

Revisiting factorability and indeterminism

David Rodríguez¹

¹*Departamento de Física Aplicada III, Universidad de Sevilla, E-41092 Sevilla, Spain**

(Dated: November 18, 2018)

Perhaps it is not completely superfluous to remind that Clauser-Horne factorability, introduced in [1], is only necessary when λ , the hidden variable (HV), is *sufficiently* deterministic: for $\{M_i\}$ a set of possible measurements (isolated or not by space-like intervals) on a given system, the most general sufficient condition for factorability on λ is obtained by finding a set of expressions $M_i = M_i(\lambda, \xi_i)$, with $\{\xi_i\}$ a set of HV's, all independent from one another and from λ . Otherwise, factorability can be recovered on $\gamma = \lambda \oplus \mu$, with μ another additional HV, so that now $M_i = M_i(\gamma, \xi_i)$: conceptually, this is always possible; experimentally, it may not: μ may be inaccessible or even its existence unknown (and so, too, from the point of view of a phenomenological theory). Results here may help clarify our recent post in [6].

PACS numbers:

In relation to Bell inequalities, and maybe caused by the lack of a common perspective, factorability and indeterminism are sometimes a subject of prejudiced argumentation (at least at the informal level; that is my experience); let us for that reason revisit those two concepts here. We will try to settle a simple, completely abstract approach; not necessary orthodox, we must warn.

Definitions:

We will say a measurement M upon a certain physical system, with k possible outcomes m_k , is *deterministic* on a hidden variable (HV) λ (summarizing the state of that system), if (and only if)

$$P(M = m_k | \lambda) \in \{0, 1\}, \quad \forall k, \lambda, \quad (1)$$

which allows us to write

$$M \equiv M(\lambda), \quad (2)$$

and *indeterministic* iff, for some λ , some k' ,

$$P(M = m_{k'} | \lambda) \neq \{0, 1\}, \quad (3)$$

i.e., at least for some (at least two) of the results for at least one (physically meaningful) value of λ .

Let also $\mathcal{M} = \{M_i\}$ be a set of possible measurements, each with a set $\{m_{i,k}\}$ of possible outcomes, not necessarily isolated from each other by a space-like interval.

Now, indeterminism can be turn into determinism, i.e., (3) can into (1), by defining a new hidden variable μ , so that now, with $\gamma \equiv \lambda \oplus \mu$:

$$P(M_i = m_{i,k} | \gamma) \in \{0, 1\}, \quad \forall i, \forall k, \gamma, \quad (4)$$

which means we can write, for any of the M_i 's,

$$M_i \equiv M_i(\lambda, \mu), \quad (5)$$

a proof that such a new hidden variable μ can always be found (or built) given in [5].

So far, then, our *determinism* and *indeterminism* are conceptually equivalent, though of course they may correspond to different physical situations, depending for instance on whether γ is experimentally accesible or not. Nevertheless, for us there is still another natural step to take, introducing the following distinction: we will say indeterminism is

(a) *λ -factorizable*, iff we can find a set $\{\xi_i\}$ of random variables, *independent from each other and from λ too*, such that

$$\mu = \bigoplus_i \xi_i, \quad (6)$$

and (1) holds again for each M_i on $\gamma_i \equiv \lambda \oplus \xi_i$:

$$P(M_i = m_{i,k} | \gamma_i) \in \{0, 1\}, \quad \forall i, \forall k, \gamma_i, \quad (7)$$

this last expression meaning of course that we can write, again for any of the M_i 's,

$$M_i \equiv M_i(\lambda, \xi_i). \quad (8)$$

(b) *non λ -factorizable*, iff (7) is not possible for any set of statistically independent ξ_i 's.

Now let us, for simplicity, restrict our reasonings to $A, B \in \mathcal{M}$, with two possible outcomes, $A, B \in \{+1, -1\}$, all without loss of generality. We have seen that, as the more general formulation, we can always write something like $A = A(\lambda, \xi_A)$, $B = B(\lambda, \xi_B)$.

Lemma:

(i) *If A and B are deterministic on λ , i.e., (1) holds for A and B , then they are also λ -factorizable, i.e.,*

$$P(A = a, B = b | \lambda) = P(A = a | \lambda) \cdot P(B = b | \lambda), \quad (9)$$

for any $a, b \in \{+1, -1\}$. Eq. (9) is nothing but the so-called Clauser-Horne factorability condition [1].

*Electronic address: drodriguez@us.es

(ii) If A and B are *indeterministic* on λ , i.e., if (1) does not hold for λ , *then*: for some μ (always possible to find [5]) such that now (4) holds for $\gamma \equiv \lambda \oplus \mu$, A, B are γ -factorizable,

$$P(A = a, B = b|\gamma) = P(A = a|\gamma) \cdot P(B = b|\gamma), \quad (10)$$

i.e., (9) holds for γ , but this time not necessarily for λ .

(iii) Let (7) hold for A, B , on λ, ξ_A, ξ_B : if λ, ξ_A, ξ_B are statistically independent, (hence, A and B are what we have called λ -factorizable), then (9) holds for λ , not necessarily on the contrary.

Proof:

(i) When (1) holds, for any λ and any $a, b \in \{+1, -1\}$, $P(A = a|\lambda), P(B = b|\lambda) \in \{0, 1\}$, from where we can, trivially, get to (9). ■

(ii) It is also trivial that, if (4) holds, (9) can be recovered for γ . That the same is not necessary for λ can be seen with the following counterexample: suppose, for instance, that for $\lambda = \lambda_0$, either $A = B = 1$ or $A = B = -1$ with equal probability. It is easy to see that

$$P(A = B = 1|\lambda_0) \neq P(A = 1|\lambda_0) \cdot P(B = 1|\lambda_0), \quad (11)$$

numerically: $\frac{1}{2} \neq \frac{1}{4}$. ■

(iii) We have, from independence of λ, ξ_A, ξ_B , and working with probability densities ρ 's: $\rho_\lambda(\lambda, \xi_A, \xi_B) = \rho_\lambda(\lambda) \cdot \rho_A(\xi_A) \cdot \rho_B(\xi_B)$, which we can use to write

$$\begin{aligned} P(A = a, B = b|\lambda) &= \int P(A = a, B = b|\lambda, \xi_A, \xi_B) \\ &\quad \times \rho_A(\xi_A) \cdot \rho_B(\xi_B) d\xi_A d\xi_B. \end{aligned} \quad (12)$$

[Those conditioned probabilities should be defined also as densities but for simplicity we leave that aside.]

Using now the fact that we can recover (4) for A (B) on $\gamma_A = \lambda \oplus \xi_A$ ($\gamma_B = \lambda \oplus \xi_B$),

$$\begin{aligned} P(A = a, B = b|\lambda) &= \int P(A = a|\lambda, \xi_A) \cdot P(B = b|\lambda, \xi_B) \\ &\quad \times \rho_A(\xi_A) \cdot \rho_B(\xi_B) d\xi_A d\xi_B \\ &= \int P(A = a|\lambda, \xi_A) \cdot \rho_A(\xi_A) d\xi_A \\ &\quad \times \int P(B = b|\lambda, \xi_B) \cdot \rho_B(\xi_B) d\xi_B \\ &= P(A = a|\lambda) \cdot P(B = b|\lambda). \end{aligned} \quad (13)$$

On the other hand, let λ, ξ_A, ξ_B be not statistically independent: we can set for instance, as a particular case, $\xi_i \equiv \mu, \forall i$, therefore reducing our case to that of (4). Once this is done, our previous counterexample in (ii) is also valid to show that factorability is not necessary for λ here. ■

Conclusions: In a bipartite (multipartite) Bell experiment, assuming information is not degraded on its way from the source to the measurement devices, ξ_A, ξ_B (ξ_i) can be interpreted as the state of devices A, B (device i -th) and their surrounding, their independency guaranteed by a space-like separation between observers. *Given a theory that predicts results for the set \mathcal{M} of measurements, \mathcal{M} will be necessarily λ -factorizable only whenever all relevant physical variables are actually included in the vector of hidden variables λ .*

Acknowledgements: I thank R. Risco-Delgado for comments and encouragement. We also acknowledge all the previous, surely in many cases more exhaustive, work on the subject, in particular that of Selleri and Tarozzi [2, 3], as well as that of Risco-Delgado himself [4].

-
- [1] J.F. Clauser, M.A. Horne. "Experimental consequences of objective local theories", Phys. Rev. D **10**, 526 (1974).
 [2] P. Selleri, G. Tarozzi. "Is Clauser and Horne's factorability a necessary requirement for a probabilistic local theory?", Lettere Al Nuovo Cimento (1971 - 1985), **29**, N. 16, 533-536 (1980).
 [3] P. Selleri, G. Tarozzi. "Quantum mechanics reality and separability", La Rivista del Nuovo Cimento (1978-1999), **4**, N. 2, 1-53 (1981).
 [4] R. Risco-Delgado. "Bell's inequalities and indeterminism", arXiv:quant-ph/0202099v1 (2002).

- [5] A possible (not unique) procedure to build μ is this: for each M_i , we define a new random variable σ_i and assign values for each pair $(\lambda, m_{i,k})$: $\sigma_i \equiv \sigma_i(\lambda, m_{i,k})$, and now simply do

$$\mu \equiv \bigoplus_i \sigma_i. \quad (14)$$

As built, σ_i 's are not necessarily independent from one another, nor are they necessarily independent from λ .

- [6] D. Rodríguez, "Wigner-PDC description of photon entanglement can still be made completely local". Arxiv.