

6. R. B. Griffiths: Consistent resolution of some relativistic quantum paradoxes. *Phys. Rev. A* **66**, 062101 (2002)
7. R. B. Griffiths: Bohmian mechanics and consistent histories. *Phys. Lett. A* **261**, 227 (1999)
8. R. B. Griffiths: Probabilities and quantum reality: are there correlata? *Found. Phys.* **33**, 1423 (2003).

## Copenhagen Interpretation

See ► Born rule; Consistent Histories; Metaphysics in Quantum Mechanics; Non-locality; Orthodox Interpretation; Schrödinger’s Cat; Transactional Interpretation.

## Correlations in Quantum Mechanics

*Richard Healey*

The statistical algorithm of quantum mechanics predicts that measurements will reveal correlations among the values of magnitudes (“► observables”). Whenever such measurements have been performed, they have borne out the predictions. But the patterns exhibited by these correlations can be difficult to square with classical intuitions – about probability, about the nature and properties of quantum systems, and about causal connections between systems.

In a ► Hilbert space formulation, an observable is represented by a ► self-adjoint operator, while the state of a system is represented by a normalized vector (perhaps a ► wave function) or more generally a ► density operator  $\hat{W}$  (a self-adjoint operator with unit trace). If  $\{O_1, \dots, O_n\}$  is a set of observables on a system represented by pairwise commuting operators  $\{\hat{O}_1, \dots, \hat{O}_n\}$ , then quantum mechanics predicts that measured values of all these observables in state  $\hat{W}$  will conform to a joint probability distribution  $pr(O_1 \in \Delta_1, \dots, O_n \in \Delta_n)$  given by

$$pr(O_1 \in \Delta_1, \dots, O_n \in \Delta_n) = Tr \left[ \hat{W} \hat{O}_1(\Delta_1) \dots \hat{O}_n(\Delta_n) \right] \quad (1)$$

where  $\hat{O}_i(\Delta_i)$  is the element of the spectral resolution of  $\hat{O}_i$  corresponding to Borel set  $\Delta_i$  of possible values ( $i = 1, \dots, n$ ). If any two operators  $\hat{O}_i, \hat{O}_j$  in such a set fail to commute, then no joint distribution is predicted.

For example, a simple quantum mechanical model of a Hydrogen atom ► Bohr’s atom model will predict a joint probability distribution for energy, total angular momentum, and  $z$ -component of angular momentum in any state; but it will never predict a joint probability distribution for energy, position and momentum, nor for  $z$ -component and  $x$ -component of angular momentum.