

## Comment on "Quantitative wave-particle duality in multibeam interferometers"

G. Bimonte and R. Musto

Dipartimento di Scienze Fisiche, Università di Napoli Federico II,  
Complesso Universitario MSA, Via Cintia I-80126 Napoli,  
Italy; INFN, Sezione di Napoli, Napoli, ITALY.

(Dated: March 19, 2022)

In a recent paper [Phys. Rev. A 64, 042113 (2001)] S. Durr proposed an interesting multibeam generalization of the quantitative formulation of interferometric wave-particle duality, discovered by Englert for two-beam interferometers. The proposed generalization is an inequality that relates a generalized measure of the fringe visibility, to certain measures of the maximum amount of which-way knowledge that can be stored in a which-way detector. We construct an explicit example where, with three beams in a pure state, the scheme proposed by Durr leads to the possibility of an ideal which-way detector, that can achieve a better path-discrimination, at the same time as a better fringe visibility. In our opinion, this seems to be in contrast with the intuitive idea of complementarity, as it is implemented in the two-beam case, where an increase in path discrimination always implies a decrease of fringe visibility, if the beams and the detector are in pure states.

PACS numbers: 03.65.Ta, 03.65.Jd

Keywords: interferometric, duality, multibeam

## I. INTRODUCTION

As it is well known, Bohr's Principle of Complementarity, and the subsequent debate on the possibility of detecting, as proposed by Einstein, "which-way" individual quantum systems ("quantons", for short) are taking, in double-slit interference experiments, helped to shape the basic concepts of Quantum Mechanics. However, this early discussion on the duality between fringe visibility and which-way information, as it is called today, was essentially semiclassical in nature. The history of the attempts of formulating such duality, for the two beams case, within the full framework of Quantum Mechanics, has been quite long, perhaps surprisingly long, and has found, it seems fair to say, a satisfactory conclusion in 1996 in a paper by Englert [2]. Following a suggestion present in the pioneering work of Wootters and Zurek [3], Englert was able to establish a complementarity relationship between the distinguishability  $D$ , that gives a quantitative estimate of the ways, and the visibility  $V$ , that measures the quality of the interference fringes:

$$D^2 + V^2 \leq 1 \quad (1)$$

An important feature of Eq.(1) is that it becomes an equality when the beams and the detector are prepared in a pure state; when this is the case, Eq.(1) implies that a larger visibility is necessarily accompanied by a smaller path distinguishability.

It is interesting to explore if an analogous form of interferometric duality can be formulated for more than two beams of interfering quantons. An important step toward the understanding of this question has been made by Durr [1]: he argued that an appropriate multibeam

generalization of the usual concept of fringe visibility  $V$ , is provided by the (properly normalized) rms spread  $V$  of the fringes intensity from its mean value (Eq.(1.10) of Ref.[1]). By a corresponding generalization of the concept of path predictability  $P$ , provided by the quantity  $P$  defined in Eq.(1.16) of Ref.[1], Durr was able to derive an inequality analogous to that found by Greenberger and Yasin [4] for two beams:

$$P^2 + V^2 \leq 1 \quad (2)$$

Similarly to Eq.(1), the above inequality becomes an equality if the beams are in a pure state, which ensures the existence of a general see-saw relation between  $V$  and  $P$ . Since  $V$  and  $P$  undoubtedly measure, respectively, wave-like and particle-like attributes of the interfering quantons, we thus think that Eq.(2) can be correctly interpreted as expressing a form of wave-particle duality in the multibeam case.

However interesting, an inequality like Eq.(2) does not convey yet the concept of wave-particle duality, as it is involved, say, in the famous ideal experiment with two moving slits, conceived by Einstein. Indeed, the quantity  $P$  above does not represent any real knowledge of the paths followed by individual quantons, but only constitutes some measure of one's a priori ability to predict them, based on unequal populations of the beams. The relevant schemes for a discussion of wave-particle duality à la Einstein, are those in which one actually tries to obtain which-way knowledge, by placing detectors along the paths of the quantons. In order to measure the amount of which-way information, that can be obtained by measuring the detector's observable  $W$ , after the passage of each quanton, Durr defines the which-way knowledge  $K(W)$  as a weighted average of the generalized predictabilities  $P$  of the sorted subensembles of quantons, for which a certain result of the measurement is obtained (Eqs.(2.3) and (2.4) of Ref.[1]) (Actually, Durr introduces also an

---

Bimonte@na.infn.it, Musto@na.infn.it;

alternative measure  $I_{KW}$  of the which-way information, in Eq. (6.6) of Ref. [1]. For the sake of simplicity, in this Comment, we will refer only to the first one, and we address the interested reader to Ref. [5], where an extensive discussion of the problem is given). Then, the multibeam analogue,  $D$ , of Englert's path distinguishability  $D$  is defined as the maximum value of  $K(W)$ , over the set of all detector's observables (Eq.(2.11) of Ref.[1]). By using this definition, Durr is able to prove an inequality analogous to Englert's Eq.(1):

$$D^2 + V^2 \leq 1 : \quad (3)$$

This generalization of Eq.(1) to the multibeam case, is an interesting relation, that can be tested, in principle, by experiments. However, there exists a difference between the two beams and the multibeam case. In fact, differently from Eqs.(1) and (2), the inequality (3), cannot be saturated in general, even if the beams and the detector are prepared in pure states (in Ref. [5], we actually prove that in the multibeam case the above inequality can be saturated only if the visibility  $V$  is either equal to one or to zero). Therefore, one may conceive the possibility of designing two which-way detectors  $D_1$  and  $D_2$ , such that  $V_1 > V_2$ , while, at the same time,  $D_1 > D_2$ .

It is the purpose of this Comment to show that this possibility actually occurs, as will be seen in next Section, by an explicit example. In the final considerations that close this Comment, we argue that such a behavior rises doubts on the possibility of interpreting Eq.(3) as a statement of wave-particle duality.

## II. A THREE-BEAM EXAMPLE.

In this Section the problem announced in the previous Section is presented in an example with three beams of quantons in a pure state. So, we consider a three beam interferometer with equally populated beams, described by the pure state:

$$= \frac{1}{3} \sum_{i,j=1}^3 |j_i\rangle \langle j_j| : \quad (1)$$

If a detector, initially prepared in some pure initial state  $|j_0\rangle$ , is placed along the trajectories followed by the quantons, its interaction with the quantons will give rise to an entangled state  $_{b\&d}$  of the form :

$$_{b\&d} = \frac{1}{3} \sum_{i,j=1}^3 |j_i\rangle \langle j_j| |j_i\rangle \langle j_j| : \quad (2)$$

where  $|j_i\rangle$  are normalized, but not necessarily orthogonal, detector's states. Suppose, for simplicity, that the detector's Hilbert space  $H_D$  is two-dimensional. In order to further specify the states  $|j_i\rangle$ , it is then convenient

to use the Bloch parametrization, to represent rays of  $H_D$  by unit three-vectors,  $\hat{n} = (n^x; n^y; n^z)$ , via the map:

$$\frac{1 + \hat{n} \cdot \sim}{2} = |j\rangle \langle j| : \quad (3)$$

where  $\sim = (x; y; z)$  is any representation of the Pauli matrices in  $H_D$ . We shall denote by  $|j\rangle \langle j|$  the ray corresponding to the vector  $\hat{n}$ . We require that the directions  $\hat{n}_+; \hat{n}_-; \hat{n}_0$ , associated with states  $|j_i\rangle$ , are coplanar, and such that  $\hat{n}_+$  and  $\hat{n}_-$  both form an angle with  $\hat{n}_0$ . We imagine that can be varied at will, by acting on the detector. By properly choosing the orientation of the coordinate axis, we can make the vector  $\hat{n}_0$  coincide with the  $z$  axis, and the vectors  $\hat{n}$  lie in the  $xz$  plane, such that:

$$\hat{n}_0 = (0; 0; 1) ; \hat{n} = (\sin ; 0; \cos) : \quad (4)$$

Upon using the well known formula  $|j\rangle \langle j| |j\rangle \langle j| = (1 + \hat{n}_i \cdot \hat{n}_j)/2$ ; into Durr's definition for the generalized fringe visibility  $V$ , Eq. (1.12) of Ref. [1], one gets the following expression for  $V$ , as a function of :

$$V(\cdot) = \frac{\sum_{i,j \neq i}^3 \frac{1 + \hat{n}_i \cdot \hat{n}_j}{2}}{6} = \frac{1 + \cos + \cos^2}{3} : \quad (5)$$

We notice that the value of the visibility is equal to one, for  $= 0$ , and gradually decreases when is increased, until it reaches its minimum for  $= 2 = 3$ . Afterwards, it starts increasing and keeps on increasing until  $=$  (see Figure).

The next step is to evaluate the generalized path distinguishability  $D$  as a function of . This requires that we determine the observable  $W_{opt}$  in  $H_D$  that maximizes the multibeam generalization of the which-way knowledge  $K(W)$ . We briefly recall the definition of  $K(W)$  proposed in Ref.[1]. Consider any detector's observable  $W$ , and let  $|j_l\rangle$  ( $l = +; -$ ) the projector onto the subspace of  $H_D$ , relative to the eigenvalue  $w_l$ . For any  $W$ , we let  $\hat{m} = (\sin \cos ; \sin \sin ; \cos)$  the unique unit three-vector such that

$$|j_l\rangle \langle j_l| = \frac{1 + \hat{m} \cdot \sim}{2} ; \quad |j_l\rangle \langle j_l| = \frac{1 - \hat{m} \cdot \sim}{2} : \quad (6)$$

We let now  $p_{i|j}$  the conditioned probability to find a quanton in beam  $i$ , provided that the measurement of  $W$  on the which-way detector gave the outcome  $w_l$ . According to Bayes' formula:

$$p_{i|j} = \frac{q_{i|j}}{p_l} ; \quad (7)$$

where  $q_{i|j}$  is the probability of getting the outcome  $w_l$ , when the quanton occupies with certainty the beam  $i$ , while  $p_l$  are the populations of the beams, and  $p_l$  is the total-a-priori probability for obtaining the result  $w_l$ ,  $p_l = \sum_i q_{i|j}$ . Recall that, in the above equation, we have to set  $p_l = 1/3$ , because we are considering three equally

populated beams. According to Ref.[1], the which-way knowledge  $K(W)$  delivered by  $W$ , is the weighted average  $K(W) = \sum_i p_i K_i$  of the partial predictabilities  $K_i$  for the sorted subensembles of quantons:

$$K_1 = \frac{\sum_{i=1}^N \frac{1}{n} \sum_{j=1}^N p_{ij} \frac{1}{n}}{\sum_{i=1}^N \frac{1}{n}} : \quad (8)$$

Now, using the well known formula,

$$q_{ij} = \langle \hat{q}_i \hat{q}_j \rangle = \frac{1}{2} \frac{\partial^2 \Phi}{\partial q_i \partial q_j} ; \quad (9)$$

it is easy to verify that:

$$K^2 = \frac{4}{9} \cos^2 \frac{\theta}{2} \sin^2 \frac{\theta}{2} + 3 \sin^2 \frac{\theta}{2} \cos^2 \frac{\theta}{2} \cos^2 \frac{\theta}{2} \sin^2 \frac{\theta}{2} : \quad (10)$$




FIG. 1: Plots of the quantities  $D$  (solid line),  $V$  (dotted line), and  $D^2 + V^2$  (dashed line), as functions of  $\theta$ , in an ideal three-beam interference experiment.

For all values of  $\theta$ , the which-way information is maximum if  $\cos \theta = 1$ , i.e. if the vector  $\hat{m}_1$  lies in the same plane as the vectors  $\hat{n}_i$ . As for the optimal value of  $\theta$ , it depends on  $\theta$ . For  $0 < \theta < 2 = \pi$ , the best choice is  $\theta = \pi/2$ , and so for the optimal observable  $W_{\text{opt}}$  we can take any operator such that:

$$W_{\text{opt}} = \frac{1}{2} \sum_{i=1}^N \hat{q}_i \quad \text{for } 0 < \theta < 2 = \pi ; \quad (11)$$

which delivers an amount of which-way knowledge  $D$  equal to:

$$D(\theta) = \frac{1}{3} \sin^2 \frac{\theta}{2} \quad \text{for } 0 < \theta < 2 = \pi : \quad (12)$$

For larger values of  $\theta$ , the maximum information is reached for  $\theta = 0$  and then the optimal operators are those for which:

$$W_{\text{opt}} = \frac{1}{2} \sum_{i=1}^N \hat{q}_i \quad \text{for } 2 = \pi < \theta < 3 = \pi ; \quad (13)$$

which deliver an amount  $D(\theta)$  of which-way information equal to:

$$D(\theta) = \frac{2}{3} \sin^2 \frac{\theta}{2} \quad \text{for } 2 = \pi < \theta < 3 = \pi : \quad (14)$$

A plot of the quantities  $V$ ,  $D$  and  $D^2 + V^2$  is shown in the Figure. We see that something unexpected happens: while in the interval  $0 < \theta < \pi/2$ ,  $V$  decreases and  $D$  increases, as expected from the wave-particle duality, we see that in the interval  $\theta = \pi/2$ ,  $V$  and  $D$  decrease and increase simultaneously! If we pick two values  $\theta_1$  and  $\theta_2$  in this region, we obtain two which-way detectors, that precisely realize the situation described at the end of the Introduction. It can also be seen from the Figure (the dashed line) that the sum  $D^2 + V^2$  is significantly less than one, for most values of  $\theta$ . We have checked that these problems persist if, rather than  $D$ , one uses the alternative measure of which-way information  $I_D$ , provided by Eq.(6.16) of Ref. [1], since it turns out that the optimal observable for  $I_D$  coincides with that relative to  $D$ , in the interval  $0 < \theta < 2 = \pi$ .

In the literature on the Quantum Detection problem, it has been argued that it is sometimes possible to achieve a larger amount of information on an unknown quantum state, by including an auxiliary quantum system, called ancilla, in the read-out apparatus of a quantum detector [6, 7]. This question has a negative answer in the example above, but we do not touch upon this problem here, and we refer the interested reader to Ref.[5] for details.

### III. DISCUSSION.

In conclusion, the inequalities discovered by Durr in his analysis of multibeam interferometers, are very interesting, because they represent a set of testable relations between measurable quantities, that follow directly from the first principles of Quantum Mechanics. However, there is an important difference between the two-beam relation, Eq.(1), and its multibeam generalization, Eq.(3). As we pointed out above, the two-beam relation becomes an equality whenever the beams and the detector are prepared in pure states, and this entails the existence of a see-saw relation between  $D$  and  $V$ . We think that this behavior expresses the intuitive idea of wave-particle duality, according to which "...the more clearly we wish to observe the wave nature ...the more

information we must give up about... particle properties" [3]. In other words Eq.(1) conveys the basic idea of interferometric duality, for which, in an ideal interference experiment (namely one involving pure states) in Quantum Mechanics,  $D$  and  $V$  exhibit a dual behavior. Any departure from this behavior, occurring for mixed states in the two-beam case, may be attributed to the presence of extra sources of uncertainty, in addition to the unavoidable one entailed by Quantum Mechanics.

In contrast, the inequality Eq.(3) is almost never saturated, even for pure states [5]. So, while Eq.(3) sets an upper bound for either quantity, when the other takes a

fixed value, it is not strong enough to prevent the behavior exhibited in the example presented in the previous Section. According to it, even in an ideal experiment with pure states, one can easily have cases when  $D$  and  $V$  both increase or decrease at the same time. In the light of this, it seems to us difficult to regard Eq.(3), as a statement of interferometric duality, similar to Englert's inequality for the two-beam case. It is our opinion that the issue of giving a complete Quantum Mechanical formulation of the interferometric duality in multibeam experiments deserves further analysis.

---

[1] S.Durr, Phys.Rev.A 64, 042113 (2001).

[2] B.G.Englert, Phys.Rev.Lett. 77, 2154 (1996).

[3] W.K.Wootters and W.H.Zurek Phys Rev D 19, 473 (1979).

[4] D.M.Greenberger and A.Yasin, Phys.Lett.A 128, 391 (1988).

[5] G.Binonte and R.Musto, "What is the concept of interferometric duality in multibeam experiments", D SF-27-

2002, quant-ph/0301017.

[6] C.W.Helstrom, Quantum Detection and Estimation Theory, (Academic, New York, 1976).

[7] A.Peres, Found.Phys. 20, 1441 (1990); A.Peres, Quantum Theory: Concepts and Methods (Kluwer Academic, Dordrecht, 1993).