

# NOISE AND DISTURBANCE IN QUANTUM MEASUREMENT

PAUL BUSCH, TEIKO HEINONEN, AND PEKKA LAHTI

**Abstract.** The operational meaning of some measures of noise and disturbance in measurements is analyzed and their limitations are pointed out. The cases of minimal noise and least disturbance are characterized.

## 1. Introduction

No physical measurement is absolutely accurate. It seems inevitable that there will always be a residual degree of uncertainty as to how close the outcome is to what should have been expected. Likewise, a measurement, being an interaction of the apparatus with the measured system, must always be expected to effect some change, or disturbance, of the measured system. In classical physics it seems possible to achieve arbitrary levels of accuracy and to make the disturbance as small as one wishes. These options appear to be ruled out in quantum physics, due to the fact that there are pairs of physical quantities which cannot be measured together. Such quantities are represented by mutually noncommuting operators or operator measures.

In his fundamental work of 1927 on the interpretation of quantum mechanics, W. Heisenberg sketched two versions of what became known as the uncertainty principle and which can be vaguely summarized as follows:

- (UP 1) A measurement, with inaccuracy  $\Delta(A)$ , of a quantity  $A$  that does not commute with a quantity  $B$  will disturb the value of  $B$  by an amount  $\Delta(B)$  such that an appropriate payoff relation holds between  $\Delta(A)$  and  $\Delta(B)$ .
- (UP 2) A joint measurement of two noncommuting quantities  $A$ ;  $B$  must be imprecise, with the inaccuracies  $\Delta(A)$ ,  $\Delta(B)$  satisfying an uncertainty relation.

Heisenberg focussed on pairs of canonically conjugate observables and he gave model experiments to demonstrate that relations of the form  $\Delta(A) \Delta(B) \geq \hbar$  and  $\Delta(A) \Delta(B) \geq \hbar$  had to hold in the cases (UP 1) and (UP 2), respectively.

The quantities  $\epsilon$  and  $\eta$  were not formally or operationally defined but simply intuitively identified with measures of the spread of wave functions in momentum amplitudes. It took several decades of research into quantum measurement theory until concepts of imprecise and joint measurements of noncommuting quantities were developed, with an appropriate definition of measures of inaccuracy and disturbance that allowed one to give rigorous formulations of the uncertainty principle in its versions (UP1) and (UP2) for conjugate quantities. A review of the theory of joint measurements leading to (UP2) in the case of position and momentum can be found in [1]. A formalization of (UP1) and conditions for its validity have been obtained in recent years by M. Ozawa [2, 3, 4], see also his preprint [5].

In this paper we study the measures of measurement imprecision, or measurement noise, and disturbance used in these investigations. On closer inspection it turns out that these quantities do not satisfy some requirements that one might reasonably expect of measures of measurement noise and disturbance. Moreover, their definitions do not seem to apply to more general types of measurement where the observables intended to be measured are represented by positive operator measures which are not projection valued and which may even be noncommutative. We will highlight some of the shortcomings of these notions and consider possible ways of finding more suitable measures.

## 2. Measurement Noise

The intuitive idea of noise in a measurement can be captured as the dissimilarity between the actually measured probability distribution and the distribution of the observable intended to be measured. In quantum mechanics these probability measures are determined by positive operator measures: one,  $E^M$ , that represents the quantity that is actually measured by a given measurement process  $M$ , and another one,  $E$ , that represents the observable intended to be measured. We will usually assume that the operator measures are bounded so that their momentum operators are bounded and selfadjoint.

Any quantity describing measurement noise could be expected to have the following properties. First, it should be possible to estimate the noise by comparing the statistics of the measurement in question with the statistics of a 'good' measurement of the quantity in question (provided that such a 'good' measurement is available for the purpose of calibration of the new measurement). This means that the noise quantity should be a function  $\epsilon(E; E^M; \rho)$  of the input state  $\rho$  and the two observables involved. Second, whenever the noise is 'small',

this should mean that the measurement is 'good'. We take this to mean that vanishing noise (in a given state  $\rho$ ) should indicate that the probability distributions  $E$  and  $E^M$  of  $E$  and  $E^M$  are the same in that state. Finally, if the measurement is a good one, meaning that  $E = E^M$  for all states  $\rho$ , then this should be indicated by a vanishing noise measure for all  $\rho$ .

A noise measure that satisfies all these requirements is given by the total variation norm of the difference between the probability measures,  $\|E - E^M\|_1 = \int |dE - dE^M|$ , see Section 2.3. Other frequently occurring quantifications of measurement noise make use of the first and second moment operators of  $E$  and  $E^M$ . We will see that these measures of noise have limited applicability, although they are useful if applied correctly, as shown e.g. in [4]. It is well known that, in general, a probability measure cannot be determined from its first and second moments. Therefore, it is natural to expect that a measure of noise or disturbance based on first and second moments only is equally inadequate.

2.1. A measure of noise in terms of variances. We start by analyzing the variance of the probability measure  $E^M$ ,

$$\text{Var } E^M = \int x^2 dE^M(x) - \left( \int x dE^M(x) \right)^2;$$

which we write as

$$(1) \quad \text{Var } E^M = \text{tr} \{ E^M [2] - E^M [1]^2 \} + \text{tr} \{ E^M [1]^2 \} - \text{tr} \{ E^M [1] \}^2;$$

Here  $E^M [k] = \int x^k dE^M(x)$  are the first ( $k = 1$ ) and the second ( $k = 2$ ) moment operators of  $E^M$ . Both terms in the last sum are non-negative, the first describing the deviation of  $E^M$  from being a projection measure and the second term being the variance of the spectral measure of the operator  $E^M [1]$  in the state  $\rho$ . The first term is zero for all exactly when  $E^M$  is a projection measure, see e.g. [6, Appendix, Sect. 3]. Thus, among the positive operator measures having the selfadjoint operator  $C := E^M [1]$  as their first moment operator, the spectral measure  $E^C$  has the least variance, that is,  $\text{Var}(E^M) \geq \text{Var}(E^C)$  for all  $\rho$ .

Assume now that the measurement process  $M$  (see Appendix A for technical details) is intended to measure an observable given by a spectral measure  $E = E^A$ . If  $M$  is unbiased, that is,  $E^M [1] = A$ , then eq. (1) gives:

$$\text{Var } E^M = \text{tr} \{ E^M [2] - A^2 \} + \text{Var } E^A$$

The positivity of the operator  $N(E^M; A) = E^M [2] A^2$  suggests to define the number

$$(2) \quad \sigma_n(E^M; A; \rho) = \sqrt{\text{Tr}(N(E^M; A) \rho)}^{\frac{1}{2}}$$

as a quantification of the imprecision of the measurement  $M$  as a measurement of  $A$ . With this noise concept one may write

$$(3) \quad \text{Var}(E^M) = \text{Var}(E^A) + \sigma_n(E^M; A; \rho)^2.$$

We thus see that two of the listed criteria for measurement noise are satisfied:  $\sigma_n(E^M; A; \rho)$  is a function of the probability measures  $E^M$  and  $E^A$ , and this function vanishes when the probability measures are identical.

This analysis is well-known and it essentially appears already in one of the earliest monographs on quantum information theory, a book preprint by R. Ingarden from 1974 [7].

An unbiased measurement  $M$  of  $A$  is noiseless in a state  $\rho$ , that is,  $\sigma_n(E^M; A; \rho) = 0$ , exactly when the variances  $\text{Var}(E^M)$  and  $\text{Var}(E^A)$  are the same. Since for any  $\rho \in \mathcal{H}$ ,  $\sigma_n(E^M; A; \rho) = k \sqrt{\text{Tr}(N(E^M; A) \rho)}$ , we have

$$\sigma_n(E^M; A; \rho) = 0 \iff \text{Tr}(N(E^M; A) \rho) = 0.$$

Therefore, we also have

$$\begin{aligned} \sigma_n(E^M; A; \rho) &= 0 \text{ for all } \rho \\ E^M &= E^A \text{ for all } \rho; \text{ that is } E^M = E^A. \end{aligned}$$

The remaining criterion demands that vanishing noise  $\sigma_n(E^M; A; \rho) = 0$  should imply the equality of the probability measures  $E^M$  and  $E^A$ . We do not know if this is satisfied by  $\sigma_n(E^M; A; \rho)$ . The following two examples show cases where the quantity defined in (2) seems to be a natural measure of noise (Example 1), and where this noise concept may appear misleading (Example 2).

**Example 1.** Let  $Q$  be the ordinary position observable with the spectral measure  $E^Q : B(\mathbb{R}) \rightarrow L^2(\mathbb{R})$  and let  $f$  be a probability density. The formula  $X \mapsto \int_{\mathbb{R}} x f(x) dx =: Q_f(X)$ , where  $\int_{\mathbb{R}} x f(x) dx$  is the convolution of the characteristic function  $\chi_x$  with  $f$ , defines an approximate position observable  $Q_f$ , and one finds that  $f$  defines a confidence measure describing the inaccuracy involved in the  $Q$ -measurement, see e.g. [8, Sect. 3.3]. In this case the noise is state independent. In fact, for any  $\rho$ ,  $\sigma_n(Q_f; Q; \rho) = \text{Var}(f) > 0$ . Here small noise indicates a fairly accurate position measurement. A measurement model analysis of this well-known example can be found, for instance, in [1], and it can be traced back to [9, Sect. VI.3].

Example 2. The canonical phase observable  $E^{\text{can}}$  with its first moment operator  $\mathcal{M}^{\text{can}}$  gives an example where the noise  $\eta(E^{\text{can}}; \cdot; \cdot)$  can be made arbitrarily small with an appropriate choice of  $\cdot$ . It can be argued that this does not indicate that the actual  $E^{\text{can}}$ -measurement is an accurate measurement. Though the spectrum of  $\mathcal{M}^{\text{can}}$  is the phase interval  $[0; 2\pi)$ , the sharp observable  $E^{\text{can}}$  is not a phase observable since it is not covariant under the shifts generated by the number observable. (For a recent overview of the theory of covariant phase observables, see e.g. [10].) That  $\eta(E^{\text{can}}; \cdot; \cdot)$  can be made small is due to the fact that  $E^{\text{can}}$  has the norm-1-property, that is, for any  $X$  of nonzero Lebesgue measure,  $\|E^{\text{can}}(X)\|_1 = 1$  [11]. This property implies that the variance  $\text{Var}(E^{\text{can}})$  can be made arbitrarily small [11, Prop. 2]. From equation (3) it is clear that when  $\text{Var}(E^{\text{can}})$  approaches zero, also  $\text{Var}(E)$  and  $\eta(E^{\text{can}}; \cdot; \cdot)$  are approaching zero. It is an open question whether  $\eta(E^{\text{can}}; \cdot; \cdot) = 0$  for some vector state  $\cdot$ .

2.2. Measurement noise in terms of the difference of two operators. A somewhat different approach to defining the measurement noise in an approximate measurement of  $A$  in a state  $\cdot$  by means of a scheme  $M = \{K; \cdot; E^M; U\}$  (see Appendix A) was taken by Ozawa [2, 3, 5]:

$$(4) \quad \langle A; \cdot; M \rangle^2 = \hbar^2 \langle M^{\text{out}} \rangle^2 \langle A^{\text{in}} \rangle^2 \quad \text{i:}$$

Here  $M^{\text{out}} = U^\dagger M U$  and  $A^{\text{in}} = A \otimes I$ . (This characterization of noise is used frequently, for instance, in quantum optics, see, e.g., [12] or [13].) For the sake of comparison we write the noise  $\eta(E^M; A; \cdot)$  with the same notations:

$$(5) \quad \eta(A; \cdot; M)^2 = \hbar^2 \langle M^{\text{out}} \rangle^2 \langle A^{\text{in}} \rangle^2 \quad \text{i:}$$

We stress that in contrast to (5), in (4) it is not assumed that the measurement is unbiased. If the condition  $E^M([1]) = A$  is fulfilled, then we have

$$\langle A; \cdot; M \rangle^2 = \eta(A; \cdot; M)^2 = \text{Var } E^M \quad \text{Var } E^A$$

and these two notions of noise coincide.

In Appendix A it will be shown that the quantity (4) can be written as:

$$(6) \quad \langle A; \cdot; M \rangle^2 = \hbar^2 \langle E^M([2]) \rangle \langle E^M([1]) \rangle^2 \quad \text{i:} + \hbar^2 \langle E^M([1]) \rangle \langle A^2 \rangle \quad \text{i:}$$

Thus,  $\langle A; \cdot; M \rangle$  is a function of  $A$  and  $E^M$ . Each of the terms in eq. (3), or (5), has a simple operational meaning in that it can be obtained from the statistics of measurements of  $E^M$  and  $E^A$ , performed on two separate ensembles in the state  $\cdot$ . By contrast, this is not true

in general for eq. (6): there the second summand contains the operator  $E^M[\lambda]A$ , which cannot be measured together with  $E^M[\lambda]$  or  $A$  if these operators do not commute with respect to  $\lambda$ . In that case, a measurement of the selfadjoint operator  $E^M[\lambda]A + AE^M[\lambda]$ , which occurs in

$$\begin{aligned} \langle \lambda | E^M[\lambda] A^2 | \lambda \rangle &= \langle \lambda | E^M[\lambda]^2 | \lambda \rangle + \langle \lambda | A^2 | \lambda \rangle \\ &= \langle \lambda | E^M[\lambda]A + AE^M[\lambda] | \lambda \rangle; \end{aligned}$$

will in general require a process that cannot be reduced to measurements of  $E^M$  and  $A$ . In view of eq. (189) of [5] we note that the expectation value  $\langle \lambda | E^M[\lambda]A + AE^M[\lambda] | \lambda \rangle$  may be written as a combination of the expectation values of  $E^M[\lambda]$  in the (nonnormalized) vector states  $\lambda$ ,  $A\lambda$ , and  $(A+I)\lambda$ . This is just another way of expressing the fact that the measurement of the number  $\langle \lambda | E^M[\lambda]A + AE^M[\lambda] | \lambda \rangle$  cannot be achieved by measuring  $A$  and  $E^M[\lambda]$  in the state  $\lambda$  only. This state of matter is also demonstrated in Example 3 below.

From eq. (6) it follows that

$$(A; \mu; M) = 0 \iff E^M[\mu] = E^M[\mu]^2 \text{ \& } E^M[\mu] = A \text{ :}$$

Therefore, as claimed in [2, 3], the following conditions are equivalent:

- (a)  $(A; \mu; M) = 0$  for all  $\mu$ ;
- (b)  $E^M = E^A$  for all  $\mu$ , that is,  $E^M = E^A$ .

(In [5] Ozawa gives a different proof for this result.) On the basis of this result one may ask if for a given  $\mu$  the condition  $(A; \mu; M) = 0$  still is equivalent with  $E^M = E^A$ . Example 5 shows that one can have

$(A; \mu; M) = 0$  without the probability measures  $E^M$  and  $E^A$  being equal. If  $(A; \mu; M) = 0$ , then the first and second moments of the probability measures  $E^M$  and  $E^A$  are the same. On the other hand, even equality of all moments does not guarantee that the noise is zero. Indeed, examples 4 and 6 show that the probability measures  $E^M$  and  $E^A$  can be the same although  $(A; \mu; M) \neq 0$ .

In the special case of  $E^M$  being a spectral measure  $E^C$  eq. (6) takes the form

$$(7) \quad (A; \mu; M) = \langle \mu | (C - A)^2 | \mu \rangle$$

and  $(A; \mu; M) = 0$  exactly when  $A = C$ .

**Example 3.** Assume that one intends to measure the component  $A = s_a$  of the spin of a spin- $\frac{1}{2}$  object. Assume also that there is a systematic error in the measurement (e.g. misalignment of the magnet) meaning

that one is actually measuring some component  $C = s_e$ , with  $e$  a unit vector close to  $a$ . Then, for any vector state  $\psi$  we get

$$(\hat{s}_a; \psi; M)^2 = \hbar^{-2} \langle (s_e - s_a)^2 \rangle_\psi = \frac{1}{2} (1 - e \cdot a):$$

Clearly,  $(\hat{s}_a; \psi; M)$  tends to zero with  $e \cdot a$  approaching 1, but the operator  $s_e - s_a$  does not commute with  $s_e$  or  $s_a$ . Actually all these operators are pairwise totally noncommutative, unless  $e \cdot a = \pm 1$ . An estimate of  $(\hat{s}_a; \psi; M)$  cannot therefore be obtained from the statistics of measurements of  $s_a$  and  $s_e$  in the state  $\psi$  only. To estimate  $(\hat{s}_a; \psi; M)$  one should either do measurements in other states than  $\psi$  or measure some other observables than  $s_a$  and  $s_e$ .

Example 4. Continuing with Example 3, assume that the system is in a spin state  $\psi_n$ , a  $\frac{1}{2}\hbar$ -eigenstate of a spin component  $s_n$ . Then  $\hbar^{-1} \langle s_a \rangle_\psi = \frac{1}{2} n \cdot a$  and  $\hbar^{-1} \langle s_e \rangle_\psi = \frac{1}{2} n \cdot e$  showing that the spin observables  $s_a$  and  $s_e$  have same probabilities in the state  $\psi_n$  exactly when  $n \cdot a = n \cdot e$ , i.e., when the angle between  $n$  and  $a$  is the same as the angle between  $n$  and  $e$ . Thus, it may happen that the probability distributions for  $s_a$  and  $s_e$  in a given state  $\psi_n$  are the same, but the noise  $(\hat{s}_a; \psi; M)$  is nonzero.

In formula (7) no restrictions are given for the selfadjoint operators  $A$  and  $C$ , except that  $C$  is obtained by the measurement process  $M$ . Therefore, its blind application may lead to unexpected or unwanted results. This is demonstrated by Examples 5 and 6, which indicate that the actually measured quantity, here  $C$ , should somehow be related with the quantity which is intended to be measured, here  $A$ .

Example 5. Consider two selfadjoint matrices  $A$  and  $C$  in  $C^2$ ,

$$A = \begin{pmatrix} \frac{1}{2} & 1 & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & 1 \end{pmatrix}; \quad C = \begin{pmatrix} \frac{1}{8} & 3 & 5 \\ 5 & 5 & 3 \end{pmatrix}:$$

If  $\psi = \frac{1}{\sqrt{10}} (3; 1)^T$ , then  $A\psi = C\psi$ , which means that  $(A; \psi; M) = \hbar^{-1} \langle (A - C)^2 \rangle_\psi = 0$ , though the probability distributions are different. Clearly, matrices  $A$  and  $C$  have different eigenvalues but also all the probabilities in the state  $\psi$  are different.

Example 6. Let now  $A = Q$  and  $C = P$  be the usual multiplicative (position) and differential (momentum) operators acting in the Hilbert space  $L^2(\mathbb{R})$ . In this case, for all  $\psi \in L^2(\mathbb{R})$ ,  $(Q; \psi; M) \neq 0$ . However, if a function  $\psi$  is identical with its Fourier transform, then the probability distributions  $E^Q$  and  $E^P$  are the same.

Though artificial, Examples 5 and 6 seem to suggest that in order to apply the quantity (4) as a measure of noise in a measurement  $M$  of  $A$ , some further restrictions on  $M$  have to be posed, as is the case, for instance, in Example 1.

The quantity  $\eta(A; \cdot; M)$  is mathematically well-defined and it has the important property that  $\eta(A; \cdot; M) = 0$  for all  $\rho$  if and only if  $E^M = E^A$ . However, its interpretation as a measure of noise in measuring  $A$  in the state  $\rho$  with the scheme  $M$  seems to require either that  $M$  is unbiased or that  $A$  and  $E^M$  are jointly measurable in the state  $\rho$ . Furthermore, it is not obvious how this measure of noise should be adapted to observables  $E$  which cannot be represented as selfadjoint operators (like covariant phase observables). These observations lead back to the original question of finding a quantitative, operationally meaningful, measure of the difference between  $E^M$  and  $E$  where these positive operator measures are actually different and non-coexistent (in the sense of Ludwig [14]).

**2.3. Measurement noise and the total variation norm.** In order to compare two operator measures, one usually needs to compare all their moment operators. In the case of bounded operator measures, equality of all moment operators guarantees the equality of the operator measures. However, it is well-known that there are pairs of unbounded measures for which all the moment operators coincide but the measures are different [5]. In either case it is clear that one cannot expect that any quantity composed of first and second moments only would be sufficient to characterize the difference of two operator measures.

Quantum mechanics is a statistical theory and measurements give probability distributions. The most obvious way to estimate the difference of quantum observables seems to be the comparison of their probability distributions. This can be done by choosing a metric or a norm in a set of probability measures. One example is the total variation norm  $\| \cdot \|_1$ . We recall that for a measure  $\mu$  the total variation norm is defined as  $\| \mu \|_1 := \sup \sum_{j=1}^n |\mu(X_j)|$  where the supremum is taken over  $(X_j)_{j=1}^n$  finite partitions of  $R$ . Clearly, the number  $\|E^M - E\|_1$  can be obtained from the measurement outcome statistics of the observables in question and therefore the total variation norm is operationally meaningful. Now one has for each vector state  $\rho$ :

$$\|E^M - E\|_1 = 0 \quad (\Leftrightarrow) \quad E^M = E :$$

This also implies that

$$\|E^M - E\|_1 = 0 \text{ for all } \rho \quad (\Leftrightarrow) \quad E^M = E :$$



Though the total variation norm has a clear operational meaning it does not seem to lend itself easily to quantify the intuitive idea on measurement inaccuracy or disturbance expressed in (UP1).

2.4. The quantity  $\langle \langle A E^M [1] + E^M [1] A \rangle \rangle$  and covariance. In Section 2.2 we saw that the noise  $(A; \rho; M)$  contains a term

$$\langle \langle A E^M [1] + E^M [1] A \rangle \rangle$$

and the problem in its operational meaning was pointed out. In some cases the number

$$(8) \quad \frac{1}{2} \langle \langle A E^M [1] + E^M [1] A \rangle \rangle = \langle A \rangle \langle E^M [1] \rangle$$

gives the covariance of the observables  $A$  and  $E^M$  in their joint measurement. However, we will demonstrate that, in general, this kind of interpretation is problematic.

Example 7. Let  $Q$  and  $P$  be the ordinary position and momentum operators acting in  $L^2(\mathbb{R})$ . These operators are totally noncommutative and therefore the number (8), with  $A = Q$  and  $E^M [1] = P$ , cannot be interpreted as their covariance in each state. However, as well known, there are phase space distributions for which the covariance takes the form (8).

Let  $W$  be the Wigner distribution of a Gaussian state  $\psi \in L^2(\mathbb{R})$ . It is a probability density for which

$$\text{Cov}(W; x; y) = \frac{1}{2} \langle \langle Q P + P Q \rangle \rangle = \langle Q \rangle \langle P \rangle = 0:$$

The Wigner distribution  $W$  of an arbitrary state  $\psi$  has the position and momentum distributions  $E^Q$  and  $E^P$  as the marginal distributions. However,  $W$  is a probability distribution only for the Gaussian states [16] so that, in general,  $\text{Cov}(W; x; y)$  does not have a probabilistic meaning, yielding, thus, no similar interpretation for the quantity  $\langle \langle Q P + P Q \rangle \rangle$ .

The Husimi distribution  $H$  of any state  $\psi \in L^2(\mathbb{R})$  is a probability distribution and for it we get

$$\text{Cov}(H; x; y) = \frac{1}{2} \langle \langle Q P + P Q \rangle \rangle = \langle Q \rangle \langle P \rangle$$

for any  $\psi$  (for which the relevant integrals exist). The marginal distributions of the Husimi distribution  $H$  are not the position and momentum distributions  $E^Q$  and  $E^P$  being the probability distributions of unsharp position and momentum observables, compare to Example 1. Indeed,  $H$  is the density of the probability measure defined by

the phase space observable  $A^{ji}$  (associated with the oscillator Gaussian ground state  $|0\rangle$ ) and the state  $\rho$ , and the Cartesian marginal observables of  $A^{ji}$  are the approximate position and momentum observables [8, Sections 3.3 and 3.4]. In this case, therefore, the covariance  $\text{Cov}(H; x; y)$  is the covariance of approximate position and momentum observables, not of  $Q$  and  $P$ .

**Example 8.** The Husimi distribution  $H$  of Example 7 gives rise to another example when we use the polar coordinates  $(r; \theta)$ . The angle marginal measure of the phase space observable  $A^{ji}$  is a (phase shift covariant) phase observable  $A^{ji}$  and the radial marginal measure  $A_r^{ji}$  is a smeared number observable. Their first moment operators are

$$A^{ji}[1] = \sum_{n \in \mathbb{N}} \frac{1}{n!} \frac{(n + \frac{1}{2})}{(n + \frac{1}{2})} |n\rangle \langle n| + I;$$

$$A_r^{ji}[1] = N + I;$$

see, for instance, [17] and [18]. Thus, for any oscillator eigen state  $|n\rangle$  one gets

$$\frac{1}{2} \langle n | (A^{ji}[1] A_r^{ji}[1] + A_r^{ji}[1] A^{ji}[1]) | n \rangle = (n + 1)$$

but

$$\langle n | A_r^{ji}[1] | n \rangle = n;$$

showing that the covariance  $\text{Cov}(H; x; y)$  cannot be obtained from an expression of the form (8).

There are plenty of physically important cases where the covariance in the form (8) and the noise (4) are operationally meaningful. This is especially guaranteed whenever the observables  $A$  and  $E^M$  commute. Next we discuss this situation.

Assume that the observables  $A$  and  $E^M$  commute in all states  $\rho$ . Then the map

$$X \mapsto Y \mapsto \int \rho^A(X) E^M(Y) d\rho$$

extends to a probability measure on  $B(\mathbb{R}^2)$  and its (Cartesian) marginal measures are  $E^A$  and  $E^M$ . One also obtains

$$\int (A(x) - E^A(x))^2 d\rho = \int (A(x) - E^A(x))^2 d\rho$$

and

$$\int xy d\rho = \frac{1}{2} \int (A E^M[1] + E^M[1] A) d\rho;$$

so that, in particular, the value of  $\langle A; \mu; M \rangle$  can be estimated from the statistics of a joint measurement of  $E^M$  and  $A$ . We can also write

$$(9) \quad \langle A; \mu; M \rangle^2 = \frac{\text{Exp } E^M}{\text{Var } E^M} \frac{\text{Exp } E^A}{\text{Var } E^A} + 2 \frac{\text{Cov}(E^M, E^A)}{\text{Var } E^M \text{Var } E^A}$$

showing that higher covariance means lower noise.

The following example, which comes from the class of standard measurement models [1], demonstrates the previous discussion.

**Example 9.** Consider a nondemolition measurement of the photon number of a single mode optical field, applying a two-mode coupling of the form

$$U = e^{i N_1 N_2};$$

where  $N_1 = a_1 a_1^\dagger = \sum_{n=0}^{\infty} n |n\rangle_1 \langle n|_1$  and  $N_2 = a_2 a_2^\dagger = \sum_{n=0}^{\infty} n |n\rangle_2 \langle n|_2$  are the number observables of the signal mode and the probe mode, respectively, and  $\gamma$  is a real coupling constant. Fix an initial vector state  $\psi$  of the probe mode and choose a probe observable  $E^M$  as the pointer observable. The measurement scheme, which aims to measure  $N_1$ , is thus defined by  $U; \psi$  and  $E^M$ . The actually measured observable is a smeared number observable  $N_1$ ,

$$E^M(x) = \sum_{n=0}^{\infty} \gamma^n e^{i n N_2} E^M(x) e^{-i n N_2} |n\rangle_2 \langle n|_2 \quad x \in \mathbb{R};$$

so that  $N_1$  commutes with  $E^M$ . Though  $E^M[1] \notin N_1$  in general, the moment operators of  $E^M$  are functions of  $N_1$ ,

$$E^M[k] = \sum_{n=0}^{\infty} \gamma^n e^{i n N_2} M^k e^{-i n N_2} |n\rangle_2 \langle n|_2 \quad k \in \mathbb{N};$$

In this case, for any vector state  $\psi$  of the signal mode one gets

$$\begin{aligned} \langle N_1; \mu; M \rangle &= \int E^M(x) d\mu(x) = \langle N_1 + N_1^2 \rangle; \\ \text{syd} &= \langle N_1 \rangle; \end{aligned}$$

whenever the integrals in question converge and where  $\mu$  is the probability measure extending them as  $\mu(x) = \langle E^M(x) \rangle$ .

To conclude, if  $E^A$  and  $E^M$  commute, then the covariance and the noise are operationally well-defined and they are linked by eq. (9). However, in general these concepts are problematic.

### 3. Measurement disturbance

The initial state of a system will in general change under the influence of a measurement; there is no (nontrivial) measurement which would leave unchanged all the states of the system. If the object system is initially in a vector state  $\psi$ , its state after applying the measurement process  $M$  is  $I(R)(P[\cdot])$ . The state  $I(R)(P[\cdot])$  is the unique state of the object system obtained by tracing out the probe degrees of freedom from the final object-probe state  $U(\cdot)$  (see Appendix B for technical details). If  $B$  is an arbitrary object observable (a bounded selfadjoint operator on  $H$ ), then under the influence of the measurement process  $M$ , the measurement outcome probabilities for  $B$  get changed from  $E^B$  to  $E_{I(R)(P[\cdot])}^B$ . The difference between these probability measures describes the influence of the measurement of  $A$  implemented by  $M$  on the  $B$ -probabilities. Alternatively, using the Heisenberg picture, the observable  $B$ , with the spectral measure  $E^B$ , is changed into an observable  $E$  defined as

$$E(X) = I(R)(E^B(X));$$

where  $I(R)$  is the dual transform of the state transformation  $I(R)$ . In general,  $E$  is a positive operator measure. Thus, a study of the measurement disturbance may equally well be based on a comparison of the operator measures  $E^B$  and  $E$ . In this sense it is clear that a study of the measurement disturbance is completely analogous to a study of the measurement noise. We do not repeat all the analysis of Section 2 in this context. Rather, we shall point out some special aspects of the problem.

The moment operators of  $E$  can easily be computed, and one gets

$$E[1] = I(R)(B); \quad E[2] = I(R)(B^2);$$

We note that if  $E[1] = B$ , then for any state

$$\text{Var}(E; \psi) = \text{Var}(B; I(R)(P[\cdot])) - \text{Var}(B; \psi);$$

with an equality (for all states) if and only if  $E = E^B$ , that is, if and only if  $E[2] = B^2$ . It is interesting to remark that the invariance of the selfadjoint operator  $B$  under the measurement, that is,  $I(R)(B) = B$ , does not guarantee the invariance of the observable  $E^B$  under  $M$ , that is, the invariance of  $B^2$  under  $I(R)$ . An example demonstrating this fact is constructed in [19].

In [2, 3] it is proposed that the following quantity serves to describe the disturbance of the measurement  $M$  on  $B$ , intended to measure  $A$ :

$$(B; \psi; A)^2 = \sum_D \left( B^{\text{out}} - B^{\text{in}} \right)^2 \quad E:$$

Here, again,  $B^{\text{out}} = U B I U$  and  $B^{\text{in}} = B I$ . In Appendix B it will be shown that this quantity can be expressed in the form :

$$\begin{aligned} (B; ;A)^2 &= \sum_j I(R)(B^2) (I(R)(B))^2 \\ &+ \sum_j (I(R)(B) - B)^2 \\ &= \sum_j (E[2] - E[1])^2 \\ &+ \sum_j (E[1] - B)^2 : \end{aligned}$$

Since the operators  $E[2] - E[1]$  and  $(E[1] - B)^2$  are positive we obtain that  $(B; ;A) = 0$  exactly when  $I(R)(B) = B$ , i.e.  $E[1] = B$ , and  $I(R)(B^2) = I(R)(B)^2$ , i.e.  $E[2] = E[1]^2$ . Thus we come to the following result:

$$(B; ;A) = 0 \text{ for all } ( ) \quad I(R)(B) = B \text{ \& } I(R)(B^2) = B^2;$$

that is,

$$(B; ;A) = 0 \text{ for all } ( ) \quad E = E^B :$$

(This result was stated in [2, 3] and proved by different methods in the preprint [5].)

The measurement interaction is modelled by a unitary operator  $U$ . Therefore, the map  $I(R)$  is completely positive so that there is a sequence of bounded operators  $D_i$  such that  $I(R)(B) = \sum D_i B D_i$  (for all  $B$ , convergence ultraweakly). Moreover, since  $I(R)(I) = I$ , we have  $\sum D_i D_i = I$ , see e.g. [8, Theorem 2.3]. From [19, Cor. 3.4] it follows that

$$I(R)(B) = B \text{ \& } I(R)(B^2) = B^2 \quad ( ) \quad B D_i = D_i B \text{ for all } i:$$

Hence, the following conditions are equivalent:

- (a)  $(B; ;A) = 0$  for all  $B$ ;
- (b)  $I(R)(B) = B$  and  $I(R)(B^2) = B^2$ ;
- (c)  $I(R)(E^B(X)) = E^B(X)$  for all  $X \in B(X)$ ;
- (d)  $B D_i = D_i B$  for all  $i$ .

When  $(B; ;A) \neq 0$  there is no guarantee that  $E[1]$  and  $B$  would commute, and, therefore, as in the case of eq. (10), the operational meaning of the quantity  $(B; ;A)$  remains problematic, being, perhaps, only of limited validity.

Remark 1. If the A-measurement  $M$  is noiseless so that  $E^M = E^A$ , then the distorted observable  $E$ , with  $E(X) = I(R)(E^B(X))$ , always commutes with  $A$ , showing that a noiseless measurement exhibits a kind of maximal disturbance. This follows from the fact that the operator bimeasure  $(Y; X) \mapsto I(Y)(E^B(X))$  extends uniquely to a

normalized POM having  $E^A$  and  $E$  as its Cartesian marginal measures, see, e.g. [20]. For instance, any noiseless position measurement distorts the conjugate momentum such that the 'distorted momentum' commutes with the position.

#### 4. Conclusion

Each of the three measures of noise (or disturbance) investigated in this paper have their own merits and shortcomings. Therefore, the limited range of their applicability must be acknowledged. The problem of quantifying the noise and the disturbance in quantum measurements remains thus an important open problem.

#### Appendix A. Proof of Equation 6

Let  $A$  be a bounded selfadjoint operator and consider a measurement process  $M = \{K; \{M_k\}; U\}$  planned out to measure  $A$ . Here  $K$  is the probe Hilbert space,  $\dim K = k$ ,  $k = 1, 2, \dots$ , the initial vector state of the probe,  $M$  the pointer observable, a bounded selfadjoint operator on  $K$ , and  $U : H \otimes K \rightarrow H \otimes K$  a unitary mapping modeling the measurement coupling. The actually measured observable  $E^M$  is uniquely determined by the probability reproducibility condition [21, 22]

$$\text{tr}(E^M(X) \rho) = \text{tr}(U^\dagger I \otimes E^M(X) U \rho) \quad ;$$

for all  $X \in B(\mathbb{R})$ ;  $\rho \in H$ . Since  $M$  is assumed to be bounded, the first and the second moment operators  $E^M[1]$  and  $E^M[2]$  of  $E^M$  are the bounded selfadjoint operators for which for all  $\rho \in H$

$$\begin{aligned} \text{tr}(E^M[1] \rho) &= \text{tr}(U^\dagger I \otimes M U \rho) \quad ; \\ \text{tr}(E^M[2] \rho) &= \text{tr}(U^\dagger I \otimes M^2 U \rho) \quad : \end{aligned}$$

Consider now the quantity

$$\langle A; \{M_k\} \rangle^2 = \text{tr}(M^{\text{out}} A^{\text{in}} \rho) \quad ;$$

where  $M^{\text{out}} = U^\dagger I \otimes M U$  and  $A^{\text{in}} = A \otimes I$ . Now

$$\begin{aligned} \text{tr}(M^{\text{out}})^2 \rho &= \text{tr}(E^M[2] \rho) \quad ; \\ \text{tr}(A^{\text{in}})^2 \rho &= \text{tr}(A^2 \rho) \quad : \end{aligned}$$

Since  $A^{\text{in}}$  commutes with  $I \otimes P[1]$  and

$$I \otimes P[1] M^{\text{out}} I \otimes P[1] = E^M[1] \otimes P[1] ;$$

we also have

$$\begin{aligned} \text{tr}(M^{\text{out}} A^{\text{in}} \rho) &= \text{tr}(E^M[1] A \rho) \quad ; \\ \text{tr}(A^{\text{in}} M^{\text{out}} \rho) &= \text{tr}(A E^M[1] \rho) \quad : \end{aligned}$$

Therefore, we get:

$$\langle A; \rho; M \rangle^2 = \langle \rho | E^M | \rho \rangle \langle E^M | \rho \rangle^2 + \langle \rho | E^M | \rho \rangle \langle A \rangle^2 \quad (1)$$

Both terms in the right hand side of this equation are nonnegative, the first one due to  $\langle \rho | E^M | \rho \rangle \langle E^M | \rho \rangle^2$ , see e.g. [6]. Therefore,

$\langle A; \rho; M \rangle = 0$  if and only if  $\langle \rho | E^M | \rho \rangle = \langle E^M | \rho \rangle^2$  and  $\langle \rho | E^M | \rho \rangle = \langle A \rangle^2$ . Consequently, since  $A$  and  $M$  are assumed to be bounded operators, one gets that  $\langle A; \rho; M \rangle = 0$  for all  $\rho$  exactly when  $E^M$  is a spectral measure and  $E^M = E^A$ .

We close this appendix with a characterization of  $E^M$  being a spectral measure (not necessarily equal to  $E^A$ ) in terms of the measurement scheme  $M$ . This is an immediate consequence of the well-known fact that for any two projection operators  $P$  and  $R$ , the product  $PRP$  is a projection if and only if  $PR = RP$ .

**Lemma 1.** The positive operator measure  $E^M$  is a spectral measure if and only if the projection operators  $I - P[\cdot]$  and  $U I - E^M(X) U$  commute for all  $X$ .

## Appendix B. Proof of Equation 10

Consider the measurement scheme  $M = \{K; \rho; M; U\}$  as introduced in Appendix A. If  $\rho$  is the initial vector state of the system, then its state after the measurement  $M$  is  $I(\rho)(P[\cdot])$ . This is the unique state (positive trace one operator on  $H$ ) for which

$$\begin{aligned} \text{tr}[I(\rho)(P[\cdot])B] &= \langle \rho | U B U^\dagger | \rho \rangle \\ &= \langle \rho | U B U^\dagger | \rho \rangle \end{aligned}$$

for any bounded selfadjoint operator  $B$  acting on  $H$ . Using the dual transformation  $I(\rho)$ , the expression  $\text{tr}[I(\rho)(P[\cdot])B]$  can be written as  $\text{tr}[P[\cdot]I(\rho)(B)] = \langle \rho | I(\rho)(B) | \rho \rangle$ . It follows that

$$I - P[\cdot]B^{\text{out}}I - P[\cdot] = I(\rho)(B) - P[\cdot]:$$

Hence,

$$\begin{aligned} \langle B; \rho; A \rangle^2 &= \langle \rho | (B^{\text{out}} - B^{\text{in}})^2 | \rho \rangle \\ &= \langle \rho | (B^{\text{out}})^2 | \rho \rangle + \langle \rho | (B^{\text{in}})^2 | \rho \rangle \\ &\quad - 2\text{Re} \langle \rho | B^{\text{out}}B^{\text{in}} | \rho \rangle \\ &= \langle \rho | I(\rho)(B^2) | \rho \rangle + \langle \rho | B^2 | \rho \rangle - 2\text{Re} \langle \rho | B I(\rho)(B) | \rho \rangle \\ &= \langle \rho | I(\rho)(B^2) - (I(\rho)(B))^2 | \rho \rangle \\ &\quad + \langle \rho | (I(\rho)(B) - B)^2 | \rho \rangle : \end{aligned}$$

$$\begin{aligned}
k \text{ I } (R) (B) \quad k^2 &= \frac{h \text{ I } (R) (B) \quad j \text{ I } (R) (B) \quad i}{X} \\
&= \frac{h B D_i \quad j D_i \text{ I } (R) (B) \quad i}{X} \\
&\quad \frac{k B D_i \quad k k D_i \text{ I } (R) (B) \quad k}{X} \\
&\quad \frac{k B D_i \quad k^2}{1=2} \quad \frac{k D_i \text{ I } (R) (B) \quad k^2}{1=2} \\
&= j \text{ I } (R) (B^2) \quad \frac{1=2}{k \text{ I } (R) (B) \quad k} :
\end{aligned}$$

Acknowledgement. The authors wish to thank Dr. Masanao Ozawa for his comments on an earlier (August, 2003) version of this paper.

- [1] P. Busch, M. G. Rabowski, P. Lahti, *Operational Quantum Physics*, Springer-Verlag, Berlin 1997 (2nd printing).
- [2] M. Ozawa, Position measuring interactions and the Heisenberg uncertainty principle, *Phys. Lett. A* 299 (2002) 1–7.
- [3] M. Ozawa, Universally valid reformulation of the Heisenberg uncertainty principle on noise and disturbance in measurement, *Phys. Rev. A* 67, 042105 (2003).
- [4] M. Ozawa, Quantum Limits of Measurements and Uncertainty Principle. In: *Quantum Aspects of Optical Communication*, eds. C. Bendjaballah, O. Hirota, S. Reynaud, *Lecture Notes in Physics*, Vol. 378, Springer, Berlin, 1991, p. 3.
- [5] M. Ozawa, Uncertainty Relations for Noise and Disturbance in Generalized Quantum Measurements, quant-ph/0307057.
- [6] F. Riesz, B. Sz. Nagy, *Functional Analysis*, Dover Publications, Inc., New York, 1990.
- [7] R. S. Ingarden, *Information Theory and Thermodynamics*, preprint no 275, Institute of Physics, Nicholas Copernicus University, Torun, 1974.
- [8] E. B. Davies, *Quantum Theory of Open Systems*, Academic Press, London, 1976.
- [9] J. von Neumann, *Mathematische Grundlagen der Quantenmechanik*. Springer-Verlag, Berlin, 1932. English translation: *Mathematical Foundations of Quantum Mechanics*. Princeton University Press, Princeton, 1955.
- [10] J.-P. Pellonpää, Covariant Phase Observables in Quantum Mechanics, *Annales Universitatis Turkuensis Ser. A I* 288, Turku, 2002. PhD -thesis, available in <http://www.physics.utu.fi/theory/Opinnaytteita/jpps>.
- [11] T. Heinonen, P. Lahti, J.-P. Pellonpää, S. Pulmannova and K. Ylinen, The norm-1-property of a quantum observable, *J. Math. Phys.* 44 (2003) 1998–2008.



- [12] N. Imoto, S. Saito, Quantum nondemolition measurement of photon number in a lossy optical Kerr medium, *Physical Review A* 39 (1989) 675–682.
- [13] P. Grangier, J.-M. Courty, S. Reynaud, Characterization of nonideal quantum nondemolition measurements, *Optics Communications* 89 (1992) 99–106.
- [14] G. Ludwig, *Foundations of Quantum Mechanics I*, Springer-Verlag, Berlin, 1983.
- [15] This is a classic result on the nonuniqueness of the Stieltjes moment problem, translated in positive operator measures e.g. in A. Dvurecenskij, P. Lahti, K. Ylinen, *Rep. Math. Phys.* 45 (2000) 139.
- [16] R.L. Hudson, When is the Wigner Quasiprobability Density Non-negative? *Rep. Math. Phys.* 6 (1974) 249–252.
- [17] P. Lahti, J.-P. Pellonpää, Covariant phase observables in quantum mechanics, *J. Math. Phys.* 40 (1999) 4688–4698.
- [18] M. Grabowski, New observables in quantum optics and entropy. In: *Symposium of the Foundations of Modern Physics 1993*, eds. P. Busch, P. Lahti, and P. Mittelstaedt, World Scientific, pp 182–191.
- [19] A. Arias, A. Gheondea, S. Gudder, Fixed points of quantum operations, *J. Math. Phys.* 43 (2002) 5872–5881.
- [20] P. Lahti, K. Ylinen, Dilations of positive operator measures and bin measures related to quantum mechanics, *Math. Slovaca*, in the press.
- [21] M. Ozawa, Quantum measuring processes of continuous observables, *J. Math. Phys.* 25 (1984) 79–87.
- [22] P. Busch, P. Lahti, P. Mittelstaedt, *The Quantum Theory of Measurement*, Springer-Verlag, Berlin 1996 (2nd ed.).

Paul Busch, Department of Mathematics, University of Hull, Hull  
 HU6 7RX  
 E-mail address: P.Busch@hull.ac.uk

Teiko Heinonen, Department of Physics and Department of Mathematics,  
 University of Turku, FIN-20014 Turku, Finland  
 E-mail address: teiko.heinonen@utu.fi

Pekka Lahti, Department of Physics, University of Turku, FIN-  
 20014 Turku, Finland  
 E-mail address: pekka.lahti@utu.fi