

Quantum Measurement Without Collapse

Pavel Bóna*

Department of Theoretical Physics, Comenius University, Bratislava

Abstract

It is shown that the classical book by von Neumann proposing dynamics of measured systems with “reduction (or collapse) of system’s wave packet” contains also hints how to avoid this discontinuity in time evolution of the measured system (hence it is in this point not quite selfconsistent). The possibility of avoiding that collapse is a consequence of the observation that any “human observer” can observe simultaneously just mutually compatible “observables”. In the paper it is shown how to describe this fact and its consequences. The proposed interpretation of quantum measurement leads also to trivial solution of the “Schrödinger Cat Paradox”.

Let us sketch a simple model of any “measurement”:

We need to have a “system”, which is the object of our present interest intended to be “measured”. The specification of this system should distinguish it from other “systems”, i.e. some criteria of its identification should be used. For repeated trials of the experiment, which are unavoidable in such a statistical branch of science as quantum mechanics (QM), we have to be sure that repeatedly used “systems” are equal to each other (according to the experimenter’s criteria). Such a specification procedure is the decisive part of “**preparation**” of the system in the first part of experiment. The prepared system is called to exist in a “**specific state**”. Next the system is supposed to move in known environment, so that its state can be considered to be known from the known laws of nature and calculated from the corresponding known, generally accepted “**equations of motion**”.

The remaining parts of the experiment with the prepared systems are “**measurement**” and “**reading of the results**”. These parts of experiments in QM will be our main interest in this paper. We shall describe a scheme of the measuring process with observation of results in QM later in this paper, starting with a brief analysis and criticism of some of its essential features appearing in [1], which seem to be almost generally accepted in physical community.

Before that, we shall sketch the key aspects of the general scheme of the mathematical model of QM.

*email: balek@fmph.uniba.sk

The formalism of (nonrelativistic) QM

QM describes ‘physical systems’, i.e. mainly microsystems like (stable) elementary particles, atoms, molecules, and finite collections of them. Each system is specified by an “**algebra of observables**” (a C*-algebra), usually realized as a symmetric algebra of bounded operators on the Hilbert space \mathcal{H} ascribed to the system. Each system can be in any time characterized by its **state**. States are described by normalized state-vectors $\psi, \phi, \dots \in \mathcal{H}$ (equivalently by one-dimensional orthogonal projectors $\mathbf{P}_\psi, \mathbf{P}_\phi, \dots$) or by the so called density matrices, or density operators, being positive normalized operators $\rho \in \mathcal{T}(\mathcal{H})$: $\text{Tr } \rho = 1$, where $\mathcal{T}(\mathcal{H})$ is the linear space of all trace-class operators on \mathcal{H} . Each state-vector $\psi \in \mathcal{H}$ is in a physically equivalent way represented by the density matrix $\rho_\psi := \mathbf{P}_\psi$, so that we can work with “states” and the “density matrices” as with synonyms.

Observables in QM represent the physical quantities characterizing the described system, they are identified with selfadjoint operators on \mathcal{H} . It is postulated in QM that all selfadjoint operators (or at least the bounded ones) represent observables, hence some measurable quantities. It is usually unspecified which physical (measurable) meaning is to be assigned to each selfadjoint operator. It is often useful to work with abstract setting if the set of observables forms a C*-algebra (which can be always represented as an algebra of bounded operators in some Hilbert space), cf. [2].

Each selfadjoint operator is characterized by its **spectral projection measure** \mathbf{E} , i.e. a projector-valued function of Borel sets on real line \mathbb{R} with values in orthogonal projectors:

$$\begin{aligned} E : B (\in \mathcal{B}(\mathbb{R})) &\mapsto E(B), \quad E(\mathbb{R}) = I_{\mathcal{H}}; \\ B_j \cap B_k = \emptyset &\Rightarrow E(B_j)E(B_k) = 0, \quad E(\cup_k B_k) = \sum_k E(B_k). \end{aligned}$$

If an observable (i.e. a selfadjoint operator) \mathfrak{A} has purely discrete spectrum, i.e. there is a complete (i.e. such that it cannot be extended) orthonormal system of “**eigenfunctions**” or “**eigenvectors**” in $\mathcal{H} \supset \{\psi_n, n = 1, 2, \dots\}$: $(\psi_k | \psi_n) = \delta_{k,n}$, and $\mathfrak{A} \psi_n = \lambda_n \psi_n, \forall n$, then the system can attain only the values λ_n as possible values of the quantity \mathfrak{A} , i.e. by measuring \mathfrak{A} only the results $\{\lambda_n, n = 1, 2, \dots\}$ can be obtained. If another observable \mathfrak{B} can have simultaneously with \mathfrak{A} (i.e. in the same complete set of states) sharp values $\{\mu_n, n = 1, 2, \dots\}$, the operators mutually commute; and vice versa: If $\mathfrak{A}\mathfrak{B} = \mathfrak{B}\mathfrak{A}$, then these operators have a common complete orthonormal set of eigenvectors $\{\chi_n, n = 1, 2, \dots\}, \mathfrak{A}\chi_n = \lambda_n \chi_n; \mathfrak{B}\chi_n = \mu_n \chi_n$.

Each vector $\varphi \in \mathcal{H}$ can be expressed as a linear combination of any such orthonormal system: $\varphi = \sum_n c_n \psi_n$, where the coefficients $c_n = (\psi_n | \varphi)$ represent the probabilities $|c_n|^2$ of obtaining the result λ_n by measurement of the observable \mathfrak{A} in the state φ .

QM is an “**intrinsically statistical theory**”, which means that there is no state of any system in which all the observables have specific values: the state-vector or density matrix of a specific state contains just information on “**probability distributions**” of all observables in that state; a sharp value of some observable in a given state is a rather

exceptional possibility. This leads to serious problems of understanding and description of the measurement process: Each time after measurement of some quantity of a single system (i.e. after just a single “**particle**” was interacting with the measuring apparatus), the apparatus finds one specific value also in the case if the measured quantity of the considered system in the measured state has just probability distribution of possible values of the quantity with nonzero dispersion. If the observer wants to obtain the form of that probability distribution by the measurement, he has to repeat the same measurement on many copies of “**equally prepared**” system under consideration (\approx particle). This leads to questions we intend to discuss later in this paper.

The dynamics of QM-systems (similarly as in classical mechanics) is specified by the specification of the operator \mathbf{H} , the “**system’s Hamiltonian**” corresponding to the “**energy**”. If the considered system does not interact with other systems, then the time evolution of its state-vectors is:

$$\psi(t) = e^{-it\mathbf{H}}\psi(0), \text{ or } \mathbf{P}_{\psi(t)} = e^{-it\mathbf{H}}\mathbf{P}_{\psi(0)}e^{it\mathbf{H}}.$$

If the considered system is not isolated, but interacts with another system, then this pair of systems is considered as a new larger isolated system with its own new Hamiltonian, consisting of the sum of the “free Hamiltonians” of each system and, in addition, of some “interaction Hamiltonian” characterizing the mutual interaction of the two systems.

The only problematic issue in this abstract general scheme is the question of some satisfactory description of the evolution of the considered system in the time of the physical act of measurement of some specific observable: Besides the “measured system” also some macroscopic apparatus is acting (and interacting), changing its state so that the **human observer** can read the result of the measurement. The proposed description of this process leads also to an answer to the question “how can the Schrödinger Cat be simultaneously dead and alive”.

The essential points of the von Neumann scheme of measurement in QM

(i) The measured system \mathbf{S} in the state ρ interacts with the measuring macroscopic apparatus \mathbf{M} chosen for measurement of a specific observable \mathfrak{A} . In general, according to von Neumann, a chain of other similarly working apparatuses $\mathbf{M}_1 + \mathbf{M}_2 + \dots$, all of them described as quantum-mechanical systems, can be added to \mathbf{M} , ending either by a human observer (or even by his brain), or an apparatus in which the result can be fixed by some “pointer position” (and prepared for observation by human observers).

(ii) The states of above mentioned chain of apparatuses are changed due to interaction with \mathbf{S} and the following evolution by continuous unitary evolution operator of the composed system (=process 2, cf. [1, Ch. V.1 p.230]). Hence the measured state ρ is transformed subsequently isomorphically in the instant of the interaction-measurement by the measuring device \mathbf{M} to the states of the measuring systems $\mathbf{M} + \mathbf{M}_1 + \mathbf{M}_2 + \dots$ by unitary time evolution. So, we shall call the subsequently arising states of the apparatuses $\mathbf{M} + \mathbf{M}_1 + \mathbf{M}_2 + \dots$ “the measured state ρ of \mathbf{S} ”. It can be seen that the whole chain of apparatuses can

be considered effectively as a single apparatus \mathbf{M} .

(iii) The last element of the chain modifies the observed state ρ by an abrupt change depending on the measured observable \mathfrak{A} . We shall assume, for simplicity, that \mathfrak{A} has purely discrete nondegenerate spectrum with (complete orthonormal) set of eigenvectors $\{\psi_n, n = 1, 2, \dots\}$: $\mathfrak{A}\psi_n = \lambda_n\psi_n, \forall n$. The mentioned abrupt change looks as follows [1, p.230]:

$$\rho \mapsto \rho' := \sum_n (\psi_n | \rho | \psi_n) \mathbf{P}_{\psi_n}.$$

This is description of the famous “**collapse of the wave packet**”; the change $\rho \mapsto \rho'$ is considered to be instantaneous. This change cannot be reached by any unitary transformation, hence it is not accessible by Schrödinger-like continuous evolution with any Hamiltonian (in nontrivial cases $\rho' \neq \rho$).

(iv) The von Neumann’s book [1] also contains, however, certain notes which could (and will!) enable us to *avoid the above mentioned collapse*. Namely from the considerations in [1, p.262] it clearly follows that **any final human observer (as the last element of the chain of M’s) can observe simultaneously measurable, hence mutually commuting observables only.**¹

A proposal for alternative description of quantum measurement process

Let us note first that there is an ambiguity in von Neumann’s interpretation of the reduced density matrix: Since the set of density matrices does not form a **simplex**, the convex decomposition of nontrivial density matrices to extremal elements is highly nonunique. Moreover, various decompositions of a given density matrix may be incompatible: Different decompositions may contain states corresponding to eigenvectors of mutually noncommuting observables. If it is possible to describe the presently considered physical situation by elements of a simplex which are unambiguously decomposable into extremal elements having clear physical meaning, then these elements can be interpreted as “**proper mixtures**”. We shall see that the state described by the reduced density matrix can be naturally transformed into such a form.

Accepting (essentially) the point (ii) of our description of the von Neumann scheme of the measurement on a system \mathbf{S} occurring in a state $\psi := \sum_j c_j \psi_j$ by a measuring (quantum macroscopic) apparatus \mathbf{M} , we assume that the interaction of $\mathbf{S} + \mathbf{M}$ leads to such a change of the state of the combined system where the macroscopically observable and mutually distinguishable state-vectors Φ_j corresponding to the values λ_j of the observable \mathfrak{A} and to the states of ψ_j of \mathbf{S} (i.e. representing the corresponding “pointer positions”) are (via unitary

¹This assertion was even more explicitly expressed in the original German version of [1], in the paragraph situated between the last two paragraphs of [1, p.261], which was omitted in the English edition.

mapping by U) in one to one correspondence with the states ψ_j . This is in agreement with [1, p.285-286]:

$$U : \psi \otimes \Phi_0 = \sum_j c_j \psi_j \otimes \Phi_0 \mapsto \sum_j c_j \psi_j \otimes \Phi_j,$$

where Φ_0 is the state of \mathbf{M} just before the measurement interaction and $\Phi := \sum_j c_j \Phi_j$ is the state of \mathbf{M} immediately after (or in the instant of, if the measurement is instantaneous) the measurement, obtained by partial trace of the above described “two-systems state-vector” w.r.t. the measured system, cf. [3].

The following fate (i.e the subsequent dynamical evolution) of the state of the system \mathbf{S} after the interaction with macrosystem \mathbf{M} might be very diverse, c.f. [4, §7, esp. p.24]: \mathbf{S} could be absorbed by the macrosystem \mathbf{M} , or just dispersed by \mathbf{M} with various simultaneous changes of its state. For the result of the measurement this is not important. However, such a simple (and even general) scheme that the measured state of \mathbf{S} after its interaction with the macroscopic measuring device \mathbf{M} will continue its dynamical evolution, just “reduced” to the eigenstate of the measured quantity corresponding to the obtained measured eigenvalue, is rather popular but nonrealistic simplification and deformation of the process.

What is important, however, is the imprint left by \mathbf{S} on \mathbf{M} : Because the resulting “pointer positions” after each single run of the experiment should be repeatedly visible by different people, the states Φ_j should be ‘sufficiently stable’, or stationary w.r.t. the dynamics (of at least macroscopic observables) of \mathbf{M} . Then the observable of \mathbf{M} with eigenvectors $\Phi_j (j = 1, 2, \dots)$ can be denoted by $\tilde{\mathfrak{A}}$, because it is ‘a copy’ of the corresponding observable \mathfrak{A} of the measured system \mathbf{S} . So, this $\tilde{\mathfrak{A}}$, or its eigenvalues, are what has to be observed by any human observer taking part in the considered measuring process. But according to (iv) above, **all the observables of \mathbf{M} that are simultaneously observable by any human observer must, as the corresponding operators, mutually commute.**

Let us form from these mutually observable quantities of \mathbf{M} , necessarily including our macroscopic $\tilde{\mathfrak{A}}$, a C^* -algebra \mathcal{A} . Here there is some ambiguity in our construction – the choice of the C^* -algebra might depend on the ability of observers to observe certain observables from \mathcal{A} .² We could simply choose \mathcal{A} as the maximal commutative subalgebra of all observables of \mathbf{M} containing $\tilde{\mathfrak{A}}$; but this choice would necessarily contain also microscopic variables of the macroscopic system \mathbf{M} . So, let us take some ‘convenient’ abelian C^* -algebra \mathcal{A} containing $\tilde{\mathfrak{A}}$, e.g. the C^* -algebra with unit element generated by $\tilde{\mathfrak{A}}$ (as the minimal possibility).

What are the states of \mathbf{M} accessible to our human observers? These are the states, i.e. positive normalized linear functionals, of the abelian C^* -algebra \mathcal{A} . Let us describe the state space of \mathcal{A} , cf. [2, 5]: For each abelian C^* -algebra \mathcal{A} there exists its **spectrum space** \mathcal{M} , i.e. a compact subspace in the w^* -topology of the whole state space $\mathcal{S}(\mathcal{A})$ of \mathcal{A} , consisting of its extremal (pure) states. The points of \mathcal{M} are in bijective correspondence

²This corresponds to the ambiguity of the definition of **macroscopic observables** in finite systems; they cannot be unambiguously defined in an abstract theory.

with the pure (=extremal) states on \mathcal{A} . The states $\mathcal{S}(\mathcal{A})$ consist of all probability Radon measures on \mathcal{M} , which form a (Choquet) simplex (in the same sense as classical probability distributions on the phase space of classical mechanics form a simplex: each such probability distribution is a convex combination-integral of the functions supported by single points (δ functions)). This is valid for an arbitrary choice of the commutative C^* -algebra. Note that the characteristic property of any simplex is that it is a subset of a linear space such that each of its elements has **unequivocal** convex decomposition into its extremal elements.

Let us see how the state \mathbf{P}_ψ of \mathbf{S} corresponding to the measured state-vector $\psi := \sum_j c_j \psi_j$, or its unitary “macroscopic copy” Φ , as described above, looks from the point of view of a human observer. In the basis $\Phi_j (j = 1, 2, \dots)$ – the unitary “copy” of $\psi_j (j = 1, 2, \dots)$ – the measured state-vector $\psi = \sum_j c_j \psi_j$ is transformed into:

$$\Phi := \sum_j c_j \Phi_j.$$

Since we are interested in the states on \mathcal{A} only, we have to restrict the state \mathbf{P}_Φ as a linear functional on all the observables of \mathbf{M} to the observables from \mathcal{A} . The transformed macroscopic form $\tilde{\mathfrak{A}}$ of \mathfrak{A} has in the Hilbert space $\mathcal{H}_\mathbf{M}$ of \mathbf{M} the complete orthonormal set of eigenvectors Φ_j . The “measured” state Φ applied to any $a \in \mathcal{A}$ (as a linear functional on \mathcal{A}) yields

$$\Phi : a \mapsto Tr(P_\Phi a) = (\Phi|a|\Phi) = \left(\sum_j c_j \Phi_j |a| \sum_k c_k \Phi_k \right) = \sum_j |c_j|^2 (\Phi_j|a|\Phi_j), \forall a \in \mathcal{A},$$

because $\{\Phi_j : j = 1, 2, \dots\}$ is an orthonormal set of eigenvectors of all the elements of \mathcal{A} .

We see that a “pure state-vector” on the whole algebra of observables $L(H_\mathbf{M})$ decomposes into a genuine (=proper) mixture of the states corresponding to single elements of the “eigenbasis” of the commutative algebra \mathcal{A} . This is identical to the above described von Neumann’s “collapse of the wave packet” for the case $\rho := \mathbf{P}_\Phi$.

Is the Schrödinger Cat simultaneously dead and alive ?

Accepting that any human observer of macroscopic (hence visible) system can distinguish by his senses mutually commuting observables only, we have also trivial resolution of the “Problem of the Cat”.

Let us have two macroscopic state-vectors Ψ_1, Ψ_2 of the observed system, which are mutually orthogonal (e.g. ‘dead and alive cat’, or two orthogonal states of a very long spin chain). For any observable \mathfrak{A} for which these states are eigenstates it holds

$$(\Psi_1|\mathfrak{A}|\Psi_2) = 0.$$

This is valid for all \mathfrak{A} ’s from any commutative algebra. For a state of the form

$$\Psi := c_1\Psi_1 + c_2\Psi_2, \quad c_1c_2 \neq 0$$

we have

$$(\Psi|\mathfrak{A}|\Psi) = |c_1|^2(\Psi_1|\mathfrak{A}|\Psi_1) + |c_2|^2(\Psi_2|\mathfrak{A}|\Psi_2),$$

which describes a mixture applied to any given element of the commutative algebra of “observable observables”. In the case of the Cat this expresses the situation of looking at the Cat (statistically, in the sense of QM) and observing the two possibilities: the Cat is either dead or alive, with probabilities $|c_1|^2$ and $|c_2|^2$ respectively, but not both simultaneously. The above expression corresponds to a genuine (=proper) mixture of the states Ψ_1, Ψ_2 .

This also shows how to resolve the problem of possible interferences of states of large but finite subsystems of an infinite system, e.g. a spin chain. We can consider, at least “ideologically”, problems like those arising e.g. in [6, Sec. 7.6] in the construction of “Models of Quantum Measurement” to be solved.

References

- [1] J. von Neumann: *Mathematical Foundations of Quantum Mechanics: New Edition*, translated from German by R. T. Beyer (with the assistance of the author), 1949; edited by N. A. Wheeler, Princeton University Press, Princeton, 2018.
- [2] S. Sakai: *C*-algebras and W*-algebras*, Springer, Berlin, 1971.
- [3] E. B. Davies: *Quantum Theory of Open Systems*, Academic Press, Massachusetts, 1976.
- [4] L. D. Landau and E. M. Lifshitz: *Quantum Mechanics – Non-relativistic Theory*, vol.3 of the Course of Theoretical Physics, translated from Russian by J. B. Sykes and J. S. Bell, 1958; Pergamon Press, Princeton, 1991.
- [5] M. A. Naimark: *Normirovannyje kolca (Normed Rings)*, Nauka, Moscow, 1968.
- [6] P. Bóna: *Classical Systems in Quantum Mechanics*, Springer, Berlin, 2020.