

# Quantum decision theory as quantum theory of measurement

V.I. Yukalov<sup>1,2</sup> and D. Sornette<sup>1</sup>

<sup>1</sup>*Department of Management, Technology and Economics,  
Swiss Federal Institute of Technology, Zürich CH-8032, Switzerland*

<sup>2</sup>*Bogolubov Laboratory of Theoretical Physics,  
Joint Institute for Nuclear Research, Dubna 141980, Russia*

## Abstract

We present a general theory of quantum information processing devices, that can be applied to human decision makers, to atomic multimode registers, or to molecular high-spin registers. Our quantum decision theory is a generalization of the quantum theory of measurement, endowed with an action ring, a prospect lattice and a probability operator measure. The algebra of probability operators plays the role of the algebra of local observables. Because of the composite nature of prospects and of the entangling properties of the probability operators, quantum interference terms appear, which make actions noncommutative and the prospect probabilities non-additive. The theory provides the basis for explaining a variety of paradoxes typical of the application of classical utility theory to real human decision making. The principal advantage of our approach is that it is formulated as a self-consistent mathematical theory, which allows us to explain not just one effect but actually all known paradoxes in human decision making. Being general, the approach can serve as a tool for characterizing quantum information processing by means of atomic, molecular, and condensed-matter systems.

*PACS:* 03.67.Hk; 03.67.Mn; 03.65.Ta

*Keywords:* Quantum information; Quantum communication; Quantum intelligence; Measurement theory; Quantum decision theory

# 1 Introduction

The classical theory of decision making is based on the expected utility theory formalized by Von Neumann and Morgenstern [1]. In spite of its normative appeal, researchers have uncovered several types of widespread systematic violations of expected utility theory and of its underlying assumptions, in experiments involving real human beings. Beginning with the observations by Allais [2], Edwards [3], and Ellsberg [4] about fifty years ago and continuing through the present, a growing body of clear evidence has been accumulated, which shows that real-life decision makers do not conform to many of the key assumptions and predictions of expected utility theory. The deviations have been found to be systematic and reproducible, and have been classified in so-called paradoxes and fallacies, documented in a voluminous literature (see review articles [5–7] and reference therein). While classical utility theory is perfectly self-consistent, it is just that real human beings do not conform to its predictions, leading to behaviors which appear paradoxical *when interpreted in the framework of classical utility theory*.

Here, we present an alternative “Quantum decision theory” (QDT) which, while also being internally consistent as is classical utility theory, provides correct predictions concerning the decisions made by real humans under uncertainty. The behaviors of human beings, which appeared paradoxical when interpreted with classical utility theory, find a simple and unambiguous explanation, when interpreted through the lenses of QDT. The underlying mechanisms at work to explain the characteristics of decision making performed by real humans involve entanglement of actions, the ordering of prospects with respect to the probabilities, the interference between actions, and the mapping of the quantum interference terms to human aversion towards loss and uncertainty.

The roots of our theory are found in quantum theory, based on the mathematical techniques developed by Von Neumann [8] and Benioff [9,10]. Benioff [9,10] showed how the mathematical structure of quantum mechanics provides a general description of quantum measurements [8] and of quantum information processing [9,10]. Long before these works [8–10], Bohr himself [11,12] mentioned that mental processes in many respects are similar to those in quantum physics, and that quantum theory could serve as a tool for attacking the problems associated with human thinking.

It is worth emphasizing that employing the mathematical techniques of quantum theory for the description of human decision making does not necessarily imply that psychological processes are truly quantum. This simply means that such mathematical techniques are convenient tools for formalizing the description of decision making, and provide novel testable predictions. The situation here could be compared with the following well-known history of differential and integral calculi, which were developed initially for describing the motion of planets under the influence of gravity. But now, these calculi are used everywhere, for problems having no relation to gravity. In the same way, the techniques of quantum theory are nothing but the mathematical language of functional analysis, which can be employed outside the quantum world, when appropriate.

The aim of the present paper is to show that quantum decision theory can be developed in such a way that it can be applicable not only to the theory of measurements and to quantum

information processing, but also to some complex macroscopic problems, in particular by providing a coherent structure to describe and predict decision making by real humans. For this purpose, we reformulate the theory by accepting as its basic object, not a manifold of simple actions but, a set of composite prospects. It is the prospect compositeness that yields several nontrivial consequences, such as decision interference, which reflects the presence of biases (with respect to classical utility theory) in the decision making process. The developed QDT is shown to be mathematically self-consistent, and it can explain the paradoxes of classical utility theory by accounting for the empirical observations on decision making by real human beings. Its usefulness is ultimately validated by its prediction of novel behaviors that can be tested empirically. Our approach can also be applied to quantum information processing on the manifold of composite prospects. In order to show that QDT is mathematically justified, we present it in a rigorous axiomatic way. Detailed calculations to explain the many paradoxes reported in the framework of classical utility theory are given in [7,16].

## 2 Basic definitions

The simplest elements in decision making theory are intended actions, or just actions. We shall denote actions as  $A_n$ , enumerating them with the index  $n = 1, 2, \dots$

**Definition 1.** *The action ring is a set  $\mathcal{A} = \{A_n : n = 1, 2, \dots\}$  of actions  $A_n$ , endowed with two binary operations, the associative reversible addition, denoted as  $A_m + A_n$ , and the distributive noncommutative multiplication, denoted as  $A_m A_n$ , which possesses a zero element 0, called the empty action, such that  $A_n 0 = 0 A_n = 0$ .*

**Definition 2.** *Two actions  $A_m$  and  $A_n$  from  $\mathcal{A}$ , with  $m \neq n$ , are termed disjoint if and only if they are divisors of zero with respect to each other, i.e.,  $A_m A_n = 0$ .*

**Definition 3.** *An action  $A_n \in \mathcal{A}$  is composite, if and only if it can be represented as a union*

$$A_n = \bigcup_{j=1}^{M_n} A_{n_j} \quad (1)$$

*of  $M_n > 1$  disjoint subactions  $A_{n_j} \in \mathcal{A}$ , called action modes, and  $A_n$  is simple if it cannot be decomposed into a union of form (1).*

**Definition 4.** *An action prospect  $\pi_n$  is a conjunction*

$$\pi_n = \bigcap_j A_{n_j} \quad (A_{n_j} \in \mathcal{A}_n \subset \mathcal{A}) \quad (2)$$

*of the actions  $A_{n_j}$  taken from a subset  $\mathcal{A}_n = \{A_{n_j} : n_j = 1, 2, \dots\}$  of the action ring  $\mathcal{A}$ .*

**Definition 5.** *A prospect  $\pi_n$  is composite if at least one of the actions  $A_{n_j}$  in conjunction (2) is composite, and the prospect  $\pi_n$  is simple when all actions  $A_{n_j}$  in conjunction (2) are simple.*

**Definition 6.** Elementary prospects  $e_\alpha$ , with  $\alpha = 1, 2, \dots$ , are simple prospects

$$e_\alpha = \bigcap_j A_{\alpha_j} \quad (A_{\alpha_j} \in \mathcal{A}_\alpha \subset \mathcal{A}), \quad (3)$$

such that any two elementary prospects  $e_\alpha$  and  $e_\beta$ , with  $\alpha \neq \beta$ , are mutually disjoint,

$$e_\alpha e_\beta = 0 \quad (\alpha \neq \beta). \quad (4)$$

**Definition 7.** The prospect lattice  $\mathcal{L}$  is a set  $\{\pi_n\}$  of partially ordered prospects  $\pi_n$ , such that any pair of prospects can be ordered according to one of the linear transitive binary ordering relations  $\{<, =, \leq\}$ . Therefore, for any two prospects  $\pi_1$  and  $\pi_2$ , one has either  $\pi_1 < \pi_2$ , or  $\pi_1 > \pi_2$ , or  $\pi_1 = \pi_2$ , or  $\pi_1 \leq \pi_2$ , or  $\pi_1 \geq \pi_2$ . The minimal element is the empty action 0, and there exists a maximal element  $\pi_*$ , which makes the lattice

$$\mathcal{L} = \{\pi_n : 0 \leq \pi_n \leq \pi_*\} \quad (5)$$

complete.

**Remark:** The ordering operations are performed by using the probabilities of the prospects introduced in Definition 18.

**Definition 8.** For each mode  $A_{nj}$  of an action  $A_n$  there corresponds a function  $\mathcal{A} \rightarrow \mathbb{C}$ , called the mode state  $|A_{nj}\rangle$ , such that it possesses a Hermitian conjugate state  $\langle A_{nj}|$  and, for any two mode states  $|A_{ni}\rangle$  and  $|A_{nj}\rangle$ , a scalar product

$$\langle A_{ni}|A_{nj}\rangle = \delta_{ij} \quad (6)$$

is defined.

**Definition 9.** The mode space is the Hilbert space

$$\mathcal{M}_n \equiv \text{Span} \{|A_{nj}\rangle : j = 1, 2, \dots, M_n\}, \quad (7)$$

which is the closed linear envelope spanning all mode states.

**Definition 10.** For each elementary prospect  $e_\alpha$ , there corresponds a function  $\mathcal{A} \times \mathcal{A} \times \dots \times \mathcal{A} \rightarrow \mathbb{C}$ , called the basic state

$$|e_\alpha\rangle \equiv |A_{\alpha_1}A_{\alpha_2}\dots\rangle \equiv \bigotimes_j |A_{\alpha_j}\rangle, \quad (8)$$

such that it has a Hermitian conjugate state  $\langle e_\alpha|$  and, for any two basic states  $|e_\alpha\rangle$  and  $|e_\beta\rangle$ , there exists the scalar product

$$\langle e_\alpha|e_\beta\rangle \equiv \prod_j \langle A_{\alpha_j}A_{\beta_j}\rangle = \prod_j \delta_{\alpha_j\beta_j} \equiv \delta_{\alpha\beta}. \quad (9)$$

**Definition 11.** *The mind space is the Hilbert space*

$$\mathcal{M} \equiv \text{Span} \{ |e_\alpha \rangle \} = \bigotimes_n \mathcal{M}_n , \quad (10)$$

*which is the closed linear envelope spanning all basic states.*

**Definition 12.** *For each prospect  $\pi_n$ , there corresponds a vector  $|\pi_n \rangle$  in the mind space  $\mathcal{M}$ , named the prospect state  $|\pi_n \rangle \in \mathcal{M}$ , possessing a Hermitian conjugate  $\langle \pi_n |$ .*

**Definition 13.** *The vacuum state is the vector  $|0 \rangle \in \mathcal{M}$  corresponding to the empty prospect, for which*

$$\langle \pi_n | 0 \rangle = \langle 0 | \pi_n \rangle = 0 , \quad (11)$$

*for any  $|\pi_n \rangle \in \mathcal{M}$ .*

**Definition 14.** *A state of mind is a given specific vector  $|\psi \rangle \in \mathcal{M}$  from the mind space, which is normalized, such that*

$$\langle \psi | \psi \rangle = 1 . \quad (12)$$

**Definition 15.** *The probability operator for a prospect  $\pi_n \in \mathcal{L}$  is the self-adjoint operator*

$$\hat{P}(\pi_n) \equiv |\pi_n \rangle \langle \pi_n| , \quad (13)$$

*defined on  $\mathcal{M}$  and satisfying the normalization condition*

$$\sum_n \langle \psi | \hat{P}(\pi_n) | \psi \rangle = 1 , \quad (14)$$

*in which the summation is over all  $\pi_n \in \mathcal{L}$ .*

**Definition 16.** *The algebra of probability operators is the involutive bijective algebra*

$$\mathcal{P} \equiv \{ \hat{P}(\pi_n) : \pi_n \in \mathcal{L} \} , \quad (15)$$

*with the bijective involution given by the Hermitian conjugation  $\mathcal{P}^+ = \mathcal{P}$ .*

**Definition 17.** *The expectation value of a probability operator  $\hat{P}(\pi_n)$ , under the state of mind  $|\psi \rangle \in \mathcal{M}$ , is the average defined by*

$$\langle \hat{P}(\pi_n) \rangle \equiv \langle \psi | \hat{P}(\pi_n) | \psi \rangle . \quad (16)$$

**Definition 18.** *The prospect probability  $p(\pi_n)$  of a prospect  $\pi_n \in \mathcal{L}$ , under the state of mind  $|\psi \rangle \in \mathcal{M}$ , is the expectation value*

$$p(\pi_n) \equiv \langle \hat{P}(\pi_n) \rangle , \quad (17)$$

*with the normalization condition*

$$\sum_n p(\pi_n) = 1 , \quad (18)$$

where the summation is over all  $\pi_n \in \mathcal{L}$ .

**Definition 19.** The probabilistic state is the set

$$\langle \mathcal{P} \rangle = \{p(\pi_n) : \pi_n \in \mathcal{L}\} \quad (19)$$

of the prospect probabilities  $p(\pi_n)$  for all  $\pi_n \in \mathcal{L}$ .

**Definition 20.** Two prospects,  $\pi_1$  and  $\pi_2$  from  $\mathcal{L}$ , are indifferent if and only if

$$p(\pi_1) = p(\pi_2) \quad (\pi_1 = \pi_2) . \quad (20)$$

**Definition 21.** Between two prospects,  $\pi_1$  and  $\pi_2$  from  $\mathcal{L}$ , the prospect  $\pi_1$  is preferred to  $\pi_2$  if and only if

$$p(\pi_1) > p(\pi_2) \quad (\pi_1 > \pi_2) . \quad (21)$$

**Definition 22.** The prospect  $\pi_*$ , which is the maximal element of  $\mathcal{L}$ , is optimal if and only if the related prospect probability is the largest among all  $p(\pi_n)$ , so that

$$p(\pi_*) = \sup_n p(\pi_n) \quad (\pi_* = \sup_n \pi_n) . \quad (22)$$

**Definition 23.** The binary conjunction set

$$\mathcal{B} \equiv \{\pi_n e_\alpha : \pi_n \in \mathcal{L}, e_\alpha \in \mathcal{A}\} \quad (23)$$

is the family of the conjunction actions  $\pi_n e_\alpha \in \mathcal{A}$ .

**Definition 24.** The probability operator for the conjunction action  $\pi_n e_\alpha \in \mathcal{B}$  is the self-adjoint operator

$$\hat{P}(\pi_n e_\alpha) \equiv \hat{P}(e_\alpha) \hat{P}(\pi_n) \hat{P}(e_\alpha) , \quad (24)$$

defined on  $\mathcal{M}$  and satisfying the normalization condition

$$\sum_{n,\alpha} \hat{P}(\pi_n e_\alpha) = \hat{1} , \quad (25)$$

in which  $\hat{1}$  is the identity operator on  $\mathcal{M}$  and the summation is over all  $\pi_n \in \mathcal{L}$  and  $e_\alpha \in \mathcal{A}$ .

**Definition 25.** The probability  $p(\pi_n e_\alpha)$  of the conjunction action  $\pi_n e_\alpha \in \mathcal{B}$ , under the state of mind  $|\psi\rangle \in \mathcal{M}$ , is the expectation value

$$p(\pi_n e_\alpha) \equiv \langle \hat{P}(\pi_n e_\alpha) \rangle , \quad (26)$$

with the normalization condition

$$\sum_{n,\alpha} p(\pi_n e_\alpha) = 1 , \quad (27)$$

where the summation is over all  $\pi_n e_\alpha \in \mathcal{B}$ .

**Remark:** The probability  $p(\pi_n e_\alpha)$  is the analog of the classical utility, in the sense that, without additional effects, the conjunction action which would be taken corresponds to the largest  $p(\pi_n e_\alpha)$ . The next definition shows that there are additional interference terms, which modify this classical picture.

**Definition 26.** *The quantum interference term for a prospect  $\pi_n \in \mathcal{L}$ , under the state of mind  $|\psi\rangle \in \mathcal{M}$ , is the average*

$$q(\pi_n) \equiv \sum_{\alpha \neq \beta} \langle \hat{P}(e_\alpha) \hat{P}(\pi_n) \hat{P}(e_\beta) \rangle, \quad (28)$$

in which the summation is over all  $e_\alpha \in \mathcal{A}$  and  $e_\beta \in \mathcal{A}$ .

**Definition 27.** *Two prospects,  $\pi_1$  and  $\pi_2$  from  $\mathcal{L}$ , are equally repulsive (equally attractive) if and only if*

$$q(\pi_1) = q(\pi_2). \quad (29)$$

**Definition 28.** *Between two prospects,  $\pi_1$  and  $\pi_2$  from  $\mathcal{L}$ , the prospect  $\pi_1$  is more repulsive (less attractive) if and only if*

$$q(\pi_1) < q(\pi_2). \quad (30)$$

**Definition 29.** *A prospect  $\pi_1 \in \mathcal{L}$  is more repulsive (less attractive) than  $\pi_2 \in \mathcal{L}$ , in the sense of inequality (30), when one of the following is true:*

- $\pi_1$  leads to more uncertain gains than  $\pi_2$  (less certain gain),
- $\pi_1$  gives a more certain loss than  $\pi_2$  (less uncertain loss),

or  $\pi_1$ , as compared to  $\pi_2$ , requires to be:

- more active under uncertainty (less passive under uncertainty),
- more passive under certainty (less active under certainty).

**Remark:** This classification is based on empirical evidence on human decision making. To give a more complete and precise description, we formulate in the definition below the counterpart of Definition 29.

**Definition 30.** *A prospect  $\pi_2 \in \mathcal{L}$  is more attractive (less repulsive) than  $\pi_1 \in \mathcal{L}$ , in the sense of inequality (30), when one of the following is true:*

- $\pi_2$  leads to less uncertain gains than  $\pi_1$  (more certain gain),
- $\pi_2$  gives a less certain loss than  $\pi_1$  (more uncertain loss),

or  $\pi_2$ , as compared to  $\pi_1$ , requires to be:

- less active under uncertainty (more passive under uncertainty),
- less passive under certainty (more active under certainty).

### 3 Main results

The above definitions make it possible to develop a self-consistent quantum decision theory (QDT). This theory generalizes the quantum theory of measurement developed by Von Neumann [8] and Benioff [9,10]. The principal innovation of our QDT is that it deals with composite prospects, and not with simple actions. Also, the probability operator (13), generally, is an entangling operator [13–15]. These features of our QDT result in the appearance of the quantum interference term (28) and, as a consequence, in the occurrence of interferences between decisions. The latter serve as measures characterizing the prospects as more or less repulsive (more or less attractive). The novel quantity, the quantum interference term (28), makes the QDT fundamentally different from classical utility theory. In the frame of QDT, all known paradoxes, plaguing classical utility theory, disappear. In other words, QDT provides a coherent and realistic description of real human decision making processes. Below, we present the main theorems of QDT, which make clear that the theory is self-consistent and explain how the paradoxes disappear within QDT. The detailed discussion and proofs of these theorems will be given elsewhere [16].

**Proposition 1.** *The probability  $p(\pi_n)$  of a prospect  $\pi_n \in \mathcal{L}$  is the sum*

$$p(\pi_n) = \sum_{\alpha} p(\pi_n e_{\alpha}) + q(\pi_n) \quad (31)$$

*of the conjunction probabilities (26) and the quantum interference term (28).*

**Proposition 2.** *The sum of the quantum interference terms  $q(\pi_n)$  over all  $\pi_n \in \mathcal{L}$  is zero,*

$$\sum_n q(\pi_n) = 0 . \quad (32)$$

**Proposition 3.** *Between two prospects,  $\pi_1$  and  $\pi_2$  from  $\mathcal{L}$ , the prospect  $\pi_1$  is preferred to  $\pi_2$  if and only if*

$$\sum_{\alpha} [p(\pi_1 e_{\alpha}) - p(\pi_2 e_{\alpha})] > q(\pi_2) - q(\pi_1) . \quad (33)$$

This proposition 3 shows that the preference of prospect  $\pi_1$  over prospect  $\pi_2$  depends not merely on the relations between the probabilities  $p(\pi_1 e_{\alpha})$  and  $p(\pi_2 e_{\alpha})$  but also on the relation between the quantum interference terms  $q(\pi_1)$  and  $q(\pi_2)$ . These terms  $q(\pi_1)$  and  $q(\pi_2)$  influence the decision, by accounting for such emotional feelings as the prospect attraction and prospect repulsion which are involved in the process of decision making. The preferred prospect  $\pi_n$  is the one whose combined utility ( $\sum_{\alpha} p(\pi_n e_{\alpha})$ ) and attraction ( $q(\pi_n)$ ) are such that they satisfy the inequality (33).

The criterion (33) is the basis for explaining a variety of paradoxes typical of the application of classical utility theory to real human decision making [7]. In classical utility theory, the interference terms  $q(\pi_n)$  are absent, so that the preferred prospect always corresponds to the largest utility. Real human beings do not follow this specification, as exemplified by the Allais paradox [2], the Ellsberg paradox [4], the Rabin paradox [17], the Kahneman-Tversky paradox



[18], disjunction effect and the conjunction fallacy [5–7], which appear for decisions made under uncertainty. The novel quantum terms  $q(\pi_n)$  in QDT makes it possible to resolve all these paradoxes.

The possibility of relating the disjunction effect with the interference of actions was suggested earlier (see, e.g., [19,20]). However, the principal advantage of our approach is that it is formulated as a self-consistent mathematical theory, which allows us to explain not just one effect but actually all known paradoxes.

Our quantum decision theory is nothing but a general quantum theory of measurement, endowed with an action ring, a prospect lattice and a probability operator measure. The algebra of probability operators plays the role of the algebra of local observables. Because of the composite nature of prospects and of the entangling properties of the probability operators, quantum interference terms appear, which make actions noncommutative and the prospect probabilities nonadditive. The developed theory is self-consistent, containing no paradoxes, in contrast to those that plague classical utility theory.

Our approach can be applied both to the description of human decision making [7] as well as to quantum information processing. The tools for realizing the latter can be of different physical nature. For example, a convenient tool for quantum information processing can be constructed on the basis of an optical lattice with multimode nonground-state condensates of neutral atoms in each lattice site [21,22]. Then each mode state  $|A_{nj}\rangle$  corresponds to a topological coherent mode of type  $j$ , generated in a lattice site  $n$ . The mode space (7) is a Hilbert space of coherent modes of an  $n$ -site. Basic states (8) form a basis for the states of the overall optical lattice. The mind space (10) is the Hilbert space for the coherent states of the whole optical lattice. The prospect state  $|\pi_n\rangle$  is a state of  $\mathcal{M}$ , composed of the superposition of the coherent modes generated in different sites. The state of mind  $|\psi\rangle$  is a given reference state of  $\mathcal{M}$ . Consequently, the prospect probability (17) is the squared modulus

$$p(\pi_n) = |\langle \pi_n | \psi \rangle|^2$$

of the transition amplitude  $\langle \pi_n | \psi \rangle$ . The topological coherent modes can be generated by applying an external resonant alternating field, either modulating the trapping potential or varying atomic interactions [23,24]. The generation of the coherent modes can be well regulated, providing the possibility of creating an atomic multimode register [21,22].

Another way of constructing a quantum register is by using molecular magnets composed of nanomolecules with high spins. The spin states of each molecule correspond to the mode states, forming the mode space (7). The states of the whole molecular magnet pertain to the mind space (10). The spin states can be governed by applying external magnetic fields. An ultrafast spin regulation can be achieved by coupling the molecular magnet to a resonant electric circuit [25].

We have here presented the general theory of quantum information processing devices, that applies to human decision makers, to atomic multimode registers, or to molecular high-spin registers, or to other condensed-matter registers. The common procedure for any quantum register, playing the role of a decision maker, starts with the classification of action prospects and ordering them through the evaluation of their probabilities. Finding the optimal prospect serves as a key for the subsequent functioning of the information-processing device. Technical

and experimental details of such a quantum information-processing operation, requires separate investigations, depending on the physical nature of a particular system, chosen as a quantum register. But in any case, the operation of these devices can be based on the mathematical scheme presented in this Letter.

**Acknowledgement:** One of the authors (V.I.Y.) is grateful to P.A. Benioff for useful correspondence and helpful remarks. Fruitful discussions with E.P. Yukalova are appreciated.

## References

- [1] J. Von Neumann, O. Morgenstern, *Theory of Games and Economic Behavior*, Princeton University, Princeton, 1953.
- [2] M. Allais, *Econometrica* 21 (1953) 503.
- [3] W. Edwards, *J. Exp. Psychol.* 50 (1955) 201.
- [4] D. Ellsberg, *Quart. J. Econom.* 75 (1961) 643.
- [5] A. Tversky, D. Kahneman, *Psychol. Rev.* 90 (1983) 293.
- [6] M.J. Machina, in: *New Palgrave Dictionary of Economics*, Macmillan, New York, 2008.
- [7] V.I. Yukalov, D. Sornette, arXiv:0802.3597 (2008).
- [8] J. Von Neumann, *Mathematical Foundations of Quantum Mechanics*, Princeton University, Princeton, 1955.
- [9] P.A. Benioff, *J. Math. Phys.* 13 (1972) 908.
- [10] P.A. Benioff, *J. Math. Phys.* 13 (1972) 1347.
- [11] N. Bohr, *Naturwiss.* 17 (1929) 483.
- [12] N. Bohr, *Erkenntniss.* 6 (1937) 293.
- [13] V.I. Yukalov, *Phys. Rev. Lett.* 90 (2003) 167905.
- [14] V.I. Yukalov, *Mod. Phys. Lett. B* 17 (2003) 95.
- [15] V.I. Yukalov, *Phys. Rev. A* 68 (2003) 022109.
- [16] V.I. Yukalov, D. Sornette, arXiv:0808.0112 (2008).
- [17] M. Rabin, *Econometrica* 68 (2000) 1281.
- [18] D. Kahneman, A. Tversky, *Econometrica* 47 (1979) 263.

- [19] J.R. Busemeyer, Z. Wang, J.T. Townsend, *J. Math. Psychol.* 50 (2006) 220.
- [20] J.R. Busemeyer, M. Matthew, Z. Wang, in: *Proc. Cogn. Sci. Soc.*, Washington, 2007.
- [21] V.I. Yukalov, E.P. Yukalova, *Laser Phys.* 16 (2006) 354.
- [22] V.I. Yukalov, E.P. Yukalova, *Phys. Rev. A* 73 (2006) 022335.
- [23] V.I. Yukalov, E.P. Yukalova, V.S. Bagnato, *Phys. Rev. A* 56 (1997) 4845.
- [24] V.I. Yukalov, E.P. Yukalova, V.S. Bagnato, *Phys. Rev. A* 66 (2002) 043602.
- [25] V.I. Yukalov, V.K. Henner, P.V. Kharebov, *Phys. Rev. B* 77 (2008) 134427.