

INTRINSIC UNSHARPNESS AND APPROXIMATE REPEATABILITY OF QUANTUM MEASUREMENTS

CLAUDIO CARMELI, TEIKO HEINONEN, AND ALESSANDRO TOIGO

1. Introduction

In quantum mechanics, unsharpness has a fundamental role and it has to be taken into account also in theoretical studies. For instance, there is no joint measurement for sharp position and momentum observables. Only unsharp position and momentum observables may allow a joint measurement. Also, every measurement has some effect on the system and hence, an unavoidable disturbance to the subsequent measurements.

In this paper we discuss a quantification of the intrinsic unsharpness of non-discrete observables, such as position and momentum. For this purpose, we introduce the concept of resolution width. It is the minimal size of intervals for which the corresponding effects have suitable low degree of unsharpness.

It is a well known fact that only discrete observables admit repeatable measurements [1]. Hence, non-discrete observables can at best have approximately repeatable measurements [2], [3]. We show that the resolution width is closely connected with the possibility of making approximately repeatable measurements.

We examine the intrinsic unsharpness and approximate repeatability of position and momentum measurements in detail. We also give a sufficient criterion assuring that discretized versions of position and momentum observables admit repeatable measurements. A necessary inaccuracy relation for any jointly measurable pair of position and momentum observables is formulated using their resolution widths. Joint measurements are closely related to sequential measurements in the sense that a suitable kind of sequential measurement leads to a joint observable. We show that any covariant phase space observable can be formed from a mixture of certain kind of sequential measurements.

We shall proceed as follows. In Section 2 we give some basic definitions and mathematical facts related to the unsharpness of a quantum observable. The discussion of Subsection 2.1 follows [4] and in Subsection 2.2 we introduce the notion of resolution width, which is central for everything that follows. In Section 3 we review the definitions and some results on approximately repeatable instruments. Also, the connection between resolution width and approximate repeatability is demonstrated. Sections 4 and 5 deal with position measurements. In this concrete case a rather complete analysis can be done. Finally, in Section 6 we analyze the role of resolution width and approximate repeatability in joint measurements of position and momentum.

Concluding this section we fix the notation and recall some basic definitions; for further details we refer to [5], [6], [7]. Let H be a complex separable Hilbert space. We denote by $L(H)$ and $T(H)$ the algebra of bounded operators and the ideal of trace class operators on H , respectively. A positive operator $T \in T(H)$ of trace one is called a state and the set of all states is denoted by $S(H)$. A pure state is a one-dimensional projection and P_{ψ} denotes the pure state generated by a nonzero vector $\psi \in H$. A positive operator bounded from above by the unit operator $\mathbb{1}$ is called an effect and the set of all effects is denoted by $E(H)$.

Let \mathcal{A} be a nonempty set and \mathcal{A} a σ -algebra of subsets of \mathcal{A} . A mapping $E : \mathcal{A} \rightarrow E(H)$ is an observable if it is σ -additive with respect to the weak operator topology and $E(\mathcal{A}) = \mathbb{1}$. An observable E which has only projections in its range, that is, $E(X) = E(X)^2$ for any $X \in \mathcal{A}$, is conventionally called a sharp observable. We will mostly deal with observables defined on $B(\mathbb{R})$, the Borel σ -algebra of the real line \mathbb{R} .

An operation (or state transformation) is a positive linear mapping $\mathcal{I} : T(H) \rightarrow T(H)$ which satisfies the condition $0 \leq \text{tr}[\mathcal{I}(T)] \leq 1$ for every $T \in S(H)$. An instrument is a mapping $X \mapsto I_X$ from $B(\mathbb{R})$ to the set of operations, which satisfies the normalization condition $\text{tr}[I_{\mathbb{R}}(T)] = 1$ for every $T \in S(H)$ and is σ -additive in the sense that, whenever $T \in T(H)$ and $(X_i)_{i \in \mathbb{N}} \subset B(\mathbb{R})$ is a sequence of disjoint Borel sets, then $I_{\bigcup_i X_i}(T) = \sum_i I_{X_i}(T)$ where the sum converges in the trace-norm topology. In order to have a meaningful physical interpretation, it is essential that an operation is completely positive [8]. We say that an instrument I is completely positive if every operation $I_X; X \in B(\mathbb{R})$, is completely positive. This also assures that the instrument is induced by a (normal) premeasurement, [9], [10].

Each instrument I determines an associated observable E by the formula

$$(1) \quad \text{tr}[I E(X)] = \text{tr}[I_X(T)]; \quad X \in B(\mathbb{R}); T \in S(H):$$

Any instrument satisfying condition (1) is called E -compatible.

2. Intrinsic unsharpness of an observable

2.1. Actualizability of effects. Let $E : \mathcal{A} \rightarrow E(H)$ be an observable and $X \in \mathcal{A}$.

Definition 1. An effect $E(X)$ is actual in a state T if

$$(2) \quad \text{tr}[I E(X)] = 1:$$

An effect which is actual in some state is actualizable.

Condition (2) means that a measurement outcome belongs to the set X with probability 1 when a measurement of the observable E is performed in the state T .

An actualizable effect is actual in some pure state. Indeed, assume that an effect $E(X)$ is actual in a mixed state T . The state T has a (trace norm convergent) σ -convex decomposition of the form

$$(3) \quad T = \sum_{i=1}^{\infty} p_i T_i;$$

where (p_i) is a sequence of positive numbers summing to 1 and (T_i) is a sequence of pure states. We then have

$$1 = \text{tr}[E(X)] = \sum_{i=1}^{\infty} p_i \text{tr}[T_i E(X)];$$

which implies that $\text{tr}[T_i E(X)] = 1$ for every $i = 1; 2; \dots$. For the reader's convenience we give a proof for the following elementary fact.

Proposition 1. An effect $E(X)$ is actualizable if and only if it has eigenvalue 1.

Proof. If $E(X)$ has eigenvalue 1 and ρ is a corresponding eigenvector, then $E(X)$ is actual in the state ρ .

Now, assume that $E(X)$ is an actualizable effect. Then there is a pure state T such that (2) holds. This also means that there is a unit vector $h \in H$ such that

$$(4) \quad h \cdot jE(X) i = 1;$$

Using the Cauchy-Schwarz inequality and the fact that $E(X) \leq \mathbb{1}$ we get

$$1 = |h \cdot jE(X) i| \leq \|h\| \|jE(X) i\| = \|E(X)\| \|h\| = \|E(X)\|;$$

and therefore,

$$|h \cdot jE(X) i| = \|E(X)\| \|h\|.$$

This implies that the vector $E(X)h$ is a scalar multiple of h , i.e., $E(X)h = \lambda h$ for some $\lambda \in \mathbb{C}$. It then follows from (4) that $\lambda = 1$.

Every nonzero projection is an actualizable effect. It is easy to construct also other examples. For instance, take two orthogonal unit vectors ρ_1 and ρ_2 and $0 < p < 1$. Then the effect $p\rho_1 + p\rho_2$ is actualizable but not projection. Generally, however, actualizability is a strong requirement and often not fulfilled. Therefore, the following weakening is needed.

Definition 2. Let $\frac{1}{2} < c < 1$. An effect $E(X)$ is c -actual in a state T if

$$(5) \quad \text{tr}[TE(X)] > c;$$

An effect which is c -actual in some state is c -actualizable.

The reason for the restriction $c > \frac{1}{2}$ is to avoid the situation where an effect $E(X)$ and its complement $E(R \setminus X) = \mathbb{1} - E(X)$ would both be c -actual in the same state. Moreover, since c -actualizability is introduced as an approximation of actualizability, c can usually be thought as a number close to 1.

Since $E(X)$ is a positive operator, the operator norm can be expressed as

$$\|E(X)\| = \sup_{T \in \mathcal{S}(H)} \text{tr}[TE(X)];$$

This leads to the following conclusion.

Proposition 2. An effect $E(X)$ is c -actualizable if and only if $\|E(X)\| > c$.

Assume that an effect $E(X)$ is c -actual in a state T . Using a c -convex decomposition as in (3) for T , it is seen that there is a pure state T_i such that $E(X)$ is c -actual in T_i . However, unlike the case of an actualizable effect, there may be a pure state T_i in the decomposition of T such that $E(X)$ is not c -actual in T_i .

Definition 3. An effect $E(X)$ is almost actualizable if it is c -actualizable for every $\frac{1}{2} < c < 1$.

As a direct consequence of Proposition 2 we conclude that an effect $E(X)$ is almost actualizable if and only if $\|kE(X)\| = 1$. If an effect $E(X)$ is almost actualizable but not actualizable, then 1 belongs to the spectrum of $E(X)$ but it is not an eigenvalue.

The difference between actualizability and almost actualizability has been pointed out, for instance, by Ballentine in [1, footnote 4]. It seems quite impossible to distinguish between actualizability and almost actualizability in any practical situation. Therefore, we take almost actualizability to represent the optimal reality content which an effect can have.

However, it is an interesting fact that in some cases the theoretical difference between actualizability and almost actualizability is crucial. A physically relevant example is the canonical phase observable, whose all nontrivial effects are almost actualizable but not actualizable; see [12] and [13]. Other interesting examples are the localization observables of a massless particle with non-zero helicity constructed by Castriano in [14]. He showed that for these observables any effect corresponding to a bounded Borel set with non-void interior is almost actualizable but not actualizable.

2.2. Resolution width. In the rest of the paper any observable E in consideration is, if not otherwise stated, defined on $B(\mathbb{R})$. In later sections we study position and momentum observables, which have the same null sets as the Lebesgue measure. For our purposes in this section, it is enough to assume that each observable E has the whole real line \mathbb{R} as its support. This assumption is equivalent to the condition that $E(I) \notin 0$ for every open interval $I \subseteq \mathbb{R}$. With some simple modifications one could make a similar analysis for observables which are supported in an interval.

Let $X \in B(\mathbb{R})$ and assume that $E(X)$ is a c -actualizable effect for some fixed c . If $Y \in B(\mathbb{R})$ is such that $X \leq Y$, then $E(X) \leq E(Y)$ and therefore, also the effect $E(Y)$ is c -actualizable. With this in mind, we may ask for the minimal width such that any effect $E(I)$ corresponding to an interval I bigger than this width is c -actualizable.

For any $x \in \mathbb{R}; r \in \mathbb{R}_+$, we denote the open interval $(x - \frac{r}{2}; x + \frac{r}{2})$ by $I_{x,r}$.

Definition 4. Let $\frac{1}{2} < c < 1$. We denote

$$(E;c) := \inf\{r > 0 \mid E(I_{x,r}) \text{ is } c\text{-actualizable for every } x \in \mathbb{R}\};$$

and say that $(E;c)$ is the resolution width of E with confidence level c .

We adopt the definition $\inf; = 1$, and thus, the range of possible values of $(E;c)$ is the closed interval $[0;1]$. The function $c \mapsto (E;c)$ from $[\frac{1}{2};1]$ to $[0;1]$ is increasing, that is,

$$(6) \quad c_1 < c_2 \implies (E;c_1) \leq (E;c_2);$$

It is natural to give the following definition.

Definition 5. We denote

$$(E;1) := \lim_{c \downarrow 1} (E;c);$$

and say that $(E;1)$ is the resolution width of E with confidence level 1.

Proposition 3.

$$(7) \quad (E;1) = \inf_{\epsilon > 0} \{ \exists E(I_{x,r}) \text{ is almost actualizable for every } x \in R \text{ g} \}$$

Proof. Let us first note that by (6), we can write Definition 5 alternatively as $(E;1) = \sup_{\frac{1}{2} < c < 1} (E;c)$, while the right hand side of equation (7) can be rewritten as $\inf_{\epsilon > 0} \{ \exists E(I_{x,r}) \text{ k} = 1 \text{ s.t. } R \text{ g} =: M \}$. From this it is evident that $(E;c) \leq M$ for each $\frac{1}{2} < c < 1$. Hence, $(E;1) = \sup_{\frac{1}{2} < c < 1} (E;c) \leq M$. Fix now $\epsilon > 0$, then $(E;1) + \epsilon > (E;c)$ for each $\frac{1}{2} < c < 1$. It follows that $E(I_{x, (E;1)+\epsilon}) > c$ for every $\frac{1}{2} < c < 1$ so that $E(I_{x, (E;1)+\epsilon}) = 1$. This being true for each $\epsilon > 0$ we can conclude that $(E;1) \leq M$, and the claim now follows.

The function $(E; \cdot)$ is a description of the intrinsic unsharpness, or inaccuracy, of the observable E . Typically, a single number $(E;c)$ with a well chosen confidence level c (or a finite sample) gives enough information on the precision of E .

The best resolution width $(E;1) = 0$ is achieved, for instance, when E is a sharp observable. Also the worst case is possible, namely, that $(E;\frac{1}{2}) = 1$. To give an example of this latter situation, let μ be a probability measure on $B(\mathbb{R})$ and define an observable E by formula $E(X) = (X) \mathbb{1}$. If I and J are two disjoint intervals, then either $\mu(I) \leq \frac{1}{2}$ or $\mu(J) \leq \frac{1}{2}$. This implies that $(E;\frac{1}{2}) = 1$.

3. Approximately repeatable instruments

A measurement is said to be repeatable if its repetition does not give a new result (from a probabilistic point of view). The quantum theory of sequential measurements leads naturally to the following formulation of repeatability; see, for instance, [15].

Definition 6. An instrument I is repeatable if for all $T \in S(\mathcal{H})$ and $X \in B(\mathbb{R})$,

$$\text{tr}[I_X(I_X(T))] = \text{tr}[I_X(T)];$$

It is a well known result that an instrument I can be repeatable only if its associated observable E is discrete [1], that is, there is a countable subset $X \subseteq \mathbb{R}$ such that $E(X) = \mathbb{1}$. Under this precondition, a necessary and sufficient requirement in order that there exists an E -compatible repeatable instrument is that all the nonzero effects $E(X)$ are actualizable; see, for instance, [16, Section II.3.5].

To understand the properties and operational meaning of non-discrete observables, one is forced to seek alternatives to Definition 6. To formulate two existing proposals, we denote for each $X \subseteq \mathbb{R}$ and $\epsilon > 0$,

$$X_\epsilon := \left[\begin{array}{l} I_{x,\epsilon} = \{ y \in \mathbb{R} \mid |x - y| < \frac{\epsilon}{2} \text{ for some } x \in X \text{ g} \\ \text{x2x} \end{array} \right.$$

Definition 7. Let I be an instrument, $\epsilon > 0$ and $\frac{1}{2} < c < 1$.

(i) I is ϵ -repeatable if for all $T \in \mathcal{S}(H)$ and $X \in \mathcal{B}(R)$,

$$(8) \quad \text{tr}[I_{X^c}(I_X(T))] = \text{tr}[I_X(T)];$$

(ii) I is $(\epsilon; c)$ -repeatable if for all $T \in \mathcal{S}(H)$ and $X \in \mathcal{B}(R)$ such that $\text{tr}[I_X(T)] \neq 0$,

$$(9) \quad \text{tr}[I_{X^c}(I_X(T))] > c \text{tr}[I_X(T)];$$

Here we clearly have a chain of properties: repeatability implies ϵ -repeatability, which, in turn, implies $(\epsilon; c)$ -repeatability.

The concept of ϵ -repeatable instrument was introduced by Davies and Lewis in [3] to replace the repeatability condition for non-discrete observables. They proved that if E is an observable such that any effect $E(I)$ corresponding to an interval I is actualizable, then for each $\epsilon > 0$, there exists an E -compatible instrument which is ϵ -repeatable [3, Theorem 4].

As ϵ -repeatability requires that the associated observable has actualizable effects, one needs more relaxed concept for general investigations. The important definition of an $(\epsilon; c)$ -repeatable instrument was introduced in [2] and [15]; see also [16, Section IV.1] and [17].

Assume that an observable E admits an $(\epsilon; c)$ -repeatable instrument I . This implies that whenever $E(X) \neq 0$, the effect $E(X^c)$ is c -actualizable. Indeed, choose a state such that $\text{tr}[I_X(T)] \neq 0$. Then condition (9) implies that $\text{tr}[I_X(T)E(X^c)] > c$, where $T_X := I_X(T) = \text{tr}[I_X(T)]$.

Proposition 4. Let E be an observable whose support is R . If $\epsilon < (E; c)$, there is no E -compatible instrument which is $(\epsilon; c)$ -repeatable.

Proof. Fix ϵ^0 such that $\epsilon < \epsilon^0 < (E; c)$. By Definition 4, there is $X \in \mathcal{B}(R)$ such that $\text{tr}[I_X(T)] \geq c$ for every $T \in \mathcal{S}(H)$. Choose $X = I_{X^c, \epsilon^0}$, in which case $X^c = I_{X, \epsilon^0}$. Then $E(X) \neq 0$ but $E(X^c)$ is not c -actualizable. This means, due to the discussion in the previous paragraph, that there cannot be any $(\epsilon; c)$ -repeatable instrument.

The following positive result on the existence of $(\epsilon; c)$ -repeatable instruments is a modification of Theorem 4 in [3].

Proposition 5. Let E be an observable, $\frac{1}{2} < c < 1$ and $\epsilon > 2(E; c)$. Then there is a completely positive E -compatible instrument which is $(\epsilon; c)$ -repeatable.

Proof. For each $n \in \mathbb{Z}$, denote by X_n the half-open interval $[\frac{n}{2}\epsilon; \frac{(n+1)}{2}\epsilon)$ and choose a pure state P_n such that the effect $E(X_n)$ is c -actual in the state P_n . The formula

$$I_X(T) := \sum_{n=-1}^X \text{tr}[I_X(T)E(X \setminus X_n)]P_n$$

defines an E -compatible instrument I .

Fix an orthonormal basis $f_{k,m}$ for H . Expanding the trace in this basis, each $I_X; X \in \mathcal{B}(R)$, can be written in the Kraus form

$$I_X(T) = \sum_{k,m=-1}^X A_{k,m} T A_{k,m}^*$$

where

$$A_{k,n} := \int_{X_n} \int_{X_k} E(X \setminus X_n)^{\frac{1}{2}} \cdot_k j;$$

Thus, the instrument I is completely positive; see, e.g., [8, x3, Theorem 1].

To prove that I is $(\epsilon; c)$ -repeatable, let $X \in \mathcal{B}(\mathbb{R})$ and $T \in \mathcal{T}(\mathcal{H})$. We then get

$$\begin{aligned} \text{tr}[I_{X_n}(I_X(T))] &= \sum_{n=1}^{\infty} \sum_{k=1}^{\infty} \text{tr}[P_k E(X_n \setminus X_n)] \text{tr}[E(X \setminus X_k)] \\ &= \sum_{k=1}^{\infty} \text{tr}[P_k E(X_n)] \text{tr}[E(X \setminus X_k)] \end{aligned}$$

If $X \setminus X_k \notin \emptyset$, then $X_k \subset X_n$. This implies that either $\text{tr}[E(X \setminus X_k)] = 0$ or $\text{tr}[P_k E(X_n)] > c$. Assume now that $\text{tr}[E(X)] \notin 0$, in which case $\text{tr}[E(X \setminus X_k)] \notin 0$ at least for some k . Therefore,

$$\begin{aligned} \sum_{k=1}^{\infty} \text{tr}[P_k E(X_n)] \text{tr}[E(X \setminus X_k)] &> \sum_{k=1}^{\infty} c \text{tr}[E(X \setminus X_k)] \\ &= c \text{tr}[E(X)]: \end{aligned}$$

4. Intrinsic unsharpness of position observables

4.1. Definition of position observables. In the rest of this paper $\mathcal{H} = L^2(\mathbb{R}; dx)$. The canonical position observable, denoted by Q , is the sharp observable defined as

$$Q(X)(x) = \chi_X(x) \cdot (x); \quad X \in \mathcal{B}(\mathbb{R});$$

where χ_X is the characteristic function of X .

Let μ be a probability measure on \mathbb{R} . The formula

$$(10) \quad Q(X) = \int_{\mathbb{R}} (\chi_X \cdot x) d\mu(x); \quad X \in \mathcal{B}(\mathbb{R});$$

defines an observable Q , whose action on a function $\psi \in \mathcal{H}$ is given by

$$(11) \quad Q(X)(\psi)(x) = (\chi_X \cdot x)(\psi)(x):$$

We call Q a position observable; motivation for this terminology is briefly explained below. Note that the canonical position observable Q is recovered from equation (10) when $\mu = \delta_0$, the Dirac measure concentrated at the origin.

The observable Q has the same kinematical symmetry properties as the canonical position observable Q . Namely, for every $q, p \in \mathbb{R}$, define the unitary operators U_q and V_p by

$$\begin{aligned} (U_q \psi)(x) &= \psi(x - q); \\ (V_p \psi)(x) &= e^{ipx} \psi(x): \end{aligned}$$

These unitary operators correspond to position shift and momentum boost, respectively. The kinematical symmetry properties of Q can be expressed as

$$(12) \quad U_q Q(x) U_q^{-1} = Q(x + q);$$

$$(13) \quad V_p Q(x) V_p^{-1} = Q(x):$$

As proved in [18, Proposition 1] and [19, Proposition 3], the observables satisfying the symmetry conditions (12) and (13) are in one-to-one correspondence with the probability measures on \mathbb{R} via the formula (10).

An observable Q can be interpreted as an imprecise version or a smearing of the canonical position observable Q , the probability measure quantifying the inaccuracy. We refer to [16] and [20] for discussions on the interpretation and properties of Q .

4.2. Resolution width of a position observable. Since a position observable has the simple form (10), we can express the corresponding resolution width $(Q; c)$ in terms of the probability measure μ . We denote by $\text{ess sup}_{x \in \mathbb{R}} f(x)$ the essential supremum of a function $f: \mathbb{R} \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ with respect to Lebesgue measure.

Proposition 6. Let Q be a position observable and $\frac{1}{2} < c < 1$. Then

$$(14) \quad (Q; c) = \inf_{r > 0} \text{ess sup}_{x \in \mathbb{R}} (\mathbb{I}_{x, r}) > cr$$

and this is a finite number.

Proof. The covariance condition (12) implies that for any $x \in \mathbb{R}$,

$$(15) \quad \|Q(\mathbb{I}_{x, r})\| = \|U_x Q(\mathbb{I}_{0, r}) U_x^{-1}\| = \|Q(\mathbb{I}_{0, r})\|:$$

Since $Q(\mathbb{I}_{0, r})$ is a multiplicative operator in $L^2(\mathbb{R}; dx)$, we have

$$\|Q(\mathbb{I}_{0, r})\| = \text{ess sup}_{x \in \mathbb{R}} (\mathbb{I}_{0, r} + x) = \text{ess sup}_{x \in \mathbb{R}} (\mathbb{I}_{x, r});$$

and hence, the resolution width $(Q; c)$ has the claimed form.

As

$$\lim_{r \rightarrow 1} (\mathbb{I}_{0, r}) = (\mathbb{R}) = 1;$$

there is an interval $\mathbb{I}_{0, r}$ such that $(\mathbb{I}_{0, r}) > c$. Fix $\epsilon > 0$. Then for every $x \in \mathbb{I}_{0, r}$, we have $\mathbb{I}_{0, r} \subset \mathbb{I}_{x, r+\epsilon}$ and hence, $(\mathbb{I}_{x, r+\epsilon}) > c$. Therefore,

$$\text{ess sup}_{x \in \mathbb{R}} (\mathbb{I}_{x, r+\epsilon}) = \text{ess sup}_{x \in \mathbb{I}_{0, r}} (\mathbb{I}_{x, r+\epsilon}) > c:$$

This shows that $(Q; c) \in \mathbb{R}$.

Let us note that the translation covariance of Q makes an estimation of the resolution width more achievable than for observables in general. Indeed, if one finds a state T such that the effect $Q(\mathbb{I}_{0, r})$ is c -actual in T , then by equation (15) one concludes that $(Q; c) \leq r$.

To formulate the following result, we denote by $\text{diam } X$ the diameter of a set $X \subset \mathbb{R}$, i.e., $\text{diam } X = \sup\{|x - y| : x, y \in X\}$. We also recall that the support of a probability measure on $B(\mathbb{R})$ can be expressed as $\text{supp } \mu = \overline{\{x \in \mathbb{R} : \mu(\{x\}) > 0\}}$.

Proposition 7. Let Q be a position observable. Then

$$(16) \quad (Q; 1) = \text{diam supp } \nu$$

The proof of Proposition 7 follows easily from the next lemma. We emphasize that $(Q; 1)$ may be infinite.

Lemma 1. Let $r > 0$.

- (i) If $\text{ess sup}_{x \in \mathbb{R}} (\mathbb{I}_{x,r}) = 1$, then $\text{diam supp } \nu = r$.
- (ii) If $\text{diam supp } \nu < r$, then $\text{ess sup}_{x \in \mathbb{R}} (\mathbb{I}_{x,r}) = 1$.

Proof. (i) Suppose $\text{ess sup}_{x \in \mathbb{R}} (\mathbb{I}_{x,r}) = 1$. For each $\epsilon > 0$, denote

$$B_\epsilon = \{x \in \mathbb{R} \mid \mathbb{I}_{x,r} \geq 1 - \epsilon\}$$

Since $\mathbb{I}_{x,r}$ is bounded, B_ϵ is a bounded set. We then have $B_\epsilon \subseteq B_{\epsilon/2}$; and $B_\epsilon \cap B_{\epsilon/2} = B_{\epsilon/2}$ if $\epsilon < r$. Choose $x_n \in B_{1/n}$, $n \in \mathbb{N}$. Let $(x_{n_k})_{n \in \mathbb{N}}$ be a convergent subsequence, and let \bar{x} be its limit. Thus, $\exists \delta > 0 \exists k \in \mathbb{N}$ such that $k \leq n_k$ implies $\mathbb{I}_{\bar{x},r} \geq \mathbb{I}_{x_{n_k},r}$. So,

$$(\mathbb{I}_{\bar{x},r}) \geq \lim_{k \rightarrow \infty} \mathbb{I}_{x_{n_k},r} = 1 - \frac{1}{n_k} \text{ for all } k \in \mathbb{N}. \text{ It follows that } (\mathbb{I}_{\bar{x},r}) = 1. \text{ Hence}$$

$$\overline{\mathbb{I}_{\bar{x},r}} = \bigcap_{\epsilon > 0} \overline{\mathbb{I}_{\bar{x},r} \geq 1 - \epsilon} = \lim_{\epsilon \downarrow 0} (\mathbb{I}_{\bar{x},r} \geq 1 - \epsilon) = 1;$$

ie. $\text{supp } \nu = \overline{\mathbb{I}_{\bar{x},r}}$.

- (ii) Suppose $\text{diam supp } \nu = r^0 < r$. Let \bar{x} be such that $\text{supp } \nu = \overline{\mathbb{I}_{\bar{x},r^0}}$. Since $\overline{\mathbb{I}_{\bar{x},r^0}} \subseteq \mathbb{I}_{x,r}$ for all $x \in (\bar{x} - (r - r^0), \bar{x} + (r - r^0))$, so that $(\mathbb{I}_{x,r}) = \overline{(\mathbb{I}_{\bar{x},r^0})} = 1$ for such x 's, and the interval $(\bar{x} - (r - r^0), \bar{x} + (r - r^0))$ has nonzero Lebesgue measure, we have $\text{ess sup}_{x \in \mathbb{R}} (\mathbb{I}_{x,r}) = 1$.

Proof of Proposition 7. Let $r = (Q; 1)$ (possibly $r = 1$). Then r is fixed by the conditions:

- (a) $\text{ess sup}_{x \in \mathbb{R}} (\mathbb{I}_{x,r^0}) = 1$ for all $r^0 > r$; (b) $\text{ess sup}_{x \in \mathbb{R}} (\mathbb{I}_{x,r^0}) < 1$ for all $r^0 < r$ (if $r = 1$, condition (a) is trivial). From (a) and item (i) in the lemma, $\text{diam supp } \nu = r$ follows. Now suppose $\text{diam supp } \nu = r^0 < r$. Let $\epsilon > 0$ be such that $r^0 < r^0 + \epsilon < r$. By item (ii) in the lemma, $\text{ess sup}_{x \in \mathbb{R}} (\mathbb{I}_{x,r^0 + \epsilon}) = 1$, a contradiction. Hence, $\text{diam supp } \nu = r$.

It is a direct consequence of Proposition 7 that the best resolution width $(Q; 1) = 0$ is achieved only if ν is the Dirac measure $\delta_{\bar{x}}$ for some $\bar{x} \in \mathbb{R}$, which is the case exactly when Q is a sharp position observable; see also [18, Proposition 2] for a related characterization. A natural relaxation is to require that $(Q; 1)$ is a finite (but nonzero) number. In this case the uncertainty of a measurement result can be made negligible whenever outcome sets are bigger than $(Q; 1)$. Another interesting possibility is that $(Q; c) = 0$ for some $\frac{1}{2} < c < 1$. This means that a measurement of Q is efficient enough to discriminate arbitrarily small intervals if uncertainty of $1 - c$ is tolerated. This situation is characterized in Propositions 8.

Proposition 8. Let Q be a position observable and $\frac{1}{2} < c < 1$. The following conditions are equivalent:

- (i) $(Q; c) = 0$;

(ii) there exists $\bar{x} \in \mathbb{R}$ and a probability measure μ with $\bar{x} \in \text{supp } \mu$ such that

$$(17) \quad \int f(x) d\mu(x) = c \bar{x} + (1-c) \int f(x) d\nu(x) :$$

Proof. Assume that (i) holds. By Proposition 6 this means that

$$(18) \quad \forall r > 0 : \text{ess sup}_{x \in \mathbb{R}} (I_{x,r}) > c :$$

For each $r > 0$, denote

$$A_r = \{x \in \mathbb{R} : (I_{x,r}) > c\} :$$

Since $r_1 < r_2$ implies $A_{r_1} \supseteq A_{r_2}$, it follows from (18) that $A_r \neq \emptyset$; for every $r > 0$. For each $n = 1, 2, \dots$, we choose an element $x_n \in A_{1/n}$. We then have $(I_{x_n, 1/n}) > c$, and since μ is a finite measure, the sequence $(x_n)_{n=1}^\infty$ is bounded. Hence, there exists a subsequence $(x_{n_k})_{k=1}^\infty$ converging to some $\bar{x} \in \mathbb{R}$. For each $\epsilon > 0$, there exists k such that $I_{x_{n_k}, 1/n_k} \geq I_{\bar{x}, \epsilon}$, so that $(I_{\bar{x}, \epsilon}) > c$. Thus,

$$(f\bar{x}g) = \inf_{\epsilon > 0} (I_{\bar{x}, \epsilon}) = \lim_{\epsilon \downarrow 0} (I_{\bar{x}, \epsilon}) > c :$$

It follows that $\mu = (1-c)^{-1} \int f(x) d\mu(x) + c(1-c)^{-1} \bar{x}$ is a probability measure. For any $\epsilon > 0$, we have $(I_{\bar{x}, \epsilon}) = (1-c)^{-1} \int (I_{\bar{x}, \epsilon}) d\mu(x) + c > 0$, which implies that $\bar{x} \in \text{supp } \mu$. Thus, (i) implies (ii).

Assume that (ii) holds and let $r > 0$. Then

$$\begin{aligned} \text{ess sup}_{x \in \mathbb{R}} (I_{x,r}) &= \text{ess sup}_{x \in \mathbb{R}} [c I_{x,r}(x) + (1-c) (I_{x,r})] \\ &= \text{ess sup}_{x \in \mathbb{R}} [c I_{x,r}(x) + (1-c) (I_{x,r})] \\ &= c + (1-c) \text{ess sup}_{x \in \mathbb{R}} (I_{x,r}) : \end{aligned}$$

Since $\bar{x} \in \text{supp } \mu$, it follows that $(I_{\bar{x}, r=2}) = \mu > 0$. For any $x \in \mathbb{R}$, $I_{x,r=2} \leq I_{\bar{x}, r=2}$, and therefore $(I_{x,r}) \leq \mu$. Thus,

$$\text{ess sup}_{x \in \mathbb{R}} (I_{x,r}) \leq c + (1-c)\mu > c ;$$

which means that $(Q ; c) \leq \mu$. As this holds for every $r > 0$, we get (i).

Proposition 8 shows, especially, that $(Q ; c) = 0$ can hold only if Q is a mixture (convex combination) of a sharp position observable and some other position observable.

5. Approximate repeatability of position measurements

Since we have shown in Proposition 6 that $(Q ; c)$ is a finite number for every $\frac{1}{2} < c < 1$, it follows from Proposition 5 that Q admits $(\mu ; c)$ -repeatable instruments for any confidence level $\frac{1}{2} < c < 1$ whenever μ is chosen big enough. In Subsection 5.1 we show that a position observable admits also a covariant instrument which has better approximate repeatability property than the one used in the proof of Proposition 5. In Subsection 5.2 we discuss the possibility of discretizing a position observable to achieve repeatability.

5.1. Approximately repeatable covariant instrument. Let E be an observable, $T_0 \in \mathcal{S}(\mathcal{H})$, and define

$$(19) \quad I_X(T) = \int_{\mathcal{X}} U_x T_0 U_x^* \text{tr}[T E(dx)]; \quad X \in \mathcal{B}(\mathcal{R}); T \in \mathcal{S}(\mathcal{H})$$

This formula defines an E -compatible instrument I .

Proposition 9. The instrument I is completely positive.

Proof. Let $X \in \mathcal{B}(\mathcal{R})$. The dual mapping I_X^* of I_X is

$$I_X^*(B) = \int_{\mathcal{X}} \text{tr}[U_x T_0 U_x^* B] dE(x); \quad B \in \mathcal{L}(\mathcal{H})$$

The mapping I_X^* is completely positive exactly when I_X is completely positive, and thus, we need to show that I_X^* is N -positive for each $N = 1, 2, \dots$; see, e.g., [8, x2]. Fix N and let $i \in \mathcal{H}$ and $B_{jk} \in \mathcal{L}(\mathcal{H})$ for $1 \leq j, k \leq N$. Then

$$(20) \quad \sum_{i,j,k} I_X^*(B_{jk})_{ik} = \int_{\mathcal{X}} \text{tr} \left[\sum_{j,k} B_{jk} U_x T_0 U_x^* B_{ji} \sum_{i,k} h_i(x) dE(x) \right]$$

By the Naimark dilation theorem, there exist a Hilbert space \mathcal{H}^{\otimes} , an isometry $W : \mathcal{H} \rightarrow \mathcal{H}^{\otimes}$, and a sharp observable $F : \mathcal{B}(\mathcal{R}) \rightarrow \mathcal{E}(\mathcal{H}^{\otimes})$ such that $E(X) = W F(X) W^*$ for all $X \in \mathcal{B}(\mathcal{R})$. It is not restrictive to assume that \mathcal{H}^{\otimes} is the Hilbert space $L^2(\mathcal{R}; \mu; K)$, where μ is a Borel measure on \mathcal{R} , K is an infinite dimensional Hilbert space K , and F is given by

$$[F(X)](x) = \sum_{i,k} h_i(x) dE(x)$$

(This follows from the fact that we don't assume the dilation to be minimal. For the relevant form of the spectral theorem, see e.g. [21, Section IX.10].) We thus have

$$\sum_{i,k} h_i(x) dE(x)_{ik} = \sum_{i,k} h(W_i(x)) h(W_k(x)) d\mu(x)$$

and the right hand term in the equation (20) can be written as

$$\begin{aligned} & \int_{\mathcal{X}} \text{tr} \left[\sum_{j,k} B_{jk} U_x T_0 U_x^* B_{ji} \sum_{i,k} h(W_i(x)) h(W_k(x)) d\mu(x) \right] \\ &= \int_{\mathcal{X}} \text{tr} [C(x) D(x)] d\mu(x); \end{aligned}$$

where for each $x \in \mathcal{R}$ we have introduced the $N \times N$ matrices $C(x)$ and $D(x)$

$$\begin{aligned} C(x)_{ki} &= \text{tr} \sum_{j,k} B_{jk} U_x T_0 U_x^* B_{ji} \\ D(x)_{ik} &= \sum_{i,k} h(W_i(x)) h(W_k(x)) \end{aligned}$$

Since these matrices are positive semidefinite, we have

$$\int_{\mathcal{X}} \text{tr} [C(x) D(x)] d\mu(x) = \int_{\mathcal{X}} \text{tr} [C(x)^{\frac{1}{2}} D(x) C(x)^{\frac{1}{2}}] d\mu(x) \geq 0;$$

and the claim follows.

The instrument I satisfies the covariance condition

$$U_q I_X (U_q T U_q) U_q = I_{X+q}(T); \quad q \in \mathbb{R}; X \in \mathcal{B}(\mathbb{R}); T \in \mathcal{S}(\mathbb{H});$$

exactly when the associated observable E is translation covariant. Davies has proved that if E is a translation covariant sharp observable, then any E -compatible covariant instrument has the form (19) for some $T_0 \in \mathcal{S}(\mathbb{H})$ [22, Theorem 3]. Moreover, as noted by Busch and Lahti in [2, Section 3.1], a translation covariant sharp observable has ϵ -repeatable instrument of the form (19) for each $\epsilon > 0$. They also pointed out that any position observable has $(\epsilon; c)$ -repeatable instrument of the type (19) for suitable numbers ϵ and c . In the next proposition we make this observation explicit using the concept of resolution width.

Proposition 10. Let Q be a position observable and $\frac{1}{2} \leq c < 1$. For each $\epsilon > (Q; c)$, there is a Q -compatible instrument of the form (19) which is $(\epsilon; c)$ -repeatable.

Proof. Since $\epsilon > (Q; c)$, there is a state $T_0 \in \mathcal{S}(\mathbb{H})$ such that $\text{tr}[T_0 Q(I_0, \epsilon)] > c$. Let I be the instrument generated by T_0 . For any $T \in \mathcal{S}(\mathbb{H})$ and $X \in \mathcal{B}(\mathbb{R})$, we get

$$\begin{aligned} \text{tr}[I_{X, \epsilon}(I_X(T))] &= \int_{\mathbb{Z}} \text{tr}[I_X(T)Q(X, \epsilon)] \\ &= \int_{\mathbb{Z}^X} \text{tr}[U_x T_0 U_x Q(X, \epsilon)] \text{tr}[T Q(dx)] \\ &= \int_x \text{tr}[T_0 Q(X, \epsilon - x)] \text{tr}[T Q(dx)]; \end{aligned}$$

For every $x \in \mathbb{Z}$, we have $I_0, \epsilon(X, \epsilon - x)$, hence $\text{tr}[T_0 Q(X, \epsilon - x)] > c$. Therefore, whenever $\text{tr}[T Q(X)] \neq 0$, we get

$$\text{tr}[I_{X, \epsilon}(I_X(T))] > \int_x c \text{tr}[T Q(dx)] = c \text{tr}[I_X(T)];$$

as claimed.

5.2. Discrete version of a position observable. Let E be an observable and let $\{X_n\}_n$ be a sequence of disjoint measurable sets such that $E(\bigcup_n X_n) = \mathbb{1}$. For each n , we denote

$$(21) \quad \mathbb{E}(fng) = E(X_n):$$

This equation defines an observable \mathbb{E} . The observable \mathbb{E} is clearly discrete and we say that \mathbb{E} is a discrete version of E . We emphasize that the properties of \mathbb{E} depend not only on the observable E but also on the sequence $\{X_n\}_n$. Generally, there is no preferential choice of the sequence $\{X_n\}_n$.

Let Q be a position observable. We fix a number $r > 0$ and denote $X_n = I_{nr, nr}$ for every $n \in \mathbb{Z}$. Then $Q(\bigcup_{n=1}^1 X_n) = \mathbb{1}$, and thus, equation (21) defines a discrete version \mathbb{Q} of Q .

Proposition 11. The effect $Q(I_0, r)$ is actualizable if and only if

$$(22) \quad \text{diam supp } < r:$$

Proof. Let us first note that $Q(I_{0;r})$ has eigenvalue 1 if and only if there is $X \in B(\mathbb{R})$ with positive Lebesgue measure such that $\mu(X) = 1$. Assume that this condition holds and let $x_1, x_2 \in X$, $x_1 \neq x_2$. Then $|x_1 - x_2| < r$, since otherwise $\mu(I_{x_1;r} \cap I_{x_2;r}) = \mu(I_{x_1;r}) + \mu(I_{x_2;r}) = 2$, contradicting $\mu(\mathbb{R}) = 1$. We have

$$\begin{aligned} 1 &= \mu(I_{x_1;r} \cap I_{x_2;r}) = \mu(I_{x_1;r}) + \mu(I_{x_2;r}) - \mu(I_{x_1;r} \setminus I_{x_2;r}) \\ &= 2 - \mu(I_{x_1;r} \setminus I_{x_2;r}); \end{aligned}$$

so that $\mu(I_{x_1;r} \setminus I_{x_2;r}) = 1$. This implies that $\text{supp } \overline{I_{x_1;r} \setminus I_{x_2;r}}$, hence $\text{diam supp } < r$.

Conversely, suppose that $\text{diam supp } < r$. Then there exists $\bar{x} \in \mathbb{R}$ and $r^0 < r$ such that $\text{supp } \overline{I_{\bar{x};r^0}}$. If $|x - \bar{x}| < (r - r^0)/2$, then $I_{\bar{x};r^0} \subset I_{x;r}$, so $\mu(I_{x;r}) = 1$. The claim follows since such x 's form a set of positive Lebesgue measure.

Recalling the discussion after Definition 6, Propositions 7 and 11 lead to the following result.

Corollary 1. The discrete observable \mathcal{Q} admits a repeatable instrument if and only if $Q(\cdot; 1) < r$.

We conclude that to obtain a discrete version \mathcal{Q} of Q which would have a repeatable instrument, one has to choose the partitioning intervals of the outcome space \mathbb{R} strictly bigger than the resolution width $Q(\cdot; 1)$. A necessary precondition for this is, obviously, that $Q(\cdot; 1)$ has to be finite.

6. Joint measurements of position and momentum

The problem of joint measurability of position and momentum observables in quantum mechanics has a long history and different viewpoints have been presented. Naturally, an analysis of this problem depends on the definitions of position and momentum observables, and the concept of joint measurability.

In Subsection 6.1 we fix the setting of the current discussion. We then show in Subsection 6.2 that the product of the resolution widths of jointly measurable position and momentum observables has a positive lower bound. In Subsection 6.3 we investigate the connection between sequential measurements and joint measurements.

6.1. Definitions. The canonical momentum observable, denoted by P , is the sharp observable defined as

$$(23) \quad P(Y) = F^{-1}Q(Y)F; \quad Y \in B(\mathbb{R});$$

where F is the Fourier-Plancherel transformation on H . Generally, a momentum observable is defined as a velocity boost covariant and translation invariant observable. Thus, an observable $E: B(\mathbb{R}) \rightarrow \mathcal{E}(H)$ is a momentum observable if, for all $q, p \in \mathbb{R}$ and $Y \in B(\mathbb{R})$,

$$(24) \quad V_p E(Y) V_p^* = E(Y + p);$$

$$(25) \quad U_q E(Y) U_q^* = E(Y);$$

Similarly as in the case of position observables, a probability measure defines a momentum observable P through the formula

$$(26) \quad P(Y) = \int_{\mathbb{Z}} (Y - y) dP(y); \quad Y \in B(\mathbb{R});$$

and all momentum observables have this form. Since Q and P satisfy the relation (23), the results of Section 4 and 5 are directly applicable to the case of momentum observables.

A position observable Q and a momentum observable P are jointly measurable if there exists an observable $G : B(\mathbb{R}^2) \rightarrow \mathcal{E}(H)$ such that for all $X, Y \in B(\mathbb{R})$,

$$Q(X) = G(X \times \mathbb{R}); \quad P(Y) = G(\mathbb{R} \times Y);$$

In this case we say that G is a joint observable of Q and P , and also that Q and P are the margins of G ; for motivation and details see, for instance, [23].

An observable $G : B(\mathbb{R}^2) \rightarrow \mathcal{L}(H)$ is a covariant phase space observable if for all $q, p \in \mathbb{R}$ and $Z \in B(\mathbb{R}^2)$,

$$(27) \quad U_q V_p G(Z) V_p^* U_q^* = G(Z + (q; p));$$

As shown, for instance, in [24], each covariant phase space observable G is generated by a unique operator $T \in \mathcal{S}(H)$ such that $G = G_T$,

$$(28) \quad G_T(Z) = \frac{1}{2} \int_{\mathbb{Z}} U_q V_p T V_p^* U_q^* dq dp; \quad Z \in B(\mathbb{R}^2);$$

We recall that if a position observable Q and a momentum observable P have a joint observable, then they also have a joint observable which is a covariant phase space observable; see [19] and [25].

6.2. Inaccuracy relation. By [19, Corollary 8], a position observable Q and a momentum observable P are jointly measurable if and only if there is a Hilbert space K and a vector valued function $\mu \in L^2(\mathbb{R}; dx; K)$ such that

$$(29) \quad \mu(x) = k(x) \mu dx; \quad \mu(y) = b(y) \mu dy;$$

where b is the Fourier-Plancherel transform of μ . It is then a consequence of Proposition 8 that for any confidence level c , the resolution widths $(Q; c)$ and $(P; c)$ are strictly positive. The specific form (29) of the probability measures μ and ν leads also to the following results, demonstrating the interrelationship between the resolution widths $(Q; c)$ and $(P; c)$.

Proposition 12. Let Q and P be position and momentum observables which are jointly measurable. Then

$$(Q; 1) \cap (P; 1) = 1;$$

Proof. Let $\{e_i\}_g$ denote an orthonormal basis of K . The functions appearing in formula (29) can be written as

$$(30) \quad \mu = \sum_i \mu_i e_i \quad \text{and} \quad \nu = \sum_i \nu_i e_i$$

where each ψ_i belongs to $L^2(\mathbb{R}; dx)$.

Suppose that $\langle Q; \psi \rangle < 1$. Due to Proposition 7, we then have $\text{diam supp } \psi < 1$. This implies that each ψ_i is confined to a bounded interval. Hence, each ψ_i does not vanish on any interval (see for instance [26, Section 2.9]). Therefore, $\text{diam supp } \psi = \mathbb{R}$. By Proposition 7 this means that $\langle P; \psi \rangle = 1$.

Proposition 13. Let Q and P be position and momentum observables which are jointly measurable. For any confidence levels $c_1, c_2 \in [\frac{1}{2}, 1]$, we have

$$(31) \quad \langle Q; c_1 \rangle + \langle P; c_2 \rangle \leq (c_1 + c_2 - 1)^2 :$$

Proof. Let $\psi \in L^2(\mathbb{R}; dx; K)$ be such that (29) holds and let $c_1, c_2 \in [\frac{1}{2}, 1]$. Since the function

$$x \mapsto \langle I_{x,r} \rangle = \int_{x-r}^{x+r} k(x)k^2 dx^0$$

is continuous and goes to 0 when $|x| \rightarrow \infty$, formula (14) gives

$$(32) \quad \langle Q; c_1 \rangle = \inf_{r > 0} \text{jm ax}_{x \in \mathbb{R}} \langle I_{x,r} \rangle > c_1 g :$$

Similarly,

$$(33) \quad \langle P; c_2 \rangle = \inf_{s > 0} \text{jm ax}_{y \in \mathbb{R}} \langle I_{y,s} \rangle > c_2 g :$$

Let $x > \langle Q; c_1 \rangle$ and $y > \langle P; c_2 \rangle$. By formulas (32) and (33), this means that there exist $x, y \in \mathbb{R}$ such that

$$(34) \quad \int_{x-2}^{x+2} k(x)k^2 dx > c_1; \quad \int_{y-2}^{y+2} b(y)^2 dy > c_2 :$$

We recall the decomposition (30) of ψ . As shown in [27] and [28], each $\psi_i \in L^2(\mathbb{R}; dx)$ satisfies

$$\frac{1}{\langle k^i \rangle^2} \int_{x-2}^{x+2} |j^i(x)|^2 dx + \int_{y-2}^{y+2} |j^i(y)|^2 dy \leq 1 + \frac{p}{\theta_i}$$

where θ_i is the largest eigenvalue of the positive trace class operator $Q(I_{x; 2})P(I_{y; 2})Q(I_{x; 2})$.

Since $\langle k^i \rangle^2 = \int |j^i(x)|^2$ and $\langle k^i \rangle^2 = 1$, we conclude that

$$\int_{x-2}^{x+2} k(x)k^2 dx + \int_{y-2}^{y+2} b(y)^2 dy \leq 1 + \frac{p}{\theta_i}$$

and this with (34) gives

$$(35) \quad c_1 + c_2 < 1 + \frac{p}{\theta_0}$$

The eigenvalue θ_0 has the following upper bound:

$$(36) \quad \theta_0 = \text{tr}[Q(I_{x; 2})P(I_{y; 2})Q(I_{x; 2})] = \text{tr}[Q(I_{x; 2})P(I_{y; 2})] = \frac{p}{2} ;$$

for the last equality, see e.g. [29]. Thus, combining (35) and (36) we get

$$(37) \quad c_1 + c_2 < 1 + \frac{r}{2} :$$

Since c_1 and c_2 can be chosen arbitrarily close to $(Q; c_1)$ and $(P; c_2)$, inequality (31) follows.

By Proposition 12 we have $(Q; 1) (P; 1) = 1$. Therefore, to complete the proof it is enough to consider the product $(Q; c_1) (P; c_2)$ for $c_2 \notin 1$. We then have

$$(Q; c_1) (P; c_2) = (Q; c_1) (P; c_2) (c_1 + c_2 - 1)^2$$

for every $\frac{1}{2} < c_1 < 1$. This implies that

$$(Q; 1) (P; c_2) \geq c_2^2;$$

and hence, (31) holds.

If $c_1 = c_2 = \frac{1}{2}$, then (31) does not give a positive lower bound for the product of the resolution widths. Actually, in this case there exist jointly measurable position observable Q and momentum observable P with the product $(Q; \frac{1}{2}) (P; \frac{1}{2})$ arbitrarily small; this is a consequence of Theorem 2 in [27]. Concerning this situation, we note that the related claim in [18, Proposition 6] is incorrect.

6.3. Sequential measurements. Let us consider a sequential measurement of a position observable Q and a momentum observable P . Suppose that Q is measured first and the state change is given by a Q -compatible instrument I , which satisfies the covariance and invariance conditions:

$$(38) \quad U_q I_X (U_q^* T U_q) U_q = I_{X+q}(T);$$

$$(39) \quad V_p I_X (V_p^* T V_p) V_p = I_X(T);$$

for every $q; p \in \mathbb{R}; X \in B(\mathbb{R})$ and $T \in S(\mathcal{H})$. We denote by $I_X : L(\mathcal{H}) \rightarrow L(\mathcal{H})$ the dual mapping of I_X . Then G , defined by the condition

$$(40) \quad G(X \otimes Y) := I_X(P(Y)); \quad X, Y \in B(\mathbb{R});$$

is the joint observable corresponding to the sequential measurement. (As proved, for instance, in [30, Theorem 4.5], formula (40) determines a unique observable G on $B(\mathbb{R}^2)$). Also, it follows from (38) and (39) that

$$U_q V_p G(X \otimes Y) V_p^* U_q^* = G(X \otimes Y + (q; p))$$

for every $q; p \in \mathbb{R}$ and $X, Y \in B(\mathbb{R})$, so that G is a covariant phase space observable. Since

$$Q(X) = I_X(\mathbb{1}) = G(X \otimes \mathbb{R});$$

is absolutely continuous with respect to the Lebesgue measure (see the beginning of Subsection 6.2). The other margin

$$P \circ(Y) := I_R(P(Y)) = G(\mathbb{R} \otimes Y)$$

depends on the instrument I . Generally, $P \circ$ differs from P since the position measurement disturbs the system.

Summarizing, if Q admits a covariant and invariant instrument, it is a margin of a covariant phase space observable and, in particular, is absolutely continuous with respect to the Lebesgue measure. In the following we show that the converse is also true, namely, if Q is absolutely continuous then there is a Q -compatible instrument which is covariant and invariant. Moreover, we show that any covariant phase space observable G_T generated by a projection $T = P$ can be formed in the previously described manner from a sequential measurement.

Fix a unit vector $\psi \in H = L^2(\mathbb{R}; dx)$. For each $\psi_1, \psi_2 \in H$ and $X \in B(\mathbb{R})$, let $I_X(\psi_1, \psi_2)$ be the integral operator with kernel

$$K_X^{\psi_1, \psi_2}(x; y) = \int_X \overline{\psi_1(x-z)} \psi_2(y-z) dz;$$

that is,

$$(41) \quad I_X(\psi_1, \psi_2) \psi(x) = \int_X K_X^{\psi_1, \psi_2}(x; y) \psi(y) dy;$$

With the notation $f(x) = f(x)$ we can write the kernel $K_X^{\psi_1, \psi_2}$ in two alternative forms

$$\begin{aligned} K_X^{\psi_1, \psi_2}(x; y) &= \int_X \overline{\psi_1(x-z)} \psi_2(y-z) dz \\ &= \int_X \overline{\psi_1(x-z)} \psi_2(y-z) dz \end{aligned}$$

Since the convolution of two L^2 -functions is a bounded function, we conclude that $K_X^{\psi_1, \psi_2}$ is in $L^2(\mathbb{R}^2; d^2x)$ and so, $I_X(\psi_1, \psi_2)$ is a bounded (actually, Hilbert-Schmidt) operator from $L^2(\mathbb{R}; dx)$ into $L^2(\mathbb{R}; dx)$. Moreover, the mapping I_X extends by linearity to the space of finite rank operators, which is a dense subspace in $\mathcal{T}(H)$.

Proposition 14. Formula (41) determines a unique instrument I whose associated observable is Q , with $d(x) = \int |\psi(x)|^2 dx$. The instrument I satisfies covariance and invariance conditions (38) and (39).

Proof. We first show that for all $\psi_1, \psi_2 \in H$ the operator $I_X(\psi_1, \psi_2)$ is trace class. For all $\psi \in L^2(\mathbb{R}; dx)$, an easy computation gives

$$(42) \quad \text{Tr} I_X(\psi_1, \psi_2) \psi = \int_X \overline{\psi_1(x-z)} \psi_2(y-z) \psi(x) dx;$$

For each $\psi \in L^2(\mathbb{R}; dx)$, we define the operator B_X' by the formula

$$\begin{aligned} (B_X' \psi)(x) &= \int_X \overline{\psi_1(x-z)} \psi_2(y-z) \psi(x) dx \\ &= \int_X B_X^{\psi_1, \psi_2}(x; y) \psi(y) dy; \end{aligned}$$

where

$$B_X^{\psi_1, \psi_2}(x; y) = \int_X \overline{\psi_1(x-z)} \psi_2(y-z) dz;$$

Since the kernel $B'_X(\cdot; \cdot)$ is in $L^2(\mathbb{R}^2; d^2x)$, the operator B'_X is Hilbert-Schmidt. By equation (42) we have

$$\int_{\mathbb{R}^2} \int_{\mathbb{R}^2} (f_1 ih'_{2j}) = \int_{\mathbb{R}^2} \int_{\mathbb{R}^2} h B_X'^1 j B_X'^2 i = \int_{\mathbb{R}^2} \int_{\mathbb{R}^2} h j (B_X'^1) B_X'^2 i$$

for all $f_1 \in L^2(\mathbb{R}; dx)$, so that $I_X(f_1 ih'_{2j}) = (B_X'^1) B_X'^2$ is a trace class operator.

Equation (42) shows that $I_X(P, \cdot) = 0$, and hence, using spectral decomposition we conclude that $I_X(T) = 0$ if T is a positive finite rank operator.

We now show that I_X is trace-norm bounded on finite rank operators, so that it uniquely extends to a bounded operator $I_X : T(H) \rightarrow T(H)$. By decomposition of an operator into its self-adjoint and skew-adjoint parts, we see that it is enough to show that $I_X(T) \in C_k T k_{tr}$ for all T self-adjoint and with finite rank (we denote by k_k the trace class norm). So, let T be finite rank and self-adjoint, and let $T = T_+ - T_-$ be its decomposition into positive and negative parts. Let $T = \sum_{i=1}^n P_i$ be the spectral decompositions of the two parts. Since $I_X(T_{\pm})$ are positive operators, denoting by k_{HS} the Hilbert-Schmidt norm, we have

$$\begin{aligned} I_X(T)_{tr} &= \text{tr} I_X(T) = \sum_i \text{tr} I_X(P_i) \\ &= \sum_i \int_{\mathbb{R}^2} \int_{\mathbb{R}^2} \text{tr} (B_X'^i) B_X'^i = \sum_i \int_{\mathbb{R}^2} \int_{\mathbb{R}^2} B_X'^i{}^2_{HS} \\ &= \sum_i \int_{\mathbb{R}^2} \int_{\mathbb{R}^2} B_X'^i(x; y)^2 dx dy \\ &= \sum_i \int_{\mathbb{R}^2} \int_{\mathbb{R}^2} x(x) j(y-x) j dx \int_{\mathbb{R}^2} y^2 dy \\ (43) \quad &= \sum_i \int_{\mathbb{R}^2} j Q(X) j = \text{tr}[T Q(X)]; \end{aligned}$$

where $d(x) = \int_{\mathbb{R}^2} j(x)^2 dx$. Hence,

$$I_X(T)_{tr} = I_X(T_+)_{tr} - I_X(T_-)_{tr} = kQ(X)k (kT_+ k_{tr} + kT_- k_{tr}) = kQ(X)k kT k_{tr};$$

and the boundedness of I_X follows. Note that if $T \in T(H)$ is positive, then equation (43) implies that

$$(44) \quad \text{tr} I_X(T) = \text{tr}[T Q(X)];$$

If $T = \sum_{i=1}^n P_i$ is a positive element of $T(H)$ (not necessarily with finite rank) then, by continuity of I_X and monotone convergence theorem, equation (42) gives

$$\int_{\mathbb{R}^2} \int_{\mathbb{R}^2} I_X(T) = \int_{\mathbb{R}^2} \int_{\mathbb{R}^2} \sum_i [(P_i)_{tr}](x)^2 dx;$$

Hence, the map $X \mapsto \int_D jI_X(T)$ is a positive Borel measure and its density with respect to the Lebesgue measure is $\int_E [(\overline{f_i})](x)^2$. In particular, the map $B(\mathbb{R}) \ni X \mapsto \int_D jI_X(T) \in L(H)$ is σ -additive when $L(H)$ is endowed with the weak operator topology. Since $I_X(T)$ is positive for each X , the map $B(\mathbb{R}) \ni X \mapsto \int_D jI_X(T) \in T(H)$ is σ -additive in the trace-norm topology. Thus, σ -additivity in the trace-norm topology for generic $T \in T(H)$ then follows.

We have thus shown that I is an instrument, whose associated observable is Q by equation (44).

Finally, from equation (42) we have

$$\begin{aligned} \int_D jU_q V_p I_X(V_p U_q P, U_q V_p) V_p U_q &= \int_E \\ &= \int_Z V_p U_q \int_D jI_X(V_p U_q P, U_q V_p) V_p U_q \\ &= \int_Z x(z) \left[\overline{y U_q'} V_p U_q \right] (z)^2 dz \\ &= \int_Z x(z) [(\overline{f_i})](z+q)^2 dz \\ &= \int_D x+q(z) [(\overline{f_i})](z)^2 dz \\ &= \int_D jI_{X+q}(P, \cdot) \end{aligned}$$

and so conditions (38) and (39) are satisfied for all $P \in S(H)$, hence for all $T \in S(H)$.

Note that if $f \in L^1(\mathbb{R}) \setminus L^2(\mathbb{R}; dx)$, for each $x \in \mathbb{R}$ we can introduce the operator

$$K_x : L^2(\mathbb{R}; dx) \rightarrow L^2(\mathbb{R}; dx); \quad [K_x](y) = \overline{(y-x)}(y):$$

We have

$$[(\overline{f_i})](x) = \int_D h K_x' j i$$

so that equation (42) can be rewritten as

$$\int_D jI_X(j_1 i h' j_2) = \int_x h \int_D j K_x' j_1 i h' j_2 j i dx = \int_x K_x j_1 i h' j_2 K_x dx:$$

We thus have for all $T \in T(H)$

$$I_X(T) = \int_x K_x T K_x dx:$$

This kind of instrument was introduced in [22] and its properties have been studied in [2] and [31]. A measurement theoretical model leading to this instrument has been analyzed in [32].

Proposition 15. Let P be a momentum observable and let G be the covariant phase space observable defined via the formula

$$G(X, Y) = I_X(P(Y)); \quad X, Y \in B(\mathbb{R}):$$

Then $G = G_T$, where G_T is the observable defined in (28) with

$$(45) \quad T = \int_Z V_x P V_x d(x):$$

Proof. We show that $G = G_T$ by verifying that $G(X; Y) = G_T(X; Y)$ for all $X; Y \in B(\mathbb{R})$. This is indeed enough since the mapping $(X; Y) \mapsto G(X; Y)$ determines a unique observable on $B(\mathbb{R}^2)$; see, for instance, [30, Theorem 4.5].

For each $f \in H$, we have (continuing with the notations of the proof of Proposition 14)

$$(46) \quad \begin{aligned} \langle f | G(X; Y) f \rangle &= \text{tr} \int_X (P \cdot) P(Y) \\ &= \text{tr} [(B'_x) B'_x F Q(Y) F] = \int_{H_S} (B'_x F Q(Y))^{\frac{1}{2}} \end{aligned}$$

Since the kernel $B'_x(\cdot; \cdot)$ is in $L^2(\mathbb{R}^2; d^2x)$, by Fubini theorem there is a negligible set Z such that $B'_x(x; \cdot)$ is in $L^2(\mathbb{R}; dx)$ for all $x \in \mathbb{R} \setminus Z$. For such x 's and for all $f \in L^2(\mathbb{R}; dx)$, we have

$$\begin{aligned} \int_{H_S} (B'_x F Q(Y))^{\frac{1}{2}}(x) &= \int_{\mathbb{R}} \frac{D}{B'_x(x; \cdot)} \int_{\mathbb{R}} F Q(Y)^{\frac{1}{2}}(y) E \\ &= \int_{\mathbb{R}} Q(Y)^{\frac{1}{2}} F \overline{B'_x(x; \cdot)}(y) dy \\ &= \int_Z \frac{D}{Q(Y)^{\frac{1}{2}} F B'_x(x; \cdot)}(y) dy \\ &= \int_{\mathbb{R}} (Y - y)^{\frac{1}{2}} [F B'_x(x; \cdot)](y) dy; \end{aligned}$$

thus showing that $(B'_x F Q(Y))^{\frac{1}{2}}$ is the integral operator with kernel

$$\begin{aligned} (x; y) &= (Y - y)^{\frac{1}{2}} [F B'_x(x; \cdot)](y) \\ &= (Y - y)^{\frac{1}{2}} \int_Z e^{iyz} B'_x(x; z) dz \\ &= \int_Z (Y - y)^{\frac{1}{2}} \overline{B'_x(x; z)}(y) e^{iyz} dz \\ &= \int_Z (Y - y)^{\frac{1}{2}} \overline{B'_x(x; z)}(y) e^{iyz} dz \end{aligned}$$

(here we used the fact that $B'_x(x; \cdot)$ is in $L^1(\mathbb{R}; dx)$ for all x to evaluate explicitly its inverse Fourier transform). So we have

$$\begin{aligned} B'_x F Q(Y)^{\frac{1}{2}} &= \int_{\mathbb{R}^2} \int_{\mathbb{R}^2} j(x; y) j^2 dx dy \\ &= (2\pi)^{-1} \int_{\mathbb{R}^2} \int_{\mathbb{R}^2} j_x(x) (Y - y) V_y U_x P U_x V_y dx dy \\ &= (2\pi)^{-1} \int_{\mathbb{R}^2} \int_{\mathbb{R}^2} j_y(z + y) j_x(x) V_y U_x P U_x V_y dx dy d(z) \\ &= (2\pi)^{-1} \int_{\mathbb{R}^2} \int_{\mathbb{R}^2} j_y(y) j_x(x) V_y U_x V_z P V_z U_x V_y dx dy d(z) \\ (47) \quad &= h' j_{G_T}(X - Y)' i: \end{aligned}$$

Comparing equations (46) and (47), equality $G(X - Y) = G_T(X - Y)$ follows.

We recall that the correspondence $T \leftrightarrow G_T$ between operators in $S(H)$ and the covariant phase space observables is one-to-one (see e.g. [19, Proposition 6]). In particular, an observable G_T is an extremal point in the convex set of covariant phase observables exactly when T is a projection. This is our motivation for the following statement.

Proposition 16. The generating operator T defined in equation (45) is a projection if and only if the momentum observable P is sharp.

Proof. If P is sharp, then $\psi = \delta_x$ for some $x \in \mathbb{R}$ and equation (45) gives $T = V_x P V_x = P_{V_x}$.

Assume then T is a projection, so that it has eigenvalue 1. Let ψ be a corresponding eigenvector of unit norm. Then

$$1 = h' j T \psi = \int_{\mathbb{R}^2} \int_{\mathbb{R}^2} j_h j_{V_x} j^2 d(x);$$

implying that $\int_{\mathbb{R}^2} \int_{\mathbb{R}^2} j_h j_{V_x} j^2 = 1$ for every $x \in \text{supp } \psi$. This shows that if $x, y \in \text{supp } \psi$, then V_x and V_y are proportional to ψ , and so ψ is an eigenvector of the operator $V_x - V_y$. But $V_x - V_y$ has eigenvectors only if $V_x - V_y = \mathbb{1}$, i.e., $x = y$. Thus, $\text{supp } \psi$ consists only of one point.

Now we turn to the question of the approximate repeatability of the instrument I .

Lemma 2. Suppose $A \in L(H)$ commutes with Q . Then $\text{tr}[A I_X(T)] = \text{tr}[I_X(AT)]$ for all $T \in S(H)$.

Proof. It is not restrictive to assume that A is positive, so that there exists a function $\alpha \in L^1(\mathbb{R}; dx)$, with $\alpha \geq 0$, such that $(A \psi)(x) = \alpha(x) \psi(x)$; see, for instance, [33, Section 75]. With the notations of the proof of Proposition 14, we have

$$\text{tr}[A I_X(P, \cdot)] = \text{tr}[A (B'_x) B'_x] = \int_{\mathbb{R}^2} \alpha^{\frac{1}{2}}(B'_x) :$$

The operator $\alpha^{\frac{1}{2}}(B'_x)$ is the integral operator with kernel

$$K(x; y) = \alpha(x)^{\frac{1}{2}} \int_{\mathbb{R}^2} \overline{\alpha(x - y)};$$

so that

$$\begin{aligned}
 A^{\frac{1}{2}}(B'_X)_{HS} &= \int_Z \int_Z K(x; y) f(x) f(y) dx dy \\
 &= \int_Z (x) \int_Z (y) j(x, y) f(y) dy f(x) f(x) dx \\
 &= \int_Z (x) (X - x) f(x) f(x) dx = h' j_Q(X) A' i \\
 &= \text{tr}[I_X(A P,)];
 \end{aligned}$$

where $d(x) = \int (x) f(x) dx$. This proves the lemma for $T = P, \cdot$. The claim for general $T \in S(H)$ then follows.

Proposition 17. The instrument I has the following properties.

- (i) I is ϵ -repeatable for any $\epsilon > 2 \text{ diam}(\text{supp } Q; 1)$.
- (ii) If $\text{diam}(\text{supp } Q; 1) = 1$, there is no $\epsilon > 0$ and $\frac{1}{2} c < 1$ such that I is $(\epsilon; c)$ -repeatable.

Proof. (i) Let $\epsilon > 2 \text{ diam}(\text{supp } Q; 1)$, which by Proposition 7 means that $\epsilon > 2 \text{ diam}(\text{supp } Q)$. Using Lemma 2 we get

$$\begin{aligned}
 \text{tr}[I_{X, \cdot}(I_X(P, \cdot))] &= \text{tr} \int_Q (X, \cdot) (I_X(P, \cdot)) = \text{tr} \int_Q (X, \cdot) Q(X, \cdot) P, \cdot \\
 &= \int_Z \text{tr} \int_Q (X) Q(X, \cdot) P, \cdot \\
 (48) \qquad \qquad \qquad &= \int (X, \cdot - x) (X - x) f(x) f(x) dx:
 \end{aligned}$$

On the other hand

$$\begin{aligned}
 \text{tr}[I_X(P, \cdot)] &= \int_Z \text{tr} \int_Q (X) P, \cdot \\
 (49) \qquad \qquad \qquad &= \int (X - x) f(x) f(x) dx:
 \end{aligned}$$

If $(X - x) > 0$ for some $x \in \mathbb{R}$, then $(X - x) \setminus \text{supp } Q \neq \emptyset$, so that $\text{supp } Q \cap (X - x)$, and then $(X - x) = 1$. The claim then follows comparing equations (48) and (49).

(ii) Assume that I is $(\epsilon; c)$ -repeatable. As noticed in (i), Lemma 2 implies that

$$\text{tr}[I_{X, \cdot}(I_X(T))] = \text{tr} \int_Q (X, \cdot) Q(X, \cdot) T$$

for any $T \in S(H)$. Hence, the requirement that

$$\text{tr}[I_{X, \cdot}(I_X(T))] > c \text{tr}[I_X(T)] \quad \forall T \in S(H)$$

is equivalent with

$$h j_Q(X, \cdot) Q(X, \cdot) i > c h j_Q(X) i \quad \forall T \in S(H); \quad \epsilon > 0:$$

This means that $(X - x) (X - x) > c (X - x)$ for almost all x . So, we must have $(X - x) > c$ for almost all x such that $(X - x) > 0$, and, since $x \mapsto (X - x)$ is a continuous function, this amounts to $(X - x) > c$ for all $x \in A = \{x \mid (X - x) > 0\}$. If $\text{diam}(\text{supp } Q; 1) = 1$, then $\text{diam}(\text{supp } Q) = 1$. Take $X = I_{0, r}$ with $r > 0$, in which case the

set A is unbounded. Since $(X_n - x) > c$ for all $x \in A$, this is in contradiction with $(R) = 1$.

Finally, we note that Proposition 12 together with Proposition 17 lead to the following trade-off relation between the approximate repeatability of a position measurement and the corresponding momentum disturbance. Consider again the sequential measurement procedure described in the beginning of this subsection, where a measurement of Q is followed by a measurement of P . If the Q -compatible instrument I is $(\epsilon; c)$ -repeatable for some ϵ and c , then the position measurement disturbs the system in such a way that the actually measured momentum observable P_0 has $(P_0; 1) = 1$.

Acknowledgements

This work has mainly been done during a visit of T.H. at Dipartimento di Fisica, Università di Genova. The hospitality of Dipartimento di Fisica and the financial support by Helsinki Sanomain 100-vuotissaatio are gratefully acknowledged. Authors want to thank Paul Busch and Pekka Lahti for helpful comments on an earlier version of this paper and for their proposed improvement in Proposition 13.

References

- [1] M. Ozawa. Conditional probability and a posteriori states in quantum mechanics. *Publ. RIMS, Kyoto Univ.*, 21:279{295, 1985.
- [2] P. Busch and P. Lahti. Some remarks on unsharp quantum measurements, quantum nondemolition, and all that. *Ann. Physik*, 47:369{382, 1990.
- [3] E.B. Davies and J.T. Lewis. An operational approach to quantum probability. *Comm. Math. Phys.*, 17:239{260, 1970.
- [4] P. Busch. Unsharp reality and joint measurements for spin observables. *Phys. Rev. D*, 33:2253{2261, 1986.
- [5] P. Busch, P.J. Lahti, and P. Mittelstaedt. *The Quantum Theory of Measurement*. Springer-Verlag, Berlin, second revised edition, 1996.
- [6] E.B. Davies. *Quantum Theory of Open Systems*. Academic Press, London, 1976.
- [7] A.S. Holevo. *Probabilistic and Statistical Aspects of Quantum Theory*. North-Holland Publishing Co., Amsterdam, 1982.
- [8] K. Kraus. *States, Effects, and Operations*. Springer-Verlag, Berlin, 1983.
- [9] P. Busch and P. Lahti. Completely positive mappings in quantum dynamics and measurement theory. *Found. Phys.*, 20:1429{1439, 1990.
- [10] M. Ozawa. Quantum measuring processes of continuous observables. *J. Math. Phys.*, 25:79{87, 1984.
- [11] L. Ballentine. The statistical interpretation of quantum mechanics. *Rev. Mod. Phys.*, 42:358{381, 1970.
- [12] P. Busch, P. Lahti, J.-P. Pellonpää, and K. Ylinen. A real number and phase complementary observables? *J. Phys. A*, 34:5923{5935, 2001.
- [13] T. Heinonen, P. Lahti, J.-P. Pellonpää, S. Pulmannova, and K. Ylinen. The norm-1-property of a quantum observable. *J. Math. Phys.*, 44:1998{2008, 2003.
- [14] D.P.L. Castriano. On Euclidean systems of covariance for massless particles. *Lett. Math. Phys.*, 5:303{309, 1981.
- [15] P. Busch, G. Cassinelli, and P. Lahti. On the quantum theory of sequential measurements. *Found. Phys.*, 20:757{775, 1990.

- [16] P. Busch, M. Grabowski, and P. J. Lahti. *Operational Quantum Physics*. Springer-Verlag, Berlin, 1997. second corrected printing.
- [17] P. Busch, M. Grabowski, and P. Lahti. Repeatability in quantum theory: their role and feasibility. *Found. Phys.*, 25:1239{1266, 1995.
- [18] C. Carmeli, T. Heinonen, and A. Toigo. Position and momentum observables on \mathbb{R} and on \mathbb{R}^3 . *J. Math. Phys.*, 45:2526{2539, 2004.
- [19] C. Carmeli, T. Heinonen, and A. Toigo. On the coexistence of position and momentum observables. *J. Phys. A*, 38:5253{5266, 2005.
- [20] W. Stulpe. *Classical Representations of Quantum Mechanics Related to Statistically Complete Observables*. Wissenschaft und Technik Verlag, Berlin, 1997. Also available: quant-ph/0610122.
- [21] J. B. Conway. *A Course in Functional Analysis*. Springer, 2nd edition, 1990.
- [22] E. B. Davies. On the repeated measurements of continuous observables in quantum mechanics. *J. Funct. Anal.*, 6:318{346, 1970.
- [23] P. Lahti. Coexistence and joint measurability in quantum mechanics. *Int. J. Theor. Phys.*, 42:893{906, 2003.
- [24] G. Cassinelli, E. De Vito, and A. Toigo. Positive operator valued measures covariant with respect to an abelian group. *J. Math. Phys.*, 45:418{433, 2004.
- [25] R. Werner. The uncertainty relation for joint measurement of position and momentum. In O. Hirota, editor, *Quantum Information, Statistics, Probability*, pages 153{171. *Paramus, NJ* Rinton, 2004. Also available: quant-ph/0405184.
- [26] H. Dym and H. P. McKean. *Fourier Series and Integrals*. Academic Press, New York, 1972.
- [27] H. J. Landau and H. O. Pollak. Rotate spheroidal wave functions, Fourier analysis and uncertainty. II. *Bell System Tech. J.*, 40:65{84, 1961.
- [28] A. Lenard. The numerical range of a pair of projections. *J. Functional Analysis*, 10:410{423, 1972.
- [29] P. Busch and P. J. Lahti. To what extent do position and momentum commute? *Phys. Lett. A*, 115:259{264, 1986.
- [30] K. Y. Lin. Positive operator bimasures and a noncommutative generalization. *Studia Math.*, 118:157{168, 1996.
- [31] M. Ozawa. Canonical approximate quantum measurements. *J. Math. Phys.*, 34:5596{5624, 1993.
- [32] P. Busch and P. J. Lahti. Correlation properties of quantum measurements. *J. Math. Phys.*, 37:2585{2601, 1996.
- [33] N. J. Akhiezer and I. M. Glazman. *Theory of Linear Operators in Hilbert Space*. Vol. II. Frederick Ungar, New York, 1963.

Claudio Carmeli, Dipartimento di Fisica, Università di Genova, Via Dodecaneso 33, 16146 Genova, Italy.

E-mail address: carmeli@ge.infn.it

Teiko Heinonen, Department of Physics, University of Turku, Finland.

E-mail address: teiko.heinonen@utu.fi

Alessandro Toigo, Dipartimento di Fisica, Università di Genova, and I.N.F.N., Sezione di Genova, Via Dodecaneso 33, 16146 Genova, Italy.

E-mail address: toigo@ge.infn.it