

Shortcomings in the Understanding of Why Cosmological Perturbations Look Classical

Daniel Sudarsky

*Instituto de Ciencias Nucleares
Universidad Nacional Autónoma de México
A. Postal 70-543, México D.F. 04510, México*

Abstract

There is a persistent state of confusion regarding the account of the quantum origin of the seeds of cosmological structure during inflation. The issue is the transition from the quantum uncertainties in the homogeneous and isotropic initial state, into the late time “classical” anisotropies and inhomogeneities. There seems to be a widespread belief that decoherence addresses the issue in a satisfactory way. This view is taken, often implicitly, by most researchers working in the field. This can be seen most clearly in those accounts intent on facing the issue directly. For instance, a recent article [1] argues just that, and presents a detailed explanation of the justifications. The explicit nature of that account will allow us to discuss the issue in detail. There are, of course, various other works that often indirectly address the issue with similar approaches [2]. This type of arguments, do not only implicitly assume that decoherence offers a satisfactory solution to the measurement problem in quantum mechanics, but also that, in particular, such approach is applicable to these quantum aspects of cosmology. We will review here, why do we, together with various other researchers in the field, consider that this is not the case in general. Moreover as has been previously discussed [8, 9], we will argue that the cosmological situation is one where the measurement problem of quantum mechanics appears in a particular exacerbated form, and that, it is this, even sharper conundrum, the one that should be addressed when dealing with the inflationary account of the origin of the seeds of cosmic structure in the early universe. We briefly discuss the ideas behind what we feel might be a promising approach.

I. INTRODUCTION

The coming of age of cosmological scientific inquiry with the recent outpouring of high precision empirical data, has been accompanied with the establishment of the inflationary paradigm as part of the standard model of cosmology. In fact, one of the major successes of inflationary cosmology is considered to be its ability to “account for ” the spectrum of the temperature anisotropies in the cosmic microwave background, which is understood as the earliest observational data about the primordial density fluctuations that seed the growth of structure in our Universe.

The impact of the data obtained by the various missions: COBE, Boomerang, WMAP, and, hopefully in the near future, Planck, on our understanding of the universe, reaches up to the very sources of the processes that made us possible: Galaxies, Stars, Planets, life and human beings with all their scientific advances should be regarded as results of the evolution of those early inhomogeneities we are now studying.

However, when considering this account in more detail, one immediately notes that there is something exceedingly strange about it, namely, that out of an initial situation, which is taken to be perfectly homogeneous and isotropic (H.&I.), and based on a dynamics that supposedly preserves those symmetries, one ends with a non-homogeneous and non isotropic situation. Most of our colleagues, who have been working in this field for a long time, would reassure us, that there is no problem at all by invoking a variety of arguments. It is noteworthy that these arguments would tend to differ, in general, from one inflationary cosmologist to another [2]. Other cosmologists do acknowledge that there seems to be something unclear at this point ([3] for instance, indicates that one must work with *certain classical objects mimicking the quantum fluctuations*, and that this is not easy to do and to justify). Actually, some recent books on the subject acknowledge that there is a problem. For instance, in [4], we find “... *the field configurations must become locked into one of an ensemble of classical configurations with ensemble averages given by quantum expectation values... It is not apparent just how this happens...*”, while [5] clearly acknowledges that the problem is not resolved simply by invoking decoherence: “ .. *However decoherence is not enough to explain the breakdown of translational invariance..*”. Nevertheless most of the cosmology community continues to hold the belief that the issues have been successfully resolved within that approach.

In a recent series of papers [8, 9], a critical analysis of such proposals has been carried out indicating that all the existing justifications fail to be fully satisfactory.

The aim of this manuscript is to present, in general terms, the problems surrounding the accounts of the quantum origin of cosmic structure, placing the issue within the general conceptual framework concerning the interpretation of quantum theory in general, and, to illustrate the various traps, sources of confusion and inconsistencies one might encounter in this enterprise. We will focus on the approach most widely accepted in the community working in the field, and explore the shortcomings through the discussion of a specific example. Recognizing the extent of these shortcomings, is the first step in the uncovering of what might be a thread that connects the problem posed by the quantum origin of the cosmological structure with other conceptual and technical problems, facing our current theoretical framework, such as the general measurement problem in quantum theory, or the problem of time, which arises in many proposals for putting together quantum theory and gravitation. The article is organized as follows: In Section II we review the general setting, concentrating on the relation between the classical and quantum descriptions of a

problem, and the difficulties in the transition between those two in the cosmological context in particular. Section III, will treat the applicability of quantum theory to cosmology, within the framework provided by the general views one can take about quantum mechanics. Section IV, will focus on the decoherence approach and refute the widespread notion that it, by itself, fully addresses the problem at hand. In Section V, we will argue that the measurement problem becomes even more vexing in the cosmological context. Finally, in Section VI, we identify the specific manner in which problems appear in specific accounts by focussing on a particular work [1] which we consider as characterizing the predominant view regarding the issue, and show the extensive set of problems that are overlooked when taking such posture. Section VII will briefly discuss other approaches that have been considered for dealing with the problem. Section VIII presents an overview of an approach, implemented explicitly in [8–10], that we have been advocating and that seems capable of successfully addressing the issue, at the price of adding new physics, in the form of a dynamical collapse of the wave function, inspired by Penrose’s ideas. There the issue of how could such dynamical reduction be incorporated in the general current paradigm of physics is addressed in a rather schematic way, hoping that it may serve as the basis for the development of a more rigorous treatment. We end with a brief conclusion.

II. THE PROBLEM

For most of its existence, cosmology has been discussed in a classical language, as it is in fact done in many other disciplines closely tied to physics, such as hydrodynamics, bridge building, and the study of trajectories of space probes, while everybody knows that our world is quantum mechanical¹. The justification is, of course, that we believe that the classical description is nothing but an approximation to the quantum description, and so, when we consider, say, the classical description of the trajectory of a satellite in space, we view it as indicating that the wave function of its constituting atoms (or even that of its more elementary constituents) is a sharply peaked wave packet where the uncertainties in the position and velocities are negligible compared with the precision of the description we are making. The classical description does not enter into a fundamental contradiction with the characteristics of our satellite trajectory. It would be very unsettling if we were forced to consider the classical elliptical trajectory around Earth while at the same time we were forced to admit that, at the more fundamental level, the satellite was described by a spherically symmetric wave function. We know this is not the case, because it is clear that the precise quantum description of the situation would call for a suitable superposition of energy and momentum eigenfunctions leading to a wave packet corresponding to a sharply localized object. Needless is to say that the precise way to accomplish this is filled with issues that, at this time, are technically insurmountable, but this is not the point here, the principle is clear. Moreover, we should recognize that in the case of the satellite, one is dealing with an open system, and its interaction with the clearly identifiable environment is likely to play an important role in making compatible the quantum and classical descriptions.

In the cosmological setting, however, when we want to connect our classical descriptions of the cosmological late times with a quantum description of early cosmological times, we cannot escape from the corresponding requirements. We know that our universe is quantum

¹ Throughout this manuscript, we will take the conservative view that Quantum Theory has universal validity, unless something else is stated specifically within certain specific discussions of alternative views.

mechanical and, thus, the classical descriptions must be regarded as nothing but short-hand and imprecise characterizations of complicated quantum mechanical states involving peaked wave packets and complex correlations. The universe that we inhabit today is certainly very well described at the classical level by an in-homogeneous and anisotropic classical state, and such description must, in accordance with the previous paragraph, be nothing but a concise and imperfect description of an equally in-homogeneous and anisotropic quantum state, where the wave functions are peaked at those values of the variables corresponding to those indicated by the classical description (or values very close to those). This would, in principle, involve no essential differences from the case of the classical and quantum description of our satellite, except for the lack of a clearly identifiable environment, if we take the universe to include, by definition, all the degrees of freedom of our theory. But there is nothing that indicates that, even without the identification of an environment, we should not be able to make, in principle, such quantum semi-classical description through the use of the sharply peaked wave functions and taking into account all the interactions in the analysis of its dynamics. The situation changes dramatically, however, if we want to seriously consider a theory, in which the early quantum state of the universe was particularly simple in a very special and precise way. This is the case in the inflationary paradigm, and in particular, as it refers to the predictions about the spectrum of perturbations that we believe constitute the seeds of cosmic structure.

Inflation was initially devised as a mechanism to deal with the, so called, naturalness problems of standard Big Bang Cosmology: Namely, the Horizon problem, The Flatness problem and the Primordial relics problem [22]. The essential idea is that if the Universe undergoes an early era of accelerated (almost exponential) expansion (lasting at least some 80 e-folds or so), it would come out of this period as an essentially flat and homogeneous space-time with an extreme dilution of all relics and, indeed, of all particle species. The states of all fields would, thus, be extremely well described by suitable vacua. The deviations from this state will be exponentially small. What is needed is something that behaves early on as a cosmological constant but that is later “turned off” as a result of its own dynamics, returning the universe to the standard Big Bang cosmological evolutionary path. This is generically thought to be the result of a scalar field with a potential of certain specific characteristics called the “inflaton field”. The remarkable fact is that this scheme also results in a spectrum of primordial quantum uncertainties of the inflaton field that matches the form of the famous Harrison-Z’eldovich spectrum of primordial perturbations and which has been observed in the various analysis of the extraordinary data on the CMB sky collected in the various recent experiments.

This is the basis of the claim that inflation “accounts for the seeds of the cosmic structure”. They “emerge from the quantum vacuum”, continue to evolve after inflation has ended, and after leaving their mark on the CMB, result in the emergence of the structure of our universe. That structure which at late times is characterized by the conditions permitting our own existence.

The predictive power is, thus, remarkable, but it would be completely lost if we needed to rely on the imperfections of the state that resulted from inflation. That is, if the whole picture depended, in a critical way, on the minute deviations from the very simple state that we indicated is thought to describe the universe as it emerges from the inflationary regime, we would not be able to make any predictions at all. It could well be that the structure of our universe today (and the markings on the CMB) depended in that way on those minute inhomogeneities, but in that event, the matching of the spectra of the quantum

uncertainties and that of the CMB spectra would be nothing but a miraculous coincidence. We do not believe in such coincidences; however, that does not mean that we should avoid taking a critical look at the “successful account”. In particular, we must carefully inquire into the identification of these quantum uncertainties and the perturbation spectrum for the seeds of structure that characterize our universe. In so doing, one must be careful in taking the simple state that inflation provides as if that was the complete description of the starting point of the whole account of the origin of these fluctuations, because we have no justification for claiming anything about the remaining imperfections, except that they are exponentially small.

Therefore, in turning back to the main subject, the issue we want to discuss is: does the standard inflationary scenario, which starts off by arguing that the universe entered, as the result of inflation, into a simple state characterized as the vacuum of all fields and the flat FRW space-time, when put together with decoherence arguments, really account for the transition from that H.&I. early state of the universe, to the anisotropic and inhomogeneous universe we inhabit²?

This article will be devoted, to a large extent, to deal with the conceptual issues above, and will not include the developments that are possible when taking a stricter ontological view of the essence of quantum physics, and consequently adding new elements to deal with the shortcomings we encounter in the present context, and would refer the interested readers to other articles that dwell on those topics[8, 9].

We now proceed to consider the views one can take regarding quantum theory, and how they impact its application to problems in cosmology .

III. COSMOLOGY AND VIEWS ON QUANTUM PHYSICS

In analyzing the present topic, we have to consider the views that one might take regarding cosmology and quantum physics, first to enhance the sharpness of the discussion, in order to avoid possible misunderstandings, and to clarify to the reader the reasons for our posture regarding the matter at hand.

The issue we are facing is related to the so called “measurement problem in quantum mechanics”, a subject that has puzzled physicists and philosophers of physics from the time of the inception of the theory [13]. These issues continue to attract the attention of several thinkers in our field, and we are, for the most part, merely recounting the status of the general problem, touching, when appropriate, on the particular instance that concerns us here: the cosmological setting, a subject that has received much less attention from the physics community. There are, of course, notable exceptions to the assessment above, represented by thinkers like R. Penrose[21], J. Hartle [24], and others.

Any reasonably complete discussion of the interpretation of Quantum Mechanics is well beyond the scope of this manuscript, and needless is to say that much more exhaustive discussions on the subject exist in the literature [25], but we must include a very brief account of what seems to be the most common postures, in order to put our discussion in the appropriate context. Let us, thus, briefly consider some of the views that can be taken

² This point is sometimes characterized as the “transition from the quantum regime to the classical regime”, but we find this a bit misleading: most people would agree that there are no classical or quantum regimes. The fundamental description ought to be always a quantum description. However, there exist regimes in which certain quantities can be described to a sufficient accuracy by their classical counterparts represented by the corresponding expectation values. All this depends, of course, on the physical state, the underlying dynamics, the quantity of interest, and the context in which we might want to use it.

on the subject of Quantum Theory and the “measurement problem” that are relevant to our situation:

- **a)** *Quantum physics as a complicated theory of statistical physics.* It is a position that holds that quantum mechanics acquires meaning only as it is applied to an ensemble of identically prepared systems. In this view, one must accept that a single atom, in isolation, is not described by quantum mechanics. Let us not get confused by the correct, but simply distracting, argument that atoms in isolation do not exist. The point is whether, to the extent to which we do neglect its interactions with distant atoms, and specially with the electromagnetic field which, even in its vacuum state is known to interact with the atom, quantum mechanics is applicable to the description of a single atom. Again, what can we mean by that, if we know that, in order to be able to say anything about the atom, we must make it interact with a measuring device? Well, the question is simply whether applying the formalism of quantum mechanics to treat the isolated atom can be expected to yield correct results as it pertains the subsequent measurements.? One might think that this is a nonsensical question, as these results are always statistical in nature. The point is that this statement is not really accurate: for instance, if the atom (say, of hydrogen) was known to having been prepared in its ground state, the probability of measuring any energy, other than the one in the ground state, is zero. In fact, for any observable commuting with the hamiltonian the predictions are not statistical at all, but 100% deterministic and precise! If so, there must be something to the description of that single atom by its usual quantum mechanical state. It is thus a clearly false notion, the idea that quantum mechanics can not be applied to a single system [15]. What is true, of course, is that, in applying the theory to a single system, the predictions we can make with certainty are very limited, with the extent of such limitations being determined, both by the nature of the system’s dynamics, and by the way the system was initially prepared. Moreover, in relation with the issue that concerns us in this article, taking a posture like this about quantum physics, would be admitting from the beginning that we would have no justification in employing such theory in addressing questions concerning the unique universe to which we have access, even if we were to accept that somehow there exists an ensemble of universes to which we have no access. Note, moreover, that we should beware from confusing statistics of universes and statistics within one universe. Furthermore, if a quantum state serves only to represent an ensemble, how is each element of the ensemble to be described? Perhaps, it can not be described at all ? What do we do in that case with our universe?
- **b)** *Quantum physics as a theory of human knowledge.* Within this view of quantum theory, the state of a quantum system does not reflect something about the system, but just what we know about the system³. Such view, naturally rises the question: what is there to be known about the system if not something that pertains to the system? The answer comes in the form of: correlations between the system and the measuring devices, but then, what is the meaning of these correlations? The usual meaning of the word “correlation” implies some sort of coincidence of certain conditions pertaining to one object with some other conditions pertaining to the second object. However,

³ One can find statements in this sense in well known books, for instance “Quantum Theory is not a theory about reality, it is a prescription for making the best possible predictions about the future, if we have certain information about the past” [16]. See also[18]

if a quantum state describes such correlation, there must be some meaning to the conditions pertaining to each one of the objects. Are not these, then, those very same aspects that are described by the quantum mechanical state for the object? If we answer in the negative, it must mean that there are further descriptions of the object that can not be casted in the quantum mechanical state vector. On the other hand, if we answer in the positive we are again taking a view whereby the state vector says something about the object in itself. Perhaps, we are just going in circles. If one were inclined to read these considerations as philosophical nonsense, one should not forget that if we follow the above described view, we would have abandoned the possibility to consider questions about the evolution of the universe in the absence of sapient beings, and much less to consider the emergence, in that universe, of the conditions that are necessary for the eventual evolution of humans, while using Quantum Theory. We could take it even further and ask ourselves: what would be, for instance, the justification for considering states in any model of quantum gravity, if we took such view of quantum physics?

- **c) *Quantum physics as a non-completable description of the world.*** Here, we refer to any posture that effectively, if not explicitly, states: “The theory is incomplete, and no complete theory containing it exists or will ever do”. Such view will be considered as being advocated by any posture indicating, either openly or implicitly, to use quantum mechanics “as we all know how”, and supported by the observation that no violation of quantum mechanics has ever been observed⁴. While this is, with not doubt, a literally correct statement, we must remind our colleagues that by this, one would refer, of course, to the rules as found in any quantum mechanics text book, that essentially rely on the Copenhagen interpretation, which, as we all know, raises severe interpretational issues that **become insurmountable once we leave the laboratory and consider applying quantum theory to something like the universe itself**. According to this view, we should content ourselves using its tools, and making, in the situation at hand, “non-rigorous predictions”. We must acknowledge, however, that in situations where one can not point to the classical-quantum dividing line, where we can not identify the system and the apparatus, nor the observables that are to be measured, the entity carrying out those measurements and the time at which the measurements are to be thought as taking place, we have no clearly defined scheme specifying how to make the desired predictions. That is, in dealing with the questions pertaining to the early universe in terms of quantum theory, we have no clear and specific rules for making predictions. However, according to such practical posture, we should be content with the fact that the predictions have, in fact, been made, and that they do seem to agree with observations. The issue is, of course, that in the absence of a well defined set of rules,— rules that are explicit to the point where a computer could, in principle, arrive to the predictions using only the explicit algorithm and the explicitly stated inputs—, we have no way to ascertain whether or not, such “predictions” do or do not, follow from the theory. We can not be sure whether or not, some unjustified choices, manipulations and arguments have been used as part of the process by which the predictions have been obtained. **Correct quantitative** forecasts are not enough. These must first be **actual predictions**. This should be quite clear, particularly,

⁴ In practice, this view is essentially indistinguishable from the so called FAPP (*For all Practical purposes*) approach to the matter [23]

when thinking about cases where the argumentative connections used in arriving to the “predictions” are so loose that never-ending debates can arise which can not be translated into arguments about precise mathematical statements. Specially suspicious are, of course, those “predictions” which are, in fact, retrodictions, and on this point we should be aware that long before inflation was invented, Harrison and Z’eldovich [26] had already concluded what should be the form of the primordial spectrum, based on rather broad observations about the nature of the large scale structure of our universe.

- **d)** *Quantum physics as part of a more complete description of the world.* Here we are not referring to an extension of the theory into some sort of hidden variable type, as the problem we want to face here about the theory is not its indeterminism, but the s“measurement problem” (see [19] for more extensive discussions on the problem). Completing the theory would require something that removes the need for a external measurement apparatus, an external observer, etc. Here we must include D. Bohms “Pilot Wave Theory” [57], and in particular we should mention a specific proposal to apply such ideas to the cosmological problem at hand [58]. We will briefly touch on the difficulties we see in it, in section VII. Then there are other proposals invoking something like the dynamical reduction models proposed by Ghirardi, Rimini & Weber [27], and the ideas of R. Penrose about the role of gravitation in modifying quantum mechanics in the merging of the two aspects of physical reality [21] (See also [20]). In the particular context of inflationary cosmology, our own work [8–10] offers an example of an analysis in which the issues are faced directly, and which leads to the possibility of confrontation with observations. In this sense, this is the position we advocate, inspired in part by the arguments made in [21, 27], and by the problem at hand.
- **e)** *Quantum physics as a complete description of the world.* The view that quantum mechanics faces no open issues and that, in particular, the measurement problem has been solved. Among the holders of these views one can further identify two main currents: those that subscribe to ideas along the so called “many world interpretation of quantum mechanics” and consider this to be a solution to the measurement problem, and those that hold a view that the measurement problem in quantum mechanics has been solved by the consideration of “decoherence”. Let us first note that the many world interpretation does very little to ameliorate the measurement problem, as there is a mapping between what in that approach would be called the “splittings of worlds”⁵ and what would be called “measurements” in the Copenhagen interpretation. Thus every question that can be made in the latter interpretation has a corresponding one in the many worlds interpretation. For the case of the measurement problem the issues would be: When does a world splitting occur? Why, and under what circumstances does it occur? What constitutes a trigger? Finally we should mention the proposal for generalization of quantum physics using a scheme based on the realms of decoherent coarse grained histories proposed by J. Hartle [24], and related ones, an approach that we will consider briefly in section VII.

⁵ It often claimed that there are no “splitting of the world” in the many world interpretation, but the fact of the matter is that whenever people make use of it they can not avoid talking about things such as “our branch”, “the realms we perceive” or other notions that implicitly make use of a notion that is essentially just that a “world splitting”. One can see this in each specific application of the idea, by focussing on the complete description of what one would take as “the relevant state describing our reality” and following it in time backwards and forwards. In the inflationary situation at hand, this is easily done, by focussing on the symmetry of the state describing the quantum fields.

Next, as it seems to be the most widely held view on the way of addressing our problem, we shall consider the decoherence “solution” in more detail.

IV. DECOHERENCE

Decoherence is a clear and inescapable prediction of quantum mechanics and it has important implications in many experimental situations, particularly in the design of potentially useful quantum computers. However, there is a widespread belief that it has implications that go well beyond and allow for a complete and satisfactory solution of the measurement problem in quantum mechanics. This is not the case, but unfortunately the exhaustive discussion of this issue alone would require an inordinate amount of space. The reader is thus directed to consult the vast literature on the matter (including that referenced in this manuscript) and here we will provide only a small “taste” for the issues. For a sharp discussion on the subject we refer the reader to [28]. We should start by quoting the postures that in this regard are held by several people that have considered the issue at length, in order to contrast them with the often held notion that such is the consensus view:

Take for instance the conclusion: *“Many physicist nowadays think that decoherence provides a fully satisfying answer to the measurement problem. But this is an illusion.”* Arnold Neumaier [29].

Or the warning against misinterpretations:

“...note that the formal identification of the reduced density matrix with a mixed state density matrix is easily misinterpreted as implying that the state of the system can be viewed as mixed too... the total composite system is still described by a superposition, it follows from the rules of quantum mechanics that no individual definite state can be attributed to one of (the parts) of the system ...”, M. Schlosshauer [30].

Or the explicit refutation:

“Does decoherence solve the measurement problem? Clearly not. What decoherence tells us is that certain objects appear classical when observed, But what is an observation? At some stage we still have to apply the usual probability rules of Quantum Theory.” E. Joos [31].

We will, of course, not reproduce the complete discussion by these authors here and would turn the interested reader to the corresponding references.

However, we will see that, when dealing with cosmology, the problem becomes even more vexing and acute. We should note however, that there exists in the field a widespread notion that some version of decoherence provides the paradigm where the direct application of the standard forms of quantum mechanics to the problem at hand finds its justification. Significantly, the diversity of precise approaches indicates also a degree of disagreement in the field, about the details of such schemes[2].

Before engaging on the specific discussion of the cosmological case, let us review briefly what decoherence is, and what it can and cannot do.

A. Decoherence and the measurement problem

Decoherence is the process by which a system that is not isolated, but in interaction with an environment (as are all physical systems, except the universe itself) “loses” or “transfers” coherence into the degrees of freedom of such environment. It is a well studied

effect that follows rather than supersedes the laws of quantum physics. It is, therefore, clear that, in principle, it can not be thought to offer explanations that go beyond what can be directly inferred from the application of the principles of quantum physics. Its main achievement is to allow for the study of the conditions in which the quantum interferences expected from the idealized consideration of a system as isolated, become observationally suppressed as the result of the system's interaction with the environment.

The basic recipe for an analysis of decoherence in a given situation follows the following steps:

- **1)** Divide D.O.F. : system + environment (identify inaccessible or irrelevant D.O.F.).
- **2)** Compute Reduced Density matrix (trace over environment D.O.F.).
- **3)** Perform suitable time average so that the off-diagonal matrix elements vanish.
- **4)** Regard the diagonal density matrix as describing a statistical ensemble.

The Problems: once one has understood why certain interferences can not be observed in practice, it is tempting to conclude that one has understood the “emergence of classicality”, and that, therefore, there is nothing left of the so called “measurement problem” in quantum mechanics. This turns out to be a simplistic and misguided conclusion, as indicated by the quotations listed above. There are, actually, at least two very serious problems with considering decoherence in this light:

- **I) The basis problem:** it is clear that the diagonal nature of the reduced density matrix, obtained in the step 3) of the program above, will be lost, in general, upon a change of basis for the Hilbert space of the system at hand. This is taken to mean that the nature of the system-environment interaction selects a so called pointer basis, which underscores the aspects that have become classical as a result of decoherence. The point, of course, is that this leaves one with the usual situation whereby, if the selected basis is, say, the position basis, or one made out of narrow wave packets in position space, the momentum of the system would remain, correspondingly, highly undetermined, and thus one could not argue that classicality has really emerged. It is only that the uncertainties might be small ”for all practical purposes” something that underscores the need to further specify those purposes, and which necessarily refers us back to certain practicalities of the human condition.
- **II) The definite outcomes problem:** here the problem is the absence of sufficient justification for the interpretation of the mixed state described by the density matrix as describing a statistical ensemble, and in regarding a single system as being in a definite, yet unknown, state among the ones represented in the diagonal elements of the density matrix. The result that emerges from the decoherence calculations rather indicates that the system must be regarded as coexisting in the various alternatives, but with the interferences in the appropriate observables, being suppressed. Selecting among these alternatives can be viewed as deciding between the “choice vs. coexistence” interpretations. In order to argue that decoherence really leads to the emergence of classicality, one would have to advocate the “choice” interpretation; i.e., that somehow only one of the decoherent possibilities represents reality, but well known, and

experimentally confirmed aspects of quantum mechanics such as the violation of Bell’s inequalities, force us to opt for the “coexistence” interpretation⁶[32].

The next example, from ordinary non-relativistic quantum mechanics, serves as a clear analogy of the situation we face: consider a single particle in a state corresponding to a minimal wave packet centered at $\vec{X} = (D, 0, 0)$ (the vectors in 3-D space are given in cartesian coordinates (x, y, z)). Let the particle have its spin pointing in the $+y$ direction. Take this state and rotate it by an angle π about the z axis. Now consider the superposition of the initial and the rotated states. The resulting state is clearly symmetric under rotations by π around z . Now consider taking the trace over the spin D.O.F., simply because we decide to ignore the spin variable (no measurement is contemplated here). The resulting density matrix is diagonal. Can we say that the situation has become classical? Of course not. Is the state still invariant under rotations of magnitude π about the z axis? Obviously, the answer is yes. Can a mathematical manipulation with no physical process counterpart (as ignoring some D.O.F. would normally not be thought as having an effect on the system) ever change the state of the system? Answering yes would take you to the view discussed in b) of section III.

Therefore, we must conclude that, neither decoherence, nor the many worlds interpretation do offer satisfactory solutions to the measurement problem. But, is it perhaps the case that when both are put together they do offer one? We face that question next.

B. On the shortcomings of decoherence plus many world interpretation as solution to the measurement problem

Consider the traditional problem of Shroedinger’s cat: The traditional paradigmatic problem that brings to the forefront the interpretational problems of Quantum Mechanics. A cat is placed in a box with an excited atom whose decay is arranged to trigger the release of certain poisonous gas that would kill the cat. The unitary evolution of Quantum Mechanics then leads, after some appropriate time, to a state of the system which is a superposition of Excited-atom/Live-cat with Decayed-atom/Dead-cat. The issue is how to make sense of this situation. The proponents of decoherence or decoherence plus multiple world interpretation offered the following solution to the problem:

Concretely:

- 1) Let us say, we have prepared the system in an initial set up, of the box with the cat and with the excited atom, represented by the the state ψ_0 , and that,
- 2) after a short time, this system has evolved into a typical state of the form : Dead-Alive cat, that is represented by the wave function $\psi = c_1\psi_1 + c_2\psi_2$ (where, as usual, ψ_1 represents the state of the whole system where the cat is alive and ψ_2 represents the state of the whole system where the cat is dead).

⁶ In an Einstein-Podolsky-Rosen-Bohm Gedankenexperiment (EPR) setup, for instance, the experimentalist who is dealing with one of the particles of the EPR pair, might invoke decoherence by arguing that the D.O.F. of the second particle are, at that time, inaccessible to him. But taking this as support for the “choice” view would lead to the “conclusion” that the individual particles have (even if unknown to him) a well defined spin. This conclusion is incorrect, as it is known to lead to contradictions (See[37]).

- 3) Then, one invokes decoherence (of any kind), and ends up with a diagonal density matrix operator providing the description of the system:

$$\hat{\rho} = c_1^2 |\psi_1\rangle\langle\psi_1| + c_2^2 |\psi_2\rangle\langle\psi_2|$$

- 4) Then, one argues that the problem is solved.

This is the decoherence solution to the problem.

One might want to accept this as reasonable. However upon closer inspection, it seems rather unclear in what sense does this mean that the problem is solved. If we take the view that the quantum state represents the reality “out there”, as would be necessary in any realistic interpretation of Quantum Theory (rather than, say, the view **b**) of section III), we would still face a serious interpretative issue, simply because the equation in item 3 above, continues to represent a situation in which the two alternatives Dead and Alive cat coexist (even if they do not interfere).

At this point, we need to rely on an interpretational instruction, for which there appears to be none else but one of the following two OPTIONS:

- **5a)** “One of the two ALTERNATIVES becomes reality, and the other disappears”. This is, of course, analogous to the collapse (or reduction postulate). So we are almost back to square one.
- **5b)** “The two alternatives coexist in a reality with multiple branches. Only one of these branches corresponds to what we perceive, (presumably because we or our mind is entangled with the system). This seems to be the point of view adopted, in general, by a big part of the school advocating the decoherence type of solutions to the measurement problem and it seems closely connected with the “many worlds” interpretation. (In fact this would be the the view offered by the “decoherence plus many worlds” interpretation).

Thus the position represented by **5a)** does not help, while that of **5b)** has a serious problem, which has to do with the issue of how do we treat the “things that happen”?

The problem in this particular case is the following: The posture **5b)** indicates that we only perceive one branch of reality, and that there are many other branches “out there”, about which in most cases we can know nothing at all. We would know of a branch that is not ours if we are aware that a particular current condition of our world follows from a previous situation which was somehow a superposition of the current one and some others that must have branched out. However most of the time we would simply not know anything about these other coexisting branches. Moreover, it is clear that if we take such view, we must accept (unless re-coherence is forbidden in principle within some modified version of the theory) that some of those other branches, might possibly re-cohere with our own branch, leading to completely unpredictable, and yet in principle, observable, effects. We would not be able to justifiably argue that re-coherence is impossible, or even unlikely, in any concrete situation, simply because, by hypothesis, we do not know what is going on in those branches that we do not perceive. In fact, this posture seems to eliminate any justification we might have in stating that the initial (would be) wave function in the previous example,

corresponds to that of **2**). This is so, simply because we could not, at step **1**) be able to argue that we had described the totality of the (relevant) existing reality, any more than we could, in step **5b**) argue that, say, the Dead Cat alternative, represents the totality of the (relevant)existing reality [40]. That is, if we took this approach, we would be forced to acknowledge that in exactly the same fashion that the Live Cat alternative, is part of the wave-function representing (together with the Dead Cat alternative), the full situation at stage **5b**), we would have to accept that, in principle, there exists out-there many other branches or alternative realities that should be incorporated in the description of the full situation at stage **2**).

Thus, the decoherence ideas, even if taken together with the many worlds interpretation, clearly fail to offer a satisfactory resolution of the matter in general [39], and, in particular, it fails to do so in connection for the situation we face here⁷.

V. THE EXACERBATED PROBLEM: APPLYING QUANTUM PHYSICS TO THE EARLY UNIVERSE

We should point out that some researchers in the field, such as [3], have acknowledged that there is something mysterious in the standard account of the emergence of structure, and people like J. Hartle [24] have pointed out the need to generalize quantum mechanics to deal with cosmology, and, of course, R. Penrose, who in his last book [34] has stressed the relevance of the general measurement problem in quantum mechanics to the problem of breakdown of the H.&I. during inflation, comparing it with the problem of the breakdown of spherical symmetry in a particle decay. In our view, this analogy does not emphasize the point that, in the cosmological context, the problem is even more severe than in ordinary situations, because, in that case, we can not even rely on the strict Copenhagen interpretation as a source of “safe and practical rules”. We will come back to the specific example in Section VII.

The exacerbation can be illustrated with an example that exhibits quite clearly the deepening of the problem in this context: Let us consider the following quotation from a well known thinker on these issues in quantum theory: *“As long as we remain within the realm of mere predictions concerning what we shall observe (i.e. what will appear to us) and refrain from stating anything concerning “things as they must be before we observe them “ no break in the linearity of quantum dynamics is necessary”*. D’Espagnat [35].

However, in the cosmological setting, we need to deal, precisely, with this situation: we need to think about the state of affairs of the universe before the emergence of the conditions that make us possible, before we existed and before we ever carried out an observation or measurement.

That is, we can not rely on ourselves and our measuring apparatuses, as part of the explanation, precisely because both are the result of the emergence of the conditions we want to explain.

Other avenues that might be used in different contexts to address the problem, even partially; are equally closed in this case: Inflation is supposed to drive all fields to their

⁷ The problem of the quantum origin of the cosmological structure has some degree of overlap with the Quantum Suicide contemplated in [38], and, in fact, is, if anything, even more dramatic and relevant than the latter.

corresponding Bunch Davies vacuum, so there is no nontrivial environment⁸, and there are evidently no external measuring apparatus. In short, in the situation at hand, the problem is exacerbated by: i) the absence of a nontrivial environment, ii) the absence of measuring apparatus iii) the absence of observers⁹. That items i), ii), and iii) above, play a fundamental role in the standard arguments for the emergence of classicality, can be seen, for instance in [17].

Next, we turn to consider a particular account which, as we already indicted, we consider representative of a widespread view held in the field of inflationary cosmology, and which can be characterized by the idea that there is no problem with the inflationary account of the quantum origin of cosmic structure. The objective here is to illustrate in the concrete example offered in that account, the serious problems that, often ignored, lie behind those views.

VI. A CONCRETE EXAMPLE

With all of our general discussion in mind, we will now look carefully at one of the most explicit of the traditional accounts on the matter, the one recently presented in [1] concerning the question: “Why do the Cosmological Perturbations Look Classical to us?”. One further advantage of using this manuscript as illustration is that when the article was written, the authors were aware of the generic criticisms made against the standard accounts in [8], and elsewhere. We should stress that many of the remarks that lie ahead have been discussed, albeit in a less specific setting, in [8], with some other points having been made indirectly in [20]. When following this section of the manuscript it is convenient for the reader to have a copy of [1] at hand. We believe that most of the criticisms presented here, apply equally to many of the works in [2], with all of them affected by at least one of the generic problems we have reviewed. However, the detailed discussion of each one of those works and their specific problems is well beyond the scope of this paper. Nevertheless, it is not hard to see, the source for the generic shortcoming, which is simple and very well known: Given a system whose initial quantum state has a given symmetry (in the situation at hand the symmetry is homogeneity and isotropy), there is no mechanism by which the standard unitary evolution governing the system, would result in a state lacking that symmetry, as long as the dynamics governing the evolution respects the symmetry. To escape this well known fact about quantum theory, the various proposals have to resort to some kind of approximate description of a partial system, and assigning to that partial description a superior value overriding the precise and generic conclusions mentioned before. The point is that in the cosmological setting we are dealing with here, there is no justification for doing so. In fact, when considering any explanation where the conclusions from the *approximate analysis* (such as those of [1, 2]), come into conflict with the *rigorous and general results*, such as the ones we have just expressed above, it is clear that the approximate analysis must be flawed (the flaw often residing in the implicit introduction of unwarranted assumptions).

In considering in detail a discussion such as that in [1], the first thing that one should consider, is whether or not the approach described in that manuscript starts out by taking

⁸ The requirement that the environment be nontrivial is implicit in the assumptions about energy exchange and information fluxes from the system to and from the the environment and can be seen explicitly for instance in [17] and similar treatments of the emergence of classicality and related issues.

⁹ The fact that the emergence of each of these components is, in this case, contingent on what we must understand, indicates that these aspects can not be used in the discussion unless one is willing to accept some sorts of circular reasoning. Needless is to say that we believe scientific explanations should not allow that.

an exceedingly narrow view of the issue. In fact, it is not uncommon to encounter analysis where the underlying assumption is that all what needs to be understood is “why do we see the perturbations as classical?”, while taking as **a given that we are here** with our machines and their limitations, to act as observers of the cosmological perturbations¹⁰, and *ignoring the fact that we are one of the outcomes of these perturbations*. This view of the problem seems to ignore that the issue is set within the more general problem of cosmology. The point, as we have already noted, is that cosmology is the quest for the understanding of how the universe evolved, including the conditions that resulted in late appearance of human beings capable of looking at the sky and of studying the traces of the perturbations in question. Therefore, by limiting the question to an issue of observation, one would be implicitly putting into the formulation of the problem what should indeed be part of the answer: That the universe eventually develops the structure that makes feasible the emergence of human beings capable of viewing the CMB sky. Once that fundamental aspect of the problem is overlooked, the question becomes simply why the spectrum has certain detailed features, and a big part of the main problem is bypassed. In fact, such approach is, in a sense, the application to quantum problems in cosmology, of the generic approach to the measurement problem in quantum mechanics that starts off by assuming that one of the parts of the subsystem is a classical apparatus, or that there is a classical observer, whose origin and description is not attempted, and which provides the set up with a clearly identified referent for the use of the Copenhagen interpretation or something very close to it. This is clearly a rather unsatisfactory way to address the issues of cosmology from within a quantum theory of reality, unless, of course one takes the view that quantum theory is not such a thing, but rather one of the unpalatable possibilities enumerated in section III. Any such approach, as indicated in the previous section, would call into question the whole justification for applying quantum theory to cosmology.

Furthermore, apart from the very general issues above, we will see that the general arguments behind the conventional accounts on the question rely on, what a detailed examination shows are, inappropriate interpretations and problematic arguments. In order to see these aspects in detail, one must look at an individual proposal in some detail. We will focus on the above mentioned proposal for concreteness.

The setting is that of a background Robertson Walker space-time undergoing exponential inflation and described with the metric:

$$ds^2 = a(\eta)^2 [-d\eta^2 + \delta_{ij} dx^i dx^j], \quad (1)$$

where the scale factor is given by $a(\eta) = -\frac{1}{H_I \eta}$, with $H_I^2 \simeq (8\pi/3)GV$ with V , the inflaton potential, and the field ϕ_0 in slow-roll regime. The conformal time η running from $-\infty$ to 0. The quantum aspect of the scalar field $\delta\phi \equiv \phi - \phi_0$ is described in terms of a rescaled field $y \equiv a\delta\phi$. The field is written in terms of creation and annihilation operators and written in terms of its (spatial) Fourier transform:

$$y(\eta, k) = f_k(\eta)\hat{a}_k + f_k^+(\eta)\hat{a}_{-k}^* \quad (2)$$

with $f_k = \frac{-i}{\sqrt{2k}}e^{-ik\eta}(1 - \frac{i}{k\eta})$ and where the conjugate momentum

$$p(\eta, k) = g_k(\eta)\hat{a}_k + g_k^+(\eta)\hat{a}_{-k}^* \quad (3)$$

¹⁰ In fact, when we consider the question posed as “why do we see the perturbations as classical” one can not but wonder, what should we have in mind when considering the alternatives that such question seems to evoke. In other words, what would it mean for us, not to see the perturbations as classical? What would they look like if we saw them as quantum mechanical? Clearly bringing our own selves into the center of the question in this way, transforms the issue into something that can not be addressed in the simple terms that the approach of the manuscript is based on.

with $g_k = -i\sqrt{\frac{k}{2}}e^{-ik\eta}$ (Note that we have suppressed the distinction of the vector \vec{k} and its magnitude k for simplicity of notation).

The approach followed makes use of the fact one can write these operators as combinations of the following time independent operators:

$$\hat{Y}(k) = \frac{1}{\sqrt{k}}(\hat{a}_k + \hat{a}_{-k}^*), \quad \& \quad \hat{P}(k) = \sqrt{\frac{2}{k}}(\hat{a}_k - \hat{a}_{-k}^*). \quad (4)$$

where the coefficients are:

$$f_{k1} = \Re(f_k) = \frac{-1}{\sqrt{2k}}[\sin(\eta k) + \frac{1}{\eta k} \cos((\eta k))], \quad f_{k2} = \Im(f_k) = \frac{-1}{\sqrt{2k}}[\cos(\eta k) - \frac{1}{\eta k} \sin((\eta k))], \quad (5)$$

and

$$g_{k1} = \Re(g_k) = \frac{-1}{\sqrt{2k}} \sin(\eta k), \text{ and} \quad g_{k2} = \Im(g_k) = \frac{-1}{\sqrt{2k}} \cos(\eta k) \quad (6)$$

respectively. That is

$$y(\eta, k) = \sqrt{2k}f_{k1}(\eta)Y(k) - \sqrt{\frac{2}{k}}f_{k2}(\eta)P(k), \quad (7)$$

and

$$p(\eta, k) = \sqrt{2k}g_{k2}(\eta)Y(k) - \sqrt{\frac{2}{k}}g_{k1}(\eta)P(k). \quad (8)$$

The first set of considerations offered in [1], in the section "Quantum to Classical Transition: the pragmatic view", are based on the properties of these functions. The point is that in the limit $k\eta \rightarrow 0$ (corresponding, for a given k , to the infinity future of a never-ending inflationary era) the coefficients f_{k2} and g_{k1} vanish.

- This is next used to argue that *the non-commutativity of the operators $Y(k)$ and $P(k)$ becomes irrelevant* and can be ignored as it concerns the quantum field and its momentum conjugate.

The first thing we note is that this discussion, so far, applies to the quantum field operator itself, and, thus, nothing of what has been said up to this point is limited to the vacuum state alone. Thus, in principle, it should apply to all states. The quantum field has become equivalent in all generality to a classical field. But why should this be limited to the inflaton field? All fields present during inflation should be subject to the same analysis. Thus, we would conclude that all fields in nature are equivalent to their classical counterpart¹¹. After all, every field that exists should be present in its corresponding vacuum state during the inflationary epoch. The fields are not simply turned on when we need them. This is required by the working hypothesis behind all of physics regarding the *invariance of the laws of physics in "time"*. The conclusion is, of course, incorrect for other fields, why should it be correct for the inflaton? It seems that the only possible posture here is that the modes of all quantum fields have become classical if they correspond to wavelengths that are "large

¹¹ That is, unless one wants to argue somehow that other fields, say those of the standard model of particle physics, were not affected by the inflationary expansion which drove the inflaton to the vacuum state. Such idea would lead us to serious conflicts with the basic tenant of General Relativity: the equivalence principle, and thus we will not further consider that problematic possibility here.

enough”. But then we must ask ourselves: large enough in comparison to what? the human scale? perhaps the current horizon scale? Anyway, it seems clear, that in order to justify this approach, one would need to introduce several other *ad hoc* rules into the theory. Moreover, as it has been recently discussed in [42], the position that one could consider the quantum field simply as a collection of independent modes, as would be needed in order to subject the different modes to very different treatments (such as considering some to be classical, while some others are considered as fully quantum mechanical), **is untenable** in light of the locality of the field theory and the need for composite operator renormalization.

The next thing we should note is that, when speaking about an operator, the issue of what is small and what is not can only make sense once one has identified the way one wants to extract a number from the operator at hand. In general, one would need to consider the matrix element of the operator in a certain class of states, including the states constructed through the application of other relevant operators on certain collection of relevant states (in our case, that would involve the states constructed out of the vacuum by suitable application of field operators, i.e., the Fock space). Moreover, it is not at all clear why one should not consider one of the most direct, the c-numbers that can be extracted from the operators at hand: the commutator between the field and its conjugate-momentum. Taking this more rigorous mathematical stand, one sees that it is rather unclear how can one convincingly argue that the operator in question vanishes. In fact, the decoherence arguments of this type rely up to this point, on the behavior of the field and momentum conjugate as operators, and not just on particulars of the state. Thus, in accepting them, we would have to conclude it is not just the vacuum state that becomes classical, but the full quantum mechanical system, as a physical entity. And if this is the case for this field, we must in turn question, why would it not be the same for the other fields?

Finally, we should recall that inflation is not supposed to continue indefinitely, but must stop at some point (even if something like 80 e-folds of expansion are accomplished while it lasts) the quantity that is being discarded in the arguments of [1] is not, strictly speaking, zero (in any of the senses that can be given to this statement, as discussed above). One can argue that is extremely small, and thus negligible, but in order to do that one would have to face other issues: 1) In comparison to what is it to be taken as small? certainly not as its contribution to the commutator of field and momentum conjugate is concerned. 2) Why should we trace over it? presumably because the quantities are too small to be measured, but this, of course, can only mean, “to be measured by us with current technology” as there is no possibility of arguing about the un-measurability of those quantities by other conceivable beings, or even by future generations of humans.

This reliance on what is experimentally accessible to us (or that which the author envisions as being attainable in the relatively near future) is prevalent throughout the decoherence type of analysis. We find this, in [1]: for instance, when considering the separation of the field y and momentum conjugate π (equations 24, and 25, of that work, which correspond to equations (7) and (8) of this manuscript) and the reliance on the existence of modes characterized by the functions f_{k2} and g_{k1} that “become vanishingly small” as a result of inflation. These are thus considered as unobservable, negligible, etc. As we have indicated, such reliance, is unacceptable for a theory that is supposed to explain our own origins.

The ease with which unjustified assumptions appear, often unnoticed, in this kind of discussions can be further exemplified by considering the concrete argument in more detail: The first point is that such functions only serve to connect the operators $\hat{y}(k, \eta)$ and momentum conjugate $\hat{p}(k, \eta)$ with the operators $\hat{Y}(k)$ and $\hat{P}(k)$. The point is that, even if we identify

an operator \hat{O} which is written in terms of other operators with coefficients that vanish in a certain limit, we must concern ourselves with how is this connected with the quantities we measure. In the inflationary setting, we can always construct the operator $a(\eta)^n \hat{O}_k(\eta)$ and note that, for an appropriate choice of n , it does not decrease at all. Actually, in the case at hand, we can even look at the commutator as an observable that does not tend to zero even if $a \rightarrow \infty$. In fact, it is worthwhile mentioning that if we consider, instead of the rescaled field $\hat{y}(\eta, k) = a\hat{\phi}(\eta, k)$ and its conjugate momentum $\hat{p}(\eta, k)$, the original un-scaled inflaton field $\hat{\phi}(\eta, k)$ and its conjugate momentum $\hat{\pi} = a\hat{p}(\eta, k)$, we end up replacing the functions f_k and g_k of section II of [1] by $f'_k = f_k/a$ and $g'_k = g_k a$, and when resorting to a similar analysis, as done in that paper, we would see that the mode g_{k_1} no longer vanishes in the $a \rightarrow \infty$ limit. The ratio of the different modes, is, of course, unaltered, but in order to argue for the un-observability of such mode, one would have to argue that the big value of the other mode, somehow makes this mode unobservable, and, in order to justify that, one would have to get into the issues regarding the possible precision of instruments, as an essential part of the arguments.

Furthermore, such accounts tend to make heavy use of unjustified identifications, that rely on mixing up classical and quantum arguments: We can see this, explicitly, at several points in the example provided by [1]:

- For instance below equation 26 of that manuscript

$$p(k, \eta) = p_{cl}(k, \eta) = \frac{g_{k_2}}{f_{k_1}} y(k, \eta) \quad (9)$$

(where presumably the assumption is that one should focus on something like the value of p corresponding to the maximum value of the Wigner functional, considered as a function of p , with the given value of y held fixed), we read: *“For a given realization of the perturbation $y(k, \eta)$, the corresponding momentum $p_{cl}(k, \eta)$ is fixed and equal to the the classical momentum corresponding to this value of $y(k, \eta)$. Then the quantum system is effectively equivalent to the classical random system, which is an ensemble of classical trajectories with certain probability associated with each of them”*.

To uncover the problem we must consider the above statement with some care: First of all, what justifies talking about a given realization? What are these realizations? Where, in the standard quantum theory, is there any reference to “a realization”? In fact, one must wonder if the position advocated by followers of these type of approaches is that each one of those realizations is characterized by a definite value of field and momentum conjugate, as characterized by equation 26 (reproduced above) of [1]? Perhaps, we should think that this only refers to the mean values of the corresponding quantities in some quantum states (one for each realization)? If so, which ones? Then, the manuscript states that *“the quantum system is equivalent to classical random system”*, indicating that, according to such posture, there is associated to our quantum system a given *“probability assigned to each of the elements”* of a certain classical ensemble. What is this classical ensemble supposed to be representing? Should we view our universe as an element of an ensemble of classical universes? In that case, our particular universe would be classical!. Perhaps, what the manuscript refers to, implies the association with a classical ensemble to the collection of possible outcomes of certain measurements. That is to say, to an implicit assumption that the quantum state is not characterizing the objective physical conditions of the system

under description, but it is just a codification of the results of subsequent measurements. This does not seem to have any justification, unless one is taking the view a) of section III, which, as we have seen, does not allow us to apply quantum theory to cosmology.

- Regarding the state of the field, the situation at hand is simply that, in terms of the original creation and annihilation operators, the state we identified as a vacuum is now a squeezed state. But having a squeezed state has no effect on the quantum field and momentum operators which do, of course, continue to satisfy the Heisenberg uncertainties. **The manuscript seems to ascribe a fundamental value to the squeezing of the state, ignoring that one can always find a new set of operators in terms of which, the evolved vacuum will look as a “standard vacuum”.** One can see exactly what lies behind such arguments by considering a simple harmonic oscillator in Quantum Mechanics. The Hamiltonian $H = \frac{p^2}{2m} + \frac{m\omega^2 x^2}{2}$, (with $\omega^2 = k/m$) and standard commutation relations $[p, x] = -i$. We can write the usual creation and annihilation operators as

$$a = \frac{e^{s_0}}{\sqrt{2}}x + i\frac{e^{-s_0}}{\sqrt{2}}p, \quad a^\dagger = \frac{e^{s_0}}{\sqrt{2}}x - i\frac{e^{-s_0}}{\sqrt{2}}p \quad (10)$$

with $e^{s_0} = \sqrt{m\omega}$. These operators satisfy the usual commutation relations $[a, a^\dagger] = 1$. We can now define (without changing the system or its hamiltonian), for arbitrary values of s , new operators:

$$a_s = \frac{e^s}{\sqrt{2}}x + i\frac{e^{-s}}{\sqrt{2}}p, \quad a_s^\dagger = \frac{e^s}{\sqrt{2}}x - i\frac{e^{-s}}{\sqrt{2}}p \quad (11)$$

which are related to the original creation and annihilation operators through a “Lorentzian rotation”. In fact, these operators satisfy the same commutation relations $[a_s, a_s^\dagger] = 1$. However, following the logic of [1], we would have to say, by looking at equation (11) that *in the limit when s is very large (i.e. $s \rightarrow \infty$) the fact that x and p do not commute becomes irrelevant and that, therefore, we are in an essentially classical situation, where for each value of a_s there is a corresponding value of a_s^\dagger (which, in this case, would be the same value).* This argument would imply that, through the simple act of choosing to express things in terms of suitable variables, we can change the nature of a purely quantum mechanical system into something which is essentially classical. The analogy with the situation being examined, can be further strengthened by noting that, as a matter of fact, the above construction is just what is used to define squeezed states, namely, the states annihilated by the operator a_s are squeezed states when seen from the point of view of the usual basis of the harmonic oscillator Hilbert space: $\{|n\rangle^{osc}\}$. Analogously, the usual ground state of the harmonic oscillator would appear as a squeezed state when viewed in the basis of generated by the repeated application of a_s^\dagger on the “displaced vacuum” $|0, s\rangle$ (the state defined by $a_s|0, s\rangle = 0$). Therefore, the claim made just below equation 26 of [1], that such equation “is true for the quantum system (in the operator sense)” is incorrect. If we try to consider how these lines of argument might be justified, we would have to assume that there is an implicit assumption about a notion of a “preferential role” for the particular operators that represent variables that are “more natural” than others, and that there is some particular aspect of the state of the field one is dealing with, that bypasses the counter-arguments we have exposed above (some sort of argument

that would say, for instance, that the relevant parameter in this case is s_0 rather than the “less natural” parameter s). That seems to be the tenor of part of the discussion in section V of [1], but we will get to that shortly and will see that it also fails to pass further scrutiny. However, before doing so, we must lastly point out that a related situation where s is very large can be indeed achieved by forcing the “natural” parameter s_0 to be very large, corresponding, for instance, to the situation where m is very large for fixed value k . Actually, we can choose both, m and k to be very large, while keeping the value of ω fixed at any desired value. But it should be clear that, in that case, the ground state of an harmonic oscillator is not a classical state. For instance, the uncertainty of the momentum is much larger than the corresponding expectation value, and the energy levels of the system are separated by the usual $\Delta E = \hbar\omega$. Finally, we must note that these squeezed states of the electromagnetic field¹² are well studied in the field of quantum optics, and, in fact, rather than being “almost classical” as indicated in [1], they are known to exhibit behavior that is quantum “in extreme” [44]. For example, we note that when a system consisting of two harmonic oscillators, is in a state where both degrees of freedom are in squeezed states, the appearance of highly nonclassical EPR correlations is inescapable[45]. Thus, in the case of an infinite set of harmonic oscillators in squeezed states, such as the vacuum of quantum field we are interested on, the situation can not be said to be anything but of a highly quantum-mechanical nature.

On further examination, we find other problematic arguments which are of common usage, being explicitly stated in this section of [1]:

- Below equation 26 of [1], we find the following statement referring to the issue at hand: *“an analogous situation happens for a free non-relativistic particle possessing an initial Gaussian minimal uncertainty wave function.... At very late times the position of the particle does not longer depend on its initial wave position $x(t) \sim (p_0/m)t$. We get an equivalence with an ensemble of classical particles obeying this where p_0 is a random variable with probability $P(p_0) = |\Psi|^2(p_0)$ ”*. Thus, if one were to accept such arguments without caveats, we would be forced to conclude that, if we wait long enough, a free quantum particle would become classical. One thus, must assume that authors have something more restrictive in mind. Perhaps what they want to point to, is the fact that if one were to consider the measurement of the position of an ensemble of such particles, a long time after it was prepared in the minimal wave packet, and concentrates on distances that are not to big, the results of a series of identical experiments, would, – according to quantum mechanics **including the reduction and Bohr probability rule postulate**– coincide with those of a classical ensemble they describe. However, it is clear that the statement would be valid only if one has in mind such “measurement context”, and, in fact, a particular kind of observable (such as position) associated with such measurement. Regarding other possible observables the statement would be false. Thus, the problem with this sort of claim, indicating that the situation is analogous with that faced in inflationary cosmology, is that in the latter case there seems to be no identifiable reasonable measurement context, measuring apparatus, or observable, and of course the situation is such that one would not want to refer, explicitly, to the fact that they are relying on the uncomfortable part

¹² Defined with respect to the usual construction of Quantum Field theory in Minkowski space-time.

of the postulates of quantum theory. The point is then, that statements such as the one in italics above, are nonsensical unless an appropriate context is specified, and, in the cosmological setting we are interested, one can not justify the identification of any appropriate “measurement context”. The fact that such caveat is not mentioned in connection with the statement in italics above, a fact which renders it indefensible, hides the essence of the problem in the cosmological context.

Next, we consider the more refined arguments such as those presented (on section V of [1]) under the title Quantum To Classical Transition: Decoherence. There we see the recasting of the previous arguments relying now, explicitly, on the standard decoherence argument that interprets the fact that the reduced density matrix has the form used in describing a statistical ensemble, to argue that the system has become one of the latter. Thus, although no specific claim is made to that end, the whole argument in this section seems based on the assumption that decoherence does in fact offer a solution to the measurement problem in QM. This is an assumption that, as we discussed in the previous sections, is not correct.

We will now look exactly how and where do the problems arise in this specific treatment.

- The first issue that is addressed is that of the identification of the environment: Here the analysis offers a path to an answer based on the notion that “.. *in any fundamental theory... there is an abundance of different fields with different interactions. Among them there will not be difficult to find appropriate candidates for environmental fields generating decoherence for primordial fluctuations*”. The problem with this assertion is that, in the same way that inflation is supposed to drive the inflaton perturbations into the vacuum state, it will drive all other fields into their corresponding vacuum state. In fact, even if we accept that there are interactions among the various fields, the point is that inflation drives the whole quantum system of interacting fields into the appropriate vacuum of the combined system. The equivalence principle indicates that all fields will be affected by the expansion associated with the gravitational sector, in the same fashion, and, thus, it would be quite difficult circumvent the conclusion.

The argument then indicates that, even if appropriate environmental fields do not exist, the fact that the theory is nonlinear indicates that there will be interactions among the different modes. But again, this argument seems to ignore the fact, that, if one wants to take into account such interactions, one must recognize that the vacuum to which inflation drives the fields is the full non-perturbative vacuum. One can not claim that the initial state of the inflaton is the free vacuum, and then argue that the interaction plays an important role in generating the desired classicality. Nature does not rely on perturbation theory, only our description of it does. Moreover, if one wants to take into account the self interactions, the fact that the Lagrangian that describes them is translationally and rotationally invariant, ensures that the resulting state will be as homogeneous and isotropic, (as well as pure) as the original one. This consideration thus breaks the analogy with the case of a quantum particle interacting with a bath of photons.

Then, it is argued, that the entanglement of the state, when considering the individual modes, is analogous to the Hawking and Unruh effects. One must be careful with taking such analogies as appropriate, because, in both of these latter situations, one is interested in looking at the state, as it is perceived by observers limited to specific regions of space time, and who do not have - by definition- access to certain degrees

of freedom. In the cosmological case, the manuscript seems to be implicitly assuming, that one is again interested in the observations made by observers that do not have access to certain degrees of freedom, but as we have argued before, that is not the case: **In cosmology, we want to understand the conditions that lead to the emergence of such observers (i.e., Us).**

Otherwise, cosmology should no longer be regarded as the search for an explanation of the evolution of the universe, in terms of the laws physics, but rather as the mere attempt at retrodiction of information, given the fact that we are here, with our particular specificities, including those that limit our ability to monitor certain degrees of freedom. *Why should one contemplate inflation at all, if that were the case?*

In the analysis presented in [1], one finds the acknowledgment that the coincidence of certain classical and quantum expectation values in a pure quantum state is not the same as an ensemble of stochastically distributed classical values, but, nonetheless, that account reiterates that a quantum to classical transition occurs thanks to decoherence and squeezing.

- It is argued that the cosmological fluctuations represent the system (or part thereof) to be decohered, while the other fields (or the inaccessible parts of the the fluctuations) represent the environment. As we have already pointed out, this posture, leads us to a circular explanation: We are the result of the evolution of the initial cosmic fluctuations, and the emergence of those is understood in terms of some of our own characteristics as sapient beings.

This does not seem to be a satisfying view of the explanatory powers of cosmology as a science. Nonetheless, such descriptions are profusely found in the literature.

- For instance, in the case of [1] (below equation 47 of that manuscript) we can explicitly read: “...it (the matrix density) assumes the form of an approximate ensemble for the various states which occur with probability...”.

We note that, this is, precisely, the misinterpretation referred to, by M. Schlosshauer, in the quote we reproduced in section IV.

Again, some of the most conspicuous and clear contradictions that arise, when considering arguments that rely on the use unjustified interpretational extrapolations such as those above, can be illustrated by considering the standard Bohm-EPR [36] setup while entertaining the notion that the two particles might have a particular spin orientation in the absence (or before) a measurement is carried out [37]. We could, for instance, decide to trace over the spin D.O.F. of one of the particles of the EPR pair and obtain, for the spin D.O.F. of the other particle, a diagonal density matrix, and be tempted to interpret this as indicating that the particle has one of the two spins orientations. But we know this leads to contradictions: It allows one to deduce that the Bell’s inequalities should hold, but these are not only contrary to Quantum Mechanics, but have been shown to be violated experimentally [33]. Such position is thus untenable.

Besides these, one often can find additional problematic aspects of in specific the traditional treatments on the subject. Focussing again on in the account of [1], one can identified the following aspects.

First is the arguments on which these type of approaches must rely very heavily when making the selection of the preferred basis of the Hilbert space, that of the so called “pointer basis”.

- Regarding this issue we find (below equation 48 of [1]): *“fields coupling to cosmological fluctuations are expected to couple to field amplitudes and not canonically conjugate momenta of field amplitudes”* One should question why would this be so? For instance, should one not expect there be vector fields A^μ , say, similar to gauge fields, that couple precisely to the combinations of the form $\psi \nabla_\mu \psi$? Doesn't the reheating process require a coupling (even if indirect) of the inflaton with all ordinary fields, including the electromagnetic one? Why can't the inflaton field be a part of a multiplet coupling to a non-abelian gauge fields? What about couplings to gravitation which should be universal and then include all forms of energy momentum including that associated with the conjugate momenta to the field amplitudes? Perhaps the argument would be that the coupling to gravitation is too small and thus the correlations with the metric variables is negligible, but then, how do we make sense of the fact that it is precisely through the imprint on the metric and the corresponding gravitational red-shift that the Newtonian potential induces in the photons, that we do observe the CMB anisotropies? One should further note that the postures in this regard, such as that taken in [1] go against the usual understanding of when a situation is classical: Following the point of view advocated in that manuscript, those squeezed states our colleagues quantum optics work so hard to construct, would have to be regarded as classical states. In fact, we should recall that one normally considers that a situation can be described as “essentially classical” when the quantum uncertainties are very small in comparison with the expectation values of the quantity of interest, or in comparison with the precision of our analysis.

The attempts to deal with the general question facing us, leads many researchers to twist the usual understandings and interpretations of our physical theories in so many ways, that it often leads to postures that are actually self-contradictory.

- For instance, in section IV of [1], after having argued that the situation after inflation is essentially classical, the manuscript instructs us to rely, for the relevant predictions, on the quantity $\langle 0 | \delta\phi^2 | 0 \rangle$ (eq. (42) of [1]), which is nothing but the uncertainty associated with the quantity $\delta\phi$ whose expectation value is ZERO. In fact, we are warned that in computing the power spectrum, what we must compute is the “quantum average”. That is, the instruction is that one should not rely too much on all the arguments indicating the situation was classical. It seems that in the end one does not know, if the situation is essentially classical or is it not. There seems to be an internal contradiction when the procedure calls for the evaluation of the relevant observable quantities using a quantum object, if the situation looks classical. In fact, one must wonder, why should we base our calculations on the vacuum state rather than on one of the states $|n\rangle$ in the ensemble of states corresponding to:

$$\rho_s \approx \sum_n |c_n|^2 |n\rangle \langle n| \quad (12)$$

which according to equation (47) of [1], is supposed to emerge from the decoherence analysis¹³? Aren't these, according to such approaches, precisely those states that look classical and which we are supposed to observe¹⁴?

¹³ In fact, we could now turn around and ask for instance: what exactly are these states $|n\rangle$? What are, for instance, the uncertainties in the field and momentum variables for each of these states? How would we even proceed in attempting to answer such questions?

¹⁴ It is actually, worthwhile noting that most of the “standard” accounts indicate that we that we perceive is some sort of “inhomogeneous and anisotropic component of the full quantum state” but are conspicuously reluctant to characterize such components, at the quantum level, any further than that, despite the fact that these are precisely the states that lead to what we are supposed to observe.

It thus seems, that in order to subscribe to the posture adopted in those proposals, one must take it to mean something like “The cosmological fluctuations look classical to us but in reality the state of our universe is the result of the unitary quantum mechanical evolution of the vacuum, and it is thus still homogeneous and isotropic. It just does not look like that to us”. This, in turn, takes us to the posture discussed in 5b) which, as we argued, would make it impossible to use quantum mechanics at all.

Therefore, we must conclude that the position taken in accounts such as that of [1] is self contradictory: We are supposed to observe the universe in one of the states – one of those schematically shown in the equation above (corresponding for example to equation 47 of [1])– that make up the superposition in which the system actually is, but on the other hand, in order to compare with observations we must make use of the full superposition, i.e., the vacuum state. Is it not the view advocated by [1] that we live in one branch and thus only see the corresponding state¹⁵ $|n \rangle$?. If so, why should the comparisons with observations be made using the full fledged superposition associated with the vacuum state? A self consistent posture on the matter at hand would prevent the simultaneous advocacy of the two conflicting points of view.

VII. OTHER IDEAS FOR A RESOLUTION OF THE PROBLEM WITH STANDARD PHYSICS

There are some other lines of thought which, although are much less popular, have been considered as offering a resolution of the problem at hand, while relying on established physics. As it turns out, a closer inspection of such “resolutions” shows that they are based on inappropriate analogies. For instance, one often hears that the problem is completely analogous to the decay of an excited atom or nucleus, from a spherical symmetric state to an unexcited nucleus or atom and a particle that is escaping along a particular direction, which is clearly not a spherically symmetric state.

The problem was considered in [46], in early days of quantum theory, and its treatment is thought, by many colleagues, to have clarified the issue completely. But let us look at it anew: The setting considered consists of a nucleus located at the origin of spatial cartesian coordinates ($\vec{X} = \vec{0}$) in an excited (unstable) state $|\Psi^+\rangle$ which is spherically symmetric, and ready to decay into an unexcited nucleus $|\Psi^0\rangle$, plus an α particle in state $|\Xi_\alpha\rangle$, which is also spherically symmetric. The setting includes also two hydrogen atoms with their nuclei fixed at positions \vec{a}_1 and \vec{a}_2 , and their corresponding electrons, in the corresponding ground states. The issue that is discussed is the degree to which the nuclei should be aligned with the origin (i.e $\vec{a}_2 = c\vec{a}_1$ with c real) if both are to be excited by the outgoing α particle.

The analysis indicates that the probability of both atoms getting excited is significant only when there is a large degree of alignment, thus explaining the fact that the α particle traces straight paths in a bubble chamber.

Thus, although, at first hearing about this, one might think that one has an example in which an initial state possessing spherical symmetry ($|\Psi^+\rangle$) evolves into a final state without such symmetry, despite the assumption that the hamiltonian (governing the decay $|\Psi^+\rangle \rightarrow |\Psi^0\rangle|\Xi_\alpha\rangle$ and the α particle evolution) is symmetric under rotations, a closer look reveals

¹⁵ It is worthwhile mentioning that one would need to take into account the evolution of the expectation values of field operators in the corresponding state, if, in the analysis of the problem, one chooses to follow such posture to its full conclusion. This would, in turn, lead to the uncovering of the type of unconventional effects analyzed in [8, 10].

the fallacy: As indicated, the setting includes the two unexcited atoms, which, through the localizations of their nuclei, break the rotational symmetry. Indeed, the discussion is based, not on the Hamiltonian for the evolution of the free α particle, but rather on the Hamiltonian for the joint evolution (including the interaction) of the α particle and the two electrons corresponding to the two localized hydrogen atoms. In fact, the projection postulate associated with a measurement is also coming into play in the analysis of [46] when computing probabilities by projecting on the subspace corresponding to the two atoms being excited. It is clear that if we were to replace these atoms by some hypothetical detectors whose quantum description corresponded to spherically symmetric wave functions, each one with support, say, on a thin spherical shell with radius r_i , a similar calculation would not lead to straight lines, but rather it would in a spherical pattern of excitations. We would find that there was a certain probability of the detectors corresponding shells i^{th} & j^{th} being excited and the symmetry would not have been compromised. The inflationary situation we must face is, in this regard, if anything, closer to the later rather than the former version of this problem.

Another example of the reliance on inappropriate analogies is found in [47] which proposes an analogy between the process that lies at the origin of the anisotropies and inhomogeneities in the early universe, with the process of particle creation out of the vacuum in the presence of a sufficiently intense electric field, “the Schwinger process”. Such type of analysis of the Schwinger process consists in the evaluation of the S matrix element between the “in” vacuum and the “out” vacuum, and the identification of the difference between 1 and the result as a measure of particle creation. This identification would be justified by unitarity, and the observation that the S matrix element between the “in” vacuum and the other vectors in the “out” Hilbert space, such as a specific state with a single electron-positron pair, would be interpreted as the probability of pair creation in such state. This would, in turn, be justified by the standard quantum mechanics postulate of the projection postulate, indicating that $|\langle A|B\rangle|^2$ is the probability of *finding* the system in the state $|A\rangle$, if it was originally prepared in a state $|B\rangle$. However, note the need to rely on an observation or measurement, implicit in the use of the word *finding*. It is clear, that in the absence of such measurement, the system will remain in the state given by the unitary evolution of the state $|B\rangle$, namely $e^{iHt}|B\rangle$. The probability interpretation is only valid in conjunction with a measurement. An alternative posture, supporting the notion that one can consider the system described by a state $|\psi\rangle$ to have a definite value (even if it is unknown to us) for quantities for which $|\psi\rangle$ is not an eigenstate, is known to lead to conclusions that are in conflict with Bells inequalities (See [37]), and thus to contradiction with experiments (see also the discussion in Section IV A).

Getting back to the analysis of Schwinger process, we can use it to further clarify the situation we face in the cosmological context. First, let us note that we must imagine the electric field to be turned on at some finite time, for otherwise, the problem of the electron field in interaction with an external electric field, would be stationary, and if the system was prepared in its vacuum state, or the state corresponding to the minimal eigenvalue of the full hamiltonian, it would remain in that state for all times and the issue of pair creation would not make any sense. So, let us assume that the electric field is turned on adiabatically during an interval $\Delta(t)$ centered at some t_1 . Analogously, we assume the electric field to be turned off adiabatically around some later time t_2 . Let us take the electric field pointing in the direction x . We now assume that the system is prepared at a time $t \ll t_1$ in the vacuum state ($|in, 0\rangle$), and we ask about the probability amplitude for observing the system

in the state containing an electron and a positron, in the single particle states ψ_1 and ψ_2 , respectively. This question has a very well defined answer in quantum theory, which is simply

$$\langle 0; in | S | (\psi_1, -), (\psi_2, +); out \rangle. \quad (13)$$

However, let us note that we can not assume that the system, in the absence of a measurement, has a well defined probability of being in the state,

$$|(\psi_1, -), (\psi_2, +); out\rangle, \quad (14)$$

among other things, because the initial state is invariant under translations in the y, z plane, the hamiltonian preserves this invariance, but the state,

$$|(\psi_1, -), (\psi_2, +); out\rangle \quad (15)$$

will not, in general, share such invariance. Thus, while we are perfectly justified in viewing the S matrix calculation to yield the prediction for probability for the observation of pair creation out of the vacuum, when contemplating the *measurement* of the number of pairs at a certain time, we are not justified in regarding the state of a field as being anything but $U|B\rangle$ (where U is the unitary time evolution operator), in the absence of a measurement. Similarly, in the early universe within the inflationary context, we can find no justification to view the state of the universe, as anything but the state $U|0\rangle$, in the absence of a measurement.

One other notion that is sometimes mentioned in oral discussions (we have never seen this proposal being advanced in any written article, or book), is that somehow what accounts for the transition from the early H&I universe to the late asymmetric one, is similar to a “spontaneous symmetry breaking”. In this regard, we must note that in contrast with what occurs, say, in the breaking of the rotational symmetry in a ferromagnet as the temperature drops below the critical value, which is a process intimately tied to environmental perturbations, which play an important role in tipping the system from an unstable to one of the thermodynamical stable states, in the cosmological situation at hand we lack the thermal environment with its perturbations, but also the phase transition from the one characterized by the symmetric Bunch Davies vacuum, to one where there are only asymmetric (but degenerate) thermodynamical stable states. If what one wants to consider is something like the spontaneous symmetry breaking in field theories, one should note that there are no arguments indicating that, in the cosmological situation at hand the ground state is one lacking the rotational and translational symmetries possessed by the Bunch Davies vacuum. In fact, if one were to advocate such views one would have to point to the Nambu Goldstone bosons or the Higgs mechanism which are known to be intimately tied with such breakdown, and which are of course nowhere to be found in the present context. We refer the reader, interested on the general subject to the extensive discussion in [48].

Another, quite recent and very intriguing proposal that must be mentioned, is the approach based on Bohmian quantum mechanics[57], as adopted in [58]. Here the issue one must come to terms, in the context of the problem at hand, is whether one assumes that what ” gravitates” is the ”pilot wave” or the individual ”configuration trajectory” (i.e. whether the energy momentum tensor is computed using one or the other). The problem for us is that there seems to be no satisfactory choice: If we take the view that it is the pilot wave what gravitates, the fact that the wave function corresponding to the vacuum is H&I, leads us to conclude the universe is H&I throughout its complete history. If on the other had, one takes the view that it is the specific configuration space trajectory what gravitates,

then the universe was never H&I and one would have a hard time trying to argue that the appropriate wave function to be used in the inflationary context is the Bunch Davies vacuum. There might be some way to escape this conundrum, but it is very hard to envision.

Finally we should mention the proposals of solution of the problem, based on the *decoherent (or consistent) histories approach* to the measurement problem in quantum mechanics[59] (a slightly modified version of the formalism is proposed in [60]). The general scheme is based on the consideration, given a quantum state of the system $|\Phi\rangle$ (or more generally a density matrix $\hat{\rho}$) for the system at time t_0 , of families of histories characterized by a set of projection operators $\{\hat{P}_n(t_n)\}$, each of which is associated with the system possessing a value of certain physical property in a given range at a given time¹⁶. That is, each of the projector operators is associated with a certain range within the spectrum of a given observable. A given family F of such projectors, is called self consistent, if the resulting histories do not interfere among themselves, a situation that allows the assignment of probabilities to each individual “coarse grained history” within the family.

In fact, the probabilities to be assigned to one such a particular coarse grained history within a consistent family are given by:

$$P = Tr(\hat{P}_n(t_n)U(t_n, t_{n-1})\hat{P}_{n-1}U(t_{n-1}, t_{n-2})\dots\hat{P}_2U(t_2, t_1)\hat{P}_1U(t_1, t_0)\hat{\rho}U(t_n, t_0)^\dagger), \quad (16)$$

where the U s stand for the standard unitary evolution operators connecting two times, of the usual Schroedingers quantum mechanics. This approach has gained some followers in cosmology community, but it has been subjected to some strong criticisms in the foundational physics community[65].

The main problem is that, although the scheme works fine once one has selected the decoherent family, there exist, in principle, an infinitude of such decoherent families, which are however mutually inconsistent, (i.e. there are elements of F and F' that do interfere, and thus $\{F\} \cup \{F'\}$ is not decohering). This is addressed by the “single family rule” which indicates one should never consider more than one family at a time. The issue becomes how to single out a particular family to be that from which the particular history that one considers as the actual one, is to be chosen (it seems very reasonable that the fact that one assigns probabilities within a family indicates that the interpretation must be that one of the histories in that family is actualized in our world. Otherwise, one must wonder what these probabilities refer to (i.e. the probabilities assigned according to 16, are probabilities of what? (see however [64]). Recall that we do not want to say that they are probabilities of observing a certain value of a physical quantity when that quantity is measured, or an observation is made, because we do not want to bring concepts like measurement or observation into the discussion.

This is, there seems to be, in principle, no clear way to single out a specific family without relying on an *a-priori* given set of questions one is asking– those associated with the quantities whose spectral family one choses to construct the family - and this can lead to serious interpretational difficulties, in general.

In a given experimental setup, we might guide ourselves, in practice, by the questions the experimental set up is “asking” (in fact, this has a close analogy with the use Bohr rule in a given experiment or series of experiments). However, in the absence of such guidance (i.e. without *a priori* considering that the experimental set up corresponds to asking certain

¹⁶ In the cosmological setting, one must use a subtler relational time approach[62], where one of the dynamical variables is used as an effective time parameter. The cosmological scale factor is a popular choice.

yes /no questions, as it seems to be required if one does acknowledge the possibility of all superposition states of the apparatus itself) one does not know how to select the family. Note that one is not asking how to select a particular history within the family, but how to select a particular the family from within the collection of all possible decoherent families.

In fact, it is hard to see, in describing the universe, what would dictate the selection of the appropriate projector operators, and thus of the appropriate family, (if we require a description which do not makes use of our own existence and our own asking of certain questions, as part of the input).

Thus in the cosmological context the problem can be seen, for instance in the following example: Consider the family of projector operators as is done in [63], and obtain their results, but then note that alternatively we might consider the following family: Now construct the projector operator into the space of homogeneous and isotropic states P_{HI} . This is simply the projector into the intersection of the kernels of the generators of translations and rotations. Let us further define $P_{non} \equiv I - P_{HI}$ the orthogonal projector. Take the initial state for the quantum fluctuations (usually called the vacuum) $|\Phi_0\rangle$, and note that it is homogeneous and isotropic.

Now take any set of values for time $\{t_i\}$ and consider the family associated with that initial state and the two projector operators P_{HI} and P_{non} at all those times. This can easily be seen to define a family of consistent histories, simply because the dynamics preserves the symmetries (homogeneity and isotropy).

Thus, one might consider the question, what is the probability that (at given time, characterized in the appropriate relational way), the universe is isotropic and homogeneous. This can be evaluated using the formula 16 starting with the vacuum state.

Any history containing the orthogonal projector at any time P_{non} , will have zero probability, but the history containing only the operators P_{HI} will have probability one. This leads us to conclude that at any time the universe is homogeneous and isotropic. It thus can have no inhomogeneities or anisotropies at all. We would have then to face not only that problematic conclusion, but also the fact that the approach has lead us to two conflicting conclusions. This later one, and the one obtained in, say, [63]. We would thus need to find a way to decide how to believe one of them and not the other, despite the fact that both are obtained by the very same procedure¹⁷. Apparently one would have to adopt a rather problematic position of the kind of the posture **b)** in section III, about the nature of quantum theory, with the difficulties already mentioned there. It seems that this is not a satisfactory situation regarding something that ought to serve as a fundamental theory and, in particular, to help us deal with the quantum aspects of the early universe. The interested reader is referred to the literature, particularly to the works referred above for much more extensive discussions on the matter.

¹⁷ After the first version of this article was written the author learned that the advocated posture is that one should believe both, and use the appropriate one in connection with the questions one is asking (see [64]), although this posture is not shared by the authors of [60], [61]. I admit I simply can not come to terms with such view of the nature of science and of the nature of knowledge in general. This views seemed to be shared for instance by the authors of [65]. The motivation for the approach advocated there, is the quest for a formulation that is consistent with both quantum theory and relativity, and one can only agree with such goals. However in my view the price is just too heavy.

VIII. ADDRESSING THE PROBLEM

Before presenting these ideas, we should warn the reader that these are, at this stage, far from being completely developed. One might be tempted to be frustrated that after reading about the shortcomings of the traditional explanation, one is presented with a relatively vague set of ideas, so we warn the reader against the fallacious comparisons between I) an account that is presented as “fully understood and established”, and based on the existing accepted laws of physics, and II) a research project under construction, which seeks to make the first steps in understanding what is belief to be a new and not understood aspect of physics, which is argued must play a role in addressing the shortcomings of the generally accepted paradigm. The first should be judged, as we have, as a “finished product, ready for consumption”, while the former should be judged on the basis of its potential to successfully deal with the issues on general grounds. In fact, this is presented here just as one example of a possible path out of the problem, and certainly not as anything that can be regarded as even close to finished. We will, mention some of the most serious hurdles, found so far, that the program must deal with before it can be considered as part of the “understood areas of physics”. Actually, one of the aims of the present manuscript is to encourage other colleagues to consider alternative proposals having the potential to address the exposed problem. Having clarified what the reader can expect in this section, we can proceed with the exposition.

We have, so far, seen that the existing accounts of a transmutation of the homogeneous and isotropic situation to which inflation takes the universe into the in-homogeneous and anisotropic situation containing the seeds of cosmic structure are flawed. Moreover, we have argued that one can not hope to find an appropriate justification within the established paradigms of physics. The general unease in accepting these conclusions, and the many proposal and heroic efforts in attempting to escape from them, are quite understandable in view of the fact that the specific form of the “inflationary predictions” regarding the origin of the primordial seeds of cosmic structure work so well. However having convinced ourselves of the severe shortcomings we face, it seems clear that one should seek to add new elements to such paradigm in order to deal with the problem. In other words, we must incorporate some, hopefully minimalist, extra element into physics which would justify the success of the “inflationary prediction” of the primordial perturbation spectrum observed in the CMB. In this section, we will sketch a path leading to a proposal for a possible source of such modification, inspired on the ideas originally expressed by Penrose in [21], indicating that Quantum Gravity might be associated with a modification of Quantum Mechanics that would resolve the measurement problem. It should be stressed that this is nothing but a rough description of a path that can be envisioned at this time, and that a explicit calculation is far beyond the scope of this work, among other reasons, because we still do not have a fully workable theory of quantum gravity which should be the starting point.

As we have seen, the measurement problem is very much an open problem if we insist (as we do here) that quantum theory should be regarded as a theory of the world as it is, and not merely as a tool that is of some use in making certain predictions (see discussion in section III). In fact the problem becomes much more serious once we want to go beyond the consideration of simple quantum mechanical examples and consider applying the usual interpretational recipes to actual candidates for fundamental physical degrees of freedom characterized, for instance, by quantum fields. The attempts to do so lead to very severe conflicts with standard notions of causality as revealed by the analysis of R. Sorkin[49].

There, it is shown, that if we take the view that a projection into a given subspace of a Hilbert space can be generically triggered by the decision to carry out a measurement, the result is that information can be transmitted faster than light. As the author puts it, we end up with a EPR type of situation in which the normal impediments for a-causal messaging are not at work. This analysis clearly leaves us with a situation in which we have no general interpretational framework for the quantum field theories in general, and in particular, for any such theory involving the gravitational degrees of freedom.

In this context we present briefly vision of how the proposals first made in[8] might fit into the wider structure of our physical theories. The basic idea we want to contemplate here is to related the problem at hand to a different problem encountered when trying to write a theory of quantum gravity through the canonical quantization procedure. It is well known that, when following such path either in the old Wheeler de Witt approach[50], or its more modern incarnation, in the form of Loop Quantum Gravity[51], one ends up with an atemporal theory. This is known as *the problem of time in quantum gravity* [52]. That is, in both schemes, one starts with a formulation in which the basic canonical variables describe the geometry of a 3- spatial hypersurface Σ , and characterize the embedding of this 3-surface in a 4-dimensional space-time. Let us denote generically the pair of canonical variables as (\mathcal{G}, Π) . However time, or its general relativistic counterpart, a time function usually specified by the lapse function and shift vector, is no longer part of the theory. The most hopeful approach towards addressing this problem is to consider, simultaneously with the geometry, some matter fields, which are canonically described by a set of ordered pairs of variables

$$\{(\phi_1, P_1), \dots, (\phi_n, P_n)\}, \quad (17)$$

and to identify an appropriate variable $T(\phi_1, \mathcal{G}, \Pi)$, in the joint matter gravity theory, that could act as physical clocks and to characterize the state for the remaining variables, in terms of the correlations of their values with those of the physical clock. That is, one starts from the wave function for the configuration variables of the theory $\Phi(\phi_1, \dots, \phi_n, \mathcal{G})$, which must satisfy the so called hamiltonian and momentum constraints $H_\mu \Phi(\phi_1, \dots, \phi_n, \mathcal{G}) = 0; \mu = 0, 1, 2, 3..$ Next, one needs to obtain an effective wave function Φ' for the remaining variables by projecting Φ into the subspace where the operator $T(\phi_1, \mathcal{G}, \Pi)$ takes a certain range of values. That is, let us denote by $P_{T,[t, t+\delta t]}$ the projector operator onto the subspace corresponding that part of spectrum of the operator T lying between the values t and $t + \delta t$. The next step would be to recover a Schrödinger type of evolution equation by studying the dependence of $\Phi'(t) \equiv P_{T,[t, t+\delta t]} \Phi'$ on the parameter t . Needless is to say, that the actual construction, in the general relativistic setting, would need to overcome the more general character of the nature of the time parameter, which would need to be specified as a global time function \mathcal{T} which one might want to map in the reconstructed approximate space-time. That is, after obtaining, by the above procedure, a wave function associated with the spectrum of the operator of \mathcal{T} , we might use it to compute the expectation values of the 3 dimensional geometrical operators (say the triad $E_i^a(x)$ and connection $A_a^i(x)$ variables of Ashtekar, or some relevant smoothing thereof) for the wave function $\Phi'(t)$. Such collection of quantities could be seen as providing the geometrical descriptions of the “average” space-time in terms of the 3 + 1 decomposition of space-time. In other words, one would have constructed a space-time where the slicing would correspond to the hypersurfaces on which the geometrical quantities are given by the expectations of the projected wave functions $\Phi'(t)$, and thus one would be able to characterize the space-time and its slicing in terms of the lapse and shift functions. The precise realization of this procedure depends strongly on the situation and specific theory

of matter fields which one is considering, and such study is quite beyond the scope of the present paper, and on the other hand several works along these lines exist in the literature [53]. The point, however, is that the standard Schrödinger type equation emerges only as an effective description, and is only approximately valid. Under those circumstances, small modifications of that equation would not be unexpected. In fact, in a recent analysis [54] of the changes in such effective-Schrödinger-time evolution equation for a quantum mechanical system, when described in terms of the time measured by a physical clock, it was found that the modifications do away with the unitary evolution. We believe, therefore, that this can be the grounds where a modification of Schrödinger evolution, involving something akin to a collapse of the wave function, might find its explanation. There are, indeed, several proposals for such a modification centering on the analysis of standard laboratory situations [27, 55, 56]. It seems that with a paradigm where the quantum jumps occur generally, rather than being triggered by the decisions of observers to measure such and such quantity, we might avoid the sort of problem discussed in [49].

Going back to our situation, it is clear that when considering, in conjunction with the quantum evolution of the matter fields, the semiclassical approximation in the gravity sector, it is clear one would need to incorporate, in some form, the back reaction of the metric variables to the quantum jumps of the wave function of matter. Needless is to say, that nothing of this sort can be achieved at present time, among other reasons due to the fact that we lack a truly workable theory of quantum gravity. Nevertheless one can envision a setting leading up to the kind modifications to the standard physics that we think are needed if we want to successfully address the issues we have been discussing in the previous sections. Focussing more concretely on the problem at hand, namely the quantum origin of the seeds of cosmic structure during inflation, one can make an educated guess about some of the characteristics of an effective description emerging from a procedure like the one envisaged above, and starting with a appropriate theory of quantum gravity. With the view on its application to addressing the problems we have encountered in considering the quantum origin of the seeds of cosmic structure during inflation, a proposal in this spirit has been put forward in [8].

In accordance with the ideas above, and further motivated by Penrose's proposals that quantum gravity should play a role in triggering a physical collapse of the wave function for matter fields, the scheme was built to rely on a semi-classical description of gravitation in interaction with quantum fields as reflected in the semi-classical Einstein's equation

$$R_{\mu\nu} - (1/2)g_{\mu\nu}R = 8\pi G\langle T_{\mu\nu} \rangle \quad (18)$$

whereas the matter fields are treated in the standard quantum field theory in curved space-time fashion. It is clear that this can not be but an effective description of limited applicability, but we will assume that it includes the cosmological setting at hand. The extra element that we consider, as reflecting the ideas discussed in this section, is the quantum collapse of the wave function of the matter fields. That is, the normal unitary evolution, characterizing the field theory, will be supplemented by instances of quantum collapse of the wave function, thought to be triggered, somehow, by the effects of gravitational degrees of freedom that are not described by the metric (the metric is regarded as a mere effective description of some average behavior of the true gravitational degrees of freedom). The rest of the system is then described in terms of the Heisenberg picture, where the field operators reflect the standard and unitary part of the evolution, while the states will remain constant, except when a collapse occurs, which will be characterized by a random jump of the state

$|\Phi'\rangle$ to one among a set of suitable related states

$$\{|\Xi'_1\rangle, \dots, |\Xi'_i\rangle, \dots\}, \quad (19)$$

in what we will call a “self induced collapse of the wave function” :

$$|\Phi'\rangle \rightarrow |\Xi'_i\rangle \quad (20)$$

Alternatively, we might think of the formalism as describing a sort of *Interaction Picture*, whereby all the standard part of the evolution is encoded in the field operators, while the collapse is considered as the effective description of the nontrivial interaction with the fundamental quantum gravity degrees of freedom. It is clear that the equation 18 would not hold, in general, through the collapse of the wave function. At such times, the excitation of the fundamental quantum gravitational degrees of freedom should be taken into account, with the corresponding breakdown of the semi-classical approximation. The possible breakdown of the semi-classical approximation is formally represented by the inclusion of a term $Q_{\mu\nu}$ in the semi-classical Einstein’s equation, which is supposed to become nonzero **only** during the collapse of the quantum mechanical wave function of the matter fields. Thus, we write,

$$R_{\mu\nu} - (1/2)g_{\mu\nu}R + Q_{\mu\nu} = 8\pi G\langle T_{\mu\nu}\rangle. \quad (21)$$

Thus, we consider the development of the state of the universe during the time at which the seeds of structure emerge to be initially described by a H.& I. state for the gravitational and matter D.O.F.. At some point, the quantum state of the matter fields reaches a stage whereby the corresponding state for the gravitational D.O.F. leads to a quantum collapse of the matter field wave function. The resulting state of the matter fields does no longer need to share the symmetries of the initial state, and its connection to the gravitational D.O.F., which is assumed to again be accurately described by Einstein’s semi-classical equation, leads to a geometry that is no longer homogeneous and isotropic.

Concretely, the starting point of the analysis, is, as usual, the action of a scalar field coupled to gravity,

$$S = \int d^4x \sqrt{-g} \left[\frac{1}{16\pi G} R[g] - 1/2 \nabla_a \phi \nabla_b \phi g^{ab} - V(\phi) \right], \quad (22)$$

where ϕ stands for the inflaton or scalar field responsible for inflation and V for the inflaton’s potential.

It is customary to split both, metric and scalar field, into a spatially homogeneous (‘background’) part and an inhomogeneous part (‘fluctuation’), i.e. we write the metric as $g = g_0 + \delta g$, while the scalar field, which as we said is to be treated quantum mechanically in a semiclassical approximation, is supposed to be in a state $|\Phi_0\rangle$ (we are dropping now the primes that were used to indicate effective nature of the state as discussed above, but of course the discussion remains in that same setting). This state is assumed to be homogeneous and isotropic as a result of the early stage of inflation.

Next, we define $\phi_0(\eta) = \langle \Phi_0 | \hat{\phi}(\eta, x) | \Phi_0 \rangle$ which is of course independent of x .

The semiclassical equations, together with the field scalar field equations (and after suitable renormalization of the energy momentum tensor), then lead to a “background solution” that corresponds to the standard inflationary cosmology which, when written using the conformal time, corresponds to the scale factor: $a(\eta) = -\frac{1}{H_1\eta}$, with $H_1^2 \approx (8\pi/3)GV$ and with

the scalar ϕ_0 field in the slow roll regime so $\dot{\phi}_0 = -(a^3/3\dot{a})V'$ (with the “dot” representing $\frac{\partial}{\partial\eta}$ and the quantities associated with the scalar field being understood as expectation values evaluated in the state $|\Phi_0\rangle$, of course).

The emergence of the inhomogeneities and anisotropies is then addressed as follows: We define the shifted quantum field $\delta\phi(\eta, x) = \hat{\phi}(\eta, x) - \phi_0(\eta)\hat{I}$ where \hat{I} stands for the identity operator in the scalar field Hilbert space. The state $|\Phi_0\rangle$, when characterized in terms of the field $\hat{\phi}$, is supposed not only to have zero expectation value, but to be essentially the Bunch-Davies vacuum associated with the almost de-Sitter expansion (or something very close to it). Thus

$$\langle\Phi_0|\hat{\delta}\phi(\eta, x)|\Phi_0\rangle = \langle\Phi_0|\hat{\phi}(\eta, x)|\Phi_0\rangle = 0. \quad (23)$$

The perturbed metric can be written as

$$ds^2 = a(\eta)^2 [-(1 + 2\Psi)d\eta^2 + (1 - 2\Psi)\delta_{ij}dx^i dx^j], \quad (24)$$

where Ψ stands for the relevant perturbation and is called the Newtonian potential.

The perturbative treatment of the above situation using the semiclassical Einstein’s equations leads to an equation connecting the metric perturbation to the expectation value of the perturbed energy momentum tensor, which lowest order take the form :

$$\nabla^2\Psi = 4\pi G\dot{\phi}_0\langle\Phi|\hat{\delta}\phi|\Phi\rangle. \quad (25)$$

It is clear from 23 that for the original state $|\Phi_0\rangle$, we obtain $\Psi = 0$, and thus the metric would be homogeneous and isotropic. However, after the state of the field undergoes a series of collapses according to 20, the situation is modified, and, in particular the R.H.S. in 25 would become different from 0 and generically dependent on x , leading to a nontrivial metric perturbation characterized here by the newtonian potential $\Psi \neq 0$. Thus we have the actual emergence of the seeds of structure as a direct result of the dynamical quantum collapse of the wave function. The details of various aspects of this analysis can be found in [8], and in [9, 10, 41], where it is shown that the above scheme, supplemented by a some “natural assumptions” about the state after the collapse, leads to a prediction of the power spectrum of the CMB fluctuations, which matches the observations, if the collapse is assumed to occur in a particular form¹⁸. We point the interested readers to the above mentioned works for a more detailed exposition of this particular realization of the general set of ideas discussed in this section. Those works do constitute a concrete proposal (by no means claimed to be the only possible one) which explicitly addresses the problem at hand, and which, as a bonus, leads to concrete predictions that can, in principle, be confronted with observations.

The main obstacles facing this proposal, as far as can be envisaged at this point, are: 1) The collapse schemes that is considered here in the cosmological context must be made compatible with a generic solution to the measurement problem and thus framed in a quantum field theoretical implementation of the general type considered in [27, 55]. 2) The complete formal development requires, as indicated before, a fully workable and satisfactory theory of quantum gravity. Some particular issues that will doubtless become relevant are related with the compatibility of schemes involving a the collapse of the wave function, with general covariance. Here we should note that the tension is already there in discussions of Einstein-Podolsky-Rosen-Bohm Gedankenexperiment, (EPR) type situations. In fact, although the

¹⁸ The standard prediction is obtained when the conformal time for the collapse of a mode is proportional to its co-moving wavelength.

standard EPR set ups are known not to allow faster than light communication, the EPR-gone bad schemes discussed in [49] show that there are aspects of these problem that are still not fully understood. It is thus clear that the path required for a full development of the program is long and difficult. On the other hand the possible connection between of all these issues, as envisaged by this program is evidently filled with enormous potential.

IX. CONCLUSIONS

In the cosmological setting, we seek an historical account. That is, a development in time that describes the cosmic evolution, and which follows the laws of physics. Such description should explain how did WE arise, in a path covering the emergence of the primordial density fluctuations, of galaxies, stars, and planets, and eventually living organisms, humans, cultures, etc.. Such an account should not rely on the measurement (in) abilities of the late evolved creatures to explain the emergence of conditions that make them possible. From this perspective, one can not justify identifying some D.O.F as irrelevant environment, based on the current, or even permanent, limitations of humans, in the analysis of the emergence of the primordial density fluctuations, for doing so leads to a circular argument with no explanatory value. Alternative postures such as that in 5b) would make the use of quantum mechanics unjustified, in general, as discussed there.

One can not take one position regarding quantum mechanics (or any theory) in one instance and a different one in another.

It is still a remarkable fact that the HZ spectrum coincides with the calculations of the uncertainties in the evolved quantum state of the inflaton field. But we need to understand why is that.

There are, of course, alternatives, but those require the introduction of some novel aspect in physics, such as a “dynamical collapse of the wave function”, along the proposals by Penrose [21], Diosi[55], GRW[27], and [56]. We have shown one simple implementation of these ideas in the exploratory work [8], with further analysis in [10].

One might wonder what is gained by introducing an un-explained, and rather ad-hoc element into physical theory versus the acceptance of an problematic step in the argument within the established theoretical paradigm? Answer: The first thing is the explicit acknowledgment that there is something missing, and that it should be the subject of further research. Second, the modeling and parametrization of the unknown physics can be taken as the starting point of the research into that aspect of physics not yet incorporated into our fundamental theories. Finally, the fact that cosmology offers us a large amount of relevant data indicates that we are in the position to engage in a serious scientific study about some of the characteristics of that new physics.

Therefore, one must conclude that, in facing this issue, physicists face a dilemma: Take as a sort of confirmation of the predominant ideas on the subject, the agreement of the calculations with the observations, and ignore the fact that the scheme can not be fully justified within the context of the interpretations provided by our current physical theories, or admit the existence of shortcomings and start to work, towards clarifying the issues, and in the process hopefully gain some new insights in our quest to understand the functioning of our world. There is no doubt that in taking the second approach we will be often led to consider erroneous proposals, and explore paths that turn out to be dead ends, (as could clearly be the case with our own works mentioned above) but rather than see this as a

deterrent, I believe we should take heed from Sir Francis Bacon’s profound observation¹⁹ about scientific methodology: “*truth emerges more readily from error than from confusion*”. It seems that if we want to stay true to the scientific spirit the option is simple.

ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

This work was supported in part by DGAPA-UNAM IN119808-3. The author acknowledges very useful discussions with (in chronological order) A. Perez, A. De Unánue, Elias Okon , A. Bassi, B. Kay, M. Castagnino, R. Laura and J. Hartle. He, also thanks R. M. Wald for pointing out very useful and relevant references.

-
- [1] “Why do cosmological perturbations look classical to us? ”, C. Kiefer & D. Polarski, e-Print: 0810.0087 [astro-ph].
- [2] “Decoherence in Quantum Cosmology”, J.J. Halliwell, *Phys. Rev. D*, **39**, 2912,(1989); “Origin of Classical Structure From Inflation”, C. Kiefer *Nucl. Phys. Proc. Suppl.* **88**, 255 (2000) [e-Print:astro-ph/0006252]; “Semi-classicality and decoherence of Cosmological perturbations”, D. Polarski and A.A. Starobinsky, *Class. Quant. Grav.* **13**, 377 (1996) [e-Print: gr-qc/9504030]; “Environment Induced Super selection In Cosmology”, W.H. Zurek, Environment Induced Super-selection In Cosmology in *Moscow 1990, Proceedings, Quantum gravity (QC178:S4:1990)*, p. 456-472. (see High Energy Physics Index 30 (1992) No. 624); “Gauge Invariant Cosmological Perturbations” R. Branderberger H. Feldman and V. Mukhanov, *Phys. Rep.* **215**, 203, (1992); “Decoherence Functional and Inhomogeneities in the Early Universe”, R. Laflamme and A. Matacz *Int. J. Mod. Phys. D* **2**, 171 (1993) [e-Print:gr-qc/9303036]; “The self-induced approach to decoherence in cosmology,” M. Castagnino and O. Lombardi, *Int. J. Theor. Phys.* **42**, 1281, (2003), [e-Print:quant-ph/0211163]; “Decoherence during inflation: The generation of classical inhomogeneities,” F. C. Lombardo and D. Lopez Nacir, *Phys. Rev. D* **72**, 063506, (2005) [e-Print:gr-qc/0506051]; “Inflationary Cosmological Perturbations of Quantum Mechanical Origin” J. Martin, *Lect. Notes Phys.* **669**, 199 (2005) [e-Print:hep-th/0406011]; “Best Unbiased Estimates for Microwave background Anisotropies”, L.P. Grishchuk and J. Martin, *Phys. Rev. D* **56**, 1924, (1997) [e-Print:gr-qc/9702018]; “Decoherence in Quantum Cosmology at the onset of Inflation”, A. O. Barvinsky, A.Y. Kamenshchik, C. Kiefer, and I.V. Mishakov, *Nucl. Phys. B* **551**, 374, (1999) [e-Print:gr-qc/9812043]; “Quantum To Classical Transition of Cosmological Perturbations for Non Vacuum Initial States”, J. Lesgourgues, D. Polarski and A. A. Starobinsky [e-Print: gr-qc/961101904030] .
- [3] Section 10.4, page 364 of “ Structure Formation in the Universe”, T. Padmanabhan (Cambridge University Press, 1993).
- [4] Page 476 “Cosmology”, S. Weinberg (Oxford University Press, 2008).
- [5] Page 348 of “Physical Foundations of Cosmology”, V. Mukhanov (Cambridge University Press, 2005).
- [6] “Quantum Cosmology Problems for the 21st Century”, J. B.Hartle, [e-Print: gr-qc/9701022]; “Generalized Quantum mechanics for Quantum Gravity”, J. B. Hartle, [e-Print: gr-qc/0510126].

¹⁹ As cited in Thomas Kuhn’s “The structure of Scientific Revolutions”

- [7] “Quantum Mechanics of the scalar field in the new inflationary Universe”, A. Guth and S.-Y. Pi *Phys. Rev. D* **32**, 1899, (1985); “Fluctuations in the Inflationary Universe”, S. W. Hawking *Nucl. Phys. B* **224**, 180, (1983); “Origin of Structure in the Universe” J.J. Halliwell and S. W. Hawking, *Phys. Rev. D*, **31**, 1777,(1985).
- [8] “On the Quantum Origin of the Seeds of Cosmic Structure” A. Perez, H. Sahlmann, and D. Sudarsky, *Classical and Quantum Gravity* **23**, 2317, (2006) e-Print: gr-qc/0508100.
- [9] “The Seeds Of Cosmic Structure as a Door To New Physics”, proceedings of the conference ”Recent Developments in Gravity NEB XII ”, Napflio Greece, June 2006. *J. Phys. Conf. Ser.* **68**, 012029, (2007). e-Print: gr-qc/0612005; “A path towards quantum gravity phenomenology”, proceedings of the conference ”ERE 2006”, Palmas de Mallorca, Spain, Sep 2006. *J. Phys. Conf. Ser.* **66**, 012037, (2007); “A signature of Quantum Gravity at the Source of the Seeds Of Cosmic Structure”, proceedings of the conference “DICE 2006”, Piombino, Italy, Sep 2006. *J. Phys. Conf. Ser.* **67**, 012054, (2007) e-Print: gr-qc/0701071; “The Seeds Of Cosmic Structure as a door to Quantum Gravity Phenomena”, proceedings of the conference ‘From Quantum to emergent Gravity:Theory and Phenomenology”, SISSA, Trieste, Italy, June 2007. e-Print: gr-qc/0712.2795.
- [10] “The seeds of cosmic structure: A phenomenological approach” A. De Unanue & D. Sudarsky, *Phys. Rev. D* **78**, 043510 (2008) e-Print: gr-qc/0801.4702.
- [11] “Quantum Mechanics of the scalar field in the new inflationary Universe”, A. Guth and S.-Y. Pi *Phys. Rev. D* **32**, 1899, (1985); “Fluctuations in the Inflationary Universe”, S. W. Hawking *Nucl. Phys. B* **224**, 180, (1983); “Origin of Structure in the Universe” J.J. Halliwell and S. W. Hawking, *Phys. Rev. D*, **31**, 1777, (1985).
- [12] “Cosmological parameters From First results of Boomerang” A. E. Lange *et. al. Phys. Rev. D*, **63**, 042001, (2001); G. Hinshaw *et. al., Astrophys. J. Supp.*, **148**, 135, (2003); “Power Spectrum of Primordial Inhomogeneity Determined from four Year COBE DMR SKY Maps”, K. M. Gorski *et. al. Astrophys. J.* **464**, L11, (1996); “First Year Wilkinson Microwave Anisotropy Probe (WMAP) Observations: Preliminary Results” C. L. Bennett *et. al. Astrophys. J. Suppl.* **148**, 1, (2003); “First Year Wilkinson Microwave Anisotropy Probe (WMAP) Observations: Foreground Emission”, C. Bennett *et. al. Astrophys. J. Suppl.* **148**, 97, (2003).
- [13] For reviews about the various approaches to the measurement problem in quantum mechanics see for instance the classical reference “Philosophy of quantum mechanics. The interpretations of quantum mechanics in historical perspective” M. Jammer, (John Wiley and Sons, New York 1974); “The Interpretation of Quantum Mechanics” R. Omnes, (Princeton University Press 1994), and the more specific critiques “ Why Decoherence has not Solved the Measurement Problem: A Response to P. W. Anderson” - S. L. Adler *Stud. Hist. Philos. Mod. Phys.* **34**135-142 (2003), [e-Print: quant-ph/0112095]; “Why modal interpretations of quantum mechanics don’t solve the measurement problem”. A. Elby, *Found. of Phys. Lett.* **6**, 5-19 (1993) and the review of approaches to the problem presented in A. Bassi & G. C. Ghirardi, *Phys. Rept* ,**379**, 257, (2003)[e-Print: quant-ph/0302164];
- [14] “The statistical interpretation of quantum mechanics” L.E. Ballentine *Rev. Mod. Phys.* **.42**, 358-381,(1970).
- [15] “Measurement of the Schrödinger wave of a single particle”, Y. Aharonov, L. Vaidman *Phys. Lett. A* **178** 38,(1993); e-Print: hep-th/9304147
- [16] Sec 2.7 of “Quantum Theory Concepts and Methods”, A. Peres (Kluwer Academic Publishers 1993)

- [17] “Roots and fruits of Decoherence”, H. D. Zeh, in *Proceedings of the Seminarire Poincaré*, Nov 2005 (eds. T. Damour B. Duplantier & V Revasseau, Birkhäuser, 2006); quant-ph/0512078.
- [18] “Quantum Mechanics of Individual Systems”, J. B. Hartle *Am. J. of Phys.* **36**, 704, (1968).
- [19] “The problem of Measurement”, E. Wigner *Am. J. of Physics* **31**, 6, (1963); “Macroscopic quantum Systems and the quantum theory of measurement”, A. Laggett *Prog. Theor. Phys. Suppl.* **69**, 80, (1980).
- [20] “Quantum measurement Problem and the Possible Role of the gravitational Field” J. Anandan, gr-qc/9808033.
- [21] “The Emperor’s New Mind”, R. Penrose, *The Emperor’s New Mind*, (Oxford University Press 1989); R. Penrose, On Gravity’s Role in Quantum State Reduction, in *Physics meets philosophy at the Planck scale* Callender, C. (ed.) (2001).
- [22] “Inflationary universe: A possible solution to the horizon and flatness problems” A. Guth *Phys. Rev. D***23**, 347, (1981). For a more exhaustive discussion see for instance the relevant chapter in “The Early Universe”, E.W. Kolb and M.S. Turner, *Frontiers in Physics Lecture Note Series* (Addison Wesley Publishing Company 1990).
- [23] “Against Measurement”, J. S. Bell, *Phys. World* **3**, 33,(1990).
- [24] “Quantum Cosmology Problems for the 21st Century”, J. B. Hartle, [e-Print: gr-qc/9701022]; “Generalized Quantum mechanics for Quantum Gravity”, J. B. Hartle, [e-Print: gr-qc/0510126].
- [25] For a recent discussion on the status of the subject see for instance “The Interpretation of Quantum mechanics: where do we stand?” G. C. Ghirardi, [e-Print quant-ph/ 0904.0958]
- [26] “Fluctuations at the threshold of classical cosmology” E. R. Harrison, *Phys. Rev. D*, **1**, 2726, (1970); Y. B. Zel’dovich *Mon. Not. Roy. Astron. Soc.* **160**, 1p (1972).
- [27] “A Unified Dynamics For Micro And Macro Systems”, G. C. Ghirardi, A. Rimini, and T. Weber, *Phys. Rev. D* **34**, 470, (1986); “Dynamical Reduction Models: present status and future developments”, A. Bassi (2007) *Preprint* quant-ph/0701014v2.; “Dynamical Reduction Models”, A. Bassi and G .C. Ghirardi (2003) *Preprint* quant-ph/0302164v2.
- [28] “Why Decoherence has not Solved the Measurement Problem: A Response to P.W. Anderson”, S. L. Adler, *Stud. Hist. Philos. Mod. Phys.***34**,135, (2003).
- [29] A. Neumaier, in the “theoretical physics FAQ” at his University of Wien, webpage: <http://www.mat.univie.ac.at/neum/physics-faq.txt>.
- [30] “Decoherence, the measurement problem and interpretations of quantum Mechanics” M. Schlosshauer, *Rev. Mod. Phys.* **76**, 1267 (2004), [e-Print: quant-ph/0312059, page 9].
- [31] E. Joos, in ”Elements of Environmental Decoherence”, proceedings of the conference Decoherence Theoretical, Experimental and Conceptual Problems” (Eds. P. Blanchard, D. Giulini, E. Joos, C. Kiefer and I. O. Stamatescu, Springer 1999) [e-Print: quant-ph/9908008].
- [32] “Speakable and Unspeakable in Quantum Mechanics”, J. S. Bell (Cambridge University Press 1987).
- [33] “Experimental realization of Einstein-Podolsky-Rosen-Bohm Gedankenexperiment: A New violation of Bell’s inequalities” A. Aspect, P. Grangier, G. Roger, *Phys. Rev. Lett.* **49**, 91, (1982); “A New violation of Bell’s inequalities” A. Aspect, P. Grangier, G. Roger, *Phys. Rev. Lett.* **49**, 9, (1982).
- [34] “The Road to Reality”, R. Penrose (Alfred A. Kopf- New York, 2006).
- [35] “A note on measurement”, B. D’Espagnat, *Phys. Lett. A* **282**, 133, (2001).
- [36] See for instance discussions about the EPR experiment in A. Peres “Quantum Theory: Concepts and Methods” (Kluwer Academic Publishers, 1993)

- [37] “Is the Moon There when nobody Looks?” D. Mermin *Physics Today* **32**, 38, (1985).
- [38] “The Interpretation of quantum mechanics: Many worlds or many words? ” M. Tegmark, (Fundamental Problems in Quantum Theory, Eds. M.H. Rubin and Y.H. Shih.) *Fortsch. Phys.* **46**, 855, (1998) [e-Print:quant-ph/9709032].
- [39] For further discussion of the issue and other points of view see for instance: “Against Many Worlds Interpretations”, A. Kent, *Int. J. Mod. Phys.* **A5**, 1745,(1990). [e-Print: gr-qc/9703089]; “Against ‘Against many worlds interpretations’.” T. Sakaguchi, [e-Print: gr-qc/9704039]; “Many worlds in one” J. Garriga, A. Vilenkin, *Phys. Rev.* **D64**, 043511, (2001) [e-Print: gr-qc/0102010]; “How many new worlds are inside a black hole?” C. Barrabes, V. P. Frolov, *Phys. Rev.* **D53**, 3215, (1996) [e-Print: hep-th/9511136].
- [40] In the write up of this subsection the author benefited from an extensive discussion with B. Kay.
- [41] “The Seeds of Cosmic structure as a door to New Physics” D. Sudarsky, *J. Phys. Conf. Ser.* **68**, 012029, (2007) [e-Print: gr-qc/0612005] .
- [42] “Quantum field theory is not merely quantum mechanics applied to low energy effective degrees of freedom”, S. Hollands & R. M. Wald, *Gen. Rel. Grav.* **36** , 2595, (2004). [e-Print: gr-qc/0405082].
- [43] “Semiclassicality and decoherence of Cosmological perturbations”, D. Polarski and A. A. Starobinsky, *Class. Quant. Grav.* , **13**, 377 (1996) [e-Print: gr-qc/9504030].
- [44] “Sub-Poissonian processes in quantum optics” L. Davidovich, *Review of Modern Physics* **68**, 127, (1996); “Squeezed states of light”, D. F. Walls *Nature* **306**, 141, (1983); See also pg. 4 of “Lectures to Quantum Optics”, W. Vogel & G.G. Welsch, (Akademie Verlag, Berlin/ VHP Publishers, New York, 1994)
- [45] “Spin Squeezing and Light Entanglement in Coherent Population Trapping” A. Dantan, J. Cviklinski, E. Giacobino, and M. Pinarid *Phys. Rev. Lett.* **97**, 023605, (2006).
- [46] N. F. Mott “The Wave Mechanics of α - Ray tracks”, *Proc. of the Royal Soc. of London* **126** No 800, pg 79, (1929).
- [47] “Inflationary perturbations: The Cosmological Schwinger effect” J. Martin, [e-Print: hep-th/07043540].
- [48] “On the symmetry of the vacuum in theories with spontaneous symmetry breaking”, A. Perez & D. Sudarsky. e-Print: e-Print:0811.3181 [hep-th].
- [49] “Impossible measurements on quantum fields”, R. D. Sorkin, in “Directions in General Relativity” (B. L. Hu, T. Jacobson Eds. Cambridge Univ. Press, Cambridge, 1993).
- [50] “Quantum Theory Of Gravity. 1. The Canonical Theory”, B. S. Dewitt, *Phys. Rev.* **160**, 1113 (1967); “Superspace and the Nature of Quantum Geometrodynamics”, Battelle Rencontres: 1967 Lectures in Mathematics and Physics, (J. A. Wheeler, in C. DeWitt and J.A. Wheeler, Eds.) W.A. Benjamin, New York, 1968.
- [51] See for example, “Loop quantum gravity”, C. Rovelli, *Living Rev. Rel.* **1**, 1 (1998) [e-Print:gr-qc/9710008]; “Quantum geometry and gravity: Recent advances”, A. Ashtekar, [e-Print: gr-qc/0112038]; “Introduction to modern canonical quantum general relativity”, T. Thiemann, [e-Print: gr-qc/0110034].
- [52] B. S. De Witt *Phys. Rev.* **160**, 1113,(1967); J.A. Wheeler in *Battelle Reencontres 1987* eds. C. De Witt & J.A Wheeler (Benjamin, New York,1968); “Canonical Quantum Gravity and the problem of Time”, C.J. Isham **GIFT Seminar-** 0157228 (1992) qr-qc/9210011
- [53] See for instance, D. N. Page & W.K. Wootters *Phys. Rev.* **D 27**, 2885, (1983); W.K. Wootters *Int.J. Theor Phys* **D 23**, 701, (1984); See also “Time in Quantum Gravity: An Hypothesis”

- C. Rovelli *Phys. Rev. D* **43**, 442, (1991) and references therein.
- [54] “Realistic Clocks, Universal Decoherence and the Black Hole information paradox” R. Gambini, R. A. Porto, J. Pullin, *Phys. Rev. Lett.* **93**, 240401, (2004), [e-Print: hep-th/0406260]; “Fundamental Decoherence from relational Time in Discrete Quantum Gravity: Galilean Covariance” R. Gambini, R. A. Porto, J. Pullin, *Phys. Rev. D* **70**, 124001,(2004), [e-Print: gr-qc/0408050].
- [55] “A universal master equation for the gravitational violation of quantum mechanics” L. Diosi, *Phys. Lett. A* **120**, 377, (1987); “Models for universal reduction of macroscopic quantum fluctuations”, L. Diosi, *Phys. Lett. A* **40**, 1165,(1989); “Gravitation and quantum mechanical localization of macro-objects”, L. Diósi: *Phys.Lett.* **105A** , 199-202 (1984); Gravitation and Quantum Mechanics of macroscopic Objects” F. Karolyhazy, *Nouvo Cimento*, **XLII**, 1506 (1966).
- [56] P. M. Pearle in “Open Systems and Measurement in Relativistic Quantum Theory”, F. Petruccione and H.P. Breuer eds. (Springer Verlag,1999). e-Print:quant-ph/9901077; “Combining Stochastic Dynamical State Vector Reduction With Spontaneous Localization” P. M. Pearle, *Phys. Rev. A* **39**, 2277, (1989); “Reduction of the State Vector by a Nonlinear Schroedinger Equation.” P. M. Pearle *Phys. Rev. D* **13**, 857, (1976).
- [57] The classic reference is *Phys. Rev.* **85**, 166, (1952), although the first proposal was in fact made in by L. de Broglie at the 1927 Solvay Conference, and reported in *Électrons et Photons: Rapports et Discussions du Cinquieme Conseil de Physique* (Gauthier-Villars, Paris. 1928).
- [58] “ Inflationary Cosmology as a Probe of Primordial Quantum Mechanics” A. Valentini, *Phys. Rev. D* **82**, 063513, (2010).
- [59] Consistent interpretation of quantum mechanics using quantum trajectories. R. B. Griffiths, *Phys. Rev. Lett.* **70**,2201, (1993); “Choice of consistent family, and quantum incompatibility” R. B. Griffiths, *Phys. Rev. A* **57**,1604, (1998); “Consistent interpretations of quantum mechanics”. R. Omnes, *Rev. Mod. Phys.* **64**, 339, (1992); “Quantum classical correspondence using projection operators” R. Omnes, *J. Math. Phys.* **38**, 697, (1997); “Classical equations for quantum systems” M. Gell-Mann, J. B. Hartle, *Phys.Rev. D* **47**, 3345,(1993). e-Print: gr-qc/9210010; “Comment on ‘Consistent sets yield contrary inferences in quantum theory’” . R. B. Griffiths, J. B. Hartle, *Phys. Rev. Lett.* **81**,1981, (1998); “ Alternative decohering histories in quantum mechanics” M. Gell-Mann, J. B. Hartle, Singapore H. E. Phys.1990:1303-1310 (QCD161:H51), (1990).
- [60] “Time Translation of Quantum Properties” R. Laura & L. Vanni, *Foundations of Physics* **39**,160, (2009)
- [61] Private communication with R. Laura.
- [62] “Generalizing quantum mechanics for quantum space-time” J. B. Hartle,Contributed to 23rd Solvay Conference in Physics: The Quantum Structure of Space and Time, Brussel, Belgium, 1-3 Dec 2005. Published in *Brussels 2005, The quantum structure of space and time* 21-43 e-Print: gr-qc/0602013; “Generalizing quantum mechanics for quantum gravity” J. B. Hartle, *Int. J. Theor. Phys.* **45**, 1390, (2006); “The Quasiclassical realms of this quantum universe” J. B. Hartle. e-Print: e-Print:08; “The Classical Universes of the No-Boundary Quantum State” J. B. Hartle, S.W. Hawking, *Phys. Rev. D* **77**, 123537, (2008).
- [63] “The No-Boundary Measure in the Regime of Eternal Inflation”, J. B. Hartle , S. W. Hawking, T. Hertog, e-Print: e-Print:1001.0262 [hep-th].
- [64] “Quantum Physics and Human Language” J. B. Hartle, *J. Phys. A* **40**, 3101, (2007).

- [65] “On the consistent histories approach to quantum mechanics” F. Dowker & A. Kent, *J. Statist. Phys.* **82**, 1575, (1996). e-Print: gr-qc/9412067; “Can the decoherent histories description of reality be considered satisfactory?” A. Bassi & G. C. Ghirardi, *Phys. Lett. A* **257**, 247, (1999). e-Print: gr-qc/9811050; “About the notion of truth in the decoherent histories approach: A Reply to Griffiths”. A. Bassi & G. C. Ghirardi, *Phys. Lett. A* **265**, 153, (2000). e-Print: quant-ph/9912065