to common sense notions about observers and signals. To illustrate it, let us consider the measurement of  $S$  eigenstate  $|s_{1,2}\rangle$ , which results in the factorized  $S$ ,  $D$  state  $\Psi_C^{1,2}$  of (2). For them  $Q$  eigenvalues  $q_{1,2}$  are  $D$  real (objective) properties independent of further measurements [1]. It means that the difference between such  $D$  states is also objective and is equivalent to the one between the values  $1/0$  of some parameter  $L_g$ , which in this case corresponds to the eigenvalues of  $Q$  orthogonal projector  $\Pi_1^D$ . Therefore, it is natural to suppose that for suitable choice of  $D$ ,  $O$  interaction  $O$  can percept  $|D_{1,2}\rangle$  states as IP  $J_{1,2}^O$  component  $e^1 = q_{1,2}$ , or some  $q_i$  function with the corresponding values  $q'_{1,2}$ ; it can be called the objective discrimination of individual  $D$  states. In principle, IP  $J^O$  can include also some other parameters  $e^i$  which has the same values both for  $\Psi_C^{1,2}$ , so here they are unimportant. Note that in the regarded set-up  $O$  directly measures not  $S_z$ , but  $D$  observable  $Q$ , which expectation value  $\bar{Q}$  for arbitrary  $S$  state is equal to  $\bar{S}_z$ ; it means that such measurement has the hierarchic structure.

## 2.2 Measurement of eigenstate superposition

Now let's consider  $S_z$  measurements when both  $a_{1,2} \neq 0$ , i.e.  $\psi_s$  of (1) is  $|s_i\rangle$  superposition. The entangled state  $\Psi_{S,D}$  of (3) includes the terms proportional to both  $|D_{1,2}\rangle$  components, which correspond to the positions  $q_{1,2}$  of detector pointer. Thus, such final state isn't  $Q$  eigenstate and it's not clear what is the measurement outcome in this case. The first thorough study of this situation was done by Schroedinger in his seminal paper [14]. To illustrate it, he has compared such macroscopic states with the states of alive and dead cat. He formulated notorious 'Schroedinger cat' paradox as following: 'Ψ-function of the whole system describes the situation when the dead and alive cats, if it possible to tell so, are mixed simultaneously in the equal proportions'(here 'mixed' is understood in nonprobabilistic sense). Basing on this considerations, Schroedinger has concluded that to avoid such confusing and controversial outcomes the Reduction postulate (RP) should be added to QM formalism [14]. The similar train of arguments repeated in many books and reviews, however, to our knowledge the consistent proof of RP necessity never was presented in detailed mathematical form. We shall consider it here in the information-theoretical framework starting from the following question: given that such superposition of dead and alive cat can be perceived by  $O$ , how exactly it would look like? In particular, what is the quantitative difference between its signal detected by  $O$ , and the signals from the eigenstates which are the superposition components?

In our model such  $Q$  eigenstates are  $\Psi_C^{1,2}$  of (2), the state  $\Psi_{S,D}$  of (3) which describes  $D_1, D_2$  superposition is truly different from this states, but it doesn't mean automatically that they can be discriminated by  $O$  as the different signals. To demonstrate it, let us suppose that, on the opposite,  $O$  really percepts  $\Psi_{S,D}$  as the superposition of  $|D_{1,2}\rangle$ . It supposes that  $O$  would acquire  $\Psi_{S,D}$  signal  $\Theta'_O$ , which for  $O$  is somehow different from both  $\Psi_C^{1,2}$  signals. As was admitted above, the sig-

nals of  $Q$  eigenstates are identified by  $O$  as IP  $J_{1,2}^O$ , i.e. as the set of real parameters  $e^i$  in each event. In the framework of Boolean logic, the signal different from them:  $\Theta'_O = .not.J_{1,2}^O$  can be also characterized as some set of real parameters or IP  $J_s^O \neq J_{1,2}^O$ . To obey this condition,  $J_s^O$  should include at least one parameter  $e^i$ , which value  $g_0$  for  $\Psi_{S,D}$  is different from its values  $g_{1,2}$  for  $\Psi_C^{1,2}$ . At its best, it should be such parameter  $e^i$  which is equal to 1 or 0 depending on the presence/absence of  $|D_i\rangle$  superpositions. Meanwhile, in QM all variable parameters of the system, i.e. observables correspond to the self-adjoint (PV) operators. Therefore, if  $O$  performs the objective discrimination of described  $D$  states, such  $e^i$  should correspond to the eigenvalue of some  $S, D$  observable  $G$ . Hence one should search the set (algebra) of  $S, D$  observables looking for the suitable candidates [9]. Since  $O$  interacts directly only with  $D$ , it is reasonable to start this check from  $D$  observables.  $|D_{1,2}\rangle$  exhaust all  $Q$  eigenstates spectra, so it can't be some other  $Q$  eigenvalue different from  $q_{1,2}$ , then such  $D$  observable  $G \neq Q$ . For any other  $G$  candidate the following equations should hold [10]:

$$\begin{aligned}\hat{G}\Psi_{S,D} &= a_1\hat{G}|s_1\rangle|D_1\rangle + a_2\hat{G}|s_2\rangle|D_2\rangle = g_0\Psi_{S,D} \\ \hat{G}\Psi_C^{1,2} &= g_{1,2}\Psi_C^{1,2}\end{aligned}\tag{5}$$

and  $g_0 \neq g_{1,2}$ . In this case  $\Psi_{S,D} = \sum a_i\Psi_C^i$ , so the second equation can be substituted into first one. It follows that such equations can't be fulfilled simultaneously not only for any nontrivial  $D$  observable but also for arbitrary joint  $S, D$  observable. Hence even if to admit that  $O$  can measure an arbitrary  $D$  observable  $G$  simultaneously with  $Q$ , no such measurement would permit to discriminate  $\Psi_C^{1,2}$  from  $\Psi_{S,D}$  of (3), at least, in the same sense as  $\Psi_C^1$  is discriminated from  $\Psi_C^2$ , i.e. to perform their objective discrimination. The hypothetic parameters, which values for such states would reflect such difference, correspond to the nonlinear operators, yet their observation contradicts to QM axiomatic.

Thus, contrary to the naive expectations there is no  $D$  signals, which permit  $O$  to detect the superpositions of  $S_z$  eigenstates simultaneously with  $S_z$  measurement. Moreover, in this approach any IP, which differs from  $J_{1,2}^O$ , doesn't correspond to physically consistent final  $S, D$  states in  $S_z$  measurement. Yet any  $S_z$  measurement should have some outcome for  $O$ , in addition, for large ensemble of events  $N \rightarrow \infty$  the expectation value of  $J_s^O$  should converge to some realistic limit. It seems that under this circumstances the only sensible solution is to suppose that for arbitrary  $\psi_s$  after  $S_z$  measurement IP  $J_s^O$  for  $O$  will be equal at random to one of  $q_{1,2}$ . Hence after such individual  $S_z$  measurement  $O$  can't find any difference between  $\Psi_{S,D}$  state and the stochastic state:

$$\Phi_{S,D} = \Psi_C^1 \cup \Psi_C^2$$

Of course, at this stage this is just plausible hypothesis which still to be proved. To agree with Born rule for  $\psi_s$  ensemble  $O$  should observe  $q_{1,2}$  outcomes at random with probabilities  $P_{1,2} = |a_{1,2}|^2$ . Concerning with  $S, D$  observables, which aren't just  $D$  observables, no  $S$  observable, except  $S_z$ , can be measured by  $O$ , because in this set-up  $S$  doesn't interact with  $O$ . From the same reason the joint  $S, D$  observables are also unavailable for the measurement by  $O$  simultaneously with  $S_z$ . But even if they are

available, as follows from (5), no one of them can be discriminated by  $O$  as  $g_0 \neq g_{1,2}$ . In particular, for arbitrary  $a_{1,2}$  the considered  $\Psi_{S,D}$  is the degenerate eigenstate of  $S, D$  observable  $S_z * Q$ , but in this case  $g_0 = g_{1,2}$ . The role of joint  $S, D$  observables in the measurements will be discussed below in detail.

This semi-qualitative analysis reveals the weak points of standard arguments in favor of axiomatic state reduction in QM formalism. It turns out that even without RP the detection of  $S_z$  eigenstate superposition during  $S_z$  measurements is at least quite doubtful possibility. Of course, this considerations still don't prove the opposite statement, rather they demonstrate the need of careful study of measurement process under the different angles, first of all, concerned with the proper inclusion of  $O$  into MS scheme at the quantum level. In the next section this question will be considered in detail, in particular, the consistency of objective discrimination used here. Meanwhile, the main method of the derivations will be the same as was used here: to explore whether MS observable algebra contain PV operators which can discriminate the pure and mixed MS states after the measurement.

For our study it's worth to have the statistical estimate of state discrimination in the measurement of particular observable. Such statistical measure for two finite-dimensional states  $\rho_{1,2}$  and observable  $\Lambda$  can be described as the intersection (overlap) of their  $\lambda_i$  eigenvalue distributions:

$$K(\Lambda) = \sum [w_1(\lambda_i)w_2(\lambda_i)]^{\frac{1}{2}} \quad (6)$$

here  $w_{1,2}(\lambda_i) = Tr \rho_{1,2} \Pi(\lambda_i)$  where  $\Pi(\lambda_i)$  is the orthogonal projector on  $\lambda_i$ . In particular, the difference between the pure and mixed  $S$  states is indicated by  $S$  observables, which expectation value is sensitive to the presence of the component interference. For the regarded  $S$  pure/mixed states with the same  $\bar{S}_z$  they are  $S_{x,y}$  linear forms. For example, if  $\frac{a_1}{a_2}$  is real, the maximal distinction reveals  $S_x$  observable, for which  $|\bar{S}_x| = |a_1||a_2|$  for the pure states and  $\bar{S}_x = 0$  for the mixture. In this case their overlap

$$K(S_x) = 1 - |a_1||a_2|$$

For the arbitrary  $a_{1,2}$  the maximal discrimination of pure and mixed  $S$  states gives the expectation value of observable:

$$S_a = S_x \cos \gamma + S_y \sin \gamma \quad (7)$$

where  $\gamma$  is  $\psi_s$  quantum phase between  $|s_{1,2}\rangle$  components. The value of  $r_p = 2|\bar{S}_a|$ , which lays between 0 and 1, can be chosen as  $S$  purity rate. These estimates indicate that even the incoming pure and mixed  $S$  states with the same  $\bar{S}_z$  differ, in fact, only statistically with the minimal overlap 50%, but not on 'event by event' basis. Let's consider the final state  $\Psi_{S,D}$  of (3) and corresponding mixed ensemble induced by gemenge  $W^s$  with the same  $\bar{S}_z$ . For all conjugated  $D$  observables  $Q, Q_x, Q_y$  their overlap between pure and mixed states  $K(Q), K(Q_{x,y})$  is equal to 1, the same is true for  $Q, Q_{x,y}$  linear forms. Hence even statistically no information about  $S$  state purity is transferred to  $D$  via MS information channel, which is tuned to the optimal  $S_z$  value measurement.  $\bar{S}_z$  value is transferred to  $D$  as  $\bar{Q}$ , whereas for  $S_a$  and other

$S_{x,y}$  linear forms their expectation values aren't transferred to  $D$ , these constraints are induced by Heisenberg commutation relations. Below the similar information constraints will be considered for the individual  $S, D$  states also.

## 3 Measurements and Information Acquisition

### 3.1 System Self-Description and Measurements

Now the information system (IGUS)  $O$  will be consistently treated as the quantum object, therefore in this setting our aim is to find the relation between MS state and the information acquired by  $O$  during the measurement. As was noticed above, in the information-theoretical framework  $S, D, O$  system can be described as the informational channel. However, the standard calculations of information transfer via quantum channels describe only its statistical characteristics [11, 12], the novel features, which appear in the analysis of individual states, weren't studied. In information theory the most general and mathematically powerful approach to the measurements is introduced by the formalism of system self-description [8]. To illustrate its meaning, let's consider some information system  $\mathcal{O}$ , which measures the parameters of arbitrary object  $\Omega$ . Plainly,  $\mathcal{O}$  can be considered formally as the subsystem of 'global' system  $\Xi = \{\Omega, \mathcal{O}\}$  with the state set  $N_T$ , so that  $N_O \subseteq N_T$  where  $N_O$  is the set of  $\mathcal{O}$  states. When  $\Omega, \mathcal{O}$  interaction is finished,  $\Xi$  will be in some final state  $\Gamma$ , which for the effective measuring set-up is correlated with the initial  $\Omega$  state  $\varphi_{in}$ . Therefore, the measurement of  $\Omega$  state by  $\mathcal{O}$  in this approach is equivalent to  $\Gamma$  measurement by  $\Xi$  subsystem  $\mathcal{O}$ . In this approach it can be described as the mapping of  $\Xi$  set  $N_T$  to its subset  $N_O$ , i.e. to itself, so such process can be called  $\Xi$  measurement from inside [6]. The restrictive map  $M_O \Gamma \rightarrow R_O$  describes the restriction of  $\Xi$  state to  $\mathcal{O}$ , by the slight abuse of definitions,  $R_O$  called also  $\mathcal{O}$  restricted state. In practice, the information acquisition by  $\mathcal{O}$  always correlates with the change of its internal state, correspondingly, in our approach  $R_O$  should be correlated with  $\Gamma$ . For example, if  $\mathcal{O}$  is the atom,  $R_O$  can be the state of its electronic shells, their excitations would 'record' the incoming signals.

Such complicated formalism is useful when the final  $\Xi$  state isn't factorizable, i.e.  $\Gamma \neq \phi^f \otimes R_O$  where  $\phi^f$  is the final  $\Omega$  state; this is just the case for quantum measurements. For the start our formalism is supposed to be minimal in a sense that  $\mathcal{O}$  can discriminate as the different entities all restricted  $\mathcal{O}$  individual states if for them the relation  $R_O \neq R'_O$  holds. If it fails, the formalism can be corrected so that  $R_O$  would denote the corresponding equivalence classes. In the simplest case  $R_O, R'_O$  distinguishability by  $\mathcal{O}$  assumes that at least for one of  $\mathcal{O}$  internal parameters  $L_O$  its values 0/1 can be put in correspondence to  $R_O, R'_O$  (or  $L_O$  expectation values for statistical states) [8]. The important property of  $\Xi$  restrictions is formulated by Breuer Theorem: if for two arbitrary  $\Xi$  states  $\Gamma, \Gamma'$  their restrictions  $R_O, R'_O$  coincide, then for  $\mathcal{O}$  this  $\Xi$  states are indistinguishable [5]. It seems that for any nontrivial  $\Xi, \mathcal{O}$  at least one pair of such  $\Xi$  states exists. For classical systems the incompleteness of  $\Xi$  description by  $\mathcal{O}$  has the obvious reason:  $\mathcal{O}$  is only the part of  $\Xi$ , but it should

describe its own state  $R_O$  plus the state of  $\Xi$  'residual', hence  $N_T$  mapping to  $N_O$  can't be unambiguous [6]. The map  $M_O^-$ , which put in correspondence to  $R_O$  some  $\Xi$  state  $\Gamma$  which restriction to  $O$  is equal to  $R_O$ , i.e.  $M_O^- R_O \rightarrow \Gamma$ , is called the inference map; as follows from Breuer theorem such mapping can be ambiguous.

Constructing the quantum self-description formalism, we shall exploit standard QM axiomatic if no direct contradiction to it will appear. Namely, it will be supposed that linear QM formalism is correct relative to quantum  $\mathcal{O}$  considered as RF, in particular, the corresponding observables are linear, self-adjoint operators. In general,  $M_O$  derivation for arbitrary quantum  $\Xi$  is the difficult problem which, probably, can be solved only by use of  $C^*$ -algebra formalism. Therefore, it's instructive to start its consideration here from simple MS model with the hope to find the solution for this particular case. It turns out that it doesn't demand to exploit the complete self-description formalism, but only its most obvious features.

### 3.2 Quantum $O$ model

In our approach MS as the whole is considered as the quantum object, which is described by the quantum state  $\rho_{MS}(t)$  relative to some external RF  $O'$ .  $S, D$  are taken to be the same as in the previous section, with the same state  $\Psi_{S,D}$  of (3) interacting with IGUS  $O$ . We shall suppose that in our MS model  $O$  states are also defined on two-dimensional Hilbert space  $\mathcal{H}_O$  and  $O$  initial state:

$$|O_0\rangle = \frac{1}{\sqrt{2}}(|O_1\rangle + |O_2\rangle) \quad (8)$$

where  $|O_{1,2}\rangle$  are eigenstates of  $O$  'internal pointer' observable  $V$  with eigenvalues  $v_{1,2}$ .  $D, O$  interaction starts at some  $t_2 > t_1$  and finishes at  $t_3 = t_2 + \tau$  where  $\tau$  is the same as for  $H_{S,D}$ , during this time interval the information about  $D$  state is transferred to  $O$ .  $D, O$  interaction is also described by Zurek hamiltonian  $H_{D,O}$  with the same parameters as  $H_{S,D}$ . Under this conditions the interaction of  $\Psi_{S,D}$ ,  $|O_0\rangle$  states will result in:

$$\Psi_{MS} = \sum_{i=1}^2 a_i |s_i\rangle |D_i\rangle |O_i\rangle \quad (9)$$

relative to external  $O'$ . Such triple decomposition is unique and in this sense defines  $|O_{1,2}\rangle$  as the preferred basis (PB) of  $O$  states. Such PB has only formal meaning and doesn't suppose any physical preferences, so it differs principally from dynamical PB of decoherence theory [22]. In principle,  $O$  can include other DFs which participate in information processing, yet we shall suppose that during  $D, O$  interaction they don't interact with  $O$  DFs described by  $\mathcal{H}_O$ .

### 3.3 Restrictions of MS quantum states

We shall start our study from the restrictions of  $\Xi$  statistical states  $\Gamma_{st}$ , because their derivation is more simple. Since  $R_O$  is  $O$  internal state, let's suppose for the start that it defined on  $\mathcal{H}_O$  only, below this assumption will be reconsidered. It's also

plausible to admit that the expectation values of all  $\mathcal{O}$  observables should be the same both for given  $\Gamma_{st}$  and its  $\mathcal{O}$  restriction  $R_{st}$ . Then, from QM correspondence between this set of expectation values and the statistical states of given system it follows that the only consistent solution for  $R_{st}$  is the partial trace of  $\Xi$  state over  $\Omega$  DFs, i.e. is  $\mathcal{O}$  reduced state. For our MS model  $\Omega$  formally corresponds not to  $S$ , but to  $S, D$  subsystem, hence the statistical restriction corresponding to MS state of (9) is equal to:

$$R_{st} = Tr_{\Omega} \rho_{MS} = \sum |a_i|^2 |O_i\rangle\langle O_i| \quad (10)$$

where  $\rho_{MS} = |\Psi_{MS}\rangle\langle\Psi_{MS}|$ . Let's start the study of individual  $\Xi$  restrictions from the situations when  $\Xi$  final state is the tensor product of  $\Omega$ ,  $\mathcal{O}$  states. For our MS model they appear in the measurements of  $S_z$  eigenstates  $|s_i\rangle$ . In this case, the final MS state is equal to:

$$\Psi_i = |s_i\rangle \otimes |D_i\rangle \otimes |O_i\rangle \quad (11)$$

Plainly, due to the factorization of  $S, D$  and  $O$  states defined on their own Hilbert spaces  $\Psi_i$  restriction  $\xi_i = |O_i\rangle$ . The same conclusion follows from (10), because for the pure ensembles the statistical and individual states are equivalent. For this MS restrictions  $\xi_i$  their  $V$  eigenvalues  $v_i$  are  $O$  real (objective) properties [1], so the difference between the restricted states  $\xi_i$  is also objective. Therefore, it's reasonable to admit that in such measurement from inside  $O$  can identify them as the different states characterized by IP  $J_i^O = v_i$ . Due to such unambiguous correspondence with particular IPs,  $|O_{1,2}\rangle$  constitute the 'information' basis, the comparison with it will help to derive the measurement outcomes for other  $S$  states.

Consider now the individual measurements of  $S$  mixed ensemble  $W^s$  described in the sect. 2. By preparation, this is probabilistic mixture of  $|s_{1,2}\rangle$  states, for each of them  $S, D$  and  $D, O$  interactions results in appearance of orthogonal MS states  $\Psi_i$  of (11). Thus, such MS ensemble is described by the gemenge  $W^{MS} = \{\Psi_i, P_i\}$ . The corresponding individual MS state is stochastic, i.e. it can change from event to event:

$$\Upsilon_{MS} = \Psi_1 \cup \Psi_2 \quad (12)$$

where the frequencies of  $\Psi_{1,2}$  appearance are described by the same probabilities  $P_{1,2}$ . The restriction to  $O$  of  $\Psi_{1,2}$  were obtained above, so  $O$  restriction of this stochastic MS state is equal to:

$$R_{mix} = \xi_1 \cup \xi_2 \quad (13)$$

Each  $\xi_i$  appears with the corresponding probability  $P_i$ , so that the resulting ensemble of  $O$  restricted states is described by the gemenge  $W^O = \{\xi_i, P_i\}$ .

For nonfactorized individual  $\Xi$  states Breuer assumed phenomenologically that, analogously to the statistical states, their restrictions are equal to  $\mathcal{O}$  reduced states [6]. For our MS and  $\Psi_{MS}$  of (9) it gives:

$$R_B = Tr_{\Omega} \rho_{MS} = \sum |a_i|^2 |O_i\rangle\langle O_i| \quad (14)$$

Plainly, this ansatz excludes beforehand any kind of stochastic behavior for MS restriction. The resulting  $R_B$  differs from  $R_{mix}$  of (13) which describes the restriction

of corresponding mixed MS ensemble  $W^{MS}$ . It follows that, in principle,  $O$  can discriminate the individual pure/mixed MS states 'from inside', because the condition of Breuer theorem is violated. Yet it will be argued below that the information-theoretical analysis of individual measurements permits to derive the MS restrictions to  $O$  unambiguously without any *ad hoc* assumptions, and the obtained results will disagree with the former conclusion. Note also that even for this simple ansatz the inference map  $M_O^-$  is ambiguous: all MS states of (9) with the same  $|a_{1,2}|$  has the same restriction  $R_B$  of (14), so it's not possible, in principle, to choose just one of them from the knowledge of  $R_B$  only.

### 3.4 Discrimination of Restricted States

As was shown, the measurement of  $S_z$  eigenstates  $|s_{1,2}\rangle$  produces final MS states  $\Psi_{1,2}$ , which  $O$  restrictions  $\xi_{1,2}$  are equal to  $|O_{1,2}\rangle$ . Let's compare with this 'information' basis the measurement of  $|s_{1,2}\rangle$  superposition of (1). In this case MS final state of (9)  $\Psi_{MS} \neq \Psi_{1,2}$  of (11), but by itself, the formal difference of two MS individual states is the necessary but not sufficient condition for their discrimination by  $O$ . In addition, there should exist the particular MS measurement from inside which would permit  $O$  to detect the difference between the restrictions of this MS states to  $O$ . In our formalism  $\xi_{1,2}$  are identified by  $O$  as IP  $J_{1,2}^O$ , i.e. as some set of real parameters  $\{e^l\}$  in each event. Previously,  $J_i^O$  was expressed as  $e^1 = v_i$ , in principle, it can include also other parameters  $e^2, \dots, e^m$ , which values are identical for  $\xi_{1,2}$ . According to Boolean logic, if for  $O$  MS restriction  $R_O$  differs from  $\xi_{1,2}$ , then  $R_O$  can be identified by  $O$  in the event of measurement as the different set of real parameters, i.e. as IP  $J_R^O \neq J_{1,2}^O$ . Therefore,  $J_R^O, J_{1,2}^O$  should include at least one parameter  $e^j$ , which value  $g_0$  for  $R_O$  is different from its values  $g_{1,2}$  for  $\xi_{1,2}$ . In QM framework such  $e^j$  should be some MS observable  $G$  to which corresponds the linear, self-adjoint operator  $\hat{G}$ . In this case  $R_O, \xi_{1,2}$  will be  $G$  eigenstates with the eigenvalues  $g_{0,1,2}$ ;  $O$  would discriminate  $R_O$  from  $\xi_{1,2}$  if  $g_0 \neq g_{1,2}$ . It was supposed earlier that MS restrictions to  $O$  are defined on  $\mathcal{H}_O$ , so it follows that  $G$  should belong to the set (algebra) of  $O$  observables  $\mathcal{U}_O$ . In our MS model  $\mathcal{U}_O$  is equivalent to observable algebra of spin $\frac{1}{2}$  object, so any  $O$  nontrivial observable can be expressed as [4]:

$$A = d_0V + d_1V^x + d_2V^y$$

where arbitrary real  $d_i$  coefficients are normalized as  $\sum d_i^2 = 1$ .  $O$  observables  $V^{x,y}$  are conjugated to  $Q$  and obey the standard relations:

$$[V, V^{x,y}] = 2i\beta V^{y,x}$$

where  $\beta = 1$  for  $V^x$  commutator,  $-1$  for  $V^y$  one.  $\xi_{1,2}$  exhaust the spectra of  $Q$  eigenstates and so  $G \neq V$ . As easy to check,  $\xi_i$  can't be the eigenstate of any other  $G \neq V$ , hence there is no  $O$  observable  $G$  which can satisfy to all necessary demands simultaneously.

Thus, only  $\xi_{1,2}$  states can be unambiguously discriminated by  $O$  in such MS measurement from inside, there is no IP  $J_R^O \neq J_{1,2}^O$  which can be correctly ascribed

to  $R_O$ . Since any alternative outcomes for MS measurement by  $O$  are supposedly impossible in our formalism, in particular, 'undefined outcome', the only consistent ansatz for  $J_R^O$  is equal to:

$$J_R^O = v_1 \cup v_2$$

As the result,  $O$  can't distinguish  $R_O$  and  $\xi_i$  states and  $O$  restriction of  $\Psi_{MS}$  of (9) is equivalent to:

$$R_O = \xi_1 \cup \xi_2 \quad (15)$$

i.e. it coincides with  $R_{mix}$  of (13). It means that MS restrictive map  $M_O$  is stochastic, and because of it, the corresponding inference map  $M_O^-$  is ambiguous. Only  $O$  observables corresponding to the nonlinear operators can reveal the difference between  $\Psi_{MS}$  and  $\Psi_{1,2}$  restrictions to  $O$ , but their measurability contradicts to standard QM axiomatic. From the properties of  $O$  statistical restrictions  $R_{st}$  which describe  $R_O$  ensembles, it's reasonable to assume that  $O$  should observe the collapse of pure S state to one of  $v_i$  at random with probability  $P_i = |a_i|^2$ . Really, the statistical  $O$  state  $R_{st}$  should give the correct expectation value  $\bar{V}$  for large ensemble of events.

However, the assumption that the probabilities of  $v_i$  outcomes follow Born rule isn't self-obvious, it should be verified in any new theory of measurement [1, 19]. Leaving for the future the detailed proof, here we notice that for our MS, which consists of spin $\frac{1}{2}$  objects only, such relations can be derived from QM invariance relative to the space reflections and rotations. For example, as easy to check, for  $a_1 = a_2 e^{i\gamma}$ , the equality  $P_1 = P_2$  for arbitrary  $\gamma$  follows directly from QM reflection invariance. In this case the quantum phase  $\gamma$  defines  $S$  spin orientation  $\vec{n}$ , which is confined in  $X, Y$  plane. Hence if  $P_1 \neq P_2$  for some  $\gamma$ , it will mean the violation of QM reflection invariance relative to this plane.

In this calculations it was supposed that  $O$  restrictions of MS states can be discriminated by  $O$  observables only which seems quite reasonable. However, such assumption can be proved only in  $C^*$ algebra formalism. Hence in linear QM formalism one should check MS observable algebra in search of observables which can discriminate the pure and mixed MS ensembles described above. Basing on the properties of statistical restrictions considered in sect. 3, we suppose that if the restriction  $R_O$  of some MS state  $\Psi_a$  is the eigenstate of some observable  $\Lambda_a$ , then  $\Psi_a$  is also  $\Lambda_a$  eigenstate. In this framework MS states can be used in search of suitable observable  $G$ , so that for it the following relations should be fulfilled simultaneously:

$$\begin{aligned} \hat{G}\Psi_{MS} &= g_0\Psi_{MS} \\ \hat{G}\Psi_{1,2} &= g_{1,2}\Psi_{1,2} \end{aligned} \quad (16)$$

and  $g_0 \neq g_{1,2}$ . However, analogously to sect. 2,  $\Psi_{MS} = \sum a_i\Psi_i$ , and the substitution of second equation into the first one gives:  $g_0 = g_1 = g_2$ . Hence no MS observable  $G$  possesses the different eigenvalues for  $\Psi_{MS}$  of (9) and  $\Psi_{1,2}$  of (11), so even if all MS observables would be available for  $O$  measurement from inside, it will not permit  $O$  to discriminate such MS states. Since these calculations are applicable to arbitrary MS observable, the same conclusion should be true also for the measurements of MS observables by external  $O'$  which will be considered below.

It's well known that the decoherence of pure states by its environment  $E$  is the important effect in quantum measurements [15], so it's instructive to consider its possible influence on our results. In the simplified version of decoherence dynamics it supposed that MS,  $E$  start to interact only at the final stage of  $S$  measurement. Hence if  $D, O$  start to interact with  $E$  at  $t > t_3$ , for the typical decoherence hamiltonian it follows that  $\Psi_{MS}$  of (9) will evolve into MS,  $E$  final state:

$$\Psi_{MS,E} = \sum_{i=1}^2 a|s_i\rangle|D_i\rangle|O_i\rangle \prod_j^{N_E} |E_i^j\rangle \quad (17)$$

where  $E^j$  are  $E$  elements,  $N_E$  is their total number. If an arbitrary  $O$  pure state  $\Psi_O$  is prepared, it will also decohere in a very short time into the analogous  $|O_i\rangle$  combinations entangled with  $E$ . Thus, of all pure  $O$  states, only  $|O_i\rangle$  states are stable relative to  $E$  decoherence. Therefore it supports their choice as  $O$  information PB, since in such environment  $O$  simply can't percept and memorize any other  $O$  pure state during any sizable time interval. Yet by itself it doesn't result into MS state collapse, because  $|O_i\rangle$  superpositions are conserved. Therefore, this considerations don't change principally our previous results, the only novel feature is that now the restrictions of MS,  $E$  joint state to  $O$  should be studied.

## 4 General Properties of Quantum Measurements

### 4.1 Restrictions and Joint MS Observables

The presented calculations, in our opinion, demonstrate the principal stochasticity of measurement outcomes for considered MS model. The considered  $S_z$  measurement formally corresponds to the information transferred via the channel  $C_1$  which scheme can be expressed as :

$$S \rightarrow D \rightarrow O$$

here for the simplicity the decoherence is neglected. In this section we shall discuss some features of quantum measurements, which can be important for our formalism. We shall consider first the question whether the difference between the pure and mixed final MS states can be detected by external  $O'$ . It's argued often that if it can be shown that MS state is pure, then it excludes the possibility of stochastic outcomes for  $O$  in any theory [2]. As was shown above, this is, in fact, untrue for MS measurement from inside, yet such reasoning results in frequent confusions, so it's instructive to consider it here.

For MS the difference between the pure and mixed ensembles with the same  $\bar{S}_z$  can be revealed by interference terms (IT), which are the joint  $S, D, O$  observables [1]; the similar observables for  $S$  state superposition were considered in sect. 2. Their typical ansatz can be written as:

$$B(c) = c_1|O_1\rangle\langle O_2|D_1\rangle\langle D_2||s_1\rangle\langle s_2| + c_2|O_2\rangle\langle O_1|D_2\rangle\langle D_1||s_2\rangle\langle s_1| \quad (18)$$

where  $c_1 = c_2^*$  and  $|c_i| = 1$ .  $B$  can't be measured by  $O$  'from inside', at least for the described set-up, which tuned to the optimal  $S_z$  measurement. Being measured by

external  $O'$  via its interaction with  $S, D, O$ , for all  $c_i$  it gives  $\bar{B} = 0$  for arbitrary  $\Psi_{1,2}$  probabilistic mixture, but for any MS state  $\Psi_{MS}$  of (9) there are some  $c_i$  values for which  $\bar{B} \neq 0$ . We shall start their study from symmetric  $B$  with  $c_{1,2} = 1$ , then for symmetric  $S$  state  $\psi_s$  of (1) with  $a_{1,2} = \frac{1}{\sqrt{2}}$ , the resulting  $\Psi_{MS}$  is  $B$  eigenstate with eigenvalue  $b_1 = 1$ ;  $B$  possesses also other eigenvalues, but only  $b_2 = -1$  is important for our case. For the comparison the probability  $P_B(b_{1,2}) = .5$  for  $W^{MS}$  mixture with  $\bar{S}_z = 0$ , the intersection of its  $b$  distribution with the one for  $\Psi_{MS}$  results in their overlap  $K(B) = .5$  of (6). Hence the pure/mixed MS states with the same  $\bar{S}_z$  can be discriminated even by external  $O'$  only statistically, because the corresponding distributions of  $B$  values (or other ITs) essentially overlap. From the comparison with the results of previous section it follows that the information about  $S$  state purity, which in this case is characterized by the rate  $r_p = 2|\bar{S}_x|$ , is mapped to the expectation value of joint MS observable  $B$ , but not of any  $O$  observable. The properties of ITs for other  $c_i$  values and different  $\Psi_{MS}$  are similar to the symmetric one, so we shall not describe them here. In particular, being measured by  $O'$  for such  $c_i$  range it gives the minimal overlap:

$$K(B) = 1 - |a_1||a_2|$$

between the pure and mixed ensembles with the same  $\bar{S}_z$ .  $B(c)$  measurement or any other measurement of MS state purity corresponds formally to the information transfer via the channel  $C_2$  which scheme can be expressed as:

$$S \rightarrow (S, D) \rightarrow (S, D, O) \rightarrow O'$$

it differs principally from  $C_1$  structure, which describes the information transfer in  $S$  to  $O$ . Plainly, the similar ITs for  $S, D$  subsystem are equal to:

$$B^{S,D} = c_1|D_1\rangle\langle D_2||s_1\rangle\langle s_2| + c_2|D_2\rangle\langle D_1||s_2\rangle\langle s_1| \quad (19)$$

with the same  $c_i$  range, as above. In principle, they can be measured by  $O$  via the simultaneous interaction with  $S$  and  $D$ , but it would mean the principal modification of MS set-up and corresponding hamiltonians, which tuned to the optimal measurement of  $S_z$ . Other properties of  $S, D$  ITs are analogous to considered MS ITs, so we shall not describe them here. The account of  $D, O$  decoherence by  $E$  makes the corresponding ITs quite complicated, but their studies show that, in principle, the main conclusions about their role in the measurements don't change [1, 2].

The proposed theory admits that in general the same MS state can be stochastic for  $O$  measuring it from inside, but in the same time can evolve linearly relative to some external  $O'$  RF. However, such situation by itself doesn't lead to any experimentally observed inconsistency for the results of measurements which can be performed by  $O$  and  $O'$ . Really, for the symmetric  $\psi_s$  state prepared by  $O'$  it follows that  $O$  can perform  $S_z$  measurement with some outcome  $\tilde{s}$ , whereas  $O'$  can infer that MS is in the quantum pure state with  $B$  eigenvalue  $b_1 = 1$ . It means that  $O'$  can be aware that  $O$  has obtained in  $S_z$  measurement some definite result, but can't know its value  $\tilde{s}$ , i.e.  $S_z$  value is still uncertain for  $O'$ . This conclusion looks reasonable,

because in this set-up  $O'$  doesn't interact with MS at all, and so there is no possibility to transfer any information about MS state to  $O'$ , so that  $O'$  can use only this one, which it (he) has possessed before  $S_z$  measurement was started. In this case  $S_z$  value in given event will be subjective for  $O$ , until  $O'$  would measure it separately, then  $O'$  will percept the same  $\tilde{s}$  value as  $O$ . Therefore, such formalism is compatible with the nonapplicability of ignorance interpretation to standard QM [1].

The consistent description of this situation can be given by the formalism of unitarily nonequivalent representations developed in Algebraic QM [4]. Here we notice only that  $O$  and  $O'$  deal with different sets of available MS observables, so the transformation of states between  $O$  and  $O'$ , in principle, is nonunitary. Note that earlier  $C^*$ algebras were applied to the description of quantum measurements in the infinite systems [1], however, the practical measurement devices are finite and it seems that for the measurement process their finiteness is quite essential feature.

## 4.2 Information Transfer in Hierarchic Measurements

In our approach to self-description we exploited Boolean structure of  $S$  signal recognition by IGUS  $O$ ; it is fulfilled, in particular, if  $O$  IP space or each of its components  $e^i$  is the ordered set. Such structure reflects, in fact, the essence of any measurement procedure: as its result  $O$  puts in unambiguous correspondence to the individual event  $n$  the array of real numbers  $J(n)$ . In particular, if there are some well-defined, basic IPs ( $J_i^O$  for our MS model), then for any new event  $O$  can infer whether its outcome is equal to one of them or differs from all of them. In our MS model quantum  $O$  can identify  $|s_i\rangle$  as IP  $J_i^O = v_i$ , this is the objective difference and such  $O$  state for external  $O'$  is described by  $|O_i\rangle$ . The considered dichotomic Boolean template for  $O$  recognition of  $S_z$  eigenstates is induced by  $O$  quantum dynamics described by  $H_{D,O}$ , it is similar to the state of yes/no logical unit of macroscopic information system. If  $O$  recognition is universally Boolean, then an arbitrary entangled MS state  $\Psi_{MS}$  of (9) should induce IP  $J_R^O$ , which either can be equal to one of  $J_i^O$  or to differ from both of them. Boolean structure of recognition is rather obvious for the signal recognition in macroscopic information systems [8]; our studies demonstrate that QM observable algebra induces such structure for simple model of quantum IGUS  $O$ .

Now we shall explore whether the results for  $S_z$  measurement by  $O$  can be derived from this premises avoiding the direct use of self-description formalism or, at least, its most sophisticated part. For that purpose let us reconsider the arguments of sect. 2 in more detailed way, which is provided by our previous calculations. Remind that in our MS model after some time moment  $t_1$   $S$  and  $D$  stop to interact, whereas  $D$  and  $O$  start to interact at  $t_2 > t_1$ , so that even for arbitrary  $H_{D,O}$  interaction  $O$  can measure directly only  $D$  observables. Really, at  $t > t_2$  the object  $S$  can be miles away from  $D$  and  $O$ , in this case  $S$  and  $S, D$  observables surely will be unavailable for  $O$  directly. Thus, for our  $H_{D,O}$  interaction tuned to optimal  $Q$  measurement, we can formally regard MS as the information channel  $C_1$  described above, it transfers first  $S$  signal to  $D$ , and after that  $D$  signal to  $O$ . In our MS model the measurement of  $S_z$  eigenstates  $|s_i\rangle$  induces factorized MS state  $\Psi_i$  of (11); in this case  $O$  interacts with  $D$  separate state  $\Delta_D = |D_{1,2}\rangle$  and, as was shown,  $O$  percepts it as IPs  $J_{1,2}^O = v_{1,2}$ .

Let's consider  $S_z$  measurement for the incoming  $|s_i\rangle$  probabilistic mixture (gemenge)  $W^s$  with some  $\bar{S}_z$ . When  $S, D$  interaction is finished at  $t_1$ , it becomes the mixture (gemenge) of  $\Psi_C^{1,2}$  of (2) with  $\bar{Q} = \bar{S}_z$ . As was shown above, at  $t > t_3$  when  $D$  measurement by  $O$  is finished, its result will be perceived by  $O$  as  $J_1^O$  or  $J_2^O$  with the probabilities  $P_{1,2}$  defined by  $\bar{S}_z$ . In the same vein, consider the possible outcome for pure  $S$  state  $\psi_s$  of (1) with the same  $\bar{S}_z$ . In this framework at the final stage of  $S_z$  measurement,  $D$  separate state  $\Delta_D$  interacts with  $O$ , which results in appearance of some  $O$  IP  $J_s^O$ , which can either coincide with one of the basic  $O$  IPs  $J_{1,2}^O$  or differ from them. As was shown in sect. 2,  $\Psi_{S,D}$  of (3) and  $\Psi_C^{1,2}$  can't be the nondegenerate eigenstates of some  $D$  observable  $G$ . Thus, even if  $O$  can measure all  $D$  observables simultaneously, it wouldn't permit  $O$  to detect the difference between such pure and mixed  $S$  ensembles; so for such pure ensemble  $O$  would percept in the individual events IP:

$$J_s^O = J_1^O .or. J_2^O$$

with probabilities  $P_{1,2}$  correspondingly. Really the opposite result, i.e the observation by  $O$  of such difference would mean that  $O$  can measure  $D$  observable which corresponds to the nonlinear operator, but this is beyond the realm of standard QM. It evidences that in this set-up  $D$  state doesn't contain the information about  $S$  purity and so it principally can't be dispatched to  $O$ . This conclusion doesn't change even if suppose that  $O$  can somehow measure the joint  $S, D$  observables in this set-up.

If the information about  $S$  purity isn't transferred by  $D$ , then  $O$  performance by itself doesn't play any role in the appearance of the outcome stochasticity for  $u, d$  superposition. The only feature which  $O$  should possess is the proper discrimination of  $|D_{1,2}\rangle$  states as  $J_{1,2}^O$ . The obtained results don't mean that in the pure case the separate  $D$  state  $\Delta_D$  is the objective probabilistic mixture of  $|D_{1,2}\rangle$ , rather  $\Delta_D$  can be characterized as their 'weak' superposition stipulated by the entanglement of  $S, D$  states. In this framework  $R_D^e$  of (4) can be regarded as the symbolic expression of this difference. Yet the complete description of  $D$  properties is performed only by  $S, D$  state as the whole, so that some of them are described by the nonlocal  $S, D$  observables. No measurement performed on  $D$  only can reveal the difference of  $\Psi_{S,D}$  from the corresponding  $\Psi_C^i$  mixture. Only the measurement of some joint  $S, D$  observables, like  $B^{S,D}$ , can reveal it, but also only statistically [1].

In this framework we consider also the information content of individual  $S$  states at the input of  $C_1$  channel. Plainly,  $S_z$  eigenstates  $|s_i\rangle$  transfer 1 bit of information in  $S_z$  measurement; correspondingly, the overlap (6) of such states  $K(S_z) = 0$ . Consider now the information about  $S$  state purity characterized by the purity rate  $r_p$  for the symmetric  $|s_i\rangle$  superposition  $\psi_s$  with  $a_{1,2} = \frac{1}{\sqrt{2}}$ . As was shown in sect. 2, the minimal overlap with the corresponding  $u, d$  mixture  $W^s$  is dispatched by  $S_x$  and gives  $K(S_x) = .5$ . Hence one can tell metaphorically that  $S$  state purity is described only by 'half-bit' of information at the channel input. Yet even this incoming 'half-bit' isn't transferred to  $D$ , because, as was shown in sect. 2, for any  $D$  observable there is the complete overlap between the resulting pure and mixed  $D$  states. This example demonstrates that  $S$  individual state, in principle, doesn't contain the information about its purity on 'event by event' basis, because the operational difference between

the considered pure and mixed  $S$  states is too small for that. Such information is contained only in  $S$  statistical state, which describes the properties of large  $S$  ensemble, but even it can't transfer such information to  $O$  via MS channel. For individual states the difference between such pure and mixed  $S$  states can be described only by the observables related to the nonlinear operators.

## 5 Conclusion

Any consistent physical theory should not contain the logical contradictions, in particular, it should be true for its predictions of measurement results. In his notorious paper devoted to the role of information and observers in quantum measurements Wigner has claimed: 'The simultaneous observation of two opposite outcomes of quantum experiments is nonsense' [18]. However, this statement wasn't consistently proved and is, probably, erroneous for the measurement of quantum objects. Meanwhile, as follows from our analysis, the structure of QM Observable algebra, which includes only the self-adjoint operators, by itself excludes such controversial outcomes. It follows that for simple models this structure corresponds to Boolean logics of signals recognition. It demonstrates that the independent axiom of reduction is unnecessary in QM; all the measurement features supposedly can be deduced from QM axiom, which settles QM observables to be the linear, self-adjoint operators. Note also that the absence of quantum observables described by nonlinear operators finds its explanation in fuzzy methods of quantization [20].

In this approach the stochasticity in quantum measurements is related to the incompleteness and undecidability aspects of information theory, which studies was initiated by notorious theorem by Gödel [8]. Our approach concerns also with the self-reference of information theory, its consistency for the case of quantum measurements was shown in [5]. The described measurement mechanism can be called the subjective collapse, because MS as the whole is in the pure state throughout the measurement relative to some external observer  $O'$ . The studies of relativistic formalism of quantum measurements support the subjective character of state collapse, only in this case its consistent covariant description can be formulated [21]. In addition, the formalism of system self-description permits to resolve the old problem of Heisenberg cut in quantum measurements by the inclusion of the information system into our formalism properly and on equal terms with other MS elements. The similar ideas about the measurement process and its relation to the information acquisition were proposed in Existential interpretation of QM by Zurek [22]. Also the analogous subjective approach to the measurement problem, but in phenomenological form, was proposed in so-called Relational QM, yet it demands the modification of standard QM formalism [23].

This considerations are closely related to the question whether this theory is applicable to the observations made by human observer  $O$ , in particular, whether in this case IP  $J^O$  describes the true  $O$  'impressions' about their outcomes? This is open problem, but at the microscopic level the human brain should obey QM laws as any other object, so we don't see any serious reasons to make the exceptions. In our

model the detection of eigenstate  $|D_i\rangle$  by  $O$  can be associated with the excitation of some  $O$  internal levels. This process is supposedly similar to the excitation of brain molecules during the acquisition of external signal. Note also that in our theory the brain or any other processor  $O$  plays only the passive role of signal receiver. As was argued the real effect of information loss essential for collapse occurs 'on the way' when the quantum signal passes through the information channel.

We conclude that standard Schrödinger QM formalism together with the information-theoretical considerations permit to derive the 'subjective' collapse of pure states without implementation of independent Reduction axiom into QM axiomatic. In our approach the source of stochasticity is the principal constraint on the transfer of specific information in  $S \rightarrow O$  information channel. This information characterizes the purity of S state, because of its loss,  $O$  can't discriminate the pure and mixed S states. As the result of this information incompleteness, the stochasticity of measurement outcomes appear.

## References

- [1] P. Busch, P. Lahti, P. Mittelstaedt,  
*Quantum Theory of Measurements*, Springer-Verlag, Berlin, 1996, pp. 8–26
- [2] W. D'Espagnat, *Found Phys.* **20**, 1157–1169 (1990)
- [3] J. M. Jauch *Foundations of Quantum Mechanics*, Addison-Wesley, Reading, 1968, pp. 85–116
- [4] G. Emch, *Algebraic Methods in Statistical Physics and Quantum Mechanics*, Wiley, N-Y, 1972, pp. 71–89
- [5] T. Breuer *Phil. Sci.* 62 (2) ,197–206 (1995)
- [6] T. Breuer 1996 *Synthese* **107**, 1
- [7] P. Mittelstaedt, *Interpretation of Quantum Mechanics and Quantum Measurement Problem*, Oxford Press, Oxford, 1998, pp. 67–109
- [8] K. Svozil, *Randomness and undecidability in Physics*, World Scientific, Singapur, 1993, pp. 46–87
- [9] S. Mayburov 2007 *Int. J. Quant. Inf.* **5**, 279;  
*Quantum Measurements in Algebraic QM*, Quant-ph/0506065
- [10] S. Mayburov 2008 *Frontiers of Fundamental Physics* AIP conf. proc. **1018**, 33 (Melville, N-Y)
- [11] S. Lloyd *Phys. Rev.* A56, 1613-1621 (1997)
- [12] H. Barnum, M. A. Nielsen, B. Schumamahir *Phys. Rav.* **A57**, 4153–4175 (1997)

- [13] A. S. Holevo, R. F. Werner, *Phys. Rev.* **A63**, 032312–032326 (2000)
- [14] E.Schroedinger *Naturwissenschaften* **23** 807–844 (1935)
- [15] W. Zurek, *Phys. Rev.* **D26**, 1862–1876 (1982)
- [16] U.Grenander, *Pattern Analysis*, Springer-Verlag, N-Y, 1978, pp 12–37
- [17] A.Elby, J.Bub *Phys. Rev.* **A49**, 4213-4216 (1994)
- [18] E. Wigner, *Scientist speculates*, Heinemann, London, 1961, pp 47–59
- [19] J. B.Hartle, *Amer. J. Phys.* **36**, 704 (1968)
- [20] S.Mayburov *J. Phys. A* **41**, 164071 (2008)
- [21] Y.Aharonov, D.Z.Albert, L.Vaidman *Phys. Rev. D* **34**, 1805 (1986)
- [22] W.Zurek *Phys. Scripta* **T76**, 186, 1998; Quant-ph:0707.2832
- [23] C.Rovelli *Int. J. Theor. Phys.* **32**, 354, 1996