

# The Orientation of Local Spatial Reference Frames in Quantum Teleportation

DOUGLAS M. SNYDER  
LOS ANGELES, CALIFORNIA

## ABSTRACT

Quantum teleportation raises the question of the orientation of the local spatial reference frames from which and to which teleportation occurs where the state teleported is spin  $1/2$  along the  $z$  axis. Issues related to this question are raised, and two possible explanations of these issues are offered. An empirical test to distinguish between them is proposed in the form of a gedankenexperiment. The orientation of the local spatial reference frames is important because Bennett et al. wrote that only two bits of information need to be conveyed classically where the state to be teleported concerns spin  $1/2$  along the  $z$  axis and that essentially there need not be any prior agreement before teleportation occurs between observers at the distant locations from and where quantum teleportation occurs as regards orientation of the local spatial reference frames with one another or the locations themselves.

## TEXT

Quantum teleportation raises the question of the orientation of the local spatial reference frames from which and to which teleportation occurs where the state teleported is spin  $1/2$  along the  $z$  axis. The orientation of the local spatial reference frames is important because Bennett and his colleagues [1] in their original article on quantum teleportation wrote that only two bits of information needed to be conveyed classically where the state to be teleported concerns spin  $1/2$  along the  $z$  axis. These two bits account for the four possible results of the Bell-state measurement at the location where the quantum state is to be teleported from. Bennett and his colleagues also wrote that essentially there need not be any prior agreement before quantum teleportation occurs between observers at the distant locations from and where teleportation occurs as regards orientation of the local spatial reference frames with one another or the locations themselves. This raises the question of if, and perhaps how, these local frames are related in terms of their orientation.

Specifically, in the teleportation scheme proposed by Bennett et al. [1], a quantum state of a spin  $1/2$  particle  $X$  at one location can be teleported to another distant location where another spin  $1/2$  particle  $Y$  is located. An

## The Orientation of

experimental realization following the basic idea of Bennett et al. has been accomplished [2].

Following Bennett et al., allow that in a gedankenexperiment the state to be teleported for a spin one-half particle X for the spin component along the  $z$  axis is:

$$|\psi_X\rangle = \alpha|\uparrow_X\rangle + \beta|\downarrow_X\rangle \quad (1)$$

After teleportation, perhaps including a rotation around the  $x$ ,  $y$ , or  $z$  axes where Y is located or perhaps allowing for an unimportant phase factor, the state of Y should be the same as that which characterized X before teleportation:

$$|\psi_Y\rangle = \alpha|\uparrow_Y\rangle + \beta|\downarrow_Y\rangle \quad (2)$$

The following question arises: How does one determine the orientation of the  $x$ ,  $y$ , or  $z$  axes at Y which is distant from X, inasmuch as only two bits of information are classically communicated? When an observer obtains the classically communicated message regarding the nature of the Bell-state measurement at X, how does the observer at Y determine how the local, orthogonal spatial axes are located within which a rotation can be made, if needed, to achieve the same state for Y that characterized X before teleportation? What is the orientation frame within which these orthogonal axes for an observer at Y are located? Does one somehow attempt to define some more general spatial coordinate frame in which the local spatial coordinate frames pertaining to X and Y are oriented? Or does one not need to be concerned about using a more general spatial reference frame with regard to the relative orientations of the local spatial coordinate frames for X and Y? In the latter case, the local coordinate frame would somehow be in alignment with each other in terms of local factors. What these factors are would require investigation.

To determine whether a more general spatial reference frame is relevant or whether the local spatial frames for X and Y are *not* located within a more general frame, our gedankenexperiment can be elaborated. One cannot simply accept without investigation that some prior coordination of orientations of the local reference frames for X and Y is not necessary. In elaborating our gedankenexperiment, we will assume that Bennett et al.'s thesis is true. Consider a series of experimental runs (1,2,3...) where a number of particles  $X_{1,2,3\dots}$  are produced in the exact same state (with the same wave function  $\psi$ ) and teleported to  $Y_{1,2,3\dots}$ . Allow that  $X_{1,2,3\dots}$  is prepared in the state (1) above in

## The Orientation of

a lab located at one location on the earth's surface. Let  $Y_{1,2,3\dots}$  be located in a lab such that  $X_{1,2,3\dots}$  and  $Y_{1,2,3\dots}$  are located at two ends of the earth's diameter and  $Y_{1,2,3\dots}$  takes on state (2) after quantum teleportation.  $X_{1,2,3\dots}$  and  $Y_{1,2,3\dots}$  are at opposite locations on the earth's surface. How would an observer next to  $Y_{1,2,3\dots}$  set up the lab so as to determine the  $z$  axis needed to interpret state (2) of  $Y_{1,2,3\dots}$ ? Allow that the observers and  $X_{1,2,3\dots}$  and  $Y_{1,2,3\dots}$  do not know each others relative orientations to one another. As before, consider the case where the Bell state measurement at  $X_a$  and another particle yields a measurement indicating that state (1) is teleported with only a phase change to  $Y_a$ ,  $-\lvert\psi_Y\rangle = -(\alpha\lvert\uparrow_Y\rangle + \beta\lvert\downarrow_Y\rangle)$ .

Allow further that the lab at  $X_{1,2,3\dots}$  is set so that the  $z$  axis for  $X_{1,2,3\dots}$  noted in state (1) is orthogonal to the earth's surface and that spin up along the  $z$  axis indicates the direction pointing away from the earth's surface. In a similar lab setup at  $Y_{1,2,3\dots}$  where the  $z$  axis also points away from the earth's surface, the spin up direction for  $Y_{1,2,3\dots}$  would be reversed. They would be in opposite




Figure 1. Comparison of Directions for Spin Up for  $X_{1,2,3\dots}$  and  $Y_{1,2,3\dots}$  in Relation to a More General  $z$  axis

directions when compared to a more general  $z$  axis that encompasses the local  $z$  axes for the labs where  $X_{1,2,3\dots}$  and  $Y_{1,2,3\dots}$  are located. An example of a more general  $z$  axis is depicted in Figure 1. If the results obtained for  $Y_{1,2,3\dots}$  indicated that the state that had characterized  $X_{1,2,3\dots}$  before teleportation has accurately teleported, then the data obtained in measurements on  $Y_{1,2,3\dots}$  would have been those obtained for  $X_{1,2,3\dots}$  had they been made and the thesis that there is only a local nature for an orientation frame within which the local spatial coordinate frame is located would be supported (Table 1). These are the results

## The Orientation of

predicted by Eqn. 2. If, on the other hand, there is a more general spatial frame within which the local ones for  $X_{1,2,3\dots}$  and  $Y_{1,2,3\dots}$  are located and which serves to orient the local  $z$  axes for  $X_{1,2,3\dots}$  and  $Y_{1,2,3\dots}$  regardless of how the observers set up their local spatial frames, the results obtained for  $Y_{1,2,3\dots}$  would be different than those that would be obtained if the measurement had been made on  $X_{1,2,3\dots}$  before teleportation. An example of these results, corresponding to the example in Figure 1, is displayed in Table 2. The results in Figure 2 are not those predicted by Eqn. 2 for  $Y_{1,2,3\dots}$ .

Table 1 Percentage of Particles $Y_{1,2,3\dots}$ Expected to be Observed to Have Spin Up or Spin Down Along the Local $z$ -axis Where Only Local Spatial Frames Exist	
$\uparrow$	$ \alpha ^2$
$\downarrow$	$ \beta ^2$

Table 2 Percentage of Particles $Y_{1,2,3\dots}$ Expected to be Observed to Have Spin Up or Spin Down Along the Local $z$ -axis Where a General Spatial Frame Exists Like that In Figure 1 and Supercedes Local Frames	
$\uparrow$	$ \beta ^2$
$\downarrow$	$ \alpha ^2$

In more concrete terms, if for example  $\alpha = 1/2$  and  $\beta = \sqrt{3/4}$ , if a local orientation frame is the only relevant frame, the percentage of particles  $Y_{1,2,3\dots}$  with spin up is  $|\alpha|^2 = 1/4$  and spin down is  $|\beta|^2 = 3/4$ . If a more general spatial frame with a  $z$  axis like that in Figure 1 is relevant to the local spatial coordinate frames for  $X_{1,2,3\dots}$  and  $Y_{1,2,3\dots}$  and takes precedence, the percentage of particles  $Y_{1,2,3\dots}$  with spin up is  $|\beta|^2 = 3/4$  and spin down is  $|\alpha|^2 = 1/4$ . This result contradicts that expected by Eqn. 2.

## The Orientation of

The most general circumstances are that  $Y_{1,2,3\dots}$  could be located in a local spatial reference frame with any orientation relative to that for  $X_{1,2,3\dots}$ . As Bennett et al. [1] noted:

Teleportation has the advantage of still being possible in situations where Alice and Bob, after sharing their EPR pairs, have wandered about independently and no longer know each others' locations. Alice cannot reliably send Bob the original quantum particle, or a spin-exchanged version of it, if she does not know where he is; but she can still teleport the quantum state to him, by broadcasting the classical information to all places where he might be.

The general circumstances are the most likely, and the likelihood of a more general spatial coordinate frame relevant to the local frames, that supercedes them, is small given Bennett and his colleagues' position that prior coordination of the local reference frames is not needed and only two bits of information need to be classically conveyed in quantum teleportation. If the hypothesis is supported that a general spatial reference frame is not relevant, then psychological factors should be investigated as factors in the local orientation frames within which the local spatial axes are placed. It has been shown that psychological factors are central to an individual's sense of the upright that would form the basis for the observer's personal spatial structure [e.g., 3,4,5,6,7,8]. It may be that this personal spatial structure of the observer serves as the foundation for the local orientation frame within which the spatial coordinate frame used to measure either X or Y locally if a more general spatial coordinate frame is not applicable. The possibility that the personal spatial structure of the observer is significant can be subjected to empirical test.

### REFERENCES

- [1] C. H. Bennett, G. Brassard, C. Crepeau, R. Jozsa, A. Peres, W. K. Wootters. *Phys. Rev. Lett.* 70, 1895 (1993).
- [2] D. Bouwmeester, J. W. Pan, K. Mattle, M. Eibl, H. Weinfurter, A. Zeilinger. *Nature* 390, 575 (1997).
- [3] D. M. Snyder. On the Positioning of Objects in Space. (1998). ([xxx.lanl.gov/abs/physics/9909008](http://xxx.lanl.gov/abs/physics/9909008), [publish.aps.org/eprint/gateway/eplist/aps1998sep23\\_002](http://publish.aps.org/eprint/gateway/eplist/aps1998sep23_002)).
- [4] G.M. Stratton. *The Psychological Review*, 4, 341 (1897).
- [5] G.M. Stratton. *The Psychological Review*, 4, 463 (1897).

## The Orientation of

- [6] I. Kohler. *Psychological Issues*, 3, 19 and 165 (1964).
- [7] F. W. Snyder, N. H. Pronko. *Vision with spatial inversion* (University of Wichita Press, Wichita, Kansas, 1952).
- [8] H. Dolezal. *Living in a world transformed*. (Academic Press, New York, 1982).