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Abstract

We investigate the relativistic properties of the distinguishable non-interacting relativistic GRW model presented in [1]. We discuss how the relativistic properties of this theory are contingent on the points of collapse being time-like to each other. We show that models describing indistinguishable or interacting particles require space-like points of collapse hence it is not possible to extend to such cases whilst retaining the desired relativistic and collapse dynamics of the original model.

1. Introduction

In quantum mechanics there are two forms of dynamics; unitary evolution, which is time reversible and preserves superpositions, which describes the evolution of isolated systems, and evolution described by positive operator valued measures (POVMs) which describes a system interacting with an external environment, such as when a measurement is performed. The measurement problem is the fact that quantum mechanics fails to provide a precise description of which form of evolution describes any one situation. From observation limits can be placed on which regimes may be described with unitary evolution or POVMs, but the theory itself does not provide these.

Spontaneous collapse models, first introduced by Ghirardi-Rimini-Weber [2], solve the measurement problem by giving a unique dynamics which completely describes the time evolution of the system at a non-relativistic level. This is done by introducing additional stochastic non-linear terms to the Schrödinger equation. These terms alter the form of unitary evolution such that there is a non-zero rate of the state describing a particle undergoing a spontaneous spatial localisation. This rate is proposed to be extremely low, such that a single particle may remain in a superposition for a long period of time, in line with what is seen experimentally. However for multiple particles which are entangled then any single particle spontaneously collapsing collapses all particles it is entangled with. This effectively increases the rate of collapse for systems with high numbers of particles, such that macroscopic bodies are localised on extremely short time scales, this is often called the amplification mechanism and it ensures macroscopic classicality. This removes the need for the theory to include a description of an external observer, as macroscopic measuring apparatus interacting with a microscopic system causes the microscopic system to become entangled and hence collapse, via the amplification mechanism. For a full review of spontaneous collapse models see [3].

In order for a spontaneous collapse model to be a successful description of the underlying physics then it must be consistent with special relativity. There is a tension between quantum mechanics and special relativity as quantum mechanics is non-local because space-like separated measurements of entangled systems must be correlated (as argued by EPR in [4]). A spontaneous collapse model should predict non-local correlations in order to remain consistent with experiment.

Note that this paper is concerned with collapse model’s consistency only with special relativity. Special relativity implies the prohibition of superluminal signalling, therefore a special relativistic collapse model would automatically be causal. A collapse model (or any quantum theory) aiming to
be in agreement with general relativity would have
to have a dynamical causal structure. See [5–9] for
recent work in this area. From now on in this ar-
icle we will use relativistic to mean consistent with
special relativity.

In its original formulation the GRW model was
not relativistic and described distinguishable par-
ticles for a discrete time processes. Continuous
time collapse models have also been developed for
instance in [10, 11]. There are various proposed
models for relativistic collapse models: [12] where
a prescription for the probability distribution of a
matter density operator is Lorentz invariant, [13]
which introduces a mediating pointer field, [14] in
which collapse dynamics emerge by tracing out an
environment from a relativistic quantum field the-
ory. [15] which proposes that the terms modifying
the conventional Schrödinger equation are func-
tions of the stress-energy tensor. Pearle suggested
a model in 1999 [16] and a proposed alteration of
this in section 11 of [17] where energy is conserved
by considering relational collapses.

In [18] a collapse model on a 1 + 1 lattice is
presented and the authors suggest that it may
be relativistic in the continuum limit. In this
paper we will consider one of the most developed
types of attempted relativistic collapse models, a
relativistic GRW model. Both [1] and [19] pro-
pose relativistic extensions of GRW to described
distinguishable non-interacting particles. As it
is known that in reality particles are indistin-
guishable and interact with one another it should
be considered if these models can be extended
either to indistinguishable or interacting particles
or both, whilst remaining relativistic. In this
paper we show explicitly that this is not possible
with [1]. We argue that the same difficulty occurs
for [19] and therefore, that if it is possible to
create a relativistic collapse model another route
must be taken.

This paper is organised as follows: in section
2 requirements for a spontaneous collapse model
to be relativistic are reviewed and the Tomogona-
Schwinger formalism is discussed. In section 3 it
is shown why the original GRW model does not
meet the relativistic requirement. In section 4 Tulmulka's model is introduced and it is shown
why it is relativistic. In section 5 the indistin-
guishable extension is attempted, it is shown it is
either not relativistic or does not achieve macro-
scopic classicality, in section 6 it is shown that
Tulmulka's model extended to interacting par-
ticles is also not relativistic.

2. Collapse Models and Special Relativity

2.1. Quantum Mechanics and Special Relativity

Standard quantum mechanics provides probab-
ility distributions for the values of observables that
are measured. A relativistic quantum mechanics
must predict that observers in any two inertial
frames to have the same measurement statistics
for the outcome of any experiment they can per-
form. This is the same conclusion reached in [20]
by Aharonov and Albert. They state that for a
system with observables A, B, C... each with po-
tential values a_i, b_i, c_i... where i runs over the
potential values of each observable measured where
observable A is measured at time t_a and found
to have the value a, and other variables respect-
tively, then agreement with special relativity im-
plies that there is a covariant way of calculating
P(a, t_a, b, t_b, ...|c, t_c, d, t_d...) i.e.

\[ P(a, t_a, b, t_b, ...|c, t_c, d, t_d...) = P(a', t'_a, b', t'_b, ...|c', t'_c, d', t'_d...). \] (1)

where a', b' etc. are the values of the observables
in the coordinates of a different inertial frame.

Probability distributions in quantum mechanics
are found from the state via the Born rule. For
non-relativistic quantum mechanics states are
functions over every point in spacetime. However
if one wishes to have a relativistic quantum me-
chanics where the state undergoes instantaneous
collapses then this is not possible. Instantaneous
collapses are required to ensure that non-local ob-
servables (for example momentum or total charge)
are conserved [20].

If one attempts to treat the state as a function
over all of spacetime and describe the state as col-
lapsing instantaneously in one inertial frame then
this is equivalent to selecting a preferred frame,
as the state cannot be normalised in every frame;
see figure 1.

In order to offer a frame independent descrip-
tion of collapse of the state Aharonov and Al-
bert proposed an alternative way of describing
collapse [21], in which the state collapses instant-
aneously in every inertial frame.

To allow this the state must be considered to
be a functional on the 3D space-like hypersurfaces
which make up the 4D manifold, instead of a func-
tion over all of spacetime. States are defined on
space-like hypersurfaces, if we label a hypersur-
face as \( \omega \) then we can write a state on it as \( \psi_\omega(x) \).
The coordinate $x$ here labels the coordinates of the 3D surface $\omega$ but is a four vector $x \in \mathbb{M}^4$ as $\omega$ is understood to be embedded in 4D spacetime. So then every inertial observer has a state defined on their constant time 3D hypersurface. However each state may have different values at the same spacetime point $\psi_\omega(x) \neq \psi_{\omega'}(x')$.

In this framework every inertial observer can describe the time evolution of their system in terms of states on parallel constant time hypersurfaces within their frame using the Tomogana-Schwinger formalism. We will introduce this formalism and show that if collapses are excluded, then this description is Lorentz covariant if it is integrable. Then we will derive a condition for Lorentz covariance if collapses are time-like to each other and finally we will show that if collapses are space-like to each other then the dynamics is not Lorentz covariance and Eq. (1) is not satisfied.

2.2. The Tomogana-Schwinger formalism

The Tomogana-Schwinger formalism\cite{22,23} describes unitary evolution as maps between states defined on arbitrary space-like hypersurfaces without collapses. First we will introduce some additional notation for hypersurfaces. Let $\omega$ signify any generic space-like 3 dimensional hypersurface, let $\sigma_t$ denote a constant time hyperplane at time $t$ in a inertial frame $\mathcal{F}$ and hence $\sigma_t'$ is a constant time hyperplane in a different inertial frame $\mathcal{F}'$. Then suppose the state is defined on an $\omega$ in the manifold $\mathbb{M}^4$. In this article we restrict ourselves to considering Minkowski spacetime $\mathbb{M}^4$ as it is sufficient to see the relevant Lorentz transformation properties of the probability distributions. Then in inertial frame $\mathcal{F}$ which has coordinates $x$ on a hypersurface $\omega$ the state is $\psi_{\omega}(x) \in H$ and $H$ is a Hilbert space defined on $\omega$. In another inertial frame $\mathcal{F}'$ with coordinates $x'$ then on the same hyperplane $\omega$ the state is written $\psi_{\omega'}(x')$. A Dirac fermionic state under a Lorentz boost transforms as:

$$\psi_{\omega}(x) \rightarrow \psi_{\omega'}(x') = \Lambda \psi_{\omega}(x').$$

where $\Lambda$ the spinor representation of the Lorentz group. In other words on the same hypersurface the states are equivalent up to a Lorentz transform.

In a frame $\mathcal{F}$ there is an arrow of time which defines a time ordering between any two points in $\mathbb{M}^4$. Analogously to the Schrödinger equation Tomogana and Schwinger defined the evolution of a state as it evolves between hypersurfaces, if there are no collapses between those surfaces:

$$\frac{\delta}{\delta \omega(x)} \psi_{\omega}(x) = -i \mathcal{H}(x) \psi_{\omega}(x)$$

where $\frac{\delta}{\delta \omega(x)}$ is the functional derivative with respect to $\omega$ and $\mathcal{H}(x)$ is the Hamiltonian density. The functional derivation can be understood to be the variation in $\psi_{\omega}(x)$ with respect to an infinitesimal variation of $\omega$ about point a $x$, see figure[2]

Figure 1: A spacetime diagram showing the support of the state of a single particle in red dashed lines. Different constant time hypersurfaces are shown as blue dotted lines. Suppose that a collapse occurs along $\sigma_{t_{\omega}}$, to point P. Then the state on $\sigma'_0$ is not normalised as $\sigma'_0$ only intersects half the support of the state.

The integrability condition for this system is that $\mathcal{H}(x), \mathcal{H}(y) = 0$ if $x$ and $y$ are space-like separated. This gives rise to an unitary evolution operator which relates two hypersurfaces:

$$U_{\omega_2}^{\omega_1} = T \exp[-i \int_{\omega_1}^{\omega_2} d^4x \mathcal{H}(x)]$$

such that $\psi_{\omega_2}(x) = U_{\omega_2}^{\omega_1} \psi_{\omega_1}(x)$, where $T$ means time ordering with respect to the frame $\mathcal{F}$. This
operator is frame independent although $\mathcal{H}(x)$ is not Lorentz invariant, the only frame dependant terms from the time ordering are zero due to the integrability condition \[19\][24]. Therefore we have that for a frame $\mathcal{F}$:

\[
U_{\omega_1}^{\omega_2} = T' \exp[-i \int_{\omega_1}^{\omega_2} d^4 x' \mathcal{H}'(x')] = \Lambda^L \Lambda^A \xi
\] (5a)

\[2.3. \text{ The Tomogana-Schwinger Formalism with Collapses}
\]

Now we wish to extend this formalism to describe collapses of the state and derive conditions for theories with discrete collapses to be consistent with special relativity. In this article we will consider collapses of the state and derive conditions for the states after a collapse at a point $x\in \mathbb{M}^4$. This means that the collapse is described as occurring instantaneously as the one in eq. 1 where $\psi_0(x)$ is the state on the hypersurface $\omega$ passing through $x$. As a convention we choose the constant time hyperplane intersecting $x$, labelled $\sigma_0$ where $t = x_0$. This means that the collapse is described as occurring instantaneously in $\mathcal{F}$, as discussed in section 2.1. The state before the collapse $\psi_0$ is model dependant however in general it is not unitary. In a different frame $\mathcal{F}'$ the collapse operator $\hat{L}_{\sigma'}(x')$ is defined on a constant time hypersurface $\sigma'$.

To illustrate evolution with collapses consider in a frame $\mathcal{F}$ two hypersurfaces $\sigma_0, \sigma_f$ before and after a collapse at a point $x$. The state $\psi_{\sigma_f}$ is given by evolving the state to a hyperplane of collapse, applying the collapse operator and normalising then evolving to $\sigma_f$:

\[
\psi_{\sigma_f} = \frac{U_{\sigma_f}^{\sigma_0} \hat{L}_{\sigma_f}(x) U_{\sigma_f}^{\sigma_0} \psi_{\sigma_0}}{\left\| \hat{L}_{\sigma_f}(x) U_{\sigma_f}^{\sigma_0} \psi_{\sigma_0} \right\|^2}.
\] (6)

It is necessary that all points of collapse between $\sigma_0$ and $\sigma_f$ are known in order to construct such a map between them as in general $\hat{L}_{\sigma_f}(x) \psi_0 \neq \psi_0$ for any $\omega$. Therefore in order to relate states in different frames on their respective constant time hypersurfaces all collapses between those hypersurfaces must be known.

2.4. Relativistic Condition for Collapse Models

We will now consider a relativistic condition for a quantum mechanics with collapses. Assume that the dynamics are Markovian such that only the most recent point of collapse must be considered to specify the probability distribution of the position of the next collapse. Then in a frame $\mathcal{F}$ assuming the point of last collapse $y$ and the state of the entire system immediately after collapse $\psi_{\sigma_0}$ are known (for simplicity we will assume $y$ occurs at $t = 0$) the probability distribution of the position of the next collapse is:

\[
P(x|y, \psi_{\sigma_0}) = \left\| \hat{L}_{\sigma_0}(x) U_{\sigma_0}^{\sigma_f} \psi_{\sigma_0} \right\|^2
\] (7)

where $\sigma_f$ is the surface intersecting $x$. This conditional probability distribution is in the same form as the one in eq. 1 where $\psi_{\sigma_0}$ gives all the possible information about the system at $(y, t_0)$.

![Figure 3: The blue dotted lines show the space-like hypersurfaces. Then $\sigma_0$ labels the surface on which the initial state of the system is defined and $\sigma_0'$ is the equivalent hypersurface in a different inertial frame. The point $y$ is the initial point of collapse. The black dashed line is the future light cone of $y$. The point $x$ is space-like to $y$ and lies between $\sigma_0$ and $\sigma_0'$ and hence would effect evolution between the states defined on those surfaces.](image)

For a Lorentz transformed inertial frame $\mathcal{F}'$ with coordinates $x'$ the initial conditions are the point of last collapse $y'$ and the state on the hyperplane $\sigma_0'$. Therefore special relativity requires that:

\[
P(x|y, \psi_{\sigma_0}) = P(x'|y', \psi_{\sigma_0'}). \quad (8)
\]

This condition is stronger than only requiring that the equations of motion transform covariantly, as in order to check this condition one must be able to compare the initial conditions (here the
state and position of the previous collapse) between different inertial frames, as noted in [19]. This has consequences when considering collapse models for multiple particles.

In order to verify eq. [8] the map between \( \psi_{\sigma_0} \) and \( \psi_{\sigma'_{0'}} \) must be known, therefore positions of all collapses between those surfaces must be known. For a series of time-like collapses this condition is met as there can be no collapses between \( \sigma_0 \) and \( \sigma'_{0'} \) hence they are related by:

\[
\psi'_{\sigma'_{0'}} = \Lambda^\dagger U_{\sigma'_{0'}} \psi_{\sigma_0} \quad (9)
\]

To specify the transformation of \( \hat{L}_{\sigma_0}(x) \) we consider the fact that special relativity also requires that the conditional probability distribution for two subsequent collapses must be Lorentz invariant:

\[
P(x_1, x_2 | y, \psi_{\sigma_0}) = P(x'_1, x'_2 | y', \psi'_{\sigma'_{0'}}), \quad (10)
\]

where \( x_1, x_2 \) and \( y \) are all time-like to each other. The conditional probability is given by:

\[
P(x_1, x_2 | y, \psi_{\sigma_0}) = \left\| \hat{L}_{\sigma_2}(x_2) U_{\sigma_2}^\dagger \hat{L}_{\sigma_1}(x_1) U_{\sigma_1} \psi_{\sigma_0} \right\|^2 \quad (11)
\]

where \( \sigma_1 \) is the hypersurface of collapse intersecting \( x_1 \) in frame \( \mathcal{F} \) and \( \sigma_2 \) intersects \( x_2 \). Assuming that the Hamiltonian is covariant so that eq. [11] holds then eq. [11] can be written as:

\[
P(x'_1, x'_2 | y', \psi'_{\sigma'_{0'}}) = \left\| \hat{L}'_{\sigma'_{0'}}(x'_2) U_{\sigma'_{0'}} \hat{L}'_{\sigma'_1}(x'_1) U_{\sigma'_1} \psi'_{\sigma'_0} \right\|^2 = \left\| \hat{L}'_{\sigma'_{0'}}(x'_2) \Lambda^\dagger U_{\sigma'_{0'}} \hat{L}'_{\sigma'_1}(x'_1) \Lambda U_{\sigma'_1} \psi'_{\sigma'_0} \right\|^2 \quad (12)
\]

Where eq. [12] has been used to transform the unitary operators and \( \sigma_1 \) and \( \sigma_2' \) are hypersurfaces of collapse intersecting \( x_1 \) and \( x_2 \) in frame \( \mathcal{F}' \). So by inspection the condition for eq. [10] to hold is:

\[
\hat{L}'_{\sigma'_1}(x') = \Lambda^\dagger U_{\sigma'_1} \hat{L}_{\sigma_1}(x) U_{\sigma_1} \Lambda. \quad (13)
\]

Eq. [13] requires that the collapse operator transforms covariantly and that the collapse can be described by an operator acting on any space-like hypersurface intersecting \( x \). This is equivalent to requiring that the collapse happens instantaneously in all inertial frames. With these conditions spatial collapses which are time-like to one another may be described in a way that is consistent with special relativity.

For a theory with spatial collapses which are space-like to each other the initial state in different inertial frames can no longer necessarily be related to each other by eq. [9] as there might be collapses in the region enclosed between \( \sigma_0 \) and \( \sigma'_{0'} \), as shown in figure [3]. To verify eq. [9] the position of all collapses in this region must be known, since this region includes points which are in the future of \( y \) in \( \mathcal{F} \). This is equivalent to requiring knowledge of future points of collapse.

Stochastic theories cannot meet this requirement, as the points of collapse are a single realisation of a random process and hence cannot be determined with certainty.

So spontaneous collapse models can meet condition [2] when collapses are time-like to each other but for space-like collapses the initial condition for observers in two frames cannot be compared so the condition is not satisfied. As we shall see, this observation is crucial for showing that Tulmulka’s model cannot be extended to indistinguishable or interacting particles.

3. The original GRW model

The original GRW model is a model for \( N \) distinguishable particles, however in order see that it is not relativistic it is sufficient to consider the one particle case. We define the model as follows. Consider a one particle state on some initial hyperplane \( \psi_{\sigma_0}(z, t = 0) \in H \), where \( z \in \mathbb{R}^3 \) is the coordinate of the particle. The unitary evolution operator is of the form of eq. [4]. Define for a collapse at \( t \) the collapse operator as:

\[
\hat{L}_{\sigma_t}(z) := \left( \frac{\alpha}{\pi} \right)^{\frac{3}{4}} \exp\left(-\frac{\alpha(z - \hat{q})^2}{2} \right) \quad (14)
\]

where \( \alpha \) is a free parameter of the model and \( \sigma_z \) is the surface intersecting the point \((z, t)\), and \( \hat{q} \) is the position operator on \( H \).

The model also has a stochastic Poisson process \( \mathcal{T} \) with an average \( \tau \), which gives the time interval between two points of collapse. Let a realisation of the this process be labelled \( \Delta t \). In a frame \( \mathcal{F} \) given a collapse at point \( y \in M^4 \) where \( y^0 = 0 \) then the next collapse must occur on the hypersurface \( \sigma_{\Delta t} \), as shown in figure [4]. The probability distribution for a collapse at a point \( x \in \mathbb{R}^3 \) on this surface is:

\[
P(x | y, \Delta t, \psi_{\sigma_0}) = \left\| \hat{L}_{\sigma_{\Delta t}}(x) U_{\sigma_{\Delta t}}^\dagger \psi_{\sigma_0} \right\|^2. \quad (15)
\]

This distribution is normalised such that:

\[
\int_{\mathbb{R}^3} d^3x P(x | y, \Delta t, \psi_{\sigma_0}) = 1. \quad (16)
\]
As eq. 14 does not meet condition eq. 13 then the model is not Lorentz covariant.

4. Tumulka’s Relativistic Collapse Model for distinguishable particles

In [1] Tumulka suggested a relativistic version of the GRW model in which the domain of the probability distribution for the position of the collapse is not a flat hyperplane but a hyperboloid. The model describes non-interacting distinguishable particles, as such the only distinction between the N-particle model and N one-particle models is that in the former the initial wavefunction may have entangled particles. Here we will briefly describe the one-particle theory.

4.1. Single Particle Model

The unitary evolution for this model is given by the Dirac equation for a single particle. The model also includes a stochastic Poisson process T, with a mean τ, with a realisation labelled Δt. Instead of defining the probability distribution for the position of a collapse on a flat hypersurface, it is defined on a Lorentz invariant future pointing hyperboloid, see appendix A for definition.

![Figure 4](image)

Figure 4: Surfaces of collapse for the GRW model (top) and the Tumulka’s single particle model (bottom). The blue dashed lines show hypersurfaces of interest. For both models the initial collapse, y, is assumed to be at the origin, so σ0 labels the hypersurface on which the initial state of the system is defined. For the GRW model the next collapse will occur on a flat hypersurface σt whereas for Tumulka’s model the next collapse will occur on the hyperboloid Σ, which lies with the light cone (red dotted lines).

In a frame F given an initial state ψσ0 at t = 0 and given a point of collapse at y and a time interval Δt then the next collapse will occur on a Lorentz invariant hyperboloid Σ, with a minimum at the point (y, cΔt), where c is the speed of light, as shown in figure 4. Define a collapse function on the surface Σ:

$$\hat{L}_\Sigma(x) := K_\Sigma(\hat{q}_t) \exp\left(-\frac{\alpha}{2} \text{s-dist}_\Sigma^2(x, \hat{q}_t)\right)$$

(17)

where as before α is a parameter of the model, $\hat{q}_t$ is the position operator on the Hilbert space defined on Σ, x = f(x, Σ), where f is a function that maps a 4-vector point in $M^4$ to a 3-vector, s-dist$_\Sigma$ is the Lorentz invariant distance on Σ, and $K_\Sigma(z)$ is a normalisation constant defined such that:

$$\int_\Sigma d\sigma \|\hat{L}_\Sigma(x)\psi_\sigma\|^2 = 1.$$  

(18)

for all $x \in \Sigma$, where $d\sigma$ is the volume element of Σ induced by $M^4$.

Thus the conditional probability distribution for there to be a collapse at position $x \in \Sigma$ is:

$$P(x|y, \Delta t, \psi_{\sigma_0}) = \| \hat{L}_\Sigma(x)U^{\Sigma}_{\sigma_0} \psi_{\sigma_0}\|^2$$

(19)

The distribution 19 completely defines the collapse dynamics as once the position x is known then $\psi_{\sigma_t}$, a state on the constant time hypersurface at $t = x_0$, can be defined using eq. 6. Then the process can be iterated to find the position of each subsequent collapse.

Since the model specifies that collapses only occur on Σ then the collapses are time-like to another hence the relationship eq. 9 holds, as for a one particle model there are not collapses between Σ and $\sigma_0$. As the unitary dynamics are given by the Dirac equation they satisfy condition eq. 5b.

The collapse operator on a constant time hypersurface can be defined as:

$$\hat{L}_{\sigma_x}(x) = U^{\sigma_x}_\Sigma \hat{L}_\Sigma(x)U^{\Sigma}_{\sigma_x},$$

(20)

It is shown in appendix B that the operator 20 meets the condition eq. 13. Therefore this model is consistent with special relativity. In order for this model to localise the particle in any inertial frame, it must be true that $\hat{L}_{\sigma_x}(x)$ can be approximated as:

$$\hat{L}_{\sigma_x}(x) \approx K_{\sigma_x}(\hat{q}_x)f_\alpha(x, \hat{q}_x)$$

(21)

where $f_\alpha(x)$ is a function sharply peaked about $x = 0$ with a width proportional to $1/\alpha$ and $K_{\sigma_x}(\hat{q}_x)$ is a normalisation function. If this were not true then the collapse would not localise the state in the position basis in each inertial frame.
The extension to \( N \) distinguishable non-interacting particles is done by defining \( N \) single particles on \( N \) different spacetime manifolds, see [1]. This model does not go far beyond the single particle model, as the particles are non-interacting and distinguishable. If the state is initially entangled then the model is non-local, but if the state is not initially entangled then there is no way of generating entanglement as there is no interaction.

This model for single particles uses the Dirac equation. The Dirac equation for a single particle leads to solutions with negative energy so is not physical. Solutions to the Dirac equation describe particles and anti-particles which are elements of a Fock space, hence in order to be physically realistic the Tumulka collapse model must be extended to indistinguishable particles.

5. **Attempt at an Indistinguishable Particle Extension**

Here we present an attempted extension to the model presented in [1] to non-interacting indistinguishable particles. Initially we will consider collapses which are time-like to each other.

In an \( N \) particle model without interaction the number of particles remains constant. As we are considering fermions the Hilbert space of the system is an \( N \)-particle anti-symmetric Fock space for a fixed number of particles.

\[
H = S_- H_{(1)}^{\otimes N}
\]

(22)

where \( \mathscr{H}_{(1)} \) the one particle Hilbert space, \( S_- \) is a tensor operator which anti-symmetrises the tensor product of \( N \) Hilbert spaces. A state of this system is a completely anti-symmetric combination of single particle states \( \Psi_\omega \). The unitary evolution of this model is given by the Dirac equation. The collapse operator is the number operator with a weighting function. On a hyperboloid \( \Sigma \) the collapse operator is:

\[
\hat{J}_\Sigma(x) := \int_{-\infty}^{\infty} d\Sigma(y) K_\Sigma(y) \exp(-\frac{\alpha}{2} s\text{dist}_\Sigma^2(x, y)) \hat{a}^\dagger(y) \hat{a}(y)
\]

(23)

where \( \hat{a}^\dagger(y) \) and \( \hat{a}(y) \) are the creation and annihilation operators on the anti-symmetric Fock space. The model proceeds much the same way as the the single particle case, given an initial state on a constant time hypersurface \( \Psi_{\sigma_0} \) and a point of collapse \( y \) and a stochastic interval \( \Delta t \) then probability distribution for the position of the next collapse is:

\[
P(x|y, \Delta t, \Psi_{\sigma_0}) = \left| \left| \hat{J}_\Sigma(x) U^{\Sigma}_{\sigma_0} \Psi_{\sigma_0} \right| \right|^2
\]

(24)

with \( \Sigma \) defined as before.

This indistinguishable particle extension with collapses which are time-like to each other is consistent with special relativity as condition eq. 5b is met by the unitary operator given by eq. 45, condition eq. 13 is met as the collapse operator has the same form as the single particle operator. Finally as the collapses are time-like to each other then there are no collapses between \( \sigma_0 \) and \( \Sigma \) and therefore \( U^{\Sigma}_{\sigma_0} \) can be specified hence the relationship eq. 9 can be used.

However this model has an issue. If given a point of collapse \( y \) the only region that the subsequent collapse can occur is in the future light cone of \( y \) then macroscopic classicality is not recovered.

This can be seen with a simple example, with two macroscopic objects. Suppose there is a system made up a large number of indistinguishable particles \( N \), where \( N \) is an even number. The initial state of the system is two macroscopic objects, i.e. two areas with high densities of particles, with a large distance separation between the centre of mass of these two areas, labelled \( 2d \), see figure 6. Assume that initially each object is in a spatial superposition, separated by a distance \( 2r \), where \( r \ll d \) For simplicity we will work in one dimension but the argument can be extended to three dimensions. We will work in the framework of second quantization.

The initial state of the system on a constant time hypersurface \( \sigma_0 \) is:

\[
\left| \Psi_{\sigma_0} \rightangle = \frac{1}{2}(\hat{A}_1 + \hat{A}_2)(\hat{B}_1 + \hat{B}_2)|0\rangle
\]

(25)

where \( |0\rangle \) is the vacuum of a \( N \) particle anti-symmetric Fock space and:

\[
\hat{A}_1 = \prod_{n=0}^{N/2} \hat{g}(-d - r, n)
\]

(26a)

\[
\hat{A}_2 = \prod_{n=0}^{N/2} \hat{g}(-d + r, n)
\]

(26b)

\[
\hat{B}_1 = \prod_{n=0}^{N/2} \hat{g}(d - r, n)
\]

(26c)

\[
\hat{B}_2 = \prod_{n=0}^{N/2} \hat{g}(d + r, n)
\]

(26d)
where:

\[
\hat{g}(x, n) = \hat{a}^\dagger(x - N\epsilon/4 + n\epsilon)
\]  

(27)

Figure 5: Diagram showing the action of the operator \(\hat{A}_1\) on the vacuum, were particles are created separated by distance \(\epsilon\).

were \(\epsilon\) is a distance such that \(N\epsilon/2 \ll r \ll d\). Additionally assume that the distance scale of the collapse is much less than the size of the superposition: \(1/\alpha \ll r\). So the operator \(\hat{A}_1\) acting on the vacuum creates \(N/2\) fermions each displaced a distance \(\epsilon\) from each other centred about the point \(-d-r\) see figure 3 and similarly for \(\hat{A}_2, \hat{B}_1\) and \(\hat{B}_2\).

The number operator for the whole system is:

\[
\hat{N}_T = \int_{-\infty}^{\infty} dx \hat{a}^\dagger(x)\hat{a}(x).
\]

(28)

The number operator for the left part of the system is:

\[
\hat{N}_A = \int_{-\infty}^{0} dx \hat{a}^\dagger(x)\hat{a}(x),
\]

(29)

With a the equivalent definition for \(\hat{N}_B\). Finally the number operator for the region to the left of \(-d\) is:

\[
\hat{N}_{A1} = \int_{-\infty}^{-d} dx \hat{a}^\dagger(x)\hat{a}(x).
\]

(30)

The initial state \(|\Psi_{\sigma_0}\rangle\) is an eigenstate of the number operator for the total system:

\[
\hat{N}_T|\Psi_{\sigma_0}\rangle = \int_{-\infty}^{\infty} dx \hat{a}^\dagger(x)\hat{a}(x)\frac{1}{2}(\hat{A}_1 + \hat{A}_2)(\hat{B}_1 + \hat{B}_2)|0\rangle
\]

\[
= \frac{1}{2}(N\hat{A}_1\hat{B}_1 + N\hat{A}_1\hat{B}_2 + N\hat{A}_2\hat{B}_1 + N\hat{A}_2\hat{B}_2)|0\rangle
\]

\[
= N|\Psi_{\sigma_0}\rangle.
\]

The initial state is also an eigenstate of the number operator for the left part of the system:

\[
\hat{N}_A|\Psi_{\sigma_0}\rangle = \int_{-\infty}^{0} dx \hat{a}^\dagger(x)\hat{a}(x)\frac{1}{2}(\hat{A}_1 + \hat{A}_2)(\hat{B}_1 + \hat{B}_2)|0\rangle
\]

\[
= \frac{N}{2}|\Psi_{\sigma_0}\rangle
\]

and similarly for the right part of the system \(\hat{N}_B|\Psi_{\sigma_0}\rangle = N/2|\Psi_{\sigma_0}\rangle\). However the initial state is not in an eigenstate of the number operator for the region to the left of \(-d\):

\[
\hat{N}_{A1}|\Psi_{\sigma_0}\rangle = \int_{-\infty}^{-d} dx \hat{a}^\dagger(x)\hat{a}(x)(\hat{A}_1\hat{B}_1 + \hat{A}_1\hat{B}_2 + \hat{A}_2\hat{B}_1 + \hat{A}_2\hat{B}_2)|0\rangle
\]

\[
= \frac{1}{2}(N\hat{A}_1\hat{B}_1 + N\hat{A}_1\hat{B}_2 + \hat{I} + \hat{I})|0\rangle
\]

(33)

which is not proportional to \(|\Psi_{\sigma_0}\rangle\). \(|\Psi_{\sigma_0}\rangle\) is also not an eigenstate of \(\hat{N}_{A2}, \hat{N}_{B1}\) and \(\hat{N}_{B2}\). This implies there are two objects each in a superposition over two areas, not one object in a superposition over four areas nor four objects each in a localised position.

The amplification mechanism will cause a collapse of one of the objects almost immediately. Suppose that the collapse is at spacetime point \((t,-d+r)\), where \(t\) is so small that \(U_{\sigma_0}^{\alpha t} \approx \hat{I}\). Then following eq. [6] and eq. [20] we find the state immediately after the collapse, on constant time hypersurface \(\sigma_t\) to be:

\[
|\Psi_{\sigma_t}\rangle = \frac{\hat{J}_{\sigma_t}(-d+r)|\Psi_{\sigma_0}\rangle}{\left\|\hat{J}_{\sigma_t}(-d+r)|\Psi_{\sigma_0}\rangle\right\|^2}
\]

(34)

where:

\[
\hat{J}_{\sigma_t}(-d+r)|\Psi_{\sigma_0}\rangle = \int_{-\infty}^{\infty} dy K(y) f_n(-d+r-y)\hat{a}^\dagger(y)\hat{a}(y)|\Psi_{\sigma_0}\rangle
\]

(35)

where a similar approximation to eq. [21] has been made such that \(f_n(x)\) is a function sharply peaked about \(x = 0\) with a width proportional to \(1/\alpha\) and \(K(y)\) is a normalisation function. To evaluate this consider just the term:

\[
\hat{J}_{\sigma_t}(-d+r)\hat{A}_1\hat{B}_1|0\rangle = \frac{1}{2} \int_{-\infty}^{\infty} dy K(y) f_n(-d+r-y) \times \]

\[
\hat{a}^\dagger(y)\hat{a}(y) \prod_{n=0}^{N/2} \prod_{m=0}^{N/2} \hat{g}(-d-r,n)\hat{g}(d-r,m)|0\rangle
\]
The contributions from the \( \hat{g}(-d - r, n) \) and \( \hat{g}(d - r, m) \) operators are weighted by factors of \( f_\alpha(-2r + n\epsilon/4) \) and \( f_\alpha(2d - 2r + n\epsilon/4) \) respectively. As \(-2r + n\epsilon/4 \gg 1/\alpha \) and \( 2d - 2r + n\epsilon/4 \gg 1/\alpha \) then \( f_\alpha(-2r + n\epsilon/4) \approx 0 \) and \( f_\alpha(2d - 2r + n\epsilon/4) \approx 0 \). Hence:

\[
\hat{J}_\alpha(-d + r)\hat{A}_1\hat{B}_1|0\rangle \approx 0. \quad (37)
\]

A similar suppression occurs for \( \hat{J}_\alpha(-d + r)\hat{A}_2\hat{B}_2|0\rangle \). However the terms \( \hat{A}_2\hat{B}_1 + \hat{A}_2\hat{B}_2 \) are not suppressed as the \( f_\alpha \) is approximately 1 for the part of the state centred on \(-d + r \). Therefore we are left with:

\[
\hat{J}_\alpha(-d + r)|\Psi_{\sigma_0}\rangle \approx \frac{N}{4} \hat{A}_2(\hat{B}_1 + \hat{B}_2)|0\rangle \quad (38)
\]

therefore:

\[
|\Psi_{\sigma_1}\rangle \approx \frac{1}{\sqrt{2}} \hat{A}_2(\hat{B}_1 + \hat{B}_2)|0\rangle \quad (39)
\]

Figure 6: Schematic spacetime diagram showing the evolution of a pair of space-like separated macroscopic objects separated by distance \( d \). If there is a collapse at point \( x \) the next collapse must occur on the hyperboloid (dotted blue line), and therefore the object on the right will stay in a superposition.

So object 1 has been collapsed but object 2 remains in a superposition. Object 2 will be left in a superposition for approximately \( 2d/c \) seconds, where \( c \) is the speed of light, as can be seen in figure 6. If \( d \) is sufficiently large then one of the macroscopic objects will remain in a spatial superposition for an arbitrarily long time, in violation of what we observe in nature.

To avoid this problem for macroscopic objects then a collapse model must permit space-like points of collapse. If there are space-like collapse points then the position of the initial collapse does not limit the region of possible collapses. Hence any region with a high-average number density of particles is almost certain to have a collapse occur within it in a short time interval. However as discussed in section 2.3, if one attempts to include space-like collapses into the indistinguishable particle model suggested here then the model is not consistent with special relativity as the relationship eq. [9] does not hold. See appendix C for an explicit demonstration of this.

In summary, for an indistinguishable particle version of Tumulka’s relativistic collapse model, either there is a single series of time-like collapses and macroscopic classicality is not recovered, or the collapse points are space-like separated from each other and the model is not relativistic. As these are the only two possibilities, we conclude that such an extension is not possible. As [19] also relies upon the initial condition being a single point of collapse in order to be consistent with special relativity then it suffers from the same issue as [1] i.e. that including space-like collapses would break the Lorentz covariance.

We turn now to the question of whether it is possible for this relativistic collapse model to be extended to distinguishable, but interacting particles.

6. Attempt at a distinguishable interacting particle extension

For this extension we will treat the particles as distinguishable hence the Hilbert space does not have to be a Fock space. The state for an \( N \) particle model is:

\[
\Psi_\omega(z_1, z_2, ..., z_N, t) \in H = H_1 \otimes H_2 \otimes ... \otimes H_N \quad (40)
\]

where \( z_i \) labels the position of each particle. By definition, for an interacting theory it is not possible to express the Hamiltonian density as a factorised operator:

\[
\mathcal{H} \neq \mathcal{H}_1 \otimes \mathcal{I}^{\otimes N-1} + \mathcal{I} \otimes \mathcal{H}_2 \otimes \mathcal{I}^{\otimes N-2} + \mathcal{I} \otimes ... \otimes \mathcal{I}^{\otimes N-1} \otimes \mathcal{H}_N 
\]

where \( \mathcal{H}_i \) are Hamiltonian densities which act on one particle states. Therefore it is not possible to write the associated unitary evolution operator as a separable tensor product on each sub-Hilbert space:

\[
U^{\omega_2}_{\omega_1} \neq U^{\omega_2}_{1,\omega_1} \otimes ... \otimes U^{\omega_2}_{1,\omega_1} \otimes ... \otimes U^{\omega_2}_{N,\omega_1}, \quad (42)
\]
where \( U_{\omega_1}^{\omega_2} \) acts only on the \( i^{th} \) particle. Instead the evolution between two surfaces \( \omega_1 \) and \( \omega_2 \) must be given by unitary operator which acts over all of \( H \). As a consequence of this, in order to specify the evolution between two states on different hypersurfaces, all points of collapse between them must be known. For \( N \) distinguishable particles there are \( N \) series of collapses with points of collapse that may be space-like to each other. Hence the relationship does not hold and the model is not consistent with special relativity.

7. Conclusion

In this work we have considered spontaneous collapse models and their consistency with special relativity. We have shown that although Tumulka’s model for one particle is consistent with special relativity extensions to either interacting or indistinguishable particles are not possible. The question is then if any spontaneous collapse model can be relativistic, whether that model describes point like collapses such as in GRW or other models such as continuous spontaneous collapse. The two requirements that collapses must be time-like to each other to preserve frame independent probability distributions and that collapses must be space-like to ensure that macroscopic objects remain localised seem to imply a contradiction and therefore that such a model is not possible. Recent work by Adler [25] supports this idea. If collapse models are not consistent with special relativity the effect of violations of the Lorentz symmetry should be investigated in order to be confronted by experiment.
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Appendices

A. Lorentz Invariant Hyperboloid

Define \( \mathbb{F}(x) \) to be the future of the point \( x \in \mathbb{M}^4 \), i.e. the region contained within the future light cone and its boundary. Then the hyperboloid about a point \( y \), parametrised by \( r \), is:

\[
H_r(y) = \{ x \in \mathbb{F}(y) | (y^\mu - x^\mu)(y_\nu - x_\nu) + \frac{1}{2} = r \}\.
\]

Then the space-like distance on a hyperboloid to be the shortest path length between two points \( x \) and \( y \) can be defined:

\[
s-dist(x, y) := \inf \{ L[\gamma] | \gamma(a) = x, \gamma(b) = y \}
\]

where \( \inf \) denotes infimum, and \( L[\gamma] \) is the length of a smooth path \( \gamma \) on \( H_r(y) \). \( s-dist(x, y) \) is Lorentz invariant. A Hilbert space \( H \) can be defined on this hypersurface as the space of all solutions to the Dirac equation:

\[
i \hbar \gamma^\mu (\nabla_\mu - \frac{ie}{\hbar} A_\mu(x)\psi) = m\psi
\]

where \( x \in \mathbb{M}^4 \), \( e \) is the charge, \( m \) is the mass, \( A_\mu \) is the electromagnetic vector potential. Working in the interaction picture, the inner product on \( H \) is given by:

\[
\langle \psi_\omega | \psi_\omega \rangle := \int d\omega \bar{\psi}(x) n_\mu(x) \gamma^\mu \psi(x)
\]

Where the domain of the integral is over the surface \( \omega, x \in \mathbb{M}^4 \), \( d\omega \) is the volume element induced on \( \omega \) by the metric of \( \mathbb{M}^4 \), \( n_\mu(x) \) is the future pointing normal vector to \( \omega \) and \( \bar{\psi} = \gamma^0 \psi^\dagger \).

B. Lorentz Covariance of Collapse Operator of Original Tumulka Model

We will directly demonstrate that the requirement eq. 8 is met for this model. To see if eq. 19 meets the condition of eq. 8 consider a Lorentz transformed frame \( \mathcal{F}' \) with coordinates \( y' = \{ y'_0, y'_1, y'_2, y'_3 \} \). In this frame the position of the previous collapse is \( y' \), which along with \( \Delta t \) specifies \( \Sigma = H_{t'}\Delta t \). As it is a scalar \( \Delta t \) is a frame independent quantity.

The initial state at \( t' = 0 \) which is \( \psi_{\sigma_0} \) can be related to \( \psi_{\sigma_0} \) by \( \psi_{\sigma_0} = U_{\sigma_0}^{\sigma_0} \psi_{\sigma_0} \) as once the position of the collapse at \( y \) is known then are no collapses between the surface \( \sigma_0 \) and \( \sigma_0' \) as they only occur on \( \Sigma \), see figure 4. As before we will work in the interaction picture. Then:

\[
P(x' | y', \Delta t, \psi_{\sigma_0}) = \\
\int_{\Sigma} d\Sigma' n_\mu(z') L_{\Sigma'}(x', z') \bar{\psi}(z') \gamma^\mu L_{\Sigma'}(x', z') \psi(z').
\]
The domain of integration is $\Sigma$ which is Lorentz invariant, and $n^\mu(x)\bar{\psi}(x)\gamma^\mu\psi(x)$ is also an Lorentz invariant quantity. In $\mathcal{F}$ with coordinates $x$ there is a metric on the 3 dimensional $\Sigma$ induced by the metric on $\mathbb{M}^4$. For $\mathcal{F'}$ this is also true. Then there exists Jacobian matrix $J$ between the coordinate system induced on $\Sigma$ in frame $\mathcal{F}$ and the coordinate system induced on $\Sigma$ in frame $\mathcal{F'}$ such that the volume elements can be related by:

$$d\Sigma' = \det(J)d\Sigma \quad (48)$$

Then due to the normalisation condition the function $L'_\Sigma(x',z')$ can be written (up to a phase):

$$L'_\Sigma(x',z') = \frac{\exp(-\frac{\alpha}{2} \text{s-dist}^2(x',z'))}{\left(\int_{\Sigma} \det(J)d\Sigma' \left| \exp(-\frac{\alpha}{2} \text{s-dist}^2(x,z)) \right|^2 \right)^\frac{1}{2}} \frac{\exp(-\frac{\alpha}{2} \text{s-dist}^2(x,z))}{\left(\int_{\Sigma} \det(J)d\Sigma \left| \exp(-\frac{\alpha}{2} \text{s-dist}^2(x,z)) \right|^2 \right)^\frac{1}{2}} \quad (49)$$

as $\text{s-dist}(x,z) = \text{s-dist}(x',z')$. Therefore:

$$P(x'|y',\Delta t,\psi_{\sigma_0}) = \int_{\Sigma} \det(J)d\Sigma L'_\Sigma(x',z')n_\mu(z)\bar{\psi}(z)\gamma^\mu\psi(z) \quad (50)$$

With the last line being reached because the Jacobians cancel.

C. TULMULKA’S MODEL FOR INDISTINGUISHABLE PARTICLES WITH SPACE-LIKE COLLAPSES

To see that Tulmulka’s model for space-like collapses with indistinguishable particles is not viable consider the joint probability distribution for two collapse points $x_1, x_2 \in \mathbb{M}^4$ which are space-like separate from one another. This distribution must also be Lorentz covariant, as it is a probability distribution of the value of observables. The probability distribution for points of future collapse can no longer be conditioned on a single point of collapse. In the spirit of the distinguishable particle model, assume there are multiple series of collapse points, such that the subsequent point of collapse in each series is defined to be on a hyperboloid defined by the previous point. To see that under such an assumption Lorentz covariance is lost, it is sufficient to consider only two series.

$$P(x_1, x_2 | y_1, y_2, \Delta t_1, \Delta t_2, \psi_{\sigma_0}) = P(x_2 | x_1, y_1, y_2, \Delta t_1, \Delta t_2, \psi_{\sigma_0}) \times (51)$$

In the frame $\mathcal{F}$ the second term on the LHS can be written $P(x_1, | y_1, \Delta t_1, \psi_{\sigma_0})$ as $y_2$ and $\Delta t_2$ define $\Sigma_2$ which has no effect on the position of $x_1$ that is not already accounted for by conditioning on $\psi_{\sigma_0}$. If it is assumed that:

$$\psi_{\Sigma_1} = U_{\sigma_0}^{-1} \psi_{\sigma_0} \quad (52)$$
Then eq. [51] will be proportional too:

\[ P(x_2, |x_1, y_1, y_2, \Delta t_1, \Delta t_2, \Psi_{\sigma_0}) \propto \left\| \hat{L}(x_2) U_{\Sigma_2} \hat{L}(x_1) U_{\Sigma_1} \Psi_{\sigma_0} \right\|^2. \]  

(53)

For the assumption of eq. [52] to be true there must be no collapses in the region between the hypersurfaces. As the hypersurface \( \Sigma_2 \) intersects with this region, (see figure [7]) on which there may be a collapse, then this assumption is not justified. There is a similar problem with the operator \( U_{\Sigma_1} \). Therefore this model cannot specify the probability distributions for the next set of collapses given the previous set and hence is not a viable model.
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