

QUANTUM MEASUREMENT PROBLEM AND SYSTEMS
SELFDDESCRIPTION IN OPERATORS ALGEBRAS FORMALISM

S.N.Mayburov

Lebedev Inst. of Physics

Leninsky Prospect 53, Moscow, Russia, 117924

E-mail : mayburov@sci.lpi.msk.su

Abstract

Quantum Measurement problem studied in Information Theory approach of systems selfdescription which exploits the information acquisition incompleteness for the arbitrary information system. The studied model of measuring system (MS) consist of measured state S environment E and observer O processing input S signal. O considered as the quantum object which interaction with S,E obeys to Schrodinger equation (SE). MS incomplete or restricted states for O derived by the algebraic QM formalism which exploits Segal and C^* -algebras. From Segal theorem for systems subalgebras it's shown that such restricted states $V^O = |O_j\rangle\langle O_j|$ describes the classical random 'pointer' outcomes O_j observed by O in the individual events. The 'preferred' basis $|O_j\rangle$ defined by O state decoherence via O - E interactions.

Talk given on 'Quantum Information and Computations' workshop,
Triest, October 2002

1 Introduction

Despite that Quantum Mechanics (QM) is universally acknowledged physical theory there are still several problems concerned with its interpretation. Of them the state collapse or objectification problem is the most widely and long discussed (for the review see [1]). In our previous paper [2] we studied the quantum information transfer in the measurement process and resulting from it the information restrictions. Basing on it we propose the phenomenological formalism in which the collapse observation can coexist with Schrodinger measurement dynamics. In this paper we reconsider the proposed theory in Algebraic QM framework and demonstrate that it can be derived from C^* algebras formalism without any phenomenological assumptions used in our first paper.

In our approach the information system (Observer) O in the measurement process regarded as the quantum object which interactions can't be neglected. Really, any measurement quantum or classical is the information acquisition on the studied system S parameters by the information system O via their direct or indirect interaction. In classical case this interaction can be neglected in the calculations, but in QM it can be quite important for obtained measurement outcome [4]. In our approach Observer is an information gaining and utilizing system (IGUS) of arbitrary structure [3] which can be both a human brain or some automatic device processing the information. But in all cases it's the system with some internal degrees of freedom (DF) some of which actively interact during the information acquisition. The computer information processing or the perception by human brain supposedly corresponds to the physical objects evolution which on microscopic level obeys to QM laws. Example of it are the electron pulses excited in the computer circuits during the information bits memorization. Such correspondence for the mental processes isn't proved, but there are now the strong experimental evidences that QM can successfully describe a complex systems including biological ones [5]. Consequently we concede in our paper that QM description is applicable both for a microscopic and macroscopic objects including observer O (he, Bob) [8]. In the simplest case we suppose that O state described by Dirac state vector $|O\rangle$ (or density matrix ρ in other cases) relative to another observer O' (she; Alice) [7].

Such approach corresponds with the general trends of quantum information theory but our novel point is that O should describe consistently its own quantum state. Observer selfdescription in the measurement process (selfmeasurement) can be regarded in the context of the general mathematical problem of selfreference [6, 9]. From its study it was argued that O selfdescription is always incomplete; this results often interpreted as the analog of Godel Theorem for Information theory [6, 9]. In this framework Breuer demonstrated that O selfmeasurement effects for classical and quantum measurements can be described via the restricted MS states [4]. We'll argue here that in quantum case MS restricted states in the measurement can be derived from the generalization of standard QM called algebraic QM which use Jordan or C^* - algebras formalism [18].

Here it's necessary to make some comments on our model premises and review some terminology. Our formalism applies both the quantum states in the individual events - i.e. individual states and the states for quantum ensembles called statistical states. Their formal definitions are given in [4] and some of this states features described below. Note only that for the pure case the individual and statistical states coincide, yet for the mixture they can differ. We must stress that throughout our paper the observer consciousness never referred directly and none of their special physical properties beyond standard QM assumed. Rather in our model observer O can be regarded as active reference frame (RF) which interacts with studied object S changing O internal state and via it storing the information about S . Thus S state description 'from the point of view' of the particular O referred by the terms 'S state in O RF' or simply 'S state for O '. The terms 'perceptions', 'impressions' used by us to characterize observer subjective description of experimental results and defined below in strictly physical terms [4]. In our theory the different impressions associated with the different internal (restricted) O physical states which description is operationally unambiguous.

2 Selfmeasurement and Quantum States Restrictions

We start from reminding the main features of our selfmeasurement theory. The microscopic model of the measuring system (MS) studied here includes the measured state (particle) S and observer O which processes and stores the information. O interaction with environment E - decoherence accounted at the next stage of the model. To illustrate our model let's consider the measurement of the observable \hat{Q} of S binary state performed by O :

$$\psi_s = a_1|s_1\rangle + a_2|s_2\rangle$$

where $|s_{1,2}\rangle$ are Q eigenstates with eigenvalues $q_{1,2}$. In our model O has one effective DF and its Hilbert space \mathcal{H}_O contains at least three orthogonal states $|O_i\rangle$ which are the eigenstates of Q_O 'internal pointer' observable with eigenvalues q_i^O . Initial O state is $|O_0\rangle$ and MS initial state is :

$$\Psi_{MS}^{in} = (a_1|s_1\rangle + a_2|s_2\rangle)|O_0\rangle \quad (1)$$

Let's assume that S- O measuring interaction starts at t_0 and finished effectively at some finite t_1 . MS evolution described by Schrodinger equation (SE) with the suitable S- O interaction Hamiltonian \hat{H}_I which results in the final state of MS system :

$$\Psi_{MS} = a_1|s_1\rangle|O_1\rangle + a_2|s_2\rangle|O_2\rangle \quad (2)$$

to which corresponds the density matrix ρ_{MS} ; their set denoted L_q . $|O_{1,2}\rangle$ are O final states induced by the measurement of eigenstates $|s_{1,2}\rangle$. All this states including $|O_i\rangle$ belongs to MS Hilbert space \mathcal{H}'_{MS} defined in some external O' RF. The set (algebra) of all S, O observables denoted M_S, M_O correspondingly, the set of other (collective) MS observables which isn't belong to M_O, M_S denoted M_{MS} . In practice IGUS O have many internal DFs, but their account doesn't change principally the results obtained below. We omit detector D in MS chain assuming that S directly interacts with O because the only D effect is the amplification of S signal to make it conceivable for O.

QM predicts that at time $t > t_1$ for external O' MS is in the pure state Ψ_{MS} of (2) which is the superposition of two states for different measurement outcomes. MS state in O RF Ψ_{MS}^O obtained from Ψ_{MS} by the unitary transformation U' and if to consider only MS internal state $\Psi_{MS}^O = \Psi_{MS}$. Yet we know that experimentally macroscopic O observes some random Q_O value $q_{1,2}^O$ from which he concludes that S final state is $|s_1\rangle$ or $|s_2\rangle$, i.e. S state collapses. In standard QM with Reduction Postulate S final state described by the statistical ensemble of individual final states for O described by the density matrix of mixed state ρ_m^s :

$$\rho_m^s = \sum_i |a_i|^2 |s_i\rangle\langle s_i| \quad (3)$$

In our model we can phenomenologically ascribe to MS the corresponding mixed state :

$$\rho_m = \sum_i |a_i|^2 |s_i\rangle\langle s_i| |O_i\rangle\langle O_i| \quad (4)$$

which principally differs from ρ_{MS} . From O 'point of view' Ψ_{MS}^O describes the superposition of two contradictory impressions : $Q = q_1$ and $Q = q_2$ perceived simultaneously which as Wigner claimed is nonsense [7]. If observer regarded as the quantum object then this contradiction

constitutes famous Wigner 'Friend Paradox' for O, O' [7]. It's quite difficult to doubt both in correctness of O' description of MS evolution by Schrodinger dynamics and in the state collapse experimental observations. We attempt to reconcile this two alternative pictures in the united formalism which incorporate both quantum system descriptions 'from outside' by O' and 'from inside' by O - i.e. selfdescription.

In general any classical or quantum measurement of the arbitrary studied system S' is the mapping of S' states set N_s on observer states set N_O . If an observer O actively interacts with S' so that O state change can't be neglected then formally O can be regarded as the part of the large studied system $S'_T = S + O$ with the states set N_T . In this approach N_O is N_T subset and O state is S'_T state projection on N_O called an restricted state R_O . From N_T mapping properties the principal restrictions for MS states discrimination by O were formulated in Breuer theorem [4]. Namely, if for two arbitrary S'_T states Φ_S, Φ'_S their restricted states R_O, R'_O coincide, then for O this S'_T states are indistinguishable. The origin of this effect in classical case is easy to understand qualitatively : O has less number of DFs then S'_T and so can't describe completely S'_T state [9]. QM introduces additional features connected with observables noncommutativity and nonlocality which should be also accounted.

For our MS system it's natural to assume that R_O state depends only of O observables M_O and doesn't depend of other MS observables. Breuer results doesn't permit to derive the restricted states for arbitrary quantum system unambiguously and this was our motivation for application of Algebraic QM for this problem. Breuer proposed to chose as the phenomenological ansatz the partial trace which for MS state (2) is equal to :

$$R_O = Tr_s \rho_{MS} = \sum |a_i|^2 |O_i\rangle\langle O_i| \quad (5)$$

R_O is in fact ρ_{MS} projection into \mathcal{H}_O defined in O' RF and all R_O belong to ρ_O set L_O .

Note that for MS mixed state ρ_m of (4) the corresponding restricted statistical state is the same $R_O^m = R_O$. This equality doesn't mean automatically the collapse of MS pure state Ψ_{MS} because as Breuer argues the collapse presence must be verified for the individual events [4]. For this purpose it's important to define the individual mixed state ; as we noticed for pure MS state it simply coincides with Ψ_{MS} . For the incoming S mixture (4) of $|S_{1,2}\rangle$ states MS individual state objectively exists in each event n , but differs from event to event and presented as :

$$\rho^m(n) = |O_l\rangle\langle O_l| |s_l\rangle\langle s_l|$$

for random $l(n)$ with probabilistic distribution $P_l = |a_l|^2$ [4]. This individual state can be initially unknown for O , but exists objectively. $\rho^m(n)$ differs from statistical state (2) and its restricted state is $R_O^m(n) = |O_l\rangle\langle O_l|$ also differs from R_O of (5). Due to it the main condition of Breuer Theorem violated and consequently O can differentiate pure/mixed states 'from inside' in the individual events. Thus the proposed ansatz doesn't results in the collapse appearance in standard QM [4]. Note hence that the formal states difference in QM by itself doesn't mean automatically that O percepts them as different ones. It should be at least one observable $A_O \in M_O$ for which \bar{A}_O expectation values are different which isn't true for Breuer ansatz.

It's important to note that even in this ansatz MS state for O i.e. 'from inside' is different from MS state for O' 'from outside' i.e. Ψ_{MS} . Because of this incompleteness O can't see the difference between the physically different pure states with different $D_{ij} = a_i^* a_j + a_i a_j^*$. This situation can be called the partial state collapse. This states difference reveals MS interference term (IT) observable :

$$B = |O_1\rangle\langle O_2| |s_1\rangle\langle s_2| + j.c. \quad (6)$$

In standard QM being measured by O' it gives $\bar{B} = 0$ for the mixed MS state (4) but $\bar{B} \neq 0$ for the pure MS states (2). Note that B value principally can't be measured by O directly, because O performs Q_O measurement and $[Q_O, B] \neq 0$. We define here also O IT observable:

$$B_O = |O_1\rangle\langle O_2| + |O_2\rangle\langle O_1|$$

which will be used below.

Note that formally MS individual state for O can be written in doublet form $\Phi^B(n) = |\phi_D, \phi_I \gg$, where $\phi_D = \rho_{MS}$ dynamical state component, and ϕ_I is O information about MS state acquired in event n . ϕ_I is equal to R_O for pure state and $\phi_I = R_O^m(n)$ for S mixture correspondingly. Of course in this ansatz for pure state ϕ_I is just ϕ_D projection, but in other selfdescription schemes they can be more independent and such states doublet structure becomes principally important.

The selfmeasurement theory permits to discuss the relation between IGUS evolution and its subjective information (impression) which supposedly corresponds to O internal state. Concerning the relations between the observer state evolution and his information perception we introduce the following assumptions: for any Q eigenstate $|s_i\rangle$ after S measurement finished at $t > t_1$ and O 'internal pointer' state is $|O_i\rangle$ observer O have the definite impression corresponding to q_i^O eigenvalue of Q_O that the measurement event occurred and the input S state is $|s_i\rangle$. This calibration condition for O internal state is quite nontrivial and important because it settles hypothetically the correspondence between MS quantum dynamics model and human perception. It also related to 'Preferred basis' problem discussed below [14]. Note that Breuer restricted state R_O corresponds to such condition. Futhermore if S state is the superposition ψ_s it supposed that its measurement by O also results in appearance for each individual event n of some definite and unambiguous O impression denoted as $q^{sup}(n)$. This assumption doesn't mean that this impression for O can corresponds only to one of mentioned q_i^O eigenvalues but that it devoids of any ambiguities which O quantum state can have. In our framework the simplest O toy-model of the information memorization is a hydrogen-like atom for which O_0 is its ground state and O_i are the metastable levels excited by s_i , resulting so into the final S - O entangled state.

To explain our alternative selfmeasurement theory consider it first for the considered MS system with the initial state (1). In its formalism alike in the regarded example MS state presented in doublet form $\Phi = |\phi_D, \phi_I \gg$ for dynamical and O information components. The first component of our dual state ϕ_D is equal to QM density matrix $\phi_D = \rho$ and obeys always to Schrodinger-Liouville equation (SLE) for arbitrary Hamiltonian \hat{H}_c :

$$\dot{\phi}_D = [\phi_D, \hat{H}_c] \quad (7)$$

which for pure states is equivalent to Schrodinger equation (SE). Thus for our MS system $\phi_D = \rho_{MS}$; for the information component ϕ_I it supposed that after S state ψ_s measurement in the individual event n the final state $\phi_I(n) = V^O$. Here $V^O = |O_j\rangle\langle O_j|$ is the stochastic state with $j(n)$ having the probabilistic distribution $P_j = |a_j|^2$. Thus such doublet individual state $\Phi(n)$ changes from event to event and O subjective information ϕ_I is relatively independent of ρ_{MS} and correlated with it only statistically. Clearly for such restricted states ansatz O can't differ the pure and mixed states with the same $|a_i|^2$. Thus Breuer theorem conditions fulfilled and we'll call this effect the weak (subjective) collapse. $\phi_I = V_i^O$ corresponds to Ψ_{MS} branch $|\Psi_i\rangle = |O_i\rangle|S_i\rangle$ which describes MS quantum state in O RF i.e. the subjective state. An initial

state $\phi_D = \rho(t_0)$ defined also by standard QM rules. Before measurement starts O state vector is $|O_0\rangle$ (no information on S) and the doublet state is $\Phi = |\rho(t_0), V_0^O \gg$ where $V_0^O = |O_0\rangle\langle O_0|$ is the initial O information.

The complete states set in O RF for this individual states is $N_T = L_q \otimes L_V$ i.e the product of dynamical and information components subsets. If we restrict our consideration only on the pure states as done below then N_T is equivalent to $\mathcal{H} \otimes L_V$ and the state vector $|\Psi\rangle$ can be used as the dynamical component ϕ_D which evolution obeys to SE. It assume the modification of QM states set, which normally is Hilbert space \mathcal{H} . Remind that \mathcal{H} is in fact an empirical set choice advocated by fitting QM data. Its modifications were published already of which most famous is Namiki-Pascasio many Hilbert spaces formalism [10]. Analogous the superselection formalism is well studied in nonperturbative Field theory (QFT) with infinite DF number [11] and were applied for quantum measurement problem [12, 13].

Of course in this approach the quantum states for external O' (and other observers) also has the same doublet form Φ' . O' doesn't interact with MS and due to it MS final state for her is $\phi'_D = \rho_{MS}$ of (2) and $\phi'_I = |O'_0\rangle\langle O'_0|$. Her information is the same before and after S measurement by O , because O' doesn't get any new information during it. In this approach O' knows that after S measurement O acquired some definite information q_i^O but can't know without additional measurements what this information is. Naturally in this formalism O' has her own subjective information space L'_V and in her RF the events states manifold is $N'_T = \mathcal{H}' \otimes L'_V$ for pure states and the same is true for any number of observers. In general if in the Universe altogether N observers exists then the complete states manifold described in O RF is $L_T = \mathcal{H} \otimes L_V \otimes L'_V \dots \otimes L_V^N$ of which only first two subsets elements are observed by O directly. From the described features it's clear that subspace L_V is principally unobservable for O' (and vice versa for L'_V, O), because in this formalism only the measurement of ϕ_D component described by eq. (7) permitted for O' . Clearly in this ansatz Φ, Φ' are unitarily nonequivalent - i.e. no unitary transformation U can transform them into each other [11]. Note that Selfrefence problem resolved in this case by use of the natural but unproved assumption that all observers are similar in relation to their information acquisition properties.

For the comparison in standard QM framework S interaction with detector D induces the abrupt and irreversible S state ψ_s change to random S state ψ_j - i.e Reduction occurs and in accordance with it D pointer acquires definite position D_j . This process is claimed to be objective, i.e. independent of any observer. Such S,D interaction can't be described by SLE and needs to introduce alternative dynamics, which violates the quantum states evolution linearity and reversibility. Yet it seems practically impossible to incorporate in QM this two contradictive dynamics consistently. In distinction in our dual formalism the dynamical component ϕ_D of MS doublet state evolves linearly and reversibly in accordance with (7). This is the objective evolution in a sense that it described equivalently relative to any observer. Only subjective component ϕ_I which describes O subjective information about S changes stochastically after S measurement - i.e S,O interaction.

From the doublet individual state Φ one can derive the doublet statistical state for the quantum ensembles description, because all the necessary probabilities contained in ϕ_D . Due to its importance it's reasonable to define it separately :

$$|\Theta \gg = |\eta_D, \eta_I \gg = |\rho, R_V \gg$$

where $R_V = \sum |a_i(t)|^2 |O_i\rangle\langle O_i|$ is the probabilistic mixture of V_i^O states. Θ set is $N_\Theta = L_q \otimes L_R$, where L_R set of diagonal density matrixes with $Tr \eta_I = 1$ but as noticed above N_Θ is equivalent

to L_q . $|\Theta \gg$ evolution for arbitrary Hamiltonian is most simply expressed by the system of equations for its components :

$$\begin{aligned}\frac{\partial \eta_D}{\partial t} &= [\eta_D, \hat{H}_c] \\ P_j(t) &= \text{tr}(\hat{P}_j^O \eta_D) \\ \eta_I &= \sum P_l |O_l\rangle \langle O_l|\end{aligned}\tag{8}$$

If S don't interact with O (no measurement) then η_I is time invariant and MS obeys to the standard QM evolution for the dynamical component $\eta_D = \rho$ - statistical state. Thus our doublet states are important only for measurement-like processes with direct system $S_A - O$ interactions, but in such case it's the analog of regarded MS system. Note that in this theory only Φ gives complete MS state description in the individual event, from which its future state can be predicted.

The time of $V_0^O \rightarrow V_j^O$ transition for O is between t_0 and t_1 and can't be defined in this formalism with the larger accuracy, but it doesn't very important at this stage. The most plausible assumption compatible with standard QM is that O perception time t_p in MS measurement has the distribution :

$$P_p(t) = c_p \sum \frac{\partial P_i(t)}{\partial t} \quad ; \quad i \neq 0$$

where c_p is normalization constant. Note that this result is compatible with standard QM.

The preferred basis (PB) problem importance is acknowledged in quantum measurement theory [1]. In its essence, Ψ_{MS} decomposition on O, S states in general isn't unique and so any theory must explain why namely $|O_i\rangle$ states appears in final mixture ρ^m . In our theory PB acquires the additional aspects being related to O information recognition. As indicated above we choose as the calibration condition that $|O_i\rangle$ state perceived by O as q_i^O value corresponding to q_i value of S parameter Q . But it's not clear why such states set responds to it and not some other $|O_j^C\rangle$ - eigenstates of some Q_O^C , belonging to another orthogonal basis. For example, it can be $|O_{\pm}\rangle = \frac{|O_1\rangle \pm |O_2\rangle}{\sqrt{2}}$ for the binary subspace \mathcal{H}_O . Yet the situation changes principally, if to account decoherence - i.e. O interaction with environment E [15, 3]. In the simple decoherence model E considered here consists of N two-level systems (atoms) independently interacting with O with H_{OE} Hamiltonian, which for arbitrary E states $|E^0\rangle$ at large t gives: $|O_i^E\rangle |E^0\rangle \rightarrow |O_i^E\rangle |E_i^0\rangle$, where $|O_i^E\rangle$ belongs to an arbitrary orthogonal basis O^E of O states. $|E_i^0\rangle$ are E states which aren't necessarily orthogonal; S, O, E joint Hilbert space denoted \mathcal{H}_{MS+E} . Tuning specially the measurement Hamiltonian H_I one can make two bases equal: $|O_i^E\rangle = |O_i\rangle$ and only this case will be regarded here. If in S measurement at $t < t_1$ $O-E$ interaction can be neglected then under simple assumptions it results in the final MS-E state :

$$\Psi_{MS+E} = \sum a_i |s_i\rangle |O_i\rangle |E_i^0\rangle\tag{9}$$

It was proved that such triple decomposition is unique, even if $|E_i^O\rangle$ aren't orthogonal [14]. Thus PB problem formally resolved if the decoherence accounted and this is essential also for our model. It isn't necessary in our case to use $N \rightarrow \infty$ limit, E can be also a finite, closed system.

In addition the decoherence results in the important consequences for the definition of the mentioned information basis. Really the memorized states $|O_i^C\rangle$ excited by S_i signals must be

stable or at least long-living. But as follows from eq. (9) any state $|O_j^C\rangle$ different from one of $|O_i\rangle$ in the short time would split into $|O_i\rangle$ combinations - entangled O,E states superposition. But our calibration condition demands that at least Q_O eigenstates will be conserved copiously and not transferred to any combinations. Thus in this model $O-E$ decoherence interaction selects the basis of long-living O eigenstates which supposedly describes O events perception and memorization, i.e. ϕ_I . It means that if our S signal is Q eigenstate inducing Q_O eigenstate $|O_i\rangle$ then it's memorized by O for long time. As the result the only O observable which can be memorized by O is Q_O ; for any other O observable Q'_O and any Ψ_{MS} one obtains that in MS,E final state $\bar{Q}'_O = 0$.

Decoherence influence should be accounted in any O selfdescription formalism. In Breuer ansatz O interaction with E states accounted analogously to S states, so that $R_O = Tr_{S,E}\rho$ derived taking trace both on S and E states. For our dual formalism an analogous approach permits to derive $|\Theta \gg$, thus defines ϕ_I distribution. In the individual events ϕ_I corresponds to $|O_i\rangle|S_i\rangle|E_i^O\rangle$ branch. In other aspects decoherence doesn't change our selfmeasurement model.

3 System Selfdescription in Algebraic QM

Now we regard the quantum system selfmeasurement in Algebraic QM framework and derive MS restricted states C^* algebras formalism [16]. We'll show that algebraic QM applied to the systems selfdescription in fact corresponds to our phenomenological results. Algebraic QM includes the unitary nonequivalent representations of commutation relations which describes successfully phase transitions and other nonperturbative effects which standard QM fails to incorporate. Consequently we have the serious premises to regard Algebraic QM as the consistent generalization of standard QM. As noticed above the nonperturbative QFT formalism was applied also to the study of measurement problem [13]. Application of Operators Algebras to quantum measurements studied also in [17] but without the selfdescription consideration.

Remind that in standard QM the primordial structure is the states set - Hilbert space \mathcal{H} on which an observables - Hermitian operators defined. In distinction in Algebraic QM formalism as the fundamental structure is the observables algebra \mathcal{U} which can be Jordan or Segal algebra with formal extension to C^* -algebra [18]. Consequently the system S_f states set Ω properties defined by \mathcal{U} and under some assumptions Ω is the vector space dual to \mathcal{U} defined by the famous GNS construction. The obtained algebraic states $\varphi \in \Omega$ are equivalent to the normalized positive linear functionals on \mathcal{U} . Formally in the situations described by standard QM they corresponds to QM density matrixes ρ . The pure quantum states φ in this formalism are an extremal Ω points.

In many realistic situations for given measurement set-up not all the system S_f observables are available for experimentalist, but only some restricted subset to which corresponds \mathcal{U} subalgebra \mathcal{U}_R . It was shown that for some \mathcal{U}_R the corresponding states set Ω_R can be constructed which states φ_R differs from φ [18]. For this case Segal theorem demonstrates that if all $A_R \in \mathcal{U}_R$ commute and unit operator $I \in \mathcal{U}_R$, then Ω_R is set of classical states φ_R with no superpositions between them [19]. In Algebraic QM notations A_R expectation values defined as

$$\bar{A}_R = \langle \varphi; A_R \rangle = \langle \varphi_R; A_R \rangle$$

coincide for Ω, Ω_R states. A_R measurement corresponds to the simultaneous measurement of all A_R projectors P_i^A which expectation values \bar{P}_i^A reproduces the probabilistic A_R distribution.

For our MS,E system \mathcal{U} Segal algebra for observables sets $M_S, M_O, M_{MS}, M_E, \dots$ can be defined and φ states set Ω 'spanned' on them naturally is equivalent to \mathcal{H}_{GS} . In this case O complete observables set is M_O but as was demonstrated above for the regarded MS,E measurement dynamics O can measure (percept) only the single observable Q_O which illustrated by Ψ_{MS+E} of (9). So in this case $\mathcal{U}_{\mathcal{R}}$ subalgebra consists of Q_O and I which obviously is available for O . Then from Segal theorem MS restricted states φ_R should be the discrete classical states. If the incoming S state ψ_s is S eigenstate $|S_i\rangle$ then from our calibration condition such MS restricted states can be associated with our O states $\varphi_i^O \sim |O_i\rangle\langle O_i|$ to which corresponds $\phi_I = V_i^O$ of our dual formalism. Thus in any such individual S measurement event the final MS restricted state from O 'point of view' describes definite discrete O_i value so that $\bar{Q}_O = q_i^O$. But if the incoming Ψ_{MS}^{in} described by (1) with several $a_j \neq 0$ i.e. is Q eigenstates superposition one obtains :

$$\bar{Q} = \bar{Q}_O = \langle \varphi_R; Q_O \rangle = \langle \varphi; Q_O \rangle = \sum |a_i|^2 q_i^O$$

and no φ_i^O state corresponds to such \bar{Q}_O . To interpret this result note first that for the incoming S mixture of $|s_i\rangle$ eigenstates (2) the final statistical MS state described for O as the mixture $\rho_O^m = \sum |a_i|^2 \varphi_i^O$ with the same expectation value \bar{Q}_O . q_i^O probabilistic distribution naturally described by $P_i = |a_i|^2$. As was shown above the difference between the pure and mixed MS states reflected by B IT expectation values. Thus O observation of S pure/mixed states difference means that O acquires some information on MS B expectation value. But $B \notin \mathcal{U}_{\mathcal{R}}$ and isn't correlated with Q_O via some interaction alike Q of S; so this assumption for φ_R states results in contradiction. Summing all the given arguments we conclude that for the pure incoming S state ψ_s O observes stochastic q_i^O distribution with probabilities $|a_i|^2$ described by statistical mixture $\varphi_R = \sum |a_i|^2 \varphi_i^O$ and thus can't be discriminated from incoming S mixture with the same P_i . It corresponds to the natural generalization of Algebraic QM premises settling that not only statistical but individual restricted states defined solely by $\mathcal{U}_{\mathcal{R}}$. Alike in the previous calculations we assume that the individual S mixed states described by one of pure states $|S_i\rangle$ which after S measurement induces the corresponding restricted state φ_i^O . Our doublet state Φ components ϕ_D, ϕ_I corresponds to φ and φ_i^O in the individual event.

In fact Algebraic QM supports the simple and consistent selfmeasurement picture : any O can observe only the object parameters for which it posses the suitable 'internal' instrument. For example O can't observe $|O_i\rangle$ superpositions because O detecting structure doesn't permit IT observable B_O to be measured simultaneously with Q_O . Such considerations were already regarded above in the phenomenological picture of our dual formalism but in Algebraic QM they acquire additional support. Restricted subalgebras $\mathcal{U}_{\mathcal{R}}$ were applied already for the information restrictions stipulated by the practical impossibility of the large systems complete description [18]. We applied them for a restrictions induced not by a studied system, but by IGUS O quantum structure, yet we don't see any contradictions in such generalization. Note that in Algebraic QM an appearance of stochastic final states related to the phenomena of spontaneous symmetry breaking. By the analogy the effect of measurement results randomization can be called Information symmetry breaking. Its origin connected with the fact that the final physical states φ_i^O doesn't posses the symmetry of the incoming measured state Ψ_{MS}^{in} and the final q_i^O values are undecidable according to Svozil approach [9]. We don't discuss here Algebraic QM foundations consistency and in particular the feasibility of the algebraic states which deserve the separate consideration [20].

We perform algebraic calculations for our very simple IGUS O model, which probably is

more primitive than any realistic IGUS structure. But in Algebraic QM the only important condition for the classicality appearance is \mathcal{U}_R observables commutativity and it's reasonable to expect it to be feasible also for complex IGUS structures. Clearly this subalgebras properties can't depend directly on the surrounding E properties and its particular state. Thus we can suppose that obtained results can be true not only for closed but also for the open systems.

4 Discussion

Our studies demonstrates that the account of the information system quantum properties permit to explain the state collapse as the consequence of the principal system selfdescription incompleteness. It was studied with the simple IGUS O model in which O states decoherence selects the preferred 'perception' basis. Breuer selmeasurement study shows that by itself the inclusion of observer as the quantum object into the measurement scheme doesn't result in the collapse appearance [4]. Our theory indicates that to describe the collapse it's necessary also to modify the quantum states set. In this approach different observers becomes nonequivalent in a sense that the physical reality description becomes principally different for each of them [8]. This nonequivalence reflected by the presence of subjective component ϕ_I available directly only for particular O and for him the subjective state collapse can be obtained. This theory permit to conserves Schrodinger evolution for arbitrary quantum system. Eventually the consistent selfmeaurement formalism constructed alternative to Breuer formalism.

It was shown here that Algebraic QM formalism presents the additional arguments in favour of our selfmeasurement theory. It permits to calculate the restricted O states φ_R from the given O physical structure and corresponding O observables algebra. Obtained O states corresponds to our phenomenological doublet states Φ and are unitarily nonequivalent for different observers. Algebraic QM formalism - Jordan , Segal and C^* -algebras of operators is acknowledged generalization of standard QM. In this paper it was applied for the simplest measurement model but if this formalism universality will be proved it will mean that the proposed selfmeasurement theory follows from the established Quantum Physics realm without any additional assumptions [18].

From this considerations the natural question arise : does the observation of random outcomes $\phi_I = V_j^O$ means that before the measurement starts S state can be characterized by some objective 'hidden parameter' j_S ? Our theory is principally different from Hidden Parameters theories where this stochastic parameters influence the quantum state dynamics and so differs from standard QM. Due to it in our theory ϕ_I internal parameter j can be 'generated' during S- O interaction and don't exists objectively before it starts. This is analog of spontaneous symmetry breaking effect derived in Algebraic QM. Yet our dual theory demonstrates that the probabilistic realization is generic and unavoidable for QM and without it QM supposedly can't acquire any operational meaning. Wave-particle dualism was always regarded as characteristic QM feature, but in our theory it has straightforward correspondence in dual selfmeasurement formalism.

The ideas close to our dual theory were discussed in QM modal interpretation, but they have there quite unclear philosophical motivations [1]. Now this is the whole class of different theories, of which the most close to us is Witnessing interpretation by Kochen [21]. His theory phenomenologically supposed that for apparatus A measured value S in pure state always has random definite value S_j , yet no physical arguments for it and no mathematical formalism differ

from standard QM were proposed.

In general all our experimental conclusions are based on human subjective perception. Regarded computer-brain perception analogy in fact means that the human signal perception also defined by \bar{Q}_O values. Despite that this analogy looks quite reasonable we can't give any proof of it. We present here very simple measurement theory and we don't regard it as the final solution of measurement problem. Yet from its results we believe that it's impossible to solve it without account of O interaction with the measured system at quantum level [22]. We must stress that our theory doesn't need any addressing to human observer consciousness. Rather in this model O is active RF which internal state excited by the interaction with the studied object. This approach to the measurement problem has much in common with Quantum reference frames theory introduced by Aharonov [24].

Historically the possible influence of observer on measurement process was discussed first by London and Bauer [23]. They supposed that Observer Consciousness (OC) due to 'introspection action' violates in fact Schrodinger equation for MS and results in state reduction. This idea was seriously criticized by Wigner [7]. In distinction in our dual theory OC perception doesn't violate MS Schrodinger evolution from O' point of view. But measurement subjective perception in it also performed by OC and its results partly independent of dynamics due to its dependence on the stochastic component ϕ_I . This effect deserves further discussion, but we believe that such probabilistic behavior is general IGUS property not related to OC only.

References

- [1] P.Busch, P.Lahti, P.Mittelstaedt, 'Quantum Theory of Measurements' (Springer-Verlag, Berlin, 1996)
- [2] S.Mayburov Proc. of Vth Quantum Structures conference (Cesenatico, 2001), quant-ph 0205024
- [3] D.Guilini et al., 'Decoherence and Appearance of Classical World', (Springer-Verlag,Berlin,1996)
- [4] T.Breuer, Phyl. of Science 62, 197 (1995), Synthese 107, 1 (1996)
- [5] R.Penrose, 'Shadows of Mind' (Oxford, 1994)
- [6] P.Mittelstaedt 'Interpretation of Quantum Mechanics and Quantum Measurement Problem' (Oxford Press, 1998)
- [7] E.Wigner, 'Scientist speculates' , (Heinemann, London, 1962)
- [8] C. Rovelli, Int. Journ. Theor. Phys. 35, 1637 (1995); quant-ph 9609002 (1996),
- [9] K.Svozil 'Randomness and undecidability in Physics', (World Scientific, Singapour, 1993)
- [10] M.Namiki, S.Pascazio, Found. Phys. 22, 451 (1992)
- [11] H.Umezawa,H.Matsumoto, M.Tachiki, 'Thermofield Dynamics and Condensed States' (North-Holland,Amsterdam,1982)

- [12] R. Fukuda, Phys. Rev. A ,35,8 (1987)
- [13] S.Mayburov, Int. Journ. Theor. Phys. 37, 401 (1998)
- [14] A.Elby, J.Bub Phys. Rev. A49, 4213, (1994)
- [15] W.Zurek, Phys Rev, D26,1862 (1982)
- [16] O.Bratteli, D.Robinson 'Operators Algebra and Quantum Statistical Mechanics' (Springer-Verlag, Berlin, 1979)
- [17] H.Primas, in 'Sixty two years of uncertainty' ,ed. E.Muller, (Plenum, N-Y, 1990)
- [18] G.Emch 'Algebraic Methods in Statistical Physics and Quantum Mechanics' (Wiley,N-Y,1972)
- [19] I.Segal, Ann. Math., 48, 930 (1947)
- [20] H.Primas, 'Quantum Mechanics, Chemistry and Reductionism' (Springer, Berlin, 1983)
- [21] S.Kochen 'Symposium on Foundations of Modern Physics' , (World scientific, Singapour, 1985)
- [22] W.Zurek Phys. Scripta , T76 , 186 (1998)
- [23] London F., Bauer E. La theorie de l'Observation (Hermann, Paris, 1939)
- [24] Y.Aharonov, T.Kaufherr Phys. Rev. D30, 368 (1984)