

Quantum Dynamics of Systems Under Repeated Observation¹

Dedicated to the memory of *Detlef Dürr* and
Vaughan F. R. Jones - great scientistst and friends

Mathematik, Universität Regensburg, 14. Mai, 2021


Outline

After a short review of some puzzling features of QM I will study the effective quantum dynamics of systems under repeated observation, more specifically ones interacting with a chain of independent probes, which, afterwards, are subject to a projective measurement and are then lost. This leads to a theory of **indirect measurements** of **time-independent** quantities (non-demolition measurements).

Subsequently, a theory of **indirect weak measurements** of **time-dependent** quantities is outlined, and a new family of diffusion processes, dubbed **quantum jump processes**, is described. –

To conclude, some open problems are sketched.

Here are the founding fathers of Quantum Mechanics:



Credits and Contents

- *Thanks are due to:* B. Schubnel, M. Ballesteros, T. Benoist, N. Crawford, and M. Fraas – for collaboration; to M. Bauer, D. Bernard, Ph. Blanchard, F. Finster, S. Goldstein, B. Kümmerer, C. Paganini, A. Tilloy, and others – for useful discussions. I sadly remember my many useful encounters with Detlef Dürr.
- *Contents:*
 1. Introduction – some fundamental questions and claims
 2. Systems subject to repeated observation – examples: Haroche-Raimond- and solid-state experiments
 3. Indirect non-demolition measurements: General results
 4. Weak measurements of time-dependent quantities - Markov chains on spectra of observables
 5. Open problems, conclusions

Prologue: *The Problem of the Unsolved Problems*

I feel I have a reasonably precise idea of what some of the big unsolved problems afflicting the foundations of modern physics are. Among others, a well known example concerns the *Foundations of Quantum Mechanics*.

My impression is that people much prefer to endlessly talk about puzzles and paradoxes and the “weirdness” of Quantum Mechanics rather than to sit down and to try to solve the most pressing open problems.

In fact, I suspect that many physicists, information scientists, philosophers,... would be deeply disappointed if someone actually **solved**, for example, the so-called “*Measurement Problem*.” This would deprive them of the pleasure of endless debates with essentially no outcome. They therefore prefer to think that it is **impossible** to make decisive progress in answering some of the deep questions about the foundations of Quantum Mechanics, and they do not pay attention to people who claim otherwise. – That is the experience I have made!

Unfortunately, the phenomenon of just **talking** about big problems rather than attempting to **solve** them has infiltrated all circles and spheres of human society ...

1. Introduction – some fundamental questions and claims

In our courses, we tend to describe the Quantum Mech. of systems, S , in terms of pairs of a Hilbert space, \mathcal{H} , of pure state vectors and a propagator, $(U(t, s))_{t, s \in \mathbb{R}}$, describing “time evolution.”

Unfortunately, these data hardly encode *any* information about S enabling one to draw conclusions about its physical properties, and they give the erroneous impression that quantum theory might be a *linear and deterministic theory*.

→ **Fundamental questions and problems:**

1. What do we have to add to the usual formalism of Quantum Mechanics (QM) to arrive at a mathematical structure that – through interpretation – can be given unambiguous physical meaning; hopefully *without the intervention* of “observers”?
2. Where does the *intrinsic randomness* of QM come from, given the deterministic character of the Schrödinger and Heisenberg equations? How does it differ from classical randomness?

Fundamental questions

3. What do we mean by an *isolated* (but open) *system* in QM, and why is this an important notion? How can one prepare an isolated system in a *prescribed state*?
4. What is the meaning of “*observables*”/*phys. quantities* and of *states* of systems in QM? What is the *time evolution* of *phys. quantities* and of *states* in the Heisenberg picture? What does it have to do with solutions of the Schrödinger equation?
5. What is a *potential/actual event*, and how should one describe an *instrument* used to record an event, in QM? Does QM require the intervention of “*observers*” to make sense?

Basic definitions and claims:

- i. An *isolated system*, S , is one that has negligible interactions with the rest of the Universe.
- ii. “*Observables*” of S are *linear operators* representing *physical quantities*. In QM, *for isolated systems*, the *Heisenberg(-picture) time evolution* of such operators makes perfect sense.

Basic claims

Yet, *nothing could be farther from the truth than the claim that the Schrödinger equation yields a correct description of the time evolution of states of an isolated system featuring events!*

- iii. In non-relativistic QM, *potential events* are described by certain partitions of unity by disjoint orthogonal projections. All potential events setting in at time t or later generate a (von Neumann) algebra $\mathcal{E}_{\geq t}$. An isolated system is characterized by a co-filtration, $\{\mathcal{E}_{\geq t}\}_{t \in \mathbb{R}}$, of such algebras.
- iv. An *isolated open system*, S , i.e. one releasing *actual events* accessible to observation with suitable *instruments*, has the property that

$$\mathcal{E}_{\geq t} \supsetneq \mathcal{E}_{\geq t'}, \quad \text{whenever } t' > t,$$

expressing the *Principle of Diminishing Potentialities (PDP)*.

(PDP) typically holds in *relativistic quantum theories with massless modes*. –

Basic claims – ctd.

Together with the phenomenon of “*Entanglement*”, (*PDP*) yields a *stochastic law* for the *time evolution of states*, replacing Schrödinger evolution, enabling one to understand why “*pure*” *states* may evolve into “*mixed*” *states* and to develop a probabilistic quantum theory of *histories* of *actual events* and of their projective recordings.

- v. In the q.m. description of *isolated open systems* sketched here, interventions of “*observers*” are superfluous; *events* happen spontaneously. – ~~‡~~ *any information- or unitarity paradoxes!* ...

A substantiation of these claims forms the basis of the so-called *ETH Approach to QM*, where “*ETH*” stands for:

“*Events, Trees, and Histories*”.

Upshot: In QM, the fundamental dynamics of *states* of phys. systems featuring events can be described in terms of a new kind of *stochastic branching process* whose (non-commutative) state space can be described in terms of partitions of unity by disjoint orthogonal projections, with branching rules determined by *Born's Rule*.

Metaphor for the "mysterious holistic aspects" of QM



QM is QM-as-QM and
everything else is everything
else

"The one thing to say about art is that it is one thing.
Art is art-as-art and everything else is everything
else." (Ad Reinhardt)

It is time to open this black box and see what's inside!

The *ETH Approach* to QM appears to succeed in doing that. (Don't be afraid of some sophisticated math concepts!) Unfortunately, it would take too much time to present it here. Instead, I will make use of some of its *conclusions* without further justification. –

And let's, for once, leave out discussions of *Bell's inequalities* and of what people call the "*non-locality*" of QM!

2. Examples of systems under repeated observation – Haroche-Raimond- & solid-state exps., particle tracks

The *ETH approach* represents a “*quantum theory without observers*” describing *actual events* and their observation in *projective measurements*, using *instruments*. – Taking this theory of projective measurements for granted, the theory of *indirect* (in particular, non-demolition-) *measurements* is fairly straightforward and can be presented with mathematical precision – at least on examples.

The *Theory of Indirect Measurements* of physical quantities – pioneered by Karl Kraus – is the *main topic of this lecture*.



Karl Kraus (1938-1988)

We will focus on the discussion of *examples*, rather than develop an abstract theory!

A metaphor for the theory of indirect observations



Plato's Allegory of the Cave – ‘*Politeia*’, in: Plato’s ‘*Republic*’

As Plato was anticipating, more than 350 years BC, all we “*prisoners of our senses*” are able to perceive of the world are “**shadows of reality**” – in the form of long streams of crude, uninteresting, directly perceptible signals (= outcomes of projective measurements) – from which **events** and **meaningful facts** can be **reconstructed**. – As *Socrates* explains:

Philosophers (= **mathematicians and theoretical physicists**) are “liberated prisoners” who are able to infer the fabric of reality from the shadows it creates on the wall of the cave. (↗ Theory of perception!)

Systems/experiments to be studied

I. The *Haroche-Raimond experiment*: $S = E \vee C$ (cavity)





Fig. 4: Experimental setup to study microwave field states with the help of circular Rydberg atoms (see text).

B : atom/probe gun, R_1 : State prep., C : Cavity, ..., D : Detector

II. A *solid-state (Gedanken-) experiment*: $S = E \vee P$



Particle tracks – an interesting story for next time!

- III. In a bubble-, cloud- or wire chamber, *tracks of quantum particles* become visible and resemble *classical trajectories*. How can this be explained? Answers: Figari-Teta; (Ballesteros-) Benoist-Fraas-JF.



Electrons and positrons produced simultaneously from individual gamma rays curl in opposite directions in the magnetic field of a bubble chamber. In the above example the gamma ray has lost some energy to an atomic electron, which leaves the long track, curling left. The gamma rays do not leave tracks in the chamber, as they have no electric charge.

Courtesy of the Lawrence Berkeley Laboratory, the University of California, Berkeley

Details concerning experiments I and II

Isolated open system: $S = E \vee P$, where P = subsystem of interest, i.e., cavity C , **or** quantum dot; E = “environment/equipment” consisting of:

- (1) **Probes:** Independent atoms A_1, A_2, \dots prepared in R_1 , **or** indep. **electrons** prepared in e^- gun – all in the same initial state.

In time interval $[(m-1)\tau, m\tau)$, m^{th} **atom** streams through cavity C , **or** m^{th} e^- travels from e^- gun through T -shaped wire to either the detector D_L , or the detector D_R , respectively.

τ : duration of a “measurement cycle.”

- (2) An **atom detector**, D , **or** two **electron detectors**, D_L, D_R , resp., serving to perform projective measurements on probes.

It is a little easier to picture how the *solid-state experiment* works:

- Physical quantities referring to quantum dot P :

$$\mathcal{O}_P := \{\text{functions of } e^- \text{-number (charge) operator, } \mathcal{N}\}$$

- Physical quantities referring to environment E :

$$\mathcal{O}_E = \{\mathbf{1}_P \otimes \mathbf{1}_{e_1^-} \otimes \dots \otimes X_{e_m^-} \otimes \mathbf{1}_{e_{m+1}^-} \otimes \dots\}_{m=1,2,3,\dots}$$

Description of solid-state experiment

Here the operator $X_{e_m^-}$ acts on the one-particle Hilbert space of the m^{th} electron traveling through the T -shaped wires towards D_L, D_R , resp. It is given by

$$X_{e_m^-} = \begin{pmatrix} \mathbf{1} & 0 \\ 0 & -\mathbf{1} \end{pmatrix},$$

with infinitely degenerate eigenvalues $\xi = \pm 1$:

$$\xi = +1 \leftrightarrow e_m^- \text{ hits } D_L, \quad \xi = -1 \leftrightarrow e_m^- \text{ hits } D_R.$$

From now on, “ L ” is replaced by $+1$ and “ R ” by -1 . The eigenprojection of $X_{e_m^-}$ corresp. to the eigenvalue ξ is denoted by π_ξ^m ; $X_{e_m^-}$ measured around time $m \cdot \tau$.

In the following, ρ denotes the state of S (some density matrix).

Our aim is to determine the *probability*, μ_ρ , of the events that, for $m = 1, 2, \dots, k$, the m^{th} electron hits the detector D_{ξ_m} , $\xi_m = \pm 1$; $k = 1, 2, \dots$

The LSW formula

For (strictly) independent electrons², this probability is given by a formula proposed by *Lüders, Schwinger* and *Wigner* (LSW):

$$\mu_\rho(\xi_1, \xi_2, \dots, \xi_k) := \text{tr}(\pi_{\xi_k}^k \cdots \pi_{\xi_1}^1 \rho \pi_{\xi_1}^1 \cdots \pi_{\xi_k}^k) \quad (1)$$


Since $\pi_1^k + \pi_{-1}^k = \mathbf{1}, \forall k$, and because of the cyclicity of the trace,

$$\sum_{\xi_k} \mu_\rho(\xi_1, \xi_2, \dots, \xi_{k-1}, \xi_k) = \mu_\rho(\xi_1, \xi_2, \dots, \xi_{k-1}).$$

Thus, by a lemma due to *Kolmogorov*, μ_ρ extends to a measure on the space, Ξ , of “histories” (= ∞ long measurement records, $\underline{\xi} := (\xi_j)_{j=1}^\infty$) equipped with the σ -algebra, Σ , generated by cylinder sets.

The measure μ_ρ can be decomposed on the σ -alg. at ∞ :

$$\mu_\rho(\underline{\xi}) = \int_{\Xi_\infty} dP_\rho(\nu) \mu(\underline{\xi}|\nu), \quad (2)$$

²the property of strict indep. of e^- 's is a special case of “*decoherence*”! 

Exchangeable probability measures

where Ξ_∞ is the spectrum of the algebra of bounded meas. functions on Ξ measurable at ∞ ;³ Ξ_∞ is the “space of facts” (or of the “Dinge an sich” – quite in the sense of *Plato* and *Kant*).


First, we consider the situation where the e^- 's are indep., and their passage from the electron gun through the T -shaped wire to one of the detectors D_ξ , $\xi = \pm 1$, does *not* affect the charge, ν , of the quantum dot P , assumed to be conserved \rightarrow “non-demolition measurements”. One can then argue that the measure μ_ρ is exchangeable, i.e.:

$$\mu_\rho(\xi_{\sigma(1)}, \dots, \xi_{\sigma(k)}) = \mu_\rho(\xi_1, \dots, \xi_k),$$

for all permutations, σ , of $\{1, \dots, k\}$, for arbitrary $k < \infty$.

According to *De Finetti's* Theorem this implies that (in Eq. (2))

$$\mu(\underline{\xi}_k | \nu) = \prod_{m=1}^k p(\xi_m | \nu), \quad \underline{\xi}_k := (\xi_1, \dots, \xi_k). \quad (3)$$

³equiv. classes (w.r. to a measure class determined by normal states of S) of functions on Ξ not dep. on any finite number of measurement outcomes! 

Interpretation of Ξ_∞ in the solid-state experiment

Suppose every **electron** traveling from the e^- -gun to one of the detectors $D_{\pm 1}$ is prepared in same one-particle state ϕ_0 . Assuming that the **charge operator**, \mathcal{N} , of the quantum dot P is a conservation law, the time evol. of the state ϕ_0 during one measurement cycle is given by

$$U_\nu \phi_0,$$

where U_ν is a unitary operator on the one-electron Hilbert space dep. on the charge $\nu \leq N$ of P : The charge (\propto nb. of e^-) bound by P creates a “Coulomb blockade” in the right arm of the T -shaped wire; whence: the larger ν , the more likely it is that an electron in the wire will be scattered onto the detector $D_1 \equiv D_L$.

The projection of one-electron wave functions that vanish identically near $D_{-\xi}$ is denoted by π_ξ . The probability, $p(\xi|\nu)$, that an e^- hits D_ξ is given by **Born's Rule**

$$p(\xi|\nu) = \langle \phi_0, U_\nu^* \pi_\xi U_\nu \phi_0 \rangle, \quad (4)$$

and the space Ξ_∞ of the “**Dinge an sich**” is given by

$$\Xi_\infty = \text{spec}(\mathcal{N}) = \{0, 1, 2, \dots, N\}, N < \infty, \quad \mathcal{N} = \text{charge operator of } P.$$

3. Indirect Non-Demolition Measurements: Basic Assumptions and General Results

Thinking of the solid-state experiment, we will henceforth assume:⁴

- (i) The measures μ_ρ are exchangeable (non-demolition obs. using independent e^- !) \Rightarrow they are convex combinations of product measures

$$\mu(\underline{\xi}_k | \nu) = \prod_{m=1}^k p(\xi_m | \nu), \quad \xi_m \in \mathcal{X}_S, \forall m, \nu \in \Xi_\infty.$$

- (ii) The space of “facts” is a finite set of points (charge values):

$$\Xi_\infty = \{0, 1, 2, \dots, N\}, \quad \text{for some } N < \infty. \quad (6)$$

- (iii) We also assume that $p(\xi | \cdot)$ separates points of Ξ_∞ : There exists $\kappa > 0$ such that

$$\min_{\nu_1 \neq \nu_2} |p(\xi | \nu_1) - p(\xi | \nu_2)| \geq \kappa > 0, \quad \text{for some } \xi \in \mathcal{X}_S. \quad (7)$$

⁴these assumptions can and have been generalized 

Summary of main results

Equivalence classes of functions on the space Ξ of histories meas. at ∞ form an abelian algebra: the *algebra of “observables at infinity”*, (= funs. on the “space of facts” Ξ_∞), which is isomorphic to $\text{Diag}_{(N+1)}$. An example of an “observable at infinity” is the *“asymptotic frequency”* of an event $\xi \in \mathcal{X}_S$: We define the frequencies

$$f_\xi^{(l, l+k)}(\underline{\xi}) := \frac{1}{k} \left(\sum_{m=l+1}^{l+k} \delta_{\xi, \xi_m} \right), \quad \text{with} \quad \sum_{\xi} f_\xi^{(l, l+k)}(\underline{\xi}) = 1. \quad (8)$$

Summary of Main Results:

(I) Law of Large Numbers for exchangeable measures: For every $\underline{\xi} \in \Xi$, the asymptotic frequency satisfies

$$\lim_{k \rightarrow \infty} f_\xi^{(l, l+k)}(\underline{\xi}) =: p(\xi | \nu), \quad (9)$$

for some “fact” $\nu \in \Xi_\infty$.

“q-hypothesis testing” / parameter estimation

Definition: With each $\nu \in \Xi_\infty$ we associate a subset Ξ_ν of Ξ def. by

$$\Xi_\nu(l, k; \underline{\varepsilon}) := \{\underline{\xi} \mid |f_\xi^{(l, l+k)}(\underline{\xi}) - p(\xi|\nu)| < \varepsilon_k\}, \quad (10)$$

where

$$\varepsilon_k \rightarrow 0, \quad \sqrt{k} \varepsilon_k \rightarrow \infty, \quad \text{as } k \rightarrow \infty$$

(II) Distinguishability: It follows from Hyp. (7) and definition (8) that, for k so large that $\varepsilon_k < \kappa/2$,

$$\Xi_{\nu_1}(l, k; \underline{\varepsilon}) \cap \Xi_{\nu_2}(l, k; \underline{\varepsilon}) = \emptyset, \quad \nu_1 \neq \nu_2.$$

(III) Central Limit Theorem: \Rightarrow Under suitable hypotheses on the states ρ , e.g., (i) through (iii),

$$\mu_\rho \left(\bigcup_{\nu} \Xi_\nu(l, k; \underline{\varepsilon}) \right) \rightarrow 1, \quad \text{as } k \rightarrow \infty.$$

hypothesis testing – ctd.

(I), (II) & (III) \Rightarrow As $k \rightarrow \infty$, every measurement record ξ_k detcs. a **unique point** (charge) $\nu \in \Xi_\infty$; (with error $\rightarrow 0$, as $k \rightarrow \infty$).

Moreover, *Born's Rule* holds:

$$\mu_\rho(\Xi_\nu(I, k; \underline{\varepsilon})) \xrightarrow{k \rightarrow \infty} \rho(\delta_{\mathcal{N}, \nu}) = P_\rho(\nu)$$

(See Eq. (3).)

(IV) *Theorem of Boltzmann-Sanov* \Rightarrow If the measures μ_ρ are exchangeable one has that

$$\mu(\Xi_{\nu_1}(I, k; \underline{\varepsilon}) | \nu_2) \leq C e^{-k\sigma(\nu_1 || \nu_2)},$$

where σ is the relative entropy of the distribution $\rho(\cdot | \nu_1)$ given $\rho(\cdot | \nu_2)$.

(V) *Theorem of Maassen-Kümmerer & Bauer-Bernard* (see (III), (IV), above!) \Rightarrow In the *Haroche-Raimond exp.*, state of S , restr. to $B(\mathcal{H}_P)$, approaches a state, ρ^ν , with a *fixed number*, ν , of photons in the cavity $P (\equiv C)$, as $k \rightarrow \infty$: **"Purification"!**
(Analogous results for solid-state experiment.)

Summary of theory of non-demolition experiments

The theory of indirect measurements outlined so far only concerns measurements of **time-independent “facts”**, which correspond to points in Ξ_∞ : *non-demolition measurements!* The outcomes of such measurements only depend on the tails of histories (at arb. late times). The “extremal” measures $\mu(\cdot|\nu)$, $\nu \in \Xi_\infty$, come from normal states ρ_ν . (This is a non-trivial statement.)

However, most interesting facts depend on **time**, i.e., are **“events”** appearing and disappearing, and $\Xi_\infty = \emptyset$! Thus, we must ask how one can infer or reconstruct information concerning *events* and their time evolution from finitely long records of projective measurements of quantities referring to probes and represented by operators that act on the Hilbert spaces of probes. – This question will be answered next!

4. Weak Measurements of Time-Dependent Quantities –

Markov Jump Processes on the Spectra of Observables & Particle Tracks

We consider an isolated physical system $S = P \vee E$, as before.

States of S are given by density matrices, ρ_S , acting on a Hilbert space $\mathcal{H}_S = \mathcal{H}_P \otimes \mathcal{H}_E$, where $\mathcal{H}_P = \mathbb{C}^{N+1}$, for some $N < \infty$. When restricted to observables of P , states are given by density matrices $\rho_P := \text{tr}_E \rho_S$.

- ▶ Hilbert space of a single probe A_j : $\mathcal{H}_{A_j} \simeq \mathcal{H}_A$
- ▶ Initial state of each probe A_j : $\phi_0 \in \mathcal{H}_A$.
- ▶ Reference state in \mathcal{H}_E : $\bigotimes_{j=1}^{\infty} \phi_0^{(j)}$, $\phi_0^{(j)} = \phi_0, \forall j$.
Space $\mathcal{H}_E =$ completion of linear span of vectors $\bigotimes_{j=1}^{\infty} \psi^{(j)}$, with $\psi^{(j)} = \phi_0$, except for finitely many j .
- ▶ For each probe A_j , the same observable, represented by an operator

$$X = \sum_{\xi \in \mathcal{X}_S} \xi \pi_{\xi}, \quad \text{card}(\mathcal{X}_S) = k < \infty, \quad (11)$$

acting on \mathcal{H}_{A_j} , is measured in a detector D at a *random time* t_j , with $t_j < t_{j+1}$, $t_{j+1} - t_j$ Poissonian, $\forall j$; (D ignored in the following).

The formalism

During the j^{th} measurement cycle $(t_{j-1}, t_j]$, *only* A_j briefly interacts with P at time t_j . Measurement results for probes A_1, \dots, A_{j-1} at times $\underline{t}_j = (t_k)_{k=1}^j$ are denoted by $\underline{\xi}_{j-1} = (\xi_k)_{k=1}^{j-1}$ (measurement record).

- $\rho_t^{(j-1)}(\underline{t}_{j-1}, \underline{\xi}_{j-1})$: State of P at time $t < t_j$, *after* interaction with probe A_{j-1} at time t_{j-1} .
- Let \mathcal{N} be an “observable” acting on \mathcal{H}_P with simple spectrum,

$$\text{spec}(\mathcal{N}) = \{0, 1, \dots, N\}, N < \infty.$$

By E_ν we denote the spectral projection of \mathcal{N} corresp. to ev ν .

We obtain a recursion formula for the states $\rho^{(j)} := \rho_{\underline{t}_j, \underline{\xi}_j}^{(j)}$ of P :

$$\rho^{(j)} = \mathcal{Z}_{\xi_j}^{-1} V_{\xi_j} e^{-i(t_j - t_{j-1})H_P} \rho^{(j-1)} e^{i(t_j - t_{j-1})H_P} V_{\xi_j}, \quad (13)$$

where H_P is the Hamiltonian of P in the absence of interactions with probes, ...

Formalism – ctd.

... Z_ξ is a normalization factor, and the operator V_ξ is given by

$$V_\xi = \sum_\nu V_\xi(\nu), \text{ where } V_\xi(\nu) := E_\nu \sqrt{p(\xi|\nu)}, \text{ with}$$

$$p(\xi|\nu) := \langle U_\nu \phi_0, \pi_\xi U_\nu \phi_0 \rangle,$$

with ϕ_0 the initial state of a probe, (\nearrow Eq. (4), Sect. 2).

Note that

$$V_\xi = V_\xi^*, [V_\xi, \mathcal{N}] = 0, \forall \xi, \text{ and } \sum_{\xi' \in \mathcal{X}_S} V_{\xi'}^2 = \mathbf{1}. \quad (14)$$

The recursion formula (13) yields a trajectory of states of the subsystem P (the cavity/quantum dot) given by

$$\rho_t(\underline{t}, \underline{\xi}) := e^{-i(t-t_j)H_P} \rho_{t_j}^{(j)}(\underline{t}_j, \underline{\xi}_j) e^{i(t-t_j)H_P}, \quad t_j < t < t_{j+1} \quad (15)$$

Averaged time-evolution of state of P

We suppose that the differences $t_j - t_{j-1}$ of times of interaction between the probes A_j and the subsystem P are **Poisson distributed**, with rate $\gamma = 1, \forall j$. Fixing a time t and taking an average, \mathbb{E} , over *measurement times* and *measurement outcomes*, we find that

$$\mathbb{E}[\rho_t(\underline{t}, \underline{\xi})] = e^{t\mathcal{L}} \rho, \quad (16)$$

where ρ is the initial state of the subsystem P at time $t = 0$, and \mathcal{L} is a Lindblad generator given by

$$\mathcal{L} \rho = -i \text{ad}_{H_P}(\rho) + \left(\sum_{\xi \in \mathcal{X}_S} V_\xi \rho V_\xi \right) - \rho. \quad (17)$$

Eq. (15) is what one calls the *“unravelling”* of the Lindblad evolution (16); it appears as the integrand in the *Dyson expansion* of the right side of (16), with the *second term* on the right side of (17) treated as the *perturbation*.

Main result

We suppose that the “Basic Assumption” (iii) of Sect. 3 is valid.
We assume furthermore that

$$H_P = \varepsilon h_P, \quad \text{for some } \varepsilon > 0, \quad (19)$$

and we rescale time: $t = \varepsilon^{-2}\tau$. We define a continuous-time Markov jump process, with state space $= \text{spec}(\mathcal{N})$, paths $\nu_\tau(\omega)$, $\omega = (\underline{t}, \underline{\xi})$, and transition function generated by the Markov kernel:

$$Q(\nu, \nu') = -\frac{|\langle \nu | h_P | \nu' \rangle|^2}{\sum_{\xi \in \mathcal{X}_S} V_\xi(\nu) V_\xi(\nu') - 1} + cc, \quad \nu \neq \nu',$$

with $Q(\nu, \nu) = \dots \geq 0, \forall \nu$.

We are now prepared to state our *Main Result*, (which has similarities with models illustrating the “*ETH approach*” to QM!).

Main result – ctd.

Theorem.


- Convergence of qm evolution to Markov jump process:

$$\lim_{\varepsilon \searrow 0} \mathbb{E}[\rho_{\varepsilon^{-2}\tau}(\omega = (\underline{t}, \underline{\xi}))] = e^{-\tau Q} \rho_0,$$

where $\rho_0 = \text{Diag}(\langle \nu | \rho | \nu \rangle)$.

- The state $\rho_{\varepsilon^{-2}\tau}(\omega = (\underline{t}, \underline{\xi}))$ approaches in law a diagonal matrix, $\text{Diag}(\delta_{\nu, \nu_\tau(\omega)})$.

Numerical simulation for the behaviour of the diagonal matrix elements of $\rho_{\varepsilon^{-2}\tau}(\underline{t}, \underline{\xi})$ in the special case where $N = 1$ (i.e., $\mathcal{H}_P = \mathbb{C}^2$), for small ε :



5. Open Problems, Conclusions

- ▶ More general models of probes and “cavities”; in particular:
- ▶ Correlated probes; ∞ -dimensional state spaces for cavity, P .
- ▶ More general models of indirect measurements of *time-dependent* quantities. –
Approach to classical dynamics: Consider “observables,” $\vec{\mathcal{N}}$, with continuous spectrum $\sigma(\vec{\mathcal{N}}) \simeq \mathbb{R}^d$; e.g., *particle position operators*. Then H_P may generate dynamics describing a particle motion on $\sigma(\vec{\mathcal{N}})$ resembling classical motion; the full dynamics of P may then describe **tracks** on $\sigma(\vec{\mathcal{N}})$ with “diffusive broadening:” Theory of “*Mott tracks*”; (now fairly well understood, at least in semi-classical regime – next time!). Etc.
- ▶ **Theory of projective (direct) measurements – *ETH-Approach***

Our conclusion: Quantum Mechanics and its foundations are well and alive. There are plenty of beautiful new experiments testing fundamental aspects of Quantum Mechanics, and there are plenty of interesting problems for theorists to worry about – good luck!

Thank you!

Epilogue: “Vivre et Survivre” – 50 years later

... depuis fin juillet 1970 je consacre la plus grande partie de mon temps en militant pour le mouvement *Survivre*, fondé en juillet à **Montréal**. Son but est la lutte pour la survie de l'espèce humaine, et même de la vie tout court, menacée par le déséquilibre écologique croissant causé par une utilisation indiscriminée de la science et de la technologie et par des mécanismes sociaux suicidaires, et menacée également par des conflits militaires liés à la prolifération des appareils militaires et des industries d'armements. ...

Alexandre Grothendieck

Let's take up this struggle again – it matters!