

# QUANTUM SUPERPOSITION OF A MIRROR AND RELATIVE DECOHERENCE (AS SPONTANEOUS SUPERPOSITION BREAKING)

Vladan Pankovic, Milan Predojević, Miodrag Krmarić<sup>z</sup>  
Institute of Physics, Faculty of Natural Sciences and Mathematics,  
21 000 Novi Sad, Trg Dositeja Obradovica 4.  
Serbia and Montenegro, mpgalant@ptt.yu  
<sup>z</sup> California State University Dominguez Hills  
1000 E Victoria Street, Carson, California, mkrmar@csudh.edu

PACS numbers: 03.65.Bz

## Abstract

In this work recently suggested (by Marshall, Simon, Penrose and Bouwmeester) experiment of the quantum superposition of a (quasi)-macroscopic mirror (an oscillating part of a Michelson interferometer) interacting with a single photon is consequently interpreted by relative decoherence. Namely, it is shown that relative decoherence (based on the spontaneous unitary symmetry (superposition) breaking (effective hiding)) on the photon caused by mirror is sufficient to model real measurement with photon as a measured quantum object and mirror as a measurement device.

# 1 Introduction

Recently Marshall, Simon, Penrose and Bouwmeester [1] suggested a very interesting and important experiment. Their primary aim is an experimental realization of an analogy of Schrödinger cat paradox [2].

Precisely it was creation of a realistic, i.e. observable, quantum superposition on a mesoscopic, even (quasi)macroscopic system (with  $10^{14}$  atoms and linear dimensions of 10  $\mu\text{m}$ ). It is a tiny mirror (a oscillating part of a Michelson interferometer with high-fines cavities) interacting with a single photon. More precisely speaking there is a quantum dynamical interaction between single photon (being initially in a quantum superposition) and mirror (being initially described by a wave packet) that do form only a quantum supersystem photon+mirror. In conditions of the extremely low temperature (less than 2 mK, which eliminate any environmental thermal absolute decoherence) given dynamical interaction periodically, i.e. alternately correlates (entangles) photon and mirror into photon+mirror or decorrelates (disentangles) photon+mirror into photon and mirror. Dynamical restitution of correlation breaks effectively previous quantum superposition of the photon and does that the mirror be described by a quantum superposition of the wave packets (more precisely speaking it is described by a second kind mixture [3] that includes given quantum superposition). But dynamical decorrelation breaks effectively previous quantum superposition of the mirror and reverts a quantum superposition of the photon which can be simply experimentally tested (by detection of the photon interference effects). Quantum superposition of the photon would not be reverted in case that by correlation any absolute decoherence on photon+mirror, as well as on mirror itself appears. For this reason revival of the quantum superposition of the photon can be

considered as an immediate and retrospective proof that mirror previously, i.e. during correlation has been in a quantum superposition.

Second aim of the authors, i.e. : "one long-term motivation for this kind of experiment is the search for unconventional decoherence processes" [1]. In other words authors considerate implicitly different possibilities (without standard quantum mechanical formalism [3] – [5] and its usual interpretation [6], [7] for an absolute decoherence (collapse) on photon+mirror.

In this work suggested experiment of the quantum superposition of given mirror will be consequently analyzed in the conventional way, i.e. from view point of the standard quantum mechanical formalism including its usual interpretation.

Namely an important theorem will be proved that any exact quantum superposition of the wave packets (that does not represent any wave packet) turnse ectively approxim ately, i.e. spontaneously and probabilistically (spontaneous unitary symmetry (superposition) breaking (e ective hiding)) in some of wave packets from superposition. It admits that a relative and e ective decoherence (collapse) be consequently de ned as a special case of the general formalism of the spontaneous symmetry breaking (applicable in many different domains of the physics, eg. quantum eld theory, quantum theory of ferro-magnetism, classical mechanics of the deformable bodies, etc.) [8],[9].

Such relative and e ective decoherence represents, of course, a consequent formalization of Bohr principle of the relative boundary (even complementarity) between measured quantum object and measurement device [6], [7]. Bohr said : "Especially, the singular position of the measuring instruments in the account of the quantum phenomena, just discussed, appears closely analogous to well-known necessity in relativity theory of upholding an or-

dinary description of all measurement process, including a sharp distinction between space and time coordinates, although the very essence of this theory is the establishment of new physical law, in the comprehension of which we must renounce the customary separation of space and time ideas. The dependence of the reference system, in relativity theory, of all readings of scales and clocks may even be compared with the essentially uncontrollable exchange of the momentum or energy between the objects of measurements and all instruments defining the space-time system of the reference, which in quantum theory confronts us with the situation characterized by notion of complementarity. In fact this new feature of natural philosophy means a radical revision of our attitude as regards physical reality, which may be paralleled with the fundamental modification of all ideas regarding the absolute character of physical phenomena, brought about by the general theory of relativity." [6]

Finally, it will be proved that in given Marshall et al. experiment of a quantum superposition of a mirror all conditions for relative decoherence on the correlated photon+mirror are satisfied so that in this case photon can be consequently treated as a measured quantum object and mirror as a measurement device. So, mirror can be exactly treated as a (quasi)macroscopic object in a quantum superposition (Schrödinger cat), but complementary, i.e. effectively approximately it can be treated as a (quasi)microscopic measurement device.

All this indicates, quite generally, that any absolute decoherence is not necessary in any measurement process. Thus, it will be suggested that, like remarkable Michelson experiment that amended Einstein relativistic statement on the absence of the absolute space, Marshall et al. experiment on the quantum superposition of a mirror (really included in a Michelson inter-

ferometer) would to a *la* Bohr statement on the absence of the absolute decoherence (collapse) and on the completeness of the standard quantum mechanical formalism.

## 2 Relative decoherence as a spontaneous unitary symmetry (superposition) breaking

Within standard quantum mechanical formalism [3]–[5] dynamics of a quantum system is described by Schrödinger equation

$$\hat{H} \psi = i\hbar \frac{\partial \psi}{\partial t} \quad (1)$$

where  $\hat{H}$  represents corresponding Hamiltonian observable,  $\psi$  – quantum state of the unit norm from Hilbert space  $H$ ,  $t$  – time moment and  $\hbar$  reduced Planck constant. Formal solution of (1) can be presented by expression

$$\psi(t) = U(t) \psi_0 \quad (2)$$

where  $U(t)$  represents corresponding unitary evolution operator and  $\psi_0$  initial quantum state. Obviously, there is deterministic, i.e. one-to-one correspondence between initial and final quantum state.

Let  $B = \{ |n\rangle \}$  be an arbitrary time independent basis in  $H$  and let  $U(t)B = \{ |n(t)\rangle \}$  represents basis in  $H$  that represents the dynamical evolution of  $B$ . Then it follows

$$\psi(t) = \sum_n |n(t)\rangle \langle n(t) | \psi(t) \rangle \quad \psi_0 = \sum_n |n\rangle \langle n | \psi_0 \rangle \quad (3)$$

where

$$\sum_n |\langle n(t) | \psi(t) \rangle|^2 = \sum_n |\langle n | \psi_0 \rangle|^2 = 1 \quad (4)$$

In sense of (3) and (4) quantum mechanical dynamical evolution conserves superposition and unit norm of the quantum state during time and it does not prefer any basis in  $H$ . It represents a fundamental symmetry of quantum mechanics, called unitary symmetry, which practically means that all referential frames, i.e. all bases in Hilbert space can be treated as completely same right. In this way unitary symmetry represents a very important symmetry that connects the kinematical aspects (characteristics of Hilbert space) and dynamical aspects of the quantum mechanics, like Galilei symmetry within classical mechanics or Lorentz symmetry within special theory of relativity.

But there is following, seemingly unambiguous, experimental fact. By a measurement of some observable with eigen basis  $B$  realized on the measured quantum object  $O$ , in quantum state  $|\psi(t)\rangle$  given state turns exactly in some quantum state  $|\phi_n\rangle$  from  $B$  with probability  $w_n(t) = |\langle \phi_n | \psi(t) \rangle|^2$  for arbitrary  $n$ . Duration of the measurement is relatively very short, so that during this measurement effects of the dynamical evolution of isolated  $O$  can be neglected. In this way given measurement breaks exactly and absolutely unitary symmetry (does absolute exact collapse), since even if it conserves unit norm of the quantum state it breaks superposition. For this reason within standard quantum mechanical formalism measurement cannot be consistently presented by any exact quantum mechanical dynamical evolution on  $O$ .

Moreover, von Neumann proved [4] that within standard quantum mechanical formalism measurement cannot be presented by any exact quantum mechanical dynamical evolution even on the quantum supersystem  $O + M$ , consisting from dynamically interacting quantum subsystems,  $O$  and measurement device  $M$ . This von Neumann proof is conceptually very simple.

Namely, let  $O$  before measurement be in a quantum state

$$|O\rangle = \sum_n c_n |O_n\rangle \quad (5)$$

Here  $|O_n\rangle$  represents eigen basis of the measured observable in Hilbert space  $H_O$  of  $O$ , while  $c_n$  for  $|O_n\rangle$  represent superposition coefficients that satisfy normalization condition

$$\sum_n |c_n|^2 = 1 \quad (6)$$

Let before measurement  $M$  be in a quantum state  $|M_0\rangle$  from  $B_M = \{|M_n\rangle\}$  that represents eigen basis of the so-called pointer observable in Hilbert space  $H_M$  of  $M$ . Then before measurement  $O+M$  is described by noncorrelated quantum state

$$|O\rangle \otimes |M\rangle = \sum_n c_n |O_n\rangle \otimes |M_0\rangle \quad (7)$$

from  $H_O \otimes H_M$ , where  $\otimes$  represents tensorial product.

Usual empirical facts that characterize measurement need that unitary evolution operator  $U_{O+M}$  corresponding to measurement be determined in such way that it restitutes one-to-one correspondence between  $B_O$  and  $B_M$  without any changing of the superposition coefficients in (7). It simply means that after measurement treated as a quantum mechanical dynamical evolution on  $O+M$  this  $O+M$  must be finally in the following correlated quantum state

$$|O+M\rangle = \sum_n c_n |O_n\rangle \otimes |M_n\rangle \quad (8)$$

from  $H_O \otimes H_M$ .

However within standard quantum mechanical formalism  $|O+M\rangle$  (as the final result of the quantum mechanical dynamical evolution on  $O+M$ ) is different from any pure or mixed quantum state of  $O+M$  that can correspond

to natural empirical measurement results. Precisely within standard quantum mechanical formalism  $O+M$  is different from any  $O_n$  or  $M_n$  or from mixture of such quantum states with corresponding statistical weights  $w_n = \frac{1}{2^n}$  for  $8n$ .

In this way, according to von Neumann proof, deterministic dynamical evolution and probabilistic measurement represent two exact but quite independent and different ways of the change of the quantum state within standard quantum mechanical formalism. Origin of the quantum mechanical dynamical evolution is more or less clear, while origin ("place and time") of the measurement, precisely decoherence (collapse) is completely unclear and it must be ad hoc postulated (von Neumann projection postulate), like absolute space in classical mechanics. In any way it represents a serious open problem in quantum mechanics foundation [10].

There are two opposite attempts of the solution of given problem. First one accepts unitary symmetry (superposition) breaking (decoherence, collapse) by measurement as an absolute exact phenomenon. Simultaneously it considers that standard quantum mechanical formalism is incomplete (even contradictory) and that it must be extended by some unconventional but complete theory. But, as it is well-known [11] – [13], such solution is very nonplausible since it predicts basic contradiction between quantum mechanics and theory of relativity and forbids building of any consistent quantum field theory.

Second one attempt of the solution of measurement or decoherence (collapse) problem represents Bohr relative boundary between  $O$  and  $M$  or relative decoherence (collapse) principle (this principle represents general form of the Bohr complementarity principle) [6], [7]. It supposes that quantum mechanical dynamical evolution represents unique completely exact form of



the quantum state change which implies that unitary symmetry stands always exactly conserved. Also, it means that final result of the completely exact interaction between  $O$  and  $M$  is given by  $\psi^{O+M}$  (8), so that absolute boundary between  $O$  and  $M$  or absolute decoherence (collapse) does not exist at all.

But introduced supposition needs that measurement be defined in an especial way but within standard quantum mechanical formalism exclusively. It seems that Bohr suggested that exact decoherence (collapse) on the quantum mechanically exactly described  $O$  is not absolutely exact but only relatively and effectively exact. Namely, it appears only in relation to approximately quantum mechanically, i.e. "classical mechanically" described  $M$ . In this sense given "classical" description of  $M$  generates effective and relative boundary between quantum described  $O$  and "classically" described  $M$ . More precisely speaking [14], [15]  $B_M$  must be an especially chosen basis of weakly interfering wave packets (which means that the distance between centers of any two wave packets must be greater than any wave packet width), while  $B_O$  is exactly uniquely correlated  $B_M$  by  $U_{O+M}$ . Obviously given exact unique quantum dynamical correlation between  $B_O$  and  $B_M$  forbids any simultaneous exact unambiguous quantum dynamical correlation between any basis incompatible with  $B_O$  in  $H_O$  and  $B_M$ . In other words it means that mutually noncommutative observable of  $O$  can be measured neither simultaneously nor by the same measurement device which, obviously, corresponds to Heisenberg uncertainty relations.

Thus, completely exact quantum description of  $O+M$  (without any boundary between  $O$  and  $M$ ) and hybrid description of  $O+M$  (effectively exact description of  $O$  and "classical" description of  $M$ ) exist simultaneously but on the discretely different levels of the analysis accuracy. Any of these two levels

can be chosen quite arbitrary but relative and effective decoherence exists on the level of hybrid description only. In this way Bohr principle of the relative boundary and relative decoherence yields a solid basis for understanding of the measurement process within standard quantum mechanical formalism without any contradiction (in previously noted sense [11] – [13]) with theory of relativity or quantum field theory.

However, as it has been pointed out [10], measurement cannot be completely formalized by presented suppositions on the relative boundary or relative decoherence principle only. Namely, even for  $B_M$  as a basis of weakly interfering wave packets  $\psi^{O+M}$  conserves the same form (8) that cannot to explain appearance of  $\psi_n^O$  with probability  $w_n$  for arbitrary  $n$  in case of an individual measurement.

Nevertheless, noted problem of the consequent formalization of the relative boundary or relative decoherence principle can be solved in following way. It can be observed that a physical state is dynamically stable if it satisfies corresponding dynamical equation, i.e. corresponding Hamilton least action principle. In this sense a quantum state is quantum mechanically always dynamically but it is not always classically mechanically dynamically stable. Precisely speaking a quantum state is classically mechanically dynamically stable only in wave packet approximation while in all other cases it is classically mechanically dynamically nonstable. As it is well-known [3], [5] a quantum state satisfies wave packet approximation if following is satisfied

$$j(\psi; \hat{A})j = ((\psi; \hat{A}^2) - (\psi; \hat{A})^2)^{\frac{1}{2}} \quad (9)$$

i.e. if absolute value of average value of any observable  $\hat{A}$  from orbital Hilbert space in  $\psi$  is many times greater than the standard deviation  $\hat{A}$  in  $\psi$ .

Further it is not hard to see that following is satisfied. Any quantum state

representing a (nontrivial) superposition of weakly interfering wave packets from some basis of Hilbert space does not represent any wave packet. It means that any superposition of the weakly interfering wave packets is quantum mechanically dynamically stable but that it is classically mechanically dynamically unstable. For this reason given superposition without any its change on the quantum level of analysis accuracy turns spontaneously (dynamically nonobservable and probabilistically), under condition of the conservation of unit norm of the quantum state, in its arbitrary wave packet on the "classical mechanical" level of the analysis accuracy. This spontaneous unitary symmetry (precisely superposition) breaking (effective hiding), representing an especial case of the general formalism of the spontaneous symmetry breaking (applicable in different domains of the physics: quantum field theory, quantum theory of the ferromagnetism, classical mechanics of the deformable bodies, etc.) [8], [9], can be treated as a selfdecoherence (selfcollapse). In this way an important theorem on the selfdecoherence as spontaneous unitary symmetry (superposition) breaking (effective hiding) is proved.

Such "classical mechanical" selfdecoherence appears obviously on  $M$  and, by means of the previously quantum mechanically dynamically realized correlation between  $O$  and  $M$ , it manifests itself immediately as an effective exact quantum mechanical relative decoherence (collapse) on  $O$ .

So, it can be concluded that Bohr principle of the relative boundary or relative decoherence can be consequently formalized within standard quantum mechanical formalism by means of the spontaneous unitary symmetry (superposition) breaking.

In this way it can be stated that, there are, practically only two possible general ways for solution of the problem of the quantum measurement: first one with absolute decoherence and second one with relative decoher-

ence. Independently from noted theoretical nonplausibility of the absolute decoherence theories and theoretical plausibility of the relative decoherence theories, a decision which of these two general types of theories is physically acceptable can be obtained only by means of a convenient experiment (measurement). Such experiment must detect exact quantum superposition effects, if they exist, on  $O + M$ , and, without any principal changing (except corresponding approximation) of the dynamical interaction between  $O$  and  $M$ , decoherence effects, if they exist, on  $O + M$ . In case of the positive detection in both cases it can be stated that  $M$  realizes relative decoherence on  $O$  and that experiment verifies relative decoherence theories. In case of the positive detection in second case only it can be stated that  $M$  realizes absolute decoherence on  $O$  and that absolute decoherence theories are verified.

It can be observed that suggested experiment can be very hardly technically realized on usual measurement devices that represents very macroscopic objects with extremely weakly manifestable quantum characteristics. It represents basic reason why problem of the measurement within quantum mechanics is not yet definitely solved! But it can be pointed out that theories of the relative decoherence does not need that  $M$  be only macroscopic. Relative boundary can be translated toward mesoscopic, even microscopic systems that can be conveniently chosen for measurement devices.

In further work it will be shown that Marshall et al. experiment on the superposition of the mirror [1] represents an experiment that can completely check theories of the absolute decoherence as well as theories of the relative decoherence. In other words this experiment is completely able to answer there is an absolute or relative decoherence within quantum mechanics and nature. In this sense Marshall et al. experiment would be compared with

remarkable Michelson experiment that admitted absence of the absolute space.

### 3 Quantum Superposition of a Mirror as an experimental test of the relative decoherence existence

Suggested experimental circumstances of the quantum superposition of a mirror is discussed in [1] while theoretical basis of this experiment is accurately given in [16]–[19]. Emphasis of [1], [16]–[19] is the possibility that a (quasi)macroscopic mirror (like Schrödinger cat [2]) be in a quantum superposition without any absolute decoherence. Namely it is supposed implicitly in [1], [16]–[19] that absolute decoherence really exists but that it can be caused by environmental thermal influences or by some other unconventional way. Supposing that at extremely low temperature (smaller than 2 mK) such environmental influences can be neglected in given mirror experiment it is concluded in [1], [16]–[19] that here absolute decoherence does not occur. It represents a correct conclusion that, very probably, should be admitted by realization of the experiment.

But in [1], [16]–[19] the possibility that in given experiment with mirror a relative decoherence can appear and relative boundary principle can be admitted is not considered. In further work it will be shown that in the same mirror experiment all conditions for relative decoherence are satisfied so that it can be expected that real experiment should to admit relative decoherence concepts. Precisely speaking it will be demonstrated that single photon in Michelson interferometer can be treated as 0 and tiny oscillating mirror as  $M$  in sense of the relative decoherence discussed in the previous section of this work. In other words it will be demonstrated that here both cases, first

one with quantum superposition on  $O+M$ , and second one with absolute or relative decoherence on  $O$  caused by  $M$  only (since environment can be neglected) exist and can be realistically experimentally checked. (For relative boundary view point environmental influences can to cause only relative decoherence (collapse) too while quantum superposition, that really exist on the supersystem  $O+M$  + environment is extremely hardly experimentally checkable.)

Since in [1], [16] – [19] all experimental and theoretical details of the quantum superposition of given mirror have been presented clearly and completely attention of this work will be directed on the principal aspects of given experiment only.

So, before exact quantum mechanical dynamical interaction with tiny mirror  $m$ , photon  $p$ , that propagates through Michelson interferometer, is in a quantum superposition

$$j^p_i = \frac{1}{\sqrt{2}} (\beta^p_i + \alpha^p_i) \quad (10)$$

where  $\beta^p_i$  represents quantum state of  $p$  propagating through interferometer arm B without  $m$  while  $\alpha^p_i$  represents quantum state of  $p$  propagating through interferometer arm A with  $m$ . (Given quantum superposition on  $p$  can be simply immediately detected by corresponding interference effects detectors but such detection would represent a radical revision of given experimental scheme.) Simultaneously  $m$  is, before interaction with  $p$ , described by a rested wave packet  $j^m_i$  so that  $p+m$  is described, before interaction, by noncorrelated quantum state

$$j^p_i j^m_i = \frac{1}{\sqrt{2}} (\beta^p_i + \alpha^p_i) j^m_i \quad (11)$$

Exact quantum mechanical dynamical interaction between  $p$  and  $m$  [1],

[16] - [19] changes  $|j^p\rangle$  into  $|j^m\rangle$  during time  $t$  into following quantum state

$$|j^{p+m}(t)\rangle = \frac{a}{2} \exp(-i\omega_p t) (|j^p\rangle + f(k; \omega_m; t) |j^m\rangle) \quad (12)$$

Here  $\omega_p$  represents constant  $p$  frequency,  $\omega_m$  - constant  $m$  frequency,  $k$  - constant parameter that quantifies the displacement of  $m$  in units of the size of the ground state wave packet. Also, here  $f(k; \omega_m; t) = \exp(i k^2 (\omega_m t \sin \omega_m t))$  represents a quasiperiodical (with period  $T_m = \frac{2}{\omega_m}$  function, and  $|j(k; \omega_m; t)\rangle$  a periodical (with period  $T_m$ ) quantum state such that

$$|j(k; \omega_m; T_m)^m\rangle = |j^m\rangle \quad (13)$$

It means that, according to (12), (13),  $p+m$  is initially, i.e. in zero time moment, as well as in following later time moments  $T_m; 2T_m; \dots$ , exactly described by a noncorrelated quantum state, while in all other time moments  $p+m$  is exactly described by a correlated quantum state. (More precisely speaking there is a relatively small (in respect to  $T_m$ ) time intervals  $(nT_m - \frac{\pi}{2}; nT_m + \frac{\pi}{2})$  for  $n=0, 1, 2, \dots$  whose equivalent durations depend from experimental circumstances. Within any of these intervals  $p+m$  is described by a noncorrelated quantum state while without these intervals it is described by a non-correlated quantum state in a satisfactory approximation. For this reason  $\frac{\pi}{2}$  can be treated as a time interval of an effective correlation or decorrelation.)

It is satisfied

$$|j^m\rangle = |j(k; \omega_m; t)^m\rangle = |j_-(k; \omega_m; t)^m\rangle + |j_+(k; \omega_m; t)^m\rangle = |j^m\rangle + |j_+^m\rangle \quad (14)$$

where  $|j^m\rangle = |j(k; \omega_m; t)^m\rangle$  and  $|j_+^m\rangle = |j_+(k; \omega_m; t)^m\rangle$  are time dependent wave packets of  $m$ . They move periodically in opposite directions so that distance between these two packets becomes maximal, close to  $2k$ , in time

momenta  $\frac{T_m}{2}; \frac{3T_m}{2}; \dots$  and minimal, i.e. zero in time moments  $0, T_m; 2T_m; \dots$ . Obviously, (14), except in time moments  $0, T_m; 2T_m; \dots$  (precisely time intervals  $(nT_m - \frac{T_m}{2}; nT_m + \frac{T_m}{2})$  for  $n=0,1,2,\dots$ ), represents a nontrivial quantum superposition (for this reason  $\frac{T_m}{2}$  can be treated as a time interval of the restitution of an effective decoherence or coherence too).

Under a condition

$$k^2 \gg 1 \quad (15)$$

momentum that  $m$  obtains from  $p$  is greater than initial momentum uncertainty of  $m$ . Also it means that maximal distance between two superposition terms  $|j^m_i\rangle$  and  $|j^m_+\rangle$  becomes equal or greater than one size of the ground state wave packet of  $m$ ,  $|j^m_i\rangle$ . Roughly speaking under condition (15)  $m$  appears simultaneously in two places distinct from initial. It can be added that under condition (15) wave packets  $|j^m_i\rangle$  and  $|j^m_+\rangle$  become weakly interfering not only mutually but with wave packet of the ground state of  $m$ ,  $|j^m_i\rangle$  too.

As it has been noted, in [1] it is demonstrated that for temperature less than 2 mK thermal influence of the environment on  $m$  can be neglected. For this reason, for given temperature, environment cannot to generate any (absolute) decoherence on  $p+m$ .

All this admits following conclusions. Initially noncorrelated  $p+m$  described by (11), with  $p$  in a quantum superposition (10), evolves dynamically during time interval  $(0; \frac{T_m}{2})$  in a correlated quantum state (12). Given correlated quantum state includes, roughly speaking, a subsystemic effective decoherence on  $p$  and subsystemic quantum superposition  $|j^m_i\rangle$  on  $m$  (precisely speaking  $m$  is described by a second kind mixture [3] of initial wave packet  $|j^m_i\rangle$  and quantum superposition  $|j^m_+\rangle$  (14)). This quantum superposition (12), without any decorrelation or without any subsystemic coherence



revival on  $p$  or without any subsystemic decoherence of (14), evolves dynamically during time interval  $(0 + \frac{\tau}{2}; T_m - \frac{\tau}{2})$ . During time interval  $(T_m - \frac{\tau}{2}; T_m)$  a dynamical decorrelation on  $p+m$ , a subsystemic coherence revival on  $p$  and a subsystemic decoherence on  $m$  occur. So in time moment  $T_m$  there is a complete dynamical return of  $p+m$  in a like initial, noncorrelated quantum state which can be simply immediately checked by corresponding detection of the interference effects on  $p$  only. Positive detection of  $p$  interference effects admits a consistent mediate and retrospective statement that previously, in  $(0 + \frac{\tau}{2}; T_m - \frac{\tau}{2})$ ,  $p+m$  has been in a correlated quantum state and  $m$  in a quantum superposition. But the same positive detection represents none immediate and predictive detection of corresponding correlated quantum state of  $p+m$  or corresponding subsystemic quantum superposition of  $m$ . Also, given detection representing an additional, control measurement changes radically previous dynamical evolution on  $p+m$ . Without this detection dynamical evolution on  $p+m$  occurs in any later time moment periodically in an equivalent way.

On the basis of the previous analysis it can be expected that real experiment will show that dynamical interaction between  $p$  and  $m$  does not cause any absolute decoherence on  $p+m$  in any time moment.

But it is not hard to see that during  $(0 + \frac{\tau}{2}; T_m - \frac{\tau}{2})$ , when  $p+m$  is in correlated quantum state (12), all conditions for an effective approximation of this state by relatively decoherent state (presented in previous section of this work) are satisfied.

Firstly,  $p+m$  is really described by a correlated quantum state  $j^{p+m}(t)$  (12).

Secondly,  $m$  is effectively subsystemically described by a second kind mixture of the initial wave packet  $j^m_i$  and  $j^m_f$  representing an quantum

superposition of the wave packets  $\psi^m_i$  and  $\psi^m_+$ .

Thirdly, according to (12) there is one-to-one correlation between  $\mathcal{B}^p_i$  and  $\psi^m_i$  from one, and between  $\mathcal{A}^p_i$  and  $\psi^m_i$  from other side.

Fourth, according to (15), all three wave packets  $\psi^m_i, \psi^m_i$  and  $\psi^m_+$  are mutually weakly interfering.

For this reason, according to theorem of the selfdecoherence, during  $(0 + \frac{\epsilon}{2}; T_m + \frac{\epsilon}{2})$  on subsystem  $i$  classically effectively approximately, i.e. "classically" described M effectively approximate selfdecoherence exists. Simultaneously, according to quantum correlation (12), in relation to selfdecoherent  $m$  on subsystem  $i$  classically effectively quantum mechanically exactly described p effective exact relative decoherence exists. This effective and relative decoherence on  $p$  can be certainly affirmed by additional control measurement, i.e. by detection of the complete absence of the interference effects on  $p$  only during given time interval. Certainty of the detection of absence of interference effects on  $p$  can be, in sense of Einstein criterion [20], used as a sufficient proof that before detection  $p$  is effectively in a relatively decoherent state caused by selfdecoherence on  $m$ . Thus, in sense of Einstein criterion given detection is neither mediate nor retrospective, but of course such detection as an additional measurement changes radically previous dynamical evolution on  $p+m$ . Of course, equivalent detection in time moment  $T_m$ , in sense of previous discussion, can to affirm that previous decoherence is really effective and relative but not absolute.

All this admits that during  $(0 + \frac{\epsilon}{2}; T_m - \frac{\epsilon}{2})$  exact correlated quantum state  $j^{p+m}(t)$  (12) on  $p+m$  can be effectively approximated by a discretely different hybrid description of  $p+m$  corresponding to a relative collapse on  $p$  as 0 caused by selfdecoherent  $m$  as  $M$ . In this way  $m$  is not only a (quasi)macroscopic system in a quantum superposition but it is, comple-

mentary, a (quasi)microscopic measurement device. Also, it can be pointed out that here time interval  $(0; \frac{1}{2})$  can be treated in two discretely different ways. Exactly quantum mechanically dynamically it represents the time interval of the dynamical realization of the correlation between  $p$  and  $m$ . But effectively approximately quantum mechanically, or "classically" it represents a time interval of the relative decoherence realization.

In this way it is proved that Marshall et al. experiment of the quantum superposition of a mirror represents an experimental test that should to affirm the relative decoherence concept, i.e. relative boundary principle and completeness of the standard quantum mechanical formalism.

## 4 Conclusion

In conclusion following can be only repeated and pointed out. Marshall et al. experiment of the quantum superposition of a mirror should to testify not only a (quasi)macroscopic quantum superposition. It should to testify also relative decoherence (as a spontaneous unitary symmetry (superposition) breaking (effective hiding)), i.e. relative boundary principle and completeness of the standard quantum mechanical formalism. In this sense it would have same significance in foundation of the quantum mechanics as well as remarkable Michelson experiment in foundation of the special theory of relativity. It is a curiosity that both experiments use practically identical experimental circumstances and that they negate absolute concepts, i.e. concepts of the fundamental symmetries absolute breaking.

Acknowledgements

Authors are deeply grateful to ProfD r. Fedor Herbut whose personal views on the relative decoherence (collapse) has been very instructive and inspirational for this work and to ProfD r. Darko Kapor and ProfD r. Milan Vujicic on the illuminating discussions, support and help.

## References

- [1] W Marshall, C Simon, R Penrose, D Bouwmeester, Phys. Rev. Lett. 91,130402 (2003)
- [2] E Schrdinger, Naturwissenschaften 48, 807, 823, 844 (1935).
- [3] B d'Espagnat, Conceptual Foundations of Quantum Mechanics (Benjamin, London-Amsterdam-New York,1976.)
- [4] J.von Neumann, Mathematische Grundlagen der Quanten Mechanik (Springer Verlag, Berlin,1932.)
- [5] P A M Dirac, Principles of Quantum Mechanics (Clarendon Press, Oxford,1958.)
- [6] N Bohr, PhysRev. 48, 696, (1935.).
- [7] N Bohr, Atomic Physics and Human Knowledge (John Wiley, New York,1958.)
- [8] J.Bemstein, Rev.Mod.Phys. 46, 7 (1974) .

- [9] F Halzen, B Martin, Quarks and Leptons: An Introductory Course in Modern Particle Physics (John Wiley and Sons, New York, 1984.)
- [10] J.S Bell, Physics World 3, 53 (1990).
- [11] J.S Bell, Physics 1, 195 (1964) .
- [12] A Aspect, P Grangier, G Roger, Phys. Rev. Lett. 47, 460 (1981.)
- [13] A Aspect, J Dalibard, G Roger, Phys Rev Lett. 49, 1804 (1982.)
- [14] A Dameri, A Loinger, G M Prosperi, Nuclear Physics 33, 297 (1962) .
- [15] M Cini, M De Maria, G M attioli, F Nicolò, Foundations of Physics 9, 479 (1979) .
- [16] S Bose, K Jacobs, P L Knight, Phys. Rev. A 59, 3024 (1999) .
- [17] C K Law, Phys. Rev. A 49, 443 (1993).
- [18] C K Law, Phys. Rev. A 51, 2537 (1994) .
- [19] S Mancini, V IM an'ko, P Tomasi, Phys. Rev. A 55, 3042 (1997).
- [20] A Einstein, B Podolsky, N Rosen, Phys. Rev., 47, 777 (1935) .