

PART III

INTERPRETATION


*What's the most resilient parasite?
A bacteria? A virus? An intestinal worm??*

An Idea!

*Resilient, highly contagious.
Once an idea has taken hold of the brain it's
almost impossible to eradicate.*

*Cobb
Inception*

The complications in the interpretation of quantum theory come from the interpretation of probabilities occurring in quantum theory. We follow Adan Cabello's classification of the various interpretations of quantum mechanics [21]. Interpretations of quantum theory can be broadly classified according to whether they view probabilities of measurement outcomes as determined or not by intrinsic properties of the observed system.



Depending on the choice of interpretation of quantum states, the physical meaning of experiments is interpreted differently. So, questions like what is quantum theory about, what is the meaning of quantum entanglement, what does teleportation means, etc. depend on the choice of interpretation of quantum states.

1 | ψ -ONTIC INTERPRETATIONS

2 | ψ -EPISTEMIC INTERPRETATIONS

3 | ψ -DOXASTIC INTERPRETATIONS

4 | OTHER EPISTEMIC INTERPRETATIONS

REFERENCES

- [1] H HALVORSON, To Be a Realist about Quantum Theory. 2018
- [2] R P KOSTECKI, Quantum theory as inductive inference. <http://arxiv.org/abs/1009.2423v4>, 2011
- [3] L BALLENTINE, Statistical Interpretation of Quantum Mechanics. *Rev. Mod. Phys.* 42, 358, 1970
- [4] C A FUCHS, A PERES, Quantum Theory Needs No ‘Interpretation’. *Physics Today* 53, 3, 70, 2000
- [5] C A FUCHS, Quantum Mechanics as Quantum Information (and only a little more). <https://arxiv.org/abs/quant-ph/0205039>, 2002
- [6] C A FUCHS, N D MERMIN, R SCHACK, An Introduction to QBism with an Application to the Locality of Quantum Mechanics. <https://arxiv.org/abs/1311.5253>, 2013
- [7] A BARZEGAR, QBism Is Not So Simply Dismissed. *Foundations of Physics*, <https://doi.org/10.1007/s10701-020-00347-3>, 2020
- [8] R CLIFTON, J BUB, H HALVORSON, Characterizing Quantum Theory in terms of Information-Theoretic Constraints. <https://arxiv.org/abs/quant-ph/0211089>, 2002
- [9] J A WHEELER, Information, physics, quantum: the search for links, *Proceedings of the 3rd International Symposium on Quantum Mechanics*, 354-368, Tokyo, 1989
- [10] J A WHEELER, “On recognizing ‘law without law,’ ” Oersted Medal Response at the joint APS-AAPT Meeting, New York, 25 January 1983, *American Journal of Physics* 51, 398, <https://aapt.scitation.org/doi/10.1119/1.13224>, 1983
- [11] C ROVELLI, Relational Quantum Mechanics. <https://arxiv.org/abs/quant-ph/9609002>, 1996
- [12] C ROVELLI, Agency in Physics. <https://arxiv.org/abs/2007.05300v2>, 2020
- [13] J PIENAAR, QBism and Relational Quantum Mechanics compared. <https://arxiv.org/abs/2108.13977v1>, 2021
- [14] J PIENAAR, Extending the Agent in QBism. <https://arxiv.org/abs/2004.14847v1>, 2020
- [15] H ZWIRN, Is the Past Determined?. *Found Phys* 51, 57. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s10701-021-00459-4>, 2021
- [16] R SPEKKENS, In defense of the epistemic view of quantum states: a toy theory. *Physical Review A* 75, 032110 <https://arxiv.org/abs/quant-ph/0401052>, 2007
- [17] R COLBECK, R RENNER, The completeness of quantum theory for predicting measurement outcomes. <https://arxiv.org/abs/1208.4123>, 2012
- [18] D SCHMID, J H SELBY, E WOLFE, R KUNJWAL, R W SPEKKENS, Characterization of Non-contextuality in the Framework of Generalized Probabilistic Theories. *PRX Quantum* 2, 010331 <http://dx.doi.org/10.1103/PRXQuantum.2.010331>, 2021
- [19] M PUSEY, J BARRETT, T RUDOLPH, On the reality of the quantum state. <https://arxiv.org/abs/1111.3328>, 2012
- [20] C A FUCHS, On Participatory Realism. <https://arxiv.org/abs/1601.04360>, 2016
- [21] A CABELLO, Interpretations of Quantum Theory: A Map of Madness. <http://arxiv.org/abs/1509.04711>, 2015
- [22] J BELL, Against Measurement. *Physics World*, vol. 3, p. 33, 2015
- [23] A PERES, Unperformed experiments have no results. *American Journal of Physics*, 1978
- [24] F HELLMANN, W KAMIŃSKI, R P KOSTECKI, Quantum collapse rules from the maximum

- relative entropy principle. *New J. Phys.* 18, 013022. <http://arxiv.org/abs/1407.7766>, 2016
- [25] R P KOSTECKI, Lüders' and quantum Jeffrey's rules as entropic projections. <https://arxiv.org/abs/1408.3502>, 2014
 - [26] S L ADLER, Why Decoherence has not Solved the Measurement Problem: A Response to P.W. Anderson. <http://arXiv.org/abs/quant-ph/0112095v3>, 2001
 - [27] H ZWIRN, The Measurement Problem: Decoherence and Convivial Solipsism. <https://arxiv.org/abs/1505.05029>, 2015
 - [28] E P WIGNER, Remarks on the mind-body question. In *Symmetries and Reflections*. pages 171–184. Indiana University Press, 1967
 - [29] Ć BRUKNER, On the quantum measurement problem, <https://arxiv.org/abs/1507.05255>, 2015
 - [30] D FRAUCHINGER, R RENNER, Quantum theory cannot consistently describe the use of itself. <https://arxiv.org/abs/1604.07422>, 2018
 - [31] M F PUSEY, An inconsistent friend. *Nature Phys* 14, 977–978. <https://doi.org/10.1038/s41567-018-0293-7>, 2018
 - [32] J BUB, Understanding the Frauchiger-Renner Argument. <http://arxiv.org/abs/2008.08538v2>, 2020
 - [33] J BUB, In Defense of a “Single-World” Interpretation of Quantum Mechanics. <http://arxiv.org/abs/1804.03267v1>, 2018
 - [34] J B DEBROTA, C A FUCHS, RÜDIGER SCHACK, Respecting One's Fellow: QBism's Analysis of Wigner's Friend. <https://arxiv.org/abs/2008.03572>, 2020
 - [35] P BLANCHARD, J FRÖHLICH, B SCHUBNEL A “Garden of Forking Paths” - the Quantum Mechanics of Histories of Events. <https://arxiv.org/abs/1603.09664>, 2010
 - [36] R B GRIFFITHS, Consistent Histories and the Interpretation of Quantum Mechanics. *J. Stat. Phys.* 36, 219–272, 1984
 - [37] R OMNES, *Quantum Philosophy*. Princeton University Press, 1999