Weak quantum evolution as the origin of weak values: measurement-determined definition of quantum transition probability
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It is shown, that the Aharonov-Albert-Vaidman concept of weak values appears to be a consequence of a more general quantum phenomenon of weak quantum evolution. Here the concept of weak quantum evolution is introduced and discussed for the first time. In particular, it is shown on the level of quantum evolution that there exist restrictions on the applicability of weak quantum evolution- and, hence, weak values approach. These restrictions connect the size of given quantum ensemble with the parameters of pre- and post-selected quantum states. It is shown, that the latter requirement can be fulfilled for the model system, where the concept of weak values was initially introduced by Aharonov, Vaidman and Albert. Moreover, a deep connection between weak quantum evolution and conventional probability of quantum transition between two non-orthogonal quantum states is established for the first time. It is found that weak quantum evolution of quantum system between its two non-orthogonal quantum states is inherently present in the measurement-determined definition of quantum transition probability between these two quantum states.

PACS numbers:

Among numerous peculiarities of quantum mechanical description of nature a simple concept of operator weak values as quantum system's characterization between any two of its quantum states is one of the most questionable. All the story has began in 1988, when Aharonov, Albert and Vaidman have shown in their seminal (AAV-) paper[1], that if one transforms system's initial quantum state \(|i\rangle\) by acting on it with certain operator \(\hat{A}\) and project the result on certain other quantum state \(|f\rangle\), which is non-orthogonal to \(|i\rangle\) then the resulting projection \(\langle f|\hat{A}|i\rangle\) divided by the non-zero overlap of these two states \(\langle f|i\rangle\) will be equal to what they define as "weak value" \(A_w = \frac{\langle f|\hat{A}|i\rangle}{\langle f|i\rangle}\) of operator \(\hat{A}\) with respect to two given quantum states \(|i\rangle\) and \(|f\rangle\). These two non-orthogonal quantum states can be referred to as initial, or pre-selected and final, or post-selected quantum states of the system disturbed by acting on it with operator \(\hat{A}\) during the time interval between the moments of system pre- and post-selection[1]. At this point one immediately sees the main peculiarity of weak values as compared to conventional quantum averages: in most general case pre- and post-selected states being non-orthogonal to each other can still have very small overlap \(|\langle f|i\rangle| \ll 1\) which means that weak value \(A_w\) of operator \(\hat{A}\) can be much larger than any of its eigenvalues. In this case one has anomalous weak value. Evidently, the realization of such situation strongly depends on the particular choice of three independent characteristics of given quantum system: on the form of system disturbance (or measurement) i.e. on the form of operator \(\hat{A}\) as well as on two chosen (pre- and post-selected) quantum states of given quantum system. Therefore, the main achievement of Aharonov, Albert and Vaidman in their AAV-paper was the successful choice of these free characteristics for realistic quantum system. This way, during the recent thirty years, the concept of weak values has got a sense of independent property of those quantum systems experienced measurement of certain their characteristics (spin projections or photon polarizations) between the procedures of their pre- and post-selections(see e.g. Refs.[2,3,4]). Especially, as one could notice from the above considerations, the time arrow is inherently present in any experimentally relevant definition of weak values[2]. Therefore, such type of averages as weak values, obviously, can serve as certain additional and quite exotic marker of system’s evolution from its "initial" to "final" state, while disturbed by measurement operator \(\hat{A}\) in between. Taking into account this observation, Aharonov, Vaidman and others in their later papers on the subject have concluded that weak values of quantum operators can be even more fundamental quantum concept than the conventional concept of operator eigenvalues, incorporating the latter only as important particular case[2]. This has led them further to the concept of two-vector formalism being an interesting philosophical generalization of Dirac's "bra-" and "ket" vector of states quantum description[2]. Thus, weak values have emerged as technically conventional but quite paradoxical by nature example of quantum mechanical description, having caused numerous experimental and theoretical proposals[2,4]. Naturally, precisely because of that a lot of attempts to trivialize weak value concept have been made: some people tried to reduce all the phenomena just to exotic post-selection procedures on the classical ensembles which has nothing to do with quantum phenomena[5], other studies refer all the phenomena to the artifact of strong quantum fluctuations during the incompatible projective measurements performed on the non-commuting observables very close to each other in the time domain[5,6]. However, despite or due to such polar opinions on the true meaning of weak values, this concept still remains a mysterious peculiarity in the body
of conventional quantum mechanics people still trying to understand and agree on.

So far, within the above-mentioned context, the aim of this paper is to give a clear, natural and at the same time novel quantum statistical explanation to weak value phenomena, including anomalous weak values situation, within the standard ideology of quantum mechanics all members of the community could agree on. Especially, below I will show, in which way the statistical meaning of weak values is connected with the projective measurement-accompanied evolution of quantum system, what are the restrictions on the ensemble size under which the evolution of each quantum system of the ensemble will characterize by weak value of observable and finally what is the quantum statistical role of anomalous weak values in definition of quantum transition amplitudes.

Below I will keep most general theoretical description taking into account the possibility of widest interpretation of related results, while the parallel with historically first model system by Aharonov, Albert and Vaidman[1] will be also maintained. Therefore, let us begin from a most common definition of weak value given in Ref.[1] $A_w = \frac{\langle f|\hat{A}|i \rangle}{\langle f|i \rangle}$ with quantities $\hat{A}$, $|i \rangle$ and $|f \rangle$ have been already defined in the above [1]. Now let us use this expression in a bit inconvenient way, not as widely known definition of weak value, but as a new definition of transition amplitude from pre- to post-selected quantum state via weak measurement resulting in weak value

\[
\langle f|i \rangle = \frac{\langle f|\hat{A}|i \rangle}{A_w}.
\] (1)

On the first glance, it might seem that Eq.(1) contains no new information as compared to common definition of weak value[1]. However, below we will see that it actually does if one takes Aharonov-Albert-Vaidman (AAV-) theoretical model in a most general fashion. Beforehand, let us make quite straightforward trick, multiplying and dividing both sides of Eq.(1) on projection $\langle i|f \rangle$ (which is always non-zero by the assumption). Taking into account standard quantum mechanical definition of the transition probability $P_{i\rightarrow f} = |\langle f|i \rangle|^2 = \langle i|f \rangle \langle f|i \rangle$ between two arbitrary quantum states $|i \rangle$ and $|f \rangle$ as well as common definition of the projection operator $\Pi_f = |f \rangle \langle f|$ on the state $|f \rangle$ one obtains

\[
P_{i\rightarrow f} = \frac{\langle i|\Pi_f \hat{A}|i \rangle}{\langle i|\Pi_f |i \rangle_w},
\] (2)

where $\langle i|\Pi_f \hat{A}|i \rangle_w = \langle i|f \rangle A_w$. Equation (2) already contains something interesting enough since it defines common quantum transition probability in a new way, as the ratio between two different types of measurement on given quantum system (remember that operator $\hat{A}$ as well as any projection operator $\Pi_f = |f \rangle \langle f|$ both can be associated with certain type of measurement on given quantum system). Namely, as it was initially introduced in Ref.[1], if $\hat{A}$ represents certain continuous quantum measurement between pre- and post-selection, while post-selection $\Pi_f$ itself is represented by another continuous quantum measurement, which follows the measurement performed by $\hat{A}$, then the nominator of Eq.(2) is the average over initial (pre-selected) quantum state of two operators $\hat{A}$ and $\Pi_f$ acting on the system consequently.

As it was shown first in AAV-paper[1], in order to obtain weak value of arbitrary operator $\hat{A}$ one should consider the quantum amplitude $\langle f|\hat{U}_A|i \rangle$ associated with system’s evolution governed by evolution operator $\hat{U}_A$ between the states $|i \rangle$ and $|f \rangle$ . For connection with parameters of Ref.[1] see [8].

Since the nature of operator $\hat{A}$ in Eq.(2) is not specified, i.e. it can be arbitrary, one can straightforwardly re-write Eq.(2) with operator $\hat{U}_A$ instead of $\hat{A}$. This results in remarkable relation

\[
P_{i\rightarrow f} = \frac{\langle i|\hat{U}_A|\Pi_f t|i \rangle_w}{\langle i|\hat{U}_A|\Pi_f |i \rangle_w}.
\] (3)

Now it is time to notice that main approximate transformation of Ref.[1] which has led authors to $A_w$ was following

\[
\frac{\langle f(t)|\hat{U}_A(t)|i \rangle}{\langle f|\hat{A}|i \rangle} = \frac{\langle f(t)|\hat{U}_A(t)|i \rangle}{\langle f|\hat{A}|i \rangle} = \exp\left(-i \int_0^t dt' \hat{H}_A(t')|i \rangle \langle i|\right).
\] (4)

where $\langle i|\hat{U}_A(t)|\Pi_f t|i \rangle_w = \exp(-iS_w(t))$ with $S_w(t) = \int_0^t dt' \langle f|\hat{U}_A(t')|i \rangle \langle i|\hat{A}|i \rangle = \varepsilon_A(t)q_A A_w$ being a “weak action” for interaction Hamiltonian $\hat{H}_A$ of the system being proportional to the weak value $A_w$ of operator $\hat{A}$. In equation (4) one has $\langle f|t \rangle = \langle f|\hat{U}^+_t(t)| \rangle$, where $\hat{U}_s(t) = \exp(-iS_m(t)B/N)$ is evolution operator with "strong" action $S_m(t) = \int_0^t dt' H_s(t')$ related to strong measurement (post-selection) with corresponded Hamiltonian (of strong measurement) $\hat{H}_s(t) = (dS_m(t)/dt)q_B B$ in which operator $B$ of strong measurement normally does not commute with operator $\hat{A}$ of preceding weak measurement[9] . As well, symbol $T_i$ in the definition of system’s evolution operator $\hat{U}_A(t)$ means time-ordering procedure acting on time-dependent, operator-valued exponential operator. (Here and everywhere below we have put $\hbar = 1$ for simplicity.)

Obviously, the first line of Eq.(4) represents exact statement, while the second line of this equation is nothing but the result of a certain approximation. Practically, in the most simple cases, such as e.g. one from
AAV-paper[1], the latter approximation can be made either assuming ε\_A(t) ≪ 1 and taking a large enough ensemble of N ≫ 1 identical quantum systems and performing a weak measurement with "ensemble-weighted" interaction Hamiltonian \( \hat{H}_A = \frac{\hat{H}}{N} \) on each system in the ensemble [10]. So far, the approximation (4) is crucial for entire concept of weak values. Therefore, one may think of the second line of Eq.(4) as of definition of "weak quantum evolution" - a special sort of system’s quantum evolution associated with the existence of weak values of a given weakly measured observable between system’s pre- and post-selections.

Now, the limits of the applicability for the approximation (4) of "weak quantum evolution" should be clarified. In order to establish to what extent the approximation of Eq.(4) can be valid in most general cases, including AAV-case, one needs to expand exact T-exponent in the first line of Eq.(4) into infinite time-ordered power series. But beforehand let us do some straightforward preparations. First, according to AAV-model of Ref.[1], for the finite statistical ensemble of N identical quantum systems one has a straightforward modification of propagator from the first line of Eq.(4)

\[
\langle f_N(t)\hat{U}_A(t|i_N) \rangle = \left( \langle f(t)\hat{U}_A(t|i) \rangle \right)^N
\]

with \( \hat{U}_A(t) \) from Eq.(4) with Hamiltonian \( \hat{H}_A(t) = \hat{H}_A(t)/N \) instead of \( \hat{H}_A(t) \), see also Ref.[1]. Due to non-orthogonality of states \( |i\rangle \) and \( |f\rangle \) one can always decompose \( |i\rangle \) as follows \( |i\rangle = |f\rangle \langle f|i\rangle + |\bar{f}\rangle \langle \bar{f}|i\rangle \), where vectors of states \( |f\rangle \) and \( |\bar{f}\rangle \) form complete orthonormal basis of eigenstates for Hamiltonian \( \hat{H}_A(t) \) with properties: \( \langle f|f\rangle = \langle f|\bar{f}\rangle = 0 \) and \( \langle f|i\rangle = \langle \bar{f}|i\rangle = 1 \). In what follows it will be also useful to introduce a vector of state \( |\bar{i}\rangle = |f\rangle \langle i|f\rangle - |\bar{f}\rangle \langle \bar{f}|i\rangle \) being "complementary" (and orthogonal) to \( |i\rangle \), i.e., \( \langle \bar{i}|i\rangle = \langle \bar{i}|\bar{i}\rangle = 0 \). One can always parametrize the latter decompositions as follows \( |i\rangle = \cos \theta |f\rangle + \sin \theta |\bar{f}\rangle \) and \( |\bar{i}\rangle = \cos \theta |f\rangle - \sin \theta |\bar{f}\rangle \), in the same fashion as it was done for the ensemble of N spin-1/2 electrons in AAV-paper of Ref.[1].

Now let us introduce following general unit operator (projector) \( \hat{1}_{f,\bar{f}}(t) \) which acts as a unit operator on the eigenstates of \( |f\rangle \) and \( |\bar{f}\rangle \) at arbitrary instant of time \( t \):

\[
\hat{1}_{f,\bar{f}}(t) = \hat{U}_{\bar{s}}(t) \left( \langle f|f\rangle + |\bar{f}\rangle \langle \bar{f}| \right) \hat{U}_{\bar{s}}^\dagger(t) \\
= \hat{U}_{\bar{s}}(t) \left( |i\rangle + |\bar{i}\rangle \right) \langle f|f\rangle + \hat{U}_{\bar{s}}^\dagger(t) \left( |i\rangle - |\bar{i}\rangle \right) \langle \bar{f}|\bar{f}\rangle
\]

(6)

With the help of definition (6) one can expand exact time-ordered exponent in the propagator from the first line of Eq.(4) into exact infinite time-ordered power series. The result reads

\[
\frac{\langle f|\hat{U}_A(t)|i \rangle}{\langle f|i \rangle} = 1 - i \int_0^t dt_1 \frac{\langle f(t_1)|\hat{H}_A(t_1)|i \rangle}{\langle f|i \rangle} \\
+ (-i)^2 \int_0^t dt_1 \int_0^{t_1} dt_2 \frac{\langle f(t_1)|\hat{H}_A(t_1)\hat{1}_{f,\bar{f}}(t_2)|i(t_2) \rangle}{\langle f|i \rangle} \\
+ \ldots + (-i)^n \int_0^t dt_1 \ldots \int_0^{t_n-1} dt_n \frac{\langle f(t_1)|\hat{H}_A(t_1)\hat{1}_{f,\bar{f}}(t_2)\ldots\hat{1}_{f,\bar{f}}(t_n)|i(t_n) \rangle}{\langle f|i \rangle} \\
+ \ldots
\]

(7)

At this point from Eqs.(4,7) it becomes evident, that in order to reduce exact time-ordered expansion (7) to its weak quantum evolution form in the second line of Eq.(4)

\[
\frac{\langle f|\hat{U}_A(t)|i \rangle}{\langle f|i \rangle} \approx \langle i|\hat{U}_A(t)|f \rangle \varepsilon \\
= 1 - i \int_0^t dt_1 \frac{\langle f(t_1)|\hat{H}_A(t_1)|i \rangle}{\langle f|i \rangle} \\
+ (-i)^2 \int_0^t dt_1 \int_0^{t_1} dt_2 \frac{\langle f(t_1)|\hat{H}_A(t_1)|i(t_1) \rangle \langle f(t_2)|\hat{H}_A(t_2)|i(t_2) \rangle}{\langle f|i \rangle^2} \\
+ \ldots + (-i)^n \int_0^t dt_1 \ldots \int_0^{t_n-1} dt_n \frac{\langle f(t_1)|\hat{H}_A(t_1)|i(t_1) \rangle \ldots \langle f(t_n)|\hat{H}_A(t_n)|i(t_n) \rangle}{\langle f|i \rangle^n} \\
+ \ldots
\]

(8)

one should be able to neglect \( |\bar{f}\rangle \langle f| - \) component in the decomposition (6) of our projector \( \hat{1}_{f,\bar{f}}(t) \) -one needs to substitute into decomposition (7). Another requirement of the validity of Eq.(8) is the same (zero) phase of two time-dependent amplitudes \( \langle i|\bar{i}(t) \rangle \) and \( \langle i|\bar{i}|i \rangle \) meaning that one also should be able to neglect approximately the \( |\bar{i}\rangle \langle f| \) contribution to decomposition (7). Obviously, the first among two latter requirements can be formulated as inequality

\[
N \ll \left| \frac{\langle i|\bar{f} \rangle}{\langle i|f \rangle} \right|
\]

(9)

while second one can be written as following restriction

\[
\arg\left( \frac{\langle i|\bar{s}(t)|i \rangle}{\langle i|\bar{s}(t)|i \rangle} \right) \cong \arg\left( \frac{\langle i|\bar{s}(t)|i \rangle}{\langle i|\bar{s}(t)|i \rangle} \right)
\]

(10)

One can easily obtain conditions (9,10) of the validity of weak quantum evolution regime for any statistical ensemble consisting of N identical quantum systems, just expanding in the formula (5) the product of N terms of the form (7) each under assumption that the largest
correction to expression (8) in the formula
\[\langle f_N(t)\hat{U}_A(t)\rangle_w = \langle (f(t))\rangle_\ast^N \langle (i|\hat{U}_A(\Pi_f; t)|i)_w \rangle_\ast^N\]
should be much smaller than r.h.s. of Eq.(11).

Now it becomes clear that conditions (9,10) are compatible with each other and both needed for regime of 
ensemble weak evolution of the type (8). Recalling that, according to our presumed definition \(H_A(t') = H_A(t')/N\) and \(\hat{H}_A(t') \propto \hat{A}\) one immediately obtains
\[\langle (i|\hat{U}_A(\Pi_f; t)|i)_w \rangle_\ast^N \approx \exp\left(-i\int_0^t dt'\langle (i|\hat{\Pi}_f \hat{H}_A(\Pi_f)(t')|i)_w \rangle_\ast\right).\]

(12)

Equally, equation (12) can be written as
\[\langle f_N(t)\hat{U}_A(t)|i\rangle_w \approx \langle (f(t)|i)\rangle_\ast^N \exp\{-i\varepsilon_wqA_w\} \text{ (see Ref.[1])} \text{ with standard weak value } A_w = \langle f(A)|i \rangle / \langle f|i \rangle \text{ of operator } \hat{A}. \]
For the case of parametrization being used for AAV-model of Ref.[1] the conditions (9,10) connect the size \(N\) of the ensemble of 1/2-spin electrons, the angle \(\theta\) of pre-selected 1/2-spins' polarization in the \(x\)
plane for each particle of the ensemble together and the "strength" \(\varepsilon_{st}(t)q_x\) of strong measurement associated with post-selection process in the double
Stern-Gerlach type of experiment considered in Ref.[1]. Remarkably, general constraints (9,10) in terms of
AAV-model parametrization of Ref.[1] result in the following inequality
\[\varepsilon_{st}(t)q_x \sin(2\theta) \ll N \ll \tan(\theta).\]

(13)

Evidently, constraints (9,10,13) signal about the limits of the applicability of entire weak values- and weak quantum evolution concepts. The latter remain valid only for high asymmetry in the probability amplitudes of pre-
and post-selected quantum states (as it takes place in AAV-model [1]) in the finite-sized statistical ensembles of
quantum systems under consideration.

One can see that with respect to identities \(|f\rangle\langle f| = \hat{\Pi}_f\) and \(|i\rangle\langle f| = \langle i|\hat{\Pi}_f|i\rangle\) one can perform Eq.(8) in the following remarkable form
\[\langle i|\hat{U}_A(\Pi_f; t)|i\rangle_w = \langle i|\hat{U}_A(\Pi_f^w; t)|i\rangle \]
\[= 1 - i\int_0^t dt_1 \langle i|\hat{\Pi}_f \hat{H}_A(\Pi_f)(t_1)|i\rangle + \]
\[(-i)^2 \int_0^t dt_1 \int_0^{t_1} dt_2 \langle i|\hat{\Pi}_f \hat{H}_A(\Pi_f)(t_2)|i\rangle \langle i|\hat{\Pi}_f \hat{H}_A(\Pi_f)(t_1)|i\rangle + \ldots + (-i)^n \int_0^t dt_1 \ldots \]
\[\int_0^{t_n-1} dt_n \langle i|\hat{\Pi}_f \hat{H}_A(\Pi_f)(t_1)|i\rangle \ldots \langle i|\hat{\Pi}_f \hat{H}_A(\Pi_f)(t_n)|i\rangle + \ldots\]

(14)

where \(\hat{H}_A(t_1) = \hat{U}_A(t)\hat{H}_A(t)\hat{U}_A^+(t)\) - is the Hamiltonian of weak measurement in the interaction representation 
with respect to Hamiltonian \(\hat{H}_A(t)\) associated with strong measurement (post-selection). In Eq.(14) we introduced a new quantity, a projection operator
\[\hat{\Pi}_f = \langle i|\hat{\Pi}_f|i\rangle\]

(15)

which one can think of as the operator of weak conditioned measurement, or, alternatively, as the operator of
strong fluctuative measurement. It is easy to justify both these definitions. Indeed, just because of evident properties \(\langle i|\hat{\Pi}_f|i\rangle = \langle i|i\rangle = 1\) and \(\langle f(\hat{\Pi}_f)|f\rangle = \langle f|f\rangle / \langle i|f\rangle = 1/P_{\text{post-f}}\) one sees that the result of operator \(\hat{\Pi}_f^w\) action on the corresponded pre-selected state \(|i\rangle\) averaged over this pre-selected state is the same as the result of scalar product \(\langle i|i\rangle = 1\) without any post-selection, i.e. the "strong" projective measurement described by the operator \(\hat{\Pi}_f^w\) remains non-demolishing for the state \(|i\rangle\) "in average". In this sense related projective measurement is "weak" [12]. Therefore, one can think of the operator (15) as of operator of simultaneous measurement of two non-commuting variables: variable described by vector \(|i\rangle\) remains well-defined in average after "weak" projection onto \(|f\rangle\), performed by means of operator \(\hat{\Pi}_f^w\), while the measurement of variable associated with quantum state \(|f\rangle\) by means of the same operator - gives strongly fluctuating result \(\langle f(\hat{\Pi}_f)|f\rangle = \langle f|f\rangle / \langle i|f\rangle \rightarrow \infty\) when \(\langle i|f\rangle \rightarrow 0\) if \(\hat{H}_A(t), \hat{H}_s(t) \neq 0\), see [13].

Now one can see deep quantum statistical sense of formula (3) for transition probability between two arbitrary
quantum states. Taking into account that according to Eqs.(3,8,14) \(\langle i|\hat{U}_A(\Pi_f; t)|i\rangle_w = \langle i|\hat{U}_A(\Pi_f^w; t)|i\rangle\) describes quantum evolution of the state \(|i\rangle\) with Hamiltonian \(\hat{H}_A(t)\) accompanied by all possible combinations of weak measurements of the post-selected quantum state \(|f\rangle\) one can write down
\[P_{\text{post-f}}(t) = \langle (f(t)|i\rangle^2 = \langle i|\hat{\Pi}_f\hat{U}_A(t)|i\rangle / \langle i|\hat{U}_A(\Pi_f^w; t)|i\rangle.\]

(16)

Equation (16) means that any transition probability from arbitrary quantum state \(|i\rangle\) to another arbitrary quantum state \(|f\rangle\) can be calculated as the ratio of two time-propagators corresponded to two different types of system's evolution between pre- and post-selected quantum states of interest, see [14].

As the consequence of the above context, one can claim, that introduced in the above weak quantum evolution concept (resulted in weak values of corresponded observables) for arbitrary quantum system (or finite ensemble of identical quantum systems) describes a fixed class of quantum evolutions, where certain (post-selected) quantum state appears most frequently during overall system evolution, as the result of quantum fluctuations gen-
erated by all possible sequences of weak- and strong fluctuating measurements of two non-commutative observables.

To conclude, in the above it was shown that quantum weak values are fingerprints of a novel more general quantum phenomenon of weak quantum evolution for arbitrary quantum system with pre- and post-selection. Especially, it was found that weak regime of quantum evolution resulting in weak values can take place only for finite (not being very large) statistical ensembles of identical quantum systems with fixed inequality between the size of ensemble and the small overlap of pre-and post-selected quantum states. It is shown, that such conditions of weak quantum evolution regime should be compatible with conditions of thought experiment from the seminal Aharonov-Albert-Vaidman paper, where the concept of weak values was introduced for the first time. As the result, it has been demonstrated for the first time that probability of quantum transition between two arbitrary quantum states can be defined via weak quantum evolution of given quantum system between these two quantum states.
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[8] Obviously, evolution operator $\hat{U}_A$ in AAV-model describes system’s evolution due to its interaction with detector $\hat{d}$, where corresponded interaction Hamiltonian is $\hat{H}_A = \frac{d\hat{d}}{dt} q\hat{A}$. As well, in AAV-paper for $\hat{H}_A$ one has $\hat{A} = \sigma_x$, $q = z$ and $\frac{d\hat{A}}{dt} = -\mu (\hat{B}_x/\partial z) \hat{g}(\hat{y}(t, \tau))$, where $\partial B_x/\partial z$ is a gradient of external magnetic field in $z$-direction, while function $\hat{g}(\hat{y}(t, \tau)) \propto [\theta(t+\tau) - \theta(t-\tau)]$ is a “square pulse”-function of time where the width of the pulse $\tau$ is the electron’s “time of flight” in $y$-direction through the region of a non-zero gradient of $B_z$.

[9] In AAV-model of Ref.[1] one has $\hat{B} = \sigma_z$ while $\hat{A} = \sigma_x$, that is why classical variable $q$ of the detector has different indices ($x$ and $y$) in definition of $\hat{H}_A(t)$ and $\hat{H}_A(t)$, correspondingly. Analogously, in Ref.[1] for $\hat{H}_s(t)$ one has $q_s = x$, $\frac{d\hat{e}_s(t)}{dt} = -\mu (\hat{B}_x/\partial x) \hat{g}[\hat{y}(t, \tau_s)]$ with $\partial B_x/\partial x$ - a gradient of the external magnetic field in $x$-direction and the same type of function $\hat{g}[\hat{y}(t, \tau_s)]$ in the above, but dependent on $\tau_s$ instead of $\tau$, where $\tau_s = \tau - \tau_s$ - is electron’s “time of flight” in $y$-direction, in the region of inhomogenous $x$-component of magnetic field, while $\tau > \tau_{x,z}$ - is the total “time of flight” of the electron along $y$-direction from the source to one (post-selected) among two available screens.

[10] In the latter situation it is presumed that $N$ is so large that commutator $[\hat{H}_A(t_1), \hat{H}_A(t_2)]$ tends to zero for arbitrary values of $t_1$ and $t_2$.

[11] For the case of parametrization being used for AAV-model of Ref.[1] constraints on the applicability of weak quantum evolution regime (9,10) connect the size $N$ of the ensemble of 1/2-spin electrons, the angle $\theta$ of pre-selected 1/2- spin polarization in the $xz$ -plane for each particle of the ensemble together and the “strength” $\varepsilon_{x,t}(t)\mu$ of strong measurement associated with post-selection process in the double Stern-Gerlach type of experiment considered in Ref.[1].

[12] The operator $\Pi_+^\tau$ (by its definition, transforms vectors of state $|i\rangle$ and $|f\rangle$ to vectors $|i,f\rangle$ and $|f,f\rangle/(|i,f\rangle|^2$ correspondingly, which both tend to $|i\rangle$ if $(|f,f\rangle \rightarrow 1$ and both diverge when $(|i,f\rangle \rightarrow 0 signalling about the appearance of strong quantum fluctuations when one tries to project certain initial (pre-selected) quantum state $|i\rangle$ to another (post-selected) quantum state $|f\rangle$ being approximately orthogonal to the former.

[13] The latter fact, in turn, explains why according to Eqs.(9,10,13) for large enough ensembles, in the limit $N \rightarrow \infty$, the picture of temporal evolution (14) governed by weak values breaks down. The limit $N \rightarrow \infty$ describes the situation $[\hat{H}_A(t), \hat{H}_s(t)] \rightarrow 0$, where variables corresponded to vectors $|i\rangle$ and $|f\rangle$ becomes effectively “classical” and, hence, the strong quantum fluctuations during simultaneous measurement of both quantum states - disappear since they average to zero due to those extra terms in exact propagator (5) which cannot be captured by the structure of weak quantum evolution approximation (8,11,12) of given exact evolution operator of the system.

[14] The nominator of Eq.(16) represents time-propagator describing quantum evolution of the state $|i\rangle$ due to certain weak measurement governed by arbitrary Hamiltonian $\hat{H}_{A,I}(t)$ with consequent post-selection of chosen quantum state $|f\rangle$ via arbitrary strong measurement. Whereas, the denominator of Eq.(16) describes the time-evolution with $\hat{H}_{A,I}(t)$ being interrupted by all possible combinations of strongly fluctuating projective measurements (15) of the post-selected quantum state $|f(t)\rangle$ performed at all possible stages of system’s temporal evolution.