

Random-coefficient pure states, the density operator formalism and the Zeh problem

Alain Deville

†Aix-Marseille Université, CNRS, IM2NP UMR 7334, F-13397 Marseille, France

Yannick Deville

*Université de Toulouse, UPS, CNRS, CNES, OMP, IRAP (Institut de Recherche en Astrophysique et Planétologie), F-31400 Toulouse, France

Abstract

Quantum electronics is significantly involved in the development of the field of quantum information processing. In this domain, the growth of Blind Quantum Source Separation and Blind Quantum Process Tomography has led, within the formalism of the Hilbert space, to the introduction of the concept of a Random-Coefficient Pure State, or RCPS: the coefficients of its development in the chosen basis are random variables. This paper first describes an experimental situation necessitating its introduction. While the von Neumann approach to a statistical mixture considers statistical properties of an observable, in the presence of an RCPS one has to manipulate statistical properties of probabilities of measurement outcomes, these probabilities then being themselves random variables. It is recalled that, in the presence of a von Neumann statistical mixture, the consistency of the density operator ρ formalism is based on a postulate. The interest of the RCPS concept is presented in the simple case of a spin 1/2, through two instances. The most frequent use of the ρ formalism by users of quantum mechanics is a motivation for establishing some links between a given RCPS and the language of the density operator formalism, while keeping in mind that the situation described by an RCPS is different from the one which has led to the introduction of ρ . It is established that the Landau - Feynman use of ρ is mobilized in a situation differing from both the von Neumann statistical mixture and the RCPS. It is shown that the use of the higher-order moments of a well-chosen random variable helps solving a problem already identified by Zeh in 1970.

1 Introduction

Superconducting qubits are presently proposed as a possible solution in the building of quantum gates. John Bardeen was twice a Nobel Laureate, in 1956 with Shockley and Brattain for their invention of the transistor, and in 1972 with Cooper and Schrieffer for their theory of superconductivity. In both cases Quantum Mechanics (QM) was mobilized. The developments of Telecommunications and Electronics have led to the birth and growing of a Theory of Information, first in the classical context (see e.g. the appearance of the Shannon entropy [1]) and, for several decades, in the quantum domain (see e.g. the *Feynman*

Lectures on Computation [2], and *Quantum Computation and Quantum Information* by Nielsen and Chuang [3]). Quantum Information Processing (QIP) is a significant part of the Quantum Information field, and the development of quantum gates and more generally of quantum circuits devoted to QIP is an important activity within Quantum Electronics, itself reflected in the existence of the Quantum Electronics Section in this Journal.

Working in the field of QIP for more than fifteen years, we have been led first to extend the classical field of Blind Source Separation (BSS) [4],[5] to a quantum version, namely Blind Quantum Source Separation (BQSS) [6], [7], [8], [9]. More recently we introduced the field of Blind Quantum Process Tomography (BQPT) [10], [11], [12], [9], an extension of Quantum Process Tomography (QPT). In these contexts, we were led not to use the density operator formalism, but to introduce what, as in [13], is hereafter called a Random-Coefficient Pure State (RCPS): Σ being an isolated quantum system, $\mathcal{E}$ its state space, with dimension d , and $\{|k\rangle\}$ an orthonormal basis of $\mathcal{E}$, it is considered that at *some time* t_r Σ may be in a random-coefficient pure state

$$|\Psi\rangle = \sum_k c_k |k\rangle, \quad (1)$$

where the c_k are Random Variables (RV), with the constraint $\sum_k |c_k|^2 = 1$. In contrast, the coefficients of the development of the usual pure states are deterministic quantities. It must be emphasized from the beginning that if $\{|k\rangle\}$ is an eigenbasis of some observable O attached to Σ , then if the state of Σ is described by this RCPS $|\Psi\rangle$ and if O is measured, *the probability* of obtaining the (assumed non-degenerate) eigenvalue associated with $|k\rangle$, i.e. $|c_k|^2$, *is itself an RV*.

The present paper uses standard Quantum Mechanics (QM). As a result of its postulates, including the existence of a principle of superposition (of states), which the late Nobel Laureate Steven Weinberg called the first postulate of QM [14], then, given a quantum system Σ , and its state space $\mathcal{E}$, a Hilbert space, any vector of $\mathcal{E}$ (defined up to a phase factor $e^{i\varphi}$, φ being a real quantity) represents a possible state of Σ called a pure state. This standard Hilbert space framework is used by both the so-called orthodox interpretation of QM (Bohr, Heisenberg, Pauli, Rosenfeld) and by the statistical interpretation (Einstein, Schrödinger, Blokhintshev, Ballentine), with the meaning given by Ballentine [15] to that latter expression, one of these interpretations more or less implicitly accepted by many users of QM. Weinberg has stressed that "*quantum field theory is based on the same quantum mechanics that was invented by Schrödinger, Heisenberg, Pauli, Born, and others in 1925-26, and has been used ever since in atomic, molecular, nuclear, and condensed matter physics*" [16]. We warn the reader that we are therefore outside the approach initiated by Segal [17], with his introduction claiming "*Hilbert space plays no role in our theory*", an approach known as the C^* -algebra formulation of QM, then developed by Haag and Daniel Kastler, and more recently by Strocchi [18] (see also [19]). We are also outside the approach from Mielnik [20] and again Haag, together with Bannier [21]. The

formal constructions and possible results from mathematical physicists trying to build general quantum theories aiming at unifying general relativity and Quantum Mechanics (QM), an important field in present day Physics, are out of the scope of this paper.

A state of the Hilbert space - pure state - used in QM, and described by a ket in the Dirac formalism, obeying the Schrödinger equation if Σ is isolated, can be obtained from a preparation act. von Neumann considered a more general situation, called a mixed state or statistical mixture (of states), and, as a consequence of his introduction of a postulate (cf. Sections 3 and 7), established that it can be formally described with a density operator ρ [22], [23].

An experimental situation leading to the introduction of an RCPS is first described in Section 2, and the ambiguity in the present use of the expression random pure state is stressed. Within a given theory (an abbreviation for *a given theoretical frame*, here the standard version of quantum mechanics), one should obviously distinguish between an experimental (or possibly simulated) situation and the formal tools used in its description. One should therefore keep in mind the origin of a given formal tool when deciding to use it in a given situation. *An RCPS is not a statistical mixture, and our already cited papers devoted to either BQSS or BQPT, including our recent paper [13], did not use the density operator ρ . However, since ρ is quite often used in QM studies, it is useful to establish links between the experimental situation described by an RCPS and the formal density operator*, clearly distinguishing between what is related to an RCPS and the possible suggestions about the content of the density operator ρ in the specific situations described by a statistical mixture. The present work is *not* devoted to a historical study, but can't ignore that the present debates within QM are still largely dependent upon its developments in the 1924-1935 years.

In Section 3, the existence of the measurement postulate introduced by von Neumann and its consequences in the description of statistical mixtures are presented. Links between an RCPS and the density operator ρ are established in Section 4. The interest of the RCPS concept is presented in Section 5 in the simple case of a spin 1/2. In a first instance, the RCPS depends on a single real random parameter obeying a truncated Gaussian law, with two unknown real parameters, and one accesses experimental or simulated data. It is impossible to evaluate these two unknown parameters through the density matrix associated with this RCPS, but this can be done, within this quantum context, thanks to statistical properties of a probability, not of an observable. A second instance numerically compares two RCPS with the same associated density operator, and which are shown to be different when using also a moment with higher order than the one used through the density operator formalism. The reader may consult our already cited papers for quite more complex uses of the RCPS concept. In Section 6, it is explained that the limitations of the ρ formalism also exist in a situation historically first discussed by Landau and later on clarified by Feynman, and which, for brevity, we call the Landau-Feynman approach. In Section 7, stimulated by our use of higher-order moments in the presence of an RCPS, we come to the Zeh problem, with a spin 1/2 and *the two von Neumann*

mixed states considered by Zeh, described by the same density operator. Using the moments of an RV linked to the results of measurements, we show that if the measured spin component and the RV are both well-chosen, the values of *at least one of its moments* differ, when considering these two mixtures, which allows us to differentiate between these statistical mixtures. Conclusions are drawn in Section 8.

2 An experimental situation with a system in an RCPS

We recall a simple situation - detailed, in the context of BQSS, in [9] - when the random-coefficient pure state concept is meaningful. Σ consists of the magnetic moment $\vec{\mu}$ of an electron spin 1/2, with $\vec{\mu} = -G \vec{s}$ (isotropic $\vec{g}$ tensor), in a static field $\vec{B}_0 = B_0 \vec{Z}$ with amplitude B_0 . Writing the Zeeman Hamiltonian as $h = -\vec{\mu} \vec{B}_0 = GB_0 s_Z$ indicates that while the spin is a quantum object, the magnetic field is treated classically. Someone (the Writer) first prepares the spin in the $|+Z\rangle$ eigenstate of s_Z (eigenvalue $+1/2$). The moment is then received by a second person (the Reader), who ignores the direction of $\vec{B}_0$, chooses some direction z (unit vector $\vec{u}_z$) attached to his own Laboratory as the quantization direction and introduces a Laboratory-tied cartesian frame xyz , used to define θ_E and φ_E , the Euler angles of $\vec{Z}$. Since the field is treated classically, θ_E and φ_E behave as classical variables, while s_Z is an operator. The Reader measures $s_z = \vec{s} \vec{u}_z$ (eigenstates: $|+\rangle$ and $|-\rangle$), and is interested in the probability p_{+z} of getting $+1/2$. An elementary calculation indicates that, when the time interval between writing and reading may be neglected:

$$|+Z\rangle = \alpha|+\rangle + \sqrt{1 - \alpha^2} e^{i\varphi} |-\rangle, \quad (2)$$

with

$$\alpha = \cos \frac{\theta_E}{2}, \quad \varphi = \varphi_E, \quad (3)$$

and therefore $p_{+z} = \cos^2 \theta_E / 2$. Once the direction of $\vec{B}_0$ has been chosen, state $|+Z\rangle$ is then unambiguously defined. If this direction has a deterministic nature, α and φ are deterministic variables, and $|+Z\rangle$, usually called a pure state, may be called a deterministic-coefficient pure state. If θ_E and φ_E obey probabilistic laws, one may consider that the quantum quantities α and φ , which depend upon the classical RV θ_E and φ_E , do possess the properties of conventional, i.e. classical, RV. We are not strictly facing the quantum equivalent of a classical situation here. Rather, the stochastic character of the field direction, with classical nature, is reflected in the random behaviour of the quantum state expressed through Eq. (2). While random operators are well known e.g. in NMR (see Ch. VIII of [24]), we here meet a random-coefficient pure state. And the probability p_{+z} , equal to $\cos^2 \theta_E / 2$, is therefore itself a random variable.

In the field of probability theory, a vector whose components are random variables is called a random vector (see e.g. page 243 of [25]). In Eq. (2),

$|+Z\rangle$, with its random coefficients α and φ , may therefore be called a random ket, or as describing a random pure state (of the spin 1/2), and since our 2007 paper [6], we used these expressions with this meaning, keeping in mind that, once a given sample of this random vector has been selected, then its components, in the considered quantum context, while being deterministic quantities, have a probabilistic content. In order to try and suppress any ambiguity, in the present paper, as in [13], instead of speaking of a *random pure state* we speak of a *random-coefficient pure state*, since moreover the expression *random quantum pure states* was already used in 1990 by Wootters [26] with three different contents, and since, as detailed in Section 5 of [13], the expression *random pure states* today appears with different meanings.

3 von Neumann statistical mixture and measurement postulate

With a physical observable quantity O attached to Σ , QM associates a linear Hermitian operator $\hat{O}$ acting on the states of Σ . The mean value of $\hat{O}$ when Σ is in the pure (normed) state $|\Psi\rangle$ is a quantity written, in the Dirac formalism, as $\langle\Psi|\hat{O}|\Psi\rangle$. A statistical mixture, as historically introduced by von Neumann [22], [23], is denoted as $\{p_i, |\varphi_i\rangle\}$, where p_i is the probability of presence of the normed pure state $|\varphi_i\rangle$ (for any i , $p_i \geq 0$ and $\sum_i p_i = 1$), and the mean value of $\hat{O}$ is then equal to $\sum_i p_i \langle\varphi_i|\hat{O}|\varphi_i\rangle$. With such a statistical mixture, one associates its density operator $\rho = \sum_i p_i |\varphi_i\rangle\langle\varphi_i|$, acting linearly on the (hereafter assumed to be normed) states of Σ . The eigenvalue spectrum of a Hermitian positive operator with finite trace is entirely discrete, a result of Hilbert space theory ([27], page 335). When an isolated system is in a statistical mixture, ρ obeys the Liouville-von Neumann equation. In the special case when Σ is in a pure state $|\Psi\rangle$, ρ is a projector: $\rho = |\Psi\rangle\langle\Psi|$. The relation $\text{Tr}\rho^2 \leq \text{Tr}\rho$ is obeyed by ρ , the equality being verified iff ρ is a projector, i.e. if and only if ρ describes a pure state. A *fundamental postulate* (see e.g. Peres [28], pages 75-76, and Section 7), first proposed by von Neumann, is used: "the ρ matrix completely specifies all the properties of a quantum ensemble" [28]. Then, $\hat{O}$ being attached to an arbitrary observable O of Σ , von Neumann claims that the whole information which can be reached through measurements of O is contained in the expression $E\{\hat{O}\} = \text{Tr}\{\rho\hat{O}\}$ (von Neumann introduced the density operator ρ while aiming at this result, cf. Section 7). Consequently, the writing $\{p_i, |\varphi_i\rangle\}$ is considered ambiguous: if two so-defined statistical mixtures possess the same density operator they must be seen as the same statistical mixture.

In the situation considered by von Neumann, the limits of the ρ tool are therefore those of a postulate, but they are not always identified, a result of von Neumann's authority, as in [23] he wrote that he had demonstrated a result about ρ (which he named as U), whereas, as shown in Section 7, *in fact he had just postulated it*.

4 RCPS and the density operator ρ

Starting from a given RCPS, it is shown that one and only one density operator can be associated with it. Then, starting from a given density operator, it is shown that more than one RCPS can be associated with it.

4.1 From an RCPS to ρ

At some time t_r , an isolated system Σ (state space $\mathcal{E}$, with dimension d , and $\{|k\rangle\}$ an orthonormal basis of $\mathcal{E}$) is supposed to be in an arbitrary random-coefficient pure state

$$|\Psi\rangle = \sum_k c_k |k\rangle, \quad (4)$$

where the c_k are RV, with the constraint $\sum_k |c_k|^2 = 1$. One is interested in the mean value then taken by the scalar Hermitian operator $\hat{O}$ associated with some observable of Σ . One first considers a given choice of the value of each RV c_k . The contribution of this specific, then deterministic-coefficient pure state, denoted as $|\Psi_s\rangle$, is, from the rules of QM:

$$\langle \Psi_s | \hat{O} | \Psi_s \rangle = \sum_{k,l} c_k^* \langle k | \hat{O} | l \rangle c_l. \quad (5)$$

The mean value of $\hat{O}$ when Σ is in this RCPS is defined as the expectation (denoted as E) or mean value of this quantity:

$$E\{\langle \Psi_s | \hat{O} | \Psi_s \rangle\} = \sum_{k,l} E\{c_k^* c_l\} \hat{O}_{kl} = \sum_{k,l} r_{lk} \hat{O}_{kl} = Tr(r\hat{O}), \quad (6)$$

where, in the chosen basis, $\hat{O}_{kl} = \langle k | \hat{O} | l \rangle$ and

$$r_{lk} = \langle l | r | k \rangle = E\{c_k^* c_l\} \quad (7)$$

$$r = \sum_{k,l} r_{kl} |k\rangle \langle l|. \quad (8)$$

The introduction of the linear operator r with matrix elements r_{lk} in the $\{|k\rangle\}$ basis, and that of a trace, are the consequences of the superposition principle and of the fact that the expectation of the sum is equal to the sum of the expectations. r has the following properties, resulting from a transposition of the usual arguments in the presence of a statistical mixture to the present situation, i.e. an arbitrary RCPS (cf. also the Appendix):

- 1) for any pair (k, l) , $r_{lk} = r_{kl}^*$: the operator r is Hermitian,
- 2) in a basis $\{|i\rangle\}$ in which the Hermitian operator r is diagonal, its diagonal elements are its eigenvalues; being of the form $E\{|c_i|^2\} = p_i$, they are all non-negative (r is a positive operator), and their sum is equal to 1,
- 3) for any ket $|u\rangle$, $\langle u | r | u \rangle \geq 0$, since it is equal to $\sum_i p_i |\langle i | u \rangle|^2$,

4) H being the Hamiltonian of Σ , for each choice of the c_k values the corresponding ket $|\Psi_s\rangle$ obeys the Schrödinger equation, and from t_r on, r obeys the Liouville-von Neumann equation $i\hbar dr/dt = [H, r]$.

This operator r has all the properties of a density operator. This result had been suggested, for a qubit, in [9].

It must be realized that the Gleason theorem can be opposed neither to the existence of an RCPS nor to the establishment of the properties discussed in this section, since the establishment of this theorem starts by introducing projectors (see e.g [29], page 189), i.e. a formal object associated with deterministic-coefficient pure states.

4.2 From a given ρ , towards RCPS

It has been recalled that, as a consequence of the von Neumann postulate (cf. Section 3), if several statistical mixtures $\{p_i, |\varphi_i\rangle\}$ have the same density operator, they are considered as being the same statistical mixture. But a statistical mixture is not an RCPS. Presently starting with system Σ and its state space $\mathcal{E}$, Σ is assumed to be in a statistical mixture described by a density operator ρ . In an orthonormal basis of $\mathcal{E}$, $\{|i\rangle\}$, in which ρ is diagonal:

$$\rho = \sum_i p_i |i\rangle\langle i| \quad (9)$$

where the p_i are probabilities. Is it possible to associate at least one and possibly more than one RCPS with ρ ? It is hereafter shown that the answer is yes.

We are first able to show that at least some well-chosen RCPS $|\Psi_1\rangle = \sum_i c_i |i\rangle$, developed over this basis and the c_i being RV, may be associated with a statistical matrix r equal to that representing ρ in that basis, even while the following strong conditions have been imposed upon the coefficients c_i : 1) the RV c_i are real, which avoids considering complex RV. 2) RV c_d obeys $c_d = \delta \sqrt{1 - \sum_{i=1}^{d-1} c_i^2}$, δ being an RV taking the values $+1$ and -1 , each with probability $1/2$, and δ is statistically independent from all the c_i with $i < d$. 3) All the $c_i, c_{j \neq i}$ pairs with $i < d$ and $j < d$ are statistically independent. 4) each RV c_i with $i < d$ obeys a centered, truncated ($|c_i| \leq 1$) Gaussian probability density function, with a variance equal to p_i . As a consequence of these assumed properties, if $i < d, j < d$ and $i \neq j$, then $r_{ij} = \langle c_j \rangle \langle c_i \rangle = 0$, and if $i < d$ and $j = d$, then $r_{id} = \langle c_i \delta \sqrt{1 - \sum_{l=1}^{d-1} c_l^2} \rangle$ and, as δ is independent from the c_i and is a centered RV, $r_{id} = 0$; the same is true for r_{dj} with $j < d$. Therefore, the non-diagonal matrix elements of r , the statistical matrix associated with this random-coefficient pure state in the chosen basis, namely the mean values $r_{ij} = \langle c_j^* c_i \rangle$, with $j \neq i$, are all equal to 0: in the orthonormal basis $\{|i\rangle\}$ both r and ρ are diagonal matrices. And, from 4), $r_{ii} = p_i$. Therefore, starting from a statistical mixture described by a density operator ρ , it has been possible to build a random-coefficient pure state with a matrix r equal to ρ . We will say that $|\Psi_1\rangle$ may be associated with ρ .

A second possible random-coefficient pure state $|\Psi_2\rangle$, again written as in Eq. (4) (the c_i are again RV), may be supposed to obey assumptions 1), 2), 3), whereas 4) is now replaced by the following condition 4'): each RV c_i with $i < d$ has a centered truncated ($|c_i| \leq 1$) Laplace probability density function, again with a variance equal to p_i . Then $|\Psi_2\rangle$ may be associated with ρ .

A third possible random-coefficient pure state $|\Psi_3\rangle$, again written as in Eq. (4) (the c_i are again RV) may be built, which is supposed to obey the following conditions: assumptions 1) and 2) are kept, but it is now assumed that: 3') if $i < d$, $j < d$ and $i \neq j$, any mean value $r_{ij} = \langle c_j^* c_i \rangle$ is equal to zero and 4'') for any value of i , c_i obeys $\langle c_i^2 \rangle = p_i$. Then $|\Psi_3\rangle$ may be associated with ρ .

5 Two instances of the interest of the RCPS concept

An experimental situation with an RCPS was described in Section 2. In simulations, an RCPS can be imagined at the input of some device with only partly known properties, and from the state obtained at its output, information can be obtained about the device itself. We present two simple instances, using a spin 1/2, showing the interest of the RCPS concept. A recent, more complex instance of the interest of RCPS, in the domain of Blind Quantum Process Tomography, may be found in [13].

5.1 A spin 1/2 in an RCPS

One decides to consider an isotropic magnetic moment associated with a spin 1/2, in a situation when its state is described by the following RCPS:

$$|\Phi\rangle = \alpha |+\rangle + \sqrt{1-\alpha^2} |-\rangle \quad (10)$$

with $s_z | \pm \rangle = (\pm 1/2) | \pm \rangle$. α is a real RV, following a truncated Gaussian law, with $0 \leq \alpha \leq 1$, with two unknown parameters, its mean value η and its variance σ^2 .

At a first level, we introduce N independent identical systems, each one with this isotropic magnetic moment and a Stern-Gerlach device, the static field having the same well-defined direction (denoted as Z) and amplitude in all devices, and all the spins being in the same deterministic-coefficient pure state at the input of the Stern-Gerlach device. The s_z component of each spin is then measured, which allows us to get the mean value of s_z for this given direction of the magnetic field. One could also imagine a single spin and a single device, the same experiment being made M times, with $M \gg 1$ (more time consuming, but with a single equipment).

At a second level, as suggested by the content of Section 2, the amplitude of the magnetic field being unchanged, this experiment is made for (a high number of) random directions of the magnetic field, with however systematically $\varphi = 0$ in Eq. (2), and α obeying the just defined truncated Gaussian law.

One first uses the ρ formalism, introducing the density operator r associated with this RCPS, given by Eq. (8). The mean value of s_z is then

$$E\{s_z\} = \text{Tr}\{rs_z\} = r_{++} \langle + | s_z | + \rangle + r_{--} \langle - | s_z | - \rangle \quad (11)$$

$$= \frac{1}{2}r_{++} - \frac{1}{2}r_{--} = r_{++} - \frac{1}{2}. \quad (12)$$

$E\{s_z\}$ is estimated from the experiments (or the simulations). The expression of $r_{++} = E\{\alpha^2\}$ mobilizes the two unknown quantities η and σ^2 , which therefore can't be derived from Eq. (12), as one faces a single equation and two unknown quantities.

Our conclusion is different when explicitly using the fact that $|\Phi\rangle$ is an RCPS. The probability of getting $+1/2$ as a result of a given trial is $p_+ = \alpha^2$. This probability is therefore itself an RV. One may then consider both its first and second moments, i.e. the second and fourth moments of α :

$$E\{p_+\} = E\{\alpha^2\} = \frac{\int_0^1 \alpha^2 e^{-(\alpha-\eta)^2/2\sigma^2} d\alpha}{\int_0^1 e^{-(\alpha-\eta)^2/2\sigma^2} d\alpha} \quad (13)$$

$$E\{p_+^2\} = E\{\alpha^4\} = \frac{\int_0^1 \alpha^4 e^{-(\alpha-\eta)^2/2\sigma^2} d\alpha}{\int_0^1 e^{-(\alpha-\eta)^2/2\sigma^2} d\alpha}. \quad (14)$$

The numerical values of $E\{p_+\}$ and $E\{p_+^2\}$ can be estimated from the experimental (or simulated) data. Thanks to Eq. (13) and (14), one now faces a system of two equations, with the two unknown quantities η and σ^2 , which can then in principle be accessed.

5.2 Again a spin 1/2, and now two RCPS

The interest of using the statistical properties of the probabilities (of the results of measurements) as compared with the use of the operator r associated with an RCPS will now be illustrated by considering a spin 1/2 described with an RCPS obeying the following equation:

$$|\Phi\rangle = \alpha |+\rangle + \sqrt{1-\alpha^2} e^{i\varphi} |-\rangle \quad (15)$$

where α and φ are real, independent RV, with $0 \leq \alpha \leq 1$, $-\pi \leq \varphi \leq \pi$, and φ being uniformly distributed between $-\pi$ and $+\pi$. Then $E\{e^{i\varphi}\} = 0$, and r , the corresponding density operator with matrix elements $r_{lk} = E\{c_k^* c_l\}$, is represented by a diagonal matrix in the standard basis, since:

$$r_{-+} = E\{c_+^* c_-\} = E\{\alpha \sqrt{1-\alpha^2} e^{i\varphi}\} = E\{\alpha \sqrt{1-\alpha^2}\} E\{e^{i\varphi}\} = 0. \quad (16)$$

We then successively consider two specific RCPS, α moreover taking two values only, with the following probabilities:

- in the first RCPS: $\{\alpha = 0.45, p = 0.5, \text{ and } \alpha = 0.55, p = 0.5\}$,
- in the second RCPS, α again takes two values, but now: $\{\alpha = 0.9, p = 97/320, \text{ and } \alpha = 0.1, p = 223/320\}$.

Here, in both cases, $r_{++} = E\{\alpha^2\} = 0.2525$: the density operators r associated with these two RCPS are identical.

We now consider the first and second moments of the RV p_+ , the probability of obtaining the value $+1/2$ as a result of the measurement of s_z , in this two level measurement, and this for the first and then for the second RCPS.

The first moment of p_+ is $E\{p_+\} = E\{|c_+|^2\} = E\{\alpha^2\}$. The second moment of p_+ is $E\{p_+^2\} = E\{\alpha^4\}$. The numerical value of the first moment of p_+ is therefore already known. It is the same for both RCPS: $E\{p_+\} = 0.2525$. In contrast, the value of the second moment of p_+ is:

- for the first RCPS, $E\{p_+^2\} = E\{\alpha^4\} = 0.06625625$,
- for the second RCPS, $E\{p_+^2\} = E\{\alpha^4\} = 0.19895$, a value roughly three times greater than that for the first RCPS.

The two chosen RCPS of the spin $1/2$ therefore have the same associated density operator. The probability p_+ of obtaining the result $1/2$ when measuring s_z is then an RV. Whereas the first moment of p_+ has the same value for both RCPS, this is not verified with its second moment.

One may notice that our treatment of quantum systems in states described with the RCPS concept uses the general postulates of QM, with of course the exception of the specific one introduced by von Neumann in the treatment of statistical mixtures (cf. Section 3). When a description with an RCPS is relevant, the use of its statistical properties is then more powerful than the use of its associated density operator, a fact which may be translated into the language of the order of the moments of RV (for its interest in the context of BQPT, see e.g. [13]).

6 About the Landau-Feynman approach

In the first section of [30], entitled "*Coupled systems in wave mechanics*", Landau wrote: "*A system cannot be uniquely defined in wave mechanics; we always have a probability ensemble (statistical treatment). If the system is coupled with another, there is a double uncertainty in its behaviour*". But an operator then introduced through a *Partial Trace* procedure in the presence of such a coupling does not obey the Liouville-von Neumann equation, and calling it a density operator may nowadays introduce confusion. In Volume III of their Course (English translation of the second edition, [31]) Landau and Lifshitz first supposed that a "*closed system as a whole is in some state described by a wave function $\Psi(q, x)$, where x denotes the set of coordinates of the system considered, and q the remaining coordinates of the system considered*". Integrating over the q variables -which corresponds to introducing a partial trace -, they introduced an operator which they again called a *density matrix* (thus keeping the difference with its now well-accepted meaning resulting from the von Neumann approach). Then, in a second step only, they "*suppose that the system*" (of interest) "*is closed, or became so at some time*". In Chapter 2 of his *Statistical Mechanics* [32], Feynman suppressed the possible confusion resulting from the use of the expression density (or statistical) operator by both von Neumann and Landau under dif-

ferent assumptions (the possible existence of a coupling of the system of interest with a second system in Landau's approach). Feynman considers a system Σ composed of the system of interest, Σ_1 , and Σ_2 , the rest of the universe. He explicitly writes "*it is unknown whether or not the rest of the universe is in a pure state*". In the following, as in [9], Σ_2 will be the collection of systems with which Σ_1 may interact at the chosen time scale, the whole system Σ being isolated at this time scale. At a time t_0 when Σ_1 and Σ_2 are uncoupled, Σ_1 and Σ_2 are separately prepared, each in a pure state. Σ , the global system, is therefore in a pure state $|\Psi(t_0)\rangle$. In a situation when, after this preparation act, an internal coupling exists between Σ_1 and Σ_2 , and this until some time t_1 , one is interested in the behaviour of Σ_1 for $t \geq t_1$, i.e. once this coupling has disappeared, at the chosen time scale. Feynman first observes that for $t \geq t_0$ the whole system obeys the Schrödinger equation, and then, *for $t \geq t_1$, i.e. after the disappearance of this internal coupling*, he calculates the mean value of $\hat{O}$ for an arbitrary observable of Σ_1 . He first shows that this mean value at t_1 is equal to $Tr_1\{\rho_1(t_1)\hat{O}\}$, where $\rho_1(t_1) = Tr_2\rho(t_1)$ ($\rho(t_1)$ being the projector $|\Psi(t_1)\rangle\langle\Psi(t_1)|$, and $|\Psi(t_1)\rangle$ the ket describing Σ at t_1 , according to the Schrödinger equation, and Tr_1 (resp. Tr_2) being a trace calculated over the kets of an orthonormal basis of Σ_1 (resp. Σ_2), then that the result keeps true for any time $t > t_1$, and finally that the partial trace $\rho_1(t)$ obeys the Liouville-von Neumann equation for $t \geq t_1$. The use of the Schrödinger equation for $t \geq t_1$ for the establishment of this property implies that when $t \geq t_1$, Σ_1 may be submitted to time-dependent forces giving birth to a time-dependent Hamiltonian, the sources of these forces (e.g. an oscillating magnetic field acting on a spin magnetic moment) being then included in Σ_1 .

One may then say that, once Σ_1 is uncoupled from Σ_2 , if one is interested in the mean value of the Hermitian operator attached to *an observable of Σ_1 only, everything happens as if Σ_1 were in a statistical mixture* described by $\rho_1(t)$ (it can be verified that $\rho_1(t)$ possesses all the properties of a density operator).

Under the assumptions made, and when $t \geq t_1$, the obtained results may be read by claiming that the system of interest Σ_1 keeps a memory of its past coupling with Σ_2 , and once this has been said the existence of Σ_2 should be forgotten. The way $\rho_1(t_1)$ is introduced shows that this claimed memory is a manifestation of the (so-called quantum) correlations created by the $\Sigma_1 - \Sigma_2$ coupling which did exist between t_0 and t_1 and created an entangled state. Of course, someone could take Σ_2 as the system of interest, and introduce his own so-called reduced density operator $\rho_2(t)$. But he is not allowed to forget that Σ is in a pure state $|\Psi(t)\rangle$, and not allowed to suggest that the state of Σ is $\rho_1(t) \otimes \rho_2(t)$, generally a statistical mixture.

The situation considered in the Landau-Feynman approach does also mobilize a density operator ρ , but is clearly different from the situation considered by von Neumann. An interest of Feynman's treatment is that, using already existing quantum postulates, and specifically the fact that the mean value of $\hat{O}$ in state $|\Psi\rangle$ is $\langle\Psi|\hat{O}|\Psi\rangle$, it introduces the density operator in a specific situation. However, by the very link to ρ established in this Feynman-Landau approach, the postulate made by von Neumann is kept, while perhaps

masked. In 1966 B. d’Espagnat had called a statistical mixture as defined by von Neumann a proper mixture, and one imagined from a partial tracing an improper mixture [33]. The 1972 clarification about the conditions of the use of the Landau approach, by Feynman, did not introduce the existence of a statistical mixture. After 1972, d’Espagnat however kept his distinction and the expression *improper mixture* [34] with, consequently, controversies about the relevance of this distinction (see e.g. [35]).

QPT often considers a composite system made of the system of interest Σ_1 (state space $\mathcal{E}_1$) and its environment Σ_2 (state space $\mathcal{E}_2$) and introduces a partial trace over (a basis of) $\mathcal{E}_2$ (see e.g. Ch. 8 of [3], and [36]), with the reservation that introducing a density operator through a partial Trace is relevant only if the Σ_1 - Σ_2 coupling has disappeared at the time when this partial tracing is considered.

Beyond the choice of the words, the important point to be kept is the idea that the introduction of ρ by von Neumann and the just described Landau-Feynman partial tracing refer to two distinct physical situations, the manipulation of an RCPS referring to a third one.

7 The Zeh problem and the use of higher-order moments

In 1927, Weyl [37], von Neumann [22] and Landau [30] separately insisted that, in the quantum domain, what Weyl then called a pure state (*reiner Fall*) was not the whole story. Von Neumann used the frequentist approach to probabilities then recently developed by von Mises, and before the publication of Kolmogorov’s work (about Kolmogorov and the frequentist approach, see [38]). The existence of von Neumann’s measurement postulate was stressed in Section 3, but one has to try and identify the reason of its introduction. In the preface of his 1932 book [23], von Neumann wrote that, at the time of its writing, *the relation of quantum mechanics to statistics and to the classical statistical mechanics was of special importance*. And 25 years later Fano [39] noted that, in that time interval, *“States with less than maximum information, represented by density matrices ρ , have been considered primarily in statistical mechanics and their discussion has been influenced by the historical background in this field”*. In the previous development of classical statistical mechanics, Gibbs had introduced a probability density (within the phase space), used for the calculations of mean values. In contrast, what corresponds to what is now called higher-order moments (see e.g. their use in [13]) had not been explicitly considered in physics. Therefore, when von Neumann introduced his measurement postulate, this he could implicitly consider not to be responsible for a loss of information as compared with that contained in the definition of a statistical mixture through the explicit consideration of the $\{p_i, |\varphi_i\rangle\}$ collection.

When examining von Neumann’s conception of a statistical mixture from [23], a first difficulty is the fact that this question occupies parts of four of its

six chapters. A second one, for the modern reader, results from the fact that von Neumann does not use the now standard ket formalism, introduced seven years later [40]. In [23], von Neumann, having considered the probability content attached to a pure state, adds (pages 295-296) *"the statistical character may become even more prominent, if we do not even know what state is actually present - - for example when several states $\phi_1, \phi_2, \dots$ with the respective probabilities $w_1, w_2, \dots (w_1 \geq 0, w_2 \geq 0, \dots w_1 + w_2 + \dots = 1)$ constitute the description"* of S , the quantum system of interest. He moreover considers (page 298) *"great statistical ensembles which consist of many systems $S_1, \dots, S_N$, i.e., N models of S , N large"*. Similarly, at the beginning of his Chapter V, devoted to thermodynamical questions, von Neumann, extending Gibbs' replica method into the quantum domain, introduces a mental ensemble of identical systems in which he measures some operator R , now separating this ensemble into sub-ensembles according to the result of the measurement. He has started Ch. IV of [23] saying that in his previous chapter he has *"succeeded in reducing all assertions of quantum mechanics"* to a formula expressing that the mean value of a physical quantity O when the system is in the state $|\Psi\rangle$ is equal to a quantity written, with our notations, as $\langle \Psi | \hat{O} | \Psi \rangle$. But this he postulated in his Ch. III, as the reader may convince himself: he has first to see the existence of property E_2 in page 203 of [23], and then, in its page 210, to read that: *"we recognize P . (or E_2 .) as the most far reaching pronouncement on elementary processes"*. But von Neumann has first written: *"We shall now assume this statement P to be generally valid"* (page 201), and *"We shall now deduce E_1 . from P ., and E_2 . from E_1 ."* (page 203).

Consequently, given a system Σ in a statistical mixture described by ρ and $\hat{O}$ attached to an observable O of Σ , the assertion that everything should be contained in the expression $E\{\hat{O}\} = \text{Tr}\{\rho\hat{O}\}$ expresses a postulate.

Bell's strong reluctance about the place presently given to measurements in the foundations of QM [41] and his question *"Was the wavefunction of the world waiting to jump for thousands of millions of years until a single-celled living creature appeared? Or did it have to wait a little longer, for some better qualified system ... with a PhD?"* are well-known. Saying that his question was provocative is a statement about the question, not an answer. Already in 1970 Zeh [42] stressed a consequence of that von Neumann postulate (which he called the *measurement axiom*, leading to a *circular argument*), when writing: *"the statistical ensemble consisting of equal probabilities of neutrons with spin up and spin down in the x direction cannot be distinguished by measurement from the analogous ensemble having the spins parallel or antiparallel to the y direction. Both ensembles, however, can be easily prepared by appropriate versions of the Stern-Gerlach experiment. One is justified in describing both ensembles by the same density matrix as long as the axiom of measurement is accepted. However, the density matrix formalism cannot be a complete description of the ensemble, as the ensemble cannot be rederived from the density matrix"* [42]. We call this situation for neutrons proposed by Zeh **the Zeh problem**.

Zeh introduces a Stern-Gerlach (SG) equipment. In their 1922 experiment,

Stern and Gerlach used silver atoms placed in a furnace heated to a high temperature, leaving the furnace through a hole and propagating in a straight line. They then crossed an inhomogeneous magnetic field and condensed on a plate (see [43], page 394). As they have no electric charge, they were not submitted to the Laplace force, but they have an electronic permanent magnetic moment. In a classical approach, one should then observe a single spot, *whereas two spots* were observed, which could only be explained, later on, as the result of a quantum behaviour: a silver atom has a spin $1/2$. Zeh considers the random emission of neutrons by a neutron source. It is well-established that a neutron has a nuclear spin $1/2$ here denoted as $\vec{s}$ (it is usually written as $\vec{I}$, the symbol $\vec{s}$ being kept for spins with electronic origin) and a magnetic moment $\mu = -1.913047 \mu_N$ (μ_N : nuclear magneton) proportional to its spin. The force acting on the magnetic moment of the successive neutrons deflects them into two well-identified beams, one beam corresponding to the spin quantum state $|z, +1/2\rangle$ and one beam corresponding to the spin quantum state $|z, -1/2\rangle$. The letter z is reminiscent of the fact that the field gradient and the force on the spin were directed along z in Fig 1, in page 395 of [43]. As the neutrons are emitted one by one (no interaction between them), interact only with the magnetic field before being collected on the plate, and are not each one identified when leaving the furnace, but are only counted when arriving on the plate, with the same total number $N/2$ in the two packets, one may say (strictly speaking, in the limit $N \rightarrow \infty$) that one prepared the following (von Neumann) statistical mixture: $|+z, 1/2\rangle, \frac{1}{2}, |-z, 1/2\rangle, \frac{1}{2}$. This mixture is the one compatible with the SG equipment in reference [43]. Following up the question from Zeh in [42], we now consider a spin $1/2$, and successively its state in:

$$\begin{aligned} \text{Mixture 1: } & |+x\rangle, 1/2 \text{ and } |-x\rangle, 1/2, \\ \text{Mixture 2: } & |+y\rangle, 1/2 \text{ and } |-y\rangle, 1/2, \end{aligned}$$

$|+x\rangle$ and $|-x\rangle$ being the eigenkets of s_x for the values $+1/2$ and $-1/2$ respectively, and $|+y\rangle$ and $|-y\rangle$ the eigenkets of s_y for the values $+1/2$ and $-1/2$ respectively.

The density operator associated with both mixtures is $\rho = I/2$ (I : identity operator in the state space of the spin). We decide to forget the existence of the von Neumann measurement postulate, which suggests that both mixtures are the same, and therefore discourages us from doing what follows. We choose to use, instead of the ρ formalism, the very definition of these mixtures. And, in order to try and clarify the Zeh problem, our previous use of moments in the presence of an RCPS here suggests us to use moments of an arbitrary order (and not only the mean value) of a well-chosen RV. Just before the plate, at the level of each arriving beam, we introduce an equipment able to measure the $\mathbf{s}_x$ component of each neutron, and to store the result. Von Neumann told us that the mean value of the result of this measurement, written in the Dirac

formalism, is:

$$\begin{aligned}\frac{1}{2} &< +x | s_x | +x > + \frac{1}{2} < -x | s_x | -x > \text{ for mixture 1} \\ \frac{1}{2} &< +y | s_x | +y > + \frac{1}{2} < -y | s_x | -y > \text{ for mixture 2}\end{aligned}$$

One can interpret these results as the mean value (over all pure states that compose the considered mixed state) of a random variable which we denote as X , and which is defined as being itself the *mean* value taken by s_x when the spin is in a given pure state. Its name X recalls us that it mobilizes the x component of the spin. In the specific case of a pure state $|\varphi\rangle$, X takes the value $\langle \varphi | s_x | \varphi \rangle$.

For any value of the non-negative integer n , μ_n , the n th moment of X has the value for mixture 1:

$$\begin{aligned}\text{mixture 1: } \mu_n(X) &= \frac{1}{2}(\langle +x | s_x | +x \rangle)^n + \frac{1}{2}(\langle -x | s_x | -x \rangle)^n \\ &= \frac{1}{2}\left(\frac{1}{2}\right)^n + \frac{1}{2}\left(-\frac{1}{2}\right)^n\end{aligned}$$

Therefore, in statistical mixture 1, any odd moment of X has a value equal to 0, and any even moment (n even) is equal to $1/2^n$.

Considering now mixture 2, the n th moment of X has the value:

$$\text{mixture 2: } \mu_n(X) = \frac{1}{2}(\langle +y | s_x | +y \rangle)^n + \frac{1}{2}(\langle -y | s_x | -y \rangle)^n$$

We recall the developments of $|+y\rangle$ and $|-y\rangle$ within the standard basis:

$$|+y\rangle = \frac{|+ \rangle + +i | - \rangle}{\sqrt{2}} \quad \text{and} \quad |-y\rangle = \frac{|+ \rangle - i | - \rangle}{\sqrt{2}}$$

The quantity $\langle +y | s_x | +y \rangle$ is equal to zero, as the diagonal quantities $\langle + | s_x | + \rangle$ and $\langle - | s_x | - \rangle$ are both equal to 0, and the sum of the interference terms is equal to zero. The same result is obtained for $\langle -y | s_x | -y \rangle$.

Therefore, in statistical mixture 2, any moment of X is equal to 0.

One guesses that if, in contrast, the same mixtures being considered, one measures s_z instead of s_x , and one then introduces the RV Z , defined in the same way as X (and which, of course, has nothing to do with Z , the direction of a magnetic field), the difference found with the moments of X should disappear with Z , since the choice of s_z introduces a new symmetry, and an inability for the new RV Z to distinguish between the two mixtures through the use of the moments of s_z . We choose to examine this question explicitly. Z , the new RV, is defined through the way already used for X , s_x measurements being replaced by s_z measurements. One first considers the values of the moments of Z when the spin is in mixture 1. The developments of $|+x\rangle$ and $|-x\rangle$ in the standard basis are respectively:

$$|+x\rangle = \frac{|+ \rangle + | - \rangle}{\sqrt{2}} \quad \text{and} \quad |-x\rangle = \frac{|+ \rangle - | - \rangle}{\sqrt{2}}$$

The value of Z in the pure state $|+x\rangle$, i.e. $\langle +x | s_z | +x \rangle$, when $|+x\rangle$ is developed in the standard basis, is obtained as the sum of its interference terms, each equal to zero, and of the diagonal terms, the sum of their contributions being equal to 0. Therefore $\langle +x | s_z | +x \rangle = 0$. For the same reason, $\langle -x | s_z | -x \rangle = 0$. Therefore, any moment of s_z in mixture 1 has a value equal to 0. Following the same approach, one gets the same result for Z and mixture 2. As expected, considering measurements of s_z and the moments of Z , one is unable to establish any difference between Zeh mixtures 1 and 2. This result however does not change the previous conclusion, which corresponds to a sufficient condition: using two well-chosen mixtures -those introduced by Zeh- possessing the same density operator, we have been able to introduce a well-chosen RV, which we called X , related to results of measurements of a well-chosen spin component, namely s_x , and such that at least one of the moments of X had a different value in the two Zeh mixtures.

In summary, in his 1970 paper focused on the spin of neutrons and Stern-Gerlach equipments, and on two statistical mixtures chosen so that both mixtures have the same density operator $\rho = I/2$, Zeh observed that the description with ρ should not tell the whole story for these mixtures, since it forgets the initial preparation process of these mixtures. We have just: 1) decided to ignore the von Neumann measurement postulate (cf. Section 3), 2) introduced a well-chosen spin-operator, s_x , and an RV denoted as X and compatible with what one usually says in QM about the mean value of an observable in the presence of a statistical mixture, 3) established that the even moments of X have different values in mixture 1 and in mixture 2. This result allows us to say that, contrary to what is claimed when assuming the von Neumann measurement postulate, these two mixtures should be distinguished. This result is a sufficient property: when two mixtures have the same density matrix, once the von Neumann postulate has been given up, one should consider the very definition of a given statistical mixture, and use e.g. a well-defined RV linked to this mixture, and its moments. The associated density operator, certainly an important tool, does not necessarily contain the whole information contained in the mixture $\{p_i, |\varphi_i\rangle\}$, which confirms an intuition from Zeh.

8 Conclusion

Quantum Information Processing (QIP) is expanding its own place within Quantum Electronics. In the development of Blind Quantum Source Separation (BQSS) and Blind Quantum Process Tomography (BQPT), the use of the concept of a random-coefficient pure state (RCPS) has been found useful, within standard Quantum Mechanics (QM) and its Hilbert space framework. An RCPS has to be clearly distinguished from a statistical mixture - a quantum isolated physical system in different pure states, each one with a given probability - which, as a consequence of von Neumann's work, uses the density operator ρ as the formal tool for the treatment of its statistical properties. In the present paper, an experiment leading to the existence of an RCPS was presented. When

a system is described with an RCPS, probabilities of results of measurements of observables become themselves Random Variables (RV), presenting an informative content through their statistical laws. With a given RCPS one may associate a single, well-defined, density operator, and with a given density operator one may associate more than one random-coefficient pure state. An instance of a spin $1/2$ in an RCPS with two unknown parameters was introduced, and it was shown that information obtained from s_z measurements allows the determination of these parameters using known properties of the statistical laws obeyed by these probabilities, while that determination is impossible using the density operator associated with this RCPS. It was stressed that the use of the ρ formalism in the description of a statistical mixture rests upon a postulate. It was also shown that the use of what we called the Landau-Feynman approach, in a situation well identified by Feynman, makes an implicit use of this postulate, by its very use of the ρ operator. In the presence of a von Neumann mixture, stimulated by the existence a 1970 paper from Zeh, by our use of the moments of RV in the presence of an RCPS, and by the reason which historically led von Neumann to introduce his density operator, we gave up the von Neumann measurement postulate and then established a sufficient condition allowing us to say that, in the presence of a von Neumann statistical mixture, the exclusive use of the density operator may imply a loss of some information contained in the very definition of that mixture, which can be kept if one considers the moments of a well-chosen RV associated with results of measurements of observables.

The present paper therefore contains two main contributions with respect to quantum systems and algorithms, that are of importance for the Quantum Electronics Section of this Journal. The first one relates to the representation of the quantum states manipulated in these systems and algorithms, and to associated measurements: whereas the usual representation of mixed states is restricted to the use of the density operator formalism, we showed that their original representation as a set of (deterministic-coefficient) pure states and associated probabilities, together with adequate measurements, may allow one to extract more information about them than the one contained in their density operator, which in turn may yield more powerful information processing capabilities. Moreover, our second contribution relates to the exploitation of results of measurements performed for the mixed states considered above, or for the random-coefficient pure states that we introduced in our previous papers and that we further analyzed here: we showed that higher-order statistics of random variables associated with both types of states allow one to extract more information about these states and hence to extend quantum information processing capabilities.

9 Appendix

A justification of some properties obeyed by the operator r associated with a random-coefficient pure state, introduced in Subsection 4.1, is given here, using the notations of that section. r acts on the (deterministic-coefficient) states of

$\mathcal{E}$, the state space of Σ . For instance, when considering $r\hat{O}|\Psi_s\rangle$, r acts on the (deterministic-coefficient) state $\hat{O}|\Psi_s\rangle$ resulting from the action of $\hat{O}$ on the (deterministic-coefficient) state $|\Psi_s\rangle$.

Property 1: hermiticity of r . If X is a complex random variable with $X = A + iB$, A and B being real random variables, then $(E\{X\})^* = E\{A\} - iE\{B\} = E\{X^*}$ (expectation and complex conjugation commute). Therefore, considering the matrix with elements

$$r_{lk} = E\{c_k^* c_l\} \quad (17)$$

in the chosen basis, then $r_{kl}^* = (E\{c_l^* c_k\})^* = E\{c_l c_k^*\} = r_{lk}$. Therefore, the matrix with elements r_{lk} and the operator r are Hermitian.

Property 3: $\langle u | r | u \rangle = \langle u | \sum_i p_i | i \rangle \langle i | u \rangle = \sum_i p_i |\langle i | u \rangle|^2 \geq 0$.

Property 4: Σ has been assumed to be isolated, with Hamiltonian $\mathcal{H}$. Once a (deterministic-coefficient) pure state $|\Psi_s\rangle$ has been defined, its time evolution is well-defined, following the Schrödinger equation. If an RCPS is defined at some time t_r (r : reference), as $|\Psi\rangle = \sum_k c_k |k\rangle$, its time behaviour is therefore defined by this Hamiltonian and by the probability laws associated with the random variables c_k defined at time t_r . Consequently:

$$\frac{d}{dt}r = \sum_{k,l} \frac{dr_{kl}}{dt} |k\rangle\langle l| = \sum_{k,l} \frac{dE\{c_l^* c_k\}}{dt} |k\rangle\langle l| \quad (18)$$

$$= \sum_{k,l} E\left\{\frac{d(c_l^* c_k)}{dt}\right\} |k\rangle\langle l| \quad (19)$$

$$= \sum_{k,l} E\left\{\frac{dc_l^*}{dt} c_k + c_l^* \frac{dc_k}{dt}\right\} |k\rangle\langle l|. \quad (20)$$

Since $i\hbar \sum_k (dc_k/dt) |k\rangle = \sum_k c_k \mathcal{H} |k\rangle$, then

$$i\hbar \frac{d}{dt}r = \sum_{k,l} E\{-c_k c_l^* |k\rangle\langle l| \mathcal{H} + c_l^* c_k \mathcal{H} |k\rangle\langle l|\} \quad (21)$$

$$= -r\mathcal{H} + \mathcal{H}r = [\mathcal{H}, r]. \quad (22)$$

r therefore obeys the Liouville-von Neumann equation.

Statements and declarations

The authors declare to have no financial or non-financial conflict of interest.

References

- [1] Shannon, C.E. A Mathematical Theory of Communication, *Bell Syst. tech. J.* **1948**, *27*, 379-423 and 623-656.

- [2] Feynman, R.P. *Feynman Lectures on Computation*, Perseus Publishing, Cambridge, USA, 1996.
- [3] Nielsen, M.A.; Chuang, I.L. *Quantum Information and Quantum Computation*, Cambridge University Press, Cambridge, UK, Eighth printing, 2005.
- [4] Jutten, C.; Comon, P. Ch. 1. in *Handbook of Blind Source Separation*, Eds: Comon P., Jutten C., Academic Press, Oxford, UK, 2010, pp. 1-22.
- [5] Deville, Y.; Jutten, C.; Vigario, R. Overview of source separation applications, Ch. 16, in *Handbook of Blind Source Separation*, Eds: Comon P., Jutten C., Academic Press, Oxford, UK, 2010, pp. 639-681.
- [6] Deville, Y.; Deville, A. Blind separation of quantum states: estimating two qubits from an isotropic Heisenberg spin coupling model. In Proceedings of the 7th International Conference on Independent Component Analysis and Signal Separation (ICA 2007) London, 2007, Springer-Verlag, LNCS 4666, pp. 706-713.
- [7] Deville, Y.; Deville, A. Classical-processing and quantum-processing signal separation methods for qubit uncoupling, *Quantum Inf. Process.* **2012**, *11*, 1311-1347.
- [8] Deville, Y.; Deville, A. Ch. 1: Quantum-source independent component analysis and related statistical blind qubit uncoupling method. *Blind source separation: Advances in theory, algorithms and applications*, Eds: Naik G.R., Wang W., Springer, Berlin, Germany, 2014, pp. 3-38.
- [9] Deville, A.; Deville, Y. Concepts and criteria for blind quantum source separation and blind quantum process tomography, *Entropy* **2017**, *19*, 311.
- [10] Deville, Y.; Deville, A. From blind quantum source separation to blind quantum process tomography. In Proceedings of the 12th International Conference on Latent Variable Analysis and Signal Separation, LVA/ICA 2015 (Liberec, Czech Republic, Aug. 25-28, 2015), Springer International Publishing, Switzerland, LNCS **2015** 9237, pp. 184-192.
- [11] Deville, Y.; Deville, A. The blind version of quantum process tomography: operating with unknown input values. In Proceedings of the 20th World Congress of the International Federation of Automatic Control, IFAC 2017, Toulouse, France, July 9-14, 2017, IFAC PapersOnLine 50-1, 2017; pp. 11731-11737.
- [12] Deville, Y.; Deville, A. Quantum process tomography with unknown single-preparation input states: Concepts and application to the qubit pair with internal exchange coupling, *Phys. Rev. A* **2020**, *101*, 042332.

- [13] Deville Y.; Deville A. Exploiting the higher-order statistics of random-coefficient pure states for quantum information processing, *Quantum Inf. Process.* **2023**, *22*, 216.
- [14] Weinberg S. *Lectures on Quantum Mechanics*, Cambridge University Press, Cambridge, UK, 2013.
- [15] Ballentine, L. The Statistical Interpretation of Quantum Mechanics, *Rev. Mod. Phys.* **1970**, *42* (4), 358-381.
- [16] Weinberg, S. *The Quantum Theory of Fields*, Vol. 1, Cambridge University Press, Cambridge, UK, 1995.
- [17] Segal, I. E. Postulates of general quantum mechanics. *Ann. Math.* **1947**, *48*, 930-948.
- [18] Strocchi, F. The physical principles of quantum mechanics. A critical review, *Eur. Phys. J. Plus* **2012**, *127*:12.
- [19] Drago, A. Is the C*-Algebraic Approach to Quantum Mechanics an Alternative Formulation to the Dominant One? *Advances in Historical Studies* **2018**, *7*, 58-78.
- [20] Mielnik, B. Generalised quantum mechanics, *Commun. Math. Phys.* **1974**, *37*, 221-256.
- [21] Haag, R.; Bannier, U. Comments on Mielnik's generalized (non linear) quantum mechanics, *Commun. Math. Phys.* **1978**, *60*, 1-6.
- [22] von Neumann, J. Wahrscheinlichkeitstheoretischer Aufbau der Quantenmechanik, *Nachr. Ges. Wiss. Göttingen* **1927**, 245-272.
- [23] von Neumann, J. *Mathematical Foundations of Quantum Mechanics*, English translation (Princeton University Press, Princeton, USA, 1955) of *Mathematische Grundlagen der Quantenmechanik*, Springer, Berlin, 1932.
- [24] Abragam A. *Principles of nuclear magnetism*, Oxford University Press, London, UK, 1961.
- [25] Papoulis A.; Pillai S.U. *Random Variables and Stochastic Processes*, 4th ed., Mc Graw Hill, New York (2002).
- [26] Wootters, W.K. Random quantum states, *Found. Phys.* **1990**, *20*, 1365-1378.
- [27] Messiah, A. *Quantum Mechanics*, Vol. 1, North-Holland, Amsterdam, The Netherlands, 1961, translation from *Mécanique quantique*, Vol. 1, Dunod, Paris, France, 1959.
- [28] Peres, A. *Quantum Theory: Concepts and methods*, Kluwer Academic Publishers, Dordrecht, The Netherlands, 1995.

- [29] Le Bellac, M. *Physique quantique*, 2nd ed., CNRS Editions, Paris, France, 2007.
- [30] Landau L.D. Das Dämpfungsproblem in der Wellenmechanik, *Z. Phys.*, **1927**, *45*, 430-441. English translation: The damping problem in wave mechanics, in *Collected Papers of L.D. Landau*, edited by D.Ter Haar, Pergamon Press, Oxford, UK, 1965.
- [31] Landau, L.D.; Lifshitz, E.M. *Quantum Mechanics* (Non relativistic theory), Course of theoretical physics, Vol. 3, Translated from Russian, second (revised) edition Pergamon Press, Oxford, UK, 1965.
- [32] Feynman, R. P. *Statistical Mechanics: a Set of Lectures*, Benjamin, Reading, USA, 1972.
- [33] d’Espagnat, B. An elementary note about ”mixtures” in: *Preludes in Theoretical Physics*, in honor of V.F. Weisskopf, 185, North-Holland, Amsterdam, The Netherlands, 1966.
- [34] d’Espagnat, B. *Conceptual Foundations of Quantum Mechanics*, 2nd ed. Perseus books, Reading, USA, 1999.
- [35] Kirkpatrick, K.A. Error in an argument regarding “improper” mixtures, arXiv:quant-ph/0405058, 2004.
- [36] Branderhorst, M.P.A.; Nunn, J., Walmsley, I.A.; Kosut, R.L. Simplified quantum process tomography, *New J. Phys.*, **2009**, *11*, 115010.
- [37] Weyl, H. Quantenmechanik und Gruppentheorie, *Zeit. Physik* **1927**, *46*, 1-46.
- [38] Shafer, G.; Vovk V. A letter from Kolmogorov to Fréchet, English translation, Appendix A2 in The origins and legacy of Kolmogorov’s Grundbegriffe, arXiv:1802.06071v1 [math.HO], 2018. In that letter, Kolmogorov stresses that in practical situations his mathematical treatment of probabilities is as an idealization, and he refers to von Mises’ frequentist description.
- [39] Fano, U. Description of States in Quantum Mechanics by Density and Operator Techniques, *Rev. Mod. Phys.* **1957**, *29*, 74-93.
- [40] Dirac, P.A.M. A new notation for quantum mechanics, *Math. Proc. Cambridge Philos. Soc.* **1939** *35*, 416-418.
- [41] Bell, J.S. Against “Measurement”. In *Sixty-two years of uncertainty*, Proceedings of a NATO International school of History held in Erice, Sicily, Italy, August 5-14 1989, NATO ASI Series (Series B: Physics, 226), edited by Miller A.I., Springer, Boston, USA, 1990.
- [42] Zeh, H.D. On the Interpretation of Measurement in Quantum Theory, *Found. Phys.* **1970** *1*, 69-76.

- [43] Cohen-Tannoudji C.; Diu B.; Laloë F. *Quantum Mechanics* Vol.1, English version, 2nd ed., Wiley, Weinheim, Germany, 2019.