

# Connecting classical finite exchangeability to quantum theory

Alessio Benavoli\*

*School of Computer Science and Statistics, Trinity College Dublin, Ireland.*

Alessandro Facchini<sup>†</sup> and Marco Zaffalon<sup>‡</sup>

*Istituto Dalle Molle di Studi sull'Intelligenza Artificiale (IDSIA), USI-SUPSI Lugano, Switzerland*

(Dated: June 7, 2023)

Exchangeability is a fundamental concept in probability theory and statistics. It allows to model situations where the order of observations does not matter. The classical de Finetti's theorem provides a representation of infinitely exchangeable sequences of random variables as mixtures of independent and identically distributed variables. The quantum de Finetti theorem extends this result to symmetric quantum states on tensor product Hilbert spaces. However, both theorems do not hold for finitely exchangeable sequences. The aim of this work is to investigate two lesser-known representation theorems. Developed in classical probability theory, they extend de Finetti's theorem to finitely exchangeable sequences by using quasi-probabilities and quasi-expectations. With the aid of these theorems, we illustrate how a de Finetti-like representation theorem for finitely exchangeable sequences requires a mathematical representation which is formally equivalent to quantum theory (with boson-symmetric density matrices).

## I. INTRODUCTION

Let  $(t_1, t_2, \dots, t_r)$  be a sequence of  $r$  random variables, each variable taking values in a finite possibility space  $\Omega$ , and let  $P(t_1, t_2, \dots, t_r)$  be their joint probability distribution. When  $P(t_1, t_2, \dots, t_r)$  is symmetric to permutations of the labels of the variables  $t_i$ , the sequence is called finitely exchangeable with respect to  $P$ . The classical de Finetti theorem states that, whenever the considered sequence is finitely exchangeable with respect to  $P$  and for every  $s > r$  there is a finitely exchangeable sequence  $(t_1, t_2, \dots, t_s)$  with respect to a joint probability  $P'$  such that  $P$  coincides with the marginal of  $P'$  on  $(t_1, t_2, \dots, t_r)$ , then  $P(t_1, t_2, \dots, t_r)$  can be represented as:

$$\begin{aligned} P(t_1, t_2, \dots, t_r) &= E[P(t_1)P(t_2) \cdots P(t_r)] \\ &:= \int P(t_1)P(t_2) \cdots P(t_r) dq(P), \end{aligned} \quad (1)$$

with  $q$  a probability measure on the marginal probability distribution  $P(t)$  (of one variable).

One well known issue with this theorem is that it necessarily requires an infinite sequence extending  $(t_1, t_2, \dots, t_r)$  for which exchangeability holds for each segment longer than  $r$ . Without such requirement, and thus by sticking to a finitely exchangeable sequence only, the representation of the operator  $E$  in Equation (1) as a probabilistic mixture of identical product distributions fails in general. However, if the finitely exchangeable sequence of  $r$  variables is part of a finite but large enough finitely exchangeable sequence of  $s \gg r$  variables, the joint distribution of the initial  $r$  random variables can be

well-approximately represented in a de Finetti-like manner. Much of the work on finite exchangeability in classical probability has actually focused on deriving analytical bounds for the error of this approximation [1, 2].

A quantum analogue of de Finetti's theorem has been derived in [3–8]. Widely used in quantum information theory, it states the following. Let  $\rho^r$  be a density matrix on the  $r$ -tensor product Hilbert space  $\mathcal{H}^{\otimes r}$ . Whenever  $\rho^r$  is symmetric, that is it is such that  $\Pi \rho^r \Pi^\dagger = \rho^r$  with  $\Pi$  being the so-called ‘symmetriser’, and there is a symmetric density matrix  $\rho^s$  on  $\mathcal{H}^{\otimes s}$  such that  $\rho^r = Tr_{s-r}(\rho^s)$  for every  $s > r$ , where  $Tr_{s-r}$  denotes the partial-trace, then it holds that

$$\rho^r = \int (\sigma^{\otimes r}) dq(\sigma), \quad (2)$$

with  $\sigma$  a density matrix in  $\mathcal{H}$  and  $q$  a probability measure on the set of all density matrices in  $\mathcal{H}$ . The research on analytical bounds has also been extended to the quantum setting [5, 6] with applications to quantum cryptography [9], emergence of classical reality [10] and, more recently, the black hole information puzzle [11].

In this paper we investigate two lesser-known representation theorems that extend the classical de Finetti's theorem so as to cover also the case of finitely exchangeable sequences. Both modify the definition of operator  $E$  in Equation (1). The first solution keeps the same representation as in the original theorem, except that  $q$  is a normalised signed-measure (a quasi-probability). The second solution instead employs a *quasi*-expectation operator applied to certain polynomial functions. Our objective is to illustrate, with the aid of the above results, how de Finetti-like representation theorems for finitely exchangeable systems require a mathematical representation which is formally equivalent to quantum theory (QT for short). This objective is achieved in two steps. First, we will use polynomials of complex conjugate variables to re-derive the extension of the classical de Finetti's theo-

\* Corresponding author: alessio.benavoli@tcd.ie

<sup>†</sup> alessandro.facchini@idsia.ch

<sup>‡</sup> marco.zaffalon@idsia.ch

rem based on *quasi*-expectation operators but expressed with the same mathematical objects as in QT. Second, we will demonstrate that such *quasi*-expectation operators are equivalent to boson-symmetric density matrices. In doing so, we will be able to simulate finite exchangeable sequences using quantum experiments with bosons. In summary, we will show that a de Finetti-like representation of finite exchangeability leads to a representation theorem which encompasses both classical and quantum theories as special cases. By way of conclusion, we will discuss how such representations are similar to other formulations of QT involving quasi-probability densities and expectations, and are consistent with the Wigner function formalism.

To provide a clearer and more practical understanding of the different representation theorems, in what follows we use a dice rolling experiment as a case study.

## II. THE CLASSICAL DE FINETTI'S REPRESENTATION THEOREM

Consider a dice whose possibility space is given by its six faces:

$$\Omega := \left\{ \begin{array}{c} \text{1} \\ \text{2} \\ \text{3} \\ \text{4} \\ \text{5} \\ \text{6} \end{array} \right\}.$$

Let us assume that the upward-facing side of the dice is the one that is facing the reader. By  $t_1, t_2, \dots, t_r$  we denote the results of  $r$ -rolls of the dice. For example, for  $r = 3$ , we can have the three outcomes:

$$\begin{array}{ccc} \begin{array}{c} \text{2} \\ \text{1} \\ \text{3} \end{array} & \begin{array}{c} \text{3} \\ \text{1} \\ \text{2} \end{array} & \begin{array}{c} \text{3} \\ \text{2} \\ \text{1} \end{array} \\ t_1 & t_2 & t_3 \end{array},$$

That is  $t_1 = 2$ ,  $t_2 = 3$ , and  $t_3 = 3$ .

**Definition 1.** Let  $t_1, t_2, \dots, t_r$  a sequence of variables and  $P$  a joint probability. The sequence is said to be finitely exchangeable with respect to  $P$ , if

$$P(t_1, t_2, \dots, t_r) = P(t_{\pi(1)}, t_{\pi(2)}, \dots, t_{\pi(r)}),$$

for any permutation  $\pi$  of the index sequence  $(1, 2, \dots, r)$ .

Considering the previous example. To say that the three rolls are finitely exchangeable means that

$$P\left(\begin{array}{c} \text{2} \\ \text{3} \\ \text{3} \end{array}\right) = P\left(\begin{array}{c} \text{3} \\ \text{2} \\ \text{3} \end{array}\right) = P\left(\begin{array}{c} \text{3} \\ \text{3} \\ \text{2} \end{array}\right)$$

and so on for all the  $3!$  permutations of the positions of the rolls.

**Definition 2.** The sequence is called infinitely exchangeable (with respect to  $P$ ) if it is finitely exchangeable (with respect to  $P$ ) and if for any  $s > r$ , there is a distribution  $P'$  with respect to which  $t_1, t_2, \dots, t_s$  is finitely exchangeable and such that

$$P(t_1, t_2, \dots, t_r) = \sum_{t_{r+1}, \dots, t_s} P'(t_1, t_2, \dots, t_r, t_{r+1}, \dots, t_s).$$

Stated otherwise, an infinitely exchangeable sequence can be understood as a subsequence

$$\dots, t_{k-1}, t_k, \overbrace{t_{k+1}, t_{k+2}, \dots, t_{k+n-1}, t_{k+r}, t_{k+r+1}, \dots}^{\text{subsequence of length } r}$$

of an infinite sequence of random variables where the order of these variables does not matter.

Given  $r$  exchangeable rolls  $t_1, t_2, \dots, t_r$ , their output is fully characterised by the counts:

$$\begin{array}{cccccc} \begin{array}{c} \text{1} \\ \text{2} \\ \text{3} \\ \text{4} \\ \text{5} \\ \text{6} \end{array} & \begin{array}{c} \text{1} \\ \text{2} \\ \text{3} \\ \text{4} \\ \text{5} \\ \text{6} \end{array} & \begin{array}{c} \text{1} \\ \text{2} \\ \text{3} \\ \text{4} \\ \text{5} \\ \text{6} \end{array} & \begin{array}{c} \text{1} \\ \text{2} \\ \text{3} \\ \text{4} \\ \text{5} \\ \text{6} \end{array} & \begin{array}{c} \text{1} \\ \text{2} \\ \text{3} \\ \text{4} \\ \text{5} \\ \text{6} \end{array} & \begin{array}{c} \text{1} \\ \text{2} \\ \text{3} \\ \text{4} \\ \text{5} \\ \text{6} \end{array} \\ n_1 & n_2 & n_3 & n_4 & n_5 & n_6 \end{array}$$

where  $n_i$  denotes the number of times the dice landed on  $i$ -th face in the  $r$ -rolls. Based on this fact, de Finetti proved his famous *representation theorem*.<sup>[12]</sup>

**Proposition 1** ([13]). Let  $\Omega$  be the possibility spaces given by the six faces of a dice, and let  $(t_1, \dots, t_r)$  be a sequence of random variables that is infinitely exchangeable with probability measure  $P$ . Then there exists a distribution function  $q$  such that

$$P(t_1, \dots, t_r) = \int_{\Theta} \theta_1^{n_1} \theta_2^{n_2} \dots \theta_5^{n_5} \theta_6^{n_6} dq(\theta), \quad (3)$$

where  $\theta = [\theta_1, \theta_2, \dots, \theta_6]^T$  are the probabilities of the corresponding faces and whose values belong to the possibility space:

$$\Theta = \left\{ \theta \in \mathbb{R}^6 : \theta_i \geq 0, \sum_{i=1}^6 \theta_i = 1 \right\},$$

and  $n_i$  is the number of times the dice landed on the  $i$ -th face in the  $r$  rolls, meaning that  $\sum_{i=1}^6 n_i = r$ .

In the context of Bayesian statistics, the theorem states that any infinitely exchangeable sequence can be seen as generated by first selecting a probability distribution  $\theta$  from some prior  $q$  (probability distribution on the space of probability distributions) and then letting the  $t_i$  to be i.i.d. with common distribution  $\theta$ . For a selected  $\theta$ , this for instance means that  $P(t_1 = 2, t_2 = 3, t_3 = 3) = \theta_2 \theta_3^2$  (the product comes from the independence assumption).

As mentioned in Section I, one known issue with the above theorem is that the assumption of an infinite exchangeable sequence is necessary for the specific representation to hold [14, 15]. As a counter-example, consider:

$$\begin{aligned} P(t_1 = i, t_2 = i) &= 0, \\ P(t_1 = i, t_2 = j) &= P(t_1 = j, t_2 = i) = \frac{1}{30} \end{aligned} \quad (4)$$

for all  $i \neq j = 1, 2, \dots, 6$ . The variables  $t_1, t_2$  are exchangeable. Assume that a representation like (3) holds. Then

$$0 = P(t_1 = i, t_2 = i) = \int_{\Theta} \theta_i^2 dq(\theta)$$

for all  $i$ , would imply that  $q$  puts mass 1 at all the  $\theta_i = 0$ , which is impossible. This means that, although the  $P$  in (4) is a valid probability, we cannot express it as (3). In other words, exchangeability is not equivalent to independence.

Examples of situations that are truly finitely exchangeable were already discussed by de Finetti in [14]. They can be illustrated by the act of selecting items from an urn without replacement.

**Example 1.** Suppose we have an urn containing one black ( $B$ ) ball and one white ( $W$ ) ball. Draw out balls, one at a time and without replacement, and note the colour. We denote with

$$t_i = \begin{cases} 1 & \text{it the } i\text{-th ball is black,} \\ 0 & \text{other.} \end{cases}$$

Then we have that

$$\begin{aligned} P(t_1 = B, t_2 = B) &= 0, \\ P(t_1 = B, t_2 = W) &= P(t_1 = W, t_2 = B) = 0.5, \\ P(t_1 = W, t_2 = W) &= 0, \end{aligned}$$

which is finitely but not infinitely exchangeable.

In  $QT$ , we can rule out this type of urn-model dependence by choosing the direction of the measurement randomly and independently for each particle. This is done in Bell's experiments. This comment is relevant for the relationship between exchangeability and entanglement, which we discuss in Section V.

Kendall [16] proved that every finite system of exchangeable events is indeed equivalent to a random sampling scheme without replacement, where the number of items in the sampling has an arbitrary distribution.

While it is evident that de Finetti's theorem can be invalid for finite exchangeable sequences, for a large enough integer  $s > r$ , the distribution of the initial  $r$  random variables of an exchangeable vector of length  $s$  can be approximately represented as in (3). Much of the work on finite exchangeability has focused on deriving analytical bounds for the error of this approximation [1, 2]. In order to better illustrate what the term 'bound' means in this context, we discuss in our example of rolling a dice the more general problem of bounding an expectation.

**Example 2.** Consider  $r = 2$  (two rolls) and assume we want to find the finitely exchangeable probability  $P_2$ , which minimises the following expectation (worst-case  $P_2$ ):

$$v_2 = \min_{P_2} P_2 \left( \begin{array}{|c|c|} \hline \blacksquare & \blacksquare \\ \hline \end{array} \begin{array}{|c|c|} \hline \blacksquare & \blacksquare \\ \hline \end{array} \right) - P_2 \left( \begin{array}{|c|c|} \hline \blacksquare & \blacksquare \\ \hline \end{array} \begin{array}{|c|c|} \hline \blacksquare & \square \\ \hline \end{array} \right) + P_2 \left( \begin{array}{|c|c|} \hline \blacksquare & \square \\ \hline \end{array} \begin{array}{|c|c|} \hline \blacksquare & \square \\ \hline \end{array} \right)$$

It is not difficult to see that the minimum is  $v_2 = -0.5$  and the finitely exchangeable  $P_2$  which achieves it given by setting  $P_2 \left( \begin{array}{|c|c|} \hline \blacksquare & \blacksquare \\ \hline \end{array} \begin{array}{|c|c|} \hline \blacksquare & \blacksquare \\ \hline \end{array} \right) = P_2 \left( \begin{array}{|c|c|} \hline \blacksquare & \square \\ \hline \end{array} \begin{array}{|c|c|} \hline \blacksquare & \square \\ \hline \end{array} \right) = 0.5$  and zero otherwise. Now assume that these two rolls are at the beginning of a finitely exchangeable sequence of three rolls,

and let  $P_3$  be the relative finitely exchangeable probability. What is the solution of the problem

$$v_3 = \min_{P_3} P_3 \left( \begin{array}{|c|c|} \hline \blacksquare & \blacksquare \\ \hline \end{array} \begin{array}{|c|c|} \hline \blacksquare & \blacksquare \\ \hline \end{array} \right) - P_3 \left( \begin{array}{|c|c|} \hline \blacksquare & \blacksquare \\ \hline \end{array} \begin{array}{|c|c|} \hline \blacksquare & \square \\ \hline \end{array} \right) + P_3 \left( \begin{array}{|c|c|} \hline \blacksquare & \square \\ \hline \end{array} \begin{array}{|c|c|} \hline \blacksquare & \square \\ \hline \end{array} \right),$$

where  $P_3(t_1 = a, t_2 = b) = \sum_{t_3} P_3(t_1 = a, t_2 = b, t_3) ?$  This problem is more challenging because exchangeability imposes many constraints on  $P_3$ , such as:

$$\begin{aligned} P_3 \left( \begin{array}{|c|c|c|} \hline \blacksquare & \blacksquare & \blacksquare \\ \hline \end{array} \right) &= P_3 \left( \begin{array}{|c|c|c|} \hline \blacksquare & \square & \blacksquare \\ \hline \end{array} \right) \\ &= P_3 \left( \begin{array}{|c|c|c|} \hline \blacksquare & \square & \square \\ \hline \end{array} \right) \end{aligned}$$

In particular this means that  $P_3 \left( \begin{array}{|c|c|} \hline \blacksquare & \blacksquare \\ \hline \end{array} \right)$  cannot be equal to zero (it depends on  $P_3 \left( \begin{array}{|c|c|c|} \hline \blacksquare & \blacksquare & \blacksquare \\ \hline \end{array} \right)$  via marginalisation). We will later show that in this case the solution of the minimisation problem is  $v_3 \approx -0.167$ . We can also show that when the two rolls are at the beginning of an infinitely exchangeable sequence of rolls it holds that

$$v_\infty = \inf_{P_\infty} P_\infty \left( \begin{array}{|c|c|} \hline \blacksquare & \blacksquare \\ \hline \end{array} \right) - P_\infty \left( \begin{array}{|c|c|} \hline \blacksquare & \square \\ \hline \end{array} \right) + P_\infty \left( \begin{array}{|c|c|} \hline \square & \square \\ \hline \end{array} \right) = 0.$$

In summary, we have computed the inequalities

$$-0.5 = v_2 < v_3 < \dots < v_\infty = 0,$$

which provide a lower and upper bound to  $v_n$  for any  $n \geq 2$ . In Section IV, we will discuss a general numerical algorithm to compute  $v_n$ .

Why are these bounds important? First, statistical problems and experiments involve exchangeable sequences that are always finite. It is not possible to perform an infinite number of trials. Second, de Finetti's theorem provides a useful and simple representation of the mechanism generating the data (which, in turn, can be inverted to estimate  $\theta$  from the counts  $n_1, \dots, n_6$  via Bayes' rule). Consequently, practitioners are still inclined to use de Finetti's theorem as an approximation for the mechanism generating the finite exchangeable sequence. These facts motivate the search for representation theorems that apply to both the finite and the infinite case.

### III. FIRST GENERALISATION

A fact about finite exchangeability that has not received equal attention is that a de Finetti-like representation actually holds in the finite case if we drop the non-negativity condition for  $q$ . The result was already known to de Finetti [17]. Explicitly derived in [18, 19] for some special cases, it was generalised by [20].

**Proposition 2** ([20]). Given a sequence of finitely exchangeable variables  $t_1, t_2, \dots, t_r$ , there exists a signed measure  $\nu$ , satisfying  $\int_{\Theta} d\nu(\theta) = 1$ , such that:

$$P(t_1, \dots, t_r) = \int_{\Theta} \theta_1^{n_1} \theta_2^{n_2} \dots \theta_5^{n_5} \theta_6^{n_6} d\nu(\theta). \quad (5)$$

Signed measure means that  $\nu$  can have negative values. Note that, in Equation (5), the only valid signed-measures  $\nu$  are those which give rise to well-defined (non-negative and normalised) probabilities  $P(t_1, t_2, \dots, t_r)$ .

By comparing the two representations (3) and (5), it becomes apparent that there exists a significant difference that may not be immediately noticeable.

Any probability measure  $q$  originates, via (3), into a valid (non-negative and normalised) probability  $P(t_1, \dots, t_k)$ , that is for any  $[n_1, \dots, n_6]$  such that  $\sum_{i=1}^6 n_i = r$ , we have that:

$$\int_{\Theta} \theta_1^{n_1} \theta_2^{n_2} \dots \theta_5^{n_5} \theta_6^{n_6} dq(\theta) \geq 0, \quad (6)$$

$$\sum_{[n'_1, \dots, n'_6]: \sum_{i=1}^6 n'_i = r} \int_{\Theta} \theta_1^{n'_1} \theta_2^{n'_2} \dots \theta_5^{n'_5} \theta_6^{n'_6} dq(\theta) = 1. \quad (7)$$

Notice that not all signed measures  $\nu$  that integrate to one define valid probabilities  $P(t_1, \dots, t_k)$  via (5). In some cases, these measures may result in a negative value for  $P(t_1, \dots, t_k)$ . These are the same reasons why QT does not use ‘negative probabilities’, even though it is widely known that negative probabilities would enable a hidden variable representation (at least mathematically). For finite exchangeability, Jaynes’ work [19] is interesting because it contains a method to define valid  $P$  via (12) using Bernstein (or Legendre) polynomials. A more recent approach is discussed in the next section.

#### IV. SECOND GENERALISATION

Reasoning about finitely exchangeable variables  $t_i$  can be reduced to reasoning about polynomials of count vectors, known as Bernstein polynomials [19–23]. Working with this polynomial representation automatically guarantees that finite exchangeability is satisfied and that  $P$  are valid probabilities, without having to deal directly with the signed measure  $\nu$ .

The *multivariate Bernstein polynomials* are polynomials of the form

$$\theta_1^{n_1} \theta_2^{n_2} \dots \theta_5^{n_5} (1 - \theta_1 - \dots - \theta_5)^{n_6} \quad \text{with} \quad \sum_{i=1}^6 n_i = r, \quad (8)$$

where  $r$  is the number of rolls. They satisfy many useful properties, such as forming a base for the linear space of all polynomials whose degree is at most a given  $r$  and forming a partition of unity. To simplify the notation, we will denote  $1 - \theta_1 - \dots - \theta_5$  as  $\theta_6$ , so that  $\sum_{i=1}^6 \theta_i = 1$ .

The fundamental concept behind the new representation theorem that focuses on Bernstein polynomials involves working directly with the linear operator  $L$  defined as

$$L(\dots) := \int_{\Theta} (\dots) d\nu(\theta), \quad (9)$$

and determining the specific properties that  $L$  must adhere to in order to produce valid probabilities.

More precisely, let  $L$  be a *linear operator* from the space  $\mathcal{B}_r$  of polynomials of degree at most  $r$  to  $\mathbb{R}$ . Our goal is to write any finitely exchangeable  $P(t_1, t_2, \dots, t_r)$  as  $L(\theta_1^{n_1} \theta_2^{n_2} \dots \theta_6^{n_6})$ , where  $\sum_{i=1}^6 n_i = r$ . In the aim of determining the appropriate properties of  $L$ , we first introduce the closed convex cone

$$\mathcal{B}_r^+ = \left\{ \sum_{\mathbf{n}=[n_1, \dots, n_6]: \sum_i n_i = r} u_{\mathbf{n}} \theta_1^{n_1} \theta_2^{n_2} \dots \theta_6^{n_6} : u_{\mathbf{n}} \in \mathbb{R}^+ \right\}, \quad (10)$$

which includes the all non-negative linear combination of Bernstein polynomials of degree  $r$ , as well as all constant polynomials with value  $c$ .

**Proposition 3** ([23]). *Given a sequence of finitely exchangeable variables  $t_1, t_2, \dots, t_r$ , there exists a linear operator  $L : \mathcal{B}_r \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$  satisfying*

$$P(g) \geq \sup c \text{ s.t. } g - c \in \mathcal{B}_r^+, \quad (11)$$

for all polynomials  $g \in \mathcal{B}_r$  and where  $c$  is the constant polynomial of value  $c$ , such that:

$$P(t_1, \dots, t_r) = L(\theta_1^{n_1} \theta_2^{n_2} \dots \theta_5^{n_5} \theta_6^{n_6}). \quad (12)$$

The condition (11) ensures that  $L$  defines valid (non-negative and normalised) probabilities  $P$  via (12). We call a linear operator  $L$  satisfying (11) a *quasi-expectation operator*.

**Example 3.** *Consider the case  $r = 2$  and the linear operator:*

$$\begin{aligned} P(t_1 = 1, t_2 = 1) &= L(\theta_1^2) = 0, \\ P(t_1 = 1, t_2 = 2) &= P(t_1 = 2, t_2 = 1) = L(\theta_1 \theta_2) = 0.5, \\ P(t_1 = 2, t_2 = 2) &= L(\theta_2^2) = 0, \end{aligned}$$

and zero otherwise. It is easy to check that  $L$  satisfies (11) and defines a valid finitely exchangeable  $P$ . In fact, note that, for  $g = c$  (the constant polynomial), the condition (11) is equal to  $L(c) = c$ . This implies that  $L(1) = 1$  and so  $P$  is normalised.

**Example 4.** *Let us consider again the problem discussed in Example 2, with  $r = 2$ . Assume we want to find the finitely exchangeable probability  $P_2$  which minimises the following expectation*

$$v_2 = \min_{P_2} P_2 \left( \begin{array}{|c|c|} \hline \square & \square \\ \hline \end{array} \right) - P_2 \left( \begin{array}{|c|} \hline \square \\ \hline \end{array} \begin{array}{|c|} \hline \square \\ \hline \end{array} \right) + P_2 \left( \begin{array}{|c|c|} \hline \square & \square \\ \hline \end{array} \right).$$

Using the operator  $L$ , this quantity can be rewritten as

$$v_2 = \inf_{L_2} L_2(\theta_1^2 - \theta_1 \theta_2 + \theta_2^2) = \min_{L_2} L_2(\theta_1^2) - L_2(\theta_1 \theta_2) + L_2(\theta_2^2)$$

where the subscript in  $L_2$  indicates that it is the linear operator corresponding to  $P_2$ . Note that,

$$\begin{aligned} v_{\infty} &= \inf_E L_{\infty}(\theta_1^2 - \theta_1 \theta_2 + \theta_2^2) \\ &= \inf_E L_{\infty}(\theta_1^2) - L_{\infty}(\theta_1 \theta_2) + L_{\infty}(\theta_2^2) = 0. \end{aligned}$$

$v_\infty = 0$  because  $\theta_1^2 - \theta_1\theta_2 + \theta_2^2$  is nonnegative and its infimum is 0.

By (11), knowing that  $\theta_6 := 1 - \theta_1 - \dots - \theta_5$ , the value  $v_2$  can be determined by solving the following optimisation problem:

$$v_2 = \max c \quad \text{s.t.} \quad \theta_1^2 - \theta_1\theta_2 + \theta_2^2 - c \in \mathcal{B}_2^+, \quad (13)$$

where

$$\begin{aligned} \mathcal{B}_2^+ = \{ & u_{200000}\theta_1^2 + u_{110000}\theta_1\theta_2 + u_{101000}\theta_1\theta_3 + \\ & u_{100100}\theta_1\theta_4 + u_{100010}\theta_1\theta_5 + u_{100001}\theta_1(1 - \theta_1 - \dots - \theta_5) + \\ & u_{020000}\theta_2^2 + \dots + u_{000011}\theta_5(1 - \theta_1 - \dots - \theta_5) \\ & + u_{000002}(1 - \theta_1 - \dots - \theta_5)^2 : u_{[n_1, n_2, \dots, n_6]} \geq 0 \}. \end{aligned} \quad (14)$$

The solution of (13) can be computed by solving the following linear programming problem:

$$\begin{aligned} & \max_{c \in \mathbb{R}, u_{[n_1, n_2, \dots, n_6]} \in \mathbb{R}^+} c \\ & - u_{000002} + u_{100001} - u_{200000} + 1 = 0 \\ & - 2u_{000002} + u_{010001} + u_{100001} - u_{110000} - 1 = 0 \\ & - u_{000002} + u_{010001} - u_{020000} + 1 = 0 \\ & - c - u_{000002} = 0 \\ & - 2u_{000002} - u_{101000} + u_{100001} + u_{001001} = 0 \\ & \text{additional 16 constraints} \end{aligned} \quad (15)$$

where the equality constraints have been obtained by equating the coefficients of the monomials in

$$\begin{aligned} \theta_1^2 - \theta_1\theta_2 + \theta_2^2 - c = & u_{200000}\theta_1^2 + u_{110000}\theta_1\theta_2 + u_{101000}\theta_1\theta_3 + \\ & u_{100100}\theta_1\theta_4 + u_{100010}\theta_1\theta_5 + u_{100001}\theta_1(1 - \theta_1 - \dots - \theta_5) + \\ & u_{020000}\theta_2^2 + \dots + u_{000011}\theta_5(1 - \theta_1 - \dots - \theta_5) \\ & + u_{000002}(1 - \theta_1 - \dots - \theta_5)^2. \end{aligned}$$

For instance, consider the constant term in the r.h.s. of the above equation: that is  $u_{000002}$ . It must be equal to the constant term  $-c$ . Therefore, we have that

$$-c - u_{000002} = 0.$$

Similarly, consider the coefficient of the monomial  $\theta_1^2$ : this is  $u_{200000} - u_{100001} + u_{200002}$ . It must be equal to the coefficient of the monomial  $\theta_1^2$  in  $\theta_1^2 - \theta_1\theta_2 + \theta_2^2 - c$ , which is 1, that is

$$1 - (u_{200000} - u_{100001} + u_{200002}) = 0.$$

The last constraint in Equation (15) is relative to the monomial  $\theta_1\theta_3$ : since  $\theta_1\theta_3$  is not in  $\theta_1^2 - \theta_1\theta_2 + \theta_2^2 - c$ , its coefficients are equated to zero. In total, there are 21 constraints.

The solution of Equation (13) is

$$v_2 = -0.5.$$

The problem

$$v_3 = \min_{P_3} P_3 \left( \begin{array}{|c|c|} \hline \cdot & \cdot \\ \hline \end{array} \begin{array}{|c|c|} \hline \cdot & \cdot \\ \hline \end{array} \right) - P_3 \left( \begin{array}{|c|} \hline \cdot \\ \hline \end{array} \begin{array}{|c|c|} \hline \cdot & \cdot \\ \hline \end{array} \right) + P_3 \left( \begin{array}{|c|c|} \hline \cdot & \cdot \\ \hline \end{array} \begin{array}{|c|} \hline \cdot \\ \hline \end{array} \right),$$

where  $P_3(t_1 = a, t_2 = b) = \sum_{t_3} P_3(t_1 = a, t_2 = b, t_3)$ , can be solved as the previous one. In this case, we only need to express the above marginalisation in terms of the  $L_3$  operator, for instance:

$$\begin{aligned} P_3 \left( \begin{array}{|c|c|} \hline \cdot & \cdot \\ \hline \end{array} \begin{array}{|c|c|} \hline \cdot & \cdot \\ \hline \end{array} \right) &= L_3(\theta_1^2(\theta_1 + \theta_2 + \dots + \theta_6)) \\ P_3 \left( \begin{array}{|c|} \hline \cdot \\ \hline \end{array} \begin{array}{|c|c|} \hline \cdot & \cdot \\ \hline \end{array} \right) &= L_3(\theta_1\theta_2(\theta_1 + \theta_2 + \dots + \theta_6)) \\ P_3 \left( \begin{array}{|c|c|} \hline \cdot & \cdot \\ \hline \end{array} \begin{array}{|c|} \hline \cdot \\ \hline \end{array} \right) &= L_3(\theta_2^2(\theta_1 + \theta_2 + \dots + \theta_6)) \end{aligned} \quad (16)$$

where we have exploited that  $\theta_1 + \theta_2 + \dots + \theta_6 = 1$ . We can thus compute marginals on the result of two rolls by using a linear operator which is only defined on polynomials of degree 3, an operation that, as clarified in the next Section, corresponds to the operation **partial trace** in QT. The solution is

$$v_3 \approx -0.167.$$




FIG. 1. Value of  $v_n$  as a function of  $n$ . The red line corresponds to  $v_\infty$ .

Figure 1 shows the value of  $v_n = \min L_n(g)$  for  $g = \theta_1^2 - \theta_1\theta_2 + \theta_2^2$ , that is

$$v_n = \min_{P_n} P_n \left( \begin{array}{|c|c|} \hline \cdot & \cdot \\ \hline \end{array} \begin{array}{|c|c|} \hline \cdot & \cdot \\ \hline \end{array} \right) - P_n \left( \begin{array}{|c|} \hline \cdot \\ \hline \end{array} \begin{array}{|c|c|} \hline \cdot & \cdot \\ \hline \end{array} \right) + P_n \left( \begin{array}{|c|c|} \hline \cdot & \cdot \\ \hline \end{array} \begin{array}{|c|} \hline \cdot \\ \hline \end{array} \right),$$

as a function of  $n$ . Notice that the gap between the value computed using de Finetti's theorem (red line) and the value computed for finitely exchangeable probabilities reduces as of the number of rolls  $n$  increases. This implies that, as the total number of rolls increases, the worst-case marginal expectation for two rolls, which are part of a longer finitely exchangeable sequence of additional  $0, 1, 2, \dots$  rolls, converges to the classical probability value. We can refer to this phenomenon as the 'emergence of classical probability'. We will discuss it again in the next Section.

## V. MAKING THE CONNECTION WITH QT

In this section, we will strengthen the connection between finite exchangeability and finite dimensional QT.




FIG. 2. The worst-case marginal expectation for two rolls, which are part of a longer finitely exchangeable sequence of additional  $0, 1, 2, \dots$  rolls, converges to the classical probability value.

Let  $\mathbf{x}$  be a complex vector in  $\mathbb{C}^d$  such that  $\mathbf{x}^\dagger \mathbf{x} = 1$ . We can express the probabilities of the six faces ( $d = 6$ ) of the dice as:

$$\boldsymbol{\theta} = [\theta_1, \dots, \theta_6] = [x_1^\dagger x_1, \dots, x_6^\dagger x_6].$$

Moreover, notice that we can represent the monomials of the Bernstein polynomials with a specific degree  $r$  as  $\otimes_r \boldsymbol{\theta}$ , where  $\otimes$  is the Kronecker product. It follows that any polynomial in  $\mathcal{B}_r$  can equivalently be written as

$$g(\boldsymbol{\theta}) = (\otimes_r \mathbf{x})^\dagger D (\otimes_r \mathbf{x}) \quad (17)$$

where  $D$  is a diagonal Hermitian matrix.

**Example 5.** The polynomial  $\theta_1^2 - \theta_1 \theta_2 + \theta_2^2$  can be written as

$$\begin{aligned} g(\mathbf{x}^\dagger, \mathbf{x}) &= (x_1^\dagger x_1)^2 - (x_1^\dagger x_1)(x_2^\dagger x_2) + (x_2^\dagger x_2)^2 \\ &= (\otimes_2 \mathbf{x})^\dagger D (\otimes_2 \mathbf{x}) \end{aligned}$$

where  $D$  is a diagonal matrix with all zero entries except  $D_{11} = 1 = D_{77}$  and  $D_{22} = D_{88} = -0.5$ .

We now introduce a new linear operator  $\widehat{L}$  from the space of the polynomials with degree  $r$  of the variables  $x_i, x_i^\dagger$ , for  $i = 1, \dots, 6$ , into  $\mathbb{C}$ .

From linearity of the trace  $Tr(\cdot)$  and of  $\widehat{L}$ , we have:

$$\widehat{L}(g) = \widehat{L}((\otimes_r \mathbf{x})^\dagger D (\otimes_r \mathbf{x})) = Tr\left(D \widehat{L}\left((\otimes_r \mathbf{x})(\otimes_r \mathbf{x})^\dagger\right)\right). \quad (18)$$

Note that,  $\widehat{L}\left((\otimes_r \mathbf{x})(\otimes_r \mathbf{x})^\dagger\right)$  is a Hermitian matrix of dimension  $d^r \times d^r$ . Example for  $r = 2, d = 6$ :

$$\begin{aligned} \widehat{L}\left((\otimes_2 \mathbf{x})(\otimes_2 \mathbf{x})^\dagger\right) &= \quad (19) \\ \widehat{L} \begin{pmatrix} (x_1^\dagger)^\dagger x_1^2 & (x_1^\dagger)^\dagger x_1 x_2 & (x_1^\dagger)^\dagger x_1 x_3 & \dots & (x_1^\dagger)^\dagger x_6^2 \\ (x_1 x_2)^\dagger x_1^2 & (x_1 x_2)^\dagger x_1 x_2 & (x_1 x_2)^\dagger x_1 x_3 & \dots & (x_1 x_2)^\dagger x_6^2 \\ (x_1 x_3)^\dagger x_1^2 & (x_1 x_3)^\dagger x_1 x_2 & (x_1 x_3)^\dagger x_1 x_3 & \dots & (x_1 x_3)^\dagger x_6^2 \\ \vdots & \vdots & \vdots & \ddots & \vdots \\ (x_6^\dagger)^\dagger x_1^2 & (x_6^\dagger)^\dagger x_1 x_2 & (x_6^\dagger)^\dagger x_1 x_3 & \dots & (x_6^\dagger)^\dagger x_6^2 \end{pmatrix} \end{aligned} \quad (20)$$

where  $\widehat{L}$  is applied element-wise. Note that the above matrix has additional symmetries (besides being Hermitian), which follow by the symmetries of  $(\otimes_r \mathbf{x})(\otimes_r \mathbf{x})^\dagger$ . We can then prove the following representation theorem.

**Theorem 1.** Let  $\widehat{L}$  be a linear operator that maps monomials, which are the matrix entries in  $(\otimes_r \mathbf{x})(\otimes_r \mathbf{x})^\dagger$ , to  $\mathbb{C}$ , satisfying

$$\widehat{L}(g) \geq \sup c \text{ s.t. } g - c \in \mathcal{S}_r^+, \quad (21)$$

for all polynomials  $g \in \mathcal{S}_r = \{(\otimes_r \mathbf{x})^\dagger G (\otimes_r \mathbf{x}) : G \text{ is Hermitian}\}$ , where  $c$  is the constant polynomial of value  $c$  and  $\mathcal{S}_r^+ = \{(\otimes_r \mathbf{x})^\dagger H (\otimes_r \mathbf{x}) : H \text{ is Hermitian and PSD}\}$  with PSD meaning Positive Semi-Definite. We can then prove that

1. If  $\widehat{L}$  satisfies (21) for each polynomial  $g \in \mathcal{S}_r$ , then the matrix  $M = \widehat{L}\left((\otimes_r \mathbf{x})(\otimes_r \mathbf{x})^\dagger\right)$  is PSD with trace one. Vice versa, the operator defined by  $\widehat{L}(g) := Tr(GM)$  for all  $g \in \mathcal{S}_r$ , with  $M$  PSD, trace one and having the same symmetries as  $(\otimes_r \mathbf{x})(\otimes_r \mathbf{x})^\dagger$  satisfies (21) for each  $g \in \mathcal{S}_r$ .
2.  $P(t_1, \dots, t_r) = \widehat{L}((\otimes_r \mathbf{x})^\dagger D (\otimes_r \mathbf{x})) = Tr(DM)$  where  $D$  is a diagonal Hermitian matrix and  $M = \widehat{L}\left((\otimes_r \mathbf{x})(\otimes_r \mathbf{x})^\dagger\right)$  is a probability (nonnegative and normalised) and is symmetric to permutations of the labels of the variables  $t_i$ .

We have constructed a quasi-expectation operator  $\widehat{L}$  on a space of polynomials of complex variables, which is completely determined by trace-one PSD matrices  $M$  that share the same symmetries as the matrix  $(\otimes_r \mathbf{x})(\otimes_r \mathbf{x})^\dagger$ . Moreover, this operator, when applied to polynomials  $(\otimes_r \mathbf{x})^\dagger D (\otimes_r \mathbf{x})$ , defines a probability  $P$  which is symmetric to permutations of the labels of the variables  $t_i$ . Notice that  $Tr(DM) = Tr(D \text{diag}(M))$  holds for any diagonal matrix  $D$ . Hence Theorem 1 uses some redundant quantities through  $\widehat{L}\left((\otimes_r \mathbf{x})(\otimes_r \mathbf{x})^\dagger\right)$ . This withstanding, it enables another representation result that links finite exchangeability to QT, as discussed next.

First, we recall some useful definitions. Let  $\mathcal{H}^{\otimes r}$  be the compound Hilbert space of  $r$  particles. A fundamental postulate of QT for bosons is that the quantum states are symmetric upon exchange of the subsystems, respectively. This postulate is formulated mathematically by introducing a projection operator  $\Pi$  from the tensor product space to this subspace. The projector is called *symmetriser* and is defined as

$$\Pi |\psi_1, \dots, \psi_r\rangle = \frac{1}{N!} \sum_{\pi} |\psi_{\pi(1)}, \dots, \psi_{\pi(r)}\rangle, \quad (22)$$

where the summations are performed over the  $N!$  permutations of the labels.

We can thus prove the following equivalence result.

**Theorem 2.** The following sets are equal:

$$\mathcal{S}_1 = \{\rho : \rho = \Pi \rho \Pi, \rho \succeq 0, Tr(\rho) = 1\}, \quad (23)$$

$$\mathcal{S}_2 = \{M : M = \widehat{L}\left((\otimes_r \mathbf{x})(\otimes_r \mathbf{x})^\dagger\right)\}, \quad (24)$$

where  $\rho$  is the density matrix of  $r$ -indistinguishable bosons (each one being a  $d$ -level quantum system).

This result states that boson-symmetric density matrices and the set of matrices  $M$  obtained by applying the operator  $\widehat{L}$  to the matrix  $(\otimes_r \mathbf{x})(\otimes_r \mathbf{x})^\dagger$  of  $r$ -th degree polynomials in the variables  $x_i, x_i^\dagger$  for  $i = 1, \dots, d$  are equivalent. Equation (24) is obtained by applying a simple change of variables to the classical probability models for finitely exchangeable probabilities, and actually offers an alternative representation of the second-quantisation formalism in QT, which is of interest in its own right (as discussed in the proof of Theorem 2).

Theorem 2 actually shows that every finite system of exchangeable events is equivalent to a quantum experiment with indistinguishable bosons measured using projective measurements along the coordinate axis. We clarify this observation with an example.

**Example 6.** We can compute  $v_n = \min_{P_n} P_n(\text{classical}) - P_n(\text{quantum}) + P_n(\text{classical})$  using  $n$  indistinguishable bosons. Let  $\rho^n$  denote the density matrix of  $n$  6-level bosons, and  $\Pi_n$  the symmetrizer for the  $n$  bosons. Then, we have that  $v_n = \min_{\rho^n} \text{Tr}(D^n \rho^n)$  with  $\rho^n = \Pi_n \rho^n \Pi_n$ ,  $\text{Tr}(\rho^n) = 1$  and  $\rho^n \succeq 0$ . All the superscripts are just indexes. Note that, for  $n = 2$ ,  $D^2$  is a diagonal matrix with all zero entries except  $D_{11}^2 = 1 = D_{77}^2$  and  $D_{22}^2 = D_{88}^2 = -0.5$  (this is a physical-observable operator). This holds because the diagonal of  $\rho^2$  corresponds to the monomials  $[\theta_1^2, \theta_1 \theta_2, \dots, \theta_2^2, \theta_2 \theta_1, \dots, \theta_6^2]$ . Any  $D^n$  (for  $n > 2$ ) can be defined in a similar way exploiting the ‘partial trace’-style operations illustrated in equations (16). The value of  $v_n$  is shown in Figure 3.




FIG. 3. Value of  $v_n$  as a function of  $n$ . The red line corresponds to  $v_\infty$ .

This implies that the worst-case marginal expectation for an operator  $D$  on two bosons, which are part of a longer sequence of additional 0, 1, 2, ... bosons, converges to the classical probability value as the total number of bosons increases, see Figure 4. In QT, we would refer to this phenomenon as the ‘emergence of classical reality’.

The example above illustrates the following connection between finite exchangeability and entanglement. To understand it, for simplicity, we consider the case when




FIG. 4. The worst-case marginal expectation for two bosons, which are part of a longer indistinguishable sequence of additional 0, 1, 2, ... bosons, converges to the classical probability value.

$r = d = 2$ , which corresponds to a coin tossing experiment with two coins. By Theorem 2, the finitely exchangeable sequence  $t_1, t_2$  with respect to the probability  $P_2(t_1 = H, t_2 = T) = P_2(t_1 = T, t_2 = H) = 0.5$  (H=Heads, T=Tails) can be represented as

$$\rho = \begin{bmatrix} 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & 0.5 & 0.5 & 0 \\ 0 & 0.5 & 0.5 & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 \end{bmatrix}$$

$$= M = \widehat{L} \begin{pmatrix} (x_1^2)^\dagger x_1^2 & (x_1^2)^\dagger x_1 x_2 & (x_1^2)^\dagger x_1 x_2 & (x_1^2)^\dagger x_2 x_2 \\ (x_1 x_2)^\dagger x_1^2 & (x_1 x_2)^\dagger x_1 x_2 & (x_1 x_2)^\dagger x_1 x_2 & (x_1 x_2)^\dagger x_2 x_2 \\ (x_1 x_2)^\dagger x_1^2 & (x_1 x_2)^\dagger x_1 x_2 & (x_1 x_2)^\dagger x_1 x_2 & (x_1 x_2)^\dagger x_2 x_2 \\ (x_2^2)^\dagger x_1^2 & (x_2^2)^\dagger x_1 x_2 & (x_2^2)^\dagger x_1 x_2 & (x_2^2)^\dagger x_2 x_2 \end{pmatrix} \quad (25)$$

where  $\widehat{L}((x_1 x_2)^\dagger x_1 x_2) = 0.5$  and zero otherwise.

The diagonal elements of  $\rho$  include the probabilities  $\rho_{11} = P_2(t_1 = H, t_2 = H) = 0$ ,  $\rho_{22} = P_2(t_1 = H, t_2 = T) = 0.5$ ,  $\rho_{33} = P_2(t_1 = T, t_2 = H) = 0.5$  and  $\rho_{44} = P_2(t_1 = T, t_2 = T) = 0$ . The symmetry condition  $\rho = \Pi \rho \Pi$  implies that the off-diagonal elements  $\rho_{23}, \rho_{32}$  are equal to 0.5. In fact, when considering the matrix defined by  $\widehat{L}$ , the four elements  $M_{22}, M_{23}, M_{32}, M_{33}$  are equal: by definition, the operator  $\widehat{L}$  applies to the same monomial  $x_1^\dagger x_2^\dagger x_1 x_2$ .

We then chose a Hermitian operator  $D$ , which for the two coins case reduces to  $D = \text{diag}([1, -0.5, -0.5, 1])$ , and results in the value  $\text{Tr}(D\rho) = -0.5$ . This value is the same value obtained by solving  $v_2 = \min_{P_2} P_2(H, H) - P_2(H, T) + P_2(T, T) = 0 - 0.5 + 0 = -0.5$ .

In Example 5, we observed that the coefficients in the diagonal of  $D$  correspond to the polynomial  $\theta_1^2 - \theta_1 \theta_2 + \theta_2^2$ . This polynomial is always nonnegative and, therefore, can serve as a *finite exchangeability witness*. In fact, we used the inequality  $-0.5 = v_2 < v_\infty = 0$  to prove that  $P_2$  is finitely exchangeable.

The reader may thus ask: is  $D$  also an entanglement witness for  $\rho$ , as defined in Equation (25)?

However, several nonequivalent ways of identification and quantification of the entanglement have been proposed, see [24] for a recent review. One of the main notions of entanglement for bosons states that non-entangled states are equivalent to *simple symmetric tensors* [25–43]. In the case of two bosons, this means that a pure state is non-entangled if and only if it is a tensor product of two identical one-particle states [32]. Notice that this definition is consistent with the model introduced through the operator  $\widehat{L}$  in Theorem 1. Indeed, a pure non-entangled density matrix is simply the matrix  $(\otimes_r \mathbf{x})(\otimes_r \mathbf{x})^\dagger$  corresponding to the product of

identical one-particle states (each state corresponding to  $\mathbf{x}$ ). This means that  $D$  is a witness for this definition of entanglement. Indeed, observe that the polynomial  $(\otimes_2 \mathbf{x})^\dagger D (\otimes_2 \mathbf{x})$  is nonnegative. Since  $Tr(D\rho) < 0$ , this means that  $\rho$  is entangled.

The discussion above shows that, for indistinguishable bosons, there is a definition of entanglement that is ‘equivalent’ to the one that is used to disentangle finite (entangled) and infinite (non-entangled) exchangeable sequences. The difference is that in QT we can have operators (witnesses)  $D$  that correspond to full (non-diagonal) Hermitian matrices, which measure along ‘directions’ different from the canonical basis.

The reader may however argue that this connection only applies to one of the definitions of entanglement for indistinguishable particles (the one called ‘entanglement I’ in [24]). As future work, we plan to investigate how the link between exchangeability and indistinguishability, underlined by the current work, can in fact provide a new insight into the issue of the correct definition of entanglement for indistinguishable particles.

### A. Similarity to the Wigner-Weyl formalism

Finally, it is worth pointing out that the representation of  $\rho$  as  $\widehat{L}\left((\otimes_r \mathbf{x})(\otimes_r \mathbf{x})^\dagger\right)$  can be interpreted as a phase-space formulation generalising the Wigner-Weyl formalism in QT. The reason is that variables  $\mathbf{x}$  are continuous. In classical probability theory, in the infinitely exchangeable case,  $\widehat{L}_\infty\left((\otimes_r \mathbf{x})(\otimes_r \mathbf{x})^\dagger\right)$  can be understood as a moment-matrix, that is expectations computed with respect to a probability measure on  $\mathbf{x}$ . This interpretation does not hold for  $\widehat{L}_n\left((\otimes_r \mathbf{x})(\otimes_r \mathbf{x})^\dagger\right)$ . In fact, we cannot write this matrix as a moment matrix, but only as an integral with respect to a signed-measure. Rather it should be seen as an abstract/approximate representation which uses the same ‘hidden-variables’ as the infinitely exchangeable case.

This is a similar justification that Wigner used to introduce the so-called Wigner function [44]: “it cannot be really interpreted as the simultaneous probability for coordinates and momenta, as is clear from the fact, that it may take negative values. But of course this must not hinder the use of it in calculations as an auxiliary function which obeys many relations we would expect from such a probability”.

We point to [45] for a general discussion about generalised dynamical theories in phase space and why these types of representations are useful.

## VI. CONCLUSIONS

We have established a link between the mathematical representation of finite and infinite exchangeability in

classical probability and the mathematical model of indistinguishable bosons in QT. We have demonstrated the parallelism between approaches from two ‘independent’ research communities: probability theorists and quantum physicists. Both communities have developed related mathematical models, with similar structure and purpose, to tackle analogous problems, such as negative probabilities, symmetries and bounds with respect to the classical probability limit. They both have also obtained finite dimensional representations, via  $L, \widehat{L}, \widetilde{L}$  and  $\rho$ , for computing probabilities instead of relying on infinite dimensional objects such as the signed measure  $\nu$ .

We believe that what above points to a deeper and fundamental connection between the two areas. For instance, the representations in Propositions 2 and 3 can actually be seen as specific instances of representations in Generalised Probabilistic Theory [46–74]. Moreover, as already mentioned, the strong affinities between the two perspectives can help to clarify the definition of entanglement for indistinguishable particles.

## Appendix A: Proofs

### 1. Proof of Theorem 1

We will first prove the first statement.

About the trace, by exploiting linearity of  $\widehat{L}$ , note that

$$Tr(M) = \widehat{L}\left((\otimes_r \mathbf{x})^\dagger I (\otimes_r \mathbf{x})\right)$$

where  $I$  is the identity matrix. Remember that, by an abuse of notation, by  $c$  we denote the constant polynomial of value  $c$ . For  $g(\mathbf{x}, \mathbf{x}^\dagger) = (\otimes_r \mathbf{x})^\dagger I (\otimes_r \mathbf{x})$ , we have that  $g - c$  is equal to  $(1 - c)(\otimes_r \mathbf{x})^\dagger I (\otimes_r \mathbf{x})$ . This polynomial belongs to  $\mathcal{S}_r^+$  provided that the matrix  $(1 - c)I$  is PSD. Therefore,  $\sup c$ , such that  $(1 - c)I$  is PSD, is equal to  $c = 1$ . Similarly, we can consider the polynomial  $-g - c$ , with  $g$  as before, and note that  $\sup c$  is equal to  $-1$ . Therefore, we have shown that

$$\widehat{L}(g) \geq 1, \quad \widehat{L}(-g) = -\widehat{L}(g) \geq -1$$

which implies that  $\widehat{L}(g) = 1$ . For the proof about  $M$  being PSD, note that for any polynomial  $(\otimes_r \mathbf{x})^\dagger G (\otimes_r \mathbf{x})$  with  $G$  PSD, we have that  $\widehat{L}(g) \geq 0$ . This implies that  $Tr(GM) \geq 0$  for all PSD matrices  $G$ . From a well-known result in linear algebra this implies that  $M$  is PSD.

For the other direction, assume that  $M$  is not PSD, since

$$\widehat{L}(g) = \widehat{L}\left((\otimes_r \mathbf{x})^\dagger G (\otimes_r \mathbf{x})\right) = Tr(GM),$$

we can find a Hermitian matrix  $G$  such that  $Tr(GM) < 0$ , for instance when  $G = P_i$  that is the projector relative to the negative eigenvalue of  $M$ . This is a contradiction, because  $\sup c$  such that polynomial  $g - c =$



$(\otimes_r \mathbf{x})^\dagger (P_i - cI)(\otimes_r \mathbf{x})$  is in  $\mathcal{S}_r^+$  gives the value  $c = 0$ . Instead, we verified that  $\widehat{L}(g) = \text{Tr}(P_i M) < 0$ . We can similarly verify that, whenever  $M$  does not have trace one,  $M$  cannot satisfy (21). Note also that the set  $\mathcal{M}$  of matrices  $M$  which are PSD, with trace one and with same symmetries as  $(\otimes_r \mathbf{x})(\otimes_r \mathbf{x})^\dagger$ , is closed and convex.

For the second part of the theorem, we first notice that  $(\otimes_r \mathbf{x})^\dagger D(\otimes_r \mathbf{x}) = \mathbf{1}^\top D(\otimes_r \boldsymbol{\theta})$ , where  $\mathbf{1}$  is a column vector of ones of suitable dimension. From (12), this allows us to rewrite

$$P(t_1, \dots, t_r) = L(\theta_1^{n_1} \theta_2^{n_2} \dots \theta_5^{n_5} \theta_6^{n_6}) = L(\mathbf{1}^\top D(\otimes_r \boldsymbol{\theta})).$$

We will now prove that, for each fixed  $L$ , there exists one  $\widehat{L}$  such that  $L(\mathbf{1}^\top D(\otimes_r \boldsymbol{\theta})) = \widehat{L}((\otimes_r \mathbf{x})^\dagger D(\otimes_r \mathbf{x}))$  for each diagonal  $D$ . This shows that we can represent any finitely exchangeable  $P$  via  $\widehat{L}$  and that, moreover, the relative  $P$  is nonnegative and normalised.

The result is obtained by showing that, for any polynomial  $g(\otimes_r \boldsymbol{\theta}) = \mathbf{1}^\top D(\otimes_r \boldsymbol{\theta}) = g(\mathbf{x}, \mathbf{x}^\dagger) = (\otimes_r \mathbf{x})^\dagger D(\otimes_r \mathbf{x})$  with  $D$  diagonal, having defined

$$L(g) \geq \sup c_1 \text{ s.t. } g - c_1 \in \mathcal{B}_r^+, \quad (\text{A1})$$

and

$$\widehat{L}(g) \geq \sup c_2 \text{ s.t. } g - c_2 \in \mathcal{S}_r^+, \quad (\text{A2})$$

we have that  $c_1 = c_2$ .

This is immediate, because  $g - c_2 = (\otimes_r \mathbf{x})^\dagger (D - c_2 I)(\otimes_r \mathbf{x})$ . This polynomial is in the cone of  $\mathcal{S}_r^+$  when the coefficients  $\text{diag}(D - c_2 I)$  are all nonnegative. The same condition, being nonnegative, holds for the coefficients of the polynomial in  $\boldsymbol{\theta}$ . Note that, we can write any polynomial  $g(\otimes_r \boldsymbol{\theta})$  as  $\mathbf{1}^\top D(\otimes_r \boldsymbol{\theta})$ , where  $\mathbf{1}$  is the column vector of ones. Therefore,  $g - c_1 = \mathbf{1}^\top (D - c_1 I)(\otimes_r \boldsymbol{\theta})$ . Since  $\mathbf{1}^\top (D - c_1 I) = \text{diag}(D - c_1 I)$ , the polynomial  $g - c_1$  belongs to the cone  $\mathcal{B}_r^+$  whenever the coefficients  $\text{diag}(D - c_1 I)$  are all nonnegative, equivalently when  $D - c_1 I$  is PSD. Then the statement follows by convexity of the cones  $\mathcal{B}_r^+$ ,  $\mathcal{S}_r^+$  and Proposition 3.

## 2. Proof Theorem 2

In order to prove Theorem 2, we need to introduce some notation and state a lemma.

First, we recall some results from [75]. They will allow us to rewrite any density matrix of  $r$ -particles as  $\rho = \widetilde{L}((\mathbf{z}_1 \otimes \mathbf{z}_2 \otimes \dots \otimes \mathbf{z}_r)(\mathbf{z}_1 \otimes \mathbf{z}_2 \otimes \dots \otimes \mathbf{z}_r)^\dagger)$  where  $\mathbf{z}_i \in \mathbb{C}^n$  ( $n=2$  for a qubit) such that  $\mathbf{z}_i^\dagger \mathbf{z}_i = 1$ , where  $\widetilde{L}$  is a linear operator from the monomials represented by the elements of the matrix  $(\mathbf{z}_1 \otimes \mathbf{z}_2 \otimes \dots \otimes \mathbf{z}_r)(\mathbf{z}_1 \otimes \mathbf{z}_2 \otimes \dots \otimes \mathbf{z}_r)^\dagger$  to  $\mathbb{C}$ , such that the matrix  $\widetilde{L}((\mathbf{z}_1 \otimes \mathbf{z}_2 \otimes \dots \otimes \mathbf{z}_r)(\mathbf{z}_1 \otimes \mathbf{z}_2 \otimes \dots \otimes \mathbf{z}_r)^\dagger)$  is PSD and with trace one ( $\widetilde{L}$  preserves the constants).

We can equivalently rewrite the elements of  $\rho_{ij}$  as  $(y_{\alpha,\beta})_{\alpha,\beta} := (\widetilde{L}(\mathbf{z}^\alpha (\mathbf{z}^\dagger)^\beta))_{\alpha,\beta}$  where  $\mathbf{z} :=$

$[\mathbf{z}_1^\top, \mathbf{z}_2^\top, \dots, \mathbf{z}_r^\top]^\top$  and  $\alpha$  and  $\beta$  are a binary encoding of the indexes  $i$  and, respectively  $j$ . In particular, we have  $\alpha := [\alpha_1, \dots, \alpha_r]$  where  $\alpha_k$  is a vector in  $\mathbb{N}^n$  which has all zero entries except one element which is equal to one. The notation  $\mathbf{z}^\alpha$  must be interpreted as  $\prod_{i=1}^r \prod_{j=1}^n z_{ij}^{\alpha_{ij}}$ .

**Example 7.** For instance, for  $n = 2$  and  $r = 2$  (two particles), we have that  $\mathbf{z} := [z_{11}, z_{12}, z_{21}, z_{22}]^\top$ . We can then rewrite for instance  $\rho_{11}$  as  $\widetilde{L}(z_{11} z_{21} (z_{11} z_{21})^\dagger) = \widetilde{L}(\mathbf{z}^\alpha (\mathbf{z}^\dagger)^\beta) = \widetilde{L}(\mathbf{z}^{[1,0,1,0]} (\mathbf{z}^\dagger)^{[1,0,1,0]})$ , where  $\alpha = [\alpha_1, \alpha_2]$  with  $\alpha_1 = [1, 0]$  and  $\alpha_2 = [1, 0]$ , and  $\beta = \alpha$ . Note that, we have

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbf{z}^{[1,0,1,0]} &= z_{11}^1 z_{12}^0 z_{21}^1 z_{22}^0 = z_{11} z_{21} \\ (\mathbf{z}^\dagger)^{[1,0,1,0]} &= z_{11}^\dagger z_{21}^\dagger. \end{aligned}$$

Introducing the notation  $(y_{\alpha,\beta})_{\alpha,\beta} := (\widetilde{L}(\mathbf{z}^\alpha (\mathbf{z}^\dagger)^\beta))_{\alpha,\beta}$ , we have that the elements of the matrix  $\rho$ , for the example  $n = r = 2$ , can be denoted as follows:

$\rho =$

$$\begin{bmatrix} y_{[1,0,1,0],[1,0,1,0]} & y_{[1,0,1,0],[1,0,0,1]} & y_{[1,0,1,0],[0,1,1,0]} & y_{[1,0,1,0],[0,1,0,1]} \\ y_{[1,0,0,1],[1,0,1,0]} & y_{[1,0,0,1],[1,0,0,1]} & y_{[1,0,0,1],[0,1,1,0]} & y_{[1,0,0,1],[0,1,0,1]} \\ y_{[0,1,1,0],[1,0,1,0]} & y_{[0,1,1,0],[1,0,0,1]} & y_{[0,1,1,0],[0,1,1,0]} & y_{[0,1,1,0],[0,1,0,1]} \\ y_{[0,1,0,1],[1,0,1,0]} & y_{[0,1,0,1],[1,0,0,1]} & y_{[0,1,0,1],[0,1,1,0]} & y_{[0,1,0,1],[0,1,0,1]} \end{bmatrix}. \quad (\text{A3})$$

where  $y_{[1,0,1,0],[1,0,1,0]} = \widetilde{L}(z_{11} z_{21} (z_{11} z_{21})^\dagger)$  and so on.

If  $\rho$  is the density matrix of  $r$  indistinguishable bosons, then it has to satisfy the constraint  $\Pi \rho \Pi = \rho$ . We can then prove the following lemma.

**Lemma 1.** Let  $\rho_{\alpha,\beta} = \widetilde{L}(\mathbf{z}^\alpha (\mathbf{z}^\dagger)^\beta) = y_{\alpha,\beta}$ . If  $\rho$  satisfies  $\Pi \rho \Pi = \rho$  then for all the indexes  $\alpha, \beta$ , the elements  $\rho_{\alpha,\beta}$  have to satisfy the following constraints:

$$\begin{aligned} y_{[\alpha_1, \dots, \alpha_r], [\beta_1, \dots, \beta_r]} &= y_{[\alpha_1, \dots, \alpha_r], [\beta_{\pi(1)}, \dots, \beta_{\pi(r)}]} \\ &= y_{[\alpha_{\pi(1)}, \dots, \alpha_{\pi(r)}], [\beta_1, \dots, \beta_r]} = y_{[\alpha_{\pi(1)}, \dots, \alpha_{\pi(r)}], [\beta_{\pi(1)}, \dots, \beta_{\pi(r)}]} \end{aligned}$$

for any permutation  $\pi$  of the labels of the variables.

*Proof.* This follows from the following known property of the symmetriser:

$$\Pi P_\pi = P_\pi \Pi = \Pi$$

where  $P_\pi$  is any permutation matrix (defined by the permutation  $\pi$  of the labels) associated with the  $r$  particles. Given that  $\rho = \Pi \rho \Pi$ , this means that

$$P_\pi \rho = P_\pi \Pi \rho \Pi = \Pi \rho \Pi P_\pi = P_\pi \Pi \rho \Pi P_\pi = \Pi \rho \Pi = \rho.$$

Therefore, by linearity of  $\widetilde{L}$ , we have that

$$\begin{aligned} \rho &:= \widetilde{L}((\mathbf{z}_1 \otimes \mathbf{z}_2 \otimes \dots \otimes \mathbf{z}_r)(\mathbf{z}_1 \otimes \mathbf{z}_2 \otimes \dots \otimes \mathbf{z}_r)^\dagger) \\ &= P_\pi \widetilde{L}((\mathbf{z}_1 \otimes \mathbf{z}_2 \otimes \dots \otimes \mathbf{z}_r)(\mathbf{z}_1 \otimes \mathbf{z}_2 \otimes \dots \otimes \mathbf{z}_r)^\dagger) \\ &= \widetilde{L}(P_\pi (\mathbf{z}_1 \otimes \mathbf{z}_2 \otimes \dots \otimes \mathbf{z}_r)(\mathbf{z}_1 \otimes \mathbf{z}_2 \otimes \dots \otimes \mathbf{z}_r)^\dagger) \\ &= \widetilde{L}((\mathbf{z}_1 \otimes \mathbf{z}_2 \otimes \dots \otimes \mathbf{z}_r)(\mathbf{z}_1 \otimes \mathbf{z}_2 \otimes \dots \otimes \mathbf{z}_r)^\dagger P_\pi) \\ &= \widetilde{L}(P_\pi (\mathbf{z}_1 \otimes \mathbf{z}_2 \otimes \dots \otimes \mathbf{z}_r)(\mathbf{z}_1 \otimes \mathbf{z}_2 \otimes \dots \otimes \mathbf{z}_r)^\dagger P_\pi) \end{aligned}$$

for every  $P_\pi$ . Note that, the permutation matrix rearranges the  $\alpha$ -th element of the vector  $\mathbf{z}_1 \otimes \mathbf{z}_2 \otimes \cdots \otimes \mathbf{z}_r$  according to the following rule:

$$\begin{aligned} P_\pi(\mathbf{z}_1 \otimes \cdots \otimes \mathbf{z}_r)_{[\alpha_1, \dots, \alpha_r]} &= (\mathbf{z}_1 \otimes \cdots \otimes \mathbf{z}_r)_{[\alpha_{\pi(1)}, \dots, \alpha_{\pi(r)}]} \\ &= \mathbf{z}^{[\alpha_{\pi(1)}, \dots, \alpha_{\pi(r)}]} \end{aligned}$$

which ends the proof.  $\square$

For the example in (A3), the results of the above lemma implies for instance that

$$\begin{aligned} y_{[1,0,0,1],[1,0,0,1]} &= y_{[1,0,0,1],[0,1,1,0]} \\ &= y_{[0,1,1,0],[1,0,0,1]} = y_{[0,1,1,0],[0,1,1,0]}. \end{aligned}$$

We are now ready to prove Theorem 2. First we prove that  $\mathcal{S}_2 \subseteq \mathcal{S}_1$ . Note that

$$\Pi M \Pi = \widehat{L} \left( \Pi (\otimes_r \mathbf{x}) (\otimes_r \mathbf{x})^\dagger \Pi^\dagger \right) = \widehat{L} \left( (\otimes_r \mathbf{x}) (\otimes_r \mathbf{x})^\dagger \right) = M,$$

where we have exploited (22) to derive  $\Pi (\otimes_r \mathbf{x}) = \otimes_r \mathbf{x}$ . Note in fact that,  $\otimes_r \mathbf{x}$  is clearly symmetric to permutations, being the r-times tensor product of  $\mathbf{x}$ .

We will now prove that  $\mathcal{S}_1 \subseteq \mathcal{S}_2$ . This part is based on the same insight that motivates the second quantisation formalism in QT. We start from Lemma 1 and note that in

$$\begin{aligned} y_{[\alpha_1, \dots, \alpha_r], [\beta_1, \dots, \beta_r]} &= y_{[\alpha_1, \dots, \alpha_r], [\beta_{\pi(1)}, \dots, \beta_{\pi(r)}]} \\ &= y_{[\alpha_{\pi(1)}, \dots, \alpha_{\pi(r)}], [\beta_1, \dots, \beta_r]} = y_{[\alpha_{\pi(1)}, \dots, \alpha_{\pi(r)}], [\beta_{\pi(1)}, \dots, \beta_{\pi(r)}]} \end{aligned}$$

the permutation acts on the indexing vectors. Each  $\alpha_i$  is an indicator vector which denotes a component of the vector  $\mathbf{z}_i$  and the permutation simply swaps this indicator vectors. We now introduce the occupation number vector  $[k_1, k_2, \dots, k_n]$  which, for a given  $\alpha_1, \dots, \alpha_r$ , counts the number of variables  $\mathbf{z}_i$  that are in their state 1, state 2,  $\dots$ , or state  $n$ . All the vectors  $[\alpha_{\pi(1)}, \dots, \alpha_{\pi(r)}]$  have the same occupation number. For instance, for the previous example  $y_{[1,0,0,1],[1,0,0,1]} = y_{[1,0,0,1],[0,1,1,0]} = y_{[0,1,1,0],[1,0,0,1]} = y_{[0,1,1,0],[0,1,1,0]}$ . The occupation number for  $[1, 0, 0, 1]$  is  $[1, 1]$  because variable 1 is in state 1 and variable 2 in state 2.  $[0, 1, 1, 0]$  has the same occupation number. Therefore, we can write  $y_{[1,0,0,1],[1,0,0,1]} = y_{[1,0,0,1],[0,1,1,0]} = y_{[0,1,1,0],[1,0,0,1]} = y_{[0,1,1,0],[0,1,1,0]} \rightarrow y_{[k_1, k_2][k'_1, k'_2]}$  with  $k_1, k_2, k; k'_1, k'_2 = 1$ , where we used ' to denote the occupation number relative to  $\beta$ . The representation of  $y_{[1,0,1,0],[1,0,1,0]}$  using the occupation number as index is  $y_{[2,0],[2,0]}$ .

We conclude the proof by noticing that we can represent the elements of  $\widehat{L}((\otimes_r \mathbf{x})(\otimes_r \mathbf{x})^\dagger)$  as  $(\widehat{L}(\mathbf{x}^{\mathbf{k}}(\mathbf{x}^\dagger)^{\mathbf{k}'}))_{\mathbf{k}, \mathbf{k}'} = y_{\mathbf{k}, \mathbf{k}'}$ , where  $\mathbf{k} = [k_1, \dots, k_n]$  is such that each  $k_i \in \mathbb{N}$  denotes the degree of the i-th variable in the monomial. For instance,  $\widehat{L}(x_1 x_2 (x_1 x_2)^\dagger) = y_{[1,1],[1,1]}$  and  $\widehat{L}(x_1^2 (x_1^2)^\dagger) = y_{[2,0],[2,0]}$ .

- [1] P. Diaconis, Finite forms of de finetti's theorem on exchangeability, *Synthese* **36**, 271 (1977).
- [2] P. Diaconis and D. Freedman, Finite exchangeable sequences, *The Annals of Probability*, 745 (1980).
- [3] R. L. Hudson and G. R. Moody, Locally normal symmetric states and an analogue of de finetti's theorem, *Zeitschrift für Wahrscheinlichkeitstheorie und verwandte Gebiete* **33**, 343 (1976).
- [4] C. M. Caves, C. A. Fuchs, and R. Schack, Unknown quantum states: the quantum de finetti representation, *Journal of Mathematical Physics* **43**, 4537 (2002).
- [5] R. Renner, Symmetry of large physical systems implies independence of subsystems, *Nature Physics* **3**, 645 (2007).
- [6] M. Christandl, R. König, G. Mitchison, and R. Renner, One-and-a-half quantum de finetti theorems, *Communications in mathematical physics* **273**, 473 (2007).
- [7] R. König and R. Renner, A de finetti representation for finite symmetric quantum states, *Journal of Mathematical physics* **46**, 122108 (2005).
- [8] R. Koenig and G. Mitchison, A most compendious and facile quantum de finetti theorem, *Journal of Mathematical Physics* **50**, 012105 (2009).
- [9] R. Renner, Security of quantum key distribution, *International Journal of Quantum Information* **6**, 1 (2008).
- [10] F. G. Brandao, M. Piani, and P. Horodecki, Generic emergence of classical features in quantum darwinism, *Nature communications* **6**, 7908 (2015).
- [11] R. Renner and J. Wang, The black hole information puzzle and the quantum de finetti theorem, arXiv preprint arXiv:2110.14653 (2021).
- [12] De Finetti actually proved his theorem for the binary case, a coin. His result can easily be extended to the dice.
- [13] B. de Finetti, La prévision: ses lois logiques, ses sources subjectives, *Annales de l'Institut Henri Poincaré* **7**, 1 (1937).
- [14] B. De Finetti, Funzione caratteristica di un fenomeno aleatorio, in *Memorie della R. Accademia dei Lincei* **4** (1930) pp. 86–133.
- [15] P. Diaconis and D. Freedman, Finite exchangeable sequences, *The Annals of Probability* **8**, 745 (1980).
- [16] D. G. Kendall, *On finite and infinite sequences of exchangeable events.*, Tech. Rep. (Johns Hopkins univ Baltimore md dept of statistics, 1966).
- [17] B. de Finetti, Sulla proprietà conglomerativa delle probabilità subordinate, *Rendiconti del Reale Istituto Lombardo* **63**, 414 (1930).
- [18] C. Dellacherie and P.-A. Meyer, Probabilities and potential. b, volume 72 of north-holland mathematics studies (1982).
- [19] E. Jaynes, Some applications and extensions of the de finetti representation theorem, *Bayesian Inference and Decision Techniques with Applications: Essays in Honor of Bruno de Finetti*. North-Holland Publishers (1982).
- [20] G. J. Kerns and G. J. Székely, De Finetti's theorem for abstract finite exchangeable sequences, *Journal of Theoretical Probability* **19**, 589 (2006).
- [21] Gert de Cooman and Enrique Miranda, *Symmetry of models versus models of symmetry* (Probability and Inference: Essays in Honor of Henry E. Kyburg, Jr., eds. William Harper and Gregory Wheeler, pp. 67-149, King's College Publications, London, 2007).
- [22] G. De Cooman and E. Quaeghebeur, Exchangeability and sets of desirable gambles, *International Journal of Approximate Reasoning* **53**, 363 (2012).
- [23] A. Benavoli, A. Facchini, and M. Zaffalon, Bernstein's socks, polynomial-time provable coherence and entanglement, in *ISIPTA '19: Proceedings of the Eleventh International Symposium on Imprecise Probability: Theories and Applications*, PMLR, edited by J. D. Bock, C. de Campos, G. de Cooman, E. Quaeghebeur, and G. Wheeler (JMLR, 2019).
- [24] F. Benatti, R. Floreanini, F. Franchini, and U. Marzolino, Entanglement in indistinguishable particle systems, *Physics Reports* **878**, 1 (2020).
- [25] R. Paškauskas and L. You, Quantum correlations in two-boson wave functions, *Physical Review A* **64**, 042310 (2001).
- [26] K. Eckert, J. Schliemann, D. Bruß, and M. Lewenstein, Quantum correlations in systems of indistinguishable particles, *Annals of physics* **299**, 88 (2002).
- [27] X. Wang and B. C. Sanders, Canonical entanglement for two indistinguishable particles, *Journal of Physics A: Mathematical and General* **38**, L67 (2005).
- [28] D. Zhou, Correlation in quantum states of two identical particles, *Europhysics Letters* **88**, 10006 (2009).
- [29] M. Kuś and I. Bengtsson, "classical" quantum states, *Physical Review A* **80**, 022319 (2009).
- [30] M. Kotowski, M. Kotowski, and M. Kuś, Universal nonlinear entanglement witnesses, *Physical Review A* **81**, 062318 (2010).
- [31] J. Grabowski, M. Kuś, and G. Marmo, Segre maps and entanglement for multipartite systems of indistinguishable particles, *Journal of Physics A: Mathematical and Theoretical* **45**, 105301 (2012).
- [32] J. Grabowski, M. Kuś, and G. Marmo, Entanglement for multipartite systems of indistinguishable particles, *Journal of Physics A: Mathematical and Theoretical* **44**, 175302 (2011).
- [33] A. Sawicki, M. Oszmaniec, and M. Kuś, Critical sets of the total variance can detect all stochastic local operations and classical communication classes of multiparticle entanglement, *Physical Review A* **86**, 040304 (2012).
- [34] P. Hyllus, L. Pezzé, A. Smerzi, and G. Tóth, Entanglement and extreme spin squeezing for a fluctuating number of indistinguishable particles, *Physical Review A* **86**, 012337 (2012).
- [35] M. Oszmaniec and M. Kuś, Universal framework for entanglement detection, *Physical Review A* **88**, 052328 (2013).
- [36] T. Wasak, P. Szańkowski, P. Ziń, M. Trippenbach, and J. Chwedeńczuk, Cauchy-schwarz inequality and particle entanglement, *Physical Review A* **90**, 033616 (2014).
- [37] M. Oszmaniec and M. Kuś, Fraction of isospectral states exhibiting quantum correlations, *Physical Review A* **90**, 010302 (2014).
- [38] A. Sawicki, M. Oszmaniec, and M. Kuś, Convexity of momentum map, morse index, and quantum entanglement, *Reviews in Mathematical Physics* **26**, 1450004 (2014).
- [39] G. Rigolin, Entanglement, identical particles and the uncertainty principle, *Communications in Theoretical*

- Physics **66**, 201 (2016).
- [40] G. García-Calderón and R. Romo, Buildup of symmetrization entanglement for the nonescape probability of two identical particles, *Physical Review A* **96**, 062124 (2017).
- [41] M. Karczewski, S.-Y. Lee, J. Ryu, Z. Lasmar, D. Kaszlikowski, and P. Kurzyński, Sculpting out quantum correlations with bosonic subtraction, *Physical Review A* **100**, 033828 (2019).
- [42] B. Morris, B. Yadin, M. Fadel, T. Zibold, P. Treutlein, and G. Adesso, Entanglement between identical particles is a useful and consistent resource, *Physical Review X* **10**, 041012 (2020).
- [43] P. Kunkel, M. Prüfer, H. Strobel, D. Linnemann, A. Frölian, T. Gasenzer, M. Gärttner, and M. K. Oberthaler, Spatially distributed multipartite entanglement enables epr steering of atomic clouds, *Science* **360**, 413 (2018).
- [44] E. P. Wigner, On the quantum correction for thermodynamic equilibrium, Part I: Physical Chemistry. Part II: Solid State Physics , 110 (1997).
- [45] M. Plávala and M. Kleinmann, Generalized dynamical theories in phase space and the hydrogen atom, arXiv preprint arXiv:2212.12267 (2022).
- [46] G. Birkhoff and J. Von Neumann, The logic of quantum mechanics, *Annals of mathematics* , 823 (1936).
- [47] G. W. Mackey, *Mathematical foundations of quantum mechanics* (Courier Corporation, 2013).
- [48] J. M. Jauch and C. Piron, Can hidden variables be excluded in quantum mechanics, *Helv. Phys. Acta* **36**, 827 (1963).
- [49] L. Hardy, Foliabile operational structures for general probabilistic theories, *Deep Beauty: Understanding the Quantum World through Mathematical Innovation*; Halvorson, H., Ed , 409 (2011).
- [50] L. Hardy, Quantum theory from five reasonable axioms, arXiv preprint quant-ph/0101012 (2001).
- [51] J. Barrett, Information processing in generalized probabilistic theories, *Physical Review A* **75**, 032304 (2007).
- [52] G. Chiribella, G. M. D’Ariano, and P. Perinotti, Probabilistic theories with purification, *Physical Review A* **81**, 062348 (2010).
- [53] H. Barnum and A. Wilce, Information processing in convex operational theories, *Electronic Notes in Theoretical Computer Science* **270**, 3 (2011).
- [54] W. Van Dam, Implausible consequences of superstrong nonlocality, arXiv preprint quant-ph/0501159 (2005).
- [55] M. Pawłowski, T. Paterek, D. Kaszlikowski, V. Scarani, A. Winter, and M. Żukowski, Information causality as a physical principle, *Nature* **461**, 1101 (2009).
- [56] B. Dakic and C. Brukner, Quantum theory and beyond: Is entanglement special?, arXiv preprint arXiv:0911.0695 (2009).
- [57] C. A. Fuchs, Quantum mechanics as quantum information (and only a little more), arXiv preprint quant-ph/0205039 (2002).
- [58] G. Brassard, Is information the key?, *Nature Physics* **1**, 2 (2005).
- [59] M. P. Mueller and L. Masanes, Information-theoretic postulates for quantum theory, in *Quantum Theory: Informational Foundations and Foils* (Springer, 2016) pp. 139–170.
- [60] B. Coecke and R. W. Spekkens, Picturing classical and quantum bayesian inference, *Synthese* **186**, 651 (2012).
- [61] C. M. Caves, C. A. Fuchs, and R. Schack, Unknown quantum states: the quantum de Finetti representation, *Journal of Mathematical Physics* **43**, 4537 (2002).
- [62] D. Appleby, Facts, values and quanta, *Foundations of Physics* **35**, 627 (2005).
- [63] D. Appleby, Probabilities are single-case or nothing, *Optics and spectroscopy* **99**, 447 (2005).
- [64] C. G. Timpson, Quantum Bayesianism: a study, *Studies in History and Philosophy of Science Part B: Studies in History and Philosophy of Modern Physics* **39**, 579 (2008).
- [65] C. A. Fuchs and R. Schack, Quantum-Bayesian coherence, *Reviews of Modern Physics* **85**, 1693 (2013).
- [66] C. A. Fuchs and R. Schack, A quantum-bayesian route to quantum-state space, *Foundations of Physics* **41**, 345 (2011).
- [67] N. D. Mermin, Physics: Qbism puts the scientist back into science, *Nature* **507**, 421 (2014).
- [68] I. Pitowsky, Betting on the outcomes of measurements: a bayesian theory of quantum probability, *Studies in History and Philosophy of Science Part B: Studies in History and Philosophy of Modern Physics* **34**, 395 (2003).
- [69] I. Pitowsky, *Physical theory and its interpretation: Essays in honor of jeffrey bub* (Springer Netherlands, Dordrecht, 2006) Chap. Quantum Mechanics as a Theory of Probability, pp. 213–240.
- [70] A. Benavoli, A. Facchini, and M. Zaffalon, Quantum mechanics: The Bayesian theory generalized to the space of Hermitian matrices, *Physical Review A* **94**, 042106 (2016).
- [71] A. Benavoli, A. Facchini, and M. Zaffalon, A Gleason-type theorem for any dimension based on a gambling formulation of Quantum Mechanics, *Foundations of Physics* **47**, 991 (2017).
- [72] S. Popescu and D. Rohrlich, Causality and nonlocality as axioms for quantum mechanics, in *Causality and Locality in Modern Physics* (Springer, 1998) pp. 383–389.
- [73] M. Navascués and H. Wunderlich, A glance beyond the quantum model, in *Proceedings of the Royal Society of London A: Mathematical, Physical and Engineering Sciences*, Vol. 466 (The Royal Society, 2010) pp. 881–890.
- [74] M. Plávala, General probabilistic theories: An introduction, arXiv preprint arXiv:2103.07469 (2021).
- [75] A. Benavoli, A. Facchini, and M. Zaffalon, The weirdness theorem and the origin of quantum paradoxes, *Foundations of Physics* **51** (2021).