

The Plausibility Arguments for Teleportation of Entangled Coherent States through Visual Pathways in the Human Brain

^{1,2,3}V. Salari* , ^{1,2}M. Rahnama[†] and ⁴J. A. Tuszynski[‡]

¹*Department of Physics, Shahid Bahonar University of Kerman, P. O. Box 76175, Kerman, Iran*

²*Afzal Research Institute, Kerman, Iran*

³*Neuroscience Research Center, Kerman, Iran*

⁴*Department of Physics, University of Alberta, Edmonton, T6G 2J1, Canada*

Abstract:

In this paper we propose a new model for visual consciousness based on the premise that there exists a quantum teleportation mechanism between the eye and the brain. Specific assumptions used to build the model involve both classical and quantum mechanical elements. Within our model, some open questions in the area of visual information processing in the brain will be answered.

1) Introduction

Schrödinger's book "What is life?" has had an enormous influence on the development of molecular biology [1]. The great physicist's insight has since then inspired many researchers to investigate the molecular basis of living organisms [2,3,4]. Several researchers have noticed the sweeping consequences that would follow from the discovery that living organisms might process information quantum mechanically, either at the bio-molecular level, or the cellular/neuronal level [5,6,7,8,9]. However, a vast majority of the computational models of the behavior of neuronal networks is still mainly based on the integrate-and-fire model of neural function. Mainstream cognitive neuroscience has thus far largely ignored the role of quantum physical effects in the neuronal processes underlying cognition and consciousness. Clearly, many unsolved problems still remain, suggesting the need to consider new, possibly more radical approaches. Recent contributions to the investigations of quantum effects in the human brain are due to Jibu and Yasue, Pribram, Lockwood, Mavromatos and Nanopoulous, Hameroff and Penrose, and Stapp [10]. These authors have proposed models in which the operation of consciousness is associated with some sort of explicit wave function collapse. There have been numerous suggestions that consciousness is a macroscopic quantum effect that may involve various physical phenomena associated with superconductivity, superfluidity, electromagnetic fields, Bose-Einstein condensation or some other physical mechanism. Perhaps the most specific model developed thus far is that of Penrose and Hameroff and it asserts that quantum information processing takes place at the level of neuronal microtubules (MTs). It has been argued that MTs can process information similarly to a cellular automaton, and hence Hameroff and Penrose suggest that neuronal MTs may operate as a quantum computer. There are still open issues related to the persistence of quantum effects under physiological conditions but until conclusive experimental evidence is found for or against such effects, theoretical discussions will continue unabated. Our intention in this paper is to consider the consequences of the Hameroff-Penrose assumption for the visual system.

In this paper, we investigate visual information transfer from a quantum information point of view. Theoretically we consider the conscious observer looking at a quantum system and propose that the state of this system is reported via superposed photons. We address the question of whether the observer can receive the exact same state of this system quantum mechanically in his/her brain or this quantum state collapses before reaching the brain. Below we investigate this problem in detail.

* vahidsalari@graduate.uk.ac.ir

† Majid.rahnama@mail.uk.ac.ir

‡ jtus@phys.ualberta.ca

2) Evolution of Information from the Eye to the Brain

We assume that a conscious observer directs his/her attention to a quantum system. For simplicity we consider this system to be a manifestation of the famous *Schrödinger's cat*. This system can exist in two states: Live $|L\rangle$, or Dead $|D\rangle$.

$$\psi_{sys} = \frac{1}{\sqrt{2}}(|L\rangle + |D\rangle) \quad (2-1)$$

The state of this system is then reported via superposed photons. As is documented in the literature in the biophysics of vision, 4% of these photons are reflected from the cornea. 50% of the remaining photons are dissipated through ocular media absorption. The rest of the photons enter the 200-250 μm thick retina. There, they interact with the photoreceptors in the layer composed of rods and cons following an 80% loss due to retinal transmission [11],[12]. In this case, we consider just a few remaining photons which are in a superposed quantum state. The key question here is whether this quantum state of photons can be reported to the brain.

When this state interacts with the last layer of retina, according to Thaheld, this superposed photon undergoes a wavefunction collapse. On the other hand, photons can be absorbed and then transformed into classical signals. Here, we use the symbols introduced by Tegmark [13] for the observer. The symbol $|\ddot{_}\rangle$ denotes the state for which the information on photons is not received by the brain and thus the observer is amphoteric. The symbol $|\ddot{\smile}\rangle$ stands for the state in which the information received in the brain reports that the cat is alive (and the observer is happy). Finally, the symbol $|\ddot{\frown}\rangle$ corresponds to the state in which the information received in the brain indicates that the cat is dead (and hence the observer is sad). It means that:

$$U|\ddot{_}D\rangle = |\ddot{\frown}D\rangle \quad (2-2-a)$$

$$U|\ddot{_}L\rangle = |\ddot{\smile}L\rangle \quad (2-2-b)$$

where $U = \exp\left[-\frac{i}{\hbar} \int H_{photon-brain} dt\right]$.

Now, we consider another state in which the brain interacts with itself. Penrose and Hameroff have proposed a model of consciousness involving quantum computation with objective reduction in *microtubules* within the brain's neurons (see Figure 1) [14],[15],[16],[17]. MTs are cylindrical polymers comprised of the protein tubulin which organize numerous cellular activities including neuronal motor transport. According to Hameroff and Penrose, switching of tubulin conformational states is governed by quantum mechanical forces within the interior of each tubulin dimer, and an essential feature of the Orch OR model is that tubulin dimers may exist in quantum superpositions of two stable conformations. Therefore, these states could function as quantum bits, or "qubits" by interacting non-locally (through their entanglement) with other tubulin qubits so that MTs may act as quantum computers. When sufficiently many entangled tubulins are superposed for long enough to reach Penrose's OR threshold given by $E=\hbar/T$, where E is the gravitational self-energy of the system, \hbar is Plank's constant and T is the decoherence time, an objective reduction (OR) "conscious event" occurs as stated in the Orch-OR model,




Figure 1 Representation of MTs in a brain neuron. The Orch OR model suggests that the main information processing is implemented in these structures.

If the previous evolution is described by Penrose's self-collapse in the brain (i.e. Orch-OR), MTs in the neurons of the brain collectively evolve and then collapse (i.e. conscious event) to one of the happy or sad states. It mathematically means that:

$$U|\dot{-}\rangle = \frac{1}{\sqrt{2}}(|\dot{-}\rangle + |\dot{-}\rangle) \quad (2-3)$$

where $U = \exp\left[-\frac{i}{\hbar} \int H_{brain} dt\right]$.

If we compare this state (2-3) and the state which has the information about the photon (2-2), we can say that there is a great amount of correlation between the retina and the visual cortex, because the results registered by them should be identical. We know that in accordance with the Einstein-Podolsky-Rosen (EPR) pair, when two entities originate from a common source they can be entangled with each other. Retina has a similar layered structure as the top layers of the gray matter in the cerebral cortex of the brain. In fact, retina is an extension of the central nervous system (the brain and spinal cord) that forms during embryonic development. One reason why scientists are interested in retinal processing is that retina is an accessible part of the brain that can be easily stimulated with light [18]. Thus, we can venture to state that retina and the visual cortex are entangled with each other.

The human body is made up of many organs, which themselves are made up of many millions of cells. How can such a system, with millions, or even billions, of parts function effectively and coherently? This is a no small feat as even small-size human societies often undergo periods of turbulence and trouble due to conflict and poor organization. Now, some scientists think that quantum coherence in MTs is a major factor responsible for our bodies, and especially our brains, being so efficient. Here, we intend to describe visual processing on the basis of quantum information theory.

3) Generation of Entangled Coherent States

Centrioles and cilia, which are complex microtubular structures, are involved in photoreceptor functions in single cell organisms and primitive visual systems. Cilia are also found in all retinal rod and cone cells. The dimensions of centrioles and cilia are comparable to the wavelengths of visible and infrared light (see Figure 2) [52]. Moreover, the cytoskeleton is found mostly among the retina and the visual cortex in the cells of the optic nerve. Cytoskeletal structures of the centrioles can be expected to vibrate like a harmonic oscillator in its ground state. Vibrational dynamics of MT's has been the subject of a recent paper where typical frequency ranges have been discussed [19].

When a photon interacts with a centriole, its electric field can displace the potential of the harmonic oscillator and then releases it, thus generating coherent states [20]. It means that:

$$D(\alpha)|0\rangle = |\alpha\rangle \quad (3-1)$$

where $D(\alpha)$ is the displacement operator; $D(\alpha) = e^{\alpha a^\dagger - \alpha^* a}$, and $|0\rangle$ is the ground state of harmonic oscillator, and $|\alpha\rangle$ is the coherent state: $|\alpha\rangle = e^{-\frac{|\alpha|^2}{2}} \sum_{n=0}^{\infty} \frac{\alpha^n}{\sqrt{n!}} |n\rangle$.

In the above formula, a^\dagger and a are the creation and annihilation operators, respectively, and α is the eigenvalue of the annihilation operator.

Hameroff [21] and Penrose [22] have suggested that MTs inside cells support long-range quantum coherence, enabling quantum information processing to take place at the sub-cellular level. They use this hypothesis to develop their theory of consciousness. Cells interconnected by gap junctions form networks which fire synchronously, behaving like one giant neuron [23], and possibly accounting for synchronized neural activity such as coherent 40 Hz waves [24]. Marshall [25] has suggested that coherent quantum states known as Bose-Einstein condensates occur among neuronal proteins [26], [27], [28]. Other issues, such as preconscious-to-conscious transitions were identified and discussed by Stapp [29] with the collapse of a quantum wave function in pre-synaptic axon terminals [7]. The other reason for coherence of these structures is that light is an electromagnetic wave and thus represents a vibrational degree of freedom. According to Froehlich's theory [46-48] it can excite within these cytoskeletal structures (i.e. nonlinear structures composed of electric dipoles) a single mode of frequency giving rise to long-range coherence.




Figure 2 Representation of one centriole, the dimensions of centrioles are comparable to the wavelengths of visible and infrared light.

Centrioles are two cylinders composed of nine MT triplets surrounding a central axoneme which are perpendicular to each other (which, according to Hameroff may be of significance in the molecular origin of cancer [30]). Due to their physical correlation, they may be viewed to be entangled with each other. Because of this entanglement, when a coherent state $|\alpha\rangle$ is generated in one centriole, in the other it will generate the state $|- \alpha\rangle$. Now, we can say that after the interaction of photons with centrioles, they generate “entangled coherent states” in these structures in the retina, i.e.:

$$|\varphi\rangle_{12} = (A|\alpha\rangle_1|\alpha\rangle_2 - B|-\alpha\rangle_1|-\alpha\rangle_2) \quad (3-2)$$

where $|\varphi\rangle_{12}$ is an entangled coherent state in centrioles with two modes 1 and 2. QED-cavity model of MTs [31] asserts that coherent modes of electromagnetic radiation can be sustained in the interior of the MTs. These modes are provided by the interaction of the electric dipole moments of the ordered-water molecules in the interior of MTs with quantized electromagnetic radiation [32],[33]. Jibu, et. al.[51], have proposed that the quantum dynamical system of water molecules and the quantized electromagnetic field confined inside the hollow MT core can manifest a specific collective dynamical effect called superradiance [34] by which the MT can transform any incoherent, thermal and disordered molecular, atomic or electromagnetic energy into coherent photons inside the MT. Furthermore, they have also shown [51] that such coherent photons created by superradiance penetrate perfectly along the internal hollow core of the MT as if the optical medium inside it were made “transparent” by the propagating photons themselves. This is referred to as the quantum phenomenon of self-induced transparency [35].

Superradiance and self-induced transparency in cytoskeletal MTs can lead to “optical” neuronal holography [36]. Thus Jibu, et. al.[51], suggest that MTs can behave as optical waveguides which result in coherent photons. They estimate that this quantum coherence is capable of superposition of states among MTs spatially distributed over hundreds of microns. These in turn are in superposition with other MTs hundreds of microns away in other directions, and so on. With the above conclusions $|\varphi\rangle_{12}$ can produce those photons which produced themselves, thus if the state $|\varphi\rangle_{12}$ can be restored in the brain, it will reproduce the photons which were absorbed in the retina.

Additional arguments in favor of the feasibility of production of photons in the brain can be found in the conclusions of the paper by Bokkon [37], which also asserts that there exists a neural activity-dependent ultra-weak photon (biophoton) emission in the brain. Thus there is the possibility to restore the initial state of the photon in the brain after absorption in the eye. This process can be implemented through the quantum teleportation mechanism between the retina and the visual cortex as will be discussed in the following sections.

Recent advances in femtosecond laser-based two dimensional spectroscopy and coherent control have made it possible to directly determine the relevant timescales of quantum coherence in biological systems and even manipulate such effects, respectively. The picture that is emerging is that there are primary events in biological processes that occur on timescales commensurate with quantum coherence effects [38]. In a recent paper, Sension [39] argued that plants and bacteria harvest light for photosynthesis so efficiently because of the coherent application of quantum principles.

4) *The Decoherence Problem*

The important question about the quantum information processing in the living systems is: how is it possible for MTs to process information quantum mechanically while the environment surrounding them is relatively hot, wet and noisy?

According to the Orch-OR model, microtubular structures in the neurons of the brain process information quantum mechanically and to avoid decoherence, like lasers, they maintain quantum coherence against thermal noise. Water within cells is itself not truly liquid, but has been shown to be, to a large extent, ordered [40]. Most of the ordered water in the cell in fact surrounds the cytoskeleton [41]. MTs and other cytoskeletal components are embedded in cytoplasm which exists in alternating phases of (1) “sol” (solution, liquid); and (2) “gel” (gelatinous, “solid”). Among the most primitive of biological activities, “sol-gel transformations” within neurons and other living cells are caused by assembly and disassembly of cytoskeletal actin (e.g. regulated by calcium ions through the protein calmodulin, in turn regulated by MTs). Sol-gel transformations are essential in basic cellular activities such as (“amoeboid”) movement, growth and synaptic formation and neurotransmitter vesicle release [42], [43]. Transitions can occur rapidly (e.g. 40 sol-gel cycles per second), and some actin gels can be quite solid, and withstand deformation without transmitted response [44]. Cyclical encasement of MTs by actin gels may thus be an ideal quantum isolation mechanism. In the gel phase of cytoplasm, the water ordering surfaces of a MT are within a few nanometers of actin surfaces which also order water. Thus bundles of MTs encased in actin gel may be effectively isolated extending over the radius of the bundle, on the order of hundreds of nanometers. There are many mechanisms which can protect these structures against decohering factors. In general, quantum states of tubulin/MTs may be protected from environmental decoherence by biological mechanisms which include phases of actin gelatin, plasma-like Debye layering, coherent pumping and topological quantum error correction [56]. Moreover, quantum spin transfer between quantum dots connected by benzene rings (the same structures found in aromatic hydrophobic amino acids) is more efficient at warm temperature than at absolute zero [45]. It is conjectured that the “flexibility” of the resonant benzene electrons is advantageous to quantum processes by harnessing ambient thermal energy.

MTs may possibly utilize nonspecific thermal energy for "laser-like" coherent pumping, for example in the GHz range by a mechanism of "pumped phonons" suggested by Froehlich [46,47,48].

5) *What is the mechanism of Teleportation?*

According to the definition of teleportation as stated in [49], in the process of quantum teleportation, one can construct an exact replica of the original unknown quantum state at a cost of destroying the original state. Therefore, to call a quantum state transfer operation- quantum teleportation, the process should not only generate output states with better qualities than what can be done classically but also obey the no-cloning theorem [50]. The quantum state of a system can be transmitted from a given location to a distant one by using only classical information, provided that an entangled quantum channel (an EPR pair) exists between the sender and the receiver. Sharing entangled states between the two parties opens the necessary quantum channel. Research in quantum state transfer, especially the quantum teleportation, has emerged as one of the major research areas of theoretical and experimental quantum mechanics. Assume that Alice wants to send Bob an unknown quantum state, but, when she receives this state, she does not know anything about that, unless she affects it and collapses it to a classical state, or in other words she destroys that quantum state. She just can send classical signals to Bob through a classical channel, but if there is a shared entangled channel between Alice and Bob, Bob can construct an initial quantum state with the help of a classical signal which is sent by Alice and a quantum channel between them. This operation is implemented by operating special unitary operators. For more details see [49]. Here, we would like to simulate visual information transfer with the help of a quantum teleportation mechanism. We know that when a photon penetrates the retina, it changes to an action potential or electrical signal and these classical signals are sent to the brain for interpretation. It means that *retina* (Alice) wants to send the *brain* (Bob) a *photon state* (unknown quantum state which she has received), but *retina* (Alice) absorbs it (collapses the quantum state) and changes it to an *action potential* (classical state) and sends it through *membranes of axons of the brain neurons* (classical channel). *Brain* (Bob) can reconstruct the initial *state of the photon* (unknown quantum state) to process it resulting in the emergence of consciousness.

In summary, our argument for the quantum teleportation mechanism which uses all the major arguments offered in this connection before is as follows:

- 1- *According to Orch OR* [14], [15]: There is quantum processing in the neurons of the brain (there is a quantum channel between retina and the brain)
- 2- *According to Tegmark* [13]: Displacement of ions through membranes of brain neurons is a classical phenomenon (action potentials are classical signals and membranes of neurons are classical channels).
- 3- *According to Thaheld* [11],[12]: Superposed photons do collapse in the retina (the quantum state is collapsed by the sender [Alice]).

Note that the above three steps are all correct, but not independently and only as parts of the quantum teleportation process which we suggest in this paper. (See Table 1)

Table 1 Simulation of visual information from the eye to the brain via quantum Teleportation mechanism.

<i>"Human Brain"</i>	<i>Quantum Teleportation Mechanism</i>
Retina	Alice
Membrane of axons in the neurons	Classical channel
Cytoskeletal structures	Entangled channel (quantum channel)
Visual cortex	Bob
Action potentials	Classical signals

Now we would like to investigate in more detail this teleportation mechanism via entangled coherent states through visual pathways. We will show how photon states can be constructed in the visual cortex.

6) *Teleportation of Entangled Coherent States through Visual Pathways*

Super radiance and self induced transparency [51] in addition to Froehlich's dipolar oscillations can cause the coupling of MT dynamics over long distances and create a superposition coherent state. While in a superposition state, tubulin dimers may mutually communicate in the same manner, and in MTs in neighboring neurons, and through macroscopic regions of the brain via tunneling through gap junctions and possibly tunneling nanotubes [52]. As mentioned above, retina and the visual cortex are entangled with each other. Thus there is a quantum channel between retina and the visual cortex which is composed of microtubular structures. MTs interact with membrane structures mechanically by linking proteins, chemically by ions and second messenger signals, and electrically by voltage fields. Transduction of light into electrical signals takes place in the photoreceptors. Except for the ganglion cells, none of the retinal cells display action potentials [53].




Figure 3 The LGN is a laminated structure, having 6 layers. Contralateral fibers and ipsilateral fibers couple in the LGN. The ipsilateral fibers of the optic nerve terminate in laminae 2,3 and 5 of LGN, while the contralateral fibers terminate in laminae 1, 4 and 6.[54]

Axons leaving the temporal half of the retina traverse the optic nerve to the optic chiasm, where they join the optic tract and project to ipsilateral structures. Axons leaving the nasal half of the retina cross the midline at the chiasm and terminate in contralateral structures. This arrangement means that all the axons in the optic tract carry information about the contralateral visual field. Axons of the optic tract terminate in three areas of the central nervous system, the lateral geniculate nucleus (i.e. LGN), the superior colliculus and the pretectal area. The trajectory through the LGN is the largest most direct and clinically most important pathway by which visual information reaches the cerebral cortex. About 80% of the optic tract axons synapse in the LGN. The LGN is a laminated structure, having 6 layers. Contralateral fibers and ipsilateral fibers couple in the LGN. The ipsilateral fibers of the optic nerve terminate in laminae 2,3 and 5 of LGN, while the contralateral fibers terminate in laminae 1, 4 and 6 of LGN (see Figure 3). There are about 10^6 neurons in each LGN, all of which project to the ipsilateral occipital cortex (area 17) as the optic radiations. The portion of the cerebral cortex that receives LGN axons is called the striate cortex and is usually labeled V1 to designate it as the primary visual cortical area (see Figure 3). Virtually all information in the visual system is recognized as being processed by V1 first, and then passed on to higher order systems [55]. The upper visual cortex receives signals from the lower visual field and similarly, lower visual cortex process information from the upper visual field. The right visual cortex processes the left field of view and vice versa (see Figure 4).

Now, we investigate the information transfer through visual pathways. One of the most important quantum models of the information processing in the human brain is the Orch-OR model which is based on the structure of the cytoskeleton. As stated earlier, this model asserts that the main information processing in the neurons of the brain is performed in the MTs and the nature of the processing is mainly quantum mechanical. The processing unit in this model is *tubulin* which can be in a superposed state. Tubulins act like qubits in quantum computers. *Tegmark* has vigorously argued against quantum processing in the human brain having calculated decoherence times for every superposition state which can be possible in the neurons of the brain [13]. In his opinion, superposition states include ions such as Na^+ which are “in” and “out” of the membrane of an axon. On the other hand, Na^+ ions are in the superposition of “in” and “out” with a separation distance comparable to the membrane thickness. He has considered three factors which can destroy this superposition state in neurons. *Collisions with the neighboring ions*, *collisions with the water molecules* and *interactions with distant ions* are the factors which Tegmark investigated for decoherence. He estimated the corresponding decoherence times to be in the range between 10^{-19} s and 10^{-20} s. It is clear that these decoherence times are very small for the brain processes such as seeing, thinking, speaking and the other cognitive processes. Typically, dynamical timescales for neuron firing and cognitive processes are in the range of 10^{-4} to 1 second, whereas decoherence timescales are many orders of magnitude shorter. Thus, action potentials should be regarded as classical signals and the displacement of ions through the membrane of axons should be investigated classically. It is worth noting that Tegmark has also calculated decoherence times for MTs, but these calculations were made under wrong assumptions about these structures (for more details see [56]) and hence, while we can accept his calculations about action potentials, the calculations for MTs are not relevant to the problem discussed here. Thaheld [11], [12] believes that the wave function of any superposed photon state or states is always objectively changed within the complex architecture of the eye, and any incident photons have to run a very daunting gauntlet before they are even converted or transduced to retinal ganglion cell spike trains (to learn more about Thaheld arguments, the reader is referred to refs. [57,58,59]). According to Thaheld, the quantum state of photons does collapse in the retina and it does not reach the brain. Is Thaheld right? Is not there any mechanism to rebuild the quantum state of photons in the brain? Here, we accept that the states of photons collapse in the retina but we believe that they can be restored in the visual cortex via the teleportation mechanism described above.

Now, the question is how can it be possible to restore the exact state of photons in the brain while their state is collapsed in the retina. The other question which one may ask is: if this state is reported through action potentials how is this information reported to the brain and how can it interpret action potentials to obtain the exact state of the photons? Our solution to the above problems involves the teleportation of entangled coherent states through visual pathways. The state of the photon is teleported from the eye to the brain. On the other hand, the state of the photon is transferred via some “cut-and-paste” mechanism from the eye to the brain. But how is it possible?




Figure 4 Visual pathways from the eye to the brain. See crossing of pathways.

We concluded before that retina and the visual cortex are entangled. Also we explained how the entangled coherent state is generated in the retina. Now, we wish to formulate the process of information transfer from the retina to V1. The state (3-2) with two modes 1 and 2 should be teleported to V1. After the interaction of light with retina, modes 3, 4 and 5, 6 are generated through microtubular structures between retina and V1, and thus they can produce entangled coherent channels between retina and V1. It means that the channels are:

$$|\psi\rangle_{35} = \frac{1}{\sqrt{N_\alpha}}(|\alpha\rangle_3|\alpha\rangle_5 - |-\alpha\rangle_3|-\alpha\rangle_5) \quad (6-1)$$

$$|\phi\rangle_{46} = \frac{1}{\sqrt{N_\alpha}}(|\alpha\rangle_4|\alpha\rangle_6 - |-\alpha\rangle_4|-\alpha\rangle_6) \quad (6-2)$$

where N_α denotes the normalization factor in each channel. Each mode is reported via a special fiber through visual pathways. All of the neurons which are collected in the LGN are divided into two major pathways: ipsilateral fibers and contralateral fibers. Information transfer in the contralateral fibers takes longer than information transfer in ipsilateral fibers because contralateral fibers have crossing relative to ipsilateral fibers and then they have longer lengths than ipsilateral fibers. On the other hand, contralateral fibers have a retarded phase relative to ipsilateral fibers. Now we will attempt to answer the following questions. What is this phase difference? What is the role of this crossing? And how does crossing restore the initial state in the retina?

7) *The Role of the Phase Shift to Restore Information in LGN*

When the information is collapsed in the retina, action potentials are produced. The shape of action potentials is the same for each neuron, but the main problem is which neurons are fired, or in other words which neurons carry action potentials and information. Consider two fibers selected from ipsilateral fibers and two fibers selected from contralateral fibers. The two ipsilateral fibers are called 1 and 2, and the two contralateral fibers are called 3 and 4 while the two fibers from the LGN to V1 are called 5 and 6 which are selected from the group of magnocellular and parvocellular fibers. Now, we start from the retina. The state of centrioles and channels is:

$$\begin{aligned} |\psi'\rangle &= |\varphi\rangle_{12} \otimes |\psi\rangle_{35} \otimes |\phi\rangle_{46} \\ &= \frac{1}{N_\alpha} (A|\alpha\rangle_1|\alpha\rangle_2|\alpha\rangle_3|\alpha\rangle_4|\alpha\rangle_5|\alpha\rangle_6 \\ &\quad - A|\alpha\rangle_1|\alpha\rangle_2|\alpha\rangle_3|-\alpha\rangle_4|\alpha\rangle_5|-\alpha\rangle_6 \\ &\quad - A|\alpha\rangle_1|\alpha\rangle_2|-\alpha\rangle_3|\alpha\rangle_4|-\alpha\rangle_5|\alpha\rangle_6 \\ &\quad + A|\alpha\rangle_1|\alpha\rangle_2|-\alpha\rangle_3|-\alpha\rangle_4|-\alpha\rangle_5|-\alpha\rangle_6 \\ &\quad - B|-\alpha\rangle_1|-\alpha\rangle_2|\alpha\rangle_3|\alpha\rangle_4|\alpha\rangle_5|\alpha\rangle_6 \\ &\quad + B|-\alpha\rangle_1|-\alpha\rangle_2|\alpha\rangle_3|-\alpha\rangle_4|\alpha\rangle_5|-\alpha\rangle_6 \\ &\quad + B|-\alpha\rangle_1|-\alpha\rangle_2|-\alpha\rangle_3|\alpha\rangle_4|-\alpha\rangle_5|\alpha\rangle_6 \\ &\quad - B|-\alpha\rangle_1|-\alpha\rangle_2|-\alpha\rangle_3|-\alpha\rangle_4|-\alpha\rangle_5|-\alpha\rangle_6) \end{aligned} \quad (7-1)$$

All of the above states are collected in the LGN. But here the role of action potentials is very important. They determine which fibers are fired. If fibers 1 and 2 carry action potentials, then it shows that information passes through ipsilateral fibers. Thus to select information from the LGN to send it via fibers 5 and 6 to V1 there is no need for phase difference (or to apply the phase shift operator on the states) and thus the state of (3-2) can be transferred like its first state through fibers 5 and 6. In the formulation (7-1) we see that if fibers x and y are fired, the expression with $|\alpha\rangle_x|\alpha\rangle_y$ should be selected from the terms with coefficients $+A$ besides the expression $|\alpha\rangle_x|-\alpha\rangle_y$ from the terms with coefficients $-B$. Hence,

$$1, 2 \text{ firing} \xrightarrow{\text{yields}} |\phi'\rangle_{56} = A|\alpha\rangle_5|\alpha\rangle_6 - B|-\alpha\rangle_5|-\alpha\rangle_6 \quad (7-2)$$

In another state, if fibers 1 and 4 are fired, it means that one fiber is selected from ipsilateral fibers and the other is from contralateral fibers, thus they have a phase difference with respect to each other. Hence,

$$1, 4 \text{ firing} \xrightarrow{\text{yields}} |\phi'\rangle_{56} = A|\alpha\rangle_5|-\alpha\rangle_6 - B|-\alpha\rangle_5|\alpha\rangle_6 \quad (7-3)$$

To restore initial information, the operator

$$R(\varphi) = e^{-i\pi a^\dagger_6 a_6}$$

should operate on the state in LGN in which fibers 1 and 4 have conveyed action potentials. This operator changes the ket $|\alpha\rangle_6$ to $|-\alpha\rangle_6$ and vice versa. It means that fiber 4 has a π radian phase difference with respect to fiber 1, and this phase difference can restore the exact state of the photon. If fibers 2 and 3 are fired, this yields:

$$2, 3 \text{ firing} \xrightarrow{\text{yields}} |\phi'\rangle_{56} = A|-\alpha\rangle_5|\alpha\rangle_6 - B|\alpha\rangle_5|-\alpha\rangle_6 \quad (7-4)$$

In this case the operator

$$R(\varphi) = e^{-i\pi a^\dagger_5 a_5}$$

should be involved. For the case of 3 and 4 firing, this yields,

$$3, 4 \text{ firing} \xrightarrow{\text{yields}} |\phi'\rangle_{56} = A|-\alpha\rangle_5|-\alpha\rangle_6 - B|\alpha\rangle_5|\alpha\rangle_6 \quad (7-5)$$

in which case the operator

$$R(\varphi) = e^{-i\pi(a^\dagger_5 a_5 + a^\dagger_6 a_6)}$$

should be involved. In this case we see that the main path is that of ipsilateral fibers which are directly connected to each eye and fibers 3 and 4 both have a π radian phase difference with respect to it. We also know that there are two LGNs and the left and right V1. Now, another question emerges. How do these two left and right parts in V1 can instantaneously receive information? To answer this question, we propose that the synaptic β -neurexin/neuroigin-1 adhesive protein complex can play the role of a device mediating entanglement between the cytoskeletons of the cortical neurons. Thus the macroscopic coherent quantum state can extend through large brain cortical areas [60].

We see that crossing or rotation of neurons in the visual pathways has an important role in restoring information in the brain. It is conceivable that rotations or crossings of neurons throughout the body are there for this very reason.

8) Discussion

In general, we can briefly summarize our approach by listing the following properties:

- 1- We have combined the main assumptions of the Orch-OR model with Tegmark's approach and the Thaheld conclusion in a compact physical model which we call "The Teleportation Model".
- 2- Our model investigates visual pathways from atomic to macroscopic scales. This approach includes classical descriptions as well as new answers to open questions.
- 3- The proposed model explains why the shape of action potentials stays the same. Classical models state that "sensations" are action potentials that reach the brain via sensory neurons, and "perception" is the awareness and interpretation of the sensation. It is reasonable to assume that the constant shape of action potentials cannot result in different profiles of information. Thus the shape of information should be due to neurons. In this approach MTs are the representatives of information carriers. In our approach action potentials just determine which neurons fire and which do not.
- 4- The teleportation hypothesis explains why neurons cross at some point. This crossing causes a phase shift relative to a special pathway. In teleportation of entangled coherent states the phase shift operators can rebuild initial information.
- 5- Our model can describe how different information can be simultaneously perceived as a binding nature of conscious experience. This can be done via quantum parallel processing.
- 6- It explains how the brain of the observer can receive quantum information from the environment.

We can see that there still exists the possibility that the mind can play the main role in the measurement problem, and this is in accord with what von Neumann, London, Bauer, and Wigner (initially) asserted.

9) Conclusions

In this paper we have theoretically demonstrated the plausibility of a quantum teleportation mechanism between the eye and the brain which can describe different aspects of the visual processing through visual pathways. Our model is brought to bear on both quantum and classical aspects of neuroscience.

Acknowledgement

V. Salari and M. Rahnama thank Dr. Vahid Sheybani, the head of Neuroscience Research Center, for helpful and informative discussions.

References:

-
- [1] Schrödinger. E, What is life? Cambridge University Press, London, 1944.
 - [2] Davies. P, *Does quantum mechanics play a non-trivial role in life?*, Biosystems, 78, 69, 2004.
 - [3] Matsuno. K, *Quantum and biological computation*, Biosystems, 35, 209-212, 1995.
 - [4] Penrose. R, *Shadows of the mind*, Oxford University Press, 1994.
 - [5] Matsuno. K and Paton. R. C, *Is there biology of quantum information?*, Biosystems, 55, 39-46 2000.
 - [6] Vedral. V, *Entanglement hits the big time*, Nature, 425, 28-9, 2003.
 - [7] Beck. F and Eccles. J.C, *Quantum aspects of brain activity and the role of consciousness*, Proc. Nat. Acad. Sci. USA, 89, 11357-11362, 1992.
 - [8] Penrose. R, The Emperor's New Mind (Oxford University Press, Oxford, 1989); S.R., *Quantum coherence in MTs: a neural basis for emergent consciousness?*, Journal of Consciousness Studies, 1, 98-118, 1994.
 - [9] Davies. P.C.W.s, *The Origin of Life* (Penguin, London, 2003); The Fifth Miracle (Simon & Schuster, New York, 1998)
 - [10] Tarlaci. S., NeuroQuantology 2003; 3: 292-294

-
- [11] Thaheld. F. 2005 *Preprint* quant-ph/0509042
- [12] Thaheld. F. 2006 *Preprint* quant-ph/060418
- [13] Tegmark. M., Phys. Rev. E61, 4194-4206 (2000). It's preprint exists in [arXiv:quant-ph/9907009 v2].
- [14] Penrose. R. and Hameroff. S.R., J. Conscious. Stud. **2**, 98(1995).
- [15] Hameroff. S.R. and Penrose. R., J. Conscious. Stud. **3**, 36(1996).
- [16] Hameroff. S.R., Philos. Trans. R. Soc. London Ser. A **356**, 1869(1998).
- [17] Hameroff. S.R., *NeuroQuantology*, March 2007, Vol 5, Issue 1, Page 1-8
- [18] Dowling. J. E., *The Retina: An Approachable Part of the Brain*. Belknap Press of Harvard University Press, Cambridge. (1987).
- [19] Portet. S., Tuszynski. J. A., Hogue. C. M. and Dixon. J. M., *Elastic vibrations in seamless microtubules*, European Biophysics Journal, 34, Number7, October 2005, 912-920.
- [20] Gerry, C., Knight, P. “*Introductory Quantum Optics*”, Cambridge University Press,(2005).
- [21] Hameroff, S.R., 1994. *Quantum coherence in MTs: a neural basis for emergent consciousness?* J. Conscious. Stud. 1, 98–118.
- [22] Penrose, R., 1989. *The Emperor's New Mind*. Oxford University Press, Oxford.
- [23] Kandel, E. R., Siegelbaum, S. A. & Schwartz, J. H. 1991 *Synaptic transmission*. In Principles of neural science (ed. E. R. Kandel, J. H. Schwartz & T. M. Jessell), 3rd edn, pp. 121-134. New York: Elsevier. Karplus, M. & McCammon
- [24] Jibu, M. *On a heuristic model of the coherent mechanism of the global reaction process of a group of cells. Bussei Kenkyuu (Mater. Phys. Res.)* **53**, 431-436. (In Japanese.) (1990)
- [25] Marshall, I. N. *Consciousness and Bose-Einstein condensates*. New Ideas Psychol. **7**, 73, 83. (1989)
- [26] Penrose, R. *Newton, quantum theory and reality*. In 300 years of gravity (ed. S. W. Hawking & W. Israel). Cambridge University Press. (1987).
- [27] Bohm, D. & Hiley, B. J. 1993 *The undivided universe*. New York: Routledge.
- [28] Jibu, M. & Yasue, K. 1995 *Quantum brain dynamics: an introduction*. Amsterdam: John Benjamins.
- [29] Stapp, H. P. 1993 *Mind, matter and quantum mechanics*. Berlin: Springer.
- [30] Hameroff. S. R., *BioSystems* **77** 119-136 . (2004).
- [31] Mavromatos, N. E., Mershin, A. and Nanopoulos, D. V. (2002), “*QED-Cavity model of MTs implies dissipationless energy transfer and biological quantum teleportation*,” <http://arxiv.org/abs/quant-ph/0204021>
- [32] Del Giudice. E., Doglia. S., Milani. M. and Vitiello. G., Nucl. Phys. B275 (FS 17) (1986), 185.
- [33] Del Giudice. E., Preparata. G. and Vitiello. G., Phys. Rev. Lett. 61 (1988), 1085.
- [34] Dicke. R. H., Phys. Rev. 93 (1954) 99.
- [35] McCall. S. L. and Hahn. E. L., Phys. Rev. Lett. 18 (1967) 908
- [36] Hameroff. S. R., *Ultimate Computing: Biomolecular Consciousness and Nanotechnology* (North-Holland, Amsterdam, 1987), and *Journal of Consciousness Studies*, 1 (1994) 91.
- [37] Bokkon. I., *Phosphene phenomenon: A new concept*, *BioSystems* 92(2008) 168-174.
- [38] Nagy A., Prokhorenko V. and Miller R. J. D., “*Do we live in a quantum world? Advances in multidimensional coherent spectroscopies refine our understanding of quantum coherences and structural dynamics of biological systems*”, *Current Opinion in Structural Biology*, 16:654–663 (2006).
- [39] Sensen R. J., *Biophysics: “Quantum path to photosynthesis”*, *Nature* 446, 740-741 (2007).

-
- [40] Clegg, J. S. Amer. J. Physiol. **246**, R133 (1984).
- [41] Clegg, J. Coll. Phenomena **3**, 289 (1981).
- [42] Miyamoto, S. "Changes in mobility of synaptic vesicles with assembly and disassembly of actin network." *Biochim. Biophys. Acta* **1244**, 85-91. (1995).
- [43] Muallem, S., Kwiatkowska, K., Xu, X. & Yin, H. L. *Actin filament disassembly is a sufficient final trigger for exocytosis in nonexcitable cells. J. Cell Biol.* **128**, 589-598. (1995).
- [44] Wachsstock, D. H., Schwarz, W. H. & Pollard, T. D. *Cross-linker dynamics determine the mechanical properties of actin gels. Biophys. J.* **66**, 801-809. (1994).
- [45] Ouyang, M., Awschalom, D. D., "coherent spin transfer between molecularly bridged quantum dots". *Science*, 301, 1074-1078, (2003).
- [46] Fröhlich, H., *Int. J. Quantum Chem.* **2**, 641 (1968).
- [47] Fröhlich, H., *Nature (London)* **228**, 1093 (1970).
- [48] Fröhlich, H., *Proc. Natl. Acad. Sci. U.S.A.* **72**, 4211 (1975).
- [49] Bennett, C. H., Brassard, G., Crépeau, C., Jozsa, R., Pešes, A., and Wootters, W. K., *Phys. Rev. Lett.* **70**, 1895 (1993).
- [50] Wootters, W. K. and Zurek, W. H., *Nature (London)* **299**, 802 (1982); Dieks, D., *Phys. Lett. A* **92**, 271 (1982).
- [51] Jibu, M., Hagan, S., Hameroff, S.R., Pribram, K.H., Yasue, K. (1994). "*Quantum optical coherence in cytoskeletal MTs: implications for brain function*", *Biosystems* 32, 95-209.
- [52] Hameroff, S., Tuszynski, J., "*Quantum states in proteins and protein assemblies: The essence of life?*", Proceedings of SPIE Conference on Fluctuation and Noise, Canary Islands, June 2004
- [53] D. D. Georgiev, arXiv: quant-ph/ 0208053
- [54] Web address: http://thebrain.mcgill.ca/.../i_09_cl_dev.html
- [55] Zeki, S. "The visual image in mind and brain", *Scientific American*, 267:42-50 (1993).
- [56] Hagan, S., Hameroff, S. R., and Tuszynski, J. A., *Quantum computation in brain MTs: Decoherence and biological feasibility*. *Physical Review E*, Volume **65**, 061901. (2002).
- [57] Thaheld, F. H., *A method to explore the possibility of nonlocal correlations between brain electrical activities of two spatially separated animal subjects*. *BioSystems* **73**, 205-216.(2004).
- [58] Thaheld, F. H., *Can we determine if the linear nature of quantum mechanics is violated by the perceptual process?* *BioSystems* **71**, 305-309.(2003).
- [59] Thaheld, F. H., *Comment on Quantum superpositions and definite perceptions: envisaging new feasible experimental tests*. *Phys. Lett. A* **273**,232-234.(2000).
- [60] Georgiev, D. D., Glazebrook, J. F., *Informatica* **30**, 221–232 (2006).