

Updating Bohr's Complementarity Principle

Diego S. Starke^{1,*}, Marcos L. W. Basso^{2,†} and Jonas Maziero^{1,‡}

¹*Department of Physics, Center for Natural and Exact Sciences, Federal University of Santa Maria, Roraima Avenue 1000, Santa Maria, Rio Grande do Sul, 97105-900, Brazil*

²*Center for Natural and Human Sciences, Federal University of ABC, States Avenue 5001, Santo André, São Paulo, 09210-580, Brazil*

(Dated: May 10, 2024)

Bohr's complementarity principle has long been a fundamental concept in quantum mechanics, positing that, within a given experimental setup, a quantum system (or quanton) can exhibit either its wave-like character, denoted as W , or its particle-like character, denoted as P , but not both simultaneously. Modern interpretations of Bohr's complementarity principle acknowledge the coexistence of these aspects in the same experiment while introducing the constraint $W + P \leq \alpha$. Notably, estimations of W or P frequently rely on indirect retrodiction methods, a practice that has led to the claim of the violation of Bohr's complementarity principle. By taking a different route, recent advancements demonstrate that complementarity relations can be rigorously derived from the axioms of quantum mechanics under specific quantum state preparation conditions. To reconcile these observations and eliminate potential paradoxes or violations, we propose an updated formulation of Bohr's complementarity principle, which is stated as follows: *For a given quantum state preparation ρ_t at a specific instant of time t , the wave and particle behaviors of a quanton are constrained by a complementarity relation $W(\rho_t) + P(\rho_t) \leq \alpha(d)$, which is derived directly from the axioms of quantum mechanics.*

Keywords: Quantum Mechanics; Bohr's complementarity principle; Complementarity relations; Wave-particle duality

I. INTRODUCTION

At the 1927 International Congress of Physics in Como, Niels Bohr introduced his groundbreaking complementarity principle [1, 2], which has since become a cornerstone of quantum mechanics. According to Bohr's qualitative statement, quantum systems (or quantons) exhibit properties that are equally real but mutually exclusive within a given experimental setup, with the wave-particle duality serving as its most prominent illustration.

However, it was not until 1979 that the first quantitative formulation of Bohr's principle was put forward by Wootters and Zurek [3], rooted in an information-theoretic inequality. As succinctly stated by these authors, "the more clearly we wish to observe the wave nature of light, the more information we must give up about its particle properties".

Nearly a decade later, in 1988, Greenberger and Yasin [4] synthesized these two facets of quantons into a quantitative complementarity relation like $W + P \leq \alpha$ and expressed as

$$\mathcal{V}^2 + \mathcal{P}^2 \leq 1. \quad (1)$$

Here, $W = \mathcal{V}^2$ represents a quantifier of wave-like behavior, $P = \mathcal{P}^2$ represents a quantifier of particle-like behavior, and $\alpha = 1$. This inequality, applicable to a given experiment, encapsulates the idea that both wave and particle aspects can be observed in the same experimental setup, however there exists an inherent limitation on the extent to which they can manifest. As introduced by Greenberger and Yasin, interferometric

visibility \mathcal{V} is defined as

$$\mathcal{V} \equiv \frac{p_i^{\max} - p_i^{\min}}{p_i^{\max} + p_i^{\min}}. \quad (2)$$

This definition is applied to a Mach-Zehnder interferometer (MZI), with the index $i = 1, 2$ representing the detectors used to measure the maximum and minimum probabilities p_i when varying the phase within the phase shifter [4, 5].

For the particle-like measure, Greenberger and Yasin introduced predictability $\mathcal{P} \equiv |w_1 - w_2|$, where w_j represents the probability that a quanton follows the path j inside the interferometer. This quantification serves as a measure of *a priori* which-way information and it is related to the probability of correctly guessing the path of the quanton within the MZI. Notably, \mathcal{V} is intended to indirectly quantify W within the MZI through probabilities obtained using detectors positioned outside the MZI. Therefore, it is important to acknowledge that P and W , defined in this manner, depend on probabilities estimated at different instants of time.

Subsequently, Englert [6] extended the concept of a complementarity relation akin to Eq. (1) using \mathcal{V} as the quantifier of wave-like behavior and the distinguishability D as the quantifier of particle-like behavior. Distinguishability quantifies the which-way information that is available through the path detectors inserted into the arms of the MZI, effectively representing *a posteriori* path information. Notably, Englert's work expressed these wave-particle quantifiers as functions of the state preparation of the two-level quanton.

Over recent decades, there has been a growing interest in quantifying Bohr's complementarity principle through complementarity relations. The pioneer work by Dürr [7] and Englert et al. [8] laid the foundation for establishing fundamental properties that any quantifier of wave-like and particle-like behavior should satisfy. A significant development has been the formulation of complementarity relations for d -dimensional

*starkediego@gmail.com

†marcoslwbasso@hotmail.com

‡jonas.maziero@ufsm.br

quants, commonly referred to as qudits. This became possible as researchers recognized that quantum coherence [9] provides a natural extension of the wave-like aspect of a qudit [5, 10–12] and captures the essence of the wave-like behavior, i.e., the path superposition inside the interferometer [13]. Furthermore, a multitude of complementarity relations have emerged to account for the state preparation of the quantum system [10, 11, 14–19]. These complementarity relations are generally expressed in the form $W(\rho_t) + P(\rho_t) \leq \alpha(d)$, where $\alpha(d)$ is a constant that depends on the dimension d of the quanton and ρ_t is the density matrix associated with the system at time t . In this work, although it is always possible, we choose not to normalize these functions to make the dimension of the system explicit.

Motivated by these valuable contributions that have expanded the significance and generality of complementarity relations, a pioneering step forward was taken by introducing a procedure for deriving complementarity relations that quantitatively describe Bohr’s complementarity principle based on the fundamental postulates of quantum mechanics [19] and which satisfy the basic properties established in Refs. [7, 8]. This new approach explicitly utilizes the quantum state postulate. Built upon recent developments, we propose to review the formulation of Bohr’s complementarity principle in light of these complementarity relations. Our reformulation implies that the complementarity principle becomes an integral part of quantum mechanics, rather than a peripheral notion existing alongside it [20, 21]. Moreover, our proposal effectively tackles potential breaches of Bohr’s complementarity principle, as the Afshar’s experiment [22, 23], and resolves peculiar situations, as the Wheeler’s delayed choice experiment [13, 24].

The remainder of this article is organized as follows. In Sec. II, we review the procedure established in Ref. [19] in order to derive complementarity relations from the axioms of quantum mechanics and propose our reformulation of Bohr’s complementarity principle. Sec. III is reserved for the discussion of the different interferometric experiments, such as Afshar’s experiment and Wheeler’s delayed choice experiment, as well as two other experimental setups that highlight the subtlety of our reformulation of the complementarity principle. Finally, in Sec. IV, we give our conclusions.

II. UPDATING BOHR’S COMPLEMENTARITY PRINCIPLE

Let us briefly recall the set of density matrices acting on a Hilbert space \mathcal{H} , i.e., $\mathcal{D}(\mathcal{H}) \equiv \{\rho_t \in \mathcal{L}(\mathcal{H}) \mid \rho_t \geq 0, \text{Tr} \rho_t = 1\}$ where $\mathcal{L}(\mathcal{H})$ is the set of linear operators on \mathcal{H} . According to the quantum state postulate, for every quantum system associated with a Hilbert space \mathcal{H} , the quantum state of the system at any given time is described by a density matrix $\rho_t \in \mathcal{D}(\mathcal{H})$.

The procedure established in Ref. [19] starts with the selection of a wave-like quantifier that aligns with the fundamental properties mentioned above [7, 8], exemplified by any quantum coherence quantifier [9]. For instance, let us consider the l_1 -norm quantum coherence given by $C_{l_1}(\rho_t) = \sum_{j \neq k} |\rho_{jk}|$, where ρ_{jk} are the elements of the density operator ρ_t on a given

basis (such as the path basis in an interferometer). Subsequently, the properties of the density matrix are necessary to derive an upper bound for the wave-like measure in terms of the diagonal elements of the density matrix which correspond to probabilities. In our example, the property $\rho \geq 0 \Rightarrow |\rho_{jk}|^2 \leq \rho_{jj}\rho_{kk} \forall j, k$ which implies that

$$C_{l_1}(\rho_t) \leq \sum_{j \neq k} \sqrt{\rho_{jj}\rho_{kk}} \leq d - 1. \quad (3)$$

This, in turn, facilitates the identification of the corresponding predictability quantifier, since it has to be a function only of the diagonal elements of the density operator [7]. Hence, the inequality (3) suggests the following predictability quantifier: $P_{l_1}(\rho_t) = d - 1 - \sum_{j \neq k} \sqrt{\rho_{jj}\rho_{kk}}$. The final step involves determining the maximum value for both quantifiers, resulting in the desired complementarity inequality, which is expressed by

$$C_{l_1}(\rho_t) + P_{l_1}(\rho_t) \leq d - 1. \quad (4)$$

It is noteworthy that the complementarity relations obtained in Ref. [19] only saturate when applied to pure quantum states, i.e., in the case of a mixed quantum state described by the quantum state preparation ρ_t , the complementarity relations do not reach their upper bound. Notwithstanding, the way to achieve the saturation of a complementarity relation is to consider that the quantum system of interest, denoted as A , is part of a bipartite pure quantum system AB such that $\rho_t = \text{Tr}_B(|\Psi\rangle_{AB} \langle\Psi|)$, where $|\Psi\rangle_{AB}$ serve as a purification of ρ_t . Taking into account the entanglement between A and B , inequalities in complementarity relations like Eq. (4) can be transformed into equalities [25, 26]. These special complementarity relations are known as complete complementarity relations or triality relations [27–29].

In particular, a compelling theorem [26] was proved affirming that it is feasible to construct an entanglement monotone for a bipartite pure quantum system from any complementarity relation of the form $W(\rho_t) + P(\rho_t) \leq \alpha(d)$, which saturates only if ρ_t is pure and if the wave-like quantifier W and the predictability quantifier P satisfy the required properties established in Refs. [7, 8]. Then, the entanglement monotone has the form $E(\rho_t) = \alpha(d) - W(\rho_t) - P(\rho_t)$. This implies that it is always possible to complete such complementarity relation and, for instance, Eq. (4) can be transformed into an equality by introducing the entanglement monotone $E_{l_1}(\rho_t)$, expressed by

$$C_{l_1}(\rho_t) + P_{l_1}(\rho_t) + E_{l_1}(\rho_t) = d - 1, \quad (5)$$

where E_{l_1} is equal to the robustness of entanglement for global pure states [30]. Moreover, the combination of the predictability measure with the corresponding entanglement monotone can be regarded as a path distinguishability measure [31, 32], effectively serving as a particle-like measure determined by the *a priori* accessible information and entanglement with a path-marker [15]. It was demonstrated that an entanglement monotone can be constructed from the largest value of distinguishability and its corresponding predictability, provided

that the predictability satisfies the specified criteria [32]. This result effectively establishes a formal connection among various types of complementarity relations found in the existing literature.

In addition, it is worth mentioning that complete complementarity relations of type (5) exhibit invariance under global unitary operations [15, 33, 34], which have important implications. Namely: (i) It allows for the consistent tracking of the wave and particle aspects of the quanton at every time instant since the complete complementarity relations remain invariant under unitary evolution; (ii) It maintains its invariance under transformations of inertial reference frames in Minkowski spacetimes; (iii) It retains its invariance under transformations of local reference frames in curved spacetimes.

Grounded in these recent developments, we present an important advancement for Bohr's complementarity principle, which is suggested by the connection between complementarity relations and the axioms of quantum mechanics, specifically tied to the quantum state of the system. The updated version of the complementarity principle that we propose states the following: *For a given quantum state preparation ρ_t at a specific time instant t , the wave and particle behaviors of a quanton are constrained by a complementarity relation $W(\rho_t) + P(\rho_t) \leq \alpha(d)$, which is derived directly from the axioms of quantum mechanics.*

Let us notice that our proposal introduces several notable benefits. First, the complementarity principle becomes an integral and inseparable component of quantum mechanics, rather than a peripheral concept existing alongside quantum mechanics, underlining the interdependence of Bohr's complementarity principle with the foundations of quantum mechanics [20, 21]. In addition, this quantitative approach enhances our understanding of the practical applications and limitations of Bohr's complementarity principle. Our proposal effectively addresses potential violations of Bohr's complementarity principle and resolves peculiar situations reported in the literature [13, 22–24], thus ensuring the internal consistency of Bohr's complementarity principle. Hence, in the next section, we delve into a discussion of some of these scenarios.

III. INTERFEROMETRIC EXPERIMENTS IN THE LIGHT OF THE UPDATED COMPLEMENTARITY PRINCIPLE

A. Biased Mach–Zehnder interferometer

We initiate our discussion with the biased Mach–Zehnder interferometer (BMZI), as discussed in Ref. [5] and illustrated in Fig. 1, for which it is possible to control both transmission (T_k) and reflection (R_k) coefficients of the biased beam splitter (BBS_k), with $k = 1, 2$. The action of the BBS on the path basis is $U_{\text{BBS}}|0\rangle = T|0\rangle + iR|1\rangle$ and $U_{\text{BBS}}|1\rangle = T|1\rangle + iR|0\rangle$. Let us then follow the evolution of the initial state $|\psi_0\rangle = |0\rangle$ through the different stages of the BMZI. After passing through BBS_1 , the state transforms to

$$|\psi_1\rangle = T_1|0\rangle + iR_1|1\rangle. \quad (6)$$




Figure 1: Variant of the Mach–Zehnder interferometer (MZI), referred to as the biased MZI (BMZI) in Ref. [5], from which the figure was adapted. In contrast to traditional MZI, where balanced beam splitters (BS_k) with fixed transmission (T_k) and reflection (R_k) coefficients equal to $2^{-1/2}$, the BMZI introduces the flexibility to manipulate the amplitudes T_k and R_k for $k = 1, 2$, such that $T_k, R_k \in [0, 1]$ and $T_k^2 + R_k^2 = 1$. This distinction opens avenues for enhanced control and tunability within the interferometric system. The biased beam splitter is represented by BBS_k , M stands for the mirrors, PS is the phase-shifter, and D_l are the detectors, with $l = 0, 1$, for the horizontal and vertical spatial modes, respectively. Defining $|0\rangle$ and $|1\rangle$ as horizontal and vertical spatial modes of the quanton, respectively, the initial state is $|\psi_0\rangle = |0\rangle$. The action of BBS_k in $|0\rangle$ and $|1\rangle$ leads to $T_k|0\rangle + iR_k|1\rangle$ and $iR_k|0\rangle + T_k|1\rangle$, respectively. The mirrors reflect the path inserting a phase $e^{i\pi/2} = i$. The PS controls the phase difference $e^{i\phi}$ between the upper and lower paths within the BMZI.

The reflection due to the mirrors is described by the unitary operation $U_M|0\rangle = i|1\rangle$ and $U_M|1\rangle = i|0\rangle$, while the action of the phase shifter (PS), placed on the vertical path, is described by $U_{\text{PS}}|0\rangle = |0\rangle$ and $U_{\text{PS}}|1\rangle = e^{i\phi}|1\rangle$. Therefore, the state transforms into

$$|\psi_2\rangle = ie^{i\phi}T_1|1\rangle - R_1|0\rangle. \quad (7)$$

Finally, after BBS_2 the state is given by

$$|\psi_3\rangle = -(e^{i\phi}T_1R_2 + R_1T_2)|0\rangle + i(e^{i\phi}T_1T_2 - R_1R_2)|1\rangle. \quad (8)$$

The interferometric visibility \mathcal{V} relies on the variation of phase ϕ within the phase shifter to discern the maximum and minimum detection probabilities at D_l (with $l = 0, 1$). These probabilities, derived from Born's rule for the state given by Eq. (8), are expressed as

$$\text{Pr}(D_0) = T_1^2R_2^2 + R_1^2T_2^2 + 2T_1R_1T_2R_2 \cos \phi, \quad (9)$$

$$\text{Pr}(D_1) = T_1^2T_2^2 + R_1^2R_2^2 - 2T_1R_1T_2R_2 \cos \phi, \quad (10)$$

which in turn leads to two distinct expressions for the interferometric visibility, i.e.,

$$\mathcal{V}_0 = \frac{2T_1R_1T_2R_2}{T_1^2R_2^2 + R_1^2T_2^2}, \quad (11)$$

$$\mathcal{V}_1 = \frac{2T_1R_1T_2R_2}{T_1^2T_2^2 + R_1^2R_2^2}. \quad (12)$$

In the particular case where BBS_2 is balanced, i.e., $T_2 = R_2 = 1/\sqrt{2}$, both expressions for the visibilities coincide and

are equal to the l_1 -norm quantum coherence. However, certain scenarios emerge in which the visibility measure is inappropriate for effectively quantifying the wave-like aspect of the quanton within the interferometer. An illustrative example occurs when $R_1 = R_2 = R$ and $T_1 = T_2 = T$, resulting in $\mathcal{V}_0 = \mathcal{V}_1 = 1$ regardless of the specific values of T and R [5]. In addition, when T and R take different values, the predictability measure introduced by Greenberger and Yasin [4] yields $\mathcal{P} > 0$, thereby violating Eq. (1) and suggesting a potential breach of Bohr's complementarity principle. However, it is crucial to note that in such cases the apparent violation arises from the inappropriate application of the wave-like measure.

Contrary to the use of the visibility, where the wave behavior is inferred retroactively, the updated version of Bohr's complementarity principle relies on the use of the density matrix at a specific moment in time within the interferometer. In the case of the BMZI, any state inside the setup can be chosen for the application of the complementarity relations that depend on the quantum state preparation. For instance, considering the state given by Eq. (7), the corresponding density operator is given by $\rho_2 = |\psi_2\rangle\langle\psi_2|$, which enables the evaluation of the quantum coherence and the predictability in Eq. (4), i.e.,

$$C_{l_1}(\rho_2) = 2|T_1 R_1|, \quad (13)$$

$$P_{l_1}(\rho_2) = 1 - 2|T_1 R_1|. \quad (14)$$

Here, it is important to note that $C_{l_1}(\rho_2) + P_{l_1}(\rho_2) = 1$, since the state is pure. Hence, we are quantifying the complementarity principle at the exact location where the phenomenon of interest takes place. Consequently, potential issues caused by retrodiction are circumvented, providing a more streamlined approach to assessing the complementarity behavior of a quanton within the BMZI.

Considering the insights we have just explored, it seems that the conventional method of quantifying the wave behavior of a quantum superposition based on the sensitivity of the detection probabilities to phase differences does not apply universally. In contrast, any density operator can be expressed in terms of a basis of Hermitian operators. Consequently, by measuring the average values of these operators, one can, in principle, reconstruct the state of the system, employing a method known as quantum state tomography [35–37]. This approach allows for the direct witness or quantification of both wave and particle behaviors from the system's density matrix. In essence, quantum state tomography offers a more versatile way of characterizing the system, bypassing the constraints associated with the traditional sensitivity to phase differences.

B. Wheeler's delayed choice experiment

We can extend our previous analysis to Wheeler's delayed choice experiment (WDCE) [13, 24] by using the same apparatus as depicted in Fig. 1. Note that, when $T_2 = 1$, the effect is the same as the absence of BBS_2 , while, for $R_2 = T_2 = 2^{-1/2}$, the effect is the same as the presence of a balanced beam splitter, BS_2 . Hence, when BBS_2 is absent ($T_2 = 1$), the phase

sensitivity leads to a null visibility and the detectors reveal a particle-like behavior, according to Ref. [38]. However, it should be observed that, allowing T_1 and R_1 to vary freely, we can have all sorts of quantum superposition inside the interferometer, but we still have $\mathcal{V} = 0$. In particular, when $R_1 = T_1 = 2^{-1/2}$, we have the maximum superposition inside the interferometer and the visibility is null, which implies that the visibility does not reflect the quantum superposition inside the interferometer.

On the other hand, when the BS_2 is present, the visibility correctly quantifies the quantum superposition inside the interferometer, being equal to the l_1 -norm quantum coherence. Moreover, the delayed aspect of this experiment implies that the observer retains the flexibility to decide until the last moment which behavior will be recorded in the detectors. In addition, Ref. [38] enhanced Wheeler's experiment by considering the second beam splitter in a superposition of being inside and outside the interferometer, the so called quantum delayed choice experiment (QDCE).

This apparent back-in-time causation is effectively avoided through our updated version of the complementarity principle. Inclusion or exclusion of BS_2 has no impact on wave- or particle-like behavior at earlier times. In particular, if BBS_1 is balanced, we have $C_{l_1}(\rho_t) = 1$ and $P_{l_1}(\rho_t) = 0$ inside the interferometer, reflecting the maximum path quantum superposition, regardless of the choice to place or not the BBS_2 . We observe that Ref. [39] further explores this issue by demonstrating that the wave element of reality, as defined by the authors, is consistently maximum in the QDCE, aligning with our updated version of Bohr's complementarity principle. Those authors also established complementarity relations in terms of wave-particle elements of reality, which depend on the system quantum state preparation, fitting into our proposal.

C. Partial quantum eraser

The partial quantum eraser (PQE), as discussed in Refs. [40–42] and depicted in Fig. 2, presents another compelling case that highlights the necessity of our proposal. Let us consider that, in addition to the spatial mode, the quanton enters the MZI with horizontal polarization. The lower path is equipped with a half-wave plate (HWP), which changes the horizontal to vertical polarization. Consequently, the paths can be distinguished through the photon's polarization, and thus the paths become distinguishable. Outside the MZI, there is the option to include (QWP_{in}) or not (QWP_{out}) a quarter-wave plate (QWP), which is responsible for converting linear polarization into circular polarization. The polarized beam splitter (PBS) is designed to transmit horizontal polarization and reflect vertical polarization. Consequently, each detector will only click to a specific polarization. For QWP_{out} , the click on detectors D_0 or D_1 is linked to the upper path, while detection in D_2 or D_3 is linked to the lower path. On the other hand, for QWP_{in} , the path information becomes effectively erased in the detectors D_0 and D_2 . If a detection occurs at D_1 or D_3 , it is still possible to infer the path of a quanton.

Quantitatively, let us consider that the initial state is $|\psi_0\rangle =$




Figure 2: Modified representation of the partial quantum eraser (PQE) discussed on Refs. [40–42]. The beam splitter is represented by BS_m with $m = 1, 2$, M stands for the mirrors, HWP is a half-wave plate, PS is the phase-shifter, QWP is a quarter-wave plate that can be inserted into the apparatus (QWP_{in}) or removed (QWP_{out}), PBS is a polarizing beam splitter and D_n are the detectors, with $n = 0, 1, 2, 3$. Horizontal and vertical polarization modes (a subscript represented by a capital letter A) are defined by $|0\rangle$ and $|1\rangle$, respectively. Similarly, the horizontal and vertical spatial modes (a subscript represented by a lowercase letter a) of the quanton are defined as $|0\rangle$ and $|1\rangle$, respectively. HWP inverts the input polarization, i.e., $U_{HWP}|0\rangle_A = |1\rangle_A$ and $U_{HWP}|1\rangle_A = |0\rangle_A$. QWP converts a linear polarization into a circular polarization, i.e., $U_{QWP}|0\rangle_A = |\oplus\rangle_A$ and $U_{QWP}|1\rangle_A = |\ominus\rangle_A$, where $|\oplus\rangle = 2^{-1/2}(|0\rangle + i|1\rangle)$ and $|\ominus\rangle = 2^{-1/2}(|0\rangle - i|1\rangle)$. The PBS only transmits horizontal polarization and reflects vertical polarization, so that $U_{PBS}|00\rangle_{aA} = |00\rangle_{a_0A}$, $U_{PBS}|01\rangle_{aA} = i|11\rangle_{a_2A}$, $U_{PBS}|10\rangle_{aA} = |10\rangle_{a_1A}$ and $U_{PBS}|11\rangle_{aA} = i|01\rangle_{a_3A}$, where the subscript a_n at the output of the PBS represents the path leading to the detector D_n .

$|00\rangle_{aA}$, where the spatial mode is represented by the subscript a while the polarization is represented by the subscript A . Horizontal and vertical polarization are represented by $|0\rangle$ and $|1\rangle$, respectively. After passing through the BS_1 , the state becomes

$$|\psi_1\rangle = \frac{1}{\sqrt{2}}(|0\rangle_a + i|1\rangle_a)|0\rangle_A. \quad (15)$$

The action of the HWP inverts the polarization yielding

$$|\psi_2\rangle = \frac{1}{\sqrt{2}}(|00\rangle_{aA} + i|11\rangle_{aA}), \quad (16)$$

which implies that there is entanglement between the path and the polarization of the system. As the system passes through the mirrors, phase-shifter, and BS_2 , the quantum state evolves to

$$|\psi_3\rangle = -\frac{1}{2}[|0\rangle_a(e^{i\phi}|0\rangle_A + |1\rangle_A) - i|1\rangle_a(e^{i\phi}|0\rangle_A - |1\rangle_A)]. \quad (17)$$

If the quarter-wave plate is absent, i.e., for QWP_{out} , the state is then given by

$$|\psi_4^{out}\rangle = -\frac{1}{2}(e^{i\phi}|00\rangle_{a_0A} + i|11\rangle_{a_1A} - ie^{i\phi}|10\rangle_{a_2A} - |01\rangle_{a_3A}), \quad (18)$$

with the transmission of the horizontal polarization and the reflection of the vertical polarization by the PBS. A direct calculation shows that this setup yields the probability of 1/4 for all detectors, allowing for the distinction between the upper and lower paths.

On the other hand, if the quarter-wave plate is present, i.e., for QWP_{in} , the state of system after the PBS becomes

$$|\psi_4^{in}\rangle = -\frac{1}{2\sqrt{2}}[(e^{i\phi} + 1)|00\rangle_{a_0A} - (e^{i\phi} - 1)|11\rangle_{a_2A} - i\sqrt{2}e^{i\phi}|10\rangle_{a_1A} - \sqrt{2}|01\rangle_{a_3A}]. \quad (19)$$

The probabilities for the detectors D_0 and D_2 are respectively given by

$$\Pr(D_0) = \frac{1}{4}(1 + \cos\phi), \quad (20)$$

$$\Pr(D_2) = \frac{1}{4}(1 - \cos\phi), \quad (21)$$

while the probabilities at D_1 and D_3 remain untouched, giving the probability of 1/4 for each detector. Here, the probabilities at D_0 and D_2 are indeed sensitive to phase variation. Therefore, based on the definition of wave behavior through phase variation, we may conclude that the wave pattern is restored within the interferometer when detectors D_0 or D_2 clicks. Conversely, path information is obtained when detectors D_1 or D_3 clicks.

Similarly to the analysis for Wheeler's delayed choice experiment, we can use the complementarity relation that depends on the quantum state in each step of the interferometer to better understand what happens in the partial quantum eraser. The state given by Eq. (15) results in a separable state between the polarization and the path degrees of freedom with maximum path quantum superposition. Consequently, the complete complementarity relations given by Eq. (5) yields $C_{l_1}(\rho_{1,a}) = 1$ and $P_{l_1}(\rho_{1,a}) = E_{l_1}(\rho_{1,a}) = 0$, where $\rho_{1,a} = \text{Tr}_A(|\psi_1\rangle\langle\psi_1|)$. That is to say, there is no path information yet, only the wave behavior.

After the action of the HWP, the state is given by Eq. (16) and we can see that there is entanglement between the polarization and the path degrees of freedom, which provides a path marker. The complete complementarity relation given by Eq. (5) leads to $C_{l_1}(\rho_{2,a}) = P_{l_1}(\rho_{2,a}) = 0$ and $E_{l_1}(\rho_{2,a}) = 1$, where $\rho_{2,a} = \text{Tr}_A(|\psi_2\rangle\langle\psi_2|)$.

In contrast with the biased Mach-Zehnder interferometer (see Sec. III A), where the choice of state inside the interferometer does not matter for quantifying the wave and particle aspects of the system, here the choice is important once the HWP alters drastically the quantum state and, therefore, the dynamics of the complete complementarity relation. In the partial quantum eraser, the relation among coherence, predictability, and correlations is altered. The quantum coherence is converted into entanglement when there is a change in the polarization by the HWP. Therefore, this setup highlights the subtlety of the updated version of the complementarity principle and how the wave and the particle behavior are temporally marked through the time evolution of the quantum state.




Figure 3: Schematic depiction of Afshar's experiment (AE). The incident quantum travels from left to right, passing through slits S_1 and S_2 . The solid and dashed lines represent the quantum paths through slits S_1 and S_2 , respectively. At location A , vertical dotted lines denote wires oriented perpendicularly to the page, meticulously positioned at the interference pattern minima, enabling the capture of wave-like information. At region B , a lens supposedly redirects the interfered quantum to detector D_q , where $q = 1, 2$. Afshar claimed that this configuration allows for the determination of the slit from which the quantum originated. This figure was adapted from Ref. [22].

D. Unruh's experiment: an analogue to the Afshar's experiment

Let us now consider Afshar's experiment (AE) [22, 23], which is an interesting variation of Young's double-slit experiment [43]. Let us recall that Afshar claimed that, in his experimental setup, both wave and particle quantifiers can attain their maximum values, thus challenging Bohr's complementarity principle.

In the experimental setup depicted in Fig. 3, an incident quantum travels from the left to the right and passes through the slits S_1 and S_2 and interferes maximally within region A . In region A , the wire grids, perpendicular to the plane of the page, are meticulously positioned at the interference pattern minima. These grids are designed to capture wave-like information through a non-perturbation criterion. At position B , a lens is employed to direct the quantum originating from the slit S_q to detector D_q , with $q = 1, 2$.

The author used a different experimental configuration, in which one of the slits was closed, resulting in detection occurring exclusively in the detector corresponding to the open slit. Thus, when both slits are open, interference is observed at position A , and the quantum continues through the lens. Upon arrival at one of the detectors, the author states that there is a violation of Bohr's principle of complementarity, because at position A we have maximum wave behavior (maximum W) and the click of one of the detectors will inform which slit the photon passed (maximum P). Since its conception, AE has been the subject of extensive discussions among researchers and has prompted ongoing investigations aimed at resolving the apparent paradox [44–51].

To elucidate the concepts discussed in the AE, we can examine a simpler but analogous experiment proposed by Unruh that involves a two-level system [51]. The experiment features two MZIs arranged in sequence, as illustrated in Fig. 4. The paths of the MZI_1 play the role of the two slits in the AE,




Figure 4: A schematic depiction of Unruh's experiment, adapted from Ref. [51], which involves the sequential utilization of two Mach-Zehnder interferometers (MZIs) used as the analogous case to Afshar's experiment employing two-level systems. After traversing MZI_1 , the quantum state achieves maximum path coherence. Blocking either path 1 or path 2 results in detections exclusively at detector D_0 or D_1 , respectively. By analogy with Afshar's reasoning, when both paths 1 and 2 are unobstructed, it becomes feasible to deduce the path taken by the quantum within MZI_1 through measurements at the detectors. Importantly, this deduction occurs while maintaining maximum wave-like behavior, as per the reasoning outlined by Afshar.

while MZI_2 mimics the region of the wires grid in the AE. By obstructing the path 2, all quanta passing through the path 1 are directed to detector D_1 . Conversely, blocking path 1 results in all quanta from path 2 being measured at D_0 . When both paths in MZI_1 are unblocked, we will have constructive (destructive) interference in path 3 (4) of the MZI_2 . Therefore, the conclusions drawn from the analysis of the Unruh's experiment can also be used in the Afshar experiment and vice-versa.

Let us then follow the evolution of the quantum state in Unruh's experiment. As depicted in Fig. 4, the initial state is given by

$$|\psi_0\rangle = |0\rangle. \quad (22)$$

The first beam-splitter creates a maximum quantum superposition such that the state right after BS_1 is given by

$$|\psi_1\rangle = \frac{1}{\sqrt{2}} (|0\rangle + i|1\rangle), \quad (23)$$

while inside the second MZI the state is given by

$$|\psi_2\rangle = -|0\rangle. \quad (24)$$

Finally, after the third beam-splitter, the state of the system

becomes

$$|\psi_3\rangle = \frac{1}{\sqrt{2}}(|0\rangle - i|1\rangle). \quad (25)$$

In the AE, this situation corresponds to the ordinary situation of two unblocked slits. Now, if we block the path **2** and consider the same initial state given by Eq. (22), all quantons that pass through the path **1** will be described by the normalized state

$$|\psi'_1\rangle = |0\rangle, \quad (26)$$

which implies that the state right after the second beam splitter will present maximum quantum superposition, i.e.,

$$|\psi'_2\rangle = -\frac{1}{\sqrt{2}}(|0\rangle - i|1\rangle), \quad (27)$$

which implies that, according to Afshar, the upper path in MZI_1 will always be identified with the detections in D_1 , once the state after the third beam splitter is given by

$$|\psi'_3\rangle = -i|1\rangle. \quad (28)$$

Similarly, if we block the path **1**, all quantons that pass through the path **2** will be described by the normalized state $|\psi''_1\rangle = i|1\rangle$. Once again, the state right after the second beam splitter will present maximum quantum superposition and, therefore, the lower path in MZI_1 will always be identified by the detections in D_0 , given that the state after the third beam splitter becomes $|\psi''_3\rangle = |0\rangle$. Hence, each unblocked path is associated with one detector.

Now, let us analyze Unruh's experiment in light of Afshar's argumentation. When both paths in MZI_1 are unblocked, which corresponds to the quanton coming from both slits in the AE, we will have constructive interference in the path **3** of MZI_2 and destructive interference in the path **4** of MZI_2 , which corresponds to the region of the wires grid in the AE. After this, Afshar argues that a detection at D_0 or D_1 will reveal which path the quanton took before being detected. Therefore, Afshar concludes that we have a violation of the Bohr's complementarity principle, since we have maximum wave-like behavior and maximum particle-like behavior in the same experimental setup.

Here, one can see that two different assumptions are made regarding these experiments. The first assumption is the acceptance of quantifying Bohr's complementarity principle in the whole experimental setup with the wave and particle behavior being quantified in different parts of the experiment. In the case of the Afshar experiment, the retrodiction occurs in the quantification of the particle behavior, which associates the detection in one of the detectors with one of the slits, while the wave-like behavior is quantified in the region of the wires grid by the interferometric visibility. Beyond that, in the experiment reported in Ref. [23], in order to calculate the wave and particle quantifiers, it was necessary to have three different configurations: no wire grid, wire grid in central minima, and wire grid in central minima and one pinhole blocked.

The second assumption is that the conclusions drawn about one experimental setup remain valid in the other experimental setup. More specifically, the conclusion that the click of each detector corresponds to a particular path which the quanton went through, when one of the path is blocked, remains valid when none of the paths are blocked. These situations (one path blocked and both paths open) correspond to different experimental setups (or different configurations of the same experimental setup), which was already criticized in Ref. [51].

From the perspective of the updated Bohr's complementarity principle, the question becomes clear. When both paths are open, the state presents maximum path quantum superposition in the MZI_1 region, while it presents maximum path predictability in MZI_2 . In contrast, when one of the paths is blocked, the state presents maximum path predictability in the MZI_1 region, while it presents the maximum quantum superposition of the path in MZI_2 . Therefore, it is easy to see that the complementarity relation (4) is always satisfied in each step of the different experimental setups.

IV. FINAL REMARKS

Although Heisenberg's uncertainty principle was deeply rooted in the foundations of quantum mechanics from its early days, Bohr's complementarity principle encountered a more enigmatic genesis. By focusing on the whole experimental setup, conceptual challenges were raised, historically exemplified by the Wheeler's delayed choice experiment and the Afshar's experiment. Our proposal sought to address these challenges by advocating an updated interpretation of Bohr's complementarity principle, grounded in complementarity relations derived directly from the postulates of quantum mechanics. These complementarity relations, emerging from quantum postulates, establish rigorous criteria for quantifying complementarity and highlight the role of the density matrix at each moment in time. This formal redefinition not only brings clarity to the principle, but also illuminates experiments that remained veiled in conceptual ambiguity.

Acknowledgments

This work was supported by the Coordination for the Improvement of Higher Education Personnel (CAPES), Grant No. 88887.827989/2023-00, the São Paulo Research Foundation (FAPESP), Grant No. 2022/09496-8.3, the National Council for Scientific and Technological Development (CNPq), Grants No. 309862/2021-3, No. 409673/2022-6, and No. 421792/2022-1, and the National Institute for the Science and Technology of Quantum Information (INCT-IQ), Grant No. 465469/2014-0.

-
- [1] N. Bohr, The Quantum Postulate and the Recent Development of Atomic Theory, *Nature* **121**, 580 (1928).
- [2] N. Bohr, *Essays 1932-1957 on Atomic Physics and Human Knowledge*. Woodbridge, Conn: Ox Bow Press (1958).
- [3] W. K. Wootters and W. H. Zurek, Complementarity in the Double-Slit Experiment: Quantum Nonseparability and a Quantitative Statement of Bohr's Principle, *Phys. Rev. D* **19**, 473 (1979).
- [4] D. M. Greenberger and A. Yasin, Simultaneous Wave and Particle Knowledge in a Neutron Interferometer, *Phys. Lett. A* **128**, 391 (1988).
- [5] D. S. S. Chrysothemios, M. L. W. Basso, and J. Maziero, Quantum Coherence versus Interferometric Visibility in a Biased Mach-Zehnder Interferometer, *Quantum Inf. Process.* **22**, 68 (2023).
- [6] B. G. Englert, Fringe visibility and which-way information: An inequality, *Phys. Rev. Lett.* **77**, 2154 (1996).
- [7] S. Dürr, Quantitative wave-particle duality in multibeam interferometers, *Phys. Rev. A* **64**, 042113 (2001).
- [8] B. G. Englert, D. Kaszlikowski, L. C. Kwek, and W. H. Chee, Wave-particle duality in multi-path interferometers: General concepts and three-path interferometers, *Int. J. Quant. Inf.* **6**, 129 (2008).
- [9] T. Baumgratz, M. Cramer, and M. B. Plenio, Quantifying Coherence, *Phys. Rev. Lett.* **113**, 140401 (2014).
- [10] M. N. Bera, T. Qureshi, M. A. Siddiqui, and A. K. Pati, Duality of Quantum coherence and path distinguishability, *Phys. Rev. A* **92**, 012118 (2015).
- [11] E. Bagan, J. A. Bergou, S. S. Cottrell, and M. Hillery, Relations between coherence and path information, *Phys. Rev. Lett.* **116**, 160406 (2016).
- [12] S. Mishra, A. Venugopalan, and T. Qureshi, Decoherence and visibility enhancement in multi-path interference, *Phys. Rev. A* **100**, 042122 (2019).
- [13] J. A. Wheeler, *Quantum Theory and Measurement*, edited by J. A. Wheeler and W. H. Zurek (Princeton University Press, Princeton, NJ, 1984).
- [14] P. J. Coles, J. Kaniewski, and S. Wehner, Equivalence of wave-particle duality to entropic uncertainty, *Nat. Commun.* **5**, 5814 (2014).
- [15] R. M. Angelo and A. D. Ribeiro, Wave-particle duality: An information-based approach, *Found. Phys.* **45**, 1407 (2015).
- [16] P. J. Coles, Entropic framework for wave-particle duality in multipath interferometers, *Phys. Rev. A* **93**, 062111 (2016).
- [17] E. Bagan, J. Calsamiglia, J. A. Bergou, and M. Hillery, Duality games and operational duality relations, *Phys. Rev. Lett.* **120**, 050402 (2018).
- [18] P. Roy and T. Qureshi, Path predictability and quantum coherence in multi-slit interference, *Phys. Scr.* **94**, 095004 (2019).
- [19] M. L. W. Basso, D. S. S. Chrysothemios, and J. Maziero, Quantitative Wave-Particle Duality Relations from the Density Matrix Properties, *Quantum Inf. Process.* **19**, 254 (2020).
- [20] M. Scully, B. G. Englert and H. Walther, Quantum optical tests of complementarity, *Nature* **351**, 111 (1991).
- [21] B. G. Englert, M. Scully, and H. Walther, Complementarity and uncertainty, *Nature* **375**, 367 (1995).
- [22] S. S. Afshar, Violation of the Principle of Complementarity, and Its Implications in The Nature of Light: What Is a Photon?, *SPIE* **5866**, 229 (2005).
- [23] S. S. Afshar, E. Flores, K. F. McDonald, and E. Knoesel, Paradox in Wave-Particle Duality, *Found. Phys.* **37**, 295 (2007).
- [24] X. Ma, J. Kofler, and A. Zeilinger, Delayed-choice gedanken experiments and their realizations, *Rev. Mod. Phys.* **88**, 015005 (2016).
- [25] M. L. W. Basso and J. Maziero, Complete Complementarity Relations for Multipartite Pure States, *J. Phys. A: Math. Theor.* **53**, 465301 (2020).
- [26] M. L. W. Basso and J. Maziero, Entanglement Monotones from Complementarity Relations, *J. Phys. A: Math. Theor.* **55**, 355304 (2022).
- [27] M. Jakob and J. Bergou, Quantitative complementarity relations in bipartite systems: Entanglement as a physical reality, *Opt. Comm.* **283**, 827 (2010).
- [28] M. Jakob and J. Bergou, Generalized Complementarity Relations in Composite Quantum Systems of Arbitrary Dimensions, *Int. J. Mod. Phys. B* **20**, (2012).
- [29] A. K. Roy, N. Pathania, N. K. Chandra, P. K. Panigrahi, and T. Qureshi, Coherence, path predictability, and I concurrence: A triality, *Phys. Rev. A* **105**, 032209 (2022).
- [30] G. Vidal and R. Tarrach, Robustness of entanglement, *Phys. Rev. A* **59**, 141 (1999).
- [31] T. Qureshi, Predictability, Distinguishability and Entanglement, *Opt. Lett.* **46**, 492 (2021).
- [32] M. L. W. Basso and J. Maziero, Entanglement monotones connect distinguishability and predictability, *Phys. Lett. A*, **425**, 127875 (2021).
- [33] M. L. W. Basso and J. Maziero, Complete complementarity relations and their Lorentz invariance, *Proc. R. Soc. A* **477**, 20210058 (2021).
- [34] M. L. W. Basso and J. Maziero, Complete complementarity relations in curved spacetimes, *Phys. Rev. A* **103**, 032210 (2021).
- [35] D. F. V. James, P. G. Kwiat, W. J. Munro, and A. G. White, On the Measurement of Qubits, *Phys. Rev. A* **64**, 052312 (2001).
- [36] J. S. Lundeen, B. Sutherland, A. Patel, C. Stewart, and C. Bamber, Direct measurement of the quantum wavefunction, *Nature* **474**, 188 (2011).
- [37] G. S. Thekkadath, L. Giner, Y. Chalich, M. J. Horton, J. Banker, and J. S. Lundeen, Direct Measurement of the Density Matrix of a Quantum System, *Phys. Rev. Lett.* **117**, 120401 (2016).
- [38] R. Ionicioiu and D. R. Terno, Proposal for a Quantum Delayed-Choice Experiment, *Phys. Rev. Lett.* **107**, 230406 (2011).
- [39] P. R. Dieguez, J. R. Guimarães, J. P. S. Peterson, R. M. Angelo, and R. M. Serra, Experimental assessment of physical realism in a quantum controlled device, *Commun. Phys.* **5**, 82 (2022).
- [40] O. Pessoa Júnior, Refinamentos da interpretação da complementaridade a partir do experimento de Afshar, *Sci. stud.* **11**, 119 (2013).
- [41] O. Pessoa Júnior, Complementing the Principle of Complementarity, *Phys. Essays* **13**, 50 (2000).
- [42] T. J. Herzog, P. G. Kwiat, H. Weinfurter, and A. Zeilinger, Complementarity and the Quantum Eraser, *Phys. Rev. Lett.* **75**, 3034 (1995).
- [43] Y. Maleki and M. S. Zubairy, Revisiting wave-particle duality in Bohr-Einstein debate, *AVS Quantum Science* **5**, 031401 (2023).
- [44] T. Qureshi, Modified Two-Slit Experiments and Complementarity, *J. Quantum Inf. Sci.* **02**, 35 (2012).
- [45] O. Steuernagel, Afshar's Experiment Does Not Show a Violation of Complementarity, *Found. Phys.* **37**, 1370 (2007).
- [46] V. Jacques, N. D. Lai, A. Dreau, D. Zheng, D. Chauvat, F. Treussart, P. Grangier, and J.-F. Roch, Illustration of Quantum Complementarity Using Single Photons Interfering on a Grating, *New J. Phys.* **10**, 123009 (2008).

- [47] D. Georgiev, Quantum Histories and Quantum Complementarity, *International Scholarly Research Notices* **2012**, e327278 (2012).
- [48] A. Knight, No Paradox in Wave-Particle Duality, *Found. Phys.* **50**, 1723 (2020).
- [49] B. Gergely and H. Batelaan, Simulation of Afshar's Double Slit Experiment, *Found. Phys.* **52**, 69 (2022).
- [50] T. Qureshi, Understanding Modified Two-Slit Experiments Using Path Markers, *Found. Phys.* **53**, 38 (2023).
- [51] W. G. Unruh, Shahriar Afshar - Quantum Rebel? <http://axion.physics.ubc.ca/rebel.html>.