

Probability, unitarity, and realism from generally covariant quantum information

S. Jay Olson* and Jonathan P. Dowling

*Hearne Institute for Theoretical Physics, Department of Physics and Astronomy,
Louisiana State University, Baton Rouge, LA 70803*

(Dated: June 21, 2024)

The formalism of covariant quantum theory, introduced by Reisenberger and Rovelli, casts the description of quantum states and evolution into a framework compatible with the principles of general relativity. The leap to this fully covariant formalism, however, outstripped the standard interpretation used to connect quantum theory to experimental predictions, leaving the predictions of the theory ambiguous. Here we discuss in detail some implications of our recently proposed description of covariant quantum information, which addresses these problems. We show explicit agreement with standard quantum mechanics in the appropriate limit. In addition to compatibility with general covariance, we show that this framework has other attractive and surprising features — it is fully unitary, realist, and self-contained. The full unitarity of the formalism in the presence of measurements allows us to invoke time-reversal symmetry to obtain new predictions closely related to the quantum Zeno effect.

PACS numbers: 03.65.Ta, 03.67.Mn, 03.67.Hk, 03.67.Lx

I. INTRODUCTION

Quantum information in recent years has become a topic of enormous interest to the physics community. Driven primarily by interest in exotic new technologies, the surge in interest has also cast new light on the foundations of quantum mechanics (QM). There is a similar dual role for relativistic quantum information [1]. On the one hand, incorporating aspects of general relativity into quantum information theory will be needed to extend quantum technology over large regions of spacetime in the presence of gravity — for example, between satellites in Earth orbit. On the other hand, an understanding of generally covariant quantum information may be essential for interpreting quantum gravity, where many standard assumptions taken for granted in quantum mechanics are no longer valid.

In 2002, Reisenberger and Rovelli constructed a generally covariant quantum formalism, applicable to any quantum system, up to and including quantum gravity [2]. Originally, the main difficulty with this formulation was in correspondence with orthodox, single particle quantum theory. In standard quantum mechanics, the measurement postulate forces the future to be treated very differently from the past; in the covariant approach, this sort of distinction is not allowed. It should be emphasized that this feature of standard quantum theory does not go away simply by making the dynamics globally or locally Lorentz invariant — it has been firmly entrenched in the definition of quantum mechanics itself from the beginning. Additionally, Reisenberger and Rovelli's probability postulate relies upon a certain small-region approximation to obtain agreement with orthodox quantum theory. As we will see, both problems are subtly

connected to quantum information.

The correspondence problem manifests itself most clearly in the case of multiple measurements. For example, if \hat{x} and \hat{p} are two non-commuting observables, then the probability to measure a particular value of x and a particular value of p clearly depends on the time ordering of the measurements, as well as the state of the system. In covariant quantum mechanics, however, there is no pre-selected time variable to order the measurements — no coordinate of the extended configuration space is allowed to play any special role in the formalism. In the context of more sophisticated theories of quantum gravity, no background causal structure exists and the problem remains essentially the same.

Recently, we have proposed that an information-theoretic approach should be used to obtain predictions from covariant quantum theory [3]. Using a generalized partial trace, our idea immediately reproduces the predictions of standard quantum mechanics (including an effective notion of quantum collapse) in the appropriate single-particle Schrödinger-picture limit, but requires no special time variable to be identified to make well-defined predictions and requires no small region approximation to be invoked in order to obtain agreement with standard QM. A form of time ordering emerges, nonetheless, as an entropy relationship in the state of the observers, which are modeled quantum mechanically.

In the present paper we explore in more detail the implications of this concept. In section II, we review the basic elements of covariant quantum mechanics, and our information theoretic formalism. In section III, we directly compare and contrast our approach to the original probability postulate of Reisenberger and Rovelli, which has been recently elaborated in more detail by Hellmann, Mondragon, Perez, and Rovelli, to find a way around the multiple measurement problem [4]. We analyze a perturbative measurement calculation that demonstrates disagreement between our two approaches, and agreement of

*Electronic address: solson2@lsu.edu

our formalism with orthodox quantum theory. In section IV, we discuss the fully realist interpretation of quantum theory implied by our approach. In section V, we apply the formalism to the Einstein, Podolsky, Rosen (EPR) scenario and demonstrate a new approach to understanding non-local correlations, without invoking any nonlocal collapse. In section VI, we take advantage of the unitary framework of this measurement formalism and demonstrate time-reversal in the context of the quantum Zeno effect — an effect on the evolution of a quantum system by *disentangling* from an ancilla. In section VII, we point out the fully self-contained nature of our probability postulate, and discuss the possible implications for quantum cosmology. We offer our concluding remarks in section VIII.

II. COVARIANT QUANTUM THEORY AND INFORMATION

Here we review the basic ingredients of our work. We first consider the Cerf-Adami measurement formalism of standard, Schrödinger-picture quantum mechanics, which is the conceptual starting point of our work [5, 6]. We then review the formalism of covariant quantum theory and the associated problems with correspondence to orthodox quantum theory. Finally, we show how to merge these ideas into a measurement formalism we call covariant quantum information (CQI). Section III will be devoted to a direct comparison of covariant quantum information with the original measurement postulate of covariant quantum theory, and a demonstration that the correspondence problems are solved in the context of covariant quantum information.

A. The Cerf-Adami Description of Measurement

Here we begin in in the standard Schrödinger-picture description of states and evolution. The states of the theory are generally L^2 functions of some non-relativistic configuration space, \mathcal{M}_0 . A unitary time-evolution operator evolves these states from one to another through different instants of the classical background time, t .

Measurement, however, is not described by the usual non-unitary projection onto an eigenstate of an observable, nor is decoherence by an external environment invoked. Instead, we model the observer quantum mechanically, describing his interaction with the quantum system unitarily, while keeping track of the entropy of the reduced density operator describing the observer alone — this is the central insight of Cerf and Adami [5, 6]. This approach is motivated by the observation that the outcome of all quantum mechanical experiments can ultimately be phrased in terms of the final state of the observer — is he described by a state of [observed outcome i], or a state of [observed outcome j]? The probabilistic features of quantum mechanics are thus

interpreted as components of the mixed state *of the observer*, rather than probabilities for the rest of the universe (except the observer) to make a non-unitary jump. This subtle shift in focus is extremely important.

To see how this idea works, and reproduces standard physics while retaining unitarity, we consider a sequence of measurements of (in general) incompatible observables — an analysis first described in Ref. [5]. Consider a quantum system we wish to study, Q , in the following state:

$$|Q\rangle = \sum_i \alpha_i |a_i\rangle. \quad (1)$$

To perform the first measurement, we allow interaction with a measurement-observer system A (Alice), whose basis states $|i\rangle$ are in one-to-one correspondence with eigenstates of the observable of interest, $|a_i\rangle$. The interaction is such that after it has taken place, we have the following entangled state of QA :

$$|QA\rangle = \sum_i \alpha_i |a_i, i\rangle. \quad (2)$$

Now we introduce a second measurement system B (Bob), whose basis states $|j\rangle$ are in one-to-one correspondence with eigenstates $|b_j\rangle$ of an observable that does not commute with that measured by A (implying that the overlap $U_{ij} = \langle b_j | a_i \rangle$ is not the identity matrix). After interaction with B , we find the system in the following state:

$$|QAB\rangle = \sum_{i,j} \alpha_i U_{ij} |b_j, i, j\rangle. \quad (3)$$

This is a pure state with zero entropy. However, it contains everything we need to obtain probabilities for the outcome of Alice and Bob's experiment. Notice that observers generally do not have access to the full state of the system. Alice generally only has access to the state of Alice. Thus, to predict what Alice sees in this experiment, we are interested only in the reduced density operator ρ_A , and similarly ρ_B for Bob. We do this by performing a partial trace, obtaining:

$$\rho_A = \sum_i |\alpha_i|^2 |i\rangle\langle i|, \quad (4)$$

$$\rho_B = \sum_{i,j} |\alpha_i|^2 |U_{ij}|^2 |j\rangle\langle j|. \quad (5)$$

Although the full state is pure, the states of the observers themselves are mixed — classical probabilities have thus entered the picture. These density operators have von Neumann entropy identical to the classical Shannon entropy associated with random variables with probability distributions:

$$p_A(i) = |\alpha_i|^2, \quad (6)$$

$$p_B(j) = \sum_i |\alpha_i|^2 |U_{ij}|^2. \quad (7)$$

Note that these are exactly the probabilities associated with the traditional assumption of a projective collapse during Alice's measurement, and another during Bob's subsequent measurement, though we have introduced no such concept. The distinction is that we are looking only at the state of the observers (hence the partial trace) and the classical probabilities associated with their being described by a particular quantum state. We are free to read off the probabilities without bringing non-unitarity into the theory.

This prescription is quite general. For a sequence of N measurements, we have the following density matrix for the N^{th} measurement system [7]:

$$\rho_N = \sum_{i,j,\dots,k,l} |\alpha_i|^2 |U_{ij}^{(2)}|^2 \dots |U_{kl}^{(N)}|^2 |l\rangle\langle l|. \quad (8)$$

If we define $p^1(i) = |\alpha_i|^2$, $p^n(ij) = |U_{ij}^{(n)}|^2$, and $p^n(i) = \sum_j |U_{ij}^{(n)}|^2$ and define the classical conditional entropies:

$$H(n|n-1) = - \sum_{i,j} p^{n-1}(i) p^n(ij) \log p^n(ij). \quad (9)$$

We find the following classical entropy chain:

$$H(N) = H(1) + H(2|1) + \dots + H(N|N-1). \quad (10)$$

This implies a well-known result — that projective measurements whose outcome is unknown can only increase (or leave constant) the entropy of a system [8]. Here, this is reflected by the increasing entropy of the observer systems (since the entropy of the *combined* system remains zero). In this way, a quantum mechanical arrow of time (the direction of increasing observer entropy) as well as an effective quantum mechanical collapse is subtly hidden in Schrödinger picture quantum mechanics, when information theory is accounted for — we did not have to postulate these things, they are emergent within a fully unitary framework, so long as we remember to interpret probabilistic predictions in terms of the state of the observer.

We must mention an objection sometimes raised against the standard decoherence measurement formalism, which leads to a similar mixed density operator method of obtaining probabilities (though the logic leading to the final answer is quite different — here we are concerned with the reduced density operator describing the observer and specifically *not* the system Q under observation, and we required no external environment to interact with the system or observers). There are many ways to express the mixed density operator ρ_A — how do we know which basis corresponds to the *experience basis* of Alice, i.e., what is the basis in which Alice does not find herself in a superposition after the measurement? Answering this question is essential if we are to obtain the proper probabilities and make unambiguous predictions.

We propose that the preferred representation of ρ_A , from which probabilities may be read directly, is the

unique basis in which ρ_A is diagonal and whose components are orthogonal. The uniqueness of this prescription is spoiled in degenerate cases, but such states are of measure zero in the Hilbert space of any reasonable quantum system. This is similar to the einselection criterion proposed by Zurek [9], with one important distinction — Zurek's einselected basis of Q is chosen by interactions with the environment which causes the state of Q to undergo decoherence. In our proposal, this basis (a basis of A , not of Q !) is selected entirely by the measurement interaction alone. Thus it is the experimental setup alone which selects the basis to be observed (which is in keeping with a certain amount of intuition).

One might object to this proposal on the following grounds: Suppose in the above experiment performed by Alice (with Q a qubit), the final state is *not* given by the perfectly entangled state:

$$|QA\rangle = \alpha|0,0\rangle + \beta|1,1\rangle \quad (11)$$

but in keeping with inefficient, realistic detectors, is instead given by:

$$|QA\rangle = \alpha|0,0\rangle + \gamma|1,0\rangle + \delta|1,1\rangle. \quad (12)$$

That is, there is an amplitude that Alice does not see Q 's transition to the $|1\rangle$ -state. In this case, ρ_A describing Alice is no longer diagonal in the $\{|0\rangle, |1\rangle\}$ basis she set out to observe.

This may at first appear to be a problem, since we do not perceive our experience basis to be dependent on the efficiency of the detectors we use. However, what is failing here is just our oversimplification of the observer-detector as a single system. In reality, the detector is a separate system D which first becomes entangled with the quantum system Q , and then becomes entangled with an observer system, A . Thus to handle this issue we must expand the description of the observed state further — the state of QDA representing a less than perfect measurement is now expressed as:

$$|QDA\rangle = \alpha|0,0,0\rangle + \gamma|1,0,0\rangle + \delta|1,1,1\rangle. \quad (13)$$

Now the reduced density operator describing the observer Alice is again diagonal in the $\{|0\rangle, |1\rangle\}$ basis she set out to measure, and the probabilities again have their standard interpretation. Note that we assumed again perfect entanglement between the detector and the observer, but this is now a perfectly reasonable assumption, since these are macroscopically distinguishable states — i.e. there is never any real inefficiency in the detector's ability to communicate detection to the observer. If the detector's lightbulb comes on, indicating a detection of the $|1\rangle$ state, we are safe in assuming that an attentive observer will always be able to distinguish this detector state from a dark lightbulb. Of course there may be many more steps analogous to this in a more complete description of the detector and observer, but the central point is that as long as the *final* communication between detector and

observer can be regarded as reliable, then no basis problem exists in this formalism. In the idealized limit of perfectly efficient detectors, however, we may safely bypass this additional step and consider the detector and observer to be a single system — we will often do this in what follows, suppressing the observer-detector distinction unless a detailed description of the detection interaction requires us to abandon the assumption of perfectly efficient detectors.

B. Covariant Quantum Theory

The structure of covariant quantum theory is somewhat different than that of orthodox quantum theory, but it is far more general [2, 10, 11]. Rather than work with a Hilbert space of L^2 functions on the non-relativistic configuration space \mathcal{M}_0 (e.g. L^2 functions on *space* in the case of single-particle quantum mechanics), we work directly on the extended configuration space \mathcal{M} , (e.g. functions on *space-time* in the case of single-particle quantum mechanics). There are two state spaces that we will build from \mathcal{M} , and the predictions of covariant quantum mechanics are in some sense an interplay between them.

The *physical* Hilbert space \mathcal{H} is the space of solutions to the equations of motion, generally expressed in Wheeler-DeWitt form, $H\Psi = 0$. This defines our use of the word “Hamiltonian” in this paper. These states generally have support throughout all spacetime (or \mathcal{M}), and are not themselves square-integrable functions. To get predictions from the theory, we introduce another state space \mathcal{K} called the *kinematical* Hilbert space. It is defined as $L^2(\mathcal{M})$ — e.g. square integrable functions on space-time, rather than on space.

The role of the kinematical states in \mathcal{K} is to represent information specified by an observer, while the role of physical states in \mathcal{H} is to contain information on the full dynamics of the theory. So, for example, if we know a particle was observed in spacetime region \mathcal{R} , we specify a \mathcal{K} -state, $|\psi^{\mathcal{K}}\rangle$, such that the function $\psi^{\mathcal{K}}(x) = \langle x|\psi^{\mathcal{K}}\rangle$ has support in \mathcal{R} . To make dynamical predictions about this particle, we must take $|\psi^{\mathcal{K}}\rangle$ to its corresponding state in \mathcal{H} , by means of the following projector, P :

$$P : \mathcal{K} \rightarrow \mathcal{H} \quad (14)$$

$$P : \psi^{\mathcal{K}}(x) \mapsto \psi^{\mathcal{H}}(x) \quad (15)$$

$$\psi^{\mathcal{H}}(x) = \int_{\mathcal{M}} dx' W(x; x') \psi^{\mathcal{K}}(x') \quad (16)$$

where $W(x; x')$ is the propagator for the theory, which is determined by the Hamiltonian. Naturally, there are many kinematical states that project to the same physical state. Since all physical predictions come through specifying kinematical states, the inner product between two states on \mathcal{H} ($\phi^{\mathcal{H}}$ and $\psi^{\mathcal{H}}$) is given by the L^2 inner product on \mathcal{K} in the following way:

$$\begin{aligned} \langle \phi^{\mathcal{H}} | \psi^{\mathcal{H}} \rangle &= \langle \phi^{\mathcal{K}} | P | \psi^{\mathcal{K}} \rangle \quad (17) \\ \langle \phi^{\mathcal{K}} | P | \psi^{\mathcal{K}} \rangle &= \int_{\mathcal{M}} dx dx' \phi^{*\mathcal{K}}(x) W(x; x') \psi^{\mathcal{K}}(x') \quad (18) \end{aligned}$$

The interplay of quantum kinematics and dynamics formulated by Reisenberger and Rovelli in this way is beautiful in its range of applicability, naturally incorporating general covariance and making itself available to fundamental, background-free theories of quantum gravity at the Planck scale. In addition, it clarifies some of the conceptual issues that historically caused confusion in quantizing gravity and spacetime itself, and grants us a starting point for discussing quantum physics without an external, classical, pre-defined notion of time (note that an explicit t -variable appears nowhere in the formalism).

The formalism, however, has had one critically weak link. It has been far from obvious how to reproduce the measurement postulate of orthodox quantum mechanics in this covariant approach, and thus it has not been completely clear how to generally interpret and extract predictions from the formalism. Reisenberger and Rovelli originally postulated that the probability to observe state $\psi^{\mathcal{K}}$, given state $\phi^{\mathcal{K}}$, is given by the square of the physical inner product, that is:

$$\mathcal{P}_{\phi \rightarrow \psi} = |\langle \psi^{\mathcal{H}} | \phi^{\mathcal{H}} \rangle|^2 \quad (19)$$

in analogy with orthodox quantum theory. However, it was clear from the beginning that there were some problems with this postulate — to obtain agreement with standard QM in the case of single measurements requires the use of a “small region approximation” which assumes that $\psi^{\mathcal{K}}$ has support in a sufficiently small region of the extended configuration space. For multiple measurements, it originally appeared to require a pre-defined time variable to order the measurements, though recently Hellmann, Mondragon, Perez, and Rovelli have recently argued that any series of measurements can be treated mathematically within the formalism as a single measurement, for the purposes of making predictions. We will elaborate more upon these points further in the next section, where we will argue that this cannot be a *general* probability postulate.

C. Covariant Quantum Information

Recently, we have proposed an information theoretic interpretation of measurement within covariant quantum theory that appears to solve these difficulties [3]. The idea can be thought of as an extension of the description of standard quantum measurement given by Cerf and Adami, which we reviewed above. That is, we include a model of the observer in any experimental scenario, and obtain probabilities by looking at the observer’s reduced

density operator — generally speaking, due to the properties of entanglement, quantum theory predicts that a measurement will result in an initially pure observer state evolving into a mixed one, and thus the predictions of quantum mechanics are inherently probabilistic.

To invoke these ideas in the context of covariant quantum mechanics, we clearly need a partial trace. This is simple on the kinematical Hilbert space \mathcal{K} , which has the usual L^2 tensor product form, but it is not so obvious on the physical Hilbert space, \mathcal{H} , in which states cannot generally be expressed as a tensor product of subsystem states.

To begin, we define a covariant system analogous to Q by specifying its extended configuration space \mathcal{M}_1 and a relativistic Hamiltonian H_1 . To include an observer system analogous to A , we enlarge the configuration space via the Cartesian product, i.e. $\mathcal{M} = \mathcal{M}_1 \times \mathcal{M}_2$, and define a new Hamiltonian H for the combined system. In what follows, let x represent coordinates of \mathcal{M}_1 , and let y represent coordinates of \mathcal{M}_2 — i.e. we express a general point on \mathcal{M} by the pair, $\{x, y\}$.

By analogy with Cerf and Adami, we wish the partial trace to express local information held by a specific subsystem, but not by using a preferred time variable. Instead, we select a generic region of interest \mathcal{S} somewhere in \mathcal{M} . In the limit of the Schrödinger picture, \mathcal{S} corresponds to a constant time slice of space, but in general \mathcal{S} may be chosen freely, provided a few conditions

are met: We require that the physical state $\phi^{\mathcal{H}}$ under consideration can be expressed via the projection of a \mathcal{K} state $\phi^{\mathcal{K}}$ with support in \mathcal{S} . Next, we require that for all $\{x, y\}$ and $\{x', y'\}$ in \mathcal{S} , the propagator takes the form $W(x, y; x', y') = W_1(x; x')\delta(y-y')$, where $W_1(x; x')$ is obtained from the free Hamiltonian H_1 . This expresses the fact that we are considering a region \mathcal{S} where no interactions between system one and two are taking place (i.e. before or after the measurement interaction has taken place) and the evolution of system two, the observer, is trivial. That is, if the observer has performed a measurement, he does not forget about the outcome.

When these conditions are met, we can approximate the full Wheeler-DeWitt equation $H(x, y)\Psi(x, y) = 0$ as $H_1(x)\Psi(x) = 0$ in our region of interest, and thus the physical state space \mathcal{H} is locally indistinguishable from $\mathcal{H}_1 \otimes L^2(\mathcal{M}_2) \equiv \mathcal{H}_1 \otimes \mathcal{K}_2$.

We define a new projector, P_1 , from \mathcal{K}_1 to \mathcal{H}_1 , so that we can now express our state as a physical density operator via $\rho = P_1|\phi^{\mathcal{K}}\rangle\langle\phi^{\mathcal{K}}|P_1^\dagger$ (valid only in the region \mathcal{S}). Now express $|\phi^{\mathcal{K}}\rangle$ via a Schmidt decomposition as $\sum_i \lambda_i |\phi_i^{\mathcal{K}_1}\rangle |\phi_i^{\mathcal{K}_2}\rangle$. Now P_1 operates only on \mathcal{K}_1 , so we can take a partial trace over \mathcal{K}_1 and using the cyclic property of the trace, the properties of the projector and the physical inner product ($\langle x|P^\dagger P|x'\rangle = W(x; x')$ [11]), we obtain a reduced density operator on $\mathcal{K}_2 \equiv L^2(\mathcal{M}_2)$:

$$\rho_2 = N^{-1} \sum_{i,j} \int_{\mathcal{M}_1} dx dx' \lambda_i \lambda_j^* \phi_i^{\mathcal{K}_1}(x) W(x; x') \phi_j^{\mathcal{K}_1}(x') |\phi_i^{\mathcal{K}_2}\rangle \langle \phi_j^{\mathcal{K}_2}| \quad (20)$$

where $N = \int_{\mathcal{M}} dx dx' \phi^{*\mathcal{K}}(x) W(x; x') \phi^{\mathcal{K}}(x')$ is for normalization. This is now a reduced density operator on \mathcal{K}_2 , containing the physically relevant information locally available to the observer within \mathcal{S} . Note the range of integration is contained entirely within \mathcal{S} due to the support of the L^2 functions $\phi^{\mathcal{K}}$. This covariant definition immediately reduces to the ordinary definition of the partial trace when the region of interest \mathcal{S} is a constant time slice as before, but it is clearly more general — $\phi^{\mathcal{K}}$ may be smeared in any number of ways over a non-zero time interval, provided that the observer system is making no transitions. It also remains meaningful for fully covariant systems having no pre-defined time variable at all.

Using this partial trace, then, we have implemented the idea of Cerf and Adami covariantly. Within a given spacetime region, an observer will be described by a mixture on his kinematical state space \mathcal{K} , even if we know the full physical state in \mathcal{H} is pure. The probabilities can be extracted exactly as we have described in subsection A — by finding the unique diagonal, orthogonal basis of the observer. Note that in obtaining equation 20 we

have used a Schmidt decomposition, so that this basis is automatically selected by equation 20.

This covariant approach to quantum information has several important features which we mention here, and it is the purpose of the sections that follow to elaborate each of them in more detail.

- **Agreement with standard QM predictions:**

Due to the fact that the covariant partial trace reduces exactly to the standard definition when the region \mathcal{S} corresponds to a constant time slice of space, the formalism of Cerf and Adami is guaranteed to emerge in the limit of standard Schrödinger equation dynamics and the usual (though unphysical) assumption of arbitrarily good clocks. This will be demonstrated in the next section, where we show how correspondence with the standard Born interpretation is recovered. The original objections to covariant quantum theory based on its failure to correspond with standard QM results are completely answered, and the problems resolved.

- **Fully realist:** Remarkably, all predictions for all observers can be obtained from a single physical state in the theory, implying that a single, objective state ultimately characterizes the universe, rather than different states for different observers. We will demonstrate this feature in more detail in sections IV and V.
- **Fully unitary:** Because there is no collapse or reduction of the full state vector upon observation, all evolution in the theory is unitary. This means that time reversal is a good symmetry, even in the presence of quantum measurements. This will allow us to make new experimental predictions for phenomena associated with measurement, e.g. the quantum Zeno effect, which we will consider in section VI.
- **Fully covariant:** By construction, the formalism is compatible with generally covariant physics. No coordinates of \mathcal{M} are pre-selected to play any special role, or require identification to formulate the theory or to obtain predictions from it (though it is clear that in many cases the dynamics under investigation may make one choice of coordinates far more *convenient* than another, as is the case with single-particle Schrödinger dynamics).
- **Fully self-contained:** Since all observers are modeled quantum mechanically, there is no sense in which probabilities are assumed to refer to an external, classical agent. This may make the formalism natural for quantum cosmology, where the concept of an external observer is undefined, and much debate has centered on the interpretation of quantum probabilities for this reason. Section VII will comment on this feature.

Thus, covariant quantum information casts new light on foundational issues of quantum mechanics and quantum cosmology, and simultaneously allows us to make use of generally covariant quantum mechanics for all quantum systems, in essence establishing a working connection between concrete atomic-scale quantum measurements, and those of untested Planck-scale theories of quantum gravity.

III. COMPARISON OF PROBABILITY POSTULATES FOR COVARIANT QUANTUM THEORY

It is important to realize that covariant quantum information predicts *different* probabilities than does the Reisenberger-Rovelli postulate. This is because entanglement is a necessary feature of measurement in the covariant information approach, whereas the Reisenberger-Rovelli probability postulate assigns probabilities between any two kinematical states. Thus, there are many situations in which the Reisenberger-Rovelli postulate assigns a probability but covariant quantum information does not — for example, whenever we ask about the probability that a system is found in state $\psi^{\mathcal{K}}$, without specifying a quantum system to perform the measurement.

Equally important is that this shift in interpretation can lead to different probabilities for the same physical question. To see this explicitly, we analyze here single-particle dynamics, where we can make contact with the well-known Born interpretation as a correspondence rule that must be reproduced in the appropriate limit.

It was immediately clear to Reisenberger and Rovelli that there was difficulty with the original probability postulate [2, 4, 10, 12]. Here we consider the system described in their original paper [2] — a single particle satisfying the Schrödinger equation, and a simple two-state detector designed to activate if the particle passes through spacetime region \mathcal{R} . The detector is prepared in state $|0\rangle$, and transitions to state $|1\rangle$ if the particle interacts with the detector in \mathcal{R} . The interaction Hamiltonian can be written as $H_{int}(x) = \alpha V(x)(|1\rangle\langle 0| + |0\rangle\langle 1|)$, where the potential $V(x)$ is constant in \mathcal{R} and zero elsewhere. The potential is assumed to be sufficiently weak so that first order perturbation theory can be used, and thus transitions from the state $|1\rangle$ back to the state $|0\rangle$ can be ignored.

To ask the question “what is the probability that the detector is activated?” in the standard Born-rule interpretation, we need an initial state $\Psi_0(x)$ at some initial time, T_0 , and we must specify some later time T after the interaction to look at the form of the wave function. Reisenberger and Rovelli showed that at late time T the quantum system has evolved to a state of the form:

$$\int dX' W(X, T; X', T_0) \Psi_0(X', T_0) |0\rangle + \frac{\alpha}{i\hbar} \int_{\mathcal{R}} dX' dT' W(X, T; X', T') V(X', T') \Psi(X', T') |1\rangle \quad (21)$$

Where here $\Psi(x) = \int dx' W(x, x') \Psi_0(x')$. From here, the Born rule tells us that the probability that the detector was activated is the square of the second term integrated over X at the constant time T . With some manipulation

and use of the properties of the Schrödinger propagator, it can be shown that this probability takes the following

form:

$$\mathcal{P}_{Born} = \frac{\alpha^2}{\hbar^2} \int_{\mathcal{R}} dx \int_{\mathcal{R}} dx' \Psi^*(x) W(x; x') \Psi(x') \quad (22)$$

Now, for this scenario, the postulate of Reisenberger and Rovelli for covariant quantum theory is that:

$$\mathcal{P}_{R-R} = |\langle \mathcal{R} | P | \Psi_0^{\mathcal{K}} \rangle|^2 \quad (23)$$

$$= \left| \int dx \int dy \mathcal{R}^*(x) W(x; y) \Psi_0^{\mathcal{K}}(y) \right|^2 \quad (24)$$

Here, $\mathcal{R}(x)$ is a normalized, constant function in \mathcal{R} , and zero elsewhere. $\Psi_0^{\mathcal{K}}$ is the initial state prepared on a constant-time slice as above. Using the definition of $\Psi(x)$ above, we can re-write this as follows:

$$\mathcal{P}_{R-R} = \left| \int dx \mathcal{R}^*(x) \Psi(x) \right|^2 \quad (25)$$

$$= \int dx \int dy \Psi^*(x) \mathcal{R}^*(x) \mathcal{R}(y) \Psi(y) \quad (26)$$

$$= \int_{\mathcal{R}} dx \int_{\mathcal{R}} dy \Psi^*(x) \Psi(y) \quad (27)$$

This form of \mathcal{P}_{R-R} is similar to the form of \mathcal{P}_{Born} shown in equation 22, except for the missing factor of the propagator in the integrand. If \mathcal{R} is taken to be sufficiently small, then these two results agree up to a constant factor related to the description of the measurement apparatus. A similar small- \mathcal{R} limit has been taken in all the referenced presentations of covariant quantum theory. However, it is easy to construct examples outside of this limit where disagreement immediately arises. For example, take \mathcal{R} to be the union of two points at coordinates $x = a$ and $x = b$ on a single constant-time slice (so that $W(a; b) \approx 0$) — then we have that $\mathcal{P}_{Born} \propto |\Psi(a)|^2 + |\Psi(b)|^2$, but that $\mathcal{P}_{R-R} \propto |\Psi(a)|^2 + |\Psi(b)|^2 + \Psi^*(a)\Psi(b) + \Psi^*(b)\Psi(a)$. If a and b are sufficiently separated, then the probabilities cannot be made to agree.

This illustrates an extremely important point — if the original probability postulate fails to reproduce what we already know to be true in standard atomic-scale quantum mechanics, it can certainly not be taken for granted in unexplored Planck-scale or entire universe-scale regimes.

The covariant quantum information approach, by contrast, has no difficulty here. Recall that CQI requires us to define a region of the extended configuration space, \mathcal{S} , in order to obtain probabilities. We take the same measurement apparatus defined above, and if \mathcal{S} is taken to be a constant-time slice of space, then the Born result is reproduced identically. However, we are by no means *required* to take \mathcal{S} to be a constant-time slice — one main motivation for this approach to physics was in fact to do away with the preferred status of the time variable in the construction of the theory.

To see this explicitly in this example, note that to the future of the interaction region \mathcal{R} , the detector is evolving trivially, thus the physical Hilbert space \mathcal{H} is indistinguishable from $\mathcal{H}_1 \otimes \mathbb{C}^2$ in this region [22]. Thus all regions to the future of \mathcal{R} are equivalent for the purposes of calculating the transition probability, so long as they are large enough to support a \mathcal{K} state $\Psi^{\mathcal{K}}(x)$ that projects to the relevant physical states on \mathcal{H}_1 . Using the covariant partial trace, the observer's reduced density operator can be expressed as follows:

$$\rho_{obs} = N^{-1} \left[\frac{\alpha^2}{\hbar^2} \langle \phi | \phi \rangle^{\mathcal{H}_1} |1\rangle\langle 1| + \langle \psi | \psi \rangle^{\mathcal{H}_1} |0\rangle\langle 0| \right] \quad (28)$$

where $\phi(x) = \int_{\mathcal{R}} dx' \int_{\mathcal{M}_1} dx'' W(x; x') V(x') W(x', x'') \Psi_0(x'')$ and $\psi(x) = \int_{\mathcal{M}_1} dx' W(x; x') \Psi_0(x')$ are unnormalized states in \mathcal{H}_1 , and $N = \langle \psi | \psi \rangle^{\mathcal{H}_1} + \frac{\alpha^2}{\hbar^2} \langle \phi | \phi \rangle^{\mathcal{H}_1}$. The probability for the detector to be activated is thus given by:

$$\mathcal{P}_{CQI} = N^{-1} \frac{\alpha^2}{\hbar^2} \langle \phi | \phi \rangle^{\mathcal{H}_1} \quad (29)$$

which depends on the physical inner product in \mathcal{H}_1 rather than on the preferred status of any time coordinate. However, because of the isomorphism between \mathcal{H}_1 and $L^2(\mathbb{R})$ on a constant time slice [11], we can immediately show that this probability is identical to that obtained by the Born interpretation above, which *does* make use of a preferred time coordinate (but is well-established experimentally). Using the above definitions of $\phi(x)$ and $\Psi(x)$, we have:

$$\mathcal{P}_{CQI} = N^{-1} \frac{\alpha^2}{\hbar^2} \langle \phi | P | \phi \rangle^{\mathcal{K}_1} \quad (30)$$

$$= N^{-1} \frac{\alpha^2}{\hbar^2} \langle \phi_{t=T} | P | \phi_{t=T} \rangle^{\mathcal{K}_1} \quad (31)$$

$$= N^{-1} \frac{\alpha^2}{\hbar^2} \int dX \phi^*(X, T) \phi(X, T) \quad (32)$$

$$= N^{-1} \int dX \left| \frac{\alpha}{i\hbar} \int_{\mathcal{R}} dX' dT' W(X, T; X', T') V(X', T') \Psi(X', T') \right|^2 \quad (33)$$

$$= N^{-1} \frac{\alpha^2}{\hbar^2} \int_{\mathcal{R}} dx \int_{\mathcal{R}} dx' \Psi^*(x) W(x; x') \Psi(x') \quad (34)$$

Which, though defined in a coordinate-free, covariant manner by equation 29, is in exact agreement with the Born rule. The entanglement properties of measurement and use of the covariant partial trace are responsible for the discrepancy with the Reisenberger-Rovelli postulate, and agreement with standard QM. In CQI, entanglement is *essential* for obtaining probabilities, for it is only through entanglement that a partial trace leads a quantum observer into a mixed state. This is not true of the R-R postulate, which assigns probabilities between any two states in \mathcal{K} .

Another difficulty associated with the Reisenberger-Rovelli probability postulate is that there is no preferred time variable or causal structure available to order multiple measurements. For example, suppose we wish to measure the state $|\phi\rangle$, and also the state $|\xi\rangle$. What is the probability that the system is measured in *both* of these states? In general, if the projector onto $|\phi\rangle$, Π_ϕ , does not commute with the projector onto $|\xi\rangle$, Π_ξ , then we need to distinguish between $|\Pi_\phi \Pi_\xi |\Psi\rangle|^2$ and $|\Pi_\xi \Pi_\phi |\Psi\rangle|^2$, which will be two distinctly different probabilities. In standard QM, this distinction is easy — we simply order the projections according to the external time variable t (or order them according to the causal structure on a fixed background). However, this is not allowed in the covariant theory — the theory must not be required to reference a preferred coordinate of \mathcal{M} in order to make predictions (and likewise, nonperturbative quantum gravity must not be required to reference a fixed background causal structure to make predictions).

Recently, Hellmann, Mondragon, Perez, and Rovelli have argued that this problem can be avoided by interpreting all predictions of covariant quantum theory strictly as single-measurement probabilities only [4, 12]. That is, instead of constructing Π_ϕ and Π_ξ separately, we enlarge the system to include at least one measuring apparatus that determines for example whether or not ϕ was observed. We then take the projector onto the state $|\xi\rangle$ as well as the projector onto the state $|\phi = \text{yes}\rangle$ of the detector (call it Ω_ϕ). Then the single projector $\Pi_\xi \Omega_\phi$ on this larger, combined system gives an effective multiple-measurement probability $|\Pi_\xi \Omega_\phi |\Psi\rangle|^2$ according to the original probability postulate, but makes use of only a single non-unitary collapse and so evades the multiple-measurement probability problem. Note that in the case of N measurements, this approach makes use of $N - 1$ measurement devices to remove the ordering ambiguity.

This approach is similar to our own, which makes use of N observers for N measurements. In doing so, however, the CQI approach also obtains an effective arrow of time. Given two observers Alice and Bob, who make

observations by becoming entangled with Q at different points in \mathcal{M} , we can identify three different regions in \mathcal{M} . In the first region, \mathcal{S} , both Alice and Bob are separable with respect to Q and the covariant partial trace. In the second region, \mathcal{S}' , the entropy of either Alice or Bob has increased, while the entropy of the other remains equal to zero. In the third region, \mathcal{S}'' , both Alice and Bob are described individually by mixed states, with one entropy typically greater than the other (measurements in general increase the entropy of subsequent observers). This defines an effective time ordering without reference to any time variable or causal structure (it is, in fact, the most general “quantum mechanical arrow of time”), and as shown in section IIA in the the limiting case of the standard Schrödinger picture where the regions of interest are constant-time slices, the formalism automatically returns probabilities identical to those associated with the traditional assumption of a collapse during the first measurement. Correspondence with known physics is again emergent.

We also point out that the quantum mechanical arrow of time, defined in the coordinate-independent way above, need not point in the same direction everywhere in \mathcal{M} . Even in the case of simple Schrödinger dynamics, it is easy to construct examples where the direction of entropy increase (and thus, time ordering of the effective collapse) reverses itself [3].

To sum up, Hellmann, Mondragon, Perez, and Rovelli seek to solve the time-ordering problem by postponing a non-unitary collapse until the end of the analysis, while we *never* introduce one. In addition, we resolve the Born correspondence problem in the case of single-measurements, and define an entropic quantum mechanical arrow of time independent of any coordinate on \mathcal{M} or background causal structure. We do not interpret quantum probabilities as probabilities for the full physical state $\Psi^{\mathcal{H}}$ of the universe to make any kind of jump to a new state — the probabilities in covariant quantum information simply represent the classical ignorance inherent in the state of an entangled observer. In essence, CQI realizes perfect correspondence with standard QM in the appropriate limit and removes the only serious objections to covariant quantum theory as proposed by Reisenberger and Rovelli.

IV. REALISM

Although the aim of covariant quantum information is primarily to remove ambiguities and to obtain correspondence with the well-established predictions of standard

quantum mechanics in the appropriate limit, it also inherits a realist picture from the Cerf-Adami description of measurement [13]. It is remarkable that a well-known interpretational issue in the foundations of quantum mechanics is forced to the surface by our desire to express the concept of measurement covariantly — and even more remarkable, that a realist interpretation of the quantum state function Ψ should naturally emerge in the process.

Our definition of quantum realism is the following: We describe a quantum measurement formalism as *realist* if at each individual time (or in the covariant language, each sufficiently large region of \mathcal{M}), all observers can correctly obtain all physical predictions about a quantum system from the same state function Ψ . This definition allows for the possibility that the universe is described by a single quantum state in \mathcal{H} , independent of our knowledge of it. It is straightforward to show that the standard description of projective measurement is not a realist formalism, according to this definition.

The prototype scenario to demonstrate this has been called “the observer observed” by Carlo Rovelli [11, 14]. Here we start with a quantum system Q in a superposition state $|Q\rangle = \alpha|0\rangle + \beta|1\rangle$, and two observers A (Alice) and B (Bob). At time t_1 , Bob performs a measurement of Q , in the $|0\rangle, |1\rangle$ basis.

We now ask the question, “what is the state of the system?” As described by Bob (using the standard formalism of projective measurement), the state of Q has been collapsed and will either be described by $|0\rangle$ or $|1\rangle$, depending on the outcome of his measurement. Alice, on the other hand, describes the system differently — no collapse has taken place, but the system has grown into an entangled state that encompasses Bob as well as Q , $|QB\rangle = \alpha|0\rangle|\text{Bob sees } 0\rangle + \beta|1\rangle|\text{Bob sees } 1\rangle$.

This necessary disagreement on the state used to describe the system Q has led many thinkers to the conclusion that quantum states have no independent meaning

outside of their use by a particular observer. Quantum mechanical states are to be thought of a kind of book-keeping device which may be different for each separate observer. Asher Peres wrote, for example [15]:

In summary, the question raised by EPR “Can quantum-mechanical description of physical reality be considered complete?” has a positive answer. However, reality may be different for different observers.

... and Carlo Rovelli [14]:

If different observers give different accounts of the same sequence of events, then each quantum mechanical description has to be understood as relative to a particular observer. Thus, a quantum mechanical description of a certain system (state and/or values of physical quantities) cannot be taken as an “absolute” (observer independent) description of reality, but rather as a formalization, or codification, of properties of a system relative to a given observer.

And indeed, these are quite reasonable conclusions if one takes the process of measurement to physically correspond to a projection onto states of Q . However, we need not do this. Remarkably, the principle that takes us out of this picture is precisely the same principle we used to remove the time ordering ambiguity for generally covariant quantum mechanics, and to obtain correspondence with the Born rule. *Predictions must be obtained from a quantum model of the observer.*

When we do this, we find that we have a new description of the observer observed. Both Alice and Bob can agree that the initial state (a \mathcal{K} -state on hypersurface $t = t_0$) of the system is:

$$|QAB\rangle = (\alpha|0\rangle + \beta|1\rangle)|\text{Alice ready}\rangle|\text{Bob ready}\rangle. \quad (35)$$

On hypersurface $t = t_1$, after Bob performs his measurement, the system is described by:

$$|QAB\rangle = (\alpha|0\rangle|\text{Bob sees } 0\rangle + \beta|1\rangle|\text{Bob sees } 1\rangle)|\text{Alice ready}\rangle. \quad (36)$$

Predictions are obtained by analyzing Alice and Bob. On this $t = t_1$ slice, we have for Alice that

$$\rho_A = |\text{Alice ready}\rangle\langle\text{Alice ready}| \quad (37)$$

indicating that no outcome observed by Alice is yet probabilistic. On the other hand, on the same hypersurface:

$$\rho_B = |\alpha|^2|\text{Bob sees } 0\rangle\langle\text{Bob sees } 0| + |\beta|^2|\text{Bob sees } 1\rangle\langle\text{Bob sees } 1| \quad (38)$$

(the unique diagonal, orthonormal representation of ρ_B) indicates that the outcome of Bob’s experiment will be $|0\rangle$ or $|1\rangle$ with probabilities $|\alpha|^2$ and $|\beta|^2$, respectively.

Now suppose that at $t = t_2$, Alice discusses with Bob the results of his experiment or she performs her own measurement on Q . The state on this hypersurface is:

$$|QAB\rangle = \alpha|0\rangle|\text{Bob sees } 0\rangle|\text{Alice sees } 0\rangle + \beta|1\rangle|\text{Bob sees } 1\rangle|\text{Alice sees } 1\rangle. \quad (39)$$

Like Bob, Alice will see outcomes $|0\rangle$ and $|1\rangle$ with re-

spective probabilities $|\alpha|^2$ and $|\beta|^2$, but importantly, the

conditional entropy between Alice and Bob on this hypersurface is zero: $S(A|B) = S(AB) - S(B) = 0$ — i.e. the outcome of Bob’s experiment (which was performed at t_1) completely determines what Alice will see at time t_2 .

Thus, all predictions (including those usually ascribed to a collapse) are obtained from a *single* physical state in \mathcal{H} , analyzed on different regions (in this case, spacelike hypersurfaces) of \mathcal{M} . At no point were Alice and Bob forced to disagree on the physical state describing their situation, yet they are both able to make all of the standard predictions about what they will see. Surprisingly, in the pursuit of consistently incorporating general covariance into a formalism of quantum measurement, we have been led directly into a working realist interpretation of quantum theory. This paints a beautiful and intuitive picture of quantum reality — that a single physical state Ψ describes the universe; the past, the present, and the future. We may not have complete knowledge of Ψ , but all probabilistic predictions for all observers at all times are ultimately, in principle, obtainable from it.

V. QUANTUM COLLAPSE AND EPR STATES

Not surprisingly, a formalism that dispenses with collapse will have implications for non-locality in the EPR scenario [16]. Quickly setting up the scenario, we have Alice located at spatial point a , and Bob at point b . An entangled quantum state is prepared, $\alpha|00\rangle + \beta|11\rangle$, and Alice is given control of the first qubit, and Bob the second. For simplicity here, we take the qubits to be abstract two-state systems that transform trivially under Lorentz transformations, i.e. the two-state system should not be thought of as a spinor in 3-space.

Suppose now that Alice performs a measurement on her qubit in the $\{|0\rangle, |1\rangle\}$ basis. The standard explanation is that the full, nonlocal state has *instantly* been collapsed to $|0\rangle|0\rangle$ or to $|1\rangle|1\rangle$. Worse still, if Bob performs a measurement at an instant that is spacelike separated from Alice’s measurement, there are frames of reference in which the order of collapse changes. Some involve Alice collapsing the state, and Bob performing a measurement on a collapsed state, and some involve Bob collapsing the state. This state of affairs has caused a great deal of concern among many who notice the seeming contradiction with special relativity. Happily for relativists, a no-communication theorem ensures that the effects of

this collapse cannot be used to send superluminal information between Alice and Bob [1].

This is not the end of the story, though. What did we mean when we said the state was collapsed *instantly* by Alice? Instantly in which frame of reference? The immediate and seemingly reasonable answer is Alice’s frame of rest [17]. However, suppose a third observer, Charlie, were to pass by Alice with some velocity exactly as she performs her measurement. If the non-local collapse is instant in Alice’s frame, it cannot be instant in Charlie’s frame, though he observed the measurement outcome at precisely the same moment as Alice. Although this scenario is closely related to the issue of realism described in the previous section, the addition of relativity considerations to the mix causes thinking along these lines to be thorny enough that clever experiments have actually been performed to observe the speed of collapse of separated, entangled pairs [18] (incidentally, setting lower bounds of order 10^4c on the “speed of quantum information”).

In the CQI framework, the description is greatly clarified. The wave function does not undergo a collapse, instantaneous or otherwise. Probabilities are interpreted as the classical uncertainty of the observer’s reduced state, which becomes a mixture via local entangling interactions with the EPR pair — we do *not* have probabilities for any kind of non-local quantum operation, and require no propagation of any effect. Alice and Charlie do not disagree on the way in which the state of the universe is collapsed, since there are no nonlocal effects required to occur instantly. The “speed of collapse” is a completely undefined, nonsensical concept. Alice and Charlie are both described by mixtures to the future of Alice’s measurement event, and Bob is described by a mixture to the future of his own measurement event — there is absolutely no contradiction.

The addition of relativity simply means that there are more spacelike surfaces (related by Lorentz transformations) on which we can express the full physical state in \mathcal{H} as the projection of a kinematical state. On some of these surfaces, Alice has performed a measurement (and is described by a mixture) but Bob has not. On others, Bob has performed a measurement (and is described by a mixture), but Alice has not. However, on any constant-time slice in which Alice and Bob could have compared notes via transmission of their results, the \mathcal{K} -state describing the situation looks like this:

$$|Q_1 A Q_2 B\rangle = \alpha|0\rangle|Alice\ sees\ 0\rangle|0\rangle|Bob\ sees\ 0\rangle + \beta|1\rangle|Alice\ sees\ 1\rangle|1\rangle|Bob\ sees\ 1\rangle, \quad (40)$$

i.e. Alice and Bob have both become entangled with Q . Calculating the reduced density operators for Alice and Bob, standard results are obtained. Individually for Alice and Bob, we have:

$$\rho_A = |\alpha|^2|Alice\ sees\ 0\rangle\langle Alice\ sees\ 0| + |\beta|^2|Alice\ sees\ 1\rangle\langle Alice\ sees\ 1| \quad (41)$$

$$\rho_B = |\alpha|^2|Bob\ sees\ 0\rangle\langle Bob\ sees\ 0| + |\beta|^2|Bob\ sees\ 1\rangle\langle Bob\ sees\ 1| \quad (42)$$

giving the standard probabilities. Considered together, we have:

$$\begin{aligned} \rho_{AB} &= |\alpha|^2 |Alice\ sees\ 0\rangle\langle Alice\ sees\ 0| |Bob\ sees\ 0\rangle\langle Bob\ sees\ 0| \\ &+ |\beta|^2 |Alice\ sees\ 1\rangle\langle Alice\ sees\ 1| |Bob\ sees\ 1\rangle\langle Bob\ sees\ 1| \end{aligned} \quad (43)$$

which reproduces the standard correlations (which can also be seen via the vanishing conditional entropy: $S(A|B) = S(AB) - S(B) = 0$ — i.e. if we know the results of Bob’s experiment, then we know the results of Alice’s experiment, and vice versa). The no-communication theorem still applies as well as ever, as any local unitary operation applied to Alice alone will have no effect on the information available to Bob, due to the partial trace.

Thus, in the context of CQI, standard results are obtained without the confusing mental baggage created by the concept of instantaneous, non-local collapse. All operations are entirely local from start to finish, and Lorentz transformations imply no strange, superluminal propagation of quantum information for observers in differing states of motion.

VI. UNITARITY AND THE TIME-REVERSED QUANTUM ZENO EFFECT

Our formalism (along with that of Cerf and Adami) emphasizes the fact that measurement and collapse are merely the information theoretic consequences of a system becoming entangled with an observer, and that all evolution is fundamentally unitary. A consequence of this fact is that time-reversal becomes a useful symmetry to invoke, even in the presence of quantum measurements.

To see this feature in action, we will analyze a well-known effect of quantum measurement — the quantum Zeno effect [19]. Ordinarily, the non-unitary formalism of projective measurement is invoked to demonstrate the surprising fact that *merely observing* a quantum system can effectively slow its evolution. It has also been shown that clever use of projective measurement can also be used to accelerate the evolution of a system, in what has been termed the quantum anti-Zeno effect [20] (here, we take the term “quantum Zeno effect” to be more general than the particular application to decaying atomic states).

However, it should by now be clear that projective measurement corresponds to entanglement with an observer. Hence, both the quantum Zeno effect and the quantum anti-Zeno effect may be obtained as the result of entangling a quantum system with an ancilla, as we will soon show. An important point, however, that has been missed due to the reliance on the formalism of projective

measurement is that the time reversal of the quantum Zeno effect (and the quantum anti-Zeno effect) also represents a way to manipulate the evolution of a quantum system. That is, *disentangling* a quantum system from an ancilla can be used to accelerate (or slow) its evolution. We refer to this as the time-reversed quantum Zeno effect. Not surprisingly, a combination of Zeno effect and time-reversed Zeno effect cancel completely, leaving ordinary time evolution.

Let us first analyze the quantum Zeno effect within this framework (here for convenience and familiarity we revert to non-covariant notation, which is really identical to that of Cerf and Adami, with the understanding that this corresponds to the “Schrödinger picture limit” of CQI). We consider a system composed of three subsystems, Q , A , and B . Q will be the time dependent system under study, while A (for “Alice,” or “ancilla,” whichever the case may be — the result is the same) represents the system we will entangle with Q . B (Bob), represents the macroscopic observer, modeled quantum mechanically. To keep our demonstration as simple as possible, all systems will be modeled by a single qubit, and we take Q to be the only system with non-trivial time evolution in the absence of interactions.

Specifically, we take Q to evolve independently as $|Q(t)\rangle = \cos(\omega t)|0\rangle + i \sin(\omega t)|1\rangle$, as is well-known to happen when the energy eigenstates of Q are $\frac{1}{\sqrt{2}}(|0\rangle + |1\rangle)$ and $\frac{1}{\sqrt{2}}(|0\rangle - |1\rangle)$. The systems A and B are taken to be in the state $|0\rangle$ at $t = 0$.

In the absence of intermediate entanglement, the situation is straightforward. At time $t = 2\epsilon$, Bob interacts with Q by means of a CNOT gate (effectively an ideal measurement), producing the entangled state $|QB(2\epsilon)\rangle = \cos(\omega 2\epsilon)|0\rangle|0\rangle + i \sin(\omega 2\epsilon)|1\rangle|1\rangle$. On the $t = 2\epsilon$ surface, the reduced density operator describing Bob is thus $\rho_B = \cos^2(\omega 2\epsilon)|0\rangle\langle 0| + \sin^2(\omega 2\epsilon)|1\rangle\langle 1|$, and so the probability for B to detect Q in the state $|1\rangle$ is thus $\sin^2(\omega 2\epsilon) \approx 4\omega^2 \epsilon^2$.

Now we introduce an intermediate CNOT operation at $t = \epsilon$, entangling Q with A , before Bob’s measurement. Thus on the $t = \epsilon$ surface, we have $|QA(\epsilon)\rangle = \cos(\omega \epsilon)|0\rangle|0\rangle + i \sin(\omega \epsilon)|1\rangle|1\rangle$, while Bob remains in the state $|0\rangle$. At time $t = 2\epsilon$, though, (just before we apply the CNOT operation to entangle Bob with QA), this state has evolved to:

$$|QA(2\epsilon)\rangle = \cos(\omega \epsilon) [\cos(\omega \epsilon)|0\rangle + i \sin(\omega \epsilon)|1\rangle] |0\rangle + i \sin(\omega \epsilon) [\cos(\omega \epsilon)|1\rangle - i \sin(\omega \epsilon)|0\rangle] |1\rangle. \quad (44)$$

Now applying the CNOT between Q and B , representing Bob's measurement, and rearranging gives us the state from which we can extract predictions:

$$|QAB(2\epsilon)\rangle = \cos^2(\omega\epsilon)|0\rangle|0\rangle|0\rangle + \sin^2(\omega\epsilon)|0\rangle|1\rangle|0\rangle + i\cos(\omega\epsilon)\sin(\omega\epsilon)|1\rangle(|0\rangle + |1\rangle)|1\rangle. \quad (45)$$

Now performing a partial trace over Q and A gives us the reduced density operator describing Bob:

$$\rho_B = [\cos^4(\omega\epsilon) + \sin^4(\omega\epsilon)] |0\rangle\langle 0| + 2\cos^2(\omega\epsilon)\sin^2(\omega\epsilon)|1\rangle\langle 1|. \quad (46)$$

The probability that Bob finds Q to have transitioned to the $|1\rangle$ state is thus $2\cos^2(\omega\epsilon)\sin^2(\omega\epsilon) \approx 2\omega^2\epsilon^2$ — half of what it was in the case of no intermediate entanglement. This is the quantum Zeno effect on simply evolving qubits. Note that this is *not* a result of projections, or of altering the single particle evolution — we have merely introduced an entangling CNOT operation, and nothing else.

Even more interesting is that by avoiding the non-unitarity inherent in the projective measurement formalism, we can identify a new effect simply by invoking time reversal symmetry. That is, we start with an entangled QA state, evolve some, and then *disentangle* A from Q (e.g. by applying another CNOT operation), with the result that Q 's effective evolution is accelerated. To see this explicitly, we start with the following entangled state as a function of time:

$$|QA(t)\rangle = \alpha [\cos(\omega t)|0\rangle + i\sin(\omega t)|1\rangle] |0\rangle + \beta [\cos(\omega t)|1\rangle - i\sin(\omega t)|0\rangle] |1\rangle. \quad (47)$$

If Bob were to perform measurements on this system, he would find that Q oscillates from states of maximum probability in the $|0\rangle$ -state at time $0, \frac{\pi}{\omega}, \frac{2\pi}{\omega}, \dots$ (for $|\alpha|^2 > |\beta|^2$) to states of maximum probability in the $|1\rangle$ -state at times $\frac{\pi}{2\omega}, \frac{3\pi}{2\omega}, \dots$

However, let us apply a CNOT operation between Q and A before Bob makes his measurement. We apply the CNOT at time $t = 0$. The now-separable state as a function of time can be described by:

$$|QA(t)\rangle = \{[\alpha\cos(\omega t) - \beta i\sin(\omega t)] |0\rangle + [\alpha i\sin(\omega t) + \beta\cos(\omega t)] |1\rangle\} |0\rangle. \quad (48)$$

After the disentangling CNOT, the solution still oscillates with the same frequency between states of maximum probability in $|0\rangle$ and states of maximum probability in $|1\rangle$, but the peaks and troughs no longer generally occur at $t = 0, \frac{\pi}{2\omega}, \frac{\pi}{\omega}, \frac{3\pi}{2\omega}, \frac{2\pi}{\omega}, \dots$. In the case that $\alpha = \cos(\theta)$ and $\beta = -i\sin(\theta)$ for some value of θ , we have exactly the time-reversal of the Zeno effect shown above, and we find that evolution has been advanced precisely by an amount $\delta t = \frac{\theta}{\omega}$, leaving us with the solution:

$$|Q(t)\rangle = \cos(\omega(t + \delta t))|0\rangle + i\sin(\omega(t + \delta t))|1\rangle \quad (49)$$

Thus we see that through measurement-like interactions, the quantum Zeno effect trades evolution for entanglement. But in the absence of projective collapse, the logic can be reversed and we can also trade entanglement for evolution.

VII. A NOTE ON PROBABILITIES IN QUANTUM COSMOLOGY

Before we conclude, we would like to emphasize one more feature of covariant quantum information. That is, it is completely self-contained. By this, we mean that the theory does not require an external, classical observer in order to properly interpret probabilities. In fact, the theory requires that we avoid such constructs — probabilis-

tic predictions are not made in CQI unless the observer is included as part of the full description of the system.

This seems to suggest a natural application with quantum cosmology, where the meaning of quantum probabilities is controversial for exactly this reason — to whom do probabilities apply? We would like to suggest that some simple cosmological models (e.g. the simplest minisuperspace cosmologies) simply do not have a consistent probabilistic interpretation, because they do not include enough degrees of freedom to model a quantum observer, and do not model an entangling interaction required to define a measurement. We defer a detailed analysis of this proposal to future work, but we note that it seems to mesh perfectly with historic insights into the character of quantum gravity and quantum cosmology. Consider, for example, the following quote by Bryce DeWitt [21]:

Perhaps the most impressive fact which emerges from a study of the quantum theory of gravity is that it is an extraordinarily economical theory. It gives one just exactly what is needed in order to analyze a particular physical situation, but not a bit more. Thus it will say nothing about time unless a clock to measure time is provided, and it will say nothing about geometry unless a device (either a material object, gravitational waves, or some other form of radiation) is introduced to tell when and where the geometry is to be

measured.

Our proposal merely takes this insight one step further — a fully consistent, generally covariant quantum theory says nothing about *probabilities* unless a quantum subsystem (playing the role of the observer) is introduced to become entangled with the degrees of freedom being studied. Once this is done, however, interpretational problems go away — the probabilities are *not* the probability that the entire universe will collapse to some specific state. The probabilities simply refer to the mixed state of the observer alone, which is in principle the best description of the observer quantum theory can offer.

VIII. CONCLUSIONS

The picture painted by covariant quantum information is most remarkable in the way it ties together and clari-

fies seemingly unrelated issues in a single, coherent framework. Who would have expected that making a quantum measurement formalism compatible with general covariance would immediately result in a formalism that is also automatically realist, unitary, local, and which defines a quantum mechanical arrow of time independent of any pre-existing causal structure or time coordinate? Furthermore, the theory naturally suggests a new class of readily measurable quantum mechanical effects which are obtainable simply by invoking time-reversal symmetry in the presence of standard, measurement-related phenomena (the first example of these being the time-reversed quantum Zeno effect).

We would like to acknowledge useful discussions with Christoph Adami and John Sipe, as well as support from the Disruptive Technologies Office and the Army Research Office.

-
- [1] A. Peres and D. R. Terno, *Rev. Mod. Phys.* **76**, 93 (2004), quant-ph/0212023v2.
- [2] M. Reisenberger and C. Rovelli, *Phys. Rev. D* **65**, 125016 (2002), gr-qc/0111016v2.
- [3] S. J. Olson and J. P. Dowling, *Information and measurement in generally covariant quantum theory* (2007), quant-ph/0701200v2.
- [4] F. Hellmann, M. Mondragon, A. Perez, and C. Rovelli, *Multiple-event probability in general-relativistic quantum mechanics* (2006), gr-qc/0610140.
- [5] Cerf and Adami, *Quantum mechanics of measurement* (2003), quant-ph/9605002.
- [6] N. J. Cerf and C. Adami, *Physica D* **120**, 62 (1998), quant-ph/9605039v2.
- [7] C. Adami, private communication.
- [8] M. A. Nielsen and I. L. Chuang, *Quantum Computation and Quantum Information* (Cambridge U. Press, 2000).
- [9] W. H. Zurek, *Rev. Mod. Phys.* **75**, 715 (2003), quant-ph/0105127v3.
- [10] D. Marolf and C. Rovelli, *Phys. Rev. D* **66**, 023510 (2002), gr-qc/0203056v2.
- [11] C. Rovelli, *Quantum Gravity* (Cambridge U. Press, 2003).
- [12] M. Mondragon, A. Perez, and C. Rovelli, *Multiple-event probability in general-relativistic quantum mechanics: a discrete model* (2007), arXiv:0705.0006v1.
- [13] C. Adami and N. J. Cerf, *What information theory can tell us about quantum reality* (1998), quant-ph/9806047.
- [14] C. Rovelli, *Int. J. of Theor. Phys.* **35**, 1637 (1996), quant-ph/9609002v2.
- [15] A. Peres, *Foundations of Physics* **35**, 511 (2005), quant-ph/0310010.
- [16] A. Einstein, B. Podolsky, and N. Rosen, *Physical Review* **47**, 777 (1935).
- [17] A. Suarez and V. Scarani, *Phys. Lett. A* **232**, 9 (1997), quant-ph/9704038v1.
- [18] H. Zbinden, J. Brendel, W. Tittel, and N. Gisin, *J. Phys. A: Math. Gen.* **34**, 7103 (2001), quant-ph/0002031v1.
- [19] B. Misra and E. C. G. Sudarshan, *J. Math. Phys.* **18**, 756 (1977).
- [20] A. G. Kofman and G. Kurizki, *Nature* **405**, 6786 (2000).
- [21] B. DeWitt, *Physical Review* **160**, 1113 (1967).
- [22] Actually, by the argument of section IIA, we take the system to be $\mathcal{H}_1 \otimes \mathbb{C}^2 \otimes \mathbb{C}^2$ in this region, making a distinction between the detector and the observer, which become entangled to the future of \mathcal{R} . We then take the covariant partial trace over both \mathcal{H}_1 and D . We are suppressing the explicit mention of the additional detector system in the calculation to avoid distraction based on this finer point of the formalism, which is required to do away with off-diagonal elements in the density operator in the $|0\rangle, |1\rangle$ basis.