

Can one see entanglement ?

Nicolas Brunner,* Cyril Branciard, and Nicolas Gisin
 Group of Applied Physics, University of Geneva, CH-1211 Geneva 4, Switzerland
 (Dated: November 1, 2018)

The human eye can detect optical signals containing only a few photons. Compared to man-made detectors, the main characteristic of these biological detectors is a detection threshold. We show that this feature is not a limiting factor for observing quantum entanglement in Bell-type experiments. In other words, entanglement could in principle be seen ! Remarkably, quantum non-locality can be demonstrated without any further assumptions when the response function of the detector is close to a step function. For smoother response functions, one needs the standard fair sampling assumption.

PACS numbers:

The human eye is an extraordinary light sensitive detector. It can easily stand a comparison to today's best man-made detectors. Already back in the forties, experiments on the sensibility of the human eye to very weak optical signals were conducted [1], leading to the conclusion that rod photoreceptors can detect a very small number of photons, typically less than 10 during an integration time of about 300ms. To date, this prediction has been confirmed by many experiments [2]. Though most specialists still disagree on the exact number of photons required to trigger a neural response, it seems to be now commonly accepted that there is a threshold number of incident photons, below which no neural signal is sent to the brain. This assumption is supported by the good agreement between theoretical models and experimental data from behavioral experiments. The mechanism of photon detection in the eye contains basically three steps: first the photon is absorbed by the rod, which then amplifies the signal with some very efficient chemical reactions; then some post-processing (basically a thresholding) is performed [3]; finally a neural signal is sent to the brain. It is believed that the role of this threshold is to maintain a very low dark noise, in particular to get rid of thermal noise originating from the optical cavity itself [3].

In the context of quantum information, it is quite intriguing to ask whether one could perform Bell-type experiments in which standard detectors are replaced by biological detectors. The challenge could even be pushed one step further: could one perform a Bell experiment with human eyes ? Could quantum non-locality be demonstrated in this way ? Though such an experiment would probably not lead to a better understanding of quantum non-locality itself, it would definitely be fascinating !

As mentioned above, the main difference between man-made photon counters and the human eye is the detection threshold. To test whether a detector is able to detect single

photons, one usually checks that the response of this detector to very low intensities is linear. Indeed this is not the case for the eye, which we therefore call a non-linear detector. In this paper we report a preliminary theoretical study of Bell tests with such non-linear detectors. Our goal is to provide a good understanding of Bell experiments with a model of detector that captures the main characteristic of the human eye, namely a detection threshold.

The presentation is organized as follows. First, we consider perfect thresholds (no detection below the threshold and perfect detection above). We show that, even for a poissonian source, the threshold is not a restriction for demonstrating quantum non-locality; in other words, Bell inequalities can be violated (in the strict sense) with such detectors. Next we smoothen the threshold, in order to make the detector more realistic. We show that, except for close to perfect thresholds, one must then perform post-selection, as in (photonic) Bell experiments with linear detectors, to obtain a violation of a Bell inequality.

General framework. Let us consider a typical Bell test scenario. A source sends pairs of entangled particles (each pair being in state ρ) to two distant observers, Alice and Bob, who perform measurements on their respective particles. In this paper we will focus on the case where Alice and Bob choose between two different measurement settings A_1, A_2 and B_1, B_2 , each of these measurements giving a binary result $\alpha, \beta \in \{+, -\}$. This simple situation is well characterized from the point of view of non-locality: there is only one Bell inequality [4], the famous CHSH inequality [5], which we will express here in the CH [6] form

$$CH \equiv P_{++}(A_1 B_1) + P_{++}(A_1 B_2) + P_{++}(A_2 B_1) - P_{++}(A_2 B_2) - P_+(A_1) - P_+(B_1) \leq 0, \quad (1)$$

where $P_{++}(A_i B_j)$ is a shortcut for $P(++ | A_i B_j)$, the probability that $\alpha = \beta = +$ when Alice (Bob) has performed measurement $A_i (B_j)$.

Perfect threshold. Now we bring the biological detector into the picture. We start by assuming our detector has a perfect threshold at N photons; optical signals containing at least N photons are always detected (note that our detector is not photon number resolving), while signals with less than N photons are never detected. In other words, the response




FIG. 1: Bell experiments with human detectors.

function of our detector is simply a step function, the step occurring at N photons.

First, it is clear that the number of emitted pairs M (during the integration time of the detector) has to be larger or equal than the threshold N , otherwise the detectors will never fire. To gain some intuition, let us start with the simplest situation $M = N$: the source emits exactly the threshold number of pairs. In this case a detector clicks whenever all photons take the same output of the polarizing beam splitter. Thus the probabilities entering the CH inequality are simply given by

$$P_+(A_i) = p_+(A_i)^N, \quad P_{++}(A_i B_j) = p_{++}(A_i B_j)^N, \quad (2)$$

where $p_{++}(A_i B_j) = \text{tr}([A_i^+ \otimes B_j^+] \rho)$ is the quantum joint probability for a single pair, and similarly for the marginal probability $p_+(A_i)$.

It should be pointed out that, though the detectors are supposed to be perfectly efficient, there are many inconclusive events, because of the threshold. One may label these events with a third outcome " \emptyset ". Since we consider only the outcome "+" in the CH inequality, this third outcome can be grouped with the outcome "-", such that our experiment still provides binary outcomes ("+" or "-, \emptyset ") [9]. Alternatively, one may also discard inconclusive events, but we will come back to this issue later.

Inserting probabilities (2) into the CH inequality, we compute numerically the maximal amount of violation for pure entangled states of two qubits $|\psi\rangle = \cos\theta|00\rangle + \sin\theta|11\rangle$. The optimization is performed over the four measurement settings. The results are presented in Fig. 2 (a), for different values of the threshold N . Surprisingly, the inequality can be violated for any N [10]. For large values of N , this is quite astonishing, since the probabilities (2) are very small; most events do not lead to a click. Another astonishing feature, is that, for increasing values of N , the state that achieves the largest violation is less and less entangled [11].

Next we compute the resistance to noise, defined as the maximal amount $(1 - w)$ of white noise that can be added to the state $|\psi\rangle$ such that the global state $\rho = w|\psi\rangle\langle\psi| + (1-w)\frac{\mathbb{1}}{4}$ still violates the Bell inequality. The optimization is performed as above. We find that the more entangled the state is, the more robust it is, though for $N \geq 2$ the maximal violation is never obtained for the maximally entangled state (see Fig. 2). So the close relation that exists, in the standard case $N = 1$, between the amount of violation and the resistance to noise, does not hold here anymore [12]. Indeed, in the perspective of experiments, the resistance to noise is the relevant figure of merit.

Now let us consider the case where the source emits $M \geq N$ entangled pairs, and the detector is characterized by a response function $\Theta(x)$, where x is the number of incident pho-




FIG. 2: Violation of the CH inequality (a) and resistance to noise w (b) versus the degree of entanglement of the state, for different threshold values N . Remarkably the inequality is violated for any value of the threshold N .

tons. The probabilities (2) now read

$$P_+^{(M)} = \sum_{n_+ + n_- = M} \Theta(n_+) M! \frac{p_+^{n_+}}{n_+!} \frac{p_-^{n_-}}{n_-!} \quad (3)$$

$$P_{++}^{(M)} = \sum_{\sum n_{\alpha\beta} = M} \Theta(n_+^A) \Theta(n_+^B) M! \prod_{\alpha, \beta = \pm} \left(\frac{p_{\alpha\beta}^{n_{\alpha\beta}}}{n_{\alpha\beta}!} \right)$$

where the indices $n_{\alpha, \beta}$ represent the numbers of pairs that take the outputs α on Alice's side and β on Bob's side, and $n_+^A \equiv n_{++} + n_{+-}$ while $n_+^B \equiv n_{++} + n_{-+}$.

For now, we still consider detectors with a perfect threshold, i.e. $\Theta(x < N) = 0$ and $\Theta(x \geq N) = 1$. Again, the amount of violation of the CH inequality as well as the resistance to noise can be computed numerically. We have performed optimization for $N \leq 10$ and found that the CH inequality can still be violated but that the resistance to noise decreases for increasing values of M . In Fig. 3 we present the results in a slightly different way: for a fixed number of emitted pairs ($M = 7$), we compute the violation of CH and the resistance to noise for different thresholds N . The optimal threshold is found to be $N = \lfloor \frac{M+1}{2} \rfloor$. Note that if we had photon counting detectors, then this threshold would simply correspond to a majority vote: if $n_+ \geq n_-$ then the result is "+", otherwise it is "-". It should also be pointed out that detectors with threshold N and $M - N + 1$ are equivalent, which can be seen by inverting the outputs "+" and "-".

Next we consider a poissonian source. The probability of




FIG. 3: Violation of the CH inequality (inset) and the resistance to noise w (figure) versus the degree of entanglement of the state, for different thresholds N . The source emits a fixed number of pairs $M = 7$. The optimal threshold, $N = 4$, corresponds to a majority vote (see text).

emitting M pairs is $p_M = e^{-\mu} \frac{\mu^M}{M!}$, where μ is the mean number of emitted pairs. Again we compute the probabilities entering the CH inequality: $P_+^{(\mu)} = \sum_M p_M P_+^{(M)}$, $P_{++}^{(\mu)} = \sum_M p_M P_{++}^{(M)}$, with $P_+^{(M)}$ and $P_{++}^{(M)}$ defined in equations (3). Again numerical optimizations show that the CH inequality can be violated. Fig. 4 shows the results for a detector with a perfect threshold at $N = 5$. The largest violation is obtained for $\mu \approx 9.05 \approx 2N - 1$, so basically when the threshold corresponds to a majority vote on the mean number of pairs ($N \approx \frac{\mu+1}{2}$). The resistance to noise has a very different dependence on μ (see Fig. 4). Smaller values of μ are more robust against noise. Intuitively this can be understood as follows. The term with $M = N$ pairs is the most robust against noise, as discussed previously. For small values of μ , more weight is given to this term (compared to terms with more pairs), thus leading to a stronger resistance to noise.

Smooth threshold. We just showed that a threshold is not a limiting factor for demonstrating quantum non-locality. However the response function of real biological detectors, such as the human eye, is not a perfect threshold but a smooth curve. Typically, for a number of photons near the threshold, the efficiency is limited. We have checked that, for smooth thresholds, the demonstration of quantum non-locality in the strict sense is compromised, except if the response function is close to a step function. Similarly to standard photonic experiments, where the efficiencies are too low for closing the famous detection loophole [7], one must add a further assumption: the fair sampling assumption, which says that the statistics obtained from the conclusive events only, fairly samples the global statistic. This will allow us to discard inconclusive events.

Post-selection. The fair sampling assumption allows one to post-select only the conclusive events, i.e. when both Alice's and Bob's detectors fire. In this case probabilities must be renormalized such that $\bar{P}(\alpha\beta|ij) = P(\alpha\beta|A_i B_j) / \sum_{\alpha, \beta = \pm} P(\alpha\beta|A_i B_j)$. Since we post-select




FIG. 4: Violation of CH (inset) and resistance to noise w (figure) versus the degree of entanglement of the state, for a poissonian source. The threshold is fixed to $N = 5$, while the mean number of emitted pairs μ is varied.

coincidences, it is now more convenient to express the CHSH inequality in its standard form (in which only correlation terms appear)

$$S \equiv |E(A_1, B_1) + E(A_1, B_2) + E(A_2, B_1) - E(A_2, B_2)| \leq L, \quad (4)$$

where $E(A_i, B_j) = \sum_{\alpha, \beta = \pm} \alpha\beta \bar{P}(\alpha\beta|A_i B_j)$, and L is the local bound (for a single pair $L = 2$).

We start again with the case where the source sends exactly N pairs, N being the detector's threshold. Let us stress that the source is supposed to send multiple copies of the same state ρ , as previously. For the singlet state ($\rho = |\psi^-\rangle\langle\psi^-|$), one has that $p_{\psi^-}(\alpha\beta|\vec{a}\vec{b}) = (1 - \alpha\beta\vec{a}\cdot\vec{b})/4$, the measurement settings being represented by vectors on the Bloch sphere (\vec{a} , \vec{b}). This leads to

$$E^{(N)}(\vec{a}, \vec{b}) = \frac{(1 - \vec{a}\cdot\vec{b})^N - (1 + \vec{a}\cdot\vec{b})^N}{(1 - \vec{a}\cdot\vec{b})^N + (1 + \vec{a}\cdot\vec{b})^N}. \quad (5)$$

These correlations are stronger than those of quantum physics, for a single pair. This is a consequence of the post-selection we performed. Inserting the correlators (5) into the CHSH inequality, one gets an expression which is maximized by the usual optimal settings, i.e. $A_1 = \sigma_z$, $A_2 = \sigma_x$, $B_1 = (\sigma_z + \sigma_x)/\sqrt{2}$ and $B_2 = (\sigma_z - \sigma_x)/\sqrt{2}$. In this case one gets

$$S_{\psi^-}^{(N)} = 4 \frac{(1 + 1/\sqrt{2})^N - (1 - 1/\sqrt{2})^N}{(1 + 1/\sqrt{2})^N + (1 - 1/\sqrt{2})^N}. \quad (6)$$

For $N \geq 2$, $S_{\psi^-}^{(N)}$ exceeds the Tsirelson bound ($2\sqrt{2}$) [8]: for example, $S_{\psi^-}^{(2)} = 8\sqrt{2}/3 \approx 3.77$. In fact, $S_{\psi^-}^{(N)}$ tends to the algebraic limit of CHSH, $\lim_{N \rightarrow \infty} S_{\psi^-}^{(N)} = 4$.

Thus we find that the violation of CHSH for the singlet state increases with the threshold N . However, in order to conclude for the presence of entanglement one has still to find the bound

for separable states. For $N = 1$ this bound is indeed equal to the local limit of the inequality ($\text{lhv}=2$). In case $N \geq 2$, the local bound will be increased because of the post-selection, as intuition suggests. Next we compute this local bound, which is indeed also a bound for any separable state of the form $\rho^{\otimes N}$.

We proceed as follows. We perform a numerical optimization over any local probability distribution for two binary settings on each side. This probability distribution is of the form of N copies of a two-output probability distribution, because of our hypothesis. The largest value of $S^{(N)}$ is obtained for the following probability distribution [13]:

$$p(\alpha = \beta|ij) = \frac{3}{8}, \quad p(\alpha \neq \beta|ij) = \frac{1}{8}, \quad \text{if } i = 1 \text{ or } j = 1$$

$$p(\alpha = \beta|ij) = \frac{1}{8}, \quad p(\alpha \neq \beta|ij) = \frac{3}{8}, \quad \text{if } i = j = 2, \quad (7)$$

leading to the local bound

$$L^{(N)} = 4 \left[\frac{3^N - 1}{3^N + 1} \right]. \quad (8)$$

One can check that $S_{\psi_-}^{(N)} > L^{(N)}$ for any N (see Fig. 5).

Remarkably, probability distribution (7) is obtained quantum mechanically by performing the optimal measurements (mentioned above) on the Werner state ($\rho_w = w|\psi_-\rangle\langle\psi_-| + (1-w)\mathbb{1}/4$) for $w = \frac{1}{\sqrt{2}}$, i.e. when ρ_w ceases to violate the CHSH inequality. Thus the resistance to noise for the singlet state, is independent of N . In other words one can tolerate the same amount of noise for any detection threshold N .

Note however that the bound (8) is valid only under the assumption that the source sends multiple copies of the same state ρ . In case this assumption breaks, the local bound reaches the algebraic limit of CHSH ($\text{lhv}=4$) [14], thus removing any hope of demonstrating entanglement. We stress that this was not the case for close to perfect thresholds; there no assumption had to be made on the source; thus a violation of the CH inequality implied the presence of entanglement.

Curiously no violation is obtained when the source sends a fixed number of pairs larger than the threshold ($M > N$) [15]. However for a poissonian source, CHSH can be violated for small values of μ , the mean number of emitted pairs (see Fig. 5). This is quite intuitive since, if $\mu \ll N$, the term with N pairs is dominant: its contribution is much larger than the following terms ($M > N$) [16]. Also, when μ tends to zero, the curve $M = N$ is recovered.

Conclusion. Amazed by the performances of the human eye, which can detect a few photons, we investigated whether biological detectors might replace man-made detectors in Bell-type experiments. We showed that the main characteristic of these detectors, namely a detection threshold is not a restriction for violating Bell inequalities. Thus entanglement could in principle be seen !

The authors thank J.D. Bancal, V. Scarani and C. Simon for discussions. We acknowledge financial support from the EU project QAP (IST-FET FP6-015848) and Swiss NCCR Quantum Photonics.




FIG. 5: Violation of the CHSH inequality for different thresholds N . The local bound is a function of N , but the resistance to noise for the singlet state is independent of N (see text). Violations are obtained for a source emitting exactly N pairs (solid blue lines) as well as for a poissonian source with $\mu = 0.1$ (dotted green lines). Note also that the set of pure entangled states that violate CHSH becomes smaller for increasing N . The settings are optimized for all states.

* Electronic address: nicolas.brunner@physics.unige.ch

- [1] S. Hecht, S. Schlaer, and M. Pirenne, *J. Gen. Physiol.* **25**, 819 (1942).
- [2] F. Rieke and D. A. Baylor, *Rev. Mod. Phys.* **70**, 1027 (1998).
- [3] G. Field, A. Sampath, and F. Rieke, *Annu. Rev. Physiol.* **67**, 15.1 (2005).
- [4] A. Fine, *Phys. Rev. Lett.* **48**, 291 (1982).
- [5] J. F. Clauser, M. A. Horne, A. Shimony, and R. A. Holt, *Phys. Rev. Lett.* **23**, 880 (1969).
- [6] J. F. Clauser and M. A. Horne, *Phys. Rev. D* **10**, 526 (1974).
- [7] P. M. Pearle, *Phys. Rev. D* **2**, 1418 (1970).
- [8] B. S. Tsirelson, *Hadronic J. Suppl.* **8**, 329 (1993).
- [9] With this relabelling of the outcomes, the CH and CHSH inequalities are equivalent.
- [10] Consider the maximally entangled state for instance, with the settings $A_1 = \sigma_z, A_2 = \cos(2\varphi)\sigma_z + \sin(2\varphi)\sigma_x, B_1 = \cos(\varphi)\sigma_z + \sin(\varphi)\sigma_x, B_2 = \cos(\varphi)\sigma_z - \sin(\varphi)\sigma_x$, one gets $CH \sim \frac{3N}{2N+1}\varphi^2 > 0$ when $\varphi \rightarrow 0$. Therefore, the CH inequality can be violated for any N , with φ small enough.
- [11] In general the relation between entanglement and non-locality is not well understood, but there are hints suggesting that partially entangled state contain more non-locality than maximally entangled ones. See for example: A. A. Méthot, V. Scarani, *Quant. Inf. Comput.* **7**, 157 (2007).
- [12] In the case $N = 1$ the resistance to noise w can be expressed as a function of the amount of violation Q : $w = \frac{L-\mathcal{M}}{Q-\mathcal{M}}$, where $Q = \text{tr}(\mathcal{B}|\psi\rangle\langle\psi|)$, $\mathcal{M} = \text{tr}(\mathcal{B})/4$ and \mathcal{B} is the Bell operator, L the local bound of the inequality.
- [13] We checked for small values of N that probability distribution (7) gives the largest violation of CHSH. We conjecture that (7) is always optimal, since it is obtained by an equal mixture of the eight deterministic strategies saturating the CHSH inequality; geometrically, it sits in the center of the CHSH facet.
- [14] To be more precise, there exists a local model that reaches the algebraic maximum of the CHSH inequality ($\text{lhv}=4$) for all

$N \geq 2$. It is unclear whether this bound can be reached by a separable state or not.

[15] Here we have considered the following response function:

$$\Theta(x < N) = 0, \Theta(x = N) = \eta > 0 \text{ and } \Theta(x > N) = 1.$$

[16] Note that in case of a poissonian source, the local bound must

be defined carefully, since the number of emitted pair is not fixed. However when $\mu \ll N$ it is reasonable to consider that the local bound is given by $L^{(N)}$.