

**Linking Physics and Psychology of Bistable Perception Using an Eye Blink
Inspired Quantum Harmonic Oscillator Model**

Ivan S. Maksymov¹ and Ganna Pogrebna^{1,2,3}

¹Artificial Intelligence and Cyber Futures Institute,
Charles Sturt University, Bathurst, NSW 2795, Australia

²The Alan Turing Institute, British Library, 96 Euston Rd.,
London NW1 2DB, United Kingdom

³The University of Sydney Business School, Abercrombie Building H70, Corner
Abercrombie Street and Codrington St., Darlington NSW 2006, Australia

Author Note

Ivan Maksymov  <https://orcid.org/0000-0002-1428-1216> Ganna Pogrebna 
<https://orcid.org/0000-0002-5487-7284>

We declare no known conflict of interest. Correspondence concerning this article should be addressed to Ivan Maksymov, AI and Cyber Futures Institute, Charles Sturt University, Bathurst, NSW 2795, Australia. E-mail: imaksymov@csu.edu.au

Abstract

This paper introduces a novel quantum-mechanical model that describes psychological phenomena using the analogy of a harmonic oscillator represented by an electron trapped in a potential well. Study 1 demonstrates the application of the proposed model to bistable perception of ambiguous figures (i.e., optical illusions), exemplified by the Necker cube. While prior research has theoretically linked quantum mechanics to psychological phenomena, in Study 2 we demonstrate a viable physiological connection between physics and bistable perception. To that end, the model draws parallels between quantum tunneling of an electron through a potential energy barrier and an eye blink, an action known to trigger perceptual reversals. Finally, we discuss the ability of the model to capture diverse optical illusions and other psychological phenomena, including cognitive dissonance.

Keywords: quantum mechanics, quantum tunneling, bistable perception, Necker cube, cognitive dissonance, eye blink

Linking Physics and Psychology of Bistable Perception Using an Eye Blink Inspired Quantum Harmonic Oscillator Model

Recent decades have seen numerous attempts to address the question whether the unparalleled computing power of a biological brain could be explained by quantum-mechanical processes that are likely to occur in the neurons (). Studies that incorporate physical concepts have also been conducted in the field of psychology (), where the hypotheses of quantum mind and quantum consciousness were proposed () to improve the existing classical models of brain function (C. Koch and K. Hepp, 2006). As a result of these endeavors, quantum-physical models of cognition and decision-making have been developed ().

One particular motivation behind these works was the fact that the classical models of cognition and decision-making have been unable to satisfactorily reproduce well-documented behavioral regularities (Bardsley et al., 2009) and decision making anomalies such as Ellsberg paradox (D. Ellsberg, 1961) and Machina's re-examination of it (Machina, 2009). Subsequently, novel mathematical models were urgently required. Quantum mechanical models also help unify and formalize previously heuristically formulated concepts and ideas in the field of psychology (E. M. Pothos and J. R. Busemeyer, 2022). For example, in P. D. Kvam et al., 2021 an analogy between varying mental states and oscillating quantum states has been used to explain cognitive dissonance (Festinger, 1962). A similar approach has been adopted in G. Gronchi and E. Strambini, 2017 to study the phenomenon of confirmation bias (Wason, 1960). Quantum mechanics has also underpinned the models of two-stage gambling and Prisoner's Dilemma game (E. M. Pothos and J. R. Busemeyer, 2009) and of conjunction fallacy ().

The rationale of applying a quantum theory in cognition and decision-making may be explained comparing the principles of classical and quantum computing. A quantum computer uses a quantum bit (qubit) that can be in the states $|0\rangle = \begin{bmatrix} 1 \\ 0 \end{bmatrix}$ and $|1\rangle = \begin{bmatrix} 0 \\ 1 \end{bmatrix}$

that are analogous to the '0' and '1' binary states of a classical digital computer. However, a qubit exists in a continuum of states between $|0\rangle$ and $|1\rangle$, i.e. its states can be a superposition $\psi = \alpha|0\rangle + \beta|1\rangle$, where the probability amplitudes α and β are complex numbers and $|\alpha|^2 + |\beta|^2 = 1$.

Quantum algorithms that employ qubits are exponentially faster than any possible deterministic classical algorithm (Nielsen and Chuang, 2002). Subsequently, it has been suggested () that models that represent mental states similarly to the possible states of a qubit can better explain certain psychological phenomena that appear paradoxical from a classical perspective.

This strategy has been applied in J. R. Busemeyer and P. D. Bruza, 2012 to model the bistable perceptual processing of the Necker cube (Figure 1a), which is an optical illusion caused by an ambiguous graphical representation (). In contrast to a classical Markov model of bistable perception, where the possible states of the cube were '0' and '1' (J. R. Busemeyer and P. D. Bruza, 2012), in the quantum model the states of the cube can be in a superposition of the states $|0\rangle$ and $|1\rangle$. When the perception state is measured, the quantum state corresponding to it collapses from a superposition of $|0\rangle$ and $|1\rangle$ to one of the stable perception states of the cube (Figure 1a). Hence, the quantum model can account for multiple outcomes while processing input data with a large set of constraints. The outputs of the quantum model are probabilistic and they have been shown to describe human mental states more efficiently than classical models of similar complexity (J. R. Busemeyer and P. D. Bruza, 2012).

The implementation of qubits in an experimental physical system (e.g., electrons) could be used to model the human decision-making and perception, also having implications for our understanding of complex cognitive processes, should the still-debated quantum mind hypothesis gain wider acceptance (e.g.,). However, while such physical experiments are feasible, quantum measurements are technically challenging. On the other hand, quantum-physical systems can be studied using the well-known mathematical models

such as the Schrödinger equation. This approach is adopted in this present work to demonstrate that a mathematical model of a real-life physical system could be used to bridge a gap between theoretical and experimental results obtained in the studies of psychological phenomena.

The Schrödinger equation is a partial differential equation that governs the wave function of a quantum-mechanical system (Griffiths, 2004). For a single electron that exists in a one-dimensional space it can be written as

$$i\hbar \frac{\partial \psi(x, t)}{\partial t} = \left[-\frac{\hbar^2}{2m} \frac{\partial^2}{\partial x^2} + V(x) \right] \psi(x, t), \quad (1)$$

where $\psi(x, t)$ is a wave function, i is the imaginary unit, m is the mass of the electron, \hbar is Planck's constant and $V(x)$ is the potential that represents the environment where the electron exists.

In J. R. Busemeyer and P. D. Bruza, 2012, the space and time variables of Eq. (1) were algebraically separated, resulting in an equation that predicts the existence of stationary states. Interpreting such states as probabilities of perception of the states of the Necker cube, it was demonstrated that the probability harmonically alternates from zero to one as a square sine function of time. A similar result was obtained in H. Atmanspacher and T. Filk, 2010, where some principles of quantum mechanics were used to describe the switching of mental states during the perception of ambiguous figures.

However, the theoretical results produced by the aforementioned quantum models cannot fully explain experimental data obtained in experiments involving the perception of the Necker cube and other ambiguous figures. For example, in G. Piantoni et al., 2017, electroencephalograms were recorded consistently with subjective inputs given by observers. Whereas those inputs were represented by abruptly changing square pulses of a seemingly random duration, the envelopes of the corresponding electroencephalogram data were continuously changing pulse-like waveforms (see Figure 1b, where generic experimental data are schematically plotted alongside a square-pulse representation of the perceptual reversal). Similar continuously varying waveforms were observed in eye-tracking

experiments, where a blink or movement of eye was associated with a perceptual reversal (G. M. Long and T. C. Toppino, 2004).

Thus, in Study 1 of this current work, we address the problems of discrepancy between experimental data and the traditional representation of perceptual reversal as a series of abrupt switches between two discrete states. Then, in Study 2 we numerically validate a physiology-consistent quantum-physical model of bistable perception based on the Schrödinger equation. Finally, we discuss the ability of our model to capture diverse optical illusions and other psychological effects such as cognitive dissonance.

Method

The model

We analyze a physical system consisting of an electron that undergoes a harmonic motion in a parabolic potential well (Figure 2a). In classical mechanics, a counterpart of this system would be a small idealized ball that constantly rolls back and forth inside a bowl. Whereas the ball may not have enough energy to surmount or penetrate a physical barrier placed inside the bowl, in a similar scenario the electron may pass through the barrier by virtue of the quantum tunneling effect (Figure 2a).

In Figure 2b we present the results of modeling of the electron tunneling through a potential barrier located in the middle of a parabolic potential well. The x -axis is the spatial coordinate across the potential well. The right y -axis plots the $V(x)$ profile of the barrier. The left y -axis plots the modulus square of the wave function ψ obtained by solving Eq. (1). The wave function ψ has the meaning of probability amplitude but its modulus square corresponds to the probability density of finding the electron at a certain position in space.

Representing the electron as a Gaussian-shape energy wave packet that moves towards the potential barrier (the blue dashed curve in Figure 2b), we observe that one part of the incident wave packet becomes reflected from the barrier but another part is transmitted through it. This result means that there is a certain probability that the

electron passed through the barrier and a certain probability that it has been reflected from the barrier.

We virtually split the parabolic potential well into two equal spatial regions and we denote them as $|0\rangle$ and $|1\rangle$. We compute the probabilities of finding the electron inside those regions and we interpret them as the probabilities of perceiving the Necker cube in the states $|0\rangle$ and $|1\rangle$, respectively. In Figure 2b the electron starts moving from the left side of the potential well, which means that, at the beginning of the simulation, the probability of finding the electron in the region $|0\rangle$ is $P_{|0\rangle} = 1$ (note that $P_{|0\rangle} + P_{|1\rangle} = 1$). At the end of the simulation, analyzing the wave packets that have been reflected from and transmitted through the barrier, we obtain $P_{|0\rangle} = 0.35$ and $P_{|1\rangle} = 0.65$.

Finite-difference time-domain method

We numerically solve the Schrödinger equation Eq. (1) using a finite-difference time-domain (FDTD) method (D. M. Sullivan, 2000). We split the wave function $\psi(x, t)$ into the real and imaginary parts:

$$\psi(x, t) = \psi_{re}(x, t) + i\psi_{im}(x, t) \quad (2)$$

and rewrite Eq. (1) as

$$\begin{aligned} \frac{\partial \psi_{re}(x, t)}{\partial t} &= -\frac{\hbar}{2m} \nabla^2 \psi_{im}(x, t) + \frac{1}{\hbar} V(x) \psi_{im}(x, t) \\ \frac{\partial \psi_{im}(x, t)}{\partial t} &= \frac{\hbar}{2m} \nabla^2 \psi_{re}(x, t) - \frac{1}{\hbar} V(x) \psi_{re}(x, t). \end{aligned} \quad (3)$$

The coordinate x , time t and wave function $\psi(x, t)$ are represented as discrete quantities using a spatially uniform mesh with the size Δx and a temporal mesh with the size Δt . The x -coordinate becomes a vector of discrete elements $x_k = k\Delta x$, where $k = 1 \dots N_x$ and N_x is the number of nodes of the spatial mesh. Similarly, the discrete time instances are $t_n = n\Delta t$ with $n = 1 \dots N_t$. The value of Δt must be related to Δx via the Courant stability criterion (D. M. Sullivan, 2000):

$$\Delta t = \frac{1}{8} \frac{2m}{\hbar} (\Delta x)^2. \quad (4)$$

Thus, we obtain a spatio-temporally discretized representation of Eq. (3):

$$\psi_{re}^n(k) = \psi_{re}^{n-1}(k) - \frac{1}{8} \left[\psi_{im}^{n-1/2}(k+1) - 2\psi_{im}^{n-1/2}(k) + \psi_{im}^{n-1/2}(k-1) \right] + \frac{\Delta t}{\hbar} V(k) \psi_{im}^{n-1/2}(k) \quad (5)$$

$$\psi_{im}^n(k) = \psi_{im}^{n-1}(k) + \frac{1}{8} \left[\psi_{re}^{n-1/2}(k+1) - 2\psi_{re}^{n-1/2}(k) + \psi_{re}^{n-1/2}(k-1) \right] - \frac{\Delta t}{\hbar} V(k) \psi_{re}^{n-1/2}(k).$$

The electron is modeled as a Gaussian-shape energy wave packet:

$$\begin{aligned} \psi_{re}^n(k) &= \exp \left(-0.5 \left(\frac{k - k_0}{\sigma} \right)^2 \right) \cos \left(\frac{2\pi(k - k_0)}{\lambda} \right) \\ \psi_{im}^n(k) &= \exp \left(-0.5 \left(\frac{k - k_0}{\sigma} \right)^2 \right) \sin \left(\frac{2\pi(k - k_0)}{\lambda} \right), \end{aligned} \quad (6)$$

where λ is the wavelength, σ is the width of the Gaussian pulse and k_0 is the coordinate of origin of the pulse. Since we require the electron to be present somewhere in the potential well, the amplitudes of the wave functions are normalized as

$$\int_{-\infty}^{\infty} \psi^*(x) \psi(x) dx = 1. \quad (7)$$

The probabilities of finding the electron in the $|0\rangle$ and $|1\rangle$ regions of the potential well are calculated as

$$P_{|0\rangle} = \int_{-\infty}^{x_{centre}} \psi^*(x) \psi(x) dx \quad (8)$$

$$P_{|1\rangle} = \int_{x_{centre}}^{\infty} \psi^*(x) \psi(x) dx, \quad (9)$$

where $P_{|0\rangle} + P_{|1\rangle} = 1$. The following physically meaningful model parameters were used in the simulations: $\Delta x = 0.1 \times 10^{-11}$ m, $N_x = 4001$, $N_t = 3 \times 10^6$, $\lambda = 1.6 \times 10^{-10}$ m and $\sigma = 1.6 \times 10^{-10}$ m.

Results

Study 1: Bistable perception

We start with the discussion of a single parabolic potential well (Figure 3a). We plot the numerical data as a false-color map (Figure 3b), where the blue color corresponds

to the zero probability density but the yellow color denotes the maximum value of the probability density. One can understand this color map as a set of individual plots, such as the one in Figure 2b, that are arranged together in a chronological order.

We can observe a harmonic oscillator behavior, as a result of which the probability of finding the electron in the $|0\rangle$ and $|1\rangle$ states periodically varies with time (Figure 3c). While the electron is more likely to be found in the pure $|0\rangle$ and $|1\rangle$ states, its transition between them is not instantaneous but gradual. This means that the electron exhibits a temporal nonlocality since its states are not sharply localized but continuously change over a time interval (H. Atmanspacher and T. Filk, 2010). For example, at certain instances of time, the probability of finding the electron in the states $|0\rangle$ or $|1\rangle$ equals 0.5. This situation may also be interpreted as a temporally interleaved percept-choice sequence known in the context of neuro-dynamical bistable perception models (A. J. Noest and R. J. A. van Wezel, 2012). Importantly, the result in Figure 3c is in good agreement with the simulated data produced using the quantum-mechanical models in H. Atmanspacher and T. Filk, 2010 and J. R. Busemeyer and P. D. Bruza, 2012.

However, the predictions of the single parabolic potential well model do not fully agree with the experimental electroencephalogram and eye-tracking data obtained in the tests involving the Necker cube. To resolve this problem, we use a double parabolic well with a barrier located in the middle of the computational domain (Figure 4a). In this updated model, the electron undergoes quantum tunneling through the barrier, which gives rise to wave function interference processes (Griffiths, 2004). In Figure 4b, where we present the relevant simulation results, the energy wave packet originates from the well with a lower spatial coordinate value and it moves in the positive direction. We can see that at the discrete time of approximately $T = 25$ the wave packet splits into two approximately equal waveforms due to the interaction with the barrier.

The corresponding probabilities of finding the electron in the states $|0\rangle$ and $|1\rangle$ are plotted in Figure 4c as a function of time, where we can observe a periodic switching

between the fundamental perception states. However, apart from a short period at the beginning of the simulation where the system is temporarily strongly affected by the input, we can see that the electron is mostly found in a superposition of the $|0\rangle$ and $|1\rangle$ states due to wave function interference processes. Such a superposition has often been attributed to the potential existence of mental “superposition” states ().

The result in Figure 4c also aligns with the outcomes of a recent test of perceptual reversals of the Necker cube (M. Wilson et al., 2023), where it has been shown that perception can become unstable before the actual reversal event is reported by the viewer. Yet, observers may intentionally control their perception of the cube, thus changing the number of perceptual reversals over time (G. M. Long and T. C. Toppino, 2004). However, the reversal cannot be prevented entirely. The result in Figure 4c reproduces both varying number and time duration of perceptual reversals, also confirming the impossibility of a complete prevention of the reversal.

Perceptual ambiguity does not mean that two alternative interpretations are always equally possible. Instead, there is typically a preferred interpretation that an observer tends to see (H. Nakatani et al., 2011). Moreover, the perceptual reversal rate often depends on the familiarity of the ambiguous figure, adaptation and concentration (G. M. Long and T. C. Toppino, 2004).

Our model enables us to adjust the behavior of the electron to account for these processes. In Figure 5a, we use an asymmetric double parabolic well with a higher barrier compared with that in Figure 4a. The probability of electron tunneling through this barrier decreases accordingly, thereby increasing the probability of finding the electron inside the same well from where it originates (Figure 5b, c). We interpret this result as a preference that can be induced by changing the gaze direction and suppressing eye blinking (G. M. Long and T. C. Toppino, 2004). The model also shows that perceptual reversals cannot be suppressed because it is impossible to hold a preferred cube orientation for a long time.

Study 2: Link between physics and physiology of bistable perception

While previous studies have successfully employed overarching principles of quantum mechanics to model the perception of ambiguous figures, a comprehensive link between the physics and physiology of bistable perception has remained elusive. The present paper bridges this gap, establishing a concrete connection between these two realms. We also suggest that the physical processes that underpin the model proposed in this work correspond to an eye blink, which is an action that leads to a change in the perception state (G. M. Long and T. C. Toppino, 2004) and improves the ability to recognize objects (J. W. A. Ang and G. W. Maus, 2020).

Quantum harmonic oscillations result in a continuous conversion of energy from kinetic to potential and vice versa. Yet, due to the potential barrier located between the adjacent parabolic wells, the energy conversion processes are accompanied by redistribution of energy from a region where destructive wave function interference occurs to a region of constructive interference.

Although the human eye is often considered to be sensitive only to the intensity of light, it has been argued that optical illusions and cognition may be caused by phase-sensitive optical wave phenomena (E. Gladilin and R. Eils, 2015). Variations of phase are also important in the context of quantum interference, which, in the framework of our model, means that phase plays a role in defining the probability of finding the electron in the states $|0\rangle$ and $|1\rangle$ that correspond to the perceptual states of the Necker cube.

A blink is important for maintaining the lubrication of the eye: a thin layer of fluid that covers the outer mucosal surfaces of the eye is renewed every time the eye blinks (A. Sharma and H. B. Hindman, 2014). From the point of view of optical wave physics, the formation of this liquid film inevitably leads to optical interference processes and phase shifts (ϕ).

While, to our best knowledge, any connection between the optical properties of the lubricated eye and bistable perception has not been demonstrated, several plausible

arguments can be provided in favor of it. For example, it is known that aged people often suffer from the syndrome of dry eyes and from reduced amplitude and speed of eye blinks (A. Sharma and H. B. Hindman, 2014). At the same time, many experiments have revealed a lower ability of aged people to experience bistable stimuli (K. Patel and M. Reed, 2016). Subsequently, a connection between wave-optical changes in the eye due to eye blinking and lubrication and bistable perception cannot be ruled out.

Thus, we suggest that in our model a phase shift should be associated with eye blinks. In Figure 6, we plot the probability of finding the electron in the states $|0\rangle$ and $|1\rangle$ (the same data as in Figure 5c but plotted on a shorter time scale) alongside the phase detected in the middle of the potential barrier formed by the adjacent parabolic wells. We reveal that every perceptual reversal is heralded by shifts in an otherwise monotonically increasing phase of the wave function. Interestingly, this results qualitatively agrees with the experimental observation of perception destabilization that precedes the perceptual reversal by approximately one second (M. Wilson et al., 2023). Yet, the phase shifts occur closer to the end of the stable perception periods and they are followed by a gradual change in the probability. A similar behavior was predicted previously in J. R. Busemeyer and P. D. Bruza, 2012 and it is consistent with the fact that an eye blink improves the ability to recognize objects. Naturally, the changes caused by an eye blink cannot occur instantaneously, which explains, for example, a gradual decrease in the probability to perceive the state $|0\rangle$ at the discrete time of approximately $T = 100$ in Figure 6.

Discussion

The proposed quantum-mechanical model can be applied to different optical illusions, multistable perception effects and other psychological phenomena. We tested several ambiguous two-dimensional drawing, including Rubin's vase, "My Wife and My Mother-in-Law", rabbit-duck illusion and Spinning Dancer illusion, and we established that changes in their perception are essentially similar to those of the Necker cube but follow different temporal dynamics. Our observations agree with the previously published data

that reveal a high correlation between the switching rates of different bistable stimuli (T. Cao et al., 2018).

Our model can capture the differences in temporal dynamics using different profiles of the potential well. For example, longer switching times can be achieved using a quartic oscillator and different types of double potential wells with a Gaussian perturbation (Griffiths, 2004). Optimization and machine learning techniques can also be used to produce a unique profile of the potential well that would reproduce experimental data. More complex two-dimensional potential wells can also be used. Moreover, the model can be generalized to N dimensions ($N = 1, 2, 3, \dots$), where instead of the position x of the electron in the one-dimensional space one would use the coordinates x_1, \dots, x_N . The same approach will also enable the modeling of multistable perceptual states (J. R. Busemeyer and P. D. Bruza, 2012).

It can also be demonstrated that the same model can be applied to cognitive dissonance, a mental discomfort experienced by a person, who holds two or more contradictory beliefs, ideas or values. Previous works showed that temporal oscillations serve as a plausible model of cognitive dissonance (P. D. Kvam et al., 2021). Independently, it has been experimentally demonstrated that the oscillatory activities in the brain play an important role in bistable perception and other complex cognitive processes (S. Sen et al., 2020).

We suggest that a quantum harmonic oscillator system can be used to simulate oscillations of mental states between two or more contrasting beliefs and ideas. In such a model, the contradictory beliefs and values could be assigned specific priorities using potential wells of arbitrary complex configuration. Moreover, an energy barrier and the quantum tunneling through the barrier could represent a psychological barrier that needs to be overcome to resolve a conflicting situation (W. Friend and D. Malhotra, 2019).

We note that the model of cognitive dissonance proposed in P. D. Kvam et al., 2021 is effectively an extension of the classical and quantum-mechanical models of bistable

perception previously used in J. R. Busemeyer and P. D. Bruza, 2012. Since our quantum harmonic oscillator model has been inspired by the models from J. R. Busemeyer and P. D. Bruza, 2012 and it shares with them a number of essential physical features, the results obtained in P. D. Kvam et al., 2021 also speak in favor of the ability of our model to handle cognitive dissonance and, potentially, other psychological phenomena. Interestingly, in P. D. Kvam et al., 2021 only a combination of the classical and quantum models could satisfactorily reproduce alternations between the mental states. Since our model also combines the elements of a classical and quantum oscillators, a hybrid nature of our model and of that from P. D. Kvam et al., 2021 confirms that advanced physics-focused quantum-mechanical approaches are needed to adequately describe complex psychological phenomena that involve oscillations of mental states.

Conclusion

Our study presents a novel quantum-physical model that successfully integrates the principles of quantum mechanics with the physiological dynamics of bistable perception, specifically in relation to eye blink dynamics. The model proposes a mechanism for perceptual reversals, featuring energy conversion and redistribution processes, underscored by wave function interference within a quantum-mechanical context.

The proposed model assigns a key role to phase variations, particularly in relation to wave interference. Intriguingly, these phase shifts are linked with eye blinks, a function that refreshes eye lubrication and that has been found to impact perceptual state changes and object recognition.

While existing research works have not established yet a definitive link between the optical properties of the lubricated eye and bistable perception, our findings suggest a plausible association, strengthened by the evidence of age-related declines in eye lubrication and blink rate coinciding with a decreased ability to experience bistable stimuli ().

Finally, the scope of our model extends beyond bistable perception of the Necker cube and similar ambiguous figures. In particular, we have provided considerable

arguments in favor of the ability of our model to capture the effects of cognitive dissonance. This versatility, in conjunction with the bridging of quantum principles and physiological mechanisms, underscores the potential influence of our findings on the field.


References

- A. J. Noest & R. J. A. van Wezel. (2012). Dynamics of temporally interleaved percept-choice sequences: Interaction via adaptation in shared neural populations. *J. Comput. Neurosci.*, *32*, 177–195.
- A. Sharma & H. B. Hindman. (2014). Aging: A predisposition to dry eyes. *J. Ophthalmol.*, *2014*, 781683.
- Bardsley, N., Cubitt, R., Loomes, G., Moffatt, P., Starmer, C., & Sugden, R. (2009). Experimental economics. In *Experimental economics*. Princeton University Press.
- C. Koch & K. Hepp. (2006). Quantum mechanics in the brain. *Nature*, *440*, 611.
- D. Aerts & J. A. Arguëlles. (2022). Human perception as a phenomenon of quantization. *Entropy*, *24*, 1207.
- D. Ellsberg. (1961). Risk, ambiguity, and the Savage axioms. *Math. Comput. Simul.*, *40*, 453–480.
- D. M. Sullivan. (2000). *Electromagnetic simulations using the ftd method*. IEEE Press, New York.
- E. Gladilin & R. Eils. (2015). On the role of spatial phase and phase correlation in vision, illusion, and cognition. *Front. Comput. Neurosci.*, *9*.
<https://doi.org/10.3389/fncom.2015.00045>
- E. M. Pothos & J. R. Busemeyer. (2009). A quantum probability explanation for violations of ‘rational’ decision theory. *Proc. R. Soc. B*, *276*, 2171–2178.
- E. M. Pothos & J. R. Busemeyer. (2022). Quantum cognition. *Annu. Rev. Psychol.*, *73*, 749–778.
- Festinger, L. (1962). *A theory of cognitive dissonance*. Stanford University Press.
- G. Gronchi & E. Strambini. (2017). Quantum cognition and bell’s inequality: A model for probabilistic judgment bias. *J. Math. Psychol.*, *78*, 65–75.
- G. M. Long & T. C. Toppino. (2004). Enduring interest in perceptual ambiguity: Alternating views of reversible figures. *Psychol. Bull.*, *130*, 748–768.

- G. Piantoni, N. Romeijn, G. Gomez-Herrero, Y. D. Van Der Werf, & E. J. W. Van Someren. (2017). Alpha power predicts persistence of bistable perception. *Sci. Rep.*, *7*, 5208.
- Griffiths, D. J. (2004). *Introduction to quantum mechanics*. Prentice Hall, New Jersey.
- H. Atmanspacher & T. Filk. (2010). A proposed test of temporal nonlocality in bistable perception. *J. Math. Psychol.*, *54*, 314–321.
- H. Nakatani, N. Orlandi, & C. van Leeuwen. (2011). Precisely timed oculomotor and parietal EEG activity in perceptual switching. *Cogn. Neurodyn.*, *5*, 399–409.
- J. R. Busemeyer & P. D. Bruza. (2012). *Quantum models of cognition and decision*. Oxford University Press, New York.
- J. W. A. Ang & G. W. Maus. (2020). Boosted visual performance after eye blinks. *J. Vis.*, *20*. <https://doi.org/10.1167/jov.20.10.2>
- K. Patel & M. Reed. (2016). Multistable perception in older adults: Constructing a whole from fragments. *Brain Sci.*, *6*, 10.
- Lo, C., & Dinov, I. (2011). Investigation of optical illusions on the aspects of gender and age. *UCLA USJ*, *24*.
- Ludwin-Peery, E., Bramley, N. R., Davis, E., & Gureckis, T. M. (2020). Broken physics: A conjunction-fallacy effect in intuitive physical reasoning. *Psychological Science*, *31*(12), 1602–1611.
- M. Wilson, L. Hecker, E. Joos, A. Aertsen, L. T. van Elst, & J. Kornmeier. (2023). Spontaneous Necker-cube reversals are not that spontaneous. *Front. Hum. Neurosci.*, *17*, 1179081.
- Machina, M. J. (2009). Risk, ambiguity, and the dark-dependence axioms. *Am. Econ. Rev.*, *99*, 385–392.
- Mason, R. A., & Just, M. A. (2016). Neural representations of physics concepts. *Psychological science*, *27*(6), 904–913.

- Mindell, A. (2012). *Quantum mind: The edge between physics and psychology*. Deep Democracy Exchange.
- Necker, L. A. (1832). Observations on some remarkable optical phenomena seen in Switzerland; and on an optical phenomenon which occurs on viewing a figure of a crystal or geometrical solid. *Lond. Edinb. Philos. Mag. J. Sci.*, 1, 329–337.
- Nielsen, M., & Chuang, I. (2002). *Quantum computation and quantum information*. Oxford University Press, New York.
- P. D. Kvam, J. R. Busemeyer, & T. J. Pleskac. (2021). Temporal oscillations in preference strength provide evidence for an open system model of constructed preference. *Sci. Rep.*, 11, 8169.
- S. E. Temple, J. E. McGregor, C. Miles, L. Graham, J. Miller, J. Buck, N. E. Scott-Samue, & N. W. Roberts. (2015). Perceiving polarization with the naked eye: Characterization of human polarization sensitivity. *Proc. Biol. Sci.*, 282, 20150338.
- S. Gruppetta, F. Lacombe, & P. Puget. (2005). Study of the dynamic aberrations of the human tear film. *Opt. Express*, 13, 7631–7636.
- S. Sen, S. N. Daimi, K. Watanabe, K. Takahashi, J. Bhattacharya, & G. Saha. (2020). Switch or stay? Automatic classification of internal mental states in bistable perception. *Cogn. Neurodyn.*, 14, 95–113.
- T. Cao, L. Wang, Z. Sun, S. A. Engel, & S. He. (2018). The independent and shared mechanisms of intrinsic brain dynamics: Insights from bistable perception. *Front. Psychol.*, 9. <https://doi.org/10.3389/fpsyg.2018.00589>
- W. Friend & D. Malhotra. (2019). Psychological barriers to resolving intergroup conflict: An extensive review and consolidation of the literature. *Negot. J.*, 35, 407–442.
- Wason, P. C. (1960). On the failure to eliminate hypotheses in a conceptual task. *Q. J. Exp. Psychol.*, 12, 129–140.
- Wendt, A. (2015). *Quantum mind and social science*. Cambridge University Press.

Wong, K. W., Bi, W., Soltani, A. A., Yildirim, I., & Scholl, B. J. (2023). Seeing soft materials draped over objects: A case study of intuitive physics in perception, attention, and memory. *Psychological Science*, *34*(1), 111–119.

**Figure 1**

(a) The Necker cube and its two possible stable interpretations denoted as the $|0\rangle$ and $|1\rangle$ states in the main text. (b) Schematic of a typical discrete perception pattern (solid line), where the cube can be either in $|0\rangle$ or $|1\rangle$ state. The dashed line sketches a possible continuous curve that might correspond to an electroencephalogram or an eye-tracking signal measured simultaneously with the state of the Necker cube reported by an observer.




Figure 2

(a) In classical mechanics, a ball that typically rolls back and forth (i.e. undergoes harmonic motion) inside an empty bowl cannot surmount a barrier placed on its way. In quantum mechanics, an electron trapped in a parabolic well behaves as a harmonic oscillator and it can tunnel (pass) through a barrier. (b) Result of a numerical simulation of quantum tunneling through the barrier. The labels $|0\rangle$ and $|1\rangle$ correspond to the states of the Necker cube.




Figure 3

(a) Model using a potential well with a single parabolic profile. The electron wave packet originates at approximately 1 nm and it moves in the positive direction. (b) False color map plot of the probability density $\psi^*\psi$ plotted as a function of both the spatial coordinate inside the potential well and the discrete time. (c) Probability of finding the electron in the states $|0\rangle$ (solid curve) and $|1\rangle$ (dotted curve) as a function of discrete time.




Figure 4

(a) Model using a potential well with a symmetric double parabolic profile. The electron wave packet originates in the middle of one of the wells and it moves in the positive direction. (b) False color map plot of the probability density $\psi^*\psi$ plotted as a function of both the spatial coordinate inside the potential well and the discrete time. (c) Probability of finding the electron in the states $|0\rangle$ (solid curve) and $|1\rangle$ (dotted curve) as a function of discrete time..




Figure 5

(a) Model using a potential well with an asymmetric double parabolic profile obtained by shifting one of the wells by -10 eV. (b) False color map plot of the probability density $\psi^*\psi$ plotted as a function of both the spatial coordinate inside the potential well and the discrete time. (c) Probability of finding the electron in the states $|0\rangle$ (solid curve) and $|1\rangle$ (dotted curve) as a function of discrete time.




Figure 6

Probability of finding the electron in the states $|0\rangle$ (solid curve) and $|1\rangle$ (dotted curve) in the asymmetric double parabolic well plotted alongside the phase shift. The arrows highlight the changes in phase that herald the changes in the perception state.