

# Comment on “The photon identification loophole in EPRB experiments: computer models with single-wing selection”

Mateus Araújo,<sup>1</sup> Philippe Grangier,<sup>2</sup> and Jan-Åke Larsson<sup>3</sup>

<sup>1</sup>*Institute for Theoretical Physics, University of Cologne, Zùlpicher StraÙe 77, 50937 Cologne, Germany*

<sup>2</sup>*Laboratoire Charles Fabry, IOGS, CNRS, Université Paris Saclay, F91127 Palaiseau, France*

<sup>3</sup>*Institutionen för systemteknik, Linköpings Universitet, 581 83 Linköping, Sweden*

(Dated: 19th April 2022)

Contrary to the claims made in Ref. [1], the recent Bell tests by Giustina et al. [2] and Shalm et al. [3] do not suffer from a “photon identification loophole”. The model discussed in Ref. [1] is exploiting the well-known detection loophole, that is precisely what was closed in the recent experiments.

In Ref. [1], the authors claim that due to the procedure used to identify which events correspond to a photon detection, the recent loophole-free Bell tests by Giustina et al. [2] and Shalm et al. [3] suffer from a “photon identification loophole” and are therefore inconclusive. To support this claim, the authors propose a hidden-variable model that is supposedly able to exploit this loophole in order to violate the Eberhard inequality  $J_{\text{Eberhard}} \geq 0$ , where

$$J_{\text{Eberhard}} = n_{oe}(\alpha_1, \beta_2) + n_{ou}(\alpha_1, \beta_2) + n_{eo}(\alpha_2, \beta_1) + n_{uo}(\alpha_2, \beta_1) + n_{oo}(\alpha_2, \beta_2) - n_{oo}(\alpha_1, \beta_1). \quad (1)$$

and all quantities are defined in Ref. [4]. The local hidden-variable model consists of sampling a real number  $\lambda$  uniformly from the interval  $[0, 2\pi]$ , and setting the local voltages of Alice and Bob’s photons as

$$\begin{aligned} v_A &= r \sin^4(2(\alpha_x - \lambda))/2 - 1, \\ v_B &= r' \sin^4(2(\beta_y - \lambda - \pi/2))/2 - 1, \end{aligned} \quad (2)$$

where  $\alpha_x, \beta_y$  are local detector settings, and  $r, r'$  are random numbers sampled uniformly from the interval  $[0, 1]$ . Each photon is considered detected if the local voltage is smaller than a threshold  $V$ , in which case the outcomes  $a$  and  $b$  of Alice and Bob are given by

$$\begin{aligned} a &= \text{sign}[1 + \cos(2(\alpha_x - \lambda)) - 2r''], \\ b &= \text{sign}[1 + \cos(2(\beta_y - \lambda - \pi/2)) - 2r'''], \end{aligned} \quad (3)$$

where  $r'', r'''$  are again random numbers from the interval  $[0, 1]$ . These outcomes are labelled  $o = +1, e = -1$  for Alice and  $o = -1, e = +1$  for Bob. If the photon is not detected, the outcome is labelled  $u$ .

Each photon is detected with probability

$$\begin{aligned} \eta_A(x, \lambda) &= \min \left\{ 1, \frac{2(V+1)}{\sin^4(2(\alpha_x - \lambda))} \right\}, \\ \eta_B(y, \lambda) &= \min \left\{ 1, \frac{2(V+1)}{\sin^4(2(\beta_y - \lambda - \pi/2))} \right\}, \end{aligned} \quad (4)$$

that depends only on the local settings and the hidden variable  $\lambda$ . Therefore this threshold model is not exploiting a new loophole, but simply the well-known detection loophole. As such, it can violate inequalities that do not properly account for undetected photons, but cannot violate inequalities that do so. For instance, the Eberhard inequality (1) accounts for undetected photons by including the “single” counts  $n_{ou}(\alpha_1, \beta_2)$  and  $n_{uo}(\alpha_2, \beta_1)$ , where one photon is counted but not the other.




Figure 1. Results of the simulation without thresholding (red squares), with thresholding (green circles), and with thresholding and deleting the terms  $n_{ou}(\alpha_1, \beta_2)$  and  $n_{uo}(\alpha_2, \beta_1)$  (blue triangles). The Eberhard inequality  $J_{\text{Eberhard}} \geq 0$  is obeyed in the two first cases, whereas in the third case the violation of the modified inequality is due to the detection loophole.

The authors claim, nevertheless, that their model can violate the Eberhard inequality, and present numerical results purporting to show this. As a double check, we implemented their hidden-variable model (our code is available as an ancillary file), and ran the program with the same settings:  $\alpha_1 = \theta + 3\pi/8$ ,  $\alpha_2 = \theta + \pi/8$ ,  $\beta_1 =$

$\pi/8$ , and  $\beta_2 = 3\pi/8$ . The results are shown in Fig. 1: the red squares show the case of threshold  $V = 0$ , implying perfect efficiency, and the green circles show the case of threshold  $V = -0.995$  as used in Ref. [1], implying imperfect efficiency. We calculated the average efficiency to be  $\bar{\eta} = (6 + 50 \arcsin(1/\sqrt{10}))/25\pi \approx 0.28$ . Each point consists of  $4 \times 10^5$  trials.

In order to reproduce the claimed violation, represented here by the blue triangles, we had to set  $n_{ou}(\alpha_1, \beta_2) = n_{uo}(\alpha_2, \beta_1) = 0$ , whereas the model gives  $n_{ou}(\alpha_1, \beta_2) > 0$  and  $n_{uo}(\alpha_2, \beta_1) > 0$ . The exact procedure for producing the graph of Ref. [1]

cannot be found in the paper, but the authors told us in a private communication that they also took  $n_{ou}(\alpha_1, \beta_2) = n_{uo}(\alpha_2, \beta_1) = 0$ , so all the simulation data is fully consistent. We will not discuss here the reasons for their decision to delete counts where one photon remains undetected ( $u$ ). We only point out that the deletion of these terms changes the tested inequality from Eberhard's into a different inequality that is vulnerable to the detection loophole.

As a conclusion, and as it can be seen in Fig. 1, when all relevant counts are taken into account there is clearly no violation of the Eberhard inequality via the thresholding mechanism – as it must be.

- 
- [1] H. De Raedt, K. Michielsen, and K. Hess, "The photon identification loophole in EPRB experiments: computer models with single-wing selection," *Open Physics* **15**, 85 (2017), [arXiv:1707.08307 \[quant-ph\]](#).
- [2] M. Giustina, M. A. M. Versteegh, S. Wengerowsky, J. Handsteiner, A. Hochrainer, K. Phelan, F. Steinlechner, J. Kofler, J.-Å. Larsson, C. Abellán, W. Amaya, V. Pruneri, M. W. Mitchell, J. Beyer, T. Gerrits, A. E. Lita, L. K. Shalm, S. W. Nam, T. Scheidl, R. Ursin, B. Wittmann, and A. Zeilinger, "Significant-Loophole-Free Test of Bell's Theorem with Entangled Photons," *Phys. Rev. Lett.* **115**, 250401 (2015), [arXiv:1511.03190 \[quant-ph\]](#).
- [3] L. K. Shalm, E. Meyer-Scott, B. G. Christensen, P. Bierhorst, M. A. Wayne, M. J. Stevens, T. Gerrits, S. Glancy, D. R. Hamel, M. S. Allman, K. J. Coakley, S. D. Dyer, C. Hodge, A. E. Lita, V. B. Verma, C. Lambrocco, E. Tortorici, A. L. Migdall, Y. Zhang, D. R. Kumor, W. H. Farr, F. Marsili, M. D. Shaw, J. A. Stern, C. Abellán, W. Amaya, V. Pruneri, T. Jennewein, M. W. Mitchell, P. G. Kwiat, J. C. Bienfang, R. P. Mirin, E. Knill, and S. W. Nam, "Strong Loophole-Free Test of Local Realism\*," *Phys. Rev. Lett.* **115**, 250402 (2015), [arXiv:1511.03189 \[quant-ph\]](#).
- [4] P. H. Eberhard, "Background level and counter efficiencies required for a loophole-free einstein-podolsky-rosen experiment," *Phys. Rev. A* **47**, R747–R750 (1993).