

Comment on “the Spin Dependence of Detection Times and the Nonmeasurability of Arrival Times”

Siddhant Das* and Serj Aristarhov†

Mathematisches Institut, Ludwig-Maximilians-Universität München, Theresienstr. 39, D-80333 München, Germany

(Dated: Oct. 6, 2023)

We respond to the recent article by S. Goldstein, R. Tumulka, and N. Zanghì [arXiv:2309.11835 [quant-ph] (2023)] concerning the spin-dependent arrival-time distributions reported in [S. Das and D. Dürr, *Sci. Rep.* **9**: 2242 (2019)].

In a recent article [1], Goldstein, Tumulka and Zanghì (GTZ in the sequel) claim that the arrival-time distributions of a spin-1/2 particle moving within a waveguide reported in [2] are “not measurable”, i.e., it is impossible that the results of any actual experiment have the reported distributions. They base their conclusion on the following points:

1. *Criterion of measurability*: The statistics of outcomes of any quantum experiment are governed by a Positive Operator-Valued Measure (POVM). The probability for the measured quantity to lie in some set $S \subset \mathbb{R}$, in this case, takes the form $\langle \Psi_i | O(S) | \Psi_i \rangle$, where $O(S)$ is an experiment-specific positive operator and $|\Psi_i\rangle$ is the prepared quantum state of the probed system.
2. The arrival-time probability distributions reported in [2] contradict 1.

In the arrival-time (or time-of-flight) experiment proposed in [2], the particle is prepared in various space-spin separated (or spin-polarized) states $|\Psi_i\rangle = |\psi\rangle \otimes |\hat{\mathbf{n}}\rangle$ with identical spatial-state $|\psi\rangle$, but different spin states $|\hat{\mathbf{n}}\rangle$; $\hat{\mathbf{n}} \in \mathcal{S}^2$ being the direction of spin-polarization. Let $P_{\hat{\mathbf{n}}}$ denote the probability distribution of the experimental outcomes when the particle is prepared with the spin-state $\hat{\mathbf{n}}$.

To demonstrate 2, GTZ show that a key property of spin-polarization-dependent probability distributions compatible with 1, *viz.*,

$$P_{\hat{\mathbf{n}}} + P_{-\hat{\mathbf{n}}} \text{ is independent of } \hat{\mathbf{n}}, \quad (1)$$

is violated by those reported in [2], thus contradicting 1. We agree with this conclusion. Since the direction defined by the waveguide axis is distinguished in the setup of [2], the failure to comply with (1) does not surprise us. However, we do not think that the criterion 1 of measurability is suitable for judging with certainty what can or cannot be observed in actual experiments.

This criterion [3, Sec. 7.1.], GTZ assert, is a “fundamental tenet in standard quantum mechanics,” and in fact “a theorem within the framework of Bohmian mechanics”—“an immediate consequence of the very meaning of an experiment from a Bohmian perspective” [4]. In what follows, we limit our discussion to Bohmian mechanics (BM hereafter) since this theory serves as the foundation for the theoretical calculations in [2]. At the same time, we note that the arrival-time problem [5] has long been challenging the “all’s POVM postulate of standard QM”. Among the many proposed solutions,

some comply with it and some do not (e.g., [6–9] that are *non-bilinear* in the prepared state).

The “all’s POVM theorem in BM” is proved in, e.g., [10, Sec. 5.1.2.], [11, Sec. 7.2], [4, Sec. 6], [3]. In order to effectively convey our objection, a brief explanation of the basic framing, core assumptions, and a sketch of the proof of this theorem are recalled next.

The proof is based on a Bohmian analysis of an experiment that takes place between times t_i and t_f . The system of interest and the apparatus(es) it interacts with are combined into a single composite system, to which the wave function $\Phi_i(x, y) = \Psi_i(x) \Xi_i(y)$ is assigned at time t_i ,¹ and the system (apparatus) particles are assumed to have the configuration $X_i (Y_i)$. It is subsequently granted that

the many-body wave function $\Phi_i(x, y)$ evolves *linearly* via Schrödinger’s equation up until time t_f .

and, furthermore, that (quantum equilibrium hypothesis)

the initial configuration of the composite system, (X_i, Y_i) , realized at the beginning of different runs of this experiment—each featuring the same composite wave function Φ_i —is random with probability density $|\Phi_i(x, y)|^2$.

From these posits, it follows via a well-known consequence of the defining equations of BM that the system configuration at time t_f , (X_f, Y_f) , is distributed with density $|\Phi_f(x, y)|^2$. This enables one to calculate the statistics of the apparatus configuration Y_f , which records the outcome of the experiment. From this point, a few lines of straightforward calculations establish that the statistics of the apparatus-configuration Y_f , as a functional depending on the *probed system’s initial wave function* $\Psi_i(x)$ must have the form dictated in 1. In particular, *it must be bilinear in Ψ_i* , from which property (1) essentially follows.

While we do not doubt the correctness of the proof of the theorem, we do find one of its key underlying assumptions questionable. To explain why, we must clarify the meaning of the joint wave function $\Phi(x, y)$ in BM.

In a universe ruled by BM, there is only one system that is a priori subject to it, namely the universe itself. However, experimental consequences of quantum theories, including BM,

¹ For instance, $\Psi_i(x)$ would be the spin-polarized states introduced previously.

can only be deduced from subsystem wave functions, such as those of the macroscopic system discussed above or the single spin-1/2 particle used in [2]. In BM one can ascribe a so-called conditional wave function (CWF) to an *arbitrary* subsystem of particles [3, Sec. 2.2], using the resources of the theory, *viz.*, the universal wave function and the Bohmian trajectories of its constituent particles.² Thus, $\Phi_{i(f)}(x, y)$ encountered in the proof of the “all’s POVM theorem in BM” must be understood—absent further hypotheses—as the CWF of the macroscopic system comprised of the particle and measuring apparatuses.

Once that is admitted, by its very construction, the CWF *does not* evolve by Schrödinger’s equation, as claimed in the proof of the “all’s POVM theorem in BM”. The equations governing the evolution of CWFs are *highly non-linear and non-unitary* (see, e.g., [12, Sec. 3.1, p. 3137] for the CWF equation of one particle in a two-particle universe).³ The assumption of the linear evolution of $\Phi_i(x, y)$ is evidently crucial; without it the theorem does not hold.

It has been suggested that in certain special situations (e.g., where the effective wave function ansatz [3, Eq. (2.7)] holds) the subsystem CWF actually behaves as an *effective wave function*—one satisfying an autonomous Schrödinger evolution. But this constitutes a further assumption about the nature of the universal wave function. Of perhaps greater concern, this ansatz being *preserved* over time between the instants t_i and t_f , perhaps even longer, is more difficult to justify.

At this point one could argue that if we doubt the effective wave function ansatz, we should also question ascribing to microscopic subsystems a proper wave function evolving according to the Schrödinger equation, as was done in [2]. But the assumption that, after certain painstaking laboratory operations (which are usually called “the state-preparation”) and subsequent isolation, microscopic subsystems do possess a definite wave function evolving according to the Schrödinger equation, remains plausible even without theoretical justification. In fact, this is precisely the assumption made in the analysis of nearly every quantum experiment, leading to excellent accord between theory and observation. The same reasoning evidently does not apply to the case of macroscopic bodies like measuring equipment. In fact, we would expect that the CWF of macroscopic objects evolves non-linearly, accounting for their necessarily Newtonian behaviour; see [13, Sec. V], [14].

To sum up, the proof of the “all’s POVM theorem in BM” rests on the assumption that macroscopic systems (such as

complete experimental setups) possess their own (effective) wave functions evolving according to the Schrödinger equation. In our view, this assumption is not plausible enough to use the consequences of the theorem to judge with certainty what can and cannot be seen in a real experiment.

The reader should not confuse our doubts with any sort of certainty that the assumption in question is wrong. We find it implausible for the reasons listed above, but by no means do we have proof of its incorrectness. It may be correct together with the conclusion of [1], or it may be wrong and the empirical arrival-time distributions will resemble those calculated in [2]. The best way to make progress here is to perform the arrival-time experiment in question.

* Siddhant.Das@physik.uni-muenchen.de

† S.Aristarkhov@campus.lmu.de

- [1] S. Goldstein, R. Tumulka, and N. Zanghì, “On the spin dependence of detection times and the nonmeasurability of arrival times,” (2023), [arXiv:2309.11835 \[quant-ph\]](https://arxiv.org/abs/2309.11835).
- [2] S. Das and D. Dürr, *Sci. Rep.* **9**, 2242 (2019); S. Das, M. Nöth, and D. Dürr, *Phys. Rev. A* **99**, 052124 (2019).
- [3] D. Dürr, S. Goldstein, and N. Zanghì, *J. Stat. Phys.* **116**, 959 (2004).
- [4] D. Dürr, S. Goldstein, and N. Zanghì, “Bohmian mechanics and the meaning of the wave function,” (1995), [arXiv:quant-ph/9512031 \[quant-ph\]](https://arxiv.org/abs/quant-ph/9512031).
- [5] J. G. Muga, R. Sala, and J. Palao, *Superlattices and Microstructures* **23**, 833 (1998); J. G. Muga and C. R. Leavens, *Phys. Rep.* **338**, 353 (2000).
- [6] R. S. Bondurant, *Phys. Rev. A* **69**, 062104 (2004); L. Maccone and K. Sacha, *Phys. Rev. Lett.* **124**, 110402 (2020); R. Gambini and J. Pullin, *New J. Phys.* (2022).
- [7] A. Marchewka and Z. Schuss, *Phys. Lett. A* **240**, 177 (1998); *Phys. Rev. A* **63**, 032108 (2001); *Phys. Rev. A* **65**, 042112 (2002).
- [8] T. Jurić and H. Nikolić, *Eur. Phys. J. Plus* **137** (2022).
- [9] J. León, J. Julve, P. Pitanga, and F. J. de Urrés, *Phys. Rev. A* **61**, 062101 (2000).
- [10] R. Tumulka, “General observables,” in *Foundations of Quantum Mechanics* (Springer International Publishing, Cham, 2022) pp. 179–255.
- [11] D. Dürr and D. Lazarovici, *Understanding Quantum Mechanics: The world according to modern quantum foundations* (Springer International Publishing, Cham, 2020).
- [12] T. Norsen, D. Marian, and X. Oriols, *Synthese* **192**, 3125 (2015).
- [13] M. Toroš, S. Donadi, and A. Bassi, *J. Phys. A: Math. Theor.* **49**, 355302 (2016).
- [14] X. Oriols and A. Benseny, *New Journal of Physics* **19**, 063031 (2017).

² It should be noted that as yet it is unclear how to define CWFs for a spin-aware Bohmian theory. Taking this crucial issue into account would only strengthen our argument, but we will ignore it for the sake of simplicity.

³ For this reason, in appropriate situations, Bohmian CWFs can explain the illusion of wave-function collapse.