

DETECTION IN HUMAN-SENSOR SYSTEMS UNDER QUANTUM PROSPECT THEORY USING BAYESIAN PERSUASION FRAMEWORKS

Yinan Hu and Quanyan Zhu

Tandon School of Engineering, New York University, Brooklyn, NY, USA

ABSTRACT

Human-sensor systems has a variety of applications in robotics, healthcare and finance. Sensors observe the true state of nature and produce strategically designed signals to help human arrive at more accurate decisions of the state of nature. We formulate the human-sensor system into Bayesian persuasion framework consolidated into prospect theories and construct a detection scheme where human wants to find out the true state by observing the realization of the quantum states from the sensor. We obtain the optimal signaling rule for the sensor and optimal decision rule and verify that the total law of probability is violated in this scenario. We also illustrate how the concept of rationality and influence human's detection performance and also the sender's signaling rules.

Index Terms— Quantum detection, quantum signal processing

1. INTRODUCTION

Detection methods play an essential role in statistical signal processing. It has many applications in studying sensor-attacks [1], internet traffic, etc. Detection frameworks in human-sensor systems have played an important role in robotics [2], healthcare systems, as well as recommender systems [3]. One important topic is how a sensor can guide human's decision making process by carefully designing signals delivered to human beings. Recently studies have adopted quantum decision theories to interpret [4] a variety of phenomena in human cognitive science that cannot be interpret using classical counterparts. One phenomenon of such kind is order effect [5], which means that human's posterior belief on perception is impacted by the order at which the classical information is provided; Another phenomenon is violation of sure-thing principle [6], which refers to the violation of total probability law when the probabilities represent human perception in decision making process. Recently, authors in [7] have developed quickest detection frameworks consolidated quantum decision models to capture bounded rationalities in human decision making. However, risk-preference [8] also plays an important role in

human's decision making process as humans may not value gains and losses at the same weight. Risk-averse humans may not be willing to sacrifice the chance of a loss in exchange for the chance of a gain when selecting lotteries. There are also theories on risk measures [9] to characterize human's risk preferences in a more sophisticated way.

To this end, we formulate the detection of sensor-human systems to using quantum prospect theory [10]. Such a decision model incorporates exogenous classical outcome with psychological state to capture human's bounded rationality including the risk-preference in decision making. We have following contributions: first we develop a detection framework in human-sensor system where risk-preference, combined with interference to constitute the human's bounded rationality; second, we show the existence of an optimal likelihood-ratio-test-like policy for the human receiver; third, we illustrate the violation of sure-thing-principle as well as the relationships between the optimal threshold and prior beliefs and risk-preference parameter.

The rest of the paper is organized as follows: in section 2 we formulate the relationship between the sensor and the human receiver and characterize the protocol that the sensor communicates with human regarding the true state of nature. In section 3 we the optimal decision policies for the human receivers and optimal signaling rules for sensors. In section 4 we simulate the solution concepts numerically. In particular, we verify the violation of sure-thing-principle and depict the optimal thresholding regarding the prior upon the true hypothesis. Finally, we conclude in section 5.

Related work: This work serves as a variation of the work [7] by taking into consideration of risk-preferences in human's decision making process. We here adopt Bayesian persuasion [11] model to formulate sensor's behaviors. There are numerous game-theoretic frameworks to formulate the relationship between strategic agents.

Notation: \mathcal{H} : the Hilbert space (over the set of real numbers \mathbb{R}); \mathcal{H}^* : the dual space of \mathcal{H} ; $\langle \Phi | \in \mathcal{H}^*$: the left state vector; $|\Phi\rangle \in \mathcal{H}$: the right state vector; $B(\mathcal{H})$: the space of all positive, Hermitian and bounded operators




Fig. 1: The human-sensor interaction scheme. Before the game starts the sender (sensor) commits to a type-dependent signaling devices $\rho_0, \rho_1 \in \mathcal{S}$. The sender is a sensor/machine that obtains the true state.

from \mathcal{H} to itself; \mathcal{S} : the subset of $B(\mathcal{H})$ such as trace of its operators is 1; \mathcal{V} : the space of projection-valued measurements [12]; \mathcal{S} : the space of signals; $\Delta(\cdot)$: the set of probability measures over the given space; $\mathbf{1} \in B(\mathcal{H})$: the identity operator; $\Omega = \{H_0, H_1\}$: the space of states.

2. FORMULATION

In this section we develop the framework of detection in human-sensor systems where human adopts quantum prospect theory [10]. We assume that there are two underlying state of the system: normal H_0 and abnormal H_1 , under each hypothesis the observations generated $s' \in S$ obeying different distributions:

$$H_0 : s' \sim f_0(s), \quad H_1 : s' \sim f_1(s), \quad (1)$$

where f_0, f_1 are probability density functions. We associate a common prior $p(H_1), p(H_0)$, with $p(H_1) + p(H_0) = 1$ with the true hypothesis. The key feature of quantum prospect theory is the entanglement of quantum states that corresponds to a classical, exogenous outcome with the quantum states associated with endogenous psychological mind state of humans. Mathematically, for every classical observation of the signal $s' \in S$, the human receiver associates a composite state of mind to produce a prospect state $|\Phi\rangle \in \mathcal{H} = \mathcal{H}_C \otimes \mathcal{H}_I$, $|\psi^s\rangle \in \mathcal{H}_C$, $|\varphi\rangle \in \mathcal{H}_I$. The human receiver produces a ‘prospect state’ $|\Phi\rangle = |\psi^s\rangle \otimes \sum_k a_{sk} |\varphi_k\rangle = \sum_k a_{sk} |\psi^s \varphi_k\rangle$, where $\{|\varphi_k\rangle\}$ is a set of orthonormal basis spanning \mathcal{H}_I as with the normalization condition $\sum_{k=1}^K |a_{sk}|^2 = 1$. When the realization of signals s is stochastic obeying distributions f_1, f_0 as in (1), depending on the true state of nature, the sensor/sender equivalently, generates two possible ‘mixed prospect states’ $\tilde{\rho}_1, \tilde{\rho}_0 \in \mathcal{S}$ as follows:

$$\tilde{\rho}_1 = \sum_s f_1(s) \left(\sum_k a_{sk} |\psi^s \varphi_k\rangle \right) \left(\sum_{k'} a_{s'k'} \langle \psi^s \varphi_k' | \right) \quad (2)$$

$$\tilde{\rho}_0 = \sum_s f_0(s) \left(\sum_k a_{sk} |\psi^s \varphi_k\rangle \right) \left(\sum_{k'} a_{s'k'} \langle \psi^s \varphi_k' | \right) \quad (3)$$

The protocol We adopt a framework of sender-receiver to formulate the relationship between a sensor

and a human being as depicted in figure 1. There is a system with underlying state satisfying the requirement in (1). We apply the following decision-making protocol for human-sensor system: the sender(sensor) first commits to a type-dependent signal devices: $\rho_1, \rho_0 \in \mathcal{S}$ based on the ‘vanilla prospect states’ $\tilde{\rho}_1, \tilde{\rho}_0$; the sender observes the realization of the true state $\omega \in \Omega$; sender delivers randomized signal to the receiver(human); receiver observes the realization of the signal $\Phi \in \mathcal{H}$; the receiver takes an action $a = \delta(\Phi) \in \{0, 1\}$ suggesting that the human thinks the hypothesis H_a holds true; the sender and the receiver both obtain reward/cost based on the true state and their actions.

Sender’s utility function We denote $v : \mathcal{S} \times \mathcal{S} \times B(\mathcal{H}) \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ be the sender’s utility function. The sender aims at seeking optimal signaling devices ρ_1^*, ρ_0^* by solving the following optimization problem:

$$\begin{aligned} \max_{\rho_1, \rho_0 \in \mathcal{S}} & \left\{ \mathbb{E}_{\substack{\Phi_0 \sim \rho_0 \\ \Phi_1 \sim \rho_1}} [v(\Phi_1, \Phi_0, \Gamma)] \right\}, \\ \text{s.t. } P^* & \in \arg \min_{P \in B(\mathcal{H})} u(\rho_1^*, \rho_0^*, P, \Phi) \end{aligned} \quad (4)$$

where P^* and u refer to the optimal decision rule and utility function of the human receiver, which we specify later.

Human’s decision model: Upon receiving the signal $s \in S$ from the sensor, the human receiver first construct a prospect state Φ based on s as mentioned before. Then the human receiver updates the common prior belief $p(H_0), p(H_1)$ on the true hypothesis into posterior belief based on Bayes’ rule:

$$p(H_j | \Phi) = \frac{p(H_j) \langle \Phi | \rho_j | \Phi \rangle}{p(H_0) \langle \Phi | \rho_0 | \Phi \rangle + p(H_1) \langle \Phi | \rho_1 | \Phi \rangle}, \quad j = 0, 1.$$

The human arrives at a decision rule δ^* through projective positive-valued measurements (POVM) [12]: $P(\cdot) = \sum_j |\eta_j\rangle \langle \eta_j|$, where $\{|\eta_j\rangle\}_j \subset \mathcal{H}$ forms a set of orthonormal base vectors for the decision maker to find out. Given any realization of the prospect state $|\Phi\rangle \in \mathcal{H}$, we can form that the human receiver makes a probabilistic decision $a_1 = \delta(\Phi) = 1$ (i.e. considering that H_1 holds true) with $\Gamma(1) = \mathbb{P}(a_1 = 1 | \Phi) = \langle \Phi | P | \Phi \rangle$. The probability

$$\begin{aligned} \langle \Phi | P | \Phi \rangle &= \sum_{s, s'} \sum_{k, k'} c_{sk} c_{s'k'} \langle \Phi | s \varphi_k \rangle \langle s' \varphi_{k'} | \Phi \rangle \\ &= \sum_{s, s'} \sum_k c_{sk} c_{s'k} |\langle \Phi | s \varphi_k \rangle|^2 \\ &+ \sum_{s, s'} \sum_{k \neq k'} c_{sk} c_{s'k'} \langle \Phi | s \varphi_k \rangle \langle s' \varphi_{k'} | \Phi \rangle \\ &\equiv g(P; \Phi) + q(P; \Phi), \end{aligned}$$

where $g(P; \Phi)$ and $q(P; \Phi)$ are named *utility factor* and *attraction factor* regarding the prospect state Φ upon human’s decision making rule P .

Similar to the frameworks raised in [13], we associate the probability $P_F = \text{Tr}(P\rho_0)$ means the false alarm rate, and the probability $P_D = \text{Tr}(P\rho_1)$ meaning the detection rate, to characterize receiver's risk function. We now formulate human's problem as an optimization problem where we construct the human receiver's weighted risk function $u : \mathcal{S} \times \mathcal{S} \times B(\mathcal{H}) \times \mathcal{H} \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ that takes into account the probabilities P_F, P_D in a way similar to [13] based on sensor's equivalent signaling rules ρ_1, ρ_0 as follows:

$$\begin{aligned} & \min_{P \in B(\mathcal{H})} u(\rho_1, \rho_0, P, \Phi) \\ & = w(p(H_0|\Phi)\text{Tr}_{\mathcal{H}}(P\rho_0))u_{01} + w(p(H_1|\Phi)\text{Tr}_{\mathcal{H}}(P\rho_1))u_{11} \\ & + w(p(H_0|\Phi)(1 - \text{Tr}_{\mathcal{H}}(P\rho_0)))u_{00} \\ & + w(p(H_1|\Phi)(1 - \text{Tr}_{\mathcal{H}}(P\rho_1)))u_{10}, \end{aligned} \quad (5)$$

where the function $w : [0, 1] \rightarrow [0, 1]$ in (5) is a weight function of the following form (the parameter ϵ characterizes the decision maker's risk preference):

$$w(z; \epsilon) = \frac{z^\epsilon}{(z^\epsilon + (1-z)^\epsilon)^{1/\epsilon}}, \quad z \in [0, 1], \quad \epsilon > 0 \quad (6)$$

We notice when $\epsilon = 1$, the weight function reduces to a risk-neutral preference $w(z; 1) = z$. For convenience in deriving the human's optimal decision rules, we assume the following on payoff values under different state-action pairs.

Assumption 1 We assume that the human receiver earns positive reward under correction predictions and incurs cost under incorrect ones: that is, $u_{11}, u_{00} > 0$, $u_{01}, u_{10} < 0$.

3. THEORETICAL RESULTS

In this section we solve the optimization problems (5) and (4). We first show that there is an optimal decision policy for the human receiver and an optimal signaling policy for the sender. Then we analyze the solution.

3.1. Obtaining the results

Proposition 1 (LRT as human's optimal decision rule) Let $\rho_1, \rho_0 \in B(\mathcal{H})$ be the sender's signaling devices. Let the problem (5) be the human's receiver's optimization problem, where the receiver aims at developing optimal measurements $P^* \in B(\mathcal{H})$. Suppose the weight function w defined in (6) is monotonically increasing. and the assumption 1 holds. Then we have the following conclusion:

$$P^* = \sum_{\eta_j > 0} |\eta_j\rangle\langle\eta_j|, \quad (7)$$

where $|\eta_j\rangle$ are eigenvectors of $\rho_1 - \tau\rho_0$ with eigenvalues η_j , $j = 1, 2, \dots$

$$(\rho_1 - \tau\rho_0)|\eta_j\rangle = \eta_j|\eta_j\rangle.$$

for some $\tau \geq 0$.

Proof. See the appendix 7.1 ■

The conclusion in proposition 7.1 states that the human decision rule under prospect theory is nothing but a likelihood ratio test in quantum hypothesis testing formulation [14] if assumption 1 holds.

3.2. Analysis of the result

We would show that under mild assumptions, when the attraction factor q vanishes for some prospect state $|\Phi\rangle$, the human receiver's decision rule reduces to one equivalent to likelihood ratio test [15] in classical hypothesis testing.

Proposition 2 Let $\rho_1, \rho_0 \in B(\mathcal{H})$ be the sender's signaling rule as indicated before with the vector of eigenvalues $\sigma_1, \sigma_0 \in \Delta(\mathbb{R}^d)$. Let P^* be the optimal detecting policy for the human-receiver as mentioned in proposition 1. Let $q(P_1; \Phi)$ be the attraction factor for the operator P_1 regarding the realization of the quantum state $|\varphi\rangle \in \mathcal{H}$. Construct the diagonal operator $\Lambda \in \mathbb{R}^{dK \times dK}$ as follows:

$$\Lambda = \begin{bmatrix} \Lambda_1 & \cdots & \cdots & \cdots \\ \vdots & \Lambda_2 & \vdots & \vdots \\ \vdots & \vdots & \ddots & \vdots \\ \cdots & \cdots & \cdots & \Lambda_d \end{bmatrix}, \quad (8)$$

where every $\Lambda_s \in \mathbb{R}^{K \times K}$, $s = 1, 2, \dots, d$ is also a diagonal matrix:

$$\Lambda_s = \begin{bmatrix} a_{s1}\gamma_\tau(s) & \cdots & \cdots & \cdots \\ \vdots & a_{s2}\gamma_\tau(s) & \vdots & \vdots \\ \vdots & \vdots & \ddots & \vdots \\ \cdots & \cdots & \cdots & a_{sk}\gamma_\tau(s) \end{bmatrix},$$

where $\gamma_\tau(s) = \sigma_1(s) - \tau\sigma_0(s)$. If the attraction factor $q(P; \Phi) = 0$ for some $\Phi \in \mathcal{H}$, then $\langle\Phi|P^*|\Phi\rangle = \langle\Phi|\Lambda|\Phi\rangle$.

Proof. See the appendix on the arxiv paper. ■

4. NUMERICAL RESULTS

In this section we illustrate the optimal detection policy for the human and the optimal signaling rule for the sensor as characterized in Section 3. The first numerical example originates from a cognitive case study named Prisoner's dilemma in [16], in which there are two parties: a




Fig. 2: Demonstration of violation of sure-thing-principle. We here choose $\epsilon = 1$. The probability of defection for the human receiver when the opponent is known to defect and cooperate is 0.39, 0.26, respectively. The probability of defection when the action of the opponent is unknown depends on attraction factor as illustrated in the dashed curve. Observing that when the attraction factor is larger than 0.001 (the green region), the chance of defection is not a convex combination of the counterparts when the opponent's defection or cooperation is certain. Thus the total law of probability is violated.

human and her opponent. The human decision maker has two choices: to defect ($a = 1$) and cooperate ($a = 0$), while her opponent's choices, characterized by the true state of nature, are to defect H_1 or to cooperate H_0 . The human does not know the opponent's action until after she takes an action. The human receives higher reward if her action and her opponent's coincide. We adopt human here makes a decision based on (5) while sensor (interpreted as a message passer) producing signaling rules according to ρ_1, ρ_0 .

Violation of sure-thing-principle: The sure-thing-principle (STP), or total probability law, can be interpreted in decision theory as a phenomenon that if under two states H_1, H_0 , an action a is preferred to a' , then such preference is carried over to the scenario where the state is unknown. Authors in [16] adopts quantum probabilistic models to justify such violations under investigations of the case of Prisoner's dilemma. We assume $d = 2$ and $K = 5$ and fix the realization of the state $|\Phi\rangle$. We apply the same payoff matrix as in [16] and set the reward values as $u_{00} = 20, u_{01} = 5, u_{10} = 10, u_{11} = 25$. Using different values of the attraction factor from 0 to 1, we construct the violation in [17] in the following figure 2. In addition, we plot in Figure 3 the human detector's optimal decision rule, characterized by the threshold, given the prior that the opponent chooses to defect $p(H_1)$. We observe that as $p(H_1)$ increases from 0 to 1, the optimal detecting threshold initially increases slowly, but later drastically after a certain point, indicating that




Fig. 3: The optimal threshold τ in terms of the prior $p(H_1)$. We pick $\epsilon = 1$ as parameterization of the risk-preference.




Fig. 4: Optimal threshold in terms of the risk-preference parameter ϵ .

the probability that human cooperates decreases slowly when the prior $p(H_1)$ is not too large, but switch to defect very quickly after a certain point.

Risk preference and threshold In Figure 4, we illustrate the human receiver's optimal threshold in terms of the risk-preference parameter. We observe that when $\epsilon < 1$, the human is risk-averse in some regions so that she tends to defect. As ϵ grows larger, human tends to be more risk-seeking and are more likely to cooperate.

5. CONCLUSION

We formulate the human-sensor system using quantum prospect theory, capturing bounded rationality that also includes human's risk preference. We illustrate the violation of total probability law, which serves an important feature of quantum decision models. We also characterize the receiver's strategy as an optimal threshold policy and studies its dependence in terms of risk preference.

One aspect that we have not addressed is the dynamical scenario where the human receiver's psychological states evolve through time while the sensor can controls the evolution by adjusting Lindbladian parameters [18]. It is also worthwhile investigating the quantitative improvement of performance for human under the sensor's influence.

6. REFERENCES

- [1] Rômulo Meira-Góes, Eunsuk Kang, Raymond H Kwong, and Stéphane Lafortune, “Synthesis of sensor deception attacks at the supervisory layer of cyber–physical systems,” *Automatica*, vol. 121, pp. 109172, 2020.
- [2] Hadis Amini, Ram A Somaraju, Igor Dotsenko, Clément Sayrin, Mazyar Mirrahimi, and Pierre Rouchon, “Feedback stabilization of discrete-time quantum systems subject to non-demolition measurements with imperfections and delays,” *Automatica*, vol. 49, no. 9, pp. 2683–2692, 2013.
- [3] Linyuan Lü, Matúš Medo, Chi Ho Yeung, Yi-Cheng Zhang, Zi-Ke Zhang, and Tao Zhou, “Recommender systems,” *Physics reports*, vol. 519, no. 1, pp. 1–49, 2012.
- [4] Jerome R Busemeyer and Peter D Bruza, *Quantum models of cognition and decision*, Cambridge University Press, 2012.
- [5] Jennifer S Trueblood, James M Yearsley, and Emmanuel M Pothos, “A quantum probability framework for human probabilistic inference.,” *Journal of Experimental Psychology: General*, vol. 146, no. 9, pp. 1307, 2017.
- [6] Emmanuel M Pothos and Jerome R Busemeyer, “A quantum probability explanation for violations of ‘rational’ decision theory,” *Proceedings of the Royal Society B: Biological Sciences*, vol. 276, no. 1665, pp. 2171–2178, 2009.
- [7] Luke Snow, Vikram Krishnamurthy, and Brian M Sadler, “Quickest detection for human-sensor systems using quantum decision theory,” *arXiv preprint arXiv:2208.08583*, 2022.
- [8] Amos Tversky and Daniel Kahneman, “Advances in prospect theory: Cumulative representation of uncertainty,” *Journal of Risk and uncertainty*, vol. 5, pp. 297–323, 1992.
- [9] Philippe Artzner, Freddy Delbaen, Jean-Marc Eber, and David Heath, “Coherent measures of risk,” *Mathematical finance*, vol. 9, no. 3, pp. 203–228, 1999.
- [10] Giuseppe Ferro, Tatyana Kovalenko, and Didier Sornette, “Estimation and comparison between rank-dependent expected utility, cumulative prospect theory and quantum decision theory,” *Swiss Finance Institute Research Paper*, , no. 21-49, 2020.
- [11] Emir Kamenica, “Bayesian persuasion and information design,” *Annual Review of Economics*, vol. 11, pp. 249–272, 2019.
- [12] John Von Neumann, *Mathematical foundations of quantum mechanics: New edition*, Princeton university press, 2018.
- [13] Sinan Gezici and Pramod K Varshney, “On the optimality of likelihood ratio test for prospect theory-based binary hypothesis testing,” *IEEE Signal Processing Letters*, vol. 25, no. 12, pp. 1845–1849, 2018.
- [14] Carl.W.Helsotrom, *Quantum Detection and Estimation Theory*, ISSN. Elsevier Science, 1976.
- [15] Bernard C Levy, *Principles of signal detection and parameter estimation*, Springer Science & Business Media, 2008.
- [16] Jerome R Busemeyer, Mervin R Matthew, and Zheng Wang, “A quantum information processing explanation of disjunction effects,” in *Proceedings of the annual meeting of the cognitive science society*, 2006, vol. 28.
- [17] Amos Tversky and Eldar Shafir, “The disjunction effect in choice under uncertainty,” *Psychological science*, vol. 3, no. 5, pp. 305–310, 1992.
- [18] Ismael Martínez-Martínez and Eduardo Sánchez-Burillo, “Quantum stochastic walks on networks for decision-making,” *Scientific reports*, vol. 6, no. 1, pp. 1–13, 2016.
- [19] Jerzy Neyman and Egon Sharpe Pearson, “Ix. on the problem of the most efficient tests of statistical hypotheses,” *Philosophical Transactions of the Royal Society of London. Series A, Containing Papers of a Mathematical or Physical Character*, vol. 231, no. 694-706, pp. 289–337, 1933.

7. APPENDIX

7.1. Proof of proposition 1

Proof. We adopt the proof similar to the one for proposition 1 in [13]. We know that the human receiver aims to distinguish between two states H_1, H_0 where the underlying target mixed prospect states are ρ_1, ρ_0 , respectively as in (3) and (2).

Denote $y = \text{Tr}(P\rho_1)$ as the detection rate and $x = \text{Tr}(P\rho_0)$ as the false alarm rate.

Thus we could construct decision rule P^* for binary hypothesis testing as (7).

Then we prove it is the optimal decision rule. Consider another arbitrary projective operator-valued measurement $P' \in B(\mathcal{H})$ leading to detection rate x' and false alarm rate y' . We construct the decision rule $\delta^* : \mathcal{H} \rightarrow [0, 1]$ as

$$\delta^*(\Phi) = \langle \Phi | P^* | \Phi \rangle,$$

where the operator P^* is as follows:

$$P^* = \sum_{\eta_j > 0} |\eta_j\rangle\langle\eta_j|, \quad (9)$$

where $|\eta_j\rangle$ are eigenvectors of $\rho_1 - \tau\rho_0$ with eigenvalues η_j , $j = 1, 2, \dots$

$$(\rho_1 - \tau\rho_0)|\eta_j\rangle = \eta_j|\eta_j\rangle.$$

for some $\tau \geq 0$ chosen so the detection rate is y' . According to [14] we know that P^* minimizes the Bayes risk for quantum detection:

$$P^* \in \arg \min_{P \in B(\mathcal{H})} \tau \text{Tr}(P\rho_0) + \text{Tr}((1 - P)\rho_1)$$

Similar to the proof of Neyman-Pearson lemma [19], we can derive for any $P' \in B(\mathcal{H})$,

$$\begin{aligned} & \tau(\text{Tr}(P'\rho_0) - \text{Tr}(P^*\rho_0)) \\ & \leq \text{Tr}((1 - P^*)\rho_1) - \text{Tr}((1 - P')\rho_1) \\ & = \text{Tr}(P'\rho_1) - \text{Tr}(P^*\rho_1). \end{aligned}$$

That is, $\tau(x^* - x') \leq y^* - y'$, where x^*, y^* are false alarm rate and detection rate of P^* , respectively. Since we set $y^* = y'$, we conclude $x^* \leq x'$. Since w is monotone increasing and that the left hand side is 0, we have

$$w(\text{Tr}((1 - P^*)\rho_1)) \geq w(\text{Tr}((1 - P')\rho_1)).$$

As a result, for any decision rule P' leading to a certain detection rate y' , we can always construct a corresponding P^* of the form (1) achieving a lower false positive rate than the one of P' under the same detection rate. Thus using P^* of the form (9) we can always lower the second term without changing the first term in (5). Thus a generic human's optimal decision rule P^* minimizing the utility function u must be of the form given in (7). ■

7.2. Proof of proposition 2

Proof. For a given prospect state $\Phi \in \mathcal{H}$, knowing the human receiver's decision P^* , we first write out the prospect probability $p(P^*; \Phi)$ as a sum of attraction factor and utility factor as follows:

$$q(P^*; \Phi) = \sum_s (\sigma_1(s) - \tau\sigma_0(s)) \sum_{\substack{k, k' \\ k' \neq k}} a_{sk} a_{sk'} \langle \Phi | s\varphi_{k'} \rangle \langle s\varphi_k | \Phi \rangle,$$

$$g(P^*; \Phi) = \sum_s (\sigma_1(s) - \tau\sigma_0(s)) \sum_k |a_{sk}|^2 |\langle \Phi | s\varphi_k \rangle|^2,$$

Since we assume all coefficients are real and non-negative in (1), we get that when $\bar{q}(P^*; \Phi) \rightarrow 0$, $\bar{p}(P^*; \Phi) \rightarrow \bar{f}(P^*; \Phi)$ for the given $|\Phi\rangle$. Then we know that $\langle s'\varphi_{k'} | P^* | s\varphi_k \rangle = 0$ for all $s \neq s'$ or $k \neq k'$, that is, any non-diagonal entry of the operator P^* is zero under the basis $\{|s\varphi_k\rangle\}_{\substack{s=1,2,\dots,d \\ k=1,2,\dots,K}}$. But we know the diagonal elements of the operator P^* is given as in (8), which concludes the proof. ■