

# No-signaling, Intractability and Entanglement

R. Srikanth\*

*Poornaprajna Institute of Scientific Research, Sadashivnagar, Bangalore- 560080, India. and  
Raman Research Institute, Sadashivnagar, Bangalore- 560080, India.*

We consider the problem of deriving the no-signaling condition from the assumption that, as seen from a complexity theoretic perspective, the universe is not an exponential place. A fact that disallows such a derivation is the existence of *polynomial superluminal* gates, hypothetical primitive operations that enable superluminal signaling but not the efficient solution of intractable problems. It therefore follows, if this assumption is a basic principle of physics, either that it must be supplemented with additional assumptions to prohibit such gates, or, improbably, that no-signaling is not a universal condition. Yet, a gate of this kind is possibly implicit, though not recognized as such, in a decade-old experiment involving position-momentum entangled photons. Here we describe two feasible quantum optical experiments that appear to explicitly demonstrate the action of this gate. We believe that the unexpected possibility of polynomial superluminal operations arises because some practically measured quantum optical quantities are not describable as standard quantum mechanical observables.

PACS numbers: 03.67.-a, 03.65.Ud, 03.65.Ta, 03.30.+p

## I. INTRODUCTION

In a multipartite quantum system, any completely positive map applied locally to one part does not affect the reduced density operator of the remaining part. This fundamental no-go result, called the “no-signalling theorem” implies that quantum entanglement [1] does not enable nonlocal (“superluminal”) signaling [2] under standard operations, and is thus consistent with relativity, in spite of the counterintuitive, stronger-than-classical correlations [3] that entanglement enables. For simple systems, no-signaling follows from non-contextuality, the property that the probability assigned to projector  $\Pi_x$ , given by the Born rule,  $\text{Tr}(\rho\Pi_x)$ , where  $\rho$  is the density operator, does not depend on how the orthonormal basis set is completed [4, 5]. No-signaling has also been treated as a basic postulate to derive quantum theory [6].

It is of interest to consider the question of whether/how computation theory, in particular intractability and uncomputability, matter to the foundations of (quantum) physics. Such a study, if successful, could potentially allow us to reduce the laws of physics to mathematical theorems about algorithms and thus shed new light on certain conceptual issues. For example, it could explain why stronger-than-quantum correlations that are compatible with no-signaling [7] are disallowed in quantum mechanics. One strand of thought leading to the present work, earlier considered by us in Ref. [8], was the proposition that the measurement problem is a consequence of basic algorithmic limitations imposed on the computational power that can be supported by physical laws. In the present work, we would like to see whether no-signaling can also be explained in a similar way, starting from computation theoretic assumptions.

The Turing machine (TM) represents an abstraction of the principles of mechanical computation. The machine consists of a head and a tape. The head is capable of being in one of a finite number of “internal states” and can read and overwrite a symbol from a finite set, then shifting one block left or right along the tape. It contains a finite internal program that directs its operations. The central problem in computer science is the conjecture that two computational complexity classes,  $\mathbf{P}$  and  $\mathbf{NP}$ , are distinct in the standard Turing model of computation.  $\mathbf{P}$  is the class of decision problems solvable in polynomial time by a (deterministic) TM.  $\mathbf{NP}$  is the class of decision problems whose solution(s) can be verified in polynomial time by a deterministic TM.  $\#\mathbf{P}$  is the class of counting problems associated with the decision problems in  $\mathbf{NP}$ . The word “complete” following a class denotes a problem  $X$  within the class, which is maximally hard in the sense that any other problem in the class can be solved in poly-time using an oracle giving the solutions of  $X$  in a single clock cycle. For example, determining whether a Boolean formula is satisfied is  $\mathbf{NP}$ -complete, and counting the number of Boolean satisfactions is  $\#\mathbf{P}$ -complete. The word “hard” following a class denotes a problem not necessarily in the class, but to which all problems in the class reduce in poly-time.

$\mathbf{P}$  is often taken to be the class of computational problems which are “efficiently solvable” (i.e., solvable in polynomial

---

\*Electronic address: srik@poornaprajna.org

time) or “tractable”, although there are potentially larger classes that are considered tractable such as **RP** [9] and **BQP**, the latter being the class of decision problems efficiently solvable by a quantum computer [10]. **NP**-complete and potentially harder problems, which are not known to be efficiently solvable, are considered intractable in the Turing model. If  $\mathbf{P} \neq \mathbf{NP}$  and the universe is a polynomial– rather than an exponential– place, physical laws cannot be harnessed to efficiently solve intractable problems, and **NP**-complete problems will be intractable in the physical world.

That classical physics supports various implementations of the Turing machine is well known. More generally, we expect that computational models supported by a physical theory will be limited by that theory. Witten identified expectation values in a topological quantum field theory with values of the Jones polynomial that are  $\#\mathbf{P}$ -hard [12]. There is evidence that a physical system with a non-Abelian topological term in its Lagrangian may have observables that are **NP**-hard, or even  $\#\mathbf{P}$ -hard [13].

Other recent related works that have studied the computational power of variants of standard physical theories from a complexity or computability perspective are, respectively, Refs. [8, 14, 15, 16, 17] and Refs. [8, 14]. Ref. [16] noted that **NP**-complete problems do not seem to be tractable using resources of the physical universe, and suggested that this might embody a fundamental principle, christened the **NP**-hardness assumption (also cf. [18]). We will informally refer to the proposition that the universe is a polynomial place in the computational sense (to be strengthened below) as well as the communication sense by the expression “the world is not hard enough” (WNHE) [19]. In Ref. [8], we pointed out that the assumption of WNHE (and further that of  $\mathbf{P} \neq \mathbf{NP}$ ) can potentially give a unified explanation of (a) the observed ‘insularity-in-theoryspace’ of quantum mechanics (QM), namely that QM is *exactly* unitary, linear and requires measurements to conform to the  $|\psi|^2$  Born rule [15, 20]; (b) the classicality of the macroscopic world; (c) the lack of quantum physical mechanisms for non-signaling superquantum correlations [7].

In (a), the basic idea is that departure from one or more of these standard features of QM seems to invest quantum computers with super-Turing power to solve hard problems efficiently, thus making the universe an exponential place, contrary to assumption. The possibility (b) arises for the following reason. It is proposed that the WNHE assumption holds not only in the sense that hard problems (in the standard Turing model) are not efficiently solvable in the physical world, but in the stronger sense that any physical computation can be simulated on a probabilistic TM with at most a polynomial slowdown in the number of steps (the Strong Church-Turing thesis). Therefore, the evolution of any quantum system computing a decision problem, could asymptotically be simulated in polynomial time in the size of the problem, and thus lies in **BPP**, the class of problems that can be efficiently solved by a probabilistic TM [21].

Assuming  $\mathbf{BPP} \neq \mathbf{BQP}$ , this suggests that although at small scales, standard QM remains valid with characteristic **BQP**-like behavior, at sufficiently large scales, classical (‘**BPP**-like’) behavior should emerge, and that therefore there must be a definite scale– sometimes called the Heisenberg cut– where the superposition principle breaks down [22], so that asymptotically, quantum states are not exponentially long vectors. In Ref. [8], we speculate that this scale is related to a discretization of Hilbert space. This approach provides a possible computation theoretic resolution to the quantum measurement problem. In (c), the idea is that in a polynomial universe, we expect that phenomena in which a polynomial amount of physical bits can simulate exponentially large (classical) correlations, thereby making communication complexity trivial, would be forbidden.

In the present work, we are interested in studying whether the no-signaling theorem follows from the WNHE assumption. The article is arranged as follows. Some results concerning non-standard operations that violate no-signaling and help efficiently solve intractable problems, are surveyed in Sections II and III, respectively. In Section IV, we introduce the concept of a polynomial superluminal gate, a hypothetical primitive operation that is prohibited by the assumption of no-signaling, but allowed if instead we only assume that intractable problems should not be efficiently solvable by physical computers. We examine the relation between the above two classes of non-standard gates. We also describe an *expunger* operation on a single qubit or qutrit, possibly the simplest instance of a polynomial superluminal gate. A quantum optical realization of the expunger gate, and its application to an experiment involving entangled photons generated by parametric downconversion in a nonlinear crystal is presented in Section V. Physicists who could not care less about computational aspects could skip directly to this Section. They may be warned that the intervening sections will involve mangling QM in ways that may seem awkward, and whose consistency is, unfortunately, not obvious! On the other hand, computer scientists unfamiliar with quantum optics may skip both Sections V and VII, both of which are essentially covered in Section VI, which discusses quantitative and conceptual issues surrounding the physical realization of the expunger gate. Section VII presents a simple demonstration of the expunger gate as applied to unentangled photons. Finally, we conclude with Section VIII by surveying some implications of a possible positive outcome of the proposed experiments, and discussing how such an unexpected physical effect may fit in with the mathematical structure of known physics.

## II. SUPERLUMINAL GATES

Even minor variants of QM are known to lead to superluminal signaling, for example, one incorporating nonlinear observables [23]. In this Section, we will review the case of violation of no-signaling due to departure from standard QM via the introduction of (a) non-complete Schrödinger evolution or measurement, (b) nonlinear evolution, (c) departure from the Born  $|\psi|^2$  rule.

In each case, we will not attempt to develop a non-standard QM in detail, but instead content ourselves with considering simple representative examples.

(a) *Non-complete measurements or non-complete Schrödinger evolution.* Let us consider a QM variant that allows a non-tracepreserving (and hence non-unitary) but invertible single-qubit operation of the form:

$$G = \begin{pmatrix} 1 & 0 \\ 0 & 1 + \epsilon \end{pmatrix}, \quad (1)$$

where  $\epsilon > 0$  is a real number. The resultant state  $\sum_x \alpha_x |x\rangle$  must be normalized by dividing it by the normalization factor  $\sqrt{\sum_x |\alpha_x|^2}$  immediately before a measurement, making measurements nonlinear. Given the entangled state  $(1/\sqrt{2})(|01\rangle + |10\rangle)$  that Alice and Bob share, to transmit a superluminal signal, Alice applies either  $G^m$  (where  $m \geq 1$  is an integer) or the identity operation  $I$  to her qubit. Bob's particle is left, respectively, in the state  $\rho_B^{(1)} \propto \frac{1}{2}(|0\rangle\langle 0| + (1 + \epsilon)^{2m}|1\rangle\langle 1|)$  or  $\rho_B^{(0)} = \frac{1}{2}(|0\rangle\langle 0| + |1\rangle\langle 1|)$ , which can in principle be distinguished, the distance between the states being greater for larger  $m$  (cf. Section III), leading to a superluminal signal from Alice to Bob.

More generally, we may allow non-unitary and irreversible evolution but still conform to no-signaling, provided the corresponding set of operator(s) is *complete*, i.e., constitutes a partition of unity. Suppose Alice and Bob share the state  $\rho_{AB}$ , and Alice evolves her part of  $\rho_{AB}$  locally through the linear operation given by the set  $\mathcal{P}$  of (Kraus) operator elements  $\{E_j \equiv e_j \otimes \mathbb{I}_B, j = 1, 2, 3, \dots\}$  [11], where  $\mathbb{I}_B$  is the identity operator in Bob's subspace. Bob's reduced density operator  $\rho'_B$  conditioned on her performing the operation and after normalization is:

$$\rho'_B = \mathcal{N}^{-1} \text{Tr}_A \left[ \sum_j E_j \rho_{AB} E_j^\dagger \right] = \mathcal{N}^{-1} \text{Tr}_A \left[ \sum_j E_j^\dagger E_j \rho_{AB} \right], \quad \mathcal{N} = \text{Tr}_{AB} \left[ \sum_j E_j^\dagger E_j \rho_{AB} \right], \quad (2)$$

where  $\mathcal{N}$  is the normalization factor. We satisfy the no-signaling condition  $\rho'_B = \rho_B$  only if  $\rho_{AB}$  is unentangled or  $\mathcal{P}$  satisfies the completeness relation

$$\sum_j e_j^\dagger e_j = \mathbb{I}_A, \quad (3)$$

which guarantees that the operation preserves norm  $\mathcal{N}$ . Here  $\mathbb{I}_A$  is the identity operator in Alice's subspace. If the norm is not preserved, renormalization is required, making the evolution effectively nonlinear. If the system  $A$  is subjected to unitary evolution or non-unitary evolution due to noise, or to standard projective measurements or more general measurements described by positive operator valued measures, the corresponding map satisfies Eq. (3), and  $\rho'_B = \rho_B$ . For terminological brevity, we call a (non-standard) gate like  $G$ , or a non-complete operation  $\mathcal{P}$  that enables superluminal signaling, as 'superluminal gate', and denote the set of all superluminal gates by ' $C^<$ '. For the purpose of this work,  $C^<$  is restricted to qubit or qutrit gates. Non-unitary super-quantum cloning or deleting, introduced in Ref. [24], which lead to superluminal signaling, are other examples of non-complete operations.

Even at the single-particle level, if the measurement is non-complete, there is a superluminal signaling due to breakdown in non-contextuality coming from the renormalization. As a simple illustration, suppose we are given two observers Alice and Bob sharing a delocalized qubit,  $\cos(\theta/2)|0\rangle + \sin(\theta/2)|1\rangle$ , with eigenstate  $|1\rangle$  localized near Alice and  $|0\rangle$  near Bob. With an  $m$ -fold application of  $G$  (which can be thought of as an application of imaginary phase on Alice's side, leading to selective augmentation of amplitude) on this state, Alice produces the (unnormalized) state  $\cos(\theta/2)|0\rangle + (1 + \epsilon)^m \sin(\theta/2)|1\rangle$ , so that after renormalization, Bob's probability of obtaining  $|0\rangle$  has changed in a context-dependent fashion from  $\cos^2(\theta/2)$  to  $\cos^2(\theta/2)(\cos^2(\theta/2) + (1 + \epsilon)^{2m} \sin^2(\theta/2))^{-1}$ . By thus nonlocally controlling the probability with which Bob finds  $|0\rangle$ , Alice can probabilistically signal 1 bit of information superluminally.

(b) *Nonlinear evolution.* As a simple illustration of a superluminal gate arising from nonlinear evolution, we consider the action of the nonlinear two-qubit 'OR' gate  $R$ , whose action in a preferred (say, computational) basis is given by:

$$\left. \begin{array}{l} |00\rangle \pm |11\rangle \\ |01\rangle \pm |10\rangle \\ |01\rangle \pm |11\rangle \end{array} \right\} \xrightarrow{R} |01\rangle \pm |11\rangle; \quad \begin{array}{l} |00\rangle \pm |10\rangle \xrightarrow{R} |00\rangle \pm |10\rangle, \\ |\alpha\beta\rangle \xrightarrow{R} |\alpha\beta\rangle. \end{array} \quad (4)$$

If the two qubits are entangled with other qubits, then the gate is assumed to act in each subspace labelled by states of the other qubits in the computational basis. Alice and Bob share the entangled state  $|\Psi\rangle = 2^{-1/2}(|00\rangle - |11\rangle)$ . To transmit a bit superluminally Alice measures her qubit in the computational basis or the diagonal basis  $\{|\pm\rangle \equiv 2^{-1/2}(|0\rangle \pm |1\rangle)\}$ , leaving Bob's qubit's density operator in a computational basis ensemble or a diagonal basis ensemble, which are equivalent in standard QM. However, with the nonlinear operation  $R$ , the two ensembles can be distinguished. Bob prepares an ancillary qubit in the state  $|0\rangle$ , and applies a CNOT on it, with his system qubit as the control. On the resulting state he performs the nonlinear gate  $R$ , and measures the ancilla. The computational (resp., diagonal) basis ensemble yields the value 1 with probability  $\frac{1}{2}$  (resp., 1). By a repetition of the procedure a fixed number  $m$  of times, a superluminal signal is transmitted from Alice to Bob with exponentially small uncertainty in  $m$ . Analogous to Eq. (4), one can define a 'nonlinear AND', which, again, similarly leads to a nonlocal signaling.

(c) *Departure from the Born  $|\psi|^2$  probability rule.* Gleason's theorem shows that the Born probability rule that identifies  $|\psi|^2$  as a probability measure, and more generally, the trace rule, is the only probability prescription consistent in 3 or larger dimensions with the requirement of non-contextuality [4]. Suppose we retain unitary evolution, which preserve the 2-norm, but assume that the probability of a measurement on the state  $\sum_j \alpha_j |j\rangle$  is of the form  $|\alpha_j|^p / \sum_k |\alpha_k|^p$  for outcome  $j$ , and  $p$  any non-negative real number. The renormalization will make the measurement contextual, giving rise to a superluminal signal. One might consider more general evolution that preserves a  $p$ -norm, but there are no linear operators that do so except permutation matrices [15].

For example, let Alice and Bob share the two-qubit entangled state  $\cos\theta|00\rangle + \sin\theta|11\rangle$  ( $0 < \theta < \pi/2$ ). The probability for Alice measuring her particle in the computational basis and finding  $|0\rangle$  (resp.,  $|1\rangle$ ) must be the same as that for a joint measurement in this basis to yield  $|00\rangle$  (resp.,  $|11\rangle$ ). Therefore Bob's reduced density operator is given by the state  $\rho^{(1)} = (\cos^p\theta|0\rangle\langle 0| + \sin^p\theta|1\rangle\langle 1|) / (\cos^p\theta + \sin^p\theta)$ . On the other hand, if Alice employs an ancillary, third qubit prepared in the state  $|0\rangle$ , and applies a Hadamard on it conditioned on her qubit being in the state  $|0\rangle$ , she produces the state  $\frac{\cos\theta}{\sqrt{2}}|000\rangle + \frac{\cos\theta}{\sqrt{2}}|001\rangle + \sin\theta|110\rangle$ . The probability that Alice obtains outcomes 00, 01 or 10 must be that for a joint measurement to yield 000, 001 or 110. Along similar lines as in the above case we find that she leaves Bob's qubit in the state

$$\rho^{(2)} \equiv \frac{2^{(1-p/2)} \cos^p\theta|0\rangle\langle 0| + \sin^p\theta|1\rangle\langle 1|}{2^{(1-p/2)} \cos^p\theta + \sin^p\theta}. \quad (5)$$

Since  $\rho^{(1)}$  and  $\rho^{(2)}$  are probabilistically distinguishable, with sufficiently many shared copies Alice can signal Bob one bit superluminally, unless  $p = 2$ .

### III. EXPONENTIAL GATES

As superluminal quantum gates like  $G$  or  $R$  are internally consistent, one can consider why no such operation occurs in Nature, whether a fundamental principle prevents their physical realization. One candidate principle is of course no-signaling itself. Alternatively, since we would like to derive it, linearity of QM may be taken as an axiom. Since all the above non-standard operations involve an overall nonlinear evolution, the assumption of strict quantum mechanical linearity can indeed rule out such non-standard gates. Yet it must be admitted that, from a purely physics viewpoint, assuming that QM is linear affords no greater insight than assuming it to be a non-signaling theory. We would like to suggest that the the absence of such operations may have a complexity theoretic basis.

Both superluminal gates as well as hypothetical gates that allow efficient solving of intractable problems involve some sort of communication across superposition branches. In particular, the superluminal gates of Section II can be turned into the latter type of gates, as discussed below.

(a) *Non-complete quantum gates.* It is easily seen that the gate  $G$  in Eq. (1) can be used to solve **NP**-complete problems efficiently. Consider solving boolean satisfiability (SAT), which is **NP**-complete: given an efficiently computable black box function  $f : \{0, 1\}^n \mapsto \{0, 1\}$ , to determine if there exists  $x$  such that  $f(x) = 1$ . With the use of an oracle that computes  $f(x)$ , we prepare the  $(n + 1)$ -qubit entangled state

$$2^{-n/2} \sum_{x \in \{0, 1\}^n} |x\rangle |f(x)\rangle, \quad (6)$$

and then apply  $G^m$  to the second, 1-qubit register, where  $m$  is a sufficiently large integer, before measuring the register. In particular, suppose that at most one solution exists. The un-normalized 'probability mass' of obtaining outcome  $|1\rangle$  becomes 1 (and the normalized probability about 1/2) when  $m = n / (2 \log(1 + \epsilon))$ , if there is a solution, or, if no solution exists, remains 0. Repeating the experiment a fixed number of times, and applying the Chernoff bound, we find that to solve SAT, we only require  $m \in O(n)$ . For terminological brevity, we will call as 'exponential

gate' such a non-standard gate that enables the efficient computation of **NP**-complete problems, and denote by  $E$  the set of all exponential gates, restricted in the present work to qubits and qutrit gates.

(b) *Nonlinear quantum gates.* The nonlinear operation  $R$  in Eq. (4) can be used to efficiently simulate nondeterminism. We prepare the state  $|\psi\rangle$  in Eq. (6), where the first  $n$  qubits are called the 'index' qubits and the last one the 'flag' qubit. There are  $2^{n-1}$  4-dim subspaces, consisting of the first index qubit and the flag qubit, labelled by the index qubits  $2, \dots, n$ . On each such subspace, the first index qubit and flag qubit are in one of the states  $|00\rangle + |11\rangle$ ,  $|01\rangle + |10\rangle$ ,  $|00\rangle + |10\rangle$ . The operation Eq. (4) is applied  $n$  times, pairing each index qubit sequentially with the flag. The number of terms with 1 on the flag bit doubles with each operation so that after the  $n$  operations, it becomes disentangled and can then be read off to obtain the answer [17]. A slight modification of this algorithm solves  $\#\mathbf{P}$ -complete problems efficiently, by replacing the flag qubit with  $\log n$  qubits and the 1-bit nonlinear OR operation with the corresponding nonlinear counting. The final readout is then the number of solutions to  $f(x) = 1$  [17]. Applying the nonlinear OR and AND alternatively to the state  $|\psi\rangle$  in Eq. (6) allows one to efficiently solve the quantified Boolean formula problem, which is **PSPACE**-complete [25].

(c) *Non-Gleasonian gates.* By employing polynomially many ancillas in the method of (c) in the previous subsection, one can show that non-Gleasonian quantum computers (for which  $p \neq 2$ ) can solve **PP**-complete problems [26] efficiently. Defining **BQP** $_p$  as similar to **BQP**, except that the probability of measuring a basis state  $|x\rangle$  equals  $|\alpha_x|^p / \sum_y |\alpha_y|^p$  (so that **BQP** $_2 = \mathbf{BQP}$ ), it can be shown that **PP**  $\subseteq$  **BQP** $_p$  for all constants  $p \neq 2$ , and that, in particular, **PP** exactly characterizes the power of a quantum computer with even-valued  $p$  (except  $p = 2$ ) [15].

In view of the connection between the two classes of gates, we now propose, as we earlier did in Ref. [8], that the reason for the absence in Nature of the superluminal gates of Section II is WNHE: in a universe that is a polynomial place, exponential gates like  $G$  and  $R$  are ruled out. In the next Section we will consider in further detail the viability of the WNHE assumption as an explanation for no-signaling.

#### IV. POLYNOMIAL SUPERLUMINAL GATES

Even though WNHE excludes the type of superluminal gates considered above, for the exclusion to be general, it would have to be shown that every superluminal gate is exponential, i.e.,  $C^< \subseteq E$ . It turns out that this cannot be done, because one can construct hypothetical polynomial superluminal gates, which are superluminal operations that are not exponential. In fact, it is probably true that  $E \subset C^<$ . To see this, let us consider solving the **NP**-complete problem associated with Eq. (6) via Grover search [27], which is optimal for QM [28] but offers only a quadratic speed-up, thus leaving the complexity of the problem exponential in  $n$ , at least in the black box setting. The optimality proof relies on showing that, given the problem of distinguishing an empty oracle ( $\forall_x A(x) = 0$ ) and a non-empty oracle containing a single random unknown string  $y$  of known length  $n$  (i.e.  $A(y) = 1$ , but  $\forall_{x \neq y} A(x) = 0$ ), subject to the constraint that its overall evolution be unitary, and linear (so that in a computation with a nonempty oracle, all computation paths querying empty locations evolve exactly as they would for an empty oracle), the speed-up over a classical search is at best quadratic.

Any degree of amplitude amplification of the marked state above the quadratic level would then require empty superposition branches being 'made aware' of the presence of a non-empty branch, i.e., a nonlinearity of some sort. Let us suppose Bob can perform a trace-preserving nonlinear transformation  $\rho_j \rightarrow \tilde{\rho}_j$  of the above kind on an unknown ensemble of separable states. Further, let Alice and Bob share an entangled state, by which Alice is able to prepare, employing two different POVMs, two different but equivalent ensembles of Bob. Then, depending on Alice's choice, his reduced density matrix evolves as  $\rho_B = \sum_j p_j \rho_j \rightarrow \sum_j p_j \tilde{\rho}_j \equiv \rho'$  or  $\rho_B = \sum_s p_k \rho_k \rightarrow \sum_s p_k \tilde{\rho}_k \equiv \rho''$  where  $(\rho_j, p_j)$  and  $(\rho_k, p_k)$  are distinct, equivalent ensembles [29]. The assumption of linearity is sufficient to ensure that  $\rho' = \rho''$ . This is not guaranteed in the presence of nonlinearity, leading to a potential superluminal signal. In a nonlinearity of the above kind, the result would depend on whether the particular ensemble remotely prepared by Alice has states that include  $|y\rangle$  in the superposition. This would lead to a scenario similar to that encountered with nonlinear gate  $R$  in Section II.

Possibly the simplest examples of polynomial superluminal gates are the non-invertible *expunger gates*

$$Q = \begin{pmatrix} 1 & 1 \\ 0 & 0 \end{pmatrix}; \quad Q' = \begin{pmatrix} 0 & 1 & 1 \\ 0 & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & 0 \end{pmatrix}, \quad (7)$$

acting in Hilbert space  $\mathcal{H}_2 \equiv \text{span}\{|0\rangle, |1\rangle\}$  and  $\mathcal{H}_3 \equiv \text{span}\{|0\rangle, |1\rangle, |2\rangle\}$ , respectively. They have the effect of mapping any given state in  $\mathcal{H}_2$  or the subspace  $\text{span}\{|1\rangle, |2\rangle\} \subset \mathcal{H}_3$ , to a fixed (apart from a normalization factor) state  $|0\rangle$  [30] ( $Q'$  annihilates  $|0\rangle$ ). Both  $Q$  and  $Q'$  are non-complete, inasmuch as  $Q^\dagger Q \neq \mathbb{I}$  and  $(Q')^\dagger Q' \neq \mathbb{I}$ , and represent superluminal gates. For example, by applying or not applying  $Q$  to her register in the state  $(1/\sqrt{2})(|01\rangle + |10\rangle)$  shared

with Bob, Alice can remotely prepare his state to be the (unnormalized) pure state  $|0\rangle + |1\rangle$  or leave it as a maximal mixture, respectively. Similarly, by choosing to apply, or not,  $Q'$  on her half of the state  $(1/\sqrt{2})(|11\rangle + |22\rangle)$  shared with Bob, Alice can superluminally signal him 1 bit.

For a single-particle state, the operators in Eq. (7) imply superluminal signaling via renormalization. As an illustration: in  $\mathcal{H}_3$ , let us augment  $Q$  by padding it with an identity operation in the extra dimension to obtain the operator  $Q'' \equiv Q \oplus \mathbb{I}$ . Let the states  $|0\rangle$  and  $|1\rangle$  be localized near Alice and  $|2\rangle$  near Bob. Applying  $Q''$  on the state  $|\psi\rangle \equiv a|0\rangle + b|1\rangle + c|2\rangle$ , Alice obtains the (unnormalized) state  $Q''|\psi\rangle = (a+b)|0\rangle + c|2\rangle$ . Thus, Alice may nonlocally influence Bob's probability to find  $|2\rangle$  to be  $|c|^2/(|a+b|^2 + |c|^2)$  or  $|c|^2$ .

On the other hand, clearly, neither  $Q$  nor  $Q'$  nor  $Q''$  is an exponential gate: each of them merely expunges the information in a qubit or qutrit and gives no unexpected computational power. As any of these gates always outputs a fixed pure state at the qubit/qutrit it acts on, it cannot increase entanglement by its local action, and in fact necessarily destroys any pre-existing entanglement possessed by the operated-upon system.

It is worth noting that the expunger gate is quite different from the quantum deleter [31], in which a qubit is subjected to a *complete* operation, in specific, a contractive completely positive map that prepares it asymptotically in a fixed state  $|0\rangle$ . The action of a quantum deleter is given by an amplitude damping channel [11], which has an operator sum representation  $\rho \rightarrow \sum_j E_j \rho E_j^\dagger$  (in the qubit case) or  $\rho \rightarrow \sum_j E'_j \rho E'_j{}^\dagger$  (when extended to the qutrit case), with the Kraus operators given by Eq. (8a) or (8b), respectively

$$E_1 \equiv \begin{pmatrix} 1 & 0 \\ 0 & 0 \end{pmatrix}, \quad E_2 \equiv \begin{pmatrix} 0 & 1 \\ 0 & 0 \end{pmatrix}, \quad (8a)$$

$$E'_1 \equiv \begin{pmatrix} 1 & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & 0 \end{pmatrix}, \quad E'_2 \equiv \begin{pmatrix} 0 & 1 & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & 0 \end{pmatrix}, \quad E'_3 \equiv \begin{pmatrix} 0 & 0 & 1 \\ 0 & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & 0 \end{pmatrix}. \quad (8b)$$

Unlike in the case of  $Q$ ,  $Q'$  or  $Q''$ , there is no actual destruction of quantum information, but its transfer through dissipative decoherence into correlations with a zero-temperature environment. The reduced density operator of Bob's entangled system remains unaffected by Alice's application of this operation on her system. The deleting action, though nonlinear at the state vector level, nevertheless acts linearly on the density operator.

The seemingly immediate conclusion due to the fact  $C^< \not\subseteq E$  is that the WNHE assumption is not strong enough to derive no-signaling, and would have to be supplemented with additional assumption(s), possibly purely physically motivated ones, prohibiting the physical realization of polynomial superluminal gates.

An alternative, highly unconventional reading of the situation is that WNHE is a fundamental principle of the physical world, while the no-signaling condition is in fact not universal, so that some polynomial superluminal gates may actually be physically realizable. Quite surprisingly, we may be able to offer some support for this viewpoint. We believe that expunger gates of above type can be quantum optically realized when a photon detection is made at a *path singularity*, defined as a point in space where two or more incoming paths converge and terminate. In graph theoretic parlance, a path singularity is a terminal node in a directed graph, of degree greater than 1. In principle, a detector placed at the focus of a convex lens realizes such a path singularity. This is because the geometry of the ray optics associated with the lens requires rays parallel to the lens axis to converge to the focus after refraction, while the destructive nature of photon detection implies the termination of the path. We describe in Sections V and VII experiments that possibly physically realize  $Q'$ . We find that although conceptually and experimentally simple, the high degree of mode filtering or spatial resolution that these experiments require will be the main challenge in implementing them. Indeed, we believe this is the reason that such gates have remained undiscovered so far.

Our argument here has implicitly assumed that  $\mathbf{P} \neq \mathbf{NP}$ . If it turns out that  $\mathbf{P} = \mathbf{NP}$ , then even the obviously non-physical operations such as  $G$  or  $R$  would be polynomial gates, and the WNHE assumption would not be able to exclude them. Nevertheless, the question of existence and testability of certain superluminal gates, which is the main result of this work, would still remain valid and of interest. If polynomial superluminal gates are indeed found to exist (and given that other superluminal gates do not seem to exist anyway), this would give us greater confidence that  $\mathbf{P} \neq \mathbf{NP}$  (or, to be safe, that even Nature does not 'know' that  $\mathbf{P} = \mathbf{NP}$ !) and that the assumption of WNHE is indeed a valid and fruitful one.

## V. AN EXPERIMENT WITH ENTANGLED PAIRS OF PHOTONS

Our first proposed implementation of  $Q'$ , based on the use of entanglement, is broadly related to the type of quantum optical experiments encountered in Refs. [32], and closely related to an experiment performed in Innsbruck that elegantly illustrates wave-particle duality by means of entangled light [33, 34]. As in the Innsbruck experiment, pairs of position-momentum entangled photons are produced by means of type-I spontaneous parametric down-conversion




FIG. 1: An ‘unfolded’ version of the proposed experiment. A pair of momentum-entangled photons is created by type-I parametric down conversion. Alice’s photon (the signal photon) is registered by a detector behind the Heisenberg lens. Bob’s photon (the idler) enters a double-slit assembly after traversing a direction filter that permits only (nearly) horizontal modes to pass through, absorbing the other modes at the filter walls. If the Heisenberg detector is placed in the focal plane of the lens (of focal length  $F$ ), it projects Bob’s state into a mixture of plane waves, of which only the horizontal modes can pass through the direction filter, to produce an interference pattern. On the other hand, positioning the Heisenberg detector in the imaging plane can potentially reveal the path the idler takes through the slit assembly, and thus does not lead to an interference pattern on Bob’s screen.

(SPDC) at a nonlinear source, such as a BBO crystal. The two outgoing conical beams from the nonlinear source are presented ‘unfolded’ in Figure 1. One of each pair, called the ‘signal photon’, is received by Alice, while the other, called the ‘idler’, is received and analyzed by Bob. Alice’s photon is registered by a detector behind a ‘Heisenberg lens’.

In the Innsbruck experiment, Bob’s photon directly enters a double-slit assembly. If the detector behind the lens is positioned at the focal plane of the lens and detects a photon, it localizes Alice’s photon to a point on the focal plane. By virtue of entanglement, this projects the state of Bob’s photon to a ‘momentum eigenstate’, a plane wave propagating in a particular direction. For example, if Alice detects her photon at  $f$  (resp.,  $f''$ ), Bob’s photon is projected to a superposition of the parallel modes 2 and 5 (resp., 3 and 6). Since this cannot reveal positional information about whether the particle originated at  $p$  or  $q$ , and hence reveals no which-way information about slit passage, therefore, in coincidence with a registration of her photon in the focal plane, the idler exhibits a Young’s double-slit interference pattern [33, 34]. The patterns corresponding to Alice’s registering her photon at  $f$  or  $f''$  will be shifted with respect to each other. Bob’s observation in his single counts will therefore not show any sign of interference, being the average of all possible such shifted patterns.

If the Heisenberg detector is placed at the imaging plane (at distance  $2F$  from the plane of the lens), a click of the detector can reveal the path the idler takes from the crystal through the slit assembly which therefore cannot show the interference pattern even in the coincidence counts. For example, if Alice detects her photon at  $l$  (resp.,  $m$ ), Bob’s photon is projected to a superposition of the mutually non-parallel modes 4, 5 and 6 (resp., 1, 2 and 3) and, because the double-slit assembly is situated in the near field, can then enter only slit  $y$  (resp.,  $x$ ). Therefore, Alice’s imaging plane measurement gives path or position information of the idler photon, so that, again, no interference pattern emerges in Bob’s coincidence counts [33, 34], and consequently also in his singles counts.

### A. Qualitative overview of the proposed experiment

The experiment presented here, proposed earlier by us in Ref. [35], is revisited here in order to clarify in detail why, in the light of the above discussions, the experiment can potentially yield a positive result, and also, what is, and what is not, responsible for the claimed signaling effect. In Ref. [36], we studied a version of nonlocal communication inspired by the original Einstein-Podolsky-Rosen thought experiment. Recently, similar experiments, based on the Innsbruck experiment, have been independently proposed in Refs. [37, 38].

The only difference between the original Innsbruck experiment and the modified version we propose here is that the latter contains a ‘direction filter’, consisting of two convex lenses of the same focal length  $G$ , separated by distance  $2G$ . Their shared focal plane is covered by an opaque screen, with a small aperture  $o$  of diameter  $\delta$  at their shared focus.

We want  $\delta$  to be small enough so that only almost horizontal modes are permitted by the filter to fall on the double slit diaphragm. The angular spread (about the horizontal) of the modes that fall on the aperture is given by  $\Delta\theta = \delta/G$ , we require that  $(\delta/G)\sigma \ll \lambda$ , where  $\sigma$  is the slit separation, to guarantee that only modes that are horizontal or almost horizontal are selected to pass through the direction filter, to produce a Young's double-slit interference pattern on his screen plane. On the other hand, we don't want the aperture to be so small that it produces significant diffraction, thus:  $\delta \gg \lambda$ . Putting these conditions together, we must have

$$1 \ll \frac{\delta}{\lambda} \ll \frac{G}{\sigma}. \quad (9)$$

The ability to satisfy this condition, while preferable, is not crucial. If it is not satisfied strictly, the predicted signal is weaker but not entirely suppressed. The point is clarified further down.

An intuitive overview of the modified experiment is as follows. If Alice makes no measurement, the idler remains entangled with the signal photon, which renders incoherent the beams coming through the upper and lower slits on Bob's side, so that he will find no interference pattern on his screen. Similarly, if she detects her photon in the imaging plane, she localizes Bob's photon at his slit plane, and so, again, no interference pattern is seen.

On the other hand, if Alice scans the focal plane and makes a detection, she remotely measures Bob's twin photon's momentum and erases its path information, thereby leaving it in a superposition of parallel modes incident on the double-slit diaphragm. Therefore, in the coincidence counts, Bob should see a Young's double slit interference pattern. This pattern can be thought of as produced by a virtual source located at the point of Alice's detection [34]. Now, on account of the direction filter, from Bob's viewpoint, the *only* relevant virtual source locations on the focal plane lie at focus  $f$  or close to  $f$ , since plane waves originating from other virtual locations are filtered out and do not reach Bob's double slit assembly. Hence an interference pattern will emerge in Bob's *singles counts*, coinciding with Alice's detection at  $f$  or close to  $f$ . Thus Alice can remotely prepare inequivalent ensembles of idlers, depending on whether or not she measures momentum on her photon. This constitutes a superluminal signal.

## B. The experiment in detail

Here we give a simple, quantitative exposition of the experiment. The state of the SPDC field of Figure 1 is modeled by a 6-mode vector:

$$|\Psi\rangle = \left(1 + \frac{\epsilon}{\sqrt{6}} \sum_{j=1}^6 a_j^\dagger b_j^\dagger\right) |\text{vac}\rangle \quad (10)$$

where  $|\text{vac}\rangle$  is the vacuum state,  $a_j^\dagger$  (resp.,  $b_j^\dagger$ ) are the creation operators for Alice's (resp., Bob's) light field on mode  $j$ , per the mode numbering scheme in Figure 1. The quantity  $\epsilon$  ( $\ll 1$ ) depends on the pump field strength and the crystal nonlinearity. The coincidence counting rate for corresponding measurements by Alice and Bob is proportional the square of the second-order correlation function, and given by:

$$R_\alpha(z) \propto \langle \Psi | E_z^{(-)} E_\alpha^{(-)} E_\alpha^{(+)} E_z^{(+)} | \Psi \rangle = \| E_\alpha^{(+)} E_z^{(+)} | \Psi \rangle \|^2, \quad (\alpha = f, f'', l, m, \dots). \quad (11)$$

where  $E_\alpha^{(+)}$  represents the positive frequency part of the electric field at a point on Alice's focal or imaging plane, and  $E_z^{(+)}$  that of the electric field at an arbitrary point  $z$  on Bob's screen. As an idealization (to be relaxed below), assuming perfect filtering and low spreading of the wavepacket at the aperture, we have:

$$E_z^{(+)} = e^{ikr_D} \left( e^{ikr_2} \hat{b}_2 + e^{ikr_5} \hat{b}_5 \right), \quad (12)$$

where  $k$  is the wavenumber,  $r_D$  the distance from the EPR source, via  $o$  to the upper/lower slit on Bob's double slit diaphragm (the length of the segment  $\overline{qou\bar{x}}$  or  $\overline{povy}$ );  $r_2$  (resp.,  $r_5$ ) is the distance from the upper (resp., lower) slit to  $z$ . We study the two cases, corresponding to Alice making a remote position or remote momentum measurement on the idler photons.

*Case 1. Alice remotely measures position (path) of the idler.* Suppose Alice positions her detector at or close to point  $l$  or  $m$  on the image plane. The corresponding field at her detector is

$$E_m^{(+)} = e^{iks_{1m}} \hat{a}_1 + e^{iks_{2m}} \hat{a}_2 + e^{iks_{3m}} \hat{a}_3; \quad E_l^{(+)} = e^{iks_{4l}} \hat{a}_4 + e^{iks_{5l}} \hat{a}_5 + e^{iks_{6l}} \hat{a}_6 \quad (13)$$



where  $s_{jm}$  (resp.,  $s_{jl}$ ) is the path length along ray path  $j$  from the source point  $p$  (resp.,  $q$ ) through the lens upto point  $m$  (resp.,  $l$ ). Setting  $\alpha = l, m$  in Eq. (11), and substituting Eqs. (10), (12) and (13) in Eq. (11), we find the coincidence counting rate for detections by Alice and Bob to be

$$R_\alpha(z) \propto \epsilon^2, \quad (\alpha = l, m), \quad (14)$$

which is a uniform pattern (apart from a  $\text{sinc}^2(\cdot)$  envelope due to single slit diffraction, which we ignore for the sake of simplicity). The intensity pattern Bob finds on his screen in the singles count, obtained by averaging  $R_\alpha(z)$  over  $\alpha = l, m$ , is thus not a double-slit interference pattern. A similar lack of interference pattern is obtained by Bob if Alice makes no measurement. The above expressions (namely, Eqs. (10, 11, 12, 13, 14)) and conclusions hold true also for the original Innsbruck experiment, with the minor difference that Bob's singles count pattern is obtained by marginalizing  $R_\alpha(z)$  over *all* points on Alice's imaging plane illuminated by the signal beam. However, as in the present proposed experiment and for the same reason, Bob finds no interference pattern in his singles counts.

*Case 2. Alice remotely measures momentum (direction) of the idler.* Alice positions her detector at focus  $f$  of the Heisenberg lens. The field at her detector is

$$E_f^{(+)} = e^{ikr_{2f}} \hat{a}_2 + e^{ikr_{5f}} \hat{a}_5 = e^{ikr_f} (\hat{a}_2 + \hat{a}_5), \quad (15)$$

where  $r_{2f}$  (resp.,  $r_{5f}$ ) is the distance from  $p$  (resp.,  $q$ ) along the path 2 (resp., 5) path through the lens upto point  $f$ . The distances along the two paths being identical,  $r_{2f} = r_{5f} \equiv r_f$ . Substituting Eqs. (10), (12) and (15) in Eq. (11), we find the coincidence counting rate is given by

$$R_f(z) \propto \epsilon^2 [1 + \cos(k \cdot [r_2 - r_5])] = 4\epsilon^2 \cos^2(\pi Sz/D\lambda), \quad (16)$$

which represents a conventional Young's double slit pattern. Detection of a signal photon at or near  $f$  is the *only* possible event on the focal plane such that Bob detects the twin photons in coincidence. Focal plane detections sufficiently distant from  $f$  will project the idler into non-horizontal modes that will be filtered out before reaching Bob's double-slit assembly. Therefore, the interference pattern Eq. (16) is in fact the one seen in Bob's singles counts. The above expressions (namely, the equations (10, 11, 12, 13, 16)) and conclusions hold true also for the original Innsbruck experiment, with the vital difference that Bob's singles count pattern is obtained by averaging  $R_\alpha(z)$  over *all* points on Alice's focal plane illuminated by the signal beam. Hence Bob finds no interference pattern in his singles counts, as in the case where Alice measures in the imaging plane basis.

Our main result is the difference between the patterns described by Eq. (14) and Eq. (16), which implies that Alice can signal Bob one bit of information across the spacelike interval connecting their measurement events, by choosing to measure her photon in the focal plane or not to measure. In practice, Bob would need to include additional detectors to sample or scan the  $z$ -plane fast enough. This procedure can potentially form the basis for a superluminal quantum telegraph, bringing into sharp focus the tension between quantum nonlocality and special relativity.

In an actual experiment, the conditions (9) may not hold strictly, with narrow filtering leading to a diffractive spreading of Bob's photon. It might appear that because the direction filter localizes the photon in momentum space, it would cause a complementary positional spread of the wavefunction, as a result of which Bob should observe a fixed interference pattern always, no matter what Alice does (or does not). However, a closer examination shows that such a spreading only causes a reduction in the visibility— and not a total washout— of the pattern received by Bob in the case of Alice's focal plane measurement. Thus, the spreading only lowers— but does not eliminate— the distinguishability between the two kinds of pattern that Bob receives. A simple, quantitative explanation of this situation is discussed in the remaining part of this Subsection.

For illustration, suppose we choose  $\delta = 10\lambda$ , and as a result, nearly only horizontal modes  $r_2$  and  $r_5$  are selected, but the diffraction is strong. We model this diffraction as a unitary rotation  $\begin{pmatrix} \cos\theta & \sin\theta \\ -\sin\theta & \cos\theta \end{pmatrix}$  in the space acted on by  $\hat{b}_2$  and  $\hat{b}_5$ , where  $\theta$  is determined by the geometry of the filter. In place of Eq. (12) we now have:

$$E_z^{(+)} = e^{ikr_D} \left( e^{ikr_2} (\cos\theta \hat{b}_2 + \sin\theta \hat{b}_5) + e^{ikr_5} (\cos\theta \hat{b}_5 - \sin\theta \hat{b}_2) \right). \quad (17)$$

In case of Alice's position measurement, we now have in place of Eq. (14)

$$R'_\alpha(z) \propto \epsilon^2 [1 \pm \sin(2\theta) \cos(k \cdot [r_2 - r_5])], \quad (\text{with } \pm \text{ according as } \alpha = l, m), \quad (18)$$

where the interference has arisen because the diffraction at  $o$  has given rise to an amplitude input to both slits. The pattern found by Bob in his singles counts is proportional to  $R'_l(z) + R'_m(z)$ , which is a constant pattern (ignoring the finite width of the slits). On the other hand, in place of Eq. (16), we now obtain

$$R'_f(z) \propto \epsilon^2 [1 + \cos(2\theta) \cos(k \cdot [r_2 - r_5])], \quad (19)$$

We recover the case of clearest distinction by setting  $\theta = 0$  (which corresponds to the zero diffraction limit), but even otherwise, the two cases (18) and (19) are in principle distinguishable in terms of visibility (except in the case  $\theta = \pi/4$ , which is highly unlikely, and in any case, can be precluded by altering  $\delta$  or  $G$ ).

## VI. ORIGIN OF THE SUPERLUMINAL SIGNALING

It might at first be supposed that as the only difference between our set-up in Figure 1 and the Innsbruck experiment, the direction filter must be responsible for the signaling, and that therefore, there must be some unphysical assumption in the way the filter is described to work. However, this is not the case. Below, we will find that the mode-selection at the filter can be described as a local, linear unitary (and hence complete) operation acting on the idler, and thus should not lead to any violation of no-signaling. It turns out that the filter only serves the practical purpose of exposing the signaling that would otherwise be hidden in the pattern that Bob receives. The signaling arises from the fact that Alice's 'momentum' measurement realizes a noncomplete operation in the subspace of interest. These points are discussed in the following Subsections.

### A. Alice's focal plane measurement implements an expunger gate

The state (10) is now represented in a simple way as the unnormalized state

$$|\Psi^{(1)}\rangle = \frac{\epsilon}{\sqrt{6}} \sum_{j=1}^6 |j, j\rangle, \quad (20)$$

where for simplicity the vacuum state, which does not contribute to the entanglement related effects, is omitted, and it is assumed that each mode contains at most one pair of entangled photons (i.e., no higher excitations of the light field). Further because of the direction filter, it suffices to restrict our attention to the state

$$|\psi^{(2)}\rangle \propto |2, 2\rangle + |5, 5\rangle, \quad (21)$$

the projection of  $|\Psi^{(1)}\rangle$  onto  $\mathcal{H}_2 \otimes \mathcal{H}_2$ , where  $\mathcal{H}_2$  is the subspace spanned by  $\{|2\rangle, |5\rangle\}$ . Under these assumptions, Alice's position measurement in this subspace, represented by the operators  $\hat{a}_2$  and  $\hat{a}_5$ , can be written as the Kraus operators  $\hat{a}_2 \equiv |0\rangle\langle 2|$  and  $\hat{a}_5 \equiv |0\rangle\langle 5|$ . Within  $\mathcal{H}_2$  these operators form a complete set since  $\hat{a}_2^\dagger \hat{a}_2 + \hat{a}_5^\dagger \hat{a}_5 = |2\rangle\langle 2| + |5\rangle\langle 5| = \mathbb{I}_2$ . Thus, Alice's measurement on  $|\Psi^{(2)}\rangle$  in the position basis does not nonlocally affect Bob's reduced density operator in this subspace, which is proportional to  $\mathbb{I}_2/2$ .

On the other hand, if Alice measures momentum, her measurement is represented by the field operator  $E_f^{(+)}$  in Eq. (15). We have in the above notation

$$E_f^{(+)} \propto \hat{a}_2 + \hat{a}_5 \equiv |0\rangle(\langle 2| + \langle 5|). \quad (22)$$

This is just the polynomial superluminal gate  $Q'$  in Eq. (8).

By contrast, Bob's measurement, which involves no focussing, is complete (which rules out a Bob-to-Alice superluminal signaling). Each element of Bob's screen  $z$ -basis is a possible outcome, described by the annihilation operator approximately of the form  $\hat{E}_z^{(-)} \propto \hat{a}_2 + e^{i\gamma} \hat{a}_5$ , where  $\gamma = \gamma(k, z)$  is the phase difference between the paths 2 and 5 from the slits to a point  $z$  on Bob's screen. This represents a POVM of the form  $\hat{E}_z^{(-)} \hat{E}_z^{(+)} = (|2\rangle + e^{-i\gamma}|5\rangle)(\langle 2| + e^{i\gamma}\langle 5|)$ . Even though  $\hat{E}_z^{(+)}$  has the same form as Alice's operator  $\hat{E}_f^{(+)}$  as a Kraus operator describing the absorption of two interfering modes at a point  $z$ , yet, when integrated over his whole 'position basis', Bob's measurement is seen to form a complete set, for, as it can be shown,  $\int_{z=-\infty}^{+\infty} \hat{E}_z^{(-)} \hat{E}_z^{(+)} dz = |2\rangle\langle 2| + |5\rangle\langle 5|$ . On the other hand, because Alice's momentum measurement corresponds to a path singularity, a similar elimination of cross-terms via integration is not possible, whence the non-completeness. It is indeed somewhat intriguing how geometry plays a fundamental role in determining the completeness status of a measurement. This has to do with the fact that the direct detection of a photon is practically a determination of *position* distribution. For example, even in remotely measuring the idler's momentum, Alice measures her photon's position at the focal plane. We will return again to this issue in the final Section.

## B. Role of the direction filter

A simple model of the action of the perfect direction filter is

$$D \equiv \sum_{j=2,5} |j\rangle\langle j| + \sum_{j \neq 2,5} |-j\rangle\langle j| \quad (23)$$

acting locally on the second register of the state of Eq. (20). Here  $|-j\rangle$  can be thought of as a state orthogonal to all  $|j\rangle$ 's and other  $|-j\rangle$ 's, that removes the photon from the experiment, for example, by reflecting it out or by absorption at the filter. It suffices for our purpose to note that  $D$  can be described as a local, standard (linear, unitary and hence complete) operation. Since the structure of QM guarantees that such an operation cannot lead to nonlocal signaling, the conclusion is that the superluminal signal, if it exists, must remain *even if the the direction filter is absent*.

We will employ the notation  $|j+k+m\rangle \equiv (1/\sqrt{3})(|j\rangle + |k\rangle + |m\rangle)$ . To see that the nonlocal signaling is implicit in the state modified by Alice's actions even without the application of the filter, we note the following: if Alice measures 'momentum' on the state  $|\Psi^{(1)}\rangle$  and detects a signal photon at  $f$ , she projects the corresponding idler into the state  $|2+5\rangle$ . Similarly, her detection of a photon at  $f''$  projects the idler into the state  $|3+6\rangle$ , and her detection at  $f'$ , projects the idler into the state  $|1+4\rangle$ . Therefore, in the absence of the direction filter, Alice's remote measurement of the idler's momentum leaves the idler in a (assumed uniform for simplicity) mixture given by

$$\rho_P \propto |2+5\rangle\langle 2+5| + |1+4\rangle\langle 1+4| + |3+6\rangle\langle 3+6|. \quad (24)$$

Her momentum measurement is non-complete, since the summation over the corresponding projectors (r.h.s of Eq. (24)) is not the identity operation  $\mathbb{I}_6$  pertaining to the Hilbert space spanned by six modes  $|j\rangle$  ( $j = 1, \dots, 6$ ).

On the other hand, if Alice remotely measures the idler's position, she leaves the idler in the mixture

$$\rho_Q \propto |1+2+3\rangle\langle 1+2+3| + |4+5+6\rangle\langle 4+5+6|. \quad (25)$$

Here again, her position measurement is non-complete, reflected in the fact that the summation over the corresponding projectors (r.h.s of Eq. (25)) is not  $\mathbb{I}_6$  [39].

Since  $\rho_P \neq \rho_Q$ , we are led to conclude that the violation of no-signaling *is already implicit in the Innsbruck experiment*. Nevertheless, since Bob measures in the  $z$ -basis rather than the 'mode' basis, without a direction filter Bob's screen will not register any signal, as indeed confirmed in the original Innsbruck experiment, for the following reason. In case of Alice's focal plane measurement, the integrated diffraction-interference pattern corresponding to different outcomes will wash out any observable interference pattern. On the other hand, in case of Alice's imaging plane measurement, Bob's each detection comes from the photon's incoherent passage through one or the other slit, and hence—again—no interference pattern is produced on his screen. Thus, measurement at Bob's screen plane  $z$  without a direction filter will render  $\rho_P$  effectively indistinguishable from  $\rho_Q$ . The role played by the direction filter is to prevent modal averaging in case of Alice's momentum measurement, by selecting one set of modes. The filter does not create, but only exposes, a superluminal effect that otherwise remains hidden.

## C. Complementarity of single- and two-particle correlations

It is well known that path information (or particle nature) and interference (or wave nature) are mutually exclusive or complementary. In the two-photon case, this takes the form of mutual incompatibility of single- and two-particle interference [40, 41], because entanglement can be used to monitor path information of the twin particle, and is thus equivalent to 'particle nature'. One may thus consider single- and two-particle correlations as being related by a kind of complementarity relation that parallels wave- and particle-nature complementarity. For a brief exposition of this idea, cf. Section A.

In the context of the proposed experiment, this could raise the following purported objection to our proposed signaling scheme: as the experiment happens in the near-field regime, where two-particle correlations are strong, one would expect that Bob should not find an interference pattern in his singles counts. Yet, contrary to this expectation, Eq. (16) implies that such an interference pattern does appear. The reason is that in the focal plane measurement, Alice is able to erase her path information in the subspace  $\mathcal{H}_2$ , but, by virtue of the associated non-completeness, she does so in *only one* way, viz. via the non-complete operation  $E_f^{(+)}$  associated with her measurement. If her measurement were *complete*, she would erase path information in more than one way, and the corresponding conditional single-particle interference patterns would mutually cancel each other in the singles count.

As a simple illustration, let us suppose Alice's measurement at  $f$  is replaced by a *complete* scheme in which her measurement is deferred to a point behind a beam-splitter placed at  $f$ , whereby the path singularity is removed. The




FIG. 2: A beam of light of width  $w$ , entering from the left, is amplitude-split into two at 50-50 beam splitter BS1. The outgoing upper beam is in turn split into two beams,  $A$  and  $B$  at beam splitter BS2. Alice (resp., Bob) observes  $A$  and  $B$  (resp.,  $C$ ). Charlie is located at the laser source. Beams  $A$  and  $B$  are folded so that they cross at the ‘path singularity’  $q$ , where they may be detected indistinguishably; or they may be detected distinguishably at DA1. By making  $w$  sufficiently small, one ensures that only a single fringe appears at  $q$ .

action of such a beam splitter is

$$\begin{aligned}\hat{a}_2 &\longrightarrow \hat{a}_{2'} \equiv \cos \beta \hat{a}_2 + i \sin \beta \hat{a}_5 \\ \hat{a}_5 &\longrightarrow \hat{a}_{5'} \equiv i \sin \beta \hat{a}_2 + \cos \beta \hat{a}_5.\end{aligned}\quad (26)$$

Completeness now holds since  $\hat{a}_{2'}^\dagger \hat{a}_{2'} + \hat{a}_{5'}^\dagger \hat{a}_{5'} = \mathbb{I}_2$ . From Eqs. (10), (11), (12) and (26), we find that the joint probability for detection of a photon in mode  $2'$  or  $5'$  by Alice and at  $z$  by Bob is given by

$$p_{2'}(z) \propto \langle E_z^\dagger a_{2'}^\dagger, E_z a_{2'} \rangle = \frac{1}{2} (1 + \sin(2\beta) \sin[k(r_5 - r_2)]) \quad (27a)$$

$$p_{5'}(z) \propto \langle E_z^\dagger a_{5'}^\dagger, E_z a_{2'} \rangle = \frac{1}{2} (1 + \sin(2\beta) \sin[-k(r_5 - r_2)]). \quad (27b)$$

Tracing over Alice’s outcomes, we find  $p_{2'}(z) + p_{5'}(z) \propto 1$ , and so no superluminal signaling occurs.

## VII. AN EXPERIMENT WITH SEPARABLE PHOTONS

Our second proposal for an experimental demonstration of a polynomial superluminal gate, based on ordinary separable light, is simpler than the experiment proposed above. However, because of the stringent demands placed on beam width and the detector optics, it may turn out that, from an experimental point of view, the use of entanglement is preferable.

When a system is subjected to measurement described by a non-complete operation, the subsequent renormalization of the state vector leads to nonlocal signaling even at the single (i.e., unentangled) particle level, as noted in Section II. This sort of signaling was noted in Ref. [42], where we proposed an experiment which we revisit in greater detail below. A similar experiment has recently been independently proposed in Ref. [43].

The proposed experiment is based on simple linear optics and implements the expunger gate  $Q'$ . Linearly polarized laser light, of low divergence and beamwidth  $w$ , is split up into two beams ( $H$  and  $C$ ) by means of a 50-50 beam splitter BS1, as shown schematically in Figure 2. In turn,  $H$  is split into two beams ( $A$  and  $B$ ) by means of a beam splitter BS2. The outgoing beams from BS2 are folded back and made to overlap at angle  $\theta$  in region  $q$ . BS2 is assumed to be lossless, and characterized by the rotation:  $M(\beta) = \begin{pmatrix} \cos \beta & i \sin \beta \\ i \sin \beta & \cos \beta \end{pmatrix}$ , where  $\cos \beta$  and  $i \sin \beta$  are, respectively, the transmission and reflection coefficients. The action of the phasor  $\Phi$  on path  $A$  is to provide relative phase  $\phi$  between the paths  $A$  and  $B$ .

The mirrors M0, MA45 and MAx (resp., MB45 and MBx) are used to fold beam  $A$  (resp.,  $B$ ), and get the two beams to interfere and be detected at region  $q$ , which is thereby a *path singularity*. Unlike in Figure 1, where any single

point on the focal plane serves as a path singularity for all modes converging to that point behind the Heisenberg lens, by contrast, in Figure (2), any point  $x$  at  $q$  serves as a path singularity for precisely two paths: one in the upper-arm  $A$  and another in the lower  $B$ . Both beams  $A$  and  $B$  are linearly polarized along the same direction, with their polarization vector perpendicular to the page (i.e., plane of the experiment) in order that they may interfere. Thus, detection at  $q$  implements an expunger gate. Apart from at the plane DA2, which contains region  $q$ , the detector may be positioned also at the plane at DA1, where the two beams do not overlap, and where therefore a *complete* measurement is performed.

The input state to the experiment can be written as

$$|\Psi\rangle = |\text{vac}\rangle + \frac{\epsilon}{\sqrt{2}}(\hat{a}_A^\dagger \cos \beta + i\hat{a}_B^\dagger \sin \beta + \hat{a}_C^\dagger)|\text{vac}\rangle, \quad (28)$$

where  $\epsilon$  ( $\ll 1$ ) depends on the light source strength. Since the two modes  $A$  and  $B$  have identical polarization, the electric field at a point  $x$  in the region  $q$ , namely  $E_q^{(+)}(x)$ , is simply the arithmetic sum of field contributions from the two beams:

$$E_q^{(+)}(x) = \hat{a}_A e^{ikr_{Ax}} + \hat{a}_B e^{i(\phi+kr_{Bx})}, \quad (29)$$

where  $r_{\alpha x}$  ( $\alpha = A, B$ ) is the distance along a ray in beam  $\alpha$  that reaches point  $x \in q$ , starting from a point at BS2. The probability density  $P_q(x)$  that a click is detected at point  $x$  is given, via (28) and (29), and similarly the probability  $P_C$  that a click is detected by Bob, by:

$$P_q(x) \propto \|E_q^{(+)}(x)|\Psi\rangle\|^2 = \frac{\epsilon^2}{2}[1 + (\sin 2\beta) \sin(\chi(x))],$$

$$P_C = \frac{\epsilon^2}{2}. \quad (30)$$

where  $\chi(x) \equiv (\phi + kr_{Ax} - kr_{Bx})$  is the phase difference between the two converging ‘rays’ at point  $x$ . Typically,  $\chi(x)$  will vary rapidly with  $x$ . If we denote by  $\theta/2$  the angle with which the mirrors MAx and MBx are tilted away from  $45^\circ$  (on the plane of the paper, clockwise and anti-clockwise, respectively), then the angle at which  $A$  and  $B$  converge towards  $q$  is  $\theta$ . The interference fringes are given by a stationary pattern with spatial frequency being  $k \sin \theta \approx k\theta$ .

For a typical laboratory set-up, this fringe variation can be too rapid to detect. Putting  $\lambda = 633$  nm,  $S = 1$  cm, and  $d = 1$  m, we find that  $k \sin \theta \approx (2\pi/\lambda)(S/d) \approx 500/\text{cm}$ . The number  $n$  of fringes that form at  $q$  is about  $(k\theta)(w/2\pi) \approx kSw/2\pi d$ . If the beam is so thin that  $n \approx 0.5$ , only a *single* fringe is found at  $q$ , which is either bright or dark, depending on whether  $\sin \chi$  is greater or less than 0 across  $q$ . We thus have the remarkable situation that we may obtain a total intensity that is in excess or in deficit of the average intensity of the laser.

Inserting the experimental values:  $w = 3$  mm,  $\lambda = 633$  nm and  $S = 1$  cm, we obtain  $d = 95$  m. The quantity  $d$  can in principle be reduced by using light of infrared wavelength. Employing fiber optic cables and winding through many loops can help reduce the space taken up by the experiment. To maintain coherence over such a large distance, frequency-stabilized Helium-Neon lasers, whose coherence lengths runs into several kms, can be employed.

An observation of such a single-fringe would offer a direct demonstration of measurement described by a non-complete operation, in particular, that of the gate represented by  $\mathcal{Q}'$ . This is seen by noting that detection at  $q$  is described by the operator  $E_q^{(+)}(x)$ , given by Eq. (29), which has a form similar to  $E_f^{(+)}$  in Eq. (22). If the values in Eq. (30) are observed as such, there will be no signaling but a violation of energy conservation. On the other hand, if we demand energy conservation, then these values must be renormalized, and Alice’s and Bob’s observed intensity will depend on the renormalization recipe used, as discussed below.

In Section VB, in describing the experiment of Figure 1, which employs entanglement, it was not necessary to fix the proportionality constants for Eqs. (14) and (16) because, to demonstrate superluminal signaling it was enough to note the difference between the *patterns* (i.e., the forms of the fourth-order correlation of the field) described by those equations. For the experiment of Figure 2, where we use separable particles, we need to consider the problem of renormalization because potential signaling effects show up in the field intensity (proportional to the second-order correlation of the field). We present below an outline of three speculative recipes for renormalization, each of which is potentially testable. In all of them the superluminal signaling result for entangled photons presented from Section V remains qualitatively unchanged.

*Scenario 1.* The wavefunction is globally renormalized. If by positioning her detector at  $q$  Alice produces a dark single-fringe, Bob correspondingly finds a compensatory upsurge at his detector. For the experiment above, assuming  $\chi(x) \approx \chi_0$  throughout the half-fringe, Bob’s renormalized probability of detection becomes  $1/(2 + \sin[2\beta] \sin[\chi_0])$ , which becomes in general the ‘natural’  $1/2$  if Alice moves her detector away from the path singularity  $q$ . Alice could thus nonlocally signal Bob 1 bit of information by positioning her detector at  $q$  or away from it.

*Scenario 2.* The wavefunction is renormalized locally within the non-complete domain so that the total probability of detection anywhere within this domain is the *complete* value. In other words, under threat of potential non-completeness, the incoming amplitudes simply fail to interfere. For Figure 2 this scenario predicts that the probability of detection somewhere in  $q$  remains  $1/2$ , with the intensity at each point  $x \in q$  being the intensity sum due to the two beams, irrespective of the value of  $\phi$ . This can be directly tested by performance of the experiment. Whereas it would rule out the above signaling mechanism from Alice to Bob, it is contradicted by the observed two-particle interference in the Innsbruck experiment, where Bob’s particle manifests a double-slit pattern when Alice’s particle is detected by means of  $\hat{E}_f^{(+)}$ .

*Scenario 3.* In place of renormalization, the non-completeness associated with the measurement, and hence the appearance of bright or dark single-fringe, is interpreted as signifying coherent augmentation or suppression of light generation in the laser cavity. When a dark single-fringe is produced at  $q$ , photons are understood to remain *coherently trapped* within the laser cavity, somewhat in the manner of coherent trapping of atoms [44] (because of destructive interference between the two available pathways, which yields a vanishing transition amplitude). Here “a photon remaining trapped” simply means that the corresponding excited atom in the cavity is being prevented from de-exciting. This in turn would lead to a small downsurge in the power consumed by the laser. Thus while this recipe suppresses the superluminal channel from Alice to Bob, it opens up a new, one-way superluminal communication channel from Alice to Charlie, located near the light source. Alice would be able in principle to superluminally signal Charlie 1 bit of information by her choice of positioning her detector at DA2 or DA1. The latter positioning would cause no such coherent trapping of photons, and so no dip in the laser power consumption.

## VIII. DISCUSSIONS AND CONCLUSIONS

In the surprising event that either of the proposed experiments yields a positive outcome, a number of issues would clearly be brought up. Foremost among them: the apparent violation of locality in standard, linear QM would now emerge as a real violation, and no-signaling would no longer be a universal condition. Even though this conclusion is problematic, it is not clear how a positive outcome to the experiment may be averted, mainly because the physics leading to it is simple, leaving not much room to alter our explanation of the experiments. And we saw that potential issues that would weaken or hinder a positive outcome (such as the spreading of the wavefunction at the direction filter) can only serve to prevent the signaling in practice, but leave it intact in principle. Thus, the issue of ‘speed of quantum information’ [45] would assume practical significance.

A putative positive outcome to either of the two experiments proposed in Sections V and VII would bolster the case for believing that the WNHE assumption is a basic principle of quantum physics, while undermining the case for no-signaling or the linearity of QM. It would then follow that intractability, and by extension uncomputability, matter to physics in a fundamental way. This would suggest that physical reality is fundamentally computational in nature [8]. At the least, WNHE could serve as an informal guide to issues in the foundations of QM.

Even granting that the noncomplete gate  $Q'$  turns out to be physically valid and realizable, this brings us to another important issue: how would non-completeness fit in with the known mathematical structure of the quantum properties of particles and fields, and why, if true, should it have remained theoretically unnoticed so far in spite of its far-reaching consequences? We venture that the answer has to do with the nature of and relationship between observables in QM on the one hand, and those in quantum optics, and more generally, in quantum field theory (QFT), on the other hand.

It is frequently claimed that QFT is just the standard rules of first quantization applied to classical fields, but this position can be criticized [46, 47, 48]. For example, the relativistic effects of the integer-spin QFT imply that the wavefunctions describing a fixed number of particles do not admit the usual probabilistic interpretation [47]. Again, fermionic fields do not really have a classical counterpart and do not represent quantum observables [48].

In practice, measurable properties resulting from a QFT are properties of particles, and that of photons in quantum optics. Particulate properties such as number, described by the number operator constructed from fields, or the momentum operator, which allows the reproduction of single-particle QM in momentum space, do not present a problem. The problem is the *position* variable, which is considered to be a parameter, and not a Hermitian operator, both in QFT and single-particle relativistic QM, and yet relevant experiments measure particle positions. Both experiments described in this work involve measurement of the positions of photons, as for example, Alice’s detection of photons at points on the imaging or focal plane, or Bob’s detection at points on the  $z$ -plane, respectively. There seems to be no way to derive from QFT the experimentally confirmed Born rule that the nonrelativistic wavefunction  $\psi(\mathbf{x}, t)$  determines quantum probabilities  $|\psi(\mathbf{x}, t)|^2$  of particle positions. In most practical situations, this is really not a problem. The probabilities in the above experiments were computed according to standard quantum optical rules to determine the correlation functions at various orders [49], which serve as an effective wavefunction of the photon, as seen from Eqs. (11) and (30). In QFT, particle physics phenomenologists have developed intuitive rules to predict

distributions of particle positions from scattering amplitudes in *momentum* space.

Nevertheless, there is a problem in principle, and leads us to ask whether QFT is a genuine quantum theory [48]. If we accept that properties like position are valid observables in QFT, the answer seems to be ‘no’. We see this again in the fact that the effective ‘momentum’ and ‘position’ observables that arise in the above experiments are not seen to be Hermitian operators of standard QM (cf. note [39]). Further, non-complete operations like  $\hat{E}_f^{(+)}$ , disallowed in QM, seem to appear in QFT. This suggests that it is QM, and not QFT, that is proved to be strictly non-signaling by the no-signaling theorem.

Since nonrelativistic QM and QFT are presumably not two independent theories describing entirely different objects, but do describe the same particles in many situations, the relationship between observables in the two theories needs to be better understood. Perhaps some quantum mechanical observables are a coarse-graining of QFT ones, having wide but not universal validity. For example, Alice’s detection of a photon at a point in the focal plane was quantum mechanically understood to project the state of Bob’s photon into a one-dimensional subspace corresponding to a momentum eigenstate. Quantum optically, however, this ‘eigenstate’ is described as a superposition of a number of parallel, in-phase modes originating from different down-conversion events in the non-linear crystal, producing a coherent plane wave propagating in a particular direction.

### Acknowledgments

I am thankful to Dr. S. Rangwala and Mr. K. Ravi for insightful elucidation of experimental issues, and to Prof. J. Sarfatti and Prof. J. Cramer for helpful discussions.

## APPENDIX A: SINGLE- VS TWO-PARTICLE INTERFERENCE

For a particle in a double-slit experiment, we restrict our attention to the Hilbert space  $\mathcal{H}$ , spanned by the state  $|0\rangle$  and  $|1\rangle$  corresponding to the upper and lower slit of a double slit experiment. Given density operator  $\rho$ , we define coherence  $C$  by  $C = |\rho_{01}|/2 = |\rho_{10}|/2$ . States on the Bloch sphere equator, such as  $|\psi_a\rangle = \frac{1}{\sqrt{2}}(|0\rangle + |1\rangle)$ , have the maximum value of  $C$ , given by  $1/2$ . We consider the particle, initially in the state  $|\psi_a\rangle$ , and a “monitor”, initially in the state  $|0\rangle$ , interacting with each other by means of an interaction  $U$ , parametrized by variable  $\theta$ , such that if  $\theta = 0$ , the particle and monitor remain separable (via an identity operation on both systems), whereas if  $\theta = \pi/2$ , the operation  $U$  is maximally entangling (via a CNOT gate [11]). It is convenient to choose  $U$  as  $U = \cos\theta I \otimes I + i \sin\theta \text{CNOT}$ , where CNOT is the operation  $|0\rangle\langle 0| \otimes I + |1\rangle\langle 1| \otimes X$ , where  $X$  is the Pauli  $X$  operator.

We will find that as  $U$  becomes more entangling, coherence falls. This is because, if the particle becomes strongly entangled with the monitor, the latter can be used extract path information, which is detrimental to single-particle coherence (per standard complementarity). A direct calculation shows that under the action of  $U$ , the particle goes to the state

$$\rho = \text{Tr}_m[U(|\psi_a\rangle|0\rangle\langle\psi_a|\langle 0|)U^\dagger] = \frac{I}{2} + \frac{1}{2}[(\cos\theta + i \sin\theta) \cos\theta|0\rangle\langle 1| + \text{c.c.}], \quad (\text{A1})$$

where  $\text{Tr}_m[\dots]$  indicates taking trace over the monitor. Applying the above formula for coherence to  $\rho$ , we calculate that coherence  $C = \cos\theta$ . Since we started the two systems in a pure state, the degree of mixedness of  $\rho$  is a measure of entanglement. We let  $\lambda_\pm$  denote the eigenvalues of  $\rho$ . Since  $\lambda_\pm = (1 \pm \cos\theta)/2$ , it follows that when  $\theta = 0$ ,  $\rho$  remains pure, with  $\lambda_\pm = \{1, 0\}$ , while when  $\theta = \pi/2$ ,  $\rho$  is maximally mixed, with  $\lambda_\pm = \{\frac{1}{2}, \frac{1}{2}\}$ . Quantifying the degree of entanglement by concurrence [50], we have  $E \equiv 2\sqrt{\lambda_- \lambda_+} = \sin\theta$ . We thus obtain a trade-off between coherence and entanglement given by:

$$C^2 + E^2 = 1, \quad (\text{A2})$$

a manifestation of the complementarity between single-particle and two-particle interference. In other words, maximal single particle interference and maximal two-particle interference (between particle and monitor) are mutually exclusive.

---

[1] A. Einstein, N. Rosen, and B. Podolsky. Is the Quantum-Mechanical Description of Physical Reality Complete? Phys. Rev. Lett. **47**, 777 (1935).

- [2] P. H. Eberhard, *Nuovo Cimento* 46B, 392 (1978); C. D. Cantrell and M. O. Scully, *Phys. Rep.* **43**, 499 (1978). G. C. Ghirardi, A. Rimini, and T. Weber, *Lett. Nuovo Cimento* **27**, 293 (1980). P. J. Bussey, *Phys. Lett.* **A 90**, 9 (182). T. F. Jordan, *Phys. Lett.* **94A**, 264 (1983). A. J. M. Garrett, *Found. Phys.* **20** 381 (1990). D. Bohm and B. J. Hiley, *The Undivided Universe: An ontological interpretation of Quantum Theory* (Routledge, London and New York, 1993). A. Shimony, in *Proc. of the Int. Symp. on Foundations of Quantum Mech.*, eds. S. Kamefuchi et al. (Phys. Soc. Japan, Tokyo, 1993); R. Srikanth, *Phys Lett.* **A 292**, 161 (2002).
- [3] J. S. Bell, *Physics* **1**, 195 (1964); J. F. Clauser, M. A. Horne, A. Shimony, and R. A. Holt, *Phys. Rev. Lett.* **23**, 880 (1969); A. Aspect, P. Grangier and G. Roger, *Phys. Rev. Lett.* **49**, 91 (1982); W. Tittel, J. Brendel, H. Zbinden and N. Gisin, *Phys. Rev. Lett* **81** 3563 (1998); G. Weihs, T. Jennewein, C. Simon, H. Weinfurter and A. Zeilinger, *Phys. Rev. Lett.* **81**, 5039 (1998); P. Werbos, arXiv:0801.1234.
- [4] A. M. Gleason. Measures on the closed subspaces of a Hilbert space. *J. Math. Mech.*, **6**, 885 (1957).
- [5] A. Peres, *Quantum Mechanics: Concepts and Methods*, (Kluwer, Dordrecht, 1993).
- [6] C. Simon, V. Bužek and N. Gisin, *Phys. Rev. Lett.* **87**, 170405 (2001); *ibid.* **90**, 208902 (2003). H. Halvorson, *Studies in History and Philosophy of Modern Physics* 35, 277 (2004); quant-ph/0310101.
- [7] G. Brassard, H. Buhrman and N. Linden et al. A limit on nonlocality in any world in which communication complexity is not trivial. *Phys. Rev. Lett.* **96** 250401 (2006).
- [8] R. Srikanth. The quantum measurement problem and physical reality: a computation theoretic perspective. *AIP Conference Proceedings* **864**, (Ed. D. Goswami) 178 (2006); quant-ph/0602114v2.
- [9] In complexity theory, **RP** is the class of decision problems for which there exists a probabilistic TM (a deterministic TM with access to genuine randomness) such that: it runs in polynomial time in the input size; if the answer is ‘no’, it returns ‘no’; if the answer is ‘yes’, it returns ‘yes’ with probability at least 0.5 (else it returns ‘no’).
- [10] More precisely, in complexity theory, **BQP** is the class of decision problems solvable by a *quantum* TM [11] in polynomial time, with error probability of at most 1/3 (or, equivalently, any other fixed fraction smaller than 1/2) independently of input size.
- [11] M. A. Nielsen and I. Chuang, *Quantum Computation and Quantum Information*, (Cambridge 2000).
- [12] E. Witten. Quantum field theory and the Jones polynomial. *Commun. Math. Phys.* **121**, 351 (1989).
- [13] M. Freedman. *P/PN* and the quantum field computer. *Proc. Natl. Acad. Sci. USA* **95**, 98 (1998).
- [14] C. S. Calude, M. A. Stay. From Heisenberg to Goedel via Chaitin. *Int. J. Th. Phys.* 44 1053 (2005); quant-ph/0402197.
- [15] S. Aaronson, quant-ph/0401062; *ibid.*, quant-ph/0412187.
- [16] S. Aaronson. NP-complete Problems and Physical Reality. *ACM SIGACT News, Complexity Theory Column*, **36** 30 (2005); quant-ph/0502072.
- [17] D. S Abrams and S. Lloyd. Nonlinear quantum mechanics implies polynomial-time solution for NP-complete and #P problems. *Phys. Rev. Lett.* **81**, 3992 (1998).
- [18] S. Aaronson. The limits of quantum computers. *American Scientist* **42**, March 2008.
- [19] That is, ‘the universe is not hard enough to *not* be simulable using polynomial resources’. The expression is non-technically related to the statement “The world is not enough” (“*orbis non sufficit*”), the family motto of, as well as a motion picture featuring, a well known Anglo-Scottish secret agent!
- [20] S. Weinberg. *Dreams of a Final Theory* (Vintage 1994).
- [21] More formally, **BPP** is the class of decision problems solvable by a probabilistic TM in polynomial time, with error probability of at most 1/3 (or, equivalently, any other fixed fraction smaller than 1/2) independently of input size.
- [22] A. Bassi and G. Ghirardi, A General Argument Against the Universal Validity of the Superposition Principle. *Phys. Lett.* **A 275** (2000); quant-ph/0009020.
- [23] N. Gisin, *Helv. Physica Acta* **62**, 383 (1989); *Phys. Lett.* **A 143**, 1 (1990). J. Polchinski. Weinberg’s nonlinear quantum mechanics and the Einstein-Podolsky-Rosen paradox. *Phys. Rev. Lett.* **66**, 397 (1991).
- [24] A. Sen-De and U. Sen. Testing Quantum Dynamics using Signaling. *Phys. Rev. A* **72**, 014304 (2005); eprint quant-ph/0401186.
- [25] **PSPACE** is the class of decision problems solvable by a Turing machine in polynomial (memory) space and in exponential time.
- [26] In complexity theory, **PP** is the class of decision problems for which there exists a polynomial time probabilistic TM such that: if the answer is ‘yes’, it returns ‘yes’ with probability greater than  $\frac{1}{2}$ ; if the answer is ‘no’, it returns ‘yes’ with probability at most  $\frac{1}{2}$ .
- [27] L. Grover. Quantum mechanics helps in searching for a needle in a haystack. *Phys. Rev. Lett.* **79**, 325 (1997).
- [28] C. Bennett, E. Bernstein, G. Brassard and U. Vazirani. Strengths and weaknesses of quantum computing. quant-ph/9701001.
- [29] A. Peres. How the no-cloning theorem got its name. quant-ph/0205076.
- [30] It could as well have been called ‘erasure gate’, except that such a name would suggest an operation that introduces an erasure error.. And the name ‘quantum deletion’ has been preempted by a completely positive (CP) operation [31]. Operations (7) are in fact a kind of superquantum deleter envisaged in Ref. [24].
- [31] R. Srikanth and S. Banerjee. An environment-mediated quantum deleter. *Phys. Lett. A* **367**, 295 (2007); quant-ph/0611161.
- [32] R. Ghosh and L. Mandel, *Phys. Rev. Lett.* **59**, 1903 (1987); P. G. Kwiat, A. M. Steinberg and R. Chiao, *Phys. Rev. A* **47**, 2472 (1993); D. V. Strekalov, A. V. Sergienko, D. N. Klyshko, and Y. H. Shih, *Phys. Rev. Lett.* **74**, 3600 (1995); T. B. Pittman, Y. H. Shih, D. V. Strekalov, and A. V. Sergienko, *Phys. Rev. A* **52**, R3429 (1995); Y. -H. Kim, R. Yu, S. P. Kulik, and Y. Shih, M. O. Scully, *Phys. Rev. Lett.* **84**, 1 (2000).



- [33] A. Zeilinger. Experiment and foundations of quantum physics. *Rev. Mod. Phys.* **71**, S288 (1999).
- [34] B. Dopfer. Zwei Experimente zur Interferenz von Zwei-Photonen Zuständen: ein Heisenbergmikroskop und Pendellösung. Ph.D. thesis (University of Innsbruck, 1998).
- [35] R. Srikanth, *Pramana* **59**, 169 (2002); *ibid.* quant-ph/0101023.
- [36] R. Srikanth. quant-ph/9904075; *ibid.* quant-ph/0101022.
- [37] J. G. Cramer, W. G. Nagourney and S. Mzali. A test of quantum nonlocal communication. CENPA Annual Report (2007).
- [38] R. Jensen, STAIF-2006 Proceedings M. El-Genk, ed. 1208 (AIP, 2006); <http://casimirinstitute.net/coherence/Jensen.pdf> (2006).
- [39] We can then define Alice's (remote) 'momentum observable' as  $\hat{P} \equiv f|2+5\rangle\langle 2+5| + f'|1+4\rangle\langle 1+4| + f''|3+6\rangle\langle 3+6|$ . Interpreted as a quantum field theoretic observable,  $\hat{P}$  is non-complete because the projectors to its eigenstates  $|2+5\rangle$ ,  $|1+4\rangle$  and  $|3+6\rangle$  do not sum to  $\mathbb{I}_6$ . Similarly, Alice's non-complete 'position' observable is  $\hat{Q} \equiv m|1+2+3\rangle\langle 1+2+3| + l|4+5+6\rangle\langle 4+5+6|$ . But note that  $\hat{Q}$ 's projection into the subspace  $\mathcal{H}_{2,5}$  is indeed a complete observable.  $\hat{P}$  and  $\hat{Q}$  are of rank 3 and 2, respectively, which is smaller than 6, the dimension of the relevant Hilbert subspace.
- [40] A.F. Abouraddy, et al. Demonstration of the complementarity of one- and two-photon interference. *Phys. Rev. A* **63**, 063803 (2001).
- [41] S. Bose and D. Home. Generic Entanglement Generation, Quantum Statistics, and Complementarity. *Phys. Rev. Lett.* **88**, 050401 (2002).
- [42] R. Srikanth. Single particle nonlocality: A proposed experimental test. quant-ph/0110132v2.
- [43] A. Shiekh. Reply to 'On a recent proposal of faster than light quantum communication'. *Electr. Jour. of Theor. Phys.* **18**, 109, 2008; arXiv:0801.0099v1.
- [44] M. Scully and S. Zubairy. *Quantum Optics* (Cambridge University Press, 1997).
- [45] D. Salart, A. Baas, C. Branciard, N. Gisin, and H. Zbinden. Testing the speed of 'spooky action at a distance'. *Nature* **454**, 861 (2008); arxiv:0808.331v1.
- [46] H. D. Zeh. There is no "first" quantization. *Phys. Lett. A* **309**, 329 (2003); quant-ph/0210098.
- [47] H. Nikolič. There is no first quantization - except in the de Broglie-Bohm interpretation. quant-ph/0307179.
- [48] H. Nikolič. Is quantum field theory a genuine quantum theory? Foundational insights on particles and strings. arXiv:0705.3542.
- [49] R. J. Glauber. The Quantum Theory of Optical Coherence. *Phys. Rev.* **130**, 2529 (1963).
- [50] W. K. Wootters. Entanglement of Formation and Concurrence. *Quant. Info. and Comput.* **1**, 27 (2001).