Typicality vs. probability in trajectory-based form ulations of quantum mechanics

B runo G alvan Loc. M elta 40, 38014 Trento, Italy.

January 2007

A bstract

Bohm ian mechanics represents the universe as a set of paths with a probability measure de ned on it. The way in which a mathematical model of this kind can explain the observed phenom ena of the universe is examined in general. It is shown that the explanation does not make use of the full probability measure, but rather of a suitable set function deriving from it, which de nes relative typicality between single-time cylinder sets. Such a set function can also be derived directly from the standard quantum formalism, without the need of an underlying probability measure. The key concept for this derivation is the quantum typicality rule, which can be considered as a generalization of the Born rule. The result is a new form ulation of quantum mechanics, in which particles follow de nite trajectories, but which is based only on the standard formalism of quantum mechanics.

1 Introduction

Bohm ian mechanics is a complete and coherent formulation of non-relativistic quantum mechanics [4, 5, 9, 1, 8]. A coording to this formulation, the particles of the universe follow de nite trajectories satisfying a di erential equation, the guidance equation. The set of these trajectories is endowed with a probability measure deriving from the universal wave function. In spite of its completeness and coherence, Bohm ian mechanics is far from a universally accepted formulation of quantum mechanics, the presence of unobservable entities like Bohm ian trajectories being one of its most criticized features.

In short, we will refer to a generic set of paths with a probability measure de ned on it as a path space. The way in which a path space can explain the observed phenom ena of the universe is a very intriguing conceptual issue, and we think it has been only partially

E lectronic address: b.galvan@ virgilio.it

investigated in the literature. M ost of the work in this sense has been done in the context of B ohm ian mechanics [8].

A path space has the same structure as a stochastic process, and usually stochastic processes are utilized to represent ensembles of open systems, such as particles in a liquid subjected to B rownian motion. There are two fundamental dierences when a path space represents the universe instead of an ensemble of open systems: (1) the observers are inside the system, and they cannot perform all the measurements allowed in the previous case; (2) there is just one universe, thus the probability measure is not used to derive relative frequencies, but rather typicality.

A swewill see, the consequences of these di erences are that the full structure of the probability measure is unobservable, and that the explanation given by a path space is based on the set function

$$r (S_1 \not B_2) \coloneqq \frac{(S_2 n S_1)}{(S_2)}; \qquad (1)$$

where S_1 and S_2 are single-time cylinder sets. This set function will be referred to as the relative typicality function, because $r(S_1 \not S_2) = 1$ implies that S_1 is typical relative to S_2 , i.e. the overwhelm ing majority of the paths of S_2 also belong to S_1 .

The crucial point is that, while the quantum form alism cannot de ne a probability measure on a set of paths, in a natural way it can de ne a set function, them utual typicality function, from which the relative typicality function can be derived. The mutual typicality function must be accompanied by an interpretative rule connecting it with typicality. This rule will be referred to as the quantum typicality rule, and it can be considered a generalization of the Born rule. The result is a new form ulation of quantum mechanics, in which particles follows de nite trajectories, as in Bohm ian mechanics, but which is based only on the form alism of standard quantum mechanics, the guidance equation being replaced by the quantum typicality rule.

The paper is structures according to the following scheme. In section 2 a formal de nition, the main properties and some examples of path spaces are given. In section 3 the way in which a path space explains the observed phenom ena of the universe is studied, and it is shown that this explanation is based on the relative typicality function. In section 4 the possibility to derive typicality functions from the quantum formalism is shown, and many related technical issues are discussed. In section 5 there is a nal discussion about the proposed formulation of quantum mechanics.

2 Path spaces

In this section, the form alde nition and the main properties of a space of paths with a probability measure de ned on it are explained. Since such a structure is a stochastic process, most of the term inology and the properties of these spaces are derived from stochastic processes.

Let (M;B) be a measurable space, T an index set and a set of mappings from T to M. In this paper T will always be the positive time axis R^+ , and, with the exception of

the example of the classical universe, M will always be the conguration space R^{3N} of an N-particle system. Given t 2 T and 2 B, the subset (t;) = f 2 : (t) 2 g is a single-time cylinder set (s-set, in short); a cylinder set is any nite intersection of s-sets. The shorthand notation S_i will be used to denote the s-set (t_i; _i), i = 1;2;:::. Let S denote the class of the s-sets, and (S) the -algebra generated by S.

A path space is the pair (;), where $\;$ is a probability measure on (S). A path space is de ned to be canonical if $\;$ = M $^{\rm T}$, where M $^{\rm T}$ is the set of all the mappings from T to M .

By dening $z_t() := (t)$, fz_tg_{t2T} is then a class of random variables on the probability space (; (S);), indexed by T. Thus any path space (;) naturally corresponds to the stochastic process (; (S); ; fz_tg_{t2T})¹.

The values of the measure on the cylinder sets are the nite dimensional distributions of the path space, while its value on the s-sets is the single-time distribution. Two path spaces with the same index set and state space are said to be equivalent if they have the same nite dimensional distributions. Two path spaces with the same eset and the same nite dimensional distributions are identical, i.e. they have the same probability measure . Any class of nite dimensional distribution theorem, given any class of nite dimensional distributions theorem, given any class of nite dimensional distributions are identical, i.e. and the same est is the same est of the K olm ogolov reconstruction theorem, given any class of nite dimensional distributions are identical and the same est of the K olm ogolov reconstruction theorem.

We say that a path space is determ inistic if for any s-set $(t_1; 1)$ and any $t_2 \ge T$ there exists $(t_1; 2) \ge 0$, where 4 is the symmetric difference.

We now give some examples of path spaces. Classical system. The state space M is the phase space of a classical H am iltonian system. Let be a subset of M with 0 < $_{\rm L}$ () < 1, where $_{\rm L}$ is the Lebesgue measure on M. The set is composed of the H am iltonian trajectories : R⁺ ! M such that (0) 2. The measure $_{\rm C}$ on is defined by

$$_{C}() = \frac{_{L}[z_{t}()]}{_{L}()}; \quad 2 \quad (S):$$
 (2)

Due to the Liouville theorem, the above de nition does not depend on the time. This path space is determ inistic.

Bohm ian mechanics. Hereafter the state space M will always be the con guration space R^{3N} of an N-particle system. Let us assume a normalized universal wave function (t) = U (t) $_0 2 L^2$ (M), where U (t) is the unitary time evolution operator. is the set of the trajectories satisfying the guidance equation

$$\frac{\mathrm{d}\mathbf{x}_{k}}{\mathrm{d}\mathbf{t}} = \frac{\mathrm{h}}{\mathrm{m}_{k}} \operatorname{Im} \frac{\mathrm{r}_{k}}{\mathrm{m}_{k}}; \quad \mathbf{k} = 1; \dots; \mathbf{N}:$$
(3)

¹The converse is not true in general: given a stochastic process (;F; ;fz_tg_{t2T}), every element ! 2 de nes the sam ple path (t) = z_t (!), but the correspondence between and the set of the sam ple paths may be non-biunivocal. How ever, by de nition, a canonical stochastic process is also a path space.

The measure $_{\rm B}$ is dened by

$$_{B}() \coloneqq \mathbf{\dot{r}} [\mathbf{z}_{t}()] (t) \mathbf{\ddot{l}}^{2}; \tag{4}$$

where E() is the spatial projector onto 2 B. Due to the equivariance property of Bohm ian mechanics, the above de nition does not depend on the time. The single-time distribution of Bohm ian mechanics is

$$_{\rm B}[(t;)] = j_{\rm E}() (t) j_{\rm I}^{2}$$
: (5)

Bohm ian mechanics is determ inistic.

The Everett-Belluniverse.

The set is M^T, and the measure $_{\rm E}$ is dened by the nite dimensional distributions

$$_{E}(S_{1} \setminus ::: \setminus S_{n}) \coloneqq \textcircled{I}(1)(t_{1}) \ddagger ::: \cancel{I}(n)(t_{n}) \ddagger;$$
(6)

where the assumption is made that $t_i \in t_j$ for $i \in j$. This universe was introduced, although in a less form alway, by Bell [2, 3], as a version of the relative state form ulation of quantum mechanics by Everett. This universe is very unphysical, because it has no dynamics, i.e. no law connecting con gurations at di erent times, and it de nes no physical trajectory.

The impossible quantum path space. One could try to de ne the following \quantum " nite dimensional distributions:

$$Q(S_1 \setminus ::: \setminus S_n) \coloneqq \mathbf{f}_{E}(n) U(\mathbf{t}_n = \mathbf{t}_{E_1}) E(n_1) ::: E(1) U(\mathbf{t}_1) \circ \mathbf{f}_{F}$$
(7)

where the assumption is made that $t_1 \\ t_2 \\ \vdots \\ t_i$. This de nition derives from the Born rule and from the reduction postulate, according to which it corresponds to the quantum mechanical probability to nd the trajectory in the regions i at the times t_i , for $i = 1; \ldots; n$. The problem is that this expression is not additive, i.e.

$$\begin{array}{c} {}_{Q} \left(S_{1} \setminus ::: \setminus (t_{i}; i [\stackrel{0}{i}) \setminus ::: \setminus S_{n} \right) \notin \\ {}_{Q} \left(S_{1} \setminus ::: \setminus (t_{i}; i) \setminus ::: \setminus S_{n} \right) + {}_{Q} \left(S_{1} \setminus ::: \setminus (t_{i}; \stackrel{0}{i}) \setminus ::: \setminus S_{n} \right); \end{array}$$

and thus it cannot be a consistent class of nite dimensional distributions. This is the paradoxical aspect of the superposition principle of quantum mechanics, which prevents an open quantum systems from being represented by a path space (or by a stochastic process). As we will see, the situation changes when the system is the universe.

3 Paths spaces and explanation

In this section we study the way in which a path space representing the universe can explain the observed phenom ena. As an example, let us consider set the case in which the path space represents an ensemble of open systems, such as particles in a liquid subjected to B rownian motion. In this case, a natural assumption is that all and only the possible measurements which can be performed on the systems are nite sequences of position measurements at dierent times, in such a way that any one of these measurements corresponds to a cylinder set. A ssume that the experimenter performs the same measurement on all the systems of the ensemble. Then the path space explains the relative frequency of the \yes" outcomes of the measurements if such a frequency is approximately equal to the probability measure of the cylinder set corresponding to the measurements. Therefore, in this kind of explanation, the nite dimensional distributions are utilized, while the exact structure of the paths is not relevant.

This form of explanation is no longer valid when the path space represents the universe, for two reasons: (1) the universe is a closed system, and the observers are inside it; as we will see, the consequence is that the assumption that all and only the admissible measurements are position measurements at di erent times is no longer valid. (2) There is just one universe, therefore we cannot speak of relative frequency of the outcomes.

Thus a new form of explanation must be developed, and this will be the subject of this section. In this study, and in the rest of the paper, the universe will be considered as an idealized non-relativistic universe composed of N distinguishable spinless particles.

3.1 The Everett-Bell universe

O ur study starts with a discussion on the Everett-Bell universe. In spite of its very unphysical features, Bell claim s that {at least from the form alpoint of view { such a m odel of universe can explain the observed phenom ena. The problem of course is the follow ing: how can the Everett-Bell universe explain our perception of a de nite past evolution if it does not de ne trajectories, i.e. if it does not provide any kind of correlation am ong the positions of the particles at di erent times? The Bell's answer is that \we have no access to the past, but only to m em ories, and these m em ories are just part of the instantaneous con guration of the world" [2]. In other words, we have m em ories, i.e. inform ation about the position of the particles in the past, only because such inform ation are encoded in som e way in the present con guration of our recording devices, possibly including the neurons of our brain. Thus our m em ories do not derive from the actual past evolution of the particles, but just from their present con guration. W e think that such a position is very questionable, but it is useful for the tim e being to m ake this assumption, and to study the form of explanation deriving from it.

A coording to the above assumption, for every $x \ge M$ it is possible to decide if this represents a correct con guration or not, i.e. if in x are encoded the memories of a quasiclassical past evolution and the correct results for all the past statistical experiments. For example, let us suppose that a suitable con guration x includes a laboratory in which a two-slit experiment has been performed, as resulting from the con guration of the laboratory which includes a video recording of the experiment; suppose moreover that, according to x, the image of the particles on the photographic plate of the screen does not correspond to the expected distribution with the interference fringes; than x is not a correct con guration.

Let M denote the subset of M composed of all the correct con gurations. Then one can claim that the path space explains the observed phenom ena of the universe if

where the over-bar denotes the complement. In order to better justify such a claim, consider a generic set of times $ft_1; :::; t_n g$, and the n corresponding random variables $X_i() \coloneqq [(t_i)]$, where is the characteristic function of the set . We have $E(X_i) = 1$ and ${}^2(X_i)$. Consider also the random variable $X \coloneqq \frac{1}{n}^P_i X_i$. By using the formula for the variance of a sum and the Schwarz inequality, it is easy to check that

$$E(Y_n) = 1 \quad \text{and}^2(Y_n) :$$
 (9)

Since (9) holds for any set ft_1 ;:::; t_ng , one can deduce that the overwhelm ing majority of the trajectories spend the overwhelm ing majority of the time inside the set \cdot .

As to the explanation of statistical experiments, we can also consider the following reasoning. A statistical experiment consists of a long sequence of identical elementary experiments, such as the toss of a coin or the passage of a quantum particle through a screen with two slits. Let us consider a speci c statistical experiment, i.e. an experiment perform ed in a speci c place at a speci c time; the experiment ends at the time t. The experimental setup must include a recording device which registers the outcomes of the elementary measurements (in the two slit experiment this device is simply a photographic plate behind the screen). Let M be the set of the con gurations representing a universe at the time t in which that experiment has been performed. The set includes the con qurations corresponding to all the possible results for the elementary measurements. For instance, in the case of the coin tosses it also includes the sequence with all heads, and in the case of the two slit experiment it includes all possible distributions of the particles on the photographic plate. Let 0 be the set of the con qurations corresponding to the correct results, i.e. an equal distribution for heads and tails in the coin toss experiment, and the interference fringes in the two slit experiment. Again we can claim that the path space explains these results if

$$\frac{[(n^{0};t)]}{[(;t)]} = 1:$$
(10)

The explanations expressed by conditions (8) and (10) are based on the fact that the correct results are typical, i.e. they are the overwhelm ing majority of the possible results. See for instance [12] for a discussion of the validity of such a explanation. This explanation is analogous to the one given for the second law of therm odynamics [12] and for the quantum equilibrium hypothesis [8].

One can see that only a small part of the structure of a path space is involved in this explanation. Namely, what is needed is just the information that two sets and

 $^{\circ}$ satisfy (10) (note that (8) represent a particular case of (10)). This means that only

the single-time distribution of the path space is relevant, being how ever redundant, while the correlations at dierent times given by the nite dimensional distributions are totally irrelevant. The structure of the paths is of course also irrelevant.

This is the reason why, according to this approach, the Bell-Everett universe has enough structure to explain the observed phenomena. Bell, after explaining why this model of the universe can work, claims that it cannot be taken seriously [3]. H is opposition is however on the philosophical level rather than on the logical one; at the same time, we argue that there is also a logical reason to reject it. The reason is that it is im possible for a universe without any dynamics to allow us to have memories, because the m em ories encoded in the present con guration cannot be decoded without m aking use of a dynam ical law, i.e. of a law correlating con gurations at di erent times. For instance, if we have a Im reproducing the fall of a stone, in order to extract the true trajectory of the stone from the lm we must make a number of dynam ical assumptions: we must assume that light rays travel along straight lines, we must know the laws of refraction to understand the behaviour of light inside the lens of the camera, and so on. If the Bell approach were correct, dynamics could be deduced from only a knowledge of the set; for instance, New ton's second law could be extracted from the Everett-Bell universe. Bell does not provide any m ethod to do this, and we argue that such a m ethod does not exist. On the contrary, we propose that a dynam ics does exist, and that memories depend on it. The study of memories and of their dependence on dynamics will be the subject of the next subsection.

3.2 Memory and know ledge

A very natural requirement for memories is that they correspond to what actually happened (of course this is not the case for the Everett-Bell universe). In order to express such a requirement in a mathematical form, let us suppose that a subset $_2$ M represents the know ledge that an observer has about the conguration of the universe at a time t_2 . Than the observer can remember that at a time $t_1 < t_2$ the conguration of the universe was in a suitable set $_1$ M only if

$$\frac{(S_2 n S_1)}{(S_2)} = 1;$$
(11)

where, as usual, $S_i = (t_i; i)$. Indeed, suppose that (11) does not hold. This means that a non-in nitesimal part of the trajectories of S_2 does not come from S_1 . Therefore the observer at the time t_2 cannot remember that at the time t_1 the con guration of the universe was in $_1$ because there is a non-negligible probability that this fact never happened. Thus condition (11) corresponds to the requirement that only what (alm ost) surely happened can be remembered.

A n im m ediate consequence of this reasoning is that observers cannot m easure" generic cylinder sets. For instance, an observer can m easure the cylinder set $S_1 \setminus S_2$, with $t_1 < t_2$, only if (11) is satistical. Indeed such a m easurement requires that the observer knows that at the time t_2 the conguration of the universe belongs to t_2 , and that he remembers that

at the time t_1 the conguration belonged to $_1$; this requirement implies the condition (11). This conclusion is very important, and it implies that most of the structure of the probability measure is unobservable.

As to know ledge, a natural requirem ent is that what can be known is only what can be remem bered for a suitable am ount of time. We are thus led to the notion of branch. Let us represent the know ledge, evolving with time, that an observer has about the con guration of the universe as a mapping h: I! B, where I is a time interval, and B is the -algebra of the measurable subsets of M. A coording to the previous requirements for memories and know ledge, h must satisfy the following condition:

$$\frac{[\text{H}(t_2)\text{ n H}(t_1)]}{[\text{H}(t_2)]} \qquad 1 \text{ for } t_{\underline{z}} = t_{\underline{z}} + t_{\underline{z}}$$
(12)

where H (t) is the s-set (t; h(t)), and t is a suitable non-in nitesimal amount of time. Condition (12) guarantees that for any t2 I, the know ledge h(t) can be remembered at least for a time t. A map h satisfying (12) will be referred to as a branch². One can say that branches represent the observable evolutions of the universe.

In order to simplify the mathematical formulation of the theory, hereafter we will assume R^+ as the time interval I, and t = 1; the last equality express the assumption that know ledge must be remembered forever. W ith a reasoning analogous to that of the previous section, if h is a branch, one can prove that for every t the overwhelm ing majority of the paths belonging to H (t) spent the overwhelm ing majority of the time interval [0;t] inside the set $s_{2,0,tl}^{T}H$ (s).

3.3 Path spaces and explanation: conclusion

In conclusion, a path space representing the universe explains the observed phenom ena by de ning: (1) the typical con gurations at a xed time relative to a subset of the con guration space, which explain the results of statistical experiments; (2) the branches, which explain the macroscopic evolution.

As shown by conditions (10) and (12), both these notions are de ned by m eans of the set function

$$r (S_1 \not S_2) \coloneqq \frac{(S_2 n S_1)}{(S_2)}$$
: (13)

This set function is only used in the typicality regime, i.e. when $r(S_1 \not S_2) = 1$, to de ne relative typicality. This means that $r(S_1 \not S_2) = 1$ implies that S_1 is typical relative to S_2 , i.e. the overwhelm ing majority of the paths of S_2 also belong to S_1 . For $t_1 = t_2$, r de nes the typical congurations of a subset of the conguration space, while for $t_1 < t_2$ it constitutes the dening condition for branches. The set function r will be referred to as the probabilistic relative typicality function.

 $^{^{2}}$ T his term is used here analogously to the quantum case, in which it is appropriate due to the tree structure of the universal wave function.

Thus the only structure of a path space which is utilized in the explanation of the observed phenom ena of the universe is the set function r in the typicality regime, while the detailed structure of the probability measure and, of course, the structure of the paths, are empirically irrelevant.

4 Quantum Typicality Theory

In section 2 we saw that the quantum form alism cannot de ne a probability measure on a set of paths. However, according to the results of the previous section, what we need in order to explain the observer phenom ena is just the relative typicality function for s-sets. In this section we will show that the quantum form alism can provide such a function, without the need of an underlying probability measure. To our know ledge, a de nition of typicality not based on a probability measure has never been explicitly proposed before in the literature, even if the possible independence of the two notions, probability and typicality, has been pointed out in [12].

4.1 Probabilistic typicality functions

The state is to study typicality more exactly in the probabilistic case. Let (;F;) be a probability space. We have already seen the relative typicality function

$$r (A \not B) \coloneqq \frac{(B n A)}{(B)}; A; B 2 F; \qquad (14)$$

with the meaning r $(A \not B)$ 1 implies that A is typical relative to B, that is the overwhelming majority of the elements of B also belong to A. It is useful to introduce two other typicality functions:

$$a(A) := (\overline{A}); \tag{15}$$

$$m (A;B) \coloneqq \frac{(A 4 B)}{m \operatorname{axf} (A); (B)g}:$$
(16)

The rst one is the absolute typicality function, with the meaning a (A) 1 implies that A is typical relative to ; the second one is the mutual typicality function, with the meaning m (A;B) 1 implies that A and B are mutually typical, i.e. A is typical relative to B and vice-versa. The normalization factor of m has been chosen from the following possibilities:

$$N_1 = m \operatorname{axf}(A); (B)g; N_2 = [(A) + (B)]=2; N_3 = m \operatorname{inf}(A); (B)g:$$
 (17)

It is easy to show that, by de ning $m^{i} = (A 4 B) = N_{i}$, we have

$$m^{1} m^{2} m^{3} \frac{m^{1}}{1 m^{1}} 2m^{1} \text{ for } m^{1} 0.5:$$
 (18)

The inequality $m^3 m^1 = (1 m^1)$ derives from the inequality (A 4 B) N₁ N₃. Thus the three set functions m^i are equivalent in the typicality regime, i.e. m^i (A;B) 1, m^j (A;B) 1 for any i; j. The normalization factor N₁ = maxf (A); (B)g has been chosen because, in this way, a and r can be expressed in term sofm . We have in fact:

$$a(A) = m(;A);$$
 (19)

$$r (A_{B}) = m (A \setminus B_{B}):$$
 (20)

Note that the inequalities

m (A;B) r (A;B) + r (B;A)
$$\frac{m (A;B)}{1 m (A;B)}$$
 (21)

guarantee the implication r (B_{A}) ; r (B_{A}) 1, m (A_{B}) 1, which must hold for obvious reasons.

A last interesting set function is the following:

$$(A;B) \coloneqq \frac{2(A \setminus B)}{(A) + (B)} = 1 \frac{(A + B)}{(A) + (B)}$$
: (22)

We have that 0 (A;B) 1; (A;B) = 0 i (A \ B) = 0; (A;B) = 1 i (A 4 B) = 0; (A;B) 1, m (A;B) 1. Since these properties resemble those of a probability measure, the set function will be referred to as the probabilistic mutual typicality measure.

4.2 The origin of quantum typicality

The quantum formalism allows us to de ne the single-time distribution of a stochastic process, namely $_{Q}[(t;)] := jE()(t)jj^{2}$, but, apparently, it does not provide any correlation between di erent times sets, because the nite dimensional distributions (7) are not additive. However we argue that there is a kind of correlation between two di erent times sets which can be extracted from the quantum formalism, even if it is not as detailed as the nite dimensional distributions. This correlation is expressed in terms of mutual typicality, and it can be mathematically represented by means of a mutual typicality function analogous to (16), but deriving from the quantum formalism.

The origin of such a correlation is based on a very natural assumption. Suppose that the wave function of a particle is the sum of two non-overlapping wave packets. The assumption is that, during the time in which the wave packets are non-overlapping, the particle stays inside the support of one of the two wave packets, without jumping to the other.

Let and $_{?} \coloneqq (t_{1})$ be the two wave packets at a time t_{1} , where (t) is the wave function of the particle. At a time $t_{2} > t_{2}$ the two wave packets will be $(t_{2}) \coloneqq U(t_{2} t_{1})$ and $_{?}(t_{2}) \coloneqq U(t_{2} t_{1})_{?}$, where U(t) is the unitary time evolution operator. The requirement that the two wave packets are non-overlapping at the times t_{1} and t_{2} in plies that there exist two subsets $_{1}$ and $_{2}$ of the conguration space of the particle such that

$$E(_1)(t_1) \text{ and } U(t_2 t_2) = E(_2)(t_2);$$
 (23)

where E () is the projection-valued measure on the conguration space of the particle. The sets $_1$ and $_2$ can be considered as the supports of and U (t_2 t₂) respectively. The conditions (23) can be combined to give the condition

$$U(t_2 \ t_1)E(1)(t_1)E(2)(t_2)$$
: (24)

This reasoning can also be reversed: given two subsets $_1$ and $_2$ satisfying condition (24), the wave packet $= E(_1)(t_1)$ satisfies the conditions of (23).

Therefore the condition $jE(_2)(t_2) \cup (t_2) \cup (t_2) \subseteq (t_1)(t_1)j = 0$, properly norm alized, in plies that a trajectory belonging to $(t_1;_1)$ also belongs (almost certainly) to $(t_2;_2)$, and vice-versa, i.e. that the two s-sets $(t_1;_1)$ and $(t_2;_2)$ are mutually typical. This result will be form alized in the next subsections.

4.3 Quantum typicality functions

Consider the space (M^T;S), and assume as usual that a norm alized universal wave function (t) = U (t) $_0$ is given. In order to simplify the notation, given S = (t;) 2 S, let S $_0$ denote the state U^Y(t)E ()U (t) $_0$.

Let us de ne the quantum mutual typicality function as

$$m (S_1; S_2) \coloneqq \frac{j S_1 \circ S_2 \circ j j}{m \arg j S_1 \circ j j}; j S_2 \circ j j g$$
(25)

An explicit expression for (25) is

$$m (S_1; S_2) = \frac{\underline{jE}(2)}{\max \underline{jE}(1)} U(\underline{t}_2) U(\underline{t}_2) \underline{E}(1) (\underline{t}_1) \underline{jf}; \underline{jE}(2) (\underline{t}_2) \underline{jfg};$$
(26)

another possibility being the same expression with 1 and 2 interchanged. Thus we see that the de nition (25) corresponds to the typicality function introduced in the previous subsection. Note that m is de ned on S S and not on (S) (S), as in the probabilistic case. Here too the chosen norm alization factor is maxfj β_1 of β_2 of β_2 . Other possible norm alization factors are de ned analogously to the probabilistic case, and the inequalities (18) become

$$m^{1} m^{2} m^{3} - \frac{m^{1}}{q m^{1}} 2 2m^{1} \text{ for } m^{1} 0.08;$$
 (27)

in such a way that, also in the quantum case, the di erent norm alization factors are equivalent in the typicality regime.

For two equal times sets $S_1 = (t; 1)$ and $S_2 = (t; 2)$, the function m becomes

m
$$(S_1;S_2) = \frac{jE(_14_2)(t)j^2}{m \arg jE(_1)(t)j^2; jE(_2)(t)j^2g};$$
 (28)

which is the probabilistic mutual typicality function deriving from the probability measure jE() (t) 2j.

In order to interpret (25) as a function de ning typicality, one must postulate the following

Quantum Typicality Rule:

m
$$(S_1; S_2)$$
 1) S_1 and S_2 are mutually typical: (29)

There is a strong analogy between this rule and the Born rule, as we will see better at the end of this section. The main consequence of the quantum typicality rule is that the typical trajectories of the universe follow the branches of the universal wave function, as we will see in section 4.6. Another way to look at this rule is related to inform ation: if $M(S_1;S_2)$ 1, the inform ation that the trajectory of the universe was inside 1 at the time t_1 is not lost at the time t_2 .

By analogy with equation (19), we de ne the quantum absolute typicality function as:

Note that (30) is equal to the probabilistic absolute typicality function deriving from the probability measure jE() (t)²j.

As to the quantum relative typicality function $r(S_1 \not S_2) := m(S_1 \setminus S_2; S_2)$, since $S_1 \setminus S_2 \ge S$ only if S_1 and S_2 are equal time s-sets, it is defined only in that case. Thus, given $S_1 = (t; 1)$ and $S_2 = (t; 2)$ we have:

$$r (S_{1} j S_{2}) \coloneqq m (S_{1} \setminus S_{2}; S_{2}) = \frac{j j (t; 1 \setminus 2) \circ S_{2} \circ j j}{j S_{2} \circ j j} = \frac{j E (2n 1) (t) j j^{2}}{j E (2) (t) j j^{2}} : (31)$$

Again, for equal time s-sets, r is equal to the probabilistic relative typicality function deriving from jE() (t)²j.

Even if the quantum form alism does not allow directly de ning r $(S_1 \not S_2)$ when $t_1 \in t_2$, it is possible to provide an indirect de nition for such a function. Consider the lower bound

$$\inf_{2B} j \mathcal{B}_{1 \ 0} \quad (\mathbf{t};) \quad _{0} j j = \inf_{2B} j \mathcal{E} () \ (\mathbf{t}_{2}) \quad U \ (\mathbf{t}_{5} \ \mathbf{t}_{2}) \mathcal{E} (\ _{1}) \ (\mathbf{t}_{1}) j j; \qquad (32)$$

It is a m in im um , and the natural set \sim corresponding to the m in im um is

~= fx 2 M :
$$jxj(t_2)if < 2Reh(t_2)jxihxjU(t_2 t_2)E(1)j(t_1)ig:$$
 (33)

This can be seen by inserting the identity $I = {R \atop r}$ jxidxhx j into the scalar products. Thus we can de ner $(S_1 j_2)$ as:

$$r (S_1 J_2) := m axfm [S_2 \setminus (t_2; \gamma); S_2];m [S_1; (t_2; \gamma)]g:$$
 (34)

If $r (S_1 \not S_2)$ 1, both functions in the right hand member of (34) are 1. Thus, according to the rst term, the overwhelm ing majority of the trajectories of S_2 belong to

 $(t_2; \gamma)$, and according to the second term the overwhelm ing majority of the trajectories of $(t_2; \gamma)$ belong to S₁. As a consequence, S₁ is typical relative to S₂. Note however that this function may fail to work when $jS_2_0 jj$ is too small, that is when $jS_2_0 jj$, $jS_{1,0}$ ($t_2; \gamma)_0 jj$.

The quantum mutual typicality measure is de ned analogously to (22):

$$(S_{1};S_{2}) \coloneqq \frac{2\Re eh_{0} \Re_{1}S_{2} j_{0} i j}{j \Re_{1} \ 0 j j + j \Re_{2} \ 0 j j} = 1 \quad \frac{j \Re_{1} \ 0 \ S_{2} \ 0 j j}{j \Re_{1} \ 0 j j + j \Re_{2} \ 0 j j} :$$
(35)

We have: 0 $(S_1;S_2)$ 1; $(S_1;S_2) = 0 i \text{ Reh } {}_0 f_1 S_2 j_0 i = 0$; $(S_1;S_2) = 1 i S_1 0 = S_2 0$; $(S_1;S_2)$ 1, m $(S_1;S_2)$ 1.

W ith respect to typicality, the quantum typicality rule plays the same conceptual role that the Born rule plays with respect to probability. A ctually, the quantum typicality rule is the extension to unequaltime sets of the Born rule in the typicality regime. Indeed, for equal time sets, all the quantum typicality functions, namely (28), (30), (31), have the same form and the same meaning of the corresponding probabilistic typicality functions obtained from the Born rule, i.e. assuming that jE() (t) 2j is a probability measure. On the contrary the Born rule has nothing to say about the mutual typicality of non equal time sets. A ctually, one could try to de nemutual typicality by means of an expression of the type:

$$m (S_1; S_2) \coloneqq \frac{\text{if}(\ _2) \cup (t_2 \ _{\xi}) \ge (\ _1) \ (t_1) \text{if}}{\text{if}(\ _1) \ (t_1) \text{if}} + \frac{\text{if}(\ _1) \cup (t_1 \ _{\xi}) \ge (\ _2) \ (t_2) \text{if}}{\text{if}(\ _2) \ (t_2) \text{if}}: (36)$$

A coording to the Born rule, if t_2 t_1 , the rst term is the probability that a trajectory belonging to $_1$ at the time t_1 belongs to $_2$ at the time t_2 . By assuming a sort of reverse Born rule, the same meaning (with 1 and 2 interchanged) can be given to the second term. However, this de nition is surely less natural and more complex than de nition (25).

O ne last remark about the denition of the quantum typicality function \underline{m} : Due to the vagueness of the notion of typicality, the set function M $(S_1;S_2) \coloneqq m (S_1;S_2)$ could also be a possible denition for the mutual typicality function. The denition m has the advantage that, for equal times sets, it reduces to the typicality function deriving from the Born rule. On the other hand, the denition M has the advantage that the proof of some consistency conditions is more simple, due to the fact that $jS_1 \ S_2 \ 0 \ jj$ is a distance. Further studies may suggest adopting M instead of m as the denition of the quantum mutual typicality function.

4.4 Typicality function and non-overlapping wave packets

In this subsection we study the connection between the quantum mutual typicality function and the non-overlapping property of the wave packets. Due to the spreading of the wave packets, such a property must be considered in an approximate way; appropriate mathematical tools will be developed to this purpose. Given a state $2 L^2 (M)$, we say that 2 B is a support for if

The overlapping degree of two states $_1; _2$ 2 $\rm L^2\,(M$) can be expressed by the following overlapping measure:

$$w(_{1};_{2}) \coloneqq \inf_{2B} \frac{\text{jE}(\overline{)}_{1} \text{jf} + \text{jE}()_{2} \text{jf}}{\min f \text{j}_{1} \text{jf}; \text{j}_{2} \text{jf}g} = \frac{\operatorname{R} \min f \text{j}_{1}(x) \text{j}_{1}; \text{j}_{2}(x) \text{j}_{3} \text{d}x}{\min f \text{j}_{1} \text{jf}; \text{j}_{2} \text{jf}g} : \qquad (38)$$

N ote that

We have 0 w(1; 2) 1; w(1; 2) = 0 i 1(x) 2(x) = 0 alm ost everywhere, and w(1; 2) = 1 i j (x) j (x) j j (x) j j (x) j alm ost everywhere. The expression of the lower bound (38) assumes its minimum value for the set

$$\stackrel{\sim}{:=} fx 2 M : j_1(x) j > j_2(x) j;$$
(39)

If w $(_1;_2)$ 1 than $_1$ and $_2$ adm it disjoined supports, and therefore we say that they are non-overlapping.

Let us study now the wave packets of the universal wave function. G iven an s-sets $S_1 = (t_1; 1)$, with $j\beta_1 0 j^2 = 1=2$, let us consider the states $U(t_2)S_1 0 = U(t_2 t_2)E(1)$ (t_1) and $U(t_2)S_1 0 = (t_2) U(t_2)S_1 0$. The overlapping measure of the two states is:

$$w [U (t_2)S_1 _0; U (t_2)S_1 _0] = \frac{\inf f_2 j S_1 _0 S_2 _0 j j}{j S_1 _0 j j} = \frac{j S_1 _0 (t_2; \sim_2) _0 j j}{j S_1 _0 j j};$$
(40)

where $S_2 = (t_2; t_2)$, and

$$\sim_2 \coloneqq fx \ 2 \ M \quad : jxj(t_2)ij < 2Reh(t_2)jxihxjU(t_2)S_1j_0ig:$$
(41)

From (40) we obtain the following inequalities:

$$\inf_{2} (S_{1};S_{2}) \quad w [U(t_{2})S_{1}] (t_{2})S_{1}] \inf_{2} (S_{1};S_{2}); \quad (42)$$

where

$$m^{3}(S_{1};S_{2}) \coloneqq \frac{j\beta_{1} \circ S_{2} \circ jj}{m \inf j\beta_{1} \circ jj}; j\beta_{2} \circ jjg$$

M oreover, we have

$$\frac{jj (t_2) S_1 \circ E(2) U(t_2) S_1 \circ jj}{j S_1 \circ jj} m^3 (S_1; S_2):$$
(43)

Since m^3 (S₁;S₂) 1, m (S₁;S₂) 1 (inequalities (27)), from the inequalities (42) and (43) we obtain the implications

$$w (U (t_2)S_1 _0; U (t_2)S_1 _0) 1, \inf_2 (S_1; S_2) 1;$$
(44)

m
$$(S_1;S_2)$$
 1) ₂ is a support of U $(t_2)S_1$ ₀; (45)

which express the relationship between the typicality function and the overlapping of the wave packets. In words, the rst implication states that if there exists $_2$ such that m (S₁;S₂) 1, than the two wave packets U (t₂)S_{1 0} and U (t₂)S_{1 0} are non-overlapping, and vice-versa.

4.5 A sym ptotic extension

It is possible to extend the quantum typicality rule and the related form alism to the lim it $t=\,1\,$.

G iven a trajectory 2 M^{T} , the lim it

$$v^{+}() \coloneqq \lim_{t! \to 1} \frac{(t)}{t};$$
 (46)

if this exists, is referred to as the asymptotic velocity of . For instance, under very general assumptions for the H am iltonian, one can prove that the trajectories of a classical system adm it an asymptotic velocity [7], p. 245. Let M^T denote the subset of M^T composed of the trajectories adm itting the asymptotic velocity. Given $v = R^{3N}$, let us denote the asymptotic s-set (1; v) as

$$(1; v) = f 2 M^{T} : v^{+}() 2 vg:$$
 (47)

Let A denote the class of asymptotic s-sets, and let $C \coloneqq S$ [A. We replace the space $(M^T;S)$ utilized in the previous section with the space $(M^T;C)$. With this replacement we assume that the admissible trajectories of the universe must have a well de ned asymptotic velocity.

As to the quantum form alism , under very general assumption for the quantum H am iltonian H , the lim its

$$V_{i}^{+} \coloneqq s \quad \lim_{t! \to 1} V_{i}^{t} \coloneqq s \quad \lim_{t! \to 1} \frac{U^{\vee}(t)Q_{i}U(t)}{t}; \text{ for } i = 1; \dots; 3N$$
(48)

do exist, where Q_i are the position operators for the particles. The operators $fV_i^+ g$ are referred to as the asymptotic velocity operators, and they commute with each others and with the Ham iltonian [7], p. 299.

Let us study the lim it (48). For a single particle whose H am iltonian adm its the wave operator $_+$, we have [7], p. 166:

$$V^{+} = + \frac{P}{m} + ;$$
 (49)

C onsider how ever that the asymptotic velocity operators exist even if the wave operator does not exist. For a free particle we have V $^+$ = P =m .

Let E_x , F_v^t and F_v^+ denote the spectral fam ilies of Q, V^t and V⁺ respectively, and E (), F^t() and F() their spectral measures (for sim plicity, the coordinate particle indices i are om itted here). From the equalities

$${}^{Z} vdF_{v}^{t} = {}^{Z} \frac{x}{t} U^{y}(t) dE_{x} U(t) = {}^{Z} vU^{y}(t) dE_{vt} U(t);$$
(50)

we obtain $F_v^t = U^y(t)E_{vt}U(t)$, and $F^t(v_v) = U^y(t)E(t_v)U(t)$, where $t_v = fvt 2 M$: v 2 vg. From the theory of convergence of the self-adjoint operators [16], if v_v does not belong to the pure point spectrum of V^+ , one obtains

$$s \lim_{t! \to 1} U^{y}(t)E(t_{v})U(t) = s \lim_{t! \to 1} F^{t}(v_{v}) = F^{+}(v_{v}):$$
(51)

W e can extend the quantum formalism of the previous subsections to $(M^T;C)$. Given C 2 C, let us de ne

$$C_{0} := \begin{array}{c} U^{y}(t)E()U(t) & _{0} & \text{for } C = (t;) 2 S; \\ F^{+}(v) & _{0} & \text{for } C = (1; v) 2 A: \end{array}$$
(52)

In this way, all the quantum typicality functions and the quantum typicality rule can be extended to $(M^T;C)$. For instance, given S 2 S and A = (1; v) 2 A, ifm (S;A) 1 then the overwhelm ing majority of the trajectories belonging to S have an asymptotic velocity belonging to v, and vice versa.

The results obtained in subsection 4.4 relative to the wave packet U (t)S₁ ₀ also hold for a wave packet of the type U (t)C ₀, where C 2 C, and always with jjC ₀ jf 1=2. Moreover, it is possible to calculate the lim it w [U (t)C ₀; U (t)C ₀] for t ! +1. Let us consider indeed the lower bound inf $_{v}$ jjC ₀ F^{+} ($_{v}$) ₀ jj. The minimum value is reached for the set

$$\sim_{v} \coloneqq \text{fv } 2 \text{ R}^{3N} : \overset{X}{\text{jv; }} v j_{0} i j^{2} < \overset{X}{\text{2Reh }} 2 \text{Reh } j_{v}; v i h v; v j C j_{0} i g;$$
(53)

where fj $_v$; vig is a complete set of generalized eigenvectors of the asymptotic velocities ($_v$ being the quantum numbers resolving the possible degeneracy of the eigenvalue v). We have

 $\lim_{t \to +1} \inf j C_{0} \quad (t;)_{0} j j = j C_{0} \quad F^{+} (\sim_{v})_{0} j j;$ (54)

Indeed inf jc_0 (t;) $_0jj = inf_v jc_0$ $F^t(v)_0 jj$, and

$$\inf_{v} j c_{0} F^{t}(v) _{0} j j c_{0} F^{t}(^{v}v) _{0} j j$$

$$\inf_{v} j F^{t}(v) _{0} F^{t}(^{v}v) _{0} j j j F^{t}(^{v}v) _{0} F^{t}(^{v}v) _{0} j j! 0 \text{ for t ! 1 : }$$

Thus

$$\lim_{t! + 1} w [U (t)C_{0}; U (t)C_{0}] = \frac{jC_{0} F^{+} (\sim_{v})_{0} jj^{2}}{jjC_{0} jj^{2}};$$
(55)

and the equation (42) is valid also at the time $t_2 = +1$. In this case the set S_2 becomes an asymptotic s-set.

4.6 Subtrees and branches

In this section the mathematical de nitions of subtrees and branches as non-overlapping parts of the universal wave function are given.

Branches are present, in a more or less explicit manner, in many formulations of quantum mechanics, namely Bohm ian mechanics, the Many Worlds Interpretation [11, 10], the Consistent H istories formulation of quantum mechanics [13] and the theory of decoherence [18]. The de nition of branches as non-overlapping parts of the universal wave function is present mainly in the works connected with Bohm ian mechanics, for instance [5, 17, 15, 6]. A coording to these authors, during its evolution the universal wave function splits into permanently non-overlapping wave packets, for instance in the presence of a measurement. This process is also called the elective collapse of the wave function. Here a schematic description of the process.

Let us suppose that during the time interval $(t_1; t_2)$ a measurem ent with two possible outcom es is perform ed on a quantum system . At the tim e t_1 the wave function of the universe is of the form $(t_1) = ('_+ + '_-)_0$ $_{\rm E}$ (t₁), where ' are eigestates of the quantum system corresponding to the measured observable, $_{0}$ is the state of the m easuring device before the m easurem ent, and $_{\rm E}$ (t₁) is the state of the environm ent, ie. of the rest of the universe. At the time t₂, when the measurem ent has been just perform ed, the universal wave function is of the form $(t_2) = ('_+)$ + + **′**) $_{\rm E}$ (t₂), are the states of the measuring device which has recorded the rewhere + and sults + and represent the instrum ent with a pointer respectively. Since + and in two macroscopically distinct positions, they are non-overlapping. The measuring device unavoidably interacts with the environment; thus, at a subsequent time t_3 , we have $(t_3) = '_+$ $_{E}^{+}$ (t₃) + ' $_{\rm E}$ (t₃), where $_{\rm E}^+$ (t₃) and $_{\rm E}$ (t₃) are the states of + the environment which have interacted with $_+$ and respectively. It is easy to accept that $\frac{1}{E}$ (t₂) and $\frac{1}{E}$ (t₂) are perm anently non-overlapping: rem ember that it is su cient that a single particle has two different positions in $\frac{+}{E}$ (t₂) and $\frac{+}{E}$ (t₂) in order to guarantee that the two states are non-overlapping. Of course, the splitting of the universal wave function in perm anently non-overlapping wave packets m ay occur in m any other di erent situations, non only during a measurem ent.

This is the usual sem i-qualitative description of the branching process of the universal wave function. We propose now an explicit de nition for the branches, which is based on the mathematical formalism developed in the previous sections.

The rst step is to de ne the subtree-supports. We say that an s-set $S_1 = (t_1; _1)$ is a (forward) subtree-support if $jS_1 _0 j^2 = 1=2$, and moreover the states U (t) $S_1 _0 =$

 $U(t \ t_{2})E(t_{1})$ and $U(t)S_{1} = (t) U(t)S_{1} = non-overlapping for t_{2}. In mathematical terms:$

$$w [U (t)S_{1} _{0}; U (t)S_{1} _{0}] = 1 \text{ for } t_{1}t;$$
(56)

where w is the overlapping measure de ned by (38). Given the above de nition of subtreesupport, it is natural to de ne a (forward) subtree as a mapping $k : [t_0;+1) !$ B satisfying the condition

m [K (
$$t_1$$
); K (t_2)] 1 for t_1 $t_2 < 1$; (57)

where K (t) = (t; k(t)) 2 S. A coording to the implications (44) and (45), this condition guarantees that K (t) is a subtree support for every t t_{i} , and that, for t_{i} ; t_{2} t, the set k (t₂) is a support of the state U (t₂ t₁) $E k(t_1)$ (t₁). Moreover, according to the quantum typicality rule, for any $t_1; t_2$ to the overwhelm ing majority of the trajectories of K (t_1) also belong to K (t_2) , and vice-versa. If the de nition of K (t) derived from a mutual typicality measure of probabilistic nature, with a reasoning analogous to that of section 3 one could deduce that for any time t_1 t and for the overwhelm ing majority t, the overwhelming maprity of the trajectories belonging to K (t) of the times to also belong to K (t_2) . A rguably such a conclusion can be extended to the case in which the typicality measure is of a quantum nature, even if this extension would have to be supported by further studies on the interpretation of typicality. The conclusion is that the trajectories of the particles follow approximately the subtrees of the universal wave function.

It is useful to introduce the notion of asymptotic subtree-support: we say that an s-set S_1 is an asymptotic subtree-support if the states U (t) S_1 0 and U (t) S_1 0 are non-overlapping at the time t = +1, that is:

$$\lim_{t! + 1} w [U (t)S_{1 0}; U (t)S_{1 0}] 1:$$
(58)

Therefore the two states may sometimes overlap in the time interval $(t_1; 1)$; however the information that at the time t_1 the trajectory was in $_1$ is not lost, and it can be recovered at least at the time +1. Of course a subtree-support is also an asymptotic subtree-support, but the contrary is not true. Consider for instance a particle in one dimension, whose initial wave function $_0$ is the sum of two non-overlapping G aussian wave packets

, with mean positions j_0 jand mean momenta j_0 j. The two wave packets move in opposite directions, overlap in the neighbourhood of the origin and then move away and become permember overlapping. The s-sets (0; R) are asymptotic subtree-supports but not subtree-supports. This example allow sus to show an important difference between the trajectories defined by the quantum typicality rule and those defined by Bohm ian mechanics. Since Bohm ian trajectories cannot cross each other, in this example Bohm ian trajectories belonging for instance to (0; R) \bounce" and belong to (t; R) for every t. On the other hand, according to the quantum typicality rule, the overwhelm ing majority of the trajectories belonging to (0; R) will belong to (t; R⁺) after a suitable time to.

A nother m eaningful de nition is that of an irreducible subtræ-support. W e say that an s-set S = (t;) is an irreducible subtræ-support if it is an asym ptotic subtræ-support, and m oreover, for any other asym ptotic subtræ-support $S^0 = (t; ^0)$ S, we have

m (S;S⁰) 1 and
$$\frac{L(4^{0})}{\max L(); L(^{0})g}$$
 1; (59)

where $_{\rm L}$ is the Lebesgue measure on M. In words, S does not \properly" contain any asymptotic subtree-support, and its spatial extension is the minimum extension compatible with being an asymptotic subtree-support. The information that the trajectory of the universe is in some proper subset of an irreducible subtree-support is destined to be bst, because after a suitable time there is no longer any spatial measurement which can recover such information. This is the case, for instance, with the two-slit experiment, in which the information of the slit crossed by the particle is de nitively lost when the two wave packets emerging from the slits overlap and hit the screen. If we assume, as in section 3.2, that what can be known is only what can be remembered forever, then for no observer can the know ledge of the position of the trajectory of the universe exceed the know ledge represented by an irreducible subtree-support.

By using the relative typicality function (34) we can de ne branches: a mapping $h : [t_0; +1)!$ B is a branch if jH (t) $_0 jj^2 = 1=2 \text{ for } t \ge [t_0; +1)$, where H (t) := (t; h(t)), and moreover

$$r [H (t_1)] + (t_2) = 1 \text{ for } t_1 + t_2$$
 (60)

Due to the structure of r, every sset H (t) is also a subtree-support. A coording to the meaning of r, the branches have the required property relative to typicality, i.e. t_2 to make that H (t_1) is typical relative to H (t_2).

Two last remarks. The de nitions of subtrees and branches are vague, that is no de nite value for in (57) and (60) is given. Moreover, probably it is possible to give other equivalent de nitions for such entities. However this is not a problem, because subtrees and branches are not structural elements of this form ulation, but rather descriptions of the in uence of the universal wave function on the trajectories. Note that this is not the case in the M any W orlds Interpretation, where the branches, i.e. the worlds, constitute the primitive ontology of that interpretation, and the vagueness of their de nition is surely a problem.

Since the overwhelm ing majority of the trajectories follow the branches of the universal wave function, this formulation of quantum mechanics explains the quasi-classical macroscopic evolution of the universe only if the universal wave function actually has a branch structure, and if the branches have a quasi-classical structure. Here we do not face the problem of proving this, and we lim it ourselves to the argument that the Ehrenfest theorem and M ott's analysis of the cloud chamber [14] should be important tools to obtain more rigorous results in this sense.

4.7 On the consistency of the quantum typicality rule

In order to guarantee that the quantum typicality rule is consistent, the quantum mutual typicality function must releast the structural properties of mutual typicality. For instance, we cannot have m $(S_1;S_2)$; m $(S_1^0;S_2) = 1$ and $S_1 \setminus S_1^0 =$; at the same time. In this subsection we present some inequalities satistical by the quantum typicality function, which guarantee that some natural structural properties of mutual typicality are satistical.

For the mutual quantum typicality function m (in this subsection the subscript will be om itted) we have the following inequalities:

$$m (S_1; S_3) = m^3 (S_1; S_2) + m^3 (S_2; S_3) + 2 m^3 (S_1; S_2) m^3 (S_2; S_3);$$
 (61)

$$m (S_1 \setminus S_1^0; S_2); m (S_1 [S_1^0; S_2) m^3 (S_1; S_2) + m^3 (S_1^0; S_2);$$
 (62)

1 w (S;S⁰)
$$\frac{1}{2}$$
 m³ (S;S⁰); (63)

$$w (S_2; S_2^0) = a m (S_1; S_2) + b m (S_1^0; S_2^0) + cw (S_1; S_1^0);$$
(64)

where: S and S⁰ in (63), and S_i and S_i⁰ i = 1;2;... in (62) and (64) are equal time s-sets;

$$a = \frac{\max fj \beta_1 \quad _0 jj; j\beta_2 \quad _0 jjg j\beta_2^0 \quad _0 jj}{\min fj \beta_2 \quad _0 jj; j\beta_2^0 \quad _0 jjg j\beta_1 \quad _0 jj}; b = \frac{\max fj \beta_1^0 \quad _0 jj; j\beta_2^0 \quad _0 jjg j\beta_1 \quad _0 jj}{\min fj \beta_2 \quad _0 jj; j\beta_2^0 \quad _0 jjg};$$
$$c = \frac{\min fj \beta_1 \quad _0 jj; j\beta_1^0 \quad _0 jjg}{\min fj \beta_2 \quad _0 jj; j\beta_2^0 \quad _0 jjg};$$

w (S;S⁰) is a shorthand notation for w \mathbb{E} () (t); E (⁰) (t)]. Note that

$$w (S; S^{0}) = \frac{jj(S \setminus S^{0})_{0}jj}{m \inf jS_{0}jj; jS^{0}_{0}jjg}:$$

P roof. The inequality (61) derives from the triangle inequality $j\beta_{1} \ _{0} \ S_{3} \ _{0}jj \ j\beta_{1} \ _{0}$ S₂ $\ _{0}jj+j\beta_{2} \ _{0} \ S_{3} \ _{0}jj$. Inequalities (62) derive from the equality

Inequality (63) is straightforward. Inequality (64) is obtained by applying the Schwarz inequality to the right hand m on ber of the equation

$$h_{0}jS_{2}S_{2}^{0}j_{0}i = h_{0}j(S_{2} S_{1})S_{2}^{0} + S_{1}(S_{2}^{0} S_{1}^{0}) + S_{1}S_{1}^{0}j_{0}i;$$

and then slightly manipulating.q.e.d.

From inequalities (61) to (64) we obtain the following implications:

$$m (S_1; S_2); m (S_2; S_3) = 1) m (S_1; S_3) = 1;$$
 (65)

$$m (S_1; S_2); m (S_1^0; S_2) = 1) m (S_1 \setminus S_1^0; S_2); m (S_1 [S_1^0; S_2) = 1;$$
(66)

$$jS_1 \circ jf jB_1^0 \circ jf$$
 and $m(S_1;S_2); m(S_1^0;S_2^0); w(S_1;S_1^0) = 1) w(S_2;S_2^0) = 1;$ (68)

where, given two positive number c_1 and c_2 , with c_1 g we mean here that, if 1, then $(c_1=c_2)$ 1 and $(g=c_1)$ 1 as well. We say that g and c_2 are of the same order. Note that c_1 g implies $c_2=c_1$; $c_1=c_2$ 1.

Implications (65) to (67) can be deduced from inequalities (61) to (63) respectively because $m^3(S_1;S_2) = 1$, $m(S_1;S_2) = 1$ (implication (67) also make use of inequality (61)). Implication (68) derives from inequality (64) due to the fact that a; b; c = 1. Indeed, assume that $m(S_1;S_2)$; $m(S_1^0;S_2^0) = 1$, and consider for instance a. We have:

W e have

$$\begin{matrix} \qquad \frac{\max f j \overline{\mathfrak{f}}_1 \quad _0 j \mathfrak{j} \mathfrak{j}_2 \quad _0 j \mathfrak{j}}{\mathfrak{j} \overline{\mathfrak{f}}_2 \quad _0 \mathfrak{j} \mathfrak{j}} ; \frac{\mathfrak{j} \overline{\mathfrak{f}}_2 \quad _0 \mathfrak{j}}{\mathfrak{j} \overline{\mathfrak{f}}_1 \quad _0 \mathfrak{j}} ; \frac{\mathfrak{j} \overline{\mathfrak{f}}_1^0 \quad _0 \mathfrak{j}}{\mathfrak{j} \overline{\mathfrak{f}}_2 \quad _0 \mathfrak{j}} \quad \frac{1}{1} \\ \end{matrix}$$

Thus a is the product of four numbers which are of the order of unity, and therefore a is also of the same order.

In plication (67) guarantees that the example discussed at the beginning of this subsection is satis ed. In plication (68) guarantees that, if S_1 and S_1^0 are non-overlapping subtree supports, also the supports of their subtrees are non-overlapping fort \ddagger . In fact this result requires an assumption of the type 1) 1, which is not completely satisfactory. This is due to the fact that inequality (64) contains the square root of the typicality function. Hopefully further studies will allow us to nd a better inequality.

It is obvious that the results discussed in this section only partially solve the problem of proving the consistency of the quantum typicality rule, for which a rigorous proof remains an open problem.

5 Discussion and conclusion

We have seen that the explanation of the observed phenomena given by a path space representing the universe (i.e. a set of paths with a probability measure de ned on it) is based on the de nition of: (1) the typical congurations at a xed time relative to a subset of the conguration space, which explain the results of statistical experiments and (2) the branches, which explain the observable structure of the trajectories, i.e. the macroscopic evolution. Both these notions can be derived by a relative typicality function.

We have also seen that the quantum form alism can provide such a typicality function, without the need of an underlying probability measure. As a consequence, in place of a path space (M^{T} ;), a more econom ic model for the universe is the pair (M^{T} ;), where represents the universal wave function, i.e. the initial wave function $_{0}$ plus the unitary time evolution operator U (t) (the possible requirement for the trajectories to have a well de ned asymptotic velocity is ignored in this section). In order to make the model more

palatable, the set M^T could be replaced by the set M^T_c of the continuous functions, even if this replacem ent has no empirical consequence.

It is natural to attribute to M^T and a meaning analogous to that of the elements M^T and of a canonical stochastic process. The presence of M^T endows the model with a de nite ontology, and allow sus to think that the particles of the universe follow de nite trajectories, even if there are theoretical limits to our possibility to know them . These lim its depend on the possibility of recording know ledge. On the other hand, the universal wave function would have to be considered som ething like a probability measure, even if it contains less structure than a probability measure; namely, in place of the detailed nite dim ensional distributions, it provides correlations between two di erent tim e s-sets in term s of mutual typicality. These correlations are expressed by the quantum typicality rule. A nalogously to a canonical stochastic process, the set M^T has no empirical content, ie. any empirical prediction provided by the model can be derived from the only universal wave function. However, removing M^{T} from the model for this reason would not be a good idea, in the same way in which removing M^T from a canonical stochastic process is not a good idea. The presence of M^T gives logical coherence to the model; by removing it one would obtain the M any W orld Interpretation, with its well known conceptual and interpretative problem s.

The formulation of quantum mechanics proposed in this paper has the merits of Bohm ian mechanics, namely the solution of the measurement problem, the explanation of the emergence of a classical world, and the presence of a non-vague ontology. On the other hand, this formulation does not make use of the guidance equation and of the related trajectories, which, due to their non-observability, are sources of many controversies. One can say that the guidance equation is replaced by the quantum typicality rule.

In fact, what has been argued in this paper is that the pair $(M^{T};)$, together with the quantum typicality rule, can potentially explain the observed phenom ena, but it has not been proved that it actually explains them. In order to prove this, one must prove that the model gives rise to (i) the expected results for the statistical experiments, and (ii) to a quasi-classical structure for typical trajectories. As to the rst request, most of the work has already been done by proving the quantum equilibrium hypothesis [8]. As to the second request, since typical trajectories follow the branches of the universal wave function, one must prove that the universal wave function actually has a branch structure, and that the branches have a quasi-classical structure. We have not confronted this problem in this paper.

6 A cknow ledgm ents

The author wants to thank N. Zangh for a useful discussion and encouragement.

References

- [1] V.Allori, N.Zangh: W hat is Bohm ian M echanics, Int. J. Theor. Phys. 43, 1743 (2004).quant-ph/0112008
- [2] J. S. Bell: The measurement theory of Everett and de Broglie's pilot wave, in J. S. Bell: Speakable and Unspeakable in Quantum Mechanics, Cambridge University Press, Cambridge (1987).
- [3] J. S. Bell: Quantum mechanics for cosmologists, in J. S. Bell: Speakable and Unspeakable in Quantum Mechanics, op. cit.
- [4] D.Bohm: A Suggested Interpretation in Terms of \Hidden Variables": Part I and Part II, Phys. Rev. 85, 166 and 180 (1952).
- [5] D.Bohm, B.J.Hiley, P.N.Kaloyerou: An Ontological Basis for the Quantum Theory, Phys. Rep. 6, 321 (1987).
- [6] E.Deotto, G.C.Ghirardi: Bohm ian Mechanics Revisited, Found. Phys. 28, 1 (1998). quant-ph/9704021
- [7] J. Derezinski, C. Gerard, Scattering Theory of Classical and Quantum N-Particle Systems, Springer-Verlag, New York (1997). Also available at the url http://www.fuw.edu.pl/ derezins/bookn.pdf
- [8] D. Durr, S. Goldstein, N. Zangh: Quantum Equilibrium and the Origin of Absolute Uncertainty, J. Stat. Phys. 67, 843 (1992). quant-ph/0308039
- [9] D. Durr, S. Goldstein, N. Zangh: Bohm ian Mechanics as the Foundation of Quantum Mechanics, in J. T. Cushing, A. Fine, S. Goldstein (eds): Bohm ian Mechanics and quantum Theory: an Appraisal, Kluwer Academ ic Publisher (1996). quant-ph/9511016
- [10] B.DeW itt, N.Graham (eds.): The Many-W orlds Interpretation of Quantum Mechanics, Princeton University Press (1973).
- [11] H.Everett, Relative State Form ulation of Quantum Mechanics, Rev. Mod. Phys. 29, 454 (1957).
- [12] S. Goldstein: Boltzmann's Approach to Statistical Mechanics, in J. Brian ont, D. Durr, M. C. Galavotti, G. Ghirardi, F. Petruccione, N. Zangh (eds.): Chance in Physics: Foundations and Perspectives, Lecture Notes in Physics 574, Springer-Verlag (2001).cond-mat/0105242
- [13] R.B.Griths, Consistent Quantum Mechanics, Cambridge University Press (2002).

- [14] N.M ott: The wave mechanics of alpha-ray tracks, in Proceedings of the Royal Society A 126, 79 (1929); (reprinted as Sec.I-6 of Quantum Theory and Measurement, JA. W heeler. and W H. Zurek, (1983) Princeton).
- [15] G. Peruzzi, A. R in ini: Quantum measurements in a family of hidden-variables theories, Found PhysLett. 9, 505 (1996). quant-ph/9607004
- [16] M.Reed, B.Simon: Functional Analysis, A cadem ic Press, New York (1972), p.290
- [17] W .Struyve, H.W estman: A New Pilot-W ave Model for Quantum Field Theory. To appear in A.Bassi, D.Durr, T.Weber, N.Zangh (eds): Quantum Mechanics: A re there Quantum Jumps? and On the Present Status of Quantum Mechanics, A IP Conference Proceedings 844. American Institute of Physics (2006). quant-ph/0602229
- [18] W.H.Zurek: Decoherence, einselection, and the quantum origins of the classical, Rev.M od.Phys.75,715 (2003).quant-ph/0105127