

The Born rule

Yurii V. Brezhnev

Department of Quantum Field Theory, Laboratory of mathematical physics, Tomsk State University, Russia

We deduce the Born rule. No use is required of quantum postulates. One exploits only rudimentary quantum mathematics—a linear, not Hilbert’, vector space—and empirical notion of the statistical length of a state. Its statistical nature comes from the experimental detector-clicks being formalized into the abstract quantum micro-events. We also comment on that it is not only that the use has not been made of some quantum axioms when deriving the rule but, in a sense, their invoking would be inconsistent.

PACS numbers: 03.65.-w, 03.65.Ta, 03.65.Ca

Keywords: Statistics of quantum micro-events, Born rule

The connection between quantum theory and physical experiment begins with the famous ‘square of the magnitude’ formula $|\psi|^2$. This intuitive guess by Max Born [4]—“an intuition without a precise justification” (A. Cabello)—determines the statistical interpretation of quantum wave-function and, presently, no violation of the ‘rule of squares’ has ever been discovered. Its purposeful experimental testing, however, came into implementation relatively recently. The pioneering works of U. Sinha et al [26, 27] have demonstrated, in a 3-slit interference laser experiment, the null-effect within an accuracy $10^{-2} \pm 10^{-3}$. The rule is considered as one of the cornerstone of the theory, although many researchers have long pointed out [3, 9, 11, 15, 24, 25, 31–33], and it seems to be a majority opinion, that this Born formula stands apart from other tenets of quantum mechanics (QM), because it can be derived from the other ones and, thereby, it is not a fundamental ‘mantra’. Attempts at deriving the rule are of great variety, reveal interesting parallels [24], and have been the subject of an extensive literature.

Gleason [12] proved an advanced version of Born’s result as a statement about abstract measures on Hilbert’s spaces (see also [7] for a more comprehensive variant of this result), and Everett, in the framework of his famous treatment of QM [25], considered specifically the rule [11, pp. 71–72]. In 1999, D. Deutsch [9] revived Everett–DeWitt’s approach and initiated a new one, which relates the QM-theory with the representation theorems of classical decision theory through the characteristic terminology: strategies of a rational agent, bets, weight/utility functions (attributed to experimental outcomes), game theory, etc. Deutsch’s ideas were refined by Wallace [29], [25, p. 227–263] and Saunders [24] in the 2000’s; see also [2], Ch. 3 in the book [25] and bibliography therein. W. Zurek, by the “fine/coarse-graining” technique [31–33], developed a different—envariance/decoherence—strategy for deriving the rule. Graham [13] and Hartle [15], in the 1960–70’s, have proposed the frequency-operator method. There are other ways of looking at the problem [25, Ch. 5–6], [1, 21, 30]. These references are by no means complete; say, the arXiv-search

yields hundreds items with mentioning the ‘Born rule’ in abstracts.

All approaches—for extended bibliography see [20]—have been subject to mutual criticism [25, Ch. 4], [32, p. 25], [3, 8, 17, 20, 22, 28]. In particular, most if not all of the derivations appeal to unitary t -evolution and tensor products, whereas neither of these concepts has been present in Gleason’s theorem. One of the typical objections voiced against the alternative ideas is circular reasoning [8, 10, 13, 20, 25, 33]. This is a criticism made not just by proponents of one approach towards another, but one that is sometimes admitted by the authors of the ideas themselves [25, p. 415]. Most of the known approaches, including the Everettian one, have undergone revisions and refinements [25, Ch. 5], [10, 33]. These points reflect the long-standing problem with quantum foundations—linguistic self-referentiality in their substantiating. Thus the situation seems to be one whereby the numerous attempts to rationalize the ‘square’ preserve the status quo; none of the approaches have been widely accepted to date. The Born rule is continuing to exist as an arduous task, especially considering that the formula should be derived rather than being proved.

In this work we exhibit a straightforward deducing the mod-squared dependence. In doing so, it is suffice to rely not on the canonical axiomatics (of a Hilbert space) but on a formulation of QM-foundations as a theory of micro-events/clicks [5]. One uses only the most primitive property of the quantum-state set: to be a linear vector space (LVS). The primary idea of derivation—separation of the number entities—was in effect announced in sects. 9.1–2 of the work [5]. These sections, including some illustrative counterexamples therein, can be considered as an extended introduction to the present work and we reproduce the ideology here very briefly.

DOCTRINE OF NUMBERS IN QUANTUM THEORY, REVISITED

Theory begins with a number, and intuitive percep-

tion of this object is always accompanied by the notion of a physical unit [5, sects. 7.1–3 and Remark 16]. This is the interpretative reading the number in terms of the ‘quantity of something real’: metres, Stücke, sheep, etc. The releasing the number from such units—mathematization—turns it into an abstract operator \hat{n} and, then, into an abstract element n of the abstract set \mathbb{R} with arithmetic operations $\{+, \times\}$. Thereupon there arises a \mathbb{C} -structure of the complex numbers $\mathbf{a} := n + im$ equipped with the binary operations $\{\oplus, \odot\}$ and unary involutions

$$(n + im) \mapsto (n - im), \quad (n + im) \tilde{\mapsto} (m + in). \quad (1)$$

Recall [5, II-nd principium of QM], with specification of the number conceptions missing, the exegesis of ‘everything the quantum’ acquires the character of a circular argument. The last step is a creation of the other kind number-entities: *non*-abstract, reified quantities per se. It constitutes a mathematical realization of what we have been calling observable quantities: statistics, spectra, means, etc. In a word, the abstract numbers and the observational ones are significantly distinct by their nature. What is more, the quantum foundations themselves may not be grounded on the physical/observable concepts and their numeric forms.

Now, the quantum mathematics, in its rudimentary form, is *but an abstract* algebra* of a linear space \mathbb{H} over the \mathbb{C}^* -number objects and $|\alpha\rangle$ -expansions

$$\mathbf{a}_1 \cdot |\alpha_1\rangle \hat{+} \mathbf{a}_2 \cdot |\alpha_2\rangle \hat{+} \cdots \in \mathbb{H} \quad (2)$$

with respect to the eigen-vectors $|\alpha_j\rangle$ of an instrument \mathcal{A} . Because the notion of ‘observable’ is initially absent not only in nature but in theory as well,

- (•) the numerical values of that which is associated with the term ‘observable quantity’ may arise only as a supplement to the \mathbb{H} -algebra: the extra rules for manipulating the symbols $\{\mathbf{a}, |\alpha\rangle, \cdot, \hat{+}, \oplus, \odot, *, \sim\}$ in the construct (1)–(2).

These rules must constitute the mathematical maps—math add-ons over \mathbb{H} —into the ordered continuum equipped with arithmetic $\{+, \times\}$; the \mathbb{R} -numbers for short. The ‘ordered’ here because of the language’s notion ‘greater/lesser’. Such a scheme delivers the only means of formalizing anything that accompanies the low-level quantum mathematics in the form of notions that we portray in terms of natural language. These are usually referred to as physical quantities.

For example, statistics of $\underline{\alpha}$ -clicks [5, sect. 2.5–6], i.e., the relative frequencies (ν_1, ν_2, \dots) may come only from

\mathbf{a} -coefficients in (2):

$$(\mathbf{a}_1, \mathbf{a}_2, \dots) \mapsto \nu_j \iff \nu_j = f_j^{(?) }(\mathbf{a}_1, \mathbf{a}_2, \dots). \quad (3)$$

However, the ν -numbers are not the primordial empirical entities. In experiments—colliders, ion traps, interferometers, or any other quantum installation—we are dealing not with quantities that are subject to ‘rather specific’ constraints $0 \leq \nu_j \leq 1$ —a theoretical act that does not follow from QM-empiricism—but with gathering the registered micro-events $\underline{\alpha}_j$. It has been just these (additive) accumulations, being formalized into \mathbf{a}_j -coefficients, which are to be turned into the \mathbb{R} -numbers mentioned above, because it is in this way that the number tokens arise in theory at all [5, sect. 7.2]. Therefore, what is taken as a primary mathematical map must be not (3) but what we shall call *statistical length of an $|\alpha\rangle$ -representation*:

StatLength of (2).

Inasmuch as mathematics of $\underline{\alpha}$ -clicks implies the infiniteness of quantum-click ensembles, the **StatLength** should be created as a mathematical equivalent to the empirical wording ‘the quantity of micro-events’ having regard to—also empirical— Σ -postulate about theoretical infinity of the event number [5, sect. 2.5]. Considering that “das Unendliche findet sich nirgends realisiert” (D. Hilbert (1926)), we rely on the following underlying semantics:

$$(\text{infinite number of } \underline{\alpha}\text{-clicks} = \text{StatLength} \times \infty. \quad (4)$$

Notice that the integer-valued domain \mathbb{Z} , as such, does not appear in quantum theory. The discrete infinity \aleph_0 , upon applying the Σ -postulate, disappears and yields to continuum 2^{\aleph_0} . That is, an infinite accumulation of the $[\text{event-number} \mapsto \mathbb{Z}]$ leads to the following sequence of infinities

$$(\mathbb{Z} \times \infty) \mapsto \aleph_0 \mapsto 2^{\aleph_0} \mapsto \mathbb{R} \mapsto (\mathbb{R} \times \mathbb{R}) =: \mathbb{C} \stackrel{(3)}{\mapsto} \mathbb{R}^+$$

[5, sect. 4]. It is the quantum ensembles that give birth to the state-vector $\mathbf{a} \cdot |\Psi\rangle$ itself. The function **StatLength** is thus understood further to be the \mathbb{R}^+ -numeric one. Let us take a closer look at the situation, in order to ascertain properties of this function.

AXIOMS OF STATISTICAL LENGTH

First and foremost, the **StatLength** is associated only with (2) because quantum “empiricism ... yields *not* states and superpositions thereof *but* $|\alpha\rangle$ -representations” [5, sect. 8.3]. It is such representations that are primary in QM rather than the formal (superpositions of) states. For example, the writing **StatLength**($|\Psi\rangle \hat{+} |\Phi\rangle$) lacks meaning—or rather, in no way determinable—unless

* The abstracta themselves, the process of abstracting, its naturalness and inevitability are the subject matter of a comprehensive discussion in sects. 9.2–3 of [5].

the $|\Psi\rangle$ and $|\Phi\rangle$ are indicators of certain eigen-elements. At the same time, the writing $\text{StatLength}(|\Psi\rangle)$ is admissible since any element $|\Psi\rangle = 1 \cdot |\Psi\rangle \in \mathbb{H}$ may serve as the eigen one for a certain instrument \mathcal{B} . What are the empirical definienda (linguistic semantics) for the conception StatLength ?

Each of $\underline{\alpha}$ -clicks, in accord with their (\approx) -distinguishability, corresponds to a certain ket $|\alpha_j\rangle \leftrightarrow \underline{\alpha}_j$. Consequently, the need for frequencies (3) means that the partial lengths $\text{StatLength}(\underline{\alpha}_j \cdot |\alpha_j\rangle)$ should come into play. Certainly, these lengths must correlate with the total StatLength of (2). Besides, the numeric values of all the StatLength 's appear to be compatible with each other, for any statistical \mathcal{A} -representative

$$\mathbf{a}_1 \cdot |\alpha_1\rangle \hat{+} \mathbf{a}_2 \cdot |\alpha_2\rangle \hat{+} \dots = \dots$$

is re-developable with respect to other instrument \mathcal{B} :

$$\dots = \mathbf{b}_1 \cdot |\beta_1\rangle \hat{+} \mathbf{b}_2 \cdot |\beta_2\rangle \hat{+} \dots \quad (5)$$

What is more, even the very formal $|\Psi\rangle$ -object cannot be constructed without matching the two instruments \mathcal{A} , \mathcal{B} [5, sect. 5.4]. Let us agree to call the relation

$$\text{StatLength}(\mathbf{a}_1 \cdot |\alpha_1\rangle \hat{+} \dots) = \text{StatLength}(\mathbf{b}_1 \cdot |\beta_1\rangle \hat{+} \dots)$$

the instrument- or device-independence.

If the two events $\underline{\alpha}_1$ and $\underline{\alpha}_2$ are distinguishable by the \mathcal{A} -instrument ($\underline{\alpha}_1 \not\approx \underline{\alpha}_2$) then the statistical length of a $(\hat{+})$ -sum of two statistical $|\alpha\rangle$ -representatives

$$\text{StatLength}(\mathbf{a}_1 \cdot |\alpha_1\rangle \hat{+} \mathbf{a}_2 \cdot |\alpha_2\rangle) = \dots,$$

by the very nature of ‘the number of clicks’ and of ‘the mutual exclusivity of $\underline{\alpha}$ ’s’, is split into the numeric sum of the partial lengths:

$$\dots = \text{StatLength}(\mathbf{a}_1 \cdot |\alpha_1\rangle) + \text{StatLength}(\mathbf{a}_2 \cdot |\alpha_2\rangle). \quad (6)$$

This property determines a translation (homomorphism) of the ‘abstract’ $(\hat{+})$ -operation on \mathbb{H} -vectors into the ‘concrete arithmetical plus +’ between the \mathbb{R} -numbers. Of course, this is a peculiarity of the $|\alpha\rangle$ -bases, not of the arbitrary ones.

Definition (*axioms of StatLength*). The \mathbb{R} -valued function \mathcal{N} formalizes (homomorphically) the statistical-length conception by the rules of carrying the abstracta $\{\hat{+}, \cdot\}$ over to the arithmetic $\{+, \times\}$:

$$(\hat{+}) \mapsto (+) : \quad \mathcal{N}[\mathbf{a}_1 \cdot |\alpha_1\rangle \hat{+} \mathbf{a}_2 \cdot |\alpha_2\rangle \hat{+} \dots] = \mathcal{N}[\mathbf{a}_1 \cdot |\alpha_1\rangle] + \mathcal{N}[\mathbf{a}_2 \cdot |\alpha_2\rangle] + \dots \quad \forall \mathbf{a}_j, \quad (10)$$

$$(\cdot) \mapsto (\times) : \quad \mathcal{N}[\mathbf{c} \cdot (\mathbf{a} \cdot |\alpha\rangle)] = \text{const}(\mathbf{c}) \times \mathcal{N}[\mathbf{a} \cdot |\alpha\rangle] \quad \forall \mathbf{a}, \mathbf{c}. \quad (11)$$

The total StatLength is device-independent (meaningfulness of the StatLength -number):

$$\mathbf{a}_1 \cdot |\alpha_1\rangle \hat{+} \mathbf{a}_2 \cdot |\alpha_2\rangle \hat{+} \dots = \mathbf{b}_1 \cdot |\beta_1\rangle \hat{+} \mathbf{b}_2 \cdot |\beta_2\rangle \hat{+} \dots \quad (12)$$

\Downarrow

Meantime, there is yet another operation with the \mathbb{H} -vectors—the unary multiplication $|\alpha\rangle \mapsto \mathbf{c} \cdot |\alpha\rangle$ —and it should also be carried over to the arithmetic of the StatLength -numbers:

$$\text{StatLength}(|\alpha\rangle) \xrightarrow{\hat{+}} \text{StatLength}(\mathbf{c} \cdot |\alpha\rangle) = ?$$

Clearly, $\text{StatLength}(\mathbf{c} \cdot |\alpha\rangle)$ is a certain function of the StatLength of $|\alpha\rangle$. Therefore, simplifying notation $\text{StatLength}(\dots) \mapsto \mathcal{N}[\dots]$, we have to find a C-function:

$$\mathcal{N}[\mathbf{c} \cdot |\alpha\rangle] = \overset{(?)}{\mathcal{C}}(\mathcal{N}[|\alpha\rangle]). \quad (7)$$

On the other part, $|\alpha\rangle$ -objects are elements of LVS. This means that the \mathcal{N} -function must respect its axioms. In particular, the distributivity

$$\mathbf{c} \cdot (|\alpha\rangle \hat{+} |\beta\rangle) = \mathbf{c} \cdot |\alpha\rangle \hat{+} \mathbf{c} \cdot |\beta\rangle \quad (8)$$

entails

$$\mathcal{N}[\mathbf{c} \cdot (|\alpha\rangle \hat{+} |\beta\rangle)] = \mathcal{N}[\mathbf{c} \cdot |\alpha\rangle \hat{+} \mathbf{c} \cdot |\beta\rangle].$$

When $|\alpha\rangle$ and $|\beta\rangle$ correspond to distinguishable clicks $\underline{\alpha} \not\approx \underline{\beta}$, the additivity (6) entails a translation $(\hat{+}) \mapsto (+)$ on the right:

$$\mathcal{N}[\mathbf{c} \cdot (|\alpha\rangle \hat{+} |\beta\rangle)] = \mathcal{N}[\mathbf{c} \cdot |\alpha\rangle] + \mathcal{N}[\mathbf{c} \cdot |\beta\rangle].$$

All the \mathcal{N} -functions here are the ones of $[\mathbf{c} \cdot (\dots)]$. Hence,

$$\mathcal{C}(\mathcal{N}[|\alpha\rangle \hat{+} |\beta\rangle]) = \mathcal{C}(\mathcal{N}[|\alpha\rangle]) + \mathcal{C}(\mathcal{N}[|\beta\rangle])$$

and, applying additivity (6), now on the left, we obtain

$$\mathcal{C}(\mathcal{N}[|\alpha\rangle] + \mathcal{N}[|\beta\rangle]) = \mathcal{C}(\mathcal{N}[|\alpha\rangle]) + \mathcal{C}(\mathcal{N}[|\beta\rangle]).$$

The $(\hat{+})$ -abstractum disappears and we arrive at the standard functional equation for the linear (real-valued, continuous) numeric function [19, pp. 128–129]:

$$\mathcal{C}(x + y) = \mathcal{C}(x) + \mathcal{C}(y) \quad \Rightarrow \quad \mathcal{C}(x) = \text{const} \times x. \quad (9)$$

Thus, the abstract (\cdot) -sign in (7) has been converted into the numerical \times . Summing up, we introduce the function \mathcal{N} by a definition, which will suffice to derive the rule.

$$\mathcal{N}[\mathbf{a}_1 \cdot |\alpha_1\rangle \hat{+} \mathbf{a}_2 \cdot |\alpha_2\rangle \hat{+} \dots] = \mathcal{N}[\mathbf{b}_1 \cdot |\beta_1\rangle \hat{+} \mathbf{b}_2 \cdot |\beta_2\rangle \hat{+} \dots], \quad (13)$$

and the function \mathcal{N} is invariant under involutions (1):

$$\mathcal{N}[\mathbf{a}^* \cdot |\alpha\rangle] = \mathcal{N}[\mathbf{a} \cdot |\alpha\rangle] = \mathcal{N}[\tilde{\mathbf{a}} \cdot |\alpha\rangle]. \quad (14)$$

Property (11) is actually not an axiom because the sequencing between formulas (7) and (9) is a derivation of (11); nor is (14) an axiom [5]. Beyond that, the (\times) -scalability (11) may be postulated even purely semantically. Indeed, an operator characterization of the number [5, sect. 7.2]—no matter, of the real/complex—entails the replication of quantum ensembles. The replication means that the quantity $\text{StatLength}(|\Psi\rangle)$, upon action of the ‘ $\hat{\mathbf{c}}$ -operator’ on $|\Psi\rangle$, is merely multiplied by a certain $\mathbb{R}\text{-const}(\mathbf{c})$. Speaking more loosely, we are dealing with a kind of homomorphism

$$(\hat{\cdot})\text{-replication} = \left\{ \begin{array}{l} \text{to be multiplied by } \dots \\ \Rightarrow \text{scalability (11)} \end{array} \right\}.$$

But it is just this mechanism—a group with \mathbf{c} -scalars as operator automorphisms—that is realized in the axiomatic structure which has been calling ‘*the LVS*’; in particular, axiom (8). See a selected thesis following Remark 16 in the work [5]. With regard to axiom (10), symbols $\hat{+}$ and $+$ are inherited from the ‘ensemble-accumulation theory’ by means of the union operation \cup [5, sect. 5].

A shorter way to put the said above is that the language usage of the notion (4), in all the linguistic diversity of the StatLength ’s descriptions, will boil down to the formal precepts (10)–(14).

Remark 1. Let us return once again to the thesis (•). The $|\alpha\rangle$ -additivity, scalability, and device-independence are not merely semantic characteristics. That is, the meaning associated with the terms ‘observable value/lengths/volumes etc’ is *not* something that is conceived of or rephrased by various words, but precisely—and this we stress with emphasis—what’s being (abstractly) added ($+$), multiplied (\times), and calculated with \mathbb{R} -characters, irrespective of how it is being observed. However, any math-realization of this entity does not and cannot exist a priori as a formula*. The latter is to be created from scratch while we have no (more primary) mathematics at our disposal apart from the \mathbb{H} -space algebra: the \mathbb{C}^* -numbers and LVS. Accordingly, *there is no room here for interpretations*—the correspondence $[\text{math} \mapsto \text{phys}]$ —of mathematical symbols in terms of (yet unclear) ‘observable categories’ or other words. The former are created on the basis of the rules listed above and of the quantum-clicks’ theory [5]. Or, if it comes to that, *the interpretation is in itself the rules* (10)–(14). No other sources of the StatLength -formula exist.

* “There is no arithmetic in interferometers/colliders—there are only clicks there ...” [5, sect. 2.3].

THE RULE

Now, we have to find the numeric $N(\mathbf{a})$ -representation

$$\mathcal{N}[\mathbf{a} \cdot |\alpha\rangle] = \overset{(?)}{N(\mathbf{a})}. \quad (15)$$

Stated differently, additivity (10) creates the function N (of a *single numeric* argument) whose properties are specified by **Definition**. The further strategy is to process axioms (11)–(14). The first step is (14) and scalability (11); the result will be $N(\mathbf{a}) \sim |\mathbf{a}|^{2 \cdot p}$. The second step concerns the ‘arrow’ (12), which will result $N(\mathbf{a}) \sim |\mathbf{a}|^{2 \cdot 1}$.

Condition (14) tells us that $N(\mathbf{a})$ must be invariant upon actions of the non- \mathbb{C} -algebraical involutions (1):

$$N(\mathbf{a}^*) = N(\mathbf{a}) = N(\tilde{\mathbf{a}}),$$

but due to the algebraic connection $\tilde{\mathbf{a}} = \mathbf{i} \odot \mathbf{a}^*$, we may forget either of them. Hence $N(\mathbf{a})$ is a symmetrical function $N_*(\mathbf{a}, \mathbf{a}^*)$ of the two (\mathbb{C} -algebraically independent) variables $(\mathbf{a}, \mathbf{a}^*)$ and can be represented as an expression in the symmetrical polynomials $\{1, \mathbf{a} \oplus \mathbf{a}^*, \mathbf{a} \odot \mathbf{a}^*\}$:

$$\begin{aligned} N(\mathbf{a}) &= N_*(\mathbf{a}, \tilde{\mathbf{a}}) \\ &= 1\gamma_0 + \gamma_1(\mathbf{a} + \tilde{\mathbf{a}}) + \gamma_2(\mathbf{a}\tilde{\mathbf{a}}) + \gamma_3(\mathbf{a} + \tilde{\mathbf{a}})(\mathbf{a}\tilde{\mathbf{a}}) \\ &\quad + \dots + \gamma_{\ell p}(\mathbf{a} + \tilde{\mathbf{a}})^\ell (\mathbf{a}\tilde{\mathbf{a}})^p + \dots \end{aligned} \quad (16)$$

(γ ’s $\in \mathbb{R}$, $\gamma = ?$). Here, as always in the sequel, we have adopted a bar notation for the complex conjugation $\mathbf{a}^* =: \tilde{\mathbf{a}}$ and the standard convention for the addition/multiplication symbols $\{\oplus, \odot\}$ and $\{+, \times\}$ between both the \mathbb{C} - and \mathbb{R} -numbers.

Let us consider the N_* -representation of the scalability property (11):

$$N_*(\mathbf{c}\mathbf{a}, \tilde{\mathbf{c}}\tilde{\mathbf{a}}) = \text{const}(\mathbf{c}) \times N_*(\mathbf{a}, \tilde{\mathbf{a}}). \quad (17)$$

This identity, upon substitution (16), reads as follows

$$\begin{aligned} \sum_{\ell, p} \gamma_{\ell p} (\mathbf{c}\mathbf{a} + \tilde{\mathbf{c}}\tilde{\mathbf{a}})^\ell (\mathbf{c}\mathbf{a}\tilde{\mathbf{c}}\tilde{\mathbf{a}})^p \\ = \text{const}(\mathbf{c}) \times \sum_{\ell, p} \gamma_{\ell p} (\mathbf{a} + \tilde{\mathbf{a}})^\ell (\mathbf{a}\tilde{\mathbf{a}})^p. \end{aligned}$$

Since \mathbf{c} is arbitrary in axiom (11), put $\mathbf{c} = r \in \mathbb{R}$ for a moment. One obtains

$$\sum_{\ell, p} \gamma_{\ell p} \{r^{2p+\ell} - \text{const}(r)\} (\mathbf{a} + \tilde{\mathbf{a}})^\ell (\mathbf{a}\tilde{\mathbf{a}})^p = 0 \quad \forall r, \mathbf{a}, \tilde{\mathbf{a}}$$

and, hence, nontrivial solutions for $\text{const}(r)$ is possible only if $2p + \ell$ is a fixed (external) integer; denote it K .

Therefore, sum (16) becomes the one of finitely many terms and all of them are homogeneous in \mathbf{a} , $\bar{\mathbf{a}}$:

$$\begin{aligned} N_*(\mathbf{a}, \bar{\mathbf{a}}) &= \sum \gamma_{\ell p} (\mathbf{a} + \bar{\mathbf{a}})^\ell (\mathbf{a}\bar{\mathbf{a}})^p \Big|_{2p+\ell=K} \\ &= \sum_{p=0}^{K/2} \gamma_{K-2p,p} (\mathbf{a} + \bar{\mathbf{a}})^{K-2p} (\mathbf{a}\bar{\mathbf{a}})^p. \end{aligned} \quad (18)$$

When $K = 1, 3, 5, \dots$ we have only the odd $(K - 2p)$ -powers $(\mathbf{a} + \bar{\mathbf{a}})^1, (\mathbf{a} + \bar{\mathbf{a}})^3, \dots$ in the p -sum (18). In such a case, $N_*(\mathbf{a}, \bar{\mathbf{a}}) \sim (\mathbf{a} + \bar{\mathbf{a}})$ and, hence, $N(\mathbf{a}) = 0$ at $\mathbf{a} = i\mathbb{R} \neq 0$. That K -case must be discarded because $N(\mathbf{a}) = 0$ only if $\mathbf{a} = 0$ by the very statistical nature of the \mathbf{a} -coordinates. More formally, suppose the contrary, i. e., let there exist some ‘specific’ $\mathbf{a}' \neq 0$ such that $N(\mathbf{a}') = 0$. From (11) and (15) there follows

$$\begin{aligned} \forall \mathbf{c}: \quad N(\mathbf{c}\mathbf{a}') &= \text{const}(\mathbf{c}) \times N(\mathbf{a}') = \text{const}(\mathbf{c}) \times 0 = 0 \\ \Rightarrow \quad N(\mathbf{c}\mathbf{a}') &= 0 \quad \Rightarrow \quad N(\mathbf{c}') = 0 \quad \forall \mathbf{c}'; \end{aligned}$$

the trivial solution.

Thus, only the even $K = 0, 2, 4, \dots$ and even powers $(K - 2p) \in \{K, K - 2, \dots, 0\}$ of $(\mathbf{a} + \bar{\mathbf{a}})$ are allowed in (18):

$$N_*(\mathbf{a}, \bar{\mathbf{a}}) = \gamma_0 (\mathbf{a} + \bar{\mathbf{a}})^0 (\mathbf{a}\bar{\mathbf{a}})^p + \gamma_2 (\mathbf{a} + \bar{\mathbf{a}})^2 (\mathbf{a}\bar{\mathbf{a}})^{p-1} + \dots$$

($2p := K$). Homogeneity in \mathbf{a} guides us, before substituting this ansatz into (17), to switch over to the modulus-phase forms $\mathbf{a} = \varrho e^{i\varpi}$, $\mathbf{c} = r e^{it}$:

$$N_*(\mathbf{a}, \bar{\mathbf{a}}) = \varrho^{2p} \{ \gamma_0 + \gamma_2 \cos^2 \varpi + \gamma_4 \cos^4 \varpi + \dots \}$$

(we renormalized γ ’s). Then the scaling $\mathbf{a} \mapsto \mathbf{c}\mathbf{a}$ amounts to the change $(\varrho, \varpi) \mapsto (\varrho r, \varpi + t)$ in the latter expression. One gets, instead of (17),

$$\begin{aligned} (\varrho r)^{2p} \{ \gamma_0 + \gamma_2 \cos^2(\varpi + t) + \gamma_4 \cos^4(\varpi + t) + \dots \} \\ = \text{const}(r, t) \times \varrho^{2p} \{ \gamma_0 + \gamma_2 \cos^2 \varpi + \gamma_4 \cos^4 \varpi + \dots \}, \end{aligned}$$

where all the variables $(\varrho, \varpi; r, t)$ are understood to be independent and equal in rights. It is immediately seen that there is only one possibility here:

$$\text{const}(r, t) = \text{const}'(r) = r^{2p}, \quad \gamma_0 = \text{free},$$

and $\gamma_2 = \gamma_4 = \dots = 0$; put, for example, $\varpi = 0$. As a result, only one term survives in sum (16):

$$N(\mathbf{a}) = \gamma_0 \times (\mathbf{a}\bar{\mathbf{a}})^p$$

with yet free $p = 1, 2, 3, \dots$. Clearly, the (\sim) -involution (1) would yield the same answer:

$$\begin{aligned} \mathcal{N}[\mathbf{a}_1 \cdot |\alpha_1\rangle + \mathbf{a}_2 \cdot |\alpha_2\rangle + \dots] \\ = \text{const} \times (|\mathbf{a}_1|^{2p} + |\mathbf{a}_2|^{2p} + \dots). \end{aligned} \quad (19)$$

Getting ahead of ourselves, we could claim $p = 1$ right here because none of the values $p = 2, 3, \dots$ may be

preferable to any other (the ‘world constant’ $p \geq 2$?), while $p = 1$ is minimal in this series. And yet, we address the device-independence (12) because it implies a changing of instruments $\mathcal{A} \rightleftharpoons \mathcal{B}$ and so the change of eigenstate bases: $\{|\alpha_1\rangle, |\alpha_2\rangle, \dots\}_{\mathcal{A}} \rightleftharpoons \{|\beta_1\rangle, |\beta_2\rangle, \dots\}_{\mathcal{B}}$.

When the family of \mathcal{A} -distinguishable clicks coincides with the family of the \mathcal{B} -distinguishable ones $\{\alpha_1, \dots\} = \{\beta_1, \dots\}$, we have actually one and the same instrument: $\mathcal{A} = \mathcal{B}$. In the $|\alpha\rangle$ -language, this means

$$\{|\alpha_1\rangle, |\alpha_2\rangle, \dots\}_{\mathcal{A}} = \{|\beta_1\rangle, |\beta_2\rangle, \dots\}_{\mathcal{B}},$$

and the scale transformations $|\alpha\rangle \mapsto \mathbf{c} \cdot |\alpha\rangle = |\beta\rangle$ may be disregarded here since the eigen-states themselves* are defined to within multiplicative constants. We then have to declare transformations like $|\alpha_j\rangle \mapsto |\beta_s\rangle \sim |\alpha_k\rangle$ as *trivial* permutations.

It is clear that the arbitrary permutation is formed from transpositions like $\{|\alpha_1\rangle \mapsto |\alpha_2\rangle, |\alpha_2\rangle \mapsto |\alpha_1\rangle\}$. Therefore it will suffice to consider the 2-dimensional changes and to exclude the trivial diagonal (identical) and antidiagonal (transpositions) ones:

$$\begin{pmatrix} |\beta_1\rangle \\ |\beta_2\rangle \end{pmatrix} = \begin{pmatrix} 1 & 0 \\ 0 & 1 \end{pmatrix} \begin{pmatrix} |\alpha_1\rangle \\ |\alpha_2\rangle \end{pmatrix}, \quad \begin{pmatrix} |\beta_1\rangle \\ |\beta_2\rangle \end{pmatrix} = \begin{pmatrix} 0 & 1 \\ 1 & 0 \end{pmatrix} \begin{pmatrix} |\alpha_1\rangle \\ |\alpha_2\rangle \end{pmatrix}.$$

The nontrivial basis-changes, say, the simplest ones

$$(|\alpha_1\rangle, |\alpha_2\rangle; |\alpha_3\rangle, \dots)_{\mathcal{A}} \rightleftharpoons (|\beta_1\rangle, |\beta_2\rangle; |\alpha_3\rangle, \dots)_{\mathcal{B}}, \quad (20)$$

correspond to observations by ‘non-commuting devices’ $\mathcal{A} \neq \mathcal{B}$ and the latter do, without fail, exist in quantum theory [5, III-rd principium of QM]. We now have to pass to the ‘erasing’ the $|\text{ket}\rangle$ -symbols from (13) because (15) and the formal applying (19) to (13) ignore the down-arrow (12) and thereby any relationships (20) between $|\alpha\rangle$ ’s and $|\beta\rangle$ ’s, as well as the very consequence (13):

$$(\mathbf{a}_1 \bar{\mathbf{a}}_1)^p + (\mathbf{a}_2 \bar{\mathbf{a}}_2)^p = (\mathbf{b}_1 \bar{\mathbf{b}}_1)^p + (\mathbf{b}_2 \bar{\mathbf{b}}_2)^p. \quad (21)$$

Inasmuch as we have dealt with an LVS-basis change (20), the coordinate representative $(\mathbf{a}_1, \mathbf{a}_2, \dots)$ of (one and the same) $|\text{ket}\rangle$ -vector (5) undergoes an associated *linear* transformation U . In consequence, there must exist the numeric changes

$$\begin{pmatrix} \mathbf{a}_1 \\ \mathbf{a}_2 \end{pmatrix} \xrightarrow{U} \begin{pmatrix} \mathbf{b}_1 \\ \mathbf{b}_2 \end{pmatrix} = \begin{pmatrix} a & b \\ c & d \end{pmatrix} \begin{pmatrix} \mathbf{a}_1 \\ \mathbf{a}_2 \end{pmatrix} \quad (22)$$

and their (anti)diagonal subclass

$$U = \begin{pmatrix} a & 0 \\ 0 & d \end{pmatrix} \quad \text{or} \quad U = \begin{pmatrix} 0 & b \\ c & 0 \end{pmatrix}$$

* Notice that the ‘eigen’ does not mean here the eigen-vector of an operator. No operators appear in reasoning or in ‘ \mathbb{H} -mathematics’ at the moment. We also put for simplicity that the spectral labels assigned to these vectors are non-degenerated (= distinguishable).

should also be thought of as the trivial changes. Apart from the obvious $\det U \neq 0$, this yields the nontriviality condition for (22):

$$ab \neq 0 \neq cd. \quad (23)$$

That said, equality (21) should be supplemented with (22)–(23) and obeyed under all \mathbf{a} 's. Simplifying notation $(\mathbf{a}_1, \mathbf{a}_2) \mapsto (\mathbf{x}, \mathbf{y})$, we require

$$\begin{aligned} & (\mathbf{x}\bar{\mathbf{x}})^{\mathbf{p}} + (\mathbf{y}\bar{\mathbf{y}})^{\mathbf{p}} \\ &= (\mathbf{a}\mathbf{x} + \mathbf{b}\mathbf{y})^{\mathbf{p}}(\overline{\mathbf{a}\mathbf{x} + \mathbf{b}\mathbf{y}})^{\mathbf{p}} + (\mathbf{c}\mathbf{x} + \mathbf{d}\mathbf{y})^{\mathbf{p}}(\overline{\mathbf{c}\mathbf{x} + \mathbf{d}\mathbf{y}})^{\mathbf{p}} \end{aligned}$$

for all $(\mathbf{x}, \bar{\mathbf{x}}, \mathbf{y}, \bar{\mathbf{y}})$, which are understood to be independent variables. By expanding, some binomial expansions arise ($\mathbf{p} \geq 2$):

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbf{x}^{\mathbf{p}}\bar{\mathbf{x}}^{\mathbf{p}} + \mathbf{y}^{\mathbf{p}}\bar{\mathbf{y}}^{\mathbf{p}} &= (\mathbf{a}^{\mathbf{p}}\bar{\mathbf{a}}^{\mathbf{p}} + \mathbf{c}^{\mathbf{p}}\bar{\mathbf{c}}^{\mathbf{p}}) \cdot \mathbf{x}^{\mathbf{p}}\bar{\mathbf{x}}^{\mathbf{p}} + \dots \\ &+ \mathbf{p}^2 \cdot \{(\mathbf{a}\mathbf{x})^{\mathbf{p}-1}(\mathbf{b}\mathbf{y}) \cdot (\bar{\mathbf{a}}\bar{\mathbf{x}})^{\mathbf{p}-1}(\bar{\mathbf{b}}\bar{\mathbf{y}}) \\ &+ (\mathbf{c}\mathbf{x})^{\mathbf{p}-1}(\mathbf{d}\mathbf{y}) \cdot (\bar{\mathbf{c}}\bar{\mathbf{x}})^{\mathbf{p}-1}(\bar{\mathbf{d}}\bar{\mathbf{y}})\} + \dots \\ &+ (\mathbf{b}^{\mathbf{p}}\bar{\mathbf{b}}^{\mathbf{p}} + \mathbf{d}^{\mathbf{p}}\bar{\mathbf{d}}^{\mathbf{p}}) \cdot \mathbf{y}^{\mathbf{p}}\bar{\mathbf{y}}^{\mathbf{p}} = \dots, \end{aligned}$$

where only one cross-term $(\mathbf{x}\bar{\mathbf{x}})^{\mathbf{n}} \cdot (\mathbf{y}\bar{\mathbf{y}})^{\mathbf{m}}$ has been displayed. Collecting in $\mathbf{x}\bar{\mathbf{x}}$ and $\mathbf{y}\bar{\mathbf{y}}$, one gets (among other terms)

$$\begin{aligned} \dots &= \dots + \mathbf{p}^2 \cdot \underbrace{\{|a|^{2\mathbf{p}-2}|b|^2 + |c|^{2\mathbf{p}-2}|d|^2\}}_{\text{wavy-emphasized}} \\ &\quad \times (\mathbf{x}\bar{\mathbf{x}})^{\mathbf{p}-1}(\mathbf{y}\bar{\mathbf{y}}) + \dots \end{aligned}$$

Clearly, such expressions have always been present in the sum and the wavy-emphasized term must be zero. Hence,

$$|a^{\mathbf{p}-1}b|^2 + |c^{\mathbf{p}-1}d|^2 = 0 \quad \Rightarrow \quad \{ab = 0 = cd\}.$$

This contradicts (23). Only trivial permutations (consequently, only ‘commuting devices’) are allowed under $\mathbf{p} \geq 2$. Thus, $\mathbf{p} = 1$ and (19) is refined:

$$\begin{aligned} & \text{StatLength}(\mathbf{a}_1 \cdot |\alpha_1\rangle \hat{+} \mathbf{a}_2 \cdot |\alpha_2\rangle \hat{+} \dots) \\ &= \text{const} \times (|\mathbf{a}_1|^2 + |\mathbf{a}_2|^2 + \dots), \quad (24) \end{aligned}$$

where **const** must be a common, while free, constant for all the $|\alpha\rangle$ -representations. Extended to the higher dimensions ($N \times N$), the U -matrices (21)–(22) preserve the sum of squares (24), and matrix $(U^{\top})^{-1}$ determines a corresponding change of the base vectors $|\alpha_j\rangle$ into the other ones. Thereby, an abstract \hat{U} -transform on \mathbb{H} has been well defined, and it is known to be nontrivial. Call this property *unitarity*, and that’s the point where this concept comes into quantum theory.

We now return to the task (3). The semantics (4) suggests the only way of harmonizing the ‘theoretical infinity ∞ ’– Σ -postulate—with finite quantities* coming

from experiment; their \mathbb{R}^+ -numerical images, to be precise. Namely, we introduce by definition the concept (it was not so far) of the micro-events’ long-run frequencies:

$$\nu_k := \frac{\text{StatLength}_k \times \infty}{\sum_j (\text{StatLength}_j \times \infty)}.$$

Finally, the completed formulation of Born’s result has not been exhausted by the squares’ formula.

• The 2-nd theorem of quantum empiricism

- 1) *Basis-independence*: the sum of squares (24) is the only rule that is compatible with the **StatLength**-additivity and the ‘device non-commutativity’ $\{|\alpha_j\rangle\}_{\mathcal{A}} \neq \{|\beta_k\rangle\}_{\mathcal{B}}$.
- 2) *The \hat{U} -equivalence of bases*: the changing of observational instruments $\mathcal{A} \rightleftharpoons \mathcal{B}$ is represented in \mathbb{H} by unitary transformation $\{|\alpha_j\rangle\} \xrightarrow{U} \{|\beta_k\rangle\}$ between their eigen-states.
- 3) The $\underline{\alpha}$ -events’ statistics for representation (2) is approximated according to the *Born rule*

$$\nu_k = \frac{|\mathbf{a}_k|^2}{|\mathbf{a}_1|^2 + |\mathbf{a}_2|^2 + \dots}. \quad (25)$$

- 4) No use is required of the Hilbertian/tensor/orthogonality/projector/operator/.../unitarity structures when deducing the rule.

The rudimentary physics at the moment is just the click collections. Therefore the rule (25) does not require—it should also be emphasized—any physical terminology: interactions, dynamics, evolution, measuring processes, apparatus, etc. Nor does the derivation address a density matrix—mixture of $|\alpha\rangle$ ’s—and such concepts as space/time/causality (in the EPR-controversy, say), (non)relativity, gravity*, and (non)inertial reference frames; to say nothing of the moot and debatable [22, 25, 29] notions like collapses, ‘the world(s)/mind(s)’, the MWI-bifurcations of the universe [11, 25], (classical/objective) reality, or a subjective/anthropic [10, p. 155–165] category of the rational belief/preference [25]. In essence, we have made do only with the two obvious premises: (10) and (13). These are obligatory requirements, which is why the word **StatLength** may be formally even cast away from the theorem. The quadratic dependence above is, roughly speaking, a mathematical

* Hilbert: “Das Operieren mit dem Unendlichen kann nur durch das Endliche gesichert werden”.

* In particular, the binding the rule to unitarity or t -dynamics would be contradictory and entail a grave problem of reconciliation with the well-known issues in quantum gravity [18]: the problem with the very Hilbert (and Fock) space, with the dynamical (non-fixed as in QFT) background and the observer-dependent concepts of particles and their number, of time itself, etc.

statement concerning the correctly defined—invariance (13)—function on \mathbb{H} with $|\alpha\rangle$ -additivity (10). An additive property, in one form or another, is present almost in all works on the rule [2, 7, 9, 10, 12, 14, 15, 24, 25, 30], and each derivation of formula (25) is in anyway a construction of a map from more primary tenets, even though we do not pronounce explicitly (or subconsciously) the thesis (•).

It is also clear that the proposed inference procedure appears to be unique—no non-Born statistics exists—because the premises (10) and (12)–(13) are ‘non-reducibly’ minimal; as it should be for a formula, which by itself defines the math of a quantum-lab experiment at the very low level, i. e., the meaning of the words ‘handling the click collections’.

DISCUSSION

How would derivation look in the orthodoxy?

Let us forget the **StatLength**-conception and theorem about linearity of quantum superposition—‘accumulation of clicks into coefficients \mathbf{a}_j ’ [5], and the very doctrine of numbers in QM. What points should be introduced into the quantum axiomatics in order to derive (25)?

First of all, we should accept the statistical treatment of the \mathbf{a}_j -coordinates. It is widely known as early as the 1926 works by Born himself [4]. The words “Statistik/statistischen” appear at the very end of the first brief communication [4] (and disappear in the second of the works [4]); though in the context of the particle-collision processes, *not of the abstract* micro-events.

The (relative) frequency view of the state-rays in a Hilbert space—the multiplicatively statistical reading of the equivalence $|\Psi\rangle \approx \mathbf{c} \cdot |\Psi\rangle$ —suggests to give up the notions like ‘up to a constant, inaccessible phases, etc’ and to deal with the non-normalized $(\hat{+})$ -sums* (2), i. e., without constraint $\|\Psi\| = 1$; cf. [10, p. 185]. The (\cdot) -normalization and $(\hat{+})$ -summation are the opposing requirements but linearity is of course primary. (Parenthetically, the math-normalization of a QM-state has nothing to do with its statistical nature). Therefore, a certain notion of the *additive* ‘quantifying/sizing’ must be introduced [30, p. 1296]. Such an additivity manifests in the well-known orthogonality and distinguishability of eigenstates. See, e. g., [12, 32], page 890 in [2], and also a concept of the orthogonal additivity in [14, sect. 5.2]. The α -, $|\alpha\rangle$ -distinguishability is thus of fundamental importance when deducing both the LVS and **StatLength** structures.

Further, the difference between an abstract state (or an abstract sum $\mathbf{a} \cdot |\Psi\rangle + \mathbf{b} \cdot |\Phi\rangle$) and its \mathbb{C} -numerical

basis-dependent $|\alpha\rangle$ -representation (in a reference frame for the ‘observer \mathcal{A} ’) does of course not go away and remains the conceptual point [5, sect. 8.3]. No \mathcal{A} -instrument is exclusive because any $|\alpha\rangle$ -preference—e. g., privileged observables or pointer states [25] in some takes on the ‘measurement problem’—would run counter to the basic principle of the representation invariance of physical theories and of QM-mathematics (12) in particular; “democracy of bases”, by Jeffrey Barrett.

We should also declare what the complex $(*)$ -conjugation does in QM-theory; except for a scalar-product axiom. The declaration is this: a $(*)$ -invariance of the ν -statistics. Subsequent actions, including the reading of the device/operator non-commutativity $\mathcal{A} \neq \mathcal{B}$, do not then require any postulations and have been described in the previous section. The sequence (7) \mapsto (8) \mapsto (9) and point 4) in the theorem remain in force.

Informally, to disclose ‘Born’s square’ by manipulating the $|\text{ket}\rangle$ -symbols like $\hat{P}_{|\alpha\rangle}|\psi\rangle$ is a rather non-efficient way, to say the least. The Born rule is a statement not about $|\text{in}\rangle \rightarrow |\text{out}\rangle$ reductions or von Neumann’s \hat{P} -projectors but about numbers. That is, about \mathbb{C} -representatives $(\mathbf{a}_1, \mathbf{a}_2, \dots)$ irrespective of their calculation method $\mathbf{a} = \langle \alpha | \psi \rangle$, because *\mathbf{a} -coefficients are not ‘aware of’ the binary structures on LVS*; neither of the inner-product nor of the orthogonality [23]. Expressed differently, rather than being a consequence of the ideology [Hilbert space + physical consideration], the rule does determine the Hilbert structure itself; a definitional superstructure over LVS.

A. Gleason (with his famous representation theorem [12]) and H. Everett [11] were perhaps the first to attempt at vindicating the rule in the framework of the orthodox axiomatics. Everettian approach came under criticism of many authors [3, 20, 22, 25] and later N. Graham [13] and J. Hartle [15] reconsidered Everett’s conclusions through the frequency operator as an observable; see, however, [28].

Remark 2. When deducing the rule, Everett [11, p. 71] freely changes the function arguments, puts “ $\mathfrak{M}(\mathbf{a}_i) = \mathfrak{M}(\sqrt{\mathbf{a}_i^* \mathbf{a}_i})$ ” and does “impose the additivity requirement”, then restricts “the choice of \mathfrak{M} to the square amplitude” and puts “ $\mathfrak{M}(\mathbf{a}_i) = \mathbf{a}_i^* \mathbf{a}_i$ ”, does “replace the \mathbf{a}_i by their amplitudes $\mu_i = |\mathbf{a}_i|$ ”, defines “a new function $g(x) = \mathfrak{M}(\sqrt{x})$ ”, etc, etc. Finally, on p. 72, he draws a conclusion that “the only choice ... is the square amplitude measure”. That is to say, by use of the fact that square of a coefficient is a sum of other squares (Hilbert), one infers a rule of squares. Clearly, in no way is this any proof [13, p. 236], [10, pp. 163, 185], however, its ‘refinements and justifications’ have got even into textbooks [34, sect. 8.4.1, “Everett’s theorem”].

It is also not clear, what would be changed in reasoning on pp. 71–72 of [11], if the two and $\sqrt{}$ would be substituted for \mathbf{p} and $\sqrt[p]{}$. Expressed another way, why and which the L^p -norms are relevant to the quantum state-space?

* Whether this idea has been expressed in the literature, the author is not aware. I would be grateful for an information in this regard.

Math-rigors: topology, continuity, and the like

The latter question was fully considered by S. Aaronson in the work [1] wherein the exclusiveness of an L^2 -norm was justified. His analysis, besides other important questions, is extended even to non-integer p 's, and realization of device-independence $\mathcal{A} \rightleftharpoons \mathcal{B}$ by the U -matrices above fits completely Aaronson's idea of the (power dependence) norm's preservation under linear transformation. In this context, the Pythagorean theorem Aaronson mentions [1, pp. 2, 4] should be thought of as the only possible way of introducing the very first numeric quantity in quantum theory—the function (24). In other words, the QM-version of Pythagoras' theorem is not a theorem, and even not a \mathbb{C} -orthogonality property $|\alpha\rangle \perp |\beta\rangle$ [23], but *merely a definition* [6] of additivity

$$\mathcal{N}[\mathbf{a} \cdot |\alpha\rangle + \mathbf{b} \cdot |\beta\rangle] = \mathcal{N}[\mathbf{a} \cdot |\alpha\rangle] + \mathcal{N}[\mathbf{b} \cdot |\beta\rangle], \quad \forall \mathbf{a}, \mathbf{b} \in \mathbb{C}$$

in the language of vector \mathbb{H} -representatives $|\alpha\rangle, |\beta\rangle$ to the distinguishable (= eigen) quantum micro-events $\underline{\alpha} \not\approx \underline{\beta}$. In the accustomed notation for 'lengths', and with Born's square, this additivity might be written as

$$\|\mathbf{a} \cdot |\alpha\rangle + \mathbf{b} \cdot |\beta\rangle\|^2 = \|\mathbf{a} \cdot |\alpha\rangle\|^2 + \|\mathbf{b} \cdot |\beta\rangle\|^2, \quad \forall \mathbf{a}, \mathbf{b} \in \mathbb{C}.$$

On the other hand, the state-space \mathbb{H} is almost a 'bare' LVS at the moment. It is neither a normed nor a topological space [23], because construction of (continuous) maps from \mathbb{H} —no matter where—does not yet arise as a task. Inasmuch as the states themselves are not observable entities (whatever that means [5, sect. 10]) and are not yet comparable with each other, the low level quantum ' \mathbb{H} -mathematics' does not care questions like 'whether we need a construction $\|\cdot\|$ with axioms of a norm?—the triangle inequality, etc'. The more so as there is an equivalence relation on norms in the finite-dimensional LVS [23]; e. g., the L^2 -norm is (topologically) equivalent to the L^1 -norm. Since QM-theory needs to be a quantitative one, the topology should be implemented in a numeric way, i. e., through \mathbf{a} 's.

The QM-empiricism in turn does not yet give grounds to introduce any functions on \mathbb{H} , other than **StatLength**. We thus draw a conclusion that if such a function is exclusive, that is how it will induce the topology on the abstract \mathbb{H} -vectors by means of the numeric \mathcal{N} -function (24) of their $|\alpha\rangle$ -representatives. This point does precede the Hilbert space and Born statistics, and not the other way round. The quantum state-space can thus be turned into an L^2 -normed vector space whose topology conforms to the \mathbb{C} - and \mathbb{R} -field topology of numbers \mathbf{a}_j .

This \mathbb{R} -topology has already been used when deriving the C-function (9)*. On the other hand, ansatz

(16) should be understood not as the (infinite) series in $(\mathbf{a}, \mathbf{a}^*)$ but just as a finite (purely algebraic) symmetrical sum. Otherwise, if this were the 'infinity'-case, we would deal with a non-motivated non-algebraic extension of the 'pure' \mathbb{H} -algebra and thereby with some extra-topological requirements that do not follow from empiricism. However, the restriction on such an 'implied infinity' is not a loss of generality because, in any case, homogeneity (17)–(18) extracts the only term from (16).

Yet a further aspect of function \mathcal{N} concerns the very statement of the problem. Every LVS has infinitely many bases. However, as the space \mathbb{H} was arising alongside the bases of observables [5]—eigen-vectors $|\alpha_j\rangle$, let us ask ourselves the question: What is the way in which the basis of an observable stands out from the other abstract bases, which are as good as any one? Quantum empiricism tells us that all one has to do is to invoke some statistical considerations. These will boil down to the following semantic supplement: a certain function on \mathbb{H} (better to say, functional), which reflects the natural-language notion of the accumulating the distinguishable micro-events; i. e., [additivity = mutual exclusivity]. The presence (or non) of such a numeric function—a new math (scalar) add-on over \mathbb{H} —will determine these 'good bases'. Thus the mathematics accompanying the quantum statistics—motivation and the **Definition** itself—can be restated as a question of special bases of LVS and has a quite minimalistic formalization:

- ◇ Given an LVS of quantum states, define the \mathcal{A} -base(s)—due to QM-non-commutativity, it must be not unique—by the following requirement. Basis $\{|\alpha_j\rangle\}$ is referred to as *basis of an observable* \mathcal{A} if there exists a well-defined function(al) \mathcal{N} on \mathbb{H} , which satisfies the properties of $|\alpha\rangle$ -additivity (10) and of $(*)$ -invariance (14) for all \mathbf{a} 's.

Is such a definition meaningful? What is the function? How is it derived? Whether it exists (in what sense?) and is unique/nontrivial? What is relationship between different \mathcal{A} -bases? A group, the \mathcal{U} -equivalence class? Where does it come from? The answers to these questions are the derivation of the theorem from (10)–(14). All the other bases—beyond the unitarity condition—remain the abstract ones in LVS. In particular, that such a function is known to exist for certain bases follows, again, from the fact that the \mathbb{H} -space itself was being fabricated from the statistical $|\alpha\rangle$ -representatives. This point—pt. 4) in the 1-st Theorem [5]—elucidates what should be meant by the "almost a 'bare' LVS" above. The \mathbb{H} -space is not a completely abstract LVS, but one that

* All the other solutions to this equation are "pretty 'weird'"

(J. Aczél–J. Dhombres). They are globally/locally irregular [19, pp. 129–130] and their graphs are everywhere dense in \mathbb{R}^2 .

must have been equipped with a numeric superstructure \mathcal{N} . Parenthetically, the same method provides a tool of deriving the ‘topological \mathcal{N} -function’ for other linear manifolds: different numeric fields, different involutions, etc.

Summing up, the questions of topology on the \mathbb{H} -space (and on numbers) are, strictly speaking, to be solved simultaneously with the construction of function \mathcal{N} , which, in turn, comes from quantum empiricism as the **StatLength**. There is also no difficulty in extending the above theorem to mixtures of states—the Gleason theorem [12], when using the orthodox QM-mathematics of operators.

Of course, the reasoning given in this subsection is not quite rigorous arguments and is merely a mathematical ideology. However we are of the opinion that the entire quantum foundations, and not just their algebraic LVS-constituent, admit a considerable strengthening the mathematical motivation and rigor—a proposal for the mathematics experts—even to the extent of pedantic justification of all the topologies/ordering, of the (general quantum) case $\dim \mathbb{H} = \infty$, of a numeric domain— \mathbb{C} , \mathbb{R} , or \mathbb{R}^+ —and the like. (Of course, wouldn’t have to presume the positive values for **StatLength**, as the \mathbb{R}^+ -domain came on its own.) In the first place, this fully applies to the work [5]. The more so as the mathematical grounds to the semantic notions of continuity, connectivity, and the physical (numeric) lexicon of completeness, approximations, limits, infinitesimal ε ’s, convergence, etc have long been formalized in topology [19, 23].

Remarks on spacetime

A word on the physical (3+1)-spacetime. This topic bears on the full (\mathbf{x}, t) -representation—the continuous (\mathbf{x}, t) -parameters of automorphism—of the invariant \mathbb{H} -theory of [\mathcal{A} -bases + $|\text{ket}\rangle$ ’s + Born’s unitarity], because the abstract states themselves are not tied to the chrono-geometrical notions of causality/(non)locality/propagation-speed (of something, say of light c) and to “the objective determination of space-time phenomena” (W. Heisenberg). Here, there is no way to bypass the matters of principle. Among them: a state-space separability, accurate introduction of the \mathbb{H} -representatives to observables in QM/QFT and of Hilbert’s space itself; why/where the binary (?) inner (?) product (?) on \mathbb{H} comes from [6]. (Realization of the Hilbert space in quantum gravity is not a ‘ t -constant’, as with the elementary QM.) We should also ascertain “what is to be regarded as an observable in a quantum theory of gravity” [16, pp. 107, 91], [18] and the numeric labeling the space-time continuum, degrees of freedom, dimension $D = 1 + 3$ (?), and other data. In particular, we encounter non-rhetorical question about bringing formula (25) into correlation

with non-discrete (and conventional) constructions like

$$|\psi(x)|^2 dx, \quad |\psi(x, t)|^2 dx \quad (?).$$

The global inference to be drawn from these remarks and (marked) questions is such that the coherent strategy needs to be not a relativistic QFT-generalization of QM followed by a quantization of the gravity (to be renormalizable?) ‘as of fields’, but a direct creation of a framework for entirely covariant theory, in which all the [math + phys]-ingredients—clicks’ statistics and quantum nature of observables/spectra/coordinates on manifolds (the equivalence principle)—are consistently introduced at the level of all possible (\mathbf{x}, t) -realizations to the abstract \mathbb{H} -space ab initio.

These (difficult) matters call for special consideration, and (some of them) will be treated at length elsewhere. The absence of the word ‘probability’ in the present work is no accident [5, sect. 11.2]. As we have seen, the micro-events supplemented with the LVS-structure—superposition principle—do not require such a concept.

The author would like to thank the QFT-department staff of TSU for discussions. The work was supported by a grant of Tomsk State University.

-
- [1] AARONSON S. *Is Quantum Mechanics An Island In Theoryspace?* <https://arxiv.org/abs/quant-ph/0401062> (2004), 1–9.
 - [2] ASSIS A. V. D. B. *On the nature of $a_k^* a_k$ and the emergence of the Born rule.* Ann. Phys. (Berlin) (2011) **523**(11), 883–897.
 - [3] BALLENTINE L. E. *Can the Statistical Postulate of Quantum Theory be Derived?—A Critique of the Many-Universes Interpretation.* Found. Phys. (1973) **3**(2), 229–240.
 - [4] BORN M. *Zur Quantenmechanik der Stoßvorgänge.* Zeit. Phys. (1926) **XXXVII**, 863–867; **XXXVIII**, 803–827.
 - [5] BREZHNEV YU. V. *Linear superposition as a core theorem of quantum empiricism.* <https://arxiv.org/abs/1807.06894> (2018), 1–70.
 - [6] BREZHNEV YU. V. *Whence the Hilbert space?* In preparation.
 - [7] BUSCH P. *Quantum States and Generalized Observables: A Simple Proof of Gleason’s Theorem.* Phys. Rev. Lett. (2003) **91**(12), 120403(4).
 - [8] CAVES C. M. *Notes on Zurek’s derivation of the quantum probability rule.* <http://info.phys.unm.edu/~caves/reports/ZurekBornderivation.pdf> (2005), 1–6.
 - [9] DEUTSCH D. *Quantum theory of probability and decisions.* Proc. Royal Soc. London **A** (1999) **455**, 3129–3137.
 - [10] DEWITT B. S. & GRAHAM N. (eds) *The Many-Worlds Interpretation of Quantum Mechanics.* Princeton University Press (1973).
 - [11] EVERETT H., III. *The Theory of the Universal Wave Function.* PhD Thesis, Princeton University (1956). In [10], pp. 3–140.

- [12] GLEASON A. M. *Measures on the Closed Subspaces of a Hilbert Space*. Journ. Math. Mech. (1957) **6**(6), 885–893.
- [13] GRAHAM N. *The measurement of relative frequency*. In [10], pp. 230–253.
- [14] GUDDER S. P. *Stochastic Methods in Quantum Mechanics*. North Holland (1979).
- [15] HARTLE J. B. *Quantum mechanics of individual systems*. Amer. Journ. Phys. (1968) **36**(8), 704–712.
- [16] ISHAM C. J. *Canonical Quantum Gravity and the Problem of Time*. <https://arxiv.org/abs/gr-qc/9210011> (1992), 1–124.
- [17] JARLSKOG C. *A Comment on a Recent Derivation of the Born Rule by Zurek*. <https://arxiv.org/abs/1107.3736> (2011), 1–4.
- [18] KUCHAR K. V. *Time and interpretations of quantum gravity*. Int. Journ. Mod. Phys. **D** (2011) **20**(1), 3–86.
- [19] KUCZMA M. *An Introduction to the Theory of Functional Equations and Inequalities*. Birkhäuser (2009).
- [20] MANDOLESI A. L. G. *Analysis of Wallace’s proof of the Born rule in Everettian quantum mechanics II: Concepts and axioms*. Found. Phys. (2019) **49**(1), 24–52.
- [21] MASANES L., GALLEY T. D. & MÜLLER M. P. *The measurement postulates of quantum mechanics are operationally redundant*. Nature communications (2019) **10**(1361), 1–6.
- [22] RAE A. I. M. *Everett and the Born Rule*. Stud. Hist. Phil. Mod. Phys. (2009) **40**(3), 243–250.
- [23] REED M. & SIMON B. *Methods of modern mathematical physics 1. Functional analysis*. Academic Press, Inc (1980).
- [24] SAUNDERS S. *Derivation of the Born Rule from Operational Assumptions*. Proc. Royal Soc. London **A** (2004) **460**, 1–18.
- [25] SAUNDERS S., BARRETT J., KENT A. & WALLACE D. *Many worlds? Everett, Quantum Theory, and Reality*. Oxford University Press (2010).
- [26] SINHA U., COUTEAU C., JENNEWAIN T., LAFLAMME R. & WEIHS G. *Ruling Out Multi-Order Interference in Quantum Mechanics*. Science (2010) **329**, 418–421.
- [27] SINHA U., COUTEAU C., MEDENDORP Z., SOLLNER I., LAFLAMME R., SORKIN R. & WEIHS G. *Testing Born’s Rule in Quantum Mechanics with a Triple Slit Experiment*. AIP Conf. Proc. (2009) **1101**, 200–207.
- [28] SQUIRES E. J. *On alleged “proof” of the quantum probability law*. Phys. Lett. **A** (1990) **145**(2/3), 67–68.
- [29] WALLACE D. *Everettian Rationality: Defending Deutsch’s Approach to Probability in the Everett Interpretation*. Stud. Hist. Phil. Mod. Phys. (2003) **34**(3), 415–439.
- [30] DE ZELA F. *Gleason-Type Theorem for Projective Measurements, Including Qubits: The Born Rule Beyond Quantum Physics*. Found. Phys. (2016) **46**(10), 1293–1306.
- [31] ZUREK W. H. *Environment-Assisted Invariance, Entanglement, and Probabilities in Quantum Physics*. Phys. Rev. Lett. (2003) **90**(12), 120404(4).
- [32] ZUREK W. H. *Probabilities from entanglement, Born’s rule $p_k = |\psi_k|^2$ from envariance*. Phys. Rev. **A** (2005) **71**(5), 052105(29).
- [33] ZUREK W. H. *Quantum Theory of the Classical: Quantum Jumps, Born’s Rule, and Objective Classical Reality via Quantum Darwinism*. Phil. Trans. Royal Soc. **A** (2018) **376**, 20180107(26).
- [34] ИВАНОВ М. Г. *Как понимать квантовую механику? Регулярная и хаотическая динамика* (2015). <https://mipt.ru/students/organization/mezhpr/biblio/q-ivanov.php>