Measuring a "Probability" > 1

Sanchari Chakraborti¹, Rafael D. Sorkin^{1,2,3,4}, and Urbasi Sinha^{*1,5}

Abstract

The history based formalism known as Quantum Measure Theory (QMT) generalizes the concept of probability-measure so as to incorporate quantum interference. Because interference can result in a greater intensity than the simple sum of the component intensities, the *quantum measure* can exceed unity, exhibiting its non-classical nature in a particularly striking manner. Here we study the two-site hopper within the context of QMT; and in an optical experiment, we determine the measure of a specific hopper event, using an ancilla based event filtering scheme. For this measure we report a value of 1.172, which exceeds the maximum value permissible for a classical probability (namely 1) by 13.3 standard deviations. If an unconventional theoretical concept is to play a role in meeting the foundational challenges of quantum theory, then it seems important to bring it into contact with experiment as much as possible. Our experiment does this for the quantum measure.

1 Introduction

What exactly are we measuring when we perform a quantum measurement? What, beyond the fact that a certain detector has clicked or the trace on a certain oscilloscope has shown some specific behavior, does the measurement teach us about events in the physical world? A full answer to this question would go a long way toward resolving the foundational puzzles raised by

¹Light and Matter Physics, Raman Research Institute, Bengaluru 560080, India

²Perimeter Institute for Theoretical Physics, Waterloo, ON N2L 2Y5, Canada

³Department of Physics, Syracuse University, Syracuse, NY 13244-1130, U.S.A.

⁴School of Theoretical Physics, Dublin Institute for Advanced Studies, 10 Burlington Road, Dublin 4, Ireland

⁵Department of Physics and Astronomy, University of Calgary, Alberta T2N 1N4, Canada

^{*}email: usinha@rri.res.in

quantum theory because it would clarify the relationship that formal mathematical objects like wave functions and complex amplitudes bear to physical processes and events in the microscopic realm.

Consider for example an optical experiment involving an apparatus consisting of a laser together with components such as mirrors, beam splitters, polarization optics, and photo detectors mounted on an optical bench. Imagine now that a photon emerges from the laser and makes its way through the various optical elements to a detector which accordingly "clicks", and in the process destroys the photon, thereby bringing the experiment to an end. What does the "click" of this detector reveal to us about the micro-world?

Thanks to some combination of convention, habit, and prior experience, we feel comfortable in saying that the "click" signifies the arrival of the photon. One might question how this implied transformation of a photon to a click actually takes place (the so-called measurement problem); but even if we refrain from asking about this, a more glaring explanatory gap remains. The final click tells us nothing definite about the photon's career after it left the laser and before it arrived at the detector. It fails to answer the question, What, exactly, happened in between the initial emission and the final detection?

But if you believe (as almost any working physicist will) that something really did happen in-between, then the paradigm of preparation — evolution — observation — leaves much to be desired (not least because if we are honest, we have to admit that we live our whole lives in this in-between condition). All the more interesting, therefore, are measurement procedures that aim to shed light on entire physical processes and not just on certain types of correlation between an "input" and an "output" (or between a "preparation" and a "detection") — procedures that concern themselves with temporally extended events rather than just momentary states.

As instances of such event-oriented procedures, one might mention so-called "negative result measurements" [1, 2]. For example, one might direct a photon toward a polarizing beam-splitter that transmits the H component and reflects the V component of polarization. If one then places a detector behind the beam splitter in the transmitted direction, and if this detector does not click, then one can conclude (for an ideal scenario without any absorption) that the photon was reflected with V polarization. In this measurement, the photon (in favorable runs) is not destroyed, and hence one has acquired "in-between" information on an ongoing physical process while allowing the process itself to continue.

Further on we will describe how such a technique could be used to enhance the experiment

reported in the present paper. Our experiment builds what we will call an "event filter" that obtains information about the trajectory followed by photons in the experiment. More precisely, it selects for a particular $set\ E$ of trajectories. In the present design, though, the photon gets destroyed by a detector placed at the desired output port, a negative-result modification of our design would render the filter non-destructive, allowing subsequent processing to verify that the filter had truly selected for the intended trajectories. A non-destructive event filter also has potential applications in connection with quantum computing.

Other measurement procedures that aim to illuminate the *in-between* physical processes are those known as weak measurements [3]. What renders them particularly relevant to our discussion is their intimate connection to path-integral formulations of quantum mechanics. The quantity being measured in weak measurements, is a complex number of the form $\frac{\langle f|\hat{O}|i\rangle}{\langle f|i\rangle}$ (where $|i\rangle$ is the "pre-selected state" and $|f\rangle$ is the "post-selected state"), being known as the weak value $\langle \hat{O} \rangle_v$ of the operator \hat{O} under the given experimental conditions.

This number, long known to quantum field theorists as an *in-out expectation value*, is a transition amplitude of the sort that is ubiquitous in calculations of S-matrix elements; and it is directly reducible to a path integral.¹ The connection to path integrals (see also [4]), moreover, is no accident, because *histories-based* frameworks are the only ones (known to us) that take as their starting point processes in their entirety, rather than momentary states evolving temporally via the Schrödinger equation.

Inspired by the path-integral approach, Quantum Measure Theory (QMT) offers to quantum mechanics a history-based formalism which, at its most fundamental level does not rest on concepts like wave function, superposition of states, or operators as observables [5]. QMT describes the kinematics (or "ontology") of a physical system in terms of its histories (e.g. a particle trajectory) and its events, an event being a set of histories. It describes the dynamics of the system in terms of quantum measure, which assigns to every event a generalized probability (which though non-negative can exceed unity). This paper presents a study of the two-site hopper model [6] within the framework of quantum measure theory. It realizes the model for a photonic system and reports an experiment that employs an ancilla-based event-filtering scheme in order to determine the quantum measure of a specific hopper event E, as described in detail below.

The experiment addresses a question which, posed in a classical setting, would ask "Which

¹When one thinks of $\langle \hat{O} \rangle_w$ as a (ratio of) transition amplitude(s) rather than an expectation value, one feels no surprise that in general, it fails to be a real number.

path did the photon follow in going from source to detector?" This however is not a very enlightening question to pose quantum mechanically since it suppresses the interference between distinct paths which is the hallmark of quantum processes. Instead of trying to pin the photon down to a unique path, we will select a set of paths and ask whether that set was "realized", in a sense which the experiment will in effect define. Such a set of paths (more generally termed histories) constitutes what probability theory knows as an event, and we have adopted that terminology. We are thus attempting to ask about some event of our choice, "Did this event happen?". An apparatus that implements this question, we will call an "event filter". It is meant to select for a particular event in a manner similar to how a polarizer selects for a particular polarization.

The specific event filter we will describe below is inspired by the class of event-oriented measurement protocols set out in [7], but it contains some novel features. Firstly we employ the photon's polarization degree of freedom as what is called an ancilla (discussed in detail in 3); and secondly (since no second polarization is available) we are led by necessity to reuse this ancilla by in effect coupling it to the system twice. The first modification is merely a small complication made for convenience, but we believe that the technique of coupling the same ancilla to the system more than once offers an improvement that could be important in application to more complicated events containing large numbers of histories.

In the remainder of this paper, we provide some background helpful for understanding more fully the significance of our experiment, and we describe the experiment itself, its results, and some of its implications as we see them. The background and an overview of this history-based framework are presented in section 2. The experimental details and the results are described in sections 3 and 4 with sections 5 and 6 presenting the final remarks, interpretations, and proposals for further experiments that would enhance or extend the one we have performed.

2 Overview: Conventional Quantum Theory to Quantum Measure Theory

In what one might refer to as the standard quantum formalism, a microsystem is described by a wave function ψ that resides within a Hilbert space, and the dynamics of the system is governed by the Schrödinger equation that generates unitary time-evolution of ψ under a particular Hamiltonian. A property of the system manifests itself in the outcome of a measurement of an observable \hat{O} . The probability distribution over different possible outcomes can be obtained from ψ and \hat{O} by using the Born rule [8]. Although the predictions made by this formalism have

always been found to be consistent with experiments, the theory appears to be inadequate as it fails to comment on the reality of the micro-system at intermediate times between preparation and observation. Nor does it address the question of what exactly takes place during the measurements (or preparations) themselves 2 . These two lacunae lie at the core of the so-called quantum measurement problem, and have given rise to continuing debates over whether one can assign an ontological meaning to ψ [10], and how to conceive of what (if anything) happens between preparation and measurement.

Amidst all these debates and attempts to provide a complete description of the quantum system and its behaviors, one finds oneself continually returning to the fact that the conventional interpretation, with its emphasis on the measurement-process, presupposes an a priori division of the universe into an observer (classical system) and an observed (quantum system); but it does so without providing any coherent account of this "Heisenberg's cut" [11, 12]. This has led many physicists to feel the need for a more unified conception that could encompass both the micro and macro worlds within a single framework.

In this quest, one can observe a contrast between approaches that have inherited the prerelativistic notion of momentary states evolving in time, and approaches that adopt a more global, space-time point of view from the very beginning. An approach of the former type will typically conceive of ψ as a function defined on configuration-space and evolving continuously over time. In contrast, manifestly covariant descriptions are more natural to gravitational physics, as well as to high energy processes and quantum field theory in Minkowski spacetime. For these reasons, it has been argued that the Dirac-Feynman path integral [13], or more generally a sum-over-histories approach towards quantum dynamics like that in [14], is more appropriate in adapting quantum mechanics to special relativity, and especially to general relativity [15]. ³

Moreover, a formalism that, like Quantum Measure Theory (QMT) [18, 19], could dispense at a fundamental level with concepts like wave function, observable, and state-vector reduction, would be better suited to cosmology and the study of the early universe [20]. This is because

²A 1962 talk by Wendell Furry [9] offers an exceptionally clear account of this second aspect. We limit ourselves to quoting just the following extract. "The important thing is, the statement is simply: when you measure, this is what you get. There is no statement made as to what happens in the actual measuring process. . . . This is what various people . . . call the cut. It is where something happens which the theory does not describe mathematically."

³This allies with the philosophy of "gravitizing quantum mechanics" [16], i.e. modifying it to fit better with general relativity, as opposed to only quantizing gravity", i.e. modifying general relativity to fit better with existing formulations of quantum mechanics and quantum field theory [17].

on the one hand, quantum effects cannot be neglected in the early universe, while on the other hand, and unlike in a laboratory setting, nothing in the physics of that epoch obviously corresponds to the concepts of observer or state preparation and measurement.

2.1 Quantum Measure Theory: A Histories-based Formulation

Quantum Measure Theory (QMT) offers a space-time formulation of quantum mechanics based on a path-integral or sum-over-histories approach. It interprets the behavior of a quantum system from the perspective of a suitably generalized theory of stochastic processes [5]. The kinematics or "ontology" of such a theory rests on the concepts of *history* and *event*; and the dynamics is a kind of quantum-stochastic law of motion for the history [14], given mathematically by a *quantum measure* which generalizes the classical notion of a probability-measure so as to incorporate quantum interference.

A history in this framework is taken to be the fundamental building block of reality; it gives the finest grained description conceivable in the theory of the system in question. If, for example, the system in question were a single particle, a history would be a single worldline; if it were a field, a history would be any of its conceivable space-time configurations, etc. In general, the definition of history depends on the system one is dealing with and the model or context adopted to describe it. An event is then identified with a set of histories of the system, and it is mapped to a non-negative real number called its quantum measure, that generalizes the classical notion of the probability of a random event.⁴ Formulated in this manner, a quantum theory is more akin to a classical theory of stochastic processes like Brownian motion than it is to classical Hamiltonian dynamics.

In quantum measure theory, the kinematics and dynamics of a given system are defined mathematically by a triple $(\Omega, \mathcal{A}, \mu)$; where Ω (the history space) is the space of all conceivable histories, \mathcal{A} (the event algebra) is the set of all subsets of Ω to which a measure can be assigned (including the empty set \emptyset and Ω itself), and μ (the quantum measure) is a function that maps each element of event algebra to a positive real number $(\mu : \mathcal{A} \to \mathbb{R}^+)$. Unlike a classical probability, a quantum measure incorporates quantum interference, and hence, its values cannot (except in important special cases) be interpreted as probabilities in the usual sense. They neither obey the probability sum rule nor (because of constructive interference) are

⁴Notice that when one speaks of "the event E" one does not imply that E really happens, only that it might or might not happen in any particular case. For this reason David Reid has suggested the alternative term "occurable" instead of "event". However, for now we stick with the usage that has become standard in probability theory.

they bounded above by unity.

The quantum measure μ can be characterized abstractly by certain positivity conditions and axioms that generalize the Kolmogorov sum rule for probabilities. For a large class of theories μ takes the form of a "double path integral" designed in such a way that when E is what we will term an "instrument event", $\mu(E)$ will be equal to the Born-rule probability of the instrument "reading" corresponding to E. For the type of unitary system that figures in our experiment, where a history corresponds to a particle-trajectory γ restricted to a definite interval of time, and for an event $E = {\gamma^1, \gamma^2,}$ comprising a finite number of histories, $\mu(E)$ is given by the formula,

$$\mu(E) = \sum_{\gamma^i, \gamma^j \in E} A(\gamma^i) A^*(\gamma^j) \delta_{\gamma^i_{end}, \gamma^j_{end}}$$
(1)

Here, $A(\gamma)$ is (as illustrated below) the quantum amplitude associated with the history γ , and the delta-function $\delta_{\gamma_{end}^i,\gamma_{end}^j}$ limits the interference between histories to those that terminate at the same point. Because of how the measure of an instrument event relates to the Born rule, the measure μ for a given system encodes in particular all the predictions about that system made by the ordinary quantum formalism.

2.2 Different types of Events and their Measures

Events, as defined in QMT, can be classified broadly into two categories, instrument events and non-instrument events (one might also name the latter as "system events").

Instrument events concern the histories of an instrument; by instrument here we mean a piece of measuring apparatus, and the intended histories are those of the variables that describe the instrument's macroscopic behaviour, in practice the variables that express the "output" of the measurement. For example, a particle-detector (in our experiment, a photo-detector) could have the history space, $\Omega_I \equiv \{\checkmark, \times\}$; where \checkmark and \times are the two histories of the detector corresponding respectively to the two classically admissible outputs, 'click' and 'not-click'. In this case, the event algebra contains four instrument events $\mathcal{A}_I = \{\emptyset, \{\checkmark\}, \{\times\}, \{\checkmark, \times\}\}\}$, with the measures of the first and the last events being 0 and 1 respectively. The measure μ_{\checkmark} of the event $\{\checkmark\}$ gives the probability of detection, and we have $\mu_{\checkmark} + \mu_{\times} = 1$, provided that the detector functions perfectly.

Non-instrument events, on the other hand, are events that do not involve any instrument (specifically any detector). For example, the photonic events associated with a photon encountering a lossless optical beam splitter are such events, and the history space corresponding to

this episode in the photon's career can be taken to be $\Omega_{NI} \equiv \{\mathcal{T}, \mathcal{R}\}$, where \mathcal{T} and \mathcal{R} are the trajectories of the photon undergoing transmission or reflection through the BS, respectively. Non-instrument events can be made more and more complex by introducing more devices with multiple output ports in the path of the system.

The classification into instrument and system events is not intended to be either precise or exhaustive. For one thing, microscopic events happen within instruments as well as outside them, but such events are of secondary interest as long as the functioning of the instrument can be taken for granted, being deemed not to be in need of a detailed analysis.

Although system events are not directly observed, they can often be inferred from suitable instrument events. Whether a photon was transmitted or reflected from an optical beam splitter remains unknown to us until a detector registers the photon either in the transmitting port or in the reflecting port of the beam splitter. It's well to recall, however, that this kind of deduction is only justified to the extent that the detector has high efficiency, because a dark count in the detector can falsely imply the presence of the photon. Deducing the occurrence of a non-instrument event from an instrument event relies on the assumption that there exists a perfect correlation between the two classes of events, an assumption that needs to be substantiated either by calibrating the instrument empirically, or by analyzing its functioning theoretically when this is possible.

An important subsidiary distinction between two different categories of system events will come into play in our experimental protocol. This is the distinction between serial events and non-serial events. Serial events include all those that could in principle be directly identified from a sequence of momentary instrument events, without the need for any quantum ancilla. More abstractly a serial event is one that can be identified mathematically with a sequence of projection operators, and thereby with a corresponding sequence of projective ideal measurements⁵. In contrast, a non-serial event is one whose occurrence cannot be revealed in this simple manner. Detection of such an event E seems to require the use of ancillas which obtain information on the path of the photon (say), and which subsequently are processed so as to retain only the precise amount of information encoded in the statement that "The event E has happened". Below we describe in detail an "event filter" which functions in this manner, namely the one realized in our experiment.

A practical example might help to clarify the distinction between serial and non-serial events. Consider a particle passing through two double slit diaphragms, one placed after the other, sep-

⁵It follows in particular that the quantum measure of such an event can never exceed unity.

arated by a finite gap. Let A_1 , B_1 represent the upper and lower slits in the first diaphragm, and A_2 , B_2 represent the same in the second diaphragm. The events like, $E_1 = \{A_1A_2, B_1A_2\}$ and $E_2 = \{A_1A_2, A_1B_2\}$, are then to be considered as serial events, as they can be detected simply by a placing an instrument (say a detecting screen) after the second diaphragm, while blocking the slit B_2 (for E_1) or B_1 (for E_2). In words, E_1 is the event that the photon traverses "either of the two slits in the first diaphragm and then the upper slit in the second diaphragm", and similarly for E_2 . Even more simply the event $E_3 = \{A_1B_2\}$ is also a serial event, because it answers to the phrase "upper slit in the first diaphragm and then lower slit in the second diaphragm". On the other hand the events, $E_3 = \{A_1A_2, B_1B_2\}$ and $E_4 = \{A_1B_2, B_1A_2\}$, are non-serial events, as they cannot be detected by masking any subset of the slits and then asking whether or not the photon has arrived at the final screen.

The serial events form, clearly, a very special category within the full event algebra of a system. The possibility to design event filters corresponding to system-events which are not serial opens up therefore a much greater range of possible measurements than is ordinarily contemplated. By dealing with all kinds of events, including non-serial events, quantum measure theory goes beyond ordinary QM in the direction where a better understanding of relativistic quantum field theory, and beyond that quantum gravity, appears to lie.

3 Experimetal Determination of Quantum Measure of a Photonic Event

Here, we will analyze a two-site hopper in an optical setup, implemented using amplitude division. An optical implementation of the scheme for a photonic system is presented using the idea similar to two-site hopper [21]. We present the design of an experimental setup, allowing interference, that helps in filtering the desired set of histories and gives a non-classical quantum measure for the event of interest associated with the photonic system. Here, the system would be a photon passing though two beamsplitters (BS_1, BS_2) arranged in the form of an interferometer, either Mach-Zehnder Interferometer (MZI) or Displaced Sagnac Interferometer (DSI). A photon incident on a beamsplitter either gets transmitted or gets reflected, with the chance depending on the splitting ratio T:R of the beamsplitter ⁶. The history space for the photon can be defined as $\Omega^{(2,2)} = \{\mathcal{T}_1\mathcal{T}_2, \mathcal{T}_1\mathcal{R}_2, \mathcal{R}_1\mathcal{T}_2, \mathcal{R}_1\mathcal{R}_2\}$, where $\mathcal{R}_1\mathcal{T}_2$ represents the path of the photon undergoing reflection in first BS and transmission in second BS etc. Alternatively, it can be described as $\Omega = \{00, 01, 10, 11\}$ corresponding to the case when the upper and lower

⁶For a beam splitter, T and R respectively represents Transmissivity and Reflectivity of it, where T+R=1.

spatial modes of the photon after a BS are labelled as 0 and 1 respectively, as shown in Fig. 1.




Figure 1: A photon propagating through two optical beam splitters $BS_1(t_1, r_1, \varphi_1)$ and $BS_2(t_2, r_2, \varphi_2)$ arranged in the form of an interferometer with the mirrors M_1 and M_2 redirecting the paths of the photon from outputs of BS_1 to inputs of BS_2 .

Aim: The aim of the experiment is to infer the value of the quantum measure $\mu(E)$ for a specific non-serial hopper event $E = \{00, 01, 11\}$ associated with a photonic system.

Computing Measure in Ideal Scenario: Let, t_i and r_i respectively represents the transmission and reflection coefficients of i-th beamsplitter BS_i which is assumed to be lossless, giving $|t_i|^2 + |r_i|^2 = 1$. Assuming $\{t_i, r_i\} \in \mathbb{R}$ and a phase φ_i is acquired by the photon upon reflection, we get the possible amplitudes associated with the histories as $A(00) = r_1 e^{i\varphi_1} r_2 e^{i\varphi_2}$, $A(01) = r_1 e^{i\varphi_1} t_2$, $A(10) = t_1 t_2$, $A(11) = t_1 r_2 e^{i\varphi_2}$. Hence, from Eqn. 1 the quantum measure $\mu(E)$ for the event $E = \{00, 01, 11\}$ is obtained to be,

$$\mu(E) = |A(00)|^2 + |A(01) + A(11)|^2 \tag{2}$$

$$\mu(E) = \left| r_1 r_2 e^{i\varphi_1} e^{i\varphi_2} \right|^2 + \left| r_1 t_2 e^{i\varphi_1} + t_1 r_2 e^{i\varphi_2} \right|^2 \tag{3}$$

For symmetric lossless 50 : 50 beamsplitters $t_i = r_i = \frac{1}{\sqrt{2}}$ and $\varphi_i = \frac{\pi}{2}$, the value of measure is obtained to be,

$$\mu(E) = \left| \frac{i}{\sqrt{2}} \frac{i}{\sqrt{2}} \right|^2 + \left| \frac{i}{\sqrt{2}} \frac{1}{\sqrt{2}} + \frac{1}{\sqrt{2}} \frac{i}{\sqrt{2}} \right|^2 = \frac{1}{4} + 1 = \frac{5}{4} = 1.25$$
 (4)

Thus, for an ideal system device combination, the value of measure associated with the event E takes a value beyond the classical-quantum limit, $\mu_{cq} = 1$.

Experimental Setup: In this experiment, we have used laser light for the demonstration of the working principle of an optical event filter modeled for a photonic system passing through a beam splitter BS twice within a Displaced Sagnac geometry, as can be seen from the Fig. 2. Though the concept of an Event filter strictly applies to a single photon, where detection of a photon at the end would confirm the occurrence of the event. However, the result of the experiment here depends on the phenomena of quantum interference and determination of probability of the desired event, both of which are described for an ensemble and can not be obtained from a single particle. Since, the average statistical properties of light are equivalent for an ensemble of discrete photons and for a coherent beam [22], the obtained value of quantum measure using a laser light source would be the same as the one obtained using a stream of single photons. Also, the Displaced Sagnac geometry (where the system encounters same device twice) is chosen, over the Mach-Zehnder geometry (where the system encounters two identical devices) in order to make the interferometer setup robust against the external vibrations. Any external vibration affects the two individual paths of the MZI differently, causing the path-difference and as a consequence, the relative phase between the two interfering beams (here, 01 and 11) to change over time that alters the interference intensity to be recorded at the end.




Figure 2: Experimental Design of the event filter for the event $E = \{00, 01, 11\}$ associated with a photonic system. The system is allowed to pass through a 2 inch beam splitter BS_1 twice inside the Displaced Sagnac Interferometer (DSI) setup aligned in collinear geometry. The path d.o.f. of photon would be considered to label the histories and the polarization d.o.f. of photon would be considered as an effective ancilla, operations on which would filter out the desired event. Measurement of the intensities of the beams at the input and the output of the setup, would allow us to determine the value of quantum measure associated with E.

Light at wavelength $\lambda=810~nm$ emitting from a narrow bandwidth (linewidth typically <300~kHz) diode laser [Toptica DL Pro] is used as the source for this experiment. The laser beam is coupled to a FC/PC to FC/APC Polarization Maintaining Single Mode Fiber (PMSMF) [P5-780PM-FC-2, Thorlabs] to (i) maintain the polarization while the beam propagates through the fiber, thus reducing the power fluctuation after any polarization optics, (ii) to reduce the pointing fluctuation about the transverse plane of the beam as compare to the bare beam, (iii) to get the spatial mode at the output of the fiber as much Gaussian as possible [?]. The beam is collimated using an adjustable fiber collimator [CFC11P-B, Thorlabs] ensuring the beam divergence to be less than 1 mrad and is redirected towards the DSI. A Glan Thompson Polarizer⁷ (GT) [GTH5M-B, Thorlabs] with the optic axis oriented to transmit

⁷A Glan Thompson polarizer transmits the s-polarized component of beam (the e-ray) and reflects the

the horizontal component of polarization ($|H\rangle$), is placed in the path of the beam from the Collimator to the DSI in order to achieve high degree in polarization purity.

The horizontally polarized beam after the GT is made incident on the beam splitter BS_1 [20BC17MB.2, Newport] which forms the Displaced Sagnac interferometer (DSI) with the mirrors M_T , M_R and M_M (all of them are [5122, Newport]). Let, the paths associated with anticlockwise and clockwise direction of propagation of the beam inside the interferometer are named as path-A and path-C respectively, giving the state at BS_1 just after the single pass to be $|\Psi_1\rangle = \frac{1}{\sqrt{2}}(|A\rangle^{(0)}+i|C\rangle^{(1)})|H\rangle$ 8. The relative phase between the two paths of the interferometer is controlled by tilting a Glass Plate GP [WG40530, Thorlabs] in path-A. In one of the paths (here in path-C) of the interferometer a half-wave plate (HWP_1) [WPO02-H-810-UM, NewlightPhotonics] is placed with its fast axis oriented at 45° with respect to the horizontal that realizes the σ_x evolution operator. Thus, the state at BS_1 just before the second pass becomes, $|\Psi_2\rangle = \frac{1}{\sqrt{2}}(e^{i\varphi_g}|A\rangle^{(0)}|H\rangle + i|C\rangle^{(1)}|V\rangle$). Any polarization measurement in the basis $\{|H\rangle, |V\rangle\}$ at one of the port of the DSI can give the information about the path of the photon inside the interferometer. The state at BS_1 after second pass becomes $|\Psi_3\rangle = \frac{1}{2}(e^{i\varphi_g}|U\rangle^{(00)}|H\rangle + i^2|U\rangle^{(10)}|V\rangle + ie^{i\varphi_g}|L\rangle^{(01)}|H\rangle + i|L\rangle^{(11)}|V\rangle$, where $|U\rangle$ and $|L\rangle$ respectively represents the paths corresponding to upper and lower output ports of DSI.

After the DSI, actions on the polarization d.o.f. are performed to make the two histories 01 and 11 interfere, select the paths 00,01 and 11 and recombine them to ensure any detection at the position of PM as shown in Fig. 2 corresponds the occurrence of the event E. A polarizing beamsplitter PBS_1 [PBS_122 , Thorlabs] placed in path-U reflects the history 10 away from the setup and a half-wave plate HWP_2 [$RZQ_2.15L.0810$, B. Halle] and PBS (PBS_2) [PBS_122 , Thorlabs] combination placed in path-L makes the two histories 01,11 interfere which otherwise have orthogonal polarizations. HWP_2 has its fast axis oriented at 22.5° with respect to the horizontal that physically realizes a Hadamard operator that transforms { $|H\rangle$, $|V\rangle$ } basis to { $|+\rangle$, $|-\rangle$ } basis 9 . Another half-wave plate HWP_3 [$RZQ_2.15L.0810$, B. Halle] as σ_x operator and a 50 : 50 beamsplitter BS_2 [BS005, Thorlabs] placed in the upper arm ensures the beam from the 00 path ends up at PM without any bias associated it.

⁹Here,
$$|+\rangle = \frac{1}{\sqrt{2}}(|H\rangle + |V\rangle)$$
 and $|-\rangle = \frac{1}{\sqrt{2}}(|H\rangle - |V\rangle)$

p-polarized component of beam (the o-ray) of any unpolarized beam incident on it.

⁸The superscripts on the spatial modes of the system give the path information, upper and lower paths being labelled as 0 and 1 respectively

Data Acquision and Analysis: The DSI is aligned in the collinear configuration, with a back-aligned GP being present in one of the paths (here, path - A). Next, the event filter is setup by placing different polarization optics at different locations keeping in mind that only the beams from 00,01,11 paths needs to be detected at the output and the beams from 01 and 11 needs to be made to interfere. Using a power meter sensor PM [sensor: S121C, Thorlabs, meter: PM100D, Thorlabs] (or a detector) the powers are recorded (i) at the input to the setup i.e., after the GT (labelled as P_I) and (ii) at the output of the event filter (labelled as P_E) when beams from 01 and 11 paths interfere constructively. Constructive interference is ensured by tuning the tilt of the GP in small steps while observing the power at the output and fixing it at an angle that corresponds to maximum power. Other than P_I and P_E , the powers P_{int} , P_{01} , P_{11} , P_{00} are monitored at the output of the event filter with (path - U), (path - U), path - C) and (path - U), (path - A), (path - L) being blocked respectively, in order to get an idea about the interferometric phase fluctuation and individual power fluctuations over time.

Experimental data is always associated with some real limitations, imperfections, noise, fluctuations, losses etc. In optical experiments there are always some losses associated with absorption in the material of the optical element. Imperfections in the optical components being used, like deviation in the splitting ratio (T:R) of the beamsplitters from the quoted value, the polarization dependent reflection¹⁰ from mirrors and beamsplitters, the extinction ratio of the polarization optics, the surface quality of the components etc., modifies the outcome of the experiment. Further, there are systematic instrumental errors, like the nonlinear behavior of the power meter sensor, which are a matter of characterization. The lab conditions i.e., temperature, pressure, humidity, air current etc impacts the optical alignment and the experimental data, causing a deviation in the experimental result from the theoretical value computed considering ideal conditions. Additionally, in an interferometric experiment, the phase instability inside the interferometer, wavefront distortion of the beam, beam wander of the two overlapping beams etc., will also lead to experimental errors. Hence, the experimental data needs to be analyzed accounting for the potential sources of non-idealnesses while providing feasible corrections for some parameters depending on the degree it affects the experiment.

Experimental Distribution of "Measure": Experimentally the the distribution of the value of quantum measure $\mu_{exp}(E)$ for the event E is inferred from the experimentally obtained probability of occurrence of the event $\mathcal{P}_{exp}(E)$, where the probability is to be determined from the ratio of the powers obtained at the output (P_E) and input (P_I) of the event filter, provided both

¹⁰In most of the optical elements $R_s \neq R_p$, i.e., the reflectivity is not the same for s- and p- polarizations and adds a relative phase between s- and p-polarized components making the beam elliptically polarized.

the powers are measured simultaneously and remain unchanged over the time. However, the powers P_E and P_I , recorded at different times can not, in general, be combined to compute the probability because the powers have some random fluctuations along with some systematic and periodic drifts over time. Depending on the acquisition time some random fluctuations (even some high frequency oscillations) in power can be averaged out, but the effect due to the drift in power would remain, that would introduce an error to the experimentally obtained quantity $\mathcal{P}_{exp}(E)$ propagating to $\mu_{exp}(E)$. To minimize the uncertainty from power fluctuation, small time scale ($\approx 100s$) statistics pE and pI are drawn randomly from the long time data P_E and P_I respectively and the probability is determined as the mean of the ratio pE/pI. The process is repeated for 10^5 times to get the probability distribution $\mathcal{P}_{exp}(E)$. This distribution is corrected accounting for the absorption loss in the thickness of the material (also due to reflection of a fraction of the beam from surface) of the 2 inch beamsplitter BS_1 , that significantly reduces P_E .

The transmittance $\eta_s = 0.9356$ of BS_1^{11} is determined experimentally from the recorded data P_I, P_T, P_R as, $\eta_s = \frac{P_T + P_R}{P_I} = T_{abs} + R_{abs}^{12}$, where P_I is the power of the beam incident on BS_1 , P_T and P_R are respectively the powers of the beams transmitted and reflected from BS_1 . The corrected distribution of probability in this setup, where the system encounters BS_1 twice would be,

$$\mathcal{P}_{exp}^{(c)}(E) = \frac{\mathcal{P}_{exp}(E)}{\eta_s^2} \tag{5}$$

Upon determining $\mathcal{P}_{exp}^{(c)}(E)$, the distribution of quantum measure for E is obtained by multiplying it with the loss factor associated with the design of the event filter. In the setup for the event filter, making 01, 11 paths interfere using HWP_2 and PBS_2 combination and the presence of BS_2 in path 00 redirects half of the intensity associated with the event, away from the setup, giving the loss factor to be 2. These systems can not reach the detector, though they actually belong to the event E after travelling twice through the E. Hence, the quantum measure associated with an event E is obtained as $\mu(E) = 2\mathcal{P}_{exp}^{(c)}(E)$.

Theoretical Expectation of "Measure": The theoretical formula given in Eqn. 2 computes the value of the quantum measure for the event $E = \{00, 01, 11\}$ of a photonic system to be $\mu_{th}^{ideal} = 1.25$, considering ideal system, devices and laboratory conditions. Any loss in any part of the setup would reduce the amplitudes associated with different paths which would effectively lower the value of quantum measure obtained experimentally. Also, the computation of μ_{th}^{ideal} considers constructive interference between the paths 01 and 11, i.e., the relative phase between

¹¹average overall transmission through the beamsplitter

 $^{^{12}}$ For BS_1 , The absolute Transmissivity and Reflectivity are obtained as, $T_{abs} = 49.21\%$ and $R_{abs} = 44.34\%$.

the two paths of the interferometer to be $\varphi = 0$. Hence, any variation in phase from zero would only reduce the obtained interference intensity and effectively reduce the value of $\mu(E)$. Therefore, it is important to have an estimation of the range within which the experimentally obtained quantity would lie, given the non-ideal laboratory setting.

For event $E = \{00, 01, 11\}$, the modified theoretical expression for measure considering the effect of different parameters associated with the experiment is given as,

$$\mu_{\varphi}^{e}(E) = |A_{e}(00)|^{2} + |A_{e}(01) + \exp(i\varphi)A_{e}(11)|^{2}$$
(6)

The second term in the above expression represents the interference intensity of 01,11 beams in presence of interferometric phase variation. The amplitudes $A_e(\gamma)$ for different paths γ are computed considering the transmission of the system through the optical components present in the respective paths in the setup. This includes taking into account the overall transmission factor (η) through the components, splitting ratio T:R ratio of the beamsplitters, the extinction ratio of the polarization optics, possible changes in the polarization due to the HWP misalignment¹³, and polarization dependent reflectivity $R_p \neq R_s$ of the mirrors used etc.. The variation in the relative phase φ is determined as,

$$\varphi = \arccos\left(\frac{I(\varphi) - I_1 - I_2}{2\sqrt{I_1 I_2}}\right) \tag{7}$$

provided the following condition is satisfied,

$$I(\varphi) \le I_1 + I_2 + 2\sqrt{I_1 I_2}$$
 (8)

Here, the intensities $I(\varphi)$, I_1 and I_2 are respectively determined from the recorded power data P_{int} , P_{01} and P_{11} . A distribution for the phase Φ is obtained by choosing samples randomly from $I(\varphi)$, I_1 and I_2 , and determining φ for which the criteria in Eqn. 8 is satisfied. Since, determination of the phase depends on the distribution of the powers, Φ does not only represent the phase variation, but possible effect due to power fluctuation as well. The distribution Φ and distribution of the amplitudes $A_e(00)$, $A_e(01)$, $A_e(11)$ associated with the inherent uncertainty in the parameters of the real components, gives a range of possible $\mu_{\varphi}^e(E)$ values resulting in a distribution $\mu_{th}(E)$, for the event E.

 $^{^{13}}$ The uncertainty associated with the HWP orientation, here, is related to the random detection noises and random power variations as the fast axis of a HWP is not aligned looking at the label of the rotation mounts but from the observation of powers at the output ports of a PBS placed after it.

4 Results and Significance

The histogram plot for the experimentally obtained distribution of measure $\mu_{exp}(E)$ for the event $E = \{00, 01, 11\}$ of the photonic system is shown in the above plot. The distribution is asymmetric in nature, with the asymmetry mostly arising from the systematic temporal drifts of the power data P_E and P_I , recorded at different times, that are used in the determination of μ_{exp} . Since $\mu_{exp}(E)$ is not a Normal distribution, the standard deviation can not be considered as the measure of spread of the data and median instead of mean would be a better choice to describe the measure of central tendency of the distribution. The uncertainty of the distribution would be defined as the range for the 68.26% confidence interval and would be given by σ_{\pm} , where σ_{+} and σ_{-} respectively represents the range of 84.13th and 15.87th percentiles of the data with respect to the median. For the event $E = \{00, 01, 11\}$, we report the experimentally obtained value of measure to be $\mu_e(E)$: 1.172 $^{+0.013}_{-0.019}$. The 68.26%, 95.44% and 99.74% confidence intervals (CI) associated with the 1σ , 2σ and 3σ of the distribution, are presented with three different shaded regions in the plot. The theoretical expectation of measure under ideal lab conditions is shown with a red line at $\mu^{(ideal)}(E) = 1.25$. Considering imperfections, losses, power fluctuation, phase variation and other uncertainties associated with different parameters that can impact the experimental outcome, the value of the expected measure is obtained to be $1.182^{+0.013}_{-0.011}$, representing the median and $\pm 1\sigma$ error of the distribution $\mu_{th}(E)$. The vertical blue line and the blue band in the plot respectively represent the median and the 1σ uncertainty of $\mu_{th}(E)$. This blue band can be considered as theoretical uncertainty band.




Figure 3: Quantum Measure associated with an event $E = \{00, 01, 11\}$ for a photonic system.

Considering only the effects of the real optical components present in the paths and disregarding the power and phase fluctuations while assuming $\varphi = 0$, the theoretically expected value of measure for the event $E = \{00, 01, 11\}$ is obtained to be 1.2095 ± 0.0015 . Next, considering the effects of real components and the power variation while ignoring phase fluctuation, the expected theoretical value of measure is computed to be $1.1981^{+0.0084}_{-0.0075}$ from the expression below,

$$\mu_{\varphi=0}^{e}(E) = I_e(00) + I_e(01) + I_e(11) + 2\sqrt{I_e(01)} I_e(11)$$
(9)

Here, the intensities $I_e(\gamma)$ are obtained from the experimentally recorded data, P_{00} , P_{01} , P_{11} from the following expression,

$$I_e(\gamma) = \frac{2}{\eta_s^2} \left(\frac{P_\gamma}{P_I}\right) \tag{10}$$

Statistical significance analysis of the data μ_e obtained from the experimental distribution $\mu_{exp}(E)$ revealed that μ_e is 13.32 standard deviation away from the maximum value of 1 for the classical probability measure $(\mu_{C(max)})$, implying that the quantity μ_e does not belong to

the classical measure space and is instead non-classical in nature. Next, the experimentally obtained quantity μ_e is also found to be within 0.52 standard deviations of the theoretical value of measure μ_t computed within the framework of Quantum Measure Theory (QMT), suggesting that the quantity μ_e can be considered to belong to the quantum measure space. Now, unlike classical measure space, quantum measure space allows for interference that causes the measures to go beyond the classical-quantum boundary (μ_{eq}) and take values greater than one.

5 Discussion:

In an experiment that begins with a "preparation" and ends with a "registration", these two events are "initial" and "final" only to the extent that we agree to ignore events which took place either earlier than the first or later than the second; this we ordinarily do for the sake of simplicity. But why should we ignore as well those events that happened at "in-between" times? Even if, for the sake of argument, we grant that such *in-between* events are inaccessible to observation, they nevertheless acquire a meaning in the context of history-based frameworks such as quantum measure theory.

Consider for example the particular event E which is the subject of our experiment, and whose verbal description could be "the photon did not follow path 00". The known initial and final locations of the photon do not by themselves determine whether or not E happened, but that does not mean that nothing can be said on the matter. In a stochastic world, one would not expect to be able to deduce with certainty whether E happened, but what theory does provide in the classical case is a probability for E to have happened. In the quantum case, it provides a kind of "non-classical probability" for E: its quantum measure, which in the present case is $\mu(E) = 5/4$.

But how exactly is one to understand the physical meaning of this number? On being presented for the first time with the concept of quantum measure, someone might well ask whether $\mu(E)$ has any direct experimental significance outside of the special case where E is an instrument-event and $\mu(E)$ can therefore be interpreted as a classical probability.

If, as we hope, theoretical developments based on the quantum measure can help to resolve the interpretational paradoxes of quantum mechanics (if μ can find a role in a more complete description of the micro-world), this would amply answer the question being raised. We are not there yet, but a big step in that direction would be any way to put $\mu(E)$ on a more immediate experimental footing. A procedure to do precisely that is what reference [7] provided. Indeed, it showed, via the concept of *event filter*, how to bring not only the *measure* of an event, but also in a certain sense the *event* concept itself, into direct contact with experiment. In effect, it put forward two main claims, the first of them being that the *quantum measure* can in fact be measured experimentally.

To that end, it presented a class of protocols that would allow one to ascertain the quantum measure $\mu(E)$ for an arbitrary event E, including events like the one treated in this paper, whose measure exceeds unity and therefore admits of no interpretation as a probability in the classical sense. Moreover, this event appears to correspond to no selfadjoint operator, and it also seems impossible to determine its measure by any sequence of simple measurements of projective or POVM type.

Our table-top experiment has carried through a model inspired from the proposal presented in [7] in one particular case by designing and realizing a filter for the event we have been calling E. This filter correctly determined the measure to be 5/4 within experimental error ¹⁴, and in particular to be greater than 1 with a statistical significance of 13.32σ . Although our experiment employs laser light as the source, its results would apply equally to an ensemble of single photons, because an interference pattern generated from a coherent source of light (exhibiting wave nature) is equivalent to the average pattern produced by an ensemble of single photons (exhibiting corpuscular nature) [22]

The second main claim implicit in reference [7] is that the event-filters proposed therein are, in a well-defined sense, non-destructive (exactly as the name "filter" suggests). By this we mean that when the detector "clicks", the resulting "collapsed wave function" of the system (in this case the photon) is whatever results when one evolves the initial wave function by summing over precisely those paths which correspond to the event E. (In particular, the interference terms between pairs of these paths are not disturbed.)¹⁵ Because it ends up destroying the photon, our experiment could not address this second claim, but a pair of relatively simple modifications would allow it to do so.

Firstly, in order to avoid destroying the photon, one could (in the spirit of a negative-result measurement) remove the detector from the main output port and instead install complemen-

 $^{^{14}}$ Our experiment uses only commonly employed pieces of experimental apparatus, and it would not be difficult to predict its outcome by the ordinary procedure of evolving a state-vector via the Schrödinger equation. However, such a computation would fail utterly to bring out how the measurement acts as a filter for a very simple and definite "in-between" event E – a set of three photon trajectories.

¹⁵In this way, one obtains a technique for state-preparation that might conceivably be useful in applications like quantum computing.

tary detectors on all the remaining output ports. A positive outcome or "click" would then be signalled by these detectors *not registering* the photon, which therefore would survive to be subjected to further tests.

Secondly, one would need to replace the laser with a single-photon source so that the distinction between "click" and "no click" would become meaningful. This modification to the setup would be straightforward, but it would make the collection of adequate statistics more tedious and would require a re-consideration of the loss factor depending on the detection efficiency of the single-photon detectors.

Finally, in order to test whether the event filter was functioning as claimed, one would need to incorporate, downstream from the filter per se, some type of "state tomograph" designed to verify that the effective state of the emergent photon was the one determined by the propagation-amplitudes exhibited in equation 9.

Imagine then that these modifications have been made and the experiment carried out. What will we have learned thereby about the micro-world? At an intuitive level, one would like to believe that when "the detector clicks", it is informing us that event E has actually happened. Appealing as it is, this conclusion must remain in abeyance until the notorious "quantum foundational" puzzles are more fully resolved than they are at present. However, if it is ultimately upheld it will answer, in the particular case of our experiment, the question this paper began with: "What are we measuring when we perform a quantum measurement?".

6 Conclusion

The paper presents an experimental demonstration that determines the "quantum measure" of a particular photonic event and establishes the *non-classical* nature of the derived quantity through hypothesis testing and statistical significance analysis. The experiment is performed by devising a toy-model of the ancilla based event filter setup, which employs an optical arrangement to select the photon paths as histories and manipulates the polarization of photons to extract the desired histories associated with the chosen event. According to the original proposal, this could demonstrate a non-destructive procedure to infer the intermediate process that a micro-system undergoes during its evolution from preparation to detection.

The experiment reports a median value of the quantum measure for an event $E = \{01, 10, 11\}$ as 1.172, which is claimed to be non-classical with an evidence of it being 13.32 standard devia-

tions away from the maximum value permissible for the classical probability measure (which is 1). The experimental result aligns within one standard deviation of the theoretical estimation of the quantum measure, analyzed considering the laboratory conditions and the experimental imperfections. This signifies the experimentally obtained quantity belonging to the quantum measure space that incorporates interference. The experiment attempts to provide an empirical foundation for the theoretical framework discussed so far, paving the way for future studies on quantum foundations.

Mapping the theoretical elements to the experimental scenario aids in providing a concrete description of non-classical behavior and brings us a step closer to answering the foundational questions. The proposed theory, which extends the scope of measurement by attributing probabilities beyond those defined by the Born rules to certain non-instrument events that are experimentally inaccessible by conventional quantum measurements, could potentially lead to the design of innovative quantum circuits involving such events. This opens up new opportunities in the field of quantum computing and quantum information protocols.

7 Acknowledgements

US is grateful for the hospitality of Perimeter Institute where part of this work was carried out. Research at Perimeter Institute is supported in part by the Government of Canada through the department of Innovation, Science and Economic Development Canada and by the Province of Ontario through the Ministry of Economic Development, Job Creation and Trade. This research was also supported in part by the Simons Foundation through the Simons Foundation Emmy Noether Fellowship Program at Perimeter Institute. U.S. also acknowledges partial support provided by the Ministry of Electronics and Information Technology (MeitY), Government of India under a grant for Centre for Excellence in Quantum Technologies with Ref. No. 4(7)/2020-ITEA as well as partial support from the QuEST-DST Project Q-97 of the Government of India.

References

- [1] A. J. Leggett. Experimental approaches to the quantum measurement paradox. Foundations of Physics, 18(9):939–952, 1988.
- [2] A J Leggett. Realism and the physical world. Reports on Progress in Physics, 71(2):022001, jan 2008.

- [3] Yakir Aharonov, David Z. Albert, and Lev Vaidman. How the result of a measurement of a component of the spin of a spin-1/2 particle can turn out to be 100. *Phys. Rev. Lett.*, 60:1351–1354, Apr 1988.
- [4] A. Matzkin. Weak values from path integrals. Phys. Rev. Res., 2:032048, August 2020.
- [5] Rafael D. Sorkin. Quantum mechanics as quantum measure theory. *Modern Physics Letters* A, 09(33):3119–3127, 1994.
- [6] Stanley P. Gudder and Rafael D. Sorkin. Two-site quantum random walk. *General Relativity and Gravitation*, 43(12):3451–3475, Dec 2011.
- [7] Álvaro Mozota Frauca and Rafael Dolnick Sorkin. How to measure the quantum measure. *International Journal of Theoretical Physics*, 56(1):232–258, jan 2017.
- [8] Nicolaas P. Landsman. Born Rule and its Interpretation, pages 64–70. Springer Berlin Heidelberg, Berlin, Heidelberg, 2009.
- [9] Wendell H. Furry. Conference on the foundations of quantum mechanics. 1962.
- [10] Matthew Leifer. Is the quantum state real? an extended review of ψ -ontology theorems. Quanta, 3(1):67–155, 2014.
- [11] Wojciech H. Zurek. Decoherence and the Transition from Quantum to Classical. *Physics Today*, 44(10):36–44, 10 1991.
- [12] George F.R. Ellis. On the limits of quantum theory: Contextuality and the quantum–classical cut. *Annals of Physics*, 327(7):1890–1932, 2012. July 2012 Special Issue.
- [13] R. P. Feynman. Space-time approach to non-relativistic quantum mechanics. *Rev. Mod. Phys.*, 20:367–387, Apr 1948.
- [14] Sukanya Sinha and Rafael D. Sorkin. A sum-over-histories account of an epr(b) experiment. Foundations of Physics Letters, 4(4):303–335, Aug 1991.
- [15] James B. Hartle. The spacetime approach to quantum mechanics. *Vistas in Astronomy*, 37:569–583, 1993.
- [16] Roger Penrose. On the gravitization of quantum mechanics 1: Quantum state reduction. Foundations of Physics, 44(5):557–575, jan 2014.
- [17] C. J. Isham and N. Linden. Quantum temporal logic and decoherence functionals in the histories approach to generalized quantum theory. *Journal of Mathematical Physics*, 35(10):5452–5476, 10 1994.

- [18] Rafael D. Sorkin. On the Role of Time in the Sum Over Histories Framework for Gravity. *Int. J. Theor. Phys.*, 33:523–534, 1994.
- [19] Rafael D. Sorkin. Quantum measure theory and its interpretation, 1997.
- [20] J. B. Hartle. Quantum kinematics of spacetime. ii. a model quantum cosmology with real clocks. *Phys. Rev. D*, 38:2985–2999, Nov 1988.
- [21] Stanley P. Gudder and Rafael D. Sorkin. Two-site quantum random walk. *General Relativity and Gravitation*, 43(12):3451–3475, Dec 2011.
- [22] E. C. G. Sudarshan. Equivalence of semiclassical and quantum mechanical descriptions of statistical light beams. *Phys. Rev. Lett.*, 10:277–279, Apr 1963.