

State-independent violation of correlation inequalities for non-contextual theories

Piotr Badziąg,¹ Ingemar Bengtsson,¹ Adán Cabello,² and Itamar Pitowsky³

¹*Department of Physics, Stockholm University, S-10691, Stockholm, Sweden*

²*Departamento de Física Aplicada II, Universidad de Sevilla, E-41012 Sevilla, Spain*

³*Department of Philosophy, The Hebrew University, Mount Scopus, Jerusalem 91905, Israel*

(Dated: February 6, 2020)

We show that for any physical system of dimension $d \geq 3$, any non-contextual theory satisfies some inequalities for the correlations of compatible measurements which are violated by quantum mechanics for any quantum state. These inequalities are obtained from the observables used in the proofs of the Kochen-Specker theorem.

PACS numbers: 03.65.Ta, 03.65.Ud, 42.50.Xa, 03.75.Dg

Introduction. Suppose that \mathcal{A} , \mathcal{B} , and \mathcal{C} are physical observables such that \mathcal{A} is compatible with \mathcal{B} and \mathcal{C} , but \mathcal{B} is incompatible with \mathcal{C} . The principle of *non-contextuality of probability* states that, for every state, the expectation value of \mathcal{A} is the same whether \mathcal{A} is measured with \mathcal{B} , or whether \mathcal{A} is measured with \mathcal{C} . That is, the expectation of an observable is context independent. A non-contextual theory is one in which the non-contextuality of probability is satisfied. Non-signaling theories are special cases of non-contextual theories, where unrestricted non-contextuality is replaced by a particular type of non-contextuality: no-signaling. In quantum mechanics, non-contextuality of probability leads to Born's rule (this is Gleason's theorem [1]).

Consider then a physical system admitting d compatible dichotomic observables (values ± 1) and consider n different (mutually incompatible) characterizations of this system $S^j = \{A_1^j, \dots, A_d^j\}_{j=1}^n$. Some of the mutually incompatible sets S^j may overlap, so one can have $j \neq k$, for which $A_i^j = A_m^k$ for some values of i and m . The non-contextuality of probability implies that the expectation of $A_i^j = A_m^k$ remains the same, whether measured in the context S^j or S^k . As is well known, the situation is different when one tries to assign non-contextual values to the observables: The Kochen-Specker (KS) theorem [2] states that, for $d \geq 3$, there are families of compatible dichotomic observables $\{S^j\}_{j=1}^n$, such that it is impossible to consistently assign non-contextual values ± 1 to all the observables A_i^j , so that exactly one observable in every family is assigned -1 . Finding a suitable family $\{S^j\}_{j=1}^n$ establishes a proof of the KS theorem.

The question addressed in this paper is whether one can derive from every proof of the KS theorem an inequality for correlations, which will be satisfied by every classical theory (i.e., whenever the A_i^j are interpreted as ± 1 valued classical random variables), and will be violated by the family $\{S^j\}_{j=1}^n$ for any quantum state. Such an inequality can be tested in the following way: Fix a quantum state, measure the observables in the set S^1 , then prepare another system in the same state and repeat the experiment for S^2 , and so on many times. Then, vary the state and repeat it. For the procedure to make sense,

the inequality must be written as a bound on the sum of components, each involving only compatible observables.

In a previous publication, one of us [3] derived such inequalities on the basis of a few proofs of the KS theorem, and asked whether a general construction can work for every KS proof. We settle this problem below. For a detailed history of the problem, see [3].

Classical inequality. Consider a physical theory which interprets the observables A_i^j as classical random variables with (simultaneous) non-contextual values ± 1 . We shall show that it must satisfy the following inequality:

$$\beta(d, n) \leq n(d-2) - 2, \quad (1)$$

where

$$\beta(d, n) = \sum_{j=1}^n \langle B^j \rangle, \quad (2)$$

and

$$\begin{aligned} B^j &= - \sum_{p \neq q} A_p^j A_q^j - \sum_{p \neq q \neq r \neq p} A_p^j A_q^j A_r^j - \dots \\ &\quad - \prod_{k=1}^d A_k^j - 1. \end{aligned} \quad (3)$$

The proof is as follows:

$$B^j = \sum_{k=1}^d A_k^j - \prod_{k=1}^d (1 + A_k^j). \quad (4)$$

When $A_k^j = 1$ for all k , then $B^j = d - 2^d$. When, for at least one value of k , $A_k^j = -1$, then $B^j = \sum_{k=1}^d A_k^j$. For any $d \geq 2$, the former value is smaller than all the latter values. Therefore, $B_{\max}^j = d - 2$, which is obtained for $d - 1$ positive and one negative value of A_k^j . Since the (overlapping) sets S^j are chosen so that it is impossible to produce B_{\max}^j for all j (because $\{S^j\}_{j=1}^n$ yields a proof of the KS theorem), then an upper bound for $\sum_{j=1}^n B^j$ is $n(d-2) - 2$. Therefore, this is also an upper bound for $\sum_{j=1}^n \langle B^j \rangle$.

Quantum violation. Quantum predictions violate inequality (1). If we associate every A_k^j with a unit vector $|v^{j,k}\rangle$ by

$$A_k^j = \mathbb{1} - 2|v^{j,k}\rangle\langle v^{j,k}|, \quad (5)$$

where $\langle v^{j,k}|v^{j,k'}\rangle = \delta_{kk'}$ for every $1 \leq j \leq n$, then the operator corresponding to the observable B^j is

$$B^j = \sum_{k=1}^d A_k^j - \prod_{k=1}^d (\mathbb{1} + A_k^j) \quad (6)$$

$$= (d-2)\mathbb{1}, \quad (7)$$

where equality (7) follows from the observation that $\mathbb{1} + A_k^j$ is twice the projection on the $(d-1)$ -dimensional subspace orthogonal to $|v^{j,k}\rangle$; hence $\prod_{k=1}^d (\mathbb{1} + A_k^j) = 0$ and thus (7) follows from $\sum_{k=1}^d A_k^j = (d-2)\mathbb{1}$.

By summing Eq. (7) over all the sets S^k , one concludes that, *independently of the quantum state*, the results of the measurements of the observables B^j lead to a violation of inequality (1). Specifically, according to quantum mechanics,

$$\beta_{\text{QM}} = n(d-2). \quad (8)$$

Remarks. Among all known proofs of the KS theorem for $d = 3$ [2, 4, 5, 6, 7, 8], the one with the smallest n has $n = 36$ sets and 49 observables [4]. Among all known proofs of the KS theorem for $d = 4$ [8, 9, 10, 11, 12, 13], the one with the smallest n has $n = 9$ sets and only 18 observables [11]. There are also proofs for other values of d [14, 15], and methods to generate proofs of the KS theorem for any value of d [9, 15, 16, 17].

For some $\{S^j\}_{j=1}^n$, the upper bound of inequality (1) cannot be reached. For instance, for the 24 observables in $d = 4$ of [8], $n = 24$. However, the upper bound of inequality (1) is not 46, but 40, while the value predicted by quantum mechanics is 48 (thus the violation is 8 instead of 2). This is due to the fact that the set of 24 observables in [8] is not critical in the sense that it contains 96 (critical) 20-observable and 16 (critical) 18-observable proofs of the KS theorem [11].

The case $d = 4$ using the 18 observables in [11] deserves a closer examination. The resulting inequality is a sum of 99 terms and is bounded by 16, while the quantum prediction is 18. However, if we omit all the correlations but those between 4 observables, then we obtain the 9-term inequality bounded by 7 but violated by 9 introduced in [3]. Therefore, the method presented here lead to inequalities that are not optimal in the sense that they can contain inequalities with fewer terms but the same violation. Finding simpler inequalities with the same violation is interesting since in actual experiments every expectation value is affected by errors.

Our inequality (1) is related to earlier ‘‘KS inequalities’’ [18, 19] between probabilities instead of correlations. Although an equivalence can be established between the final inequalities, the main difference is that,

while the derivation of the inequalities in [18, 19] assumes the sum rule (i.e., it requires quantum mechanics), the derivation of inequality (1) *only* requires the assumption of non-contextual probabilities (i.e., it does not require quantum mechanics). Quantum mechanics is only used to predict that (1) will be violated by the experimental results.

This result solves one of the problems formulated in [3] and provides a new insight in the relationship between the proofs of the KS theorem and experimentally testable inequalities.

The authors thank J.-Å. Larsson for valuable discussions. AC thanks the Department of Physics of Stockholm University for its hospitality, and acknowledges support from projects No. P06-FQM-02243 and No. FIS2008-05596. IP acknowledges the support of the Israel Science Foundation grant number 744/07.

-
- [1] A.M. Gleason, *J. Math. Mech.* **6**, 6, 885 (1957).
 - [2] S. Kochen and E.P. Specker, *J. Math. Mech.* **17**, 59 (1967).
 - [3] A. Cabello, e-print arXiv:0808.2456 [quant-ph].
 - [4] K. Schütte in 1965, first reported by K. Svozil in 1994. See also J. Bub, *Found. Phys.* **26**, 787 (1996).
 - [5] F.J. Belinfante, *A Survey of Hidden-Variables Theories* (Pergamon Press, New York, 1973). See also E. de Obaldia, A. Shimony, and F. Wittel, *Found. Phys.* **18**, 1013 (1988).
 - [6] A. Peres and A. Ron, in *Microphysical Reality and Quantum Formalism*, edited by A. van der Merwe, F. Selleri, and G. Tarozzi (Kluwer, Dordrecht, 1988), vol. 2, p. 115.
 - [7] J.H. Conway and S. Kochen around 1990, first reported in A. Peres, *Quantum Theory: Concepts and Methods* (Kluwer, Dordrecht, 1993), p. 114. See also J.H. Conway and S. Kochen, in *Quantum [Un]speakables: From Bell to Quantum Information*, edited by R.A. Bertlmann and A. Zeilinger (Springer-Verlag, Berlin, 2002), p. 257.
 - [8] A. Peres, *J. Phys. A* **24**, L175 (1991).
 - [9] J.R. Zimba and R. Penrose, *Stud. Hist. Philos. Sci.* **24**, 697 (1993).
 - [10] M. Kernaghan, *J. Phys. A* **27**, L829 (1994).
 - [11] A. Cabello, J. M. Estebarez, and G. García-Alcaine, *Phys. Lett. A* **212**, 183 (1996).
 - [12] R. Penrose, in *Quantum Reflections*, edited by J. Ellis and D. Amati (Cambridge University Press, Cambridge, England, 2000), p. 1.
 - [13] P.K. Aravind, and F. Lee-Elkin, *J. Phys. A* **31**, 9829 (1998).
 - [14] M. Kernaghan and A. Peres, *Phys. Lett. A* **198**, 1 (1995).
 - [15] A. Cabello, J.M. Estebarez, and G. García-Alcaine, *Phys. Lett. A* **339**, 425 (2005).
 - [16] A. Cabello and G. García-Alcaine, *J. Phys. A* **29**, 1025 (1996).
 - [17] M. Pavičić, J.-P. Merlet, B.D. McKay, and N.D. Megill, *J. Phys. A* **38**, 1577 (2005).
 - [18] C. Simon, Č. Brukner, and A. Zeilinger, *Phys. Rev. Lett.* **86**, 4427 (2001).
 - [19] J.-Å. Larsson, *Europhys. Lett.* **58**, 799 (2002).