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Abstract

Because quantum measurements have probabilistic outcomes they can appear to violate conservation laws in individual experiments. Here I argue that if wave function collapse is assumed to be a real process that is induced by entangling interactions then it can be shown to be fully consistent with the conservation of quantities such as momentum, energy, and angular momentum, when the computation of these quantities is taken over all relevant interacting systems, and pre-existing entanglement relations of the measured system are properly taken into account. The essential idea is that apparent changes in conserved quantities in the measured system are correlated with compensating changes in the (usually larger) systems with which they are entangled. The demonstrations by Gemmer and Mahler[1], and by Durt[2], that entanglement is a generic result of interaction are central to the argument. After briefly reviewing the status of conservation laws in various interpretations of the quantum measurement process I present a stochastic collapse equation that insures conservation of the relevant quantities in all situations that are subject to experimental verification.

1 Introduction

Symmetries insure that the total momentum, energy, and angular momentum of a closed physical system are strictly conserved under unitary evolution. But when measurements intervene, the seemingly nonunitary changes in the state of the system can appear to violate the standard conservation laws in individual experiments. The range of responses to this situation has included denials that the apparently nonunitary changes are genuine physical occurrences, assertions that the uncertainty principle renders the violations innocuous, and claims that the conservation laws hold only statistically and that the relevant quantities are conserved when experimental results are averaged over a large enough set of similar cases.
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This note presents a reevaluation of the status of the conservation laws based on the assumption that the apparent collapse of the wave function associated with measurement is a real, nonlocal occurrence that is induced by the kinds of entangling interactions that constitute measurements. I argue that when all relevant entanglement relations are taken into account, it can be seen that the conservation laws are respected in individual cases. The argument turns on considering both the entanglement relations of the measured system generated during the measurement process and those resulting from prior interactions. It relies heavily on the demonstrations by Gemmer and Mahler[1] and by Durt[2] that entanglement is a generic result of any interaction between systems. These demonstrations have important implications for how one should frame the question of whether quantities such as momentum, energy, and angular momentum are conserved in measurement processes. Given the web of entanglement relations that must be taken into account in these situations, they imply that the “total system” over which the relevant quantities are computed must include all subsystems that have interacted with the measured (sub)system in a significant way, including any preparation apparatus. So, for a typical “conserved” quantity, q, associated with the observable, Q, its value should be calculated as $q = \langle \psi^\dagger | Q | \psi \rangle$, where $\psi$ is taken to represent the total system (measurement instrument, preparation apparatus, the measured (sub)system, and possibly others). The question of conservation then becomes whether $q_{\text{final}}$ can be made arbitrarily close to $q_{\text{initial}}$ by considering all relevant systems and taking into account enough history. I will argue that conservation does, in fact, hold in this sense.

The focus on the quantity, $q = \langle \psi^\dagger | Q | \psi \rangle$, as the value that quantum theory assigns to a system, rather than as merely the “expectation value” requires a somewhat new perspective on conserved quantities. Given the fact that elementary systems are almost invariably entangled to some extent with other systems both before and after they undergo measurement, one cannot, strictly speaking, even attribute a state to them without reference to those other systems. Therefore, the idea that they must be in eigenstates of observables for a quantity to be well-defined is far too limiting. In order to properly address the issue of conservation during measurement processes, we need a more general method of calculating the relevant quantities in these situations. This issue will be discussed at greater length in Section 2.

The assumption that wave function collapse is a real (nonlocal) effect, and that it is induced by measurement-like interactions is crucial to the argument developed here. It is important to emphasize that collapse involves a network of entangled subsystems - not just an isolated elementary system in a product state. It is mediated by entanglement relations, and when it occurs it collapses the entire wave function to one of its branches. The branches are defined by the correlations of the quantities that have been exchanged in the interactions that generated the entanglement. The change of state brought about by the elimination or enhancement of a branch alters the physical record of the exchanges that have taken place. The record that remains shows a history of exchanges that is completely consistent with the conservation of
the relevant quantities.

Although a number of proposed stochastic collapse equations predict violations of energy conservation associated with the localization of the measured (sub)system,\(^1\), it is possible to develop an equation that fully respects the conservation laws. This is the reason for the assumption that collapse is induced by interactions with the measuring apparatus (or other measurement-like interactions). This insures that the increase in energy associated with the localization is obtained at the expense of the apparatus, and not from some unknown source. To implement this idea I propose a collapse equation with a stochastic operator based on the interaction potentials.

The structure of the argument is as follows. Section 2 proposes a more general method for evaluating conserved quantities that takes into account the fact that virtually all systems are entangled. Section 3 illustrates the main argument of the paper with several examples. It examines the often hidden entanglement that results from an interaction between a microscopic and a macroscopic system (such as a preparation apparatus), and attempts to show that this very small amount of entanglement is sufficient to insure that conservation laws are respected in individual cases when measurements induce the collapse of the wave function. Section 4 generalizes the argument by examining the evolution of interacting systems in configuration space. In Section 5 various views on what happens during quantum measurements are evaluated against the requirement that momentum, energy, and angular momentum should be strictly conserved in all circumstances. I argue that this requirement strongly suggests that measurement-like interactions induce a real, nonlocal collapse of the wave function, and that it also leads to a specific form for the stochastic collapse equation that connects collapse to elementary processes. Section 6 summarizes the argument.

2 Calculating Conserved Quantities

Gemmer and Mahler\(^2\) and Durt\(^2\) have shown that whenever two systems interact they become entangled. Even if the amount of entanglement is very small one cannot, strictly speaking, attribute a state to one of the systems without taking account of the entanglement relations. Therefore, elementary systems are almost never in eigenstates of observables, even immediately after measurements are made on them. So the idea that conserved quantities can only be attributed to systems in factorizable states is completely inadequate for analyzing the status of conservation laws in quantum theory.

Despite this obvious logical point the eigenvalue-eigenstate link is so deeply embedded in the lore of quantum theory that it is necessary to briefly examine the reasons for the belief that conserved quantities can only take definite values when the systems in question are in an eigenstate of the relevant observable. One rea-

\(^1\)See \(^3\) and references cited therein. A more comprehensive list of references is given in Section 5.
son derives largely from the view of the process of measurement in classical physics, where measurements are regarded as simply revealing the pre-existing state of the system. Although this understanding has been modified somewhat to accommodate the distinctive features of quantum theory, many still feel that one should not ascribe a quantity to a system unless its value can be read out through a fairly simple and direct interaction with the system. The problem with this tendency is that it fails to recognize that most quantities, and especially conserved quantities, are, to some extent, theoretical constructs. The attribution of a value to a system always involves some theoretical calculation, no matter how simple, or implicit. The position of a pointer on a dial, or a digital read-out are, at least in part, the output of an algorithm that is implemented in the measurement instrument either mechanically or electronically. There is no fundamental reason why we could not design an instrument to read out a value for a conserved quantity based on a measurement that showed the system to be in a superposition of eigenstates.

Another key reason for the eigenvalue-eigenstate bias is the belief that “measurements yield real numbers”, while the result of applying an operator to one segment of a wave function is, in general, complex: 
\[ q = \frac{\int_a^b \psi^\dagger Q \psi \, dx}{\int_a^b \psi^\dagger \psi \, dx} = r e^{i \theta}. \]
In reality measurements, without some theoretically based calculation, do not yield real numbers, or, for that matter, any other sort of numbers. Even a meter stick laid next to an object to determine its length merely places some etchings on an artifact in proximity to the end points of the object. To derive a number one must perform some arithmetic operation or count tick marks. With a suitably designed instrument implementing some sort of algorithm it is possible to generate a symbolic representation of a rational number. With somewhat more theoretical analysis one can attribute an irrational number involving one of the special symbols such as \( e, \pi \) or \( \sqrt{2} \), to a measurement outcome.

Notions like “measurements yield real numbers” actually stem from other theory-based expectations such as the requirement that probabilities must be real numbers between 0 and 1, or the belief that space and time are best represented as real continua. For the quantities that we are interested in here (momentum, energy, and angular momentum), the conservation laws assume that they (or their vector components) will be expressed as real numbers.

Consider the case of energy. For the associated conservation law to be a useful principle it is essential that energy be represented as a real number that is bounded from below. Since the energy operator applied to any portion of a wave function usually produces a complex number, the only way to insure that we get a real result is to integrate over the entire (typically entangled) wave function. The integration over entangled states forces one to treat the individual systems that make up the total system as being in a superposition of eigenstates of the relevant observable. To derive any meaningful result one must take the “expectation value” as the proper

\[ \langle q \rangle = \langle \psi | \, Q \, | \psi \rangle. \]

\[ \text{That is, the so-called “expectation value” } q = \langle \psi | \, Q \, | \psi \rangle. \]
representation of the quantity in question.

In a very interesting recent article concerning conservation laws Aharonov, Popescu, and Rohrlich (APR) have made a related point. They say:

“That paradoxical processes must arise in quantum mechanics in connection with conservation laws is to be expected... measurable dynamical quantities are identified with eigenvalues of operators and their corresponding eigenfunctions are not, in general, localized. Energy, for example, is a property of an entire wave function. However, the law of conservation of energy is often applied to processes in which a system with an extended wave function interacts with a local probe. How can the local probe “see” an extended wave function? What determines the change in energy of the local probe? These questions lead us to uncover quantum processes that seem, paradoxically, not to conserve energy.”

The conflict described by APR and its relation to the the point that I made above can be appreciated as follows. The conservation laws depend on the constraints imposed on interactions by various symmetries, and these symmetries also essentially dictate the form and the distance-dependent nature of the interactions that are responsible for generating the entanglement relations. These interactions are limited in their range due to their local nature. This limited range implies that various segments of the “entire wave functions” of interacting systems are never engaged equally in the interaction, and therefore, the conserved quantities associated with particular entangled branches are almost invariably complex-valued. On the other hand, the usefulness of the conservation laws depends on the relevant quantities being real-valued, and this requires, in general, that the associated operators be integrated over the entire wave function. So we are faced with the job of interpreting the relationship between the complex values of the conserved quantities that result from the exchanges between the segments of the interacting systems in various entangled branches and the need to arrive at a real-valued result for the quantities in order to maintain the usefulness of the conservation laws.

As stated above several times there is a straightforward way of insuring a real-valued result for entangled wave functions. One simply defines the “value” of the conserved quantity as what is usually called the “expectation value”, \( q = \langle \psi | Q | \psi \rangle \). I argue here that the fundamental assumption of this paper, “that the apparent collapse of the wave function associated with measurement is a real, nonlocal occurrence that is induced by the kinds of entangling interactions that constitute measurements”, offers a reasonable explanation of the relationship between the complex-valued quantities associated with individual entangled branches and the real-valued results associated with the integration over the entire entangled wave function.

\(^3\)I do not mean to imply that APR necessarily agree with the views advocated here.

\(^4\)In nonrelativistic quantum theory, the “local nature” of the interactions is reflected in the fact that they are represented by position-dependent potentials.
The various entangled branches generated by the interactions are all “candidates” for full realization when subsequent interactions eventually bring about collapse to one of the possibilities. The collapse is a probabilistic process, and so the fact that the conserved quantities associated with the various entangled branches are complex should be seen as an indication that these are possible results of the further stochastic evolution of the wave function\(^5\). These values calculated as 
\[ q = \left( \int_a^b \psi^* Q \psi dx \right) / \left( \int_a^b \psi^* \psi dx \right) = re^{i\theta} \] are complex because, when the limits, \( a \) and \( b \), do not span the entire wave function the orthogonality of the eigenfunctions of \( Q \) is lost, and different eigenfunctions can interfere constructively or destructively. Another way of saying this is that the eigenfunction decomposition of \( Q \) for the entire wave function is not the same as the decomposition for the segment from \( a \) to \( b \). However, when the wave function collapses the limits, \( a \) and \( b \) do, by definition, span the entire resulting wave function, and the new decomposition comes into play with appropriately adjusted eigenfunctions which are orthogonal over the relevant interval. The result of the calculation becomes real: 
\[ q = \left( \int_a^b \psi^* Q \psi dx \right) / \left( \int_a^b \psi^* \psi dx \right) = r \] So we can take the real magnitude, \( r \), in the complex expression, \( re^{i\theta} \), as the possible value that the conserved quantity will assume if the entangled branch with which it is associated is the branch selected in the collapse. This can be illustrated with the following example, which will focus on momentum as the relevant conserved quantity. In particular, the example will show that the value, \( r \), computed in this fashion, fits with our intuition that a particle initially localized around the point, \( x_i \), at time, \( t_i \), and found to be at the point, \( x_f \), at a later time, \( t_f \), has a momentum proportional to \((x_f - x_i)/(t_f - t_i)\).

Consider a wave function with a Gaussian shape, centered at the origin \((x_i = 0)\) with zero total momentum\(^6\) and an initial width of \(2a\): 
\[ \psi_i(x) = N_i * e^{-x^2/m} \] \(N_i\) is a normalization factor. After a time, \( t \), the wave function will have expanded:
\[ \psi_i(x) = N_i * e^{-a^2/(a^2 + (ix, \bar{p}))} \] If the particle is detected at time, \( t \), in a localized region centered at \( x_f \) between \( x_f - \epsilon \) and \( x_f + \epsilon \), the net momentum contributed by the pre-detection wave function can be calculated by applying the momentum operator to the portion of \( \psi_i \) that lies within this region, and then normalizing:
\[ \left[ \int_{x_f-\epsilon}^{x_f+\epsilon} dx \psi_i^*(x)(-i\hbar \partial \psi_i(x)/\partial x) \right] / \left[ \int_{x_f-\epsilon}^{x_f+\epsilon} dx \psi_i^*(x)\psi_i(x) \right] = i\hbar \frac{x_f}{2(a^2 + (ix, \bar{p}))} = \frac{m x_f}{t - 2ma^2/\hbar}. \]

Another way of deriving this expression is to expand the wave function at time, \( t \), in the momentum basis: 
\[ \psi_i(x) = \int dp \psi(p) * e^{i[px/\hbar] - (p^2/2m)} \] and then determine which momentum eigenstates dominate the wave function at the point, \( x_f \). In the momentum basis the wave function can be represented as, 
\[ \psi(p) = N_p * e^{-p^2/2m} \] Inserting this expression into the integral we get: 
\[ \psi_i(x) = C * \int dp e^{-(a^2/2m) - (ix/h)p} - (ix/h)p \] where \( C \) is a constant. By completing the square of the exponent we can change the variable, \( p \to p' \), and express the integrand as a Gaussian:

\(^5\)The stochastic equation describing the collapse process will be presented in Section 5.
\(^6\) As discussed in the previous section, the term, “total momentum”, refers to what is usually called the expectation value.
\[ p' = \left( \sqrt{2m^2 + i\hbar} \right) \left( \frac{1}{2m^2} \right) p - \left( \frac{ix}{2\hbar} \right) \left( \sqrt{2m^2} \right) \left( \frac{1}{2m^2} \right) \left( 2m^2 + i\hbar \right) \]. Note that \( p' \) depends on the value of \( x \). At any particular value of \( x \) the wave function will be dominated by momentum terms centered at \( p'(x) = 0 \). Setting \( p'(x) = p'(x_f) = 0 \), and solving for \( p \) gives \( p = \frac{mx_f}{t-2ma^2/\hbar} \), the same value derived earlier.

This expression can be converted into the polar form, \( re^{i\theta} \). When the entangled branch centered at \( x_f \) is realized in the collapse the complex value becomes real: \( re^{i\theta} \to r = \frac{mx_f}{t+4m^2a^4/(\hbar^2)} \). As stated above, aside from the term in the denominator involving \( m^2a^4 \) (representing the initial spread in the wave function) whose influence decreases with time, the momentum contributed to the combined particle-apparatus system is just what we would intuitively expect: \( \frac{m(x_f-x_i)}{t} \).

To reemphasize, subsequent to the detection at \( x_f \), this quantity should be regarded as the momentum contributed by the particle to the combined particle-apparatus system. If we assume that the particle has been localized within a region of width, \( 2\epsilon \), then the total range of momenta in the particle’s post-detection wave function will be approximately \( \hbar/(2\epsilon) \), but this can be attributed primarily to the action of the apparatus on the particle. The combined system will have experienced a change in momentum approximately proportional to \( mx_f/t \).

This result fits our intuitions about a particle that moves from \( x_i \) to \( x_f \) in time, \( t \). However, since the net momentum of the particle was zero initially, the change clearly violates our expectations regarding conservation laws. As stated earlier, typical responses to such apparent violations include claims that specific values of momentum can only be ascribed to eigenstates of the momentum operator, and statements that the conservation laws are respected on average. But the argument here is intended to show that we can apply a much stricter standard - that conservation laws are respected in individual instances. To show this we must ascertain what has been overlooked in the description of this situation. This issue is addressed in the next section.

### 3 Collapse and Conservation: Examples

What I will try to illustrate in this section is that by treating both the preparation and measurement apparatus as quantum systems and taking account of the entanglement relations between them and the measured system the conservation laws can be seen to be fully respected in individual instances of wave function collapse. The appearance of violations is a result of describing the macroscopic systems as classical devices and ignoring the entanglement generated by their interactions with the measured system. One illustration of this over-simplification has been touched on in the example presented at the end of the previous section. Subsequent to the measurement the measured system will have acquired a momentum spread inversely proportional to the distance, \( 2\epsilon \). Confusion about apparent violations of conservation laws can arise if it is not recognized that this resulting momentum comes from the measurement
apparatus. However, because the effects of the measured system on the measuring instrument are very obvious, these kinds of oversight are less likely to occur than those involving the preparation apparatus.

The tendency to overlook the role of the preparation apparatus in analyses of measurement situations stems in part from the fact that, typically, one simply stipulates that the system to be measured is in some particular state. But the need to take the preparation procedure into account can be seen if we consider again the example of a spreading Gaussian wave packet. At time, $t$, the probability distribution associated with the wave function is

$$\langle \psi_t(x)^* | \psi_t(x) \rangle = N_t^2 e^{-\frac{x^2}{2(a^2 + (t^2\hbar^2/(4m^2a^2)))}}.$$  

The standard deviation associated with this expression is $\left(a^2 + (t^2\hbar^2/(4m^2a^2))\right)^{\frac{1}{2}}$. For elementary particles initially localized in small regions the width of the wave function expands extremely rapidly. For a free electron (mass $\approx 10^{-30} \text{kg}$) it would stretch from atomic dimensions to about one meter in a microsecond.

This tells us that highly localized wave functions of “free” particles typically will not occur without interacting with some large system that acts to “prepare” the particle in the assumed state. This large system can be either a preparation apparatus in a laboratory or a naturally occurring system consisting of a very large number of particles. The entanglement between the particle and the preparation apparatus must be included in the analysis of the situation.

The main reason that one typically ignores the role of the preparation apparatus is probably that the effect on the state of the apparatus by the system to be measured is extremely small, and so the entanglement between them is also quite small. However, while this entanglement is small it is not zero. Whenever two systems interact they have some effect on one another. The demonstrations in [1] and [2] make it clear that entanglement is a generic result of any interaction between subsystems. In particular, any set of interactions that results in a particle being subject to clearly distinguishable possible measurement outcomes (such as a range of different position states) generates some degree of entanglement. When a subsequent measurement induces a collapse of this subsystem to one of those component states, it also collapses the state of the (often much larger) subsystem that was involved in the prior set of interactions.

The following simple example can help to illustrate how the apparent violations of conservation laws are eliminated by this “back reaction” on the preparation apparatus (and, possibly, on other systems with which the measured system has previously interacted). When a photon is reflected from the surface of a mirror there is an exchange of momentum. The states of both systems are changed from what they were prior to the interaction. This is very obvious for the photon, but it is almost entirely hidden for the mirror. If the mirror is a component of a beam-splitter that partially transmits the photon and partially reflects it, then the interaction results in some entanglement between the photon and the beam-splitter. Designate the branch of the photon that undergoes the reflection as $|\gamma_r\rangle$ and the transmitted branch as $|\gamma_t\rangle$. The beam-splitter state prior to the reflection can be labeled $|B_0\rangle$, and the (very
slightly) altered states brought about by the interaction can be labeled $|\mathcal{B}_r\rangle$ and $|\mathcal{B}_t\rangle$. The resulting entangled state can be represented as $(1/\sqrt{2})(|\mathcal{B}_r\rangle|\gamma_r\rangle + |\mathcal{B}_t\rangle|\gamma_t\rangle)$ (assuming equal amplitudes for the two branches).

The photon and the beam-splitter states almost factorize because there is very little difference between the resulting beam-splitter states: $|\langle \mathcal{B}_r | \mathcal{B}_t \rangle| = 1 - \delta$, where $\delta \ll 1$. But the fact that the overlap between the beam-splitter states is not complete means that there is some nonzero entanglement. In order to illustrate this an explicit calculation of the entanglement between the photon and the beam-splitter is given in the appendix (using the relative von Neumann entropy as an entanglement measure).

For very small $\delta$ the entanglement can be approximated as $(\delta/2)[1 - \ln(\delta/2)]$. Since entanglement is what mediates wave function collapse, if the reflected branch of the photon is subsequently detected, the detection collapses not only the photon wave function, but also the state of the mirror/beam-splitter which initially separated the two photon branches. If we include the detector, $|\mathcal{D}\rangle$, in the description, the collapse can be represented schematically as:

$$(1/\sqrt{2})(|\mathcal{B}_r\rangle|\gamma_r\rangle + |\mathcal{B}_t\rangle|\gamma_t\rangle) \otimes |\mathcal{D}\rangle_0 \implies |\mathcal{B}_r\rangle|\gamma'_r\rangle|\mathcal{D}_r\rangle$$

(where $|\gamma'_r\rangle|\mathcal{D}_r\rangle$ represents the absorption of the reflected branch of the photon by the detector).

The differences in the states for the macroscopic systems are, of course, completely unobservable in practice. However, the point is that the differences in the momenta of the two photon branches originated in the exchange of momentum with the much larger system. These types of exchange create very small differences in the states of macroscopic systems. When the collapse of the wave function transfers all amplitude out of one state and into another, it eliminates any physical trace of the momentum correlation between the undetected branch of the photon and preparation apparatus, and it enhances the exchange that provided momentum to the branch that is detected. In other words, the momentum apparently lost from the branch that has disappeared is effectively transferred back to the system with which it had previously interacted, and the “extra” momentum gained by the branch which has had its amplitude enhanced is paid for by the enhancement of the correlated state of the larger system(s) with which it has interacted. The total momentum of the combined system consisting of beam-splitter, photon, and detector is the same after the collapse of the wave function as it was before the interaction between the photon and the beam-splitter.

The collapse effects will actually extend even further since the macroscopic systems, $\mathcal{B}$ and $\mathcal{D}$, will have also interacted with their environments and become entangled with them. But this additional exchange of conserved quantities does not affect the essential point. There will also be residual entanglement relations between the measured system and systems with which it has interacted prior to encountering the preparation apparatus. In the example just described this would include the device

---

7For the most part this argument will deal with the issue of conservation laws in nonrelativistic quantum theory. However, for the essential aspects of entanglement exhibited in these simple sorts of exchange interactions, the relativistic nature of the photon and the technical complications in defining photon wave functions are irrelevant.
that emitted the photon. The effects on the states of these “pre-preparation” devices will naturally tend to decrease as one goes farther back in the entanglement chain. Later changes must be consistent with the pre-existing state, and, as these earlier systems develop new entanglement relations, the effects mediated by older, residual relations will diminish.

A couple of key aspects of this example should be noted. First, as stated at the beginning of this section, in order to consistently track conserved quantities, both microscopic and macroscopic systems (including any preparation apparatus) must be described in strictly quantum terms, with no classical interface or boundary. The Hamiltonian should contain only expressions referring to free evolution or to interactions between the component systems. External potentials must be avoided. When these conditions are not observed apparent paradoxes can arise. The paper of Aharonov, Popescu, and Rohrlich\[4\] mentioned earlier illustrates this point. Their example consists of a particle in a superposition of low-energy states that is confined to a box. They describe a situation in which the particle can escape and be detected in a high-energy state without any obvious source for the extra energy. In terms of the argument offered here, the generic explanation of the apparent paradox is that the small amount of entanglement between the particle and the box is not taken into account, and also that the box is described as a classical system which means that it acts as an \textit{external} potential. External potentials can serve as sources or sinks of normally conserved quantities. When they are included one cannot expect to make a detailed accounting of those quantities. (A more detailed analysis of the APR example will be given below in the discussion about conservation of energy.)

Gemmer and Mahler emphasize that a full description of these types of cases would recognize the entanglement between the microscopic and macroscopic systems:

“Thus it is, strictly speaking, unjustified to describe a particle in a box, \textit{which is part of an interacting quantum system}, by a wave-function” (italics added).

A second key aspect is that the manner in which the relevant quantities are conserved is \textit{nonlocal}, as is to be expected in situations involving wave function collapse. Initially, one might be concerned that such nonlocal changes in momentum or other conserved quantities might lead to superluminal signaling, since a measurement in one location can change the state of a distant system. The answer to this is that such changes can only be detected by a measurement on the system whose state has been changed. This “second” measurement is itself capable of bringing about the collapse to the observed state; so no information about whether a distant measurement has occurred can be acquired.

As noted, the tendency to ignore the very small amount of entanglement between the measured system and the preparation apparatus stems largely from the fact that the effect on the state of the apparatus is almost imperceptible. This tendency is reinforced by the fact that it is much more mathematically convenient to describe
these situations in terms of factorizable approximations. Both Gemmer and Mahler[1], and Durt[2] examine these approximations in some detail. In [1] the authors develop an estimate for the error involved in using the product state description. They derive an expression for the inner product between the approximate and exact quantum states and relate it to the purity, $P$, where their entanglement measure is defined as $1 - P$. Their relationship between the inner product and entanglement is generally similar to the example calculation given in the appendix, although their entanglement measure is somewhat different from the relative von Neumann entropy.

The relationship between entanglement and factorizability has also been examined by Thirring, Bertlmann, K"ohler, and Narnhofer[5, 6]. They show that entanglement depends on the tensor product structure of the Hilbert space, and that (pure) entangled states can always be transformed into factorizable states by a unitary transformation that alters that structure. Ordinarily we construct the Hilbert space for a combined system by forming the tensor product of the individual subsystems. In the example above one sector would correspond to the photon and the other to the beam-splitter. However, in order to analyze the interaction between systems it is usually more convenient to redefine the variables involved in order to decouple the equations. This decoupling implies a switch to a different tensor product structure.

For example, consider a system of two particles interacting through a position-dependent potential. In these situations the wave functions of the particles almost certainly become entangled, but the factorizable description in which one wave function corresponds to the center of mass, and the other to the reduced mass does not reflect the entanglement between the interacting systems. The redefinition of the coordinates as $R_{cm} = \frac{m_1 r_1 + m_2 r_2}{m_1 + m_2}$ and $r_{rel} = r_2 - r_1$ is a rotation of the coordinates in configuration space. This rotation is associated with a unitary transformation in the Hilbert space that changes the tensor product structure. When one of the systems is macroscopic and the other microscopic one has $m_1 \gg m_2$. This implies that $M_{tot} \approx m_1$, $\mu_{reduced} = \frac{m_1 m_2}{m_1 + m_2} \approx m_2$, and $R_{cm} \approx r_1$. If the center of mass is placed at the origin then we also have $r_{rel} \approx r_2$. Thus, it is very tempting to make the identifications suggested by the approximate equivalence, and to ignore the very small entanglement between the interacting systems. But we must remember that this is an approximation based on a deformation of the original tensor product structure. In any accounting of conserved quantities of the individual subsystems, we must keep track of possible exchanges brought about by the interaction between them. This means that we must recognize the residual entanglement induced by that interaction.

The example above has focused on momentum because that is the simplest way to illustrate the basic point, but the argument can be extended to cover the other conservation laws as well. The APR paper referred to above provides an especially interesting example of the apparent violation of energy conservation. They describe a particle in a box that has been prepared in a very special superposition of low-

---

\[ P = \text{Tr}(\rho^2) \] where $\rho$ is the reduced density matrix.
energy states which generate superoscillations. These special states are characterized by the fact that, over limited intervals, they can oscillate arbitrarily faster than the fastest Fourier component. The authors describe the situation as a low-energy particle that looks like a high-energy particle in the center of the box. Initially, the box is completely closed, but an opening mechanism slides along the top of the box, allowing segments of the wave function in the exposed region to escape. If a segment of the wave function in the high-frequency region is exposed there is some (very small) probability that the particle can be detected in a high-energy state outside the box. The detection of an initially low-energy particle in a high-energy state constitutes the apparent paradox. The example is carefully constructed to eliminate obvious sources for the extra energy. The opening mechanism cannot supply it, and correlations between it and the particle are minimized. The opening mechanism is the only system in the example other than the particle that is treated as a quantum system. Since it does not supply the extra energy APR pose the question of where the particle’s energy comes from.

As stated earlier the generic answer to the question is that the box, itself, and the preparation apparatus have to be included in the quantum description, and the entanglement relations between them and the particle have to be taken into account. More particularly, we can also examine the way in which the particle’s wave function is decomposed into Fourier components. The authors initially introduce the wave function as a superoscillation, and then show that when it is integrated over the entire box it can be represented as a superposition of low-energy Fourier components. This particular decomposition is appropriate as long as the box remains completely closed. However, when the box is partially opened, and a detector is placed outside, one could choose a different segmentation and decomposition that is especially adapted to the experimental situation. Since it is only the central segment of the wave function that is involved in the detection of the particle, one could calculate the energy by applying the energy operator to just this portion of the wave function, as was done with the momentum calculation for the localized detection of the spreading Gaussian wave packet described at the end of the previous section. The fact that the calculation gives a complex value should be seen as a reflection of the fact that, prior to detection, this is only a possible result of the measurement. Once the particle is detected, this calculation is over the entire resulting wave function, and the value becomes real. The “extra” energy supplied to the particle comes at the expense of the box and the preparation apparatus. The very slight changes in the states of these macroscopic systems that result from the collapse of the overall wave function are completely adequate to account for a substantial increase in energy by the elementary system.

The conservation of orbital angular momentum follows from conservation of momentum, provided that any exchanges of momentum are in the direction defined by the line between the systems involved. For the position-dependent potentials mentioned above this is automatic. However, since conserved quantities are reallocated in a nonlocal manner by wave function collapse it might seem that there is a chance
that the collinearity requirement could be violated by the reallocation. One can see that this does not happen by considering, again, the points that were made in discussing the conservation of momentum earlier in this section. When the wave function collapses the effects of the interactions that generated the unrealized branches are undone, and the effects of the interactions that generated the selected branch are enhanced. Therefore, all of the traces in the physical record are of local or "quasi-local"\[^9\] interactions. Hence, collinearity and conservation of orbital angular momentum are preserved. This is shown in more detail in the next section in which the illustrative arguments of this section are generalized by analyzing the evolution of interacting (and collapsing) systems in configuration space.

The analysis for spin (or intrinsic angular momentum) is somewhat more involved because systems involving this quantity are described by multi-component wave functions. The multi-component character of the wave function forces us to examine more carefully how the superposition principle affects the evolution of entanglement between two systems that are interacting. This examination also emphasizes, again, the need to treat both microscopic particle and macroscopic apparatus as interacting quantum systems.

The original Stern-Gerlach experiment\[^7\,^8\,^9\] used spin-\(\frac{1}{2}\) particles with unknown initial states. However, before considering this more general situation it will be easier to begin the discussion by assuming that the particles have been previously placed into an x-up state (parallel to the direction of motion). The inhomogeneous magnetic field of the S-G apparatus is in the z-direction and separates z-up and z-down components of the x-up particles. Downstream detectors then measure the z-spin state, collapsing it to one of the two possibilities. Since the collapse seems to eliminate any information about the phase relationship between the z-spin branches, it might not be obvious how the x-up angular momentum could be conserved.

The apparent elimination of relative phase information comes about because descriptions of Stern-Gerlach experiments typically treat the apparatus and magnetic field as classical entities. The Pauli equation describes the spin-\(\frac{1}{2}\) particle with a two-component wave function that is acted on by the magnetic field of the apparatus. This action is represented by the relevant term in the Hamiltonian: 
\[
-\frac{\hbar}{2\imath m c} \sigma \cdot B \begin{bmatrix} \phi_1 \\ \phi_2 \end{bmatrix}.
\]

In this representation the (external) magnetic field acts on the two components of the particle wave function, but these components do not act on the apparatus. Thus, any information about the relative phase differences that distinguish an x-up state from an x-down state appears to be lost when one of the two z-spin branches is subsequently detected.

The approximate, semi-classical description of the action treats the S-G apparatus as simply separating the z-up and z-down components of the particle state. In a more complete description the wave function would include both the particle and the apparatus as quantum systems, and the Hamiltonian would reflect the interaction

\[^9\]That is, interactions that are described by a position-dependent potential energy function.
between these two systems. A sufficiently detailed account of the interaction would show that the effect of the particle on the apparatus is different depending on whether it is initially in an x-up or x-down state (or a z-up state).

The crucial point is that the magnetic effects of the z-up and z-down components on the state of the apparatus will differ (very slightly) depending on their relative phases (corresponding to an initially x-up or x-down state)\(^\text{[10]}\). According to [1] and [2], subsequent to the interaction between the apparatus and particle there must be some entanglement between them. This can be represented as 
\[
\frac{1}{\sqrt{2}}(|P_{\text{up}}\rangle|z-\text{up}\rangle + |P_{\text{down}}\rangle|z-\text{down}\rangle),
\]
where \(P\) represents the (preparation) S-G apparatus.

The resulting combined state will vary depending on the initial phase relationship of the z-spin components, and, hence, must contain the initial phase information. (Note also that, since at this stage prior to any collapse the evolution is unitary, the x-angular momentum of the combined system must be conserved.) This means that as the \(|z-\text{up}\rangle\) and \(|z-\text{down}\rangle\) branches are deflected upward or downward, either some rotational motion about the x-axis must be induced, or the x-angular momentum must be transmitted to the apparatus.

Although the magnetic field is asymmetric the interactions between the \(|z-\text{up}\rangle\) and \(|z-\text{down}\rangle\) branches and the apparatus are generally similar. Therefore, the information about the initial x-angular momentum is shared, approximately equally, between the two component states, \(|P_{\text{up}}\rangle|z-\text{up}\rangle\) and \(|P_{\text{down}}\rangle|z-\text{down}\rangle\). So these two correlates reflect the conversion of an initially x-up (or x-down) state to either a z-up or z-down state. Roughly speaking, for the case of an initially x-up particle, they would be equivalent to the rotation of the x-up particle to a z-up state by a clockwise rotation about the y-axis (or some equivalent set of rotations) and a counterclockwise rotation to a z-down state. For an initially x-down state these rotations would be reversed. (If it had been in a z-up state there would be a simple deflection.) So, in the case of an initially x-up state that is subsequently detected in a z-up state the apparent creation of z-up angular momentum is actually supplied by the torque that the apparatus exerts on the spin state of the particle, and the apparent elimination of x-up angular momentum is, in reality, a transfer of angular momentum from the particle to the apparatus (or to a rotational motion about the x-axis)\(^\text{[11]}\).

This argument can be extended to cases in which the state of the system to be measured is unknown prior to its interaction with the preparation apparatus. The assumption of a specific phase relationship between the z-up and z-down components

---

\(^{10}\)The absence of, say, a z-down component would also result in a different apparatus state.

\(^{11}\)Note that the argument does not imply that the Hamiltonian acts in two different ways on an x-up state (which would be a violation of unitarity). Rather, the z-up and z-down components evolve differently under the action of the Hamiltonian, but this evolution will vary in a way that depends on the initial phase relationship of these z-spin components. This is due to the fact that the full Hamiltonian takes into account the action of both the component states of the particle (and the phase relationship between them) on the apparatus.
of the spin-$\frac{1}{2}$ particle was convenient for the purposes of illustration, but it was not really essential. If one assigned the components arbitrary amplitudes of $\alpha$ and $\beta$ then the superposed effects of the particle components on the preparation apparatus would result in superposed apparatus states corresponding to appropriate rotations of the initial particle spin state to $z$-up and $z$-down states. Angular momentum would again be conserved.

These examples have focused on the exchanges between the measured system and the preparation apparatus because, as noted at the beginning of this section, these are the exchanges that tend to be ignored in most discussions of conservation laws in relation to measurement processes. Clearly, the same general sorts of exchanges can occur during interactions with the measurement apparatus. As stated, these have been more frequently recognized since the effects of the measured system on the measurement apparatus are very obvious. The overall point is that when the total system consisting of the preparation apparatus, $P$, the measured system, $S$, and the measurement apparatus, $M$, is considered (along with incidental environmental interactions and prior relevant interactions involving $S$), the total $x$-angular momentum and the total $z$-angular momentum are the same before and after the measurement.

To avoid confusion over the fact that the $x$-angular momentum and the $z$-angular momentum do not commute, recall from Sections 1 and 2 that the way in which these quantities are being defined is as $q = \langle \psi | Q | \psi \rangle$, where $\psi$ is taken to represent the total system. The noncommutativity of two quantities simply prevents a system from simultaneously being in an eigenstate of both. The more general definition of these quantities can be applied to any pure state.

There are still several issues that must be addressed. Since the examples that have been discussed here are (of necessity) somewhat idealized, we must first consider the extent to which this analysis can be generalized. In many measurement situations the “preparation apparatus” is not as readily identifiable as in the cases examined above. To make the argument as inclusive as possible let us consider situations in which there are two successive measurements resulting in wave function collapse, with no intervening interactions. For definiteness, we can consider (approximate) position measurements.\footnote{In practice, almost all measurements can be construed as this type of measurement. This is due largely to the fact that the interactions that constitute measurements are position-dependent.}

First, it must be shown that the demonstrations in \cite{1} and \cite{2} that entanglement is a generic result of interaction can still be applied to this situation. This is necessary because one typically regards the initial wave function collapse as eliminating previously existing entanglement relations. To see that some residual entanglement between the measured system and measuring apparatus persists after the initial collapse, note that the relationship between them is essentially the same as it would have been if the measured system had been in an eigenstate\footnote{In almost all cases “eigenstates” of elementary systems are actually approximate eigenstates since there is nearly always some residual entanglement with larger systems.} of the relevant observable.
prior to the interaction with the instrument. In this situation there would have been no collapse, and one would expect that the results of [1] and [2] would still apply.

In the initial measurement the wave function is localized in a very small region. The collapse induced by the measurement effectively truncates the wave function that existed prior to the measurement, and thus eliminates most of the entanglement relations that were generated before the first measurement. Because the resulting wave function is highly localized it must consist of a large number of momentum states. For the most part these momentum states are induced by interactions of the particle with the measurement apparatus. The generation of these components of the particle wave function by the apparatus implies some amount of entanglement between the resulting apparatus and particle states. This means that the conclusions of [1] and [2] about the connection between interaction and entanglement still apply, even though we ordinarily think of a measurement as leaving the combined system in a product state. As in the situations involving interactions between a system to be measured and a preparation device the resulting state is only approximately factorizable.

After the initial measurement the various momentum components spread in different directions, thus diffusing the wave function of the particle over a large area. The subsequent detection by the second position measurement implies the selection of a relatively small subset of these momenta, namely, those consistent with the transmission of the particle from the initial measurement to the subsequent detection (as we saw with the spreading Gaussian wave packet in the previous section). As pointed out above, these momenta are entangled with the state of the first measurement apparatus. Thus the second collapse of the particle wave function also collapses the state of the initial measurement device.

Note that, although the second measurement selects a small subset of the momenta constituting the particle wave function, the change that is induced in the state of the first measurement apparatus is quite small. The mass of the apparatus greatly exceeds that of the measured system, typically by a factor of $10^{20}$ or more. Even in the case of a very energetic particle, the distribution of momenta in the apparatus wave function will easily dwarf the total momentum of the particle.

A related issue that merits some discussion was touched on briefly after the presentation of the example involving the photon, beam-splitter, and momentum conservation. It concerns possible differences in conserved quantities between the orthogonal states that existed prior to the interaction with the preparation apparatus. In the spin angular momentum example presented earlier these would correspond to the $z$-up and $z$-down components, and in the beam-splitter example these would correspond to predecessor photon component states (possibly differing polarization states) that were either transmitted or reflected. In the beam-splitter case, it is obvious that the differences in momentum of the two branches originate with the interaction between

---

14The re-localization of the particle also introduces new momentum components, but these can be attributed to the local interactions with the second measurement apparatus.
the photon and the beam-splitter, and the exchange in momentum makes it quite clear that there are two, very slightly different beam-splitter states, indicating some small degree of entanglement. In the spin angular momentum example the interaction between the S-G apparatus and the incident particle accounts for the changes in angular momentum. However, it is possible that there were conserved quantities other than those that were the main focus of the discussion that differed between the predecessor states. It is important to see how conservation can be insured for these other quantities. The argument to show this proceeds in a manner quite similar to what has already been presented.

In the beam-splitter example there are two orthogonal predecessor states, one of which is transmitted and the other reflected. These can be labeled, $|\text{t}_p\rangle$ and $|\text{r}_p\rangle$. If there are differences in some conserved quantity between these two states then there will be some entanglement between the photon and the emitting device, and subsequent to the interaction with the beam-splitter there will be some entanglement between the beam-splitter and the emitter. Therefore, when the state of the beam-splitter is collapsed to the state corresponding to reflection, the emitter is also involved in the collapse, and the quantities exchanged in the original emission are readjusted accordingly.

It might seem at first that there is a danger of an infinite regress involved in the chain of entangled systems affected by the collapse. However, as described a few paragraphs back, earlier measurement-induced collapses largely cut off the entanglement chain, thus limiting the extent of collapse effects.

To summarize, these illustrations have been intended to show how conservation laws can be strictly respected in measurement situations involving wave function collapse, even when the value of the conserved quantity attributed to the measured (sub)system is obviously changed. The redistribution of the relevant quantities within the total, entangled system including preparation apparatus, measurement instrument and, possibly, others can fully account for apparent differences. The resulting physical situation is one in which the conserved quantities, computed across all relevant systems as described in Sections 1 and 2, are the same after the collapse as they were prior to the initial interaction with the preparation system.

The argument so far has been made through examples. In the next section it will be generalized for nonrelativistic situations by carefully tracing, in configuration space, the evolution of the overall states of systems that interact and then collapse.

4 Entanglement, Collapse and Conservation in Configuration Space

The claim that conservation laws are strictly respected in individual instances of wave function collapse presupposes that the conservation laws hold for all cases of unitary evolution. In nonrelativistic theory this means that all exchanges of conserved
quantities are mediated by *conservative* potential energy functions. To insure strict conservation these potential energy functions must be position-dependent. It is also necessary that all systems be treated as quantum systems. There must be no classical boundary or external potentials.

At the end of Section 2 we saw that the values of momentum associated with different, approximately localized segments of a spreading Gaussian wave packet can vary in a way that depends on \( x \) and \( t \). The fact that conserved quantities can vary in this manner across a wave function is what leads people to suspect (or assume) that wave function collapse ordinarily leads to a violation of conservation laws in individual experiments. The examples of Section 3 were intended to show that: (1) apparent differences in conserved quantities are attributable to prior interactions with a preparation (or measurement) apparatus, (2) that these interactions generate entanglement relations with the apparatus, and (3) that when these relations are properly taken into account the apparent differences are compensated for by corresponding differences in their entangled partner states; hence, there is no violation of conservation laws in measurement processes. The goal here is to go beyond the examples of the previous section, and present a general argument by tracing the evolution of the wave functions of interacting systems in configuration space. It is the intimate link between the generation of entanglement and the exchange of conserved quantities that is the key to establishing the fundamental claim of this paper. To guarantee conservation through the measurement process it is also assumed that wave function collapse is induced by the kinds of interactions that constitute measurements.

I will first show that when exchanges of conserved quantities between systems are brought about by the interactions that generate entanglement relations, the segments of the wave function that carry the information about the exchanges are precisely those that define the entangled branches. In other words, variations in conserved quantities across different segments of a system’s wave functions can be associated with different entangled branches that result from prior interactions with other systems. When one of the systems undergoes a wave function collapse as a result of a measurement, the segment to which it collapses is entangled with the segment of the other system with which it exchanged conserved quantities. As a result of the collapse the physical state which instantiates the record of these exchanges between interacting systems is altered. Because the exchanges are conservative the surviving physical state will show no trace of any violation of conservation laws resulting from the interaction and subsequent collapse of the two systems.

To establish complete conservation it must also be shown that the loss of conserved quantities associated with the branches of the wave functions that were eliminated by the collapse is somehow compensated for. This is done by iterating the argument. As stated in the previous paragraph, “variations in conserved quantities across different segments of a system’s wave functions can be associated with different entangled branches that result from prior interactions with other systems”. Both of the systems under consideration will have experienced many prior interactions with other systems.
that account for the variations in conserved quantities and established entanglement relations. Therefore, the effects of the collapse propagate “backward” through all of the systems with which the measured system has interacted, collapsing the states of those systems to the branches that are entangled with the surviving branch of the measured system. To the extent that the values of conserved quantities of all of the systems involved have been determined by prior (entangling) interactions, the result is that the total value of the conserved quantities calculated across all the involved systems is the same after the collapse as it was before the collapse.

Consider two systems that are assumed, initially, to be unentangled. At some point in their evolution they interact and become entangled, after which one of them undergoes wave function collapse as a result of a measurement. The two systems can be labeled as $\phi(\vec{x})$ and $\chi(\vec{y})$. These systems will, in general, have pre-existing entanglement relations, but for now let us focus on the evolution of these two. The wave function representing the two systems in configuration space can be designated as $\psi(\vec{x},\vec{y})$. Prior to the interaction between the systems it is decomposable as a product state, $\phi(\vec{x})\chi(\vec{y})$. At some point the systems interact and become entangled. Subsequently, we assume that $\phi(\vec{x})$ collapses as a result of a measurement.

Since measurements consist of interactions, and interactions are position-dependent, virtually all measurements are, fundamentally, measurements of approximate position (or combinations of such measurements). So when $\phi(\vec{x})$, collapses, we can suppose that it is confined to a narrow region about some point, $\vec{x}_0$. Therefore, the combined wave function, $\psi(\vec{x},\vec{y})$, is collapsed to a narrow “strip” in configuration space, $\approx \psi(\vec{x}_0,\vec{y})$. So only the portion of $\chi(\vec{y})$ that lies within this strip survives. If, prior to the measurement, $\psi(\vec{x},\vec{y})$ had been factorizable ($\psi(\vec{x},\vec{y}) = \phi(\vec{x})\chi(\vec{y})$), the collapse would have had no effect on $\chi(\vec{y})$. However, since the systems are entangled as a result of their prior interaction, the probabilities and relative phases of the surviving components of $\chi'(\vec{y})$ are changed by the measurement outcome.

What must be shown is that after $\psi(\vec{x},\vec{y})$, has collapsed to $\approx \psi(\vec{x}_0,\vec{y})$, all changes in the relevant quantities in the surviving portion of $\phi(\vec{x})$ from before the interaction with $\chi(\vec{y})$, are due to exchanges with the surviving portion of $\chi(\vec{y})$, and vice versa. It is reasonable to expect that this is true since, as repeatedly argued, the exchange of conserved quantities and the generation of entanglement relations both result from the interactions between the systems. The fact that it must be true can be seen most easily by considering the evolution of the systems in the Feynman path integral formulation of (non-relativistic) quantum theory\[10\]. The amplitude of $\psi(\vec{x},\vec{y})$ at any point, $(\vec{x},\vec{y})$, in the collapse region is the sum of all of the interfering paths that pass through the point. The action associated with each path reflects the history of interactions between exactly those segments of the two systems that contribute to the net amplitude. The relative contributions of interactions at various points depend on how the paths interfere - constructively or destructively - at the point under consideration. So we see that the components, $\phi(\vec{x})$ and $\chi(\vec{y})$, of $\psi(\vec{x},\vec{y})$ at any point in the collapse region share a common history. Hence the only changes
of conserved quantities in these segments of the wave function result from exchanges between exactly these segments.

This point can be argued in a more heuristic fashion as follows. Observe that the assumption that the systems, \( \phi(\vec{x}) \) and \( \chi(\vec{y}) \), have become entangled implies that they have interacted, and that therefore, during the period of interaction \( -\nabla V(\vec{x}, \vec{y}) \neq 0 \). These variations in \( V(\vec{x}, \vec{y}) \) across the wave function will have led to variations in phase. These phase variations lead to destructive interference between components of the wave function that experience substantial differences in \( V \). Therefore, the wave function tends to separate into pairs of components, \( \phi(\vec{x})\chi(\vec{y}) \), that have experienced substantially similar levels of \( V(\vec{x}, \vec{y}) \). These are the components that have exchanged conserved quantities with one another, and it is these component pairs that essentially define the entanglement structure of the wave function.

This argument has been presented on the assumption that the wave function of one of the systems has undergone a collapse as a result of a measurement. However, it can be readily generalized to cover any situation in which two systems have interacted. Conceptually, after an interaction has occurred we can divide the configuration space into any number of “strips” centered about points, \( \vec{x}_1, \vec{x}_2, \vec{x}_3, \ldots \vec{x}_n \) (or \( \vec{y}_1, \vec{y}_2, \vec{y}_3, \ldots \vec{y}_n \)). The same analysis given in the previous paragraphs can be applied to this situation. This general argument shows that, in all cases of interaction, “variations in conserved quantities across different segments of a system’s wave functions can be associated with different entangled branches that result from prior interactions with other systems”. These entanglement relations will ordinarily persist until there is a wave function collapse. As outlined earlier, this means that the collapse effects can propagate “backward” through all of the systems that have exchanged conserved quantities with the measured system, or with other systems which have interacted with systems that are entangled with the measured system. So the collapse is capable of redistributing conserved quantities throughout the entanglement chain in a way that insures that the final value of those quantities, calculated over all of the affected systems is the same after the collapse as it was prior to the interactions that created the entanglement chain.

A few final points should be made. First, in the discussion about interactions between \( \phi(\vec{x}) \) and \( \chi(\vec{y}) \) no assumption was made about the size of \( \chi(\vec{y}) \). If, for example, it happened to have a very large mass, and act as a preparation apparatus, the argument would still go through, as long as it is treated as a quantum system. The assumption that the ordinary unitary evolution is conservative implies that it is still affected by interactions with \( \phi(\vec{x}) \), even though the effects are not readily discernible.

Second, a few limitations of this analysis should be mentioned. Since the evolution of interacting systems has been described in configuration space, it is clearly limited to nonrelativistic situations. There are some reasons to think that the claim concerning strict conservation can be extended to relativistic theory. To a large extent,
the argument depends on conserved quantities being shared by entangled systems. In some respects entanglement plays an even greater role in relativistic theory since particles are created in local, conservative interactions. Furthermore, most interactions with macroscopic systems can be described largely in nonrelativistic terms. I have also avoided dealing with situations in which magnetic fields must be described with vector potentials. In most nonrelativistic settings, scalar (position-dependent) potentials are sufficient to characterize magnetic interactions. There could be cases in which spin angular momentum is converted into orbital angular momentum (or vice versa) which require a more careful treatment.

Finally, aside from the assumption that wave function collapse is induced by measurement-like interactions, nothing has been said about how the collapse process guarantees conservation. Very briefly, this is done by adding a stochastic term to the Schrödinger equation. This term generates random shifts in amplitude among various segments of the wave function, proportional to the strength of the potential, in a way roughly similar to the shifts in phase brought about by the potential term in the ordinary Schrödinger equation. Even though the evolution is not strictly unitary, the overall normalization of the wave function is preserved by the additional stochastic term, thus insuring conservation of probability. This is described in more detail in the next section.

5 Implications for Quantum Measurement

Given the central role of conservation laws in physical theory one would like to see that they hold, without qualification, in all circumstances. The preceding argument for this possibility was developed by treating the apparent collapse of the wave function that occurs during quantum measurements as an actual physical occurrence. Let us now look, very briefly, at how some other approaches to understanding the quantum measurement process deal with the issue of conservation laws.

One very general way of classifying various views concerns whether they regard the role of the state vector as epistemic or ontological. Clearly, the assumption that wave function collapse is a real effect implies that the state vector is a genuine physical entity. Since epistemic interpretations do not view the wave function in this manner it could be argued that they are less firmly committed to strictly maintaining conservation laws in all situations. Therefore, to the extent that some ontological interpretations are not fully compatible with strict conservation, this could be regarded as an advantage for the epistemic viewpoint. The argument presented in the previous sections could eliminate that advantage, at least in relation to some accounts that explicitly incorporate wave function collapse. Given the complexity of the epistemic/ontological relationship, I will not attempt to examine it further in this note, and will turn instead to look at the implications for some ontological interpretations.

Ontological interpretations of the state vector can be broadly categorized as either
collapse or no-collapse accounts. No-collapse versions include Everett-type ("many worlds")\[11\] approaches and pilot wave (deBroglie-Bohm)\[12, 13\] theories\[16\].

The assumption that the state vector does not collapse means that it evolves in a strictly unitary manner according to the Schrödinger equation. Since conservation laws follow from unitary evolution in a very straightforward way, this is often regarded as an advantage for no-collapse views. But this has to be looked at more closely since the conservation that is predicted by unitary evolution is not the conservation that is observed.

Under strictly unitary evolution, as interactions occur they generate more and more entangled branches of the state vector. In the Everett approach each suitably delineated branch corresponds to a separate “world”. Observations are restricted to individual worlds. But the strict conservation of energy, momentum, and angular momentum that follows from unitary evolution holds only in the “multiverse”, the vast majority of which is not accessible to observation. Consistency between observation and the conservation laws is only obtained by continual rescaling of the state vector and the relevant quantities.

Although the ontology of pilot wave theories is quite different, the relationship between observation and conservation laws is generally similar. In this approach, the wave function propagates (unitarily) in a very high dimensional configuration space. Under a very simplified description of the deBroglie-Bohm approach, a particular system point in configuration space is selected which is assumed to indicate the positions of particles in physical space. One can envision the configuration space being extended in the time dimension so that the probability current defined in terms of the wave function generates flow lines in the extended space. The system point then follows whatever flow line it is on. All interactions are described by the Hamiltonian which determines the evolution of the wave function. Observations are restricted to the interactions that occur in the immediate vicinity of the system point. As in the many-worlds approach, an effective rescaling of the wave function and “conserved” quantities is required to achieve consistency.

In contrast to the no-collapse interpretations, wave function collapse implies that the evolution of the state vector is not completely unitary. Measurement processes effectively truncate the wave function and readjust the distribution of momentum, energy, and angular momentum. This general approach to understanding measurement suggests that it should be possible to give a theoretical description combining unitary and nonunitary evolution in strict adherence to conservation laws without ad hoc adjustments to the calculation of the relevant quantities. The conservation that is observed would be completely consistent with the conservation predicted by the theory. However, whether strict conservation can be maintained depends on how the collapse is assumed to come about.

The projection postulate of von Neumann\[14\] states that measurements on quan-

\[16\]Decoherence accounts can be viewed as either variants of the many-worlds approach, or as epistemic interpretations.
tum systems result in wave function collapse, but it gives very little indication of how collapse is connected to fundamental physical processes. To deal with this explanatory gap a number of stochastic collapse equations have been proposed to explain collapse at a more fundamental level. However, the most widely discussed versions of stochastic collapse do not appear to reproduce strict conservation in individual experiments. Some of them even violate the conservation laws when averaged over a large number of cases, at least as far as observable effects are concerned.

Stochastic collapse equations begin with the (unitary) Schrödinger equation in the form, $|d\psi\rangle = (-i/\hbar)\hat{H}|\psi\rangle dt$, and then add nonunitary, stochastic modification terms. The additional terms are chosen to reproduce Schrödinger evolution (to a very good approximation) for microscopic systems, but to yield reduction to an (approximate) eigenstate of the measured observable for macroscopic systems. ("Measured" can refer to either actual measurements in a laboratory, or measurement by environmental interactions.) There is a substantial body of literature devoted to this subject; some of the main papers include [15, 16, 17, 18, 19, 20, 21, 22, 23, 24, 25, 26].

A good general discussion of norm-preserving stochastic collapse equations is provided by Adler and Brun [27]. With $\hbar$ set to 1, one of the fairly general forms they arrive at can be represented as: $|d\psi\rangle = -i\hat{H}|\psi\rangle dt - \frac{1}{2}\sum_k \hat{\beta}_k^\dagger \hat{\beta}_k|\psi\rangle dt + \sum_k \hat{\beta}_k|\psi\rangle d\xi_k$. The $\hat{\beta}_k$ are nonlinear operators constructed from Lindblad operators, $\hat{L}_k$, with $\hat{\beta}_k = \hat{L}_k - \langle \hat{L}_k \rangle$. This formulation uses the Itô stochastic calculus, in which the $d\xi_k$ are independent, complex Wiener (Brownian motion) processes. The mean of these processes is assumed to be zero, and the Itô calculus rules state that $d\xi_j^* d\xi_k = dt \delta_{jk}$, $dtd\xi_k = 0$. Thus the $d\xi_k$ have the units: $(dt)^{1/2}$.

For this application the Lindblad operators are usually taken to be self-adjoint. Typically, they correspond to a particular type of observable; the idea is that the wave function will eventually collapse to an eigenstate of that observable. What differentiates various approaches to stochastic collapse is the choice of operator type. The two approaches that have been most prominent seek to reduce $\psi$ either to an approximate position state, or to an energy eigenstate. The problem for position-based approaches in regard to conservation laws is that the narrowing of the wave function implies an increase in energy. It has been proposed that this energy could be supplied by a randomly fluctuating classical field [28], but this field is not directly observable. In any case energy is conserved only on average - not in individual cases. The energy eigenstate approach was originally suggested by Gisin [22] and has been developed extensively by Hughston and Brody [29]. In it the $\hat{\beta}_k$ operators are constructed from the Hamiltonian. It does conserve energy on average, but not in individual experiments.

In order to develop a collapse equation that fully respects conservation laws we need to view wave function collapse as the selection of one entire branch in a system of entanglement relations, rather than as just the picking out of a particular eigenstate of the measured subsystem. We also need to focus on the interactions between subsystems that are responsible for the exchange of conserved quantities, and for the
generation of the entanglement relations. These relations are what mediate collapse, but the way in which they do so depends on the definition of the collapse basis. The argument of the previous sections strongly suggests that this basis be defined in terms of the interactions that generated the relations. In other words, the collapse operators, β_k, should be constructed from the interaction potentials.

The effect of the operators should also be scaled to reflect the degree of entanglement that is generated by the interaction. As noted earlier, the entanglement between the measured system and the preparation apparatus is extremely small, while that between the measured system and measurement apparatus approaches a maximum prior to the complete collapse. The scaling can be done by dividing the interaction potential by the combined mass of the interacting systems. Define \( \hat{V}' = \sum_{ij} V_{ij}/(m_i + m_j) \), where \( V_{ij} \) is the interaction potential between system \( i \) and system \( j \), and \( m_i \) and \( m_j \) are their masses. What distinguishes an apparatus used for preparation from one used for measurement is in the way that measured subsystems interact with them. Since instruments used to prepare a system are designed not to be affected to any noticeable extent by the interaction, a Schrödinger equation describing the preparation process would characterize the interaction with a single potential and a very large apparatus mass. In contrast, measurement processes involve a chain or cascade of interactions between the measured system and very small components of the measurement instrument.

By defining \( \hat{V}' \) as above we need only one collapse operator, simplifying the stochastic equation to:

\[
|d\psi\rangle = \left( -\frac{i}{\hbar} \hat{H} |\psi\rangle + \frac{1}{2} \beta^\dagger \beta |\psi\rangle \right) dt + \beta |\psi\rangle d\xi.
\]

ℏ has been explicitly reinserted here in order to draw attention to the dimensional properties of the equation. In order to maintain overall consistency, the expression, \( \beta |\psi\rangle d\xi \), must be dimensionless. This can be achieved by defining \( \hat{V} = \hat{V}'/(c^2 \sqrt{\tau_o}) \), and setting \( \beta = \hat{V} - <\hat{V}> \). Here \( c \) is the speed of light, and \( \tau_o \) is a time parameter that helps to determine the collapse rate. Since this discussion has been framed mainly in nonrelativistic terms, \( c \) serves simply as a convenient notation; it does not carry its usual significance as a limiting speed. However, given the ratio of ordinary interaction energies to energies represented by expressions like \( mc^2 \), it does remind us that we expect the collapse-inducing effect of individual elementary interactions to be very small.

Conservation laws can be maintained in individual instances of wave function collapse if the collapse process is tied directly to the interaction potentials because it is these potentials that mediate the exchange of momentum, energy, and angular momentum between systems. It is the variations in the potential energy, \( V \), that generate variations in phase across the wave function, and thus create entanglement. In the stochastic modification proposed here, these same variations are tied to the enhancement or reduction of different entangled branches, and hence, lead directly

\[\text{[17] Although its approach to the quantum measurement problem is fundamentally different from that advocated here, the decoherence program describes the collapse basis in essentially the same way.}\]
to the enhancement or reduction of the exchanged quantities. This enhancement or reduction also extends to quantities exchanged in the earlier interactions that generated entanglement relations.

In the collapse equation proposed here the type of state to which the wave function collapses is determined by the particular arrangement of interactions designed into the measurement instrument. The observable to which the relevant states correspond can vary, but it is again worth noting that since the interaction potentials are ordinarily of limited range, measurement results typically approximate position eigenstates.

The argument for this version of the collapse equation has been based on the possibility of maintaining the conservation laws under all circumstances. The same formulation is argued for separately in [31] based on the no-superluminal-signaling principle. That work provides a more comprehensive discussion of the issues surrounding quantum measurement, and, in particular, it addresses the problem of reconciling the nonlocal nature of wave function collapse with relativity.

6 Discussion

The projection postulate states that measurements on quantum systems induce wave function collapse. I have argued that if the postulate is taken as an integral part of quantum theory, and if the theory is consistently applied then it can be shown that conservation laws are fully respected in measurement processes. Consistent application means that all systems must be described in strictly quantum terms. In addition to the measured system this includes the preparation and measurement apparatus, along with any other systems with which they have interacted in a relevant way. Consistent application also means that the collapse process must originate in the kinds of entangling interactions that constitute measurements. The key to the argument is the recognition that the interactions among these systems are responsible both for the exchange of conserved quantities and the generation of entanglement relations.

The recognition that conserved quantities are almost always shared among entangled systems forces a new perspective on the way in which these quantities should be calculated. The conventional notion that a system must be in an eigenstate of an observable for the corresponding quantity to be well-defined is far too limiting. Since the superposition principle is central to quantum theory, there is simply no reason not to calculate these quantities by integrating over superpositions of eigenstates. This more inclusive form of calculation permits the assignment of these quantities in virtually all situations, and it makes possible a much more comprehensive discussion of conservation laws.

The fact that entanglement is what mediates wave function collapse is what allows this nonlocal process to be consistent with conservation laws. But, it also forces us to adjust our view of the nature of wave function collapse. In many discussions, collapse is treated, at least implicitly, as leaving the measured system in a pure product
state. This is too simplistic a view. Although collapse eliminates most entanglement relations, the nature of the interactions that induce it insure that some of these relations persist.

Perhaps the chief obstacle to considering projection or wave function collapse as an integral part of quantum theory is that its connection to elementary processes has been largely shrouded in mystery. I have argued in the previous section that the requirement that it must strictly respect conservation laws essentially determines the nature of this connection. It implies that collapse is induced by the sorts of entangling interactions that constitute measurements, and largely dictates the form of the stochastic collapse modification of the Schrödinger equation.

There have been a number of arguments in favor of a limited connection between entanglement and conservation laws in the literature. The original paper on entanglement (EPR) [32] relies, at least implicitly, on the conservation of momentum. Unnikrishnan has argued that entanglement follows from the need to respect conservation laws on average for discrete quantized observables [33, 34]. What I have tried to show here is that the connection between entanglement and conservation is both broader and deeper than indicated by these examples. Entanglement is an essentially universal feature of particle wave functions, even those we usually treat as being in (approximate) product states.

References


7 Appendix: Preparation Entanglement Measure

The entangled state used as an example in section 2 involved a photon, $|\gamma\rangle$, and the mirror component of a beam-splitter, $|B\rangle$. A formula for the photon/beam-splitter entanglement is derived here in order to illustrate that, although it is very small, the entanglement is not zero. For these simple cases the relative von Neumann entropy [14] serves as a useful measure of entanglement. It is defined as:

$$S(\rho_\gamma) \equiv -Tr[\rho_\gamma \log(\rho_\gamma)] = S(\rho_B) \equiv -Tr[\rho_B \log(\rho_B)],$$

where $\rho_\gamma$ and $\rho_B$ are the reduced density matrices. If the two branches of the photon wave function have equal amplitudes, then the entangled state that results when one of the branches is reflected by the mirror and the other is transmitted can be represented as

$$\left(\frac{1}{\sqrt{2}}(|\gamma_r\rangle|B_r\rangle + |\gamma_t\rangle|B_t\rangle\right).$$

Since $|B_r\rangle$ and $|B_t\rangle$ are not orthogonal, to compute the
entropy one first does a Schmidt decomposition of the state into the form,
\[ \alpha |\gamma_a\rangle |B_a\rangle + \beta |\gamma_b\rangle |B_b\rangle, \]
where both the pairs, |\gamma_a\rangle and |\gamma_b\rangle, and |B_a\rangle and |B_b\rangle, are orthogonal. The entropy is then given by
\[ -|\alpha|^2 \log(|\alpha|^2) - |\beta|^2 \log(|\beta|^2). \]

To perform the decomposition, we first represent the inner product between
\[ |B_r\rangle \] and \[ |B_t\rangle \] as
\[ |\langle B_r | B_t \rangle| = \mu = 1 - \delta. \]
Intuitively, one expects that \( \delta \ll 1 \). In a slightly more formal way it can be noted that, in order to get a fairly “clean” reflection of the photon, the position of the mirror must have an uncertainty much less than \( \lambda \), where \( \lambda \) is the wavelength of the photon. Hence, the representation of the beam-splitter state in momentum space prior to reflection, |\mathcal{B}_{\bar{0}}\rangle, must have a spread much greater than \( \hbar/\lambda \) where \( \hbar/\lambda \) is the momentum of the photon. So the change in the mirror state resulting from the exchange of momentum with the photon must be very small.

The assumption that the amplitudes of the two photon branches are equal implies a symmetrical form for the orthogonal states. (In general, calculating the Schmidt decomposition is more complicated.) The unnormalized states are:
\[ |\gamma'_a\rangle = |\gamma_r\rangle + |\gamma_t\rangle; \quad |\gamma'_b\rangle = |\gamma_r\rangle - |\gamma_t\rangle; \]
\[ |B'_a\rangle = |B_r\rangle + |B_t\rangle; \quad |B'_b\rangle = |B_r\rangle - |B_t\rangle. \]

Using the inner product, \[ |\langle B_r | B_t \rangle| = \mu \], to normalize the states we get:
\[ |\gamma_a\rangle = \frac{1}{\sqrt{2}} [ |\gamma_r\rangle + |\gamma_t\rangle ]; \quad |\gamma_b\rangle = \frac{1}{\sqrt{2}} [ |\gamma_r\rangle - |\gamma_t\rangle ]; \]
\[ |B_a\rangle = \frac{1}{\sqrt{2(1+\mu)}} [ |B_r\rangle + |B_t\rangle ]; \quad |B_b\rangle = \frac{1}{\sqrt{2(1-\mu)}} [ |B_r\rangle - |B_t\rangle ]. \]

Rearranging and substituting into the original form for the entangled photon-mirror state, we get:
\[ (1/\sqrt{2})(|\gamma_r\rangle |B_r\rangle + |\gamma_t\rangle |B_t\rangle) = \sqrt{\frac{1+\mu}{2}} (|\gamma_a\rangle |B_a\rangle) + \sqrt{\frac{1-\mu}{2}} (|\gamma_b\rangle |B_b\rangle). \]

So the coefficients in the Schmidt decomposition are:
\[ \alpha = \sqrt{\frac{1+\mu}{2}} = \sqrt{1-\frac{\delta^2}{2}} \quad \text{and} \quad \beta = \sqrt{\frac{1-\mu}{2}} = \sqrt{\frac{\delta^2}{2}}. \]
Thus, the entanglement measure given by the relative entropy, \(-|\alpha|^2 \log(|\alpha|^2) - |\beta|^2 \log(|\beta|^2)\), is
\[ -[(1-\frac{\delta^2}{2}) \log(1-\frac{\delta^2}{2}) + (\frac{\delta^2}{2}) \log(\frac{\delta^2}{2})]. \]
For \( \delta \ll 1 \), we can approximate by:
\[ -[1 * (-\frac{\delta^2}{2}) + (\frac{\delta^2}{2}) * \log(\frac{\delta^2}{2})] = (\delta/2)[1 - \ln(\delta/2)], \]
the form given in section 2.