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Niels Bohr:
“If you are not confused by quantum physics then you haven’t really understood it”

Richard Feynman:
“I think I can safely say that nobody understands quantum mechanics”
Quantum mechanics =

Schrödinger equation +
collapse postulate

1) Probability of measurement result
   \[ p_r = |\langle \psi | \psi_r \rangle|^2 \]

2) Wavefunction after measurement
   \[ = \psi_r \]

   - State collapse follows from common sense
   - Does not follow from Schrödinger equation
     (contradicts; random vs. deterministic)

Collapse postulate is controversial since 1920s
(needs an observer, contradicts causality)
Einstein-Podolsky-Rosen (EPR) paradox

Phys. Rev., 1935

In a complete theory there is an element corresponding to each element of reality. A sufficient condition for the reality of a physical quantity is the possibility of predicting it with certainty, without disturbing the system.

\[ \psi(x_1, x_2) = \sum_n \psi_n(x_2) u_n(x_1) \]  

(nowadays we call it entangled state)

\[ \psi(x_1, x_2) = \int_{-\infty}^{\infty} \exp\left[ \frac{i}{\hbar} (x_1 - x_2)p \right] dp \sim \delta(x_1 - x_2) \]

 Measurement of particle 1 cannot affect particle 2, while QM says it affects (contradicts causality)

\[ \Rightarrow \text{Quantum mechanics is incomplete} \]

Bohr’s reply  (Phys. Rev., 1935) (seven pages, one formula: \( \Delta p \Delta q \sim h \))

It is shown that a certain “criterion of physical reality” formulated … by A. Einstein, B. Podolsky and N. Rosen contains an essential ambiguity when it is applied to quantum phenomena.

Crudely: No need to understand QM, just use the result
Bell’s inequality (John Bell, 1964)

\[ \psi = \frac{1}{\sqrt{2}}(\uparrow_1 \downarrow_2 - \downarrow_1 \uparrow_2) \]

Perfect anticorrelation of measurement results for the same measurement directions, \( \hat{a} = \hat{b} \)

Is it possible to explain the QM result assuming local realism and hidden variables or collapse “propagates” instantaneously (faster than light, “spooky action-at-a-distance”)?

Assume: \( A(\hat{a}, \lambda) = \pm 1, \quad B(\hat{b}, \lambda) = \pm 1 \) (deterministic result with hidden variable \( \lambda \))

Then: \[ |P(\hat{a}, \hat{b}) - P(\hat{a}, \hat{c})| \leq 1 + P(\hat{b}, \hat{c}) \]

where \( P \equiv P(++) + P(--) - P(+-) - P(-+) \)

QM: \( P(\hat{a}, \hat{b}) = -\hat{a} \cdot \hat{b} \) For 0\(^\circ\), 90\(^\circ\), and 45\(^\circ\): \[ 0.71 \leq 1 - 0.71 \] violation!

Experiment (Aspect et al., 1982; photons instead of spins, CHSH): yes, “spooky action-at-a-distance”
What about causality?

Actually, not too bad: you cannot transmit your own information choosing a particular measurement direction $a$.

Result of the other measurement does not depend on direction $a$.

Randomness saves causality.

Collapse is still instantaneous: OK, just our recipe, not an “objective reality”, not a “physical” process.

Consequence of causality: **No-cloning theorem**

Wootters-Zurek, 1982; Dieks, 1982; Yurke

*You cannot copy an unknown quantum state*

**Proof:** Otherwise get information on direction $a$ (and causality violated)

**Application:** quantum cryptography

Information is an important concept in quantum mechanics.
Quantum measurement in solid-state systems

No violation of locality – too small distances

However, interesting informational aspects of continuous quantum measurement (weak coupling, noise ⇒ gradual collapse)

Starting point:

What happens to a solid-state qubit (two-level system) during its continuous (weak) measurement by a detector?
Superconducting “charge” qubit


Vion et al. (Devoret’s group); Science, 2002
Q-factor of coherent (Rabi) oscillations = 25,000
More of superconducting charge qubits

Duty, Gunnarsson, Bladh, Delsing, PRB 2004
Guillaume et al. (Echternach’s group), PRB 2004

Cooper-pair box measured by single-electron transistor (SET) (actually, RF-SET)

Setup can be used for continuous measurements

All results are averaged over many measurements (not “single-shot”)
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Some other superconducting qubits

**Flux qubit**
Mooij et al. (Delft)

**Phase qubit**
J. Martinis et al. (UCSB and NIST)

**Charge qubit with circuit QED**
R. Schoelkopf et al. (Yale)
Some other superconducting qubits

**Flux qubit**

J. Clarke et al. (Berkeley)

**“Quantronium” qubit**

I. Siddiqi, R. Schoelkopf, M. Devoret, et al. (Yale)
Semiconductor (double-dot) qubit

T. Hayashi et al., PRL 2003

Detector is not separated from qubit, also possible to use a separate detector

Rabi oscillations
Some other semiconductor qubits

**Spin qubit**
C. Marcus et al. (Harvard)

**Double-dot qubit**
J. Gorman et al. (Cambridge)
The system we consider: qubit + detector

\[ H = H_{QB} + H_{DET} + H_{INT} \]

\[ H_{QB} = \frac{\varepsilon}{2}(c_1^+c_1 - c_2^+c_2) + H(c_1^+c_2 + c_2^+c_1) \]

\[ \varepsilon \text{ – asymmetry, } H \text{ – tunneling} \]

\[ \Omega = (4H^2 + \varepsilon^2)^{1/2}/\hbar \text{ – frequency of quantum coherent (Rabi) oscillations} \]

Two levels of average detector current: \( I_1 \) for qubit state \( |1\rangle \), \( I_2 \) for \( |2\rangle \)

Response: \( \Delta I = I_1 - I_2 \)

Detector noise: white, spectral density \( S_I \)

**DQD and QPC** (setup due to Gurvitz, 1997)

\[ H_{DET} = \sum_l E_l a_l^+ a_l + \sum_r E_r a_r^+ a_r + \sum_{l,r} T(a_r^+ a_l + a_l^+ a_r) \]

\[ H_{INT} = \sum_{l,r} \Delta T (c_1^+ c_1 - c_2^+ c_2)(a_r^+ a_l + a_l^+ a_r) \]

\[ S_I = 2eI \]
Quantum Bayesian formalism

Evolution due to measurement (“spooky” quantum back-action)

1) $\rho_{ii}$ evolve as probabilities, i.e. according to the Bayes rule
(for $\psi=\alpha|1\rangle+\beta|2\rangle$, $|\alpha(t)|^2$ and $|\beta(t)|^2$ behave as probabilities)

2) $\rho_{ij}/(\rho_{ii} \rho_{jj})^{1/2} = \text{const}$, i.e. pure state remains pure
(for $\psi=\alpha|1\rangle+\beta|2\rangle$, the phases of $\alpha(t)$ and $\beta(t)$ do not change)

Bayes rule (1763, 1812):

$$P(A_i | R) = \frac{P(A_i) P(R | A_i)}{\sum_k P(A_k) P(R | A_k)}$$

Add physical (realistic) evolution

- Hamiltonian evolution, classical back-action, decoherence, etc.
  (technically: add terms in the differential equation)

Same idea as in POVM, general quant. meas., quantum trajectories, etc.
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Even more general formalism

POVM, general quantum measurement, etc. (known since 1960s)

Nielsen and Chuang, “Quantum information and quantum computation”, p. 85

Measurement with a result $r$ is characterized by a linear operator $M_r$:

$$|\psi\rangle \rightarrow \frac{M_r |\psi\rangle}{\sqrt{\langle \psi | M_r^\dagger M_r |\psi\rangle}}$$

Probability: $P_r = \langle \psi | M_r^\dagger M_r |\psi\rangle$

Completeness: $\sum_r M_r^\dagger M_r = 1$

Textbook collapse: when $M_r$ is a projection operator

POVM collapse is equivalent to a projective collapse in a larger Hilbert space (including detector)
Measurement vs. decoherence

Widely accepted point of view:

measurement = decoherence (environment)

Is it true?

- Yes, if not interested in information from detector (ensemble-averaged evolution)
- No, if take into account measurement result (single quantum system)

Measurement result obviously gives us more information about the measured system, so we know its quantum state better (ideally, a pure state instead of a mixed state)
Undoing a weak measurement of a qubit (quantum uncollapsing)

It is impossible to undo “orthodox” quantum measurement (for an unknown initial state)

Is it possible to undo partial quantum measurement? **Yes!** (but with a finite probability)

If undoing is successful, an unknown state is **fully** restored
Uncollapsing of a qubit state

Evolution due to partial (weak, continuous, etc.) measurement is **non-unitary** (though coherent if detector is good!), therefore it is impossible to undo it by Hamiltonian dynamics.

**How to undo? One more measurement!**

(similar to Koashi-Ueda, PRL-1999)  
(Figure partially adopted from Jordan-A.K.-Büttiker, PRL-06)
Uncollapsing for DQD-QPC system

\[ \psi = \alpha |1\rangle + \beta |2\rangle \]

Simple strategy: continue measuring until result \( r(t) \) becomes zero. Then any initial state is fully restored. (same for an entangled qubit)

It may happen though that \( r = 0 \) never crossed; then undoing procedure is unsuccessful.

Probability of success:

\[ P_S = \frac{e^{-|r_0|}}{e^{r_0} |\alpha_{in}|^2 + e^{-|r_0|} |\beta_{in}|^2} \]

Averaged probability of success (over result \( r_0 \)):

\[ P_{av} = 1 - \text{erf}[\sqrt{t/2T_m}], \quad T_m = \frac{2S_I}{(\Delta I)^2} \]

(does not depend on initial state)
General theory of uncollapsing

Uncollapsing operator: \( C \times M_r^{-1} \) (to satisfy completeness, eigenvalues cannot be >1)

\[
\max(C) = \min_i \sqrt{p_i}, \quad p_i - \text{eigenvalues of } M_r^\dagger M_r
\]

Probability of success:

\[
P_S \leq \frac{\min P_r}{P_r(\psi_{\text{in}})}
\]

\( P_r(\psi_{\text{in}}) \) – probability of result \( r \) for initial state \( \psi_{\text{in}} \),

\( \min P_r \) – probability of result \( r \) minimized over all possible initial states

Averaged (over \( r \)) probability of success:

\[
P_{av} \leq \sum_r \min P_r
\]

(cannot depend on initial state, otherwise get information)

(similar to Koashi-Ueda, 1999)
Partial collapse of a phase qubit

How does a coherent state evolve in time before tunneling event?

(What happens when nothing happens?)

Main idea:

$$\psi = \alpha |0\rangle + \beta |1\rangle \rightarrow \psi(t) = \begin{cases} 
|\text{out}\rangle, & \text{if tunneled} \\
\frac{\alpha |0\rangle + \beta e^{-\Gamma t/2} e^{i\phi} |1\rangle}{\sqrt{\alpha^2 + |\beta|^2}} & , \text{if not tunneled}
\end{cases}$$

(better theory: Leonid Pryadko & A.K., 2007)

amplitude of state $|0\rangle$ grows without physical interaction

continuous null-result collapse

(similar to optics, Dalibard-Castin-Molmer, PRL-1992)
Superconducting phase qubit at UCSB

Courtesy of Nadav Katz (UCSB)

\[ |0\rangle \quad \text{or} \quad |1\rangle \]

\[ \omega_{01} \]

\[ 1 \Phi_0 \]

\[ I_{dc} + I_z \]

\[ I_{\mu W} \]

\[ \text{SQUID} \]

\[ I_s \]

\[ V_s \]

\[ \text{Reset} \quad \text{Compute} \quad \text{Meas.} \quad \text{Readout} \]

\[ 10\text{ns} \quad 3\text{ns} \]

\[ \text{Repeat 1000x} \quad \text{prob. 0,1} \]
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Experimental technique for partial collapse

Nadav Katz et al.
(John Martinis’ group)

Protocol:
1) State preparation by applying microwave pulse (via Rabi oscillations)
2) Partial measurement by lowering barrier for time \( t \)
3) State tomography (microwave + full measurement)

Measurement strength
\[ p = 1 - \exp(-\Gamma t) \]
is actually controlled by \( \Gamma \), not by \( t \)

\( p=0 \): no measurement
\( p=1 \): orthodox collapse
Experimental tomography data

\[ \psi_{in} = \frac{|0\rangle + |1\rangle}{\sqrt{2}} \]

Nadav Katz et al. (UCSB)

\[ p = 0 \]
\[ \theta_y \]
\[ \theta_x \]

\[ p = 0.06 \]

\[ p = 0.23 \]

\[ p = 0.32 \]

\[ p = 0.56 \]

\[ p = 0.70 \]

\[ p = 0.83 \]
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Partial collapse: experimental results

N. Katz et al., Science-06

- In case of no tunneling (null-result measurement) phase qubit evolves
- This evolution is well described by a simple Bayesian theory, without fitting parameters
- Phase qubit remains fully coherent in the process of continuous collapse (experimentally ~80% raw data, ~96% after account for T1 and T2)

Quantum efficiency $\eta_0 > 0.8$

$T_1=110\text{ ns},\ T_2=80\text{ ns}$ (measured)
Uncollapsing of a phase qubit state

1) Start with an unknown state
2) Partial measurement of strength $p$
3) $\pi$-pulse (exchange $|0\rangle \leftrightarrow |1\rangle$)
4) One more measurement with the same strength $p$
5) $\pi$-pulse

If no tunneling for both measurements, then initial state is fully restored!

$$
\alpha |0\rangle + \beta |1\rangle \rightarrow \frac{\alpha |0\rangle + e^{i\phi} \beta e^{-\Gamma t/2} |1\rangle}{\text{Norm}} \\
e^{i\phi} \frac{\alpha e^{-\Gamma t/2} |0\rangle + e^{i\phi} \beta e^{-\Gamma t/2} |1\rangle}{\text{Norm}} = e^{i\phi} (\alpha |0\rangle + \beta |1\rangle)
$$

phase is also restored (spin echo)
Experiment on wavefunction uncollapsing


Uncollapse protocol:
- partial collapse
- $\pi$-pulse
- partial collapse (same strength)

State tomography with $X$, $Y$, and no pulses

Background $P_B$ should be subtracted to find qubit density matrix
**Experimental results on Bloch sphere**

N. Katz et al.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Initial state</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>$</td>
<td>1\rangle$</td>
<td>$\frac{</td>
<td>0\rangle +</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

- **Partial collapse**
  - $|1\rangle$
  - $\frac{|0\rangle + |1\rangle}{\sqrt{2}}$
  - $\frac{|0\rangle + i|1\rangle}{\sqrt{2}}$
  - $|0\rangle$

- **Uncollapsed**
  - $|1\rangle$
  - $\frac{|0\rangle + |1\rangle}{\sqrt{2}}$
  - $\frac{|0\rangle + i|1\rangle}{\sqrt{2}}$
  - $|0\rangle$

**Collapse strength:** $0.05 < p < 0.7$

**Uncollapsing works well!**
Same with polar angle dependence
(another experimental run)

Both spin echo (azimuth) and uncollapsing (polar angle)

Difference: spin echo – undoing of an unknown unitary evolution,
uncollapsing – undoing of a known, but non-unitary evolution
Quantum process tomography

Why getting worse at $p>0.6$?

Energy relaxation $p_r = t/T_1 = 45\text{ns}/450\text{ns} = 0.1$

Selection affected when $1-p \sim p_r$

Overall: uncollapsing is well-confirmed experimentally

N. Katz et al. (Martinis group)
Conclusions

● Quantum measurement is not as simple as in a textbook

● In many cases quantum collapse happens gradually (possible to describe how but impossible to understand why)

● A partial collapse can be reversed (uncollapsing), though with a probability less than 100%

● Partial collapse and uncollapsing have been recently demonstrated experimentally