

Mathematical Structure of Quantum Decision Theory

V.I. Yukalov^{1,2} and D. Sornette^{1,3}

¹*Department of Management, Technology and Economics,
ETH Zürich, Zürich CH-8032, Switzerland*

²*Bogolubov Laboratory of Theoretical Physics,
Joint Institute for Nuclear Research, Dubna 141980, Russia*

³*Swiss Finance Institute,
c/o University of Geneva, 40 blvd. Du Pont d'Arve, CH 1211 Geneva 4, Switzerland*

Abstract

One of the most complex systems is the human brain whose formalized functioning is characterized by decision theory. We present a “Quantum Decision Theory” of decision making, based on the mathematical theory of separable Hilbert spaces. This mathematical structure captures the effect of superposition of composite prospects, including many incorporated intentions, which allows us to explain a variety of interesting fallacies and anomalies that have been reported to particularize the decision making of real human beings. The theory describes entangled decision making, non-commutativity of subsequent decisions, and intention interference of composite prospects. We demonstrate how the violation of the Savage’s sure-thing principle (disjunction effect) can be explained as a result of the interference of intentions, when making decisions under uncertainty. The conjunction fallacy is also explained by the presence of the interference terms. We demonstrate that all known anomalies and paradoxes, documented in the context of classical decision theory, are reducible to just a few mathematical archetypes, all of which finding straightforward explanations in the frame of the developed quantum approach.

Keywords: Decision theory, utility theory, paradoxes in decision making, action interference and entanglement, action prospects

JEL: D03, D81, D83, D84

1 Introduction

The human brain is certainly one of the most complex systems known in nature and it is therefore attracting strong interest in the attempts of understanding its functioning. There are two ways of describing the latter. One way is the study of physiological processes occurring in the brain, related to physical and chemical effects governing the process of thinking. Another approach is devoted to the formalized description of the thinking process in terms of decision making theory. The latter approach forms the basis of decision theory employed in social and economic sciences.

The scope of the present paper is the description of the brain functioning in terms of decision theory. We propose a novel theory of decision making, based on the mathematical theory of Hilbert spaces (Dieudonné, 2006) and employing the mathematical techniques that are used in the quantum theory of physical measurements. Because of the latter, we call this approach the *Quantum Decision Theory* (QDT). This approach can be thought of as the mathematically simplest and most natural extension of objective probabilities into nonlinear subjective probabilities. The proposed formalism allows us to explain *quantitatively* without adjustable parameters the known paradoxes, such as the disjunction and conjunction effects. The disjunction effect is the failure of humans to obey the sure-thing principle of classical probability theory. The conjunction effect is a logical fallacy that occurs when people assume that specific conditions are more probable than a single general one. Our QDT also unearths a deep relationship between the conjunction and the disjunction effects. We show that the former is sufficient for the later to exist.

Decision theory is concerned with identifying what are the optimal decisions and how to reach them. Traditionally, it is a part of discrete mathematics. Much of decision theory is normative and prescriptive, and assumes that people are fully-informed and rational (von Neumann and Morgenstern, 1953; Savage, 1954). These assumptions have been questioned early on with the evidence provided by the Allais paradox (Allais, 1953) and by many other behavioral paradoxes (Camerer et al., 2003), showing that humans often seem to deviate from the prescription of rational decision theory due to cognitive and emotion biases. Problems, occurring in the interpretation of classical utility theory and its application to real human decision processes, have been discussed in an extensive literature (e.g., Berger, 1985; Weidlich, 1991; Zeckhauser, 2006; Machina, 2008). The theories of bounded rationality (Simon, 1955) and of behavioral economics (Kahneman and Tversky, 1979; Shfrin, 2005) have been developed to account for these deviations. As reviewed by Machina (2008), alternative models of preferences over objectively or subjectively uncertain prospects have attempted to accommodate these systematic departures from the expected utility model, while retaining as much of its analytical power as possible. In particular, non-additive nonlinear probability models have been developed to account for the deviations from objective to subjective probabilities observed in human agents (Quiggin, 1982; Gilboa, 1987; Schmeidler, 1989; Gilboa and Schmeidler, 1989; Cohen and Tallon, 2000; Montesano, 2008). Decision making in the presence of uncertainty about the states of nature has been formalized in the statistical decision theory (Lindgren, 1971; White, 1976; Hastings and Mello, 1978; Rivett, 1980; Buchanan, 1982; Berger, 1985; Marshall and Oliver, 1995; Bather, 2000; French and Insua, 2000; Raiffa and Schlaifer, 2000; Weirich, 2001). However, many paradoxes remain unexplained or are sometimes rationalized on an ad hoc basis, which does not provide much predictive power.

To break this stalemate, our approach relies and extends von Neumann (1955) theory of quantum measurements in two principal aspects. First of all, we generalize the theory of quantum measurements to *active* objects, which are not simply passive systems exposed by a measurement performed by an external observer, but which are complex decision makers themselves, characterized by their own strategic state. Certainly, humans are extremely complex systems with many inaccessible features, such as emotions, biases, and subconscious processes. Indeed, even the most modern and precise measurements and localization of brain activity offer at best a rough cartography of physical operations only indirectly related to the thought processes. While inaccessible, one should not underestimate the importance of emotions and of subconscious processes in decision making, as is evidenced by a growing body of multidisciplinary research. The problem is that these inaccessible features of brain processes cannot be accounted for in the decision procedures based on the classical utility theory (von Neumann and Morgenstern, 1953) and its extensions. As a consequence, a variety of different anomalies and paradoxes, some of them already mentioned, have emerged from the confrontation of classical decision theory with empirical data on the decisions and choices made by real humans. In contrast, QDT is based on a minimalist set of axioms that lead to predictions on decision making that are in agreement with observed behaviors.

While being a direct descendent of the von Neumann (1955) theory of measurement, our approach is more general, complementing it by novel notions that are necessary for practical applications to active decision makers. The second important point of our theory is that, beyond simple actions, we consider *complex* actions that can be composed of several action representations or action modes. The relevance of the quantum description for classical objects can be justified by the following analogy. Quantum theory, as is known, could be interpreted as a cross-section of an underlying classical theory equipped with a large number of *contextual hidden variables* (see, e.g., Yukalov, 1975). However, in order to describe the results of N measurements on a single quantum system, it is necessary to involve a number of hidden variables which is proportional to N (Dakic et al., 2008). Hence, to describe any number of experiments on many systems, it is necessary to introduce an infinite number of hidden variables. Such a way of describing physical measurements is, evidently, unpractical. The techniques of quantum theory, avoiding the necessity of dealing with numerous unspecified hidden variables, provide the simplest method of characterizing any number of physical measurements on an arbitrary number of systems. In the case of decision theory, the role of hidden variables is played by various biases, underlying emotions, subconscious feelings, and other hidden features characterizing decision makers. This is why the quantum approach seems to provide the simplest way of taking into account such hidden characteristics, at the same time avoiding the necessity of explicitly dealing with them, similarly to avoiding the hidden variables in quantum theory.

Our approach is based on more than just the argument that human decisions involve complex processes beyond the reach of detailed empirical or theoretical analysis. It is based on the hypothesis that the thought processes, involved in the definition and analysis of alternative prospects and scenarios, do not necessarily separate them according to the recipes of standard probability theory. Our QDT formalizes systematically a broader class of decision making processes in which prospects can interact, interfere and remain entangled. Our formulation of QDT thus captures the effect of superposition of composite prospects, including many incorporated intentions. Dealing with composite prospects involves entangling operations and the appearance of decision interference, characterizing decision procedures under the perception

of uncertainty and/or potential harmful consequences. When such a generalization to standard probability theory and to the usual optimization of classical decision theory is introduced, we find that all the paradoxes are explained as unavoidable consequences of the more general process of decision making described by the QDT. We apply the developed machinery to several examples typical of various paradoxes of classical decision theory. By the corresponding theorems, we prove that no such paradoxes exist in QDT.

Historically, the idea that the process of human thinking can be described by the techniques of quantum theory was advanced by Bohr (1933, 1937). Using these techniques, it would be possible to characterize the complex psychological processes occurring in human mind and accompanied by the effects typical of quantum theory, for instance, by interference. From time to time, the Bohr ideas have been revived in the literature (e.g., Busemeyer et al., 2006). However, no decision theory has been suggested, which would have predictive power.

While developing the mathematical theory of quantum measurements, Von Neumann (1955) mentioned that the measurement procedure, to some extent, reminds of the process of taking decisions. This analogy has been further emphasized by Benioff (1972) in his description of quantum information processing. The basics of a general approach, treating human decision making as a kind of quantum theory of measurements, was announced in the brief letter (Yukalov and Sornette, 2008). The possibility of constructing a thinking quantum system, imitating the process of human decision making, has been advanced (Yukalov and Sornette, 2009). It was also shown that the QDT approach provides a natural explanation for the phenomenon of dynamic inconsistency (Yukalov and Sornette, 2009). The main aim of the present paper is twofold. First, we develop the general Quantum Decision Theory, describing in detail the basic mathematical structure of QDT. Second, we prove several theorems explaining the origin of the classical paradoxes in standard decision making and show that such paradoxes do not appear in QDT. The rigorous mathematical proof that QDT is free of any kind of the paradoxes, plaguing classical decision theory, is the principal novel result of this paper.

In our recent paper (Yukalov and Sornette, 2009), we have concentrated our attention on the phenomenon of dynamic inconsistency, which we do not touch here. In contrast, we analyze here other paradoxes that have not been treated in our previous papers, which makes the main content of the present paper principally different and new.

It is also worth stressing the main points distinguishing our approach from the von Neumann quantum theory of measurement:

(i) First of all, in quantum measurements, a *passive* quantum system is subject to a measuring action from an *external* observer. Contrary to this, a decision maker is an *active* subject taking decisions by himself/herself, thus, the decisions being the product of an *internal* process.

(ii) The measuring devices, acting on quantum systems, are more or less the same for different systems. Mathematically, the measurement procedure can be described by calculating the expectation values for local observables, with respect to any complete basis. But a decision maker is a personality that is characterized by his/her own features, which mathematically implies that there exists a specific *strategic state* associated with this decision maker. Therefore any expectation value is to be taken with respect to this strategic state, and not with respect to an arbitrary basis. This point is one of the principal differences with the previous attempts to use the formalism of quantum mechanics to decision theory.

(iii) Quantum systems, in the majority of cases, are relatively simple, as compared to human brains. In the process of decision making, one usually considers not just simple actions

but rather complicated prospects, composed of several actions. This makes it necessary to systematically consider composite prospects, which is somewhat similar to dealing with complex systems with a complicated internal structure.

The organization of the paper is as follows. In order to emphasize that the theory is problem-driven, we present in Sec. 2 several most often cited paradoxes in classical decision making, the Allais paradox, the Ellsberg paradox, and the Kahneman-Tversky paradox. Section 3 introduces the definition of “intended actions” and “prospects” and of the mathematical notions to describe them. Section 4 defines the mathematical structure of the mode states, mode space, and the space of mind. Section 5 introduces the prospect probability operators. Section 6 defines the prospect probabilities as being the observables in the decision process. Section 7 formulates the rules according to which a decision is performed within the mathematical construction of QDT. Section 7 also describes the phenomenon of decision interference occurring under uncertainty and/or perceived potential harm. For this, the notion of composite prospects is introduced and the principle of “aversion to uncertainty and loss” is defined. Section 8 applies the previous definitions and concepts to binary decision cases, as they form the most common situation in the empirical literature. Section 9 presents the major results of the theory, showing how the main paradoxes documented in the literature are explained within QDT. The following paradoxes are addressed: the Allais paradox (or compatibility paradox), the independence paradox, the Ellsberg paradox, the inversion paradox, the invariance violation, described by Kahneman and Tversky, the certainty effects, the disjunction effect (or violation of the Savage sure-thing principle), the conjunction fallacy, and the isolation effect (or focusing, availability, salience, framing, or elicitation effects). Section 9 ends with a prediction on the condition under which several of these paradoxes can occur simultaneously. In particular, we predict that the conjunction fallacy should be accompanied by the disjunction effect. Section 10 summarizes and concludes.

2 Some Famous Paradoxes

There exist several paradoxes in classical decision theory based on the notion of expected utility. Despite numerous attempts to resolve these paradoxes, none of the suggested approaches have been able to resolve all of them in the frame of the same theory. Various extensions of utility theory, based on constructing non-expected utility functionals (Machina, 2008), do not resolve these paradoxes, as has been proved by Safra and Segal (2008). Usually, extending the classical utility theory “ends up creating more paradoxes and inconsistencies than it resolves” (Al-Najjar and Weinstein, 2009). In order to stress that the necessity of advancing a novel variant of decision theory, the QDT presented here, is not just “theory-driven” but is fundamentally “problem-driven”, with the aim of resolving the existing paradoxes, we describe below some of the most often discussed paradoxes occurring in classical decision making.

2.1 Allais paradox

The Allais paradox expresses the observation that several decisions which are mutually incompatible, according to classical utility theory, are nevertheless embraced by real human people (Allais, 1953). The mathematical structure of this paradox is as follows. One considers four

alternatives corresponding to four prospects. For example, let us consider the actions A_n corresponding to the n -th choice procedure (prospect), with n taking the values 1, 2, 3 and 4. Let the X_j 's be the amounts of money to be gained with the corresponding probabilities $p_n(X_j)$. The utility function, measuring the utility of getting an amount X_j of money is $U(X_j)$. According to utility theory, a prospect π_n is characterized by a lottery $\{p_n(X_j), U(X_j)\}$. The expected utility of the prospect π_n is

$$U(\pi_n) = \sum_j p_n(X_j)U(X_j) . \quad (1)$$

One also assumes the balance condition among the four prospects:

$$p_1(X_j) + p_3(X_j) = p_2(X_j) + p_4(X_j) \quad \text{for all } j . \quad (2)$$

In the Allais paradox, subjects prefer π_1 to π_2 which, according to utility theory, implies that

$$U(\pi_1) > U(\pi_2) . \quad (3)$$

And π_3 is preferred or indifferent to π_4 , which means that

$$U(\pi_3) \geq U(\pi_4) . \quad (4)$$

Using the definition of the expected utility (1), one has from (3) the equation

$$\sum_j [p_1(X_j) - p_2(X_j)]U(X_j) > 0 , \quad (5)$$

while from Eq. (4) one gets

$$\sum_j [p_3(X_j) - p_4(X_j)]U(X_j) \geq 0 . \quad (6)$$

Using the balance condition (2), the latter inequality transforms into

$$\sum_j [p_1(X_j) - p_2(X_j)]U(X_j) \leq 0 . \quad (7)$$

Equations (5) and (7) are evidently incompatible.

In the original Allais paradox, the amounts of money were chosen so that $U(X_1) < U(X_2) < U(X_3)$, with $X_1 \rightarrow \$0$, $X_2 \rightarrow \$10^6$, and $X_3 \rightarrow \$5 \times 10^6$. The probabilities $p_n(X_j)$ were defined as

$$\{p_1(X_j)\} = \{0, 1, 0\} , \quad \{p_2(X_j)\} = \{0.01, 0.89, 0.10\} , \quad (8)$$

$$\{p_3(X_j)\} = \{0.90, 0, 0.10\} , \quad \{p_4(X_j)\} = \{0.89, 0.11, 0\} . \quad (9)$$

The balance condition (2) here is valid, since

$$p_1(X_1) + p_3(X_1) = p_2(X_1) + p_4(X_1) = 0.9 ,$$

$$p_1(X_2) + p_3(X_2) = p_2(X_2) + p_4(X_2) = 1 ,$$

$$p_1(X_3) + p_3(X_3) = p_2(X_3) + p_4(X_3) = 0.1 .$$

Decisions, when the prospect π_1 is preferred to π_2 and the prospect π_3 is preferred to π_4 , are clearly incompatible. The explanation of this paradox, in the framework of QDT, will be given in Sec. 9, being based on the fact that the prospect π_2 is more uncertain than π_1 , while the prospects π_3 and π_4 are of a comparable uncertainty.

The balance condition (2) also leads to the violation of the independence axiom of expected utility theory. This axiom postulates that if the prospect π_1 is strictly preferred to π_2 , and the prospect π_3 is preferred or indifferent to π_4 , in the sense of conditions (3) and (4), then the prospect $\pi_1 + \pi_3$ is strictly preferred to $\pi_2 + \pi_4$, so that

$$U(\pi_1 + \pi_3) > U(\pi_2 + \pi_4) . \quad (10)$$

However, under the balance condition (2), one has

$$U(\pi_1 + \pi_3) = U(\pi_2 + \pi_4) . \quad (11)$$

Equations (10) and (11) violate the independence axiom of utility theory. This anomaly will be resolved in Proposition 6.

2.2 Ellsberg paradox

The Ellsberg paradox demonstrates that no utility function can describe the choices made by real human agents for the following process (Ellsberg, 1961). One considers two prospects π_1 and π_2 , defined as the conjunctions $\pi_n = A_n X$, with $X = X_1 + X_2 + \dots$. And one assumes the validity of the equivalence condition

$$p_1(X_j) = p_2(X_j) \quad (\forall j) . \quad (12)$$

Under this condition, the expected utility functions (1) for both prospects π_1 and π_2 coincide,

$$U(\pi_1) = U(\pi_2) . \quad (13)$$

This equality holds for arbitrary utility functions. But in the realization of this paradox, one defines the probabilities $p_1(X_j)$ explicitly, while keeping the value of $p_2(X_j)$ unknown or, perhaps better said, ambiguous. This ambiguity does not remove the fact that condition (12) holds true. But the value of $p_2(X_j)$ is perceived less clearly or, using different framing of the decision making process, π_2 is organized as a more uncertain prospect than π_1 . It turns out that subjects always prefer π_1 to π_2 , which necessarily implies

$$U(\pi_1) > U(\pi_2) , \quad (14)$$

if classical utility theory is to describe this situation. But, Eqs. (13) and (14) are in contradiction with each other, which implies that there are no utility functions that would satisfy both these equations simultaneously.

Such a paradox does not arise in QDT, as will be proved in Proposition 7.

2.3 Kahneman-Tversky paradox

The logical meaning of the Kahneman-Tversky paradox is as follows (Kahneman and Tversky, 1979). One considers four prospects, $\pi_n = A_n X$, with $n = 1, 2, 3, 4$ and the structure is as in the Ellsberg paradox above. The actions A_n characterize the choices, enumerated with $n = 1, 2, 3, 4$. The alternatives X_j describe the amounts of money which are such that $U(X_1) < U(X_2) < U(X_3)$ and

$$U(X_2) = \frac{1}{2} [U(X_1) + U(X_3)] . \quad (15)$$

The probabilities $p_n(X_j)$ are given in such a way that

$$U(\pi_n) = \text{const} \quad (n = 1, 2, 3, 4) , \quad (16)$$

with the expected utility function defined as in Eq. (1).

The procedure is organized so that the prospect π_1 provides a more uncertain gain than π_2 , hence, π_1 is more uncertain than π_2 . And the prospect π_4 is defined as yielding more certain loss than π_3 , consequently, π_4 is more repulsive than π_3 . In response to the involved risks, real human subjects prefer π_2 to π_1 and π_3 to π_4 , which implies

$$U(\pi_1) < U(\pi_2) , \quad U(\pi_3) > U(\pi_4) , \quad (17)$$

in contradiction with Eq. (16).

In the original Kahneman-Tversky paradox (Tversky and Kahneman, 1983), the probability sets were defined as

$$\{p_1(X_j)\} = \{0.5, 0, 0.5\} = \{p_3(X_j)\} , \quad \{p_2(X_j)\} = \{0, 1, 0\} = \{p_4(X_j)\} .$$

The Kahneman-Tversky paradox does not occur in QDT, as will be proven in Proposition 9.

3 Intended Actions and Prospects

Decision making is concerned with the choice between several intended actions that, for brevity, can be called intentions or just actions. The analog of actions in classical probability theory is the notion of events forming a field of events. In contrast, in QDT, actions are not necessarily commutative and, generally, do not compose a field. Noncommutativity of actions in QDT is similar to the noncommutativity of events in noncommutative probability theory (Vioculescu et al., 1992). This echoes the general observation that intended actions in real life are also very often noncommutative. It is interesting to note that Pierce (1880) was, probably, the first to emphasize that logical statements are generally noncommutative. The formalization of his relative logic (Pierce, 1880) is based on the recognition that the order of logical statements can be essential. We start from these premises to describe and analyze the algebra of actions within QDT. In the Introduction, we have described the main ideas of QDT in simple words. In what follows, we turn to a more rigorous consideration in the style widely accepted in economic literature and in the literature on mathematics of complex systems.

3.1 Action ring

Let us consider a set of intended actions

$$\mathcal{A} = \{A_n : n = 1, 2, \dots\}, \quad (18)$$

where the actions are enumerated with the index $n = 1, 2, \dots$. It is natural to require the validity of the binary operation *addition*, such that for every $A, B \in \mathcal{A}$ their sum $A + B \in \mathcal{A}$. The sum $A + B$ means that either the action A or action B , or both, are intended to be accomplished, hence $A + B = B + A$. The addition is assumed to be associative, so that for any $A, B, C \in \mathcal{A}$, one has $A + (B + C) = (A + B) + C$. By direct extension, the addition is defined as a reversible operation, such that from $A + B = C$ it follows that $A = C - B$. Thus, the elements of the action set (18) form the action group, which is an Abel group with respect to addition.

Another natural binary operation for the action of set (18) is *multiplication*, when for any $A, B \in \mathcal{A}$, there exists $AB \in \mathcal{A}$. The product of actions AB implies that both actions are intended to occur together. The multiplication can be defined as a distributive operation, for which $A(B + C) = AB + AC$. However, since the order of the actions can be important, the multiplication, in general, is not commutative, so that AB is not necessarily the same as BA . When writing AB , we mean that the action B is to be accomplished before A . This makes it painless to define the associative triple product $ABC = (AB)C = A(BC)$. The zero element 0 can be introduced as that satisfying the equalities $A \cdot 0 = 0 \cdot A = 0$ for any $A \in \mathcal{A}$. This element characterizes an *empty action*, that is, an impossible action. If one would assume that the action set (18) does not contain the divisors of zero, so that $AB \neq 0$ for any nonzero A and B , then the nonzero elements of set (18) would form a groupoid with respect to multiplication. However, this is not the case as the action set (18) does indeed contain divisors of zero: any product of two disjoint actions, by definition, is an empty action, so that mutually disjoint actions are divisors of zero with respect to each other. By this definition, two nonzero actions are disjoint if and only if their intersection is an empty action.

The described properties characterize the action set (18) as a noncommutative ring, which will be called the *action ring*. A set of subsets of \mathcal{A} , closed with respect to countable unions and complementations, is a σ -ring, and if \mathcal{A} pertains to this set, it is a σ -field. For the purpose of developing our QDT, we need to specify some constructions that can be formed with the actions belonging to the action ring \mathcal{A} .

3.2 Action modes

In decision theory, an intended action can possess several representations corresponding to different particular ways of realizing this action. Such a *composite action* takes the form of the union

$$A_n \equiv \bigcup_{\mu=1}^{M_n} A_{n\mu} \quad (A_{n\mu} \in \mathcal{A}), \quad (19)$$

whose partial terms are the *action modes*, with $M_n \geq 1$ being the number of modes. When $M_n = 1$, the action (19) is simple.

3.3 Action prospects

A more complicated structure is an *action prospect*, which is an intersection

$$\pi_n \equiv \bigcap_j A_{n_j} \quad (A_{n_j} \subset \mathcal{A}_n \subset \mathcal{A}) \quad (20)$$

of the actions A_{n_j} from a subset \mathcal{A}_n of the action ring \mathcal{A} . The actions in the product (20) can be either simple or composite as in the union (19). The difference between A_{n_j} in (20) and $A_{n\mu}$ in (19) is that the former can be a composite action, while the latter is a simple action representing a single action mode.

3.4 Elementary prospects

The simplest structure among the action prospects (20) corresponds to the prospects including only the simple single-mode actions or separate modes of composite actions. Let $\{j_n\}_\alpha$ be a set of indices labelling simple actions or separate modes. The *elementary prospect* is the product

$$e_\alpha \equiv \bigcap_n A_{nj_n} \quad (j_n \in \{j_n\}_\alpha), \quad (21)$$

where each A_{nj_n} is simple and enters only one of the prospects, so that different elementary prospects are disjoint in the sense that their conjunction is an empty action, $e_\alpha e_\beta = 0$ ($\alpha \neq \beta$).

3.5 Prospect lattice

For use as a decision theory, it is important that the set of all possible prospects could be in some sense ordered. Suppose that the set $\{\pi_n\}$ of admissible prospects can be organized so that, for each two prospects from $\{\pi_n\}$, an ordering binary relation \leq can be defined. Then for each pair π_1 and π_2 , one should have either $\pi_1 \leq \pi_2$ or $\pi_2 \leq \pi_1$. The ordering relation is linear, such that $\pi_1 \leq \pi_2$ implies $\pi_2 \geq \pi_1$. And it is transitive, so that, if $\pi_1 \leq \pi_2$ and $\pi_2 \leq \pi_3$, then $\pi_1 \leq \pi_3$. Such a partially ordered manifold $\{\pi_n\}$ composes a *lattice*.

The lattice is assumed to be *complete*, containing the minimal and the maximal elements, for which

$$\inf_n \pi_n \equiv 0, \quad \sup_n \pi_n \equiv \pi_* . \quad (22)$$

Thus, we obtain a complete lattice of partially ordered prospects,

$$\mathcal{L} \equiv \{\pi_n : 0 \leq \pi_n \leq \pi_*\}, \quad (23)$$

named the *prospect lattice*. An explicit ordering procedure will be defined below.

4 Mode and Prospect States

The notion of states is crucial in quantum theory (Glimm and Jaffe, 1981). And it is equally important in QDT. In order to represent the quantum-mechanical states, we shall employ the Dirac notation (Dirac, 1958, 1967), which allows for a very compact representation of formulas.

4.1 Mode states

For every single mode A_{nj} of an action A_n , we put into correspondence a state $|A_{nj}\rangle$, which is a function $\mathcal{A} \rightarrow \mathbb{C}$. A conjugate state (in the sense of a Hermitian conjugate) is denoted as $\langle A_{ni}|$, and will be necessary in the definition of the scalar product and for introducing the probability operators associated with intentions and prospects. For each two mode states, a scalar product is defined as $\langle A_{ni}|A_{nj}\rangle$, which is a function $\mathcal{A} \times \mathcal{A} \rightarrow \mathbb{C}$. The mode states can be normalized to one, and they are assumed to be orthogonal, so that

$$\langle A_{ni}|A_{nj}\rangle = \delta_{ij} ,$$

where δ_{ij} is the Kronecker symbol. The orthogonality here reflects the fact that the action modes A_{ni} and A_{nj} for $i \neq j$ represent incompatible actions.

4.2 Mode space

The closed linear envelope, spanning all mode states, composes the mode space

$$\mathcal{M}_n \equiv \text{Span}\{|A_{nj}\rangle : j = 1, 2, \dots, M_n\} . \quad (24)$$

The dimensionality of \mathcal{M}_n is $\dim \mathcal{M}_n = M_n$. For each two elements $|A\rangle$ and $|B\rangle$ of \mathcal{M} , a scalar product is defined enjoying the property $\langle A|B\rangle = \langle B|A\rangle^*$, where the symbol $*$ denotes the complex conjugate, and possessing all other properties characterizing scalar products. That is, the mode space (24) is a Hilbert space.

4.3 Basic states

Using the mode states $|A_{nj}\rangle$, it is possible to construct the states of the elementary prospects (21) as functions $\mathcal{A} \times \mathcal{A} \times \dots \times \mathcal{A} \rightarrow \mathbb{C}$,

$$|e_\alpha\rangle \equiv |A_{1j_1}A_{2j_2}\dots\rangle \equiv \bigotimes_n |A_{nj_n}\rangle , \quad (25)$$

where $j_n \in \{j_n\}_\alpha$. The states (25) are termed the basic states. Their scalar product is given as

$$\langle e_\alpha|e_\beta\rangle = \prod_n \langle A_{ni_n}|A_{nj_n}\rangle ,$$

where $i_n \in \{i_n\}_\alpha$ and $j_n \in \{j_n\}_\beta$. Given the orthonormality of the mode states, one has

$$\langle e_\alpha|e_\beta\rangle = \delta_{\alpha\beta} .$$

The orthonormality of the basic states again reflects the fact that two elementary prospects e_α and e_β are incompatible for $\alpha \neq \beta$.

4.4 Space of mind

The space of mind, or *mind space*, is the closed linear envelope

$$\mathcal{M} \equiv \text{Span}\{|e_\alpha \rangle\} = \bigotimes_n \mathcal{M}_n , \quad (26)$$

spanning all basic states (25). Its dimensionality is

$$\dim \mathcal{M} = \prod_n \dim \mathcal{M}_n . \quad (27)$$

The space of mind (26) is a Hilbert space, represented as a tensor product of the Hilbert spaces \mathcal{M}_n . If the number of Hilbert spaces \mathcal{M}_n is infinite, the space (26) is understood as a von Neumann infinite tensor product (von Neumann, 1938).

4.5 Strategic state of mind

The strategic state of mind $|\psi_s \rangle$ is a normalized vector of \mathcal{M} . As any vector of the Hilbert space (26), it can be expanded over the basic states (25),

$$|\psi_s \rangle = \sum_\alpha c(e_\alpha) |e_\alpha \rangle . \quad (28)$$

The normalization condition reads as

$$\langle \psi_s | \psi_s \rangle = \sum_\alpha |c(e_\alpha)|^2 = 1 . \quad (29)$$

The strategic state of mind characterizes the mind of the considered decision maker, describing the latter as a particular being, with his/her specific features as well as with the concrete available information (Dixit and Besley, 1997). Each decision maker possesses his/her own strategic state. We stress that this strategic state of mind $|\psi_s \rangle$ is specific of a person at a given time and may display temporal evolution, according to different homeostatic processes adjusting the individual to the changing environment (Dawkins, 2006).

4.6 Prospect states

To each action prospect (20), one can put into correspondence a prospect state $|\pi_n \rangle \in \mathcal{M}$. As any member of \mathcal{M} , it can be expanded over the basic states (25),

$$|\pi_n \rangle = \sum_\alpha b_n(e_\alpha) |e_\alpha \rangle . \quad (30)$$

The states (30) do not need to be neither orthogonal nor normalized, which assumes that different prospects are not necessarily disjoint, but could be realized together in the probabilistic sense described below.

For the empty prospect, there corresponds the *vacuum state*, or *empty state* $|0 \rangle$, such that

$$\langle 0 | e_\alpha \rangle = \langle e_\alpha | 0 \rangle = 0$$

for any basic state $|e_\alpha \rangle \in \mathcal{M}$.

5 Probability Operator Measure

In order to introduce a probability operator measure, we consider the set of prospects forming a complete lattice. Specifying a prospect as a composite action, we keep in mind that real decisions are usually made by choosing among composite actions, but not among simple structureless actions. As we show below, the existence of internal structures within prospects has consequences of great importance for applications.

Let $\Sigma(\mathcal{L})$ be a set of subsets of the prospect lattice \mathcal{L} , closed under countable unions and complementations. Then $\Sigma(\mathcal{L})$ is a σ -ring of \mathcal{L} . And let $\mathcal{B}(\mathcal{M})$ be the set of all bounded linear positive operators on the Hilbert space \mathcal{M} . Let us consider a positive mapping $\hat{P} : \Sigma(\mathcal{L}) \rightarrow \mathcal{B}(\mathcal{M})$ enjoying the following properties. For an empty prospect,

$$\hat{P}(0) = \hat{0} , \quad (31)$$

where $\hat{0}$ is the zero operator in $\mathcal{B}(\mathcal{M})$. The mapping \hat{P} is self-adjoint, so that for any $\pi_n \in \mathcal{L}$, one has

$$\hat{P}^+(\pi_n) = \hat{P}(\pi_n) , \quad (32)$$

where the cross implies the Hermitian conjugate. A mapping \hat{P} , satisfying conditions (31) and (32), is an *operator measure*.

Including \mathcal{L} in $\Sigma(\mathcal{L})$ makes the latter a σ -field. Then $\hat{P}(\mathcal{L})$ can be defined as a unity operator. In what follows, we assume that it is a unity operator in the weak sense, with respect to the matrix elements of the strategic state:

$$\langle \psi_s | \hat{P}(\mathcal{L}) | \psi_s \rangle = 1 . \quad (33)$$

An operator measure, satisfying conditions (31), (32), and (33), is the *probability operator measure* $\{\mathcal{L}, \Sigma(\mathcal{L}), \hat{P}\}$. More information on operator measures can be found, for instance, in the book (Berberian, 1966).

In our case, the probability operator measure \hat{P} is defined on the σ -ring $\Sigma(\mathcal{L})$ of the prospect lattice $\mathcal{L} = \{\pi_n\}$. This probability operator measure includes the probability operators of the prospects $\hat{P}(\pi_n)$. The latter can be represented in the Dirac notation as

$$\hat{P}(\pi_n) \equiv |\pi_n \rangle \langle \pi_n| . \quad (34)$$

The *prospect probability operators* (34) are similar to projection operators, but are not exactly projectors as they lack the property of being idempotent. In addition, the operators (34) are not commutative. But it is known (Benioff, 1972a,b,c) that the operators of such measures do not need to be neither projection operators nor have to commute with each other.

The set of all probability operators (34), over the field of complex numbers \mathbb{C} , forms the *algebra of probability operators*

$$\mathcal{P} \equiv \left\{ \hat{P}(\pi_n) : \pi_n \in \mathcal{L} \right\} . \quad (35)$$

The involution in \mathcal{P} is defined as the Hermitian conjugation. Since operators (34) are self-adjoint, the involution in \mathcal{P} is a bijection. Thus, \mathcal{P} is an involutive bijective algebra.

A property of the probability operators (34), which is of importance for QDT, is that $\hat{P}(\pi_n)$ is, generally, an entangling operator. One should not confuse entangled states and entangling

operators. Entangled states are those that cannot be represented as tensor products of partial states (Keyl, 2002; Nielsen and Chuang, 2000; Williams and Clearwater, 1998). Entangling operations are those that produce entangled states, even when acting on disentangled states (Yukalov, 2003a,b,c). Entangling operations in decision theory are of great importance, resulting in a variety of nontrivial effects. The entangling property of the probability operators (34) is due to the composite structure of the action prospects π_n .

6 Prospect Operators as Observables

The algebra of the probability operators (35) is analogous to the algebra of local observables in quantum theory (Bratelli and Robinson, 1979; Dixmier, 1969; Emch, 1972). In quantum theory, observable quantities are defined as the expectation values, or averages, of the operators over the algebra of local observables. The complete set of these expectations composes the statistical state of a quantum system.

The observable quantities in QDT are the expectation values of the probability operators, which define the scalar probability measure. The expectation value of a probability operator $\hat{P}(\pi_n)$, under the strategic state of mind $|\psi_s\rangle$, is

$$\langle \hat{P}(\pi_n) \rangle \equiv \langle \psi_s | \hat{P}(\pi_n) | \psi_s \rangle . \quad (36)$$

The corresponding observable quantity is the *prospect probability*

$$p(\pi_n) \equiv \langle \hat{P}(\pi_n) \rangle . \quad (37)$$

Taking into account the explicit form of the probability operator (34), from Eqs. (36) and (37), we have

$$p(\pi_n) = | \langle \pi_n | \psi_s \rangle |^2 . \quad (38)$$

This expression shows that $p(\pi_n)$ is evidently non-negative. Of course, the normalization condition

$$\sum_n p(\pi_n) = 1 \quad (39)$$

is imposed, where the summation is over all $\pi_n \in \mathcal{L}$. Thus, the mapping (37) defines the scalar probability measure $p : \mathcal{L} \rightarrow [0, 1]$.

Definition 6.1. *The probability $p(\pi_n)$ of a prospect $\pi_n \in \mathcal{L}$ is the expectation value (37) of the probability operator (34), with normalization condition (39).*

The scalar probability measure, introduced above, makes it possible to realize the ordering of the prospects in the prospect lattice \mathcal{L} , classifying them as follows.

Definition 6.2. *Two prospects, π_1 and π_2 from the prospect lattice \mathcal{L} , are indifferent ($\pi_1 = \pi_2$) if and only if*

$$p(\pi_1) = p(\pi_2) \quad (\pi_1 = \pi_2) . \quad (40)$$

Definition 6.3. *Between two prospects π_1 and π_2 belonging to the prospect lattice \mathcal{L} , the prospect π_1 is preferred to π_2 ($\pi_1 > \pi_2$) if and only if*

$$p(\pi_1) > p(\pi_2) \quad (\pi_1 > \pi_2) . \quad (41)$$

Definition 6.4. A prospect $\pi_* \equiv \sup_n \pi_n$ from the prospect lattice \mathcal{L} is optimal if and only if the related prospect probability is the largest:

$$p(\pi_*) = \sup_n p(\pi_n) \quad \Longleftrightarrow \quad (\pi_* = \sup_n \pi_n) . \quad (42)$$

Definition 6.5. The procedure of decision making in QDT consists of the enumeration of the possible action prospects, the evaluation of the prospect probabilities, and the choice of the optimal prospect.

7 Interference of Composite Prospects

The decision procedure described in the previous section, when applied to composite prospects containing composite actions, results in nontrivial consequences, often connected to the fact that the probability operators (34) for composite prospects correspond to entangling operations (Yukalov, 2003a,b,c). Several modes of a composite action can interfere, leading to the appearance of interference terms. The occurrence of several modes of an action implies the existence of uncertainty and of the perception of possible harmful consequences. In contrast, the elementary prospects (21) yield no interference. This is because the states of the elementary prospects are the basic states (25).

7.1 Composite prospects

It is important to distinguish between composite and simple prospects, since these have different properties related to their structure.

Definition 7.1 A prospect $\pi_n \in \mathcal{L}$ is composite if and only if it is formed by not less than two actions and at least one of its forming actions is composite.

The prospect state (30) can be represented as a superposition

$$|\pi_n \rangle = \sum_{\alpha} |\pi_n(e_{\alpha}) \rangle \quad (43)$$

of the partial weighted states of the elementary prospects,

$$|\pi_n(e_{\alpha}) \rangle \equiv b_n(e_{\alpha}) |e_{\alpha} \rangle . \quad (44)$$

The probability of such a weighted elementary prospect, under the strategic state of mind $|\psi_s \rangle \in \mathcal{M}$, according to Eq. (38), is

$$p_n(e_{\alpha}) \equiv | \langle \pi_n(e_{\alpha}) | \psi_s \rangle |^2 . \quad (45)$$

Taking into account Eqs. (28) and (44) gives

$$p_n(e_{\alpha}) = |b_n(e_{\alpha}) c(e_{\alpha})|^2 . \quad (46)$$

To be classified as a probability, $p_n(e_{\alpha})$ is to be normalized, so that

$$\sum_{n,\alpha} p_n(e_{\alpha}) = 1 , \quad (47)$$

which will be always assumed in what follows. The peculiarity of dealing with composite prospects is that the prospect probability $p(\pi_n)$, generally, is not a sum of the partial probabilities (46).

Proposition 1. *The probability of a composite prospect $\pi_n \in \mathcal{L}$, under the strategic state of mind $|\psi_s\rangle \in \mathcal{M}$, is the sum*

$$p(\pi_n) = \sum_{\alpha} p_n(e_{\alpha}) + q(\pi_n) \quad (48)$$

of the partial probabilities of the weighted elementary prospects (46) plus the quantum interference term

$$q(\pi_n) \equiv \sum_{\alpha \neq \beta} b_n^*(e_{\alpha})c(e_{\alpha})c^*(e_{\beta})b_n(e_{\beta}) . \quad (49)$$

Proof: Formula (48) follows from the definition of the prospect probability (37), or (38), with the substitutions of Eqs. (28) and (30), and with the use of notations (46) and (49).

The use of quantum techniques for defining the prospect probability yields the appearance in QDT of the effects typical of quantum theory, such as interference and entanglement. The interference effect in QDT is analogous to the interference in quantum mechanics (Feynman, 1965). In QDT, interference happens only for composite prospects, containing actions represented by several modes. Therefore it involves interferences between modes.

The entanglement effect may have two different origins. First, the state of mind $|\psi_s\rangle$ can be expected in general to be entangled. But more important is that the probability operator (34), generally, is an entangling operator, which can create entangled states even from disentangled ones (Yukalov, 2003a,b,c). This is somewhat similar to the generation of entanglement in the transfer of information through quantum channels (Keyl, 2002; Nielsen and Chuang, 2000; Williams and Clearwater, 1998).

There exists several measures of entanglement (Keyl, 2002; Nielsen and Chuang, 2000; Williams and Clearwater, 1998) and of entanglement production (Yukalov, 2003a,b,c). It is important to stress that the degree of entanglement is correlated with the level of order in the considered system (Yukalov, 2003c). This is especially clear if the system order is classified by means of the *order indices* (Coleman and Yukalov, 1991, 1992, 1993, 1996), which can be introduced for arbitrary operators (Yukalov, 2002), and in particular, for reduced density matrices (Coleman and Yukalov, 2000). Generally speaking, the notions of order and entanglement are complementary to each other (Yukalov, 2003c). The more a system is ordered, the less it is entangled.

In decision theory, the presence of disorder is equivalent to the existence of uncertainty, and the latter is accompanied by risk (Epstein, 1999; Malevergne and Sornette, 2006). Keeping in mind the above discussion, we can associate the interference term (49) with the uncertainty caused by the presence of several modes representing one action as well as with the perception of potential harmful consequences accompanying the decision-making process occurring under uncertainty.

7.2 Aversion to uncertainty and loss

The following definitions give an explicit formulation of the *principle of “aversion to uncertainty and loss”*, which replaces the principle of risk aversion, as being necessary to understand and explain the decision making processes of real human beings. The interference term $q(\pi_n)$, defined in (49), characterizes the subjective attitude of a decision maker with respect to the considered prospect π_n . This includes the appreciation of the prospect as being potentially more or less uncertain or harmful, as a result of which the decision maker can look to the prospect as being more or less attractive. Comparing the terms in (48), we can distinguish them as having different meanings. The first, additive, term, represented by the sum, defines the *objective quantitative* characteristic of the considered prospect, showing its usefulness. While the second, interference, term $q(\pi_n)$ describes the *subjective qualitative* feature of the prospect, showing how much the latter is subjectively attractive. This understanding is formalized in the definitions below.

Definition 7.2. *The interference term $q(\pi_n)$, defined in (49), characterizes the subjective attractiveness, or the quality, of the prospect π_n , because of which it can be called the attraction, or quality, factor.*

Definition 7.3. *Two prospects, π_1 and π_2 from \mathcal{L} , are equally attractive, or are of equal quality, if and only if*

$$q(\pi_1) = q(\pi_2) .$$

This implies that they are perceived as equally uncertain or as potentially equally harmful.

Definition 7.4. *Between two prospects, π_1 and π_2 from \mathcal{L} , the prospect π_1 is termed more attractive, or of better quality, if and only if*

$$q(\pi_1) > q(\pi_2) .$$

This means that π_2 is perceived as more uncertain or potentially more harmful than π_1 .

From these definitions and formula (48), it follows that the more uncertain or potentially more harmful prospect π_2 possesses a smaller interference term $q(\pi_1)$, thus, diminishing the probability $p(\pi_2)$. The stronger perceived uncertainty or potential harm suppresses the prospect probability. The prospect probability $p(\pi_n)$ is composed of two terms, one defining the usefulness of the prospect and another characterizing the attractiveness of the latter. In selecting an optimal prospect, subjects try to avoid potential harm and choose the prospect that is more useful and, at the same time, more attractive, or has a subjectively better quality. The probability of choosing this or that prospect is based on the total value of $p(\pi_n)$, as is defined in Definitions 6.2 and 6.3.

In order for the previous definitions to be applicable to real decision processes, it is necessary to specify the notion of uncertainty and of perceived potential harm by formulating a sufficient condition for one of the prospects to be treated as more uncertain or more potentially harmful than another.

Definition 7.5. *Between two prospects, π_1 and π_2 from \mathcal{L} , the prospect π_1 is said to be more attractive if π_1 possesses at least one of the following features, as compared to π_2 :*

- (a) *getting more certain gain,*

- (b) *getting more uncertain loss,*
- (c) *being active under certainty,*
- (d) *being passive under uncertainty.*

In other words, π_2 is perceived as more uncertain or potentially more harmful than π_1 .

Remark 7.1. The notions of “gain” and “loss” are assumed to have the standard meaning accepted in the literature on decision making. The same concerns the notions of “being active” and “being passive”. The notion “being active” implies that the decision maker chooses to accomplish an act. While “being passive” means that the decision maker restrains from an action. For instance, in the Hamlet hesitation “to be or not to be”, the first option “to be” implies activity, while the second possibility “not to be” means passivity.

Remark 7.2. Note that (b) is the double negation of (a), and (d) is the double negation of (c). Hence, from the point of view of mathematical logic (Mendelson, 1963), the statements (a) and (b) are equivalent, as are (d) and (c).

Remark 7.3. We are careful to distinguish the concept of “uncertainty or perceived potential harm” from “risk”. Risk involves the combination of the uncertainty of a loss and of the severity or amplitude of that loss. In contrast, uncertainty and perceived potential harm that we consider in QDT emphasize more the subjective pain that a human subject visualizes in his/her mind when considering the available options and making a decision.

7.3 Interference alternation

The attraction factors enjoy a very important property, without which it would be impossible to resolve the paradoxes occurring in the classical decision making.

Proposition 2. *Let us consider a lattice \mathcal{L} of prospects π_n , with the prospect states $|\pi_n\rangle \in \mathcal{M}$, under the normalization conditions (39) and (47). Then*

$$\sum_n q(\pi_n) = 0 . \tag{50}$$

Proof: Summing the prospect probabilities (48) over all $\pi_n \in \mathcal{L}$, and using the normalization conditions (39) and (47) yields (50).

Remark 7.4. The interference alternation (50) shows that some of the interference terms are positive, while other are negative, so that the total sum of all these terms is zero. This means that the probability of prospects with larger uncertainty and/or perceived potential harm will be suppressed, while that of less uncertain and/or harmful prospects will be enhanced.

8 Binary Prospect Lattices

In the majority of applications, one considers the structures that are equivalent to a binary lattice $\mathcal{L} = \{\pi_1, \pi_2\}$, containing two composite prospects. In order to address these applications, we specify below the above mathematical structure to the case of a binary lattice.

8.1 Binary lattice

Suppose that A and X are the actions from the action ring \mathcal{A} . And let A contain just two modes,

$$A = A_1 + A_2 . \quad (51)$$

While $X \in \mathcal{A}$ can include $M_2 \geq 2$ modes,

$$X = \bigcup_{j=1}^{M_2} X_j \quad (M_2 \geq 2) . \quad (52)$$

The mind dimensionality is therefore $\dim \mathcal{M} = 2M_2$. The elementary prospects $A_n X_j$ define the basic states $|A_n X_j \rangle$, with $n = 1, 2$ and $j = 1, 2, \dots, M_2$. The strategic state of mind (28) takes the form

$$|\psi_s \rangle = \sum_{nj} c(A_n X_j) |A_n X_j \rangle . \quad (53)$$

Let the prospect lattice $\mathcal{L} = \{\pi_n\}$ consist of two prospects

$$\pi_n \equiv A_n X \quad (n = 1, 2) . \quad (54)$$

The prospect states (30) read as

$$|\pi_n \rangle = \sum_j b(A_n X_j) |A_n X_j \rangle . \quad (55)$$

The probabilities of elementary prospects (46) are now

$$p(A_n X_j) = |b(A_n X_j) c(A_n X_j)|^2 , \quad (56)$$

with their normalization condition (47) written as

$$\sum_{nj} p(A_n X_j) = 1 . \quad (57)$$

The quantum interference term (49) becomes

$$q(\pi_n) = \sum_{i \neq j} b^*(A_n X_i) c(A_n X_i) c^*(A_n X_j) b(A_n X_j) . \quad (58)$$

Then the prospect probability (38) yields

$$p(\pi_n) = \sum_j p(A_n X_j) + q(\pi_n) , \quad (59)$$

in agreement with formula (48). And the normalization condition (39) reduces to

$$p(\pi_1) + p(\pi_2) = 1 . \quad (60)$$

The theorem on interference alternation (Proposition 2) leads to the equality

$$q(\pi_1) + q(\pi_2) = 0 . \quad (61)$$

This case of a binary prospect lattice $\mathcal{L} = \{\pi_1, \pi_2\}$ explicitly demonstrates that the quantum interference term (58) is caused by the occurrence of the composite action (52) making prospects (54) composite. The interference between several modes reflects an uncertainty and/or a perceived potential harm accompanying the choice of one of the modes representing the composite action.

From the principle of “aversion to uncertainty and loss” (Definitions 7.3 and 7.4), one can conclude the following. If the prospects π_1 and π_2 are perceived as equally uncertain and/or potentially harmful, then the theorem on interference alternation (61) yields $q(\pi_1) = q(\pi_2) = 0$.

And when one of the prospects, say π_2 , is more uncertain and/or potentially harmful than π_1 , then, by Definition 7.5 and equality (61), one has

$$q(\pi_1) = -q(\pi_2) > 0, \quad q(\pi_1) = |q(\pi_2)| > 0. \quad (62)$$

8.2 Conditional probabilities

Let us consider two actions, A and X from the action ring \mathcal{A} , with the action A being arbitrary and the action X being composite as in notation (52). By the definition of the action ring \mathcal{A} , an action AX_j implies joining two actions A and X_j to be accomplished together, with the probability $p(AX_j)$. The related conditional probability $p(A|X_j)$ can be introduced in the standard manner (Feller, 1970) through the identity

$$p(AX_j) \equiv p(A|X_j) p(X_j). \quad (63)$$

Here $p(X_j)$ is a prescribed weight of the action X_j , satisfying the conditions

$$\sum_j p(X_j) = 1, \quad 0 \leq p(X_j) \leq 1. \quad (64)$$

Interchanging in identity (63) the actions A and X_j , one gets

$$p(X_j A) \equiv p(X_j|A) p(A), \quad (65)$$

where $p(A) \equiv p(AX)$ is assumed. The above relations can be formalized as follows.

Definition 8.1. *For the actions A and X from the action ring \mathcal{A} , where A is arbitrary and X is a composite action given by Eq. (52), the conditional probability $p(A|X_j)$ of A under condition X_j and the conditional probability $p(X_j|A)$ of X_j under condition A are defined by the equations*

$$p(A|X_j) \equiv \frac{p(AX_j)}{p(X_j)}, \quad p(X_j|A) \equiv \frac{p(X_j A)}{p(AX)}, \quad (66)$$

where the weights $p(X_j)$ satisfy normalization (64).

It is worth emphasizing that $p(A|X_j)$ does not equal $p(X_j|A)$. Recall that this is so already in classical probability theory (Feller, 1970). There is even less reason to expect their equality in QDT. The relation between the conditional probabilities (66) is given by the following formula below.

Proposition 3. *The conditional probabilities $p(A|X_j)$ and $p(X_j|A)$, defined in Eq. (66), satisfy the relation*

$$p(X_j|A) = \frac{p(X_j A)}{\sum_j p(A|X_j)p(X_j) + q(AX)} . \quad (67)$$

Proof: Let us consider the prospect AX , with an arbitrary A and with the composite X given by Eq. (52). Then, according to Eq. (59), the corresponding prospect probability is

$$p(AX) = \sum_j p(AX_j) + q(AX) .$$

Substituting this into the second of Eqs. (66) and using Eq. (63), we come to relation (67).

Remark 8.1. Formula (67) is the generalization of the Bayes' formula of classical probability theory (Feller, 1970). Equation (67) reduces to the Bayes formula, provided that there is no interference, when $q(AX)$ is zero, and that the actions pertain to a field where all actions are commutative. However, in QDT, the actions belong to a noncommutative ring \mathcal{A} , so that in general $p(AX_j)$ and $p(X_j A)$ are not equal, since AX_j is not the same as $X_j A$. As already mentioned, the noncommutativity of actions is an important feature of QDT.

8.3 Noncommutativity of actions

Since the action ring \mathcal{A} is not commutative with respect to multiplication, the prospects AX and XA from \mathcal{L} are generally different, in the sense that $p(AX)$ does not coincide with $p(XA)$.

Proposition 4. *Let us consider two prospects AX and XA in \mathcal{L} , with $A \in \mathcal{A}$ being arbitrary and X being a composite action given in Eq. (52). And let at least one of the action modes X_j be certainly realized under action A so that*

$$\sum_j p(X_j|A) = 1 . \quad (68)$$

Then the prospects AX and XA are indifferent ($AX = XA$) if and only if there is no mode interference, that is,

$$p(AX) = p(XA) , \quad (69)$$

if and only if

$$q(AX) = q(XA) = 0 . \quad (70)$$

Proof: For the prospect XA , invoking the general procedure, we have

$$p(XA) = \sum_j p(X_j A) + q(XA) .$$

Employing here the definition of the conditional probabilities (66) gives

$$p(XA) = \sum_j p(X_j|A) p(AX) + q(XA) .$$

Using normalization (68) yields

$$p(XA) - p(AX) = q(XA) .$$

Interchanging the actions A and X results in

$$p(AX) - p(XA) = q(AX) .$$

From the latter two equations, we obtain the statement formalized in Eqs. (69) and (70).

Remark 8.2. This theorem emphasizes the intimate relation between the noncommutativity of actions and the appearance of the interference terms. The action noncommutativity and the presence of action interference constitute both characteristic features of QDT.

9 Explanation of Classical Paradoxes

A series of paradoxes have been unearthed which cannot find satisfactory explanations within the framework of classical utility theory. These paradoxes are well documented in a growing body of empirical evidence. Numerous related citations can be found in the review articles (Tversky and Kahneman, 1983; Machina, 2008) which provide detailed descriptions of these paradoxes referring to a voluminous literature. All these studies unambiguously show that decision makers systematically violate the predictions of classical utility theory, when decisions are made under uncertainty and risk. There have been numerous attempts to treat these paradoxes by modifying the expected utility theory with introducing some more complicated unexpected utility functionals (Machina, 2008). However, in addition to being more complicated, ambiguously defined, and spoiling the nice mathematical properties of the expected utility, such modifications cannot solve all existing paradoxes in the classical decision making, as has recently been proved (Safra and Segal, 2008).

The existence of such paradoxes in classical utility theory can be traced back to the fact that the impact of risk and uncertainty is embodied only within the choice of the utility function of the decision maker, which is supposed to fully capture by its functional shape the risk and uncertainty aversions of the agent. Given a set of competing actions or prospects, classical utility theory assumes that one can independently and objectively estimate their corresponding probabilities. Then, the preferred action is that one which maximizes the expected utility, where the expectation is performed over all possible scenarios weighted by their corresponding probabilities. In contrast, QDT takes into account the fact that the existence of competing actions or prospects in the presence of risk and uncertainty leads to an entanglement of the probabilities of these different actions, and therefore to distortions away from pure absolute objective probabilities. The interference terms and the noncommutativity of actions, discussed above, describe the fact that the probabilities of different actions depend on the coexistence of other potential actions in the mind of the decision maker. From the point of view of QDT, this single fact is at the origin of the paradoxes in classical utility theory. Since, as we now show, QDT is able to account qualitatively and quantitatively for all known classical paradoxes, this suggests that the axioms of QDT correctly embody at a coarse-grained level the effective thought processes underlying decision making of real humans.

In the present section, we discuss the main known paradoxes classified as such by classical utility theory. Naturally, each of these paradoxes can be represented by an infinite number

of variants in different real life situations. And a large number of such illustrations has been described in the literature (Tversky and Kahneman, 1983; Machina, 2008). However, from the point of view of mathematics, there are only a finite number of typical structures. Here, our aim is specifically to analyze the mathematical structure of these paradoxes, omitting secondary descriptive details. In so doing, we provide a general demonstration that no such paradox occurs in the framework of QDT, allowing one to adapt the same reasoning to the many variants of each paradox.

9.1 Compatibility violation

This paradox, first described by Allais (1953), and now known under his name, is a choice problem showing an inconsistency of actual observed choices with the predictions of expected utility theory. It is also often referred to as the violation of the independence axiom of classical utility theory. This paradox is that two decisions which are incompatible in the framework of classical utility theory are nevertheless taken by real human agents. The mathematical structure of the Allais paradox has been presented in Sec. 2. Its explanation in the framework of QDT is as follows.

Let us consider two composite actions

$$A = \bigcup_{n=1}^4 A_n, \quad X = \bigcup_{j=1}^{M_2} X_j, \quad (71)$$

where $M_2 \geq 2$. Four action prospects

$$\pi_n \equiv A_n X \quad (n = 1, 2, 3, 4) \quad (72)$$

form a quadruple lattice $\mathcal{L} = \{\pi_n\}$. Suppose that the prospect ordering is such that π_1 is strictly preferred to π_2 , hence,

$$p(\pi_1) > p(\pi_2) \quad (\pi_1 > \pi_2), \quad (73)$$

with π_2 being perceived as more uncertain and/or potentially more harmful than π_1 , that is,

$$q(\pi_2) < q(\pi_1). \quad (74)$$

And let π_3 be preferred, or indifferent, to π_4 , so that

$$p(\pi_3) \geq p(\pi_4) \quad (\pi_3 \geq \pi_4), \quad (75)$$

with the prospects π_3 and π_4 being of equal uncertainty and potential harm,

$$q(\pi_3) = q(\pi_4). \quad (76)$$

In addition, one assumes the balance condition

$$p(A_1|X_j) + p(A_3|X_j) = p(A_2|X_j) + p(A_4|X_j). \quad (77)$$

In the framework of utility theory, this condition makes incompatible the decisions associated with the ordering $\pi_1 > \pi_2$ and $\pi_3 \geq \pi_4$. In other words, this ordering is contradictory (see Sec. 2). But this contradiction does not arise in QDT.

Proposition 5. *Let a quadruple lattice $\mathcal{L} = \{\pi_n\}$ of prospects (72) be ordered so that: (i) $\pi_1 > \pi_2$, in the sense of Eq. (73), with π_2 being more uncertain and/or potentially harmful than π_1 in the sense of Eq. (74), and (ii) $\pi_3 \geq \pi_4$ in the sense of Eq. (75), with π_3 and π_4 being of equal uncertainty and potential perceived harm according to Eq. (76). And let the balance condition (77) be valid. Then the decisions $\pi_1 > \pi_2$ and $\pi_3 \geq \pi_4$ are compatible, provided that*

$$0 \leq \sum_j [p(A_2 X_j) - p(A_1 X_j)] < q(\pi_1) - q(\pi_2). \quad (78)$$

Proof. The probabilities of the prospects (72) read as

$$p(\pi_n) = \sum_j p(A_n | X_j) p(X_j) + q(\pi_n). \quad (79)$$

Since $\pi_1 > \pi_2$, in the sense of inequality (73), we have

$$\sum_j [p(A_1 | X_j) - p(A_2 | X_j)] p(X_j) > q(\pi_2) - q(\pi_1). \quad (80)$$

Because of $\pi_3 \geq \pi_4$, according to Eq. (75), we get

$$\sum_j [p(A_3 | X_j) - p(A_4 | X_j)] p(X_j) > q(\pi_4) - q(\pi_3). \quad (81)$$

Equation (80) can be rewritten as

$$\sum_j [p(A_2 X_j) - p(A_1 X_j)] < q(\pi_1) - q(\pi_2). \quad (82)$$

And Eq. (81), invoking the balance condition (77), transforms into

$$\sum_j [p(A_1 X_j) - p(A_2 X_j)] \leq q(\pi_3) - q(\pi_4). \quad (83)$$

Taking into account condition (76) reduces Eq. (83) to

$$\sum_j [p(A_2 X_j) - p(A_1 X_j)] \geq 0. \quad (84)$$

Combining Eqs. (82) and (84) yields the desired result (78).

Remark 9.1. In the classical utility theory, there are no interference terms. The reduction of QDT to classical utility theory is obtained by setting the terms $q(\pi_n)$ to zero. Then, Eq. (78) becomes a contradiction, which is nothing but the Allais paradox. In QDT, there is no contradiction (and no paradox) since the right-hand side of Eq. (78) is positive according to condition (74).

9.2 Independence paradox

As has been already mentioned, the Allais paradox not only reveals that real human beings can select decisions which are mutually incompatible within the standard expected utility theory, but it also shows that the independence axiom of utility theory is violated by real humans. The independence axiom stipulates that, if $\pi_1 > \pi_2$ and $\pi_3 \geq \pi_4$, then $\pi_1 + \pi_3 > \pi_2 + \pi_4$. The mathematics of how this independence axiom breaks down is explained in Sec. 2. In contrast, within QDT, the violation of the independence-axiom does not occur. Instead, we can state the following independence theorem.

Proposition 6. *Let a lattice $\mathcal{L} = \{\pi_n\}$ of six prospects be ordered so that $\pi_1 > \pi_2$, with π_1 being perceived as more uncertain and/or potentially more harmful than π_2 , and $\pi_3 \geq \pi_4$, with π_3 and π_4 being of equal uncertainty and potential harm. And let $\pi_2 + \pi_4$ be more uncertain and/or more potentially harmful than or at the same perceived level as $\pi_1 + \pi_3$, so that*

$$q(\pi_2 + \pi_4) \leq q(\pi_1 + \pi_3) . \quad (85)$$

Then the prospect $\pi_1 + \pi_3$ is strictly preferred to $\pi_2 + \pi_4$, that is,

$$p(\pi_1 + \pi_3) > p(\pi_2 + \pi_4) . \quad (86)$$

Proof. By employing the definition of the prospect probabilities defined above, we have

$$p(\pi_1 + \pi_3) \equiv | \langle \pi_1 + \pi_3 | \psi_s \rangle |^2 , \quad p(\pi_2 + \pi_4) \equiv | \langle \pi_2 + \pi_4 | \psi_s \rangle |^2 ,$$

for a given state of mind $|\psi_s\rangle$. Straightforward calculations give

$$p(\pi_1 + \pi_3) = p(\pi_1) + p(\pi_3) + q(\pi_1 + \pi_3) , \quad p(\pi_2 + \pi_4) = p(\pi_2) + p(\pi_4) + q(\pi_2 + \pi_4) .$$

Using inequalities (73), (75), and (85) yields the above inequality (86).

Remark 9.2. Let us stress that invoking the notion of uncertainty and/or perceived potential harm, which is rigorously related to the occurrence of the interference terms, makes Proposition 6 a theorem rather than an assumption.

9.3 Utility failure

Another well-known anomaly in the use of utility theory to account for real human decisions is called the *Ellsberg paradox* (Ellsberg, 1961). It states that, in some cases, no utility function can be defined at all, so that utility theory fails. The mathematical structure of the Ellsberg paradox is described in Sec. 2. As we show below, such a paradox does not arise in QDT.

Let us consider two composite actions

$$A = A_1 + A_2 , \quad X = \bigcup_{j=1}^{M_2} X_j , \quad (87)$$

where $M_2 \geq 2$. The case of interest is the binary lattice $\mathcal{L} = \{\pi_n\}$ of the prospects

$$\pi_n \equiv A_n X \quad (n = 1, 2) . \quad (88)$$

The Ellsberg paradox is characterized by the equivalence condition

$$p(A_1|X_j) = p(A_2|X_j) \quad (\forall j) . \quad (89)$$

The prospects π_1 and π_2 are distinguished by the fact that $p(A_1|X_j)$ is given explicitly, while $p(A_2|X_j)$ is not explicitly available, but its existence is just stated. While the structure of the decision making process is such that (89) holds true, its formulation adds what has been termed an ‘‘ambiguity’’ for one of the prospects (π_2). Within QDT, this ambiguity is simply taken into account by saying that π_2 is perceived as more uncertain than π_1 which, according to Definition 7.5, implies

$$q(\pi_2) < q(\pi_1) . \quad (90)$$

Human subjects are found to decide in favor of the less uncertain prospect π_1 , which is usually preferred to π_2 . But, as explained in Sec. 2, the option $\pi_1 > \pi_2$, under condition (89), cannot be correct with any utility function. In contrast, within QDT, the choice $\pi_1 > \pi_2$ is not merely admissible but is compulsory, given the structure of the problem. The prediction of QDT for this problem can be stated under the following proposition.

Proposition 7. *Let us consider the binary lattice $\mathcal{L} = \{\pi_n\}$ of prospects (88), supplemented by condition (89). And let π_2 be perceived as more uncertain than π_1 . Then π_1 is preferred to π_2 , that is,*

$$p(\pi_1) > p(\pi_2) . \quad (91)$$

Proof. Following the mathematical structure of QDT, we have

$$p(\pi_1) - p(\pi_2) = \sum_j [p(A_1|X_j) - p(A_2|X_j)] p(X_j) + q(\pi_1) - q(\pi_2) ,$$

Invoking condition (89) yields

$$p(\pi_1) - p(\pi_2) = q(\pi_1) - q(\pi_2) .$$

Taking into account that π_2 is more uncertain than π_1 , in the sense of Eq. (90), we obtain inequality (91) telling us that $\pi_1 > \pi_2$ (π_1 is preferred to π_2).

Remark 9.3. The reduction of QDT to classical utility theory is obtained, as usual, by putting the interference terms to zero. In this case, $p(\pi_1)$ is equal to $p(\pi_2)$, which is incompatible with the choice $\pi_1 > \pi_2$ performed by most real human beings, retrieving the Ellsberg paradox.

9.4 Inversion paradox

A large set of paradoxes found when applying classical utility theory to the decision making of real human beings are related to the unexpected inversion of choice, when decisions are made in the presence of uncertainty. In other words, the ordering or preference of competing choices according to classical utility theory is reversed by human beings. For this literature, we refer to the numerous citations found in Tversky and Kahneman (1983) and Machina (2008). This anomaly is sometimes called the Rabin paradox (Rabin, 2000).

Let us consider two composite actions

$$A = \bigcup_{n=1}^{M_1} A_n, \quad X = \bigcup_{j=1}^{M_2} X_j, \quad (92)$$

where $M_1 \geq 2$ and $M_2 \geq 2$. The prospect lattice $\mathcal{L} = \{\pi_n\}$ is composed of M_1 prospects

$$\pi_n \equiv A_n X \quad (n = 1, 2, \dots, M_1). \quad (93)$$

Suppose that the partial probabilities obey the majorization condition

$$\sum_j p(A_1 X_j) \geq \sum_j p(A_2 X_j). \quad (94)$$

From the point of view of classical utility theory, under condition (94), the prospect π_1 should be preferred or equivalent to π_2 . However, subjects often decide in favor of π_2 , when π_1 is perceived as more uncertain than π_2 , which contradicts utility theory. But this contradiction is removed in QDT, as formulated by the following proposition.

Proposition 8. *Let us consider a lattice $\mathcal{L} = \{\pi_n\}$ of prospects (93). And let condition (94) be valid. Nevertheless, π_2 is preferred to π_1 , that is $p(\pi_2) > p(\pi_1)$, when π_1 is more uncertain than π_2 , such that*

$$q(\pi_2) - q(\pi_1) > \sum_j [p(A_1 X_j) - p(A_2 X_j)]. \quad (95)$$

Proof: For the difference of the prospect probabilities, we have

$$p(\pi_1) - p(\pi_2) = \sum_j [p(A_1 X_j) - p(A_2 X_j)] + q(\pi_1) - q(\pi_2).$$

This, together with condition (95), gives $p(\pi_2) > p(\pi_1)$, which means that π_2 is preferred to π_1 .

Remark 9.4. Within classical utility theory, characterized by the absence of interference terms, condition (95) would result in the inverse conclusion that π_1 is preferred to π_2 . The inversion paradox occurs in situations where subjects would nevertheless opt for $\pi_2 > \pi_1$.

9.5 Invariance violation

This paradox was described by Kahneman and Tversky (1979), who pointed out that in some cases utility theory yields the same expected utility outcomes for several prospects, while subjects clearly prefer some prospects to others. The mathematical structure of the Kahneman-Tversky paradox is explained in Sec. 2.

One considers four composite prospects, as in Eq. (93), under the invariance condition

$$\sum_j p(A_n X_j) = \text{const} \quad (n = 1, 2, 3, 4). \quad (96)$$

Since condition (96) leads to the invariance of the expected utility functions with respect to permutations or replacements among these four prospects, if subjects were basing their decision

according to the recipes of classical utility theory, they should be indifferent with respect to the four choices. However, real human subjects demonstrate evident preference for some of the prospects, when the choices are accompanied by uncertainty. Kahneman and Tversky characterize the prospect π_1 as yielding more uncertain gain than π_2 . And the prospect π_4 is defined as resulting in a more certain loss than π_3 , that is, π_4 is more potentially harmful than π_3 . Summarizing, one has

$$q(\pi_1) < q(\pi_2), \quad q(\pi_4) < q(\pi_3). \quad (97)$$

Under these conditions, there is no paradox remaining within QDT, as shown by the following proposition.

Proposition 9. *Let us consider a quadruple lattice $\mathcal{L} = \{\pi_n\}$ of the composite prospects (93), under the invariance condition (96) and uncertainty conditions (97). Then π_2 is preferred to π_1 and π_3 is preferred to π_4 , so that*

$$p(\pi_2) > p(\pi_1), \quad p(\pi_3) > p(\pi_4). \quad (98)$$

Proof: It is easy to notice that the Kahneman-Tversky paradox is nothing but a slightly complicated version of the Ellsberg paradox. The Kahneman-Tversky paradox can be treated as a particular case of the inversion paradox. Therefore the proof of Eqs. (98) is the same as in Propositions 7 and 8.

Remark 9.5. In classical utility theory, with no interference terms, all prospect probabilities would be the same for all prospects, contradicting inequalities (98). This is the meaning of the Kahneman-Tversky paradox of invariance violation (see Sec. 2).

9.6 Certainty effects

A number of paradoxes, related to the description of prospects as more or less certain, and robustly violating expected utility theory, are collectively called certainty effects. Typical examples of such paradoxes have already been discussed, such as the Allais paradox, the Ellsberg paradox, and the Kahneman-Tversky paradox, when real human subjects prefer a less uncertain prospect notwithstanding the fact that it has a smaller expected utility. The mathematical structure of such paradoxes, analyzed in Sec. 2, demonstrates that these paradoxes are associated with difficulties in discriminating between different reward values.

In addition to these direct certainty effects, there exist reversed certainty effects (Shafir et al., 2008), when subjects prefer a more uncertain prospect. This happens when rewards are easily discriminated, being evidently different. The reversed certainty effects can also be explained in the framework of QDT.

Proposition 10. *Let us consider a lattice $\mathcal{L} = \{\pi_n\}$ of prospects defined in Eq. (93). Suppose that a prospect π_1 is more uncertain or more potentially harmful than π_2 , in the sense that $q(\pi_1) < q(\pi_2)$. Despite the fact that the prospect π_1 is more uncertain, it is preferred to π_2 when and only when*

$$\sum_j [p(A_1 X_j) - p(A_2 X_j)] > q(\pi_2) - q(\pi_1) > 0. \quad (99)$$

Proof: Writing the difference $p(\pi_1) - p(\pi_2)$, as in Proposition 8, and requiring that $p(\pi_1)$ be larger than $p(\pi_2)$ yields condition (99).

Remark 9.6. When the left-hand side of Eq. (99) is close to zero, this inequality cannot be true in the presence of dissimilar uncertainties between the two prospects. Instead, inequality (95) holds, since, by assumption, $q(\pi_1) < q(\pi_2)$. That is, we retrieve the direct certainty effect. But when the left-hand side of Eq. (99) is sufficiently large, this inequality may become valid, while Eq. (95) loses its validity. This means that the reversed certainty effect holds true. These conclusions confirm that the direct certainty effects emerge when it is difficult to discriminate between rewards, whereas the reversed certainty effects arise when the discrimination of rewards is easy, in agreement with empirical observations on decision making under uncertainty by human subjects (Shafir et al., 2008).

9.7 Disjunction effect

The disjunction effect is the violation of the Savage “sure-thing principle” (Savage, 1954). According to this principle, if an alternative A_1 is preferred to an alternative A_2 , when an event X_1 occurs, and it is also preferred to A_2 , when an event X_2 occurs, then A_1 should be preferred to A_2 , when it is not known which of the events, either X_1 or X_2 , has happened (the so-called “sure-thing” principle). In real life, human subjects often violate the sure-thing principle, this violation being called the disjunction effect. In the literature, there are hundreds of examples of concrete realizations of the disjunction effect (Tversky and Kahneman, 1983; Tversky and Shafir, 1992; Machina, 2008) and references therein), all of them having the same mathematical structure.

One considers a binary lattice $\mathcal{L} = \{\pi_n\}$ of prospects

$$\pi_n \equiv A_n X, \quad X = \bigcup_{j=1}^{M_2} X_j, \quad (100)$$

where $n = 1, 2$ and $M_2 \geq 2$. The majorization condition

$$p(A_1 X_j) > p(A_2 X_j) \quad (\forall j) \quad (101)$$

is assumed. The Savage “sure-thing principle” (Savage, 1954) states that, under condition (101), the prospect π_1 must be preferred to π_2 . This, however, does not happen when π_1 is sufficiently more uncertain than π_2 , a situation which leads subjects to prefer π_2 over π_1 , in blatant contradiction with the Savage principle. The following proposition shows how this contradiction is removed within QDT.

Proposition 11. *Let us consider a binary lattice $\mathcal{L} = \{\pi_1, \pi_2\}$, with π_1 being more uncertain than π_2 , i.e., $q(\pi_1) < q(\pi_2)$. And let the majorization condition (101) be valid. Notwithstanding this majorization, the prospect π_2 is preferred to π_1 , so that $p(\pi_2) > p(\pi_1)$, provided that*

$$q(\pi_2) > \frac{1}{2} \sum_j [p(A_1 X_j) - p(A_2 X_j)] . \quad (102)$$

Proof: We notice that the majorization condition (101) is a sufficient condition for inequality (94) to hold, so that the disjunction effect is a particular case of the inversion paradox. Following

the same proof as in Proposition 8, we get inequality (95) as a condition for $\pi_2 > \pi_1$. Using the theorem on interference alternation (Proposition 2), which for a binary lattice takes the form of Eqs. (62), we come to condition (102) under which $\pi_2 > \pi_1$.

Remark 9.7. Equation (102) clearly shows the origin of the disjunction effect, contradicting the Savage “sure-thing principle”. In classical utility theory, where the interference term $q(\pi_2)$ is zero, the left-hand side of Eq. (102) is zero, while the right-hand side, owing to condition (101), is positive, leading to a contradiction. It is easy to check numerically that condition (102) always holds when the disjunction effect is observed empirically (Tversky and Kahneman, 1983; Tversky and Shafir, 1992; Machina, 2008).

9.8 Conjunction fallacy

The conjunction rule of classical probability theory requires that the probability of the conjunction of two events cannot be larger than any of the probabilities of the separate events forming the conjunction. However, again, when decisions are made under uncertainty, subjects often reliably violate the conjunction rule, which is termed the conjunction fallacy (Tversky and Kahneman, 1983). There exist numerous particular examples of this fallacy (Tversky and Kahneman, 1983; Yates and Carlson, 1986; Machina, 2008).

To describe the mathematical structure of the problem, let us consider two composite actions A and X and a lattice $\mathcal{L} = \{\pi_n\}$ of the prospects

$$\pi_n \equiv A_n X, \quad A = \bigcup_{n=1}^{M_1} A_n, \quad X = \bigcup_{j=1}^{M_2} X_j, \quad (103)$$

with $M_1 \geq 2$ and $M_2 \geq 2$. In applications, one usually takes M_1 and M_2 equal to two. But the mathematical structure of the problem does not change for arbitrary $M_1 \geq 2$ and $M_2 \geq 2$. In classical probability theory, $p(\pi_n)$ can never be smaller than any $p(A_n X_j)$ for arbitrary n and j . This is why, when it happens that there is at least one pair of $n = n_0$ and $j = j_0$, such that subjects support the following inequality,

$$p(\pi_{n_0}) < p(A_{n_0} X_{j_0}), \quad (104)$$

this is classified as the conjunction fallacy. There can exist several n and j for which the conjunction fallacy (104) occurs. The most general case is when there is at least one n_0 , for which condition (104) holds true, with j_0 corresponding to the largest partial probability, such that

$$p(A_{n_0} X_{j_0}) \equiv \sup_j p(A_{n_0} X_j). \quad (105)$$

In QDT, the conjunction-fallacy paradox finds a natural explanation, if decisions are made in the presence of uncertainty.

Proposition 12. *Let us consider a lattice $\mathcal{L} = \{\pi_n\}$ of prospects defined in Eqs. (103). The conjunction fallacy, in the sense of inequality (104), happens when and only when there exists at least one uncertain prospect $\pi_{n_0} \in \mathcal{L}$, for which*

$$q(\pi_{n_0}) < - \sum_{j(\neq j_0)} p(A_{n_0} X_j). \quad (106)$$

Proof: From the difference

$$p(\pi_{n_0}) - p(A_{n_0}X_{j_0}) = \sum_j p(A_{n_0}X_j) - p(A_{n_0}X_{j_0}) + q(\pi_{n_0})$$

it follows that inequality (106) is the necessary and sufficient condition for Eq. (104) to be true.

Remark 9.8. As has been stressed above, the reduction to classical probability theory can be done by setting all interference terms $q(\pi_n)$ to zero. But then inequality (106) could never be true, showing that the conjunction fallacy is a real paradox in the framework of the classical theory. In QDT, as we have numerically checked in a number of concrete examples, condition (106) always holds in the situations where the conjunction fallacy has been observed with human subjects (Tversky and Kahneman, 1983; Machina, 2008).

9.9 Isolation effect

The isolation effect is a common name for a large variety of phenomena known under different guises, such as the focusing effect, the availability effect, the salience effect, the framing effect, or elicitation effect (McCaffery and Baron, 2006). The essence of all these phenomena is that, when choosing among several alternatives, subjects are more inclined towards the certain benefits and at the same time they prefer the prospects with more uncertain losses. For instance, there exists a well documented tendency to prefer hidden to transparent taxes (McCaffery and Baron, 2006). Subjects tend to prefer what is related to more uncertain loss, while not being necessarily optimal from the point of view of classical utility theory.

According to Definition 7.5, an alternative with more certain loss is more repulsive than that one with more uncertain loss. In other words, subjects simply prefer alternatives that are less painful to them, when they choose those having more uncertain losses. Using this view point, the origin of the isolation effect can be easily understood in the framework of QDT.

Let us consider a lattice $\mathcal{L} = \{\pi_n\}$ of prospects (103). And let the actions A_j be enumerated so that

$$\sum_j p(A_1X_j) = \sup_n \sum_j p(A_nX_j). \quad (107)$$

Then, according to classical utility theory, the prospect π_1 should be preferred to all other π_n , with $n \neq 1$. In reality, however, this does not happen (McCaffery and Baron, 2006), when π_1 is more uncertain or potentially more harmful. Subjects choose another prospect π_n from \mathcal{L} , with $n \neq 1$, which is less uncertain or harmful than π_1 .

Proposition 13. *For a lattice $\mathcal{L} = \{\pi_n\}$ of prospects (103), under condition (107), there exists a prospect π_n , with $n \neq 1$, which is preferred to π_1 , when and only when the prospect π_1 is so uncertain or harmful that*

$$q(\pi_1) < q(\pi_n) + \sum_j p(A_nX_j) - \sup_n \sum_j p(A_nX_j). \quad (108)$$

Proof: Equation (107) is a slight generalization of the majorization condition (94) in the inversion paradox. Therefore the proof of inequality (108) is the same as in Proposition 8. If

Eq. (107) is strengthened by the majorization condition (101), then the isolation effect reduces to the disjunction effect and can be treated as in Proposition 11.

Remark 9.9. In classical utility theory, where there is no decision interference, all $q(\pi_n)$ are vanishing. In this case, the left-hand side of inequality (108) is zero, while the right-hand side is negative, leading to a contradiction. The isolation effect is thus a paradox in the framework of classical utility theory, which is absent in QDT.

9.10 Combined paradoxes

It may happen that several paradoxes among those considered above occur simultaneously. In the literature, one usually studies each paradox separately. This suggests to consider different experimental situations in which several paradoxes occur simultaneously in order to test our QDT through novel predictions in context not yet explored. To prove theoretically that such a situation can really happen, we analyze below the conditions under which the conjunction fallacy could coexist with the inversion paradox, and therefore, with the disjunction effect which is a particular case of the inversion paradox.

We consider two actions $A = A_1 + A_2$ and $X = X_1 + X_2$ from the action ring \mathcal{A} . And let the prospect π_n be formed as in Eq. (103), with $M_1 = M_2 = 2$. We are thus dealing with the binary lattice

$$\mathcal{L} = \{\pi_n \equiv A_n X : n = 1, 2\} . \quad (109)$$

Suppose that the X_j 's are enumerated so that

$$p(A_1 X_1) \equiv \sup_j p(A_1 X_j) \quad (j = 1, 2) . \quad (110)$$

This is just a notation, which simplifies the following formulas. In this notation, the conjunction-fallacy condition (104), taking account of Eq. (105), simplifies to

$$p(\pi_1) < p(A_1 X_1) . \quad (111)$$

Depending on the value of $p(A_1 X_1)$, three different situations can be found.

Proposition 14. *Let us consider the binary lattice (109), with notation (110). And assume that*

$$p(A_1 X_1) < \frac{1}{2} . \quad (112)$$

Then the conjunction-fallacy condition (111) makes the prospect π_2 preferred to π_1 , so that $p(\pi_1) < p(\pi_2)$.

Proof. Suppose that the conjunction-fallacy condition (111) holds, which is a particular case of Eq. (104). According to Proposition 12, the necessary and sufficient condition for the validity of Eq. (104) is inequality (106). The latter, with notation (110), reads as

$$q(\pi_1) < -p(A_1 X_2) . \quad (113)$$

Keeping in mind the interference alternation theorem (Proposition 2), which for a binary lattice takes the form of Eqs. (62), inequality (113) can be rewritten as

$$q(\pi_2) > p(A_1 X_2) . \quad (114)$$

For the right-hand side of Eq. (114), from condition (112), we have

$$p(A_1X_2) > \sum_j p(A_1X_j) - \frac{1}{2}. \quad (115)$$

Using the normalization condition (57) gives

$$\sum_j p(A_1X_j) - \frac{1}{2} = \frac{1}{2} \sum_j [p(A_1X_j) - p(A_2X_j)]. \quad (116)$$

In this way, inequality (113) acquires the form

$$q(\pi_2) > p(A_1X_2) > \frac{1}{2} \sum_j [p(A_1X_j) - p(A_2X_j)]. \quad (117)$$

This shows that Eq. (102) is valid, which, in the case of a binary lattice, is the necessary and sufficient condition for $\pi_2 > \pi_1$ (π_2 is preferred to π_1).

Proposition 15. *Let us suppose that for the binary lattice (109), with notation (110), the inequality*

$$p(A_1X_1) > \frac{1}{2} \quad (118)$$

holds. Then the assumption that π_2 is preferred to π_1 , in the sense that $p(\pi_1) < p(\pi_2)$, results in the conjunction-fallacy condition (111).

Proof: For a binary lattice, the necessary and sufficient condition for $p(\pi_1) < p(\pi_2)$ is inequality (102). Employing Eq. (116) gives

$$q(\pi_2) > \sum_j p(A_1X_j) - \frac{1}{2}. \quad (119)$$

Under condition (118), one has

$$\sum_j p(A_1X_j) - \frac{1}{2} > p(A_1X_2). \quad (120)$$

Combining Eqs. (119) and (120) yields Eq. (114), which is equivalent to inequality (113). The latter is the necessary and sufficient condition for the conjunction-fallacy Eq. (111).

Proposition 16. *Let us assume that for the binary lattice (109), with notation (110), the equality*

$$p(A_1X_1) = \frac{1}{2} \quad (121)$$

is satisfied. Then the conjunction-fallacy condition (111) is the necessary and sufficient condition for π_2 to be preferred to π_1 , so that $p(\pi_1) < p(\pi_2)$.

Proof: The proof is the same as in Propositions 14 and 15, except that inequalities (115) and (120), under equality (121), are replaced by the equality

$$p(A_1X_2) = \sum_j p(A_1X_j) - \frac{1}{2}. \quad (122)$$

Remark 9.10. The proofs of Propositions 14, 15, and 16 do not depend on the relation between $p(A_1X_j)$ and $p(A_2X_j)$. Therefore, if in addition to the assumptions underlying these propositions, we invoke the majorization condition (94), then the above propositions describe the interconnection between the conjunction fallacy and the inversion paradox. And if we add the majorization conditions (101), then we obtain the relation between the conjunction fallacy and the disjunction effect. The simultaneous occurrence of the latter two effects has not been analyzed experimentally, as far as we are aware. But, as we have proved, it may happen. From the analysis of the available experimental data on the conjunction fallacy (Tversky and Kahneman, 1983; Machina, 2008), we find that the latter is usually characterized by condition (112). Thus, we predict that the conjunction fallacy should be accompanied by the disjunction effect.

10 Outlook

We have presented a detailed description of Quantum Decision Theory (QDT), whose ideological source can be found in the insightful writings of Niels Bohr on the qualitative interpretations of measurements in quantum theory (Bohr, 1933, 1937, 1961). Bohr advocated the feasibility of describing psychological processes, such as decision making, by means of mathematical techniques of quantum theory. Developing the theory of measurement, von Neumann (1955) noted that the projection operators can be treated as statements about events, with the operator expectations providing the event probabilities. The von Neumann theory of quantum measurement describes the situation when an observer accomplishes measurements on a passive quantum system (Benioff, 1972a,b,c). We have extended the von Neumann theory in several aspects summarized below.

(1) The principal novelty of our approach viewed from the vantage of measurement theory is the possibility of applying it to *active* systems making decisions. This is achieved by introducing a specific state, the strategic state of mind, characterizing the considered decision maker.

(2) We have specified the basic techniques of QDT so that they could be applicable to real decision processes. In particular, the manifold of intended actions is defined as a noncommutative ring, since noncommutativity is a typical property that captures accurately what we believe is an essential property of human decision making. The set of action prospects is characterized as a complete lattice.

(3) The point of fundamental importance in our approach is that the action prospects are described as composite objects, formed by composite actions. The composite structure of prospects, together with the entangling properties of probability operators, result in the appearance of decision interferences, which take into account the uncertainties and repulsion to potential harmful consequences associated with the decision procedure.

(4) The noncommutativity of prospects and their interference are shown to be intimately connected, and they arise simultaneously.

(5) The interference of prospects is proved to exhibit the property of alternation, leading to the suppression of the probabilities of more uncertain or potentially more harmful prospects in favor of those of less uncertain or less harmful prospects which are comparatively enhanced.

(6) We have demonstrated that practically all known anomalies and paradoxes documented

in the context of classical utility theory are reducible to just a few mathematical archetypes, all of which finding straightforward explanations in the framework of QDT.

(7) We predict that some of the analyzed effects can occur together. For instance, the conjunction fallacy is found to be a sufficient condition for the disjunction effect.

The major novel results of the present paper is the mathematical development of the decision theory, based on quantum rules, and the proof that all known paradoxes of classical decision theory find a natural explanation in the frame of this quantum decision theory.

Acknowledgements

We appreciate financial support from the ETH Competence Center for Coping with Crises in Socio-Economic Systems (CCSS) through the ETH Research Grant CH1-01-08-2. We are also grateful to the participants of the CCSS Seminars for their remarks. One of the authors (V.I.Y.) is grateful to P.A. Benioff for useful correspondence and advice. We appreciate helpful discussions with E.P. Yukalova.

References

- Allais, M., Le comportement de l'homme rationnel devant le risque, critique des postulats et axiomes de l'école américaine, *Econometrica* **21** (1953) 503-546.
- Al-Najjar, N.I. and Weinstein, J., The ambiguity aversion literature: a critical assessment, *Kellogg School of Management Working Paper* (Northwestern University, 2009).
- Bather, J., *Decision Theory* (Wiley, Chichester, 2000).
- Benioff, P.A., Operator valued measures in quantum mechanics: finite and infinite processes, *Journal of Mathematical Physics* **13** (1972) 231-242.
- Benioff, P.A., Decision procedures in quantum mechanics, *Journal of Mathematical Physics* **13** (1972) 908-915.
- Benioff, P.A., Procedures in quantum mechanics without von Neumann projection axiom, *Journal of Mathematical Physics* **13** (1972) 1347-1355.
- Berberian, S.K., *Notes on Spectral Theory* (Reinhold, New York, 1966).
- Berger, J.O., *Statistical Decision Theory and Bayesian Analysis* (Springer, New York, 1985).
- Bohr, N., Light and life, *Nature* **131** (1933) 421-423, 457-459.
- Bohr, N., Causality and complimentarity, *Erkenntniss* **6** (1937) 293-303.
- Bohr, N., *La Physique Atomique et la Connaissance Humaine* (Gontier, Genève, 1961).
- Bratelli, O., Robinson, D., *Operator Algebras and Quantum Statistical Mechanics* (Springer, New York, 1979).
- Buchanan, J.T., *Discrete and Dynamic Decision Analysis* (Wiley, Chichester, 1982).
- Busemeyer, J.R., Wang, Z. and Townsend, J.T., Quantum dynamics of human decision-making, *Journal of Mathematical Psychology* **50** (2006) 220-241.
- Camerer, C. F., Loewenstein, G. and Rabin, R., eds. *Advances in Behavioral Economics* (Princeton University, Princeton, 2003).
- Cohen, M. and Tallon, J.M., Décision dans le risque et l'incertain: l'apport des modèles non additifs, *Revue d'Economie Politique* **110** (2000) 631-681.
- Coleman, A.J. and Yukalov, V.I., Order indices and mid-range order, *Modern Physics Letters B* **5** (1991) 1679-1686.
- Coleman, A.J. and Yukalov, V.I., Order indices for boson density matrices, *Nuovo Cimento B* **107** (1992) 535-552.
- Coleman, A.J. and Yukalov, V.I., Order indices and ordering in macroscopic systems, *Nuovo Cimento B* **108** (1993) 1377-1397.

- Coleman, A.J. and Yukalov, V.I., Relation between microscopic and macroscopic characteristics of statistical systems, *International Journal of Modern Physics B* **10** (1996) 3505-3515.
- Coleman, A.J. and Yukalov, V.I., *Reduced Density Matrices* (Springer, Berlin, 2000).
- Dakic, B., Suvakov, M., Paterek, T. and Brukner, C., Efficient hidden-variable simulation of measurements in quantum experiments, *Physical Review Letters* **101** (2008) 190402.
- Dawkins, R., *The Selfish Gene* (Oxford University, New York, 2006).
- Dieudonné, J., *Foundations of Modern Analysis* (Hesperides, London, 2006).
- Dirac, P.A.M., *The Principles of Quantum Mechanics* (Clarendon, Oxford, 1958).
- Dirac, P.A.M., *Lectures on Quantum Field Theory* (Yeshiva University, New York, 1967).
- Dixit, A. and Besley, T., James Mirrlees' contributions to the theory of information and incentives, *Scandinavian Journal of Economics* **99** (1997) 207-235.
- Dixmier, J., *Les C^* -Algèbres et Leurs Représentations* (Gauthier-Villars, Paris, 1969).
- Ellsberg, D., Risk, ambiguity, and the Savage axioms, *Quarterly Journal of Economics* **75** (1961) 643-669.
- Emch, G.G., *Algebraic Methods in Statistical Mechanics and Quantum Field Theory* (Wiley, New York, 1972).
- Epstein, L.G., A definition of uncertainty aversion, *Reviews of Economic Studies* **66** (1999) 579-608.
- Feller, W., *Introduction to Probability Theory and Its Applications* (Wiley, New York, 1970).
- Feynman, R.P., Hibbs, A.R., *Quantum Mechanics and Path Integrals* (McGraw-Hill, New York, 1965).
- French, S. and Insua, D.R., *Statistical Decision Theory* (Arnold, London, 2000).
- Gilboa, I., Expected utility with purely subjective non-additive probabilities, *Journal of Mathematical Economics* **16** (1987) 65-88.
- Gilboa, I. and Schmeidler, D., Maxmin expected utility with non-unique prior, *Journal of Mathematical Economics* **18** (1989) 141-153.
- Glimm, J. and Jaffe, A., *Quantum Physics* (Springer, New York, 1981).
- Hastings, N.A. and Mello, J.M., *Decision Networks* (Wiley, Chichester, 1978).
- Kahneman, D., Tversky, A., Prospect theory: an analysis of decision under risk, *Econometrica* **47** (1979) 263-291.
- Keyl, M., Fundamentals of quantum information theory, *Physics Reports* **369** (2002) 431-548.

- Lindgren, B.W., *Elements of Decision Theory* (Macmillan, New York, 1971).
- Machina, M.J., Decision-making in the presence of risk, *Science* **236** (1987) 537-543.
- Machina, M.J., Non-expected utility theory, In: Durlauf, S.N., Blume, L.E. (eds.), *New Palgrave Dictionary of Economics* (Macmillan, New York, 2008).
- Malevergne, Y., Sornette, D., *Extreme Financial Risks* (Springer, Berlin, 2006).
- Marshall, K.T. and Oliver, R.M., *Decision Making and Forecasting* (McGraw-Hill, New York, 1995).
- McCaffery, E.J. and Baron, J., Isolation effects and the neglect of indirect effects of fiscal policies, *Journal of Behavioral Decision Making* **19** (2006) 289-302.
- Mendelson, E., *Introduction to Mathematical Logic* (Van Nostrand, Princeton, 1963).
- Montesano, A., Effects of uncertainty aversion on the call option market, *Theory and Decision* **65** (2008) 97-123.
- Nielsen, M.A., Chuang, I.L., *Quantum Computation and Quantum Information* (Cambridge University, New York, 2000).
- Pierce, C.S., On the algebra of logic, *American Journal of Mathematics* **3** (1880) 15-57.
- Quiggin, J., A theory of anticipated utility, *Journal of Economic Behavior and Organization* **3** (1982) 323-343.
- Rabin, M., Risk aversion and expected utility theory: a calibration theorem, *Econometrica* **68** (2000) 1281-1292.
- Raiffa, H. and Schlaifer, R., *Applied Statistical Decision Theory* (Wiley, New York, 2000).
- Rivett, P., *Model Building for Decision Analysis* (Wiley, Chichester, 1980).
- Safra, Z. and Segal, U., Calibration results for non-expected utility theories, *Econometrica* **76** (2008) 1143-1166.
- Savage, L.J., *The Foundations of Statistics* (Wiley, New York, 1954).
- Schmeidler, D., Subjective probability and expected utility without additivity, *Econometrica* **57** (1989) 571-587.
- Shafir, S., Reich, T., Tsur, E., Erev, I. and Lotem, A., Perceptual accuracy and conflicting effects of certainty on risk-taking behaviour, *Nature* **453** (2008) 917-921.
- Shefrin, H.M., *A Behavioral Approach to Asset Pricing* (Academic Press, New York, 2005).
- Simon, H.A., A behavioral model of rational choice, *Quarterly Journal of Economics* **69** (1955) 99-118.

- Tversky, A. and Kahneman, D., Extensional versus intuitive reasoning: the conjunction fallacy in probability judgement, *Psychological Review* **90** (1983) 293-315.
- Tversky, A. and Shafir, E., The disjunction effect in choice under uncertainty, *Psychological Science* **3** (1992) 305-309.
- Vioculescu, D.V., Dykema, K.J., and Nica, A.M., *Free Random Variables* (American Mathematical Society, Providence, 1992).
- von Neumann, J., On infinite tensor products, *Composite Mathematics* **6** (1938) 1-77.
- von Neumann, J., *Mathematical Foundations of Quantum Mechanics* (Princeton University, Princeton, 1955).
- von Neumann, J., Morgenstern, O., *Theory of Games and Economic Behavior* (Princeton University, Princeton, 1953).
- Weidlich, W., Physics and social science - the approach of synergetics, *Physics Reports* **204** 1-163.
- Weirich, P., *Decision Space* (Cambridge University, Cambridge, 2001).
- White, D.I., *Fundamentals of Decision Theory* (Elsevier, New York, 1976).
- Williams, C.P. and Clearwater, S.H., *Explorations in Quantum Computing* (Springer, New York, 1998).
- Yates, J.F. and Carlson, B.W., Conjunction errors: Evidence for multiple judgement procedures, including signed summation, *Organizational Behavior and Human Decision Processes* **37** (1986) 230-253.
- Yukalov, V.I., Causality problem in quantum physics, *Philos. Sci.* **18** (1975) 145-147.
- Yukalov, V.I., Matrix order indices in statistical mechanics, *Physica A* **310** (2002) 413-434.
- Yukalov, V.I., Entanglement measure for composite systems, *Physical Review Letters* **90** (2003) 167905.
- Yukalov, V.I., Evolutional entanglement in nonequilibrium processes", *Modern Physics Letters B* **17** (2003) 95-103.
- Yukalov, V.I., Quantifying entanglement production of quantum operations, *Physical Review A* **68** (2003) 022109.
- Yukalov, V.I. and Sornette, D., Quantum decision theory as quantum theory of measurement, *Physics Letters A* **372** (2008) 6867-6871.
- Yukalov, V.I. and Sornette, D., Scheme of thinking quantum systems, *Laser Physics Letters* **6** (2009) 833-839.

Yukalov, V.I. and Sornette, D., Physics of risk and uncertainty in quantum decision making, *European Physical Journal B* **71** (2009) 533-548.

Zeckhauser, R. Investing in the unknown and unknowable, *Capitalism and Society* **1** (2006) 1-39.