

## Asymptotic completeness in the many-body scattering theory, local time and the measurement-like processes

J. Jeknić-Dugić<sup>a1</sup>, M. Arsenijević<sup>b</sup>, M. Dugić<sup>b</sup>

<sup>a</sup>Department of Physics, Faculty of Science and Mathematics, 18 000 Niš,  
Serbia

<sup>b</sup>Department of Physics, Faculty of Science, 34 000 Kragujevac, Serbia

Solution to the problem of asymptotic completeness in many-body scattering theory offers a specific view of the quantum unitary dynamics. It allows straightforward introduction of local time for every (approximately) closed many-particles system with (virtually arbitrarily) interacting constituent particles. While every single system sustains quantum coherence through unitary dynamics, there is time uncertainty for an ensemble of such systems. Time appears as a classical hidden parameter for the unitary evolution of a many-particles system. Given a Gaussian probability distribution for the ensemble, we analyze the standard quantum measurement-like scheme with strong interaction. We find that the ensemble of a closed many-particles system can exhibit behavior that is characteristic for open quantum systems and the quantum measurement problem is formally dissolved: the ensemble mixed state provides definite outcomes and unique "pointer observable" for the measurement. Ensembles of the closed few-particles systems bear high quantum coherence. Deeper physical nature of time can non-trivially contribute to the presented results and possibly link the quantum and relativistic theory, e.g. through introducing time as a "classical subsystem" in a "hybrid system" form of the local-time scheme.

---

<sup>1</sup>Corresponding author. Email: jjeknic@pmf.ni.ac.rs

## Contents

- 1. Introduction**
- 2. Outlook of the many-body scattering theory and the notion of local time**
  - 2.1 Asymptotic completeness in the many-body scattering theory*
  - 2.2 The notion of local time*
- 3. Ensemble uncertainty of local time**
  - 3.1 The state eq.(9) is mixed*
  - 3.2 Few-particles versus many-particles systems*
  - 3.3 Local-time as a dynamical map*
- 4. A local-time scheme for quantum-measurement-like processes**
  - 4.1 Analysis of the measurement-like scheme*
  - 4.2 Unique "pointer observable"*
  - 4.3 Introducing the apparatus' environment*
  - 4.4 Quantum measurement and locality*
  - 4.5 Overview*
- 5. Examples**
  - 5.1 A pair of spin-1/2 particles*
  - 5.2 Four spin-1/2 particles: a case study*
  - 5.3 Decoherence and measurement of a single qubit: the qubit environment*
  - 5.4 Position measurement*
  - 5.5 Walls-Collet-Milburn measurement model*
- 6. Discussion**
- 7. Conclusion**

## 1. Introduction

A solution to the problem of asymptotic completeness in the many-body scattering theory offers a specific view of the quantum unitary dynamics. The important work of Enss [1] opened the door for new methods in solving the problem. On this basis, the later elaboration due to Kitada [2] allowed Kitada [3] to introduce the notion of local time, that is a dynamics generated by the Hamiltonian of the local system that can serve as a [local] "clock".

The notion of local time or "multi-time" is not a new idea. Mainly motivated by relativity, a local time coordinate for every particle in a composite system has been introduced, see e.g. Ref. [4] and the references therein. It is also shown that the "timeless" Wheeler-DeWitt equation:

$$H(x)|\Psi\rangle = 0, \tag{1}$$

follows if one assumes the existence of a preferred foliating family of spacelike surfaces in spacetime [5].

However, on closer inspection, such ad hoc schemes for local times face serious obstacles in the quantum context. For example, it can be shown, that "Multi-time Schrödinger equations cannot contain interaction potentials" [6]. That is, assigning local times to constituent particles is not allowed for interacting particles. Consequently, the following scenario appears to be inescapable: the Universe, seen as a collection of interacting subsystems, must have unique, global time that is common for all subsystems. In other words, it would seem that there is no room for the idea of local time in non-relativistic quantum theory.

However, Kitada's [3] concept of local time is neither *ad hoc* nor does it suffer from such problems. Based on the many-body scattering theory, Kitada's approach directly addresses all many-body systems while allowing for the virtually arbitrary (short-range or long-range) pair interactions in the system. Local clocks implemented by many-particles systems are assumed to be (approximately) independent of each other thus providing a specific interpretation of eq.(1): on the level of the total universe, time does not exist, but on the local level, time does exist [2,3].

*Prima facie*, the assumption [3] on independent local clocks may seem to be a reminiscent of the observation [6] that interactions (and the induced quantum entanglement) may ruin the idea of local time in non-relativistic quantum theory. However, closer inspection of the assumption brings an interesting conclusion. Namely, Kitada's concept of "local time" concerning macroscopic systems is perfectly suited for the purposes of quantum measurement [7-9] and decoherence [9-12] as well as for some models of open quantum systems [13,14] theory. Vividly expressed: as we already know

from measurement and decoherence, at some point, the conglomeration of a small few-particles systems can produce a many-particle system that is approximately isolated from the other "conglomerates".

In quantum measurement, one deals with the many-particles systems that are assumed to be almost isolated (closed) systems. That is, an "object of measurement + apparatus" ( $O + A$ ) system<sup>2</sup> is subjected to unitary (Schrödinger) dynamics disregarding existence of other such systems. In the standard decoherence theory, the composite system "open system + environment" ( $S + E$ ) is assumed to be subject to the unitary Schrödinger dynamics, despite the presence of other open systems and their environments. Finally, in the context of the open quantum systems theory, it is known that virtually every [physically reasonable] dynamics of an open system  $S$  can be described by the Schrödinger law for the extended system  $S + E$  [14]. So, the macroscopic (many-particles) systems  $O + A$ ,  $O + A + E$  and  $S + E$  that are subject to the Schrödinger law appear as the perfect candidates for application of, and some kind of a test for, the local time scheme of Kitada [3]. Needless to say, if the local-time scheme passes the test, we may have another and rather fresh foundation of quantum theory.

With this motivation in mind, we hypothesize the following rule for the universally valid quantum theory: "Every many-particles system that is subject to the Schrödinger law, can be assigned a local time independently of other such systems", and we investigate the consequences for the description of the quantum-measurement-like processes.

In this paper we slightly extend the original proposal [3] by pointing out uncertainty of local time for an *ensemble* of local clocks. This introduces the local time effectively as a hidden parameter in the dynamical description of the ensemble. While every *single* clock is objectively and uniquely described by the unitary Schrödinger evolution, an *ensemble* of clocks is described by a classical probability distribution on a proper time interval.

We introduce a Gaussian distribution for the time interval as a natural guess and for a *closed* many-particles system we obtain behavior that is typical for *open* systems. Our results come from the *macroscopic* domain—e.g. the quantum apparatus, and therefore the "object of measurement + apparatus", is macroscopic—but without a need to resorting to "(quasi)classical apparatus". Rather, the apparatus does not possess any (quasi)classical degrees of freedom that might be induced by environmental decoherence nor does its state objectively collapse. *Operationally*, generic stochastic nature of quantum measurement *cannot* reveal coherence for a single system, but provides apparent, non-objective, "wavepacket collapse" for an *ensemble* of

---

<sup>2</sup>Or "object of measurement + apparatus + the apparatus' environment" ( $O + A + E$ ).

*closed* systems.

Implications of the local-time scheme of Kitada [3] are remarkable. Hence we believe it is worth further investigation in the foundations of quantum theory as well as towards the original relativistic motivations with the view of the possible reduction of the gap between the quantum and relativistic theories.

The contents of this paper are as follows. In Section 2 we provide a brief account of the many-particles scattering theory and recapitulate Kitada's notion of local time. In Section 3 we point out uncertainty of time in an ensemble of bipartitions of a many-particles system and set the quantitative criteria for our considerations. In Section 4 we apply Kitada's scheme to the standard measurement-like processes; Section 4.2 provides the main result of our paper. Section 5 provides some illustrative examples that exhibit technical simplicity, generality and clarity of the local-time scheme in the context of quantum measurement and decoherence. Section 6 is discussion with an emphasis on the formal solution to the quantum measurement problem. We also emphasize the limitations and some open questions of our findings. As to the later, we emphasize that the physical picture can be non-trivially changed by deeper investigating physical nature of time, with the possible emerging link between non-relativistic quantum theory and general relativity.

## **2. Outlook of the many-body scattering theory and the notion of local time**

### *2.1 Asymptotic completeness in the many-body scattering theory*

A reader uninterested in details of the many-body scattering can skip to Section 2.2. Scattering theory is essentially time-independent perturbation theory applied to the case of a continuous spectrum. The goal of scattering theory is to solve the full energy-eigenstate problem

$$(E - H_0 - V)|\Psi\rangle = 0, \tag{2}$$

where  $E > 0$  (unless otherwise specified), and  $|\Psi\rangle$  is the eigenstate of the full Hamiltonian  $H = H_0 + V$  with energy  $E$ . Already two-particles scattering is a hard problem. The many-body scattering poses even the more serious technical problems. It is due to Enss [1] that the method of clustering the composite system in conjunction with the so-called micro-local analysis method offers a systematic approach to the problem for both short-range and long-range interactions (denoted by  $V$  in eq.(2)). Subsequent development of the field of many-body scattering can be found e.g. in Sigal [1] and

the references therein; some technical details can be found in Supplemental Material.

The method of clustering consists in the following idea. A composite system  $\mathcal{S}$  that consists of  $N$  nonidentical particles, can be differently structured [15], e.g. clustered in mutually non-intersecting clusters. E.g. a tripartite system  $\mathcal{S} = 1 + 2 + 3$  can be structured as:  $\mathcal{S}_1 = \{1, 2, 3\}$ ,  $\mathcal{S}_2 = \{\{1\}, \{2, 3\}\}$ ,  $\mathcal{S}_3 = \{\{2\}, \{1, 3\}\}$ ,  $\mathcal{S}_4 = \{\{3\}, \{1, 2\}\}$ ,  $\mathcal{S}_5 = \{\{1\}, \{2\}, \{3\}\}$  where the brackets " $\{*\}$ " denote one cluster. So, the structures  $\mathcal{S}_i$ ,  $i = 2, 3, 4$  are different bipartitions of the total system  $\mathcal{S}$ , the  $\mathcal{S}_5$  is a tripartite structure of the total system  $\mathcal{S}$  while the  $\mathcal{S}_1$  represents a formally unstructured system (only one cluster). For every cluster the center-of-mass ( $CM$ ) and the relative-positions ( $R$ ) degrees of freedom are introduced; the  $R$  system's degrees of freedom are often chosen as the Jacobi relative coordinates [1,2,3]. Then, bearing in mind the variety of the different possible structures, *all* the possible scattering scenarios are described by the scattering of the clusters'  $CM$ -systems.

For the  $b$ th structure (cluster decomposition) with  $k$  clusters, the collective relative positions variable  $x_b = \{x_{bi}, i = 1, 2, 3, \dots, k\}$  and the related conjugate momentum,  $p_b = \{p_{bi}, i = 1, 2, 3, \dots, k\}$ , are introduced for the clusters' centers-of-mass systems. The commutators  $[x_{bi}, p_{b'j}] = i\hbar\delta_{ij}\delta_{bb'}$ . The rest of the relative-positions variables are collectively denoted by  $x^b$  with the conjugate momentums  $p^b$ . Then the Hilbert state space factorizes:

$$\mathcal{H} = \mathcal{H}_{CM} \otimes \mathcal{H}_b \otimes \mathcal{H}^b, \quad (3)$$

and in the position representation, the factors in eq.(3) are [in the standard notation of functional analysis]:  $\mathcal{H}_{CM} = L^2(\mathcal{R}_{X_{CM}}^3)$ ,  $\mathcal{H}_b = L^2(\mathcal{R}_{x_b}^{3(k-1)})$  and  $\mathcal{H}^b = L^2(\mathcal{R}_{x^b}^{3(N-k)})$ .

Of course, the factorization eq.(3) is different for different structures, i.e.  $\mathcal{H}_b \neq \mathcal{H}_{b'}$ . By placing the reference frame in the total-system's  $CM$  system, which is common for all structures, i.e. by choosing  $X_{CM} = 0$ , the factorization eq.(3) is reduced:

$$\mathcal{H} = \mathcal{H}_b \otimes \mathcal{H}^b. \quad (4)$$

Therefore, observation of the scattering process reduces to observation of the inter-cluster Jacobi coordinates  $x_{bi}$ , for every structure  $b$ .

Another essential point in Ref. [1] comes from the fact that, as emphasized above, scattering refers to the continuous spectrum of the total system's Hamiltonian. So, the pure point-spectrum of the Hamiltonian should be removed from the consideration. The Enss' solution is remarkable: he introduces projectors on the continuous spectrum of the Hamiltonian  $H$ ,

eq.(1), and considers the "velocity operator"  $v_b = m_b^{-1}p_b$ , where  $p_b$  denotes the intercluster momentum operator (canonically conjugate to  $x_b$ ) and  $m_b$  is the diagonal mass matrix with the diagonals being the intercluster reduced masses (see Supplemental Material).

Let us introduce an operator (a kind of projection)  $\tilde{P}_b^{M_b^m}$ , that can be found in Supplemental Material. Then for every quantum state  $|\Psi\rangle$  with non-zero component in the continuous-spectrum subspace for the Hamiltonian  $H$  Enss [1] proved:

$$\|(\frac{x_b}{t_m} - v_b)\tilde{P}_b^{M_b^m} \exp(-it_m H/\hbar)|\Psi\rangle\| \rightarrow 0, \quad (5)$$

as the time index  $m \rightarrow \pm\infty$ , for *every* structure  $b$  save for the "structureless" one with only one cluster ( $k = 1$ ). The limit in eq.(5) is monotonic—there is not recurrence of the initial values.

On the basis of eq. (5), i.e. of the more elaborated and complete theorem provided by Enss [1] [see Supplemental Material], one can reach the complete proof of the asymptotic completeness for the many-body systems for both short- and long-range potentials (the term  $V$  in eq.(2)), i.e. pairwise interactions between the constituents of the total system  $\mathcal{S}$ .

## 2.2 The notion of local time

Eq.(5) naturally and directly offers the possibility to introduce the notion of local time [3]. Eq.(5) concerns all the systems with  $N \geq 2$  particles.

Physical meaning of eq.(5) is as follows. For a single free particle:

$$(x - tv) \exp(-itT/\hbar) = \exp(-itT/\hbar)x, \quad (6)$$

where  $x$  is the position and  $v$  the velocity observable, while  $T$  stands for the kinetic-energy observable and  $t$  is an instant of time. Action of the operators in eq.(6) on a wave function  $\Psi(x)$  is as follows: If the support of  $\Psi(x)$  is around some  $x_o$  in the instant  $t_o = 0$ , then the support of the propagated wave function  $\exp(-itT/\hbar)\Psi(x)$  is localized around the point  $x_o + vt$  in the instant of time  $t$ . Eq. (5) essentially says that *the same holds* for the wave function of a *many-body* (many-particles) system with virtually arbitrary kinds of pair interactions in the system.

Eq.(5) encompasses all the possible scattering scenarios for the total system  $\mathcal{S}$  as both the Hamiltonian,  $H$ , and the time instants,  $t_m$ , are *common for all structures*. Therefore, measurement of arbitrary  $x_b$  and  $v_b$  and obtaining their mean values,  $\langle x_b \rangle$  and  $\langle v_b \rangle$ , provides, at least sketchily, the measurement of time for the total system [3]:

$$\frac{\langle x_b \rangle}{\langle v_b \rangle} \sim t, \quad (7)$$

in the asymptotic limit.

Scattering is a fundamental method of interaction for systems at all quantum scales. In analogy with eq.(6), it is therefore reasonable to interpret eq. (7) as a *notion* of time, which is common for all the structures, clusters and particles in the system  $\mathcal{S}$ , but *not necessarily* for some other systems,  $\mathcal{S}'$ ,  $\mathcal{S}''$  etc. The different rates of operation give rise to the intuitive picture of time as an inherent characteristic of a local, e.g., a many-body system.

The system's Hamiltonian generates unitary Schrödinger dynamics and the  $R$  system appears as an (internal) clock, which operates differently and independently of the other local clocks. Existence of mutually independent clocks is only approximate, in the sense that every realistic many-body system interacts with its environment and with other many-body systems. Nevertheless, approximate independence and validity of the Schrödinger unitary dynamics is a general assumption in quantum measurement, decoherence and some parts of the open quantum systems theory. To this end, the typical examples are the "object of measurement + apparatus" and "open system + environment". Assumption on independence of "local systems" [3] is therefore *implemented* by mutually independent many-body systems in which quantum measurements and/or decoherence processes take place.

While the concept of local time in certain schemes is an *ad hoc* idea [see e.g. Refs. [4,6] and the references therein], in the many-body scattering theory, this notion naturally fits with eq. (5). Eq. (5) directly provides the following rules for the local (non-interacting), e.g., many-body systems [3]: (a) Systems with different Hamiltonians [e.g. with different number of particles, or different kinds of particles, or different kinds of interactions between the particles] are subject to different local times; (b) Systems that mutually interact are subjected to the same time; (c) Noninteracting systems need not have the common time; (d) The many-body systems which do not interact and locally follow independent Schrödinger dynamics do not have the common time—which makes the universal time un-definable, as for eq.(1); (e) Local times refer even to the mutually identical many-body systems, as long as they represent the mutually independent local systems, in the sense of the above point (d).

The point (e) is supported by the following observation. Eq. (5) clearly states: local time  $t$  is defined *only asymptotically*. While the limit (asymptotically) is the same for all mutually identical many-body systems, there is not yet such a guarantee for the finite time intervals. More precisely: eq.(5) does not determine any *finite*  $t_\circ$ , and therefore does not provide unique such

instant for all identical many-body systems. This observation suggests introduction of local time even for an ensemble of identical many-body systems.

In the remainder of this paper, we use the above points (a)-(e) as a matter of principle i.e. as the *universal rule* in quantum theory.

### 3. Ensemble uncertainty of local time

In certain processes, such as atomic collisions and chemical reactions, there may occur a change in the system's structure,  $\mathcal{S}_b \rightarrow \mathcal{S}_{b'}$  [15]. To the extent that such processes are reducible to the particles scattering, eq.(5) encapsulates such processes. In the more fundamental [nonrelativistic] particles scattering experiments, a structure  $\mathcal{S}_b$  typically remains unchanged. Then the measurement of the intercluster observable  $x_b$  describes collisions of the particles for that structure.

Within the standard universally valid quantum mechanics, a closed system is defined by the unique state [in the Schrödinger picture]:

$$|\Psi(t_o)\rangle = U(t_o)|\Psi(t=0)\rangle, \quad (8)$$

where  $U(t) = \exp(-itH/\hbar)$  and  $H$  is the total system's Hamiltonian. Of course, eq.(8) assumes unique, global time for all elements of an ensemble of identical systems. If eq.(8) models a measurement, then the measurement is assumed to be complete in an instant  $t_o$ , and the limit  $t_o \rightarrow \infty$  is formally allowed.

However, regarding the quantum-measurement-like processes, eq.(8) directly raises the problem of "Into what mixture does the wave packet collapse?" [10]. The often offered answers go from the suspension of universal validity of the unitary dynamics [the "objective wavepacket collapse"] to the introduction of the apparatus' environment,  $E$ , that is the substantial role of decoherence, to incompleteness of quantum theory—see Ref. [8] for a review.

As we are going to show below, the local-time scheme, Section 2, leads to an original, formally simple and conceptually clear answer already for closed many-particles system.

According to the point (e), Section 2.2, even in the limit of zero metrological error, *there is a time uncertainty*  $\Delta t$  in determining the time instant  $t_o$  for a single system: every single element of an ensemble has its own time that flows differently than for some other elements of the ensemble. So, there is *objective* time uncertainty,  $\Delta t$ , and the ensemble is described by the following quantum state:

$$\sigma = \int_{t_o-\Delta t}^{t_o+\Delta t} \rho(t) |\Psi(t)\rangle \langle \Psi(t)| dt, \quad (9)$$

where for the time density-probability  $\rho(t)$ :

$$\int_{t_o-\Delta t}^{t_o+\Delta t} \rho(t)dt = 1, \quad (10)$$

and

$$\int_{t_o-\Delta t}^{t_o+\Delta t} t\rho(t)dt = t_o. \quad (11)$$

For the time density-probability we require: (1) to be symmetric on the narrow interval  $[t_o - \Delta t, t_o + \Delta t]$ , (2) regarding the measurement-like processes, the time instant  $t_o$  is the time instant in which, ideally, the measurement is complete, and therefore the limit  $t_o \rightarrow \infty$  should be formally allowed, and (3) to allow a proper limit  $\rho(t) \rightarrow \delta(t)$ , with the Dirac delta function  $\delta(t)$ , in order to be reducible to the standard case eq.(8).

Physically, and also operationally, i.e. for an observer, the state eq. (9) is *objective*—the so-called "proper mixture". Determining the time instant  $t$  from the interval  $[t_o - \Delta t, t_o + \Delta t]$  is equivalent with distinguishing between non-orthogonal states  $|\Psi(t)\rangle$ . Hence the no-cloning theorem [16] makes the task of distinguishing the time instants for different elements of the ensemble impossible *in principle* [17] regarding both local or collective measurements/operations.

The time uncertainty  $\Delta t$  does not introduce uncertainty of energy. Every single system undergoes unitary Schrödinger evolution with energy preservation:  $\langle \Psi(t)|H|\Psi(t)\rangle = \langle \Psi(t=0)|H|\Psi(t=0)\rangle$ . Then there is energy conservation also for the ensemble:  $tr\sigma H = const.$

### 3.1 The state eq.(9) is mixed

By construction, the state eq.(9) is mixed. Nevertheless, for the arbitrarily short interval  $\Delta t \ll t_o$ , from eq.(11):

$$\begin{aligned} \sigma \approx \int_{t_o-\Delta t}^{t_o+\Delta t} \rho(t) \left( I - \frac{i(t-t_o)}{\hbar} H \right) |\Psi(t_o)\rangle \langle \Psi(t_o)| \\ \left( I + \frac{i(t-t_o)}{\hbar} H \right) dt = |\Psi(t_o)\rangle \langle \Psi(t_o)|. \end{aligned} \quad (12)$$

For  $t_o \gg 1$  [cf. the above point (2)], the interval  $\Delta t$  need not be that short while it can still fulfill  $\Delta t \ll t_o$ —also see Section 4.1.

On the other hand, for  $\Delta t > \tau_{min} = max\{\pi\hbar/2\Delta H, \pi\hbar/2(\langle H \rangle_{t=0} - E_g)\}$ , where  $\Delta H$  is the standard deviation and  $E_g$  stands for the Hamiltonian

ground energy, there are three time instants,  $t_o - \Delta t$ ,  $t_o$  and  $t_o + \Delta t$ , which pertain to mutually [approximately] orthogonal states [18]. While  $\Delta t$  can be very small in some physical units, it can still be "large" so as, for the coarse grained time axis with the width  $\Delta t$ , the state eq.(9) reads:

$$\sigma = p_- |\Psi(t_o - \Delta t)\rangle \langle \Psi(t_o - \Delta t)| + p_o |\Psi(t_o)\rangle \langle \Psi(t_o)| + p_+ |\Psi(t_o + \Delta t)\rangle \langle \Psi(t_o + \Delta t)|. \quad (13)$$

For such time interval  $\Delta t$ , the states in eq.(13) can be mutually distinguishable. We are not aware of any hint of local times eq.(13) in experimental evidence and observations. So eq.(13) seems to be in sharp contrast with the standard eq.(8) and therefore our focus will be on the proper short  $\Delta t$  intervals, which allow for the limit  $\Delta t \rightarrow 0$  i.e. only a slight deviation from the standard Schrödinger evolution eq.(8), while not leading either to eq.(12) or to eq.(13).

In accordance with eqs.(10)-(11) and due to the above points (1)-(3), we choose a Gaussian time probability-distribution:

$$\rho(t) = \sqrt{\frac{\lambda}{\pi}} \exp(-\lambda(t - t_o)^2), \quad (14)$$

which in the limit  $\lambda \rightarrow \infty$  provides the standard case eq. (8). Therefore, we choose the smallest possible  $\lambda$  so as  $\tau_{min}/2 > \Delta t > \lambda^{-1}$  and:

$$\int_{t_o - \Delta t}^{t_o + \Delta t} \rho(t) dt \approx \int_{-\infty}^{\infty} \rho(t) dt = 1. \quad (15)$$

Then for arbitrary initial pure state  $|\Phi\rangle = \sum_n c_n |n\rangle$  with the Hamiltonian eigenstates  $|n\rangle$  and eigenvalues  $h_n$ , eq.(8) reads:

$$U(t_o) \sum_n c_n |n\rangle = \sum_n c_n \exp(-it_o h_n / \hbar) |n\rangle. \quad (16)$$

Now eq.(9) reads:

$$\sigma = \sum_n |c_n|^2 |n\rangle \langle n| + \sum_{n \neq n'} c_n c_{n'}^* \exp(-it_o (h_n - h_{n'}) / \hbar) \exp(-(h_n - h_{n'})^2 / 4\hbar^2 \lambda) |n\rangle \langle n'|. \quad (17)$$

In calculating eq. (17) we used the Gaussian integral:  $\int_{-\infty}^{\infty} \exp(-ax^2/2 + \iota Jx) dx = (2\pi/a)^{1/2} \exp(-J^2/2a)$ . The first term in eq.(17) defines the block-diagonal form of the state  $\sigma$ , while the off-diagonal terms that carry quantum coherence refer to the states with different energy. By very definition eq.(9), the state  $\sigma$  is hermitean, positive and with unit trace.

From eq.(17):

$$tr\sigma^2 = \sum_{n,n'} |c_n|^2 |c_{n'}|^2 \exp(-(h_n - h_{n'})/2\hbar^2\lambda) < 1, \quad (18)$$

that clearly exhibits: the state  $\sigma$  is mixed.

### 3.2 Few-particles versus many-particles systems

The terms  $\exp(-(h_n - h_{n'})^2/4\hbar^2\lambda)$  appearing in eq.(17) can in general vary from almost 0 to 1. There can be plenty of close energy values and thus plenty of terms in the sum eq.(17) can equal or be very close to 1. For poor energy spectrum, which is characteristic for small (few-particles) systems, eq.(18) can be very close to 1, i.e. there can be pure states in close vicinity of the mixed  $\sigma$  state. This is readily seen for the standard state eq.(8) and eq.(16): the fidelity [17],  $\mathcal{F} = tr \sqrt{|\Psi\rangle\langle\Psi|\sigma|\Psi\rangle\langle\Psi|} = \sqrt{\langle\Psi|\sigma|\Psi\rangle} = \sqrt{\sum_{n,n'} |c_n|^2 |c_{n'}|^2 \exp(-(h_n - h_{n'})/4\hbar^2\lambda)}$ .

Therefore, high quantum coherence in the total  $O+A$  system is expectable as a consequence of the constraint  $\tau_{min}/2 > \Delta t > \lambda^{-1}$  and eq.(15). To this end appear the following two questions. First, whether mixed state eq.(9) for an ensemble of few-particles systems, such as e.g. the EPR pairs, could be in conflict with phenomenology? And, the second, whether one can safely use pure state(s) in the vicinity of the mixed state  $\sigma$  for many-particles systems?

The first question appears in the context of the decoherence theory and the open system theory: how can we reproduce validity of the Schrödinger law, i.e. quantum coherence, on the microscopic level [8]? The often offered answer is pragmatic: the small systems are very well isolated and the environmental influence is *almost* negligible *in practice*, e.g. Schlosshauer's [8]:

"Only in very special cases of typically microscopic (atomic) phenomena, so goes the claim of the decoherence program, is the idealization of isolated systems applicable so that the predictions of linear quantum mechanics (i.e., a large class of superpositions of states) can actually be observationally confirmed."

Hence the local-time scheme goes along with the standard decoherence theory in describing the few-particles systems [8,9]: mixedness of states of small systems can be weak and ensembles of small systems can be considered as pure for the most of the practical purposes.

On the other hand, bearing in mind dense energy spectrum for many-particles systems, the typical macroscopic measurements, [which are with relatively large metrological errors], bury the exact [discrete, point-spectrum]

eigenvalues and provide a seemingly continuous spectrum—the very basis of the "continuous approximation" that is widely used e.g. in condensed matter physics. Then eq.(9) reads:

$$\sigma = \int dE dE' \Psi(E) \Psi^*(E') \exp(-it_o(E-E')/\hbar) \exp[-(E-E')^2/4\hbar^2\lambda] |E\rangle \langle E'|. \quad (19)$$

Eq.(19) resembles the well known expressions for the continuous-variable (CV) systems decoherence: close values in the continuous spectrum cannot be resolved, but large values can. While there is high coherence in the state  $\sigma$ , eq.(19), there is substantial loss of coherence for certain energy values, for which  $\exp(-(E-E')^2/4\hbar^2\lambda) \ll 1$ . This situation is typical for virtually all CV open systems [8,9,11,13]. Bearing in mind that this cannot *in principle* be achieved by pure states, we obtain the answer to the above-posed second question: no, the use of the "close" pure states in general cannot be useful.

While eq.(19) resembles the wisdom of a significant part of the open- and decoherence- theory models, it also particularly clearly emphasizes a well-known caveat. The eigenstates  $|E\rangle$  in eq.(19) are unnormalizable and lie in the rigged but not in the Hilbert space of normalizable states (integrable functions, in the position or momentum representation). For this reason, inclusion of the normalizable states into consideration, that can provide proper probability distributions/densities, has its price—that is the coarse graining of the real axis [8-13], in our case of the continuous energy spectrum. To this end, some care is needed. There are not eigenstates for the continuous spectrum in the Hilbert space—of interest are only the so-called "scattering states" [cf. Supplemental Material]. So effectively the *only way to introduce normalizable states* for the CV systems is to use "approximate eigenstates"—in analogy with the decoherence "approximate pointer basis [preferred states]" [8-13]—such as the "coherent states" or the other "wave packets" of the Gaussian form.

Coarse graining of the energy spectrum can reduce coherence in the total system. While this is always possible for the many-particles systems, it is not the case for some few-particles systems with poor spectrum. The interval  $\Delta = [G_{min}, 1]$ , where  $G_{min}$  denotes the minimum of the set of the Gaussian factors  $\exp(-(h_n - h_{n'})^2/4\hbar^2\lambda)$ , can be very narrow for the few-particles systems but virtually never for the many-particles systems thus providing the approximation  $\sigma \approx \bar{G}|\Psi\rangle\Psi|$  with the error not larger than the length of the  $\Delta$ ;  $\bar{G}$  denoting the average value of the Gaussian factors. To this end, some examples can be found in Section 5 and discussion in Section 6.

Hence while the few-particles systems are expected to exhibit approximate quantum behavior, the many-particles systems can exhibit quantal versus

classical-like behavior as a reminiscence of the conjecture that this is not merely a matter of the system's spatial size or mass but rather of the energy scale [19]. Subtlety of these general observations is illustrated in Section 5.

### 3.3 Local-time as a dynamical map

It cannot be overemphasized: the mixed state eq.(9) refers to an ensemble of a *closed* system. Every individual element of the ensemble is in a pure state  $|\Psi(t)\rangle$ ,  $t \in [t_o - \Delta t, t_o + \Delta t]$ .

Eq.(9) pertains to the following map:

$$|\Psi(t=0)\rangle\langle\Psi(t=0)| \rightarrow \sigma(t_o) = \int_{t_o-\Delta t}^{t_o+\Delta t} \rho(t)|\Psi(t)\rangle\langle\Psi(t)|dt.$$

It is readily extendible to the following dynamical map:

$$\mathcal{S}(t=0) = \sum_i p_i |\Psi_i(t=0)\rangle\langle\Psi_i(t=0)| \rightarrow \mathcal{S}(t_o) = \sum_i p_i \sigma_i(t_o)$$

where every  $\sigma_i(t_o)$  is of the form of eq.(9). Since the  $\sigma$ , eq.(9), is Hermitean, positive and with unit trace, this dynamical map is positive. Furthermore, this dynamical map is an instance of the "random unitary evolution" that is known for the finite-dimensional systems to be completely positive [Scheel 20].

Of course, collective behavior of composite quantum systems does not reveal much about the constituent systems. To this end, in the next section we analyze bipartitions of many-particles systems in the standard measurement-like processes.

## 4. A local-time scheme for quantum-measurement-like processes

In this section we analyze the idealized orthogonal-measurement-like situations [8-13]. In accordance with eq.(8), we are concerned exclusively with the pure initial states of the closed  $O + A$  system. As the "generalized measurements" are reducible to the von Neumann orthogonal measurement scheme [17], we will not discuss such measurements (that also include the POVM measurements).

### 4.1 Analysis of the measurement-like scheme

The points (a)-(e) in Section 2.2 set the clear-cut scenario of measurement-like situations. Before "measurement", non-interacting pair  $O + A$  need not

be defined by unique time—see the point (c) of Section 2.2. According to the point (a), Section 2.2, the many-body system  $A$  is subject to some local time. However, the interaction, which induces measurement, *introduces a new many-body system,  $O + A$* . According to the point (a), the time for the  $O + A$  system is not the same as for the  $A$  system alone. So, the start of the measurement process defines the initial time instant,  $t$ , for the newly formed many-body system  $O + A$  and sets the "clock" implemented by this system to the value  $t = 0$ , *for every single pair  $O + A$* . An ensemble of such pairs is presented by the mixed state eq.(17), which assumes the pure initial states for both  $O$  and  $A$ . Sudden change of times for noninteracting  $O$  and  $A$  makes the standard assumption [11,13,14] on the initial tensor-product state natural, and possibly unavoidable in the local-time scheme.

In quantum measurement, typically, interaction in the  $O + A$  system is assumed to dominate the system's dynamics [8-13]. Physically it means that, in the course of measurement [that is described by the local clock for the  $O + A$  system], the self-Hamiltonian can be neglected:  $H = H_O + H_A + H_{int} \approx H_{int}$ .

We consider a pure initial tensor-product state  $|\phi\rangle_O |\chi\rangle_A$ —every single pair  $O + A$  [in an ensemble of pairs] is assumed to be in this state. The separable spectral form for the interaction Hamiltonian [20,10]:

$$H_{int} = \sum_{\alpha,\beta} h_{\alpha\beta} P_\alpha^O \otimes \Pi_\beta^A, \quad (20)$$

where appear the projectors,  $P$  and  $\Pi$ , on the respective factor spaces,  $\mathcal{H}_O$  and  $\mathcal{H}_A$ .

Then a single pair  $O + A$  is in a state:

$$|\Psi(t)\rangle = \sum_{\alpha} b_{\alpha} |\alpha\rangle_O |\chi_{\alpha}(t)\rangle_A, \quad (21)$$

where

$$|\chi_{\alpha}(t)\rangle_A = \sum_{\beta} d_{\beta} \exp(-ith_{\alpha\beta}/\hbar) |\beta\rangle_A; \quad (22)$$

with  $b_{\alpha} |\alpha\rangle_O = P_{\alpha}^O |\phi\rangle_O$  and  $d_{\beta} |\beta\rangle_A = \Pi_{A\beta} |\chi\rangle_A$ ;  $\sum_{\alpha} |b_{\alpha}|^2 = 1 = \sum_{\beta} |d_{\beta}|^2$ . Notice that  $P^O = \sum_{\alpha} |\alpha\rangle_O \langle\alpha| \equiv \sum_{\alpha} p_{\alpha}^O < I$  and analogously for the  $A$  system.

Substituting eq.(21) into eq.(9):

$$\sigma = \sum_{\alpha} |b_{\alpha}|^2 |\alpha\rangle_O \langle\alpha| \otimes \rho_{\alpha}^A(t_o) + \sum_{\alpha \neq \alpha'} b_{\alpha} b_{\alpha'}^* |\alpha\rangle_O \langle\alpha'| \otimes \rho_{\alpha\alpha'}^A(t_o). \quad (23)$$

In eq.(23):

$$\rho_{\alpha}^A = \sum_{\beta, \beta'} d_{\beta} d_{\beta'}^* \exp(-it_{\circ}(h_{\alpha\beta} - h_{\alpha\beta'})/\hbar) \exp(-(h_{\alpha\beta} - h_{\alpha\beta'})^2/4\hbar^2\lambda) |\beta\rangle_A \langle\beta'|. \quad (24)$$

and

$$\rho_{\alpha\alpha'}^A = \sum_{\beta, \beta'} d_{\beta} d_{\beta'}^* \exp(-it_{\circ}(h_{\alpha\beta} - h_{\alpha'\beta'})/\hbar) \exp(-(h_{\alpha\beta} - h_{\alpha'\beta'})^2/4\hbar^2\lambda) |\beta\rangle_A \langle\beta'|. \quad (25)$$

It is easy to see, that  $\rho_{\alpha}^A$ s are hermitean and positive with unit trace.

**Lemma 1.** (i) *The density matrices  $\rho_{\alpha}^A$  are mutually orthogonal in the limit  $t_{\circ} \rightarrow \infty$ , i.e.  $\lim_{t_{\circ} \rightarrow \infty} \rho_{\alpha}^A \rho_{\alpha'}^A = 0, \forall \alpha \neq \alpha'$ ; (ii)  $\lim_{t_{\circ} \rightarrow \infty} tr_A \rho_{\alpha\alpha'}^A = 0, \forall \alpha \neq \alpha'$ .*

*Proof.* (i) From eq.(24), the matrix elements:

$$\begin{aligned} (\rho_{\alpha}^A \rho_{\alpha'}^A)_{\beta\beta''} &= d_{\beta} d_{\beta''}^* \exp(-it_{\circ}(h_{\alpha\beta} - h_{\alpha'\beta''})/\hbar) \sum_{\beta'} |d_{\beta'}|^2 \exp(-it_{\circ}(h_{\alpha'\beta'} - h_{\alpha\beta'})/\hbar) \times \\ &\exp\{-[(h_{\alpha\beta} - h_{\alpha\beta'})^2 + (h_{\alpha'\beta'} - h_{\alpha'\beta''})^2]/4\hbar^2\lambda\} \\ &\equiv d_{\beta} d_{\beta''}^* \exp(-it_{\circ}(h_{\alpha\beta} - h_{\alpha'\beta''})/\hbar) \zeta \chi, \forall \alpha \neq \alpha', \beta, \beta''. \end{aligned} \quad (26)$$

In the last row of eq.(26) we simplify notation and introduce:  $0 < \epsilon_{\beta'} \equiv \exp\{-[(h_{\alpha\beta} - h_{\alpha\beta'})^2 + (h_{\alpha'\beta'} - h_{\alpha'\beta''})^2]/4\hbar^2\lambda\} \leq 1$ ,  $\zeta \equiv \sum_{\beta'} |d_{\beta'}|^2 \epsilon_{\beta'}$ ,  $p_{\beta'} \equiv |d_{\beta'}|^2 \epsilon_{\beta'} / \zeta$  and  $\omega_{\beta'} \equiv (h_{\alpha\beta'} - h_{\alpha'\beta'})/\hbar$ . Since  $\sum_{\beta'} p_{\beta'} = 1$ ,  $\chi \equiv \kappa/\zeta = \sum_{\beta'} p_{\beta'} \exp(-it_{\circ}\omega_{\beta'})$  is the "correlation amplitude" [10], for which  $\lim_{t_{\circ} \rightarrow \infty} \chi = 0$  [for every  $\alpha \neq \alpha'$ ]. Bearing in mind that  $\zeta \leq 1$ , the point (i) is proved.

(ii) From eq.(25) and having in mind the above (i):

$$\lim_{t_{\circ} \rightarrow \infty} tr_A \rho_{\alpha\alpha'}^A = \lim_{t_{\circ} \rightarrow \infty} \sum_{\beta} |d_{\beta}|^2 \exp(-it_{\circ}(h_{\alpha\beta} - h_{\alpha'\beta})/\hbar) \exp(-(h_{\alpha\beta} - h_{\alpha'\beta})^2/4\hbar^2\lambda) = 0, \forall \alpha \neq \alpha'. \quad (27)$$

Q.E.D.

In Lemma 1, we resort to the results on the almost periodic functions presented in Ref.[10]. Temporal behavior of the almost periodic functions is rather subtle [10,21] and, in general, requires separate careful investigation. So, here, we basically have in mind the cases essentially described in Ref. [10]<sup>3</sup> which *exclude the few-particles systems*.

<sup>3</sup>Temporal behavior of the  $\kappa$ s is an instance of a two-dimensional random-walk problem with the restriction on the total length of the path,  $\sum_{j'} |d_{j'}|^2 \epsilon_{j'} < 1$ .

Lemma 1(i) implies  $\rho_\alpha^A = \sum_m p_{\alpha m} |m\rangle_A \langle m|$ ,  $\sum_m p_{\alpha m} = 1, \forall \alpha$ , and therefore the first term in eq.(23) in the limit  $t_o \rightarrow \infty$ :

$$\sum_{\alpha, m} |b_\alpha|^2 p_{\alpha m} |\alpha\rangle_O \langle \alpha| \otimes |m\rangle_A \langle m|, \quad (28)$$

which is the so-called "classical-classical" state with zero two-way discord [22],  $D^{\leftrightarrow}(O|A) = 0$ , i.e. without quantum correlations. Notice that the states  $|\alpha\rangle_O$  diagonalize  $H_{int}$ , while, in general, this is not the case with the  $|m\rangle_A$  states in eq.(28).

Due to Lemma 1, eq.(23) gives rise to:

$$\begin{aligned} \lim_{t_o \rightarrow \infty} \rho^O &= \lim_{t_o \rightarrow \infty} tr_A \sigma = \sum_{\alpha} |b_\alpha|^2 |\alpha\rangle_O \langle \alpha| \\ \rho^A &= tr_O \sigma = \sum_{\alpha} |b_\alpha|^2 \rho_\alpha^A, \end{aligned} \quad (29)$$

which are the states at the the observer's disposal; only for the few-particles systems, the observer may have access to the total system's state eq.(23).

#### 4.2 Unique "pointer observable"

Orthogonality of the  $\rho_\alpha^A$ s, Lemma 1(i), implies that they have orthogonal support. Then from eq.(29), the mutual information  $I(O : A)$  [17] can easily be calculated [in the limit  $t_o \rightarrow \infty$ ]:

$$I(O : A) = S(\rho^A) - \sum_{\alpha} |b_\alpha|^2 S(\rho_\alpha^A) = H(O), \quad (30)$$

where  $S(*)$  is the von Neumann entropy and  $H(O)$  is the Shannon entropy of the  $O$ 's state; the last equality in eq.(30) is a direct consequence of Theorem 11.10 in Ref. [17]. In the context of decoherence theory, eq.(30) exhibits: the environment carries perfect, classically distinguishable records about the open system's states  $|\alpha\rangle_O$ . In this sense, quantum environment is performing a measurement on the open system [23].

For the pure state eq.(8) of the total system arises a problem as the Schmidt form of the state need not be unique. This happens only if  $\rho_O$ , eq.(29), has degenerate spectrum,  $|b_\alpha|^2$ , as a consequence of the choice of the initial state of the  $O$  system. Then eq.(30) may simultaneously apply to mutually non-commuting observables—this is known as the "preferred-basis problem" [8]. In the remainder of this section we show that this is not the case for the mixed state  $\sigma$ , eq.(23). Thus we learn an important technical lesson:

even a tiny mixedness in a bipartite many-particles system can remove the ambiguity known for the Schmidt form of pure states of the total system.

Following Lemma 1(i),  $\rho_{\alpha\alpha'}^A \rho_{\alpha''\alpha'''}^A = \delta_{\alpha'\alpha''} \rho_{\alpha\alpha'}^A \rho_{\alpha''\alpha'''}^A$ , and it is easy to obtain (we assume the limit  $t_o \rightarrow \infty$ ):

$$\text{tr} R_{\nu\nu'}^A = \sum_{\alpha} |b_{\alpha}|^2 c_{\alpha\nu} c_{\alpha\nu'}^* = {}_O \langle \nu' | \left( \sum_{\alpha} |b_{\alpha}|^2 |\alpha\rangle_O \langle \alpha| \right) | \nu \rangle_O, \quad (31)$$

$$\begin{aligned} (R_{\nu}^A R_{\nu'}^A)_{\beta\beta'} &= \sum_{\alpha, \alpha'} b_{\alpha} b_{\alpha'}^* c_{\alpha\nu} c_{\alpha'\nu'}^* \sum_{\alpha''} |b_{\alpha''}|^2 c_{\alpha''\nu}^* c_{\alpha''\nu'} (\rho_{\alpha\alpha''}^A \rho_{\alpha''\alpha'}^A)_{\beta\beta'} = \\ &= \sum_{\alpha, \alpha'} b_{\alpha} b_{\alpha'}^* c_{\alpha\nu} c_{\alpha'\nu'}^* {}_O \langle \nu' | \left( \sum_{\alpha} |b_{\alpha}|^2 (\rho_{\alpha\alpha''}^A \rho_{\alpha''\alpha'}^A)_{\beta\beta'} |\alpha\rangle_O \langle \alpha| \right) | \nu \rangle_O. \end{aligned} \quad (32)$$

For degenerate spectrum of  $\rho_O$ , eq.(29), that is for at least two equal  $|b_{\alpha}|^2$ s, we can choose an alternative basis for which  $\text{tr} R_{\nu\nu'}^A = 0, \forall \nu \neq \nu'$ .<sup>4</sup> E.g. for  $|b_1|^2 = |b_2|^2$ , eq.(31) is fulfilled for the orthonormalized basis  $\{|\nu_1\rangle_O, |\nu_2\rangle_O, |\alpha\rangle_O, \alpha = 3, 4, 5, \dots\}$  for  $|\nu_i\rangle_O = \sum_{\alpha=1}^2 c_{i\alpha} |\alpha\rangle_O, i = 1, 2$ . However, as long as  $\langle \nu' | * | \nu \rangle = 0$  in eq.(31), the matrix element  $\langle \nu | * | \nu' \rangle$  in eq.(32) cannot equal zero, and *vice versa*. On the other hand, the condition  $(R_{\nu}^A R_{\nu'}^A)_{\beta\beta'} = 0$  is required for all combinations of the indices  $\nu \neq \nu', \beta, \beta'$ . Bearing in mind that Lemma 1 does not apply to the few-body systems, there is a huge number of equations for the many-particles systems that should simultaneously be fulfilled. E.g. for fixed  $\nu, \nu'$ , and for  $n$  qubits in the  $A$  system, it's the number of  $2^{n-1}(2^n+1)$  equations that should be simultaneously fulfilled. This completes the argument: there is not any alternative basis  $|\nu\rangle_O$  (for which  $c_{\alpha\nu} \neq \delta_{\alpha\nu}$ ) for which both points, (i) and (ii), of Lemma 1 could be valid for every combination of the indices  $\nu \neq \nu', \beta$ , and  $\beta'$  for a many-particles  $O + A$  system.

Now Lemma 1 and eqs.(23)-(32) *uniquely* determine the "superselection sectors"  $P_{\alpha}^O$  and the measured "pointer observable"  $A^O = \sum_{\alpha} a_{\alpha} P_{\alpha}^O$  for a *many*-particles  $O + A$  system. At variance with the case of the pure state, our conclusion *applies also for the degenerate spectrum of  $\rho^O$* , eq.(29), i.e. independently of the initial state of the  $O$  system as well as of the interaction-energy spectrum and the number of particles in the  $A$  system,  $N$  [except that  $N \gg 1$ ]. Hence the local-time scheme provides the definite records that are carried by the environment (apparatus) states and *unambiguously and*

---

<sup>4</sup>This is precisely the case when appears non-unique Schmidt form of a pure state [e.g. eq.(8)] of the composite system [8]. For a pure state  $\sigma = |\Psi\rangle\langle\Psi|$ ,  $\rho_{\alpha\alpha'}^A = |\alpha\rangle_A \langle\alpha'|$  (when, as emphasized in Section 3.2, the exponential gaussian-form factors are absent—in the limit  $\lambda \rightarrow \infty$ ). Then for degenerate spectrum of  $\rho^O$ , one can choose the basis  $|\nu\rangle_O$  such that  $(R_{\nu}^A R_{\nu'}^A)_{\beta\beta'} = b_{\beta} b_{\beta'}^* c_{\beta\nu} c_{\beta'\nu'}^* \sum_{\alpha} |b_{\alpha}|^2 c_{\alpha\nu} c_{\alpha\nu'}^* = 0, \forall \nu \neq \nu', \beta, \beta'$ .

*unconditionally* answers the question [10] "Into what mixture does the wave packet collapse?". This brings the *main result* of this paper:

A bipartition of a *closed*, finite-dimensional or infinite-dimensional, *many-particles* system can exhibit behavior that is characteristic for *open* systems. Neither "objective wave packet collapse" nor the environmental influence is required. Hence an answer also to the measurement problem—see Section 4.4.

### 4.3 Introducing the apparatus' environment

Many-particles (macroscopic) systems are in inevitable interaction with their environments. For the many-particles  $O$  system, Section 4.1 provides the results that are otherwise obtained in the standard decoherence theory via the environmental influence. This provides a basis for describing quantum measurement situations, in which there is the object of measurement (the microscopic system  $O$ ), macroscopic apparatus ( $A$ ) and the apparatus' environment ( $E$ ), which is not in direct interaction with the object  $O$ . It is worth stressing: as we emphasized in Section 4.2, presence of the apparatus' environment is not necessary in the local-time scheme in order to answer the question [10] "Into what mixture does the wave packet collapse?". So, the following analysis is exclusively due to unavoidable interaction of the realistic macroscopic apparatus with its environment.

In the standard measurement theory [8,9], interaction of the  $O$  and  $A$  systems gives rise to "premeasurement", i.e. to formation of quantum entanglement in the  $O + A$  system. The second phase of measurement is decoherence of the apparatus that is induced by the environment [8,9].

In the local-time scheme, the two phases of measurement are necessarily, clearly distinguished. They refer to different many-particles systems,  $O + A$  and  $O + A + E$  [and their related local times], respectively. Regarding premeasurement, in an instant  $t_o$  of local time for the  $O + A$  system, the total system's state is (approximately) given in a Schmidt canonical form,  $\sum_i b_\alpha |\alpha\rangle_O |\alpha\rangle_A$ .

Now, in the local-time scheme, the second phase considers another, newly formed many-particles system,  $O + A + E$ , which dynamically evolves in accordance with *its own* local time and re-sets its own time to the instant  $t = 0$ .

The correlation between the  $O$  and  $A$  systems is preserved by the environment [8-12] and carries the information that constitutes the measurement performed on  $O$  by the  $A$  system. Of course, this requires robustness of the apparatus' states  $|\alpha\rangle_A$  as the very basic requirement of successful measurement [8-12]. For a single tripartite system  $O + A + E$ , the Schrödinger dynamics gives:

$$U(t) \sum_{\alpha,j} b_\alpha d_j |\alpha\rangle_O |\alpha\rangle_A |j\rangle_E = \sum_{\alpha,j} b_\alpha d_j \exp(-ith_{\alpha j}/\hbar) |\alpha\rangle_O |\alpha\rangle_A |j\rangle_E, \quad (33)$$

while assuming strong interaction between the  $A$  and  $E$  systems; without loss of generality, we ignore degeneracy in the interaction between  $A$  and  $E$ .

Then the state eq.(23) for the ensemble of the  $O + A + E$  systems takes the following form:

$$\sigma = \sum_{\alpha} |b_\alpha|^2 |\alpha\rangle_O \langle\alpha| \otimes |\alpha\rangle_A \langle\alpha| \otimes \rho_\alpha^E + \sum_{\alpha \neq \alpha'} b_\alpha b_{\alpha'}^* |\alpha\rangle_O \langle\alpha'| \otimes |\alpha\rangle_A \langle\alpha'| \otimes \rho_{\alpha\alpha'}^E. \quad (34)$$

The operators  $\rho_\alpha^E$  and  $\rho_{\alpha\alpha'}^E$  are exactly of the form of eqs. (24) and (25), respectively, and Lemma 1 applies. Consequently, the conclusions are analogous: the environment monitors the composite system  $O + A$ , while not affecting the correlations formed in premeasurement in the  $O + A$  system. Of course, the environment's subsystems can be of interest for some models, see Section 5.4.

Bearing Lemma 1 in mind, now eq.(34) implies:

$$\rho^{O+A} = tr_E \sigma = \sum_{\alpha} |b_\alpha|^2 |\alpha\rangle_O \langle\alpha| \otimes |\alpha\rangle_A \langle\alpha|, \rho^O = tr_A \rho^{O+A} = \sum_{\alpha} |b_\alpha|^2 |\alpha\rangle_O \langle\alpha|. \quad (35)$$

Notice that the  $O + A$ 's state is another kind of classical-classical mixed state with zero two-way discord [22]—compare to eq.(28).

#### 4.4 Quantum measurement and locality

Within the local-time scheme, "local system" and "local operations" are *defined* via the set of local times in a composite system. If certain pair interactions are of similar strength, then the composite system can be subject to the unique time, cf. eq.(5). The recipe for determining the local times is conceptually rather simple as everything is written in the total system's Hamiltonian: the degrees of freedom that are relatively strongly coupled and (approximately) unitary evolve in [local] time constitute a subsystem, i.e. a "local system" that is defined by its own local time that flows differently than for some other local systems. A distribution of local times in a composite system determines the composite system's structure [15].

The local-time scheme bears universality, i.e. is independent of spatial size, energy or mass of the many-particles system as well as of initial states

of the constituent local systems. This is the basis of an answer to the measurement problem. An observer that is locally observing the  $A$  system is left with a classical information provided by the apparatus' state eq.(29), i.e. by the information gain described by eq.(30). For an *ensemble* of many-particles systems, Lemma 1 answers the questions [8] "why do we seem to perceive the pointer to be in one position [...] but not in a superposition of positions?", which is the "problem of definite outcomes" [7-10]. Section 4.2 answers the question [10] "Into what mixture does the wave packet collapse?", i.e. the question [9] "Why is it so easy to find apparatus in states [with a well defined value of the pointer observable]?", which is the "problem of the preferred basis" [8,10]. Hence those answers dissolve the quantum measurement problem [8] and directly *reject the standard position* [8]: "When quantum mechanics is applied to an isolated composite object consisting of a system  $S$  and an apparatus  $A$ , it cannot determine which observable of the system has been measured...". Whilst the pointer observable  $A^O$  is uniquely determined, there is *not a need for the objective (actual) wavepacket collapse or environmental influence*. More details on this in Section 6.

#### 4.5 Overview

Lemma 1 and eq.(30) are not applicable to the few-particles systems. On the other hand, regarding the many-particles systems, the results of this section are independent of the details of the model, such as the interaction-energy spectrum, amount of quantum coherence in the total system, initial state of the subsystems as well as of the coarse graining of the interaction-energy and/or of the pointer-observable spectrum.

### 5. Examples

In this section we analyze some well-known analytically-solvable models described by "pure decoherence" [12,23] Hamiltonian eq.(20). We observe technical simplicity and clarity of the local-time scheme. In accordance with Section 3, we choose the highest possible values for  $\Delta t$  and the smallest possible value for  $\lambda$  with the constraint eq.(15), and  $\tau_{min}/2 > \Delta t > \lambda^{-1}$ . Coarse graining of the pointer observable ( $A^O$ ) values is considered without a change of values of the  $\Delta t$  and  $\lambda$  parameters; for motivation see Section 6.

#### 5.1 A pair of spin-1/2 particles

Consider a pair of spin-1/2 particles [qubits] and interaction  $H_{int} = CS_{1z}S_{2z}$ . This is a separable interaction [20], cf. eq.(20), with the eigenstates  $|++\rangle, |+-\rangle, |-+\rangle, |--\rangle$  and eigenvalues (in the units of the Planck constant,

$\hbar = 1$ )  $h_{++} = C/4 = h_{--}$ ,  $h_{+-} = -C/4 = h_{-+}$ , while the ground energy  $E_g = -C/4$ . In order to choose the reasonable minimum upper-bound for  $\Delta t$ , we choose  $\langle H_{int} \rangle_{t=0} = 0$ ; this constraints the initial state and allows large values for  $\Delta t$  and  $\lambda^{-1}$ , as we discuss below. Then for arbitrary initial state of the 1 system we obtain  $\Delta H_{int} = C/4$  and therefore the unique bound  $\tau_{min} = 2\pi/C$ .

Let us consider the mixed state eq.(23), for this case:

$$\rho_{2+} = \begin{pmatrix} |d_+|^2 & d_+ d_-^* e^{-\frac{it_0 C}{2} - \frac{C^2}{16\lambda}} \\ d_+^* d_- e^{\frac{it_0 C}{2} - \frac{C^2}{16\lambda}} & |d_-|^2 \end{pmatrix}$$

and

$$\rho_{2-} = \begin{pmatrix} |d_+|^2 & d_+ d_-^* e^{\frac{it_0 C}{2} - \frac{C^2}{16\lambda}} \\ d_+^* d_- e^{-\frac{it_0 C}{2} - \frac{C^2}{16\lambda}} & |d_-|^2 \end{pmatrix}$$

while

$$\rho_{2+-} = \begin{pmatrix} |d_+|^2 e^{-it_0 C/2} e^{-C^2/16\lambda} & d_+ d_-^* \\ d_+^* d_- & |d_-|^2 e^{it_0 C/2} e^{-C^2/16\lambda} \end{pmatrix}.$$

Now it easily follows:

$$\begin{aligned} (\rho_{2+}\rho_{2-})_{++} &= |d_+|^2 e^{-it_0 C/2} [|d_+|^2 e^{it_0 C/2} + |d_-|^2 e^{-it_0 C/2} e^{-C^2/8\lambda}] \\ tr_2 \rho_{2+-} &= e^{-C^2/16\lambda} [|d_+|^2 e^{-it_0 C/2} + |d_-|^2 e^{it_0 C/2}] = e^{-C^2/16\lambda} \cos \frac{Ct_0}{2} \end{aligned} \quad (36)$$

i.e. Lemma 1 is not fulfilled for this case.

As we emphasized above,  $\pi/C > \Delta t > \lambda^{-1}$  is required. The choice  $d_{\pm} = 2^{-1/2}$  satisfies the condition  $\langle H_{int} \rangle_{t=0} = 0$ . Hence, for  $C = 1$ , we can choose  $\Delta t = 3$  and  $\lambda = 1$ , with the very well satisfied equality eq.(15). Then  $\exp[-C^2/16\lambda] = \exp(-1/16) \approx 0.939$  and the small off-diagonal term,  $\exp[-(h_{++} - h_{--})^2/4\lambda] = \exp(-1/16) \approx 0.939$ . Hence

$$\sigma \approx |\Psi\rangle\langle\Psi|, \quad (37)$$

with the error less than 0.062, [the error decreases with the increase of  $\lambda$ ], and with  $|\Psi\rangle = [c_+ \exp(-it_0/4)|++\rangle + c_- \exp(-it_0/4)|--\rangle + c_+ \exp(it_0/4)|+-\rangle + c_- \exp(it_0/4)|-+\rangle]/\sqrt{2}$ —that is eq.(8) for this case;  $|c_+|^2 + |c_-|^2 = 1$ . So quantum coherence is very high in the local-time scheme for ensembles of the "microscopic" systems—and is analogous to the approximate isolation (and coherence) of the microscopic systems in the context of open quantum systems (and also in the measurement and decoherence theory, as emphasized in Section 3.2.

### 5.2 Four spin-1/2 particles: a case study

A spin-1/2 system is in interaction with mutually noninteracting spin-1/2 systems [qubits]:  $H_{int} = S_{1z}(S_{2z} + S_{3z} + S_{4z})$ . The system 2 + 3 + 4 is the 1 system's environment. The interaction is separable [20], eq.(20), and the eigenstates and eigenvalues [in the units  $\hbar = 1$ ] can be denoted  $|\pm i\rangle$  and  $h_{\pm i}$ , respectively. The indices  $\pm$  refer to the 1 system, while the index  $i = 1, 2, \dots, 8$  denotes the set of mutually orthogonal tensor-product states,  $|m_2 n_3 p_4\rangle$ ,  $m, n, p = \pm$ , which constitute an orthonormalized basis for the 2 + 3 + 4 system. The eigenvalues  $h_{\pm\beta}$  and degeneracies  $g_\beta$  are as follows:  $h_{\pm 1} = 3/4 = -h_{\mp 4}$ ,  $h_{\pm 2} = 1/4 = -h_{\mp 3}$  and  $g_1 = 1 = g_4$ , while  $g_2 = 3 = g_3$ .

Again we choose  $\langle H_{int} \rangle = 0$  that is satisfied e.g. with equal distribution of eigenstates  $|m_2 n_3 p_4\rangle$  for the initial environment's state,  $8^{-1/2}, \forall i = 1 - 8$ . Then, bearing in mind degeneracies, with the use of notation of eqs.(21),(22),  $|d_1|^2 = 1/8 = |d_4|^2$  and  $|d_2|^2 = 3/8 = |d_3|^2$ . For arbitrary initial state of the 1 system,  $\pi/4\Delta H_{int} = \pi/4(\langle H_{int} \rangle - E_g) = \pi/3$ . Hence we can choose  $\Delta t = 1$  and  $\lambda = 2$  in order to provide a very good approximation for eq.(15). This gives e.g.:

$$\begin{aligned} (\rho_{(234)+} + \rho_{(234)-})_{11} &= |d_1|^2 \exp(-3it_o/2) [|d_1|^2 \exp(3it_o/2 - 9/16) + \\ &|d_2|^2 \exp(it_o/2 - 1/4) + |d_3|^2 \exp(-it_o/2 - 1/16) + |d_4|^2 \exp(-3it_o/2)]; \\ tr_{234} \rho_{(234)+-} &= |d_1|^2 \exp(-3it_o/2 - 9/32) + |d_2|^2 \exp(-it_o/2 - 1/32) + \\ &|d_3|^2 \exp(it_o/2 - 1/32) + |d_4|^2 \exp(3it_o/2 - 9/32) = \\ &\frac{1}{4} \cos\left(\frac{3t_o}{2}\right) \exp(-9/32) + \frac{3}{4} \cos\left(\frac{t_o}{2}\right) \exp(-1/32), \end{aligned} \quad (38)$$

where the last equality follows from substitution of the values for the  $|d_\beta|^2$  terms and for convenience we choose  $|b_\alpha|^2 = 1/2$ .

Needless to say, due to the small terms in the sums in eq.(38), Lemma 1 is not satisfied. Nevertheless, comparison of eqs.(36) and (38) clearly exhibits: increase in the size of the environment gives better satisfied Lemma 1. Both traces in eq.(36) and (38) are periodic functions [with the periods approximately  $2\pi$  and  $4\pi$ ] and increase in the number of terms in the sum leads to the almost periodic functions, Lemma 1. Physically, eq.(38) reveals environment's periodic memory, with small period, about the object's state—that is not a good measurement or decoherence of the 1 system.

The real exponential terms  $\exp[-(h_{\alpha\beta} - h_{\alpha'\beta'})^2/4\lambda]$  for the above set of energy eigenvalues and for small  $\lambda = 2$  have the smallest value  $\exp(-9/32) = 0.755$  and the largest value  $\exp(-1/32) = 0.969$ . Compared to the previous model, there is less quantum coherence in the total system. So

$$\sigma \not\approx |\Psi'\rangle\langle\Psi'| \quad (39)$$

where  $|\Psi'\rangle = \sum_{\alpha=\pm} \sum_{\beta=1}^4 b_\alpha d_\beta \exp(-it_\circ h_{\alpha\beta}) |\alpha\beta\rangle$  is the standard state eq.(8). The fidelity satisfies  $0.869 = \sqrt{0.755} < \mathcal{F} = \sqrt{\langle \Psi' | \sigma | \Psi' \rangle} = \sqrt{\sum_{\alpha,\beta,\alpha',\beta'} |b_\alpha d_\beta|^2 |b_{\alpha'} d_{\beta'}|^2 \exp[-(h_{\alpha\beta} - h_{\alpha'\beta'})^2/8]} < \sqrt{0.969} = 0.984$ . After a straightforward but lengthy computation, the exact fidelity amounts to 0.894. Decrease of quantum coherence relative to the model of Section 5.1 supports and illustrates the general notions provided in Section 3.2: the larger the environment the less quantum coherence in the total system.

### 5.3 Decoherence and measurement of a single qubit: the qubit environment

We consider the well-studied, analytically solvable model of "decoherence of a single qubit" [10]. This also models the Stern-Gerlach experiment, if the environment is modelled as the set of molecules in the plate that can be either decayed or non-decayed by the atoms caught by the plate.

The interaction Hamiltonian for the pair  $O + A$ , where the  $O$  system is the single qubit is separable [20]:

$$H_{int} = (a_+|+\rangle_O \langle +| + a_-|-\rangle_O \langle -|) \otimes \sum_{k=1}^N g_k (|+\rangle_{Ak} \langle +| - |-\rangle_{Ak} \langle -|) \Pi_{k \neq k'} I_{k'}, \quad (40)$$

with  $a_+ = -a_- = 1$  and with  $N \gg 1$ .

Initial state of a single total system  $|\Psi\rangle = (a|+\rangle_O + b|-\rangle_O) \prod_{k=1}^N (\alpha_k |+\rangle_{Ak} + \beta_k |-\rangle_{Ak})$  gives for a single total system in an instant of time [10]:

$$|\Psi(t)\rangle = a|+\rangle_O |\chi_+(t)\rangle_A + b|-\rangle_O |\chi_-(t)\rangle_A, \quad (41)$$

where [for  $\hbar = 1$ ]

$$|\chi_\pm(t)\rangle_A = \prod_{k=1}^N (\alpha_k e^{-a_\pm i g_k t} |+\rangle_{Ak} + \beta_k e^{i a_\pm g_k t} |-\rangle_{Ak}). \quad (42)$$

Eq.(42) can be written as:

$$|\chi_\pm(t)\rangle_A = \sum_{j_1 \dots j_N = \pm} c_{j_1} \dots c_{j_N} e^{-i t a_\pm \sum_k g_k \alpha_k} \prod_{i=1}^N |j_i\rangle_A \quad (43)$$

where  $\alpha_k = \nu_k - \mu_k$  and  $\nu, \mu = 0, 1$  with the following rule: if  $j_k = +$ , then  $\nu_k = 1$  and  $\mu_k = 0$ , while for  $j_k = -$ , then  $\nu_k = 0$  and  $\mu_k = 1$ , with independent constants for different indices  $k$ .

Then the ensemble of the total system is in the mixed state:

$$\sigma = |a|^2 |+\rangle_O \langle +| \otimes \rho_+^A + |b|^2 |-\rangle_O \langle -| \otimes \rho_-^A + a b^* |+\rangle_O \langle -| \otimes \rho_{+-}^A + a^* b |-\rangle_O \langle +| \otimes \rho_{-+}^A. \quad (44)$$

In eq.(44):

$$\begin{aligned}
\rho_{\pm}^A(t_o) &= \sum_{j_1 \dots j_N j'_1 \dots j'_N} c_{j_1} \dots c_{j_N} c_{j'_1}^* \dots c_{j'_N}^* e^{-it_o a \pm \sum_k g_k (\alpha_k - \alpha'_k)} e^{-(a \pm \sum_k g_k (\alpha_k - \alpha'_k))^2 / 4\lambda} \Pi_i |j_i\rangle_A \langle j'_i| \\
\rho_{+-}^A(t_o) &= \sum_{j_1 \dots j_N j'_1 \dots j'_N} c_{j_1} \dots c_{j_N} c_{j'_1}^* \dots c_{j'_N}^* e^{-it_o \sum_k g_k (a + \alpha_k - a - \alpha'_k)} \times \\
&e^{-(\sum_k g_k (a + \alpha_k - a - \alpha'_k))^2 / 4\lambda} \Pi_i |j_i\rangle_A \langle j'_i|
\end{aligned} \tag{45}$$

From eq.(45):

$$\begin{aligned}
\rho_+^A(t_o) \rho_-^A(t_o) &= \sum_{j_1 \dots j_N j'_1 \dots j'_N} c_{j_1} \dots c_{j_N} c_{j'_1}^* \dots c_{j'_N}^* e^{-it_o \sum_k g_k (a + \alpha_k - a - \alpha'_k)} \Pi_i |j_i\rangle_A \langle j'_i| \times \\
&\left( \sum_{j''_1 \dots j''_N} |c_{j''_1}|^2 \dots |c_{j''_N}|^2 e^{-it_o (a - a +) \sum_k g_k \alpha''_k} e^{-[(a + \sum_k g_k (\alpha_k - \alpha''_k))^2 + (a - \sum_k g_k (\alpha''_k - \alpha'_k))^2] / 4\lambda} \right) \\
tr_A \rho_{+-}^A &= \sum_{j_1 \dots j_N} |c_{j_1}|^2 \dots |c_{j_N}|^2 e^{-it_o (a + a -) \sum_k g_k \alpha_k} e^{-((a + a -) \sum_k g_k \alpha_k)^2 / 4\lambda}.
\end{aligned} \tag{46}$$

The term in the parenthesis and the trace  $tr_A \rho_{+-}^A$  are of the form of the  $\kappa$ -function defined in the proof of Lemma 1(i)—see below eq.(26). Therefore, Lemma 1 applies for the case studied:  $\lim_{t_o \rightarrow \infty} \rho_+^A \rho_-^A = 0$  and  $\lim_{t_o \rightarrow \infty} \rho_{+-}^A = 0$  for  $N \gg 1$ .

In order to compare with Zurek's [10], we deal with the random values for  $g_k \in (0, 1)$  and  $|\alpha_k| \approx |\beta_k|, \forall k$ ; the later gives rise to  $\langle H_{int} \rangle \approx 0$ . The interaction eigenvalues are  $\sum_k g_k \alpha_k$  and for the randomly chosen [with the same probability for the intervals of the length  $1/N$ ]  $g_k$ s, we can ignore degeneracy, i.e. there can be only (relatively) small fraction of the exponential terms  $\exp[-(h_n - h_{n'})^2 / 4\lambda] = 1$ . It is easy to obtain  $\Delta H_{int} = \sqrt{\sum_k g_k^2} = \sqrt{N^{-3} \sum_{k=1}^N k^2} = 3^{-1/2} < E_g = \sum_k g_k = N^{-2} \sum_{k=1}^N k = 1/2$ , for  $N \gg 1$ . Therefore  $\tau_{min} = \pi / 4\sqrt{3} = 1.36$ . So we choose  $\Delta t = 1.358$  and the smallest value  $\lambda = 1$  that provides good approximation for eq.(15).

Then the exponential factors appearing in the  $\rho_{+-}^A$  in eq.(46):

$$e^{-(\sum_k g_k (a + \alpha_k \pm a - \alpha'_k))^2 / 4\lambda} = e^{-\frac{(\sum_k g_k (\alpha_k \pm \alpha'_k))^2}{4}}. \tag{47}$$

Since  $\max\{\alpha_k \pm \alpha'_k\} = 2$ , the smallest exponential factor is  $\exp(-1/4) = 0.779$ . All other terms are with the nominator in the exponent of the form  $(\pm \sum_{k=1}^M g_k \mp \sum_{k=M+1}^N g_k)^2 = (N^{-2} [\pm \sum_{k=1}^M k \mp \sum_{k=M+1}^N k])^2$ . Numerical

estimates reveal that such terms are not less than 0.94. In order to compare with the model of Section 5.2, we set  $N = 3$  [and placing  $\lambda = 2$  and the eigenvalues  $\pm 1$  instead of  $\pm 1/2$ ] and obtain similar results. So we find that there is high quantum coherence for both models of Section 5.2 and of this section.

Without further ado, let us consider the object's spectrum  $a_i \in \{-2, -1, 1, 2\}$ —which can describe the four spin-1/2 particles total-spin values; the  $a_i$  values substitute the above  $a_{\pm}$  values. For the pair of the the values, e.g. 2 and  $-1$ , the smallest Gaussian factor  $\exp(\sum_k g_k(2\alpha_k - \alpha_{k'})^2/4) = \exp(-1/4) \approx 0.778$ , while the minimum  $\exp(-1) = 0.368$ . Now, let us consider the coarse graining of this spectrum by introducing the new set of values,  $a'_j \in \{-2, 0, 2\}$ . For the values 2 and 0, [with  $\lambda = 1$ ], there is the unique value of  $\exp(-1/4) = 0.778$ , while the minimum exponential term, [pertaining to the pair 2,  $-2$ ],  $\exp(-1) \approx 0.368$ , remains intact. So we obtain a rough idea about decrease of coherence due to the coarse graining of spectrum of the pointer observable, and consequently of [the interaction] energy in the composite system. Needless to say, due to the poor spectrums, this is not possible for the microscopic objects of Sections 5.1, 5.2 and eq.(42). In turn, we also realize: finer measurements—e.g. of the spectrum  $a_i$  instead of the coarse-grained values  $a'_j$ —can in principle provide observation of coherence, i.e. of quantum correlations in the total system.

#### 5.4 Position measurement

The classic von Neumann's model [24] that implements the Heisenberg's idea of position measurement is described by strong interaction  $H_{int} = Cx_O \otimes P_A$  between the one-dimensional object  $O$  and the apparatus  $A$ ; the conjugate momentum/position observables  $p_O$  and  $X_A$ , respectively. The model is readily generalized for measurement of any continuous observable  $Q_O$  as well as to the three dimensional models [25]. Similar results are obtained for the interaction  $H_{int} = x_O \otimes X_A$ . For the collective position observable  $X_A = \sum_j \kappa_j x_{Aj}$ , the object  $O$  undergoes quantum Brownian motion [13] that does not depend on the strength of interaction.

Let us consider the composite system initially spatially contained in the linear dimensions  $[-L, L]$  and the initial state  $|\phi\rangle_O |\chi\rangle_A$  as a tensor product of two wavepackets with the position and momentum spreads  $\sigma_{x_O} \equiv \sigma_1$  and  $\sigma_{P_A} \equiv \sigma_2$ , while for convenience  $\langle H_{int} \rangle = 0$ . For the analogous interval for the apparatus momentum  $[-P, P]$  the ground energy  $E_g = -LP \ll 1$ . If the spreads  $\sigma_1 \sim 1$  and  $\sigma_2 \sim 1$ , then [in the units  $\hbar = 1$  and for  $C = 1$ ]  $\tau_{min} = \max\{\pi/2\sigma_1\sigma_2, \pi/2LP\} = \pi/2$ , while  $\Delta t = 0.78$  and  $\lambda = 3$  well satisfy eq.(15).

Then the ensemble state eq.(23) reads:

$$\sigma = \int dx dx' |x\rangle_O \langle x'| \otimes \rho_A(x, x'), \quad (48)$$

with

$$\rho_A(x, x') = \int dP dP' \phi(x) \phi^*(x') \chi(P) \chi^*(P') \exp(-it_o(xP - x'P')) \exp(-(xP - x'P')^2/12) |P\rangle_A \langle P'|. \quad (49)$$

From eq.(49) one easily obtains validity of Lemma 1, due to direct applicability of the Riemann-Lebesgue lemma, cf. e.g. Proposition 5.2.1 in Ref.[14], in our case:  $\lim_{t_o \rightarrow \infty} \int dP |\chi(P)|^2 \exp(-it_o(x' - x)P) \exp\{-[(xP' - xP)^2 + (x'P - x'P')^2]/12\} = 0$  for  $x \neq x'$ .

The fidelity  $\sqrt{\int dx dx' dP dP' |\phi(x)|^2 |\phi(x')|^2 |\chi(P)|^2 |\chi(P')|^2 \exp(-(xP - x'P')^2/12)}$  reveals very high coherence for the object's state—there are plenty of close  $x$  and  $x'$ . Nevertheless, there are still very small values for the Gaussian factors for which  $|x - x'| \gg 12$ —that is within the initially determined domain of  $L \gg 1$ . This observation distinguishes the CV systems as paradigmatic for the observation that Lemma 1 and Section 4.2 provide the results in complete independence of the amount of quantum coherence for the *mixed* state  $\sigma$ .

Coarse graining of the pointer-observable  $x_O$  continuous spectrum (while keeping the parameter  $\lambda$  fixed) reduces the number of the Gaussian terms, which almost equal 1. If the width of the spatial interval is  $\Delta x$ , then one can choose the wavepackets with the spread  $\Delta x$  as the approximate (non-orthogonal) normalizable "pointer basis" states. Formally, for a set of approximately orthogonal minimum-uncertainty (the "coherent") states  $|\psi_{ij}\rangle_O$ , such that  ${}_O\langle \psi_{ij} | \psi_{i'j'} \rangle_O \approx \delta_{ii'} \delta_{jj'}$ , one obtains  ${}_O\langle \psi_{ij} | x_O | \psi_{i'j'} \rangle_O \approx x_i \delta_{ii'} \delta_{jj'}$ . Then the exact interaction is almost diagonal for the  $|\psi_{ij}\rangle_O$  states:  ${}_O\langle \psi_{ij} | H_{int} | \psi_{i'j'} \rangle_O \approx 0, \forall i \neq i', j, j'$ . Furthermore, the unitary operator generated by the interaction is also almost diagonalizable for these states. The proof reduces to computing the  ${}_O\langle \psi_{ij} | x_O^n | \psi_{i'j'} \rangle_O$  terms. For  $\psi_{ij}(x) = (2\pi\sigma_i)^{-1/2} \exp(-(x - x_i)^2/2\sigma_i^2 + ixp_j)$ :

$${}_O\langle \psi_{ij} | x_O^n | \psi_{i'j'} \rangle_O = (2\pi\sigma_i\sigma_{i'})^{-1} \exp(-(x_i - x_{i'})^2/2(\sigma_i^2 + \sigma_{i'}^2)) \mathcal{I}_n \quad (50)$$

where  $\mathcal{I}_n = \int_{-\infty}^{\infty} dx x^n \exp(-(x - x_o)^2/2\sigma^2 - ix(p_j - p_{j'}))$ ;  $\sigma^2 = \sigma_i^2 \sigma_{i'}^2 / (\sigma_i^2 + \sigma_{i'}^2)$  and  $x_o = (x_{i'} \sigma_i^2 + x_i \sigma_{i'}^2) / (\sigma_i^2 + \sigma_{i'}^2)$ . The Gaussian term in eq.(50) proves the claim:  $\|{}_O\langle \psi_{ij} | U(t_o) | \psi_{i'j'} \rangle_O\| \propto \exp(-(x_i - x_{i'})^2/4) \ll 1$ .

Since  $\sum_{i,j} |\psi_{ij}\rangle_O \langle \psi_{ij}| < I$ , there are plenty of "coherent states"  $|\alpha\rangle_O$  in the vicinity of every  $|\psi_{ij}\rangle_O$  that contributes to degeneracy of the interaction. Hence for the set of the values  $x_i$  (out of the continuous set of the position values  $x \in (-\infty, \infty)$ ) one obtains substantial decrease of the Gaussian factors, while the coherent states  $|\psi_{ij}\rangle_O$  constitute a set of approximate pointer basis states for the exact continuous pointer observable  $x_O$ . The more rigorous methods of "macroscopic measurement" [24] or introduction of quasi-projectors (in the micro-local analysis) for defining "collective observables" [26] give rise to redefinition of the exact pointer observable and of the interaction Hamiltonian that we are not interested in—see Section 6.

### 5.5 Walls-Collet-Milburn measurement model

The open system  $O$  and the apparatus  $A$  are taken to be harmonic oscillators defined by the respective annihilation operators,  $a$  and  $b$  (the modes) and with the separable interaction, [that we assume to be strong], [27]:

$$H_{OA} = \frac{\hbar}{2} a^\dagger a (\epsilon^* b + \epsilon b^\dagger). \quad (51)$$

There is also the apparatus environment  $E$ , which is a thermal bath of harmonic oscillators with the interaction

$$H_{AE} = b \sum_j \kappa_j^* c_j^\dagger + b^\dagger \sum_j \kappa_j c_j \quad (52)$$

which we also assume to be strong and with the environmental annihilation operators (the modes)  $c_j$ . The thermal bath can be "purified" and appears as a subsystem of a larger system, which is initially in a pure state that we are concerned with, cf. eq.(8), and will continue to be denoted by  $E$ .

According to Section 4.3, eq.(51) describes pre-measurement that gives rise to the final state of the  $O + A$  system [13]:

$$|\Psi(t)\rangle_{OA} = \sum_n c_n |n\rangle_O |n\epsilon t/2\rangle_A, \quad (53)$$

where  $a^\dagger a |n\rangle_O = n |n\rangle_O$  and the apparatus states are "coherent states" [the Gaussian states with the minimum uncertainty for position and momentum of the system]. Setting  $t = t_o \rightarrow \infty$ , the apparatus states are approximately orthogonal [13] and in the instant of time  $t_o$ , pre-measurement is complete.

The second phase of the measurement, cf. Section 4.3, is described by the interaction eq.(52). By following Ref.[28], the interaction eq.(52) is obtained via the so-called rotating-wave approximation [13,14] that reveals the Schrödinger-picture, original interaction to be of the separable form [27,28]:

$$H_{AE} = X_A \left[ \sum_j \kappa_j^* c_j + \sum_j \kappa_j c_j^\dagger \right], \quad (54)$$

where  $X_A$  is the apparatus position observable. Eq.(54) is of interest within the local-time scheme.

Eq.(54) is actually the model considered in Section 5.4: The environment  $E$  measures the apparatus' position  $X_A$ . So we conclude that the second phase of the measurement—according to Section 4.3—is an (almost ideal) "non-demolition" measurement [27] that distinguishes the  $X_A$  observable as the pointer observable with the approximate pointer basis  $|n\epsilon t/2\rangle_A$  for the apparatus. Needless to say, the object's exact pointer observable is  $a^\dagger a$  and the exact pointer basis states  $|n\rangle_O$ . As in eq.(35), the related density matrices:

$$\rho_{O+A} = \sum_n |c_n|^2 |n\rangle_O \langle n| \otimes |n\epsilon t/2\rangle_A \langle n\epsilon t/2|, \rho_O = \sum_n |c_n|^2 |n\rangle_O \langle n|. \quad (55)$$

## 6. Discussion

"Local time" is inseparable from "local system" and directly defines "local operations" in a composite quantum system. Following eq.(5) and Section 2.2, the composite system's Hamiltonian defines distribution of local times, i.e. the local systems, via the two criteria. First, it's the relatively strong interactions in the system, and, the second, that the "local systems" are (at least approximately) subject to the unitary Schrödinger law. Since the later is a *phenomenological* rule of decoherence and measurement in quantum theory, it should be separately considered for different models. Existence of more than one local time implies non-existence of unique, global time for the composite system, such as the universe, eq.(1). In this context, the standard relativistic concept of locality needs a redefinition. Every local time, implemented by the local system's Hamiltonian, eq.(5), works as required and described by the standard quantum mechanical theory.

It is remarkable that the local-time scheme is technically simple. It straightforwardly reproduces (Section 5) some basic results of the standard decoherence and measurement theory. Amount of quantum coherence in the total system depends on the system's state that is reflected by the values of the parameters  $\Delta t$  and  $\lambda$  parameters. On the other hand, coarse graining of the energy- and/or of the pointer-observable-spectrum gives rise to a decrease of the quantum coherence as it is found in some other contexts [24,26,29]. The point strongly to be emphasized (see also Section 4.5): the results of

Section 4 are independent of the amount of quantum coherence (quantum correlations) in the closed total system.

The local-time scheme is unlike the other measurement and interpretation schemes in quantum mechanics. It promotes universal validity of the Schrödinger law while the apparent collapse—i.e. the measurement problem that drives the interpretations [8]—is exclusively due to non-unique time for an *ensemble*. The classical information eq.(30) hold by the observer unambiguously *operationally* answers the question [10] "Into what mixture does the wave packet collapse?" solely due to the spectral form of the interaction Hamiltonian. Bearing in mind generic stochastic nature of quantum measurement, we obtain an answer to the measurement problem: The apparent collapse is neither objective nor avoidable and is based exclusively on the classical information collected by the observer on an *ensemble* of systems. Within the local-time scheme there is *not* necessity for the "objective state collapse", or for the world branching, or for the hidden variables or for the environmental influence in order to answer the question "Into what mixture does the wave packet collapse?". In a sense the local-time scheme may be regarded to be closest to the Copenhagen interpretation [7,8]: Solution of the measurement problem requires *macroscopic* apparatus. Otherwise, it has no common elements with the Copenhagen interpretation: in the local-time scheme, the apparatus is quantum, not "classical". Finally, the local-time scheme is not instrumentalist or purely operational. Rather, in our considerations, *quantum states and observables are exact and unaltered for all operationally different situations*. E.g. coarse graining introduced in Section 3.2 and illustrated in Section 5 does not imply redefinition of states or of the observables in order to describe the lack of information due to the coarse graining. To this end, our considerations are more like the standard decoherence description, Section 3 and eq.(19), than like some elaborate coarse graining schemes [24,26,29]. Nevertheless, the conclusions are similar: coarse graining of the exact ("microscopic") eigenvalues reduces quantum coherence in the system. In the context of our considerations, operational approach [24,26,29] requires redefinition of the spectral form of the Hamiltonian and/or of the total system's state and leads to a change in the time bound  $\tau_{min}$ , Section 3.1, i.e. in the values of the parameters  $\Delta t$  and  $\lambda$ . E.g. within the microlocal analysis [26], one introduces the quasi-projectors that approximate and thus redefine the position observable  $x$  and consequently the interaction considered in Section 5.4. Introduction of the new sets of eigenvalues and (approximate) eigenspaces give inevitably rise to a change in the bound  $\tau_{min}$ —as it can be easily shown. Not doing so, Section 5, highlights the observation, Section 3.2, that refining the measurement, i.e. operational accessibility of the exact, "microscopic", eigenvalues, can in principle give

rise to observation of quantum effects in the many-particles systems.

Our conclusions do not directly apply to the weak-interaction scenarios (e.g. the weak-measurement and some Markovian open systems dynamics) that require separate considerations. Mutual relations between the local times remains intact in the present paper (but see Ref. [3] for a proposal).

Encouraged by the above-presented results, we believe that the local-time scheme is worth further pursuit in the foundations of quantum theory. Investigating the deeper physical nature of time can non-trivially contribute to the findings of this paper.

If time is physically not fundamental but rather emergent, or "relational" [30] (and the references therein), our conclusions may remain essentially intact. However, if time is fundamental, then the following prospect emerges: Removing of the integration from eq.(9) provides the state  $\rho(t)|\Psi(t)\rangle\langle\Psi(t)|$ , which introduces time as a classical system,  $T$ , which extends the quantum system  $O + A$ . Then the total system  $T + O + A$  appears, at least formally, as a hybrid system [31] (and the references therein) that might link quantum and relativistic theories in a non-trivial way [32]. To this end, the state eq.(23) can be interpreted as the state of every individual pair [that is subject to local-time fluctuations] in the ensemble of pairs  $O + A$ . To this end the work is in progress.

## 7. Conclusion

The local-time scheme of Kitada [3] is unlike the other measurement and interpretation schemes in quantum theory. It is not an *ad hoc* scheme but a natural interpretation of the quantum many-body scattering theory that assumes Schrödinger dynamics for every single quantum system and introduces non-unique time for an ensemble of such systems. The few-particles systems sustain very high quantum coherence and can be considered to be in pure state for the most of the practical purposes. Description of the many-particles systems is perfectly suited for the purposes of quantum decoherence and measurement in the limit of strong interaction. Within the local-time scheme, the measurement problem is dissolved already for a closed many-particles system. In contrast to the complex machinery of the quantum many-body scattering, the local-time scheme is technically simple, intuitively clear and easily implementable for arbitrary bipartition of a composite system. Deeper physical foundations of the time uncertainty can nontrivially contribute and possibly link the quantum and relativistic theory.

## Acknowledgements

We are deeply indebted to Hitoshi Kitada for patiently explaining the foundations of the many-body scattering theory and also of his local-time theory. We benefited much from discussions with Hitoshi Kitada, Allen Francom and Stephen P. King. We acknowledge financial support by the Ministry of education, science and technology Serbia under the grant no 171028 and the EU COST Action MP1006.

## References

- [1] V. Enss, Commun. Math. Phys., **61**, 285 (1978);  
V. Enss, Introduction to asymptotic observables for multiparticle quantum scattering, in "Schrödinger Operators, Aarhus 1985" edited by E. Balslev, Lect. Note in Math., vol. 1218, Springer-Verlag, 1986, 61-92;  
I. M. Sigal, AMS Translations **175**, 183 (1996)
- [2] H. Kitada, Rev. Math. Phys. **3**, 101 (1991);  
H. Kitada, Asymptotic completeness of N-body wave operators II. A new proof for the short-range case and the asymptotic clustering for long-range systems, Functional Analysis and Related Topics, 1991, Ed. by H. Komatsu, Lect. Note in Math., vol. 1540, Springer-Verlag, 1993, 149-189.
- [3] H. Kitada, Nuovo Cim. **B 109**, 281 (1994);  
H. Kitada and L. Fletcher, Apeiron **3**, 38 (1996);  
H. Kitada and L. Fletcher, Comments on the Problem of Time, <http://xxx.lanl.gov/abs/gr-qc/1997>.
- [4] S. Petrat, R. Tumulka, Multi-Time Equations, Classical and Quantum, *Preprint* arXiv:1309.1103v1 [quant-ph]  
S. Petrat, R. Tumulka, Multi-Time Formulation of Pair Creation, *Preprint* arXiv:1401.6093 [quant-ph]
- [5] J. B. Hartle, Time and Prediction in Quantum Cosmology, in Conceptual Problems of Quantum Gravity, Einstein Studies Vol. 2, Edited by A. Ashtekar and J. Stachel, Birkhauser, Boston, Basel, Berlin, 1991.
- [6] S. Petrat, R. Tumulka, Multi-Time Schrodinger Equations Cannot Contain Interaction Potentials, E-print arXiv:1308.1065 [quant-ph]
- [7] J. A. Wheeler, W. H. Zurek, Quantum Theory and Measurement Princeton Univ Pr (January 1984)
- [8] M. Schlosshauer, Rev. Mod. Phys. **76**, 1267 (2004)
- [9] W. H. Zurek, Rev. Mod. Phys. **75**, 715 (2003)
- [10] W. H. Zurek, Phys. Rev. D **24**, 1516 (1981)  
W. H. Zurek, Phys. Rev. D **26**, 1862 (1982)
- [11] E. Joos et al 2003 Decoherence and the Appearance of a Classical-World in Quantum Theory 2nd edn (Berlin: Springer)

- [12] C. Jess Riedel, W. H. Zurek, M. Zwolak, The objective past of a quantum universe—Part 1: Redundant records of consistent histories, arXiv:1312.0331v1 [quant-ph]
- [13] H.-P. Breuer, F. Petruccione, The Theory of Open Quantum Systems, Oxford Univ. Press, 2002
- [14] Á. Rivas, S. F. Huelga, Open Quantum Systems. An Introduction, SpringerBriefs in Physics 2011
- [15] J. Jeknić-Dugić, M. Arsenijević, M. Dugić, Quantum Structures: A View of the Quantum World, LAP LAMBERT Academic Publishing (July 31, 2013)
- M. Dugić, M. Arsenijević, J. Jeknić-Dugić, Sci. Chi. Phys., Mech. Astron. **56**, 732 (2013)
- [16] W. K. Wootters, W. H. Zurek, Nature **299**, 802 (1982)
- [17] M. A. Nielsen, I. L. Chuang, Quantum Computation and Quantum Information, Cambridge University Press 2000
- [18] N. Margolus, L. B. Levitin, Physica **D120**, 188 (1998)
- M. Dugić, M. M. Ćirković, Phys. Lett. A **302**, 291 (2002)
- [19] A. J. Leggett, Prog. Theor. Phys. Suppl. **69**, 80 (1980)
- [20?] K. M. R. Audenaert, S. Scheel, New J. Phys. **10**, 023011 (2007)
- [20] M. Dugić, Phys. Scr. **56**, 560 (1997)
- [21] A. S. Besicovitch, Almost periodic functions, Cambridge University Press, Dover, 1963
- M. Kac, Am. J. Math. **65**, 609 (1943)
- [22] K. Modi, A. Brodutch, H. Cable, T. Paterek, V. Vedral, Rev. Mod. Phys. **84**, 1655 (2012)
- [23] M. Zwolak, H. T. Quan, W. H. Zurek, Phys. Rev. Lett. **103**, 110402 (2009)
- M. Zwolak, C. Jess Riedel, W. H. Zurek, Amplification, Redundancy, and the Quantum Chernoff Information, e-print arXiv:1312.5373 [quant-ph]
- [24] J. von Neumann, Mathematical Foundations of Quantum Mechanics, Princeton Univ. Press, Princeton NJ, 1955
- [25] M. Dugić, J. Res. Phys. **27**, 141 (1998)
- [26] R. Omnes, The Interpretation of Quantum Mechanics, Princeton Univ. Press, Princeton, 1994
- [27] D. F. Walls, M. J. Collet, G. J. Milburn, Phys. Rev. D **32**, 3208 (1985)
- [28] G. S. Agarwal, Phys. Rev. A **4**, 739 (1971)
- [29] J. Kofler, Č. Brukner, Phys. Rev. Lett. **99**, 180403 (2007)
- T. Wang, R. Ghobadi, S. Raesi, C. Simon, Phys. Rev. A **88**, 062114 (2013)
- H. Jeong, Y. Lim, M. S. Kim, Phys. Rev. Lett. **112**, 010402 (2014)

- P. Sekatski, N. Gisin, N. Sangouard, How difficult it is to prove the quantumness of macroscopic states ?, e-print arXiv:1402.2542v1 [quant-ph]
- [30] R. Gambini, R. A. Porto, J. Pullin, *New J. Phys.* **6**, 45 (2004)
- J. Simon, *Change Without Time: Relationalism and Field Quantization*, Ph.D. Thesis, Universität Regensburg, 2004
- [31] L. Diosi, Hybrid Quantum-Classical Master Equations, e-print arXiv:1401.0476 [quant-ph]
- [32] D. Kafri, J.M. Taylor, G. J. Milburn, A classical channel model for gravitational decoherence, e-print arXiv:1401.0946v1 [quant-ph]