

# Interaction-free measurement: Some interference

Renato M. Angelo

Department of Physics, Federal University of Paraná, Curitiba, PR, 81531-990, Brazil

Otávio Bueno

Department of Philosophy, University of Miami, Coral Gables, FL 33124-4670, USA

Adonai S. Sant'Anna

Department of Mathematics, Federal University of Paraná, Curitiba, PR, 81531-990, Brazil

Two seminal works proposing the term “interaction-free measurement” (IFM), namely [Am. J. Phys. **49**, 925 (1981)] by R.H. Dicke and [Found. Phys. **23**, 987 (1993)] by A.C. Elitzur and L. Vaidman, are critically reviewed. We point out some conceptual misunderstandings in the original treatments and argue that the term is not consistent neither with the standard interpretation of quantum mechanics nor with the lessons provided by the EPR debate.

PACS numbers: 03.65.-w, 03.65.Ta, 03.65.Ud.

The term *interaction-free measurement* (IFM) appeared for the first time in 1981 in a paper by Dicke [1]. Inspired in Renninger’s ideas of “negative result experiments” [2] Dicke concludes that the wave function of an observed particle may change even in a situation in which a light beam is not scattered when passing through the region where the particle is likely to be. Since some information has been obtained in the process a IFM is claimed to occur.

In 1993, Elitzur and Vaidman (EV) invoked the term IFM to nominate a peculiar technique that allows for detecting infinitely fragile objects without destroying them [3]. Along the subsequent decade, the term IFM received several criticisms, which make Vaidman return to the subject in a effort to justify and dissipate the confusion generated around the term (see [4] and references therein to track the whole discussion). Despite its unusual features, the technique has received experimental support [5, 6] and a fair bit of discussion [7, 8].

After this long period it seems, however, not to exist a consensual answer to the central question: *Is IFM really interaction-free?* In evident conflict, some authors state: “Of course IFMs are not really interaction free” [9] or “It is a triviality that in all cases some kind of interaction, describable by a Hamiltonian, plays an important role in the unitary stage of the processes” [10] and also “We stress that from the viewpoint of a single event, a successful measurement is *completely* interaction-free” [5].

In this paper we argue that the acceptance of the term IFM implies a flagrant contradiction with the knowledge produced by the EPR debate [11, 12, 13]. In the best case, the term IFM could be accommodated within some particular interpretation of quantum theory (not the standard one), thus not being possible to apply it generally.

In his paper of 1981 [1], Dicke considers a trapped particle (an ion) initially prepared in the ground state of the trapping potential (see the Gaussian-like distribution in Fig.1-(a)). An intense pulse of radiation, represented by

the sphere in Fig.1, moves towards the region where the particle is trapped. Detectors are placed all around the trap (ideally a  $4\pi$  solid angle counter) in order to collect any scattered photon, and a beam stop, placed behind the trap, absorbs all undeviated light. Only two outputs are expected in this thought experiment: (i) photons are counted in the detectors, implying that the particle was in the beam, or (ii) no photon is counted (a null result), meaning that the particle was out of the light beam.




FIG. 1: Simplified version of the thought experiment proposed by Dicke. (a) A pulse of radiation (the sphere) is focused in a region where an ion is initially prepared in a Gaussian state. (b) If not scattered by the trapped particle, the pulse is collected in a beam stop and none of the detectors clicks (a null result).

According to Dicke, the paradoxical situation occurs in the second case: When no photon is scattered, the particle is certainly out of the region illuminated by the beam, so that  $\psi = 0$  in this region (see Fig.1-(b)). As a consequence, the particle wave function changes even without any apparent interaction between the photon and the particle.

Although the argument seems to be somewhat compelling it is actually incorrect. Problems in Dicke’s arguments start when he roughly analyze a collision between *physical corpuscles* (the photons in the beam) with the *particle wave function*, as illustrated in Fig.1. Of course, it would be much more reasonable, and more consistent with quantum formalism, to investigate the colli-

sion among wave entities, namely, the particle wave function and the wave functions of each photon of the beam. In this fully quantum treatment, things would be much more difficult to heuristically describe. Before the light pulse entering the region where the particle is likely to be, the global wave function of the system may be written as a tensorial product as  $\Psi = \psi(\mathbf{r}_p) \otimes \prod_i \psi_i(\mathbf{r}_i)$  where  $\mathbf{r}_p$  and  $\mathbf{r}_i$  denote, respectively, the spatial coordinate associated with the particle and with the  $i$ -th photon. After passing through the interaction region, the system becomes entangled and all the quantum formalism predicts is a global function  $\Psi(\mathbf{r}_p, \mathbf{r}_1, \dots, \mathbf{r}_N)$  which cannot be factorized in individual wave functions corresponding to each corpuscle of the system. In the best case, by tracing over the undesirable degrees of freedom one might obtain density matrices for each corpuscle, which would represent collisions among waves. Certainly, in this case, Dicke could not predict that kind of *erasing* in the particle wave function as represented in Fig.1-(b).

Such a misunderstanding seems to derive from a conception which tries to associate the wave function with an individual realization of the experiment. In fact, this idea already appears in the motivating question proposed by Dicke: “Is the particle located in the light beam or not?” In general, this question cannot be answered by the quantum theory, which is able to predict only the *probability* of finding the particle. When a light pulse is sent we have only a single realization of the experiment. If in one realization no photon is scattered, in another it can be. Quantum results cannot be connected with the first or the second, but with all realizations composing the statistics of the experiment [14].

In trying to corroborate his own claims Dicke applies formal measurement theory to analyze a null experiment. Using an initial state that mixes spatial functions with vector states in an unclear way and also a *non-normalized* projection operator (in conflict with the postulate of the quantum mechanics), the author concludes that the center of mass wave function of the target particle changes even when no scattering occurs. According to the quantum formalism this is not expected at all since no coupling between the center of mass and the others degrees of freedom has been taken into account in the Hamiltonian of the system.

The whole analysis by Dicke can be simplified as follows. Let us replace the light pulse by a large probe particle (or “particle  $P$ ”) and the trapped ion by a free target particle (“particle  $T$ ”). The problem is now regarded as a local collision between two distinguishable quantum particles. Initially, the particles are free and the joint quantum state describing the system can be written as  $|\psi_{\text{before}}\rangle = |\text{free}\rangle_P \otimes |\text{free}\rangle_T$ , where  $|\text{free}\rangle_{P(T)}$  denotes the vector state of the particle  $P$  ( $T$ ) before entering the interaction region. These states may be thought of as Gaussian distributions in configuration space with increasing variances (see, e.g., [15]). According to the quantum formalism, the time-evolved wave function will

be written as

$$|\psi_{\text{after}}\rangle = \alpha|\text{free}\rangle_P \otimes |\text{free}\rangle_T + \beta|\text{scatt}\rangle_P \otimes |\text{scatt}\rangle_T, \quad (1)$$

where  $|\alpha|^2 + |\beta|^2 = 1$  and  $|\text{scatt}\rangle_{P(T)}$  denotes that the particle  $P$  ( $T$ ) has been scattered.

Notice by (1) that when no scattering is detected (a null result) both particles must remain in their original quantum states of free particles, with no alteration in their respective mean momenta. Since this simple model retains the essence of the problem investigated by Dicke, we may conclude that it is not correct at all to suppose that the null result implies that “erasing” in the wave function of the particle  $T$ , as suggested in Fig.(1). In such a case, the target wave function must remain unchanged.

Lastly, the initial question may be reformulated as: Does some interaction take place when no scattering occurs? This question will be discussed hereafter since this is the central point also in the EV experiment.

The EV scheme is based on a Mach-Zehnder interferometer (see Fig.2). Single photons are horizontally sent towards the first beam splitter (BS<sub>1</sub>) with a transmission coefficient 1/2. With no obstacles in the arms the transmitted and reflected parts of the photon wave are reflected, respectively, by mirrors M<sub>1</sub> and M<sub>2</sub>, being afterwards reunited at the beam splitter BS<sub>2</sub>, whose transmission coefficient is 1/2 too. Two photon detectors, LD (light detector) and DD (dark detector), are positioned according to Fig.2. The setup geometry is such that no photon arrives at DD (destructive interference) when the arms are empty. On the other hand, when an object is at some arm, say at position X, the condition of destructive interference is broken and DD may collect the photon with probability 1/4. When in some realization of the experiment a single photon is detected at DD, we can know for sure that there is something inside the interferometer. Since in this case the photon has not been absorbed by the object, thus apparently not interacting with it, this is called an interaction-free measurement.




FIG. 2: Generalization of the EV experiment. An object is initially placed in region X, Y or in a quantum superposition of X and Y.

As a first comment, we point out that knowing that an object is inside the interferometer does not provide accurate information about the vector state of the object. In

fact, any state  $|\Psi\rangle$  yielding a wave function  $\Psi(\mathbf{r}) = \langle \mathbf{r} | \Psi \rangle$  that is finite within the interferometer region may cause a click in DD in some realization of the experiment. However, this information *per se* does not allow for determining the state  $|\Psi\rangle$  precisely. In this sense one may object whether the term *measurement* is indeed appropriate.

The question whether IFM is indeed interaction-free is more subtle. In order to investigate this in more details we review the EV calculations with some convenient generalizations. Consider that before entering the interferometer the quantum state of the system photon + object is given by

$$|\psi_0\rangle = |1_x 0_y\rangle \otimes (\alpha|G, X\rangle + \beta|G, Y\rangle), \quad (2)$$

with  $|\alpha|^2 + |\beta|^2 = 1$ . The state  $|1_x, 0_y\rangle$  indicates the situation in which there is one photon in the  $x$  direction (horizontal paths in Fig.2) and none in the  $y$  direction (vertical paths). The object is assumed to have been initially prepared in its lowest level of energy ( $G$ ) in a quantum superposition of  $X$  and  $Y$ , which represent regions where the object is likely to be found.

After the photon crossing the first beam-splitter, BS<sub>1</sub>, the quantum state reads

$$|\psi_1\rangle = \left( \frac{|1_x 0_y\rangle + \imath |0_x 1_y\rangle}{\sqrt{2}} \right) \otimes (\alpha|G, X\rangle + \beta|G, Y\rangle). \quad (3)$$

The phase  $\imath$  is added after each reflection. Next, the photon visits the region where the object is supposed to be in. Following the EV approach we obtain

$$|\psi_2\rangle = \frac{\beta}{\sqrt{2}} |1_x 0_y\rangle \otimes |G, Y\rangle + \frac{\imath\alpha}{\sqrt{2}} |0_x 1_y\rangle \otimes |G, X\rangle + |\psi_{\text{coll}}\rangle, \quad (4)$$

where

$$|\psi_{\text{coll}}\rangle \equiv |0_x 0_y\rangle \otimes \left( \frac{\alpha|E, X\rangle + \imath\beta|E, Y\rangle}{\sqrt{2}} \right). \quad (5)$$

The state  $|\psi_{\text{coll}}\rangle$  describes the portion of the Hilbert space accounting for the collision between photon and object: the photon is absorbed and the object reaches its excited state  $|E\rangle$ . Note that the collision is supposed to occur only when photon and object are at the same arm, this being the indicative of a *local coupling* in the Hamiltonian of the system. State (4) presents an important difference from the one deduced originally by EV [3]: it displays nonlocal correlations.

After the reflection of the wave photon by the mirrors the global quantum state reads

$$|\psi_3\rangle = \frac{\imath\beta}{\sqrt{2}} |0_x 1_y\rangle |G, Y\rangle - \frac{\alpha}{\sqrt{2}} |1_x 0_y\rangle |G, X\rangle + |\psi_{\text{coll}}\rangle. \quad (6)$$

Finally, after the second beam-splitter we have

$$|\psi_{\text{final}}\rangle = |\psi_{\text{coll}}\rangle - \frac{|1_x 0_y\rangle}{2} \otimes (\alpha|G, X\rangle + \beta|G, Y\rangle) - \imath \frac{|0_x 1_y\rangle}{2} \otimes (\alpha|G, X\rangle - \beta|G, Y\rangle). \quad (7)$$

EV results are reproduced by setting  $\alpha = 0$  and  $\beta = 1$ :

$$|\psi_{\text{EV}}\rangle = |\psi_{\text{coll}}\rangle - \frac{1}{2} |1_x 0_y\rangle \otimes |G, Y\rangle + \frac{\imath}{2} |0_x 1_y\rangle \otimes |G, Y\rangle. \quad (8)$$

Note by (8) that when DD clicks the object state collapses to  $|G, Y\rangle$ , which is precisely the initial state of the object. In this case, the term “interaction-free” seems to be appropriate, since neither the photon has been absorbed by the object nor the object state has changed. However, in (7) we identify a more subtle situation. If DD clicks, the object state collapses to  $|\text{obj}_{\text{final}}\rangle = \alpha|G, X\rangle - \beta|G, Y\rangle$ , which is rather different from the initial state  $|\text{obj}_{\text{initial}}\rangle = \alpha|G, X\rangle + \beta|G, Y\rangle$ . In fact, the correlation between these two states, which is given by

$$\mathbb{C} \equiv |\langle \text{obj}_{\text{final}} | \text{obj}_{\text{initial}} \rangle|^2 = (|\alpha|^2 - |\beta|^2)^2, \quad (9)$$

shows that while there is no change in the object state in the EV experiment ( $\mathbb{C} = 1$ ) those states can become orthogonal ( $\mathbb{C} = 0$ ) when  $|\alpha| = |\beta| = 1/\sqrt{2}$ . This means that the object state can change even when no photon is absorbed by the object. Is it possible to maintain the term “interaction-free” to describe this situation? As far we can see, the result (9) obligates us to give a negative answer to this question, since no self-dynamics is allowed to the object in the experiment. That is, the object state can change only by means of an external influence, which in this case is provided by some interaction with the photon.

The coupling operator  $H_{\text{int}}$ , which is certainly present in the global Hamiltonian in order to cause the inseparability of the state (7), is a local potential, as mentioned above. The puzzling question is thus to understand which nonlocal interaction is this which can change the object state, making  $\mathbb{C} < 1$ , even without any local collision between the object and the photon.

The answer for the problem is provided by nonlocal quantum resources. In fact, the main ingredient in the EV problem is the association of a local interaction  $H_{\text{int}}$ , describing the energy exchange between the photon and the object, with nonlocal quantum states, which is introduced in the setup by the first beam-splitter. The combination of these elements produces the nonlocal correlations (entanglement) that play central role in several controversial issues underlying the quantum phenomena, as for instance in the EPR debate [11, 12, 13].

In globally pure bipartite systems, the degree of entanglement is quantified by the von Neumann entropy, which is defined as  $E(|\psi\rangle) = -\text{Tr}_1(\rho_1 \ln \rho_1)$ , where  $\rho_1 = \text{Tr}_2(|\psi\rangle\langle\psi|)$ . The indices 1 and 2 denote any one of the subsystems (“photon” or “object” in our case). From (7) we can obtain and diagonalize  $\rho_1$  and then calculate the entanglement via  $E(|\psi\rangle) = -\sum_n \lambda_n \ln \lambda_n$ , where  $\lambda_n$  is the  $n$ -th eigenvalue of  $\rho_1$ . The result reads

$$E(|\psi_{\text{final}}\rangle) = \ln \sqrt{2} - |\alpha|^2 \ln \left( \frac{|\alpha|}{\sqrt{2}} \right) - |\beta|^2 \ln \left( \frac{|\beta|}{\sqrt{2}} \right). \quad (10)$$

In Fig.(3) the entanglement degree (10) and the correlation function (9) are plotted in terms of the modulus of the coefficient  $\alpha$ . The relation  $|\alpha|^2 + |\beta|^2 = 1$  has been used to eliminate  $|\beta|$ .




FIG. 3: Entanglement degree  $E(|\psi_{\text{final}}\rangle)$  (solid line) and correlation  $C$  (dashed line) as a function of  $|\alpha|$ . The maximum (minimum) of the entanglement (correlation) occurs for  $|\alpha| = |\beta| = 1/\sqrt{2}$  (vertical line).

A first important point in the analysis is the one concerned with the conception, grounded on the standard interpretation and generally adopted by researchers in the field of quantum information, that it is impossible to entangle two systems without making them to interact, at least indirectly [16]. In the formalism, the inseparability of the global state is dynamically induced by the operator  $H_{\text{int}}$ . Then, since the entanglement is present even in the EV case ( $|\alpha| = 0$ ), we have to accordingly accept that an interaction takes place during the photon dynamics.

Also remarkable is the fact shown in Fig.3 that the lowest correlation, and therefore the most flagrant fail in the “interaction-free” interpretation, occurs precisely when the entanglement reaches a maximum. In this case, DD clicks (the photon is not absorbed by the object) but the object state changes dramatically ( $C = 0$ ). This result emphasizes the role played by the nonlocal correlations in

effectively inducing such a kind of nonlocal interaction, which, according to the above discussion, can be thought of as deriving from the dynamical combination of local interactions with nonlocal quantum states.

This interpretation can be corroborated by applying the Bohmian theory [18] to a similar EV experiment in which the photon is replaced by a probe particle with mass  $m$  (see [17] for a experimental proposal of Mach-Zehnder interferometer with particles). According to the Bohmian theory, even when the object is out of the interferometer – corresponding to a situation of null Newtonian potential – there is a quantum potential associated with the wave function, namely,  $U(\mathbf{r}) \equiv -(\hbar^2/2m)\nabla^2|\psi|/|\psi|$ . The nonlocality introduced by the beam-splitter on the wave function will attribute an underlying nonlocal character to the Bohmian potential. As a consequence, a nonlocal potential will always be present influencing the Bohmian trajectory, regardless the arm chosen by the probe particle. Consequently, the term “interaction-free” is not applicable in this interpretation as well.

Finally, we note that according to the EPR lessons, it is not possible to interpret the state (7) as a pre-defined mixture of a local reality “photon absorbed + object excited” with “photon in the  $X$  ( $Y$ ) path + object in the ground state.” The same applies to the state (1) associated with Dicke’s experiment. In these cases a less naive interpretation is required which conceives these pure states as nonlocal correlated superpositions of orthogonal realities. The EPR debate [11, 12, 13] teaches us that we cannot state that the branch “free” (without interaction) or “scattered” (with interaction) has been chosen by the particles *a priori*. Rather, both branches, “with” and “without” interaction, coexist in a flagrant nonclassical physical state. Therefore, the use of the term “interaction-free” in the EV experiment is not consistent with the knowledge presently established.

R. M. Angelo thanks CNPq for financial support (process # 471072/2007-9).

- 
- [1] R.H. Dicke, Am. J. Phys. **49**, 925 (1981).
  - [2] M. Renninger, Z. Phys. **158**, 417 (1960).
  - [3] A.C. Elitzur and L. Vaidman, Found. Phys. **23**, 987 (1993).
  - [4] L. Vaidman, Found. Phys. **33**, 491 (2003).
  - [5] P. Kwiat, H. Weinfurter, T. Herzog, A. Zeilinger, and M.A. Kasevich, Phys. Rev. Lett. **74**, 4763 (1995).
  - [6] P. G. Kwiat, A. G. White, J. R. Mitchell, O. Nairz, G. Weihs, H. Weinfurter, and A. Zeilinger, Phys. Rev. Lett. **83**, 4725 (1999).
  - [7] G. Ghirardi, *Sneaking a look at God’s cards* (Princeton, Princeton University Press, 2005).
  - [8] A. S. Sant’Anna and O. Bueno, Found. Phys. Lett. **19** 481 (2006).
  - [9] S. Pötting *et al*, Phys. Rev. A **62**, 060101(R) (2000).
  - [10] Tamas Geszti, Phys. Rev. A **58**, 4206 (1998).
  - [11] A. Einstein, B. Podolsky and N. Rosen, Phys. Rev. **47**, 777 (1935).
  - [12] J.S. Bell, Physics (N.Y.) **1**, 195 (1965).
  - [13] A. Aspect, P. Grangier, and G. Roger, Phys. Rev. Lett. **49**, 91 (1982).
  - [14] L.E. Ballentine, *Quantum Mechanics*, Prentice-Hall (New Jersey, 1990).
  - [15] C. Cohen-Tannoudji, B. Diu, and F. Laloë, *Quantum Mechanics*, vol. I, 2nd ed., John Wiley & Sons (New York); Hermann (Paris), pp. 64 (1977).
  - [16] J.-W. Pan, D. Bouwmeester, H. Weinfurter, and A. Zeilinger, Phys. Rev. Lett. **80**, 3891 (1998).
  - [17] L. Marton, Phys. Rev. **85**, 1057 (1952).
  - [18] D. Bohm, Phys. Rev. **85**, 166 (1952); Phys. Rev. **85**, 180 (1952).