

Application of Quantum Darwinism to Diffusion during Cosmic Inflation

Nicolás F. Lori

IBILI, Universidade de Coimbra, 3000-354 Coimbra, Portugal

`nicolas.lori@gmail.com`

Alex H. Blin

Departamento de Física, Universidade de Coimbra, 3004-516 Coimbra, Portugal

`alex@fis.uc.pt`

Abstract: A baby-universe model of cosmic inflation is analyzed using quantum Darwinism. In this model cosmic inflation can be approximated as Brownian motion of a quantum field, and quantum Darwinism implies that decoherence is the result of quantum Brownian motion of the wave function. The quantum Darwinism approach to decoherence in the baby-universe cosmic-inflation model yields the decoherence times of the baby-universes. The result is the equation relating the baby-universe's decoherence time with the Hubble parameter, the speed of light in vacuum, and the overlap of the fields describing the baby-universes. A brief discussion of the relation between Darwinism and determinism is provided in the Appendix.

1 Introduction

In this work a possible relation between universe creation during cosmic inflation and quantum Darwinism is proposed. Linde's approach to the Big Bang [1] indicates that the creation of a universe from nothing occurs in a Brownian motion-like process. Zurek's quantum Darwinism approach to quantum mechanics [2] indicates that the reason for quantum indeterminacy is that the existence of a state is directly related to that state's capacity to transmit information about itself, and that this capacity is related to diffusion for the case of quantum Brownian motion [2].

The approaches of Linde and Zurek are examples of two diverging approaches to quantum physics. There is no disagreement about experimental evidence that quantum systems exist in a multitude of states, with only a portion of those states being observable. The approaches differ in what happens to the non-observed states and in the process by which states become observed states.

The approach by Linde and others proposes that the universe follows a deterministic evolution about which we can only observe partial aspects of the multiple possible occurrences that are deterministically created. The approach by Zurek and others proposes that the deterministic evolution of the universe is constrained by a Darwinian extinction of some of the possible evolution paths of the system. The approaches by Linde and Zurek agree in what is observed, but they disagree about what happens to the non-observed states. In the case of quantum gravity effects during cosmic inflation these differences may be relevant.

The random extinction of information in quantum Darwinism contrasts with the preservation of information in Hilbert's formal axiomatic systems (FAS) [3]. The FAS is a deterministic system where the consistence of the axioms is preserved, meaning that no proposition can be both true and not true; and the logic in the FAS obtains true propositions from true propositions. In Darwinian approaches (e.g. quantum Darwinism) if survival is identified with truth, then some true propositions lead to false propositions (which become extinct) and so Darwinism is not consistent. However, in Darwinism there are no true propositions that are not obtained from true propositions (all entities have parent entities that need to be true since they gave offspring); meaning Darwinism is necessarily complete. Gödel's incompleteness theorems showed that a non-trivial FAS cannot be both complete and consistent [3, 11].

An axiomatic system made to be complete and not consistent would have validly inferred propositions being both true and not-true. A form of dealing with this difficulty would be to validate propositions not by the valid application of inference rules, but by

using a proof-checking algorithm that would eliminate propositions that are inconsistent within themselves. Such a process of selecting valid propositions is called here a Darwinian axiomatic system (DAS), and is described more extensively in the Appendix. The FAS and the DAS are the two extreme forms of dealing with Gödel’s incompleteness theorems, respectively the consistent and the complete forms. It is possible to conceive an hybrid axiomatic system (HAS) between the FAS and the DAS.

This work mostly uses the works of Linde [1] and Zurek [2]; other approaches considered are Chaitin’s use of information in mathematics [3], Wheeler’s concept of ‘it for bit’ [4], Rovelli’s relational approach to quantum gravity [5], Smolin’s relation between quantum mechanics and quantum gravity [6], and Guth’s approach to cosmic inflation [7].

The remainder of the present article is structured as follows. The next five sections discusses the underlying theory: Introduction to Quantum Measurement; Introduction to Quantum Darwinism; Relation between Quantum Darwinism and Quantum Diffusion; Diffusion in Cosmic Inflation; Effects of a Quantum Darwinism Approach to Cosmic Inflation. The calculations at the end of each subsection are then presented in the section on Results, with their relations highlighted. The section entitled Discussion and Summary describes the possible implications of the results obtained and highlights the principal results.

2 Introduction to Quantum Measurement

Quantum Darwinism [2, 10] is an approach to quantum measurement that is strongly based on Wheeler’s “it-for-bit” approach [4] and so it has parallels with both information theory and computation. The classical technical definition of the amount of information was provided by Shannon’s information entropy and stated that if the sending device has a probability P_j of sending message j from a set of N messages, then the information produced when one message is chosen from the set is, in units of bits [3],

$$H = -\log_2 P_j . \tag{1}$$

For a brief description of quantum Darwinism it is helpful to resort to a short description of the limitations of non-Darwinian quantum mechanics, the limitations that quantum Darwinism addresses. In quantum mechanics the universe is separable into 3 parts: I. System S , II. Apparatus A , III. Environment E . The evolution of quantum systems occurs according to Schrödinger’s equation. Entanglement between system and apparatus can be modeled by unitary Schrödinger evolution

$$|\Psi_0\rangle \equiv |\psi_S\rangle |A_0\rangle = \left(\sum_k a_k |s_k\rangle \right) |A_0\rangle \rightarrow \sum_k a_k |s_k\rangle |A_k\rangle = |\Psi_{SA}\rangle .$$

There is nevertheless a basis ambiguity that is the basis for the EPR paradox,

$$|\Psi_{SA}\rangle = \sum_k a_k |s_k\rangle |A_k\rangle = \sum_k b_k |r_k\rangle |B_k\rangle .$$

Von Neumann [8] proposed a non-unitary selection of the preferred basis,

$$|\Psi_{SA}\rangle \langle\Psi_{SA}| \rightarrow \sum_k |a_k|^2 |s_k\rangle \langle s_k| |A_k\rangle \langle A_k| = \rho_{SA} .$$

Von Neumann [8] also proposed the non-unitary “collapse” enabling the occurrence of a unique outcome (e.g. for state 17):

$$\sum_k |a_k|^2 |s_k\rangle \langle s_k| |A_k\rangle \langle A_k| \rightarrow |a_{17}|^2 |s_{17}\rangle \langle s_{17}| |A_{17}\rangle \langle A_{17}| .$$

Zurek [2, 10] proposed an approach to entanglement which is unitary and as un-arbitrary as possible, using the environment. The use of the environment implies abandoning the closed-system assumption [10], requiring the following alteration:

$$|\Psi_{SA}\rangle |e_0\rangle = \left(\sum_k a_k |s_k\rangle |A_k\rangle \right) |e_0\rangle \rightarrow \sum_k a_k |s_k\rangle |A_k\rangle |e_k\rangle = |\Psi_{SAE}\rangle .$$

The selection of the preferred basis is obtained using unitary evolution by assuming $|\langle e_k | e_l \rangle|^2 = \delta_{kl}$ and tracing over the environment [10],

$$\rho_{SA} = \text{Tr}_E |\Psi_{SAE}\rangle \langle\Psi_{SAE}| = \sum_k |a_k|^2 |s_k\rangle \langle s_k| |A_k\rangle \langle A_k| .$$

The preferred basis is defined by the set of states the apparatus can adopt that do not interact with the environment and therefore only interact with the system. The apparatus adopts one of the pointer states after it makes a measurement. For this set of pointer states to exist it is necessary that the apparatus be entangled with the environment. Entanglement is a non-classical quantum behaviour where two parts of the universe that have interacted at a certain point in time have to be described with reference to each other even if they are now separated in space, as long as they remain entangled. The above explanations of quantum measurement do not clarify the meaning of tracing over the environment, and the non-unitary “collapse” is not really explained. Quantum Darwinism addresses both issues successfully [2, 12].

3 Introduction to Quantum Darwinism

In quantum Darwinism, the following statements are considered to be valid: (a) The universe consists of systems. (b) A pure (meaning completely known) state of a system can be represented by a normalized vector in Hilbert space H_S . (c) A composite pure state of several systems is a vector in the tensor product of the constituent Hilbert spaces. (d) States evolve in accordance with the Schrödinger equation $i\hbar|\dot{\psi}\rangle = H|\psi\rangle$ where H is Hermitean. In quantum Darwinism no “collapse” postulate is needed. An assumption by von Neumann [8] and others is that the observers acquire information about the quantum system from the quantum system, but that is (almost) never the case. The distinction between direct and indirect observation might seem inconsequential as a simple extension of the von Neumann chain [8], but the use of the point of view of the observer in quantum Darwinism makes it possible to obtain the “collapse” [10, 12].

In quantum Darwinism there is “no information without representation”, meaning that the information is always about a state that is being represented. Preferred pointer states selected through entanglement define what is being stored in the environment. Information in quantum systems has several definitions; the one used here is based on the density matrix ρ and is similar to Eq. (1):

$$H = -\log_2 \rho . \tag{2}$$

Mutual information between system and environment is in the quantum formalism given by

$$I(SA : E^{(n)}) = H(SA) + H(E^{(n)}) - H(SA, E^{(n)}) .$$

The mutual information in quantum formalism is identical to the classical expression, although the details are different. Redundancy can be estimated as

$$I^{(N)} = \sum_{n=1}^N I(SA : E^{(n)}) .$$

The redundancy ratio is equivalent in quantum and classical systems [2],

$$R \equiv \frac{I^{(N)}}{H(SA)} = N .$$

Redundancy of information storage in the N environment states gives objectivity by enabling multiple observers to obtain identical information about the system. Redundancy also allows for tracing over the environment as the information stored in the N environment states is identical (assuming that Darwinian extinction has already occurred which is typically the case).

Environment-assisted invariance (envariance) is a quantum symmetry exhibited by the states of entangled quantum systems. The joint state can always be described by a Schmidt basis (if the environment is made big enough). The SA system is now simply S for notational convenience,

$$|\Psi_{SE}\rangle = \sum_k^K a_k |s_k\rangle |e_k\rangle .$$

Envariance refers to the existence of unitary transformations U_S acting on S alone that alter $|\Psi_{SE}\rangle$ non-trivially and whose effect can be canceled by the action of a unitary operation U_E acting on E alone,

$$U_E (U_S |\Psi_{SE}\rangle) = |\Psi_{SE}\rangle ,$$

or, in more detail,

$$[1_S \otimes u_E] ([u_S \otimes 1_E] |\Psi_{SE}\rangle) = |\Psi_{SE}\rangle .$$

All envariant unitary transformations have the eigenstates that coincide with the Schmidt expansion given by

$$u_S = \sum_k^K e^{i\phi_k} |s_k\rangle \langle s_k| .$$

The corresponding operator in the environment is

$$u_E = \sum_k^K e^{i(\phi_k + 2\pi l_k)} |e_k\rangle \langle e_k|$$

with l_k integer. Properties of global states are envariant iff they are functions of the phases of the Schmidt coefficient. To regard phases as unimportant and absorb them using the Schmidt expansion is a dangerous over-simplification as phases do matter.

4 Relation between Quantum Darwinism and Quantum Diffusion

In molecular Brownian motion there is a permanent oscillation between position measurement and momentum measurement. Next, Brownian motion of quantum states describe decoherence; this is also an accurate description of molecular Brownian motion. The quantum Brownian motion model used here consists of an environment E made of a collection of harmonic oscillators of position q_n , mass m_n , frequency w_n , and coupling constant c_n , interacting with a system S of mass M , position x , and harmonic potential

$V(x) = \frac{1}{2}MW^2x^2$. The total Lagrangian is [13]

$$L(x, q_n) = \underbrace{\frac{M}{2} [\dot{x}^2 - W^2x^2]}_{L_S} + \underbrace{\sum_n \frac{m_n}{2} \left[\dot{q}_n^2 - w_n^2 \left[q_n - \frac{c_n x}{m_n w_n^2} \right]^2 \right]}_{L_{SE}}. \quad (3)$$

The Lagrangian component L_{SE} takes into account the renormalization of the potential energy. If the temperature T is higher than all other relevant energy scales, including the energy content of the initial state and energy cutoff in the spectral density of the environment $C(v)$; then the master equation for the density matrix (ρ_S) of an initially environment-independent system S depends on the renormalized Hamiltonian H_{ren} and on

$$\gamma = \frac{2}{MW} \int_0^\infty dl \int_0^\infty dv C(v) \sin(Wl) \sin(vl)$$

in the following way [13]:

$$\dot{\rho}_S = -\frac{i}{\hbar} [H_{ren}, \rho_S] - \gamma [x - y] \left[\frac{\partial}{\partial x} - \frac{\partial}{\partial y} \right] \rho_S - \frac{2M\gamma KT}{\hbar^2} [x - y]^2 \rho_S. \quad (4)$$

In this high T case the master equation is independent of $V(x)$. The relaxation time is γ^{-1} and the decoherence time is [10, 9]:

$$\tau_D = \gamma^{-1} \left[\frac{\frac{\hbar}{\sqrt{2MKT}}}{x - y} \right]^2. \quad (5)$$

In SI units (Kg, m, s) and for $T=300\text{K}$, τ_D is

$$\tau_D \approx \gamma^{-1} 10^{-48} \left[\sqrt{M} [x - y] \right]^{-2}.$$

The distance dependence of L_{SE} means that the measurement in S is a position measurement; for a momentum measurement L_{SE} would be different.

The Wigner quasi-distribution representation Z of the high temperature density matrix master equation (Eq. (4)) is [13]:

$$\dot{Z} = -\frac{p}{M} \frac{\partial}{\partial x} [Z] + \frac{\partial V}{\partial x} Z + 2\gamma \frac{\partial}{\partial p} [pZ] + 2\gamma M KT \frac{\partial^2}{\partial p^2} [Z]. \quad (6)$$

The basis for the classical molecular Brownian motion of velocity u , friction coefficient ζ , and random acceleration A is the Langevin equation

$$\dot{u} = -\zeta u + A.$$

The Langevin equation generates the Chandrasekhar phase space distribution Z general-

ization of the Focker-Planck equation [9]:

$$\dot{Z} = -\frac{p}{M} \frac{\partial}{\partial x} [Z] + \frac{\partial V}{\partial x} Z + \zeta \frac{\partial}{\partial p} [pZ] + \zeta MKT \frac{\partial^2}{\partial p^2} [Z]. \quad (7)$$

The comparison of Eq. (7) with Eq. (6) establishes they are identical equations except for a change from ζ in the Chandrasekhar equation (Eq. (7)) to 2γ in the Wigner quasi-distribution (Eq. (6)), meaning that in quantum Darwinism, classical Brownian motion is obtained from quantum Brownian motion.

The minimum uncertainty Wigner quasi-distribution for a phase space localized wave-packet is [13]:

$$Z(x_0, x, p_0, p) = \frac{1}{\pi \hbar} \exp \left(- \left[\frac{x - x_0}{\sqrt{\frac{\hbar}{2MW}}} \right]^2 - \left[\frac{p - p_0}{\sqrt{\frac{\hbar MW}{2}}} \right]^2 \right). \quad (8)$$

If there are two wave packets separated by Δx , with average location x and average momentum p , then the joint Wigner quasi-distribution is equal to averaging the two localized Wigner distribution expressions plus a non-classical interaction term equal to [13]

$$W_{\text{int}} \approx \frac{1}{\pi \hbar} \cos \left(\frac{\Delta x}{\hbar} p \right) \exp \left(- \left[\frac{x}{\sqrt{\frac{\hbar}{2MW}}} \right]^2 - \left[\frac{p}{\sqrt{\frac{\hbar MW}{2}}} \right]^2 \right). \quad (9)$$

Joining the diffusion coefficient expression [13, 9]

$$D = \frac{2KT}{\zeta M} = \frac{KT}{\gamma M}$$

with the decoherence-time definition of Eq. (5) yields a relation between decoherence-time and diffusion coefficient,

$$\tau_D = \frac{D}{2} \left[\frac{\hbar}{KT[x - y]} \right]^2. \quad (10)$$

5 Diffusion in Cosmic Inflation

The purpose of this section is to describe how cosmic inflation relates to Brownian motion. It is not intended to present a thorough description of cosmic inflation. In the present description of cosmic inflation there are multiple Big Bang occurrences, and in each of these occurrences baby-universes are created. One of the baby-universes is our own universe [1]. In order to describe cosmic inflation it is helpful to explain what is being

inflated. The behavior of spacetime is characterized by the relation between differences in time and differences in spatial location, and can be represented by the behavior of a single characteristic time varying scale parameter a which appears in the line element which is characteristic of spacetime. The Hubble parameter is the fractional change of a with time: $H = \frac{1}{a} \frac{da}{dt}$. Inflation describes the early epoch period of rapid growth of a . During inflation H is approximately constant at a value roughly of the order $H \cong 10^{34} \text{s}^{-1}$ which makes a approximately proportional to e^{Ht} . Inflation comes to an end when H begins to decrease rapidly. The energy stored in the vacuum-like state is then transformed into thermal energy, and the universe becomes extremely hot. From that point onward, its evolution is described by the hot universe theory.

To correctly describe Brownian behavior during cosmic inflation, it is convenient to distinguish between two horizons: the particle horizon and the event horizon. The particle horizon delimits what an observer at a time t can observe assuming a capacity to detect the smallest of signals. The event horizon delimits the part of the universe from which we can ever (up to some maximal time t_{max}) receive information about events taking place now (at time t). The particle and event horizons are in a certain sense complementary. In an exponentially expanding universe, the radius of the event horizon is equal to cH^{-1} where c is the speed of light in vacuum. In an exponentially expanding universe, any two points that are more than a distance cH^{-1} apart will move away from each other faster than c , meaning that those two points will never observe each other. They might belong to the same baby-universe if they come from the same Big Bang, but the points will lie beyond each other's particle horizons.

In a simplified manner it can be said that in quantum field physics the position \mathbf{x} is replaced by the field φ and the momentum \mathbf{p} by the field ψ . As described in Ref. [1], cosmic inflation leads to the creation of multiple baby-universes one of them our own. Some of those universes will have physical behaviors very different from the behavior of our universe, but we will now consider the behavior of quantum fluctuations in the cosmic inflation model; the Higgs field φ is represented as [1]

$$\varphi(\mathbf{x}, t) = (2\pi)^{-\frac{3}{2}} \int d^3p \left[a_p^+ \psi_p(t) e^{i\mathbf{p}\mathbf{x}} + a_p^- \psi_p^*(t) e^{-i\mathbf{p}\mathbf{x}} \right]. \quad (11)$$

The $(2\pi)^{-\frac{3}{2}}$ term is simply a normalization factor, $\int d^3p$ is the integration over all possible values of the momentum, a_p^+ creates a field with momentum \mathbf{p} parameter with a probability modulated by $\psi_p(t)$ and propagating in spacetime as the wave $e^{i\mathbf{p}\mathbf{x}}$, and a_p^- destroys that same field.

The first cosmic inflation models considered that φ was a classical field (meaning non-quantum). The way a quantum system becomes classical is through the process of de-

coherence. As described in the previous section, the process of decoherence has strong similarities to Brownian motion. Ref. [1] describes the similarity of the behavior of φ during cosmic inflation and Brownian motion.

As it is typical in Brownian motion, the diffusion of the field φ can be described by the probability distribution $P(\varphi, t)$ of finding the field φ at that point in instant t . In Eq. 7.3.17 of Ref. [1] it is found that

$$\frac{\partial P(\varphi, t)}{\partial t} = D \frac{\partial^2 P(\varphi, t)}{\partial \varphi^2}. \quad (12)$$

Using Eq. (12), Ref. [1] shows that

$$\langle \varphi^2 \rangle = 2Dt$$

as is expected in diffusion processes (Eq. 7.3.12 in Ref. [1]) and that

$$D = \frac{H^3}{8\pi^2 c^2}. \quad (13)$$

6 Effects of a Quantum Darwinism Approach to Cosmic Inflation

The way a quantum system becomes classical is through the process of decoherence, which according to quantum Darwinism is described by quantum Brownian motion in the high temperature limit. So it is possible that the Brownian process in cosmic inflation described in Ref. [1] entails the extinction of the non-decohered universe states.

Gödel's incompleteness theorems propose to describe the difficulties of creating a mathematical formalism from nothing using Hilbert's FAS [3, 11], a deterministic approach. Quantum Darwinism proposes to address the creation of classical reality from a quantum reality, a Darwinian approach. The deterministic and the Darwinian approach to creation can be considered as the two extreme approaches of dealing with Gödel's incompleteness theorems (see Appendix). The Big Bang proposes to describe the creation of an observable universe from nothing, and so it will need to be somewhere between a Darwinian and a deterministic approach. A Darwinian evolution is Brownian evolution where extinction might occur; and so this study of the relation between decoherence (extinction of some quantum states) and diffusion (Brownian motion) of baby-universes is a study of the Darwinian processes occurring during cosmic inflation.

Solving the diffusion equation (Eq. (12)) during cosmic inflation, one obtains the probability for creation of a universe with a certain vacuum energy. Summing over all

topologically disconnected configurations of just-created universes enables obtaining the probability for creating universes with a certain cosmological constant value [1], causing Linde to write that although “*it is often supposed that the basic goal of theoretical physics is to find exactly what Lagrangian or Hamiltonian correctly describes our entire world. ..one could well ask...if the concept of an observer may play an important role not just in discussions of the various characteristics of our universe, but in the very laws by which it is governed.*” The answer proposed here to Linde’s question is that if the quantum Darwinism approach is applied to cosmic inflation, then the laws of physics are themselves the result of a Darwinian evolution of quantum systems.

7 Results

We generalize the results obtained about molecules in quantum Brownian motion to baby-universes undergoing Brownian motion during cosmic inflation. The decoherence time is the time during which two baby-universes - located at x and y and described by the corresponding fields $\varphi(x)$ and $\varphi(y)$, respectively - remain entangled after initial interaction:

$$\tau_D = H^{-1} \left[\frac{\hbar}{4\pi cK} \frac{H^2}{T [\varphi(x) - \varphi(y)]} \right]^2 . \quad (14)$$

The hot universe theory of the Big Bang received strong observational validation by the discovery of the microwave background radiation in 1964 [1]. This experimental result has been used as indicating the objective existence of multi-verses as mentioned in Wheeler’s approach, but Eq. (14) indicates that the duration of coherent multi-verses differs from H^{-1} by a factor of

$$\left[\frac{\hbar}{4\pi cK} \frac{H^2}{T [\varphi(x) - \varphi(y)]} \right]^2 .$$

In Linde’s approach [1] the probability P is the probability of occurrence of a field describing the probability of creation of baby-universes. Baby-universes at their creation have an entanglement with their mother-universe but during cosmic inflation separate faster than c from other possibly created baby-universes and so there is no capacity of information transmission between baby-universes. In Ref. [1], baby-universes are created in energy-antienergy pairs, and so baby-universes are *quanta* of the field φ . Linde chose the energy-antienergy approach rather than the particle-antiparticle approach for mathematical implementation reasons, but both approaches are considered in Ref. [1] to be equivalent. The expression for decoherence time in Eq. (14) makes sense because P is the probability of occurrence of a field and not the probability of occurrence of a displacement, which makes the step from Eq. (10) to Eq. (14) reasonable. The fact that a diffusion

mechanism is invoked implies a generalization of the pair creation scenario: in the present picture a multitude of entangled baby-universes is spawned by the mother-universe. This multitude then undergoes diffusion and inflation in the described manner.

The differing Linde and Zurek approaches, which can be linked to the differences between FAS and DAS axiomatic systems respectively, imply different outcomes for the non-observed outcomes. The FAS/Linde approach considers that the outcomes incompatible with the observed outcome exist in differing multi-verses, while the DAS/Zurek approach considers the outcomes incompatible with the observed outcome have become non-existent. In Zurek's approach information-transmission is what enables existence [13], while in quantum gravity the difference between quasi-particles (quantum oscillations) and particles is vague at best [1].

Decoherence is the selection of states from a group of selectable states, the state can be existence itself. Immediately after the Big Bang, the parallel between baby-universes and molecules in quantum Brownian motion is more accurate if the molecules are in a liquid state. During and after cosmic inflation the best parallel would be with molecules in a rarefied gaseous state. Cosmic inflation is so fast that information leaving a baby-universe cannot reach other baby-universes [1], but what causes decoherence is the departure of information from a system so that it could be detected, the fact that it will not be detected is irrelevant [10, 13]. So, even in the case of cosmic inflation the parallel with molecular quantum Brownian motion holds well.

The representation of cosmic inflation using a diffusion process in a de Sitter space allows to consider thermal equilibrium with [14, 1]

$$T = \frac{\hbar H}{K}$$

so that Eq. (14) becomes

$$\tau_D = \frac{H}{16\pi^2 c^2} [\varphi(x) - \varphi(y)]^{-2} . \quad (15)$$

The value of τ_D depends on the actual form of the fields $\varphi(x)$ and $\varphi(y)$, for which we would need some model assumptions, and on the Hubble parameter H during inflation which is also not known sufficiently well.

If τ_D is smaller than the time between Big-Bang and cosmic inflation, typically assumed to be $t \cong 10^{-34}$ s, then it would be correct to represent cosmic inflation by a classical field. If τ_D is bigger than that time, but smaller than duration of cosmic inflation, which should end at around $t \cong 10^{-32}$ s, then baby universes would be non-entangled after end of cosmic inflation. If τ_D is bigger than the duration of cosmic inflation, then some of

the observable parts of the universe might show signs of entanglement. Just as it is not possible to detect if two molecules are entangled by just observing one, it is not possible to detect if our baby-universe is entangled with other baby-universes. But it might be possible to experimentally test if other baby-universes are entangled by looking for effects of that entanglement.

If τ_D is smaller than the time between Big-Bang and start of cosmic inflation, the decoherence time is best described using t_D obtained by Eq. (16). Using $H = \frac{1}{a} \frac{da}{dt}$ the duration of the quantum coherence of the baby-universes following the Big Bang would be a t_D such that

$$t_D^2 - \int_0^{t_D} \frac{1}{8\pi^2 c^2 [\varphi(x) - \varphi(y)]^2} \frac{d[\log a]}{dt} dt = 0 . \quad (16)$$

8 Discussion and Summary

Obtaining values for the decoherence-time requires knowledge of the value of the Hubble parameter before and during inflation. Values of the Hubble parameter have a large range, and the measurement of its value is a topic of current research [1]. The existence of baby-universes is also a not yet established observational fact [1]. Thus, obtaining proof of Eq. (14) and Eq. (15) is not yet possible. But if baby-universes exist, and if more information is obtained about the time-dynamics of the Hubble parameter, the relation between Hubble parameter and decoherence-time expressed in Eq. (14) and Eq. (15) would be likely to become useful.

A characteristic of biological Darwinism is the existence of a first cell. The approach to cosmic inflation described in Ref. [15] indicates that the inflating region of spacetime must have a past boundary; this truly initial Bang would have occurred a lot earlier than our own Big Bang. In this work a relation between Quantum Darwinism and HAS is presented in the Appendix, with the HAS becoming more and more Darwinian as the forces considered become closer to what they were at the truly initial Bang (the initial forces because of their extremely high energy are likely to be also the most fundamental forces). The Quantum Darwinism treatment of the truly initial Big Bang would therefore correspond to a process that is as Darwinian as it gets, even more Darwinian than the evolution of species. This Darwinian process would become more and more deterministic as the interactions between aspects of the universe *de-facto* measure those aspects of the universe. The measurement described in Eq. (14) and Eq. (15) obtains what the physical constants (and laws) will be for a certain baby-universe by a Darwinian extinction of the other possible values. That the measurement occurring during cosmic inflation is the selector of the physical constants is already proposed in section 10 of Ref. [1], but the

approach proposed here is different in that it proposes the Darwinian extinction of the non-obtained quantum alternatives that are not moving away at a speed faster than c .

To summarize, an expression was obtained for the time after which different previously entangled baby-universes would decohere.

Acknowledgments: NFL thanks Nachum Dershowitz, Jean-Claude Zambrini, Juan Sanchez, and Juan Pablo Paz for answering his questions.

Appendix: Formal and Darwinian Axiomatic Systems

Chaitin's approach to Gödel's incompleteness theorems is based in the concept of information [3], and so is Quantum Darwinism based in the concept of information [2]. Gödel's incompleteness theorems describe fundamental limitations to Hilbert's attempt to base mathematics on a formal axiomatic system (FAS) that is consistent and complete. An FAS is complete if all propositions (sentences) expressed in the FAS can be logically valuated given the logical value of the FAS's axioms. An FAS is consistent if for no proposition ϖ both ϖ and not- ϖ are provable from the axioms. Chaitin's approach to Gödel's incompleteness theorems indicates that the reason for the incompleteness is that the limited amount of information in the axioms limits the proving power of the FAS [3].

A FAS is constituted by alphabet, grammar, axioms, rules of inference, and a proof-checking algorithm. In the FAS approach to mathematics, one starts with axioms considered as self-evident and built using the alphabet and the grammar; then the rules of inference are applied to the axioms and all the theorems (logical inferences of the axioms) are obtained. A proof-checking algorithm checks if a proof follows all the rules by doing reverse inference starting from the proof's result and checking if what is obtained are the axioms. Gödel's incompleteness theorems showed that a non-trivial FAS cannot be both complete and consistent [3, 11].

Axioms in FAS are typically made to be consistent so that the FAS is consistent, but an FAS cannot be both consistent and complete. A form of dealing with this difficulty is to validate propositions not by the valid application of inference rules, but by using a proof-checking algorithm that would eliminate propositions that are inconsistent within themselves. Such a process of selecting valid propositions is called here a Darwinian axiomatic system (DAS). The FAS and the DAS are the two extreme forms of dealing with Gödel's incompleteness theorems, respectively the consistent and the complete forms. It is possible to conceive an hybrid axiomatic system (HAS) between the FAS and the DAS. In the next paragraphs it will be proposed that Quantum Darwinism is similar to an HAS.

To Chaitin’s information-based Gödel incompleteness conclusion [3] that real numbers are non-computable with probability 1, quantum Darwinism answers through a discrete universe. In mathematical randomness [3] the value of a random variable is only known by running a computer, and in quantum Darwinism the value of a random quantum variable only occurs if the interaction in an experiment is strong enough [12]. The quantum randomness [10, 12] concept is identical to the mathematical randomness [2] concept if the quantum systems’ existence is enabled through their transmission of information, which occurs in quantum Darwinism. The existence’s dependence on information is the part of the Existentialist philosophical structure added by quantum Darwinism [10].

Quantum Darwinism’s Existentialism does not allow for an actual computation as that expressed in Turing’s halting problem both because of its lack of concrete existence and its lack of absolutely closed systems. It is proposed here that envariance [12] enabled by quantum entanglement is an expression of Turing’s halting problem in quantum Darwinism. The entanglement between system and its environment means that a program running on the system can be counter- run by a program in the environment.

In quantum Darwinism/Existentialism the existence of a system is not all-or-nothing. In quantum Darwinism the quantum state expresses both a description of the state (epistemological aspect) and the stuff making the state be (ontological aspect). Quantum states are therefore epiontic [10].

The mathematical requirement of completeness requires that all propositions obtained by the rules of deduction are true, which requires complete/global access to the states of the system. The mathematical requirement of consistency requires that a state cannot simultaneously be and not be, in quantum Darwinism only “pointer” states are like that [10, 12]. Global states occur when observation focus on the “system+environment”, and “pointer” states are obtained when the focus is on the system to the detriment of the environment. Observing the “system+environment” and observing the system are complementary approaches, similar to the complementarity of measuring position and momentum. The measurement of position is similar to measurement of a local state, and the measurement of momentum is similar to measurement of a global state [12]. This similarity has limits, as both position and momentum have their corresponding pointer states.

The axiomatic system representing quantum Darwinism would have DAS characteristics because of the Darwinian aspect of quantum Darwinism. Constraints on the evolution of quantum systems provided by Schrödinger’s equation make quantum Darwinism also have a deterministic aspect to it. The axiomatic system of quantum Darwinism is therefore an HAS. The decoherence described in Eqs. (14)-(16) is the first extinction in a “Dar-

winism at all scales” process where properties surviving Darwinian extinction at a more fundamental scale become deterministic structures for the Darwinian processes occurring at less fundamental scales (e.g. classical physics influence in biological Darwinism).

References

- [1] Linde, A. *Particle Physics and Inflationary Cosmology*. arXiv:hep-th/0503203 v1 (2005).
- [2] Zurek, W.H. *Quantum Darwinism and Envariance*. arXiv:quant-ph/0308163 v1 (2003).
- [3] Chaitin, G.J. *Meta Math!* Vintage Books (2005).
- [4] Wheeler, J.A. *It from bit*. Proceedings of the 1st International Sakharov Conference on Physics, Vol. 2 (1992).
- [5] Rovelli, C. *Quantum Gravity*. Cambridge University Press (2004).
- [6] Smolin, L. *Three Roads to Quantum Gravity*. Perseus Books Group (2002).
- [7] Guth, A.H. *The Inflationary Universe: A Possible Solution to the Horizon and Flatness Problems*. Phys. Rev. **D23**, 347 (1981).
- [8] von Neumann, J. *Mathematical Foundations of Quantum Mechanics*, Princeton University Press, (1955).
- [9] McQuarrie, D.A. *Statistical Mechanics*. Harper & Row (1975).
- [10] Zurek, W.H. *Decoherence and the transition from quantum to classical - revisited*. Los Alamos Science **27** (2002).
- [11] Gödel, K. *On Formally Undecidable Propositions of Principia Mathematica and Related Systems (Über formal unentscheidbare Sätze der Principia Mathematica und verwandter Systeme)*. Monatshefte für Mathematik und Physik **38**, 173 (1931).
- [12] Zurek, W.H. *Probabilities From Entanglement. Born’s Rule From Envariance*. arXiv:quant-ph/0405161 v2 (2005).
- [13] Zurek, W.H. *Decoherence, einselection, and the quantum origins of the classical*. Rev. Mod. Phys. **75**, 715 (2003).
- [14] Gibbons, G.W., and Hawking, S.W. *Action integrals and partition functions in quantum gravity*. Phys. Rev. **D15**, 2752 (1977).
- [15] Borde, A., Guth, A.H., and Vilenkin, A. *Inflationary spacetimes are incomplete in past directions*. Phys. Rev. Lett. **90**, 151301 (2003).