

# On EPR-type Entanglement in the Experiments of Scully et Al. II. Insight in the Real Random Delayed-choice Erasure Experiment

F. Herbut

**Abstract** It was pointed out in the first part of this study that EPR-type entanglement is defined by the possibility of performing any of two mutually incompatible distant, i. e., direct-interaction-free, measurements. They go together under the term 'EPR-type disentanglement'. In this second part, quantum-mechanical insight is gained in the real random delayed-choice erasure experiment of Kim et al. [Kim et al.: Phys. Rev. Lett. **84**, 1-5 (2000)] by a relative-reality-of-unitarily-evolving-state (RRUES) approach (explained in the first part). Finally, it is shown that this remarkable experiment, which performs, by random choice, two incompatible measurements at the same time, is actually an EPR-type disentanglement experiment, closely related to the micromaser experiment discussed in the first part.

**Keywords** Real experiment. Delayed-choice erasure. Distant measurement. Random-choice EPR-type disentanglement. Detector as quantum mechanical system

## 1 Introduction

Scully and Drühl published a thought experiment on erasure in 1982 [1], which, 18 years later Kim, Yu, Kulik, Shih, and Scully reported to have performed in an inessentially changed way [2]. In this article we investigate the experiment because it realizes several provoking and baffling fundamental quantum-mechanical ideas: (i) delayed choice (in the sense of Wheeler [3]), (ii) erasure, (iii) erasure in part of the state, (iv) delayed-choice erasure in the sense of Scully (or after-detection erasure), (v) random choice of particle-like or wave-like behavior after detection, finally, (vi) EPR-type disentanglement.

The authors lean on Glauber's second-quantization theory for precise quantitative quantum mechanical predictions, which turn out well confirmed by the experiment. (For references to Glauber's theory and references to earlier work see the article of Kim et al. [2].)

One of the first attempts to perform a real erasure experiment [4] also presented its theoretical part in second quantization. However, it has turned out that first-quantization quantum mechanical insight [5] is feasible and useful.

A quantum mechanical analysis of the Kim et al. article [2] is presented in this paper in order to provide insight, shed more light, and help to demystify the mentioned puzzling quantum mechanical ideas. At last but not at least, this study, along with the preceding ones along parallel lines (Ref-s [5] and [6]), should hopefully help to understand in what direction one should look

---

F. Herbut (mail)

Serbian Academy of Sciences and Arts, Knez Mihajlova 35, 11000 Belgrade, Serbia

e-mail: fedorh@infosky.net and from USA etc. fedorh@mi.sanu.ac.rs




Figure 1: The two-photon 'two-slit' random-choice and delayed-choice erasure experiment outlined in section 2.

for an objective, preparation- and observation-independent quantum mechanics.

## 2 Basic Idea of the Kim et al. Experiment and Questions

A quantum eraser experiment very close to and somewhat simpler in details than the experiment of Kim et al. [2] itself is illustrated in the Fig. (The notation is in accordance with that in the first part of this study [6].)

Two atoms labeled by 1 and 2 (counterparts of the two slits in Young's experiment [7]) are excited by a weak laser pulse. A pair of entangled quanta, photon  $I$  and photon  $II$ , is then emitted from either

atom 1 or atom 2 (coherently added possibilities) by atomic cascade decay (into photons  $I$  and  $II$ ). Photon  $II$ , propagating to the right, is registered by detector  $D_{II}$ , which can be scanned by a step motor along its  $x$  axis for the observation of interference fringes.

Photon  $I$  propagates to the left. If the pair is generated in atom 1, photon  $I$  will follow path 1 (see the Fig.) meeting beam splitter  $BS1$  with 50% chance of being reflected or transmitted. If the pair is generated in atom 2, photon  $I$  will follow path 2 meeting the beam splitter  $BS2$  with 50% chance of being reflected or transmitted. In case of the 50% chance of being transmitted at either  $BS1$  or  $BS2$ , photon  $I$  is detected by either detector  $D_I^a$  or  $D_I^d$ . The registration of  $D_I^a$  or  $D_I^d$  provides the *which-path information* (path 1 or path 2 respectively) of photon  $I$ , and this in turn provides the which-path information for photon  $II$  due to the entanglement nature of the two-photon state generated by atomic cascade decay.

Given a reflection at either  $BS1$  or  $BS2$ , photon  $I$  continues its 1 or 2 path to meet another (central) 50–50 beam splitter  $BS$ , and then, possibilities 1 and 2 having *interfered*, photon  $I$  is detected by either detectors  $D_I^b$  or  $D_I^c$  shown in the Fig. The triggering of detectors  $D_I^b$  or  $D_I^c$  erases the which-path information of photon  $II$ , and creates the *which-coherence* information.

The random choice takes place in the beam splitters  $BS1(2)$ . As to the delayed-choice (in the sense of Scully), the which-path or both-path (random) choice in the beam splitters  $BS1$  and  $BS2$  is delayed compared to the detection of photon  $II$ .

There are some *questions* that come to mind.

(i) If the quantum correlations in a bipartite state, like that of the two-photon system at issue, are such that one particle contains which-path information on the other, then there is no coherence in the single photon state (hence, one cannot detect interference) as it is well known. Can this be made obvious in the Kim et al. experiment?

(ii) It is known that pure-state entanglement is due to coherence in the state of the composite system, i. e., it stems from superposition of orthogonal uncorrelated bipartite states. How is the which-path information erased, and, particularly, how does the *coherence descend* from the bipartite system to the subsystem of photon-*II* ?

(iii) The behavior of the (improper [8]) ensemble of photons *II* is described by its state, i. e., by the reduced density operator  $\rho_{II}$ , of photon *II*. It is known that this state cannot be influenced by whatever happens to the photon-*I* partner (improper) ensemble alone (as long as there is no interaction between the two photons). Can one see this in the description of the experiment?

(iv) Can a gradual increase in complexity of the concepts involved be displayed? There is the delayed choice in the sense of Wheeler [3], random choice between which-path and coherence information, Wheeler's delayed choice with erasure, and, finally, delayed choice in the sense of Scully with erasure in part of the state.

(v) It is known that quantum correlations can not provide signalling. This means that whatever happens to the individual photon *I*, no change is detectable on its partner, photon *II*. How is erasure feasible in view of this fact?

(vi) Photon *I* 'makes the delayed choice' by *randomly* being either transmitted in  $BS1(2)$  or being reflected there. The photon-*II* partner

has *before that been detected* in detector  $D_{II}$ . How can the one-path or interference origin of this localization be decided later, after the photon has been detected?

Next we are going to give a precise first-quantization form to the above outline of a physical picture in order to enable one to answer the questions and gain generally more insight in the experiment.

### 3. Quantum-mechanical Description

Next, the propagation of the *two-photon* state vector (in terms of single-photon state vectors) is presented.

One should have in mind that the "path" state of the photon is multiplied by the imaginary unit when reflected on a beam splitter, and is unchanged when transmitted ([9], p. 189). Further, we denote by  $|0\rangle_{D_{II}}$  the state vector of the localization detector at the beginning of the experiment, and by  $U_{IID_{II}}$  the unitary evolution operator containing the interaction between photon  $II$  and the localization detector  $D_{II}$  in the process of localization and afterwards. Then, the two-photon state vector in the experiment, *after passage of photon  $I$  through the central beam splitter  $BS$*  (see the Fig.), but before it reaches any of the detectors  $D_I^q$ ,  $q = a, b, c, d$ , having in mind the above outline of the experiment, reads as follows:

$$\begin{aligned} |(1, 2) \rightarrow D_I^a, D_I^b, D_I^c, D_I^d\rangle_{I, II} &= (1/2)|1 \rightarrow D_I^a\rangle_I \left\{ U_{IID_{II}}(|1\rangle_{II}|0\rangle_{D_{II}}) \right\} + \\ &(1/2) \left\{ (1/2)^{1/2} i \left[ |1 \rightarrow D_I^b\rangle_I + |1 \rightarrow D_I^c\rangle_I \right] \right\} \left\{ U_{IID_{II}}(|1\rangle_{II}|0\rangle_{D_{II}}) \right\} + \end{aligned}$$

$$(1/2)\left\{(1/2)^{1/2}i\left[|2 \rightarrow D_I^b\rangle_I + i|2 \rightarrow D_I^c\rangle_I\right]\right\}\left\{U_{IID_{II}}(|2\rangle_{II}|0\rangle_{D_{II}})\right\} + \\ (1/2)|2 \rightarrow D_I^d\rangle_I\left\{U_{IID_{II}}(|2\rangle_{II}|0\rangle_{D_{II}})\right\}. \quad (1)$$

Actually, there is also the (coherently added) possibility that photon  $I$  misses the beam splitters  $BS1(2)$  etc. But this component of the bipartite state vector is left out (projected out) as irrelevant in the experiment.

One actually has  $|1 \rightarrow D_I^q\rangle_I = |2 \rightarrow D_I^q\rangle_I$ ,  $q = b, c$  because, after passage through the central beam splitter, photon  $I$  cannot 'remember' where it has come from.

Hence, we can omit  $|1(2)$  in the state vector of photon  $I$ . Then, the rhs of (1) can be rearranged, as easily seen, so that we have an expansion in the ortho-normal basis  $\{| \rightarrow D_I^q\rangle_I : q = a, b, c, d\}$  of photon  $I$ :

$$|(1, 2) \rightarrow D_I^a, D_I^b, D_I^c, D_I^d\rangle_{I,II} = \\ (1/2)| \rightarrow D_I^a\rangle_I\left\{U_{IID_{II}}(|1\rangle_{II}|0\rangle_{D_{II}})\right\} + \\ (1/2)| \rightarrow D_I^b\rangle_I U_{IID_{II}}\left\{\left[(1/2)^{1/2}\left(-|1\rangle_{II} + i|2\rangle_{II}\right)\right]|0\rangle_{D_{II}}\right\} + \\ (1/2)| \rightarrow D_I^c\rangle_I U_{IID_{II}}\left\{\left[(1/2)^{1/2}\left(i|1\rangle_{II} - |2\rangle_{II}\right)\right]|0\rangle_{D_{II}}\right\} + \\ (1/2)| \rightarrow D_I^d\rangle_I\left\{U_{IID_{II}}(|2\rangle_{II}|0\rangle_{D_{II}})\right\}. \quad (2)$$

The state (reduced density operator)

$$\rho_{II} \equiv \text{tr}_I\left(|(1, 2) \rightarrow D_I^a, D_I^b, D_I^c, D_I^d\rangle_{I,II}\langle(1, 2) \rightarrow D_I^a, D_I^b, D_I^c, D_I^d|_{I,II}\right)$$

of photon  $II$  can immediately be read from the canonical Schmidt expansion (2) (cf a short form in subsection 2.1 in [10]):

$$\rho_{II} = (1/4)\left\{U_{IID_{II}}(|1\rangle_{II}|0\rangle_{D_{II}})\right\}\left\{\langle 1|_{II}\langle 0|_{D_{II}}\right\}U_{IID_{II}}^\dagger +$$

$$\begin{aligned}
& (1/4)U_{IID_{II}} \left\{ \left[ (1/2)^{1/2} ( - |1\rangle_{II} + i|2\rangle_{II} ) \right] |0\rangle_{D_{II}} \right\} \times \\
& \left[ (1/2)^{1/2} ( - \langle 1|_{II} - i\langle 2|_{II} ) \right] \langle 0|_{D_{II}} \left\} U_{IID_{II}}^\dagger + \right. \\
& (1/4)U_{IID_{II}} \left\{ \left[ (1/2)^{1/2} ( i|1\rangle_{II} - |2\rangle_{II} ) \right] |0\rangle_{D_{II}} \right\} \times \\
& \left\{ \left[ (1/2)^{1/2} ( - i\langle 1|_{II} - \langle 2|_{II} ) \right] \langle 0|_{D_{II}} \right\} U_{IID_{II}}^\dagger + \\
& (1/4) \left\{ U_{IID_{II}} ( |2\rangle_{II} |0\rangle_{D_{II}} ) \right\} \left\{ ( \langle 2|_{II} \langle 0|_{D_{II}} ) U_{IID_{II}}^\dagger \right\}. \tag{3}
\end{aligned}$$

Multiplying out the terms, one obtains

$$\begin{aligned}
\rho_{II} = & (1/2) \left\{ U_{IID_{II}} ( |1\rangle_{II} |0\rangle_{D_{II}} ) \right\} \left\{ ( \langle 1|_{II} \langle 0|_{D_{II}} ) \right\} U_{IID_{II}}^\dagger + \\
& (1/2) \left\{ U_{IID_{II}} ( |2\rangle_{II} |0\rangle_{D_{II}} ) \right\} \left\{ ( \langle 2|_{II} \langle 0|_{D_{II}} ) U_{IID_{II}}^\dagger \right\}. \tag{4}
\end{aligned}$$

The time variable in the unitary evolution operator  $U_{IID_{II}}$  has been suppressed. As it has been stated, its value is some instant after photon  $I$  has passed the central beam splitter  $BS$ , but has not yet reached any of the four detectors  $D_I^a$ - $D_I^d$  (or, possibly, has already been detected in the first or in the last of them).

If the experiment were a *simple erasure* (or before-detection) one, then one would still have lack of interaction between photon  $II$  and the localization detector  $D_{II}$  at the moment in question:  $U_{IID_{II}} = U_{II}U_{D_{II}}$ . Hence, detector  $D_{II}$  could be omitted (moved from the 'object' of description to the 'subject'). If, on the contrary, we have delayed-choice (or after-detection) erasure, then we have interaction, and the description as it stands is essential (cf insight in delayed-choice erasure in part I of this study [6]).



## 4 Answers

Relations (1) and (4) give answer to *question (i)*. The former makes it obvious that orthogonal states of photon  $I$  'mark' or distinguish the 'being emitted from atom 1' and 'being emitted from atom 2' states of photon  $II$ . Relation (4) then makes it evident that this has the consequence of 'suppressing' the coherence in the state of photon  $II$ .

Note that the much-used term '*erasure*' is not meant to be a synonym for this 'suppression'. On the contrary, it denotes *elimination of the described mechanism of 'suppression'*, which is still present in (1) or (2). The very detection of the beam of photons  $I$  in the detectors  $D_I^q$   $q = a, b, c, d$ , turns (2) into a (proper) mixture (of the 4 component states in (2)). Then, also  $\rho_{II}$  given by (3) is a proper mixture containing two coherence states (terms 2 and 3).

Answer to *question (ii)* follows from the fact that the central beam splitter  $BS$  (cf the Fig.) treats the components of photon  $I$  coming from atoms 1 and 2 *differently only by a phase difference of  $(\pi/2)$* . This makes possible *erasure*, so that, upon detection in  $D_I^q$ ,  $q = a, b, c, d$ , half of the ensemble of photons  $II$  displays interference (cf relation (3)).

Note that state decomposition (3), as it stands, is only a mathematical relation. The second and third subensembles of the ensemble of photons  $II$  in it are *not defined physically on the local, photon-II, level*. They are defined only distantly (or, one might say, globally) on part of photon  $I$  propagating towards the detectors  $D_I^q$ ,  $q = b, c$ .

*Question (iii)* is answered in the affirmative by comparing relations (2)

and (4): in spite of the erasure in part of the two-photon state vector displayed in (2), locally, i. e., in the entire ensemble of photons  $II$ , there is no change induced (as obvious in (4)).

To answer *question (iv)*, we can begin by drastically downgrading the Kim et al. experiment, and then by upgrading it in steps.

**a).** Let us imagine that one, so to say, 'by hand' either just removes the beam splitters  $BS1(2)$  or, as an alternative, replaces them by mirrors  $M1(2)$  (cf the Fig.). Further, we imagine that the choice between these two possibilities is made *after* the photons begin to propagate from the atoms (the 'slits'). Thus, the choice of a particle-like or a wave-like experiment would be *delayed* with respect to the moment of preparation (or beginning of the experiment).

This would constitute a genuine Wheeler delayed-choice experiment (though upgraded from the original one-photon case [3] to a two-photon one).

**b).** In the Kim et al. experiment the 'by hand' choice is replaced by a *random* mechanism (transmission or reflection on the beam splitters  $BS1(2)$ ). This upgrading of Wheeler's idea is extremely important on two counts:

**(i)** Let us remember the famous wave-particle duality form of Bohr's complementarity principle and the rebellions against its claim of universal validity (see the impressive work of Home et al. in [11], and the references therein). The random choice mingles particle-like and wave-like behavior in one experiment, thus giving support to the mentioned rebellions.

**(ii)** At the very beginning of the first erasure paper of Scully et al. [1] the authors say:

"... *the role of the observer* lies at the heart of the problem of measurement and state reduction in quantum mechanics." (Italics

by F. H.)

A few lines lower they say:

”... Wheeler has pointed out that *the experimentalist* may delay his *decision* as to display wave-like or particle-like behavior in a light beam long after the beam has been split by the appropriate optics.” (Italics by F. H.)

The random-choice property of the Kim et al. experiment (beam splitters  $BS1(2)$  ) has replaced the 'decision' of the 'observer' or the 'experimenter' by an automatic step in the experiment. This goes a long way in warning against the fallacy of overestimating the role of the human observer.

On the other hand, the Kim et al. experiment performs a *partial-state erasure* having the two-photon state in mind. This is not partial erasure. The erasure is complete, but it takes place only in a part of the two-photon state. Since states are ensembles in the laboratory, one experimentally deals with two sub-ensembles: the one 'seen' in the coincidence of the detectors  $D_I^q$  and  $D_{II}$ ,  $q = a, d$ , and the other 'seen' in the  $D_I^q, D_{II}$ ,  $q = b, c$  coincidence.

c) Kim et al. actually performed a delayed-choice (in the sense of Scully) or after-detection (of photon  $II$  ) experiment in which this detection was performed so early in the experiment, that photon  $I$  has not yet reached the beam splitters  $BS1(2)$  , i. e., the random choice has not yet taken place. (This seems to put a dramatic emphasis on question (vi).)

I believe that the answer to *question* (v) has now become clear. The fact that no signal can be sent from photon  $I$  to photon  $II$  is based on the circumstance that the *entire state* (ensemble)  $\rho_{II}$  of photons  $II$  (cf

(4)) cannot be distantly manipulated on account of entanglement. Whatever change photon  $I$  undergoes due to some local interaction, this does not influence the state  $\rho_{II}$  of photon  $II$ . But this is not so if one makes coincidence measurements on photon  $I$  and photon  $II$ . Then distant (or global) influence does show up and erasure can appear.

Answer to question (vi) was given in part I [6]: the combined photon- $II$ - $D_{II}$  system is analogous to the photon- $II$  system alone as far as the definite-way or coherence states are concerned. Therefore, there is no question of 'acting backwards in time' or any other mystification .

## 5 The Experiment is an EPR-type Disentanglement

Now we proceed to a deeper layer of physical insight in the random-choice and delayed-choice erasure experiment that we investigate: we view it as an EPR-type disentanglement in which both mutually incompatible distant measurements are performed simultaneously.

We write down the two-photon state vector *before photon  $I$  reaches the beam splitters  $BS1(2)$*  (see the Fig.), and, of course, after the photons have been emitted from the atoms. We allow for both simple and delayed-choice erasure.

$$\begin{aligned} |(1, 2) \rightarrow BS1(2)\rangle_{I,II} = & (1/2)^{1/2} |1\rangle_I \{U_{IID_{II}}(|1\rangle_{II} |0\rangle_{D_{II}})\} + \\ & (1/2)^{1/2} |2\rangle_I \{U_{IID_{II}}(|2\rangle_{II} |0\rangle_{D_{II}})\}. \end{aligned} \quad (5)$$

Next, we take into account the change that occurs by transmission or reflection on the beam splitters  $BS1(2)$  . Each "path" state  $|q\rangle_I$ ,  $q =$

1, 2 , splits up

$$|q\rangle_I \rightarrow (1/2)^{1/2} \left( |q \rightarrow D_I^{r(q)}\rangle_{I,i} |q \rightarrow BS\rangle_I \right), \quad q = 1, 2, \quad r(1) = a, \quad r(2) = d. \quad (6)$$

Replacing the "path" states  $|q\rangle_I$ ,  $q = 1, 2$  in (5) by the rhs of (6), we obtain the corresponding change in the two-photon state vector that is due to the action of  $BS1(2)$  .

$$|(1, 2) \rightarrow D_I^a, BS, D_I^d\rangle_{I,II} = (1/2)^{1/2} \left\{ |1 \rightarrow D_I^a, 2 \rightarrow D_I^d\rangle_{I,II}^{ww} + |(1, 2) \rightarrow BS\rangle_{I,II}^{coh} \right\}, \quad (7a)$$

where

$$|1 \rightarrow D_I^a, 2 \rightarrow D_I^d\rangle_{I,II}^{ww} \equiv (1/2)^{1/2} \left\{ |1 \rightarrow D_I^a\rangle_I \otimes U_{IID_{II}}(|1\rangle_{II} |0\rangle_{D_{II}}) + |2 \rightarrow D_I^d\rangle_I \otimes U_{IID_{II}}(|2\rangle_{II} |0\rangle_{D_{II}}) \right\}, \quad (7b)$$

and

$$|(1, 2) \rightarrow BS\rangle_{I,II}^{coh} \equiv (1/2)^{1/2} \left\{ i |1 \rightarrow BS\rangle_I \otimes U_{IID_{II}}(|1\rangle_{II} |0\rangle_{D_{II}}) + i |2 \rightarrow BS\rangle_I \otimes U_{IID_{II}}(|2\rangle_{II} |0\rangle_{D_{II}}) \right\}. \quad (7c)$$

The two-photon state vectors  $|1 \rightarrow D_I^a, 2 \rightarrow D_I^d\rangle_{I,II}^{ww}$  of (7b) and  $|(1, 2) \rightarrow BS\rangle_{I,II}^{coh}$  of (7c), which are coherently added up in the total state vector (7a), describe the which-way and the coherence possibilities after the random choice of photon  $I$  . The coherence state vector (7c) is still in an unsatisfactory which-way form.

Relation (7c) is a canonical Schmidt decomposition. It can be obtained as a result of (generalized) expansion of the lhs in, essentially, the first-photon which-way basis  $\{i |q \rightarrow BS\rangle_I, q = 1, 2\}$  . One can, instead, expand the

lhs in any coherence basis  $\{|a\rangle_I, |b\rangle_I\}$  (cf (7a,b) and (9) together with (8a,b) in section 3 of Part I).

The micromaser experiment discussed in Part I was based on expansion in the first simple coherence basis  $|\pm\rangle_I \equiv (1/2)^{1/2}(|1\rangle_I \pm |2\rangle_I)$  (cf (10) in Part I).

We now expand the lhs of (7c) in the second simple coherence basis  $|\pm i\rangle_I \equiv (1/2)^{1/2}(|1 \rightarrow BS\rangle_I \pm i |2 \rightarrow BS\rangle_I)$  (cf (11) in Part I) to obtain the following canonical Schmidt decomposition:

$$\begin{aligned} |(1,2) \rightarrow BS\rangle_{I,II}^{coh} &= (1/2)^{1/2} \left\{ [(1/2)^{1/2} (|1 \rightarrow BS\rangle_I + i |2 \rightarrow BS\rangle_I)] \otimes \right. \\ &\quad \left[ (1/2)^{1/2} i (U_{IID_{II}}(|1\rangle_{II} |0\rangle_{D_{II}}) - i U_{IID_{II}}(|2\rangle_{II} |0\rangle_{D_{II}})) \right] + \\ &\quad \left[ (1/2)^{1/2} (|1 \rightarrow BS\rangle_I - i |2 \rightarrow BS\rangle_I) \right] \otimes \\ &\quad \left. \left[ (1/2)^{1/2} i (U_{IID_{II}}(|1\rangle_{II} |0\rangle_{D_{II}}) + i U_{IID_{II}}(|2\rangle_{II} |0\rangle_{D_{II}})) \right] \right\} \quad (8) \end{aligned}$$

(cf (13) and Appendix A for the 'partner' state in the decomposition in Part I).

Comparison of the canonical Schmidt decomposition (8) with that in (13) in Part I reveals an extra imaginary unit in the second (tensor) factors in the former. It is due to the fact that reading the correlation operator  $U_a$  (cf Appendix A in Part I) in (7c), we obtain  $U_a |q \rightarrow BS\rangle_I = i U_{IID_{II}}(|q\rangle_{II} |0\rangle_{D_{II}})$ ,  $q = 1, 2$ .

It is seen in (8) that the direct measurement of the two first-photon simple coherence states  $|\pm i\rangle_I$  is *ipso facto* measurement of the corresponding coherence states for the second photon (in reverse order). This is distant *coherence measurement*, which, together with the distant *which-way measurement* based on (7b), constitutes the *EPR-type disentanglement* in question.

At first glance, one is confused at the thought how to perform the direct measurement required by (8). But in the random-choice and delayed-choice erasure experiment that we are investigating is performed precisely that!

We view the first-photon process from reflection at the random-choice beam splitters  $BS1(2)$  up to reaching the detectors  $D_I^q$ ,  $q = b, c$  as an *evolution*, governed by a unitary evolution operator  $U_I$  that is *part of the measurement*. Then, *the claim is* that  $D_I^q$ ,  $q = b, c$  actually measure (in direct measurement) if photon  $I$  was in the state  $(1/2)^{1/2}(|1 \rightarrow BS\rangle_I + i|2 \rightarrow BS\rangle_I)$  or in the state  $(1/2)^{1/2}(|1 \rightarrow BS\rangle_I - i|2 \rightarrow BS\rangle_I)$ .

One can prove the claim by showing that the so-called calibration condition is satisfied (see in [12] sections 2 and 4, in particular Theorem 2 and the last passage in section 4). One has to show that the above introduced unitary operator  $U_I$  performs the following mappings:

$$U_I \left[ (1/2)^{1/2} (|1 \rightarrow BS\rangle_I \pm i|2 \rightarrow BS\rangle_I) \right] = e^{i\lambda_q} |\rightarrow D_I^{r(q)}\rangle_I, \quad q = \pm, \\ 0 \leq \lambda_q < 2\pi, \quad r(+)=b, \quad r(-)=c. \quad (9)$$

This will prove that if one has a definite value of the measured observable, the measurement gives the claimed result with certainty (as the calibration condition requires). Here (the projector)

$$\left[ (1/2)^{1/2} (|1 \rightarrow BS\rangle_I + i|2 \rightarrow BS\rangle_I) \right] \left[ (1/2)^{1/2} (\langle 1 \rightarrow BS|_I - i\langle 2 \rightarrow BS|_I) \right]$$

is the measured observable, and 1 and 0 are the definite values at issue.

The proof goes as follows. If one makes use of the equality  $|1 \rightarrow D_I^q\rangle_I = |2 \rightarrow D_I^q\rangle_I$ ,  $q = 1, 2$  (cf beneath (1)), one can see from relation (1) that

$$U_I |1\rangle_I = (1/2)^{1/2} (-|\rightarrow D_I^b\rangle_I + i|\rightarrow D_I^c\rangle_I), \quad (10a)$$

$$U_I |2\rangle_I = (1/2)^{1/2} (i|\rightarrow D_I^b\rangle_I - |\rightarrow D_I^c\rangle_I). \quad (10b)$$

Solving (10a) and (10b) for  $|\rightarrow D_I^q\rangle$ ,  $q = b, c$ , one obtains

$$U_I\left[(1/2)^{1/2}\left(|1\rangle_I + i|2\rangle_I\right)\right] = -|\rightarrow D_I^b\rangle, \quad (11a)$$

and

$$U_I\left[(1/2)^{1/2}\left(|1\rangle_I - i|2\rangle_I\right)\right] = i|\rightarrow D_I^c\rangle. \quad (11b)$$

Thus, (9) is satisfied, and the claim is proved.

## 6 Concluding Remarks

The experiment discussed in this article provides us with a clear understanding of the distinction of 'potential' and 'actual' in the usual sense of these words (cf remark F in the first part of this study [6]).

Let us think of the experiment at issue as if it were performed in the single-photon (or rather photon-by-photon) version. Then all the coherent possibilities (terms in (1) or (2)) are the photon's realities though still in a relative sense with respect to the preparator. (We call them 'potential' with respect to our subjective choices of highlighting parts of it.) 'Actuality' comes to the fore when we consider a detection coincidence, e. g.,  $D_I^b$  and  $D_{II}^n$ . Then, taking photon by photon, and considering different values of  $n$ , the fringes of the corresponding interference pattern come about. But this is no more than a subjective highlighting of part of the reality of the experiment. The single photon in reality has both the which-way property and the coherence property. (And by this it has both which-way values and both coherence possibilities.)

This is analogous to the original EPR situation [13] with position and linear momentum disentanglement. But the present experiment has a big



advantage. The original EPR (thought) experiment could have this advantage only if it contained measurement of position and momentum in the same experiment.

The Kim et al. experiment is, in the opinion of the present author, the most accomplished realization of an EPR-type disentanglement. I believe that this experiment is so important from the foundational point of view that it should be performed both in the single-photon version, like e. g. the Mach-Zehnder interferometer experiments [14], [15] and in terms of positive-rest-mass particles.

Jaynes writes [16] (the last passage in the web version):

”... it is pretty clear why present quantum theory not only does not use - it does not even dare to mention - the notion of a ”real physical situation”. Defenders of the theory say that this notion is philosophically naive, a throwback to outmoded ways of thinking, and that recognition of this constitutes deep new wisdom about the nature of human knowledge. I say that it constitutes a violent irrationality, that somewhere in this theory the distinction between reality and our knowledge of reality has become lost, and the result has more the character of medieval necromancy than of science. It has been my hope that quantum optics, with its vast new technological capability, might be able to provide the experimental clue that will show how to resolve these contradictions.”

Isn't it possible that Jaynes' hope has, at least to some extent, come true

precisely on account of the work of Scully et al.? I find it hard to think of the Kim et al. experiment [2] in any other terms than as a "real physical situation". Its comprehension suggests the RRUES interpretation. Then why not think of reality, at least as far as experiments are concerned, in this way? Understanding experiments is the natural springboard for understanding nature.

## References

- [1] Scully, M. O., Drühl, K.: Quantum eraser: A proposed photon correlation experiment concerning observation and "delayed-choice" in quantum mechanics. *Phys. Rev. A* **25**, 2208-2213 (1982)
- [2] Kim Y.-H., Yu R., Kulik S. P., Shih Y., Scully M. O.: Delayed "choice" quantum eraser. *Phys. Rev. Lett.* **84**, 1-5 (2000)
- [3] Wheeler J. A.: The 'past' and the delayed-choice double-slit experiment. In: Marlow A. R. ed. *Mathematical Foundations of Quantum Theory*. Academic Press, New York (1978), pp. 9-48
- [4] Kwiat P. G., Steinberg A. M., Chiao R. Y.: Observation of a "Quantum Eraser": A Revival of Coherence in a Two-photon Interference Experiment. *Phys. Rev. A* **45**, 77297739 (1992)
- [5] Herbut F., Vujičić M.: First-quantisation quantum-mechanical insight into the Hong-Ou-Mandel two-photon interferometer with polarizers and its role as a quantum eraser. *Phys. Rev. A* **56**, 1-5 (1997)

- [6] Herbut F.: On EPR-type Entanglement in the Experiments of Scully et al. I The Micromaser Case and Delayed-Choice Quantum Erasure.
- [7] T. Young, *Trans. R. Soc. XCII* **12**, 387 (1802)  
A quantum-mechanical discussion in [17]
- [8] D'Espagnat B.: *Conceptual Foundations of Quantum Mechanics*. Second Edition. W. A. Benjamin, Inc., Reading, Massachusetts (1976). Subsection 7.2
- [9] Bub J.: *Interpreting the Quantum World*. Cambridge University Press, N. Y. (1997)
- [10] Herbut F.: Quantum probability law from 'environment-assisted invariance' in terms of pure-state twin unitaries. *J. Phys. A: Math. Theor.* **40**, 5949-5971 (2007)
- [11] Ghose P., Home D.: The two-prism experiment and wave-particle duality of light. *Found. Phys.* **26**, 943-953 (1996)
- [12] Herbut F.: Delayed-choice experiments and retroactive apparent occurrence in the quantum theory of measurement. *Found. Phys.* **24**, 117-137 (1994)
- [13] Einstein A., Podolsky B., Rosen N.: Can quantum-mechanical description of physical reality be considered complete? *Phys. Rev.* **47**, 777-780 (1935)
- [14] Grangier P., Roger G., Aspect A.: Experimental evidence for a photon anticorrelation effect on a beam splitter: A new light on single-photon interferences. *Europhys. Lett.* **1**, 173-179 (1986)

- [15] Jacques V., Wu E., Grosshans F., Treussart F., Grangier P., Aspect A., Roch J.-F.: Delayed-choice test of complementarity with single photons. *Archiv quant-ph/0801.0979*
  
- [16] Jaynes, E. T.: in *Foundation of Radiation Theory and Quantum Electronics*, Barut A. ed., Plenum, 1980; also item 38 of the Jaynes bibliography on the web
  
- [17] Herbut F.: Quantum interference viewed in the framework of probability theory. *Am. J. Phys.* **60**, 146-150 (1992)