

Article

A logic for quantum register measurements

Andrea Masini ^{1,‡} and Margherita Zorzi ^{1,‡,*}¹ Dipartimento di Informatica, Università di Verona ; andrea.masini@univr.it¹ Dipartimento di Informatica, Università di Verona ; margherita.zorzi@univr.it

* Correspondence: margherita.zorzi@univr.it

‡ These authors contributed equally to this work.

Abstract: We know that quantum logics are the most prominent logical systems associated to the lattices of closed Hilbert subspaces. But what does it happen if, following a quantum computing perspective, we want to associate a logic to the process of quantum registers measurements? This paper gives an answer to this question, and, quite surprising, shows that such a logic is nothing else than the standard propositional intuitionistic logic.

Keywords: Intuitionistic Logic; Quantum Computing; Kripke-Style Semantics.

1. Introduction

The long tradition of Quantum Logics comes from the ideas of Birkoff and von Neumann [1] (see also [2] for an extended tutorial on the subject), where they defined a new "non classical" logic to deal with the algebraic structures obtained from Hilbert spaces by means of quantum projective measurements. Although Quantum Logics are extremely interesting for their ability to formalize quantum-algebraic structures such as orthomodular lattices, these logics are inadequate to reason on the computational aspects relevant to Quantum Computing.

Quantum Computing born from Feynman's ideas exposed in [3] where, in order to simulate complex quantum systems, the author proposed a new computational paradigm based on quantum physics. The basic units of the standard quantum computing model are the so called *quantum bits*, or *qubits* for short (mathematically, normalized vectors of the Hilbert Space \mathbb{C}^2). Qubits represent informational units and can assume both classical values 0 and 1, and all their super-positional values (see e.g. [4] for an extended treatment of quantum computing).

Following the quantum computing paradigm, a numbers of authors have proposed both paradigmatic languages [5–9] and logical systems in order to cope with quantum computations, see e.g. [10–15]. Most of these latter approaches are based on a modal logic viewpoint, where the main subject of the study is the treatment of unitary transformations.

But what can we say, from a purely logical point of view, about the measurement process of quantum registers? More precisely, let us suppose to have a quantum register $|\psi\rangle$ and, starting from $|\psi\rangle$, to perform an arbitrary numbers of projective measurements. In such a way we obtain a tree-like computational structure, which we call here *observational tree*, with root $|\psi\rangle$ and where each node is a quantum state resulting from a sequence of measurements.

This paper give a positive answer to the following question:

"Is there a propositional logic that has the observational trees as set of models?"

1.1. A gentle informal introduction of our proposal

First, let us suppose to have a denumerable set $Q = \{e_i\}_{i \in \omega}$ of qubits with distinguishable names and an arbitrary finite non-empty set $R = \{e_{i_1}, \dots, e_{i_k}\} \subseteq Q$. Let Reg_Q be the set of quantum registers

based on Q . As we know, each quantum register in Reg_Q can be represented by an expression of the kind

$$\sum_{j=1}^{j=2^k} a_j |e_{i_1} = v_{j_1}, \dots, e_{i_k} = v_{j_k}\rangle$$

32 where each $v_{j_i} \in \{0, 1\}$ and each $a_j \in \mathbb{C}$.

33 As a second step let us fix a standard propositional language, where Q is the set of propositional
34 symbols.

35 It is immediate to observe that each $|e_{i_1} = v_{j_1}, \dots, e_{i_k} = v_{j_k}\rangle$ is a standard boolean evaluation of
36 propositional symbols e_{i_1}, \dots, e_{i_k} , namely:

$$e_{i_j} \text{ is true in } |e_{i_1} = v_{j_1}, \dots, e_{i_k} = v_{j_k}\rangle \Leftrightarrow e_{i_j} = 1$$

37 In order to simplify the notation, given a finite set $R = \{e_{i_1}, \dots, e_{i_k}\}$ of qubits, we can represent
38 each element $|e_{i_1} = v_{j_1}, \dots, e_{i_k} = v_{j_k}\rangle$ of the computational basis as a subset C (eventually empty) of R ,
39 where $e_{i_k} \in C$ iff $e_{i_k} = 1$. As a consequence, each quantum register can be represented by an expression
40 of the form $\sum_{C_i \in 2^R} a_i |C_i\rangle$.

41 The idea is that the truth of a propositional symbol must be *stable under measurement*, i.e. if e is true in a
42 quantum register $|\phi\rangle = \sum a_i |C_i\rangle$ iff then each possible measurement¹ of ϕ returns (probabilistic) a set
43 of new quantum registers in which in turn p is true. Following this intuition we set that e is true in
44 $\sum_{C_i \in 2^R} a_i |C_i\rangle$ iff e is true in each $|C_i\rangle$ iff $e \in C_i$.

45 The notion truth for a generic formula is therefore given in terms of stability under measurements.
46 Let us consider for example the cases of disjunction and implication:

- 47 • a formula $A \vee B$ is true in a quantum state $|\psi\rangle$ iff after every sequence (eventually the empty
48 sequence) of measurements of $|\psi\rangle$ in the resulting state $|\psi\rangle$ we have either the truth of A or those
49 of B ;
- 50 • a formula $A \rightarrow B$ is true in a quantum state $|\psi\rangle$ iff after each sequence (eventually the empty
51 sequence) of measurements of $|\psi\rangle$, in the resulting state $|\psi\rangle$ we have that if A is true then B is
52 true;

53 In order to formalize the notion of truth above sketched we need to introduce suitable partial order
54 structures, where the order is naturally induced by the measurement process. We call these structures
55 *observational trees*. Observational trees represent the core of our investigation, these structures will
56 allow us to explain the constructive nature of the logic of measurement, and its deep difference from
57 the classical logic.

58 *Synopsis*

59 In Section 2.2 we introduce the key notion of *observational trees*. The observational logic $\mathcal{L}_{\mathbb{P}}$ is
60 semantically defined in Section 3, where we state the relationship between observational trees and
61 intuitionistic Kripke models. Section 4 is finally devoted to possible further work.

62 2. A quantum tree model for observations

63 In order to introduce the notion of *observational trees*, in Section 2.1 we first recall some basic
64 notions. Formal definition of observational trees is in Section 2.2

¹ in order to simplify the treatment we consider here only the so called PVM-Projection Value Measurement [4]

65 2.1. Background

66 In the following paragraph, we briefly introduce the notion of trees seen as sets of sequences
67 of natural numbers (see e.g. [16]), and the mathematical representation of quantum registers and
68 quantum measurement operators (see e.g. [4]).

69 2.1.1. Trees

70 Let S^* be the set of finite sequences of natural numbers. We denote the empty sequence by $\langle \rangle$
71 and an arbitrary sequence by $\langle n_0, \dots, n_k \rangle$. We use the symbol $*$ for concatenation of sequences. We
72 define a partial ordering \leq on S^* as follows: $t \leq \langle \rangle$ for all $t \in S^*$ and $\langle n_0, \dots, n_k \rangle \leq \langle m_0, \dots, m_l \rangle$ if and
73 only if $l \leq k$ and $n_i = m_i$ for all $0 \leq i \leq l$. We denote by $<$ the associated strict order.

74 A tree $\mathcal{T} = \langle T, \leq \rangle$ is a partial order with of $T \subseteq S^*$ satisfying the property that whenever $t \in T$
75 and $t \leq s$ then $s \in T$. Elements of T are called *nodes*. A *leaf* is a node with no successors. With \mathbb{E} we
76 denote the set of edges of \mathcal{T} , namely the set $\{(\alpha, \alpha * \langle n \rangle) : \alpha, \alpha * \langle n \rangle \in T, n \in \mathbb{N}\}$.

77 Given a tree T and $s \in T$, we let T_s the tree defined by: $s' \in T_s \Leftrightarrow s * s' \in T$. Notice that $T_{\langle \rangle} = T$.

78 In the graphical representation of a tree, if $i < j$ we put $t * \langle i \rangle$ to the left of $t * \langle j \rangle$.

79 2.1.2. Quantum registers

80 Let \mathbb{P} be a denumerable set of propositional symbols and let \mathbb{X} be a finite non void subset of \mathbb{P} ,
81 moreover let \mathbb{F} be the set of finite parts of \mathbb{X} .

Let us consider the Hilbert-space $\ell^2(\mathbb{F})$ of square summable, \mathbb{F} -indexed sequences of complex numbers

$$\mathcal{H}_{\mathbb{X}} = \{ \phi \mid \phi : \mathbb{F}_{\mathbb{X}} \rightarrow \mathbb{C} \},$$

82 equipped with an *inner product* $\langle \cdot, \cdot \rangle$ and the *euclidean norm* $\|\phi\| = \sqrt{\langle \phi | \phi \rangle}$.

83 The elements of the set $\mathcal{R}_{\mathbb{X}} = \{ \phi \in \mathcal{H}_{\mathbb{X}} : \|\phi\| = 1 \}$ are called *q-registers* (quantum registers), and
84 represent the superposition states of a quantum system.

For any $c \in \mathbb{F}_{\mathbb{X}}$ let $|c\rangle : \mathbb{F}_{\mathbb{X}} \rightarrow \mathbb{C}$ be the function

$$|c\rangle(d) = \begin{cases} 1 & \text{if } c = d \\ 0 & \text{if } c \neq d. \end{cases}$$

85 The set $\text{CB}(\mathbb{X})$ of all such functions is a Hilbert basis for $\ell^2(\mathbb{F})$. In particular, following the literature on
86 quantum computing, $\text{CB}(\mathbb{F})$ is called the *computational basis* of $\ell^2(\mathbb{F})$. Each element of the computational
87 basis is called *base q-register*.

88 Let us assume to fix an enumeration $\{b_i\}_i$ of $\mathbb{F}_{\mathbb{X}}$. We shall use Dirac notation for the elements ϕ, ψ
89 of \mathcal{R} , writing them $|\phi\rangle, |\psi\rangle$. As usual, each quantum state $|\phi\rangle$ is expressible via the computational
90 basis as $\sum_i a_i |b_i\rangle$.

91 In the following, with a little abuse of notation, we will write:

- 92 • $p \in |b_i\rangle$ to mean that $p \in b_i$;
- 93 • and $p \in \sum_i a_i |b_i\rangle$ to mean that $\forall a_j \neq 0. p \in |b_j\rangle$

94 2.1.3. Measurement operators

95 We introduce now a standard definition of measurements operators in terms of orthogonal
96 projectors.

97 **Definition 1.** Let $P : \mathcal{H}_{\mathbb{X}} \rightarrow \mathcal{H}_{\mathbb{X}}$ be a linear operator, P is called orthogonal projector iff

- 98 • P is hermitian;
- 99 • $\ker(P) \perp \text{im}(P)$.

100 With $\mathcal{O}_{\mathbb{X}}$ we denote the set of orthogonal projectors of $\mathcal{H}_{\mathbb{X}}$.

101 Let $x \in [0, 1]_{\mathbb{R}}$ and $P \in \mathcal{O}_{\mathbb{X}}$. $|\psi\rangle \rightarrow_x^P |\phi\rangle$ means that $x = \langle \psi | P | \psi \rangle$ and $|\phi\rangle = \frac{P|\psi\rangle}{\sqrt{x}}$

102 A register observation is obtained performing an arbitrary, finite sequence of orthogonal
103 projections:

104 **Definition 2.** Let $K \in \mathbb{N}$. A sequence $(P_i)_{i < K}$ of orthogonal projectors is an observation iff $\sum_{i < K} P_i = Id$. Let
105 us denote with \mathfrak{M} the set of observations.

106 2.2. Observation Trees

107 We can now introduce our tree models.

108 **Definition 3 (Observational Tree).** Let \mathbb{X} a finite set of propositional symbols. An observational tree is a
109 structure $\mathbb{T}_{\mathbb{X}} = \langle \langle T, \leq \rangle, \mathfrak{p}, \mathfrak{a}, \mathfrak{s} \rangle$ where

- 110 • $\mathcal{T} = \langle T, \leq \rangle$ is an abstract tree;
- 111 • $\mathfrak{p}, \mathfrak{a}, \mathfrak{s}$ are the following labelling functions:

- 112 - $\mathfrak{p} : \mathbb{E} \rightarrow (0, 1]_{\mathbb{R}}$;
- 113 - $\mathfrak{a} : T \rightarrow \mathfrak{M}$;
- 114 - $\mathfrak{s} : T \rightarrow \mathcal{R}_{\mathbb{X}} \cup \{0\}$

115 for which some constraints holds. Let us suppose that $\mathfrak{a}(\alpha) = (P_i)_{i < k} \in \mathfrak{M}$, then:

- 116 - $\forall i < k. (P_i(\alpha) \neq 0 \Rightarrow \alpha * \langle i \rangle \in T)$;
- 117 - if $\forall j \geq K. \alpha * \langle j \rangle \notin T$;
- 118 - $\forall i < K$ if $\alpha * \langle i \rangle \in T$ then
 - 119 - $\mathfrak{p}(\alpha, \alpha * \langle i \rangle) = \langle \mathfrak{s}(\alpha) | P_i | \mathfrak{s}(\alpha) \rangle$
 - 120 - $\mathfrak{s}(\alpha * \langle i \rangle) = \frac{P_i(\mathfrak{s}(\alpha))}{\sqrt{\mathfrak{p}(\alpha, \alpha * \langle i \rangle)}}$

121 Informally:

- 122 • \mathfrak{p} assigns a (correct) probability to each edge;
- 123 • \mathfrak{a} assigns to each node a sequence of observations (an element in \mathfrak{M}), in particular the sequence
124 that generates the current (evaluation of the) state, starting from the root node;
- 125 • \mathfrak{s} assigns to each node a quantum register.

126 The following property trivially holds:

Proposition 1 (Monotonicity). Let $\mathbb{T}_{\mathbb{X}} = \langle \langle T, \leq \rangle, \mathfrak{p}, \mathfrak{a}, \mathfrak{s} \rangle$ an observational tree, then

$$\forall \alpha \in T. (q \in \mathfrak{s}(\alpha) \Rightarrow \forall \beta \leq \alpha. q \in \mathfrak{s}(\beta))$$

127 **Remark 1.** In the graphical representation of observation trees we will omit nodes labeled with 0-vectors.

128 3. The logic of observations

129 In this section we semantically define the logic $\mathcal{L}_{\mathbb{P}}$ of quantum observations. As anticipated in
130 the introduction, we fix the set of propositional symbols to the set of qubit names and we adopt the
131 standard connectives of propositional logic. Formally:

132 **Definition 4 (Language of $\mathcal{L}_{\mathbb{P}}$).** The language $\mathcal{L}_{\mathbb{P}}$ of $\mathcal{L}_{\mathbb{P}}$ is built upon propositional symbols, which we set
133 to \mathbb{P} and connectives $\rightarrow, \wedge, \vee, \perp$.

134 We also exploit some auxiliary notation. Let us denote with $\mathfrak{Form}_{\mathbb{P}}$ the set of resulting well formed
135 formulas built in the standard way. Given a formula A let us denote with $\mathbb{P}[A]$ the set of propositional
136 symbols occurring in A .

137 We define now the *semantics of a formula w.r.t. on observational tree*.

138 **Definition 5** (Semantics). *The semantics of a formula A w.r.t to an observational tree $\mathbb{T}_{\mathbb{X}}$ with $\mathbb{X} \supseteq \mathbb{P}[A]$ is*
139 *defined as:*

- 140 • $\mathbb{T}_{\mathbb{X}}, \alpha \models q$ iff $q \in \mathfrak{s}(\alpha)$;
- 141 • $\mathbb{T}_{\mathbb{X}}, \alpha \not\models \perp$
- 142 • $\mathbb{T}_{\mathbb{X}}, \alpha \models A \wedge B$ iff $\mathbb{T}_{\mathbb{X}}, \alpha \models A$ & $\mathbb{T}_{\mathbb{X}}, \alpha \models B$
- 143 • $\mathbb{T}_{\mathbb{X}}, \alpha \models A \vee B$ iff $\mathbb{T}_{\mathbb{X}}, \alpha \models A$ OR $\mathbb{T}_{\mathbb{X}}, \alpha \models B$
- 144 • $\mathbb{T}_{\mathbb{X}}, \alpha \models A \rightarrow B$ iff $\forall \beta \leq \alpha \mathbb{T}_{\mathbb{X}}, \beta \models A \Rightarrow \mathbb{T}_{\mathbb{X}}, \beta \models B$

145 **Proposition 2.** 1. $\mathbb{T}_{\mathbb{X}}, \alpha \models A \Leftrightarrow \forall \beta \leq \alpha \Rightarrow \mathbb{T}_{\mathbb{X}}, \beta \models A$;
146 2. $\mathbb{T}_{\mathbb{X}}, \langle \rangle \models A \Leftrightarrow \forall \alpha \in T_{\mathbb{X}}, \mathbb{T}_{\mathbb{X}}, \alpha \models A$.

147 **Proof.** By easy induction on the structure of the formula A , following Definition 5. Let us show some
148 case for 1), as a title of example. Let A be a propositional symbol q : the thesis follows by Proposition 1
149 (monotonicity). Let A be of the sharp $B \wedge C$. By i.h., for all $\beta \leq \alpha$, we have both $\mathbb{T}_{\mathbb{X}}, \beta \models B$ and
150 $\mathbb{T}_{\mathbb{X}}, \beta \models C$ then, by Definition 5, $\mathbb{T}_{\mathbb{X}}, \beta \models B \wedge C$. Other cases are similar and 2) plainly follows from
151 1). \square

152 With $\mathbb{T}_{\mathbb{X}} \models A$ we mean that $\forall \alpha. \mathbb{T}_{\mathbb{X}}, \alpha \models A$ (A is true in $\mathbb{T}_{\mathbb{X}}$). With $\models A$ we mean that
153 $\forall \mathbb{T}_{\mathbb{P}[A]}, \mathbb{T}_{\mathbb{P}[A]} \models A$ (A is valid).

154 It is easy to observe that, given a formula A , the set of propositional symbols is enough to state its
155 satisfiability in a model.

156 **Proposition 3.** *Let A be a formula, then for each $\mathbb{X} \supseteq \mathbb{P}[A]$ we have that $\mathbb{T}_{\mathbb{X}} \models A$ iff $\mathbb{T}_{\mathbb{P}[A]} \models A$.*

157 We can formally state a relationship between observational trees and Kripke models. In section 3.1
158 we show how to extract a Kripke model from an observation tree. The converse is shown in Section 3.2.

159 3.1. From observational trees to Kripke models

160 Let $\mathbb{T}_{\mathbb{X}} = \langle \langle T, \leq \rangle, p, a, \mathfrak{s} \rangle$ an observational tree. We associate to $\mathbb{T}_{\mathbb{X}}$ a Kripke model $\mathfrak{K}_{\mathbb{T}_{\mathbb{X}}} = \langle T_{\mathbb{T}}, \sqsubseteq_{\mathbb{T}}$
161 $, V_{\mathbb{T}} \rangle$ defined in the following way:

- 162 • $T_{\mathbb{T}} = T$;
- 163 • $\alpha \sqsubseteq \beta \Leftrightarrow \beta \leq \alpha$;
- 164 • $V_{\mathbb{T}} : T_{\mathbb{T}} \rightarrow 2^{\mathbb{P}}$ is s.t. $q \in V_{\mathbb{T}}(\alpha) \Leftrightarrow q \in \mathfrak{s}(\alpha)$.

165 Proposition 1 ensures that $\mathfrak{K}_{\mathbb{T}_{\mathbb{X}}}$ is an intuitionistic model:

166 **Proposition 4.** $\mathfrak{K}_{\mathbb{T}_{\mathbb{X}}}$ is an intuitionistic Kripke model.

167 The semantics interpretation the Kripke models above defined is standard:

168 **Definition 6** (Kripke Semantics). *The semantics of a formula A w.r.t to an Kripke Model $\mathfrak{K}_{\mathbb{T}_{\mathbb{X}}}$ with $\mathbb{X} \supseteq \mathbb{P}[A]$*
169 *is defined as:*

- 170 • $\mathfrak{K}_{\mathbb{T}_{\mathbb{X}}}, \alpha \Vdash q$ iff $q \in V_{\mathbb{T}}(\alpha)$;
- 171 • $\mathfrak{K}_{\mathbb{T}_{\mathbb{X}}}, \alpha \not\Vdash \perp$;
- 172 • $\mathfrak{K}_{\mathbb{T}_{\mathbb{X}}}, \alpha \Vdash A \wedge B$ iff $\mathfrak{K}_{\mathbb{T}_{\mathbb{X}}}, \alpha \Vdash A$ & $\mathfrak{K}_{\mathbb{T}_{\mathbb{X}}}, \alpha \Vdash B$;
- 173 • $\mathfrak{K}_{\mathbb{T}_{\mathbb{X}}}, \alpha \Vdash A \vee B$ iff $\mathfrak{K}_{\mathbb{T}_{\mathbb{X}}}, \alpha \Vdash A$ OR $\mathfrak{K}_{\mathbb{T}_{\mathbb{X}}}, \alpha \Vdash B$;

174 • $\mathfrak{R}_{\mathbb{T}_X}, \alpha \Vdash A \rightarrow B$ iff $\forall \beta, \alpha \sqsubseteq_{\mathbb{T}} \beta \Rightarrow (\mathfrak{R}_{\mathbb{T}_X}, \beta \Vdash A \Rightarrow \mathfrak{R}_{\mathbb{T}_X}, \beta \Vdash B)$.

175 With $\mathfrak{R}_{\mathbb{T}_X} \Vdash A$ we mean that $\forall \alpha. \mathfrak{R}_{\mathbb{T}_X}, \alpha \Vdash A$ (A is true in $\mathfrak{R}_{\mathbb{T}_X}$). With $\Vdash A$ we mean that
 176 $\forall \mathbb{T}_{\mathbb{P}[A]}. \mathfrak{R}_{\mathbb{T}_{\mathbb{P}[A]}} \Vdash A$ (A is valid).

177 Moreover, the following proposition holds:

Proposition 5. For each formula A , $X \ni \mathbb{P}[A]$ and observational model $\mathbb{T}_X = \langle \langle T, \leq \rangle, \mathfrak{p}, \mathfrak{a}, \mathfrak{s} \rangle$ and for each $\alpha \in T$

$$\mathbb{T}_X, \alpha \Vdash A \Leftrightarrow \mathfrak{R}_{\mathbb{T}_X}, \alpha \Vdash A$$

178 **Proof.** The thesis follows by construction of the model $\mathfrak{R}_{\mathbb{T}}$ from the observational tree. If A is a
 179 propositional symbol q , then $\mathbb{T}_X, \alpha \Vdash q$ iff (by definition of the semantics) $q \in \mathfrak{s}(\alpha)$, iff and only if
 180 $q \in V_{\mathbb{T}}(\alpha)$. The other cases are easily provable by induction on the structure of A . We show the \wedge case
 181 as a title of example. Suppose $\mathbb{T}_X, \alpha \Vdash B \wedge C$. This holds iff $\mathbb{T}_X, \alpha \Vdash B$ & $\mathbb{T}_X, \alpha \Vdash C$. By i.h., we have
 182 $\mathfrak{R}_{\mathbb{T}_X}, \alpha \Vdash B$, $\mathfrak{R}_{\mathbb{T}_X}, \alpha \Vdash C$ and, by definition 6, $\mathfrak{R}_{\mathbb{T}_X}, \alpha \Vdash B \wedge C$. \square

183 Since for each \mathbb{T}_X , $\mathfrak{R}_{\mathbb{T}_X}$ is a Kripke model, we have trivially that:

184 **Corollary 1.** $\Vdash A \Rightarrow \Vdash A$.

Corollary 1 shows that \Vdash is a logic that leaves between intuitionistic and classical logic, namely the following set of inclusions hold (\Vdash is the classic logic notion of truth):

$$\{A : \Vdash A\} \subseteq \{A : \Vdash A\} \subsetneq \{A : \Vdash A\}$$

185 The last inclusion is trivially shown, since we know that classical validity may be formulated with
 186 finite models. A finite model is nothing else that a finite set $X \subseteq \mathbb{P}$, with the clause for propositional
 187 symbols $X \Vdash q \Leftrightarrow q \in X$. Given a finite model $X = \{r_0, \dots, r_n\}$, we can associate to X the observation
 188 tree \mathbb{T} where the root is labelled with $|X\rangle$ and for each node t , $\mathfrak{a}(t) = \{I\}$. It is trivial to observe that
 189 $X \Vdash A \Leftrightarrow \mathbb{T} \Vdash A$. The thesis follows immediately.

190 On the other hand, as shown below, \Vdash does not validate the *tertium non datur principle*, and
 191 consequently the *last inclusion is proper*.

192 **Theorem 1.** $\not\Vdash A \vee \neg A$

193 **Proof.** Let us consider the observational tree \mathbb{T} represented in Figure 1. Let $\alpha \langle \rangle = (P_r, P_r^\perp)$ where P
 194 is the projector in the subspace of vectors β s.t. $r \in \beta$. Moreover for each $\alpha \neq \langle \rangle$ let $\mathfrak{a}(\alpha) = Id$. It is
 195 immediate to observe that $\mathbb{T} \not\Vdash r \vee \neg r$, and therefore $\not\Vdash r \vee \neg r$. \square

196 The question is now to classify \Vdash w.r.t intuitionistic logic. In the next section, we show how any
 197 (tree-like) Kripke model can be translated into an observational tree.

198 3.2. From Kripke models to Observational trees

199 We now show how to associate to a tree-Kripke model K an observational model \mathbb{T}_K .
 200 Let K be a tree Kripke model $\langle N, \leq, V \rangle$. We denote with \mathbb{P}_K the set of propositional symbols $\bigcup_{t \in N} V(t)$
 201 and with F_K the set of formulas built on the basis of \mathbb{P}_K .

Theorem 2. For each tree-like Kripke model K and for each $A \in F_K$

$$K, t \Vdash A \Leftrightarrow \mathbb{T}_K, t \Vdash A$$




Figure 1. Tertium Non Datur: a counterexample

202 **Proof.** We show a simple procedure to associate an observational tree $\mathbb{T}_K = \langle N, \sqsubseteq, \mathfrak{p}, \mathfrak{a}, \mathfrak{s} \rangle$ to $K = \langle N, \leq,$
 203 $, V \rangle$.

204 **step 1** choose a set of distinguishable propositional symbols $PN = \{p_t : t \in N\}$ s.t. $\mathbb{P}_T \cap N = \emptyset$ and
 205 build the Hilbert Space is $\mathcal{H}_{PN \cup \mathbb{P}_T}$.

206 **step 2** define \sqsubseteq as \leq^- ($t \sqsubseteq u \Leftrightarrow u \leq t$);

207 **step 3** Let $\mathfrak{a}(t)$ be the set of projectors $\mathcal{O}_t = \{P_{i_1}, \dots, P_{i_m}\}$ defined as:

$$208 \quad \mathcal{O}_t = \begin{cases} \emptyset & \text{if } t \text{ is a leaf} \\ \{P_{i_1}, \dots, P_{i_m}\} \text{ s.t. } \forall j \in [1, m]. P_{i_j} \text{ is the projector in the subspace of registers} \\ \beta \text{ s.t. } t * \langle i_j \rangle \in \beta \text{ and } t * \langle i_j \rangle \sqsubseteq t, & \text{otherwise.} \end{cases}$$

209 **step 4** The functions $\mathfrak{p}, \mathfrak{s}$ are univocally defined by the following labelling $\mathfrak{s}(\langle \rangle)$ of the root.

210 Let us consider the set of L of leaves of K , and consider for each $u \in L$: the set $C_u = \{t : t \in N \ \& \ u \sqsubseteq$
 211 $t \ \& \ t \in N\}$ and the set $Pr_u = \bigcup_{t \in C_u} V(t)$. We define $\mathfrak{s}(\langle \rangle) = \sum_{u \in L} \frac{1}{\sqrt{|L|}} |C_u \cup Pr_u\rangle$


212 Given the above translation the proof proceeds by means of a standard induction on the length of
 213 formulas. \square

Example 1. Let us consider the tree-like Kripke model of figure 2-(a). Applying the four steps above scripted we
 obtain an observational model as in figure 2-(b) where the relevant Hilbert space is

$$\mathcal{H}_{r, s, u, v, p_{\langle 0 \rangle}, p_{\langle 0, 0 \rangle}, p_{\langle 1, 0 \rangle}, p_{\langle 1, 1 \rangle}, p_{\langle 1, 1, 0 \rangle}}$$


214 (for the sake of readability, we have depicted only the labelling function \mathfrak{a} .)

215 As a corollary of Theorem 2, we can state the following:



a) a kripke model

$$\begin{aligned}
 & 1/\sqrt{6}|v\rangle + 1/\sqrt{6}|p_{\langle 0 \rangle, r, u, v}\rangle + 1/\sqrt{6}|p_{\langle 1 \rangle, s, v}\rangle + \\
 & 1/\sqrt{6}|p_{\langle 1 \rangle, p_{\langle 1,0 \rangle}, r, s, v}\rangle + 1/\sqrt{6}|p_{\langle 1 \rangle, p_{\langle 1,1 \rangle}, s, u, v}\rangle + \\
 & 1/\sqrt{6}|p_{\langle 1 \rangle, p_{\langle 1,1 \rangle}, p_{\langle 1,1,0 \rangle}, s, r, u, v}\rangle
 \end{aligned}$$



b) the associated observational model

Figure 2. The transformation of a Kripke model in a observational tree

216 **Corollary 2.** $\models A \Rightarrow \Vdash A$

217 Therefore Corollary 1 and 2 give us the final theorem:

Theorem 3. *The class of valid formulas w.r.t. the classes of observational trees is exactly the class of intuitionistic provable formula, or in other words:*

$$\models A \Leftrightarrow \Vdash A$$

218 4. Possible developments

219 The further investigations based on the proposed approach will follow two different directions of
220 research.

- 221 1. We have shown that intuitionistic logic is "the" logic of observational tree. This means that we
222 could think to move from the model theoretic approach to a proof theoretical one. It is well
223 known that, via the so called Curry-Howard isomorphism, it is possible to associate a lambda
224 calculus to the intuitionistic proofs. Is it possible to give a quantum interpretation of such a
225 calculus? Our idea is to start again with the BHK interpretation of intuitionistic logic. For
226 example, according to this interpretation, a proof of $A \rightarrow B$ could be seen as a measurement
227 process that transforms each measurement process A into one of B .
- 228 2. We think also to extend the model theoretic approach in order to deal with unitary
229 transformations. One possibility we have in mind is to add a temporal (classical? intuitionistic?)
230 dimension to intuitionistic logic, so that we can move in two different directions: an intuitionist
231 one linked to the measurement process, and an linear temporal one that is linked to unitary
232 evolution of the quantum system. The studies of Finger and Gabbay on the temporization of
233 logical system could help (see e.g.[17].)

234 **Author Contributions:** All authors contributed equally to this paper.

235 **Funding:** This research received no external funding.

236 **Conflicts of Interest:** The authors declare no conflict of interest.

237 References

- 238 1. Birkhoff, G.; von Neumann, J. The logic of quantum mechanics. *Ann. of Math. (2)* **1936**, *37*, 823–843.
- 239 2. Dalla Chiara, M.L. Quantum Logic. In *Handbook of Philosophical Logic: Volume III: Alternatives to Classical*
240 *Logic*; Gabbay, D.; Guentner, F., Eds.; Reidel, 1986; pp. 427–469.
- 241 3. Feynman, R.P. Simulating physics with computers. *Internat. J. Theoret. Phys.* **1981/82**, *21*, 467–488. Physics
242 of computation, Part II (Dedham, Mass., 1981).
- 243 4. Nielsen, M.A.; Chuang, I.L. *Quantum computation and quantum information, 10h Anniversary Edition*;
244 Cambridge University Press: Cambridge, 2010; pp. xxvi+676.
- 245 5. Selinger, P.; Valiron, B. A lambda calculus for quantum computation with classical control. *Mathematical*
246 *Structures in Computer Science* **2006**, *16*, 527–552. doi:10.1017/S0960129506005238.
- 247 6. Díaz-Caro, A.; Arrighi, P.; Gadella, M.; Grattage, J. Measurements and Confluence in Quantum
248 Lambda Calculi With Explicit Qubits. *Electr. Notes Theor. Comput. Sci.* **2011**, *270*, 59–74.
249 doi:10.1016/j.entcs.2011.01.006.
- 250 7. Pagani, M.; Selinger, P.; Valiron, B. Applying quantitative semantics to higher-order quantum computing.
251 Proceedings of POPL '14. ACM, 2014, pp. 647–658.
- 252 8. Zorzi, M. On quantum lambda calculi: a foundational perspective. *Mathematical Structures in Computer*
253 *Science* **2016**, *26*, 1107–1195. doi:10.1017/S0960129514000425.
- 254 9. Coecke, B.; Duncan, R. Tutorial: Graphical Calculus for Quantum Circuits. *Reversible Computation*;
255 Glück, R.; Yokoyama, T., Eds.; Springer Berlin Heidelberg: Berlin, Heidelberg, 2013; pp. 1–13.
- 256 10. ABRAMSKY, S.; DUNCAN, R. A categorical quantum logic. *Mathematical Structures in Computer Science*
257 **2006**, *16*, 469–489. doi:10.1017/S0960129506005275.

- 258 11. Baltag, A.; Smets, S. The logic of quantum programs. Proceedings of the 2nd QPL, 2004.
- 259 12. Baltag, A.; Smets, S. LQP: the dynamic logic of quantum information. *Math. Structures Comput. Sci.* **2006**,
260 16, 491–525.
- 261 13. Masini, A.; Viganò, L.; Zorzi, M. Modal deduction systems for quantum state transformations. *J.*
262 *Mult.-Valued Logic Soft Comput.* **2011**, 17, 475–519.
- 263 14. Viganò, L.; Volpe, M.; Zorzi, M. Quantum State Transformations and Branching Distributed Temporal Logic
264 - (Invited Paper). Logic, Language, Information, and Computation - 21st International Workshop, WoLLIC
265 2014, Valparaíso, Chile, September 1-4, 2014. Proceedings, 2014, pp. 1–19. doi:10.1007/978-3-662-44145-9_1.
- 266 15. Viganò, L.; Volpe, M.; Zorzi, M. A branching distributed temporal logic for reasoning
267 about entanglement-free quantum state transformations. *Inf. Comput.* **2017**, 255, 311–333.
268 doi:10.1016/j.ic.2017.01.007.
- 269 16. Girard, J.Y. *Proof theory and logical complexity*; Vol. 1, *Studies in Proof Theory. Monographs*, Bibliopolis: Naples,
270 1987; p. 505.
- 271 17. Finger, M.; Gabbay, D. Combining Temporal Logic Systems. *Notre Dame J. Formal Logic* **1996**, 37, 204–232.
272 doi:10.1305/ndjfl/1040046087.