

Some consequences of Sica's approach to Bell's inequalities.

Alejandro A. Hnilo.

CEILAP, Centro de Investigaciones en Láseres y Aplicaciones, (CITEDEF-CONICET).

CITEDEF, J.B. de La Salle 4397, (1603) Villa Martelli, Argentina.

email: ahnilo@citedef.gob.ar

Abstract

Louis Sica derived Bell's inequalities from the simple hypothesis that the time series of outcomes observed in one station does not change if the setting in the other (distant) station is changed. This derivation is based on arithmetical properties only. It does not involve the controversial definitions of Locality and Realism, it does not require the definition of probabilities, and is valid for series of any length. Although it is not directly testable, Sica's approach puts a decisive criterion for computer codes aimed to explain the violation of Bell's inequalities without violating classical intuition. In this paper, the approach is extended to series with non ideal efficiency and to series recorded at different times. The first extension leads to an interesting relationship involving the entanglement parameter S_{CHSH} and efficiency, what puts the so-called "detection loophole" under a new light. The second extension makes visible that measuring with different settings unavoidably means recording series at different times, and leads to replace "Local Realism" (as the condition for the validity of Bell's inequalities), with the condition that the recorded series can always be arbitrarily reordered. At the end of the paper, promising lines for future research based on Sica's approach are proposed.

March 5th, 2024.

1. Introduction.

Bell's inequalities have been derived in different ways. The hypotheses involved in their derivation are also different. The best known ones can be gathered in two big groups: "Locality" and "Realism". Discussions on the precise definition, meaning and consequences of these hypotheses are the subject of myriads of papers. Nevertheless, there is a derivation of Bell's inequalities that is free from philosophical and mathematical ambiguities, from the definition of classical probabilities and from statistical limitations. This derivation is due to Louis Sica [1]. In this paper, I explore some new consequences of Sica's approach.




Figure 1: Sketch of a time-stamped Bell's experiment. The source S emits pairs of entangled photons that propagate towards stations A and B , which are separated by a (large) distance L . The "+1" (-1) in the tables means that detector "+1" (-1) fired during that time slot, "0" means that no detector fired. In this illustration, a coincidence (-,-) occurs at $t=00.00$, a (+,-) at $t=00.01$, a (+,+) at $t=00.04$. Single detections occur at $t=00.02$ (0,+), $t=00.03$ (-,0), etc. The rate coincidences/singles defines the efficiency η of the corresponding detector. F.ex., here the time series of detector $A+$ shows 3 singles and 2 coincidences, then $\eta^+_{A} = 2/3$.

2. Review of Sica's derivation of Bell's inequalities ($\eta=1$).

Let consider the setup in Figure 1 with ideal efficiency ($\eta = 1$) in all detectors. This means that all detections in one of the stations are time-coincident with some detection in the other station. The flux of incident particles is adjusted low (or the time slots sufficiently short), so that simultaneous detections in two detectors in the same station are zero. Let call a_i (a'_i) the time series of outcomes recorded in station A when the angle setting is α (α'), and the same for the time series b_i (b'_i) recorded in station B when the angle setting is β (β'). Let introduce the following assumption, that I call here *Sica's condition*:

- The time series $a_i, a'_i (b_i, b'_i)$ are the same regardless $B = \beta$ or β' ($A = \alpha$ or α').

which is at first sight intuitive, but involves a strong counterfactual assumption (see later). Assuming Sica's condition valid, it is possible to write down a table of series of outcomes as it is illustrated in Figure 2. Note that all the series are the same for both settings in the other station.

Time (i)	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	13	14	15	16
a_i	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
b_i	-	-	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	-	-	-	-	-	-
a'_i	-	-	-	-	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	-	-	-	-
b'_i	-	-	-	-	-	-	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	-	-

Figure 2: Table of a possible (although improbable) time series of $N=16$ outcomes recorded with ideal efficiency ($\eta = 1$), all single detections are also coincidences. The series a_i (a'_i) is made of the outcomes observed at station A when the angle setting is α (α'). The series b_i (b'_i) is made of the outcomes observed at station B when the angle setting is β (β'). As the table is fixed and fully determined, Sica's condition is valid. Note that $S_{\text{CHSH}} = 2$; $S_{\text{CHSH}} > 2$ is impossible in a table with $\eta = 1$ (see the text).

In the general case:

$$\left| \sum a_i b_i - \sum a_i b'_i \right| = \left| \sum a_i (b_i - b'_i) \right| \leq \sum |a_i| \cdot |b_i - b'_i| = \sum |b_i - b'_i| \quad (1)$$

where the sum goes from $i=1$ to N . Here, N is the number of time slots, the number of single detections and also the number of coincidences in the experimental run ($N = 16$ in Fig.2). Note that $a_i = +1$ or $-1 \forall i$. In the same way:

$$\left| \sum a'_i b_i + \sum a'_i b'_i \right| \leq \sum |b_i + b'_i| \quad (2)$$

summing up eqs.1 and 2:

$$\left| \sum a_i b_i - \sum a_i b'_i \right| + \left| \sum a'_i b_i + \sum a'_i b'_i \right| \leq \sum |b_i + b'_i| + \sum |b_i - b'_i| \quad (3)$$

For a given value of i , the first term in the rhs is 2 (0) if b_i and b'_i have the same (different) sign. The opposite occurs for the second term in the rhs, so that the rhs is 2 for all values of i . Hence:

$$(1/N) \cdot \left| \sum a_i b_i - \sum a_i b'_i \right| + (1/N) \cdot \left| \sum a'_i b_i + \sum a'_i b'_i \right| \equiv S_{\text{CHSH}} \leq 2 \quad (4)$$

which is the Clauser-Horne-Shimony and Holt inequality (CHSH). Compare with the usual derivation, which involves averages over a space of hidden variables [2].

Note that Sica's derivation involves observed (i.e., well defined) time series of outcomes, and arithmetical properties only. It is valid for series of any length. It is free of the discussions involving the definitions of "Locality" and "Realism", of the size of statistics or of the hypothesis of hidden variables. It does not require using probabilities either. Recall that defining classical probabilities presupposes a Boolean algebra, what is a logical inconsistency when dealing with the quantum realm [3].

On the other hand, Sica's condition is more restrictive than the usual requirement of Locality, which only means statistical independence: $P_{A=\alpha, B=\beta}(\alpha, \beta, \lambda) = P_{A=\alpha}(\alpha, \lambda) \cdot P_{B=\beta}(\beta, \lambda)$ (i.e., an equality on averaged frequencies). Sica's condition, instead, requires the identity of time series term by term. It may be depicted as the strongest form of non-contextuality. Besides, considering the series recorded in A when $B=\beta$ and (simultaneously) $B=\beta'$ involves a counterfactual situation, for it is impossible measuring two series with different settings at the same time (this problem is considered in Section 4). However, counterfactual results can be effectively explored in computer simulations, where the program can be run many times with identical values of the relevant variables (hidden or not). Sica's condition is then a criterion for computer programs aimed to explain "how Nature does it" [4] within the classical realm. A satisfactory classical code should be able to print sets of time series $\{a_i, a'_i, b_i, b'_i\}$ violating Bell's inequalities and holding to Sica's condition. As it is just demonstrated, this is impossible if $\eta=1$.

Before going on, let see how Sica's condition applies to the Clauser-Horne (CH) inequality. The CH setup uses only one detector per station, say the "+" ones (see Fig.1). The relevant terms in the CH inequality are:

$$J \equiv N_c(\alpha, \beta) + N_c(\alpha, \beta') + N_c(\alpha', \beta) - N_c(\alpha', \beta') - S(\alpha) - S(\beta) \quad (5)$$

where $N_c(i, j)$ is the number of "+, +" coincidences when the angle setting is $\{i, j\}$ and $S(\alpha)$ ($S(\beta)$) is the number of single detections in station A(B) with $A=\alpha$ ($B=\beta$). Then $a_i, b_i = 0$ or 1 only, and $S(\alpha) = \sum a_i$ ($S(\beta) = \sum b_i$) where the sum is over the total number of time slots in the run. Using Sica's condition, then:

$$J = \sum (a_i \cdot b_i + a_i \cdot b'_i + a'_i \cdot b_i - a'_i \cdot b'_i - a_i - b_i) \equiv \sum T_i \quad (6)$$

For an arbitrary term T_i in the sum: $T_i = a_i \cdot (b_i + b'_i) + a'_i \cdot (b_i - b'_i) - a_i - b_i$. If $a_i = 0$ and $a'_i = 1$, then $T_i = -b'_i \leq 0$ (recall $b'_i = 0$ or 1 now). If $a_i = a'_i = 0$, then $T_i = -b_i \leq 0$. If $a_i = 1$ and $a'_i = 0$, then $T_i = b'_i - 1 \leq 0$. Finally, if $a'_i = a_i = 1$ then $T_i = b_i - 1 \leq 0$. Therefore, $T_i \leq 0 \forall i \Rightarrow J \leq 0$, and the CH inequality is demonstrated from Sica's condition and arithmetical properties only. The usual derivation involves defining probabilities, the assumption of statistical independence, and proper integration over a space of hidden variables [2].

3. Case $\eta < 1$.

It was early recognized that a minimum value of efficiency is necessary to refute classical theories experimentally. Depending on the quantum state, the inequality and the alternative (classical) theory

involved, that minimum value ranges from $2/3$ [5] to $2(\sqrt{2}-1) \approx 0.83$ [6] or even $3-3/\sqrt{2} \approx 0.88$ [7]. This necessity is generally known as the “detection loophole”. After much effort, sophisticated experiments reached the required efficiency limit and confirmed the violation of Bell’s inequalities [8-13]. I have always considered the “detection loophole” a sort of hair-splitting argument. I concurred with J.S.Bell’s opinion that: “...it is hard for me to believe that QM works so nicely for inefficient practical set-ups and is yet going to fail badly when sufficient refinements are made” [14]. The results in this Section make me doubtful now.

If $\eta < 1$, some elements in the time series are zero. In Figure 3, just one element in each series (which are otherwise the same as in Fig.2) is chosen to be zero. Elements in series a_i that do not produce coincidences when correlated with series b_i are now free to produce coincidences when correlated with series b'_i . In Fig.3, $E(\alpha,\beta) = (6+5-2-1)/14 = 8/14$; the same holds for the other settings, and $S_{\text{CHSH}} = 32/14 \approx 2.29 > 2$, hence violating CHSH without violating Sica’s condition.

Time (i)	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	13	14	15	16
a_i	0	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
b_i	-	-	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	0	-	-	-	-	-
a'_i	-	-	-	-	0	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	-	-	-	-
b'_i	-	-	-	-	-	-	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	0	-

Figure 3: The outcome “0” means that no photon is detected in that time slot. There is only one “0” in each series, then $\eta = 14/15 < 1$. Some detections that are not coincidences in (f.ex.) a'_i series when correlated with b_i , become coincidences when correlated with b'_i . The series now violate CHSH without violating Sica’s condition, here $S_{\text{CHSH}} = 32/14 \approx 2.29 > 2$.

The question now is: what is the form of CHSH derived from Sica’s condition if $\eta < 1$? Consider eq.3, that now reads:

$$\left| \sum a_i b_i - \sum a_i b'_i \right| + \left| \sum a'_i b_i + \sum a'_i b'_i \right| \leq \sum |a_i| \cdot |(b_i - b'_i)| + \sum |a'_i| \cdot |(b_i + b'_i)| \quad (7)$$

where the sums are over the number of coincidences N_c (for, only terms with both factors different from zero add to the sum). For simplicity, N_c is assumed the same for all angle settings (besides, this feature is desirable in experiments). The lhs is then $N_c \cdot S_{\text{CHSH}}$. The rhs requires some analysis. Let define the following sets (note the bold typing) of elements of the time series:

α is the set made of the terms of a_i that are different from 0, i.e.: $\alpha \equiv \{i / a_i \neq 0\}$.

α' is the set made of the terms of a'_i that are different from 0, i.e.: $\alpha' \equiv \{i / a'_i \neq 0\}$.

β is the set made of the terms of b_i that are different from 0, i.e.: $\beta \equiv \{i / b_i \neq 0\}$.

β' is the set made of the terms of b'_i that are different from 0, i.e.: $\beta' \equiv \{i / b'_i \neq 0\}$.

Besides, let call **Bs** (**Bd**) the set made of the terms where b_i and b'_i have the same (different) sign. Note that $\mathbf{Bs} \cup \mathbf{Bd} = \beta \cap \beta'$.

The first term in the rhs of eq.7 can be different from zero only for $i \in \alpha \cap (\beta \cup \beta')$. In the same way, the second term can be different from zero only for $i \in \alpha' \cap (\beta \cup \beta')$. But $\alpha \cap (\beta \cup \beta') = (\alpha \cap \beta) \cup (\alpha \cap \beta') - \alpha \cap \beta \cap \beta'$ and the same for the second term and α' . The number of elements (or i -values) in the set $\alpha \cap \beta$ is, by definition, the total number of coincidences recorded when the setting is $A=\alpha$ and $B=\beta$, that is, $N_c(\alpha, \beta)$. The same applies to the sets $\alpha \cap \beta'$, $\alpha' \cap \beta$ and $\alpha' \cap \beta'$. The elements in the set $\alpha \cap \beta \cap \beta'$ are different from zero only if b_i and b'_i have different sign, that is, if they belong to **Bd**, in which case they sum twice (see eq.7). The same applies to the elements in the set $\alpha' \cap \beta \cap \beta'$ and the set **Bs**. Eq.7 then becomes:

$$N_c \cdot S_{\text{CHSH}} \leq N_c(\alpha, \beta) + N_c(\alpha, \beta') + N_c(\alpha', \beta) + N_c(\alpha', \beta') - 2 \cdot N_{\alpha \cap \beta \cap \beta' \cap \text{Bs}} - 2 \cdot N_{\alpha' \cap \beta \cap \beta' \cap \text{Bd}} \quad (8)$$

where $N_{\alpha \cap \beta \cap \beta' \cap \text{Bs}}$ (or $N_{\alpha' \cap \beta \cap \beta' \cap \text{Bd}}$) is the number of elements in the set $\alpha \cap \beta \cap \beta' \cap \text{Bs}$ (or $\alpha' \cap \beta \cap \beta' \cap \text{Bd}$).

The signs of the outcomes in station A and in station B are correlated depending on the angle setting, but there is no necessary correlation between the signs of outcomes recorded in the *same* station with different settings, say b_i and b'_i . Therefore, the number of elements in the set $\alpha \cap \text{Bs}$ and in $\alpha \cap \text{Bd}$ can be assumed to be nearly the same in long series (yet, be warned that in Fig.3 $N_{\alpha \cap \text{Bs}} = 6$ and $N_{\alpha \cap \text{Bd}} = 7$). We have already assumed that the total number of coincidences N_c is the same for all settings. Using these two assumptions, eq.8 simplifies to:

$$N_c \cdot S_{\text{CHSH}} \leq 4 \cdot N_c - N_{\alpha \cap \beta \cap \beta'} - N_{\alpha' \cap \beta \cap \beta'} \quad (9)$$

Let define now $\mu \equiv N_{\alpha \cap \beta \cap \beta'} / N_c$ and $\mu' \equiv N_{\alpha' \cap \beta \cap \beta'} / N_c$ and assume, as a further simplification, that $\mu = \mu'$, also presumably valid in long series. The task now is to find a relationship between efficiency η (assumed the same for all detectors and settings) and μ . A graphical representation is helpful.




Figure 4: The squares represent the set $\alpha \equiv \{i/a_i \neq 0\}$. The light gray areas represent the sets $\alpha \cap \beta$ (arrow from above) and $\alpha \cap \beta'$ (arrow from below); their size (as a fraction of the area of the whole square) measure the efficiency η , which is assumed equal for all settings. Left: if $\eta \leq 1/2$, $\alpha \cap \beta \cap \beta' = 0$. Right: if $\eta > 1/2$ the sets $\alpha \cap \beta$ and $\alpha \cap \beta'$ intersect (dark grey). This intersection measures the rate $N_{\alpha \cap \beta \cap \beta'} / N_{\text{singles}} = \mu \cdot \eta$, and is geometrically equal to $1 - 2 \cdot (1 - \eta)$, then eq.10 follows.

In the Figure 4, the set of α is represented by a square. The number of elements in the square is the number of single detections in station A (regardless the sign). The gray areas are the sets $\alpha \cap \beta$ and $\alpha \cap \beta'$ (which are of the same size, for η is assumed the same for all detectors and it is also assumed that $\mu = \mu'$), then $\eta = N_{\alpha \cap \beta} / N_{\alpha}$. It is visible that if $\eta \leq 1/2$ the set $\beta \cap \beta'$ is empty, and eq.9 becomes the tautology $S_{\text{CHSH}} \leq 4$. If $\eta > 1/2$ instead, $\beta \cap \beta' \neq \emptyset$ and:

$$\mu = (2 \cdot \eta - 1) / \eta \quad (10)$$

Replacing eq.10 into eq.9 using the definition of μ ($=\mu'$), this interesting expression is obtained:

$$S_{\text{CHSH}} \cdot \eta \leq 2 \quad (11)$$

which is valid only if $\eta > 1/2$, otherwise $S_{\text{CHSH}} \leq 4$ applies. Eq.11 has been derived before in the framework of specific hidden variables models [15]. Here, instead, eq.11 is derived from arithmetical relationships involving observable series of outcomes of any length, plus Sica's condition. No hidden variables or conspiratorial mechanisms are involved.


Regarding the CH inequality, the elements in the series are allowed to take the value "0" from start, thus violation of CH refutes Sica's condition regardless the value of η . Yet, the value of η does become important when considering the problem of observing that violation in practice. Assume the series recorded with $\eta=1$ do violate CH. In practice, $N_c(\alpha, \beta) = P^{++}(\alpha, \beta) \cdot N \cdot \eta^2$ and $S(\alpha) = P^+(\alpha) \cdot N \cdot \eta$, where $P^{++}(\alpha, \beta)$ and $P^+(\alpha)$ are the probabilities of detection predicted by QM. This implies that a minimum value of η must be reached in order to be able to observe the violation, even if the probabilities predicted by QM (which do violate CH) are exactly valid in the ideal case. Depending on the quantum state used and assumed loopholes, the different bounds on η mentioned at the beginning of this Section are obtained.

The Reader may have noted that the values in Fig.3 do not hold to eq.11: $S_{\text{CHSH}} \cdot \eta = (32/14) \cdot (14/15) = 32/15 \approx 2.13 > 2$. This is because (as it is warned), $N_{\alpha \cap \beta_s} = 6 \neq N_{\alpha \cap \beta_d} = 7$, and one of the assumptions leading to eq.9 fails. If eq.8 is used instead, then: $14 \times S_{\text{CHSH}} \leq 4 \times 14 - 2 \times 6 - 2 \times 6 = 32$ and it follows that $S_{\text{CHSH}} \cdot \eta < 32/14 \approx 2.29$, which does hold ($2.13 < 2.29$).

Note that the usual bound $S_{\text{CHSH}} \leq 2$ can be violated without violating Sica's condition as soon as $\eta < 1$. That is, in all real cases. This makes me think that the value of efficiency plays a role more fundamental than I had believed. The "detection loophole" may be not an artificial assumption after all, but a feature real time series of outcomes must have to violate CHSH. Some years ago, I concluded the performed experiments had settled the problem [16]. Now I feel that a second look to the "detection loophole" and related experiments may be advisable.

4. Measuring with different settings implies measuring at different times.

Actually, the tables in Figs.2 and 3 are both unreal. It is impossible measuring with different angle settings (say, $A=\alpha$ and $A=\alpha'$) at the same time slot. A typical *distribution* of measuring times during an experimental run is shown in the upper part of Figure 5. The table of actually recorded series as in Fig.2 is shown in the lower part. The empty boxes correspond to non-performed observations. F.ex: for time slots from $i= 17$ to 32 , the setting is $A=\alpha'$, so that there are *no outcomes* (neither +,-, or 0) for the series a_i between $i= 17$ and $i= 32$. Note that Sica's condition is not valid now. F.ex., the series a_i is a string of "+" when $B=\beta'$ ($i= 1$ to 8), but a string of "-" when $B=\beta$ ($i= 9$ to 16).



i	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	13	14	15	16	17	18	19	20	21	22	23	24	25	26	27	28	29	30	31	32	
a_i	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-																	
b_i									-	-	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	-	-	-	-	-	-									
a'_i																	-	-	-	-	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	-	-	-	-	
b'_i	-	-	-	-	-	-	+	+																	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	-	-

Figure 5: Up: Typical distribution of the total measurement time T among the different angle settings. F.ex: A is set equal to α for time between $t=0$ and $t=T/2$ (gray area in line "Alice"), B is set equal to β for time between $t= T/4$ and $t= 3T/4$ (black area in line "Bob"). Down: series of outcomes as in Fig.2, if measuring time is assigned as in the upper part of this Figure. The empty boxes correspond to non-performed observations. They can be filled only after assuming a "possible world" [17], meaning that information external to the experiment must be added.

One may think that Fig.2 can be retrieved from Fig.5 by *reordering* the recorded series. But this may be not always possible. For reasons of space and simplicity, let reduce the example to (balanced) factual series of length $N=4$, see Figure 6. Let suppose that $a_i = (-,+)$ is recorded for time slots $i= 1,2$ (i.e., when $B= \beta'$), and that $b'_i = (+,-)$ is simultaneously measured, so that $E(\alpha,\beta')= -1$. In order to hold to Sica's condition, a_i for $i=3,4$ (i.e., when $B= \beta$) must be also $(-,+)$. This does not necessarily occur in reality but it is possible to achieve it by reordering the elements of the actually recorded series a_i . Be aware that correlations between observed outcomes cannot change by reordering the series; if the series recorded in one station is reordered, the series in the other station must be reordered in the same way. Let suppose then that in $i=3,4$ b_i is simultaneously measured to be $(-,+)$, so that $E(\alpha,\beta)= 1$. In order to hold to Sica's condition, then b_i in $i=5,6$ must be reordered (if

necessary) to be $(-,+)$ too. Let suppose that a'_i is simultaneously measured to be $(-,+)$ in $i=5,6$ so that $E(\alpha',\beta)=1$. At $i=7,8$, a'_i is reordered (if necessary) to $(-,+)$ to fit Sica's condition. At this point, if b'_i is simultaneously measured to be $(-,+)$, then $E(\alpha',\beta')=1$ and $S_{CHSH} = 4$. But, in this case, we would get $b'_i = (+,-)$ for time slots $i= 1,2$ ($A= \alpha$) and $b'_i = (-,+)$ for time slots $i= 7,8$ ($A= \alpha'$), violating Sica's condition. There is no possibility of further reordering.

If we forced Sica's condition to hold, by imposing (f.ex.) b'_i to be $(-,+)$ in time slots $i= 1,2$ (in brackets, in red, see Fig.6) *without* simultaneously reordering a_i , then we would get $E(\alpha,\beta') = 1$ and $S_{CHSH} = 2$. But this would mean changing the measured correlation (between α and β'), which is something that legitimate reordering cannot do. Instead, if we simultaneously reordered a_i to keep $E(\alpha,\beta') = -1$, then all series would have to be reordered in cascade in order to hold to Sica's condition, and at the end we would arrive to $b'_i = (+,-)$ for time slots $i= 7,8$. As we forced $b'_i = (-,+)$ for slots $i= 1,2$, Sica's condition would be violated again (and we would get, once again, $S_{CHSH} = 4$).

<i>Time (i)</i>	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8
a_i	-	+	-	+				
b_i			-	+	-	+		
a'_i					-	+	-	+
b'_i	+ (-)	- (+)					-	+

Figure 6: Possible table of factual series of length $N=4$ (distribution of time as in the upper part of Fig.5). Sica's condition does not hold (see the series b'_i) and $S_{CHSH} = 4$.

On the other hand, if the observed correlations are such that arbitrary reordering the series is possible, then the table in Figure 7 can be drafted. Note that the value of N is halved with respect of Fig.6:

<i>Time (i)</i>	1	2	3	4
a_i	-	+	-	+
b_i	-	+	-	+
a'_i	-	+	-	+
b'_i	-	+	-	+

Figure 7: The data in Fig.6 when arbitrary reordering is possible. Here $S_{CHSH} = 2$.

In this case Sica's condition holds (as in Fig.2) and CHSH is valid. There are easily visible differences between Fig.6 (which corresponds to an actually recorded table of data) and Figure 7 (which is obtained after arbitrary reordering). Leaving aside the different series' lengths, there is no

reason the time series of outcomes b'_i in Fig.6 to be equal when measured in time slots $i = 1,2$ and in $i = 7,8$. A series rarely repeats itself identically at different times, and arbitrary reordering is not always possible (without altering physical results), as it is shown in this simple example. The difference between the series of outcomes b'_i when $i = 1,2$ ($A = \alpha$) and when $i = 7,8$ ($A = \alpha'$) does not need to be explained by a “spooky action at a distance”. The difference is explained simply because they are measured at different times. Hence, there is no evident reason for Sica’s condition to hold and to conclude that $S_{\text{CHSH}} \leq 2$. The situation may be described by saying that *time* plays here the role of the context [2]. This same reasoning applies to the CH inequality.

In conclusion: in Sica’s approach, the experimentally observed violation of Bell’s inequalities is explained by assuming that arbitrary reordering the time series is *not always* possible. In my opinion, this assumption is far more acceptable to intuition than giving up Locality or Realism in the usual derivation. Note that this conclusion is valid even if $\eta = 1$.

Summary.

The usual derivation of Bell’s inequalities using hidden variables and probabilities is replaced by considering the actual time series of outcomes, plus the condition that the series recorded in one station remains the same if the setting in the other station is changed. This condition suffices to derive Bell’s inequalities in the case of ideal efficiency. In the case of real efficiency, the interesting inequality eq.11 is derived. In my opinion, eq.11, which arises from pure arithmetical properties, puts new light on the meaning and importance of the so-called “detection loophole”.

Sica’s approach also makes easily visible the (often unnoticed) unavoidable limitation that measuring with different settings requires measuring at different times. This limitation implies that Bell’s inequalities are valid only if arbitrary time reordering of the series is assumed always possible. Giving up this assumption is (once again, in my opinion) far more acceptable to intuition than the usual alternative of giving up Locality or Realism. It is equivalent to accept a sort of “time contextuality”.

Sica’s approach opens the door to other interesting questions. The boxes filled with data in Fig.6 (which violate CHSH) form a “factual sub-table” of the whole, partially counterfactual table. Is it possible to fill the *empty* boxes in such a way that any arbitrary (but balanced among the different settings) sub-table also violates CHSH? The answer is negative, for it would mean providing a table of outcomes able to reproduce *all* predictions of QM for all settings. This would be in contradiction with Kochen-Specker and GHZ theorems. Yet, how many of these arbitrary sub-tables fail to violate CHSH? How does this number increase with the series length N ?

The motivation for these questions is the following: for GHZ states of $q=3$ qubits, it is easy to see that a simple classical model can reproduce all the QM predictions for the $2^3=8$ possible settings of observation *excepting one*. Therefore, in a GHZ experiment with $q=3$, the probability that a classical model fails to fit the QM predictions is $1/8$ (per detected trio of qubits). Contrarily to intuition, this probability decreases as q increases, what provides an elegant way to explain the classical limit as $q \rightarrow \infty$ [18]. Perhaps, something similar may occur with the series of outcomes in a Bell's experiment. If the *rate* of sub-tables that violate CHSH could be made (by appropriately filling the empty boxes) to increase with N then, in the limit $N \rightarrow \infty$, the violation of Bell's inequalities would have a classical explanation (for, the probability of arbitrarily picking out a sub-table that does not violate CHSH would tend to zero). This would depend of the "possible world" [17] that defines the empty boxes (the counterfactual outcomes), which is in a realm unavoidably beyond our experience. If this "perhaps" were true, the contradiction classical vs quantum would be proven to be undecidable, after all [19].

Another interesting problem is the combination of the two features discussed in this paper, that is, the case of a table with empty boxes and $\eta < 1$. It is worth saying that this problem is the closest to a real situation.

As it is just glimpsed, Sica's approach opens new and promising ways to explore the meaning and consequences of Bell's experiments.

Acknowledgements.

This work received support from grants N62909-18-1-2021 Office of Naval Research Global (USA), also from PIP 202200484CO and PUE 229-2018-0100018CO, both from CONICET (Argentina).

References.

- [1] L.Sica, "Bell's inequalities I: an explanation for their experimental violation", *Opt. Commun.* **170** p.55 (1999), and "Bell's inequalities II: Logical loophole in their interpretation", *ibid* p.61, see also: "The Bell inequalities: identifying what is testable and what is not", *arxiv:1903.02116*.
- [2] J.Clauser and A.Shimony, "Bell's theorem: experimental tests and implications", *Rep. Prog. Phys.* **41** p.1881 (1978).
- [3] S.Fortín *et al.*, "A logical approach to the Quantum-Classical transition", in *Quantum Worlds: Perspectives in the ontology of Quantum Mechanics*, O.Lombardi *et al.* Editors, Cambridge University Press, Cambridge 2019.
- [4] N. Gisin, "Quantum nonlocality: how does nature do it?", *Science* **326**, p.1357 (2009).
- [5] P.Eberhard, "Background level and counter efficiencies required for a loophole-free Einstein-Podolsky-Rosen experiment"; *Phys.Rev.A* **47** p.R747 (1993).
- [6] J.Clauser and M.Horne, "Experimental consequences of objective local theories", *Phys. Rev. D* **10** p.526 (1974).
- [7] J.Larsson and R.Gill; "Bell's inequality and the coincidence-time loophole"; *Europhys.Lett.* **67** p.707 (2004).
- [8] M.Giustina *et al.*, "Bell violation using entangled photons without the fair-sampling assumption", *Nature* **497** p.227 (2013).

- [9] B.Christensen *et al.*, “Detection-loophole-free test of quantum nonlocality, and applications”, *Phys.Rev.Lett* **111** 130406 (2013).
- [10] M.Giustina *et al.*, “A significant loophole-free test of Bell’s theorem with entangled photons”, *Phys.Rev.Lett.* **115**, 250401 (2015).
- [11] L.Shalm *et al.*, “A strong loophole-free test of Local realism”, *Phys.Rev.Lett.* **115**, 250402 (2015).
- [12] B.Hensen *et al.*, “Loophole-free Bell inequality violation using electron spins separated by 1.3 kilometres”, *Nature* **526** p.682 (2015).
- [13] W.Rosenfeld *et al.*, “Event-ready Bell-test using entangled atoms simultaneously closing detection and locality loopholes”, *arXiv:1611.04604*.
- [14] J.Bell, *Speakable and Unspeakable in Quantum Mechanics* (Cambridge University Press, Cambridge, 1987), p.139.
- [15] M.Agüero *et al.*, “Testing a hypothetical transient deviation from Quantum Mechanics: preliminary results”; *J.Opt.Soc.Am B* **40**(4) C28-C34 (2023).
- [16] A.Hnilo, “Consequences of recent loophole-free experiments on a relaxation of measurement independence”; *Phys.Rev.A* **95**, 022102 (2017).
- [17] B.d’Espagnat, “Nonseparability and the tentative descriptions of reality”, *Phys. Rep.* **110** p.201 (1984).
- [18] A.Hnilo, “Simple explanation of the classical limit”, *Found. Phys.* **49**(12) p.1365 (2019).
- [19] R.Gill, “Time, Finite Statistics, and Bell’s Fifth Position”, *arXiv:0301059*.